

EURIPIDES, *PHOENISSAE* 64f.*

Προλογίζει ἡ Ἰοκάστη. She has told the story of Oedipus up to the point when their sons lock him up in the house (63–8):¹

ἐπεὶ δὲ τέκνων γένος ἐμῶν σκιάζεται,
κλήθροισι ἔκρυψαν πατέρ', ἵν' ἀμνήμων τύχη
γένοιτο πολλῶν δεομένη σοφισμάτων. 65
ζῶν δ' ἔσται ἐν οἴκοις, πρὸς δὲ τῆς τύχης νοσῶν
ἀρὰς ἀράται παῖσιν ἀνοσιωτάτας,
θηκτῷ σιδήρῳ δάμα διαλαχεῖν τόδε.

These lines present various difficulties. Elsewhere, ἀμνήμων seems to be found only in the active sense 'unmindful, forgetful' (LSJ I.1). For the passive meaning 'forgotten, not mentioned', LSJ quote no other example (I.2). If ἀμνήμων were here to be taken in the active sense, one would have to translate: 'that τύχη might become forgetful'. Perhaps ἀμνήμων γίγνομαι could in this case also be regarded as equivalent to ἀμνημονέω, and could, thus, govern the participle δεομένη: 'that τύχη might forget that it needed many a σοφισμα'. Either way, it is hard to see what this would mean (even if one were to push τύχη into the direction of 'the unhappy one'—i.e. Oedipus—in his misfortune'). On the other hand, it seems natural enough to admit that these verbal adjectives are, strictly speaking, neither 'active' nor 'passive', and that their exact meaning depends on the closer context.² The simplex μνήμων is normally active—as one might expect, if this formation is in origin (like ἡγεμών) a *nomen agentis*.³ On the other hand, adjectives of this type are closely associated with verbal nouns in -μα.⁴ In this case, ἀμνήμων would mean 'having no μνήμα', which could refer to 'remembering' or 'being remembered'. The correct rendering of ἀμνήμων would then be 'without memory', and τύχη would here be called 'without memory', because the sons of Oedipus hope that their father's fate will not be remembered. This is how the line is generally understood.⁵

However, one should not seek to determine the meaning of ἀμνήμων without addressing the main difficulty of this passage. The phrase πολλῶν δεομένη σοφισμάτων is curiously vague and imprecise. What are these σοφίσματα? What is

* I am grateful to Professors J. Diggle, R. Kannicht, R. G. M. Nisbet, and P. J. Parsons for valuable advice. I am also indebted to the comments of an anonymous referee.

¹ Quotations are from the Teubner edition of the *Phoenissae* by D. Mastronarde (Leipzig, 1988). See also his commentary (Cambridge, 1994).

² This phenomenon is well documented for the adjectives in -τος: see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 12 and 238 (with literature); Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 677–9; Collard on Eur. *Suppl.* 80b–2; cf. the notes on the passages listed by Chr. Collard, *Composite Index to the 'Clarendon' Commentaries on Euripides 1938–71* (Groningen, 1981), 24 ('III: Language') s.v. Adjective, verbal, both 'act.' and 'pass.' (*Alc.* 173, *El.* 1046, *Ion* 701, *I.T.* 1418–19, 1476, *Med.* 109, 212).

³ Euripides does not use the simplex. See E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (Berlin, New York, 2nd ed., 1974), 51f. Cf. also P. Chantraine, *La Formation des Noms en Grec Ancien* (*Collection Linguistique* 38, Paris, 1933), 171f., who paraphrases μνήμων 'qui se souvient' (172).

⁴ Mastronarde on 64 compares ἀπήμων (act. and pass.), and ἀπράγμων (only pass.). See Risch (n. 3) 52f. Cf. ἀσήμων at Soph. *O.C.* 1668 (*hapax* with gen. obj.; I owe this reference to Professor Parsons).

⁵ Schol. 64 ἵνα ἡ τύχη λήθῃ παραδοθείη (I. 258, 25 Schwartz); cp. W. Dindorf (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis Tragoedias III: Scholia in Phoenissas* (Oxford, 1863), 55, 6 on 63; 55, 9–11 on 63; 55, 16–19 on 63; 56, 11f. on 67. F. A. Paley (ed.), *Euripides, with an English Commentary*, Vol. III (London, 2nd ed., 1880), 122 on 64. Cf. A. C. Pearson (ed.), *Euripides. The Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1909), 80 on 64. Note also Platnauer on Eur. *I.T.* 1418–19.

their purpose? And at whom are they directed—who is meant to forget? In the scholia, one reads two alternative explanations. The scholion on 64 runs: ἵνα ἡ τύχη λήθῃ παραδοθείη καίπερ δυσαπόνητος οὐσα καὶ πολλῆς δεομένη μηχανῆς εἰς τὸ λαθεῖν (I. 258, 25f. Schwartz). The scholion on 65 first repeats this interpretation, and then proceeds to offer an alternative solution: ἤτοι πολλῆς δεομένη μηχανῆς πρὸς τὸ λαθεῖν, ἢ πολλῶν παραινέσεων καὶ πολλῆς παραμυθίας δεομένη διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ πάθους (I. 258, 27 – 259, 2 Schwartz). The first of these explanations—μηχανὴ εἰς τὸ λαθεῖν—is generally accepted,⁶ but different views have been advanced.⁷ Furthermore, the second option proposed in the scholia—that the *κοφίσματα* are not intended to bring about public oblivion, but are concerned, as a *παραμυθία* διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ πάθους, with Oedipus' own peace of mind—cannot be refuted out of hand. It is arguable that Oedipus' attempts to forget played some role in the *Cyclic Thebaid*. There, Oedipus cursed his sons because Polyneices had disobeyed his orders and set before him the cup of Laius—ἐλύπησε γὰρ ὡς ἔοικε τὸν γέροντα οὐ μόνον ἢ τῶν τέκνων παρακοή, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἀνάμνησις τοῦ πατρικοῦ φόνου, comments Eustathius.⁸ And yet, would imprisonment be a natural course of action to keep Oedipus from brooding over his fate? Would *κοφίσματα* alone be intelligible for 'tricking Oedipus into comfort'? Would the wording not require a context that could give it this special force? Thus, one could argue oneself into subscribing to the *opinio communis*—but whatever version may be accepted, *μηχανὴ εἰς τὸ λαθεῖν* or *παραμυθία* διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ πάθους, a lot has to be read into the *κοφίσματα*. The reader is left to infer the precise nature and specific relevance of the 'tricks'.

Either way, the main problem remains. The phrase is unclear and comes strangely unexpected. For what is the exact logical force of the participle? If the preceding line states, as it appears to do, that in shutting away their father it was the sons' intention to let his *τύχη* fall into oblivion, one feels that the participle, in providing the crucial qualification of this *τύχη*, should somehow relate to their action, or reflect upon it, and perhaps explain why that *τύχη* is to be forgotten. One would assume that it

⁶ Mastronarde on 65: 'requiring many clever shifts to be forgotten' (quoting Heliod. 4. 6. 26 for the ellipse of sense). Paley (n. 5) 122 on 64: 'The sense is, "that his fate might pass out of memory, requiring as it did many devices (for its concealment)"'. J. U. Powell (ed.), *The Phoenissae of Euripides* (London, 1911), 151 on 64: 'κοφισμάτων "devices to conceal it"'. Chr. Mueller-Goldingen, *Untersuchungen zu den Phönissen des Euripides (Palingenesia 22, Wiesbaden-Stuttgart, 1985)*, 47: 'Es bedurfte vieler Kniffe, um dieses Schicksal in Vergessenheit geraten zu lassen.' E. Craik (ed.), *Euripides. Phoenician Women* (Warminster, 1988), 65 translates: '... they hid their father with barred doors, so that his fortune should be unmentioned, despite needing many devices to conceal it.' Cf. also the translation by H. Grotius (quoted from L. C. Valckenaer's edition of the *Phoenissae*, 1755): iam barba postquam filios pinxit meos, / patrem coercent carcere, ut sortem tegant, / quae ne patescat artibus multis eget. / domi ille vivit, atque fortunae ad mala / diras tremendas in genus cumulat suum, / ut sanguinante dividant ferro domum. The referee points to *Bacchae* 30, where 'Cadmus' supposed attempt to disguise a human rape as a divine one is termed a *κόφισμα*.

⁷ Cf., e.g., N. Wecklein (ed.), *Euripidis Phoenissae* (Leipzig, 2nd ed., 1881), 22 on 65: "Quae multis indiget artibus ad excusandum" i.e. quae aegre excusari potest. Scilicet purgat mater filios"; N. Wecklein (ed.), *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides V: Phönissen* (Leipzig, 1894), 35 on 64f: 'schwer zu beschönigen' (E. Fraenkel in the margin of his copy, kept in the Ashmolean Library: 'Nein: "schwer zu verheimlichen"'). The referee: "'so that O.'s *τύχη* might become forgotten because it needed a good deal of cleverness (to explain it) or (to handle its consequences)'" (comparing 472; 871; 1259).

⁸ *Cycl. Theb.* fr.2 Bernabé or Davies (Eustathius is quoted *ad l.*). As ὡς ἔοικε shows, this is Eustathius' own interpretation of the fragment. Welcker and Bethe thought that he was right (E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder. Untersuchungen über die Epen des thebanisch-argivischen Sagenkreises* [Leipzig, 1891], 103 with note 40). Cf. below, n. 13, on Oedipus' curse(s).

should clarify in what circumstances and under which conditions the sons decided on their way of action—not what they met with as a result of this decision (which would be expressed far more naturally in a relative clause, if not in an independent main clause). The most satisfactory paraphrase is perhaps the following: ‘the sons locked up their father that a *τύχη* might be forgotten which would require many a *κόφισμα* (if they were to succeed)’. *πολλῶν* would stand in pointed opposition to the one *κόφισμα* of imprisoning their father, stressing the futility of their attempt.⁹ This, however, is not the point to which Iocasta is building up. She is not concerned with the possible inefficiency of their measure, but with the terrible truth that, although he may be forgotten, Oedipus is still very much alive, hurling curses against his sons and thus bringing about yet another disaster. Or could one argue that Iocasta tries to defend her sons? ‘Yes, they confined their father—but only under dire necessity.’ As the experimental paraphrase shows, the stress on *πολλὰ κοφίσματα* does not quite suit this approach, and a qualifying attribute—e.g. *δεινῶν*—would have brought out the justificatory tendency of the argument far more forcefully.

There is one further point that will prove relevant. Oedipus curses his sons *πρὸς ... τῆς τύχης νοσῶν*. Pearson (n. 5, on 66) comments: ‘It is not easy to determine whether these words mean (1) “though suffering at the hands of fortune”,¹⁰ or (2) “distracted in consequence of his ill fortune”’.¹¹ The concessive notion of (1) seems hard to pick up, and since the causal use of *πρὸς c. gen.* is well attested (LSJ A.II.2), (2) will be at once the easier and the safer course. But what exactly does *τύχη* here refer to? Why does Oedipus curse his sons? Is it just because of his bad luck in general (schol. 66: *ἀντὶ τοῦ κάμνων ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης*. I. 259, 3 Schwartz)? That is hardly satisfactory. The definite article makes one suspect that Oedipus’ reason for cursing his sons is more specific, that *πρὸς τῆς τύχης* refers, not just to ‘his’ fate in general, but to ‘that’ disgrace just mentioned: the imprisonment he suffers at the hands of his

⁹ Cf. Mastronarde on 65. The same effect is achieved by J. Geelius (ed.), *Euripidis Phoenissae* (Leiden, 1846), who conjectures *δεόμενοι* (85f *ad l.*; attributed to ‘Zakas 1891’ by Mastronarde in his *appendix coniecturarum*, 128): ‘Suspisor duplicem Scholiastae interpretationem admitti non posse, sed corrigendum esse *δεόμενοι*. Ipsa oclusio Oedipi erat *κόφισμα*. Potuerunt sane reliqua *κοφίσματα* in Cyclica Thebaide commemorari, ut Poeta eo respicere videatur; sed *δεομένη* refertur ad *τύχη*, ut 475. *ὁ δ’ ἄδικος λόγος—φαρμάκων δέεται σοφῶν*, non ad praedicatum *ἀμνήμων*: itaque sententia non accurate enuntiata est: substituto *δεόμενοι*, interpretor: *patrem occultum tenuerunt, multos modos excogitantes, quibus calamitatem eius ab hominum notitia removerent*. Sed urgere hoc nolim.’ The final clause can hardly depend on the participle, and to read the *πολλὰ κοφίσματα* as a reference to the *Thebaid* seems as arbitrary (or desperate) as C. Robert’s Callimachean verismo (*Oidipus. Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes im griechischen Altertum* [Berlin, 1915], vol. I, p. 173): ‘Um den vielfachen Fragen nach dem Befinden und dem Aufenthalt ihres Vaters zu begegnen, haben Eteokles und Polyneikes den Thebanern gegenüber viele Ausreden nötig’ (cf. Call. h. 6. 72–86).

¹⁰ This is the view which Pearson adopts in the end. Cf. Wecklein 1881 (n.7), 22 on 66: ‘I.e. quamquam Fortuna ei causa malorum est, non filii qui includentes patrem necessitati paruerunt’ (cf. *ibid.* on 65); Wecklein 1894 (n. 7), 35 on 66ff.: ‘... obwohl die Schuld an seinem Wehe dem Schicksal zufiel, nicht den Söhnen’; schol. 67: *κατάρας χαλεπὰς καταράται τοῖς υἱοῖς μηδὲν ἀδικήσαν* (III.56, 9f. Dindorf).

¹¹ Cf. Mastronarde on 66. Paley (n. 5) 122 on 66: ‘While other writers, following the account in the Cyclic poems, made Oedipus curse his sons because he had been badly fed by them (*ἐπικότος τροφᾶς*, Aesch. *Theb.* 783), Euripides has here preferred to describe him simply as “maddened by his fortune”, or by the circumstances of his position.’ Craik (n. 6) translates ‘deranged from ill-fortune’ (65), but comments (172 on 66–8): ‘Iokaste glosses over ... the reason for Oidipous’ curse on his sons, blaming neither him nor them’ (cp. *ibid.* on 64–5). On the contrary, she clearly condemns Oedipus’ curses as *ἀνοσιωπάτα*, nor is there any trace of her palliating her sons’ deed.

sons¹². Thus, Euripides would be in broad agreement with the poetic tradition in that here as elsewhere Oedipus would curse his sons for a specific offence.¹³ (The nexus is mentioned later in the play, 874–7,¹⁴ but since the whole passage 869–80 is under suspicion,¹⁵ no argument can be built on it.)

The reason why this possibility is rarely considered is presumably that *τύχη* in 64 and *πρὸς δὲ τῆς τύχης νοσῶν* in 66 stand in close proximity. That is not in itself objectionable,¹⁶ but the close vicinity of two instances of the same word makes it difficult to dissociate the one from the other. *τύχη* in 64 appears to refer to Oedipus' fate in general; the same is then inferred for the instance in 66. Again, there is a problem, and again, it seems to hinge on 64f.

The 'rhetorical surface' of the passage is strangely vague and blurred. Verse 65 is particularly obscure—although the difficulty of this turgid phrase lies less in its grammatical structure than in its general pointlessness and lack of reference. None of these objections on its own would be sufficient to impugn the authenticity of any of these lines. It is the cumulation of oddities that raises one's suspicion. Verse 65 looks highly suspect—get rid of it and see what happens.¹⁷

ἐπεὶ δὲ τέκνων γένος ἐμῶν κιάζεται, κλήθροισι ἐκρυψαν πατέρ', ἵν' ἀμνήμων τύχη·	64
ζῶν δ' ἔστ' ἐν οἴκοις, πρὸς δὲ τῆς τύχης νοσῶν	66
ἀράς ἀράται παισὶν ἀνοσιωτάτας, θηκτῷ κιδήρῳ δῶμα διαλαχεῖν τόδε.	

ΤΥΧΗ in 64 turns out to be a verb, and at once, everything falls into place. The sons imprison their father that he may be forgotten—but he is yet alive, and has cursed them for their offence. Verse 64 on its own is perfectly straightforward: the subject of the final clause is now Oedipus, and *ἐκρυψαν* makes it clear that the sons intend

¹² Thus Mastronarde on 66: '*τύχη* = specifically "what had just happened to him"'. Robert (n. 9) I.177 on 66f.: 'Hier wird also als das Motiv seines Zornes und seiner Gemütsstörung schon die bloße Gefangenhaltung hingestellt.' Cf. schol. 66: *παρὰ δὲ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος κακοῦ, ἡγουν τῆς καθείρξεως, νοσῶν, ἡγουν μικροψυχῶν* (III.55,26–56,1 Dindorf; cf. 56,10–4 on 67).

¹³ See Bethe (n. 8) 102–6; Robert (n. 9) I.67. 109. 169–80. 263f. 353f. 466–71; G. O. Hutchinson (ed.), *Aeschylus. Septem contra Thebas* (Oxford, 1985), xxvf. Cf. fr.2 and 3 of the *Cyclic Thebaid* (literature in Bernabé *ad l.*); TrGF adesp. 346b, and 458.

¹⁴ Teiresias is speaking about Oedipus' sons: οὔτε γὰρ γέρα πατρὶ / οὔτ' ἔξοδον διδόντες, ἄνδρα δυστυχῇ / ἐξηγγρίωσαν ἐκ δ' ἔπνευσ' αὐτοῖς ἀράς / δεινάς, νοσῶν τε καὶ πρὸς ἡτιμασμένον.

¹⁵ 869–80 were deleted by E. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoinissen des Euripides* (SB München, 1963/1), 37–43. For a defence of the passage, see H. Diller's review of Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 36 (1964), 641–50, at 647, and H. Erbse, 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der Euripideischen Phoinissen', *Philologus* 110 (1966), 1–34, at 9–13. Cf. M. D. Reeve, 'Interpolation in Greek Tragedy I', *GRBS* 13 (1972), 247–65 (reviewing J. Baumert, *ENIOI AΘETOYΣIN* [Diss. Tübingen, 1968]); 'Interpolation in Greek Tragedy II', *GRBS* 13 (1972), 451–74 (against Erbse's article); 'Interpolation in Greek Tragedy III', *GRBS* 14 (1973), 145–71 (he does not discuss 869–80 in detail, but see pp. 458f. of the second article).

¹⁶ See J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), 220–2: 'Unconscious Repetitions by the Poet'; cf. 198f.; 223–7: 'Unconscious Repetitions by the Copyist'; D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), 122f.; cf. 127f.; 145.

¹⁷ Mastronarde notes in the *app. crit.* that 65 is omitted in Laurentianus 32.33 *ante correctionem*; but since it was added between the lines, this looks like a chance omission, not like independent testimony (see D. J. Mastronarde & J. M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai* [University of California Publications. Classical Studies 27, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1982], 194 on 65: 'versum om., deinde inter lineas add. RF'). Neither Wecklein, in the *app. crit.* or the *appendix coniecturas minus probabiles continens* of his edition (*Euripidis Fabulae*, R. Prinz & N. Wecklein [eds.], III.4, Leipzig, 1901), nor Mastronarde, in *app. crit.*, *appendix coniecturarum*, or *conspetus versuum suspectorum*, note any prior deletion of 65.

him—not to forget, but to be forgotten (if ἀμνήμων can mean this).¹⁸ τύχη adds a nice touch (lost in γένοιτο): the sons hope that their father will ‘happen to be forgotten, sink into oblivion’—casually and imperceptibly, accidentally and as if by chance, without any further incidents and public attention. Once 65 is gone, no neighbouring τύχη blurs the precision of 66 (the quasi-repetition is covered by Jackson’s and Page’s examples: see above, n. 16). And into the bargain, a dreary anticlimax¹⁹ turns into the splendid juxtaposition of ἴν’ ἀμνήμων τύχη and ζῶν δ’ ἔστ’ ἐν οἴκοις²⁰. The rhetoric of the passage is far more successful without 65. Forgotten Oedipus may be—but he is still alive. The prologue-speech as a whole builds up to this surprise.

The interpolated line may derive from a gloss which was added to the text and elaborated into a complete trimeter.²¹ In the present case, γένοιτο could be a gloss on τύχη, designed to draw attention to the slightly uncommon construction (see above, n. 18) and to prevent confusion with the noun (which would be a great danger anyway, and is so all the more for the lack of a participle).²² The gloss (meaning ‘i.e. γένοιτο’) would be mistaken for an addition (‘scil. γένοιτο’), thus becoming the cause of the error which it was designed to avoid—the confusion of τύχη and τύχη.

However, whether 65 came into being with or without a γλώσσα πρόδρομος may remain open. Either way, the origin of the interpolation is not difficult to explain. ΤΥΧΗΙ was mistaken for the noun, and consequently, a line was added to complete the sentence by supplying a predicate.²³ At the beginning of a line, γένοιτο would be

¹⁸ Still, this use of ἀμνήμων remains difficult. For the omission of ὦν etc. with τυγχάνω, see LSJ A.II.2.a; Kühner-Gerth II.67c; Schwyzler-Debrunner 392.6; E. Bruhn, Anhang zu: *Sophokles*, F. W. Schneidewin & A. Nauck (eds.), *Achtes Bändchen* (Berlin, 1899), 74: ‘§134. τυγχάνω mit zu ergänzendem ὦν’.

¹⁹ H. v. Herwerden, ‘Novae curae Euripidae’, *Mnemosyne* 31 (1903), 261–94, at 286: ‘Quia misere abundant verba ζῶν δ’ ἔστ’ ἐν οἴκοις, ambigo utrum deleto toto hoc versu in sequenti legam ἀρὰς <δ> ἀράται, an sic refingam: ζέων δὲ θυμῷ πρὸς τε τῆς τύχης νοσῶν κτέ.’

²⁰ Note how carefully not only ἀμνήμων and ζῶν, but also τύχη and ἔστ(ι) balance each other.

²¹ As opposed to glosses that intrude into the text, ‘either in place of what they were meant to explain or in addition to it’ (M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* [Stuttgart, 1973], 22f.). See Fraenkel III.564 on Aesch. Ag. 1226 (with literature); cf. III.580.4 on 1256f. (‘expansion of an interjection to a trimeter’); Page (n. 16), 114 on Eur. I. A. 1416; M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 262; 173f. with Denniston-Page (*ad l.*) against the deletion of Aesch. Ag. 7 (cf. Fraenkel II.9 *ad l.*). Cf. R. J. Tarrant, ‘Toward a Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry’, *TAPhA* 117 (1987), 281–98, at 290f. (‘gloss elaborated into a metrically appropriate insertion’; I owe this reference to Professor Nisbet); A. E. Housman (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae* (Cambridge, 2nd ed., 1931), xxxiii; xxxvf. This casts a shadow of doubt on many lines beginning with enjambement: Page (n. 16) 56f. (cf. also Eur. Or. 695. 716); G. Jachmann, *Binneninterpolation*. II. Teil, *NGG* 1/9 (1936), 185–215, at 200–202 (cp. 194–8) = *Textgeschichtliche Studien*, Chr. Gnllka (ed.), (*Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 143, Königstein/Ts., 1982), 550–80, at 565–7 (cf. 559–63), on proper names. The dating of this category remains uncertain; see U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (ed.), *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Berlin, 1914), xxviii: ‘quae interpolationes utrum iam in archetypo fuerint, an Byzantii demum confictae, diiudicare non audeo.’

²² Would γένοιτο not presuppose τύχοι? τύχη and τύχοι are both possible (and are confused at Archil. fr. 178 W.), but τύχη seems preferable, because—with or without iotacism—its confusion with τύχη is slightly easier. Cf. F. Johnson, *De coniunctivi et optativi usu Euripidee in enuntiatis finalibus et conditionalibus* (Diss. Berlin, 1893; I owe this reference to Professor Diggle). The optative γένοιτο was perhaps chosen to stress the force of the mood. Geelius (n. 9) 86 *ad l.* points out that the scholion on 64 presupposes the subjunctive: ἵνα μηδενὸς ὁράντοσ τῷ χρόνῳ ἀμνήμων ἢ συμφορὰ γένηται (III.55, 18f. Dindorf).

²³ This type of interpolation is well known: H.-Chr. Günther, ‘Textprobleme im Prolog der Aulischen Iphigenie des Euripides’, *WüJbb* N.F.13 (1987), 57–74, at 63, 34 (with literature on ‘Prädikatsergänzung’); Jachmann (n. 21) 189–92 = 554–7 (on interpolation following corruption); Tarrant (n. 21) 288f. (‘a mistaken impression of syntactical incompleteness has

the easiest verb, and the rest is padding (perhaps inspired by 472 or something like it).

Worcester College, Oxford

ARND KERKHECKER

prompted an unnecessary attempt at restoration'); R. G. M. Nisbet, *JRS* 52 (1962), 235 = *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1995), 23 (cf. 240 = *BICS* 51 [1988], 95) on Juv. 6. 568. See also U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin, 1875), 205–9, on ῥ- interpolations which make an implicit contrast explicit; cf. Page (n. 16) 51f. on Eur. *Or.* 51; Bond on Eur. *Her.* 452.

HIPPONICUS' TRAPEZA: HUMOUR IN ANDOCIDES 1.130–1

Andocides is generally not considered one of the best orators. To point up his flawed style, scholars have discussed a notoriously vindictive and humorous section in Andocides 1: in 124ff. Andocides describes the profligate lifestyle of his prosecutor, Callias III the Ceryx, the son of Hipponicus II and *dadouchos* of the Eleusinian Mysteries.¹

The oration, dated to c. 400, was delivered by Andocides after his return from his second period of exile. The speech was initially a defence against Callias' charge that Andocides profaned the Eleusinian Mysteries of 400, but Andocides also addressed in detail the old charge which implicated him in the Hermocopidae Affair and the profanation of the Mysteries in 415.² The following short discussion agrees that Andocides' slanderous response to Callias is humorous, and will point out several instances of humorous puns in sections 124–31. This discussion will argue that these sections do not necessarily diverge from the theme of sacrilege in Andocides 1³ and will then focus on 130–1, the passage in which Callias is described as a demon overturning a *τράπεζα* (table) in his father's household.

First it is necessary to summarize the context in which 1.130 appears. Sections 113ff. explain that Callias as priest of the Eleusinian rites charged that Andocides profanely placed a bough on the altar of Demeter and Kore. In response Andocides denies the charge and resorts to diatribe. Just as Callias was infatuated by the divine mother and daughter, so also Callias lived with a mother and her daughter, who were Chrysilla, the widow of Ischomachus, and the unnamed widow of Epilycus. This ménage à trois is then described in terms of two ambiguous verbs (124ff.) *συνοικέω* and *λαμβάνω*, which can connote either formal or informal unions. Callias is seen here as taking or living with both women in informal and unholy unions.⁴

The word play in 1.124ff. is within a decidedly religious context. Andocides informs us in 124ff. that Chrysilla became pregnant, Callias dismissed her from his house, and after the son was born disclaimed the infant as his own.⁵ Callias swore on the altar

¹ See, for example J. F. Dobson, *The Greek Orators* (Freeport, NY, 1969, 2nd ed.), p. 67; R. C. Jebb, *The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus* (New York, 1962), 1.106, where Jebb feels that this anecdote diverges from Andocides' argument, and 127 where Jebb states that sections 97ff. are 'a confused appendix'. For Callias III's ancestry: J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.*, (Oxford, 1971, henceforth *APF*), pp. 254ff.

² The fullest discussion of these events and of Andocides 1 is still D. M. MacDowell, *Andokides on the Mysteries* (Oxford, 1990), and esp. pp. 1–18.

³ A. Missiou, *The Subversive Oratory of Andokides* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 53 argues that superstition forms the basis of Andocides' argument.

⁴ For Callias' marriages: *APF* pp. 263–8. For the vagueness of the term *συνοικέω* see R. Just, *Women in Athenian Law and Life* (London and New York, 1989) pp. 43–4.

⁵ B. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Athens* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 196–7 argues that Andocides hopes to demonstrate how Callias was a bad son and, therefore, a bad citizen to his fatherland.