

power in the second century, to Rome.¹³ The third century is the most likely time for a Ptolemaic gift to Cos.

It is debatable whether the grant of distant pieces of territory was characteristic of Ptolemaic policy. The location of, for example, the grants of land which Ptolemy II Philadelphus made to his friend and ally Miletus, in 279 B.C.,¹⁴ and to the independent city of Byzantium, is uncertain. The land awarded by Philadelphus to Byzantium is known, from Dionysius of Byzantium, to have been *ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας*, on the Asiatic mainland.¹⁵ But its position is not attested beyond this general indication.¹⁶ The location of the land granted to Miletus is also not certain. The general assumption that it was formerly royal land (not that of a neighbouring *polis*), is acceptable but adds no information on its whereabouts.¹⁷ In view

¹³ It is worth noting here the evidence of Coans who served as Ptolemaic officials in Cyprus. It has been tentatively suggested that Lochus, the general of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (145–116 B.C.) and sometime governor of Cyprus (*cf.* T. B. Mitford, *Op. Ath.* i (1953) 159–63; *BSA* lvi (1961) 28–9, nos. 75, 76), may have been Coan: *cf.* P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria II* (Oxford 1972) 150–1 n. 121. Lochus' ethnic is not attested, but the name is not common. P. M. Fraser cited V. Grace, *Excavations at Nessana I* (London 1962) 121, who pointed out that the name Lochus occurs frequently on Coan handles. Reference was also made to Coan coins which bear the name (*PH* pp. 314–15, nos. 154, 163). To this collection of material may be added the name's occurrence in the Coan list of new members of the gymnasium: *cf.* G. Pugliese Carratelli, *apud Synteleia: Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz II* (Naples 1964) 816–19, lines 30–1, *Νυνφόδοτος Λόχου* (reign of Claudius). For Aristus, son of Timodemus, the Coan *ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως* of Carpasia, see T. B. Mitford, *Op. Ath.* i (1953) 154. It is conceivable that the Coan estate in Cyprus may have derived from a Ptolemaic gift to a Coan official. This hypothesis, however, entails a series of unsubstantiated assumptions and should probably be dismissed; only if the Ptolemaic *dorea* was not revocable but was granted on terms of absolute ownership (*cf.* e.g. the Seleucid grants of *OGIS* 221, 225) does the beneficiary gain the right of free disposal of his domain, and only if he (or one of his descendants) chose to dispose of it not to his family but to the Coan *polis*, could the Coans have secured tenure of their Cypriot land from such a source.

¹⁴ *Cf.* A. Rehm, *Milet* 1 (3) 123, 38.

¹⁵ Dion. Byz. 41 (ed. Güngerich), *μικρὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ νεὸς Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου· τοῦτων ἐτίμασαν ἴσα θεῶ Βυζάντιοι, μεγαλοφροσύνης τ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τιμῆς τῆς περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀπολαύσαντες· καὶ γὰρ χώραν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας δωρεῖται καὶ κίτρον πολλὰς μυριάδας καὶ βέλη καὶ χρήματα.*

¹⁶ For Byzantine territory in 'Mysia' in the reign of Prusias I (c. 230–182 B.C.) see Polybius iv 52. For epigraphic evidence from the Gulf of Nicomedia of the Byzantians' possessions in Bithynia see L. Robert, *Hellenica* vii (Paris 1949) 30–44. On Byzantine territory at Dascylium see Strabo xii 576. It is uncertain what, if any, of this territory is to be identified with the gift of Philadelphus.

¹⁷ *Cf.* C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (Yale 1934) 74 (with bibliography).

both of Ptolemaic possession of coastal and inland cities in Caria in the third and early second century B.C., and the geographic proximity of Cos, we might expect the Coans to have been given land in Caria and not in Cyprus. It was after all neighbouring Calymnos which was incorporated by the Coans, under Ptolemaic patronage, at the end of the third century.¹⁸

By contrast, the award to states of distant territory, made to suit the convenience of the donor rather than the beneficiary, is a well attested feature of Roman rule both in the Republic and in the Imperial period. Certain unidentified Italian towns owned land in Cilicia, as a letter of Cicero, dated to 51 B.C., attests.¹⁹ Octavian granted Capua territory in Crete, at Cnossus, which it still possessed in the reign of Domitian.²⁰ Cyzicus and Stratoniceia were also among Greek states which were rewarded by Rome with land for past services.²¹

It is clear that Coan territory in Cyprus may in fact have derived from a grant by Rome; on the basis of the comparative material there is a slight presumption in favour of identifying Rome as the benefactor. The *terminus post quem* would be the Roman annexation of 58 B.C. and the *terminus ante quem* the *restitutio agrorum* which occurred, perhaps, in Claudius' region. It is idle to speculate when in this long period the Coans are likely to have acquired this gift, or for what services.

S. M. SHERWIN-WHITE

Hertford College, Oxford

¹⁸ R. Herzog, *Riv. Fil. NS* xx (1942) 5, no. 2 (M. Segre, *ASAA NS* vi–vii (1944–5) XII (Plate II); H. H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* III (Munich 1969) no. 545).

¹⁹ *Ad Fam.* viii 9, 4.

²⁰ *Cf.* P. Ducrey, *BCH* xciii (1969) 846–52, for the literary and epigraphic evidence (including new material) of Campanian territory at Cnossus.

²¹ For the awards, which were made after the First Mithridatic War, see *OGIS* 441 (Stratoniceia); Strabo, xii 576 (Cyzicus). On Roman gifts of territory to Greek states *cf.* T. R. S. Broughton, *apud* T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV (Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1938) 798–9. The Coan land is assumed, without discussion, to have resulted from a Roman gift.

The Title of Prometheus Desmotes

All I hope to do in this note is to reinforce Lesky's protest against 'the attitude of mind shown by many modern scholars, who refuse to admit that there is a *Prometheus* problem at all, and pass over in silence so many arguments which deserve the most careful attention'.¹ One reason why the majority of scholars are so sanguine about the peculiarities of *Prometheus Desmotes* is that they take it for granted that the surviving play was the first of a trilogy, and that the remainder of the trilogy would somehow or

¹ *History of Greek Literature* English tr. (London 1966) 255; German 3rd edn. (Bern 1971) 294.

other have resolved some or most or all of the problems of the surviving part. It is assumed that the second play was, as the titles apparently proclaim, *Prometheus Luomenos*: the chief exception to this view is W. Schmid, the much reviled but scarcely refuted champion of the bastardy of *Prom. Desm.*, who argued that the surviving play was written in the third quarter of the fifth century by an imitator of Aeschylus.² Next it is usually supposed that *Prometheus Purphoros* (a title in the catalogue in M, twice cited elsewhere) was the third play—though there have been more respectable exceptions to that step.³ The fourth *Prometheus* title (twice cited by Pollux), *Prometheus Purkaeus*, is very plausibly taken to be the satyr play of 472 B.C., called simply *Προμηθεύς* in the *hypothesis* to *Pers.* Despite this, no-one seems to have questioned the easy assumption that the other three *Prometheus* titles are evidence for the connected trilogy. I shall offer here a neglected reason for thinking that, on the contrary, the titles are evidence that the *Prometheus* plays were not produced together. The argument is pedantic, even irritating, but it is nonetheless coherent and hard to contradict.

What, firstly, is the origin of the additional subtitles *δεσμώτης*, *λύμενος*, *πυρφόρος* and *πυρκαεύς*? There is good reason to think that such subtitles were added by later bibliographers and librarians, doubtless at Alexandria.⁴ We may assume that the dramatist himself rather than the keeper of the *didaskaliai* gave the plays their original titles:⁵ in any case the title was almost invariably put in the form of a single word, either the name of one of the main characters or a collective plural which identified the

chorus. This means that there would often be two or more tragedies with identical titles, not only in the total corpus of tragedy but even more confusingly within the works of a single author. For it was of no concern to the dramatist at the time if he gave a play the same title as he had given to another earlier work. Hence the *didaskaliai* did not distinguish between plays of different years with the same title: the *hypothesis* of *Αἴας* [*μαστιγοφόρος*] says *ἐν δὲ ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ψιλῶς Αἴας ἀναγράφεται*, the *didaskalia* to *Pers.* names *Γλαῦκος* [*ποτινεύς*, added in some later MSS.] and *Προμηθεύς* [*πυρφόρος*] without subtitles, and the *didaskalia* recorded in the scholia on Aristophanes' *Frogs* 67 records plain *Ἀλκμέων* without *ὁ διὰ Κορίνθου*.⁶

But obviously the scholars of Alexandria had to distinguish in such cases. The simplest way was to refer to the earlier and later play of the same title, as e.g. Soph. *Τυρώ α'* and *β'*, Eur. *Φρίξος α'* and *β'*;⁷ cf. *hypothesis* to Soph. *ΟΤ εἰς δὲ καὶ οἱ πρότερον, οὗ Τύραννον, αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφοντες*. But the more common method was by the addition of a distinctive 'sub-title': the surviving pairs are *Οἰδίπους Τύραννος* and *Οἰδίπους ἐπὶ Κολωνοῖ*, *Ἰφιγένεια ἡ ἐν Ταύροις* and *Ἰφιγένεια ἡ ἐν Αἰδίδι*, and we know of many others. There can be little doubt that the four *Prometheus* subtitles are Alexandrian, for each seems fairly typical. For *δεσμώτης* compare Eur. *Μελανίππη δεσμώτης*; and for *πυρκαεύς* Soph. *Ναύπλιος πυρκαεύς*;⁸ we find other participles like *λύμενος*, e.g., Eur. *Ἰππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος* or Spintner's *Σμελέη κεραυνουμένη*, and other epithets like *πυρφόρος*, apparently taken from whatever the character was carrying on first entry, cf. *Αἴας μαστιγοφόρος*, *Ἰππόλυτος στεφανηφόρος*.⁹

If the argument so far is right, then the next inference must be that the Alexandrian bibliographers were faced with four plays in the Aeschylean corpus called simply *Προμηθεύς*. Admittedly this is not incontrovertible, but alternative explanations all seem to lead to special pleading. One was the satyr play of 472, and the other three were, it follows, performed in three separate years, each making up one part of three separate trilogies, probably of unconnected plays (as in 472). So what looks at first sight a reason for connecting the *Prometheus* plays turns out on closer inspection to be grounds for dissociating them.

I can think of only one reasonable way out of this argument in an attempt to salvage the *Prometheus*

² *Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus* (Tübingen Beitr. 9, Stuttgart 1929).

³ Notably Focke *Hermes* lxx (1930) 263 ff., who argued that *Prom. Desm.* and *Luom.* made up a 'dilogy'. Focke made the noteworthy point that the aetiology of the garland attributed to *Prom. Luom.* by Athenaeus (*fr.* 334M) looks like a concluding element ill-suited to the middle play of a trilogy. A recently published Apulian vase-painting suggests that the play may also have included an aetiology of the flower *προμηθεῖον*: see Trendall *J Berl Mus* xii (1970) 168 ff. esp. 173. Recently Lloyd-Jones *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley 1971) 97 ff. has suggested that the third play had nothing directly to do with Prometheus, and was in fact *Aitnaiai*. As he himself admits (97, 102) this is 'nothing but a speculation'.

⁴ See A. E. Haigh *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (Oxford 1896) 395 ff. This is still the best discussion of the neglected topic of the titles of Greek tragedies; cf. also Pearson *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge 1917) I xviii ff., Zilliacci *Eranos* xxxvi (1938) 1 ff., esp. 10, and Nachmanson *Acta Univ. Gotoborgensis* xlvii (1941) esp. 6 f. (repr. Darmstadt, 1967). The titles of about 500 tragedies are preserved out of a total of something between 2000 and 6000 (?).

⁵ It may be that the titles of Eur. *Hik.* and *Phoen.* acknowledge debts to earlier plays of the same name. All the play titles found in Aristophanes seem to be those transmitted to us: I have noted some 14 (*Clouds* 553 f., *Thesm.* 153, 848–50, *Frogs* 833–4, 1121–2, *frr.* 78, 678).

⁶ Epigraphic evidence seems to point the same way. In *IG* ii² 2320 (= *TrGF* DID A 2a), cut in about 278 B.C., an *Iphigeneia* of Euripides is recorded without further distinction; and in a third century inscription from the Agora (*Hesperia* vii [1938] 116 = *TrGF* DID A 4b) there is an *Oidipous* of Sophocles.

⁷ Confirmed, against doubters, by *POxy* 2455 *fr.* 14 col. xvi and *fr.* 17 col. xix.

⁸ It is common titles which concern Pollux 9.156. He, or his source, imagines that they go back to the dramatist.

⁹ These have some precedent in titles taken from the chorus like *Χορηφόροι*, *Υδροφόροι*, *Ξοαναφόροι*.

trilogy. That would be to suppose that Aeschylus did not give each play of his *Prometheus* trilogy an individual title, but only gave an overall title to the set—*Προμήθεια* or perhaps *οἱ Προμηθεῖς*. In support one might point to the citations in Aristophanes of Aeschylus' *Λυκούργεια* (*Thesm.* 135) and *Ῥόετεια* (*Frogs* 1124), and might note that trilogy-titles are occasionally found in the *didaskaliai*, at least for minor tragedians.¹⁰ On the other hand in all other known trilogies of Aeschylus, whether or not there was an overall title, each individual play has a title of its own: thus *Οἰδίπους* is distinguished from *Σφίγξ*, *Ἰκέτιδες* from *Λαοαῖδες*, the three *Achilles* plays by their three choruses, and so on. Moreover *Ἐπιτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας* is already current in Ar. *Frogs* 1021 and *Φρόγες* in Ar. *Fr.* 678K. So it looks like special pleading to make an exception of the *Prometheus* plays.

While this argument is not so weighty nor so impregnable as to prove that *Prom. Desm.* did not belong to a trilogy with the other *Prometheus* plays, it may be more resilient evidence against that assumption than the evidence for it. *ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἐξῆς δράματι λέγεται* in the scholion on *Prom. Desm.* 511 (Herington p. 151) might refer only to the next play in the collected works; compare the scholion on Pind. *Isthm.* 3.24 (Drachmann III p. 224) *ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐξῆς ωιδῇ . . .* Or it may be that the scholiast was simply mistaken in supposing that *Prom. Desm.* and *Prom. Luom.* belonged to the same trilogy. This could happen if Aeschylus composed a similar treatment of a similar subject on separate occasions, like Euripides with Hippolytus; or if *Prom. Desm.* was composed by a successor to Aeschylus on the model of *Prom. Luom.*, perhaps even as a companion piece.¹¹ Either of these hypotheses would also explain the evident similarities between the two plays. Other than the scholion on 511 the arguments for the traditional *Prometheus* trilogy rest entirely on the internal evidence of forward-looking references in *Prom. Desm.*¹² But loose ends and references to the future do not of themselves demand or prove a sequel: there is nothing in *Prom. Desm.* which is intrinsically more demanding of a sequel than there is in, say, Eur. *Med.* or Soph. *Phil.* In any case these forward-looking references may also be accounted for by the hypothesis that our *Prometheus* was written by an imitator to be a companion piece to the genuine *Luomenos*. Those who argue that there are things in *Prom.* which are inexplicable or unacceptable without other plays to follow are, in this context, begging the question of authenticity.

¹⁰ Namely Polyphrasmon's *Λυκούργεια* (*TrGF* DID C 4), Philocles' *Πανδιονίς* (*TrGF* 24T6c) and Meletos' *Οιδιπόδεια* (*TrGF* DID C 24); cf. Σοφοκλῆς *ἐδίδακε Τηλέφειαν* in *IG* ii² 3091 (fourth century Aexone = *TrGF* DID B 5).

¹¹ Cf. Schmid (above n. 2) 102 f.

¹² These are discussed more fully than ever in R. Unterberger *Der Gefesselte Prometheus des Aischylos* (Tübingen Beitr. 45, Stuttgart 1968).

This is not the occasion to go into the question of the authenticity of *Prom. Desm.*¹³ It is a notoriously dangerous and emotional set of problems, and to stir the hornets' nest here would only obscure the single simple point I wish to make. I hope merely to have given pause to those who assume the traditional trilogy without demur, and especially those who have regarded the trilogy as a kind of critical anaesthetic against all the problems of *Prom. Desm.* Could they explain its peculiarities if it were to stand by itself, and not in a connected trilogy?

O. TAPLIN

Magdalen College, Oxford

¹³ Those who are reassured by the latest defence in C. J. Herington *The Author of the Prometheus Bound* (Austin, Texas 1970) are easily pleased. 'Quonam anno acta sit fabula omnino ignoramus; etiam de auctore Aeschylo dubitatur'—Page's new Oxford text (1972) p. 288.

A Note on the Date of the Athenian-Egestan Alliance¹

(PLATES XXIII–XXIV)

The text of the alliance between Athens and Sicilian Egesta is partially extant in *IG* i² 19 and *IG* i² 20.1–2.² Crucial for the dating of the inscription and the alliance which it records is the third line of the first fragment, for it contains what remains of the name of the eponymous archon who held office at the time. Only the last two letters of the archon's name are clear and undisputed: they are *ON*, and appear in stoichoi 37 and 38. (See PLATE XXIII a). On the basis of these two letters, only five fifth-century B.C. archons appear as possibilities: the name must be restored to read *ἡάβρον* (458/7), *Ἀρίστον* (454/3), *Ἐπαμείνον* (429/8), *Ἀριστίων* (421/0), or *Ἀντιφῶν* (418/7).

It has been customary for scholars automatically to eliminate the last three names from consideration on the grounds that the stonemason made use of the three-bar sigma (usually believed to have been replaced by the four-bar sigma in virtually all

¹ I wish to thank Professor Jack M. Balcer, The Ohio State University, Professor Harold B. Mattingly, University of Leeds, and Mr John D. Smart, University of Leeds, for reading the manuscript; Professor Benjamin D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, for his generosity and aid at various points; Mlle Chara Karapa, of the Epigraphic Museum, for her expert assistance in preparing the squeeze which is, in part, reproduced in PLATE XXIV a–b, and for the photographing of which I am indebted to Mr Marvin Zivney, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point. The photograph in PLATE XXIII a was made available to me by Professor Meritt, and it and the partial enlargement of it in PLATE XXIII b are reproduced here through the courtesy of the Epigraphic Museum and its director, Mme D. Peppas Delmousoy.

² *IG* i² 19 and 20.1–2 = Bengtson, *Staatsverträge* 139 = ML 37. Tod i² 31 does not include the two lines from