

The Dramaturgy Of Sophocles' *Inachus*

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

Columbia University

THE PUBLICATION IN A RECENT VOLUME of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri of a new fragment of the *Inachus* of Sophocles provides a suitable occasion for investigating the dramaturgy of that play.¹ There is disagreement as to whether the *Inachus* was a tragedy or a satyr play. Because the latter opinion is threatening to prevail, there is need to say a few words at the start in defense of the other view. The rest of the paper will reconstruct the tragedy in the light of the surviving fragments.

Tiberius Hemsterhuis² created a problem by suggesting for no apparent reason that *Inachus* was satyric. The great English editor, A. C. Pearson,³ in his preface to the play is

¹ E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XXIII* (London, 1956), No. 2369, 55-59 (henceforth cited: *POxy*).

² Tiberius Hemsterhuis, *Aristophanes, Plutus*,² (Leipzig, 1811), 248 on Schol. 727.

³ A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1917), 198-199.

ambiguous as to his stance. In his notes to fragments 291 and 292, however, he appears to align himself in the satyr camp. Jebb, whom he quotes on frg. 270.4, is implicitly on the tragic side;⁴ and disagreement with his predecessor may be a reason for his ambiguity. Certain recent scholars have wholeheartedly endorsed Hemsterhuis' suggestion.⁵ The satyric school argue from the "jovial" matter of the play, from alleged representations of portions of the drama in later vase paintings, and now from *PTebt* 692. Yet there need be nothing jovial in watching one's daughter become a beast. Further the relevance of the archaeological material to the Sophoclean play can only be asserted and never proved.⁶ *PTebt* 692 will be discussed below.

Wilamowitz disagreed with the suggestion of Hemsterhuis and disposed of it with the acute observation that among the almost thirty fragments quoted by ancient sources not

In this paper Pearson's edition of the fragments and his enumeration are used. There is no force in Pearson's attempt to apply the epic (see *Il.* 2. 262) "a covering of shamelessness" (frg. 291) to satyrs; nor has he cogent grounds to consider the rare word of frg. 292 ἀελλόθριξ, *with hair floating in the wind* (*LSJ* s.v.), to be "an instance of comic hyperbole." Rather the word shows Aeschylean influence: see Schmid-Stählin I. 2 p. 487 n. 4. In short the remark of Hunt and Smyly, *The Tebtunis Papyri*, 3 (London, 1933), 3 [henceforth cited: *PTebt*] that the satyr position "is cogently upheld by Pearson, *Fragments of Sophocles*, i 198." is hyperbolic.

⁴ Jebb considers the chorus to have been composed of Argives not satyrs.

⁵ See especially the important monograph of Rudolf Pfeiffer, "Die Netzfischer des Aischylos und der Inachos des Sophokles Zwei Satyrspiel-Funde," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Abteilung*, 1938, Heft 2 (henceforth cited: Pfeiffer). Pfeiffer has convinced Max Pohlenz, *Die Griechische Tragödie*,² (Göttingen, 1954), vol. 1, p. 169 and vol. 2, p. 72, Albin Lesky, *Die Tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* (Göttingen, 1956), 135, and D. L. Page, *Select Papyri III, Literary Papyri Poetry* (Cambridge, 1950), 22-26 (henceforth cited: Page).

⁶ There are too many variables. Only a fraction of satyric and tragic titles are preserved. A vase may refer to a lost drama. In the fourth century Chaeremon composed an *Io*; others may have in the fifth. Further the freedom with which vase-painters treated stage representations is notorious: see e.g. Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford, 1953), 176, ". . . vase-paintings . . . which depict scenes based on tragedy, can rarely, if ever, be taken to reproduce the scene as acted." One can never be certain that a satyr is not present on a vase for artistic reasons rather than historical ones.

one speaks of the play as a satyr drama.⁷ The distinguished scholars, Wilhelm Schmid and A. von Blumenthal, realized the cogency of this observation and accepted *Inachus* as a tragedy.⁸ Pearson's (p. 198) attempted refutation through comparison of the nine fragments of *Achilles' Lovers* is not cogent because, as Pearson neglects to observe, the context of frg. 153 speaks of the chorus of satyrs and no further description would have been necessary to identify the play as satyric drama.⁹

The observation of Wilamowitz may be further elaborated. Frg. 270P (vol. 1, 200-201) from the parodos is quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*AR* 1. 25) with the remark: Σοφοκλεῖ δ' ἐν Ἰνάχῳ δράματι ἀνάπαιστον ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ λεγόμενον. Dionysius' care in the quotation is evident by his meticulous specification of the author, title, metre, and speaker. Furthermore, he glosses the title *Inachus* with the word δράματι. Compare his other two quotations from Sophocles in the first book of *AR*. They are from plays known to be tragedies. In *AR* 1. 48 from the *Laocoon* (frg. 373P) he introduces his quotation ἐν Λαοκώωντι δράματι and in *AR* 1. 12 from the *Triptolemus* (frg. 598P) similarly he writes ἐν Τριπτολέμῳ δράματι. If *Inachus* were a satyr play and not a tragedy I submit that Dionysius would have written ἐν Ἰνάχῳ σατυρικῶ or . . . σατύροις and not ἐν Ἰνάχῳ δράματι which is the way he refers to a Sophoclean tragedy. Dionysius was a grammarian and a literary critic who would never have tolerated such an ambiguity. Those persons who wish to consider *Inachus* a satyr play must provide a parallel for δρᾶμα alone

⁷ Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die Griechische Tragödie* (Berlin, 1907), 88 n. 53: "es gilt für ein satyrdrama, aber es ist unerlaubt, in fast 30 anführungen, wo diese bezeichnung fehlt, zufall anzunehmen." Wilamowitz in Tycho von Wilamowitz, *Die Dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Berlin, 1917), 372 joins *die Laune* of *Inachus* with those of *Ichneutae* and *The Lovers of Achilles*, the latter two undisputedly satyr-plays. This accords with his view that it was a *Nachspiel*, as *Alcestis*: see note 58 *infra*.

⁸ Schmid-Stählin, I. 2, p. 435 n. 3 (contrast *id.* p. 325 n. 8) and von Blumenthal, *RE* 5A (1927) 1062. 33ff.

⁹ See the scholiast on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1025 (p. 458 Dübner), from Photius *Lex.* p. 369. 4ff. Naber.

with no qualifying epithet or substantive to mean "satyr-play." When the ancients referred to satyric drama, they said satyric drama, sometimes merely the epithet alone, and not drama.¹⁰ Indeed *δρᾶμα* was not used absolutely of comedy in Attic and rarely elsewhere.¹¹ For the restriction compare the English *play* which never covers *opera*.

The setting of the play before the palace (*δόμοις* frg. 277P) of King Inachus further militates against the satyric hypothesis. The action of tragedies regularly took place before palace fronts while satyr plays preferred a rustic setting.¹² The number of roles in *Inachus* (there were excluding the coryphaeus surely six and probably seven) is excessive for a satyr play. *Cyclops* has three and *Ichneutae* four. It is what one would expect for a Sophoclean tragedy.¹³ *Inachus* requires three actors; *Ichneutae* only two.¹⁴ A satyr play evidently did not exceed 800 verses.¹⁵ If the stichometric *POxy* 2369 is from the first epeisodion, then the play is too long to be a satyr play. Further there is no evidence to believe the chorus of *Inachus* was composed of satyrs but rather of

¹⁰ For examples see Stephanus-Dindorf, 3. 1666D and Herbert Richards, *CR* 14 (1900), 388.

¹¹ This was proved in an excellent article by Herbert Richards, "On the Word *Δρᾶμα*," *CR* 14 (1900), 388–393. See further Schmid-Stählin, I, p. 631 n. 1. I have taken the analogy of English *play* from Richards, 392.

¹² For the palace fronts of tragedy see Schmid-Stählin I. 2 p. 67; for the rustic settings of satyr plays see *ib.*, 81.

¹³ In the preserved tragedies Sophocles varies from five to eight speaking parts with a distinct preference toward the larger figure (eight in *Aj.*, *OT*, and *OC*). Euripides prefers eight but experimented with more (*Supp.* 9; *Andr. & Or.* 10, *Phoen.* 11). If one considers Silenus to be coryphaeus, the roles in *Cyc.* are two, in *Ich.* three. The tragic tabulations do not include the coryphaeus. See further Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 59 n. 2 whence I have taken these figures but which are not consistently accurate. *Trachiniaiæ* has only seven characters not eight; and *Ich.* does not have only two.

¹⁴ If Silenus is coryphaeus and not a true actor, *Cyclops* needs only two actors. It is customary, however, to give it three: see Albert Müller, *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Bühnenalterthümer* (Freiburg, 1886), 173, n. 4; A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*³ (Oxford, 1907), 224; Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, 137. Later, however, Pickard-Cambridge (p. 244) admits Silenus was "leader of the chorus."

¹⁵ See Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 65 n. 5.

Argive elders.¹⁶ A satyr play requires by definition a satyr chorus.¹⁷ Next there is no literary evidence that fifth century satyr plays treated the Io story whereas Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vinc-tus*, is proof enough that she could be adapted to effective tragic presentation.¹⁸

There is new evidence from the papyrus. Lobel's remark:¹⁹ "The trace under $\chi\sigma(\rho\acute{o}\varsigma)$ is compatible with $\sigma\alpha\tau\acute{\upsilon}] \rho(\omega\nu)$, which would resolve all doubts about the classification of the play . . ." is not untrue but misleading. The trace is just as compatible with $\gamma\epsilon] \rho(\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu)$. That is how I should restore it. This restoration has the advantage of preserving an even margin for the scenic notations. Lobel's $\sigma\alpha\tau\nu$ is too long for an even margin but would extend too far to the left and so not accord with the careful symmetry of the MS elsewhere.

For all these reasons there is no alternative but to consider the drama a tragedy and not a satyr play. Now there is need to establish the probable *dramatis personae*. Each character is listed with the evidence for his presence in the action.

Inachus	Title
Io	Frag. 281P
Chorus of Argive Elders	Frgg. 270, 284P

¹⁶ Wilamowitz (*Einleitung*, 88, n. 53) saw this and Jebb (quoted by Pearson on frg. 270.4P). The lofty address to their king (frgg. 270, 271P) is the evidence and the choric utterance (frg. 284P) calling Inachus *father*. In a satyr's mouth this could only refer to Silenus.

¹⁷ See A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*³ (Oxford, 1907): "The chorus was always composed of satyrs."

¹⁸ For a catalogue of the subject matter of satyr plays with comic parallels see Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 82 n. 5. For Sophocles in particular see the essay of William Nickerson Bates, "The Satyr Dramas of Sophocles," *Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday* (Princeton, 1936), 14-23, who considers *Inachus* satyric. Exclusive of *Inachus* no satyr play is known to treat the Io theme. For the tragic Io see Sam Eitrem, *RE* 9 (1916), 1732ff. It is amusing to find critics who consider the play satyric citing with approval Wilamowitz' dating on the basis of friendly Athenian relations with Argos at the close of the Archidamian War. Such a view attributes an extraordinary sense of humor to any Argive ambassadors in the audience.

¹⁹ *POxy* 23, 59.

Hermes	<i>PTebt</i> 692
Messenger from Palace	<i>POxy</i> 2369
Iris	Frg. 272P
Argos	Frg. 281P
Second Messenger (?)	Frg. 282P ²⁰

Lobel²¹ believes that Zeus was present on the stage during the prologue. However, there is no ancient testimonium that Zeus shared in the action whereas the presence of Hermes and Iris is attested. Further it would have been unsuitable to bring the highest gods onto the tragic stage. Pearson, even when possibly thinking in terms of a satyr play, saw this and following Wilamowitz observed: "Hermes and Iris appeared as the agents of Zeus and Hera . . . themselves too august personages for stage representation." This wise view was accepted by Wilhelm Schmid.²² *POxy* 2369 frg. 1 col. i. 24 affords new evidence. Here the stranger is called *ὁ πᾶν μύσος*, *the abominable fellow*, (Lobel) and (i 28) *φηλώσας ἐμέ*, *hoodwinked*, (Lobel). Sophocles would never bring Zeus on stage as "an abominable fellow who hoodwinked King Inachus," although for Hermes such treatment would not be so shocking.²³ A reconstruction of the action of the tragedy, *Inachus*, in the light of the fragments follows.

²⁰ The second messenger would be the one to whom frg. 282P is addressed. The fragment should be translated: "Well done. And know, as the proverb has it, 'from lowly state a man may grow renowned.'" The fragment apparently was delivered in dialogue to a single male character of humble station and still young who had just performed a meritorious deed, probably offstage (such a maxim would not be recalled for a transitory favor performed in the speaker's presence). If so this would have just been narrated in a messenger speech. The speaker most easily is Inachus addressing a servant, who is not the messenger for the metamorphosis.

²¹ *POxy* 23, 55.

²² Pearson, vol. I, 199, cf. Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 435.

²³ Lobel's citation (p. 59) of frg. 275P as evidence "that Zeus took part in the action" is tendentious. The language is metaphorical and refers to the prosperity that came to the Argive plain when Io was loved by Zeus (see Pearson vol. I, 199 and frg. 273P).

I. PROLOGUE

The prologue consists of exposition and one piece of action. Compare the prologue of *Trachiniae* where the dramatic situation is roughly similar. Deianeira and Nutrix provide the audience with the necessary exposition and then there occurs the dismissal of Hyllus. The prologue of *Oedipus Tyrannus* is similar with its expository dialogue between the king and priest and then the interruption caused by the arrival of Kreon from Delphi. *Inachus* requires the protagonist on stage and an interlocutor to develop the exposition. Of the known *dramatis personae* Io would best be there. The king discusses with his daughter the benefits that have come to the Argive Plain through the beneficence of his daughter's paramour. Fragg. 273P and 275P are compatible with the first part of the prologue. The choice of Io is important dramatically because it allows the audience to see her in her pristine shape and so her later entrance as a heifer is rendered more effective. Io would be gentle and feminine in the manner of Tecmessa, Deianeira, Ismene, or Chrysothemis, i.e. portrayed to gain the audience's sympathy. This is imperative if the wrath of the protagonist at the later mistreatment of his daughter is to be justified before the spectators.

A visitor arrives.²⁴ His arrival would be announced to the king by Io for the coryphaeus is not yet present. He presents an extraordinary appearance in the theater; for he is in foreign guise, *κάρβανος*, a word previously unattested for Sophocles.²⁵ The epithet suggests an elaborate costume of some sort. The Egyptian Herald (A. *Supp.* 914) gained the same adjective and so too Cassandra (A. *Ag.* 1061). *αἰθός* is applied to him and may mean he was an Egyp-

²⁴ *POxy* 2369 proves that the stranger who effected the metamorphosis arrived early in the action: see Lobel, *POxy* 23, 55. The situation could only have occurred in the prologue.

²⁵ See *POxy* 2369 frg. 1 col. ii. 28. P. Groeneboom, *Aeschylus' Agamemnon* (Groningen, 1944), 286, n. 8 collects the ancient evidence for this word and concludes: "de lexicographische overlevering wijst op een Karisch-Phoenicische origine."

tian.²⁶ Lobel correctly renders *burnt black*; for *tanned* would not be unusual for a Greek. Probably Hermes (for that as we shall see is who it is) is masquerading as an ambassador or wealthy traveler from the tropics. Like Admetus, Inachus acts the perfect host, receives the visitor, and instructs his daughter to lead him into the palace. Here is the clearest reason for the presence of a third actor attendant on the king during the prologue. There must be someone to get Hermes off stage into the palace. It can not be Inachus who keeps position. It may be a mute but this would force a monologue exposition in the Euripidean manner. Deianeira is no parallel for Nutrix enters with the queen at line one. Of the known *dramatis personae* Io is the most likely candidate. Iris and Argos are obviously impossible. Her only rival is the Messenger as a "Servant of the House." But this would force the exposition to become a dialogue between the king and a hireling; and a hireling not a princess would be the rich stranger's escort into the palace.

Io and Hermes then exit into the palace while Inachus remains alone on stage during the recitation of the parodos. There is a similar retention of the actor in *Philoctetes* and *Oedipus at Colonus*. It is important to realize the position of the three actors at this moment in the action, because much of the reconstruction depends on it. We now know (*POxy* 2369) that the metamorphosis of Io took place off stage (ergo Io must be in the palace) and at the hands of the visitor (ergo Hermes must be in the palace during the moment of the metamorphosis). We know from frg. 270P that Inachus was on stage during the parodos in which he is *directly addressed* by the chorus. It is because he forgot this that Lobel erred in the assignment of speakers. Inachus was *not* an eyewitness to the metamorphosis of his daughter. Sophocles purposely did not make him an eyewitness just so that he might provide an excellent motivation for describing the metamorphosis of the girl to the audience, sc. the king

²⁶ So Lobel on *POxy* 2369 frg. 1 col. ii. 25. This is not necessarily so. Compare the parallel Greek μέλας and Latin *niger* as *sunburnt* and not necessarily *negroid*. Illustrative material is collected by W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, 2 (Cambridge, 1950), p. 267 n. 5 and p. 452.

would want to know, and would have every reason in the world to want to know, the details of his daughter's misfortune. A horrified servant would come out from the scene of the change and tell his master. This is better than having the august personage of the tragic basileus burst forth in undignified haste to inform a group of elders, who are of inferior social position, of so personal a tragedy. Such conduct, the public airing of royal grief, would be unseemly. In just such spirit did Kreon gently reprove the wailing Oedipus (*OT* 1515); and so Nutrix reminds Phedra in *Hippolytus* (213-215). It is for this reason that Inachus retains his position on stage during the parodos.

2. PARODOS

The song praised a king who had brought prosperity to the land. The audience had been informed of the prosperity during the exposition. Two anapaestic fragments (270, 271P) from the parodos have survived. The basileus is addressed with the respect and honor that is due an aged sovereign by his people. The extended invocation is more compatible with a situation of peace and prosperity than otherwise. The misfortune is yet to come. The anapaestic marching song is Aeschylean and was used in *Ajax* 134-171. Frg. 270 deserves comparison with *Ajax* 134-135 which has the same form, though is more compressed.²⁷ There is the common vocative *παῖ*, the patronymic, then the realm; and as here the words are sung by subjects to their king. The wealth of proper nouns (frg. 271P)²⁸ that Sophocles has succeeded in skill-

²⁷ Ajax is directly addressed although he evidently exited at 177. But Ajax is in a tent with a flap for a door and not in a palace of stone. The sailors may reasonably hope that their master will hear them as he rests within the tent. See further the comment of Denniston-Page on *A. Ag.* 23ff. with which I am in substantial agreement.

²⁸ Jebb, quoted by Pearson on frg. 271P, is vague concerning the details of geography. I should add the underlined words and read: "from the (northern) extremity of Pindus and *southern tip* of Lacomos." When he later speaks of the river Inachus "sending out branches" he must mean "absorbing branches." Great rivers absorb streams and rivulets and then flow into the sea. They do not dwindle out into a multitude of branches. For further details see Jacoby on *FGrHist* 1 F 102c.

fully inserting into his anapaests reminds us of the parodos of Persae.²⁹ These noble verses are not imaginable in the mouths of satyrs and silenés. If the analogy of *Ajax* is valid, the parodos would consist of an anapaestic marching song (c. 40 lines), strophe, antistrophe, and epode. Frg. 277P is conveniently assigned to the lyric portion of the parodos. I should emend frg. 277P to read:

1. ξανθὴ δ' Ἀφροδισία λάταξ
2. <τοῖς> πᾶσιν ἐπεκτύπει δόμοις.

This simple addition to the text of Athenaeus (668B) makes metrical uniformity out of the fragment which can now be scanned:

1. — : — ∪ ∪ — / ∪ — ∪ —
2. — : — ∪ ∪ — / ∪ — ∪ —

Translate “a reddish Aphrodisiac drop clattered on the whole house.” Sophocles regularly uses the plural as *house* referring to the stage building. The fragment describes in metaphorical language taken from the game of cottabus the passion of Zeus for Io. Without the article one would render “all houses.” There is no reason why a drop should fall on all the houses in Argos nor could it. The metaphor in the received text is inaccurate and ludicrous. The emendation, therefore, is in the interests of metre and sense.

The metre of frg. 287P forms the end of a lyric unit,³⁰ whether antistrophe or epode. The translation is “the beating of Argive earth,” a poetic expression for “I hear someone coming.” The phrase could signal the entrance of the messenger rushing from the palace to tell Inachus of the metamorphosis of Io. The letters are not incompatible with the traces of *POxy* 2369. frg. 1 col. i. 15-16.

²⁹ The Aeschylean characteristics in the fragments of *Inachus* have already been noted by Chandler R. Post, *HSCP* 33 (1922), 58. They may well argue for an early dating. For Aeschylean characteristics in the speech of the early plays see Lesky, 140 and Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 pp. 486ff. with notes.

³⁰ Compare S. *Tr.* 851, 862 and S. *El.* 834–835, 847–848.

3. FIRST EPEISODION

Both the papyrus fragments reasonably fit into the first epeisodion. Col. i. 21-22 are too fragmentary to determine the speaker. If as Lobel suggests (p. 58) the imperative λάβε]τε could be restored, one would assume that an irate Inachus was addressing the elders. Col. i. 23-28 are spoken by Inachus (Lobel rightly). Lobel is further correct in assigning col. ii. 1-3 to the coryphaeus, who addresses Inachus. The shocked repetition of the fact of Inachus being deceived and the protestation of ignorance suggest that this is the first articulated response of the chorus to the news. If so we can assume that the fragment is from the beginning of the epeisodion. The stichometric MS (verse 300 is indicated) favors the first epeisodion, sc. in every extant Sophoclean tragedy verse 300 occurs within the first epeisodion. Lobel assigns col. ii. 4-17 to Inachus. Because Inachus did not witness the metamorphosis and so could not tell the chorus of it, these lines are better assigned to a Messenger from the palace. It is true that the coryphaeus addressed his remarks to Inachus (σὰ) and that Inachus does not answer. But this is spirited, indeed highly excited, dialogue and it is effective for the distraught servant to burst in and answer for his master. Compare *Tr.* 429 ff. where a highly excited Messenger answers a question directed to his Queen. In Euripides' *Heracles* Megara replies (534-537) for Amphitryon. At vv. 18ff. the chorus respond in lyric metre. It may be a short kommos in which Inachus shares.³¹ Here the new fragment ends. Lobel rightly connects fragment 290P with col. ii. 23. Inachus and the Messenger are not on stage during *PTebt* 692. Therefore, they must

³¹ Lobel remarks (p. 59): ". . . it is not far-fetched to infer that in Sophocles' version of the story (which would have resembled that of Apollodorus . . .) Zeus visited Io both to beget Epaphus and to metamorphose her into a cow . . ." If this means that the conception of Epaphus and the metamorphosis of Io occurred in the same visit, I can not agree. The metamorphosis resulted from a previous affair which Hera must have discovered. If Hermes effects the change, there is no problem. It is dangerous to reconstruct Sophocles from Apollodorus who may be following the Hesiodic *Aegmios* which treated the Io-Saga (see Schmid-Stählin, I. 1 p. 287).

exit into the palace. A motivation would not be difficult, e.g. to investigate further the plight of Io and perhaps to help her.

The compressed narration of the metamorphosis (vv. 296-309 of the original tragedy) is best explained as due to the need to include much further action in the epeisodion. The audience must be given the motivation for the change. They can have no idea who the *xenos* is nor know why the virtuous Io has been so vilely treated. One should speculate upon the motivation of Zeus in effecting the metamorphosis. Since he loved the princess and had further shown his pleasure in her by bringing prosperity to Argos, we can not suppose that he turned her into a heifer in wrath. His intentions must have been charitable however the persons involved might interpret the results. The only imaginable reason would be to protect Io from the wrath of the proverbially and justifiably jealous Hera. Only one character among the known *dramatis personae* could inform the audience of these matters. This is Hermes, the lackey of Zeus, the very person who effected the metamorphosis. He enters from the palace shortly after the exit of Inachus and Messenger.³² He had escaped detection within the palace through the use of the Hades-Cap, which like the ring of Gyges makes its wearer invisible. He is still wearing this in *PTebt* 692 Col. ii 4.³³ At the start of the papyrus, if indeed it is from the Sophoclean *Inachus*,³⁴ Hermes has not yet informed the chorus of the state of affairs. They are still in confusion, running about the orchestra in search of the stranger. For a similar situation compare the sailors searching for Ajax in *Ajax* 866ff. Hermes

³² For a time, therefore, the stage is empty and the audience see only the chorus in the orchestra. For the technique compare *A. Ag.* 1331-1372. Cassandra exits into the palace at 1330. The stage is empty until the entrance of the protagonist at 1372, and there is no stasimon.

³³ This was first seen by Hunt and Smyly, *op. cit.*, 11. For the stage device in Sophoclean tragedy of a character visible to the audience while invisible to the other characters compare *S. Aj.* 69ff., 85f. where Athene makes Odysseus invisible to the protagonist.

³⁴ The Sophoclean attribution is not unanimous see e.g. Alfred Körte, *APF* 11 (1935), 252-257, who concludes (p. 257): "Ob Sophokles der Dichter war, werden hoffentlich weitere Untersuchungen ermitteln."

identifies himself as "The messenger of the loves of Zeus, a great courier."³⁵ The chorus do not believe him (they quite obviously would consider him a foreign charlatan and a knave) and reply "One might readily guess from your sounds that you are Hermes himself who has turned me back hither."³⁶ The dialogue is couched in trochaic tetrameters, a metre occasionally used by Sophocles in his tragedies.³⁷ There are none in *Ichneutae*. Hermes mischievously but in the manner of Sophoclean stichomythia (he can not neglect an opportunity to tease the old men) picks up their verb with *ἔοικας*. "I guess that in a moment you will set out on another useless task." The remarks that follow are perfectly understandable if one recalls the situation. Hermes is invisible to the chorus, who are frantically hunting a magician whose incorporeal voice they hear in their midst and who very likely (col. iii. 5-7) even touches them. They associate the voice with the villainous foreigner of the prologue and do not believe that he is the messenger of Zeus. The scene is good fun. But this does not *prove* it to be satyric. There is no more levity here than in the first Phylax scene of *Antigone*, the Lichas-Old Man encounter in *Trachiniae*, or the hurling of the chamber pot in *Fellow Banqueters* (frg. 565P). Sophocles must have had a reason for inserting a comic sequence. One can only conjecture. Perhaps it was relief from the horror of the metamorphosis, a desire to mitigate its effect upon the audience. The spectators must realize that Zeus is not a villain and acted as he did to protect, not punish, Io. What better way to create such an atmosphere than to have the agent of the metamorphosis himself make so light of it that he can

³⁵ *Courier* translates *τρόχιν, vox Aeschylea*, see *Pr.* 941 where Prometheus applies the noun to Hermes.

³⁶ This translates col. ii. 6-8. The colloquial English of Hunt and Smyly is not justified. *μον* should be retained with the *editio princeps*. Pfeiffer, supporting a satyr thesis, altered to *μοι*. Pfeiffer's *μοι* was then put into the text by Page who does not list the MS *μον* in his apparatus.

³⁷ Examples are collected in Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 481 n. 1. The presence of colloquialisms (see Hunt and Smyly, *op. cit.*, 11) does not rule out a tragedy: see P. T. Stevens, "Colloquial Expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles," *CQ* 39 (1945), 95-105.

tease the old men who fret over it? Also there is need to play down, from a dramatic point of view, the metamorphosis. So drastic a device can easily run away with the play; and, as Professor Schmid reminds us,³⁸ the play is called *Inachus* and not *Io*. The action centered about Inachus and not his daughter. The fate of the daughter at the hands of Zeus must be played down and this is done by making the audience laugh.³⁹

4. FIRST STASIMON

It is impossible to establish the contents of this song. The praise of Zeus suggests itself. No fragments can be specifically attributed to this stasimon.

5. SECOND EPEISODION

Hermes earlier revealed the attitude of Zeus. It is time to hear Hera's side. The following action easily fits here. A female, Iris, enters (frg. 272P) to present the female side. She is a perfect foil to Hermes. Hera evidently capitalizes on Io's bovine shape and forces her to wander far from her native Argos. An instigator is provided for the wandering. This is Argos (surely Sophocles would pun the name)⁴⁰ who now enters (frg. 281P) with Io as heifer.⁴¹ The Oxyrhynchus fragment proves that the metamorphosis was complete⁴² so

³⁸ Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 435.

³⁹ The choice of a heifer's shape is suitable for a river's daughter; for rivers habitually assumed bovine forms: see S. *Tr.* 11 with Jebb *ad loc.*

⁴⁰ For the *figura etymologica*, here it would be Argos as realm and guardian, in tragic poetry see Kamerbeek on S. *Aj.* 430, Dodds on E. *Ba.* 367, and Platnauer on E. *IT* 32. On the punning on Oedipus in *OT* see Bernard M. W. Knox, *Oedipus at Thebes* (London and New Haven, 1957), 182-184 with notes. Aeschylus approved a pun: see Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 297 n. 2 for examples.

⁴¹ Argos would enter wearing the special many-eyed Argos-Mask: see Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, 193. Accius wrote an *Io* of which one line survives (frg. 386 Klotz): "Custodem adsiduum Ioni adposuit virgini." Hera is setting Argos to guard Io. The line would easily fit into the action of *Inachus* which was perhaps Accius' source.

⁴² See *POxy* 2369. frg. 1. col. ii. 12ff. with Lobel's commentary.

that the actor does not just enter with a cow mask but as a heifer. Perhaps an animal was used and not an actor; for there is no evidence that Io was articulate after the metamorphosis. In *Aegeus* Sophocles may have brought the Marathonian bull on stage⁴³ and his handling of the heifer would be parallel. The technique was used in old comedy as well. In *Dionysalexander* Cratinus brought Dionysus on stage in the form of a ram.⁴⁴ Such use of an animal in the Greek theatre is not alarming. A horse must have drawn Agamemnon's chariot into the orchestra at Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 782ff. Only in *Inachus* the animal is absorbed more closely into the action. Whether or not Inachus is present the fragment does not say. It is doubtful, however, that the dramatist would keep his protagonist off-stage through a whole epeisodion.

6. SECOND STASIMON

It is impossible to specify a subject for this ode. The action of the scene that immediately precedes affords a wealth of possibilities for trite moralizing.⁴⁵

7. THIRD EPEISODION

Wilamowitz cogently argues from frgg. 278, 284, and 286P that during the action Hera reduced the realm to poverty.⁴⁶ The lyric metre of these fragments would put them in a choral utterance, specifically the stasimon that followed the epeisodion which narrated the famine. The fragments of dialogue, 276, 285, 289, and 293P, should be assigned to the narration of the famine or plague. The plague

⁴³ See frg. 25P with commentary (vol. 1, p. 21).

⁴⁴ See *POxy* 663 and frg. 43 Edmonds, 36-37.

⁴⁵ On the general subject of the relation of choral odes to the action see the useful and sensitive monograph of G. M. Kirkwood, "The Dramatic Role of the Chorus in Sophocles," *Phoenix*, 8 (1954), 1-22; repr. *id.*, *A Study of Sophoclean Drama* (Cornell, 1958), 181-214.

⁴⁶ Wilamowitz, *Einleitung*, 88 n. 53.

would have been inflicted on Argos during the singing of the second stasimon. The time factor is no problem.⁴⁷ The plague would be narrated in the following epeisodion and described in lyric measures in the third stasimon. Such a reconstruction involves the least structural difficulties. The progress of the action is not difficult to surmise. Plagues occur in ancient fiction (e.g. *OT* 1ff. from *Iliad* 1) when the author wishes to reveal the wrath of a deity. Here, as Wilamowitz saw, the divinity most likely to have been enraged is Hera. The protagonist, as in *Oedipus Tyrannus*, would be the instigator of the divine wrath. There would be occasion for Inachus to anger the goddess. She had sent Argos (nothing is ever said of the gadfly) to lead his daughter away. We can readily imagine that in protesting the injustice of the act Inachus blasphemed Hera. The situation is similar to *Bacchae* where an irate king blasphemes a deity whose subsequent wrath motivates the remaining action. Inachus' tragic dilemma is obvious. He was a pious and prosperous ruler beloved of his subjects, who had hospitably received Zeus (see frg. 274P) and given his daughter to him only to feel, through no fault of his own, the effects of the jealousy of Hera.⁴⁸ The actual blasphemy would have occurred in the second epeisodion.⁴⁹

8. THIRD STASIMON

The lyric fragments associated by Wilamowitz with the wrath of Hera (278, 284, 286P) fit here. Frg. 278P contrasts the bliss of the past (see Schol. Aristoph. *Pax* 531) with present

⁴⁷ See Roy C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*³ (Chicago, 1929), 252.

⁴⁸ For the tradition of his grief see Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 1. 583–585.

⁴⁹ Frg. 276P *στροὶ κριθῶν*, *storage-pits* of grain (cf. New England's *root-cellars*) would need the context "even the storage-pits of grain are empty now." The baleful implications of frg. 289P, "with a dark storm," are obvious, whether an actual storm sent by the goddess or in metaphorical language the plague itself. The fox of frg. 293P may allude to a scavenger connected with the famine, and the oath by flowing springs (frg. 285P) may reflect a famine originating in drought and dried up rivers. These latter two suggestions were made to me by James A. Coulter of Harvard University.

evil. Wilamowitz ingeniously refers frg. 284P to the parched condition of Inachus as a result of Hera's wrath. "Inachos selbst ward fast zu einer trocknen mumie." The highly artificial choric diction of frg. 286P which may be rendered "everything is laden with spiderwebs of weavers," is a reference to the desolation in the land.⁵⁰

9. EXODOS

The requirements of the exodos are first to supply a suitable climax and close to the drama sufficient to offset the metamorphosis and the purely theatrical stroke of bringing the heifer on stage. Also the playwright must vindicate his protagonist. The latter would be especially important, apart from the demands of the drama itself, if the play were intentionally composed as a vehicle of pro-Argive propaganda.

The dramaturgical problem is similar to that which Sophocles faced in the exodos of *Ajax*, viz. the need to provide an ending strong enough to survive an important crisis earlier in the action. He builds up tension to a pitch, cuts it, and then must rebuild it again.⁵¹ In *Ajax* the wordy debate over the burial can only be anticlimactic to the suicide. Waldock is entirely right that the tension goes flat after verse 865.⁵² Death-scenes that do not coincide with the last act are *always* a risk and must either be early enough to have their effect diminished by the end *or* be offset by a second death-scene of a more important character at the end. Shakespeare realized this in his handling of Gaunt in *Richard II*, where both these expediencies are combined. In *Ajax* Sophocles partially redeems himself, however, because he ends the play with the stage-business of removing the corpse. The solemn exit of the cortège with the bier in production can

⁵⁰ See Wilamowitz, *loc. cit.*, "spinnewebe füllten die leeren scheuern."

⁵¹ Sophocles enjoyed this sort of challenge. Compare the exit of Iocaste at *OT* 1072 which he daringly inserted only some 100 lines before the great exit of Oedipus.

⁵² A. J. A. Waldock, *Sophocles the Dramatist* (Cambridge, 1951), 51.

make a powerful ending but it can never *fully* counteract the suicide.⁵³

In *Inachus* the metamorphosis, followed by the entrance of the heifer, posed the same problem as the suicide in *Ajax*. We can never know how Sophocles solved it. What follows is merely a suggestion not incompatible with the slender remains of the play. Sophocles may have written a trial scene. Tradition already associated the king with courts.⁵⁴ Other dramas show that Sophocles was much interested in the judiciary and realized its dramatic potential.⁵⁵ Sophocles had a great model. Aeschylus had already established the tradition of ending a play with a trial scene and had proved its dramatic effectiveness in both the *Oresteia* and the Danaid Trilogy.⁵⁶ Sophocles may well have himself already ended a play with a trial-scene in *Locrian Ajax*.⁵⁷ A trial-scene is always filled with the opportunity for high tension and in a medium familiar to many of the audience. Shakespeare realized this and ended *Merchant* with a splendid one and so did Shaw in *St. Joan*.

The situation in *Inachus* is ripe for a trial-scene. Was Inachus justified in his criticism of the goddess and is he therefore being unjustly treated? On the analogy of *Eumenides*,

⁵³ The early death of Alcestis gave Euripides the same problem. Like *Ajax* he had a suicide, cortège, and epiparodos. Euripides however was more successful. He set the death earlier in the action and played an ace. For if there is one situation that can counteract a death-scene, it is a resurrection-scene and that is precisely what Euripides gives us when he brings his heroine back from the tomb.

⁵⁴ See Englemann in Roscher, *MythLex*, II, 1. 126. 20ff. and H. J. Rose, *HGM*,⁴ 68–69.

⁵⁵ The defense of Oedipus in *OC* is a defense of involuntary homicide. The lost *Larisaioi* concerned a man who slew another accidentally with a wild throw of the discus. This is just the subject of Antiphon's second tetralogy (cf. Aristot. *EN* 5. 8. 1135B 11ff.). For the legal aspect of *OT* see now the meticulous study of Knox, *op. cit.*, pp. 78–98 with notes 114–189 (pp. 223–232). Even the speech of Sophocles' characters is occasionally noticeably influenced by judicial oratory: see the excellent material collected by Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 316 n. 1.

⁵⁶ The best commentary on the trial in *Eumenides* is still Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles u. Athen*, 2, 329ff. For the trial of Hypermnestra see Robertson, *CR* 38 (1924) 51ff. See further Schmid-Stählin, I. 2 p. 255.

⁵⁷ See Pearson, *Fragments*, vol. 1, 9–10.

the elders of Argos would be the jurors; Iris, the prosecutor; Hermes, the attorney for the defense; and Inachus, the defendant. Inachus would be acquitted. A speech by Hermes (compare Athene in *Eumenides*) would follow, commending what had happened and placating Inachus by foretelling the glorious future of Io.

Such a conclusion would provide a powerful vindication of the protagonist and further be strong enough to unify the play and relegate the Argos-Io sequence to its proper dimension (it was included first because it was good theatre and next because it was a way of vividly impressing upon the audience the justification that Inachus had in blaspheming the goddess). Here also is why the play was entitled *Inachus* and not *Io*. Two fragments suggest that a trial was included within the action of *Inachus*. They are of too technical and prosaic a nature to be the stuff of similes or of metaphors. They are rendered: "the dicast who votes with a bean" (frg. 288P) and "the funnel-shaped top of the voting urn" (frg. 295P).⁵⁸

⁵⁸ The latter translation is from *LSJ* s.v. *κημός* II, 2. Wilamowitz, *loc. cit.*, considered *Inachus* to be a substitute for a satyr play in the same way that *Alcestis* was. The contention can never be proved nor refuted.