1. Historical Background

In my reconstruction of the Oidipus figure of the lost Oidipodeia, in the previous issue of Acta Classica, in addition to other material, I attached much significance to certain facts contained in the schol. Eur. Phoin. 1760, which has come to us under the name of the elusive Peisandros. And this was quite natural because the only two known fragments of the Oidipodeia are contained in the Peisandros scholium—the one to the effect that Haimon, Kreon's son, had been killed by the Sphinx, actually in the form of the only literal quotation we possess. From this one can argue that the Oidipodeia, even if it were not the sole source, either directly or indirectly, was at least one of the sources of the Peisandros scholium. This immediately raises the question: how much of the rest of the Peisandros scholium stems from the Oidipodeia, or—more broadly—what are the sources of the scholium? This question is certainly not a new one. It has a long history, of which by way of introduction, I should like to mention only certain highlights.

Bethe expressed the opinion in his Thabanische Heldenlieder of 1891 that the scholium not only showed ‘einer tadelloser, unlösbaren Zusammenhang’ (p. 12), but that, with the exception of certain minor interpolations and a significant hiatus, the scholium is in fact an index of the lost Oidipodeia. This view was respected for over twenty years until Robert in his monumental Oidipus of 1915 pointed out its indefensibility, and quite rightly redirected the stream of research into other channels. Robert is very outspoken. He considers the scholium ‘eine heillose Konfusion’ (p. 157), ‘ein Flickwerk aus aller mögliche Lappen’ (p. 163) through which ‘zwei zeitlich weit auseinanderliegende und völlig heterogene Ereignisse, der Raub des Chryisippos und das Auftreten der Sphinx, in einen kausalen Konnex miteinander gebracht worden sind’ (p. 157). Moreover, the words, Ισότροπα Πεισανδρος ζει, with which the scholium begins, and the words ταυτά φησι Πεισανδρος with which it ends, merely mean, according to Robert (p. 167), that the account

---

1 Acta Classica (= A.C.) 4 (1961) 15ff. For the abbreviations used in this article see A.C. 4, 28.
2 For the scholium’s text see Schwartz Scholia in Euripidem I. 493ff. (whose numbering of the lines I follow); Bethe 5-6; Robert 150-1; FgH 16, fr. 19; Deubner 4; Kirchhoff 130-1; Delcourt xxii-ili. See on Peisandros’ person and time RE 19, 147ff. (Keydell), Deubner 3-5, Delcourt xxiff., Robert 149ff., II 134, n. 11, 141, n. 25 and esp. II 63, n. 22.
3 = fr. 2.
4 See for a more detailed picture Deubner 3-5, Lamer RE 12.477, 10ff.
5 Compare Bethe’s idea (5-6) of the amended text with Robert’s (164-7) justified criticism.
had been *inspired* by Peisandros—surely an indefensible suggestion. Robert (p. 163) believed that only the description of Laios’ death had any original worth, as all the rest were novelesque adaptations of Sophokles and Euripides by a sensationalistically minded logographer (cf. 163, II 63 n. 22). Two years later Kirchhoff in his Münster dissertation *Die Kampf der Sieben vor Theben und König Oidipus* traced the sources of the scholium (pp. 128-36) to the lost *Oidipodeia* and the *Thebaid*, practically as Wecklein* had done before him. Kirchhoff’s inaccurate, if not ‘dishonest’,* interpretation of the closing lines of the scholium ruined his efforts from the start. In his *RE*-article* Lamer stressed that the abduction of Chrysippos, the big stumbling block Robert saw in Bethe’s theory, could be dated back, not to Euripides’ *Chrysippos*, as Robert had stated, but to the epics of, say, the 6th century. Jacoby, who examined this scholium minutely in his *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, *passed a more favourable judgment on its inherent worth, and acknowledged the Oidipodeia and Tragedy, especially Euripides’ Phoinissai and Chrysispos, as its sources—a point which Robert’s work had actually suggested.* Exactly twenty years later Deubner’s *Oidipusprobleme* was published on the 31st August, 1942, to give us the most comprehensive and detailed study yet. Deubner stated that, but for two smaller parentheses (= ll. 5-11 and 31-3, a point Robert 149 ff. had already stressed) which were undeniably from the *Oidipodeia*, the whole Peisandros scholium was merely a combination of only two sources, Euripides’ lost *Chrysippos* (= the first part of the scholium as far as l. 16) and his lost *Oidipus* (= the second part of the scholium, l. 16 to the end). And Deubner emphasized that a grammatical anacolouthon in l. 16, *κτέιναζ* (scil. Oidipus) δέ ..., is the easily recognizable connecting link between the two sources. Only two years later, Marie Delcourt in her *Oedipe ou la Légende du Conquérant* (pp. xv-xxiii) raised doubts concerning the validity of certain points in Deubner’s theory. Her arguments were either not noticed or else, as part of a work which received widespread criticism,* they were purposely ignored and conveniently forgotten. In any case, the fact remains that Deubner’s view has already dominated the scene for twenty years, and that apart from an occasional dissentient voice,* no one bothered to offer any objections to his attempts at reconstruction or interpretation. The time has come to draw, even if somewhat belatedly, attention to his lapses in logic and method, and, in doing so, to focus attention on the good points in Delcourt’s work and, where necessary, to revise it.

2. *The Peisandros scholium itself*\(^\text{12}\)  
Under the name of Peisandros—an important fact—the scholium reports the following:

---

6 Cf. Wecklein 668ff. who ascribes the Chrysippos history to the *Thebaid* (= p. 671).
7 See on this esp. Deubner 56f.
8 s.v. Laios = *RE* 12, 467ff., esp. 476ff., 480ff.
9 cf. I p. 493ff. and esp. his notes on Peisandros (= 16, fr. 10).
10 See e.g. Rose *C.R.* 60 (1946) 122ff., Bates *A.J.Ph.* 69 (1948) 113-4, Lesky *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 71 (1950) 170.
12 See n. 2.
Laios abducted Chrysippos, the son of Pelops, and took him to Thebes, thus becoming the first lover of boys. Consequently Hera Gamostolos sent the Sphinx to Thebes to torture the Thebans as a community for having allowed this unlawful love, to continue, and for having refrained from punishing it. Chrysippos committed suicide from shame whereupon Laios, who previously might have been considering the advisability of consulting the god Apollo, came to a definite decision, but went to the seer Teiresias first. Teiresias urged him not to go to Apollo but to placate the wronged goddess Hera with offerings. Laios, however, paid no attention to the seer’s warning, and he was on his way to Apollo when both he and his charioteer were killed at a crossroad by Oidipus after the charioteer had struck Oidipus with his whip. Oidipus buried the bodies and stripped Laios of his sword and belt, which he henceforth wore. He returned to Polybos and gave him Laios’ waggon. Thereupon Oidipus went to Thebes where he married his mother after he had solved the riddle of the Sphinx. After this, Oidipus and his wife Iokaste went to sacrifice on Kithairon.

13 Through Ailianos, nat. an. 6.15 and s.p. 13.5 we know that Euripides, presumably in his Chrysippos, had represented Laios as the first lover of boys. See on the interpretation of the Ailianos passages Robert 40f.; Deubner 10; Lamer RE 12,508, 13ff., whose point of view I fully endorse, notwithstanding Deubner’s very curt disapproval.

14 The title Gamostolos appears here only. The function as such, however, is well known under other names too, such as her epithets Gamelia, Gamelios, Teleia, Zugia. Cf. esp. Roscher’s Lexikon s.v. Hera 2080-1; RE 8,376,32ff., 382 (esp. the above mentioned epithets); Nilsson Gr. Religion I. 400ff.; Nilsson Gr. Feste 40ff., esp. 50ff. (Daidala); Gruppe passim, see his index s.v. Hera.

15 Robert’s inference (135) that the Sphinx appeared only after the suicide of Chrysippos is incorrect. Correct on this aspect Deubner 8.

16 After the appearance of the Sphinx Chrysippos must have realized, perhaps through a warning of Teiresias, that through his illicit love-affair with Laios he also was an accessory to the Sphinx catastrophe, and this might have been the real cause for his suicide.

17 Schneidewin 185 thinks of an oracle of Apollo somewhere in Boiotia; Mass (Commentatio mythographica IV, p. iv) of an oracle of Apollo at Thespiae, on the strength of schol. Arat. 223; Bethe 8 (cf. however 143), Robert 155, and Deubner 7 think of the well-known Phocian schiste near Delphi. I believe, with Höfer (713.58ff., Roscher’s Lexikon s.v. Oidipus) and Lamer (RE 12,497.10ff.), that we must think in terms of an oracle of Apollo situated somewhere between Thebes and Kithairon, i.e. south of Thebes (cf. on this also Wernicke, RE 2,73.8ff., s.v. Apollo). The statement of Apollodoros (3.5.8) and Pausanias (10.5.4) that Damasistratos, the king of Plataiai, buried Laios, in any case points towards a tradition according to which the murder scene was somewhere in the vicinity of Plataiai, i.e. south of Thebes. It is true that the same Pausanias, as also Apollodoros, locates the tomb of Laios at the Phocian crossroad. But this might have been under the influence of the latest almost canonical tradition of Phocis. It also looks as if Paus. 9,18.5 (cf. the interpretation of Höfer 715.3ff.) supports a murder scene nearer to Thebes.

18 The scholium has Ἡγιωτός 1, 16; in Soph. O.T. 806 and in Eur. Phoen. 39 there is mention of a τροχοφάλατας.

19 i.e. presumably shortly after their marriage. So Schneidewin 186 (30), Höfer 728.61; cf. also Deubner 16.

20 Presumably to beg for Hera Gamostolos’ blessing on their marriage. More detail on this in Bethe 9ff., Höfer 728.65ff., and Deubner 16.
On their return journey to Thebes Oidipus showed Iokaste the place where he had once killed a man, and confirmed this claim by showing her the belt of the murdered Laios. Iokaste now realized that she was married to the murderer of her former husband, but suffered this shock in silence. Later, an old actually came from Sikyon and told the whole story of how he had found the exposed child Oidipus and had given him to Merope; and he thereupon confirmed his assertions by producing the spárγενα and κέντρα, at the same time demanding his ζωάγρια. Iokaste's death ensued, and Oidipus remarried, this time with Euryganeia (as in the Oidipodeia) by whom he had the four children of tradition (although their names are not mentioned).

3. Preliminary remarks

(i) In only three sources, Apollodoros (3.3.8.), Dio Chrysostomos (11.8) and our scholium, is Hera described as the sender of the Sphinx. The way, however, the scholium links up and motivates this role of Hera is unique. She is here made to act in her capacity as the outraged goddess of the rights of women in marriage—a factor (see n. 52) which the other two sources obviously failed to take into consideration, especially Apollodoros in whose version an angered goddess of marriage would not make sense since the Sphinx is made to appear only after the death of the sinner Laios. The scholium stresses the fact that the Sphinx, the torturing instrument in the hands of the goddess, appeared during Laios' lifetime. It also stresses the fact that the punishment affected the community as a whole to a far greater extent than it affected the individual concerned—an idea which, as Delcourt has observed, fits in much better with the heroic era's conception of the joint responsibility and solidarity of the community, than with later ideas.

(ii) The scholium does not state whether Laios intended to consult Apollo on a possible means of getting rid of the Sphinx or merely wanted information about his exposed son, who might still be alive and therefore dangerous.

21 The scene of the murder is thus south of Thebes, and not, as in Sophokles, at the Phoictian crossroad.

22 Robert 61 finds it very disturbing that, although Oidipus all the time wore Laios' belt and sword, Iokaste did not recognize it previously. Cf. on this also Lamer 501.4ff., 508.1ff.; Daly 776.38ff. To solve this anomaly Lamer deletes a ζαίφαρα, as an inaccuracy committed by a later and inattentive scholiast. Deubner's (26) answer to Robert on the strength of similar anomalies in the Theseus history (Plut. Thes. 12) is convincing. Let us not forget that even in Sophokles' O.T. Iokaste never recognized Oidipus by his pierced ankles, nor ever asked awkward questions regarding his past on account of his scars—an anomaly which the more logical, but less artistically minded Vatican Mythographer 'improved' by his own version in which Iokaste's recognition of Oidipus was actually initiated by his scars (2.230).

23 Does this indicate a short marriage as in the Odyssey and in the Oidipodeia? The former especially is not exactly a suitable means of identification. See on the whole reconstruction of the recognition scene Deubner 18. His rather fantastic reconstruction is undoubtedly plausible.

24 For a more detailed discussion of this, see n. 52.

25 p. XVIII.
Either alternative is possible, though the second is more likely. Perhaps Deubner\(^7\) is right that Laios, who had been considering to enquire of the god whether his son Oidipus was still alive, was actually forced to a definite decision by the state of affairs prevailing since the appearance of the Sphinx, and especially by Chrysippos’ unexpected suicide.

(iii) The stripping of Laios’ body reminds us of ἀκραιπή in the Nekyia passage of the Odyssey (11.275). This particular detail occurs only in the Nekyia passage and in Peisandros’ scholium, and is therefore significant.

(iv) That Oidipus returned to Polybos after the murder, and gave him Laios’ waggon is an uncommon version, which, elsewhere appears only in Eur. Phoin. 44, the later Antimachos’ Lyke (fr. 70 Wyas), Nikolaos Damascenus (= FgH 90, fr. 8) and in schol. Phoin. 44. The most natural explanation, unless as a last resort we assume an interpolation as Bethe (p. 6) had done, is that the scholium is here inspired by the passage in Euripides’ Phoinissai.

(v) Oidipus went to Thebes probably because, as in the Oidipodeia and in almost every author since, Kreon had offered the throne and Iokaste’s hand as the prize for the conqueror of the Sphinx—an old motif which dates back at least to the time of the Oidipodeia.\(^9\) The marriage to his mother is also an old and constant element in the Oidipus structure, at all events since the Nekyia and the Oidipodeia. Robert’s (p. 160) deduction that the scholium’s version of this marriage is only a summary of Euripides’ Phoin. 49-53 cannot be proved and is in fact improbable. More important is the fact that Oidipus overcame the Sphinx precisely by solving a riddle, which undoubtedly is a departure from the picture of Oidipus in the Oidipodeia where he was represented as a figure excelling in the sphere of physical strength. This motif of solving a riddle cannot be traced further back than the 6th century, and it was most probably inspired by the Riddle-poetry which flourished during that century.\(^2\) The deduction which we should make at this stage is that the scholiast, or his source, is here using older motifs, such as marriage to his mother or victory over the Sphinx, side by side with newer ones, such as victory by solving a riddle, just as the tragedians of the 5th century had done. Possibly the scholiast was not even aware of this fact.

(vi) We get the impression that, as in the Nekyia and in the Oidipodeia, Oidipus’ marriage to Iokaste did not last a long time before the actual anagnorismos. On the other hand, Iokaste’s silence after discovering that she was married to the murderer of her former husband, may have been an exaggerated imitation of Iokaste’s silence in Sophokles’ O.T., as Robert (p. 161) suggested.

(vii) The anagnorismos was actually brought about by the arrival of the ἴπποβολόκαλος. This word also appears in Euripides’ Phoin. 28; but Sophokles O.T. 1028 speaks of a shepherd. This point was used both by Robert (p. 162) and Deubner (p. 17) to prove that the scholium at least knew the Phoinissai version. It is quite possible, even likely, that we have here a verbal borrowing from the Phoinissai. But there is evidence that this rare word did appear in

---

\(^7\) p. 13.

\(^8\) cf. A.C. 4, 15ff.

\(^9\) cf. A.C. 4, 21ff.
Sophokles elsewhere, and thus this argument, if taken in isolation, must necessarily lose much of its virtue.

(viii) Sikyon as the place from which the ἵπποβουκόλος came still appears in schol. Od. 11.271, whereas in the post-Sophoklean vulgata Corinth dominates the scene. It is difficult to determine whether Sikyon (so Bethe 67) or Corinth (so Robert 71f.) represents the older phase, and I am not prepared to make a definite choice. The fact is, however, that Sikyon at least represents an old phase, which after the 5th century undoubtedly represents a tradition not supposed to be the normal one.

(ix) The anagnorismos which we meet with in the scholium is of a somewhat primitive kind, i.e. with the aid of external gnorismata. After the very artistic anagnorismos in Sophokles’ O.T. such an anagnorismos would not, at least in drama or epic, make any impression. It would even be difficult to account for, unless indeed a later writer had purposely taken recourse to such a primitive anagnorismos in the hope of making an archaic impression. And this suits a mythographer better than any post-Sophoklean epic or tragic poet.

Our first impressions are that the scholium at least tells a very probable story, and that Robert’s verdict (‘heillose Konfusion’) was far too severe and exaggerated. Our impression is also that beside typical older motifs—primitive anagnorismos, Hera punishing the community as a whole, the second marriage of the Oidipodeia—there are decided traces of Sophoklean and Euripidean influence. A solitary verbal reminiscence of Euripides (ἵπποβουκόλος 1. 24) does not prove much. The combination of elements which could all be possible borrowings from Euripides, should, however, have some significance (the sin with Chrysippos, the returning of the waggon after the parricide, the whole motivation and the circumstances of the parricide, and the isolated word ἵπποβουκόλος).

4. Criticism of Deubner’s method

As I have already stated, Deubner’s theory on the sources of the Peisandros scholium held the stage for twenty years. It would perhaps be worthwhile to obtain a true picture of his method of work, and thus I quote Deubner himself. ‘Wer das Pisanderscholion unvoreingenommen liest, wird den Eindruck gewinnen müssen, dass die Erzählung ... glatt und ungebrochen verläuft—bis auf eine Stelle: in Z. 16 knickt sie plötzlich um. Subjekt ist nicht mehr Laios, wie in dem Satze vorher, sondern plötzlich Oedipus, obwohl der Wechsel syntaktisch nicht zum Ausdruck gebracht ist ... Es ist, wie wenn wir plötzlich

---

81 Deubner 9 made much of this. His view is that an anagnorismos through external gnorismata could not occur in an old epic (‘ist dem Epos so fremd wie dem Drama gelauf’). After Delcourt’s (p. XIXf.) thorough refutation of Deubner’s views, I do not consider any further argument really necessary. Perhaps, however, it should be added that Aristotle (Poetics 24.1459b.15) himself considered the Odyssey ‘as anagnorisith throughfrom, beginning to end’; and the way in which Odysseus was recognized by various persons proves convincingly, as Delcourt has shown, that external gnorismata were not lacking.
82 p. 157.
83 cf. p. 16.
den Standpunkt geändert hätten und nun nicht mehr Laios, sondern Oedipus im Mittelpunkt des Interesses stehe. *Das bedeutet aber, dass Pisander von Z. 16 an einer zweiten Quelle folgt*. (pp. 6-7.) This Deubner finds borne out by his interpretation that, although in l. 15 (his first source) as well as in l. 21 (his second source) mention is made of the *schiste hodos*, the crossroad, where Laios was killed by Oedipus, the first crossroad refers to the Phocian crossroad, the second to a different one between Thebes and Kithairon—an unacceptable viewpoint. Immediately he goes on to say: 'Im übrigen [i.e. apart from the above mentioned two lapses] aber zeigt der Text des Pisander keine Unstimmigkeiten, und so muss man sich die Frage vorlegen, ob man nicht überhaupt mit der Annahme auskommt, dass er bloss aus zwei Quellen geschöpft hat, deren Verbindungsstelle in Z. 16 sichtbar wird. Es könnten dafür sowohl zwei Epen in Betracht kommen wie zwei Dramen . . . ' (p. 7), and then he chooses the second alternative, drama.

In other words: the grammatical anacolouthon of l. 16, together with the conflicting report on the scene of the murder betray the presence of his two sources, whose point of contact becomes visible in l. 16. These sources can only (why?) be two epics or two dramas. In the first half (ll. 1-16) there is mention of a paederastic motif which, according to Deubner (p. 7), excludes old epic. Thus only the alternative, drama, is left. Deubner knew that the Chrysippus affair was dealt with by Euripides. He also points out that the material of the first part of the scholium is indeed very promising material for drama. And therefore the most likely conclusion, according to him, is that in the first part of our scholium we indeed have an abridged version of Euripides’ *Chrysippus*. He then gives (8ff.) a possible reconstruction of this lost play, based, amongst others, on this first part of our scholium. Thereupon he attempts—not always very convincingly—to prove that this reconstruction contains nothing conflicting with the facts which, via the *Phoinissai*, the third drama of the trilogy, we could identify as ingredients of the lost *Chrysippus*. And as if this were not sufficient, he then goes on to say: 'Nachdem wir den ersten Teil des Pisanderscholions auf den *Chrysippus* des Euripides zurückgeführt haben, ist zu erwarten, dass ein Drama dieses Dichters auch dem zweiten Teile zugrunde liegt . . . ' (p. 16). Deubner finds this drama in Euripides’ lost *Oidipus*, but in order to succeed in his attempt, he was, amongst other things, forced (cf. 19, 22) to declare spurious the most important fragment we possess.

---

34 cf. n. 17.
35 See on this pp. 10-11.
36 His effort (p. 12) to harmonize Hera as sender of the Sphinx (as in Peisandros and, according to Deubner’s own reconstruction, also in Euripides’ *Chrysippus*) with Eur. *Phoin.* 805, where Hades is explicitly named as its sender, is very far from convincing. Even less so is his strenuous effort to prove that in the *Phoinissai* (as in the *Chrysippus* according to his view) the Sphinx also appeared during the lifetime of Laios. To succeed in this Deubner had to translate the *Phoin.* 45 (see Deubner 15) not as temporal, but as causal (‘Da aber . . . ’). But does this really prove his point?
37 = Nauck 541, in which Oidipus, while still known as the son of Polybos (i.e. before his *anagnorismos* as the child of Laios), was blinded by Laios’ servants. See on this Delcourt XVII n. 2.
of this *Oidipus*. This is, to say the least of it, very, very suspicious, and I shall consequently limit myself to a consideration of the first part of his arguments. That in *κτελεύας* (scil. *Oidipus*) δὲ ... (l. 16) a clumsy grammatical anacolouthon indeed is employed, no one can gainsay. But the 'explanation' and 'solution' which Deubner proffers, viz. the change over to another source, is too far fetched. In the first place, such cases of sudden change of subject are not without precedent in Greek, as Herodotos 2.141 38 and the very last sentence of the Dositheos fragment 39 prove. One could in any case proffer a much easier solution by assuming that the writer was either merely careless, or that the essential word (i.e. *Oidipus*) just dropped out, 40 as in the case of the Dositheos fragment. But Deubner's attempt is not only very improbable, it is in reality impossible. He would have it that the writer, who at all events seems to be a learned man, had in a purely mechanical manner summarily joined two sources together ... and in this process had been able to condense his sources, but nevertheless unable to link them up without an obvious anacolouthon! Surely this conflicts with everything which one could call probable.

What applies to the grammatical anacolouthon is equally applicable to the much discussed 'conflicting' reports on the scene of the murder. It is well known that there are different traditions 41 concerning this place; it is also common knowledge that the Phocian crossroad, thanks to the classical version of Sophokles 42 in the 5th century, almost gained the status as the scene of the murder, thus replacing all other, and older, murder scenes, as e.g. Laphystion and Potniai. If our starting point is right, namely that we are dealing with a learned 43 writer who employed a number of varying sources and in the process showed a marked preference for the out of the way traditions, 44 this entails that such a person would be doubly wary of any possible contradictions. It also implies that the writer deliberately combined various traditions with the specific intention of creating an overall new picture. With this in mind, it is hardly credible that a Peisandros would within the compass of ten lines contradict himself on so important a fact as the scene of the murder without noticing it. The most natural answer is that if these words do come from Peisandros himself, both refer to one and the same murder scene, the one between Thebes and the Kithairon as stated in 1. 21. The mention of 'Apollo' in 1. 15 does not necessarily suggest Phokis (= Delphic Apollo) because long before Delphi there were surely other oracles of Apollo in Boiotia. 45 A conflicting report could of course be the work of a careless scholiast who unthinkingly had used Peisandros. In our scholium even this possibility is almost excluded because we nowhere get the impression that the scholiast

---

38 See Delcourt XVIII.
39 = FgH 54, fr. 1.
40 So Delcourt XVIII.
41 See i.a. Robert 80ff., n. 17 supra.
42 who in his *O.T.* deliberately shifted the murder scene from Potniai (as in Aischylos, cf. schol. Soph. *O.T.* 733) to Phokis.
43 cf. n. 47.
44 cf. n. 48.
45 cf. n. 17.
displays any lapses in logic, and he twice warns us when he is no longer quoting Peisandros.

The foundations of Deubner's assumption that the sources must be either epic or tragedy, are equally shaky. In the scholium's extremely brief version of the Oidipus story we might, though hesitatingly, detect that a certain motif or word could have been inspired by some specific author. However, it is dangerous, if not altogether impossible, to make conclusions as to the nature of the genre itself. I cannot emphasize this better than by quoting Delcourt: 'Quant à vouloir distinguer, sous ce résumé maladroit et interpolé (?), une forme littéraire précise, le style et l'esthétique d'un auteur, c'est, je pense, perdre son temps'. (xxi)

This discussion, I hope, would prove that Deubner's method is unsound. In the following pages I propose to show that even his findings cannot be accepted without reservations.

5. Deductions from the Peisandros scholium

The dominating impression I gained from the scholium is that it is a decidedly learned and critical report characterized especially by an interest in diverging motifs, and by a determination to present a soundly motivated structure, often by coupling older and more recent motifs.

46 = 1. 5 and 1. 28 (φασι...).

47 Cf. Jacoby F2H I, p. 494. That the writer was indeed a learned and critical man may be inferred from his use of a variety of sources without falling into any real inconsistencies. It may also, although in an indirect way, be inferred from the fact that although he used Euripides as a source for the description of the murder scene, he was not so awed by an esteem for him as to incorporate all his unnecessary romantic details, e.g. that Laios' horses 'bloodied up' Oid.'s feet (Phoin. 42). In any case, in comparison with e.g. Apollodoros, we see a far more critical mind at work. Apollodoros e.g. tells us that the winged Sphinx threw herself from the citadel (3.5.8); that Lykos seized the throne, but also that he was elected commander-in-chief (3.5.5); that Laios who had been banned from Thebes, abducted the beautiful Chrysippos; and then he continues to tell us that Hera eventually sent the Sphinx after the death of Laios. A Sphinx as the torturing instrument sent by an angered goddess of marriage obviously does not make sense after the death of the real sinner. Nevertheless it was Apollodoros whom Robert (400ff.) considered reliable enough for his reconstruction of Euripides' Chrysippus, whilst deeming Peisandros worthless!

48 i.e. diverging for us, schooled in the classical Oidipus figure of a Sophokles. We are immediately struck by the absence of certain typically Sophoklean and/or Euripidean features, e.g.: (i) Phokis as the place of the parricide; (ii) the typically Sophoklean prominence of Apollo and the influence of Delphic theology, around which the O.T., to a very great extent, was built; (iii) the typically Sophoklean account of the time, the circumstances and the motivation of the parricide (in Sophokles the initiative which ended in the parricide came from Laios who whipped the innocent Oidipus; in the scholium it came from the charioteer who struck Oidipus with his whip); (iv) the artistic Sophoklean anagnorismos. In contrast certain unusual motifs are incorporated in the scholium: (a) the predominant position of Hera (undoubtedly in her capacity as Gamostolos); (b) the abduction of Chrysippus for erotic purposes (a motif which Euripides implemented in his Chrysippus); (c) the time of the Sphinx's appearance, during Laios' lifetime, the description of the Sphinx, and the enumeration of at least some of her victims; (d) the time, circumstances and motivation of the parricide, coupled with the spoiling of the father's body; (e) the
It is especially in two respects that this scholium deviates from the classical Oidipus structure of a Sophokles, viz. by the prominent position \(^{61}\) of the fact that, as in \textit{Phoin.}, 44, Oidipus gave Laios' wagon to Polybos; (\(f\)) the second marriage after a short and childless first marriage; (\(g\)) the prominence of Sikyon, not Corinth, in the rescue of the exposed infant; (\(h\)) the primitive anagnorismos.

\(^{50}\) See my discussion on p. 36.

Among the older motifs we may include: (i) parricide, marriage to the mother, and the second marriage; (ii) the primitive anagnorismos; (iii) the idea that a community as a whole is punished for the sin of the individual; (iv) the place of the murder scene; and (v) the rôle of Sikyon in the rescue of the infant Oidipus.

Among the more recent motifs we may include: (i) the fact that Oidipus' victory over the Sphinx was not by a feat of physical strength but by solving a riddle; (ii) Laios' sin with Chrysippos; (iii) the idea that a community as a whole is punished for the sin of the individual; (iv) the place of the murder scene; and (v) the rôle of Sikyon in the rescue of the infant Oidipus.

The combination of typically Euripidean features must be of some significance, such as ii, iii, v, vii (the rôle of golden pins as gnorismata), as well as the fact that the real initiative in the parricide came from the charioteer, as in Euripides, and that the place where Laios' unlawful love-affair took place was Thebes (good on this Deubner 11ff., against Robert 413). On the other hand the scholium's linking up of both Hera Gamostolos and Laios' sin with Chrysippos (but without the curse of Pelops, cf. p. 15) with the Sphinx is unique.

\(^{61}\) Hera's prominence is stressed by certain details in the scholium: she sends the Sphinx (cf. also n. 32); Laios is advised not to go to Apollo but to bring conciliatory offerings to her in her capacity as Gamostolos, i.e. as protectress of the rights of woman in marriage (see on this Nilsson \textit{Gr. Rel.} I. 405—'Hera vertritt die Frau in ihren Rechten als Gattin, nicht als Mutter . . . '); the newly married couple, Oidipus and Iokaste, go to Kithairon with offerings for Hera. Without exaggeration it may be stated that the scholium deliberately gave Hera the predominant position which Sophokles in his \textit{O.T.} had given to Apollo. This, of course, also entailed a certain reshuffling of the known motifs. On the extent and age of Hera's cult, and her early influence in Boiotia, with special associations with Plataiai, Kithairon and The rspiai, see Bethe 9ff., Nilsson \textit{Gr. Feste}, pp. 50-56, \textit{Gr. Rel.} I. 404; Herodotos 9.52, Paus. 9.2.7, Clem. Alex. \textit{Protrept.} 4.46, Plut. \textit{Arist.} 11. It is an undeniable fact (see Delcourt XVIII) that in the tragedies of the 5th century Hera plays almost no part whatsoever. Any later writer wishing to give her a prominent rôle in any Theban saga could, however, build on the foundations of early established cults of Hera in Boiotia, and, thereby, could have given her innovation the stamp of antiquity. He could also have derived his inspiration from the fact that in epic Hera was especially the severe punisher, the jealous goddess (cf. Gruppe 1130). I believe that this is just what happened when our scholium deliberately gave Hera a prominent position.

In this he might have been inspired by innocent phrases such as Euripides' \textit{Phoin.} 24, where we are told that Oidipus was exposed by shepherds 'in Hera's field high on Kithairon's rock'—an idea which also reappears in the lesser known Kephallion (\(=\) \textit{fr. 6 F.H.G.} 3.629), where Amphion and Zethos were also exposed in the fields of Hera on Kithairon. This, however, is very difficult to prove. The important point, in any case, is that Peisandros grasped Hera's old associations with Kithairon and Boiotia to give his handling of the Oidipus story a completely new turn, while also giving his innovation a stamp of antiquity.
goddess Hera and by the paederastic motif of Laios abducting Chrysippos. And both these diverging motifs, if my reconstruction is correct, are employed to motivate the same element in the Oidipus structure, namely the Sphinx.

It is explicitly said that the Sphinx was sent as a result of the anger of Hera. We, therefore, surely have good reason to assume that Hera is involved in her capacity of Gamostolos, protectress of the rights of women in marriage, and that for this reason the Sphinx’s appearance is purposely put in the lifetime of Laios.

The linking of Laios’ sin against Chrysippos with the Sphinx is, however, more difficult. Robert (157) summarily set aside this linking as impossible and found this proof of the hopeless confusion which characterizes our scholium. Recently Wehrli (110) also, in his reconstruction of Euripides’ Chrysippos, rejected this as highly improbable and preferred to link as follows: Laios’ sin against Chrysippos—Apollo’s denial of children to Laios—the parricide. The problem, therefore, is briefly: whether the sin against Laios together with Hera must serve as motivation for the Sphinx, or whether Hera was introduced to motivate the Sphinx, and the sin against Chrysippos introduced as motivation for the parricide. In support of Wehrli’s choice of the latter alternative it can be said that parricide would be a most fitting punishment for such a sin of the father, and that the denial of children to Laios would thus at once be motivated. The greatest advantage that Wehrli sees in linking the sin against Chrysippos with the parricide is that the presence of the Sphinx is then also

As has been said, in only three sources in antiquity (Apollodoros 3.5.8; Dio Chrysostomos 11.8, cf. also 10.24; and our Peisandros scholium) Hera is explicitly mentioned as sender of the Sphinx. And it also strikes us that in all three Laios’ sin with Chrysippos features as a motif. Of course the mere name Hera as sender of the Sphinx does not, in itself, prove that the writer attached any deeper significance to this fact. At least four gods are known as senders of the Sphinx, viz. Hera, Hades (Eur. Phoin. 810), Ares (schol. Phoin. 1064; cf. Robert II. 62, n. 12), Dionysos (Eur. Antigone, cf. 178 N, schol. Phoin. 1031, 934 and Robert 158, 394-5, II. 62, n. 12). One gets the impression that the ancient authors used the very first god they could think of. In Apollodoros, as has already been said (see n. 47), Hera as protectress of woman’s rights in marriage, does not really make sense, since she sends the Sphinx only after the death of the sinner Laios. From Dio who did not arrange his material strictly chronologically we can make no definite deductions as to the time of the Sphinx’s appearance, and consequently as to whether his linking Hera with the Sphinx really makes sense. The important fact is, therefore, that our scholium is the only source which places the appearance of the Sphinx at an earlier stage, during the life of Laios, and also explicitly emphasizes that Hera sent it angered by the sin against a woman’s rights in marriage. This must compel us to conclude that the scholium wants to stress that Hera was acting, not as a mere functionless name, but in her capacity as angered protectress of the rights of woman in marriage. The importance of just this is far-reaching.

But why the frantic search to motivate the oracle of Apollo? Sophokles, in fact, left it unmotivated, and Wehrli himself quite rightly says: ‘Für jene (= old epic) wie für die ältere Tragödie müssen wir vielmehr mit einer Sagenversion rechnen nach welcher Laios’ Schicksal unverschuldet ist. Dies entspricht aber durchaus jener alten Orakelgläubigkeit, welche ohne nach Gründen zu fragen sich mit der bloßen Eröffnung begnügt.’ (110)

Remember Wehrli is concerned with Euripides’ Chrysippos, but the argument is also applicable in this case mutatis mutandis.
motivated as punishment for the unexpiated murder of Laios. The truth is that Wehrli’s linking necessarily assumes that the sin against Chrysippos took place before the birth of Oidipus, and that the Sphinx only appeared after the parricide. In the Peisandros scholium, however, neither of these is the case. The reconstruction of Wehrli, therefore, fails, at any rate regarding the scholium.

It must be stressed that the Peisandros scholium begins in medias res. Whether the abduction of Chrysippos occurred before the marriage of Laios, or after his marriage but before the birth of Oidipus, or after his marriage and after Oidipus’ birth and exposure, is not stated explicitly in the scholium. The second and third alternatives have at least in their favour that Laios’ perverted love would thereby be well motivated, viz. by fear of another child or frustration of a heterossexual romance. If we accept, however, that the scholiast is a learned man who was primarily concerned in a soundly motivated structure, we must prefer the third alternative, and imagine the picture in his mind as follows.

6. A possible reconstruction of the Peisandros scholium’s content
Laios marries, is warned against a dangerous child (this oracle is unmotivated in accordance with Sophokles and the older popular fancy), nevertheless begets a child (whether in disobedience as in Aischylos’ Septem 745ff., or through lust or in drunkenness as in Euripides’ Phoin. 21), rids himself of this dangerous child by exposing it, hence avoids his wife, and turns to Chrysippos with whom he lives in an unnatural relationship with the full knowledge of the Thebans (Laios’ perversity motivated). Hera as goddess of the rights of women in marriage sends the Sphinx (Sphinx motivated) within the lifetime of Laios (the time of the Sphinx’s appearance motivated), Chrysippos commits suicide (suicide motivated); Laios sets out for the oracle of Apollo (motivated by the troubled times and C.’s suicide), is killed by Oidipus (parricide motivated as punishment of Laios’ disobedience of Apollo’s prohibition of children long ago).

In this reconstruction the Sphinx is, therefore, motivated both by Laios’ sin against Chrysippos and by Hera’s subsequent anger; the parricide by Laios’ disobedience to Apollo’s oracle. In short, and this is very, very important, in the Peisandros scholium both divergent motifs, the abduction of Chrysippos and Hera Gamostolos who sends the Sphinx, are purposefully linked to the Sphinx. Furthermore, if we remember that this scholium is an explanatory note on Euripides’ Phoin. 1760, i.e. on Oidipus’ words, ‘It was I alone who put down the murdering power of the Sphinx’ (Wyckoff); and if we keep in mind that in Sophokles’ O.T. the appearance of the Sphinx was in fact

---

55 With the further inconsequence that the Sphinx as the one who exacts punishment for the parricide, is killed by none other than Oidipus, the parricide himself.
56 So Apollodoros 3.5; 3.7.
57 So Lamer, RE 12.506.
59 See n. 53.
60 by Hera’s anger, as could be inferred from the presence of the Sphinx.
 unmotivated, then it is surely not too fantastic to maintain that in our scholium we are dealing with a later and lesser mind who purposely attempted to ‘improve’ on Sophokles by introducing a motive for the Sphinx’s appearance. Even if he has failed in other respects, he has most certainly succeeded in this.

To what extent do these factors throw light upon the sources of our scholium and their age?

7. Laios’ sin against Chrysippos—age of the motif

Robert,61 and after him Jacoby, Pohlenz and Wehrli,62 emphasized that Euripides was the first to introduce this motif into the story of Oidipus, and that the Peisandros scholium, therefore, took it over in its entirety from Euripides. And the Euripidean drama is according to Robert and his school of thought the lost Chrysippos which was produced as the second play of the trilogy, the Oinomaos, Chrysippos and Phoinissai, presumably in 409 B.C.63

They base their arguments (i) on the statement of Ailianos64 that Euripides made Laios the first paederast among men, which they interpret as though Euripides was the first to make Laios the first paederast, which is certainly not explicitly stated in Ailianos, and (ii) on the apodeictic viewpoint as expressed by Deubner that such a paederastic motive is quite foreign to Old Epic.65 This view has since been questioned thoroughly by Delcourt66 who, however, does not exclude the possibility of an epic source for this motif.

My own view is that Euripides was indeed the first to introduce Laios’ abduction of Chrysippos, in order thereby to motivate Apollo’s denial of children to Laios. In this respect Robert cum suis was correct despite the fact that they attached far too much weight to the rather thoughtless Apollo-doros who was Robert’s real starting point in his reconstruction of Euripides’ Chrysippos.67 But I am also convinced that for this motif the Peisandros was at most inspired by Euripides and that it was certainly not taken over as a whole from his Chrysippos, because, as it will soon be shown, the accounts in the Chrysippos and in the scholium differ radically.68

How old is a paederastic motif in Greek literary remains, and may we maintain with apodeictic certainty that it is quite foreign to Old Epic?

61 157, 396ff. He came to this view in reaction to Bethe’s idea (4ff.) that Laios’ abduction of Chrysippos already featured in the Oidipodeia.
62 Jacoby 1.495; Pohlenz I. 373 l. 36 and II. 153; Wehrli 109.
64 nat. an. 6.15 and v.l. 13.5.
65 ‘Die Liebesgeschichte zwischen Laios und Chrysippos ist einem alten Epos alles anders als angemessen’ (5).
66 Delcourt XIX.
67 See on this n. 47. In spite of this Robert’s reconstruction (396ff.) of Euripides’ Chrysippos was not too far off the rails. We must agree with him (as against Von Wilamowitz and Hartung) that our starting point cannot be the Dositheos fragment (= FGH 54, fr. 1) where the central theme is rather the jealousy and cruelty of Chrysippos’ stepmother, Hippodameia, than Laios’ abduction of Chrysippos.
68 In this respect, at least, Delcourt XVff. was correct.
That in ancient Greece paederasty was a common practice, is well known. Even though isolated voices were raised against it, it is clear that in the Greek world, at any rate since the 6th century BCE, it was no longer viewed with disfavour. Actually, in many circles—especially, although not exclusively, the Doric states, inter alia Crete, Sparta and Argos—love of boys was not only extolled as ennobling, and even valued more than love for women, but it was also considered as reconcilable with love for women, and not summarily condemned as an unnatural perversity. Already in Solon's day paederasty was sanctioned with certain provisos in Ionic Attica. Pindaros does not hesitate to let Pelops summon the help of his lover, the god Poseidon, in his effort to gain Hippodameia as wife. Neither does Polykrates hesitate to erect in Ionian Samos of the 6th century a statue in honour of his beloved Bathyllos in the temple of Hera, the goddess of marriage.

In view of this, one would be amazed if paederastic motifs were not echoed in early literary remains with a certain amount of approval. Since the oldest literary remains, the beauty of the boy, the charm of his eyes or cheeks are praised with ever increasing candour. Naturally this in itself need not imply erotic motives, and the impression we gain from our literary sources, considered chronologically, is indeed that the explicit incorporation of erotic motifs was secondary, and that a certain line of development can be traced—an indication that paederasty was gradually accepted as rather normal. Homeros,

69 See on paederasty in general Kroll RE 11.897-905 and Hans Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece, 1935 (the only copy available to me), pp. 411-499.

70 On the early occurrence of homosexual love in Greece, cf. Licht, passim, esp. 458ff. Of great importance are Athen. 13.602ff. (Crete), Euphros FgH 70. fr. 149.21 (Crete); Plut. Amat. narr. 2.772 (Corinth); schol. Pind. Oil. 1.7.84; Paus. 9.23.1; Plut. Psel. 8 (Thebes-Iolaiia festival); Aischin. Tim. 40, 137-8 (Solon's law in Athens); schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.75 (homosexual brothel on the Lykabettos).

71 Cf. Licht pp. 446ff. Dissident voices were raised by Xenophon, Plutarchos and Euripides. For Euripides cf. Lesky Trag. Dicht. 169; Hik. 899; fr. 362.24 N° (= Erechtheus). For the other side of the picture (Eur. being himself called a paederast) cf. Schmid 1. 324 n. 5, 538.

72 Cf. e.g. the Athenian Plato, Symp. 178c-ff.

73 See Licht 452; Aisch. Tim. 138; Charikles ii. 262ff.

74 Cf. Apuleios Florilegium ii.15.

75 In this connection it is also interesting to note that Ovidius, Metam. 1.10, 11.50ff., relates that Orpheus, the classical model of conjugal fidelity, after refusing all love for women after the loss of his wife Eurydice, himself turned to the more ennobling love of boys, and 'thus became the first to introduce the love of boys in his home in Thrace'.


77 See on this Licht 436ff.; Solon's law (Aisch. Tim. 13, 137, 138); Plato Symp. 178C; Herakles' love of Iolaos (Paus. 9.23.1, Plut. Psel. 8) which inspired him to even greater feats.
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for example, explicitly praises the beauty of certain youths;\(^7\) his poems betray definite knowledge of paederasty.\(^7\) He describes the friendship of Patroklos and Achilleus in words highly suggestive of erotic moments,\(^8\) but he nevertheless hesitates explicitly to attach erotic aspects to this friendship, and the Alexandrian scholars by their elimination of precisely these passages\(^8\) in Homeros seem to show that they, at any rate, understood erotic moments to be present which for them were too frank for Old Epic. Homeros\(^8\) also relates that Zeus abducted Ganymedes because of his beauty, and that he gave him the esteemed post of cupbearer of the gods. But explicit erotic motives are ascribed to this case only secondarily by the 6th century Ibykos, and by Theognis and Pindaros\(^8\) after him. This picture, though incomplete, already suffices to prove that, although paederasty as such hovers in the background in the Homeric poems, it does not gain a clear footing because of some scruple or other. With this reservation Robert cum suis was, therefore, correct. Paederasty has no explicit rôle in Old Epic. It is thus unlikely that it would already in the Oidipodeia be part of the story of Oidipus. Therefore, if the Peisandros scholium refers to paederastic love as ‘unlawful’ it betrays either the thought of the Epic where it is viewed with some scruple, or the frank opinion of somebody in a later age who, against popular sentiment, condemns this type of love as unnatural. Since we have no clue for a definite choice between these alternatives, we cannot from this fact alone deduce anything with certainty as to the age of the motif in the Peisandros scholium.

*Was Euripides then the first to incorporate a paederastic motif in the Oidipus story?*

This Robert, Deubner and others maintain on the basis of Ailianos. But it is nowhere stated, not even in Ailianos. Lamer\(^8\) was therefore, in spite of Deubner’s\(^8\) disdaining denial, correct when he said that Ailianos cannot be used as an argument in this case. Ailianos says that Euripides portrayed Laios as the *first* paederast, not that Euripides was the *first* to portray Laios as the first paederast. Other arguments must, therefore, be looked for.

As far as I am concerned the answer is to be found in the whole line of development in the application of paederastic motifs in literature since the 6th century B.C. In the fragments of the lyric and elegiac poets, especially

---

\(^7\) II. 2.671, 24.629.

\(^8\) E.g. trade in beautiful boys; cf. *Od.* 14.297, 15.449, II. 19.193 (Agamemnon when finally reconciled with Achilleus, offers a number of gifts, amongst them several noble boys). After the death of Patroklos, Antilochos took his place with Achilleus (cf. *Od.* 24.78, 3.109, 11.467, 24.15).

\(^8\) Cf. n. 79 in combination with i.a. II. 9.186, 663 (?); 18.22ff., 65, 315, 334; 19.209, 315; *Od.* 24.78 (Antilochos).

\(^8\) They delete i.a. II. 24. 6-9. Cf. schol. T to *Iliad* 16.97, schol. A’T to *Iliad* 23.94. See, however, Schmid I.\(^1\) 179 n. 2 together with 63 n. 8.

\(^8\) II. 20.234ff., 5.265ff., Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* 207-8.

\(^8\) Ibykos fr. 30 Bgk,\(^4\) *Theognis* 1345ff. (but cf. Schmid I.\(^1\) 377); Pindaros *Ol.* 1. 37-45.

\(^8\) RE 12.508.13ff.

\(^8\) cf. n. 13.
Solon, Ibykos and Anakreon, paederastic motifs have a definite place, but it is only with Pindaros, who himself clearly praised the love of boys above that of women, that this motif acquired the status of a literary device, and especially in his recasting the abduction of Pelops by Poseidon. Our countryman, Viljoen, has convincingly shown how Pindaros used Zeus’ abduction of Ganymedes as his model for the abduction of Pelops by Poseidon for erotic motives. In doing so, Pindaros purposely chooses later and non-Homeric variants to bring home the fact that it was not Ganymedes, but indeed Pelops who deserves priority, and thus has the particular honour of being the first exemplum of someone transferred to heaven for paederastic motives. A divine lover, therefore, gives additional status to the hero, Pelops, and thus a paederastic motif achieves in the artful hands of Pindaros the status of a literary device. If we continue the line of development we see that lesser minds would by humanizing and rationalizing the abduction of Ganymedes alter it so that no longer a god but a human being, whether it be Tantalos or Minos, gains the honour of being the paederast to abduct the beautiful Ganymedes. It seems, therefore, that the humanizing element has been incorporated as a secondary factor. The same tendency seems to me to be present in the Chrysippos story. Already before Euripides Pindaros’ countryman, the poetess Praxilla, knew that Chrysippos, the beautiful son of Pelops, was abducted by a god, Zeus. Her source of inspiration was apparently Pindaros. Does she do it in imitation of Pindaros to add greater glory to the Pelopidai—both the father and the son being irresistible to the gods? After her, Euripides by humanizing the motif replaces the god by a human abductor, Laios, and thus gives Laios the honour of being the first paederast among men. It is true that the evidence of Praxilla, in itself, is not conclusive on the question of priority for Zeus or Laios, and both schools of thought have support among scholars. I believe, however, that the analogy with the abduction of Ganymedes and that of Pelops makes it likely that the humanizing and rationalizing of the myth is secondary and that Euripides was indeed the first—even though Ailianos does not explicitly state it—to make a human being, Laios, the abductor of Chrysippos. In point of motif, his source of inspiration was Pindaros and Praxilla; the humanizing was his own.

But Euripides’ contribution goes further. Paederastic motifs as such are certainly older in tragedy than Euripides. Already Phrynichos has a paede-
rastic motif in one of his lost tragedies; Aischylos likewise in his *Myrmidon,* while Sophokles, whose name is explicitly linked with paederastic tendencies, involved paederastic motifs at least in his *Troilos, Lovers of Achilles, Niobe,* and *Kolchides.* Euripides, however, was to have the last word in this ever increasing candid use of paederastic motifs by making it the hub of an entire tragedy, the *Chrysippos.*

8. Euripides' *Chrysippos* versus the Peisandros scholium
To decide about Robert's, and especially Deubner's, idea that the Peisandros scholium took over the Chrysippos story in its entirety from Euripides, we must naturally know the content of Euripides' lost *Chrysippos* and also how it compares with the reconstruction which we have attempted for the Peisandros scholium. In this respect much has been erred. In fact Delcourt was, in my opinion, the only one to see the matter in perspective when she said that for the reconstruction of the *Chrysippos* we should not base our arguments on the Peisandros scholium and Apollodoros, but on the disdained hypotheses, viz. the short Laurentianus hypothesis to the *Phoinissai,* the Byzantine hypothesis of the *Phoinissai,* and the Byzantine hypothesis of the *Septem,* of which the first part is a summary of Euripides' *Chrysippos* and the second part the starting point of Euripides' *Phoinissai,* and certainly not of Aischylos' *Septem*—a fact which Robert already noticed.

---

93 = fr. 9 N² (Troilos). Already at an early stage erotic motives were associated with Achilleus' murder of Troilos. See on this esp. Lesky *RE* 7A.603ff. (on the interpretation of schol. T to *Iliad* 24.257).
94 = fr. 135-6 N,² 228 Mette. Cf. also Plato *Symp.* 180A, Athen. 13.601a.
96 = fr. 161 N,² 410 N,² Athen. 13.601, 320 N,²
97 For efforts at the reconstruction of Euripides' *Chrysippos* see e.g. Robert 396ff., Deubner 8ff., Pohlenz 373, II 153, Schmid 1² 571 (cf. esp. n. 5 for bibliographical material), Lesky *Trag. Dicht.* 169, 180 n. 1, 190. On the abduction of Chrysippos and the Chrysippos figure as such cf. Bethe *RE* 3.2498.58ff., Lamer *RE* 12.474.60ff., Daly *RE* 17.2107.21, Robert 149ff., 396ff. The primary sources for Chrysippos' abduction are Athen. 13.603A = Praxilla fr. 6., Apollodoros 3.5.5ff., Dio Chrysostomos 10.24 and 11.8, Aelianus *nat. an.* 6.15 and s. b. 13.5; Dositheos (*FigH* 54, fr. 1—see on this n. 67); hypothesis Laurentianus Eur. *Phoin.* = Schwartz p. 244; Byzantine hypothesis to Eur. *Phoin.* (in Guelf. and Barr. V = p. 5f. Dindorf = Robert II. 134, n. 10); Byzantine hypothesis of the *Septem* (see Robert 401ff. for the text in part) and H. Weil's Teubner Aischylos, 1907, for the text in full); schol. Eur. *Phoin.* 60, 26, 21; Hyginus fab. 85.
98 XVff.
99 as Robert 396ff. and Deubner 8ff. have done.
100 hypothesis Laurentianus XXXII.33 = Schwartz p. 244.
101 Cf. n. 97.
102 In the first instance the exact agreement of the hypothesis with the background details as sketched in Euripides' *Phoinissai* prologue; the various verbatim quotations from the *Phoinissai*; the sentences that, although no verbal quotations, were inspired, not by the *Septem,* but by Euripides' *Phoinissai.* A few examples may suffice: Laios' long childlessness (= *Phoin.* 13/14); only then Laios consults the oracle of Apollo (= *Phoin.* 15/16); the phrasing of Apollo's oracle warning Laios against a child (a direct quotation from *Phoin.* 18); Laios avoids intercourse with his wife but in an unguarded moment, in drunkenness, begets the dangerous Oidipus (= *Phoin.* 21/2);
In the Laurentianus, the shortest of the three, we read:

A careful comparative study of the three arguments indicate: (i) that the three hypotheses have exactly the same story; (ii) that all the moments that are emphasized in the Laurentianus, the shortest of the three, are also emphasized in the other two more extensive renderings; and (iii) that the other two at most incorporate finer details within the frame of the Laurentianus, but without disturbing its image in any way. The two moments important to all three are firstly that the Theban Laios abducts forceful and with erotic motives the son of Pelops, Chrysippos, and, secondly, that directly as result of this Pelops curses Laios in his descendants.

Compared to this we are struck by the complete absence of Hera in each of the three hypotheses, and, secondly, the fact that in none of them the abduction of Chrysippos is in any way linked up with the appearance of the Sphinx. Immediately the reader will notice that this picture differs radically from the Peisandros scholium where one is struck in particular by the prominence of Hera, and also by the fact that the sin against Chrysippos in fact motivates the appearance of the Sphinx. Delcourt, therefore, is correct.

We cannot trace Euripides' lost Chrysippos in the Peisandros scholium as well as in the three hypotheses, but at most in the one or the other. Delcourt quite correctly then chooses the second alternative. We can trace Euripides' Chrysippos only in the hypotheses.

The dominant motifs which occur in each of the three hypotheses, and probably also in Euripides' Chrysippos, as already stated, are Laios' violent abduction of Chrysippos, and the curse of Pelops as motivation for Laios'...
eventual childlessness. This picture, which already features in the short Laurentianus, the two longer hypotheses supplement with the following details:

(i) that Chrysippus was a child from Pelops' earlier marriage and not from his marriage with Hippodameia; 107

(ii) that Laios, passionately in love, abducted him to Thebes; 108

(iii) that Laios thus became the first pederast among men, just as Zeus was this among the gods by his abduction of Ganymedes—a fact which Euripides, as we know from the passage in Aelianos discussed above, certainly did emphasize in his Chrysippus;

(iv) that Laios after being childless for a long time 109 went to the oracle of Apollo to consult the god on the matter of children;

(v) that the god warned Laios against a child; 110

(vi) that Laios, although he respected the oracle, 111, 112 nevertheless begot a child, Oidipus, in an unguarded moment;

(vii) that Laios after this rid himself of the dangerous Oidipus by exposing him, as in Euripides' Phoinissai.

The complete picture gained from the three hypotheses, and the picture we may quite justifiably accept for Euripides' Chrysippus, boils down to this: Laios tarried at Pisa before the birth of Oidipus (differing, therefore, from the Peisandros scholium); fell in love with Chrysippus; abducted him forcefully (in the Peisandros scholium the abduction apparently meets with no resistance from Chrysippus 113); he hereby incurred the curse of Pelops and subsequently lived in fear of a possible child; in his perplexity Laios consulted the oracle of Apollo; Apollo confirmed the curse of Pelops; 114 Laios respected Apollo's warning, but in an unguarded moment, nevertheless, begot the dangerous Oidipus.

Although the Sphinx is not mentioned in the Laurentianus or the Phoinissai hypothesis, we know from the Septem hypothesis that she appeared only after...
the parricide. This is also the case in Euripides’ Phoin. 45 and we are, therefore, fully justified in assuming it also for his Chrysippus. Therefore, in Euripides’ Chrysippus the appearance of the Sphinx after the parricide is either motivated as a punishment for the parricide, or it is left unmotivated as in Sophokles.

In Euripides’ Phoin. 810, the play that follows the Chrysippus in the trilogy, Hades, not Hera, is mentioned as sending the Sphinx. Deubner who, as has already been said, believed that the first part of the Peisandros scholium was entirely taken from Euripides’ Chrysippus, necessarily had to find a place for Hera as the one who sends the Sphinx in the Chrysippus. I am convinced that Deubner’s effort was not successful. The fact remains that Hera Gamostolos, that is, Hera specifically in her capacity as goddess of the conjugal rights of women, would be entirely without significance if she should be responsible for sending the Sphinx only after the death of the sinner, only after the parricide. I would even go further and state categorically that neither Euripides, nor any other writer for that, could have used both motifs combined, viz. the curse of Pelops and Hera as sender of the Sphinx, unless Hera is merely used as a name and not in the rôle of an enraged protectress of woman’s rights in marriage. And this is evidently impossible for the Peisandros scholium (and thus, for Deubner who considered the scholium a mere summary of Euripides’ Chrysippus, necessarily also for the Chrysippus).

And the reason why both motifs could never feature combined, is so evident, that it is rather surprising that no one, as far as I know, has noticed it. The curse of Pelops is only meaningful in the linking: Laios’ sin against Chrysippus — prohibition of children to Laios — parricide. This means that the curse of Pelops is really meaningful only if it motivates Laios’ long childlessness after his abduction of Chrysippus, and thus also Apollo’s prohibition of children to Laios, and the subsequent parricide, as a fitting punishment for the sin of the father, Laios. The curse of Pelops, therefore, assumes a still childless (and presumably, though not necessarily, a still unmarried) Laios. On the other hand a Hera, who in her capacity of enraged goddess of woman’s rights in marriage sends a Sphinx to punish a transgression against a woman’s marriage rights, is only significant if there is an already married Laios, an already exposed Oidipus, and punishment of the sinner during his lifetime. And hence it is truly no coincidence that in the only three ancient sources in which Laios’ sin of abducting Chrysippus and Hera as the sender of the Sphinx occur, the curse of Pelops is persistently lacking. And conversely, that in the only three known sources in which the curse of Pelops, together with Laios’ abduction of Chrysippus, is explicitly stated, Hera Gamostolos as sender of the Sphinx

---

115 See Deubner 12.
116 See n. 52.
117 a fact which the hypotheses explicitly emphasize.
118 Because (see section VI) this is the only way Oidipus as the already full grown parricide could sensibly come into the picture. See also Robert’s criticism (155) of Bethe’s reconstruction of the Peisandros scholium.
119 See n. 52.
120 i.e. the three hypotheses.
is persistently lacking. It follows that Deubner erred when he concluded that both motifs could feature in Euripides’ *Chrysippus*.

In short: Hera must be omitted in Euripides’ *Chrysippus* which has as a dominating characteristic that Laios is cursed by Pelops in his descendants because of his violent abduction of the boy Chrysippus, whereas in the Peisandros scholium where Hera exacts punishment especially in her capacity as goddess of woman’s conjugal rights, the curse of Pelops must be omitted. Let it immediately be stated: (a) in the scanty fragments that we have of Euripides’ *Chrysippus*, there is nothing that clashes with the picture I have just reconstructed; (b) in Euripides’ *Phoinissai*, the third drama of the trilogy of which the *Chrysippus* is the second, I could find nothing either that clashes with this reconstruction; and (c) if my reconstruction is correct, then each of the three plays of Euripides’ trilogy is characterized by a remarkable symmetry in motif. Each of the three is concerned with the terrible consequences of Eros; in each a prominent place is given to the disastrous consequences of a curse: in the *Oinomaos* the curse of the cheated Myrtilos on Pelops, and its consequences in his unhappy marriage; in the *Chrysippus* the curse of Pelops on Laios, and its disastrous consequences; in the *Phoinissai* the equally disastrous consequences of the curse of Oidipus on his sons, i.e. the fratricide.

It must have been noticed that, apart from the fact as such of Laios’ abduction of Chrysippus, and the explicit remark that Laios was the first pederast—both motifs which the Peisandros scholium most certainly derived from Euripides’ *Chrysippus*—not a single motif which I have considered as prominent in Euripides’ *Chrysippus*122 is re-echoed in the Peisandros scholium,123 Neither the Peisandros scholium as a whole nor its first part is, therefore, taken over in its entirety from the *Chrysippus*.

9. Concluding Remarks

It has become abundantly clear from the foregoing argument that our scholiast used in a very unique way older and newer motifs in an earnest attempt to form a new and soundly motivated structure of the Oidipus case. It is evident that our scholium contains elements which were already present in the *Oidipodea*. So for example, Haimon as a victim of the Sphinx;124 Oidipus as victor of the Sphinx, but then linked with a decidedly later riddle-motif; and the second marriage, with the well-known four children not incestuous. But there is also a combination of motifs and one or two verbal borrowings which point to Euripides, esp. to his *Chrysippus* and *Phoinissai*. There are also very strong indications that the Sophoclean motif of the plague in his *O.T.*, whereby

---

122 i.e. Laios’ sin of abducting Chrysippus violently before the birth of Oidipus; the subsequent curse of Pelops confirmed by Apollo in motivation of Laios’ childlessness and parricide; the absence of Hera; Laios’ death as a natural punishment for his sin with Chrysippus; the Sphinx coming only after Laios’ death.
123 Where the dominating motif is Hera, the enraged goddess of conjugal rights, as the sender of the Sphinx during the lifetime of Laios.
124 This even in the form of a direct citation.
a whole community is punished for the unexpiated sin of an individual, was the ultimate inspiration for our scholiast's rendering of the menace of the Sphinx punishing a whole community for the sin of Laios with Chrysippos which they allowed to continue.

It is remarkable that precisely the two aspects wherein our scholium differs particularly from the 'classical' Oidipus, viz. Laios' sin of abducting Chrysippos for erotic motives and the prominence of Hera, both linked with the appearance of the Sphinx, seem to point respectively to Euripides and to Sophokles. Laios' sin of abducting Chrysippos points to Euripides who was the first to incorporate this motive in the Oidipus structure; Hera and the Sphinx point, though in an indirect way, to Sophokles who suffered the community as a whole to be punished by the plague. At this stage, therefore, we must concede that both Robert and Deubner were correct in at least one respect: the writer of our scholium did know Euripides' Chrysippos. And in this regard both Lamer and Delcourt erred when in reaction to Robert and Deubner they tried to trace this motif back to a pre-Euripidean source. But with this ends the real contribution of Robert and Deubner. Deubner's further efforts are crippled by a far too mechanistic conception of his sources; Robert's efforts in that he considered it as his task to find at all costs the source of each utterance—a good ideal, but dangerous and even impossible in view of our extremely incomplete heritage of Greek writings. The most we can usually attain, is to determine a *terminus ante quem* for a specific motif in a specific author.

What is my own conclusion? If we begin with Sophokles' O.T. where the 'classical' Oidipus was really created, we find an artistic work of the truly great master who did not attempt in the first place to erect an Oidipus structure at all points soundly motivated at all costs, or which at all times could stand the test of the cold rationalist, but the master who simply aimed at a drama of the tragic Oidipus. The rationalist who wishes to apply cold logic, will soon find that the plague as punishment for the parricide, and that after 14 years—Antigone was already in her teens—cannot stand the test of cold reason! And he who at all costs searches for a soundly motivated structure, will soon find that it is precisely the oracle of Apollo and the appearance of the Sphinx that are left unmotivated—and yet these two unmotivated facts are, as I indicated in my previous article, elements which Sophokles considered as important and fully employed.

After Sophokles, Euripides not only ventured on the same ground, but he 'improved' on Sophokles by incorporating a radically new paederastic motif. And through the curse of Pelops on Laios as confirmed by Apollo's oracle the sin of the father very naturally resulted in the parricide as punishment. Euripides thus motivated the oracle of Apollo which in Sophokles still stood unmotivated. How Euripides treated the Sphinx we do not know. The fact that it appeared after the parricide compels us to assume that, if motivated, it could at any rate not have been motivated by the sin of Laios.

---

125 Think especially of his *Chrysippos* and, to a lesser extent, also of his *Phoinissai*.
126 Cf. *Phoin.* 44.
If we now consider the Peisandros scholium, we immediately notice a later and lesser mind at work who after Sophokles and Euripides deliberately attempted a product more soundly motivated. In the process he dragged in the Chrysippos motif of Euripides, but not to result directly in a parricide and thus to motivate the warning oracle of Apollo, but to result in the menace of the Sphinx. Unmistakably one gains the impression, as already said, that his inspiration came from the plague of the O.T. whereby the community as a whole was punished for the sin of the individual. One also gets the idea that it was purposely attempted to motivate the Sphinx which in Sophokles (and presumably also in Euripides) was still unmotivated. And in this effort the scholiast’s novum was that he consciously de-throned Apollo, who in Sophokles is actually always lurking in the background, and replaced him by Hera Gamostolos. Thus he deliberately ‘improved’ on Sophokles and Euripides by creating a structure in which everything is motivated—except the oracle of Apollo which, in accordance with older views on this score, he apparently felt needed no particular motivation. He motivated the parricide by Laios’ disobedience to Apollo’s oracle; the Sphinx was motivated both by the married Laios’ sin of abducting Chrysippos for erotic motives, which practically set the ball rolling, and by the anger of Hera Gamostolos. And to achieve this the writer had to alter certain Euripidean facts radically. He had to eliminate the curse of Pelops, and by his emphasis that it was Hera in her capacity as Gamostolos that dominated the scene, he also had to alter the time and the circumstances of the Sphinx’s appearance. And to give his creation the mark of authenticity he saw to it that certain typically archaic motifs, for instance the very primitive anagnorismos, were included.

Who was the writer? The scholium gives the story under the name of Peisandros. And we have every indication that the scholiast himself did not make any radical alterations to the finished product of this elusive Peisandros. But this is about the nearest we come to the truth. The mythographer, rather than the writer of epic or tragedy, respects a structure which is at all costs soundly motivated. If we may surmise in the midst of uncertainties, one would be inclined to suggest that Peisandros was a Hellenistic mythographer, rather than an epic or tragic poet. A comparison of his treatment of Hera with that of Apollodoros also suggests that the finished scholium came after rather than before Apollodoros, since the scholiast, or Peisandros his source, had considered all the implications of Hera’s association with the Sphinx—something Apollodoros had not done.

The important deduction we can draw from our scholium is that, because we cannot determine all its sources with absolute certainty, we have no right to rely on it alone in our reconstruction of the Oidipodia.
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