

Ioanna Karamanou
Euripides
Danae and Dictys

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von
Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall, Ernst Heitsch,
Ludwig Koenen, Reinhold Merkelbach,
Clemens Zintzen

Band 228



K · G · Saur München · Leipzig

Euripides
Danae and Dictys

Introduction, Text and Commentary

by
Ioanna Karamanou



K · G · Saur München · Leipzig 2006

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind
im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

© 2006 by K. G. Saur Verlag GmbH, München und Leipzig
Printed in Germany

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. All Rights Strictly Reserved.

Jede Art der Vervielfältigung ohne Erlaubnis des Verlags ist unzulässig.

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Gesamtherstellung: Druckhaus „Thomas Müntzer“ GmbH, 99947 Bad Langensalza

ISBN 13: 978-3-598-77840-7

ISBN 10: 3-598-77840-6

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations.	ix
General Introduction.	xiii
1. Introductory Note.	xiii
2. The <i>Danae</i> and <i>Dictys</i> and the Transmission of Euripides.	xv
3. Exploring the Evidence.	xviii
Euripides' <i>Danae</i> :	
1. The Legend.	1
1a. The Mythical Background.	1
1b. The Legend in Attic Tragedy.	10
1c. The Legend in Attic Comedy.	13
1d. The Legend in Latin Literature.	15
1. Date.	17
2. <i>Dramatis Personae</i> and Setting.	18
3. Plot-Structure.	22
4. Reception.	30
Text.	31
Commentary.	43
Euripides' <i>Dictys</i> :	
1. The Legend.	119
1a. The Mythical Background.	119
1b. The Legend in Attic Tragedy.	126
1c. The Legend in Attic Comedy.	128
1d. Later Versions.	129
1. Date.	131
2. <i>Dramatis Personae</i>	131
3. Plot-Structure.	134
4. Setting.	139
5. Reception.	141
Text.	142
Commentary.	152
Appendix: The ' <i>Danae</i> -prologue' ([E.] fr. 1132 Kn).	225
1. Diagnosis of Spuriousness.	227

2. Sources.	231
3. Style.	232
4. Dramatic Technique.	234
Conclusion.	238
Bibliography.	239
Indexes.	278
Plates.	291

To my Parents

PREFACE

This book originates in my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of London in January 2005. I am hugely indebted to my supervisor at University College London, Professor Chris Carey, for his careful guidance and valuable criticism. I have been extremely fortunate to receive his unstinted interest in and support of my research, as regards the present book and related publications. Warmest and sincerest thanks are due to my examiners, Professor John Wilkins and Dr Nick Lowe, for their very constructive comments coming from their expertise in Greek Drama and for recommending the thesis for publication. I am grateful to Professor Dr Michael Erler and the members of the Board of the *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* for accepting the book for publication in this series. I owe a special debt to Professor Richard Janko, my supervisor during the first year of my PhD research, for encouraging me to deal with this topic and subjecting the first drafts of my work to his robust criticism. I benefited greatly from the expertise of Professor Dr Egert Pöhlmann in staging, of Professors Eric Handley and Axel Seeberg in iconographic evidence and from the philological vigour of Professor Giuseppe Giangrande and Dr Heather White. At the Department of Greek and Latin of University College London, Mr Alan Griffiths kindly read most of this thesis offering stimulating ideas and much advice and Professor Cornelia Roemer initiated me to the exciting field of Papyrology. Warmest thanks are due to Professor Dr Richard Kannicht for so generously sending me the valuable proofs of his text of the *Danae* and *Dictys* a year before the publication of *TrGF V*.

At this point, I need to express my gratitude to Professor Pat Easterling for her scholarly advice and unfailing encouragement throughout my graduate studies, ever since my first tentative steps in the field of research of tragic fragments during my MPhil at Cambridge. I owe a great debt to late Professor Herman van Looy for so kindly encouraging me to work and publish on Euripidean fragments and for making this possible with the four volumes of his Budé edition in co-operation with

Professor F. Jouan. I am particularly grateful to Professor Evangelos Moutsopoulos, member of the Academy of Athens, for his valuable academic advice and support. I am also indebted to Professor Gerasimos Chrysafis for his inspiring lectures and encouragement.

Special thanks are due to the A. S. Onassis and O. Stathatou Foundations for successively funding my post-graduate studies. My research was made possible thanks to the staff and rich collections of the Library of the Institute of Classical Studies in London, the British Library and the Library of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. I am much indebted to the staff of K.G. Saur Verlag: to Dr Elisabeth Schuhmann for her editorial guidance and patience and to Mrs Anja Arndt and Mrs Karin Stötzer for advice about technical matters. Warmest thanks are due to my dear friend and promising young archaeologist, Ms Theodora Moullou, for her generous help with practical issues.

Finally, the debt to my family cannot be adequately expressed in words. My dear late grandfather, John Xanthakis, has been for me a model of steadfastness and academic zeal. My parents amply offered their affectionate, intellectual and material support throughout my studies and my mother should be credited with inspiring me love for tragedy and fragments. My brother, Yiannis, encouraged me throughout with his good cheer and bright sense of humour. And my husband, Emmanuel, has patiently stood by me all the way from the very beginning, offering great help, inspiration, understanding and moral support.

*Athens,
March 2006*

I.K.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of names of Greek and Latin authors and their works follow those in the *Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones* (9th edition) and *Lewis & Short* respectively. Abbreviations of journals are cited after *L' Année Philologique*.

- A. C. Austin, *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta* (Berlin 1968)

- D.-K. H. Diels - W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Berlin 1952⁶)

- FGrH* F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin and Leiden 1923-1958)

- G.-P. A.S.F. Gow - D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965)

- J.-v.L. F. Jouan - H. van Looy, *Euripide. Fragments*. 4 Vols (Paris 1998-2003)

- K.-A. R. Kassel - C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin 1983-)

- Kn. R. Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. V, 1-2: *Euripides* (Göttingen 2004)

- Kn.-Sn. R. Kannicht - B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. II: *Fragmenta Adespota* (Göttingen 1981)

- LfgrE* B. Snell, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (Göttingen 1979-)

- LIMC* *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zurich and Munich 1981-1999)

- L.-P. E. Lobel - D.L. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1955)

- LSJ*⁹ H.G. Liddell- R. Scott- H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek English Lexicon* (9th edition, Oxford 1940, repr. with supplement 1996)
- M. H.J. Mette, *Euripides. Die Bruchstücke. Lustrum* 23/24 (1981-1982)
- M.-W. R. Merkelbach - M.L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967)
- N.² A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1889², repr. with supplement by B. Snell, Hildesheim 1964)
- OCD*³ S. Hornblower - A. Spawforth, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd edition, revised Oxford 2003)
- PCG* cf. above, K.-A.
- PMG* D.L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962)
- R. S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. III: *Aeschylus* (Göttingen 1985), Vol. IV: *Sophocles* (Göttingen 1999²)
- RE* *Real – Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart and Munich 1893-1980)
- RVAp*
Suppl. 2 A.D. Trendall and A. Cambitoglou, *Second Supplement to the Red-figured Vases of Apulia*. 2 Vols (London 1991-1992)
- Sn. B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. I: *Didascaliae, Tragici Minores* (Göttingen 1986², revised by R. Kannicht)
- Sn.- M. B. Snell, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. 2 Vols (revised by H. Maehler, Leipzig and Stuttgart 1987-1989)
- TrGF* *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 5 Vols (cf. above, Kn., Kn.-Sn., R., Sn.)
- W.-H. C. Wachsmuth - O. Hense, *I. Stobaei Anthologii Libri I-IV* (Berlin 1884-1894)

Euripides' plays are cited by title only (the abbreviation of Euripides' name is omitted, unless required for reasons of clarity). Of his lost plays the following are abbreviated, according to Collard-Cropp-Lee-Gibert (*Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays*. Vols I-II, Warminster and Oxford 1995-2004):

<i>Alcm. Cor.</i>	<i>Alcmeon in Corinth</i>
<i>Alcm. Ps.</i>	<i>Alcmeon in Psophis</i>
<i>Bell.</i>	<i>Bellerophon</i>
<i>Chrys.</i>	<i>Chrysippus</i>
<i>Cresph.</i>	<i>Cresphontes</i>
<i>Hipp. Cal.</i>	<i>Hippolytus Calyptomenos</i>
<i>Hyps.</i>	<i>Hypsipyle</i>
<i>Mel. D.</i>	<i>Melanippe Desmōtis</i>
<i>Mel. S.</i>	<i>Melanippe Sophē</i>
<i>Pha.</i>	<i>Phaethon</i>
<i>Sthen.</i>	<i>Stheneboea</i>

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. Introductory Note

The *Danae* and *Dictys* both belong to the Danae-myth, treating the earlier and subsequent phase of the legend, respectively. It is therefore interesting to explore what can be recovered of Euripides' treatments of a myth-cycle unrepresented among extant plays and his dramatic predilections in each one of the two plays. The *Danae* belongs to the group of Euripidean plays dealing with a maiden's clash with her paternal *oikos* owing to her illicit motherhood (cf. *Danae*, Plot-Structure). The *Dictys*, on the other hand, provides a change of scenery from Argos to the island of Seriphos and could be described as a *nostos* play following Euripides' plot-pattern of 'catastrophe survived'¹ (cf. *Dictys*, Plot-Structure). Likewise, it may be observed that other Euripidean treatments of successive phases of the same legend, such as the pairs *Iphigenia in Aulis*-*Iphigenia in Tauris* and *Melanippe the Wise*-*Captive Melanippe*, tend to present parallel features; the mythically earlier plays (*Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Melanippe the Wise*) treat the maiden's separation from her native family, whereas those inspired by subsequent phases of the myth (*Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Captive Melanippe*) have the scenery transferred to a remote place—presumably suggestive of the heroine's isolation—dealing with the motif of rescue and reunion between kin.

Apart from their mythical affiliation, a full-scale treatment of both tragedies is prompted by the fact that a respectable amount of lines survives from each play, whereas recent iconographic evidence from an Apulian volute-crater combined with literary sources sheds new light on the plot-structure and staging of the *Dictys*. Moreover, as observed below (cf. Plot-Structure of each play), these two tragedies are early treatments of main Euripidean plot-patterns that anticipate more familiar works in the

¹ The term originates in Burnett (1971).

corpus, both extant and fragmentary. With the purpose of exploring the function of these plot-patterns, a cautious recovery of scenes from each play is attempted, on the basis of the evidence of the fragments and testimonia, as well as of tragic conventions and parallel situations from Euripidean drama (cf. section 3: Exploring the Evidence). The *Danae* also calls for a reassessment of ambivalent philological issues, such as the piece that purports to be its 'hypothesis' (T5) and the spurious 'prologue' of [E.] fr. 1132 Kn. (cf. Appendix). The commentary aims to shed light on various aspects of Euripidean dramatic technique (such as the *agōn*, cf. *Danae* fr. 8-12, *Dictys* fr. 4, 5, imagery, cf. *Danae* fr. 2, 15), stagecraft (such as the 'cancelled entry' and the imposing opening tableau in the *Dictys*, cf. Setting and note on fr. 1), key themes (the motif of supplication in *Dictys* T3, T4, T5, the precarious position of women in *Danae* fr. 4, 5, 6, the possible self-sacrifice in *Danae* fr. 13, 14, the Euripidean type of the assertive old man in *Dictys* fr. 3), ideas and values (the different definitions of *eugeneia* in *Danae* fr. 9 and *Dictys* fr. 14, the positions for and against wealth in *Danae* fr. 7-12, the consolation in *Dictys* fr. 2, the perception of *eros* as god-sent and overmastering passion in *Dictys* fr. 8, 9, 18). The exploration of issues raised by fragmentary material and the cautious recovery of the two lost plays, so far as possible, seek to complement our knowledge of Euripides' drama by contributing to an overview and more comprehensive picture of the dramatist's technique, as the extant tragedies represent only a small portion of his oeuvre. A detailed study of the two plays seems thus to be well justified.

To address textual problems and issues of transmission, I have re-read the papyri of the testimonia (*Dictys* T4, T6), the Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 287, f^o 147^v-148^r (*Danae* T5 and [E.] fr. 1132 Kn.), mss L and G of Sophocles (*Dictys* fr. 11) and the manuscripts of Stobaeus, where needed. The resulting text differs in some cases from Prof. Kannicht's recent edition (*TrGF* V) and previous editions of Euripidean fragments (*Danae* fr. 3.2, 7.4, 15.2, *Dictys* T4.7, T6.2). There are certain cases where my emendations of the text have happily coincided with Prof. Kannicht's, though made independently (*Danae* fr. 2.7, *Dictys* fr. 2.2, 11.1, 19; they are assigned, of course, to Prof. Kannicht, as his edition preceded my thesis and book). Owing to the multiplicity of sources for the text of the testimonia and fragments of both plays, one may refer to the particular editions cited, as regards the manuscript sigla of each source.

2. The *Danae* and *Dictys* and their Place in the Transmission of Euripides

On the basis of the available evidence, the position of the two plays in the process of transmission of the Euripidean corpus can be explored up to a certain extent.² Unlike his own era, the dramatist enjoyed great popularity from the fourth century BC onwards, as emerges from inscriptional evidence with reference to revivals of his plays throughout the Greek speaking world,³ literary and pictorial testimonies, as well as the reception of his drama in middle and new comedy.⁴ The Apulian vase-painting inspired by the *Dictys* and dated in 370/360 BC (*Dictys* T3) is suggestive of a fourth-century performance of the play in South Italy. Likewise, the probable allusion to a performance of his *Danae* in Menander's *Samia* (*Danae* T6) points to its revival in that era.

The official Athenian copy of the plays belonging to the theatrical repertory, which was implemented thanks to Lycurgus' decree of about 330 BC (cf. [Plut.] *Decem Oratorum Vitae* 841F), seems to have been consulted by Aristophanes of Byzantium, while preparing his edition towards the end of the third century (cf. Galen in *Hp. Epid.* III *Comm.* 2. 4);⁵ Aristophanes' edition is estimated to have comprised the surviving 78 out of the 92 plays of Euripides' production (cf. *Vita Eur. TrGF* V,1, T 1, IA 28, IB 57f.) arranged alphabetically. The plays not included in the edition, thereby missing the opportunity to be cited by later authors, had evidently been already lost during the fourth century. The satyr play *Theristae*, for instance, is mentioned as lost in Aristophanes' hyp. *Med.* (*Dictys* T1), as opposed to the *Medea*, *Philoctetes* and *Dictys* of the same production, which were preserved to be included in Aristophanes' edition.

Considering that the evidence for literary treatments of Polydectes' petrification after the fifth century BC is very scanty (cf.

² For a detailed study of Euripidean transmission throughout Antiquity, cf. van Looy (1964) 1-14.

³ Cf. *TrGF* I, 17-21. For the frequency of revivals of Euripidean plays, cf. Tuilier (1968) 26f., van Looy (1964) 7f.

⁴ For Euripides' popularity from the fourth century onwards, cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) 28-34, also note on *Dictys* T1. On the reception of his drama in comedy, cf. notes on *Danae* T6 and fr. 6.

⁵ Cf. Wartelle (1971) 107-110, 113-115, Pfeiffer (1968) 82, 192, Tuilier (1968) 28-30, 49f., 54.

Dictys, 1d. Later Versions), the depiction of this theme in the Cyzicene relief of the second century BC (*Dictys* T7), in combination with the wide reception of Euripidean drama in this collection of reliefs (cf. note *ad loc.*) and the dramatist's popularity in Hellenistic times, may tell in favour of the appeal of the *Dictys* in that era. Moreover, inscriptional evidence (*Danae* T2) reveals that a copy of the *Danae* was kept in a school library in Piraeus in about 100 BC and thus widely read by that time. Meanwhile, gnostic anthologies of educational character, citing excerpts from Euripides and other authors are estimated to have appeared as early as the fourth century BC;⁶ the notorious fr. 7 of the *Danae*, for instance, is cited in a florilegium from Hellenistic Egypt dated in the second century BC.⁷ In both cases, part of the appeal of the play for the schoolroom may have been the moralizing about wealth.

The earliest attested commentary on Euripides, in which the roots of the 'selection' of late antiquity may be traced, is that by Didymus in the second half of the first century BC/ early first century AD.⁸ The ten plays of the 'selection' (the nine annotated plays plus the *Bacchae*, which is widely held to have belonged to the select plays⁹) must have been eminently popular in Didymus' time and presumably part of the school syllabus.¹⁰ Having been singled out for commentaries, they were given greater chance of long-term survival.¹¹ This gradual process of canon formation emerges also from the preservation in papyri from the second century BC onwards of fewer unannotated (non-select) plays than those with commentaries.¹² Nevertheless, the fact that non-select plays continued to be performed at least till the end of the second century AD¹³ and were

⁶ Cf. Horna (1935) 78f., Barns (1950) 134-137.

⁷ Cf. Zereteli and Krüger (1925) 60-62.

⁸ There is safe evidence that Didymus wrote *hypomnēmata* at least on six of the select plays, though one cannot tell how many plays altogether he commented on; cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 277.

⁹ For this matter, cf. Zuntz (1965) 110-125, Turyn (1957) 311, Barrett (1964) 51 and n.3.

¹⁰ Cf. Zuntz (1965) 254f.

¹¹ So Easterling (1997) 225, van Looy (1964) 14, Barrett (1964) 53.

¹² Cf. Roberts (1953) 270f.

¹³ Cf. Luc. *De Salt.* 27 (with reference to a performance of the *Heracles*), Plut. *Mor.* 556A (*Ino*), 998E (*Cresphontes*), Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 7. 5 (*Ino*), Tatian *Or. ad Gr.* 24. 1 (mime from one of Euripides' *Alcmeon* tragedies). Cf. also Turner (1963) 122-127, pointing out the possible use of the *Cresphontes* papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 2458, 3rd century AD) for dramatic representation, Kokolakis (1960) *passim*, Di Gregorio (1976) 161-164, Zuntz (1965) 255 and n. 7.

still obtainable among literary circles ¹⁴ suggests that the encroachment of the 'selection' was a slow process and its influence was limited to the school syllabus by that time. For instance, Lucian's allusion to the context of the situation of *Danae* fr. 7 (*Timon* 41) and perhaps also of fr. 13 (*D. Mar.* 12), as well as the possibility that the rescue of mother and child by the Nereids might reflect Euripides (cf. note on T5), imply that he could have known the play directly. Likewise, the reference to the situation of *Dictys* fr. 2 by the author of the *Consolation to Apollonius* (perhaps written by Plutarch in his youth or by one of his contemporaries ¹⁵) could suggest his direct knowledge of the play. In addition, the performance of a selection of extracts referring to Eros and Aphrodite in Plutarch's time, including *Danae* fr. 8, is at least suggestive of the continuing popularity of themes from the play in that era. At the same time, the narrative hypotheses of Euripides' plays possibly dated in the Imperial period were very popular, saving the toil, which the study of the classical originals entailed.¹⁶ Ps. Apollodorus' account reflecting the plot of the *Dictys* (cf. opening note on *Dictys* T5) presents certain features suggesting that it may have gone back to this collection of narrative hypotheses through intermediary sources.

The establishment of Christianity evidently led to the consolidation of the 'selection', as the parts of pagan tradition standing any chance of long-term survival were only those included in the school syllabus.¹⁷ The size of the 'selection' seems to have been linked also with the capacity of the codex, which prevailed over the roll in about the fourth century, since a single codex could accommodate a poet's most popular plays.¹⁸ Moreover, the trend of excerpting literature for educational purposes and the compilation of gnomic anthologies presenting passages conveniently arranged by subject ¹⁹ eventually resulted in only indirect access to non-select plays. The latest known ancient manuscripts of plays

¹⁴ Cf. the papyri of the *Oedipus* (*P. Oxy.* 2459, 4th AD), *Captive Melanippe* (*P. Berol.* 5514, 4th/ 5th AD) and the palimpsest of the *Phaethon* (Paris, Greek ms. 107B, 5th/ 6th AD). Cf. also the quotations from non-select plays in Luc. *Menipp.* 1 (*HF* 523f.), *J. Trag.* 1 (*HF* 538), D.Chr. *Or.* lii (paraphrasis of the *Philoctetes*), which seem to derive from direct access to these plays, rather than intermediary sources, such as anthologies; cf. Zuntz (1965) 254, 255 and n. 3 and 4.

¹⁵ Cf. Defradas, Hani and Klaerr (1985) 4-12.

¹⁶ Cf. Zuntz (1955) 139-142, 146, van Rossum (1998) 31.

¹⁷ Cf. Zuntz (1965) 256, Reynolds and Wilson (1991³) 53f., van Looy (1964) 14.

¹⁸ Cf. Roberts (1955) 203, Zuntz (1965) 256, Barrett (1964) 53, Easterling and Knox (1985) 36.

¹⁹ On this topic, cf. Morgan (1998) 120-151, Cribiore (2001_b) 248f., Barns (1950) 135-137.

outside the 'selection' are the papyri of the *Oedipus* and *Captive Melanippe* dated in the fourth/ fifth century and the palimpsest of the *Phaethon* dated in the fifth/ sixth century (cf. n. 14). The spurious fr. 1132 Kn. written some time between the fourth and seventh century AD points to the appeal of Euripides and of the earlier phase of Danae's myth in late antiquity; nevertheless, if it was an independent composition (e.g. a rhetorical exercise imitating a Euripidean opening on Danae's legend), rather than a specially composed supplement for the lost beginning of the *Danae* in an alphabetic collection of Euripides' plays (the latter is West's assumption²⁰), it would not tell us much about the survival of the play by that time (cf. Appendix, Diagnosis of Spuriousness). The majuscule manuscripts of the text of the 'selection', presumably written in about the sixth or seventh century, were transcribed into minuscule possibly in about the tenth century.²¹ A copy of the nine 'alphabetic', non-select plays evidently originating in an ancient manuscript in uncial seems to have been possessed by Eustathius in the twelfth century. It was discovered by Triclinius, who made from it the copy which became the model of Ms L (Laur. 32. 2); the latter, in turn, formed the basis of the text of the 'alphabetic' plays in Ms P (Pal. Gr. 287 and Laur. Conv. Soppr. 172).²²

3. Exploring the Evidence: The Sources and Recovery of the Plot

The direct evidence for Euripides' lost plays comprises their surviving fragments, which may be either papyrus (or parchment) fragments coming from the plays as such or book-fragments, that is, excerpts or quotations in the works of other authors. The indirect evidence consists of the testimonia for the plays, either textual or artistic.²³

The lack of papyrus-fragments coming from the text of the *Danae* and *Dictys*,²⁴ which, in the case of the *Danae* in particular, may be a matter

²⁰ Cf. West (1981) 78, n. 49.

²¹ Cf. Zuntz (1965) 261, Barrett (1964) 57f.

²² Cf. Zuntz (1965) 185, 192.

²³ On the distinction between direct and indirect evidence, cf. Collard (2005) 49-51, Laks (1997) 237-239. For a thorough survey of the various sources for Euripidean fragments, cf. van Looy (1964) 14-57.

²⁴ The two surviving papyrus-fragments (*Dictys* fr. 1 and *Danae* fr. 7) are excerpts coming from later works and not from the plays as such.

of coincidence rather than an indication of lesser popularity (cf. *Danae*, Reception), leaves fragments cited by later authors as the sole direct source. In the latter case, it should be taken into account that the nature of the selected passage and the manner, in which the text is cited, primarily depends on the author's reasons for quoting it.²⁵ Most of the present material comes from Stobaeus' fifth-century AD compilation (*Danae* frs. 1-15, except for fr. 10a, *Dictys* frs. 3-10, 12-18), which draws on earlier anthologies.²⁶ The generalising character of gnomic excerpts entails problems of locating the fragments within the play. Preservation in gnomic anthologies also has implications for the state of the text, mainly due to the compilers' trend to render the quotations self-contained (cf. note on *Danae* fr. 4.1).²⁷ Philodemus (the sole source for *Dictys* fr. 1) often quotes anonymously,²⁸ usually with no reference to the context, making it difficult to identify the citation confidently in the case of fragments, for which he is the only source. Plutarch, whose work of youth could have been the source for *Dictys* fr. 2, also tends to quote anonymously, though by mentioning the speaker, the addressee and briefly the situation, he generally makes the identification of the play possible and may even give hints at the location of the fragment within the play.²⁹ The ancient scholia are often a helpful source, particularly when a fragment is cited as a parallel to the commented passage,³⁰ which, in certain cases, may give scope for exploring its context (cf. *Dictys* fr. 11). The least helpful sources for locating a fragment within a play are evidently lexicographical citations (cf. *Danae* fr. 16, *Dictys* fr. 19), preserving words completely isolated from their context.

The indirect evidence needs also to be assessed in terms of its reliability and degree of access to the play. The reliability of inscriptional evidence, for instance, cannot be disputed (cf. the catalogues of Euripidean plays in *Danae* T2 and T3= *Dictys* T2), though it is mainly informative on questions of transmission, rather than matters of form and content. Alexandrian scholarship constitutes a solid source as well; the *Dictys* is

²⁵ On the difficulties in treating fragmentary material surviving thanks to quotation, cf. Gill (2005) 151-158, Dionisotti (1997) 1f.

²⁶ For the prevalence of Euripidean citations in Stobaeus' *Florilegium*, cf. Kannicht (1997) 68-71, Kassel (1991) 248f.

²⁷ Cf. West (1973) 18.

²⁸ Cf. van Looy (1964) 24 and n. 4 with examples.

²⁹ Cf. Plutarch's citations of *Cresph.* fr. 456 Kn., *Hyph.* fr. 754 Kn., *Pha.* fr. 783a Kn. and van Looy (1964) 27 and n. 3.

³⁰ So *Antigone* fr. 159 Kn., *Archelaus* fr. 241 Kn., *Bell.* fr. 305 Kn., *Cresph.* fr. 452, 455 Kn., *Oedipus* fr. 541 Kn.

safely dated thanks to hyp. *Med.* by Aristophanes of Byzantium (*Dictys* T1). There are cases where the pieces of evidence complement each other and thus assist in retrieving the outline of the lost play;³¹ the accounts of Theon (*Dictys* T4) and the *Bibliotheca* (*Dictys* T5) could not be confidently regarded as reflecting the plot of the *Dictys* without the further evidence provided in the Apulian pictorial representation of the supplication of Danae and Dictys (*Dictys* T3). Yet, iconographic evidence should be approached with reasonable caution;³² as regards tragedy-related South-Italian vase-paintings, in particular, it should be borne in mind that they hardly aim at an accurate, 'photographic' illustration of scenes, but rather seem to offer their viewers a recollection of key-themes from the plays by which they are inspired (cf. note on *Dictys* T3). The combination of evidence of T3, T4 and T5, in turn, assists in identifying with much probability *Dictys* T6 as a small scrap of the narrative papyrus hypothesis of the play and in supplementing the name of the god, at whose altar Danae and Dictys have sought refuge.

On the other hand, there are sources, whose reliability should be questioned; the validity, for instance, of what purports to be the 'hypothesis' of the *Danae* (*Danae* T5) could be contested for a number of reasons in combination (cf. note *ad loc.*). In addition, testimonies depending on the arbitrary and oversimplifying interpretation of sources or on anecdotal material, such as those of Pollux (*Danae* T1) and Satyrus (*Danae* fr. 10a) respectively, need to be treated with due caution. One should also distinguish between cases of direct inspiration (cf. Menander in *Danae* T6) and indirect access to the play (cf. John Malalas' testimony in *Danae* T4).

The lack of papyri from the text of either play and of a well preserved hypothesis evidently limits the scope for a recovery of the details of the plot. My purpose therefore is, first, to assign the fragments to the dramatic characters relying on the evidence of the testimonia and on interrogation of the fragments in terms of theme, gender of speaker and interlocutor, where possible, the speaker's emotional state, rhetoric and ethical stance. Subsequently, I attempt to locate the fragments into scenes, on the basis of the testimonies for the broad plot of the play, particular hints of the fragments at the dramatic situation, parallels from Euripidean scene-construction and tragic conventions. In this effort, commentary writing assists in the close interrogation of the fragmentary material, with

³¹ On the combination of literary and pictorial evidence for the recovery of the plot of lost tragedies, cf. Kannicht (1997) 76f.

³² For this matter, cf. Green (1991) 38-44.

the purpose of retrieving as much as possible from each play. Moreover, remarks made in particular notes in the commentary are gathered and summarized in the introduction to each fragment, which addresses matters of location, key-themes and aspects of Euripidean dramatic technique.

The numbering of the fragments follows their proposed location in scenes, while those, whose position cannot be fixed with much probability, are placed at the end as 'fragmenta sedis magis incertae'. The order of the testimonia is congruent with the extent of information for the play that they provide, as well as the degree of their reliability. There are cases where the association of certain testimonia with either play is contested (cf. notes on *Danae* T5 and *Dictys* T7); yet, their proposed relation to the plays by some scholars calls for their inclusion among the testimonia and for a further exploration and fresh assessment of their validity.

EURIPIDES' *DANAE*

1. The Legend: The Events in Argos

The legend of Danae and Perseus enjoyed great popularity in Antiquity, inspiring a wide range of literary and artistic treatments. Euripides' *Danae* draws on the earlier phase of the myth with Argos as place of action, while his *Dictys* is inspired by the subsequent events at Seriphos (cf. *Dictys*, The Legend). Before studying Euripides' treatment of the early stage of the Danae-myth, it is essential to go through the sources prior and subsequent to his play, with the purpose of establishing the mythical background of his production, as well as exploring the appeal and versions of the myth in different periods of time (The possible cases of reception of the *Danae* are discussed in the relevant chapter).

1a. The Mythical Background

Danae was the beautiful daughter of Acrisius, son of Abas¹ and king of Argos, and of his wife Eurydice, daughter of Lacedaemon.² Her fine physical appearance is described in the epics with the fixed epithets *καλλίσφυρος* (*Il.* 14. 319 and schol. Eust. *ad loc.*, Hes. fr. 129.14 M.-W.) and *ἡύκομος* (*Aspis* 216).³

¹ Hes. fr. 129, 135 M.-W., E. *Archel.* fr. 228b. 5ff. Kn., also schol. *Hec.* 886b (Schwartz), Paus. 2. 16. 2, [Apollod.] 2. 1.

² Hes. fr. 129 M.-W., Pherecyd. fr. 10 Fowler/ *FGrH* 3 F10, schol. T *ad Il.* 14.319 (Erbse), [Apollod.] 2. 2.1. Tzetzes' reference to Eurydice as daughter of Eurotas in his scholium on Lyc. 838 (Scheer) may well be due to a misunderstanding of the known genealogy, according to which Lacedaemon, Eurydice's father, was Eurotas' son in-law (Paus. 3. 1.2, [Apollod.] 3. 10.3, schol. *Or.* 626 Schwartz), which makes Eurydice Eurotas' granddaughter, rather than his daughter. On the other hand, Hyginus (*fab.* 63) oddly calls Danae's mother Aganippe, possibly due to confusion (cf. *Dictys*, The Legend: 1d. Later Versions).

³ For Danae's beauty, cf. also Pi. *N.* 10. 10ff., *A.P.* 5. 257, Theophyl. *Ep.* 81, schol. Eust. *Il.* 14. 315-27 (van der Valk), schol. rec. Pi. *P.* 12. 9ff. (Abel). Danae is presented as a model of beauty in Greg. Naz. *Carm. Mor.* 29. 139ff.

The earliest attested complete account of Danae's adventures occurs in Pherecydes (fr. 10 Fowler/ *FGrH* 3 F10) ⁴ and has survived in summarized form in the ancient scholia on Apollonius of Rhodes (4. 1091 Wendel): the genealogist narrates how Acrisius imprisoned his daughter in an underground bronze chamber together with her nurse, on the basis of an oracle saying that he would be killed by the son born from Danae. Zeus, however, managed to impregnate Danae by transforming himself into a shower of gold and their offspring, Perseus, was hidden from his grandfather. When Acrisius found out about the child accidentally by hearing its shouts, he killed the nurse and, taking Danae to the altar of Zeus Herkeios, demanded to know who the child's father was. When Danae answered that it was Zeus, Acrisius did not believe her and enclosed both mother and son in a chest, which he cast adrift. The chest reached the coast of Seriphos, where it was fished up by a fisherman named Dictys, son of Peristhenes, who took Danae and Perseus under his protection, treating them as his own family. The text of the scholiast runs as follows:⁵

Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ β' ἱστορεῖ, ὡς Ἀκρίσιος γαμεῖ Εὐρυδίκην τὴν
 Λακεδαιμόνος· τῶν δὲ γίνεται Δανάη.⁶ χρωμένῳ δὲ αὐτῷ περὶ
 ἄρσενος παιδὸς ἔχρησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν Πυθοί, ὅτι αὐτῷ μὲν οὐκ ἔσται
 παῖς ἄρσην, ἐκ δὲ τῆς θυγατρὸς, πρὸς οὗ αὐτὸν ἀπολεῖσθαι. ὁ
 δὲ ἀναχωρήσας εἰς Ἄργος θάλαμον ποιεῖ χαλκοῦν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ 5
 τῆς οἰκίας κατὰ γῆς, ἔνθα τὴν Δανάην εἰσάγει μετὰ τροφῶν ἐν ᾧ
 αὐτὴν ἐφύλασσαν, ὅπως ἐξ αὐτῆς παῖς μὴ γένηται. ἐρασθεὶς δὲ
 Ζεὺς τῆς παιδὸς, ἐκ τοῦ ὀρόφου χρυσῷ παραπλήσιος ῥεῖ, ἥ δὲ
 ὑποδέχεται τῷ κόλπῳ· καὶ ἐκφύνας αὐτὸν ὁ Ζεὺς τῇ παιδί

1 β' Matthiae: ἐν τ' ιβ' L || 4 ἀπολεῖσθαι Keil: ἀπολέσθαι L: δεῖ ἀπολέσθαι F:
 ἀπολέεσθαι Jacoby: aliter P || 6-7 ἐν ᾧ αὐτὴν ἐφύλασσαν L: φυλάσσωσαν αὐτὴν P

⁴ Pherecydes' *Genealogy* is estimated to have appeared some time between 508 and 475 BC; cf. Jacoby (1947) 33.

⁵ The text followed is Fowler's.

⁶ The scholiast appears to have maintained Pherecydes' own words in this sentence and below (l. 10: τῶν δὲ γίνεται Περσεύς), to judge from the phrasing in actual quotations from Pherecydes' text in fr. 2, 8, 20, 21, 66, 101 Fowler.

μίννυται. τῶν δὲ γίνεται Περσεύς, καὶ ἐκτρέφει αὐτὸν ἡ Δανάη 10
καὶ ἡ τροφὸς κρύπτουσαι Ἀκρίσιον. ὅτε δὲ Περσεύς τριέτης καὶ
τετραέτης ἐγένετο, ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ τῆς φωνῆς παίζοντος, καὶ διὰ
τῶν θεραπόντων μετακαλεσάμενος τὴν Δανάην σὺν τῇ τροφῇ,
τὴν μὲν ἀναιρεῖ, Δανάην δὲ καταφέρει σὺν τῷ παιδί ἐπὶ τὸν
{ὑπὸ τῷ} Ἑρκείου Διὸς βωμόν. μόνος δὲ αὐτὴν ἐρωτᾷ πόθεν εἴη 15
αὐτῇ γεγωνῶς ὁ παῖς· ἡ δὲ ἔφη, ἐκ Διός. ὁ δὲ οὐ πείθεται, ἀλλ'
εἰς λάρνακα ἐμβιβάζει αὐτὴν μετὰ τοῦ παιδός, καὶ κλείσας
καταποντοῖ. καὶ φερόμενοι ἀφικνοῦνται εἰς Σέριφον τὴν νῆσον.
καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐξέλκει Δίκτυς ὁ Περισθένους, δικτύῳ ἀλιεύων. εἴτα
ἡ Δανάη ἀνοίξει ἱκετεύει τὴν λάρνακα, ὁ δὲ ἀνοίξας, καὶ μαθὼν 20
οἴτινές εἰσιν, ἄγει εἰς τὸν οἶκον καὶ τρέφει, ὥς ἂν συγγενεῖς
αὐτοῦ ὄντας. ἦσαν γὰρ ὁ Δίκτυς καὶ ὁ Πολυδέκτης Ἀνδροθόης
τῆς Κάστορος καὶ Περισθένους τοῦ Δαμάστορος, τοῦ Ναυπλίου,
τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀμυμώνης, ὥς Φερεκύδης ἐν α'.⁷

10 μίννυται L: μίσγεται P || 11-12 καὶ τετραέτης L: ἡ καὶ τετραέτης P || 14 Δανάην δὲ
καταφέρει L H F: Δανάη δὲ καταφεύγει Fraenkel: καταγαγὼν . . . μόνον ἐρωτᾷ
αὐτὴν P || 15 ὑπὸ τὸ del. Sturz | Ἑρκείου Sturz: ἐρκίου F: Ἑρκίον fere codd.: Ὀρκίου
West || 23 Κάστορος F: περὶ Κάστορος L: Περικάστορος P

The oracle leading Acrisius to imprison Danae in a bronze chamber,⁸ Zeus' transformation into a shower of gold⁹ and the exposure of Danae and

⁷ According to Pherecydes' genealogy, Dictys' treatment of Danae and Perseus as his own family could have to do with his own descent from Danaus; cf. Jacoby (1923-1958) *ad loc.*

⁸ For the oracle, cf. [Apollod.] 2. 4.1 followed by Zenob. *Cent.* 1. 41, Hyg. *fab.* 63, schol. Luc. *Gall.* 13 (Rabe), D-scholium II. 14. 319 (van Thiel), Myth. Vat. 1. 154, 2. 133, schol. Tzetz. Lyc. 838 (Scheer). Thomas Magister on [A.] *Pr.* 903 (Smyth) mentions an oracle saying that Acrisius' grandson would dethrone him. For Danae's bronze chamber, cf. E. *Archelaus* fr. 228b.7 Kn. (and Harder 1985, *ad loc.*), *A.P.* 5. 64.6, 217, Paus. 2. 23.7 (and Frazer 1898, *ad loc.*), D. Chr. *Or.* lxxvii/ lxxviii 31, Prop. 2. 31.29, Hor. *Carm.* 3. 16. 1, Paus. 10. 5. 11, Luc. *Men.* 2, *Salt.* 44, Ael. *N.A.* 12. 21, schol. in Luc. *Gall.* 13 (Rabe), Lib. *Or.* xxxiv 29, *Prog.* 2. 41, Nonn. *D.* 47. 543ff., D-scholium II. 14. 319 (van Thiel), Myth. Vat. 1. 154, 2. 133 and for the relevant passage in S. *Ant.* 944ff., cf. 1b. The Legend in Attic Tragedy. *TrGF* II fr. adesp. 126a Kn.-Sn. is likely to refer to Danae's chamber. For slight variations evidently originating in later versions, cf. Prop. 2. 20.9ff., Lucian (*Tim.* 13) and schol. Tzetz. Lyc. 838 (Scheer) referring to an iron chamber; for a stone prison, cf. Hyg. *fab.* 63 and for Danae's imprisonment in a tower rather than a chamber, cf. Ov. *A.A.* 3. 415f., *Am.* 2. 19.27f., 3. 4.21f., 3. 8.29, Hor. *Carm.* 3. 16.1, Myth. Vat. 1. 154, 2. 133.

⁹ For Zeus' transformation, cf. Pi. *P.* 12. 17 and schol. *ad loc.* (Drachmann), A. *Pers.* 79f. and schol. *ad loc.* (Dahnhardt), S. *Ant.* 950, E. *Archelaus* fr. 228. 9f. Kn., *TrGF* II fr. adesp. 619. 2 Kn.-Sn., Isoc. x 59, Lyc. 838 (and Fusillo, Hurst and Paduano 1991, *ad loc.*), *A.P.* 5. 64. 9. 48, 12. 20, [Erat.] *Cat.* 22, Ter. *Eun.* 588f., Ov. *Met.* 4. 610f., 697f., 11. 116f., *Am.* 3. 12.33f., Lucan. 9. 659ff., Stat. *Silv.* 1. 2. 134-6, Hyg. *fab.* 63, D. Chr. *Or.* lxxvii/ lxxviii 31,

Perseus in the floating chest ¹⁰ recur in most accounts of the legend. Nevertheless, Pherecydes' narrative provides interesting details, which are not found in later accounts, such as the figure of Danae's nurse, who appears also in several vase-paintings dated in the first half of the fifth century (cf. *LIMC* s.v. 'Akrisios' figg. 2, 6, perhaps also fig. 1, *LIMC* s.v. 'Danae' fig. 45). The nurse is a stock character in Euripides (especially in plays involving female intrigue, as the *Hippolytus*, *Stheneboea* and those sharing the tale-pattern of the *Danae*, cf. Plot-Structure), though her role in his *Danae* may only be inferred on grounds of probability (cf. *Dramatis Personae*).¹¹ Pherecydes is also the sole mythical source to clearly mention that Zeus revealed himself to Danae after sneaking into her chamber in the form of golden shower. Moreover, the connotations of Acrisius' dragging Danae to the altar of Zeus Herkeios are significant, as this particular cult protected blood ties and the integrity of the family, defining the framework within which the head of the *oikos* exercised his authority (cf. note on fr. 4.4).¹² Zeus Herkeios was also a guardian of oaths ¹³ and his cult was popular in Greek cities, including Argos,¹⁴ as early as Homer (*Od.* 22. 334f.). Acrisius thus binds Danae to reveal the truth by appealing to their kinship and his own power over his daughter, at the altar of a god honoured by Argive families. An eloquent parallel is provided in Hdt. 6. 68, where Demaratus adjures his mother at the altar of the same god to reveal to him the identity of his father.¹⁵

A reference to Perseus' divine origin occurs as early as Homer, in a scene where Zeus enumerates his love affairs with mortal women, referring to Danae's beauty and Perseus, 'most glorious among men' (*Il.*

Luc. *J.Tr.* 2.7, Ach. Tat. 2. 37.2, schol. Pi. *I.* 7. 5 (Drachmann) and Bresson (1980) 125f., Justin. *Dial. cum Tryph.* 67. 2, Lib. *Prog.* 2. 41, Nonn. *D.* 7. 120, 8. 290ff., 25. 113ff., 47. 516ff., 543ff., schol. Stat. *Theb.* 6. 286f. (Sweeney), schol. rec. [A.] *Pr.* 903 (Smyth). For Danae's union with Zeus, cf. also Hecat. fr. 21 Fowler/FGRH 1 F21, Luc. *Dial. D.* 4. 2, Nonn. *D.* 7. 355, 16. 239, 46. 30, schol. rec. Ar. *Nu.* 1081 (Koster).

¹⁰ Cf. A.R. 4. 1091, Hyg. *fab.* 63, Luc. *D. Mar.* 12. 1, 14. 1, Ach. Tat. 2. 36. 4, 37.4, Lib. *Prog.* 2. 41, Nonn. *D.* 10. 113, D-scholium *Il.* 14. 319 (van Thiel). For Hes. fr. 135. 2-5 M.-W. and Simonides *PMG* fr. 543, cf. the discussion below.

¹¹ For the role of the nurse in pre-tragic myths, cf. for instance, the figure of Orestes' nurse in A. *Ch.* 731-782, who is anticipated, though in a different name, in Pherecydes (fr. 134 Fowler) and Pindar (*P.* 11. 18, cf. schol. vet. *ad loc.*).

¹² Priam's murder at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, for instance, alludes to the devastation of his household (cf. *Tr.* 17).

¹³ Cf. Nenci (1998) 234.

¹⁴ Cf. Nilsson (1967³) I 125 and Farnell (1896-1909) I 54.

¹⁵ I owe this parallel to Mr A. Griffiths.

14. 319-20):¹⁶ οὐδ' ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλισφύρου Ἀκρισιώνης,/ ἡ τέκε Περσῆα πάντων ἀριδείκετον ἀνδρῶν. His genealogy is given in Hes. fr. 129 M.-W.: ἡ δ' ἔτεκεν Δανάην κ[α]λλίσφυρο[ν ἐν μεγάρ]οισιν,/ ἡ Περσῆ' ἔτεκεν κρα[τε]ρὸν μ[ή]στωρ[α] φόβοιο and fr. 135. 2-5 M.-W.:

.... .] Ἄβας· ὁ δ' ἄρ' Ἀκρίσιον τέκεθ' υἱόν.
 Περσῆα, τὸν εἰς ἄλλα λά[ρνακι]
 ἃ] νέτειλε Διὶ χρυσεῖ
] ἡ Περσῆα φίλον τ[

There is no trace of a reference to Danae's birth in the preserved part of fr. 135 and the reasonable assumption would be that the poet may have reverted to her and Perseus from fr. 129 (after his account of Proetus' family) perhaps by employing the *ἡ' οἴη* formula.¹⁷ Though the context of the account of Perseus' birth cannot be safely restored, if West's attractive conjecture is taken into consideration (3-5: ἡ δ' ἔτεκεν Περσῆα, τὸν εἰς ἄλλα λά[ρνακι] κοίλῃ/ ἐκβληθεῖς ἃ] νέτειλε Διὶ χρυσεῖον ἄνακτα/ χρυσογενῇ Περσῆα), it looks as if Danae might have given birth to Perseus in the floating chest in Hesiod's version (cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ἀνατέλλω: 'to give birth'); this possibility may tentatively suggest a variation of the myth.¹⁸

Danae's lament in the chest is the focus of a sensitive fragmentary poem by Simonides (*PMG* fr. 543):¹⁹

ὅτε λάρνακι ἐν δαιδαλέῃ
 ἄνεμός τε μιν πνέων <ἐφόρει>
 κινήθεισά τε λίμνα,
 δείματι φρίττεν οὗτ' ἀδιάντοισι παρειαῖς

1 δαιδαλέα V: δαιδαλαία P M || 2 τε μιν Schneidewin: τε μὴν P M : τ' ἐμῇ V: βρέμη s: τε μέμνη Page : τε, νιν post ὅτε translato coni. Hutchinson || 3 τε Brunck: δὲ codd. || 4 δείματι V: δεῖματι P: δεῖμα M | φρίττεν Usener-Radermacher: ἔριπεν P: ἔρειπεν M V

¹⁶ For Perseus' divine origin, cf. also Hdt. 6. 53, 7. 61, Isoc. xi 37, D.S. 4. 9.2, schol. vet. and Pl. *Alc. I* 120E (Westerink), Hyg. *fab.* 155, Clem. Rom. *Hom.* 5. 17.4, Eus. *Praep.* 2. 2.17, schol. Arat. 249 (Martin), Myth.Vat. 1. 201, 2. Suppl. 273.

¹⁷ Cf. West (1985) 49, 82.

¹⁸ Cf. Gantz (1993) 300.

¹⁹ I am citing the text and rich apparatus by Usener and Radermacher, whilst adding conjectures made by Page and Hutchinson.

ἄμφι τε Περσέϊ βάλλε φίλαν χέρα 5
 εἶπέν τε· ὦ τέκος,
 οἷον ἔχω πόνον, οὐ δάνιᾱ σε·
 γαλαθηνῶι δ' ἥθει κνωώσεις
 ἐν ἄτερπέϊ δούρατι χαλκεογόμφωι δίχα νυκτὸς ἀλαμπεῖ
 κυανέωι τε δνόφωι σταλαίς. 10
 ἄλμαν δ' ὕπερθεν τεᾶν κομᾶν βαθεῖαν
 παριόντος κύματος οὐκ ἀλέγεις
 οὐδ' ἀνέμου φθόγγον, πορφυρέα
 κείμενος ἐν χλανίδι πρὸς κόλπωι καλὸν πρόσωπον.
 εἰ δέ τοι δεινὸν τό γε δεινὸν ἦν, 15
 καί κεν ἐμῶν ῥημάτων λεπτὸν ὑπεῖχες οὔας.
 κέλομαι· εὗδε βρέφος,
 εὐδέτω δὲ πόντος, εὐδέτω ἄμετρον κακόν.
 μεταβουλία δέ τις φανείη,
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἐκ σέο· 20
 ὅ τι δὴ θαρσαλέον ἔπος εὐχομαι
 νόσφι δίκας, σύγγνωθί μοι

οὗτ' M V: οὐτ' P: οὐκ Thiersch | ἄδιαν τοῖσι P: ἀδιανταῖσι V: ἀδειαντῆσι (-οῖσι^{ac} ?)
 M || 6 τέκος Gudianus, Athen. IX, 396E: τεκν(ος) P: τέκνον M V || 7 οὐδ' P M V: σὺ δ'
 Athen. || 7-8 οὐ δάνιᾱ σε γαλαθηνῶι δ' ἥθει Usener-Radermacher: αὐταις
 ἐγαλαθηνῶι θει P V: αὐταῖς ἀγαλαθηνῶ (λ. corr. ex ν) δει (θει κνωώσεις syllabis
 spatium circ. IV litt. relictum) M: αὐτε εἰς γαλαθηνῶ δ' ἥτορι Ath.: ἄωτεις Casaubon:
 ἥθει Bergk || 8 κνωώσεις PV: κνώσεις M, Athen. || 9 δούρατι Gudianus: δούνατι P M:
 δούναντι V: δώματι s | δίχα νυκτὸς ἀλαμπεῖ Usener-Radermacher: <τῶι> δε (suppl.
 Page) νυκτιλαμπεῖ Ursinus: δεινυκτι λαμπεῖ P M V, ἀλαμπεῖ praeiuit Ilgen || 10
 σταλαίς Bergk: ταδ' εἰς codd.: ταθείς Schneidewin: τ' ἀδεής Headlam || 11 ἄλμαν δ'
 Bergk: ἄχναν Page: αὐλέαν vel αὐλαίαν codd. || 14 πρὸς κόλπωι καλὸν πρόσωπον
 Usener-Radermacher: πρόσωπον καλὸν πρόσωπον P: πρόσωπον καλὸν M V || 15 δέ τοι
 Usener-Radermacher: δέ τι M | ἦν Sylburg: ἦι P: ἦ M: ἦ V || 16 λεπτὸν s: λεπτῶν P M V
 || 19 μεταβουλία edd.: μαίτ(α)βουλία P: μαίτ(α)βουλίου M: ματαιοβουλία V || 21 ὅτι
 δὴ codd.: ὅτι δὲ Bergk: εἰ δέ τι Hutchinson: εἴ τι δὲ Schaefer || 22 νόσφι δίκας
 Victoriou: ηνοφι δίκας P: ἦν ὀφειδίας M V: κνόφι δίκας Gudianus | σύγγνωθί μοι P M:
 om. V

The decorated chest, in which mother and son are imprisoned, is subject to the wild forces of nature (cf. opening note on fr. 15 for the imagery of the transformations of *aethēr* and its implications for Danae's situation); the description of the uncontrollable physical environment serves as a reflection of Danae's helplessness. The bronze bolts of the chest are

suggestive of the firm confinement of mother and son ²⁰ and are also reminiscent of the bronze chamber, that is, Danae's previous prison, pointing to the possible roots of the legend in the Bronze Age (cf. also *Dictys*, 1a. The Mythical Background, p. 124).²¹ To illustrate the tenderness of Danae's address to baby Perseus, Simonides is employing the vocabulary of the child's physical appearance and habits (ll. 8, 11, 14, 16, cf. introductory note on *Danae* fr. 13). The baby is completely cut off from the situation, which makes her isolation even more poignant.²² Her speech culminates at an emotional –though respectful and submissive– plea to Zeus to change their fate for the better (cf. on the other hand, her strong protest in *A. Dictyulci* fr. 47a 783f. R.).²³ An Attic red-figure lekythos of ca. 460 BC (*LIMC* s.v. 'Danae' fig. 53) depicting Danae and Perseus in the floating chest with the sea-birds flying above them recalls the setting of Simonides' poem.²⁴

Pherecydes' account is roughly followed in [Apollod.] *Bibliotheca* 2. 4.1:

Ἀκρισίῳ δὲ περὶ παίδων γενέσεως ἀρρένων χρηστηριαζομένῳ ὁ
θεὸς ἔφη γενέσθαι παῖδα ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς, ὃς αὐτὸν ἀποκτενεῖ.
δείσας δὲ ὁ Ἀκρισίος τοῦτο, ὑπὸ γῆν θάλαμον κατασκευάσας
χάλκεον τὴν Δανάην ἐφρούρει. ταύτην μὲν, ὥς ἔνιοι λέγουσιν,
ἔφθειρε Προῖτος, ὅθεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ στάσις ἐκινήθη· ὥς δὲ ἔνιοι 5
φασι, Ζεὺς μεταμορφωθείς εἰς χρυσὸν καὶ διὰ τῆς ὀροφῆς εἰς
τοὺς Δανάης εἰσρυεῖς κόλπους συνῆλθεν. αἰσθόμενος δὲ
Ἀκρισίος ὕστερον ἐξ αὐτῆς γεγεννημένον Περσέα μὴ πιστεύσας
ὑπὸ Διὸς ἐφθάρθαι, τὴν θυγατέρα μετὰ τοῦ παιδὸς εἰς λάρνακα
βαλὼν ἔρριπεν εἰς θάλασσαν. προσενεχθείσης δὲ τῆς λάρνακος 10
Σερίφῳ Δίκτυς ἄρας ἀνέθρεψε τοῦτον.

2 ἀποκτενεῖ E: ἀποκτείνῃ A, Zenobius || 3 δὲ ὁ E, Zenobius: οὖν A || 11 ἀνέθρεψε E: ἀνέτρεψε A, Zenobius

This account accords with the outline of Pherecydes' narrative, whilst omitting certain details mentioned by the genealogist, such as the figure of

²⁰ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 314.

²¹ For the possibly Mycenaean origin of the bronze chamber, cf. Janko's note (1992) on *Il.* 14. 319 and Helbig (1887) 439f.

²² Cf. Rosenmeyer (1991) 11f., 18–25. For the difference between their two states of mind, cf. Carson (1999) 57f., Burnett (1985) 13f.

²³ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 319f.

²⁴ Cf. Woodward (1937) 66, Hutchinson (2001) 307.

the nurse and the incident at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, since they are obviously not essential for the sequence of the story.²⁵ The sole additional element in the present account is the rationalistic variant of Danae's seduction by her uncle Proetus; considering that accession to the throne in Heroic Age Greece was often the outcome of marriage to a king's daughter,²⁶ Danae's rape by her uncle could be explained by an endogamic logic assuring that the power would remain in the hands of a single dynastic group.²⁷ The D-scholium on *Il.* 14. 319 (van Thiel), a part of which presents a striking resemblance to the narrative of the *Bibliotheca*, attributes this variant to Pindar, among other authors: αὕτη δὲ, ὡς φησι Πίνδαρος καὶ ἕτεροι τινές, ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατραδέλφου αὐτῆς Προΐτου, ὅθεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ στάσις ἐκινήθη.²⁸ However, the papyrus-text of the Pindaric dithyramb (fr. 70d. 13ff. Sn.-M. = Pi. *Dith. Oxy.* 4. 13ff.), which was tentatively supposed to have provided this piece of information,²⁹ seems likelier to refer to Danae's forced cohabitation with Polydectes and his petrification (cf. *Dictys*, 1a. The Mythical Background, p. 125f.). Nonetheless, even if this treatment is lost by now, the scholiast's testimony on the Pindaric variant is consistent with the poet's inclination towards modifying and adjusting well-known myths to suit his poetic purposes.³⁰

For the sake of completeness, it should be mentioned that Acrisius left Argos and fled to Larissa, in the land of Pelasgoi, to avoid being killed by his grandson. Perseus, however, participated in athletic games at

²⁵ Cf. van der Valk (1958) 118.

²⁶ Cf. Finkelberg (1991) 303ff.

²⁷ Cf. Scarpì (1997³) 495. An eloquent parallel may be found in [Apollod.] 1. 9. 8-11, where Cretheus marries his brother's daughter, Tyro, whom he has raised in his own house. Likewise, the daughter of Pheres marries her paternal uncle. Vernant (1980, 59f.) interestingly traced in this motif the mythical roots of the *epiclērate* legislated by Solon to ensure the survival of the *oikos*; for this law, cf. note on fr. 4. 2. In Ovid *Met.* 5. 236ff., Proetus is mentioned as petrified by Perseus for seizing Acrisius' citadel. Hyginus (*fab.* 244), in turn, refers to Perseus' murder by Megapenthes, son of Proetus, to avenge his father's death.

²⁸ There are a number of cases where the mythographical D-Scholia and the *Bibliotheca* present strong similarities; cf. Wagner (1926²) xxxiv f. and van der Valk (1963) 305ff. It seems likely that the source of the D-Scholium, the 'Mythographus Homericus', followed Ps. Apollodorus, but must have also consulted other sources, as emerges from the attribution of the variant to Pindar, as well as from the reference to the version, according to which Perseus was raised by Polydectes; cf. *Dictys*, The Legend: 1d. Later Versions.

²⁹ Cf. Snell-Maehler *ad loc.*

³⁰ Cf. for instance, his modification of the story of Pelops in *O.* 1. 27, so as to avoid irreverence towards gods, and other cases where he adjusts his poetry to the tastes of his patrons; cf. Bowra (1964) 285ff.