

EMMANUEL MICHAEL PAPAMICHAEL

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 f.
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 Amyn-

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 f.

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

Παλλακίδι προμιγῆναι, ἔν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα·

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

ἀφίσταται γὰρ γέροντος νέα γυνή πειραθειῖσα ἡβῶντος ἀνδρός¹,

«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 age², for Eustathios *l.c.* stresses,

ἦν (sc. Κλυτίαν) ὁ πατήρ Ἀμύντωρ οὐπω μὲν ἔγνω, καθὰ οἱ παλαιοὶ φασιν, εἰς τοῦτο δὲ ἀνέτρεφε. διὸ οὐδὲ μιγῆναι φησιν ὁ Φοῖνιξ τῇ παλλακίδι ἀλλὰ προμιγῆναι, ἥτοι πρὸ ἐκείνου μιγῆναι, ἵνα 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 father³. 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:

οὐ τοι σύμφορόν ἐστι γυνὴ νέα ἀνδρὶ γέροντι·
οὐ γὰρ πηδαλιῷ πείθεται ὡς ἄκατος,
οὐδ' ἄγκυραι ἔχουσιν, ἀπορρήξασα δὲ δεσμὰ
πολλάκις ἐκ νυκτῶν ἄλλον 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.»

2. Cf. also *Scholias Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, ed. H. Erbse, Berlin 1971, I 449 b. ὅς μοι παλλακίδος: οὐ τῆς ἤδη μιγείσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς εἰς τοῦτο τρεφομένης· φησὶ γοῦν «προμιγῆναι» (I 452). οὐκ ἀντίκειται δὲ τὸ ὅτι τὴν μὲν ἐφίλει, ἡτίμαζε δὲ τὴν γυναικᾶ· ἐπραττε γὰρ τοῦτα ἐν νῶ ἔχων ἤδη τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὀμιλίαν.

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

ἦ (sc. μήτηρ ἐμή) δ' αἰέν ἐμὲ λισσέσχετο γούων...

reluctantly¹. 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. *Il.* I, p. 763... ὁ Φοῖνιξ ἀδικουμένη τῇ μητρὶ τιμωρήσας δυσκόλου πειρᾶται τοῦ πατρός. εἰ δὲ ψέγεται ὡς πατέρα λυπήσας, ἀλλὰ λύεται τὸ ἐγκλημα διὰ τοῦ φύσει δικαίου. γάμον γὰρ ἀδικούμενον ἀνωρθώσατο, οἷς τὸν πατέρα μὴ ἀδικήσας ἐλύπησεν. Cf. Erbse, *ibid.*: τοῦτο οὖν ὁ Φοῖνιξ ἐποίησεν εἰς ὁμόνοιαν τῶν 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:

Φοῖνιξ ὁ Ἀμύντορος—ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐτυφλώθη καταψευσαμένης καὶ τοῦ¹ φθορᾶν Φθίας (immo Κλυτίας)² τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς παλλακίδος. Πηλεὺς δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς Χείρωνα κομίσας, ὑπ' ἐκείνου θεραπευθέντα τὰς ὕψεις 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., Gaisf. Prov., p. 123³ : Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων ἔταν χλεπή τις τύχη καὶ πονηρὰ δυστυχία κατασίση πᾶσαν οἰκίαν ἀλλεπαλλήλοις δεινοῖς ἢ παροιμία λέγεται. Φασὶ γὰρ γενέσθαι τινὰ γεωργὸν ἐν τῷ Ἀναγυρασίῳ δῆμῳ αἰτίαν ἔχοντα εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἰδρυμένον βωμόν διὸ συμφοραῖς τὸν ἄνθρωπον δειναῖς περιπεσεῖν· πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀπέλαβε [sic] τὴν γυναικα, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ παῖς ἐγεγονε· εἶτα τὸν υἱὸν ἐπήρωσε διαβολῇ πλαστῇ τῆς μητρειᾶς χρησάμενος, καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἀνεβίβασεν εἰς πλοιάριον καὶ εἰς λυπρὸν ἐξέθηκε νησίδιον· εἶτα ὀνειδίει κατεχόμενος αὐτὸς τε καὶ ἡ γυνὴ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν, αὐτὸς μὲν συγκλείσας ἑαυτὸν μετὰ πάντων τῶν κτημάτων ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ πῦρ ὑποβαλὼν ἐκαύθη· ἡ δὲ γυνὴ εἰς φρέαρ ἑαυτὴν 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 δῆμῳ τῶν Ἀναγυρασίῳ. Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων, ἐπεὶ τὸν παροικοῦντα πρεσβύτην καὶ ἐκτέμνοντα τὸ ἄλλος ἐτιμωρήσατο Ἀνάγυρος ἥρω. (Ἀναγυράσιοι δὲ δῆμος τῆς Ἀττικῆς) τούτου δὲ τις ἐξέκοψε τὸ ἄλλος· ὁ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπέμνη τὴν παλλακίην, ἣτις μὴ δυναμένη συμπεῖσαι τὸν παῖδα διέβαλεν ὡς ἀσελγῆ τῷ πατρί· ὁ δὲ ἐπήρωσεν

1. L. C. Valckenaer, *Diatribes in Euripidis...*, Lugduni Batavorum 1767 (Leipzig 1824, p. 278). The insertion improves the clarity of the text.

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 Ἄντεια and Σθενέβοια and Ἀστυδάμεια or Ἰλπολύτη Κρηθείς. In any case more of our sources give us the name Κλυτία; cf. Schol. II. I (9) - Erbse, *ibid.*: ἦν δὲ Κλυτία καὶ ἡ μήτηρ Ἰπποδάμεια ἢ Ἀλκιμέδη -, Tzet. on Lyc. 421: Φοῖνιξ ὁ Ἀμύντορος ταῖς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Κλεοβούλης ἱεσίσαις μυγίς τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς παλλακίδι Κλυτία ἢ Φθία κατὰ τινὰς ἐτυφλώθη παρ' αὐτοῦ (E. Scheer, *Lyc. Alex.*, Berlin-Weidmann-1958.).

3. A. Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, vol. II. 2, Berlin 1840, p. 960.

αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγκαταφοδόμησεν· ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἑαυτὸν ἀνήρτησεν, ἣ δὲ παλλακὴ εἰς φρέαρ ἑαυτὴν ἔρριψεν. ἱστορεῖ δὲ Ἱερώνυμος ἐν τῷ περὶ τραγωδιοποιῶν, ἀπεικάζων τούτοις τὸν Εὐριπίδου Φοῖνικα.

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 *Φοῖνιξ*. 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 different¹.

Another important source that sheds light on the story of Phoenix is the testimony of the Schol. A *Il.* I 453 c. (Eust. *Il.* p. 763, 9 sqq.): τῆ πιθόμην <καὶ ἔρεξα>· Ἀριστόδημος ὁ Νυσαιεύς, ῥήτωρ τε ἄμα καὶ γραμματικός (cf. F. H. G. III 307), φεύγων τὸ ἔγκλημα, ἐπενόησε γράφειν «τῆ οὐ πιθόμην τοῦδὲ ἔρεξα». καὶ οὐ μόνον γε ἠὲδοκίμησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτιμήθη ὡς εὐσεβῆ τηρήσας τὸν ἥρωα. πρὸ δὲ αὐτοῦ Σωσιφάνης (fr. 6, T.G.F. p. 820 N.²) τὴν τοιαύτην εὖρε γραφὴν. καὶ Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἀναμάρτητον εἰσάγει τὸν ἥρωα ἐν τῷ Φοῖνικι (cf. T.G.F. p. 624 N.²). ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ Ἀρποκρατίων ὁ Δίου διδάσκαλος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς I. Eustathios then adds ἄριστον δὲ τὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἐπεισό-

1. See below, p. 226.

διον. ἔοικε γὰρ λέγειν ὁ Φοῖνιξ, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ τότε συνήνεγκε πεισθέντι τῇ μητρὶ. οὐκουν οὐδὲ σὲ ὀνήσει μήτηρ ἢ Θετίς, συμβουλεύσασα τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀποσχέσθαι συμμαχίας, καὶ εἰποῦσα «ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν μήνιε» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

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. ἄπταιστον συντηρεῖ) τὸν ἥρωα 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, πατήρ δ' ἐμός αὐτίκ' ὄϊσθεις, 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* l. c.)¹: τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα ὡς πρὸς ὁμόνοιαν γονέων τὰ παρὰ προαίρεσιν ἐποίησε· φησὶ γοῦν «ἢ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο» (I 451). καὶ πάλιν τῆς διχοστασίας αὐτῶν κρείττονα τὴν φυγὴν ἠγγήσατο. οἱ δὲ εὖ πρὸς γονεῖς ἔχοντες ἐπ' ἴσης μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν, ἐπαμύνουσι δὲ τῷ καταπονομένῳ; Eust. *Il.* I, p. 762: ῥέξει γὰρ ὁ Φοῖνιξ λέγει τὸ μιγῆναι τῇ παλλακῆϊ, εὐφημῶν καὶ φειδόμενος ἀ-

1. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (H. Erbse, Berlin 1971) l. c. τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα (I 453 b).

λιγάκις λέγειν κακά»; and p. 763: εἰ δὲ ἀνόσιόν τις ἔρεϊ τὸ παραχθέν, ἐψεύσατο. ἤδη γὰ εἴρηται, ὡς οὐκ ἐμίγη ἀλλὰ προεμίγη τῇ παλλακῇ.

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 principles¹ 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 ἄπταιστον 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 Hippolytos, but he is more free and nat-

1. 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 Ἐναγυράσιος 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, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ παῖς ἐγεγόνει· εἶτα τὸν υἱὸν ἐπήρωσε διαβολῇ πλαστῆ τῆς μητριᾶς 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 ἠμυρτιά, stepmother and no longer that of παλλακίς (ἢ παλλακή) concubine. This consideration seems to be supported by fr. 818 N.², ἀμνήστευτος γυνή· ἢ (ἢ cod.) παλλακή which may well be taken to suggest the close relationship between Amyntor and Clytia¹.

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.),

τοῦτ' ἐτόλμησας σὺ πρᾶξιαι, τοῦτ' ἔτλης; Ἄμύντορος
 νῦν ἐχρῆν ὀργὴν λαβεῖν σε, Δημέα, καὶ τουτονί
 ἔκτυφλῶσαι.

1. In the other fragments we have no indication of a wife or mother, and only the Epigr. Cyzic., Anthol. Pal. 3, 3: Ἄλκιμέδη ξυνόμενον Ἄμύντορα παιδὸς ἐρύκει, Φοίνικος δ' ἐθέλει παῦσαι χόλον γενέτου—κεῖνος δ' αὖ δολίους ψιθυρίσμασιν ἤχθητο κούρω, ἦγε δ' ἐς ὀφθαλμοὺς 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 primary importance. The Scholia I 449 b give Κλυτία as the name of the concubine, Ἰπποδάμεια ἢ Ἄλκιμέδη 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. Certainly 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:

ἀλλ' οὔ ποτ' αὐτὸς ἀμπλακῶν ἄλλον βροτὸν
 παραινέσαιμ' ἂν παισὶ προσθεῖναι κράτη,
 πρὶν ἂν κατ' ὄσσων τυγχάνῃ με καὶ σκότος,
 εἰ χρὴ διελθεῖν πρὸς τέκνων νικώμενον.

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 anger¹. 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 ῥῆσις, possibly in an ἀγών λόγων, of Amyntor against Phoenix:

.... <οί> πείραν οὐ δεδωκότες
μᾶλλον δοκοῦντες ἢ πεφυκότες σοφοί

and μέγιστον ἄρ' ἦν ἡ φύσις· τὸ γὰρ κακὸν
οὐδεὶς τρέφων εὖ χρηστὸν ἂν θεῖη 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 herself². 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 Euripides³.

1. This is the attitude of the Chorus in *Hippolytos*; in the verses 891 f. they say:

ἄναξ, ἀπέυχου ταῦτα πρὸς θεῶν πάλιν,
γνώσῃ γὰρ αἴθρις ἀμπλακῶν ἔμοι πιθοῦ.

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 ἀγών, 925 ff.; 942:

τοὺς μὴ δικαίους καὶ κακοὺς πεφυκότας
(944 f.) ... ἐξελέγχεται
πρὸς τῆς θανούσης ἐμφανῶς κάκιστος ὢν·

and fr. 265 a = 920 N.² (*Auge*):

ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ', ἥ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει·
γυνὴ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῶδ' ἔφυ.

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, «Ἀμύντορος νῦν ἐχρῆν ὀργὴν 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, δμῶσιν δ' ἐμοῖσιν εἶπον ὡς καυτήρια
 ἐς πῦρ ἔδει καὶ <ταῦτα> δὴ διῆπετῆ θεῖναι¹,

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 Valckenaer, *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.

4. *Hippolytos* 1250 ff.:

ἀναξ / ἀτὰρ τοσοῦτόν γ' οὐ δυνήσομαι ποτε,
 τὸν σὸν πιθέσθαι παῖδ' ὅπως ἐστὶν κακός,
 οὐδ' εἰ γυναικῶν πᾶν κρεμασθείη γένος.

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:

ἤδη δὲ πολλῶν ἡρέθην λόγων κριτῆς
καὶ πόλλ' ἀμιλληθέντα μαρτύρων ὑπο
τάναντί' ἔγων συμφορᾶς μιᾶς πέρι.
κἀγὼ μὲν οὕτω χῶστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ σοφὸς
λογίζομαι τάληθές, εἰς ἀνδρὸς φύσιν
σκοπῶν δίκαιτάν θ' ἦντιν' ἡμερεύεται...
ὅστις δ' ὀμιλῶν ἤδεται κακοῖς ἀνὴρ,
οὐ πάποτ' ἠρώτησα, γιγνώσκων ὅτι
τοιουτὸς ἔστιν οἷσπερ ἤδεται ζυνών.

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 σοφός (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:

καὶ τῶδε δηλώσαιμι' ἄν, εἰ βούλοιο σύ,
τάληθές, ὡς ἔγωγε καύτὸς ἀχθομαι,
ὅστις λέγειν μὲν εὐπρεπῶς ἐπίσταται,
τὰ δ' ἔργα χεῖρω τῶν λόγων παρέσχετο.

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

τοῦτ' ἔσθ' ὁ θνητῶν εὐ πόλεις οἰκουμένας
δόμους τ' ἀπόλλυσ', οἱ καλοὶ λίαν λόγοι·
οὐ γὰρ τι τοῖσιν ὡσι τερπνὰ χροῆ λέγειν
ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅτου τις εὐκλεῆς γενήσεται.

Fr. 811, τὰ φανῆ τεκμηρίοισιν εἰκότως ἀλίσκεται,

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 τεκμήρια¹.

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 insight² 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*.

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) καίτοι ποτ' εἴ τιν' εἰσίδοιμ' ἀνά πτόλιν
 τυφλὸν προηγητήρος ἐξηρητημένον,
 ἀδημονοῦντα συμφοραῖς ἐλοιδόρου,
 ὡς δειλὸς εἶη θάνατον ἐκποδῶν ἔχων.
 καὶ νῦν λόγοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐναντίως
 πέπτωχ' ὁ τλήμων· ὦ φιλόζωοι βροτοί,
 οἳ τὴν ἐπιστείχουσιν ἡμέραν ἰδεῖν
 ποθεῖτ' ἔχοντες μυρίων ἄχθος κακῶν.
 οὔτως ἔρω βροτοῖσιν ἔγκειται βίου·
 τὸ ζῆν γὰρ ἴσμεν, τοῦ θανεῖν δ' ἀπειρία
 πᾶς τις φοβεῖται φῶς λιπεῖν τόδ' ἡλίου.

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', ὦ πατρώα χθῶν ἐμῶν γεννητόρων,
 χαῖρ'· ἀνδρὶ γὰρ τοι, κἂν ὑπερβάλλῃ κακοῖς,
 οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ θρέψαντος ἡδίων πέδον.

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 μοχθηρόν ἐστὶν ἀνδρὶ πρεσβύτῃ τέκνα¹
 δίδωσιν ὅστις οὐκέθ' ὠραῖος γαμεῖ·
 δέσποινα γὰρ γέροντι νυμφίῳ γυνή·
- Fr. 805 ὦ γῆρας, οἷον τοῖς ἔχουσιν εἶ κακόν·
- Fr. 807 πικρὸν νέα γυναικὶ πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ·
- fr. 808 γυνή τε πάντων ἀγριώτατον κακόν.
- Fr. 813 ὦ πλοῦθ', ὅσω μὲν ῥᾶστον εἶ βάρος φέρειν,
 πόννοι δὲ κἄν σοὶ καὶ φθοραὶ πολλαὶ βίω
 ἔνεισ'· ὁ γὰρ πᾶς ἀσθενῆς αἰὼν 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 γυνή²; the older man in this case becomes the servant of his wife. Then comes the difficulty of old age³, 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 ἐσθλά, the good things in life:

(fr 814) φθόνον οὐ σέβω.
 φθονεῖσθαι δὲ θέλοισι' ἂν ἐπ' ἐσθλοῦς.

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 approbation, while instead of δίδωσιν we need an adjective (or substantive) like ἄφρων.

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

3. For Euripides τὸ γῆρας is πικρὸν (fr. 282. 11), δύσκολον (Ba. 1251), πολίον (Su. 170, Ba. 258), βαρὺ (Al. 672), δειλαῖον (Hc. 156), ἀναιδεῖας πλέων (Al. 727) etc.

9. ΙΑΙΑΔΟΣ Ι.

- φίλον τέκος, οὐκ ἐθέλοισι
 λείπεσθ', οὐδ' εἴ κέν μοι ὑποσταίῃ θεὸς αὐτὸς 445
 γῆρας ἀποζύσας θήσειν νέον ἠβώνοντα,
 οἷον ὅτε πρῶτον λίπον Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα,
 φεύγων νείκεα πατρός Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο,
 ὅς μοι παλλακίδος περιχώσατο καλλικόμοιο, 450
 τὴν αὐτὸς φιλέεσκεν, ἀτιμάζεσκε δ' ἄκοιτιν,
 μητέρ' ἐμήν· ἢ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων
 παλλακίδι προμιγῆναι, ἔν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα.
 τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα· πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς αὐτίκ' οὔσθεις
 πολλὰ κατηρᾶτο, στυγεράς δ' ἐπεκέκλετ' Ἐρινῦς, 455
 μή ποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν
 ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαῶτα· θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς,
 Ζεὺς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἐπαινή Περσεφόνεια.
 [τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατακτάμεν ὀξεί χαλκῶ·
 ἀλλὰ τις ἀθανάτων παῦσεν χόλον, ὅς ρ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
 δήμου θῆκε φάτιν καὶ ὀνειδέα πόλλ' ἀνθρώπων, 460
 ὡς μὴ πατροφόνος μετ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν καλεοίμην.]
 ἔνθ' ἐμοὶ οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐρητύετ' ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς
 πατρός χωομένοιο κατὰ μέγαρα στρωφᾶσθαι.

 οἱ μὲν ἀμειβόμενοι φυλακὰς ἔχον, οὐδέ ποτ' ἔσβη 471
 πῦρ, ἕτερον μὲν ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ εὐερκέος αὐλῆς,
 ἄλλο δ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ, πρόσθεν θαλάμοιο θυράων.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δεκάτη μοι ἐπήλυθε νύξ ἐρεβεννή, 475
 καὶ τότ' ἐγὼ θαλάμοιο θύρας πυκινῶς ἀραρυίας
 ῥήξας ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ὑπέρθορον ἐρκίον αὐλῆς
 ῥεῖτα, λαθῶν φύλακας τ' ἄνδρας δμωὰς τε γυναῖκας.
 φεῦγον ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε δι' Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχώροιο,
 Φθίην δ' ἐξικόμην ἐριβόλακα, μητέρα μήλων,
 ἐς Πηλῆα ἀναχθ'·

 καὶ μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθθηκε, πολὺν δέ μοι ὤπασε λαόν· 483
 ναῖον δ' ἐσχατιὴν Φθίης, Δολόπεσσιν ἀνάσσω.

 ὡς ἐπὶ σοὶ μάλα πόλλ' ἔπαθον καὶ πόλλ' ἐμόγησα, 492
 τὰ φρονέων, ὃ μοι οὐ τι θεοὶ γόνον ἐξετέλειον
 ἐξ ἐμεῦ· ἀλλὰ σὲ παῖδα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
 ποιεύμην, ἵνα μοὶ ποτ' ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀμύνης. 495

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 εις Νόμων ΙΑ, 931b 'Αμύντορα...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.) οἶον ὅτε πρῶτον λίπον Ἑλλάδα:...ἀκριβῆς δὲ διδασκαλία ἡ πεῖρα: διὸ καὶ τοσαῦτα ἡμαρτηκότι τῷ Φοίνικι καὶ ἐν προσκρούσει τοῦ πατρὸς γεγονότι τὸν υἱὸν ἐπιτρέπει ὁ Πηλεΐδης: ἑώρα γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰσθόμενον τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δι' ὧν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐκούσιον ἐπήγαγε φυγὴν. b (BE³) T

(448) φεύγων νείκια: Φοῖνιξ ὁ Ἀμύντορος ἐξέπεσε——παραδίδωσιν. ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ παρὰ γὰρ τοῖς τραγικοῖς παραλλάσσει (cf. T.G.F. p. 621 N.²). A

(449 b.) ὅς μοι παλλακίδος: οὐ τῆς ἡδῆ μιγείσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς εἰς τοῦτο τρεφομένης: φησὶ γοῦν «προμιγῆναι» (I 452). οὐκ ἀντίκειται δὲ τὸ ὅτι τὴν μὲν ἐφιλεί, ἠτίμαζε δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα: ἔπραττε γὰρ ταῦτα ἐν νῶ ἔχων ἡδῆ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαν. τοῦτο οὖν ὁ Φοῖνιξ ἐποίησεν εἰς ὁμόνοιαν τῶν γονέων. b (BE³) T | ἦν δὲ Κλυτία καὶ ἡ μήτηρ Ἴπποδάμεια ἢ Ἀλκιμέδη. T

(452 a.) <προμιγῆναι:> πρὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μιγῆναι. ἢ περισσεύει ἢ πρόθεσις. Aim

b.¹) ἴν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα: ῥᾶστα γὰρ ἀφίσταται γυνὴ γέροντος νέα πειραθεῖσα ἀνδρὸς νέου. | τινὲς «γέροντι» γράφουσιν, ἵνα μισηθῇ τῷ γέροντι'. T

b.²) ῥᾶστα γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἀφίσταται γέροντος γυνὴ νέα πειραθεῖσα νέου καὶ ἰσχυροτέρου ἀνδρὸς: ἦττον γὰρ οἱ γέροντες ἀφροδισιάζειν δύνανται. b (BE³)

(453 a.) τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα: ἐν ἡθεί δεῖ ἀναγινώσκειν ὡς μετανοοῦντος αὐτοῦ: διὸ καὶ ἐμπεπίστευται Ἀχιλλέα: «ὄ γὰρ πταίσας τι καὶ φυλάττεται»

1. H. Erbse, Berlin (Walter de Gruyter et Co.) 1971.

(Men. Asp. 28). καὶ Σοφοκλῆς (fr. 814 N.² = 900 P.). «ὄς μὴ πέπονθε τὰμά, μὴ † βουλευέται». b (BCE³ E⁴) T

b.) ἄλλως: *τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα*: ὡς πρὸς ὁμόνοιαν γονέων τὰ παρὰ προαίρεσιν ἐποίησε· φησὶ γοῦν «ἢ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο» (I 451). καὶ πάλιν τῆς διχαστασίας αὐτῶν κρείττονα τὴν φυγὴν ἠγήσατο. οἱ δὲ εὖ πρὸς γονεῖς ἔχοντες ἐπ' ἕσης μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν, ἐπαμύνουσιν δὲ τῷ καταπονουμένῳ. ἢ τάχα βούλεται λέγειν ὅτι οὐ πάντα πειστέον μητρὶ — Θέτις γοῦν ἔλεγεν· «ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν νηυσὶ παρήμενος ὠκυπόροισι | μῆνι' Ἀχαιοῖσιν» (A 421-2)—, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον πατρὶ τῷ λέγοντι· «φιλοφροσύνη γὰρ ἀμείνων» (I 256). b (BCE³E⁴) T ἀγαθοὶ δὲ διδάσκαλοι, οἳ ἐν πείρᾳ παθημάτων γεγόνασιν· καὶ Χεῖρωνα γάρ φασι τρωθέντα τὴν χεῖρα τὴν περὶ βοτανῶν ἐπιτηδεῦσαι ἰατρικὴν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὰς διαίτας τὸν Σηλυμβριανὸν Ἡρόδικον τὸν παιδοτρίβην, ὃς ἐμπειῶν διὰ τοὺς πόνους εἰς φθόγην ἐμελέτησε τὴν τέχνην. b (BE³E⁴)T

c.) *τῇ πιθόμην <καὶ ἔρεξα>*: Ἀριστόδημος ὁ Νυσαῖος, ῥήτωρ τε ἄμα καὶ γραμματικὸς (cf. F. H. G. III 307), φεύγων τὸ ἐγκλημα, ἐπενόησε γράφειν «τῇ οὐ πιθόμην †οὐδὲ ἔρεξα†». καὶ οὐ μόνον γε ἠυδοκίμησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτιμήθη ὡς εὐσεβῆ τηρήσας τὸν ἥρωα. πρὸ δὲ αὐτοῦ Σωσιφάνης (fr. 6, T. G. F. p. 820 N.²) τὴν τοιαύτην εὔρε γραφὴν. καὶ Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἀναμάρτητον εἰσάγει τὸν ἥρωα ἐν τῷ Φοῖνικι (cf. T. G. F. p. 621 N.²). ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ Ἀρποκρατίων ὁ Δίου διδάσκαλος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς I. A

(455 a.) *<μήποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέζεσθαι φίλον υἰόν>*: εἰκουῖα κατὰρα τῷ ἀτιμάσαντι πατέρα, τὴν ἀπὸ παίδων μὴ δέζεσθαι τιμῆν. b (BCE³E⁴) Til πᾶς δὲ εὖ φρονῶν πατὴρ υἱῷ εὐχεται ἀάππος γενέσθαι. b (BCE³) Til

b.) *<γούνασιν οἷσιν>*: ὅτι τινὲς γράφουσιν «<γούνας> ἔμοῦσιν». λέγει δὲ οὐ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ Φοῖνιξ, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἀμύντορος. Aint

Scholia Platonica εἰς Νόμων IA¹

931 b Ἀμύντορα...Φοῖνικι.

Φοῖνιξ Ἀμύντορος· οὗτος τυφλοῦται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός. κατεψεύσθη γὰρ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπὸ Φθίας τῆς αὐτοῦ παλλακῆς ὅτι δὴ πειραθείη πρὸς εὐνήν αὐτῇ συνελθεῖν. ἰᾶται δὲ ὑπὸ Χεῖρωνος Πηλέως σπουδῆ. ὁ δ' Ἀμύντωρ κατεῦχεται αὐτοῦ —

μήποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέψεσθαι² φίλον υἰόν (I 455).
ὁ δὲ γέγονεν· καὶ γὰρ θεοὶ ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς.

Eustathios³ ἐκ τῶν τῆς Ἰῶτα Ῥαψωδίας

(v. 447 s.) ὅτι Ἑλλαδικὸς ἀνέκαθεν ὢν ὁ Φοῖνιξ εἶτα ὕστερον εἰς Φθίαν ἐξέικε-

1. *Scholia Platonica*, G. C. Greene, Soc. philol. Amer., Pennsylv. 1938.

2. Immo ἐφέσεσθαι (ἐφέζεσθαι).

3. *Eust. Comment. ad Hom. Il. pert.*, M. van Der Valk, Leiden 1976.

το φυγῶν δι' αἰτίαν, ἥτις μετ' ὀλίγα βῆθήσεται. φησὶ γοῦν «ὄτε πρῶτον λίπον Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα φεύγων νείκεα πατρός Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο»... (v. 448-52) ὅτι ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Φοῖνικος Ἰπποδάμεια παρευδοκιμουμένη ἔρωτι παλλακίδος τῆς Κλυτίας, ἧς ἦρα ὁ τοῦ Φοῖνικος πατήρ Ἀμύντωρ, καὶ δυσωπήσασα τὸν υἱὸν τὰ εἰς τὴν βῆθησομένην ἐκδίκησιν, αἰτία γέγονεν αὐτῷ τοῦ ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος, ὡς ἐρρέθη, φυγεῖν. ἱστορῶν γοῦν τὰ τοιαῦτα ὁ Ὀμηρικὸς Φοῖνιξ φησιν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν Πηλέα ἐξικόμεν φεύγων νείκεα πατρός, ὡς εἴρηται, «ὅς μοι παλλακίδος πέρι χῶσατο καλλικόμοιο, τὴν αὐτὸς φιλέεσκεν, ἀτιμάζεσκε δ' ἄκοιτιν, | μητέρ' ἐμήν. ἦ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων παλλακίδι προμιγῆναι, ἔν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα». ἀφίσταται γὰρ γέροντος νέα γυνὴ πειραθεῖσα ἠβῶντος ἀνδρός. (v. 453-6) ὁ δὲ τοῖς τοκεῦσιν ὁμόνοιαν πραγματευόμενος ἐπέισθη τῇ μητρί. φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Φοῖνιξ «τῇ πιθόμην», ἡγουν τῇ μητρί, «καὶ ἔρεξα», μιγείς δηλαδὴ τῇ Κλυτίᾳ, ἣν ὁ πατήρ Ἀμύντωρ οὐπω μὲν ἔγνω, καθὰ οἱ παλαιοὶ φασιν, εἰς τοῦτο δὲ ἀνέτρεφε. διὸ οὐδὲ μιγῆναί φησιν ὁ Φοῖνιξ τῇ παλλακίδι ἀλλὰ προμιγῆναι, ἥτοι πρὸ ἐκείνου μιγῆναι, ἵνα ἐχθήρειε τὸν γέροντα. «πατήρ δ' ἐμός», φησὶν, «αὐτίκ' οἰσθείς», ὅ ἐστι γνούς, «πολλὰ κατηράτο, στυγερὰς δ' ἐπεκέκλετο | Ἐριννῦς, μὴ ποτε γούνασιν οἴσιν», ὅ ἐστιν ἰδίους, «εἰφέζεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαῶτα», ἵνα δηλαδὴ ὁ λυπήσας πατέρα δυστυχῆσῃ περὶ παιδὸς γονήν. «θεὸς δέ», φησὶν, «ετέλειεν ἐπαράς». καὶ καταντᾷ μετὰ πολλὰ ὁ λόγος τῷ διδασκάλῳ εἰς τὸ ἀντὶ υἱοῦ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ἐκθρέψασθαι καὶ παῖδα ποιήσασθαι καὶ τηλικούτον θεῖναι ὅποιος νῦν ἐστίν· ἀναμνήσει δὲ καὶ ὅπως ἐπαυδαγῶγει αὐτόν· ἔνθα καὶ σημειοῦνται οἱ παλαιοί, ὡς οὐχ' ὑπὸ Χείρωνος Ὀμηρος οἶδε τραφῆναι τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἴσως μόνην παιδευθῆναι τὴν ἰατρικήν. (v. 496) εἶτα εἰπὼν «ἀλλ', Ἀχιλλεῦ, δάμασον θυμὸν μέγαν» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, βῆτορεύσας | δὲ καὶ περὶ λιτῶν τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς βῆθησόμενα, ἐπάγει καὶ ἱστορίαν τὴν κατὰ τὸν Μελέαγρον οἰκείως πάνυ τῷ πράγματι καὶ συμβουλεύει ἐκόντα τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ἐπαμῦναι, μήποτε (387) καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ τοῦ Μελεάγρου πάθοι.

Εἰς Λυκόφρονα Σχόλια

421 τὸν πατρί πλεῖστον | Φοῖνιξ ὁ Ἀμύντορος ταῖς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Κλεοβούλης ἱκεσίαις μιγείς τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς παλλακίδι Κλυτίᾳ || ἢ Φθία κατὰ τινὰς ἐτυφλώθη παρ' αὐτοῦ | .φυγῶν δὲ ὁ Φοῖνιξ ἦλθε πρὸς Πηλέα | καὶ ὅς ἀπαγαγὼν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Χείρωνα ἔπεισεν ὑγιῆ γενέσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. | ταῦτα τὰ μυθικά, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς οὕτως ἔχει· Τ μιγέντα τῇ παλλακῇ γνούς αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ κατηράσατο μὴ τεκεῖν παῖδας | οὗς καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς λέγει | . ὁ δὲ φυγῶν ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Πηλέα καὶ ὅς ἀγαγὼν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ἄντρον τοῦ Χείρωνος | ἔδειξεν *αὐτῷ* τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ἐκεῖ παιδευόμενον καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτῷ εἰπὼν· ἰδὲ ὁ παῖς σου, ἀναγε οὖν αὐτὸν τοῦ λοιποῦ καὶ παιδεύε, ὡσπερ χρὴ πατέρα φίλον ἀνάγειν υἱόν. καὶ τούτου χάριν ἐμυθεύσαντο ὅτι | ἀπεκόμισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πηλεὺς

πρὸς τὸν Χείρωνα καὶ ὃς ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν πάλιν βλέπειν || . καὶ ὁ Ὀππιανὸς δὲ τὰ τέκνα φᾶεος φίλτερα καὶ βιότιοιο λέγει (H I 702). ὅτι δὲ συμβολικῶς χρή τὴν τύφλωσιν νοεῖν τοῦ Φοίνικος διὰ τὸ ἄπαιδα γενέσθαι καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ φασὶ πραγματικῶς, καὶ Ὀμηρὸς φησὶν ἔμοι συνέδων· φησὶ γὰρ λέγων ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Φοίνικος πρὸς τὸν Ἀχιλέα seqq. I 447-457 καὶ τι τοιοῦτόν φησὶν seq. I 494 ἀλλὰ σὲ - 495 ἀμύνης. T