

149): ψηφιοῦμαι . . . οὐδὲ τῶν χρεῶν τῶν ἰδίων¹⁹) ἀποκοπὰς οὐδὲ γῆς ἀναδασμὸν τῆς Ἀθηναίων οὐδ' οἰκιῶν.

Ähnlich steht es im Eid von Itanos auf Kreta: οὐδὲ γὰς ἀναδασμὸν οὐδὲ οἰκιῶν οὐδὲ οἰκοπέδων οὐδὲ χρεῶν ἀποκοπήν ποιήσω (bei Dittenberger Syll.³ 526). Solche amtlichen Versprechungen waren psychologisch wohl begründet. Die Eidesformeln bedeuten einerseits ein beruhigendes Versprechen für die Besitzenden, andererseits eine Warnung an extreme Bodenreformer und radikalsoziale Politiker, wie sie anscheinend vielerorts als Wortführer einer antikapitalistischen Zeitströmung aufgetreten sind.

Erlangen

Max Mühl

A FRAGMENT OF AESCHYLUS' AIGYPTIOI?

Oxyrhynchus Papyri XX, 2251

.	
] χειρ . [χειρ . [
]ιδεγαρωζ [. .]ξε[. . .]ν [.] . [ιδε γὰρ ὦ Ζ [εὔ] ξέ [νιε]ν [.] . [
]ονξενοδοκονκατας . [τ]ὸν ξενოდόκον κατασκ [
]στινχαρισ . νθ [. .] . σ [έ]στιν χάρις ἐν θ [εο] ισ
] . [.]σιτοισδικαιοις [] . [.]σι τοῖς δικαίοις.
τοιγαρχ [. .] πρισσομ[τοιγάρ κ [. .] πρισσομ[
κομασ[.]φειδειχε . [κόμας [ἀ] φειδεῖ χε . [
τοδ' ανα [.]λονβρεγμαπ[. .] . [τόδ' ἀνα [υ]λον βρέγμαπ [. .]
δυρομ [. .]ασονποτμονγο [δυρομ[έν] α σὸν πότμον γ
ο]τοδεγα[. . .]εινπαρωσ[[οις κτλ.
]πρ[. . .]ρμουλιμ[
]ε . [. . .]ει [
]τ . [. . .]μαι [
] [. . .] [
.	

Note Line 3: x (Or perhaps β neither normal), Lobel. Line 8, left hand column: γ is added above the line.

19) Deutlich vernehmen wir hier den Nachklang der von Aristoteles (Ἀθην. πολιτ. c. 6) übermittelten Version.

The fragment belongs to a group classified by Lobel (P. Oxy. XX. p. I.) provisionally as Aeschylean, as being in the same hand as another group of identifiable Aeschylean fragments. While there is nothing in the fragment that amounts to positive evidence of Aeschylean authorship, the style and subject matter are entirely consistent with it. Zeus ξένιος, found in Aesch. *Suppl.* 627., 671; *Ag.* 61., 362, 748, does not as far as I have been able to discover through indexes occur in the other tragedians except for Eur. *Cycl.* 354.

The first intelligible couplet, *ll.* 2-3, calls upon Zeus, the god of hospitality, to look upon a man of hospitality. The next couplet contains some reference to the favour shown by the gods towards the just. Then follow four lines of wild lamentation, almost certainly a dirge, sung by a female chorus or soloist. (cf. *δυρομένα* 1. 9.) These four lines are linked to the preceding passage by *τοιγάρ* which seems always to carry with it a strong causal force, (see Denniston *Greek Particles*, p. 565, "*τοιγάρ* bears a strong logical force 'therefore', 'in consequence', even 'that is why', never sinking to the rank of a mere progressive particle").

In order to make this connexion, it seems that the missing part of *ll.* 2-3 should contain some words indicating that the ξενόδοχος is dead.

The metre here is probably iambic¹).

υ υ	υ	—		—	υ υ υ	—	
ἰδὲ	γάρ	ὦ	Ζευ	ξενίε	ν		
—	υ υ υ	—		υ	—	υ	—
τον	ξενόδοκον	κατασχ,					

with the equivalent of a third iambic metron in each line, which seems necessary for the sense. The second metron in *ll.* 3. must be a full iambic. (See A. M. Dale, *Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 72-73.)

I have not been able to think of a supplement to *κατασχ* that seems to me likely. *κατασ<φ>[αγεντ'* would give a satisfactory sense. This is only possible on the assumption of corruption (*φ* cannot have been intended in the papyrus), per-

1) The difficulty of making 1. 3. dochmiac makes dochmiacs in the preceding line unlikely. Pure cretics are less likely because in that case there is a 4th paeon followed immediately by 1st paeon, which is improbable in cretic rhythm in tragedy.

haps to κατασκαφέντ²). The reverse corruption is seen Aesch. *Septem* 46 (see apparatus criticus in Wilamowitz *Aischylos*, Editio Maior), Soph. *Ant.* 920. For similar metatheseis of syllables in literary papyri of the second century A. D. cf. *P. Oxy* Vol. XVIII. 2167 Callimachus *Aition* α Fr. 2. Col. 1. 1. 10. p. 48., where (ε)νιψησασθ[(restored to ἐνιψήσασθε from scholiast on Pind. *Nem.* 4. 10.) is written above (ε)νισκηφα[; and in the Ichneutae *P. Oxy.* Vol. IX. 1174 Col. XII 1. 6 p. 54 the marginal τροχοιδη[for χυτρόιδης.

Any further supplement to these two lines can only be 'exempli gratia'. νῦν κείμενον in f. 2 and ἀναξίως in f. 3. (both suggested to me by Professor Webster) would supply the general sense needed.

ἰδέ γάρ ὦ Ζ[εῦ] ξέ[νι] ν[ῦν] κείμενον
τ]ὸν ξενοδόκον κατασ[φ]α[γέντ] ἀναξίως

If my assumption that the ξενοδόκος is dead is right the general sense required in f. 4-5 is not as Lobel suggests „Look Zeus upon the hospitality of so and so, or else the gods have no feeling that virtue ought to be rewarded“, but rather „The gods have no feeling that virtue ought to be rewarded“, or „How can the gods have any feeling that virtue ought to be rewarded?“.

Professor Webster suggested to me πῶ with Lobel's (rejected) ἀνδράσι³). Both supplements seem possible from the facsimile and it looks as if it might be possible to interpret the marks in f. 5. as ἀ]νδ[ρά]σι.

πῶ]στιν χάρις ἐν θ[εο]ῖς
ἀ]νδ[ρά]σι τοῖς δικαίοις;

This gives exactly the sense required. πῶ is often used by the tragedians in lines where strong indignation is joined with

2) κατασκαφέντ' itself or κατασκαφή etc. seem to me very unlikely. In the sense of 'utter destruction' they are not found applied to persons; while in the sense of 'deep burial' (supported only by two passages in the disputed end of the *Septem*, see L & S under κατασκαφή) κατασκαφέντ would seem to me clearly wrong after ἰδέ, while any phrase with the noun would be a weak anti-climax.

3) Lobel seems to reject ἀνδράσι on the ground that his whole conjecture εἰ τις ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.

ἀνδράσι κ.τ.λ.

is too long. From the photograph it does not seem that ἀνδράσι itself (or ποδ') need project further than ἰδέ 1. 2, or that the scrap of papyrus below τ]ὸν is deep enough to justify the assumption of an inset.

a feeling that no other than a negative answer is possible; e. g. *Eum.* 427

πῶς γὰρ τοσούτο κέντρον ὥς μητροκτονεῖν;

Soph. *O. T.* 390

εἰπέ πῶς σὺ μάντις εἶ σαφής;

cf. also its use in lines calling into question the moral or religious order of the world: *Cho.* 900; Soph. *El.* 823; Eur. *Hec.* 715.

With this conjecture the iambic metre of ll. 2-3 is followed by two lines in choriambic rhythm, (Telesilleian followed by Aristophanean, a combination found *Aesch. Cho.* 319-20).

1. 6. κ . . . πρισσομ.

Lobel suggests καταπρίσσομαι or its participle. This is a not unlikely formation, though if connected with πρίω or πρίζω as seems probable from the sense, it is, on the analogy of Homeric forms, e. g. ἐφοπλίσσουσι *Od.* VI. 69 (Monro, *H. Gr.*, p. 57-8), likely to be future, in which case the participle is less probable. No certain middle form is found of πρίω or πρίζω, but in the context it would be very appropriate. The sense could be 'tear' or 'clutch' or perhaps both. πρίω and πρίζω are closely connected with ἀπρίξ (see Boisacq, *Dict. Etym.* 3, 1950, p. 72 ff.), and both meanings are found with πρίω (see L. & S.).

If this formation and meaning is accepted

τοιγὰρ καταπρίσσομαι
κόμας ἀφειδεῖ χεῖρ

may be the right reading, though metrically a choriambic in the second metron of either line is possible, or longer supplements to the extent of another iambic metron or its equivalent. *l.* 8. is puzzling metrically. Either an iono-anacreontic or an anapaestic colon is an unlikely intrusion in this context. An extra syllable at the beginning of *l.* 8. is desirable. A short syllable would give an iambic rhythm (with a resolved cretic in the first metron) while a long would produce an iambo-choriambic line as in *l.* 9.

φῆν would be satisfactory stylistically. For Aeschylus' use of it in the middle of a sentence in lyric metres see *Ag.* 1143, *Eum.* 781 = 811, 837 = 870; and for its use at the beginning of a lyric line *Ag.* 1448. For its use (after another φῆν) at the head of a choriambic in aeolo-choriambic rhythm see *Ag.* 1483.

The disappearance of a word irrelevant to the sense seems comparatively easy. In the state of the papyrus mistaken transference to the end of 1.7. is a possible explanation, as well as accidental omission. In either case the mistake once made would be likely to remain undetected except by a metrical expert.

The present scribe is liable to metrical errors even in iambic trimeters. See Aesch. *Dictyulci*, Vitelli-Norsa, *Bull. soc. roy. d'arch. d'Alex.*, No 28. 1933, p. 115, = Page, *Greek Lit. Pap.* I. No. 2, 1. 8., where ξα which is clearly 'extra metrum' is written in the line.

I cannot agree with Lobel that „the metaphor in ἀναυλον βρέγμα is not appreciably odder than that in ψάλλ' ἔθειραν *Persae* 1062.” ‘Use your hair as harp-strings’ is bizarre but perfectly intelligible, as it is not difficult to see a resemblance between hair and harp-strings: but a fluteless or unmusical crown of the head seems to me pointless. I think it more likely that βρεγμαπ is the beginning of a compound (βρεγμός and απ . . .), though I know of no closer parallel than σιτα-πouxia Hesychius. βρεγμαπαχές or βρεγμάπῳδον which should be capable of meaning ‘sounding from the head’ would fit the sense. ἀναυλον would go most naturally with μέλος or some equivalent. If reconstruction on these lines were possible, κατα-πρίσσομαι would govern μέλος or its equivalent as an internal accusative. βρεγμαπαχές μέλος would describe the sound made by the hair-pulling, probably blended with a rhythmical beating as in *Cho* 423—8, as ‘unmusical music resounding from the crown of the head’. (For the generalised meaning of ἀναυλον see Pearson’s note to Soph. *Fragm.* 699). Compare ψάλλ' ἔθειραν *Pers.* 1062, where the metaphor probably includes a macabre comparison of the sound of hair-pulling to music.

τοιγὰρ κ[ατα]πρίσσομ[αι]
 κόμας [ἀ]φειδῇ χε[ρὶ]
 <φέν> τόδ' ἀνα[υ]λον βρέγμαπ[α]χές μέλος
 δυρομ[έν]α σὸν πότμον γό[οι]σι

Paragraphus under f. 13. The space where a paragraphus would have shown under f. 1 is missing, so we have either a twelve line strophe, (χείρ. f. 1 is inset and cannot coincide with τ in f. 13), or a longer strophe or antistrophe. ff. 2-13 fall into three phrases of four lines each, with a distinct sense break between them. (Either δὲ or γὰρ is inevitable in f. 10.)

In the first transition at 1.6. there is an abrupt change of mood and address as well. The text is too uncertain to tell whether this phrasing is emphasised by any metrical shape, but it seems likely. If γόοισι is the right reading in 1.9, (this seems to me much more likely stylistically than a further iambic word after γόοις) both sense breaks are marked by catalexis. If ἀνδράσι is also the right reading in 1.5. both 11.5. and 9. give clausular rhythms common in Aeschylus and elsewhere.

The context of the fragment is fairly certainly a scene where the death of a ξενόδοχος conspicuous for his righteousness has just been announced. The corpse may well be present on the stage.

Such a scene could have occurred in the second play of the *Supplices* trilogy, which has been identified with reasonable probability as the *Aigyptioi* of the Catalogus⁴). The brief accounts of the Danaus legend in other authors⁵) give no clue to the fate of king Pelasgus in Aeschylus' play. There were obviously widely different versions of the story (Schol. Euripides *Orestes* 872 shows that there were important differences before Aeschylus); and, apart from *P.V.* 853 ff., which, though consistent with the *Supplices*' version, throws no light on the king or on the circumstances in which the marriage came to be made, every account differs from the *Supplices* in some important respect⁶).

No authority other than Aeschylus speaks of an appeal by Danaus to the Argive king and people for protection and most accounts make no mention of the former king. Apollodorus briefly mentions an Argive king Gelanor who surrendered his kingdom to Danaus; in Pausanias II 19.3 this is the outcome of a lawsuit in which Danaus claimed the throne

4) The basis of the identification is the ascription of a rather garbled quotation from the *Supplices* to the *Aigyptioi* in Etym. Gud. P. 227,41. See Nauck, *Aeschylus* 5, and compare with this Nauck, *Aesch.* 46.

5) E. g. Apollodorus II. 1.4 ff. Paus. II 16,1,9; II 19,3,7 ff. scholiast to Eur. *Hecuba* 886, *Orestes* 872, 857. Hyginus *Fab.* 168. Many further references are given in Frazer's edition of *Apollodorus* (Loeb Library) Vol. I pp 137—143. See also Waser's article *Danaides* in Pauly-Wissowa.

6) E. g. Apollodorus II 1.4—5 the marriage was only broached after Danaus had settled in Argos and become king there. Schol. on Eur. *Hecuba* 886 Danaus appears to have been king of Argos all along. It is Aegyptus who is the refugee and who attempts to return when his sons have grown to manhood.

from Gelanor. Pausanias II 16 1. 11. probably implies that there were different traditions as to Danaus' immediate predecessor.

The same passage, however, undoubtedly implies that Danaus' kingship over Argos was universally accepted, and this is born out by the fact that widely conflicting versions agree on this point, and also as far as it goes an isolated scholion Eur. *Orestes* 932, which states that Pelasgus was the second king of Argos, with Inachus first and Danaus third. It thus seems likely that Aeschylus introduced Danaus' succession to the throne somewhere in the trilogy. It would seem easier for him to stage a successful murder if he were already king at the time of the marriage, as he is in all the accounts that mention his kingship.

The death of Pelasgus in battle is one of the suggestions put forward in attempts to reconstruct the plot of the *Aegyptioi* and explain how the Danaids were induced to make the marriage (see Tucker *Aeschylus' Supplices* p. XXV, where other conjectures are briefly discussed). This seems to me at least as probable as the other suggestions put forward. I find it the simplest and the most tragic. In the *Supplices* the first scene between Pelasgus and the chorus would gain greatly in tragic force, if the audience realised that the king in deciding to help suppliants was at the same time choosing his own death. The sudden death of the king in time of war would also provide a natural motive for the election of Danaus to the throne by the leaderless Argive people.

This reconstruction may also be said to have some support from Hyginus' short summary, *Fab.* 168. This cannot be a summary of the trilogy since he gives as the reason for Danaus' aversion to the match his discovery of a plot to murder himself and the maidens instead of his abomination of kindred marriage, a motif found only in Aeschylus: but he may be following substantially the same version of the legend, as he is the only authority who agrees with Aeschylus in making the projected marriage the motive and not the sequel to Danaus' flight and also in making the pursuit of the Aegyptii follow immediately on their discovery of the flight. His brief statement that the Aegyptii „*postquam Argos venerunt, oppugnare patrum coeperunt. Danaus ut vidit se iis obsistere non posse, pollicetur eis filias suas uxores, ut pugna absisterent*“ — seems to imply that some fighting adverse to Danaus had

already taken place before he was induced to give his consent to the match.

However, the suggestion that Pelasgus negotiated a settlement is also possible (see *Supplices* § 940). Wilamowitz, *Aischylos Interpretationen* p. 20-22, tentatively favours some such solution. He is unwilling to accept the idea of battle (and presumably the defeat of the Argives) on the ground that this would make a chorus of Egyptians in the second play difficult. On this question of the chorus see *infra*.

The identification of this fragment with only a conjectural reconstruction of the play to support it must obviously be extremely tentative. Its only claim to probability is the difficulty of finding alternatives. Virtuous ξενόδοκοι who come to a bad though undeserved end are not common among the themes of Greek tragedy, and the Aeschylean catalogus does not suggest any obvious alternatives⁷). It thus seems worth while to examine the implications of the identification.

1. The designation of Pelasgus as ξενόδοκος would make it probable that the Danaids accept his offer of hospitality in preference to that of the Demos so that he became ξενόδοκος in the literal sense.

2. The Aegyptii are quite likely not the main chorus of the play. The Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας should suffice to show that, as far as the title goes, they need not necessarily appear on the stage at all. The speakers of the fragment could be either a chorus of Argive women or the Danaids. The latter are somewhat more probable as they would be more likely to think of Pelasgus primarily as a ξενόδοκος. Their readiness to call in question the justice of Zeus would be in character (cf. *Suppl.* 169 καὶ τότε οὐ δίκαιοις

Ζεὺς ἐνέξεται λόγοις κ.τ.λ.),

and their moral perplexity would be a natural sequel to their rather naive belief (expressed *Suppl.* 403-6) that with Zeus as overseer the righteous have nothing to fear. Whatever the exact interpretation of νέμων — ἀδίκᾳ — ὄσια there may be, this belief is certainly implied in the whole paragraph and in their refusal to recognise the king's dilemma.

⁷) There are however a few plays in it of which virtually nothing is known, besides a tradition (*Suidas*, 90, *Vita Aeschyli*, 70+10) supported to some extent by the ascription to Aeschylus of several plays outside the Catalogus, that he wrote more than 72 plays.

If the speakers are Argive women who appear to sing a dirge over the dead king and then disappear, the main chorus could be Aegyptians perhaps singing a triumph song against them. If they are the Danaids, this is less probable, as in that case two important choruses would probably be present during a large part of the play (the lament for the king would presumably take place before the main business of the play, the marriage contract). There is no parallel for this (though second choruses singing for a short stretch are not uncommon), and it would seem an undue burden on the chorēgos. A spectacular entrance of the Aegyptii towards the end of the play would be very appropriate and has some parallel in the Propompoi of the *Eumenides*.

3. The deeds and fortunes of the Argive people which play such an important part in the *Supplices* must remain an important motif in the second and probably also in the third play of the trilogy. In view of the very strong emphasis laid in the *Supplices* on the sovereign power of the people and their solemn decision to help the maidens it seems to me fairly certain that if the identification is correct the dirge for the king forms part of a general lamentation for all those Argives who have "stained the ground with their blood for the sake of women" (*Suppl.* 477). At this point in the trilogy it must seem that the solemn prayer to Zeus and the other gods (*Suppl.* 625 ff.) calling for blessings on the Argive people as a reward for their kindness towards the suppliants, and especially for exemption from the ravages of the War god, has been in vain.

Aeschylus himself certainly realised that Zeus included the suffering of the innocent in his ordering of the world (e.g. Iphigenia, Amphiaraus), but after the strongly expressed condemnation of Zeus and the gods in general in the present fragment I should expect him to attempt some sort of justification towards the end of the trilogy, by introducing some promise, made in the name of Zeus (the speaker could be Aphrodite or some other god or goddess present at the trial), of blessings to the Argive race, probably combined with great honour to the dead king and those Argives who perished with him⁸).

University College London

M. L. Cunningham

⁸) I am indebted to R. Browning, A. M. Dale, E. G. Turner, and T. B. L. Webster for help and suggestions.