NOTES ON AESCHYLEAN FRAGMENTS

These notes are designed to explain some of the positions taken on textual and other issues in the third volume (*Fragments*) of my Loeb edition of Aeschylus (Cambridge MA 2008).

(1) *Aitnaiai*

Since from my introductory note to this play (p. 6) it might seem that I was claiming as my own the suggestion that its chorus consisted of mountain nymphs, I should make it clear that the proposal had been made by E. Grassi, "PdP" 11, 1956, 209; it has been endorsed by L. Poli-Palladini, "RhM" 144, 2001, 304, 308, 311-3, and by J.M. Lucas de Dios, *Esquilo: Fragmentos, Testimonios* (Madrid 2008) 186. It has considerable probability. For one thing, Thaleia, daughter of Hephaestus and mother of the Palici whose birth (after Thaleia had been swallowed by the earth) seems to have featured in the play, was herself a nymph[1]. For another, the Αἰτναῖαι must have taken their name either from the mountain or from the city. If from the mountain, they must certainly have been immortal beings, since the mountain itself had no human inhabitants. If from the city, while it is perfectly possible in principle (*pace* Poli-Palladini, *op. cit.* 312) that Aeschylus represented a precursor of Hieron's recent foundation as having existed in mythical times, it is unlikely that he would have represented a group of *women* of that city as ranging over much of Sicily in a play reported to have had five changes of scene (*POxy.* 2257 fr. 1).

(2) *Glaukos Pontios* fr. 25e

E. Siegmann, "Philologus" 97, 1948, 61, restored the beginning of line 4 as [ἐμὸν] μὲν ἴσθι σ[ῶμα], and reported Bruno Snell's suggestion of σ[ῶμ' ὃν οὐκέτ' εὐσθενές] for the rest of the line (Mette[2] later suggested ἐγκρατές for the last word). Snell's proposal certainly gets the broad sense right: the speaker's body as a whole may be feeble with age, but (as he goes on to say in lines 5-6) his eyesight is sound and reliable (compare, for both points, fr. 25d.5-6). However, that sense is unlikely to have been expressed in the way he or Mette suggest. In Attic poetry the neuter participle ὄν is almost always placed where it will form a heavy syllable (i.e. preceding a consonant or a pause). There are only three exceptions, all of them in the same comic fragment, Antiphanes fr. 120 (8, 14 *bis*)[3]. The fragment is a send-up of the style

[1] Macrob. *Sat.* 5.19.18; shortly afterwards (5.19.24) he cites fr. 6, on the Palici.

[2] *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin 1959) 19 (on his fr. 55).

[3] Lines 12-14 are corrupt; for a possible restoration (which incidentally gets rid of both

of philosophers discussing ontology (the speaker professes to find their language unintelligible), and ὄν each time forms part of the phrase οὐκ ὄν "non-existent" which functions here virtually as a single word. At any rate the poet has a special reason for wanting his language to sound weird. An alternative restoration might be e.g. [ἐμὸν] μὲν ἴσθι σ[ῶμα γηρᾶσαν χρόνῳ.

If the word following ἐστι in line 5 is correctly read as π̣[ί]σ̣τ̣ι̣ς, it indicates that the line means something like "but the reliability of my eyes is still good". The last word, after ὀμμά[των], might be [σαφής] (Cantarella[4]) or [καλή] (Siegmann). At the beginning of the line, [καὶ τ]ῷνδ' (Cantarella) does not provide the necessary particle to answer the μέν of the previous line, while [ἐμ]ῷν δ' (Siegmann) repeats, in an emphatic position, a possessive which was hardly necessary in the previous line and is completely otiose here. I offer [τούτ]ων δ': another possibility might be [δισσ]ῶν δ'.

In line 8 the speaker begins to describe himself. Except for its first syllable, the line can be confidently restored as]ως ἄγραυλός εἰμὶ κἀπιχ[ώριος]. For the first syllable, Siegmann suggested [ἀλλ']; but it is not then clear what the ὡς-clause is to be governed by. Lloyd-Jones[5] adopted a proposal by Page, [οἶσθ']; but if the addressee(s) are already aware of the speaker's occupation and usual whereabouts, it is odd that he should spend three or four lines giving these particulars in detail[6]. Better would be [ἴσθ'].

(3) *Glaukos Potnieus* fr. 36

In lines 2-4 of this fragment someone – most likely the chorus, in view of the lyrics that follow immediately (5-6) – is bidding farewell to Glaucus as he departs for the games. Of line 4 there survives]ἐν κελεύθῳ ξυμβολ̣ο̣[. The syllable missing at the beginning could well be [τῇδ']. As for the end, the chorus are praying (ἐπεύχ[2) for *bon voyage* (εὐοδίαν 5) for Glaucus. The verb of praying governs an accusative (σ' 2) and infinitive; unless the infinitive was fitted in at the end of line 2, it must have come in line 4 (line 3 appears to consist entirely of a prepositional phrase governed by ἕκατι); perhaps ξύμβολ̣ο̣[ν κεδνὸν λαβεῖν] or ξυμβόλ̣ο̣[υ κεδνοῦ τυχεῖν] "to get a good omen". To receive a good omen when journeying to a contest increases one's confidence in success and thereby also improves one's chances of achieving it; conversely Orestes promises (*Eum*. 769-771) that in his post-

the instances in line 14 of ὄν preceding a vowel!) see D.M. Jones, "CR" 10, 1960, 203.

[4] *I nuovi frammenti eschilei di Ossirinco* (Naples 1948) 9.

[5] In his 1957 appendix to volume II of H. Weir Smyth's Loeb edition (p. 530).

[6] And if, as in fr. 25d, he is addressing the chorus, then if they were satyrs (as they probably were: see A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in Krumeich et al. *Das griechische Satyrspiel,* Darmstadt 1999, 125-6), they would not be likely to know him anyway.

humous capacity as a hero he will frustrate any future attempt at an Argive invasion of Attica by "making their ways dispirited and their paths ill-omened, till they repent of their effort".

(4) *Edonoi* fr. 57 (lines 2-5)

ὁ μὲν ἐν χερσὶν
βόμβυκας ἔχων, τόρνου κάματον,
δακτυλόθικτον πίμπλησι μέλος, 4
μανίας ἐπαγωγὸν ὁμοκλήν

4 δακτυλόθικτον Jacobs: δακτυλόδεικτον codd.

One does not, in Greek any more than in English, "fill" a piece of music[7]; one might, on the other hand, metaphorically fill a pipe with music by blowing through it. Read δακτυλοθίκτου... μέλους.

(5) *Edonoi* fr. 60

τίς ποτ᾽ ἔσθ᾽ ὁ μουσόμαντις †ἄλλος ἀβρατοῦς ὃν σθένει†

ἔσθ᾽ Pauw cl. textu Ar. *Av.* 276: ἐστὶν Γ: ἔσται cett. Suda ἄλλος V: ἄλαλος cett. Suda: ἀμαλὸς Hermann ἀβρατοῦς V: ἀβρατεὺς cett. Suda: ἁβροβάτης Hermann, Friebel (ὀρειβάτης codd. Aristophanis loc. cit.)

The above text is that of *TrGF*. West (*Studies* 29) has argued convincingly that the person referred to here is not, as has usually been supposed, Dionysus but Orpheus; this makes ἄλλος intelligible, if we assume (as West does, for other reasons) that this passage comes later in the play than Lycurgus' interrogation of Dionysus. Lycurgus has now encountered *another* individual of much the same stamp as his first captive (and, if we accept West's argument, a devotee of his).

The mysterious ἀβρατοῦς is best emended to the Aeschylean word ἁβροβάτης (*Pers*. 1073; also Bacch. 3.48)[8] "one who walks with delicate step"; one might also think of ἀβρόπους, but that word is only found as a gloss (not a lemma) in Hesychius (σ265). Certainly it seems likely that Aristophanes (cf. *Birds* 276) read in the Aeschylean passage some word ending in -βάτης.

Now if Aeschylus wrote ἁβροβάτης here, and if no words in the fragment are out of sequence, then it is too long to fit into a trochaic tetrameter, and we must either delete ὃν σθένει or, with Mette[9], regard it as the opening of a second tetrameter the rest of which is lost. In that case, something must have been lost from the first line; and, metrically speaking, this could have happened in any of the following three places:

[7] A *TLG* search revealed no collocations of μέλος or μέλη with words built on the root πλη- "fill" earlier than Hermes Trismegistus.

[8] Both passages refer to orientals (in Bacchylides, to a slave of Croesus).

[9] *Supplementum Aeschyleum* (Berlin 1939) 12.

(a) τίς ποτ᾽ ἔσθ᾽ ὁ μουσόμαντις <– ˘ > ἄλλος ἁβροβάτης;
(b) τίς ποτ᾽ ἔσθ᾽ ὁ μουσόμαντις ἄλλος <– ˘ > ἁβροβάτης;
(c) τίς ποτ᾽ ἔσθ᾽ ὁ μουσόμαντις ἄλλος ἁβροβάτης < ˘ –>;

Now ἄλλος cannot qualify μουσόμαντις (since if it did, it would have to follow the article directly), and it could only with difficulty qualify ἁβροβάτης (since that word itself is more like an adjective than a noun). It is therefore most likely to qualify the lost word. (This at once rules out alternative (c) above.) The person described is thus being spoken of as "another *x*"; and since the first *x* was certainly Dionysus, the lost word must be one which Lycurgus had applied, or could have applied, to Dionysus.

We know one word that Lycurgus did apply to Dionysus, and which would fit the present context perfectly: γύννις (fr. 61). Certainly in artistic representations of Orpheus in Thrace, in and before Aeschylus' time, he is invariably beardless and usually has long hair, often plaited or trailing in curls[10]. And γύννις would go well with ἁβροβάτης, since walking delicately could be taken as a sign of effeminacy[11]. If γύννις is correct, it requires us to adopt alternative (a) above, which is what I have printed in the Loeb edition.

(6) *Heliades* fr. 69
ἔνθ᾽ ἐπὶ δυσμαῖς
†ἴσου† πατρὸς Ἡφαιστοτευχὲς
δέπας, ἐν τῷ διαβάλλει
πολὺν οἰδματόεντα
†φέρει δρόμου πόρον οὐθεις† 5
μελανίππου προφυγὼν
ἱερᾶς νυκτὸς ἀμολγόν

I reproduce the whole of this fragment (*TrGF*'s text, which adopts no conjectures at all) merely to give an idea of what is being said and of the metrical pattern where it is clear. Lines 3, 6 and 7, which are more or less free of textual problems, are all ionic; Ἡφαιστοτευχὲς (2) is incompatible with this metre, and Ἡφαιστοτυκὲς (Hermann) is likely to be right[12].

What about δυσμαῖς †ἴσου†? In the first place, one expects a lyric in an Aeschylean play entitled *Heliades* to be sung by the Heliades themselves,

[10] See *LIMC* Orpheus nos. *7, 8, 22, **23, **28, 35, **36, **39, 43, *44, 45, **64. An asterisk indicates that Orpheus has long hair, a double asterisk that he has trailing curls or (in 23) that his hair is in plaits.

[11] See on *Pers*. 1073, and on the connotations of ἁβρός generally, E.M. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford 1989) 81.

[12] One might have expected –τυκον (*Supp*. 959, 974, 994); but adjectives in –τυκής certainly existed (cf. Hesychius ε7256-8, Stob. 2.9.6).

which would rule out the attempts that have been made, from Casaubon (δυσμαῖσι σοῦ) onwards, to find a second-person possessive in the phrase. And secondly, if the metre is indeed consistently ionic, we must either delete ϊσου entirely (which nobody has been willing to do), or correct it to something whose metrical shape is (˘) ˘ – (–)[13]. Not one of the conjectures reported by Radt meets both these requirements; one (Pauw's δυσμαῖς ἴσον) would do so with a simple adjustment, but in every other respect it is far from attractive, placing an unrelated word between δυσμαῖς and πατρός and applying to the Sun's golden bowl an epithet of Homeric ships not otherwise used of them outside epic. The simplest solution is δυσμαῖσιν ἐμοῦ: the first two letters of ϊσου may be a dittography of the last two of δυσμαῖς, or may have got into the text from a supralinear correction (of a variant δυσμὰς?), in either case displacing the first two letters of ἐμοῦ. If this emendation is adopted, ἔνθ᾽ should be printed on a line of its own, as the last word of an otherwise lost ionic dimeter (unless it is preferred to treat ἔνθ᾽ ἐπὶ δυσμαῖσιν ἐμοῦ as just over two-thirds of a trimeter).

(7) *Heliades* fr. 72

†ὅρα σε† κρήνης ἀφθονεστέραν λίβα

ἀφθονεστέραν Photius α3349: ἀφθονεστερα (vario accentu) *Et. Gen.* s.v. ἀφθονέστατον: ἀφθονέστερον Ath. 10.424d, Eust. ad *Il.* 9.203 λίβα Ath.: idem legisse videtur Photii fons: λιβασιλ *Et. Gen.* cod. A (hoc tamquam corruptionem verborum λιβάς Ἡλ‹ιάσιν› interpretatus est Reitzenstein): om. *Et. Gen.* cod. B

Radt in *TrGF* prints ἀφθονεστέρα λιβάς, but records approvingly a remark by Kannicht that the evidence of Photius points to ἀφθονεστέραν λίβα as the reading known to his source. With Athenaeus offering a one-letter corruption of this same reading, we can confidently trace it back to the second century AD. It is also *lectio difficilior et magis Aeschylea*, since λίβα and its other inflected forms (λιβός, λίβη) occur only in Aeschylus among the tragedians (*Cho.* 292, 447; *Eum.* 54; fr. 55), whereas λιβάς is found more widely (*Pers.* 613; Soph. *Phil.* 1216; Eur. *Andr.* 116, 534, *IT* 1106, fr. 116; *trag. adesp.* 548). It is therefore likely that the "stream more abundant than a fountain [or river]" (doubtless that of the tears of the Heliades – or of the inhabitants of the Adria region, cf. fr. 71) was the object of the verb concealed by the corrupt letters that begin the line, rather than its subject as has usually been supposed (ὤρουσε Reitzenstein). Perhaps then ‹ἐν›ὦρσε "he/it stirred up"; cf. *Iliad* 6.499 where Andromache returns home in tears from her

[13] The first syllable is optional because we are free, if we wish, to replace δυσμαῖς by δυσμαῖσι(ν); the last is optional because the second half of an ionic dimeter is often shortened to ∪∪– , as happens in lines 2 (as emended) and 6 of this fragment.

meeting with Hector and comes inside among her women servants, τῆσιν δὲ γόον πάσῃσιν ἐνῶρσεν[14]. The subject of ἐνῶρσε may be the news of Phaëthon's end, or the messenger who brought it.

(8) *Herakleidai* fr. 74

The chorus tell how Heracles captured the cattle of Geryon

βοτῆράς τ᾽ ἀδίκους κτείνας
δεσπόταν τε †τριύτατον† 6

5 κτείνας Radt: κτεῖναι cod. 6 δεσπόταν Weil: δεσποτῶν cod.

They then proceed (7-9) to sing of Geryon's triple armament (three spears, three shields, three crests); nothing in those lines refers directly to the fact that he had three bodies, so it is a reasonable supposition that what underlies the corrupt τριύτατον is a word that does so refer. The metrical patterns of the passage point to one of three shapes, – ⏑ – (cf. 9) or – ⏑ – × (cf. 8) or – ⏑ ⏑ – (cf. 7 as transmitted[15]). Our source for the fragment, a scholium in cod. M to Aelius Aristeides (*Or*. 3.167 Lenz-Behr)[16], says that the passage "testifies by a kind of hint" (μαρτυρεῖ... αἰνιττόμενός πως) that "the three were brothers", i.e. that Heracles did not fight a three-bodied monster but a close-knit fraternal trio. Any such "hint" must have been contained in the corrupt word, since nothing else in the fragment gives the least suggestion that Geryon was not a single person with three physically united bodies[17].

Wilamowitz originally favoured a proposal by Kiessling, τρίζυγα τὸν: later[18] he endorsed Weil's τρίπτυχον. I suggest τρίζυγον (cf. Eur. *Hel*. 357 τριζύγοις θεαῖσι) because it would help to explain the corruption: τριύτατον could be a blend of τρίζυγον and a supralinear variant τρίζυγα[19] (of which perhaps only the last three letters were actually written). In Eur. *loc*.

[14] The verb is found in tragedy at Eur. *Supp*. 713, where it is said that Theseus θάρσος... ἐνῶρσε in the Athenian army with some well-chosen words at a critical moment in the battle with the Thebans.

[15] But probably χεροῖν should be emended to χερσίν (Weil, Wilamowitz), giving the scansion – ⏑ – –; Geryon would be carrying his spears not "in his two hands" but in his three right hands, the left ones being occupied with the shields which are mentioned immediately afterwards.

[16] Published by Wilamowitz, *De Rhesi scholiis disputatiuncula* (Ind. schol. Gryphiswald. sem. hib. 1877/8) (Greifswald 1877) 13-14 = *Kleine Schriften* i (Berlin 1935) 16.

[17] It may well, however, have been a "hint" that would only be perceived by someone already committed to euhemeristic dogma.

[18] *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921) 460; he had thought of it earlier himself but rejected it (*ibid*. n. 1).

[19] Cf. μονόζυξ (*Pers*. 139) and ἄζυξ (e.g. Eur. *Med*. 673).

cit. and in Soph. fr. 545 (Χαρίτων τριζύγων) these adjectives are applied to groups composed of three separate individuals.

(9) *Myrmidones* fr. 134
†ἀπὸ δ᾽ αὖτε† ξουθὸς ἱππαλεκτρυὼν
στάζει †κηρόθεν τῶν† φαρμάκων πολὺς πόνος

1 ἀπὸ δ᾽ αὖτε Σ Ar. *Pax* 1177: ἐπὶ δ᾽ αἰετὸς Σ Ar. *Ra*. 932

The reference is evidently to the firing by the Trojans of one of the Achaean ships (cf. *Iliad* 16.112-123), which will have been reported to Achilles and prompted him to send Patroclus out to fight; as Aristophanes makes his Aeschylus explain, the ξουθὸς ἱππαλεκτρυών was a painted σημεῖον ἐν ταῖς ναυσίν (or at least on one of them), and the paint is now running and dripping off with the heat of the fire[20]. The emblem is described as φαρμάκων πολὺς πόνος, i.e. the product of much labour with dyes. The preceding letters θεντων suggest an aorist passive participle agreeing with φαρμάκων: if so, since φαρμάκων depends on πόνος, the participle must refer to the work of the painters, not to the effect of the fire – hence of the many participial forms suggested only the proposals of Blaydes, μιγέντων "mixed" and χυθέντων "poured" or "liquefied", need be seriously considered. The latter is preferable, since in order to be used as paints, dyestuffs always need to be in liquid form but do not necessarily have to be mixed with each other.

Line 2, as transmitted, was already overfull, and the extra syllable in χυθέντων makes it even more so. Either στάζει or κηρο- must therefore be banished from the line. Neither can reasonably be deleted altogether: στάζει is the only candidate for the post of main verb, and κηρο- is hard to account for as a corruption or interpolation. Dindorf and Welcker suggested removing στάζει from line 2, both inserting an otherwise lost line between 1 and 2 to accommodate it; it is simpler to place it at the beginning of line 1, followed by e.g. δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς (Bothe):

στάζει δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς ξουθὸς ἱππαλεκτρυὼν
κηρός (Dindorf), χυθέντων φαρμάκων πολὺς πόνος

"And the tawny horsecock, the product of much labour with liquefied dyes, is dripping off it [the ship] like wax."

(10) *Xantriai* fr. 169
ἐκ ποδῶν δ᾽ ἄνω
ὑπέρχεται σπαραγμὸς εἰς ἄκρον κάρα,

[20] Perhaps, as Blass suggested ("Hermes" 32, 1897, 151), not on the actual ship that was fired but on an adjacent one.

κέντημα λύσσης[21], σκορπίου βέλος λέγω

The speaker is Lyssa, the goddess of frenzy, inspiring (ἐπιθειάζουσα) the bacchants to tear apart their victim (whether this is Pentheus or another)[22]. It is odd, in that case, that she states as a fact, in the present indicative, that the σπαραγμός is already in progress; Bergk therefore conjectured ὑπερχέτω. This, however, as Radt points out, is a barbarism, a fact exploited in Timotheus' *Persians* (*PMG* 791.155). But Aeschylus may have written ὑπελθέτω: if the ending was once corrupted to –έται, it would not be surprising if the word was then miscorrected.

(11) *Prometheus Lyomenos* fr. 190

ἥκομεν ‹ ›
τοὺς σοὺς ἄθλους τούσδε, Προμηθεῦ,
δεσμοῦ τε πάθος τόδ᾽ ἐποψόμενοι

lacunam post ἥκομεν statuit Jacobs, qui <αὐτοὶ> coniecit: <ἡμεῖς> Walker

[21] Radt retains the transmitted γλώσσης: a retrograde step, not because a final syllable cannot be short before γλ- (it can) but because tongues cannot prick, whereas madness (metaphorically) can. D. Sansone, *Aeschylean Metaphors for Intellectual Activity* (Wiesbaden 1975) 69-70 takes γλώσσης as an objective rather than a subjective genitive, and the phrase as meaning "an incentive to speech"; but even if it is possible for κέντημα to have this sense (for which Sansone provides no evidence), the phrase would be absurdly inadequate to what it would be describing, the rending in pieces of a human being.

[22] Pentheus' death was certainly mentioned in *Xantriai* (fr. 172b). Since, according to the 'Aristophanic' Hypothesis to Euripides' *Bacchae*, the same story was dramatized in Aeschylus' *Pentheus* (of which only one line survives), it is generally assumed, as by Radt, that Pentheus' death cannot have been part of the action of *Xantriai* (see e.g. E.R. Dodds, *Euripides: Bacchae,* Oxford 1960, xxix-xxxi). But I find it impossible to believe that Lyssa appeared in person in *Xantriai*, fiercely inciting a band of bacchants to tear Pentheus in pieces, and then nothing came of it until the following play: one expects divine inspiration to take effect more quickly than that. I see three possibilities: (a) that the Hypothesis is wrong, and the killing of Pentheus was included in *Xantriai* – in which case, if *Pentheus* was part of the same trilogy, he can have appeared in his name-play only as a corpse; (b) that *Xantriai* and *Pentheus* are two names for the same play (but Galen quotes them both [frr. 170, 183] in the same passage [xvii a 880.8-14 Kühn]); (c) that the bacchants' victim in *Xantriai* was not Pentheus but someone else at a mythologically later date, the death of Pentheus being mentioned as a parallel and precedent. In the Loeb I unenthusiastically favoured (a), but I wonder now if (b) would not be preferable. The Galen passage under discussion is full of inaccuracies in play-titles: he twice refers to Sophocles' *Kolchides* as *Kolchoi* (879.7, 880.4), he cites a passage from *Prometheus Desmotes* which does not occur in that play (879.12; now regarded as from *Prometheus Lyomenos* [fr. 195]), and then cites another passage from *Prometheus* without specifying which of three or four plays is meant (880.10; probably from the satyric *Prometheus* of 472 [fr. 187a Radt = 206 Sommerstein]). In discussing *Xantriai* I leave out of account the papyrus fragments ascribed to the play by Radt (frr. 168, 168a, 168b), since I regard them as belonging to *Semele* (see below).

We cannot be sure whether, as Hermann supposed, ἥκομεν was the first word of the play, but it is at any rate quite likely to be the first word of the parodos, or rather of its anapaestic prelude[23]. If so, something has been lost after it. One thing the chorus will certainly need to say at some early point is who they are. Prometheus, who is their brother, will of course know them, but they need to be identified for the audience. So maybe ἥκομεν ‹ἡμεῖς οἱ Τιτᾶνες›?

(12) *Prometheus Pyrphoros*[24] fr. 204b.1-3

-σ̣ί̣α̣ δέ μ᾽ εὐμενὴς χορεύει χάρις·
φ[α]ε̣ν̣[ὸ]ν ‹ ⏑ –›
χιτῶ̣να πάρ̣ πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγάν.

In the lacuna we require a verb, for it would be quite a stretch to suppose that χορεύει in its causative sense could govern an accusative and infinitive (‹στρέφειν› Terzaghi). What the satyrs, like (for example) Nausicaa's brothers (*Od*. 6.64-65), will want to do with a gleaming white chiton when going to a dance (1, 7, 13, 16), is wear it; yet none of the supplements recorded by Radt gives this meaning. Read ‹δ᾽ ἔχω› (the same word used in the *Odyssey* passage) or ‹φορῶ›.

(13) *Salaminiai* fr. 216

εἴ μοι γένοιτο φᾶρος ἶσον οὐρανῷ

εἴ μοι Hdn. *Καθ. Προσ.* (i 392.30 Lentz) et *Π. Μον. Λεξ.* (ii 16.6 Lentz): ἐμοὶ Hdn. *Π. Διχρ.* (ii 942.4 Lentz) ἶσον Διχρ.: ἴσον *Καθ. Προσ.* et *Π. Μον. Λεξ.*

It is not clear why anyone should want a garment "as big as the sky"; but that is what the transmitted text means. It also involves a scansion of ισος that is unknown in the spoken verse of tragedy[25]. Bergk is likely to have been right in suspecting that what is meant is a garment (or perhaps a tapestry) adorned with stars, like those which Ion uses for the roof of his banqueting tent in Eur. *Ion* 1141-58. In that case for ἶσον we should read εἰκὸς "resembling": EIKOC was read as EICOC, and this was then "corrected" to agree in gender with φᾶρος.

[23] For ἥκω as the first word spoken by a newly arriving character, cf. *Cho*. 838, *Prom*. 284; Eur. *Alc*. 614, *Andr*. 309, *Hec*. 1, *HF* 1163, *Tro*. 1, *Or*. 1323, *Ba*. 1. Like the chorus of *Prometheus Desmotes*, this one addresses Prometheus immediately it enters; the earliest other surviving tragedy in which this occurs is Euripides' *Medea*, where the chorus address the Nurse in their fourth line (134).

[24] That this (not *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*) is the proper title for the satyr-play of 472 was shown by A.L. Brown, "BICS" 37, 1990, 50-56.

[25] It occurs in lyric at Aesch. fr. 74.10.

(14) *Semele* fr. 220a (168 Radt)

I must now return to the papyrus fragments (POxy. 2164) of the scene in which Hera came on stage in the disguise of a mendicant priestess (Pl. *Rep*. 381d). The lyrics preceding her entrance contain mention of Cadmus and Semele. In various later sources[26] Hera is said to have been responsible for persuading the pregnant Semele to request Zeus to visit her in his divine form, with fatal results for Semele; in most of them she is said to have visited Semele in disguise. When in this papyrus we find Hera appearing in disguise, in a context concerned with Semele, our default assumption must be that we have here an earlier version of the same theme; nothing in the fragments contradicts this, and Hera's praise of αἰδὼς καθαρά (fr. 220a[168].23) as "the best adorner of a bride" would work all too well as an implicit rebuke to one about to become an unmarried mother, who could avoid disgrace only by proving that the father of her child was a god. We would seem to be dealing, then, with a play leading towards the climax of Semele's destruction and Zeus's rescue of the unborn Dionysus; the play, evidently, in which "Aeschylus brought Semele on stage pregnant and possessed, and the women who touched her belly also became possessed"[27]; the play, evidently, which was sometimes known by Semele's name, and sometimes as *Hydrophoroi*.

However, there is a difficulty. Hera's first two lines (fr. 220a [168].16-17) are cited in the scholia to Aristophanes' *Frogs* (1344 Νύμφαι ὀρεσσίγονοι) in the following manner: ἐκ τῶν Ξαντριῶν Αἰσχύλου, φησὶν Ἀσκληπιάδης· εὗρε δὲ Ἀθήνησιν ἔν τινι τῶν †διαθετῶν† (διασωθέντων Dindorf, prob. Chantry: διορθωθέντων Latte) [here the two lines are quoted].

Asclepiades, then, we are told, found these lines in a copy of *Xantriai* preserved (?) in Athens. From this it was not unnaturally inferred by Lobel, the first editor of the papyrus, that the fragments it contained came from *Xantriai*. Kurt Latte, however, early argued[28] that Asclepiades' authority was not worth much, since he commits serious errors of attribution elsewhere[29]. There is more than this to say, too. The fact that it was worth saying that the lines had been found in a manuscript at Athens implies that they were *not* to be found in copies of *Xantriai* in the library of Alexandria. Whatever play

[26] D. S. 3.64.3-4 (Hera disguised as a friend of Semele's); Ov. *Met*. 3.256-315 (Hera disguised as Semele's nurse Beroe); [Apollod.] *Bibl*. 3.4.3; Hyg. *Fab*. 167, 179 (Beroe again, in both).

[27] Σ Ap. Rh. 1.636.

[28] "Philologus" 97, 1948, 47-56, at 52 = Latte, *Kleine Schriften* (Münich 1968) 477-484, at 481.

[29] In Ar. *Birds* 348 he detected parody of a Euripidean play (*Andromeda*) that had not yet been written. On Aesch. fr. 238 (= Ar. *Frogs* 1270) see text below.

they belong to, they were the opening lines of one of its most famous scenes, a scene which Plato could assume to be so well known that he did not need to name the play or its author. It is quite incredible that they should have been lost from all Alexandrian copies of that play. If then they were not to be found in Alexandrian copies of *Xantriai*, it was because they did not belong to *Xantriai*… but to *Semele*. This is not the only time we find Asclepiades claiming to have discovered tragic material unknown in the capital of world scholarship. Here is a scholium to *Frogs* 1270 (κύδιστ᾽ Ἀχαιῶν Ἀτρέως πολυκοίρανε μάνθανέ μου παῖ): Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος· ἐπισκέψασθε[30] πόθεν εἰσίν. Τιμαχίδας δὲ ἐκ Τηλέφου, Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ ἐξ Ἰφιγενείας.

As Fraenkel saw, Aristarchus' and Apollonius' *aporia* can only be accounted for if, once again, the line was not in any Aeschylean script available in Alexandria. It is conceivable that the plays in question were not easily to be found anywhere at all; each is cited only once in texts later than the mid fourth century. Recent editors have assigned the line to *Telephus* (fr. 238), but usually not with much confidence; Timachidas and Asclepiades may both have been guessing[31].

At any rate, on the showing he puts up elsewhere, Asclepiades is far from being a reliable witness. And no credible account has ever been given of what a disguised Hera was trying to do if she was not trying to deceive Semele to her doom; nor does any other source suggest that a disguised Hera was involved in the story of Semele, Dionysus and the Thebans on any other occasion. To believe Asclepiades lands us in unending difficulties. To disbelieve him is what we have to do about half the time anyway. The papyrus fragments belong to *Semele*. I have therefore renumbered them as frr. 220a-c (in *TrGF* they are frr. 168, 168a, 168b).

I now wish to look at a passage from Hera's hexameter chant:

νύμφαι ναμερτεῖς, κυδραὶ θεαί, αἷσιν ἀγείρω
Ἰνάχου Ἀργείου ποταμοῦ παισὶν βιοδώροις,
αἵ τε ṗαρίστανται πᾶσιν βροτέοισιν ἐπ᾽ ἔργ[οις
ε. [(ca. 14 letters)]ṭε κ̣α̣ὶ̣ εὐμόλποις ὑμ[εναίοις
καὶ τ[(ca. 13 letters) ν]εολέκτρους ἀρτιγάμ̣[20
λευκο. [(ca. 13 letters)]μ̣μασιν ε[ὐ]φρονεσ[
φῶς δεκ[(ca. 14 letters)]περ ὄμματος εστ̣[

We can safely assume that the end of line 22 is also the end of a sentence,

[30] This is the reading of E, which Chantry prints; cf. E. Fraenkel, "Gnomon" 37, 1965, 230, who compared the scholia to *Frogs* 791 (where Apollonius is again cited).

[31] Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.* 229-230: "Es… geschah, daß gewissenhafte Forscher ihr Nichtwissen eingestanden und skrupellose behaupteten, es stammte aus der und der Tragödie".

since the second word of line 23 is γάρ. It is clear that after saying that the Inachid nymphs "attend upon all mortal activities", Hera immediately focuses on weddings, which are still the subject of the next sentence (23, quoted above). In 21, J. Diggle, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford 1998) 23, proposed [ὅ]μμασιν, but the presence of ὀμματος in the next line tells against this, particularly if the fourth and fifth letters of 22 represent the particle δέ. More likely is [καλύ]μμασιν, cf. *Ag*. 1178-9: the nymphs are kindly disposed (εὔφρονες) to the bridal veil – and to the modesty (αἰδώς 23) which it symbolizes.

(15) *Sisyphos Drapetes* and *Sisyphos Petrokylistes*

The title *Sisyphos Drapetes* is listed in the κατάλογος τῶν Αἰσχύλου δραμάτων preserved in M and a few other manuscripts, and two fragments (frr. 233-4) are cited from *Sisyphos Petrokylistes*[32]. The remaining eight (frr. 225-232) are cited simply from *Sisyphos*.

It is generally accepted that *Sisyphos Drapetes* must have been written around some version of the story told by Pherecydes fr. 119 Fowler, which I translate:

"When Zeus had transported Aegina, daughter of Asopus, from Phlius to Oenone by way of Corinth, and Asopus was seeking her, Sisyphus by his skill revealed the abduction to Asopus, and thereby provoked Zeus to anger against him. So Zeus sent Death to take him; but Sisyphus, becoming aware of his approach, bound Death in powerful bonds. It thus came about that no human being died, until Ares handed Sisyphus over to Death, releasing Death from his bonds. But before Sisyphus died, he instructed his wife Merope not to send to the underworld the customary offerings for him; and after some time, because his wife was not paying these dues to Sisyphus, Hades, discovering this, released him so that he could reproach his wife. He came to Corinth and did not go back until he died in old age, whereupon Hades compelled him to roll a great stone so that he could not run away again"[33].

[32] It has from time to time been suggested that the two *Sisyphos* plays were actually one and the same; this is briskly refuted by R. Germar, N. Pechstein and R. Krumeich in Krumeich et al. *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt 1999) 182 n.1, who point out that tragic titles are accompanied by epithets *only* when there are two plays of the same name by (or attributed to) the same author. In Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides the only exception to this rule is Sophocles' Ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ Σάτυροι – which is no real exception at all, since ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ serves to distinguish the play in question, not from a particular other play or plays, but from any and all other Sophoclean satyr-dramas. In the case of other tragic dramatists we can never be sure that a play with an epithetted title did not have a homonym, since it is never certain, or even likely, that we know the titles of all the plays of a given author.

[33] The text of the last sentence is corrupt in our source (a scholium to *Iliad* 6.153), but the

In *Sisyphos Petrokylistes*, on the other hand, Sisyphus must at some point in the play have been actually undergoing (not necessarily on stage) the punishment described in the last sentence of the Pherecydes passage, and fr. 233 (Αἰτναῖός ἐστι κάνθαρος βίᾳ πονῶν), cited from *Petrokylistes*, confirms this; its source is a scholium on Ar. *Peace* 73 which speaks of the Αἰτναῖον μέγιστον κάνθαρον recently acquired by Trygaeus, a beetle of the type that habitually *rolls along* very large (by beetle standards) balls of dung[34]. That implies very strongly that this play, like (for instance) Euripides' or Critias' *Peirithoos*, must have been set in the underworld; Taplin's attempt to show that this need not have been the case[35] requires him to hypothesize that "Sisyphus must have pushed his stone all the way up to the world above" – a speculation without any evidence whatever to support it, and one that would make nonsense of the other play's epithet *Drapetes*, since on this view Sisyphus would have been a δραπέτης in *both* plays[36]. We can also safely infer from fr. 233 that *Petrokylistes* was a satyr-play; beetles are at home in satyr-drama[37] or comedy, hardly in tragedy.

With this much information, we can assign all but one – perhaps all – of the longer fragments to one play or the other with some confidence.

In fr. 225 the speaker is about to wash "feet that carry a god" in a bronze basin, an action to which Hor. *Serm*. 2.3.21 (*quo vafer ille pedes lavisset Sisyphus aere*) evidently alludes. Evidently a traveller who either is a god, or can plausibly be spoken of as one, has just arrived at the home of a rich mortal; that is, the action is set at Sisyphus' house, not in Hades, and the play must be *Drapetes*. Germar et al. (as n. 32) 188 suggest that the visitor is Death, and that the foot-washing is a ruse (note Horace's *vafer*) to facilitate his being seized and bound. This would probably imply that in Aeschylus'

gist of the story is not in doubt.

[34] See G. Evans, *The Life of Beetles* (London 1975) 118-120; M. Davies and J. Kathirithamby, *Greek Insects* (London 1986) 84-89.

[35] Taplin, *Stagecraft* 428-9.

[36] Admittedly it is arguable that there may be a parallel for such a non-distinctive epithet. The title of the lost *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos* shows that at some point in that play Hippolytus veiled his face; but he may also have done so in the surviving *Hippolytos Stephanephoros* when he hears himself accused of raping his stepmother and Theseus tells him to show his face and look at him (*Hipp*. 946-7). However, the latter veiling is only momentary, and it may be significant that it is not *directly* mentioned in the text. In any case, it may not even have occurred: M.R. Halleran, *Euripides: Hippolytus* (Warminster 1995) 230, is right to note that Hippolytus may merely have "turned or moved away".

[37] Soph. fr. 162 (*Daidalos*, taken as satyric by D.F. Sutton, "HSCP" 78, 1974, 132 on the independent grounds that it dealt with "the destruction of an ogre" [Talos]), 314.307 (*Ichneutai*).

play the sequence of events was different from that described above, with Death being sent to fetch Sisyphus *after* his first death and his escape from Hades. This is quite a plausible supposition, especially if (as is virtually certain – see below) *Drapetes* was a satyr-drama (and therefore had to have a happy ending); in Pherecydes' account, Sisyphus' first attempt to cheat death succeeded only briefly, whereas the second gave him many years of further life, yet it was the first attempt that contained more material suitable for dramatic treatment, at least if the play was to be set up on earth.

Fragment 226 is addressed to someone who is a "head of household" – which is the definition of σταθμοῦχος that Pollux (10.20) chooses this line to exemplify; that, again, implies that the location of the action is at this man's house, and therefore that the play is *Drapetes* and the addressee Sisyphus. The language of the fragment – which may be approximately translated "Here, Mr Householder, take a good squint at this!" – shows fairly conclusively that *Drapetes*, like *Petrokylistes,* was a satyr-drama, as it has usually been taken to be[38].

In fr. 228 someone, undoubtedly Sisyphus, bids farewell to Zagreus and his "ever-hospitable <father>". The passage is quoted by its two sources[39] as evidence that "some speak of Zagreus as the son of Hades", so Welcker was most likely right to assign it to *Drapetes*. If, however, as I shall suggest below, Sisyphus' escape from Hades was not only the starting-point of *Drapetes* but also the climax of *Petrokylistes*, this line may have come near the end of the latter play.

Fragments 229 and 230 are cited together[40]; fr. 229 is introduced as by Αἰσχύλος ἐν Σισύφῳ and is immediately followed by εἶτα and then by the text of fr. 230. The two fragments thus clearly come from the same play. They both refer to the insubstantiality and strengthlessness of the dead, and fr. 230 is actually addressed to one of those "in [whom] there is no strength, [and whose] veins have [no] blood flowing in them (οὐδ' αἱμόρρυτοι φλέβες)". This can hardly be the Sisyphus of *Drapetes*; it would be intolerable in a satyr-drama that he should return from the dead to face the prospect of living twenty or thirty years on earth with no more physicality than a ghost. These two fragments are therefore from *Petrokylistes*; the addressee of fr. 230 at least is very likely to be Sisyphus, and the speaker may well be the thoroughly earthy Silenus, who has a very healthy, red φλέψ of his own[41].

[38] Germar et al. (as n. 32) 182 leave the genre of *Drapetes* open, but at p. 187 they say it is "sehr wahrscheinlich" that both the Sisyphus plays were satyric.

[39] *Et. Gud.* s.v. Ζαγρεύς; *Anecd. Oxon.* 2.443.11.

[40] By *Et. Gud.* s.v. κῖκυς.

[41] For φλέψ = phallus cf. Xenarchus fr. 1.8; *trag. adesp.* 667a.85, 97 (see *TrGF* v. 2 pp.

The only remaining substantial fragment is fr. 227. Pearson[42] was surely right to see it as an attempt by Silenus, or the satyrs, to identify an object of a kind new in their experience[43]; and Sisyphus, head down, pushing at the stone[44], might as easily be taken for a giant fieldmouse as for an Etna beetle. It is therefore quite likely that frr. 227 and 233 come from the same scene of *Petrokylistes*.

To recap, then: frr. 225, 226 and probably 228 come from *Drapetes*; 229, 230 and probably 227, as well as 233 and 234, come from *Petrokylistes*. The remaining two fragments are single words and cannot be assigned to a play with any assurance, though fr. 231 (ἄμβωνες "hill-brows") might be appropriate to a description of Sisyphus' struggles with the stone in *Petrokylistes* (cf. *Od*. 11.596-7)[45].

The fragments do not, to say the least, give us a very clear picture of the two plays. Of *Drapetes* we can say that it was set at Sisyphus' house and that it included his return from Hades (fr. 228) and probably an attempt by Death to take him back below (cf. fr. 225), which, given the nature of the genre, must have failed. The setting of *Petrokylistes* was the underworld; Sisyphus is likely (as the title would anyway suggest) to have been a speaking character (fr. 230), and there is no reason to doubt (as the title would also suggest) that he was actually seen rolling his stone, though he is likely to have taken a break from work (perhaps an unauthorized one, when Pluto was not looking) to talk with the satyrs. One would expect[46] that the satyrs' presence in the underworld was not by their own choice but as captives, and Sisyphus would be just the man to liberate them; maybe then, again altering the sequence of the myth, Aeschylus had Sisyphus set to rolling the stone the *first* time he came to Hades, and the play presented a plot between him and the satyrs, the deception of Pluto, and finally the escape of Sisyphus to the upper world taking the satyrs with him.

1137-42); *AP* 6.218; *APl* 261; also Persius 6.72 *cum morosa vago singultiet inguine vena, patriciae inmeiat vulvae?* See A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965) ii 25.

[42] "CR" 28, 1914, 224 n. 1; cf. Taplin *Stagecraft* 429.

[43] The most famous parallel is that of the lyre in Soph. fr. 314.298-324.

[44] I was probably wrong in the Loeb to suggest that what was being described was the stone itself.

[45] We cannot be sure that Aeschylus on this occasion used the plural form; Hesychius (α3536) cites the word from *two* Aeschylean plays, mentioning *Kerkyon* first, and it is not safe to assume that the same inflectional form was used in both.

[46] Cf. R.A.S. Seaford, *Euripides: Cyclops* (Oxford 1984) 33-36.

(16) *"The Dike Play"* fr. 281a

(a)]ḍ[. (.)]εσθε δ᾽ ὑμεῖς εἴ τι μὴ μά[την] λ̣έγω

δ[έξ]εσθε Fraenkel: but why should Dike be so sure that her addressees will do the sensible thing? Read δ[έχ]εσθε (imperative); cf. *Eum.* 236, 893 – and also lines 24-25 of this fragment as restored by Lobel.

(b)] . υκτα τῶν ὁδοιπόρων βέλη
] . δως ἀγκύλαισιν ἀρταμῶν,
]ῳ̣ν ἔχ[αι]ρ̣ε κἀγέλα κακὸν
]ν στάζοι φόνος·
]μουμένη
] . ιπρ[. . . . .]γον χέρα
]οῦν ἐνδίκως κ̣ικλήσκεται
]νιν ἔνδικ̣[. . . . .] . οσ.

37 στά(ζοι) $^{\gamma\rho}$Π in margin: ἄ̣ζοι or ὄ̣ζοι Π

The person being described – a "savage son" of Zeus and Hera "in whose mentality there was no shame" (31-33) – is certainly Ares. Lobel was puzzled and reluctant to accept that a major god could have been described by Aeschylus in this way, but he could see no alternative, nor is there one[47]. And Ares' shameless, random violence is firmly assigned to the *past* (note the imperfect tenses in line 36); under Dike's tutelage[48] he has now learned better – he is still, of course, a god of violence, but presumably this violence is now informed by justice[49]. There is no room for this to be explained in

[47] H. Lloyd-Jones, "JHS" 76, 1956, 59 n. 26 (also in his 1957 Loeb *Appendix*, p. 577) suggested that the person meant was Ares' son Cycnus; but Dike is speaking of a son of Zeus and Hera, not a grandson. Ph.I. Kakridis, "Eranos" 60, 1962, 111-121, and D.F. Sutton, "ZPE" 51, 1983, 19-24, opted for Heracles, and Lucas de Dios (685) appears to favour this view; but how on earth is an Athenian or Sicilian audience supposed to divine that Aeschylus is following a Theban tradition that Hera was Heracles' mother, rather than the tradition familiar to them all that made her his implacable enemy? In any case, none of the evidence cited by these scholars comes anywhere near showing that Hera was ever regarded by anyone as the *birth* mother of Heracles, as Dike's words would require her to have been; it may all refer to the post-apotheosis *adoption* story known from D.S. 4.39.2 and/or to the tradition (for sources see T.R. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* [Baltimore 1993] 378) that Heracles in infancy was clandestinely put to Hera's breast.

[48] Mette was right, against Lobel, to prefer ἔθρε[ψα] to ἔθρε[ψε] at the beginning of line 31. If the verb were third-person, and Hera were its subject, Aeschylus would never have written lines 31-32 as they stand, with Hera's name brought in late and buried in a relative clause; he would have written ἔθρεψεν Ἥρα παῖδα μάργον, ὅν [ποτε] | τίκτει μιγεῖσα Ζηνί – if, that is, he had thought it worth while to mention at all the unsurprising fact that Hera had reared her own son.

[49] So at the end of *Eumenides* the Erinyes, whose sole function had hitherto been "doing harm" (*Eum.* 125), become dispensers of blessing to the righteous while continuing to be

lines 38-39, so it must have been explained in the lines that followed the end of the surviving text.

Somewhere in line 34 or 35 we need a main verb (in the imperfect tense) meaning "he shot"; perhaps Aeschylus used the same verb that he used in *Ag*. 510 to describe the archery of Apollo, and line 35 ran [ἴαπτ᾽ ἀνα]ιδῶς (Lobel) ἀγκύλαισιν ἀρταμῶν[50].

In line 37 the marginal variant στάζοι is by far the best of the available readings. Φόνος is not the sort of entity that can be said to dry things up (ἄζοι) or to smell of something (ὄζοι)[51]; but it can most certainly drip[52].

Line 38: perhaps [ἐνθυ]μουμένη, cf. *Eum*. 222?

The tense of κικλήσκεται (40), in contrast with the earlier imperfects, shows that we have now moved from Ares' asocial past to the new Ares that Dike has helped to mould. As Lobel and others have seen, 40-41 must have contained (the beginning of) a punning etymology of Ares' name (in 40 we should surely restore [Ἄρης] οὖν). But it is likely to have been associated, not as Lobel thought with ἀρή "bane", but with some word of more auspicious meaning such as ἄρος "benefit" (cf. *Supp*. 885) or ἀρείων "better".

(17) Fr. 303

Ael. Arist. *Or*. 3.607 Lenz-Behr: μὴ μὲν οὖν ἔμοιγε κατ᾽ Αἰσχύλον μήτε [UR^2: μή μοι O] παρασπιστὴς μήτ᾽ ἐγγὺς εἴη ὅστις μὴ φίλος τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ [sc. Platoni] μηδὲ τιμᾷ τὰ πρέποντα.

Radt in *TrGF* hesitantly prints as a fragment (following Hermann) only μὴ παρασπιστὴς ἐμοὶ μήτ᾽ ἐγγὺς εἴη, adding that he suspects that the Aeschylean material may comprise no more than μή μοι παρασπιστὴς εἴη or something to that effect. But the rest of the sentence has a poetic cast too, especially the expressions (i) ὅστις μὴ φίλος (where in prose we would expect ὅστις ἂν μὴ φίλος ᾖ)[53] and (ii) τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ (where prose would probably say just αὐτῷ).

It is certainly true that attempts thus far to reconstruct Aeschylus' sentence have been consistently unsuccessful, as Radt's apparatus testifies.

implacable punishers of the wicked. Perhaps too Ares was induced to abandon the bow (34-35) in favour of a more honourable weapon, the spear; as Lobel pointed out, Ares is never normally represented as an archer.

[50] The verb ἰάπτειν is found altogether seven times in Aeschylus (*Seven* 299, 525, 544; *Supp*. 96, 547; *Ag*. 510, 1548); in Sophocles only in *Ajax* (525, 700); in Euripides not at all.

[51] Other things can smell of φόνος (as at *Ag*. 1309, quoted below); that's quite different.

[52] Cf. *Ag*. 1309 φόνον δόμοι πνέουσιν αἱματοσταγῆ, and the adjective φονολιβής (*Ag*. 1427, *Eum*. 164).

[53] We may note, too, that Aristeides only once elsewhere uses the expression μὴ (or οὐ) φίλος in reference to persons (*Or*. 11.24 L-B).

Hartung's addition of τῷδ᾽ ὃς ἀνδρὶ μὴ φίλος directly to the end of Hermann's version of the fragment gives an unsatisfactory word order. But what if we suppose that Aristeides has omitted from the Aeschylean text some words that could not be adapted to what he wished to say about Plato? Aeschylus may then have written something like this:

μὴ παρασπιστὴς ἐμοὶ
μήτ᾽ ἐγγὺς εἴη <δαΐαισιν ἐν μάχαις>
ὃς τἀνδρὶ (or ἀνδρὶ) τῷδε μὴ φίλος

Whether by "this man" the speaker meant himself (cf. *Ag*. 1438, Soph. *OT* 534) or, as in Aristeides' text, some third person, we cannot tell. The latter is more likely if Aristeides' phrase μηδὲ τιμᾷ τὰ πρέποντα also derives from Aeschylus. One has every reason not to want a personal enemy as one's neighbour in the battle-line, but a phalanx every member of which is wondering whether the man on his right is one who "honours him in the proper manner" is unlikely to win many victories. If, on the other hand, X is a person whom one loves and respects greatly and feels every other decent man would love and respect too, one might well feel that a man who does not respect X is not a man one would trust one's life to.

Whether Aristeides' last phrase does indeed derive from Aeschylus is another matter. Probably it does not. Adverbial τὰ πρέποντα, though not found in classical Attic prose, is a favourite expression of Aristeides[54]; in tragic dialogue, on the other hand, it is not only unknown but would have been metrically impossible.

(18) Fr. 369 Radt = 207b Sommerstein

ἐκ πηλοπλάστου σπέρματος θνητὴ γυνή

The scholiast on Hes. *Works* 157 who cites the line says it refers to Pandora, and in view of the close connection in both the major Hesiodic poems between Pandora and Prometheus the fragment has nearly always been attributed to one of Aeschylus' Prometheus plays. But which? The answer is surely provided by another Hesiodic scholium (on *Works* 89), which Radt prints as a fragment (207a) of *Prometheus Pyrkaeus*[55]:

‹Αἰσχύλος› (suppl. Schoemann) φησὶν ὅτι Προμηθεὺς τὸν τῶν κακῶν πίθον παρὰ τῶν σατύρων λαβὼν καὶ παραθέμενος τῷ Ἐπιμηθεῖ παρήγγειλε μὴ δέξασθαί τι παρὰ Διός, ὁ δὲ παρακούσας ἐδέξατο τὴν Πανδώραν. ὅτε δὲ τὸ κακὸν ἔσχε παρ᾽ αὐτῷ, τότε ἐνόησε τί αὐτῷ ἐπέμφθη.

This is solid evidence that the story of Pandora featured, or was referred

[54] It occurs three times more in the same oration, *On the Four* (§§381, 556, 694 L-B).

[55] Better *Pyrphoros* (see above, n. 12). As will be seen, Aeschylus' name is a conjectural restoration in the scholium, but no other satyr-play about Prometheus is known.

to, in the satyric *Prometheus*[56], and in view of this it is superfluous to seek a place for fr. 369 in any other Prometheus play[57]. How it featured I do not know; perhaps only by way of prophecy. It is curious that Radt in his annotations to fr. 207a says nothing about fr. 369, nor vice versa.

(19) Fr. 451h

χειρ.[
ἰδὲ γάρ, ὦ Z[εῦ] ξέ[νιε] ν[. .] . [
τ]ὸν ξενοδόκον κατασχ̣[
. . .]στιν χάρις ἐν θ̣[εο]ῖ̣ς
ἀν]δ̣ρ̣[ά]σι τοῖς δικαίοις(;) 5
τ̣οίγαρ κ[ατα]π̣ρ̣ισσ̣ο̣μ[
κόμας [ἀ]φ̣ειδεῖ χερ̣[
τόδ᾽ ἄνα̣[υ]λον βρέγμαπ̣ . [. .] . [
δυρομ̣[έν]α̣ σὸν πότμον γό[οισιν.]

"A Chorus composed of female persons is lamenting for a hospitable person (or for such a person's house), who (or which) has been visited by some grievous and, in their opinion[,] undeserved{,} fate" (Lloyd-Jones 571). It may reasonably be added that the emphasis placed on hospitality (2, 3) strongly suggests that the person concerned has suffered as a *result* of being hospitable; and the hair-tearing (6-7) and probably also head-beating (cf. βρέγμα 8) indicate that what the house has suffered is the death of one of its members, whether the hospitable man himself or one of his family. The suggestion of M.L. Cunningham, "RhM" 96, 1953, 223-231, that the man was Pelasgus and the play *Aigyptioi* has nothing to commend it[58]. Others[59] have

[56] Though Lucas de Dios (562, 565-6 with nn. 1898, 1912), not seeing how the "jar of evils" theme and the "bringing of fire" theme could both have figured in the same Aeschylean satyr-play, suggests that there may have been a distinct satyr-play about Pandora of which no direct evidence survives.

[57] M.L. West, "JHS" 99, 1979, 134, puts it at the end of *Prometheus Pyrphoros*, which he takes to have been the first play of a Prometheus trilogy – a view which seems to me, as it has to many others, excluded by Prometheus' account of past events in *Prometheus Desmotes* (199-236), which is far too detailed to be a retelling of facts that the audience already know; see my *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari 1996) 319-321.

[58] If the singers are the Danaids, and are the chorus of the play, we have to assume that *Aigyptioi*, despite its title, had a female chorus, like the other two plays of its trilogy – and there is no other known or probable case of an Aeschylean trilogy in which the choruses of all three plays were of the same gender (see my *Aeschylean Tragedy* [Bari 1996] 69-70), let alone in which they all represent the same persons – and in addition, perhaps even more importantly, the song would be out of character; in *Suppliants* the Danaids never show any appreciation of the dangers to which the Argives are exposing themselves on their behalf. The only alternative is to posit, gratuitously, that the Danaids (or, better, women of Argos) formed

associated the fragment with Ixion's murder of his father-in-law, presumably in *Perrhaebides*; but we know nothing of any notable display of hospitality by the latter, and he was killed in Ixion's house, not in his own.

West, *Studies* 171, still favours assigning the fragment to *Aigyptioi*, on the grounds that "no one has been able to suggest an alternative reference". Lucas de Dios (761 n. 27) offers *Argeiai, Heliades* and *Salaminiai* as possibilities. The first at least is worth considering, the reference being to the defeat of Adrastus which could indeed be seen as resulting from the hospitality he extended to Tydeus and Polyneices. Adrastus himself, however, returned safe from the war against Thebes and lost none of his blood-kin. One might think of *Epigonoi*[60], since in the war of the Epigoni Adrastus did lose his son Aegialeus; but it would be rather a stretch to associate this with Adrastus' acts of hospitality so long ago.

More likely, however, I suggest, than any of these is *Kressai*. This play dealt[61] with the story of the disappearance of Glaucus, the young son of Minos of Crete; of how the Corinthian seer Polyidus found him dead; of how Minos shut Polyidus up with the corpse, demanding that he restore it to life; and of how he succeeded in doing so. Here we have at least two of the necessary ingredients – a female chorus, and a hospitable house suffering disaster (if, as is likely, Polyidus was at the time a guest in Minos' palace). Moreover, Minos' demand that Polyidus bring Glaucus back to life or (in effect) forfeit his own seems very inappropriate, coming from a ruler renowned for justice (*Od*. 11.568-571; Pl. *Apol*. 41a) – unless he suspected Polyidus himself of being responsible for Glaucus' disappearance and death; which would give us the third required element, a disaster *caused* (or believed to have been caused) by the sufferer's hospitality.

University of Nottingham, UK ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

a secondary chorus. (I am here for the sake of argument assuming, as do Cunningham and virtually all those who have discussed her proposal, that *Aigyptioi* was the second play of the trilogy and was set at Argos; my own view is that of W. Rösler, "RhM" 136, 1993, 1-21, that it was the first play and was set in Egypt – see now my Loeb edition [i 283-6].)

[59] D. Bindzus, "Dioniso" 19, 1956, 228; F.C. Görschen, "APF" 17, 1960-2, 57.

[60] We do not know who formed the chorus of this play; it need not have been the Epigoni themselves, since the title, like *Seven against Thebes*, may have referred to the mythical episode being dramatized (note that *Epigonoi* was also the title of an epic) rather than to the chorus.

[61] As is shown by fr. 116 which, like the exactly parallel Soph. fr. 395 (from *Manteis or Polyidos*), was Polyidus' answer to the riddle that was posed to identify the person who could find the lost Glaucus ([Apollod.] *Bibl*. 3.3.1; Hyg. *Fab*. 136).