

## TrGF 2.624 – A EURIPIDEAN FRAGMENT

In the authoritative new collection of the *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (TrGF), a five-trimeter passage appears as No. 624 in the second volume which contains the ‘Fragmenta adespota’.<sup>1</sup> Whereas Nauck<sup>2</sup> placed the lines among the ‘Fragmenta dubia et spuria’ of Euripides (Eur. fr. 1131), Kannicht and Snell separate them totally from the Euripidean fragments and associate them with various pseudepigraphical pieces of tragic poetry which are commonly thought to have originated in the ‘workshop of a Jewish forger’.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of my article is to challenge this decision and to show that TrGF 2.624 may well be genuine poetry by Euripides if we restore the lines to their probable original form. An attempt to reconstruct the original context of the fragment will also be added.

## I

The text of the fragment given in TrGF 2 is as follows:

ὁράθ' ὅσοι νομίζετ' οὐκ εἶναι θεόν,  
 δις ἑξαμαρτάνοντες οὐκ εὐγνωμόνως;  
 ἔστιν γὰρ ἔστιν. εἰ δέ τις πράσσει καλῶς  
 κακὸς πεφυκώς, τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνετω·  
 χρόνῳ γὰρ οὗτος ὑστέρον δώσει δίκην.

The lines have been handed down only by two comparatively late writers: the unknown author of Ps.-Justin's treatise *De monarchia* – a selection of genuine and forged passages of pagan Greek literature, often irritatingly intertwined, which are quoted in support of a Jewish monotheistic doctrine<sup>4</sup> – and Clement of Alexandria.

<sup>1</sup> R. Kannicht and B. Snell (edd.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. II *Fragmenta adespota* (Göttingen, 1981).

<sup>2</sup> A. Nauck (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1889; repr. with a *Supplement* by B. Snell, Hildesheim, 1964).

<sup>3</sup> TrGF 2.617–24 ‘ex fabrica falsarii Iudaei (saec. I<sup>a</sup>?)’. In the apparatus to fr. 624, Kannicht and Snell refer to A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden, 1970), p. 226 with n. 15, but this reference is not very helpful since Denis, loc. cit., only gives a summary of Ps.-Justin's *De monarchia*.

<sup>4</sup> It is rather difficult to give an exact date for the treatise. It is commonly attributed to the second century A.D. (cf. A. Elter, *De gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine* [Universitätsprogramm Bonn, 1893–7], p. 203; A. von Harnack, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrhunderts in der alten Kirche und im Mittelalter*. [TU 1.1] [Leipzig, 1882], pp. 154f.; A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*<sup>2</sup> Bd. II.1 [Leipzig, 1958 = 1897], p. 512; R. Harris, *Justin Martyr and Menander* [Cambridge, 1932], p. 25 ‘earlier than Justin’; N. Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos* [TU 86] [Berlin, 1964], p. 211; M. Hengel, ‘Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und “Literarische Fälschung” in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur’, *Entretiens de la Fond. Hardt* 18 [Genf, 1972], p. 294 n. 2 ‘Ende 2. oder Anfang des 3. Jahrhunderts n.Chr.’; J.-M. Vermader, ‘La parution de l'ouvrage de Celse et la datation de quelques apologies’, *Rev. des études aug.* 18 (1972), 32f.; cf. also O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*<sup>2</sup> Bd. 1 [Freiburg i.Br., 1913], pp. 236f.; W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* [München, 1971], p. 161; N. Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du I<sup>er</sup> siècle* [Louvain, 1972], pp. 8–9 and 18). But it seems to me quite certain – for reasons I cannot expand in detail in this article – that *De mon.* belongs to the first century B.C. or A.D. Scholars used to

Both Ps.-Justin (*De mon.* 3.2–3) and Clement (*Strom.* 5.121.1–3)<sup>5</sup> transmit the fragment as part of almost identical packages of lines containing Diphilus *PCG* 5.136, Eur. fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup> and *TrGF* 2.624. This correspondence suggests that either both authors drew on a similar florilegium, or Clement directly depends on the treatise *De monarchia*. Both views have been held.<sup>6</sup> To resolve this issue would require an evaluation of the many other instances where both authors quote the same fragment. But that is beyond the scope of this article.

It is Clement's citation of the lines on which Valckenaer based his negative judgement about the fragment.<sup>7</sup> Clement of Alexandria generally enjoys a rather high reputation among classicists, and in cases where his wording of a passage differs from others, modern scholars tend to give preference to his reading. But this rule of thumb quite often proves to be unreliable, and each case must be considered on its merits.

Clement *Strom.* 5.121.1–3 introduces the sequence of verse-passages with the remark Δίφιλος πάλιν ὁ κωμικὸς τοιαῦτά τινα περὶ τῆς κρίσεως διαλέγεται. Immediately after the quotation of the Diphilean fragment (*Diph. PCG* 5.136), he adds – still under the same heading – the lines Eur. fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup> and *TrGF* 2.624. Yet it is fairly obvious that the ascription to Diphilus applies in fact only to the first quoted comic verse, which Ps.-Justin for his part attributes to Philemon (*De mon.* 3.2). The authenticity of the Euripidean fr. 835 has never been seriously doubted because Sextus Empiricus and Stobaeus quote the lines as taken from Euripides' tragedy *Phrixus*:<sup>8</sup>

S. E. *Math.* 1.274<sup>9</sup> καὶ μὴν οὐ ταῦτα μόνον τοῖς ποιηταῖς δεξιῶς εἰρῆσθαι φαίνεται ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περὶ θεῶν, οἷόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῷ Εὐριπίδῃ λεχθέν ἐν Φρίξῳ.<sup>10</sup>

ὅστις δὲ θνητῶν οἶεται τοῦφ'<sup>11</sup> ἡμέραν  
κακὸν τι πράσσων τοὺς θεοὺς λεληθέναι,  
δοκεῖ πονηρὰ καὶ δοκῶν<sup>12</sup> ἀλίσκεται,  
ὅταν σχολὴν ἀγούσα τυγχάνῃ Δίκη.<sup>13</sup>

oscillate between whether the treatise had been compiled by a Jew or a Christian. Yet nothing within the six chapters presupposes Christian doctrine, whereas on the other hand we find many thoughts and concepts which are well known from the late writings of the LXX and Philo.

<sup>5</sup> The whole passage of Clement is cited by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio evangelica* 13.13 (§47 for *TrGF* 2.624). Since Clement's *Stromata* are transmitted in only one manuscript, Eusebius serves as an important independent witness for the constitution of Clement's text.

<sup>6</sup> (a) Ps.-Justin and Clement use the same source: Harris, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 17f.; Harnack, loc. cit. (n. 4); Walter, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 186 (in connection with the so-called Testament of Orpheus); Hengel, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 295; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*<sup>2</sup>, Vol. III.1 (Edinburgh, 1986), p. 657; (b) Clement is dependent on *De monarchia*: A. Elter, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 188, 198, 201ff.

<sup>7</sup> L. C. Valckenaer, *Diatribae de Aristobulo Iudaeo, philosopho peripatetico Alexandrino* (published posthumously by J. Luzac) (Leiden, 1806), pp. 1–5. References to his discussion will be given with name and page only.

<sup>8</sup> Euripides seems to have written two tragedies called *Phrixus*, see below part IV.

<sup>9</sup> The lines are quoted again in *Math.* 1.287, but without mentioning the name of the play: Καὶ μὴν ὅσον ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπ' Εὐριπίδου λεχθέντι περὶ θεῶν, τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ οἱ ἰδιῶται δόξαν ἔχουσιν. ἰσὺν γὰρ ἐστὶ τῷ Ὅστις δὲ... Δίκη, καὶ τὸ οὕτω παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγόμενον, Ὅψέ θεῶν ἀλέουσι μύλοι, ἀλέουσι δὲ λεπτά. Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1.3.15 alone adds a fifth line, wrongly printed among the 'adespota' in *TrGF* 2.490, as will be pointed out later (cf. n. 80).

<sup>10</sup> cf. Stob. loc. cit. *Εὐριπίδης Φρίξῳ*.

<sup>11</sup> The manuscripts of Sextus give in this passage the reading καθ', but τοῦφ' in 1.287 (cf. n. 9) which is supported by Ps.-Justin, Clement (and Eusebius) and Stobaeus.

<sup>12</sup> F. H. Bothe, *Euripidis fabularum fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1844), p. 300, adopted the reading of the Stobaeon codex F καθικῶν. But καὶ δοκῶν is generally attested and can be regarded as 'lectio difficilior'. Cf. H. van Looy, *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides* (Brussels, 1964), p. 153.

<sup>13</sup> For the probable context of the fragment, see below part IV. One could, of course, always play the devil's advocate in suggesting that the passage may be a sententious interpolation. But

Ps.-Justin also mentions Euripides, but his remark *Kaì Eùrπίδης* appears in our manuscripts in the wrong place, i.e. two lines before the fragment of Euripides.<sup>14</sup> Mechanical corruptions occur several times in *De mon.*<sup>15</sup> They are symptomatic of the poor condition in which this monotheistic florilegium has come down to us, and Marcovich, in his forthcoming edition of three treatises of Ps.-Justin,<sup>16</sup> is surely right in correcting the manuscripts and transposing *Kaì Eùrπίδης* just before the generally acknowledged fragment of Euripides.<sup>17</sup>

Ps.-Justin thus introduces Eur. fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup> and *TrGF* 2.624 as one continuous piece of Euripides. At first sight, this ascription may seem rather unlikely because of the strongly monotheistic character of the sentiment in '*Opāth*' *ὅσοι νομίζετ' οὐκ εἶναι θεόν... ἔστιν γὰρ ἔστιν*. The Dutch scholar mentioned above, Valckenaer, was the first to doubt the authenticity of the five lines *TrGF* 2.624, and his principal objection was, indeed, to the singular *θεόν*.<sup>18</sup> In addition to that, he felt that his scepticism was confirmed by the fact that Clement writes *δοκεῖτε* instead of *νομίζετ'* (p. 3):

Sed vide mihi turpem istum in Attico versu hiatum, '*Opāth*' ὅσοι δοκεῖτε οὐκ – nam correctoris potius esse videtur paulo doctioris, quem offendeat hiatus, illud apud Justinum, '*Opāth*' ὅσοι νομίζετ' οὐκ –.

This precisely reflects the favourable view which scholars in general hold of Clement's accuracy, but it proves to be a false prejudice if we consider his citation of this

since Euripides is generally quite fond of gnomic sentences, the 'onus probandi' lies, I think, on the side of people who question the testimony of our sources. There is, at any rate, nothing whatsoever in either language or thought of fr. 835 which speaks against a Euripidean origin of the lines. For *ὅστις δὲ θνητῶν οἶεται... |... λεληθέναι, | δοκεῖ πονηρὰ*, cf. *Oinomaos*, fr. 575 N<sup>2</sup> *ὅστις δὲ θνητῶν βούλεται δυσώνυμον | εἰς γῆρας ἔλθειν, οὐ λογιζέται καλῶς κτλ.* and *Tro.* 1203 *θνητῶν δὲ μῶρος ὅστις εὖ πράσσειν δοκῶν | βέβαια χαίρει κτλ.*; for *τοῦφ' ἡμέραν*, see *Cycl.* 336 *ὡς τοῦμπειν γε καὶ φαγεῖν τοῦφ' ἡμέραν; ἀλίσκεται* (line 3) occurs five times elsewhere in Euripides at the end of an iambic trimeter (*Med.* 84, *Hipp.* 913, *IT* 1038 and 1419, fr. 811 N<sup>2</sup>); for *ὅταν σχολῇν ἀγούσαν... cf. Med.* 1238 *καὶ μὴ σχολῇν ἀγούσαν... For the concept of Dike, who sometimes may be inconspicuous and tardy but will always exert her power in the end, cf. Antiope*, fr. 223 N<sup>2</sup> (see below part II), fr. 979 N<sup>2</sup> (*οὗτοι προσελθοῦσ' ἡ Δίκη σε, μὴ τρέσῃς, | παίσει πρὸς ἥπαρ οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων βροτῶν | τὸν ἄδικον, ἀλλὰ σίγα καὶ βραδεῖ ποδὶ | στεῖχουσα μάρφει τοὺς κακοὺς, ὅταν τύχῃ*); *El.* 771, *Archelaos*, fr. 255 N<sup>2</sup> etc.; see in general H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus*<sup>2</sup> (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983), pp. 151ff.

<sup>14</sup> cf. M. Marcovich, 'Patristic Textual Criticism', *ICS* 13 (1988), 143f.; H. J. Mette, 'Euripides (insbesondere für die Jahre 1939–1968), Erster Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke', *Lustrum* 12 (1967), 282 ('beide Wörter versehentlich um 2 Zeilen nach oben versetzt'). – N. Walter, *Gefälschte Verse auf Namen griechischer Dichter*. In: *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (hg. von W. G. Kümmel) Bd. IV (Gütersloh, 1983), p. 246 hazards a guess that *καὶ Eùrπίδης* might be explained as a 'sekundäre "Verbesserung"', but this seems to me to be very unlikely. If *καὶ Eùrπίδης* was already misplaced in Clement's time, it would be easy to understand why he has disregarded the phrase.

<sup>15</sup> The two most prominent examples are: (1) chapter 2.4 where the so-called Testament of Orpheus is quoted without the first two lines (this has commonly been regarded as a result of a mechanical distortion, cf. A. Elter, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 157; H. Erbse, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien* (Hamburg, 1941), p. 17 n. 37; N. Walter, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 211; (2) *De mon.* 3.1 + 2 (lines 6f. of Diphilus *PCG* 5.136 occur in our MSS. some six lines too early where they are totally out of place).

<sup>16</sup> Pseudo-Iustini *Cohortatio ad Graecos, De Monarchia, Oratio ad Graecos* (Patristische Texte und Studien, Verlag W. de Gruyter [Berlin and New York]). I should like to thank Prof. Marcovich very much for his outstanding generosity in letting me use the typescript of his new critical edition.

<sup>17</sup> Marcovich, loc. cit. (n. 14).

<sup>18</sup> cf. p. 3. All later discussions of the fragment are in one way or another indebted to the work of this scholar (cf. the note in the apparatus criticus *TrGF* 2.617–24 'duce Valckenaerio'; A. Matthiae, *Euripidis tragoediae*, Vol. IX [Leipzig, 1829], p. 298; Th. Fix, *Euripidis fabulae* [Paris, 1843], p. 822 etc.).

fragment more closely. For it seems clear from Eusebius' quotation,<sup>19</sup> that in the third line of *TrGF* 2.624 Clement wrote *κακῶς* instead of *καλῶς* – a rather careless error, probably caused by assimilation to the following *κακός*,<sup>20</sup> and perhaps also influenced by *κακόν τι πράσων* in the previous second line of Eur. fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup>. Valckenaer in fact questioned Clement's reading in this case (p. 2), and Otto in his edition has definitely rejected *κακῶς* as wrong.<sup>21</sup> Clement cannot, on the other hand, be blamed for the erroneous reading *κερνάτω* instead of *κερδαινέτω* in the next line because Eusebius clearly found the correct form in Clement's text.<sup>22</sup> Yet Eusebius' quotation confirms that Clement omitted line 2 *δὲς ἑξαμαρτάνοντες οὐκ εὐγνωμόνως* for reasons to be considered below.<sup>23</sup>

Thus, in this particular case, Ps.-Justin is obviously more reliable than Clement. The latter was evidently capable of making mistakes more characteristic of an ancient or medieval scribe than of a scholar. For his variant *δοκείτε* instead of *νομίζετ'* in the first line can be similarly accounted for as a 'Perseverationsfehler' following *δοκεῖ πονηρὰ καὶ δοκῶν ἀλίσκεται* in the penultimate line of fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, one should not be surprised that Clement writes an unmetrical form such as *δοκεῖτ(ε)*. A glance at other passages where he and Ps.-Justin transmit the same lines reveals quite clearly that Clement sometimes does not bother about metre at all. In *Strom.* 5.120.2 for instance, line 6 is so defective that one wonders whether Clement's reading ought not rather to be considered as a prose paraphrase.<sup>24</sup>

If we examine Clement's reliability as a source in connection with fr. 835, we find further that he is the only one who writes *εἴ τις* at the beginning, whereas Sextus Empiricus, Ps.-Justin and Stobaeus unanimously transmit *ὅστις*. The latter seems to be the preferable reading for Euripides.<sup>25</sup>

On the other hand, Clement is more reliable than Ps.-Justin in one particularly important detail. In line 2, his wording *κακόν τι πράσων τοὺς θεοὺς λεληθέναι* agrees with that of Sextus Empiricus and Stobaeus, whereas the Codices of *De monarchia* have *τὸν θεόν*. It is a matter of dispute whether Ps.-Justin himself used the singular, or whether a Christian copyist has assimilated the plural to the singular in the following lines *TrGF* 2.624. The latter must be the case if *De monarchia* is one of Clement's sources. But that cannot be proved in this article.

Be that as it may, the wavering between the singular *θεόν* and the plural *θεούς* here should encourage us to consider the possibility that something similar may have happened in *TrGF* 2.624. Both our witnesses, Clement and Ps.-Justin, transmit the singular in this case. It is therefore undoubtedly the correct reading for Ps.-Justin's treatise. But since the fundamental question of whether god(s) exist(s) or not arises in the first half of the fragment, the author of a treatise *About the monarchy* of God is likely enough to have substituted *θεόν* for an original *θεούς* in his pagan source.

<sup>19</sup> cf. above n. 5.

<sup>20</sup> cf. A. Matthiae, op. cit. (n. 18), p. 198 '*κακῶς* facile scribi potuit propter *κακός*, quod sequitur'.

<sup>21</sup> I. C. Th. von Otto (ed.), *Iustini philosophi et martyris opera quae feruntur omnia*<sup>3</sup> (Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi, vol. III) (Jena, 1879; 1842<sup>1</sup>; 1849<sup>2</sup>), p. 139 n. 23. It is worth noticing that Clement and Eusebius have *πράττει* for *πράσσει*; the latter is the correct form for Euripides (cf. fr. 835.2 N<sup>2</sup>, *IT* 668, and elsewhere).

<sup>22</sup> *κερνάτω* must be a scribe's error; cf. O Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*<sup>3</sup> ii (GCS) (Berlin, 1960) *ad loc.* and Kannicht-Snell *TrGF* 2.624 *ad loc.*

<sup>23</sup> See n. 36.

<sup>24</sup> *Βροντῆς ἐὰν ἀκούσῃς μὴ φύγῃς* vs. Ps.-Justin, *De mon.* 4.2 *Βροντῆς ἀκούσας μηδαμῶς πόρρω φύγῃς*; cf. *ibid.* line 1 (*δικαίους ἔργοις* for the metrically correct *ἔργοις δικαίοις*); see, moreover, *Strom.* 5.121.1 (Diphil. *PCG* 5.136, quoted in Ps.-Justin, *De mon.* 3.2).

<sup>25</sup> cf. the parallels quoted in n. 13 (there is no *εἴ τις* ... *θνητῶν* at the beginning of a trimeter in Euripides).

And in fact a restoration of the plural creates no problems because both forms fit the metre perfectly:<sup>26</sup>

ὁράθ' ὅσοι νομίζετ'<sup>27</sup> οὐκ εἶναι θεούς,<sup>28</sup>  
 δις ἐξαμαρτάνοντες οὐκ εὐγνωμόνως·<sup>29</sup>  
 εἰσὶν γάρ, εἰσὶν.<sup>30</sup> εἰ δέ τις πράσσει<sup>31</sup> καλῶς<sup>32</sup>  
 κακὸς πεφυκώς, τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνειτω·  
 χρόνῳ γὰρ οὗτος ὑστερον<sup>33</sup> δώσει δίκην.

## II

This easy emendation produces a piece of verse which could well come from a reputable source,<sup>34</sup> and nothing in language or thought is now inconsistent with classical tragedy. Valckenaer particularly objected to line 2. Although he admitted the line to be 'sonorum nec invenustum', he considered the thought expressed by it not to be appropriate for Euripides.<sup>35</sup> Yet whereas ἐξαμαρτάνειν seems indeed to strike a Judaeo-Christian note in connection with the singular form θεόν,<sup>36</sup> no objections can be raised against the line in the context of the fragment in its emended form. For the concept of ἀμαρτία in general is not at all alien to Greek tragedy,<sup>37</sup> and the verb ἐξαμαρτάνειν in particular occurs quite frequently,<sup>38</sup> especially in Euripides.<sup>39</sup> It usually refers to errors in the human sphere, to offences against fellow-men, e.g. *Alc.* 708 *Ad.* ... εἰ δ' ἀλγείς κλύων | τάληθές, οὐ χρὴν σ' εἰς ἔμ' ἐξαμαρτάνειν. | Φε. σοῦ δ' ἂν προηγήσκων μάλλον ἐξημάρτανον. But the root ἀμαρτ- also covers offences against the gods: cf. for the simple verb *Peirithoos* 11 (fr. 15a Page) ... ἀλλὰ βορέ[άσων πνοαῖς ἐκεῖ] | διεσπαράχθη συμμ[έτρῳ κομπάσμασιν] | πατὴρ ἀμαρτῶν εἰς θε[οὺς τιμωρίαι],<sup>40</sup> for the composite ἐξαμαρτάνειν *Aesch. Prom.* 944 (*ΕΡΜΗΣ*) σὲ τὸν σοφιστήν, τὸν πικρῶς ὑπέρικρον, | τὸν ἐξαμαρτόντ' εἰς θεοὺς ἐφημέροις | πορόντα

<sup>26</sup> For the convenience of the reader, I give the text with critical notes, which entails the repetition of things mostly already mentioned above.

<sup>27</sup> Ps.-Justin: Clement (and Eusebius, cf. n. 5) δοκεῖτε.

<sup>28</sup> Ps.-Justin and Clement (and Eusebius) θεόν.

<sup>29</sup> The line is omitted by Clement (and Eusebius, cf. above and below [n. 36]). Kannicht-Snell's punctuation (semicolon) is not appropriate, see below part III.

<sup>30</sup> Ps.-Justin and Clement (and Eusebius) ἔστιν γάρ, ἔστιν.

<sup>31</sup> Ps.-Justin: Clement (and Eusebius) πράττει (cf. above n. 21).

<sup>32</sup> Ps.-Justin: Clement (and Eusebius) κακῶς.

<sup>33</sup> H. Grotius, *Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis Graecis* (Paris, 1626), p. 416 – followed by J. Barnes, *Euripidis quae exstant omnia* (Cambridge, 1694), p. 503, and Valckenaer p. 5 – reads ὑστέρῳ, contra necessitatem.

<sup>34</sup> This is, in a way, already suggested by the association with fragments of Diphilus and Euripides in both Ps.-Justin and Clement (see above).

<sup>35</sup> 'si sententiam [sc. spectes], minus aptum nec Euripidi congruum [sc. versum]' (p. 5).

<sup>36</sup> cf. Valckenaer, p. 5 'Noster ille posuit quo sensu Judaei dicebant et Christiani ἀμαρτάνειν εἰς θεόν'. I have a feeling that this may, in fact, have been the reason why Clement avoided quoting the line; for there are other passages where one gets the impression that Clement considerably leaves out what he – sometimes rightly – thinks is suspicious in his source (cf. *Strom.* 5.119.2 = Men. fr. 683 Körte).

<sup>37</sup> The problem of tragic ἀμαρτία has formed the subject of numerous books and articles; one may refer to J. M. Bremer, *Hamartia. Tragic Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy* (Amsterdam, 1969); T. C. W. Stinton, 'Hamartia in Aristotle and Greek Tragedy', *CQ* 25 (1975), 221–54; and S. Saïd, *La faute tragique* (Paris, 1978).

<sup>38</sup> See Bremer, op. cit. (n. 37), pp. 31ff., and Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 44.

<sup>39</sup> A careful discussion of the history of the word-group and the changes of meaning from one author to the other is given in Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), pp. 41ff.

<sup>40</sup> See Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 411; cf. also Aphrodite's words in the Prologue of *Hipp.* 21 ἂ δ' εἰς ἔμ' ἡμάρτηκε τιμωρήσομαι | Ἰππόλυτον ἐν τῇδ' ἡμέρᾳ with the comments of Stinton, art. cit. (n. 37), 247f., and Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 413.

τιμάς, τὸν πυρὸς κλέπτῃν λέγω.<sup>41</sup> A suggestion concerning the exact meaning of the 'double' mistake in our fragment will be made below (part IV).

In lines 4–5, a Judaeo-Christian reader may, of course, have seen a reference to the Last Judgement.<sup>42</sup> Yet such a tendentious interpretation cannot be used as an argument against a classical origin of the five lines, since the thought expressed is, in fact, nothing else than the very traditional one that divine justice sometimes comes late but will surely come; cf. e.g. Solon, fr. 13.8 West πάντως ὕστερον ἦλθε δίκη.<sup>43</sup> Euripides in particular often points at this 'sera numinis vindicta',<sup>44</sup> e.g. *Antiope*, fr. 223 N<sup>2</sup> Δίκα τοι, Δίκα χρόνιος, ἀλλ' ὅμως ὑποπεσοῦς | ἔλαθεν, ὅταν ἔχη τιν' ἀσεβῆ βροτῶν; *Antiope*, fr. 222 N<sup>2</sup> τήν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ' εἶναι χρόνου, | δείκνυσσι δ' ἡμῶν ὅστις ἐστὶ μὴ κακός; *Heracl.* 941 εἰλέ σ' ἡ Δίκη χρόνῳ; *Ion* 1614 ... αἶε γὰρ οὖν | χρόνια μὲν τὰ τῶν θεῶν πως, ἐς τέλος δ' οὐκ ἀσθενῇ (cf. 1621f.); *Philoct.* fr. 800 N<sup>2</sup> φεῦ, μήποτ' εἶην ἄλλο πλὴν θεοῖς φίλος | ὥς πᾶν τελοῦσι, κἂν βραδύνωσιν χρόνῳ; *Ba.* 882–90 (with the commentary by E. R. Dodds [Oxford, 1969]).<sup>45</sup> For the exact wording of *TrGF* 2.624 line 5, *Herc. fur.* 740 may be the closest Euripidean parallel (see below part IV).

Ps.-Justin's ascription of our fragment to Euripides<sup>46</sup> gains further credibility by the fact that the first half of it is also perfectly in line with Euripidean thought, if we accept the emendation as proposed above. Numerous recognized passages attest the special attention this tragedian paid to the 'theological' question, whether the gods exist or not. This issue is usually associated with the problem of theodicy, reflecting the traditional view that righteousness should be rewarded by the gods and injustice punished. It is from the downfall of the villain, we are told in Euripides' *Oinomaos*, fr. 577 N<sup>2</sup>, that human beings can infer the existence of the gods:

ἐγὼ μὲν εὖτ' ἂν τοὺς κακοὺς ὁρῶ βροτῶν  
πίπτοντας, εἶναι φημί δαιμόνων γένος.<sup>47</sup>

For the converse argument, cf. *El.* 583–4:

... ἡ χρηὴ μὴκέθ' ἡγείσθαι θεοὺς,  
εἰ τὰδικ' ἔσται τῆς δίκης ὑπέρτερα.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>41</sup> cf. the comments *ad loc.* by Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), pp. 319ff. One may, moreover, refer to Soph. *Ant.* 743 Αἰ. οὐ γὰρ δίκαιά σ' ἐξαμαρτάνονθ' ὁρῶ. | Κρ. ἀμαρτάνω γὰρ τὰς ἐμὰς ἀρχὰς σέβων; | Αἰ. οὐ γὰρ σέβεις, τιμάς γε τὰς θεῶν πατῶν, and Eur. *Hipp.* 1433 ἀνθρώποισι δὲ θεῶν διδόντων εἰκὸς ἐξαμαρτάνειν.

<sup>42</sup> This is indeed the reason why Ps.-Justin has quoted the fragment, cf. the introduction to chapter 3 of *De monarchia*, Καὶ περὶ τοῦδε, ὅτι μόνος δυνατός ἐστι καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ συντελουμένων πράξεων καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀγνώσεως κρίσιν ἐνστήσασθαι, οἰκείους μάρτυρας παραστήσαι ἔχω. Cf. also Clem. *Strom.* 5.121.1 (τοιαῦτά τινα περὶ τῆς κρίσεως διαλέγεται).

<sup>43</sup> cf. lines 25ff. τοιαύτη Ζηρὸς πέλεται τίσις· οὐδ' ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ | ὥσπερ θνητὸς ἀνὴρ γίγνεται ὀξύχολος, | αἶε δ' οὐ ἐλέγηθε διαμπερές, ὅστις ἀλιτρὸν | θυμὸν ἔχει, πάντως δ' ἐς τέλος ἐξεφάνη· | ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν αὐτίκ' ἔτεισεν, ὁ δ' ὕστερον κτλ.

<sup>44</sup> Both fr. 835 and *TrGF* 2.624 similarly express this idea, see above n. 13 and below part IV.

<sup>45</sup> cf., moreover, *Bellerophon*, fr. 303.3–5 N<sup>2</sup>, *Alexandr.*, fr. 60 N<sup>2</sup>, and *Alope*, fr. 112 N<sup>2</sup> (three passages which stress the importance of time as bringing everything to light). In *El.* 953, Euripides says we should not allow ourselves to be blinded by the temporal well-being of the wicked, for they cannot overcome Dike in the long run (ὡδέ τις κακοῦργος ὦν | μὴ μοι τὸ πρῶτον βῆμ' ἐὰν δράμῃ καλῶς, | νικᾶν δοκεῖτω τὴν Δίκην, πρὶν ἂν πέλας | γραμμῆς ἵκηται καὶ τέλος κάμψῃ βίου).

<sup>46</sup> See above part I.

<sup>47</sup> cf. *Supp.* 731 νῦν τήνδ' ἄελπον ἡμέραν ἰδοῦς· ἐγὼ | θεοὺς νομίζω ... | ... τῶνδε τεισάντων δίκην, perhaps also fr. 913 N<sup>2</sup> τίς τάδε λεύσσων θεὸν οὐχὶ νοεῖ ...; see already Hom. *Od.* 24.351 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἡ ρ' ἔτ' ἐστὶ θεοὶ κατὰ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, | εἰ ἐτέον μνηστήρες ἀτάσθαλον ὕβριν ἔτεισαν; see also G. W. Bond's commentary on Euripides' *Hercules furens* (Oxford, 1981), lines 772f.

<sup>48</sup> cf. *Herc. fur.* 841 ... ἡ θεοὶ μὲν οὐδαμοῦ, | τὰ θνητὰ δ' ἔσται μεγάλα, μὴ δόντος δίκην. See also



Unlike Aeschylus and Sophocles,<sup>49</sup> Euripides freely put such ‘atheistic’ sentiments into the mouths of his characters, as is shown by *Bellerophon*, fr. 286 N<sup>2</sup>:<sup>50</sup>

Φησὶν τις εἶναι δῆτ' ἐν οὐρανῷ θεούς;  
οὐκ εἰσὶν, οὐκ εἶσ', εἴ τις ἀνθρώπων θέλει  
μὴ τῷ παλαιῷ μῶρος ὦν χρῆσθαι λόγῳ<sup>51</sup> κτλ.

The wording of these three lines is so similar to our fragment that it supports, I think, quite strongly the authenticity of *TrGF* 2.624. Since it is a well-known feature of Euripidean tragedy that the same rhetoric can be used for arguing ‘in utramque partem’,<sup>52</sup> we should not be surprised that the speakers in the two fragments voice precisely opposite views. Only if we take into consideration the complete plots of the relevant plays, can we try to grasp the poet’s own outlook, if at all, and in the case of *Bellerophon*, the hero’s ‘atheistic’ declaration seems to have been outweighed in the play by the pitiable outcome of his bold attempt to fly to heaven, as I have suggested elsewhere.<sup>53</sup> Lines 4ff. of fr. 286 show, moreover, that the basic structure of the argument is the same both in this fragment and in *TrGF* 2.624. *Bellerophon* deduces his rebellious conviction that the gods do not exist from the bewildering observation that the wicked and impious enjoy a comfortable and prosperous life whereas the good suffer hardship and affliction. *TrGF* 2.624, which obviously answers a statement like the one of fr. 286, admits that such a situation may exist (line 3 εἰ δέ τις πράσσει καλῶς | κακὸς πεφυκὼς κτλ.), but warns that the happiness of the wicked will not last for ever and that sooner or later he will have to pay for his wrong. For, as Euripides also has his characters saying in other passages, there are, in fact, gods who care and watch over human affairs.<sup>54</sup>

*TrGF* 2.99 πῶς οὖν τὰδ' εἰσορῶντες ἡ θεῶν γένος | εἶναι λέγωμεν ἢ νόμοισι χρώμεθα; *TrGF* 2.465 τολμῷ κατεπειν, μήποτ' οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί | κακοὶ γὰρ εὐτυχοῦντες ἐκπλήσσοι μὲ.

<sup>49</sup> Sophocles develops the same idea in *Electra* 245–50 but is much more cautious in his wording: εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν (sc. Agamemnon) θανὼν γὰρ τε καὶ οὐδὲν ὦν | κείσεται τάλας, | οἳ δὲ μὴ ἅλιν | δώσουσ' ἀντιφόνους δίκας, | ἔρροι τ' ἀν' αἰδῶς | ἀπάντων τ' εὐσέβεια θνατῶν (cf. also *OT* 892ff.). I cannot think of any passage in either Aeschylus or Sophocles where a character is driven to deny explicitly the existence of the gods. Aeschylus only touches upon the periphery of the problem when he mentions in *Ag.* 369–72 atheists who dare to say that the gods disdain to care about wrongdoers: ... οὐκ ἔφα τις | θεοὺς βροτῶν ἀξιόσθαι μέλειν | ὅσοις ἀήκτων χάρις | πατοῖθ'· ὁ δ' οὐκ εὐσεβής.

<sup>50</sup> cf. A. B. Drachmann, *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity* (Copenhagen, 1922), p. 53. I have argued in an article on ‘The “Atheistic” Fragment from Euripides’ *Bellerophon* (286 N<sup>2</sup>) (forthcoming, *ICS* 15.1 [1990]) that it may have been precisely this outspoken Euripidean passage which provoked Aristophanes to impute atheism to Euripides (*Thesm.* 450 νῦν δ' οὗτος ἐν ταῖσιν τραγῳδαῖσι ποιῶν | τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀναπέπεικεν οὐκ εἶναι θεούς). M. Lefkowitz, in a recent article on ‘“Impiety” and “Atheism” in Euripides’ Dramas’, *CQ* 39 (1989), 70–82, has convincingly shown that such a charge against Euripides is unfounded; cf., moreover, her article ‘Was Euripides an Atheist?’, *SIFC* [Ser. III] 5 (1987), 149–66.

<sup>51</sup> The fragment is only transmitted by Ps.-Justin, *De monarchia* 5.6. In lines 2–3, I have given the reading of the Argenteratensis gr. 9 which Nauck and Marcovich (cf. above n. 16) rightly adopt, whereas the previous editor of *De monarchia*, Otto (n. 21), followed Matthiae’s edition of Euripides (n. 18) and gave preference to the reading of the Parisinus gr. 450 (εἴ τις ἀνθρώπων λέγει, | μὴ τῷ παλαιῷ μῶρος ὦν χρῆσθαι λόγῳ) – a codex which is often more reliable than the Argenteratensis, but not in this particular case.

<sup>52</sup> cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, op. cit. (n. 13), p. 146 ‘The case for women is sometimes argued with all the resources of the poet’s eloquence, but so is the case against them; the same is true of almost every other regularly controversial subject’.

<sup>53</sup> See n. 50. Such an interpretation of *Bellerophon* confirms the results which Lefkowitz obtained looking at other Euripidean tragedies (see *CQ* 39 [1989], 70ff.; it is rather surprising that she never mentions the particularly relevant fr. 286 in her fine article).

<sup>54</sup> cf. fr. 991 N<sup>2</sup> ἀλλ' ἔστι, καὶ τις ἐγγελά <τῶμῳ> (coni. Nauck) λόγῳ, | Ζεὺς καὶ θεοί, βρότεια λεύσσαντες πάθῃ; *Herc. jur.* 757 τίς ὁ θεοῦ ἀνομία χραίνων, θνατὸς ὦν, | ἄφρονα λόγον |

## III

Concerning the thought, the five lines thus display a striking similarity with genuine pieces of Euripides' poetry. The same is true for the phrasing which contains not only nothing alien to Euripidean language but also offers some positive evidence (cf. especially lines 2 and 4).

**Line 1** The phrase *ὁράθ' ὅσοι* occurs also in *Ion* 1090 *ὁράθ' ὅσοι δυσκελάδοι-|σιν κατὰ μούσαν ἰόντες ἀείδεθ' ὕμνοις | ἀμέτερα λέχεια κτλ.* It does not introduce a question, as Kannicht and Snell (following Nauck) have assumed in printing a semicolon at the end of the sentence (see above part I); the verb has to be understood as an imperative ('watch out', 'mark'), cf. *Herc. fur.* 1072 *ὁράθ' ὁράτε* (with Bond's comment, op. cit. [n. 47] *ad loc.*).<sup>55</sup> The use of the verb *νομίζω* to express belief in the gods is standard Greek language,<sup>56</sup> cf. for drama Eur. *Suppl.* 731 *νῦν τήνδ' ἄελλον ἡμέραν ἰδοῦσ' ἐγὼ | θεοὺς νομίζω*; A. *Pers.* 497 *θεοὺς δέ τις | τὸ πρὶν νομίζων οὐδαμῶς τὸτ' ἠῦχετο | λιταῖσι κτλ.* The best Euripidean parallels for *οὐκ εἶναι θεοὺς* are *Bellerophontes*, fr. 286.<sup>157</sup> and *Phrixus B*, fr. pap. 154.1–2 Austin.<sup>58</sup>

**Line 2** *δὲς ἐξαμαρτάνοντες*: the exact combination occurs only in Menander, *Sent.* 183 Jäkel *Δὲς ἐξαμαρτεῖν ταυτὸν οὐκ ἀνδρὸς σοφοῦ*. Yet the sort of 'mathematical' intensification found in *δὲς ἐξ-* is rather characteristic of Euripides, as C. W. Willink suggested to me, cf. the phrase *δὲς τόσ-* which occurs not less than ten times in the surviving plays (e.g. *Med.* 1134, *El.* 1092). For *ἐξαμαρτάνειν* see above; Eur. uses the verb in the same metrical position in *IA* 1204 (*ἡ δ' ἐξαμαρτοῦσ'*), fr. 1027.3 N<sup>2</sup> (... *νέος δ' ὅταν | πόλλ' ἐξαμάρτη*), *Hypsipyle*, fr. 22.8 Bond (*ἦν δ' ἐξαμαρτ...*). The point of *δὲς* is not altogether clear<sup>59</sup> but may have been clearer in the original context. The most natural explanation of the 'double' mistake is that it is (a) a false belief and (b) an error with serious practical consequences.<sup>60</sup>

*οὐκ εὐγνωμόνως*: the word *εὐγνώμων* is not found in the surviving plays of the three tragedians (in drama, it only occurs in Menander, fr. 571.1 Körte *ἐν ἔστ' ἀληθὲς φίλτρον, εὐγνώμων τρόπος*, cf. *Sent.* 334 Jäkel *Θεοῦ πέφυκε δῶρον εὐγνώμων τρόπος*), but the notion expressed by it is a very familiar one.<sup>61</sup> The phrase *οὐκ εὐγνωμόνως* can be paralleled with Soph. *Tr.* 473 *κοῦκ ἀγνώμονα* (also at the end of the verse; cf. in the same metrical position *οὐκ ἀγνώμονες* in Men. fr. 762 Körte). It

*τοῦρανίων μακάρων | κατέβαλ' ὡς ἄρ' οὐ | σθένουσιν θεοί; 772 θεοὶ θεοὶ | τῶν ἀδίκων μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπάειν.*

<sup>55</sup> I do not think that C. W. Willink, 'Sleep after Labour', *CQ* 38 (1988), 97, is right in objecting to Bond's translation 'look out', 'be careful' of *Herc. fur.* 1072, for such a translation adequately brings out the warning overtones of *ὁράτε* in both this passage and our fragment. Cf. also Ar. *Plu.* 215 *ὁράτε*, translated by van Daele with 'Prenez garde' (V. Coulon–H. van Daele, *Aristophane V* [Paris, 1954], p. 99).

<sup>56</sup> See generally W. Fahr, *ΘΕΟΥΣ ΝΟΜΙΖΕΙΝ. Zum Problem der Anfänge des Atheismus bei den Griechen* (Spudasmata 26) (Hildesheim and New York, 1969).

<sup>57</sup> See above, and compare the probable echo in Aristoph. *Thesm.* 450 (n. 50).

<sup>58</sup> See below part IV.

<sup>59</sup> It has strongly bothered Valckenaer (p. 5 'Sed cur, obsecro, dicuntur Δὲς, bis, stulte peccantes gravissime?') and, in his wake, Matthiae, loc. cit. (n. 18).

<sup>60</sup> Another possible explanation would be that one of the 'mistakes' concerns the human realm (because those people really behave wickedly towards others, cf. *κακὸς πεφυκώς*), and the other *ἀμαρτία* consists of the neglect, or rather the denial, of a divine power; for whereas in Aeschylus every *ἀμαρτία* was at the same time an offence against men and gods, the two aspects are clearly separated in Euripides, as Said, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 429, has pointed out.

<sup>61</sup> To have an 'upright and good sense' is, according to Eur. *Hipp.* 426, absolutely crucial for life: *μόνον δὲ τοῦτό φασ' ἀμύλλασθαι βίω, | γνώμην δίκαιαν κἀγαθὴν, ὅτῳ παρή; cf. Hipp.* 240 *ποῖ παρεπλάγχθη γνώμης ἀγαθῆς; 377f.; cf. Soph. OT* 687 *ἀγαθὸς ὢν γνώμην ἀνὴρ* etc.



is, moreover, the sort of new locution to be expected in Euripides, who shows an idiosyncratic fondness for the use of οὐκ εὐ-,<sup>62</sup> cf. e.g. οὐκ εὐδαιμον- at the end of a trimeter in *IT* 619, *Hel.* 895, *Or.* 541 and 601, *Ba.* 1232; see also Bond, op. cit. (n. 47) on *Herc. fur.* 1284 (he speaks of a 'sinister litotes'), and C. W. Willink on *Or.* 600–1. (Oxford, 1986).

**Line 3** εἰσὶν γάρ, εἰσίν: 'epanalepsis' as in fr. 286.2 N<sup>2</sup> (see above part II). Euripides uses the same emphatic figure e.g. *Antiope*, fr. 223 N<sup>2</sup> Δίκα τοι, Δίκα; *Bellerophon*tes, fr. 285.7 N<sup>2</sup> ἀλγεί μὲν, ἀλγεί; *Andr.* 980 ἤλγουν μὲν, ἤλγουν; *Alc.* 1017 καὶ μέμφομαι μὲν, μέμφομαι etc.

εἰ δέ τις πράσσει καλῶς: cf. the striking parallels *Oineus*, fr. 564 N<sup>2</sup> (ὅταν κακοὶ πράξωσιν, ὦ ξένοι, καλῶς, | ἄγαν κρατοῦντες κοῦ νομίζοντες δίκην | δώσειν ἔδρασαν πάντ' ἐφέντες ἡδονῇ) and *Polyidos*, fr. 644 N<sup>2</sup> (ὅταν κακὸς τις ἐν πόλει πράσῃ καλῶς, | νοσεῖν τίθησι τὰς ἀμεινόνων φρένας κτλ.); πράσσει καλῶς occurs at the end of a trimeter in *IT* 668 and *Belleroph.* fr. 287.3 N<sup>2</sup> (cf. also *Ion* 730, *Suppl.* 728, fr. 443.2 N<sup>2</sup>).

**Line 4** κακὸς πεφυκῶς: cf. *Ion* 440 καὶ γὰρ ὅστις ἂν βροτῶν | κακὸς πεφύκη, ζημιούσιν οἱ θεοί; *ibid.* 1622 οἱ κακοὶ δ', ὥσπερ πεφύκασ', οὐποτ' εὐ πράξειαν ἄν; *Hipp.* 1031, 1075, 1191 εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ; *Hec.* 332.

τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνετω: the exact combination occurs only later (in Lysias, *Or.* 13.84... τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνειν ὃν ἔζη οὐ προσήκον αὐτῷ and Demosth. *Philipp.* 3.29 τὸν χρόνον κερδάναι). Yet time as 'a gain', as 'profit', is well paralleled in Greek tragedy (*Soph. El.* 1485 τί γὰρ βροτῶν ἂν σὺν κακοῖς μεμειγμένον | θνήσκειν ὁ μέλλων τοῦ χρόνου κέρδος φέροι;<sup>63</sup> cf. Eur. *Or.* 789 τῷ χρόνῳ δὲ κερδαίνεις 'and you will profit by...the (saving of) time' – Willink, op. cit. *ad loc.*, following Di Benedetto), and so is κερδαίνειν with accusative (e.g. Eur. *Heracl.* 154). The combination in our fragment may thus possibly be new but is at any rate unexceptionable (*pace* Valckenaer p. 5).<sup>64</sup>

**Line 5** χρόνῳ γὰρ οὗτος ὕστερον δώσει δίκην: cf. *Herc. fur.* 740 ἦλθες χρόνῳ μὲν (according to Wilamowitz brachylogical for χρόνῳ μὲν ἦλθες, ἀλλ' ἦλθες γε τοι) οὐ δίκην δώσεις θανῶν, | ὕβρεις ὑβρίζων εἰς ἀμεινόνας σέθεν. Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 732 also offers a quite close parallel (... χρόνῳ τοι κυρίῳ τ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ | θεοὺς ἀτίζων τις βροτῶν δώσει δίκην); see, moreover, Aristoph. *Nub.* 1242 (ἡ μὴν σὺ τούτων τῷ χρόνῳ δώσεις δίκην), Eur. *El.* 952 (ἔρρ', οὐδὲν εἰδὼς ὦν ἐφευρεθεὶς χρόνῳ | δίκην δέδωκας) and *Heracl.* 1025 (οὗτος δὲ δώσει τὴν δίκην θανῶν ἐμοί). The phrase δώσει(ς) δίκην occurs at the end of the verse in *Med.* 1298, *Hec.* 1024, *Or.* 1134, 1597 and *Ba.* 847; even more frequent is χρόνῳ at the beginning of a trimeter, e.g. *Med.* 904, *Hipp.* 1181 (cf. also de Romilly, op. cit. [n. 64], pp. 125ff.).

It is noticeable that the parallels quoted in this short commentary mostly attest similar, but not identical, idiom in authentic Euripidean contexts. This clearly indicates that *TrGF* 2.624 in its emended form is not merely a competent pastiche, written e.g. in the fourth century by a pious poetaster. On the contrary, the five lines disclose some quite typical features of both Euripides' style and thinking and therefore deserve to be accepted as much as similar passages in the Euripidean canon.

<sup>62</sup> I owe this important observation to C. W. Willink.

<sup>63</sup> cf. *Aj.* 457f.; *El.* 1485f. may be interpolated, as Dindorf and others assumed (cf. R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, Vol. I: *The Manuscripts and the Text* [Leiden, 1973], pp. 202f.), but are still probably by a tragedian or, at least, an actor of classical times. (N. G. Wilson drew my attention to this problem.)

<sup>64</sup> cf. for the thought, J. de Romilly, *Time in Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca and New York, 1968), p. 134, with regard to Euripides, 'time offers an opportunity for reflection and rectification [sc. of passions]'.

## IV

As for the original context of the fragment, Ps.-Justin's presentation may perhaps give us a hint. He quotes fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup> and *TrGF* 2.624 as one continuous piece of Euripidean poetry (see above part I). Both of them strongly argue the case of divine justice, the former in pointing out the impossibility of escaping the gods when doing evil, the latter in stressing the fact that the gods really exist and that the wrongdoers will have to pay for their offences sooner or later. It therefore seems to me quite possible that both fragments indeed belonged to the same tragedy, as the arrangement in *De monarchia* suggests.

As noticed above, Sextus Empiricus and Stobaeus, who alone adds a fifth line which we will have to include in our discussion,<sup>65</sup> introduce fr. 835 as being taken from the tragedy *Phrixus*. With the publication of *P.Oxy.* 2455, which contains hypotheses of Euripides' plays, it now seems clear that Euripides wrote two tragedies named *Phrixus*, both of them lost.<sup>66</sup> This papyrus, however, is rather incomplete, especially in relation to the first *Phrixus*, and only a few of the remaining fragments are explicitly attributed to one or the other of the plays by the sources.<sup>67</sup> They do not allow us to get a clear idea of how the two plays compared with each other. Not until a further papyrus with a fuller text of the hypothesis of *Phrixus A* came to light was it possible to appreciate that Webster was wrong in differentiating the stories of the two *Phrixus*. For according to his ingenious suggestion, *Phrixus A* would have focused on Phrixus' adventures in Colchis, whereas *Phrixus B* would have covered the earlier part of the myth.<sup>68</sup> But the new papyrus, *P.Oxy.* 3652 col. II. 16ff., shows quite clearly that both plays had almost identical plots.<sup>69</sup> Both the hypotheses of *Phrixus A* and *B*, as far as they are preserved in the papyri, can therefore safely be used for summarizing the action.<sup>70</sup>

Ino, the daughter of Cadmos and Harmonia and the second wife of Athamas, plays the notorious role of the malicious stepmother. In an attempt to kill the two children, Phrixus and Helle, whom Athamas had by Nephele, she conspires with all the women

<sup>65</sup> Wecklein arbitrarily separated this line from fr. 835 (see below n. 80), followed by Nauck and Kannicht-Snell who record it in *TrGF* 2 under No. 490.

<sup>66</sup> cf. E. G. Turner's comment on line 221 of *P.Oxy.* 2455, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 27 (London, 1962), p. 64; H. van Looy, op. cit. (n. 12), p. 132. The hypotheses of *Phrixus A* and *B* are printed also in C. Austin (ed.), *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* (Berlin and New York, 1968), pp. 101f. Wilamowitz's verdict 'somniasse eos qui duplicem Phrixum extitisse dixerunt' (*Analecta Euripidea* [Berlin, 1875], p. 158) has for a long time prohibited scholars from giving due credit to the remark of the Scholion in *Aristoph. Ran.* 1225 which correctly attributed fr. 819 N<sup>2</sup> to the second *Phrixus*.

<sup>67</sup> *Phrixus A*: fr. 821 N<sup>2</sup>; *Phrixus B*: fr. 819 N<sup>2</sup>, 827 N<sup>2</sup>, and – most likely (cf. n. 84) – fr. pap. 154 Austin.

<sup>68</sup> T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967), pp. 131f. His suggestion was based on the fact that Tzetzes argued that the prologue of *Phrixus B* was in fact that of *Phrixus A* (cf. N<sup>2</sup> fr. 819), a confusion which Webster tried to explain by the chronological priority of plot *B* over plot *A*.

<sup>69</sup> See H. M. Cockle, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 52 (London, 1984), pp. 22f.; cf. moreover W. Luppe, 'ΙΑΤΡΙΚΟΣ ΚΕΡΑΥΝΟΣ im "Phrixos" A des Euripides?', *ZPE* 51 (1983), 25–8; W. Luppe, 'Hypothesis zum ersten "Phrixos" des Euripides', *APF* 32 (1986), 5–13. One may refer to the two *Hippolytus*-plays with nearly the same plot.

<sup>70</sup> The gaps which still remain can be bridged by Apollodor. 1.9.1 and Hygin. *Fab.* 2 and 3. Both show such striking parallels with the two hypotheses that one has to assume that they either rely directly on Euripides or on the hypotheses. Cf. Webster, op. cit. (n. 68), pp. 132–6; van Looy, op. cit. (n. 12), pp. 165–84; Cockle, op. cit. (n. 69), p. 22; Luppe, op. cit. (1983) (n. 69), 6–7; see generally also H. J. Mette, 'Euripides (insbesondere für die Jahre 1968–1981), Erster Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke', *Lustrum* 23–24 (1981–2), 299–306.

of the country to roast the corn before sowing it.<sup>71</sup> The consequences of this procedure are famine and pestilence. Athamas, king of Thessaly or Orchomenos,<sup>72</sup> sends one of his attendants to consult the oracle at Delphi. Ino urges the messenger to report back that only the sacrifice of Phrixus will bring an end to the pestilence.<sup>73</sup> The father refuses to kill his son, and Phrixus offers himself to save his native city.<sup>74</sup> But seeing him standing at the altar, the messenger is moved by pity and reveals Ino's intrigue.<sup>75</sup> Athamas hands her over to Phrixus to be killed.<sup>76</sup> But Ino escapes death with the help of Dionysus who drives Phrixus and Helle mad and leads them into the desert with the intention of their being killed by the maenads. But now Nephele, on her part, intervenes and rescues the siblings, providing them with the famous ram to escape.<sup>77</sup>

In this plot, there is only one place appropriate for a general consideration of justice and the impossibility of the rogue hiding his evil deeds for ever: after the uncovering of Ino's plot and her delivery to Phrixus.<sup>78</sup> Thus, fr. 835 – including Stobaeus' line *TrGF* 2.490 – and *TrGF* 2.624 may both have featured in a long speech, probably delivered by Athamas.<sup>79</sup> The king will have pointed to Ino as a vivid example of the general truth expressed in the lines:

ὅστις δὲ θνητῶν οἶεται τοῦφ' ἡμέραν  
κακόν τι πράσσωσιν τοὺς θεοὺς λεληθῆναι,  
δοκεῖ πονηρὰ καὶ δοκῶν ἀλίσκεται,  
ὅταν σχολὴν ἄγουσα τυγχάνῃ Δίκη... 1

Since Phrixus can now take complete revenge on her, Justice has indeed visited Ino, late in time, for evil which she initiated:

τιμωρίαν ἔτ<ε>ισεν ὧν ἤρξε<ν> κακῶν<sup>80</sup>.... 5

<sup>71</sup> cf. *Hypothesis Phrixus A* 9–12 Luppe συγκα-λέσασα γὰρ τῶν [Θεττάλων γ]υναίikas ὀρ-κοῖς κατησφαλίσασα πυρὸν πεφρυγμέ-|νον ἐπὶ τὴν κα[τασπορὰν διδόναι.

<sup>72</sup> This is one point where the two plays obviously differed from each other. In *Phrixus A*, Athamas rules over Thessaly (*P.Oxy.* 2455. 224f. and *P.Oxy.* 3652 col. II. 19), in *Phrixus B* over Orchomenos (*P. Oxy* 2455.270).

<sup>73</sup> *Hypothesis Phrixus A* 12–17 Luppe τῆς δὲ ἀκαρτίας [ἔπεισε γενήσεσθαι ἕκ-|λυσιν, εἰ Φρίξος [σφαγείη Διί- τὸν γὰρ]εῖς Δελφούς ἀποσταλησόμενον ἄγγε-|λον ἔπεισε ὡς ἄλγοι τοῦτο κεχρησμέ-|νον εἶναι.

<sup>74</sup> Hygin. *Fab.* 2 'quod cum Athamas se facturum abnuisset, Phrixus ultro ac libens pollicetur se unum civitatem aerumna liberaturum'.

<sup>75</sup> Hygin. loc. cit. 'itaque cum ad aram cum infulis esset adductus, satelles, misericordia adulescentis Inus Athamanti consilium patefecit'. Cf. the ἀγών between Ino, Athamas and the slave in the Florence papyrus (D. L. Page, *Select Papyri*, Vol. III. *Literary Papyri* (London, 1950), No. 32), discussed by W. Schadewaldt, 'Zum "Phrixos" des Euripides', *Hermes* 63 (1928), 1–14 (= *Hellas und Hesperien*<sup>2</sup> Bd. I [Zürich and Stuttgart, 1970], pp. 505–15).

<sup>76</sup> Hygin. loc. cit. 'rex facinore cognito, uxorem suam Ino et filium eius Melicerten Phrixo dedit necandos'.

<sup>77</sup> cf. the end of the *Hypothesis Phrixus B*, *P. Oxy.* 2455.280] τῶι ἐπιβο[υ]λενομένῳ· | ἡ δὲ τὸν Διόνυσον] ἐπικαλέ[σασα] ἐναρ[γῆ] | θάνατον διώλισθεν· ἐμμανεῖς γὰρ π[οι]-|ήσας [ὁ] Δ[ι]όνυσος Φρίξον τε [κ]αὶ [τ]ῆν | ἀδε[λφ]ῆν | προηγάγετο εἰς τὴν ἐρη[μ]ιν | χω[ρ]αν | (285) ὧ[ς] περ ἀνάλωμα τῶν μαινάδων ποι-|ήσων· Νεφέλη δὲ καταπτᾶσα καὶ διαρ-|πάσασα τοῦ[s] ἐαυ[τ]ῆς κριὸν ἔδωκε[ν] | αὐ-|τοῖς ὁδηγῆσ[αι] [...] [...] ...; for the end of *Hypothesis Phrixus A* see Luppe, op. cit. (1986) (n. 69), 12f.

<sup>78</sup> 4th epeisodion in van Looy's reconstruction (op. cit. [n. 12], p. 177).

<sup>79</sup> cf. van Looy, op. cit. (n. 12), p. 153 'Waarschijnlijk dient Athamas als de spreker beschouwd, hoewel ook Phrixus of de koorleider niet uitgesloten zijn'; Webster, op. cit. (n. 68), p. 135 '835N<sup>2</sup> ... may well belong to the context when Athamas hands Ino over to Phrixos'.

<sup>80</sup> ἤρξε<ν> Grotius; ἔτ<ε>ισεν Nauck. As already mentioned, this fifth line is only transmitted by Stob. *Ecl.* 1.3.15. N. Wecklein, 'Studien zu Euripides', *Jahrb. f. cl. Philol.* Suppl. 7 (Leipzig, 1874), 355–6 reads ἔρξεν instead of ἤρξεν and wanted to separate the line from fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup>

Her downfall is positive proof that the gods really exist<sup>81</sup> and that the wicked man has to be on his guard, for he, too, will be punished:

ὁράθ' ὅσοι νομίζετ' οὐκ εἶναι θεούς,  
 δις ἑξαμαρτάνοντες οὐκ εὐγνωμόνως·  
 εἰσὶν γάρ, εἰσὶν. εἰ δέ τις πράσσει καλῶς  
 κακὸς πεφυκώς, τὸν χρόνον κερδαινέτω·  
 χρόνῳ γὰρ οὗτος ὕστερον δώσει δίκην.

10

It seems quite likely that Sextus Empiricus and Stobaeus as well as Ps.-Justin and – if not dependent on the former – Clement have used the same anthology. The compiler of the extract from the *Phrixus* will naturally have selected only the gnomic lines, which means that we have to reckon with the omission of quite a few lines between the different parts. We can check this procedure against a selection of lines taken from a preserved tragedy in *De mon.* 5.4, where Ps.-Justin quotes from Euripides' *Orestes*, and he, or his source, tacitly leaves out a substantial body of 173 lines between 416–18 and 591–8. Something similar may apply to our fragment from the *Phrixus*.

What still remains to be considered, is the extremely tricky problem of whether the ten lines belonged to *Phrixus A* or *Phrixus B*.<sup>82</sup> We may possibly get a clue from yet another papyrus which contains a florilegium, including five quotations from Euripides.<sup>83</sup> One of them, fr. pap. 154 Austin, is most probably taken from *Phrixus B*:

Εὐριπίδου ἐν δευτέρῳ <Φρίξου><sup>84</sup>

ὦ θνητὰ παραφρονήματ' ἀνθρώπων, μάτην  
 οἱ φασιν εἶναι τὴν τύχην ἀλλ' οὐ θεούς·  
 ὥς οὐδὲν ἴστε κεῖ [λ]έγειν δοκεῖτε τι.  
 εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἡ τύχῃ ἔστιν οὐδὲν δεῖ θεῶν,<sup>85</sup>  
 εἰ δ' οἱ θεοὶ σθένουσιν, οὐδὲν ἡ τύχῃ.

(‘Vielmehr gehört der lästige Vers nicht hieher, und eine äussere Bestätigung liegt darin, dass Sext. Emp. etc. gleichfalls nur V. 1–4 in Verbindung mit anderen bringen’). This was a reaction against earlier scholars who tried to link the fifth line closer to the previous four; they either wrote τιμωρίαν <τ> ἔτισεν (S. Musgrave, *Euripidis fragmenta* [Leipzig, 1779], p. 467 – he suggested as another possibility τιμωρίᾳ ἔτισεν), or they printed a semicolon after ἀλίσκεται line 3 and took lines 4 and 5 together (e.g. A. Matthiae, op. cit. [n. 18], p. 297; a similar proposal was already made by H. Grotius, op. cit. [n. 33], pp. 415 and 959, who, however, felt forced to change the conjunction ὅταν line 4 to ὅτε δ' ἂν; Grotius was followed by J. Barnes, loc. cit. [n. 33]). But all the problems disappear if we assume that the compiler of the extract has omitted a few lines between 4 and 5 (cf. below). – The phrase τιμωρίαν ἔτ(ε)ισεν is impeccable (pace Musgrave, loc. cit.), cf. Plat. *Leg.* 905a6–7 τεῖσεις...τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμωρίαν; for ὧν ἤρξε<ν> κακῶν, cf. Eur. *Hel.* 425 κρύψας γυναῖκα τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἐμοὶ ἀρξασαν..., *Ba.* 1114 etc.

<sup>81</sup> cf. Eur. *Oinomaos*, fr. 577 N<sup>2</sup>, quoted above (part II).

<sup>82</sup> With the publication of *P.Oxy.* 3652 (see above), it has become almost impossible to ascribe the fragments, for which the sources do not give a precise designation, to one or other of the plays. The attempts of van Looy, op. cit. (n. 12), pp. 176–83, and Webster, op. cit. (n. 68), pp. 132–6, who both concentrated on *Phrixus B* and considered fr. 835 as part of this second play, have therefore ceased to be likely, although the general considerations of both scholars remain useful.

<sup>83</sup> See V. Bartoletti, ‘Frammenti di un florilegio gnomologico in un papiro fiorentino’, *Atti dell' XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Milano, 1966), pp. 1–14. The Euripidean fragments are printed in Austin's collection (cf. n. 66) under Nos. 152–6.

<sup>84</sup> Wilamowitz's attribution to the *Hypsipyle* was based on an inadequate interpretation of Joh. Lydus, *De mens.* 4.7 p. 72 Wünsch, cf. V. Di Benedetto, ‘Giovanni Lido e due frammenti Euripidei’, *Maia* 17 (1965), 388ff.

<sup>85</sup> It is very interesting that Joh. Lyd., who, loc. cit., quotes four out of these five lines, changes the plural θεῶν into the singular θεοῦ. As in Ps.-Justin's quotation of Eur. fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup> (see above part I), it is not absolutely certain whether this change is due to the author himself or to a scribe.

Here, again, we find Euripides polemicizing against people who do not believe in the existence of the gods. The similarity of thought is striking enough, and I wonder if fr. pap. 154 Austin may not be a reworking of our passage in the second play. If that is true, the ten lines fr. 835 N<sup>2</sup>–*TrGF* 2.490–*TrGF* 2.624 will have featured in the first version, *Phrixus A*. Not only, on this hypothesis, did Euripides deal with the same plot in *Phrixus A* and *B*, he also used quite similar arguments in both plays.

## V

To sum up briefly the less speculative observations, *TrGF* 2.624 in its transmitted form is not Euripidean. But by an easy emendation, a Euripidean original, and even a possible context, can be plausibly reconstructed. It may be worth mentioning that Wilamowitz, according to the apparatus criticus to *TrGF* 2.624, jotted down in the margin of his copy of Nauck's collection the following comment on our fragment: 'recipe' (*sc. inter fragmenta Euripidea*). From the available evidence, his advice ought to be followed in the new collection of Euripides' fragments which is being prepared for *TrGF*.\*

Zürich/Lincoln College, Oxford

CHRISTOPH RIEDWEG

\* I should like to express my sincere thanks to Nigel G. Wilson, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, who kindly read an earlier version of the article, and whose scholarly approach was a source of inspiration to me, and to John H. Sykes who sacrificed a good deal of his valuable time to make my English intelligible. I am also indebted to C. W. Willink for helpful references and many critical suggestions. And, last but not least, I am grateful to the Swiss National Foundation (Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung) for the generous scholarship which enabled me to spend a stimulating year in Oxford.