

Aeschylus' *Philoctetes*

William M. Calder III

SOPHOCLES' *Philoctetes* holds a special interest for historians of literature. It is the only extant Sophoclean tragedy, if we exclude the posthumous *Oedipus Coloneus*, precisely dated. It is as well the only extant tragedy by one of the three which we know to be the third treatment of the same theme; for the priority of either *Electra* can never be proved. Hence a need to scrutinize all that can be known of its two lost predecessors: only thus may we detect Sophoclean originality, the best clue for his intentions. This essay tries to gather what can be learned of Aeschylus' *Philoctetes*. I shall proceed by treating (1) dramatic time and place, (2) the *dramatis personae*, (3) the action and (4) the date of production. Although I must often express disagreement, without the fundamental work of G. Hermann, A. Nauck, O. Ribbeck, F. G. Welcker, and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff I should be unable to compose this article, which, if nothing else, will, I hope, remind the young how much we owe our forebears.

Dramatic Time and Place and Dramatis Personae

Dio Chrysostom (52.6–7) attests the dramatic time and place: before the dwelling¹ of Philoctetes on Lemnos near the shore during the tenth year of the War at Troy. As to the cast of characters, Dio (52.5) and the title attest Philoctetes. Dio again (52.5) attests Odysseus. A short-lived heresy claimed Neoptolemos. The “evidence” was *POxy.* 2256 fr.5 (Pack² 46), a lacunose hypothesis with a list of characters. “It may be . . . the *Philoctetes* of Aeschylus,” remarked Lobel *ad loc.* If the characters were in order of appearance, Neoptolemos delivered the prologue. After an uncritical review by Snell,² Lesky³ and

¹ Probably his home was represented to be a rustic wooden shack. I doubt that the pre-Periclean theater could provide hillside and cave. Wilamowitz, *Griechische Tragödien* IV (Berlin 1923) 11 (henceforth: *GrTr* IV) argued “ein Holzhaus” for Euripides' *Philoctetes* in 431. The Aeschylean scenery would, if anything, be simpler still.

² See B. Snell, *Gnomon* 25 (1953) 439.

³ See Albin Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* (Göttingen 1956) 127; cf. M. Pohlenz *Die griechische Tragödie* II² (Göttingen 1954) 136.

Lloyd-Jones⁴ prematurely allowed an Aeschylean Neoptolemos. A convincing alternative restoration by Stella Kossyphopoulos,⁵ rightly accepted by Mette⁶ and Erbse,⁷ has reduced Lesky's confidence.⁸ We have no evidence that Neoptolemos appeared in Aeschylus' play.

But was there a third character? Wilamowitz⁹ suggested another person: "denn die Wahrheit musste an den Tag kommen." One must argue from analogy and circumstantial evidence. No extant Greek tragedy has a cast of only two. Even *Supplices* has three rôles, Danaos, the Argive King and a Herald. Philoctetes must be told the truth by a convincing speaker. Odysseus, who had shamelessly deceived him, would not be one. The rustics of Lemnos would not be competent to elucidate Greek policy at Troy. One longs for a god or hero. That Dio mentions no divine rôle is not decisive. He omits a Sophoclean character, the false merchant (52.15).¹⁰ One adduces fr.251 N.² (401 M.), transmitted in the scholion to *Odyssey* 14.12 (580.9 Dindorf): κρεμάσασα τόξον πίτυος ἐκ μελανδρύου. A female has hung a bow from a pine branch. F. H. Bothe¹¹ is alleged to have emended to κρεμάσας τὸ τόξον, following Eustathius. Or one may believe that the fragment is from a narrative. Otherwise a goddess must have appeared on stage.¹²

⁴ See H. Lloyd-Jones, *Aeschylus II: The Appendix* (LCL, London and Cambridge [Mass.] 1957) 586 n.1.

⁵ See S. G. Kossyphopoulos, *Hellenika* 14 (1955–56) 449–51, which I know only by citation.

⁶ See H. J. Mette, *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin 1959) 144 fr.392 and *Der verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin 1963) 104.

⁷ See H. Erbse, *Hermes* 94 (1966) 180 n.2.

⁸ See A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*² (Bern and München 1963) 321; *Die griechische Tragödie*³ (Stuttgart 1964) 158; and *AnzAlt* 20 (1967) 213.

⁹ See Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.10.

¹⁰ See N. Wecklein, *SBMünchen* 1 (1888) 130, and J. S. Kieffer, "Philoctetes and Arete," *CP* 37 (1942) 43.

¹¹ Thus Nauck on fr.251 N.²; but I cannot trace the reference. F. H. Bothe, *Aeschyli Dramata quae supersunt et Deperditorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig and London 1805) 588–89, does not even edit this fragment. The change is implied by Wilamowitz in his translation (*GrTr* IV.10 n.1): "er hängte den Bogen an einen Fichtenast"; cf. Mette, *Der verlorene Aischylos* (*supra* n.6) 103.

¹² F. G. Welcker, *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Litteratur* III (Bonn 1861) 183 (henceforth: WELCKER, *KS* III) already attributed the verse to Athene. G. Hermann, *Opuscula* III (Leipzig 1828) 116, had earlier argued Athene's inclusion in the cast. He is followed by Th. Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* III (Berlin 1884) 426 n.185. Contrarily, R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles, the Plays and Fragments, Part IV: The Philoctetes* (Cambridge 1898) xv (henceforth: JEBB), prefers only two characters, no *deus ex machina* and no accomplice; cf. K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles*³ (Frankfurt am Main 1947) 172.

Hermann¹³ drew attention to the Aeschylean habit of introducing a new character in each 'act'. The habit was no rule, however: *Septem* and *Supplices* provide exceptions. The chorus, we learn from Dio (52.7), consisted of twelve men of Lemnos. To sum up:

Dramatis Personae (in probable order of appearance)

Philoctetes

Odysseus

A Goddess (?)

Chorus of the Men of Lemnos.

The Action

Friedrich Leo¹⁴ declared fr.249 N.² (404 M.), *Σπερχειὲ ποταμὲ βούνομοί τ' ἐπιστροφαί*, to have begun the play, a view endorsed and popularized by Wilamowitz.¹⁵ Eduard Fraenkel,¹⁶ who oddly attributed the thesis to Wilamowitz rather than to Leo, called it "possible . . . but not certain." Mette¹⁷ accepts it unquestioningly. The argument is (1) that the verse is quoted by Aeschylus at *Ranae* 1383 as riposte to Euripides' quotation of *Medea* 1, and (2) the frequency of Aeschylean first lines containing vocatives (*Sept.* 1; *Cho.* 1; fr.143 N.²). The Spercheios is the river in southern Thessaly which empties into the Gulf of Malia. The speaker, therefore, is surely Philoctetes, who apostrophizes his homeland. Sophocles remembered the line and has his hero also address the river (*Phil.* 492; cf. 1215f). If Leo were right, the play would have begun as *Septem* with a monologue by the protagonist. But Apuleius (*de Deo Socratis* 24) cites Accius' *Philoctetes* (520–24 Ribbeck) specifically *in eius tragoediae principio*. Accius' tragedy began with a *parodos*, that is, in the archaic Aeschylean manner. I wish not to re-open the problem of Accius' sources¹⁸ but shall merely state that,

¹³ See G. Hermann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) III.116: "Non est enim credibile, solos Vlysem, Philoctetam, et chorum eam fabulam egisse, praesertim quum Aeschylus in singulis actibus novam introducere personam consuevisset."

¹⁴ See Friedrich Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* I (Berlin 1913; repr. Darmstadt 1967) 396 n.2. Welcker, *KS* III.188, thought the verse probably the beginning of a speech.

¹⁵ See Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.9 n.2.

¹⁶ See Ed. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* II (Oxford 1950) 1 n.1.

¹⁷ See Mette, *Der verlorene Aischylos* (*supra* n.6) 103.

¹⁸ See G. Hermann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) III.113ff; Welcker, *KS* III.180ff (both Aeschylus); H. Patin, *Etudes sur les tragiques grecs: Sophocle* (Paris 1913; repr. Amsterdam 1969) 134ff (Aeschylus); E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* II (Cambridge and London 1936) 505 ("in part at least based on Aeschylus"); Otto Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der*

in spite of Wilamowitz,¹⁹ I see nothing to disprove the opinions of Hermann,²⁰ Welcker²¹ and their followers that Accius' original was fundamentally Aeschylean. Accius' play, *e.g.*, requires only two actors, while Sophocles and Euripides demonstrably required three. Of course *contaminatio* existed in Roman tragedy as well as comedy; and a Roman could add details at will. Seneca's *Troades* shows us that.²² We know that neither Euripides (Dio 59) nor Sophocles began his *Philoctetes* with a parodos. Accius either (1) invented the device, (2) took it from an otherwise unknown Hellenistic archaizing tragedian, or (3) took it from Aeschylus. The last hypothesis is the most economical. Dio's stress (52.7) on the abrupt entrance of Aeschylus' chorus (ὁ δ' Αἰχχύλος ἀπλῶς εἰσήγαγε τὸν χορόν) may reflect an opening parodos.

The Accian fragment is an address to Odysseus, and the ode may have contained a praise of Lemnos.²³ If Accius has translated an Aeschylean original, either the Lemnians are apostrophizing an Odysseus whom they believe absent in a lyric catalogue of Greek heroes at Troy or they have already met Odysseus, who has bribed or cajoled them into helping deceive Philoctetes. In either case Philoctetes would not be on stage and so would not hear the distasteful sentiments. The latter is more probable. Thus the audience would learn the identity of the deuteragonist. Dio (52.5–6) informs us that after ten years' absence Philoctetes did not recognize Odysseus. To understand the intrigue the audience must know what Philoctetes

Republik (Leipzig 1875; repr. Hildesheim 1968) 376ff (Euripides); F. Leo, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.14) (Hellenistic original); and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff *apud* Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles." *PhilUnters* 22 (Berlin 1917) 315 n.1 (the Roman play was basically original).

¹⁹ See U. von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra*, n.18) 315 n.1: "Die Gelehrsamkeit seiner Parodos, Mysterien von Lemnos, Feurraub des Prometheus, schmeckt nach hellenistischer Poesie viel mehr als nach einer attischen Tragödie."

²⁰ See G. Hermann, *op.cit.* (*supra*, n.12) III.113ff.

²¹ See Welcker, *KS* III.180ff.

²² See my "Senecas 'Troerinnen': eine Untersuchung über die Kompositionsweise der Sekundär-Tragödie," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock* 15, *Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 4/5 (1966) 551–59, and "Originality in Seneca's *Troades*," *CP* 65 (1970) 75–82. P. Meltzer, *De Aeschyli Euripidis Accii Philoctetis, Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Schneeberg für Ostern 1907* (Schneeberg 1907) 16 pp., argued that Accius' *Philoctetes* was a contamination. I know Meltzer's work only from the useful summary by K. Löschnhorn, *BPW* 24 (1907) 1109–11; cf. Schanz-Hosius, *GRL* I⁴.134.

²³ See Ribbeck, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 380.

does not. Odysseus himself could not reveal his identity if Philoctetes were already on stage or if the chorus were not in on the trick. Choral exposition, therefore, seems the easiest way. In short, Aeschylus began his play with a lyric parodos that later was adapted by Accius.²⁴

After the choral ode the protagonist enters. Fr.249 N.² (404 M.) then would be the first line of dialogue, in what would be the first epeisodion rather than a prologue.²⁵ I should compare *Agamemnon* 503 where, directly after the choral ode, an entering character, without noticing the chorus, apostrophizes his homeland. Philoctetes addresses his home. He continues, as Dio says (52.9), to relate his sad history to the chorus of Lemnians. A passage of this speech is illustrated by Hermonax on the Louvre stamnos from Caere.²⁶ There is an analogy in Prometheus' recitation of his woes to the Okeanids.²⁷ Here one may easily place fragments 252 N.² (396 M.) and 253 N.² (397 M.), the fragment which Euripides sought later to improve (*Arist. Poet.* 1458b23). Presumably the chorus inform Philoctetes that the Greeks have landed. The transmission of the news would be the most obvious motivation for the visit. Philoctetes exits, and the first stasimon follows.

The second epeisodion introduces the deuteragonist. Odysseus enters from the shore, inquires after and meets Philoctetes, who re-enters and does not recognize his old enemy (Dio 52.6). Odysseus deceives him by presenting bogus news calculated to delight the bitter hero. He reports, says Dio at 52.10, (1) the disasters of the Achaeans, (2) that Agamemnon is dead, (3) that Odysseus is arraigned for a most shameful crime, and (4) that in general the Greek expedition has been

²⁴ U. von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 315 n.2, suggested that the play may have lacked a prologue.

²⁵ Thus G. Hermann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) III.121–22; but Hermann, arguing from Accius, has the parodos preceded by a prologue containing a dialogue between Odysseus and Athene. The theory was rightly discarded by Meltzer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22): see *BPW* 24 (1907) 1111.

²⁶ Jebb (*supra* n.12) p. xxxviii with drawing, wrongly dated the stamnos to "about 400 B.C." He was corrected by L. Séchan, *Etudes sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*² (Paris 1967) 486 n.4: "en réalité, au milieu du v^e siècle." See further Beazley, *ARV*² 484 no.22, and Barbara Philippaki, *The Attic Stamnos* (Oxford 1967) 103–04 (ca. 450). J. Frel, *per coll.*, dates the vessel 450–460 B.C. The vase, therefore, can neither illustrate Euripides nor Sophocles; and thus, if it does not revert to the epic cycle, must reflect an Aeschylean speech.

²⁷ Thus Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.9.

a lamentable failure. Wilamowitz,²⁸ Jebb²⁹ and H. Weir Smyth³⁰ allege that Odysseus reported his own death. A Greek would be reluctant to do this (*cf.* Soph. *El.* 59–66), and Dio writes (52.10, von Arnim):

τὸν Ὀδυσσεύα ἐπ' αἰτία ὡς οἶόν τε αἰσχίστην.

The source of error is instructive. Schneidewin-Nauck-Radermacher³¹ summarize Dio thus: "Odysseus berückt den nichts Arges Ahnenden durch die Erzählung, dass Agamemnon tot, das Heer vor Troia fast gänzlich aufgerieben und Odysseus schmäählich untergegangen sei." Both Wilamowitz and Jebb³² misinterpreted the words "untergegangen sei" as a euphemism for death without checking the original. The heinous deed for which Odysseus is allegedly arraigned may have been the murder of Palamedes,³³ a theme which reappears in Euripides' *Philoctetes* (Dio 59.8). Odysseus' deception consisted of crude lies. The Sophoclean Neoptolemos is more subtle. Although he laments affairs at Troy, he reports but once³⁴ only truth, though truths that will win the sympathy of Philoctetes. Philoctetes is cheered (*εὐφρᾶναι*: Dio 52.10) and duped. The two presumably *exeunt* into the hero's dwelling. The second stasimon followed.

The third epeisodion contained what in Wilamowitz's³⁵ opinion was

²⁸ See Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.9: "Agamemnon und Odysseus wären gefallen." Tycho von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 271, alludes only to Odysseus' "Untergang"; *cf.* G. Hermann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) III.115: "suum denique turpissimum quemdam exitum." The error is found again in Türk, "Philoktetes," in Roscher, *MythLex* III.2 (Leipzig 1902–09) 2315.1–3.

²⁹ See Jebb (*supra* n.12) xv: "Odysseus, too, was gone—having been put to death for an atrocious crime."

³⁰ See H. Weir Smyth, *Aeschylus* II (LCL, Cambridge [Mass.] and London 1957) 465: "Odysseus had been put to death by reason of some shameful crime." Clearly he followed Jebb uncritically. The error is perpetuated by T. B. L. Webster, *Sophocles, Philoctetes* (Cambridge 1970) 3: "Odysseus had been put to death as a criminal."

³¹ See F. W. Schneidewin/A. Nauck/L. Radermacher, *Sophokles, Philoktetes*¹¹ (Berlin 1911) 16. The same words are at Schneidewin-Nauck, *Sophokles, Philoktetes*⁹ (Berlin 1887) 18, which Jebb would have used.

³² There is a further error at Jebb (*supra* n.12) xiv, where Dio is alleged to have "spent a summer afternoon in reading the story of Philoctetes at Lemnos . . ." In fact Dio makes it clear (52.1) that he read in the morning. Jebb has apparently been misled by Schneidewin-Nauck⁹, p.17 "an einem Tag."

³³ This seems more reasonable than any scandal surrounding the arms of Achilles.

³⁴ Neoptolemos lies (Soph. *Phil.* 445) in saying that Thersites still lives: see G. Huxley, *GRBS* 8 (1967) 33f.

³⁵ See U. von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 314.

the most memorable scene of the play. Here would be enacted the paroxysm and agony³⁶ of the hero in the presence of Odysseus. Philoctetes in unbearable pain calls, in his second attested Aeschylean apostrophe,³⁷ upon Death to heal him of his ills (fr.255 N.², 399 M.). Sophocles imitated the famous passage in his later play (*Phil.* 797–98).³⁸ The hero in delirium even threatened to cut off his foot (fr.254 N.², *Soph. Phil.* 748). During the attack Odysseus secured the bow (Dio 52.2);³⁹ as later in Euripides, Diomedes did;⁴⁰ and in Sophocles, Neoptolemos (*Phil.* 774–75). The scene of the paroxysm, in short, remained a pivotal one for the plot in all three tragedies. Odysseus presumably exited hastily with the bow before the second stasimon. Of the resolution of the action in the exodos we know nothing other than that (Dio 52.2) Philoctetes left for Troy whether willingly or no. The chorus would return home. Were the chorus and Odysseus alone able to convince Philoctetes?⁴¹ Did a goddess appear? “Aber darüber ist nichts bekannt.”⁴²

Aeschylus first adapted the epic tale to tragedy, a slice from Lesches’ banquet table. His great innovation⁴³ was to substitute Odysseus for

³⁶ His affliction has recently been diagnosed as Madura foot: see E. B. Zeisler, *Archives of Dermatology* 84 (1961) 136.

³⁷ See K. Reinhardt, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 284, for the effect of the monologue, and Wolfgang Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der griechischen Tragödie*² (Berlin, Zürich, Dublin 1966) 71 n.1.

³⁸ For the sentiment ‘Death the Healer’, see A. C. Pearson on *Soph.* fr.698 P.

³⁹ See Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.10; Tycho von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 271; and J. S. Kieffer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 39.

⁴⁰ See Paus. 1.22.6 and L. Preller/C. Robert, *Griechische Mythologie* II.3.2.1⁵ (Dublin and Zürich 1967) 1211 n.5.

⁴¹ Dio’s words (52.9), οἱ λόγοι δι’ ἃν προσηγάγετο αὐτόν, do not rule out a third character in the exodos.

⁴² Thus Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.10; cf. Tycho von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 271, and G. Hermann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) III.127 (Philoctetes learns the truth whether from a revealed Odysseus or a divinity). Kieffer’s view, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 39 n.2 and 45 (“Aeschylus’ play ended in more of the epic manner with the involuntary departure of Philoctetes”) will not do. *πειθοῖ ἀναγκαίᾳ* (Dio 52.2) ought not to be restricted to Aeschylus. Dio means that Philoctetes was not only persuaded, but that to remain on Lemnos without his bow would be suicide, for it furnished his livelihood (*βίον*). Nor is there evidence that the epic Philoctetes departed unwillingly for Troy. Indeed, if Quintus Smyrnaeus (9.403ff) reflects Lesches, Philoctetes, softened by Athene, was most coöperative.

⁴³ See Jebb (*supra* n.12) p. xiv: “This change at once strikes the key-note of the theme, as Tragedy was to handle it.” Tycho von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 270–71, wonders whether Aeschylus were following a lost epic source. The evidence is not compelling: see Th. Bergk, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) III.425 with n.183.

Diomedes and so create a drama of intrigue.⁴⁴ Kieffer⁴⁵ has well observed: "From this substitution follows the necessity of disguise and deception, the theft or seizure of the bow, and the complication of Philoctetes' anguish by the addition to the plot of his rancor against Odysseus, more personal and intense than his resentment against the Greeks in general." Euripides and Sophocles retained from Aeschylus: the time and place for the action, Odysseus, his disguise or concealment, Philoctetes' recital of his woes, the theft or capture of the bow during or because of a paroxysm, and the voyage to Troy that ended the action. Dio's opinion (52.4) of the Aeschylean play as a whole is too vague to be useful.⁴⁶ His characterization (52.5) of Odysseus as *δριμὴν καὶ δόλιον* agrees with what can be learned of the action, deceit by blatant lying, rather than rhetorical persuasion or the insidious use of truth. Wilamowitz⁴⁷ final judgement is right: "Ganz einfachen Bau dürfen wir voraussetzen." I should hesitate, however, to call it "ein dramatisierter Dithyrambus."⁴⁸

Date of Production

Séchan,⁴⁹ after Jebb,⁵⁰ confidently dated Aeschylus' *Philoctetes* to ca. 471. Kieffer⁵¹ more reasonably wrote "the date of Aeschylus' is unknown." Is there a middle ground? The poet's death at Gela ca. 456 provides the *terminus ante quem*. The tragedy was limited to two actors; for this reason Aeschylus discarded Diomedes.⁵² Aristotle (*Poetics* 1449a18–19) tells us that Sophocles introduced the third actor. He began exhibiting in 468 (Plut. *Cimon* 8.7–8), and by 458 Aeschylus had included a third actor in the *Oresteia*. At some point within this decade, therefore, the third actor first appeared. If, as I have argued,

⁴⁴ Thus Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.2.260.

⁴⁵ See Kieffer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 39.

⁴⁶ Jebb (*supra* n.12) p. xv, makes the best of what is given us.

⁴⁷ See U. von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 315.

⁴⁸ See U. von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 313.

⁴⁹ See L. Séchan, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.26) 32 n.1 and 485.

⁵⁰ See Jebb (*supra* n.12) p. xv: "some forty years or more, perhaps, after that of Aeschylus." Jebb was followed by F. J. H. Letters, *The Life and Work of Sophocles* (London and New York 1953) 263: "some forty years later."

⁵¹ See J. S. Kieffer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 38 n.2.

⁵² See Tycho von Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 270, and U. von Wilamowitz, *GrTr* IV.10 n.1.

the play lacked a prologue, this too suggests relatively early composition. Further, *Philoctetes* was not part of a connected trilogy but belonged to the period when Aeschylus preferred independent plays.⁵³ Finally, that the play was famous enough to be twice imitated suggests that it was well received. This would place it after 485/4, Aeschylus' first victory (*FGrHist* 239 F 50). I should not be opposed—in spite of the archaistic *Supplices* of ca. 463⁵⁴—to a date between 484–473 B.C.⁵⁵

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
March, 1970

⁵³ Thus argued Meltzer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22): see *BPW* 24 (1907) 1110. For the evidence for connected Aeschylean trilogies see Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.2.188 n.8.

⁵⁴ For the archaistic dramatic technique of *Supplices* see H. Lloyd-Jones, *AntCl* 33 (1964) 362ff.

⁵⁵ I have not been able to consult M. Untersteiner, *Gli 'Eraclidi' e il 'Filottete' di Eschilo (Saggi di ricostruzione)* (Firenze 1942). Untersteiner restored Aesch. *Philoctetes* to bolster his thesis that the foundation of all tragedy was “der im Mythos inkarnierte einstige Kampf zwischen nordischer und mediterraner Religiosität”; see A. von Blumenthal, *Gnomon* 20 (1944) 140–44. Untersteiner apparently argued (pp. 168–78) an Aeschylean source for Accius' play.