

## AISCHYLOS' LOST PLAYS: THE FIFTH COLUMN

While the number of Aischylos' surviving dramas seems more or less secure, the number of those not preserved to us is another matter<sup>1</sup>). And though the question is admittedly not one of the most crucial in Aischylean studies, a brief look at the arguments for that number will I think be useful in assessing the possibilities for his lost work, which does by any count represent over ninety percent of his total production. Our sources on the matter are three. The *Souda* says *ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ ἐλεγεία καὶ τραγωδίας ἐνενήκοντα*, "he wrote both elegies and ninety tragedies". In the Medicean *Vita* we find *δράματα ὁ' καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις σατυρικά ἀμφὶ τὰ ε'*, "seventy dramas and in addition to these about five satyr plays". Lastly, the catalogue of plays included with the *Vita* lists seventy-three titles, all neatly arranged in four columns by alphabetical order. One might suppose that this last item solved the problem, but of course it does not: the list omits at least seven and perhaps as many as eleven lost plays attributed to Aischylos by ancient writers (including all three plays produced with the *Persai*<sup>2</sup>). For purposes of reference the catalogue and the missing titles are given below<sup>3</sup>).

Titles attested as Aischylean and missing from the Catalogue:

*Γλαῦκος Ποτνιεύς, Ἰέρειαι, Παλαμήδης, Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς, Σίσυφος πετροκλιστής, Φινεύς, Ὠρείδνυια.*

---

1) When I first wrote these words, in 1975, I had not yet seen M. Griffith's *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1977), nor the literature that followed it (most especially M. L. West's article in *JHS* 99 [1979] 130-48). The authorship of this play does now seem to be in some doubt, but for our purposes here it is sufficient that a *Prometheus Desmotes* of some description was thought by the compiler of the Medicean Catalogue to have been composed by Aischylos.

2) Assuming, of course, that the *Προμηθεΐ* (no epiclesis is given) listed in the hypothesis to the *Persai* was in fact the *Pyrkaeus* rather than the *Pyrphoros* (the latter is in the Catalogue; the former is not). With most scholars I think this very likely, but it is not absolutely certain. For the theory that the two *Prometheus* plays in question were the same, cf. below n. 5.

3) For variant readings and corrections cf. the editions of Dindorf (Oxford 1851: vol. III, 9-10) and Wilamowitz (Berlin 1914: 7-8).



Titles perhaps Aischylean and missing from the Catalogue:

Ἄλκμήρη, Θαλαμοποιοί, Κύκνος, Τηρέυς<sup>4</sup>).

Of the omitted plays, the absence of the *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* has been explained by supposing it to be another title for the *Prometheus Pyrphoros*, and the same argument has also been used with respect to the *Sisyphos Petrokylistes* and *Sisyphos Drapetes*<sup>5</sup>). It has also been suggested that these titles did represent separate plays but were lost in the Catalogue through haplography, as possibly too with the *Glaukos Potnieus*, which though surely different from the *Glaukos Pontios* does start with the same word<sup>6</sup>). But it would be a remarkably careless scribe (or series of them) who made the same mistake of omission three times within the

4) The plays in the first group are all cited or mentioned at least four times, save for *Sisyphos Petrokylistes* (referred to by Hesychios, Comment. on Arist. *EN*, and Σ Aristoph. *Eirene*), *Oreithyia* (Ioannes Siculus, with respect to a passage in Longinus describing Boreas), and *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* (the epiclesis is given only by Pollux, though a number of fragments seem to fit the plot). In all cases the titles are clearly ascribed to Aischylos; for the actual citations cf. H. J. Mette's edition of the fragments (Berlin 1959). The plays in the second group are attested as follows: *Alkmene* in Hesychios (fr. 34 Mette, 12 Nauck: Αἰσχύλος Ἰσθμιασταῖς καὶ Ἄλκμήρη); *Thalamopoioi* in Pollux (114<sup>M</sup>, 78<sup>N</sup>: two lines cited as ἐν Αἰσχύλου Θαλαμοποιοῖς); *Kyknos* in Aristoph. *Batr.* 962-3, where Kyknos is mentioned as an Aischylean character but not necessarily an Aischylean play; *Tereus* (again a hypothesized title) from a quote in Arist. *HA* (609<sup>M</sup>, 304<sup>N</sup>). As regards the *Tereus* it should be added that the fragment in question could of course have come from an already titled play, and that it has also been assigned (though Aristotle does make it Aischylean) rather to Sophokles' drama of the same name (cf. A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* [Cambridge 1917] II, 223-4).

5) On the presumed identity of the *Prometheus* plays cf. F. Focke, *Hermes* 65 (1930) 263-9, and my remarks in an article on the Aischylean tetralogy, *CJ* 74 (1979) 298 n. 52. As Wecklein long ago noted, references to Prometheus' binding would seem difficult in a satyr play set before that action, when Prometheus is giving fire to the satyrs; if that difficulty is real, then the plays must be separate. With regard to the *Sisyphos* plays, the *Drapetes* appears only in the Catalogue, the *Petrokylistes* three times in citations. Six other references give simply *Sisyphos* (as do a number of references to *Prometheus*, where there was certainly more than one play). From this situation a number of scholars have supposed a single play. On the other hand, in a drama about Sisyphos' return to earth his eventual fate would presumably be nothing more than foretold (barring a substantial scene shift), and it seems curious that a scene outside the play's action could become its title. Given the earlier imprisonment of Thanatos and the arrangement with Merope, there certainly appears ample material for two plays, if Aischylos so desired.

6) So Murray-Maas in their Oxford Aischylos (1955) 376.

space of seventy-odd names. And while there seems some grounds for presuming identity for the two *Sisyphos* plays, there is really very little to support that notion in the case of the *Prometheus* group<sup>7)</sup>, nor would its acceptance account for the loss of *Hiereiai*, *Palamedes*, *Phineus*, and *Oreithyia*, plays almost certainly Aischylean. It would appear, then, that the Catalogue does contain a considerable number of omissions, not just a title dropped out here and there, and that these omissions must somehow be explained.

In response to this situation Albrecht Dieterich in 1893 noted that the Medicean Catalogue had four columns of eighteen plays each (plus the extra *Psychagogoi* in column two), whereas if one followed the *Souda*'s figure of ninety titles in all one might have expected to find five columns of eighteen plays<sup>8)</sup>. Accordingly Dieterich hypothesized that the fifth column had been lost, and proceeded to construct a provisional restoration of what such a column might look like so as to see whether the missing plays, when added in, would adhere to the alphabetical sequence. His results are to say the least suggestive: *Γλαῦκος Ποτνιεύς* fits in after *Γλαῦκος Πόντιος* in line 3, *Ἱέρειαι* comes after *Ἰφιγένεια* at line 6, *Παλαμίδης* falls between *Ὀστολόγοι* in line 12 and *Πενθεύς* in line 13, *Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς* follows *Προμηθεὺς πυρφόρος* at line 14, *Σίσυφος πετροκυλιστής* likewise after *Σεμέλη* in line 15 and before *Σίσυφος δραπέτης* in line 16, and *Φινεύς* after *Φορκίδες* in line 17. Only *Ὠρείθνια*, closing as it does line 18 with *Ψυχαγωγοί* still to be tacked on, seems a bit out of place (though the position of the latter play in column two is in itself odd). Of course it must be conceded that the coincidence factor in this congruence is higher than might first appear, since the alphabetizing here as generally in ancient times is by first letter only. Thus *Ἱέρειαι*, for example, might fit in at several different points. Nevertheless it must also be admitted that the *Glaukos*, *Prometheus*, and *Sisyphos* titles all fall directly next to catalogued plays with the same name, as one would expect, and that the positioning of the *Hiereiai*, *Palamedes*, and *Phineus* is at least

7) Cf. above n. 5. The reconstruction of a Prometheus tetralogy (assuming there was one) without the *Pyrrhoros* would certainly be possible (nothing demands that the third tragedy have *Prometheus* as part of the title), but finding a suitable title does create further difficulties.

8) A. Dieterich, *RbM* 48 (1893) 141-6. Cf. also his article "Aischylos" in *RE*, cols. 1069-70, and earlier Th. Bergk, *Griech. Lit.* (Berlin 1884) III, 284.

reasonable. As for the less certain titles, *Ἀλκμήνη* could find room at line 1, *Κύννος* at line 7 or 8, and *Τηρεΐς* at line 16. For *Θαλαμοποιοί*, on the other hand, there is in fact no place, but Dieterich argued that this rather confirmed the play's identification with the *Aigyptioi*. Finally, the *Ῥοεΐθνια*'s placement before *Ψυχαγωγοί* was justified by Dieterich through a presumed ditto-graphy of *Φρύγιοι* from *Φρύγες*. The extra title inadvertently inserted would then displace *Ψυχαγωγοί*, which would be added at the bottom after the list was otherwise finished. In this way too the original Catalogue minus *Φρύγιοι* would contain ninety plays, just as the *Souda* maintained.

Dieterich's proposal was acknowledged to be ingenious, but the problems in it did not escape critics. Bannier in 1900 objected that if *Φρύγιοι* really had displaced a title in line 18, that title should be the directly following *Χοηφόροι*, not *Ψυχαγωγοί*<sup>9</sup>). Accordingly he conjectured a catalogue of five columns and nineteen lines, with the nineteenth line as well as the fifth column lost, save for *Ψυχαγωγοί*. The consequent total of ninety-five plays he squared with the *Souda* and the *Vita* by an emendation of the latter<sup>10</sup>). For Wilamowitz, however, the faults were more serious. In his 1914 edition of the text of Aischylos he argued that Dieterich's whole theory was invalid on three counts<sup>11</sup>): (1) it required the insertion of a title between *Αἰτναῖαι γνήσιοι* and *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι*, something which Wilamowitz at least found improbable<sup>12</sup>), (2) *Θαλαμοποιοί* would as noted not have a place (Dieterich's equation of *Thalamopoioi* and *Aigyptioi* is not here mentioned; elsewhere Wilamowitz rejects it but also concedes that a *Thalamopoioi* by Aischylos is very uncertain<sup>13</sup>), and (3) an enlarged catalogue would necessitate the existence of eleven Aischylean plays otherwise unmentioned in any ancient source. As regards Dieterich's numerical calculations, he added that it was impossible to trust in the figures traditionally given,

9) W. Bannier, *RbM* 55 (1900) 479–80.

10) i. e., *δράματα ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις σατυρικά κ'. ἀμφίβολα ε'.* Cf. below n. 22.

11) Cf. his text of Aischylos (above n. 3) 8. The statement that Bannier "corrupt ingeniosam opinionationem [Dieterichii]" must of course be taken to mean that Bannier worsened Dieterich's argument, not that he refuted it.

12) On these plays cf. E. Fraenkel, *Eranos* 52 (1954) 61–75. Dieterich's suggestion (144–5) that *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι* was originally in the lost column but subsequently replaced *Ἀλκμήνη* in column one is admittedly not very convincing.

13) *Aischylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914) 19 n. 2. Cf. also below n. 24.

nor even to be sure that Aischylos always presented groups of four plays<sup>14</sup>).

More recent opinion has been divided. Murray in his Oxford edition of Aischylos summarized Dieterich's arguments for the missing column but also summarized Wilamowitz's opposition to it, with a resulting suggestion of support for the latter<sup>15</sup>). V. Steffen for his part accepted the *Souda's* figure of ninety plays and emended the *Vita* accordingly, but supposed the Catalogue complete nonetheless because its author, though aware of the total of ninety, could only locate seventy-two/seventy-three titles to record<sup>16</sup>). On the other hand Mette in his 1959 publication of the fragments accepts a fifth column without question, and even proposes several new titles of his own (*Alexandros* and *Tenes*, based on fragments) in addition to those filled in by Dieterich<sup>17</sup>). Still more original is the attempt of L. Ferrari to reconstruct all the lost plays of Aischylos, an approach lamentably long on guess-work and short on evidence<sup>18</sup>). With regard to gaps in the Medicean list, Ferrari agrees that a number of titles have been lost but prefers to suppose a catalogue with initially seven columns, each containing thirteen names. The first column would drop four names for reasons of illegibility,

---

14) For the early period of Attic tragedy nothing is known for certain about the rules or conditions of presentation, but our evidence from the fifth century B. C. seems on every occasion to indicate that four plays was standard; for arguments on the matter cf. *CJ* 74 (1979) 290-1.

15) As indicated above, Murray would prefer to suppose that the unlisted Glaukos, Prometheus, and Sisyphos plays were inadvertently dropped; he also suggests that the (to him) spurious *Phrygioi* may have supplanted the *Phineus*.

16) Against Dieterich's argument that the Medicean scholia certainly reflect a knowledge of at least the plays produced with the *Persai*, Steffen supposes that *Vita* and Catalogue were a late addition by someone not familiar with the scholia. Lesky (*Tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*<sup>2</sup> [Göttingen 1972] 71) approves, but I find the theory dubious; the plays in question do not seem likely ones for a cataloguer not to know, nor is it clear when and how such a compiler would have made up his list. It is however important to note that Steffen, unlike Wilamowitz, does seem to believe in a large number of missing plays.

17) Above n. 4: 258. P. Oxy. 2254 (497<sup>M</sup>) does in fact contain the name of Priam and an apparent reference to satyrs, and could well be a satyr play for the Achilleus trilogy (though *Paris* or *Priamos* would seem equally suitable titles). A *Tenes* play, however, appears to arise largely from Mette's supplements to P. Oxy. 2256 frs. 51-3 (388-90<sup>M</sup>), where *Tenes* is conjectured as a son of Kyknos and king of the island of Tenedos.

18) L. Ferrari, *I drammi perduti di Eschilo* (Palermo 1968).

and the last column would be lost altogether, thus accounting for the disappearance of seventeen titles in the revised four-column version. Such an assumption does carry several advantages: it permits *Αἰτναῖαι γνήσιοι* and *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι* to stand next to each other, it allows for the inclusion of *Θαλαμοποιοί*, and it requires only seven new titles to fill up the list. But against these advantages the sequence of presumed events involves so many hypotheses that it loses whatever credibility Dieterich originally generated. Thus Hugh Lloyd-Jones, in the most recent comment on the problem, understandably rejects Ferrari's modifications; in the process he also adds his own not inconsiderable support to Wilamowitz's objections<sup>19</sup>).

What, then, are we to conclude, in the face of such differing opinions? Should we agree with Mette that Dieterich's theory is basically sound, or with Wilamowitz and others that it founders on insuperable obstacles? In proceeding further I think it may be well to remember, as Steffen seems to have done, that the *number* of Aischylos' plays is surely important here<sup>20</sup>). As we have seen, the Medicean Catalogue with its seventy-three titles is clearly incomplete, whatever the reasons; the omissions, in fact, seem sufficiently numerous to invalidate it entirely as evidence for the total production, though its titles plus those we know to be missing indicate a figure of at least eighty. Much the same holds for the testimony of the *Vita*: since we have the names of at least twelve Aischylean satyr dramas (and may reasonably suppose the existence of more)<sup>21</sup>), the phrase *δράματα ο' καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις σατυρικά ἀμφὶ τὰ ε'* cannot well be right either. A number of simple emendations have been proposed, including the insertion of an omitted κ' (twenty) after *σατυρικά* and the expansion of ε' to *εἴκοσιν* (again producing a total of ninety or more). There are other possibilities as well<sup>22</sup>), but for the present

19) *CR* 20 (1970) 294-6.

20) For the following arguments cf. also M. Untersteiner, *Misc. Phil. in mem. A. Beltrami* (Genova 1953) 239-45.

21) *Amymonē, Diktyoukoi, Kerykes, Kirke, Leon, Lykourgos, Prometheus Pyrkaeus, Proteus, Sisyphos Drapetes, Sphinx, Theoroi* are all either attested or extremely likely to be satyric. Other conjectures include *Glaukos Pontios, Kabeiroi, Nemea, Oreithyia, Ostologoi*, and *Trophoi*: for the evidence cf. D.F. Sutton, *HSCPb* 78 (1974) 123-30.

22) Cf. Dieterich, 146. Among the suggestions is also the proposal to emend *ἀμφὶ τὰ ἀμφίβολα*, thereby creating an additional category of plays whose classification as tragic or satyric would be uncertain. Thus Steffen corrects to *σατυρικά ιε', ἀμφίβολα ε'*: fifteen satyr plays, five ambiguo-

argument it is enough to note that as with the Catalogue the transmitted total is incomplete, though here too the figures (seventy tragedies plus at least twelve satyr plays) suggest a final total in excess of eighty. In our third source, however, there are no immediately obvious problems; the *Souda* says ninety plays, *τραγωδίας ἐνεήκοντα*, and from the other evidence at our disposal this figure may well be right; in any case it cannot be too far off the truth.

Given such considerations, I think the notion of as many as seventeen or eighteen lost titles, and with it the theory of an omitted column in the Catalogue, deserve another look. It is true that with the addition of a fifth column the resulting total for the original catalogue would be ninety-one plays, not ninety, but this is surely not a serious difficulty. We might suppose the *Souda* to have miscounted by one, or to have excluded the *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι*, or even to have equated *Φρύγιοι* with *Φρύγες* (though I doubt this: see below). As for Wilamowitz's objections, we must admit first of all that no cataloguer is likely to write *Αἰτναῖαι γνήσιοι*, *Ἀλκμήνη* (or a similar title), *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι* deliberately. On the other hand, in any alphabetizing of a list of this length mental slips are certainly a possibility, nor would the insertion of another play before *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι* constitute an actual mistake in a system where only the first letter mattered (perhaps the cataloguer thought of *Ἀλκμήνη* at this juncture and wanted to put it down before he forgot it)<sup>23</sup>. Then too, we might argue that the cataloguer had not actually planned to include *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι* at first, but mulled the matter over while he was writing the next title and decided it had better be added after all, if only to explain the previous use of *γνήσιοι*. With regard to the omission of *Θαλαμοποιοί* from the supposed lost column, Wilamowitz's insistence that the play cannot be equated

---

ous, for a total of ninety. On the other hand Untersteiner prefers to emend *δράματα ο'* to *δραματα ρ'*, which with the expansion of *ε'* to *εἴκοσι* would yield: "ninety dramas, among which about twenty satyr plays." Obviously there is no lack of solutions.

23) We might observe in this regard that elsewhere in the list the cataloguer's alphabetizing is often erratic by our standards: thus *ἐπὶ ἐπιθήβας*, *εὐμενίδες*, *ἐπίγονοι*, and *περραιβίδες*, *πρωτεύς*, *πέρσαι*. Dieterich may well have been right in supposing that the cataloguer attempted a stricter order in the first few lines but eventually abandoned the effort. Observe also that the *Prometheus Lyomenos* does not immediately follow the *Prometheus Desmotes* as one might expect if the cataloguer had the plays memorized in any logical order.

with *Αιγύπτιοι* seems now generally accepted<sup>24</sup>). But we should also remember that *Thalamopoioi*, which is a choral appellation, could be an alternate title for a number of other plays, including some not otherwise known<sup>25</sup>). To take a parallel example, if the *Σεμέλη* were missing from our list, and we knew it only under the title *Υδροφόροι*, we might well wonder why there seemed no place for it under the letter *v*.

When we come to Wilamowitz's third objection, however, we encounter more substantial difficulties. Utilizing only the seven plays definitely excluded from the Catalogue, we would find that our fifth column required eleven additional titles not mentioned in any preserved source. If we add in the *Αλκμήνη*, as seems on the whole likely<sup>26</sup>), and *Κύρκος* or *Θαλαμοποιοί* (under an alternate title) we might reasonably reduce the number needed to nine, but hardly less than that. Against such a figure we must put the disturbing fact that in the whole seventy-three-title Catalogue preserved to us only five titles are otherwise completely unknown<sup>27</sup>). Thus the laws of probability are rather in Wilamowitz's favor. Yet the total disappearance of nine plays is, I think, still not impossible. If we look for example at column two of the preserved Catalogue, we find the following: two plays (*Nemea* and *Polydektes*) are otherwise not mentioned at all, three (*Bakchai*, *Dikyoulkoi*, and *Oidipous*) are mentioned only once, and three others (*Eleusinioi*, *Propompoi*, and *Hypsipyle*) only twice. Nor is it possible to say what we would have done with

24) The theory of identity goes back to Hermann (*Opusc.* VIII 177–84). Wilamowitz's objection was based, reasonably enough, on the point that after the offer of Pelasgos and the city of Argos to provide lodging the Danaids are not likely to require special marriage quarters. Cf. also A.F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplikes: Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge 1969) 190–1.

25) For instance, the chamber-builders might well be the chorus for (and alternate title of) the *Polydektes*, with the evil king of Seriphos threatening to marry Danae should Perseus fail to return with Medousa's head (cf. Pherekydes, *FGrH* 3 F11). Or we might conjecture them as the backdrop to an *Epimetheus* satyr play (for which there is appropriate room in the fifth column) in which the brother of Prometheus receives Pandora from Zeus.

26) I have tried to be objective on this point, in view of the doubts of some scholars, but there is really very little reason to question this title, save that it does not appear in the preserved Catalogue. Of course Hesychios may have meant in his reference the *Alkmene* of Euripides or some other tragedian, but what he *says* in our tradition is the *Alkmene* (and *Isthmiastai*) of Aischylos.

27) *Atalanta*, *Lemnioi*, *Nemea*, *Polydektes*, *Phrygioi* (I argue below that this last is a legitimate title).

the various references mistakenly credited to *Agamemnon* did the same column not tell us of a *Memnon* (elsewhere unmentioned in its proper form) to which we might assign them. Thus half the plays in the second column are attested sparingly, or not at all. That cannot by itself make the total loss of half the fifth column probable, but it does place it well within the realm of possibility<sup>28</sup>).

In sum, even though the prospects for so many lost titles are not what we might wish, the evidence of the *Souda* plus the need to explain a certain seven to nine omissions would seem to create a stronger argument for Dieterich's hypothesis than is usually conceded. It is simple, possesses internal logic, and assimilates the known omissions suspiciously well. Moreover, the postulating of such a number of lost plays (this argument cannot be used as proof, but it should be noted) would affect quite advantageously another aspect of Aischylos' production: his sometime presentation of his dramas in connected groups. We know of at least four such attested groups (not counting the Prometheus plays), and in several other instances the presence of several titles denoting continuous action around the same character (Achilleus, Memnon, Aias, Odysseus, Perseus) makes similar groupings highly likely<sup>29</sup>). Yet (unless we accept Hermann's old notion of dilogies, which I find extremely doubtful<sup>30</sup>) there remain even within these groups some major gaps. The Perseus, Memnon, and Ixion sequences all lack a third tragedy, while the latter two as well as the Achilleus and Aias groups need satyr plays (assuming these were always connected<sup>31</sup>).

---

28) Other plays mentioned only once outside the Catalogue include *Aigyptioi*, *Argo*, *Kallisto*, *Leon*, and *Penelope*. Plays referred to twice would include *Epigonoï*, *Kirke*, *Ostologoi*, *Pentheus*, *Phorkides*, and *Prometheus Pyrrhoros*. In any case, as noted above, even scholars such as Steffen and Lesky who support Wilamowitz's position seem agreed that a substantial number of Aischylean dramas have disappeared altogether; so also Untersteiner.

29) I have tried to present an overview of evidence and conjectures for these (and indeed all conjectured Aischylean tetralogies) in an article forthcoming in *AJP* 101 (1980). Work on such groups has now probably hypothesized a bit excessively, but in some of these cases tetralogies surely did exist, whatever their reconstruction. That the groupings are not better attested is only what we should expect, given the nature of our evidence and the interests of ancient commentators.

30) Hermann, *Opusc.* III 310; cf. the discussion of his and later arguments in *CJ* 74 (1979) 297-9.

31) The case for connection with *Sphinx*, *Lykourgos*, *Amymon*, and *Proteus* is certain, while *Diktyoukoi*, *Kabeiroi* (or *Argo*), and *Kirke* present

Some help for this situation might come from attested titles (for example *Hiereiai* and *Propompoi*) of whose content nothing is really known, but there are not enough of these to solve all the problems, even in those groups where connection seems fairly certain. Admittedly these considerations are somewhat circular, since they depend on evidence from the very small amount of the playwright's work preserved. Nevertheless it seems worth observing that if we did not have the Catalogue, but only the total number given by the *Souda*, we would likely have conjectured a number of unattested titles to account for the gaps noted.

Finally, a word about the *Φρύγιοι*. The play is not referred to outside the Catalogue, and scholars well before Dieterich supposed it merely a scribal reduplication of the immediately following *Φρύγες ἢ Ἔκτορος λύτρα*, a drama long accepted as part of a *Myrmidones-Nereides-Phryges* trilogy<sup>32</sup>). But such an error would be a strange sort of mistake for a scribe to make; we should have to imagine him writing the incorrect *Φρύγιοι*, then (rather than attempting a simple correction or even indicating the error) adding the correct *Φρύγες* in the next position, together with its proper alternate title *Ἔκτορος λύτρα*. The order of events here (and the logic behind it) is surely odd, nor can one see any very immediate reason why Aischylos should not have written both a *Phryges* and a *Phrygioi*, as the Catalogue appears to say (Greek playwrights not being given to titling their plays for the convenience of posterity). Indeed, as Ferrari points out, the presence of an alternate title for *Phryges* could well represent an attempt to distinguish between two similar-sounding plays<sup>33</sup>). As regards the content of a genuine *Phrygioi* naturally nothing can be certain. Nevertheless if the chorus was composed of Phrygians the setting was very likely Troy, and we have already noted that the Memnon sequence (*Memnon, Psychostasia*) is one of those lacking a third tragedy. It seems at least worth suggesting that the *Phrygioi* was the final play of this group<sup>34</sup>),

---

good possibilities. Nevertheless the number of other conjectured groups without an appropriate hypothesis for the fourth title makes it hazardous to insist that the satyr play was always so connected: cf. *CJ* 74 (1979) 299-301.

32) Cf. Dindorf (above n. 3) 10. Wilamowitz, however, suggested that a play entitled *Φρύγιοι* might not be out of the question; so also Mette, 86. I would concur that the chorus may well have been female, but the issue is not crucial here.

33) Ferrari (above n. 18) 132.

34) So in fact Ferrari, but with *Phrygioi* as the first play of the group,

and that the trilogy as a whole dramatized the main action of the *Aithiopsis*, much as the Achilles trilogy dramatized the main action of the *Iliad*<sup>35</sup>). If that guess is right, then the *Phrygioi* would recount the death of Achilles following upon that of Memnon, Thetis would lose her son as Eos lost hers in the *Psychostasia*, and Plato's unplaced fragment in which the sea-goddess accuses Apollo of falsehood in his predictions concerning her son might well find an appropriate location<sup>36</sup>). But likely or not, these hypotheses at least serve to illustrate the possibilities for the *Phrygioi* as a separate play. Thus we would have an original catalogue of five columns, eighteen plays to the column. *Ψυχαγωγοί* would be placed at the very end because the scribe momentarily forgot it after *Ψυχοστασία*: haplography, we might say, or perhaps he became confused by the last-minute decision to include *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι*. In any case the total is ninety-one, but of course Aischylos did not write the *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι*, and we may well assume that the *Souda* did not count it. The result, then, would be ninety Aischylean dramas<sup>37</sup>).

University of Georgia

Timothy Gantz

and presenting for subject matter the (one would think) unrelated death of Penthesilea from the very beginning of the epic.

35) That Achilleus' death did comprise the finale was the view of both Welcker (*Die Aeschyleische Trilogie Prometheus* [Darmstadt 1824] 430-7) and Hermann (*Opusc.* VII 343-8), though Welcker tried to place here as title *Nereides* and Hermann suggested an unattested *Musai\**. H. W. Smyth, in his edition of the fragments (*Aeschylus* [Loeb Library: London 1926] 421), seems to have a similar reconstruction in mind, though he offers no title.

36) Plato *Resp.* II 383a = 284<sup>M</sup>, 350<sup>N</sup>. The passage has been located in a number of different plays, including those of both the Achilles and Memnon groups. Mette for his part (*Der Verlorene Aischylos* [1963] 121-2) follows those who would assign it to Thetis' appearance in the *Hoplion Krisis*. Narratively there is not much to choose, since a lament for Achilleus might equally well be spoken at the end of the Memnon or the beginning of the Aias group. But the accusation of Apollo creates a serious theological crisis which can scarcely be allowed to drop without some kind of resolution. Reconciliation could come in the *Salaminiiai* (if this was the third play of the Aias group), but the relevance of Thetis' quarrel with Apollo to Aias' situation and that of his family is hard to see, unless Apollo made similar misleading predictions to Teukros or Telamon. On the whole it seems simpler to connect this divine clash with the death of Memnon and the grief of the two goddesses for their children: so too Welcker (above n. 35) 436-7. It would of course be easy enough for Apollo to appear at the end of the *Phrygioi* to defend his prophecy.

37) Untersteiner (above n. 20) supposes the figure of ninety plays to

---

include the *Aitnaiai notboi*. By dropping it from the total he arrives at the number eighty-nine, i.e. twenty-two tetralogies (or better four-play *didaskaliai*) plus the special production of the *Aitnaiai gnesioi*. The explanation is attractive, but it makes no attempt to account for the omissions from the Catalogue. Nor does it seem likely that, because the Catalogue lists a spurious play for the sake of clarity, the *Souda* would actually consider it a part of Aischylos' work. If what in fact is meant is ninety plays without the *Aitnaiai notboi* we would need a rationale for yet another extra play, but in view of the possibilities for presentations such as the one at Syracuse (and the lack of absolute certainty that Aischylos *always* produced in four-play units) that should not be too difficult.