

# Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and  
Roman Language and Literature

*Editorial Board*

G.J. Boter  
A. Chaniotis  
K.M. Coleman  
I.J.F. de Jong  
P.H. Schrijvers

VOLUME 314

# The Play of Texts and Fragments

Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp

*Edited by*

J.R.C. Cousland and James R. Hume



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2009

THE LOST *PHOENISSAE*:  
AN EXPERIMENT IN RECONSTRUCTION  
FROM FRAGMENTS

DONALD J. MASTRONARDE

One of the most exciting aspects of recent Euripidean studies has been the intense study of the lost plays, fueled and inspired by papyrological discoveries over the past 100 years and more. Now students and scholars are assisted by detailed commentaries on the remnants of many dramas, by the discussions of reconstruction and the translations in the Budé edition (Jouan and Van Looy 1998–2003), in the Aris & Philips edition (Collard, Cropp, and Lee 1995; Collard, Cropp, and Gibert 2004), and by the masterly magnum opus of Richard Kannicht (Kannicht 2004).<sup>1</sup> In the following essay I want to conduct a thought experiment<sup>2</sup> in order to explore two issues: the gaps and uncertainties that remain even when we have fairly ample fragments of a play, and the advances made possible by papyrological and other discoveries since the 1890s. For this experiment, I take Euripides' *Phoenissae*, a triad play surviving in over 100 medieval manuscripts and now represented by a couple dozen papyri, a play popular with performers and readers in antiquity and well known to erudite Byzantine writers. Let us suppose, however, that *Phoenissae* did not survive the end of antiquity. If we limit ourselves to indirect and fragmentary evidence, how would our knowledge of the "lost" *Phoenissae* look? I consider this question in two stages: first, by pretending to be in the position of August Nauck (Nauck 1889), that is, before papyrological discoveries and before modern collections of iconographic evidence; and, second, by taking the position of modern scholars, who can use papyri of the plays and of hypotheses and have much fuller iconographic evidence. This exercise also sheds interesting light on the reception and *Nachleben* of *Phoenissae*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Our honoree, with Christopher Collard, has also provided us with a Loeb edition of the fragments Collard and Cropp 2008a and 2008b.

<sup>2</sup> For a similar experiment, see Nauck 1871: vi–xiii (*Electra, Heracleidae, Heracles*); Kannicht 1997: 76–77; Dover 2000.

The testimonia to *Phoenissae* were collected by Jan Maarten Bremer and redacted by me (Mastronarde and Bremer 1982; also Mastronarde 1988), and a few additions can be made by searching in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae database (online version as of May 2006). In conducting this experiment, I have reviewed the testimonia to isolate (1) those that explicitly refer to *Phoenissae* and (2) those that are ascribed to Euripides and can plausibly be attributed to *Phoenissae* because of ancillary information in the context of quotation. I have eliminated (with a few exceptions, noted below) items that lack ascription to Euripides or that are reported as Euripidean but could not confidently be attributed to *Phoenissae*. For instance, with the full text in hand, we can now identify many passages in Hesychius as glosses of forms used in *Phoenissae*, but without the surviving text we would not even know these words were from Euripides, and so they cannot be counted as “fragments” in our edition of the lost *Phoenissae*. I have also eliminated the evidence provided by Tzetzes and Eustathius (both active in the 12th century) and the *scholia recentiora* of various authors, as these reflect the survival of *Phoenissae* as a whole and its status as a standard text in the “curriculum” of the medieval scholars who took an interest in classical poetry.<sup>3</sup> I have admitted the evidence of the *Suda*, *Etymologicum Genuinum*, and *Etymologicum Magnum*, but ignored various 13th and 14th century lexicons. In addition, since we are positing that the play has not survived in the manuscript tradition, we must also ignore the prefatory material (hypotheses) transmitted with the play and the entire corpus of *scholia vetera* on this play (but testimonia to *Phoenissae* in *scholia vetera* of other plays are allowed).

Limitations of space prevent me from presenting a documented edition of the fragments within this essay, but a full version of my hypothetical edition of the fragments of the lost *Phoenissae* is printed in the appendix to this volume.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> It is worth noting, however, that Eustathius more often quotes from the play without naming either the play or Euripides himself, so even if we allowed Eustathius in our experiment, most of the testimonia identified from him would not emerge as “fragments” for this experiment.

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 481–496 below.

## I

A first edition of the fragments, representing what scholars would have known by 1889, already provides extensive knowledge of the play. Test. 1 (from Apollonius Dyscolus) tells us “The *Phoenissae* of Euripides contains as its subject the Theban war.” Diodorus Siculus’ anecdote about the Athenian general Thrasybulus’ dream before the sea-battle at Arginusae (Test. 2) confirms that the deaths of the Seven against Thebes occurred in the play. The struggle for sole power between the sons of Oedipus is mentioned by Aristotle (Test. 6a) and Epictetus (Test. 6b, 6c; cf. perhaps ps.-Apollodorus, Test. 10), and the latter also criticizes Polyneices’ false evaluation of exile as a great evil. Pollux (Test. 7) tells us there was a scene in the play in which Antigone looked out at the attacking army from an upper-floor room. Over a dozen ancient passages speak of Menoeceus’ voluntary sacrifice to ensure the salvation of Thebes in the battle against the Argives (Test. 8 from ps.-Apollodorus, with Test. 8a–8k from various others): although none of these explicitly refer to Euripides or to *Phoenissae*, it is a probable conjecture that this incident occurred in the play and that Teiresias informed Creon of the need for this sacrifice. Other aspects of the content must be inferred or conjectured from the fragments, to which we will turn next. But we also have in Test. 5 (Sch. to Aristophanes) an ancient complaint about Euripidean choruses: “Through these words too Aristophanes is disparaging Euripides, because he brings on choruses that either sing material that is not pertinent to the subject-matter of the plot (instead they narrate some mythical story or other, as in *Phoenissae*) or fail to passionately take the side of those who have been wronged (instead they oppose them in the midst of their troubles).”

The *dramatis personae* attested in fragments are Jocasta, Antigone, Eteocles, Polyneices, Creon, and Teiresias, and a messenger can also be assumed. The testimonia suggest that Menoeceus may have appeared, and Euripides’ treatment of characters like Polyxena in *Hecuba* and Heracles’ daughter in *Heracleidae* makes it attractive to guess that he too was a speaking character. There is no secure hint that Oedipus appeared in the play (Malalas, Test. 8, is too vague, and may not refer to *Phoen.* at all). The chorus of Phoenician women can be inferred from the title of the play, but the reasons for their depiction would have been left to pure guesswork. Nor is it certain who spoke the prologue-monologue.

As for the dating of the play, Test. 4 tells us that *Phoenissae*, like *Hypsipyle* and *Antiope*, was performed after *Andromeda* (412) and before *Frogs* (405), and the presence of tetrameters and the frequency of res-

olutions<sup>5</sup> agree with a late date. Scholars fond of guessing at the makeup of tragic trilogies and tetralogies might have been tempted to suggest grouping *Phoenissae* with Euripides' *Oedipus* and *Antigone*, and it cannot be ruled out that someone might have suggested that the three plays named in Test. 4 were all from the same year (as some scholars have in fact done).

Most of the fragments can be arranged in a probable order, and several scenes take shape. A quotation of the Pythian oracle to Laius, Fr. 1 [= 18–20], clearly belongs to a detailed reporting of the past, suitable only to a prologue-speaker. Any character who refers later in the play to the previous troubles of the family would do so more briefly and allusively. The speaker is most likely a character from the older generation, but that leaves us a choice among Jocasta, Creon, Teiresias, or an elderly servant of the household. No other fragment can be confidently assigned to the prologue, but one may speculate that mention of the patricide and the explicit report of Oedipus' curse on his sons (Fr. 40 ["Oedipus killed his father"], 41 [= 69a]) also belong to the prologue-speech. The prologue is one possible source of the address to the sun in Fr. 42 [= 3, and compare Accius *Phoen.* fr. I], but not the only possibility. If it belongs to the prologue, it is probably the first line of the play.

Because of the rare word δῆρος we can place Fr. 2 [= 90] in a scene in which, as Pollux tells us (Test. 2), Antigone views the army. With the full text of *Phoenissae*, we know that Euripides' staging simply used the roof of the skene and that Pollux is misleading in suggesting Antigone looks out from a room. One might guess that Antigone is the object of the verb "let go, allowed" in this line, that one of her parents is the subject, and some unidentified character the speaker. Antigone could have appeared up above most easily before the chorus entered, so it is attractive to place this scene right after the prologue, although it is not impossible to imagine a daring sequence in which she appeared while the chorus was present (for instance, after the *agôn* scene) and indeed conversed with them from the second story. Moreover, we expect in Euripides more than one scene before the parodos, and if Antigone is not featured in it, it is hard to think of any other action to put before the parodos. One might conjecture

<sup>5</sup> Using the methodology of Cropp and Fick 1985, in the first edition of the fragments I find 48 resolutions in 533 resolvable feet (9.01% compared to 6.96% for the whole play according to Cropp and Fick 1985: 17), or if the tetrameters are taken into account as well, 48 resolutions in 563 resolvable feet (8.53%). Three types of resolution (6.2e, 2.2eD, 8.2c) are also indicative of late style: see Cropp and Fick 1985: 62–65.

that Fr. 47 [= 198–201] also referred to the appearance of the maiden in public, but whether it fell in this scene or during a later appearance of Antigone would be unknown.

The next groups of fragments come from the scenes involving Polyneices' presence on stage, which clearly must precede the battle narrative and thus form the probable content of the first episode. There are enough fragments to allow us to recognize a conversation between Jocasta and Polyneices in which she interrogates him on his experiences in exile, and such a dialogue would best have been carried out without the presence of Eteocles. Therefore, the fragments involving Eteocles as well come from the following scene (or episode), in which there is a formal debate with long speeches, certainly by Eteocles and Jocasta and presumably by Polyneices too, creating a three-part *agôn logôn*. It makes sense to place the entry of the chorus before the entry of Polyneices, but we have no trace of their song.

Fr. 3 [= 344–348a] gives us some dochmiacs sung by Jocasta (Plutarch tells us the speaker). Dochmiacs are typical of reunion and recognition scenes, and on the basis of the parallels we might conjecture that the scene featured an *amoibaion* in which Polyneices took part with iambic lines (as we actually know, this would be an incorrect conjecture, since Jocasta's lyric here is uninterrupted). Fr. 4 [= 357–360] and 5 [= 273] together look like some of Polyneices' lines in the early part of the scene, showing his concern that he may be ambushed. We would have no reason to conjecture that Fr. 5 actually precedes the entry of Jocasta. Fr. 6–8 give us a glimpse of a *stichomythia* on the ills of exile. It is clear enough that Fr. 6 [= 388–393] comes before Fr. 7 [= 406–407] (with its conclusive "as it appears"). The order of the two pieces of Fr. 8 [396–397, 402–405] and Fr. 9 [= 430–432a] is implied by Plutarch's presentation of the quotations, but the relative order of these pieces with Fr. 7 cannot be conjectured accurately: we actually know that Fr. 7 follows Fr. 8. It is not so certain that Fr. 10 [= 438–440] belongs here, since there is disapproval of the value of wealth in Jocasta's *agôn*-speech, so it is possible that one of her sons praised *χρήματα* in the *agôn*.

From the formal *agôn* (in the same or next episode) we have no certain lines of Polyneices, who as the complainant must have had the first *rhesis*, but by process of elimination it seems likely enough that the famous lines on the straightforwardness of the just case come from Polyneices' formal argument that he has been wronged by his brother (Fr. 11 [= 469–472]). Polyneices' speech will have been followed by Eteocles' reply (for which we have three fragments, 12–14), and then Jocasta addressed both sons.

Jocasta's speech was obviously extremely famous and popular, as it is quoted extensively and by many sources (Frr. 15–22). Fr. 12 [= 503–506] ought to be near the beginning of Eteocles' speech, as it uses a formula ("hiding nothing") that often introduces a narrative or declaration, but it cannot be the opening lines, since it is linked by γάρ to something preceding it. Fr. 13 [= 524–525] is closely related in sense to Fr. 12, but we cannot gauge how closely it followed in the text, and it would only be a lucky guess if someone suggested that it was the conclusive gnome of the rhesis. Fr. 14 [= 515–517], identified as from *Phoenissae*, is easily inferred to come from this debate and only Eteocles makes sense as the speaker, but its relative ordering with Fr. 13 cannot be safely guessed. The lines covered by Jocasta's fragments are 460–461a, 528–530, 531–540, 546–547, 570, 555b–557, 554, 582. In Fr. 19 we cannot tell whether the couplet [= 556–557] should be joined directly to the sentence that ends with κέκτηνται βροτοί [= 555b] or followed after some interval. The placement within this rhesis of Jocasta of Fr. 21 [= 582] is not certain, and one would be unlikely to guess the truth, that the first word of the line is the end of a quoted speech. It is probable that someone would have conjectured that at least the first line of the couplet from Strattis' *Phoenissae* (Fr. 22) came more or less verbatim from Euripides, but we would not have any confidence about how the second line related to its tragic original, nor would we necessarily realize that the exhortation to both sons might come from a speech other than the rhesis from which Frr. 15–21 derive.

From the confrontation of the brothers, we also have argumentative trochaic tetrameters attested in Frr. 23–28. The meter is certain in Frr. 25 [= 599], 26 [= 597], and 28 [= 621–622] and highly probably in 24 [= 598a]. The use of tetrameters fits the style of late Euripidean plays, and the change of rhythm is well suited to the intensified argument that often follows hostile *agôn*-speeches. We can infer the speakers of Frr. 24–25 and also suspect that 25 might be the reply to 24. Since Polyneices seems to be trying to regain his wealth (Frr. 8, 10), currently usurped by Eteocles, Fr. 26 is probably spoken by Polyneices. In Fr. 28, the phrase "will stand before the battlements" is more likely to refer to the defender than the attacker, so we can conjecture that Polyneices has the first half of each line. With its antilabe, Fr. 28 presumably comes after the exchange of full tetrameters, but otherwise there are no secure clues to the relative order of 23, 24 + 25, 26, and 27.

Another episode presumably preceding the battle will have been the one in which Creon and Teiresias conversed on stage, where Teiresias

wore a crown he had received for victory-bringing advice he gave to the Athenians (Fr. 29 [= 854–855] and Fr. 30 [cf. 856–857]). Fr. 30 would mislead us into thinking that Creon himself remarked on the crown and asked for its origin, whereas in the full text Teiresias himself refers to the crown and explains it. It is likely enough that the subject of their discussion was the need to sacrifice Menoeceus to save the city (cf. Test. 8, 8a–8k), a motif used by Euripides also in *Heracleidae* and *Erechtheus*. Moreover, the parallel of the daughter of Heracles and the great popularity of Menoeceus' decision in the philosophical and rhetorical tradition both suggest that Euripides gave Menoeceus a speaking role, explaining his willingness to kill himself for the city. Several testimonia emphasize Menoeceus' self-sacrifice without speaking to Creon's attitude or his knowledge or ignorance of his son's decision. But two testimonia (8g, 8i) say that the boy did this behind his father's back or against his father's will, and Libanius' rhetorical exercise (8h) has Menoeceus say that his father wants him to flee. On the other hand, a couple of late testimonia (see the end of 8k) suggest Creon's agency as the one who gives his son for the sake of the city. Since the fragments themselves are so uninformative, we would have no way to be confident in embracing the conjecture if anyone suggested that Libanius' speech reflected specific motifs of Euripides' treatment, although this is obvious enough when we have the full text of *Phoenissae*.

There are a few remnants of what appears to be a messenger's report of the attack and repulse of the Seven, but we do not know the addressee of this report. It is reasonable to conjecture that Fr. 31 [= 750, "having set an equal number against the same number of enemies"] comes from *Phoenissae* and that Eteocles set seven champions at the gates against seven Argive attackers; one would also easily assume (wrongly, as we can see) that the line comes from the messenger-speech. From Fr. 34, which tells us that Periclymenus son of Poseidon killed Parthenopaeus in Euripides (cf. 1156–1158), one might speculate that Euripides matched Aeschylus in naming Theban champions who warded off or killed the attacking heroes; and from Frr. 34 and 35 [= 1172–1182a, omisso 1179]<sup>6</sup> that the messenger gave a circumstantial treatment of each attacker. We would not be in a position to guess that Euripides did not name any other

<sup>6</sup> I am not completely certain that Fr. 35 should be allowed in this "edition," but if I understand correctly the difficult edition of Lycophron scholia (Scheer 1908), this extensive quotation is found in a scholion extant in witnesses that are supposed to carry a tradition older than Tzetzes' work on these scholia.

Theban defender and that the deaths of only two heroes, Parthenopaeus and Capaneus, were actually narrated.

Four fragments give us a glimpse of the duel and death of the brothers. One would guess that Aristophanes' lines from his *Phoenissae* (our Fr. 36) imitate something in Euripides' *Phoenissae*. If Aristophanes is taken to be a sufficiently precise imitator here, the discrepancy between the present-time reference in Fr. 36 ("Ares has crashed down upon the two sons of Oedipus, and now they are preparing for/engaging in a contest of one-to-one wrestling") and the *ex post facto* narrative implied by Frr. 38–39 (which quote Polyneices' dying requests) would suggest that different speakers (or the same speaker in successive episodes) reported on the main battle and the duel. This would match the sequence in Test. 8 (ps.-Apollodorus), which is only uncertainly related to *Phoenissae*: there, after the death of Capaneus and a resulting first rout of the Argives, the duel follows and then a second intense battle of the whole armies. Thus, an ambitious reconstruction might assign Fr. 36 to the end of a narrative about the general attack (which could have been addressed to Jocasta) and the other fragments to a separate narrative in a later episode about the duel and deaths (addressed to the chorus or an unknown party, since Jocasta is on the battlefield). That would be close to the truth, but we would have no suspicion how fully developed the two messenger-scenes actually are. From Fr. 38 [= 1447–1450, 1450A, 1451–1452] and 39 [= 1453] we can infer the presence of Jocasta and Antigone at the site of the duel, or at least at the death. Their presence is paralleled in the unfinished *Phoenissae* of Seneca (lines 427–664), where Jocasta's frenzied arrival actually suspends the battle of two full armies. Anyone tempted to infer more about Euripides' original from Seneca would fall into error, but anyone who recognizes the impracticality of Seneca's scenes for genuine staging would realize that Euripides' treatment must have been quite different. Fr. 37 [= 1364a & 1375] tells us that the messenger also quoted directly portions of prayers made by the brothers before the duel.

The remaining fragments would be classified as *incertae sedis*; all but two of these are explicitly ascribed to the play. These tell us very little about the play, and so I do not discuss them (or the three doubtful fragments) further here.

We can see, then, that if *Phoenissae* had been a lost play treated by Nauck in his edition of fragments, scholars would have known even then quite a lot about the play. In particular, they would have had a good idea of the sequence of scenes from Polyneices' entry to his departure, which

we actually know all fell within the first episode. Also clear would have been the identities of most of the characters and the probable order of some main scenes, including the probability of two separate messenger scenes. On the other hand, scholars would have been likely to make some false inferences, and our knowledge of other features would be quite deficient: the relevance of the chorus and the richness of its contributions; the fact that Antigone sings lyrics in the *teichoskopia* and the *exodos*; the conversation of Eteocles and Creon in the second episode; the precise treatment of Menoeceus; Creon's entry at 1308; and the possible contours of the final scenes following the second messenger's report.

## II

We now move to the era of modern editions of Euripidean fragments, where we often have additional material from the discoveries of papyri and from more thorough study of mythological iconography. *Phoenissae* in particular, because of its theatrical and textual popularity in antiquity, gains significant new information between our first and our second edition of the lost play. There are two dozen papyri from ancient copies of the play (or of excerpts), and more than a dozen more from anthologies or authors quoting the play.<sup>7</sup> Not all of these items could have been identified as deriving from *Phoenissae* if the full text of the play were lost, and the discussion below may overstate somewhat the gain in knowledge, because I am making the generous assumption that the papyri would have been deciphered more or less as they have been, even though in several cases a papyrus text is extremely faint or damaged and would not have yielded so much without the guidance provided by the complete text.

Favorinus (Π<sup>a</sup>) is the most extensive of the new papyri providing testimony, but for the most part his *de exilio* simply confirms what we knew before, mainly from Plutarch's *de exilio*. It is evident that in Hellenistic Stoicism and the tradition of philosophical diatribe it was useful to draw upon well-known mythological examples as depicted in popular works. It is essentially Euripides' Medea who is taken as an example in discussions of reason vs. passion, and it is Euripides' Polyneices from *Phoenissae*

<sup>7</sup> The papyri are referred to by the symbols used in Mastronarde 1994; I have added Π<sup>m</sup> (Luppe 1997: 96) and Π<sup>23</sup> (= P. Oxy. 67.4566) and Π<sup>24</sup> (Mastronarde 2007). For the papyri of the play itself the same sigla are used in Diggle 1994: 73–74.

who becomes a target in philosophical critiques of conventional values regarding the importance of one's homeland and the alleged disadvantages of exile. Favorinus provides us with one new line and with fuller information in two passages we have from elsewhere.

Several other testimonial papyri ( $\Pi^c$ ,  $\Pi^d$ ,  $\Pi^i$ ,  $\Pi^j$ ,  $\Pi^k$ ,  $\Pi^m$ ) overlap with passages given in other sources, but  $\Pi^c$  is important because it allows us to see that our previous Frr. 15 and 16 are continuous.  $\Pi^{aa}$ ,  $\Pi^b$ ,  $\Pi^e$ , and  $\Pi^f$  would not even have been recognized as reflecting *Phoenissae*.

Two fragments of the epitome of *Phoenissae* are now known.<sup>8</sup>  $\Pi^g$  gives us the last lines of the summary: after a possible reference to Jocasta's suicide, we are told that Creon assumed the kingship, then: "and the Argives, routed in battle, withdrew. And Creon, making rather free use of his good fortune, did not allow those of the enemy who fell beneath the walls of Thebes to be buried. And he cast Polyneices out without mourning, and sent Oedipus into exile from the city, ... not preserving the law of mankind ... not postponing the payment of ... (nor) pitying the (unfortunate?)." We thus gain some knowledge of Creon's treatment of Polyneices and Oedipus in the exodos, but the reference to non-burial of the Argive dead does not correspond to the surviving exodos (nor to the assumptions made by those who delete all or part of the exodos) and is presumably a mythographic supplementation of the narrative by the author of the epitome.  $\Pi^h$  would have had to be ascribed to *Phoenissae* by conjecture and tells us little, since we can read only isolated words ("Eteocles"; "brother Polyneices"; "exile"; "married"; "persuaded"; "to arrive"; "of the kingship"; "bring together children"; "lining up for battle").

There are six so-called Homeric bowls (Hellenistic relief bowls with mythological scenes impressed from molds, probably produced in Macedonia) now associated with *Phoenissae*. None of them in fact have the words Euripides or *Phoenissae* on them, but the labelled characters correspond to those we know to have appeared in the play and fit so well with what can be reconstructed that it is legitimate to include them as new testimonia. The vases are catalogued as MB 45–50 in Sinn 1979: 107–109 (illustrated in Tafeln 18–20). Six scenes are attested, listed here in the order they might have occurred in the play (whether as staged or as narrated by a messenger), except that the order of (5) and (6) is uncertain. (1) Creon supplicating Teiresias, with Manto beside the seer (all three characters labelled), evidently from the scene in which Teiresias

<sup>8</sup> Note that my siglum  $\Pi^g$  is  $\Pi^a$  in Diggle 1994, while my  $\Pi^h$  is his  $\Pi^b$ .

demanded the sacrifice of Creon's son. We already suspected that Creon resisted the demand, but not that he supplicated Teiresias. Menoeceus is not shown in this illustration. (2) A messenger starting to move away, with Jocasta turning back to Antigone, who is emerging from the door (all three labelled).<sup>9</sup> This scene suggests how Jocasta went to the battlefield for her suicide and how Antigone was brought back into the action so that she too could be present at the death of Polyneices. (3) Polyneices and Eteocles in single combat, with personified Thebe next to Eteocles (all three labelled). (4) Eteocles dead, Polyneices dying, Antigone mourning, and Jocasta stabbing herself (all labelled) with personifications of the father's Curses or Erinyes (only  $\Pi\text{ATP}\Omega\text{IAI}$  survives of the label, above the one remaining demon-figure; probably two similar figures have been lost). Four additional figures of soldiers, in pairs, represent the two armies, with the two Thebans racing toward Jocasta as if to stop her suicide,<sup>10</sup> and the whole is framed by labelled personifications of Thebes and Argos. (5) Antigone supplicating Creon (both labelled). Together with the hypothesis fragment ( $\Pi^g$ ), this suggests a little of the ending of the play. (6) Blind Oedipus reaching for something; from the inscription, one can assume that the bodies of his sons and Jocasta were depicted, and one might guess that Antigone was present too to be the recipient of Oedipus' request. We cannot say whether Creon was illustrated. Inscription:  $[\text{OIAI}]\text{PIOY}\Sigma \text{KEAEYEI A}[\Gamma]\text{E}[\text{IN } \Pi\text{PO}\Sigma] / [\text{TO}] \Pi\text{T}\Omega\text{MA } \text{TH}\Sigma \text{AYTOY MHT}[\text{PO}\Sigma \text{TE}] / [\text{KAI}] \text{GYNAIKOS KAI } \text{T}\Omega\text{N YI}\Omega\text{N}$ .

A Roman clay lamp of the 1st century CE (*LIMC* s.v. Eteokles 43) is inscribed PHOENISSA (sic) and POLYN and shows Polyneices dead, Eteocles sinking down, and Jocasta between them stabbing herself. This seems to confirm the relevance to *Phoenissae* of the Homeric bowls just discussed.<sup>11</sup>

The fragments of the play itself are considerably expanded in the second edition. In the prologue, an expanded version of Fr. 1 now covers the first 38 lines of the play [= 3–40] in an almost entirely readable

<sup>9</sup> The door is the palace-door (skene-door), not the gate of the city as stated by I. Krauskopf, *LIMC* s.v. Iokaste 8.

<sup>10</sup> So correctly Robert 1908: 191, whereas Sinn 1979: 108 describes them as putting the two Argives to flight.

<sup>11</sup> Other art works of Etruscan and Roman origin show family members, including Oedipus, present at the duel or death of Eteocles and Polyneices. Their relationship to *Phoenissae* is more uncertain, but they shed light on Seneca's treatment. These are discussed in the appendix edition of the fragments.



form. Twenty-four further lines of the prologue [= 46–69] survive from a combination of three papyri (Fr. 1a), but we would not know the extent of the gap between Fr. 1 and Fr. 1a, and in most lines of Fr. 1a only a word or two survives. In Antigone's viewing scene, a new Fr. 2a gives us scraps of an *amoibaion*, so that we learn that Antigone sang lyrics as she gazed at the Argive army and was in dialogue with an unidentified character speaking trimeters. In the scene involving Polyneices and his mother before Eteocles arrives for the *agôn*, Fr. 3 is now also expanded, giving us more of Jocasta's lyric greeting of her son [= 337–351], but also traces of the dialogue before Jocasta appears, in which Polyneices introduces himself to the chorus [= 280–298, 307–310]. The former Fr. 43 is subsumed and we can now see that the two trimeters in that fragment were separated by an intervening line. A new Fr. 5a [= 363] apparently belongs to this scene as well. Fr. 6 now also has an expanded form, covering 364–377 (only 368–375 produce sense, but we gain some new evidence of Polyneices' nostalgia) and, after a gap of unknown length, 379–393 (387 omitted, only 384–393 produce sense).

From the *agôn* itself we gain a trace of the end of Polyneices' speech, a choral couplet, and then the beginning of Eteocles' speech in an expanded Fr. 12 [= 494–512, with 499–500 and 503–506 fully readable thanks to the secondary tradition]. For Jocasta's speech the gains are greater: we can now join Frr. 15–16 as continuous [= 528–540], and Frr. 18–20 are subsumed in a larger passage covering 552–575 (line beginnings only, except for full lines already known from the secondary tradition, 554–557, 570). In the trochaic tetrameters that follow the formal speeches, we acquire some meagre scraps before and after 597 in an expanded Fr. 26 [= 591–597, 601–604, 615–618].

We gain our first glimpse of a scene between Eteocles and Creon, with the beginning of the scene in Fr. 28a [= 690–703, 719–739, all partial lines] and its end followed by a chorus in Fr. 28b [= 768–789, 792–806, minimal remains of most lines]. Enough survives for us to see that Eteocles is sending an attendant to fetch Creon when Creon himself arrives, and that there is some discussion of military arrangements. At the end of the scene we see Eteocles forbid the burial of Polyneices (an unexpected feature, not suggested by the fragment of the epitome) and depart with a prayer to Eulabeia. The Menoecus scene is still poorly documented, but we now have a few words in a few short passages in Fr. 28d [= 846–851, 861–867, minimal remains] (is the "child" addressed Menoecus himself or Teiresias' daughter?) and Fr. 30a [= 898–900, 931–934, minimal remains] (where mention of Dirce and the form *σφαγέντα* suggest we

have Teiresias' prophecy). The gnomic passage that was formerly Fr. 46 [= 1015–1018] can now be placed at the beginning of the new Fr. 30b [= 1015–1047, 1064–1071], so that we know the lines are the end of the episode; but we still know too little about the scene to be sure who spoke them, for even if we assume that Creon opposed the sacrifice, we don't know whether he opposed it all the way to the end of the scene or whether Teiresias was still present at the end of the scene to speak these lines. Fr. 30b also gives us a good deal of the following stasimon on the murderous attacks of the Sphinx on the Thebans (almost the entire strophe can be restored, but little survives after the opening clause of the antistrophe, with "in time wretched Oedipus arrived"). The cries of the first messenger summoning someone (Jocasta, as we can see from Fr. 30c) from the house follow this stasimon.

The papyri bring major gains for the first messenger scene. Fr. 30c [= 1079–1095] shows Jocasta asking whether Polyneices is still alive and saying that "the old man in the house" (our first trace of Oedipus in the fragments) will be glad to hear of the safety of the city. And then the messenger's rhesis begins. The old Frr. 32 and 33 are now recognized as parts of an expanded fragment covering 1097–1107 and 1113–1137 (but 1113–1125 have only a few letters each extant). This passage includes much of the catalogue of the Argive heroes (1104–1140), marked as spurious in most modern editions, but without the fuller context there is no reason to believe that anyone would have challenged the authorship of the lines in their fragmentary state. The second messenger scene gains nothing from the papyri, although the Homeric bowls and the fragmentary epitome are suggestive. The Strassburg papyrus of Euripidean lyrics, however, [Fr. 39a = 1499–1581, 1710–1736] gives us a whole new perspective on the ending of the play, as we have (even if in a corrupt and partially damaged form that could not be restored with great confidence) much of Antigone's lyric mourning for her dead kin and textual proof of Oedipus as a speaking character present on stage. Whereas the artistic evidence and Seneca might have led us to wonder whether Oedipus was taken to the battlefield to view the corpses, this papyrus assures us that the bodies were on stage with Antigone when Oedipus was called out of the house. We can just barely make out that in the final lines of this papyrus text Antigone and Oedipus are moving off hand-in-hand, and if we combine that with the epitome's report of Oedipus' exile, we can conclude, despite the absence of any word about exile or Creon in what survives, that this lyric duet of departure was in a separate scene after an intervening dialogue scene involving Creon and his orders.

I embarked on this experiment in the expectation that the lost *Phoenissae* would prove to be quite elusive and that the exercise would support scepticism about how much we can accurately deduce about lost plays from the fragments and testimonia we have. In fact, however, we now have a fairly complete outline of the incidents in the play and some passages of impressive length, and even with just the first edition of fragments scholars would have known a great deal. The reason for this result is the popularity of the play in antiquity, which generated so many testimonia, quotations, and ancient copies capable of surviving as our papyri. It would be fascinating to test whether the other triad plays, *Hecuba* and *Orestes*, would fare as well in such an experiment, and a further control would be to study some select plays in the same way. It remains true, however, that even with all this evidence for the lost *Phoenissae*, we would not be able to appreciate the varied stylistic artistry, the niceties of tone, the ironies of repetition and correspondence, the development of thematic and verbal motifs, the dynamics of multiple tensions and resolutions, and other important qualities that we value in a complete drama.

EURIPIDES' LOST *PHOENISSAE*:  
THE FRAGMENTS

DONALD J. MASTRONARDE

In these two editions, item numbers preceded by one asterisk (\*) are explicitly ascribed to Euripides but only conjecturally assigned to *Phoenissae*; items preceded by two asterisks (\*\*) lack any explicit indication of the author or of the work. For testimonia with many sources, only the most important are given here. For omitted sources, see the Teubner edition.

**First Edition** (showing how the evidence for the “lost” play would have looked at the time of August Nauck’s second edition of tragic fragments published in 1889)

## TESTIMONIA

1. Apoll. Dysc. *de constructione* 93 [*GrammGr* 2:2.78, 3 ff.]

As examples of using the names of literary works without or with the article, the grammarian gives πρῶτον Ἀλκαίου, Φοίνισσαι Εὐριπίδου (“first book of Alcaeus, *Phoenissae* of Euripides”) versus αἱ Φοίνισσαι Εὐριπίδου περιέχουσι τὸν Θηβαϊκὸν πόλεμον, τὸ πρῶτον Ἀλκαίου ἀνέγνωμεν (“The *Phoenissae* of Euripides contains as its subject the Theban war. We read the first book of Alcaeus.”).

2. Diod. Sic. 13.97.6 (preliminaries of the sea-battle at Arginusae)

“The Athenian general Thrasybulus, who was in command for that day, had had a dream of the following sort during the night: he dreamed that he and the other six generals were performing Euripides’ *Phoenissae* before a full theater audience in Athens; and he dreamed that, with their opponents performing *The Suppliant Women*, his side won a Cadmean victory, and that all the generals died, in imitation of the fate of those who attacked Thebes.”

3. Plut. *Mor.* 348F–349A (a Spartan's criticism of Athenian expenditures on recreation, specifically the theater)  
 "If the total cost of each of the plays is reckoned up, it will be apparent that the demos has expended more on *Bacchae*, *Phoenissae*, *Oedipuses*, *Antigone*, and the sufferings of Medea and Electra than they spent waging war against the Persians over leadership and freedom."
4. Sch. Aristoph. *Ran.* 53 (on an allusion to *Andromeda*)  
 "Why didn't he mention instead one of the beautiful plays produced just a little earlier [sc. than *Frogs* in 405], *Hypsipyle*, *Phoenissae*, *Antiope*? The *Andromeda* was seven years earlier [sc. in 412]."
5. Sch. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 443 (incorrectly detecting an allusion in Dikaiopolis' insulting reference to the Acharnian choreuts whom he wants to bamboozle)  
 "Through these words too Aristophanes is disparaging Euripides, because he brings on choruses that either sing material that is not pertinent to the subject-matter of the plot (instead they narrate some mythical story or other, as in *Phoenissae*) or fail to passionately take the side of those who have been wronged (instead they oppose them in the midst of their troubles)."
- 6a. Aristotle *EN* 1167a32–34 (discussing *homonoia* and its absence)  
 "But whenever one person wants himself [sc. to rule exclusively], like the characters in *Phoenissae*, people engage in civil strife."
- \*\* 6b. Epictetus *Diss.* 4.5.29  
 "Nothing other than this is what caused Eteocles and Polyneices [to behave as they did]: the belief about tyranny, the belief about exile, namely that the latter is the worst of ills, and the former is the greatest of goods."
- \*\* 6c. Epictetus *Enchir.* 31.4 (cf. Simplicius, *comm. in Enchir.* p. 92)  
 "This is what made Polyneices and Eteocles enemies to each other: believing that tyranny is good."
- \*\* 6d(?). Paus. 10.5.3 (there are memorials of Oedipus' misfortunes all over Greece: Cithaeron, Corinth, Phocis . . .)  
 "And for the Thebans to an even greater degree there is notoriety from the marriages of Oedipus and the injustice of Eteocles."

7. Pollux 4.129  
 "The *distegia* is sometimes a second-story room [διήρες δωμάτιον] in a royal palace, such as the one from which in *Phoenissae* Antigone views the army."
- \* 8. ps.-Apollodor. *Bibl.* 3.73–75  
 "Now this Teiresias, when the Thebans sought an oracle from him, told them they would be victorious if Menoeceus son of Creon offered himself as a sacrificial victim to Ares. After hearing this Menoeceus son of Creon slaughtered himself in front of the gates. When the battle occurred, the Cadmeans were chased together up to the walls, and Capaneus grabbed a ladder and climbed the walls using it, and Zeus struck him with a thunderbolt. (74) After this happened, there was a rout of the Argives. And since many were being destroyed, once both armies decided this was best, Eteocles and Polyneices fought in single combat for the kingship, and they killed each other. And when an intense battle again arose, the sons of Astacus put on the best display of valor. For Ismarus killed Hippomedon, Leades killed Eteocles, and Amphidicus killed Pathenopaeus. (75) But according to Euripides, Periclymenus son of Poseidon killed Parthenopaeus. And Melanippus, the remaining son of Astacus, wounded Tydeus in the belly."
- \*\* 8a. Plut. *Pelopidas* 21.3 (on human sacrifice for victory in war, some cite old examples of Macaria daughter of Heracles and Menoeceus son of Creon)
- \*\* 8b. Epictetus *Diss.* 3.20.5–6 (Menoeceus benefitted in no small way from dying, by preserving his patriotism and nobility and avoiding cowardice and baseness)
- \*\* 8c. ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.73 (Teiresias prophesied to the Thebans on the need for sacrifice; Menoeceus heard it and sacrificed himself)
- \*\* 8d. Ammonius *de impropriis* 24 (grammatical observation noting difference between "Ajax or Menoeceus killed himself" and "Eteocles and Polyneices killed each other")
- \*\* 8e. Lucian *de saltat.* 43 (destruction of Menoeceus as one part of story of Seven against Thebes)
- \*\* 8f. Paus. 9.25 (Menoeceus willingly sacrificed himself when Polyneices attacked Thebes)
- \*\* 8g. Philostratos *Imag.* 1.4 (MENOIKEΥΣ) (in response to Teir's prophecy, Men. dies "without his father's knowledge" [λαθὼν τὸν πατέρα])
- \*\* 8h. Liban. *progymnasmata* 11.22  
 "What would Menoeceus say when he wants to sacrifice himself on behalf of the victory of his fatherland?" "1. The seer revealed the starting-point for decision

and proclaimed in what way it is necessary for the city to be saved or, on the contrary, go to ruin. My father is totally governed by natural feelings and wants his son to be kept alive, and he gives me the password for flight, condemning our country to destruction and enslavement. 2. But I could never become a betrayer of my own country, nor so cowardly and ignoble in the face of death that I fail to give to my fatherland victory and the ability to remain always in the same dignified stature in the future. 3. Death is common to all, and it is unavoidable that all men, once born, die, but what is characteristic of men with the right ideas is to accept one's death with one's dignity intact. Now then, if I should be persuaded by my father and take advantage of flight, the city will be captured, its walls will fall, there will be much slaughter of the men in their prime, the children and women will be enslaved, and the great name of Thebes will not have its glory in Greece. 4. My life would be deserving of reproach, if I should not choose to die for Greece. But if I should submit to the sacrifice and apply the blow to myself, then the camp of the enemy will fall, those who have attacked us will pay the penalty, and our city will be famed far and wide for its victory monuments, having its freedom in full measure, taking pride in its victory. Everyone will credit this result to me, and Menoeceus will be often mentioned in praise and encomia, having honors like those for a god. 5. One must not, then, behave like a coward. How many have fallen in the line of battle! How many have received the blow while waging war! I too myself must become one of these and win repute that is greater than theirs. For there is no encomium for them once they have died for their fatherland, but for me is reserved the whole sum of glory and I will have honors worthy of a god and remembrance in all minds for having died on behalf of my own country."

\*\* 8i. ps.-Nonnus, *schol. mythologica* 4.9 ("having heard this oracle and wishing to free his city from the siege, Menoeceus gave himself for slaughter without his father Creon's consent" [δῖχα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Κρέοντος])

\*\* 8j. Sch. vet. Soph. *Ant.* 1303 (some identify Megareus with "the Menoeceus who sacrificed himself")

\*\* 8k. Cf. pseudo-Justin Martyr, *quaestiones et responsiones* 491C; Greg. Naz. vol. 35, p. 592, 9 and *carm. moralia* col. 729, 5; Simplic. *comm. in Epict. Enchir.* 27, 23; Olympiod. *in Pl. Phaedonem* 1.8; Theodoretus, *graec. affect. cur.* 7.43; both Aeneas *Theophrastus* 68, 12 and Sch. Ael. Arist. 119, 5 write as if Creon willingly sacrificed his son for the city.

\* 9(?). Joannes Malalas, *Chronographia* p. 53 (at the end of a version of the early history of Thebes and incidents ranging from Laius down to the Seven)

"All these incidents just recorded the learned Palaephatos set out in true form. For the learned Euripides set out in poetic manner a drama about Oedipus and Jocasta and the Sphinx. For Africanus the chronographer set out the history of the kings of Thebes."

This could refer to the content of the choral ode *Phoen.* 1019–1054 as well as the prologue, but the phrasing suggests a whole play on the subject, and so the sentence is generally accepted as a testimonium to Euripides' *Oedipus* (test. ii in Kannicht).

\*\* 10(?). ps.-Apollodor. *Bibl.* 3.57

"Eteocles and Polyneices came to an agreement with each other about the kingship, and they determined that one of the two would rule for a year at a time. Now, some say that Polyneices ruled first and surrendered the kingship to Eteocles after a year, and some say that Eteocles ruled first and refused to surrender the kingship."

\*\* 11. Accius, *Phoenissae* frs. I–XIII (TrRF pp. 244–247 Ribbeck)

Fr. I seems to overlap with our Fr. 42 (address to sun); other fragments could be conjectured to be spoken by Eteocles (VII), Polyneices (VIII), Teiresias (X), and one is apparently addressed to Oedipus (XII).

DRAMATIS PERSONAE attested in fragments: Jocasta, Antigone, Eteocles, Polyneices, Creon, Teiresias; suggested by testimonia: Menoeceus, (?) Oedipus (uncertain because we can't say how closely Accius' *Phoenissae* followed the details of Eur.'s play; the reference of Malalas, Test. 9, is more likely to be the tragedy *Oedipus*).

THE CHORUS of Phoenician women can be inferred from title of the play.  
Prologue-speaker: uncertain.

DATE: after 412 (Test. 4). The plays performed in the same tetralogy can only be guessed at: scholars might have conjectured that *Oedipus* and *Antigone* could have formed a trilogy with *Phoenissae*, and some might have proposed that the three plays mentioned together in Test. 4 were all from the same year.

PLAYS OF THE SAME NAME are known for the early tragedian Phrynichus (similar in plot to Aeschylus' *Persians*: TrGF 3 F 8–12, with 3 T 5, 10d), and for the comic poets Strattis (fr. 46–53 = PCG VII.644–648) and Aristophanes (fr. 570–576 = PCG III:2.292–296); also tragedies of Accius and Seneca, and an Atellan farce by Novius. For other tragic treatments of the attack of the Seven against Thebes, see Aeschylus' *Septem* and TrGF adesp. 458, 665 (many think the latter is an exercise in imitation, not a real play).

## FRAGMENTA

## Prologue

Fr. 1 [= 18–20]

Origen *Cels.* 2.20; (18 only) Stob. 4.22d.92, *Et. Gen.* α 527; alii

μη σπείρε παιδων ἄλοκα δαιμόνων βία·  
εἰ γὰρ τεκνώσεις παιδ' ἀποκτενεῖ σ' ὁ φύς,  
καὶ πᾶς σὸς οἶκος βήσεται δι' αἱμάτων.

## Antigone views the army from a second-story room

Fr. 2 [= 90] *Et. Magnum* 274, 25

μεθῆκε μελάθρων ἐς διῆρες ἔσχατον

## Polyneices and his mother

(a) *initial greetings*Fr. 3 [= 344–348a] Plut. *de exilio* 606F; Sch. Ap. Rhod. 4.808–809; *Et. Magn.* 285, 28

ἐγὼ δὲ οὔτε σοι πυρὸς ἀνήψα φῶς  
νόμιμον ἐν γάμοις,  
ὡς πρέπει μητρὶ μακαρία.  
ἀνυμέναια δ' Ἴσμηνὸς ἐκηδεύθη  
λουτροφόρου χλιδᾶς

\*Fr. 4 [= 357–360] Stob. 3.39.22

μητέρα, φρονῶν εὖ κοῦ φρονῶν ἀφικόμεν  
ἐχθροὺς ἐς ἄνδρας· ἀλλ' ἀναγκαιῶς ἔχει  
πατρίδος ἐρᾶν ἅπαντας· ὅς δ' ἄλλως λέγει,  
λόγοισι χαιρεί, τὸν δὲ νοῦν ἐκεῖσ' ἔχει.

Fr. 5 [= 273] Sch. Aristoph. *Aves* 348

κἀκεῖσε καὶ τὸ δεῦρο, μὴ δόλος τις ἦ.

(b) *the ills of exile*Fr. 6 [= 388–393] Stob. 3.40.9; Musonius, 391–392; Stob. 3.13.11, Stob. 3.39.17; Plut. *Mor.* 599E; cf. Cicero *ad Att.* 2.25.1 [393a]

(IO.) τί τὸ στέρεσθαι πατρίδος; ἢ κακὸν μέγα;  
(PO.) μέγιστον· ἔργω δ' ἔστι μείζον ἢ λόγῳ.

(IO.) τίς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ; τί φυγάσιν τὸ δυστυχές;  
(PO.) ἐν μὲν μέγιστον· οὐκ ἔχει παρησίαν.  
(IO.) δούλου τὸδ' εἶπας, μὴ λέγειν ἅ τις φρονεῖ.  
(PO.) τὴν τῶν κρατούντων ἀμαθίαν φέρειν χρεῶν.

Fr. 7 [= 406–407] Stobaeus 3.39.3

(IO.) ἢ πατρίς, ὡς ἔοικε, φίλτατον βροτοῖς;  
(PO.) οὐδ' ὀνομάσαι δύναι' ἂν ὡς ἔστιν φίλον.

\*Fr. 8 [= 396–397, 402–405] Plut. *de exilio* 606C–E

(IO.) αἱ δ' ἐλπίδες βόσκουσι φυγάδας, ὡς λόγος.  
(PO.) καλοῖς βλέπουσαι γ' ὄμμασιν, μέλλουσι δέ.

\*\*\*\*\*

(IO.) φίλοι δὲ πατρὸς καὶ ξένοι σ' οὐκ ὠφέλουν;  
(PO.) εὖ πράσσε· τὰ φίλων δ' οὐδέν, ἦν τι δυστυχῆς.  
(IO.) οὐδ' ἠυγένειά σ' ἦρεν εἰς ὕψος μέγα;  
(PO.) κακὸν τὸ μὴ ἔχειν· τὸ γένος  
{δὲ} οὐκ ἔβοσκε με.

\*Fr. 9 [= 430–432a] Plut. *de exilio* 606F

(ὡς αὐτὸς [sc. Polyneices] μετὰ μικρὸν ὁμολογεῖ)  
πολλοὶ (δὲ) Δαναῶν καὶ Μυκηναίων ἄκροι  
πάρεισι, λυπρὰν χάριν ἀναγκαίαν δ' ἐμοὶ  
διδόντες.

Fr. 10 [= 438–440] Stobaeus 4.31a.2 (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 497B, with ἀνθρώποιον εὐρίσκειν φίλους in second line)

πάλαι μὲν οὔν ὑμνηθέν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐρῶ·  
τὰ χρήματ' ἀνθρώποισι τιμώτατα,  
δύναμίν τε πλείστην τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἔχει.

## The formal agon

(a) *Polyneices*

Fr. 11 [= 469–472] Stobaeus 3.11.1, alii

ἄπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφην,  
κοῦ ποικίλων δεῖ τάνδιχ' ἐρμηνευμάτων·  
ἔχει γὰρ αὐτὰ καιρόν· ὁ δ' ἄδικος λόγος  
νοσῶν ἐν αὐτῷ φαρμάκων δεῖται σοφῶν.

(b) *Eteocles*Fr. 12 [= 503–506] Stobaeus 4.6.3; Plut. *Mor.* 481A

ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδέν, μήτερ, ἀποκρύψας ἔρω,  
 ἄστρον ἂν ἔλθοιμ' αἰθέρος πρὸς ἀντολάς  
 καὶ γῆς ἔνερθε δυνατὸς ὦν δρᾶσαι τάδε,  
 τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὥστ' ἔχειν τυραννίδα.

Fr. 13 [= 524–525] Stobaeus 4.6.4 (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 18D, *Mor.* 125D–E);  
 translated into Latin in Cicero, *de officiis* 3.82, who says that Julius  
 Caesar loved to quote the Greek couplet

εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρῆ, τυραννίδος πέρι  
 κάλλιστον ἀδικεῖν, τᾶλλα δ' εὐσεβεῖν χρεῶν.

Fr. 14 [= 515–517] Orion, *Antholog.* 1.8; cf. Plut. *Pyrrh.* 14, alii

χρῆ δ' αὐτὸν οὐχ ὄπλοισι τὰς διαλλαγὰς, [διαλογὰς Orion]  
 μήτερ, ποιεῖσθαι· πᾶν γὰρ ἔξαιρεῖ λόγος  
 ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολεμίων δρᾶσειεν ἄν.

(c) *Jocasta to her sons*(i) to *Eteocles*

Fr. 15 [= 528–530] Stobaeus 4.50a.1; Sch. in Dionysii Thracis *Artem  
 Grammaticam*, *GrammGr* I:3.166, 4–6 (identifying speaker); Sext. Emp.  
*adv. math.* 1.62

ὦ τέκνον, οὐχ ἅπαντα τῷ γήρῳ κακά,  
 Ἐτεόκλεες, πρόσσεσιν· ἀλλ' ἡμπειρία  
 ἔχει τι δεῖξαι τῶν νέων σοφώτερον.

\*Fr. 16 [= 531–540] Dio Chrys. *Orat.* 17.8–9; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 481A, et al.

τί τῆς κακίστης δαιμόνων ἐφίεσαι  
 πλεονεξίας, παῖ; μὴ σὺ γ' ἀδικὸς ἢ θεός.  
 πολλοὺς δ' ἐς οἴκους καὶ πόλεις εὐδαίμονας  
 εἰσῆλθε (κάξῃλθ') ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῶν χρωμένων·  
 ἐφ' ἢ σὺ μαινεῖ. τοῦτο κάλλιστον βροτοῖς,  
 ἰσότητα τιμᾶν καὶ φίλους εἶναι φίλοις  
 πόλεις τε πόλεσι συμμάχους τε συμμάχοις  
 συνδεῖν· τὸ γὰρ ἴσον νόμιμον ἀνθρώποις ἔφυ,  
 τῷ πλέονι δ' αἰεὶ πολέμιον καθίσταται  
 τοῦλασσον, ἐχθρᾶς θ' ἡμέρας κατάρχεται.

Fr. 17 [= 546–547] Theodoret. *Graec. affect. cur.* 4.40; Oenom. apud  
Euseb. *praep. evang.* 6.7.30; 546 Isidor. *Pelus. ep.* 4.58

εἴθ' ἥλιος μὲν νύξ τε δουλεύει βροτοῖς,  
 σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀνέξει δωμάτων ἔχειν ἴσον;

## (iii) to Polyneices

\*Fr. 18 [= 570] Oenom. apud Euseb. *praep. evang.* 6.7.29

ἀσύνετα δ' ἦλθες καὶ σὺ πορθήσων πάτραν

## (iv) uncertain which brother addressed

Fr. 19 [= 555–557] Plut. *Mor.* 116A; cf. Stobaeus 4.31d.104, 4.31d.98

ὡς φησιν Εὐριπίδης, τὰ χρήματα οὐκ  
 ἴδια κέκτηνται βροτοί,

\*\*\*\*\*

τὰ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα.  
 ὅταν δὲ χρήζωσ', αὐτ' ἀφαιροῦνται πάλιν.

Fr. 20 [= 554] Stobaeus 4.32a.4; Clemens Alex. *strom.* 6.2.24.7

ἐπεὶ τὰ γ' ἀρκοῦνθ' ἱκανὰ τοῖς γε σώφροσι.

Fr. 21 [= 582] Priscian *Institut.* 1.11 & 2.12 (*GrLat* II.10, 14, II.52, 5)

ἀπωλόμεσθα. δύο κακῶ σπεύδεις, τεκνον

## (v) to both

\*\*Fr. 22 [= 460–461a] Athen. 4.51

κατὰ τὴν Στράτιδος τοῦ κωμωδιοποιοῦ Ἰοκάστην, ἥτις ἐν ταῖς  
 ἐπιγραφόμεναις Φοινίσσαις φησίν·  
 παραινέσαι δὲ σφῶν τι βούλομαι σοφόν·  
 ὅταν φακὴν ἔψητε, μὴ πιχεῖν μύρον.

## After the agon-speeches: sharp exchanges of Et. and. Pol. in trochaic tetrameters

\*Fr. 23 [cf. 637] Quintilian 5.10.31

*nam et illud apud Euripiden frigidum sane, quod nomen Polynicis ut argu-  
 mentum morum frater incessit.*

Fr. 24 [= 598a] Apoll. Dysc. *de conjunct.* [*GrammGr* 2:1:1.230, 3]

(ET.) κᾶτα σὺν πολλοῖσιν ἦλθες (...);

Fr. 25 [= 599] Stobaeus 4.13.19

(ΠΟ.) ἀσφαλῆς γάρ ἐστ' ἀμείνων ἢ θρασὺς στρατηλάτης.

Fr. 26 [= 597] Stobaeus 4.31c.75

(ΠΟ.)? εἰσορῶ· δειλὸν δ' ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ φιλόψυχον κακόν.

Fr. 27 [= 600a] *Et. Magnum* 527, 49.

κόμπος εἶ.

\*\*Fr. 28 [= 621–622] Epictetus 2.22.13

(ΠΟ.) ποῦ ποτε στήση πρὸ πύργων; (ΕΤ.) ὡς τί μ' ἴ ἐρωτᾷς τῷδ' ἴ;  
(ΠΟ.) ἀντιτάξομαι κτενῶν σε. (ΕΤ.) κἀμέ τοῦδ' ἔρωσ ἔχει.

### Teiresias and Creon (and Menoecus)

Fr. 29 [= 854–855] Sch. Ael. Arist. 118, 10

κἀκεῖ γάρ ἦν τις πόλεμος Εὐμόλπου δορός,  
οὗ καλλινίκους Κεκροπίδας ἔθηκ' ἐγώ

\*Fr. 30 [cf. 856–857] [Plato] *Alcib.* II 151b

ὥσπερ δὲ καὶ ὁ Κρέων Εὐριπίδῃ πεποιήται τὸν Τειρεσίαν ἰδὼν ἔχοντα τὰ στέφη  
καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ἀπαρχὰς αὐτὸν εἰληφέναι διὰ τὴν τέχνην

### The battle narrative

\*Fr. 31 [= 750] *Et. Magnum* 477, 15 Gaisford

ἴσους ἴσοισι πολεμίοισιν ἀντιθεῖς.

\*Fr. 32 [= 1099] Sch. vet. Soph. *Ant.* 106

λεύκασπιν εἰσορῶμεν Ἀργείων στρατόν.

Fr. 33 [= 1135–1136] Scholia in Lucianum 1.8.

(Ἄδραστος)  
ἔκατὸν ἐχίδναις ἀσπίδ' ἐκπληρῶν γραφῆ  
Ἕδρας

\*Fr. 34 [cf. 1156–1158] ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.75

ὡς δὲ Εὐριπίδης φησί, Παρθενοπαῖον ὁ Ποσειδῶνος παῖς Περικλύμενος ἀπέ-  
κτεινε

Fr. 35 [= 1172–1182a, omisso 1179] Schol. in Lycophronem 436 [cf. Scholia in Lycophronem 433 line 13]

Καπανεὺς δὲ πῶς εἶπομι' ἂν ὡς ἐμαίνετο;  
μακροῦχενος γὰρ κλίμακος προσαμβάσεις  
ἔχων ἐχώρει, καὶ τοσόνδ' ἐκόμπασεν,  
μηδ' ἂν τὸ σεμνὸν πῦρ νιν εἰργαθεῖν Διὸς  
τὸ μὴ οὐ κατ' ἄκρων περγάμων ἐλεῖν πόλιν.  
καὶ ταῦθ' ἄμ' ἠγόρευε καὶ πετρούμενος  
ἀνείρωφ' ὑπ' αὐτὴν ἀσπίδ' εἰλίξας δέμας,  
ἦδη δ' ὑπερβαίνοντα γεῖσα τειχέων  
βάλλει κεραυνῶι Ζεὺς νιν· ἐκτύπησε δὲ  
χθῶν

### Duel and death of sons of Oedipus

\*\*Fr. 36 Aristoph. *Phoen.* fr. 570 K–A (Athenaeus 4.41)

ὅτι δὲ ἀρχαῖον ἦν τὸ περὶ τοὺς μονομάχους καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης εἶρηκεν ἐν  
Φοινίσσαις οὕτως·  
ἐς Οἰδίου δὲ παῖδε, διπτύχῳ κόρω,  
Ἄρης κατέσκηψ', ἔς τε μονομάχου πάλης  
ἀγῶνα νῦν ἐστᾶσιν.

Fr. 37 [= 1364a & 1375] Diod. Sic. 10.9.8 (quoting an anonymous Pythagorean)

καὶ τοῦτο γνοίη ἂν τις ἐπιστήσας τοῖς ἐν ταῖς Εὐριπίδου Φοινίσσαις στίχοις, ἐν  
οἷς οἱ περὶ τὸν Πολυνείκην εὐχονται τοῖς θεοῖς, ὧν ἡ ἀρχὴ  
βλέψας ἐς Ἄργος,  
ἕως  
εἰς στέρον' ἀδελφοῦ τῆσδ' ἀπ' ὠλένης βαλεῖν.  
οὔτοι γὰρ δοκοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς εὐχεσθαι τὰ κάλλιστα ταῖς ἀληθείαις καταρῶν-  
ται.

\*\*Fr. 38 [= 1447–1450, 1450A, 1451–1452] Teles apud Stob. 3.40.8

θάψον δέ μ' ὦ τεκοῦσα, καὶ σύ, σύγγονε,  
ἐν γῆ πατρώα, καὶ πόλιν θυμουμένην  
παρηγορεῖτον, ὡς τοσόνδε γοῦν τύχῳ  
χθονὸς πατρώας, κεῖ δόμους ἀπώλεσα.

\*\*\*\*\*

καὶ γῆς φίλης ὄχθοισι κρυφθῆναι καλόν.

\*\*\*\*\*

συνάρμοσον δέ μου βλέφαρα τῇ σῆ χειρί,  
μῆτερ.



\*Fr. 39 [= 1453] Lucian *pro lapsu* 2 (Polyneices on the point of death)

καὶ χαίρετ', ἤδη γὰρ με περιβάλλει σκότος.

#### Fragmenta incertae sedis

Fr. 40 Scholia in Aristoph. *Ran.* 1185

ἀποκτενεῖν τὸν πατέρα: παρὰ τὰ Εὐριπίδου ἐν Φοινίσσαις εἰρημένα περὶ Οἰδίποδος καὶ Λαΐου.

Perhaps from the prologue narrative.

\*\*Fr. 41 [= 68a] Plut. *vitae* 388A = *Pyrrhus* 9

θηκτῶ σιδήρῳ δῶμα διαλαχεῖν (- -)

Perhaps from the prologue narrative. This line is quoted as tragic, but not specifically Euripidean, so it could be treated as an *adespota*; but since it is a trimeter form of Oedipus' curse on his sons, the temptation to assign it to *Phoenissae* would be strong.

Fr. 42 [= 3] Stob. 1.25.6, alii

Ἦλιε θεοῦ ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσω φλόγα,

An address to the sun might come from the prologue, but could also form the opening words of another entering character or introduce an invocation of the sun as witness to a statement.

\*Fr. 43 [= 283, 285] Schol. *Odyss.* 12.181

μέλλων δὲ πέμπειν μ' Οἰδίπου κλεινὸς γόνος,  
ἐν τῷ δ' ἐπεστράτευσαν Ἀργεῖοι πόλιν

This fragment is easily assigned to the play because it mentions the son of Oedipus and the moment when the Argives brought an army against Thebes. One wonders whether anyone would have identified the "me" of these lines as the chorus; the lack of a destination makes the fragment even less helpful.

Fr. 44 [cf. 1062] Herod. *de prosod. cathol.* [*GrammGr* 3:1.232, 8], cf. idem *de prosod. Iliac.* [*GrammGr* 3:2.41, 32]; sch. *Iliad.* 3.354a

λιθόβολον εἶμα κατειργάσω

Apparently from a lyric passage; "you accomplished a garment made by casting stones" seems highly artificial (and obscure of reference), so some might have declared the fragment corrupt. But if taken at face value, the

line would imply stoning (cf. *Il.* 3.57 λάϊνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα) of someone either within the play or in a mythical story narrated within the play.

Fr. 45 [= 1025] Herod. περὶ παθῶν [*GrammGr* 3:2.362, 7 ff., cf. 3:2.688, 42]

χαλαῖσι τ' ὠμοσίτοις

Clearly from lyric; someone might have conjectured that the words refer to the Sphinx.

Fr. 46 [= 1015–1018] Stobaeus 4.1.1

εἰ γὰρ λαβῶν ἕκαστος ὃ τι δύναιτό τις  
χρηστὸν διέλθοι τοῦτο κείς κοινὸν φέροι  
πατρίδι, κακῶν (ἂν) αἰ πόλεις ἔλασσόνων  
πειρώμεναι τὸ λοιπὸν εὐτυχοῖεν ἄν.

Gnomic; unclear whether from the *agôn* or another scene, where, for instance, it could have been spoken by Creon or Teiresias. It is unlikely that anyone would have challenged Euripidean authorship, though we now know that most recent editors bracket these lines at the end of Menoecus' speech.

Fr. 47 [= 198–201] Stobaeus 4.22g.198

φιλόψογον δὲ χρῆμα θηλειῶν ἔφυ.  
σμικρὰς δ' ἀφορμὰς ἦν λάβωσι τῶν λόγων,  
πλείους ἐπεισφέρουσιν· ἡδονὴ δὲ τις  
γυναιξὶ μηδὲν ὕγιες ἀλλήλας λέγειν.

Gnomic: it would have been mysterious how these fit into the play, although it would not have been impossible to guess the lines have something to do with Antigone's appearance in the play, since she is an unmarried girl, and Euripides regularly makes explicit the transgression of public appearance of such girls.

Fr. 48 [= 1320–1321] Stobaeus 4.57.9

τοῖς γὰρ τεθνεῶσι χρῆ τὸν οὐ τεθνηκότα  
τιμὰς διδόντα χθόνιον εὐσεβεῖν θεόν.

Gnomic: from the content we might have guessed at a burial debate after Polyneices' death, and it is improbable that anyone would have guessed that this is Creon speaking of the funeral rites of Menoecus.

Fr. 49 [= 821b] *Et. Magnum* 626, 38

ᾄνειδος  
λαμβάνεται καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κλέους, ὡς Εὐριπίδης ἐν Φοινίσσαις. Ἔστι δὲ τῶν  
μέσων λέξεων, ὡς τύχη, καὶ ζῆλος, καὶ δόλος.

Fr. 50 [= 1408b] Schol. *Eur. Or.* 1082

ὁμιλία χθονός

Fr. 51 [= 1209] Sch. *Eur. Or.* 1633

ἕα τὸ λοιπόν. δεῦρ' αἰεὶ γὰρ εὐτυχεῖς

Fr. 52 [= 28b] Sch. *Il.* 22.221

ἵπποβουκόλοι

Fr. 53 [= 86b–87] Sch. *Dion. Thrac. GrammGr* I:3.289, 20–21

(x) εἰ σοφός πέφυκας, οὐκ ἔαν βροτῶν  
τὸν αὐτὸν αἰεὶ δυστυχῆ καθεστάναι.

This is readily identified as an address to a god (probably Zeus, but δαίμων is another possibility) akin to nouthetic prayers. We cannot be sure where in the play it comes, but one might conjecture that Jocasta is the most likely speaker.

### Fragmenta dubia

\*Frag. Dub. 1 [= 24b] Sch. *Ap. Rhod.* 1.1265–1272b

καὶ Κιθαίρωνος λέπας

If from *Phoen.*, this could be from the prologue or some other reference to Oedipus' life, even in a lyric passage.

\*\*Frag. Dub. 2 [cf. 130] *Et. gen.* s.v. ἡμέριοι

ἡμέριοι· οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς ἡμέραν ζῆν ἐν ὑπομνήματι Φοινισ-  
σῶν

This might be taken to imply that the word was in the text of *Phoen.* itself, but the inference is uncertain, and with the full play before us we see that ἄμεριων is an inferior reading at line 130.

\*\*Fr. Dub. 3 [= 1688] *Plut. Mor.* 72C

ὁ δ' Οἰδῖπους ποῦ καὶ τὰ κλείν' αἰνίγματα;

This is quoted just before *Eur. Her.* 1250, so could reasonably be guessed to be Euripidean, and then his *Phoen.*, *Oedipus*, and *Antigone(?)* would be the logical possibilities.

**Second Edition** (showing how the "lost" play would appear to scholars of today)

Sigla used for papyri: Π<sup>1</sup> through Π<sup>22</sup> as listed in Mastronarde CCTC 1994 or Diggle OCT 1994; add Π<sup>23</sup> (= P. Oxy. 67.4566) and Π<sup>24</sup> (P. Tebt. Suppl. 1245, ZPE 160 (2007) 29–31, with a few letters of lines 261–267; but this could not be recognized as from *Phoenissae*); testimonial papyri Π<sup>aa</sup> through Π<sup>k</sup> as listed in Mastronarde CCTC 1994; add Π<sup>m</sup> (Luppe *Archiv* 1997: 96); note that the siglum Π<sup>a</sup> in Diggle OCT 1994 is our Π<sup>g</sup>, while Diggle's Π<sup>b</sup> is Π<sup>h</sup>. Note also I have not attempted to show all details of the papyri as in a complete critical edition, but am rather presenting the most interpretable portions in a simplified form. For the readings of the papyri, in addition to the original publications, see J.M. Bremer in *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983) 293–305 and J.M. Bremer and K.A. Worp in *Mnemosyne* 39 (1986) 240–260.

### TESTIMONIA

Test. 1–11 as in first edition above.

Several testimonial papyri (Π<sup>c</sup>, Π<sup>d</sup>, Π<sup>i</sup>, Π<sup>j</sup>, Π<sup>k</sup>, Π<sup>m</sup>) all overlap with passages given in other sources, so do not add to our knowledge (except as to the widespread knowledge of certain lines); but Π<sup>c</sup> is important because it allows us to see that our previous Frs. 15 and 16 are continuous. Π<sup>aa</sup>, Π<sup>b</sup>, Π<sup>e</sup>, and Π<sup>f</sup> would not have been recognized as reflecting *Phoenissae*. Three others are of some significance:

1a. fragments of the epitome

Π<sup>g</sup> is the more substantial and certain fragment:

Φ[ο]ίνισσαι ὧν ἀρχή[ι]  
ἢ[λ]ιε [θοα]τ[ς] ἵπποισι[ν] εἰλίσσ[ων] φ[λόγ]α·  
[ἦ δὲ ὑπόθ]εσις[·  
                    ]τῆν[          ]βαις βα  
                    ]ν[              ]ν απε[  
                    ]εινος εἰς  
                              ]γημ[  
                              ]λ[

*desunt aliquot lineae*

]ι[.]δ[                  ]το[  
]λεως[                 ]μεν[

]αγιον[ ]μ[  
 ]ανισκ[  
 ]αξε[  
 ]των αρ[  
 [ ]  
 τεσα[  
 αυτ[.]ιοκ[  
 παιδας εαυτ[ ]σε[π]εσφ[αξ]εν[ο]  
 ταύτης ἀδελ[φός] Κρέων παρελ[  
 τήν βασιλείαν[· οἱ δὲ Ἄ(ρ)γεῖοι τῆι μάχη[ι τ]ρ[ε]  
 φθόντες ἀπε[χώρ]ησα[αν·] Κ[ρ]έων δὲ παρρη-  
 σιαστικώτερο[ν] τῆι τύ[χη]ι χρώμενος  
 τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν Καδμείαν τῶν πολεμίων  
 πεσ[ό]ντ[α]ς εἰς τ[α]φήν οὐκ [ἔ]δωκεν· Πολυ-  
 νεΐκην δ' ἀκήδευτον ἔρ[ρ]{ε}ι[ψε]ν· Οἰδίποδ[α]  
 δὲ φυγάδα τῆς π[ό]λεως ἀπέστειλε[ν]·  
 ἐφ' ὧ[ν] οἱ φυλάξ[ας τὸ]ν ἀνθρώπων νό-  
 [μο]ν· ]ν οὐ λοιπογραφή-  
 σας[ ]παρα[ ]ν[ ]δυστυ]χεῖς  
 ἐλεήσας

Π<sup>h</sup>

Ἐτεοκλῆς π[ca. 6]ων τὴν ἐν θ[ή]βαις  
 τ[.]ν ἀδελφ[όν] Πολυ[ν]εικην απε[  
 .]αιου φυγα[ca. 6-7]ς παραγε[ν  
 ...]ς ἔγημεν[ca. 6-7]ρατ[.]βα..[  
 ...]ουκ[.]τε[  
 ...]ενο[.]κ[  
 ]ονιδων συ[  
 ]των ἐπεισε[  
 ]παραγενέσθα[ι  
 τ]ῆς τυραννίδ[ος  
 τέ]κνα συναγαγ[  
 πα]ραταξομεν[  
 ]υς ἐκ τῆς[

1b. Favorinus, *de exilio* = Π<sup>a</sup>

Favorinus for the most part simply confirms what we knew before (Frr. 7, 8, 15-16), mainly from Plutarch's *de exilio*. But this papyrus gives one new trimeter (Fr. 5a); allows us to fill out line 40 in the expanded Fr. 1 since Favorinus' traces overlap with an unascribed line quoted in Diogenes Laertius and Stobaeus; and gives us more of lines 367-370 in Fr. 6.

## NEW EVIDENCE FROM WORKS OF ART

A. Six Homeric bowls (2nd cent. BCE, probably made in Macedonia), catalogued as MB 45-50 in Sinn 1979, with illustrations on his Tafeln 18-20.

These do not in fact have the words Euripides or *Phoenissae* on them, but the labelled characters correspond to those we know to have appeared in the play and fit so well with what can be reconstructed that it is legitimate to include them as new testimonia. Moreover, the illustration on one seems closely related to the Roman lamp (B), which does have PHOENISSA inscribed.

The scenes attested are:

1. [MB 45a Sinn] Creon supplicating Teiresias, with Manto beside the seer (all three characters labelled), evidently from the scene in which Teiresias demanded the sacrifice of Creon's son. We already knew that Creon resisted the demand, but not that he supplicated Teiresias. Menoeceus is not shown in this illustration.
2. [MB 45b, 47 Sinn] Polyneices and Eteocles in single combat, with personified Thebe next to Eteocles (all three labelled).
3. [MB 45c, 46 Sinn] A messenger starting to move away, with Jocasta turning back to Antigone, who is emerging from the door (all three labelled). This scene suggests how Jocasta went to the battlefield for her suicide and how Antigone was brought back onto the scene so that she can later mourn the corpses.
4. [MB 45d Sinn] Antigone supplicating Creon (both labelled). Together with Π<sup>g</sup>, this suggests a little of the ending of the play.
5. [MB 48a, 48b, 49 Sinn] Eteocles dead, Polyneices dying, Antigone mourning, and Jocasta stabbing herself (all labelled) with personifications of the father's Curses or Erinyes (only ΠΑΤΡΩΙΑΙ survives of the label, above the one remaining demon-figure; it is postulated that two similar figures have been lost). Four additional figures of soldiers, in pairs, represent the two armies, with the two Thebans racing toward Jocasta as if to stop her suicide (so correctly Robert, whereas Sinn describes them as putting the Argives to flight), and the whole is framed by labelled personifications of Thebes and Argos.
6. [MB 50 Sinn] Blind Oedipus reaching for something; from the inscription, one can assume that the bodies of his sons and Jocasta were depicted, and one might guess that Antigone was present too to be the recipient of Oedipus' request. We cannot say whether Creon was

illustrated. Inscription: [ΟΙΔΙ]ΠΟΥΣ ΚΕΛΕΥΕΙ Α[Γ]Ε[ΙΝ ΠΡΟΣ] / [ΤΟ] ΠΙΤΩΜΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΜΗΤ[ΡΟΣ ΤΕ] / [ΚΑΙ] ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΥΙΩΝ.

B. Roman clay lamp (1st half of 1st century CE) with inscribed PHOENISSA (sic) and POLYN (*LIMC* s.v. Eteokles 43)

This shows in a circular relief the brothers on either side in different stages of collapse and Jocasta between them stabbing herself. PHOENISSA could be a mistake for PHOENISSAE, or it could be taken to be the name of the woman, if the artist who inscribed it copied a traditional picture but no longer knew this was Jocasta. But in either case, the illustration must at an earlier point have claimed to reflect *Phoenissae*.

C. Other Etruscan and Roman art-works (*LIMC* s.vv. Antigone 5, Eteokles 20–28, Iokaste 8)

These are of less certain relevance to reconstructing the play. The duel and mutual fratricide of the brothers is depicted on a number of Etruscan burial urns, sometimes with one or two women present or trying to intervene, occasionally with Oedipus present too or the suicide of Jocasta. A remarkable terracotta pediment group (*LIMC* s.v. Eteokles 26) from a temple in the Etruscan site of Telamon/Talamone (2nd cent. BCE) shows both brothers slumping in death, with the one on the left supported by a woman (perhaps Jocasta), and between them a kneeling Oedipus with arms upraised, mourning. A Roman sarcophagus (*LIMC* s.v. Antigone 5) depicts Jocasta, Antigone, and Oedipus present as the two brothers start to attack each other. Seneca's placement of Antigone, Oedipus, and Jocasta all on the battlefield before the duel seems to be related to the form of the story popular in Etruria and Rome; the idea of the family's intervention looks, to us who have *Phoenissae* in full, as if it is post-Euripidean, but some scholars have suggested that such an incident already goes back to an archaic *Thebaid*.

#### FRAGMENTA

#### Prologue

Fr. 1 [expanded, =3–40, from Π<sup>16</sup> with Π<sup>11</sup>, Π<sup>17</sup>, and 18–20 from testimonia, 21 from ΣArist. Ach. 263b, 32 from ΣTheoc. 6.2–3d, 34–35 from Strabo 16.38; also incorporates Fr. 52 [ἵπποβουκόλοι] and Fr. dub.1 [=

24b]; and Π<sup>a</sup> gives a full text of 40, which was known without ascription from Diog. Laert. 6.55 and Stob 3.17.15; line 3 also in Π<sup>d</sup>]

ΙΟΚ. Ἥλιε, θεαῖς ἵπποισιν εἰλίσσων φλόγα,  
ὡς δυστυχή Θήβαιαι τῆι τόθ' ἡμέραι  
ἀ[κτ]ῖν['] ἐφ' ἤκας, Κάδμος ἠνίκ' ἦλθε γῆν  
τῆνδ', ἐκλιπὼν Φοίνισσαν ἐναλίαν χθόνα-  
δς] παῖδα γήμας Κύπριδος Ἀρμονίαν ποτὲ  
Πολύδωρον ἐκξ ... υ .. τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακ[ον  
φῦναι λέγουσιν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦδε Λάιον.  
ἐγὼ δὲ παῖς μὲν κλή(ι)ζομαι Μενοικέως,  
Κρέων τ' ἀ[δε]λφός ..... [ ]υ  
καλοῦσι δ' Ἰοκάστην με· τοῦτο γὰρ πατὴρ {ε}  
ἔθετο. γαμῆ δὲ Λαῖός μ'· ἐπεὶ δ' ἄπαις  
ἦν χρόνια λέκτρα τὰμ' ἔχων ἐν δώμασιν,  
ἐλθὼν ἐρωτᾷ Φοῖβον ἔξαιτεῖ θ' ἅμα  
παίδων ἐς οἴκους ἀρσένων κοινωνίαν.  
ὁ δ' εἶπεν· ὦ Θήβαισιν εὐίπποις [ἄναξ,  
μὴ σπείρε παίδων ἄλοκα δαυμόνων βίαι·  
εἰ γὰρ τεκνώσεις παῖδ', ἀποκτενεῖ σ' ὁ φύς,  
καὶ πᾶς σὸς οἶκος βήσεται δι' αἵματος.  
ὁ δ' ἠδονῆι δούς ἐς τε βακχεῖον πεσὼν  
ἔπειρεν ἡμῖν παῖδα, καὶ σπ[ε]ῖρας βρέφος  
γνοὺς τὰμπλάκημα το[ῦ θε]οῦ τε τὴν φάτιν,  
λεμῶν' ἐς Ἥρας καὶ Κυθαιρώνας λέπας  
δίδωσι βουκόλ[οισιν ἐκθ]εῖναι βρέφος  
σφυρῶν σι[δηρᾶ κ]έν[τρ]α διαπείρας μέσων·  
ὄθεν νιν Ἑλλάς ὠνόμαξεν Οἰδίπουν.  
Πολύβου δὲ νιν λαβόντες ἵπποβουκόλοι  
φέρουσ' ἐς οἴκους εἰς τε δεσποίνης χέρας  
ἔθηκαν. ἡ δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν ὠδίνων πόνον  
μαστοῖς ὑφέϊτο κα(ι) πόσιν πείθει τεκεῖν.  
ἦδη δὲ πυρσαῖς γένυσιν ἐξανδρούμενος  
παῖς οὐμὸς ἢ γνοὺς ἢ τινος μαθὼν πάρα  
ἔστειχε τοὺς φύσαντας ἐμαθεῖν θέλων  
πρὸς δῶμα Φοῖβου, Λαῖός θ' οὐμὸς πόσις  
τὸν ἐκτεθέντα [παῖδα μαστεύω]ν ι[2–3]ν  
εἰ μηκέτ' εἴη, καὶ ξυνάπτετον πόδα  
ἐς ταῦτόν ἀμφω Φωκίδο[ς] σχιστῆς ὁδοῦ.  
καὶ νιν κελεύει Λ[αῖ]οῦ τρο[χηλάτης]  
ὦ ξένε, τυράννοις ἐκποδὼν μεθίστασο.  
40

With this fragment so restored, it becomes obvious that Accius *Phoen.* fr. I reflects this opening pretty closely:

*Sol, qui micantem candido curru atque equis  
flammam citatis fervido ardore explicas,*

*quianam tam adverso augurio et inimico omine  
Thebis radiatum lumen ostentum tuum?*

entryFr. 1a [new = 46–69, from Π<sup>16</sup>, Π<sup>19</sup>, Π<sup>17</sup>]

Σφιγξ ἀρ[  
Κρέων δ' ἀ[  
ὄστις σο[φ  
τούτωι ξ[  
μούσας ἐ[μὸς π]αῖς Οἰ[δίπους × - - -  
ὄθεν τύ[ραννος τ]ῆσδ[ε γῆς καθί]στατα[ι  
× - - - ]θλα τῆσ[δε - ]άνει χθονός, [verse omitted in Π<sup>17</sup>]  
γαμεῖ δὲ [-]εκοῦσ[ - ×]ῶς τάλας  
οὐδ' ἢ τεκ[οῦσα - - - × -]μένη.  
τίκτ[ω - - × - -] δύο μὲν ἄρσενας,  
Ἔτεο[κλέα × - -] Πολυνείκου / [- - -  
κόρας [- - ×]ς· τὴν μὲν Ἴσμήνη[- -  
ἄνόμ[ασε, - × -]εν Ἀντιγόνην ἐγώ.  
μαθ[- - - × - -] μητρῶων γάμω[ν  
ὁ πά[ν]τ[- - × Οἰδίπο]υς παθήματα  
ἐς ὄμ[μα - × - -]ν [ἐ]μβάλλει φόνον  
× - - - × - -]ν [αἰ]μάξας κόρας.  
× - - - × -] ἐ[μ]ῶν σιαίεται,  
× - - - × - -]ῆμων τ[- -  
× - - - × - - - × -]μάτω[ν.  
× - - - × - -]ῆς τύχ[- - -  
[  
× - - - × - - - × - -]δε.  
× - - - × - - - × -]όρ[ο]υς

### Antigone views the army from a second-story room

Fr. 2 [= 90] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 2a [= 106–118 and 128–140 from Π<sup>3</sup>]

<Θε.> ἰδοῦ, ξύναψον, παρθέν' {ον}· ἐς καιρὸν †δεμε-  
κινούμενος γὰρ τυγχάνει Πελασγικὸν  
στράτευμα· χωρίζουσιν ἀλλήλων λόχο(υ)ς.  
<Αν.> [ . ]πότνια παῖ Λατοῦς Ἑκάτα, κατάχαλκον  
2–3]ν ὄπλοις πεδίον ἀστράπτ{α}(ε)ι.  
<Θε.> οὐ γὰρ τι [ca. 5]ς ἦλθε Πολυνείκη[ς χθ]όνα,  
πολλοῖς [ca. 6–7]ις, μυριοῖς ὄπλ[ca. 7–8]ν.  
<Αν.> ἄρα πύλαι  
[ca. 11]κότ ... ἔμβ[2–3]λαίνοις ἀμφ[  
[ca. 14]ιχεος ωρμαστ[αι  
[ca. 16]πόλιν ἀλ[

<Αν.> [ ]  
γεγονότα γηγενηθλαν προσόμοιος ἀστερω-  
πὸς ἐν γραφαῖσιν, οὐχὶ πρόσπολος ἀμερίωι  
γέννα(ι). 130  
<Θε.> τὸν δ' ἐ[υ]ξαμείβον(τ') οὐχ ὄρᾱ(ι)ς Δίρκης ὕδωρ;  
<Αν.>? λοχαγὸς ἄλλος ἄλλος .τε τευχ[  
τρόπου  
τίς οὗτός ἐστι; <Θε.> παῖς μὲν Οἰ[κ] (ν)[εως] ἔφω  
Τυδεύς, Ἄρης δ' Αἰτωλὸς ἐν [× - ] ἔχει.  
<Αν.> οὗτος ὁ τᾶς Πολυνείκ[  
αὐτοκασιγνήτα(ι) νύμφας ὁ[  
ὡς ἀλλλ..χλοισμυχο. [  
ca. 5]φ[2]οι γὰρ παισίν[  
ca. 15]ε[ς] 140

### Polyneices and his mother

#### (a) initial greetings

Fr. 3 [expanded = 280–298, 307–310, 337–351 from Π<sup>13</sup> fr. 1, col. i–ii  
and Π<sup>8</sup>, with 344–348a from Plut. *de exilio* 606F; Sch. Ap. Rhod. 4.808–  
809; *Et. Magn.* 285, 28, and subsumes Fr. 43 = 283 + 285]

<Χο.> θ]ρ[έ]ψασά με, 280  
]δων δορὸς  
]νθάδ' ἀκροθίνιον.  
μέλλων δὲ πέμπειν μ' Οἰδίπου κλεινὸς γόνος  
]ιο. τ' ἐπ' ἐσχά[ρ]α[ς,  
ἐν τῶιδ' ἐπεστράτευσαν Ἀργεῖοι πόλιν.  
]στις ὦν ἐλ[ή]λ[υθ]ας  
πύ]ργωμα Θηβαία[ς] χθονός.  
<Πολ.> ]Οἰδίπους ὁ Λαίου,  
]παῖς Μενουκίως.  
Πολυνείκ]ην με Θηβαῖος λεώς. 290  
<Χο.> ]ρας προσπίπτω σ', ἀναξ,  
]ν σέβουσα .  
πα]τρῶ(ι)αν. 295  
]λε προδρομος,  
μάτερ;

#### quot versus desint incertum

]έρος, 306b  
]τ' ὄρεγμα βοστρῶ[χ  
χ]ρωατα χαίταις πλοκ[  
]δέραν ἐμάν.

#### quot versus desint incertum

σέ δ' ὦ τ[έκνον,] καὶ γάμοις ἤδη κλύω  
 ζυγέντ[α] παιδοποιὸν ἄδονάν  
 ξένοισιν ἐν δόμοις ἔχειν,  
 ξένον δὲ κ[ῆδος] ἀμφέπειν,  
 ἄλαστ[α] μα[τρὶ ..]δε Λαίωι τε  
 τῶ(ι) πάλαιγεν[εῖ,  
 γάμων ε[ca. 6] ἄταν.  
 ἐγὼ δ' οὔτε σοι πυρὸς ἀνήψα φῶς  
 νόμιμον ἐν γάμοις  
 ὡς πρέπει ματρὶ μακαρία·  
 ἀνυμέναια δ' Ἰσμηνὸς ἐκηδεύθη  
 λουτροφόρου χλιδᾶς,  
 ἀνά δὲ Θηβα[ί]αν πόλιν τῆσίγαος  
 σ[ῆ]ας ἔσοδοι νύμφας.  
 ὄλοιτο τὰδ' εἴτε σίδα[ρ]ος  
 ca. 7 εἴτε πατ[ῆρ] ὁ [3] αἰ[ ]

(v.l. γάμ)οισιν δῆ)

(|εινεχειν v.l.)  
340

345-346

350

\*Fr. 4 [= 357-360] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 5 [= 273] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 5a [new =363], from Π<sup>a</sup>

ὥστε ξιφήρη χεῖρα ἔχειν δι' ἄστεως

(b) *the ills of exile*

Fr. 6 [expanded = 364-377, 379-392 from Π<sup>13</sup> fr. 2-3, also 367-370 in scraps in Π<sup>a</sup>, with 388-393 from Stob. 3.40.9; Musonius, 391-392; Stob. 3.13.11, Stob. 3.39.17; Plut. *Mor.* 599E; cf. Cicero *ad Att.* 2.25.1 [393a]; all of 393 in Π<sup>b</sup>; 368 in whole from unascribed quotation in Plut. *Mor.* 526F]

ca. 6]πρόσ[  
 ca. 5]αί [τ]ε κα[ ]  
 ca. 4]η πατρῶι[ ]  
 ca. 4]ιος [ἰ]δὼν [..] λα[ ]θεῶ[ν  
 γυμνάσιά θ' οἷσιν ἐνετράφην Δίρκης θ' ὕδαρ·  
 οὐδ' δικα[ί]ω[ς] ἀπ[ε]λαθεῖς ξένην π[όλιν  
 ...]ων δι' ὄσ[σ]ω[ν] ὄμι' ἔχων δακρῦρ[ροον].  
 ...] ἐκ γὰρ ἄλγ[ουσ] ἀλγος αὖ, σέ δ[ ]  
 ....] ξυρῆμε[ς καὶ] πέπλους μ[ε]λα-  
 ....]σαν· οἴμο[ι τῶν] ἐμῶν ἐγὼ [κακῶν,  
 ὡς δ]εινὸν ἔχ[θρα], μῆτερ, οἴκ[εῖων φίλων.  
 ... δ]υσλ[ύ]τ[ο]υς [ἔ]χο[υ]σι τὰς διαλ[α]γάς.  
 πρ[έ]σβυς ἐ[ ]  
 ]ι[ ]

365

370

cf. Alc. 427

375

*quot versus desint incertum*

Οἰ]δίπ[ ]  
 ]αμε[ ] 380  
 ]γ[ca. 6-7]ερα[3]φ[ ]  
 ]υτα[ca. 5]ρην τὰ τῶ[ν  
 ca. 7]ρωμαιμ[.]ι σὴν δάκω [ ]  
 ca. 6]ἄ χρή(ι)ζω· διὰ πόθου δ' ἐλή[λυθα.  
 <Πο.> [ca. 8]ω, μηδὲν ἐνδεὲς λίπ[ ] 385  
 ca. 5 βο]ύλει, ταῦτ' ἐμοί, μῆ[τερ, - - 387 om.  
 <Ιο.> τί τὸ στέρεσθαι πατρίδος; ἢ κακὸν μέγα;  
 <Πο.> μέγιστον· ἔργω δ' ἐστὶ μείζον ἢ λόγῳ. (v.l. μάλλον)  
 <Ιο.> τίς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ; τί φυγάσιν τὸ δυστυχές;  
 <Πο.> ἐν μὲν μέγιστον· οὐκ ἔχει παρρησίαν.  
 <Ιο.> δούλου τὸδ' εἴπας, μὴ λέγειν ἅ τις φρονεῖ.  
 <Πο.> τὰς τῶν κρατούντων ἀμαθίας φέρειν χρεῶν. 393

Fr. 7 [= 406-407] unchanged from first edition (but 406 also in Π<sup>a</sup>)\*Fr. 8 [396-397, 402-405] unchanged from first edition (but 403 also in Π<sup>a</sup>)

\*Fr. 9 [= 430-431] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 10 [= 438-440] unchanged from first edition

**The formal agon**(a) *Polyneices (see now also Fr. 12)*Fr. 11 [= 469-472] unchanged from first edition (but 469 also in Π<sup>m</sup>)(b) (i) *end of Pol.'s speech and beginning of Eteocles'*

Fr. 12 [expanded = 493-512 from Π<sup>12</sup> with 503-506 from Stobaeus 4.6.3; Plut. *Mor.* 481A, and now also 499-500 from Galen VIII 636 Kühn, with ascription also given by Π<sup>k</sup>]

ἀποστεροῦ[ ]  
 καὶ ταῦθ' ἐκ[ ]  
 λόγων ἀθροί[ ] 495  
 καὶ τοῖσι φα[ύλοισ]  
 Χο. ἐμοί τῆι μῆ[ ]  
 τεθράμμ[εθ]  
 <Ετ.> εἰ πᾶσι ταῦτὸν καλὸν ἔφην σοφὸν θ' ἄμα,  
 οὐκ ἦν ἂν ἀμφίλεκτος ἀνθρώποις ἔρις·  
 νῦν [ ]  
 π[ ]

ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδέν, μῆτερ, ἀποκρύψας ἐρῶ·  
 ἄστρον ἂν ἔλθοιμ' ἥλιου πρὸς ἀντολὰς  
 καὶ γῆς ἐνερθε, δυνατὸς ὦν δοῦσαι τάδε,  
 τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὥστ' ἔχειν Τυραννίδα.  
 τοῦτ' οὖν τ[ὸ  
 ἄλλω(ι) παρε[  
 ἀνανδρία γ[άρ  
 τοῦλασσον ε[  
 ἐλθόντα συ[  
 τυχ[

(v.l. αἰθέρος)  
505

510

(b) (ii) elsewhere in Eteocles' speech

Fr. 13 [= 524–525] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 14 [= 515–517] unchanged from first edition (but the passage is also in Π<sup>k</sup>)

(c) Jocasta to her sons

(i) to Eteocles

Fr. 15–16 [= 528–540, text unchanged, but Π<sup>c</sup> now proves the lines continuous; add Π<sup>12</sup> as source of ends of 533–534; 531–536 in Π<sup>a</sup>, and 536 in Π<sup>l</sup> for second part; 529–530 also known from an inscription BCH 49 (1925) 88 no. 15

Fr. 16a [new = 543–548 ends only, from Π<sup>12</sup>, overlap with Fr. 17 not detectable]

]τε φῶς  
 ]  
 ]κώμενον.  
 ]ς,  
 ]  
 ]κη;

545

Fr. 17 [= 546–547] unchanged from first edition

(iii) end of address to Eteocles, beginning of address to Polyneices

Fr. 18–20 [expanded = 552–575 from Π<sup>15</sup>, 565–569 from Π<sup>12</sup> and previous Fr. 18 = 570, Fr. 19 = 555–557, Fr. 20 [= 554]

]πολλὰ μοχ[θ  
 βούλει; τί δ[  
 ἐπει τὰ γ' ἀρκοῦνθ' ἱκανὰ τοῖς γε σάφροσι.  
 οὔτοι τὰ χρήματ' ἴδια κέκτηνται βροτοί,  
 τὰ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα.

555

ὅταν δὲ χρήζωσ' αὐτ' ἀφαιροῦνται πάλιν·  
 ὁ δ' ὄλβος οὐ βέβα[ιος  
 ἄγ', ἦν σ' ἔρωμ[αι  
 π[ό]τ[ε]ρα τυραν[νεῖν  
 ἐρεῖς τυραννεῖν; η[  
 Ἄ]ργεῖά τ' ἔγχη δό[ρυ  
 δ]ψη(ι) δαμασθῆν ἀσ[τυ  
 δ]ψη(ι) δὲ πολλὰς αἰχμα[λωτ  
 β]ία(ι) πρὸς ἀνδρῶν πολεμίων[  
 δ]απανηρὸς α[ π]λοῦρος δν ζ[ητ  
 γ]ενήσεται Θή[βαισ]ι; φιλότιμ[  
 σο]ι μὲν τάδε [αὐδ]ῶ· σὺ δέ, Π[ο]λύνεικες - -  
 ἀ]μαθεῖς Ἄδρα[στο]ς χά[ρ]ι[τας  
 ἀσύνετα δ' ἦλθες καὶ σὺ πορθητῶν πόλιν.  
 φέ]ρ', ἂν ἔλη(ι)ς δ[  
 πρ]ὸς θεῶν, τρο[  
 πῶ]ς δαῖ κατάρ[ξ  
 κα]ὶ σκῦλα γράψ[εις  
 Θή]βας πυρώσα[ς

560

565

570

575

(iv) uncertain which brother addressed

Fr. 21 [= 582] unchanged from first edition

(v) to both

\*\*Fr. 22 [= 460–461a] unchanged from first edition

After the agon-speeches: sharp exchanges of Et. and. Pol. in trochaic tetrameters

\*Fr. 23 [cf. 637] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 24 [= 598] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 25 [= 599] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 26 [expanded 591–597 plus 601–604, 615–618 from Π<sup>12</sup>, with previous Fr. 26 = 597 from Stobaeus 4.31c.75]

ο]ῦντα[  
 ]αγεῖσα νο[  
 κ]ομίς[ο]υ τειχέω[ν  
 ]δ' ἄτρωτος ὅστις εἰς[  
 β]αλὼν ταῦτόν οὐκ ἀπ[  
 ]ω βέβηκεν· εἰς χέρας [  
 (Πο.) εἰσορῶ· δειλὸν δ' ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ φιλόψυχον κακόν.  
*quot versus desint incertum*

595

(Πο.)	]αιτώ σκήπτρα	
	]θ'· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὸν[	
	]ἔχων τὰ πλ[	
(Ετ.) [	ἀπαλ]λάσσου δὲ [	603
	]μοὶ πατρ[	
<i>quot versus desint incertum</i>		
	τ]ύχοις [	615
	]θένου[	
(Ετ.) [	τά]σδ' ὄψη(ι) ποτ[έ.	
(Πο.) [	ᾧ] κασίγ]νηται.	
(Ετ.) [	]ς ἀνακαλεῖς ἔχθι[στ	
(Πο.) [	]ἀλλά †σὺ με χαίρε	
(Ιο.) [	]υν πάσχω, τέκνον.	618

Fr. 27 [= 600] unchanged from first edition

\*\*Fr. 28 [= 621–622] unchanged from first edition

#### new scene: Eteocles and Creon

Fr. 28a [new, =690–703 and 719–739, from Π<sup>12</sup>; perhaps recognizable as beginning of scene if traces above 690 are recognized as preceding lyric lines in eisthesis]

(Ετ.)	χάρει σὺν καὶ κόμιζε[	690
	Κρέο[ντ'], ἀδελφὸ[ν] μη[τρὸς	
	λέγων τάδ', ὡς οἰκεῖα κα[	
	θέλω πρὸς αὐτὸν σ[	
	πρὶν ἐς μ[άχ]ην τε κ[	
	καίτοι [ca. 7]ν μ[	
	ὄρω γὰ[ρ] αὐτὸν πρὸς δ[	
	Κρ. ἢ πόλ[.]πληθο[	
	Ἐτεόκλεες[	
	φ[ca. 4]ας τ[ca. 4]θον[	
	καὶ [ca. 3] ἐγ[ώ] σ' ἔχρη(ι)ζ[ον	700
	πολ[ca. 6]υρον ἐν[	
	ὡς ἐς [ca. 6] συν[.]ψα[	
	- [..]ουσα[ca. 6]α[	
<i>quot versus desint incertum</i>		
	]πόνου.	
	]τ[	720
	] ]	
	]ς τινάς;	
	]ολεῖν.	
	]λόχου;	

]πάλιν.	725
]ωσι πλέον.	
]κνέφ[α]ς.	
]προσβάλω δόρου;	
]νικήσαι ἔδει.	
]ωρεῖν[	730
]θαι καλῶς.	
]Ἀργείων στρατόν;	
]ασιν πέριξ.	
]ω πόλιν;	
]σοφός.	735
]σοφωτέ[ρ]α;	
]ν, ὡς ἤκουσ' ἐγὼ ...	
]ὸ γὰρ σθ[ένος] βραχύ.	
]οσκεῖν[	

Fr. 28b [new, =768–789, 792–806, from Π<sup>10</sup>, end of same scene as 28a]

]σον	
]μον,	
]Κρέον·	770
]εται,	
]μψάμην	
]φας ... σ	
]πτω, Κρέον·	
ca. 3]ερ κρατη[ca. 6]Πολυν(ε)λικους νέκυν	775
ca. 2]ποτε ταφ[ca. 6–7]δε Θηβαία(ι) χθονί,	
ca. 3]σκεῖν δὲ[ca. 7]ντα, κὰν φίλοις τις ἦι.	
ca. 3]έρετε τε[ca. 6]σπλά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα	
ca. 4]ς ἀγῶ[ν]α τὸν προκειμένον δορός (780) [781 omitted]	
ca. 4]Εὐλα[βεί]αι, χρησιμωτάτη θεῶι,	
ca. 4]ευχ[όμε]σθα τήνδε διασῶσαι πόλιν.	
(Χο.)	
ca. 4]ύμοχθος Ἄρης, τί ποθ' αἵματι	
ca. 4]νάτωι κ[ca. 8–9]μίου παρὰ	
ca. 7–8]ταῖς;	785
ca. 7–8]αλλιφοροί[ca. 6]νοῖσι νε	
ca. 6]ωρας	
ca. 7–8]ον ἄμπε[ca. 5]λωτοῦ κατὰ	
ca. 7–8]ταμε[	
ca. 7–8]αῖς χ[ca. 10]π[	
<i>quot versus desint incertum</i>	
]βαινων	
] ]	
] ]	
] ]	
] ]	795
]νοπλον	



]τειχεα	
]ε	
]λευσιν	800
]λυθηρατα	
]χιονοτροφον	
]προτεθεντα	
]ψαιβρεφος	
]πισαμον	805
]ονουδει	

Fr. 28c [new = 829–833 from Π<sup>12</sup>, assuming it can be recognized as lyric by line-length and possible Doric participle ending]

]ατο	
]να	830
]νοισι	

#### Teiresias and Creon (and Menoecus)

Fr. 28d [new = 846–851 and 861–867 from Π<sup>12</sup>]

]αυτου, τεκνον.	
]βυτου φιλει	
κο]υφισματα.	
σ]πουδη, Κρεον;	
]ξαι σθενος	850
]βαλων οδοϋ.	

*quot versus desint incertum* β[

ηδ[	
εμ[	
τι δ[	
Τε. Έτε[οκλ	865
χ[	
λ[	

Fr. 29 [= 854–855] unchanged from first edition

\*Fr. 30 [cf. 856–857] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 30a [new = 898–900 and 931–934 from Π<sup>12</sup>]

]ιαν.

]η τάχα.	
]αι θέλω;	900

*quot versus desint incertum*

δεϊ τονδε θ[	
εγένετο Διρκ[	931
σφαγέντα φον[	
Κάδμου παλ[	

#### End of episode, choral ode, and arrival of messenger for next episode

Fr. 30b [expanded, 1015–1018 from old Fr. 46, 1017–1047, 1064–1071 from Π<sup>2</sup> and Π<sup>7</sup>, incorporating previous Fr. 45 [= 1025]; not enough of 1067 survives here to allow us to recognize that the full line is quoted in *Et. Gen.* α 593]

Εϊ γάρ λαβών έκαστος ο τι δύναϊτό τις	1015
χρηστών διέλθου τοϋτο κείς κοινόν φέροι	
πατριδι, κακῶν [ἄ]ν αϊ πόλεις έλασσόνων	
πειρώμεναι τὸ λοιπὸν εϋτυχοῖεν ἄν.	

<Χο.> [ε]βας [ε]β[ας ὃ [πτε]ροϋσσα, Γᾶς λόχευμα

[ν]ερτ[ε]ρου τ' Έ[χι]δνας,	1020
[Κα]δμε[ι]ων ἄ[ρ]παγά,	
[π]ολύφορος πολύστονος	
[μ]ιξοπάρθενος,	
δάιον τέρας,	

φοιτάσιν πτ[ε]ροῖς  
χαλαῖσι τ' ὠμοσίτοις.

Διρκαιῶ[ν ἄ π]οτ' ἔκ	1025
[τ]όπων νέους πεδαίρουσα-	
ἄλυρον [ἄ]μφι μοϋσαν,	
ὀλομέναν τ[ca. 4]ύν,	

ἔφερες[ca. 9–11]πατριδι  
φόνια φο[ca. 5–7..]θεῶν

ὃς τάδ' ἦν ὁ [πρ]αξας.	1030
ιάλε[δε]μοι δὲ ματέρων,	
ιάλε[δε]μοι δὲ παρθένων	
ἔστεναξαν οἴκοις.	1035

ιητήιον βοάν,  
ιητήιο[ν] μέλος

ἄλλος ἄλλον ἐπωτότυξε	(v.l. εποτο[ ])
διαδοχαῖς ἀνά πτόλιν.	
βρονταῖ δὲ στεναγμὸς	

ἀχά[ι] τ' ἦν ὁμοιος,

ὁπότε πόλεος ἀφανίσαιεν	1040
ἄ περοϋσσα παρθένος τιν' ἀν[δρῶν].	(v.l. αποτε[.]λεως)

<p>χρόνοι δ' ἔβα Πυθίαις[          Οἰδίπους ὁ τλάμων          Θηβαίαν τάνδε γὰν          τότε ἄσμενοι, πα[          ματρὶ [.]αρ[          δυσγ..[</p> <p><i>desunt vv. xvii</i></p> <p>ὄρμη[          οἴθε[          [                    ]          Αγ. ὦή, τ[          [.]νο[          ὦή μά[λ' αὔθις          ἔξελθ', α[          [..]ξ[</p>	<p>1045</p> <p>1065</p> <p>1070</p>
---	-------------------------------------

#### Messenger scene with Jocasta, reporting attack of the Seven

Fr. 30c [new, =1079–1095 from Π<sup>9</sup> and Π<sup>12</sup>, with an overlap with Photius πυργηρούμενοι; overlap at 1083–1086 places the two papyri relative to each other]

<p>(Αγ.) ἔστα[σ ca. 5–6]στοι κοῦκ ἀνήρ(π)αστα[ι πό]λις.          (Ιο.) ἤλ[θ ca. 4]πρὸς κίνδυνον Ἄργ[ - - ]ρός          (Αγ.) ἀκμή[ν ca. 3 α]ὕτην· ἀλ(λ)' ὁ {κα}Καδμε[ι - - ]ης          { - }κ(ρ)εῖσ[ων ..]πέστη τοῦ Μυκηνα[ίου δο]ρός.          (Ιο.) ἐν εἰπ[έ .... ]εῶν, ε(ῖ) τι Πολυνείκους πέρι          { - }οἴσθα [ca.4]λει μοι καὶ τόδ'; εἰ λεύσσει φά[ο]ς.          Αγ. ζῆ[ι σοι]σ[υ]ν[ω]ρις εἰς τόδ' ἡμέρας τέκνων.          Ιο. εὐδα[ι]μ[ον]ο[ί]ης. πῶς γὰρ Ἄργεῖον δόρ[υ          πυλῶ[ν] ἀπεστήσα(σ)θε πυργηρούμενοι;          λέξον, γέ[ι]ροντα τυφλὸν ὡς κατὰ στέγας          ἐλθοῦσα τέρω, τῆσδε γῆς σεσωμένης.          (Αγ.) ἐπεὶ Κρέοντος παῖς ὁ γῆς ὑπερθαν[ών          πύργων ἐπ' ἄκρων (σ)τάς μελάνδε[τον ξί]φος          λαμῶι διῆκε, [τ]ῆδε γῆι σωτήρ(ι)ον,          λόχους ἔνεμιαν ἐπτά καὶ λοχαγέτας          πύλας ἐφ' ἐ[πτ]ά, φύλακας Ἄργεῖου δο[ρός,          ]ου[....]ιωτας μὲν[                    ]ταις</p>	<p>1080</p> <p>1085</p> <p>1090</p> <p>1095</p>
--	---

\*Fr. 31 [= 750] textually unchanged from first edition, but one might now speculate that it comes from an earlier scene (such as the new Eteocles-Creon scene), since there is no overlap with new Fr. 30c]

Fr. 32–33 [expanded = 1097–1107, 1113–1137 from Π<sup>1</sup> and Π<sup>12</sup>, with prev. Fr. 32 = 1099 Fr. 33 = 1135–1136a]

<p>ὡς τῶ(ι) νοσοῦντι τειχέων εἴη δορός          ἀλκή δι' ὀλίγου. περγάμων δ' ἀπ' ὄρθ(ι)ων          λεύκασπιν εἰσορῶμεν Ἄργείων στρατὸν          Τευμησσὸν ἐκλιπόντα καὶ τάφρου πέλας          δρόμοι ξυνήψαν ἄστυ Καδμείων χθονός.          παιὰν δὲ καὶ σάλπιγγες ἐκελάδουν ὁμοῦ          ἐκείθεν ἔκ τε τειχέων ἡμῶν πάρα.          καὶ πρῶτα μὲν προσήγε Νηίσταις πύλαις          λόχον πυκναῖσιν ἀσπίσιν πεφρικτότα          ὁ τῆς κυναγοῦ Παρθενοπαῖος ἔκγονος          ..... ἔχων οἰκείον ἐν μέσω(ι) σάκει</p> <p><i>desunt aliquot versus</i></p> <p>ᾠγγυ[          ἔστ(ε)ιχ[          στικτ[          τὰ μ[          βλέ[π]οντα, τ[          ὦ[.] ὑστερον[          τ[ο]μ[ο]λογω[          Τυδ[ε          χα[          τι[          ο[          αρ[          ἐπ[          εὖ πως στρόφιγξιν ἐνδοθεν κυκλομ[εν -          πόρπαχ' ὑπ' αὐτόν, {ωστον} ὥστε μαίνεσθαι δοκ[εῖν.          ὁ δ' οὐκ ἔλασσον Ἄρεος ἐς μάχην φρονῶν          Καπανεὺς προσήγε λόχον ἐπ' Ἠλέκτραις πύ[λαις].          σιδηρονώτου δ' ἀσπίδος κύκλοις ἐπῆν          γίγας ἐπ' ὤμοις γηγενῆς ὄλην πόλιν          φέρων μοχλοῖσιν ἐξανασπάσας βάρθρων,          ὑπόνοια(ν) ὑμῖν οἷα πείσεται πό[λις].          ταῖς δ' ἐβδόμαις Ἄδραστος .. πύλα[ισιν] ἦν,          ἑκατὸν ἐχίδνας ἀσπίδ' ἐκπληρῶν γραφῆι,          ὕδραν ἔχων λαιοῖσιν ἐν βραχ[ε]ῖο(ι)σιν          Ἄργεῖον αὐχημ'· ἐκ δὲ τειχέων μέσ[ων</p>	<p>1100 (Καδμείας s.l.)</p> <p>1105 (-παίου ἐγγόνου Π<sup>1</sup>)</p> <p>1115</p> <p>1120</p> <p>1125</p> <p>1130 (προσηγε Π<sup>1</sup> a.c.)</p> <p>1135 (v.l. ὕδρας)</p>
---	--

\*Fr. 34 [cf. 1156–1158] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 35 [= 1172–1182a, omisso 1179] unchanged from first edition

**Duel and death of sons of Oedipus**

\*\*Fr. 36 unchanged from first edition

Fr. 37 [= 1364a &amp; 1375] unchanged from first edition

\*\*Fr. 38 [= 1447–1450, 1450A, 1451–1452] unchanged from first edition

\*Fr. 39 [= 1453] unchanged from first edition

**new scene: Antigone and Oedipus mourning in lyrics**Fr. 39a [new = 1499–1581 and 1710–1736 from Π<sup>5</sup>, using only WG307, because impossible to add scraps of WG305 confidently]

]δάκ[ρ]υσι δάκρυσι[.] δόμος, ἰὼ δόμος, ἀνακαλέσωμαι  
 ] α σύγγονα, ματέρα καὶ τέκνα, χάσματα Ἐρινύος, ἀ δόμον Οἰδιπόδα  
 ] τὰς ἀγρίας ὅτε δυσξύνετ[.] ξυνετὸν μέλος ἔγνω Σφιγγὸς αἰοιδῶ  
 σῶμα  
 ] οἱ τίς Ἑλλάς ἢ βάρβαρος ἢ τῶ[ν] προπάρουθε εὐγενετᾶν ἕτερος  
 ἔτλα—  
 ] ν τοσῶνδε αἵματος εν.αμερίου τοιάδε ἄχεα φανερά φανερά—  
 ] λίζη τις ἄρ' ὄρνις δρυὸς ἢ ἐλάτας ἀκροκόμοις ἐμ πετάλοις μουνα  
 ] ρημα ἔμοις ἄχεσι συνωιδό[.] λινον αἰάγμασιν ἀ τούσδε προκλαίω—  
 ] ἄζουσα τὸν αἰὲ χρόνον ἐν λειβομένοισιν δακρύοις.—ετινα πρῶτον  
 ] αγμον ἀπὸ χαιτάς βάλω; ματρὸς ἐμάς ἐν διδύμοις γάλακτος παρὰ  
 μασ[τ]οῖσ[  
 ] λόμεν' ἴάπεισματα δισσῶν; ὅτοτοτοτοτοῖ, λίπε σοὺς δόμους, ἀλ[  
 ] αιε, δεῖξον, Οἰδιπόδα—ὅσον αἰῶνα μέλεα μέλεος ὄν ἔτι δά[  
 ] ασι σοῖσι βαλὼν ἔλκεις μακρόπουν ζόαν.—κλύεις, ὦ κ. [   
 ] δυστήνοισι δεμνίοις ἰαύων;—τί μ' [ῶ] πα[ρ]θέ[νε] ... τ[   
 ] ς φῶς λεχήρη σκοτίων ἐκ θαλάμων οἰκ[τ]ρ[   
 ] νέκυν ἔ[ν]ερθεν ἢ πτανὸν ὄν. - [ca. 12]—δυ[   
 ] ι σοι τ[έ]κνα λεύσσει φ[ά]ος[ca. 6] λοχο[ς] παρὰ βάκτροις πόδα σόν[   
 ] ἀέν ἐμόχθει, πάτε[ρ] .μοι[.] - ... οἱ ἐμῶν παθέων. πάρα γὰρ σ[τ]   
 ] σαι ψυχὰί ποῖαί μοῖραι φῶς ἔλιπον, τάδε μοι, τέκνον, αὔδα - [   
 ] ασ[... ] ἄλ' ὀδύνας λέγω. σὸς ἀλάστωρ ἕξφεισι βροίθων καὶ π[   
 ] τερο. [ ]—ετι τόδε καταστένεις τέκνα - [   
 ] ν ἀελίου φάος ὄμμα[τ]ος αὐγ[   
 ]   
 ]   
 ]   
 ]   
 ] σινορο[   
 ] κοινὸ[ν] ἐνυάλιον[ca. 9] λέοντ[   
 ] αν λοιβάν φόνιον ἂν ἔλαχε Ἄρης ωπ[   
 ] φ[ά]σαν[ο]ν εἶσω σαρκὸς ἐπεμψε ἄχει[   
 ] ε συνήγαγεν, ὦ πάτ[ca. 6] ἔροισιν ἄχη μελάθροισι θεὸς δὲ τάδε[   
 ] ε χεῖρα φίλαν πάτ[ca. 8] πομπίμαν ἔχων ἐμὲ ὥστε ν[ 1710 ff.

]υμ ... οδα. ος ἀθλι[ca. 6 γ] ενόμεθα γενόμεθα ἄθλι. [   
 ] - [ ] που θυ[ca. 5] τίθημι ἴχνος; βάκτρα πόθι φέρω, τ[   
 ] τίθειω[ca. 9] ἰσχύν—ἰὼ ἰώ, δυστυχε[σ]τ[   
 ]—ἰὼ [ca. 11] ἐγὼ τλᾶς—τί τλᾶς; ουχο[   
 ] μ ..σ .ν καλλίνικον οὐρανὸν[   
 ] αα. δω τάδε σ' ἐπέμενε μέλ[   
 ]   
 ]

**Fragmenta incertae sedis**

Several of these are now placed in context, and one additional papyrus fragment joins this category.

Fr. 40 unchanged from first edition

If this statement (that Oedipus killed his father) was found in the prologue narrative, then it fell between our Fr. 1 and Fr. 1a.

\*\*Fr. 41 [= 68a] unchanged from first edition (we cannot place it in new Fr. 1a because only line-end survives in papyrus while last word of line is missing from the quotation).

Fr. 42 [= 3] now first line of Fr. 1

\*Fr. 43 [= 283, 285] now part of Fr. 3, and known to be non-consecutive lines

Fr. 44 [cf. 1062] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 45 [= 1025] now part of Fr. 30b

Fr. 46 [= 1015–1018] now part of Fr. 30b (still not enough context available to raise doubts about authenticity)

Fr. 47 [= 198–201] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 48 [= 1320–1321] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 49 [= 821b] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 50 [= 1408b] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 51 [= 1209] unchanged from first edition

Perhaps with a clearer notion that the first messenger reports to Jocasta and that she subsequently goes to the battlefield, one might conjecture that “Leave the rest aside. Up to this point in time you are fortunate” is addressed to Jocasta before she learns of the duel of her sons.

Fr. 52 [= 28b] now part of Fr. 1

Fr. 53 [= 86–87] unchanged from first edition

Fr. 54 [= new, 646–656 from the Rylands Library part of Π<sup>2</sup>, identified by the editor as from the same roll as P.Oxy 224, although the exact basis of this identification is not stated]

νοτις ε[	
Δίρκας χ[	
καί βαθυ[	
Βρόμιον ε[	
μάτηρ διο[	
κισσὸν δν[	650
έλικτός ευ[	
χλοηφορο[	
καί κατασκ[	
[β]άκχε[ιο]ν χ[	655
[..]σ[	

Clearly a lyric passage.

#### Fragmenta dubia

One of these is now placed and no longer dubious; three additional fragments from papyri join this category.

\*Frag. Dub. 1 [= 24b] now part of Fr. 1

\*\*Frag. Dub. 2 [cf. 130] no change from first edition

\*\*Fr. Dub. 3 [= 1688] no change from first edition

\*\*Fr. dub. 4 [new, =171–184, 220–226, 625–635, from Π<sup>4</sup>]

The papyrus scrap with 625–635 was found separately, but these papyri are known to be by the same scribe and may be from the same roll, in which case they are probably from the same play. There is no decisive indication that we are dealing with *Phoenissae*, but we may note that fr. a has the ends of trimeters alternating with lyric lines (possible dochmiac), and that a servant is addressing a “mistress”; moreover, if μετρῶν is understood to be a participle and *hybris* against the city is involved, one could conjecture that Kapaneus and Thebes are at issue and that the mistress addressed is Antigone. In that case, the chariot driving and something or somebody *sôphrôn* might refer to Ampharaus. In fr. b, the mention of Thebes could reinforce these hints, and the farewell could be guessed to be that of Polyneices at the end of the *agôn*-scene. But we could

not ascertain whether these are the line-ends of trimeters or tetrameters, since the left margin is lost.

a.	] ς π[ο]θεν</td <td></td>	
	ή]νιοστροφεῖ βεβ[ώς	
	]ᾶ δέσπο(ι)ν' ὄδε	
	]ης φιλαίματοι ῥοαί	
	θ]ύγατερ Ἀελίου	175
	χρ]ύσειον κύκλοιν φέγγος	
	]καί σάφρονα	
	]ων {ε}ἰθύνει	
	]δ ἐφυβρίζει πόλει	
	]	180
	]εις τεκμαίρεται	
	κάτω{ι} τείχη μετρῶν	
	]ιος βαρύβρομοι	
	]φῶς αἶθαλο	
	]ριαν[...ρ	

*quot versus desint incertum*

γαμασ[	220
βωλατ[	
υδωρ[	
θενιο[	225
ωλαμ[	

b.	]ξίφος	625
	μα]ρτύρομαι	
	]ομαι χθονός	
	]ουσι[	
	]αιτιωι	
	]αι χθονός	630
	]α χαιrete	
	]ς ὑμᾶς ποτ[ε]	
	π]έποιθα σὺν θεο[ις	
	θηβ[αί]α[ς χθ]ονός	635

\*\*Fr. dub. 5 [new, =244–250, from Π<sup>20</sup>]

The combination of “seven-gated” and “Phoenician” suggests this may be from *Phoenissae*, although other plays on a Theban theme could not be ruled.

κοινὰ δε[...π[	
έ]πτάπυργος α[	245
Φ]οινισσασα ..[	

...]νον αιμα[  
 ... κ]ερασφόρο[υ  
 ....]τεστιμ[  
 ca. 5-6]πτο[

\*\*Fr. dub 6 [new, = 1327-1337, from Π<sup>23</sup>]

This can be guessed to accompany the arrival of a messenger ("I see," "face," "will announce"), and the presence of "concerning life" and Oedipus after a dative plural ending makes it tempting to think we have the arrival of the news of the death of the brothers.

	]σαγα[	
	]αιταδε[	
	]ητηπα[	
π]ερί ψυχῆς κ[		1330
]οῖσιν Οἰδίπ[ου		
]εἰσορῶ τόδ[ε]		
]πρόσωπον[		
ἀγ]γελεῖ τὸ δρ[ώμενον.]		
]ον ἢ τίνας[		1335
]φρ[		
]λαγ[		

## Bibliography

- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., and Lee, K. H. 1995. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, vol. I. Warminster.
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., and Gibert, J. 2004. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, vol. II. Oxford.
- Collard, C., and Cropp, M. J. 2008a. *Euripides: Fragments*, VII.1 *Aegeus-Meleager*. LCL. Cambridge, MA.
- Collard, C., and Cropp, M. J. 2008b. *Euripides: Fragments*, VII.2 *Oedipus-Chrysippus*. LCL. Cambridge, MA.
- Cropp, M., and Fick, G. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: the Fragmentary Tragedies*. BICS Supplement 43. London.
- Diggle, J. 1994. *Euripidis Fabulae*, tomus III. Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. 2000. "Foreword: Fragments" in Harvey and Wilkins 2000: xvii-xix.
- Harvey, D., and Wilkins, J. (eds.). 2000. *The Rivals of Aristophanes*. London
- Jouan, F., and Van Looy, H. 1998-2003. *Euripide. Tome VIII: Fragments*. Paris.
- Kannicht, R. 1997. "TrGF V Euripides," in G. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments, Fragmenten sammeln*. Aporemata. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte 1. Göttingen. 67-77.
- Kannicht, R. 2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 5: Euripides*. Göttingen.
- Luppe, W. 1997. "Literarische Texte," *ArchPF* 43: 93-106.
- Mastrorade, D. J. 1988. *Euripides. Phoenissae*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig.
- Mastrorade, D. J. 1994. *Euripides. Phoenissae*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29. Cambridge.
- Mastrorade, D. J. 2007. "A Ptolemaic Scrap of Euripides' *Phoenissae*: P. Tebt. Suppl. 1245," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 160 (2007) 29-31
- Mastrorade, D. J., and Bremer, J. M. 1982. *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai*. University of California Publications: Classical Studies 27. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Nauck, A. 1871. *Euripidis Tragoediae. Vol. III: Perditarum Tragoediarum Fragmenta*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Leipzig.
- Nauck, A. 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Leipzig.
- Robert, C. 1908. "Homerische Becher mit Illustrationen zu Euripides' Phoenissen," *JdI* 23: 184-203.
- Scheer, E. 1908. *Lycophronis Alexandra. Vol. 2: Scholia*. Berlin.
- Sinn, U. 1979. *Die Homerischen Becher. Hellenistische Reliefkeramik aus Makedonien*. AM-BH 7. Berlin.