

AESCHYLUS' *PROMETHEUS PYRKAEUS*



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 ἐν Λίμναις, the ἀρχαιότερα 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, *TrGF 3*, Aeschylus, Göttingen 1985, pp. 321–328. All the fragments apart from \*\* 204a–\*\* 207a (Radt's *Prom. Pyrkaeus* 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 [. . . .] †δοθερομοναθ'† ἥλιον  
θάλποντα κάκχέο[ν]τα βλαστημὸν 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. Pyrkaeus*; it was too late when I came across it.

Hdn. Π. καθολ. πρ. cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10 fol. 4<sup>v</sup>, 42 (ed. Hunger, *Jahrb. der Österr. Byzant. Gesellsch.* 16, 1967, 6 [fr. 15]. 24, qui meum in usum codicem denuo inspexit; tertias eius curas publicavit Zuntz, *PCPhS* 207, 1981, 93sq. [= *Hermes* 111, 1983, 265sq.]) ἔστιν τὸ παρ' Αἰσχύλω βλαστημὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ βλαστῶ γενόμενον· τὸ — βλαστημὸν θοροῶ[.]χριστ[. . . . .]ε.γ.ως οὐκ ἔστιν ἕψ[

1 τὸ<γ>? Zuntz | τὸ λ. ἄστρον, ἰδιόθερμον ἤ.? Hunger, ἀθροῶ τὸ λ. δ' ἄμμα, θερμὸν ἡλίου? G. M. Lee 1977, 145 || 2 κἀκχέο[ν]τα Zuntz : καὶ ἐκχέα[.]τα cod. (teste Hunger ap. Zuntz : Hunger olim καὶ ἀναχέοντα legerat), καὶ χέοντα A. L. Brown (ap. Zuntz 1981, 95 n. 14) | θέρος Zuntz : θοροῶ (pro ο fort. ε, pro α fort. c) cod. (teste Hunger ap. Zuntz)

The fragment comes from Herbert Hunger's readings of the palimpsest cod. Vind. Hist. gr. 10 (*scriptio inferior* 10th cent.), fol. 4<sup>v</sup>,<sup>1</sup> with fragments of Herodian's *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσοφίας*,<sup>2</sup> the specific passage concerning *βλαστημὸς*.<sup>3</sup> The surviving introductory text of Herodian in the palimpsest is: ἔστιν τὸ παρ' Αἰσχύλω βλαστημὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ βλαστῶ γενόμενον. The noun in question, *βλαστημὸς*, 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 *βλαστημὸς* in fr. 332a, and its interpretation is different. Unlike the other two occurrences, it is qualified as adjective (*βλαστημὸς -ον*) 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. 4<sup>v</sup> 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.
2. Dickey (2014), 325–345, esp. 334–5, no. 27 *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσοφίας* / *De prosodia catholica*, "On prosody in general". Quoting from Dickey (334) "It was chiefly concerned with accentuation and now survives only in fragments and epitomes, from which Lentz has reconstructed the work": Aug. Lentz, *Herodiani Technici reliquiae*, in *GG* 3.1: 1–547 + corrigenda in *GG* 3.2: 1233–40.
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 *-μος*. Neither *βλαστημὸς* nor *βλαστιμὸς* are mentioned among the examples.

At *Su.* 318, Marcianus, the *codex unicus*, transmits

τίν' οἶν ἔτ' ἄλλον τῆσδε 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 progenatus?". 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 *γένεθλον* and, on the other, the succeeding lineage after Belus until the Danaids. 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 I<sup>1</sup> is interesting: ζήτει δὲ περὶ τῆς τοῦ βλάστημον γραφῆς εἰδῶς τέως κρεῖττον εἶναι τὴν διὰ τοῦ ι κατὰ παραγωγὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βλαστῶ. Whether *-ημον* or *-ιμον*, the Scholia usually explain it as adjective. 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 κ 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*, *Ηγήμων*).<sup>4</sup>

4. Lobeck (1843) 159.

Now, back to our fragment. Herodian must not be concerned with the quantity of the penultimate syllable (*-ῖμον* or *-ημον*), 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: *βλαστημός* or *βλάστημος*. 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, *ἔστιν τὸ παρ' Αἰσχύλωι βλαστημος*, the neuter of *βλαστήμων* being clearly ruled out.

I would suggest a tiny but necessary conjecture in the first verse: *ῆ]δὲ* for Hunger's reading *]δο*, which led to his odd supplement *ιδιόθερμον ἥλιον*. Thus,

*τὸ λαμπρὸν [ - × ῆ]δὲ θερμόν, ἄθ' ἥλιον*

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 *εἶδον* or *ἔγνων* 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 (*θερμόν, | ἄθ' ἥλιον*), which undoubtedly indicates a satyr-play: West 1982, 88. The sense of the intelligible part until *θάλλοντα* seems to be: 'which [I saw] bright and hot, just like the heating sun'. *ἄθ' ἥλιον θάλλοντα κτλ.* is not a causal clause (LSJ s.v. *ἄτε* II causal, *inasmuch as, seeing that*, with part.), because here *ἄτε* is not connected with the participle but with the subject of the participle. Therefore, *ἄθ' ἥλιον* must mean 'like the sun' (LSJ s.v. *ἄτε* I) with at least the first participle (*θάλλοντα*) qualifying the sun. The particular simile is poetically established, also with *ἄτε*: Alc. 1.63 *ἄτε σήριον ἄστρον*, Pind. *O.* 1.2 *αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἄτε*. The initial *τό* 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. *Eu.* 263 *αἶμα μητροῶν ... , τὸ διερὸν πέδοι χύμενον οἴχεται*, *Su.* 699 *τὸ δάμιον, τὸ πτόλιν κρατύνει*. The adjectives, *λαμπρὸν ἠδὲ θερμόν*, are treated as predicates.

The employment of the epic *τό*, the copulative *ἠδέ*, the comparative *ἄτε*, and possibly further highbrow words of the fragment (e.g. *βλάστημον*) 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.<sup>5</sup>

5. The same stratagem occurs in Soph. fr. 269c from *Inachos*, 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 νόσθηξ, 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 ἀκκχέο[γ]τα . . . θέρος, though his readings seem to have been wormed out of Hunger, whose original readings were different (καὶ ἀναχέοντα and then και εκχέα[ ]τα, and θοροα). 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 βλαστημὸν θέρος, 'sprouting summer'. Zuntz's θέρος was supported by PV 455/6 καρπίμων 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 -ημων as 2nd declension substantive βλαστημός.<sup>6</sup>

What follows after the second verse is [. ]χριοc[ . . . . . ]ε.γ . . . ως οὐκ ἔστιν ὑψ[ . Its first part, [. ]χριοc[ , does not seem to scan,<sup>7</sup> but the rest fits well in an iambic trimeter, whose opening limit is uncertain: × – ∪ ] covered by ]ε.γ . . . ? [ἄ]χρι ὅσ[ου is likely, "as far as, to the extent that"; cf. Damascius, *Pr.* 1.254.12, ἄχρις ὅσον, and the common μέχρι(ς) ὅσον. Apparently, it refers to the key word of the fragment, βλάστημων, justifying its link with θέρος: e.g., [ἄ]χρι ὅσ[ου φέει], "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, × – ∪ ] ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑψ[× – ∪ –, obviously scans. I suggest ὑψ[όθεν ῥέον, since the unknown stuff, which the speaker likened in terms

---

prosatyric play, 16–20, where repeated instances of epic forms appear in the part sung by the king Inachos.

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, -ημων.

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 *ἔγγιτον*, 'nearer'. For reasons of space available, I opt for the latter.

Here is then the restoration I propose:

τὸ λαμπρὸν [εἶδον ἦ] δὲ θερμόν, ἄθ' ἦλιον  
 θάλλοντα κἀκχέο[γ]τα βλάστημον θέρος  
 ἔ[γ]γ[ι]τον, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑψ[όθεν ῥέον

1 τὸ<γ>? Zuntz | τὸ λ. ἄστρον, ἰδιόθερμον ἦ.? Hunger, ἀθρῶ τὸ λ. δ' ὄμμα, θερμόν ἦλιον? G. M. Lee 1977, 145, [εἶδον (vel ἔγνω) ἦ] δὲ Ts. 2 κἀκχέο[γ]τα Zuntz : καὶ εκχέα[.] τα cod. (teste Hunger ap. Zuntz : Hunger olim καὶ ἀγαχέοντα legerat), καὶ χέοντα A. L. Brown (ap. Zuntz 1981, 95 n. 14) | θέρος Zuntz, θέρσα (pro ο fort. ε, pro α fort. ς) cod. (teste Hunger ap. Zuntz) | ut vid., Herodianus vel scholiasta prosaice explicavit βλάστημον cum [.]χρῖος[. . . .], quod e.g. [ἄ]χρῖ δσ[ον φύει] suppl. Ts. 3 ]ε.γ. . . ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑψ[. cod. teste Hunger, ἔ[γ]γ[ι]τον, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑψ[όθεν ῥέον suppl. Ts.

“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. Pyrkl.* 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. Pyrkl.*, before the choral songs of P.Oxy. 2245, where the gift and its beneficial qualities are named (204b, 3–5 *παρ πυρός ἀκάματον ἀγάν ... παρ' ἔστιοῦχον σέλας*), and before the specific references to the celebration of Prometheus' gift (204b, 6–8 (= 15–17) *Νύμφας δέ τοι πέποιθ' ἐγὼ | στήσειν χοροῦς | Προμηθέως 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.<sup>8</sup>

\*\*207

τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενθήσεις σύ γε

Plut. *De cap. ex inim. util.* 2, 86E (1, 173.13 Paton – Wegehaupt – Pohlenz) (= Aesop. Fab. Gr. 467 [p. 506] Perry) τοῦ δὲ σατύρου τὸ πῦρ, ὡς πρῶτον ὤφθη, βουλομένον φιλησθαι καὶ περιβαλεῖν ὁ Προμηθεύς 'τράγος — σύ γε'· καίει τὸν ἀγράμενον, ἀλλὰ φῶς παρέχει καὶ θερμότητα καὶ τέχνης ἀπάσης ὄργανόν ἐστι τοῖς χρῆσθαι μαθοῦσι.

The fragment has been attributed to *Prom. Pyrk.* by Welcker (1824), 120. Earlier, it had been assigned to *Prometheus Pyrrhoros* (Stanley ap. Butler 1809, 264, Schütz 1782, 84), but these scholars considered *Pyrrhoros* the same play as *Prom. Pyrk.* Bates (1934) 170–1, connected the fragment with Sophocles' *Κωφοί*, 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 ὤφθη.

Late authors, like Epiphanius (*Ancor.* 106.2) and Eustathius (*Il.* 415.6), but also modern scholars, like Schwyzler, *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 ὄν, 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.<sup>9</sup> Now, the papyrus text (fr. 204b.18) shows that the Satyrs in *Prom. Pyr.* 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. ὡς πρώτον ὄφθῃ, 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,<sup>10</sup> ‘vix recte’, according to Radt (*Dubia* fr. \*\*474):

τέχνης ἀπάσης ἐστὶν ὄργανον (sc. τὸ πῦρ) ~ - .

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

βραχεῖ δὲ μύθῳ πάντα συλλήβδην μάθε·  
πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως.

9. Shorey (1909) 433–436; Kassel (1973) 109–112; Slenders (2007) 136–137; Tsantsanoglou (2015) 1–40, esp. 16–17.

10. Crusius (1893) 108 n. 2.



187a = 206 N.<sup>2</sup>

ΠΡΟΜ. (ad Satyrum)

ἔξευλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ σε προσβάλη στόμα  
πέμφιξ· πικρὰ γάρ, κοῦ διαζώης ἀτμοῖς

Galen. in Hippocr. *Epid.* libr. VI comm. 1.29 ed. Wenkebach – Pfaff *ἠντι δ' ἀρκέσει τοῖς γραμματικοῖς ἀκολουθήσαντα κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνων διάταξιν εἰπεῖν τι περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν πέμφιγα σημαυνομένων. δοκεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐπι μὲν [– –] ἐπι δὲ τῆς ῥανίδος ὁ αὐτός (sc. Αἰσχόλος) φησιν ἐν Προμηθεῖ· ‘ἔξευλαβοῦ – ἀτμοί’.*

2 καὶ οὐ διὰ ζωῆς ἀτμοί Galenus; obelis notavit Radt, καὶ δίχα ζόης ἀτμ. Herwerden, κοῦδὲν εὐζαεῖς ἀτμ. Headlam, κοῦλία <λίαν> ζόηι vel κοῦλία λαμῶι <λίαν> Wenkebach, alii alia; κοῦ διαζώης ἀτμοῖς Tsantsanoglou

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, πυρὰ, 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 κοῦλία <λίαν> ζόηι, 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 οὐδὲν διὰ ζωῆς* stands for *κοὸν διαζώιης*, i.e. *διαζῶ* in pres. opt. 2nd sing., without *ἄν* (Schwyzer *GG* II 324–5), equivalent to *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως διαζώιης*, a syntax occurring in all three tragedians and Aristophanes. Prometheus continues his address in second person (*ἐξευλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ σε προσβάλλῃ* → *οὐδὲν 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’.<sup>11</sup>

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*, *ἔτνος*, *κνκεών*) 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

11. From the same Galen passage comes Soph. fr. 538 R. from the satyr-play *Salmoneus*, where *πέμφιξ* is also mentioned in connection with foul smell and *σε λάβοι* (*σε* Dobree; vel *βάλοι* Bentley), but in a context of wind, thunder and lightning. Apparently, a funny reference to Salmoneus breaking wind at Zeus. However, had no scholarly proposals intervened in almost every word, the fragment would remain incomprehensible.

(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 *a* of *ἀτμ-* in this fragment, insofar as they produce *ἀτμ-* from *ἀετμ-* by contraction; see Hsch. *a* 1422 *ἄετμα· φλόξ*; *a* 1423 *ἀετμόν· τὸ πνεῦμα*; *EM* 20.10 *ἄετμα· φλόξ· οἱ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα*. “La quantité de l’*a-* n’est pas connue” according to Boisacq. The etymology published in *DGE* (Adrados) connects *ἀτμός* with *ἀήρ*, Sanscrit *ātman-*, ‘soul’, OHG *ātum*, ‘breath’, ending with “*a* originariamente breve”, an etymology, however, already rejected by Frisk, Chantaine and Beekes.

288

*δέδοικα μῶρον κάρτα πυραύστου μόρον*

Aelian. *Nat. an.* 12.8 (1.297.4 Hercher) ≡ Apostol. 18.18 (*CPG* 2.721.16) *ζῶϊόν ἐστιν ὁ πυραύστης, ὅπερ οὖν χαίρει μὲν τῇ λαμπηδόνι τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ προσπέτεται τοῖς λόγχοις ἐνακμαζόσῃ τῇ φλογί, ἐμπεσὼν δὲ ὑπὸ ῥύμης εἴτα μέντοι καταπέφλεκται. μέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ Αἰσχόλος ὁ τῆς τραγωδίας ποιητῆς 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 fr. 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 *πυρκαέα*, 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 ἀψάμενον, ἀλλὰ φῶς παρέχει καὶ θερμότητα καὶ τέχνης ἀπάσης ὄργανόν 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 *πυρκαεὺς*, ‘fire-kindler’. Then, either Silenus or the coryphaeus can respond: ‘I am extremely afraid of such a stupid death in the fire’.

336

ἄχνη

*EM 182.54 ἄχνη· Ὅμηρος τὸ ἐπιπολάζον τῇ θαλάσῃ ἀφροῶδες. Ἱπποκράτης τὸ λεπτὸν ξύσμα τοῦ λίθου. Αἰσχύλος δὲ τὸν καπνόν. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης οὕτως· ἄχνη ἔπνον; 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 (*ἄχνη πυρός*), but, if the word comes from *Prom. Pyr.*, 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*) *τοῦπίπλου*, ‘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[ι]*, ‘therefore, you’ll weep not with smoke’, must be supplemented *δ’ ὥσπερ πάρος*, with cross-reference between satyr-plays. If so, connected with *ἄχνη* = ‘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. Pyr.*

## \*\*204a (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 1, col. I)

2 ]  
] φέγγρος·  
]  
4 ]ι τότε  
]ηριον·  
6 ]ς  
]  
8 ]ν  
]  
10 ]·φλεκτο[  
]. [

12 ].ς τότε  
]παντελε[  
14 ]μόγης  
]σοσι[  
16 ]πων[  
].·φαι[  
18 ] [

20 ].ι· [

].ν [

. . .

4 vel ]N Radt 10 ]. 'a tail descending from left to right, e.g. α' Lobel 12 ]Q vel Q̇  
(hoc malim: ὤς τότε) 19 vel ]Ṅ· [ 20 ]ON[ vel ]ΩN[

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

. . .

].α[.·.]· [ (str. 1)

[—]

2 γλεῦκ[ο]ς δέ τοι τέ[θεικ' ἐγὼ ia ia | eph.  
πέλας πυρός, ia |

4	ἀν̄ τρεῖς μεθυσ[θ — ἔστ' ἀν̄ Ζε[ὺς] μὲν [.] . [	ia [ith	
6	χίων δ' ἐρίστ' ἰπ[ι]π[ο]ῖ[ι] ~ - βεβρεγμένον ἔ]π' ὄμβρον κ[ά]ρα, . [	δ [δ? ant. 1 ia ia [ia   δ [	
	. . .		

1 'A horizontal stroke on the line' Lobel; equidem nihil quam incertum A atque vestigium litterae rotundae (E, O, C) in fine video (Ts.) 2 .]. [ . . ] Lobel, ΓΛΕΥΚ[.]C (γλεῦκ[ο]ς) leg. Ts. | TP[ Lobel, TE[ leg. Ts. | τέ[θεικ' ἐγώ suppl. Ts. 4 . . . POIC Lobel; 'Remains compatible with ]αντ̄ ο might be ε' Lobel | ἀν̄ τρεῖς Ts. | [ Lobel, C[ leg. Ts. | ἀν̄ τρεῖς μεθυσ[θέντας ὡς χορεῦσαι e.g. Ts. 5 . . . AN Lobel, AN Radt, ECTAN (ἔστ' ἀν̄) leg. Ts., ὄ[τ]αν Mette | Ζε[ὺς] μὲν [ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν ὕγι] Mette, ἔστ' ἀν̄ Ζε[ὺς] μὲν [ἔ]ω[ν] τέργῃ βροτοὺς e.g. Ts. 6 APICΤΙΠΠ[.] [ Lobel, EPICΤΙΠΠ[.] leg. Ts. | ἀριστιπ[ι]. [ Lobel, ἀριστιππο[ς Snell teste Mette, ἐρίστ' ἰπ[ι]π[ο]ῖ[ι] ~ - βεβρεγμένον Ts. 7 ἔ]π' ὄμβρον, plura proposuit Radt | κ[ά]ρα· Snell teste Mette

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 (]. α[. .]. [) and of the last line of 204a (]. ον[) 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 ]φέγγος, 10 ]. φλεκτο[, 17 ].. φαι[), but not with new wine.

2–3. ΓΛ 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 γλεῦκ[ο]ς has been important, because the word was not recorded in literature before Aristotle. However, γλεῦκος is found in three 5th cen-

ture 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* I<sup>3</sup> 237.4 (Att., 410–404), *IG* XII Suppl. 347.1 (Thasos, 4th c. BCE), *IG* IV 49 personal name Γλενκίτας of a Cypriot Salaminian (found in Aegina, 5th c. BCE); also, the derivative ἀγλενκῆς 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 γλνκ- with the Lat. *dulcis*.

*TE*[ 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 πεδιήρεις, *Su.* 350 ἀμ πέτραις, not to count the numerous compounds: e.g., *Ag.* 305 ἀνδαίοντες, *Su.* 806 ἀμφονγᾶς. 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.<sup>12</sup> Completely unreliable are the statements of Tzetzes *Prolegomena de comoedia Aristophanis* 2.85 Koster, πρόσωπα δὲ τοῖς μὲν τραγικοῖς καὶ σατυρικοῖς ἀνὰ δεκαεὲς ἦσαν, and *Versus de poematum generibus* 108–110 Koster, διαφορὰν μάνθανε τῆς κωμωδίας, | ἧς εἰκοσιτέσσαρες οἱ χοροργάται, | ἑκκαίδεκα δὲ σατύρων, τραγωδίας. 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. Pyr.*, 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.

μεθός[τερο- would be unmetrical. Possibly, ἂν τρεῖς μεθυσ[θέντας ὡς χοροῦσαι, ‘so that we could dance drunk in groups of three’.

5. Mette (1959, 128) supplemented ὄ[τ]αν Ζε[ύς] μὲν [ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν ὕη]. The papyrus reads ἔστ’ ἄν. Now, Ζε[ύς] μὲν [ῥ]η[ι is an easy conjecture, but I cannot confidently suggest anything for the close of the verse. In any case, the sense demands something like ‘soaking the mortals’. E.g., ἔστ’ ἄν Ζε[ύς] μὲν [ῥ]ω[ν τέγγη βροτούς, completes two dochmiacs.

6–7. Where Lobel read *ΕΠΙΤΙΠΠΙ*. [ and Radt published ἀριστιππ. [, describing the last uncertain letter as ‘litt. rotunda’, while Snell, teste Mette, suggested ἀριστιππο[ς as an attribute of χιών (?), I discern *ΕΠΙΤΙΠΠΟ*[. 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. ἐρίστ’, i.e. adv. ἐριστά, ‘as if in rivalry, competitively’. The only words beginning with ιππο- are ἵππος and its numerous compounds and derivatives, which have no place here. I conjecture ἰπόω, ‘press, weigh down’ from ἵππος, ἦ, ‘any weight or press’, which are frequently written in MSS with double pi for obvious reasons.<sup>13</sup> Zeus soaks the mortals with the rain, but snow as if rivalling it weighs down their soaked head. χιών δ’ ἐρίστ’ ἰπ[π]ο[ι] ἰ ~ - βεβρεγμένον | ὕ]π’ ὄμβρον κ[α]ρά makes perfect sense. After ἰποῖ possibly an adverb (βαρέως, λίαν<sup>14</sup>). Three consecutive iambs, each self-contained, without the typical caesuras of the trimeter, appear also in the first two verses of the ephymnia: Νύμφας δέ τοι / πέποιθ’ ἐγὼ / στήσεν χορούς (x2) / γλεῦκος δέ τοι / τέθεικ’ ἐγὼ / πέλας πυρός (x2) / χιών δ’ ἐρίστ’ / ἰποῖ ~ - / βεβρεγμένον.<sup>14</sup> 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 Πύρρα ἢ Προμαθεύς, where the benefits of the fire are enumerated:

13. Pind. *Ol.* 4.7 ἵπον (ἵππον codd. A ζ), Cratin. fr. 91 ἰποῦμεν · πιέζομεν from Hsch. ι 860 (ἰποῦμεν cod.), Aesch. *PV* 365 ἰπούμενος (ἰπ[π]οῦ- H<sup>1</sup>).

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



baking of bread (241–243), warming oneself (243–244), drying the soaked fleece (244–247), warming water for bathing (252–253). Cf. also Eur. *Cyc.* 323–331, where Cyclops fights against Zeus' ὄμβρον and Boreas' χιόνα.

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

		οὐχ ἔκον-]	δ δ]	(str. 2)
		σία δέ μ' εὐμενῆς χορεύει χάρις,	ka δ	
2	φ[α]εῖν[δ]ν [δ' ἔω]		δ	
		χιτῶνα παρ πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγάν.	ia δ -	
4	κλυοῦσ' ἔμοῦ δὲ Ναϊδῶν τις παρ' ἔσ-		ka δ	
		τιοῦχον σέλας πολλὰ διώξεται.	δ δ	
		—		
6	Νύμφας δέ τοι πέποιθ' ἔγῳ		ia ia	eph.
		στήσει[ν] χοροῦς	ia	
8	Προμηθέως δῶ[ρ]ον ὡς σεβούσας.		ia ith	
		—		
		καλ[δ]ν δ' ἔμνον ἀμφὶ τὸν δόντα μολ-	δ δ	ant. 2
10	πάσειν [ἔ]ολ[π' ἔγ]ῳ λεγούσας τόδ' ὡς		ka δ	
		Προμηθε[ὺς βρο]τοῖς	δ	
12	φερέσβιός θ' [ἄμα κ]α[ί] σπενσίδωρ[ος].		ia δ -	
		χορεύσειν δ[ὲ δεσπόσ]αντ' ἔλπεις ὡ-	δ δ	
14	ρ]ίου χε[ί]ματ[ος πολυθ]ερεῖ π[υρ]ᾶι.		δ δ	
		— ]		
		Νύμφας δέ τιοι πέπειθ' ἔγῳ	ia ia	eph.
16	στήσειν χοροῦς		ia	
		Προμηθεῖως δῶρον ὡς σεβούσας.	ia ith	
		— ]		
18	αὐχῶ δὲ [κ]αὶ ποιμέν[α]ς πρέπειν		ia hδ	epod.
		χορο[ί]σι] καὶ τὸ νκτίπλαγ-	ia ia	
20	κτον' ὄρχημ' ἀ[μό]μφ[οι]σιν ἐπιστε[φεῖς		δ δ	
		φύλ]λοις ἰ[στάναι συμπεφ]ορημέν[ους	δ δ	
22		] οὔ[.]μεν[		
		]ν·		



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 <υ ->, 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' ἐῶ], makes perfect sense. The Satyr strips off the chiton, the dress worn next to the skin, and leaves it aside by the burning fire. ἐῶ here means 'leave aside, abandon'; *Il.* 4.226 *ἵππους μὲν γὰρ ἔασε καὶ ἄρματα 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 Satyros 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 allusion 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.<sup>15</sup> More dressed Satyrs appear on several vase-paintings (Brommer 1959, Abb. 56, 63, 64, 67, 69). Also, the coryphaeus seems to be differ-

15. Simon (1981) 21–34; Simon (1982) 141–2.

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 χιτῶν δασύς, ὃν οἱ Σειληνοὶ (= Satyrs) φοροῦσιν*. This *χορταῖος χιτῶν*, is very likely the dress initially worn by the Satyrs of *Prom. Pyrkl.*, 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 Naiad; cf. *Prat. PMG 708.4 ἄν’ ὄρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων*. Apparently, until the end of the play, the Chorus remain naked, apart from the usual loin-girdle.

3. Hes. *Th.* 566 *ἀκαμάτιο πυρὸς ... ἀγῆν*, referring to Prometheus’ theft of fire; *Il.* 18.610 *θώρηκα φαινότερον πυρὸς ἀγῆς*, *Od.* 6.305 *ἦ δ’ ἦσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάρῃ ἐν πυρὸς ἀγῆι*, Aesch. *Ag.* 9 (of the beacon from Ilium) *ἀγῆν πυρὸς*.

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

*Ναΐδων τις* 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:  $\cup - - \cup - . - \cup \cup - \cup -$ . The corresponding verses 13–14 have also a fourth dochmiac of the type  $- \cup ] \cup - \cup -$ , 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 synecphonesis, would produce a dochmiac instead of kaibelianus; I keep the latter for reasons of resposion 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*, *ἔλπη*.

12. The enclisis of *φερέσβιός*, noted in the papyrus, deceived Lobel and Radt into thinking that the letter following was *T* (*τε or τ’*). However, after *φερέσβιός*, traces of a circular letter are clearly visible, no doubt *θ’*. What follows fits exactly space-wise the proposal made by V. Liapis *ἄμα καὶ σπ*. The

first trace visible after  $\Theta$ [*AMAK*] looks like a tiny top curve, but it can well be a slice of the top loop of A, which is often quite thick. Radt rightly notes “[.] littera rotunda, ut vid., sed etiam ]A possis”. There follows a short gap, which can accommodate an I, and then *σπενσίδωρ[ος]*.

The hapax *σπενσίδωρος* 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 *ἄμα καί* 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 *σπενσίδωρος*, ‘eager to provide gifts’, have nearly the same meaning, the second being somewhat more vague than the first. Hesitantly, I suggest {σ}πενσίδωρος, 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 *πενσίδωρος* (*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 δωρονμένη τὰ ἄλγη, λύπας δωρονμένη. Also, the personal name *Ὀνασίδωρος* / *Ὀνησίδωρος*, ‘offering profit, advantage’. What Prometheus presents mortals with is the nominal root of *πέυθομαι*, the Aeschylean *πενθῶ* (*Se.* 370), ‘tidings, information’ or the later *πεῦσις* in the meaning ‘information’, not the Stoic theoretical term *πεῦσις* (= question, inquiry). Sense-wise, this is exactly what Prometheus conferred on mortals: not only *βίον*, ‘life and crops’, but also *πενθῶ* / *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. *Ar. Av.* 686 *πλάσματα πηλοῦ* about human beings. According to Lucian, *Prom. es in verbis* 3, Athena cooperated with Prometheus, *ἐμπνέουσα τὸν πηλὸν καὶ ἔμψυχα 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 *πενσίδωρος* as a dubitable proposal in the app. crit., since *σπενσίδωρος* is the certain reading of the papyrus and makes sense, no matter how satisfactory.

## 13-14. I propose

χορεύσειν δ[ὲ δεσπόσ]αντ' ἔλπλις ὠ-  
[ρ]ίου χε[ί]ματ[ος πολυθ]ερεῖ π[υρ]ᾶι.

'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 Δ. Then, δ[ὲ] followed by an acc. aorist participle, not only for filling the now read ]αντ', but also for governing ὠρίον χείματος. I supplement πολυθερεῖ, though the word occurs only as a gloss on βουθερεῖ (λειμῶνι) in the Schol. Soph. *Trach.* 188, where not even its exact meaning is clear; "where cattle graze in summer" (Diggle). Apparently, the scholiast took Sophocles' βου- for the prefix used colloquially for 'huge, immense'. But did the compound exist before or was it a coinage of the scholiast? More usual is ζαθερής, which is, however, unmetrical; cf. Leonidas *AG* 6.120, ζαθερεῖ καύματι, and Suid. ζ 8 ζαθερεῖ· ἄγαν θερμῶι, while Zonaras, 951.8 Titt., adds ζαθ<ε>ρές· μεσημβρινὸν καῦμα τὸ δειλινόν. Also from the stem of θέρομαι, εἰληθερής, 'warmed by the sun' (verb εἰληθερέω, 'bask in the sun') and Hsch. ε 1840 ἐλαθερές· ἡλιοθαλπές.

Be that as it may, the reason I prefer πολυθ]ερεῖ is different. The sound consonance between the corresponding distichs 4-5 and 13-14 is remarkable:

4 -ῦσ' ἔ-	~	13 -ύσε-
4 δὲ	~	13 δὲ
4 -ν τ-	~	13 -ντ'
5 -ιοῦχ-	~	14 -ίου χ-
5 -ς πολ-	~	14 -ς πολ-
5 -αι.	~	14 -ᾶι.

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. ποιμένας πρόπειν. × -] δὲ [κ]αι fits the scanty traces. See below on 21.

19. *νοκίπλαγκτος* is a favourite adjective of Aeschylus, possibly coined by him; *Ag.* 12, 330, *Cho.* 524, 751; cf. also *αίγίπλαγκτος* *Ag.* 303, *θαλασσόπλαγκτος* *PV* 467, *παλίμπλαγκτος* *PV* 838, *πολόπλαγκτος* *Supph.* 572, *τηλέπλαγκτος* *PV* 576.

20.  $\dot{\alpha}[\mu\epsilon]\mu\varphi[\acute{\epsilon}\sigma]σιν$  Snell, but the space of the gap that is filled  $[\acute{\epsilon}\sigma]$  is somehow shorter. Therefore,  $\dot{\alpha}[\mu\acute{o}]\mu\varphi[οι]σιν$ , apparently proposed by Radt, though he printed the irregular  $\dot{\alpha}[\mu\acute{\epsilon}]\mu\varphi[οι]σιν$ .  $\acute{\alpha}\muομοφος$  is a form employed by Aeschylus alternatively to  $\acute{\alpha}\muεμοφής$ .

21. Since the shepherds do not constitute an established unit, like the Nymphs who are supposed to dance, *συμπεφ]ορημέν[ους*, '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, fr. 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 *Ποι]μέσιν* in the didascalia of *Supplikes* (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,  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\chi\tilde{\omega}$  would be a most likely verb (cf. Aesch. *PV* 338  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\chi\tilde{\omega}$  γὰρ  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\chi\tilde{\omega}$  τήνδε δωρειὰν ἐμοὶ | δώσειν Δί(α)), with  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  [κ]αὶ highlighting their equality or perhaps rivalry with the Nymphs in dancing aptitude.  $\deltaοκ\tilde{\omega}$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  [κ]αὶ is equally possible, perhaps with a scent of ironic superiority, 'if I'm not mistaken'.

22. ]τὸν[ς] μὲν[ is possible. In the interlinear space above the *N* of *μὲν*, right before the lacuna, a second *N* is written. Possibly, it is a supralinear correction of the missing noun that follows *τὸς μὲν*; e.g., *τὸς μὲν εἰούς* corrected to *τὸς μὲν νέους*; cf. a similar correction in Aesch. *Pe.* 13 *νέον δ' ἄνδρα*, where  $\Phi^{7e}$  notes *γρ. καὶ ἑόν*.

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 *συμπεφ]ορημέν[ους*, forming a two-line subunit similarly to the pair of str./antistr. 2. However, see on 24–25.

24–25. *βαθὺξυλο*[ 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 *ῶ λειμών*). It is unlikely that an ephymnion covered lines 24–26. The iambic ]β[α]θὺξυλο[ 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 ]β[α]θὺξυλο[ 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/epheymnion ~ antistrophe/epheymnion pattern. I name it tentatively epode.

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

	θελονσα[.]..[
2	ῶ λειμών, . . . .[
	οἴοι χορεύμασι[ν
	>
4	ἰερά δ' ἀκτίς σελ[.]^ [
	τῆλέγνωτον ν[
6	ἄ[ν]τισέληρον [
	σ[ώ]σει· πα. \. [
8	[
	[
10	[
	[
12	. [
	ῶ π[
14	. [
	υ[
16	. [
	θ[
18	αν[



κ' ἐ[  
 20 . . [  
 . [  
 22 σκη[  
 ηδ[  
 24 στυ[  
 κα[  
 26 κε[  
 β· [  
 28 [  
 —  
 μ[  
 . . .

1 in marg. sinistra punctum | . [Lobel, *A*[.] . . [ (*θελονσα*[.] . . [ ] leg. Ts. 2 . Λ Lobel, *Q*1 leg. Ts. | *Q*N· Lobel, *Q*N[.] . . [ Radt, *Q*N . . . [ (*ῶ λειμών*) leg. Ts. 3 . . I Lobel, Radt (qui dub. *οἴσι* leg., propter spiritus accentusque vestigia), *Ὀἴοι* (*οἴοι*) leg. Ts. | C [Lobel, Radt, C I [ (*χορεύμασι*[ν] leg. Ts. 4 fort. *σελ[αγ]*δ[νσα 7 [.]C I·T . . . [Lobel, Radt, C [.]CEI·ΠA . . . [ (*σ[ώ]σει·πα·* . . [ ] leg. Ts. 8–12 hic 204d 3 inseruit Mette 13 sqq. *ἐν ἐκθέσει* 3 litterarum 13 ῶ *π[οιμένες* si iambi erant, ῶ *Π[ρομηθεῦ]* si trochaei 19 fort. *καί* in elisione

1–3. If Radt's calculation of ca. 36 lines per column (see above) is trustworthy, the lines from 204b.18 (*ἀρχῶ] δὲ [κ]αὶ ποιμίν[α]ς πρόπειν*) to the end of the column are 18, and, with 204c.1–3 added, 21 to the end of the choral part (*οἴοι χορεύμασι*[ν]). 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 *οἴσι*. The circle of the third letter is clearly closed. *οἴος*, '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 *οἴοι*: 'οἴος c. inf. implies fitness or ability for a thing' (LSJ s. *οἴος* III 1). Clearly, the shepherds must be implied (204b.18–22; cf. 2 ῶ *λειμών*).

4–7. The dipole 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 (*ἱερὰ ἀκτίς*) belongs to the moon, but *σελ[* 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 *νοκτίπλαγκτον 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. *ἀντῆλιος* = 'opposite the sun'), though = *ἰσοσέληνον*, of the *πῶρ*, 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 *κ'ε[* on the papyrus. Possibly, *κεῖς* was considered by the scribe a case of elision in contrast to the crasis of *κὰς*, as is done by most modern critics: Schwyzer, *GG* I 402 ('gewöhnlich *κ' εἰς* mit Elision'), West 1982, 10 ('*καί* is elided before a long vowel or diphthong in epic, Ionic, and Attic').

13. The first of the recitative verses, begins with *ωπ[*, 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 π[οιμένες*, with iambic trimeters, or inversely the coryphaeus can address the principal character of the play, *ὦ Π[ρομηθεῦ*, with trochaic tetrameters. Both fr. 187a (= 206 N.<sup>2</sup>) 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. Pyrkh*. The vase paintings can witness with an equal degree of probability either Aeschylus' *Prom. Pyrkh. ἀναδεδιδαγμένον* or a new play by another poet (Brommer 1959, 49, Snell in *TrGF* 2 adesp. F 8i).

## \*\*204d 2–3 (P.Oxy. 2245 frs. 2–3)

	2		3
	. . .		. . .
	]. <i>vn</i> [		]ι[
2	]ορο[	2	χε[
	]δαν[		—
4	]θεο[		ἀπ[
	]υκ[	4	τλ.[
	. . .		γε[
			. . .

2 1 ]σνν[? 2 ]ω Lobel, Radt, ‘possibly ]ο’ Lobel, certe ]ο Ts. 5 ]. Lobel, Radt, ]υ Ts. 3 4 τ. . [ Lobel, Radt, τλ. [ Ts. 5 infra *Γ* linea obliqua in marg.

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

	. . .
	]οιακα[
2	]ειτε διπ[
	χ]ορρέεις [
4	]δεσμῶν . [
	]... κλαίεις ον[
6	]υω Ζῆν’ ἔψι . [
	]υτ. σε . [
8	].. [
	. . .

1 ] ‘a middle dot’ Lobel | κω[ Lobel, Radt, κα[ Mette | οἰᾶκα[ Mette, an δ]μοῖα κα[ι?; plura possis 2 -εἴτε vel εἴτε; διπ[λ vel διπ[τ 3 χ]ορρέεις [ Mette 5 ‘Traces consistent with ]προ’ Lobel 6 fort. οὐκ ἰσχυ]ρόω | ἸΨΙ. [ (ἔψισ[τον) Ts. 7 fort. τα]ῦτά σε

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

2. If -εἴτε, it must refer to the choreuts. διπ[, whether διπ[λ or δίπ[τυχ, possibly qualifies the dance; cf. Aesch. fr. 78 (*Theoroi*) c.38 τῶνδε διστοίχω[ν χορῶν. Also, *infra* 379.2 κύνκλωι περιστήτ' ἐν λόχῳι τ' ἀπειροῖι implying the onefold κύνκλιος χορός. The same sense might be offered by εἴτε; 'whether double or simple', e.g., ἀλλ' εἴτε διπ[λοῦς εἴτ' ἄρ' οὖν ἀπλοῦς χορούς | × -] 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. Pyrkl.* 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' ἀδ' προκλαίεις ὄν [σὺ, 'Why do you lament beforehand one you ...?'

6. ]υω Ζῆν' ὕψι . [, possibly οὐκ ἰσχ]ύω followed by an infinitive? The accent on Ψ noted in the papyrus suggests ὕψιστον, which, together with οὐκ ἰσχ]ύω, disagrees with iambs. οὐκ ἰσχ]ύω Ζῆν' ὕψισ[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 parodos.

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

vid. 204b.18–21

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

⋮  
]ρσο[

2 ]εγ. κν[. .]. [  
 ]ογδο[.]ca [  
 4 ]δ' ἔμ. υ. ῑ. . [  
 ]σχ.ε.τε. τοῦ. πυρ[ός  
 6 ]οδονκαλλ[  
 ]πιστος. ωσπ[  
 8 ]νι. . [.] . [.] ε[

1 an ]ρω. [? 2 Γ valde incertum 3 δουca[? 4 Δ'Ε | 'fort. ΜΟΥ' Radt, sed hasta  
 vert. post M; an Π?, sc. ἔμ. πυρόγ[? 6 λ[? οὐκ ἀλλ[ vel οὐ καλλ[ 7 ὡς π[ vel ὥσπ[ερ  
 8 fortasse columnae finis

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

\*\*204d 7–11 (P.Oxy. 2245 fr. 7–11)

7	8	9	10	11
. . .	. . .	. . .	. . .	. . .
] . [	] . [	] α [	] κκα. [	. [
] φάδ[	] ει. [	. . .	. . .	2 ο [
] [	] [			τ [
	. . .			>—
				4 ἰω [
				. [
				. . .

7 columnae finis 1 hasta vert., fort. Π | fort. νι]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 dipole and the ἔκθεσις denote change of metre. What is puzzling is the ἔκθεσις of line 3, before the dipole, and the further ἔκθεσις of line 5, two lines after the dipole.

(ad feminas)

ὕμεῖς δὲ βωμὸν τόνδε καὶ πυρὸς σέλας  
 κύκλωι περίστητ' ἐν λόγῳι τ' ἀπείρονοι  
 εὔξασθε

*Schol. B Hom. Il.* 14.200 (vol. 4, p. 51 Dindorf) = Porphyg. *Quaest. Hom. Il.* 191.10 Schrader; *Schol. DEJ Hom. Od.* 1.98d.17 Pontani, ... καὶ Αἰσχύλος τὰς ἐν κύκλω ἐστώσας ἐν ἀπείρονοι σχήματι φησιν ἴστασθαι· ὕμεῖς — εὔξασθε· τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν ἐν τάξει κατὰ κύκλον· ὁ γὰρ λόγος ἐστὶ τάξις, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ λοχαγὸς ταξίαρχος.

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 *Μελίαι*. His argument depends on Hesiod, *Th.* 563–4 οὐκ ἐδίδου (sc. Zeus) μελίησι πυρὸς μένος ἀκαμάτιοι | θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἳ ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάουσιν, 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:

Νύμφας δέ τοι πέποιθ' ἐγὼ  
 στήσειν χοροὺς  
 Προμηθέως δῶρον ὡς σεβούσας.

‘I am confident that the Nymphs will start (or ‘establish’) dances’ is not a simple expression of the chorus-leader’s belief, but a specific promi-

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 *Ναϊδῶν τις ... πολλὰ διώξεται*, and who are coupled with the Satyrs elsewhere too, with erotic innuendoes: Prat. *PMG* 708.4 *ἀν' ὄρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων*. 204b 24 *βαθυξυλο*[ 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 (*εὐξασθε*) to Prometheus: *Προμηθέως δῶρον ὡς σεβούσας*. Even the content of their hymn is synopsised in the first period of antistrophe 2 (9–12):

*καλὸν δ' ὕμνον ἀμφὶ τὸν δόντα μολ-  
πάσειν ἔολπ' ἐγὼ λεγούσας τόδ' ὡς  
Προμηθεὺς βροτοῖς  
φερέσβιός θ' ἅμα καὶ σπενσίδωρος.*

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 *θελοῦσα*[.] . . [ , 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 τάρων γονὰς  
δοῦς (sc. ego) ἀντίδουλα καὶ πόνων ἐκδέκτορα*

I Plut. *De fort.* 3.98C νῦν δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ τύχης οὐδ' αὐτομάτως περιέσμεν αὐτῶν καὶ κρατοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ὁ Προμηθεύς, τουτέστιν ὁ λογισμός, αἴτιος ἔπιπων – ἐκδέκτορα' κατ' Αἰσχύλου | II id. *De soll. anim.* 7.964F οὐ γὰρ ἀδικοῦσιν οἱ τὰ μὲν ἄμικτα καὶ βλαβερὰ κομιδῆι ἀποκτιννύοντες, τὰ δ' ἡμέρα καὶ φιλόανθρωπα ποιούμενοι τιθασὰ καὶ συνεργὰ χρείας, πρὸς ἣν ἕκαστον εὖ πέφυκεν, ἔπιπων – γονάς, ὃν ὁ Αἰσχύλου Προμηθεύς 'δοῦναι' φησὶν ἡμῖν ἀντίδουλα – ἐκδέκτορα' | III Porphyg. *De abst.* 3.18 ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ὅτι μηδὲν πονεῖν δεομένοις (sc. animalibus) χρώμεθα προκάμνουσι καὶ μοχθοῦσιν, ἔπιπων – γονάς, ὡς Αἰσχύλος φησὶν, ἀντίδουλα – ἐκδέκτορα' χειρωσάμενοι καὶ καταζεύξαντες

Promethea loquentem esse e II ὁ Αἰσχύλου Προμηθεὺς ... φησὶν efficere licet || 1 ὄχεῖα I, ὄχειαν II, III inepte | γονάς codd., γένος Wil., γένη Blaydes | 2 ἀντίδουλα II, ἀντίδωρα I, ἀν δούλα III | ἐκδ. I, III, inter ἐκδ., ἀνδ. et ἐνδ. fluctuant codd. II

Of course, the fragment may come from any Prometheus play other than the *Δεσμώτης* (*Λυόμενος*, *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 = ὄχημα, ὄχος. Accordingly, Wilamowitz changed γονάς into γένος. In *PV* 462–466, Prometheus makes the same claim, possibly corroborating Wilamowitz's rejection:

κάξευξα πρῶτος ἐν ζυγοῖσι κνώδαλα,  
 ζεύγλῃσι δουλεύοντα σάγμασιν θ' ὄπως  
 θνητοῖς μεγίστων διάδοχοι μοχθημάτων  
 γένοιθ'· ὕφ' ἄρμα τ' ἤγαγον φιληνίους  
 ἔπιπους, ἄγαλμα τῆς ὑπερπλοῦτου χλιδῆς.

205

λινᾶ δὲ πεσσὰ κώμολίνου μακροὶ τόνοι

Poll. 10.64 τῶν δὲ γυμνασίοις προσηκόντων σκευῶν ... ὠμόλινον, οὐ Κρατίνου (fr. 10 K.-A.) μόνον εἰπόντος τὸ ὠμόλινον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Αἰσχύλου ἐν Προμηθεῖ Πυρκαεῖ 'λίνα δὲ πίσσα – τόνοι'.



The text as transmitted was puzzling: *λίνα δὲ πίσσα κῶμολίνου μακροὶ τόροι*, with numerous odd conjectures. Metrical adjustment (*λινᾶ δὲ Bentley*) and an ingenious emendation (*πίσσα* → *πεσσά 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 ὄργανόν ἐστι τοῖς χρῆσθαι μαθοῦσι*. They rather seem better connected with 204b.12 *πενσίδωρος*, 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, εἴ τις εἰς νόσον πέσοι,  
οὐκ ἦν ἀλέξημι' οὐδέν, οὔτε βρώσιμον,  
οὐ χριστόν οὐδὲ πιστόν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων  
χρεῖαι κατεσκέλλοντο, πρὶν γ' ἐγὼ σφισιν  
ἔδειξα κράσεις ἠπίων ἀκεσμάτων  
αἷς τὰς ἀπάσας 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. Pyrkaëus* 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 *κῶμολίνου* used to be the only proof that *Prom. Pyrkaëus* 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.

## \*\*207a

Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies, 89 (p. 43.9 Pertusi) <\*\*\*> φησὶν ὅτι Προμηθεὺς τὸν τῶν κακῶν πύθον παρὰ τῶν Σατύρων λαβὼν καὶ παραθέμενος τῷ Ἐπιμηθεὶ παρήγγειλε μὴ δέξασθαι τι παρὰ Διός, ὃ δὲ παρακούσας ἐδέξατο τὴν Πανδώραν.

Schoemann (1857) 281 n. 39, and Dimitrijević (1899) 59, conjectured a lacuna which, in their view, should be filled *Αἰσχύλος*, with the scholion referring to *Prom. Pyrkl.* 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. Pyrkl.* 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.

## 307

σφύρας δέχεσθαι κάπιχαλκεύειν μύδρους  
ὡς ἀστενακτὶ θύννος ὡς ἠρείχετο  
ἄναυδος

Athen. 7.303C μνημονεῖ δὲ τοῦ θύννου καὶ Αἰσχύλος λέγων 'σφύρας — ἀναυδος'· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ κτλ.

1 λέγων] 'σφύρας Jacobs, ἄκμων] 'σφύρας? Blaydes | -ειν μ. Jacobs, Blomfield; -ει λέγων μ. Athenaei A, -ειν μύδρος Dobree, -ειν ἄκμων Blaydes 2 ὡς A, ὅς Musurus, ὃ δ' vel ὃ γ' Bothe | ὡς Toup, ὡς A | ἠρείχετο Hermann, ἠνιχετο A, ἠρέσχετο Jacobs, alii alia 3 ἄναυδος Musurus, ἄν λυδός A, <πληγὰς> ἄναυδος? Blaydes

It is very likely that the fragment comes from an Aeschylean satyr-play, but the ascription to *Prom. Pyrkl.*, which Bothe (1844) suspected and West supported (*per litteras* to Radt), cannot stand, insofar as the tense of ἠρείχετο 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.-A. τύπτεσθαι μύδρος, Ar. *Nu.* 422 ἐπιχαλκεύειν παρέχοιμ' ἄν, Aristophon com. fr. 5.6 K.-A.

*ὀπομένειν πληγὰς ἄκμων.* Can the subject be Prometheus (reading *μόδρος*) with reference to the torture he endured uncomplainingly? We suspected such a mention in fr. 204d 4, 4 ]*δεσμῶν.* [, 5 ]*πρόκλαιεις ο.* [, but there, the verb postulated a future act, and so we could assume it was a Promethean prophesy. It is preferable to read *μόδρους* with Athenaeus' *A* and to take as subject some long-suffering yet stoically tolerant hero of Aeschylus. I would also opt for *ὄσ' ἄστ.* in place of *ὡς ἄστ.*, 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<sup>16</sup>

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. Pyrkaëus*. This is clearly testified by the replacement of a short by two shorts in fr. 205, the unique fragment cited as *Αἰσχύλου ἐν Προμηθεῖ Πυρκαεῖ*. Fr. 332a offers also a similar metrical testimony, but the title is not indicated. The detailed plot is difficult to re-

16. Calame (2010) 65–78, esp. 66.

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 *Προμηθεύς*, 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.<sup>17</sup> 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 *Προμηθεὺς Πυρκαεὺς* 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 *PV*, 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 *Προμήθεια*. 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 Αἴμναις Διονύσιον*

Various internal elements locate the action of *Prom. Pyrk.* in the winter. The chorus hope to dance having prevailed over the *ὄριον χεῖμα* (204b.13–14), the season's cold, with the help of the *πολυθερῆς πυρά*, 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 *Ἀνθεστηριῶν*, about the end of February. On the 12th, the *Χόες* was considered the official (*ἐπίσημος*) festival of Dionysus *ἐν Αἴμναις*, where the *ἀρχαιότερα* or *ἀρχαιότατα* Dionysia were celebrated by the Athenians with choral dances.<sup>18</sup>

More particulars can be drawn from Thucydides and his Scholia: Thuc. 2.15.3–4 *τὸ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ* (before Theseus' *ξυνοικισμός*) *ἢ ἀκρόπολις ἢ νῦν οὔσα πόλις ἦν, καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον. τεκμήριον δέ· τὰ γὰρ ἱερὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκροπόλει καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἐστι* (i.e. apart from Athena's, who is mentioned before) *καὶ τὰ ἕξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἴδονται, τό τε τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τὸ Πύθιον καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς καὶ τὸ ἐν Αἴμναις Διονύσιον, ὧν τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν.*

18. See Hamilton (1992), Robertson (1993).

Schol. Thuc. 2 in P.Oxy. 853 (ed. Grenfell/Hunt 1908), col. x. 7 ff.: |<sup>7</sup> τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσο[υ· Καλλιμάχος |<sup>8</sup> μὲν φησ[ιν·] εἶ δὲ Διονυ[σ . . . . . |<sup>9</sup>[.]ητον[.]τ' Ἐλευθῆρ ει[.· Λιμναῖοι |<sup>10</sup> [δὲ χ]οροστάδας ἦγον ἐ[ορτάς· . . . |<sup>11</sup> [. . .]ος δὲ οὔτ[ω]ς φησὶν [καλεῖσθαι |<sup>12</sup> [δι]ὰ τὸ ἐκλελ[ι]μνάσθαι [τὸν τόπον. |<sup>13</sup> [ἔσ]τι δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ Λακωνί[αι] ἱερὸν |<sup>14</sup> [ῥ]ου Λιμναῖ[ι]ς ἐστὶν Ἄρτ[εμις. |<sup>15</sup> [ῶ]ι τ[ὸ] ἀρχαίότατα Διονύσια τῇ ιβ' ποι |<sup>16</sup>[εῖται·] ἐπὶ τρεῖς μέ[ν] ἐσ[τι]ν ἑορτὴ ἡμέ[ρ]α[ς] |<sup>17</sup>[ρ]α[ς] ια' ιβ' ιγ', ἐπίσ[ημὸς] ἐσ[τι] δὲ ἡ ιβ', |<sup>18</sup> [ῶ]ς] καὶ εἶπεν ἀδ[ρό]ς].

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 (Λιμναῖοι – 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:

εἶτε Διώνυ[σον πρὶν ἀοί[κ]ητόν [πο]τ' Ἐλευθῆρ  
εἶ[α, Λιμναῖοι |<sup>10</sup> δὲ χ]οροστάδας ἦγον ἐ[ορτάς].

1 εὐδε pap., εἶτε Ts. | Διονυ[σ] pap., Διονυ[σ] Wil. ap. Gr./H. | .]η pap. sec. Gr./H. πρὶν ἀοί[κ]ητόν Ts. | [πο]τ' Wil. 2 εἶ[α] Ts.

“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 Διονύ[σ]ωι Μελαναί[γ]ιδι, τόν [πο]τ' Ἐλευθῆρ  
εἶ[σατο, Λιμναῖοι |<sup>10</sup> δὲ χ]οροστάδας ἦγον ἑορτάς.

1 εὐδε pap., οὐδὲ Barrett ap. Hollis | Διονυ[σ] pap., Διονυ[σ] Wil. ap. Gr./H. | .] δι pap. sec. Barrett ap. Hollis | Διονύ[σ]ωι Μελαναί[γ]ιδι Barrett ap. Hollis (Διώνυ[σ]ωι Μελαναίγιδι)<α> iam Kapp 1915, fr. 94) 1-2 τόν [πο]τ' Ἐλευθῆρ | εἶ[σατο] Wil.

“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  $\Gamma\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}$  (or  $\Gamma\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}]<A>$ , as I. Kapp) for what Gr./H. read ]H is, I believe, too long, but also, at the right-hand margin, Wilamowitz's  $E\dot{\iota}[C\dot{A}T\dot{O}L\dot{I}M\dot{N}\dot{A}I\dot{O}\dot{\iota}$  for Gr./H.'s  $E\dot{\iota}[ \dot{A}I\dot{M}\dot{N}\dot{A}I\dot{O}\dot{\iota}$ , 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  $\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}$  could be read or not. However, I have serious doubts about whether  $\Gamma\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}\dot{\iota}$  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 *ἐν 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  $\dot{\Delta}\dot{\iota}|\dot{\delta}\nu\mu\dot{\iota}$ ]ος Gr./H.,  $\Phi\dot{\iota}\dot{\lambda}\dot{\omicron}|\dot{\chi}\rho\dot{\omicron}$ ]ος Wil.,  $\dot{\Lambda}\dot{\rho}\dot{\omicron}\dot{\lambda}\dot{\lambda}\dot{\omicron}|\dot{\delta}\omega\dot{\rho}$ ]ος Barrett, 11  $[\dot{\kappa}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\lambda}\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\dot{\sigma}\theta\dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}$ ] Gr./H.,  $[\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\pi}\dot{\iota}\dot{\kappa}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\lambda}\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\dot{\sigma}\theta\dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}$ ] Barrett, 12  $[\dot{\tau}\dot{\omicron}\nu\ \dot{\tau}\dot{\omicron}\dot{\rho}\dot{\omicron}\nu]$  Gr./H.,  $[\dot{\rho}\dot{\omicron}\dot{\tau}\dot{\epsilon}\ \dot{\tau}\dot{\omicron}\ \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\omicron}\nu]$  Barrett, 13  $\dot{\Lambda}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\kappa}\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{\iota}[\dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}\ \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\omicron}\nu]$  Gr./H.,  $\dot{\Lambda}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\kappa}\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{\iota}[\dot{\kappa}\dot{\eta}\dot{\iota}\ \dot{\tau}\dot{\omicron}\dot{\rho}\dot{\omicron}\nu]$  Wil.,  $\dot{\Lambda}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\kappa}\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{\iota}[\dot{\alpha}\dot{\iota}\ \dot{\lambda}\dot{\iota}\mu\eta\ \dot{\tau}\dot{\iota}\nu]$  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  $\Phi\dot{\iota}\dot{\lambda}\dot{\omicron}|\dot{\chi}\rho\dot{\omicron}$ ]ος). 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: *Καλλιμάχος* |<sup>8</sup> *μὲν φησ[ιν·] εὐδε*. 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 μὲν* 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. *εἴτε* 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 Διόνυσον 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 νεὸς 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 Ἀθηναί  
Λιμναῖον μετὰ Βάκχον Ἐλευθερίωι Διονύσωι.*

*Ἐλευθερίωι* C. F. Hermann : *Ἐλευσινίωι* 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 Anthesteriōn: *καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἀρχαιοτάτῳ ἱερῷ του Διονύσου καὶ ἀγνωτάτῳ ἐν Λίμναις ἔστησαν, ἵνα μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσιν τὰ γεγραμμένα· ἅπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου 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 Διόνυσοι, ὃ τε Ἐλευθερεὺς καὶ ὃν Ἀλκαμένης ἐποίησεν ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ.*

### Topography, Hieron of Horae, τὰ Ἴκρια

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 I<sup>3</sup> 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. Travlos<sup>19</sup> connected the sanctuary with a horos stone inscribed *HOPOS TO HIEPO* 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

19. Travlos (1971) p. 332–3 fig. 435.

to the legend. N. W. Slater<sup>20</sup> rejected the identification, because Travlos “ignores the ancient evidence that Kodros fell outside the wall”. However, Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 20.86–87, places the spot where Kodros fell *κατὰ 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,<sup>21</sup> 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 *ἐν Αἴμναις* lies in the area adjoining the south side of the new Acropolis Museum. The question is whether the old Dionysion *ἐν Αἴμναις* 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 *ἐν Αἴμναις*, 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.<sup>22</sup> The relationship of the two sanctuaries may be highlighted by Callimachus’ distich from *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 Theus—, before a temple or other structures were erected, and so the Athenians worshipped the god in a marshy area by outdoor dances.<sup>23</sup>

20. Slater (1986) 255–264, esp. 260–261.

21. Isaeus 8.35 *Κίρων γὰρ ἐκέκτητο οὐσίαν, ... οἰκίας δ’ ἐν ἄστει δύο, τὴν μὲν μίαν μισθοφοροῦσαν, παρὰ τὸ ἐν Αἴμναις Διονύσιον*.

22. The mention of a property of Zeus Olympios *παρὰ τὸ Διονύσιον* in the 343/2 BCE inscription published by Walbank (1983) 117–8, 123–4, may imply such a common sanctuary.

23. An extremely useful and documented, yet inconclusive, discussion in Pickard-Cambridge (<sup>2</sup>1968) 1–25. Marchiandi/Savelli (2011), and Di Cesare (2011), gave a most valuable account of the Kodros, Neleus, and Basile hieron, and the *ἐν Αἴμναις* topographical problems in combination with a report about the Anthesteria festival, thoughtfully updating the conclusions of Travlos.

The mention of *γλεῦκος*, i.e. the new wine, in the *Prom. Pyr.* (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 *Πιθόγια*, 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 *ἀρχαιότερα* and his Scholiast *ἀρχαιότατα Διονύσια*. It was then that, according to Callimachus' fr. 305, the Athenians held *χοροστάδας ἐορτάς*.

The 4th century BCE Attidographer 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.<sup>24</sup> The Athenians, then, enjoyed drinking the mixture, and worshipped Dionysus with songs and dances calling him *Εὐάνθης* (some conjecture *Εὔας*), *Διθύραμβος*, *Βακχευτάς* and *Βρόμιος*.

In another version of the story, as told by the 3rd century Attidographer 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 τῶν Ὠρῶν ἱερῶι*); Niasfas (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 τῷι τεμένει, ὃ κατασκευάζει, ἰδρυσάμενοι βωμὸν καὶ θύοντι ἐπὶ τούτου Διονύσωι καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Ὠραις*.

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 Anthesteria and the ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσια. Pindar's Dithyramb Ἀθηναίους 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 ὀπότ' οἰχθέντος Ὠρᾶν θαλάμον | εὐδομον ἐπάγοισιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια, “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 I<sup>2</sup> 4877*, Ὠραις 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.<sup>25</sup>

Thucydides' wording in 2.15.4 τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ὧι τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῆι δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι 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> (conj. Latte; *AS* cod.) τόπος ἀνεμμένος Διονύσῳι, ὅπου τὰ Λαῖα (sic cod., *Λήρεια* Musurus) ἤγετο, 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 Ἀθηναίων. Both the Hesychius entry and the Aristophanic scholion are rejected by many scholars, sometimes reading ὅπου τὰ Λ<ιμν>αῖα ἤγετο or emending Διονύσου Ἀθηναίων to Διονύσου Λιμναίων. In any case, the location of the *Λήρεια* is a different problem.

25. Neer/Kurke (2014) 527–579.

Be that as it may, it is very likely that the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια of Thucydides were not limited to χοροστάδες ἐορταί. Though Pickard-Cambridge (<sup>2</sup>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): ἤγοντο δὲ ἀγῶνες αὐτόθι οἱ Χύτρινοι καλούμενοι, καθά φησι Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ ἔκτῃ τῶν Ἀτθίδων. The Scholia on the next verse (*Ran.* 219) specify where αὐτόθι was: κατ' ἐμὸν τέμενος] ἐαυτῶν τέμενος λέγουσι (sc. the *Frogs*) τὸ ἐν Λίμναις τοῦ Διονύσου ἱερόν. Of course, ἀγῶνες 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 ἴκρια, the wooden benches whose collapse was the cause of the construction of the Dionysus theatre. However, Pausanias, the Atticist lexicographer, quotes: ι 3 Erbse, from Eust. 1472.3 = Phot. ι 95 Theodoridis, ἴκρια· τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, ἀφ' ὧν ἐθεῶντο τοὺς Διονυσιακοὺς ἀγῶνας πρὶν ἢ 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 ἰκριοποιοὶ δ' εἰσὶν οἱ πηγνύντες τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἴκρια, 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 ἴκρια was specified in Phot. α 505 αἰγείρον θέα καὶ ἡ παρ' αἰγείρον θέα· Ἀθήνησιν αἰγείρος ἦν, ἧς πλησίον τὰ ἴκρια ἐπήγνον εἰς τὴν θέαν πρὸ τοῦ τὸ θέατρον γενέσθαι. οὕτως Κρατῖνος (Cratin. fr. 372 K.-A.). Numerous versions are recorded in lexica, some of which offer possibly useful details. E.g., Hsch. π 513 παρ' αἰγείρον θέα, which mentions Eratosthenes (fr. 3 Str.) as the original source of the gloss, or Hsch. α 1695 αἰγείρον 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 ἴκρια 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 Διονύσου ἱερόν* cannot be ruled out. However, a parallel article, Hsch. θ 166 *θέα παρ' αἰγείρωι· τόπος αἰγείρων ἔχων, ὅθεν ἐθεώρουσι. ἐντελής δὲ ἐδόκει ἢ ἐντεῦθεν θεωρία· μακρόθεν γὰρ ἦν καὶ εὐώνου* (sc. *τιμῆς* vel *τιμῆματος*) ὁ τόπος 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 “*ἀπὸ τα βραγάκια*; from the little rocks”, for watching the modern shows at the Odeum of Herodes Atticus adjacent to the theatre of Dionysus. 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 I<sup>3</sup> 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, ἀναγράψας ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήλῃι λιθίνῃ καταθέτω ἐν τῶι Νηλείωι 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.–A., 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 Neleion next to the theatre or next to the railings.

However, ‘the theatre’ is an inaccurate spot, especially when it is expressed in an everyday term, ‘next to the stalls’. Further, this interpretation 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 theatre. 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 Moock<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup>

There can be no doubt that the posts were part of *ἴκρια*, the wooden benches on which the spectators sat. Were they, however, the famous *ἴκρια*, 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 ... φηγὸν δὲ εἰς Σικελίαν διὰ τὸ πεσεῖν τὰ ἴκρια ἐπιδεικνυμένου αὐτοῦ, χελώνης ἐπιρριφείσης αὐτῶι ὑπὸ ἀετοῦ φέρουτος κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἀπώλετο ἐτῶν ἑνῆ 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

26. Papastamati-von Moock (2020).

27. Papastamati-von Moock (2020) 62–66, fig. 17, 18, 20.

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 τοῦδὲ τινος λεχθέντος ἢ γραφέντος ... ἀπέβη τι δεινόν, mentions παραδείγματος ἕνεκα ... καὶ ὁ Αἰσχύλος ὁ ἐπὶ ταῖς Εὐμενίδεισι (*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 ἐπιδείξει τῶν Εὐμενίδων σποράδην εἰσαγαγόντα τὸν χορὸν τσοσῶτον ἐκπλήξαι τὸν δῆμον ὡς τὰ μὲν νῆπια ἐκψῶξαι, τὰ δὲ ἔμβρυα 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.<sup>28</sup> I am not certain whether Aristarchus and Apollonius Dyscolus refer to the *Oresteia* as a trilogy χωρὶς τῶν σατύρων meaning that the satyric *Proteus* was unconnected with the story of the three tragedies (not fully correct) or implying that the satyr-play was not included in the archives.<sup>29</sup> 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 Πρατίνας ... ἐπιδεικνυμένον δὲ τούτου συνέβη τὰ ἴκρια, ἐφ’ ὧν ἐστήκεσαν οἱ θεαταί, πεσεῖν, καὶ ἐκ τούτου θέατρον ὠικοδομήθη 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,

28. Wilamowitz (1914b) 249, rejected the event, even Pickard-Cambridge who describes it as “absurd in itself”, but the collapse of the ikria and Aeschylus’ *φυγή* to Sicily after the *Oresteia* performance cannot be refuted. Cf. Newiger (1976) 82, and Lefkowitz (1981) 71 f.

29. Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1124 (Aesch. T 65c R.) τετραλογία φέρουσι τὴν Ὀρέστειαν αἱ διδασκαλῆαι· Ἀγαμέμνονα, Χοηφόρον, Εὐμενίδας, Πρωτέα σατυρικόν. Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος τριλογία λέγουσι χωρὶς τῶν σατύρων.



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 Λίμναις, at the Callimachean χοροστάδες ἐορταί of the ἀρχαιότερα 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 βασιλείαν· ὁ δ' ἀλλὸς ὕστερον 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.<sup>30</sup>

A third relevant lexicographical article does not enlighten us as to the collapse, but it places the initial ikria outside the Dionysus theatre: Hsch. ι 501 ἴκρια· ... ἢ τὰ ἐπὶ ξύλοις κατασκευαζόμενα θεωρεῖα. ... καὶ τὰ ξύλινα οὕτως ἐλέγοντο Ἀθήνησιν, ἀφ' ὧν ἐθεῶντο, πρὸ τοῦ τὸ ἐν Διονύσου θέατρον γενέσθαι.

I suppose, therefore, that the decree of 418/7 refers to τὰ Ἰκρια 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 Ἰκρια. 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 Lenaean 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 Λίμναις, 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 *ἱκρία* 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 ἑορταί*) and later drama shows of the *ἀρχαιότερα 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 (*Χύτροι ἀγῶνες*) denotes that they were held on the last day of the festival of *Anthesteria*, in the *Χύτροι*, i.e. on the 13th of *Anthesteriōn*, 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 *εἰσήνεγκεν δὲ καὶ νόμον* (sc. *Lycurgus*), *τὸν μὲν περὶ τῶν κωμωιδῶν, ἀγῶνα τοῖς Χύτροις ἐπιτελεῖν ἐφάμιλλον ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ τὸν νικήσαντα εἰς ἄστυ καταλέγεσθαι, πρότερον οὐκ ἐξόν, ἀναλαμβάνων τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐκλελοιπότα*. The revival of the theatrical *agon* by *Lycurgus* in the third quarter of the fourth century BCE concerned comedy.<sup>31</sup> However, it is unknown whether the *ἐκλελοιπῶς ἀγῶν* 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.

*Χύτροινοι 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. Pyr.* Winter time (ὠρίον χειματος; χιών; ὄμβρον), night rituals (φέγγος; νυκτίπλαγκτον ὄρημα; ἀντισέληνον), drunken revelry (γλεῦκος; ἄν τρεῖς μεθυσθέντας), choral dances (*passim*). It goes without saying that choral dances (χοροστάδες ἐορταί) are the dominant element in the surviving text of *Prom. Pyr.* The marshy meadow of the *Λίμναι* is also present (204c.2 ὦ λειμών).

In Ar. *Ach.* 1000–02 the Herald proclaims: Ἀκούετε λεῶν· κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τοὺς Χοᾶς | πίνειν ὑπὸ τῆς σάλπιγγος· ὃς δ' ἂν ἐκπίη | πρότιστος, ἄσκον Κτησιφῶντος λήφεται. As described in the Scholia *ad loc.*, ἐν ταῖς Χοαῖς ἀγὼν ἦν περὶ τοῦ ἐκπιεῖν τινὰ πρῶτον χοᾶ, καὶ ὁ πῶν ἐστέφετο φυλλίνω στεφάνω καὶ ἄσκον οἶνον ἐλάμβανεν. In *Prom. Pyr.* 204d 12.2–4, γλεῦκ[ο]ς δέ τοι τέ[θεικ' ἐγὼ] | πέλας πυρός, | ἄν τρεῖς μεθυσ[θέντας 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 (μεθυσ[θέντας]), 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 ἐπιστε[φεῖς] | [φύλ]λοις). Also, the song of the *Frogs* suggests a drunken revelry (ἦνίχ' ὁ κραιπαλόκωμος τοῖς ἱεροῖσι Χύτροισιν ἐχώρει κατ' ἐμὸν τέμενος λαῶν ὄχλος).

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. Pyr.* are the Naiads, i.e. the spring- and stream-nymphs mentioned in 204b.4. As we saw above, the Athidographer Phanodemus (*FGrHist* 325 F 12), speaking about the opening of the wine-jars, connected the occasion with the hieron of Dionysus ἐν *Λίμναις*, 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: διόπερ ὀνομασθῆναι τὰς πηγὰς Νύμφας καὶ τιθήνας τοῦ Διονύσου, ὅτι τὸν οἶνον ἀξάνει τὸ ὕδωρ κιννάμενον; similarly Philochorus

(*FGrHist* 328 FF 5a, 5b). We do not know whether the female dancers of *Prom. Pyr.*, 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 *Διονύσων Τροφοί* (frs. 246a–d R.). It must have been the satyr-play of the trilogy *Τοξότηδες, Σεμέλη, Αθάμας*.<sup>32</sup> 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. Pyr.* and *Τροφοί* is the double chorus of Satyrs and Nymphs.

In Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 1076–7 it is asserted that *ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρῃ ἄγονται οἱ τε 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 Anthesteriōn, 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 (*ἔστιοῦχον 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 (*ὦ λειμῶν*), 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 *ἰερά δ' ἀκτις σελ[.]*˘[; *σελαγοῦσα* 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 Elapheboliōn, 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' *Theoroi or Isthmiastai*; see also Gantz (1980) 154–158.

the *Prom. Pyrka.* 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 Elapheboliōn would be lit by a full-moon.

Be that as it may, if the close interconnection of the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια (Anthesteria, ἐν Αἰμυναίς, Χύτροι) with the action of *Prom. Pyrka.* is valid, then *Prom. Pyrka.* could not have been performed at the City Dionysia in company with *Persae* and the other tragedies of the 472 production. Consequently, the *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 prosatyrical tragedy, the *Prometheus Desmotes*, performed as a prerelease version.

Then, the Promethean tetralogy (*Prometheus Desmotes*, *Lyomenos*, *Pyrphoros*, *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 *Triptolemos*, a play greatly influenced by *Prometheus Desmotes* as argued, among many scholars, by G. Zuntz,<sup>33</sup> in spite of M. L. West's objections, who agrees on the similarities but inverts the dependency course.<sup>34</sup> 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 *Persae* there. It is very likely that together with *Persae* he also reperformed *Prometheus Desmotes* from the same 472 City Dionysia production, as can be inferred from the insertion of a conspicuous graft of Sicilian myth (*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 *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

33. Zuntz (1983b); also, with more cogent arguments, Zuntz (1993).

34. West (1990) 51–52.

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:

- 472 BCE (City Dionysia) *Φινεύς, Πέρσαι, Γλαῦκος, Προμηθεὺς*  
*(Δεσμώτης)*  
 471 BCE (no participation)  
 470 BCE (Sicily) *Πέρσαι, Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης*, (more plays?)  
 469 BCE (Anthesteria) *Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης, Προμηθεὺς Ανόμενος,*  
*Προμηθεὺς Πυρφόρος, Προμηθεὺς Πυρκαεὺς.*

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.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bates, W. N. (1934), "The ΚΩΦΟΙ of Sophocles", *AJPh* 55, 167–174.  
 Beekes, R. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, I–II, Leiden/Boston.  
 Bothe, F. H. (ed.) (1844), *Aeschyli dramatum fragmenta*, Leipzig.  
 Brommer, F. (1959), *Satyrspiele: Bilder griechischer Vasen*, 2nd ed., Berlin.  
 Butler, S. (ed.) (1809), *Aeschyli tragoediae quae supersunt, deperditarum fragmenta et scholia graeca ex editione Thomae Stanleii ...*, vol. I, Cambridge.  
 Calame, C. (2010), "Aetiological Performance and Consecration in the Sanctuary of Dionysos", Taplin/Wyles 2010, 65–78.  
 Casaubon, I. (1605), *De satyrica Graecorum poesi & Romanorum satira libri duo*, Paris.  
 Chantraine, P. (1933), *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris.  
 Chantraine, P. (1968–1980), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris.

- Cipolla, P. B. (2015), "Il Prometeo satiresco di Eschilo: *Pyrkaeus* o *Pyrphoros*?", *Aevum antiquum* n.s. 12-13, 83-112.
- Conomis, N. C. (1964), "The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama", *Hermes* 92, 23-50.
- CPG = Leutsch, E. L. von/Schneidewin, F. G. (eds.) (1839-51), *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, I-II, Göttingen (repr. Hildesheim 1965).
- CPG Suppl. = *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum, Supplementum*, Hildesheim 1961.
- Crusius, O. (1893), "Sphinx und Silen", *Festschrift für Johannes Overbeck. Aufsätze seiner Schüler zur Feier seines 40 jährigen professoren-jubiläums Dargebracht*, Leipzig, 102-108.
- DGE = Adrados, F. R. (ed.) (1980-), *Diccionario griego-español*, Madrid.
- Di Cesare, R. (2011), "Il Santuario di Dionysos en Linnais", *Greco* 2011, 423-424.
- Dickey, E. (2014), "A Catalogue of Works Attributed to the Grammmarian Herodian", *CPh* 109, 325-345.
- Dimitrijević, M. R. (1899), *Studia Hesiodica*, Leipzig.
- Eckhart, L. (1957), "Prometheus", *RE* XXIII.1, 653-730.
- FGrHist = Jacoby, F. (ed.) (1923-58), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin/Leiden.
- Flintoff, E. (1986), "The Date of the Prometheus Bound", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, 39, 82-91.
- Fraenkel, E. (1942), "Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems (Aisch. *Diktyulkoi, Isthmiastai, Prometheus*)", *PBA* 28, 237-258.
- Fraenkel, E. (ed.) (1950), *Aeschylus: Agamemnon, Edited with a Commentary*, I-III, corrected repr. 1962, Oxford.
- Frisk, H. (1960-1972), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Gantz, T. (1980), "The Aeschylean Tetralogy: Attested and Conjectured Groups", *AJPh* 101, 133-164 = Lloyd (2007) 40-70.
- Gargiulo, T. (1979), "Il 'Prometeo' eschileo di Ossirinco: P. Oxy 2245", *BollClass* n.s. 27, 79-103.
- Garvie, A. F. (1969), *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogly*, Cambridge.
- GG 3 = *Grammatici Graeci*, Pars 3: A. Lentz, *Herodiani Technici reliquiae*, I-II, Leipzig, 1867-70.
- Greco, E. (ed.) (2011), *Topografia di Atene: Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.*, vol. 2: *Colline sud-occidentali - Valle dell'Ilisso*, *SATAA* 1, Athens/Paestum.
- Grenfell, B. P./Hunt, A. S. (eds.) (1908), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part VI, London.
- Hamilton, R. (1992), *Choes and Anthesteria*, Ann Arbor.
- Heath, B. (1762), *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, Oxford.
- Hermann, G. (1825), "Review of F. G. Welcker, *Die aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken über die Trilogie des Aeschylus überhaupt*, 1824", *Leipziger Literatur-Zeitung* 1925, 1-21.
- Hermann, G. (1827-77), *Opuscula*, I-VIII, Leipzig.

- Hermann, G. (1847), “Coniectanea critica”, *Philologus* 2, 131–135 = Hermann (1827–77), VIII 309–314.
- Hermann, G. (ed.) (1852), *Aeschyli Tragoediae*, Lipsiae et Berolini.
- Hollis, A. (ed.) (2009), *Callimachus: Hecale*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Hunger, H. (1967), “Palimpsest–Fragmentum aus Herodians *Καθολικὴ προσοφδία*, Buch 5–7”, *ἸÖBG* 16, 1–33.
- IC = Guarducci, M. (ed.) (1935–50), *Inscriptiones Creticae*, I–IV, Rome.
- IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 1877–, Berlin.
- Kapp, I. (ed.) (1915), *Callimachi Hecalae Fragmenta*, Berlin.
- Kassel, R. (1973), “Kritische und exegetische Kleinigkeiten IV”, *RhM* 116, 97–112.
- Kokkaliou, A. (1996 [2001]), “Οδός Φαλήρου (σκάμμα αποχέτευσης)”, *AD* 51.B1, 49–50.
- Kühner/Gerth = Kühner, R./Gerth, B. (1898–1904), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Part II revised by B. Gerth: *Satzlehre*, I–II, 3rd ed., Hannover/Leipzig.
- Lasagni, C. (2018), “‘For anyone who wishes to read up close...’. A few thoughts revolving around the formula *σκοπεῖν τῶι βουλομένῳ* in Attic inscriptions”, *RFIC* 146, 334–380.
- Lee, G. M. (1997), “An Aeschylean fragment”, *StudClas* 17, 145.
- Lefkowitz, M. (1981), *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, Baltimore.
- LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, I–VIII, Zurich, 1981–1999.
- Lloyd, M. (ed.) (2007), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Aeschylus*, Oxford.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1957), “Appendix”, Smyth, H. W. (ed.), *Aeschylus*, vol. II, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA/London, 526–603.
- Lobeck, C. A. (1829), *Aglaophamus sive de theologia mystica Graecorum causis libri tres*, I–II, Königsberg.
- Lobeck, C. A. (1843), *Pathologiae sermonis graeci prolegomena*, Lipsiae.
- Lobel, E. (ed.) (1952), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XX, London.
- LSJ = Liddell, H. G./Scott, R./Jones, H. S. (1996), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. with a revised supplement, Oxford.
- Marchiandi, D./Savelli, S. (2011), “Il Santuario degli *Horoi* di Ieof. Syngrou: lo *hieron* di Kodros, Neleus e Basile?”, *Greco* (2011) 421–423.
- Mette, H. J. (ed.) (1959), *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*, Berlin.
- Mette, H. J. (1963), *Der verlorene Aischylos*, Berlin.
- Neer, R. T./Kurke, L. (2014), “Pindar Fr. 75 SM and the Politics of Athenian Space”, *GRBS* 54, 527–579.
- Niafas, K. (2000), “Athenaeus and the Cult of Dionysus Orthos”, Braund, D./Wilkins, J. (eds.), *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter, 466–475.
- Papastamati-von Moock, Chr. (2020), “‘Το θέατρο των μεγάλων τραγικών’: Αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα και λειτουργικά ζητήματα”, *Logeion* 10, 1–124.
- Pearson, A. C. (ed.) (1917), *The Fragments of Sophocles*, I–III, Cambridge.
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949), *Callimachus*, vol. I: *Fragmenta*, Oxford.



- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1968), *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd ed. revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford.
- PMG = Page, D. L. (ed.) (1962), *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford.
- Robertson, N. (1993). "Athens' Festival of the New Wine", *HSCP* 95, 197–250.
- Schnurr, Ch. (1995), "Zur Topographie der Theaterstätten und der Tripodenstraße in Athen", *ZPE* 105, 139–153.
- Schoemann, G. F. (1857), *Opuscula academica*, vol. 2: *Mythologica et Hesiodica*, Berlin.
- Schütz, C. G. (1782), *In Aeschylī tragoedias quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta commentaries*, vol. I: *In Prometheus Vincitum et Septem adversus Thebas*, Halle.
- Schwyzler GG I = Schwyzler, Ed. (1939), *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1: *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, Munich.
- Schwyzler GG II = Schwyzler, Ed. (1950), *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, Munich.
- SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden, 1923–.
- Shorey, P. (1909), "Aeschylus Fr. 207 and the Satyr Chorus", *CPh* 4, 433–436.
- Silk, M. S. (1983), "LSJ and the Problem of Poetic Archaism: From Meanings to Iconyms", *CQ* n.s. 33, 303–330.
- Simon, E. (1981), *Das Satyrspiel Sphinx des Aischylos*, Heidelberg.
- Simon, E. (1982), "Satyr Plays on Vases in the Time of Aeschylus", Kurtz, D. C./Sparkes, B. A. (eds.), *The Eye of Greece: Studies in the Art of Athens*, Cambridge, 123–48.
- Slater, N. W. (1986), "The Lenaean Theater", *ZPE* 66, 255–264.
- Slenders, W. L. G. M. (2007), *Τραγωδία παίζουσα*, Dissertatio Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Snell, B. (1953), "Review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part 20. Edited with notes by E. Lobel, E. P. Wegener, C. H. Roberts", *Gnomon* 25, 433–440.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (ed.) (1989), *Aeschylus: Eumenides*, Cambridge.
- Terzaghi, N. (1954), "Il Prometeo di Oxyrhynchos", *RFIC* n.s. 32, 337–352.
- Travlos, J. (1971), *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London.
- TrGF = *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. I: Snell, B. (ed.) (1986), *Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum*, revised by R. Kannicht; vol. II: Kannicht, R./ Snell, B. (eds.) (2007), *Fragmenta Adespota*; vol. III: Radt, S. (ed.) (2009), *Aeschylus*; vol. IV: Radt, S. (ed.) (1999), *Sophocles*; vol. V.1–2: Kannicht, R. (ed.) (2004), *Euripides*, Göttingen.
- Tsantsanoglou, K. (2015), "ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ – ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑ: From Private Feast to Public Festival", *Logeion* 5, 1–40.
- Tsantsanoglou, K. (2020), "Prometheus Bound and Sophocles' Inachos: New Perspectives", *Trends in Classics* 12, 267–296.
- Walbank, M.B. (1983), "Leases of Sacred Properties I", *Hesperia* 52, 100–135.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1967), *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play*, BICS Suppl. 20, 2nd ed., London.
- Welcker, F. G. (1824), *Die aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken über die Trilogie des Aeschylus überhaupt*, Darmstadt.

- Wenkebach, E. (1931), “*ΠΕΜΦΙΞ*. Glossographische Verszitate in neuer Gestalt”, *Philologus* 86, 300–331.
- West, M. L. (1979), “The Prometheus Trilogy”, *JHS* 99, 130–148.
- West, M. L. (1982), *Greek Metre*, Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1990), *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart.
- West, M. L. (ed.) (1998), *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheus*, 2nd corrected ed., Stuttgart/Leipzig.
- Westphal, R. (1869), *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien*, Leipzig.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1886), “Die Bühne des Aischylos”, *Hermes* 21, 597–622 = Wilamowitz (1935) 148–172.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1912), “Die Spürhunde des Sophokles”, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 29, 449–476 = Wilamowitz (1935) 347–383.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (ed.) (1914a), *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1914b), *Aischylos: Interpretationen*, Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1935), *Kleine Schriften*, vol. I, ed. P. Maas, Berlin.
- Zuntz, G. (1981), “Notes on Some Passages in Aeschylus’ *Septem*”, *PCPhS* n.s. 27, 81–95.
- Zuntz, G. (1983a), “Textkritische Anmerkungen zu Aischylos’ *Hepta*”, *Hermes* 111, 259–281.
- Zuntz, G. (1983b), “*Αἰσχύλου Προμηθεύς*”, *Hermes* 111, 498–499.
- Zuntz, G. (1993), “Aeschyli Prometheus”, *HSCP* 95, 107–111.

ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI

kyrtsan@gmail.com