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Euripides' *Danae* and *Dictys* belong to the Danae-myth, treating the earlier and subsequent phase of the legend, respectively. As far as the evidence allows, a cautious reconstruction of the plot of each play is attempted, based on interrogation of the fragmentary material and the *testimonia*. In this effort, Euripidean scene-construction, parallel thematic and structural patterns, parallel rhetoric and general rules of tragic practice are also taken into account as evidence for the dramatist's usage. As regards the generic affiliations of each play, the *Danae* may be paralleled to Euripides' *Alope, Melanippe the Wise* and *Auge*, all of which treated the clash of a royal daughter with her paternal *oikos*, due to the disclosure of her illicit motherhood resulting in most cases from her union with a god. The evidence for the *Dictys* indicates that it was probably built upon a central altar-scene (cf. E. *Heraclidae*, *Andromache*, *Suppliant Women*, *Heracles*, *Helen*) and that it had the features of a *nostos*-play, following the 'return-rescue-revenge' pattern (cf. the first part of the *Heracles*). The reception of both plays and their position in the transmission of Euripides are also explored, on the basis of the available evidence.

This is the first commentary on Euripides' *Danae* and *Dictys*; a detailed commentary on language, style, themes and values, aiming also to shed light on various aspects of Euripidean technique (e.g. his rhetoric, imagery, as well as staging directions, where possible). The exploration of issues raised by the fragmentary material seeks to complement our knowledge of Euripides' drama, as derived from surviving plays, which represent only a portion of the whole Euripidean oeuvre. Where appropriate, textual and philological matters are discussed, as well as questions of authenticity, such as a *Danae* 'hypothesis' and 'prologue' (the spurious fr. 1132 Kn.) transmitted in Euripides' manuscript P (Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 287, f° 147°-148°).
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GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Danae and Dictys both belong to the Danae-myth, treating the earlier and subsequent phase of the legend, respectively. It is therefore interesting to explore how Euripides treated different stages of the same mythical cycle and his dramatic predilections in each play. The Danae deals with the maiden’s clash with her paternal oikos and her exposure together with her baby-son. The Dictys, on the other hand, provides a change of scenery from Argos to the island of Seriphos and could be described as a nostos-play following the pattern of "catastrophe survived"1 (cf. Dictys, Structure). Likewise, other Euripidean treatments of successive phases of the same legend, as the pairs Iphigenia in Aulis-Iphigenia in Tauris and Melanippe the Wise-Captive Melanippe tend to present parallel features; the mythically earlier plays (Iphigenia in Aulis, Melanippe the Wise) treat the maiden’s separation from her native family, whereas those inspired by subsequent phases of the myth (Iphigenia in Tauris, Captive Melanippe) have the scenery changed to a remote place, dealing with the motif of rescue and reunion between kin.

No commentary has ever been written on either play and the relevant bibliography is very limited. A considerable amount survives from both tragedies and the outline of the plot of the Dictys can now be substantiated by combination of the literary sources with recent iconographic evidence from an Apulian volute-crater inspired by a fourth-century revival of the play. Apart from the plot structure, a reconstruction of scenes from each play is attempted, so far as the evidence from the fragments and the relevant sources allows. In building on the fragments, I have also drawn on parallel thematic and structural patterns in Euripidean drama and, where relevant, on the work of the other two surviving fifth-century tragedians. Where appropriate, textual and philological issues are discussed, as well as matters of authenticity, such as the ‘hypothesis’ of the Danae and the spurious fr. 1132 Kn. The commentary sheds light on various aspects of Euripidean technique (as the agon, cf. Danae frr. 8-12, Dictys frr. 4, 5, imagery, cf. Danae frr. 2, 15, also staging directions, such as the ‘cancelled entry’ and the imposing opening tableau in the Dictys, cf. Setting), themes (the motif of supplication in Dictys T3, T4, T5, the precarious position of women in

---

1 The term belongs to Burnett (1971).
Danae frr. 4, 5, 6, the possible self-sacrifice in Danae frr. 13, 14, the Euripidean type of the assertive old man in Dictys fr. 3) and values (the different definitions of eugeneia in Danae fr. 9 and Dictys fr. 14, the positions for and against wealth in Danae frr. 7-12, the consolation in Dictys fr. 2, the perception of eros as god-sent and overwhelming passion in Dictys frr. 8, 9, 18). The exploration of issues raised by the fragmentary material and the cautious recovery of lost plays, so far as possible, aim to complement our knowledge of Euripides' drama by contributing to an overview and more comprehensive picture of the dramatist's technique, as the extant tragedies represent only a small portion of his oeuvre. A detailed study of the two plays may thus be well justified.

The Danae and Dictys and their Place in the Transmission of Euripides

On the basis of the available literary and artistic evidence, the position of the two plays in the transmission of Euripides can be explored up to a certain extent. The Apulian vase-painting inspired by the Dictys and dated in 370/360 BC (Dictys T3) is suggestive of a fourth-century revival of the play in South Italy. Likewise, the possible allusion to the Danae in Menander's Samia (Danae T6) points to a revival of the play by Menander's time. The edition by Aristophanes of Byzantium towards the end of the third century relied on the official Athenian copy of the plays belonging to the repertory, as instigated by Lycurgus in about 330 BC (cf. Plut. Mor. 841F, Galen In Hipp. Epid. 3, Comm. 2.4); it is estimated to have comprised the surviving 78 out of the 92 plays of Euripides' production (cf. Vita Eur. TrGF V, T 1, IA 28, IB 57f.) arranged alphabetically. The plays not included in the edition, and thus missing the opportunity to be cited by later authors, had evidently been already lost during the fourth century. The satyr play Theristae, for instance, is mentioned as lost in Aristophanes' hyp. Med. (Dictys T1), as opposed to the Medea, Philoctetes and Dictys of the same production, which were preserved to be included in Aristophanes' edition. The theme of Polydectes' petrification, as depicted in the Cyzicene relief of the monument of Apollonis dated in the second century BC (Dictys T7), may have

---

been appealing in Hellenistic times thanks to the Dictys, given Euripides’ popularity in that era, particularly the wide reception of Euripidean drama in this collection of Cyzicene reliefs, and the fact that no literary treatment of this phase of the myth is attested after the fifth century (cf. Dictys, The Myth, p. 128). Further, inscriptive evidence (Danae T2) reveals that a copy of the Danae was kept in a school library in Piraeus in about 100 BC. Meanwhile, gnomic anthologies of educational character, citing excerpts from Euripides and other authors are estimated to have appeared as early as the fourth century BC;4 the notorious fr. 7 of the Danae, for instance, is cited in a gnomic anthology from Hellenistic Egypt dated in the second century BC.5 Part of the appeal of the play for the schoolroom may have been the moralizing about wealth.

The earliest attested commentary on the nine plays of Euripides is that by Didymus in the second half of the first century BC/ beginning of the first century AD.6 These plays must have been eminently popular and probably part of the school syllabus. Having been singled out for commentaries, they were given much greater chance for long-term survival.7 Accordingly, fewer unannotated (non-select) plays than those with commentaries have been preserved in papyri from the second century BC onwards.8 Nevertheless, the fact that non-select plays continued to be performed at least till the end of the second century AD9 and were still obtainable among literary circles10 suggests that the encroachment of the ‘selection’ was a slow process and its influence was limited to the school syllabus by that time. Lucian’s allusion to the context of the situation of Danae fr. 7 (Timon 41) and perhaps also of fr. 13 (D. Mar. 12), as well as the possibility that the rescue of mother and child by the Nereids might reflect Euripides (cf. note on T5), imply that he could have known the play directly. Likewise, the reference to the situation of Dictys fr. 2 by the

---

6 There is no safe evidence that Aristarchus had previously written hypomnēmata on tragic poetry; cf. Pfeiffer (1968) pp. 222-224.
9 Cf. Luc. De Salt. 27 (HF), Plut. Mor. 556A (Ino), 998E (Cresphontes), Tatian Or. ad Gr. 24. 1 (mime from one of Euripides’ Alcmeon tragedies).
10 Cf. the papyri of the Oedipus (P. Oxy. 2459, 4th A.D.), Phaethon (P. Berol. 9771, 4th A.D.) and Captive Melanippe (P. Berol. 5514, 4th/5th A.D.) and several quotations from non-select plays, as Luc. Menipp. 1 (HF 523f.), D.Chr. Or. 52 (paraphrasis of the Philoctetes), which seem to derive from direct access to the plays and not from intermediary sources, such as anthologies or mythographical hypotheses. Cf. Zuntz (1965) p. 254ff.
author of the *Consolation to Apollonius* (perhaps written by Plutarch in his youth or by one of his contemporaries) could suggest his direct knowledge of the play. At the same time, the mythographic hypotheses of Euripides' plays possibly dated in the Imperial period were very popular, saving the toil, which the study of the classical originals entailed. Ps. Apollodorus' account providing the plot of the *Dictys* (*Dictys T5*) presents certain features suggesting that it may have derived from this collection of narrative hypotheses through the use of intermediary sources (cf. note *ad loc.*). Similarly, the Cyzicene epigram (*Dictys T7*) of a much later date (dated in the sixth century at the earliest) seems to be only remotely related to the *Dictys*, perhaps relying on a mythographic manual (cf. note *ad loc.*).

The establishment of Christianity evidently led to the consolidation of the 'selection', as the parts of pagan tradition standing any chance of long-term survival were only those included in the school syllabus. The new book-type of the codex, not allowing for any additions, and its prevalence over the roll in about the fourth century apparently had the same effect. Moreover, the trend of excerpting literature for educational purposes and the compilation of gnomic anthologies presenting passages conveniently arranged by subject eventually resulted in only indirect access to non-select plays. The latest known papyri of plays outside the 'selection' are those of the *Phaethon*, *Oedipus* and *Captive Melanippe* dated in the fourth/fifth century. The spurious fr. 1132 Kn. written some time between the fourth and seventh century AD points to the appeal of Euripides and of the earlier phase of Danae's myth in later antiquity; nevertheless, if it was an independent composition (e.g. a rhetorical exercise imitating a Euripidean opening on Danae's legend), rather than a specially composed supplement for the lost beginning of the *Danae* in an alphabetic collection of Euripides' plays (the latter is what West assumed), it would not tell us much about the survival of the play by that time (for this issue, cf. Appendix, Diagnosis of Spuriousness). The majuscule manuscripts of the 'select' plays, presumably written in about the sixth or seventh century, were transcribed into minuscule possibly in about the tenth century. A copy of the nine 'alphabetic', non-select plays evidently

---

originating in an ancient manuscript in majuscule seems to have been possessed by Eustathius. His twelfth-century copy was discovered by Triclinius, who corrected and annotated the text, thus providing the model for L and, consequently, for P.17

Exploring the Evidence: The Sources and ‘Reconstruction’

The evidence for lost plays is direct, namely the fragments of each play distinguished to papyrus and book-fragments, and indirect, consisting of the testimonia for the plays, either textual or artistic.18 The lack of papyri for the text of the Danae and Dictys (the only fragment on papyrus is Danae fr. 7, which is, however, an excerpt from a gnomic anthology and not from a papyrus of the play), which, in the case of the Danae in particular, may be a matter of coincidence rather than an indication of lesser popularity (cf. Danae, Reception), leaves fragments cited by later authors as the sole direct source. In the latter case, it should be taken into account that the nature of the selected passage and the manner, in which the text is cited, primarily depends on the author’s reasons for quoting it.19 Most of the material comes from Stobaeus’ fifth-century compilation (Danae frr. 1-15, except for fr. 10a, Dictys frr. 3-10, 12-18), which draws on earlier anthologies. The generalising character of gnomic excerpts entails problems of locating the fragments within the play. Preservation in gnomic anthologies also has implications for the state of the text, partly due to the compilers’ trend to render the quotations self-contained (cf. note on Danae fr. 4.1).20 Plutarch, whose work of youth could have been the source for Dictys fr. 2, tends to quote anonymously, though by mentioning the speaker, the addressee and briefly the situation, he generally makes the identification of the play possible, often providing hints at the location of the fragment within the play.21 Philodemus (the sole source for Dictys fr. 1), on the other hand, quotes anonymously, usually with no reference to the context,22 making

22 Cf. van Looy (1964) p. 24 and n. 4 with examples.
it difficult to identify the citation confidently in the case of fragments, for which he is the only source. The ancient scholia are often a helpful source, particularly when a fragment is cited as a parallel to the commented passage,\(^{23}\) which, in certain cases, may give scope for exploring its context (cf. *Dictys* fr. 11). The least helpful sources for locating a fragment within an individual play are evidently lexicographical citations (cf. *Danae* fr. 16, *Dictys* fr. 19), preserving words completely isolated from their context.

The indirect evidence needs also to be assessed in terms of its reliability and degree of access to the play (namely direct or indirect, through intermediary sources). The reliability of inscriptionsal evidence, for instance, cannot be disputed (cf. the catalogues of Euripidean plays in *Danae* T2 and T3= *Dictys* T2), though it is more informative on questions of transmission than on matters of form and content. The *Dictys* is safely dated thanks to the hyp. *Med.* by Aristophanes of Byzantium (*Dictys* T1). The pieces of evidence in certain cases complement each other; the accounts of Theon (*Dictys* T4) and the *Bibliotheca* (*Dictys* T5) referring to the supplication-scene could not be confidently regarded as reproducing the plot of the *Dictys*, without the further aid of the Apulian vase-painting inspired by the play (*Dictys* T3), which depicts this altar-scene. On the other hand, there are sources, whose reliability should be questioned; the validity, for instance, of what purports to be the ‘hypothesis’ of the *Danae* (*Danae* T5) could be contested for a number of reasons in combination (cf. note *ad loc.*). Further, testimonies depending on the arbitrary and oversimplifying interpretation of sources or on anecdotological material, as those of Pollux (*Danae* T1) and Satyrus (*Danae* fr. 10a) respectively, need to be treated with much caution. In addition, John Malalas’ accounts of tragic plots (cf. *Danae* T4) are not particularly helpful, in view of his evidently indirect knowledge of non-select plays and his habit of fusing material from different sources. One should also distinguish between cases of reception inspired directly by Euripides (cf. Menander in *Danae* T6) and cases where intermediary sources seem to have been used (cf. the Cyzicene epigram in *Dictys* T7).

The lack of papyrus-fragments and of a detailed hypothesis for each play limits the scope for a full recovery of the plot. My purpose therefore is, first, to assign the fragments to the dramatic characters based on the evidence of the *testimonia* and on interrogation of

---

the fragments in terms of theme, gender of speaker and interlocutor, where possible, as well as the speaker’s emotional state, rhetoric and ethical stance. Subsequently, I attempt to locate the fragments in scenes on the basis of evidence for the broad plot of the play, particular hints of the fragments at the dramatic situation, parallels from Euripidean scene-construction and tragic conventions. The numbering of the fragments follows their proposed location in scenes, while those, whose position cannot be fixed with much probability, are placed at the end as ‘fragmenta sedis magis incertae’.
1. The Myth in Literature and Art

Before studying Euripides’ treatment of the earlier phase of Danae’s legend, it is important to examine the sources prior and subsequent to his play, in order, firstly, to establish the mythical framework of his production and, secondly, to explore the popularity and versions of the myth at different periods of time. (The possible cases of reception of his Danae are explored in the relevant chapter and in the notes on the testimonia for the play).

Danae was daughter of Acrisius, son of Abas and king of Argos, and of his wife Eurydice, daughter of Lacedaemon. Danae’s beauty is described in the epics with the conventional epithets καλλίστηρος (II. 14. 319, cf. schol. Eust. ad loc., Hes. Catalogue of Women fr. 129.14 M.-W.) and ἀλεξιμός (Aspis 216). The earliest full account of Danae’s adventures occurs in Pherecydes (fr. 10 Fowler/ FGrH 3 F10) and has survived in summarized form in the ancient scholia on Apollonius of Rhodes (4. 1091 Wendel): the genealogist narrates how Acrisius imprisoned his daughter in an underground bronze chamber together with her nurse, on the basis of an oracle saying that he would be killed by the son born from Danae. Zeus, however, managed to impregnate Danae by transforming himself into a shower of gold and the offspring of this union was hidden from his grandfather. When Acrisius found out about Perseus accidentally by hearing the child’s shouts, he killed the nurse and, taking Danae to the altar of Zeus Herkeios, demanded to know who the child’s father was. When Danae answered that it was Zeus, Acrisius did not believe her and enclosed both mother and son in a chest, which he cast adrift. The chest reached Seriphos, where it was fished up by a fisherman...

---

27 Pherecydes’ Genealogy is estimated to have circulated some time between 508 and 476 BC; cf. Jacoby (1947) p. 33.
named Dictys, son of Peristhenes, who took Danae and Perseus under his protection, treating them as his own family. The text of the scholiast runs as follows:

The oracle leading Acrisius to imprison Danae in a bronze chamber, Zeus' transformation into a shower of gold and the seclusion of Danae and Perseus in the chest occur in

28 The scholiast seems to have maintained Pherecydes' phrasing in this sentence and below (I. 8: νῦν δὲ γίνεται Περιστέρας), to judge by the same phrasing in the actual quotations from Pherecydes' text in frs. 8, 21, 66, 101 Fowler.

29 Dictys treats Danae and Perseus as his own family, since he is also a descendant of Danaus, according to this genealogy attested only by Pherecydes; cf. the note by Jacoby (1923-1958) ad loc.

30 For the oracle, cf. schol. Luc. Gall. 13 (Rabe), Hyg. fab. 63, D-scholium II. 14. 319 (van Thiel), Myth. Vat. 1. 154, 2. 133, schol. Tz. Lyc. 838 (Scheer). Danae's bronze underground chamber is described in Paus. 2. 23.7; cf. Frazer's note (1898) ad loc. For Danae's prison, cf. also S. Ant. 94ff. and schol. ad loc. (Papageorgius), Jebb (1900a) p. 169f. and Griffith (1999) pp. 283ff., 288f., E. Arctel. fr. 228b.7 Kn. and Harder (1985) ad loc., A.P. 5. 64, 217, D. Chr. Or. 77/78.31, Prob. 2. 31.29, Hor. Carm. 3. 16.1, Paus. 10. 5. 11, Luc. Men. 2, Salt. 44, Ael. N.A. 12. 21, schol. in Luc. Gall. 13 (Rabe), Lib. Or. 34. 29, Lib. Prog. 2. 41, Nonn. D. 47. 543ff., D-scholium II. 14. 319 (van Thiel), Myth. Vat. 1. 154, 2. 133. For slight variations evidently originating in later versions, cf. Lucian (Tim. 13) referring to a bronze or iron chamber; the latter is also mentioned in Prob. 2. 20.9ff. and schol. Tz. Lyc. 838 (Scheer), while Hyginus refers to a prison made of stone (fab. 63). Certain Latin sources refer to Danae's imprisonment in a tower rather than a chamber: cf. Ov. AA 3. 415f., Am. 2. 19.27f., 3. 4.21f., 3. 8.29, Hor. Carm. 3. 16.1, Myth. Vat. 1. 154, 2. 133. The later scholium of Thomas Magister on [A.] Pr. 903 (Smyth) mentions Danae's imprisonment in a bronze tower by
most accounts of the legend. Nevertheless, Pherecydes' narrative provides interesting
details, which are not found in later accounts, such as the figure of Danae's nurse, who also
appears in several early fifth-century vase-paintings (cf. LIMC s.v. 'Akrisios' figg. 2, 6,
perhaps also fig. 1, LIMC s.v. 'Danae' fig. 45). The nurse is a stock character in Euripides
(especially in plays involving female intrigue, as the Hippolytus, Stheneboea and those
sharing the tale-pattern of the Danae, cf. Structure), though her role in his Danae can only
be inferred on grounds of probability (cf. Dramatis Personae). Moreover, the
connotations of the incident at the altar of Zeus Herkeios are significant, as this particular
cult protected blood ties and the integrity of the family, defining the framework within
which the head of the oikos exercised his authority (cf. note on fr. 4.4). Zeus Herkeios
was also a guardian of oaths and his cult was popular in Argos among other Greek
cities, going back to Homer (Od. 22. 335). Acrisius thus binds Danae to reveal the truth by
appealing to their kinship and his own power over his daughter, at the altar of a god
honoured by Argive families. An eloquent parallel is provided in Herodotus 6. 68, where
Demaratus adjures his mother at the altar of the same god to reveal to him who his father
was.

A reference to Perseus' divine origin occurs as early as Homer, in a scene where
Zeus enumerates his love affairs with mortal women referring to Danae's beauty and to

---

Acrisius on the basis of an oracle saying that his grandson would dethrone him, which seems to vaguely occur
also in fr. 1132 Kn. (cf. Appendix, The Sources).

31 For Zeus' transformation, cf. Pi. P. 12. 17 and schol. ad loc. (Drachmann), A. Pers. 79f. and schol. ad loc.
(Dahnhardt), S. Ant. 950, E. Archel. fr. 228.9f. Kn., TrGF II fr. adesp. 619 Kn.-Sn., Isoc. x 59, Lyc. 838 and
Fusillo, Hurst and Paduano (1991) ad loc., A. P. 5. 64, 9. 48, 12. 20, schol. Pi. I. 7. 5 (Drachmann) and cf.
286f. (Sweeney), schol. rec. [A.] Pr. 903 (Smyth). For Danae's union with Zeus, cf. also Hecat. fr. 21 Fowler/


33 For the role of the nurse in pre-tragic myths, cf. for instance, the figure of Orestes' nurse in A. Ch. 731-782,
who is anticipated, though in a different name, in Pherecydes (fr. 134 Fowler) and Pindar (P. 11. 18, cf. schol.
vet. ad loc.).

34 Priam's murder at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, for instance, alludes to the devastation of his household (E.
Tr. 17).


37 I owe this parallel to Mr A. Griffiths.
Perseus, 'most glorious among men' (II. 14. 319-20): 

οὐδ' ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλισφόρου Ἀκρισιών, ἦ τέκε Περσεία πάντων ἀριθμεῖκεν ἄνδραν. A brief account of his birth is given in Hes. fr. 135. 2-5 M.-W.:

...... ....] ᾿Αβας σ' Ὑ πρ' Ἀκρίσιον τέ[κεθ' υἱόν.
...... Περσεία, τῶν εἰς ἄλα λά[ρνακι
...... ....] νέτειλε Δί θροσε[ι
...... ....].η Περσεία φίλων τι|

Danae's name is not mentioned anywhere in the surviving part of the papyrus, but it should have occurred in this genealogy in its undamaged form. Though the context cannot be restored with confidence, if West's attractive conjecture is taken into account (ἤ δ' ἐτεκεν Πε]ροή, τῶν εἰς ἄλα λά [ρνακι κοιλή/ ἐκβληθεῖν ἄ] νέτειλε Δί θροσε [ον ἀνακτα, LSJ

s.v. ἀνατέλλω: 'to give birth'), it looks as if Danae gives birth to Perseus in the floating chest in Hesiod's version, which suggests a variation of the myth. 

Danae's lament in the chest is the subject of a sensitive fragmentary poem by Simonides (PMG fr. 543):

οτε λάρνακι
ἐν δαιμαλέαι
ἀνεμὼς τ' ἦμητ' πνέον
κινθηεῖσά τ' ἐμνα δειματι
ἐρεπεν, οὐκ ἀδιάκοντοι παρειαὶς
ἀμφὶ τε Περσεί βάλλε φίλαιν χέρα
eπεὶν τ' ὅ τεκος οἴον ἔχον πόνον-

sυ δ' ἁμοτεῖς, γαλαξθηνώι
δ' ἤθει κνωκσεις
ἐν ἀντερπεί δῴαρατι χαλκεογόμφωι
<τώι> δ' νυκτιλαμμει,


The decorated chest, in which mother and son are imprisoned, is subject to the wild forces
of nature (cf. the imagery of the transformations of aether in fr. 15 and for its connotations,
cf. introductory note ad loc.); the description of the physical environment serves as a
reflection of Danae’s emotions.40 The bronze bolts of the chest allude to the firm
confine ment of mother and son,41 also recalling the bronze chamber, that is, Danae’s
previous prison, and pointing to the possible roots of the legend in the Bronze Age (cf. also
Dictys, The Myth, p. 124).42 Danae’s tender address to baby Perseus, who is completely cut
off from the situation, makes her isolation even more poignant. Her speech culminates at a
passionate—though respectful and submissive—plea to Zeus to change their fate for the
better (cf. her protest in A. Dictyulci fr. 47a 783f. R.43). An Attic red-figure lekythos of ca.
460 BC (LIMC s.v. 'Danae' fig. 53) depicting Danae and Perseus in the floating chest with
the sea-birds flying above them seems to be reminiscent of Simonides’ poem.44

41 op. cit. p. 314.
42 For the possibly Mycenean origin of the bronze chamber, cf. Janko’s note (1992) on II. 14. 319 and Helbig
(1887) p. 439f.
44 Cf. Woodward (1937) p. 66.
The later account of Ps.-Apollodorus’ *Bibliotheca* (2. 4.1) mainly agrees with Pherecydes and runs as follows:

This account follows the outline of Pherecydes' narrative, while omitting certain details mentioned by the genealogist, such as the figure of the nurse and the incident at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, as they are obviously not essential for the sequence of the story. The sole additional element in the present account is the rationalistic variant of Danae’s seduction by her uncle Proetus; considering that accession to the throne in Heroic Greece was often the outcome of marriage to a king’s daughter, Danae’s rape by her uncle could be explained by an endogamic logic assuring that the power would remain in the hands of a single dynastic group. The D-scholium on *Il. 14. 319* (van Thiel), a part of which presents striking resemblance to the narrative of the *Bibliotheca*, attributes this variant to Pindar, among other authors: aúthi ðé, ðós φησι Πινδάρος καὶ ἑτεροι τινες, ἐφθάρῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατριάδελφου αὐτῆς Προῖτου, ðéven αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ στάσις ἐκκνηθη. However, the papyrus-

---

45 This narrative is followed by Zenobius in *Cent. 1. 41.*
46 Cf. van der Valk (1958) p.118.
48 Cf. Scarpi (1997) p. 495. An eloquent parallel can be found in *[Apollod.] 1. 9. 8 and 11,* where Cretheus marries his brother’s daughter, Tyro, whom he has raised in his own house. Likewise, the daughter of Pheres (who was one of their sons) marries her paternal uncle. Vernant (1980, p. 59f.) aptly noted in this motif the mythical roots of the *epicerate* legislated by Solon to ensure the survival of the *oikos*; for this law, cf. note on *Danae* fr. 4. 2. For Proetus, cf. Ovid *Met.* 5. 236ff., mentioning that he was petrified by Perseus as revenge for seizing Acrisius’ citadel. Hyginus (*Fab.* 244) refers to Perseus’ murder by Megapenthes, son of Proetus, to avenge his father’s death.
49 There are a number of cases where the mythographical D-Scholia and the *Bibliotheca* present strong similarities; cf. Wagner (1926) p. xxxiv f. and van der Valk (1963) pp. 305 ff. It seems likely that the source of the D-Scholium, the ‘Mythographus Homericus’, followed Ps.-Apollodorus, but must have also consulted
text of the Pindaric dithyramb (fr. 70d. 13ff. M. =Pi. Dith. Oxy. 4. 13ff.), which was tentatively supposed to have provided this piece of information, seems likelier to refer to Danae’s forced cohabitation with Polydectes and his petrification (cf. Dictys, The Myth, p. 125). Nonetheless, the scholiast’s testimony that there was such a treatment of the legend by Pindar confirms the poet’s inclination towards the modification and adjustment of well-known myths to his poetic purposes.

For the sake of completeness, it should be mentioned that Acrisius left Argos and fled to Larissa, in the land of Pelasgoi, to avoid being killed by his grandson. Perseus, however, participated in athletic games at Larissa throwing the discus, which accidentally struck his grandfather’s foot and killed him. This story probably provided the background for Sophocles’ Larissaioi. Ashamed of claiming his grandfather’s throne in Argos, Perseus exchanged it for Tiryns, leaving the kingship of Argos to Proetus’ son, Megapenthes, and founded Mycenae (for the foundation of Mycenae, cf. Dictys, The Myth, pp. 124-126).

The exposure (sometimes on the basis of an omen) and miraculous survival of the hero (often a god’s son) as a baby and his eventual restoration to his proper status belong to a common mythical pattern; cf. the well-known tales of Oedipus, Ion, Telephus (E. Auge, Telephus fr. 696 Kn.), Alexandros (E. Alexandros, possibly also S. Alexandros), Jason (Pi. P. 4. 108-116, schol. Lyc. 1180 Scheer), Cyrus (Hdt. 1. 108-117), Hippothoon (E. Alope), Amphion and Zethus (E. Antiope), Neleus and Pelias (S. Tyro A and B), Aeolus and Boeotus (E. Melanippe the Wise and Captive Melanippe), Erichthonius (E. Ion 20-26, 268-274, 1427-1429, Hyg. fab. 166, [Apollod.] 3. 14.6), Romulus and Remus.
Holley associated the seclusion and ordeal in the floating chest with rites of consecration of the young hero and his mother; their miraculous rescue seems to demonstrate the child’s divine election and predestination, as well as his mother’s innocence. For Euripides’ treatments of the clash of the hero’s mother with her paternal oikos owing to the disclosure of her illicit motherhood (Danae, Melanippe the Wise, Alope and Auge), cf. Structure.

The earlier stage of Danae’s adventures inspired several dramatic treatments (for Aeschylus’ tetralogy covering the phase from their rescue by Dictys onwards, cf. Dictys, The Myth, p. 126). Danae’s persecution by her father was treated by Sophocles in his Acrisius and Danae, which have often been regarded as two titles for the same play. Nevertheless, typical cases of plays with double titles are those, in which one title of the play bears the name of the hero and the other the name of the chorus. Moreover, not even one citation provides the titles Acrisius and Danae together. The possibility that the second title occurred due to careless citation is quite unlikely, since, as Pearson admitted, the error would have been unusually persistent (sixteen fragments ascribed to the Acrisius and six to the Danae, of which Danae fr. 165 R. is cited by the ancient scholiast).

The most informative fragments of the Acrisius do not contain any reference to Perseus’ birth; the word ἀφρόματα (fr. 75 R.), which is often used by Sophocles to denote ‘begetting children’ (cf. OT 1485, 1497), may, in my view, either imply Danae’s pregnancy or be part of the oracle given to the king. The terms for wall-construction (fr. 68 R.: ἀκτίς λίθος) and wall-decoration (fr. 69 R.: μαριεύς ἀλομός) have been taken to refer to Danae’s imprisonment in the chamber. I believe that such a possibility is strengthened by the fact that the epithet μαριεύς derives from Marion, a town of Cyprus famous for its

---

60 Cf. Holley (1949) pp. 16-26, 55-58 and Delcourt (1944) pp. 9-14, 22, 36-46 arguing for primitive ordeals, such as legitimacy-tests, as the substratum of the exposed hero-tales. Cf. also Huys (1995) pp. 19-22, 38f.
61 For an exposition of these views, cf. Lloyd-Jones (1996) p. 29.
64 This was a type of limestone originating either in the Acte of Peloponnese or in the Attic Acte. Cf. also Syll. 537. 17.
copper that was widely exported to Greece. Furthermore, the similarity of ἀλομῶς to πετάλωσις in terms of technique (i.e. wall-covering with gold-leaf) according to lexicographers, points to a method of metallic wall-plating, which associated with the epithet μαραίνεις may well imply, I suggest, that the walls were covered with plates of bronze. This piece of information seems to be congruent with the image of Danae’s bronze chamber, as attested by the relevant sources. Accordingly, the specific references to the manner in which the chamber was presumably constructed could imply that Danae’s seclusion in the chamber was part of the play, thus favouring Sutton’s suggestion that the Acrisius may have treated the earlier phase of the myth. Sophocles’ interest in the earlier part of Danae’s legend emerges from Ant. 944-954 (ἔλαμα καὶ Δανάας οὐράνιον φῶς/ ἀλλάξας δέμας ἐν χαλκοδέτῳ σύλλαξι/ κρυπτομένα δ’ ἐν τυμβήρει θαλάμῳ κατεξορήθη/ καίτων <και> γενεὰ τίμιος, ὥ σαϊ, σαϊ/ καὶ Ζηνὸς ταμιεύεσκε γονᾶς χρυσορότους./ ἀλλ’ ἀ μουρίδια τις δύνασις δείνη/ οὕτ’ ἐν νιν ὀλβὸς οὗτ’ Ἄρης./ οὐ πύργος, οὐχ ἀλκτυποί/ κελαιναί νάες ἐκφόγουν). Acrisius’ fear for the fulfillment of the oracle is prominent in several fragments (fr. 61 R.: βοξ τις, ὥ ἀκούετ; ἢ μάτην ὑλὼ/ ἀπαντα γάρ τοι τῷ/ φοβομένῳ ψοφεί, 66 R.: τοῦ ζην γάρ οὔδεις ὡς ὃ γηρᾶσκον ἐρᾷ. 67 R.: τὸ ζην γάρ, ὥ σαϊ, παντὸς ἠδὸν γέρας/ θανείν γάρ οὔκ ἔξεστι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δις) and may have been decisive for his actions, at least so far as our scanty evidence goes. Fr. 64 R. points to a scene of confrontation between Danae and her father, while fr. 65 R. may have been addressed to Danae’s mother as consolation.

In the Danae, on the other hand, Perseus is presented as born, to judge from fr. 165 R. (οὐκ οἴδα τὴν σήν πείραν ἐν δ’ ἐπίστασαι/) τοῦ παιδὸς δόντος τοῦδ’ ἐγὼ δύλλωμαι), which was evidently spoken by Acrisius rejecting Danae’s possible allegation that she was the victim of forcible usage, due to his fear for his own life; what must have reasonably followed is the seclusion of mother and son in the chest and their casting adrift. Sophocles

---

66 Cf. IG II1 1675. 18 and note ad loc. Cf. also Senff (1999) col. 900f.
67 E.M. s.v. ‘ἄλομος’ (69, 42-44 Gaisford): ἄλομος ταῖς χρίσεις καὶ ταῖς ἐπαλέψεις ἀλομῶς ἐλεγον. Σοφοκλῆς ‘Μαρείς ἄλομος’ ἦν ἐπάνω <τῆς> τοῦ θαλάμου γανόσεως ἐνείσα ἐπαλέψεις, καθαυτηρεῖν πετάλωσις οὖσα ἐν αὐτῷ. Cf. Pearson (1917) ad loc., pointing out that such ornamentation was associated with the art of the Heroic Age.
68 Cf. the bronze walls in Alcinous’ palace in Od. 7. 86.
70 Cf. De Dios (1983) p. 50 and n. 84.
71 Cf. Pearson (1917) ad loc.
72 op. cit., ad loc.
could have thus treated Danae's ordeal in two plays, of which the *Acrisius* may have covered the earlier phase of the legend including her imprisonment in the chamber, while the *Danae* apparently dealt with the theme of the exposure. As already noted, Acrisius' fear and attempts to evade the fulfillment of the oracle seem to have been prominent in Sophocles' treatments of the myth; tragic conflict arising from the vain struggle against processes inaccessible to human reason is a typically Sophoclean notion (for the oracle in Euripides, cf. note on fr. 16). At the same time, however, Acrisius' preoccupation to escape from his fate leads him to a series of acts of cruelty against his own daughter. As in most extant plays of Sophocles, where the question of human responsibility is raised along with the role of fate and divine will, the final fulfillment of the oracle given to Acrisius albeit inevitable may have well come about as the deserved punishment for his actions; his fate does not seem to be independent of his character.

The theme of the exposure of Danae and Perseus became popular in Greek art from the beginning of the fifth century until its third quarter, which could imply that early mythography and the literary treatments of the legend, especially tragedy and perhaps also Simonides, provided the material and incentive for these artistic creations, bringing this phase of the myth into prominence (cf. *LIMC* s.v. 'Akrisios' figs. 1-8). A vase-painting of about 440-430 BC (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Akrisios’ fig. 7) depicting Acrisius and two female figures, probably his wife and Danae's nurse, as witnessing the seclusion of Danae and Perseus in

---

75 In this light, Lucas (1993) pp. 42ff. proposed a connected tetralogy presenting Acrisius' successive attempts to escape his fate and consisting of the *Acrisius, Danae, Larissaioi* and perhaps *Andromeda* as the satyr-play; yet, there is no evidence supporting the possibility of the connected tetralogy nor the satyric character of the *Andromeda*. Though didascalic evidence (*TrGF* I, DID B 5. 8) attests that Sophocles produced a 'Telephsea', which was a connected trilogy, he is also known to have stirred the development of the independent single play, according to the Suda (ο 815 Adler).
76 For ‘Akrisios’ figg. 1-3 and the possibility of their inspiration by a lost early fifth-century *Danae* play, cf. Dictys, *The Myth*, p. 126f., n. 266. Jucker (1970, pp. 47 ff.) associated an Attic white lekythos of ca. 460-50 BC (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Akrisios’ fig. 10) depicting Acrisius sitting on a tomb bearing the inscription ΠΕΡΣΕΟΣ and possibly also the name ΑΝΑΕΙ with Sophocles' *Acrisius*. The unusual theme and peculiarity of this vase-illustration may imply that it was inspired by tragedy rather than by the myth in general. However, if this illustration is taken to reflect Danae's imprisonment in the chamber, the inscription bearing Perseus' name does not fit this phase of the myth. Maffre (*LIMC* I p. 452) assigning the painting to the same play, suggested that Acrisius may have raised a monument after having Perseus and Danae exposed in the chest, believing that they are dead. I would add that if this scene is to be related to a play of Sophocles, that might be the Danae, which treated the theme of exposure; after casting mother and son adrift, Acrisius would have been confident that they would both die. The image of the king sitting on the cenotaph of his daughter and grandson seems to reflect his obsession to evade the oracle (cf. *Danae* fr. 165 R.).
the chest might have been inspired by a dramatic treatment, in view of the theatrical, ‘speaking’ gestures and the dignity of the figures depicted; the unknown date, however, of the Danae plays by Sophocles and Euripides, both of which probably dealt with this theme, makes it impossible to specify which treatment might have been in the painter’s mind.

Danae’s confrontation with her father recurs in a Latin Danae tragedy by Naevius (frs. 2-12 Traglia). The available evidence for the play does not hint at Acrisius’ fear for the fulfillment of the oracle, which is a persistent notion in Sophocles. By contrast, in the surviving fragments of Naevius’ play, Acrisius’ indignation appears to arise from the social dimension of his daughter’s seduction (fr. 5 T.: Eam nunc esse inventam probis componem scis and fr. 7 T.: Desubito famam tollunt, si quam solam videre in via). This idea occurs in Euripides’ Danae fr. 6 (for further parallels on the social issue of a maiden’s seclusion, seduction and clash with her natal family in Euripides, cf. note on fr. 6.2 and Structure). The king is determined to impose a hard penalty on his daughter for her disgrace (fr. 8 T.: Quin, ut quisque est meritus, praeans pretium pro factis ferat),77 which recalls E. Melanippe the Wise fr. 485 Kn. (ei de pαρθενος φθαιεια εξηθηκε τα παιδια και φοβουμενη των πατηρα, συ φωνον δρασεις;) and fr. 497 Kn. (τεισασθε τηνδε και γαρ ένεπεθεν νοσει τα των γυναικων οι μεν ή παιδιον περι/ ή συγγνευειας εινεκ’ ουκ απολεσαιν/ κακην λαβοντες ειτα τωτο ταδικον/ πολλαις υπερρηνης και χωρει προσω/ δαστ’ εξηθηλος άρετη καθισταται, cf. Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.). Fr. 9 T. must be part of Danae’s outburst facing her unfair condemnation to exile (indigne exigor patria innocens).78 An obscure fragment is ascribed to an earlier Danae by Livius Andronicus, coming from a quarrel between two characters, whose identity cannot be established (fr. 14 T.: <Haec> etiam minitas <mi>? Mitte ea quae mea sunt magis quam tua).79

The theme of Danae’s seduction by Zeus provided rich material for comedy. The fifth-century poet Sannyrion wrote a Danae, a fragment of which presents someone as trying to change form, in order to sneak into somewhere (fr. 8 K.-A.); a reasonable

78 Morelli (1974, p. 87, n. 13), following Marmorale (1953, p. 146) and Paratore (1957, p. 68), assumed that the foundation of Ardea by Danae, according to the widespread Latin version of the legend (cf. below, p. 20f.), might have been foretold at the epilogue of Naevius’ play, especially since he was presumably the first to write Roman-focused tragedies (praetextae, cf. his Clastidium and Romulus and Fraenkel 1935, col. 627); however tempting this suggestion may be, no evidence for the play points in this direction.
79 Ribbeck (1875, p. 32) followed by Carratello (1979, p. 63) suggested that the two persons may be Acrisius and Proetus, while Traglia (1986, p. 166) assumed that it could be a quarrel between Dictys and Silenus inspired by the Dictyulci of Aeschylus. The evidence, however, is scanty and inconclusive.
assumption is that this character could be Zeus, trying to transform himself, in order to reach and seduce Danae.80 Fr. 10 K.-A. of the same play praises the maiden’s beauty. Another Danae, of which only the title is known, was written by Apollonius.

The surviving fragment from Eubulus’ play of the same title (fr. 22 K.-A.) presents Danae as complaining of being a victim of cruelty:

\[\text{This passage may have been part of a paratragic lament in lyric iambics.}^81\text{ It has been widely supposed that the incident to which Danae is referring is her rape by Zeus.}^82\text{ I think that such an interpretation is plausible, considering that it is Zeus whom she blames for her misfortune in fr. 47a.}^783-4\text{ R. of the Dictyulci (cf. Dictys, The Myth, p. 126) and who is also the addressee of her plea in Simonides’ poem. Besides, rape was an attractive subject for later Greek comedy}^83\text{ and the idea of Zeus as rapist would have given scope for mythological burlesque. Furthermore, the scene presented in this fragment seems to resemble the description of Pamphile’s reaction to her rape in Menander’s Epitrepostes (v. 487 f.: εἶτ’ ἐξαπίνης κλάουσα προστρέξει μόνη/ τίλλουσ’ ἐαυτῆς τὰς τρίχας) and Habrotonon’s account of her supposed rape in the same play (v. 526 f.: ὡς ἀναδυθής ἤσθα καὶ/ ἰταμός τις, 528 f.: κατέβαλες δὲ μ’ ὡς σφόδρα/ ἵματια δ’ οἶ ἀπώλεσ’ ἢ τάλαιν’ ἐγώ). Danae’s lament is thus consistent with the expected reaction of a seduced maiden, as treated by comic poets.}

Danae’s seduction became an attractive topic also for New Comedy; in Diphilus’ Chrysochoos (fr. 85 K.-A.) someone is peeping at a pretty girl from the smoke-hole. Relating this title (‘one who pours in as gold’, presumably connoting Zeus’ transformation)
to a fragment from the *Pentathlos* of Xenarchus (fr. 4.11 K.-A.), which presents lovers as sneaking into women’s chambers from the smoke-hole, it seems quite tempting to suppose that the surviving fragment of Diphilus could belong to a burlesque of Danae’s seduction by Zeus. 84 Comic illustrations of Zeus as secret lover, as the one depicted on a phlyax-vase in the Vatican, also point in this direction. 85

The theme of Danae’s seduction by Zeus transformed into a shower of gold was a source of artistic inspiration, as emerges from fifth and fourth-century Greek vase-illustrations, as well as Roman paintings dating from the first to the fourth century AD (cf. *LIMC* s.v. ‘Danae’ figg. 1-36). In literature from the end of the fourth century onwards (the earliest occurrence seems to be Menander’s *Samia*, cf. T 6 and note *ad loc.*), this subject became proverbial for the power of money over virtue (for references, cf. note on *fr.* 7). 86

On the basis of the surviving evidence for the myth, I suggest below that this idea seems to originate in *Danae* fr. 7 (cf. note *ad loc.*), which was notorious and widely cited by later authors and could have thus inspired the interpretation of Danae’s seduction as bribery after Euripides.

A Latin version of Danae’s fate is attested in Verg. *Aen.* 7. 371f., 409ff., followed by later authors and scholiasts. 87 According to this story, the chest in which Danae and Perseus were imprisoned reached the coast of Latium, where Danae married the local king Pilumnus and helped found Ardea; Turnus, the leader of the Rutuli who resided in Ardea, is in the *Aeneid* Danae’s descendant. Owing to the silence of sources, it cannot be proved whether this adaptation of Danae’s legend in Latin foundation-myths is a Virgilian fabrication or goes back to lost sources prior to the poet; 88 Turnus’ descent from Danae, at
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85 Cf. Bieber (1920) fig. 76.
87 Cf. Plin. *H.N.* 3. 5. 56 and S. Ital. 1. 659f. Cf. also Solin. 2.5 probably relying on Pliny, and Servius’ schol. Verg. *Aen.* 7. 372 (Thilo-Hagen) and Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 2. 220f. (Sweeney); these scholia seem to have been the main sources of the later accounts of the Vatican Mythographers (*Myth. Vat.* 1. 154, 2. 133).
88 Geflick (1892, p. 41) followed by Montenegro Duque (1949, p. 85) assumed that this version might go back to Timaeus.
least, is not mentioned in earlier and almost contemporary sources (Cato fr. 9, 11 Peter, Livy 1. 2.1-5, D.H. 1. 64.2). Apart from the traditionalising trends of the Augustan era, which favoured the borrowing of venerable legends from Greek Antiquity, Virgil must have shaped this myth so as to serve his literary goals. Firstly, by attributing the foundation of Ardea to a noble mythical figure, such as Danae, and by connecting this town to Heroic-Age Argos, the poet probably aimed to lend dignity to the roots of Latin people and grandeur to Ardea, once a powerful town in Latium, but desolated by the time of Virgil. Moreover, the Argive ancestry of Turnus in contrast with Aeneas' Trojan identity prepares the ground for a new conflict between old enemies. Considering that there is no archaeological evidence to support the legend of the Argive foundation of Ardea, the connection of the two cities might have been the outcome of popular fallacious traditions, which could have existed before Virgil. It seems likely that the Illyrian race of Dauni mentioned by Lycophron as inhabitants of Latium (1253 ff.) could have been falsely associated with Argos on the basis of popular etymology (Dauni <Danai), which led to the belief that they were descendants of Argives. This idea may have thus found its mythical explanation in the adaptation of Danae's famous legend in Latin foundation-myths.

### 2. The Date of the Play

There is no external evidence as to the date of the Danae. As regards internal criteria, the sole means of attaining a very approximate result is metre: from a total of 72 complete trimeters, which is a reasonable sample for metrical analysis, only two resolutions of the third longum (fr. 8.4, 12.4), which is a resolution-type common in Euripides’ early production, occur out of 360 resolvable syllables, providing a very low resolution-rate of

---

89 Cf. Tilly (1947) p. 44.
92 Cf. Della Corte (1972) p. 232. In this light, the figure of Daunus (<Danaus), father of Turnus and king of Ardea in the Aeneid, would have presumably served to strengthen the bonds between Ardea and Argos. Cf. Paratore (1962) p. 93ff.
0.56%. Cropp and Fick suggested an early date of production (from 455 to 425 BC), estimating a slightly higher rate of 0.83%, as they included in the sample also fr. 3.2 on the basis of Nauck’s conjecture, which seems unnecessary (the manuscript reading can be retained, cf. note ad loc.).

3. Dramatis Personae and Setting

As I argue below, the index personarum of T5 (cf. note ad loc.) should be approached very cautiously. We can only be confident for those characters of the index, whose role can be established by the fragments of the play and the relevant sources:

(1) Danae: for her role, cf. T4, T6. Fr. 13 can be assigned to her with certainty and she seems to be the likeliest speaker of frr. 11-12. If Euripides chose to follow the mythical tradition, according to which Danae was kept in a bronze chamber by her father, where she gave birth to Perseus, she may have then remained secluded in the chamber, at least at the beginning of the play. In this case, she would have been confined indoors (that is, behind the skene-door, which is the interface between public and private, the latter often representing the secluded space of women) and is thus unlikely to have appeared on stage to deliver the prologue-speech. The earliest appearance of Danae, as suggested by the fragments, could be her possible participation in the formal debate with Acrisius (frr. 8-12), after the latter’s discovery of her seduction (cf. introductory notes on frr. 7, 8), though Euripides might have found a dramatic ‘excuse’ to present her on stage earlier than that. Hence, if Danae did not appear from the beginning of the play, the possible stratagem to protect baby Perseus from his grandfather (cf. Structure) may have been implemented with the help of another female character (cf. note on fr. 1), perhaps her nurse (and also her mother?), whose roles can only be inferred (cf. below). Danae, after whom the play is named, must have been at the centre of dramatic interest, especially at the climactic point of her possible self-sacrifice for her son (cf. note on fr. 13: her plea to Acrisius to be enclosed in the chest together with Perseus poignantly presents her emotional force and attachment.

94 Cropp and Fick (1985) pp. 70 and 78. Webster (1967, p. 4) placed the Danae in the ‘Severe Style’ category, suggesting a date from 455 to 428 BC.
to her baby-son, and for the vocabulary of self-sacrifice, cf. note on fr. 14). Her possible participation in the *agon* perhaps with Acrisius, where she is likely to have defended herself against the accusation that she was bribed to be seduced (frr. 8-12, cf. note on fr. 8) by refuting the opponent’s position on the superiority of wealth and power of money over love would illustrate her *dianoia* (cf. similarly Melanippe’s articulate defence in *Melanippe the Wise* frr. 483-485 Kn. and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 *ad loc.*).

(2) Acrisius: for this character, cf. T4. He is the strongest candidate for frr. 2-4, 6-10.96 His figure appears to have been modeled upon the cruel father-type from Euripides’ plays about royal daughters giving birth to illegitimate (often divine) offspring; cf. Cercyon in the *Alope*, Aeolus and Hellen in the *Melanippe the Wise*, Aleos in the *Auge*, Aeolus in the play of the same title (for more detail, cf. Structure).

(3) Female chorus, as attested in T1, perhaps consisting of Argive maidens; the comment of fr. 14 and possibly also fr. 5 are likely to have been uttered by the chorus-leader.

(4) Danae’s nurse is mentioned in the doubtful index of T5. She had a part in early versions of Danae’s legend, as attested by Pherecydes and pictorial evidence (cf. The Myth, pp. 8-10). The nurse is the usual ‘accomplice’ in Euripides’ plays involving female intrigue, as the *Hippolytus, Sthenboea* (fr. 661. 10-14 Kn.) and tragedies sharing the pattern of the *Danae* and focusing on women giving birth to illegitimate children, as the *Melanippe the Wise, Cretans, Aeolus, Alope* and *Auge*.97 Fr. 1 hints at a female stratagem possibly planned by Danae helped by another woman, who may well be her nurse.

(5) Acrisius’ wife and Danae’s mother, whose name is attested as Eurydice in the mythical tradition (cf. Hesiod fr. 129 M.-W., Pherecydes fr. 10 Fowler and [Apollo]. 2. 2.1 and she is also illustrated in a vase-painting of ca. 440-430 BC, cf. *LIMC* s.v. ‘Akrisios’ fig. 7). She appears to have had a role in Sophocles’ *Acrisius* (cf. fr. 65 R.).98 She could be the king’s female interlocutor in fr. 2 99 (whom he addresses as γυναῖ in fr. 2.1: if the speaker is Acrisius, it seems reasonable to assume that he is expressing his personal delight

to someone intimate, as his wife, rather than another female character, e.g. the nurse—
Danae would have not been addressed as ἕνωτα, cf. note ad loc.) and perhaps also in frr. 3
and 4 and a possible speaker of fr. 5, all of which could belong to the same context.

(6) a messenger is needed to narrate the off-stage exposure of the chest containing
Danae and Perseus. Fr. 15 describing the fragility of human fortune may have been the
concluding evaluation of his account (cf. note ad loc.)

(7) the rescue of mother and child is likely to have been foretold by a deus ex
machina. The index in T5 mentions Athena; even if we doubt the authority of the index,
Athena or Hermes would be feasible candidates for this role, in view of their involvement
in Perseus’ adventures (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 11 Fowler and [Apollod.] 2. 4.2). If Lucian’s D.
Mar. 12 (and thus also T5) goes back to Euripides, then a Nereid, perhaps Thetis
(who is narrating Danae’s story in Lucian), might have appeared to announce their rescue.

(8) Hermes as prologue-speaker is uncertain, as is pointed out in the note on T5.
Apart from the doubtful authority of the index, there is no obvious benefit from introducing
here a divine rather than mortal speaker, as he would not have possessed information which
could not be reported by other dramatic characters (for the function of gods as prologue-
speakers, cf. Appendix, Dramatic Technique). Though Hermes cannot be ruled out, the
προπεπραγμένα could have well been narrated by Danae’s nurse, who would have been
aware of the situation and assisted her or by Danae herself (cf. Structure), unless she was
excluded in the chamber at the beginning of the play.

The setting was evidently Acrisius’ palace in Argos, as suggested by the mythical
sources (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler, [Apollod.] 2. 4.1) and alluded to in fr. 2. 7 (ἐν δόμοις).

4. The Structure of the Play

Apart from the lexicographical citation of fr. 16, the quotations from the Danae are of a
gnomic nature, thus making the location of the fragments within the play conjectural up to

100 Cf. Webster (1967) p. 95.
101 Cf. Jouan and van Looy (2000) p. 59. For the necessity of a messenger-speech reporting events, which are
an extent. In addition, the absence of a reliable hypothesis (cf. note on T5) leaves aspects and possible complications of the plot unclear. On the basis of the fragments and the relevant mythographic accounts (Pherescyd. fr. 10 Fowler, [Apollod.] 2. 4.1 and T4, reproducing the vulgata), we are in a position to distinguish the following scenes:

(1) a narrative prologue could have been delivered by the nurse\textsuperscript{104} (cf. Medea and probably Aeolus\textsuperscript{105}) or Danae (as by Melanipe in the structurally and thematically similar Melanippe the Wise fr. 481 Kn., provided that Danae was not secluded in the chamber early in the play) setting out the προπεπραγμένα: presumably the oracle received by Acrisius leading to Danae’s seclusion (fr. 16 might belong here), her seduction by Zeus transformed into golden shower and Perseus’ secret birth. Fr. 1 points to a female intrigue possibly aiming to protect Perseus from his grandfather (for plots with the same purpose, cf. p. 28). Unless coming from a deliberation-scene between Danae and a female confidant, presumably her nurse (cf. Andr. 56-90, Auge fr. 271a-b Kn.), this fragment may be located at the end of the prologue-speech following the reference to the stratagem for Perseus’ safety (cf. note ad loc.). Hermes mentioned as prologue-speaker in T5 cannot be ruled out absolutely, though the reliability of the index is questionable (cf. note ad loc.) and the appearance of a divine speaker has no obvious purpose here (cf. Dramatis Personae and Appendix, Dramatic Technique).

(2) a scene where a character, possibly Acrisius, is expressing his enthusiasm at the sight of a new-born child (fr. 2. 7) and is presented as an old man praising fatherhood, which he regards as his own situation (fr. 3), pointing out the superiority of male to female offspring (fr. 4). The addressee could be his wife (cf. fr. 2. 1: γόναι and note ad loc.). The specific reference to the new-born (fr. 2. 7) may well point to infant Perseus and Acrisius’ joy can be explained only if we assume that he is ignorant of the baby’s identity, that is, if it was introduced to him as coming from a mother other than Danae. Taking into account also fr. 2. 6 corresponding to the mythographically attested yearning of Acrisius for a son (cf. esp. Pherescyd. fr. 10 Fowler, [Apollod.] 2. 4.1) and fr. 3 suggesting that he has become father (presumably of a male child, as implied in fr. 4) at an old age, it is conceivable that part of the intrigue of fr. 1 might have been to introduce the baby to Acrisius under false


pretences and, as the fragments seem to suggest —though it is ultimately unprovable— as the solution to his lack of male descendant, perhaps with his wife’s consent (for more detail, cf. introductory note on fr. 2). Van Looy made this suggestion, drawing a parallel to the analogous situation in Menander’s Samia, which, in this case, might have originated in Euripides’ Danae (cf. note on T6).106 Fr. 5 is expressive of the social inferiority of women and may have thus belonged to the same context (spoken perhaps by Acrisius’ wife or the female chorus-leader).

(3) Acrisius’ discovery of Danae’s seduction (fr. 6). On finding gold in her chamber, he appears to have assumed that his daughter was seduced by a rich man (cf. note on fr. 7).107 Frr. 8 –10a asserting the power of wealth and frr. 11 and 12 refuting this idea could be assigned to Acrisius and Danae respectively in the context of an agon,108 possibly a trial-debate with Acrisius as plaintiff and Danae as defendant (cf. notes ad loc.). The debate may have ended with Acrisius’ condemnation of Danae’s illicit motherhood (cf. also p. 30) and his possible decision to eliminate Perseus, which could have raised Danae’s plea in fr. 13 (cf. next scene).

(4) Danae pleads with and persuades Acrisius (as emerges from the final exposure of Danae and Perseus, cf. T4) not to be separated from her child (fr. 13), thus choosing to be exposed in the sea together with Perseus, presumably over death for her son and a lesser penalty for herself,109 the vocabulary of self-sacrifice in praise of her act possibly by the chorus-leader in fr. 14 also points in this direction (cf. note ad loc.).

(5) a messenger-speech reporting presumably to Acrisius (cf. Hipp. 1153ff.) the off-stage exposure of the chest in the sea (cf. Dramatis Personae).110 The general reflection in fr. 15 may have been located at the end of the messenger-speech (cf. note ad loc.).

(6) a deus ex machina (Athena and Thetis are feasible candidates, or even Hermes, if he had not delivered the prologue-speech, cf. Dramatis Personae)111 is likely to have addressed Acrisius, confirming that Perseus is son of Zeus (cf. Athena’s similar

106 Cf. Jouan and van Looy (2000) p. 59f. and much earlier, Hartung’s reconstruction (1843-1844, 1 p. 88), which is, however, highly conjectural.
108 These fragments were located in the context of an agon by Duchemin (1968) p. 91 and Jouan and van Looy (2000) p. 58.
confirmation in *Ion* 1560-1568) and foretelling the rescue of mother and child and perhaps also Perseus’ heroic deeds and Acrisius’ accidental death at the hands of his grandson.

The motif of the seduction and impregnation of a royal daughter usually by a god recurs in several Euripidean plays. The dramatist handles this subject in two main directions: he either focuses on the clash of the princess with her natal *oikos* and the persecution of mother and offspring by her father upon the discovery of her illicit motherhood (*Danae, Melanippe the Wise, Alope, Auge* and partly the *Aeolus*) or on the crucial recognition between mother and her grown-up offspring, from whom she has long been separated (*Ion, Captive Melanippe, Antiope, Hypsipyle*).

On the basis of metrical evidence (cf. Date), the *Danae* seems to have been one of the earliest Euripidean treatments of the first group of plays. Euripides' preoccupation with the tale-pattern of rape and infant exposure, which occurs in these plays (in the *Danae* the young hero is exposed together with his mother), seems to have been motivated by contemporary life up to an extent; female chastity before marriage would ensure the production of legitimate offspring, which would preserve not only the dignity of the *oikos*, but also that of the *polis*, since any male child of a married Athenian woman would receive the rights of Athenian citizenship (cf. note on fr. 6). Social norms thus imposed the seclusion of women, as well as infant exposure. The Euripidean tale-pattern of rape and infant exposure widely recurs in New Comedy transferred from the divine/heroic to the human sphere (cf. Satyr. *Vit. Eur.*, *P. Oxy.* IX 1176, fr. 39, col. vii).

In all these plays, the pattern of intrigue is employed as a means of protecting the child from its grandfather. Stratagems are often set up in tragedy by characters finding themselves at a state of weakness against another figure’s power and thus having to resort to their own wits (cf. indicatively, the ambush against Lycus in *HF* 707ff., against Clytaemestra in *S. El.* 47ff., 673ff. and *E. El.* 651-660, 998ff., Iphigenia’s plot in *IT* 112 The main deviation of the *Aeolus* from this group lies in the poet’s apparent focus on the father-son (rather than father-daughter) conflict.


116 Cf. the *Epitrepontes* and *Heros* containing both rape and exposure. Girls are seduced and often give birth to illegitimate children in the *Samia, Georgos, Kitharistes*, possibly in the *Perinthia*, as well. Infant exposure also occurs in the *Periceiromene*. 
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The Danae seems to have also contained the pattern of self-sacrifice (cf. the relevant vocabulary in fr. 14), since the princess possibly chose to be exposed together with her baby-son, in order to avoid his elimination by Acrisius (cf. introductory note on fr. 13).

The outline of the plays of the first category follows a story-pattern consisting of the mother's intrigue to protect the baby, her father's discovery of her illicit motherhood and the punishment of mother and child. In more specific terms:

(1) Intrigue to hide/protect the baby from its grandfather:

- **Danae**
  Fr. 1 hints at a possible stratagem organized presumably by Danae; a possible 'accomplice' in such a plot could be her nurse (for an exploration of what this intrigue might have involved, cf. above, scene 2 and note on fr. 2).

- **Melanippe the Wise**
  She hid her twins at the cowshed helped by her nurse (cf. hyp. *Melanippe the Wise*, as attested by I. Logothetes, Comm. on Hermog. Περί μεθόδου δεινότητος 28 Rabe).

- **Alope**
  She gave her baby-son to her nurse to expose, evidently hoping that he would be rescued by a childless person (Hyg. *fab*. 187, also fr. 108 Kn. hinting at the plot between the two women).

- **Auge**
  She hid infant Telephus at the temple of Athena Alea ([Apollod.] 2. 7.4, 3. 9.1, in conjunction with fr. 264a Kn.) probably helped by her nurse (cf. frr. 271b, 271a Kn.).

- **Aeolus**
  Canace pretended that she was ill, in order to hide her new-born baby (hyp. *Aeolus P. Oxy*. 2457, l. 25f.). Macareus then managed to persuade Aeolus to marry his sons with his daughters, without revealing his personal involvement with Canace (hyp. *Aeolus P. Oxy*. 2457, l. 27f. and also frr. 20, 22, 23 Kn.).

---

(2) Discovery: the maiden’s father finds out about his daughter’s illicit motherhood:

- **Danae**
  Acrisius’ discovery of gold in Danae’s chamber (as suggested by fr. 7), from which he is likely to have inferred that she was seduced by a rich man (cf. frr. 7-10), could have partly led to the revelation of truth;\(^{120}\) no evidence as to how he found out about Perseus. Danae could have defended herself in a debate against her father’s accusation of having been bribed with gold to be seduced; frr. 11-12 rejecting the power of money formed presumably part of her reply to Acrisius’ allegation that Eros is attracted by wealth (frr. 7-10).

- **Melanippe the Wise**
  Melanippe’s twins were discovered by a herdsman at the cowshed and condemned to be burnt as monstrous progeny of the cow (hyp. *Melanippe the Wise*). Melanippe vainly interceded for the lives of the twins to her father by arguing against this idea (frr. 484, 485 Kn.).\(^{121}\) No evidence as to how the truth came out (from the nurse or Melanippe herself? \(^{122}\)).

- **Alope**
  Alope’s baby-son was found by two herdsmen, who argued over the baby’s trinkets in front of Alope’s father as judge (Hyg. *fab.* 187). The latter recognized his daughter’s garment, into which the baby was wrapped and by interrogating the nurse, he found out the truth (Hyg. *fab.* 187).

- **Auge**
  Auge’s baby seems to have been discovered by Aleos after his inspection of Athena’s temple in search of the cause of the plague (cf. [Apollod.] 2. 7.4, 3. 9.1 and fr. 266 Kn. pointing to the plague sent by Athena).


\(^{122}\) loc. cit.
• **Aeolus**

Macareus failed to draw the lot, on which Canace’s name was written (hyp. *Aeolus*). No evidence as to how Aeolus discovered the baby (in Ov. *Her.* 11. 70-76, he heard the baby’s cries).

(3) On the basis of our evidence, the father-daughter conflict seems to have touched on the social issue of the maiden’s illicit pregnancy (for more detail, cf. note on fr. 6):

• **Danae**

Fr. 16 implies that the oracle foretelling Acrisius’ death at the hands of his grandson may have affected his decision to eliminate the child. Yet, fr. 6 and frr. 7-10 (alleging the power of gold over love and possibly spoken by Acrisius) refer to the social issue of Danae’s seduction.

• **Melanippe the Wise**

The gravity of Melanippe’s misconduct at the eyes of her father is expressed in fr. 485 and possibly also in fr. 497 Kn.

• **Alope**

Alope’s seduction is strongly reproached by her father in frr. 109, 110, 111 Kn. possibly in the context of an *agon* (perhaps a trial-debate, cf. the formal proem of Cercyon’s *thesis* in fr. 110 Kn.).

• **Auge**

No evidence survives for Auge’s conflict with her father; the apologetic lines of fr. 272b Kn. evidently spoken by Heracles refer to the seriousness of his offence.

• **Aeolus**

Though the main confrontation appears to have occurred between father and son, Aeolus seems to be the likeliest speaker of fr. 36 Kn. strongly censuring female misconduct.

The father decides to punish his daughter severely and often has her illegitimate offspring exposed:

- **Danae**
  
  Danae and Perseus are both imprisoned in the chest, which is cast adrift (cf. above, scene 4 and notes on frr. 13-14).

- **Melanippe the Wise**
  
  There is no sound evidence for Melanippe's sentence nor for the fate of the twins (if fr. 497 Kn. belonged to the *Melanippe the Wise*, it could point to her father's or grandfather's intention to have her severely punished;\(^{125}\) Hyg. *fab.* 186 cannot be completely trusted). The background of the *Captive Melanippe* at least presupposes her separation from her sons, though it may tell us nothing of Euripides' untying of the plot in the *Melanippe the Wise*. It is unknown whether the purpose of the appearance of Melanippe's mother, Hippo *ex machina* (Pollux 4. 141 Bethe) was to avert their punishment or merely to foretell future events.

- **Alope**
  
  Hyg. *fab.* 187 reports that Alope was imprisoned and left to die (for a possible allusion to her prison cf. fr. 112a Kn.\(^{126}\)) and that Hippothoon was exposed again.

- **Auge**
  
  Webster tried to reconcile the versions of Moses of Chorene (*Prog.* 3.3) and Strabo (13. 1.69) for the reconstruction of the *Auge*: baby Telephus may have been exposed by Aleos for the first time and found by Heracles. It is unclear whether the hero managed to rescue mother and child from punishment; if Strabo's testimony is reliable, then Heracles might have interceded with Aleos to commute their punishment from death to imprisonment in the chest and exposure in the sea, thus leaving a hope of safety for them.\(^ {127}\)

---


• **Aeolus**

Canace seems to have been driven to suicide by her father, to judge by a Lucanian vase-painting inspired by the *Aeolus* (Trendall and Webster 1971, III 3.4, cf. Ov. *Her.* 11.122). No evidence survives as to the fortune of the baby in the play.\(^{128}\)

The parallel survey of the treatment of these myths by Euripides, so far as our evidence goes, reveals a recurring theme and a roughly common sequence of events. Nevertheless, since we are dealing with lost plays, their plot-structure cannot be safely recovered, therefore, one cannot confidently argue for a common structural plan, especially in terms of placement of events such as discovery as part of the desis or lusis of the plot.

On a larger scale, this group of tragedies is thematically affiliated to other ‘plays about unhappy women’, as described by Webster,\(^ {129}\) such as the *Cretans*, *Scyrioi* and *Alcmene* (misconduct and pregnancy kept as a secret—discovery by the father in the *Scyrioi*/by the husband in the *Cretans* and *Alcmene*—punishment in the *Cretans*/ averted punishment in the *Alcmene*/ no evidence for Lycomedes’ reaction in the *Scyrioi*).\(^ {130}\)

### 5. Reception of the Danae

Euripides’ *Danae* appears to have been a popular play. The notorious fr. 7 in praise of gold, the speaker of which was possibly accusing Danae of having been bribed to be seduced, was widely cited by later authors and seems to have instigated the interpretation of Danae’s seduction as bribery from the end of the fourth century BC onwards (cf. note *ad loc.*). The first surviving allusion to this idea occurs in the *Samia* (T6), with reference to a performance of the *Danae*, which points also to a revival of the play in Menander’s time. In the context of the assertion on the overwhelming power of money, the content of fr. 10\(^ a\) was arbitrarily taken by ancient biographers to refer to Socrates as the sole person able to


resist wealth (cf. note ad loc.). Though the possibility of Naevius' influence from Euripides in his treatment of Danae's legend cannot be established on the basis of the surviving evidence, it should be noted that the social issue of the maiden's seduction, which occurs in Danae fr. 6 and is a recurring theme in Euripides' plays following the same pattern (cf. p. 30 and note on fr. 6), is also raised by the Latin dramatist in his Danae (cf. The Myth, p. 18). The appeal of Euripides' treatment of Danae's legend even in later Antiquity emerges from fr. 1132 Kn. (cf. Appendix). The fact that the author of this spurious fragment mainly draws on Lucian may imply that the latter was regarded as alluding to the Euripidean Danae in D. Mar. 12 (cf. note on T5). As regards artistic inspiration, though the theme of the exposure of mother and son was popular in fifth-century pottery, the unspecified date of Euripides' play, in conjunction with the unknown date and similar theme of the Sophoclean Danae, hinder any attempt to relate any vase-painting from mid-fifth century onwards to either play (cf. The Myth, p. 17f.).
TESTIMONIA

T 1

tὸν δὲ χορικῶν ἀσμάτων τῶν κωμικῶν ἐν τι καὶ ἡ παράβασις, δητοὶ ὁ ποιητής πρὸς τὸ θέατρον βούλεται λέγειν, ὁ χορὸς παρελθὼν λέγη, ἐπιεικῶς δ' αὐτῷ ποιοῦσιν οἱ κωμιδοκοιταί, τραγικῶν δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλ' Ἐυριπίδης αὐτὸ πεκοίηκεν ἐν πολλοῖς δράμασιν, ἐν μὲν γε τῇ Δανάῃ τὸν χορὸν ἕκαστος γυναικακος, ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τι ποιήσας παράδειγμα ὡς ἀνδρᾶς λέγειν ἐκτικὴ τῷ σχῆματι τῆς λέξεως τὰς γυναικάς καὶ Σωφροκλῆς δ' αὐτὸ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἑκείνον ἀμίλλης κοιτὶ σκανιάκις, ὥσπερ ἐν Ἰππόνῳ.

T 2
DANAH

T 3
DANAH

T 4

Ὁ δὲ προειρημένος Πίκος ὁ καὶ Ζέδης ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέροις χρόνοις ἔσχε μετὰ τὸν Ἑρμῆν καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ ἅλλον υἱόν, τὸν Περσεά, ἄκο εὐκρέπεος γυναικός ὄνοματι Λανάθης, θυγατρὸς τοῦ Ἀκρισίου τοῦ καταγομένου ἐκ τῆς Ἀργείαν χώρας· περὶ ἢς ἐμπυθολόγησεν Ἐυριπίδης ὁ
οφέτατος ἐν τῇ συντάξει τοῦ αὐτοῦ δράματος ἐν κιβωτίῳ τινὶ
βληθεῖσαν καὶ ρυθεῖσαι κατὰ θάλασσαν τὴν Δανάην, ὡς φθαρεῖσαν
ὡς Δίως μεταβληθέντος εἰς χρυσὸν.

Τ5

Ὑπόθεσις Δανάης

'Ακρίσιος Ἀργοὺς ἄν βασιλέας κατὰ χρησμὸν
δὴ τινὰ τὴν παῖδα Δανάην κατάκλειστον
ἐν τοῖς καρθενώσιν ἐφύλαττε καλλίστην
οὖσαν· ὥς ἐρασθεῖσιν ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐκεῖ οὖθε εἰχὲν δίκαιος
μυχθεῖν αὐτῇ χρυσὸς γενόμενος καὶ ὑμείς
διὰ τοῦ τέγους εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς παρθένου
ἐγκύμον' ἐκοίσεν. ἑξήκοντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου
βρέφος (τὸν Περσέα) ἀπέτεκε. τοῦτο μαθὼν
'Ακρίσιος εἰς κιβωτῶν ἀμφότερον, τὴν τε
μητέρα καὶ τὸ βρέφος, ἐνέβαλε καὶ κελεύει δίκτειν
κατὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. ἴδοισαι δὲ ταῦτ' αἰ Νηρηίδες
καὶ κατελήσασαι τὸ γεγονὸς ἐμβάλλουσι τὴν
κιβωτῶν εἰς δίκτυα Σερφιών ἀλίεών,
κάνειτεθέν περισσόθη ἢ τὴ μήτηρ καὶ τὸ βρέφος
ἀνδρωθῆν Περσέως ἀνομίσθη.

Τὰ τοῦ δράματος πρόσωπα: Ἰερήμης Δανάη Τροφός
'Ακρίσιος Ἄγγελος Χαρός Ἀθηνᾶ

Τ5 Argumentum Danaes in cod. Vatic. Palat. gr. 287, f° 147 r.
Δη) οὐκ ἀκήκοας λεγόντων, εἰπέ μοι, Νικήρατε,
tῶν τραγωδιῶν ὡς γενόμενος χρυσός ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρύῃ
dιὰ τέγους καθειργμένην τε παῖδ' ἐμοίχευσέν ποτε;
(Ni) εἶτα δὴ τί τούτο;
(Δη) ἵσας δὲι κάντα προσδοκᾶν. σκόπει,
tοῦ τέγους εἰ σοι μέρος τι ρέι.
(Ni) τὸ πλείστον. ἀλλὰ τί
tούτο πρὸς ἐκεῖν' ἐστὶ;
(Δη) τότε μὲν γίνεθ' ὁ Ζεὺς χρυσίων,
tότε δ' ὅδωρ. ὅραίς· ἐκεῖνου τοὐθρογν ἐστίν. ὡς ταχὺ
eδρομεν.
(Ni) καὶ βουκολεῖς με.
(Δη) μά τὸν Ἀπόλλω, 'γώ μὲν οὖ.
ἀλλὰ χείρων οὐδὲ μικρὸν Ἀκρισίου δήσουθεν εἰ·
eι δ' ἐκείνην ἡξίωσε, τὴν γε σήν—
FRAGMENTA

Fr. 1 (321 Kn., 6 J.-v.L.):

ην γάρ τις αἴνος, ως γυναιξί μὲν τέχναι
μέλουσι, λόγχη δ' ἄνδρες εὐστοχῶτεροι.
εἰ γὰρ δόλοισιν ἦν τὸ νικηθήριον,
ημεῖς δὲν ἀνδρῶν εἰχομεν τυραννίδα.

Fr. 2 (316 Kn., 2 J.-v.L.):

γύναι, καλόν μὲν φέγγος ἡλίου τόδε,
καλόν δὲ πόντου χεῦμ' ιδεῖν εὗήνεμον,
γῆ Τ' ἤριν θάλλουσα πλοῦσιν θ' ὄδαρ,
πολλῶν Τ' ἐκαίνων ἔστι μοι λέξαι καλῶν·
ἀλλ' οὖδέν οὖν λαμπρὸν οὖθ' ἴδειν καλὸν
ὡς τοῖς ἀκαστὶ καὶ κόσφι δεδηγμένοις
παῖδων νεογνῶν ἐν δόμιοις ἴδειν φάος.

---

Fr. 1 Stob. 4.22g. 172 W.-H. (Περὶ γάμουν· ψόγος γυναικῶν) Ἐυριπίδου Δανάης S M A
Fr. 2 Stob. 4.24a. 5 W.-H. ("Ον καλὸν τὸ ἐξεῖν παῖδας) Ἐυριπίδου Δανάης<1> S M A

Fr. 1 1 ἦν γάρ τις αἴνος Voss.2 et Trinc.: τῇν τῇ γάρ τις αἴνος S M A: αἴνος τις ἦν ἄρ' conieci:

Fr. 2 1 καλὸν van Herwerden RPh 2, 56, prob. Nauck, Hense, Friis Johansen: φιλὸν S M A, prob.
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Fr. 3 (317 Kn., 3 J.-v.L.):
καὶ νῦν παραίνει κάσι τοῖς νεωτέροις
μὴ πρὸς τὸ γήρας τοὺς γάμους ποιομένους
σχολὴ τεκνοῦσθαι καΐδας —οὐ γὰρ ἡδονή,
γυναικὶ τ’ ἔχθρὸν χρῆμα πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ—,
ἀλλ’ ὡς τάξιστα, καὶ γὰρ ἐκτροφαῖ καλαί
καὶ συννεάζῃ ἡδὺ καὶς νέῳ πατρί.

Fr. 4 (318 Kn., 4 J.-v.L.):
γυνὴ γὰρ ἐξελθοῦσα πατρίῳν δόμων
οὐ τῶν τεκνῶν ἑστίν, ἄλλα τοῦ λέχους:
ὸ δ’ ἀρσεν ἐπτηκ’ ἐν δόμῳ ἄεὶ γένος
θεῶν πατρίῳν καὶ τάφῳν τιμάορον.

Fr. 5 (319 Kn., 5 J.-v.L.):
συμμαρττὼ σοι ἐκοιμῆθη λελείμμεθα
κάσι γυναίκες ἀρσένων ἂεὶ δίσια.

---

Fr. 3 Stob. 4. 22e. 115 W.-H. (Περὶ γάμουν ὅτι ἐν τοῖς γάμοις τὰς τῶν συναπτομένων ἡλικίας χρη σκοπεῖν) Εὐρυκίδου Δανάης S M A
Fr. 5 Stob. 4. 22g. 174 W.-H. (Περὶ γάμουν ψόγος γυναίκων) S M A, Εὐρυκίδου Δανάης S A: Δανάης Μ

Fr. 4 1 γὰρ Stob. 4. 22g. 148 prob. Nauck, Jouan-van Looy, Kannicht: μὲν Stob. 4. 24c. 34 || 3 ἐπτηκ’ ἐν edd.: ἐστηκεν ἐν S: ἐστηκεν M || 4 τιμάορον Valesius apud Wachsmuth-Hense: τιμάορον S M A
Fr. 5 2 δίσια S M A: δίσια Madvig Adv. Cr. 1719: λίαν Schmidt Krit. Stud. II 463
Fr. 6 (320 Kn., 7 J.-v.L.):
οὔκ ἔστιν οὕτω τείχος οὕτε χρήματα
οὕτ᾽ ἄλλο δυσφύλακτον οὐδὲν ὡς γυνή.

Fr. 7 (324 Kn., 8 J.-v.L.):
ὁ χρυσόε, δεξίαμα κάλλιστον βροτοῖς,
ὡς οὕτω μήτηρ ἡδονᾶς τοῖς ἔσχει,
οὐ καίδες ἀνθρώποισιν, οὐ φίλος κατήρ,
ὅτι σὺ τοῖς σὲ δώμασιν κεκτημένοις.)
ei δ᾽ ἡ Κόρης τοιαύτῳ ὀφθαλμοῖς ὅρα, 5
οὐ θαμῆ ἔρωτις μουρίους αὐτήν τρέφειν.

________________________

Fr. 6 Stob. 4. 23.13 W.-H. (Γαμικά παραγγέλματα) Εὐριπίδου (om. S) Δανάης (Δανάη Μ Α),
idem locus cum lemm. 'Αλέξιδος legitur Stob. 4. 22g.154 W.-H. (Περὶ γάμου: ψόγος γυναικῶν);
inter dubia Alexidis fr. 340 K.-A.
Fr. 7 1-3, 5-6 P. Ross. Georg. 1 9 (edd. Zereteli et Krüger), Stob. 4. 31a.4 W.-H. (Περὶ πλοῦτον:
ἐπαίνοις πλοῦτον) Εὐριπίδου Δανάης S M A | 1-6 Ath. 4. 159B om. fab. et poet. nom. οὕτω γὰρ
καὶ οἱ τοιούτῳ μονονομίᾳ μονονομίαν ἀποκαθίσκουσιν toioit' ἢ ἢ πλοῦτι ἡ ἡ φιλοσοφία παρὰ τοῖς
τοῖς | 1-4 S.E. M. 1. 279 om. fab. et poet. nom. οὕτως ἔστι καὶ ὁ τοιαύτα τοιαύτα καίομαν καί
καὶ ὁ κρατομῶμεν ἀκρατοῖς παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, οὕτως διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς πρὸς τοῦτον ἐκτιμώμας
παρ᾽ ἐκαστὰ προφέρονται τοιοῦτοι τοῖς στίχοις τῶν κοινών | Athenag. Supp. Pro Christ. 29
τοῖς ἔστι καὶ οὕτω ἀνεκπάθεις γὰρ καὶ κριτῶν ἐκτιμώμας
toii' 1-3 D.S. 37. 30.2 om. fab. et poet. nom., Const. Porph. Sent. 460 τοιαύταν ὁ χρυσός ἔσχε δύναμιν ἐπὶ
καὶ ὁ κρατομῶμεν ἀκρατοῖς παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, οὕτως διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς πρὸς τοῦτον ἐκτιμώμας
παρ᾽ ἐκαστὰ προφέρονται τοιοῦτοι τοῖς στίχοις τῶν κοινών_____ | Athenag. Supp. Pro Christ. 29
τοῖς ἔστι καὶ οὕτω ἀνεκπάθεις γὰρ καὶ κριτῶν ἐκτιμώμας
toii' 1-4 S.E. | M. 1. 279 om. fab. et poet. nom. οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ ὁ τοιαύτα τοιαύτα καίομαν καί
καὶ ὁ κρατομῶμεν ἀκρατοῖς παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, οὕτως διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς πρὸς τοῦτον ἐκτιμώμας
παρ᾽ ἐκαστὰ προφέρονται τοιοῦτοι τοῖς στίχοις τῶν κοινών | Athenag. Supp. Pro Christ. 29
τοῖς ἔστι καὶ οὕτω ἀνεκπάθεις γὰρ καὶ κριτῶν ἐκτιμώμας

________________________

Fr. 6 1 χρήματα Stob. 4. 23. 13 et S Stob. 4. 22g. 154; χρήμα Μ Α S M A 4. 22g. 154 2 oû' Stob.
4. 23.13: oû' Stob. 4. 22g. 154 | χρήμα Stob. 4. 22g. 154 | oû' Stob. 4. 23.13 et S Stob. 4. 22g. 154: oû' M Α Stob. 4.
22g.154 cf. Arnott Alexis 89s.
Fr. 7 1 χρυσόε plerique: χρυσόε S.E. D | δεξίαμα Stob., Ath. C, S.E., D.S., Athenag. S: δεξίαμα
et Seneca, delevi; spurium esse censuerunt iam Grotius apud Nauck, Zereteli et Krueger, Jouan et van
Looy | τοῖς σὲ δώμασιν κεκτημένοι Schmidt ZfA 14 (1856) 550, prob. Nauck: χοί σὲ δώμασιν
κεκτημένοι Ath., S.E. | 5 ὀφθαλμοῖς plerique: ὀφθαλμοῖς Stob. S | 6 τρέφειν Stob.: ἔχειν P.
Fr. 8 (322 Kn., 17 J.-v.L.):
ερως γάρ ἀργόν κατὶ τοῖς ἁργοῖς ἐφυ-
φίλει κάτοστρα καὶ κόμης ἐκθυσίματα,
φεύγει δὲ μόχθους. ἐν δὲ μοι τεκμήριον-
οúdeis προσαιτάν ἔκτων ἡράσθη βροτῶν,
ἐν τοῖς δ’ ἐχουσιν τῇ ἡβηνής πέφυκ’ δὲ.

Fr. 9 (326 Kn., 11 J.-v.L.):
ἀρ’ οἶσθ’ θοῦνε’ς’ οἱ μὲν εὐγενεῖς βροτῶν
πέντες δ’ εἶνεν οὔδ’ ἀλφάνουσ’ ἐτι,
οἰ δ’ οὔδ’ ἦσαν πρόσθεν, ὀξύμιοι δὲ νῦν,
δὸξαν φέρονται τοῦ νομίσματος χάριν
καὶ συμπλέκοντες σκέμα καὶ γάμους τέκνων ;
δὸναι δὲ πᾶς τις μᾶλλον ὅλβιας κακὶ
πρόσομος ἔστιν ἢ πένητι κάγαθε.
κακὸς δ’ ὃ μὴ ἔχων, οἱ δ’ ἐχοντες Ῥ ὀξύμιοι.

Fr. 9 Stob. 4. 31b. 41 W.-H. (Plut. πλούτου: δῶρο πλούτου ποιεῖ διὰ τῆς πλείονον ἄνων) Εὐριπίδου Δανάης Μ A om. S | Stob. 4. 31a.29 W.-H. (Plut. πλούτου: ἕκαστος πλούτου) Εὐριπιδοῦ 

Fr. 10 (325 Kn., 9 J.-v.L.):
κρείσσων γὰρ σύνεις χρημάτων πέφυκ' ἀνήρ,
κλήν εἰ τις— ὅστις δ' ὀφθώς ἐστιν οὐχ ὅρω.

Fr. 10a (325a Kn., 10 J.-v.L.):
Sententia περὶ πλεονεξίας

Fr. 11 (327 Kn., 12 J.-v.L.):
φιλοσφ. γάρ τοι τῶν μὲν ὀλίβιων βροτοὶ
σοφοῖς τίθεσθαι τοὺς λόγους, διὰ τὸς
λεκτῶν ἀν' οἴκων εὖ λέγγει πένης ἀνήρ,
γελάνε ἐγὼ δὲ πολλάκις σοφωτέρους
πένητας ἀνδράς εἰσορῶ τῶν πλουσίων
καὶ <τοὺς> θεοίς μικρά πάντως τέλη
τῶν βουθυτούντων ὄντας εὐσεβεστέρους.

Fr. 10 Stob. 3. 10.18 W.-H. (Περὶ ὀδυσσίας) Ἑυριπίδου (τοῦ αὐτοῦ Σ) Δανάης ΜΑ

Fr. 11 Stob. 4. 33.14 W.-H. (Σύγκρισις πενίας καὶ πλουτοῦ) Ἑυριπίδου (ποιητ. nom. om. Σ)
Δανάης <<< S M A | 6-7 Ath. 2. 12.2 (om. nom. fab.) Eὐριπίδης φησὶ καὶ σημαίνει ὅτε
τὸ τέλος τῆς θυσίας | 6 Schol. Eust. II. 12.59 (van der Valk) δῆλον δ' ὅτι τέλος καὶ ἧ θυσία
Εὐριπίδης δὴεν καὶ αἱ τελεται θυσίας ἔχουσαι.

Heath: θεοίς (θεοίς Cantor, Grotius, prob. Musgrave et Kannicht) μικρά χειρί θύοντας Stob.
Fr. 12 (328 Kn., 13 J.-v.L.):
δόσις δόμοις μὲν ἠδεται πληρομένοις,
γαστρὸς δ' ἀφαιρών σῶμα δύστηνσα κακοί,
tοῦτον νομίζω κἂν θεῶν συλῆν βρέτη
tοῖς φιλτάτοις τε πολέμιον κεφυκέναι.

Fr. 13 (323 Kn., 14 J.-v.L.):
tάχ' ἀν πρὸς ἀγκάλαισι καὶ στέρνοις ἐμοίς
πηδῶν ἀθρόι καὶ φιλημάτων ὄχλῳ
ψυχὴν ἐμὴν κτήσατο· ταῦτα γὰρ βροτοῖς
φίλτρον μέγιστον, αἱ ξυνούσιαι, πάτερ.

Fr. 14 (329 Kn., 15 J.-v.L.):
φεῦ, τοῖσι γενναίοισιν ὡς ἀπαντάχοθ
πρέπει χαρακτῆρ χρηστός εἰς ἑψυχίαν.
Fr. 15 (330 Kn., 16 J.-v.L.):

ες ταύτων ἦκειν φημι τάς βροτῶν τύχας 
τὸ δ' ἵνα καλοῦσιν αἰθέρ', οὗ τάδ' ἐστι δή
οὗτος θέρος τε λαμπρὸν ἐκλάμπει σέλας,
χειμῶνα τ' αδέξει συντιθείς πυκνῶν νέφων,
θάλειν τε καὶ μή, ζῆν τε καὶ φθίνειν ποιεῖ
οὗτω δὲ θυντῶν σκέρμα: τῶν μὲν εὔνυχει
λαμπρὰ γαλήνη, τῶν δὲ συννέφει πάλιν,
ζωσὶν τε σὺν κακοῖσιν, οἷς δ' ὅλβου μέτα
φθίνουσ' ἐτείοις προσφερεῖς μεταλλαγαῖς.

Fr. 16 (330a Kn., 1 J.-v.L.):

χρησμοφοία
According to Pollux’s testimony, the chorus was female, perhaps consisting of Argive women or maidens sympathetic to Danae’s situation (for the sympathy towards Danae possibly expressed by the chorus, cf. fr. 14). Female choruses are also a basic medium for the creation of the image of intimacy within the oikos, as women in tragedy have a separate place from the male sphere of activity, not least Danae who has been literally subject to seclusion. What needs to be questioned, however, is the validity of Pollux’s statement that Euripides inserted a type of parabasis, where he used the chorus as his mouthpiece and accidentally made them refer to themselves in masculine gender. The interpretation of tragic passages as containing the poet’s direct address to the audience is common in ancient criticism (cf. schol. Alc. 962 Schwartz, Plut. Mor. 539B-C) and can be attributed to the commentators’ zeal to assign viewpoints expressed by the chorus-leader in the first person singular to the poet himself, in order to accumulate as much biographical detail as possible. This sort of interpretation is thus arbitrary and there is no evidence from the tragic texts to support it (cf. note on fr. 10a). An interestingly parallel case to Pollux’s statement is provided by the ancient scholiast of Hipp. 1102 (Schwartz), who assigned the masculine participles κεμίθων (1105) and λεύθσαν (1107) to the female chorus, thus supposing that they are speaking on behalf of the poet: γυναικεις μεν εισιν αι τοι χοροι, μεταφερει δε το πρόσωπον ἑπ’ ἐαυτοῦ ὁ ποιητής καταλιπων τὰ χορικὰ πρόσωπα: μετοχαις γὰρ ἀρσενικαίς κέχρηται. Nevertheless, as Bond convincingly argued, the strophe of the ode containing the masculine participles must have been sung by the subsidiary male chorus of Hippolytus’ followers prompted by the hero to escort him from his country on 1098f. (Ἰτ’, ὡ νέοι μοι τήσει γῆς ὀμηλικες, προσείποθ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ προσέψατε χθονός).

132 The same phrasing is used to describe the comic parabasis in schol. vet. Ar. Nu. 518 Holwerda (the poet is thought of as speaking through the πρόσωπον of the chorus). Aeschines (i 151) cites Euripidean passages as bearing the poet’s own voice for the purposes of his argumentation. Cf. also Ael. Aristides xxviii 97 Keil.
Considering that secondary choruses are often misleadingly designated as χορῶς in the manuscripts (in Hipp. 61, Pha. 227, A. Eum. 1032), the scholiast could have been easily deluded into thinking that the strophe of the ode was sung by the female chorus. Likewise, Pollux or, more likely, his source (perhaps a scholium or biographer)—considering that his work is mainly derivative—might have supposed that the main female chorus referred to themselves using masculine forms as the poet’s mouthpiece, based on a manuscript designating a feasible subsidiary chorus of men as χορῶς. Alternatively, there are cases in tragedy, where a female character refers to herself using the masculine plural, which has generalizing overtones; cf. the chorus-leader in A. Supp. 204 and also S. Ant. 926, Tr. 491, E. Alc. 383, Med. 315f., IA 824. It is thus conceivable that the female chorus-leader of the Danae may have referred to herself using the masculine plural, which would explain Pollux’s remark on the use of masculine forms by a female chorus. The reference to Sophocles’ use of the chorus as his mouthpiece in the Hipponous could be attributed to the trend of ancient criticism to regard Sophocles and Euripides as overt rivals (cf. for instance, schol. vet. E. Ph. 1 Schwartz).

T2:

This inscription dated at the end of the second/beginning of the first century BC is likely to be a list of the contents of book-rolls donated to the Library of a Gymnasium in Piraeus presumably by epheboi from various demes of Attica. The remains of the list preserve the titles of twenty plays of Euripides (Scyrioi, Stheneboea, Sciron, Sisyphus, Thyestes, Theseus, Danae, Polyidus, Peliades, Pleisthenes, Palamedes, Peleus, Protesilaus, Philoctetes, Phoenix, Phrixus, Alcmene, Alexandros, Eurystheus, Alcestis) and, according

137 Cf. OCD s.v. ‘Pollux’.
140 Cf. Bain (1975) p. 17 and n. 1. Comparison between Sophocles and Euripides in terms of dramatic technique occurs often in ancient scholia; cf. schol. S. Al. 520 (Christodoulou), schol. S. OT 264 (Papageorgius), schol. S. OC 220 (De Marco) and Bain (1975) p. 17, n. 2.
to Wilamowitz’s estimation, about thirty-one titles appear to have been mentioned, that is, thirty-one out of the seventy-eight surviving Euripidean plays of Aristophanes’ edition. It should be noted that this catalogue antedates the earliest attested commentary on the nine plays of Euripides, which was written by Didymus in the second half of the first century BC/ beginning of the first century AD. The nine annotated tragedies were made very prominent and thus given much greater chance for long-term survival. This inscription seems to indicate that some plays, which in the centuries to follow were presumably obtainable mainly among literary circles, were widely read by the beginning of the first century BC. On the basis of our evidence, the appeal of the Danae appears to have continued until late antiquity (cf. General Introduction, p. 3f., Reception and Appendix).

T3:
Roman seated relief-statue of Euripides found on Esquiline and kept in Louvre (Richter 1965, I fig. 760-1), tentatively dated in the second century AD. The poet’s name is inscribed on the plinth and forty-one titles of his plays (thirty-seven titles with Alcmeon, Autolycus, Iphigenia and Melanippe counted twice) are preserved in the background in alphabetic order. At the missing part of the background, there is room for the remaining thirty-seven titles of Euripides’ seventy-eight συνάγωγα of the Alexandrian edition. To the same era belongs the alphabetic list of the Euripidean corpus in P.Oxy. xxvii 2456, from which the eighteen last titles have been preserved. The process of consolidation of the ‘selection’ (i.e. the nine plays annotated by Didymus) seems to have been gradual, to judge from the number of papyri of ‘non-select’ plays dating to that era and even later and presumably studied in literary circles and the revivals of such plays till the end of the second century (cf. General Introduction, p. 3 and n. 9). The Danae seems to have been

---

147 Cf. note on IG XIV 1152.
148 Cf. Archelaus (P.Oxy. iii 419, second/ third AD), Cretans (P. Berol. 13217, second century AD), Hypsipyle (P.Oxy. vi 852, late second/ early third AD), Cresphonies (P.Oxy. xxvii 2458, third century AD), Phaethon (P.Berol. 9771, fourth century AD), Oedipus (P.Oxy. xxvii 2459, fourth century AD), Captive Melanippe (P.Berol. 5514, fifth century AD).
among those plays obtainable in literary circles, to judge by Lucian’s allusion to the context of the situation of *Danae* fr. 7 (*Timon* 41) and the possibility of his inspiration from the play in *D. Mar.* 12 (cf. note on T5). The appeal of the play in late antiquity is suggested also by fr. 1132 Kn. (cf. Appendix and Reception).

**T 4:**

According to John Malalas, Euripides treated the disclosure of Danae’s seduction and her exposure in the chest. This brief reference accords with the accounts of Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler and [Apollod.] 2. 4.1, and is confirmed by frs. 6 (the revelation of Danae’s seduction) and 13 (Danae’s plea to be exposed together with her baby-son). Malalas is not usually the most helpful source for the restoration of Euripidean lost plays, firstly because he seems to have had only indirect knowledge of Euripides, possibly deriving his material from Domninos, and secondly in view of his fusion of material from Hellenic, Old Testament, Christian and Antiochene sources. These two factors account for his quite vague (as the present testimonium, which adds nothing to our knowledge of the play) and at times inaccurate references to Euripidean treatments of certain myths (e.g. he mentions that Euripides wrote on the three-eyed Cyclops [5. 18 Thurn] and attributes the content of *Ba.* 28f. to Pentheus rather than Dionysus [2. 15 Thurn]). Malalas’ aetiological reasoning often leads him to reject firmly the Euripidean versions mentioned in his work in favour of more rationalizing ones. In the case of the *Danae*, for instance, he juxtaposes Euripides’ treatment to Boutios’ more truthful version of the story, according to which Picus Zeus — the figure of the ruler as conflated from Hellenic and Eastern sources— lured Danae by offering her much gold (cf. fr. 7 and note *ad loc.* for the interpretation of Danae’s seduction by later authors). Likewise, Zeus’ transformation into a satyr to seduce Antiope is contrasted to Cephalion’s rationalizing narrative (2. 16 Thurn).

This passage transmitted in the fourteenth-century Ms P (Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 287, f° 147') as 'Υπόθεσις Δανάης follows the spurious IA 1578-1629 and precedes the sixty-five lines from the equally spurious 'Danae-prologue' (fr. 1132 Kn., cf. Appendix). On metrical and linguistic grounds, IA 1578-1629 and the spurious fr. 1132 Kn. are dated between the fourth and seventh century. In view of their similarity in technique, West suggested that both pieces could have been composed by the same author and that fr. 1132 Kn. may have been written with the same purpose as the spurious ending of the Iphigenia in Aulis, namely as a specially composed supplement aiming to replace the lost beginning of the play by someone who had volumes from an alphabetic collection of Euripides' plays at his disposal. The implications of this suggestion are dealt with in the relevant discussion (cf. Appendix, Diagnosis of Spuriousness), where the question whether the 'Danae-prologue' could have been written as an independent composition, perhaps as a rhetorical exercise aiming to imitate an Euripidean opening, is also raised and regarded as worth exploring.

The 'hypothesis' (97 words) is clearly much shorter than the narrative papyrus-hypotheses of Euripidean plays, which are estimated to have been written in about the first century BC and amount to 170-200 words. The manuscript hypothesis of the Alcestis, which seems to be a synopsis of the original papyrus-hypothesis (partially surviving in P. Oxy. 2457, ll. 1-17), also amounts to 90 words. Luppe noted in this account some elements of vocabulary and style, which he suggested that could originate in narrative hypotheses of Euripides' plays and attempted to reconstruct the original hypothesis on the

Nevertheless, there is a serious issue to be tackled before accepting Luppe’s reconstruction. The Nereids of the ‘hypothesis’ are found also in Lucian’s D. Mar. 12, where Doris and Thetis rescue Danae and Perseus by pushing the chest into the nets of Seriphian fishermen. On this basis, Kannicht expressed his reservation as to the provenance of ‘hyp.’ Danae from the original narrative hypothesis of the play, also in view of certain common stylistic elements between this narrative and Lucian’s dialogue, which could suggest that ‘hyp.’ Danae derived from Lucian.158 The dialogue runs as follows:

ΔΩΡΙΣ Τι δακρύεις, ὁ Θέτι;
ΘΕΤΙΣ Καλλίστην, ὁ Δωρὶ, κόρην εἰδὼν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐμβληθείσαν, αὐτὴν τε καὶ βρέφος αὐτὴς ἀρτιγένετον ἐκέλευσεν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ τοὺς ναῦτας ἀναλαβόντας τὸ κιβώτιον, ἐπειδὴ πολὺ τῆς γῆς ἀποσπάσασθιν, ἀφείνει εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς ἀπόλοιπο ή ἀθλία, καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ τὸ βρέφος.

ΔΩΡΙΣ Τίνος ἔνεκα, ὁ ἄδελφῃ; εἰπέ, εἰ τι ἐμαθες ἀκριβῶς,
ΘΕΤΙΣ Ἀπαντα. ὁ γὰρ Ἀκρίσιος ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῆς καλλίστην ὁδοὺν ἐπαρθένευεν ἐὰς χαλκοὺν τίνα θάλασσαν ἐμβαλὼν· εἰτα, εἰ μὲν ἀλήθεις ὡς ἔχοι εἰπέν, φασί δ᾽ ὅτι τόν Δια χρυσὸν γενόμενον ρυθήναι διὰ τοῦ ὀρόφου ἐπι αὐτῆς, δεξαμένην δὴ ἐκείνην ἐς τὸν κόλπον καταρρέουντα τὸν θεὸν ἐγκύμονα γενέσθαι. τούτῳ αἰσθόμενος ὁ πατὴρ, ἄγριος τις καὶ ξηλότυπος γέρων, ἤγανάκτησε καὶ ὡς τίνος μεμοιχεύσασθι οἴηθεις αὐτῆς ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὴν κιβώτιον ἄρτη τετοκικάν.

ΔΩΡΙΣ Ἡ δὲ τί ἐκρατέσ, ὁ Θέτι, ὅποτε καθίστο;
ΘΕΤΙΣ Ὁπερ αὐτῆς μὲν ἐσίγα, ὁ Δωρὶ, καὶ ἐρεφε τὴν καταδίκην. τὸ βρέφος δὲ παρητεῖτο μὴ ἀποθενεὶν δακρύωσαι καὶ τῷ πάπῃ δεικνύουσα αὐτό, καλλίστον δυντὸ δὲ ὡς ἀγνοίας τῶν κακῶν ὑπεμειδία πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν. ὑποσπὶμλαμαι αὐτίς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς δακρύων μνημονεύσασα αὐτῶν.

As regards the thematic resemblance between Lucian’s dialogue and ‘hyp.’ Danae, it can be argued that Euripides was very popular in the second sophistic and evidently the second most quoted poet after Homer in Lucian’s work. The latter regularly cites and alludes to Euripides and in certain cases he even makes unassigned references to lines or scenes from Euripidean drama, probably assuming that they are easily recognizable by his readers (cf. Med. 340 in Cat. 8, Ph. 18f. in J. Conf. 13, Ph. 359f. in Bis Acc. 21, Danae fr. 7 in Gall. 14 and Tim. 41 on the power of gold). Lucian’s knowledge of Euripides does not seem to be indirect and merely based on the narrative hypotheses, which were popular in that era. He apparently had access also to plays outside the ‘selection’; his unassigned citation of Danae fr. 7.1 in Tim. 41 and allusion to the context of the situation (i.e. the power of gold over love, as alleged also in frs. 8, 9) may suggest that he knew the play directly and not through intermediary sources. In this direction points also his description of Danae’s plea for her child’s life to Acrisius in this Marine Dialogue, which recalls Danae fr. 13 (for the possible context, cf. note ad loc.). It is thus conceivable that Lucian may have been inspired in this dialogue by the epilogue of the Danae, where it could have been foretold that mother and child would be rescued—supposedly by the Nereids. Even so, he cannot be regarded as reproducing Euripides faithfully, given his known literary creativity and the possibility that multiple sources could have been conflated in his account.

Hence, in terms of the thematic coincidence between the ‘hypothesis’ and D. Mar. 12, the latter might have found its point of departure in the Euripidean play. As regards the similarity in phrasing, the common stylistic elements are the following: (1) καλλίστην

160 op. cit. p. 41.
162 Cf. General Introduction, p. 3 and n. 9 and 10. For a list of these references, cf. Householder (1941) p. 14.
163 For this possibility, cf. Rein (1926) pp. 115-129.
οὖσαν,164 (2) χρυσός γενόμενος, (3) ἐγκύμονα, (4) the asyndeta τούτο μαθῶν (‘hyp.’ Danae) and τούτο αἰσθόμενος (D. Mar. 12),165 (5) εἰς κιβωτόν ενέβαλε (‘hyp.’ Danae), ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν (D. Mar. 12), (6) ἐμβάλλουσι εἰς δίκτυα Σερφιὼν ἀλλιῶν (‘hyp.’ Danae), τοῖς ἀλιεῦσι ἐμβαλοῦσαι εἰς τὰ δίκτυα τοῖς Σερφιῶις (D. Mar. 12),166 (7) κελεύει ρίπτειν κατὰ τὴν θάλασσαν (‘hyp.’ Danae), ἐκέλευσεν δὲ ὁ πατήρ τοὺς ναύτας . . . ἀφεῖναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (D. Mar. 12). Of these, (2), (3 with ἐγκυώμα ῃ instead of the later ἐγκύμονα), (5), (6) and (7) could go back to the original narrative hypothesis, on which Lucian supposedly might have drawn, as suggested by Luppe.167 However, the phrase καλλιστήν οὖσαν in Lucian and ‘hyp.’ Danae (instead of the fixed phrase of mythographic hypotheses κάλλει διαφέρουσαν168) and the asyndeton τούτο μαθῶν (completely alien from the style of the hypotheses, instead of the possible phrase μαθῶν δὲ τὰ γεγενημένα169), which resembles the asyndeton τούτο αἰσθόμενος of D. Mar. 12, cannot have derived from the original hypothesis.170 It is rather improbable that Lucian had read ‘hyp.’ Danae, if we suppose that this is a synopsis of the original hypothesis, firstly because there is not even one case of abridged narrative hypothesis from the bulk of the surviving papyrus-hypotheses, which date from the first to the third century AD, and secondly because hypotheses are rather unlikely to have become liable for abbreviation and modification before being prefixed to the corresponding dramatic texts171 (the earliest case of prefatory material transmitted with the dramatic text is the metrical hypothesis, didascalia and personarum index of the Dyscolus in the Bodmer papyrus of Menander dated in late third century AD172). It would also be very unusual for Lucian to imitate a source verbatim in this way.

A survey of the ‘Danae-prologue’ (the spurious fr. 1132 Kn., cf. Appendix) brings to light its relation to both ‘hyp.’ Danae and Lucian’s D. Mar. 12. The ‘prologue’ accords with the ‘hypothesis’ in terms of the oracle given to Acrisius (ll. 7-18), which is absent

168 Cf. hypp. Hipp. (P. Mil. Vogl. 2. 44, col. i, l. 9f.), Melanippe Sophie (P. Oxy. 2455, fr. 2, l. 3f.), Auge (P. Colon. 264, l. 5f.) and Luppe (1991) p. 3.
171 Cf. Barrett (1965) p. 62ff., who found it highly unlikely that full and abbreviated versions of narrative hypotheses were circulating side by side in the second century AD.
from D. Mar. 12, and Danae's seclusion ἐν παρθένωσι (ll. 22-24), which is not specified as
the widely attested bronze chamber. Certain linguistic similarities are also worth noting:
‘prologue’ l. 39: ἐγκατάκλειστον and ‘hyp.’ l. 3: κατάκλειστον,173 ‘prologue’ l. 39: μαθὼν
πατήρ and ‘hyp.’ l. 8: τοῦτο μαθὼν Ἀκρίσιος. For the wide use of Lucian in fr. 1132 Kn.,
cf. Appendix, The Sources. Hence, both the ‘hypothesis’ and the ‘prologue’ are congruent
with Lucian's treatments of Danae's legend and, at the same time, congruent with each
other. Whether Lucian was inspired by Euripides' Danae, as Rein suggested,174 is
ultimately unprovable, though, apart from the points made above in favour of this
possibility, the fact that the author of a composition aiming to imitate a Euripidean opening
on the Danae-myth (fr. 1132 Kn.) has chosen to widely consult Lucian might also point in
this direction.

As to the provenance, purpose and worth of 'hyp.' Danae, I can see the following
possibilities:

(i) if West's suggestion is taken into account and the ‘prologue’ (fr. 1132 Kn.) was
written as a supplement of the lost beginning of the Danae, its author would have
presumably drawn on Lucian and might have also supposedly consulted the original
narrative hypothesis of the Danae. Subsequently, according to Luppe,175 he might have
used Lucian to epitomize the hypothesis of the play to what survives today as 'hyp.' Danae
and prefixed it to the text of the Danae, in accordance with the trend of adding prefatory
material before dramatic texts. Such a possibility may account for the instances of common
would one use another text to create a synopsis, instead of directly reducing the original?
And secondly, why would a full hypothesis of the play be changed to an epitome, which is
completely uninformative of the plot and refers to the myth in general 176 (the sole new
piece of information is the reference to the Nereids, for which one could well argue that it
may have derived from Lucian). By contrast, the manuscript hyp. Alcestis already
mentioned, albeit a synopsis of the original papyrus-hypothesis, is informative of the
peculiarities of the Euripidean plot.

174 Rein (1926) pp. 115-129.
(ii) The ‘hypothesis’ may have been written by the author of the ‘prologue’ as prefatory material to the text of the Danae, again in the light of West’s argument that fr. 1132 Kn. was a specially composed supplement; this person seems to have been well-learnt on Euripides and the myth of Danae and evidently consulted Lucian to write his ‘prologue’, which would explain Lucian’s echoes on the ‘hypothesis’, as well. It is also worth bearing in mind that the fixed stylistic features of the hypotheses observed by Luppe would be easily imitable for someone who had read a number of narrative hypotheses, not least for someone who could imitate a Euripidean opening. This likelihood could account for all the similarities between the ‘hypothesis’ and the ‘prologue’ and the former and Luc. D. Mar. 12.

(iii) If the spurious fr. 1132 Kn. was written as a rhetorical exercise, which may seem likelier than the argument for a specially composed supplement (for the shortcomings of the latter, cf. Appendix, Diagnosis of Spuriousness), then the present narrative may have been a school exercise as well, perhaps a διήγημα possibly written by the same person, in view of the similarities between the ‘hypothesis’ and the ‘prologue’ observed above. Among the Progymnasmata of rhetorical schools, διήγημα was a particular kind of exercise in composition, aiming to briefly retell a mythological story sometimes popular from epics or drama (cf. [Hermog.] Prog. 2. 12f., Quint. Inst. 2.4).\(^{177}\) Purpose of this kind of composition was to introduce students to the technique of narratio of a judicial speech, by teaching them to write in clarity and briefly state the acting person and those involved, the action, place, manner and cause of events,\(^ {178}\) which are features also found in the narrative in question. A brief account of this type inspired by the myth of Danae occurs in Lib. Prog. 2. 41. Likewise, Lib. Prog. 2. 15, which is of comparable length with the present account, is a retelling of the story of Alcestis with no allusion to a dramatic production (cf. on the other hand, the manuscript synopsis of hyp. Ale. already mentioned).\(^ {179}\) The author of our narrative, which shares the features of διήγημα noted above and does not hint at a dramatic plot either, seems to have drawn material from Lucian, as emerges from the resemblance of style and theme. As in the case of the ‘prologue’ (cf. Appendix, The Sources), he may have additionally consulted other mythical sources, since the reference to


\(^{179}\) For further examples of διήγημα, cf. Ziebarth (1913) No 40, Beudel (1911) p. 58f.
the oracle does not originate in Lucian. Considering that hypotheses of books of Homer and drama seem to have been used for educational purposes (cf. Plut. Mor. 14E)\textsuperscript{180} and perhaps for rhetorical exercises in particular,\textsuperscript{181} it is possible that in this process the author could have also used the original narrative hypothesis of the Danae directly or through an intermediary source, which would account for the stylistic similarities observed by Luppe. Nevertheless, in view of the loss of the original hypothesis and relevant evidence from the play (which might have referred, for instance, to the intervention of the Nereids), what can only be diagnosed with probability is the relation of the transmitted account and of the ‘prologue’ with Lucian, whereas it cannot be firmly proved that Lucian goes back to Euripides. Even if the original hypothesis was consulted for the writing of this narrative, the author does not seem to have aimed to reproduce the Euripidean plot, which would account for the loss of dramatic information; this would suggest, in turn, that the present narrative cannot assist in the recovery of the peculiarities of the plot of the Danae.

An equally important question concerns the index personarum transmitted with the ‘hypothesis’; it is worth noting that not even one surviving narrative hypothesis of Euripidean plays is followed by a catalogue of dramatis personae, therefore, this index is very unlikely to have belonged to the original hypothesis. A further shortcoming of the transmitted index is that for the main part of the plot —leaving aside Hermes as prologue-speaker and Athena as dea ex machina— only four dramatic characters are mentioned (Acrisius, Danae, Nurse, Messenger) plus the chorus. Such a short number of main characters is unparalleled\textsuperscript{182} and raises serious doubts about the authenticity of the index. It thus seems quite likely that this list of dramatis personae is a later addition.

To assess the weight of the index, it may be worth exploring hypothetically the implications of West’s assumption that fr. 1132 Kn. could have been a specially composed supplement of the lost opening of the Danae by someone who had volumes from an alphabetic collection of Euripides’ plays, including the Danae, at his disposal;\textsuperscript{183} the index personarum might have then been added by the author of fr. 1132 Kn., supposedly on the


\textsuperscript{182} In Euripides’ extant plays, the minimum number of dramatic characters excluding gods is six (cf. Alcestis, Electra and Ion).

\textsuperscript{183} Cf. West (1981) p. 78, n. 49.
basis of the remaining text of the Euripidean Danae. The possibility that more leaves of the volume containing the Danae might have been lost may account for characters which remained unknown to the author of the catalogue and thus for the shortness of the index. Still, the inclusion of Hermes in the index remains a problem: if the false prologue was composed as substitute for the lost prologue of the play, how did the author of fr. 1132 Kn. know the prologue-speaker? Unless he knew the speaker from a source lost by now (e.g. by a lost argument of Aristophanes of Byzantium mentioning the name of the προλογίζων), it is reasonable to suppose that he may have invented him, perhaps based on Luc. D. Deor. 4. 2, on the god’s mythographically attested involvement in Perseus’ adventures (cf. Dramatis Personae) and perhaps also on Hermes’ delivery of the prologue-speech in the Ion with reference to a similar situation (cf. Appendix, The Sources). Hermes as prologue-speaker is thus uncertain. Athena’s role as dea ex machina could have been known to the author, presumably if he had access to either the epilogue of the Danae or the original mythographic hypothesis of the play (referring to the deus ex machina, cf. hypp. Hipp., Andr., Or., Ba.). Even if he had not, Athena would easily occur to someone for this role, in view of her involvement in Perseus’ exploits (cf. Dramatis Personae) and again perhaps in view of her closing role in the Ion. A messenger is required to report the off-stage event of the exposure of the chest with Danae and Perseus (cf. Dramatis Personae). Danae and Acrisius are the obvious characters of the play and the Nurse (the usual ‘accomplice’ in such plots) would be expected to have a role as well. On the whole, it should be noted that the catalogue of dramatic characters looks like a combination of learning and common sense—and not necessarily the outcome of one’s direct access to the play—which might imply that the characters mentioned may have well been inferred, even if the author of the index did not have the play available, that is, even if fr. 1132 Kn. was not meant to be a supplement, but rather an independent composition, such as a rhetorical exercise (cf. Appendix, Diagnosis of Spuriousness). The fact that the ‘hypothesis’, ‘personarum index’ and ‘prologue’ have been added in Ms P by the hand of Ioannes Katrases may deserve attention; this rubricator (i) has in several cases added prefatory material in Ms P (e.g. the personarum index of the Electra and the hypothesis of the Helen, which could be of his own composition184), presumably since it was intended for the book-trade, which, in turn,

required that every play in this manuscript was provided with this standard kind of material and (ii) has copied in Esc. Φ-Ω-19, f. 91v another dramatic pastiche on a fictitious theme amounting to 35 lines and preceded by a list of dramatic characters with no obvious function, since what follows is only a monologue; it may be assumed that Katrares prefixed this index of characters to the pastiche in the Escorialensis, perhaps on the basis of his familiarity with the arrangement of prefatory material in dramatic manuscripts (cf. also Appendix, Diagnosis of Spuriousness). In this light, it is conceivable that having the spurious fr. 1132 Kn. and the relevant narrative transmitted to us as ‘hypothesis’ (which may have been independent compositions, such as rhetorical exercises) at his disposal, Katrares might have (a) entitled the present account as ”Υπόθεσις”, prefixing it to the tragic pastiche of fr. 1132 Kn. and (b) invented and inserted a list of anticipated characters in a Danae play (fr. 1132 Kn. already provided Hermes as prologue-speaker and presented also Acrisius) to suit the arrangement of prefatory material in Ms P.

T6:

In this scene of the Samia, wealthy Demeas is trying to calm down his poor neighbour Niceratus, who has just found out that his unmarried daughter has born a child to the former’s stepson. He refers to Danae’s impregnation by Zeus transformed into golden shower that dropped through the roof of her chamber, as told by tragic actors. This theme was treated by Sophocles in his Acrisius and Danae and by Euripides in his own Danae and the reference to a tragic performance known to Demeas and Niceratus seems to point to the revival of a tragedy on Danae in Menander’s time.

Demeas draws a parallel between the tragic example and the particular situation of the comic play; his use of the diminutive χρυσίον (here ‘money’ rather than an everyday word for ‘gold’) instead of χρυσός, in association with Niceratus’ poverty, which is

---

particularly stressed in this context by means of his leaking roof, implies that Niceratus would certainly benefit from his daughter’s marriage to Demeas’ rich son. Frr. 7-10 of Euripides’ Danae assert the power of gold over love and it thus seems quite likely that this is the tragic play, to which Demeas is alluding in l. 3, given also the notoriety and wide citation of fr. 7 (cf. note ad loc.), as well as the large number of fourth-century revivals of Euripidean plays. Hence, Demeas is using his experience as tragic spectator to accredit his case, like Syriscus in Epitr. 325-333, who is referring to the story of Neleus and Pelias as performed on tragic stage, and Onesimus in Epitr. 1123-1126, citing E. Auge fr. 265a Kn. as a piece of proverbial wisdom applying to the circumstances of that play.

Fr. 1:

The first person plural (ἡμεῖς) identifying the speaker with female dolos clearly points to a female character. The notion of plotting as a feature of women par excellence is emphasized in this fragment and could point to an intrigue set up by Danae to protect infant Perseus from his grandfather presumably early in the play (for her possible stratagem to deceive Acrisius, cf. notes on frr. 2-4 and Structure). Plotting with such a purpose recurs in Euripidean plays thematically affiliated to the Danae (Melanippe the Wise, Alope, Auge and partly Aeolus, for detail, cf. Structure). Taking these parallel cases into consideration, this fragment could be located in a deliberation-scene between Danae and her nurse (cf. Andr. 56-90 and the parallel scene possibly between Auge and her nurse in Auge fr. 271 b Kn.). The confidence of the statement pointing to the speaker’s experience might tell in favour of the nurse as speaker of these lines rather than Danae (cf. similarly Hipp. 480f., and for the nurse’s skill in ruse, cf. Stheneboea fr. 661. 10-14 Kn.). Alternatively, these trimeters may have been the closing lines of the narrative prologue (perhaps likelier to have been

192 Cf. IG II 2320 attesting that revivals only of Euripidean tragedies were produced for three successive years (341-339 BC). For the popularity of Euripides in the fourth century, cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) pp. 28-34.
193 Tyro plays were written by Sophocles, Astydamas and Carcinus II; the allusion here might involve one of the two Sophoclean Tyro plays, which were evidently more prominent.
delivered by the nurse rather than Danae, cf. Structure), following the reference to the stratagem to protect Perseus. In this case, the first person would not be an inclusive reference to two participants in a dialogue, but simply to women as a sex. For the closure of the opening monologue with a gnome, cf. AIC. 75f., Med. 48, Su. 40f. (and Collard 1975a ad loc.), HF 57-59, Tr. 95-97, Or. 70.


ἡν γάρ: the Imperfect of εἰμί is generally accompanied by ἄρα to denote that a common fact or truth has just been recognized (a colloquialism, cf. Stevens 1976, p. 62f. and Denniston 19542 p. 36f. and note on Dictys fr. 4. 4). This seems to be the case here as well, since the speaker recognizes the authority of the proverb as corresponding to her own situation. The absence of ἄρα, however, raised suspicions that the text could be corrupt. In order to include it in the line, Meineke proposed ἡν ἄρα τις αἰνος, which is unsuitable on metrical grounds, since this particular resolution-type (first-foot dactyl) does not appear in Euripides' plays of 'severe style', among which the Danae has been classified (cf. Date). A structure that occurs to me, in order to fit ἄρα into this line in accordance with metre and

style, presupposes transposition of words: \( \text{αἴνος} \) τις ἐν ἀρή, . . . (for the word-order, cf. Tr. 412: οὔδεν τι κρείσσω τῶν τὸ μὴδὲν ἦν ἄρα, Alcmeon in Corinth fr. 75 Kn.: ὁ παῖ Κρέοντος, ὡς ἀληθὲς ἦν ἄρα, IT 369: "Αἰδής Ἀχιλλείς ἦν ἄρα", οὔχ ὁ Πηλέως, Alexandros fr. 54 Kn.: κακὸν τι παίδευμι ἦν ἄρα εἷς εὐανδρίαν). Nevertheless, ἄρα may not be indispensable; it is absent in Ion 184-189, where the imperfect of εἰμί also occurs in the same sense (cf. Lee 1997, p. 179): οὔκ ἐν ταῖς ζαθέαις 'Ἀθά/- ναις εὐδικοίς ἦσαν αὖ/- λαί θεῶν μόνον οὔδ' ἁγι/- ἅτις θεραπεῖαι. ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ Λοξιαῖ/ τῶι Λατοῦς διδύμων προσώ/- πων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς. Hence, our line may not necessarily be corrupt and γάρ could be used as confirmatory (cf. Denniston 1954, p. 58), following the speaker's possible reference to the stratagem. The occurrence of the second γάρ in 1. 3 is not an obstacle, since the accumulation of γάρ is not rare in tragedy; cf. for instance, fr. 3, El. 368f., IT 1325, Hel. 1430, S. Ai. 20, 215, OT 317 and Denniston loc. cit. On balance, since the reading of the manuscripts can be accepted in stylistic and metrical terms, I would incline towards favouring the manuscript tradition.


of ‘riddle’ (‘to speak allegorically, in covert terms’, cf. indicatively Hdt. 5. 56, S. Ph. 1380).


2 λόγχη εὐστοχώτεροι: ‘more accurate with spear’; cf. Ph. 140: λόγχαι εὐστοχώτεροι, for λόγχη connoting βία as opposed to σοφία, cf. also Or. 712.


4 ἡμεῖς: the speaker, the addressee and women in general.

τυραννίδα: ‘absolute power’; the use of the adynaton as regards female dominance of men entails that it is the latter who have absolute power over women; this idea is strongly expressed in fr. 5 (cf. note ad loc.). For the range of connotations of τυραννος, cf. note on Dictys fr. 5.

Fr. 2:

This fragment contains a priamel (cf. note on ll. 1-7) stressing the delight felt by someone yearning for a child (l. 6: πῶθο δεδηγμένος) at the sight of a newborn (l. 7). Likewise, fr. 3 is spoken by an evidently old man (cf. l. 1f.), who is asserting the pleasures of parenthood and fr. 4 comments on the significance of male children for the preservation of the oikos (fr. 5 seems to reply to fr. 4). Acrisius' yearning for a male offspring is widely attested in mythography (cf. particularly Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler and [Apollod.] 2. 4.1) and he thus seems to be the likeliest speaker of the present fragment, expressing his enthusiasm at the
sight of a newborn child. Though we cannot absolutely dismiss the slight possibility that
the play introduced another character, whose situation in some way resembled that of
Acrisius, on present evidence it is difficult to assume that the old man of fr. 3 (cf. also Luc.
_D. Mar._ 12 describing him as γέρων) expressing the same joy and possibly also the speaker
of the thematically relevant fr. 4 could be someone other than Acrisius. In our effort to
roughly reconstruct the context, we should bear in mind that Danae probably tried to
protect her baby-son from his grandfather, perhaps in view of the oracle saying that
Acrisius would be killed by his grandson (cf. note on fr. 16) and also because of her illicit
pregnancy (cf. Structure, for the similar efforts of Melanippe, Auge, Canace and Alope to
protect their illegitimate offspring from their fathers). The reference to the newborn (fr. 2.
7) is far too specific to belong to the context of a general wish and could point to infant
Perseus, while the _καὶ νῦν_ in fr. 3. 1 hints to a particular fact, due to which the old man is
praising parenthood and advising other men not to delay begetting children. In addition,
frs. 2-5 occupying nineteen lines in total are evidently excessive for the expression of a
general hope, while the technique of priamel moving from the general to the specific also
points to a particular situation. Acrisius' affection towards the baby Perseus can only be
explained if we assume that he is ignorant of its identity. It is thus conceivable that the baby
may have been introduced to him under false pretences, namely as coming from a mother
other than Danae. The lines uttered possibly by Acrisius in fr. 3 (and fr. 4, which appears
to continue the thoughts expressed in fr. 3) seem to suggest that he has just begotten a male
offspring. Hence, on the basis of the evidence examined so far, it is conceivable —if
ultimately unprovable—that Perseus might have been presented to Acrisius as a solution to
his lack of a male descendant (namely as his own child or as an adopted one). In
Menander's _Samia_ a baby is cunningly introduced to his grandfather as his own son; given
Menander's trend to exploit Euripidean patterns by remodelling them to fit his own
dramatic purposes, if this situation in the _Samia_ originated in the supposedly similar

---

197 Webster (1967, p. 95) and Aélion (1986, p. 154) regarded frs. 2, 3 and 4 as merely expressive of Acrisius' wish for a son.
199 Cf. for instance, his probable reception of the general situation from E. _Auge_ and of the arbitration-scene
from E. _Alope_ in the _Epitrepontes_ (for the latter, cf. _Epitr._ 218-375), as well as of the messenger-speech from
circumstances of Euripides’ Danae, the allusion to the Danae in T6 might further point to the comic poet’s hypothetical debt to the Euripidean pattern.200

The speaker (i.e. possibly Acrisius) is addressing a female character, as evident from the vocative γύναι, which in tragedy denotes ‘lady’, ‘wife’, and also occurs as address to nurses (in Med. 136, Hipp. 267, 656). Danae is unlikely to have been the addressee, as she is a maiden and would have probably been called παι (cf. Heracl. 484, Hec. 172, 194, 513, Ph. 154, S. OC 188, 322, 330), τέκνοι (cf. Heracl. 539, 556, Hec. 172, 175, 180, Tr. 256, 345, 349, Ph. 139, 193, IA 638, 649, S. Ant. 855, OC 9, 81, 327, 845, 1102) or θύγατρε (cf. Hec. 334, 382, 415, 439, Ph. 1272, 1280, 1683, IA 665, 1117, S. OC 170, 225, 398). On the other hand, γύναι is a husband’s most common address to his wife (cf. Alc. 386, Hipp. 827, 841, HF 530, Hel. 779, IA 725, S. Ai. 685, OT 700, 726, 755, 767, 800). Though the nurse cannot be completely excluded as addressee, Acrisius is much likelier to have expressed his personal feelings of enthusiasm to his wife, if she had a role in the play,201 rather than the nurse.

1-7: A typical case of priamel, i.e. accumulation of parallel statements (illustrantia), which through contrast or comparison lead up to the idea with which the speaker is primarily concerned (illustrandum); cf. Fraenkel (1950) II, p. 407, n. 3. In priamels it is the notion of amplification (αδεξίας) that dominates, by which the superiority (υπεροχή) of the illustrandum is highlighted; cf. Arist. Rh. 1368a. 21-29 (and Cope and Sandys 1877, I p. 186). This is the case of a Contrast-Priamel (for this type of priamel, cf. particularly Krischer 1974, pp. 81-87 and Schmid 1964, pp. 51-66). The Contrast-Priamel in E. fr. inc. 1059. 1-4 Kn. follows the same structure (anaphora, connection of parallel examples with μέν-δέ and the use of ἄλλα to signal the climax, cf. also Kurtz 1985, p. 167f.): δεινὴ μὲν ἄλκη κυματων θαλασσίων,/ δειναὶ δὲ ποταμῶν καὶ πυρὸς θερμοῦ πνοϊ,/ δεινὸν δὲ πενία, δεινὰ δὲ ἄλλα μορία,/ ἄλλ' οὐδέν οὕτω δεινὸν ὡς γυνὴ κακὸν. Cf. the Contrast-Priamel in fr. 6 (and note ad loc.). We have numerous cases of priamel in Greek literature; cf. Il. 6. 450-455, Od. 11. 416-420, 24. 87-92, Hes. Op. 435f. (and West 1978 ad loc.), Sol. fr. 9 W.,

structural and thematic patterns from Euripides’ Alcmeon in Corinth, which recur in Menander’s Periceirnome.

200 Cf. Jouan and van Looy (2000) p. 59f. Likewise, the quotation of Auge fr. 265a Kn. in Epitr. 1123-1126 may be Menander’s acknowledgement of his debt to the Euripidean play, of which he seems to have borrowed the general situation; cf. Hunter (1985) p. 135f.


The present Priamel focuses on the idea of prosperity and beauty, as introduced by the *illustrantia* (sunlight, calmness of sea, *the locus amoenus*, cf. below), reaching its climax with the *illustrandum* (the radiance of a new-born child and the happiness it brings).

1 καλὸν: van Herwerden's emendation of the transmitted reading φιλὸν, in view of the constant occurrence of καλὸν in ll. 2, 4 and 5. A case of anaphora, which frequently occurs in priamels; cf. fr. 6, Hipp. 530-532, Ba. 902-911 (and Dodds 19602 ad loc.), fr. inc. 1059. 1-4 Kn., ll. 9. 378-391, 13. 729-734, 14. 315-328, 394-401, Tyrtaeus fr. 12. 1-14 W., Alcman fr. 1. 64-77, S. Tr. 1058-1063 (and Davies 1991a, p. 239f.). Professor C. Carey draws my attention to passages such as Alc. 722: φιλὸν τὸ φέγγος τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ, φιλὸν, also Tr. 1157: λυπρὸν θέαμα κοῦ φιλὸν λεύσειν ἐμοὶ, Andromeda fr. 122. 20f. Kn.: ὦ γὰρ ἐξ ἀθανάτων φλόγα λεύσειν/ ἐστίν ἐμοὶ φιλὸν, ὡς ἐκρεμάσθην, by recollection of which the reading φιλὸν may have replaced καλὸν. This is one of many instances in Greek literature of answers to the question what is τὸ κάλλιστον or τὸ ἠδιστον; from the many examples cited by Fraenkel (1950, II p. 407f.), cf. indicatively Thgn. 255f., Bacch. Epin. 4. 18-20, E. Heracl. 892-896 (and Wilkins 1993, p. 170), Ar. Pax 1140, Av. 785.

φέγγος ἤλιον τόδε: τόδε implies that the speaker may be pointing to the sun. Sunlight often connotes joy, brightness and prosperity, as in A. Ag. 1577, Danaides fr. 43 R., S. Ant. 100 (and Griffith 1999 ad loc.), E. Supp. 650, 990 (and Collard 1975a ad loc.), El. 586 (and Denniston 1939 ad loc.). Cf. Pi. fr. 52k M., where the disappearance of the sun is taken as a sign of danger. Sunlight is one of the *illustrantia* also in the priamel in Pi. O. 1.5. The reference to sunshine could also be related to the *locus amoenus* of l. 3 (for sunlight as a standard feature in this kind of imagery, cf. indicatively Thesleff 1981, p. 32).

ιδεῖν: cf. its repetition in ll. 5 and 7. It occurs regularly in priamels focusing on what is τὸ κάλλιστον or τὸ ἱδιόστον (cf. note on l. 1); cf. Heracl. 895f.: τερπόν δὲ τι καὶ φίλων ἄρ' εὔτυχιαν ἰδέσθαι, A. Ag. 900: κάλλιστον ἡμαρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χεύματος, Asclepiades A.P. 5. 169ff.: ἦδυ τέρνους διψοῦσιν χιόν ποτόν, ἦδυ δὲ ναῦταις / ἐκ χευμάνως ιδεῖν εἰαρινῶν Στέφανον, Lucr. 2. 1-7 and Fraenkel (1950) II p. 408.


πλούσιον ὀδόφ: Pace Meineke (who suggested ποτάμιον ὀδόφ) and Kurtz (1985, p. 166), I can see no particular reason why the reading πλούσιον may need emendation: it occurs here in the sense of 'ample, abundant' (LSJ 5), as in A.R. fr. 2 Powell: πλούσιον Νείλου, cf. also E. Hel. 295f.: πρὸς πλούσίαν τράπεζαν Ἰζους', Tr. 1249: πλούσιων κτερισμάτων, Or. 394: ὁ δαίμων δ' ἐς ἐμὲ πλούσιος κακῶν. Water in abundance is a blessing, considering its life-sustaining qualities, and fits the context of fertility and family growth; cf. Hipp. 121-128, Archelaus fr. 228. 2: κάλλιστον ἐκ γαίας ὀδόφ, also Il. 14. 246, Pi. O. 11. 2f., Hdt. 7. 16, Pl. Euthyd. 304b. 3f., Schol. vet. Pi. O. 1. 1d-1e (Drachmann) and Rudhardt (1971) p. 117. Owing to its vital role, water often appears among illustrantia in priamels; cf. Pi. O. 1. 1 (and Instone 1996 ad loc.), 3. 42, Bacchyl. 3. 85ff.


λαμπρόν: literally ‘bright, radiant’ and metaphorically ‘joyous, splendid’. Here, it is used both literally alluding to φέργος ἥλιον (l. 1) and metaphorically, referring to the illustrandum, i.e. the splendid sight of the newborn (l. 7). Cf. the similar phrasing in Ar. Pl. 144: εἰ τί γ' ἔστι λαμπρόν καὶ καλὸν, also Pi. P. 8. 97, A. Ch. 810, S. El. 1130, OT 81, E. Supp. 608.

6 ἀκαίρια: For the significance of having children, cf. note on fr. 4. 3-4 (for male children) and on Dictys fr. 2. 6.


7 παίδων νεογνῶν φῶς: I agree with Friis-Johansen (1959, p. 42f., n. 81) and Prof. Kannicht (2004, I p. 372) that the reading of the manuscript-tradition should be kept, firstly because light is frequently used as metaphor for a long-desired and precious person (and in more general terms, for deliverance and happiness); to HF 531: ὁ φῶς μολὼν πατρὶ and Ion 1439 (cf. Lee 1997 ad loc.): ὁ τέκνων, ὁ φῶς μητρὶ κρείσσον ἥλιον, which are cited by Kannicht ad loc., I would add IT 848f. (with reference to Orestes): μοι συνομαίμονα τόνδε

65
The speaker of these lines is evidently an old man (cf. l. 1: πάσι τοῖς νεατέροις, l. 2: πρὸς τὸ γῆρας, l. 4: πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ). So far as our evidence goes, it is difficult to suppose that this old man is someone other than Acrisius (Lucian in D. Mar. 12.1 also describes him as old). The phrase καὶ νῦν seems to allude to a particular event, which leads Acrisius to praise parenthood (and more precisely, the merits of begetting a male offspring, since he already has a daughter, cf. l. 6: συννεᾶζων ἥνοι παῖς νέῳ πατρί for the relationship of fathers with their sons, even more explicitly in fr. 4 and for Acrisius' desire for a son, cf. also Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler and [Apollod.] 2. 4.1) As very tentatively observed in the introductory note on fr. 2 (taking also frs. 3 and 4 into account), Acrisius might be regarding baby Perseus as the solution to his lack of a male descendant, in ignorance of its true identity. His reference to marriage at an old age in our fragment (l. 2 and the parenthesis in l. 3f.) may not necessarily reflect his own situation (though if it does, it would bear implications as to whether his wife in the play—and presumably the addressee of fr. 2— is Eurydice, Danae's mother, or he has re-married or has a pallake, like Amyntor in the Phoenix); it appears more like an incidental detail, to judge also by the parenthesis, which serves as clarification in passing. Moreover, it is worth bearing in mind that Euripidean rhetoric often moves beyond the limits of the immediate situation; cf. Med. 230-251 (and Page 1938, p. 89, Mastronarde 2002 ad loc.), where Medea identifies herself with the chorus as to the nature of female misfortune, though not all the examples, which she gives, apply to her own situation. Cf. on a larger scale, the generalizing discourses in Hipp.

375-387 (and Barrett 1964, p. 275, Schadewaldt 1966, pp. 119, 122f.), Hec. 592-602 and Conacher (1981) pp. 9-17, 22-25. Likewise, our speaker may be pointing out the general fact that having children at an old age—which is his preoccupation—usually results from getting married late, thus referring to a norm, in order to substantiate his position.

2 τοὺς γάμους ποιομένους: Nauck suggested ἀναβολὰς ποιομένους referring to Men. Thesaurus fr. 176. 8 K.-A.: οἱ δ᾽ εἰς τὸ γῆρας ἀναβολὰς ποιομένου. His conjecture is consistent with metre, as resolutions of the third longum occur frequently in Euripides’ early plays (cf. Cropp and Fick 1985, p. 29f., Devine and Stephens 1980, p. 66, Ceadel 1941, p. 72f.). Nevertheless, there is no compelling reason why the manuscript reading should be questioned. Moreover, the word ἀναβολὰς creates tautology with σχολὴ (1. 3: ‘tardily’), while μή πρὸς τὸ γῆρας τοὺς γάμους ποιομένους is clearly explained by the parenthesis in 1. 3f. (why one should not get married at an old age: οὔ γὰρ ἡδονή/ γυναικὶ δ᾽ ἐχθρὸν χρῆμα πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ), which looked redundant with Nauck’s conjecture.

4 γυναικὶ δ᾽ ἐχθρὸν χρῆμα πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ: Jouan and van Looy deleted this line, as it seemed redundant on the basis of Nauck’s conjecture on 1. 2 (cf. note ad loc.). As argued above, however, the parenthesis (in ll. 3-4) aptly serves to explain the shortcomings of marriage at an old age (l. 2: μὴ πρὸς τὸ γῆρας τοὺς γάμους ποιομένους) and should thus be preserved. The same idea occurs in Phoenix fr. 807 Kn.: πικρὸν νέα γυναικὶ πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ, fr. 804 Kn., Aeolus fr. 23 Kn.: ἄλλ’ ἡ τὸ γῆρας τὴν Κύπριν χαϊρειν ἐξ/ ἢ τ’ Ἀρροδίτη τοῖς γέρουσιν ἐχθεῖται. Cf. also Thgn. 457-460: οὗ τοις σύμφωνοι ἐστὶ γυνὴ νέα ἀνήρ γέροντι/ οὔ γὰρ πτυβάλιον πείθεται ὡς ἄκατος,/ οὗτ’ ἄγκυρας ἐχουσίν· ἀπορρήξασα δὲ δεσμὰ/ πολλάκις ἐκ νυκτῶν ἄλλον ἐχει λιμένα (parodied in Theophilus’ Neoptolemus fr. 6 K.-A.).

Old age entails physical debilitation and disfigurement; in Greek consciousness to become old was to become ugly and physically undesirable. Traditional epithets for old age occur as early as Homer: cf. σταγερόν (‘hateful’, II. 19. 316), λυγρόν (‘miserable’, II. 10. 79, 18. 434, 23. 644), χαλεπόν (‘harsh’, II. 8. 103, 23. 623, Od. 11. 196). In Hes. Th. 211-225 Γῆρας, the personification of old age, is mentioned in the same context with other antisocial monstrosities. As in the present case, distress over aging often acquires an erotic focus; cf. for instance, h. Hom. Ven. 218-238, Minm. frr. 1, 4, 5 W., Sappho fr. 58 L.-P., Thgn. 1131, Crates fr. inc. 18 K.-A., A.P. 11. 51. Cf. on the other hand, the comic chorus of elders in Ar.


6: συννέαζων: ‘to be young with another’ (LSJ9); this is the sole occurrence of the verb in its compound form with σῶν before the fourth century AD (cf. Philostr. VS 2. 21.2, Alciphr. Ep. 4. 18.3), while in its simple form it occurs in Ph. 713, 1619, also A. Supp. 105, Ag. 764, S. Tr. 144, OC 374. For the idea expressed in this line, cf. particularly Men. fr. inc. 831 K.-A.: ὃς ἠδο πράξει καὶ νεάζων τῷ πρόσωποι πατήρ. In Menander, however, the focalizer is the son, while in Euripides it is the father, which reflects the emphasis throughout the fragment on the parent’s benefits and joy. Ἡδο δείκνυε nicely balances ηδονή in l. 3; pleasure is to have children while still young.

Fr. 4:

These lines asserting the significance of a male offspring for one’s oikos seem to be related to frr. 2 and 3 (praising parenthood, particularly the birth of a son, for Acrisius’ desire for a son, cf. Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler and [Apollod.] 2. 4.1, cf. also introductory note on fr. 3) and could have been uttered by the same person, i.e. Acrisius204, who might be regarding baby Perseus as a solution to his lack of a male heir, ignorant of its identity (cf. Structure and introductory notes on frr. 2 and 3). This passage offers an interesting insight into Euripides’ rhetorical ability to approach the same issue from different perspectives depending on the situation, in which his characters find themselves;205 while in Medea’s monologue (Med. 230-251, cf. similarly Procne’s rhesis in S. Tereus fr. 583 R.) the maiden’s transition from her natal to the marital oikos is described as a traumatic experience from the female perspective, the same process is viewed here from the male point of view in pragmatic rather than emotional terms.

---

1 γυνὴ γάρ: this reading is transmitted in Stob. 4. 22g. 148, whereas Stob. 4. 24c. 34 reads γυνὴ μέν. Though the latter is wholly acceptable in terms of syntax, it renders the passage more self-contained and thus more suitable for anthologies, unlike γάρ, which tends to be replaced in anthology excerpts, where possible, in view of its links with the context of the passage; cf. West (1973) p. 18 citing two excerpts from Solon (frr. 6.3, 15.1 W.) in Theognis 153, 315, where τοι has substituted γάρ, in order to make the quotations self-contained. Hence, on the basis of the principle utrum in alterum abiturum erat, γάρ seems likelier to be the original reading of the present fragment, introducing the speaker’s explanation of his preference of male to female offspring.

2 οὐ τῶν τεκόντων ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ λέγουσ: a maiden’s kyrios (i.e. the man responsible for her legal representation and her general welfare) was her father until she was given to marriage, from which point onwards she would be under the tutelage of her husband (cf. Is. iii 2.3, where the husband acts as his wife’s kyrios, and MacDowell 1978, p. 84f., Erdmann 1934, pp. 267-276, Foley 1981, p. 129f.). Nevertheless, it seems that in certain cases a girl’s bonds with her native family were not completely cut off; according to the law of the epiclerate (established by Solon, cf. Plut. Sol. 20. 2-3), in the absence of a male heir, one’s oikos could be perpetuated through a daughter, the ‘epicleros’, who even if already married, could be claimed in marriage by her father’s nearest relative, in order to produce a son, who would become the kyrios of her father’s oikos (cf. Is. iii 64, x 19 and Harrison 1968, II pp. 132-138, Todd 1993, p. 230f., Cox 1998, pp. 94-99). In addition, the father had the moral authority to dissolve his daughter’s marriage (whether his authority was also legally established is unclear; cf. D. xli 4, Men. Epitr. 655-724, P. Didot fr. adesp. 1000 K.-A. and Scafuro 1997, pp. 307-309, Harrison 1968, II pp. 30-32, Just 1989, p. 74f.). The ending of a marriage would entail return of the woman’s dowry, which according to the engye does not belong to the husband, but its purpose is to procure for her sons a share in the estate of their maternal family (cf. Wolff 1944, pp. 48-50, 61f. and Foxhall 1989, p. 37f.).

The strictly patrilinear type of succession, to which the speaker refers, was a typical feature of marriage-law in fifth-century Athens. In Heroic Greece, however, to which Danae’s legend belongs, the matrilinear pattern of succession (i.e. transmission of inheritance and kingship through the female line by marriage to the king’s daughter) was

On the basis of our evidence, the ambiguous position of women between their natal and marital oikos seems to have been an issue in fifth-century Athens and is a recurring theme especially in Euripidean drama; Euadne (Supp. 1034-1071), Laodameia (in E. Protesilaus, as attested in Hyg. fabb. 103, 104, Schol. Eust. ll. 2. 701 van der Valk, [Apollod.] Ep. 3. 30) and possibly Alphesiboea (if the plot of E. Alcmeon in Psophis is reflected in [Apollod.] 3. 7.5f.) clash with their natal families for their husbands’ sake (cf. Seaford 1990a, pp. 151-156, 165f. and Blundell 1995, p. 118f.). Cf. also Men. Epitr. 714-724 and fr. adesp. 1000 K.-A. On the other hand, Proce’s speech in S. Tereus fr. 583. 6-12 R. is expressive of the maiden’s sorrow at her departure from the paternal household: ὅταν δ’ ἐς ἠβήν ἐξικόμεθ' ἐμφρονεῖ, / ὡθοῦμεθ' ἔξω καὶ διεμπολώμεθα/ θεῶν πατρῴων τῶν τε

3-4: a male offspring ensures the perpetuation of his father’s oikos by inheriting the paternal estate and undertaking the task of keeping the domestic cult and tending the family graves (cf. note ad loc.). According to a law introduced by Solon, a man without any sons could make a will disposing of his property to an adopted heir (Is. ii 10, 13, 46f., cf. Rubinstein 1993, pp. 68-76, underlining that on the basis of the sources, the need to perpetuate the oikos and its cults are the driving force in adoption, also Harrison 1968, II pp. 82-96 and Garland 1998, p. 66). Cf. Ἰτ. Ἰτ. 57: στύλοι γάρ οἰκῶν πατέσει εἰσιν ἄρσενες, 697f., 984f., Α. Ἀγ. 896-898 (and Fraenkel 1950 ad loc.): λέγουμ’ ἄν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κόρα,/ σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλής στέγης/ στύλον ποδήρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί, Ἰ. Α. 1394 (and Stockert 1992, p. 589): εἶς γ' ἀνὴρ κρείσσον γυναικῶν μυρίων ὀρῶν φῶς, Α. θ. 564f., Eccl. 549, also Ar. θ. 502-516 (for one’s yearning for a son, and

4 θεῶν πατρᾶ φων καὶ τάφων: succession from father to son involved not only material inheritance, but also the primary duty of preserving the sacra of the house, that is, domestic religion and the observances in honour of the dead ancestors (ἀγγελείας ἱερῶν καὶ ὀσίων); cf. Is. ii 46, vi 47, iv 19, D. xxxix 35, xili 51, 65 and Harrison (1968) I pp. 123, 130 and n. 2 and 3. Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 55. 2-3) refers to the scrutiny of candidates for the higher magistracies in Athens as to whether they have in their households altars of Ζεύς Ἐρκείως and Ἀπόλλων Πατρᾶ φως and where their family-tombs are, which indicates that these criteria served as proof of Athenian citizenship (cf. D. lvii 66 and Sjövall 1931, pp. 30f., 35). Zeus Herkeios was regarded as protecting blood-ties and the authority of the head of the household as early as Homer (cf. Il. 11. 771-775, Od. 22. 335, Hdt. 6. 68, S. Ant. 487 and Jebb 19003, p. 96, Griffith 1999, p. 350, E. Tr. 17, schol. Pl. Euthyd. 302d Greene, Harpocration s.v. Ἐρκείως Ζεύς p. 134 Dindorff and Nilsson 1940, p. 66f., Burkert 1985, p. 255, Vernant 1980, p. 97). In Pherecydes’ account of Danae’s legend (fr. 10 Fowler, cf. the Myth, p. 10), it is at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, where Acrisius adjures Danae to reveal who seduced her, appealing to their kinship and to his own authority over her as head of the household. The domestic cult of Apollo Patrōs became public in Athens towards the end of the fifth century and was closely associated with the organization of phratries in the fourth century (cf. Plut. Alec. 2 and Hedrick 1988, Nilsson 19672, I p. 556f., Farnell 1896-1909, IV pp. 154, 373, n. 54). Hestia, the goddess of the domestic hearth, was the least anthropomorphic of all household deities and details of her cult are scanty; she was honoured first in libations (cf. h. Hom. Vest. 4-6, E. Phaethon fr. 781.35 Kn. and Diggle 1970, p. 161, S. Chryses fr. 726 R.), cf. also Hes. Op. 733f., 748f., h. Hom. Ven. 29f., E. Alec. 162, HF 599 (and Bond 1981 ad loc.) and Rose (1957) p. 104f. For her public cult in the Prytaneia of the Greek states, cf. Farnell (1896-1909) V pp. 369-373. The figure of Zeus Patrōs represented paternal authority and filial obligation towards parents (cf. El.
worshipped in phratries in Chios, Delphi and Ionia, but apart from literary references there is no archaeological evidence for his cult in Athens (cf. De Schutter 1987, p. 121, n. 105, Sjövall 1931, pp. 50-52). A widespread domestic cult was that of Zeus Ktēsios ‘the god of the store-room’, who ensured the prosperity and imperishability of the household (cf. A. Supp. 442-445 and Friis Johansen and Whittle 1980, p. 352, Ag. 1038 and Denniston and Page 1957 ad loc., Is. viii 16, Men. Pseud. fr. 410 K.-A., Sud. s.v. Ζεύς Κτήσιος ζ 40 Adler and Rose 1957, pp. 100-103, Sjövall 1931, pp. 53-58); his symbol was a jar containing ambrosia (a mixture of water, honey and various fruits), into which things found by chance were to be put (cf. Ath. 473 B-C). On other domestic cults of Zeus, such as Melichios and Philios, cf. Sjövall 1931, pp. 75-116. For the necessity of preserving the cults of the household, cf. Heracl. 877 (and Wilkins 1993 ad loc.), Ph. 604, h. Hom. Ven. 29f., A. Th. 582, 640, 914, 1010, 1018, Pers. 404f., Supp. 704, S. El. 67, 411, 1135, Ant. 199, 659, 839, 938 (and Griffith 1999 ad loc.), Ph. 933, Ar. Ach. 1527, V. 388 (and Sommerstein 1983 ad loc.), [D.] vii 17, Aeschin. ii 152, Lycurg. i 25, X. Hell. 2. 4.21.


τιμήρος: doric form, here in the sense of ‘one who pays honour to s.o/sth.’ (cf. Pi. O. 9. 84), and ‘protector, succourer’ (cf. A. Supp. 42, Ag. 514). It also denotes ‘avenger’ (cf. A. Ag. 1280, 1324, 1578, Ch. 143) and widely occurs in its contract attic form τιμῷρος (cf. Hdt. 2. 141, 4. 200, 7. 171, Antiph. 1. 2, 5. 37, S. El. 14, 811, E. Hec. 790, 843, El. 676, Th. 4. 2.3, Pl. Lg. 716a, 872e). In late epic it occurs as τιμήρος; cf. A.R. 4. 709, 1309, 1323, 1358, Nonn. D. 2. 567, 8. 70, 26. 80, 30. 207 and EM s.v. τιμήροι (τ 759 Gaisford): ἔρως καὶ ἐφοροῖ.
Fr. 5:

These lines are spoken by a female character (cf. γυναῖκες and the first person plural) asserting the disadvantaged position of women and seem to stand in agreement with the remark in fr. 4 (possibly spoken by Acrisius, cf. introductory note ad loc.), which is stressing the significance of having a son rather than a daughter for the preservation of one’s οἶκος. Our fragment could have been spoken by the female chorus-leader, in view of the clearly consenting tone of the distich (cf. Alc. 369f., Med. 906f., Hipp. 431f., HF 583f., 1311f., Hel. 1030f., IA 469f., 504f., 917f.), which is stressed by the use of συμματωριῶ and the pleonasm πανταξοῦ- πάσαι- ἀεὶ. Another candidate may be the addressee of fr. 4 (which is thematically related to frs. 2 and 3 and if they all belonged to the same context, Acrisius’ interlocutor may have been his wife, cf. introductory note on fr. 2). In such a case, the sweeping acceptance of female inferiority might be disingenuous, with the purpose of manipulating Acrisius, if we take into account the possible stratagem implied in fr. 1. The pleonasm πανταξοῦ- πάσαι- ἀεὶ could thus be very effective. Cf. Medea and Clytaemestra outmaneuvering Jason (Med. 869-905 and Mastronarde 2002, p. 312f.) and Agamemnon (A. Ag. 861-905) respectively, by appealing to their female weakness. The possibility that these lines were uttered in the context of a deliberation-scene perhaps between Danae and her nurse, in which case fr. 1 might have followed our fragment as a contrasting reference to female intellect, may seem less likely in view of the occurrence of δίκα; the speaker does not just allege that ‘we women are inferior to men’, which could be a preparation for the reference to female dolos as the sole means of subverting male power, but that ‘we women are deficient without men’, that is, ‘we need men’. This statement may allude to the fact that women are under male tutelage throughout their lives, which could further connect this distich to the idea expressed in fr. 4. 1-2.

The same notion occurs in E. Supp. 40f.: πάντα γὰρ δι’ ἄφενενων/ γυναῖξι πράσσειν εἰκός αἵτινες σοφοί, A. Ag. 861f. (part of Clyteamestra’s intrigue, cf. above): τὸ μὲν γυναῖκα πρῶτον ἄφενος δίκας/ ἡσθαί δόμως ἐρημον ἑκατάλοι κακόν, and on female inferiority in general, cf. Med. 230f.: πάντων δ’ ὅσ’ ἐστ’ ἐμψυχα καὶ γνώμην ἐχει/ γυναῖκές


1 συμμαρτυρώ: ‘to bear witness with/ in support of s.o.’, cf. S. Ph. 438: ξυμμαρτυρώ σοι, El. 1224: ὁ φίλτατον φώς. - φίλτατον, ξυμμαρτυρώ, E. Hipp. 286: καὶ σὺ μοι ξυμμαρτυρήσῃς, Hec. 1080, IA 1158: συμμαρτυρήσεις ὡς ἀμεμπτος ἢ γυνῆ, Solon fr. 36.3
Fr. 6:


The emphasis on the futility of guarding a woman points to the disclosure of Danae’s seduction. Such a disparaging statement on female misconduct must have naturally been uttered by a man and the likeliest candidate is Acrisius,209 whose effort to restrain his daughter by enclosing her in the bronze chamber—if Euripides chose to follow the mythical tradition— has proved to be fruitless. There is no evidence as to how Danae’s illicit motherhood was revealed, though fr. 7 (praising the power of gold over love) and frr. 8-11 (possibly from an agon on the power of wealth, cf. introductory note on fr. 8) seem to support the widely held view that Acrisius may have found the pieces of gold in her chamber, thus inferring that she was bribed to be seduced (cf. introductory note on fr. 7). The present fragment may thus hint at the reversal of dramatic action, which could have

brought about the *agon* on the power of wealth possibly between Danae and Acrisius (frr. 8-12) and her self-sacrifice by choosing to be exposed together with her baby-son (frr. 13, 14).


1 οὔτε τείχος οὔτε χρήματα: the *illustrantia* refer to basic elements ensuring the well-being of the *polis* (city-wall) and prosperity in private life (domestic wealth), thus pointing out the necessity as well as difficulty of guarding a woman. If the speaker is Acrisius, as he seems to be, the reference to χρήματα could hint at his preoccupation with the value of wealth, which is what is alleged in the possible *agon* (cf. frr. 7, 8-10 likely to have been uttered by Acrisius).

2 δυσφύλακτον: here 'hard to guard', cf. its similar usage in Plb. 2. 55.2, D.S. 15. 68.5 (for cities), and Strabo 9. 3.8 (for wealth), 11. 4.2, Plut. *Mor.* 49b and E. *Andr.* 727f.: ἀνεμένων τι χρήμα πρεσβυτῶν γένος καὶ δυσφύλακτον ἀξιωθυμίας ὕπο ('hard to keep off'), *Ph.* 924: δυσφύλακτ' οἴνει κακά ('hard to avert').

Though the comment on the difficulty of guarding a woman arises from the particular situation of Danae's seclusion, the generalizing overtones of the statement could also allude to sexual segregation in Classical Athens, which aimed to ensure female chastity before marriage and thus the production of legitimate offspring (cf. Lys. 1 33). The dignity of the *oikos* was regarded as concerning the *polis* as a whole, since any son of a married Athenian woman would receive the rights of Athenian citizenship. Hence, female honour involved sexual purity and male honour assumed the responsibility of defending the purity of the female members of his household; cf. *Heracl.* 43f. (and Allan 2001 ad loc.): νέας

The difficulty of guarding a woman, as asserted in our fragment, reveals men’s perception of female sexuality; cf. Med. 569-573, Hipp. 967-970, Andr. 220f., Ion 1090-1095 (and Lee 1997, p. 278), also Hes. fr. 275 M.-W., Anaxandr. fr. inc. 61 K.-A., Men. Sam. 349f. and Cohen (1991) p. 144f., Dover (1974) p. 101f. A law established by Solon, but perhaps not applied in the fifth and fourth century, allowed fathers to sell as slaves any unmarried daughters who had lost their virginity (Plut. Sol. 23. 2). Likewise, Aeschines (i 182) refers to the cruel punishment of a seduced daughter, who was imprisoned by her father in a deserted house together with a horse; cf. schol. ad loc. (Dilts). The social issue of a maiden’s seduction and her clash with her natal family seems to have preoccupied Euripides in his Danae, Alope, Melanippe the Wise and Auge, where the father-daughter confrontation appears to have been a climactic point in dramatic action (cf. Structure); cf. Alope fr. 109 Kn. (probably uttered by Cercyon): οὐ μὴν σὺ γ’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς τεκόντας ἢδεσω, fr. 111 Kn.: τί δήτα μοχθεῖν δεῖ γυναικεῖον γένος/ φρουροῦντας; αὐ γὰρ εἰ τεθραμμέναι πλέον/ σφάλλουσιν οἴκους τῶν παρημελημένων (cf. Borecky 1955, p. 88f., Karamanou 2003, p. 34f.), Melanippe the Wise fr. 485 Kn. (prose paraphrase in [D.H.] Rhet. 9. 11.34, the speaker is Melanippe): ἐὰν δὲ παρθένος φθορεῖσα ἐξέθηκεν τὰ παιδία καὶ φοβομένη τὸν πατέρα, σὺ φόνον δράσεις; fr. 497 Kn. (assigned to Hellen or Aeolus against Melanippe and
likelier to belong to the Wise rather than the Captive Melanippe, cf. Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.): τείσασθε τήνδε· καὶ γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν νοσεῖ· τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν· οἱ μὲν ἢ παιδῶν πέρυ· ἢ συγγενεῖς εἰνεκ’ οὐκ ἀκόλουσαν κακὴν λαβόντες· εἰτα τοῦτο τάδικοι· πολλαῖς ὑπερήφανε καὶ χωρεῖ πρόσωπο· ἀστ’ ἐξητιλος ἀρετή καθίσταται. Similarly, Naevius’ Danae evidently touched on the social aspect of the girl’s seduction, to judge from fr. 5 Traglia: eam nunc esse inventam probris compotem scis and fr. 7 Traglia (and his note ad loc.): desubito famam tollunt, si quam salam vide in via (the notion of impropriety for a maiden to be seen in public, cf. The Myth, p. 18). In these plays, the father, the kyrios, often imprisons his daughter after the disclosure of her misconduct, using spatial confinement as a means of reasserting his control over her; cf. Seaford (1990b) pp. 81, 84 and Guidorizzi (2000) p. 468.

Fr. 7:

This fragment illustrates the overwhelming power of gold over people and even over love. The widely held view is that Acrisius may have uttered these lines upon discovering the pieces of gold left from Zeus’ transformation, assuming that his daughter was seduced by a rich man (it has been suggested that Amphitryon in the Alcmene could have made the same assumption, on the basis of frs. 95, 96 Kn.). This possibility can be supported by a number of factors in combination: (a) the reference to gold in a play about Danae reasonably points to Zeus’ transformation into golden shower (b) the association of Cypris with gold links this fragment with fr. 8 stressing the power of money over love (and on a larger scale, with fr. 9 for wealth as a basic criterion for marriage), which could be assigned to Acrisius in the context of an agon possibly between him and Danae (cf. introductory note on fr. 8) and (c) there are many references to Danae’s seduction as bribery after Euripides (and not before, on the basis of the available evidence): cf. T6, Hedylus 1865-70 G.-P. (and Gow-Page 1965 ad loc.), Antipater A.P. 5. 31, Parmenion A.P. 33, 34, Ov. Am. 3. 8.29ff., Petron. Sat. 137 (and Walsh 1996, p. 200), Mart. 14. 175 (and Leary 1996, p. 237), Hor.

As noted above, this fragment is thematically related to frr. 8-12, the rhetorical argumentation of which points to the context of an agon (cf. introductory note on fr. 8), where Acrisius could have accused Danae of having been overwhelmed by gold and thus bribed to be seduced (frr. 8-10) and she may have refuted the accusation by denouncing wealth (frr. 11-12). The present fragment is a general reflection evidently motivated by the disclosure of Danae’s seduction (for such exclamations commenting on one’s conduct, cf. note on l. 1) and does not display the argumentative character of frr. 8-12, which locates them in the context of a formal debate with much probability. Nevertheless, it is consistent with the view held in frr. 8-10 and may thus fit the beginning or closure of Acrisius’ possible rhesis in the debate; cf. similarly the general reflections at the start of the agonistic speeches in Hipp. 935-942 (and Barrett 1964, p. 335), Andr. 183-185, 693-702, Ph. 469-472, 499-502 and at the closure of Medea’s rhesis in Med. 516-519 (and Mastronarde 2002, p. 256), also Friis Johansen (1959) pp. 152-155 and n. 17, p. 158, n. 26.

Aphrodite’s association with gold originates in Homer, where she is the only goddess to be described as ‘golden’; cf. Il. 3. 64 (μή μοι δόρ’ ἐρετά πρόφερε χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης), 5. 427 (χρυσῆ Αφροδίτη), 9. 389, 19. 282 (χρυσῆ Αφροδίτη), 22. 470, 24. 699 and Od. 4. 14 (ἐν εἰδος ἔσι χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης), 8. 337, 342, 17. 37, 19. 54. However ornamental the Homeric epithet may have been, the image of ‘golden Aphrodite’ recurs in Mimn. fr. 1 W. (τι δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης). Thgn. 1381f. (χρυσῆς Κυπρογενοῦς), Bacch. Epin. 5. 174 (ἂν ἐτι χρυσάεας Κύπριος θελζμβρότου), Theoc. 15. 101 (χρυσῷ παιζου Ἀφροδίτη), Philodemus A.P. 5. 121 (ὁ χρυσῆς Κύπρι), Antipater A.P. 5. 30 (χρυσῆν ὅτι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, ἐξοχά καὶ πάντων εἴπεν ὁ Μαιονίδης) and D.S. 1. 97 (τὴν τε Ἀφροδίτην ὁμομάζεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις χρυσῆν ēκ παλαιῶς παραδόσεως, καὶ
Likewise, in this praise of the power of gold, Euripides seems to be 'playing' with Cypris' irresistible 'golden gaze', which rouses erotic passion (cf. the textual note on l. 5), and relating it to Danae's situation and to the false inference that she was bribed with gold. Cf. Eustathius' interpretation of Danae's seduction as bribery in his scholium on 'golden Aphrodite' (schol. II. 3.64 van der Valk): χρυσὴ δὲ Αφροδίτη ἡ χρυσοφόρος, ὡς καὶ χάλκεος Ἀρης διὰ τὸ φόρμημα, ἢ ἢ καλὴ ἢ, δεὶ χρυσῷ καταπράττεται, ὁ καὶ Ζεὺς τὴν Δανάην χειροῦται.


TrGF II fr. adesp. 129 Kn.-Sn. deriving from a choral ode presents a striking similarity with our fragment as to the illustration of the overwhelming power of gold over love and nature as a whole (Hartung 1843-1844, I p. 92 attempted to associate this fragment with the Danae, on the basis of the common theme): ὁ χρυσός, βλάστημα χθονός, ὁ οὖν ἐρωτὰ βροτοῦσι φλέγεισ', ἐν πάντων κρατιστεύουσιν τύραννι/ πολέμοισι δ' Ἀρεσικ/ κρείσσον/ ἔχον δύναμιν, ἐν τῷ πάντα θέλεις: ἐπὶ γὰρ Ὀρφείας μὲν ἰδιαίτερο εἴπετο δέντρα καὶ/ θηρῶν ἀνόητα γένη, σοι δὲ καὶ χθῶν πάσα καὶ πόντος καὶ ὁ παμμηστῶρ Ἀρης. Greek poetry abounds in praises of gold as the most valuable of commodities; cf. Od. 1. 165, 6. 232, Alcman PMG fr. 1. 54, Sol. fr. 24. 2 W., Simon. PMG fr. 12, Pi. O. 1. 1f. (and Gerber 1982, p. 10f.): ὁ χρυσός αἰθιόμενον πῦρ/ ἀπε τειχώμεναι νυκτὶ μεγάλορος ἔξοχα πλωτοῦ, 2. 72, 3. 42: κτενάνων δὲ/ χρυσός αἰθιόπετατος, 13. 78, N. 4. 82f., I. 5. 1-3, E. Med. 965:

δεξιάμα: ‘welcome thing’ (LSJ 9); rare word from δεξιόμαι ‘to greet, to welcome’, hence ‘gift most welcome to men’ (Jebb’s translation 1900 b, p. 105), with two further occurrences before Byzantine Greek as ‘pledge or mark of friendship’ in S. OC 619 (with Jebb 1900 b and Kamerbeek 1984 ad loc.) and D.Chr. Iviii 5. P. Ross. Georg. (preserving an excerpt from an anthology from Hellenistic Egypt dated in the second century BC) and certain mss of Athenaeus, Lucian and Athenagoras read δεξιάμα, which occurs as a variant for δεξιόμα also in some mss of S. OC 619. Δεξιάμα appears occasionally in texts written in the Koine — used by the time the text was copied in our papyrus— to judge from the occurrence of δεξιώσιμος (instead of δεξιόσιμος) in LXX 2 Ma. 4. 34, while even later, in the fourth century AD, the verb occurs in the middle voice as δεξιάζομαι (P. Lips. 41.5).

2 ἡδονάς ἔχει: ‘gives pleasure’; similar phrasing in E. Polyidus fr. 642 Kn.: τὰ χρήματι ἀνθρώποισιν ἡδονάς ἔχει, HF 732: ἔχει γὰρ ἡδονάς θνήσκον ἀνήρ· ἐξήρος τίνων τε τῶν δεδραμένων δίκην. For the joy felt between close kin, cf. E. El. 596: φίλας μὲν ἡδονᾶς ἀσπασμάτων, Tr. 371f.: τὰ φιλατ' ἄλεσ', ἡδονάς τὰς οἴκοθεν/ τέκνων, Ion 1461, 1468f.: μήτερ, παρόν μοι καὶ πατήρ μετασχέτω/ τῆς ἡδονῆς τήσδ' ἡς ἐδοξ' ὑμῖν ἐγώ, IT 842, Hel.

τοῖας: attested in cod. S of Stobaeus and in the text of Sextus Empiricus, whereas the papyrus, cod. A of Stobaeus, Athenaeus and Athenagoras read τουάσδ': Both readings fit the metre. In view of its poetic style, τοῖας occurs in stylistically elaborate passages in tragedy (cf. Alc. 453, 870, 1004, Hec. 907, Theseus fr. 383 Kn., A. Pers. 606, S. Ant. 124, Hippodameia fr. 474 R.) and, in this light, it would fit the context of the rhetorical apostrophe better than τουάσδ', which could have replaced the lectio difficilior in certain manuscripts during the process of transmission.

4: this line is absent from nearly all the basic sources for this passage, namely the papyrus, which is our earliest source, Stobaeus and Seneca, and is poorly transmitted in the mss of Athenaeus and Sextus Empiricus (χοὶ σὲ δόμασιν κεκτημένοι). Even with Schmidt’s emendation (τοῖς σὲ δόμασιν κεκτημένοις), the style remains prosaic as compared to the rest of the passage and the line does not add anything to the meaning, rather it makes explicit what is self-evident. Hence, this could be the case of an explanatory interpolation, perhaps a histrionic one (for such cases, cf. Page 1934, pp. 56, 117); a terminus ante quem for its occurrence would be the second century AD, as the line must have been in the sources of Athenaeus and Sextus Empiricus.

5 τοιοῦτον ὀφθαλμοίς ὀφθῆ: ‘has such an expression/glance— i.e. the glance of gold— in her eyes’. Seneca (Ep. Mor. 115. 14) accordingly translates ‘tam dulce siquis Veneris in vultu micat’. Cf. Hes. Scut. 426: δεινὸν ὀφθὰν ὀδύοσι, Sol. fr. 34.5 W.: λοξὸν ὀφθαλμοίς ὀφθασι πάντες ὅστε δὴμον, Pi. O. 9. 111: εὐχειρα, δεξίογυνον, ὀράντ' ἄλκαν, Theoc. 13. 45: ἔαρ θ' ὀρώσασα Νόεια. The most common use of the dative ὀφθαλμοί is instrumental ‘to see with my own eyes’; cf. for instance, Heracl. 571, 883, Hel. 118, A. Eum. 34, S. Ai. 84, 993, Aeschin. iii 119.

6 οὐ θαῦμ: litotes aiming to draw emphasis (cf. Lausberg 1998, p. 268); cf. similarly Ia 823f.: οὐ θαῦμα σ' ἡμᾶς ἄγνοειν, οἷς μὴ πάρος/προσήκες· σινὸ δ' ὅτι σέβεις τὸ σοφρονεῖν, Protesilaus fr. 651 Kn.: οὐ θαῦμ' ἔλεξας θυμὸν δῦνα δυστυχεῖν, also E. El. 284 : νέα γὰρ, οὐδὲν θαῦμ', ἀκεξίχθης νέου, A. Supp. 513: οὔτοι τι θαῦμα δυσφορεῖν φοβηφένα, S. OT 1319f.: καὶ θαῦμά γ' οὔδεν ἐν τοσοίτω πήμασιν/διπλὰ σε πενθείν καὶ διπλὰ φορεῖν κακά, Ar. V. 1139.
τρέφειν: the papyrus and Athenaeus read ἔχειν, which seems to be an unconscious scribal mistake possibly under the influence of ἔχει three lines above (at the end of l. 2). For the use of τρέφω with personified ideas, cf. Hec. 232f.: οὐδ’ ἄλλας ἡμείς εἰς Ζεύς, τρέφει δ’ ὅπως ὅρᾳ· κακῶν κάκ’ ἄλλα μείζον’ ἡ τάλαιν’ ἐγώ, A. Ch. 585f.: πολλὰ μὲν γά τρέφει/ δεινὰ δειμάτων ἄχη, S. Ai. 1124: ἡ γλῶσσα σου τὸν θυμόν ὡς δεινὸν τρέφει, Ant. 1089: καὶ γνῷ τρέφειν τὴν γλῶσσαν ἡσυχωτέραν, OT 356: πέφευγα· τάλητες γὰρ ἰσχύον τρέφω, Tr. 28: ξυστάσ’ ἀεὶ τιν’ ἐκ φόβου φόβον τρέφω. For the description of Aphrodite as breeding Erotes, cf. Pi. fr. 122. 4-6 M.: ματέρ’ ἐρώτων/ οὐρανίαν πιάμεναι/ νομίματι πρὸς Ἀφροδίταν.

Fr. 8:

Fr. 8-10 display rhetorical argumentation for the power and impact of wealth, while frr. 11-12 include counter-arguments disparaging richness. The reference to gold and its power over love in fr. 7 hints at the discovery of pieces of gold from Zeus’ transformation, which seems to have led to Acrisius’ false assumption that Danae was bribed with gold, in order to be seduced by a rich man (cf. note on fr. 7). This rhetorical opposition of views has reasonably been regarded as belonging to a formal debate,²¹² where one character affirms the overwhelming power of wealth, based on the discovery of gold in Danae’s chamber, and another character censures opulence by defending the righteousness of humble people. The latter must naturally be a sympathetic figure, who adopts this position presumably as a means of refuting the accusation of Danae’s bribery. The likeliest candidate for this role should be Danae herself, whose participation in the agon would have illustrated her dianoia (Arist. Poet. 1450b) and placed her at the centre of dramatic interest, whereas Acrisius is reasonably expected to be the one affirming the power of wealth, based on the false inference that his daughter was bribed. Hence, on the basis of the available evidence, the agon seems to have been instigated by the disclosure of Danae’s seduction, which would make it presumably a ‘trial-debate’, though no explicit accusation against Danae is preserved in the available fragments, whose generalizing tone accounts for their inclusion in a gnomic anthology. As a rule, the plaintiff should have spoken first (fr. 8-10— fr. 7 may have also belonged to the agon, cf. note ad loc.) and the defendant second (frr. 11-

The prevailing speech (which is that of the sympathetic character) is usually placed second, in climactic order. An initial dialogue between the participants may have introduced the debate—as in several cases—and account for the emphatic question in fr. 9, which presupposes that the plaintiff already knows the defendant’s position. Rhetorical confrontations of father and daughter with a similar focus take place in the Melanippe the Wise and Alope (cf. Structure). Another formal debate touching on wealth as a criterion for marriage occurs between Aeolus and Macareus in Aeolus frs. 20, 21, 22 Kn.


214 For the order of speakers and very few exceptions, cf. Schlesinger (1937) p. 69f., also Collard (1975 s) p. 62.
216 Alternatively, there might have been two pairs of set-speeches (cf. Andr. 590-746).

2 κάτοπτρα: mirroring is a feminine attribute *par excellence*, which often acquires an erotic focus. Mirrors are principally associated with Aphrodite (cf. Call. 5. 17-22 and Bulloch 1985, p. 130, Stat. *Silv.* 3. 4.93-98, *A.P.* 6. 18.5f., Ath. 687C, Philostr. *Imag.* 1. 6.304), Helen (cf. E. *Tr.* 1107, *Or.* 1112 and Karouzou 1951, pp. 582-584, Thomson de Grummond 1982, p. 37 for Aphrodite and Helen as decorative figures in bronze mirrors) and women in general (cf. Ar. *Th.* 140, Plaut. *Most.* 250f., Mart. 11.50, Ov. *Am.* 2. 17.9f., *Ars Am.* 2. 215f., 3. 135f., Prop. 3. 6.11 and several vase-illustrations of women gazing at mirrors in Frontisi-Ducroux and Vernant 1997, pl. 1-29). Female self-adornment and the fascination of catoptric experience in erotic contexts frequently involve the beholder’s entrapment within the mirror itself or the experience it defines; this is the case in our fragment, as well as *El.* 1071, also *Hec.* 925 (expressive of oriental self-indulgence, cf. Collard 1991 *ad loc.*) and *Med.* 1161 (where the mirror provides a false reflection of the princess’s beauty, as she is about to be deformed), cf. McCarty (1989) p. 180f. The intimacy of mirroring also hints at female seclusion, as opposed to the dimension of male social life and public participation; cf. Frontisi-Ducroux and Vernant (1997) p. 243. Hence, the reference to mirroring in a play about Danae may allude to the maiden’s seclusion and sexuality, especially since a mirror appears as a detail in certain vase-paintings depicting her receiving the golden shower in the bronze chamber (cf. *LIMC* figg. 1, 2, 4, 6 and the relevant comments of Frontisi-Ducroux and Vernant 1997, p. 81). For further aspects of metaphorical catoptrics, cf. the discussions in McCarty (1989) pp. 161-179 and Assael (1992) pp. 562-571.

Ξανθίσματα: dying the hair blond is expressive of female self-adornment. Menander (fr. inc. 450 K.-A.) presents dyed blond hair as the feature of a reckless woman: νόν δ’ ἐρπ’ ἀπ’ οἶκων τόνδε: τὴν γυναῖκα γάρ τὴν σώφρον’ οὐ δεῖ τὰς τρίχας ξανθάς ποιεῖν. Cf. also E. *El.* 1071 (and Cropp 1988 *ad loc.*). Dionysus’ perfumed blond curls in *Ba.* 235 (cf. Dodds 19602 *ad loc.*) are expressive of his effeminate beauty. Blond hair is a typical sign of beauty and the epithet ξανθός is attached mostly to goddesses and beautiful women: to Aphrodite


4 οὖδεὶς προσατάν βίοτον ἡράσθη βροτάν: resolution of the third longum, which is common even in Euripides' early plays (cf. Cropp and Fick 1985, pp. 29, 44f., 47, classifying it as resolution-type 6.1c, Devine and Stephens 1980, p. 66, Ceadel 1941, p. 72f.) and thus not chronologically distinctive. Lack of wealth inhibits leisure and self-adornment, which are here regarded as prerequisites for ἐρως; cf. fr. inc. 895 Kn.: ἐν πλησμονῇ τοι Κύριτις, ἐν πεινώνι  δ' οὖ, [E.] Rhadamanthys fr. 659 N.2: ἐρωτε ἦμιν εἰς παντοτι βιόν;  δ' μὲν γὰρ εὐγένειαν ἰμείριν λαβεῖν; τῷ δ' οὖχι τούτου φροντίς, ἀλλὰ
As noted above (cf. introductory note on fr. 8), this fragment together with frs. 7, 8 and 10 arguing for the overwhelming power of wealth could be assigned to Acrisius in the context of a possible formal debate with Danae, instigated by his false inference that his daughter was bribed to be seduced (probably on the basis of pieces of gold discovered in her chamber, cf. note on fr. 7). The rhetorically elaborate lines of the present fragment argue for wealth as basic criterion for marriage, asserting that monetary values overshadow the traditional qualities of noble lineage, if the latter is not combined with wealth. A parallel argument with a different purpose is employed by Macareus in his agon with Aeolus in E. Aeolus fr. 22 Kn.: τὴν δ' εὐγένειαν πρὸς θεῶν μὴ μοι λέγει, ἐν χρήμασιν τὸδ' ἔστι, μὴ ἔμουρθο, πάτερ/ κύκλῳ γὰρ ἔρπετ' τῷ μὲν ἔσθ', δ' όυκ ἔχει/ κοινοὶς δ' αὐτοῖς χρόμεθ' ὥς δ' ἄν ἐν δόμοις/ χρόνων συνοικῇ πλείστον, οὗτος εὐγενής.218

The speaker is 'playing' with contrast in terms of style and values; stylistic antithesis is a common rhetorical figure employed in agonēs (cf. indicatively Hipp. 986f., Ph. 360, 389, 433f., Or. 546f. and Lloyd 1992, p. 34, Lausberg 1998, p. 350), while antithesis of content is an intrinsic feature of Euripidean debates, on the basis of the pattern

of *dissoi logoi* (cf. Solmsen 1975, p. 30f.). More specifically, emphatic contrast is drawn (a) with the juxtaposition of contradictory terms: *οἱ μὲν εὐγενεῖς· οἱ δὲ οὐδὲν ἃσαν, πένθητες· δλίβου· πρόσθεν-νῦν, ὀλβίωρ· πένητι· κακῷ· κάγαθῳ, κακός· ἃ δλίβου, ὁ μὴ ἔχων· οἱ δὲ ἔχοντες, (b) with the qualities of lineage and monetary values, as a result of the detachment of wealth from aristocracy: *εὐγενεῖς πένητες δῶντες, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲν ἃσαν πρόσθεν-δλίβου (‘prosperous, rich’) δὲ νῦν, ὀλβίωρ κακῷ (‘of low birth’)· πένητι κάγαθῳ (‘well-born’). Further rhetorical figures are the *chiastic anadiplosis* of 1.8 (see note *ad loc.*) and the rhetorical question of 11.1-5.

1-5: The detachment of wealth from lineage and the contestation of the latter if not combined with monetary values is an anachronism in a heroic-age myth (cf. note on coinage in 1.4). The significant economic upheaval of the seventh and sixth century due to the colonization and expansion of trade and craft activity led to the monetization of economic life. As the level of prosperity rose, more opportunities for social mobility appeared, which eventually caused the decline of aristocracy. The latter was also severely harmed by the ‘hoplite reform’ of the seventh century, which brought prosperous *commoners* into high military ranks (cf. Bryant 1996, pp. 66f., 90f.). Consequently, those who were once *kakoi* (‘of low birth’) became prosperous, successful and thus powerful in view of their potential for effective contribution in war and public life. Money thus became a distinct value compared to other basic values, such as lineage, virtue or justice (for the comparison between money and justice, cf. note on *Dictys* fr. 15); cf. Seaford (2004) pp. 160-162, 164, 170. Theognis alludes to the stresses and strains upon values imposed by the invention of money; 173-192 (of which cf. particularly 173: ἀνδρ’ ἀγαθόν πενίῃ πάντων δόμνησι μάλιστα, 177f.: καὶ γὰρ ἀνὴρ πενίῃ δεδημένος οὔτε τι εἰπέν / οὔθ’ ἔρξαι δύναται, γλῶσσα δὲ οἱ δέδηται), 315: πολλοὶ τοι πλουτοῦσι κακοῖ, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ πένονται. Cf. also Alcaeus fr. 360 L.-P.: ὡς γὰρ δῆσκοτ’ Ἀριστόδαμον φαίνει’ οὔκ ἀπάλαιμον ἐν Σπάρται λόγον εἴπην. χρήματ’ ἀνηρ, πένιονος δ’ οὖδ’ εἰς πέλετ’ ἔσλος οὖδ’ τίμιος and the recurrence of this view in Pi. I. 2. 10 (and Privitera 1982 *ad loc.*), E. El. 37f. (and Cropp 1988 *ad loc.*): λοιποί γὰρ ἐς γένος γε, χρημάταν δὲ δὴ πένητες, ἐνθεν ποῦγενε ἀπόλλυται, Ph. 438-442, Aeolus fr. 20 Kn.: μὴ πλουτὸν εἴπης· οὔχι θαυμάζω θέον, δὲν χὼ κάκιστος ῥάδιος ἐκτήσατο, Bellerophon fr. 285. 11-13 Kn. (and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995, p. 113); δοτῖς δὲ γαῖρόν σπέρμα γενναίον τ’ ἔχων/βίου σπανίζει, τῷ γένει μὲν εὐτυχεῖι· πενία δ’ ἐλάσσοσν ἐστίν, ἐν

1-3: The antithesis is reinforced by the cross-arrangement of ideas:

οἱ μὲν εὐγένεις (status) οὐδὲν ἄλφανοσ' (insignificance)
οἱ δ' οὐδὲν ἢσαν (insignificance) δόξαν φέρονται (status)


ὁθούνεχ'· it occurs in the place of ὃς or ὅτι ('that') frequently after οἶδα, cf. Alc.796: καὶ σάφ' οἴδ' ὁθούνεχα, fr. inc. 1024 Kn.: εἰδώς ὁθούνεχ', S. El. 47, 617, 1308, OT 572, Tr. 813: οὗ κάτοικος οἴδ' ὁθούνεχα, Ph. 634, OC 853: οἴδ' ἐγώ, γνώσης τάδε, ὁθούνεχ', 944: ἢδη δ' ὁθούνεχ'. In other cases, it is explanatory ('because'); cf. Ion 662, Hel. 104, 591, fr. inc. 862 Kn., S. Ai. 123, 553, TrGF II fr. adesp. 116 Kn.-Sn.


ἐπι: indicative of the transition of social conditions and values; cf. also πρόσθεν and νῦν (l. 3) and above, note on ll. 1-5.

3 οἵ δ' οὐδὲν ἦσαν: 'worthless, useless, of no account', corresponding to the epic use of ὀστιδανός and widely found in Euripides and Sophocles; cf. HF 314: νῦν δ' οὐδέν ἐσμὲν, 634f.: οἵ τ' ἀμφίνεοι βροτῶν/ οἵ τ' οὐδέν ὄντες, Hel. 1194, Ph. 598, Or. 717f., Bellerophon fr. 285. 15 Kn. (and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.): ὁ δ' οὐδέν οὐδεῖς, διὰ τέλους δὲ δουςτυχών, S. Ai. 1231, El. 677, Ph. 951, 1217, Tereus fr. 583. 1-3 R.: νῦν δ' οὐδέν εἰμι


νομίσματος: generally 'custom, institution' (cf. A. Th. 269, E. IT 1471, Ar. Nu. 248), here it bears the specific sense of 'coin, money' (cf. Hdt. 1. 94, 3. 56, 4. 166, Ar. Ra. 720, 722). The reference to currency and money in the treatment of a heroic-age myth is an anachronism (archaeological evidence indicates that the earliest development of coinage in Greece possibly occurred at the end of the seventh century, cf. indicatively Seaford 2004, pp. 129-131, citing relevant bibliography, and Schaps 2004, pp. 93-110), but one which in tragedy seems to be so firmly absorbed into the texture, that it remains oblique (cf. Lowe 1988, p. 41f., Easterling 1987, p. 7); cf. similarly Erechtheus fr. 362. 29 Kn. Accordingly, νόμισμα may denote 'coin, currency', while alluding at the same time to the very conventions of the polis which impose the acceptability of currency (cf. Arist. EN 1133a 19-33, Pol. 1257b and Seaford 1998, p. 135f.); in Oedipus fr. 542 Kn. (οὗτοι νόμισμα λευκός ἄργυρος μόνον/ καὶ χρυσός ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ κάρετη βροτοῖς/ νόμισμα κεῖται πάσιν, ἢ
χρήσθαι χρέων), for instance, the sense of νόμισμα ranges from the specific meaning of ‘coins made of precious metal’ to its general sense as ‘institution’ (cf. also Easterling 1987, p. 7). Cf. however, the less oblique references to coins in satyr-play: Cyc. 160 (cf. Seaford 1984 and Ussher 1978 ad loc.), Sciron fr. 675 Kn. (where Silenus is trying to sell prostitutes for coins).

5 συμπλέκοντες: ‘they join’; cf. IA 292 (‘to bind together’), Th. 4.4 (‘to join hands’), Pl. Soph. 242d 7, Pol. 309b 7, Str. 10. 3.13 (‘to connect’), Plb. 2. 45.2 (‘to become intimate’). The middle usage of the verb is unattested, therefore συμπλέκοντες is preferable to συμπλέκονται.


κακός: here 'of low birth', as opposed to καγαθός ('well-born') of the next line. Both adjectives here commend the traditional qualities of aretē. On the other hand, the sense of κακός in l. 8 is detached from the notion of lineage, denoting baseness due to poverty. For the range of nuances of kakos, cf. notes on ll. 1-5 and on Dictys fr. 4.2.


κακός δ' ὁ μη ἑχαν: synizesis of η with ε, producing a long syllable. Κακός here in the sense of 'worthless, insignificant', because of his ineffectiveness to contribute to public life, which deprives him of prestige; cf. Adkins (1972) pp. 38-41. Cf. Anon. Iambi. 3.11-13 D.-K. (and Den Boer 1979, p. 174f.): κακία προσγίγνεται μετά τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν χρημάτων, ἐὰν ἐκ πλουσίου πένης γένηται καὶ ἐκ κεκτημένου μηδὲν ἑχον, where kakia (here 'ruin') is identified with penia. Cf. Hemelrijk (1925) p. 21 and for further references, note on 1-5.

οἱ δ' ἔχοντες † δῆμοι: Hense aptly observed that in this context δῆμοι is a synonym of οἱ ἔχοντες, while what is needed is an antonym of κακός (here 'base, worthless'). His emendation εὐγενεῖς can be supported by Aeolus fr. 22. 4 Kn.: ὁ δ' ἐν ἐν δόμοις (τά χρήματα) χρόνον συνοικία πλείστον, οὕτως εὐγενῆς and Erechtheus fr. 362. 14f. Kn. (cf. West 1983, p. 72) and would offer an interesting redefinition of the notion of εὐγένεια, as compared to its use in l. 1, while corresponding to the successive antitheseis of the passage. West's alternative emendation οὐκέτι (cf. loc. cit.) is palaeographically attractive.

Fr. 10:

These lines are consistent with the argument of frs. 7 and 9 for the overwhelming power of wealth and thus likely to have been uttered by the same speaker, i.e. possibly Acrisius. The allegation that nobody can resist money probably serves to support the accusation of Danae's bribery (ἀνηπ semble here to occur in a generalizing sense, cf. note ad loc.).

ο demean ἀνήρ: here in the generalizing sense of ‘no one’, rather than ‘no man’, including Danae among those who cannot resist wealth. Cf. particularly Hypsipyle fr. 760 Kn. (and Bond 1964 ad loc.): ἐξο γὰρ ὦργῆς πᾶς ἀνήρ σοφότερος, which is evidently uttered with reference to Eurydice, also Or. 1523: πᾶς ἀνήρ, κἂν δούλος ἢ τις, ἰδεῖ τὸ φῶς ὅρων, Meleagros fr. 532 Kn.: καταθανόν δὲ πᾶς ἀνήρ/ γῆ καὶ σκιά.

2 πλὴν εἴ τις: to the examples cited by Kannicht (2004, p. 377: Ar. Av. 601: o devez δὲν τὸν θησαυρὸν τὸν ἐμὸν πλὴν εἰ τις ἀρ’ ὅρνις, Th. 531f.: ἀλλ’ οὐ γὰρ ἐστι τῶν ἀναισχύντων φόσει γυναικῶν/ o devez κάκιον εἰς ἀπαντὰ πλὴν ἀρ’ εἰ γυναῖκες, X. Hell. 4. 2.21) I would add [D.] x 39.3, xI 3.4, D. xvi 320.5, xxi 158.3: ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὖχ ὀρῶ, πλὴν εἴ ταῦτά τις θεωρεῖ, xxiiv 42.5, 67.6, xxi 3.6: ἵστε γὰρ πάνθ’ ὡς ἐγένετο, πλὴν εἰ τι παρέλιπον, Is. iv 29.5: οὗτε εἰσφοράν οὐδεμίαν εἰσενήνοχε, πλὴν εἰ τι ἄρα ἐξ ὅτι τῶν Νικοστράτου ἡμφοβήτησεν, Pl. Apol. 18c.2: δὲ πάντων ἀλογώτατον, ὥστε οὐδὲ τὰ ὁνόματα οἶον τε αὐτῶν εἰδέναι καὶ εἰπεῖν, πλὴν εἰ τις κομφοδοποίους τυγχάνει δὲν, Pol. 286d, R. 366d.1: οὐδὲν ὅτι πλὴν εἰ τις θεία φώσει δυσχεραίνων τὸ ἀδικεῖν ἢ ἐπιστήμην λαβὼν ἀπέχειται αὐτοῦ, τῶν γε ἄλλων ο devez ἐκάν δίκαιος. Unlike the cited examples, which introduce a genuine modification, usually slight, in our fragment the conditional clause is not continued and the apparent concession is undermined (‘except somebody—but I do not see who that person is’).
Fr. 10a:

This testimony has been widely associated with fr. 10 and it has been aptly suggested that a possible interpolation of \( \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \) and \( \varepsilon \rho \delta \) in the place of \( \varepsilon \iota \tau \varepsilon \) and \( \varepsilon \rho \delta \) may have given ground to Satyrus’ inference.\(^{219}\) The similarity (only one person = except Socrates) is tempting; considering, however, the vagueness of the statement in Satyrus and how much of the Danae is missing, it cannot be absolutely ruled out that he may be referring to a completely lost passage perhaps also coming from the agon, given the reference to \( \pi \lambda \varepsilon \omega \nu \varepsilon \chi \lambda \alpha \). 

Euripides’ association with Socrates is reported in anecdotal, biographical and comic contexts; cf. Ar. Ra. 1491f. (and Dover 1993 ad loc.), Ael. V.H. 2. 13.41-47, Gell. N.A. 15. 20, Sud. epsilon 3695 (Adler). Moreover, the comic passages in Ar. Clouds I fr. 392 K.-A., Teleclides fr. inc. 41 K.-A., Callias Pedetae fr. 15 K.-A., as well as Vit. Eur. TrGF V, 1 Test. A1 IA 9-12 go even further by presenting Socrates as having contributed to the composition of Euripides’ plays.\(^{220}\) The latter was evidently interested in his contemporary intellectual activity, such as the sophist movement (cf. notes on Dictys frr. 4, 14. 2-4), rhetoric (cf. introductory notes on Dictys frr. 2, 4), natural philosophy (cf. note on fr. 15.2), perhaps also Socratic theories; cf. Egli’s cautious survey (2003, pp. 164-178) of Euripidean passages thought to reflect Socratic doctrines (cf. especially Hipp. 380-383 and Chrysippus fr. 841 Kn., perhaps also Med. 1078-1080, studied in relation to Socrates’ definition of incontinence, as occurring in Pl. Prt. 352d.5-353c.2 and X. Mem. 3. 9.4).\(^{221}\) Ancient biography, however, to the context of which Satyrus’ work belongs, tends to approach poetic passages by a process of inference and oversimplification, mainly aiming to draw biographical material from a poet’s own work, as well as from anecdotes (for this trend of ancient biography and criticism, cf. note on T1).\(^{222}\) It is thus self-evident that a personal reference to Socrates would be completely out of place in a tragic play and that Satyrus’


testimony is obviously based on the arbitrary interpretation perhaps of fr. 10, presumably aiming to present Euripides as expressing his personal admiration for Socrates (for the practice of interpreting tragic passages as expressing the poet’s own view in ancient criticism and biography, cf. note on T1). An eloquent parallel occurs in D.L. 2. 44, where Euripides is alleged to have alluded to Socrates’ death in *Palamedes* fr. 588 Kn., which was proved false by Philochorus (*FGRH* 328 F 221), as Euripides died before Socrates: 

Eὐριπίδης δὲ καὶ ὄνειδίζει αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ Παλαμήδει λέγων ἐκάνετε τὰν πάνσοφον, 

ὅσι τοῖς μὲν ἀλλὰ ἀλγόνοισαν ἀπόδονα μουσάν'. καὶ τάδε μὲν ὄδε. Φιλόχορος δὲ φησὶ προτελευτήσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην τὸν Σωκράτους.

**Fr. 11:**

These lines and fr. 12 contest the position of fr. 9 for the high status of the wealthy class, with reference to its public, private and religious activity. The refutation of the argument for the superiority of wealth and, in turn, for the power of money over love (cf. frs. 7-10, for which Acrisius is the strongest candidate), must come from the party defending the opposite view in the debate, evidently in an effort to release Danae from the probable accusation of bribery. As argued above (cf. introductory note on fr. 8), the likeliest character for this sympathetic role would be Danae herself. The present fragment seems to be a reply to the argument of fr. 9 on the impact of wealthy people (ll. 1-5) and the reference to their religious activity (l. 6f.) may have aimed to refute a possible allegation of the opponent that the wealthy are more pious than the poor, as they offer rich sacrifice. The further development of the argument as to their conduct in the religious sphere in fr. 12. 3 seems also to favour this possibility.

Here, as in fr. 9, the successive *antitheses* display rhetorical elaboration: φιλοῦσι βροτοὶ-ἐγὼ δὲ (the speaker’s position, as opposed to public opinion), ὀλβίων-πένης, σοφοὺς τίθεσθαι τοὺς λόγους- ἐπὶ λέγη (controversy of seeming and being), also σοφοὺς τίθεσθαι τοὺς λόγους- γελᾶν (contrasting reactions), μικρὰ θύοντας τέλη-τῶν βουθυτούντων.

---

1-4: the speaker addresses the question of the status of the wealthy class (as alleged in fr. 9) by referring to its role in public contexts. Class-consciousness in Athens lay in the distinction between rich (the élite) and poor (the basis of the demos, cf. note on l. 3). The passage reflects the continuing deference to wealth and status and the disproportionate influence of the leisured class on the public life of democratic Athens; in terms of political participation, for instance, the élite was heavily overrepresented in the set of all politically active citizens by employing personal networking and material contributions to the state (cf. Connor 1971, pp. 18-22, Ober 1989, p. 85f., 116-118, Hunter 1988, p. 29, Finley 1983, p. 83). Our speaker's support of the sophia and eusebeia of members of the demos, on the other hand, points to his democratic orientation. Similarly, in the gathering of the Argives in Or. 884-945 (cf. Porter 1994, pp. 73-76, Willink 1986, p. 224), the equivalent of the pénης ἀνῆρ of our fragment is the prudent and righteous farmer (917-930) distinguished again from the wealthy class (887-897), as well as from the demagogue, who manipulates the mob (902-916).

In a different light, Socrates disapproves of the participation of the many in political decisions, in view of their lack of expert knowledge (Pl. Prt. 319d): ἐπειδὴ δὲ τι περὶ τῶν τῆς πόλεως διοικήσεως δὲ μη βουλεύσασθαι, συμβουλεύει αὐτοῖς ἀνιστάμενος περὶ τούτων ὁμοίως μὲν τέκτων, ὁμοίως δὲ χαλκείς σκυτωτόμος, ἐμπορος ναύκληρος, πλούσιος, pénης, γενναίος, ἀγνηνής, καὶ τούτοις οὐδεὶς τούτο ἐπιπλήττει ὅσπερ τοῖς πρῶτοι, ὅτι καὶ ὅσαμόθεν μαθὼν, οὐδὲ ὅντος διδασκάλου οὐδενὸς αὐτῷ, ἔπειτα συμβουλεύειν ἐπιχειρεῖ.


τῶν μὲν ὀλίβων: 'wealthy', as opposed to pénης (l. 3), cf. τῶν πλουσίων (l. 5) and note on fr. 9.3. Thucydides repeatedly attaches the term oί δυνατοί to the social and political élite; cf. indicatively 1. 24.5, 2. 65.2, 3. 27.3, 5. 4.3, 8. 73.2 and for further

2 σοφοίς τίθεσθαι τοῖς λόγοις: τίθεσθαι (here, ‘to assume, hold, reckon, regard’) is Valckenaer’s emendation of the unmetrical reading ἤγεισθαι of the manuscript tradition. It seems to be preferable to Blaydes’ νομίζειν, as it could account for the intrusion of ἤγεισθαι, which may have been a gloss specifying the sense of τίθεσθαι in this context (νομίζειν, on the other hand, does not need clarification). Cf. Med. 572f.: τὰ λαύστα καὶ κάλλιστα πολεμιώτατα/ τίθεσθαι, Hec. 848: φίλους τιθέντες τούς γε πολεμιώτατους, Andr. 210, Tr. 288: φίλα τὰ πρότερ’ ἄφιλα τιθέμενος πάλιν. The use of this verb suggests that their words are merely regarded as wise, without being necessarily so; the basic sophistic distinction between seeming and being. Cf. Guthrie (1962-1981) III pp. 179-181.

3 λεπτῶν ἀκ’ οὖκαν: ‘small, weak, of slender means’; cf. PMG fr. adesp. 69d.1: λεπτῶς μεριμνώντες/ πένονται, Men. Mon. 442 Jákel: λεπτώς γέ τοι ζήν κρείσσον ἡ λαμπρός κακῶς. Thphr. Ch. 26. 5, Plb. 24. 7: οἱ λεπτοὶ (‘the poor’), Cent. 3. 59: λεπτὴν πλέκειν ἐπὶ τῶν πενιχρῶν τοῦτο λέγεται, Sud. λ 292 Adler: λεπτὰ ξαίνεις· ἐπὶ τῶν πενιχρῶς διαγόντων τὸν βιον. Nauck suggested the rare word λειτῶν (‘poor’), which, according to Photius (λ 154 Theodorides), occurs in Menander and also in Timon of Phlius (Ath. 4. 50.18-22) and A.P. 6. 226, 303, 7. 472. It would be unwise, however, to replace the transmitted reading, especially when it is acceptable, with a rare word nowhere else attested in Euripides, which, on the basis of our evidence, first occurs in Menander.

ἐδ λέγη: here suggestive of a skilled and prudent speaker; cf. Or. 930: καὶ τοῖς γε χρηστοῖς ἐδ λέγειν ἐφοίνετο, Bacchae 266f. (and Dodds 1960 ad loc.): διὰν λάβην τις τῶν λόγων ἀνήρ σοφῶς/ καλὰς ἀφορμάς, οὐ μέγ’ ἔργον ἐδ λέγειν, Autolycus fr. 282. 26f. Kn. Eloquence is regarded as a virtue of civic usefulness in Aeschines iii 170 (δυνατῶν εἰπεῖν· καλὸν γὰρ τὴν μὲν διάνοιαν προαρείσθαι τὰ βέλτιστα, τὴν δὲ παρείαν τὴν τοῦ ῥήτορας καὶ τὸν λόγον πείθειν τοὺς ἄκούοντας) and Anon. lambi. 1.1, 3.1 D.-K. In many cases in Euripides, however, ἐδ λέγειν (merely in the sense of ‘eloquence’, excluding the content of the speech) is conceived as opposed to truth and justice; cf. Hipp. 503, Hec. 1191, Ph. 526 (and Mastronarde 1994 ad loc.), Archeleaus fr. 253 Kn. (and Harder 1985 ad loc.), Palamedes fr. 583 Kn., Antiope fr. 206 Kn. (and Kambitsis 1972, p. 80f.) and for more detail, cf. Jouan (1984) pp. 7-10 and note on Dictys fr. 5.
πένης: poor are those citizens who labour for their living, such as the peasants, labourers, shopkeepers, self-employed artisans, hence, the bulk of the population, which form the basis of the demos (cf. X. Mem. 4. 2.37f., Pl. R. 565a). They are to be distinguished from the rich (the leisured class, living comfortably on the labour of others, cf. Arist. Pol. 1291b 7, 1310a 3-10) and from the paupers (πτωχοὶ, the beggars, the idlers, cf. Ar. Pl. 549-554, where personified Πενία denies being sister of Πτωχεία). Cf. Finley (1983) p. 10f., Nippel (1980) pp. 103-105, Finley (1985) p. 41, Wood and Wood (1978) p. 43.


4 γελάν: for heckling and jeering at public speakers, cf. X. Mem. 3. 7.8: οὐ δοκοῦσι σοι πολλάκις οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ὀρθῶς λεγόντων καταγελάν; also Hell. 6. 5.36, D. xix 23, 46, Aeschin. i 80-84, Pl. Prt. 319c and Hansen (1987) p. 70f.

σοφωτέρους: ‘wise, prudent’; sophia in this context is closely related to the notion of sophrosyne (comprising in Euripides the ideas of self-control, moderation and good sense,

5 εἰσοράω: ‘to look upon, to regard’ (here, as often, it involves intellectual capacity); cf. Ph. 1332, Ba. 252: τὸ γῆρας όμοιος εἰσοράν νοῦν οὖν ὡθ ἔχον, S. fr. inc. 923 R.: ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ὅραντες εἰσορώσι τάμμανή.


The richness of offerings was naturally proportionate to one’s possessions and thus a matter of status. Hence, βουθυσία was restricted to the wealthy class; cf. especially Thphr.

eὔσεβεστέρον: 'pious, reverent'; apart from referring to the god-man relationship in fifth-century literature, it also commends those who honour the relationships which the gods are believed to uphold (namely kinship-ties and relationships between the state and those bound to it, such as protection of suppliants, cf. for instance A. Supp. 419, Th. 598, 602, 831, S. Tr. 1222, El. 464 and Adkins 1960, pp. 132-134). In view of the context of sacrifice, eusebeia here primarily reflects the religious feeling. In addition, fr. 12.3f. (evidently developing the present argument on the detachment of eusebeia from wealth and hecatombs) maintains that greediness leads one to assault not only gods, but also kin, which is an attitude opposed to eusebeia in its dimension as a quiet moral virtue, as well. For eusebeia and sophrosyne as civic virtues, cf. Isoc. x 31. The position that eusebeia is not proportional to the greatness of one’s offerings to the gods, recurs in fr. inc. 946 Kn.: εὖ ἢθ', ὅταν τις εὔσεβῶν θὴ θεοίς/ καὶ μικρὰ θὺς, τυγχάνει σωτηρίας; in both Euripidean fragments gods are perceived as agents of justice and upholders of quiet moral virtues. Cf. similarly Isoc. ii 20: ήγοὺ δ' θύμα τοῦτο κάλλιστον εἶναι καὶ θεραπείαν μεγίστην, ἃν ὡς βέλτιστον καὶ δικαίωτατον σαυτόν παρέχης: μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐλκίς τοίς τοιούτοις ἢ τοῖς ἱερεῖα πολλὰ καταβάλλοντας πράξειν τι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἁγαθῶν, Antiphanes Mystis fr. 162 K.-A.: ταῖς εὐτελείαις οἱ θεοὶ χαίρουσι γὰρ/ τεκμήριον δ', ὅταν γὰρ ἐκατούμβας τινὲς/θῶσιν, ὕπι τοῦτοις ἀπασιν ὅστατοι/... πάντων καὶ λιβανωτὸς ἐπετέθη, ὡς τάλλα μὲν τὰ πολλὰ παραναλούμενα/ ὑπάνην ματαίαν οὐδαν αὐτῶν ἐινεκα,/ το δὲ μικρόν αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἀρεστὸν τοῖς θεοῖς, X. Mem. 1. 3.3: οὕτε γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς ἔρε καλὰς ἔχειν, εἰ ταῖς μεγάλαις θυσίαις μᾶλλον ἢ ταῖς μικραῖς ἔχαρον, Men. fr. inc. 1001 K.-A., Theopompus FGrH 115 F 344, Hor. Carm. 3. 23.13-20 (and West 2002, p. 191f.): te nihil attinet/ temptare multa caede bidentium/ parvos coronantem marino/ rore deos fragilique myrto./ immunis aram si tetigit manus,/ non sumptuosa blandior hostia/ mollivit aversos Penatis/ farre pio et saliente mica and Adkins (1960) pp. 65f., 132-134, Dover (1974) pp. 253f., 258, Yunis (1988) pp. 54f. and n. 38, 101-109, Dodds (1951) p. 48f. Reciprocal allegiance suits the idea of non-moral
gods, who must be won over in a non-moral way with abundance of offerings; this is a main feature of shame-culture, where gods, like men, are very touchy with regard to their *timē* and the attention which must be paid, in order to acknowledge it; cf. *Il.* 1.65, 9.498, 536ff., 20.297-299, *Od.* 1.60-62, *Bacch.* 3.61, *Hdt.* 1.87 and Adkins (1960) pp. 62-64, 134ff., Dodds (1951) pp. 29-32, Frisch (1949) p. 51. This passage, on the other hand, suggests that gods are capable of looking beyond the costliness of offerings to the piety which motivates the giver—or at least that human observers can.

**Fr. 12:**

This fragment coheres very closely with *fr. 11.6f.*, developing the argument on the relation of piety with wealth; the speaker asserts that wealthy people are prone to transgress religious and kinship laws, having been corrupted by greed and avarice, as opposed to the *eusebeia* (in the sense of religious and quiet moral behaviour, cf. note on *fr. 11.7*) of less prosperous people. This position may be refuting a possible argument of the opponent that poverty is likely to cause misconduct through need (for this common idea, cf. Dover 1974, p. 109f. and note on *Dictys fr. 15.2*). Again the likeliest speaker seems to be Danae defending herself from the possible accusation of bribery (cf. introductory note on *fr. 11*).


δόστηνος: here 'wretched and pitiable', as in HF 1346 (and Bond 1981 ad loc.): ἄοιδὼν οἷς δόστηνοι λόγοι, El. 924 ('wretched and pitiable' in view of the misery of the inevitable disillusionment, cf. Denniston 1939 ad loc.): δόστηνος ἐστιν, εἰ δοκεῖ τὸ σωφρονεῖν / ἐκεῖ μὲν αὐτὴν οὖκ ἔχειν, παρ' οὗ δ' ἔχειν. In Sophocles, it denotes 'dis hominibusque invisus' (cf. Ellendt s.v. 'δόστηνος'); cf. Ai. 1290, El. 121 (and March 2001 ad loc.): πατὶ δυστανατάτας/ Ἦλεκτρα ματρός, Ph. 1016.

συλάν: ‘to plunder, to despoil, to pillage’; the closest parallel is A. Pers. 809f.: ὁ γὰρ μολόντες Ἑλλάδα οὐ θεών βρέτη/ ἡδοντο συλάν οὐδὲ πιμπάναι νεώς, where συλάν seems to involve the robbing of the precious metals and stones with which the statues were adorned (cf. Broadhead 1960 ad loc.). Cf. Hdt. 6. 118.6: εὔρων δὲ ἐν νη Ἰονίσσῃ ἀγάλμα ἀπόλλωνος κεχρυσομένον ἕπωθεν σεσυλημένον εἶν, and for further usages of the verb, Heracl. 243 (carrying off suppliants from the altar, cf. Wilkins 1993 ad loc.), Hipp. 799 (robbing of fortune), IT 158 (to deprive from a beloved person), Ion 917 (to be caught as prey), Hel. 600, 699 (to seize as booty), IA 1275 (to be robbed). The plundering of the statues of gods is here conceived as an act of ὑβρις bred by wealth; cf. Th. 3. 45.4 (and Balot 2001, p. 158f.), 1. 38.5, 84.2, D. xxi 98, X. Cyr. 8. 4.14 and Dover (1974) p. 110f.

βρέτη: ‘the wooden image of a god’; cf. Alc. 974, Heracl. 936, El. 1254, IT 980, 1165, also A. Th. 96, 185, Eum. 80, 242, Ar. Eq. 31f., Lys. 262.

Fr. 13:

The speaker is clearly Danae imploring her father not to be separated from her baby-son. It has been suggested that this plea could have arisen from Acrisius’ intention of killing Perseus,224 possibly through reminiscence of the oracle (for its role, cf. note on fr. 16), but perhaps also because of the baby’s illegitimate status (likewise, the illegitimate babies in the Alope, Melanippe the Wise and Auge are punished with exposure by their grandfathers, cf. Structure). With her plea, Danae appears to have persuaded Acrisius to commute the punishment from death for the child to exposure in the sea for both Perseus and herself. Lucian’s passage (D. Mar. 12. 2) might be reminiscent of her supplication: τὸ βρέφος δὲ παρατείνω μὴ ἀποθανεῖν δακρύσουσα καὶ τῷ πάππῳ δεικνύουσα αὐτὸ κάλλιστον ὅν (for the possibility that Lucian may have been inspired by the Danae, cf. note on T5).225 Fr. 14 praising her act of courage with the vocabulary of self-sacrifice (cf. note ad loc.) may imply that Danae could have chosen a remote hope of rescue for both of them to her own safety and her son’s death.226 Acrisius’ final decision to cast them adrift may have been motivated by his effort to avoid the pollution of killing the child, thus choosing exposure as veiled infanticide.227 By enclosing mother and child in the chest and casting it adrift, Acrisius reasserts his control over his daughter by imposing spatial confinement on her (cf. note on fr. 6.2), while sending, at the same time, the mother and the dangerous child to be carried far away in unbounded space.228 This scene would have reasonably been located after the agon, which is likely to have occurred between Danae and Acrisius (frr. 8-12), where she would have argued in defence of herself and her child against her father’s accusation that she was bribed to be seduced (cf. introductory note on fr. 8). If the agon was a trial-debate, it would have ended presumably with Acrisius’ strong condemnation of Danae’s illicit motherhood and perhaps the announcement of the penalty.

Danae’s words are a typical case of the manner in which Euripides’ imagery of physical appearance and tangible everyday experience functions as the strongest hold over

225 Cf. Huys loc. cit.
228 Cf. Seaford (1990b) p. 81.

1 πρὸς ἀγκάλασι: mostly in plural; a common expression of affection for children, cf. Cyc. 142: ὃν ἐξέθρεψε ταῖσθ᾽ ἐγὼ ποτ᾽ ἀγκάλασι, Alc. 190f.: ἥ δὲ λαμβάνουσ᾽ ἐς ἀγκάλασι/ ἱσπάξετ’ ἄλλοιν’ ἄλλον, Hipp. 1431f.: σὺ δ’, ὅ γεραιοῦ τέκνων Αἰγέως, λαβέ/ σὸν παῖδ᾽ ἐν ἀγκάλασι, Andr. 747: ἤγοι τέκνων μοι δεῦρ᾽ ὅπ’ ἀγκάλασι σταθεῖς, Tr. 750f., 757: ὁ νέον ὑπαγκαλίσαια μιτρὶ φῖλτατον, IT 834f., Ion 280, 1375f.: χρόνον γὰρ ὅν μ᾽ ἔχρην ἐν ἀγκάλασι/ μητρὸς τρυφήσαι, Hypsipyle fr. 60. 10-12 Bond: τοῦμὸν τιθήνημ’, ὅν ἐκ’ ἐμαίσιν ἀγκάλασι/ πλὴν οὐ τεκοῦσα τάλλα γ’ ὡς ἐμὸν τέκνων/ στέργουσο ἐφερβον, also A. Ag. 723f., Ezechiel Exag. 27.

καὶ στέρνοις ἐμοίς: mainly used for males, in tragedy also for women; apart from its literal meaning, the word occurs here also in its metaphorical sense, being perceived as the seat of affections (cf. the vocabulary of affection, ἀγκάλασι, φιλημάτων, ψυχῆν, φίλτρον, συνουσία); cf. similarly Hec. 424: ὅ στέρνα μαστοί θ’, οἱ μ’ ἐθρέψαθ’ ὁδέως, HF 485f.: τίν’ ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἢ τίν’ ὑστατον/ πρὸς στέρνα θόμαι; 1361: πρὸς στέρν’ ἐρείσας μιτρὶ δοὺς τ’ ὑς ἀγκάλασς, 1408: πατρὸς τὲ στέρνα προσθέσθαι θέλω, El. 1321f., IT 213-233: σύγγονον, ὁν ἐλυπὸν ἐπιμαστίδοιον/ ἐτὶ βρέφος, ἐτὶ νέον, ἐτὶ θάλας/ ἐν χειριν ματρὸς πρὸς στέρνοις τ’, IA 634-636, Hypsipyle fr. 64. 94 Bond: ἀπομαστίδοιον γ’ ἐμὸν στέρνων.

2 πηδῶν: ‘to leap, to frolic’. Though Nauck’s conjectures πεσῶν or πιτῶν are supported by Ion 962 (πρὸς ἀγκάλασι πεσεῖν) and Hes. fr. 252.5 M.-W. (ἐν ἀγκοίνησι πεσοῦσα), the transmitted reading occurs in a similar context in Pl. Lg. 672c: ἀτάκτως σὺ πηδᾷ and can be paralleled to IT 1251: ἐπὶ ματερὸς ἀγκάλασι θρόσκον (a synonym of πηδῶν). For the image of young children as unable to keep still and susceptible to leaping about and frolicing, cf. S. Dionysiscos Satyricos fr. 171 R., Pl. Lg. 664e, Arist. Pol. 1340b. 29 and Golden (1990) p. 9f.

(ὅν) ἄθροι: LSJ<sup>9</sup>: epic word, ‘to play (of children)’; cf. Ion 52f.: νέος μὲν οὖν ὁν ὁμφὶ βωμίουσ τροφῆς/ ἥλατ’ ἄθροιον, Auge fr. 272 Kp.: τίς δ’ οὐχὶ χαίρει νηπίοις


3 ψυχὴν ἐμὴν (ἂν) κτήσαιτο: 'he will win my heart'. Apart from the traditional occurrences of the word as 'life' and 'shade of the dead', Euripides treats ψυχή also as a vital psychic entity with emotional, intellectual and moral functions, which is the case here; cf. similarly Med. 110, 474, Hipp. 173, 505, 1006, Ion 859, 877, Or. 526, Theseus fr. 388 Kn. and Sullivan (2000) pp. 94-112, also S. Ant. 227, OT 64, 727, El. 903, Ph. 712, X. Oec. 6. 14. Cf. the similar phrasing in S. Ph. 1281: οὐ γὰρ ποτ' ἐννοεῖ τὴν ἐμὴν κτήση φρένα, also Ion 1170: ψυχὴν ἐκλήρουν, Hipp. 1040: ψυχὴν κρατήσειν.

4 φίλτρον μέγιστον: (LSJ 7): 'charm, spell'; for the φίλτρον of kinship, cf. Tr. 51f.: οἳ γὰρ συγγενεῖς ὀμίλιαι, ἀνασσ' Ἀθάνα, φίλτρον οὐ σμικρὸν φρενῶν and for maternal affection, in particular, IA 917 (and Stockert 1992 ad loc.): δεινὸν τὸ τίκτειν καὶ φέρει φίλτρον μέγα, Alcmene fr. 103 Kn.: δεινὸν τι τέκνων φίλτρον ἐνῆκεν/ θεὸς ἀνθρώποις, Protesilaus fr. 652 Kn.: ὁ παῖδες οἶον φίλτρον ἀνθρώπως φρενῶς, Biotus Meadea (TrGF I 205 F1 Sn.): τὸ θέρψαι δ' ἐν βροτοῖς πολλάκις/ πλείω πορίζει φίλτρα τοῦ φόσαι τέκνα. It also occurs widely in the sense of 'love-charm' (cf. Hipp. 509, Andr. 207, 540, S. Tr. 584, 1142, Theoc. 2. 1, Dsc. Mat. Med. 2. 164).

Fr. 14:

This distich seems to belong to the same context as fr. 13, where Danae pleads with her father not to be separated from her baby-son, thus choosing to be imprisoned in the chest together with Perseus rather than presumably ensuring safety for herself and death for her son (cf. introductory note on fr. 13). The most plausible speaker of these lines is the female chorus-leader,229 who should have been sympathetic to Danae’s situation and thus ready to praise her self-sacrifice; cf. note on φεῦ with parallels of choral distichs in praise of a character’s noble conduct.

Euripides favoured the theme of self-sacrifice (mostly female) on a personal level for one’s nearest and dearest, as here and in the Alcestis, Supp. 990-1071 (for both plays, cf. Loraux 1987, p. 28f.) and Protesilaus (Hyg. fab. 104, on self-sacrifice for one’s philoi, cf. Schmitt 1921, pp. 72-77, Lattimore 1964, p. 49) and also on a public level, as in Heracl. 474-607, Hec. 342-443, Ph. 977-1018 (the sole case of male voluntary sacrifice), IA 1368-1531, Erechtheus fr. 360 Kn. (on voluntary sacrifice for the state, cf. Wilkins 1990, pp. 177-194, Loraux 1987, pp. 32-48, Lattimore 1964, pp. 47-49). The dramatist’s insistence on the pattern of female voluntary sacrifice may point to women conceived as victims, who, however, do not hesitate to demonstrate their free will by word and action, when faced with necessity; cf. Vellacott (1975) pp. 178-204.

1 φεῦ: apart from expressing suffering, φεῦ (uttered once or twice) serves to initiate a general reflection as reaction (positive or negative) to another character’s act or utterance mostly in Euripides (cf. also introductory note on Dictys fr. 17). Even in these cases, φεῦ seems to maintain its initial emotional nuance, pointing to the speaker’s own engagement in the situation. Cf. the choral praise of Macaria’s self-sacrifice in Heracl. 535-538 (cited by

The occurrence of *γενναίοισιν* in our passage points to the importance attached to the notion of *eugeneia* in Euripidean contexts of voluntary sacrifice; similarly, the noble birth of Macaria, Polyxena, Menoeceus and Iphigenia is the driving force in each one’s self-sacrifice (cf. *Heracl.* 507-510, 513, 533f., 539-541, 553: δῆ αὕτη λόγος σοι τοῦ πρὶν εὐγενεστέρος, *Hec.* 347f.: εἰ δὲ μὴ βουλήσωμαι,/ κακὴ φανοῦμαι καὶ φιλόψυχος γυνὴ, 380f., *Ph.* 997-999, 1003-1005, *IA* 1376: εὐκλεώς πράξαι, παρείσα γ’ ἐκποδῶν τὸ δυσγενές, cf. also *Erechtheus* fr. 370. 69f. Kn. and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 *ad loc.*: γενναίοιτης οὖν Ἔκκλεια as a moral

ἀπανταχοῦ: ‘on all occasions, consistently’.

2 ἱπέπει: LSJ ⁹: here personal, ‘to shine forth’, which in this context may be preferable to the sense of ‘to suit + dative’, since the distich is praising Danae’s self-sacrifice, stressing that the valiant nature of a high-born and high-minded person (γενναίος) shines forth in all circumstances; cf. ll. 12. 104: ὅ δὲ ἐπρεπε καὶ διὰ πάντων, h.Hom. Cer. 214: ἔπι τοι πρέπει ὁμοσών αἰδώς, Pi. P. 10. 67: πειρώντι δὲ καὶ χρυσοῦ ἐν βασάνῳ πρέπει, A. Ag. 389: πρέπει δὲ, φῶς αἰνολαμπές, σίνος.


This general reflection on the mutability of human fortune, which seems to allude to Danae’s fate, should reasonably be located towards the end of the play. Webster, followed by van Looy,\(^{230}\) regarded these lines as Acrisius’ final comment, presumably after his having listened to the possible speech of the *deus ex machina* (cf. Structure). Nevertheless, on the basis of the available evidence for tragic closures attained with the appearance of a god, the plot tends to be swiftly untied upon the delivery of the divine speech, allowing for the characters’ brief submission to the god’s will, whilst leaving no space for general reflections of this length; cf. the reaction of the dramatic characters in *Hipp.* 1446-1456, *Andr.* 1273-1282, *Supp.* 1227-1231, *El.* 1295-1341, *I.T.* 1475-1485, *Ion* 1606-1618, *Hel.* 1680-1687 and *Or.* 1666-1681. I would suggest that this fragment, which directly comments on reversal of fortune, could have been the concluding evaluation of a messenger-speech reporting the exposure of the chest, in which Danae and Perseus are imprisoned (for the messenger-speech, cf. Structure); cf. the general reflection of comparable length and similar tone at the end of the messenger-speech in *Med.* 1224-1230 (cf. Page 1938, Mastronarde 2002 *ad loc.*), also *Andr.* 1161-1165, *Supp.* 726-730 (and Collard 1975, *ad loc.*), *Heracl.* 863-866 (and Wilkins 1993 *ad loc.*) Captive Melanippe fr. 495. 40-44 Kn. and Friis Johansen (1959) pp. 151 f. and n. 3, p. 155, De Jong (1991) pp. 74-76, 191f.

The simile of the mutability of human fortune to the transformations of *aether* (for the all-disposing power of which, cf. note *ad loc.*) points to humans as subject to necessity and cosmic order. Cf. similarly *Hypsipyle* fr. 757. 2-7 Kn. (and Bond 1964 *ad loc.*), *Ino* fr.

---

415 Kn. and the extended cosmic image in *Ph.* 541-545 (though the natural world is offered there as model rather than parallel). At the same time, the present simile alludes to the exposure of Danae and Perseus to the forces of nature and the occurrence of πώδεις with its specifying nuance (cf. note *ad loc.*) could point to this very experience; cf. the depiction of the uncontrollable physical environment reflecting Danae’s helplessness in Simon. *PMG* 543 (cf. The Myth, p. 12). The imagery of the present fragment seems thus to provide a transition between the literal and the symbolic. Cf. the similar function of the nautical metaphor in *Tr.* 688-696 and Barlow (1971) p. 118f. The imagery of *aethēr* as reflecting the fragility of human fate occurs also in *HF* 508-512: ὅρατ' ἐμ' ὅσπερ ἢ περίβλεπτος βροτοίς/ ὄνομαστά πράσσων. καὶ μ' ἀφελεβ' ἢ τύχη/ ὅσπερ πτερόν πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἡμέραι μιᾶι/ ὁ δ' ὀλβος ὁ μέγας ἢ τ' ὁδὲ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτων/βεβαιός ἔστι, fr. inc. 908b Kn.: ὡς δυστυχεῖν φὺς καὶ κακός πεπραγέναι/ ἀνθρώπως ἔγένου καὶ τ' δυστυχεῖς βίου/ ἐκείθεν ἔλαβες, ὥθεν ἀπασίν ἤρξατο/ τρέφειν δι' αἰθήρ ἐνδιδοὺς θνητίσι πνοάς.


2 τῷ: the deictic quality of the pronoun indicates that the speaker is probably pointing towards the sky, from which the transformations of aether emerge. The gesture also presents aether as a less abstract element, which may allude to the tangible experience of the subjection of Danae and Perseus to its successive transformations.


οὖ τάδ' ἔστι δή: I would propose οὖ, though not as genitive of origin, as Bothe suggested (‘ex quo mundus genitus’). The pronoun evidently needs to refer to the attributes of *aether*, which are about to be described, and rather seems to be a predicative genitive of possession (‘which has the following features’); cf. for instance, *Alc.* 788f.: εὐθραυσείς σαυτόν, πίνε, τὸν καθ' ἠμέραν̣/βίον λογίζου σὸν, τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῇς τύχῃς, *Hipp.* 911: σιωπής δ' οὖδεν ἔργον, *LA* 1142f.: αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ σιγάν ὁμολογοῦντος ἔστι σοι/ καὶ τὸ στενάζειν and Cooper (1998) I pp. 172-176.

3-5: the oldest division of the year was in two parts (i.e. summer and winter) and kept occurring in literature, even when the other seasons were added; cf. for instance, E. *Alcmeon* fr. 78a Kn., also A. *Ag.* 4f. (and Fraenkel 1950, p. 5), S. *Ai.* 671, Thucydides’ division in summer and winter (Th. 2. 1.1) and Nilsson (1962 7) p. 24. For the division of the year in three seasons, cf. *h. Hom.* 399f. (and Richardson 1974 *ad loc.*), [A.] *Pr.* 454-456 (and Griffith 1983 *ad loc.*), *Ar. Av.* 709, Lyr. adesp. fr. 37.5 Powell, D.S. 1. 26.5.

The first reference to four seasons occurs in Alcman *PMG* 20.


6-9: at first glance, the following groups of people appear to be mentioned: those who happen to live in good fortune (1. 6f.: τῶν μὲν ἐντυχεῖ/ λαμπρά γαλήνης), others, on the contrary, who go through adversities (1. 7f.: τῶν δὲ συννέφει πάλιν/ ἕωςιν τε σὺν κακοίσιν) and some who pass from prosperity to misfortune (1. 8f.: οἱ δ’ ὀλβοῦν μέτα φθίνουσιν). As regards the first group, the idea of permanent happiness is a very strange notion for Greek poetry (cf. indicatively De Romilly 1968, pp. 89-97), not least for tragedy and for a passage comparing human fortune with the transformations of aether, therefore, it would be problematic to assume that the reference to the first group ends at 1. 7; if, on the other hand, οἱ δ’ ὀλβοῦν μέτα φθίνουσι is taken to refer to the first group of people, then we have a pathetic commonplace in tragedy, that is, the dramatic change from prosperity to misfortune, at which this passage culminates (cf. note on Dictys fr. 2.7f.). To support this interpretation, one has to understand in 1. 8 οἱ μὲν before ἕωςιν τε σὺν κακοίσιν, as noted by Kannicht ad loc. (ἕωςιν τε aut 'et vivunt' aut καὶ οἱ μὲν ἕωςιν, cf. Denniston 19542, p. 166). In this case, we would have the following cross-arrangement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>τῶν μὲν ἐντυχεῖ λαμπρά γαλήνης</th>
<th>τῶν δὲ συννέφει πάλιν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(οἱ μὲν) ἕωςιν τε σὺν κακοίσιν</td>
<td>οἱ δ’ ὀλβοῦν μέτα φθίνουσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 8f.: ‘...and some live in misfortune, while those who are prosperous perish, according to parallel seasonal changes.’
The reduction from olbos to misfortune evidently corresponds to Danaë’s situation, as in Dictys fr. 2. 3-8 (cf. note ad loc.).\(^{231}\) The reference to the fragility of fortune in the present fragment may also be an implicit final reply to the argument for the great power of olbioi expressed in fr. 9 possibly by Acrisius.

οὖτω δὲ: for similes of the same structure, cf. HeracL. 427-432: δὲ τέκν’, ἐοιγιμεν ναυτίλουσιν οὔτινες... οὖτω δὲ χήμεις... , Tr. 688-696: ναῦταις γὰρ ἦν μὲν μέτριος ἤ χειμών φέρειν... οὖτω δὲ κάγῳ..., also A. Ch. 247-254: ιδὼν δὲ γέννας εὐνιν ἀιτεῖ πατρός,... θανόντος ἐν πλεκταισι και σπειράμασιν/ δεινής ἐξήντη... οὖτω δὲ κάμε τήνδε τ’.... , S. Ant. 423-428: πικράς/ ὀρνιθος δὲν φθόγγον, ὡς ὅταν... οὖτω δὲ χαύτη... , Lovers of Achilles fr. 149. 3-9 R.: δταν πάγον φανέντος αἰθρίου... οὖτω δὲ τούς ἑρώντας... 


εὔτυχεῖ: denoting good fortune —often accidental— the achievement of some desired end and security from adversity (cf. De Heer 1969, pp. 75-78, McDonald 1978, pp. 294f., 300f.); cf. for instance, Alc. 926, Med. 1090-1092, Hipp. 1017f., Hel. 855f., 1030f., Ph. 1017f., Or. 895.

7 λαμπρά γαλήνη: corresponding to the λαμπρὸν σέλας of l. 3. For sunlight as symbol of prosperity, cf. note on fr. 2.1.


---

\(^{231}\) Kurtz (1985, p. 135f.) interpreted the present passage by taking φθίνουσιν as linked with ζῶσιν, in the sense of ζῶσιν, οἱ μὲν σῶν κακοῦσιν, οἱ δ’ ἀλήθείας μέτα, <καὶ> φθίνουσιν... The basic problem of this interpretation is that there is no second τε not καὶ, which is needed to link ζῶσιν with φθίνουσιν. Moreover, l. 8 would merely repeat what has just been said in ll. 6-7 (i.e. some live in misfortune, others in good fortune), while the dramatic change of fortune to misfortune, which is a topos in tragedy and the culminating point of this passage, as it corresponds to Danaë’s situation, would not be made clear.
8 f.: the pair ζάσιν-φθίνουσιν (they live-they perish) corresponds to ζήν τε καὶ φθίνειν (l. 5), while σὺν κακοίς-οἱ δ' ὀλβοῦ μέτα could be related to θάλλειν τε καὶ μή (l. 5); cf. Kurtz (1985) p. 136.
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Fr. 16:


The complete loss of context makes the word impossible to locate with probability; a reference to the prophecy, according to which Acrisius would be killed by his grandson (cf. esp. Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler, [Apollod.] 2. 4.1) may have occurred in the narrative prologue reporting the προπεραγμένα and could account for Danae’s seclusion in the chamber (if Euripides chose to follow the mythical tradition, cf. Structure). Acrisius’ possible reminiscence of the oracle upon his discovery of Perseus’ identity may have given rise to the matter of the baby’s elimination, which is what could have motivated Danae’s plea and perhaps her self-sacrifice (fr. 13, 14). The word might also be located in the speech of a deus ex machina, whose appearance is required to confirm that Perseus is Zeus’ son and foretell that mother and child will be rescued and presumably that the oracle will be fulfilled at the end (cf. Structure).232 In this case, χρησμοφωία may have referred either to the initial oracle, the eventual fulfillment of which is likely to be confirmed by the god, or to a possible concluding prophecy of the deus ex machina (in terms of the fate of mother and child), which is occasionally described as ‘oracle’; cf. Ion 1569f.: ἄλλ' ὡς περαίνω πράγμα καὶ χρησμοῦς θεοῦ/ ἐφ' οὕτων ἐξευζ' ἀρματ', εἰσακούσατον, Ba. 1333: χρησμὸς ὡς λέγει

232 Huys (1995, p. 130) reasonably locates this fragment in the prologue or epilogue of the play.
Δώς and the prophecies of Eurystheus and Polymestor in *Heracl.* 1028 (χρησμών παλαιών Λοξίου δερήσωματ) and *Hec.* 1267 respectively.\(^{233}\)

Apart from this single word, which seems to indicate that Euripides made use of the oracle in his treatment, there is no evidence for its dramatic function. Unlike Sophocles, who uses oracles to hint to processes inaccessible to human reason, designating, at the same time, human struggle to evade their fulfillment (for the possible function of the oracle in his treatments of Danae’s legend, cf. The Myth, pp. 15-17), oracles and divine will, in general, are taken as a starting point in Euripides and subsequently, the plot is worked out in human terms; cf. for instance, Phaedra’s condition, which is taken as god-sent from the beginning, but it is the manner in which she elects to cope with it, which gives scope for the exploration of her psychology,\(^{234}\) and also Polyxena and Iphigenia, who, when faced with the divine necessity of sacrifice, succeed in converting their helplessness to free will.\(^{235}\) Accordingly, the oracle in the *Danae* might have been taken as a given and the plot may have worked out on the basis of human psychology, though owing to the complete lack of evidence for this matter, I would not hazard any further guess as to its particular function in the play. It should be noted, however, that unlike Sophocles’ treatments, where the notion of Acrisius’ fear for the fulfillment of the oracle seems to have been prominent and decisive for his actions (cf. The Myth, p. 16f.), the surviving fragments of Euripides’ play do not provide any clue as to Acrisius’ reaction to the oracle, but rather seem to touch on the social matter of Danae’s illicit motherhood (cf. fr. 6, also frr. 7-10 and notes *ad loc.*, on the possible interpretation of her seduction as bribery, and Structure, p. 30). In the absence of further evidence for the play, of course, no conclusion can be drawn, but the oracle appears, at least on the strength of the available sources, to have been less prominent in Euripides than in Sophocles.\(^{236}\)

---

\(^{233}\) For the concluding prophecies of the *deus ex machina*, cf. Dunn (1996) p. 66f.


EURIPIDES’ DICTYS

1. The Myth in Literature and Art

In order to study Euripides’ treatment of this phase of the legend in 431 BC, it is essential to explore the sources prior to the dramatist, with the purpose of establishing the mythical background of the Dictys, as well as those subsequent to the play, which could offer an insight to the degree of popularity of the myth in later ages (the possible echoes of the Dictys in later times are studied separately in the testimonia for the play and in the chapter on Reception).

The earliest detailed account of the events following the arrival of Danae and Perseus at Seriphos belongs to Pherecydes (FGrH 3 F 11/ fr. 11 Fowler), which is briefly and to a degree confusingly reported by the scholiast on A.R. 4. 1515 (Wendel): Dictys takes Danae and Perseus under his protection,\(^{237}\) until the latter grows to manhood. Subsequently, Polydectes, Dictys’ brother and king of Seriphos, becomes enamoured of Danae. In order to win her, Polydectes organizes an eranos inviting Perseus among others. When the latter asks what contribution is needed for the feast, Polydectes replies "a horse", but Perseus is strangely reported to have answered "the Gorgon’s head" (the explanation follows below). When the next day Perseus brings a horse, like the other guests, Polydectes does not accept it and insists that he should bring the Gorgon’s head as promised, otherwise he will claim Danae. Perseus leaves at a state of despair. Helped by Hermes and Athena he manages to decapitate the Gorgon and returns to Seriphos asking Polydectes to gather the people to see the Gorgon’s head. Consequently, the king and the crowd are turned to stone. Then Perseus departs for Argos with his mother and Andromeda, leaving Dictys as king of the island. Pherecydes’ summarized narrative runs as follows:

Περιέχει ἐν Σερίφῳ μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς διάγοντος παρὰ Δίκτυς καὶ ἠβησαντος, Πολυδέκτης ὁ Δίκτυος ὁμομήτριος <ἅδελφος>,\(^{238}\) βασιλεὺς Σερίφου τυγχάνων,

\(^{237}\) Cf. Paus. 2. 18.1 referring to a precinct probably in Seriphos (and not in Athens, cf. Frazer 1898, 1 p. 572) in honour of Dictys and the Nereid Clymene, who saved Perseus’ life.

\(^{238}\) However, in FGrH 3 F 4/ fr. 10 Fowler, Pherecydes states that they also had the same father: ἠσαν γὰρ ὁ Δίκτυος καὶ ὁ Πολυδέκτης, Ἀνδροθῆς τῆς Κάστορος καὶ Περισθένου τοῦ Δαμάστορος, τοῦ
After the narration of the decapitation of the Gorgon, the account continues with Perseus' return to Seriphos:

Perseus de eis Séríphon genvómenos ἔρχεται παρά Πολυδέκτην, καὶ κελεῦει συναθροίσαι τὸν λαὸν ὅπως δείξῃ αὐτὸς τὴν τῆς Γοργώνος κεφαλὴν, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἵδοντες ἀπολιθωθήσονται. ὁ δὲ Πολυδέκτης, ἀολλίσας τὸν όχλον, κελεῦει αὐτῶν δεικνύειν. ὅ ὁ ἀποστρεφόμενος ἐξαιρεῖ ἐκ τῆς κιβίσεως, καὶ δείξαται, οἱ δὲ ἵδοντες λίθοι ἐγένοντο. ἢ ἂν Ἀθηνᾶ παρὰ Περσέος λαμβάνοσα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐντίθεσιν εἰς τὴν εὐαίσθητον αἰγίδα: τὴν δὲ κίβον Ἑρμῆς ἀποδίδοι καὶ τὰ πέδιλα καὶ τὴν κοῖνην τοῖς Νύμφαις. ἱστορεῖ Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ β'.

The genealogist closes the narrative of the adventures of Danae and Perseus in Seriphos thus (FGrH 3 F12/ fr. 12 Fowler/ schol. A.R. 4. 1091 Wendel):

ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐξης καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἄμαθου φησιν Ἀκρισίῳ, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀπολιθώσιν Πολυδέκτου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γοργώνος κεφαλῆς, δίκτυν μὲν Περσέος καταλείπει {ἐν Σερίφῳ} βασιλεία τῶν λειλομένων Σεριφιάων, αὐτὸς δὲ ἔβη πλέον

2  ἀδελφὸς add. Jacoby || 7 ἐπεκοῦμιζον conici pro ἐπεκοῦμιζον L: ἐκοῦμιζον fere P || 8 μὴ P: om. L

3 ἀολλίσας ed. princ.: ἀολλίσας L: συναθροίσας P || 6 Ἑρμής ed. princ.: Ἑρμή Stephanus, quem secutus Jacoby, ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδίδωσι post κοῖνην addidit

239 The reading ἀπεκοῦμιζον (LSJ 9: ‘to carry away’) of L and adopted by all the editors does not suit the context; instead, we need a verb denoting ‘to bring’. I suggest that ἐπεκοῦμιζον (LSJ 9: ‘to bring or carry to someone’) may have been the original reading wrongly copied as ἐπεκοῦμιζον. The reading ἐκοῦμιζον (‘to carry, to convey, to bring to a place’), which seems to occur in P, is also possible.
The summary of Pherecydes' narrative by the scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes leaves unclear what happened at the feast organized by Polydectes. The later account in [Apollod.] 2.4.2 sheds some light on the confused summary of Pherecydes' story:

Ps.-Apollodorus' account presents a clearer version of the events at the eranos, as compared to the confused summary of the scholiast: Polydectes organized the eranos on the pretext of being a suitor for the hand of Hippodamia and of collecting horses, presumably for the chariot-race with her father Oenomaus. In Pherecydes' account, the eranos seems to have been an eranos-feast, as found in Homer, where everyone has to contribute, usually by bringing food; in Pherecydes, however, the contributions are not alimentary, instead the participants are expected to bring horses as presents for the host of the banquet. On the other hand, the gathering of gifts mentioned in the Bibliotheca resembles the fifth-century type of eranos-loan, namely a friendly loan supplied to someone in particular need by a group of people, though it is not clear whether Polydectes is supposed to pay back for the contributions. If not, this would be the case of a collective gift, rather than a typical eranos-loan, which I would parallel to the gift-gathering organized by Alcinous for Odysseus (Od.

---

240 No previous reference to the Cyclopes occurs in the summary of Pherecydes' text. Though they are associated with the fortification of Mycenae (E. HF 943-945, IA 1500f., Paus. 2. 16.5), which was founded by Perseus, their role at this stage of the story remains unknown and is not attested by later authors.


8. 389-417, 13. 10-12); in fact, gift-giving in primitive and archaic societies bears the notion of reciprocity, which is a basic feature of the eranos. Perseus’ offer to bring even the Gorgon’s head seems here to be presented as a piece of foolish bravado, which is exploited by Polydectes in order to eliminate him. This appears to be the case in the summarized version of Phercydes’ account as well, except that in the latter Danae is the forfeit, which causes Perseus’ despair. It has been aptly noted, however, that Perseus’ offer could have hardly been predicted by the king and his ulterior motive for organizing the eranos cannot thus be explained, this point may indicate a gap in both narratives, as the impression given from the context is that Polydectes planned the eranos with the particular purpose of trapping Perseus in a certain manner, so as to get him out of the way.

Ps.-Apollodorus (2. 4.3) continues by reproducing the plot of the Dictys (cf. Dictys T5): upon returning to Seriphos, Perseus finds out that Polydectes’ violence has forced Danae and Dictys to become suppliants. He thus goes into the palace and lithifies Polydectes and his friends. The rest of the account follows Phercydes:

καταστήματος δὲ τῆς Σερίφου Δίκτου βασιλέα, ἀπέδωκε τὰ μὲν πέδιλα καὶ τὴν κίβισιν καὶ τὴν κυνήν Ἔρμη, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν τῆς Γοργόνος Ἀθηνᾶ. Ἐρμής μὲν οὖν τὰ

243 Cf. Finley (1977) pp. 64-66. Alcinous’ act, however, is not described by Homer as eranos, since this term is used in the epics with its early meaning, denoting a feast demanding contributions.


245 For Polydectes’ assignment to Perseus, cf. also A.R. 4. 1515, Arr. Anab. 3. 3.1 and for his petrification, Nonn. D. 25. 80ff., 47. 55ff. Πολυδέκτης is an epithet of Hades as ‘the receiver of many’ in h. Hom. Cer. 9 (cf. Richardson 1974 ad loc.) and Cornut. 35. On this basis, Fontenrose (1959, pp. 293, 298f.) perceived Polydectes as a personification of Hades sending Perseus to the land of Medusa, which symbolizes the realm of death. Since, however, there is no evidence from literature or iconography identifying the king of Seriphos as Hades, this suggestion remains speculative. On the other hand, the name Polydectes may well denote ‘the host’ of the feast, in view of the eranos he organized; so Gernet (1968) p. 48, n. 153.


247 The later scholium of Thomas Magister on Pi. P. 10. 46 (Abel) mentions that Perseus proposed to bring the Gorgon’s head, as he could not afford a horse, which may well account for both Perseus’ offer and Polydectes’ motive for organizing the eranos; considering, however, that Thomas closely follows the ancient scholium on this passage and adds only this piece of information, it cannot be proved whether this explanation originates in a lost source or is his own reasonable inference. The phrasing in Ps.-Apollodorus’ narrative could fit this interpretation, since οὐ λαβὼν τῶν ἴππων does not need to be interpreted as ‘he did not take/accept the horses’, but could also be translated as ‘he did not receive the horses’ (because Perseus did not bring any horses). In such a case, however, one should have to contest the reliability of Phercydes’ account, at least as transmitted in schol. A.R. 4. 1515, where Perseus is clearly said to have brought a horse, which Polydectes did not accept. It cannot be completely ruled out that the scholiast may have not had direct access to this part of Phercydes’ narrative — to judge from the clumsy and confusing epitome — and thus used an intermediary source, which may account for a possible inaccuracy coming from misinterpretation of the passage. Nevertheless, I would hesitate to take for granted that Phercydes’ account is corrupt, in favour of information of unknown provenance provided in a later scholium.
The earliest literary source for the Perseus-Gorgon story is Hes. *Th.* 280ff., though there is no indication associating the slaying of the Gorgon with the events in Seriphos. The Mycenaean suffix *—evg* of Perseus’ name could take the roots of his legend back to the Bronze Age (along with the references to Danae’s bronze chamber, cf. *Danae, The Myth*, p. 12) and the legendary foundation of Mycenae by the hero points in the same direction. His heroic status is attested also in the fragments of the *Ehoiai* (fr. 129. 14-15 M.-W.), where he is described as μήσταρ φόβοι (‘deviser of terror’), a formula characterizing warriors. The same source preserves the earliest reference to Dictys and Polydectes, though we are not in a position to know whether they already formed part of Perseus’ legend (fr. 8 M.-W.): Μάγνης δ’ αδίκτυν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολυδέκτεα. The fixed epithet ἀντίθεος (‘equal to a god’) is attached to kings and nobles. It certainly does not have any kind of moral dimension, but is indicative of high social status, in accordance with the values of epic poetry. Likewise, Penelope’s suitors are described as ἀντίθεοι (*Od*. 14. 18) in view of their noble origin, physical appearance, wealth and courage, as Eustathius explains (schol. *ad loc.*).

248 The reference to Athena’s responsibility for Medusa’s beheading does not originate in Pherecydes and mostly recurs in later sources, such as Servius’ schol. *Verg. Aen.* 6. 289 (Thilo-Hagen) and Tzetzes schol. *Lyce.* 838 (Scheer), who relies on the narrative of the *Bibliotheca*. In *E. Ion* 989-996 (cf. Lee 1997, p. 270) Medusa is said to have been killed by Athena herself.

249 Cf. also *Sc.* 216-237.


251 Cf. Hecat. fr. 22 Fowle/ *FGrH* 1 F22, E. *IA* 1500, Nicand. *Alex.* 100, Paus. 2. 15. 4, 2. 16. 3 and schol. Eust. *Il.* 2. 569 (van der Valk). Pausanias refers to Perseus’ Hellenistic fountain (2. 16.6) and precinct in Mycenae (2. 18.1), while there survives an archaic inscription (IG IV 493) from the hero’s cult in this city; cf. Jameson (1990) pp. 214ff.


Along with Pherecydes, Pindar is the earliest source to attest Polydectes’ deserved punishment; he is the only one to mention (in P. 12. 14f., dated in 490) that the king used Perseus’ absence to reduce Danae to slavery and make her his concubine: λυγρόν τ’ ἔρανον Πολυδέκτηθα θήκε ματρὸς τ’ ἐμπεδοῦ δουλοσύναν το τ’ ἀναγκαίων λέχος.255 Similarly, the papyrus-fragment of the Pindaric dithyramb fr. 70d M. (=Pi. Dith. Oxy. 4/ fr. inc. 284 Schröder) mentions the petrification of the king and the Seriphian crowd (ll. 40-43: ἦ γὰρ [α]ὑτῶν μετάστασιν ἄκραν / ..θη[κε]· πέτραι δ’ [ἐπ][α]θεν ἀντί[λ] φωτῶν / ...]ν τ’ ἐρωτος ἀνταμοιβάν ἐδάσσατο[ / στρατάρχῳ], while some lines above, Pindar uses similar phrasing with P. 12. 15 again possibly with reference to Danae’s forced cohabitation with Polydectes (l. 14f.: ψυτευν ματρ[υ] λεξεά τ’ ἀνα[γκ]κκαία δολ[ί]. The ἀναγκαία λέξεα have been alternatively regarded as pointing to Danae’s rape by Proetus (cf. Danae, The Myth, p. 13f.).256 The remaining lines of the dithyramb, however, refer to Polydectes, whose petrification (ll. 40-43) is presented as the retribution of his misconduct (ἐρωτος ἀνταμοιβᾶ, cf. l. 14f.), while the occurrence of ἐδάσσατο interestingly alludes to the eranos, where the king asked for the Gorgon’s head.257 Moreover, the plural suggests prolonged sexual subservience, as that imposed on Danae by Polydectes, rather than an act of rape. A reference to Proetus in this context seems thus unlikely.258

The phase of the legend dealing with Perseus’ manhood inspired several dramatic productions prior to the Dictys. A Perseus tragedy, of which only the title is known, was written by Pratinas and produced together with his Tantalus and the satyr play Palaistai by his son Aristias in 467 BC. The following interesting fragment from an unknown play ascribed to Aristias might be related to the Perseus and the foundation of Mycenae: μικάτα δ’ ὀρέχθη τὸ λάινον πέδον (TrGF I 9 F6);259 according to Pausanias (2. 16.3), Perseus being thirsty pulled a mushroom (μύκης) from the ground, whereupon water gushed out and therefore he named the town that he founded at this place (Mycenae) after the μύκης. Considering also that it was Aristias who produced the Perseus after his father’s

255 Cf. schol. vet. ad loc. (Drachmann) and Farnell (1932) p. 236, Köhnken (1971) p. 127, n. 55. The theme of the petrification of Polydectes and the Seriphian crowd briefly occurs also in P. 10. 44-48 and schol. vet. ad loc. (Drachmann).
death, it is conceivable that this fragment could have been mistakenly ascribed to Aristias instead of Pratinas.

Aeschylus wrote the *Phorcides*, in which, according to [Erat.] *Cat.* 22, Perseus outwits the Graiai by seizing their one eye and catching the Gorgons asleep, he beheads Medusa.\(^{260}\) The play is paralleled to the *Prometheus* and the tragedies set in Hades, in terms of its spectacular effects, if we trust Bywater’s plausible conjecture \(\delta\upsilon\iota\zeta\) on *Ar. Poet.* 18, 1456a.2. He is also attested to have written a *Polydectes*, of which only the title survives (*TrGF* III T 78. 15b). The complete absence of quotations may suggest that it did not survive to be included in Aristophanes’ edition, which was based on Lycurgus’ fourth-century official copy of the plays of the repertory, otherwise it would have stood a good chance of being cited by later authors.\(^{261}\) The title as such seems to point to the conflict between Polydectes and Perseus, either the petrification or the events at the eranos.\(^{262}\) The *Phorcides* and *Polydectes* may have well belonged to the same connected tetralogy with the satyr-play *Dictyulci*,\(^{263}\) which treats the arrival of the chest at Seriphos, fished up by Dictys and the chorus of satyrs (fr. 46a-c). Silenus is courting Danae, intending to take mother and child with him (fr. 47a. 765-772 R.). Danae bursts out, in view of her new misfortune (fr. 47a. 773-85 R.). Silenus, who seems to be the ‘satyric’ counterpart of Polydectes,\(^{264}\) is trying to win the infant Perseus over (fr. 47a. 786-795 R.), so as to soften the mother’s heart, and is making wedding-plans for Danae (fr. 47a. 799-832 R.). Both mother and child seem finally to have been protected by Dictys.\(^{265}\) It should be noted that apart from Euripides’ play, the sole attested dramatic appearance of Dictys is in the *Dictyulci*. On the basis of Sicelisms traced in the *Phorcides* and *Dictyulci*, the tetralogy may be dated after Aeschylus’ journey to Sicily in 472-468 BC.\(^{266}\)


\(^{263}\) Cf. Pfeiffer (1938) p. 20.


\(^{265}\) For a reconstruction of the play, cf. Werre de Haas (1961) pp. 72-75. An Attic red-figured pyxis of 470-60 BC (first published by Clairmont 1953, pp. 92-94) is considered to have been inspired by the *Dictyulci*; cf. Trendall and Webster (1971) fig. II 3. I would explain the absence of satyrs from the vase-painting by the fact that the first scene depicted is placed before their arrival to help pull off the chest and the second after their being repulsed by Dictys.

\(^{266}\) So *TrGF* III p. 362 and for further argumentation for a late date, cf. Goins (1997) pp. 193-210. The vase-illustration possibly inspired by the *Dictyulci* (cf. previous note) is also dated rather late, in about 470-60 B.C.
Unlike the art of the Archaic Age, which had a penchant for scenes depicting Perseus with the Gorgoneion and the decapitation of Medusa, fifth-century vase-painting introduced the theme of Polydectes' petrification, as treated in mythography and poetry. Accordingly, Pausanias (1. 22.7) refers to a painting in the picture-gallery at the northwestern part of the Propylaea (dated between 436-432 BC) depicting Perseus as bringing the Gorgon's head to Polydectes.

Cratinus' *Seriphioi*, which is subsequent to the *Dictys*, may be dated in about 423/422 BC. Though any allusion to Euripides' play is now impossible to discern, fr. 218 K.-A. referring to tragic masks and the echo of [A.] *Pr.* 793 in fr. inc. 343 K.-A. (probably belonging to the *Seriphioi*) with reference to the land of the Gorgons may suggest a burlesque of the tragic treatments of the myth. Strabo (10. 5.10), having obviously Cratinus' play in mind, attests that comic poets explained the infertility and the rocky image of Seriphos as resulting from the petrification of its people by Perseus. The theme of the play is mythical and further mythological references are discernible in frs. 222, 223.1 and fr. inc. 343 K.-A. (Perseus' itinerary to the land of the Gorgons) and fr. 231 K.-A. (Andromeda). Nevertheless, the references to contemporary politics in frs. 221, 223.2f., 227 and 228 K.-A., suggest that the *Seriphioi* was not merely a mythological burlesque, but

---

The title of the other tragedy of the tetralogy is lost. Gantz (1980, p.150) proposed the *Thalamopoioi*, relating it to the construction of Danae's bronze chamber. The *Thalamopoioi*, however, has also been assumed to be another title for the second play of the Danaid tetralogy dealing with the construction of the fifty marital chambers (Wecklein 1893, pp. 413 ff.) or even a satyr-play (so Webster 1950, p. 86). The meagre evidence for this play is inconclusive. Howe (1953, pp. 271ff.) pointed out the striking similarity and theatrical character of three vase-illustrations dated in around 490 B.C. (all three depicting Acrisius, Danae, the infant Perseus and a carpenter preparing the chest, see *LIMC*, s.v. 'Akrisos' figg. 1-3), and tried to relate them to the lost play of Aeschylus' tetralogy. This suggestion, however, cannot be reconciled with the evidence for the tetralogy, pointing to a late date, as already mentioned. Nevertheless, a lost early fifth-century tragedy on the Danae-myth may seem possible as source of inspiration.

267 See *LIMC* s.v. 'Perseus' pp. 335f., 339, 341, 345f.
268 See *LIMC* s.v. 'Polydectes', figg. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8.
269 Cf. Frazer (1898) *ad loc.*
273 Cf. fr. 225 K.-A. praising the fertility of the island, which could either be an ironic remark on the mock-fertility of Seriphos or could refer to the image of the island before the petrification of its people; cf. *PCG ad loc.*
may be paralleled to the *Dionysalexandros* and *Nemesis*, in terms of the exploitation of myth for political allusion.\(^{274}\)

No other treatment of these events is known and their popularity seems to have decreased from the fourth century BC onwards, with the exception of sources echoing the *Dictys* (cf. below T3, T4, T5, probably T6, and T7 only indirectly). Latin literature presents an interesting variety, as regards the phase of the legend following the exposure of Danae and Perseus. Hyginus' account (*fab.* 63) differs substantially from the known sources in terms of the events in Seriphos:

Danae Acrisii et Aganippes\(^{275}\) filia. huic fuit fatum ut quod peperisset Acrisium interficeret; quod timens Acrisius eam in muro lapideo praeclusit. Iuppiter autem in imbreauereum conversus cum Danae concubuit, ex quo compressu natus est Perseus. quam pater ob stuprum inclusam in arca cum Perseo in mare deiecit, ea voluntate lovis delata est in insulam Seriphum, quam piscator Dictys cum invenisset, effracta *<arca>* vidit mulierem cum infantae, quos ad regem Polydeectem perduxit, qui eam in coniugio habuit et Perseum educavit in templum Minervae. quod cum Acrisius rescisset eos ad Polydeectem morari, repetitum eos profectus est; quo cum venisset, Polydeectes pro eis deprecatus est, Perseus Acrisio avo suo fidem dedit se eum numquam interferturum. qui cum tempeste retineretur, Polydeectes disco misso, quern ventus distulit in caput Acrisii, eum interficit. ita quod voluntate sua noluit, deorum factum est; sepulto autem eo Argos profectus est regnaque avita possedit.

---

\(^{6}\) arca suppl. Marshall \(\|\) 8 quo Micyllus: quod F

Hyginus thus narrates how the chest was fished up in Seriphos by a fisherman named Dictys (not mentioned here as Polydeectes' brother), who took Danae and Perseus to king Polydeectes. The king married Danae, sent Perseus to be brought up in the temple of Athena, and protected them from Acrisius. The latter was accidentally killed by Perseus at the funeral games in honour of Polydeectes.\(^{276}\)


\(^{275}\) The name Aganippe for Danae's mother appears only in Hyginus; this is the name of the Nymph after whom the spring of the Muses in Helicon was named (Paus. 9. 29. 5 and schol. Call. *Aet.* 1. P. *Oxy.* 2262, fr. 2a. 16, 24) and of a daughter of Aegyptus (Plut. *De fluv.* 16. 1. 10). Hyginus may have confused the name Eurydice with Aganippe, as he does, for instance, in *fab.* 15, naming Hypsipyle's son Deipylus instead of Thoas and *fab.* 123, where the son of Andromache and Neoptolemus is named Amphialus instead of Molossus.

\(^{276}\) For Acrisius' death at the funeral games of Polydeectes, cf. also *fab.* 273.
Though the mythographer's work often provides rough plots of tragedies, especially Euripidean, there is no evidence from any of the dramatic treatments agreeing with this particular narrative. The sole reference to the variant of Perseus' upbringing by Polydectes occurs in the D-Scholium on II. 14. 319 (van Thiel): διασωθέντων δὲ τούτων εἰς Σέρυφον τὴν νήσον συνέβη ἀνατραφήναι τὸν παῖδα παρὰ Πολυδέκτη. This piece of information accords with Hyginus' account and indicates that the lost authority of fab. 63 was known to the source of the D-Scholia, the 'Mythographus Homericus' (ca. second century AD). Considering that the preference for less known forms of legends is Alexandrian and that both Hyginus and the 'MH' draw from Hellenistic authors, I would suspect that the source of Hyginus' account and of the variant in the D-scholium might have been Alexandrian.

Occasional Latin references to Polydectes' assignment to Perseus and his petrification do exist; it seems, however, that the 'Seriphian' part of the story was overshadowed in Latin literature by the 'Italian' version of Danae's adventures, which presented her as reaching the coast of Latium and founding Ardea (cf. Danae, The Myth, p. 20f.).

2. The Date of the Play

According to hyp. Medea by Aristophanes of Byzantium (T1), the Dictys was staged in 431 BC together with the Medea, the Philoctetes and the satyr play Theristae. Euripides' production won the third prize. For more detail, cf. note on T1.


278 Cf. Rose (1930) p. 43, referring to Hyginus' peculiar variants of myths, such as those introduced in the legend of the Atreidae (fab. 98, 117, 121) and of the death of Erechtheus' daughters (fab. 46 and Rose's note ad loc.), which he regards as Alexandrian.

279 Cf. van der Valk (1963) p. 313.

280 Cf. Ov. Met. 5. 242ff., Hyg. fab. 64, De Astr. 2. 12 (following [Erat.] Cat. 22), Myth. Vat. 2. 134, 135, 137, Serv. ad Verg. Aen. 6. 289 (Thilo-Hagen).
3. *Dramatis personae*

On the basis of the evidence, we are in a position to identify the following dramatic characters:

(1) Dictys: the character after whom the play is named, hence a central figure. For his role, cf. *T5, T3*. He is the speaker of *fr. 2* and among the candidates for *frr. 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16* (cf. commentary *ad loc.*). He is the addressee of *frr. 3* and *11*. It remains unclear whether Dictys is Polydectes' brother in the play, as attested in mythography (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 11 Fowler, [Apollod.] 2. 4.2). Nor are we in a position to know whether Dictys is rewarded at the exodos with the kingship of Seriphos, as mentioned in Pherecydes' account, which is followed by [Apollod.] 2. 4.3. If Dictys was Polydectes' elder brother in the play (for Dictys' old age, cf. *T3, frr. 3, 11*), his reduction to fisherman might have resulted from usurpation of his power by Polydectes in the προκεπραγμένα. In this case, he would have been rightfully restored to the throne of Seriphos after Polydectes' petrification. Though this possibility remains unproven, the popularity of the theme of usurpation in tragedy is worth noting; apart from the typical cases of the Atreidae (cf. A. *Agamemnon, Choephoroi*, the *Electra* of Sophocles and Euripides) and the Labdacids (A. *Seven, E. Phoenissae*), this theme was also treated in the *Heracles* (Lycus usurping Creon's kingship), *Oeneus* (old Oeneus thrown out of his throne by his nephews, cf. schol. Ar. *Ach. 418 Wilson*) and *Cresphontes* (Polyphontes seizing the power of his brother, elder Cresphontes, cf. Hyg. *fabb. 137, 184*).

The figure of Dictys as the type of the righteous man of modest means seems to be a precursor of the Farmer in Euripides' *Electra* and of the one, whose moral integrity is praised in *Or. 920-922*, and can be paralleled to Actor, the Lemnian shepherd in the Euripidean *Philoctetes* of the same production, who is the only one to succour the tormented hero (D.Chr. *Or. 52. 8, Hyg. *fabb. 102*); cf. note on *fr. 14*. Dictys' moral assertiveness despite his old age (cf. *fr. 3*), as well as his intellectual capacities (cf. *fr. 2* and his possible participation in the *agon* of *frr. 4, 5*), seem also to foreshadow the figures of Peleus in the *Andromache* and Amphitryon in the *Heracles*. For more detail, cf. note on *fr. 3*.
(2) Danae: for her position, cf. T3, T4, T5, T7. Fr. 11 is assigned to her with certainty and she is among the candidates for frs. 1, 10, 12 and the obscure fr. 18. She is the addressee of fr. 2 and probably of fr. 13.

(3) Polydectes: for this character, cf. T3, T4, T5, T7. Frs. 8, 9 can be assigned to him quite confidently, he is the strongest candidate for frs. 4 and 17 and a possible speaker of fr. 7. He is the addressee of frs. 5, 6, probably of fr. 16 and perhaps also of fr. 18.

(4) Perseus: for his role, cf. T3, T4, T5, T7. No fragment can be attributed to him with certainty; he is a possible speaker of frs. 13, 14, 15 and less likely of fr. 4.

(5) Polydectes’ interlocutor in frs. 6-9: his role is not attested in the testimonia, it may only be inferred on the basis of the fragments; the unusual prominence given to the effects of the king’s desire on his family and the emphasis drawn on the father-son relationship in these fragments may point to a conversation between Polydectes and another character (the king’s son?) rather than to the context of a confrontation between the king and the suppliants (cf. note on fr. 6). He is probably the speaker of fr. 6 and perhaps of frs. 7, 12, 18, as well as addressee of frs. 8 and 9.

(6) a messenger (self-evidently someone who had not looked at the Gorgon’s head) would have appeared to announce Polydectes’ off-stage petrification 281 (cf. Structure).

(7) Chorus: the likeliest speaker of fr. 3 and perhaps frs. 5 and 10. It is reasonable to assume that the chorus consisted of inhabitants of Seriphos. Yet, there is no evidence for their gender; to argue for Dictys as a central figure, after whom the play is named, may tell in favour of a chorus of the same gender, perhaps consisting of fishermen.282

? (8) a deus ex machina does not seem to be needed for the dénouement, unless required to resolve any now unrecoverable complications of the plot. He may have appeared, however, to give instructions (as Athena does in Supp. 1183-1226), in particular, to reward Dictys for his righteousness (as the Farmer is rewarded in El. 1286f., though it remains unknown whether Dictys would have been assigned with the kingship of Seriphos; cf. above, on the role of Dictys) and command that the Gorgon’s head should be given to

---

282 The Euripidean chorus usually has the same gender as the central character; cf. the Alcestis (where the chorus has the same gender as Admetus), Medea, Andromache, Hecabe, Heracles, Electra, IT, Helen, IA, Telephus, Cresphontes; cf. Hose (1990) 1 p. 18 and Arnold (1878) p. 52.
Athena. The ‘Gorgoneion’ on the aegis of the goddess was part of her attribute as protector of Athens, sculpted on the shield of Pheidias’ Athena Parthenos, which was dedicated in 438/437, and thus part of the goddess’s cult in the city; cf. the allusion in Erechtheus fr. 351, 360. 46 Kn. (and Calder 1969, p. 152f.). This possible aetiology is likely to have appealed to the sensitivity of the Athenian audience at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War and could have served to spell out the connection between past and present, showing that events of the play have survived into the present world of the audience. If Euripides followed mythography (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 12 Fowler), he would have Danae and Perseus sail back to Argos. As to the god’s identity, Hermes and Athena, who were Perseus’ allies in his pursuit of the Gorgon, seem to be the strongest candidates. Poseidon, to whose altar Danae and Dictys have fled, is also feasible; likewise, Thetis, who has received Andromache’s supplication emerges ex machina in Andr. 1231-1272, though her appearance seems to be primarily prompted by her close relation to Peleus and Neoptolemus.

4. The Structure of the Play

Thanks to the combination of the evidence of T4 and T5 with T3, we are able to recover the outline of the plot of the Dictys. On the basis of the indirect evidence and the most informative book-fragments, the scene-construction may be restored up to an extent. The context of fragments of less probable location is discussed in the commentary.

(1) Narrative prologue (fr. 1 probably belongs here) setting out the nponenpaypeva (i.e. the arrival of the chest at Seriphos, the protection that Dictys offered to Danae and Perseus and Polydectes’ mission to Perseus) and the present situation (Perseus’ long
absence, the king’s plans to get hold of Danae and the refuge sought by Danae and Dictys at the altar of Poseidon, cf. T3, T4, T5), according to Euripides’ practice. Dictys or Danae would have been equally suitable to deliver the prologue; in view, however, of the possible context of fr. 11 (Danae might have fallen asleep possibly at the beginning of the play, rather than afterwards at the crisis, cf. note ad loc.) Dictys may be a likelier speaker. As the play seems to have been built upon a central altar-scene (cf. T3, T4, T5), the prologue-speech could be visualized as delivered by one of the two suppliants, Danae or Dictys, upon a ‘cancelled entry’, which would create an imposing opening tableau (cf. Setting). Webster followed by Aélion regarded Perseus as a possible prologue-speaker before his departure for the land of the Gorgons, drawing a parallel to Bellerophon’s prologue-speech before being sent to meet the Chimaera in Stheneboea fr. 661 Kn. It should be noted, however, that Bellerophon’s prologue-speech is required by the dramatic action, so that his circumstances, reaction and ethical stance are made clear. A speech by Perseus, on the other hand, would involve a major unreality of time with no obvious dramatic gain, since the background of the play and the present situation could just as well be reported by Dictys or Danae. Moreover, in such a case, the dramatic interest would focus on Perseus, instead of Dictys, who seems to have been the prominent figure, overshadowing also the treatment of the crisis and conflict between the suppliants and the king. In addition, Euripides’ marked preference for opening tableaux in plays constructed upon a central altar-scene would tell in favour of one of the two suppliants as prologue-speaker.

(2) Dictys is trying to comfort Danae (fr. 2), as they both fear that Perseus has died. This consolation-scene may have been part of the broader context of a ‘suppliant-suppliant’ discourse on how to suffer their fate, parallel to that between Megara and Amphitryon in HF 60-106.
(3) Fr. 3 points to a scene of conflict between Dictys and Polydectes, a 'suppliant-enemy' confrontation. The king may have tried to force the suppliants to leave the sanctuary (for his violence, cf. T4 and T5: διὰ τὴν Πολυδέκτειαν), which is a topos in suppliant drama, to judge by Heracl. 59-61, Andr. 129, 135, 314-420 HF 284ff., Hel. 315, 324, also A. Supp. 872-910, S. OC 813ff. The infinitive σωθήνει in T4 l. 11f. suggests that Danae's life was threatened.

(4) Fr. 4, which is the formal proem of a rhetorical speech, and the comment on Polydectes' loquacity of fr. 5 hint at an agon between Polydectes and another character; the king's opponent is perhaps likelier to be Dictys than Perseus, as the former's participation in a rhetorical contest would bring him to the centre of dramatic interest, justifying why the play was named after him. If Dictys was the king's rival in the debate, then fr. 3 pointing to their conflict may belong here.

(5) A discussion between Polydectes and another character on the effects of the king's plans for Danae on his family (frs. 6-8). In view of the remarkable prominence given to this topic and the emphasis on the father-son relationship, the king's interlocutor may have been his son, possibly stressing the strong priority that Polydectes should give his children rather than his desire for Danae (for more detail, cf. note on fr. 6). Fr. 9 was probably spoken by Polydectes rejecting the νομοθέτησις against amorous passion and is likely to belong to the same context.

(6) Reversal of action: Perseus returns to Seriphos (T3, T4, T5) possibly at a point of culmination of the suppliant-enemy conflict (are the lives of the suppliants in jeopardy, as in HF 451-513, Andr. 425-544?). He may have narrated his exploit (like Bellerophon in Steneboea fr. 665a Kn.). One of the listeners (i.e. Dictys, Danae or the chorus) praises his courage (fr. 10). Perseus would have been informed of the critical situation and undertaken the task of rescuing his mother and Dictys (‘suppliant-deliverer’ confrontation, as in HF 562-636, Andr. 547-576). If an on-stage confrontation of Perseus with Polydectes had occurred (cf. next scene), then Danae and/or Dictys would have been encouraged to exit, so that one of the two actors returns as Polydectes.

---

There is no sound evidence pointing to an on-stage encounter between Perseus and Polydectes (a 'deliverer-enemy' confrontation). Two possibilities seem to arise: (a) Perseus, like Heracles, goes directly into the palace, where Polydectes holds a feast (cf. T4. 1-3n., T5. 2-4n.) and petrifies him and his guests; in the Heracles, however, the rapid move to revenge is designed to lead us into a false sense of moral satisfaction in preparation for the terrible events to follow and is thus part of a more complex whole. T5 presenting Perseus as entering the palace directly after having found Danae and Dictys as suppliants is not binding, for the accounts of the Bibliotheca which reflect dramatic plots tend to be quite brief, without revealing any details of the dramatic action; the possibly theatrical nuance of the vocabulary (cf. especially εἰσελθὼν pointing to dramatic space and note ad loc., and for further features of the dramatic quality of presentation in this passage, cf. introductory note on T5), however, could imply that this part of the account may reproduce a Euripidean hypothesis, which could tell in favour of the precision of the narrative. (b) There was a confrontation between Perseus and Polydectes in visible space, where the former traps the king into agreeing to look at the Gorgon's head, probably in a feast; this type of revenge can be paralleled to the ploys in Med. 869-975, Hec. 976-1022, El. 1123-1146, Cresphontes (Hyg. fab. 184 and Harder 1985, p. 53). An on-stage confrontation of this type would point to a straightforward revenge-play (unless there were any now unrecoverable plot-complications, demanding a more rapid dénouement, as in the Heracles). Moreover, the on-stage encounter of Perseus with Polydectes would give potential for dramatic irony, as the king is unaware of his imminent death (cf. El. 1093-1096 and Cropp 1988 ad loc., 1141, also Hec. 1021 f.). An agon between Perseus and Polydectes, as suggested by Jouan and van Looy, cannot be completely excluded, though it would presuppose conflict, which would not serve Perseus' purpose of trapping the king; instead, a kind of feigned reconciliation, as in the Hecabe and Cresphontes, may seem likelier, at least on grounds of probability.

(8) Since death or miraculous changes are not feasible on stage, a messenger would have entered to announce Polydectes' petrification possibly at a feast (cf. T4. 1-3n.,

---

295 Jouan and van Looy (2000) p. 82.
T5. 2-4n.). This narrative would have had a concluding function and may have illustrated the unexpected shift from royal status to utter ruin, as in Med. 1156-1230 and Ba. 1043-1152. The switch from festive mood to agony recalls the reported banquet-scene in Ion 1106-1228.

(9) Exodos: A deus ex machina may have appeared to announce the fate of the characters, especially to reward Dictys for his righteousness and perhaps to provide the aetion for the 'Gorgoneion' on the aegis of Athena (for more detail, cf. Dramatis Personae).

The play was evidently built upon the patterns of 'supplication' and 'return-rescue-revenge', which were followed by Euripides later in the first part of the Heracles. More specifically, the Dictys seems to have been constructed upon a central altar-scene (cf. T3, T4, T5), as the Heraclidae, Andromache, Suppliants, Heracles and Helen. So far as our evidence goes, it appears to have focused on the 'suppliant-enemy' confrontation (cf. T3, T4, T5, frs. 3, 13 and possibly frs. 4, 5 of the agon), as the Heracles and Andromache.

The Dictys is also a nostos-play; the archetype of this story-pattern is found in the Odyssey and followed in Aeschylus' Persians and Agamemnon, Sophocles' Trachiniae and Euripides' Andromache and Heracles. In all these plays, the absent figure is away on a mission, but central to the preoccupations of the characters left behind (cf. fr. 2 and perhaps fr. 12), who, in turn, assume great importance (as Atossa, Deianeira, Andromaché, Megara and Amphitryon, Dictys and Danae in our play). The Dictys—like the first part of the Heracles—seems to have followed the pattern of the Odyssey beyond the nostos to the specific question whether the hero is alive or not (according to fr. 2, Perseus is thought to be dead). Perseus' return, as those of Odysseus and Heracles, comes as a surprise, possibly in the nick of time for the rescue of Danae and Dictys, according to the pattern of

---

303 The term belongs to Taplin (1977) p. 124.
304 Features of the nostos-pattern occur also in A. Choephoroi, the Electra plays by Sophocles and Euripides and the latter's lost Cresphontes (cf. Harder 1985, p. 14).
'catastrophe survived'. The hero's nostos was presumably both critical and effective, as can be inferred by its depiction on the Apulian vase-painting (T3), which aimed to offer its viewers a recollection of the play.\(^\text{306}\) The Dictys can also be described as a play of mixed reversal, ending with good fortune for the righteous characters and misfortune for the villains. This type of structure was particularly appreciated by the audiences (though not by Aristotle himself, cf. Ar. Poet. 1453a. 30-35) and was followed by Euripides in the Heraclidae, the first part of the Heracles, as well as the lost Stheneboea (cf. hyp. Stheneboea), Oeneus (cf. schol. Ar. Ach. 418 Wilson), Crespontes (Hyg. fab. 184, A.P. 3.5), Captive Melanippe (cf. Hyg. fab. 186, D.S. 4.67), Antiope (cf. Hyg. fab. 8, schol. A.R. 4. 1090 Wendel) and Alcmeon in Corinth (cf. [Apollod.] 3.7, fr. 76 Kn. and Jouan and van Looy 2000, p. 99). Considering that the Dictys is anterior to all the Euripidean plays, which are known to have been built upon the 'supplication' and 'return-rescue-revenge' patterns, it seems to have been one of the earliest treatments of these types of structure by the dramatist.

5. The Setting of the Play

According to the iconographic evidence of T3 (providing the supplements for T4 and probably T6), we know that Danae and Dictys sought refuge at the altar of Poseidon. The dedication of the shrine to Poseidon might be related to the mythographically attested descent of Polydectes from the god (cf. Pherecydes fr. 10 Fowler \(^\text{307}\)), provided that Euripides had chosen to follow that particular genealogical tradition. The skene-building could have represented Polydectes' palace (cf. Andromache and Helen)\(^\text{308}\) or Dictys' hut (cf. Electra).\(^\text{309}\) It should be noted, however, that Polydectes' palace as setting would be preferable, as it conforms to all the recoverable scenes of the play (cf. Structure), whereas Dictys' hut does not seem to be the proper background, e.g. for Polydectes' conversation


\(^{307}\) Tzetzes (schol. ad Lyc. 838) is the only source to present Polydectes as son of Poseidon, but in view of the corrupt state in which this scholium is transmitted, its precision and reliability are questionable. Cf. The Myth, p. 120f., n. 238.

\(^{308}\) So Welcker (1839) I p. 669.

\(^{309}\) This suggestion was made by Webster (1967) p. 62. Jouan and van Looy (2000, p. 79) regard both settings as possible.
with the 'other character' in frr. 6-9, who could have been someone other than one of the suppliants (perhaps his own son? cf. introductory note on fr. 6), which would make the palace the likeliest background for this scene. Moreover, the representation of the dwelling of the hostile character on the façade, as distinguished from the altar, where the sympathetic characters are forced to seek refuge, as in the Andromache and Helen, would serve to designate each party’s ‘personal space’, and, in turn, indicate the conflict between them. If the altar was located at a distance from the palace-door, as possibly in both extant plays, the use of proxemic space would serve to designate the former as the opposing area to the hostile residence, as well as illustrate the power-gap and tension between the suppliant and the spiteful possessor of the palace.

As regards the question arising in all suppliant-plays whether the altar stood on stage (i.e. the area extending along the front of the skene-building at the rear of the orchestra) or further forward in the orchestra, the evidence even from extant plays remains inconclusive. Further, Poe’s cautious observations on the dramatic action of each suppliant-play on the basis of the text point to the possibility that the location of the altar could have been arranged to suit the dramatic needs of each play. It is thus obvious that it would be highly speculative to reconstruct the staging of a lost tragedy, not least of the Dictys, from which no larger fragments survive.

As in all Euripidean plays built on a central altar-scene (cf. Heraclidae, Andromache, Suppliant Women, Helen and the first part of the Heracles), upon the opening of the Dictys the suppliants are likely to have been ‘discovered’ at their places, according to the technique of ‘cancelled entry’. This practice serves to provide the semblance of duration, indicating that the supplication has been in progress long before the play

---

313 So Arnott (1962, pp. 43-53), who based his argumentation for the existence of a permanent stage-altar used in suppliant-plays on the references to the agyieus, which was evidently the conventional token of a house and unlikely to be related to the suppliants’ altar. For the function of the agyieus, cf. indicatively Poe (1989) pp. 130-137.
begins. It also offers an imposing initial tableau stressing the religious and emotional associations of supplication. Furthermore, the immobility and passiveness of the characters in the tableau constitute visual suggestions of their helplessness and thus of the dramatic tension which is to occur in the course of the play.

6. Reception of the Dictys in Art and Literature

The only piece which can be confidently related to the Dictys is the Apulian vase-painting probably inspired by a fourth-century revival of the play in South Italy (Plate I, cf. T3 and note ad loc.). The lost Cyzicene relief depicting Perseus as petrifying Polydectes (cf. the lemma in T7) and dated in the second century BC may be associated with the play, in view of the wide reception of Euripidean treatments in the reliefs of Apollonis' temple in Cyzicus and of the apparently lesser popularity of the myth in Hellenistic literature, which could suggest that the relief was inspired by a popular earlier treatment of the legend (cf. note ad loc.). The corresponding epigram (T7), possibly written not earlier than the sixth century AD, may only indirectly be related to the Dictys, through an intermediary source. It is unfortunate that no more has been preserved from Cratinus' Seriphians, which was probably staged some time after the Dictys, in about 423/422 BC; fr. 218 K.-A. of the comic play referring to tragic masks may have alluded to the tragic treatments of the myth (cf. The Myth, p. 127f.), though no precise reference can point to the Dictys in particular.

TESTIMONIA

Τ1

ἐδιδάξθη ἐπὶ Πυθοδόρου ἄρχοντος ὀλυμπιάδι πε’ ἔτει α’ (sc. 431’). πρῶτος Ἐὐφόριος, δεύτερος Σοφοκλῆς, τρίτος Ἐὐριπίδης Μηδεία, Φιλοκτήτη, Δίκτυι, Θερισταῖς σατύροις. οὐ σφῖται.

Τ2

ΔΙΚΤΥΙΣ

Τ3 (Vide Tab. I)


Τ4

[Πολυδέκτης ἀνηγόν τ’ [Ερανοῦ]

[±13] [εὐ]αξομένοις γ’(απ) αὐτοῖς τοῦτοις
[ἐδείξεν ὁ Περεῦς τῇ]ν κεφαλὴν κ(αί) ὁ(τω) ἀπελθώθησαν.

[±16] οἰς ξαψ ἔσωθεν ἠν’ ἡ [καί] τὴν

---

Τ1 Argum. Ar. Byz. E. Med. (I 90, II. 40-43 Diggle)
Τ2 IG XIV 1152, 17 (Roma; Index Euripidis Fabularum, fortasse II *)
Τ4 Theon in Pl. P. 12 (P. Oxy. XXXI 2536. 1-12, Tab. III, ed. Turner, inspexi)

Τ4 4 οἰς ξαψ έσωθεν ην’ ἡ [καί] τὴν leg. Treu
[± 16]c [±3] βιαζομένης γ(άρ) τῆς Δα-
[nάθε ύπο τοῦ Πολυδέκτου ευνέβη αὐτήν κατα-
[φυγεῖν πρό]c τὸν βομάν τοῦ <Ποσειδώνος>, τὸν δὲ
[Πολυδέκτην] εὐλαβούμενον τὸν Περεέα πέμψαι
[ἐπὶ Μεδόνης] κατασκόμαν ὡς ἀπολούμενον καὶ

[± 12] τὸν μ[έν] Πολυδέκτην θεωρήσαντα
[tὴν τῆς Γοργόνος] κεφαλὴν ἀπολιθωθῆναι κ(α)ὶ εὐθη-
[ναὶ τὴν Δανάη]ν.

Τ 5

παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς Σέριφον, καὶ καταλαβὼν προσπεφυγύην τοὺς βωμοὺς
μετὰ τοῦ Δίκτυου τὴν μητέρα διὰ τὴν Πολυδέκτου βίαν, εἰσελθὼν εἰς
tά βασίλεια, συγκαλέσαντος τοῦ Πολυδέκτου τοὺς φίλους ἀπεστραμμένος
tὴν κεφαλὴν τῆς Γοργόνος ἔδειξε· τῶν δὲ ἱδόντων, ὁποῖοι ἐκαστὸς ἐτυχε
σχῆμα ἔχων, ἀπελθόθη. καταστήσας δὲ τῆς Σερίφου Δίκτυν βασιλέα, 5
ἀπέδωκε τὰ μὲν πέδιλα καὶ τὴν κίψιν καὶ τὴν κονῆν Ἐρμῆ, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν
tῆς Γοργόνος Ἀθηνᾶ. Ἐρμῆς μὲν οὖν τὰ προειρημένα πάλιν ἀπέδωκε ταῖς
νύμφαις, Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἁσκίδι τῆς Γοργόνος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐνέθηκε.

Τ 6 (Vide Tab. Ila et llb)

.. . . . 

[.] . . 

---

Τ5 [Apollod.] 2. 4.3 (ed. Wagner)

Τ4 7 Ποσειδώνος suppl. Karamanou BICS 46, 174
Τ5 1 προσπεφυγύην Tz. schol. ad Lyc. 838: προσπεφυγύην A || 3 τὰ βασίλεια R: τὸν βασιλέα
Α || 8 ἐνέθηκε Heyne: ἐνέθηκε A
Τ6 1 44 edd.: 44 fortasse || 2 Ποσειδό] ὄνος supplevi: Ἀπόλλ] ὄνος Gallavotti || 5 ἢ edd.: ἢ fortasse
Τ 7

Ἐν τῷ ΙΑ Πολυδέκτης, ὁ Σερφίων βασιλεὺς, ἀπολυθρούμενος ὑπὸ Περσέως τῇ τῆς Γοργώνος κεφαλῇ, διὰ τὸν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ γάμον ἐκκέμψας τούτον ἐκ τῆν τῆς Γοργώνος κεφαλῆν, καὶ ὅν καθ᾽ ἐτέρου θάνατον ἐπενδεῖ γενέσθαι, τούτον αὐτὸς κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν τῆς Δίκης ἐδέξατο.

"Ετῆς καὶ σὺ λέχῃ Δανάης, Πολυδεκτα, μιαίνειν,
δυσφήμοις εὐναίς τῷ Δίι μεμψάμενος.
ἀνθ᾽ ἂν διματ᾽ ἔλυσε τὰ Γοργώνος ἐνθάδε Περσέως,
γυῖα λιθουργήσας ματρὶ χαριζόμενος."
FRAGMENTA

Fr. 1 (330b Kn., 1 J.-v.L.):
Σέριφος ἐλμὴ ποντία περίπτυος

Fr. 2 (332 Kn., 3 J.-v.L.):
δοκεῖς τὸν Ἀιδήνα σωφρονίζειν γόαν καὶ παίδ᾽ ἀνήσειν τὸν σῶν, εἰ θέλεις στένειν; παύσαι βλέπονσα δ᾽ εἰς τὰ τῶν πέλας κακά ῥάων γένοις ἄν, εἰ λογίζεσθαι θέλοις δόσοι τε δεισμοὶ ἐκμεμοχθῆνται βροτῶν δόσοι τε γηράσκουσιν ὀρφανοὶ τέκνων, τοὺς τ᾽ ἐκ μέγιστον ὄλβιας τυραννίδος τὸ μηδὲν δντας· ταῦτα σε σκοπεῖν χρεών.

Fr. 3 (337 Kn., 4 J.-v.L.):
μὴ νείκος, ὃ γεραιε, καυράνοις τίθουσιν σέβειν δὲ τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἀρχαῖος νόμος.

Fr. 1 Phld. Po. 2, P. Herc. 1676, col. 7 (Tr. C, col. 18 Sboardone) ἀλλὰ τὸ γε παρὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν εὐφωνίαν τῷ ἐπιφαίνεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ἀντιφωνεῖται τὸ δ᾽ αὐτὴν ψυχαγωγεῖν σύνθεσιν καθ’ αὐτὴν ἔτερον οὐδὲν εἰσφερομένην ἀγαθὸν, ἀπιθανὸν ἔστι.
Fr. 2 [Plut.] Consol. ad Apoll. 8, 106A (Paton-Wegehaupf) ὃ δὲ παραμυθούμενος τὴν Δανάην δυσκαθόουσαν (B: δυσκεφαθόους cett.) Δίκτυς φησὶν ἐκεῖνο γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐνθυμεῖσθαι τὰ τῶν ἰδα καὶ μείζω δυστυχοῦντων, ὡς ἐσομένην ἔλαφοτέραν.
Fr. 3 Stob. 4.2.2 W.-H. (Περὶ νόμων καὶ ἕθων) Ἑυρίσκειν Δίκτυος ΣΜΑ, fabulae nomen om. L

Fr. 3 1 καυράνοις Salmasius apud Grotium: τυράννοις ΣΜΑ L || 2 εὖ ante σέβειν add. rubricator L
Fr. 4 (334 Kn., 13 J.-v.L.):
πολλοῖς παρέστην κάφθόνησα δή βροτῶν
δότις κακοίσιν ἑσθλὸς δὲν ὅμιος ἂν,
λόγων ματαιῶν εἰς ἀμιλλάν ἐξιόν.
τὸ δ' ἂν ἄρ' οὐκ ἀκουστόν οὐδ' ἀνασχετόν,
σιγὰν κλύοντα δεινὰ πρὸς κακίων.

Fr. 5 (335 Kn., 17 J.-v.L.):
tυραννικών τοι πόλλ' ἐπίστασθαί λέγειν.

Fr. 6 (338 Kn., 6 J.-v.L.):
δόντων δὲ παίδων καὶ πεφυκότος γένους
καῖνοις φυτέσαί παίδας ἐν δόμοις θέλεις,
ἐχθραν μεγίστην σοῖσι συμβάλλων τεκνοῖς.

Fr. 4 Stob. 4. 42. 2 W.-H. (Περὶ τῶν παρ' ἄξιαν εὐτυχοῦντων) Εὐριπίδου (τοῦ αὐτοῦ Α)
Δίκτυος S M
Fr. 5 Stob. 3. 36. 15 W.-H. (Περὶ ἀδολεσχίας) Εὐριπίδου (τοῦ αὐτοῦ S) Δίκτυος AM
Fr. 6 Stob. 4. 26. 21 W.-H. (Ὀποίους χρή εἶναι τοὺς πατέρας) Εὐριπίδου ἐν Δίκτυοι S M A

4-5 a prioribus separavit Gomperz
Fr. 5 τοι S M: τε Α: τε Trinc.
Fr. 6 3 συμβάλλων S M A: συμβαλῶν Bergk apud Welcker: ἐμβαλῶν Mähly teste Nauck
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Fr. 7 (345 Kn., 10 J.-v.L.):
εγὼ νομίζω πατρὶ φιλτατον τέχνα
παισίν τε τούς τεκόντας, οὐδὲ συμμάχους
ἀλλοὺς γενέσθαι φήμ' ἄν ἐνδικωτέρους.

Fr. 8 (339 Kn., 7 J.-v.L.):
πατέρα τε παισίν ἡδέως συνεκφέρειν
φίλους ἔρωτας ἐκβαλόντ' αὐθαδίαν,
paιδᾶς τε πατρὶ· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ αὐθαίρεται
βροτοῖς ἐρωτες οὐδ' ἑκουσία νόσος,
σκαιόν τι δὴ τὸ χρῆμα γίγνεσθαι φιλεί,
θεῶν ἀνάγκας ὅστις ἱάσθαι θέλει.

Fr. 9 (340 Kn., 8 J.-v.L.):
ἂν τ' αὖ βιάζῃ, μᾶλλον ἐντείνειν φιλεί,
κάπειτα τίκτει πόλεμον· εἰς δ' ἀνάστασιν
dόμων περαινεῖ πολλάκις τὰ τοιάδε.

---

Fr. 7 Stob. 4. 26. 18 W.-H. ('Οποίος χρη εἶναι τούς πατέρας) ἐν ταυτῷ (i.e. Εὐριπίδου
Δίκτυο, ecl. 16) S M A
Fr. 8 Stob. 4. 26. 16 W.-H. ('Οποίος χρη εἶναι τούς πατέρας) Εὐριπίδου Δίκτυο S M A
Fr. 9 Stob. 4. 20b. 48 W.-H. (Ὑγίος Ἀφροδίτης) Εὐριπίδου Δίκτυο S M A, vv. 1-2 om. poet. et
fab. nom. habet Chrysippus fr. 475 von Arnim apud Galen. Plac. Hipp. et Plat. 4. 6. 39

Fr. 7 1 τέχνα Pflug et Meineke: τέκναν S M A
Fr. 8 1 ἡδέως συνεκφέρειν S M A: ἡδίως συνεκφερειν coll. fr. inc. 951 Kn. Stadtmüller: εὐμενώς
eἰκὸς φέρειν || 2 φίλους S M: φίλος A: δεῖ τοὺς Μείνκε || 3 ἐκβαλόντ' Gesner apud Wachsmuth
et Hense: ἐκβάλλοντ' S M A | αὐθαδίαν Grotius: αὐθαδεῖαν S M A || 5 σκαίν τι δὴ τὸ χρήμα S
M A: σκαίν τι δὴ τα χρήμα vel σκαίν γε δὴ τι χρήμα Μείνκε: σκαίν τι δὴ τόλμημα
Schmidt: σκαίν τι δὴ τέχνημα Stadtmüller
Fr. 9 1 οὖδὲ S M A, Chrysippus, prob. Kannicht: οὖδὲν Nauck, prob. Jouan et van Looy || 2 ἂν τ'
αὖ βιάζῃ S (ἀν pro ἂν): ἂν γὰρ βιάζῃ Chrysippus: ἄντ' ἀβίαζῃ M: ἄντ' ἀβίαζην (-ην ex -ειν
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Fr. 10 (344 Kn., 2 J.-v.L.):
νέος, πόνοις δὲ γ’ οὖκ ἀγύμναστος φρένας.

Fragmenta sedis magis incertae

Fr. 11 (342 Kn., 12 J.-v.L.):
tί μ’, ὃ γεραίε, κημάτων λειηηημένην ὀρθοῖς;

Fr. 12 (346 Kn., 11 J.-v.L.):
elο γάρ τις ἑστὶ κοινὸς ἀνθρώποις νόμος
{kαι θεοί τούτο δόξαν, ὡς σαφῶς λέγω.}
θηρσίν τε πάσι, τέκν’ ἂ τίκτουσιν φιλεῖν-
tά δ’ ἄλλα χωρίς χρώμεθ’ ἄλληλων νόμοις.

Fr. 13 (343 Kn., 9 J.-v.L.):
θάρσει· το τοι δίκαιον ἰσχύει μέγα.

Fr. 10 Stob. 4. 11. 10 W.-H. (Περὶ νεότητος) Ἐυριπίδου Δίκτυι Μ: τοῦ αὐτοῦ Δίκτυι Α, ecl. om. S
Fr. 11 Schol. vet. S. Ai. 787 (Christodoulou): τί μ’ αὖ τάλατιναν: πρὸς τὸ Ἐυριπίδου ἐν Δίκτυι Λ:
Ἐυριπίδης G lem. om. Fr. 12 Stob. 4. 26. 17 W.-H. (Ὅποιος χρῆ εἶναι τοὺς πατέρας) ἐν ταύτῃ (i.e. Ἐυριπίδου Δίκτυι, ecl. 16) S M A
Fr. 13 Stob. 3. 13. 5 W.-H. (Περὶ παρρησίας) Ἐυριπίδου ἐν Δίκτυι Σ M A: ἐκ Δίκτυος Λ poet. nom. om.

Fr. 10 πόνοις δὲ γ’ Μ Α: πόνοις δ’ Musgrave | φρένας M Α: χέρας Meineke
Fr. 11 1 τί μ’, ὃ γεραιέ G prob. Christodoulou et Kannicht: τί μ’ [[δ]] ἄρτι L: τί μ’ ἄρτιως <εὖ>
Papageorgius: <οὐμόν> τί μ’ ἄρτι Wansink De Scholliis Soph. Trag. veteribus, 31: τί μ’, <εὖ ἐκ>
Christodoulou
Fr. 12 2 del. West BICS 30, 73 | τοῦτο S M A: ταῦτῳ Heath | ὡς Grotius: ὡ S: δ’ M A || 3 τέκν’ ὃ B
Fr. 14 (336 Kn., 14 J.-v.L.):
eis δ' εὐγένειαν ὅλην' ἔχω φράσαι καλά·
ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἑσθλὸς εὐγενῆς ἔμοιη' ἀνήρ,
ὁ δ' οὖ δίκαιος κἂν ἄμεινονος πατρός
Ζηνὸς πεφύκη, δυσγενῆς εἶναι δοκεῖ.

Fr. 15 (341 Kn., 15 J.-v.L.):
mή μοι ποτ' εἰη χρημάτων νικωμένω κακῷ γενέσθαι, μὴδ' ὁμιλοῖν κακοῖς.

Fr. 16 (347 Kn., 18 J.-v.L.):
ei δ' ἡσθα μὴ κάκιστος, οὐκοτ' ἀν πάτραν
tὴν σὴν ἀτίζων τὴνδ' ἀν εὐλόγεις πόλιν·
ὡς ἐν γ' ἔμοι κρίνοιτ' ἰδν οὐ καλὸς φρονεῖν
dοσίς πατρὼς γῆς ἀτιμάζων ὅρους
ἀλλὰν ἐπαίνει καὶ τρόποισιν ἠδεταί.
Fr. 17 (333 Kn., 16 J.-v.L.):

φεῦ φεῦ, παλαιός αἶνος ὡς καλῶς ἔχει·
oūκ ἀν γένοιτο χρηστὸς ἐκ κακοῦ πατρός.

Fr. 18 (331 Kn., 5 J.-v.L.):

φίλος γὰρ ἦν μοι. καὶ μ' ἔρως ἔλοι ποτὲ
oūκ eἰς τὸ μάρον oὐδὲ μ' eἰς Κύπριν τρέπων.

Fr. 19 (348 Kn., 19 J.-v.L.):

ἀξιόμην

---

Fr. 17 Stob. 4. 30. 5 W.-H. (Περὶ δυσγενείᾳς) Εὐριπίδου Δικτυί S M A, v. 1 recurrīt in Aeolo fr. 25. 1 Kn., v. 2 sine fab. nom. afferit Chrysippus Περὶ ἀποροτικῶν fr. 180. 15 von Arnim
Fr. 18 Stob. 1. 9. 4a W.-H. (Περὶ Ἀφροδίτης Οὐρανίας) Εὐριπίδου Δικτυί F P. Quinque versus, qui in Stobaeo cum hoc fragmento coniuncti sunt, ad Euripidis Theseum retulit Wachsmuth, prob. Nauck et Kannicht (fr. 388 Kn.)
Fr. 19 Hsch. a 1475 Latte ἀξιόμην ἁγανακτοῖμην (I. ἁγανακτοῖμη) Εὐριπίδης Δικτυί

Fr. 17 ἡ καλὸς Μ: καλὸς S A
Fr. 18 ὁ φίλος γάρ ἦν μοι, καὶ μ' ἔρως ἔλοι ποτὲ P (ἔλοι F): φίλος γάρ eἰ μοι, καὶ μ' ἔρως ἔλοι ποτὲ Wilamowitz (notae manu scriptae in marginibus exemplaris sui ed. N.'): φίλος γάρ ἦν μοι, καὶ μ' ἔρως εἶλεν ποτὲ Usener, prob. Wachsmuth: φίλος γάρ ἦν μοι, καὶ μ' ἔρως ἔλοι ποτὲ Headlam CR 15, 106s: φιλόν γάρ ἦμιν, eἰ μ' ἔρως ἔλοι ποτὲ Nauck: καὶ ἔρως γάρ ἦν ἐμοὶ, καὶ μ' ἔρως ἔλοι ποτὲ Schmidt || 2 μάρον edd.: μαρὸν F P || oūκ eἰς τὸ μάρον oὐδὲ μ' eἰς Κύπριν τρέπων codd.: oūκ eἰς τὸ μάρον oὐδ' ἀν eἰς Κύπριν τρέποι Schmidt
Fr. 19 ἀξιόμην Hesychius, prob. Kannicht: ἀξιόμην Nauck, prob. Jouan et van Looy
COMMENTARY

T1:

Aristophanes’ succinct prefaces provide the data concerning the subject and other treatments of the same theme, setting, the identity of the chorus and prologue-speaker, the date of the first performance, the titles of the other plays produced simultaneously by the poet, the contesting dramatists, the outcome of the competition at the first performance, occasionally the number of the play in the chronological register of the poet’s works (cf. argum. Alc.) and a critical judgement on the play (for the latter feature, cf. argum. Alc., Supp.) On the typology of these hypotheses, cf. Zuntz (1955) pp. 131, 139f., Page (1938) pp. liii-lv, Achelis (1913) pp. 518-545, Pfeiffer (1968) p. 193f. In terms of the Dictys in particular, Aristophanes has supplied us with (1) the date of its first production (431 BC), (2) Euripides’ plays of the same production (the Medea, Philoctetes and the satyr-play Theristae), (3) the poet’s contestants (Euphorion and Sophocles) and (4) the result of the competition at the first performance (Euripides won the third prize).

τρίτος Εὐριπίδης Μήδεια, Φιλοκτήτης, Δίκτυς: Euripides’ third prize in the contest is indicative of his lesser popularity during his own lifetime (his victories amount to five in total, according to Suda s.v. ‘Εὐριπίδης’ 3695 Adler, for three of which he have didascalic evidence;321 for this matter, cf. Stevens 1956, p. 91f., Martin 1960, pp. 248-253), as compared with his great popularity from the fourth century onwards (cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, pp. 28-34). Though the plays come from different mythical cycles, the theme of exile, as Müller (2000, p. 71) observed, is shared by all three tragedies of Euripides’ production of that year. The choice of this common underlying theme and the treatment of the misery of exile from one’s homeland is likely to have appealed to the sensitivity of the Athenian audience in the period of stress at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War; cf. Adkins (1960, p. 191, n. 13) with reference to Dictys fr. 16 (cf. note ad loc.), where a character (perhaps Polydectes) is strongly reproached for preferring another city to his homeland. The wretchedness of exile is stressed in Med. 255-258, 328,

321 Cf. TrGF I: DID D1, DID C13, DID C22.
359f., while *Philoctetes* fr. 798 Kn. underlines the identification of the citizen with his *polis* and the overlap of private and communal interests, as pointed out by Pericles in the second year of the War (Th. 2. 60.2-4).

**Θερισταῖς σατύροις, οὗ σῶζεται:** the phrase *οὗ σῶζεται* evidently refers to the satyr-play *Theristae*. Aristophanes' edition was based on the official fourth-century Athenian copy of the plays belonging to the repertory (cf. General Introduction, p. 2) and is estimated to have comprised the 78 plays which were extant by then from the total of 92 plays of Euripides' production. Fourteen plays were thus already lost during the fourth century and the *Theristae* seems to have been one of them (cf. Kannicht 1996, p. 28f.), to judge from the complete absence of quotations and evidence for its theme; had it been included in the edition, it would have stood good chance of being quoted even once. It should be noted, however, that *οὗ σῶζεται*, as transmitted, is cut off from its context and further, it cannot be directly linked with *Θερισταῖς σατύροις* in terms of syntax (e.g. with a pronoun as *ὅδε οὗ σῶζεται*, that is, the play cannot be taken as a neutral), as on the basis of our evidence, references to plays tend to accord with their gender and number; cf. for instance, arg. Ar. *Pax* (Holwerda) deriving from Aristotle and perhaps following his phrasing (fr. 622 R.): θέρεται ἐν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις δεδιδαχὼς Εἰρήνης ὁμονύμως ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης. ἀδηλον οὖν, φησίν Ἕρατοσθένης, πότερον τὴν αὐτὴν ἀνεδιδαξένην ἢ ἔτεραν καθήκεν, ἢτις ὁ οὗ σῶζεται, schol. Arethae Pl. *Apol.* 18b (Greene), again relying on Aristotle (fr. 628 R.): ἐπεὶ ὁ ἢ ἔτει οἱ Πελαργοὶ ἐδιδάσκοντο, also D. L. 2. 57 and the narrative hypotheses of Euripidean plays: cf. indicatively, hyp. *Auge*: Ἀὔγυς ἤ άρχή, hyp. *Scyrioi*: Σκύριοι, ὑν ἄρχῃ (cf. van Rossum 1998, p. 2 and her collection of papyrus-hypotheses, pp. 185ff.) To keep the singular of the verb, it may be supposed that Aristophanes wrote *Θερισταῖς σατύροις, ὡς σῶζεται* or something similar, as he widely uses the word *δράμα* in his arguments (three times in arg. *Alcestis*, twice in arg. *Orestes*, also in arg. *Hippolytus*, *Supplices*, *S. Antigone*); for the phrasing, cf. Ath. 8. 57: ἐν Βουτάλιων, ὡς δράμα τῶν Ἀγρόικων ἔστιν {ἐνός} διασκευή. The corrupt and often lacunose state in which Aristophanean prefaces have been transmitted (cf. especially arg. *Phoenissae*, *Supplices*, *Bacchae* and Zuntz 1955, pp. 139-141) could account for the loss of this phrase in the

322 The phrase *<οὗ> σῶζεται* also occurs in arg. *Phoenissae*, which is, however, seriously corrupt, thus impeding any attempt to trace the development of the text with probability.
process. Alternatively, Aristophanes might have written \( \theta e \rho i \sigma \tau a \varphi s \ \sigma a \pi \iota r o i, <o> \ o \ \sigma \varphi \zeta o n t a i; \) cf. arg. Hipp. (he refers to the play in accordance with its gender and number): 'Iπ\( \pi \)\( \lambda \)l\( \upsilon o t o s \ \delta e \upsilon t e r o s \ \ldots \)(e\( m \)\( \phi \)a\( i \)n\( e \)t\( a \)i \( \delta e \upsilon t e r o s \ )g\( e \)y\( r a \)m\( m \)\( \mu \)n\( o \)s. The change of \( \sigma \varphi \zeta o n t a i \) to \( \sigma \varphi \zeta e t a i \) and the loss of \( o \iota \) are not difficult to have occurred in the process of transmission. If this phrase does not go back to Aristophanes, it may have been a marginal note (e.g. \( t \)o \( \delta r \)\( \alpha \)\( m \)a \( o \u \) \( \sigma \varphi \zeta e t a i \)), part of which gradually sneaked into Aristophanes’ argument (for parallel intrusions in Aristophanean prefaces, cf. Zuntz 1955, p. 139 f., n. 6). If so, it would have occurred presumably while the Dictys and Philoctetes were still extant; a safe terminus ante quern could be the late second century AD (cf. General Introduction, p. 3f.).

The theme of the satyr-play is unknown; the most famous myth about reapers is that of Lityerses (schol. Theocr. 10. 41-42 Wendel), who killed passers-by after forcing them to compete with him in a reaping contest and was finally overpowered by Heracles. Cf. Pechstein (1998, pp. 284-286) and Krumreicht, Pechstein and Seidensticker (1999, p. 476) pointing out the satyric elements of this myth, such as the ogre, his molestation of the passers-by, the advent of the hero and the final defeat of the ogre. The Hellenistic poet Sositheus (ca. 280 BC, cf. Suda σ 860 Adler) wrote a Daphnis or Lityerses based on this legend; cf. Kannicht (1991) pp. 208-211, Xanthakis-Karamanos (1997) pp. 123ff.

T2:

For this piece of evidence tentatively dated in the second century AD, cf. note on Danae T3. It is apparently a list of Euripides’ seventy-eight \( \sigma o u \zeta \omicron \mu e v a \) of the Alexandrian edition, most of which seem to have been obtainable at least among literary circles in that era (cf. General Introduction, p. 3f. and note on Danae T3). The reference to the context of the situation of Dictys fr. 2, in particular, by the author of the Consolation to Apollonius (which may have been written by Plutarch in his youth or by one of his contemporaries\(^{323}\)) could be suggestive of his direct knowledge of the play.

\(^{323}\) Cf. Defradas, Hani and Klaerr (1985) pp. 4-12.
T3:

An Apulian red-figure volute-crater (Princeton Art Museum 1989. 40) dated in 370/360 BC seems to have been inspired by a revival of the Dictys in South Italy. In the centre of the scene, there is the altar of Poseidon —as evident from the cult-statue of the god— represented by a naiskos, where Danae and white-haired Dictys (for Dictys as ypēnaiōς, cf. fr. 3, 11) have sought refuge. On the left, Polydectes is looking at them holding a sceptre in his right hand and a sword in his left. Unless attributed to artistic inspiration, the sword may well be suggestive of his violence and threat against the suppliants (cf. T4, l. 5f.: βιαζομένης γ(αρ) τῆς Δα/ [νάς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολυδέκτου, 11f. σωθή [νας τὴν Δανάην, T5: διὰ τήν Πολυδέκτου βιον]). All three characters are dressed in stage-costumes. On the right, Perseus is depicted in heroic nudity as arriving at Seriphos carrying his harpe and the kibisis with the Gorgon’s head. Danae and Dictys are looking at the hero with surprise, hope and relief and Dictys is making a ‘speaking’ gesture towards him. The reaction of the suppliants, as depicted, is reminiscent of that of Amphitryon and Megara upon Heracles’ return in HF 513-522. Above, on the left, Aphrodite and Eros preside over the scene, alluding to Polydectes’ desire for Danae; the impetuosity of Cypris is a recurring theme in the play (fr. 8, 9, 18).

As with most South-Italian tragedy-related vases, this vase-painting is presumably not ‘scene-specific’; the presence of four speakers on stage is not feasible, unless one of them is silent. On the analogy of HF 523-636, the scene of Perseus’ return could have well involved the hero, Dictys and Danae. There would be no obvious place for Polydectes and his absence from stage would give the suppliants the opportunity to inform Perseus of their plight. This painting seems to have aimed to offer its viewers a recollection of main themes of the play, such as the dramatic tension of the supplication-scene, Polydectes’ desire and violence and the crucial moment of Perseus’ return.

324 For the association of this vase-painting with the play, cf. Karamanou (2002-2003) pp. 167-175. This testimony is included by Kannicht in his addenda in TrGF V,2, 1160f.
In the case of the *Dictys*, iconographic evidence plays a significant role; the association of this vase-painting with the play confirms the accounts of T4 and T5 that upon returning to Seriphos, Perseus finds his mother and Dictys (the name of the latter is mentioned only in T5 and also in the scanty remains of T6) as suppliants. Both narratives can thus be safely regarded as providing the outline of the plot of our play (cf. notes *ad loc.*). The vase-painting is also informative of the god, at whose altar Danae and Dictys sought refuge, and thus fills with Poseidon's name the blank left in the papyrus of Theon's commentary (T4, l. 7), as well as the slight remainder probably coming from the hypothesis of the play in T6.

**T4:**

The outline of the plot of the *Dictys* is substantiated by combination of the evidence from this source and T5 with the pictorial testimony of T3 (cf. note *ad loc.*). Theon's account is the earliest surviving literary source for the plot of the play (first century BC). It supplies the following pieces of evidence for the *Dictys*: (1) being pressed hard by Polydectes, Danae seeks refuge at <Poseidon’s> altar (ll. 5-7), (2) the reference to Polydectes' petrification at a feast may have derived from the play (l. 2f.), (3) a possible quotation from the *Dictys* (l. 4f.)? Cf. notes *ad loc.*

The papyrus is dated in the second century AD. Three hands can be distinguished: the first scribe, whose hand preserves the reference to the altar-scene of the play, wrote col. i 1-26. The additions in the intercolumnar space belong to a second hand, while a third hand copied col. i 27-30, the whole of col. ii and probably the *subscriptio* (the letter-forms of the latter are the same as those of the third scribe, though written less cursively). The clumsy style of the narrative providing the outline of the plot of the *Dictys*, as well as the omission of several *lemmata*, imply that the first scribe was copying parts of Theon’s

---

330 Cf. the *lemma* ἐρυθάργηταν, which is added in the margin by the second hand, and τὸ τ’ ἀναγγείλον λέγοσ (Pl. P. 12. 15), which should have been placed in l. 4 or 5 followed by the explanatory scholium referring to Danae’s refuge at the altar. It does not seem to fit in l. 4, as there is no room for the *spatium* that follows each *lemma* in this hand and it cannot fit in l. 5 either, because it would not match the end of l. 4; cf.
commentary selectively. However, the end-title ΘΕΩΝΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΟΡΟΥ ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ ΠΙΤΟΥ ΦΙΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑ, which seems to have been written by the third copyist, attests that this is the actual hypomnēma of Theon and not an epitome of his commentary. The latter suggests that the hand, which wrote the subscriptio, did not regard this text as an epitome. Hence, the third copyist who finished it off seems to have copied Theon’s commentary without epitomizing it. In fact, the style of the passage written by the third scribe is evidently better than that of the first hand.

Theon was a man of great learning; apart from Pindar, he is known to have written hypomnēmata on the main Alexandrian poets, Homer, textual notes on Sophocles’ Ichneutae (P.Oxy. ix 1174) and a compilation of λέξεις κομικάι and τραγικάι. He seems thus to have studied tragedy closely and it is thanks to Theon that E. Oedipus fr. 556 Kn. survives (l. 29f. of this papyrus-fragment). Theon’s reference to the Euripidean treatment of the myth in his commentary is possibly due to his own familiarity with the poet’s work, Euripides’ popularity in his era and, furthermore, to the fact that the Dictys was probably the sole surviving tragedy from this phase of the legend by then (for the possible loss of Aeschylus’ Polydectes during the fourth century, cf. The Myth, p. 126).

1-3 λυγρόν τ’ [ἐρανον] εὐσαμνέοις γ’[δρ] αὐτοίς τούτοις/ [ἐδειξεν ὁ Περσέας τὴν κεφαλὴν κ’(αί) οδί(τος) ἀπελιθωθείσαν: There is a divergence in the interpretation of the ode at this point; the ancient scholium ad loc. interprets the lemma λυγρόν τ’ ἑρανον as the eranos organized by Polydectes to send Perseus after the Gorgon. Theon, on the other hand, refers here to a second feast (different from Polydectes’ eranos-plot), in which Perseus shows the Gorgon’s head to the king and his guests, which is the interpretation also provided in schol. vet. P. 10. 72a (Drachmann); cf. Bernardini (1971) pp. 99-101. The surviving evidence from early mythography (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 11 Fowler) does not attest a second feast and the context of the Pindaric passage does not give a reason to suppose a

Turner ad loc. In addition, the reference to the Gorgon in ll. 12-14 is probably explanatory to the lemma εὐσαμνάδυν κράτα Μεδοίσας (Pi. P. 12. 16), which was omitted by the copyist.

331 So Turner P. Oxy. XXXI p. 16 and Turner (1968) p. 119f.

332 The end-title states whether a scholar’s commentary has been abridged or not; cf. for instance, the Didymus-papyrus on Demosthenes (BKT 1), the subscriptio of which specifies that it is a work on Demosthenes’ speeches against Philip and not the actual hypomnēma of Didymus (ΔΙΑΥΜΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ ΚΗ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΚΟΝ Γ’); cf. Leo (1960) p. 390.

333 Cf. Wendel (1934) coll. 2055-2059.

reference to a second banquet. In fact, Pindar mentions the eranos along with Polydectes' offences, for which he is punished: his reducing Danae to slavery and forcing her to cohabitation (λυγρόν τ' ἔρανον Πολυδέκτες θήκε ματρός τ' ἐμπεδὸν δουλοσύναν τὸ τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος). Hence, the eranos is better understood in Pindar as the plot organized by the malicious king to get Perseus out of the way.

How should the testimonies of Theon and the scholium on P. 10. 72a (Drachmann) then be treated? Theon cannot be safely regarded as reproducing the background of the Pindaric ode in his commentary, to judge by his reference to sources other than Pindar, as for instance Danae's supplication in the Dictys, which serves to interpret the lemma τὸ τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος. Judging by the often arbitrary and authoritative interpretation of passages by ancient scholiasts (cf. note on Danae T1), it cannot be excluded that the reference to the second banquet might have been Theon's own inference, which was adopted afterwards by the scholiast on P. 10.72a; however, the recurrence of this scene in T5 in the context of the allusion to the Euripidean plot (cf. also the possible reference to theatrical space in T5. 2-4.), as well as Theon's description of the supplication-scene of the Dictys in the interpretation of the next lemma, make it likely that he could allude to Euripides. In such a case, his scholarly attitude would have required the acknowledgement of Euripides' Dictys as source of this scene, unless omitted due to the scribe's epitomization of the commentary; in fact, the third scribe, who evidently copied Theon's commentary less selectively than the first one, has preserved the ascribed quotation of E. Oedipus fr. 556 Kn. In the preserved part of 1. 2, the γὰρ indicates that the sentence starts with ἐναχωσμένοις, which implies that a short phrase of 12-14 letters is likely to have preceded this sentence. This possibility might have allowed for a short acknowledgement of the Dictys as source (e.g. ὙΣ ἐν ΤΩΙ ΔΙΚΤΥΙ (?)). It is self-evident, however, that the physical damage of the papyrus does not allow for anything but speculations. Consequently, the scholium on P. 10. 72a may have well drawn on Theon's commentary (as schol. vet. O 5. 42b Drachmann and schol. Paean 2. 372 in P. Oxy. V 841) without naming the source; Aristarchus, for instance, is not always acknowledged in the ancient Pindaric scholia (cf. Irigoin 1952, p. 104 and n. 3).

4f. ἐι..ἰόθ ἐκωθείν τῷ ἣ [[καὶ]] τῆν/ [± 16] e [±3]: the letters preceding ἐκωθείν are illegible. Treu (1974, p. 72f.) suggested that ἐκωθείν could have been the shortened epic Aorist for ἐκωθεῖαν (cf. Kühner-Blaß 1904, 1, 2 p. 55 and Monro 1891, p. 5); shortened
forms of this type occur in trimeters from messenger-speeches in *Hipp.* 1247 and *Ph.* 1246 (cf. Bergson, 1959, p. 15) and in anapaests in *Andr.* 287, *HF* 662, *Ph.* 824, A. *Pers.* 18, S. *Ai.* 167, Tr. 504. This word is followed by ἄνερ Ἐλληνικά, which is regularly used by scholiasts to introduce the paraphrase of a poetic text (cf. Maehler 1968, p. 100) and is preceded, as a rule, by the citation of the poetic excerpt (sometimes followed by a brief explanatory note); cf. schol. vet. Pi. O. 8. 37b, P. 4. 61, 188b, 195a, N. 2. 32a (Drachmann), schol. vet. E. *Or.* 224, 702 (Schwartz), schol. A.R. 1. 313-314 (Wendel), schol. Lyc. 935 (Scheer). Accordingly, what precedes ἄνερ Ἐλληνικά may have been the quotation from a poetic text — not necessarily from Pindar— or else a quotation plus a short note, and what follows it at the end of l. 4 and the lost beginning of l. 5 could have been the paraphrase of the quotation (cf. Treu 1974, pp. 73-75). From the middle of l. 5 onwards, Theon refers to the altar-scene of the Dictys; the γὰρ after βιαζομένης evidently links the new sentence with that preceding it. It could thus be assumed that the possible citation in l. 4 and its paraphrase after ἄνερ Ἐλληνικά may have been related to the Dictys and followed by the reference to the altar-scene of the play. Hence, if ἐκωθένει is taken to be the poetic third-Plural form instead of adverb, it may have referred to the rescue of Danae and Dictys; cf. l. 11f. ἄνερ Ἐλληνικά τοῦ Δανάην. If Euripides’ play was acknowledged as source of inspiration (unless the acknowledgement was omitted by the copyist or located at the beginning of l. 2, cf. 1-3 n.), the reference may have been located at the lost beginning of l. 4, before the quotation (there is space for about 16 letters, which could allow for a short reference and the beginning of the possible quotation).

5lf. βιαζομένης γὰρ τὴν Δανάην Ἐκωθένει τοῦ Πολυδέκτου; cf. T5: διὰ τὴν Πολυδέκτου βίαν; ‘being forced’ by the king to marry him/ become his concubine.

6lf. εὐνέβη αὐτὴν κατὰ [φοινίκας κρόπα]; τὸν βαμέν τοῦ <Ποσείδώνος>; the god’s name is supplied by T3 (cf. note *ad loc.*); the copyist was obviously unable to read the name written in his exemplar (cf. Turner’s note *ad loc.*), so he left a blank space, estimating the approximate size of the omitted word (nine/ ten letters). Owing to the clumsy style of the passage as epitomized by the first scribe, it is not clearly reported that Danae’s refuge at the altar follows Perseus’ departure (cf. l. 8f.), as made explicit in T5. It could also be due to the epitomization of the account that Dictys is not mentioned as having fled to the altar.
together with Danae. The physical damage of the papyrus leaves it unclear whether his name occurred in the previous lines.

9f. ὡς ἀπολούμενον καὶ [±12] τὸν μὲν Ἑνὸπολύκτην θεώρησαντα: what has been lost from the account is the reference to Perseus' return to Seriphos, which could have been located at the beginning of l. 10. Treu's supplement μηκέτι ἀνιόντα (1974, p. 68) repeats the meaning of ἀπολούμενον and does not provide the expected piece of information. What is needed, instead, is a supplement denoting 'having returned/having been rescued'; Professor C. Carey suggests ἐπανελθόντος, which fits the approximate number of 12 missing letters and aptly fills the gap in the narrative. The καὶ in the place of an expected 'but', which would have stressed Perseus' unexpected return, gives a miserably flat narrative, though in view of the clumsy style of the passage written by the first copyist, this should not be surprising.

11f. σωθή [νατ τὴν Δανᾶη: this piece of information suggests that Danae's life was threatened, if she did not yield to Polydectes' intentions. The threat of the hostile party against the suppliants' lives recurs in Andr. 245-268, 425-576, HF 140-513.

T5:

Thanks to T3, we are now confident that the supplication-scene reported in the present source and T4 comes from the Dictys. The Library is estimated to have been written some time between 50 BC and 250 AD.335 As regards the author's familiarity with Euripides, there is no evidence pointing to his direct knowledge of the plays;336 he rather seems to have been directly or indirectly indebted to Hellenistic commentaries, especially for the learned mythical variants cited, and earlier mythographic accounts.337 When reproducing the plots of Euripides' tragedies, the Library often presents similarities to the narrative papyrus-hypotheses of the dramatist's plays (possibly written in the Augustan era338) in

336 This observation was first made by Robert (1873) p. 55.
terms of content and, sporadically, phrasing. Huys' case-study has revealed that the accounts of the Library occasionally diverge from these hypotheses in some details of the plot and that their verbal agreements are not so impressive as to point to a direct debt of the Library to these hypotheses. It thus seems safer to infer that certain parts of Ps.-Apollodorus' narratives may originate in the Euripidean hypotheses through the use of intermediary sources. The present narrative (l. 1f., which can safely be regarded as reflecting the Dictys, and perhaps also l. 3f.) presents certain stylistic features shared by the mythographic hypotheses of Euripidean plays: the use of the participle παραγενόμενος, which frequently occurs in the hypotheses to indicate the first entrance of a hero on stage (this was probably Perseus' first entrance, cf. Structure), and the accumulation of participles (eight participles within a few lines). Taken alone, these features may be coincidental (παραγενόμενος, for instance, is quite common in narratives from the classical period onwards), but in combination with the dramatic quality of the presentation (cf. the possibly theatrical nuance of the participles καταλαβὼν and εἰσελθὼν and notes ad loc.) they could suggest that the account might go back to the narrative hypothesis of the play. Even so, it would have probably relied on intermediary sources, as the details and complications of the dramatic plot are missing from the account. T6 which seems to be a remain of the hypothesis of the Dictys is too scanty to shed any light on this matter; it refers to the altar-scene mentioning the name of the god, which is omitted here, but the complete loss of context allows only for conjecture as to its reconstruction (cf. note on T6.2f.).

The present account offers the following pieces of evidence for the Dictys: (1) Polydectes' violence has forced Danae and Dictys to flee to an altar (thanks to T3, we know that it was Poseidon's altar), (2) Perseus returns to Seriphos with the Gorgon's head to find his mother and Dictys at the altar, (3) he petrifies Polydectes (for the possibility of

340 Cf. [Apollod.] 1. 9.15 mentioning, for instance, that it was Core who sent Alcestis back from the dead, while her rescue by Heracles is presented as a variant, and Ep. 3. 5 referring to the transfer of Helen to Egypt according to the will of Zeus and not of Hera, as attested in hyp. Helen.
his petrification at a feast, cf. note ad loc.). The narrative of the Library was evidently the source of Tzetzes’ account of this phase of the legend in schol. Lyc. 838 (Scheer).345

The passage from [Apollo.] 2. 4.2 narrating the events at the eranos organized by Polydectes to trap Perseus is not included in the sources for the Dictys, as it presents marked similarities to the summary of Pherecydes’ narrative (cf. The Myth, p. 122ff.)346 and thus seems to reflect the myth in general, while there is no evidence pointing to particular inspiration by tragedy. This eranos would have probably belonged to the προπεπραγμένα recounted in the prologue of the Dictys and would not have formed part of the actual plot of the play.

1f. καταλαβών προσπεφευγών τοῖς βωμοῖς μετὰ τοῦ Δίκτους τὴν μητέρα: the altar-scene is also attested in T3, T4 and probably also in T6, though in the present source, unlike Theon’s account, it is made clear that Danae and Dictys were forced to seek refuge at the altar during Perseus’ absence and not before his departure. The specific nuance of καταλαβών (LSJ9: ‘to find on arrival’) suggests that Perseus actually finds them at the altar; the dramatic quality of the presentation might imply that the account could have gone back to the narrative hypothesis of the play. Cf. similarly, hyp. Hipp. 30-32: τραχυνώμενον δὲ αὐτὸν ἡ Φαιδρα καταμαθοῦσα (‘to perceive with the senses’). In addition, προσπεφευγών τοῖς βωμοῖς recalls hyp. Heraclidae: προσφυγῶν τοῖς θεοῖς.

2 διὰ τὴν Πολυδέκτου βιαν: cf. T4. 5f.: βιοξομένης γε(αρ) τῆς Δαλ [νάες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολυδ]έκτου. The king could have used threats against Danae’s life, to judge by T4. 11f.: σωθῆ [ναὶ τὴν δανάην (cf. note ad loc.).

2-4 εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια, συγκαλέσαντος τοῦ Πολυδέκτου τοῦς φίλους ἀπεστραμμένος τὴν κεφάλην τῆς Γοργόνος ἔδειξε: the verb εἰσέρχομαι regularly occurs in tragedy (LSJ9: of the actors/ chorus ‘to come upon the stage, to enter’, cf. indicatively Pl. R. 580b, X. An. 6. 1.9) often with reference to the actors’ entry into the stage-building: cf. ALC. 912, 1114, Ion 69, 1547, S. Ai. 329, El. 1106, OT 1244. The phrase εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια refers to Perseus’ entry into Polydectes’ palace, which was possibly represented by the skene-building (cf. Setting), and may thus be alluding to theatrical space. Here again, the passage might point to a possible origin of Ps.-Apolloodoros’ account in the narrative.

346 For Ps.-Apolloodoros’ debt to Pherecydes, cf. van der Valk (1958) pp. 117ff.
hypothesis of the play. The reference to the petrification of Polydectes and his friends presumably at a feast diverges from Pherecyd. fr. 11 Fowler (where Perseus asks the king to gather the Seriphian crowd). Considering that (a) the petrification at a feast is mentioned here in the context of the allusion to the Euripidean plot, (b) the feast also occurs in T4.1-3 again in the context of the reference to the plot of the Dictys and seems rather unlikely to originate in Pindar (cf. note ad loc.) and (c) taking also into account the dramatic quality of the presentation and the features, which Ps.-Apollodorus’ testimony shares with narrative hypotheses of Euripides’ plays (cf. introductory note), the petrification-scene at the banquet could well originate in the Dictys. If so, the events at the feast would have been reported in a messenger-speech (cf. Structure). Cf. similarly the narrative of the events at the banquet in Ion 1106-1228 (and Lee 1997, p. 279) stressing the sudden shift from festive excitement to disaster.

5-8: This part of the narrative follows Pherecydes closely (cf. The Myth, p. 122f.). It remains unknown whether Euripides followed the mythographic version and made Dictys king of Seriphos. For this issue and the possibility of the aetiology of the ‘Gorgoneion’, cf. Structure.

**T6:**

*PSI* 1286 comes from a roll and is written along the fibres in a regular round bilinear hand dated at the end of the second century AD; the upper margin is preserved and the back of the roll is blank. Fr. A consists of two columns, the first of which preserves the end of the narrative hypothesis of the Rhesus and the second the end of hyp. Rhadamantys and the opening of hyp. Scyrioi. Hence, this was evidently a roll containing mythographic hypotheses of Euripides’ plays, which were, as a rule, arranged in alphabetic order. Fr. B, which has remained unidentified so far and is the focus of the present inquiry, is a small,

---

347 Cf. the descriptions of Galavotti (1933) p. 177 and Bartoletti (*PSI* XII 1286) p. 191.
349 Jouan and van Looy (2000, p. 83) and Kannicht (2004, 1 382) mention this piece, without however arguing for its identification as part of the hypothesis of the Dictys.
tattered scrap written in exactly the same hand as fr. A, which indicates that it comes from
the same roll.

The only legible elements of this piece are ]ΩΝΟC IE[ in l. 2 and ]ΔΙΚΤΥΟC[ in l. 3. Dictys is a mythical figure associated in ancient sources almost exclusively with Danae's
legend (cf. The Myth, the sole exception is the marginal case in Ov. Met. 12. 334-340, cf.
below) and there is no evidence for his role in any other Euripidean play apart from the
Dictys. His name is thus very suggestive of the possibility that this is a slight remainder of
the hypothesis of the Dictys. Moreover, the reference to the shrine of a god, whose name
ends in -ovoc points to the altar of Poseidon, where Danae and Dictys fled as suppliants,
which accords with the evidence for the play provided in T3 and T4 (also in T5, which,
however, does not mention the god's name). Hence, I suggest that Dictys' name and the
additional trace of the reference to the altar-scene of the play provided in a fragment from a
roll containing hypotheses of Euripidean plays could identify this piece as a scanty relic of
the narrative hypothesis of the Dictys with much probability.

The fact that the hypothesis of a play, the first letter of which starts with Δ, has been
discovered together with those from plays starting with P and Σ (fr. A), while there is no
trace of the hypotheses of the intervening plays, raises questions as to how frs. A and B
ended up together, since they were evidently coming from distant parts of the roll. The sole
known arrangement of mythographic hypotheses in an order other than alphabetical is the
collection of hypp. Peliades and Medea (P.IFAO inv. P.S.P. 248) grouped together on the
basis of theme,350 which evidently does not apply here. It could thus be supposed that the
state in which the fragments were discovered and the manner in which they were gathered
upon excavation may account for this rather unusual case. The fact that these fragments are
of unknown provenance and were acquired by purchase could shed light on the situation;
unlike organized excavations under trained directors, papyrus-finds unearthed by locals
were often ruined by the coarse methods employed, scattered and some of them thrown
away to evade the inspection of Antiquities Service. Subsequently, the finds were divided
among the finders and in turn, texts found together were not kept together, but were sold in

small parcels and their provenance would remain unknown. This factor may well account for the missing intervening hypotheses, which might have either been ruined during excavation or thrown away or even ended up with other byers and in this case, their scraps may still lurk unrecognised or unpublished. Fr. B might have derived from a part of the roll adjacent to fr. A while folded, which could explain why they were discovered together and ended up being sold together.

Gallavotti, who was the first to edit this papyrus, attempted to associate fr. B with the hypothesis of the Rhadamanthys preserved in fr. A. Apart from the remains of this hypothesis, there is no evidence for the subject of the play; the present account mentions Rhadamanthys and his daughters, the Dioscuri, who are killed in a fight and whose association with Rhadamanthys is nowhere else attested, and Helen, who is commanded by Artemis *ex machina* to bury her brothers. Due to the complete absence of evidence for the activity of Dioscuri in the play, Galavotti assumed a fusion of two of their famous deeds, namely their recuperation of Helen, who was abducted by Theseus and brought to Aphidna (cf. Hdt. 9. 73, Paus. 1. 41, 2. 22.6, Plut. *Th.* 32, Hyg. *fab.* 79 and for more sources, cf. Guidorizzi 2000, p. 321), conflated with their battle against the sons of Aphareus, where they were all killed except for Pollux (cf. *Pi.* 10. 55ff., Theoc. 22. 137ff., *[Apollod.]* 3. 134-137, Hyg. *fab.* 80). As has been noted, however, the treatment of the conquest of Aphidna and recuperation of Helen by the Spartan heroes in Attic drama would be unflattering for Athens and Theseus, unless modified in a certain manner. The subject of the play and Rhadamanthys’ involvement in these events (perhaps as a judge?) thus remain obscure and subject to much conjecture. Gallavotti attempted to accommodate fr. B and Dictys’ name in his highly conjectural reconstruction, by identifying Dictys with a Centaur mentioned only in Ovid *Met.* 12. 334-340 as killed by Peirithous in the latter’s nuptial banquet. To accept this suggestion, however, one should have to assume first, that Peirithous had a role in the play as Theseus’ companion (which would presuppose a treatment of the events in Aphidna), moreover, that incidents from Peirithous’ wedding occurred in the Rhadamanthys in the same context with the deeds of the Dioscuri (which

---

seems irreconcilable) and, furthermore, that a very marginal figure appearing only in Ovid and nowhere else played a role sufficiently prominent to be mentioned in the hypothesis.\textsuperscript{355} To accommodate the shrine of a god, whose name ends in \(-\omega\omicron\omicron\varsigma\), Gallavotti used another version of the legend of Dioscuri, that of their abduction of Phoebe and Hilaeira, for whom they entered into fight with the sons of Aphareus; he supposed that the shrine mentioned could have been that of Apollo, as in the \textit{Cypria} (cf. Paus. 3. 16.1) the two maidens—mentioned as a rule to be daughters of Leucippus—were presented as Apollo’s daughters.\textsuperscript{356} However, there is no evidence for the role of Phoebe and Hilaeira in the play and the girls mentioned are daughters of Rhadamanthys.

Hence, in order to accommodate fr. B in hyp. \textit{Rhadamanthys}, one would have to ignore the congruence of the known evidence for the \textit{Dictys} with the legible parts of fr. B, in favour of a very hypothetical reconstruction due to lack of evidence, involving a very marginal figure from an evidently irrelevant incident of Peirithous’ myth, whose role in the play is unattested, conflated with different versions of the legend of Dioscuri.

2ff.: the fragment seems to refer to the flight of Danae and Dictys to the altar of Poseidon. Taking the rather fixed stylistic features of this type of hypotheses into account (cf. note on \textit{Danae T5}), the context might be hypothetically reconstructed as (Danae) \(\epsilon\pi\iota\;\tau\omicron\;\Pi\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\iota\delta\) \(\omega\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\;\iota\epsilon\nu\iota\;\tau\omicron\;\Delta\iota\kappa\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\;\) (cf. hyp. \textit{Andromache}: \(\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\phi\gamma\iota\nu\iota\) \(\epsilon\pi\iota\;\tau\omicron\;\iota\omicron\epsilon\nu\iota\;\Theta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\varsigma\) \(\tau\omicron\;\Pi\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\iota\delta\) \(\omega\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\;\iota\epsilon\nu\iota\;\tau\omicron\;\Delta\iota\kappa\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\;\) (cf. hyp. \textit{Heraclidae}: \(\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\phi\varsigma\gamma\omega\omicron\;\tau\omicr\iota\varsigma\;\theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\)). Likewise, the account of \textit{T5}, the stylistic features of which may suggest that it could have gone back to the mythographic hypothesis of the play possibly through an intermediary source, mentions \(\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\phi\varsigma\gamma\omega\nu\iota\omicron\;\tau\omicr\iota\varsigma\;\theta\omicr\iota\omicron\varsigma\;\beta\omicr\omicr\iota\omicr\iota\omicr\iota\;\) \(\tau\omicr\iota\varsigma\;\Delta\iota\kappa\tau\omicr\omicr\omicr\omicr\omicr\omicr\). In conclusion, this tiny scrap mentioning Dictys’ name and the shrine of a god, the traces of whose name match that of Poseidon, can be regarded with much likelihood as coming from the lost narrative hypothesis of the \textit{Dictys}. It is congruent with the testimonies

\textsuperscript{355} One could argue that this may have been a narrated element in the play (e.g. in the expository prologue or a messenger-speech), which would again be questioned by the absence of evidence for Peirithous’ role, not least for a minor figure associated with him in a later source, in the context of an incident evidently irrelevant to the play. It should also be noted that narrative hypotheses aim to report those events of the \(\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\phi\varsigma\gamma\omega\nu\iota\omicron\) which are essential for the sequence of the plot.

\textsuperscript{356} Cf. Gallavotti (1933) p. 184.
of T3, T4 and T5 as regards the altar-scene of the play, though, sadly, it is too scanty to offer any new piece of evidence for the plot.\textsuperscript{357}

\textbf{T7:}

The Eleventh Epigram of Book III of the Palatine Anthology was inspired by one of the reliefs from the Cyzicene temple that was built in honour of Queen Apollonis of Pergamos.\textsuperscript{358} This monument was raised in the second century BC\textsuperscript{359} and dedicated to Apollonis by her sons Eumenes and Attalus; for this reason, all the reliefs of the temple and the corresponding epigrams, which were written not earlier than the sixth century A.D.,\textsuperscript{360} were expressive of filial devotion. Each one of the nineteen epigrams is preceded by a \textit{lemma}, which is a description of the relief, possibly dated in the fifth century A.D. at the earliest.\textsuperscript{361}

The reason for studying this epigram and its \textit{lemma} lies in the reception of tragedy\textsuperscript{362} and especially of Euripidean drama in several Cyzicene reliefs and their corresponding epigrams; they allude to the \textit{Phoenix} (III 3.5f.),\textsuperscript{363} \textit{Cresphontes} (III 5)\textsuperscript{364}, \textit{Antiope} (III 7), \textit{Hypsipyle} (III 10)\textsuperscript{365} and \textit{Captive Melanippe} (III 16).\textsuperscript{366} Accordingly,

\textsuperscript{357} I am indebted to Prof. C. Roemer for valuable advice on this piece.
\textsuperscript{358} For Queen Apollonis, cf. van Looy (1976) pp. 151-165.
\textsuperscript{359} Between 175 and 159, according to van Looy and Demeon (1986, p. 135).
\textsuperscript{360} On the basis of language and metre; cf. the detailed study of Demeon (1988) pp. 233-248 and also Meyer (1911) p. 70.
\textsuperscript{361} Meyer (1911, pp. 53-68) regards the fifth century as the terminus post quem for the dating of the \textit{lemmata}, owing to the striking features of Byzantine rhetoric in their vocabulary and style.
\textsuperscript{362} The ninth relief and epigram was inspired by Sophocles’ \textit{Tyro}, while the second accords with the story told by Hyginus in \textit{fab.} 100, which, according to Aelian (\textit{N.A.} 3. 47), reflects a tragic plot, possibly that of Sophocles’ \textit{Mys}.; cf. Sutton (1984) pp. 78ff., Pearson (1917) II p. 71ff, Robert (1887) p. 246ff. and Radinger (1897) p. 124 and n. 2.
\textsuperscript{363} The relief depicting the blinding of Phoenix by his father at the presence of his mother Alcimede and the matching epigram must have been inspired by both the Homeric (\textit{Il.} 9. 447-477) and the Euripidean version of this legend: the artist probably ‘borrowed’ the figure of Phoenix’s mother Alcimede from Homer, while the blinding of Phoenix by his father Amyntor as the result of false accusations by his father’s concubine (III 3. 5: \textit{δολίους γινθρίσματι}) was introduced by Euripides in his \textit{Phoenix}; cf. Jouan and van Looy (2002) p. 316ff.
\textsuperscript{364} So Harder (1985) p. 55.
\textsuperscript{365} Cf. Bond (1963) pp. 19, 139.
\textsuperscript{366} The relation of these epigrams to Euripidean tragedy was supported by Radinger (1897) p. 124 and n. 2 and Calderini (1913) pp. 350-372.
Radinger suggested that the eleventh relief and epigram of the Cyzicene monument could have echoed the *Dictys*.\textsuperscript{367}

The treatment of Euripidean themes in the lost reliefs —as indicated by the descriptions in the *lemmata* that precede the epigrams— is not surprising, to judge by the popularity of Euripides in Hellenistic times,\textsuperscript{368} when this monument was raised. As regards the relief, which depicted Perseus as showing the Gorgon’s head to Polydectes, what needs to be asked is whether the source of artistic inspiration was the myth in general or a specific treatment, as, for instance, Euripides’ *Dictys*. As was observed above (cf. The Myth, p. 128), though the theme of Polydectes’ petrification inspired wide literary and artistic production during the fifth century, no more treatments of the theme are attested from the fourth century onwards (apart from the echoes of the *Dictys*), which could imply that this phase of the myth survived in Hellenistic era thanks to a popular earlier treatment of the legend. Considering that the *Dictys* seems to have been popular in the fourth century (cf. its reception in T3 pointing to a fourth-century revival outside Athens) and afterwards (to judge by Theon’s testimony in T4 and the number of surviving quotations), it could have supported the survival of the legend in Hellenistic times. Hence, though the relief did not depict an actual scene from the Euripidean *Dictys* (Polydectes’ petrification would have been reported in a messenger-speech), it could have well been inspired by the myth that remained popular in Hellenistic age possibly thanks to Euripides’ play.

The short accounts of the *lemmata* describe the representations in the reliefs, often with reference to the context of each story (cf. III 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18). Likewise, the eleventh *lemma* briefly reports the context of Polydectes’ petrification, which accords with mythography. There is no particular allusion to Euripides’ treatment of the story. The phrase κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν τῆς δίκης points to the retribution of justice and it may be far-fetched, on the basis of its sense as ‘providence’, to take it as suggestive of Perseus’ return to Seriphos in the nick of time to punish Polydectes and forestall his plans for Danae (which would refer to the play, cf. T4. 11f., T5, T3 and Structure). It is also noteworthy that Dictys, the central figure of the play, is nowhere mentioned, probably due to the fact that he was presumably not depicted in the relief, so as to raise the lemmatist’s comment.

\textsuperscript{367} Cf. Radinger (1897) p. 124 and n. 2.
\textsuperscript{368} For his popularity in Hellenistic times, cf. especially Funke (1965-1966) pp. 238-242.
parallel study of the *lemmata* reflecting Euripidean tragedies indicates that the lemmatist is unlikely to have gone back to the plays, but possibly used mythographic manuals referring to these treatments. This is revealed by the fact that the *lemmata* are confined to a rough outline of the plots (cf. III 5, 7, 10), while inaccuracies are not avoided; III 16, for instance, points to a confusion of the plot of the *Captive Melanippe* with that of *Melanippe the Wise* (Aeolus is unlikely to have had a role in the *Captive Melanippe*; the heroine seems to have been imprisoned by the villain Siris instead). Hence, the relation of the account of the eleventh *lemma* to the *Dictys* seems to be remote, as it is likely to have drawn on a source referring to the myth in general, with no particular reference to the play.

As to those epigrams taken to reflect Euripidean plots, there is again no evidence pointing to familiarity of their author with the tragic texts; III 5, 7, 10, 16 reveal knowledge of the outline of the play, as it could have been provided by an intermediary source, while III 3 is evidently a fusion of the Homeric and Euripidean treatment of the myth of Phoenix. They are free compositions inspired by themes from Euripides’ plays, but not aiming to reproduce them; their focus is on the motif of filial devotion. There is nothing, however, to relate the eleventh epigram to the plot of the *Dictys*, rather than to the myth in general. Even more, it presents a deviation from the known evidence for the play: the reference to Danae’s rape by Polydectes, which may have resulted from misinterpretation of a mythographic account (cf. note ad loc.). The relation of the epigram to the play cannot thus be substantiated.

2 διὰ τὸν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ γάμον: ‘marriage’, but also ‘unlawful wedlock’ (*LSI*); for the latter meaning, cf. *Andr.* 103, *Tr.* 932, *Hel.* 190, X. *Cyr.* 8. 4.19, Luc. *VH* 1. 22. Cf. Strabo (10. 5.10) referring to Polydectes’ planned marriage to Danae: τούτο δὲ πράξας τιμωροῦντα τῇ μητρί, ὅτι αὕτην Πολυδέκτης ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀκούσαν ἀγεσθαι προείλετο πρὸς γάμον. There is no clear evidence as to whether Polydectes was forcing Danae to become his wife or concubine in the play.

5 ἔτης καὶ σὺ λέχη Δανάης, Πολυδέκτη, μιᾶνειν: the reference to Danae’s rape by Polydectes is a deviation from the mythical sources and the evidence for the *Dictys*; the

---

369 Cf. van Looy (1964) p. 196.
371 So Meyer (1911) p. 73, Harder (1985) p. 55. On the other hand, Calderini (1913) pp. 349, 371f. defended the possibility that the author had direct knowledge of the plays.
only source mentioning such an event is Pindar P. 12. 14f., on whom, however, none of the epigrams seems to have relied. In his use of a mythographic manual, the epigrammatist may have misinterpreted as ‘rape’ a possible phrase, such as βιογομένης (cf. T4. 5) or Πολυδέκτον βιαν (cf. T5. 2), which evidently refer to the king’s pressure on Danae.

Fr. 1:

This line is quoted unascribed by Philodemus in his review of the positions probably of the ‘kritikos’ Heracleodorus, one of his literary adversaries, who cited this verse as a euphonic example because of the word-order (σώνθεσις), while rejecting content as a determinant of aesthetic value. According to Philodemus, on the other hand, the elegant σώνθεσις of this line fails to correspond to an equally high meaning and cannot as such offer μυχαγωγία.372 This iambic trimeter referring to Seriphos obviously derives from a dramatic treatment of Danae’s legend; apart from the Dictys, this island is known to have been the setting of Aeschylus’ Dictyalci and the Seriphioi of Cratinus.374 In terms of rhythm (Porson’s Law and lack of resolutions), the verse could be tragic, though consistent with comedy as well. Nevertheless, a line chosen as producing an elegant phonetic effect could hardly be assigned to a comedy or a satyr play.375 Moreover, references to comedy and satyr play are very rare in the surviving papyri of the On Poems.376 Furthermore, Euripides is the most quoted of all dramatists in this work; references to his language and dramatic technique are constantly made by Heracleodorus and other ‘kritikoi’ of the Hellenistic age


374 The Polydectes of Aeschylus is also assumed to have taken place in Seriphos, but the complete absence of quotations from this play may indicate that it was not extant in the Hellenistic era; cf. The Myth, p. 126.


376 There are only a few general references to comedy in the surviving evidence for the On Poems (in P. Herc. 1081, fr. 35/ fr. 192 Janko, P. Herc. 1081a, fr. 22/ fr. 205 Janko and P. Herc. 1081, 11N/ Tr. C, fr. h Sbordone) and, most importantly, there exist no quotations from comic plays. In addition, P. Herc. 460, fr. 15/ fr. 100 Janko (cf. Janko ad loc. n. 7), P. Herc. 1074a, fr. 23/ fr. 209 Janko (cf. Janko ad loc. n. 3) and P. Herc. 1081a, fr. 25/ fr. 210 Janko contain quotations that are only assumed to have derived from satyr-plays and which, moreover, are not presented as examples of euphony like our fragment.
and judged by Philodemus. It is also worth bearing in mind that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Philodemus' younger contemporary, regarded Euripides as the most skilled of the tragic poets at producing what Dionysius called γλαυφυρά σύνθεσις (Comp. 23. 46f.), namely a composition of words characterized by euphony and harmony. On the basis of these observations and the surviving evidence, this line can plausibly be assigned to the Dictys.

This verse revealing the place of action seems suitable as part of the beginning of the narrative prologue of the play, in accordance with Euripides' practice. References to locale in the first line of the prologue occur in the Alcestis, Suppliants, Electra, Helen, Bacchae, Telephus fr. 696 Kn., Oeneus fr. 558 Kn., Meleagros fr. 515 Kn. and Auge fr. 264a Kn., also S. Ph. 1. The setting of the play is mentioned early in the prologue also in Med. 10, Hipp. 12, Andr. 16, Hec. 8, HF 4, Tr. 4, Ion 5, Cyc. 20. The references to locale are often followed by a relative clause, as in Alc. 1, Andr. 16f., Supp. 1f., HF 4, Ion 5, El. 1f., Hel. 1f., Oeneus fr. 558. 1f. Kn. and Telephus fr. 696. 1f. Kn. Likewise, our fragment may have been followed by a phrase such as ἡδ' ἐστὶ γαῖα or something similar defining Seriphos as the place of action and then by a relative clause referring to past events (cf. Alc. 1f., El. 1f., Oeneus fr. 558 Kn., 1f.) or to particular features of this land (as in Andr. 16f., Supp. 1f., HF 4, Ion 5 and Hel. 1f., Telephus fr. 696. 1f. Kn.).

The prologue-speaker could have been either Dictys or Danae, since they would be the most suitable characters to narrate the προσεπραγμένα (the finding of the chest by Dictys and the protection that he offered to Danae and Perseus) and describe the present situation (the impossible mission assigned to Perseus by Polydectes, the former's long absence and the king's pressure on Danae, which has driven her and Dictys to seek refuge at Poseidon's altar, cf. T4, T5 and Structure). For Euripidean narrative prologues spoken by suppliants upon a 'cancelled entry', cf. the Heraclidae, Andromache, Heracles and Helen (cf. Setting). If fr. 11 (presenting Danae as if she has been roused from sleep, cf. note ad

378 For the features of γλαυφυρά σύνθεσις, cf. Comp. 23.
is located towards the beginning of the play rather than later, in the crisis, which would seem implausible, Dictys may be a likelier prologue-speaker than Danae. In this case, Dictys, as Electra in the *Orestes*, might have delivered the prologue-speech, while Danae is asleep. In terms of opening, cf. also the prologue of the *Heracles* with a male and female suppliant 'discovered' on stage upon a 'cancelled entry' (the difference being that in the opening tableau of that play we have Heracles' children as well), of whom the male delivers the narrative prologue.

Stylistically speaking, the γλαφυρά σύνθεσις of this line consists in its harmony and euphonic effect; there is a wide use of ρ, the noblest of the semi-vowels according to Dionysius, while the λ creates the most pleasant effect (cf. *Comp.* 14. 101-104, for λ, cf. also Pl. *Cra.* 427b, 434c, Dem. *De eloc.* 174). Moreover, the correspondence of the vowels at the beginning and end of the line (ε, ι, ο: Σέριφος: ε, ι, ο: περίφρυτος) adds balance and harmony to the verse.383


Fr. 2:

This fragment is not explicitly ascribed to Euripides' *Dictys*, as its source ([Plut.] *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 106a) tends to leave several of the quoted passages unascribed (cf. 102b, 102c, 102f, 103b, 103c, 104a, 105f, 106d, 108e, 110e, 110f, 115a, 116c, 117a). Nevertheless, it seems very unlikely that this quotation could have derived from any play other than the *Dictys*, considering that Aeschylus' *Polydectes* (which is only assumed to have dealt with the events at Seriphos) survives only as a title in the Catalogue of Aeschylus' plays (*TrGF* III T 78. 15b), has never been quoted and was thus possibly lost

before the Alexandrian era (cf. The Myth, p. 126). Moreover, the commentary below proves that the language, style and themes of this passage are strikingly Euripidean.

These lines contain Dictys’ consolation to Danae, who is lamenting for Perseus, as the latter is believed to have died in his pursuit of the Gorgon. This thought may have arisen from Perseus’ long absence in combination with the impossible deed that he has been sent to accomplish. Likewise, Bellerophon is thought of as killed in his struggle against the Chimaera (cf. Stheneboea ‘toasting’ Bellerophon, believing that he is dead, in Stheneboea fr. 664 Kn. and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.). Moreover, Perseus is young and untested and his mother’s grief for his fate may resemble Penelope’s lament on hearing of the plot organized by the suitors against Telemachus in Od. 4. 703-741. Nevertheless, considering that Perseus’ death is here regarded as certain (cf. 1. If.), it might be assumed that Polydectes had spread a false rumour of his death —as Lycus in HF 145f.— in order to frustrate Danae and force her to give in. 384 In this case, the consolation-scene might have followed a confrontation of Polydectes and the suppliants, in which the former could have tried to make them give up hope of the possibility of Perseus’ return and thus force Danae to succumb to his will (cf. HF 140-146). Considering the violent pressure to which Danae and Dictys would have been subjected (cf. T5. 2, T4. 5f., 11f.), the latter’s consolation to the suffering mother might have been part of a wider suppliant-suppliant discourse on how to act under these circumstances and bear their misfortune (cf. Structure); cf. Amphitrion and Megara in HF 60-106, 275-347. 385 Unlike Amphitryon, however, Dictys is here prepared to accept the worst.

Consolation-scenes occur repeatedly in Euripidean drama. An elaborate consolatory speech is that of Amphiaraus to Eurydice after the loss of her baby-son in Hypsipyle fr. 757. 920-927 Kn./ 60. 89-96 Bond (cf. Bond’s note ad loc. and Collard, Cropp and Gibert 2004, p. 248): δ' αδ' παραίνω, ταυτά μοι δέξαι, γόνατι/ ἔφυ μὲν οὐδεὶς δ' ἡμεῖς οὐ πονεῖ βροτῶν/ θάπτει τε τέκνα χάτερα κτάται νέα/ αὐτός τε θνήσκει[ν] καὶ τάδ' ἀχθονται βροτοῖ/ εἰς γῆν/ φέροντες [γῆν]. ἀναγκαίος δ' ἐξει/ βίον θερίξειν ὄστεα κάρπιμον στάχυν,/ καὶ τόν μὲν εἴποι, τὸν δὲ μή τι ταύτα δὲ πύλην ἐκπέμψαν ἀπὶ δὲν κατὰ φύσιν διεκκεράν; Cf. similarly the


Ino


The cases of consolatory speeches in Euripides were obviously not independent from the intellectual context of his era, as consolation first appears in the course of the fifth century BC and was further developed as a genre later, under the influence of the Academic Crantor, the Cynics and especially the Stoics; the orator Antiphon of Rhamnus is known to have developed a τέχνη ἀλλιώσεως directed towards the relief of distress (cf. [Plut.] Vit. X Orat. 833c) and to have organized νηπιανθέως ἀφροδήσεως with the purpose of consoling the mourners (cf. Philostr. Vit. Soph. 1. 15.2). Fr. inc. 964 Kn., in which one of Euripides’ characters claims that he has learnt from a wise man to handle disasters such as unseasonable deaths in advance, so that he will be prepared to come to terms with them when they do occur, may reflect Antiphon’s practice. In addition, according to Gorgias, λόγος (‘speech’) had the power to heal sorrow (Hel. 8 /fr. 11. 8 D.-K.: (λόγος) δόναται γὰρ καὶ φόβον παύσαι καὶ λύσῃ ἀφελείας) while the sophist Prodicus, one of Euripides’ teachers according to one strand of the tradition at least, is attested to have given laudationes mortis (Pl.] Axioch. 366c) which was a commonplace in consolatory speeches (for laudationes mortis in tragedy, cf. Heracl. 592-6, Philoctetes fr. 791 Kn., Cresphontes fr. 449 Kn., Phrixus fr. 833 Kn., Antigone fr. 176 Kn., fr. inc. 908 Kn. and the famous

Since consolation relies on λόγος as ‘reasoning’, as well as ‘speech’, Dictys’ argumentation is expressed in rhetorical figures, such as the adynaton (I. 1f., cf. Manzo 1988 passim), the example (ll. 5-8, cf. Lausberg 1998, pp. 196ff.), the anaphora (ll. 5-8: ὃσοι τε ... ὃσοι τε... τῶς τ...', cf. Lausberg 1998, pp. 281-283) and the tricolon crescendo (ll. 5-8).

Dictys’ rhesis contains certain elements of consolations which were formulated later, under the influence of Crantor and the Stoicism: (a) the futility of lament (as in Cic. Tusc. 3. 62, Sen. Ep. 99. 6, Sen. Consol. Pol. 2.1 –5.5), and (b) examples of other people suffering from misfortunes (as in Cic. Fam. 4.5- 4.6, Sen. Ep. 99.6, 99.22, Consol. Marc. 2.1- 3.4, 12.4- 16.10, Consol. Pol. 14.1- 17.2, Plut. Tranq. An. 467e, 470b-e, [Plut.] Consol. Apoll. 106b-c), which point to a consideration of the calamities of human life and the necessity to bear them (as in Cic. Tusc. 3. 34, 52, 59, Sen. Ep. 99. 7-9, Consol. Marc. 10.1- 11.5, Consol. Pol. 1.1- 1.4, 11.1- 11.6).

As regards the possible dramatic function of the consolatory rhesis, the belief that Perseus has died is a tragic irony, which prepares for the peripeteia that will take place at the moment of his return. Cf. similarly HF 296-298, 459-495 and Steneboea’s toast to the supposedly dead Bellerophon in Steneboea fr. 664 Kn. (cf. Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.). No clue survives as to any complications of the plot occurring after this scene; in HF 275-347, 451-522, for instance, the acceptance of Heracles’ death forces Amphitryon and Megara to accept their own. The elaborately rhetorical speech obviously serves to illustrate Dictys’ dianoia (cf. Ar. Poet. 1450b. 5: τὸ λέγειν δύνασθαι τὰ ἐνόντα καὶ τὰ ἀρµόττοντα); cf. also introductory note on fr. 4 for Dictys’ possible participation in the agon.


2 ἀνήσειν: *LSJ* ⁹: ‘to release’ and also ‘to send up from the grave or nether world’; both meanings are present in this case. It occurs as synonym of ἀνασκήματο (schol. vet. A. Pers. 649 Dahnhardt and schol. rec. Ar. Ra. 1462 Chantry). In the sense of ‘sending someone back from the dead’ it is found in [E.] Rh. 965, A. Pers. 650, Ch. 489. The verb ἀνήμι is also used for blessings conferred by Hades, as in Ar. Ra. 1462 (and Dover 1993 ad loc.), Ar. Tagenistae fr. 504 K.-A., Phryn. Com. fr. 16 K.-A., Pl. Cra. 403e.

εἰ θέλεις στένειν: the reading θέλεις of Φ and Π adopted in the edition of Paton and Wegehaupt and by Kannicht is preferable to θέλοις of the rest of the Mss, as the indicative expresses the real present condition needed in this context (‘if you insist on mourning’) rather than the less vivid one expressed by the optative (‘should you choose to mourn’). Likewise, in the verbal and thematic parallel in Alc. 1079, the indicative in the condition is better than the optative for the same reason (cf. Dale 1954 ad loc., this reading is also adopted by Diggle): τί δ’ ἂν προκύπτοις, εἰ θέλεις (ν. l. θέλοις) ἀει στένειν; For the argument often used in consolations that nothing can be accomplished by yielding to lamentation, cf. ll. 24. 524, S. El. 137, E. Alc. 985f., Hec. 960f., El. 193-5 (and Cropp 1988, ad loc.), Captive Melanippe fr. 507 Kn., Hypsipyle fr. 60. 95f. Bond, Oenomaus fr. 572 Kn., Antigone fr. 175 Kn.

3-8: The examples of other people struck by disasters as a consolation to the suffering person occurs often in Euripides, e.g. in Alc. 416-8, Med. 1017, HF 1314-21 (cf. Bond 1981, ad loc.), Hypsipyle fr. 757. 920-927 Kn., Iho fr. 418 Kn., Temenidae fr. 733 Kn., also in S. El. 153, Ant. 944-87 (cf. Jebb 1900 ad loc.), Pi. P. 3. 86-107 and goes back as early as ll. 5. 382-404 (cf. Willcock 1970, p. 168f.), 18. 117-121 (cf. Edwards 1991 ad loc.), 24. 602-620 (cf. Richardson 1993, p. 340). The examples provided by Dictys are specifically focused, as according to the mythical tradition Danae has been through all situations mentioned: she has been twice imprisoned by her father, reduced from royalty to penury and is now facing the dreadful prospect of a childless old age. Dictys’ consolatory speech aims to show her the way to ἐγκαρπησις, a notion which appears widely in tragedy, as in A. Pers. 293, [A.] Pr. 104, S. lon fr. 319 R., Tereus fr. 585 R., E. Heracl. 619f., HF 1227f., Tr. 727, Hel. 253f. (cf. Kannicht 1969 ad loc.) Ph. 382, 1762 (cf. Mastronarde 1994 ad loc.), Aeolus fr. 37 Kn., Alcme. fr. 98 Kn., Oenomaus fr. 572 Kn.,

3 παύσαι: Often used in Euripidean consolations with the purpose of bringing lament to an end; cf. HF 1398: παύσαι· δίδον δὲ χείρ· ὑπερέτη φίλων, IA 1435: παύσαι· μὲ μὴ κάκτζε· τάδε δὲ μοι πιθοῦ, also Andr. 1270: παύσαι δέ λύπης τῶν τεθνηκότων ύπερ.


λογιζέομαι: 'to count, to reckon up' and also 'to consider on the basis of logic'; cf. Andr. 126, 316, HF 295, Phoenix fr. 812. 5 Kn., Erechtheus fr. 360. 5 Kn. The infinitive σκοπεῖν in 1. 8 carries the same meaning. The use of λογισμός ('reasoning') was the basis of sophistic thought, as made explicit in Gorg. Helen 2 (fr. B 11. 2 D.-K., cf. MacDowell 1982 ad loc.) and occurs frequently in oratory; cf. indicatively Antiphon ii 2. 8, fr. 4a, col. 3. 17 (for the function of λόγος as rational analysis in Euripides and Antiphon, cf. Solmsen 1931, pp. 54-58), Lys. xxxii 26. 2, D. viii 18. 2, xiii 2. 3, xix 338. 2, Din. i 112. 2.

5 ἐκμεμοχθενται: LSJ 9: 'to be worn out', used commonly by Euripides in the active voice; cf. Supp. 451, HF 309, 1369, El. 307, Tr. 646, 873, IT 84. Bentley's ἐκμεμόχθενται (in the sense 'to be forced/ compelled') does not occur anywhere in fifth-century literature except for Ar. Lys. 430 in the active voice ('to force the gates open with crow-bars') and is regularly found in medical works (cf. indicatively Hp. Art. 72. 20, 77. 21, Gal. De usu partium Vol. III, p. 655. 15 Kuhn).

6 ὅρφανοι τέκνων: The birth of children was essential for the continuity of the oikos and, consequently, for the existence of the polis, since the oikos was basic unit of the latter. The state thus assumed the responsibility to defend its oikoi, as it is evident from the laws for adoption (Is. ii 13, vii 30, [D.] xliii 77f.) and of the epiclerate (Plut. Sol. 20. 2-3), established by Solon to ensure their continuity; cf. Harrison (1968) pp. 82-96, 132-138, Todd (1993) pp. 228-231, Lacey (1968) pp. 73-99, Patterson (1998) pp. 97-101, Pomeroy.

aims to draw an emphatic contrast between excessive royal prosperity and reduction to utter insignificance.

8 τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας: 'to come to nothing, to be regarded as worthless or of no account'; for the frequent occurrence of this phrase especially in Sophocles and Euripides, cf. S. Ai. 767ff., 1094, El. 1165ff., S. Tereus fr. 583. 3 R., E. Andr. 700, Hec. 622 (and Gregory 1999, ad loc.), HF 634ff., El. 370, Tr. 612f., note on Danae fr. 9.3 and Moorhouse (1965) pp. 34-40. The utter ruin of kings and the fragility of fortune, in general, is a pathetic commonplace; cf. the use of the oikeion paradeigma in Hec. 284ff.: κάγω γὰρ ἢ ποτ' ἄλλα

Fr. 3:

The γεραιῶς of the fragment is obviously Dictys, as depicted in T3 (cf. also fr. 11) and these lines explicitly refer to the conflict between Dictys and Polydectes. Webster suggested that they could have been spoken by Danae in her effort to protect Dictys by dissuading him from arguing with Polydectes and drew the parallel with HF 277ff., where Megara tries to protect the old men of the chorus from Lycus’ rage. However, there is nothing in Megara’s tone that would denote submission to the ruler, as in our fragment, and two lines above she actually praises the support of the chorus. On the other hand, the clearly submissive tone of the second line of this fragment—as evident from the use of σέθεν (see note ad loc.)—seems to be hardly compatible with Danae’s attitude of resistance to Polydectes. The conventional content of this distich makes it likelier to have

---

been spoken by the chorus-leader, who does not hesitate to take sides, when the attitude of the dramatic characters clashes with public opinion; cf. Alc. 673f., 706f., Heracl. 271 (cf. Wilkins 1993 and Allan 2001 ad loc.), 273, El. 1051-4 (cf. Cropp 1988 and Denniston 1939 ad loc.). Conciliatory interventions of the chorus-leader in the form of a gnome frequently occur in formal debates, as in the examples just cited. This fragment may have thus been located in an agon-scene between Polydectes and Dictys. Traces of the agon seem to have survived in fr. 4 and possibly fr. 5 (cf. their introductory notes).

Dictys must have belonged to the group of elderly Euripidean characters, whose weak physical condition lags behind their moral assertiveness (as Peleus in Andr. 547ff., Amphitryon in HF 170ff. and Tyndareus in Or. 477ff.) or their unexpected recovery of strength (as the 'rejuvenation' of Iolaus in Heracl. 680ff., the determined vindictiveness of Alcmene in Heracl. 941ff. and Hecabe in Hec. 864ff., and also the enunciation of bold plans by the chorus of old men in HF 252-274). The presentation of the elderly in Euripidean drama serves to arouse pathetic scenes, offers a realistic reflection of life and, furthermore, is indicative of the dramatist's interest in vulnerable social groups, such as old people, women and slaves; it is noteworthy that in our play, as in the Heraclidae and the Heracles, two representatives of these vulnerable groups, namely an old man and a woman, are facing male political power. On the basis of the surviving evidence for the play, Dictys must have displayed moral righteousness and strength of spirit (as Danae's protector, cf. also fr. 13 stressing the just cause of the suppliants, T3, T5 and Dramatis Personae), as well as intellectual capacities (mature judgement and rhetorical ability, cf. fr. 2 and for his possible participation in the agon, cf. introductory note on fr. 4). So far as our evidence goes, I would draw a parallel between the dramatic figure of Dictys and the portraits of Peleus in the Andromache and of Amphitryon in the Heracles. Like Peleus, Dictys seems to be a dynamic old man who does not hesitate to come into conflict with kings, in order to

393 So Hartung (1843-1844) I p. 368.


defend justice. Dictys is also in a similar position to that of Amphitryon, as they are both suppliants who, albeit their disadvantaged status, strongly resist tyrannical power. The fact that the play is named after Dictys implies that he must have been at the centre of dramatic interest; considering that it was produced earlier than the plays mentioned, it could be tempting to suppose that the dramatic character of Dictys might have served as a model for the morally and intellectually gifted elderly figures of Euripides.

1 κοιράνοις: Salmasius' apt emendation of the unmetrical reading τυράννοις of the manuscript tradition, which replaced the poetic and rare κοιράνοις. The same banalization occurs quite frequently; cf. Med. 1299 (κοιράνοις Β Ο Δ Ε Λ Π: τυράννοις Η Α Β), Ph. 1643 (κόιρανοι M V2: τυράννοι H V2), also A. Ag. 549 (κοράνων Τρ: τυράννον F, and cf. Fraenkel 1950 ad loc.), [A.] Pr. 958 (κορανοντ' plerique: τυράννοντ' V F).

σέβειν: *LSJ* 9: ‘to worship, to honour’, mostly referring to gods, less often and more freely used for kings (*Heracl.* 25, while in *Hel.* 726 it denotes the obedience of the slave to his master) and parents (*S. OC* 1377, E. fr. inc. 852 K.) also signifying the reverence in the practice of laws and customs (*E. IT* 1189, *Hel.* 1270). It is a strong word denoting activities ‘within a sphere which man approaches with awe’ (see Fraenkel 1950 II p. 762). When σέβειν refers to men, it can sometimes be said *cum invidia* (cf. Kamerbeek’s note on *S. Ai.* 667), as in *A. Ag.* 925: λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, σέβειν ἐμέ, *Niobe* fr. 159 R.: γίγνεσθε τάνθρωπα μὴ σέβειν ἓγαν. The ancient scholiast on *S. Ai.* 666-8 notes the bitterness and irony in Aias’ words, where the hero reverses the traditional order θεοῦς σέβειν, εἴκειν Ἀτρείδας τῷ θεῷ εἴκειν, Ἀτρείδας σέβειν (cf. Garvie 1998, p. 189). The meaning of πρέπειν in our fragment seems to be similar to that in *Heracl.* 25: τοῦς κρείσσονας σέβοντες, where it denotes ‘to respect the power of a superior’ (cf. Wilkins 1993 *ad loc.*), including the notion of awe towards the supreme authority of the ruler. If the fragment is spoken by the chorus-leader, it may point to a frightened chorus trying to put an end to the argument by encouraging Dictys to yield to Polydectes at a crucial point of the conflict between the suppliants and the king. Parallel cases, where the chorus-leader intervenes at a climactic moment of the conflict by using strong language, occur in *Alc.* 707: παράσαι δὲ, πρέσβυ, παιδα σὸν κακορρωθὼν, *Heracl.* 271: μὴ πρὸς θεῶν κήρυκα τολμήσῃς θεείν, 273: ἀπελθε· καὶ σὺ τοῦδε μὴ θίγης, ἀναξ.

Fr. 4:

This fragment has the form of the rhetorical proem from an *agon*,397 as indicated by the term ἄμελλα λόγων, which is frequently used by Euripides to describe the formal debates in his plays (cf. note *ad loc.*). The participle κλόουντα in 1. 5 indicates that the speaker is male. Nevertheless, the very nature of fragmentary material cited in gnomic anthologies (cf. General Introduction, p. 5), as well as Euripidean rhetoric, make it hard to discern whether the speaker is sympathetic (presumably Dictys or Perseus) or malicious (Polydectes). Two

different readings of the present fragment are possible: (1) if the lines are spoken by Dictys or Perseus: the speaker disapproves of those people, who albeit righteous, behave unjustly by participating in idle debates. He then underlines, however, that it is unendurable to keep silent when being abused by a villain, (2) if the fragment is spoken by Polydectes he resents nobles who descend to the level of people of lower social status by participating in vain debates with them. Nevertheless, he stresses that it is intolerable to be quiet when being offended by a socially inferior. It is clear that the key-words for each interpretation are ἔσθλος – κακός (l. 2) and κακίωνος (l. 5), which can commend either competitive or co-operative excellences (cf. below, note ad loc.). Although both readings seem possible, Polydectes might be a likelier speaker in view of the use of κακίωνον, which regularly refers to traditional values (i.e. birth, status and the question of virtue in war), when used by Euripides in place of a substantive; cf. Heracl. 178 (‘weaker’, thus of lower status): τοὺς ὀμείνονας παρὸν/ φίλους ἠλέθοι τοὺς κακίωνας λαβεῖν, Andr. 914 (and Stevens 1971 ad loc.): γέρων γε Πηλεύς τοὺς κακίωνας σέβον, Hec. 307f.: ὅταν τις ἔσθλος καὶ πρόθυμος ἄν ἄνηρ/ μηδενόν φέρηται τῶν κακίωνον πλέον, 1252f.: οὗμοι, γνωσικός, ὡς έοιχ', ἢσπῳμενος/ δούλης ὑψέζω τοῖς κακίσσιν δίκην, Hel. 1213 (with reference to Menelaus’ servant): ἔσθλον κακίους ἐνιοτ' εὐτυχέστεροι, fr. inc. 1048 Kn.: ὡς καὶ ἰσχ' ἰσχοπτος ἄν ἡτάζετο/ ἢ τόξα πάλλων ἢ μάχη διόρος σθένον,/ τοῦτον τυραννεῖν τῶν κακίωνον ἔχρην. Prof. Kannicht also regards Polydectes as a stronger candidate for these lines, drawing a thematic parallel to fr. inc. 1050 Kn., which was assumed by Hartung to belong to our play in view of its similarity to the present fragment: ἀλλ' οὐ πρέπει τύραννον, ὡς ἐγὼ φρονῶ./ οὖδ' ἀνδρα χρηστὸν νέκιος στραθέσθαι κακοῖς/ τιμή γὰρ αὐτῇ τοῖς ἀσθενεστέροις. Cf. also the parallel syntax and the notion of refusing to yield to socially inferiors in Ion 636f. (and Lee 1997 ad loc., Gregory 1995, p. 144f.): κείνο δ' οὐκ ἄνασχετόν/ εἰκεῖν ὀδὸν χαλάντα τοῖς κακίσσιν.

Hence, if Polydectes is the speaker, he declares that, though it is beneath his dignity to argue with a person of lower social status, he is forced to respond to what he sees as unacceptable parrhesia. Dictys would have made an excellent opponent to Polydectes in a

---

398 Jouan and van Looy (2000, p. 82) and Hartung (1843-1844, I p. 170) assigned the fragment to Perseus, while Webster (1967, p. 63) attributed it to Dictys.
rhetorical contest, as his intellectual capacities and moral assertiveness are evident from Fr. 2 and 3 respectively and he could have very well been the kaktov (l. 5, ‘socially inferior’) to whom Polydectes here refers, in view of his occupation as fisherman. Fr. 3 also points to a conflict between Dictys and Polydectes, which may have belonged to the context of a formal debate (cf. introductory note on fr. 3). Furthermore, given Dictys’ central role in the play (cf. Dramatis Personae), his participation in an agon would serve to further illustrate his dianoia. In this light, Dictys’ rhetorical capacity may be paralleled to the skilful rhetoric of other elderly Euripidean figures participating in formal debates, such as Iolaus (Heracl. 181-231), Peleus (Andr. 590-641, 693-726), Amphitryon (HF 170-235), Jocasta (Ph. 528-585, cf. Falkner 1995, pp. 202-205) and Tyndareus (Or. 491-541, 607-629). If this agon occurred between Polydectes and Dictys, it would reasonably have taken place before Perseus’ return, while Danae and Dictys are suppliants. It would have thus presumably been part of the supplication-scene (‘suppliant-enemy’ confrontation), serving to intensify the power gap and dramatic tension, which is a practice followed by Euripides in Heracl. 134-287, Andr. 147-273, HF 140-251, where the enemy is plaintiff and speaks first, while the suppliant is defendant and thus speaks second. Hence, in order to have Polydectes as the first speaker, it could be assumed that an introductory dialogue may have preceded the set-speeches, as in Med. 446-464, Hipp. 902-935, Supp. 399-408, Tr. 895-913, El. 998-1010, Ph. 446-468, Or. 470-490, IA 317-333, where Dictys could have criticized the king’s attitude, thus raising the latter’s indignation (l. 4f.). Though the clear benefits from Dictys’ participation in the debate have been pointed out, the lack of evidence for the plot-structure leaves possibilities open. An on-stage encounter between Polydectes and Perseus, where the hero could have presumably trapped the king into looking at the Gorgon’s head, cannot be ruled out, though ultimately unprovable (cf. Structure). Even in such a case, an agon between them would presuppose conflict, which may not have served Perseus’ purpose of trapping the king as effectively as, for instance, a feigned reconciliation, as in Med. 869-975, Hec. 976-1022, Ctesphontes (Hyg. fab. 184 and Harder 1985, p. 53).

403 In most Euripidean debates, with the exception of El. 998-1131 and Tr. 895-1059 (for which cf. Lloyd 1992, p. 101), the plaintiff speaks first and the defendant second.
The typology of the rhetorical contests in Euripidean drama is strongly influenced by sophistic rhetoric (particularly by the *dissoi logoi*) and law-court procedure (the opposition between plaintiff and defendant).\(^{404}\) Our speaker is rhetorically self-conscious, as evident from his use of agonistic terminology, such as \(\ddot{a}m\ddot{u}l\ddot{a} \ \dot{\lambda}\ddot{o}g\ddot{a}n\), and of a common type of rhetorical *aporia*:\(^{405}\) there are reasons why one should refrain from speaking, nevertheless, the magnitude of the issue forces one to speak. The typical appeal to \(\alpha\nu\acute{a}\acute{g}k\eta\) in oratory is discernible here; cf. *Hipp.* 986-991, *Andr.* 186-191, *Or.* 544-550, Antiphon i 2, iii 2.1, Lys. viii 2, xvii 1, xix 1, xxxii 1 (and Carey 1989 *ad loc.*) and D.H. Lys. 24.

\(\pi\nu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\zeta\ \pi\alpha\lambda\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\eta\nu:\) the speaker underlines his experience in public discourse; cf. *Phoenix* fr. 812 Kn.: \(\eta\acute{o}\acute{n} \ \delta\epsilon\ \pi\nu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\acute{r}\epsilon\acute{e}\theta\omicron\nu\ \dot{\lambda}\ddot{o}g\ddot{a}n \ \kappa\acute{r}i\tau\acute{e}\nu\). \(\Pi\nu\lambda\upsilon\zeta\) occurs frequently in the openings of speeches, mainly serving to initiate an antithesis between what happens in general and the present situation, the particularity of which is stressed; cf. *Alec.* 747-50 and also *A. Pers.* 176, *Ag.* 1372f., *S. Tr.* 49-51 (and Kamerbeek 1959 and Davies 1991, *ad loc.*), 153f., *Ph.* 1047f., *OC* 551-53, *Ar. Th.* 830f., *Av.* 860f., *Th.* 1. 80. 1f., 2. 35. 1, 3. 37. 1, Lys. iii 1, D. xxiii 82, Men. *Per.* 532-36 (cf. Gomme and Sandbach 1973 *ad loc.*) and Fraenkel’s discussion of the subject (1960, pp. 1-5). *LSJ*\(^9\): \(\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\iota\) + Dat. ‘to stand by, to be present at’; it is used in the same sense in *Ion* 612: \(\delta\eta\acute{n} \ \pi\varphi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\ \sigma\omicron\iota\iota\) and *S. Tr.* 748: \(\pi\omicron\ \delta' \ \epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{L}\acute{a}\acute{e}i\epsilon\upsilon\) \(\tau\acute{a}\nu\acute{r} \ \kappa\alpha\pi\iota\tau\omicron\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\alpha\). Cf. also *Heracl.* 502: \(\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\alpha\iota\) \(\sigma\rho\alpha\gamma\nu\iota\), 564, *IT* 1314, *A. Xantriae* fr. 168. 18 R.: \(\alpha\acute{t}e \ \pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{a}\acute{s}i\ \beta\omicron\rho\omicron\tau\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\iota\ \epsilon\acute{p}' \ \epsilon\acute{r}y\acute{g}i\nu\iota\).\(^{406}\)

\(\kappa\acute{a}\varphi\theta\omicron\nu\iota\sigma\varsigma\)a: usually denoting ‘to envy, to resent, to refuse sth. to s.o. from feelings of envy or ill-will, to feel righteous indignation at someone’s undeserved prosperity’ (*LSJ*\(^8\)); the latter sense corresponds to the notion of \(\delta\acute{i}k\acute{a}i\omega\iota\varsigma\ \varphi\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\) mentioned by Hippias (fr. 16 D.-K.) and to Aristotle’s *n\epsilon\mu\epsilon\sigma\varsigma\varsigma* as distinguished from \(\varphi\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\) (EN 1108b. 3-5, *EE* 1233b. 19-26), in that the former evokes the feeling of justice (cf. Stevens 1948, pp. 181-183, Milobenski 1964, pp. 63, 85f., Mills 1985, pp. 3-12, Ben Ze’ev 2003, pp. 105-112). Here, the verb occurs in the less usual sense of ‘to blame, to censure, to begrudge’ bearing the notion of strong disapproval; cf. schol. vet. *Hec.* 288 (Schwartz): \(\sigma\gamma\mu\epsilon\omega\varsigma\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\epsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\iota\nu\) \(\delta\omicron \ \dot{\delta} \ \tau\omicron\nu\ \varphi\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\) \(\acute{e} \ \tau\omicron\nu\ \mu\acute{a}m\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\iota\dot{\eta}\omicron\omicron\iota\nu\) (citing *Theseus* fr. 387 Kn.: \(\kappa\acute{a}\iota\tau\omicron\ \varphi\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\) \(\mu\nu\ \mu\acute{\dot{\theta}}\omicron\nu\ \dot{\acute{a}}\xi\omicron\nu\ \varphi\acute{\alpha}\acute{s}\omicron\omicron\OMICRON\OMICRON\) \(\acute{a}n\omicron\tau\omicron\) \(\tau\omicron\nu\ \mu\acute{\dot{e}}\mu\pi\omicron\varsigma\varsigma\), schol. vet. *Od.* 1. 346 (Dindorf): \(\lambda\acute{a}\mu\beta\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{a}n\acute{e}t\acute{a} \ \acute{e} \ \tau\omicron\nu\).\(^{407}\)

---


καλὸν καὶ μέμφεσθαι and Hec. 288f.: ἀποκτείνειν φθόνος/γυναῖκας. El. 30: παιδῶν δ' ἐδεισε μὴ φθονηθείν φῶναι, 902: νεκροὺς ύπρίζειν, μὴ μὲ τις φθόνωι βάλη; If these lines were uttered by Polydectes, he would be blaming the nobles for descending to the level of social inferiors, thus jeopardizing their own status. The notion of status is associated with the feeling of φθόνος, which is often evoked by an inferior’s encroachment on one’s own high status. Cf. Telephus fr. 703 Kn. (and Preiser 2000 ad loc.): μὴ μοι φθονήσῃτ', ἀνδρεῖς Ἑλλήνων ἄκροι εὶ πτωχός ὄν τέτληε ἐν ἐσθλοῖσιν λέγειν. This type of resentment is closely related to the notion of divine φθόνος (for which cf. Walcot 1978, pp. 22-37, 41-51, Milobenski 1964, p. 36f.) and is a common feature of kings and tyrants, as stressed in Pi. O. 2. 94, P. 3. 71, Hdt. 3. 80. 5-10, Ar. Rh. 1387b. 28-30; cf. Bulman 1992, p. 27f. and Walcot 1978, pp. 11, 19f., 38f. If, on the other hand, the fragment is assigned to a sympathetic character (i.e. Dictys or less likely Perseus), φθονῶ would serve to strongly censure the misbehaviour of righteous people when rushing towards idle debates with villains.

2 κακοῖσιν-ἐσθλὸς: In Euripides these adjectives may either commend the traditional, competitive values of noble birth, virtue in war and prosperity (as in Med. 406, Heracl. 115, 298, 642, 936, Andr. 766, 772, 872, Hec. 307, 327, Telephus fr. 703 Kn., Sthenoboa fr. 661. 2 Kn., Archelaus fr. 244 Kn., cf. Adkins 1970, pp. 74-79, Adkins 1972, pp. 58-98, Sullivan 1995, pp. 123-173 and note on Danae fr. 9. 1-5) or be used in a moral sense, in accordance with the co-operative excellences, which flourished in later fifth century (cf. note on fr. 14. 2 and also ALC. 200, 418, 615, Med. 84, Hipp. 942, 945, 1024, 1071, 1075, 1077, And. 590, 595, 608, Hec. 597, El. 380ff., 551, Ion 370, 441, IT 566, Or. 741, IA 488, Pelliades fr. 609 Kn., Cressae fr. 463 Kn., Ino fr. 402 Kn., Captive Melanippe fr. 494. 28, 511 Kn., Meleagros frr. 520, 521 Kn.). The development of co-operative excellences was primarily supported by the democratic institutions, while the sophists put the traditional qualities into question; cf. Adkins (1960) pp. 176ff., Adkins (1972) pp. 115ff., Bryant (1996) pp. 151-168, 205. The specification of the sense of κακὸς-ἐσθλὸς thus lies in context and in this case depends on who the speaker of the fragment was; if it was Polydectes, these adjectives would probably bear a social sense, namely ‘socially inferior’ and ‘noble’ respectively, whereas if these lines were spoken by Dictys or Perseus the words would carry a moral meaning, i.e. ‘unjust’ and ‘righteous’, as the king cannot be regarded as kákos in a social sense. The contrast between ἐσθλὸς and κακὸς in either a


4-5: The δ' is adversative introducing the second part of the antithesis, which focuses on the particularity of the present situation (the first part is initiated by πολλοίς, for the use of which cf. above, note ad loc.).

4 ἄρα: The Imperfect of εἰμί appearing with ἄρα to indicate that a present fact or truth has just been recognized is a colloquialism (cf. Stevens 1976, p. 62f. and Denniston 19503, p. 36f.); cf. IT 351: τούτ' ἄρα ἦν ἄληθες, Alcmeon in Corinth fr. 75 Kn.: ὁ παῖ Κρέοντος, ὡς ἄληθες ἦν ἄρα/ ἐσθαλῶν ἄρ' ἀνδρῶν ἑσθαλὰ γίγνεσθαι τέκνα καὶ Med. 703, Hipp. 359, Andr. 418, Tr. 412, 1240, IA 1330, Phoenix fr. 810 Kn., Alexandros fr. 54 Kn., 184

οὐκ ἀκουστῶν: mostly used with negation, as here. Cf. Andr. 1084: σήμαινε· ἀκούσαι δ' οὐκ ἀκούσθ' ὅμως θέλω, Hel. 663: λέγ', ὡς ἀκουστὰ πάντα δώρα δαιμόνων, S. OT 1312: ἐς δεινόν οὐδ' ἀκουστόν οὖθ' ἐπώψιμον, S. Creusa fr. 357 R.: ἀπελθ', ἀπελθε, πατ· τάδ' οὖκ ἀκουστά σοι. Photius (α 817 Theodoridis) refers to ἀκούσιμη (occurring only in S. fr. inc. 745 R.: σπουδὴ γὰρ ἡ κατ' οἴκον ἔγκεκριμένη/ οὐ πρὸς θυραίον οὐδαμῶς ἀκουσιμή) as synonym of ἀκουστή. Phrynichus (Praep. Soph. fr. 13 Borries/ Phot. α 818 Theodoridis/ Συναγωγὴ Λέξεων Χρησίμων Bekker I 373) regards ἀκουστά as πολιτικόν, i.e. befitting the language of civic life and thus of civil oratory (cf. Ar. Rh. 1356a. 26-28 with reference to ῥητορική as off-shoot of πολιτική), as in this case, where it occurs in a rhetorical context.

οὐθ' ἀνασχέτων: 'intolerable, unendurable'; mostly used with negation and expressive of either indignation, as in this fragment and also in Andr. 599, Ion 636, A. Th. 182, Oreithyia fr. 398 R., S. Ph. 987 and as early as Od. 2. 63, or weakness towards something unbearable, as in Hipp. 354, S. Tr. 721, OC 1652 (cf. Kamerbeek 1984 ad loc.).

5 κλόντα δεινά: the passive of κακῶς/κακά λέγω (‘to speak badly of’); hearing or speaking δεινὰ refers to the utterance of serious insults, as in this fragment, or unspeakable things (cf. Hipp. 498f.: ὁ δεινὰ λέξασ', οὔχι συγκλήσεις στόμα/ καὶ μὴ μεθήσεις αὕθης αἰσχίστους λόγους; 581f.: ὁ τῆς φιλίππου παῖς Ἀμαξόνος βοῶν/ Ἰππόλυτος, αὐθαί δεινὰ πρόσπολον κακά, 604: οὐκ ἔστ' ἀκούσας δειν' ὅπως σιγήσομαι) and to the announcement of disasters (cf. Hipp. 1239, HF 1186, Hel. 1519, also in A. Pers. 245, S. Aj. 331, OT 790). Right from the beginning of his rhesis, the speaker underlines his opponent’s offensive attitude, which is a common rhetorical practice (cf. Antiphon vi 7. 5, Lys. ix 2-3, xix 3. 5) also recommended by Aristotle in Rh. 1415a. 29-34. Similarly, Amphitryon states that he is forced to answer to Lycus’ abuses in HF 173: κακῶς γὰρ σ' οὖν ἔστεν κλέειν. Cf. the possible proem of Alexandros’ speech (fr. 56 Kn. and Duchemin 1968, p. 83, Jouan and van Looy 1998, p. 50), which seems to have derived from the agon of the Alexandros.

πρὸς κακίνων: for the possible nuance of κακίνων, cf. introductory note on the fragment.
Fr. 5:

This line is a comment on a king’s (i.e. Polydectes’) speech, which would have naturally followed his rhesis. References to a character’s manner of speaking and presenting a case occur regularly in formal debates; cf. Med. 576, 580-585, Hipp. 1038-1040, Andr. 234, Hec. 1187-1194, 1237f., Supp. 426, Tr. 967f., 997f., Ph. 471f., 526f., IA 333 and Jouan (1984) pp. 7-9. The location of this fragment in an agon seems thus plausible.

The speaker of this line could be the king’s opponent at the debate—the likeliest candidate for this role is Dictys, though Perseus cannot be excluded (cf. introductory note on fr. 4) — criticizing Polydectes’ lengthy and elaborate speech and attributing it to his position as τὸπαννοματι; in this case, the use of the adjective may not be ‘innocent’, but could involve the negative connotations of the word (cf. note ad loc.). It is a common tactic of the participants in rhetorical contests to pass negative judgments on the adversary’s eloquence; cf. Med. 580-585, Hipp. 1038-1040, Andr. 234, Hec. 1187-1191, Supp. 426, HF 238f., IA 333 and Jouan (1984) pp. 7-13.

This fragment may alternatively be assigned to the chorus-leader, who, as a rule, makes brief comments on the preceding speech or on the nature of the debate after each rhesis. Choral interventions usually occupy two iambic trimeters, though in Med. 576-578, Heracl. 232-235, Andr. 642-644, Tr. 966-968 and El. 1051-1054 they exceed the traditional distich. Cases in Euripides’ debates of choral judgments occupying only one line are very rare, therefore, if this verse is to be assigned to the chorus-leader, it could be assumed that it may have derived from a distich (or from a choral comment longer than a distich) following Polydectes’ speech. If so, the adjective τηραννικόν is more likely to convey a neutral rather than a negative meaning, since the chorus-leader rarely takes sides, unless particularly associated with one of the central characters in the play, as in

---

406 This line was assigned to Dictys by Stoessl (1956, p. 162) and Webster (1967, p. 64). Jouan and van Looy (2000, p. 82) regard it as Perseus’ attack on Polydectes’ tyrannical behaviour.
409 The sole case is Heracl. 271, 273, where the chorus-leader unexpectedly intervenes in the final stichomythic dialogue at a climactic point of the agon to prevent Demophon from striking the Argive messenger; it is obvious, however, that this is an exceptional case of choral interference dictated by the culminating tension of the scene.


Fr. 6:

These lines as transmitted could be a statement, as well as a question, probably addressed to Polydectes as an argument against his plans to beget children from Danae; the king already has successors of his royal oikos and the birth of new children would only raise hostility among his offspring (probably in terms of succession). The possibility that these lines could have been spoken by one of the suppliants certainly cannot be ruled out. It is worth noting, however, that father-son relationship is a recurring theme in frs. 7 and 8, as it is

---

evident from the use of the pair πατρός-παιδίς. Fr. 9 is also thematically related, describing the devastating consequences of Polydectes’ passion on his household. Hence, it can reasonably be observed that this particular discussion of the effects of the king’s desire on his family is given unusual prominence if it is merely part of a wide-ranging debate between Polydectes and the suppliants; as it occupies no fewer than four fragments (i.e. sixteen surviving lines), it may not have been a simple argument used by the suppliants (fr. 6) and refuted by Polydectes (frr. 8, 9, perhaps also fr. 7), but could have been part of a conversation devoted to the issue of Polydectes’ relationship with his children. If so, this discussion is likely to have occurred between the king and another character. This ‘other character’ may have been a kind of ‘confidant’, perhaps a servant, as the Nurse in Hipp. 176-361, 433-524, 680-731 and the old servant in Ion 735-1047,411 or perhaps even likelier, the king’s son;412 such a confrontation between father and son in terms of the impact of Polydectes’ plans on his family (cf. similarly Plut. Cat. Mai. 24. 7-8, for the same discussion of Peisistratus and Cato with their sons) could be paralleled to the intergenerational conflicts of Admetus and Pheres in Alc. 614-740, Ion and Xuthus in Ion 569-675 (cf. Owen 1939, p. 110 and Lee 1997, pp. 224-232) and the debates between Aeolus and Macareus in Aeolus fr. 15, 16, 19-26 Kn. (cf. Jouan and van Looy 1998, p. 25 and Webster 1967, p. 158), Merops and Phaethon in Phaethon 109-167 (cf. Diggle 1970, p. 38f. and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995, p. 230f.) and of course that between Creon and Haemon in S. Ant. 635-780.413 The possibility of Polydectes’ confrontation with his son would have had interesting dramatic and thematic implications, not least because it could have offered the opportunity of a double treatment of the parent-offspring relationship within the same play (cf. note on fr. 12): on the one hand, the possible crisis in the king’s


412 So Duchemin (1968²) p. 92.

relationship with his son (frr. 6-9) and, on the other hand, Danae’s affection for her own son (cf. her lament in fr. 2), by whom she is finally rescued.

The possibility that another character, of whom all trace is lost, enters the stage raises questions of staging and distribution of roles: according to Euripides’ dramatic technique, the suppliants normally occupy their places at the altar upon a ‘cancelled entry’ at the beginning of the play and one of them speaks the prologue; this is the case in the Heraclidae, Andromache, Suppliant Women, Heracles and Helen (cf. Setting). On the basis of T3 and T5, Danae and Dictys would have remained at Poseidon’s altar until Perseus’ return; considering that no more than three speakers are allowed on stage, one has to suppose that at least one of the two actors playing the suppliants must exit, in order to return as Polydectes’ interlocutor. A ready parallel occurs in the Suppliant Women, where the actor playing Aethra exits at vv. 359-364 to re-enter as Theban Herald at v. 399. Similarly, the Orestes begins with Electra and Orestes on stage, the former being induced to exit at v. 301f., as the next scene (vv. 356-728) requires two more speaking characters (i.e. Menelaus and Tyndareus), one of whom must be interpreted by the actor playing Electra. It is thus reasonable to suppose that at least one of the two actors playing Danae and Dictys exits for some reason and re-enters to interpret this other character. Since the question of leaving the sanctuary is a topos in suppliant plays, it may be supposed that Polydectes might have forced Danae and Dictys to leave the altar (cf. Structure); they could thus have been absent at the scene of the discussion on the father-son theme or have re-entered, one of them being a kōphon prosōpon. Likewise, Menelaus forces Andromache to leave the sanctuary in Andr. 411, Heracles’ family exits to prepare for death in HF 332-347 and Helen leaves altar and stage in Hel. 330-333, which serves the specific dramatic purpose of Menelaus’ entrance and self-introduction on the empty stage before the couple’s encounter and recognition.

1-2: for the significance of children for the preservation of the oikos and the polis, cf. note on fr. 2.6. Since Polydectes already has offspring, the continuity of his royal oikos has been ensured, therefore there is no point in begetting children from Danae; the same argument occurs in Med. 489-491 against Jason’s second marriage (cf. Mastronarde 2002,

---

414 Cf. Collard (1975a) ad loc. and p. 20.  
note on v. 490): προῦδωκας ἡμᾶς, καίνα δ' ἐκτήσω λέχη,/ παῖδαν γεγώτων· εἰ γὰρ ἦσθ' ἀπαίς ἐτίς. συγγνώστ' ἄν ἦν σοὶ τοῦ' ἐρασθηνίαν λέχους.

3 ἔχθραν [...] συμβάλλων τέκνους: LSJ 9: 'to set one to fight with the other'. The Present participle συμβάλλων of the manuscript tradition indicates what Polydectes is now in the process of doing, the consequences of which will affect his children. Since the reading of the manuscript tradition fits the context, there is no reason to adopt Bergk's συμβαλὼν, which would transfer the action exclusively to the future. Mahly's ἐμβαλὼν fails to denote hostility within the family, as συν- does. Moreover, συμβάλλω is frequently used by Euripides in parallel contexts; cf. Med. 44: συμβαλὼν ἔχθραν τις αὐτῆ, 521: φίλοι φίλοισι συμβάλωσ' ἐριν, El. 906: ἁσπόνδοισι νόμοσιν ἔχθραν τώδε συμβεβλήκαμεν, Ba. 837: συμβαλῶν βάρχαις μάχην. The hostility between half-brothers from the same father usually derives from the question of succession. In most mythical and dramatic treatments of the theme of a father's (usually a king's) remarriage, it is often the stepmother, the father's second wife, plotting against her stepchildren, in order to ensure that her own sons will get hold of royal power; cf. for instance, the stepmother's plot in the Ino (Hyg. fab. 4) and the two Phrixus plays by Euripides ([Apollod.] 1. 9. 1, Hyg. fab. 2, cf. van Looy 1964, pp. 165-183), the killing of Chrysippus by his half-brothers Atreus and Thyestes as instigated by their mother Hippodamia (Hellanicus FGrH 4 F157, Hyg. fab. 85), the murder of Phocus by his half-brother Peleus induced by his mother Endeeis (schol. vet. Andr. 687 Schwartz, [Apollod.] 3. 12. 6, Ov. Met. 11. 266-270, Hyg. fab. 14. 8, Ant. Lib. Met. 38) and Watson (1995) pp. 20-91. The treatment of the strife between half-siblings over royal succession in tragedy may also reflect real life, as emerges from numerous legal cases of disputes between half-brothers over their father's inheritance; cf. Is. xii, D. xlv 28, xxxix (dispute over the family-name and the legitimacy of a patrilineal half-brother, cf. Carey and Reid 1985, pp. 160-167, Cohen 1995, pp. 163-166, Humphreys 1989, pp. 182-185), [D.] xlviii 10, 1 60 (cf. Pomeroy 1997, p. 190) and Seaford (1990) pp. 189-198. Remarriage was frequent in Classical Athens (cf. Thomson 1972, pp. 211-225, Erdmann 1934, pp. 403-405) and a father's inheritance was equally shared by all his

⁴¹⁷ In Hyg. fab. 186, which roughly provides the plot of Euripides' Captive Melanippe, Theano urges her sons to kill her foster-children (namely Melanippe's sons), so that the former can obtain kingship. Stepmothers are generally regarded as malicious against their stepchildren, even if they do not have any children of their own; cf. Alc. 304-310, 371-378, Andr. 47f., 68f., 309-765, Ion 1302, Aegeus fr. 4 Kn.

**Fr. 7:**

These lines appealing to the indisputable natural and emotional bonds between fathers and children (cf. especially φιλατατον and note ad loc.) seem to have belonged to the same context as frs. 6 and 8 and perhaps also fr. 9, all of which deal with the manner in which the king’s passion affects his family (cf. introductory note on fr. 6). The prominent notion of the natural alliance and reciprocity between father and offspring recurs in fr. 8. 1-3 probably spoken by Polydectes, who uses the phrase ἥδεως συνεκφέρειν (‘to assist gladly till the end’) with reference to the love-affairs of both sides (cf. note ad loc.). Accordingly, Polydectes could have been the speaker of the present fragment as well, expressing his expectation that his offspring would support his plans for Danae. Alternatively, these lines could be assigned to Polydectes’ interlocutor, who would be expected to emphasize the strong priority that the king should give his children rather than his desire for Danae. The concept of reciprocity could perhaps be an assertion of loyalty similar, for instance, to Haemon’s in S. Ant. 635f. (cf. Griffith 1999 ad loc.) and 701-704, balancing the speaker’s attempted refutation of Polydectes. The notion of the strong alliance between father and children recurs in Amphion’s plea to his father Zeus in Antiope fr. 223. 11-14 Kn. (cf. Collard, Cropp and Gibert 2004, p. 315, Kambitsis 1972, p. 104): σοι δ’ δς τ’ λαμπρόν αἰθέρος ναίεις πέδον, λέγω τ’ θυσούτον μή γαμεῖν μὲν ἥδεως/, σπείραντα δ’ εἶναι σοῖς τέχνοις ἄνοιξιμαχὲιν φίλοις.

419 Webster (1967, p. 64 and n. 42) assigned the fragment to Perseus promising his aid to Danae and Dictys; however, as he reasonably admitted followed by Aelian (1986, p. 159, n. 29), these lines fit only loosely — and rather oddly—to the situation, due to the occurrence of πατρί: instead of referring exclusively to his foster-father, Dictys, Perseus would be expected primarily to address his mother.
1 ἐγὼ νομίζω: the verb together with the personal pronoun is often used in argumentation, in order to emphasize one's opinion and draw a contrast to ideas previously stated; cf. Med. 526-528, HF 282, Ion 645, IT 484, Antiope fr. 206 Kn. For further references, cf. note on Danae fr. 12. 3. In the present fragment, the verb serves to assert a common truth; on parental love for children, cf. notes on fr. 2. 6 and fr. 12. 3.

فيدιτατον: the emotional connotation of the superlative degree of φίλος is unmistakable (see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 329). The superlative ϕίλιτατον thus often serves to appeal to the closest natural and emotional bond between people; cf. Heracl. 414: ἐκὼν δὲ τίς κακῶς οὐτω φρονεῖ; ὡστις τὰ φίλιτατ’ ἐκ χερῶν δῶσει τέκνα; HF 1112: πάτερ, τί κλαίεις και συναμπίσχη κόρας; τοῦ φίλιτατον σοι τηλόθεν παιδὸς βεβως; El. 679: ἄμυν’ ἄμυνε τοίσδε φίλιτατοις τέκνοις and Landfester (1966) pp. 83f., 89. For the same notion, cf. Med. 329, Ph. 406, A. Ch. 193, 1051.


3 ἐνδικωτέρους: 'rightful, duty-bound'; cf. A. Th. 673, Ch. 329f., S. OT 135. The rightfulness of the alliance described in this fragment relies on blood-kinship. Similarly, ἐνδικος occurs denoting rightfulness based on kinship also in El. 224: οὐκ ἐσθ' ὅτου θίγομι' ἄν ἐνδικώτερον, Hel. 1648f.: τὰ τῶν θεῶν/ τιμῶσα πατρός τ’ ἐνδικοὺς ἐπιστολάς.

Fr. 8:

This fragment is likely to belong to the same context as frs. 6 and 7 and possibly also fr. 9, all of which focus on the impact of Polydectes' passion on his family (cf. introductory note on fr. 6). These lines were possibly spoken by Polydectes himself 420 in his effort to gain the support of his offspring for his plans for Danae and focus on the mutual understanding and assistance that should exist between fathers and sons towards each other's love affairs. The argument is reinforced by the attribution of amorous passion to divine will rather than human choice; by presenting love as a necessitating condition imposed by gods, the speaker

is denying responsibility for his attitude. This position could be paralleled to the *adikoi logoi* of Helen in *Tr.* 948-950, of the Nurse in *Hipp.* 433-481 and of Pasiphae in *Cretans* fr. 472e Kn.; cf. note on l. 4.

1 ἑδέως συνεκφέρειν: συνεκφέρειν (LSJ 9): ‘to carry out together, to bear to the end along with someone’; ἐκφέρειν denotes ‘to bring to one’s end’, as in S. Ai. 7 (and Garvie 1998 ad loc.: ‘it indicates the completion of the process of carrying’, for ἐκφέρειν as ‘carrying’ in a metaphorical sense, cf. Andr. 621, Ion 1012), S. Tr. 824. It thus presents desire as a burden (cf. note on l. 4), whose victim requires consistent help through to the end. Verbs compound with two prepositions are used by Euripides rather often, as compared with Aeschylus and Sophocles; cf. *Tr.* 1018: συνεκκλέψασα, El. 73: συνεκκομίζειν, IT 684: συνεκπνέος, Hel. 1406: συνεκκονεῖ, Andromeda fr. 136 Kn.: συνεκκόνει, for further examples, cf. Bubel (1991) p. 136. An eloquent parallel to l. 1f. occurs in *Hipp.* 464f. (cited by Kannicht 2004, I p. 386): πόσους δὲ παισὶ πατέρας ἄμαρτηκόσιν/ συνεκκομίζειν Κύπριν; Barrett (1964, p. 243) plausibly interpreted the infinitive συνεκκομίζειν of the Nurse’s words as ‘to assist’; συνεκφέρειν is a synonym of συνεκκομίζειν and given the parallel contexts of the adikos logos of the Nurse and possibly of Polydectes here, συνεκφέρειν in conjunction with ἑδέως seems to denote ‘to assist gladly/ graciously/ courteously’. Though the reading ἑδέως of the manuscript tradition is acceptable in terms of meaning, Stadtmüller’s conjecture ἦπιος (‘gently, kindly’) based on the similarity with E. fr. inc. 951 Kn. (ἡν οἱ τεκόντες τοῦτο γιγνώσκειν’ δι’ νέοι ποτ’ ἦσαν, ἦπιος τὴν τῶν τέκνων/ οὐσίασι Κύπριον;) is quite tempting. The adjective ἦπιος describes a father’s attitude towards his children also in E. fr. inc. 950 Kn.: ἢς ἔδο πατέρα παισὶν ἦπιον κυρεῖν, II. 24. 770, Od. 2. 47, 234.

Or. 795: φίλα κηδεύσατα). In this light, it coheres with ἰδέως to stress the rightness of unstinting support: as the children are dear, so are their desires.


4 αὐθ’ ἐκοσία νόσος: Acting ouξ ἐκών is conjoined with circumstances of ἀνάγκη, namely circumstances external from human will and, in this context, defined by the gods (cf. note on l. 6); cf. especially Rickert (1989) pp. 36, 60f., 63f. Parallel cases of the agent presented as acting ἄχων constrained by divine will occur in Heracl. 986: ἐγὼ δὲ νεῖκος οὐχ ἐκών τὸδ’ ἱράμην […] 989f.: ἀλλ’ εἶτ’ ἐχρημίζον εἶτε μη—θεὸς γὰρ ἢν—/ Ἡρα με κάμινον τήν’ ἐθηκε τὴν νόσον, Hipp. 319: φίλος μ’ ἀπόλλυσα’ οὐχ ἐκόσαν οὐχ ἐκών, 358-361: οἱ σώφρονες γάρ, οὐχ ἐκόντες ἄλλ’ δίμος, κακῶν ἐρώσῃ. Ἐφ’ οὖς οὐχ ἄρ’ ἢν θεός, / ἄλλ’ εἰ τι μείζον ἄλλῳ γίγνεται θεότ.,/ ἡ τήνδε κάμη καὶ δόμους ἀπόλεσεν, Andr. 680: Ἐλένη δ’ ἐμόχθησα’ οὐχ ἐκοῦσ’ ἄλλ’ ἐκ θεῶν, S. Ai. 447-455: νῦν δ’ ἡ Δίως γοργᾶς ἀδάματος θεῶ/


If amorous passion is presented as god-implanted and not as ἐκούσιον or αὐθαίρετον, humans expect to be released from responsibility for their actions; cf. De Romilly (1976) pp. 311-321, Cozzoli (2001) pp. 33-39, Rivier (1975²) p. 184f. The denial of personal responsibility by shifting the burden of one’s misconduct exclusively to the gods is prominent in the defence-speeches of Helen (Tr. 948-950, 1042, cf. Basta Donzelli


1316f.: ἀνθρώπους τὰς μὲν ἐκ θεῶν/ τὰς δὲ δοθείας ἔστ' ἀναγκαίον φέρειν, Aristarchus
TrGF 114 F 2 Sn.: ἔραστος δέστις μὴ πεπείρασαι βροτῶν,/ οὐκ οἴδ' ἀνάγκης θεσμὸν, Moschion
Telephus TrGF 197 F2 (and Xanthakis-Karamanos 1980, p. 127f.). For the invincibility of

ἰδέσθαι: the search for a cure for love is common in such contexts; cf. Hipp. 479, 509-512, 597, 698f. (and Goff 1990, pp. 49-52, Parker 1983, p. 222, Ferrini 1978, pp. 49-
62), Theoc. Id. 2. 90-92 (and Gow 1952 ad loc.), 11. 1-2 (and Hunter 1999 ad loc.), Plin.
NH 28. 256, Ov. Her. 5. 149, Rem. Am. 260, Met. 1. 523, Prop. 2. 4. 7. The speaker asserts
that there is no cure for god-sent passion and that it should thus be accepted as it is; on the
other hand, even divine diseases are regarded as curable in Bellerophon fr. 292 Kn. (as in
ἰατρὸν χρεῶν/ ἵδντ' ἀκείσθαι, μὴ ἐπιτάξ, τὰ φόρμακα/ διδόντ', ἕαν μὴ ταῦτα τῇ νόσῳ
πρέπη./ νόσοι δὲ θητῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσ' αὐθαίρετοι, αἱ δ' ἐκ θεῶν πάρεισιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ νόμῳ/
ἴσωμεθ' αὐτὰς.

Fr. 9:

This fragment is thematically related to fr. 8. 3-6, as they both illustrate the invincible
power of Aphrodite and thus the impasse, which Polydectes claims to have reached. These
lines go a step further in developing the thought expressed in fr. 8. 3-6: Cypris does not
yield when reprimanded and, if you press her hard, she engenders war ending to the
devastation of households. The speaker is likely to have been Polydectes (or someone on
his side 421), underlining all the havoc to be caused, if one does not reconcile with god-sent
passion.422 This fragment could have belonged to the same context as fr. 6-8, which deal
with the father-son relationship, for the following reasons: (a) the objection to the
νουθετησις possibly made by Polydectes' interlocutor against amorous passion; such an
admonition occurs in fr. 6, where the speaker describes the king's desire as a disruptive

421 Parallel arguments are used by the Nurses in Hipp. 443-446 and Stithenoea fr. 665 Kn.
force. The present fragment could be a response that the real destruction comes from repression. (b) The fact that the speaker warns his interlocutor on the potential desolation of Polydectes' household, if Cypris is repressed, could imply that the interlocutor would have had personal interest in preserving Polydectes' oikos, which may call for a member of the king's family as addressee of these lines; this possibility would fit the context of frs. 6-8 (for which cf. the introductory note on fr. 6) and (c) the similarity in argumentation with fr. 8.3-6.

Here, as often, Aphrodite's epithet 'Cypris' serves to connote sexual desire (schol. vet. ll. 5. 330 Erbse: Κύπριν: οἱ μὲν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, οἱ δὲ τὴν βαρβαρικὴν ἀφροσύνην αὐτὴν εἶναι λέγοντι); cf. indicatively Hec. 825, Tr. 988, Cretans fr. 472e7 Kn. (and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.), fr. 18, also [A.] Pr. 650, S. Tr. 515 (and Easterling 1982, p. 137), fr. inc. 874 R., Ar. Eccl. 722.433 The impetuosity and invincibility of Cypris is prominent in Euripidean plays treating illicit passions, as in Steneboea fr. 665 Kn. (possibly spoken by the Nurse, cf. Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995 ad loc.): τοιωθ' ἀλλειποθέσαμεν δ' ἔρως/ μᾶλλον πιέζει and Hipp. 443-446 (cf. Barrett 1964 ad loc.): Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητὸν ἤν πολλὴ ρυθῇ./ ἢ τὸν μὲν εἰκονθ' ἰσχυχῇ μετέρχεται./ ὅν δ' ἀν περισσὸν καὶ φρονοῦνθ' εὖρη μέγα./ τούτων λαβοῦσα πώς δοκεῖς καθήβησαι.


χαλά: \textit{LSJ}²: 'to loosen things drawn tightly together, to slacken one's hold'; it belongs to naval (\textit{A.R.} 2. 1264, \textit{A.P.} 5. 204.5, \textit{EM} s.v. 'χαλα' 804, 49 Gaisford) and equestrian vocabulary (cf. E. \textit{Ino} fr. 409 Kn., \textit{Ar. Eccl.} 508, Plat. \textit{Prot.} 338a. 3), as well as to the language of archery (\textit{h. Hom. Ap.} 6, \textit{h. Hom.} 27.12). The imagery of archery seems to occur here (cf. note on \textit{ἐντεινεῖν}) in combination with the metaphorical sense of χαλά as 'to yield'; for the latter sense, cf. indicatively \textit{Hec.} 403, \textit{Ion} 637, \textit{Telephus} fr. 716 Kn., \textit{Erechtheus} fr. 362. 18 Kn., \textit{Ar. V.} 727.

2 ἄν τ' αὖ βιάζῃ: 'if you press her (i.e. Aphrodite) hard', namely 'if you resist strongly/ try to prevent a lover from pursuing the object of love'; this verb is used more in the middle than in the active mood. Cf. \textit{Alc.} 1116: ἄναξ, βιάζῃ μ' ὧδ' θέλωντα δρᾶν τάδε, \textit{Med.} 339: τι δ' αὖ βιάζη κοὐκ ἀκαλλάσσα τερός; \textit{Heracld.} 647, \textit{Hipp.} 325, \textit{Or.} 1623, \textit{Chrysippus} fr. 840 Kn.: γνώμην δ' ἔχοντα μ' ὃς φύσις βιάζεται, fr. inc. 1076 Kn.: πάντων ἀριστον μὴ βιάζεσθαι θεοὺς.

\textit{ἐντεινεῖν}: \textit{LSJ}²: 'to stretch or strain tight', especially of any operation performed with straps or cords, metaphorically 'to intensify'; as χαλάω, it belongs to the vocabulary of archery (\textit{Supp.} 745, 886, \textit{A. Threstae} fr. 83 R., \textit{X. Cyr.} 4. 1.3., \textit{Luc. Scyth.} 2. 17) and horsemanship (\textit{Il.} 5. 278, \textit{X. Eq.} 8. 3), as well as naval terminology (\textit{Or.} 706). Archery is Aphrodite's attribute in Pindar (\textit{P.} 4. 213), where she is portrayed as πότινα ὁξυτάτων βελέων. Cf. also Theoc. 11. 16 (and Gow 1952 \textit{ad loc.}), \textit{A.P.} 5. 98, Asclepiades \textit{A.P.} 5. 189, \textit{Meleager} \textit{A.P.} 5. 179, Asclepiades \textit{A.P.} 12. 50, Mosch. 2. 75. Euripides tends to use pictorial language to describe love: for his descriptions of Aphrodite as archer, cf. \textit{Med.}

3 τίκτην πόλεμον: the notion of one evil engendering another is common in tragedy; cf. Hel. 363-365: τὰ δ' ἐμὰ δόρα / Κύπριδος ἔτεκε πολὺ μὲν σέμα, / πολὺ δὲ δάκρυν, Alcmeon through Psophis fr. 79 Kn., Veiled Hippolytus fr. 438 Kn., Temenidae fr. 732 Kn., fr. inc. 1071 Kn.: λύσαι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι τίκτουσιν νόσους, also A. Ag. 759, Ch. 382-385, 648-651 (and Garvie 1986 ad loc.), 806, S. El. 217-219: πολὺ γὰρ τι κακόν ὑπερεκτίσω/ σὰ δυσθῆμω τίκτουσ' αἰεὶ/ ψυχ' πολέμους, Iphigenia fr. 308 R., Tyro fr. 663 R. Judging by πόλεμος, ἀνάστασις δόμων and the vocabulary of archery (ἐντείνειν·χαλάω), as well as ἔχθρα μεγίστη (fr. 6) and συμμάχους (fr. 7), both speakers are using the vocabulary of warfare in offering divergent ideas of what causes discord.


Fr. 10:

This statement obviously refers to Perseus, whose mind has been much trained by toil, despite his youth. The hero’s tremendous exploit leading to his maturation must reflect a
rite of passage and, according to inscriptional evidence, Perseus was worshipped as patron of manhood initiation-rituals in late Archaic Mycenae. Such a praise of Perseus’ intelligence and courage could have been made by Danae, Dictys or the Chorus after the hero’s nostos and possible narration of his deed (cf. T3, T5 for Perseus’ encounter with Danae and Dictys upon his return to Seriphos). Euripides seems to have been fascinated by the energy and assertiveness of youth; cf. Supp. 442-449 (and Collard 1975a, p. 229f.), IT 122 (and Cropp 2000 ad loc.) Cressae fr. 461 Kn., Archelaus fr. 237 Kn. (and Harder 1985 ad loc.), fr. inc. 1052 Kn. and Dover (1974) p. 105, Strauss (1993) p. 113f.


φρένας: in tragedy, φρένες are mainly associated with intellectual activity, as ‘the seat of mental faculties, perception, thought’ (LSJ): cf. for instance, Med. 316, Hipp. 612, 685, 1337, Andr. 361, 365, 482, Hec. 746, Tr. 6, 1158, Hel. 160, Ba. 427 and Sullivan (2000) pp. 11-16. Perseus is here presented as an exception to the common view that φρένες are superior in old age (for this view, cf. indicatively Hipp. 969, Peleus fr. 619 Kn. and Sullivan 2000, p. 10f.). Judging by the acute mental capacities, as well as the tremendous courage demanded for Perseus’ exploit, the above meaning must here intermingle with the sense of φρένες as ‘heart, the seat of courage’ (cf. Med. 856-859: πόθεν θράσος ἢ φρενὸς ἢ/ χειρὶ τέκναν σέθεν/ καρδίας τε λήψῃ/ δεινὰν προσάγουσα τόλμαν; also Il. 3. 45, 17. 499,

427 The suggestion made by Jouan and van Looy (2000, p. 81) and Stoessl (1958, p. 161) that this line could belong to the context of Dictys’ consolation to Danae seems to be refuted by the fact that according to the mythical evidence, Perseus was untested before being sent to decapitate the Gorgon, which contradicts οὐκ ἄγυμναστος.
Fragmenta sedis magis incertae

Fr. 11:

The female speaker of this fragment is obviously Danae addressing Dictys (mentioned as \textit{γεραιός} in fr. 3 as well, cf. \textbf{T3}), who rouses her for some unknown reason. The ancient scholiast on \textit{S. Ai.} 787 paralleled these lines to Tecmessa’s reaction to the chorus-leader’s appeal to listen to the news brought by the messenger. Apart from the obvious stylistic resemblance between the two passages, it has to be asked whether there may have been any further similarity, in terms of dramatic situation. Danae uses a verb (\textit{ὣρθαίζω}), which suggests that she has been seated or prostrate. Moreover, Euripides’ \textit{λελησμένην} goes further than Sophocles’ \textit{πεπαυμένην}; Danae has forgotten her suffering, which is a surprising notion.

Sleep is linked to oblivion (\textit{λήπη}) as relieving from distress in \textit{HF} 1042-1044: \textit{καθιεῖται γέροντες, οὐ σίγα σὺ γα τὸν ὑπνοι παρεμένον ἐάσετ' ἐκ λαθέσθαι κακῶν; and Or.} 211-214 (cf. \textit{Willink} 1986, p. 120f.): ὃ φίλον ὑπνού θέλησαν, ἐπίκουρον νόσου, ὃς ἡδο μοι προσῆλθες ἐν δέοντι τε. ὅ πότινα λήπη τῶν κακῶν, ὃς οἶ φιλή καὶ τοίς δυστυχοῦσιν εὐκταίᾳ θεός. \textsuperscript{428} Danae is thus likely to have been sleeping, which could explain why she has forgotten her agony. \textsuperscript{429} However, unlike Tecmessa in the \textit{Aias} (who is summoned from the stage-building by the chorus), Danae is presumably not as free to move in the acting area, if the stage-building represents Polydectes’ palace (cf. Setting). Hence, her being asleep on stage (at the altar) at a critical moment in the play seems implausible and this line is thus less likely to belong to the climactic scene of Perseus’ return, as widely suggested; \textsuperscript{430} rather, it may be more plausibly located at the beginning, perhaps in the prologue. In this case, Dictys, as Electra in the \textit{Orestes}, might have delivered the prologue-speech, while Danae was sleeping (cf. note on fr. 1). He could have then roused her for


\textsuperscript{429} I owe this idea to Professor C. Carey.

some important reason, to judge by parallel cases in Heracl. 633-636 and Hec. 501f., where
a character stirs another when bringing significant news. Dictys, as in the cases just
mentioned and as the chorus-leader in the Aias, may want Danae to listen to news (about
Perseus? cf. introductory note on fr. 2 for the possibility that Polydectes might have spread
false rumours of Perseus' death) or may alternatively be rousing her at the entry of another
character (Polydectes?).

1 τι μ', ὁ γεραῖε: Ms L of Sophocles (belonging to the Laurentian class λ'), which
served almost exclusively as the basis for Papageorgius’ edition of the scholia on
Sophocles, gives the reading τι μ' [[ὁ]] ἄρτι πημάτων λελησμένην/ ὄρθοῖς; while G (from
the Roman class ρ) reads τι μ', ὁ γεραῖε, πημάτων πεπαυμένην/ ὄρθοῖς; The remaining ὅ in
the L, which was erased by the scribe, reveals the existence of two different readings: ὅ
γεραῖε and ἄρτι (cf. Christodoulou 1977, p. 86f., n. 29 for the transmission of this line in
the Sophoclean scholia). There is considerable evidence, as Turyn observed (1952, p. 120),
that the primary archetype (ω) of the plays and ancient scholia of Sophocles, from which
the λ and ρ families derived, abounded in double readings —the one exhibited in the text
and the other interlinear or marginal—and this phenomenon is best reflected in L, as in our
case. Hence, whenever the decision as to the choice of a reading in ρ went in a different
direction from that in λ, a divergence between the two classes would have occurred; cf.
Turyn (1952) p. 121. The reading ἄρτι, which leaves the verse metrically incomplete, seems
to have been adopted by the scribe of L in view of its correspondence with ἄρτιος in S. Ai.
787; cf. Christodoulou (1977) p. 87, n. 29. On the other hand, the ὅ γεραῖε of G, which
aptly completes the trimeter, must have been the original reading, being certainly much
more informative than ἄρτι and corresponding to the image of Dictys as γεραιός, which also
occurs in T3 and fr. 3. Manuscript G is generally admitted to emend L in certain cases,
often providing older readings; cf. De Marco (1936) p. 15f. and Turyn (1952) pp. 107-109,
for cases where G emends L.

πημάτων λελησμένην: λελησμένη is provided by L, while G reads πεπαυμένην,
which is the reading adopted by Christodoulou (1977, p. 180). As in the case of ἄρτι above,
it seems quite likely that πεπαυμένην sneaked into the scholium in view of its
correspondence to πεπαυμένη in Ai. 787, which makes L’s λελησμένη a more plausible
reading, on the principle utrum in alterum abitum erat. For λαυθάνομαι + gen. in
Euripides as expressive of sufferings, which one is trying to forget, cf. Alc. 198: τοσοῦτον ἄλγος, οὕτω οὐ λελησθείτα, Supp. 86: θανοῦσα τῶν ἄλγεων λαθοίμαν, Ion 361: ὃ, μὴ μὴ ἐπ’ οἴκτον ἔξειγ’ οὐ λελησμέθα, Tr. 606: ὁ θανὼν δ’ ἐπιλᾶθεται ἄλγεαν. This line seems to provide a fine example of how the λ and ρ traditions of the Sophoclean scholia complement each other, as Turyn pointed out (1952, p. 121).

2 ὀρθοῖς: ‘to raise up, to rise from one’s seat’. Danae’s reluctance to raise herself up seems to be indicative of her psychological weariness and frustration. Similarly, physical and psychological exhaustion prevent one from standing upright in Heracl. 635f.: ἦκ. ἔπαιρε νυν σεαυτόν, ὀρθωσον κάρα. / Io. γέροντες ἔσμεν κούδαμως ἐρρόμεθα, Andr. 1076-1078: Χο. ἄ ἄ, τί δράσεις, ἄ γεραι; μὴ πέσης: ἔπαιρε σεαυτόν. Πη, οὐδέν εἰμ’ ἀπαλλόμεν./ φρούδη μὲν αὖθι, φρούδα δ’ ἀφέρα μου κάτω, Hec. 501f.: ἕα: τίς οὔτος σάμια τοῦμόν οὐκ ἔαν κεῖθαι; τί κινεῖς μ’, ὅστις εἰ, λυπουμένην; Tr. 505 (cf. Barlow 1986, p. 180f.): τί δήτα μ’ ὀρθοῦτ’; ἐλπίδαν ποιῶν ὅπο; also in S. Ph. 820 (where the hero is overpowered by his strong physical pain, cf. Usher 1990 ad loc.): τῷ γὰρ κακὸν τὸδ’ οὐκέτ’ ὀρθοῦσθαι μ’ ἔξ.

Fr. 12:

This fragment illustrates parental affection towards their offspring, which is shared by all living creatures. These lines are quoted by Stobaeus in his chapter ‘Ὅποιοὺς χρὴ εἶναι τῶν πατέρας’ (Stob. 4. 26) together with frs. 6, 7 and 8, which focus on the theme of father-son relationship (cf. notes ad loc.). Though Stobaeus’ anthology is regarded as modeled up to a certain extent on earlier gnomic compilations, the earliest of which date as early as the third century BC, one cannot exclude the possibility that some of the titles of his sections were given by Stobaeus himself around the fifth century AD, when he would not probably have had direct access to plays outside the ‘selection’. Hence, Stobaeus’ title as such cannot be safely regarded as an authority for locating this fragment in the context of the discussion on the father-son relationship. If these lines did belong to this scene, the emphasis on parental affection (cf. I. 3: τέκν’ ἀ τίκτουσιν φίλειν), occurring also in fr. 7. 2 (πατρὶ φιλτατον

τέκνα), could perhaps serve to remind Polydectes of the strong precedence, which a father should give his children over his amorous passion.

On the other hand, this fragment may well be an expression of Danae’s love for Perseus. The verb τικτω tends to occur more frequently with reference to females than males, while regarding animals, it is used only for the female gender (cf. *LSJ* 9 and *ll. 16. 150, 20. 225, Od. 4. 86, Hes. *Op. 591*). The simile between animals and humans of the same gender as regards birth-giving may thus be more suitable, which would tell in favour of a reference to Danae rather than Polydectes. The location of these lines in a specific scene is difficult, since the notion of Danae’s affection for her son would have presumably been prominent throughout the play. This fragment has been widely assumed to belong to the consolation-scene (cf. fr. 2) 433 and such a possibility would correspond to parallel cases in Euripides, where parental affection towards children is expressed, when the latter are subject to danger; cf. *Andr. 418f.*, *HF* 633-636, *Ph. 965f.* (and Mastronarde 1994 *ad loc.*), *IA* 1256, opening note on *Danae* fr. 13.


Parental love for children is regarded as a law of universal validity also in [D.] xliii 22.

2: West (1983, p. 73) deleted this line as an interpolation, in view of the superfluous reference to the gods, which weakens the analogy between men and beasts. Moreover, it seems to exist only for the sake of its first words (the rest is mere padding), with which the interpolator claims to be completing the sense of the previous line; cf. loc. cit.


τέκνα καὶ τίκτουσιν φιλεῖν: the idea that human race is child-loving occurs also in Andr. 418f.: πᾶσι δ’ ἄνθρωποι ἤρ’ ἡν/ ψυχῇ τέκνα, HF 633-6 (cf. Bond 1981 and Barlow 1996 ad loc.): πάντα τάνθρωπων ἵσσα/ φιλοῦσι παιδάς οἱ τ’ ἀμείνονες βροτῶν/ οἳ τ’ οὐδὲν ὄντες· χρήσατιν δὲ διάφοροι/ ἔχουσιν, οἱ δ’ οὐ· πάν δὲ φιλότεκνον γένος, Ph. 965f.: πᾶσιν γὰρ ἄνθρωποι φιλότεκνος βίος, Li 917f. (and Stockert 1992 ad loc.): δεινὸν τὸ τίκτειν καὶ φέρει φίλτρον μέγα/ πᾶσιν τε κοινὸν ἐσθ’ ὑπερκάμινεν τέκναν, Alcmena fr. 103 Kn.: δεινὸν τι τέκνων φιλτρον ἐνήκειν/ θεος ἄνθρωπος, Proteislaus fr. 652 Kn.: οἱ παιδεῖς οὗν φίλτρον
Fr. 13:

This line expressing confidence in the power of justice could have been uttered by Dictys encouraging Danae before Perseus’ return (with reference to the just cause defended by the suppliants) or after the hero’s nostos by Perseus himself or Dictys as reassurance that Perseus’ planned vengeance on Polydectes will turn out well (in this light, it could allude to divine retribution); cf. notes on θάρσει and τὸ δίκαιον. Though the possibility of assigning this fragment to Danae addressing Dictys at a critical moment in the play (e.g. during their confrontation or possible agon with Polydectes? cf. notes on fr. 3, 4, 5) cannot be ruled out, cases of men encouraging women, who are generally regarded as weaker, are significantly more frequent; cf. Alc. 326, Med. 926, 1015, Herac. 654, Hipp. 860, Andr. 993, Ph. 117, A. Supp. 732, 740, S. El. 1435, OT 1062, while the opposite occurs rarely, as in Hec. 345, 875, Supp. 564. Moreover, fr. 2 provides another instance, where Danae is consoled and supported by Dictys. If this line was located before Perseus’ return, it may have contributed to a series of peripeteiai: an expression of confidence in justice could have

been seemingly refuted by Polydectes’ success, only to be vindicated in the end by Perseus’ arrival.

It has been suggested that Choricius of Gaza alludes to this line in Or. xxxv 71 (ἡκίστα μὲν πόλεμος ἐπὶ ῥήτορις ἔθελει χωρεῖν καὶ πολλοῖς ἀμέλει νίκας ἀδίκους φιλοτιμεῖται. θῶμεν δὲ ὄμος,—καλὸν γὰρ οὕτω φρονεῖν—τὸ δίκαιον κρατεῖν πανταχوῦ). However, there is no reference in the context pointing to Euripides in particular, while it is worth taking into account that the belief in the power of justice seems to have been a topos in literature (cf. for instance A. Eum. 619, Pl. Rp. 540e and Menander’s phrasing in Epitr. 232f., which is almost identical to that of Choricius: ἐν παντὶ δεὶ καυρῶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐπικρατεῖν ἀπανταχοῦ). It is thus quite unsafe to assume that Choricius alludes to this particular fragment.

Θάρσει: it may either bear the sense of ‘take heart/ show courage’ and thus used for encouragement, if located before Perseus’ return (cf. similarly Hipp. 203, Andr. 993, El. 1319, S. El. 173), or the nuance of ‘fear not/ be confident!’, which could have been uttered for the reassurance of the addressee as to the progress of Perseus’ plan (cf. Alc. 326, Med. 926, 1015, Heracl. 654 and Allan 2001 ad loc., Hipp. 860, Hec. 345 and Collard 1991 ad loc., 875, Supp. 564, HF 1071, IT 1075, Ph. 117, 845, S. Ph. 667, OC 305).

τὸ τοι δίκαιον: here in the place of δίκαιος ὁν ‘justice’. The speaker is confident that the just cause defended by the sympathetic party (namely Danae and Dictys, as well as Perseus, if the line is uttered after his return) will prevail. Cf. similarly A. Supp. 732f.: θάρσει: χρόνῳ τοι κυρίω τ’ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ/ θεοὶς ἄτιξον τις βροτῶν δοσεί δίκην, also E. Supp. 564f. (and Collard 1975a p. 256): θάρσει: τό γὰρ τοι τῆς Δίκης σώζων φῶς/ πολλοῖς ὑπεκφύγοις ἀν ἀνθρώπων ψόγους, El. 1351: οἴσιν δ’ ὅσιν καὶ τὸ δίκαιον/ φιλον ἐν βιόται, τούτους χαλεπῶν/ ἐκλύοντες μόχθων σώζομεν, IA 1034f.: ει δ’ εἰσι <συνετοῖ> θεοὶ, δίκαιος ὄν ἀνήρ/ ἐσθῆλων κυρήσεις, Melanippe the Wise fr. 486 Kn.: δίκαιοσύνας τὸ χρύσον πρόσωπον, Palamedes fr. 584 Kn.: εἰς τοι δίκαιος μυρίων οὐκ ἐνδίκων/ κρατεῖ τὸ θεῖον τὴν δίκην τε συλλαβῶν, TrGF II fr. adesp. 500 Kn.-Sn.: δίκας δ’ ἐξέλαμψε θείων φῶς. For justice as a main co-operative virtue in late fifth century, cf. especially note on fr. 14. 2. If this line was uttered at the point where Perseus exits to take vengeance on Polydectes, τὸ δίκαιον would presumably connote Δίκη as the retribution of divine justice (cf. T7. 4). This


*Toi* is frequently found in gnomic utterances. For parallels, cf. note on fr. 5.


**Fr. 14:**

These lines reject noble descent as the sole criterion of *eugeneia*, if not combined with moral nobility. The speaker—evidently a righteous character—observes the failure of traditional criteria to evaluate nobility, probably in view of Polydectes' moral decadence despite his royal status, as implicitly opposed to Dictys' moral virtue and humble occupation as a fisherman. I agree with Jouan & van Looy and Hartung that Perseus could be a plausible speaker\(^{436}\) and in this light, I would draw a parallel to Orestes' rejection of the traditional qualities of *aretē* in praise of the Farmer’s righteousness (*El.* 367-385). Alternatively, these lines may have been Dictys’ rejoinder to a likely disparagement of his status by Polydectes\(^ {437}\) in the context of their confrontation (cf. fr. 3) or possible *agon* (for

---


the reference to status, cf. opening note on fr. 4, if spoken by Polydectes). Danae cannot be excluded, though the thematic relation of this fragment to fr. 15, the speaker of which is a male character (cf. note ad loc.), may weaken this possibility.


ἐοθλός: in Euripides this epithet may commend either the traditional, competitive qualities (noble birth, prosperity and virtue in war, cf. Adkins 1972, pp. 58-98, Sullivan 1995, pp. 123-173) or the co-operative excellences (the quiet moral behaviour, particularly justice and self-control, cf. Adkins 1960, p. 195), which flourished in later fifth century. For the wide range of its usage, cf. note on fr. 4.2. The sense of ἐοθλός in our fragment must comprise the notion of justice, as opposed to the οὐ δίκαιος of the next line. The praise of quiet moral behaviour as a prerequisite for eugenia and aretē is a recurring theme in Euripides; cf. El. 380-385 (and Denniston 1939, pp. 93-96, Egli 2003, pp. 225-229, Goldhill 1986, pp. 165-168): οὐτῶς γὰρ ἀνήρ οὐτ' ἐν Ἀργείοις μέγας/ οὐτ' αὖ δοξήσει δωμάτων ἀγκυμένος,/ ἐν τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς δὴν, ἄριστος ηὐρέθη:/ οὐ μὴ ἄφρονήσεθ', οὐ κενὼν
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3f.: the assumption that one can have a nobler father than Zeus is clearly an
adynaton, aiming to stress the insignificance of one’s noble descent in the absence of moral
righteousness. The figure of hyperbole is a ‘decens veri superiectio’ (Quint. Inst. 8. 6. 67,
cf. also Dem. Eloc. 124f.), creating an impressive type of poetical evidentia; cf. Lausberg

4 δοσιγενῆς: the epithet usually occurs in its social sense, describing ‘a person of low
661. 3 Kn. and also S. OT 1079. Here, on the other hand, the traditional equation of lineage
with every sort of excellence is overturned; hence, the unjust person lacks (moral) nobility
(here δοσιγενῆς as opposed to εὐγενῆς ‘noble-minded’), even if his lineage is noble. Cf.
similarly HF 663 (where δοσιγένεια ‘moral turpitude’, according to Bond’s interpretation, is
εἰ πένης ἐφυν./ οὕτω τὸ γ᾽ ἡθος δοσιγενῆς παρέξομαι. Cf. also IA 1376 for δοσιγενῆς as
opposed to εὐκλεῆς. In our fragment, the antithesis between competitive and co-operative
qualities is reinforced with sound-effect (εὐγένεια-δοσιγενῆς).

Fr. 15:
This fragment is an aphorism of bad company and wealth, which was regarded as having
the power to corrupt and mislead from a moral (‘just’, ‘self-controlled’ 438) mode of life, by
engendering pride and hybris.439 Possessions and company are here presented as defining
one’s conduct and, from this point of view, this fragment could be related and perhaps
belong to the same context as fr. 14, which defines moral behaviour as prerequisite for
eugeneia.440 A ready parallel is offered in El. 367-390, where Orestes dismisses parentage
and wealth as features of true nobility, underlining that one’s eugeneia should be judged by
one’s ἡθος (‘character’, ‘behaviour’) and ὀμιλία (‘the company one keeps’). The male
speaker of our fragment may be Perseus,441 to whom the thematically related fr. 14 can be
assigned; this possibility would create an antecedent to Orestes’ reflection. Dictys is also a
likely candidate rejecting wealth and evil-minded associates as responsible for one’s

440 Cf. Hartung (1843-1844, I p. 370f.) suggesting that frs. 14 and 15 could belong to the same context.
immoral mode of life and conceivably that led by Polydectes. Cf. also opening note on fr. 16.


Aphorisms of wealth as inhibiting the development of co-operative excellences occur widely in Euripides. The Farmer displays his moderation and prudence towards the
The speaker of this fragment accuses a male opponent of showing contempt for his own native land and enjoying the lifestyle of Seriphos (I. 2: τήν τὸπολιν). The rejection of individualism and injustice occurs also in frs. 15 and 14, though in general terms (presumably with reference to both private and public life), whereas this fragment focuses on civic behaviour. The implied target of frs. 14 and 15 could reasonably have been Polydectes (cf. notes ad loc.), which raises the question whether he could be the addressee of the present fragment as well, though the accusation is here made explicit. In this direction, it should be noted that such a serious charge should have strongly appealed to the sensitivity of the Athenian audience, especially in the period of stress at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War,\textsuperscript{442} which would tell in favour of an unsympathetic addressee; the obvious candidate for such a role would be Polydectes. Although no evidence survives as to his genealogy in Euripides, we are informed from [Apollod.] 1. 9.6 that Polydectes and Dictys were not native Seriphians, while the account of Phercydes (fr. 10 Fowler) points in the same direction.\textsuperscript{443} If Euripides did follow the mythographic tradition, the king seems to fit every feature of the person against whom the accusation is made: (1) he may have well been a foreigner having inhabited Seriphos, (2) he would fit the description of individualist and unjust (cf. frs. 15, 14), (3) his character should have looked even more appalling, in

\textsuperscript{443} According to Phercydes' genealogy, Dictys and Polydectes were of Argive origin as descendants of Nauplius, son of Poseidon and Amymone. Cf. Danae, The Myth, p. 9.
view of the sensitivity of the Athenian audience towards matters of devotion to the *polis*. This powerfully moral argument could be assigned to Dictys and located in the context of his conflict (fr. 3) or possible debate (cf. frr. 4, 5) with the king, to judge from the rhetorical type of argumentation (cf. note on ll. 1-5). This accusation may belong to the context of a general condemnation of Polydectes' malice, as Peleus censures Menelaus' whole history of malevolence in *Andr.* 590-631, describing him twice as κάκιαστος. Nevertheless, these lines may also be a specific rejoinder prompted by Polydectes, who might have praised Seriphos and his own tyrannis.

Patriotic sentiment is prominent in Euripidean plays written during the War, especially in the *Heraclidae, Suppliant Women* and *Erechtheus*. Cf. the celebrated ode in praise of Athens in *Med.* 824-845 and the notion of the identification of the citizen with his *polis* in *Philoctetes* fr. 798 Kn., both plays belonging to the same production as the *Dictys*. A parallel strong aphorism against the individualist attitude towards one's own city occurs in E. fr. inc. 886 Kn.: μισό πολιτήν ὅστις ὄφελεῖν πάτραν/βραδὺς φανείται, μεγάλα δὲ βλάπτειν ταχύς, καὶ πόρμοιν αὐτῷ, τῇ πόλει δ' ἀμήχανον and the serious accusations in oratory against those who disparage (cf. Lys. xxxi 6 and Carey 1989 *ad loc.*, D. xx 110-111, Andoc. i 5) or abandon their homelands for other cities (the subject of Lycurg. i). Likewise, Menoeceus in *Ph.* 991-1012 describes himself as κακός if he betrays his fatherland. For the notion of overlapping private and communal interests in this period, cf. Th. 2. 43 and 2. 60.2-4 and for expressions of love for one's homeland, cf. *Aegeus* fr. 6 Kn., *Phoenix* fr. 817 Kn., *Aeolus* fr. 30 Kn., *Temenidae* fr. 729 Kn.

1-5: The speaker develops a type of hypothetical syllogism, the conclusion of which (ll. 3-5) lacks the formulaic phraseology, in which it occurs in formal debates of subsequent plays of Euripides ('if...then...but in fact...'), cf. for instance, *Hec.* 1217-1223 and Lloyd

---

444 Hartung (1843-1844, 1 p. 370) and Duchemin (1968, p. 92) attributed these lines to Polydectes as attacking Perseus. However, an encounter between Polydectes and Perseus remains merely conjectural, while, as Webster aptly pointed out (1967, p. 64), there seems to be no reason why exiled Perseus could have been accused of playing the Seriphan. Moreover, the moral connotations of this argument and its possible impact favour a villain as addressee. This would also exclude Dictys, who, even if presented as a foreigner as well, cannot be imagined as enjoying the lifestyle of Seriphos, in view of his humble status, at least not to the extent to which Polydetes would.

445 So Webster (1967) p. 64, tentatively followed by Jouan and van Looy (2000) p. 82.


μη κάκιστος: the opponent is accused of being κάκιστος quite often in Euripides’ debates, this type of accusation usually being addressed against the guilty party (with the exception of Hipp. 945, 959); cf. Alc. 717, Med. 488, Andr. 590, 631, 719, Hec. 1199, HF 182.

πάτραν: poetic form of πατρίς ‘fatherland’; cf. indicatively Il. 12. 243, 24. 500, Pi. O. 12. 16, A. Pers. 186, S. Ph. 222, E. Cyc. 703, Heracl. 310, Tr. 1132, IT 929, also in parody in Ar. Ach. 147, Th. 136, Alexis Ponera fr. 198 K.-A., Diphilus Synoris fr. 74.9 K.-A.


οὐσκντ' ἰν εὐλόγεῖς: ‘you would never have praised’. Elmsley preferred ἠγάλωγεις to the reading εὐλόγεις of the manuscript tradition, presumably in view of the wide usage of spellings in εὐ- in the past tense for the earlier forms in ἠ- from the end of the fourth century onwards (cf. Threatte 1980-1996, I p. 384f.). However, the treatment of compounds of εὐδοκεῖ to have varied in the fifth century, to judge from papyri and manuscripts, while inscriptions evidence is inconclusive for this period (cf. Threatte 1980-1996, II p. 499). Scansion does not help in this case and there is no other instance in Euripides of the usage of this verb in the past tense, to give us a clear view of his preference. The earliest occurrence of the spelling in εὐδοκεῖ of compounds of εὐδοκεῖ in Euripides is Hec. 18, 301, 1208, 1228 (cf. afterwards HF 613, 1221, El. 8, IT 329). As the time-span between the Dictys and the Hecabe is not large (6-7 years), there seems to be no compelling reason why the reading of the mss may not be accepted. The verb occurs in the praise of a city also in A. Ag. 580: τοιαύτα χρή κλόντας εὐλογεῖν πόλιν, S. OC 720: ὁ πλείστι ἐπαίνοις εὐλογοῦμεν πέδον.

4-5: These lines are a variatio of ll. 1-2; the same idea was first uttered in specific and now in general terms.

πατρόφας γῆς ὅρους: ‘the boundaries of one’s homeland’, a common type of periphrasis in Euripides for the definition of a territory; cf. Heracl. 38: κλείνων Ἀθηνῶν τόνδ’ ἀφικόμεσθ’ ὅρον, 133: ποίας γῆς ὅρους λιπῶν, Hec. 963: ἐν μέσος Ἱθηκῆς ὅρους, 1260: γῆς ὅρους Ἑλληνίδους, Ion 1356: Εὐρώπης ὅρους. El. 410f.: Ἀργείας ὅρους/ (...) γαίας, 1315: γῆς πατρίας ὅρον ἐκλείπειν, IT 85: Ταυρικῆς ὅρους χθονός, 1450f.: Ἀτηδος πρός ἐσχάτους / ὅρους. The epithet πατρόφας is mainly used for homeland, as here (cf. Cyc. 108, Alc. 169, Med. 35, Heracl. 1052, Hipp. 1048, Hec. 1221, Tr. 389, IT 1066, A. Th. 668, Ag. 503, S. Tr. 236), and also with reference to one’s natal oikos and ancestral gods; cf. Danae fr. 4 (and note ad loc.).

ἀτιμάξων: ‘to hold in no honour, to bring dishonour upon’, especially for ideas held as sacred (i.e. gods, homeland, suppliants). In A. Supp. 912 and S. OT 340, it refers to a city, as in our fragment. Cf. Alc. 567, 658, Heracl. 78, Hipp. 1192, Ba. 1320, S. Ai. 1342, Ant. 572.


Fr. 17:

The general reflection is here introduced with φεῦ as reaction to another character’s act or utterance; cf. similarly Hipp. 431, Andr. 183-185, Hec. 863, 956,1238, Supp. 463, El. 367
The epithet *kakos* may be associated with either competitive or co-operative values in Euripides (cf. note on Danae fr. 4.2). In this case, the occurrence of *παλαιὸς (αἶνος)* denoting a long-established viewpoint, as well as the use of the same antithesis *χρηστὸς-κακὸς* in terms of the relation of lineage to character in *El.* 369f. (which is rejected by Orestes: ἡδη γὰρ εἶδον [...] χρηστά δ' ἐκ κακῶν τέκνα) seem to point to the traditional usage of *kakos* attached to a person of low social status. These lines could have thus been Polydectes' attack on Dictys' possibly humble origin, which in the king's eyes entails lack of all sorts of excellence and might be located in the context of their possible *agon*.\(^{447}\) Consequently, fr. 14 contesting birth as the sole criterion of *eugeneia*, unless combined with justice, may have been Dictys' rejoinder to the king.

On the other hand, the interpretation of *kakos* in a moral sense, which seems less likely for the reasons stated above, would entail also a high degree of conjecture as to the identity of the addressee; the comment on hereditary vice could have been uttered by a sympathetic figure, namely Danae, Dictys or Perseus,\(^{448}\) as specific reaction to another character's malicious attitude. The most obvious example of malice is Polydectes; no evidence, however, survives as to his father's quality, apart from the names Peristhenes and Magnes in Pherecydes (fr. 10 Fowler) and [Apollod.] 1. 9.6 respectively and he would have probably been excluded from the dramatic action, which would make this statement pointless. Alternatively, in order to explore the possibility that the vicious offspring of an evil father might have been Polydectes' son (the king's assumed interlocutor in frs. 6-9), we would have to presuppose that if he had a role in the play, it would have gone beyond the debate with his father, so as to raise this comment on malice by the sympathetic party.

1 *παλαιὸς αἶνος*: here, in the sense of 'saying, proverb'; cf. note on Danae fr. 1.1.

2 *χρηστὸς*: 'useful, worthy'; according to the first, preferred, interpretation adhering to the competitive standard of *aretē*, this quality is the outcome of noble lineage and thus restricted to the class of *agathoi*, who are so commended for their beneficial characteristics and effectiveness to assure the stability and well-being of the state. This

\(^{447}\) Stoessl (1958, p. 162) assigned this fragment to Polydectes, locating it in the debate with Dictys, though his interpretation of the fragment fails to delineate the king's position on the traditional equation of birth with character, as argued here.

\(^{448}\) So Webster (1967, p. 63ff.) attributing the fragment to Dictys and Aélon (1986, p. 159 and n. 28) assigning it to either of the suppliants. Jouan and van Looy (2000, p. 82) assigned it to Perseus.
traditional usage goes back to Homer, where *agathoi* are those who are able to effectively defend the group, by uniting in themselves courage, high birth and wealth, the qualities of which that society holds itself to be most in need; cf. indicatively *Il.* 2. 198-202, 12. 310-321, also *Pi.* P. 10.69-72 and Adkins (1972) pp. 13f., 60-65, Adkins (1960) pp. 36, 70f., Bryant (1996) pp. 28-31, 80-84, Ferguson (1958) pp. 19-21. Traditional values continued to exist in the later part of the fifth century; cf. for instance, *Heracl.* 510 and *Temenidae* fr. 739 Kn. adhering to the competitive standard of *areté*, again by praising one’s conduct as the result of one’s lineage, and for more examples, cf. note on *fr.* 4. 2.


**Fr. 18:**

The textual transmission of this fragment has raised serious issues of interpretation. The translation of these lines as transmitted is incomprehensible: ‘For he was dear to me and may Eros capture me without leading me to folly or Cypris’. Two different and unrelated ideas are expressed: the speaker’s affection for a male character in the past tense and the wish to find love in moderation. As transmitted, the fragment seems to have been badly extracted from its context; Stobaeus’ aim was evidently to cite the reference to Cypris from the second half of the first line onwards (cf. the title of his section). It seems that the received text can only be retained if we put a strong pause before *καὶ*, so that the two ideas are separated.449 The first idea must probably be linked to the lost previous part of the text.

449 I am indebted to Prof. Carey for this suggestion.
referring to the person, for whom the speaker is expressing these feelings in the past tense, which implies that this person is perhaps regarded as no longer alive. The possibility that Danae or Dictys could have expressed their affection for Perseus, whom they consider to be dead (cf. fr. 2) is weakened by the speaker’s hope to find moderate love some time in the future (ποτε+ optative), which cannot be plausibly assigned to the old fisherman or Danae, who was already ‘captured’ by Eros in the past as Zeus’ λέχος. Webster inclined towards accepting Nauck’s conjecture and assigning these lines to the young Perseus (cf. Bellerophon’s similar wish in Stheneboea fr. 661. 21-25 Kn. and Theseus in Theseus fr. 388 Kn.). However, the syntax of the proposed emendation (φιλον γὰρ ἠμίν εἶ.) is unparalleled in Attic Greek.

The problematic transmission of the fragment allows only for conjecture. Usener made a tempting suggestion, by changing ἔλοι to ἐλευ, which was adopted by Wachsmuth in his edition of Stobaeus. The movable ν can be preserved even before a consonant for metrical reasons, as in numerous other cases in Euripides (cf. indicatively Med. 566, 1302, Herac. 220, 408, 426, 715, Hec. 509, 574, 804, HF 305, El. 272, 1277, Tr. 3, 91, 440, Ion 643, Ph. 453, Or. 566, Ba. 473 etc. and Kühner-Blaß 19043, I 292). The fragment would thus be translated as follows: ‘For he was dear to me and Eros captured me once without leading me to folly or Cypris’. In this case, the speaker may be Danae referring to her sacred union with Zeus, who must be the one whom she regards as φιλος (‘nearest and dearest’). Gods were considered to be φιλοι to certain humans, particularly in cases where they had begotten offspring from their union with mortal women; accordingly, Zeus’ relationship with Antiope and her sons and with Heracles’ family is described as φιλία in Antiope fr. 223. 14 Kn. and HF 341, 346 respectively. The censure of Polydectes’ amorous folly as opposed to Danae’s holy union with Zeus could have been dramatically effective and might have been located in a confrontation-scene between the king and the suppliants.

A conjecture made by Wilamowitz seems to me to be the most attractive in terms of its potential relation to the surviving fragments of the play: φιλος γὰρ εἶ μοι, καὶ μ’ ἐρος

451 Homer describes Zeus as φιλος to several of the sons he has begotten from mortal women: Heracles (Il. 18. 118), Sarpedon (Il. 16. 433, 450, 460, 568), Dardanus (Il. 20. 304), Scamander (Il. 21. 223). Cf. Dirlmeier (1935) pp. 64-68.


...On the basis of our evidence, I would locate it in a different context than Wecklein (1888, p. 110), who suggested that the speaker may be Danae referring to Dictys, drawing a parallel to Electra’s address to the Farmer in *El. 67* (Danae, however, cannot be a plausible speaker for the reasons stated above). The speaker appeals to the idea of *philia* relating him to his interlocutor, while censuring amorous folly. The notions of *philia* and overmastering passion are recurring themes in the possible conversation of frs. 6-9 about the effects of Polydectes’ desire for Danae on his family (cf. especially fr. 7. 1f.: *πατρὶ φιλτατὸν τέκνα/ παυσίν τε τούς τεκόντας*, and for Cypris, frs. 8. 5f., 9). The speaker of these lines may thus be Polydectes’ interlocutor in this discussion, perhaps his son (cf. introductory note on fr. 6), asserting his affection for his father, as Haemon in *S. Ant.* 635 (*πάτερ, σός είμι ...* equivalent to *philos*, cf. Brown 1987 *ad loc.*), while at the same time hoping to find love in moderation (for such a hope expressed by a young character, cf. *Stheneboea* fr. 661. 21-25 Kn. and Theseus in *Theseus* fr. 388 Kn.), unlike Polydectes. In this case, the first half of the first line would be better understood as a *parenthesis* (*φίλος γὰρ ἐμι— καὶ μὲ ἔρως ἐλοί ποτὲ ...*), which might have been related to the *νοουθέτης* against amorous folly rejected presumably by Polydectes in fr. 9 (hence, hypothetically: ‘<I am making this admonition>, for you are dear to me— and may Eros capture me without leading me to folly or Cypris’, that is, ‘may I never find myself in your position’).


(referring to the libidinous Aerope of the *Cretan Women*), also Hes. fr. 275 M.-W., Anaxandr. fr. inc. 61 K.-A., Men. Samia 349f. and Dover (1974) pp. 100-102. In the *Dictys*, however, it is a man who is censured for his amorous passion (for which cf. frs. 8 and 9), as is Theoclymenus in *Hel.* 1018f.


Κύρις: often connoting sexual desire; cf. note on fr. 9.

Fr. 19:

This word is preserved by Hesychius, who reads ἄξοιμην, which was changed to ἄξοιμην with a rough breathing by Nauck. ἄξοιμαι signifies ‘to stand in awe of s.o./ sth, especially gods and one’s parents, to respect, to be afraid of’ (LSJ); cf. *Alc.* 326, *Heracl.* 600, 1038, *Or.* 1116, also *Il.* 1. 21. *Od.* 17. 401. A. *Supp.* 652, 884, *Eum.* 389, 1002, S. *OT* 155, *OC*
134, A.R. 4. 250. This verb is never found in the completely different sense of ἀγανακτῶ, which is attested by Hesychius. On the other hand, ἄζω with a smooth breathing denotes ‘to groan, to sigh’⁴⁵² and accords with one of the meanings of ἀγανακτῶ as ‘to show outward signs of grief’ (LSJ, cf. for instance Pl. Phdr. 117d. 5: καὶ δή καὶ τότε ἀναβρυχησόμενος κλάων καὶ ἀγανακτῶν). Hesychius interprets ἄζειν as στενάζειν ἢ ἐκπνεῖν διὰ στόματος (a 1445 Latte) and preserves the related glossa ἄζολει, which signifies ἀγανακτεῖ (a 1484 Latte). In S. fr. inc. 980 R. ἄζειν occurs in the sense of στένειν (Photius a 431 Theodoridis). I thus agree with Prof. Kannicht (who cites the passages from Hesychius and Sophocles) that ἄζομαιν as ἀγανακτῶ should be related to ἄζω rather than to the semantically divergent ἄζομαι and therefore, the smooth breathing must be preserved as read in Hesychius. Cf. also schol. Eust. Il. 11.441 (van der Valk) cited by Kannicht, suggesting that it derives from the exclamation ἄ expressing indignation. In view of the complete isolation of the verb from its context, I would not hazard any guess as to the speaker’s identity or its location within the play.

⁴⁵² Another meaning of the word is ‘to get dry’ (Hsch. a 1483 Latte, cf. ll. 4. 487).
APPENDIX

Euripides and Danae's Legend in Late Antiquity: The Spurious fr. 1132 Kn.

ΕΡΜΗΣ. Δόμιοι μὲν οἴδ' εὐπυργά τ' ἐρώματα χθονὸς
οὐκ ἐν πολυχρώσεισιν ἦςκεται χλιδαίς;
ἀρχὴν δὲ τῶν καὶ θεῶν ἴδρυματα
'Ακρίσιος εὐληχεν, τύραννος τῆς γῆς:
'Ελλησ τ' 'Аργος ἡ πόλις θειλήσκεται.
οὐτος δ' ἔρωτι παιδός ἄρσενος σχεθεῖς
Πυθώδ' ἀφίκτο, καὶ λέγει Φοίβῳ τάδε·
pῶς ἂν γένοιτο σπέρμα παιδὸς ἐν δώμῳ,
tίνος θεῶν βροτῶν τε πρεμιμενοῦς τυχών;
κείνος δὲ δυσξύμβληταν ἐξῆνεγκ' ὅπα·
ἐσται μὲν ἔσται παιδὸς ἄρσενος τόκος
οὐκ ἐξ ἐκείνου· πρῶτα γὰρ θῆλυν σποράν
φῶσαι δείησαι. κάτα πως κείνη ποτὲ
evήνην κρυφαίαν γνούσα καὶ μη γνούσα δὴ
ὑπόπτερον λέοντα τέξεται πατρί,
δὲ τῆς τ' ἄρξει χάτερας πολλῆς χθονός.
tοιαύτ' ἀκούσας Λοξίου μαντεύματα
γάμιον ἀπείχεθ'· διμανὶ δὲ γη τίκτει λαθῶν,
πρὸς τοῦ παρόντος ἤμερου νικώμενος.
Δανόνην δὲ πως ἄνομαις τήνδ', ὀδοῦνεκα
πολὺς παρῆλθεν εἰς γονὴν παίδων χρόνος.
ἐν παρθενώσι δ' εὐθὺς οἰς ἐδείματο
dίδωσιν 'Αργείαισιν ἐμφοροῦσιν κόραις,
eἰς ἀνδρὸς ὡπὶν εὐλαβοὔμενος μολεῖν.
evβ' ὁ μικρός ἠδόξανεν ταύτην χρόνος,

4 εὐληχεν cod.: εὐληχ' ὅπως Musgrave || 9 τυχών cod.: τύχω Bothe || 15 ὑπόπτερον emend. Bentley:
ὑπόπτερον cod., prob. Kannicht || 16 τῆς τ' Porson : τῆς γ' cod. | χάτερας Heath: θατέρας
cod. || 18 διμανὶ δὲ γη cod.: δ ᾳ γ' διμανὶ Wolff || 20 δὲ πως cod.: δε πατιθ' Boissonade
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καὶ κάλλος εἶχεν ἐξοχον καθ’ Ἑλλάδα,  
φίλτροις ἀφύκτοις Ζεῦς κατασχεθεὶς πατὴρ  
eὐνὴ συνελθεῖν λάθρα πως ἄραυλετο.  
σαφῶς δὲ πειθεῖν οὐκ ἔχον, εἰς μηχανήν  
tοιάνθ’ ἔχωρης, ὡς ἄπυρος χρυσὸς γεγέν.  
pοθεινὸν εἰδώς κτήμα τοῦτο τοῖς βροτοῖς,  
διὰ στέγους ῥέωςειν ἐν χεραίν κόρῃς.  
ἡ δ’ ἀγνοοῦσα τὸν κεκρυμμένον δόλον  
kόλπωσι τὸν θεὸν εἰσρέοντι ἐδέξατο.  
χρόνῳ δ’ ἑαυτὴν ὡς κατειδ’ ἐγκύμονα,  
eἰς θαῦμι’ ἔσθηι κάζεπεπληκτο σφοδράς,  
ὡς εἰς τόδ’ ἤλθε μέμψιν εὐλαβομένη,  
φυγῇ δὲ λάθρα τῆς ἀγείρειν μαθὴν πατήρ  
νιν, ἐγκατάκλειστον δόμιοις  
ἐργεῖ χολοθεῖς καὶ σκότῳ κρύμας ἔχει,  
tάληθές ὑπει προσκοπούμενος μαθεῖν·  
kάν ταῦτ’ ἀληθῆ καὶ σαφῶς ἔχοντ’ ἔδη,  
ἐγνοκεν ἄμφω ποντίους ἀφίέναι,  
τὴν παίδα καὶ τὸ τεχθὲν. ὡν δὲ γ’ ἐστάλην,  
μύθους Δανάη τοῦθ’ εὐπροσηγόρους ἀγών  
ἐκ Διὸς, ἀφίξομαι τάχιστα σημανοῦν.  
ὑπηρέτην γὰρ ὄντα τάπεσταλμένα  
πράσσειν προθύμος, διὸς εἰς γ’ ἢ νουνεχῆς.  
ΧΟΡΟΣ. τὸς ὁ καταντρόπος οὗτος ὀμοθὸς  
κατ’ ἐμᾶν ἤκείν ἀκούαν;  
ἐνθ’ ἀσπερχεῖς μενεαίνουσα  
tοῦτοι δόμαι σοι κοράνου ἀμφίδοξος πελάζω.  
tις δεσπότιν ἐμῆν Δανάην

1. Diagnosis of Spuriousness

Fr. 1132 Kn. is transmitted in the fourteenth-century codex P of Euripides (Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 287, f° 147v-148r) after what purports to be the ‘hypothesis’ and personarum index of E. Danae. As already mentioned (cf. note on T5), the ‘hypothesis’ and the 65 lines of this fragment are evidently written in the same hand as the preceding spurious ΛΑ 1570-1629, which was identified by Turyn as that of the rubricator Ioannes Katrares.453 The ‘Danae-prologue’ was first diagnosed as spurious by Elmsley, who also noted its resemblance in technique to the spurious ending of the Iphigenia in Aulis.454 West traced further common stylistic features in the two pieces and taking also into account the similar circumstances of their preservation, he suggested that the spurious ending of the Iphigenia in Aulis and the false ‘Danae prologue’ could have been written by the same author some

---

454 Cf. Elmsley (1811-12) p. 77, Elmsley (1813) p. 432.
time between the fourth and seventh century.\textsuperscript{455} The spuriousness of the ‘\textit{Danae-fragment}’ is suggested by:

(1) \textbf{language}: the use of later words, as observed by Wünsch:\textsuperscript{456} \textit{έγκατάκλειστον} (l. 39, the earliest use occurs in Christian authors), \textit{νουσχής} (l. 48, the earliest occurrence is Plb. 30.2.4 and then traced widely in Christian authors), \textit{κανοντρόπος} (l. 49, the earliest occurrence is Appian \textit{Mithrid.} 318), \textit{άμφιδοξος} (l. 52, first occurring in Plb. 18. 28). Certain linguistic faults were pointed out by West: \textit{δὲ γε} (ll. 18, 44), \textit{δὲτις ἃν γε} (l. 48).\textsuperscript{457} To these features, I should add the occurrence of later words, such as \textit{σχέθεις} (l. 6, the earliest use is in Lucian \textit{Lex.} 11. 10), \textit{κατασχεθείς} (l. 27, the earliest occurrence is D.S. 23. 16.1), \textit{δυσζύμβλητον} (l. 10, first occurrence in Cornutus p. 57 Lang, cf. [A.]. \textit{Pr.} 775: \textit{εὐξύμβλητον}, S. \textit{Tr.} 694: \textit{άξυμβλητον}) and the prosaic \textit{ἐμφρωνορὸς} (l. 23) and \textit{εἰσρέοντι} (l. 34), while \textit{άκοινον} (l. 50) first occurs in Cercidas fr. 4. 22 Powell, \textit{A.P.} 2. 1.326, 9. 7.1 and in plural in \textit{A.R.} 4. 17, 908.

(2) \textbf{metre}: the most striking among the later metrical features traced by West are absence of caesura (ll. 4, 46), violation of Porson’s law (l. 4), anapaests in other feet than the first, apart from names (l. 30), prosodic errors (cf. indicatively, l. 33: \textit{μὴ γνοῦσα}, 61: \textit{τῶραννον}), anapaestic dimeters with disregard of metron-diaeresis and hypercatalexis instead of catalexis (l. 62f.).\textsuperscript{458}

(3) matters of dramatic technique and inconsistency with the evidence for the play, which are to be discussed below (cf. sections 2 and 3b).

West further suggested that the ‘\textit{Danae-fragment}’ could have been composed with the same purpose as the ending of the \textit{Iphigenia in Aulis}, namely to replace the lost opening of the play, by someone who presumably had at his disposal remnants of a set of Euripides’ plays arranged alphabetically, including remnants of the \textit{Danae}.\textsuperscript{459} He thus proposed Eugenios of Augustopolis as a possible author, an eminent professor in Constantinople during the reign of Anastasios I (end of fifth/early sixth century), who studied Greek

\textsuperscript{455} Cf. West (1981) p. 74f.
\textsuperscript{456} Cf. Wünsch (1896) p. 148.
\textsuperscript{457} Cf. West (1981) p. 75.
\textsuperscript{458} For more detail, cf. West (1981) p. 74f.
\textsuperscript{459} West (1981, p. 78, n. 49) suggested that the \textit{Danae} ‘prologue’ could have been a replacement for the lost initial leaves of a volume containing \textit{Danae, Dictys, Epeios, Erectheus, Eurystheus}. For the trend of filling gaps in the transmission of texts with forgeries, cf. Speyer (1971) pp. 136-139, also Ronconi (1965) p. 16, Speyer (1969) p. 244f., Brox (1975) p. 45f.
tragedy closely and wrote on tragic lyric metres (Sud. ε 3394 Adler, cf. Cohn 1907, col. 987f.). In such a case, what purports to be the ‘hypothesis’ and *personarum index* of the *Danae* might have been prefixed to the ‘prologue’, in accordance with the trend of adding prefatory material to the dramatic texts, the earliest evidence for which is the Bodmer papyrus of Menander dated in late third century AD (cf. note on T5).

Nevertheless, this interpretation could have the following shortcomings: (i) unlike the spurious closing part of the exodos of the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, what survives from the ‘*Danae*-fragment’ implies that if it was a specially composed supplement, it would have aimed to replace the lost prologue, parodos and the beginning of the first episode of the play, which would have made it a significantly more extensive composition. Moreover, as Page plausibly argued, *IA* 1578-1629 may have not been a composed supplement in its entirety, in view of the notable difference in quality between parts of this piece, but the forged verses could have aimed to supplement several illegible lines of the text; this would be another basic difference in the motives for composing each of the two spurious pieces, (ii) certain cases of inconsistency of the ‘prologue’ with the evidence for the plot of Euripides’ *Danae* could imply that the author of this piece did not have access to the rest of the play. In terms of this fact, one may argue that more leaves of the codex could have been missing and the author thus had access from a point of the play onwards (perhaps from the discovery onwards, cf. below, The Sources). If so, it should have to be assumed that he undertook the huge task of supplementing a big part of the play on his own and may have given up in l. 65, where Acrisius’ speech is abruptly cut off (or perhaps the rest of his composition got lost).

On the other hand, the possibility that this piece was only ever written as an independent composition is worth exploring. There are numerous cases of rhetorical exercises for educational purposes in papyri from the second century BC until the seventh century AD, involving, among other things, imitation of poetry. I would note indicatively *P. Ryl. III* 487 dated towards the fourth century AD, which is a version of Odysseus’ homecoming in hexameters, as well as Libanius’ reference to an epic poem on a Homeric

---

theme composed by one of his contemporaries, Tatian, which became very popular among teachers and students (Ep. 990). Moreover, PSI XIII 1303 dated in the third century AD preserves a reworking of the agon-scene of E. Phoenissae in tragic style and metre and, in view of its quality and inconsistency, it has been reasonably classified as a rhetorical exercise.\textsuperscript{464} This piece shares with our fragment the imitation of typical elements of Euripidean dramatic technique (such as the agon and the narrative prologue in each case), stylistic weaknesses, inconsistency of content (cf. below, Dramatic Technique) and furthermore, the feature of ending abruptly, which is a common mark of exercises.\textsuperscript{465} I would thus regard the possibility that fr. 1132 Kn. could have been a rhetorical exercise imitating a Euripidean opening as worth considering. In such a case, the author is likely to have been a school-master and his knowledge of tragic style, technique and lyric metres, in particular, could fit the features of Eugenios of Augustopolis, as suggested by West, or of a professor of similar calibre. In view of the significant decline in the educational system during the reign of Justinian,\textsuperscript{466} if this piece was written for such a purpose, it seems likely to have been composed some time till the sixth century. The inconsistency with the evidence for the Danae may either be explained by the author’s wish to innovate in certain aspects (as the author of the exercise on the Phoenissae\textsuperscript{467}) or by his lack of direct access to the play. In either case, he seems to have aimed to imitate Euripidean technique, while drawing material from Danae’s legend and possibly from the dramatist’s treatment of the myth (in l. 30f., for instance, he alludes to the notorious fr. 7 and has widely consulted Lucian, whom he might regard as reproducing Euripides, cf. below, The Sources).

Another factor, which may tell in favour of the possibility of an independent composition, is Katarares’ apparent fondness of gathering various kinds of dramatic pastiche, such as a monologue of 35 lines on a fictitious theme written in Byzantine dodecasyllable and transmitted in Esc. Φ-II-19, f. 91’ (dated in 1309) after the text of the Iliad.\textsuperscript{468} This ‘jeu d’ esprit’ is preceded, as fr. 1132 Kn., by a personarum index, which

\textsuperscript{466} Cf. Kennedy (1994) p. 256.
\textsuperscript{467} Cf. Cribiore (2001b) p. 257f.
does not seem to serve any obvious purpose.\textsuperscript{469} Cf. note on T5 for the possibility that Katrares might have inserted on his own the list of dramatic characters before this pastiche and perhaps also before the \textit{Danae-fragment} to suit the arrangement of prefatory material in dramatic manuscripts.

\textbf{2. The Sources of the \textit{Danae-fragment}}

The author of the 'prologue' evidently consulted the sources for Danae's myth and literary evidence, which he might have regarded as reproducing Euripides' play, mainly Lucian (cf. note on T5). Unless he knew the prologue-speaker from a source lost by now, he is likely to have invented him and the choice of Hermes could have relied on the god's involvement in Perseus' legend (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 11 Fowler, [Apollod.] 2. 4.2) and on the reference to Hermes' visits to Zeus' beloved women, including Danae, in Luc. \textit{D.Deor.} 4.2 (και νῦν ὄρτι ἠκοντά μὲ ἀπὸ Σιδώνος παρὰ τῆς Κάδιμος θυγατρός, ἐφ' ἦν πέπομφῃ [scil. Zeus] μὲ ὄψιμενον ὅ τι πράττει ἡ παῖς, μηδὲ ἀναπνεύσαντα πέπομφεν αὐθίς εἰς τὸ Ἀργος ἐπισκεψόμενον τὴν Δανάην, εἶτ' ἐκεῖθεν εἰς Βοωτίαν, φησίν, ἔλθων ἐν παρώδῳ τὴν Ἀντιόπην ἰδὲ).\textsuperscript{470} Moreover, the author may have recalled Hermes' delivery of the prologue-speech in the \textit{Ion}, again with reference to a similar situation (the seduction of a princess by a god and the birth of divine offspring).

According to the mythical sources, the oracle given to Acrisius foretold his death at the hands of his grandson (cf. Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler and [Apollod.] 2. 4.1 and \textit{Danae, The Myth}, p. 9, n. 30); here, however, the oracle seems to vaguely foretell Acrisius' dethronement by his grandson (l. 15f., the imagery of the lion may be suggestive, cf. below, Style), which recurs in the later scholium of Thomas Magister on [A.] \textit{Pr.} 903 (Smyth) and may originate in a minor version of the myth. Despite the oracle, Acrisius begets Danae accidentally (l. 18f.), which is nowhere else attested and may have derived from the account of Oedipus’ accidental conception in \textit{Ph.} 13-22.\textsuperscript{471} In addition, Danae is mentioned as guarded ἐν παρθενώσι (l. 22f., cf. also T5), which is not inconsistent with the idea of the

\textsuperscript{470} Cf. Rein (1926) p. 126.
\textsuperscript{471} Cf. Zielinski (1925) p. 294.
widely attested bronze chamber, though unspecific. Her beauty (l. 26) is frequently mentioned in the mythical sources (cf. Il. 14. 319, Hes. fr. 129. 14 M.-W., Sc. 216, Pi. N. 10. 10ff.). The reference to the overwhelming power of gold (l. 30f.) could have derived from the numerous sources from the fourth century BC onwards alluding to Danae's seduction as bribery, including Luc. Gall. 13, 14, Tim. 41, which on the basis of the available evidence seem to have been inspired by Danae fr. 7 (cf. note ad loc.), or from the author's own knowledge of these notorious lines from the play. Furthermore, Acrisius' discovery of Danae's pregnancy clearly diverges from the mythical sources (cf. Danae, The Myth, pp. 8-10) and the evidence for E. Danae, according to which it was after Perseus' birth that Acrisius found out (cf. Structure). Hence, the author of this piece may have either tried to innovate or may have not had access at least to the part of the play before Acrisius' discovery. Accordingly, he could have consulted Luc. D. Mar. 12: φασὶ δ᾽ οὖν τὸν Δια χρυσὸν γενόμενον ῥυήναι διὰ τοῦ ὀρόφου ἐπ’ αὐτήν, δεξαμένην δὲ ἐκείνην ἐς τὸν κόλπον καταρρέοντα τὸν θεὸν ἐγκύμωνα γενέσθαι, τούτῳ αἰσθάμενος ὁ πατήρ, ἀγρίος τις καὶ ζηλότυπος γέρων, ἡγανάκτησε καὶ ὑπὸ τινὸς μεμοιχεύσθαι οἰνθεῖς αὐτήν ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὴν κυβώτον ἄρτι τετοκυίαν. Though it cannot be excluded that Lucian could have followed a less known version of the myth, he may have well relied on the known version and the brevity and ambiguity of his narrative might have led to a misinterpretation of the passage by the author of the 'prologue' and perhaps also by Tzetzes in his conflated scholium on Lyc. 838 (Scheer).

3. Imitation of Euripides

a. Style:

Apart from common poetic vocabulary, such as δόμωι (ll. 1, 39), χθονός (ll. 1, 16, 61), μολεῖν (l. 24), γεγός (l. 30), βάξις, πτόλιν (l. 54), δέμας (l. 59), ἐτήσιμα (l. 60), κοίρανον (l. 61), στείχοντα (l. 62), the author of the 'prologue' made a conscious effort to imitate tragic style, drawing especially from Euripides. The most striking cases are as follows:

1 δόμωι μὲν οἴθ᾽: cf. Hel. 1 : Νείλου μὲν αἴδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί, Meleagros fr. 515.1 Kn.: Καλυθῶν μὲν ἦδε γαῖα, Πελοπίας χθονός, Auge fr. 264a Kn.: Ἀλέας Ἀθάνας δὲ πολύχρυσος δόμος and S. Ph. 1f.: ἀκτῇ μὲν ἦδε τῆς περιπρότου χθονός/ Λήμνου.
epupaxa: widely occurring in tragedy, though only in singular; cf. Med. 597, 1322, Ph. 983, Ba. 55, IA 189, also A. Ch. 154, Eum. 701, S. Ai. 467 (the plural occurs from fourth-century prose onwards; cf. Pl. Lg. 681a.2, Xen. Hell. 3.2.14, Oec. 6.10).


4 τύραννος τῆς ἀιδης: cf. Hel. 4, also Supp. 399.

6 ἔρωτε παιδῶς: cf. Ion 67 (cited by Jacobs 1834, p. 631, n. 8); ἔρωτε παιδών, add also Archelaus fr. 228b. 21 Kn.: τέκνον ἔρωτι.


10 ἐξήνεγκα: cf. S. Tr. 741: τίν' ἐξήνεγκας, ὁ τέκνον, λόγον, also Hec. 701.


15 λέοντα τέσσαρα πατρὶ: the imagery of the lion prone to bring disaster may originate in A. Ag. 717.

20 ὀδούνεκα: cf. Ion 661f. (also occurring in the context of paremylogy): 'Ἰονᾶ δ' ὄνομάζω σε τῇ τύχῃ πρέπον, ὀδούνεκ' ἀδύτων ἐξίοντι μοι θεοῦ, also Hel. 104, S.'Tr. 277, [A.] Pr. 330.


24 εἰς ὄψιν μολείν: cf. Ion 1557: ἐς μὲν ὄψιν σφῶν μολείν, also Med. 173f., 775, IT 902.


30 ποθεινὸν κτήμα: cf. Or. 1032: Ὁ ποθεινὸν ὄμη ὀμίλλας ἐμῆς, S. Ph. 1445: ὁ φθέγμα ποθεινὸν.


The author of this piece follows tragic metres closely; the narrative prologue is written in iambic trimeters and as regards the lyric metres of the parodos, to those noted by Kannicht I would add the anapaestic dimeter upon the choral entrance ⁴⁷² (ll. 49, 51, cf. similarly the anapaestic dimeters at the beginning of the parodos in *Alc.* 77f., *Hec.* 98f., *El.* 167), the dochmiacs in l. 56 (a dochmius and a catalectic dochmius) and l. 59 (a ‘dochmius kaibelianus’ and a hypercatalectic dochmius) and the cretic in conjunction with the dochmius in l. 60. The metrical weaknesses have been briefly observed above (section 1) and naturally result from the looser metrical rules of late antiquity.⁴⁷³

---


⁴⁷³ Cf. West (1982, p. 75) comparing these metrical features with those of contemporary poems by Paul the Silentiary, John of Gaza and Gregory of Nazianzus.
b. Dramatic technique

The 'prologue' is structured upon the model of Euripides' narrative prologues spoken by gods (cf. the divine prologue-speeches in the *Alcestis, Hippolytus, Hecabe*—with Polydorus' ghost in the place of a god—*Trojan Women, Ion and Bacchae*). The structural predictability of Euripidean openings was notorious in antiquity and criticized in Ar. Ra. 946f., 1177-1250 (schol. v. 1219 Holwerda: διαβάλλει δὲ τὴν ὁμοειδίαν τῶν εἰσβολῶν τῶν δραμάτων and Sommerstein 1996, p. 264).474

The appearance of a particular god as prologue-speaker has to be justified by the god's relation to one or more of the dramatic characters; Polydorus' ties with Hecabe are self-evident (*Hec.* 30-34) and Apollo's association with Admetus (*Alc.* 9-12), as well as Hermes' involvement in Ion's rescue (*Ion* 28-40) are made clear. Further, Aphrodite (*Hipp.* 10-50), Dionysus (*Ba.* 45-48) and the pair Poseidon-Athena (*Tr.* 65-94) plan their vengeance on characters, who slighted their *timē*. Accordingly, Hermes has to give a reason for appearing; he has been sent by Zeus to console Danae (ll. 44-48). The speaker opens the monologue by referring to the setting of the play (ll. 1, 5, for parallels, cf. Style). Interestingly, the author skips the most obvious opening of Euripidean divine prologue-speeches (the ἕκκω type, cf. *Hec.* 1, *Ion* 5, *Tr.* 1, *Ba.* 1). He then reports the background of the story (ll. 6-41) and goes on to indicate the present crisis (ll. 42-44); cf. the divine prologues in *Alc.* 3-21, *Hipp.* 9-40, *Hec.* 4-41, *Tr.* 4-44, *Ion* 8-65, *Ba.* 13-42 and the rest of the narrative prologue-speeches in *Med.* 1-45, *Heracl.* 6-47, *Andr.* 1-55, *Su.* 8-40, *HF* 13-54, *El.* 1-49, *IT* 6-58, *Hel.* 4-67, *Ph.* 5-83, *Or.* 4-66.

Certain particular features need to be noted as well. The use of direct speech in the narrative (l. 8f.)—aiming to enliven the account and highlight a specific theme475—occurs also in the prologues in *Heracl.* 29f., *IT* 17-23, *Ion* 28-36, *Ph.* 17-20 and *Archelaus* fr. 228b. 23-25 κρ. The etymology of the name Danae (l. 20f.) probably from δηναιός ('after a long time')476 follows the etymologies of Euripidean prologues, which bear a didactic tone rather than dramatic punch;477 cf. the etymologies in the prologues in *Andr.* 19f. (Thessaly), *IT* 32f. (Thoas), *Ph.* 27 (Oedipus), *Hel.* 13f. (Theonoe), *Telephus* fr.

474 Cf. the criticism of his prologues in *Vita Eur.* in *TRGF* V,1, Test. A1 IB, 54f.
696.11-13 Kn. (Telephus), *Melanippe the Wise* fr. 481.5f. (land of Aeolis), 14-22 Kn. (Hippo), *Phrixus* fr. 819.7f. Kn. (lands of Kilikia and Phoenike), *Antiope* fr. 181 Kn. (Zethus), *Archelaus* fr. 228.7f. Kn. (Danai). I agree with van Looy 478 that the paretymology of Danae’s name from δηναιός seems rather unlikely to have gone back to Euripides, as I have traced it in this sense (‘after a long time’) only from Apollonius Rhodius onwards (cf. A.R. 3. 590, 4. 645, 4. 1547, whereas in A. Eum. 845, 879 and [A.] Pr. 794, 912 it denotes ‘ancient’).

Hermes also needs to account for his exit (ll. 44-48: he should convey Zeus’ words to Danae as soon as possible). The exit has to be motivated, so that the transition from one scene to the next can be attained. Again, the composer of this piece skips the most common reason for divine exit, which is the appearance of the incoming mortal 479 (cf. Hipp. 51-53, Hec. 52-54, Ion 76-78, while in Alc. 22-24 Apollo withdraws as he sees Death approaching and in Ba. 55-63 Dionysus announces the entrance of the Bacchic chorus).

The questions of the chorus upon its entrance (ll. 49-54) are a common means of stressing anxiety and crisis; cf. Alc. 77f. (and Dale 1954, p. 58), Med. 134-136 (and Mastronarde 2002, p. 192), Heracl. 73f., Tr. 153f., Hypsipyle 202-215 Bond, Alcmeon in Corinth fr. 74 Kn., also S. El. 121-126, OC 118-120 and Schmidt (1971) p. 41f. The parodos ends with the formulaic announcement of an incoming character (l. 61: ἀλλ' εἰσορᾷ γὰρ, cf. Style), as in HF 138f. 480

It is thus clear that the author had studied the dramatic conventions of Euripidean openings. Nevertheless, there are certain important issues which seem to have slipped his attention. Firstly, the god’s indispensable self-introduction is missing; there is a very general reference in l. 27 to Zeus as ‘father’, which is, after all, a common epithet of Zeus even used by mortals and in l. 46f., he describes himself as servant of the gods, possibly through reminiscence of Ion 4 (cf. Lee 1997 ad loc.) and [A.] Pr. 954. His identity, however, is nowhere clearly stated, as needed; cf. the explicit self-introductions in the divine prologue-speeches in Alc. 3f. (Apollo as Asclepius’ father), 30 (Apollo clearly addressed by Death), Hipp. 2, Hec. 3, Tr. 2, Ion 4, Ba. 2, as well as in prologues spoken by mortals in Med. 6, Heracl. 30, Andr. 5, Supp. 6, HF 2, El. 34-38, IT 5, Hel. 22, Ph. 12, Or.

480 Cf. Nauck’s note ad loc.
23, Melanippe the Wise fr. 481.13 Kn., Telephus fr. 696.11 Kn. This oversight could have well resulted from his failure to visualize the prologue as part of a dramatic performance, where the speaker’s identity should have been explicitly mentioned; by contrast, on the page his identity is inescapable, because his name is prefixed to the speech.

Secondly, a crucial question arises: what is the benefit from introducing here a divine prologue-speaker rather than a mortal speaker? Gods as prologue-speakers are in a position of superiority, namely they possess information unknown to the dramatic characters, of which the audience needs to be aware, in order to follow the dramatic action (cf. the prologues of the Hippolytus, Hecabe, Trojan Women, Ion, Bacchae). Further, divine prologue-speakers provide hints of future events, in order to excite the dramatic interest, without, however, destroying it, as the possibility of surprises is left open (cf. the prologue-prophecies in Alc. 65-76 and Ion 67-73, which are challenged later in the play). At the same time, by motivating dramatic action divine prologues give scope for exploring contradictions, such as the interplay between internal and external motivation (cf. in particular, the prologues of the Hippolytus, Trojan Women, Ion and Bacchae). The detached divine prologue thus aims to give a sense of strong temporal continuity, by projecting past events into the future along with the causal nexus which produces the future. Hermes’ appearance, however, does not seem to serve any of these purposes; he vaguely accounts for his role, which is to convey Zeus’ words to Danae. What can only be inferred from the context of Hermes’ monologue is that Danae appears to be unaware of her seducer’s identity (ll. 33-37), since Zeus was transformed, in order to reach her. Hermes’ mission therefore could be presumably to reveal to Danae that she was impregnated by Zeus. Such a case would be unparalleled in Euripides’ divine prologues, since gods as prologue-speakers are typically detached from mortal dramatic characters. Instead, Hermes’ announcement to Danae about her impregnation by Zeus could have been mentioned by a mortal prologue-speaker (e.g. Danae’s nurse, cf. Structure) in the context of the προπεραγμένα (cf. Hel. 56-58, where Helen recalls Hermes’ words to her). Hence, the

486 op. cit. p. 106.
god's appearance, at least as justified by the author of this piece, does not seem to aim at any obvious dramatic benefit.

It is also noteworthy that the parodos occupies fifteen lines only, which is unparalleled in tragedy. The ode gives the substance but not the length or level of detail expected, nor is there any attempt at responsion. The lyric dialect is not followed throughout (cf. l. 53), though this could be attributed to errors through the transmission of the text. The female chorus announces Acrisius' entrance (ll. 61-63). The king is reproaching a male character (cf. ἐβοών), whose identity is unclear, as he has not been announced by the chorus nor addressed by Acrisius in an apostrophe; this may be another case of oversight in terms of the visualization of the dramatic performance by the author.

Conclusion

On the basis of this survey, this piece may seem likelier to have been an independent composition, such as a rhetorical exercise, rather than a specially composed supplement for the lost beginning of E. Danae. In either case, its author evidently aimed to imitate Euripidean openings and drew on the sources for Danae's legend, particularly Lucian, whom he may have regarded as inspired by Euripides' play. This piece is thus suggestive of the popularity of Euripidean technique, of Danae's legend and possibly of the appeal of his treatment of the legend in late Antiquity. Certain cases of inconsistency with the known evidence for E. Danae may have resulted from the author's wish for a freer composition or from his lack of access at least to the part of the play before Acrisius' discovery. The composition points to someone who had studied tragedy closely, being able to imitate tragic vocabulary and metre; the date of his activity, however (some time between the fourth and seventh century AD), made the intrusion of later words and the application of looser metrical canons inevitable. Furthermore, the author of this tragic opening took main Euripidean dramatic conventions into account, failing, on the other hand, to 'digest' the function of gods as prologue-speakers and to avoid certain oversights in terms of dramatic technique.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABEL, E. (1891): Scholia recentia in Pindari Epinicia, Budapest

ACHELIS, T.O.H (1913): 'De Aristophanis Byzantii Argumentis Fabularum' Philologus 12, 414-441, 518-545


________________ (1970): From the Many to the One, London


________________ (1986) : Quelques grands mythes héroiques dans l’œuvre d’Euripide, Paris


________________ (1966): L’Otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine, Paris


ARNOLD, R. (1878): Die chorische Technik des Euripides, Halle


ARRIGHETTI, G. (1964): Satiro, Vita di Euripide, Pisa


________ (2001): Euripide, philosophe et poète tragique, Louvain, Namur and Paris


BAIN, D. (1975): 'Audience address in Greek Tragedy' CQ n.s. 25, 13-25
BALDRY, H.C. (1965): The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought, Cambridge
_________ (1986): Euripides' Trojan Women (translated with a commentary), Warminster
_________ (1996): Euripides' Heracles (translated with a commentary), Warminster
BARNES, J. (1694): Euripidis quae exstant omnia, Cambridge
BARRETT, W.S. (1964): Euripides' Hippolytos (edited with a commentary) Oxford
_________ (1965): 'The Epitome of Euripides' Phoinissai' CQ n.s. 15, 58-71
_________ (1986): 'La Colpa di Elena: Gorgia ed Euripide a confronto' in L. Montoneri, F. Romano (eds) Gorgia e la sofistica, pp. 389-409, Catania
BENTLEY, R. (1691): Epistola ad Iloan. Millium, Oxford
BERGSON, L. (1956): L'épithète ornamentale dans Eschyle, Sophocle et Euripide, Uppsala
_________ (1959): 'Episches in den ἤθες ἀγγελικαὶ' RhM 102, 9-39
_________ (1967): 'Zum periphrastischen χρηματ' Eranos 65, 79-117
_________ (1971): Die Relativität der Werte im Frühwerk des Euripides, Stockholm

BEUDEL, P. (1911): Qua Ratione Graeci Liberos docuerint, papyris, ostracis, tabulis in Aegypto inventis illustratur, Diss. Münster


BIGGS, P. (1966): 'The Disease-Theme in Sophocles' Ajax, Philoctetes and Trachiniae' CPh 61, 223-235


BLAIKLOCK, E.M. (1952): The Male Characters of Euripides. A Study in Realism, New Zealand


__________ (1998): Women in Classical Athens, Bristol


BORECKY, B. (1955): 'La Tragédie Alopé d'Euripide' in Studia Antiqua, pp. 82-89, Prague

BORRIES, I. (1911): Phrynichi Praeparatio Sophistica, Leipzig

BOURIER, P.H. (1900): Die Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Johannes Malalas, Vols I-II, Ausburg

BOWRA, C.M. (1944): Sophoclean Tragedy, Oxford

__________ (1964): Pindar, Oxford


CALDERINI, A. (1913): ‘Degli Epigrammi Ciziceni considerati in relazione con la Tragedia’, *Athenaeum* 1, 345-372


243
CANTARELLA, R. (1964): *Euripide, I Cretesi* (with introduction and commentary), Milan
CANTER, H.V. (1930): ‘The Figure AYNATON in Greek and Latin Poetry’ *AJPh* 51, 32-41
________(1995): ‘Rape and Adultery in Athenian Law’ *CQ* n.s. 45, 407-417
COHN, L. (1907): ‘Eugenius’ *RE* VI, 1, coll. 987-988, Stuttgart
________ (1975): ‘Formal Debates in Euripides’ Drama’ *G&R* 22, 58-71


CONACHER, D.J. (1967): *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure*, Toronto

________________ (1981): ‘Rhetoric and Relevance in Euripides’ Drama’ AJPh 102, 3-25


CRIBIORE, R. (1996): *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta

_________ (2001a): *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, New Jersey


DAHNHARDT, O. (1894): *Scholia in Aeschyli Persas*, Leipzig


DELCOURT, M. (1944): *Oedipe ou la légende du conquérant*, Liège


DELLA CORTE, F. (1972): *La mappa dell’ Eneide*, Florence

DE MARCO, V. (1936): ‘Sulla Tradizione Manoscritta degli Scolii Sofoclei’ *SIFC* 13, 3-44


DIRLMEIER, F. (1935): ‘ΘΕΟΦΙΛΙΑ-ΦΙΑΟΘΕΙΑ’ *Philologus* 90 (n.s. 44) 57-77, 176-193


_______ (1951): *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Boston

_______ (1960): ‘Morals and Politics in the *Oresteia’* *PCPhS* 6, 19-31

_______ (19602): *Euripides’ Bacchae* (edited with a commentary) Oxford


247

---


---

(1985): ‘Anachronism in Greek Tragedy’ *JHS* 105, 1-10

---


---

(1993): ‘Gods on Stage in Greek Tragedy’ *GB* Supp. 5 (Festschrift W. Pötscher) 77-86

---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---

ELMSLEY, P. (1811-1812): ‘Porson’s Hecuba’ *Edinburgh Review* 19, 64-95

---

(1813): ‘Notice of Hermann’s Euripidis Supplices’ *CJ* 8, 417-440

---

(1821): *Euripidis Heraclidae*, Leipzig

---

(1822): *Euripidis Bacchae*, Leipzig

---


---


---


---


---


---


---


---

248


___________ (1985): *Catullus*, Kansas


249

FRANZENKEL, H. (1946): ‘Man’s Ephemer Nature according to Pindar’ TAPhA 77, 131-145


FRISS, H. (1949): Might and Right in Antiquity (translated by C.C. Martindale), Copenhagen

FROLEYKS, W.J. (1973): Der Agon Logon in der antiken Literatur, Bonn


GALLOTTI, C. (1933): ‘Nuove Hypotheses di Drammi Euripidei’ RFIC n.s. 11, 177-188


GEFFCKEN, J. (1892): *Timaios Geographie des Westens*, Berlin


GOINS, S.E. (1997): ‘The Date of Aeschylus’ Perseus Tetralogy’ *RhM* 140, 193-210

GOLDEN, L. (1971): ‘Children in the Medea’ *CB* 48, 10-14


GOMOLL, H. (1936): ‘Herakleodoros und die Kritikoi bei Philodem’ *Philologus* 91, 373-384

GOMPERZ, H. (1912): *Sophistik und Rhetorik*, Berlin


GOULD, J. P. (1973): ‘Hiketeia’ *JHS* 93, 74-104


251


GREENE, W.C. (1938): *Scholia Platonica*, Haverford

GREENE, W.C. (1944): *Moira. Fate, Good and Evil in Greek Thought*, New York


HANI, J. (1972): *Plutarque, Consolation à Apollonios* (text, French translation and commentary), Paris


HASLAM, M.W. (1975): 'The Authenticity of Euripides' *Phoenissae* 1-2 and Sophocles' *Electra* 1' *GRBS* 16, 149-174


HEINIMANN, F. (1945): *Nomos und Physis* (reprinted in 1965), Basel


HELM, R. (1906): *Lucian und Menipp*, Leipzig and Berlin

HEMELRIJK, J. (1925): *Penia en Ploutos*, Amsterdam


HENSE, O. (1916): 'Ioannes Stobaios' *RE* IX, 2, pp. 2549-2586, Stuttgart


HOLLEY, N.M. (1949): 'The Floating Chest' *JHS* 69, 39-47


253


HOWE, T.P. (1953): 'Illustrations to Aeschylus' Tetralogy on the Perseus' Theme' *AJA* 57, 269-275


____________________ (1986): ‘Kinship Patterns in the Athenian Courts’ *GRBS* 27, 57-91

____________________ (1989): ‘Family Quarrels’ *JHS* 109, 182-185


254

_______ (1997): 'Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps-Hyginus? Part II' *APF* 43, 11-30

_______ (1997): 'Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of Apollodoros' *Bibliotheca*? *Rhm* 140, 308-327

ICARD-GIANOLIO, N. and SZABADOS, A.V. (1992): 'Nereides', *LIMC* VI, 1, pp. 785-824, Munich and Zurich


_______ (1979): 'The *Aiolos* of Euripides' *GB* 8, 101-118


_______ (1893): *Sophocles. The Oedipus Tyrannus* (edited with translation and commentary) Cambridge

_______ (1894): *Sophocles. The Electra* (edited with translation and commentary), Cambridge

_______ (1900): *Sophocles. The Antigone* (edited with translation and commentary)

Cambridge

_______ (1900): *Sophocles. The Oedipus Coloneus* (edited with translation and commentary) Cambridge


JOHANN, H.T. (1968): Trauer und Trost, Munich


JOUAN, F. (1966): Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens, Paris

__________ (1984): ‘Euripide et la Rhétorique’ LEC 52, 3-13


KAIBEL, G. (1895): ‘Sententiarum liber septimus.’ Hermes 30, 429-46

KAMBITSIS, J. (1972): L’ Antiope d’ Euripide (edited with introduction and commentary) Athens


__________ (1953): The Plays of Sophocles: The Ajax (edited with a commentary) Leiden

__________ (1959): The Plays of Sophocles: The Trachiniae (edited with a commentary) Leiden


_____________ (1992): ‘Die Hypothesis zu Euripides *Danae*’ ZPE 90, 33-34


KASSEL, R. (1954): *Quomodo quibus locis apud veteres scriptores Graecos infantes atque parvuli pueri inducantur, describantur, commemorentur*, Meisenheim

_____________ (1958): *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*. Munich


KATSOURIS, A. (1975): *Tragic Patterns in Menander*, Athens


257
Körte, A. (1922): 'Kratinos' RE XI 2, col. 1647-1654, Stuttgart
__________ (1929): 'XAPAKTHP' Hermes 64, 69-86
__________ (1932): 'Zum griechischen Drama: ein überschienes Fragment des Euripides?' Hermes 67, 367-368
__________ (1933): 'Zwei Kolumnen eines Aischylos-Papyrus' Hermes 68, 249-275
Krause, J. (1976): ἈΛΛΟΤΕ ἈΛΛΟΣ. Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schicksalswechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides, Munich
__________ and Geth, B. (1903): Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, Hannover

258


LAKS, A. (1983): *Diogène d' Apollonie* (translated with a commentary), Lille


_________ (1997): *Euripides' Ion* (translated with a commentary), Warminster


LEO, F. (1960): *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*. (ed. by E. Fraenkel), Rome


_________ (1972): *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, Göttingen

_________ (1976): *Vom Eros der Hellenen*, Göttingen


LLOYD, M. (1984): ‘The Helen scene in Euripides’ Troades’ CQ n.s. 34, 303-313
       (1992): The Agon in Euripides, Oxford
LUCAS, F.L. (1923): Euripides and his Influence, London
LUCE, J.V. (1975): Homer and the Heroic Age, London
       (1982): ‘Die Hypothesis zu Euripides Alkestis und Aiolos’ Philologus 126, 10-18
       (1986): ‘Zur Alexandros-Hypothesis (P.Oxy. 3650) ZPE 63, 7-10
       (1993): ‘Nochmals zur Danae Hypothesis’ ZPE 95, 65-69
LURIA, S. (1929): ‘Noch Einmal über Antiphon in Euripides Alexandros’ Hermes 64, 491-497
MacDONALD, M. (1978): Terms for Happiness in Euripides, Göttingen
       (1982): Gorgias’ Encomium of Helen (edited with Introduction and Commentary), Bristol


MACKIE, C.J. (1991): 'Turnus and his ancestors' *CQ* n.s. 41, 261-265


MAEHLER, M. (1968): ‘Notes on Theon’s Hypomnema to Pindar’s *Pythians* (*P.Oxy. 2536*)’ *ZPE* 3, 100


___________ (1986): 'Danae', *LIMC* III, 1, pp. 325-337, Zurich and Munich


MARMORALE, E. (1950): *Naevius poeta* (introduction, text and commentary), Florence


mastronarde, d.j. (1979): *Contact and Discontinuity. Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London

___________ (1994): *Euripides’ Phoenissae* (edited with introduction and commentary), Cambridge


__________ (1843): ‘Marginalien’ *ZfA* 1, 185-190, 289-296

__________ (1867): *Analecta Critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, Berlin


METTE, H.J. (1963): *Der verlorene Aischylus*, Berlin


MONTENEGRO DUQUE, A. (1949): *La onomastica de Virgilio y la antigüedad pretilica*, Salamanca

MOORHOUSE, A.C. (1965): ‘A Use of *OYAEIΣ* and *MHAELΣ*’ *CQ* n.s.15, 31-40


NAVARRE, O. (1900): Essai sur la rhétorique grecque avant Aristote, Paris


NICOLSON, H. (1951): ‘Nature in Greek Poetry’ PCA 48, 7-21


__________ (1940): Greek Popular Religion, New York

__________ (1962²): Die Entstehung und Religiöse Bedeutung des Griechischen Kalenders, Lund

__________ (1967³): Geschichte der griechischen Religion, Vols I-II, Munich


NORWOOD, G. (1931): Greek Comedy, London


OCHS, D.J. (1993): Consolatory Rhetoric. Grief, Symbol, and Ritual in the Greco-Roman Era, South Carolina


__________ (2002): Aristophanes’ Acharnians (edited with a commentary) Oxford

263


PAGE, D.L. (1934): *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford

_________ (1938): *Euripides' Medea* (edited with a commentary), Oxford

_________ (1959): *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Berkeley and Los Angeles


PAPAGEORGIUS, P.N. (1888): *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias vetera*, Leipzig

PARATORE, E. (1957): *Storia del Teatro Latino*, Milan

_________ (1962): 'Sulla leggenda di Turno' *RCCM* 4, 92-97


PARRY, A. (1957): 'Landscape in Greek Poetry' *YCIS* 15, 3-29


POSITANO M.L. (1960): Ioannis Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem, Commentarium in Plutum, Groningen

POWELL, I.U. (1925): Collectanea Alexandrina, Oxford


RABE, H. (1892): 'Lexicon Messanense de iota adscripto' RhM 47, 404-413

________ (1896): Anonymi in Artem Rhetoricam Commentaria, Berlin

265
________ (2002): The Play of Space: Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy, Princeton and Oxford
RIBBECK, O. (1875): Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik. Leipzig
RICHARDSON, B.E. (1933): Old Age among the Ancient Greeks, Baltimore
RICHTER, G.M.A. (1959): Greek Portraits II: To What Extent were they Faithful Likenesses? Brussels
RICHTSTEIG, E. and FÖRSTER, R. (1929): Choricii Gazaei Opera, Leipzig
RICKERT, G.A. (1989): EKQN and AKQN in Early Greek Thought, Atlanta
RIVIER, A. (1975a): Essai sur le Tragique d' Euripide, Paris

266

ROBERT, C. (1873): De Apollodori Bibliotheca, Diss. Berlin

_______ (1887): 'Beiträge zur Erklärung des pergamenischen Telephos-Frieses' JB Deut. Arch. Inst. 2, 244-259


ROSE, H.J. (1930): Modern Methods in Classical Mythology, St Andrews

_______ (1934): Hygini Fabulae, Leiden

_______ (1957): 'The Religion of a Greek Household' Euphr. 1, 95-116

RUBINSTEIN, L. (1993): Adoption in IVth Century Athens, Copenhagen

RUDHARDT, J. (1971): Le thème de l'eau primordiale dans la mythologie grecque, Freiburg

RUSTEN, J. (1982): 'Dicaearchus and the Tales from Euripides' GRBS 23, 357-367


SBORDONE, F. (1957): 'Filodemo contro Eracleodoro nel Papiro Ercolanese 1676' RAAN 32, 173-180


_______ (1977): 'Eufonia e synthesis nella Poetica di Filodemo' MPhL 2, 255-282


SCHENKEVELD, D.M. (1968): 'Οι Κρικοί in Philodemus' Mnemosyne 21, 176-214

SCHLESINGER, A.C. (1937): 'Two Notes on Euripides' CPh 32, 67-70


SCHMIDT, F.W. (1874): Satura Critica, Neu-Strelitz


SCHMITT, J. (1921): *Freiwilliger Opfertod bei Euripides*, Giessen


SCHRÖDER, O. (1900): *Pindari Carmina*. Leipzig


__________ (1990b): ‘The Imprisonment of Women in Greek Tragedy’ *JHS* 110, 76-90


__________ (1970): ‘Shame and Purity in Euripides’ *Hippolytus* *Hermes* 98, 278-299


SHEPPARD, J.T. (1920): *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles* (translated with a commentary), Cambridge


SMYTH, H. W. (1921): ‘The Commentary on Aeschylus’ *Prometheus* in the Codex Neapolitanus’ *HSCP* 32 (1921) 1-98

SNELL, B. (1964): *Pindarus. Pars II (Fragmenta)* Stuttgart


---------- (1983): *Aristophanes’ Wasps* (translated with a commentary), Warminster

---------- (1996): *Aristophanes’ Frogs* (translated with a commentary), Warminster

---------- (2001): *Aristophanes’ Wealth* (translated with a commentary), Warminster


---------- (1971): *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, Munich


STEVENS, E. B. (1948): ‘Envy and Pity in Greek Philosophy’ *AJPh* 69, 171-189


---------- (1976): *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*, Wiesbaden


STROHM, H. (1957): *Euripides. Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form*, Munich


TOD, M.N. (1957): ‘Sidelights on Greek Philosophers’ *JHS* 77, 132-141


TRENDAU, A.D. (1990): ‘On the Divergence of South-Italian from Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painting’ in J.P. Descoedres (ed.), *Greek Colonies and Native Populations*, pp.217-230, Oxford

270


TURYN, A. (1952): *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles*, Urbana


__________ (1990): *Sophocles' Philoctetes* (translated with a commentary), Warminster

VALCKENAER, L.C. (1767): *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*, Leiden

________________ (1768): *Euripidis Tragoedia Hippolytus*, Leiden


________________ (1878): 'Novae lectiones euripideae' *RPh* 2, 19-57

271
VAN LEEUWEN, J.F. (1919): Menandri fabularum reliquiae (introduction, text and notes), Leiden

VAN LOOY, H. (1964): Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides, Brussels

___________ (1976): ‘Apollonis, Reine de Pergame’ Anc. Soc. 7, 151-165


VIANSINO, G. (1963): Paolo Silenzario (text, Italian translation and commentary) Turin


VON ARNIM, H. J. (1903): Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, Leipzig

___________ (1913): Supplementum Euripideum, Bonn

VONDELING, J. (1961): Eranos, Groningen


WAGNER, F. (1844): Euripidis Fragmenta, Paris


WALCOT, P. (1976): Greek Drama in its Theatrical and Social Context, Cardiff

__________ (1978): Envy and the Greeks, Warminster


WANSINK, H.J. (1895): *De Scholiis in Sophoclis Tragoedias veteribus a P.N. Papageorgius editis*, Leiden


WEBSTER, T.B.L. (1950): ‘Review of Brommer *Satyrspiele’*, *JHS* 70, 85-86

________________ (1953): *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester

________________ (19603): *Studies in Menander*, Manchester


________________ (1969³): *An Introduction to Sophocles*, London


WECKLEIN, N. (1878): ‘Über fragmentarisch erhaltene Tragödien des Euripides’ *SBAW* München 1, 87-139

________________ (1893): ‘Studien zu den Hikutiden des Aeschylos.’ *SBAW* München, 393-450


________________ (1935): *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*, Berlin


________________ (1973): *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart


________________ (1990): *Aeschyl Tragoediae*, Stuttgart

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. von (1875): Analecta Euripidea, Berlin
____________________________________________(1879): ‘Parerga’ Hermes 14, 161-186


_________ (1993): Euripides’ Heraclidae (edited with a commentary), Oxford
_________ (2000): The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy, Oxford

_______ (1961): ‘Tyndareus in the Orestes’ SO 37, 96-99


WILSON, J. (1968): ‘The etymology in Euripides’ Troades.’ AJPh 89, 60-71


_________ (1997): ‘Echoes of earlier Drama in Sositheus and Lycophron’ AC 66, 121-144


274


ZIEBARTH, E. (1913): Aus der Antiken Schule, Bonn

ZIELINSKI, T. (1925): Tragodumenon Libri Tres, Cracow

ZUNTZ, G. (1955): The Political Plays of Euripides, Manchester

_________ (1965): An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides, Cambridge