PHOENIX AND CLYTIA (OR PHTHIA)*

In Book I (9) of the Iliad Homer gives us the sad story of Phoenix, especially that terrible suffering which he underwent in the house of his father and which tarnished his life forever. What follows is part of the words that Phoenix, full of bitterness, addresses to Achilles as a companion of the other two members of the embassy—these are Odysseus and Ajax—who are sent to him by the Greeks at Troy, hard pressed by the Trojans and the furious warrior Hector. Their object is to placate the exasperated son of Thetis. Phoenix in particular undertakes in very pathetic language to persuade Achilles to return to the camp of the Achaeans from which he withdrew when Agamemnon took Briseis, his beloved captive girl, from him. Homer gives us here the essential elements of the myth, as he also does with other mythical stories. It was on this foundation that the tragedians1 were later to erect their dramatic superstructures. Let us see then what Phoenix tells Achilles about his youth (verses 444 ff.)2:

...for these reasons my child, I would not like to be left alone without you, not even if the god himself undertook to strip from me old age and render me young and strong, as when first I left Hellas with its beautiful women, fleeing from a quarrel with my father Amyntor, son of Ormenos. For he became very angry with me on account of a fair-haired maiden3, living in his house, for whom he felt a strong desire, and dishonoured his lawful wife, my mother. So she always besought me by clasping my knees to have a dalliance with the concubine first myself, that she might feel aversion toward the old man. I obeyed her and did as she had begged me, but my father was at once aware of my deed and cursed me terribly and invoked the abhorrent Eri-

* The present work is a chapter from my book Potiphar Motif Stories, Cologne 1984.
1. Sophocles and Euripides.
2. See p. 230 ff.
3. See below and p. 220.
nyes that no son of mine should ever sit on his knees, and the gods fulfilled his curse, Zeus of the underworld and dread Persephone.

[Then I planned to slay him with my sharp sword, but one of the immortals appeased my anger so that I should not be called a parricide among the Achaeans and pointed out that I would incur the disapprobation of my countrymen and the wrath of the people.]

Then was my heart no longer able to suffer remaining in the house of my angered father...

(471 ff.) They kept watch in their turn, and the fires were never put out, one beneath the portico of the well-fenced court and one in the porch before the door of my chamber. Even so, when the tenth dark night came upon me, then indeed I burst the solidly fitted doors of my chamber, came out and leapt the fence of the court easily, unnoticed by the watchmen and the woman servants. After that I fled away through spacious Hellas, and came to the fertile Phthia, mother of flocks, to king Peleus... (483 ff.) and he made me rich and gave many people to me, and I dwelt on the border of Phthia, ruling over the Dolopians...

(492 ff.) I have suffered much for you and toiled much, ever mindful of this that the gods in no way would grant me a son born of my body. But I made you my son, godlike Achilles, to save me from shameful ruin, when the time comes.

The characteristic elements, situations and persons of the myth are the young Phoenix, who lives together with his parents; his old father Amyntor, and his mother Hippodameia. Amyntor passionately loves the young maiden and avoids his wife, who thus feels dishonoured or even hated by him1. Phoenix’s mother has sensed the reason why her husband has these feelings towards her and seeks means to win him back before it is too late, that is, to make him give up his intentions regarding the girl, with whom he has not yet had any intimate relations. She sees the only solution in throwing her son into the arms of her rival, for, if her young son offers first his love to the girl, as the youth is by far stronger than his old father, his mother thinks it natural that she will become very attached to Phoenix and reject advances on the part of Amyntor...

1. This idea is sufficiently stressed in some tragedies of Euripides as well, but in all likelihood not in this one. See below p. 220 ff.
Phoenix and Clytia (or Phthia)

He may well arouse her aversion and disgust. We infer this from the verse 452,

\[ \text{Παλλακίδι προμιγήναι, ἵν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα' } \]

to which Eustathios (II. I, p. 762) adds,

\[ \text{ἀφίσταται γάρ γέροντος νέα γυνὴ πειραθεῖσα ἡβώντος ἀνδρός, } \]

«a young woman who has been tempted by a young (and robust) man rejects as a matter of course an old man.»

With these thoughts in mind the mother keeps on begging Phoenix, clasping his knees, to help her before her husband manages to have intimate relations with the young woman. Unfortunately we do not know the circumstances under which the young woman came to his home and became dependent on him. It is, however, probable that Amyntor has reared her and waited till she has reached a more mature age, for Eustathios i.e. stresses,

\[ \text{ἡ (sc. Κλυτίαν) ὁ πατήρ Ἀμύντωρ οὐπώ μέν ἔγνω, καθά } \]

\[ \text{οἰ παλαῖοι φασίν, εἰς τοῦτο δὲ ἄντρεφε. διὸ οὐδὲ μυγήναι φησιν οὐ } \]

\[ \text{Φοίνιξ, τῇ παλλακίδι ἀλλὰ προμιγήναι, ἤτοι πρὸ ἑκείνου μυγήναι, ἵνα } \]

\[ \text{ἐχθήρειε τὸν γέροντα. } \]

Phoenix seems not to have been willing to listen to his mother’s entreaties and apparently did not want to come into conflict with his father. He must have been faced with the dilemma that the satisfaction of one of his parents would bring the dissatisfaction of the other. In the end he gave in to his mother’s wishes though it is certain that he did so rather

1. Theognis (ed. Van Groningen, Amsterdam 1966, 457-460) expresses something similar:

\[ \text{ō̱ τοι σύμφορόν ἐστὶ γυνὴ νέα ἀνδρὶ γέροντι’ } \]

\[ \text{ō̱ γάρ πηδαλίῳ πείθεται ὡς ἀκατος, } \]

\[ \text{ō̱δὲ ἄκρυραι ἔχουσιν, ἀπορρήξασα δὲ δεσμὰ } \]

\[ \text{πολλάκις ἐκ νυκτῶν ἕξον ἔχει λιμένα. } \]

«A young woman does not bring any good to an old man, for she is like a boat that does not obey the rudder, nor can the anchors hold her firm. She, after having broken the lines, many a time finds at night another harbour.»


\[ \text{δὲ μοι παλλακίδος: οὐ τῆς ἥδη μιγείσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς εἰς τοῦτο τρεφομένης’ φησι γυνὴ προ- } \]

\[ \text{μιγήναι (I 452). οὐκ ἀντίκειται δὲ τὸ ὅτι τὴν μὲν ἐφίλει, ἡμιαζε δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα: ἔπραττε } \]

\[ \text{γὰρ τοῦτα ἐν νῷ ἔχον ἢδη τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὀμμάτων. } \]

3. One should pay particular attention to the adverb αἰέν and to the iterative form λισσέσκετο in the verse (451).

\[ \text{ἡ (sc. μήτηρ ἐμῆ) δ’ αἰέν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων... } \]
reluctantly. But his father discovered in one way or another that his son had had sexual relations with Clytia (or Phthia), became furious, and in his rage placed a curse on Phoenix to keep him from ever having a son of his own. And to seal his curse he invoked the terrible Erinyes, Zeus of the nether world, and fearful Persephone. With his curse he apparently wanted to indicate that he regretted having brought to life a mere rascal who dared do such a thing to his own father. Phoenix, very embittered, tells us that the gods fulfilled these curses. In reaction to this it is possible that the young Phoenix's θυμός rebelled, and, as he says, it occurred to him to kill his father with his sword, but a second thought or a god's interference checked him and made him recall what his people would say: They would revile him, call him a parricide, and avoid his company. After ten days of imprisonment he managed to escape and leave his native land. He came to Phthia, to Peleus' kingdom, where Achilles' father cordially received him as if he were his own son, gave him a part of his land and people to rule, and entrusted him with the task of rearing and educating Achilles. So Phoenix makes clear to Achilles that, since his destiny did not allow him to have children of his own, the affection and devoted service he has rendered to Achilles entitle him to exact from him, his pupil or so to speak his stepson, support and protection in his old age, just as he would expect from a real son, if he had one.

It is in this spirit that Phoenix speaks to Achilles to assuage his rancour and make him give in and come to relieve the Achaeans, who are being massacred by the unrestrained Trojans.

These are the essential parts of the myth that Homer has handed down to us and which, as we shall see, Euripides took into account to a great extent in writing his tragedy. Keeping this story in mind, let us see how the tragedian handled it in his play.

1. One could possibly go a bit further here and maintain that perhaps a concept of natural justice and defence of the rights that derive from marriage and some feeling of sympathy towards the injured party may have determined Phoenix's decision. On the other hand one should be careful not to push this very far, for such ideas are mainly influenced by Christian beliefs and moral convictions that characterize a much later era. Even if we find enough evidence in support of this view in the Scholiasts, we should never forget that the matter is mainly seen through the prism of Christianity or monastic ideals of the time. Eust. II. I, p. 763... ο Φοίνιξ δικωμένη τῇ μητρὶ τιμωρήσας διυκίλου πειράτα τοῦ πατρός. εὶ δὲψέγεται ὡς πατέρα λυπήσας, ἀλλὰ λύεται τὸ ἐγκλήμα διὰ τοῦ φύσει δικαίου. γάμον γὰρ ἀδικομένου ἀνωθόσκατο, ὡς τὸν πατέρα μὴ ἀδικήσας ἐλύσησεν. Cf. Erbse, ibid.: τοῦτο οὖν ο Φοίνιξ ἐποίησεν εἰς οἰκόνομον τὸν γονέων. Euripides seems to have taken full advantage of this and depicted a much more virtuous character. See below.
Our main source for the plot in the Euripidean play is Apollodoros in his *Bibl.* III. 13, 8:

Φοίνιξ ὁ Ἀμύντορος—ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐτυφλώθη καταψευσαμένης <αὐ-τοῦ> Φθίας (ино Κλυτίας) ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς παλλακίδος. Πηλεὺς δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς Χείρωνα κομίσας, ὅπ’ ἐκείνου θεραπευθέντα τὰς ὑφεις βασιλέα κατέστησε Δολόπων.

An equally important source that goes into some detail and which seems to have been recognized as a good parallel of the Euripidean play is the story of Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων which we find in the codex Coisl., Gaisl. Prov., p. 123a: Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων δῆμων ἢπείρωστον εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἱδρυμένου βασιλέα διὸ συμφοράς τὸν ἄνθρωπον δεινὰς περιπεσεῖν πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀπέλαβε [sic] τὴν γυναῖκα, εἰ δὲ αὐτὸ τὴν ἀνθρώπην ἐγενόμενη: εἰτα τὸν ὕλον ἐπήρωσε διαβόλος πλαστὴ τῆς μητρός γυναῖκος, καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἄνεβιβάσας εἰς πλοιάριον καὶ ἐξέθηκε νήσῳ: εἰτα ὁ ὅρις κατεχόμενος αὐτὸς τε καὶ ἡ γυνὴ κατὰ πάντα τὴν πόλιν, αὐτὸς μὲν συγκλείσας εἰς πάντα τῶν κτημάτων ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ πῦρ ὑποβαλὼν ἐκάυθη; ἡ δὲ γυνὴ εἰς φρέαρ ἔαυτην ἔρριψεν.

The same story, though less accurately related, is found in Suidas under the entry Ἀναγυράσιος. There we read:

Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων καὶ τέμενος Ἀναγύρου ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ἀναγυρασίων. Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων, ἐπεὶ τὸν παροικοῦντα πρεσβύτην καὶ ἐκτέμνοντα τὸ ἄλσος ἐτιμώρησα τὸν Ἀνάγυρος ἔρως. Ἄναγυράσιος δὲ δῆμως τῆς Ἀττικῆς τούτου δὲ τῆς ἔξεικοφε τὸ ἄλσος· ὁ δὲ τῷ ὕλῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπέμηνε τὴν πάλλακας, ἣτις μὴ δυναμένη συμπετάσι τὸν πατρὸν διέβαλεν ὡς ἀσελγή τῷ πατρί: ὃ δὲ ἐπήρωσεν


2. It is possible that the name of the concubine in Euripides' play was Κλυτία; Φθία would be rather improbable and may point to a confusion of the young woman and the toponymy. Φθία is the place to which Phoenix comes after he leaves his native land. It is rather improbable that both, person and place, would have the same name. On the other hand, if this is not the result of confusion, we may have here a change in her name from Φθία into Κλυτία, as it seems to be the case with Ἀντεια and Σθενέβους and Ἀστυδάμεια or Ἰππολύτη Κρηθείς. In any case more of our sources give us the name Κλυτία; cf. Schol. II. I (9) - Erbse, ibid.: ἥ δὲ Κλυτία καὶ μήτηρ Ἰππολύτη καὶ Ἀλκιμή - Tzetz. on Lyc. 421: Φοίνιξ ὁ Ἀμύντορος ταῖς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Κλεαθούλῃς ικεσίαις μιγεῖς τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς παλλακίδος Κλυτίας ἢ Φθίας κατὰ τινὰς ἐτυφλώθη παρὶ αὐτοῦ (E. Scheer, *Lyc. Alex*, Berlin-Weidmann-1958.).

Here Hieronymos tells the story of the daemon Anagyrasios and finds it, at least in its main outlines, similar to the plot of the Euripidean play Φοίνιξ. The hero punishes the old peasant who has desecrated his altar or his grove near which he has his domicile. The method of punishment is somewhat strange, because the daemon in his vengeance upon the old man makes use of and brings great misfortune upon persons who are innocent or seem to be so. Thus occurs here the same thing as in the tragedy of Hippolytos: Aphrodite punishes in the first place Hippolytos against whom she has a grudge, but a number of other persons have to suffer as well. Phaedra and Theseus experience the repercussions of the calamity. In like manner the hero, Anagyros, uses the young man, the son of the peasant, as the immediate object of his punishment, while he indirectly extends his vindictiveness to the concubine and the old man. The hero causes the young woman to strongly desire the peasant’s son. She presses her lewd advances on him but does not manage to persuade him. He rebuffs her. Anticipating denunciation, she turns the tables and accuses him to his father of rape. The jealous father in his fury burns his son’s eyes out with red-hot spits. When the father realizes what he has done to his son, and apparently after he has discovered that the son is innocent, he hangs himself, or according to another version he burns himself and all his belongings, while the concubine throws herself into the well. As a whole the story is indeed very like that of Phoenix, but its end is certainly different.

Another important source that sheds light on the story of Phoenix is the testimony of the Schol. A II. I 453 c. (Eust. II. p. 763, 9 sqq.): τῆς έρεξα: 'Αριστόδημος ὁ Νυσαιεύς, βήτωρ τε ἀμα καὶ γραμματικός (cf. F. H. G. III 307), φεύγων τὸ ἐγκλημα, ἐπενόησε γράφειν «τῇ οὐ πιθόμην οὔδε ερεξα». καὶ οὐ μόνον γε ἡδοκιμήσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτιμήθη ὡς εὐσεβή τηρήσας τὸν ἢρωα. πρὸ δὲ αὐτοῦ Σωσιφάνης (fr. 6, T.G.F. ρ. 820 Ν.2) τὴν τοιαύτην εὐφράγην, καὶ Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἀναμένην εἰσάγει τὸν ἢρωα ἐν τῷ Φοίνικι (cf. T.G.F. p. 621 Ν.2). ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ Ἀρσοχρατίων ὁ Δίου διδάσκαλος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς I. Eustathios then adds ἄριστον δὲ το τῆς μητρὸς ἐπεισό-

1. See below, p. 226.
Here the Scholiasts stress the essential difference between the Homeric Phoenix and the Euripidean one. Euripides portrays a flawless character: Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἀναμάρτητον εἰσάγει (Eust. ἀπταιστὸν συντηρεῖ) τὸν ἠρώα ἐν τῷ Φοίνικι.

Moreover Eustathios develops an interesting hypothesis: that the way the tragedian presents his Phoenix would better suit the Homeric one, for, if the young man had not obeyed his mother, he would then clearly have suggested to Achilles that it would not be in his interest to obey his mother Thetis, either. Achilles’ mother keeps advising him to stay away from the Greek allies, trying of course, as a mother would do, to avert the impending doom that was to come upon her son in the battle. She says: «But you do be wroth at them (sc. the Greeks) and so forth.» This, however, is not meant to be taken as a possible correction of the Homeric text, for that would destroy the whole story of Phoenix there and what follows, πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς αὔτικ' ὤσθείς, would not make any sense because in Homer there is no mention of an accusation on the part of the concubine. In any case Eustathios’ remark is misleading and should not have been made.

We can already see—it will become clearer as we progress—that the tragic element which we find in Homer became in the hands of Euripides even more tragic and an important part of his work. The tragedian brought some very important changes in the roles and characters of the persons involved which enabled him to transform his material into acts and scenes and stage a successful play.

One can certainly see the kind and virtuous character of Phoenix in the Iliad from his thoughts reflected in the words expressed to Achilles (Scholia in the Iliad 1. c.): τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔφεξα· ὡς πρὸς ὅμοιοις γονέαν τὰ παρὰ προαίρεσιν ἐποίησε· φησί γοὺν ἃ δ' ἀιὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο» (I 451). καὶ πάλιν τῆς διχοστασίας αὐτῶν κρείττονα τὴν φυγήν ἐπαμύνουσι δὲ τῷ καταπομμένῳ; Eust. II. I, p. 762: ἰδέσι γὰρ ὁ Φοίνιξ λέγει τὸ μιγήνα τῇ παλλακῇ, εὐφημῶν καὶ φειδόμενος «ὁ—

Euripides developed the nobility in Phoenix’s character to the full. If Phoenix in Homer was unwilling to set himself against the desires of his father and did so only in response to the fervent entreaties of his mother, here in Euripides he rejects the seductive, lewd advances of his father’s young mistress for more or less the same reasons we come across in the stories with the same motif. Because of his integrity and moral principles⁴ he rebuffs her, who, feeling despised, turns the tables by accusing him of rape or attempted rape. It is expressly stated that Euripides εἰσάγει and συντηρεῖ his hero ἀναμάρτητον or ἀπταιστον blameless, flawless. The problem is how he did this, and then what happened to the mother with her entreaties. What role did she have to play in the tragedy? It is exactly here that the tragedian made his greatest changes. The mother’s entreaties are absent. In their place come the open, seductive advances on the part of the young mistress, who is clearly not the innocent girl we see in the previous account². The dilemma for Phoenix—should he respect his father or fulfil his mother’s wish—does not confront him here. The role of his mother was almost certainly discarded and her figure as such is of very minor importance. The young girl, here a concubine, stepped into her place and practically superseded her in her conjugal rights and possibly in her so to speak maternal duties towards the young Phoenix. This tightening of the bond between Amyntor and concubine and to some extent between the concubine and Phoenix, who in a way becomes her stepson in consequence of the removal of the mother, is the core of the tragic plot. In this way the young Phoenix is practically free to act. He is under no great psychological compulsion to do or not to do anything imposed upon him from outside. His decisions are based on convictions as to what is right or wrong. Some sort of respect towards the father may or may not account for the rejection of his father’s concubine. It is only under such circumstances that the really noble character of the young man can be fully appreciated. The way in which the tragedian works is familiar to us from plays with the same motif. The young woman here plays a role not different from that of Phaedra, and Phoenix is dependent on his father and presumably on his father’s mistress in some ways like Hippolytus, but he is more free and nat-

⁴. Except for consideration for or some kind of respect towards his father that may account for his decision, but also may not.

². See above, p. 214 f.
ural with no encumbrances of traits from an Amazon mother and bastardy, and he is surely not preoccupied with Artemis and her cult. We must view Clytia as playing a role similar to that of Chrysis in the Samia of Menander. This arrangement is suggested by the dramatic economy of the play and justifies the extent of the wrath of the father and the magnitude of punishment he inflicts upon his son after he is accused by the mistress. In other words Euripides could never have effectively permitted Amyntor to blind his son in his fury, if he had kept the Homeric setting with a wife still rather close to her husband and a very young girl whom the old Amyntor had not yet touched. In addition, our main sources, Apollodoros and Hieronymos, make no mention of a wife, while the other valuable piece of information we get from the parallel story of Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων, which we find in the codex Coisl. (Gaisf. Prov., p. 123, see above), gives us a very significant detail, which in all likelihood reflects a feature of the Euripidean play: πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀπέλαβε [sic] τὴν γυναῖκα, ἕξις αὐτῷ παῖς ἐγεγόνει· εἶτα τὸν υἱὸν ἐπῆρωσε διαβολῇ πλαστῇ τῆς μητρῶς χρησάμενος... This is supposed to be part of the calamity which befalls the old peasant and which points simultaneously to two things emphasized above: his separation from his wife, obviously some time before the accusation is brought against Phoenix by the mistress—this probably occurred before or by the time Amyntor developed his relationship with Clytia—; and Clytia’s bearing the title of 'μητρῶι', stepmother and no longer that of παλλακίς (ή παλλακή) concubine. This consideration seems to be supported by fr. 818 N.², άμνήστευτος γυνή-ή (ή cod.) παλλακχῆ which may well be taken to suggest the close relationship between Amyntor and Clytia³.

We have a parallel case to this story in the Samia of Menander where Nikeratos says to Moschion in front of Demeas, to whom he thereafter addresses the speech (verses 498 ff.),

τούτ’ ἐτάλμησας σὺ πρᾶξαι, τούτ’ ἔτλης; Ἀμύντορος
νῦν ἐχρῆγν ὀργήν λαβεῖν σε, Δημέα, καὶ τουτοί
ἐκτυφλώσαι.

1. In the other fragments we have no indication of a wife or mother, and only the Epigr. Cysic., Anthol. Pal. 3, 3: Ἀλκιμέδη ξυνόμευν Άμύντορα παιδός ἔρυχευ, Φοινικὸς θ’ εθέλει παύσαι χόλον γενέτου—κείνος θ’ αὖ δολίος ψυχρίσασαν ἰχθύτου κούρω, ήγε θ’ ἕς ὀφθαλμοφόρη λαμπάδα παιδολέτιν, refers to the mother and to her mediation in the feud. The source does not seem to be trustworthy as far as the Euripidean tragedy is concerned; it does not mention the role of the concubine, which is of primacy importance. The Scholia I 449 b give Κλυτία as the name of the concubine, 'Ἰπποδάμεια ἢ Ἀλκιμέδη that of the mother; see above.
«Is it you who dared do such a thing? No less than Amyntor's wrath should fall upon you now, Demeas, and blind him (Moschion) once and for all.»¹

Nikeratos has in mind Euripides' tragedy and sees the relations of the triad—Demeas, Chrysis, and Moschion—as he does those of Amyntor, Clytia, and Phoenix. He thinks that Moschion, Demeas' adopted son, has seduced the mistress of his father, Chrysis, and has had a child by her—while in fact it is his daughter's child by Moschion before their marriage². In a strange way, comic in Menander's play and tragic but nonetheless analogous to that of Euripides, the young Moschion is as innocent towards Chrysis as Phoenix is towards Clytia, who has accused him because she has not obtained from him what she desires. Cetainly in the case of Amyntor and Phoenix the natural bond of father and son makes the deed of seduction of the father's mistress by the son more scandalous and abhorrent than the supposed sexual relationship and its fruit between Moschion and Chrysis, for Moschion and Demeas are not blood relatives.

Amyntor believed the words of his mistress that his son had raped her and in his fit of anger may have placed a curse on him here as in the Iliad never to beget children of his own. Fr. 806 N.² seems to belong in this context:

άλλ' ουπτ' αυτὸς αμπλακάων ἄλλον βροτόν
παρανέσαιμ' ἀν παισὶ προσθείναι κράτη,
πρὸν ἄν κατ' ὄσσων τυγχάνῃ μὲ καὶ σκότος,
εἰ χρὴ διελθεῖν πρὸς τέκνων νυκώμενον.

These words very likely come from Amyntor. He regrets he has sired a son who, he thinks, has turned against him and against his wishes. He advises others not to rely on successors. He himself would rather spend his life childless than to have to live with children as his masters³.

From the role the Chorus usually plays, the nature of the situation,

¹. It is as if Nikeratos wanted to say, «You, Demeas, are in the same situation as Amyntor was. You should act likewise: blind for good him who deceived you. In fact you should get even angrier than he did»—Amyntor was tricked to believe unfounded accusations and punished his son severely. «You really have been dishonoured by your son. Look at the child he has begotten by your Chrysis. You do not need a better proof than this, do you?»

². See note 1.

³. The meaning in the last two verses is not very clear. Meineke attributes this fragment to Amyntor as well.
and parallel works, it is reasonable to believe that they expressed their doubts as to the guilt of the young Phoenix. One would expect them to warn Amyntor to be careful, not to lend a ready ear to the words of a woman, nor to commit a violent deed in his anger. But the old, stubborn Amyntor, blind with fury, placed all his trust in his mistress’s words.

Fragments 809 and 810 may belong to a ἡγών λόγων, of Amyntor against Phoenix:

\[\ldots \quad \text{ὅι} \text{ πείραν οὐ δεδωκότες} \]
\[\text{μᾶλλον δισσαυτες ἡ πεπωκότες σοφοί} \]

and

\[\text{μέγιστον ἁρ' ἄν ἡ φύσις: τὸ γάρ κακὸν} \]
\[\text{οὕδεις τρέφων εὖ χρηστὸν ἄν θείῃ ποτέ.} \]

Until he is accused, Phoenix seems to live a blameless life, respected by his father as well as by his countrymen. He is apparently admired for his virtue even by the concubine herself. With the accusation, however, (and the allegedly unexpected conduct) which his father accepts without question, things become different altogether. Amyntor is surprised at the sudden change of his son’s character as Theseus is in Hippolytos’ case. And what they cannot tolerate is having been deceived for so long and not having noticed what villain sons they were rearing. It is such thoughts that arise in these fragments. Both Amyntor and Theseus become exasperated at the discrepancy they ascertain between the impression other people make—which prima facie is praiseworthy—and their true nature. Their conclusion is that ἡ φύσις plays so great a role that one cannot resist it, and this is a topos in the tragedy of Euripides.

1. This is the attitude of the Chorus in Hippolytos; in the verses 891 f. they say:
\[\text{άναξ, ἀπεύχου ταῦτα πρὸς θεῶν πάλιν,} \]
\[\text{γνῶσιν γάρ αδίς ἀμπλακών' ἐμοι πιθό.} \]

2. These qualities characterize the hero of the Potiphar motif stories, Hippolytos, Bellerophon, Peleus, Joseph and the rest. No wonder that their good looks together with their other qualities attract women who, in their desire, attempt to seduce them.

3. Hippol., from the ἡγών, 925 ff.; 942:
\[\text{τοὺς μὴ δικαίους καὶ κακοὺς πεφυκότας} \]
\[\text{(944 f.)} \quad \text{ἔξελεγχεται} \]
\[\text{πρὸς τῆς θανούσης ἐμφανῶς κάκιστος ὄν'} \]

and fr. 265 a = 920 N.2 (Auge):
\[\text{ἡ φύσις ἐβουλεῖθ', ἡ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει;} \]
\[\text{γινὴ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ τὸδ' ἔφι.} \]
We may suppose with a fair degree of probability that the poor Phoenix, like another Hippolytos, tried with all his might to shake off the accusation and prove his innocence, but with his furious father he had no luck, and what Nikeratos says in the verse we saw above, α’Αμύντορος νῦν ἐχρήν ὀργήν λαβεῖν σε», must have become proverbial, that is, it purported to show the severity with which parents punished their children, when in their eyes they had transgressed.

Fr. 815, δμωσίν δ’ ἐμοίσιν εἶπον ὡς καυτῆρα
ἐς πῦρ ἔθει καὶ <ταύτα> δὴ διϊπετῆ θείναι¹,
comes probably from Amyntor. Although corrupted, the sense is clear: it points to the order he gives to his servants to put the spits on the fire so that they will become red-hot before the terrible act of burning out his son’s eyes.

One may wonder at this point whether the father himself blinded his son with his own hands off-stage, or whether the servants did it after he gave them all the instructions, while he remained on the stage waiting to be informed of the execution of his orders². Though we are completely in the dark regarding this problem, one would assume that Euripides’ dramatic taste would not push Amyntor to such extreme brutality. The dramatist is very careful not to blacken thoroughly his character. Even in his worst characters he allows some possibility for repentance and something humane to win sympathy, even at the last moment and after the catastrophe. But without much doubt we can be pretty sure that the abhorrent deed took place away from the scene³ and that the details first became known to the chorus and to Amyntor only through the Messenger’s speech. Moreover, the Messenger’s speech, as in Hippolytos, is intended to describe as vividly as possible events that for plausible reasons occur away from the stage and beyond the immediate experience of the actors and the audience. One of its purposes is to reveal the truth, very often the innocence of the hero, and the injustice done to him⁴. The guilty father must hear this account, when he himself, like Theseus, has not been present at the catastrophe. The Messen-

1. According to the emendation of Valckenaeur, Diatr., p. 274 (815 N.²).
2. Fr. 815 that brings in the role of servants in this respect may also be a hint in that direction.
3. The most that one might have heard would be the shrill, painful cries of Phoenix coming from some distance, when the burning spits were thrust into his eyes.
ger is in a position to pronounce this judgment on the earthly level and to prepare the ground for the *deus ex machina*, who in his turn and on another level will reveal why things happened in the way they did and determine what is still to be done. In this way he helps to tidy up the loose strands of the play and bring some sort of order after confusion has got the upper hand in men’s dealings.

Fr. 812 contains words most likely addressed to Amyntor after the blinding of Phoenix. If so, they are pronounced by the Messenger¹ in his plea:

\[
\text{ήδη δὲ πολλών ἡρέθην λόγων κρίτης}
\]
\[
\text{καὶ πολλ’ ἀμιλληθέντα μαρτύρων ὑπὸ}
\]
\[
\text{τάναντ’ ἔγνων συμφορᾶς μιᾶς πέρι.}
\]
\[
\text{κάγῳ μὲν οὕτω χῶστες ἐστ’ ἄνηρ σοφὸς}
\]
\[
\text{λογίζομαι τάληθες, εἰς ἄνδρος φύσιν}
\]
\[
\text{σκοτῶν διαχτάν θ’ ήμνιν’ ἡμερεύεται...}
\]
\[
\text{όστις δ’ ὁμιλῶν ήδεται κακοῖς ἄνηρ,}
\]
\[
\text{οὐ πώποτ’ ἡρώτησα, γιγνώσκω δὴ}
\]
\[
\text{τοιοῦτος ἐστὶν οὐσπερ ἡδεται ξυνόν.}
\]

The sense of the fragment is: It has often happened before that I have been chosen to judge between arguments on the basis of their plausibility. I have taken into consideration a great number of opposing testimonies about the same thing in order to form my opinion. But I myself, and whoever claims to be σοφὸς (wise), come to this conclusion. To find the truth I draw my logical inferences after examining the nature of the man and the way he spends his day...and whoever takes pleasure in associating with the wicked, I have never needed up to now to ask (what sort of man he is), for I know him to be such as the people with whom he likes to converse².

---

1. Though these words could also come after the accusation had been made and be spoken by the Chorus-leader or even by a servant.

2. A related theme that seems to have been brought up in the play is the distinction between words and deeds. This is the point of fr. 813 a = ad. 515 N.²:

\[
\text{καὶ τῷ δὲ δηλώσαιμ’ ἂν, εἰ βούλοις σὺ,}
\]
\[
\text{τάληθες, ὡς ἐγώνε γαύτος ἀχθομαι,}
\]
\[
\text{δόστις λέγειν μὲν εὔπρεπεῖς ἐπιστάται,}
\]
\[
\text{τὰ δ’ ἔργα χείρω τῶν λόγων παρέσχετο.}
\]

Euripides is very fond of stressing their essential difference; cf. also *Hippolytos* 486 ff.:

\[
\text{τοῦτ’ ἐσθ’ ὁ νητῶν ἐν πόλεις οὐκουμένας}
\]
\[
\text{δόμους τ’ ἀπόλλυσ’, οἱ καλοὶ λοιπὸν λόγοι.}
\]
\[
\text{οὐ γὰρ τι τοῖσιν ὡσι τερπνὰ χρῆ λέγειν}
\]
\[
\text{ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὧν τις εὐκλείης γενήσεται.}
\]
Fr. 811, τάφανη τεκμηρίουσιν εἰκότως ἀλήσκεται,
the sense of which is that hidden truth is obtained only through proof, may belong in the same context as fr. 812, but it is also possibly a remark from the Chorus who approve what the Messenger says or even part of what the deus ex machina may have said, rebuking Amyntor, who has placed confidence in the concubine’s words and ignored his son’s refutation and who is too eager to inflict punishment without having first searched for τεκμήρια.

Up to this point our sources have been of some help, at least in their very general outlines. The incident of the Daemon Anagyrasios in Hieronymos’ account we saw above follows a non-Euripidean end. It looks more like a natural occurrence than the end of a tragedy of Euripides that follows its own characteristic way according to his refined dramatic technique. What happened after the blinding of Phoenix can only be surmised from parallel tragedies. Their denouement can give us some hints as to how the exodos would have run in very broad lines here.

Clytia, as Hieronymos tells us, committed suicide. She did so either having first revealed the truth, confessing her own lust and her rejection by Phoenix, or, more likely, without saying anything. She could not suffer the burden of her guilt and the remorse of her conscience, seeing the blind youth so helpless. Very possibly she did this before Amyntor found out the truth. It must have been her death that in one way or another helped him to gain insight into his family tragedy. If so, then it was she who established Phoenix’s innocence, just as it was she who made his guilt believable. Her death also brought her κάθαρσις.

Contrary to Hieronymos’ account with regard to the peasant, Amyntor does not hang himself. The Euripidean domineering hero, who becomes the vehicle of the tragic incident, does not die. He suffers in life. So do Theseus, Admetos, Jason, Lycos in the Antiope and so forth. It is primarily to Amyntor that the terms of deus ex machina are dictated and the whole truth revealed and established.

Amyntor is wretched and pitiable. His son is blind, his mistress dead; his wife, if she is alive, has no connection with him. He is all alone. He prays for death, but it does not come. In this helplessness in which both father and son find themselves the deus ex machina appears. The

1. See Hippol. 1320 ff.
2. So seems to be the case in Stheneboea.
Phoenix and Clytia (or Phthia) best candidate for this task one could imagine would be Thetis. Homer had already pointed the way by emphasizing the close relationship between Phoenix on the one hand and Peleus and Achilles on the other. In view of the role that, according to the myth, Phoenix played in the upbringing of Achilles, Euripides would not have looked for another deity. Thetis had every reason to appear and dictate terms that secured such a virtuous παιδαγωγός for her son, a young man who had proved to be so pure and trustworthy. He had to be rewarded for that, and this was done according to the terms the goddess dictated. These terms seem to be contained in the brief testimony of Apollodoros:

Πηλεύς δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς Χείρωνα κομίσας ὑπ’ ἐκείνου θεραπευθέντα τὰς ὤψεις βασιλέα κατέστησε Δολόπων. (cf. Propertius II. 1, 60).

Thetis would have also dictated that Phoenix should quit forever his homeland and that consequently the terms were doubtless expected to bring some minor consolation to the afflicted father: His son was, after all, innocent and rewarded, if he could only forgive his father and be reconciled, even if his father were not to see him again! It is possible to think of a formal kind of reconciliation and forgiveness between father and son, such as we have between Hippolytos and Theseus. In Euripides' plays the god or the goddess always finds the way through Euripides.

1. Hermes (or Cheiron) might be another.
2. In like manner Artemis announces that Hippolytos will be rewarded for his εὐσέβεια κάγαθη φρενός χάρις even after death. Verses 1424 ff. mention his cult. She is going to give him the greatest honours in the city of Troezen: The unmarried girls before their weddings will offer him their hair, and for a long time he will receive their greatest mourning accompanied by tears while the virgins will always be mindful to sing their songs in his honour. The gods also bestow on Peleus as a reward for his chastity, a magic sword wrought by the divine Hephaestos; cf. Aristophanes Clouds 1063, ὅ γον Πηλέως ἔλαβε διὰ τούτο (sc. διὰ τὸ σωφρονεῖν) τὴν μάχαιραν; 1067, καὶ τὴν Θέτιν γ’ ἔγιμε διὰ τὸ σωφρονεῖν ὁ Πηλέως. See Schol. on Aristoph., Clouds 1063 a-1063 d; 1063 b, ...καὶ λαβὼν (sc. "Ακαστος") αὐτὸν εἰς ἐρημίαν καὶ τῶν δπλων γυμνώσας, ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἄνεχόρισαν ENNΠΝ εἰπὼν εἶ δικαιὸς εἴ, σωθῆσαι, ὡς δὲ ἔμελλεν ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων διαφθείρεσθαι, οἱ θεοὶ μάχαιραν αὐτῷ ἔχαρισαντο ἡραίατοτέωκτον δι’ Ἑρμοῦ καὶ ῥατιστος αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν κυνίδων. ENNΠΝ οἱ δὲ φασιν, ὡς "Ἀκαστος τὴν Πηλέως μάχαιραν ὑπὸ κόπρον βοῶν ἔκρυψε, Χείρων δὲ ταῦτα εἰρήνην διδόσαν αὐτῷ. E
3. We find some vindication of this in the last words of the fr. 817. See below. In some symbolic way the blinding of the son by the father purports to stress their mutual alienation, since one is plunged into permanent darkness. Cf. Hippolytos 1094 ff.: ἀλλὰ χαίρετο τὸν ἐαυτὸν γάρ σ’ εἰσορῶν προσφῆγγομαι.
4. See note 2.
pides—or one might put it the other way around—to transfer responsibility to someone else and thus lighten in the world of theatre the human condition.

The play very probably ended with the blind Phoenix on the stage pronouncing his last words before he departed from his homeland. The two preserved fragments show the moral stature and magnanimity of the hero:

(Fr. 816) καὶ τοί ποτ' εἰ τιν' εἰσίδομ' ἀνὰ πτόλιν
τυφλὸν προηγητήρος ἐξημνημένον,
ἀδημονούντα συμφοραῖς ἐλοιδόρουν,
ὡς δειλὸς εἰ θάνατον ἔκποδῶν ἔχων.
καὶ νῦν λόγοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐναντίως
πέπτωχ' ὁ τλήμων ὁ φιλόξων ἐνου,
οἷς τὸν ἐπιστείχουσαν ἡμέραν ἰδεῖν
ποθεῖτ' ἔχοντες μυρίων ἁχθὸς κακῶν.
οὕτως ἐρως βροτοῖσιν ἐγκεῖται βίου·
τὸ ζην γὰρ ἵσμεν, τοῦ θανείν δ' ἀπεφίλη
tὰς τις φοβεῖται φῶς λαπεῖν τὸδ' ἥλιον.

Whenever I happened to see a blindman walking about in the city, hanging onto his guide, and complaining because of his misfortunes, I railed at him how cowardly he was, for he avoided death. And now I myself, a wretched man, have been brought to contradict my own words. O, mortal men, how much you cherish your life! You desire so much to see the coming day, though you are burdened with innumerable evils. So great is the desire of mortal men for life, for we know what life is. Not having any idea what death is like, everyone is afraid to quit the light of the sun.

The tragedy approaches its end with fr. 817:

σὺ δ', ὁ πατρώα χθῶν ἐμὼν γεννητόρων,
χαῖρε· ἄνδρι γὰρ τοι, καὶ ὑπερβάλλει κακοῖς,
οὐχ ἐστι τοῦ θρέψαντος ἡδιον πέδων.

My fatherland, land of my parents, farewell. Truly, even if you send someone more evils than he can bear, there is no more pleasant soil than you which nourished him¹. These are the last, embittered words of the young Phoenix. Blind and in tattered clothes², he leaves the scene (His

---
¹. Cf. note 2 above.
². The evidence of Aristophanes Ach. 421 on this point is valuable: (418 τὰ ποῖα τρύχη;) τὰ τοῦ τυφλοῦ Φοίνικος;
leaving the stage signifies at the same time his leaving, apparently forever, his native land). Someone guides Phoenix on his way to Phthia.

Below are some other fragments which, in view of our evidence, are hard to place. Fortunately they are rather sententious utterances and do not seem to influence substantially the reconstruction of the play in its main lines.

Fr. 804 μογχηρόν ἐστιν ἄνδρι πρεσβύτη τέκνα
 δίδωσιν ὅστις οὐκέθ' ὁράεις γαμεῖν
 δέσποινα γὰρ γέροντι νυμφίῳ γυνή.

Fr. 805 δὲ γῆρας, οἶον τὸις ἔχουσιν εἰ κακόν.

Fr. 807 πικρὸν νέα γυνακί πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ.

fr. 808 γυνὴ τε πάντων ἀγριώτατον κακόν.

Fr. 813 ὡ τλούθ', ὡσι μὲν βαστόν χ ό φέρειν,
 πόνοι δὲ κακόν σει καὶ φθοραὶ πολλαὶ βίοι
 ἐνεισέναι δὲ γὰρ πάς ἀσθενῆς ἀλῶν βροτοῖς.

These words are mainly comments or remarks, possibly made here and there by a third person, most probably by the Chorus and by some servant or παιδαγωγός of the young Phoenix, who may have played some role in the play. These ideas are τόποι (common places) in the tragedy generally and in Euripides specifically. Here, apparently, the reference is to the great difference of age between Amyntor and the young ἀμνήστευτος γυνή; the older man in this case becomes the servant of his wife. Then comes the difficulty of old age, the fierce temper of woman—a common theme in the works of ancient writers and particularly in those of Euripides—and a reference to wealth and that while it may relieve distress, it also causes pain and ruin and cannot help man’s precarious lot. Lastly, if one should desire something, it would be worth while emulating those who strive after τὰ ἔσθλα, the good things in life:

(fr 814) φθονὸν οὐ σέβω.

φθονεῖσθαι δὲ θέλουμ' ἀν ἐπ' ἔσθλοις.

1. Fr. 804 is corrupted, particularly the words τέκνα and δίδωσιν. In the place of τέκνα we need something like νέα γυνή, a conjecture by Valckenaer, Diatr. p. 273, that found some approporation, while instead of δίδωσιν we need an adjective (or substantive) like ἀφρων.

2. Fr. 818 ἀμνήστευτος γυνή· ἥ (ἡ cod.) παλλακή· Sophocles in his Phoenix calls her φορβάς γυνή [Eust. II. II (16), v. 808, p. 1117, 35].

3. For Euripides τὸ γῆρας is πικρόν (fr. 282. 11), δύσκολον (Ba. 1251), πολλόν (Su. 170, Ba. 258), βαρύ (Al. 672), δείλαιον (Hc. 156), ἀναιδείας πλέων (Al. 727) etc.
9. ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ I.

..... φίλον τέχος, οὐκ ἔθελομι λείπεσθ', οὐδ' εἰ κέν μοι ὑποσταίθε θεός αὐτός γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσειν νέον ἤδηλων, οἷον ὅτε πρῶτον λύπον Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα, φέυγων νείκεα πατρὸς Ἀμύντουρος Ὀρμενίδαο, δς μοι παλλακίδος περιχώσχτο καλλικόμοιο, τήν αὐτός φιλέεσκεν, ἀτιμάζεσκε δ' ἀκοιτιν, μητέρ' ἐμήν· ἡ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων παλλακίδα προμιγήναι, ἐν' ἐχθρήσει γέροντα. τῇ πυθόμην καὶ ἐρέξα· πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς αὐτίκ' ὀὔσθείς πολλὰ κατηράσατο, στυγερὰς δ' ἐπεκέκλειτ' Ἐρινύς, μὴ ποτε γούνασιν οἴσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υίόν ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαώτα θεοί δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς, Ζεὺς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἐπαίνῃ Περσεφόνεια. [τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευκα κατακτάμεν οἵξιν χαλκώρ' ἀλλά τις ἀθανάτων παῦσεν χόλον, δς ρ' ἐνι θυμό δήμου θῆκε φάτιν καὶ οἵξινα πόλλα ἀνθρώπων, ὡς μὴ πατροφόνος μετ' Ἀχιλλεὺς καὶ Περσεφόνης.] ἐνθ' ἐμοὶ οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐρήμετ' ἐν φρεσί κατακτάμεν κατὰ μέγαρα στρωφάσθαι. οἱ μὲν ἀμενὶδόμνειν φυλακάς ἐχον, οὕτε ποτ' ἐσβη τῷ ναίον δὲ μοι ὑπάσε λαὸν γούνασιν ἐπαθον καὶ πολλ' ἐμόγησα, τά φρονέων, δ μοι οὐ τί θεοί γόνον ἐξετέλειον ἐξ ἐμεύ' ἀλλὰ σέ παῖδα, θεοΐς ἐπιείκε' Ἀχιλλεύ, ποιεύμην, ἐνα μοί ποτ' ἀεικάει λοιγὸν ἀμύνης.
Excursus on the *Phoenix*

With regard to the story of Phoenix one must have a general idea of the relevant sources. Most of those discussed in the appropriate chapter are not mentioned here. Here are mainly those sources of secondary importance which accord closely either with Homer’s account or with that of Apollodoros. They do not add anything new and may have been directly influenced by those accounts. Others are so much at variance that they no doubt follow other models or arbitrarily attempt to rationalize the peculiarities of the myth. These are the most unreliable.

a) Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem, I 447 ff.

b) Scholia Platonica εἰς Νόμον ΙΑ, 931b 'Αμύντορος...Φοίνικι.

c) Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, I Vv. 447-496, p. 762 f.

d) Johannis Tzetzae Scholia ad Lycophronis Alexandram, 421-423.

Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)¹, I 447 ff.

(447 b.) οἶνον ὅτι πρῶτον λίπον Ἠλλάδα:...ἀκρίβης δὲ διδασκαλία ἡ τείρα: διὸ καὶ τοσαύτα ἡμαρχήσας τῷ Φοίνικι καὶ ἐν προσκρούσει τοῦ πατρὸς γεγονότι τὸν ὕδων ἐπιτρέπει ο Πηλεὺς: ἢδίκα γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰσθόμενον τῆς ἀμαρτίας, δι’ ὅν ἕκατον τὴν ἴκον οἴηκα λυγήν. b (BE³) Τ

(448) φεύγων νείκεα: Φοίνικς ὁ 'Αμύντορος ἐξέπεσε—παραδίδουσιν. ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ: παρὰ γὰρ τοῖς τραγικοῖς παράλλασσει: (cf. T.G.F. p. 621 N.²).

(449 b.) δὲ μοι παλλακίδος: οὔ τῆς ἡδῆ μυγέσες, ἀλλὰ τῆς εἰς τοῦτο τρεφομένης: φησι γοῦν «προμιγήναι» (I 452). οὐκ ἀντίκειται δὲ τὸ ὅτι τὴν μὲν ἐφίλει, ἢτίμαζε δὲ τὴν γυναίκα: ἐπετατε γὰρ ταῦτα ἐν νῷ ἔχων ἡδῆ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαν. τούτῳ οὖν ὁ Φοίνιξ ἐπόησεν εἰς ὁμόνοια τῶν γονέων. b (BE³) Τ

| ἤν δὲ Κλυτία καὶ ἡ μῆτηρ Ἰπποδάμεια ἢ Ἀλκιμέδη. Τ

(452 a.) <προμιγήναι: πρὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μεγηθαί. ἡ περισσεύει ἡ πρόθεσις.

Aim

b.¹) ἐν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα: ὅρατα γὰρ ἀφίσταται γυνὴ γέροντος νέοι πειραθείσα ἄνδρός νέοι. | τινὲς «γέροντι» γράφουσιν, ἢνα μισηθηνὶ τῷ γέροντι.

Τ

b.²) ὅρατα γὰρ ἄνδρός ἀφίσταται γέροντος γυνὴ νέοι πειραθείσα νέοι καὶ ὑπομονήτερον ἄνδρός ἡττον γὰρ οἱ γέροντες ἀφροδισιακῶς ἔλαβανται. b (BE³)

(453 a.) τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἤρεξα: ἐν ἦθει δὲ ἁναγινώσκειν ὡς μετανοοῦντος αὐτοῦ: διὸ καὶ ἐμπεπίστευται Ἀχιλλέα: ὁ γὰρ πταίσας τι καὶ φυλάττεται

(Men. Asp. 28). καὶ Σοφοκλῆς (fr. 814 N.² = 900 P.)· «δε μη πέπονθε ταμά, μη δι βουλέσθαι». b (BCE³ E⁴) Τ

b.) ἄλλως· τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἑρέξα: ὃς πρὸς διμόνιαν γονέων τὰ παρὰ προαίρεσιν ἐποίησεν· ὑφι «ἡ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λυσσάσκετο» (I 451). καὶ πάλιν τῆς διγονσίως αὐτῶν κρείττονα τὴν φυγὴν ἤγγισατο. οἱ δὲ εὖ πρὸς γονεῖς ἔχοντες ἐπὶ ἂς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν, ἐπακούσιν ὑμὶ τῷ καταπονούμενῳ. ἡ τάς χα βούλεται λέγειν ὅτι οὐ πάντα πειστέαν μητρὶ—Θέτις γονὸν ἔλεγεν· «ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν νησαὶ παρήμενον ὑμωτέροις | μήν 'Αχιοίσιν» (A 421-2), ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον πατρὶ τῷ λέγοντι· «φιλοφροσύνῃ γὰρ ἀμείνων» (I 256). b (BCE³E⁴) Τ ἀγαθοὶ δὲ διδάσκαλοι, οἱ ἐν πείρας παθημάτων γεγόνασι καὶ Χείρωνα γὰρ φασὶ τρωθέντα τὴν χείρα τὴν περὶ βούλεται. τὴν δὲ περὶ τὰς διακάς τὸν Σηλυμβριανὸν Ἡρόδικον τὸν παιδοτρίβην, δώς ἐμπεσῶν διὰ τοὺς πόνους εἰς φθόνον ἐμελέτησε τὴν τέχνην. b (BCE3E⁴)Τ
c.) τῇ πιθόμην <καὶ ἑρέξα>· 'Αριστόδημος ὁ Νυσαιεύς, ῥήτωρ τε καὶ γραμματικός (cf. F.H.G. III 307), φεύγων τὸ ἔγκλημα, ἐπενόησε γράφειν «τῇ οὐ πιθόμην οὐδὲ ερεξα». καὶ οὐ μόνον γι' ἡδοκύμησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμπεσὼν: ὡς εὐσεβὴς τηρῆσατο τὸν ἤρωα· πρὸ δὲ αὐτὸυ Σωσιφάνης (fr. 7, T.G.F. p. 820 N.²) τὴν τοιαύτην εὐρείαν γράφην, καὶ Εὐρίπις δὲ ἀναμικτοῦν εἰσαγάγε τὸν ἤρωα ἐν τῷ Φοίνικι (cf. T.G.F. p. 621 N.²). ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ 'Αριστοκράτιον ὁ Δίου διδάσκαλος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς I. A (455 a.) <μήτοτον γούνασιν οἰσιν ἐφέξεσθαι φίλον υἱόν:> έσκελε κατάρα τῶ ἀτιμάσαντι πατέρα, τὴν ἄτιμον μὴ δέξασθαι τιμῆν. b (BCE³E⁴) Til πάς δὲ εὐ φρονῶν πατὴρ υἱῷ εὔχεται πάππος γενέσθαι. b (BCE3) Til
b.) <γούνασιν οἰσιν:> δι τίνες γράφουσιν «<γούνα'> ἐμοίσιν». λέγει δὲ οὐ περὶ ἔχουτον ὁ Φοίνιξ, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἀμύντωρος. Αιντ

Scholia Platonica εἰς Νόμων IA¹

931 b Ἀμύντωρο...Φοίνικι.

Φοίνιξ Ἀμύντωρος· οὕτως τυφλῶσετο ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός. κατεψεύθη γὰρ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπὸ Φθίας τῆς αὐτοῦ παλλακίς ὅτι δὴ πειραθεῖ πρὸς εὐνήν αὐτῇ συνελθεῖν. Ιάται δὲ ὑπὸ Χείρωνος Πηλέως σπουδῆς, δὲ Ἰμμυντωρ κατεψεύθη τοῦ —

μήτοτον γούνασιν οἰσιν ἐφέξεσθαι² φίλον υἱόν (I 455).

δ δὴ γέγονεν· καὶ γὰρ θεοὶ ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς.

Eustathios³ ἐκ τῶν τῆς 'Ιώτα 'Ραψωδίας

(v. 447 s.) δι τῆς Ἐλλαδικῆς ἀνέκκαθεν οὐν ὁ Φοίνιξ εἰσὶ ὑστερον εἰς Φθίαν ἐξίσκε—

---

2. Immo ἐφέξεσθαι (ἐφέξεσθαι).

Εἰς Λυκόφρονα Σχόλια

421 τὸν πατὸ Πλείστον | Φοίνιξ ο Άμύντορος ταῖς τῆς μητρός αὐτοῦ Κλεοβούλης ἰκεσίαις μιγεὶς τῇ τοῦ πατρός παλλακίδι Κλυτίᾳ || ἡ Φθία κατά τινας ἐτυφλώθη παρ' αὐτοῦ | .φυγὼν δὲ ο Φοίνιξ ἔθηκε πρὸς Πηλέα | καὶ οὶ ἀπ'] αγαγόν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Χείρωνα ἔτεισεν ύγιὴ γενέσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. | ταῦτα καὶ μυθικά, τὸ δ' ἀλλῆς οὕτως ἔχει. Τι μιγείται τῇ παλλακίδῃ γυνώς αὐτῶν ο πατήρ κατηράσατο μὴ τεκείν παῖδες | οὔς καὶ ὀψιδίως λέγει | . δὲ ψυχών ἔθηκε πρὸς τὸν Πηλέα καὶ οὶ ἀγαγόν αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ἀντί τοῦ Χείρωνος | ἐδείξεν *αὐτῷ* τὸν 'Αχιλέα ἐκεί παιδευόμενον καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτῶν αὐτῶν εἰπών ἢδε ὁ παῖς σου, ἄναγκη οὖν αὐτὸν τοῦ λοιποῦ καὶ παίδεως δὲ ἀρχῇ πατέρα φίλον ἄναγειν ύιόν, καὶ τούτῳ χάριν ἐμυθεύσατο δ' | ἀπεκόμισεν αὐτῶν ὁ Πηλέως
πρὸς τὸν Χείρωνα καὶ ὃς ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν πάλιν βλέπειν ἦ. καὶ ὁ Ὁππιανὸς δὲ τὰ τέκνα φάεος φίλτερα καὶ βιότοιο λέγει: (Η Ι 702). ὡς δὲ συμβολικῶς χρῆ τὴν τύφλωσιν νοεῖν τοῦ Φοίνικος διὰ τὸ ἀπαιδα γενέσθαι καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ φασὶ πραγματικῶς, καὶ Ὁμηρὸς φησιν ἐμοὶ συνάδων φησὶ γὰρ λέγων ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Φοίνικος πρὸς τὸν Ἀχιλέα seqq. I 447-457 καὶ τι τοιοῦτον φησιν seq. I 494 ἀλλὰ σὲ - 495 ἀμώνης. Τ