

# Sophocles, *Aleadae*: a Reconstruction

*Akiko Kiso*

HERE AN ATTEMPT is made to establish the cast of the characters, dramatic time and place, the course of action, the approximate date of its first performance and the significance of Sophocles' *Aleadae* for the history of Sophoclean tragedy.

The preserved fragments of the play (listed by Pearson numbers<sup>1</sup>) are the following:

FR. 77. *But when they want to apply evil as a remedy for evil, all things human grow sick.*

FR. 78. *For it is not easy to hold against the right.*

FR. 79. *It is bad to conceal and does not befit a man of noble birth.*

FR. 80. *For the just tongue has great strength.*

FR. 81. *O child, be silent. Silence holds much good.*

FR. 82. *Why do these matters still need so many words from you? For superfluous words are always painful.*

FR. 83. *Do not ask everything. It is also good to conceal many things.*

FR. 84. *And I do not know what to say about these things. When the noble are defeated by the ignoble, what country would endure this?*

FR. 85. *I think no one will. But don't you think it better to conquer the enemies even by blasphemous means rather than to be a slave of one's neighbors?*

FR. 86. *Stop. It is enough that I am called son of this father, if I am his son. If not, the name decreases the misfortune. Indeed what goes as fact prevails over the truth.*

FR. 87. A. *But can he, if he is a bastard, compete with the legitimate?*  
B. *All that is good has a noble nature.*

FR. 88. *Money brings friends to men and fame also, and indeed to those who sit nearest to the seat of sovereignty! Next, not only does no one become the foe of the rich man, but even his former enemies refuse to hate him. For tremendous is the power of wealth to steal into places both sacred and secular and into quarters where a poor man could not obtain objects of his*

<sup>1</sup> A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles I* (Cambridge 1917) pp.48-57 [henceforth, PEARSON I].

*desire even if they came into his way. It makes even an ugly person a delight to look at, a person ill-favored in tongue an orator. The rich man alone can be happy even in sickness and can cloak misfortune.*

FR. 89. *And down from the steep rocks came roaming a horned hind, lifting its nostrils . . . and the tynes of its horns . . . the hind moved on in peace.*

FR. 90. *chant over*

FR. 91. *consider*

Testimonia of the myth are the following: Ps.-Alcidamas, *Ulixes* 14–16 (which I translate below from the text of L. Radermacher, *Artium Scriptores* p.144); Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* 2.7.4, 3.9.1; Diodorus Siculus 4.33.7–12; Hyginus, *Fabula* 99; Pausanias 1.4.6; 3.26.10; 8.4.9; 8.45.1,7; 8.47.4, 48.7, 54.5–6; 9.31.2; 10.28.8; Moses Chorenensis, *Progymnasmata* 3.3; Strabo 12.8.4, 13.1.69; Tzetzes, *Scholia ad Lycophronem* 206; *Paroemiographi Graeci*, App. Prov. 2.85 (Leutsch/Schneidewin I pp.411–12 and n.). Ps.-Alcidamas gives this version of the myth:

And to Aleus, King of Tegea, who came to Delphi, it was prophesied by the god that if his daughter should bear an offspring, his sons must die by the hand of his grandson. Aleus, hearing this, hastens for home and makes his daughter priestess of Athena, saying that if she ever lay with a man, she should be killed. Now incidentally Heracles, marching against Augeas, comes to Elis, and Aleus welcomes him in the temple of Athena. Now Heracles, seeing the daughter in the temple, debauched her in drunkenness. When Aleus her father took notice of her pregnancy, he summoned his [*sc.* Palamedes'] father, knowing him to be a seaman, and a skilled one. Nauplius arriving, he hands over his daughter to him to be sunk in the sea. He took her along, and when they arrived at Mt Parthenius, she gave birth to Telephus. Nauplius, neglecting what Aleus had ordered him, took her and the child to Mysia to sell to King Teuthras. Teuthras, being childless, makes Auge his wife and, naming her child Telephus, adopts him as his own son and gives him to Priam in Ilium to be educated.

### *Dramatis Personae*

ALEADAE. The title shows that the sons of Aleus must have appeared in the play. We know several tragedies named after the sons of mythological figures: Sophocles' *Antenoridae*, Euripides' *Heraclidae*, *Temenidae*, Ion's *Eurytidae*, Lycophron's *Pelopidae*, and the *Phineidae* of

an unknown author. It seems certain that the sons appeared in the action of these plays.<sup>2</sup>

As far as we can ascertain in mythology, the only incident in which the Aleadae are involved is their murder by their nephew Telephus, which is mentioned by Ps.-Alcidamas in the form of an oracle given to Aleus, grandfather of Telephus. Its confirmation is given in *Paroem.* App. 2.85 and Hygin. *Fab.* 244. It was Fr. Vater who explained the title and the main action of the play by calling attention to the oracle in Ps.-Alcidamas.<sup>3</sup>

One of Aleus' sons is named by Hyginus at *Fab.* 244: *Telephus Herculis filius Hippothoum et Neerae<sup>4</sup> aviae suae filios [sc. occidit]; cf. Fab. 243, Neera Autolyxi filia propter Hippothoi filii mortem [sc. se ipsa interfecit].* Robert<sup>5</sup> restored the name of the other son as Peneus (accepted by Wernicke<sup>6</sup>) and Welcker<sup>7</sup> as Nereus. But Pearson<sup>8</sup> accepts neither of these emendations and considers the name of the other son as lost. The reconstruction here presented entails the guess that one of the sons may have appeared as a mute (see below p.16). Probably Cepheus, Lycurgus and Amphidamas, given as Aleus' sons by other writers (Apollod. 3.9.1, Paus. 8.4.8, Ap.Rhod. 1.161), did not appear in this play.

TELEPHUS. If the play was concerned with the murder of the Aleadae, it is most reasonable to expect the murderer, if he is known, to appear, not as a mere nameless person but as a famous mythological figure. Telephus, whom both *Paroem.* App. 2.85 and Hygin. *Fab.* 244 give as the murderer of the Aleadae, is the son of Heracles and Auge daughter of Aleus, as the tradition unanimously records. But the story of Telephus' birth and infancy appears in several versions,

<sup>2</sup> For *Antenoridae* see Strabo 13.1.53; for *Heraclidae*, cf. the child-mutes; for *Temenidae*, Eur. fr.628-741 N.<sup>2</sup>; for *Eurytidae*, Athen. 11.495b; for *Pelopidae*, Stob. *Flor.* 119.13; doubtfully for *Phineidae*, Arist. *Poet.* 1455a. Except for the possible three in *Eurytidae*, the sons seem most likely to have appeared as pairs of brothers.

<sup>3</sup> Fr. Vater, *Die Aleaden des Sophokles, ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte dieses Dichters* (Berlin 1835). I have not had the opportunity to read this monograph, but follow the general evaluation of this work and esp. that of Pearson, I 46.

<sup>4</sup> et *Nerea aviae* cod.: et *Neerae aviae* St.

<sup>5</sup> C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* III.2 (Berlin 1923) 1145 n.1 [henceforth, ROBERT, *Held.*]; "Beiträge zur Erklärung des pergamenischen Telephos-Frieses," *JdI* 3 (1888) 61 [henceforth, ROBERT, *Beitr.*]: et *Perea aviae* (*Fab.* 244), *propter Hippothoi et \* \* filiorum mortem* (*Fab.* 243).

<sup>6</sup> Wernicke, *RE* 2 (1896) 2302 s.v. Auge [henceforth, WERNICKE].

<sup>7</sup> F. G. Welcker, *Die griechische Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet* I (Bonn 1839) 410 [henceforth, WELCKER].

<sup>8</sup> Pearson I 47.

most of which say that a hind nourished the exposed baby. *Aleadae* fr.89 P. undoubtedly refers to this hind. In the version of Ps.-Alcidamas, however, there is no room for a hind to play a part,<sup>9</sup> nor would the murder of the uncles happen if Telephus lived so far away from them and knew his own parentage. In all other versions he is either abandoned on Mt Parthenius by Aleus or his deputy (Apollod. 2.7.4, Tzetz. *ad Lyc.* 206, Apollod. 3.9.1) or deserted by Auge, who, banished by Aleus while pregnant, gives birth to Telephus on her way to Mysia (Diod.Sic. 4.33, Hygin. *Fab.* 99). In the latter version, even if Telephus alone remained in Arcadia his recognition by Aleus cannot happen unless Aleus was informed later by an attendant of Auge or by Nauplius on returning to Aleus.

Telephus' discovery is recorded in three ways:

(1) He is discovered and recognized by means of a token by Heracles. Heracles brings his baby son to Aleus. Whether there ensued reconciliation with Aleus<sup>10</sup> or his indignant rejection of the baby,<sup>11</sup> this version of Moses Chorenensis cannot be Sophocles' but most certainly goes back to Euripides' *Auge*,<sup>12</sup> a very late play as critics agree.<sup>13</sup> The pestilence motive (Apollod. 2.7.4, fr.267 N.<sup>2</sup>), Heracles' vindication of his own passion (fr.269 and 265 N.<sup>2</sup>), and benevolent direction by a god probably from the *mechane* (Strabo 13.1.69, Mos.Chor.) seem to have been prominent features of Euripides' *Auge*.

(2) He is discovered and reared by shepherds. The mystery of his birth urges Telephus when adult to go to Delphi to ask about his parentage. On receiving the oracular response Telephus repairs to Mysia (Hygin. *Fab.* 99–100, Apollod. 2.7.4, 3.9.1). If the adult Telephus goes to Delphi first and is at once directed to Mysia, the murder of the uncles cannot happen.

Welcker (pp.406–14), following this version, supposed that the rumor of the shepherds' foundling being Heracles' son encouraged him to go to Aleus' court to request acknowledgement of his noble

<sup>9</sup> So Pearson, *loc.cit.*, and A. Szantyr, "Die Telephos-trilogie des Sophokles," *Philologus* 93 (1938) 305 [henceforth, SZANTYR]. So also Paus. 8.4.9 (on the authority of Hecataeus), who has Auge and her child settle in Mysia without the intervention of Nauplius.

<sup>10</sup> Robert, *Held.* 1143; Wernicke 2303.

<sup>11</sup> T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967) 239, on the ground of Strabo 13.1.69.

<sup>12</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin 1875) 189.

<sup>13</sup> Wilamowitz, *loc.cit.* Webster, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.11) 238, dates the play to 408 B.C. mainly on the ground of the statistics given by Th. Zielinski, *Tragodumenon libri tres* (Krakow 1925).

birth by the King and the Aleadae. But Welcker's interpretations of the fragments are not quite satisfactory. Indeed fr.86 attests that the speaker's birth is questioned; and the only person in the story whose birth may be doubted is Telephus. The word *νόθος* in fr.87 undeniably refers to him. We may accept Welcker's supposition that the murder of the Aleadae by Telephus did take place in the play and that the doubt of Telephus' legitimacy was closely connected with it.

But fr.86 and 87 are better interpreted in the context that Telephus appeared as an alleged son of a respectable man and that his legitimacy was doubted, rather than that a shepherd's foundling claimed Heracles as father. As for other weaknesses in Welcker's interpretation see fr.89 and 84 below.

(3) He is discovered by the shepherds of Corythus, king of a certain *demos* of Tegea (Paus. 8.45.1 and 54.5 gives him as ancestor of the Corytheis, inhabitants of the southeast side of Mt Parthenius), and adopted by the king as his real prince, as Diodorus records (4.33).<sup>14</sup>

In Diodorus no tragic incident concerning Telephus' birth is suggested. But the reference to Corythus as Telephus' stepfather provides the key for the Sophoclean version.<sup>15</sup> It is evident that the speaker of fr.86 is Telephus, if we accept that the action of the play included the murder of the Aleadae and that question of Telephus' birth was connected with it; and Telephus is aware that he is not a real son, not at least a genuine heir of 'this father'. 'This father', then, certainly means a man of distinction. Can anybody else but Corythus be 'this father', whose paternity saves Telephus the ignominy of low birth (*μείων βλαβή* = *τοῦδε τοῦ πατρὸς κεκλήσθαι*)? *νόθος* in fr.87 is undoubtedly an allusion to Telephus' inferior birth. Much more abuse is heaped upon Telephus, until he restrains the slanderer from calling him a foundling, *παῦσαι* (fr.86).

ALEUS. There is no direct evidence for Aleus' appearance, but the virtual hero of the story is Aleus.<sup>16</sup> Of course Telephus' misfortune is great: he is harassed by the question of his birth, he kills his uncles. But the real tragedy is that of Aleus. He put his daughter to the

<sup>14</sup> The ambiguous expression of Apollod. 3.9.1 (*ὑπὸ Κορύθου βουκόλων*) may be regarded as agreeing with Hygin. *Fab.* 99–100; so M. Fromhold-Treu, "Die Telephos-trilogie des Sophokles," *Hermes* 69 (1934) 328 [henceforth, FROMHOLD-TREU]. But Robert, *Beitr.* 61, and G. Brizi, "Il mito di Telefo nei tragici greci," *AeR* n.s. 9 (1928) 108 [henceforth, BRIZI], regard it as agreeing with Diod.Sic. 4.33.

<sup>15</sup> So Robert, *Beitr.* 61, Brizi 106, Szantyr 306, and Fromhold-Treu 326.

<sup>16</sup> So Szantyr 306.

service of Athena to escape the foretold misfortune. When his grandson was born in spite of this, he was tortured by the dilemma whether to put his daughter to cruel death and save his sons or to save his daughter and leave his sons to the hazard of violent death at the hand of his grandson. So much he suffered, so enormous was his sacrifice, only to see the oracle fulfilled. That he is the hero does not necessarily mean that he should be longest on stage. Neoptolemus has a longer rôle than the hero of *Philoctetes*.

If Telephus' legitimacy is to be questioned, for the investigation to go on there must be two witnesses, the one who exposed the baby and the other who discovered it. The exposure-witness who can speak in exact accordance with the memory of the discoverer can be played, as the examination above of Telephus' exposure concluded, by Aleus, or by his deputy (Nauplius or a slave) on condition that Aleus is later informed of the fact. On the same condition, either Auge's attendant or Nauplius is eligible to be the witness of desertion after Telephus' birth on the mountain. Aleus is the most probable of the three because of the dramatic necessity for his appearance described above and, if Corythus did not appear, implied by fr.79.

**CORYTHUS' SLAVE.** Robert, Brizi and Szantyr<sup>17</sup> assumed the appearance of Corythus, of whom Aleus would demand surrender of his sons' murderer and who could reveal that Telephus was a foundling. But the witness of the discovery of the infant is better played by a shepherd than by Corythus, in that a king generally learns about these things only by report. In fact fr.89 must derive from a direct speech of the witness himself and not from a quoted speech. The speaker is giving a full account of the hind's graceful appearance in a deep recess of the mountain, probably to come back to her nursling.<sup>18</sup> The precise observation and vivid expression (*ὄρθίων πάγων, ἄραα μύξας, εἶρπε*) exclude the possibility that the words are quoted second-hand.

Thus if Corythus' shepherd be admitted as the witness of the dis-

<sup>17</sup> Robert, *Beitr.* 63, Brizi 107 and Szantyr 307.

<sup>18</sup> The possibility that Heracles is the speaker is ruled out since the version in which he appears (mainly Mos.Chor.) is not Sophoclean. Welcker (410) regarded fr.89 as a quotation in Telephus' speech pleading Heracleian parentage. But the detailed description of the discovery does not make this supposition likely. The hind could have been present when Auge bore Telephus on Mt Parthenius, but Auge's attendant (or Nauplius) could not have been sure that this particular hind would take care of the baby thereafter; he cannot therefore be the speaker of fr.89.

covery, Corythus' appearance in the play is not required. His presence is not even needed in the elucidation scene, where three characters should be expected to be present: the discovery-witness (= Corythus' shepherd), the exposure-witness (= Aleus, as the person who recognizes the fulfilment of the oracle and thus suffers most by the elucidation) and Telephus (= the person whose identity is to be elucidated). A fourth speaking character is not permitted in Greek tragedy.

It is not impossible, as Robert and Szantyr<sup>19</sup> assumed, for Corythus to appear while Aleus directs his accusation to Telephus' attendant and then for Corythus' shepherd to appear when the matter comes to final disclosure of the old secret. But the appearance of the shepherd just to give testimony is by all means inexpedient (especially if the scene of the action is Aleus' court: see p.12 below) and would cause the actor of Corythus the great difficulty of leaving the stage abruptly and promptly reentering as the shepherd. A more economical and efficient device is to have the discovery-witness cover the rôle of Telephus' guardian also. If he appeared as an elderly attendant of a young prince like the paedagogue of Orestes in *Electra*, he could well function as a sort of guardian. He would most naturally be expected to know his master's old secret, too. One would not call a shepherd a paedagogue. So Corythus' slave in the character of Telephus' paedagogue, rather than a shepherd, would best perform the two functions.

MESSENGER. Direct evidence is lacking, but the murder of the Aleadae must be reported, and such a rôle is normally assigned to a messenger in Greek tragedy.

QUEEN NEAERA? Hyginus attests the suicide of Queen Neaera because of her sons' death (*Fab.* 243). This may go back to Sophocles.<sup>20</sup>

CHORUS. On the ground of fr.84, the Chorus must have been comprised of citizens of Tegea.<sup>21</sup> The anapaestic rhythm suggests that the fragment can be a part either of the Parodus or of the remark delivered by the Chorus introducing a new character or a theme after a stasimon (see p.13 below on fr.84). The 'noble' in contrast to the 'ignoble' undoubtedly refers to the Aleadae, so that the Chorus can be assumed to side with Aleus and the Aleadae, not with Telephus.

The number of the speaking characters would thus be six (supposing one of the Aleadae to be mute; see p.16 below), as in *Electra*.

<sup>19</sup> Robert, *Beitr.* 63; Szantyr 307.

<sup>20</sup> Robert, *Beitr.* 61 and *Held.* 1143.

<sup>21</sup> Brizi 107.

### Dramatic Time and Place

If the cast of characters is decided as above, the dramatic time and place are already evident. Telephus must appear before Aleus and the Aleadae as Corythus' son; assumed antecedents were his exposure by Aleus or his deputy, suckling by a hind and discovery by Corythus' Slave. Thereupon the murder of the Aleadae and the related inquiry into Telephus' origin can proceed.

The encounter can take place more conveniently at Aleus' palace than at Corythus', if we accept the appearance of Telephus' paedagogue in lieu of Corythus. If Hyginus' account of Neaera (*Fab.* 243) goes back to Sophocles, the scene of the action at Aleus' court is confirmed. According to the convention of Greek tragedy the setting would be specified as 'Tegea before Aleus' Palace'. Successful dramaturgy would require that Corythus stay at home and not appear in the action. So the dramatic occasion would be when young Prince Telephus, presumed son of Corythus, accompanied by his paedagogue visits King Aleus of Tegea and his royal sons.

The distribution of the characters to three actors could have been as follows:

PROTAGONIST	Telephus
DEUTERAGONIST	Aleus, Hippothous
TRITAGONIST	Corythus' Slave, Neaera, Messenger

### Tentative Reconstruction of the Action

**PROLOGUE.** Telephus with the Paedagogue must appear before Aleus' palace and be received by either Aleus or the Aleadae (Hippothous and the mute). Corythus' *demos* may be thought to be an independent small town, whereas Aleus' *polis* is the historical Tegea.<sup>22</sup> The occasion can be imagined as, say, a good-will visit or a sojourn on Telephus' journey for some religious purpose. A cordial welcome seems probable, to contrast effectively with the hostility that follows.<sup>23</sup>

**PARODUS.** The Chorus of Tegeans enter. The subject-matter is unknown.

**FIRST EPISODE.** How did it happen that the visiting young prince should kill the royal sons of his host? Wernicke<sup>24</sup> rightly guessed the insult-motive, but is that enough to cause Telephus' violent deed?

<sup>22</sup> Hdt. 1.65–68; 9.26, 28, 62, 70, 71.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Schmid-Stählin, I.ii (München 1934) 424.

<sup>24</sup> Wernicke 2302.

Robert<sup>25</sup> guessed that the situation was similar either to the case of Meleager (who kills his uncles the Testiadae on the boar hunt) or to the funeral contest of the Paris legend (Paris, thought to be a shepherd, defeats the royal princes, actually his own brothers). The latter suggestion seems highly probable because of the strong resemblance of fr.93 P. (*Alexander*) to our fr.84. Fr.84 reads:

κοῦκ οἶδ' ὅτι χρῆ πρὸς ταῦτα λέγειν,  
 ὅταν οἷ γ' ἀγαθοὶ πρὸς τῶν ἀγενῶν  
 κατανικῶνται.  
 ποία πόλις ἂν τὰδ' ἐνέγκοι;

The illegitimate birth of the 'ignoble' (Telephus) must have been already mentioned before these lines, for the indignant words show that in the event just ended the Aleadae had been expected as a matter of course to win over Telephus because they are 'noble'.

Assignment of fr.84 to the Parodus is supportable because of its anapaestic rhythm. But the sentiment of the fragment—indignation at the humiliating defeat of the Aleadae on whose side they stand—requires it to be placed after at least a bout of action. Short anapaestic passages appear in *Antigone* after stasima to introduce new characters or themes.<sup>26</sup> The verses after the first stasimon may offer a parallel to fr.84: they convey the perplexed apprehension of the citizens at the disconcerting situation Antigone has brought about.

The sequence surrounding fr.84 was probably as follows. The rumor of Telephus' bastardy may have reached Aleus' court before the First Episode. The Aleadae must call him *νόθος* in the First Episode. The insinuation enrages Telephus. He cannot but challenge the Aleadae to a contest of physical prowess, or something of the kind, to disprove the allegation by demonstrating his own genuine birth. Without an event of this sort and an unexpected defeat of the royal princes (during the First Stasimon) resulting in more indignant abuses (Second Episode), Telephus cannot lose himself so completely as to commit murder. How otherwise could his discomfiture at malicious gossip develop into such uncontrollable hatred?

So we can conjecture in the First Episode Telephus' challenge of the Aleadae to a contest.<sup>27</sup> Fr.87 reinforces this conjecture:

<sup>25</sup> Robert, *Beitr.* 62 and *Held.* 1145.

<sup>26</sup> e.g. *Ant.* 151–62 after the parodus, 376–83 after the first stasimon, 526–30 in the middle of the second episode, 626–30 after the second stasimon, 801–05 after the third stasimon.

<sup>27</sup> Robert (*Beitr.* 62) interprets fr.84 as referring to the contest, whereas Welcker (413) and Brizi (107) take it to refer to the murder itself. I think that proper division of the action

A. ὁ δ', εἰ νόθος τις, γνησίους ἴσον θένει;

B. ἅπαν τὸ χρηστὸν γνησίαν ἔχει φύειν.

---

ὁ δ' εἰ *codd.* ὁ δὴ *vulgo* : ὁδ' εἰ . . . θένει Pearson: οὐ δὴ νόθος τις . . . θένει; Nauck:  
ὁ δ', εἰ . . . θένει; *scripsi.*

The words, if they are to be interpreted as above, show that the result of the defeat of the 'noble' is not yet known. Therefore I should place the fragment before the contest, *i.e.* before the end of the First Episode. The second line should in any case be a defence of Telephus. While the victory of the Aleadae is expected by the Chorus as a matter of course, Corythus' Slave is confident of Telephus' victory.<sup>28</sup>

FIRST STASIMON. The subject is unknown, but the proposed contest must take place offstage and the First Stasimon conveniently provides an occasion.

SECOND EPISODE. After the First Stasimon fr.84 would seem likely as announcing the unexpected defeat of the Aleadae: the reputed 'ignoble' proved to be superior to the 'noble'. It is quite natural that their wounded self-respect should cause the Aleadae to insult the visitor still more. Unless extravagantly abusive language by the Aleadae is actually heard onstage and the exacerbation of Telephus is witnessed, the audience cannot accept the murder as an inevitable outcome.

In fr.86 the anger of Telephus seems to have gone to the extreme.

παῦσαι. καταρκεῖ τοῦδε κεκλήσθαι πατρός,  
εἶπερ πέφυκά γ'· εἰ δὲ μή, μείων βλαβή.  
τό τοι νομισθὲν τῆς ἀληθείας κρατεῖ.

---

2 μείων Gesner : μείζων S A, μείζον M.

The interlocutor must be Hippothous.<sup>29</sup> He would have said something like, "Not only is your mother a nameless woman (νόθος). You are

---

and the connection here suggested between fr.84 and fr.87 show that the latter interpretation fails.

<sup>28</sup> Robert, *Held.* 1145 n.4, accepting Nauck's emendation, made it a conversation between Hippothous and Telephus. But if one understands that Telephus is being referred to in the third person in the first line, the speaker of the second line must be Corythus' Slave.

<sup>29</sup> So Fromhold-Treu 328 n.1. One can imagine Aleus as the interlocutor of fr.86 and place it in Telephus' conversation with Aleus (Third Episode); but this seems less likely to me because, if Telephus thus blocked the way, further investigation becomes difficult.

called son of Corythus. But it is only the name, the fact is different.” Hippothous is alluding to the even more damaging rumor that Telephus is not Corythus’ real son. The Aleadae, out of spite for their defeat, must have gone so far as to call Telephus not only a bastard but a foundling. One must feel not only Telephus’ fierce anger but also the bitter apprehension spreading through his mind: “What if my father were an obscure person of dubious origin!” In such violent perturbation the young prince can easily lose his temper beyond control.

But I suggest that still another dramatic force combines with Telephus’ sense of outrage. Effective dramaturgy might employ remonstrance and efforts to restrain, and these seem confirmed by fragments 88, 77, 82, 85 and 87 (B).

We saw above that Corythus’ Slave must have played an indispensable part in the recognition scene; also since the scene occurs before Aleus’ palace, that it would be clumsy to call him out after so great a lapse of time only when his speech is required, and then from a distant place. In order to make the appearance of Corythus’ Slave in the recognition scene ready and natural, the best device is to let him appear far ahead of the scene. If he appeared as the Paedagogue attending the Prince on his journey, he would naturally be expected to know his master’s secret. He would have tried to keep Telephus from suspecting some truth in the words of insult, and he could have exerted a counteracting dramatic force against his young master’s accelerating rage. The Paedagogue must speak words like fr.88 to urge the young prince to pay no heed to the increasingly offensive insults which the Chorus may have joined in offering (*τῆς ὑπερτάτης τυραννίδος θακοῦσιν ἀγχίστην ἔδραν* = the Aleadae?).

- FR. 88. *τὰ χρήματ’ ἀνθρώποισιν εὐρίσκει φίλους,  
αὐθις δὲ τιμάς, εἶτα τῆς ὑπερτάτης  
τυραννίδος θακοῦσιν ἀγχίστην ἔδραν.  
ἔπειτα δ’ οὐδεὶς ἐχθρὸς οὔτε φύεται  
πρὸς χρήμαθ’ οἷ τε φύντες ἀρνοῦνται στυγεῖν.  
δεινὸς γὰρ ἔρπειν πλοῦτος ἔς τε τᾶβρατα  
καὶ πρὸς βέβηλα, χυπόθεν πένης ἀνήρ  
οὐδ’ ἐντυχῶν δύναιτ’ ἂν ὦν ἐρᾶ τυχεῖν.  
καὶ γὰρ δυσειδὲς σῶμα καὶ δυσώνυμον  
γλώσση σοφὸν τίθησιν εὐμορφόν τ’ ἰδεῖν.*

μόνω δὲ χαίρειν κἄν νόσων ξυνουσία  
 πάρεστιν αὐτῷ κάπικρύπτεσθαι κακά.<sup>30</sup>

The speech is similar to *Ant.* 295–301, where the speaker explains by probable motive of money what is unpleasant and what he refuses to accept.

If the Paedagogue tries further in fr.77 to remonstrate with Telephus not to react rashly and if Telephus retorts with fr.82 and 85, the urgent remonstrance of the Paedagogue confirms his anxiety lest his young master should develop doubt about his own birth.

- FR. 77. ἐνταῦθα μέντοι πάντα τᾶνθρώπων νοσεῖ,  
 κακοῖς ὅταν θέλωσιν ἰᾶσθαι κακά.  
 FR. 82. τί ταῦτα πολλῶν ῥημάτων ἔτ' ἔστι σοι;  
 τὰ γὰρ περισσὰ πανταχοῦ λυπήρ' ἔπη.  
 FR. 85. δοκῶ μὲν, οὐδεὶς· ἀλλ' ὄρα μὴ κρεῖσσον ἦ  
 καὶ δυσσεβοῦντα τῶν ἐναντίων κρατεῖν  
 ἢ δοῦλον αὐτὸν ὄντα τῶν πέλας κλύειν.

The more earnest the remonstrance of the Paedagogue, the more inevitable and fatal seems the misdeed of Telephus.

If fr.87 (B) is assigned to the Paedagogue (“All brave men, even if obscure in birth, have a noble nature”), his deep participation in the action should be accepted already in the First Episode. His frequent presence on stage in the first part of the action explains why one of the Aleadae is more probably a mute (*cf.* a singular interlocutor of fr.86). The Second Episode ends with Telephus rushing off stage in fury in spite of the Paedagogue’s earnest protest.

SECOND STASIMON. The murder of the Aleadae must take place during the stasimon. The subject of the stasimon can be apprehension of the unhappy consequence after the violent exchange of words.

THIRD EPISODE. The third episode often begins a new turn in the action.<sup>31</sup> I surmise that the Third Episode of *Aleadae* began with Aleus’ appearance after the Messenger’s brief report of the murder of the

<sup>30</sup> It is not impossible to see in fr.88 a charge of bribery directed by Telephus to the Paedagogue, who refuses to give a definite answer in the Third Episode. But the worldly wisdom of the lines suggests rather an elderly speaker.

<sup>31</sup> In *Ajax* the third episode begins with the messenger from Teucer; in *Antigone* with the appearance of Haemon; in *Trachiniae* with the sudden anxiety of Deianeira; in *Oedipus Rex* with the arrival of the Corinthian messenger; in *Electra* with Orestes’ appearance before Electra.

Aleadae. The audience's tragic involvement was realized in witnessing the fulfilment of the oracle by completely unsuspecting persons and in sharing the suffering of those most deeply concerned in the unhappy development as they discover step by step how they unknowingly fulfilled the fearful oracle, while simultaneously pursuing the quest for Telephus' true origin, on which doubt had already been thrown in the beginning of the play.

Aleus can appear in anger and shower Telephus with words of reproach<sup>32</sup> after the announcement of the murder. To vindicate himself Telephus must first of all insist that the insult of bastardy was false. The character from whom Telephus could demand support for his own belief in his legitimacy is the Paedagogue. Without his presence between Aleus and Telephus, the scene of Aleus' indictment cannot evolve to the elucidation which necessarily followed without delay, for already before the murder Telephus himself had been deeply perturbed about his legitimacy (fr.86).

If Telephus already suspected something of truth in the Aleadae's double abuse, his first words to the Paedagogue would have been an urgent question about his own birth. But the Paedagogue naturally refuses to tell the truth.

FR. 81. ὦ παῖ, ciώπα· πόλλ' ἔχει ciγῆ καλά.

FR. 83. μή πάντ' ἐρεύνα· πολλὰ καὶ λαθεῖν καλόν.

How the young prince caused the Paedagogue to disclose the devastating secret can be conjectured from the similar scene in *Oedipus Rex*. Oedipus blames the Shepherd for avoiding the question (1150), threatens him with force (1152), bullies him (1154), demands honesty (1156), forbids delay (1160), orders him to be definite (1164), threatens him with death (1166), discloses his own pain yet pushes forward the cross-examination and leaves nothing unknown (1179). A similar procedure (fr.78 and 80, both exhortations by Telephus to speak truth?) would have led to the confession (fr.89).

FR. 78. τοῖς γὰρ δικαίοις ἀντέχειν οὐ ῥάδιον.

FR. 80. καὶ γὰρ δικαία γλῶσσι' ἔχει κράτος μέγα.

<sup>32</sup> Fr.77 (as spoken by Aleus) and fr.85 (as spoken by Telephus) can belong here, but less likely, because conversation between Aleus and Telephus could not linger on the morality of enmity or wickedness and its result. Welcker supposed that Heracles speaks fr.77 in the epiphany—a valid hypothesis if a *deus ex machina* is approved.

FR. 89. νομὰς δέ τις κερούσς' ἀπ' ὀρθίων πάγων  
καθεῖρπεν ἔλαφος . . .  
. . . .  
ἄρασα μύξας . . . καὶ κερασφόρους  
στόρθυγγας εἶρφ' ἔκηλος

THIRD STASIMON. In *Oedipus Rex* the secret is almost disclosed at the end of the third episode (1085, Oedipus' abuse of Jocasta for leaving), and the curiously joyful tone of the third stasimon contrasts with the horrible revelation to be completed in the unusually short fourth episode (1110–85). Sophocles apparently relished the effect of contrasting emotion in anticipation of imminent tragic catastrophe.<sup>33</sup> The situation in *Aleadae* is very like that of *Oedipus Rex* (see Jebb *ad loc.*), so that the Third Stasimon may here too be a hyporcheme.

FOURTH EPISODE. The pain of the old Paedagogue in his confession is indeed great, but his pain is only that of admitting the obscurity of his master's origin. He was quite unconscious of the hidden blood-relationship between his master and the victims. For Aleus' confession of the past could not take place before the old story of the Paedagogue was finished. One may think it possible that Aleus, in the presence of Telephus and the Paedagogue, first expressed relief at the apparent failure of the oracle. But in that case the Paedagogue would have made a desperate effort to avoid revealing the old secret, as soon as he realized in horror what an irredeemable catastrophe his words would bring to these men of high status. Therefore if Aleus first confessed his past deed as an accidental remark of relief, the dramatist would have needed an extra effort to wrench open the mouth of the Paedagogue, and he would have lost a chance to practise his favorite art of so constructing his dramatic scheme that a step of action inescapably leads to a second and it in turn serves as cue for a third. I dare presume that Sophocles did not miss the chance to build an inexorable scheme of ever increasing dramatic suspense: the first and less tragic *anagnorisis* (Telephus' learning his own past from the Paedagogue in the Third Episode) would inevitably provoke the second and more tragic *anagnorisis* (revelation of the blood-relationship between Telephus and the Aleadae and recognition of the fulfilment

<sup>33</sup> Other instances are *Aj.* 693–718 and *Trach.* 633–62, as noted by R. Jebb, *Oedipus Tyrannus* (Cambridge 1887) 143, and M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie*<sup>3</sup> (Göttingen 1954) 24.

of the oracle in the Fourth Episode). Thus he would achieve the most powerful dramatic effect that the story can provide.

When Aleus heard the account of discovery, he could not have remained unmoved. His consternation cannot pass unnoticed. Telephus may ask Aleus why he betrays such dismay, and with this the second elucidation scene begins. Fr.79 (spoken by Telephus) may show in combination with fr.81 and 83 (spoken by Aleus), if placed here, a firm determination by Aleus to keep silence against Telephus' importunity.

(FR. 81. ὦ παῖ, σιώπα· πόλλ' ἔχει σιγή καλά.)

(FR. 83. μὴ πάντ' ἐρεύνα· πολλὰ καὶ λαθεῖν καλόν.)

FR. 79. κακὸν τὸ κεύθειν· κοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς εὐγενοῦς.

Can the confession of Aleus be extracted after all? It may have been that he could not suppress his realization of the blasphemous situation or that he could not endure to hear his own grandson bewailing the now disclosed obscurity of his birth.

But the Paedagogue must have left the stage never to reappear after that painful confession (fr.89). As a matter of human reaction he would not have dared to face his young master after the disclosure. His dramatic function was also completed. The actor who played the Paedagogue can now appear as another character. Queen Neaera's suicide on account of the death of her sons is assumable from Hygin. *Fab.* 243. She could have participated in the second elucidation. The exchange of words between Neaera and Aleus may have led to the eventual confession. She may have left the stage as soon as she was convinced of the fulfilment of the oracle, her suicide to be announced afterwards. Eurydice in *Antigone* offers a parallel to Neaera in that the wife shares the misery of the husband and enhances it by suicide.

FOURTH STASIMON. The fourth stasimon of *Oedipus Rex* is devoted to the Chorus' sympathetic lamentation for the hero's misfortune. No other subject is imaginable for the Fourth Stasimon of *Aleadae*.

EXODUS. Atonement and exile of the murderer was a rule in ancient Greece. The added sorrow of Aleus was that he had to banish his own grandson whom he had just recognized as his only remaining kinsman. According to *Paroem.* App. 2.85 Telephus goes to Delphi to ask where to seek for purification (Cod.Vat. I 64 and Cod.Bodl. 363) or to inquire about his parents. The Delphic oracle points to Mysia. The divine intention is undoubtedly to realize Telephus' reunion with his

mother and to confer upon him sovereignty over Mysia. How much of this was included in *Aleadae* we do not know. Telephus' departure for Delphi can be announced by either Aleus or Telephus himself. There is no particular reason to imagine a *deus ex machina* as in the reconstruction of Welcker (to assure the claim of Telephus to be Heracles' son) or Robert (Heracles *ex machina* to promise Telephus a glorious future in Mysia).<sup>34</sup>

### *Oedipus Rex* and *Aleadae*

Remarkable resemblance of the play to *Oedipus Rex* has been pointed out.<sup>35</sup> The material is similar: an ominous oracle, exposure of the infant prince to avoid its fulfilment, discovery and adoption by a neighboring king, slander of bastardy, doomed murder in ignorance and inevitable disclosure of the fulfilment of the oracle.

In *Oedipus Rex*, however, each element of the story is more complicated—not only parricide but also incest, double inquiry of the oracle, a longer span of time covering the unhappy incidents. In *Oedipus Rex* these complicated elements are woven into a drama of unique concentration and power<sup>36</sup> by careful construction with skillful

<sup>34</sup> If *Aleadae* were part of a connected trilogy comprising also *Mysi* and *Achaion Syllogos* as supposed by Schmid-Stählin I.ii 425, T. B. L. Webster (*An Introduction to Sophocles*<sup>2</sup> [London 1969] 199), and A. Lesky (*Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*<sup>3</sup> [Göttingen 1972] 260), Robert's concern would be needless, because the supposed contents of the last two plays would seem to compensate Telephus for his misery in the first play. But both of the texts which formerly seemed to support the supposition—BKT 5.2.64 (1907) + P.Ryl. III 482 (1938) and the Aixone inscription, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 3091 (A. A. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, *Polemon* 1 [1929] 161ff)—are no longer thought to attest a connected trilogy: see E. Handley and J. Rea, *The Telephus of Euripides* (BICS Suppl. 5, London 1957) esp. 21–22, and W. Luppe, "Zu einer Choregeninschrift aus *Aißowal*," *ArchP* 19 (1969) 147–51 (cf. Snell, TGF<sup>3</sup> I [Göttingen 1971] pp.17 and 39).

The passage long attributed to Aeschylus' *Mysi* (Arist. *Poet.* 24, 1460a32), however, should more reasonably be attributed to Sophocles: see H. J. Mette, *Der verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin 1963) 79. If Sophocles presented the hero in long silence in the prologue of *Mysi* (Parthenopaeus speaking for Telephus), that dramatic feature would follow more naturally from his treatment of Telephus in the preceding play than if *Mysi* were an independent play. So the opening scene of *Mysi* would seem more effective if *Aleadae* had preceded it; and the most probable subject of *Mysi* (*anagnorisis* between Telephus and Auge, and transfer of the sovereignty over Mysia by Teuthras to Telephus) would amend for the misfortune of the family.

<sup>35</sup> e.g. by Szantyr 307.

<sup>36</sup> In spite of the second prize which the play obtained at its first performance, its distinction has been unanimously acclaimed since the praise of Aristotle (*Poet.* 1452a, 1454b7, 1460a29 etc.) and Aristophanes' hypothesis.

dramatic techniques. Tycho von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff<sup>37</sup> pointed out the remarkable cases of identification of characters in *Oedipus Rex*: Sophocles made the servant who had abandoned the child the same man as the attendant of King Laius on his travel, although two different incidents were witnessed. And he made the Corinthian messenger who brought the news of King Polybus' death the same as the Corinthian shepherd who had rescued the baby. These more daring identifications may have been modeled after the successful combination of two characters with different functions into one, viz. Telephus' Paedagogue in *Aleadae*. On the assumption that dramatization of more complicated material is undertaken after a successful attempt with simpler material of the same kind, we are induced to regard *Aleadae* as a prototype of *Oedipus Rex*.

Among extant Greek tragedies an anapaestic parodus is found only in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Vincetus*, *Persae*, *Supplices* and *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Ajax* and *Inachus* and Euripides' *Alcestis*. The anapaestic systems employed in *Antigone* must be regarded as an echo of the ancient manner.<sup>38</sup> I have assumed that fr.84 of *Aleadae* can be another example of the latter case.

We have admitted that three characters are on stage at least in the first elucidation scene (fr.89), but three characters are used already in *Ajax* and *Antigone*, although under the restriction that one of them is silent.

The central theme of divine knowledge (the oracle) and human ignorance places the play near *Trachiniae* and *Oedipus Rex*. One might also be reminded of the story of Croesus' son (Hdt. 1.34-45). If Herodotean influence is to be recognized in the theme, the play should not be assigned to the earliest years of Sophocles.<sup>39</sup> These considerations urge us to date *Aleadae* before, but not too long before, *Oedipus Rex*.

TACHIBANA JOSHI DAIGAKU, KYOTO  
June, 1975

<sup>37</sup> T. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Berlin 1917) 71.

<sup>38</sup> A. E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (Oxford 1896) 181 and 355; M. Pohlenz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.33) 221.

<sup>39</sup> Herodotus is supposed to have arrived in Athens sometime before 443 B.C. because he joined the Athenian colony at Thurii (founded in that year), where his tomb and epitaph were shown. Sophocles' dedication of a poem to Herodotus is dated to 441 B.C. by Plut. *An seni* 3.785B.