

Christopher Collard-Martin Cropp, *Euripides VII. Fragments. Aegaeus-Meleager*. Edited and Translated by Ch. C. and M. Cropp. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass. – London: Harvard University Press, 2008, pp. 688, ISBN 978-0674996250.

This is the first of two volumes of Euripidean fragments and the second volume, the last of the collection, has been recently published (*Euripides VIII. Oedipus-Chrysippus & Other Fragments*, 2010). There are now several editions of Euripides' fragments, that by R. Kannicht (2004) and again that by F. Jouan and H. van Looy in *Belles Lettres* (1979-2003). Thus we have here a third collection of the Euripidean fragments, for which the two volumes *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays I and II* for Aris & Philips Classical Texts (respectively 1995 and 2004)¹ can be considered the preliminary basis. This collection, edited according to the standards of the Loeb Classical Library and geared towards the wider audience of that series, joins the edition of Sophocles' fragments by H. Lloyd Jones (1996) in this very series and it is to be expected that it will enjoy similar success, the existence of other recent editions notwithstanding.

The study of fragmentary texts usually entails conspicuous interpretive problems and sometimes, in particular for those authors of whom complete works are also extant, may not be considered the primary focus of scholarly investigation; this may also depend on the lack of interpretive tools such as good editions or translations. Thanks to Pfeiffer's edition (1949-53), for example, Callimachus' fragments have enjoyed much more attention than that poet's *Hymns*; it is however only since G. Massimilla's edition (1996-2010) and G. B. D'Alessio's annotated translation (second, revised edition 2007) that this Hellenistic poet has been accessible to a wider audience. The same trend is surfacing in Euripidean studies as well and it should help bridge the interpretive gap between fragmentary and complete plays. Thus the volumes edited by Collard and Cropp are an important contribution and offer, beside the translations, short but effective introductions to each play that aid the readers to negotiating their way to reading and interpreting the fragments.

The introductory remarks to the single plays offer a bibliography, arranged in editions and studies, followed by a short discussion of the myth treated in the play, and a reconstruction of the plot with the assignment, if possible, of the fragments to the different scenes, an outline of the main interpretive issues, a list of fragments (often of doubtful attribution) not included in the edition, the chronology and the play's *Fortleben*.

The authors explicitly underline² their debt to previous editions but the attentive reader soon perceives the original contribution of this book. Of course,

¹ The first with Lee, the second with Gibert.

² P. ix.

as should be expected in this series, fragments are usually edited without *apparatus* or references to the *testimonia* and the text is based on previous editions (Kannicht's numbering is kept throughout), yet there are also new contributions of particular relevance to the interpretation of single fragments or more general questions. I shall discuss the most compelling of these in the pages that follow.

In the case of Euripides' *Antigone* and *Antiope* the attribution of fragments quoted in ancient sources may sometimes be doubtful due to the similar titles of the two plays. One vexed question involves *POxy* 3317, re-edited, after Hughes, by W. Luppe ('Das neue Euripides-Fragment *P.Oxy* 3317', *ZPE* 42, 1982, 27-30): a woman depicted as a *baccha* nobly faces her death. Stobaeus quotes lines 14-5 as from the *Antigone* and Hughes, in the *editio princeps*, has tried to place the fragment within the play comparing the last lines of the *Phoenissae* (1754-5), where Oedipus invites Antigone to cease from her grief by joining Bacchic rites and dance on mount Cithaeron. The placement of *POxy* 3317 within the *Antigone* is therefore quite uncertain; the closing lines of the *Phoenissae* would have to be an allusion or a quotation from the other play, or even an anticipation of a not yet composed and staged play (the date of the *Antigone* falls between 416 and 409 or, according to Cropp and Fick, between 420 and 406). Besides, Webster was right in pointing out that the Antigone of the namesake tragedy is far different from the character in the *Phoenissae*; the incompatibility between the two Antigones would be even more startling than that between the two *Helens*, staged in 412 and 408³. In 1982 Luppe challenged Hughes' attribution by identifying the female character in the papyrus with Dirce, stepmother of Amphion and Zetes, who persecutes Antiope and appears as a *baccha* at the end of the tragedy that bears Antiope's name (cf. test. iii a *TrGF*). In fact, according to Luppe this is the only Euripidean tragedy where a similar scene is attested. Yet there is no hesitation in attributing the fragment to the *Antigone* by either Kannicht or Jouan-van Looy, where, after lengthy discussion, their choice is due mainly to an *argumentum ex silentio*: our scanty knowledge of the *Antigone*, in their view, cannot rule out a scene where Antigone appears in Bacchic garments⁴. This view seems debatable, at the very least, as there is no evidence for such a scene either in the extant fragments or in the play's *hypothesis* (test. ii a *TrGF*). The very fact that the speaking character stresses her high social status—she is free, her interlocutor is slave (v. 10)—actually argues against the identification with Antigone and Creon; much more plausible is that they are the queen of Thebes, Dirce, wife of Lycus (an usurpator and enemy of Heracles), and Amphion, not free since raised by a shepherd. Not really helpful, though the subject of much critical debate⁵, is the reference at line 11 to 'Heracles' royal pal-

³ *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London 1967, 181.

⁴ For the *Antigone*'s plot cf. L. Inglese, "Antigone di Euripide: la trama e l'occasione", *RCCM* 34, 1992, 175-90. Actually Hyg. *fab.* 72 seems not to be relevant to euripidean tragedy cf. Inglese, "Antigone di Euripide", 178.

⁵ Inglese, "Antigone di Euripide", 175-90; R. Scodel, "P. Oxy 3317 Euripides' *Antigone*", *ZPE* 46, 1982, 37-42.

ace', which apparently just points to Thebes' royal palace⁶. As to the more problematic line 9, Luppe first suggested e.g. σαφές τὸ] μέλλον· συνθανεῖν πρέ[πει ο πρέ[πον; on a second occasion, declining Kannicht's implausible integration σύνες τὸ] μέλλον· συνθανεῖν πρέ[πει γ' εμοί⁷, he has refined his suggestion to σαφές τὸ] μέλλον· συνθανεῖν πρέ[πει φίλοις ('συνθανεῖν πρέπει zu 3317', *ZPE* 102, 1994, 40-2). *Habent sua fata verba!* Curiously, what is nothing more than a conjecture has become a sort of indirect proof of the attribution to the *Antigone*. The φίλοι restored by Luppe have been identified with Antigone's brothers, thus the female character must be Antigone⁸.

Reasoning is flawed, demonstration is groundless. V. 9 deals with an event about to take place (τὸ] μέλλον) and with the necessity of dying with someone or something (συνθανεῖν). This implies the sharing of a common situation, but Eteocles and Polynices are already dead and it is not possible to think of Antigone's future as dying along with her brothers. Highly plausible however is the interpretation suggested by Collard and Cropp. They reject the solutions adopted by Jouan-van Looy and Kannicht and, while attributing the papyrus to the *Antiope*, they stress the implications of Luppe's integration (n. 5 p. 205): were this accepted, there would be on stage with Dirce a secondary chorus of φίλαι and not of φίλοι, which seems to be granted by ancient sources for the *Antiope* (cfr. Schol. Eur. *Hipp.* 58 e Luppe 1994, 42 n.10), but of which there is no trace in *POxy* 3317. Some further reflection on the matter is in order and we need a better understanding of the reconstructed trimeter and its context. In the preceding lines, which in his 1994 article Luppe sums up but does not quote in full, there is no reference to other dramatic characters. Yet if we read line 9 along with line 8, the woman's answer appears less problematic than thought thus far. To her interlocutor, who finds the sacred rituals or paraphernalia (ἱερά) such as the nebrid unfitting for her polluted condition, the baccha replies at lines 9 ff. that she understands what is going to happen to her but she wishes to die with these sacred paraphernalia (ἱερά). She does not wish to be separated from the things she perceives as 'her own' or 'dear', thus accepting her fate not passively, but with the dignity natural to her noble birth (vv.11-5). φίλοις, as Luppe already observed ("συνθανεῖν πρέπει zu 3317", 41), is not necessarily a masculine adjective, but can also be a neuter plural; in the neuter φίλον often (notably when plural) refers to what is 'own' or 'dear'. It is clear that my interpretation, which implies the equation φίλοις = ἱεροῖς, does not rule out another possible supplement such as τούτοις, referring to ἱερά: the demonstrative οὗτος usually concerns what is close or familiar to the speaker.

Another tragedy that deserves further investigation is the *Archelaus*; it was commissioned and staged in Macedonia, either in Dion or in what is now Vergina. A plausible *terminus post quem* is 408/7, i.e. the year when Euripides left Athens. Apparently two different beginnings are known for the *Archelaus*. In

⁶ Collard-Cropp-Gibert, *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays II*, Warminster 2004, 312.

⁷ In *KOTINOS. Festschrift für E. Simon*, Mainz 1992, 252-5.

⁸ F. Jouan- H. Van Looy, *Euripides, Fragments*, VIII,1, Paris 1998, 1999 n. 17.

the *Frogs* the episode of the *lekylthion* begins with a quotation from a Euripidean prologue, Αἴγυπτος, ὡς ὁ πλείστος ἔσπαρται λόγος, / Ξὺν παισὶ πεντήκοντα ναυτίλῳ πλάτῃ / Ἄργος κατασχών, whose attribution to the *Archelaus* is debated among ancient commentators (apparently Aristarchus was not able to find this passage in any Euripidean tragedy). Several sources also quote a different *incipit*, Δαναὸς ὁ πεντήκοντα θυγατέρων πατήρ / Νείλου λιπὼν κάλλιστον ἐκ γαίας ὕδωρ, / ὃς ἐκ μελαμβρότοιο πληροῦται ῥοὰς / Αἰθιοπίδος γῆς, ἥνικ' ἂν τακῆ χιῶν / τέθριππ' ἄγοντος ἡλίου κατ' αἰθέρα, / ἐλθὼν ἐς Ἄργος ὄκισ' Ἰνάχου πόλιν / Πελασγιώτας δ' ὠνομασμένους τὸ πρὶν / Δαναοὺς καλεῖσθαι νόμον ἔθηκ' ἂν' Ἑλλάδα. For Nauck only the latter was the tragedy's authentic prologue (F 228), whereas Aristophanes' quotation became F 846 *incertarum fabularum*; the same position is shared by Kannicht and Jouan-van Looy, after A. Harder excluded F 846 from her edition of the *Archelaus*⁹. Collard and Cropp are of a different opinion; they not only point out (p. 234) «F 228 below was the beginning of the play in the text known to Alexandrian and later scholars, but F 846 (= Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1206-8) may have been its original beginning...», but consider F 288.3-5 interpolated for the close resemblance to E. *Hel.* 1-3 and, unlike their predecessors, bracket them in their text. In fact Nauck (p. 636) offered two plausible explanations for the prologue of the *Archelaus*: «aut igitur diversi extiterunt eiusdem tragoediae prologi, aut errarunt qui Archelai initium proferri ab Aristophane dicerent». In the Hellenistic age the play must have been staged several times, two of which are attested in III cent. BCE inscriptions pertaining to the Argive *Heraia* and to the *Naïa* of Dodona (*TrGF* test. iib); in this period the myth of Danaids and Egyptians becomes an instrument of Ptolemaic dynastic propaganda, as it offers the basis for the historical mingling of Greeks and Egyptians in the land of the Nile. Although Euripides did not write two different plays with the same title, the *Archelaus* could have been staged in different versions with modifications of the beginning of the play: the second mythical moment—the arrival of Egypt and his sons at Argos to reach the fugitive brides—could have been replaced by the first one—the arrival of Danaos and his daughter in the Egyptian land—in order to stress the Egyptian *allure* of the play and to privilege the expectations of a mixed audience. The 'revised' play thus recreated an Egyptian location at the very beginning and alluded to the historical reality of Greek presence in the land by projecting the mythical past, the mingling of the two peoples in the marriage of Lynceus and Hypermestra, ancestors of the Argive dynasty¹⁰. These considerations strengthen to the hypothesis supported by Collard and Cropp that “F 846 (=Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1206-8) may have been its original beginning...”. This has an important implication that is already clear in the introduction to the play, where the authors are inclined to accept Scullion's¹¹ suggestion that «the parody of Aristophanes *Frogs* 1206-8 (=

⁹ *Euripides*' Kresphontes and Archelaos, Leiden 1985.

¹⁰ Cf. K. Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, Oxford 1994, 339-40.

¹¹ “Euripides and Macedon”, *CQ* 53, 2003, 389-400: Euripides should have died in Athens and *Archelaos* should have been performed in the city.

F 846) points to a subsequent production before an Athenian audience». There is no evidence for an Athenian official staging of the *Archelaos*, yet it is clear that, if Aristophanes chose to begin the *lekythion* scene with a citation from the *Archelaos*¹², the play, which probably arrived in Athens only after the death of Euripides, had to be a recent memory for the audience. In Athenian culture drama was a fundamental element and unauthorized scripts were easily found among theatre professionals; this is also true for the dramatic performances that took place in the peripheral theatres of the *demoi*. This is in all probability the channel through which the *Archelaos* became known to the Attic audience, for the choice of a myth not strictly connected to Attica, the foundation of Aigai and the encomiastic nature of the play, completely related to a Macedonian subject, would have hardly elicited the polis' interest in its usual, official occasions of performance.

In the study of fragmentary tragedies there are two aspects that merit further research, i.e. the evidence from vase iconography and a more nuanced discussion of paratragic scenes in comedy. Neither is omitted in the volume. In the introduction vase representations are theoretically thought of as 'evidence for the lost plays' and are thus discussed in the reconstruction of each play.

The first sequence of the *Andromeda*, one of the most typical among Euripides' tragedies, is reconstructed using the parody in *Thesm.* 1008-24. Kannicht ascribes to Euripides only text that has precise documentation in the scholia; Jouan-van Looy attribute to Euripides long passages from the *Thesmophoriazousae*, as is clear from the editorial layout of F 122 and the addition of vv. 1047-55 *ubi scholia silent*. In this respect Collard and Cropp have a sound approach: they differentiate what may be safely attributed to Euripides (in regular writing) from what may not (in italics and smaller writing), yet also marking what may have been Euripidean words, readapted in Aristophanes' comic lines detortion (underlining in italics and smaller writing)¹³. Probably in F 122 κημὸν ἔστηκ' ἔχουσ' belong to *Andromeda*'s song and are thus highlighted by the editors. The text is here corrupt for next to κημὸν we find ψῆφον, in origin perhaps an interlinear gloss since the word κημὸν, in fact glossed as ψῆφον by the scholia *ad loc.*, is understood as the basket of the judges where the vote (ψῆφον) was to be placed. κημὸν = ψῆφον 'urn, box' would be then an *aprosdoketon* with which Euripides' relative *in persona Andromedae*, after citing Euripidean lines (ὄρᾳς; οὐ χοροῖσιν / οὐδ' ὑφ' ἡλίκων νεανίδων), would comically distort the original situation of the drama. Yet besides the fact that the ballot box was not held in the hands¹⁴, it is not clear what is funny about this *boutade*, for the spectator should have fun at a completely incongruous scene, something nonsensical. Aris-

¹² For the *Frogs*' chronology cf. Dover, *Frogs*, 6 ss. As we know by test. C Dover, that comedy had been twice performed, the last time some months after Athens' defeat.

¹³ «The scolia suggest that the words printed in larger type are taken from *Andromeda*'s monody, but the indications are imprecise. Most of the rest is in tragic style and may reflect the monody more or less closely, except for the comic adaptations printed with underline (italics in the translation)», p.136.

¹⁴ Cf. Collard-Cropp p. 137 n. 1.

tophanes' theatre is not a theatre of the absurd but develops a concrete, real comedy; to take effect every joke must be immediately understood by the audience. This was clear to the playwright since the *Clouds*, when his defeat represented the failure of a sophisticated and elitist comedy, as such not easily accessible to the audience. C. Austin and S. D. Olson¹⁵ think κημόν is a feminine adornment on account of ancient lexicographical sources, and apparently Collard and Cropp share the same idea. We should recall here that Aristophanes has anticipated lyric verses of Andromeda's amoebeus with the chorus, a sequence that in the tragedy came after the anapestic monody delivered at the beginning of the play by the main character, probably to make the paratragedy easier and clearer, allowing the audience to immediately recognize what character from the *Andromeda* Euripides' relative was about to interpret¹⁶. Vase representations of Andromeda's rescue may shed some light on this. A box with her bridal accouterments is often shown next to her, sometimes there is also a basket, next to her or in Perseus' hands (as in the first artistic representation, from Corinth, VI cent. BCE)¹⁷; in all probability the basket held Medusa's head, to be used to fight the sea monster and often imprudently or unrealistically brought by Perseus. Iconography, employing a set of conventions other than those of poetry or drama, here as often elsewhere offers a synchronic perspective of what in the myth itself is developed over time; the basket is thus a reference to a later development in the plot. Among the attested meanings of κημόν (cf. Austin-Olson, p. 316) one is particularly striking: κημόν is a basket used for fishing, and interestingly enough this meaning is found in tragedy, notably Soph. *TrGF* 504. Is it not more plausible to think that Euripides' relative, in the appearance of an impromptu Andromeda, is here alluding to Medusa's basket, which might have showed up in a scene of Euripides' drama but could not be mentioned in the heroine's lyric dialogue, to make the parody more effective and immediately activate, in the audience, the memory of the original sequence?

It is again Aristophanic parody that helps us understand the development of the beginning section of another Euripidean tragedy, the *Bellerophon* (F 286b). Here Collard and Cropp show some skepticism about the corruptions and lacunae assumed by scholars¹⁸. In the *Peace's* dialogic prologue the two servants are commenting on their master's illness, a new Bellerophon wishing to assault the sky to check on the gods and see if they care about men; Trigaëus' νόσος reproduces the tragic sickness of the Corinthian hero. F 286b is the only one in the tragedy that discusses, in an apparently not very perspicuous fashion, how to cure a sickness: «As to illness, a doctor too must cure it after examining it, not by giving remedies by rote, in case these do not suit the illness. Human illnesses are some

¹⁵ *Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazuse*, Oxford 2004, 316.

¹⁶ For Aristophanes' parody cf. G. Mastromarco, "La parodia dell'Andromeda euripidea nelle *Tesmofoiazuse* di Aristofane", *CFC egi* 18, 2008, 177-88; P. Mureddu, "Un caso singolare di teatro nel teatro: la scena di Eco nelle *Tesmofoiazuse*", *Annali della facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari*, 6, 1987, 15-22

¹⁷ Cf. K. Schauenburg, *LIMC s.v. 'Andromeda'*.

¹⁸ pp. 300-1, n.1.

of them self-inflicted, others come from the gods, but we treat them by the rule of practice. This is what to say to you, however: if gods do anything shameful, they are not gods». These lines, found in Stobaeus, may belong to Bellerophon's speech (F 286), as is usually assumed, whether it be to the prologue or, more plausibly, to one of the first episodes. Here (F 286, 4) the hero is addressing a group of people to demonstrate or disprove the existence of gods; yet on account of Aristophanes' parody we have to assume that another character was already on scene commenting on his master's 'illness', a dramatic feature found in other tragedies of this period such as *Medea* or *Hippolytus*. Thus F 286b may be spoken by one character, Bellerophon, or two, in which case Stobaeus may be mistaken in unifying its lines; if so, vv. 1-3 could be an observation by a secondary character, whereas vv. 4-7 would be Bellerophon's reply. If the hero is the only speaker he would go as far as disproving the existence of gods, in a quite eristic fashion, for from them nothing bad can come (all sicknesses, even those men call divine, are human and curable because gods cannot wish for anything foul, otherwise they are not gods)¹⁹; if the speakers are two, the other character would observe that Bellerophon's illness needs an appropriate treatment and not just any cure. In this way he betrays—but this is not surprising for Euripides' minor characters—an understanding far deeper than expected for his status, thus emulating or anticipating the nurse's attempt to treat Phaedra's illness, whereas the hero exploits his suggestions for there is no illness that may be god-sent. In this way the link, which Collard and Cropp are right in finding quite confused, between the medical analogy of vv. 1-3 and the main argument, the existence of gods, in vv. 4-7, becomes, if not perfectly clear, at least more understandable. Bellerophon's sickness is not one of those that can be treated in a traditional fashion, be it magic or medicine: it is the same kind of psychological disorder forcing Trigaeus to plan his flight into the sky in the *Peace*, for through *logos* there is no secure result to achieve and the nature of the question itself, the gods, is such as a whole human life would not be enough to get at the end of it, as already argued by Protagoras (80 B 4 Diels-Kranz).

All in all, the new collection by Collard and Cropp, besides eliciting in the reader a fresh interest in still debated questions, comes out in a moment most favorable to Euripidean studies. Along with the editions of Kannicht and Jouanvan Looy it deserves to be considered a very useful interpretive tool, one to be consulted by anyone wishing to read or even deepen the understanding of Euripides' fragmentary plays.

ADELE TERESA COZZOLI
Università degli Studi Roma Tre
acozzoli@uniroma3

¹⁹ The reference to *S. Ph.* 450-1, quoted by C. W. Müller (*RhM* 136, 1993, 116-21) and W. Luppe (in C. F. Collatz et al. *Dissertatiunculae criticae. Festschrift...Hansen*, Würzburg 1998, 123-6), is not explicative of Euripides' context: Philoctetes argues about the gods' injustice, while Bellerophon argues about their non-existence.

