ABSTRACT: The first part of the article consists of an annotated edition of a number of fragments belonging or conjecturally ascribed to Aeschylus’ satyr-play Prometheus Pyrkaeus. The play’s story pertains to the donation of fire to humans by Prometheus. The Satyrs are the donees, and, accompanied by Nymphs, express their gratitude to the Titan with songs and dances. The second part attempts to dissociate the play from the 472 BCE production and ascribe it to the Promethean tetralogy as its missing satyr-play. All internal elements of the story (winter, night, dances, drunken revelry, marshy meadow, Nymphs) point to the Anthesteria festival, the Dionysion ev Limnai, the ἄρχαιο τερα Διονύσια, and possibly the Χύτρινοι ἀγῶνες. 469 BCE is proposed as a possible date for the production of the Promethean tetralogy.

THE FRAGMENTS – COMMENTARY

The fragments are published in a different order than that of St. Radt, TrGF3, Aeschylus, Göttingen 1985, pp. 321–328. All the fragments apart from ** 204a–** 207a (Radt’s Prom. Pyrk. fragments) are mostly my proposals.

332a

The text is reproduced from TrGF 3 (Aeschylus) Incertarum fabularum fragmenta together with Radt’s apparatus fontium and criticus.

τὸ λαμπρὸν [. . . . .] † δοθερμοναθ’ † ἥλιον
θάλποντα κὰρχέο[ν] τα βλαστημον θέρος

* I am greatly indebted to Professors V. Liapis and S. Tsitsiridis, who, serving as referees of Logeion, read meticulously my paper and made precise comments that enabled me to put right several errors, thus leading to numerous improvements. It is obvious that whenever I differed from them, I am to blame. I am very sorry that I did not manage to take account of P. B. Cipolla’s (2015) article on Prom. Pyrk.; it was too late when I came across it.
The fragment comes from Herbert Hunger’s readings of the palimpsest cod. Vind. Hist. gr. 10 (scriptio inferior 10th cent.), fol. 4v, with fragments of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωιδίας, the specific passage concerning βλαστημός. The surviving introductory text of Herodian in the palimpsest is: ἔστιν τὸ παρ’ Αἰσχύλῳ βλαστημός ἀπὸ τοῦ βλαστῶ γενόμενον. The noun in question, βλαστημός, occurs two more times, exclusively in Aeschylus: Su. 318 in the sense ‘offspring’, and Se. 12 in the sense ‘growth’. Of the principal current Greek lexica, only the Diccionario griego-español (DGE) contains a reference to βλαστημός in fr. 332a, and its interpretation is different. Unlike the other two occurrences, it is qualified as adjective (βλαστημός-ος) in the sense que hace germinar, germinador = ‘germinating, germinator’. However, only three occurrences in Greek poetry, all in Aeschylus, and still each with a different grammatical designation and a different sense, is, I believe, intolerable. It is perhaps better to scrutinize each passage separately.

1. A new edition of the Vienna palimpsest with the aid of digital images resulting from high-resolution multispectral photographing is being prepared by K. Alpers, J. Grusková, O. Primavesi, N. Wilson. In the latest report on the project (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Institut für Mittelalterforschung [FWF Project 31939-G25: 01.02.2019 – 31.07.2024]), fol. 4v is not included among the folia of the codex that are planned to be examined and published by the research group. So, I proceeded with my investigation based primarily on Herbert Hunger’s initial readings and the subsequent scholarly suggestions.


3. Hunger’s 1967 edition of the Vienna palimpsest could not of course be included in the text published by Lentz. However, in Book 7 of Herodian’s De prosodia catholica, GG 3.1: 171.12 ff., a concise passage mentions the grammarian’s rules on the accentuation of nouns in -ημος and -ιμος. Neither βλαστημός nor βλαστήμος are mentioned among the examples.
At Su. 318, Marcianus, the codex unicus, transmits

τίν’ οὖν ἔτ’ ἄλλον τήσεθε βλάστημον λέγεις;

It is the King asking the chorus, as believed, about Λιβύη, Io’s granddaughter, and her son Βῆλος. However, the question is about Io’s genealogy, with the previous verses, from 291 on, describing her fate and naming in turn the ancestors of the Danaids, in answer to the King’s inquiry about their γένεθλον σπέρμα τε (290). Only G. Hermann 1852, followed by Zuntz 1983a, interpreted βλάστημον in Su. 318 as adjective, adopting also the antepenultimate accentuation of M. The rendering of the verse by Hermann is: “Quemnam porro memoras, qui ex hac sit prog- natus?”. The majority of editors accepted Lobeck’s reading βλαστημόν, as substantive (= βλάστημα). I would favour Hermann’s adjective, neuter of βλαστήμων (Nic. Al. 548), in the sense ‘sprouting, germinating’ or substantivized, = βλάστη or βλάστησις, evoking, on the one hand, Io’s γέ- νεθλον and, on the other, the succeeding lineage after Belus until the Da- naids. Aeschylus uses elsewhere βλάστημα for ‘offspring’ (Se. 533), and so does often Euripides.

At Se. 12, Marcianus transmits

βλάστημον ἀλδαίνοντα σώματος πολύν.

Though the verse secures the long second syllable, most other MSS and Scholia write βλάστημον. The schol. of Π¹ is interesting: ζητεῖ δὲ περί τῆς τοῦ βλάστημον γραφῆς εἰδώς τέως κρείττον εἶναι τὴν διὰ τοῦ ι κατὰ παραγωγὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βλαστῶ. Whether -ημον or -μον, the Scholia usually explain it as adject- ive. Though, by πολύν Marcianus and the majority of the MSS seem to imply a 2nd declension masculine noun βλάστημος, the same neuter of βλαστήμων can well stand with πολύ which is transmitted in a group of MSS (W ν λ), also substantivized in the sense βλάστη or βλάστησις, ‘growth, sprouting’.

No doubt, the only certain parallel instance of βλαστήμων is too late, coming from Nicander’s Alexipharmaka. However, identical formations from contracted verbs occur already in the epic (νοήμων, δηλήμων, possibly ζηλήμων), the commonest being τλήμων, or somewhat later (5th century αἰδήμων, personal names Φιλήμων, Ἡγήμων). 4

4. Lobeck (1843) 159.
Now, back to our fragment. Herodian must not be concerned with the quantity of the penultimate syllable (\(-\iota\mu\omicron\) or \(-\eta\mu\omicron\)), otherwise he would not choose as an example a verse where this penultimate syllable falls in the anceps position. His interest in the word must lie in the question of its accentuation: \(\beta\lambda\sigma\tau\eta\mu\omicron\) or \(\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\mu\omicron\). I haven’t seen the palimpsest text, but the specimen sent by Hunger to Zuntz, as published by the latter (Zuntz 1983a, 265), is completely unaccentuated. On the other hand, Herodian clearly speaks of a 2nd declension noun, \(\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ t\ o\ p\alpha\rho'\ \Lambda\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\omicron\ \beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\mu\omicron\), the neuter of \(\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\mu\omicron\) being clearly ruled out.

I would suggest a tiny but necessary conjecture in the first verse: \(\hat{\eta}d\varepsilon\) for Hunger’s reading \(\delta\omicron\), which led to his odd supplement \(\iota\delta\omicron\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\\iota\nu\). Thus,

\[ t\o\ \lambda\alpha\mu\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\ [\ -\times\ ]\hat{\eta}d\varepsilon\ \theta\omicron\mu\omicron\nu,\ \alpha\theta'\ \iota\nu\nu\]

yields an iambic trimeter, with a long and an anceps missing in the lacuna. A verbal form might be helpful in filling the gap. I would propose \(\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\nu\) or \(\epsilon\gamma\nu\nu\nu\) or any other first person aorist verb, suitable with respect to size and metre, in the meaning ‘saw, sensed, felt, perceived’. It is important to remark the split anapaest in the fifth foot (\(\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\), | \(\alpha\theta'\ \iota\nu\nu\)), which undoubtedly indicates a satyr-play: West 1982, 88. The sense of the intelligible part until \(\theta\alpha\lambda\pi\omicron\nu\nu\) seems to be: ‘which [I saw] bright and hot, just like the heating sun’. \(\alpha\theta'\ \iota\nu\nu\ \theta\alpha\lambda\pi\omicron\nu\nu\ \kappa\tau\omicron\.\) is not a causal clause (LSJ s.v. \(\alpha\tau\omicron II\) causal, \(\text{inasmuch as, seeing that}\), with part.), because here \(\alpha\tau\omicron\) is not connected with the participle but with the subject of the participle. Therefore, \(\alpha\theta'\ \iota\nu\nu\) must mean ‘like the sun’ (LSJ s.v. \(\alpha\tau\omicron I\)) with at least the first participle (\(\theta\alpha\lambda\pi\omicron\nu\nu\)) qualifying the sun. The particular simile is poetically established, also with \(\alpha\tau\omicron\): Alcm. 1.63 \(\alpha\tau\omicron\ \sigma'\omicron\mu\omicron\ \alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\omicron\), Pind. \(\omicron.\ 1.2\ \alpha\iota\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\ \alpha\tau\omicron\). The initial \(t\o\) must not be the article of a missing neuter noun, but a relative or demonstrative pronoun referring to a previously mentioned unknown neuter. Aeschylus employs elsewhere the epic form of the pronoun; e.g. \(\omicronu.\ 263\ a\i\mu\ \mu\eta\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\ ...\), \(t\o\ \delta\epsilon\rho\omicron\ \pi\acute{\delta}\omicron\ \chi\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\nu\ \omicron'\chi\delta\eta\tau\omicron\), \(\omicronu.\ 699\ t\o\ \delta\acute{\mu}\omicron,\ t\o\ \pi\tau\omicron- \lambda\nu\ \kappa\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\nu\). The adjectives, \(\lambda\alpha\mu\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\ \hat{\eta}d\varepsilon\ \theta\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\), are treated as predicates.

The employment of the epic \(t\o\), the copulative \(\hat{\eta}d\varepsilon\), the comparative \(\alpha\tau\omicron\), and possibly further highbrow words of the fragment (e.g. \(\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\mu\omicron\)) must indicate a solemn style mouthed by an official character, such as a chorus-leader, a god, a king. In a satyr-play, as here, the character must be speaking in mock-epic style.\(^5\)

\(^5\) The same stratagem occurs in Soph. fr. 269c from \(\text{Inaches}\), also a satyric or possibly a
I suppose ‘fire’ is the expected subject in the opening of the fragment. The statement attests that it was the first time that the speaker saw this unknown stuff, which he can only compare to the sun in brightness and warmth. Yet, the missing noun should not be τὸ πῦρ, because it is unlikely for the speaker to ignore the thing he sensed but know its name. Possibly, a vague figurative reference to it was used in the previous verses.

To put it in a nutshell, I believe that the issue is about the unknown substance that gushed out of the hollow stalk of the fennel, the νάρθηξ, where Prometheus had hidden the fire he donated to the mortals, and that the fragment comes from a report of the donation in the opening of an Aeschylean satyr-play, namely Prometheus Pyrkaeus.

I accept Zuntz’s κἀκχέος[ν]τα . . . θέρος, though his readings seem to have been wormed out of Hunger, whose original readings were different (και ἀνα-χέοντα and then και εκχει[ν]τα, and θορος). In any case, I am unable to suggest anything more satisfactory. The speaker sensed the gift of Prometheus bright and warm just like the sun that provides warmth and pours down βλαστήμων θέρος, ‘sprouting summer’. Zuntz’s θέρος was supported by PV 455/6 καρπίμου θέρους. However, I would retain the antepenultimate accentuation of the adjective as in the other two Aeschylean instances, especially since here its adjectival function is clear and we do not need to have recourse to substantivization. Apparently, Herodian parses erroneously Aeschylus’ adjective βλαστήμων -ήμον as 2nd declension substantive βλαστημός.

What follows after the second verse is [. . .]χριος[. . . . .]ε. γ. .ως οὐκ ἔστιν υψ[.]. Its first part, [. . .]χριος, does not seem to scan, but the rest fits well in an iambic trimeter, whose opening limit is uncertain: [ . ] covered by [. . .] is likely, “as far as, to the extent that”; cf. Damascius, Pr. 1.254.12, ἄχρις ὅσου φύει, “to the extent that it grows plants”. The prose phrase is placed parenthetically inside the verses, as if it was a marginal note (by Herodian or a scholiast?) that was inserted in the text.

The rest, [ . ] ως οὐκ ἔστιν υψ[ . . . ], obviously scans. I suggest υψ[οθεν ζέσων], since the unknown stuff, which the speaker likened in terms

---

5. A short reference to nouns in -ήμων occurs in Herodian’s De prosodia catholica, GG 3.1: 32.16 ff., without a mention of βλαστήμων, -ήμον.

6. A short reference to nouns in -ήμων occurs in Herodian’s De prosodia catholica, GG 3.1: 32.16 ff., without a mention of βλαστήμων, -ήμον.

7. Only λέχριος, ‘slanting, crosswise’, occurs in poetry, and its first two letters cannot fit in the one-letter gap.
of its properties to the sun, is not poured from the sky, but is produced on earth near us. The metaphorical ἐκχέοντα θέρος and possibly ῥέον are apparently reflecting the actual image of the fire that flowed out of Prometheus’ νάρθηξ. In the beginning of the verse, two adjectives fit the sense and the traces: ἔγγειον/ἔγγαιον, ‘earthly’, and ἔγγιον, ‘nearer’. For reasons of space available, I opt for the latter.

Here is then the restoration I propose:

τὸ λαμπρὸν [εἶδον ἣ] δὲ θερμὸν, ἄθ’ ἦλιον
θάλποντα κάσχεον τα βλάστημον θέρος
emption γίον, ὡς οὖν ἔστιν ὑψ[όθεν δέ] ϊον

“which I sensed bright and hot, just like sun heating and pouring out fertile summer nearer (to us), as it doesn’t flow from above”.

Now, can the speaker who ignores both the substance and the name of fire be anyone else than the primitive man who received Prometheus’ gift? In an Aeschylean satyr-play, as the split anapaest shows, he must be a character of Prom. Pyrk. representing the human race. And as the speaker still ignores fire or πῦρ, the fragment must be placed in the very beginning of the story of Prom. Pyrk., before the choral songs of P.Oxy. 2245, where the gift and its beneficial qualities are named (204b, 3–5 πᾶρ πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγὰν ... παρ’ ἑστιοῦ σέλας), and before the specific references to the celebration of Prometheus’ gift (204b, 6–8 (= 15–17) Νύμφας δέ τοι πέποιθ’ ἐγὼ | στήσεις χοροὺς | Προμηθεώς δῶρον ὡς σεβούσας). Since the donation scene with the νάρθηξ and the fire gushing out of it was, of course, difficult to be shown live to the audience, it is narrated to the chorus. But the narrator could well hold a torch lit with Prometheus’ gift and show it from afar to his addressees.

Who can the narrator be? It is tempting to propose the chorus-leader who is recounting his experience of the donation scene to the members of
the chorus. However, the chorus-leader cannot detach himself from the chorus, and so cannot have experiences separate from the group. The only other character I can imagine is Silenus. If the Satyrs can stand for mankind, under the role of shepherds (fr. 204b, 18–21, from Prom. Pyrk.), a class of humans who benefitted from the sun’s brightness and heat, but lived in want of practically every other human activity that presupposes the existence of fire, Silenus, their father, can well be the receiver of the gift.

This is not the place to discuss the disputable issue of whether Silenus appears in satyr-plays in the role of coryphaeus or not. So far as we depend on the available evidence, it is impossible to equate the characteristics of the tragic coryphaeus and Silenus. Though in the plot he always appears in connection to the Satyrs, Silenus has a pronounced independence of action and communication from them. Yet, the number of the choreuts, which in several significant cases was not twelve but eleven, seems to suggest an official restriction on counting Silenus as a separate actor, irrespective of how he was treated by the poets. Thus, in the absence of a regular chorus-leader, one of the eleven acted as the coryphaeus who represented the chorus in the dialogue.8

**207

τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενθήσεις σύ γε


The fragment has been attributed to Prom. Pyrk. by Welcker (1824), 120. Earlier, it had been assigned to Prometheus Pyrophoros (Stanley ap. Butler 1809, 264, Schütz 1782, 84), but these scholars considered Pyrophoros the same play as Prom. Pyrk. Bates (1934) 170–1, connected the fragment with Sophocles’ Kωφοί, a satyr-play which has to do with fire and its use in forging iron, but at a later stage, certainly not when fire τὸ πρῶτον ὄφθη.

Late authors, like Epiphanius (Ancor. 106.2) and Eustathius (Il. 415.6), but also modern scholars, like Schwyzer, GG II 64.4, considered

8. The evidence produced by Sutton (1974b) can be enlarged.
τράγος a nominative instead of vocative, while Wilamowitz 1912, 467 n. 2 (= Wilamowitz 1935, 1.371 n. 2), followed by others, interpreted it as τράγος ὁ ν., thus supporting the etymology of τραγωιδία from τράγος and an analogous theory on the prehistory of drama. Other scholars claim that τράγος must be taken as comparative, ‘just like a he-goat’, referring to the proverbial inquisitive nature of goats. ‘Just like the he-goat’, referring to an unrecorded myth, must be ruled out, since fire was seen then for the first time, and no myth about fire could have preexisted.9 Now, the papyrus text (fr. 204b.18) shows that the Satyrs in Prom. Pyrk. are presented as shepherds, and so it is unthinkable that Prometheus could have addressed the chief shepherd as he-goat. Furthermore, the comparison with the he-goat, would be more natural in a group of shepherds, as it would come from a familiar domain.

Since the donation of the fire has not been performed in view of the audience, but is reported by Silenus to the Chorus (fr. 332a), who hear about fire or, possibly, see it from afar, but have not sensed it yet, the fragment must come from a scene, subsequent to Silenus’ report. The Satyrs have their first close experience of the fire now, their leader wishes to hug and kiss it, but Prometheus prevents him and explains to the Chorus the properties of the unknown substance. ὁς πρῶτον ὤφθη, that is, not by Silenus offstage, but by the Satyr-chorus onstage, or more precisely on the orchestra.

The text flanking the fragment in Plutarch is clearly putting to prose the previous and the subsequent verses. Otto Crusius already attempted to versify a part of it,10 ‘vix recte’, according to Radt (Dubia fr. 474):

\[ \text{τέχνης ἁπάσης ἐστὶν ὄργανον (sc. τὸ πῦρ)} \]

In PV 505–506, Prometheus addressing the Chorus sums up the same claim somewhat differently:

\[ \text{βραχεῖ δὲ μύθωι πάντα συλλήβδην μάθε·} \]
\[ \text{πάσι πέχαι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως.} \]

Though the fragment is transmitted as coming from Prometheus, without any further determinant of the title, it seems to be connected with the previous one (207). However, since the Satyrs see the fire now for the first time, they are ignorant not only of the thing but also of the words describing it (πῦρ, πυρά, φλόξ, σπινθήρ, καπνός). Therefore, Prometheus refers to these items with vague terms or metaphors from experiences familiar to the Satyrs.

πέμφιξ, a ‘poetic word of unstable meaning’, according to Beekes’s Etymological Dictionary, but also according to Galen, above, meaning ‘blowing, blast of air, cloud, lightning, ray, raindrop, drop’, senses alternating from author to author sometimes within the same author or the same work. In Soph. fr. 337 from Colchides πέμφιξ is a blowing or blast of air, but in fr. 338 from the same play it is a ray or a flash. In Aeschylus’ Prometheus, always according to Galen, it denotes ‘drop’. Wenkebach 1931 made an attempt as comprehensive as possible to reconcile the various meanings. However, Galen’s text was transmitted in a terrible condition, needing to be emended in nearly every phrase, not always irrefutably. After repeated tries, Wenkebach ends with attributing the fragment to Prometheus Lyomenos from a prophesy of the Titan to Heracles. He also changes the close of the second verse to κοδλία <λιαν> ζόη, quite remotely from the transmitted καὶ οὐ διὰ ζωῆς ἀτμοί. Silk (1983) 306 ff., thoughtfully includes πέμφιξ in a group of words with indefinite meanings that
emanated from metaphors, but the grammarians distinguished them in different lexical headings depending on their usage each time.

I believe that καὶ οὐ διὰ ζωῆς stands for κοὐ διαζώιης, i.e. διαζῶ in pres. opt. 2nd sing., without ἄν (Schwyzer GG II 324–5), equivalent to οὖν ἔσθ’ ὅπως διαζώιης, a syntax occurring in all three tragedians and Aristophanes. Prometheus continues his address in second person (ἐξευλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ σε προσβάληι — οὐ διαζώιης).

The usual interpretation is ‘be careful not to be struck in the mouth by a boiling hot drop of water, because it is sharp and causes death’. But the supposedly ejected drop could strike harmfully any bare part of the body. Why especially the mouth? Perhaps, things are not so critical. The original sense of πέμφιξ is apparently the medical one: ‘blister, pustule, skin eruption’: πεμφιγώδης Hp. Epid. 6.1.14, al. Can we apply Silk’s approach, and go back to this original meaning discarding the grammarians and Galen? The first sentence can well mean: ‘be careful not to blister in the mouth’. διαζῶ means ‘live one’s life (in a certain condition)’. As for ἀτμός, apart from the basic meaning ‘steam, vapour’, it is also used of ‘odour’, especially the unpleasant one: Aesch. Ag. 1311, Arist. Probl. 908a21. Both meanings are possible. Very hot liquid and steam can scald the mouth. But also, it is a common experience that infected tissues produce blisters with stinking pus. So, the second sentence can mean: ‘for it (the blister) yields sharp pain, and you couldn’t live with the vapour/stench’. Not in the sense ‘you shall die’, but ‘your life will be unlivable’, ‘you couldn’t stand it’.

Why should Prometheus care to speak of blisters in the mouth to the Satyr (Silenus or coryphaeus)? Probably, before that mention, the Titan must have been enumerating the everyday benefits of his gift. One of them must have been food cooking. And, as in fr. 207 the Satyr was warned not to embrace and kiss the fire or he would mourn his beard, here he is warned not to swallow boiling hot food, probably soups (ζωμός, ἕτνος, κυκεών) to account for Galen’s ‘drop’ (ancient Greeks had no spoons), or he would blister his mouth intolerably. A parallel enumeration is found in Epich. 113.241–253 K.–A., from Πύρρα ἢ Προμαθεύς, where the benefits of the fire are listed: baking of bread (241–243), warming oneself...
(243–244), drying the soaked fleece (244–247), warming water for bathing (252–253), and possibly more.

Be that as it may, etymologists cannot explain the short α of ἀτμος in this fragment, insofar as they produce ἀτμος from ἀετμος by contraction; see Hsch. a 1422 ἀετμα· φλόξ; a 1423 ἀετμόν· τὸ πνεῦμα; EM 20.10 ἀετμα· φλόξ· οί δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα. “La quantité de l’α- n’est pas connue” according to Boisacq. The etymology published in DGE (Adrados) connects ἀτμος with ἀήρ, Sanscrit ἀtmán-, ‘soul’, OHG ātum, ‘breath’, ending with “α origina-riamente breve”, an etymology, however, already rejected by Frisk, Chan-traine and Beekes.

288

dédoika μῶρον κάρτα πυραύστου μόρον

Aelian. Nat. an. 12.8 (1.297.4 Hercher) = Apostol. 18.18 (CPG 2.721.16) ζωίον ἐστιν ὁ πυραύστης, ὄπερ οὖν χαίρει μὲν τῇ λαμπηδόν τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ προσπέτεται τοῖς λέχνοις ἔνακραζούσῃ τῇ φλογὶ, ἐμπεσὼν δὲ ἐπὶ δέμης εἶτα μέντοι καταπέφλεκται. μέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἀἰσχύλος ὁ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητὴς λέγων ’δέδοικα — μόρον’.

Apart from Aelian, the verse is also transmitted in several paroemiographical sources without any significant variants. It was ascribed to Prom. Pyrk. and connected with fr. 207 by Hermann (1825, 12). μῶρον, ‘stupid, silly, foolish’, was mostly transmitted as μωρόν; the Attic form was restored by Grotius. The jocular paronomasia μῶρον ... μόρον is clearly fit for a satyr-play. There can be no doubt that the connection with frr. 207 and 187a is right. In both of them Prometheus seems to be addressing a Satyr, possibly Silenus or the coryphaeus or both. But who is the speaker in 288 who is afraid of dying stupidly like a moth in the flame? Bothe noted (the quotation in Radt): ‘Commode haec referas ad Prometheus πυραύστης, ut ita eum respondisse putemus Satyro quaerenti, cur ipse non osculetur ignem’. That Prometheus would declare he is afraid of death and, what is more, of such a death, sounds awkward to me, unless the Titan was joking. On the other hand, it is unlikely that the Satyrs, who see fire for the first time, are already aware of πυραύστης and its manner of dying. However, frs. 207 and 187a show that a rhesis of Prometheus had preceded, explaining the properties of the fire and the dangers from it. Espe-
cially, the Plutarch passage that contains fr. 207 indicates the existence of such a rhesis: καίει τὸν ἁψάμενον, ἀλλὰ φῶς παρέχει καὶ θερμότητα καὶ τέχνης ἁπάσης ὀργάνον ἐστι τοῖς χρῆσθαι μαθοῦσι. He could well include in his speech, as an example of those who would not learn how to use it, πυραύστης and his manner of death. The word would be exactly to the point, since etymologically it means ‘fire-kindled’, opposite to πυρκαεύς, ‘fire-kindler’. Then, either Silenus or the coryphaeus can respond: ‘I am extremely afraid of such a stupid death in the fire’.

336

عاطف

EM 182.54 عطف: ὁμορό τὸ ἐπιπολάζον τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἄφρωδες. Ἡπικοφάντης τὸ λεπτὸν ἐξομένιον τοῦ λίνου. Ἀιαχόλος δὲ τὸν καπνὸν, καὶ Ἡρωνομάνης οὕτως: ‘عاطف ἐπνοοῦ’; similia in Hsch. a 8894, Synag. a 2609 Cunningham, Photius Lex. a 3446 Theodoridis, Append. prov. 1.44 (CPG 1, 385.15), Sud. a 4705.

Nauck attributed also πυρός to Aeschylus (عاطف πυρός), but, if the word comes from Prom. Pyrk., as I suspect, the Satyrs do not know the word for ‘smoke’, just as they are ignorant of the word for ‘fire’, something they see for the first time after Prometheus’ donation. So, they name it with something similar, familiar to them: ‘foam, froth, chaff flying in the wind’. Analogous is Aesch. fr. 78c.57 (from Theoroi) τοῦ πίπλου, ‘implement, utensil, thingamajig’ for ἀσπίς, ‘shield’, also something the Satyrs see for the first time.

Finally, I suspect that Aesch. fr. 78c.41 (from Theoroi), where Silenus threatens the satyr-chorus that they will be punished for having abandoned Dionysus’ suite, with the words ταῦτ’ οὖν δακρύσεις οὐ καπνῶ [i, ‘therefore, you’ll weep not with smoke’, must be supplemented δ’ ὀσπερ πάρος, with cross-reference between satyr-plays. If so, connected with عطف = ‘smoke’, there must be a reference to weeping from smoke inside the scene between Prometheus and the chorus-leader indicated in frs. 207 and 288. πάρος, in Theoroi, if correct, would be a clue for the chronological precedence of Prom. Pyrk.
**204a (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 1, col. I)

2 φέγγος·

4 ι τότε

6 ζ

8 ν

10 .φλεκτο[

12 .ς τόδε

14 .μόγις

16 .πον[.

18 .ι.

20 .ν[

. .

4 vel N Radt 10 }. 'a tail descending from left to right, e.g. a' Lobel 12 } O vel Ω (hoc malim: ὡς τόδε) 19 vel } N . 20 } O N vel } Ω N

**204d 12 (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 12)

. .

]. α[. .].[

[—]

2 γλεῦκ[ο]ς δέ τοι τέ[θεικ' ἐγώ ia ia | eph.

πέλας πυρός, ia |
The correspondence of 2–4 with the ephymnia of 204b 6–8, 15–17, that speak of the Nymphs’ dance, was recognized already by Lobel. The action implied dictates that this fragment follows 204a and leads to the large fragment 204b. The ephymnion seems to announce the schedule of the dance that will follow. The papyrus piece has no physical connection through vertical fibres with 204a, as it shows the opening of the column, whereas 204a its end. Also, horizontally, the supplemented ends of 204d 12 do not agree with the visible ends of the last lines of 204a, unless the desperate relics of the first line of 204d 12 (\( \alpha \nu \tau \rho \varepsilon \iota \zeta \mu \varepsilon \theta \nu \sigma [\theta] \) \( \delta \delta ? \) \( \text{ant. 1} \)) and of the last line of 204a (\( \zeta \) \( \delta \) [\( \iota \) \( \theta \\varepsilon \mathrm{\text{ia}} \)]) can be connected.

1. The ephymnion of 2–4 presupposes a strophe, in which the new wine should have been mentioned. 204a does not help. Its few surviving words have some connection with fire and light (2 \( \varphi \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \rho \varsigma \), 10 \( \varphi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \mathrm{\text{o}} \), 17 \( \ldots \) \( \varphi \mathrm{\text{au}} \)), but not with new wine.

2–3. \( \Gamma \Lambda \) are very faintly visible but certain, of E the curve is partly effaced, but the mid horizontal is clear, of YK the bottom tips of the uprights and of K the entire low oblique are visible; of C the end of the top curve is clear. Reading \( \gamma \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma [\varsigma] \) has been important, because the word was not recorded in literature before Aristotle. However, \( \gamma \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma \) is found in three 5th cen-
tury BCE inscriptions from Gortyn in Crete (IC IV 77.3, 79.4, 144.4), one from Lyttos also in Crete (SEG 27.631A.12, 15 κλεῦκος, c. 500 BCE), in IG I² 237.4 (Att., 410–404), IG XII Suppl. 347.1 (Thasos, 4th c. BCE), IG IV 49 personal name Πιλευκίτας of a Cypriot Salaminian (found in Aegina, 5th c. BCE); also, the derivative ἀγλευκής is attested in Epich. 168 K.–A, Rhint. 25 K.–A., and Xen. Hier. 1.21. The word has gained linguistic interest after scholars read de-re-u-ko with the ideogram VINUM in the Knossos tablet Uc 160, i.e. *δλεῦκος, which connects the stem γλυκ- with the Lat. dulcis.

ΤΕ[ can be considered certain. The upper curve of epsilon and its middle horizontal are clearly visible. The Satyrs place the new wine by the fire, so that they might drink seated in warmth, while waiting for their turn to come for dancing in the Choes festival (see below). It is less likely that placing the wine by the fire implies that they are simmering it before drinking.

4. ἀν τρεῖς, ‘in groups of three’. Apocope of ἀνά in Aesch. Pe. 566 ἀμ πεδίρεις, Su. 350 ἀμ πέτραις, not to count the numerous compounds: e.g., Ag. 305 ἀνδαίοντες, Su. 806 ἀμφυγᾶς. If the groups singing the four ephymnia are also four, i.e. four half-semichoruses, this might determine the number of the choreuts to twelve. If the inference is correct, this would possibly be the first express reference to the size of the satyr chorus. The twelve choreuts seem to be reduced by one in Aesch. Theoroi, as well as in the Douris psykter of the British Museum and the Pronomos vase, because Silenus is treated more like an independent actor than a coryphaeus, so that one of the remaining eleven had to play the actual coryphaeus.12 Completely unreliable are the statements of Tzetzes Prolegomena de comoedia Aristophanis 2.85 Koster, πρόσωπα δὲ τοῖς μὲν τραγικοῖς καὶ σατυρικοῖς ἀνὰ δεκαέξ ᾖσαν, and Versus de poematum generibus 108–110 Koster, διαφορὰν μᾶνθανε τῆς κωμῳδίας, | ἡς εἰκοσιτέσσαρες οἱ χορεργάται, | ἐκκαίδεκα δὲ σατύρων, τραγῳδίας. Be that as it may, the number twelve posits the inclusion of Silenus in the dancing chorus, which is by no means unlikely, since there appears no conflict or other confrontation of the Satyrs with their father in the surviving portion of Prom. Pyrk., but on the contrary all of them, even the Nymphs added, are determined to celebrate Prometheus and his gift.

12. To be discussed in my forthcoming edition of Theoroi on c. 52–3.
μεθύσ|τερ- would be unmetrical. Possibly, ἀν τρεῖς μεθυσ[θέντας ως χορεῦσαι, ‘so that we could dance drunk in groups of three’.

5. Mette (1959, 128) supplemented άριστιππτο[ς as an attribute of χιών (?), I discern ΕΠΙΧΙΠΠΟ[. Of the first letter, whereas the low left tail of alpha is either straight or looks downward, here the surviving low curve turns upwards as in epsilon. The middle stroke of epsilon is faintly visible, but as it overlaps a horizontal fibre, it escaped the scholars’ notice. ἐριστ’, i.e. adv. ἐριστα, ‘as if in rivalry, competitively’. The only words beginning with ἐππο– are ἐππος and its numerous compounds and derivatives, which have no place here. I conjecture ἐπω, ‘press, weigh down’ from ἐπος, ἦ, ‘any weight or press’, which are frequently written in MSS with double pi for obvious reasons.13 Zeus soaks the mortals with the rain, but snow as if rivalling it weighs down their soaked head. χιὼν δ’ ἐρίστ’ ἰπό[ς] [βεβρεγμένον | ὄμβρου κάρα makes perfect sense. After ἰποῖ possibly an adverb (βαρεὺς, λιγὰν?). Three consecutive iambics, each self-contained, without the typical caesuras of the trimeter, appear also in the first two verses of the ephymnia: Νόμμας δέ τοι | πέποιθ’ ἐγὼ στήσειν χοροὺς (×2) | γλεῦκος δέ τοι | τέθεικ’ ἐγὼ πέλας πυρός (×2) | χιὼν δ’ ἐρίστ’ | ἰποὶ – | βεβρεγμένον.14 Still, the sentence remains pending, as it is only the temporal clause that survived. The main clause, certainly in future expressing a general truth, must have followed after the high stop of line 7, which must be taken as equivalent to our comma. ‘As long as heaven sends rain and snow upon earth, [the gift of Prometheus will defend humans against them]. Means of defence against winter are described in Hes. Op. 536–563, but fire is neglected. The closest parallel is possibly Epich. 113.241–253, K.–A., from Πόροι ἡ Προμαθεύς, where the benefits of the fire are enumerated:

14. The case reminds us of Victor Hugo’s famous revolt against the metrical norms: J’ai disloqué | ce grand niais | d’alexandrin.

**204b+204d 5 (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 1, col. II)**

σία δέ μ’ εὔμενης χορεύει χάρις,  

χιτῶνα πάρ πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγάν.  

κλονοῦς’ ἐμοῦ δὲ Ναίδων τις παρ’ ἐσ- 

τιούχον σέλας πολλὰ διώξεται.  

καλ[ό]γε[ί]ς τὸν ὀμφέλης τὸν ὀμφεῖ τὸν Ὀμφής τόδ’ ὡς  

πάσιν στήσεις.  

αὐχῶς ἐς καὶ ποιμέν[α]ς πρέπειν  

καὶ τὸ νυκτίπλαγ-  

φύλοις ἱστάναι συμπεφορημένους δ’ ὡς.
If the pattern I follow is reliable, the first strophe must have ended with line 1 of 204d 12. Its exact size is unknown, but if Radt’s (p. 321) calculation that ‘intervallo ca. 16 versuum sequabatur F204b’ is correct and if the strophe extended to 6 verses, like the surviving second pair of strophe/antistrophe, then 204d 12 should be placed after 204a with a two-line gap between them. There follows in lines 2–4 the three-line ephymnion that speaks of the new wine, its placing by the fire, and the drunken dance. The first 3 verses of the first antistrophe survive in lines 5–7 of 204d 12. The verses missing until the end of the antistrope must be equal to the verses of the strophe we hypothetically calculated above. After that, a three-line ephymnion is also missing as well as the first line of the second strophe. Whether the missing ephymnion was a duplicate of the previous one is unknown, but is very likely, given the paradigm of the surviving identical ephymnia that follow the second strophe and antistrophe.

1. \( \mu(\epsilon) \chiορεύει \) causal, ‘stirs me up to dance’. Terzaghi’s supplement \( \acute{e}κουν \) \( \sigmaία \) of the previous column’s bottom line is necessary, but cannot be reconciled with \( \mu' \epsilonυμενής \chiορεύει \chiάρος \), which presupposes an external interference, in contrast with \( \acute{ε}κουσία \). Now, \( \acute{oυχ} \acute{ε}κουσία \) suggests an obligatory, magic dance, as in Sophocles’ \textit{Inchos} or the Ichneutai, ‘willy-nilly’, however not punitive but \( \epsilonυμενή' \). Not \( \acute{α}κουσία \), because the initial long \( \acute{α} \)-, contracted for \( \acute{α}ε- \), would spoil the metre. By deleting \( \delta \epsilon \) we would be relieved of the kai-
belianus and gain a perfect dochmiac. But the kaibelianus responds with a similar verse in 10, and it would be too bold to emend a sentence whose context is unknown. χάρις and Χάρις are a notion and a personification frequently connected with dance. However, the chorus, though stirred up to dance, do not seem to dance yet. Perhaps they are expecting the Nymphs to enter, and then start dancing to the sound of their hymn.

2. Radt, reluctant to fill the short gap following φαεννόν, supplements <ω→ω, believing that the scribe omitted the end of the verse. T. Gargiulo enumerates a list of alternative supplements that might fit in the gap. One of them, [δ᾽ ἔω], makes perfect sense. The Satyr strips off the chiton, the dress worn next to the skin, and leaves it aside by the burning fire. ἔω here means ‘leave aside, abandon’; Il. 4.226 ἵππους μὲν γὰρ ἔασε καὶ ἅρματα ποικίλα χαλκῶι. The chiton is described as φαεννός, ‘shining, radiant’, but it is uncertain whether the description refers to a permanent or an acquired feature, i.e. whether the Satyr’s chiton was radiant from the very beginning or it was brightened by Prometheus’ gift. The second option is much likelier, as the fire has already been donated; the relics of the previous column show this clearly: 204a 2 [φεγγος, 10 ]. φλεκτο[, 17 ]. φαι[, 204d 12.3 πέλας πυρός. Obviously, frs. 332a, 207, 187a, 288, and 336, where the Chorus have not yet acquired full knowledge of the gift’s nature, precede the choral part that celebrates the benefits of the gift. Further, it is clear that the dance takes place in the dark, in any case after sunset, so that Prometheus’ gift lights up the chiton. The joke is that the Satyrs enter in the parodos dressed in a chiton, which implies that, prior to Prometheus’ gift, the Satyrs were dressed. Hor. Ars Poetica 220–21 carmine qui tragico uilem certauit ob hircum, | mox etiam agrestes Satyro nudauit. Thus, here the Satyrs assume the regular satyric dress, the loin-girdle, that leaves in view the tail and the phallus. Possibly, Aeschylus presents here a jocular aition for the typical satyric dress. Yet, it seems that the chiton was worn by the Satyrs elsewhere too. The old Satyrs depicted on the so-called Fujita-hydria (Martin von Wagner Museum in Würzburg, ZA 20; LIMC VII (1994) s.v. “Oidipous” nr. 72; LIMC VIII (1997) s.v. “Silenoi” nr. 160, pl. 160) are dressed in long ornamented chitons while attending to Sphinx, seated on klismoi and holding tall canes, an obvious allusion to the beast’s riddle. More dressed Satyrs appear on several vase-paintings (Brommer 1959, Abb. 56, 63, 64, 67, 69). Also, the coryphaeus seems to be differ-

entiated by an ornamented chiton from the rest of the Satyrs on the Douris psykter of the British Museum as well as on the Pronomos vase. Among the names of the satyric dresses mentioned by Pollux 4.118, we read καὶ χορταῖος χιτών δασύς, ὃν οἱ Σειληνοὶ (= Satyrs) φοροῦν. This χορταῖος χιτών, is very likely the dress initially worn by the Satyrs of Prom. Pyrk., if shepherds was the part played by them, as will be argued below; cf. the sense of χόρτοι, ‘places where animals are pastured, pasturage’. Stripped off then, the Satyrs will dance the involuntary but pleasant dance, by means of which the coryphaeus expects to seduce some Naïad; cf. Prat. PMG 708.4 ἀν’ ὅρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων. Apparently, until the end of the play, the Chorus remain naked, apart from the usual loin-girdle.

3. Hes. Th. 566 ἀκαμάτοιο πυρὸς ... αὐγῆν, referring to Prometheus’ theft of fire; Il. 18.610 θώρηκα φαεινότερον πυρὸς αὐγῆς, Od. 6.305 ἡ δ’ ἡσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάρηι ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῆι, Aesch. Ag. 9 (of the beacon from Ilion) αὐγήν πυρός.

4. κλυοῦσ’ ἐμοῦ, ‘having heard me’ = ‘after hearing my song’ or ‘after sensing me’?

Naïδων τίς suggests a number of Nymphs of streams, marshes, springs and the like, who apparently constitute the group expected in the ephymnia to set up dances honouring Prometheus for his gift.

5. διώξεται, ‘will pursue me’. Is ‘when she senses me naked’ implied? After σέλας a conspicuous hypodiastole, possibly standing for a pause between the two different forms of dochmiac: ⍜ – ⍜ – ⍜ – . – ⍜ – ⍜ – ⍜ – . The corresponding verses 13–14 have also a fourth dochmiac of the type ⍜ – ⍜ – ⍜ – ⍜ – , but it is impossible to say whether it is separated or not since the position of a potential hypodiastole falls in a gap.

10. ἔολπ’, if read in synecphonesia, would produce a dochmiac instead of kaibelianus; I keep the latter for reasons of responson and for highlighting the playful alliteration μολπάσειν ἔολπ(α), given that the unaccented cluster ολπ occurs only in these two words and their derivatives and compounds in Greek; even accented, only in κόλπος, ολπη.

12. The enclisis of φερέσβιος, noted in the papyrus, deceived Lobel and Radt into thinking that the letter following was Τ (τε or τ’). However, after φερέσβιος, traces of a circular letter are clearly visible, no doubt θ’. What follows fits exactly space-wise the proposal made by V. Liapis ἂμα καὶ σπ. The
first trace visible after Θ[AMAK] looks like a tiny top curve, but it can well be a slice of the top loop of Α, which is often quite thick. Radt rightly notes “[]. littera rotunda, ut vid., sed etiam Α possis”. There follows a short gap, which can accommodate an I, and then σπευσίδωρος·.

The hapax σπευσίδωρος has been unanimously accepted, though the compound adjective could equally well mean ‘eagerly bringing gifts’ and ‘eagerly seeking gifts’ (LSJ s.v. σπεύδω I.b). In any case, with the copulative ἅμα καὶ connecting them, one would expect that the two adjectives would describe two different or complementary features of Prometheus, not two practically synonymous. φερέσβιος, ‘life-bringing’, if the reference is to crops and fruit, as believed, and σπευσίδωρος, ‘eager to provide gifts’, have nearly the same meaning, the second being somewhat more vague than the first. Hesitantly, I suggest {σ}πευσίδωρος, also a hapax, which would add a significant characteristic to Prometheus. It certainly does not mean ‘requesting information about the gifts’. It agrees with φερέσβιος formation-wise, since both are verbal objective compounds, the difference being in the position of the verbal parts of the compounds: first in φερέσβιος (φέρω), second in σπευσίδωρος (δωρέομαι); Sommerstein (2019) on Su. 12. Similar is the compound ἀλγεσίδωρος, qualifying Eros in Sappho, fr. 172 V., Eris in Oppian, Hal. 2, 668; Schol. ad loc. ἡ δωρομένη τὰ ἄλγη, λύπας δωρομένην. Also, the personal name Ὀνασίδωρος/Ὀνησίδωρος, ‘offering profit, advantage’. What Prometheus presents mortals with is the nominal root of πεύθομαι, the Aeschylean πευθό (Se. 370), ‘tidings, information’ or the later πεῦς in the meaning ‘information’, not the Stoic theoretical term πεῦς (= question, inquiry). Sense-wise, this is exactly what Prometheus conferred on mortals: not only βίον, ‘life and crops’, but also πεῦθω/πεῦσιν, ‘learning by inquiry, acquiring knowledge’. Clearly, Aeschylus’ Prometheus did not endow humans with knowledge once for all, but with the ability to discover and examine the facts, so as to establish the truth. Something clearly expounded in PV 231–236, 442–506. Prometheus was believed to be the maker of men; see L. Eckhart (1957) 696–8 and 722–7. Ἀρ. Αὐ. 686 πλάσματα πηλοῦ about human beings. According to Lucian, Prom. es in verbis 3, Athena cooperated with Prometheus, ἐμπνέουσα τὸν πηλὸν καὶ ἐμψυχα ποιοῦσα εἶναι τὰ πλάσματα. In Prom. Pyrk., frs. 205 and 189a must come from a passage where Prometheus lists the skills acquired by the humans through the process inquiry → investigation → information → knowledge he presented them with. Be that as it may, I opted to keep πευσίδωρος as a dubitable proposal in the app. crit., since σπευσίδωρος is the certain reading of the papyrus and makes sense, no matter how satisfactory.
13-14. I propose

\[\text{χορεύσειν} \delta[\dot{\varepsilon} \text{ δεσπόσσαν} \text{αντ’} \text{ἐλπίς} \text{ω-}
\]
\[\text{οίον} \text{χε[\dot{i}]ματ[ος πολυθερεῖ} \text{πολυθερεῖ} \text{αι.}\]

‘I hope to dance having prevailed over the season’s cold with the help of the burning-hot fire’. Before the lacuna of line 13, a short bottom horizontal suggests \(\Delta\). Then, \(\delta[\dot{\varepsilon}\text{ ἔδεσπόσσαν} \text{αντ’}\text{ἐλπίς} \text{ω-}
\]
\[\text{οίον} \text{χε[\dot{i}]ματ[ος πολυθερεῖ} \text{πολυθερεῖ} \text{αι.}\]

After the lacuna of line 13, a short bottom horizontal suggests \(\Delta\). Then, \(\delta[\dot{\varepsilon}\text{ ἔδεσπόσσαν} \text{αντ’}\text{ἐλπίς} \text{ω-}
\]
\[\text{οίον} \text{χε[\dot{i}]ματ[ος πολυθερεῖ} \text{πολυθερεῖ} \text{αι.}\]

According to the scholiast’s note, the reason I prefer \(\text{πολυθερεῖ}\) is different. The sound consonance between the corresponding distichs 4-5 and 13-14 is remarkable:

\[
\begin{align*}
4 \text{-ôs’} & \sim 13 \text{-ôse-} \\
4 \delta & \sim 13 \delta \\
4 \text{-v} & \sim 13 \text{-v’t’} \\
5 \text{-ôn}s & \sim 14 \text{-ôn} \chi- \\
5 \text{-s} & \sim 14 \text{-s} \text{πολ-} \\
5 \text{-ai.} & \sim 14 \text{-ái.}
\end{align*}
\]

18. Lobel noticed that a short papyrus fragment, 204d 5.1–4 in Radt, could be placed in front of 204b.18–21, but he was hesitant to apply the connection, followed by Radt. Snell, whom I follow, applied the attachment. Four letters are missing from the opening of the stanza, no doubt a verb governing the infinitive c. acc. \(\text{ποιμένας πρέπειν} \times [\dot{x}\text{]\ai}\text{ fits the scanty traces. See below on 21.}\)
19. νυκτίπλαγκτος is a favourite adjective of Aeschylus, possibly coined by him; Ag. 12, 330, Cho. 524, 751; cf. also αἰγίπλαγκτος Ag. 303, θαλασσόπλαγκτος PV 467, παλίμπλαγκτος PV 838, πολύπλαγκτος Supp. 572, τηλέπλαγκτος PV 576.

20. ἀ[μέ]μφής Snell, but the space of the gap that is filled [έσ] is somehow shorter. Therefore, ἀ[μό]μφης[οι]σιν, apparently proposed by Radt, though he printed the irregular ἀ[μέ]μφης[οι]σιν. ἀμομφὸς is a form employed by Aeschylus alternatively to ἀμεμφής.

21. Since the shepherds do not constitute an established unit, like the Nymphs who are supposed to dance, συμπεφορημένοις, ‘collected together’, may well refer to their forming a group, i.e. the chorus. It is evident that shepherds is the part played by the Satyric chorus. Ποιμένες is a play by Sophocles (TrGF 4, frr. 497–521 Radt), which already G. Hermann (1847, 135 = Hermann 1827–77, VIII 314) remarked that ex illo genere fuit, quod satyrorum locum tenebat, i.e. like Euripides’ Alcestis, while others maintain that it was a manifest satyr-play. Sophocles’ story comes from the Cypria of the Epic cycle. The question is cogently discussed by A. F. Garvie 1969, 6–7, though the problem of the inclusion of Ποιμένες in the didascalia of Supplices (P. Oxy. 2256, fr. 3) remains still unsolved. In Eur. Cycl., the Satyrs are shepherds tending the sheep of Cyclops.

If then the Satyrs are playing the part of the shepherds, αὐχῶ would be a most likely verb (cf. Aesch. PV 338 αὐχῶ γὰρ αὐχῶ τήνδε δωρειάν ἐμοί | δώσειν Δί (α)); with δὲ [κ]αί highlighting their equality or perhaps rivalry with the Nymphs in dancing aptitude. δοκῶ] δὲ [κ]αί is equally possible, perhaps with a scent of ironic superiority, ‘if I’m not mistaken’.

22. τοῦ[ς] μὲν[ is possible. In the interlinear space above the Ν of μὲν, right before the lacuna, a second Ν is written. Possibly, it is a supralinear correction of the missing noun that follows τοὺς μὲν; e.g., τοὺς μὲν ἐνοῦς corrected to τοὺς μὲν νέους; cf. a similar correction in Aesch. Pe. 13 νέον δ’ ἄνδρα, where Φὐρ notes γς. καὶ ἐν.

23. ν· : Elsewhere in the papyrus, the end of a metrical unit or subunit is noted with a high dot. If this holds here too, the high dot might coincide with the end of a six-line stanza, equal-sized with the str./antistr. 2 and possibly the str./antistr. 1. It is even possible that a high dot existed also after συμπεφορημένοις, forming a two-line subunit similarly to the pair of str./antistr. 2. However, see on 24–25.
24–25. $\beta\alpha\theta\upsilon\xi\nu\lambda\omega$ may refer to the thick woodland where the seat of the Nymphs was. The text after line 22 is completely unknown. So, the mention of a stream flowing through the trees cannot be ruled out. Since the Nymphs were supposed to dance, they should leave their forest and join the shepherds in their humid meadow (204c.2 ὀ λειμών). It is unlikely that an ephymnion covered lines 24–26. The iambic $[\beta[\alpha]\theta\upsilon\xi\nu\lambda\omega$ agrees with the end of the first line of the ephymnia 6–8, 15–17, which consisted of two iambic metra, but also with the homometric ephymnion 204d 12.2–4. However, the space before $[\beta[\alpha]\theta\upsilon\xi\nu\lambda\omega$ seems too long to be filled with only one iambic metron, and, even worse, the relics of the next line, which in the other ephymnia was no more than one iambic metron, here seem to cover a length of ± 20 letters. Obviously, this choral unit does not agree with the previous strophe/ephymnion ~ antistrophe/ephymnion pattern. I name it tentatively epode.

**204c (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 1, col. III)**

```
θελονσα[..][
2 ὀ λειμών, ..[;
ὁλοι χορεύμασι[ν
> 4 ἵερα δ᾽ ἄκτις σελ[..][
τ]ηλέγνωτον ν.[
6 θ[ν]τισέληψον []
σ[ῶ]σει. πα..][
8 [][
10 ][
12 ][
14 θ[ν][
16 ][
18 ar[`
```
AESCHYLUS’ PROMETHEUS PYRKAEUS

1 in marg. sinistra punctum | . [ Lobel, A[.].. (λελουσα[.]..) leg. Ts. 2 . Λ Lobel, ΩΛ leg. Ts. | ΩΝ- Lobel, ΩΝ[.].. | [ Radt, ΩΝ... ] (ο’ λειμών) leg. Ts. 3 . I Lobel, Radt (qui dub. οἰσι leg., propter spiritus accentusque vestigia), ΟΙΟΙ (ο’ων) leg. Ts. | C[ Lobel, Radt, CI(χορεύμασιν) leg. Ts. 4 fort. σελ[αγ]ονάσα | .. ].C 1-Τ... [ Lobel, Radt, C]..[ΕΙ-ΠΑ... (σ[ω]σαμεν πα...)] leg. Ts. 8-12 hic 204δ 3 inseruit Mette 13 sqq. εν εκθέσει 3 litterarum 13 ο’οιμένες si iambi erant, ο’ Π[ομηθείν] si trochaei 19 fort. ξαι in elisione

1–3. If Radt’s calculation of ca. 36 lines per column (see above) is trustworthy, the lines from 204b.18 (αὐχώδες] δέ [κύραιοι] οιμένες [α]ς πρέπει) to the end of the column are 18, and, with 204c.1–3 added, 21 to the end of the choral part (ο’οι χορεύμασιν). Such a long lyric piece could not but be divided into smaller units, strophes and antistrophes.

2. λειμών, the well-watered meadow, where the dance is taking place.

3. Not οἰσι. The circle of the third letter is clearly closed. οἰος, ‘alone’, is extremely rare in tragedy (once in Aeschylus, twice in Sophocles). The traces of the accent and breathing above are indistinct, but a curved circumflex linked to an angular rough breathing is possible. χορεύμασιν must be followed by an infinitive governed by οἰος: ‘οἰος c. inf. implies fitness or ability for a thing’ (LSJ s. οἰος III 1). Clearly, the shepherds must be implied (204b.18–22; cf. 2 ὁ λειμών).
4–7. The diple between 3 and 4 marks the end of the lyric part and the opening of a nine-verse anapaestic system. It seems that the holy ray (ἰερὰ ἀκτίς) belongs to the moon, but σελήνης cannot conceal σελήνης, which is unmetrical. Mette published ἱερὰ δ’ ἀκτίς σέλας ἐκπέμπει | τηλέγνωτον; but one would expect the σέλας to send forth rays, not the other way around. The circumflex may suggest a form of σελαγέω, ‘illuminate’. In lines 5–6, the nocturnal dance appears again (204b.19–20 νυκτίπλαγκτον ὄρχημα). τηλέγνωτον, ‘visible from afar (because of the firelight?)’ or ‘widely known’, one way or the other implying a famous nocturnal dance. ἀντισέληνον must mean ‘opposite the moon’ (cf. ἀντήλιος = ‘opposite the sun’), though = ἰσοσέληνος, of the πῦρ, is also possible. Either way, the adjective indicates that the dance (and possibly the performance) takes place in the dark.

The last five verses of the system have fallen out. Mette (1959, 128) inserted 204d 3, a five-verse fragment from the beginning of a column, into this gap. But the paragraphos after the second line of the fragment would suggest that we have a change of speaker for three lines (in what metre?) between the end of the anapaests and the beginning of the episode (see below), something quite improbable. Lobel’s general suggestion about the same fragment ‘Perhaps from fr. 1 Col. III (= fr. 204c)’ is more reasonable, if the fragment came from the bottom end of 204c. From line 13 onward, there follows a set of recitative verses, none of which is surviving in more than 3 letters (22 σκη[ , 24 οτι[ ). Radt remarks that to the trimeters surmise ‘obstat -κ v. 19’; actually κείς on the papyrus. Possibly, κείς was considered by the scribe a case of elision in contrast to the crasis of κἀς, as is done by most modern critics: Schwyzner, GG I 402 (‘gewöhnlich κ’ εἰς mit Elision’), West 1982, 10 (‘και is elided before a long vowel or diphthong in epic, Ionic, and Attic’).

13. The first of the recitative verses, begins with ὦ ποιμενες, which, of course, can stand for many things, but in the opening of an episode that follows a long choral song, the speaker can well address the chorus, ὦ ποιμενες, with iambic trimeters, or inversely the coryphaeus can address the principal character of the play, ὦ Προμηθεῦ, with trochaic tetrameters. Both fr. 187a (= 206 N.²) and 207, as well as a number of 440–410 BCE vase paintings (Brommer 1959, 48–9, Abb. 42–46, cat. nr. 187–199 [p. 83]; Webster 1967, 144), manifest that Prometheus was a character in Prom. Pyrk. The vase paintings can witness with an equal degree of probability either Aeschylus’ Prom. Pyrk. ἀναδεδιδαγμένον or a new play by another poet (Brommer 1959, 49, Snell in TrGF 2 adesp. F 8i).
**204d 2–3 (P.Oxy. 2245 frr. 2–3)
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3 δαν[

4 θεο[

4 τλ. [ ]

. .
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.

.

2 1 σν[? 2 σο Lobel, Radt, 'possibly σ' Lobel, certe σo Ts. 5 ] Lobel, Radt, ]v Ts. 3 4 τ . ] Lobel, Radt, τλ. ] Ts. 5 infra ι’ linea obliqua in marg.

**204d 4 (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 4)

. .

]. οιακα[

2 ]ειτε διστ[

χ]ορεύεις [ ]

4 ) δεσμών .[

. . κλαίεις ον[

6 )υο Ζην υψι .[

]υτ. ce.[

8 ] . .[

. .

It seems that Prometheus is addressing the Chorus-leader. The metre is uncertain.

2. If -εἶτε, it must refer to the choreuts. διπ[,] whether διπ[λ] or διπ[τυχ], possibly qualifies the dance; cf. Aesch. fr. 78 (Theoroi) c.38 τῶνδε διστοίχων[ν] χορῶν. Also, *infra* 379.2 κύκλοι περίστητ᾽ ἐν λόχω τ᾽ ἀπείροι διπ[,] whether διπ[,] λ or διπ[,] τυχ[,] or διπ[,] τυχ[,] possibly qualifies the dance; cf. Aesch. fr. 78 (Theoroi) c.38 τῶνδε διστοίχων[ν] χορῶν. Also, *infra* 379.2 κύκλοι περίστητ᾽ ἐν λόχω τ᾽ ἀπείροι implying the onefold κύκλοις χορῶς. The same sense might be offered by εἶτε; ‘whether double or simple’, e.g., ἀλλ᾽ εἴτε διπ[,] λοῦς εἴτ᾽ ἄρ᾽ οὖν ἀπλοῦς χοροῦς | × –] χορεύεις. However, διπ[,] λ can also indicate a double chorus, i.e. one of Satyrs and one of Nymphs. See *infra* on 379.

4. Apparently, Prometheus’ bonds. However, since the action of Prom. *Pyrk.* is in a stage prior to the Titan’s punishment, it is possible that a prophecy by Prometheus has preceded to which the chorus reacted with laments.

5. προκλαίεις, as Lobel suggests, would reinforce the prophecy hypothesis. Possibly, τί δ᾽ αὖ προκλαίεις ὃν [σὺ[,] ‘Why do you lament beforehand one you …?’

6. ὑψιστόν [[,] possibly οὐκ ἰσχὺω Ζῆν[,] ὕψι[,] possibly οὐκ ἰσχύω Ζῆν[,] ὕψι[,] τον νικᾶν, would produce either an incredible for Aeschylus holospondaic decasyllable (West 1982, 55) or two dochmiacs fully lengthened? Four such dochmiacs occur in Aeschylus; Conomis 1964, 25–6. Are we then dealing, possibly from line 6 on, with a lyric passage, sung by Prometheus? Or is the verse anapaestic? Liapis wonders about a parados.

**204d 5 (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 5)**

vid. 204b.18–21

**204d 6 (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 6)**

[...]
5. Not necessarily ἀπόσχετε τοῦ πυροῦ. Both the speaker and his addressee know the word (πῦρ), so the fragment cannot be placed near 207.

**204d 7–11 (P.Oxy. 2245 frr. 7–11)**

<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>.</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 columnae finis 1 hasta vert., fort. Π | fort. ν]φάδ[ 8 1 hasta vert., fort. P 2 fort. 
C[ 10 ] hasta vert. 11 1 hasta vert., fort. P 3 T ἐν ἐκθέσει 1 litterae 5 hasta 
horiz., fort. T, ἐν ἐκθέσει 2 litterarum

11 After line 3, the diple and the ἐκθέσεις denote change of metre. What is puzzling is the ἐκθέσεις of line 3, before the diple, and the further ἐκθέσεις of line 5, two lines after the diple.
Mette (1959, 127) combined the verses with the papyrus fragment 204a, placing it at the bottom of column I, but was puzzled as to who the speaker is and which play the papyrus comes from. West 1979, 132, assigns it to Prometheus Pyrphoros, suggesting that the chorus represented the tree-nymphs known as Meliai. His argument depends on Hesiod, Th. 563–4 ὦκ ἐδίδου (sc. Zeus) μελίησι πυρὸς μένος ἀκαμάτοιο ἃθνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἱ ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάουσι, where μελίησι can mean men, as they descended from ash-trees (A. R. 4.1641 μελιηγενέων ἀνθρώπων), or ash-trees in the general sense ‘trees’, as they were the source of the fire that Prometheus donated mankind with, or, finally, Meliai, the tree-nymphs who were the intermediaries who received fire from Prometheus and handed it over to men. West dealt cogently with the same myth in his commentary of Hesiod Th. on 187, 563–4, as well as on Op. 145–6.

Prom. Pyrk. is not discussed at all by West, obviously because being a satyr-play it would certainly have a satyric chorus. However, the text surviving in P.Oxy. 2245 provides every single fact for understanding fr. 379 and inserting it into the plot of Prom. Pyrk. Just as fr. 204d 12.2–4 heralds the dance of the Satyrs who represent shepherds, so too the two identical ephymnia (204b 6–8 and 15–17) herald a dance of Nymphs:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘I am confident that the Nymphs will start (or ‘establish’) dances’ is not} \\
\text{a simple expression of the chorus-leader’s belief, but a specific promi-}
\end{align*}
\]
se proclaiming the dance of the Nymphs. Who are these Nymphs? Most likely, they are the Naiads, the stream- or spring-nymphs, who appear in 204b, 4–5 *Ναϊδον τις … πολλὰ διώξεται*, and who are coupled with the Satyrs elsewhere too, with erotic innuendoes: Prat. *PMG* 708.4 ἄν’ ὅθεν αύξει σύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων. 204b 24 βαθυξύλο[ may suggest the provenance of the Nymphs from the deep woods, but springs and streams are commonly found in woods. In fr. 379 it must be the coryphaeus who arranges the Nymphs in a single circular line around the altar and the fire for singing their hymn of reverence (*εὔξασθε*) to Prometheus: Προμηθέως δῶρον ως σε-βούςας. Even the content of their hymn is synopsized in the first period of antistrophe 2 (9–12):

καλὸν δ’ ὑμνὸν ἀμφὶ τὸν δόντα μολ-πάσιν ἐολτ’ ἐγὼ λεγούσας τόδ’ ώς
Προμηθεὺς βροτοῖς
φευτῆσιν θ’ ὀμα καὶ σπευσίδωφος.

The fragment must be placed after the surviving part of 204b, where the Nymphs’ introduction is heralded, but it is impossible to indicate a more precise position. A slight help might be 204c.1 θελουσα[, which could be related with the Nymphs, whether singing in first person or being referred to by the Satyrs.

Are we dealing here with a second, this one female, chorus, in the pattern of *Supplices*, or only with a parachoregema? Though it is difficult to tell the difference, I would opt for the latter, as I cannot imagine an action for the Nymphs beyond the performance of their hymn of reverence and the corresponding dance. The role of the direct receivers of Prometheus’ gift, in other words the part of the mortal men or of their intermediaries, is now played by the satyric chorus. We shall see that the intermediate Nymphs are introduced by the poet as a reference to the Dionysiac festival hosting the performance of the play.

*189a

ΠΡΟΜ. ἵππων ὄνων τ’ ὀχεῖα καὶ ταύρων γονὰς
dοῦς (sc. ego) ἀντίδουλα καὶ πόνων ἐκδέκτωρα
Of course, the fragment may come from any Prometheus play other than the Δεσμώτης (Ἀνύμενος, Πυρφόρος, Πυρκαεύς). However, since fr. 205, where Prometheus also mentions a skill that the humans acquired through the learning he presented them with, is expressly attributed to Prom. Pyrk., 189a might well come from the same rhesis of this play; cf. Fraenkel (1950), 3, 675, n. 1. The knowledge applies to the breeding of horses and asses for producing mules, which together with domesticated bulls serve humans like slaves. Heath (1762, 161) and Wilamowitz (1914a, 74) rejected the sense ὄχεῖα = ‘coitus’, in favour of = ὀχήμα, ὀχος. Accordingly, Wilamowitz changed γονάς into γένος. In PV 462–466, Prometheus makes the same claim, possibly corroborating Wilamowitz’s rejection:

καζενεκα πρώτος ἐν ζυγοῖσι κνώδαλα, 
ζευγλησε δουλεύοντα σάγμασίν θ’ ὅπως
θνητοῖς μεγίστων διάδοχοι μοχθημάτων
γένοιθ’· ὑφ’ ἅρμα τ’ ἤγαγον φιληνίους
ἵππους, ἄγαλμα τῆς ὑπερπλούτου χλιδῆς.

205

λινά δὲ πεσσὰ κωμολίνου μαχροί τόνοι

Poll. 10.64 τῶν δὲ γυμνασίων προσηκόντων σκευῶν ... ὀμόλινον, οὐ Κρατίνου (fr. 10 K.–A.) μόνον εἰπότος τὸ ὀμόλινον, ἄλλα καὶ Αἰσχύλου ἐν Προμηθεί Πυρκαεί ‘λίνα δὲ πίσσα – τόνοι’. 
The text as transmitted was puzzling: λίνα δὲ πίσσα κωμολίνου μακροὶ τόνοι, with numerous odd conjectures. Metrical adjustment (λινὰ δὲ Bentley) and an ingenious emendation (πίσσα → πεσσὰ Wilamowitz) made the verse understandable: ‘linen tampons and long stretched bands of raw flax’ is apparently the means to treat injuries or other bleeding diseases by achieving hemostasis and bandaging up the wounds. Perhaps, menstrual hygiene with tampons and pads is also implied. The fact that the skills mentioned in 189a are in the accusative as objects of δοῦς, but in 205 in nominative as subjects, is of no account in a long speech consisting of several sentences. The two fragments do not seem to relate to 207 where it is said about fire that τέχνης ἀπάσης δειγματῶν ἐστὶ τοῖς χρησθαι μαθοῦσι. They rather seem better connected with 204b.12 πευσίδωρος, if my proposal ad loc. is correct. Just like what we saw in the previous fragment, in PV 478–483, Prometheus claims about the medical knowledge that he offered to humans:

τὸ μὲν μέγιστον, εἰ τὶς εἰς νόσον πέσοι,
οὐχ ἢν ἀλεξημ’ οὐδὲν, οὔτε βρώσιμον,
οὐ χριστὸν οὐδὲ πιστόν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων
χρείαι κατεσκέλλοντο, πρὶν γ’ ἐγὼ σφίσιν
ἐδείξα κράσεις ἠπίων ἀκεσμάτων
αἷς τὰς ἅπασας ἐξαμύνονται νόσους.

As mentioned, both fragments (*189a, 205) are likely to have come from a list of the arts taught by Prometheus to the mortals, similar to the list found in Prometheus’ long rhesis in PV 436–506. However, it is also likely that the Prom. Pyrk. list was shorter and, possibly, ruder. No asses, whether breeding mules or put to carriages, neither tampons and pads were mentioned in PV.

The substitution of two shorts for one in κωμολίνου used to be the only proof that Prom. Pyrk. was a satyr-play. Though not mentioning the title of the play, fr. 332a also offers now a metrical indication. Mainly, however, the surviving papyrus fragments show a male chorus dancing drunk and naked, competing in dance with Nymphs and chasing or being chased by the Naiads, all too clear characteristics of the Satyr chorus.
Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies, 89 (p. 43.9 Pertusii) <****> φησίν ὅτι Προμηθεὺς τὸν τῶν κακῶν πίθον παρὰ τῶν Σατύρων λαβὼν καὶ παραθέμενος τῶι Ἐπιμηθεῖ παρήγγειλε μὴ δέξασθαι τι παρὰ Διός, ὁ δὲ παρακούσας ἐδέξατο τὴν Πανδώραν.

Schoemann (1857) 281 n. 39, and Dimitrijević (1899) 59, conjectured a lacuna which, in their view, should be filled Ἀἰσχύλος, with the scholion referring to Prom. Pyrk. The proposal was accepted by several scholars, though it would be unthinkable how the story of Pandora and the jar of ills might fit in Prom. Pyrk. Pearson (1917) 2.136, ascribed the mention of the Sch. Hes. to Sophocles’ satyr-play Πανδώρα ἢ Σφυροκόποι, an ascription I find far more likely.

σφύρας δέχεσθαι κἀπιχαλκεύειν μύδρος ὡς ἀστενακτὶ θύννος ὡς ἠνείχετο ἄναυδος

Athen. 7.303C μνημονέει δὲ τοῦ θύννου καὶ Λισχόλος λέγων ἑσφύρας — ἄναυδος’ καὶ ἄλλαξον κτλ.


It is very likely that the fragment comes from an Aeschylean satyr-play, but the ascription to Prom. Pyrk., which Bothe (1844) suspected and West supported (per litteras to Radt), cannot stand, insofar as the tense of ἡρεῖχετο presupposes a case of dealing with fire prior to Prometheus’ donation of the fire. When did the mass of redhot iron endure hammer beating and forging without sighs and speechless like a tuna, if not after the mortals acquired fire? The metaphor of tough men with the anvil and the work on it is perhaps typical: Antiphanes com. fr. 193.3 K.–Α. τύπτεσθαι μύδρος, Ar. Ἄν. 422 ἐπιχαλκεύειν παρέχομι’ ἀν, Aristophon com. fr. 5.6 K.–Α.
ὑπομένειν πλήγας ἄκμων. Can the subject be Prometheus (reading μύδρος) with reference to the torture he endured uncomplainingly? We suspected such a mention in fr. 204d 4, 4 ἄστρεμον, [, 5 ]προκλάεις o, [, but there, the verb postulated a future act, and so we could assume it was a Promethean prophesy. It is preferable to read μύδρος with Athenaeus’ A and to take as subject some long-suffering yet stoically tolerant hero of Aeschylus. I would also opt for ὡς ἄστρετ., which would mitigate the annoying simile inside a metaphor. “(He was tough enough) to receive hammer beatings and forge redhot iron masses, insofar as he suffered without groaning, like a tuna, speechless”. However, it is not easy to guess who this tough hero was, something that would identify the relevant play.

TETRALOGY, INCLUSION IN THE DIONYSIAC RITUAL, PRODUCTION DATE

Could it not be that the unfolding of the satyric plot at the end of the tragic trilogy secures the inscription of the whole tetralogy into Dionysiac celebration? Even if our tradition is too scanty to help us prove that satyric drama generally ended with the institution of ritual acts, there are, none the less, numerous close links between the performance of the chorus of satyrs in the orchestra of the theatre and the cult offered by the spectators to Dionysus the Liberator by their very presence at the tragic and comic contests.

Claude Calame

Let us now attempt to draw some general conclusions from these shreds. As argued above, there can be no doubt that the play is satyric. The choreuts are male, shepherds, who, having doffed their chiton, dance naked and drunk, expecting to compete in dance and to play erotic games with the Naiads. All of these are clear satyric features. The only Prometheus play identified as satyric in the sources is Prom. Pyrk. This is clearly testified by the replacement of a short by two shorts in fr. 205, the unique fragment cited as Ἀἰσχύλου ἐν Προμηθεὶ Πυρκαεῖ. Fr. 332a offers also a similar metrical testimony, but the title is not indicated. The detailed plot is difficult to re-

construct, but we can assume in the opening an episode with Silenus narrating to the Satyr-chorus the scene of the donation of Prometheus. Then, another episode is probable with Prometheus explaining to the chorus the properties of fire. There follows a hilarious part with songs and dances of the Satyrs, but very probably also of a group of Nymphs. Possibly, in another episode Prometheus enumerates further gifts bestowed on the human race by himself.

Being a satyr-play, which trilogy could it complement? The City Dionysia production of 472 BCE presents in its didascalia a Prometheus drama as its fourth play: ἐπὶ Μένωνος τραγωιδῶν Αἰσχύλος ἐνίκα Φινεῖ, Πέρσαις, Γλαύκωι, Προμηθεῖ. The fourth place has been considered already by Casaubon (1605) 170, a strong argument for a satyric Προμηθεῦς, a case accepted, so far as I know, unanimously by every critic to the present day. However, the 472 didascalia omits both the necessary designation σατύροις or σατυρικῶι and the epiclesis Πυρκαεῖ. I have argued elsewhere (Tsantsanoglou 2020, 267–296) that the drama in question was Prometheus Desmotes, performed as a fourth-place prosatyr play, comparable to what we would call ‘prerelease’ of the regular production of the Promethean tetralogy, something that can account for the stylistic divergences of the play from the other Aeschylean tragedies. 17 Of course, if this proposal is accepted, the necessary link of the tragic trilogy with the Dionysiac celebration, as described by Claude Calame in the introductory precept, would not hold here. However, the 472 production was obviously untypical. The separate tragedies do not make up a trilogy that would anticipate a Dionysiac tetralogy. In an Athens that was still destroyed from the Persian occupation, the warrior-poet hastily presented what was already saved in his drawer. The full Promethean tetralogy must not have been presented much later than 472. Then, there is nothing to prevent Προμηθεῦς Πυρκαεύς from being the satyr-play of the Promethean tetralogy. I shall argue below that there is a more cogent reason why Prom. Pyrk. cannot be the satyr-play of 472 BCE.

I follow the view of Westphal (1869, 216 ff.), Wilamowitz (1914b, 129), and others that Aeschylus’ Promethean trilogy consisted of Prometheus Desmotes, Lyomenos, Pyrphoros, in that order, and that the closing tragedy dealt with the restoration of friendly terms between Prometheus and

---

17. In the same article, the proposal for inauthenticity of ΠΥ, which tends to prevail among classicists, is now, as I hope, conclusively disproved through the testimony of a most reliable witness, Sophocles.
Zeus and the institution of the Attic festival of Πυρμήθεια. It seems that the epithet Πυρφόρος was applied to the Titan in the context of this festival (Soph. OC 55). However, the tragic trilogy should proceed to the satyric drama in order to make the necessary connection of the production with the Dionysiac festival. And since mythologically the story of Prometheus was completely incompatible with that of Dionysus, the poet deals with the problem by inserting the celebration of the Promethean gift into a Dionysiac celebration, which nevertheless would be simultaneous with the celebration of the festival inside which the dramatic contest took place.

Ἀνθεστήρια, Ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια,
Ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσιον

Various internal elements locate the action of Prom. Pyrk. in the winter. The chorus hope to dance having prevailed over the ὥριον χεῖμα (204b.13–14), the season’s cold, with the help of the πολυθερὴς πυρὰ, the scorching fire of Prometheus’ gift. Elsewhere the chorus sing of Zeus who rains upon the mortals’ heads, while the snow freezes their soaked heads (204d 12.5–7). The action can be more accurately located in time thanks to the mention of γλεῦκος (204d 12.2), i.e. the new wine. We know that the opening of the jars with the new wine was celebrated in the Πιθοίγια, the first day of Anthesteria, on the 11th of the month Ἀνθεστηρίων, about the end of February. On the 12th, the Χόες was considered the official (ἐπίσημος) festival of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις, where the ἄρχαιότερα or ἄρχαιότατα Dionysia were celebrated by the Athenians with choral dances.18

More particulars can be drawn from Thucydides and his Scholia: Thuc. 2.15.3–4 τὸ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ (before Theseus’ ξυνοικισμός) ἡ ἄκροπολις ἦν ὡς σοὶ πόλις ἦν, καὶ τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον. τεκμήριον δὲ· τὰ γὰρ ἱερὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἄκροπολεὶ καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν θέου ἦστι (i.e. apart from Athena’s, who is mentioned before) καὶ τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τὸ τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἱδρυται, τὸ τοῦ Διῶς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τὸ Πύθιον καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, διὶ τὰ ἄρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτη ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηρίῳ, ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄπ’ Ἀθηναίων ἱωνεῖς ἦτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν.

Schol. Thuc. 2 in P.Oxy. 853 (ed. Grenfell/Hunt 1908), col. x. 7 ff.: τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . | 7 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσῳ[ν· Καλλιμαχος] ἐν νῦν φησὶν[ιν·] ἐν δὲ Διονυσίῳ σοι... . . . 

Callimachus’ fr. 305 Pf. from Hecale, quoted by the Scholiast of Thucydides as a testimony of the prehistory of the Dionysus festival ἐν Λίμναις, has been published as a deficient hexameter (Λιμναίωι – ἑορτάς), with the help of Schol. Ar. Ran. 216 and Stephanus Byz. 417.13, where that part of the fragment was also transmitted. Making use of the fragmentary text of Thucydides’ scholion, we can reconstruct the distich as follows:

εὖτε Διώνυσον πρὶν ἀοίκητόν ποτ’ Ἐλευθὴρ εἴα, Λιμναίωι δὲ χοροστάδας ἑορτάς.

“When in times past Eleuther left Dionysus houseless, and they (the Athenians) held dancing feasts to Dionysus in the Marshes.”

A. Hollis (2009), fr. 85, published differently:

οὐδὲ Διώνυσον σωμί Μελαναίοι ἑορτάς, τόν [πο] τ’ Ἐλευθήροι εἶ[α, Λιμναίωι] δὲ χ’ ὀφοστάδας ἑγον ἑορτάς.

“They celebrated festivals with dancing, not to Dionysus of the Black Goat-skin, whose cult Eleuther established, but to Dionysus of the Marshes.”
Hollis follows I. Kapp in introducing Melanaegis into the fragment, then W. S. Barrett in connecting negatively Melanaegis with Limnaeus, and finally Wilamowitz in supplementing a parenthetic relative clause. I preferred to follow Pfeiffer in rejecting Wil.’s relative clause, as it would violate a Callimachean metrical peculiarity (word-break not allowed after a spondaic fourth foot: Naeke’s Law): “potius vocab. in -ητον exspectes”. Hollis points out (2009, 272) that “one might expect the fragment of Call. to be relevant to the greater antiquity of the festivities honouring Dionysus in the Marshes”. However, how could one surmise that one of the two festivities was older than the other based on a distich which states that the Athenians did not have dancing feasts in honour of Dionysus Melanaegis, whom Eleuther instituted some time in the past, but they did have them in honour of Dionysus Limnaeus? Two different festivities might well include different events irrespective of their relative antiquity.

The problem with the text published by Hollis is also palaeographic. It occurs mainly at the ends of line 9, both left- and right-hand. Supplementing with W.S. Barrett ΓΙΑΙ (or ΓΙΑΙ) <Α, as I. Kapp) for what Gr./H. read Η is, I believe, too long, but also, at the right-hand margin, Wilamowitz’s ΕΙΙΛΙΜΝΑΙΩΗ for Gr./H.’s ΕΙΙ ΛΙΜΝΑΙΩΗ, seems extremely long. I have not seen P.Oxy. 853 (now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo) apart from its cols. xvi–xvii, whose photographs are published in Grenfell/Hunt 1908, pl. IV. So, I do not know whether ΓΙΑΙ could be read or not. However, I have serious doubts about whether ΓΙΑΙ could fit in the space provided. The text published by Grenfell and Hunt shows that the average number of letters per line is 25–27, excepting the lines that open a scholion containing a lemma from Thucydides εν ἐκθέσει, which are longer, and the final lines of the scholia, which can be shorter. The scribe is so meticulous in keeping a straight right-hand margin, that when the final word of a regular line is somewhat shorter, he fills the gap to the imaginary right-hand margin with a filler mark. Barrett possibly destroys the alignment with the next verses, but Wilamowitz creates an enormous line of 31 characters (6 iotas), to which Gr./H. strongly objected. Barrett dealt with the problem by extending the ends of the other scholion lines beyond their average length: 10/11 Δίδευμος Gr./H., Φιλόχορος ος Wil., Καπολλούσωρ ος Barrett, 11 [καλέσθαι] Gr./H., [ἐπικαλέσθαι] Barrett, 12 [τὸν τόπον] Gr./H., [ποτὲ τὸ ιερὸν] Barrett, 13 Λακωνίαι οι ιερῶν] Gr./H., Λακωνίαι κῆι τόπος] Wil., Λακωνίαί αἱ λίμνη τις] Barrett. My proposals for the lines that contain the distich yield the following number of letters: 8 → 27 (5 iotas), 9 → 26 (4 iotas), 10 → 26 (1 iota with Φιλό|χορος). Also, line 17 has 26 (6 iotas) letters.

What Thucydides is concerned with is that, before Theseus’ ξυνοικισμός, the city of Athens was situated to the south of the Acropolis, as is shown by the fact that the old hiera were mostly placed there. Among these hiera was τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, whose antiquity was evident from the date of its festival which was the same as the one followed by the Ionian colonists
who came from Athens (it is understood, under the leadership of Neleus, son of Kodros). The Scholiast of Thucydides produces the distich of Callimachus for reinforcing the antiquity of the festivities in honour of Dionysus Limnaeus.

Indirectly, the Callimachus fragment emphasizes the precedence of the festivities ἐν Λίμναις over all other Dionysiac feasts in Athens. Eleuther introduced Dionysus’ cult image to Athens from Eleutherae, and the Athenians worshipped the god with outdoor dances ἐν Λίμναις before a temple and other auxiliary structures were constructed, possibly even before a temenos was defined for him. The god was named Λιμναῖος after the venue where the dances took place. Schol. Thuc. 2 in P.Oxy. 853, col. x 7 f. reads: Καλλίμαχος ἔμεν φησὶν· εὖ δέ. The latter was unanimously transcribed as εὖ δέ (apart from Barrett/Hollis, who emended οὐδέ), though it was unknown in what context Callimachus would approve the event (‘it was good that’), as well as whether εὖ δέ was preceded by an εὖ μέν and what that might introduce. What would serve the Scholiast’s argument about the prehistory of the dancing feasts ἐν Λίμναις would be a temporal particle. εὖτε is such a particle, especially favourite to Callimachus.

“When at some time in the past Eleuther left Dionysus houseless (sc. the xoanon of the god in the open), and they (the Athenians) held dancing feasts in honour of Dionysus in the Marshes”. The apodosis of the temporal clauses did not survive, apparently, because it did not serve the argument of the Scholiast.

However, if my proposal is correct, it is clear that Callimachus refers to an earlier situation (Ἐλευθῆρ πρὶν ποτ’ εἶα Διώνυσον ἀοίκητον), which, as is well known, changed altogether later. Schol. Ar. Ran. 216 referring to τὸν ἐν Λίμναις Διόνυσον λεγόμενον, notes τόπος ἱερὸς Διονύσου, ἐν ὧι καὶ οἶκος καὶ νεὼς τοῦ θεοῦ. In any case, it can be inferred that, later than the initial situation described by Callimachus, two feasts were held, one in honour of Dionysus Limnaeus, in the winter, and the other in honour of Dionysus Eleuthereus, in the spring. Nonnus, Dionysiaca 27.306–7, makes Zeus prophesy to Athena the victory of the Athenians over the Boeotians:

οὐ μετὰ δὴν Φρύγα ῥυθμὸν ἀνακρούσουσιν Ἀθῆραι
Λιμναῖοι μετὰ Βάρχοις Ἐλευθέριοι Διονύσωι.

Ἐλευθερίωι C. F. Hermann : Ἑλευσιόωι codd.
“not long later Athens will perform a Phrygian melody first to Bacchus Limnaeus, then to Dionysus Eleuthereus.”

The oldness of the sanctuary of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις is confirmed in [Dem.] 59 (Against Neaera) 76–77. The sanctuary was not only the oldest and holiest of the god, but also opened once every year on the 12th of Anthesterion: καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἄρχωμοτάτῳ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἁγιωτάτῳ ἐν Λίμναις ἔστησαν, ἵνα μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσιν τὰ γεγραμμένα· ἁπάξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐξάστον ἀνοίγεται, τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός. Paus. 1.20.3 places the oldest sanctuary of Dionysus close to the theatre: τοῦ Διονύσου δέ ἐστι πρὸς τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ἱερόν· δύο δέ εἰσιν ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου ναοὶ καὶ Διόνυσος, ὃ τε Ἐλευθερεὺς καὶ ὃν Ἀλκαμένης ἐποίησεν ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσόν.

Topography, Hieron of Horae, τὰ Ἰχθια

As is clear from the argument of Thucydides, the hieron of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις was located south of the Acropolis. It must have been close to the river Ilissos, something that explains the presence of marshes in the area. As Thucydides asserts, 2.15.5, Athenians collected water from the spring Καλλιρρόη, which was open, as were all the springs at that time. So, it can be surmised, it was not only the water of Ilissos but also of the open springs, which contributed to the area being named Λίμναι, Marshes.

IG I³ 84 (418/7 BCE), a decree concerning the fencing of the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile, and the renting of the temenos of Neleus and Basile, apparently inside the larger sanctuary, presents evidence for a Dionysion adjoining the specific sanctuary. J. Travlos19 connected the sanctuary with a horos stone inscribed ΗΟΡΟΣ ΤΟ ΗΙΕΠΟ found in situ at the junction of Hatzichristou and Singrou streets. A second similar stone was found later, some 40 m. east of the first, at the junction of Singrou and Vourvachi streets. Based on this evidence, Travlos placed the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile inside the city wall close to the Itonian Gates, where, as he cogently argues, Kodros was killed by the Peloponnesians according

---

to the legend. N. W. Slater\textsuperscript{20} rejected the identification, because Travlos “ignores the ancient evidence that Kodros fell outside the wall”. However, Lycurgus, \textit{Leocr.} 20.86–87, places the spot where Kodros fell \textit{kατὰ τὰς πύλας ... πρὸ τῆς πόλεως}. It was expected that the sanctuary, so expanded as the decree attests, with an orchard of more than 200 olive trees, would be founded near the gates, but inside the wall, and not in the narrow space between the walls and the Ilissos bank. The average number of olive trees per hectare is ca. 272. This possibly defines the area of the Neleus and Basile temenos —very likely the main part of the whole sanctuary—, but not its specific boundaries. The adjoining Dionysion is attested to have been inside the city wall,\textsuperscript{21} bordering the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile on the latter’s west side, as its east side is adjacent to the wall. Its dimensions, however, cannot be defined.

Following Travlos’s plan, archaeologists believe that the Dionysion \textit{ἐν Λίμναις} lies in the area adjoining the south side of the new Acropolis Museum. The question is whether the old Dionysion \textit{ἐν Λίμναις} was expanded northward after the City Dionysia festival was established, reaching the southern slope of the Acropolis, where, in c. 500 BCE, the Dionysus theatre was established. The sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, which lies exactly to the north of the new Acropolis Museum, and the Dionysion \textit{ἐν Λίμναις}, which lies right to its south, would possibly constitute in the 5th century a common sanctuary, simply Dionysion, where Dionysus was celebrated in two different festivals, in different dates, under different epithets, and at different events. Yet, the data may have changed from time to time.\textsuperscript{22} The relationship of the two sanctuaries may be highlighted by Callimachus’ distich from \textit{Hecale}, which dates the festivity back to the transfer of Dionysus’ statue from the Boeotian Eleutherae to Athens —i.e., as a passage of Pausanias (1.2.5) seems to imply, during the reign of Amphictyon, long before Theseus—, before a temple or other structures were erected, and so the Athenians worshipped the god in a marshy area by outdoor dances.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Slater (1986) 255–264, esp. 260–261.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Isaeus 8.35 Κίρων γὰρ ἐκέκτητο οὐσίαν, ... οἰκίας δ’ ἐν ἄστει δύο, τὴν μὲν μίαν μισθοφοροῦσαν, παρὰ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσιον.
\item \textsuperscript{22} The mention of a property of Zeus Olympios \textit{παρὰ τὸ Διονύσιον} in the 343/2 BCE inscription published by Wallbank (1983) 117–8, 123–4, may imply such a common sanctuary.
\item \textsuperscript{23} An extremely useful and documented, yet inconclusive, discussion in Pickard-Cambridge (\textsuperscript{’}1968) 1–25. Marchiandi/Savelli (2011), and Di Cesare (2011), gave a most valuable account of the Kodros, Neleus, and Basile hieron, and the \textit{ἐν Λίμναις} topographical problems in combination with a report about the Anthesteria festival, thoughtfully updating the conclusions of Travlos.
\end{itemize}
The mention of γλεῦκος, i.e. the new wine, in the Prom. Pyrk. (204d 12.2) leads us also to the same hieron ἐν Λίμναις and to the same festival, the Anthesteria, on whose first day, on the 11th of Ἀνθεστηριών, the Πιθοίγια, i.e., the opening of the wine-jars, were celebrated, as noted above. The next day, the 12th, was dedicated to the feast of Χόες, the official festival of Limnaeus Dionysus, what Thucydides names ἄρχαιοτερα and his Scholiast ἄρχαιότατα Διονύσια. It was then that, according to Callimachus’ fr. 305, the Athenians held χοροστάδας ἑορτάς.

The 4th century BCE Atthidographer Phanodemus (FGrHist 325 F 12) connects the opening of the wine-jars with the hieron of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις, where the Athenians brought the γλεῦκος to the god before tasting it themselves and mixed it with water from the sources in the area. This is why the Nymphs of the springs were named Nurses of Dionysus, since the water being mixed causes the wine to grow as it increases its quantity.24 The Athenians, then, enjoyed drinking the mixture, and worshipped Dionysus with songs and dances calling him Ἕδανθης (some conjecture Ἕνας), Διθυραμβος, Βακχευτάς and Βρόμιος.

In another version of the story, as told by the 3rd century Atthidographer Philochorus (FGrHist 328 F 5b), the god is supposed to have taught king Amphictyon the proper proportions of mixing water with wine. Popular aetiology has it that unmixed wine forced the drinkers to stoop, whereas mixed wine kept them erect. So, the king built an altar of Dionysus Erect inside the hieron of Horae (βωμὸν Ὀρθοῦ Διονύσου ἐν τῶι τῶι Ὡρῶι ἱερῶι; Niafas (2000). Philochorus adds that, adjacent to the altar of Dionysus Erect (apparently, inside the hieron of Horae), Amphictyon built also an altar to the Nymphs, as a reminder of the mixing of water with wine, since the Nymphs are called Διονύσου τροφοί. The interconnection of the three divine entities is not unknown. In the Mnesiepes inscription (SEG 15:517, mid-3rd c. BCE) that quotes a Delphic oracle about the institution of an Archilochus temenos in Paros, we read: 8–11 Μνησιέπει ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησε λῶιον καὶ ἄμεινον εἶμεν ἐν τῶι τεμένει, ἱδρυσαμένωι βωμὸν καὶ θύοντι ἐπὶ τούτων Διονύσου καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Ὡραις.

We do not know the location of the sanctuary of Horae in Athens. Depending on Phanodemus’ evidence, but also on the topography of Athens, since the worship of the spring-Nymphs was to be expected in an area with natural sources, as was primarily the site of Kallirrhoë (later constructed as public fountains under the name Enneakrounos) close to Ilissos, one may

24. See below on Aeschylus’ play Τροφοί or Διονύσου Τροφοί.
connect the Horae sanctuary and the altars in it with the Anthestesia and the ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσια. Pindar’s Dithyramb Ἀθηναίοις B (fr. 75 Sn.-M.), which has also been brought forward, synchronizes the opening of the chamber of Horae with the coming of the spring: 14–15 φοινικοεάνων ὁπότ’ οἰχθέντος Ὡρανθαλάμου | εὐδομον ἑπάγοις ἐαυ φυτὰ νεκτάρεα, “when, with the opening of the chamber of the crimson-robed Horae, nectareous plants bring on the fragrant spring”. Although an indirect reminder of the Horae sanctuary cannot be ruled out, the whole distich is clearly figurative, since one cannot expect a literal opening of the sanctuary’s chamber but an effusion from within of a metaphorical sweet smell of spring flowers. Pindar summons the Olympian gods of the Athenian Agora to join his chorus and to watch the choreuts advance to the god in whose celebration the dithyramb was performed, i.e., Dionysus. And this takes place at the opening of the spring, when, as is well known, the springtime festival of Dionysus was celebrated, i.e., the Great or City Dionysia, not the Dionysia in the Marshes or other festivals.

The only tangible evidence for an Athenian shrine of Horae and Nymphs is the undated inscription IG I² 4877, Ὡραις καὶ Νύμφαις ἀνέθηκεν, found some 340 m. east of the Acropolis, in an area that has been proposed as the possible site of the old Agora, quite far away from Ilissos and the sources area. In any case, the inscription was not found in situ, and the absence on the name of Dionysus makes the assumption even more inconclusive.25

Thucydides’ wording in 2.15.4 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Ἰωνεῖς ἐτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν, especially the reference to the Ionians who came from Athens and “still now” customarily use this date, seems to imply that the date of the feast was “now” changed in Athens itself. Hsch. λ 1037 (λιμναγενές· . . .) Λίμναι· ἐν Ἀθήναις δὲ ἐν Ληναίου, ὅπου τὰ Λαῖα (sic cod., Λήναια Musurus) ἦγετο, confirms the confusion both locally and temporally. Also, a scholion on Ar. Ach. 961 in recounting Orestes’ visit to Athens, which is alluded to as the aition of the ritual of Χόες, states ἦν δὲ ἑορτὴ Διονύσου Ληναίου. Both the Hesychius entry and the Aristophanic scholion are rejected by many scholars, sometimes reading ὅπου τὰ Λ<μν>αία ἦγετο or emending Διονύ- σου Ληναίαν to Διονύσου Λιμναίον. In any case, the location of the Ληναίαν is a different problem.

Be that as it may, it is very likely that the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια of Thucydides were not limited to χοροστάδες ἑορταί. Though Pickard-Cambridge (1968) rejects this possibility, the festival could well include dramatic contests. The Scholiast of Ar. Ran. 218 quotes the information given by Philochorus (FGrHist 328 F 57): ἔγοντο δὲ ἀγώνες αὐτόθι οἱ Χύτρινοι καλούμενοι, καθά φησι Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ ἐκτητί τῶν Ἀθηνῶν. The Scholia on the next verse (Ran. 219) specify where αὐτόθι was: κατ’ ἐμὸν τέμενος τέμενος λέγονσι (sc. the Frogs) τὸ ἐν Λίμναις τοῦ Διονύσου ἱερόν. Of course, ἀγώνες can refer to all sorts of contests, but the fourth century law of the orator Lycurgus, which reestablished a long-eclipsed dramatic contest in the Chytroi, clarifies the kind of contests; see below.

A dramatic contest is, of course, inconceivable without audience, and the hieron τοῦ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου did not provide the spectators with sitting facilities. We hear about the ἱεραία, the wooden benches whose collapse was the cause of the construction of the Dionysus theatre. However, Pausanias, the Atticist lexicographer, quotes: i 3 Erbse, from Eust. 1472.3 = Phot. i 95 ‘Theodoridis, ἱεραία τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, ἀφ’ ὧν ἔθεωντο τοὺς Διονυσιακοὺς ἀγώνας πρὸν ἣ κατασκευασθῆναι τὸ ἐν Διονύσου θέατρον. This led many scholars to believe that Athens initiated the theatrical activity in the marketplace and some of them to try to spot where in the Agora this activity could have taken place. However, I confidently believe that Wilamowitz (1886, 598 n. 2 = Wilamowitz 1935, 149 n. 2) was right when he suggested that Pausanias’ statement was no more than one of the usual corruptions produced in lexica by the combination of two different glosses. Pollux 7.125 describes the profession of joiners by ἱκριοποιοὶ δ’ εἰσὶν οἱ πηγνύντες τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἱεραία, which may well refer to benches or bleachers of spectators at the several shows in the Agora, but also to booths and stalls for the sale of goods in the market.

A more accurate location of the ἱεραία was specified in Phot. α 505 αἰγείρου θέα καὶ ἡ παρ’ αἰγείρου θέα: Ἀθήνησιν αἰγείρος ἦν, ἢς πλησίον τὰ ἱεραία ἑπάγγελλεν εἰς τὴν θέαν πρὸ τοῦ τὸ θέατρον γενέσθαι. οὕτως Κρατίνος (Cratin. fr. 372 K.–A.). Numerous versions are recorded in lexica, some of which offer possibly useful details. E.g., Hsch. π 513 παρ’ αἰγείρου θέα, which mentions Eratosthenes (fr. 3 Str.) as the original source of the gloss, or Hsch. α 1695 αἰγείρου θέα, which adds that the αἰγείρος was πλησίον τοῦ ἱεροῦ. If πρὸ τοῦ τὸ θέατρον (n.b. not τὸ λίθινον θέατρον) γενέσθαι, refers to the time when no theatre was founded in the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, then both the αἰγείρος and the ἱεραία should not be placed on the south slope of the Acropolis, but somewhere else. It is uncertain
which hieron is implied by πλησίον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, but the ἐν Λίμναις τοῦ Διο-
νύσου ἱερὸν cannot be ruled out. However, a parallel article, Hsch. θ 166
θέα παρ’ αἰγείρωι· τόπος αἰγείρων ἔχων, ὡθεὶν ἐθεώρουν. εὐτελὴς δὲ ἐδόκει ἢ
ἐντεῦθεν θεωρία· μακρόθεν γὰρ ἦν καὶ εὐώνου (sc. τιμῆς vel τιμήματος) ὁ τό-
πος ἐπωλεῖτο (also with numerous versions in other lexica), seems to refute
this claim. It must refer to watching the performance from afar, from the
last rows of seats or even higher in the theatre of Eleuthereus, what today
is called “ἀπό τα βραχάκια; from the little rocks”, for watching the modern
shows at the Odeum of Herodes Atticus adjacent to the theatre of Diony-
sus. And this meaning accords better with a comic treatment, as is shown
by the reference to Cratinus.

An even more accurate location is indicated in IG I³ 84, the decree of
418/7 BCE mentioned above, which concerned the fencing off of the hieron
of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile, as well as the lease of the temenos of Neleus
and Basile. As we saw, the decree shows clearly enough that a Dionysion
adjoined from its east side the specific sanctuary, and it is a widely-held
belief that the sanctuary is the Dionysion ἐν Λίμναις. The decree states
verbatim: 26–8 τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε, ὅπως ἂν ἦι εἰδέναι τῶ
[ι]βουλομένωι, ἀναγράφας οἱ γραμματεῖς ὁ τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι καταθέτω ἐν τῶι Νη-
λείωι παρὰ τὰ ἴκρια.

Now, ἴκρια, as we saw, may denote several constructions, their common
denominator being the joining of pieces of wood. They can be the benches
and bleachers for spectators, but also the wooden stalls or the booths or
the platforms of the marketplace, the wooden railings, the scaffoldings, the
decking of a ship, and, possibly even more constructions. Some times we
find τὰ ἴκρια used in a familiar tone for the theatre of Dionysus (Cratin. fr.
360 K.–Λ., Ar. Thesm. 395), as we today speak of ‘the stalls’ for the ground
floor of a theatre, especially, since, as we know, the seats in the koilon of the
pre-Lycurgean theatre were mostly wooden. The usual interpretation of the
inscription passage is that the secretary of the Council must arrange for the
decree to be engraved on a stone stele which should be erected in the Nel-
eion next to the theatre or next to the railings.

However, ‘the theatre’ is an inaccurate spot, especially when it is ex-
pressed in an everyday term, ‘next to the stalls’. Further, this interpreta-
tion would presuppose that the sanctuary of Neleus extended to the north
as far as the theatre or, to be more precise, the wooden stalls of the thea-
tre. But wasn’t the place occupied by the sanctuary of Eleuthereus? Even
if, as I speculated above, the Dionysion ἐν Λίμναις and the Dionysion of
Eleuthereus were possibly unified at some unspecified time, the decree would not refer to the Neleion but to the Dionysion.

On the other hand, ‘the railings’ were supposed to enclose the whole hieron of Kodros, Neleus and Basile; how could they define a specific spot? Chiara Lasagni (2018) 350 n. 56, suggests “some sort of barrier placed at the core of the Neleion”. However, all this is extremely vague, whereas the secretary of the Council is ordered to erect the stele at a particular spot, “so that anyone who wishes may be able to know”. And this spot is specified: “in the Neleion next to the Ikria” (I deliberately capitalize), not “next to some ikria”.

Lately, Christina Papastamati-von Moock26 published the spectacular findings from the excavations conducted at the Dionysus Theatre under her supervision. Among these findings a large number of holes of timber posts was discovered in the koilon area under and between the tiers of seats. Papastamati-von Moock argues cogently that the post-holes held the much talked-about ikria. Her ‘surgical’ examination showed that the embedded posts were not forcefully dismantled but were carefully removed leaving their positions undisturbed. She dates the original wooden theatre in the late-archaic era, and the removal of the posts in the age of Pericles, whose plan was to replace the wooden theatre with a marble one, a plan left unfinished.27

There can be no doubt that the posts were part of ἱκρία, the wooden benches on which the spectators sat. Were they, however, the famous ἱκρία, whose collapse led to the erection of the theatre of Dionysus? All information we’ve got about the collapse are two Suda articles, incompatible with each other.

The first: Sud. αι 357 Αἰσχύλος ... φυγὼν δὲ εἰς Σικελίαν διὰ τὸ πεσεῖν τὰ ἴκρια ἐπιδεικνυμένου αὐτοῦ, χελώνης ἐπιρριφείσης αὐτῶι ὑπὸ ἀετοῦ φέροντος κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἀπώλετο ἐτῶν ἄγεθεν γενόμενος. The article refers to the ikria collapse not as the reason for the construction of the Athens theatre but for driving the tragedian into exile or possibly into seeking refuge in Sicily, where, after two years, he met his death. This could be done only during the production of Oresteia in 458 BCE, when the theatre was already constructed many years ago. The collapsed ikria were undoubtedly in the koilon of the Dionysus theatre. The collapse must have caused Aeschylus’ referral to justice, if he was accused of raising with his production such a

commotion among the spectators that led to the collapse of the ikria with potential casualties—something witnessed even today in football matches and musical shows. Apsines, the 3rd century CE rhetor, 2 p. 229.14 Spengel-Hammer, speaking of legal cases ἐξ ἀποβάσεως, which he specifies (p. 227.17) as ὅπου τοῦτο ἔσχε τὸν ξηρὸν ἀληθέντος ἢ γραφέντος ... ἀπέβη τι δεινόν, mentions παραδείγματος ἐν θνητῷ καὶ ὁ Αἰσχύλος ὁ ἐπὶ ταῖς Εὔμενίσις (TrGF 3, T 95). The Vita 9 confirms the event. The report sounds greatly anecdotal, but it can reflect the usual exaggerated accusations we encounter in the Athenian courts: τινὲς δὲ φασιν ἐν τῇ ἐπίδειξι τῶν Εὔμενίδων σποράδην εἰσαγαγόντα τὸν χορὸν τοσοῦτον ἐκατέβηκεν τὸν χημών ὡς τὰ μὲν νήπια ἐκψῦξαι, τὰ δὲ ἐμβρυνα ἐξαμβλωθῆναι. The Vita continues: ἐλθὼν τοίνυν εἰς Σικελίαν, “therefore, having gone to Sicily ...”. After that, however, the Vita proceeds to a confused account, involving Hieron in Aeschylus’ doings in Sicily, though he was already dead since 467 BCE.28 I am not certain whether Aristarchus and Apollonius Dyscolus refer to the Oresteia as a trilogy χορίς τῶν σατύρων meaning that the satyr-play was unconnected with the story of the three tragedies (not fully correct) or implying that the satyr-play was not included in the archives.29 If the latter, one might think that after the collapse of the ikria during the performance of Eumenides, it would not be possible to complete the production with the conclusive satyr-play, a fact, possibly, reflected in the archives. In any case, Aeschylus earned the first prize, but soon was taken to court as accountable for the collapse. The 458 BCE collapse may have prompted Pericles to add to his huge programme of architectural works on the Acropolis the conversion of the wooden theatre into a marble one, a project that was left unfinished.

The second article: Sud. π 2230 Πράτινας ... ἐπιδεικνυμένων δὲ τούτων συνέβη τὰ ἴκρια, ἐφ’ ὧν ἑστήκεσαν οἱ θεαταί, πεσεῖν, καὶ ἐκ τούτου θέατρον ὁικοδομήθη Ἀθηναίοις. This article seems more relevant, as it clearly names the ikria collapse as the motive for the Athenians to construct the theatre. The Phliasian Pratinas must have settled in Athens since the late 6th century. He competed with Aeschylus and Choerilus in the 70th Olympiad (499/96 BCE). He died ante 467, when Aristias, his son, produced three plays of his father that had survived. Pratinas, famous for his satyr-plays,
may well have performed before the construction of the Dionysus theatre. His hyporchema (PMG 708; TrGF vol. I, 4 F 3), a dancing ode to Dionysus sung by a chorus dressed as Satyrs, offers many clues that suggest a performance in the Dionysion ἐν Λύμναις, at the Callimachean χοροστάδες ἐορταί of the ἄρχαίοτερα Διονύσια during the Anthesteria festival. He actually urges the Athenians to turn the celebration from a musical and dancing show into a, so to speak, dramatic event: τί τάδε τὰ χορεύματα; ... τὰν ἀοιδὰν κατέστασε Πιερίς βασίλειον· ὁ δὲ αὐλὸς ὑστερον χορευέτω. The Athenian public that attended initially the dances and later the drama performances must have been offered sitting facilities, apparently in the same place, which, as argued above, bordered the Neleion. Then, on the one hand, the frenzy of the intoxicated entertaining spectators and, on the other, the statically unsafe ground of the marshes area may have conspired to bring about the collapse of the ikria. So, the Athenians must have decided to reconstruct the ikria on solid ground, in the neighbouring sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus. By building the wooden theatre on the slope of the Acropolis, they benefitted greatly not only from the stable ground, but also from the height difference, which offered the spectators a better view without requiring tall “multi-storey” wooden constructions, but only the extension of the ikria to a horizontal level.30

A third relevant lexicographical article does not enlighten us as to the collapse, but it places the initial ikria outside the Dionysus theatre: Hsch. i 501 ἵκρια· ... ἡ τὰ ἐπὶ ξύλων κατασκευαζόμενα θεωρεῖα. ... καὶ τὰ ξύλινα στῶς ἔλεγοντο Ἀθήναις, ἀφ’ ὧν ἐθεῶντο, πρὸ τοῦ τὸ ἐν Διονύσου θέατρον γενέσθαι.

I suppose, therefore, that the decree of 418/7 refers to τὰ Ἴκρια as a well-known place in Athens, a significant site recognizable by everybody. We can infer that the historical location of the first Attic theatre and the event of its collapse were somehow commemorated, as was almost every notable event in Athens (by a memorial?), at a site named simply τὰ Ἴκρια. The specific site would be accurately located, if the στήλη λιθίνη found in 1884 “at the northeast corner of the intersection of Makriyanni and Chatzichristou Sts” (Travlos 1971, 332), i.e. ca. 100 m. southeast of the new Acropolis Museum, was discovered in situ, and not reused in a later wall,

30. See Slater (1986) 256, 263. However, I avoid discussing about the Λήναιον and the Leñaean performances in the sanctuary of Dionysus Limnaeus and, what is more, until the archonship of Lycurgus. Schnurr (1995), deals with the location of the Λήναιον, denies any connection with the sanctuary of Dionysus ἐν Λύμναις, and locates it in the old Agora.
as it was actually done. Archaeologists believe, however, that thanks to the size of the inscription (ca. 1.50 x 0.60 m.) it must not have been removed far from its original position. Lately, a trench opened near the location where the inscription was found (Makriyanni St. 35) revealed the rests of a classical monumental construction with blocks held together with metal dowels; Kokkaliou (1996 [2001]) 50. Can it be the memorial of the historical ikria? Of course, the ikria must have preexisted the defined and fenced off temenos of Neleus as well as the whole Kodros, Neleus and Basile hieron that must have been established later than the collapse. Though similar ἱκρια have been constructed elsewhere too, so that the Athenians might watch the events in various feasts, it is reasonable to conclude that the ikria that once collapsed during a Dionysiac festival, before a theatre was founded, were related to the initially dance (χοροστάδες ἐορταί) and later drama shows of the ἄρχαιοτερα Διονύσια that were held at the ἐν Λίμναις ἱερόν of Dionysus.

DATE OF THE PROMETHEAN TETRALOGY

So much about the place where the contests were possibly conducted. As for the date, the name of the contests (Χύτρινοι ἀγῶνες) denotes that they were held on the last day of the festival of Anthesteria, in the Ἐπετροι, i.e. on the 13th of Anthesterion, in the night of which there was a full moon. At some unspecified time, the contests of the Anthesteria festival were discontinued. A jostling of the Dionysiac contests after the institution of the City Dionysia in the late 6th century and the financial costs involved can explain the stoppage. The suspension of the contests is confirmed thanks to the information about their revival: [Plutarch], Vit. X Orat. 841F εἰσήνεγκε δὲ καὶ νόμους (sc. Lycurgus), τὸν μὲν περὶ τῶν κωμωδιῶν, ἀγῶνα τοῖς Ἀγώνες ἐπιτελεῖν ἐφάμιλλον ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ τὸν νικωμικὸν ἀγόνα εἰς ἄστυ καταλέγεσθαι, πρότερον οὐκ ἐξόν, ἀναλαμβάνον τὸν ἄγωνα ἐκλελοιπότα. The revival of the theatrical agon by Lycurgus in the third quarter of the fourth century BCE concerned comedy.31 However, it is unknown whether the ἐκλελοιπώς ἀγὸν was restricted only to comedy or could have also hosted a tragic contest. No doubt, it could not be compared with the later City Dionysia, whether in time span or in number of entries. Could the Prometheus tetralogy have been produced in the

31. Why only a contest of comic actors, as Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 15–16, claims, and not a contest of comedy, I cannot understand.
Χύτρινοι ἀγῶνες? We do not know when this Dionysiac dramatic contest was eclipsed, but there can be no doubt that Thucydides is trustworthy when he speaks of the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια, which the Scholiast changes to ἀρχαιότατα. And, certainly, time considerations do not prevent Aeschylus from participating in the Anthesteria contest.

The specific characteristics of this festival could be summarized as follows: winter time, night rituals, choral dances, drunken revelry. Now, all these features are prominent in Prom. Pyrk. Winter time (ὡρίου χειματος; χιών; ὀμβρος), night rituals (φέγγος; νυκτίπλαγκτον ὀρχημα; ἀντισέληνον), drunken revelry (γλεῦκος; ἄν τρεῖς μεθυσθέντας), choral dances (passim). It goes without saying that choral dances (χοροστάδες ἑορταί) are the dominant element in the surviving text of Prom. Pyrk. The marshy meadow of the Λίμναι is also present (204c.2 ὁ λειμών).

In Ar. Ach. 1000–02 the Herald proclaims: Ἀκούετε λεώι· κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τοὺς Χοᾶς | πίνεν ὁπο τῆς σάλπιγγος· ὃς δ’ ἂν ἐκπίη | πρῶτισσον, ἀσκὸν Κτησιφῶντος λήψεται. As described in the Scholia ad loc., ἐν ταῖς Χοαῖς ἀγών ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἐκπιεῖν τινὰ πρῶτον χοᾶ, καὶ ὁ πιὼν ἐστέφετο φυλλίνωι στεφάνῳ καὶ ἀσκὸν οἴνου ἐλάμβανεν. In Prom. Pyrk. 204d 12.2–4, γλεῦκος δέ τοι τέθεικ’ ἐγὼ | πέλας πυρός, | ἄν τρεῖς μεθυσθέντας ὡς – – , we miss the final infinitive, which would specify the action of the chorus. χορεῦσαι is very likely, contrasting with the next two ephymnia, where the chorus express their conviction that the Nymphs will stage a dance in honour of Prometheus’ gift. Choes is the day, or rather the night, before, and it is presupposed that the chorus have participated in the agon mentioned in Ar. Ach., have got drunk (μεθυσθέντας), have won the leather-flask of γλεῦκος which they place next to the fire, and have been crowned with a wreath of leaves (204b+204d 5.20–21 ἀ[μό][μφ][οι]σιν ἔπιστε[φεῖς | [φύλ]λοις]. Also, the song of the Frogs suggests a drunken revelry (ἡνίχ’ ὁ κραιπαλόκωμος τοῖς ἱεροῖσι Χύτροισιν ἐχώρει κατ’ ἐμὸν τέμενος λαῶν ὅχλος).

Above, on fr. 379, in discussing West’s view about the presence of tree-nymphs, possibly Μελίαι, in Aeschylus’ Promethean trilogy, we claimed that the Nymphs of Prom. Pyrk. are the Naiads, i.e. the spring- and stream-nymphs mentioned in 204b.4. As we saw above, the Atthidographer Phanodemus (FGrHist 325 F 12), speaking about the opening of the wine-jars, connected the occasion with the hieron of Dionysus ἐν Λήμναις, where the Athenians offered the new wine to the god mixed with water from the springs of the area and worshipped him with songs and dances. He adds: διότι οὐκ ὀνομασθήναι τὰς πηγὰς Νύμφας καὶ τιθήνας τοῦ Διονύσου, ὅτι τὸν οἶνον αὐξάνει τὸ ὄδωρ χιρνάμενον; similarly Philochorus...
We do not know whether the female dancers of Prom. Pyrk., whom we identified as nymphs of springs and streams, were presented as nurses of Dionysus. But we know that another satyr-play of Aeschylus dealt with the story of the nurses of Dionysus, Τροφοί or Διονύσου Τροφοί (frs. 246a–d R.). It must have been the satyr-play of the trilogy Τοξότιδες, Σεμέλη, Ἀθάμας. Here, the nurses of Dionysus are Nymphs on the mountain of Nysa, daughters of Oceanus (Hygin. Fab. 182.2). They seem to feed the baby god not on water, as the Athenian aetiological myth implies, but on pap (fr. 246b). They must be grown-up and are married to old Satyrs. The baby Dionysus summons Medea in order to rejuvenate his nurses and their husbands miraculously by boiling them as she had done with Aeson (fr. 246a). A remarkable similarity between Prom. Pyrk. and Τροφοί is the double chorus of Satyrs and Nymphs.

In Schol. Ar. Ach. 1076–7 it is asserted that ἐν μία ἡμέρᾳ ἄγονται οἱ Χύτροι καὶ οἱ Χόες ἐν Ἀθήναις. This can indicate that the events of the two days were telescoped into one. The shortening could be achieved by exploiting a part of the night between the 12th and the 13th of Anthesterion, with some events taking place after sunset, a feature of the worship of Dionysus established from numerous sources. It is well known that Greek calendar dates began in the evening with the setting of the sun, and not at midnight or at sunrise. This telescoping could be reflected in the plot of the satyr-play, where, as we saw above, the events of the night of the Choes are presupposed. Could the play be actually performed in the dark? An evening staging of a play about fire with a hearth or altar lit (ἑστιοῦχον σέλας) would be really impressive. The performance of the tragedies could have started early in the afternoon, the satyr-play being presented well after sunset. As a matter of fact, in fr. 204c, after the invocation to the meadow at line 2 (ὁ λειμών), in all likelihood the marshy meadow of the dances, and the end of the dances at line 3, the Chorus start an anapaestic part, where the moonlight is mentioned (4 ἰερὸς δ’ ἀκτίς σελάς [. . .]. Σελήνης vel sim.; not Σελήνης), while something, most likely the fire, appears opposite to the moon or is, possibly, likened to the moon (5 ἀντισέληνον). It is difficult not to connect the references with the Πάνδια, the full-moon festival, which was celebrated on the last day (or night?) of the City Dionysia, in 423 BCE (Thuc. 4.118.12) presumably dated on the 14th of Elaphbolion, while in 346 BCE (Dem. 21.9) possibly one or two days later. However, by placing

---

32. To be discussed in my forthcoming edition of Aeschylus’ Θεροί or Ισθμιασταί; see also Gantz (1980) 154–158.
the \textit{Prom. Pyrk.} performance at the spring festival of the City Dionysia, we seem to ignore the overstressed winter context. As for the late evening performance and the references to the moon, nothing would change whether at the Anthesteria or at the City Dionysia. There was a full-moon dividing every month in two, so that the evening of the 13/14th whether of Anthesteriōn or of Elaphebolion would be lit by a full-moon.

Be that as it may, if the close interconnection of the \textit{ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια} (Anthesteria, ἐν Λίμναις, Χύτροι) with the action of \textit{Prom. Pyrk.} is valid, then \textit{Prom. Pyrk.} could not have been performed at the City Dionysia in company with \textit{Persae} and the other tragedies of the 472 production. Consequently, the \textit{Προμηθεύς} of that production was either a different satyr-play —yet no other Promethean satyr-play is known to exist—, or, as I have argued, it was a fourth-place prosatryc tragedy, the \textit{Prometheus Desmotes}, performed as a prerelase version.

Then, the Promethean tetralogy (\textit{Prometheus Desmotes}, \textit{Lyomenos}, \textit{Pyrophoros}, \textit{Pyrkaeus}) must have been staged later than 472 and most likely before 468, when the 28-years-old Sophocles participated victoriously in the City Dionysia with \textit{Triptolemos}, a play greatly influenced by \textit{Prometheus Desmotes} as argued, among many scholars, by G. Zuntz,\footnote{Zuntz (1983b); also, with more cogent arguments, Zuntz (1993).} in spite of M. L. West’s objections, who agrees on the similarities but inverts the dependency course.\footnote{West (1990) 51–52.} A reasonable date for the performance of the whole Promethean tetralogy can be 469 BCE, since the likeliest date for Aeschylus’ visit to Hieron in Sicily seems to be 470. It is known that he restaged \textit{Persae} there. It is very likely that together with \textit{Persae} he also reperformed \textit{Prometheus Desmotes} from the same 472 City Dionysia production, as can be inferred from the insertion of a conspicuous graft of Sicilian myth (\textit{PV} 351–372). Of course, Sophocles could equally be influenced by the 472 or by the later performance of the full tetralogy. But if the 472 performance of \textit{Prometheus} was, as I suppose, of a ‘prerelease’ nature, merely for the poet to supplement a non-thematic trilogy with something still in the works, I doubt that he would have waited more than a year to present his comprehensive production; unless he was absent. And to determine the period of Aeschylus’ absence from the dramatic contests of Athens, one should take account of the fact that voyages to and from Sicily could be made only after the spring—and to make rehearsals while sailing would be preposterous. On the other hand, the reason why Aeschylus participated in this supposedly secondary
contest is disprovable. Possibly, the fact that one play of this tetralogy had already been victorious at the City Dionysia could be a legal obstacle posed by the eponymous archon, whereas participation in the Anthesteria contest was in the archon basileus’s jurisdiction (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 57.1). To sum up, a possible order of the productions discussed is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contest</th>
<th>Plays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>472 BCE</td>
<td>(City Dionysia)</td>
<td>Φινεύς, Πέρσαι, Γλαύκος, Προμηθεὺς (Δεσμώτης)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471 BCE</td>
<td>(no participation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470 BCE</td>
<td>(Sicily)</td>
<td>Πέρσαι, Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης, (more plays?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469 BCE</td>
<td>(Anthesteria)</td>
<td>Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης, Προμηθεὺς Λυόμενος, Προμηθεὺς Πυφρόφος, Προμηθεὺς Πυρκαεύς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the fact that *Prometheus Desmotes*, though transmitted in the Byzantine triad, supplied with hypothesis and copious scholia, lacks a didascalia, unlike the other two plays of the triad (*Persae, Septem contra Thebas*), possibly shows that no data of its production had reached the Hellenistic grammarians. It cannot be excluded that even in antiquity the Older Dionysia were not archived.
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