

RECENSIONE

S. NIKOLAIDOU-ARAMPATZI, *EURIPIDES' INO. COMMENTARY, RECONSTRUCTION, TEXT, AND TRANSLATION*, WASHINGTON, CENTER FOR HELLENIC STUDIES/HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2022, PP. XII, 106. [ISBN: 978-0-674-27255-2]

The present review has different contact points with part of our recent work on fragmentary plays, from the one hand, and with the female mythological characters, from the other¹. Both matters are inextricably united in this valuable contribution to the theatrical studies. The author, Smaro Nikolaidou-Arampatzi (from now on N.-A.), Professor of the Democritus University of Thrace, has written a didactic essay after a well-planned architecture: besides secondary sections intended to give further information to the reader (abbreviations, p. VII; preface, p. IX; bibliography, pp. 91-98; works quoted, pp. 99-102; thematic index, pp. 103-106), the core of the book is distributed in five sections (commen-

tary of the textual evidence, pp. 1-38; reconstruction matters, pp. 39-55; interpretation matters, pp. 57-65; reconstruction proposal, pp. 68-78; and text and translation, pp. 79-90). First of all, we would point out that the clear and logical methodological issues raised by N.-A. on page XI predict a satisfactory final result. Philological rigor, continuity of the plot line, and fluidity of the discourse are the capital criteria requested for a tenable reconstruction of the fragmentary corpus of a given dramatic play.

Euripides' *Ino* has not benefited from a favourable transmission. The extant corpus is composed by a limited number of ancient quotations transmitted by Ioannes Stobaeus (*TrGF* V.1, fr. 398-423), besides *P.Oxy.* 5131, while N.-A. agrees with Finglass in rejecting *P.Stras.* 304-307². The main indirect sources for this reconstruction are Euripides himself (*Med.* 1282-1289) and Hyginus (*Fab.* 4). Minor indirect texts are Aristophanes (*Ach.* 432-434 and *Ve.* 1412-1414), Apollodorus (*Bib.* III 4,3), Ennius (*TrRF* I, fr. 16, from his tragedy *Athamas*) and Livius Andronicus (*TrRF* I, fr. 16, from his trag-

¹ For the cases of filicide/parricide, cf. J. REDONDO, *Dramatisme i paròdia d'un motiu real i literari: amors que maten*, "SPHv" 18 (2016), 343-354: 343-345.

² P. FINGLASS, *A new fragment of Euripides' Ino*, "ZPE" 189 (2014), 65-82: 76-77.

edy *Ino*). The prior principal contribution of N.-A. to the reconstruction of the Euripidean *Ino* consists of identifying the two pivotal texts for all the present reorganization of the thirty-six direct references to the play in the ancient sources: first of all, this short 8-lines passage of the *Medea*; then, the mythological report of Hyginus. In the same way as for comparative linguistics, we know that the testimonies of languages only in recent times recorded with the help of literacy – Caucasian, Baltic & Slavic, Germanic, Celtic – are not secondary in front of Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit; in the same way as in the matter of textual criticism, we know that youngest manuscripts are not secondary towards the oldest (*recentiores non deteriores*); so, also for the reconstruction of lost texts and myths, our Hellenistic and Imperial sources are not of lesser value than the Archaic and Classical ones. Reasonably, N.-A. states (pp. 42 and 45, on the case of Hyg. *Fab.* 4) that these later authors, mythographers in this case, paid strong attention to non-current variants of the old stories.

In our opinion, it is also relevant the divine dimension of *Ino* as a benefactor deity (p. IX), in opposition to the Aeolids, featured with the sins of impiety, shamelessness, and ambition. In this regard, it seems probable that the legend of *Ino* was also dealt with by Hesiod, since an important section of his *Catalogue* was devoted to Athamas' lineage³.

³ Particularly interesting is the reference to madness in Hes. *Cat.* fr. 69 M./W. (= 39 Most): "and then Zeus took away Athamas' mind from his breast" (transl. Most).

⁴ Consider that A. KABATSCHNIK, *Blood on the Stage, 1975-2000: Milestone Plays of Crime, Mystery,*

The reconstruction suggested by N.-A. deserves plain agreement because of the author's careful reading of the corpus of evidence collected and the rigorous philological analysis that leads to a logical conclusion. The methodological exposition that opens the book has actually a huge value in itself, and every research on fragmentary literature is from now on invited to take it into account, for this is not a matter of intuition and brilliance, but a science based in the correspondence of cause and effect as reflected in the extant texts. The evolution of the Euripidean production makes sense through the chronological description suggested by N.-A., who places *Ino* before *Medea* (p. 67). Consequently, some dramatical plots and motifs are older than thought⁴.

A few points did not fully satisfy our expectations, be they right or not. In *TrGF* V.1, fr. 398, the emendation εὐδουσα supports the whole interpretation of the passage, but the original lesson should have been also given. On *P.Oxy.* 5131 l,4 (p. 31), half a line is needed to remind the reader how much frequent is the verb ἦκω in the Euripidean prologues spoken by divine characters⁵. Later, on the observation on the term πέπλος (p. 34), N.-A. could have added that this is not an innovation of the tragic genre, since this use is already attested in the Homeric poems (e.g. *Il.* XXIV 796). Finally, on *P.Oxy.* 5131, l,12 (p. 36), it is difficult not to suggest to read there ψυχὰς

and Detection, Lanham 2012, 572, shows the Euripidean *Medea* as the first play on a case of filicide.

⁵ Cf. Σ. ΝΙΚΟΛΑΪΔΟΥ-ΑΡΑΜΠΙΑΤΖΙ, *Ευρυπίδης. Βάκχες*, Thessaloniki 2006, 294, on Eur. *Tr.* 1, *Ion* 5, and *Ba.* 1.

ἐμόχθησε⁶. This transitive use of μοχθέω, occurring not rarely in tragedy (cf. Soph. *Tr.* 1047 and *El.* 64), is especially common in the Euripidean diction: cf. *Ion* 103, *Hel.* 1446, and especially *HF* 280-281 τέκνα ... ἀμόχθησα. What is relevant is in which terms Megara expresses her care for children that are destined to be put to death by their father⁷, and the similarity of the plot in *Ino*. The translation of the adverb, originally a prepositional cluster, ἐξαρχῆς as a synonym of πάλιν (p. 10) seems unconvincing. The Aristophanic passage quoted (*Pl.* 221 ἐξαρχῆς πάλιν) only gives an attestation of a well-known Attic construction (cf. e.g. Antipho I 18 and 20; V 10; VI 39). However, this does not imply that both adverbial expressions are synonymical. The potential optative οἰκήσαιμι instead of the subjunctive οἰκήσω – not a metrical alternative in any case, though this is a minor problem – does not confer a sense of reality on the expression.

The lack of agreement in *TrGF* V.1, fr. 413, 4, as the participle ὦν refers to the protagonist Ino, is perfectly explained by N.-A. after the parallel of Eur. *Hel.* 1630 ὦν. Also Eur. *Hipp.* 1102 κεύθων and 1120 λεύσσων attest the same syntactic problem, usually avoided by the editors by means of the attribution of the text to male speakers. For a similar case in the same tragedy, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 358-359 οὐχ ἐκόντες ... / κάκων (vd. J. REDONDO, *Una qüestió de crítica textual: E.*

Hipp. 359 κάκων, «Faventia» 11, 1989, 5-8), where the same antithesis is displayed at l. 319 (οὐχ ἐκοῦσαν οὐχ ἐκῶν).

Finally, there is no article in the Antiphontean γνώμη quoted on p. 12 μέγας γὰρ ἀγὼν γάμος ἀνθρώπῳ (fr. 49 Diels).

Besides these linguistic and stylistic observations, other aspects not to be neglected are those related to the plot and to the structure and performance of the play. Maybe, the prologue was spoken by a secondary actor, not by Athamas or Ino (as suggested on pp. 46 and 49), so that both protagonists would enter the scene afterwards, in order to exploit their respective reactions of pain in front of the corpse of the child.

The intersection of tragedy and satyr-play through the manifestation of a psychological disorder does need to be explained in great detail. It is quite interesting to think of the plays entitled *Athamas* by both Aeschylus and Sophocles as two different versions of the myth, tragic and satyric respectively (p. 59 and n. 10). It is also stimulating and inspiring the ancient observation on the Aeschylean satyr-play *Nurses of Dionysus* as a precedent of the Euripidean *Medea*. Even Page paid no attention to this reference of the anonymous hypothesis to the *Medea*⁸. Now, the question is if this Bacchic language associated not only to furor, but directly to madness, has left some

⁶ N.-A. suggests the dual accusative ψυχᾶ (p. 53), a possibility that remains at work even if we take into account that before <μοχ> two more letters must be reconstructed.

⁷ G.W. BOND, *Euripides. Heracles*, Oxford 1988, 134: “μόχθος and πόνος are commonly used in tragedy of the toil of rearing children [...]. Euripides is elsewhere bold in his use of intransitive verbs”.

⁸ But he recognised indeed some track of the character of Hippolytus' nurse in the nurse of the children of Medea and Jason: cf. D.L. Page, *Euripides. Medea*, Oxford 1938, XI.

evidence in our Aeschylean and Euripidean fragments. Regarding this question, N.-A. offers a capital reflection on how the *Medea* was written as a counter-example of the character⁹.

The elegant and clear style of the book fits well with the discourse of the arguments and comments. The readers find a continuous stimulating essay¹⁰ that will not leave them indifferent because of the success of the research procedure and of the results achieved.

Jordi Redondo
Universitat de València
Jordi.Redondo@uv.es

⁹ “The complete absence of Bacchic vocabulary from Medea’s act in her name play of Euripides makes the heroine unique in ancient tragedy in terms of the role that consciousness plays in the

criteria of human action. The subject is an intellectual one that characterizes the thoughts of the sophists of that time” (p. 78).

¹⁰ An only noticeable misprint occurs on p. 70, as the word “maybe” must correspond to two different words.