

## BLACK ZEUS IN SOPHOCLES' *INACHOS*

The papyrus fragments that belong almost certainly to Sophocles' *Inachos* (*P. Oxy.* 2369 and *P. Tebt.* 692) have been admirably discussed by Pfeiffer and Carden.<sup>1</sup> But one remarkable feature that has never been explained adequately is the apparent reference to a black Zeus. *P. Oxy.* 2369 contains a fragmentary description of a stranger turning Io into a cow with a touch of his hand and then leaving the palace. This means, as Carden remarks, that Sophocles is following the version of the story in which it was Zeus (and not Hera, as at Aesch. *Su.* 299) who turned Io into a cow, doing so with a touch of his hand. The fragment continues (Radt F 269a 46 ff.):

ΧΟ. ἄφθογγός εἰμι[  
 48 ἐ[. . . .] ᾽ε[  
 . κ . [  
 ὁ ξείνος ουθο . . . [  
 ἄπιστα το . . . . . [  
 ἰώ, Γᾱ, θεῶν [  
 52 ἀξύνετ . . [  
 ὁ πολυφάρμ[ακος  
 κάρβανος αἰθός ᾽ . . [  
 ὁ μὲν ε . [  
 56 ὁ δ' αἰολωπόν α . . [  
 . . . . . ]

The rare word αἰθός is translated 'burnt black, sooty' by Lobel. He compares Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 246, and Pfeiffer adds Schol. Callim. *Hymn* 3.69 αἰθῇ · τῇ κεκαυμένη, τῇ μελαίνῃ and Hesychius s.v. αἰθαί · μέλαινα. To whom does κάρβανος αἰθός refer? Lloyd-Jones (*CR* N.S. 10 (1960), 26) argued that ὁ δ' at the beginning of the narration of the metamorphosis (F 269a 32 Radt ὁ δ' ἄμφι χεῖρα παρθέν[ω]) may indicate a change of subject rather than, as Pfeiffer argued, exemplifying the kind of δέ that occurs at the beginning of a narration (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 171). This possibility, together with ὁ μὲν and ὁ δ' in verses 55 and 56, suggests that there may have been *two* strangers in the palace. If so, he goes on to suggest, then perhaps the 'sooty barbarian' is Hermes, and he compares Callimachus, *Hymns* 3.55 f., where Hermes scares naughty children by blackening his face with soot.

But it is difficult to find a motive for Hermes blackening himself here, even as a disguise. Furthermore, it was Zeus who turned Io into a cow with a touch of his hand (Apollodorus II. 1.3; = Hesiod fr. 124 M-W). And so the reference of ὁ δ' in the words ὁ δ' ἄμφι χεῖρα παρθέν[ω] must be, as Carden points out, to Zeus and not to Hermes. But if so, then the reference of ὁ ξείνος immediately after the description of the metamorphosis (45) is surely to Zeus. And this in turn makes it very likely that Zeus is referred to by ὁ ξείνος again (49), by ὁ πολυφάρμ[ακος (53, surely the agent of the transformation), and by κάρβανος αἰθός (54). ὁ δ'

<sup>1</sup> R. Pfeiffer in *Sitz.Bay.Ak.Wiss.* 1938 (pp. 23-62) and 1958 (pp. 3-41); R. J. Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles*

(de Gruyter, 1974): further bibliography is in Carden.

αἰολωπὸν (56) remains a mystery: the most obvious candidate for αἰολωπὸν is Argos, who is however not quite in place at this point in the story. But the point to be established here is that Lobel, Pfeiffer, and Carden are right in taking κάρβανος αἰθὺς to refer to Zeus.

Carden, observing that the Egyptians in Aeschylus' *Suppliants* are black (154, 719, 745), κάρβανος (914) and speak κάρβανα (118), 130), concludes (p. 70)

If, as it seems, the κάρβανος αἰθὺς is to be identified with the stranger, and thus with Zeus, Sophocles in making Zeus black was presumably thinking of the later stages of the story (cf. Aesch. *P. V.* 851) where Io bears κελαῖνὸν Ἐπαφόν in Egypt, after having been touched again by Zeus, or rather he was following the version known to us only<sup>2</sup> from Apollod. (*II* 1.3), in which Zeus begets Epaphus and changes Io into a cow at one and the same visit.

Did the black Zeus actually appear on stage, or was his visit simply related? Carden is inclined to think that he did appear, and adds 'A black Zeus would be startling in a tragedy — this must be a pointer to some sort of satyr-play.'

In all this I agree with Carden. But the argument must be taken further. Surely a black Zeus, whether he appeared on stage or not, would be startling enough even in a satyr-play. Lobel suggested that the blackness was a disguise. But what would be the advantage of blackness? Furthermore, the immediate surprise of the audience would hardly be abated by the subsequent reflection that the father of κελαῖνός Ἐπαφος must after all have been black. Or would it? Only I think if he was the 'other Zeus', the Ζεὺς ἄλλος to whom Danaos refers on his arrival in Argos from Egypt (Aesch. *Su.* 231), Zeus lord of the dead, of whom his daughters the Danaids have already made mention (154 ff.):

εἰ δὲ μή, μελανθές  
 ἡλιόκτυπον γένος  
 τὸν γάων  
 τὸν πολυξενώτατον  
 Ζῆνα τῶν κεκμηκότων  
 ἰξόμεσθα σὺν κλάδοις  
 ἀρτάναις θανούσαι,  
 μή τυχοῦσαι θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων.

Why do the Egyptian Danaids choose for themselves here the particular periphrasis μελανθές ἡλιόκτυπον γένος? Perhaps because black victims were appropriate for the lord of the dead. In an inscription of the late third century B.C. from Myconos black victims are prescribed for Ζεὺς Χθόνιος.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore the appearance of Hades, with whom Plouton and Zeus Χθόνιος were sometimes identified,<sup>4</sup> is, naturally enough, dark (κνάνεος, κυανοχαίτης etc), even 'black': μέλας δ' Ἀΐδης στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις πλουτίζεται (*S. O. T.* 29: πλουτίζεται alludes, as Jebb remarks, to Plouton).

The argument so far rests on a fragmentary papyrus, and the considerations that will now be advanced to support it are themselves mostly derived from fragments. The case must rest on the coherence of the evidence. The fact is that

<sup>2</sup> But cf. Hyginus, *Fab.* 145.

<sup>3</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1024; cf. Nilsson, *Gesch. Griech.* *Relig.* <sup>3</sup> i, 401 f.

<sup>4</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, s.v. *Plouton*, 1001 f.; West ad Hes. *Erg.* 465 ('Ζεὺς

χθόνιος then is not a separate deity but Zeus operating in the earth. This is not to say that a god so departmentalised could not acquire a separate identity').

once we realize that Io's black suitor is Zeus—Hades—Plouton — Ζεὺς εἴτ' Ἄϊδης ὀνομαζόμενος στέργεις<sup>5</sup> — much falls into place:

(1) *P. Tebt.* 692.16 ff.

πολὺ πολυδριῖδας  
ὅτις ὅδε προτέρων  
ὄνομ' εὖ σ' ἐθροῖ  
τὸν Ἀἰδοκυνέας  
σκότον ἄ<β>ροτον ὑπαί.

Lloyd-Jones<sup>6</sup> seems to me right in suggesting that this is the chorus's first (mistaken) guess, that the invisible syrinx-playing visitor is Hades, which they express in a riddling etymology — 'clever the man who gave you the name Ἄϊδης, meaning you were under the cap of darkness, the invisible one'. In fact the invisible visitor is Hermes, who has presumably been sent by Io's suitor to kill her guardian Argos. If this scene occurred after it had been revealed that the mischievous black stranger was none other than Zeus from the world below, then the chorus's mistaken guess (that the invisible intruder is Hades) is just what we would expect.<sup>7</sup> But even if this fact had not been revealed, Hermes' wearing of the Ἄϊδος κυνέη — the first time in any version of the story that he wears it for killing Argos — is best explained by the hypothesis that Sophocles made him borrow it for this errand from his infernal master.

(2) A few lines later on, in v. 41, in the scene in which it appears that the invisible Hermes is playing havoc with the chorus, Carden prefers the reading *τοῦ κατῶ διος φαλαγγί*, and takes *φάλαγξ* to mean *ἀράχνη*, as it does in comedy: 'the line would then be a remark about a hellish monster (by way of comparison?)'. To call Hermes a spider is not too irate an expression for the circumstances (Carden compares Aesch. *Su.* 886–7). But to call him or compare him to a 'spider of the god below' is I think too elaborate, unless of course he has actually been sent by ὁ κατῶ Ζεὺς.

(3) The scholiast on Aristophanes, *Ploutos* 807, compares the passage to Sophocles' *Inachos*, *ὅτε τοῦ Διὸς εἰσελθόντος πάντα μεστὰ ἀγαθῶν ἐγένοντο*<sup>8</sup> (fr. 275 Radt). For Διὸς Blaydes conjectured Πλούτου *aut* Πλούτωνος', comparing fr. 273 Πλούτωνος δ' ἐπέισδος. But emendation is unnecessary once we realize that the suitor of Io is Zeus—Plouton. The ἀγαθά in question are the blessings of fertility associated in particular with the chthonic deity. Πλούτων bestows πλούτον. On Ar. *Ploutos* 727 the scholast wrote τὸν Πλούτον Πλούτωνα εἶπε παῖζων· ἢ ὅτι Πλούτωνα αὐτὸν ὑποκοριστικῶς ἐκάλουν [ἐκάλεσεν Ald.], ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχω

Πλούτωνος δ' ἐπέισδος (fr. 273)

καὶ πάλιν

τοιόνδ' ἐμὸν Πλούτων' ἀμεμφείας χάριν (fr. 283).

<sup>5</sup> E. fr. 904.

<sup>6</sup> *CR* N.S. 15 (1965), 241–3.

<sup>7</sup> Their reference to σκότον ἄ<β>ροτον recalls τὰ σὰ σκοτώσας δμῖ[α]τα in the *P.*

*Oxy.* (v. 30), which presumably refers to the stranger in the palace; cf. the titles Σκοτίας (Paus. 3. 10. 6) and Σκότιος (Plut. *Mor.*

394a) of Zeus-Plouton. And cf. *Ov. Met.* 1. 599: 'cum deus inducta latas caligine terras/ occuluit tenuitque fugam rapuitque pudorem'.

<sup>8</sup> RE; ὅτι πάντα μεστὰ γίνεταί τοῦ Διὸς εἰσελθόντος V.

In what circumstances did the entry of Plouton—Zeus bring agricultural πλούτος to thirsty Argos? Inachos was credited with the κάθαρσις of the Argive plain (after the flood) and the creation of the river named after him.<sup>9</sup> My guess is that towards the end of the play, in order to reconcile Inachos to the strange loss of his daughter, Zeus—Plouton bestowed on the Argolid the fertility created by its most important river.<sup>10</sup> If so, then perhaps ἀμεμφεία in fr. 283 has an *active* sense,<sup>11</sup> referring to the acquiescence of the king. Inachos, who presumably appeared on stage,<sup>12</sup> is in three fragments (270, 271, 284) described as a river. This suggests the possibility that the god's bestowal of wealth entailed the metamorphosis of Inachos into a river.<sup>13</sup> In fr. 284

πατήρ δὲ ποταμός Ἰναχος  
τὸν ἀντίπλαστον νομόν ἔχει κεκμηγότων

we may read νόμον ('a customary tribute like that paid to the dead': cf. A. *Cho.* 6) or νομόν ('a realm like that of the dead': cf. the river's subterranean passage described in fr. 271); in either case I suspect that this is part of the gift bestowed on Inachos by Zeus—Plouton.

It should perhaps be added *en passant* that if the fertility of Argos was connected in this way with the union of the god with Io, and given that a typical function of the sacred marriage was to promote fertility,<sup>14</sup> then perhaps in a previous form of the myth the connection was more immediate — an immediacy that may be dimly reflected in Severus' words<sup>15</sup> τιμῶσα ἡ γῆ τὴν Διὸς ἐρωμένην ἄνθος ἀνῆκε τῇ βοί νέμεσθαι.

(4) The story that Io ended her wanderings in Egypt almost certainly derived from her resemblance to the bovine Isis.<sup>16</sup> And we have seen that in making Zeus black Sophocles was probably thinking of the birth of black Epaphos to Io and Zeus in Egypt. Now the consort of Isis was Osiris, king of the dead. Osiris was closely associated with Apis, who might be the child of Isis, and whom Herodotus associated with Epaphos.<sup>17</sup> From Osiris—Apis was formed Serapis, who retained from Osiris his lordship of the underworld and was equated at least as early as the fourth century B.C. with Plouton.<sup>18</sup> The possibility that already in the fifth century the Greeks saw in the Egyptian lord of the dead their own Plouton is not

<sup>9</sup> Schol. ad E. *Or.* 932.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the theory that the Thesmophoria (essentially an act of agrarian magic) was instituted at the end of Aesch. *Suppl.* trilogy to reconcile women to marriage (G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens*, ch. 16). An act of creation (e.g. of wine or the lyre) to benefit mankind was a common theme of satyr-play. In A. *Amymon* the creation was of a stream: see below, p. 28.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. μεμπτός at S. *Trach.* 446 (also ἀμεμπτος in Xen. *Cyr.* 14. 5. 52, 8. 4. 28; and ἀμεμφής in Plut. *Mor.* 610e, *Aemil.* 3).

<sup>12</sup> See Carden, op. cit., p. 53.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Ps. Plut. *De Fluv.* 18.

<sup>14</sup> A. Klinz, *ΙΕΡΟΣ ΓΑΜΟΣ* (Diss. Halle, 1933) and in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, Suppl. vi. 110 f.; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*<sup>3</sup> ii, chs. 10–12; West ad Hes. *Theog.* 971; Paus. 5. 16. 6. Zeus and Io as sacred marriage: Thomson,

*Aeschylus and Athens*, ch. 8.

<sup>15</sup> Waltz, *Rhet. Graec.* i. 537.

<sup>16</sup> J. Gwyn Griffiths, comm. Plut. *De Is. et Os.*, p. 443; G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens*,<sup>4</sup> 136, 285; id., *The Prehistoric Aegean*, pp. 284, 380 ff.; Roscher, *Myth. Lex.*, s.v. *Io*, p. 272; Hdt. 2. 41. For early-fifth-century Greek (notably Athenian) knowledge of Isis see R. E. Witt, 'Isis-Hellas', *PCPhS* 192 (1966), 59.

<sup>17</sup> J. Bergman, *Ich Bin Isis* (1968), p. 251; Hdt. 2. 153.

<sup>18</sup> Archemachos and Heracleides Ponticus ap. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 361e (cf. also the equation of Osiris with Plouton at 382e). For the blackness of Osiris 'as a chthonic colour' see J. Gwyn Griffiths, op. cit., pp. 375 ff., H. Kees, *Farbensymbolik in ägyptischen religiösen Texten*, pp. 418 ff.

of course precluded by Herodotus' report that the Egyptians identified Osiris with Dionysos. For even after the publication of Herodotus' work inexactitude of correspondence<sup>19</sup> would preclude a set series of one-to-one relationships between Greek gods and Egyptian.<sup>20</sup> It is therefore perhaps not too fanciful to suggest that in the *Inachos* Sophocles had in mind the Egyptian Plouton, Osiris. And that is why Plouton is called not merely *αἰθός* but *κάρβανος*. As a further element common to Plouton and Osiris, and in view of our hypothesis that at the end of the play Plouton bestowed irrigation on the Argolid, it is worth recording firstly the essential connection of Osiris with the fertility produced by the waters of the Nile and secondly the tradition that irrigation was introduced into the Argolid by Danaos and his daughters, who came from Egypt.<sup>21</sup>

Aeschylus was bold enough in these matters. He knew of Plouton's golden river far away among the Arimaspoi,<sup>22</sup> and even, if we believe Herodotus (2. 156), borrowed the novel idea of making Artemis the daughter of Demeter from the Egyptian tradition that Artemis is Bubastis and Demeter Isis. But if, as I shall argue, the *Inachos* was a satyr-play, then the identification of the Greek lord of the dead with the Egyptian (whether the dramatist's own idea or not) was no doubt to some degree playful, and perhaps even parodic.

Finally, before passing to the argument that the *Inachos* was satyric, it is perhaps worth noting the possibility that if Sophocles was conscious of the identity of Io and Isis, this might shed some light on the unsolved mystery<sup>23</sup> of the final fragmentary lines of Io's metamorphosis (F 269a Radt 40-3):

ποδῶν δὲ χηλ[αί  
κροτοῦσι θράν[  
γυνή λέαυα π . [  
ἦσται λυεργ[

It has been recognized that *γυνή λέαυα* may well refer to the Sphinx, presumably in a comparison; and this problem I can take no further. As for *ἦσται λυεργ[*, Pfeiffer, followed by Carden, argues that the word is more likely to be (passive) *λυεργής* than any other, and suggests that there may be a comparison with a Sphinx woven in a linen tapestry. But we are not condemned to the *nominative* of *λυεργής*. Metamorphosis would not necessarily dissolve Io's clothes,<sup>24</sup> which might well be, like princess Antigone's,<sup>25</sup> of linen. In that case she would be, like Isis, at once bovine and *λωστόλος*,<sup>26</sup> a striking combination. Indeed, Ovid's *linigera iuvenca* at Memphis is none other than Io.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>19</sup> e.g. Osiris is called by Hdt. (2. 156) the father of Apollo.

<sup>20</sup> e.g. Isis, who was almost certainly associated with Io in the fifth century (see above, n. 16), was identified by Hdt. (2. 59) with Demeter, then by Heracl. Pont. (ap. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 361e) with Persephassa, and by Callimachus (*Ep.* 57. 1) with Io.

<sup>21</sup> Hes. fr. 128; Strabo 1. 2. 15; Pliny, *H. N.* 7. 195; etc.; cf. Hdt. 2. 171 (and G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens*,<sup>2</sup> pp. 289, 450 n. 1 (and cf. p. 308)). For Greek familiarity in this period with the Egyptian 'under-world' see S. Luria 'Demokrit, Orphiker und Ägypten', *Eos* 51 (1961), 21 ff.

<sup>22</sup> *P. V.* 806.

<sup>23</sup> See Pfeiffer and Carden ad loc. I notice that Carden mentions the possibility of a reference to dress at the end of his note.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *πορπαφόρος* at *P. Tebt.* 692. 31, apparently after the metamorphosis, and perhaps of Io. Does the *ἀναιδέας φάρος* (fr. 291) belong to her (the satyrs would not be wearing *φάρος*)?

<sup>25</sup> *A. Sept.* 1039; cf. e.g. S. *Nausikaa* fr. 439, *E. Ba.* 832 (and Dodds ad loc.)

<sup>26</sup> The Andrian Hymn to Isis, v. 1 (ed. Peek, *Der Isis hymnus von Andros* (1930)); *Anth. Pal.* 6. 231. 1; etc. (J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Comm. Plut. De Is. et Os.*, p. 270; Peek, pp. 26 f.)

<sup>27</sup> *Ars. Am.* 1.77.

The reasons for believing the *Inachos* to be satyric have been reviewed by Carden, who takes the main factors to be formal ones: the shortness and excitement of the choral songs,<sup>28</sup> the rapid alternation of lyric lines and trimeters in vv. 147 ff. of the Oxyrrhynchus fragment, and the shortness of the report of the metamorphosis.<sup>29</sup> We are now in a position to advance a complementary argument based on the play's content.

The theme of seduction is not unknown in tragedy. But the shape that the theme takes (if our previous hypothesis is correct) in the *Inachos* seems more likely to be satyric than tragic. Dangerous though it is to generalize on the basis of such fragmentary evidence, it must be said that there are not many tragedies in which we have good reasons to believe that a successful seduction or sexual union occurred in the play as its central event.<sup>30</sup> The closest tragic thematic parallel to the *Inachos* is perhaps Euripides' *Danae*; but even here Zeus' seduction of the princess has probably occurred before the play opens. And in contrast to the Danae story, the γάμος in the *Inachos* according to our argument proved a blessing for the land: Inachos was reconciled; the Argolid was fertilized; perhaps the future of Io was predicted — her wanderings to her new home and the return of her descendants.

In the exiguous remains of satyric drama there seem to be several plays in which a γάμος is at the centre of the action.<sup>31</sup> The most striking parallel to the *Inachos* is Aeschylus' *Amymone*.<sup>32</sup> The story is told by Apollodorus (2. 1.4): Poseidon had dried up the Argolid out of anger at Inachos for testifying that the land belonged to Hera. Danaos, newly arrived from Egypt, sent his daughters out to find water. One of them, Amymone, threw a missile at a deer but hit a satyr instead, who attempted to rape her. She was saved by Poseidon, who lay with her himself and then revealed to her the springs at Lerna — or, according to Hyginus' version (fab. 169), he created by striking the ground with his trident the Lerna spring and the Amymone stream. Several vase-paintings show Amymone being attacked by satyrs.<sup>33</sup> There can be little doubt that the play ended with the revelation (or creation) of the stream. The amazement of the satyrs at marvellous revelations and creations — often gifts from the gods such as wine and the lyre — was a recurrent motif of satyric drama.<sup>34</sup> A fourth-century-B.C. vase-painting of the story<sup>35</sup> shows Poseidon with his trident standing next to Amymone and beneath them a satyr apparently taking pleasure in a fountain.

<sup>28</sup> Esp. the chorus's disorderly reaction to the invisible Hermes playing the syrinx, on which v. further *Maia* 28 (1976), 218 f.

<sup>29</sup> Carden, pp. 54–5; he adds further considerations in his commentary (see pp. 60, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 79, 81, 86).

<sup>30</sup> Even in S. *Colchides*, *Tereus*, and the plays entitled *Andromeda* and *Oenomaos* the γάμος seems to have been of secondary importance.

<sup>31</sup> S. *Helene Gamos*, *Eris* (?); A. *Amymone*, *Diktyoulkoi* (see esp. 821 ff.; despite which the eventual bridegroom may be Dictys or Polydectes: cf. Hygin. *Fab.* 63, Servius, *Aen.* 7. 372); Ion, *Omphale*; Achaïos, *Omphale*; E. *Syleus* (see esp. fr. 693, 694 Nauck).

<sup>32</sup> Satyric: P. *Oxy.* 2256 fr. 3; frs. 131, 132 Mette; also the vase-paintings mentioned

below.

<sup>33</sup> e.g. *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1155, no. 6 (see further Brommer, *Satyrspiele*,<sup>2</sup> pp. 24 f.); none of them is contemporary with Aeschylus: Brommer suggests that either A.'s son Euphorion produced his father's play or a later dramatist took up the theme.

<sup>34</sup> Seaford in *Maia* 28 (1976), 216 f. The transformation of Alope into a stream may have occurred in Choirilos' *Alope* (cf. Crusius, *Gött. Gelebr. Anz.* 152 (1890), 696; Gow ad Theocr. 7.6 f.; Seaford in *Maia* 29 (1977), 91 — also S. fr. 287?), which has been regarded as satyric (cf. Choiril. T6 Snell), but need not be.

<sup>35</sup> Calyx-crater Athens NM 12596 (Nicole, no. 1107); Brommer (fig. 16) regards it as influenced by drama.

Furthermore, Silenos and the satyrs were extensively associated in the popular imagination with springs and streams.<sup>36</sup>

They were also associated with the world of the dead, appearing in funerary art from the archaic period to the late empire.<sup>37</sup> The precise nature of this association I hope to explain elsewhere; for the moment it is enough to suggest it as the origin of a tendency in satyric drama to concern itself with the underworld. Examples are Aeschylus' *Sisyphos*,<sup>38</sup> Sophocles' *Epitainarioi*,<sup>39</sup> Euripides' *Eurystheus*,<sup>40</sup> Aristias' *Keres*,<sup>41</sup> Achaïos' *Aithon*,<sup>42</sup> probably also Aristias' *Orpheus*<sup>43</sup> and Euripides' *Sisyphos*.<sup>44</sup> Despite Aristotle, *Poetics* 1456<sup>a</sup>3, where καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἄιδου appears to refer to tragedy, the tendency is not as noticeable in the more abundant remains of tragedy.<sup>45</sup> And it has as a result been suggested that Aristotle may be tacitly including satyr-play under 'tragedy'.<sup>46</sup> Zeus—Plouton and his messenger Hermes, according to our view of the *Inachos*, appear in Argos from the world below. Appearances from beneath the earth seem to have occurred in several satyr-plays:<sup>47</sup> for example, it seems that in Aeschylus' *Sisyphos* the satyrs are startled by Sisyphos' emergence from the ground: I have argued elsewhere<sup>48</sup> that the incorrect guesses that they make at Sisyphos' identity are a satyric motif represented also by their guesses at the invisible Hermes' identity in the *Inachos*.<sup>49</sup>

*The University of Exeter*

RICHARD SEAFORD

<sup>36</sup> S. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte*, pp. 254 f.; M. Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers*, pp. 101, 175.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. *JHS* 4 (1884), 21; Cook, *Zeus* iii, 382, 386; *CIL* iii. 686; Matz, *Die Dionysischen Sarkophage* (passim; esp. i. 87 f.).

<sup>38</sup> See esp. fr. 377 Mette (it is though not impossible that A. wrote two Sisyphos plays, that one of them was tragic, and that this fr. is from this tragedy); see also frs. 378, 379.

<sup>39</sup> See Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, i. 167 f.; perhaps identical with S.'s satyric *Herakles* and his *Kerberos*.

<sup>40</sup> Fr. 371 Nauck.

<sup>41</sup> The only fragment — σύνειπνος ἡ πίκωμος ἡ μαζαργέτας, Ἄιδου τραπεζεύς, ἀκρατέα νηδὺν ἔχων — is satyric in tone (cf. e.g. E. *Kyk.* 398), in which case the satyrs were probably represented as the infernal κῆρες (does this derive from the Anthes-teria, in which both satyrs and κῆρες were present?).

<sup>42</sup> Fr. 11 Snell: χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαῖρ' ὦ Χάρων κτλ.

<sup>43</sup> Sutton (*HSCP* 78 (1974), 115 f.). And the only other *Orpheus* of which we know was a comedy (by Antiphanes) — though cf. A. *Bassarids*. The only fragment of Aristias' play may well refer to the underworld (cf. Pi. fr. 114.4; Austin ad V. *Aen.* 642 f.).

<sup>44</sup> The ancient ascription of fr. 677 (a greeting to Herakles) to the *Sisyphos* is questioned by Wilamowitz (*An. Eur.* 166) 'cum Herculi in Sisyphi fabula aegre locus

sit.' But what better place for them to meet in than the underworld?

<sup>45</sup> *Psychagogoi* may be satyric (so J. van Leeuwen; Nauck, *trag. dict. index*, p. x); A. *Psychostasia* need not have concerned Hades; E.'s prosatyrical *Alkestis* is effectively a satyr-play without satyrs. This leaves most obviously E. (or Critias?) *Perithous* — though there may have been others.

<sup>46</sup> G. Else, *Comm. Poetics*, p. 530 (add Lesky, *Trag. Dicht. Hell.*,<sup>3</sup> pp. 76 f.); as of the same type Ar. mentions *Prometheus* and *Phorkides*; Aesch. wrote a satyric *Prometheus*, but whether his *Phorkides* was satyric is unknown (a satyric *Phorkides* was produced in 339 B. C.: Snell, *DID A2a31*). Or was Ar. thinking of a contemporary tragic fashion now vanished without trace? (Cf. Lucian, *De Salt.* 60.)

<sup>47</sup> Buschor, *Feldmäuse* (*Sitz. Bay. Ak. Wiss.* 1937, Heft. 1), passim; S. *Ichneutai* (Kyllene); Snell, *Scenes from Greek Drama*, p. 107 (Pythion, Agen). The only known emergence from below in tragedy is the ghost of Darius in A. *Persai* (perhaps also S. *Polyxena*): Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), p. 447.

<sup>48</sup> In *Maia* 28 (1976), 217 f. Another example of amazement at emergence from the underworld may be indicated by P. *Oxy.* 2455 fr. 7, a fragmentary hypothesis of E. *Sisyphos* (?) (fr. 17 Austin).

<sup>49</sup> I am very grateful to Professor John Baines for help with the Egyptological questions in this paper.