

auch wenn das erste nicht zur thebanischen Sage gehört und insofern das *περὶ τοῦτου* auf das erste Stücke der Didaskalie (*Οἰνόμαος*) nur mittelbar zuträfe. Im Gegensatz zu dieser ‚Inhalts-Tetralogie‘ war dann also unserer *Phoinissai*-Hypothese zufolge der thebanische Sagenkreis im Falle der *Phoinissai* nur in einem einzelnen Stück behandelt<sup>14</sup>).

Halle (Saale)/DDR

Wolfgang Luppe

## EZECHIELIANA

*Adespota* fr. 617 Kannicht-Snell (Aesch. fr. 464 N.<sup>2</sup>)<sup>1</sup>

χώριζε θνητῶν τὸν θεὸν καὶ μὴ δόκει  
 ὁμοιον ἑαυτῷ σάρκινον καθεσθάναι.  
 οὐκ οἶσθα δ' αὐτόν· ποτὲ μὲν ὡς πῦρ φαίνεται  
 4 ἄπλατος ὄρμη, ποτὲ δ' ὕδωρ, ποτὲ γνώφος·  
 καὶ θηρσὶν αὐτὸς γίνεται παρεμφερῆς,  
 ἀνέμῳ νεφέλῃ τε κάστραπῆ, βροντῇ, βροχῇ.  
 ὑπηρετεῖ δ' αὐτῷ θάλασσα καὶ πέτραι  
 8 καὶ πᾶσα πηγὴ χυδατος συστήματα·  
 τρέμει δ' ὄρη καὶ γαῖα καὶ πελώριος  
 βυθὸς θαλάσσης κώρῳ ἕψος μέγα,  
 ἐπὰν ἐπιβλέψῃ γοργὸν ὄμμα δεσπότη.  
 12 πάντα δυνατὴ γὰρ δόξα ὑψίστου θεοῦ

14) Auf eine Behandlung einer Sage als ‚Nebenthema‘ verweist Hypoth. Aischyl. *Prom. κείται ἡ μυθοποιία ἐν παρεκβάσει παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Κολχίσι*, παρὰ δ' Εὐριπίδῃ ὄλως οὐ κείται.

<sup>1</sup>) Texts quoted (with elimination of *scriptio plena*) from R. Kannicht and B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta II* (Göttingen 1981). They are also printed by A. M. Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphicorum quae supersunt Graeca* (Leipzig 1970).

*Adespota* fr. 618 K.-S. (Soph. fr. 1126 P.)

εἷς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἷς ἐστὶν θεός,  
 ὃς οὐρανὸν τ' ἔτευξε καὶ γαίαν μακρὰν  
 πόντου τε χαροπὸν οἶδμα κἀνέμων βίας.  
 4 θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι  
 ἰδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν  
 θεῶν ἀγάματ' ἐκ λίθων ἢ χαλκῶων  
 ἢ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ ἄφαντίνων τύπους·  
 8 θυσίας τε τούτοις καὶ κενὰς πανηγύρεις  
 στέφοντες οὕτως εὐσεβεῖν νομίζομεν

These fragments are linked by several common denominators<sup>2</sup>). Both are quoted exclusively by Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Justin Martyr, and other Church Fathers. Although they are attributed to Aeschylus and Sophocles, and though the fact that they are quoted only by Church Fathers is no necessary sign of inauthenticity<sup>3</sup>), both present features of late Greek that prove these attributions false. A. C. Pearson has pointed out that in the second of these fragments 1 ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν (= τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) and 3 χαροπός ('blue-grey, of the sea' LSJ<sup>9</sup> definition 4) are late Greek<sup>4</sup>). The same can be said about 5 γίνεται in the first fragment. Both passages contain echoes of the Septuagint that establish their Jewish provenance. In fr. 617, 8 χῦδατος συστήματα recalls *Genesis* 1, 10 τὰ συστήματα τῶν ὑδάτων, and Pearson observed that fr. 618,4 καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι is a Jewish phrase (a Greek would have written something like γνώμη) and compares *Psalms* 94 (95), 10 αἰὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ.

How did these fragments come to be attributed to classical playwrights? Clement, *Strom.* V p. 717, says that the lines attributed to Sophocles were quoted by Hecataeus, *Against Abramus and the Egyptians*. It is variously debated whether this was the *Aegyptiaka* of Hecataeus of Abdera (III B. C.) or some other

2) The reader may judge whether the conclusions of this paper apply to further such *dubia* quoted by the Fathers: fr. 620–624 K.-S. Note that fr. 620 and 624 may be by the same hand: cf. fr. 620,1 ἔσται γὰρ ἔσται and fr. 624,3 ἔστιν γὰρ ἔστιν.

3) *Pace* Bentley, *Epist. ad Millerium* p. 12. Pearson made a good case that Soph. fr. 1127 P. (fr. 619 K.-S.) is satyric and authentic. Cf. further D. F. Sutton, *Sophocles' Inachus* (Meisenheim am Glan 1979) 82–84.

4) *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge U. K. 1918) III 173 f.

Jewish polemicist<sup>5</sup>). Pearson writes that the quoted fragment was “the work of a forger, whose object it was to represent the Jews as the original possessors of all true wisdom, and as the instructors of other nations. For such a purpose the utility of fabricated quotations is obvious... There is not the slightest doubt that these verses are an impudent forgery, being probably... the work of an Alexandrian Jew.”

Fr. 617 is sufficiently similar to fr. 618 that we may presume that these lines were also attributed to Aeschylus by Hecataeus or some other polemicist inspired by a similar motive.

Although Pearson is doubtless correct in describing the process whereby these fragments came to be ascribed to Aeschylus and Sophocles, it does not necessarily follow that they were originally written for the purpose of being palmed off as classical passages, or that they ought to be dismissed scornfully as “impudent forgeries”. There is nothing in either fragment that is self-evidently fraudulent, such as an attempt to imitate the style (or at any rate the obvious mannerisms) of their purported authors. An alternative hypothesis may be proposed.

We know of one Alexandrian Jewish poet, who in a tragedy entitled *Exagoge* attempted to translate the fundamentals of the Jewish faith into the language of Attic tragedy<sup>6</sup>). Then too, Eustathius writing on line 984 of Dionysius Periegetes writes of ὁ γράφας τὸ δράμα τῆς Σωσάννης, οἶμαι ὁ Δαμασκηνός, which is taken by some scholars to refer to Nicolaus of Damascus, by others to John of Damascus<sup>7</sup>). Other Jewish tragedies by these authors or others may also have existed. It is possible, therefore, that our fragments may have been written by Ezechiel or similar Alexandrian Jewish tragedians, and that they were subsequently torn out of their contexts and passed off as classical by unscrupulous polemicists precisely because they presented Jewish thought in an approximation to the language of Attic tragedy.

---

5) Besides the assessment of Pearson, cf. F. Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit. d. Alex.* (Leipzig 1891) I 312 n.16 and A. M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d' Ancien Testament* (Leiden 1970) 223–238.

6) For this work cf. Denis, *Introduction* 273–275, Bruno Snell, *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen* (Berlin 1971) 170–193, and Howard Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezechiel* (Cambridge U. K. 1983) who provides a full bibliography, to which should be added P. Fernaro, *La voce fuori scena: Saggi sull' Exagogè di Ezechiele* (Turin 1982). Jacobson's text is the best available; for a text with apparatus criticus cf. Bruno Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I* (Göttingen 1986) 288 ff.

7) Cf. Jacobson, *ib.* 4.

In the case of fr. 617 there is a strong argument for ascription to the *Exagoge* or some other tragedy by this same poet. Line 8 finds an exceptionally close parallel at *Exagoge* 134 πηγαί τε πάσαι χυδάτων συστήματα. παρεμφερής (apparently used as little more than a synonym for the usual προσεμφερής) appears in tragic contexts only in this fragment, at *Exagoge* 261, and at Isidorus 211 F 1, 2 Snell. The hallmark of Ezechiel's style is use of iambic resolution with a freedom equal to that of late Euripidean tragedy, a remarkable and evidently unique contrast with the usual tendency of postclassical tragic poets to avoid or at least minimize resolution. 11 ἐπὶ ἐπιβλέψη presents a word-division following the second element of a tribrachic resolution. This is a practice rare in Aeschylus and Sophocles, but employed with mounting frequency by Euripides<sup>8</sup>). Among postclassical tragedians, Ezechiel seems alone in imitating it, as at *Exagoge* 178 τετρας ἐπιλάμψη (-ψει mss.) δεκάδι.

These lines so markedly resemble the style of the *Exagoge* that ascription to the same author, if not necessarily to the same play, is highly attractive. They present a lofty and deeply felt statement of monotheism, expressed with vigor and ability, and are entirely worthy of Ezechiel, a poet of no little accomplishment. There is nothing fraudulent about them, and Ezechiel does nothing to disguise his own style or imitate that of someone else. There can be no equal certainty about fr. 618 or about the fragments itemized in n.2 above, as they do not exhibit free use of resolution or other traits of Ezechiel's style. But it seems probable enough that these fragments have suffered a fate similar to that of fr. 617: written by Jews for a wholly honorable purpose, they have been feloniously appropriated but they are scarcely impudent forgeries.

\*

The following suggestions for improving the text of the *Exagoge* presuppose that Ezechiel had an excellent grasp of the Greek language and the rules of iambic versification (the latter is obscured by the fact that editors unaccountably print his text in *scriptio plena*), and therefore that the irregularities noted below arise from textual corruption rather than from Ezechiel's own incompetence.

---

8) J. Descroix, *Le Trimètre Iambique* (Paris 1931) 164–169.

28 τρόφειε τοῦτον, γυναί,

τροφεύω is supposed to take its object in the genitive: read τούτου.

48 ἰδὼν ἄνδρας δύο,  
 μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς συγγενεῖς, †παρουμένους†  
 πατουμένους Dübner, κακουμένους Stephanus

παλαιμένους may be closer to the mark in view of *Exodus* 2,13 δύο ἄνδρας Ἐβραίους διαπληκτιζομένους.

112 (sc. ἀλλ' ἔρπε καὶ σήμαινε)  
 ὅπως σὺ λαὸν τὸν ἑμὸν ἐξάγοις χθονός.

Optative with a primary tense in a final clause is rare and often emended away by editors (cf. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* § 322). ἐξάγῃς is probably better here.

136 ἔπειτα τέφραν οἷς καμινάϊαν πάσω

In postclassical poetry (as in earlier prose) ὅς is sometimes encountered as a demonstrative pronoun; but, to judge by LSJ<sup>9</sup> ὅς A, this demonstrative usage is found in apposition answering to a previous article; besides Moschus 3,76, Bion 1,81, and AP 6,187, cf. lines 43 (in Dübner's emendation), 45, and 240 of the present text. As this is not the case in the present line, we should better read τοῖς.

174 τάρσενικὰ διανοίγοντα μήτρας μητέρων.

As a close student of Euripidean iambs, Ezechiel may have been aware that Porson's Law is sometimes violated by Euripides (cf. IT 580 with Platnauer's note *ad loc.*). The 'law of the final cretic' is violated here and at 163 (λαῶν γυνή τε παρὰ γυναικὸς λήψεται). Hence Ezechiel may well have written what stands in our text. (Other evident violations of the Law at lines 62, 131, 233, and 240

