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'.\(^1\) Whereas Nauck\(^2\) 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'.\(^3\) 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.

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

\[
\text{όραθ' δασον νομίζετ' οὑκ εἶναι θεόν,}
\text{δίς έξαιμαρτάνοντες οὑκ εὐγγυμόνως;}
\text{ἐστών γὰρ ἔστων, εἰ δὲ τὶς πράσσει καλὸς}
\text{kακὸς πεφύκος, τὸν χρόνον κερδανεύτων·}
\text{χρῶν χάριν οὐτὸς ὅστερόν δώσει δίκην.}
\]

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\(^4\) - and Clement of Alexandria.


\(^3\) *TrGF* 2.617–24 'ex fabrica falsarii Iudaei (saec. I a ?) In the apparatus to fr. 624, Kannicht and Snell refer to *A.-M. Denis, Introduction aux pseudepigraphes 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*.

Both Ps.-Justin (De mon. 3.2–3) and Clement (Strom. 5.121.1–3) transmit the fragment as part of almost identical packages of lines containing Diphilus PCG 5.136, Eur. fr. 835 N² 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. 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. 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 Διφίλος πάλιν ὁ καμικός τοιαύτα 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 N² 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. 32). 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: ⁵

S. E. Math. 1.274⁴ καὶ μὴν οὐ ταύτα μόνον τοῖς ποιηταῖς δεξιῶς εἰρήσθαι φαίνεται ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περὶ θεῶν, οἰον έστι καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῷ Εὐριπίδη λεγιθεν εν Φριξίς ¹⁰

οὗτος δὲ θυτῶν οἴεται τοῦθεν ἡμέραν, κακῶν τι πράσαον τοῖς θεοίς λαλήθηναι, δοκεῖ ποιητὰ καὶ δοκῶν ἀλακεται, ὅταν σχολὴν ἀγούσα τυγχάνῃ Δική. ¹³

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. 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.


⁵ L. C. Valckenaer, Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo, 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.

⁶ Euripides seems to have written two tragedies called Phrixus, see below part IV.

⁷ The lines are quoted again in Math. 1.287, but without mentioning the name of the play: Καὶ μὴν δοσον ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπ’ Εὐριπίδου λεγέντι περί θεῶν, τήν αὐτήν καὶ οἱ ιδιώται δόξαν ἔχουσιν. ἵνα γὰρ ἐστι τῷ Ὀσίας δὲ … Δίκη, καὶ τὸ ὀνόμα παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγόμενον, Ὁφε θεῶν ἀλήθειας μιλοῦ, ἀλήθειας 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).

⁸ See Matth. 1.287, but without mentioning the name of the play: Καὶ μὴν δοσον ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπ’ Εὐριπίδου λεγέντι περί θεῶν, τήν αὐτήν καὶ οἱ ιδιώται δόξαν ἔχουσιν. ἵνα γὰρ ἐστι τῷ Ὀσίας δὲ … Δίκη, καὶ τὸ ὀνόμα παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγόμενον, Ὁφε θεῶν ἀλήθειας μιλοῦ, ἀλήθειας 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).

⁹ T. 13.7.5. ¹⁰ cf. Stob. loc. cit. Εὐριπίδης Φρίξις.

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


¹³ 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 includes Euripides, but his remark *Kai Εὐριπίδης* appears in our manuscripts in the wrong place, i.e. two lines before the fragment of Euripides. Mechanical corruptions occur several times in *De mon.* 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, is surely right in correcting the manuscripts and transposing *Kai Εὐριπίδης* just before the generally acknowledged fragment of Euripides. 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 *ὅτας δὲ θυτάρων ὀδέται,...* (cf. *Oinoeas*, fr. 575 Ν° ὅτας δὲ θυτάρων ὀδέται, δυσάνωσιν ἐν γῆς ἔλθειν, αἱ λογίζεται καλὸς κτλ. and *Tro.* 1208 θυτάρων δὲ μάρος ὅτας εἴτ᾽ πράσσαιν δοκῶν βέβαια χαίρει κτλ.; for tov ἡμέραν, see *Cycl.* 336 ὡς τοιμπιεῖν γε καὶ φαγεῖν τοὐθ᾽ ἡμέραν; ἀλλάκται (line 3) occurs five times elsewhere in Euripides at the end of an iambic trimeter (*Med.* 84, *Hipp.* 913, 1038 and 1419, fr. 811 Ν°); for ὅταν χόλην ἄγουσιν... cf. *Med.* 1238 and μὴ χόλην ἄγουσιν... 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 Ν° (see below part II), fr. 979 Ν° (οὐτός προσθεανός ἢ Δίκη se, μὴ τρέπσῃ παῖτε πρὸς ἑαυτόν ὁδός τῶν ἄλλων βροτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν διδόν, ἄλλα σῖν καὶ βραδεῖ ποὺς αὐξίουσα μάρφες τοὺς κακοὺς, ὅταν τύχῃ); El. 771, *Archelaos*, fr. 255 Ν° etc.; see in general H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983), pp. 151ff.


15 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).

16 Pseudo-Justin *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.

17 Marcovich, loc. cit. (n. 14).

18 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 Valckenacrio’; A. Matthiae, *Euripidis tragœdœiae*, Vol. IX (Leipzig, 1829), p. 298; Th. Fix, *Euripidis fabulae* [Paris, 1843], p. 822 etc.).
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fragment more closely. For it seems clear from Eusebius’ quotation, 19 that in the third line of TrGF 2.624 Clement wrote κακώς instead of καλός – a rather careless error, probably caused by assimilation to the following κακώς, 20 and perhaps also influenced by κακόν τι πράσσων in the previous second line of Eur. fr. 835 N². Valckenaer in fact questioned Clement’s reading in this case (p. 2), and Otto in his edition has definitely rejected κακώς as wrong. 21 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. 22 Yet Eusebius’ quotation confirms that Clement omitted line 2 δὶς εξαμαρτάνοντες οὐκ ευγνωμόνως for reasons to be considered below. 23

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 δόκειτε instead of νομίζετε’ in the first line can be similarly accounted for as a ‘Perseverationsfehler’ following δόκει ποιητα και δοκών διάλεκται in the penultimate line of fr. 835 N². Moreover, one should not be surprised that Clement writes an unmetrical form such as δόκειτ(e).

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 εἰ τίς at the beginning, whereas Sextus Empiricus, Ps.-Justin and Stobaeus unanimously transmit δοστίς. The latter seems to be the preferable reading for Euripides. 25

On the other hand, Clement is more reliable than Ps.-Justin in one particularly important detail. In line 2, his wording κακόν τι πράσσων τοὺς θεοὺς λειταρίαν 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 θεοὺς 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 θεοὺς in his pagan source.

19 cf. above n. 5.
20 cf. A. Matthiae, op. cit. (n. 18), p. 198 ‘κακώς facile scribi potuit propter κακώς, quod sequitur’.
21 I. C. Th. von Otto (ed.), Justini philosophi et martyrish opera quae feruntur omnia² (Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi, vol. III) (Jena, 1879; 1842; 1849²), p. 139 n. 23. It is worth noticing that Clement and Eusebius have ἐπτεί for πράσσει; the latter is the correct form for Euripides (cf. fr. 835.2 N², IT 668, and elsewhere).
22 κερνάτω must be a scribe’s error; cf. O Stählin, Clemens Alexandrinus³ ii (GCS) (Berlin, 1960) ad loc. and Kannicht–Snell TrGF 2.624 ad loc. 23 See n. 36.
23 Броунтис εἶναί ἄκουσις μὴ φύγης vs. Ps.-Justin, De mon. 4.2 Βρονττίς ἄκουσις μηδαμίως πάροι φύγης; cf. ibid. line 1 (δικαίως ἐργος for the metrically correct ἐργος δικαίως); see, moreover, Strom. 5.121.1 (Diphil. PCG 5.136, quoted in Ps.-Justin, De mon. 3.2).
24 cf. the parallels quoted in n. 13 (there is no εἰ τίς ... θητών 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.\(^26\)

\[
\text{δράθ' δοσι νομίζετ' }\quad \text{oùκ εἶναι θεούς,}\quad \text{δίς εξαμαρτάνοντες οὖκ εὐγνωμονώς,}\quad \text{εἰσάν γάρ, εἰσάν.}\quad \text{εἰ δὲ τις πράσσει\(^{31}\text{ καλῶς}\quad \text{kακῶς πεφυκὼς, τὸν χρόνον κερδαινώτω· χρόνως γάρ οὗτος ὅστερον\(^{32}\text{ δώσει δίκην.}})}
\]

This easy emendation produces a piece of verse which could well come from a reputable source,\(^34\) 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.\(^35\) Yet whereas \(\text{xapaprdvov}\) seems indeed to strike a Judaeo-Christian note in connection with the singular form \(\text{deov},\)\(^36\) no objections can be raised against the line in the context of the fragment in its emended form. For the concept of \(\text{άμαρτία}\) in general is not at all alien to Greek tragedy,\(^37\) and the verb \(\text{έξαμαρτάνειν}\) in particular occurs quite frequently,\(^38\) especially in Euripides.\(^39\) It usually refers to errors in the human sphere, to offences against fellow-men, e.g. \(\text{Ac. 708 Αδ...ει δ' άλγεις κλίων} \downarrow \text{τάλθης, οὐ χρήν σ' εἰς ε' \text{έξαμαρτάνειν.}\quad \text{啡. σοῦ δ' ἁν προθήκαις μᾶλλον ἐξημάρτανον.}\) But the root \(\text{άμαρτ-}\) also covers offences against the gods: cf. for the simple verb \(\text{Peirithoos 11 (fr. 15a Page) ...άλλα βορε[άσων πνοαίς έκει| διεσπαράχθη συμμ[έτροι κοιμάσμασαι]| πατήρ άμαρτων εἰς θε[όης τιμωρία].}\)\(^40\) for the composite \(\text{έξαμαρτάνειν}\) Aesch. Prom. 944 (ΕΡΜΗΣ) \(\text{οί τῶν σοφιστήν, τῶν πικρῶς ὑπέρπικρον, τὸν \text{έξαμαρτόντ' εἰς θεοὺς εφημερίος | πορώντα}}\)

\(^{26}\) For the convenience of the reader, I give the text with critical notes, which entails the repetition of things mostly already mentioned above.

\(^{27}\) Ps.-Justin: Clement (and Eusebius, cf. n. 5) \(\text{δοκείτε.}\)

\(^{28}\) Ps.-Justin and Clement (and Eusebius) \(\text{θεοί.}\)

\(^{29}\) 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.

\(^{30}\) Ps.-Justin and Clement (and Eusebius) \(\text{εῖστιν γάρ, ἐστιν.}\)

\(^{31}\) Ps.-Justin: Clement (and Eusebius) \(\text{πράττει (cf. above n. 21).}\)

\(^{32}\) Ps.-Justin: Clement (and Eusebius) \(\text{κακώς.}\)

\(^{33}\) H. Grotius, \(\text{Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis Graecis (Paris, 1626), p. 416} \) – followed by J. Barnes, \(\text{Euripidis quae exstant omnia (Cambridge, 1694), p. 503,}\) and Valckenaer p. 5 – reads \(\text{υστέρον, contra necessitatem.}\)

\(^{34}\) This is, in a way, already suggested by the association with fragments of Diphilus and Euripides in both Ps.-Justin and Clement (see above).

\(^{35}\) 'si sententiam [sc. spectes], minus aptum nec \(\text{Euripidi congruum [sc. versum]}\)' (p. 5).

\(^{36}\) cf. Valckenaer, p. 5 'Noster ille posuit quo sensu Judaei dicebant et Christiani άμαρτάνειν εἰς θεούς.\) 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 considerately leaves out what he – sometimes rightly – thinks is suspicious in his source (cf. \(\text{Strom. 5.119.2 = Men. fr. 683 Körtre.}\)

\(^{37}\) The problem of tragic \(\text{άμαρτία}\) has formed the subject of numerous books and articles; one may refer to J. M. Bremer, \(\text{Hamartia. Tragic Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy (Amsterdam, 1969); T. C. W. Stinton, \text{'Hamartia in Aristotle and Greek Tragedy', CQ 25 (1975), 221-54; and S. Saïd, La faute tragique (Paris, 1978).}\)\(^41\) See Bremer, op. cit. (n. 37), pp. 31ff., and Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 44.

\(^{38}\) 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.

\(^{39}\) See Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 411; cf. also Aphrodite's words in the Prologue of \(\text{Hipp. 21 ά δ' εἰς ε' \text{ήμαρτηκε τιμωρήσωμαι Π}πόλυλυτον \text{ἐν τήδ' ἡμέρα with the comments of Stinton, art. cit. (n. 37),} 247ff., and Saïd, op. cit. (n. 37), p. 413.\)}}
A suggestion concerning the exact meaning of the ‘double’ mistake in our fragment will be made below (part IV).

In lines 4–5, a Judeo-Christian reader may, of course, have seen a reference to the Last Judgement. 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 ὑστέρων ἥλθε δίκη. Euripides in particular often points at this ‘sera numinis vindicta’, e.g. Solon, fr. 13.8 West.

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’ Ant., fr. 577 N2, that human beings can infer the existence of the gods:

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

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 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 N2, that human beings can infer the existence of the gods:

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

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 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 N2, that human beings can infer the existence of the gods:

For the converse argument, cf. El. 583–4:
Unlike Aeschylus and Sophocles, Euripides freely put such ‘atheistic’ sentiments into the mouths of his characters, as is shown by Bellerophontes, fr. 286 N². 50

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’, 51 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 Bellerophontes, 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. 52 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. Bellerophontes 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 δὲ τις πρᾶσσει καλῶς [κακῶς], πεφυκός 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. 53

TrGF 2.99 πῶς οὖν τὰδ’ εἰσάρωντες ἡ θεών γένος ἐναι λέγομεν ἢ νόμαις χρώμαθα; TrGF 2.465 τομῶν κατεσπεῖν, μῆπορ’ οὖκ εἰσίν θεοί [κακοί] γάρ εὐνοούστες ἐκπλησσούσι με.

Sowochos develops the same idea in Electra 245–50 but is much more cautious in his wording: εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν [σκ. Agammenon] θανάτος γὰρ τε καὶ υδάθεν ὥστε τὰλάσια, οἱ δὲ μὴ πάλιν διὰ σώσεως ἀντιψάφονος δίκαιος, ἔρροι τ’ αὖ ἀδίκος [ἀπάντων] τ’ εὐφεβεία θυτῶν (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 [θεοῦ] βροτῶν ἀξιοῦσαι μελεῖν [δόσις ἀθίκτων χάρις] πατωθ’ ἐρ’ οὐκ εὐσεβής.

50 cf. A. B. Drachmann, Atheism in Pagan Antiquity (Copenhagen, 1922), p. 53. I have argued in an article on ‘The “Atheistic” Fragment from Euripides’ Bellerophontes’ (286 N²) (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’ αὐτός ἐν ταῖσιν τραγῳδίαις ποιῶν τοὺς ἀνθρακορείκες οὐκ εἶναι θεοὺς). 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.

51 The fragment is only transmitted by Ps.-Justin, De monarchia 5.6. In lines 2–3, I have given the reading of the Argentoratensis 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 (εἰ τις ἄνθρωπον λέγει, μή τῷ παλαιῷ μῶρῳ ὃν χρήσθα λόγῳ) – a codex which is often more reliable than the Argentoratensis, but not in this particular case.

52 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’.

53 See n. 50. Such an interpretation of Bellerophontes 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).

54 cf. fr. 991 N² ἀλλ’ ἔστι, κεῖ τις ἡγεῖται (τάμωρ) [coni. Nauck] λόγῳ, [Σείξι καὶ θεοὶ, θρόστει λεύσοντες πάθη; Hesp. fur. 757 τις ὁ θεοῦς ἀνομία χραίων, ἡματικὸν ὁμόν άφρων λόγον]
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 ὧδεθ ἄσοι occurs also in Ion 1090 ὧδεθ* ἄσοι δισκελάδοις κατὰ μοῦν  ὑνοις ἀδεθη ὑμῖν | ἀμέτερα λέξεα 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 ὧδεθ ὃπατε (with Bond’s comment, op. cit. [n. 47] ad loc.).56 The use of the verb νομίζειν to express belief in the gods is standard Greek language,54 cf. for drama Eur. Suppl. 731 νὸν τῦρόν ἢλπτον ἡμέραν ὑδόου ἐγώ | θεοῦς νομίζω; A. Pers. 497 θεοὺς δὲ τίς | το πρὶν νομίζων οὐδομοῦ τότ’ ἡγκυτον | λιταίον κτλ. The best Euripidean parallels for οὐκ εἶναι θεοῦς are Bellerophontes, fr. 286.187 and Phrixus B, fr. pap. 154.1–2 Austin.58

Line 2 δίς ἔξαμαρτάνοντες: the exact combination occurs only in Menander, Sent. 183 Jäkel δίς ἔξαμαρτειν πατῶν οὐκ ἀνδρός σοφόν. Yet the sort of ‘mathematical’ intensification found in δίς ἐξ- is rather characteristic of Euripides, as C. W. Willink suggested to me, cf. the phrase δίς τά- which occurs not less than ten times in the surviving plays (e.g. Med. 1134, El. 1092). For ἔξαμαρτάνεις see above; Eur. uses the verb in the same metrical position in IA 1204 (ἡ δ’ ἔξαμαρτος’), fr. 1027.3 Ν53 (…νέος δ’ ὅταν | πάλλ ἔξαμαρτη’), Hypsipyle, fr. 22.8 Bond (ὅν δ’ ἔξαμαρτ…). The point of δίς is not altogether clear59 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.60

οὐκ εὐγνώμονος: the word εὐγνώμονος is not found in the surviving plays of the three tragedians (in drama, it only occurs in Menander, fr. 571.1 Körte ἐν ἐστ’ ἀλθῆς φιλτρον, εὐγνώμονο τρόπος, cf. Sent. 334 Jäkel Θεοῦ σέφυκε δώρων εὐγνώμονο τρόπος), but the notion expressed by it is a very familiar one.61 The phrase οὐκ εὐγνώμονος can be paralleled with Soph. Tr. 473 κοῦ κανγύμονα (also at the end of the verse; cf. in the same metrical position οὐκ ἄγνώμονες in Men. fr. 762 Körte). It

†οιράνων μακάρων† κατεβάλ’ ὡς ἄρ’ οὐ|θένονμι θεοί; 772 θεοὶ θεοὶ|τόν ἀδίκων μελνοι|καὶ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπίσειν.


57 See above, and compare the probable echo in Aristoph. Thesm. 450 (n. 50).

58 See below part IV.

59 It has strongly bothered Valckenenaer (p. 5 ‘Sed cur, obscoro, dicuntur Δίς, bis, stulte peccantes gravissime?’) and, in his wake, Matthiae, loc. cit. (n. 18).

60 Another possible explanation would be that one of the ‘mistakes’ concerns the human realm (because those people really behave wickedly towards others, cf. κακοῖς σφυκοῖς), 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.

61 To have an ‘upright and good sense’ is, according to Eur. Hipp. 426, absolutely crucial for life: μόνον δὲ τοίτο φασί άμιλλάθαι βίον, γνώμην δίκαιον κάγαιθην, ὅτι παρη; cf. Hipp. 240 ποι παρεπάλαχθην γνώμης ἀγαθής; 377γ; cf. Soph. OT 687 ἀγαθὸς ἄνεν γνώμην ἀνήρ etc.
is, moreover, the sort of new locution to be expected in Euripides, who shows an idiosyncratic fondness for the use of only ευ-,62 cf. e.g. οὐκ εὐδαίμων 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** εἰόν γάρ, εἰόν: ‘epanalepsis’ as in fr. 286.2 N² (see above part II). Euripides uses the same emphatic figure e.g. Antiope, fr. 223 N² Δίκα τοι, Δίκα: Bellerophontes, fr. 285.7 N² ἄλγει μέν, ἄλγει; Andr. 980 ἠλγον μέν, ἠλγον; Alc. 1017 καὶ μέμφομαι μέν, μέμφομαι etc.

εἰ δὲ τις πράσσει καλῶς: cf. the striking parallels Oineus, fr. 564 N² (όταν κακοί πράξασιν, ὃς ξένοι, καλῶς, ἄγαν κρατοῦντες καὶ ναμίζοντες δίκην | δώσεις ἑδράσαι πάντ' ἐφέντες ἢδωνή) and Polydios, fr. 644 N² (όταν κακοὶ τις ἐν πόλει πράσοι καλῶς, νοσεῖν τίθησι τὰς ἀμεινῶν φρένας κτλ.). πράσσει καλῶς occurs at the end of a trimeter in IT 668 and Belleroph. fr. 287.3 N² (cf. also Ion 730, Suppl. 728, fr. 443.2 N²).

**Line 4** Κακός σφεικός: cf. Ion 440 καὶ γάρ δότις ἀν βροτῶν κακός σφεικός, ἐξαιτοῦσιν οἱ θεοί; ibid. 1622 οἱ κακοὶ δ', ὁσπέρ σφεικός', οὗτος εἰ πράξειν ἄν; Hipp. 1031, 1075, 1191 εἰ κακός σφεικός' ἀμήρ; Hec. 332.

tον χρόνον κερδαινέτω: the exact combination occurs only later (in Lysias, Or. 13.84 ... τὸν χρόνον κερδαινέις ἐκ ἐξή οὖ προσήκον αὐτῷ and Demosth. Philipp. 3.29 τὸν χρόνον κερδαίναι). Yet time as ‘a gain’, ‘as profit’, is well paralleled in Greek tragedy (Soph. El. 1485 τί γάρ βροτῶν ἂν σὺν κακοῖς μεμεγημένων | θνήσκειν ὁ μέλλως τοῦ χρόνου κέρδος φέροι;63 cf. Eur. Or. 789 τὸ χρόνος δὲ κερδαινεῖς ‘and you will profit by...the (saving of) time’ – Willink, op. cit. ad loc., following Di Benedetto), and so is κερδαινεῖν 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).64

**Line 5** χρόνον γὰρ οὕτος ὅστερον δώσει δίκην: cf. Herc. fur. 740 ἡλικίας χρόνω μὲν (according to Wilamowitz brachylogical for χρόνων μὲν ἡλικίας, ἀλλ' ἡλικίας γε τοι) οὐ δίκην δώσεις θανῶν, ὃ θρεῖς ὕβρισθεν εἰς ἁμεινὰς σέθεν. Aeschylus, Suppl. 732 also offers a quite close parallel (...χρόνω τοι κυρίῳ τ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ | θεοῦς ἀτίζων τις βροτῶν δώσει δίκην); see, moreover, Aristoph. Nub. 1242 (Ἡ μὴν σὺ τούτων τὸν χρόνον δώσεις δίκην). Eur. El. 952 (ἐρ', οὗτον εἰδων ὃν εὐφρενεῖς χρόνων | δίκην δεδωκας) and Heracl. 1025 (οὕτος δὲ δώσει τὴν δίκην θανῶν ἐμοί). The phrase δώσεις(δ) 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.

62 I owe this important observation to C. W. Willink.

63 cf. Aj. 457ff.; 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. 202ff.), but are still probably by a tragedian or, at least, an actor of classical times. (N. G. Wilson drew my attention to this problem.)

64 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]’.

As for the original context of the fragment, Ps.-Justin's presentation may perhaps give us a hint. He quotes fr. 835 N² 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, 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. 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. 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. But the new papyrus, P.Oxy. 3652 col. II. 16ff., shows quite clearly that both plays had almost identical plots. 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.

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

---

65 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.
67 Phrixus A: fr. 821 N²; Phrixus B: fr. 819 N², 827 N², and – most likely (cf. n. 84) – fr. pap. 154 Austin.
68 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. N² fr. 819), a confusion which Webster tried to explain by the chronological priority of plot B over plot A.
of the country to roast the corn before sowing it. The consequences of this procedure are famine and pestilence. Athamas, king of Thessaly or Orchomenos, 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. Athamas hands her over to Phrixus to be killed. 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.

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. 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. The king will have pointed to Ino as a vivid example of the general truth expressed in the lines:

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


72 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).


74 Hygin. Fab. 2 'quod cum Athamas se facturum abnuisset, Phrixus utro ac libens policetur se unum civitatem aerumna liberaturum'.


76 Hygin. loc. cit. ‘rex facinore cognito, uxorem suam Ino et filium eius Melicerten Phrixo dedidit necandos’.


80 ἑρβεν[ν] Grotius; ἐρβεσ[ε]ν 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 ἑρβεν instead of ἑρβεν and wanted to separate the line from fr. 835 N².
Her downfall is positive proof that the gods really exist and that the wicked man has to be on his guard, for he, too, will be punished:

\[\text{ὀραθ' ὅσοι νομίζετ' οὐκ εἶναι θεοὺς, διὸ ἔξαμαρτάνοντες οὐκ ἐγνωμῶνος: εἰσὶν γὰρ, εἰσὶν. εἰ δὲ τις πράσσει καλὸς κακὸς περιφκάω, τὸν χρόνον κερδαινέων· χρόνῳ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὑπερον δώσει δίκην.}\]

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. We may possibly get a clue from yet another papyrus which contains a florilegium, including five quotations from Euripides. One of them, fr. pap. 154 Austin, is most probably taken from Phrixus B:

\[\text{Εὐριπίδου ἐγευτέρου Ἐπικουρίου.}\]

\[\text{ὠθυμένα παραφρονήματ' ἀνθρώπων, μάτην οἱ βασιν εἶναι τὴν τύχην ἀλλ' οὐ̇ θεοὺς· ὡς οὐδὲν ἵστε κεῖ [λέγεων δοκεῖσε π.], εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἣ τῇ ἰῳχῇ ἄτι οὐδὲν δεῖ θεοῦ, εἶ μὲν δ' οἱ θεοὶ σθένουσαν οὐδέν ἣ τῇ ἰῳχῇ.}\]

('Vielmehr gehört der lastige Vers nicht hierher, 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' ἐτίσεσ) (S. Musgrave, Euripidis fragmenta [Leipzig, 1779], p. 467 – he suggested as another possibility τιμωρία ἐτίσεσ), or they printed a semicolon after ἀλλ' θεούς 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 ἀλλ' line 4 to ὀτὲ δ' ὀ. 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 ἐτ'(<ε')ἰσεν is impeccable (pace Musgrave, loc. cit.), cf. Plat. Leg. 905β6–7 τείσεις...τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμωρίαν; for ὥν ἥρξεν(ν) κακῶν, cf. Eur. Hel. 425 κρύψας γυναίκα τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἑμοὶ ἄρβασαν..., Βά. 1114 etc.


82 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.


84 Wilamowitz's attribution to the Hyppisyle 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.

85 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 N² (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*-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.

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.*
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