

ARE EURIPIDES *PHOINISSAI* 1104–1140 INTERPOLATED?*

DONALD J. MASTRONARDE

AMONG THE MANY PASSAGES in Euripides' *Phoinissai* which have been subject to suspicion of interpolation, the "catalogue" of the Seven against Thebes in lines 1104–1140 is one of the few which can suitably be discussed in isolation. Whereas virtually everyone can agree on the propriety of deleting, e.g., 1737 ff., 375, 428, 558, 778, 912, 1075, 1225, 1235, 1282, 1634, and (with the evidence recently adduced by Haslam¹) 1–2, dozens of other suspected lines, such as 438–442, 753–755, 868–880, 886–890, 1242–1258, 1308 ff., and 1639–1682, can only be discussed in connection with a lengthy overall assessment of the literary intentions of Euripides: misunderstandings of characterization, thematic significance, and dramatic structure have usually influenced the theories of those who delete most readily.² In discussing *Phoin.* 1104–1140, a passage relatively free of the entanglements of the literary controversies, this study hopes both to present a review of the argumentation to be found in editions and commentaries,³ monographs, and articles⁴ (and so to illustrate the gradual

*I wish to express my thanks to M. D. Reeve and an anonymous reader for their constructive criticisms of an earlier draft of this article.

¹M. W. Haslam, "The Authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1," *GRBS* 16 (1975) 149–174. More problematic are some of the deletions proposed by Haslam in "Interpolation in the *Phoenissae*: Papyrus Evidence," *CQ* 26 (1976) 4–10: in lines 51–52 a more complicated process of rewriting and interpolation is indicated by the scholia, and so the papyri cannot tell us which line is genuine (Fraenkel wanted to delete *both* lines, not just 52); and there is more to be said in favor of, e.g., 291–292, 781, and 800 than Haslam indicates.

²See my dissertation, *Studies in Euripides' Phoinissai* (University of Toronto 1974; Canadian theses on microfiche, n. 26070, available from National Library, Ottawa); abstract in *DA* 37.5 (1976) 2845A.

³In the notes and text I refer to the following editions of Euripides' works or of *Phoinissai* by editor's name or by name and date only: J. Barnes (Cambridge 1694); C. D. Beck (Leipzig 1788); J. Geel (Leyden 1846); J. A. Hartung (Leipzig 1849); G. Hermann (Leipzig 1840); R. Klotz (Gotha 1842); A. Matthiae (Leipzig 1813–1837); L. Meridier & F. Chapouthier (Paris 1951 = Budé edition, tome 5); G. Murray (2nd ed. Oxford 1913); S. Musgrave (Oxford 1778); F. A. Paley (2nd ed. London 1880); A. C. Pearson (Cambridge 1909); R. Porson (London 1799); J. U. Powell (London 1911); L. C. Valckenaer (Franeker 1755); N. Wecklein (Leipzig 1894 = *Ausgewählte tragödien* . . . , v. 5); N. Wecklein (Leipzig 1901 = Prinz-Wecklein, *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 3, pars 4). References to the Euripidean scholia are to the edition of Eduard Schwartz unless otherwise stated.

⁴In notes and text I refer to the following articles and monographs by the author's name or name and date only: A. Balsamo, "Sulla composizione delle *Fenicie* di Euripide," *SIFC* 9 (1901) 241–290; T. Bergk, review in *Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft* 2 (1835) 961–968; G. Erdmann, *Der Botenbericht bei Euripides: Struktur und dramatische*

development, for better and for worse, of scholarly opinion)⁵ and to provide a caution against the apparent emergence of deletion of *Phoin.* 1104–1140 as the orthodox view.

I

In his epoch-making edition of *Phoinissai* in 1755 Valckenaer bracketed lines 1118 and 1133 and expressed deep suspicion of 1116–1117, but like earlier critics he had no doubt that the “catalogue” as a whole was Euripidean. In 1771, however, the German theologian and philologist S. F. N. Morus, in the course of impugning the artistry of Euripides in terms typical of German aesthetic criticism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, cast the first aspersions against 1104–1140 as a whole. Believing that the main theme, and only proper theme, of *Phoinissai* is the quarrel and fatal duel of Eteokles and Polyneikes, Morus questioned the artistic propriety of the *teichoskopia* (88–201) on the grounds that it is not part of the *totius rei series*.⁶ He rejected the argument that Euripides wanted to introduce the Seven there in a preliminary manner, alleging that those heroes do not do or say anything that is pertinent to the *summa rei* and are not named elsewhere except in the later messenger-speech. Morus added *en passant*⁷ “et ita nominantur

Funktion (diss. Kiel 1964); E. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoenissen des Euripides* [SB der Bayer. Akad. der Wiss. 1963, Heft 1] (München 1963); W. H. Friedrich, “Prolegomena zu den Phönissen,” *Hermes* 74 (1939) 265–300; J. A. Hartung, *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide . . . Praemittuntur de Euripidis fabularum interpolatione disputationes duae* (Erlangen 1837); J. A. Hartung, review in *Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft* ser. 2, 6 (1848) 455–465; H. van Herwerden, “Novae commentationes Euripidaeae,” *RPh* 18 (1894) 60–98; T. Mommsen, Excurs IV, pages 766–770 in *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen* (Berlin 1895); S. F. N. Morus, *De Euripidis Phoinissis* (Leipzig 1771); S. A. Naber, “Euripidea,” *Mnemosyne* 10 (1882) 136–162; D. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1934); E. Petersen, “Zu Euripides Phoenissen Vers 1113 bis 1118,” *Nybb* 101 (1870) 809–813; F. Polle, “Besserungs- und Erklärungsversuche zu Euripides,” in *Commentationes Fleckeisenianae* (Leipzig 1890) 37–58; C. Robert, *Oidipus. Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915); R. Sauer, “Zu Euripides' Phoinissai,” *PhilWoch* 52 (1932) 997–1000; E. O. Schmidt, *De clipeorum insignibus quae in Aeschyli Septem contra Thebas et in Euripidis Phoinissis describuntur* (Leipzig 1870); K. Walter, *Kritische-exegetische Beiträge zu griechischen Tragikern* (Wurz 1888); U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, “Die Sieben Toren Thebens,” *Hermes* 26 (1891) 191–242; W. Zipperer, *De Euripidis Phoenissarum versibus suspectis et interpolatis* (Würzburg 1875).

⁵Such illustration is valuable, it seems to me, because it is the duty of each generation of scholars to re-examine controversial questions, not out of disrespect for their predecessors, but in order to counteract the natural tendency in classical scholarship for long-repeated opinions to be adopted without sufficient critical review.

⁶Morus, 8–11.

⁷Morus, 10–11.

[in 1104–1140], ut nullam eorum mentionem factam esse mallet: adeo friget interdum ille locus, a re alienus est, a Valkenario per partes castigatus, turpique macula ineptissimorum versuum notatus, et Euripideae orationi dissimilis. Ausim propemodum optare ut integra illa particula insiticia dici possit, quod duplex illud, καὶ πρῶτα μὲν (v. 1111 [= 1104] et 1148 [= 1141]) permittere saltem videretur. sed haec in aliud tempus differenda sunt.” This wish, which should remind scholars of Goethe’s wish about *Antigone* 904 ff. (*Gespräche mit Eckermann*, 28 Marz 1827), contains three grounds for suspicion (hereafter referred to as A, B, and C): (A) the writing of the passage is frigid, inept, or un-Euripidean; (B) the passage is artistically irrelevant; (C) the repetition of καὶ πρῶτα μὲν suggests that 1141 originally followed 1103 (the interpolator clumsily beginning his passage with the same words he found in the genuine text).

Although controversy about individual passages within 1104–1140 (especially 1116–1118) continued unabated after 1771, little notice was taken during the next 110 years of Morus’ proposal to delete the whole “catalogue.”⁸ Only after 1860 did critics, beginning with Paley in England and Leidloff in Germany,⁹ contemplate interpolation on a large scale in parts of the play other than the lyric tail-piece. *Phoin.* 1104–1140 in particular came under renewed suspicion only in 1882, when the Dutch scholar Naber applied the theory of contamination to the whole passage 1090–1208 (citing the manner in which the messenger refers so briefly to Menoikeus’ sacrifice and the fact that Iokaste later comments on it although the audience is not told how she learned of it). Naber alleged that many lines in the scene were clumsily added, but admitted that he could not give proof of specific cases. He nowhere specified 1104–1140 as offensive, but remarked that Euripides wrote ineptly if after the *teichoskopia* and the “criticism” of Aischylos’ *Septem* in *Phoin.* 751–752 he wrote the long rhesis containing the names, genealogy, shield symbols, and actions of the Seven.¹⁰ From Naber’s offhand comments one can perhaps isolate two further arguments against 1104–1140: (D) it repeats the “catalogue” given in the *teichoskopia*; (E) it is inconsistent for Euripides to “criticize” Aischylos in 751–752 and then himself spend thirty-seven lines on the Seven and their shield-symbols. In 1888 K. Walter argued that 1104–1140 were due to *Überarbeitung* and supported his belief that the text has suffered interference by claiming (F) that Euripides must have

⁸Beck in his note on *Phoin.* 1104 records Morus’ argument in a garbled version, confusing what Morus says about the *teichoskopia* with what he says about 1104–1140; this error received greater exposure when Beck’s note was reproduced in the Glasgow *variorum* edition of Euripides in 1821.

⁹Paley on *Phoin.* 1221–1258; Hugo Leidloff, *De Euripidis Phoenissarum argumento atque compositione* (Holzminden 1863) 20–22 and 25–28, alleging massive interpolation in *Phoin.* 834–1018 and 1582 ff.

¹⁰Naber, 148.

given a full report of Menoikeus' death, not the hasty mention found in lines 1090–1092.¹¹ In 1890 F. Polle declared the passage to be a histrionic interpolation in imitation of Aischylos (cf. G. below), but did not bother to give arguments.¹² In Wecklein's school-edition of *Phoinissai* (1894) the lines are still not bracketed, but it is apparent that Wecklein considered interpolation probable.¹³ He mentioned arguments D and C. In listing objections, moreover, he remarked (G) that the passage is strongly reminiscent of Aischylos (though he did not explicitly say that the similarity is an index of spuriousness). Wecklein also suggested (H) that there is an inconsistency in that Adrastos is one of the seven attackers in 1134 but commander-in-chief of the whole army in 1187.

Many scholars not averse to detecting interpolations (e.g., H. van Herwerden, Wilamowitz, C. Robert) were not convinced by the arguments for excision of 1104–1140, but no comprehensive defense of the passage was produced. Attacks on the text continued. In 1901 A. Balsamo, referring to arguments C, D, G, and H, concluded that the passage came from an early Euripidean version of the play and that it had been clumsily contaminated in our texts with a later Euripidean version less imitative of Aischylos.¹⁴ Finally in 1911 J. U. Powell became the first (and only) editor to bracket the entire passage. He mentioned arguments C, D, and G, rephrased Morus' argument A in claiming that "the lines are full of obscurities and difficulties," and added (I) that these lines make the speech too long.¹⁵ D. L. Page, referring to Powell, accepted it as proven that 1104–1140 are spurious and only attempted to characterize the interpolator; Page at least observed that the imitation of Aischylos (argument G above) is not close or verbal and termed the passage "an original composition, carefully imitating the style of Euripides" (contrast Morus' *Euripideae orationi dissimilis*). W. H. Friedrich, in his highly speculative study of possible evidence for the performance of shorter versions of *Phoinissai* and for the interpolation of bridge-passages to cover larger omissions, suggested that 1104–1140 were added in performances in which the *teichoskopia* was omitted. Friedrich used a curiously negative form of argument A ([the passage] "nichts enthält, was man nur einem grossen Dichter wie Euripides zutrauen könnte") as well as arguments C, D, and I.¹⁷ In 1963 the deletion received the influential support of Eduard Fraenkel, who finally published theories on the state

¹¹As reported by Wecklein in (Bursians) *Jahresbericht über den Fortschritt der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 58 (1889) 392.

¹²Polle, 53.

¹³Wecklein (1894), 13.

¹⁴Balsamo, 248–250.

¹⁵Powell, 11–12.

¹⁶Page, 21.

¹⁷Friedrich, 271.

of the text of *Phoinissai* which he had first developed fifty years earlier.¹⁸ After referring to Wecklein, Powell, and Friedrich, Fraenkel denied in a note that obscurities in the passage can be elucidated (A); added strength to argument C by denying that *καὶ πρῶτα μὲν* can be assigned a legitimate meaning in accordance with Euripidean usage (it is merely a meaningless opening flourish stolen from 1141); introduced a new argument (J) that line 1146 (from which he infers that the Seven were initially *Einzelkämpfer*) is inconsistent with the presuppositions of 1104–1140; and expanded argument E, alleging that it would never have occurred to Euripides, after his “criticism” of Aischylos in 751–752, to produce a variation on an Aischylean model “in einer Weise, die jedem feinerem Geiste als Karikatur erscheinen musste.”¹⁹

In the course of 200 years the arguments in favor of deletion have risen in number from three to ten, and with the authority of Fraenkel's support, the athetesis of *Phoin.* 1104–1140 is on the verge of becoming an orthodoxy. Diller accepts the deletion in his important review of Fraenkel's monograph;²⁰ Erbse does not defend or even mention the passage in his counterattack against Fraenkel's deletions;²¹ and in the most recent detailed study of Euripidean messenger-speeches Erdmann accepts Fraenkel's contention (Erdmann mentions D, J, and E and states C in a stronger form by arguing that the delay of the start of the battle narrative caused by 1104–1140 is disturbing).²²

II

Since the internal, stylistic argument (A) is so dependent on individual *Sprachgefühl*, it is appropriate to examine first the major external arguments (B–E) and determine whether they produce strong evidence of interpolation. Morus' argument, B, that the passage is artistically irrelevant to the theme of the play, depends entirely on the narrow description of the proper *summa rei* of *Phoinissai* propounded by Morus, Hermann,²³ and many later critics who pick out one simple theme (e.g., the quarrel of the brothers) and criticize Euripides for including anything that does not,

¹⁸Fraenkel, 3, mentions his study of the play as a student and a letter written to Wilamowitz two weeks after Fraenkel's *Doktorprüfung* in 1912.

¹⁹Fraenkel, 53–56. Fraenkel spoke much more tentatively about the matter in *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* III (Oxford 1950) 824.

²⁰Hans Diller, review of Fraenkel in *Gnomon* 36 (1964) 641–650.

²¹Hartmut Erbse, “Beiträge zum Verständnis der Euripideischen Phoinissen,” *Philologus* 110 (1966) 1–34.

²²Erdmann, 115 n. 2.

²³Hermann, x-xxiv.

in their view, pertain to that theme. Once it is admitted, as it must be, that Euripides had more than one simple theme in mind,²⁴ argument B loses all force. One major theme of the play is the danger to Thebes and the salvation of the city despite the actions of Eteokles and Polyneikes. In evoking that danger Euripides deploys the emotional lyrics of Antigone in the *teichoskopia*, the contrasts drawn by the chorus between peaceful worship and war (202–260) and between Dionysiac revelry and the arm-bearing thiasos of Ares (784–800), and the fateful prophecy of Teiresias revealing the demand for human sacrifice (931–952). The theme of the city's danger and safety reaches its climax in the first part of the fourth episode (1067–1207a): in the exciting and masterly first messenger-speech it would be anything but *a re alienum* to parade the traditionally famous names and to evoke their strength, ferocity, or arrogance through the traditional symbolism of the blazons.

Those who concede that the naming and rapid characterization of the Seven is relevant to one major theme of *Phoinissai* will perhaps nevertheless put weight upon argument D, which notes that the Seven are “catalogued” in the *teichoskopia* and alleges that repetition in the later messenger-speech is intolerable. Repetition *per se*, however, is not in general a safe ground for suspicion, especially since it is often used deliberately to emphasize or illuminate by means of variation a theme or motif. Although one probably cannot argue that the double naming of the Seven has some designed artistic effect in the overall scheme of the play, it is important to understand the different characteristics and separate functions of the two “catalogues.”²⁵ The naming of the attackers is only a minor function of the *teichoskopia*; the “catalogue” there is lyric, informal, uneven, not related to a clear topographical scheme; the effect on the secluded maiden Antigone of the names, appearances, and associations of the heroes is much more important than the conveying of information to the audience. Lines 1104–1140, on the other hand, if accepted, clearly serve a narrative purpose; the “catalogue” is ordered according to the traditional topographical scheme, with the heroes receiving roughly equal treatment; the naming in 1104–1140 would provide information that is both traditional and (as will be argued shortly) helpful and would clear the way for a more lively narrative of the battle-action. Since 1104–1140 may have their own function in contributing to the narrative self-sufficiency of the rhesis, the claim that the repetition is intolerable should not be too readily accepted.

A critic who in turn grants the weakness of argument D by itself may

²⁴I have discussed this in my dissertation (above, note 2), and other critics have made a similar point, from (e.g.) J. A. Hartung, *Euripides Restitutus* II (Hamburg 1844) 442–471 to E. Rawson, “Family and Fatherland in Euripides’ *Phoinissae*,” *GRBS* 11 (1970) 109–127.

²⁵Cf. Sauer, 997–1000.

fall back on argument E, which refers to Eteokles' comment in 751–752 ("To speak the name of each man would be a great delay, when the enemy is camped beneath the very walls"). For over three hundred years scholars have debated the import of this couplet, with Hugo Grotius leading the faction which finds here a neutral or even respectful reference on Euripides' part to the differences between his own treatment of the Seven and Aischylos',²⁶ while Pierre Brumoy and his followers detect satire or criticism of the long rheseis in *Septem*.²⁷ Assuming satire, Naber thought it inconceivable that Euripides wrote 1090 ff. as we have it, and Walter limited suspicion to 1104–1140 in particular. In this crude form, argument E is unacceptable. Even if Euripides is "criticizing" Aischylos in 751–752, the criticism would be that it is unrealistic to devote so much time to long descriptive rheseis when the attack is imminent; in *Phoinissai*, however, the rhesis comes *after* the battle and within a deliberately contrived pause during which the news of the impending duel of the brothers is held back from Iokaste and the audience. The alleged criticism would therefore be irrelevant to the problem of lines 1104–1140. There is, nevertheless, a more subtle version of argument E: Fraenkel argued that the *teichoskopia* is the positive complement of the *Kritik* of the *Septem* offered in negative terms in 751–752 and that Euripides would not stoop to produce a further variation in caricature of the Aischylean model (for, if it were Euripidean, such it would seem *jedem feineren Geiste*).²⁸ This subtler version reduces, however, to two components:²⁹ objection to repetition of the naming (argument D) and an ennobling or classicizing prejudice about what would be worthy of Euripides *vis-à-vis* Aischylos. The former has been discussed; the latter is of interest in assessing Fraenkel's approach to several problems in *Phoinissai* and in other plays,³⁰ but it is irrelevant to

²⁶Hugo Grotius, "Prolegomena" (to his 1630 edition and translation of *Phoin.*; reprinted in the various editions of Valckenaer's commentary) 31; cf. Didymos as quoted in *ΣPhoin.* 751, Geel on *Phoin.* 751, and Diller (above, note 19), 664 n. 1.

²⁷Pierre Brumoy, *Le Théâtre des Grecs* (1730; rev. ed. Paris 1763), tome 4, 220–221; Valckenaer on *Phoin.* 751; Hermann, xix; Pearson on *Phoin.* 751. More reasonable than the detection of criticism or satire is the view of R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Arethusa* 2 (1969) 129, that the remark is intended as a display of modern cleverness *vis-à-vis* the archaic poet.

²⁸Fraenkel, 56.

²⁹There is also in "jedem feinerem Geiste" the *ad hominem* implication that anyone who disagrees has vulgar taste, but that is not relevant.

³⁰I refer to Fraenkel's tendency to ennoble, simplify, or even whitewash complex and flawed characters presented by Euripides: Polyneikes is improved by deletion of *Phoin.* 438–442 (Fraenkel, 25–27; Fraenkel and others have of course brought linguistic objections against these lines, but they are not cogent: cf. my dissertation [above, note 2], 394–395); Eteokles is made less harsh by removal of several lines in 753–783 (Fraenkel, 28–37); Oidipous, Kreon, and Antigone are rendered tame by deletions in the exodos (Fraenkel, 86–120). The same tendency may be seen in his interpretation of Aischylos' Agamemnon in *Der Agamemnon des Aeschylus: ein Vortrag* (Zürich 1957) and in his

the real issue of suspicion of *Phoin.* 1104–1140. If anyone believes that these lines, if Euripidean, would be caricature, that belief is no argument for excision. Whatever the import of *Phoin.* 751–752 and whether argument E is stated in its crude or its more subtle form, no weight should be conceded to it in judging the authenticity of 1104–1140.

Of the major external arguments there remains to be considered argument C, which has two facets: first, the presence of *καὶ πρῶτα μὲν* at the beginning of both 1104 and 1141 has been considered suspicious—or in the much stronger terms of Fraenkel's indictment, the phrase is without a legitimate Euripidean meaning at 1104 and thus a sure sign of unthinking imitation by an interpolator; secondly, it is argued that 1141 easily follows 1103—or in the stronger terms of Erdmann's argument, that 1104–1140 offensively hinder the progress of the narrative. To test Fraenkel's objection, we may usefully classify the instances of *πρῶτον μὲν* and *πρῶτα μὲν*³¹ in the tragedians according to the rhetorical contexts in which they occur. By virtue of the force of *μὲν*, these phrases always imply enumeration; the ordering implied may be purely temporal, non-temporal (i.e., implying precedence, importance, or simply clear articulation of a group of items), or a mixture of the two. Among the enumerative uses,³² most (type A) feature an anticipatory word or concept which mediates the enumeration by calling for quantitative or qualitative substantiation.³³ A minority of enumerative uses (type B), however, commentary on *Ag.* 810 ff. and 914 ff. Euripides is again protected from unworthy behavior by Fraenkel's proposed deletion in *Electra*: cf. *Agamemnon* (above, note 19) III.815–826.

³¹Fraenkel's classification of *πρῶτα μὲν* (54 and notes 1–3) treats Euripidean usage only, omits one important example (*Hek.* 357), and produces a third category which differs little if at all from his second. I consider both forms of the phrase together because they are, for the most part, metrically different forms of the same expression (there are a few cases in which *πρῶτον μὲν* is used although *πρῶτα μὲν* is metrically possible: e.g., *Tro.* 386).

³²Apart from enumerative uses I make two classifications. (I) Use with an imperative, statement of intention, or the like, either (a) temporal with respect to the order of the actions to be carried out: Aisch. *Ag.* 810, *Eum.* 1, Soph. *OK* 469, Eur. *Hkld.* 337, etc.; or (b) "temporal" only in the sense that the speaker is ordering requests or suggestions to emphasize enumeration or precedence: Aisch. *Supp.* 197, Eur. *Supp.* 301, etc. (II) Use in narrative rheseis with obvious temporal force: (a) shortly after the common *ἐπει*-clause which begins the rhesis or a section of the rhesis: Aisch. *Pers.* 388, Eur. *Hkld.* 834, *Ba.* 1048; (b) two stages of action contrasted: Aisch. *Pers.* 399, 412, Eur. *Ba.* 1096; (c) other sequences: Aisch. *Choe.* 1068, Soph. *Trach.* 763, Eur. *Hipp.* 1190, etc.

³³Quantitative clues include *πολλά* and indefinite relative clauses (e.g., the clause in *Hel.* 976 anticipates the enumeration begun in 978); the most common qualitative clues are *ἀγαθὰ* and *κακά* (e.g., *Ion* 634, *Med.* 232). Examples of type A: (1) temporal meaning prominent: Soph. *Phil.* 1418, Eur. *Kykl.* 3, *Alk.* 502, *Med.* 232, 1101, *Supp.* 517, *HF* 174, 1258, *Ion* 1595, *Tro.* 919, *IA* 1148; (2) temporal meaning weak or absent: Aisch. *PV* 447, Eur. *Med.* 536, 720, *Hipp.* 996, *Supp.* 489, 203, *El.* 304, *Tro.* 386, 647, 768, *Ion* 634, *Hel.* 270, 978, *IA* 986, fr. 282.3, fr. 360.5, 360.7, 362.6 N². I include argumentative narration (e.g., *Tro.* 919 and *HF* 1258) in this category.

features no anticipatory word or concept; that is, the speaker suddenly begins an enumeration simply to create a clear, rhetorically effective articulation of what he has to say. All the instances which fall under this heading are non-temporal.³⁴ It is this use of *πρῶτον μὲν* which is important for interpreting *Phoin.* 1104.

The unsuspected occurrence of *καὶ πρῶτα μὲν* at 1141 belongs with other instances of the phrase in narrative rheses with obvious temporal force; more specifically, it may be grouped with other passages in which two stages of battle-action are contrasted. At *Ba.* 1096 *πρῶτον μὲν* marks the *eminus* stage of the Maenads' assault on Pentheus (the *comminus* stage follows with *τέλος δὲ* . . . in 1103); at Aisch. *Pers.* 412 *τὰ πρῶτα μὲν* marks the initial stage in which the Persian fleet held its own (the disastrous second stage is introduced by *δὲ* and a temporal *ὥς*-clause in 413); likewise in *Phoin.* 1141 *καὶ πρῶτα μὲν* marks the *eminus* stage of the battle, unfavorable to the attackers (the *comminus* stage is introduced by *δὲ* and a temporal *ὥς*-clause in 1143). Similar narrative techniques are to be found in battle-narratives in prose.³⁵ The earlier use of *καὶ πρῶτα μὲν* in 1104 is not, however, of the same type. Fraenkel is correct to dismiss the interpretation implied *en passant* by Wilamowitz:³⁶ as the consistent use of the imperfect tense in 1104, 1110, 1114, 1119, 1124, 1129, and 1134 indicates, it is not a question of one action being completed before the next takes place; the seven units advance toward the seven gates at the same time.³⁷ Nor can *πρῶτα μὲν* in 1104 have temporal force contrasting the whole process of approach to the gates with what happens next, for although the same rhesis can contain more than one temporal use of *πρῶτα μὲν*,³⁸ the descriptive section 1104–1140 does not mark a temporal advance beyond what is described in 1102–1103. Rather we should recognize here, I believe, an enumerative, non-temporal sense of the phrase (without mediating clue: type B above), used solely for structural clarity in a clearly articulated list: it is closely followed by the name of the first

³⁴Examples of type B: brief pairs: Aisch. *Supp.* 410, Eur. *Ba.* 1248, *Med.* 548 (in this case the use is purely structural and does not imply precedence or importance). Longer enumerations in which importance or rank is involved: Aisch. *Sept.* 501, *Supp.* 917, probably Soph. *El.* 968, Eur. *Hipp.* 1335. Longer enumerations in which ordering is merely structural: Soph. *El.* 261, *OK* 832, Eur. *Supp.* 892, *Hek.* 357, fr. 382.5 N².

³⁵E.g., Hdt. 1.214.2; Thuc. 7.34.4.

³⁶Fraenkel, 54 n. 4, referring to Wilamowitz, 232, who so paraphrases *Phoin.* 1153 ff. as to allow the inference that he understood 1104 ff. in that way. But it is not entirely certain that Wilamowitz did read 1104 ff. that way.

³⁷Likewise in Aisch. *Pers.* 399–400 the two imperfects with *μὲν πρῶτον* and *δεύτερον δὲ* describe the gradual emergence into view of the whole fleet (starting with the right wing), and the action described by the first imperfect verb continues in (or is subsumed with) the action of the second imperfect verb.

³⁸Instances in which a poet marks more than one kind of first stage of action within the same rhesis: Aisch. *Pers.* 388, 399, 412; Eur. *Ba.* 1048, 1096. (Cf. Eur. fr. 360.5 and 7 N² for double use in an enumeration of arguments.)

gate, and each subsequent δὲ (1109, 1113, 1119, 1123, 1128, 1134) brings the name of a further gate, the final item in the enumeration being marked by the use of ἐβδόμῃς in place of a proper name in 1134. What the messenger does at 1104 is to postpone the narration of the actual fighting in order to set the scene in more detail, with its traditional topography and prosopography. After the brief summary of Menoikeus' sacrifice and Eteokles' preparations, the messenger had begun the battle-narrative *ab ovo* in 1198 with the movement of the Argive host from the direction of Teumesos (their camp NW of Thebes). The fighting would begin when the Argives reached the ditch (which marks the range within which missiles can be thrown) and broke into a run. The imperfect ἐκελάδουν describes the sounds which traditionally accompanied a charge. At 1104 the messenger diverges from the overall viewpoint of 1098–1103 and, still using the imperfect, describes the charge in seven detailed views which emphasize the blazons of the leaders. When this description is complete, the messenger returns to the overall view in narrating the beginning of the actual combat and maintains that view through 1152; at 1153, however, he shifts to "close-ups" of the action at three of the individual gates, returning to the overall viewpoint in 1187.

If the rhetorical/structural use of καὶ πρῶτα μὲν is accepted and the postponing effect of the description and the shifting viewpoints of the whole narrative are recognized, then not only is Fraenkel's apparently strong linguistic objection to the phrase answered, but a defense is available against the corollary of the objection to καὶ πρῶτα μὲν. Erdmann puts the corollary in its strongest form when he describes the passage 1104–1140 as a disturbing delay in the start of the battle-narrative. But it is argued above that the passage is deliberately subjoined to 1098–1103. The aesthetic argument that the lines hinder the progress of the narrative rests on the assumption that Euripides wanted to or needed to move rapidly into and complete the action-narrative. In another late play, however, Euripides suspends or delays the action-narrative by the inclusion of an extensive descriptive passage (*Ion* 1132–1166). There was no aesthetic compulsion for Euripides to confine himself to the action in *Phoin.* 1090 ff. Dramatic necessity for brevity was also lacking: the dramatist felt no compunction about the naturalistic inappropriateness of a lengthy speech at a moment when urgent action would, in the real world, be required; time is in suspension during the rhesis and arguments or criticisms based on a concern for real time are invalid.³⁹

³⁹Cf. *Med.* 1136–1230 (Medeia listens to a long rhesis when she has yet to kill her children and prepare her escape), *Hel.* 1526–1618 (Theoklymenos' reaction of wrath toward his sister is artificially postponed), *IT* 1327–1419 (the need to begin pursuit of the fugitives is present from the start, but action is postponed). Erdmann, 122 n. 2, quotes U. Treu, *Die Bedeutung der erzählenden Rhesis innerhalb der Handlung der attische Tragödie* (diss. Jena 1952) 92: "während der Erzählung steht die Zeit still."

The weaker forms of the objection to *πρῶτα μὲν* and of its corollary are not cogent either. The phrase has two legitimate functions separated by more than thirty lines. Double use of such a phrase within a short interval is attested elsewhere.⁴⁰ Furthermore, if 1141 can in fact easily follow 1103, that circumstance is no reliable indication of the spuriousness of the intervening lines. If 1104–1140 are Euripidean and if they express a partial, detailed, descriptive viewpoint adopted temporarily between sections containing an overall narrative viewpoint, it is entirely natural that they have the appearance of being “inorganic,” since the shift of focus is clearly articulated (likewise 1172 *could* follow 1164 because of the articulation of the narrative, but 1165–1171 should not be suspected).

Argument C, like argument D, can thus be pruned of specific textual supports and reduced to a general aesthetic judgment of the appropriateness or positive contribution made by lines 1104–1140 to the messenger-speech and to the play as a whole. It is a weakness of the conservative case that one cannot say that the naming of the famous heroes in both *teichoskopia* and messenger-speech positively affects the play as a whole and that one cannot ascribe to the “catalogue” the sort of *important* thematic or symbolic contribution which may be perceived in the messenger-speech in *Ion*.⁴² But we should consider whether the messenger-speech in *Phoin.* does in fact read smoothly and easily if 1141 follows 1103. Omission of the “catalogue” has the curious consequence that the famous seven-pronged attack is left implicit in 1098–1103 and 1141–1152 and the gate-by-gate treatment of the battle is suddenly introduced in 1153. Although the method of attack is revealed⁴² and discussed in the second episode, it is only obliquely referred to in the mention of the Theban defense arrangements in 1093–1094.⁴³ In lines 1098–1100 the Argive army moves in a single group from its encampment NW of Thebes; the use of an overall viewpoint in 1100–1103 and 1141–1152 leaves it entirely to the audience to assume the division of the Argive army into seven units and to realize that Tydeus and Polyneikes in 1144 are speaking in two different places. This is perhaps odd, especially when the topography is so important in terms both of traditional legend and of military strategy.⁴⁴ With 1104–1140, however, the attack referred to in general terms in 1100–1103 is immediately subdivided into its seven parts in the “catalogue;” then, with the topography and characters

⁴⁰Cf. above, note 38.

⁴¹On this see my article in *CSCA* 8 (1975) 163–176.

⁴²Wilamowitz, 231–233, and Pearson, 214–216 (Appendix A. 5) are incorrect in their view that the Argive army already surrounds the city with its seven units at the opening of the play. See my dissertation (above, note 2), Chapter 3, note 10.

⁴³Cf. also *Phoin.* 974, which is accepted by many critics, including Page, 27.

⁴⁴I intend to discuss elsewhere the exegesis of *Phoin.* 1101 and the relevance of that problem to the narrative flow of the rhesis. The line cannot, I believe, mean “surrounded the city at a run,” as the Budé translation would have it.

clearly established, the selective treatments of the heroes in 1153–1186 and the shifts in viewpoint at 1141, 1153, and 1187 are easy and effective.

III

The five minor external arguments for suspicion of *Phoin.* 1104–1140 may be dismissed with very little discussion. Enough is now known of the dramatic technique of the Attic tragedians to insure that no weight need be placed on the observation that there is no report of Menoikeus' death and that Iokaste seems well-informed about the self-sacrifice (objection F, Naber and Walter). Characters on the Greek stage frequently display knowledge they would not have in a real-life situation;⁴⁵ the brevity of treatment given to Menoikeus' action in the rhesis (1090–1092) is all that is dramatically necessary here.⁴⁶ Argument G (imitation of Aischylos, *Septem* 375–652) is quite inconclusive. Only if the imitation were very close and purposelessly plagiaristic would similarity between *Phoin.* 1104–1140 and Aischylos be pertinent to the question of authenticity. Once allowance is made, however, for the necessarily common terms (λόχος, πύλαι, etc.) and names, the similarity is not at all striking. Rather, the variation is noteworthy: the names are in a completely different order and Adrastus appears in place of Aischylos' Eteokles; only one matching of hero and gate is explicitly the same (Kapaneus, Electran gate), while two are implicitly the same (Hippomedon at Onchestan gate in A., Ogygian in E.;⁴⁷ Polyneikes at Krenaian gate in E., seventh in A.), and the other pairings differ; the only shield-symbol precisely the same is (necessarily) Amphiaraios' blank shield, whereas other similarities display striking *variatio* both in application of the imagery and in pairing imagery with hero (*Se.* 387–390 ~ *Phoin.* 1116–1118 [a dubious similarity]; *Se.* 433–434 ~ *Phoin.* 1121–1122; *Se.* 424 ~ *Phoin.* 1131; *Se.* 495 ~ *Phoin.* 1135; *Se.* 539–543 ~ *Phoin.* 1137–1138). The author of *Phoin.* 1104–1140 is either using the same source as Aischylos in quite a different way, or using Aischylos but carefully avoiding close reminiscence of his version. The defender of the passage may legitimately suggest that such treatment of the details may be

⁴⁵Cf. W. S. Barrett, *Euripides, Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964), on *Hipp.* 1241, and P. T. Stevens, *Euripides, Andromache* (Oxford 1971), on *Andr.* 1047–1288.

⁴⁶The parallel of the treatment of Makaria in *Hkld.* has usually occurred to critics, at least to those who believe (as I do) that *Hkld.* has not lost an episode containing a messenger-speech describing the maiden's death. In *Phoin.* the third stasimon is a sufficient encomium for Menoikeus (*pace* the criticism contained in *ΣPhoin.* 1019).

⁴⁷The Ogygian and Onchestan Gates have been identified as the same in the past, but recent discussions deny the identification: cf. F. Schober, *RE* 5A (1934) 1428–1434.

ascribed with somewhat greater probability to Euripides himself than to an interpolator.⁴⁸

Wecklein and Fraenkel believed that they had detected inconsistencies in the presuppositions of 1104–1140 and of the rest of the speech (arguments H and J). There is, however, not the slightest narrative or military difficulty in having Adrastus appear as the leader of one of the seven attacking units in line 1134 and then later in 1187–1188, in his role as senior member of the Seven and sponsor of the entire expedition, order and supervise a retreat (especially since several, perhaps five, of the Seven are by that point dead). Fraenkel inferred from the exhortation in 1146 *τί μέλλετ' ἄρδην πάντες ἐμπίπτειν πύλαις*; that up to this point in the battle the Seven leaders had attacked as *Einzelkämpfer* and the *λόχοι* had been inactive⁴⁹ (how the audience was supposed to understand that from 1100–1103 and 1141–1144 he does not explain). Fraenkel misunderstood the military conventions of the narrative: as soon as the Argives cross the ditch, they come within range of missiles and an *eminus* battle begins (stalling, it is implied, the advance of the seven units); the side which is getting the worst of such a battle must close in on the enemy and engage in *comminus* battle, and this is what Tydeus and Polyneikes order. The Seven are not viewed as *Einzelkämpfer* anywhere in the play (cf. 710–711, 739–744,⁵⁰ 787–790, 1083–1094, 1099–1103); lines 1104–1140 are perfectly consistent with the rest of the rhesis and the rest of the play.

Objection I, that the description in 1104–1140 makes the speech too long and spoils the proportions of the scene, is without value. The audience does not know until 1217 that this scene is to contain a further rhesis. Euripides has contrived the scene in such a way as to lull Iokaste (and to a certain extent the audience) into a false sense of relief before announcing the imminent fratricidal duel. A messenger-speech of a length quite normal for late Euripides⁵¹ adds to this deception by seeming

⁴⁸Of course, if it is decided on other grounds that 1104–1140 are not Euripidean, one may refer to imitation in explaining the interpolator's inspiration and motivation, but my point is that the sort of similarities which exist cannot contribute to a decision that the passage is spurious.

⁴⁹Fraenkel, 55, followed by Erdmann, 115 n. 2.

⁵⁰The corruption of the first two words of line 739 by the intrusion of the first two words of 742 makes it probable that line 739 originally began with the letters *λοχ-*. The comment *τὸ γὰρ σθένος βραχύ* in 738 also points towards Euripides' departure from the tradition of *Einzelkämpfer*.

⁵¹If we ignore for the moment any proposed lacunae or interpolations, the mss have 110 lines in *Phoin.* 1090–1199, 110 lines in *Ba.* 1043–1152, and 107 lines in *Ion* 1122–1228. If *Phoin.* 1104–1140 are deleted, the messenger-speech which remains is unusually short (73 lines), comparable only to *Hekd.* 799–866 (68 lines, but there is a lacuna) and *Hek.* 518–482 (65 lines): *Hel.* 605–621 is not comparable because it is an abortive by-form of the messenger-speech (cf. Erdmann, 173–175), while *Phoin.* 1217 ff. is an un-

complete in itself. The structure of the fourth episode is thus not fully parallel to that of the fifth: in the latter the two rheses are merely two halves of a report anticipated in 1335–1355, articulated by a couplet spoken by the koryphaios; in the former the second rhesis is an appendix to the first, a surprise addition prepared for separately by 1207–1216. It is therefore misguided to demand that 1090 ff. be shorter for the sake either of proportion within the fourth episode or of symmetry between the fourth and fifth episodes.

IV

The external arguments have been reviewed: some have no probative value, and some have much less force than the proponents of deletion believe. Before assessing the cumulative weight of those that retain some force, it is necessary to turn to the internal evidence. Some scholars malign the passage without going into details (Morus, Polle), others assail individual lines as nonsensical and/or unworthy of Euripides; Powell notes that “the lines are full of obscurities and difficulties.” On the other hand, Page describes the style as a careful imitation of Euripides. Commentators have often not bothered to carry the task of exegesis through to a firm conclusion, and some are content to let the mere fact of disagreement among modern interpreters speak against the authenticity of the passage. It would be sounder method to come to a decision about individual details before judging the whole passage: if a line is judged to be corrupt, it must be marked as such, not athetized; if one accepts the arguments of Valckenaer or another critic that a line is interpolated into its present context, then that line is to be athetized and no suspicion can be attached to the context because of that line’s obscurities or difficulties; if a line appears neither corrupt nor interpolated into its context, but has been variously interpreted, it needs exegesis before one can decide whether it contains a word, a locution, or an idea which is not Euripidean.

There is no significant textual problem or difficulty of interpretation in the first twelve lines of the passage (1104–1115). It is worth noting, however, that the bold use of the perfect passive participle *ὑβρισμένα* in 1112 is one which would perhaps be better ascribed to Euripides himself than to an interpolator.⁵² Lines 1116–1118 present the first and most serious problem in the passage. Neither Pearson nor Powell, in the most recent comments on these lines, gives a penetrating discussion of the problem,

expected appendix to the main speech and *Phoin.* 1356–1424 and 1427–1479 are really one rhesis with a breathing space (1425–1426).

⁵²For the usage cf. Pearson *ad loc.*; it appears later in Xen. *Kyr.* 2.4.5 *στολή οὐδέν τι ὑβρισμένη* and Ael. *VH* 1.31 *οὐδέν τι τῶν ὑβρισμένων οὐδὲ τῶν ἄγαν πολυτελῶν* (quoted by Klotz). Cf., however, below, note 82.

although Pearson at least mentions some attempts at explication in an appendix. The ancient exegesis of the passage, so far as we can infer it from Eustathios,⁵³ the older scholia, and the imitation in Quintus of Smyrna 10.191 (cf. Ovid, *Met.* 1.628), was this: Argos' eyes function in relay or in shifts, some sleeping while others remain vigilant.⁵⁴ Valckenaer, who considered 1118 definitely spurious, was suspicious of 1116–1117 both textually (he proposed two emendations) and aesthetically (he found it unsuitable that the messenger should describe such minute details) but conceded that Euripides himself may have been guilty of the aesthetic fault. Musgrave accepted and explicated the lines, and Porson accepted them as well. Matthiae,⁵⁵ pondering the grammar of the lines, suspected them, and in 1835 Bergk⁵⁶ declared them spurious, alleging that what the couplet says is tautologous nonsense (an argument often repeated down to Pearson and Powell). Hermann used the same argument to justify an emendation and introduced a red herring (still brought up by Powell) by positing a lacuna before 1116 containing Argos' name and mention of Io.

It is not profitable to review all the arguments and suggestions made since Hermann. The important contributions toward explicating the lines have been those of Musgrave, Geel, Petersen, and T. Mommsen. First, there is no lacuna: there is ample literary and archaeological proof that the name Panoptes by itself would be understood to mean Argos, the guardian of Io,⁵⁷ and the scholia on which Hermann based his supplement for the alleged lacuna are both late and unintelligent.⁵⁸ Secondly, given the choice between taking the participles as masculine singular in agreement with *Πανόπτην*⁵⁹ or neuter plural in agreement with *δμματα* (with Eustathios), the critic must adopt the latter view, unless he is inclined to emend *βλέποντα*.⁶⁰ There is no way to construe *δμματα* if *βλέποντα* is masculine, but it is conceivable that *κρύπτοντα* is used intransi-

⁵³Eustathios 182, 23–31, on *Il.* 2.103.

⁵⁴This is not the way ancient artists represented Argos, but their procedure does not provide evidence relevant to the authenticity of these lines. I hope to discuss this matter in detail elsewhere.

⁵⁵Matthiae, *tomus* 6, 366.

⁵⁶Bergk, 965–966.

⁵⁷Cf. Ar. *Ekkl.* 79–80 and the note *ad loc.* in R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes, Ecclesiazusae* (Oxford 1973). A vase depicting Argos with the name Panoptes inscribed (Louvre G229; cf. *CVA France* 9. Louvre 6, pl. 45, 7) was first published by T. S. Panofka in "Argos Panoptes," *Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, Philosophische, philologische und historische Abhandlungen*, 1837, 81–127. Nevertheless Hermann argued for the lacuna in 1840 and many scholars repeated his illusory objection thereafter.

⁵⁸Cf. Mommsen, 769–770.

⁵⁹This is the recommendation of a Byzantine scholar in a late scholion on *Phoin.* 1117 recorded by Dindorf and quoted by Klotz and others.

⁶⁰Wecklein (1901) lists as *minus probabiles* the conjectures of Seidler (*κλείοντα*), Geel (*οἷγοντα* or *δεικνύντα*), and Schoene (*φαίνοντα*). Cf. below, note 63.

tively (the tragedians use *κείθω* intransitively as well as transitively, and there may be parallels for intransitive *κρύπτω*).⁶¹ The neuter plurals must then be taken either as accusative in loose apposition to *Πανόπτην* . . . *δεδορκότα*⁶² or as a *nominativus pendens* occurring in *asyndeton explicativum*. Munro alleged that *τὰ μὲν* . . . *δμματα* could not mean "some of the eyes" (on the ground that the pronominal article with *μὲν-δὲ* may be accompanied by a partitive genitive or preceded by the plural noun that is divided into parts, but may not, in an Attic writer, be followed by the noun); he used this observation to justify an improbable emendation of *δμματα*,⁶³ but Pearson and Powell took it up to support deletion of the couplet. Munro's observation may well hold true for Attic prose, but this is not a prose passage. If *τὰ μὲν* . . . *δμματα* is in fact grammatically impossible Greek, then it is a questionable procedure to assign it (with Pearson and Powell) to any deliberate interpolator, since such an interpolation should have been meaningful to its author. Most scholars have, however, considered the usage possible and meaningful, assuming that *τὰ μὲν* . . . *τὰ δὲ* do convey the antithesis "some . . . other . . ." and that *δμματα* is added (not immediately after *τὰ μὲν*, it may be noted) to supply a subject-noun for *βλέποντα* and *κρύπτοντα* and eliminate the possibility of the audience's interpreting the participles as masculine singular.

The tautologous interpretation of the couplet propounded by Bergk goes hand in hand with the view that the prepositional phrases refer to two times of day, sunset (star-rise) and sunrise (star-set). Despite the fact that this interpretation produces nonsense, Pearson (following earlier critics) used as an argument for deletion the unparalleled use of *σὺν* and *μετὰ* in the sense of *ἅμα*+dative. Stars, however, rise and set throughout the night, so that the prepositional phrases can refer to a continuous process, not to two single moments; the prepositions are locative/comita-

⁶¹Intransitive *κρύπτω* seems to have been assumed by the scholiasts who paraphrase with *μύω* and *καταμύω*; this interpretation was first argued explicitly by Musgrave *ad loc.* The verb *κείθω* is elsewhere transitive, but intransitive in Soph. OT 968, *Aias* 635 (perhaps an extension of the historically justified intransitive use of the second perfect *κέκευθα* in Aisch. Sept. 588, Soph. Ant. 911, etc.). The context is lacking, but it seems the most reasonable view to take as intransitive *ἀποκρύπτουσι* in Hesiod fr. 290 Merkelbach-West (fr. 179 Rzach; Athenaios 11.80 491d). Mommsen, 766 n. 1, follows Ellendt and other early interpreters in taking *κρύπτουσιν* as intransitive in Soph. El. 826, but recent scholars correctly assume the verb is transitive there; he also refers to *ἐγκρύψαι* in *hymn. Hom.* 4.416, but there is generally (and rightly) assumed to be a lacuna there.

⁶²The closest parallels, if this is a case of loose apposition, are those listed in Kühner-Gerth I.288, paragraph 8 (especially the Herodotean examples of the type [1.52] *ἀνέθηκε* . . . *αἰχμὴν στερεὴν πᾶσαν χρυσέην, τὸ ξυστὸν τῇσι λόγχῃσι ἐὼν ὁμοίως χρύσειον*. So already G. Bernhardt, *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der Griechischen Sprache* (Berlin 1829) 120 note 84.

⁶³H. A. J. Munro, "Euripidea," *JP* 11 (1882) 284; he proposed *ἄμματι/λέποντα* for *δμματα/βλέποντα*.

tive, implying depiction of the stars rising in the east (at left) and setting in the west (at right), with various eyes opening and closing in unison with their movement.⁶⁴ Instead of meaning “half the eyes opening at sunset, the other half closing at sunrise” (Bergk, Pearson, *et al.*), the couplet means “some eyes watching (i.e. opening) together with rising stars, others closing in unison with setting stars.” It is the commentator’s duty to explicate the text. *If the text is not altered*, then whether the author is Euripides or someone else, the couplet can, I think, be explicated only in this way.

Line 1118 must of course be deleted if 1116–1117 are deleted; but there is little point in deleting the line if the previous couplet is retained. It is not true, as Pearson and Powell (following Geel and others) assert, that 1118 is “inconsistent” with 1139–1140: it is surely permissible to give a particular justification of knowledge in one case in addition to the general justification later offered for the whole description, and it is not the critic’s function or right to argue on the basis of naturalism that if the messenger saw the other details before the battle then he did not need a closer view of Hippomedon’s shield after that hero’s death. Nor is there any legitimacy in the arguments that we are nowhere else told that Hippomedon died and that mention of his death would necessitate a description of it later in the scene.⁶⁵ If there were no exegetical difficulties in 1116–1117, deletion of 1118 could not be justified.

If the critic believes that 1116–1117 are corrupt, he should obelize them and not concede to them any weight in the dispute about 1104–1140, for we cannot judge the style (and hence the authenticity) of lines whose correct text is not known. If the critic believes that there is enough cause for suspicion (syntactic looseness, intransitive κρύπτω, position of ὄμματα) to justify deletion of the lines from the context, then he should bracket them along with 1118 and again deny them any force in judging 1104–1140. Only if the critic considers the lines both textually sound and not detachable from their context,⁶⁶ yet unlikely on stylistic grounds to be Euripidean, can he cite lines 1116–1118 as evidence for the interpolation of 1104–1140.

⁶⁴It is not legitimate to argue that, even if the meaning of the lines is the one argued for here, no Greek artist could represent such a scene (cf. Schmidt, 15–16; Zipperer, 55). First, a literary art-object may well be impossibly complex (e.g., the shield of Achilles); secondly, a Greek artist probably could represent the circuit of the heavens in such a way as to suggest the movement of the stars (cf. *Ion* 1146–1158 and the use of rising and falling chariots in the east pediment of the Parthenon).

⁶⁵Geel *ad loc.*; Zipperer, 58, referring to H. T. Trautmann, *De Euripidis Phoinissarum versibus suspectis et interpolatis* (Halle 1863).

⁶⁶Geel, for instance, argued that without 1116–1117 the treatment of Hippomedon would be too brief in proportion to the treatment of the other heroes. I am uncertain what weight can be placed on such a judgment.

Pearson and Powell emphasized obscurities in lines 1120–1122, the description of Tydeus; in doing so they were following several nineteenth-century scholars,⁶⁷ but ignoring or rejecting the exegesis offered by others. Removal of any of the lines from the context is out of the question,⁶⁸ so they must be interpreted or emended. One Byzantine commentator⁶⁹ and some later scholars have assumed that the text describes two images (lion's skin and Prometheus) on one shield, probably for several reasons: the lines in Aischylos of which 1121–1122 are a reminiscence describe as the emblem on Kapaneus' shield a man with a torch assaulting a city, with the words *πρήσω πόλιν* represented on the shield (*Sept.* 432–434); in 1137–1138 a *δὲ* is used to add further details about Adrastos' blazon; and, in general, one expects the descriptions in this "catalogue" to refer to the shields. None of these reasons is, however, cogent, especially when it is admitted that it is artistically impossible to have two symbols on one shield.⁷⁰ First, we have no right to expect precise imitation of Aischylos (other instances of *variatio* have been noted above). Secondly, in 1137 the prepositional phrase does not suggest Adrastos as subject, and *δράκοντες ἔφερον* immediately follows, making it quite clear that the *δὲ*-clause continues the description of the blazon; in 1121, on the other hand, *δεξιᾷ δὲ*, after *ἔχων ἐπ' ἀσπίδι*, can only suggest Tydeus' right hand, the *δὲ* marking a contrast with the shield the warrior carries on his left arm. Thirdly, there are a few other details in the description not connected with the shields (1105, 1110, 1128). Thus it is not only legitimate but necessary to read lines 1121–1122 as a description of Tydeus and not of his shield. In the absence of a word like *σημεῖον*, 1120–1121 are to be interpreted as meaning that Tydeus has a real⁷¹

⁶⁷E.g., Paley *ad loc.*; Schmidt, 17–18.

⁶⁸Schmidt, 18, admitted he would like to delete 1121–1122, but conceded that to do so leaves Tydeus too briefly treated. (Wecklein [1901] Appendix records *olim deletbat Hartung* for this couplet. In Hartung [1837], 41, however, 1121–1122 are a misprint for 1126–1127, as Hartung's words make clear.)

⁶⁹Cf. the first scholion on *Phoin.* 1120 in Dindorf.

⁷⁰This impossibility was implicitly recognized by Grotius, Musgrave, and others and explicitly argued by Schmidt, 17. It would be possible to have a lion's head on the omphalos of a shield and a scene or several scenes around it (cf. the distribution of scenes around the Gorgon's head on the shield of the Athena Parthenos: G. M. A. Richter, *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks* (4th ed. New Haven 1970), fig. 645). But a lion's skin is not a lion's head, and the text does not (and cannot) suggest such a view.

⁷¹Lion's heads (in side view) and lion's foreparts do appear as shield symbols in Greek vase painting: cf., e.g., P. Devambez, *Greek Painting* (New York 1962), pl. 81; E. Langlotz, *Griechische Vasen in Würzburg* (Rome 1968), numbers 179, 259, 451. But I do not know of any representation of *painted* lion's skins on shields. Moreover, the text lacks any clue (*ἐπίσημα, σημεῖον; γραφή* 1135) that a painted emblem is meant. Powell *ad loc.* refers to *ἐπ' ἀσπίδι* in 1124 and rejects the sense "draped over the shield" in 1120; but the contexts determine the different senses of the prepositional phrases in 1120 and 1124 (cf. Klotz's choice of the inferior late reading *ἐπ' ἀσπίδος* in 1120 for a reason similar to Powell's).

lion's skin (a mark of ferocity and valor)⁷² mounted on his shield. Lines 1121–1122 are then to be translated: "and in his right hand a torch he bore, a Titan Prometheus, intending to burn the city." This is essentially the translation of the scholia, Grotius, Barnes (in his note; the Latin translation is ambiguous), Musgrave, Porson, Hermann, Klotz, Geel, Wecklein, and others. Musgrave and several who came after him punctuated so as to place *ὥς* in anastrophe and make the comparison obvious: *ἔφερεν ὥς, πρήσων πόλιν*. This separation of *ὥς* from the future participle creates some hesitation (contrast 1154–1155); but Musgrave's punctuation is probably not necessary to produce the meaning translated above (*pace* Pearson): *Τιτάν Προμηθεύς* can be an appositional nominative expressing metaphorical identification of Tydeus with Prometheus (cf. the scholiast's *ἀντόχρημα*, Wecklein's "Tydeus, ein echter Titan Prometheus"). Such identification, to use Fraenkel's term,⁷³ is most frequently found with animals, but also occurs with mythological figures; the identification in many cases depends on a proverbial collocation of terms, but can equally be based on well-known attributes or deeds of a famous person. In addition to several examples in Greek comedy and Latin poetry, there is at least one example in serious classical poetry: Pindar, *P.* 4.289 *καὶ μὰν κείνος Ἀτλας οὐρανῷ προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρώας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπὸ τε κτεάνων* (and he [Damophilus], a second Atlas, wrestles with the heavens . . .). This suffices to confirm and justify the use of the figure in *Phoin.* 1122.⁷⁴ Most of the other arguments adduced against understanding the text in this way are inspired by a misplaced rationalism.⁷⁵ Since the possi-

⁷²Or the lion may have some particular relevance to Tydeus as a mythological personality; cf. the oracle referred to in *Phoin.* 411 and Pearson's note on 1120.

⁷³Eduard Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (*Philologische Untersuchungen* 28 [Berlin 1928]) 51–52, and *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* II.206 (with further references); P. Shorey, *CP* 4 (1909) 433–436. Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 928, *Plut.* 314; Lucian *Apol.* 3 *κατὰ σαντοῦ ὁ Βελλεροφόντης γεγραφῶς τὸ βιβλίον*, where Naber, *Mnemosyne* ser. 2, 6 (1878) 258, would delete *ὁ*, making the identification conform to the usual pattern.

⁷⁴The rhetorical figure identification is possible here because the epithet *Pyrphoros* and the imagery of torch-bearing were readily associated in the Athenian mind with Prometheus; cf. Pearson *ad loc.* and W. Kraus, *RE* 23 (1957) 654–656. Lest it occur to anyone to suggest that the appearance of both a reference to fire-bearing and the "cognomen" *Titan* in Soph. *OK* 55–56 and *Phoin.* 1121–1122 is suspicious and suggestive of interpolation (alleged interpolator of *Phoin.* borrowing the phrase from a Theban play of Sophocles), note that Titan Prometheus is also referred to in Eur. *Ion* 455.

⁷⁵Pearson, following Hartung (1849), thought it "surely incredible that the 'warrior' Tydeus carried in the assault so ineffective a weapon as a torch." Hermann found it not entirely apt that Tydeus is compared with a Titan since in *Il.* 5.801 Tydeus is *μικρὸς δέμας*. Powell remarked that "when Prometheus stole the fire from heaven, he concealed it in a fennel-stalk." This observation is true for depictions on Attic vases (which are apparently inspired by a satyr-play about the theft of fire from heaven: cf. L. Eckhart, *RE* 23 [1957] 719–720). But literary iconography need not coincide with the iconography of *Realien*; Prometheus was closely associated with torch-bearers in Attic cult (see previous note); and the satyrs on Attic vases depicting Prometheus bear torches. Thus

bilities of artistic representation and the linguistic evidence support only the exegesis given above, it is to be accepted; and once the lines are properly explicated, they seem to me to offer no evidence to support the denial of Euripidean authorship.⁷⁶

Scholars who have had problems with lines 1126–1127 have in part let themselves be mesmerized by the confusion of the scholiasts and have in part responded to their own assumptions about heroic decorum.⁷⁷ Heath⁷⁸ was the first modern scholar to translate line 1126 correctly (*callide verticulis ab interiori clipei parte circumactae*): *στροφιγξι* means “by means of pivots” (the word’s only attested sense),⁷⁹ *ἐνδοθεν* means “from within,” i.e., from the back side of the shield, and the participle is passive. Pearson and Powell both have the correct view in their notes, although Powell argues (irrelevantly and rather feebly) in his introduction that “the device seems almost impossible.” There is nothing linguistically or aesthetically suspicious in *Phoin.* 1123–1127;⁸⁰ these lines lend no support whatever to the case against 1104–1140.⁸¹

we may reject Powell’s dogmatic assertion that Prometheus Pyrphoros, “the bringer of fire to Prometheus’ Athenian worshippers, cannot be referred to.”

⁷⁶M. D. Reeve, however, asks why a comparison with Prometheus is made at all in the context of an attack upon a city. I see the point of comparison solely in the carrying of fire; cf. the previous note.

⁷⁷Although some glosses in M and V (Schwartz I.368, lines 2–3) point to the correct interpretation, another longer note in TVB (lines 4–6) misconstrues *ἐνδοθεν* (as “within the rim,” i.e., in the middle of the front of the shield), *στροφιγξι* (as “circular paths” on which the horses run), and *κυκλοῦμεναι* (apparently taken as middle, not passive). A yet longer Byzantine note (lines 7–21) misconstrues *ἐνδοθεν* in the same way, suggests that *στροφιγξι* means “reins,” and defines *πόρπαξ* first as the hollow behind the omphalos of the shield, then as the omphalos itself. For scholarly presuppositions about heroic decorum, cf. Hartung (1837), 41, and (1848), 462; Schmidt, 18; Zipperer, 58–59.

⁷⁸Benjamin Heath, *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias* (Oxford 1762), Eur. vol. 29. Heath was followed by Beck, Hartung (1849 translation), Klotz, Wecklein, Pearson, and Powell.

⁷⁹Both *στροφιγξ* and its diminutive *στροφιγγιον* are equivalent to *στροφεύς* in meaning: all refer to a moving joint (vertebra) or pivot. The incorrect meaning assumed by the scholiast is found only for *στροφάλιγξ*.

⁸⁰Suggestions that 1126–1127 or 1126 alone be deleted have no merit and have long been abandoned. Hartung (1837), 41 began the trouble by objecting to the unworthiness of having heroic arms decked out with moving devices *tamquam crepundia puerorum*; he deleted the couplet and was followed by Trautmann (above, note 65), according to Zipperer, 59. Hartung (1848), 462 proposed deletion of 1126 only, using a dangerous *argumentum ex silentio* based on late scholia from inferior manuscripts; this course was approved by Schmidt, 18, and Zipperer, 59. Hartung (1849) no longer deleted, though his note still mentioned the scholion.

⁸¹Both Pearson and Powell repeat the parallel from Aischylos *Sept.* 541–542 adduced by Wecklein (1894) *ad loc.* But although Eustathios 1160, 49 on *Il.* 18.533–540 appears to interpret *Sept.* 541–542 as describing a figure of the Sphinx moved by a mechanism,

The traditional objection to the lines on Kapaneus (1128–1133) has been line 1133. Valckenaer observed only that *hic quoque versus, si quis alius, sapit interpolatoris ingenium* in arguing for removal of the line from its context.⁸² Of course, if he were correct, the excised line would be irrelevant to the discussion of 1104–1140 as a whole. But I see no sufficient ground for removal of the line from its context or for suspicion that its style is not Euripidean. The bold use of ὑπόνοιαν in apposition (or as internal accusative)⁸³ to the verbal phrase πόλιν φέρων is at any rate a thoroughly Euripidean construction and might even be viewed as more likely to be Euripidean than the work of an interpolator. Potentially more helpful to the proponents of deletion is the use of ὅλην in 1131. If fr. 1041 N² is denied to be Euripidean (a reasonable view), then, as Reeve points out,⁸⁴ *Phoin.* 1131 will be the only tragic line in the extant Euripidean corpus in which ὅλος is used (its use is not doubted in *Kykl.* 217, and Sophokles uses the word in tragedy). The difficulty of assessing the evidentiary value of a word which is unique in an extant corpus is notorious.⁸⁵ In a case of this sort some scholars are inclined to strong suspicion, others are not. In this case we may note that Euripides himself did not avoid the word totally and that ὅλην seems to be necessary to the sense desired here—both for the deliberate hyperbole and because πᾶσα πόλις has political connotations out of place in this reference to the physical entity.⁸⁶

γόμφοις in that passage means “nails” not “pivots” and I follow G. Italie, *Index Aeschyleus* (2nd ed. by S. Radt, Leiden 1964) s.v. νωμάω, who rightly understands Σφίγγα as equivalent by metonymy to σάκος. Thus there is no parallel in Aeschylus to the device described in *Phoin.*

⁸²Valckenaer was followed by Hartung (1837), 41, and Schmidt, 15, but by no other editor of Euripides. W. Weinberger, 76, in publishing a 5th century A.D. tablet with lines from this messenger speech, suggested that the tablet’s reading ὑπόνοια may reflect the original form of an interpolated line; it seems to me far more likely that unfamiliarity with the internal accusative construction of ὑπόνοιαν led to the trivialization ὑπόνοια. The word itself is so rare in fifth-century authors that one cannot argue, as Weinberger did, that it is not poetic in the sense required by the passage. M. D. Reeve, however, remarks that to him both ὑπόνοιαν here and ὑβρισμέν’ in 1112 “smack of fourth-century prose.”

⁸³Cf. Wecklein and Pearson *ad loc.*

⁸⁴*GRBS* 14 (1973) 162 n. 38.

⁸⁵Reeve’s attempt to set forth some guidelines, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 260, is helpful in its directness, but I believe there is still danger that his criteria are too strict. See my dissertation (above, note 2), 309–311.

⁸⁶M. D. Reeve also calls my attention to the unique use of θεάματα in 1139: elsewhere it means “a sight” or “thing seen” (product-noun or concrete noun based on passive verbal sense), but here alone it has an active verbal sense (“viewing,” “opportunity to look upon”). But nouns in -μα are not restricted to a concrete, quasi-passive sense or the product-noun sense, and Euripides himself varies his usage of other nouns in -μα (the use of the plural rather than singular also seems to have a bearing on the shift in mean-

The description of Adrastus' shield introduces the second serious difficulty. Lines 1135 and 1136 are repetitious or even tautologous, the plural *βραχίουσιν* referring to one arm is odd, and objection has been taken to *ἐκπληρῶν* and *γραφῇ*. Reiske, Valckenaer, and Geel proposed emendation;⁸⁷ Hartung, Wecklein, and others contemplated deletion of a line.⁸⁸ Fraenkel insisted that no explication of the lines satisfies and considered this to support deletion of 1104–1140 as a whole.⁸⁹ It is legitimate to wonder, however, what the alleged interpolator meant by these lines, since he writes normal Greek in the lines surrounding them. One can readily agree with Fraenkel that Geel's emendation *ἐκπληροῦν* is unacceptable because of the tortured word order and dubious sense it produces. But Pearson has well explained both the correctness of *ἐκπληρῶν* ("the verb transfers the function of the immediate agent to another person—here from the artist to the owner") and the function of the two datives (modal *γραφῇ*, instrumental *ἐχίδναις*).⁹⁰ Hartung made an essential advance when he argued that either 1135 or 1136 should be deleted, but he deleted 1135 (for bad reasons). Murray's deletion of 1136 is to be preferred, since the plural *βραχίουσιν* is very peculiar as a poetic plural of part of the body⁹¹ and since 1136 is feebler in expression (bland *ἔχων* vs.

ing): *ὄχημα* is usually concrete "chariot," but in *IT* 415 it seems to be the active verbal noun "voyaging" (internal accusative to *ἐπλευσαν*, which should not be emended); in *El.* 1124 the plural *λοχευμάτων* has active verbal sense (elsewhere *λόχευμα* = "offspring"); plural *νυμφεύματα* means "marriage" or "act of marrying" in *IT* 365 (but singular *νύμφευμα* = "bride"); cf. also Euripides' uses of *πέσημα* and *πτῶμα*. In view of such flexibility I am unwilling to ascribe any significance to the active verbal sense of *θεάματα* in 1139. (For a comparable view of nouns in *-μα* see A. A. Long, *Language and Thought in Sophocles* [London 1968] 19.)

⁸⁷J. J. Reiske, *Ad Euripidem et Aristophanem animadversiones* (Leipzig 1754) 13: *ἐκπληρῶν, γραφὴν ὕδρας ἔχων*; Valckenaer *ad loc.* proposed the same reading, but with *γ'* added after *ἐκατὸν* at the beginning to 1135; Geel would read *ἐκπληροῦν*.

⁸⁸Hartung (1837), 41, and (1848), 462, again with a dangerous *argumentum ex silentio* based on inferior scholia, deleted 1135 (followed by Zipperer, 60–61); Wecklein (1901) proposed to condense the couplet into one line reading *ἐκατὸν ἐχίδναις ἀσπίδ' ἐκπληρῶν ὕδρας*.

⁸⁹Fraenkel, 53 n. 5.

⁹⁰Cf. Pearson *ad loc.*, comparing Eur. *Hel.* 1124 (*κείραντες*) and *Or.* 54 (*ἐκπληρῶν*); the correct interpretation is also in the scholia (Schwartz, I.369, lines 23–24), although the alternative comments that follow are quite unintelligent.

⁹¹It is accepted as analogous to plurals like *στέρνα*, *στήθη*, *νῶτα*, etc. by Kühner-Gerth I.18, and by Pearson and the Budé editors. But such plurals of parts of the body refer to regions of the body which have extension and may be thought of as consisting of a multitude of non-discrete sections, but which nevertheless comprise a unitary mass; the same conditions do not apply to arms, which form two discrete masses. I view the interpolator's error as a stylistic rather than a grammatical one: i.e., it is the sort of mistake one can believe that a person to whom the Greek tongue was native could make. For further discussion of such plurals, see Jakob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (2nd ed. Basel 1926–1928) I.87 ff.; E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich 1939–1950) II.43.

lively and figurative *ἐκπληρῶν*). Deletion of 1136⁹² and correct exegesis of 1135 leave a text without suspicious features.⁹³ If this solution is accepted, no strength is added to the case for deletion of 1104–1140 (it is indicative of bad method or carelessness that Powell, who accepted Murray's solution, listed the interpolation of 1136 as part of the evidence justifying suspicion of 1104–1140).

Friedrich considered lines 1139–1140 to be patterned on *Phoin.* 95–98 (both contain justification of the detailed knowledge possessed by a character).⁹⁴ But the suggestion of a possible origin or inspiration for an alleged interpolation is not an argument for accepting the hypothesis of interpolation. In any case Euripides himself could have used the motif in both places. The same methodological point applies to the suggestion of Friedrich and Fraenkel that the whole passage was added by actors who wished to eliminate the lyric *teichoskopia*.⁹⁵ Speculation on the origin of an interpolation is in place only after one has made up one's mind about the case on other grounds.

V

Interpolation arguments almost always depend in the end on the judgment of the critic; only rarely do objectively-established points decide the case for him. It has been demonstrated above, I believe, that the separate arguments adduced against *Phoin.* 1104–1140 are either invalid (B, part of C, E, F, H, J), completely inconclusive or so subjective as to be useless as criteria (G, I), or weaker than proponents of deletions had admitted (A, part of C, D). But it is possible for an accumulation of

⁹²The line may have been intended not as a replacement for 1135, but as an addition to 1135 meant to help make the reference explicit and to provide a simpler construction for *αὔχημα* in 1137; if this is so, the line need not be histrionic, as Page, 24, believes it to be. If the hendiadys in Virgil, *Aen.* 7.657–658 *clipeoque insigne paternum/centum anguis cinctamque gerit serpentibus Hydram*, is in fact a reminiscence of *Phoin.* 1135–1136 (as Valckenaer and others believe), then we have a *terminus ante quem* for the interpolation of 1136.

⁹³No argument is necessary against the proposal of Schmidt, 22, to delete the blameless couplet 1137–1138 while reading *ἐκατὸν δ'* (*δ'* from late mss) in 1135 and *δράκων* for *ἔχων* in 1136 (with *ἦν* understood).

⁹⁴Friedrich, 271 note 3.

⁹⁵The parallels adduced by Fraenkel, 55 for iambic lines interpolated by actors who wished to omit authentic lyrics as too difficult to sing are in any case of dubious value: (1) it is not agreed by all that Eur. *Or.* 1366–1368 are interpolated: cf. A. M. Dale, *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956) 103–104, and Vincenzo di Benedetto, *Euripides. Orestes* (Biblioteca di studi superiori 51, Florence 1965) *ad loc.*; contra M. Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 263–264; (2) Eur. *Hipp.* 871–873 are, according to Barrett *ad loc.*, a pedantic interpolation, not one intended to eliminate difficult lyrics; (3) Plautus' *Stichus* comes from a rather different textual and dramatic/histrionic tradition.

separately weak arguments to build a persuasive case for deletion.⁹⁶ A final judgment should rest on three considerations. First, the internal evidence: is the style of the passage detectably not Euripidean? The answer to the question in this form should, I think, be no, although I concede that other critics may put more weight than I do on, e.g., the use of ὅλος. But the question can be rephrased: is the writing so inept or obscure as to be unlikely to be Euripides'? In view of the explications given above, I consider lines 1115–1118 and 1135–1136 to be the true problem-cases with regard to ineptness or obscurity. The latter passage is cured, in my view, by deletion of 1136. The former passage may be interpolated into its context or it may be corrupt; it is only supportive of suspicion of 1104–1140 as a whole if a critic believes three things simultaneously: that the text is sound, that the lines are integral to their context, and that the construction of the lines is inconceivable for Euripides. Adherence to all three of these points seems to me a shaky ground for suspecting 1104–1140, since any one of them is open to doubt. Secondly, the immediate external evidence: is the passage artistically intrusive and bothersome in the context of the messenger's rhesis and of the fourth episode? Thirdly, the external evidence in a wider sense: is the "repetition" involved between the *teichoskopia* and this passage artistically inexplicable and intolerable? In regard to both these issues I have argued that the critics' impression of the offensiveness of the "catalogue" has been exaggerated. On the other hand, neither I nor anyone else has yet established that the passage makes an *important* positive contribution to the artistry of the play. When the case against the passage is limited to these three points, some critics will find the balance of probability on the side of interpolation. For my part, I am not yet convinced that there is sufficient justification for the bracketing of *Phoin.* 1104–1140.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

⁹⁶This essential point of method is well brought out by Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 256.