

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Herausgeber:** Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 55 (2009)

**Artikel:** Aiskhylos the forerunner  
**Autor:** Podlecki, Anthony J.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660988>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 04.04.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## VII

ANTHONY J. PODLECKI

### AISKHYLOS THE FORERUNNER

Aiskhylos son of Euphorion of the deme Eleusis was born in 525/4 B.C.E. and "began tragedies as a young man".<sup>1</sup> He is reported to have competed at a festival shortly after 500, possibly that of 496.<sup>2</sup> His first victory was at the Dionysia of 484.<sup>3</sup>

How many dramas did Aiskhylos write *in toto*? We shall probably never know the exact number for certain (nor is it, for our present purposes, very important). Various figures are preserved in the biographical tradition, from a low of 70 (not counting satyr-dramas) to a high of 90; the κατάλογος presented by S. Radt contains 73 titles and various sources considered trustworthy add 8 or 9 more.<sup>4</sup> The Suda-lexicon *s.v.* "Sophokles" says καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξεν τοῦ δράμα πρὸς δράμα ἀγωνίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ τετραλογίαν.<sup>5</sup> This implies that at least before the *début* of the younger dramatist in 468 plays at the Dionysia were normally presented in connected groupings of three tragedies plus satyr-drama. The Hypothesis to Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας reports that in spring 467 Phrynikhos's son Polyphrasmon placed third with

<sup>1</sup> *Vita Aeschyli*, 2 (= S. RADT [ed.], *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 3, *Aeschylus* [Göttingen 1985], [= *TrGF* 3] T 1).

<sup>2</sup> This is a deduction from *TrGF* 3, Tt 52 and 53 a, b (competed with Pratinas and Khoirililos in *Ol.* 70 according to the *Suda s.v.* "Pratinas", and was 'recognized' probably in *Ol.* 70.4. [EUSEB. *Chron.*]).

<sup>3</sup> *TrGF* 3, T 54a, *Marm. Par.* A 50.

<sup>4</sup> The confused and conflicting evidence, along with suggestions for removing the inconsistencies, is at S. RADT *op.cit.* (n.1), 35 and 58-9.

<sup>5</sup> SCALIGER, MEURSIUS: MSS στρατολογίαν οἱ στρατολογεῖσθαι.

Λυκούργεια τετραλογία.<sup>6</sup> With regard to Aiskhylean tetralogies S. Radt lists as “certain” only 5: the tetralogy of 472 whose titles are known but of which only Πέρσαι survives; the tetralogy that contained Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας in 467; the extant three tragedies of Ὀρέστεια in 458; Λυκούργεια consisting in Ἡδωνοί, Βασσαρίδες, Νεανίσκοι and a satyric Λυκοῦργος, of unknown date; and the Danaid-tetralogy of the 460s, probably 463. In addition to the Danaid plays, S. Radt lists 15 other possible tetralogic groups and a variety of suggestions for filling out the four constituent plays, some of which I will touch on in what follows. By my reckoning (counting each title in the various combinations only once), 74 of the known titles have been fitted into tetralogies. But given the apparently unconnected nature of the plays produced in 472, it would be unwise to insist on discovering (and in some cases that means manufacturing) thematic connections among the plays.<sup>7</sup>

Aiskhylos is reported to have said that he considered his tragedies to be “slices (τεμάχῃ) from Homer’s great meals”.<sup>8</sup> What can he have meant by this? The first and most obvious meaning is that he drew characters and plots from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and this indeed seems to have been the case. Μυρμιδόνες and Φρύγες ἢ Ἐκτορος λύτρα have very plausibly been placed first and third in the tetralogy dubbed by F.G. Welcker the “dramatische Ilias”.<sup>9</sup> The first play opened with the Chorus, probably ambassadors sent by the Myrmidons, arriving to reproach their commander for sitting in his tent while the Greek army was

<sup>6</sup> *TrGF* 3, T 58a and b.

<sup>7</sup> A recent discussion of the evidence for productions in tetralogies can be found at M. WRIGHT, “Cyclops and the Euripidean tetralogy”, in *Cambridge Classical Journal* 52 (2006), 23-48: 27 sqq.

<sup>8</sup> *TrGF* 3, T 112a and b. According to E. Fraenkel, “there are few things more exciting in the study of Aeschylus than to watch this most powerful of all the pupils of Homer reshaping the epic motives in a spirit of faithful devotion and supreme originality”, E. FRAENKEL, “Aeschylus: new texts and old problems”, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 28 (1942), 237-58: 239-40.

<sup>9</sup> F.G. WELCKER, *Die Aeschyleische Trilogie Prometheus* (Darmstadt 1824), 415, cited by S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n.1), 113.

suffering from the enemy's assaults;<sup>10</sup> they urged him "not to betray" them in their hour of need.<sup>11</sup> If Ff \*\*132b and c are rightly assigned to Μυρμιδόνες, Akhilleus broke his long silence<sup>12</sup> first by trying to justify his position to the elderly Phoinix and then in a *rhesis*, delivered perhaps to Nestor's son Antilokhos, reflecting on what might be the result if a vote of stoning against him by the Greek army were carried out: victory would then be the Trojans' "without a spear". "If I alone by my absence from the battle caused this great [rout? destruction?], as my comrades say, behold, I am the man who is all in all to the Akhaian host".<sup>13</sup> Further Trojan successes were described, including the burning of Nestor's ship.<sup>14</sup> The arming and sending into battle of Patroklos, and his subsequent death as in *Iliad* 16, have left no traces in the fragments. His death was reported, and perhaps his corpse brought in, by Antilokhos, to whom Akhilleus says in words full of pathos, "lament for me the living rather than him who died, for I have lost my all".<sup>15</sup> At some point in the play Akhilleus or another character called for arms.<sup>16</sup>

It is uncertain which plays stood second and third. The obvious candidates (for those assuming this was a connected tetralogy) are *Νηρεΐδες* and *Φρύγες ἢ Ἐκτορος λύτρα*. From the title of the former it seems safe to assume that the chorus of

<sup>10</sup> *TrGF* 3, Ff 131, 132.

<sup>11</sup> F \*\*132a fr. 8.5.

<sup>12</sup> These silent figures were considered an Aiskhylean trademark (*TrGF* 3, T 1, 19 *sqq.*) and provided Aristophanes with material for a joke (*AR. Ra.* 911 *sqq.*). Cf. O. TAPLIN, "Aeschylean silences and silences in Aeschylus", in *HSPb* 76 (1972), 57-97.

<sup>13</sup> The supplements at the beginnings of verses 10 and 11 are conjectural, but this must be the sense. In general I follow or adapt the translations of H. LLOYD-JONES, "Appendix", in H. WEIR SMYTH (ed.), *Aeschylus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957), where they are available.

<sup>14</sup> *TrGF* 3, Ff 133 and 134.

<sup>15</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 138. I adapt H. Weir Smyth's translation. Several of the citations, presumably from the end of the play, are preserved specifically because of their homoerotic content, an element that finds little if any emphasis in Homer.

<sup>16</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 140.

sea-nymphs, probably in the company of Thetis, appeared to participate in lamentations for a dead hero, and it is his corpse that appears to be referred to in F 153 (speaker not specified), "Let fine linen be put around the body". If the play stood second in the sequence, the corpse was that of Patroklos and it will have been Akhilleus's laments for his dead friend that drew the Nereids forth, as at *Iliad* 18. 65 *sqq.* Little can be said with confidence about other events that may have transpired in the course of the action. M. L. West has, however, made a convincing case for Φρύγες ἢ Ἐκτορος λύτρα as the second play and Νηρεΐδες third. In that case, the corpse in question will be that of Akhilleus and his mother and her attendant sister nymphs sang their dirge for him, as they do in *Odyssey* 24. 47 *sqq.* and the Cyclic Αἰθιοπίς.<sup>17</sup> Whether it was second or third, Φρύγες ἢ Ἐκτορος λύτρα appears to have been a fairly faithful dramatisation of *Iliad* 24. After a short opening exchange with the divine messenger Hermes there was another long silence by a veiled Akhilleus.<sup>18</sup> The aged Priam brought with him an amount of gold equivalent to Hektor's corpse and this was weighed out onstage. Someone referred to "Hektor's dear wife"<sup>19</sup> with, however, an unHomeric patronymic; whether she actually figured as a *dramatis persona* is uncertain. An extra piece of information we owe to a fragment of Aristophanes:<sup>20</sup> the chorus of Phrygians that entered with Priam left an impression with the elaborateness and complexity of the dance-figures that, presumably, the author himself had choreographed.<sup>21</sup> No plausible conjectures have been made as to the satyr-play.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> M. L. WEST, "Iliad and Aethiopsis on the stage: Aeschylus and son", in *CQ* 50 (2000), 338-52: 341 *sq.*

<sup>18</sup> O. TAPLIN, *art. cit.* (n. 12), 63 *sq.*, 75 *sq.*

<sup>19</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 267.

<sup>20</sup> R. KASSEL et C. AUSTIN (edd.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin 1983 - ) [*PCG*], fr. 696; F. WEHRLI (hrsg.), *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar, 9. Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (Basel 1969): Chamaileon, fr. 41 [= *TrGF* 3, T 103].

<sup>21</sup> M. L. WEST, *art. cit.* (n. 17), 341 n. 14.

<sup>22</sup> E. SIMON, "Satyr-plays on vases in the time of Aeschylus", in *The Eye of Greece. Studies in the art of Athens*, ed. by D. KURTZ and B. SPARKES (Cambridge

There was also a tetralogy based on the *Odyssey*. The action of the first play, *Ψυχαγωγοί*, was drawn from *Od.* 11, the title referring to the residents of the neighbourhood of Lake Avernus in Campania who assisted those who, like Odysseus, wished to conjure the dead for purposes of divination. The sparse book fragments were supplemented by the publication in 1980 of *P. Köln* 3.125,<sup>23</sup> “identified with great probability by its first editor [Bärbel Kramer] as from the *Psychagogoi* of Aeschylus”.<sup>24</sup> The passage is in anapaests, and probably comes from the beginning of the play: “Come, stranger, stand on the grassy precincts of the fearful lake and, when you have cut the throat of this victim, let fall the blood, for the lifeless ones to drink, into the dim depths of the reeds. Invoking ancient Earth, and Hermes of the underworld, conveyor of the dead, beg the Zeus of the underworld to send up the swarm of the night-wanderers from the mouths of the river of which a branch, this miserable water, has been sent forth by the streams of the Styx”.<sup>25</sup> At some point in the action the prophet Teiresias prophesied that Odysseus would die in a rather unpleasant manner: a heron would drop on his head the dung-encased sting of some sea-urchin, causing a wound which would fester, with ultimately fatal results.<sup>26</sup> The second play in the *Odyssey*-trilogy may have been *Πηνελοπή*, from which only one one-line citation survives, “I am a Cretan of most ancient lineage”,<sup>27</sup> which has reminded commentators of the frequency with which Crete

1982), 123-48: 132 *sq.*, suggested *Πρόπομποι* (satyrs as escorts for Khryseis, who is being returned to her father Khryses).

<sup>23</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*\*273a.

<sup>24</sup> H. LLOYD-JONES, “Notes on P. Köln III 125 (Aeschylus, *Psychagogoi*?)”, in *ZPE* 42 (1981), 21-2.

<sup>25</sup> Trans. J. RUSTEN, “The Aeschylean Avernus. Notes on P. Köln 3.125 [= F 273a]”, in *ZPE* 45 (1982), 33-8: 34. An alternative setting, Lake Stymphalos in Arkadia, was suggested by H. LLOYD-JONES, *art. cit.* (n. 24) on the basis of *Schol. AR. Ra.* 1266, but this has not found much favour.

<sup>26</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 275. The lines are quoted by a scholiast on *Od.* 11. 134, Teiresias’s prophecy to Odysseus of *θάνατος... ἐξ ἄλός*. Sophokles in his *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ* seems to have followed an alternative version from the Cyclic *Τηλεγονία*, that he would be killed *κατὰ ἄγνοιαν* by Telegonos, his son by Kirke.

<sup>27</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 187.

figures in the tales spun by the Homeric Odysseus to conceal his identity. In his interview with his wife in Book 19, for example, he weaves an elaborate story of his descent from Minos.<sup>28</sup> If Ὀστολόγοι was a tragedy and not, as has sometimes been maintained, a satyr-play,<sup>29</sup> it may have stood third. Two brief citations survive that come from a speech by Odysseus justifying his slaying of the suitors (the title probably designates their relatives who have come to collect their bones) on grounds of the ὑβρισμοὺς οὐκ ἐναϊσίους they had inflicted on him.<sup>30</sup> Κίρκη σατυρική would have made an appropriate completion to the tetralogy. It clearly had to do with Kirke's transformation of Odysseus's men into beasts as in *Od.* 10. 133 *sqq.* In these malign magical activities the satyrs, ever eager to interfere, probably became involved. Did they figure as Kirke's assistants? Nothing can be said with any confidence about the plot.

Two of Aiskhylos's tetralogies were drawn directly from Homer's two epics, but perhaps we can give a wider extension to his reported preference for participation in the Homeric banquet. The plots of several of his plays, which may have had as their direct antecedents poems from the Epic Cycle no longer extant, were present already *in nuce* in the Homeric poems. It is clear that Homer knew in detail the treacherous welcome given to Agamemnon on his homecoming by his faithless wife, and the subsequent vengeance extracted by their son, for he repeatedly brings in that story as a counterpoint to Telemakhos's search for his father.<sup>31</sup> But Homer had at his disposal a

<sup>28</sup> *Od.* 19. 165 *sqq.* Cf. also *Od.* 14. 199 (to Eumaios): ἐκ μὲν Κρητῶν γένος εὐχομαι εὐρειῶν...

<sup>29</sup> That Ὀστολόγοι was not satyric was maintained by, among others, U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Aischylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914), 246-7 n. 1 and A. SOMMERSTEIN, "Comic elements in tragic language: the case of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*", in *The Language of Greek comedy*, ed. by A. WILLI (Oxford 2002), 151-68: 166.

<sup>30</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 179.2, where Eurymakhos is named specifically; in F \*180 the offender is anonymous.

<sup>31</sup> *Od.* 1. 29 *sqq.*, 298 *sqq.*; 3. 303 *sqq.*; 4. 512 *sqq.*; 24. 19 *sqq.* This has often been noted, e.g. by A. GARVIE (ed.), *Aeschylus. Choephoroi* (Oxford 1986), ix *sqq.*, with refs.

vast spectrum of mythic tales, and he demonstrates *en passant* familiarity with a large number of them. Aias's ignominious fate after being cheated — or so he believed — of Akhilleus's armour and Niobe's hubristic boastfulness about her children were in his repertoire, as is clear from Odysseus's encounter with the former in the Underworld (*Od.* 11. 543 *sqq.*) and Akhilleus's lengthy account of Niobe in his cautionary tale to Priam in *Il.* 24. 602 *sqq.* Other figures flit briefly but memorably across his epic screen: Philoktetes left in agony on Lemnos whom "the Argives would soon remember" (*Il.* 2. 721 *sqq.*); the successful campaign of the Argive Epigonoï against Thebes (*Il.* 4. 403 *sqq.*); Thracian Lykourgos's assault on the nurses of Dionysos (*Il.* 6. 130 *sqq.*); Sisyphos of Ephyrê, "craftiest of men" (*Il.* 6. 153), and his eternal agony (*Od.* 11. 593 *sqq.*). Aiskhylos probably had more immediate antecedents for his own handling of the fates of these celebrated figures, but who is to say that the seeds had not been planted in his fertile imagination by Homer's stately hexameters?

The Cyclic *Αἰθιοπίς* provided material for a tetralogy which contained *Μέμνων* and *Ψυχοστασία* (not necessarily in that order, and some have thought these are alternative titles). The action 'continued' that of the *Iliad* with the arrival of the Aithiopian prince Memnon, son of Eos, himself equipped with a set of armour fashioned by Hephaistos. Thetis "prophesied to her son about the encounter with Memnon" (this from the summary in Proklos) and in the ensuing battle Antilokhos, Nestor's son, was killed by Memnon, an event alluded to at *Od.* 4. 187 *sq.* The centrepiece of the tragedy was a visually stunning scene: the *ψυχαί* of Memnon and Akhilleus in opposing balance-pans of Zeus's scales,<sup>32</sup> with their respective divine mothers Eos and Thetis each pleading for her son's life. Eos's plea was in vain, for Memnon was slain in battle by Akhilleus.

<sup>32</sup> Possibly Zeus himself appeared on the *θεολογεῖον* holding his scales (this is denied by O. TAPLIN, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* [Oxford 1977], 431 *sqq.*, but I cannot share his skepticism). In any case, commentators have suggested that Aristophanes was parodying this scene at *Ra.* 1365 *sqq.*

The play possibly ended with the grieving mother's successful appeal to Zeus for immortality for her son. A passing reference at Ar. *Ra.* 963 to Μέμνονας κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους ("with bells on their horses' cheekplates"), besides parodying Aiskhylos's extravagant compounds, may hint at how the visual and sound effects were handled.

A place in this series of Trojan War plays needs to be found for Κᾶρες ἢ Εὐρώπη.<sup>33</sup> The scene was probably Lykia, where Europê had come from Crete with her son Sarpedon. The Chorus was composed of Carians (= Lykians).<sup>34</sup> The longest surviving piece is a passage of 23 lines preserved on a papyrus published by Henri Weil in 1879 and now in the Louvre.<sup>35</sup> Though unnamed, the speaker is clearly Europê. Zeus, who has taken her from her aged father by fraud and "effortlessly" (ἄμοχθον),<sup>36</sup> cannot complain of her fertility for she has borne him three sons, "the greatest", Minos, then the immortal Rhadamanthys, and third Sarpedon. Out of concern for him her mind is tossed by anxious thoughts, for he may have fallen in battle. "For it is famed abroad that the flower of all Hellas is come, men supreme in warlike strength, and that they are confident that they will destroy by violence the city of the Trojans".<sup>37</sup> Sarpedon's

<sup>33</sup> The source may be Eumelos's Εὐρωπία, on which Aiskhylos may also have drawn for his Λυκούργεια (M.L. WEST, *Greek epic fragments from the seventh to the fifth centuries B.C.* [Cambridge, Mass. 2003], fr. 27).

<sup>34</sup> S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 217 quotes STRABO 14.3.3, p. 665 C: "poets, especially the tragedians, are always mixing up the *ethnê*, e.g. they call Trojans, Mysians and Lydians Phrygians, and they call the Lykians Karians". Radt objects that this is not *mera confusio*, but that Europê came from Phoinikia and Phoinikia was once called Karia. (cf. H. MAEHLER [ed.], *Bacchylides. Carmina cum fragmentis* [München 112003], F 40; D.L. PAGE [ed.], *Poetae Melici Graeci*. [Oxford 1962], CORINN. 686). Further discussion by A. KEEN, "Lycians in the *Cares* of Aeschylus", in *Lost dramas of classical Athens. Greek tragic fragments*, ed. by F. MCHARDY, J. ROBSON, D. HARVEY (Exeter 2005), 63-82: 73 sqq. He thinks the action was set at Xanthos in Lykia (78).

<sup>35</sup> *P.Louvre* 7172 (= *TrGF* 3, F \*\*99)

<sup>36</sup> For the effortlessness of (genuinely) divine activity in the Presocratics and Aiskhylos, cf. G. KIRK, J. RAVEN and M. SCHOFIELD, *The Presocratic philosophers* (Cambridge 21983), XENOPHANES fr. 174; AESCH. *Supp.* 595 sqq. (See R. PARKER in these *Entretiens*, pp. 134 sq.).

<sup>37</sup> *TrGF* 3, F\*\*99, 17-19. H. LLOYD-JONES'S translation (*op. cit.* [n. 13]).

rashness in battle may lead him to “do and suffer some (incurable) evil”, so his mother stands on the razor’s edge for fear of striking a reef and spilling out all her good fortune. The climax of the play was probably the report of Sarpedon’s death at the hands of Patroklos, and the carrying of his body to Lykia by Sleep and Death as in *Il.* 16. Since *Europê* refers to the army gathering against Troy *Κᾶρες ἢ Εὐρώπη* possibly stood first in a tetralogy with *Μέμνων* and *Ψυχοστασία*.<sup>38</sup>

The plots of two tragedies, *Μυσοί* and *Τήλεφος*, derived from the *Κύπρια* and recounted an episode from the run-up to the actual Trojan War. The Greek army landed in Mysia near Pergamon and attacked it in the mistaken belief that it was Troy. The king, Telephos, son of Herakles and Augê, had come from Tegea in Arkadia at the behest of an oracle in search of his parents and had inherited the kingdom. Fighting in defense of his territory he was wounded in battle by Akhilleus. Another oracle informed him that his wound could only be healed “by the one who wounded him”. This was effected by Telephos’s return to Argos where, after supplicating Klytaimestra and promising to lead the Greek army to Troy, he was healed by Akhilleus, who put into the wound scrapings from his spearpoint. In light of the paucity of fragments (only three fragments remain of *Τήλεφος* — not all of them beyond dispute —, four from *Μυσοί*, none very informative), it is unclear how many of these events figured in the Aiskhylean version.

As well as possessing the Sophoklean version intact, we have a general outline of how the other two tragedians handled the story of Philoktetes, which was drawn from the *Μικρὰ Ἰλιάς*, but since I intend to come back to this later I shall pass over

<sup>38</sup> A persuasive case for this placement is made by M.L. WEST, *art. cit.* (n. 17), 347 *sqq.* (although I am not persuaded that the play is really by Aiskhylos’s son Euphorion). S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 114, TRI B VI.4 cites W. Schmid and H.J. Mette as earlier proponents of the view, which Radt himself rejects; see also M. FANTUZZI, “The Myths of Dolon and Rhesus from Homer to the ‘Homeric/Cyclic’ tragedy Rhesus”, in *La poésie épique grecque. Métamorphoses d’un genre littéraire. Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt*, préparés et présidés par F. MONTANARI et A. RENGAKOS (Vandœuvres 2006), 135-82: 141 *sqq.*; A. KEEN, *art. cit.* (n. 34), 66 n. 14.

here Aiskhylos's treatment except to note that it seems to have stood in an unconnected series, since no convincing suggestions have been made of plausible companions.<sup>39</sup> Several poems in the Trojan Cycle reported the unheroic end of Aias, son of Telamon. His rescue of Akhilleus's armour and corpse figured in the *Αἰθιοπίς* as well as the judgement of the arms and their award to Odysseus, while Aias's resulting madness and suicide occurred both in that poem and in the *Μικρὰ Ἰλιάς*. The judgement formed the subject of Aiskhylos's *Ὀπλῶν κρίσις*, as the title indicates. Some details, such as the composition of the chorus and who did the judging, are not clear from the fragments. In one of them<sup>40</sup> someone addresses Thetis as "mistress of Nereus's fifty daughters" and from Aias's remarks in *Od.* 11. 545 *sqq.* it appears that it was she who organized the judging and designated her dead son's armour as the prize. The mythographic tradition identified variously those responsible for the judgment: the Greek chiefs, perhaps on the basis of a remark overheard within Troy's walls and possibly at Athena's prompting; some Trojan prisoners in the Greek camp; or a general consensus of Trojan opinion as to which Greek warrior had done them most harm. Two lines survive from what was clearly an angry speech by Aias denouncing Odysseus as the bastard son of Antikleia and Sisyphos<sup>41</sup> and a plaintive remark<sup>42</sup>, probably by Aias, questioning the value of prolonging a life beset by grief. Most of what we know about the following play *Θρηῆσσαι* we owe to a learned scholiast on Sophokles's *Αἶας*.<sup>43</sup> A messenger reported Aias's suicide<sup>44</sup> and his speech contained the

<sup>39</sup> *Λήμνιοι*, a title listed in the Catalogue, was suggested by A. HAIGH, *The Tragic drama of the Greeks* (Oxford 1896), 99, but this is generally taken as a mistake for *Λήμνιοι*, which is either the same as or may have stood with *Υψιπέδλη*.

<sup>40</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 174.

<sup>41</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 175.

<sup>42</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 177.

<sup>43</sup> See J. JOUANNA, "La lecture de Sophocle dans les scholies: Remarques sur les scholies anciennes d'*Ajax*", in *Lectures antiques de la tragédie grecque*, éd. par A. BILLAULT et C. MAUDUIT (Lyon 2001), 9-26: 17 *sqq.*

<sup>44</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 83.

detail that, because of his Akhilleus-like invulnerability (the infant Aias had been wrapped by Herakles in his lion-skin, with only a part of him uncovered), his sword as it touched his body “kept bending like a bow” until a goddess — presumably Athena — appeared and revealed to him the fatal spot. The captive Thracian women who formed the chorus no doubt lamented their master’s death. What if anything was made of the madness which the Cyclic sources mention cannot be determined from the exiguous fragments. If the third tragedy was *Σαλαμίνιαι* (*Σαλαμίνιοι* in the Catalogue), as is generally held, the action may have involved the return home to Salamis of Aias’s half-brother Teukros with Aias’s young son Eurysakes. Tradition had it that after Teukros was repudiated by their father Telamon, who perhaps blamed him unjustly for Aias’s death, he went off and founded a ‘new’ Salamis in Cyprus. Once again the surviving fragments allow no confidence in trying to determine which of these events figured in the drama, or how they were handled.

There were many brave men before Agamemnon, and other myth cycles besides the Trojan. Homer knew stories about “seven-gated” Thebes and “thirsty” Argos, which were to take shape in separate poetic works.<sup>45</sup> On these Aiskhylos drew for his tetralogy of which only the third play, *Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας*, is extant. We know the names but little else about the preceding two. From *Λαῖος* two words survive<sup>46</sup> of which one, *χυτρίζειν* (“to [place in a] pot”), was apparently re-used by Sophokles (from *Πρίαμος*)<sup>47</sup>. With E. Lobel’s generally accepted restoration of *P. Oxy.* 20. 2256 fr. 1 we learn that Laios spoke the prologue. An entry in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* appears to refer to Oidipous drinking and then spitting out his slain father’s blood (a bizarre and improbable occurrence, in my

<sup>45</sup> *Od.* 11. 271 *sqq.* (Oidipous); *Il.* 4. 376 *sqq.*, 5. 800 *sqq.* for the Argive assault on Thebes.

<sup>46</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*122.

<sup>47</sup> S. RADT (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 4, Sophocles* (Göttingen 1999) [= *TrGF* 4], F 532.

opinion). The source says the word appeared in two works, *Λάϊος*<sup>48</sup> and *Περραιβίδες*<sup>49</sup>. The latter work may have been a companion-piece of *Ἰξίων*, but the only plot-detail that emerges from the scanty remains is that Ixion promised lavish bride-gifts to his prospective father-in-law Eioneus and then lured him to his death. Given the uncertainty surrounding all of this, I think F\*122a can reasonably be left out of account in trying to reconstitute the action of *Λάϊος*.

Equally obscure are the events that transpired in the second play, *Οιδίπλους*. There is no certain fragment preserved from this work, although F 387a has often been placed here: "We were coming on our journey to the place from which the three highways part in branching roads, where we crossed the junction of the triple roads at Potniai". The text of the citation has suffered fairly deep corruption, but if it should turn out to belong to this trilogy — the survivor of the murderous encounter may be speaking (*cf.* Soph. *OT.* 756) — the setting was different from the Sophoklean version, since Potniai was just south of Thebes on the road to Plataiai, whereas in the more common tradition, which Sophokles followed, father and son crossed paths to the NW of Thebes on the road from Delphi. The only other transmitted fact (if it can be called that) is that *Οιδίπλους* was one of the plays in which Aiskhylos is alleged to have broken the taboo against revealing ἀπόρρητα from the Mysteries.<sup>50</sup> Attempts have been made to fill in missing details on the basis of what appears to be a retrospective *précis* at *Sept.* 742 *sqq.*, where the Chorus of Theban women refer to a "transgression born long ago" that seems about to bring retribution to the present generation of Eteokles and Polyneikes: Laios had violated a thrice-repeated Delphic injunction against producing progeny by fathering Oidipous who, from the height of glory as saviour of his land from the ravaging Sphinx,

<sup>48</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*122a.

<sup>49</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*186a.

<sup>50</sup> *TrGF* 3, T 93b.

became the parricide who “sowed the sacred maternal furrow” (752 *sqq.*). With awareness of his deed came a guilt-inspired madness that prompted twin evils: self-blinding and a curse against his sons for their [text uncertain] nurture, a curse which the Chorus see as reaching its fulfillment in a “division of possessions” by the brothers through armed conflict. It is minimally reassuring to learn that the antecedent events in the lost plays followed in general the plot of the Sophoklean *Oedipus Tyrannus*, but the filling in of crucial details — Why did Laios disobey Apollo’s oracle? What role (if any) did Jokasta play? In what respect was the children’s nurture of their blind father deficient? — must rely on conflicting and perhaps irrelevant alternative accounts, and sheer guesswork.<sup>51</sup> The satyr-play was entitled Σφίγγξ and once again the fragments are not very informative. The longest<sup>52</sup> refers cryptically to a “garland, an ancient crown” for an unnamed ξένος, “the best of bonds, as Prometheus said”. The allusion appears to be to the cult practice, mentioned by Athenaios who cites the lines, of votaries wearing crowns of osier as a memento of the binding and subsequent release of Prometheus, but it is hard to see what relevance this might have had to the probable action of the play, the posing by Sphinx of the celebrated riddle whose answer was “the human creature”.<sup>53</sup>

There is a possibility — somewhat remote — that a connected tetralogy followed up on the events of the *Septem Contra Thebas*. Various combinations have been suggested but perhaps T. Gantz’s is the most plausible.<sup>54</sup> F 17 from Ἀργεῖοι/αι,

<sup>51</sup> See, e.g., R.P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1983), 40 *sqq.*; G. HUTCHINSON (ed.), *Aeschylus. Septem contra Thebas* (Oxford 1985), xxiii *sqq.* and (more briefly and skeptically) A.J. PODLECKI, “Reconstructing an Aeschylean trilogy”, in *BICS* 22 (1975), 1-19: 8 *sqq.*

<sup>52</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 235.

<sup>53</sup> We cannot even be certain that Oidipous himself appeared in the play (for reasons mainly subjective I believe that he didn’t). Basing herself on depictions of Sphinxes and Silenoi on vases E. SIMON, *Das Satyrspiel Sphinx des Aischylos* (Heidelberg 1981), 19 *sqq.*, has made some more or less plausible conjectures.

<sup>54</sup> T. GANTZ, “The Aeschylean tetralogy: attested and conjectured groups”, in *AJP* 101 (1980), 133-164: 158 *sq.*

though somewhat garbled, refers to the "lightning-struck limbs" of Kapanus, one of the Seven (*cf. Sept. 444 sqq.; Supp. 860*). Of the play proposed for second place, Ἐλευσίνιοι, we learn a little more from Plutarch's report (*Thes. 29*) that the action was similar to that of Euripides's *Supplices* except that in Aiskhylos's version Theseus aided Adrastus in reclaiming the bodies of the fallen heroes by persuading the Thebans to conclude a truce, not by overpowering them in battle, and that Theseus graciously acceded to Adrastus's request that they be buried at Eleusis. Of the suggested third play, Ἐπίγονοι, nothing can be said with certainty except that, as the title implies, it dealt with the second Argive expedition against Thebes in which the sons of the Seven accomplished what their fathers had set out to do. If the information that Kapanus's son Sthenelos provides at *Il. 4. 407* can be pressed,<sup>55</sup> that the second expedition were fewer in number than their fathers' troops and that the assault was made against a "stronger wall", these features may have been given some prominence in the play. Whether the play titled Νεμέα (the nymph) or Νέμεα (the games) belongs to this grouping, and if so where it stood, are matters of sheer speculation. No fragment survives but some have suggested that it dealt with the foundation of the Nemean Games, which were instituted by Adrastus and the Seven during the first expedition against Thebes, to honour the death of Nemea's infant son Arkhemoros.<sup>56</sup>

The Danaid tetralogy may have drawn on a Cyclic Δαναΐς.<sup>57</sup> Although the likeliest sequence seems to be the surviving *Supplices* first, followed by Αἰγύπτιοι, Δαναΐδες and the satyric Ἀμυμώνη, the ordering of the first two plays cannot be considered settled. Only one word survives<sup>58</sup> from Αἰγύπτιοι (Ζαγρεύς, an alternative name for the God of the underworld), but if it

<sup>55</sup> *Il. 4.407-409* were athetized by Aristarkhos.

<sup>56</sup> See on all of this T. GANTZ, *art. cit.* (n. 54), 159 with nn. 95-97.

<sup>57</sup> For the meagre citations see M.L. WEST, *op. cit.* (n. 33), 34; 266 *sqq.*

<sup>58</sup> *TrGF 3, F 5.*

was the immediate sequel to *Supplices*, the action probably involved the arrival of the male Egyptian cousins of the Danaids, as announced at verses 906 *sq.* of the surviving play, and their demands on the Argive king to be allowed to marry their cousins. Either in this play or in the following piece, *Δαναΐδες*, a series of fatal consequences ensued. The Argives under their king Pelasgos tried to make good their promise, oft reiterated in *Supplices*, that they would protect the suppliants from seizure by their cousins (this is threatened by the Egyptian herald at *Supp.* 909 *sq.*). There may have been a battle between Argives and Egyptians in which Pelasgos was killed, and possibly Danaos succeeded to the throne of Argos. At his insistence, or perhaps coercion, the Danaids married their cousins. Before the marriages could be consummated 49 Danaids slew their bridegrooms, the lone exception being Hypermestra who spared her husband Lynkeus.<sup>59</sup> In a famous passage quoted by Athenaios, Aphrodite memorably upholds the necessity — and the joys — of conjugal union in the cosmic order and in the everyday world of flocks and plants. Of this fruitful congress she is the symbol and the “co-operating agent” (*παράτιτος*).<sup>60</sup> That these lines were spoken by the goddess herself, and possibly at a trial, seems certain, but whether it was Hypermestra or her homicidal sisters who were the defendants is less clear.<sup>61</sup> In any case, Hypermestra’s sparing of her husband was justified when their son Abas succeeded to the throne of Argos. The closing play was the satyric *Ἀμυμώνη*, of whose three fragments only one<sup>62</sup> has much to offer: “it is *μόρσιμον* for you to get laid, for me to lay you [*γαμεῖν sens. obscaen.*]”, a line spoken perhaps by the

<sup>59</sup> For what may be a thumb-nail summary of the action *cf.* AESCH. *PV.* 853-69.

<sup>60</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 44.7.

<sup>61</sup> See on this whole question A. GARVIE (ed.), *Aeschylus' Supplices. Play and trilogy* (Cambridge 1969), 204 *sqq.*, and in general on the trilogy A.J. PODLECKI, *art. cit.* (n. 51), 2 *sqq.*; R.P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, *op. cit.* (n. 51), 55 *sqq.* Whether *TrGF* 3, F \*\*451h (= *P.Oxy.* 20.2251) belongs to this trilogy, as some have supposed, I feel unqualified to judge; see A. GARVIE, *op. cit.*, 200 *sqq.*

<sup>62</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 13.

god Poseidon in his suit of the Danaid Amymone, who unsuccessfully resisted his advances. He was probably abetted by the chorus of satyrs, θρώσκων κνώδαλα<sup>63</sup> apparently alluding to their sexual proclivities.

There is a bewildering array of titles that deal with the encounters between various ill-fated opponents of Dionysos, but, as E.R. Dodds commented long ago, "Of Aeschylus' Dionysiac plays our knowledge is lamentably small".<sup>64</sup> Perhaps the best place to begin is with the attested tetralogy Λυκούργεια, which comprised Ἡδωνοί, Βασσαρίδες, Νεανίσκοι and Λυκοῦργος.<sup>65</sup> Of Ἡδωνοί a fair amount survives (12 fragments, 17 complete verses). As the god Dionysos was making his progress from Asia through Phrygia and Thrace, he came to the Edonians, whose king Lykourgos "was the first to insult and expel him".<sup>66</sup> How closely Aiskhylos followed the traditional story (which was, as we have seen, known to Homer) is uncertain. The child-god, to escape the King's attack on him and his nurses, dives into the sea and is received and protected by Thetis. The god's bacchic followers are imprisoned, but then suddenly (ἐξαίφνης) released — presumably through divine agency, as in the Euripidean version. Lykourgos, driven mad by the god, attacks his son Dryas with an axe and kills him, "imagining that he was lopping off a branch of a vine".<sup>67</sup> Lykourgos recovers his senses after having cut off his son's extremities and is eventually executed by his countrymen, to whom the god had oracularly declared that only thus could their land be cured of its sterility. F 57 is a fairly long section in anapaests, probably from the parodos. The emphasis here is on the variety of instruments wielded by Dionysos's votaries:

<sup>63</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 15.

<sup>64</sup> E.R. DODDS (ed.), *Euripides. Bacchae* (Oxford 21960), xxix.

<sup>65</sup> See M.L. WEST, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990), 26 *sqq.*

<sup>66</sup> APOLLOD. 3. 5. 1. The story, as we have seen, was known to HOM. *Il.* 6. 130 *sqq.* and it turns up, somewhat confusingly, in the 4<sup>th</sup> stasimon of SOPH. *Ant.* 955 *sqq.*

<sup>67</sup> APOLLOD. 3. 5. 1

pipes, cymbals, strings, drums; the strange (and loud) noises they make, the madness they inspire, "and unseen, unknown, bull-voiced mimes in answer bellow fearfully" (vv. 8-9<sup>68</sup>). Someone remarked that Lykourgos's palace "is frenzied with the god, the roof revels, Bacchant-like".<sup>69</sup> The outlandish attire of the god himself or one of his followers elicited a comment,<sup>70</sup> and Lykourgos appears to have begun interrogating his captive in a speech parodied by Aristophanes that began, "Where is this she-man from (γύνησις)? What's his country? What is he wearing?"<sup>71</sup> The second play, *Βασσάραι* (or perhaps *Βασσαρίδες*), took its name from the chorus of Thracian bacchantals in their fox-skin caps. It is thought to have dealt with Orpheus's refusal of worship to Dionysos out of preference for Apollo the Sun-god. Mention of a "butting bull" in a snippet of lyric verse<sup>72</sup> has suggested that Dionysos took a bull's shape as in Euripides, and someone, perhaps a messenger, describes the "piercing gleam" of the "silver-studded headland of Mt. Pangaios",<sup>73</sup> which may have been the place where Orpheus had gone to practice his sun-worship and where, as punishment for his rejection of Dionysos, the Bassarai tore him limb-from-limb and scattered his remains. A few phrases are quoted from the third play, *Νεανίσκοι*, but they give no clue as to the action. The title has been taken as referring to Edonian youths who were 'converted' to Dionysos-worship in spite of Lykourgos's injunction against it, or possibly in expiation of his sin. The fact that the satyr-play bore the title *Λυκοῦργος* reminds us of how, by an unexpected and (to our taste) somewhat anomalous reversal, a character whose grim fate had been told in the preceding tragedies could be 'resurrected' as a figure of

<sup>68</sup> The translations are by, or adapted from, H. WEIR SMYTH, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 399 *sq.*

<sup>69</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*58.

<sup>70</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 59.

<sup>71</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 61, from AR. *Th.* 134 *sqq.*

<sup>72</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 23.

<sup>73</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 23a.

fun in the finale. Its plot cannot be recovered. A few words and a cryptic couplet survive: "And after this he drank beer, thinning it with time (?) and made a loud boast and made it (?) a test of his manhood".<sup>74</sup> It seems to refer to the boorish behaviour of Lykourgos, but the exact significance of his actions eludes us.<sup>75</sup>

There are at least five additional titles connected with the Theban legends of Dionysos, but it is difficult to see how these are to be joined to form a coherent sequence.<sup>76</sup> The dramas in question are Σεμέλη ἢ Ὑδροφόροι, Διονύσου Τρόφοι (or perhaps just Τρόφοι), Βάκχαι, Ξάντριάι and Πενθεύς. Το Βάκχαι only one fragment is specifically assigned, a two-line gnomic utterance appropriate for any occasion.<sup>77</sup> The work is often put *hors concours* by seeing the title as an alternative for Βασσάραι or Πενθεύς.<sup>78</sup> First slot in the sequence is generally assigned to Σεμέλη ἢ Ὑδροφόροι. The four fragments, none of them a whole verse, contribute little to an understanding of the plot, which E.R. Dodds suggested "dealt with Semele's mysterious pregnancy and the beginning of the Dionysiac possession at Thebes... and presumably ended with her death and the supposed death of her child".<sup>79</sup> To this play, or its companion piece Ξάντριάι, probably belong some lines in a variety of lyric metres, *P.Oxy.* 18. 2164 frs. 1-3.<sup>80</sup> A comment by Plato in the *Republic* provides a clue for placing the passage. Sokrates is in the process of getting Adeimantos to agree that since a god must be perfect, poetic depictions of them in altered form are

<sup>74</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 124.

<sup>75</sup> M.L. WEST, *op. cit.* (n. 65), 48, notes Deichgräber's suggestion that "the play showed Lycurgus converted from beer...to wine".

<sup>76</sup> H. WEIR SMYTH, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 378 *sq.*; S. RADT, *op. cit.*, (n.1), 116 *sq.*; E. R. DODDS, *op. cit.* (n. 64), xxviii *sqq.*

<sup>77</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 22.

<sup>78</sup> So, e.g., E.R. DODDS, *op. cit.* (n. 64), xxix.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.* He thought that F 221, "Zeus, who killed this... [male or female]", referred to the supposed incineration of the infant Dionysos along with his mother, comparing EUR. *Bacc.* 244 *sq.*

<sup>80</sup> *TrGF* 3, Ff \*\*168, \*\*168a and b.

misleading at best, at worst blasphemous and morally damaging to the young, and one of the examples he gives is a line from a play in which Hera disguised herself as a mendicant priestess and begged alms “for the life-giving sons of the river, Argive Inakhos”,<sup>81</sup> which is identified elsewhere as coming from a play by Aiskhylos.<sup>82</sup> In the extremely fragmentary opening section Semele’s name appears once by itself and again in connection with Kadmos. A generic group of Theban women, or perhaps Semele’s personal maids, seem to be praying for a “continuing straight course” (διὰ πᾶν εὐθύπορον, 10-11) for the royal family. Hera enters, disguised, as we have seen, as a begging priestess, her purpose apparently being, as E.R. Dodds puts it, “to stir up opposition against Semele’s son” Dionysos. She plays out her duplicitous role skillfully, for in the following lines, the best-preserved section of the papyrus, an extended sequence in lyric dactyls, she dilates on the beneficent function of the Argive river nymphs for whose cult she claims to be collecting alms: “They are present at all the actions of men... [They initiate] maidens lately wedded and new to love.... For unsullied modesty...is by far the best of adorners for a bride. And fruitful in children are the families of those to whom the nymphs shall come in kindness, with sweet disposition....”<sup>83</sup> Given the fiery destruction to be visited on Semele and (ostensibly) her soon-to-be-born divine child, these praises of fruitful wedlock seem laden with irony. Of *Ξάντριάι*, “Carders”, not much more can be said than that it probably contained an

<sup>81</sup> PLATO *Rep.* 381d, G.M.A GRUBE’s translation.

<sup>82</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*168.17. E. LOBEL, the first editor, assigned it to *Ξάντριάι* on the basis of *Schol. ad AR. Ra.* 1344, which cites Asklepiades, and he has been followed by many, although not all, subsequent scholars; see, e.g., E.R. DODDS, *op. cit.* (n. 64), xxx, vs. H. LLOYD-JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 566 *sqq.* following K. LATTE, “De nonnullis papyris Oxyrrhynchiis” in *Philologus* 97 (1948), 37-57: 47 *sqq.*; T. GANTZ, *art. cit.* (n. 54), 157 with n. 89; S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 281 *sqq.* *P.Oxy.* 18. 2164 and the issues it raises are treated comprehensively by F. LASSERRE, *Nouveaux chapitres de littérature grecque (1947-1986)* (Genève 1989), 69-91.

<sup>83</sup> H. LLOYD-JONES’s translation (*op. cit.* [n. 13], 570 *sq.*).

account of the tearing to pieces on Mt. Kithairon of Semele's nephew, Pentheus.<sup>84</sup> The fearsome goddess Lyssa appeared, "inciting the gods against the Bakkhai" and describing a *σπαράγ-μύς* — with the meaning here of "spasm", "convulsion", rather than "rending" — that proceeds "from the feet up to the crown of the head" like a "scorpion's sting".<sup>85</sup> Whether this was a threat or the narrative of an accomplished fact is unclear, nor can we be certain of the identity of the victim. It is perhaps unsafe to rely on a separate testimony that "the matter about Pentheus" took place in this play on Kithairon and not on Parnassos, as seems to be implied at *Eumenides* 24 *sqq.*,<sup>86</sup> to conclude that Pentheus himself was meant. From *Πενθεύς* only one verse survives<sup>87</sup> but it is generally thought (by those who consider it a separate play and not a collective title for the whole tetralogy, or an alternative for one of its components) to have anticipated the action of Euripides's *Bacchae*. As we have seen, as early as Homer Dionysos's nurses were his companions during his progress. No complete verse survives from *Τροφοί* and it is not quite certain that it was a satyr-drama, but in any case the action appears to have involved Medea's attempted rejuvenation of the nurses and their husbands by boiling them.<sup>88</sup>

Athenian myths are conspicuously missing from the Aiskhylean titles. Besides the role of Theseus in *Ἐλευσίνιοι*, as already noted, there is the celebrated prominence given to Athena and her city in what seem to be Aiskhylean innovations in the myth of Orestes in *Eumenides*. It is possible that Aiskhylos's *Ἡρακλεΐδαι* influenced Euripides in writing his play of

<sup>84</sup> *Schol. ad AESCH Eum.* 26 (= *TrGF* 3, F 172b). Alternatively, it has been suggested that the "shredding" was not of Pentheus but of the daughters of Minyas.

<sup>85</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 169.

<sup>86</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 172b.

<sup>87</sup> "Enragingly", E.R. Dodds commented, who compared EUR. *Bacc.* 837 and saw F 183 as a warning to Pentheus to refrain from acting in such a way that "you cast a drop of blood upon the ground".

<sup>88</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 246a.

the same title, but that is mere guesswork.<sup>89</sup> What survives is a fairly long description of Herakles's tenth labour, the slaying of "three-bodied Geryon",<sup>90</sup> and the Fayoum papyrus,<sup>91</sup> which seems to be a description of Herakles's fiery death on Mt. Oita. If so, it is hard to see how it could be fitted into a plot similar to that of Euripides's play.<sup>92</sup>

There may have been a tetralogy based on the Argonautic saga, but very little is left of the suggested component plays. From Ἄργώ (which may have had as an alternative title Κωπασταί or Κωπευσταί) is quoted one line, "Where is Argo's sacred speaking beam?"<sup>93</sup> Just two words survive from Λήμνιοι (or possibly Λήμνιοι), which is conjectured to have dealt with the slaughter of their husbands by the Lemnian women. The repopulation of the island by Jason and the Argonauts may have constituted the plot of Ὑψιπύλη. Athenaios reported (10. 428 sq.) that the first dramatist to portray drunken characters onstage was not Euripides (Herakles in *Alkestis*) but Aiskhylos, and that it was Jason's tipsy shipmates in Κάβειροι (or Κάβιροι — these were Hephaistos's divine helpers at his forge on Lemnos). On these rather flimsy grounds it has seemed convenient to designate this play the satyr-drama in the tetralogy. The title Φινεύς should also be noted; the play stood first in the (apparently thematically unconnected) Πέρσαι tetralogy of 472. From it Athenaios quotes a vivid description of how the Harpies "in

<sup>89</sup> H. WEIR SMYTH, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 404, after remarking that "Of the personages, action, and scene...nothing is known", nevertheless found it "probable" that Aiskhylos "in part anticipated Euripides".

<sup>90</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 74; cf. *Ag.* 870.

<sup>91</sup> *TrGF* 3, F \*\*73b.

<sup>92</sup> The ascription is based on the restoration ἀμφιμήτ[ορες in l. 4 of *TrGF* 3, F \*\*73b, which Hesychios says Aiskhylos used in his Ἡρακλειῖδαι. Cf. M. FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO, "Les papyrus d'Eschyle", in *Proceedings of the IX international congress of papyrology. Oslo, 19<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> August, 1958* (Oslo 1961), 81-133: 113-4, who calls it "un cercle vicieux: l'interprétation du fragment dépend des restitutions pour les lacunes, les restitutions dépendent des préjugés de l'éditeur en ce qui concerne le theme de la tragédie".

<sup>93</sup> H. Weir Smyth's translation of F \*20, which is in any case corrupt.

the first joy of appetite kept snatching from his ravenous jaw many unreal banquets".<sup>94</sup>

I turn now to the topic specifically promised by my title, starting with those works where enough survives, or can reasonably be conjectured, to form the basis of a relatively confident estimate of the relationship between the assumed Aiskhylean exemplar and its *Nachkommen*. The two cases where there is enough evidence to allow fairly secure conclusions are the *Philoctetes* and *Electra* plays, but since these have been gone over so often I can deal with them briefly here. The date of Aiskhylos's Φιλοκτήτης is unknown; Euripides's was produced in 431 (with the extant Μήδεια, Δίκτυς and Θερισταί σάτυροι) and Sophokles's in 408. Apart from the useful information about the three plays provided by Dion of Prusa *Orations* 52 and 59, there are 10 surviving fragments (8 complete verses) of the Aiskhylean version and about 20 fragments of Euripides's treatment.<sup>95</sup> Of the Aiskhylean fragments the most substantial is a lament by Philoktetes:<sup>96</sup> "O Death, Paian, do not refuse to come to me. For you alone are the physician of irremediable ills, and no suffering afflicts a corpse". Another verse is quoted by Aristotle (*Po.* 1458b. 19 *sqq.*) as having occurred in both the Aiskhylean and Euripidean versions with only a difference of a single word: "An ulcer, φαγέδαινα, which eats (ἐσθίει<sup>97</sup>) / feasts on (θoinᾶται<sup>98</sup>) my foot's flesh". The deception was practiced by Odysseus in both Aiskhylos and Euripides, but the

<sup>94</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 258, ATHEN. 10. 421 *sq.* The Greek is not without problems, but the language shows typical Aiskhylean vigour.

<sup>95</sup> R. KANNICHT (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 5, Euripides* (Göttingen 2004) [= *TrGF* 5], 827 *sqq.* I have benefited from the discussion in C. COLLARD, M.J. CROPP and K.H. LEE (eds.), *Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays* II (Oxford 2004), 1 *sqq.* For Dion I have taken over or adapted phrases from H. CROSBY Loeb translation (*Dio Chrysostom* IV, [Cambridge, Mass. 1946], 336 *sqq.*; 438 *sqq.*)

<sup>96</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 255.

<sup>97</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 253.

<sup>98</sup> *TrGF* 5, F 792.

latter employed the Homeric expedient of having Odysseus disguised by Athena so that his victim would not recognize him. (Dion tries to forestall the obvious criticism of the Aiskhylean version: Philoktetes's memory-lapse was due to his disease and lonely life.) Aiskhylos had Odysseus appeal to Philoktetes by telling him, in an account which perhaps blended fiction and fact, that disaster had befallen the Greeks, Agamemnon was dead and Odysseus had been charged with a shameful (but unspecified) act, and in general the whole expedition was in ruins. Sophokles, of course, develops this plot device: Philoktetes is the victim of two lying tales, first by Neoptolemos and again by the "Merchant" (*Ph.* 561 *sqq.*). Exceptionally, Euripides followed the transmitted story in making Diomedes a partner in the scheme — Sophokles gives a nod to this at *Ph.* 416 and 570 *sqq.*, in the "Merchant's" lying tale — but it is unclear how he figured in the action. It has been suggested that he played a significant part in snatching Philoktetes's bow, but there is nothing in the surviving fragments or in Dion's summary to verify this. Both plays had a chorus composed of Lemnians, but Euripides had them use *παράιτησις*, excusing themselves for their long neglect. We learn that in fact Euripides brought in a Lemnian resident, one Aktor, who presented himself as known to Philoktetes. In Aiskhylos Philoktetes himself gave his Lemnian visitors information about his abandonment by the Greek forces and "his experiences in general" (Dio Chr. *Or.* 52. 9; again, he feels he has to justify this: it is normal, he explains, for victims of misfortune to keep repeating an account of their troubles, even at the risk of boring their listeners). The speaker of the prologue in Euripides was Odysseus who gave a (characteristic, for Euripides) disquisition on his motives for eschewing a life free from care and trouble (*ἀλύπως καὶ ἀπραγμόνως ζῆν*)<sup>99</sup> for the path he has chosen, voluntarily undertaking difficult and dangerous enterprises such as this: men who

<sup>99</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 12. The inactive *vs.* the busybody life was a Euripidean *topos*; see, e.g., *TrGF* 5, F 193 from Ἀντιόπη.

are naturally gifted and well-born act out of φιλοτιμία and to acquire the widest possible reputation and acclaim. Euripides had his Odysseus proceed to tell Philoktetes of the prophecy by the captured Trojan seer Helenos and to warn him that an embassy was on its way from Troy to offer him the kingship in return for his adding himself and his weapons to their side. In the following action the Trojan ambassadors turn up and there follows a debate scene which Dion does not describe in detail but which clearly impressed him as showing Euripides's skill at plot elaboration (ποικιλία) and the composition of effective arguments on both sides of a question.

The qualities which Dion found exemplified in the three versions bear some examination. Aiskhylos's treatment shows "high-mindedness and an old-fashioned quality" (μεγαλοφροσύνη καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον,<sup>100</sup> the second is a characteristic also of his Odysseus<sup>101</sup>) and "ruggedness and simplicity" (τὸ αὐθαδὲς καὶ ἀπλοῦν<sup>102</sup>). Euripides's version is characterized by "sagacity and concern for details" (σύνεσις καὶ περὶ πάντα ἐπιμέλεια<sup>103</sup>) as well as "precision and shrewdness and urbanity" (τὸ ἀκριβὲς καὶ δριμύ καὶ πολιτικόν<sup>104</sup>). Sophokles's treatment manifests ὕψος, "grandeur", σεμνότης, "solemnity", and, especially in the lyrics, μεγαλοπρέπεια, "elevation".<sup>105</sup>

Dion comments particularly on the lyrics of Euripides and Sophokles. He responded favourably to a quality which he discovered in Euripides's lyrics but which he thought Sophokles's lacked: "sententiousness and a strong exhortation to virtue" (τὸ γνωμικόν, παράκλησις πρὸς ἀρετήν<sup>106</sup>); he found them, in today's parlance, "inspirational".

<sup>100</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 4.

<sup>101</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 5.

<sup>102</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 15.

<sup>103</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 11.

<sup>104</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 15.

<sup>105</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 15 and 17.

<sup>106</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 14 and 17.

Dion judged that Sophokles "stood in the middle between" the other two dramatists.<sup>107</sup> Given the defective evidence for precise details of his predecessors' versions, one can nevertheless risk remarking on the subtle and intricate innovations devised by Sophokles. Introduction of a chorus of Greek sailors not only removed the anomaly of hitherto absent or unresponsive Lemnians; it allowed Philoktetes the human contact for which he had been longing and in turn gave the Chorus the chance to manifest sympathy for him in a totally natural way (*Ph.* 169 *sqq.*, 680 *sqq.*), something which it is hard to imagine having been handled in the other versions without some degree of awkwardness. The δόλος which must always have been Odysseus's main characteristic (whether he was disguised or not) is passed on, as it were, and insinuated into Neoptolemos (*Ph.* 101, 107, 948, 1112, 1282), and the young man is ashamed when he recognizes it (1228). Even the noble gesture of returning his weapons is taken by Philoktetes as a second trick (1288). The introduction of the young Neoptolemos was pure gain, for viewers and readers cannot help but be absorbed by the moral quandary he faces.<sup>108</sup> This new ethical focus and as far as we know also Herakles *ex machina* are totally original, the need for divine intervention being necessitated by Neoptolemos's change of heart and return of the bow to its rightful (second) owner.

In addition to the extant play, Sophokles also wrote a Φιλοκτῆτης ἐν Τροίᾳ, but since only a few words from it are preserved, we have no way of knowing how the plot developed beyond the unavoidable inference that it dealt with the healing of Philoktetes's wound foretold by Herakles at *Ph.* 1423 *sq.* (in F 697 he is still urging an unnamed person "not to be distressed" by his smell), and perhaps also his slaying of Paris.

<sup>107</sup> DIO CHR. *Or.* 52. 15.

<sup>108</sup> It seems unlikely that Neoptolemos figured in the story before Sophokles, in spite of the occurrence of the name in what has been taken as a Hypothesis to Aiskhylos's Φιλοκτῆτης, *P.Oxy.* 20. 2256 fr. 5a (= *TrGF* 3, F \*\*451w). See F. Montanari in these *Entretiens*, p. 408.

The *Electra* plays of Sophokles and Euripides (and I sidestep here the much-debated topic of which has priority) were clearly not written independently of Aiskhylos's *Choephoroi*. As the most recent British editor of the Sophoklean version has observed, "Differences between the *Electra* plays [*sc.* of Sophokles and Euripides] are often better understood as the result of different responses to Aeschylus than as the later *Electra* reacting to the earlier".<sup>109</sup> It may be of use here to look at the way certain themes and topics are handled in the three versions.<sup>110</sup> Elektra's willingness to contribute to the deed of vengeance — and to the nature and degree of this contribution I shall return — is motivated in part by personal considerations: she has been accorded a sort of Cinderella status in the palace and has been maltreated if not physically abused by her mother and stepfather. This is sketched in, but only relatively lightly, in *Choephoroi* (thus 135 "I am equivalently a slave", 445 *sqq.* "kept in a corner like a dog"). The theme is amplified and intensified in Sophokles and Euripides. The Sophoklean Elektra laments that "like a lowborn slave I serve in the chambers of my father, in such mean attire as this, and stand at empty tables" (189 *sqq.*<sup>111</sup>); "my father's murderers are my rulers and it rests with them whether I receive or go without" (262 *sqq.*); they have "enslaved me by force" (1192, and *cf.* 814 δεῖ με δουλεύειν). She cannot leave the palace to participate in religious ceremonies (911 *sq.*)<sup>112</sup>. Euripides pushes it further: Elektra has been

<sup>109</sup> P.J. FINGLASS (ed.), *Sophocles. Electra* (Cambridge 2007), 3. As to chronology he concludes, rather unhelpfully, "We have no reason to put [Euripides's] play outside the period suggested by the resolution chronology, namely c. 422-16", whereas "Sophocles' play may date to after 416, but... it could well be rather earlier than that" (*ibid.*, 2). In his commentary he frequently draws attention to specific resonances between the Aiskhylean and Sophoklean treatments of the story.

<sup>110</sup> I reprise here some points made in an earlier study ("Four Electras", in *Florilegium* 3 [1981], 21-46).

<sup>111</sup> The translations are in general by H. LLOYD-JONES, *Sophocles I. Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Tyrannus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1994).

<sup>112</sup> P.J. FINGLASS compares the turn Euripides gives this motif (*El.* 310), calling it "an ostentatious act of self-deprivation" on Elektra's part (*op.cit.* [n. 109], 386).

'married' off to a low-born farmer, lives in what appears to be a hovel and is clothed (like so many other Euripidean heroes) in rags. Her hair is shorn (108, 18, 241, 335), her body withered (239), her clothes filthy (185, 304 *sqq.*).<sup>113</sup> Klytaimestra, lured to the cottage on the pretext that her daughter has just given birth, comments that she is shabbily dressed and unkempt (1107). Elektra does not shrink from hyperbole: Aigisthos has "inflicted on me in life twice as much as my sister suffered in death" (1092 *sq.*).

Other themes that undergo modulation are the relationship between the siblings, the amount of prodding they require to undertake their grim task and their relative inputs into the actual accomplishment of the murders. At the opening of *Choe-phori*, Elektra asks the slave women for instructions how she should proceed; "Remember Orestes", they tell her (115), and this she does forthwith in her prayer to her dead father (130 *sq.*). Just after her brother identifies himself to her in the notorious recognition scene<sup>114</sup> she tells him that for her he has four "shares" (*μοίρα*): father, mother, sister and brother (238 *sqq.*). Orestes has come armed with the urgings of Apollo's oracle — and threats of punishment — if he fails to pursue "those responsible" (273, and *cf.* 300, 558); "the deed must be done" (298). Mental acceptance of an obligation is one thing, screwing up the courage to discharge it is quite another, and the heightening of emotion effected by the *κόμμος* achieves this. The Chorus do their fair share of incitement: "I hope to be

<sup>113</sup> M. CROPP in his edition remarks on this motif (*Euripides. Electra* [Warmminster 1988], xxxvi n. 24). It occurs also, but perhaps not so insistently, in Sophokles.

<sup>114</sup> It seems to me beyond dispute that *Cho.* 168 *sqq.*, 225 *sqq.* were the specific object of the parody at EUR. *El.* 518 *sqq.* — even if he was not the author of the lines (D. KOVACS, "Euripides, *Electra* 518-44: further doubts genuineness", in *BICS* 36 [1989] 67-78 follows A. Mau in excising them.) Sophokles rings his own turn on the "lock of hair" *σημείον* by having Elektra brusquely (and unwarrentedly) squelch Khrysothemis's ingenuous enthusiasm (87 *sqq.*, with Elektra's riposte at 930 *sqq.*). Sophokles and Euripides opted for a more 'scientific' solution: Orestes's *σφραγίς* which he somewhat belatedly shows his sister in the former (1217 *sqq.*) and his scar recognized by the Old Man in the latter (558 *sqq.*, 573).

able to raise a shrill wailing over a man struck and a woman slain" (386 *sqq.*) and they pray to the "blessed nether powers" to "graciously send aid to the children for victory" (477 *sqq.*). Elektra makes her contribution, reminding her father's shade that he has an obligation to help his desolate and despondent children, who are "exiles and fugitives" at his tomb (334 *sqq.*). She looks to the day when Zeus will "lay his hand on" and "split the heads" of — presumably her mother and her lover, although she dare not, or cannot, name them (394 *sqq.*). She calls for justice to be done (462) and makes a specific request of her dead father, to do something (unfortunately the text is corrupt at a crucial point) after having inflicted [death?] on Aigisthos (482). She exits at just about the midpoint of the play (584) and leaves the carrying out of the grisly task to her brother.

Sophokles chose to make the connection between the siblings more concrete, for the point is made repeatedly that it was Elektra who personally saved her brother's life by handing him to the Παιδαγωγός (12, 296-7, 321 οὐκ ἔκνω, 601 *sqq.*, 1128, 1348 *sqq.*). (In Euripides the old servant fulfills this function: 16, 286, 416, 556.) She has discharged the duties of nurse (1143 *sqq.*) as Kilissa had done in *Cho.* 748 *sqq.*, and thus she has a vested interest in the success of their endeavour: "You never were your mother's more than you were mine", she says as she is holding the urn which she believes contains his ashes (1146). At play's opening she is tensely expectant; her brother has been sending her secret messages promising her his help and threatening retribution against their mother (169 *sq.*, 319, 778 *sqq.*, 1154 *sqq.*) and now her patience is exhausted and her frayed nerves can take no more. "I can't bear this heavy weight of grief alone," she cries (119 *sq.*, 282 *sqq.* ending with αὐτῇ πρὸς αὐτήν 285). We need to understand this in order to appreciate the mental and emotional disequilibrium she experiences from the Slave's lying tale of the fiasco at Delphi, the 'false' grave-offerings, the decoy urn. "I would have taken vengeance myself, if I had had the strength", she tells her

mother.<sup>115</sup> Antigone-like she tries to enlist her sister's aid in killing Aigisthos (954 *sqq.*) and when Khrysothemis demurs — in terms reminiscent of Ismene's rebuff to her sister —, "You're a woman, not a man" (997), Elektra avers that she is ready to take matters into her own hands and do the deed alone, if necessary (1019 *sq.*). Her piteous lament over the urn which she believes to contain her brother's ashes finally moves Orestes to reveal himself to his sister, who is all for proceeding at once against their enemies in the palace who are, after all, only women. Orestes, considerably more hesitant, reminds her that "in women, too, here is an ἄρως, a warlike spirit" (1243 *sq.*). Neither seems to be able to take a decisive step. He asks her to tell him what act they could undertake that would suit the present situation (1293 *sqq.*) and she in turn asks him for instructions how they may begin (1319), but in the end it is the Παιδαγωγός who comes up with a workable plan, telling them νῦν καιρὸς ἔρδειν (1368). Her specific contribution will be to coax Aigisthos inside (1451 *sqq.*), but this is rendered unnecessary in the event. He realizes the truth when the corpse is revealed as Klytaimestra's and when he asks for an opportunity to speak she urges her brother to ignore the request: "Kill him immediately!" (1487).

Euripides's Orestes shows more determination right from the start: "I come to pay back my father's murderers with murder" (89). Without revealing himself he tests the waters. He has brought news to Elektra that her brother is still alive (230). If he were to return, would she have the nerve to join him in killing their mother? (278); "Yes, with the same axe by which my father was slain", she responds enthusiastically (280). There is a foretaste of things to come at the close of the First Stasimon when the Chorus of countrywomen apostrophize Klytaimestra and warn that in return for her killing of her husband "the heaven-dwellers will send a judgement of death;

<sup>115</sup> 604 *sq.*, with P.J. FINGLASS'S interpretation of τὸδ' in 604, and echoing Khrysothemis's words at 333 *sq.*

some day I shall see beneath your throat blood shed with a sword" (482 *sqq.*), but since the principals have all departed and the stage is empty there is none to take this as encouragement to get on with the business. In the event, as in Sophokles, Orestes needs some help with the practicalities, and this presents itself in the person of the Old Tutor from whom Elektra had advised her husband to fetch provisions for their 'guests'. The old man comes in bringing not only the requested supplies but also news of the offering of hair at Agamemnon's tomb. It is he who precipitates the recognition when, Eurykleia-fashion, he notices the tell-tale scar by Orestes's eyebrow. His arrival, Orestes says, was *καίριος*, and without a moment's hesitation he asks him, "How can I punish my father's murderer and my mother?" (599 *sqq.*). The old man promptly replies, "Kill Thyestes's son and your mother!" (613) and then outlines the murder plan in detail (commenting that "it just came" to him, 619). When Orestes protests that he can't handle both murders at the same time Elektra steps up: "I will arrange mother's death" (647). A messenger reports (in gruesome detail) Orestes's slaughter of Aigisthos as he was performing a sacrifice to the Nymphs (774 *sqq.*) and his body is brought in, a kind of trophy. Elektra delivers a tirade of complaints and insults (including the barbed remark by the Argive people that "He belongs to his wife, not the wife to her husband" 931) and she then directs her brother's somewhat unfocussed thoughts towards their mother. When he asks, using the standard caught-in-the-middle formula, "What then are we to do? Shall we kill mother?" (966), she methodically turns the screws on his slackening resolve, reminding him that she murdered their father, that the matricide had been enjoined on him by Apollo's wise oracle. "Don't play the coward and be unmanly, but go practice the same guile on her as you used to kill Aigisthos, her husband"<sup>116</sup> (982 *sqq.*). As she had promised at verse 647, she

<sup>116</sup> D. Kovacs's translation.

plays her part in luring Klytaimestra into the cottage on the pretext of showing her her new grandchild. From the cry of the dying woman heard from within, "Children, by the gods, don't kill your mother!" (1165) and the Chorus's remark that she is being "overcome by her children" (1168), it appears that the deed was done by both Elektra and Orestes, and this is confirmed in the *kommos*. When the Chorus ask Orestes how he could look his mother in the eye as he was killing her, he replies that he held his cloak before his eyes as he "performed the sacrifice by thrusting the knife in her neck" and Elektra chimes in, "Yes and I urged you on and put my hand on the sword besides" (1221 *sqq.*).

There are specific points of contact between Aiskhylos's prototype and the two later variations we have been considering. Sophokles assigns to his Klytaimestra the death-cry ὦμοι πέπληγμαι... ὦμοι μάλ' αὔθις (1415 *sq.*), which must have been intended as a reminiscence of Agamemnon's ὦμοι μάλ' αὔθις δευτέραν πεπληγμένος (*Ag.* 1343 *sqq.*).<sup>117</sup> Secondly, in the ἄγων with Klytaimestra Elektra seeks to justify her father's sacrifice of her sister Iphigeneia by narrating the hunting incident during which Agamemnon slew a stag and in the process uttered a "boastful word" (569) in requital for which an angry Artemis demanded the sacrifice of the commander's daughter; "there was no other way of releasing the army", says Elektra, with some degree of *naïveté* (573 *sq.*). This 'excuse' for Agamemnon's act, however lame it may appear to us, is totally and conspicuously absent from the Aiskhylean account of the impasse at Aulis. In returning to the version of Agamemnon's offence given (apparently) in the Cyclic Κύπρια, Sophokles is not only bypassing but also correcting — or so at least it seems to me — his predecessor's version.<sup>118</sup> There is another striking

<sup>117</sup> This has sometimes been denied but P.J. FINGLASS, *op. cit.* (n. 109), 516, strongly reiterates a case for the parallel.

<sup>118</sup> Many of these issues are touched on by E. FRAENKEL, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950), II 96 *sqq.*, in his note on *Ag.* 158 *sq.* He does not, however, speak of a Sophoklean 'correction'.

difference, this time between Sophokles and both other versions. In Aiskhylos *Orestes*, and in Euripides both he and his sister, pay a high moral and psychological price for the matricide. At the end of *Choephoroi*, Orestes begins to see the Spirits of Retribution that will pursue him over "land and sea" (*Eum.* 240), just the kind of pursuit that Kastor foretells at the close of the Euripidean version (1341 *sqq.*). In Sophokles the killers are — apparently — to get off scot-free, exulting over their mother's corpse and gloating over their next victim, her lover. Critics have frequently addressed this issue, but a satisfactory explanation is yet to be found.<sup>119</sup>

Beyond the stories of Philoktetes and Elektra the evidence does not exist that would support firm conclusions about influence exerted by an Aiskhylean exemplar upon his successors, but we may be able to find a middle ground, works about which enough is known to justify tentative and provisional suggestions. There is an ever-present danger of circularity in such reconstructive exercises, especially when one of the *comparanda* survives intact and the other or others just in fragments. It cannot at present be determined what details if any were taken over from "Οπλων κρίσις, Θρηῆσαι and Σαλαμίνιαι by Sophokles for his Αἴας μαστιγοφόρος and fragmentary Τεῦκρος.<sup>120</sup> R. Jebb in an otherwise full and fair account of the play's literary predecessors argues for "the prominent place which the laments of Eriboea [Aias's mother] and her handmaids held" in Aiskhylos's Σαλαμίνιαι on the basis of the "noteworthy emphasis" (as he terms it) on Eriboia's grief in Sophokles's version (*Aj.* 622-34 and 850 *sq.*).<sup>121</sup> Likewise scholars have

<sup>119</sup> See, most recently, P.J. FINGLASS, *op. cit.* (n. 109), 525 *sqq.* He speaks with perhaps some understatement of the "uncomfortable atmosphere" which dominates the last part of the drama, and draws attention to the omission of the Erinyes from the Sophoklean version, rightly commenting that their presence in the other two treatments "makes their absence here seem all the more deliberate" (526).

<sup>120</sup> There is also a Sophoklean title Εὐρουσάκης, which H. LLOYD-JONES (*Sophocles III, Fragments* [Cambridge, Mass. 1996], 97) suggests may be the same as Τεῦκρος.

<sup>121</sup> R.C. JEBB, *Sophocles. The Plays and fragments. Part VII, The Ajax* (Cambridge 1907), xxii with n. 2.

suspected that details from Aiskhylos's nine or so Dionysiac titles found an afterlife in Euripides's *Bacchae*, but this cannot be documented save for a few verbal echoes. Most of these are discussed in E.R. Dodds's definitive 1960 edition of Euripides's play, and it will be sufficient simply to repeat some of them here. F \*58, probably from Ἡδωνοί, ἐνθουσιᾶ δὴ δῶμα, βακχεύει στέγη, has clear resonances with Eur. *Ba.* 726 πᾶν δὲ συνεβάκχεν ὄρος, as Longinus long ago pointed out. F 183 from Πενθείς, μηδ' αἵματος πέμφιγα πρὸς πέδω βάλῃς is similar to *Ba.* 837 ἀλλ' αἶμα θήσεις συμβαλὼν βάκχαις μάχην. The effeminate Dionysos of Euripides's play probably had as prototype the way the god was portrayed in Ἡδωνοί.<sup>122</sup> A reference in Βασσάραι to a "bull fighting with its horns"<sup>123</sup> may have prompted Euripides to present the god in bull-shape (618, 920, 1017). As already mentioned, in Ξάντριαι the goddess Λύσσα appeared in person "inspiring the Bakkhai"<sup>124</sup> and at the beginning of the Fourth Stasimon of Euripides's *Bacchae* the Chorus call on "the swift dogs of Lyssa" to "go to the mountain where Kadmos's daughters are joined in worship" and "goad them to frenzy" against the intended victim, who is himself already "infested by madness (λυσσώδη)" (977 *sqq.*). A personified Λύσσα also took part in the action of Euripides's *Hercules Furens* (822 *sqq.*).

As we have seen, Homer's Akhilleus uses — somewhat oddly — the example of Niobe in an effort to get the aged Priam to break his fast and share a meal with him (*Il.* 24. 602-19), and both Aiskhylos and Sophokles made into tragedies the story of the over-proud mother whose boasts about her children (6 boys and 6 girls in Homer, 7 of each in the dramatists) were punished by Leto's two divine offspring, Apollo and Artemis.

<sup>122</sup> So W. ALLAN, "Religious syncretism: the new gods of Greek tragedy", in *HSCP* 102 (2004), 113-155: 138 *sq.*, on the basis of AR. *Tb.* 134 *sqq.*, with J. HENDERSON, *Aristophanes III* (Cambridge, Mass 2000), 47 n. 12. E.R. DODDS, *op. cit.* (n. 64), xxxi *sq.*, proposed some further possible parallels: Dionysos taken prisoner questioned and taunted about his appearance, and a culminating "epiphany of the god in his true nature" (xxxii).

<sup>123</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 23. 1.

<sup>124</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 169.

About 22 lines of Aiskhylos's Νιόβη survive in scattered book-fragments, none of them conveying much information. We know that her father Tantalos appeared, and someone reports Zeus as saying that he will "burn the house of Amphion [Niobe's husband] to ashes with his fire-bearing eagles".<sup>125</sup> Niobe herself notoriously sat silent and veiled through the first two-thirds of the play at the tomb of her children.<sup>126</sup> By far the lengthiest passage is contained in a papyrus,<sup>127</sup> where a character (who, by general agreement, seems not to be Niobe herself<sup>128</sup>) describes the woman who has been driven into "a marriage without haven" by her father Tantalos. "You see", says the speaker, doubtless addressing the Chorus (presumably women of Thebes, if that was the scene of the action as in Sophokles), "the conclusion of the marriage: this is the third day she has sat by this tomb, wailing over her children, the living over the dead [or: she has sat brooding over the nest of her dead children; the meaning of ἐπώζει in verse 7 is disputed]". A few damaged lines later occur the verses quoted by Plato (*Rep.* 380a) that allowed identification of our passage, "A god causes a fault to grow in mortals, when he is minded utterly to ruin their estate", and, in the following lines, the moral of Niobe's story: "a mortal must preserve the (? good fortune sent by the gods) and not speak overboldly..."

More of the Sophoklean version can be reconstructed on the basis of fairly extensive papyrus finds.<sup>129</sup> The killing of the

<sup>125</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 160.

<sup>126</sup> *Vita Aeschyli*, 6 (= *TrGF* 3, T 1); cf. *AR. Ra.* 911 *sqq.*

<sup>127</sup> *PSI* 1208 (= *TrGF* 3, F 154a)

<sup>128</sup> The uncertainty results from the damaged left-hand side of the papyrus, admitting of restorations of verbs in either the first or third person. "Despite all the sagacity of excellent scholars we do not yet know who the speaker is" (E. FRAENKEL, *art. cit.* [n. 8], 239); so also J. DIGGLE, "Niobae miseras nescio-quis narrat" (*Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta selecta* [Oxford 1998], 20). I accept H. Lloyd-Jones's argument that the "tone" of the lines "is too calm and reflective to be suitable to her". (*op. cit.* [n. 13], 559). My translations are quoted, or adapted, from *ibid.*

<sup>129</sup> See the exemplary edition of W. S. BARRETT, "Niobe", in R. CARDEN, *The Papyrus fragments of Sophocles* (Berlin 1974), 171-235, who gives a succinct

children belongs to the antecedents of the drama in Aiskhylos (although it may have been described in the course of the play). In Sophokles there is no direct evidence for how the boys died, but it was almost certainly by Apollo's arrows and while they were off hunting on Mt. Kithairon; Artemis despatches the girls onstage.<sup>130</sup> The passages partially preserved in the papyri<sup>131</sup> present the horrible spectacle of Apollo urging his sister on as she showers down arrows on Niobe's daughters from the palace roof, while the girls in turn beg the goddess for mercy and their mother sorrows over their killing. Elsewhere in Sophokles her grief and endurance bring Niobe divine status (*El.* 150, *Ant.* 834) and in the latter passage Sophokles follows the tradition that she was turned into stone, on or near Mt. Sipylos, her original home. There is no evidence to show whether either of the plays we have been considering incorporated this detail; R. Seaford has suggested, mainly on the basis of depictions on vases, that in Aiskhylos Niobe refused to return to Asia with her father and was turned into a stone statue at Thebes.<sup>132</sup> Sophokles apparently also had a scene in which Niobe's husband Amphion reproached Apollo for the latter's killing of his children, and actually armed himself against the god, but was in turn shot dead by him.<sup>133</sup> This detail probably did not figure in the Aiskhylean version unless it was in a report of the general disaster (as was Zeus's threatened incineration of Amphion's house).<sup>134</sup>

account of the legend (223 *sqq.*). See also H. LLOYD-JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 120), 226 *sqq.*; J. JOUANNA, *Sophocle* (Paris 2007), 649 *sq.*

<sup>130</sup> Interestingly, this was not the tradition followed by Pheidias, who depicted the killing on the forward legs of Zeus's throne at Olympia, for there "Both [divinities] kill boys and girls alike, Apollo on Zeus' left and Artemis on his right side" (E. HARRISON, "Pheidias", in *Personal style in Greek sculpture*, ed. by O. PALAGIA and J.J. POLLITT [Cambridge 1996], 16-65: 61 n. 212).

<sup>131</sup> *TrGF* 4, Ff \*\*441a - \*\*443.

<sup>132</sup> R. SEAFORD, "Death and wedding in Aeschylus' *Niobe*", in *Lost dramas of classical Athens. Greek tragic fragments*, ed. by F. MCHARDY, J. ROBSON, D. HARVEY (Exeter 2005), 113-27: 124 *sqq.*

<sup>133</sup> S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n. 47), 757 *sq.*; H. LLOYD-JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 120), 230 *sq.*

<sup>134</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 160. See n.125 above.

As we saw, Aiskhylos carved fairly large slices from Homer's banquet for Akhilleus and Odysseus tetralogies. Sophokles, the "tragic Homer",<sup>135</sup> was reputed to have drawn many plots from the *Odyssey*.<sup>136</sup> To judge from its title, *Ναυσικάα ἢ Πλύντριαι* very probably drew on *Odyssey* 6, but so little of it survives that we cannot be quite sure. It may have been a satyr-drama and tradition had it that the youthful playwright himself took the role of Nausikaa and showed himself particularly adept at ball-playing.<sup>137</sup> In any case, there is no detectable overlap with Aiskhylos's *Odyssey*-dramas, and in fact U. von Wilamowitz suggested that Sophokles went out of his way to avoid duplication with his predecessor.<sup>138</sup> I have not been able to detect any 'Iliadic' titles in the works included by S. Radt in Sophokles's "Trojan cycle".<sup>139</sup> There is, in fact, ancient testimony to the effect that he preferred to draw on the Epic Cycle for his stories.<sup>140</sup> So far as the plots of Sophokles's *Ἀχαιῶν Σύλλογος* and *Σύνδειπνοι* can be recovered there seems to have been no overlap with the *Μυρμίδονες* sequence and it is possible that here too he was purposely avoiding stories that had been dramatized already by Aiskhylos.<sup>141</sup>

There are no detectable Euripidean works based on either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*.

<sup>135</sup> *TrGF* 4, T 115a and b.

<sup>136</sup> *Vita Sophoclis*, 20 (= *TrGF* 4, T 1. 80).

<sup>137</sup> *TrGF* 4, Tt 28-30.

<sup>138</sup> "Hübsch ist, wie diese aischyleische Odyssee [sc. *Ψυχαγωγοί, Πηνελόπη, Ὀστολόγοι, Κίρκη σατυρική*], die das Phaeakenabenteuer übergangen hat, sofort den Sophokles anregt, seine Nausikaa zu dichten" (U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Aischylos. Interpretationen*, [Berlin 1914], 246-7 n.1).

<sup>139</sup> S. RADT, "Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten", in *Sophocle. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt*, préparés et présidés par J. DE ROMILLY, (Vandœuvres 1983), 185-222: 194. As S. RADT comments elsewhere about Sophokles's *Πρίαμος*, "*argumentum prorsus ignotum*" (*op. cit.* [n. 47], 408).

<sup>140</sup> ATHEN. 7. 277 C (= *TrGF* 4, T 136).

<sup>141</sup> Cf. A. SOMMERSTEIN, "The Anger of Achilles, mark one: Sophocles' *Syndeipnoi*", in *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean fragments*, ed. by A.H. SOMMERSTEIN (Bari 2003), 355-71.

Both of Aiskhylos's successors dealt, repeatedly and at length, with the story of Oidipous. It has been widely assumed that *Oedipus Tyrannus* corresponds in broad outline to the Aiskhylean Οἰδίπους, but since, as we have seen, so little is known about the latter, it must remain an assumption. As I noted above, the location of the triple crossroads appears to have been different in the two plays. Euripides composed three works dealing with the myth, Χρύσιππος, Οἰδίπους and the surviving *Phoenissae*. Of the first very little survives and nothing much can be said about the plot beyond the fact that it dealt with Laios's infatuation with and abduction of Pelops's illegitimate son Khrysippos, and perhaps the father's curse against the boy's abductor. Two lines survive<sup>142</sup> from a speech in which Laios explains why he acted: "Nature overwhelms (βιάζεται) my judgment". A similar plot development has sometimes been mooted for the Aiskhylean Λαῖος,<sup>143</sup> but there is no evidence to support the suggestion. Of Οἰδίπους enough is left for us to conclude that Euripides has rung some striking changes in the story, at least as it is known from Sophokles. As the play opened Thebes, it seems, was actually being ravaged by the Sphinx's predations, for some fragmentary lines survive on a papyrus<sup>144</sup> in which someone, probably a Messenger, describes in rather baroque terms her hideous but fascinating appearance, the hissing sounds she makes, and, most important, the famous riddle which presumably Oidipous goes on to solve (or has already solved). F 541 reveals that Oidipous does not blind himself but is blinded by some servants of Laios and since he is described as "Polybos's son" he has presumably not yet found out about his parentage (a revelation which perhaps Euripides omits). In F \*545a Iokastê, after some sententious generalizing about the value of a faithful wife, declares her intention of accompanying her husband into exile.

<sup>142</sup> *TrGF* 5, F 840.

<sup>143</sup> Cf. R. KANNICHT, *op. cit.* (n. 95), II, 878; R. AÉLION, *Euripide héritier d'Eschyle* (Paris 1983), II, 181 *sqq.*

<sup>144</sup> *P.Oxy.* 27. 2459 (= *TrGF* 5, Ff 540-540b).

*Phoenissae* is there in its entirety to be appreciated in its weird disjointedness. Along with a sidelong glance at *Septem Contra Thebas*, Euripides has mined a pre- or at least non-Aiskhylean version of the story (of which there are traces also in Stesikhoros<sup>145</sup>) for some details. Iokastê has not killed herself or gone into exile but is living in the palace with her blind husband and her daughter Antigone. In contravention of an agreement for power-sharing that they had reached, her sons are now on the brink of war, and she tries (unsuccessfully) to reconcile them. Eteokles asks Kreon for advice and the latter suggests he choose seven defenders for the city's seven gates. Eteokles agrees to do so but says he is too pressed for time to give the names of each just now. The prophet Teiresias appears and foretells the brothers' fated doom. Against his father's opposition, Kreon's son Menoikeus sacrifices himself to save the city. Eteokles and Polyneikes die in the fatal duel and Iokastê, in grief, carries through with the delayed suicide.

Aiskhylos wrote at least one drama, and possibly two, entitled Σίσυφος (the sources distinguish, but perhaps erroneously, Σ. δραπέτης and Σ. πετροκυλιστής). The former was almost certainly satyric and probably told of Sisyphos's 'escape' from the Underworld by a ruse: before he died, he told his wife Meropê to omit his funeral offerings, which afforded him the opportunity to persuade Hades to allow him to return to earth — from where, of course, he refused to budge until the natural moment of his death as an old man. Since Σ. πετροκυλιστής was one of the works which allegedly gave grounds for the charge that Aiskhylos had committed the crime of revealing ἀπόρρητα from the Eleusinian Mysteries, H. Weir Smyth conjectured that here the satyr-chorus may have been represented

<sup>145</sup> P. Oxy. 2637 fr.1 (b). D. PAGE (ed.), *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis. Poetarum lyricorum graecorum fragmenta quae recens innotuerunt* (Oxford 1974) [=SLG] Ibycus S 222 (b).

<sup>146</sup> H. WEIR SMYTH, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 457; profanation of the Mysteries: *TrGF* 3, T 93 a-d.

as initiates and the play itself a kind of spoof on mystic initiation.<sup>146</sup> A Σίσυφος is ascribed to both Sophokles and Euripides, but since only one phrase is quoted from the former work, H. Lloyd-Jones following F.G. Welcker suggested it really belongs to one of the Aiskhylean Sisyphos dramas.<sup>147</sup> About the Euripidean version the only secure facts are that it was satyric; that someone addressed Herakles as “son of Alkmene”<sup>148</sup>; and that it was part of the tetralogy which won second prize at the City Dionysia of 415 with its tragic partners Ἀλέξανδρος, Παλαμήδης and Τρώαδες. Sisyphos probably also figured as a character in one of or both Euripides’s satyr-dramas entitled Αὐτόλυκος.

As already noted, the paucity of fragments does not permit any confidence about how Aiskhylos handled the adventures of Telephos in Τήλεφος and Μυσοί. Sophokles was credited with a trilogy-title Τηλέφεια and individual plays that treated segments of his story: Τήλεφος (which may be an alternative title for Μυσοί) as well as Ἀλεάδαι and Εὐρύπυλος. These dealt with, respectively the incurring of blood-guilt by Telephos for killing his maternal uncles, and the exploits and death of Eurypylos, Telephos’s son by the sister of Priam, Astyokhê. It is the central part of the story that is of interest here, his wounding and subsequent healing by Akhilleus, probably through the intercession of Klytaimestra. Aristotle cited as an example of τὸ ἄλογον the fact that in a play entitled Μυσοί Telephos traveled from Tegea to Mysia ἄφωνος (*Po.* 1460a 32). Since both Aiskhylos and Sophokles wrote plays with that title, Aristotle could be referring to either, although it has seemed to some that, given Aiskhylos’s penchant for portraying silent characters,<sup>149</sup> it is perhaps likelier to be his version that Aristotle had in mind.

<sup>147</sup> H. LLOYD-JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 120), 274.

<sup>148</sup> *TrGF* 5, F 673.

<sup>149</sup> D. LUCAS (ed.), *Aristotle. Poetics* (Oxford 1968), 231 refers to Aiskhylos as being “addicted to the presentation of silent actors”; see n. 12 above.

The goddess Ψαμμώ (as E. Fraenkel neatly termed her in his seminal British Academy lecture of 1942) has been particularly generous in supplying us with substantial sections of some of Aiskhylos's satyr-plays.<sup>150</sup> Until the publication by E. Lobel of *P.Oxy.* 18. 2161 in 1941, it was not definitely known that Δικτυουλκοί was a satyr-play (*PSI.* 1209 containing passages from the same play in the same hand had been published eight years earlier, in 1933<sup>151</sup>). It appears to have been the satyr-play in the *Perseus* tetralogy, which also probably comprised Φορκίδες and Πολυδέκτης. The "net-haulers" are the chorus of satyrs who are — we know not for what reason — at present situated on the island of Seriphos. Two people catch sight of a chest floating in to shore; these are Silenos and (apparently) Diktys, brother (or half-brother) of Polydektês King of Seriphos. When with the help of the chorus of satyrs, who in turn call on the local townspeople for assistance, they haul or drag the chest out of the sea, it turns out to contain Danaë and her infant son Perseus. The longest passage recounts an exchange between Danaë and an unidentified character, probably Silenos, who offers to be her "protector and supporter".<sup>152</sup> Danaë utters a plaintive lament that recalls Simonides<sup>153</sup>: she will hang herself rather than be put to sea again! There follows a scene which struck E. Fraenkel as "one of the loveliest pieces of Greek poetry",<sup>154</sup> in which the satyrs dance around Silenos as he dandles the infant Perseus, chortling and making clucking noises (ποππυσμός, 803) to allay the baby's fears and calm his whimpering.<sup>155</sup> All we can

<sup>150</sup> I have dealt with these in "Aiskhylos Satyrikos", in *Satyr drama. Tragedy at play*, ed. by G.M.W. HARRISON (Swansea 2005), 1-19.

<sup>151</sup> H. WEIR SMYTH *op. cit.* (n. 13), 469 could still refer to Δικτυουλκοί as "the first of these plays" (*sc.* in the *Perseus* trilogy) — presumably uncorrected from the first ed. of 1926.

<sup>152</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 47a 4 *sq.*

<sup>153</sup> D.L. PAGE (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962) [= *PMG*], 543.

<sup>154</sup> E. FRAENKEL, *art. cit.* (n. 8), 241.

<sup>155</sup> E. Fraenkel noted similarities in general situation and some verbal parallels with Sophokles's Διονυσίσκος (F 171), calling it "one of the many tributes

say with any confidence is that Aiskhylos's tetralogy dealt with some parts of the Danaë - Perseus story, but which ones were treated in Πολυδέκτης it is impossible to say, since not a word of it survives. One line is quoted from Φορκίδες, "he rushed into the cave like a wild boar",<sup>156</sup> where the reference seems to be to Perseus's assault on the Gorgons, who were being guarded by their sisters the Phorkides or Graiai (*cf. PV. 793 sqq.*). There is no evidence to show whether Perseus's rescue of Andromeda was in the Aiskhylean version, but both Sophokles and Euripides wrote an Ἀνδρομέδα, and of the latter a substantial amount survives.<sup>157</sup> We find among the Sophoklean titles Δανάη and Ἀκρίσιος, but of these almost nothing remains; the latter was perhaps an alternative title for the former. Of Euripides's Δίκτυς many of the 19 fragments are gnomologic, but in F \*\*332 Diktys seems to be trying to console Danaë who thinks she will never see her son again: she is better off, he tells her, than many others who suffer. The climax perhaps involved Perseus's return to Seriphos with the Gorgon's head, and his punishment of Polydektês for the latter's maltreatment of Diktys and his mother.

The transmitted information about various plays with Prometheus in the title by Aiskhylos (or, as M.L. West would have it, a close relation) is a confused mess. The Catalogue lists three, Π. δεσμώτης, Π. πυρφορός and Π. λυόμενος, but not Π. πυρκαεύς. The last is named only by Pollux (9. 16; 10. 64) where he quotes F 205, which shows a 'non-tragic' resolution.<sup>158</sup> F \*\*207, "like the goat you'll mourn for your beard, you will"<sup>159</sup> is quoted by Plutarch (*Mor.* 86 E-F) as spoken by

paid by Sophocles to his admired predecessor", *ibid.* Similarly H. LLOYD-JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 120), 66 sq.

<sup>156</sup> *TrGF* 3, F 261.

<sup>157</sup> *TrGF* 5, Ff 114-156.

<sup>158</sup> λινᾶ δε, πίσσα κώμολίνου μακροὶ τόνοι, which S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n. 1), *ad.loc.* glosses "verba obscura" (possibly Prometheus is telling about materials for making flame or for binding a fire-wound).

<sup>159</sup> H. Weir-Smyth's translation.

Prometheus to a satyr who wanted to kiss and embrace fire, having seen it for the first time. It's well-nigh certain that the tetralogy of which only *Persae* survives, produced in 472 with Perikles as choregos, closed with a Prometheus satyr-play.<sup>160</sup> The inference seems secure, if not airtight, that this was the Π. πυρκαεύς and that the relatively abundant remains of a Prometheus σατυρικός preserved in *P. Oxy.* 20. 2245 are correctly to be assigned here, as they have been by most scholars since their publication by E. Lobel in 1952<sup>161</sup>. J.D. Beazley on the basis of a thorough review of the vase-paintings suggested that the play showed Prometheus bestowing fire not on humans but on satyrs, whom he instructed how to make torches.<sup>162</sup> Excited by the wonderful discovery a satyr, ever an amorous creature, tried to kiss the flame but was warned, perhaps by Prometheus himself, to be careful "lest the fire scorch his beard" (citation from Plutarch above).

The most interesting of the fragments<sup>163</sup> is an extended lyric passage that was sung probably by the chorus of satyrs:

... gracious kindness sets me dancing. [Throw down] your bright cloak by the unwearying light of the fire. Often shall one of the Naiads, when she has heard me tell this tale, pursue me by the blaze within the hearth.

– The nymphs, I know full well, shall join their dances out of reverence for Prometheus's gift!

– Sweet, I think, will be the song they sing in praise of the giver, telling how Prometheus is the bringer of sustenance and the eager giver of gifts (φέρεσβιός [τε καὶ] σπευσίδωρος) to humans.

– The nymphs, I know full well, shall join their dances out of reverence for Prometheus's gift!<sup>164</sup>

F \*\*207a, a scholion on Hesiod *Op.* 89, reports that Prometheus received a jar of evils from the satyrs and, handing it

<sup>160</sup> *TrGF* 3, T 55a.

<sup>161</sup> E. LOBEL *et al.* (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XX (London 1952).

<sup>162</sup> J.D. BEAZLEY, "Prometheus Fire-lighter", in *AJA* 34 (1939), 618-39.

<sup>163</sup> *P. Oxy.* 20. 2245 fr. 1, col. ii (= *TrGF* 3, F \*\*204b )

<sup>164</sup> H. LLOYD-JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 565 *sq.*, slightly modified; *cf.* also E. FRAENKEL, *art. cit.* (n. 8), 246 *sq.*

over to his brother Epimetheus, warned him not to accept any gift from Zeus. The latter disregarded the warning and took in Pandora, with the inevitable sequel. This sequence of events has been assigned both to the Π. Πυρκαεύς and to a satyr-drama by Sophokles of which little more than the title survives, Πανδώρα ἢ Σφυροκόποι, which appears to have had the satyrs engaged as “hammerers” in Hephaistos’s smithy. F \*482 is an order issued by an unidentified speaker to some unspecified individual: “First begin to knead the clay with your hands”. This has been taken as referring to the tradition that Prometheus moulded the first humans from clay under instructions from Athena, but other identifications are possible.<sup>165</sup>

I conclude with a brief tabulation of those Aiskhylean titles of which little or nothing survives, and whose content can only be derived from the story-line which they are assumed to have followed. Of these little more can be said than that in these works Aiskhylos may have exerted some influence on his successors, but we cannot prove it.

AISKHYLOS	SOPHOKLES	EURIPIDES
Ἀθάμας	Ἀθάμας α' and β'	Ἴνώ, Φρίξος α' and β'
Ἀλκμήνη		Ἀλκμήνη
Ἐπίγονοι	Ἐπίγονοι, Ἐριφύλη, Ἀμφιάρεως (and/or Ἀμφιάρεως σατυρικός)	
Ἡλιάδες		Φαέθων
Ἡρακλείδαι		Ἡρακλείδαι
Ἴφιγένεια	Ἴφιγένεια (? = Κλυταιμῆστρα)	Ἴφιγένεια ἢ ἐν Αὐλίδι
Κάβειροι, Λήμνιοι	Λήμνιοι α' and β'	
Κρηῆσσαι	Μάντις ἢ Πολύιδος	Πολύιδος

<sup>165</sup> S. RADT, *op. cit.* (n. 47), 760 reports the suggestion of R. Kannicht that it is Zeus addressing Hephaistos. E. SIMON, *art. cit.* (n. 22), 146 calls attention to an Attic red-figured volute-krater of c. 450 BCE in Ferrara (T 579, J.D. BEAZLEY, *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* [Oxford <sup>2</sup>1968] [=ARV<sup>2</sup>] 612 n°. 1) on whose neck are depicted satyrs (including a satyr-child) cavorting with hammers while a figure who is possibly Pandora emerges from perhaps a subterranean cave “accompanied by Prometheus holding torches, while his brother Epimetheus stands on the right”.

Μέμνων  
Φινεύς

Μέμνων (? = Αιθίοπες)  
Φινεύς α' and β',  
Τυμπανισταί

Υψιπύλη  
Ωρείθυια

Υψιπύλη  
cf. F 956

### Annex: Aiskhylean titles

- (a) no surviving fragments  
(b) fewer than 5 full verses survive

< > = doubtful or doubtfully ascribed

Ἀγαμέμνων	Ἰζίων (b)	Πολυδέκτης (a)
Ἀθάμας (b)	Ἰφιγένεια (b)	< Προμηθεὺς
Αἰγύπτιοι or	Κάβειροι or Κάβιροι	δεσμώτης κτλ. >
Αἴγυπτος (b)	(b)	Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς
Αἰτναῖαι or Αἴτναι (b)	Καλλιστώ (b)	Προπομποί (b)
< Ἀκταίων > (a)	Κᾶρες ἢ Εὐρώπη	Πρωτεύς (b)
< Ἀλκμήνη > (b)	Κερκυών (b)	Σαλαμίνιαι/οι (b)
Ἀμυμώνη (b)	Κήρυκες (b)	Σεμέλη ἢ Ὑδροφόροι
Ἀργεῖοι/αι (b)	Κίρκη (b)	(b)
Ἀργὼ ἢ Κωπαστής	Κρηῆσσαι (b)	Σίσυφος δραπέτης
(Κωπευστής/αί) (b)	< Κύκνος > (a)	Σίσυφος πετροκυ-
Ἀταλάντη (a)	Λάϊος (b)	λιστής (b)
Βάχχαι (b)	Λέων (b)	Σφίγξ (b)
Βασσάραι or	Λήμνιοι/αι (b)	Τήλεφος (b)
Βασσαρίδες (b)	Λυκοῦργος (b)	Τοξότιδες (b)
Γλαῦκος πόντιος	Μέμνων (b)	Τροφοί or Διονύσου
Γλαῦκος Ποτνιεύς	Μυρμιδόνες	τροφοί (b)
Δαναΐδες	Μυσοί (b)	Υψιπύλη (a)
Δικτυουλοί	Νεανίσκοι (b)	Φιλοκτήτης
Ἐλευσίνιοι (b)	Νεμέα or Νέμεα (b)	Φινεύς (b)
Ἐπίγονοι (b)	Νηρεΐδες (b)	Φορκίδες (b)
Ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας	Νιόβη	Φρύγες ἢ Ἔκτορος
Εὐμενίδες	Ξάντριά	λύτρα
Ἡλιάδες	Οἰδίπους (a)	< Φρύγιοι > (a)
Ἡρακλεΐδαι	Ὅπλων κρίσις	Χοηφόροι
< Θαλαμοποιοί > (b)	Ὅστολόγοι	Ψυχαγωγοί
Θεωροί ἢ	< Παλαμήδης > (b)	Ψυχοστασία (b)
Ἴσθμιασταί	Πενθεύς (b)	Ωρείθυια (b)
Θρηῆσσαι (b)	Περραιβίδες (b)	
Ἰέραιαι (b)	Πηνελόπη (b)	

## DISCUSSION

*J. Jouanna:* Votre communication répond parfaitement aux souhaits des organisateurs. Elle présente de manière détaillée les fragments d'Eschyle et montre en quoi Eschyle a pu être un initiateur par le traitement de mythes repris par des successeurs avec d'éventuelles modifications.

Mes remarques porteront sur quelques détails. Pour la *Psychostasie*, ne serait-il pas utile de faire référence aux données sur la mise en scène signalées par Pollux dans son *Onomasticon* 4.120 (utilisation du *théologeion* et de la *méchanè*)?

*A. Podlecki:* In spite of the reservations expressed by O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1977), 431 sqq. — and he is often overly skeptical in such matters — I think it is valid to use the passage which you cite in Pollux as evidence for the staging of *Ψυχοστασία*. It may have been Hermes who held the scales in the Cyclic *Αἰθιοπίς*, but in Aiskhylos's tragedy it was almost certainly Zeus. Taplin argues that "there was some sort of inhibition against impersonating Zeus himself on the tragic stage" (*op. cit.*, 432), but the argument is circular; if Zeus appeared in person in the play, as Plutarch and Pollux state, there cannot have been such an 'inhibition'. And the *mise en scène* must have been spectacular (*cf.* n. 32 above).

*G. Avezzù:* Cosa pensare della possibilità di ipotizzare cronologie per le sequenze tri- e tetralogiche non pervenute? La questione ci riporta all'altra, relativa alla plausibilità di postulare sincronie fra determinati drammi e determinati avvenimenti storici; penso, per esempio, alle argomentazioni di M.L.

West a favore di una collocazione della *Lycurgeia* di Eschilo fra il 466 (subito dopo quella di Polifrasmone!) e il 463 (?) e comunque poco dopo la sconfitta a Drabesco.

*A. Podlecki:* In my *The political background of Aeschylean tragedy* (Ann Arbor 1966) I tried to make the case that he was (in general) on the liberal side of issues that were of contemporary political concern and that in certain instances, with the *Πέρσαι* of 472 for example, he may have been supporting the policy of a particular individual. Most commentators who pay any attention to this kind of question would, I think, agree that the *Ὀρέστεια* of 458 looks back (in some sense) to the Areiopagos reforms of several years earlier, and that it may reflect continuing partisan dissension over the wisdom of those reforms. In every instance I would say that a case for discerning the possibility of a reflection of contemporary social or political issues can only safely be made if we have a firm date for the work in question. Otherwise, the argument quickly risks becoming circular: we seem to detect contemporary relevance or topicality for some feature of the play, and we look for a date when it would have been topical. *Voilà!* We know, or think we know, when it was produced.

Any theory that M.L. West puts forward must be taken seriously but in this case, since we have no date for Aiskhylos's *Λυκούργεια* (and there are no good grounds for supposing that it was a response to Polyphrasmon's similarly titled work which was produced in 467), I would say that any attempts to find contemporary relevance in it (to the humiliating Athenian defeat at Drabeskos in Thrace in 465/4, for example, and for all that such a conjunction might appear unavoidable) must remain speculative.

*P. Judet de La Combe:* La réflexion très intense sur les fragments qui nous est proposée permet de comprendre beaucoup mieux le travail d'Eschyle sur la tradition mythique qu'il utilise. Ma première question est de savoir si d'après la liste des

mythes repris par Eschyle nous pouvons nous faire une idée de la manière dont cet auteur (ou la tragédie comme genre) considère la tradition mythique. Certes cette tradition, portée souvent par l'épopée, est très ample, multiple et riche, et beaucoup plus que ce que nous pouvons savoir par les restes qui nous sont parvenus. Mais il semble bien qu'il y ait eu, au sein de la tradition épique, une hiérarchie entre les mythes (avec, au premier plan, les cycles troyens et thébains, avec la théogonie), or la tragédie met sur le même plan l'ensemble des traditions mythiques, locales ou panhelléniques, traitées par les grands poèmes épiques ou non. Y a-t-il là une relation nouvelle à la tradition narrative héroïque?

*A. Podlecki:* This is an important question, but one difficult to answer satisfactorily. There is so much about the use of myth in early tragedy that we do not know, and even in Aiskhylos, for 7 of the preserved titles no fragments survive and of the rest 49 have fewer than 5 full verses (although in many cases the title allows some more or less safe inferences about the myth in question). I take the saying "Nothing to do with Dionysos", which, with variations, has been transmitted by several of our sources, to imply that early drama *did* have more to do with Dionysos than the meager remains would indicate. A Πενθεύς was ascribed to Thespis (and therewith another set of problems). There are no titles preserved for Khoirilos and nothing obviously Dionysiac in the 9 titles assigned to Phrynikhos. There are, as we saw, a plethora of Aiskhylean titles dealing with resistance to the god.

Where did the dramatists look for their *mythoi*? Apparently to "l'ensemble des traditions mythiques", including, but not limited to, the great mythic Cycles, Trojan, Theban, Argonautic, and others. Aiskhylos went back to "Homer's great banquet" for much of his inspiration, but he did not limit himself to these 'slices'. How could he? His active career as an entrant in the competitions spanned 40 years. If we mechanically (and probably misleadingly) divide his 80+ titles into tetralogies, we

see that he was faced with the need to present a panel of 4 plays every other year, on average. So he had to find plots wherever he could, in the well-known mythic traditions (where his skill at innovation would have been called for, as in *Μυρμιδόνες*), as well as the less familiar ones (τοὺς τυχόντας μύθους, as Aristotle says at *Po.* 1453a18; I have always been struck, and a little puzzled, by his remark at 1451b26 that “even the familiar stories [τὰ γνώριμα] are familiar only too a few”). What was important was to look for, or invent, characters caught in the throes of extreme situations that could be presented to audiences as typical and universal, for it is tragedy’s quintessential task, to adapt an observation by M. Revermann in a recent number of *Arion*, to “explore the extremes of human suffering and subject them to intense reflection”.

*R. Parker:* If one thinks about the situation of the first tragedians, they were confronted as possible plots with a huge range of stories, some of which had been treated at length in a variety of literary genres, others not. Presenting a story in tragedy is quite different from presenting it in epic or lyric or simply as a brief unelaborated narrative. Whether a given story had received literary treatment hitherto or not, the challenge of shaping or re-shaping all this material for the tragic stage was enormous. The tragedians were faced, as it were, with a massive field which had to be ploughed for the first time. I wonder if you have any sense of how much of this first ploughing was done by Aeschylus’ predecessors, how much by Aeschylus, and how much remained to be done by his successors. You mention for instance Wilamowitz’ view that Sophocles wrote his *Nausicaa* because Aeschylus had left this theme untreated.

*A. Podlecki:* I agree entirely that the earliest (as also, of course, the later) dramatists had a vast repertoire of stories from which to draw their plots. There must have been considerable pressure on would-be competitors to come up with a winning idea for next year’s Dionysia, and not all of the myths (one

would have thought) lent themselves to dramatic re-handling. It also made a difference who was handling it. The demands of choral lyric (and I see no good reason to doubt that these early odes were performed by singing and dancing choruses) were rather different, and the pace of, say, that part of the *Septem contra Thebas* story that survives as Stesikhoros 222A as well as the flow of the dialogue (Jokasta — or Epikastê — then Teiresias) seem rather relaxed. The story of Medea and Jason in *Pythian* IV, on the other hand, is eventful enough and the dialogue vigorous, but the narrative order strikes me as somewhat incoherent.

The earliest tragedians had already begun to look beyond the Trojan and Theban cycles. To Phrynikhos were ascribed Ἀλκηστις, Πλευρώνιαι (Meleagros and the boar-hunt on Kalydon), Τάνταλος and plays about Troilos, Europê and possibly Herakles (Ἀνταῖος ἢ Λίβυες) as well as some works that may have influenced Aiskhylos: Ἀκταίων, Αἰγύπτιος, Δαναΐδες, not to mention Φοίνισσαι. Pratinas also produced, at a date unknown, a Τάνταλος and Περσεύς and his son Aristias an Ἀταλάντη and Ὀρφεύς, which were probably later than Aiskhylos's Ἀταλάντη and Βασσάραι/ Βασσαρίδες, in which Orpheus figured as a character.

My impression (and it is only that, a purely personal view) is that Sophokles was in this regard more adventurous than his 'forerunner' (I leave out of account the satyr-dramas, where innovation in some sense was a *sine qua non*). Aiskhylos went to the Argonautic saga for at least three works, but seems not to have touched on the Jason/Medea story, which was the subject of Sophokles's Κολχίδες. Theseus appeared in Ἐλευσίνιοι but Sophokles introduced him in several plays, Αἰγέως, Θησεύς, Φαίδρα. With Ἀθάμας, Γλαύκος Ποτνιεύς, Ἡλιάδες (Phaethon), Ἰξίων (whose story Περραιβίδες also apparently treated), Καλλιστώ, Κρηῆσαι (the Corinthian seer Polyidos), Φινεύς and Νιόβη Aiskhylos seems to be breaking new ground. Sophokles's 'innovating' titles appear, at least at first sight, to be more numerous: Δαίδαλος (with, as continuations of the story or perhaps

alternative titles, Καμίκιοι and Μίνως), Θαμύρας, Ἰοβάτης (Bellerophon's father-in-law), Κρέουσα (perhaps to be identified with his Ἴων), Οἰνόμαος, Πρόκρις, Τήρευς, Τριπτόλεμος, and Τυρώ α' and β'.

A similar exercise could be carried out with Euripides's titles, to see which are unique to him, but I shall leave that to others.

*M. Griffith:* Among Euripides' plays, don't you think that *Orestes* and *Helen* both should count as conspicuous examples of dramas heavily influenced by, and responding to, Aeschylus' *Oresteia*? The former has Furies on-stage (if only in Orestes' imagination!), Orestes and Pylades, a trial, an appearance by Apollo.... The latter picks up on the well-known tradition (Stesichorus, Herodotus, and perhaps Aeschylus' own *Proteus*, as it has been argued) as well as on some notable hints in *Agamemnon* (415 φάσμα, 416 κολοσσῶν, 425 ὄψις etc.), to the effect that only a phantom (εἶδωλον) or statue (κολοσσός) of Helen went to Troy while she herself remained chastely with Proteus in Egypt.

*A. Podlecki:* I think Euripides's Ὀρέστης shows more signs of the 'anxiety of influence' of the Ὀρέστεια than Ἑλένη. Allusions to the phantom-at-Troy story are there in *Agamemnon* to be sure, but, as you point out, this was a well-known tradition that was probably invented by Stesikhoros and which Herodotus says he heard from his Egyptian sources (2. 112 *sqq.*), and I think Euripides was playing off directly on that, rather than the 'hints' dropped by Aiskhylos.

As for Ὀρέστης there are plenty of echoes of the Aiskhylean treatment of the story — how could there not be? —, but they seem to get swallowed up in a strange jumble of various elements that were either traditional to the story or produced by Euripides's own perfervid imagination. Apollo's responsibility is repeatedly, almost obsessively, referred to and finally confirmed by the god himself *ex machina*. Other unmistakable reminiscences are 552 *sqq.* (there are, however, problems

in the text) only the father is the parent ( $\approx$  *Eum.* 663 *sqq.*); 1204 *sq.*, where Orestes tells his sister, "You have the body of a woman but a masculine mind" ( $\approx$  *Ag.* 11); 1225 *sqq.* a brief reprise in hexameters of the great incantatory *kommos* in *Choe-phori*; and 1395 ἀίλινον ἀίλινον (= *Ag.* 121 but also elsewhere). And there are a host of Euripidean innovations: Helen and her daughter as sympathetic 'victims', Orestes's abortive appeal to his uncle Menelaos (almost as slimy here as in *Andr.*), Tyndareus's intervention, a local ἀντιουργός speaking effectively in Orestes's defense (917 *sqq.*), and a Pylades who seems actively to have participated in the matricide (406, 1074, 1089 *sq.*).

The story will not, of course, allow Klytaimestra to be totally exculpated, but by numerous touches some degree of sympathy for her is aroused; one important dramatic effect of this is to emphasize the enormity of Orestes's matricide, and thus explain the reasons for his psychological disorientation. Outdoing even Phaidra as a case-study in morbid psychology, Orestes shows strong psychosomatic signs of his haunting by the Erinyes / Eumenides, details of which Euripides lays on with a typically thick brush and vivid palette. The whole *mélange bizarre* comes to a climax with the multiple-murder plot, where Euripides rings a clever change on the 'phantom' version, 1501 *sq.*, 1557 *sq.* (Menelaos amusingly dismisses this as a κενὴν βάζειν), 1580. By a brilliant stroke of inventiveness all the versions of Orestes's trial are combined: having been tried and condemned by a human jury of his Argive countrymen he will eventually be haled into court in Athens by three Erinyes, where, like Ares charged by Poseidon with the murder of the latter's son Halir-rothios, he will be acquitted by a divine jury sitting on the Areiopagos. I am tempted to say that what we have here is Euripides's doing a paratragic 'take', almost in the manner of Aristophanes, on the whole issue of divinely authorized matricide and its consequences.

J. Jouanna: À propos des *Cariens* ou *Europe*, ne pourrait-on rappeler que la filiation de Sarpédon chez Eschyle (il est le fils

d'Europe) est une innovation par rapport à Homère où Sarpédon est fils de Zeus et de Laodamie? On pourrait comparer à l'innovation dans la filiation d'Apollon et d'Artémis mentionnée par Hdt. 2. 156. 4-5 et rappelée par R. Parker au début de son intervention sur les dieux chez Eschyle.

*A. Podlecki:* Thank you for pointing out this divergence from the genealogy Homer gives for Sarpedon (*Il.* 6. 198 *sq.*). G. S. Kirk's note on that passage reports that the discrepancy was commented on already by Aristarkhos, who assigned the innovation to οἱ νεώτεροι, which would have included Hesiod (or pseudo-Hesiod) Ἡοῖαι frs. 140 and 141.11 *sqq.* M-W and Bakkhylides fr. 10 Snell-Maehler. So the innovation was there already in the tradition. One can ask why Aiskhylos chose to follow the more 'recent' (and also, apparently, more widespread) version, and one possible reason is that it gave him the opportunity of having Europê in F \*\*99 contrast the fates of her three sons by Zeus; Sarpedon's in the course of the play will turn out to be the most 'tragic'.

*P. Judet de La Combe:* Que peut-on dire, quant à la relation entre tragédie et épopée, de l'abandon progressif de la forme dramatique particulière qu'est la "trilogie liée"?

*A. Podlecki:* As we saw, upwards of 60 Aiskhylean titles have been fitted - sometimes by Prokrustean means - into connected tetralogies, whereas for Sophokles only a Τηλέφεια is attested (although there may have been other thematically connected works, a possibility H. Lloyd-Jones entertains for Ἀλκμέων, Ἐριφύλη, Ἐπίγονοι and a satyric Ἀμφιάρεως, as well as an Argonautic group consisting of Κολχίδες, Σκύθοι and Πιζοτόμοι). I think this was more than just personal taste on the younger dramatist's part. It must have become evident that many stories did not lend themselves to narrative continuity 'between' the constituent segments as well as a tragic climax 'within' each. *Ag.* and *Cho.* are good examples of this kind of

linkage; *Supp.* leaves us with the feeling that the best is yet to come. I am not sure this has anything to do with the relationship between tragedy and epic, but I would be glad to hear your thoughts on the subject.

*G. Avezzi:* Ho un altro quesito, che invece riguarda le variazioni apportate dai successori alle strutture drammaturgiche adottate dal 'forerunner' Eschilo: in almeno due casi ben documentati si riceve l'impressione che Sofocle preferisca dare al coro un'identità più strettamente connessa a quella del protagonista (o del co-protagonista), e comunque passibile di un trattamento drammatico più coinvolgente — penso al Coro dell'*Aiace* (composto da marinai, sudditi di Aiace) a confronto con le eschilee *Donne di Tracia* (Θρηῖσσαι, composto da donne, straniere e prigioniere: l'interprete antico ne coglieva la significatività sotto un profilo del tutto particolare, *cf. schol.* [a] al v. 134), e a quello del *Filottete* sofocleo (sudditi di Neottolemo) a confronto con quello del dramma eschileo (abitanti di Lemno). L'osservazione si potrebbe estendere alle due *Elette*, di Sofocle e di Euripide, in rapporto alle *Coefore* (dove il Coro, pur femminile, è di straniere prigioniere) e in qualche misura confermerebbe che la trasformazione può coinvolgere anche Euripide.

*A. Podlecki:* Your suggestion that the choruses in Sophokles and perhaps also in Euripides were more involved with their respective protagonists than in Aiskhylos must be taken seriously. Certainly with the Philoktetes story, Sophokles's expedient of having the chorus composed of Neoptolemos's seamen was a brilliant solution to the problem of a chorus of locals who had had no contact with the hero for ten years (as we saw, Euripides typically faced the issue head-on and had them apologize for their previous neglect), and especially in view of the prominence Sophokles decided to give Neoptolemos in his version of the story (*cf.* p. 343 above). About the Ἡλεκτραι I am not so sure. The women in the palace in Aiskhylos's version may be slaves, but they seem very bound up with the affairs of

the royal family, and they identify with the sufferings of the heroine, every bit as much as the more generically 'local' women who comprised the chorus in Sophokles's and Euripides's treatments. Indeed, as palace-slaves they would have had more intimate knowledge of what was really going on indoors than their counterparts in the other two plays.

*J. Jouanna:* Les données sur les *Femmes thraces* proviennent pour la plupart des scholies à l'*Ajax* de Sophocle. Trois scholies sont importantes non seulement parce qu'elles donnent des renseignements très précis sur Eschyle qui avait traité de la même séquence mythique que Sophocle, mais aussi sur les relations que la critique ancienne voyait entre Sophocle et son devancier. C'est un bel exemple d'«intertextualité» qui rentre parfaitement dans la problématique de votre communication. Qu'en pensez-vous?

*A. Podlecki:* After submitting the provisional version of my communication, I had the opportunity of reading your very interesting and informative paper in the 1999 Lyon symposium *Lectures antiques de la tragédie grecque* (art. cit. [n. 43]). As you point out, most of what we know about Θρῆσαι we owe to the 'intertextual' instincts of an acute scholiast who saw that one could make illuminating comparisons between the Aiskhylean and Sophoklean versions which would shed light on both. He sensitively remarks on three places where Sophokles improves on his predecessor (although he is careful to point out that this was not done in a spirit of criticism or censure): composition of the Chorus, report *vs.* enactment of Aias's suicide, and manner of delivery of the fatal wound. Presumably there are other such gems of critical acumen buried among the scholia, which would therefore repay closer scrutiny than they have so far received.

*M. Griffith:* Among the lost plays of Aeschylus there are several that appear to have presented quite a strong element of erotic

relationships, whether hetero-sexual (e.g., *Amymone*, *Europe*, *Dikyoulkoi*) or homo-sexual (notably, *Myrmidons*). It has also seemed likely to many scholars, too, that Laios' original crime (referred to at *Sept.* 742-57, in rather heavily sexualized language) was the rape of Chrysis; and at *Sept.* 750, 756-57 the language appears to refer to Iokaste's improper and fatal seduction of Laios. Of course, too, *Supp.* is full of erotic threats and images; and Klytaimnestra's relationship to Aigisthos is clearly, if briefly, represented as being quite erotic too, in both *Ag.* and *Cho.* So, on the one hand, one might wonder whether the picture of Aeschylus as a clean-living, old-fashioned pillar of tragic, Marathon-machic morality, outraged at Euripides' "women in love" (*Ar. Ra*, etc.), may not be grossly distorted, sustained in part into the modern era by the selection of the seven plays that survived (of which *Supp.* has been by far the least-read). And on the other hand, the presence in at least one Aeschylean play (*Myrmidons*) of explicit homoerotic, romantic language in a plot that must have foregrounded the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus, reminds us how odd it is that male-male romantic relationships, while obviously a matter of public celebration among Athenian élites in the late 6<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> C. (witness vase-paintings; the legends of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, etc.), apparently rarely made it into high literature. Homer in the surviving version of the *Iliad* only faintly gestures towards this kind of relationship, though the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* is pretty explicit about Zeus and Ganymede. It looks to me as if Aeschylus, both in his satyr-plays and in his tragedies, had quite a lot of sex and high-class (non-comic) romance, just as Sophocles demonstrably does in his satyr-plays. Do you agree? And if so, does this suggest that Athenian tastes shifted, especially regarding the representation or mention on-stage of same-sex romance, so that this became less admissible after Aeschylus' career was over?

*A. Podlecki:* Your question highlights something that has generally not had the kind of attention paid to it that it

deserves: What factors were there influencing public taste in fifth-century Athens in the depiction of overt sexual behaviour? It's possible that, as K. Dover maintained, same-sex activity, while generally condoned, was only ever the norm among the aristocrats, and then under well-defined constraints (at gymnasia, private parties, and generally only pre-maritally). As you point out, there doesn't seem to have been much that could not be spoken about, if not actually depicted, in the satyr-plays. Tragedy was a different story. For one thing, although many of the titles of the lost dramas are less than informative about what line their plot developments might have taken, there don't appear to have been that many stories that would have lent themselves to a *tragic* outcome of same-sex passion (you note the obvious exceptions, Akhilleus-Patroklos and Laios-Khrysippos, almost certainly in Euripides's *Χρύσιππος*, although I am not sure that this is where the passages you cite in *Sept.* are pointing in Aiskhylos's lost *Λαῖος*). Perhaps you're right and it was mainly a matter of evolving tastes, especially among the theatre-going middle-class males whose voices became increasingly audible as their role in public life grew, and with it the recognition by all classes, the aristocrats included, of how essential their contribution was to the success of Athens's expansionist ambitions.

*P. Judet de la Combe*: Pour le trilogie thébaine d'Eschyle: que peut-on tirer comme renseignements du deuxième stasimon des *Sept contre Thèbes* sur les pièces antérieures quant à la raison pour laquelle Laïos n'a pas obéi l'oracle d'Apollon (750, ἐκ φίλων ἀβουλιᾶν, avec les problèmes de texte que présente ce groupe de mots), et quant à la raison de la malédiction d'Étéocle et Polynice par Oedipe (785 *sqq.*, avec les difficultés très grandes que pose ce texte)?

*A. Podlecki*: I am a little less pessimistic about using the Second Stasimon of *Sept.* to reconstruct the preceding plays than I was in 1975 ("Reconstructing an Aeschylean Trilogy", in *BICS*

22, 10 *sqq.*). “Laios”, we are told at verses 750 *sq.*, was “overcome, mastered (κρατηθείς) by ...[ text uncertain ]”, but the meaning must be “positive impulses towards foolish action” (G.O. Hutchinson’s paraphrase of the ἀβουλ- word), with φιλ- denoting “loved ones”. If the women are alluding to passionate pleas by Jocasta that the couple have unprotected sex, this seems a very roundabout way of doing so (not, of course, for that reason beyond the realm of possibility for this author). At 785 *sqq.* we learn — or are reminded, if this is recapitulation of an actual scene in the preceding play — that Oidipous, “enraged by his [...] sustenance“, uttered sharp-tongued curses against his sons....” How the τροφή was characterized is, unfortunately, uncertain. Choices are “accursed” or “slender, meagre” (ἀραιάς, the paradosis, or ἀραιᾶς, G.C.W. Schneider); “antique”, “outmoded” (ἀρχαίας, U. von Wilamowitz *et al.*); “wretched” (ἀθλίαις, C. Prien); “cruel” (ἀγρίαις, C.M. Francken). The Cyclic Θηβαίς offered apparently irreconcilable explanations: his sons served their father food in heirloom, and hence taboo, vessels, or the food itself was less than appetizing. None of this gets us very far in our efforts to fill in the missing Οἰδίπους. I think the wisest course is to confess ignorance and hope for a papyrus discovery.

*F. Macintosh:* Thank you very much for your wonderfully full and helpful reading of the fragments. I was wondering whether, given the fact that Aeschylus was accorded the unique privilege in the fifth century of being re-performed at the City Dionysia (notwithstanding other performances in the demes), would it not perhaps be more appropriate to speak of him less as ‘forerunner’ than paradigm? In some ways, *pace* the ending of *The Frogs*, Aeschylus was very much ‘alive’ in the last part of the fifth century.

*A. Podlecki:* You are right to draw attention to Aiskhylos’s unique position as a ‘classic’ almost within his own lifetime. If the testimonia recorded by S. Radt (*TrGF* 3, Tt 73-6) are

correct, after his death he was awarded the unparalleled honour of *ad lib.* re-production of his plays by anyone — i.e., any potential *khoregos* — who was willing to put up the money (in this instance, presumably there would have been only two spots for ‘regular’ competitors). The picture is somewhat clouded by a notice that his son Euphorion won four victories with his father’s plays “that had not yet been presented” (T 71) and complicated further by Quintilian’s remark that these re-productions were of works that had been revised (T 77 *correctas eius fabulas*).

Unfortunately, we don’t know how often or when his plays were reproduced. Guesses have been made on the basis of presumed echoes or parodies in Aristophanes, of which S. Radt conveniently collects the assumed ‘evidence’ at *TrGF* 3, T Gm. Although I think I see what you’re getting at by using the word ‘paradigm’ — his successors may have been looking to his plays as immediate models as they were composing their own — I think I will stick to my original formulation. His works, when they appeared, broke new ground: in the (relatively) reduced role of the chorus and the increased flexibility that a second actor afforded (T 100), as well as innovations perhaps in tragic costume and certainly in choreography (T 103). These changes were to leave a permanent mark on the way tragedies were composed, not only in the immediately succeeding generations of dramatists, but even down to our own day.

*P. Judet de la Combe*: Quelles hypothèses raisonnables peuvent être proposées non pas sur l’authenticité ou la date de la tétralogie prométhéenne, mais sur sa composition?

*A. Podlecki*: There are stylistic anomalies, to be sure, in the surviving Prometheus play, but M.L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990), 54 *sqq.* persuaded himself that what had passed unquestioned under the penetrating gaze of generations of ancient scholars should be excluded because it did not conform to what he posited as normal Aiskhylean “typology” or

formal structure. But this surely amounts to putting a strait-jacket on an artist's creative instincts — and abilities; on such reasoning we should have to conclude that Jane Austen “could not have written” *Northanger Abbey*. Whenever, and by whom-ever, they were composed (and I am yet to be convinced that a verdict of what our Italian colleagues elegantly call *la non eschileità* is the correct one), the Δεσμώτης and Λυόμενος must stand together. Enough can be recovered or reasonably conjectured about the lost play to make it virtually certain that the author planned them as a coherent *ensemble* and even included features, structural and other (journeys to exotic places by Prometheus's interlocutors, elemental composition of the choruses), that would impress their audience as mirroring techniques.

The real mystery, of course, is whether this was a tetralogy and, if so, what the other plays were and, in the case of the missing tragedy, where it stood. My own fairly strong feeling (and I am hardly alone in this) is that the Δεσμώτης reads like the ‘opener’, and I suggested in 1975 in the *BICS* article that Π. Πυρφόρος may have stood in the middle as a kind of interlude, and involved a transaction in Hades (*cf.* Arist. *Po.* 1456a, 3) whereby the centaur Kheiron, longing to die because he had been painfully and incurably wounded by one of Herakles's arrows, offered himself in exchange for Prometheus (S. Radt objected that this seems impossible in light of what appear to be two references in the scholia of the surviving play to the Λυόμενος as τὸ ἐξῆς δράμα, but scholiasts were not infallible). I sympathize with H. Lloyd-Jones's attempt to fill out the trilogy with a different play entirely, but am not entirely convinced that it was Αἰτναῖαι. If there was a satyr-play no plausible candidate presents itself because the Πυρκαεύς (the title is not in the Catalogue), of which fairly substantial excerpts are preserved in *P.Oxy.* 20. 2245 (see n. 161 above), was almost certainly the satyric romp attested for the Πέρσαι group in 472.

