The Authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1

Michael W. Haslam

THE IMPORT of this article is that the verses which our mediaeval manuscripts give as Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1 are spurious. The plays originally commenced at verses 3 and 2 respectively.[1] The evidence is remarkably voluminous and no less remarkably unequivocal. It is disturbing to find that play-openings which appear never to have caused misgivings as to their authenticity are after all additions that deprave the Euripidean text. We cannot rely on always having a mass of external evidence to impel us to the truth.

I. Euripides, *Phoenissae*

The evidence for Soph. *El.* 1 follows as a corollary to that for Eur. *Phoen.* 1–2. First, therefore, the *Phoenissae*. Since it is external evidence that has unmasked the intruders, that evidence, embarrassingly copious as it is, will be presented first.[2] The paradosis gives us (vv.1–6):

> *Ὦ τὴν ἐν ἄστροις οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδὸν*
> *καὶ χρυσοκολλήτοισιν ἐμβεβὼς δίφροις*
> *Ἥλιε, θοαῖς ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσων φλόγα,*

[1] I wish to thank my colleagues and teachers at University College London, all of whom have helped in one way or another with the preparation of this article; especially Mr Alan Griffiths and Professor E. W. Handley, who were kind enough to read a draft, and above all Professor E. G. Turner, whose contribution extends far beyond what is apparent in the following pages. A shorter and preliminary version of this article was delivered as a paper at the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists, held in Oxford in July 1974, and is published in the Proceedings of that congress. A fresh piece of primary evidence has since accrued: the codex mentioned on p.156 *infra*.

[2] It is given in a rather more logical order than it originally presented itself to me. I had noticed the anomaly of the *Phoenissae* *ἀρχή* in *P.Oxy.* 2455 fr.17 (pp.150f *infra*) and had also seen Dr Hughes' thesis (p.156 *infra*); but it was only when I stumbled across the report of the Edfu ostrakon in *JJurPap* (pp.158f *infra*) that I recalled and connected them: then everything leapt into place.

ὡς δυστυχῆ Θήβαισι τῇ τότ' ἡμέρᾳ
ἀκτῖν' ἐφῆκας, Κάδμος ἡνίκ' ἦλθε γῆν
τήνδ', ἐκλιπὼν Φοίνισσαν ἐναλίαν χθόνα·

1. *External evidence, direct*

i. PAPYRUS HYPOTHESIS. *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2455 is from a papyrus roll of the second century which contained a collection of 'hypotheses' to the plays of Euripides, arranged in alphabetical order according to the initial letter of the play title. Each ὑπόθεσις is preceded by the play title and then by quotation of the ἀρχή, *i.e.* the first line of the play, presumably to serve as a check on identification. *P.Oxy.* 2455 is the most substantial ancient remnant of a corpus fragmentarily preserved in several other papyri,[3] and widely utilized, sometimes partially copied, by ancient mythographers.[4] The corpus eventually got dismembered, the hypotheses being prefixed to their respective plays: several of them appear in more or less mutilated form (and docked of the now superfluous ἀρχή) in mediaeval MSS of the plays. Zuntz, in discussing the main types of the Euripidean hypotheses, coined "Tales from Euripides" as a convenient title.[5]

In *P.Oxy.* 2455, *Phoenissae* follows the second *Phrixus*, at the end of fr.17 col.xx. The title and ἀρχή are reported as (289–90):

[3] Collected by C. Austin, *Nova fragmenta Euripidea* (Berlin 1968) 88ff. Now add: *ZPE* 4 (1969) 43f and 173 (*Syleus*), which belongs in fact to *P.Oxy.* 2455 (compare the *ZPE* plate); *ZPE* 4 (1969) 7–11 (*Auge*); *BICS* Suppl.32 (1974) (*Andromache* and *Alexander*: from the same roll as *P.Oxy.* 2457). Apparently there are more yet to come (E. G. Turner, *Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology* [Oslo 1958] 7). *P.Oxy.* XLII 3013 has the hypothesis of a *Tereus*, almost certainly Sophocles'.

[4] One hundred years ago Wilamowitz was writing about the underlying *argumentorum sylloga* (*Analecta Euripidea* [Berlin 1875] 183–84). Somehow, and through no fault of his own, the idea of a single corpus has been credited to Zuntz.

[5] G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955) ch.6. Zuntz suggests Εὐριπίδου Ἱστορίαι as the Greek title (p.136), but ἱστορίαι are different: one might write ἡ ἱστορία (Ἀλκηστίδος, say) ἐστὶ παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ, but that does not make it Euripides' ἱστορία. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 195, says that διήγησις would be a more appropriate term than ὑπόθεσις (though he does acknowledge that ὑπόθεσις "may have been used in Peripatetic circles for the plots of plays," p.193), but διηγήσεις are different again: the Callimachean *diegeses* abound in ὅτι's and φησίν's and contain things like ὁ ποιητής, τοῦτο γέγραπται, even ὑποτίθεται, while the *hypotheses* are self-contained summaries of the plot without any reference to the poet or to the structure of the play. The ancient terminology is not to be lightly set aside. *Cf.* n.21 *infra*.

Φ [ο ι] ν ι̣ ς̣ c α ι [ων αρ]χηι[6]
τ̣[.]ν̣ ϵ[.]..[ ]φ[[7]

The papyrus then breaks off. When I had suggested that the true reading of the beginning of the ἀρχή would be η̣λ̣ι̣ϵ (*i.e.* v.3), my colleague Dr W. E. H. Cockle observed that fr.19, the first two lines of which are reported as

] ων αρ[χηι
]νειδ̣ιc̣τ̣[

might in fact be combined with this part of fr.17. Professor Turner, Dr Cockle and myself have since had a look at the papyrus itself at the British Museum, and have been able to confirm the acceptability both of the original suggestion[8] and of the placing of fr.19, and the reading as it now stands is:

Φ[ο]ι̣ν̣ι̣c̣cαι̣ ων αρχηι
η̣[λ]ι̣ϵ [θοα]ι̣[c ιπποισι]ν ειλιcc̣[ων] φ[λογ]α̣[9]

The quoted ἀρχή obviously rests on scholarly authority. It would

[6] *i.e.* ὧν ἀρχή. ὧν / οὗ / ἧc ἀρχή(ι) is the regular formula; the only deviant is the *Auge* hypothesis published in *ZPE* 4 (1969) 7–11, which has ἧc ἡ ἀρχήι, with the article (*pace* the transcriptions: see the plate, Taf. III). On the οὗ (ἡ) ἀρχή formula in general see E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel* (Göteborg 1941) 38–49. (I take it that the notice of Stesichorus' two palinodes, Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* 193, should read not ἡ μὲν ἀρχή . . ., τῆc δέ . . ., but τῆc μὲν ἀρχή . . ., τῆc δέ . . .)

[7] The reading τ̣[.]ν̣ was evidently (and quite properly) influenced by expectation of the traditional verse 1.

[8] Except that there is no trace of the *labda*: η̣[λ]ι̣ϵ, not η̣λ̣ι̣ϵ.

[9] The placing of fr.19 makes two further contributions. (a) Fr.19 had been identified by the editor, on the strength of what now turns out to have been a misleading coincidence of letter sequence, as Eur. fr.922 N² τίc τοὐμὸν ὄνομα τοὐπονείδιcτον βροτοῖc. It so appears, under the heading *BOYCIPIC(?) CATYPOI*, in Austin, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 90. (This was impossible anyway, for the title would be Βούcιριc cατυρικός, which would of course be followed by οὗ ἀρχή: the papyrus has ὧν.) This supposed identification entailed removal of *Lamia* from the Euripidean corpus; it can now be reinstated. (b) Fr.19 has remains of five more lines, from the beginning of the *Phoenissae* hypothesis. Its lower part will abut, I think, a fragment identified by W. S. Barrett as having remains of the first three lines of the *Phoen.* hypothesis (wrongly located in the *P.Oxy.* publication at fr.17 col.xiii 172–74, first part) and should serve to aid the restoration attempted by him in the addendum to his article in *CQ* 15 (1965) 58–71. But fr.19 is in so deplorable a condition (I have inspected it under glass) that it is difficult to say more than that it appears not to be inconsistent with Barrett's reconstruction. A small modification I can make without reference to the new placement is that the scrap identified by Barrett has line-ends.

be good to discover what that authority is,[10] and I think we can. It is not the authority of Aristophanes of Byzantium, for the hypotheses compiled by him were altogether more erudite, in which the subject matter was a succinct single-sentence item, one out of several. Our hypotheses may be the product not of Alexandrian but of Peripatetic scholarship—and not of the frivolous activity of a degenerate Peripatetic like Satyrus, but of the conscientious and intelligent work of one of Aristotle's own pupils. Dicaearchus of Messene composed *ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων* (Sext.Emp. *Math.* 3.3), and Carlo Gallavotti[11] suggested that the papyrus hypotheses may be they. The suggestion (which had been damned in advance by Wilamowitz) has found little or no favour, and Gallavotti himself subsequently retracted it.[12] It seems to me to border on certainty.

There are three attestations of Dicaearchus' hypotheses.

(a) The least helpful is attached to the non-Aristophanic hypothesis of *Alcestis*. To the heading *Ὑπόθεσις Ἀλκηστίδος* in **L**, Triclinius added *Δικαιάρχου*.[13] Few will believe that a thing is so simply because Triclinius says it is so; but it would be foolish to reject on principle all and everything emanating from his lively hand. Zuntz argued that this *Alcestis* hypothesis does not belong to the same stock as the rest of the 'Tales' (*Political Plays*, 144f); if that is true, either Triclinius' notice is wrong, or Dicaearchus is not our man. We happen now to have remains of the papyrus hypothesis of *Alcestis*, in *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2457. It was considerably longer than the 'Dicaearchan' hypothesis in the mediaeval MSS, but the editor, E. G. Turner (who holds no brief for Dicaearchus), adduced similarities of phrasing to support a supposition

[10] Not only for present purposes. Much in the mythographers derives more or less directly from this corpus. Our picture of this whole area of ancient scholarship might become much clearer. Then there are details such as the authenticity of *Pirithous*, *Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes*, labelled as spurious in the *Vita* but present in the corpus of hypotheses (*Rhad.*: *PSI* 1286; *Tennes*: *P.Oxy.* 2455; *Pirith.*: hypothesis quoted by John Logothetes along with those of *Melanippe Sophe* and *Sthenoboea*, of the same type).

[11] C. Gallavotti, *RivFC* N.S. 11 (1933) 188.

[12] Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 184. Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 143–46, expressly rejects and opts for 1st century B.C. Gallavotti, *PSI* 1286 introd., had eventually followed Pohlenz forward into the imperial age. W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge 1964) 7f, gives an inconclusive discussion. Turner entertains the possibility of being forced back into the 2nd century B.C. (*P.Oxy.* 2457 introd., *cf. Greek Papyri, an Introduction* [Oxford / Princeton 1968] 101). No one has said anything since.

[13] A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 286.

that the 'Dicaearchan' hypothesis is an abbreviated version of the ancient one. If so, we are still thrown back on to the slippery authority of Triclinius until we find other grounds for supposing the papyrus hypothesis to be the work of Dicaearchus, but at least Zuntz' attempt to dissociate *Alcestis* from the bulk of the 'Tales' falls to the ground. It seems that it has been unusually severely abridged, that is all.[14]

(b) From Sextus Empiricus we learn not only that Dicaearchus composed *ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων*,[15] but that they were of just this type. The word *ὑπόθεσις*, says Sextus at the beginning of his treatise against the Geometers (*Math.* 3.3 = Dicaearch. fr.78 Wehrli), is used in all sorts of ways, *πολλαχῶς καὶ ἄλλως*. He picks out three meanings, the first of which he exemplifies by reference to the *ὑποθέσεις* of Dicaearchus; in this sense all it means is *ἡ τοῦ δράματος περιπέτεια*. The passage goes: *καθ' ἕνα μὲν τρόπον ἡ δραματικὴ περιπέτεια, καθὸ καὶ τραγικὴν καὶ κωμικὴν ὑπόθεσιν εἶναι λέγομεν καὶ Δικαιάρχου τινὰς ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων*,[16] *οὐκ ἄλλο τι καλοῦντες ὑπόθεσιν ἢ τὴν τοῦ δράματος περιπέτειαν. περιπέτεια* is reasonably taken in the context to mean something like 'plot', 'progression of incidents', a substantival 'how the drama falls out': a paraphrase, in fact, of *ὑπόθεσις* = *argumentum*.[17] And why, when he wants to give an example of dramatic hypotheses, does Sextus select Dicaearchus? This is strong evidence that the Euripidean hypotheses best known around the end of the first century were those of Dicaearchus.

(c) A simple but cardinal piece of information is incidentally conveyed by the remaining attestation. The remarkable 'hypothesis' to *Rhesus* in the mediaeval MSS, discussed at some length by Ritchie,[18] contains the following. *πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος* (Nauck: *δικαίαν* codd.) *ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως·*

νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἡ διφρήλατος.

[14] So also Austin, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 89: "idem argumentum, sed in breve coactum, exstat in codd."

[15] *μύθων*: *i.e.* of the plots of the individual plays. This is clear from the phrase *ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου* in the late *Rhesus* hypothesis mentioned under (c) below.

[16] *τινάς*, as its position shows, does not imply that the collection was incomplete (A. Tuilier, *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide* [Paris 1968] 43), but is tantamount to 'for example', 'say'.

[17] 'plot' Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 144 n.2. *περιπέτεια καὶ ὑπόθεσις* is how *περιοχή* is glossed by Photius and Hesychius and the *Suda* ("glossa sacra" Naber!—for *περιοχή* *cf.* the Livy *periochae* and Sellius' *περιοχαί* of Menander, and also Sulpicius Apollinaris' metrical *argumenta* to Terence, called *periochae* in the Bembine).

[18] *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 6–40.

καὶ ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος, κτλ. We already know that Dicaearchus composed hypotheses to Euripides' plays (*Rhesus* was in the Euripidean corpus); we now learn that *he quoted the first verse.*[19]

The papyri and the mythographers alike show that our Euripidean hypotheses enjoyed popularity—were standard, even—in the early centuries of the Empire: the dramatic hypotheses which came to Sextus Empiricus' mind, and which he expected his readers to be acquainted with, were the Euripidean and Sophoclean ones (in that order) of Dicaearchus.[20] This sets up a strong presumption, a presumption that is confirmed by the nature and format of our hypotheses. Ours are the only dramatic hypotheses, of whatever author, that both (a) quote the first verse and (b) consist exclusively of a summary of the plot:[21] the same is true of Dicaearchus'.[22]

Objections to the identification may be quickly disposed of.
(a) Some have imagined that Dicaearchus' hypotheses incorporated critical matter of some kind.[23] They did not: witness Sextus Empiricus.

[19] So did Callimachus in the *Pinakes*, apparently, and it has been assumed that the author of our hypotheses took over the practice from him (by Turner, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.3] 2 and *op.cit.* [*supra* n.12] 101f; Pfeiffer, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.5] 195; and by myself [*supra* n.1]). On the contrary. *Cf.* E. Nachmanson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 46f.

P.Oxy. XVIII 2192 (a letter of *ca* A.D. 170) 15–17 mentions λόγου ἐπιτομὰς τῶν Θερσαγόρου τῶν τραγικῶν μύθων (E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* [Oxford / Princeton 1971] no.68). Whatever the title of Thersagoras' work may have been ("*On the Myths of Tragedy*" suggested Turner, *JEA* 38 [1952] 91, and *op.cit.* [*supra* n.12] 87), it is not likely to have been a collection of hypotheses if it was epitomised (and if λόγου ἐπιτομαί is rightly taken to mean 'prose epitomes', the implication is that it was in verse!).

[20] Add *ex silentio*: no Aeschylean hypotheses of our type exist. A slightly mauled Sophoclean one we now have, almost certainly, in *P.Oxy.* XLII 3013. (*Cf.* Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.4] 183.) For the order Euripides-Sophocles (tacitly reversed by Wilamowitz, Lucas and others) *cf.* Heraclides of Pontus' περὶ τῶν παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ καὶ Σοφοκλεῖ and Duris of Samos' περὶ Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους.

[21] The Menander hypotheses, for example (*P.Oxy.* 1235 and 2534, *ZPE* 6 [1970] 5–7+*ZPE* 8 [1971] 136), are supplemented by didascalic and allied information and by a critical appreciation. They are doubtless post-Aristophanic. (Ascription to Sellius is plausible.) The 'hypothesis' properly so called is just the summary, exclusive of all other matter.

[22] If only *PSI* 1286 extended another inch or so leftwards the identification would be assured (or not), for we would know what verse was given as the *Rhesus* ἀρχή. We await another bit, whether of that or of the heading of Sophocles' *Ajax* (entitled Αἴαντος θάνατος by Dicaearchus, hypoth. *Aj.*).

[23] Zuntz (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.5] 143f) rightly demurred from this 'dogma', but it is still propagated: in *OCD*[2] *s.v.* HYPOTHESIS D. W. Lucas says of our hypotheses, "Since their date is probably of the first century B.C. they cannot be the same as those produced by Dicaearchus for Sophocles and Euripides (Sext.Emp. *Math.* 3.3), which appear to have contained also investigations into the origin of the poet's subject-matter"; *cf* Turner, *op.cit.* (*supra*

The confusion, insofar as it is still current, seems to have arisen from a notice in the *Medea* hypothesis (not of our type) citing Dicaearchus along with Aristotle as authority that *Medea* was 'lifted' from Neophron. But that testimony is expressly stated *ad loc.* to have been drawn from Dicaearchus' "Life of Greece," a different and more ambitious work altogether (frr.1, 47–66 Wehrli). Dicaearchus also wrote a treatise *περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων* (schol. Ar. *Av.* 1403, fr.75 Wehrli); it may be from there that our other titbits of his work in the field of tragedy were taken.[24] To be sure, Dicaearchus pursued literary researches, but his *ὑποθέσεις* were *argumenta* (preceded by quotation of the *ἀρχή*), nothing more.

(b) Zuntz maintained that a work of such an 'uninspired' kind must belong to a later era.[25] Since we know that Dicaearchus *did* undertake such a work, this argument is something of a non-starter. But it might be remarked that (as Ritchie notes) Heraclides of Pontus did not think it unworthy of him to compile *τὰ κεφάλαια Εὐριπίδῃ*;[26] and Aristotle's *διδασκαλίαι* had not depended on inspiration.

(c) The *ὑποθέσεις*, in their original form, are stylistically elegant compositions. As an example of early minor Peripatetica to set beside the *Characters* of Theophrastus, they are most welcome and merit study.[27] Accurate and judiciously balanced in content, limpid in expression, taut but unforced in composition, choice while correct in vocabulary, there is certainly nothing in them incompatible with what we know of Dicaearchus' style, nor, I suggest, with what we might imagine of it.[28]

---

n.3) 8; Ritchie, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 8, 30f; M. H. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* I (Leiden 1963) 345.

[24] Sophocles, not Aeschylus, introduced the third actor (*Vita Aesch.* 15: no mention of Aristotle!), and *Oedipus Tyrannus* was defeated by Philocles (hypoth. II *OT*; Dicaearchus surely cited as authority only for this, not for the intitulation); *cf.* schol. *ad* Eur. *Andr.* 1.

[25] *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 138–39, 146.

[26] Antiphanes fr.113.5 Kock. The identification is generally accepted (*cf.* F. R. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles VII* [Basle 1953] 61f). *κεφάλαια* presumably of the type of *e.g.* hypoth. I Soph. *Ant.*, *τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιόν ἐστι τάφος Πολυνείκους, Ἀντιγόνης ἀναίρεσις, θάνατος Αἵμονος, καὶ μόρος Εὐρυδίκης τῆς Αἵμονος μητρός* and (nicely demonstrating the relative paucity of incident) hypoth. III *OT*, *τὸ κεφάλαιον δὲ τοῦ δράματος γνῶσις τῶν ἰδίων κακῶν Οἰδιπόδου, πήρωσίς τε τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ δι' ἀγχόνης θάνατος Ἰοκάστης*. Dicaearchus gave them stylistic clothing.

[27] The *Characters* too used to be considered a product of the imperial age.

[28] What we know is virtually nothing. Cicero calls him *copiosus* (*De Off.* 2.5.16, fr.24 Wehrli). His style will be expected to conform to the precepts of Arist. *Rhet.* III (5 on *τὸ ἑλληνίζειν*). Barrett notes avoidance of hiatus in our hypotheses (*CQ* 15 [1965] 61 n.2, 62 n.1).

More could be said, but this is hardly the place. We may still wish it were Aristophanes' hypotheses we had, not Dicaearchus'; but that will only be because the later scholar incorporated Aristotle (*via* Callimachus).

A small reservation about the authority of the quoted ἀρχή of *Phoenissae* must now be entered. If our hypotheses are Dicaearchus', *P.Oxy.* 2455 has some 500 years behind it. There may be a chance that the originally quoted ἀρχή has been changed to bring it into line with the current text, if that had a different ἀρχή. This evidently did not happen with *Rhesus*, however, and in view of the independent transmission the risk of such contamination may be thought slight.

On the evidence of the hypothesis ἀρχή on the one hand, and the mediaeval MSS on the other, texts of *Phoenissae* current in antiquity might be expected to begin either at v.3 or at v.1. We are lucky enough to have two such texts with the beginning of the play. Each starts at verse 3.

ii. PAPYRUS TEXT. A fragment of a papyrus roll of the play, *P.Oxy.* inv. 21 3B.26/E(7–8)a, was edited by David Hughes in a University of London doctoral thesis of 1972, and I am very grateful to Dr Hughes and to the Egypt Exploration Society for allowing me to mention it here. The text is written on the back of a 'numerical calculation' (Hughes) in a hand which I would assign to the late first or early second century. What is left is the upper part of two successive columns: the line-ends of one, the line-beginnings of the next. The column tops are preserved, and the first line of the first column reads]ωνφλογα, v.3.

iii. ANOTHER PAPYRUS TEXT. A still more recent accession is another papyrus text of the play, an unpublished one with the Oxyrhynchus inventory number 50 4B.30/E(1). It is an early codex: more precisely, a conjugate pair of leaves that apparently constituted the first quire (*i.e.*, a *unio*) of a codex of *Phoenissae* (and other plays?) written in a hand of a type conventionally assigned to the late second or early third century. The first leaf has its outside page blank; the text starts on the inside page, and in the margin against the first line is the *nota personae* ϊοκ, Jocasta. The first line runs ηλιεθοαιcϊππoιcινειcωνφλογα (ειcων for ειλιccων, an insignificant slip): again v.3.

2. External evidence, indirect

There is more evidence yet. It is not entirely redundant, for it does

not all come from Egypt and is not all late. Most of it has been available for very much longer than the papyri, yet the obvious and proper conclusion was not drawn. In a sense, it is the papyri that are redundant. One item carries us back beyond Alexandria to Athens in the fourth century.

i. THEODECTAS. Some verses of the distinguished littérateur Theodectas, written probably a few years after the middle of the fourth century, have often been 'compared' with the opening of *Phoenissae*. They evidently come from the beginning of one of his tragedies.[29]

> Ὦ καλλιφεγγῆ λαμπάδ' εἰλίccων φλογὸc
> Ἥλιε, ποθεινὸν πᾶcιν ἀνθρώποιc cέλαc,
> εἶδέc τιν' ἄλλον πωποτ' εἰc οὕτω μέγαν
> ἐλθόντ' ἀγῶνα καὶ δυcέκφευκτον κρίcιν; κτλ.

The points of comparison are two. Both openings are apostrophes of the Sun; and λαμπάδ' εἰλίccων φλογός echoes εἰλίccων φλόγα. The phrasing is so close that it can hardly be doubted that the reminiscence is deliberate. It makes more sense if Theodectas knew the Euripidean line as the first verse of the play than if he knew it as the third. This is a form of argument I shall be using again, and I should state that it does not purport to preclude absolutely the possibility of acquaintance with vv.1–2. We may postulate either that the verses were known or that they were not. The question is, which is more plausible?

ii. ACCIUS. Euripides' play was exploited in a more thoroughgoing manner by Accius at Rome. Accius' *Phoenissae* began, like Euripides', with an apostrophe to the Sun by Jocasta:[30]

> *Sol, qui micantem candido curru atque equis*
> *flammam citatis fervido ardore explicas,*
> *quianam tam adverso augurio et inimico omine*
> *Thebis radiatum lumen ostentum tuum . . . ?*

Take the first two lines as an expanded version solely of Eur. *Phoen.* 3. Each word in the Greek has its Latin counterpart: Ἥλιε ~ *Sol*, θοαῖc ἵπποιcιν ~ *equis . . . citatis*, εἰλίccων ~ *qui . . . explicas*, φλόγα ~ *flammam*. This is not so much adaptation as word-for-word translation.[31] What is there left over? *micantem, candido curru atque*, and *fervido ardore*. It

[29] *TrGF* 72 F 10: "initium tragoediae videtur esse" Snell, as I expect others before him. It would be a reasonable guess even without *Phoenissae*, which practically guarantees it.

[30] 581–84 Ribbeck. There can be no doubt that this is the very beginning. It is quoted by two independent authorities, Apul. *Flor.* 10, and Priscian, *De metris fab.Ter.* 15, III 424 Keil.

[31] *ad verbum e Graecis expressa*, as Cicero put it (*De Fin.* 1.4).

would be unfair to call this mere padding, but it adds nothing to the intellectual substance. The only thing that might make for any doubt at all is *candido curru*. But is not 'with bright chariot' strangely anaemic as a rendering of 'mounted on gold-welded chariot'? and why does Accius' Sun fail to cleave his way among the stars?[32] I suggest that much as *micantem* amplifies *flammam*, without qualifying it in any very meaningful way, so does *candido curru atque* amplify *equis citatis*;[33] and *miCANtem CANdido* is achieved.[34] It is not a matter for great surprise if two independent expansions of 'Sun, rolling flame with swift horses' should each introduce a chariot. I submit that when asked to consider whether Accius' opening is more plausibly regarded as a version of Eur. *Phoen.* 1–3 or of 3 alone, no one will feel obliged to vacillate. If anyone should, let him look at the first word.

The implication, then, is that Accius, like Theodectas before him, knew the first verse of Euripides' *Phoenissae* as *Ἥλιε θοαῖς ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσων φλόγα*. Later antiquity is peppered with direct but isolated quotations of the verse, which, though less decisive than its mutations in Theodectas and Accius, point in the same direction and have a certain negative value as regards vv.1–2.

iii. GRAECO-EGYPTIAN HYMN. An ostrakon found at Edfu in 1938/9 has written on it some lines which were first published by G. Manteuffel

[32] Seeking to answer the latter question, F. Leo (*De tragoedia Romana observationes criticae* [Göttingen 1910] 1–5 = *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* I [Rome 1960] 191–93) adduced a scholium that has been thought to report a tradition that *Phoen.* 1–2 were criticized by Sophocles (see p.162 *infra*), and he inferred that Accius was subtly airing his scholarship. But if that were so, the last thing Accius would have done would be to retain the chariot, thereby giving his audience the impression (if, that is, they were as learned as Leo) that "primum . . . versum omisit, alterum contraxit": he would have studiously avoided *everything* in 1–2. Leo seems not to have considered that Accius might have had no knowledge of *Phoen.* 1–2, let alone the scholium. He and all other critics have proceeded from the unquestioned and unwarranted assumption that Accius had *Phoen.* 1–3 in front of him. Subsequent scholars have taken up Leo's line (I. Mariotti, *MusHelv* 22 [1965] 215; A. Traina, *Vortit barbare* [Rome 1970] 191–94), and Accius is now in danger of being thought as allusive a scholar-poet as Callimachus. There is no need to discuss Enn. *Med. init.* here.

[33] Similarly *ὡς δυστυχῆ* (Eur. *Phoen.* 4) is filled out to *tam adverso et inimico omine* (*cf.*, as adduced by Leo, the rendering of the single word *δυστυχῆ* in *ἄνδρα δυστυχῆ ἐξηγρίωσαν*, *Phoen.* 875, by *a fortuna opibusque omnibus desertum, abiectum, adflictum*; examples could be multiplied). Accius' *Bacchae* provides a trivial but fairly close parallel: *nam neque sat fingi neque dici potest | pro magnitate* (247 Ribbeck) renders *οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην μέγεθος ἐξειπεῖν* (*ὅσος καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ἔσται*), Eur. *Bacch.* 273f. The accession of *fingi neque* (*dici*) is comparable to that of *candido curru atque* (*equis*).

[34] Virg. *Aen.* 6.165 *accéndere cántu*, said to have been improvised in recitation, is an interesting similitude.

in 1949.[35] It is assigned a date towards the end of the Ptolemaic era. After a partly illegible heading, *νεαcοι . . . . διc* (*νέα coι μελῳδία*?), the verses run:[36]

ἔποc δ' ἐφώνηcεν τόδε·
cὸν τὸ κράτοc, βαcιλεῦ,
cὸν τὸ κράτοc, ἱέραξ.
Ἥλιε θοαῖc ἵπποιcιν ἠλίccων φλόγα,
Ἥλιε θοαῖc ἵπποιcιν ἠλίccων φλόγα.

Whatever we make of this strange and unsophisticated little farrago,[37] the closing refrain is more readily explicable if the verse was known as the first line of the tragedy than if it was known as the third.

iv. Aelius Aristides. The ostrakon is kept strange company by a passage from one of the curious *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* of Aelius Aristides, sophist and hypochondriac extraordinary of the mid-second century. In one of his dreams he found himself in the agora at Smyrna, in a *λαμπαδηφορία*; it was dawn, and they were all chanting *Ἥλιε θοαῖc ἵπποιcιν εἰλίccων φλόγα*.[38]

v, vi. Metricians. The second-century metrician Hephaestion had taught that there were four disyllabic feet (by permutation: ∪–, –∪, – – and ∪∪) and eight trisyllabic.[39] His successors seized on this computational method of metrical analysis, and schematized gloriously. Pentasyllables were 32 in number, and were analysable either as

[35] *JJurPap* 3 (1949) 102–03, subsequently as *O.Edf.* 326 in *Tell Edfou 1939, Fouilles franco-polonaises* III (1950) 331–32 with pl. L.

[36] 3,4 *cvv ostr., post corr. in* 4 (*ita ed.: potius ante corr.*?).

[37] The editor suggested it might be a hymn to Horus-Helios sung by school-children—a Graeco-Egyptian "All things bright and beautiful." His metrical analysis of 3 is choriamb+ anapaest, of 4 dochmiac: both lines are in fact hemiepe, –∪∪–∪∪–. We have just the simplest iambic and dactylic measures here.

[38] *Or.* 47.22 (Keil, 1.22 Dindorf) *πάντεc ἐλαμπαδηφόρουν οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ τὸ Εὐριπίδειον τοῦτο ἔλεγον· Ἥλιε θοαῖc ἵπποιcιν εἰλίccων φλόγα· καὶ γὰρ ἅμα ἡλίου ἀνατολῇ ἐδόκουν εἰcελθεῖν.* (For *λαμπαδηδρομίαι* see J. G. Frazer on Paus. 1.30.2, Ed. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Agam.* 314.) Dindorf in his apparatus (I p.451) identifies the verse thus: "est initium Phoenissarum." This form of words might suggest that Dindorf rejected vv.1–2, were it not for the ridicule he later poured on the Euripidean scholium lending support to such a rejection (p.162 below).

[39] Choeroboscus in Heph. 3, p.212 Consbr.: *εἰcὶν οὖν διcύλλαβοι τῶν ἁπλῶν πόδεc τέccαρεc. εἶτα κατὰ ἀναδιπλαciαcμὸν τριcύλλαβοι ὀκτώ, ὡc ὁ τεχνικόc* (i.e. Heph.) *φηcιν. πάλιν κατὰ ἀναδιπλαciαcμὸν κτλ.* Apparently Hephaestion balked at more than trisyllabic feet. The matter was evidently already controversial in the time of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: he tersely ends ch.17 of *De Compositione Verborum*, *ἁπλοῦc δὲ ῥυθμὸc ἢ πουὺc οὔτ' ἐλάττων δύο cυλλαβῶν οὔτε μείζων τριῶν· καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι δεῖ τὰ πλείω λέγειν.*

disyllable+ trisyllable or as trisyllable+ disyllable.[40] One example is given, and that example is *Ἥλιε θοαῖς*. Analysed as –⏑⏑∪– it is iambic, as –∪⏑⏑– (!), trochaic. We cannot be sure when this specific illustration originated, but it may have been in the second century.[41] Since the iambic/trochaic ambivalence selected for demonstration obtains only in a pentasyllable of the shape –∪∪∪–, it is not safe to infer that the *Ἥλιε* line was known as v.3 but as v.1; but if it *was* known as v.1, its adoption for illustrative purposes is that much more comprehensible. Grammarians' predilections for first lines are notorious: metricians share them equally.

There is another citation in a metrical context, slightly more interesting. One of the more respectable parts of the mish-mash known conglomerately as the Scholia B to Hephaestion, the so-called third book (Hoerschelmann: see pp.xiv f Consbruch), begins with a section *περὶ ἰαμβικοῦ* (pp.266–69 Consbr.). It lists iambic lines in order of length, from the 'monometer brachycatalectic' (*φεῦ φεῦ*: very apt) to the full pentameter (*πάτερ Λυκάμβα κτλ.*, Archil. 172.1–2 West). The example of the 'dimeter brachycatalectic' is *Ἥλιε θοαῖς ἵπποις* (*sic*). Evidently the only way an example of the required length could be obtained was by the Procrustean expedient of cutting a trimeter down to size. The question is, why this particular trimeter? Caesuraless verses must have been known (perhaps even collected), which would have submitted to dimidiation without requiring the docking of the horses' tail. And *Ἥλιε θοαῖς* is hardly a regular iambic metron. The verse was just the first to come to mind that lent itself to the required modification.

Both these metrical instances provide no more than arguable evidence of the actual *initium*. Negatively, they fail to give any indication that vv.1–2 were known. The same may be said of the remaining three attestations.[42]

vii. MACROBIUS. Macrobius devotes no small part of the first book of

[40] Anon. *Περὶ μέτρων καὶ ποδῶν* §3, p.357f Consbr. (*cf.* xxvii f) and Schol. B Heph. Bk. 5, p.296f Consbr. (*cf.* xv). The latter has escaped the index.

[41] We shall hesitate to attribute it to Hephaestion himself (*cf.* n.39 above), but it probably antedates the dispute as to whether the grand total was 124 (4+8+16+32+64) or 144 (12 × 12), and we know that to be second century, for the latter sum was favoured by Longinus (Choerob. 3, p.212.25 Consbr.).

[42] I do not know if I have caught all the attestations. There is a great need for a collection of citations, such as has been attempted for *Orestes* by V. di Benedetto in his edition (Florence 1965) xx–xxv.

his *Saturnalia*[43] to the *ἐπικλήϲειϲ* of Apollo. One of them, he says, is *Ἐλελεύϲ* (*Sat.* 1.17.46): *Apollo Ἐλελεὺϲ appellatur ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑλίττεϲθαι περὶ τῆν γῆν, quod aeterno circa terram meatu veluti volvi videtur ut ait Euripides: Ἥλιε θοαῖϲ ἵπποιϲιν εἰλίϲϲων φλόγα.*[44]

viii. STOBAEUS. Stobaeus, on the nature of the sun (1.25.6, 1.214 Wachsmuth), reports that for Euripides the sun is fire. *λέγει γοῦν ἐν Φοινίϲϲαιϲ* introduces quotation of *Phoen.* 3. Stobaeus' source is not known.

ix. ACHILLES GRAMMATICUS. Apropos the sphericality of the sky, the Isagoge to Aratus' *Phaenomena*, ascribed to the grammarian Achilles and dated by E. Maass to the third century, quotes without attribution *Phoen.* 3.[45] Achilles draws *via* Eudorus on the first-century B.C. Alexandrian Diodorus,[46] but we cannot tell at what stage the *Phoenissae* quote got in.

I find one passage that might be held to indicate acquaintance with vv.1–2 in antiquity. Julian the Apostate, eulogizing the emperor Constantine whom he was shortly to march against, refers to gold-inlaid chariots, *χρυϲοκόλλητα ἅρματα* (*Or.* 2.50d). The sentence is too long to quote in its entirety: let us pick it up where it eventually reaches the main verb. *αἰϲχυνοίμην, εἰ μὴ τοῦ Πηλέωϲ φαινοίμην εὐγνωμονέϲτεροϲ καὶ ἐπαινοίην εἰϲ δύναμιν τὰ προϲόντα ϲοι, οὔτι φημὶ χρυϲὸν καὶ ἀλουργῆ χλαῖναν, οὐδὲ μὰ Δία πέπλουϲ παμποικίλουϲ, γυναικῶν ἔργα Ϲιδωνίων, οὐδὲ ἵππων Νιϲαίων κάλλη καὶ χρυϲοκολλήτων ἁρμάτων ἀϲτράπτουϲαν αἴγλην, οὐδὲ τὴν Ἰνδῶν λίθον εὐανθῆ καὶ χαρίεϲϲαν.* Homer-imbued as the oration is, the reference to Peleus is followed up by a citation from the *Iliad*, *πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν | Ϲιδονίων* (6.289f). Then come the Nisaean horses and the gold-inlaid chariots. The allusion here is to Xerxes' departure from Sardis for Greece as described by Herodotus (7.40.1). Xerxes' chariot is drawn by Nisaean horses, but is not stated to be inlaid with gold; golden apples and

[43] The *Saturnalia* is dated "not very long after 431" by Alan Cameron, *JRS* 56 (1966) 24–38.

[44] *Ἐλελεύϲ* evidently a back-formation from the cry *ἐλελεῦ*. *ἐλελεῦ* is something like *παιάν*, apparently: *ἐλελεῦ*, *ἐλελελεῦ*, and *ἐλελίζειν* are found in contexts both of lamentation (Aesch. *PV* 877, Eur. *Phoen.* 1514, *Hel.* 1111, Ar. *Av.* 213) and of war or war-preliminaries (Achaeus fr.37, Ar. *Av.* 364, Xen. *Anab.* 1.8.18). *Cf.* the ancient commentators, *e.g.* at Hesych. *s.v.*: *ἐπιφώνημα πολεμικόν· οἱ δὲ προαναφώνηϲιϲ παιανιϲμοῦ*. The crowd shouted *Ἐλελεῦ ἰού ἰού* at the Athenian *oschophoria* (Plut. *Thes.* 22, *q.v.* for origin of cry); it may be this that led to an association with Dionysus (Ov. *Met.* 5.14). Did Macrobius' derivation go *via* *ἐλελίζειν* (the *other* *ἐλελίζειν*, which started life as *Ϝελίξαι*)?

[45] Achilles ch.6, in *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae*, ed. E. Maass (Berlin 1898, repr. 1958) 37.

[46] Achilles ch.2 (Maass, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.45] 30); *cf.* Diels, *Dox.Graec.* 17–22.

pomegranates are the only gold in the vicinity. Does χρυσοκολλήτων come from *Phoenissae*, then? I am inclined to think it does not. Julian's allusions to drama are few, usually if not always second-hand. ἀστράπτουσαν αἴγλην carries no Euripidean allusion; ἁρμάτων is not δίφρων. χρυσοκόλλητος is a fine-sounding word eminently fit for a splendid chariot, be it the Great King's or the Sun's, and it is quite possible that the author of *Phoen.* 1–2 and Julian thought of it independently. There is nothing exclusively poetic about the word. It is found in *Rhesus* and in Antiphanes (see n.83 *infra*), but also in Lucian (31.29) and later prose writers (see H. Stephanus, *TGL s.v.* χρυσόκολλος). Compounds of -κόλλητος are readily coined and are more common in prose than in verse.

3. *Evidence of scholia*

One testimonium remains. One of the 'old' (*i.e.* pre-mediaeval) scholia on *Phoen.* 1–2 runs as follows: παλαιά τις φέρεται δόξα ὡς Σοφοκλῆς μὲν ἐπιτιμήσειεν Εὐριπίδῃ ὅτι μὴ προέταξε τούτους τοὺς δύο στίχους, ὁ δὲ Εὐριπίδης ὅτι μὴ προέταξεν ἐν Ἠλέκτρᾳ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς τὸ 'Ὦ τοῦ στρατηγήσαντος ἐν Τροίᾳ ποτε' (Soph. *El.* 1). "An ancient tradition is reported that Sophocles reproached Euripides for failing to prefix these two verses, and that Euripides in turn reproached Sophocles for failing to prefix, in the *Electra*, Ὦ τοῦ στρατηγήσαντος ἐν Τροίᾳ ποτε." Not everything is perspicuous here, but all we need observe for the present is that the premise of the δόξα is that *Phoenissae* was originally without verses 1–2—and that Sophocles' *Electra* was originally without verse 1. Unfortunately this premise has been editorially reversed. "Vulgatis, si μή abiiciatur, sensus inerit commodus," commented Valckenaer: an observation true in itself, but misguided in intent. To alter a scholium to bring it into line with the transmitted tradition is always a dangerous procedure. But ever since, the two μή's have been deleted.[47] Their removal proceeded from an assumption that *Phoen.* 1–2 and Soph. *El.* 1 were genuine[48]—an assumption that can no longer be happily made.

[47] I have not counted the number of references to the scholium that I have come across, but they all cite it in its perverted form. Of the scholia editors, Dindorf relegates the μή's to the apparatus (and calls the story *inane*), Schwartz more circumspectly puts them in square brackets. "Non Sophocli ex scholiis, sed scholiis ex Sophocle medela est afferenda" was G. Wolff's dictum (*ap.* Dindorf, *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Septem* II [Oxford 1852] lii).

[48] It did not proceed from a concern for good Greek, for ἐπιτιμήσειεν has been left untouched; in any case μή should not shock anybody. Rather μή might be taken, with caution,

The opening of Sophocles' *Electra* has now been brought into the inquiry: see pp.166–68 below. For the moment, let us merely restore the scholium to its received form and enter it as a testimony calling into question the authenticity of *Phoen.* 1–2 and Soph. *El.* 1.

More straightforward, and manifesting no doubt about the verses, is another 'old' scholium on *Phoen.* 1 (*ὦ διοδεύων . . .*), which backs up a jejune paraphrase (by no means all such are Byzantine) with a quotation from Aratus illustrating *ἄστρον* in the meaning of zodiacal constellation. The remainder of the scholia are of no evidential value.[49]

The scholia (and dubiously Julian) apart, the earliest reference I find to *Phoen.* 1–2 is mediaeval, lurking in Eustathius' prodigious commentary on the *Iliad.* Commenting on *Il.* 4.75, *οἷον δ' ἀστέρα ἧκε Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω*, Eustathius makes the standard distinction between *ἀστήρ* (a single star) and *ἄστρον* (a constellation), and he exemplifies it by quoting, in *oratio obliqua*, *Phoen.* 1: *διὸ καὶ Εὐριπίδης τὸν Ἥλιον τὴν ἐν ἄστροις οὐρανοῦ τέμνειν ἕφη ὁδόν, τὴν διὰ τῶν ζωδίων οὕτω κίνησιν φράζων, ὧν ἕκαστον ἐκ διαφόρων ἄστρων καὶ ἀστρίων διεζωγράφηται* (*Comm. ad Il.* 446.47–447.1, I 705.8–10 van der Valk). In not naming the play but merely making the attribution to Euripides he follows what is his customary practice when referring to better known plays. The distinction between *ἄστρον* and *ἀστήρ* is inherited, and so is the exegesis of *Phoen.* 1, but it could well be that Eustathius, enormously well read in Euripides as he was,[50] added the *Phoenissae* citation on his own account. If Eustathius entertained any doubts about the authenticity of the line, he conceals them.

4. *Internal evidence*

To argue now on internal grounds that *Phoen.* 1–2 are spurious may seem a piece of supererogation. However: (i) no amount of external

as indicative of a date in the early empire: *cf.* Kühner-Gerth II §511.3c, Mayser, *Griechische Grammatik* II ii 551, 562. Lucian, *Hist.conscr.* 26, is a close parallel: *τοῦτο δὲ μάλιστα ἠτιασάμην, ὅτι μὴ τὸν συγγραφέα . . . προαποσφάξας ἀπέθανε.* As for *ἐπιτιμήσειεν*, it is presumably not in quasi-historic sequence (like *e.g.* Xen. *Cyn.* 8.2.14 *λόγος . . . ἀπομνημονεύεται, ὡς λέγοι κτλ.*) but a preciosity.

[49] The one beginning *ἔθος ἔχουσιν οἱ τραγικοί*, though marked as belonging to v.1, could equally well have been comment originally on v.3. Another, beginning *ἐπεὶ κυκλότερος ὁ οὐρανός*, clearly *is* meant to apply to v.3. Everything else is Byzantine.

[50] H. W. Miller, *AJP* 61 (1940) 422–28, collects a formidable list of citations. On Eustathius knowledge of the non-select plays (were it not for which we would not have them) see A. Pertusi, *Dioniso* 20 (1957) 21 and n.18, and R. Browning, *BICS* 7 (1960) 15.

evidence will ever prove a given verse spurious (nor, let it be said, genuine)—not that I would happily construct a process of transmission whereby *Phoen.* 1–2 are genuine; and (ii) we have the opportunity of comparing the true opening with the one that was so successfully grafted on to it. But in proceeding to impugn the verses I am reminded of the case of Aeschylus' *Supplices*. It is difficult today, now that documentary evidence has shown *Supplices* not to be our earliest extant tragedy, to find a scholar who would believe, even were it not for that evidence, that it is. It seems so obvious, now, that *Phoenissae* starts at verse 3.

Here are the opening verses again, with 1–2 bracketed as a temporary compromise.

> [Ὦ τὴν ἐν ἄστροις οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδὸν
> καὶ χρυσοκολλήτοισιν ἐμβεβὼς δίφροις]
> Ἥλιε θοαῖς ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσων φλόγα,
> ὡς δυστυχῆ Θήβαισι τῇ τότ' ἡμέρᾳ
> ἀκτῖν' ἐφῆκας, Κάδμος ἡνίκ' ἦλθε γῆν
> τήνδ', ἐκλιπὼν Φοίνισσαν ἐναλίαν χθόνα·

What is the Sun doing cleaving his way among *stars*? The normal relation of the sun to stars is a simple one: the sun puts the stars to flight. If the image is not to be totally absurd,[51] we must follow the commentators[52] in supposing the ἄστρα to be the constellations of the zodiac; the ὁδός is then the Sun's *annual* course, not his *daily* one. But this is most unexpected. The Sun traverses the vault of heaven once a

[51] It will not do to adduce instances of the Sun and the stars in company. With one exception (not counting the corrupt *Phoen.* 504) these are representations of both day and night; so with the descriptions at Eur. *El.* 464ff and *Ion* 1146ff, and Zeus' turning back the sun and stars on the occasion of Thyestes' banquet (Eur. *El.* 726ff, *Or.* 1001ff). The exception does not help the present case: in Apollo's final address in *Orestes* (1685ff) he promises, Ἑλένην μελάθροις πελάσω, | λαμπρῶν ἄστρων πόλον ἐξανύσας, | ἔνθα παρ' Ἥρᾳ τῇ θ' Ἡρακλέους | Ἥβῃ πάρεδρος κτλ. This amalgamates two images, that of the constellations in the vault of the sky (Eur. fr.594.5 δίδυμοί τ' ἄρκτοι . . . τὸν Ἀτλάντειον τηροῦσι πόλον: the πόλος is supported by Atlas, as *e.g.* at Aesch. *PV* 429f), and that of the πόλος as the location of the abode of the gods (Eur. fr.911.5 βάσομαί τ' εἰς αἰθέριον πόλον ἀρθεὶς | Ζηνὶ προσμείξων); *cf. Hel.* 1096, *HF* 406f, *Phoen.* 1006; Page *PMG* 936.12.

Nor will it do to think that we are on the point of sunrise: '*among* the stars', forsooth; and dawn precedes the sunrise, in any case (J. Diggle at *Phaethon* 63). Finally, Homer's 'starry sky' in the daytime is quite different, that being an aspect of formulaic composition.

[52] Not all. It is to Wecklein's credit that he balks at this interpretation even though he has no other to put in its place: "Wenn auch der Glanz der Sterne vor der Sonne erbleicht, so erscheint es doch als unpoetisch, . . . an den Tierkreis zu denken" (*Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides* V [Leipzig 1894] 29).

day, and it is this daily circuit which we should expect to find[53]—and which, indeed, we do find once the opening is stripped of 1–2.

Then: what is the structure of this lengthy apostrophe? We have three participles, distributed either side of *Ἥλιε*.[54] A vocative can be preceded by a participle with ὦ (*e.g.* ὦ *φαεννὰς οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχὰς | Ζεῦ*) or it can be followed by a participle (*e.g.* *Ἑρμῆ χθόνιε πατρῷ' ἐποπτεύων κράτη*). But both at once? This seems stylistically horrid.

But the chief objection I would enter against 1–2 is not so much philological as aesthetic.[55] The thing is out of all proportion. The apostrophe is a device for getting the play off the ground. "It was a bad day for Thebes when Cadmus came here from Phoenicia" gets closer to the intellectual content of the opening. The three-line invocation is grossly overblown. Lines 1–2 are almost sheer bombast, for apart from the picturesque detail of 'gold-welded', verse 3 says all that they have to say and more. The circuit through the sky (v.1: forget the muddying stars) is inherent in *εἰλίσσων*, and the chariot (v.2) in *ἵπποισιν*. Euripides can afford to leave the chariot implicit, for it is a familiar image that is being evoked. Say *Ἥλιε* before the audience of a tragedy and they will *imagine* a chariot.[56]

The disproportion is shown up by the first three-line invocation that comes to mind, Aesch. *Ag.* 22–24.

> *ὦ χαῖρε λαμπτὴρ νυκτὸς ἡμερήσιον*
> *φάος πιφαύσκων καὶ χορῶν κατάστασιν*
> *πολλῶν ἐν Ἄργει τῆσδε συμφορᾶς χάριν· ἰοὺ ἰού.*

His prayers are answered, his year's watch is over: he greets the long-awaited fires. And he breaks out of metre. What a contrast with *Phoenissae*, where what has happened is—nothing at all. *Agamemnon*

[53] So, for example, in Ajax' suicide speech, Soph. *Aj.* 845f *σὺ δ', ὦ τὸν αἰπὺν οὐρανὸν διφρηλατῶν | Ἥλιε, πατρῴαν τὴν ἐμὴν ὅταν χθόνα | ἴδῃς, κτλ.* [The *second* invocation of the Sun in the same speech, 856–58, is surely spurious, as I hope to argue elsewhere.] *Cf.* [Eur.] *Epigr.* 2.1–2 Bergk (n.83 *infra*), Timoth. fr.13 Bergk, Nonn. 17.271f, Quint.Smyrn. 1.118f. When it is the *annual* circuit that is in question, this is made explicit: *e.g.* Sen. *Oed.* 250ff *tuque, o sereni maximum mundi decus, | bis sena cursu signa qui vario regis, | qui tarda celeri saecula evolvis rota, etc.*, Nonn. 38.114 *Ἥλιος λυκάβαντα δυωδεκάμηνον ἑλίσσων, κτλ.*

[54] I presume people have construed *τέμνων καὶ ἐμβεβώς*, and not, as Leo, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.32) 4=*Kl.Schr.* 193, *τέμνων καὶ εἰλίσσων* (*ἐμβεβώς intermisso*); but the logical superiority of Leo's impossible construction does serve to point the messiness of the image.

[55] "Phoenissarum hocce *πρόσωπον τηλαυγὲς*, in quo suos sibi naevos nonnulli detexisse videbantur, multis perplacuit," Valckenaer *ad loc.*

[56] It would be pleasing if *Phaethon* had been performed the previous year; but the point stands anyway.

was written many years earlier and by a very different poet, but Euripides was not so far degenerate.

The prayer to Zeus at *Phoen.* 84–85 rounds off the prologue. After the detached exposition of the intervening lines, Jocasta once more intrudes herself into the play:

> ἀλλ' ὦ φαεννὰς οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχὰς
> Ζεῦ σῶσον ἡμᾶς, δὸς δὲ σύμβασιν τέκνοις.

The empty three-line apostrophe to Helios at the beginning cheapens this far less empty prayer for salvation, first by the very weight that is a function of its length, and secondly by the specific anticipation of οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχάς by οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδόν.

II. Sophocles, *Electra*

Soph. *El.* 1 is put by the scholium on the same footing as Eur. *Phoen.* 1–2: it stands or falls with them; and Eur. *Phoen.* 1–2 have fallen. Since we do not know the genesis of the παλαιὰ δόξα, we are perhaps not absolutely bound to accept both sides of the equation. But we shall at least look at Soph. *El.* 1 with the uncritical mist removed from our eyes.

Here is the opening as transmitted.

> Ὦ τοῦ στρατηγήσαντος ἐν Τροίᾳ ποτε
> Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, νῦν ἐκεῖν' ἔξεστί σοι
> παρόντι λεύσσειν, ὧν πρόθυμος ἦσθ' ἀεί.
> τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν Ἄργος οὐπόθεις τόδε,
> τῆς οἰστροπλῆγος ἄλσος Ἰνάχου κόρης·
> αὕτη δ', Ὀρέστα, τοῦ λυκοκτόνου θεοῦ
> ἀγορὰ Λύκειος· κτλ.
>
> 1 στρατηγήσαντος: τυραννήσαντος $\Sigma^{\gamma\rho}$

One is not reduced to protesting that ὦ τοῦ στρατηγήσαντος ἐν Τροίᾳ ποτε is a wretchedly feeble verse, though protest it one certainly may. One can observe that it gives a form of address that is long without having any corresponding elevation of feeling or of language; one can argue too that such a stilted address is out of place in the mouth of the Paedagogus. Indeed, the old man just does not talk like this. He is well and consistently characterised, and his addresses are otherwise perfectly straightforward—save only when he breaks up

the brother-and-sister reunion with the far from stilted *ὦ πλεῖστα μῶροι καὶ φρενῶν τητώμενοι* (1326).

No address at all would be wrong: *Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ*, more raised than just *Ὀρέστα* but not unduly so, is exactly right: anything more must either lift the emotional level too high, or, as is the case with the traditional opening, be simply dull.[57] One can appeal to the other Sophoclean plays which open with an address:[58]

Aj. (Athena) *Ἀεὶ μὲν ὦ παῖ Λαρτίου δέδορκά σε κτλ.*

OT (Oedipus) *Ὦ τέκνα, Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή, | τίνας κτλ.*

Ant. (Antigone) *Ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα, | ἆρ' οἶσθ' κτλ.*

OC (Oedipus) *Τέκνον τυφλοῦ γέροντος Ἀντιγόνη, τίνας κτλ.*

The criticism made of the spurious prologue of *Rhesus* was that it was *πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ*, "very pedestrian and unworthy of Euripides." This charge (*mutato mutando*) is one which no one could level against any of the above four *initia*, but who could defend *ὦ τοῦ στρατηγήσαντος ἐν Τροίᾳ ποτε* from it? The first line of the *Rhesus* prologue in question is *ὦ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζηνὸς ἄλκιμον τέκος*: this has more claim to poetry than the insipid line foisted on to Sophocles in *Electra*. There *may* be duller lines in Sophocles, but never as the first verse.

The source of the line, once it is recognized as bogus, is immediately apparent. In his false messenger speech, the Paedagogus describes how Orestes was proclaimed victor at the Pythian games in these words (693–95):

> *ὠλβίζετ', Ἀργεῖος μὲν ἀνακαλούμενος,*
> *ὄνομα δ' Ὀρέστης, τοῦ τὸ κλεινὸν Ἑλλάδος*
> *Ἀγαμέμνονος στράτευμ' ἀγείραντός ποτε.*

The recollection of Agamemnon's fame is as appropriate there as it is inappropriate in the old man's unaffected and enthusiastic address to his young charge.

Once again there is external evidence to substantiate the internal. I relegate it to a subsidiary position because that is where such incidental

[57] W. Biehl, apropos Eur. *Or.* 852 (*Textprobleme in Euripides Orestes* [Jena 1955] 52), says "die unvermittelte Anrede *Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ* wäre wohl im Munde des Tieferstehende nicht angemessen." Whether or not this is true of the messenger's addressing Electra (I think it is not), it certainly could not be said of a man who is allowed *ὦ πλεῖστα μῶροι κτλ.* Eur. *Andr.* 891 makes an instructive comparison with Soph. *El.* 1–2: Orestes' inquiry after Hermione meets with Hermione's *ὦ ναυτίλοισι χείματος λιμὴν φανείς | Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, πρός σε τῶνδε γουνάτων, κτλ.* *Cf.* also Eur. *El.* 880f.

[58] To go no further afield. But does *Septem* begin *Ὦ τοῦ κρατοῦντος τῆσδε Θηβαίας χθονὸς | Κάδμου πολῖται, χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια*?

and extraneous ἕρμαια ought properly to be. This time there are as yet no papyri, but there is a piece of pornography. Machon recounts a sexual encounter between Mania, an Athenian prostitute of high repute, and Demetrius Poliorcetes, king of Macedonia.[59] Mania agreed to do Demetrius a favour if he would do her one. His side of the bargain fulfilled, Mania turned round and invited him to avail himself of the reciprocal favour with these words: *Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, νῦν ἐκεῖν' ἔξεστι σοί*. Gow calls the story unedifying, and so of course it is, but we can make it serve a more respectable end than Mania's. Such an innocuous verse: not, one would have thought, a verse to attract such a scurrilous application—not, that is, unless it had that claim to memorability automatically enjoyed by a tragedy's opening line.

The jest was not Mania's own. On its first occasion it was more genuinely witty. One of the most celebrated tragic actors of the fourth century was Theodorus. Before a tragic competition in which he was to perform, so Plutarch informs us, he and his wife abstained from sexual intercourse. On his victorious return home, the words with which his wife greeted him were *Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, νῦν ἐκεῖν' ἔξεστί σοι*.[60]

III. Iudicium et Quaestio Delendi

All scholars who have considered the shorter openings, that is to say the authentic ones, have damned them. I shall not dwell on this, nor labour the moral. The best and most serious discussion is offered by Kaibel in his commentary on Sophocles' *Electra*. He labels the address

[59] Machon 226–30 Gow. I owe the reference to Professor E. W. Handley.

[60] Plut. *Mor.* 737AB: *ἐμνήσθη τε καὶ τῆς Θεοδώρου γυναικὸς οὐ προσδεξαμένης αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ συγκαθεύδειν, ὑπογύου τοῦ ἀγῶνος ὄντος· ἐπεὶ δὲ νικήσας εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτήν, ἀσπασαμένης καὶ εἰπούσης "'Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, νῦν ἐκεῖν' ἔξεστί σοι."* The inference I wish to draw gets satisfying if oblique support from something else we are told of Theodorus: he always insisted on taking the opening part—on the grounds that *what the audience hears first* makes the greatest impression (Arist. *Pol.* 1336b: *οὐθενὶ γὰρ πώποτε παρῆκεν ἑαυτοῦ προεισάγειν, οὐδὲ τῶν εὐτελῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς οἰκειουμένων τῶν θεατῶν ταῖς πρώταις ἀκοαῖς*.). [It would seem, then, that in a performance of *Electra* Theodorus would have spoken the *Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ* line himself (as the Paedagogus), rather than have had it spoken to him (as Orestes). This is perhaps rather surprising, but incomparably less so than D. L. Page's interpretation, that plays were radically reworked so as to have the main character speak first (*Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* [Oxford 1934] 94, followed most recently by R. Hamilton, *GRBS* 15 [1974] 401). Incidentally, Mr Alan Griffiths has quite rightly pointed out to me that it is not safe to assume (as I did in my earlier discussion [n.1 *supra*]) that *Electra* was the play in which Theodorus had just acted on the occasion Plutarch refers to, for Theodorus and his wife may have constantly been making such literary witticisms; but this does not affect the point at issue.]

in *Electra* (1–2) "umständlich" but goes on to defend it on the general ground of the poets' love of Überfluss.[61] Though Kaibel went astray, he nevertheless shows an enviable sensibility in stylistic matters. The "schwülstig" address to the Sun in *Phoenissae* comes out very badly from a comparison with Sophocles' openings: yet the single-line apostrophe *Ἥλιε κτλ.*, it is asserted, would have been "unerträglich nackt." There is no denying that it does have a certain starkness,[62] compounded, I think, of the abruptness of *Ἥλιε* (without *ὦ* or any other prefatory formula and contained within the foot[63]) and the selection of detail in the imagery. But this is how Euripides chose to begin, and we must adjust our critical expectations accordingly, must effect a shift in our notions of what is and what is not tolerable.

Δήμητερ ἑστιοῦχ' Ἐλευσῖνος χθονός (*Suppl.* 1), say, is nondescript beside the brilliant *Ἥλιε* verse. While *Ἑρμῆ χθόνιε πατρῷ' ἐποπτεύων κράτη* (Aesch. *Cho.* 1) makes a fairly good formal parallel, the best comparison, I think, would be with *Medea*, twenty or so years earlier than *Phoenissae*: *Εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος*. That line too came in for exceptional praise and blame. Each of the verses is vivid and precise in detail, affective in its mode of speech, only obliquely related to the situation in hand, only indirectly expressive of the emotion of the speaker: the more expressive for being oblique.

Eur. *Phoen.* 1–2 and Soph. *El.* 1 must go. The authors by whom they purport to be written did not write them: their place is in the apparatus, not the text.

IV. Origin and Transmission

To recognize a verse as spurious is not to account for its origin and encroachment on the text. Often enough the former will be possible,

[61] *Cf.* Wecklein on the *Phoenissae initium*, "Die drei ersten Verse kennzeichnen den hohen Stil der griechischen Tragödie," *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.52). His statement "Die Dichter wussten das Imposante solcher *εἰσβολή* wohl zu würdigen" can stand if for 'Dichter' we substitute 'Schauspieler'. It is ironic that for Kaibel the scholium showed "dass ein späterer Geschmack für die würdevolle Steifheit derartigen Anreden kein Verständis mehr besass"; in fact, of course, the change in taste was just the other way. In *Eccl.* 1 *ὦ λαμπρὸν ὄμμα τοῦ τροχηλάτου λύχνου*, Aristophanes is getting at the elevated treatment Euripides accorded mundane things rather than at the inflated style itself.

[62] "exile et imperfectum" Pflug-Klotz, after Hermann. 'imperfectum', yes (and all the better for it), but 'exile' it is surely not.

[63] But the self-contained dactylic foot is not only less startling than it would have been at an earlier date but less startling than it would be with any other word. See W. S. Barrett, ed. *Euripides, Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) on *Hipp.* 19 (and his Addenda, p.432), and Ed. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* II (Oxford 1950) p.8 and n.2. (On Fraenkel's note, is there anymore reason that *Ἥλιε* should have anything preceding it than that, say, *Ἑρμῆ* should?)

the latter not. But we are bound to wonder how the bogus verses with which we are here concerned came to invade and hold such a prominent position.

Odd things did happen to the beginnings of other tragedies too.[64] The prologue of *Rhesus* known to Dicaearchus did not reach Alexandria; and the anapaests with which the play now begins had in some MSS *another* and spurious iambic prologue attached to them. *Iphigenia Aulidensis* too gained an iambic prologue and was otherwise tampered with. *Rhesus* is a rather mysterious case (suspicions of its authenticity seem not to be pre-Alexandrian),[65] and *Iphigenia Aulidensis*, being posthumous, is of course a special one.[66] More pertinent, perhaps, are the modifications that were made to the openings of *Archelaus* and of *Meleager*.

In *Frogs* Aristophanes has Aeschylus subject six of Euripides' prologues to the rude humiliation of *ληκύθιον ἀπώλεσεν*. (None of his other plays that we have the beginnings of, and none at all of Sophocles' or Aeschylus' that we have the beginnings of, is susceptible of the treatment.) They are, in Aristophanes' order, *Archelaus*, *Hypsipyle*, *Sthenoboea*, the second *Phrixus*, *Iphigenia Taurica* and *Meleager*. The first and last of these, but not the others,[67] arrived at Alexandria with a different *ἀρχή*. The scholia on *Frogs* identify each tragedy as it comes up. So on *Αἴγυπτος, ὡς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος* (*ap. Ran.* 1206) is the note *Ἀρχελάου αὕτη ἡ ἀρχή*—but appended to it is an amendment:[68] *ὥς τινες, ψευδῶς· οὐ γὰρ φέρεται νῦν Εὐριπίδου λόγος οὐδεὶς τοιοῦτος*, "so some say; erroneously, for there is not now any such verse in Euripides." And it goes on to record Aristarchus' suggestion that Euripides "changed it afterwards, and Aristophanes quoted the original version."[69] All is then plain sailing until we reach *Meleager*:

[64] Much of what follows is eclectically derivative, and I give a summary and rather dogmatic account. Page, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.60), is naturally laid under obligation.

[65] The Dicaearchan prologue was presumably the genuine article. Perhaps someone else's *Rhesus* supplanted Euripides', as may have happened too with *Pirithous*.

[66] Discussed by C. W. Willink, *CQ* 21 (1971) 343–64.

[67] We can be sure, not the others. For those plays for which we do not have the evidence either of the indirect tradition (as *Hypsipyle*) or of the direct (*IT*), we have the *ἀρχαί* of the hypotheses. If I am right in ascribing the hypotheses to Dicaearchus, their evidence is not evidence for the Alexandrian text; but then if the *ἀρχαί* of the hypotheses and of the Alexandrian text failed to coincide, we would know about it from the Aristophanes scholia *ad locc.*

[68] I assume two stages to the note; otherwise we should expect *οὐκ* at the beginning. According to whom *was* it the *ἀρχή*? Dicaearchus?

[69] *οὐ γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος, τοῦ Ἀρχελάου, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς μετέθηκεν ὕστερον, ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κείμενον εἶπε.*

Οἰνεύς ποτ' ἐκ γῆς κτλ. (1238, 1240–41). This time the scholia report that the quotation is not the actual opening, but comes *μετὰ ἱκανὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς*. They proceed to quote the current *ἀρχή*: *Καλύδων μὲν ἥδε γαῖα Πελοπίας χθονός*; and this latter line, it so happens, is quoted by Aristotle too.[70]

There is only one plausible explanation of this state of affairs; it is more or less that given by Fritzsche,[71] and, indeed, partially by Aristarchus, whether he was relying on tradition or (as seems more likely) on guesswork. The prologues of *Archelaus* and of *Meleager* must have been rewritten after the production of *Frogs*. Why? Evidently to save them from a recurrence, in actual performance, of the treatment they had got from Aristophanes: in a subsequent production, it was feared, the deflating oil-flask might be interjected from the audience.[72] (The modified versions will not admit it.) Why only these two, and not the other four? *Archelaus* is the first in the list, and therefore exceptionally prominent, while *Meleager* suffers the squib twice over, in its first verse and then again in its second.

Melanippe Sophe is a different case again. Next in line for the *ληκύθιον* after *Meleager* is *Melanippe*: *Ζεύς, ὡς λέλεκται τῆς ἀληθείας ὕπο*. At this point, though, Aristophanes has Dionysus call a halt—as indeed he must do, for we happen to know how the prologue went on, and it does not admit the *ληκύθιον*. Now we learn from Plutarch that Euripides had originally written *Ζεύς, ὅστις ὁ Ζεύς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδα πλὴν λόγῳ*, but such was the outcry that he was obliged to change it.[73] The alteration this time is not due to Aristophanes, for the version that he quotes is not the original but the second version.[74]

[70] He assigns it to Sophocles (*Rhet.* 1409b10). However suspicious this may look at first sight, its only significance is that Aristotle's pen sometimes slipped.

[71] F. V. Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (Zurich 1845), on 1206; anticipated in T. Mitchell's delightful commentary (*The Frogs of Aristophanes* [London 1839] 263).

[72] The alteration is firm evidence for subsequent production of these two plays. (A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*[2] [Oxford 1968] 99–101, does not mention them.) Such a trifling revision is quite unlike the reworking of *e.g. Hippolytus, Phrixus* and *Melanippe* (which made new plays of them), and not very like even the revamping of some comedies; presumably not the work of Euripides himself but of some producer. Did the recensions nonetheless become the official Lycurgan versions?

[73] Plut. *Mor.* 756c, see further at frr. 480, 481 N[2]. There are grave problems here (was the change made before or after a public performance?, what of the attribution to *Pirithous*?, etc.), and they have been aggravated by the accession of *P.Oxy.* 2455, which gives as the *ἀρχή* not the expected *Ζεύς, ὡς λέλεκται κτλ.* but *Ζευς δ.[* (*δε[σπότης* H. van Looy, *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides* [Brussels 1964] 213; I have verified the *delta* from the original; after it I cannot exclude *ω[* (*ε[*, *ο[*, *ρ[* Turner, *ed.pr.*)).

[74] Since the line is *not* to be 'oil-bagged', it is proper to ask why it is chosen. Because it

These cases perhaps show little more than that while *initia* always have an importance of their own, this did not always serve to protect them. The openings of several Greek epic poems were in dispute: even the *Iliad* was not exempt.[75] The *Theaetetus* of Plato had an alternative proemium to the extant one,[76] and it may be doubted whether either of them is original. The failure of the expanded beginning of the *Aeneid* to gain a place in the direct tradition may be put down to its exclusion from the definitive first edition (whose authority also kept out half-line completions). It was otherwise with Lucan: the prefatory seven lines to the *Pharsalia*, which among other things mitigate the abruptness of the original opening, became part of the manuscript tradition.[77]

In the case of *Phoenissae* and *Electra*, the scholium purports to give the source of the new openings. *Phoen.* 1–2 is Sophocles', *El.* 1 Euripides'.[78] We have seen that there is more than a grain of truth to the story (insofar as it implies the verses are not original), but this does not mean that grains of salt will be altogether out of order. Though one will want to qualify one's judgement of it as a *narratiuncula inepta*, one is still not inclined to take it at its face value. We might be prepared to believe that Sophocles found fault with the opening, and even that he said as much (it is true that we would not expect *him* to begin so[79]), but it is difficult to imagine him actually proposing the two new verses by way of amelioration. The interplay between the texts of Aristophanes and Euripides evidenced by *Meleager* and *Archelaus* might suggest a subtler interpretation, that the reported repartee between the two tragedians is lifted from a comedy;[80] but

would have called to mind the notorious first version? Or for the sake of the anticipation of *Ζεὺς ληκύθιον ἀπώλεσεν*? Or both?

[75] See T. W. Allen, *Homer, the Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford 1924) 289f, and *cf.* M. L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford 1966) *ad* v.1.

[76] *BKT* II (1905) col. iii 28–37.

[77] Commenta Bernensia: *hos vii versus primos* [*Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos* etc.] *dicitur Seneca ex suo addidisse . . ., ne videretur liber ex abrupto inchoare dicendo 'quis furor'* [8: *quis furor, o cives, quae tanta licentia ferri*]. Various discussions to be found in W. Rutz, ed. *Lucan* (*Wege der Forschung* 235, Darmstadt 1970). Literary aesthetics are largely what was involved here.

[78] It is a tempting but hardly tenable inference that Sophocles' *Electra* and Euripides' *Phoenissae* were produced the same year.

[79] *Ἥλιε, φιλίπποις Θρῃξὶ πρέσβιστον σέλας* (*σέβας* Bothe) is attested for *Tereus* (fr.582 Pearson), but there is no reason to think it the first verse; and even if it is, it is plainer. (The *Tereus* hypothesis of *P.Oxy.* 3013, anomalously, fails to give the *ἀρχή*.)

[80] Aristophanes and Strattis both wrote a *Phoenissae*, both of which contained parody of Euripides'.

here again, so constructive a criticism is not what we expect from the comedians. It remains possible that objection of some kind *was* taken to the openings (the additions themselves show only that they were amenable to supplementation, not that they were intrinsically objectionable), and that such objection, once given practical expression in the form of the extra verses, was as it were sanctified by way of the δόξα. The source of the scholium, whether in its original written form ("Sophocles reproached Euripides, etc.") or in its form as taken over into the body of the scholia,[81] is not worth guessing at.[82]

Phoen. 1–2 (I say no more of the vapid Soph. *El.* 1) are good verses, the work of someone *οὐ τὸ Εὐριπίδου λέγων ἀλλ' Εὐριπιδικῶς*.[83] We have to ask not only when they could have been composed, but when, why and by whom they could have been put at the head of the play. And the most obvious set of answers, to which moreover I see no reasonable alternative, is early, to make a more impressive declamatory opening, and by the actor playing Jocasta.

Such an audaciously conceived and creditably executed augmentation one will be inclined to assign to the fourth or early third century B.C. How is it, in that case, that the verses remained submerged until their eventual triumphant resurrection in the Middle Ages? In an earlier discussion (see n.1) I made the convenient double

[81] *παλαιά τις φέρεται δόξα* will be an integral part of the transmitted scholium: scholiasts either copy and excerpt, or they compose.

[82] A rather similar story is told by Serenus *ap.* Stob. 5.82 about a notorious line from *Aeolus* (fr.19 N²): *Εὐριπίδης εὐδοκίμησεν ἐν θεάτρῳ εἰπὼν "τί δ' αἰσχρόν, ἢν μὴ τοῖσι χρωμένοις δοκῇ;" καὶ Πλάτων ἐντυχὼν αὐτῷ "ὦ Εὐριπίδη" ἔφη "αἰσχρὸν τό γ' αἰσχρόν, κἂν δοκῇ κἂν μὴ δοκῇ."* Here however, as normally in such anecdotes, (1) the point at issue is one of moral philosophy, not literary aesthetics, and (2) the criticism, though cast in iambic form, moves outside the dramatic context. The trustworthiness of such stories may be gauged from the fact that this particular one recurs in different form and with attribution of the rebuke to Antisthenes instead of to Plato at Plut. *Mor.* 33c; *q.v.* for other *παραδιορθώσεις*.

[83] *οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδόν* perhaps draws on *οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχάς* (84), and Fraenkel compared Eur. fr.124.2f (*ap.* Ar. *Thesm.* 1097f) *διὰ μέσου γὰρ αἰθέρος | τέμνων κέλευθον* (of Perseus!). Another source might be the epigram said by Eparchidas (*ap.* Athen. II 61B) to have been composed by Euripides on a woman and her children who died through eating poisonous fungi: *ὦ τὸν ἀγήρατον πόλον αἰθέρος Ἥλιε τέμνων, | ἆρ' εἶδες τοίονδ' ὄμματι πρόσθε πάθος κτλ.* (with 2 *cf.* Theodectas fr.10, p.157 *supra*). With *ἐμβεβὼς δίφροις*, *cf.* Soph. fr.672 P. *ὄχοις Ἀκεσταίοισιν ἐμβεβὼς πόδα. χρυσοκολλήτοισιν* is striking and makes for an impressive line. *χρυσοκόλλητος* and *χρυσόκολλος* usually describe fancy vessels ('gold-inlaid'), *e.g.* Soph. fr.378 P. (*-κολλα*), Antiph. fr.106.2 K. (*-κολλήτου*), fr. 237.2 K. (*-κόλλητον*); Palamedes' oar, satirized by Aristophanes, had been *χρυσοκόλλη* (Eur. fr.587 N²); similarly at [Eur.] *Rhesus* 305 *πέλτη δ' ἐπ' ὤμων χρυσοκολλήτοις τύποις | ἔλαμπε*. [Did composers of spuria have some special liking for *χρυσο-* compounds? In three successive pseudo-Sophoclea (frr. 1025, 1026, 1027 Nauck) are found *χρυσοτεύκτων*, *χρυσόμορφος* and *χρυσωπός*.]

assumption that they were (a) in existence by the time of the recension made by Aristophanes of Byzantium and (b) known to Aristophanes of Byzantium.[84] If this is true, we may be fairly confident that Aristophanes included the verses in his text and stigmatized them with the obelus. We are then free to explain their absence from later texts of the play by postulating that Aristophanes' obeli effected their removal; but lines athetized by the Alexandrians are *not* usually omitted in later texts (and where they are, this may mean not dependence but an unstable tradition); it is more likely that the verses were not widely current, and that their (stigmatized) presence in Aristophanes' text did not lead to their importation into ordinary texts. There is nothing improbable about this; at the same time, there is no verifying the assumption that the verses did feature in the Alexandrian text. Even if they did not, they could still be of an earlier origin, and have been preserved in copies which bypassed Aristophanes, to be incorporated later in the edition of Didymus, say. At the same time, again, their total permeation of the mediaeval tradition is no argument for an early origin. We know of a good number of verses of post-Alexandrian origin that are present in all the MSS. I should myself be surprised if the verses were not delivered in some performance of *Phoenissae* prior to Aristophanes' work on the text, a little less surprised if Aristophanes was not acquainted with them. What is certain is that the original performance was without them.[85]

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF
December, 1974

[84] I am very grateful to Mr Barrett for questioning the second article and to Professor M. L. West for questioning the first.

[85] I hope to follow up elsewhere some implications that this may be thought to carry for the whole question of interpolation in Greek tragedy. Meanwhile, papyrus evidence regarding further interpolations in *Phoenissae* is presented in *CQ* N.S. 16 (1976).