Genesis and Euripides: Exchange in Virtue Ethics between Israel and Hellas in the Classical and Hellenistic Period[*]

EVANGELIA G. DAFNI

(CENTRE FOR SEPTUAGINT STUDIES, EFL, ATHENS

AND RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, DEPARTMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT, U.P.)

ABSTRACT

Several common motives and linguistic features in the works of Euripides and in the Hebrew and Greek Old Testament are an indication that an intellectual and linguistic exchange took place between the Greek and Hebrew people during the Classical and the Hellenistic period. This paper focuses on those methodological issues that entail an examination of the relationship between Greek and Hebrew literature and thought. Both traditional and current research trends are taken into consideration. As a starting point I use the theme of monogamy vs. polygamy in the Andromache of Euripides and the Genesis narratives.

A   INTRODUCTION: THE NECESSITY FOR COMPARATIVE STUDIES IN ANCIENT GREEK AND HEBREW LITERATURE

1.1 Ancient Greek authors have been considered as a kind of guidance for biblical scholars on how to understand and explain scriptural rhetoric. The issue of a literary relationship or even mutual dependence between Ancient Greek and Hebrew Literature still seems to be a *taboo* in the scholarly discussion, in spite of the fact that some Ancient Greek and Jewish Alexandrian voices report about it (Reinach 1895, Stern 1976-1984).

Diodorus Siculus (1st c. BC) preserved in the 40th chapter of his library, as quoted by Photius I, the Patriarch of Constantinople (9th c. AD), fragments of the Greek historian and Sceptic philosopher Hecateus of Abdera (4th c. BC), who claimed that both the Greeks and the Jews had had the same cultural origins, namely Egypt, where they had lived as foreigners. After an epidemic outbreak of pestilence, the local folk laid charges against all foreigners who

---

[*]   Lecture delivered at the Faculty of Theology, University of Stellenbosch, on 23rd October 2006.

dwelled in their country and decided to drive them out of its borders. Thereafter the foreigners had to escape by moving from Egypt to Hellas and Judah. An elite, under the leadership of distinguished men like Cadmus and Danaus, settled in Hellas. It is worth mentioning that Cadmus, the son of the king of Phoenicia and brother of Europe, was regarded by the Greeks to be the one who brought the Phoenician alphabet to Hellas (Herodotus, Hist. 5.58). Danaus, the founder of the Mycenean culture, was the twin brother of Aegyptus and son of Belus, a mythical king of Egypt. According to Hecateus of Abdera, the majority of the ordinary people under the leadership of Moses, who was distinguished from the ordinary people by his wisdom and courage, settled in Judah, which is not far away from Egypt and at that time had only been a wasteland.

> Κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον τὸ παλαιὸν λοιμικῆς περιστάσεως γενομένης, ἀνέπεμπον οἱ πολλοὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῶν κακῶν ἐπὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον πολλῶν γὰρ καὶ παντοδαπῶν κατοικούντων ξένων καὶ διηλλαγμένοις ἔθεσι χρωμένων περὶ τῶν ἱερὸν καὶ τὰς θυσίας, καταλελύσθαι συνέβαινε παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς τὰς πατρίους τῶν θεῶν τιμάς. ὅπερ οἱ τῆς χώρας ἐγγενεῖς ὑπέλαβον, ἐὰν μὴ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους μεταστήσονται, κρίσιν οὐκ ἔσεσθαι τῶν κακῶν. εὐθὺς οὖν ξενηλατουμένων τῶν ἀλλοεθνῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐπιφανέστατοι καὶ δραστικώτατοι συστραφέντες ἐξερρίφη- σαν, ὥς τινὲς φασιν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καί τινας ἑτέρους τόπους, ἔχοντες ἀξιολόγους ἡγεμόνας, ὧ ἡγοῦντο Δαναός καὶ Κάδμος τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιφανέστατοι. ὁ δὲ πολὺς λεὼς ἐξέπεσεν εἰς τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Ἰουδαίαν, οὐ πόρρω μὲν κειμένην τῆς Αἰγύπτου, παντελῶς δὲ ἔρημον οὖσαν κατ᾽ ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους ἡγεῖτο δὲ τῆς ἀποικίας ὁ προσαγο- ρευόμενος Μωσῆς, φρονήσει τε καὶ ἀνδρεία πολὺ διαφέρων... (Photius, Bibl. 244p380a = Diodorus Siculus, Bibl. 40).

It is obvious that Hecateus, as being handed down by Diodorus Siculus and Photius, did not make an ethnic or even racial distinction between Greeks and Jews, but a distinction of rank order according to high intellectual and ethical qualities. Therefore, an ethnic differentiation was only made after their settlement in Hellas and Judah. It is obvious that since the Classical era the idea of a close relationship between Greeks and Jews has been circulating in order to justify mental similarities with the explanation that both peoples had originally been foreigners in the same cultural ark – even though they could never identify themselves with the Egyptian religious customs. Accordingly, Greeks and Jews did not simply meet each other in Egypt in the Hellenistic period, but originally they had been different groups of the same people, who over the centuries went their own ways separately and found each other once again in Alexandria. In the New Testament, as well as in the later Christian and Jewish literary traditions, we encounter the fruits of this encounter again.

Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine (260/264-337/340 AD), known as the father of the early Church History, quotes a fragment of Aristobulus of Paneas

(160 BC), a Jewish Peripatetic philosopher, who had claimed that Pythagoras and Plato had been students of Moses (Praep. 10.3ss) and that the best of their philosophical conceptions could be indebted to him. But how could they have been students of Moses without knowing the five books of Moses? And how could they have had access to them, if not without oral or written translations? If the Greek authors could not understand Hebrew, we then have to assume that apart from the first complete translation of the Hebrew Law into Greek (the so-called Pentateuch), incomplete and partial Greek translations of the Hebrew Scriptures must have been in existence even before the Septuagint-project in local Hebrew communities – not only in Egypt, but also in Ionia. The Greek Pentateuch, which, according to the letter of Aristeas, was translated during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, was initiated by Demetrius Phalereus (4th-3rd c. BC), one of the first Peripatetics. Aristobulus tried to establish a close relationship between Greek thought and Hebrew belief, using Pythagorian and Platonic concepts. It is thus questionable whether his view ought to be under-stood in the light of the theme called 'Greeks' theft', as Dorival claims (http://www.lxxathens2001.org/Papers/Gilles Dorival.dsp). Or if it is suggested that one should talk about linguistic and mental exchange which had already taken place between Greeks and Jews during (or rather before) the Archaic pe-riod with highlights in the Classical era.

In sum, Hecateus of Abdera and Aristobulus addressed the real issue of the relationship between Greek and Hebrew literature and thought from two different perspectives: a) *The Classical Greek perspective* dealt with interac-tions between Hebrew and Greek people and had already emphasised their common cultural roots (Egypt) in the Pre-Mycenean period, which together with their creative thought were believed to be centrally involved in their unique and inimitable literary production. b) *The Jewish-Hellenistic perspective* paid more attention to the Archaic and Classical periods and highlighted the dependence of the Greek thought upon the Hebrew literary tradition, respec-tively from Moses, as the human guarantee of the written, supernaturally re-vealed, divine word. These perspectives are not mutually exclusive, but they rather seem to complement each other. Lack or even ignorance of supporting archaeological evidence, as well as scanty knowledge of both languages and literatures have so far not promoted awareness of this specific research field.

1.2 As I began to work on the relationship between Plato and Genesis 1-11 (Dafni 2001:569-584 & 2006a:584-632; 2006b:1139-1161), I realised that, even if we do not believe the Greek and Jewish voices from Antiquity and the Byzantine period, we at least have to acknowledge that a kind of closer literary and mental exchange must have taken place between Greek and Hebrew people – already before Plato. The linguistic parallels led me, among others, to the tragedies of Euripides. Those parallels predominately reflect an intensive discussion about what Genesis 2:23-24 means. The difficulties appear especially when one explains it as a *locus classicus* for monogamous

relationships in Ancient Israel and Hellas. Almost all preserved Euripidean tragedies deal with this problem, giving plentiful mythological paradigms, which indicate that, only in a few exceptions the ideal expressed in Genesis 2:23-24 can be a reality.

For the present paper I have chosen the tragedy *Andromache* by Euripides, performed in c. 430/425 BC, and the Genesis narratives dealing with the theme 'monogamy versus polygamy'. My aim is to comment on key-words and -expressions which can be an indication of a possible relationship between the two works, as well as help us to understand why an exchange between Hebrew and Greek people before Euripides, especially within the area of virtue ethics (*Aretology*), is a possibility, and not an intellectual theft. We can also detect the impact thereof in the New Testament.

B   THE CASE 'MONOGAMY VERSUS POLYGAMY' IN EURI-PIDES' ANDROMACHE AND GENESIS 2

I would like to begin my comments by paying attention to the quintessence of the tragedy of Euripides *Andromache*, which seems to be summarised in the speech of Hermione in Andr 177ss. Hermione, the daughter of Menelaus and Helena, is married to the son of Achilleus, Neoptolemus, and appears to represent a moral absolutism which tolerates no novelty values regarding marriage and family life at all. She says:

	Way's translation
Οὐδὲ γὰρ καλὸν	We count it shame
δυοῖν γυναικοῖν ἄνδρ᾽ ἕν᾽ ἡνίας ἔχειν,	that o'er two wives one man hold wedlock's reins;
ἀλλ᾽ εἰς μίαν βλέποντες εὐναίαν Κύπριν	But to one lawful love man turn their eyes,
στέργουσιν, ὅστις μὴ κακῶς οἰκεῖν θέλει.	Content-all such as look for peace in the home.

This demand of monogamy, which guarantees the family peace, will be interpreted by Andromache not as an expression of an extremely conservative Greek moral code (as represented by Hermione), but as a result of a lack of experience, thought and good judgement. The formulation οὐδὲ γὰρ καλὸν seems to continue and explicate a thought process, which had already begun in Genesis 2:18. In the Old Greek translation of Genesis 2:18 (from the 3rd c. BC), we read Οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον – לא־טוב היות האדם לבדו ('*It is not good that the man should be alone*'). Euripides seems to add: '***but** it is **also** not good that over two wives one man hold wedlock's reins*'. If the theory of improvised, partial pre-Septuagint translations of Hebrew scriptural pericopes into Greek is correct, then the Euripidean formulation may reflect oral or written material which had been available, and been handed down in a comparable manner to the Homeric epics. The Euripidean expression could,

therefore, be a response to the biblical demand, which is not quite without its own problems.

The biblical expression *'it is not good that the man should be alone'* seems to be the reasonable justification of the divine formation of the woman, who had been formed from the man's body and composed as a helper corresponding to him (Gen 2:21). After the creation of the woman, God was scripturally depicted as 'a father who presents his son with a valuable gift that is bound to please him and be cherished by him' (Cassuto 1989[4]:133). The man expresses his pleasure with a unique love-song (Gen 2:23a), which in later Old Testament passages was understood as a *Verwandtschaftsformel*, namely a formula designating close relatives (e.g. Gen 29:14: Laban and Jacob). Adam says:

Τοῦτο νῦν ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου,	This now is bone of my bones,
καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός μου·	and flesh of my flesh;

It is thus not the man himself, as was traditionally understood, but the story-teller reading the words of the man prospectively, who explains them with a) an aetiology of the term 'woman' (Gen 2:23b-c):

αὕτη κληθήσεται γυνή,	she shall be called woman (wife),
ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐλήφθη αὕτη.	because she was taken out of her husband.

and b) a formula, which was later incorporated into the New Testament and subsequently into Christian moral theology, emphasising the significance of a monogamous relationship between man and woman (Gen 2:24):

Ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέραν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέραν αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ·	Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife,
καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.	and they two shall be one flesh.

I would like to remind the reader that Matthew 19:5 implies that these are the words of God who had made human beings to be male and female. Matthew uses these words in order to give an answer to the question the Pharisees raised about the legitimacy of divorce; and namely only for being unchaste, and thus not for any other reason whatsoever. On the other hand, Paul quotes the closing sentence of Genesis 2:24, according to the LXX, namely *'and they **two** shall be **one** flesh',* in 1 Corinthians 6:16 to say that *'whoever joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her… (17) but anyone joining himself to the Lord becomes one spirit with him'.* In this way Paul puts the question of a biological or a spiritual understanding of the Old Testament text concerning sexual immorality and prostitution on the table, but not the issue of polygamy.

The Old Testament expression '*and they two shall be one flesh*' highlights the explanation of the storyteller, and it has direct parallels in Plato's Symposion, which I have already discussed (Dafni 2001 & 2006a), as well as in a fragment by Euripides (see Lesky 1976:146).

Genesis 2:24c has traditionally been understood as a reference i) to sexual relations of a married couple, ii) the spiritual relationship of the marriage partners, apart from the fact that they could remain childless, and iii) biologically, regarding the birth of a child, who is the fulfilment of a harmonic sexual and spiritual unity and carries the characteristics of both father and mother, and shares their values. In Genesis 2:23-24 the storyteller calls the reader's attention to the fact that marriage is a fundamental institution of every human community. However, the formulation '*a man shall leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his woman and they two shall be one flesh*' does not give any supporting arguments in favour of monogamy against polygamy, but the obligation to state reasons for monogamy.

On the other hand, the Euripidean formulation '*it is not good that one man over two wives hold wedlock's reins*', in the form of an aphorism, seems to be a linguistic rearrangement and mental replacement of the biblical text by means of the integration of traditional topics from Greek antiquity. This phrase focuses primarily on a certain situation, through which the lines of distinction between Greek and barbarian habits are fuzzy. It thus does not categorically forbid people to practise polygamy, but it also does not approve it. The aim of the text is rather to call attention to virtues with universal applicability. In my view, Euripides here applies schemes and central features of Genesis 2:20-24 to certain figures of the Trojan War and their blood relatives in order to make the wishes and decisions of the protagonists abundantly clear and to articulate the good habits one should obtain.

The Euripidean formulation '*it is not good that one man over two wives hold wedlock's reins*' refers to the fact that after the Trojan War the lawful wife of the dead Hector, Andromache, was taken captive by the Greeks and given as a special prize to Achilleus' son, Neoptolemus. She gave birth to his son, Molossus. After that had happened, Menelaus gave his daughter, Hermione, who was barren, as lawful wife to Neoptolemus. Andromache and her son Molossus were loved by Neoptolemus, but the childless Hermione was maltreated and hated. Andromache remained faithful to Hector and Neoptolemus' love to her seemed to be for Hector's sake (Andr 203: φιλοῦσι γὰρ μ' Ἕλληνες Ἕκτορος τ' ἄπο), as well as for the sake of the child who was the future succesor of Aeacos' line. This caused a lot of rivalry between the women, and subsequently to Menelaus' decision to slay Andromache and her son for the sake of his maltreated daughter. Menelaus understood blood-relationship as a motive for revenge and also expected from Peleus, the father of Achilleus, to inflict punishment in return for the murder of his son by Paris,

the brother of Hector, whose wife had now given birth to the bastard child of Achilleus' son Neoptolemus, the grandson of Peleus. Even if Menelaus used an expression which reminds one of the significance of 'one flesh', namely τοῦ σοῦ παιδὸς αἵματος κοινουμένη (Andr 654), the intention is retaliation and thus not mercy or forgiveness at all.

This is the reason that the Chorus says in Andr 464-470:

Οὐδέποτε δίδυμα λέκτρ᾽ ἐπαινέσω βροτῶν	Never rival brides blessed marriage-estate,
οὐδ᾽ ἀμφιμάτορας κόρους,	Neither sons not born of one mother:
ἔριδας οἴκων δυσμενεῖς τε λύπας.	They were strife to the home, they were anguish of hate.
μίαν μοι στεργέτω πόσις γάμοις	For the couch of the husband suffice one mate:
ἀκοινώνητον ἀνδρὸς εὐνάν.	Be it shared of none other.

Therefore, monogamy as the only legitimate state of marriage appears in *Andromache* of Euripides, as well as in Genesis 2:23-24, as something which is desirable. It has, however, never been given as a valid reason in either the patriarchal narratives, or in the stories of the heroes of the Trojan.

C   MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIFE IN GENESIS NARRATIVES

A closer examination of the Genesis narratives regarding the family history of Israel's most important ancestors, namely Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, shows clearly that they focus predominately on arranged marriages between blood relatives from a patriarchal perspective. Polygamy is here regarded as normative and love only plays a secondary role in all of these narratives. The reason is because God's plan in the history of his chosen people stands in the centre of the storyteller's attention, and not the historical lot of individual personalities.

Abraham was married to the originally childless Sarah and begot his first-born son Ishmael from a slave girl, Hagar the Egyptian. Sarah, after the birth of her own son, Isaac, asked Abraham to drive the slave girl and her son Ishmael away (Gen 21:10f.), in order not to share the inheritance with her lawful son Isaac. You are reminded that Menelaus (in the name of his childless and disregarded daughter) was anxious that the bastard child of Andromache will be king and successor of Aeacos' line, and decided to eliminate it with its mother. In both examples, the Old Testament and the Euripidean, we can establish the scheme 'two persons, who become one flesh', referring to nuclear families consisting of the father, mother and a child (Euripides), or rather one of the children (Genesis narratives), who will play an important role in the historical continuation of the family, namely 1) Andromache-Neoptolemus-Molossus by Euripides, and 2) Abraham-Sarah-Isaac, as well as 2) Abraham-Hagar-Ishmael in the Abraham narratives.

As John Goldingay (2003:268-269) says, only the arranged marriage of Isaac and Rebecca turned out to be a loving bond following the example set by Genesis 2:23-24; Isaac leaves his dead mother and cleaves on to his wife, but the couple will soon be divided by the love for their twin sons, Jacob and Esau. *'In obedience to his father and mother'*, Jacob went to Paddan-Aram to choose a wife there, but he had to become attached not only to one but to two wives; two sisters, Leah and Rachel, who are also his first cousins, and two concubines, the slave-maids of Leah and Rachel (Gen 29:1-30). In this case, the women had to leave their father and cleave on to their husband, who in turn saw in his twelve children the fulfilment of God's blessing to him in a dream: (Gen 28:14-15): *'Your descendants will be as plentiful as the dust on the ground; you will spread out to the west and east, to the north and south, and all clans on earth will bless themselves by you and your descendants. (15) Be sure, I am with you; I shall keep you safe wherever you go, and bring you back to this country, for I shall never desert you until I have done what I have promised you.* But only one of the children will save the whole family, namely the first son of the beloved wife, Joseph, the son of Rachel.

D   MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIFE IN EURIPIDES' ANDRO-MACHE

The book of Genesis does not appear to have any interest at all in proving that the scheme man-woman-one flesh/child in the family life of the patriarchs had been fulfilled. Whereas, on the contrary, Euripides organized the whole material of Andromache on the basis of exactly this scheme; of course with deviations providing the variety and diversity of the human life, as well as many degenerations of this simple structure of the ideal marriage. It is remarkable that, in contrast to the patriarchal Old Testament family life, Euripides talked about matriarchal family structures in the mythological past of the Ancient Greek Classical Ages. Instead of Abraham and his wives, he preferred the scheme Andromache and her husbands. But he passed a value judgment:

a) It is not by chance that, at the beginning and the end of the tragedy, he talks with obvious enthusiasm about Thetis, an immortal goddess of justice, who never had to bear children, and Peleus a mortal king, son of Aeacos, and their son Achilleus, a demigod. In the Euripidean value system, they personify the ideal nuclear family. This family bond has been destroyed through the murder of Achilleus. But Achilleus lives on in his son, Neoptolemus, and in his son's son, Molossus. This ideal pair, whose marriage is based on mutual love, will remain united in honourable wedlock eternally. Euripides explains that Thetis made Peleus a deity, who knows neither death nor decay. Both, god and goddess, now dwell together in the palace of Nereus, who was believed to be a wiser sea god and to have the power of prophecy.

b) Andromache, Hector and their son Astyanax had been portrayed as an ideal family bond between mortals, which was now also destroyed. After the death of Hector and Astyanax, at the end of the Trojan War, it can never again be restored. The memory of the beloved husband and child continues to live in the new child of Andromache, Molossus, from a symbiotic relationship, similar to marriage, with Achilleus' son Neoptolemus. The new husband admires and respects Andromache as a virtuous woman, the wife of a great hero of the Trojan War, whose original ideal marriage bond is broken through violence and blood, and as the mother of his own son, who will continue the royal line of Aeacos. It is remarkable that Euripides avoids revealing whether there is something more that unites Andromache with Neoplolemus. In terms of the plot, it is important for him to say that, after the murder of Neoptolemus by Orestis, Andromache gets married again to Hellenus, in whose homeland Molossus becomes king and ancestor of his own royal line.

Degenerative forms were described by Euripides in *Andromache* as follows: a) the marriage of convenience between Neoptolemus and Hermione, after Menelaus, her father, separated her from Orestis, her childhood love. This marriage remains childless, Hermione is hated by her husband and her husband is murdered by her lover, Orestis, who wants to take Hermione, his first cousin, as his wife. It is worthy to mention that Orestis and Hermione are children of two brothers (Agamemnon and Menelaus) and two sisters (Clytaimnestra and Helene), whose marriages are the *epitome* of degeneration in the Ancient Greek Mythology. I refer to b) the marriage of Menelaus and Helena, who joins with Paris and gives the reason of the Trojan War; c) the marriage of Agamemnon and Clytaimnestra, not explicitly mentioned in this tragedy. Clytaimnestra and Aigisthos, her lover, murdered her husband, Agamemnon, after he had returned from Troy. Both of them found death by the hand of her own son, Orestis.

The idea that two persons function as one is expressed only in Andr 495 through σύγκρατον ζεῦγος ('two yoked as one' or 'two united souls') regarding Andromache and her son Molossos, because they equally carry the heaviest load of death, commanded by Menelaus (Andr 492-500):

καὶ μὴν ἐσορῶ	Lo, these I behold, twain yoked as one
τόδε σύγκρατον ζεῦγος πρὸ δόμων,	In love, in sorrow, afront of the hall:
ψήφῳ θανάτου κατακεκριμένον.	For the vote is cast and the doom forth gone.
δύστηνε γύναι, τλῆμον δὲ σὺ παῖ,	O woeful mother, O hapless son,
μητρὸς λεχέων ὃς ὑπεραποθνήσκεις	Who must die, since her master hath humbled his thrall,
οὐδὲν μετέχων	Though naught death-worthy hast thou, child, done,
οὐδ᾿ αἴτιος ὢν βασιλεῦσιν.	That in condemnation of kings thou shouldst fall!

E   EXAMPLES OF THE SCHEME 'TWO TO ONE' IN EURIPIDES' ANDROMACHE

We find the scheme ***many/two to one*** in the speech of Andromache, who gives the following response to the accusations of Hermione (Andr 216-221):

Τύραννον ἔσχες ἄνδρ᾽, ἵν᾽ ἐν μέρει λέχος	Thou hadst for lord a prince, where one man shares
δίδωσι **πολλαῖς εἷς ἀνὴρ κοινούμενο**,	The wedlock-right in turn with many wives,

The relationship between the two wives and the one common husband is compared with the image of a twofold yoke of kings who restrict the freedom of the people in a land, make their life extremely difficult to bear and lead to rebellion (Andr 473-476):

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν πόλεσι	Never land but hath borne a twofold yoke
Δίπτυχοι τυραννίδες	Of kings with wearier straining:
Μιᾶς ἀμείνονες φέρειν,	There is burden on burden, and feud mid her folk:
ἄχθος ἐπ᾽ ἄχθει καὶ στάσις πολίταις·	

The rest of this passage (Andr 477-478) focuses on the example of the disharmony, if two rival lyres attempt to play the same song:

τεκόντοιν θ᾽ ὕμνον ἐργάταιν δυοῖν	And twixt rival lyres ever discord broke
ἔριν Μοῦσαι φιλοῦσι κραίνειν·	By the Muses' ordaining.

The same disharmony can be seen in the guidance of a ship by two helmsmen in staggering sail. Euripides says that *'collective wisdom has less weight than the inferior mind of the single man who has sole authority'* (Andr 479-484):

Πνοαὶ δ᾽ ὅταν φέρωσι ναυτίλους θοαί,	When the blasts hurl onward the staggering sail,
κατὰ πηδαλίων δίδυμαι πραπίδων γνῶμαι	Shall the galley by helmsmen twain be guided?
σοφῶν τε πλῆθος ἀθρόον ἀσθενέστερον	Wise counsellors many far less shall avail
φαυλοτέρας φρενὸς αὐτοκρατοῦς	Than the simple one's purpose and power undivided.
ἑνός, ἀ δύνασις ἀνά τε μέλαθρα κατά τε πόλιας,	Even this in the home, in the city, is power
ὁπόταν εὑρεῖν θέλωσι καιρόν.	Unto such as have wit to discern the hour.

In Genesis, the central idea of these depictions is well-developed especially in the narratives focussing in the rivalries between Jacob's wives, Lea and Rachel.

In the New Testament, we find this scheme as well as the linguistic inventory especially in the word's of the Lord in Matth 6:24: Οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει.

It is not necessarily the scheme itself, but much more the abstract principle expressed by this scheme as well as its applicability, that are important for the reception history.

Euripides gives concrete paradigms based on common experience. He opens the door to the abstraction through simplification, pointing out the essence of power in both house and state, as well as the virtues of men and women, who make the biblical scheme, two, man and woman, one flesh, to be a reality. I will now give more examples:

F   VIRTUES OF MEN AND WOMEN IN MARRIAGE

Andr 206-208 and Gen 2:20.23

Hermione accuses Andromache that she made her husband to hate her by using magical philtres. Andromache responds that it was not her sorcery, but Hermione's failure to be a suitable helper to him.

οὐκ ἐξ ἐμῶν φαρμάκων στυγεῖ πόσις,	Not of my philtres thy lord hateth thee,
ἀλλ' εἰ ξυνεῖναι μὴ 'πιτηδεία κυρεῖς.	But that thy nature is no mate for his.
φίλτρον δὲ καὶ τόδ'· οὐ τὸ κάλλος, ὦ γύναι,	This is the love charm-woman, 'tis not beauty
ἀλλ' ἀρεταὶ τέρπουσι τοὺς ξυνευνέτας.	That witcheth bridegrooms, nay, but nobleness.

According to Andromache, to attain and secure a husband's love and faith, a woman must prove herself to be her husband's willing help-mate. Love's only charm does not lie in beauty, but in nobleness and virtuous acts. That can win men's hearts. This ethical sentence of Andromache recalls Genesis 2:20 and 23 and seems to be an interpretation of what it really means to be a suitable helper, so that the husband can recognize her as *'bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh'*.

Andr 213-221 and Gen 2:20

χρὴ γὰρ γυναῖκα, κἂν κακῷ πόσει δοθῇ,	A wife, though low-born be her lord, must yet
στέργειν, ἅμιλλάν τ' οὐκ ἔχειν φρονήματος.	Content her, without wrangling arrogance.
εἰ δ' ἀμφὶ Θρῄκην χιόνι τὴν κατάρρυτον	But if in Thrace with snow-floods over-streamed
τύραννον ἔσχες ἄνδρ', ἵν' ἐν μέρει λέχος	Thou hadst for lord a prince, where one man shares

δίδωσι πολλαῖς εἷς ἀνὴρ κοινούμενος,	The wedlock-right in turn with many wives,
ἔκτεινας ἂν τάσδ ; εἶτ ἀπληστίαν λέχους	Wouldst thou have slain these? Ay, and so be found
πάσαις γυναιξὶ προστιθεῖσ ἂν ηὑρέθης.	Branding all women with the slur of lust,
αἰσχρόν γε· καίτοι χεῖρον ἀρσένων νόσον	Which were our shame! True, more than men's our hearts
ταύτην νοσοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ προὔστημεν καλῶς.	Sicken for love; yet honour curbs desire.

Andromache recognizes also that neither she nor Hermione are willingly bound up to Neoptolemus. She is a captive and Hermione had to follow her father's will. Therefore, Andromache points out the kind of additional qualities a woman ought to develop in order to be a helpful partner, even though the man, upon whom she unwillingly has been bestowed by her father, is low-born or morally worthless (κακός), namely: a) to be content with him, without wrangling arrogance, advancing presumptuous claims b) to be willing to forgive, even if the husband shares his affections with a host of wives, c) to be without slur of lust/insatiate lust, and d) though women's hearts sicken for love more than men's, they ought to give priority to honour than to desire.

What does it truly mean to practice these virtues? Andromache illustrates this with a hyperbole in Andr 222-225:

ὦ φίλταθ Ἕκτορ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν	Ah, dear, dear Hector, I would take to my heart
σοὶ καὶ ξυνήρων, εἴ τί σε σφάλλοι Κύπρις,	Even thy leman, if Love tripped thy feet.
καὶ μαστὸν ἤδη πολλάκις νόθοισι σοῖς	Yea, often to thy bastards would I hold
ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρόν.	My breast, that I might give thee none offence.

Andr 225-231

Actions of jealousy, running after men and adoption of the habits of evil mothers are morally not permitted.

καὶ ταῦτα δρῶσα τἀρετῇ προσηγόμην	So doing, I drew with cords of wifely love
πόσιν· σὺ δ᾽ οὐδὲ ῥανίδ᾽ ὑπαιθρίας δρόσου	My lord: - but thou for jealous fear forbiddest
τῷ σῷ προσίζειν ἀνδρὶ δειμαίνουσ᾽ ἐᾷς.	Even gloaming's dews to drop upon thy lord!
μὴ τὴν τεκοῦσαν τῇ φιλανδρίᾳ, γύναι,	Seek not to o érpass in cravings of desire
ζήτει παρελθεῖ· τῶν κακῶν γὰρ μητέρων	Thy mother, lady. Daughters in whom dwells

φεύγειν τρόπους χρὴ τέκν᾽, ὅσοις ἔνεστι νοῦς.	Direction, ought to flee vile mother's paths.

The non-Greek Andromache and the Greek Peleus share the same universal view of moral excellence of a man and a woman. In the stichomyth of Peleus and Menelaus, Peleus postulates 'models of virtue'. While Andromache reproaches Menelaus for fraud saying that he has one word upon his lips and another in his heart (453), Peleus emphasises that Menelaus should not rank himself with men, because he is the chief of the cowards (590f.), unable to educate his wife and his daughter in virtue (600f.). For he let Paris rob him his worthless wife, caused an unrighteous war, robbed noble sons and left grey mothers and white-haired sires childless. Peleus gives priority to **education** by observing blood-relationship. So he reminds that he had advised his grandson to marry the daughter of a good mother and warned him not to take home the daughter of an evil mother, because the daughters bear the marks of the ill-repute of their mothers into their new homes.

G   CONCLUSIONS

When asking about certain common characteristics which are mutually dependent on a literary level, it is necessary to talk about a syntagma-paradigm, or rather, a norm-application-relationship between Genesis 2, Patriarchal stories and Euripides' tragedy Andromache. Genesis 2:23-24 explicates the ideal, the Patriarchal stories tells us what happens in the historical life of Israel's ancestors, while Andromache deals with paradigms of the background of the Trojan War and the consequences in the life of Greek and non-Greek people, men and women, from both a particular and a universal point of view. However, the main question is: how did the author of Genesis 2:23-24 arrive at a hymn on Monogamy, if his historical experience only gave him examples of polygamous relationships? Is it not possible that Genesis 2:23-24 was added as a later appendix (annex) into the text in order to legitimise the monogamous marriage and family life in dependence on classical Greek moral expressed from the time of Homer to the tragic poets?

Principles and values which are expressed, for the first time, in the so-called *Urgeschichte* (Gen 1-11) have been exemplified in the stories of the Patriarchs (*Patriarchenerzählungen*). However, a discrepancy can be established between the Primeval History (*Urgeschichte*) and the Patriarchal stories.

In my view, Euripides seems to reconsider Ancient Greek issues as the Homeric epics raise them and the oral traditions or rather the Ionian critical thinking worked on and modified them also from the perspective of the Pentateuch, which was supposedly known orally or in written form through early Greek translations of the five books of Moses, as well as through the Ionian thinkers, who were first confronted with the translation of biblical texts. It must

be assumed that the first exchange between Greek and Hebrew people took place in Ionia. Through the Pre-Socratic thinking it had been transferred into Classical Athens. However, neither the works of the Pre-Socratic philosophers have been completely saved, nor has any witness to this exchange been explicitly mentioned in the works of the classical authors. We can only assume it indirectly through the specific usage of the language.

Euripides obviously must have recognised a discrepancy between Genesis 2:23-24, which has been considered as the *locus classicus* for establishing monogamy, and the whole book of Genesis, which in turn permanently talks about polygamous relationships of Israel's Patriarchs. Therefore, he wanted to bridge the gap between an ideal world belonging to the divine sphere, and his historical experience, which must be understood in connection to his own two unhappy marriages to Choerile and Melito. He attempted to emphasise the significance of monogamy while describing polygamous relationships in a derogatory way, namely as a degeneration of the applied moral of marriage into a moral luck, to arrive at practical moral standards and to tell what is justice and injustice. In this sense, he changed the ordering of the biblical scheme 'two to one' and talks in Andromache about 'one to two' respectively.

Matthew and Paul seem to follow comparable methodological ways in order to shed light on ethical theological issues, namely the legitimacy of divorce, sexual immorality, prostitution and belonging to God.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, P. R. 1968. *Exile and Restoration*. A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century BC Philadelphia.

Beers, E. 1914. *Euripides and Later Greek Thought*. Menasha.

Cassuto, U. 1961-1964. *A Commentary on the book of Genesis*, transl. from the Hebrew by I. Abrahams, Vol. 1-2. Jerusalem.

Cook, J. 1998. Greek Philosophy and the Septuagint. JNSL 24, 177-191.

Coleridge, E. P. (transl.). www.greektexts.com/library/**Euripides**/**Andromache**/eng/index.html

Dafni, E. G. 2001. אשה כי מאיש – γυνή ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς (Gen 2,23) - Zur Anthropologie von Genesis 1-11, in Wenín, A. (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis*. *Literature, Redaction and History*, BETL CLV. Leuven, 569-584.

_____ 2006a. Genesis 1-11 und Platos Symposion. Überlegungen zum Austausch von hebräischem und griechischem Sprach- und Gedankengut in der Klassik und im Hellenismus. *OTE* 19/2, 584-632.

_____ 2006b. Platos Symposion und die Septuagintafassung von Genesis 2,23f. Methodische Überlegungen zum Austausch von hebräischem und griechischem

Sprach- und Gedankengut in der Klassik und im Hellenismus. *OTE* 19/3, 1139-1161.

Daube, D. 1949. Rabbinic methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric. HUCA 22, 239-262.

_____ 1953. Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis, in Festschrift H. Lewald. Basel, 27-44.

Decharme, P. 1906. *Euripides and the Spirit of his Dramas*, translated by J. Loeb. London/New York.

Feldmam, L. H. 2006. *Judaism and Hellenism reconsiderd*. JSJ Supp. 107. Leiden/Boston.

Goldingay, J. 2003. *Old Testament Theology, Vol. I: Israel's Gospel.* Downers Grove, IL.

Gordon, C. 1956. *Before the Bible. The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilisations*. New York.

Hengel, M. [1969] 1988³. *Judentum und Hellenismus*. WUNT 10, Tübingen.

_____ 1976. *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren. Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit*. SBS 76. Stuttgart.

_____ 1989. *The 'Hellenisation' of Judea in the First Century after Christ*. London/Philadelphia, Pa.

Kaiser, O. 2000. *Die Bedeutung der griechischen Welt für die alttestamentliche Theologie*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse 7. Göttingen.

Kovacs, D. (transl. & ed.) 1994-2002. *Euripides*, Vol. I-VI, The Loeb Classical Library, Harvard.

_____ 1980. *The Andromache of Euripides: An Interpretation*. Chico, CA.

Lesky, A. 1972³. *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*. Göttingen.

_____ 1976. *Vom Eros der Hellenen*. KVR 1422. Göttingen.

Loader, W. 2004. *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge.

Murrey, G. 1967. *Euripides und seine Zeit*. Darmstadt.

Nestle, W. [1901] 1969. *Euripides. Der Dichter der Griechischen Aufklärung*. Stuttgart.

Reinach, Th. 1895. *Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaisme*. Paris.

Rösel, M. 1994. *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*. BZAW 223. Berlin/New York.

Stern, M. (ed.) 1976-1984. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, Vol. 1-3. Jerusalem.

Way, A. S. (transl. & ed.) 1924. *Euripides*, Vol. II, The Loeb Classical Library. London.

Evangelia G. Dafni, Vice-Director of the Centre for Septuagint Studies, Etaireia ton Filon tou Laou, Athens, Greece. Research associate of Dirk J. Human, Department of Old Testament, University of Pretoria.

E-mail: evangelia.dafni@uni-duisburg-essen.de & evangelia.dafni@uni-due.de