

## 1. The problem

In their edition of the Tragic fragments by unknown authors<sup>1</sup>, R. Kannicht and B. Snell print *fr.* 370 K.-Sn. ‘Αἰδην δ’ ἔχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς without venturing to offer any conjecture on possible ascription or provenance. Ps. Plutarch *Consol. Apollon.* 106c 9-d7 preserved this fragment from an unidentified play, together with four other Tragic passages, without recording the name of its author or the title of the work it belonged to: ‘Ο δ’ Αἰσχύλος καλῶς ἔοικεν ἐπιπλήττειν τοῖς νομίζουσι τὸν θάνατον εἶναι κακόν, λέγων ὡδε· ὡς ‘οὐ δικαίως θάνατον ἔχθουσιν βροτοί, / ὅσπερ μέγιστον ῥῦμα τῶν πολλῶν κακῶν’ (*A. fr.* 353 R.). τοῦτον γὰρ ἀπεμιμήσατο καὶ ὁ εἰπών· ‘ὦ θάνατε, παιὰν ιατρὸς μόλοις’ (*adesp. fr.* 369a K.-Sn.). ‘λιμὴν’ γὰρ ὄντως ‘Αἴδας ἀνιᾶν.’ (*adesp. fr.* 369 K.-Sn.) μέγα γάρ ἔστι τὸ μετὰ πείσματος τεθαρροητός εἰπεῖν ‘τίς δ’ ἔστι δοῦλος τοῦ θανεῖν ὅφροντις ὕπερ’; (*E. fr.* 958 N<sup>2</sup>) καὶ ‘Αἰδην δ’ ἔχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς’ (*adesp. fr.* 370 K.-Sn.).

<sup>\*</sup>I would like to thank Professors Manuel Sanz Morales, Alexander F. Garvie, and the anonymous referees of *Exemplaria Classica* for their helpful suggestions and criticisms, and Professor Sally E. Hadden for her help in the translation of this paper.

<sup>1</sup>R. Kannicht-B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Vol. 2: Fragmenta Adespota*, Göttingen 1981 (*TrGF 2*). Other abbreviations are S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Vol. 3: Aeschylus*, Göttingen 1985 (*TrGF 3*); B. Snell-R. Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Vol. 1. Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum*, Göttingen 1986 (*TrGF 1*). Greek grave inscriptions are taken from W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I. Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin 1955.

Ps. Plutarch transmitted these five Tragic fragments as additional evidence to support his argument that death, far from being an unmitigated evil, is actually a haven and a cure for the fatigues of this world. It is my contention that *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* Ἀιδην δέχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς could not possibly express, in any shape or form, such a concept. Rather, the provenance of *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* could be taken to be a scene from a tragedy set in the Underworld, with an infernal *katabasis* for its subject (*cf. Ar. Po.* 1455b 32–56a 3). Ps. Plutarch might have misunderstood the meaning of the polysemantic word σκιάς by interpreting it to mean ‘dark, shadowy places of Hades’, whereas in the classical age in general, and in the Tragic lexis in particular, σκιά is never found in that sense. Rather, σκιά always means ‘shadow cast down by an object or a body’, ‘thing of little substance or value’, ‘spectre, shade, ghost’ in Tragic contexts (*cf. LSJ s.v.*). Ps. Plutarch must have erroneously taken *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* to mean ‘since I can count on the help of Hades (= death), I do not fear (coming down to) the shadows (= darkness of the Underworld)<sup>2</sup>’, when he should have understood ‘since I can count on the help of Hades (= god of the dead), I do not fear the shades (= spectres)’. Therefore, the unknown and unidentified drama from which *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* seems to have been culled would be set in Hades. Its argument could be a *katabasis*, a descent to the Underworld. A nameless character, the speaker of the fragment, readies himself to brave the expected assault from the bloodless ghosts that wander the dark regions below the Earth (*cf. Od.* 11.43).

Another possibility is to understand Ἀιδην δέχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς as ‘having death as my helper, I do not fear trifling things’, with σκιάς in the sense of ‘unsubstantial thing’, and Ἀιδην as ‘death’. This would indicate that the possibility of suicide diminishes other fears to nothingness. A sense that would render the argument for the *katabasis* hypothesis worthless. However, this interpretation should be discarded for the following reasons:

<sup>2</sup> Fear of the shadows under the Earth is a known topic in grave inscriptions: *cf. Mart.* 5.34.3 *parvola ne nigras horrescat Eroton umbras*, 7.21.3. On men’s horror of the monstrous creatures that dwell in Hades see *Od.* 11.634–5, *Anacr.* 395.8–11 *PMG*, *Arist. Ra.* 143–5, *Pl. Resp.* 330d5–8, *A.P.* 7.317, *Lucr.* 3.87–90, 978–1023. *Cf. K. J. Dover, Aristophanes. Frogs*, Oxford 1993, 208; R.G. Austin, *Aeneidos liber sextus*, Oxford 1986, 151.

a) All the preserved occurrences of σκιά in the sense of ‘trifling, unsubstantial thing’ in the whole Tragic corpus are always in the singular: cf. *Comic. Adesp. Suppl. Com.* 36.1 σκιά· τὰ Σνητῶν vs. *Sch. A. Ch.* 157, 2 σκιαί· οἱ νεκροί. The interpretation ‘trifling things’ does not seem to be found for the plural of σκιά in Tragic diction: whenever a plural form of this noun is found, it invariably means either ‘(physical) shadow’, or ‘ghost’<sup>3</sup>. This is also true of the word’s usage in the Plutarchean corpus<sup>4</sup>. While the possibility of having found the exception that proves the rule must always be reckoned with, the information I have located indicates, to the contrary, that there is a greater probability of hitting the mark by taking Ἀιδῆν δ’ ἔχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς to mean ‘having Hades/death as my helper, I do not fear the ghosts/shadows’.

b) As for understanding Ἀιδῆν as common Tragic diction for ‘death’, it certainly is a possible meaning, but one far from being in the majority in the Tragic corpus. In actual fact, the frequency of the usage of Ἀιδῆν as a metonym for death is significantly low when compared with the much more common meaning of the noun as

<sup>3</sup> σκιά takes the meaning ‘trifling things’ in A. *Ag.* 839, 1328, *Eum.* 302 (probably ‘ghost’), *frs.* 154a 9 R., 399.2 R.; S. *Ant.* 1170, *Ai.* 126, 1257, *El.* 1159, *Ph.* 946, *frs.* 13.1R., 33.1; E. *Med.* 1224, *Hel.* 1240, *frs.* 509.1, 532.2 N.<sup>2</sup>; Moschion 97 F 3.1 Sn.-K.; *Adesp. fr.* 95.3 K.-Sn. Notice that all these instances are in the singular, not the plural. An apparent exception is S. *fr.* 945.2 R. σκιαῖς ἐσικότες, but it is clear that the phrase means ‘resembling (physical) shadows, moving to and fro’. The only counterexample I have been able to find is Eup. *fr.* 51 καπνοὺς καὶ σκιάς, but notice that it is a comic (i.e., not tragic) fragment transmitted without context: additionally, *Sch. Arist. Nu.* 253 seems to indicate that σκιάς must be understood merely as a rhetorical plural, so typical of the Comic genre, attracted by the similar rhetorical plural καπνούς: τὰ μηδενός ἄξια καπνούς, καὶ σκιάς, καὶ νεφέλας ὀνόμαζον. Contrast the expected use of the singular in A. *fr.* 399.2 R. πιστὸν οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἡ καπνοῦ σκιά, S. *Ant.* 1170-1 τἄλλα ἔγω καπνοῦ σκιάς / οὐκ ἄν πρωτίμην, *Ph.* 946 (R. Jebb, *Sophocles, the Plays and Fragments III. Antigone*, Cambridge 1906, 208-9).

<sup>4</sup> See *Galb.* 22.5, *Mor.* 93c 8, 104b 8-12, 165f 10, 565e 1, 709c 5, 848b 1-4. *Plu. Mor.* 479c 10 and 1001e 3 both seem to mean εἰδωλα, εἰκόνες (‘shadows of the Real’) in the Platonic sense.

‘god of the dead’ and as ‘Underworld’<sup>5</sup>. Of course, this does not prove that in each and every instance when Ἀιδηνός is used in Tragic diction either the god or his realm must necessarily be meant. However, it is not illogical to presume that a word culled from the Tragic corpus should have the most frequent meaning in Tragic diction, and that to posit Ἀιδηνός in the sense of ‘god of the dead’, statistically the most common meaning of the noun in Tragedy<sup>6</sup>, need not be more improbable than a competing explanation from a less frequent usage. Additionally, as I attempt to prove below, the metrical analysis seems compatible with an Aeschylean, not Euripidean, date. While there are eleven instances of Euripides using Ἀιδηνός in the sense of ‘death’, this same meaning is found only once in the whole Aeschylean and Sophoclean corpus<sup>7</sup>.

Positing a *katabasis* as the context of *fr. 370 K.-Sn* could raise a few objections, and rightly so. It would be quite unlikely that

<sup>5</sup> Ἀιδηνός as ‘god of the dead’ (118 times): *A. Supp.* 228, 416, 791, *Ag.* 1115, 1235, 1291, 1387, 1528, *Eum.* 273, *Pr.* 236, *fr.* 239.1, 374.10., 406.1 R., *Aristias* 9 F 3.2 Sn.-K., *S. Tr.* 1, 4, 1041, 1085, 1098, *Ant.* 308, 519, 542, 575, 654, 777, 780, 811, 911, 1075, 1205, 1241, *Ai.* 606, 660, 865, 1035, 1193, *OT* 30, 1372, *El.* 110, 463, 542, 949, 1432, *Ph.* 1211, 1349, *OC* 1221, 1689, *fr.* 298.1, 837.3, 861.2 R., *E. Alc.* 25, 73, 225, 237, 438, 626, 744, 746, 871, 900, *Held.* 949, *Hec.* 2, 368, 418, 1077, *Med.* 1234, *Hipp.* 829, 895, 1047, *Andr.* 544, *Supp.* 75, 773, 921, 1142, *HF* 24, 453, 484, 562, 608, 610, 1101, 1102, 1119, 1277, 1331, *Ion* 953, 1274, *Tr.* 442, 445, 594, *El.* 662, 1144, *IT* 369, 969, *Hel.* 969, *Phoe.* 810, 1576, *Or.* 1109, 1522, 1584, *Ba.* 857, *Rh.* 915, *I.A.* 461, 540, 1278, *fr.* 370.71 K., *frs.* 332.1, 371.1, 465, 912.2, 8, 936 N<sup>2</sup>., *Critias* 43 F 1.11 Sn.-K., *Sosiphanes* 92 F 3.6 Sn.-K., *adesp.* *fr.* 127.10, 208.1-2, 369.1, 372.4, K.-Sn. Ἀιδηνός as ‘Underworld’ (36 times): *A. Pers.* 923, *Ag.* 1291, *Pr.* 152, 433, 1029, *S. Ant.* 822, 1284, *Tr.* 282, 1161, *Ai.* 517, *OT* 972, *El.* 833, *Ph.* 449, 624, 1349, *OC* 1461, *fr.* 832.1 R., *E. Alc.* 359, *Andr.* 1217, *Hec.* 1032, *Held.* 218, *Med.* 1059, 1110, *Hipp.* 57, 829, *Supp.* 1004, *HF* 297, 426, 619, *Ion* 1496, *fr.* 120.3, 122, 533.1, 936 N<sup>2</sup>, *adesp. frs.* 369, 372.4 K.-Sn. Ἀιδηνός as metonymy for death (14 times): *A. Ag.* 667, *S. fr.* 941.3 R., *E. Alc.* 13, *Andr.* 414, 1192, *Hipp.* 1047, 1387, *IT* 486, *Tr.* 597, *HF* 145, 491, *Hel.* 1123, *Ba.* 1157, *Lyc.* 100 F 5 Sn.-K. All ambiguous usages where exact meaning is impossible to determine have been removed from the total figures (*S. OC* 1440, 1552, *E. Alc.* 268, 957, *Held.* 514, *Hipp.* 1366, 1387, *Supp.* 797).

<sup>6</sup> 70.2% of the total number of instances, vs. 21.4% ('Underworld') and a meagre 8.3% ('death').

<sup>7</sup> See above n. 5.

a native speaker of ancient Greek like Ps. Plutarch, or his source, should commit the glaring mistake of giving a word from his own tongue a meaning it never had. However, the following counterarguments must be pointed out in this regard:

a) In the first place, as is well known, Ps. Plutarch did not quote from complete texts of tragedies; that is, with full and due attention to context, plot and speaker. Rather, he culled bare quotations from ready-made compendia or anthologies comprised of famous passages and maxims suitable for philosophical purposes of consolation. Among those, Tragic passages figured prominently. Such quotations as can be found in the *Consolatio ad Apollonium*, therefore, are likely to have been taken from a florilegium that did not include the context of the passages; with no further indication, as a result, beyond what would be inferred from the verses themselves, to reveal the outline of the plot or the larger context of the play<sup>8</sup>. A clear example of such anthologies listing famous passages bare of context would be the section from Stobaeus's anthology titled 'encomium of death' (Stob. 4.52.1-55, ἔπαινον θανάτου). In point of fact, the conception of death as the definitive solution against the grief of living, primarily found in Tragic passages, is a well-favoured topic employed with unsurprising frequency in the philosophical and rhetorical genre literature of consolation (*mors, omnium dolorum exsolutio*)<sup>9</sup>. A prominent example of Ps.

<sup>8</sup> TrGF 2, 113 "omnia ut videtur e florilegio hausta". Cf. W. R. Paton-I. Wegehaupt-M. Pohlenz-H. Gärtner, *Plutarchi Moralia*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1993, I, 208 "libellus spurius ab homine stulto ex Crantoribus libro περὶ πένθους, florilegiis, argumentis consolatoriis per scholas et rhetorum et philosophorum iactatis compilatus". There have been some conjectures about the likely existence of a florilegium, approximately contemporary with Plutarch and composed by an unknown philosopher, specifically comprised of Tragic quotations on the matter of the benefits of death as opposed to the low character evinced by those who cling to life, come what may. To such a compilation might belong A. frs. 250, 254, 255, 353 R. Cf. TrGF 3, 355 and 358; J. Hani-J. Defradas-R. Klaerr, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, Paris 1985, II, 15, 22 and 26-7.

<sup>9</sup> R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1962, 205-10; A. M. Véritilhac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩPOI. *Póesie Funéraire II. Commentaire*, Athina 1982, 222-5; F. Lillo, *Palabras contra el dolor. La consolación filosófica latina de Cicerón a Frontón*, Madrid 2001, 50-1, 56-8, 188-9, 245-50 and 262-3.

Plutarch's practice of taking contextless quotes from anthologies would be *Consol. ad Apoll.* 104d 9-e 4~*Od.* 18.130-7<sup>10</sup>. In it, the writer never realized that the lines he was quoting as if belonging to two different Odyssean passages can be found, in actual fact, in the same speech in the original context<sup>11</sup>. Obviously, absence of larger context would make misinterpretation of polysemantic words that much easier. In further confirmation of Ps. Plutarch's habit, other lines Ps. Plutarch transmitted as purportedly coming from the mouth of the same speaker are, actually, divided between two characters in the original play (102b 6~A. *Pr.* 378-9)<sup>12</sup>.

b) In the second place, the anonymous writer who circulated his *consolatio* under Plutarch's name, or his source, did not always identify the name of the author whose verses he quoted in support of his own arguments, regardless of how well known the said author might be. Some instances of this habit can be found in *Consol. Apoll.* 102b, 103a-b and 109f, quoting without attribution A. *Pr.* 378-9, E. *fr.* 661 N.<sup>2</sup> (*Stheneboea*), A. *fr.* 255 R. (*Philoctetes*) and E. *Tr.* 636. At times, even when he took the trouble to ascribe authorship to a quotation, Ps. Plutarch was not always exempt from misattribution: at 116e 18, he quoted as belonging to Aeschylus some lines which, as is known from Stobaeus 4.44.36, actually come from Euripides (*fr.* 1078 N<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>10</sup> ... ὁ θεῖος "Ομηρος, εἰπών, 'οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο. / οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὀπίσσω, / ὅφρ' ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρη· / ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεοὶ μάκαρες τελέουσι, / καὶ τὰ φέρει αἰεκαζόμενος τετληρότι θυμῷ καὶ τοῖος γάρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων, / οἷον ἐπ' ἡμιαρά ἄγησι πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε".

<sup>11</sup> W. R. Paton-I. Wegehaupt-M. Pohlenz-H. Gärtner, *Plutarchi Moralia*, 214 "scriptor e florilegio hauriens se unum Homeri locum afferre non sensit".

<sup>12</sup> 'ψυχῆς' γάρ 'νοσούσης εἰσὶν ιατροὶ λόγοι, ὅταν τις ἐν καιρῷ γε μαλαθάσῃ κέαρ.'-A. *Pr.* 378-9 {Ωκ.} ὁργῆς νοσούσης εἰσὶν ιατροὶ λόγοι; / {Πο.} ἔαν τις ἐν καιρῷ γε μαλαθάσῃ κέαρ. The real Plutarch was not exempt from this practice, as a consequence of his habit of taking quotations from anthologies of passages ordered according to subject: in *Amat.* 757a he quotes E. *fr.* 322.1 N<sup>2</sup>. and S. *fr.* 941 R. as if they came ἀπὸ μιᾶς σημενῆς, without taking the trouble to specify that the author of the two quotations is not the same.

c) Thirdly, we do know of several instances in which a native Greek speaker demonstrably misunderstood the meaning of words, when such words were taken from second- (or third-) hand accounts and had been transmitted without a context. An almost exact parallel is provided by the lexicographer Ammonius (first to second century A.D.) 226 p. 59, 11 Nickau, who preserved A. *fr.* 289 R. thus: Βοᾶς τοιοῦδε πράγματος θεωρὸς ὁν: θεωρὸς καὶ θεατὴς διαφέρει. Θεωρὸς μὲν γάρ ἔστιν ὁ εἰς θεοὺς πεμπόμενος, θεατὴς δὲ ὁ ἀγώνων καὶ θεάτρων. Εὐριπίδης ἐν "Ιωνὶ (301) (...) καὶ Αἰσχύλος 'Βοᾶς ... ὁν.' S. Radt (*TrGF* 3, 388) points out that Ammonius understood that τοιοῦδε πράγματος θεωρὸς ὁν did not mean 'talis rei spectator'. Rather, he had interpreted it to mean 'legatus talis rei causa missus'. And yet, he continues, 'inauditus esset usus genitivi, et alibi (*Prom.* 118, *Choe.* 246) Aeschylus plane θεωρὸς pro θεατὴς dixit'. Therefore, S. Radt concludes, 'aut Ammoni fontem errasse vel ab Ammonio negligentius exscriptum esse aut scribam quendam Ammoni textum foede decurtasse conicias'<sup>13</sup>.

Notice how Ammonius misunderstood the authentic meaning of Aeschylus' words τοιοῦδε πράγματος θεωρὸς ὁν for precisely the same reasons I posit Ps. Plutarch did in his turn with σκιά: both authors found the verses in question in an anthology, therefore lacking context, and proceeded to assign them a meaning that, while usual in their own times (first to second century A.D.), was not common in the classical period.

Furthermore, Ps. Plutarch introduced at least one quotation in which the three observations made above, namely, a) unnamed author; b) no context; c) misunderstood meaning, could be found together: in *Consol. Apoll.* 111b 2–9 he gave *Od.* 15.245–6 ὃν περὶ αῆρι φίλει Ζεύς τ' αἰγίοχος καὶ Ἀπόλλων / παντοίην φιλότητ', οὐδὲ ἵκετο γήραος οὐδόν the well-known,

<sup>13</sup> It should be added that the Byzantine scholar and politician Theodoros Metochites († 1332 A.D.), who incorrectly assigned *fr. adesp.* 369a K.-Sn. to Aeschylus, was misled by a deficient understanding of the ps. Plutarchean text quoted above (cf. S. Radt in *TrGF* 3, 358 “Plutarchi loco indiligenter lecto *adesp. fr.* 369 a Aeschylo tribuit Theod. Metoch. *Miscell.* 58 p. 347 Müller-Kiessling”).

but erroneous, sense of ‘those the gods love die young’ (*τὸ γὰρ καλὸν οὐκ ἐν μήκει χρόνου θετέον, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ καιρίῳ συμμετρίᾳ: τοῦτο γὰρ εὑδαιμον καὶ θεοφιλές εἶναι νενόμισται. διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν τοὺς ὑπεροχωτάτους τῶν ἡρώων καὶ φύντας ἀπὸ θεῶν πρὸ γῆρως ἐκλιπόντας τὸν βίον οἱ ποιηταὶ παιρέδοσαν ἡμῖν, ὥσπερ κάκεινον “ ὅν... οὐδόν”* [Od. 15.245-6]). In fact, what Homer meant there was that Amphiaraus, despite being well-favoured by the gods, died an untimely death, betrayed by his wife. The famous conceit that the gods’ loved ones die before their time is a trite topic constantly trotted out in works of philosophical consolation. Therefore, it would not be too far-fetched to suggest that custom and habit, literary tradition, genre expectations, and the ideas commonly believed in the period, together with the fact that the Homeric verses were quoted without their context, would have led Ps. Plutarch to misinterpret even as famous a Homeric passage as this<sup>14</sup>.

Once it has been established that it would have been possible that Ps. Plutarch misunderstood the meaning of a contextless Tragic fragment, there is still the cause of such confusion to consider. *σκιά* appears thirty-seven times in the whole Tragic corpus. This figure may be broken down as follows: in eighteen occurrences (48.6%), *σκιά* means ‘thing without value or substance’<sup>15</sup>, in eleven (29.7%), ‘shadows cast down by an object’<sup>16</sup>, in the remaining eight cases (21.6%), ‘shade, ghost, spectre’<sup>17</sup>. That is to say, nowhere in the Tragic corpus can one find the meaning of ‘Underworld’ (without further modifiers) for *σκιά*<sup>18</sup>. This is precisely the case with other words from the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. R. Lattimore, *Themes*, 259; J. Hani-J. Defradas-R. Klaerr, *Plutarque*, 284 n.7, A. M. Véritilhac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ, 224-5.

<sup>15</sup> E. *Med.* 1224, *fr.* 509.1 N<sup>2</sup>., 532.2 N<sup>2</sup>., S. *Ant.* 1170, *Ai.* 126, 1257, *El.* 1159, *Ph.* 946, *fr.* 13.1 R., *fr.* 331.1 R., *fr.* 945.2 R., A. *Ag.* 839, *fr.* 273.9 R., *fr.* 154a9 R., *fr.* 399.2 R., Moschion 97 *fr.* 3.1 Sn.

<sup>16</sup> E. *Andr.* 745, *HF* 973, *Ba.* 458, *I.A.* 1, *S. Ai.* 301, *fr.* 314.147 R., A. *Ag.* 967, 1328, *fr.* 401b5, *Chaeremon* 71 *fr.* 14.6, 15 Sn.

<sup>17</sup> E. *HF* 494, *Hel.* 1240, *fr.* 659.6 N<sup>2</sup>., A. *Sept.* 976, 987, *Eum.* 302, *adesp. fr.* 95.3 K.-Sn., *adesp. fr.* 370.1 K.-Sn. See also, e.g., *Od.* 10.495, Verg. *Georg.* 4.472, *Aen.* 6.390, *Ov. met.* 4.434, *Sen. Thyest.* 24, *HF* 783.

<sup>18</sup> As is the case, e.g., with Latin *infernas umbras* (*Mart.* 1.36.5), *Stygias umbras* (*Mart.* 1.114.5).

same lexical family and endowed with similar meaning, such as ἔρεβος, σκότος, κνέφας, ζόφος. All of them, as was said, are apt to convey the meaning ‘shadows, darkness’ as a metonym for ‘realm of the dead’ without need of modifiers<sup>19</sup>: since the dawn of their literature, Greeks typically described the world below as darkness, a sunless expanse in perpetual shadow<sup>20</sup>. In stark contrast with the evidence supplied by the Tragic corpus, Plutarch’s own body of work shows isolated instances in which σκιά actually means ‘sunless place’ (ἀφθεγγὲς χωρίον, Plu. *De fac. orb. lun.* 934a 4; cf. 933e, 942e-f) and even ‘Hades, Persephone’s realm’ (placed in the Moon<sup>21</sup>, in this case: Plu. *De fac. orb. lun.* 944a 11-c 9). The clearest instance is Plu. *De fac. orb. lun.* 944b 2-3 ἄμα δὲ καὶ κάτωθεν αἱ τῶν κολαζομένων ψυχαί

<sup>19</sup> ἔρεβος: Hes. *Th.* 123, *H. Cer.* 335-8, *S. Ai.* 394-5; σκότος: *A. Ch.* 285, *Eum.* 72, *S. Ai.* 394-5, *OC* 1701, *fr.* 533.1 R, *E. Hel.* 62, *Hec.* 1-2, 208-9, *HF* 563, *Or.* 1488; cf. Plu. *Aetia rom.* 270d 9 πρὸς τὸν Ἄιδην καὶ τὸ σκότος; *De Pythia Or.* 369e 8; *De prim. frig.* 953a 3; κνέφας: *E. Hipp.* 836, *A.R.* 2.1032; ζόφος: *Od.* 20.356, 11.155, *Il.* 21.56, 15.191, *H. Cer.* 402, 446, *A. Pers.* 839, *E. Alc.* 13, *Hipp.* 1047, 1416. Cf. *Luc. De luct.* 18 τὸν παρ’ ἡμῖν ζόφον καὶ τὸ πολὺ σκότος (the speaker is a ghost), *C.E.* 55, 19 (Rome) *tenebris tenentur Ditis aeterna domu.* δνόφος, ζόφος, κνέφας are apparently cognate with θάνατος, which is not the case with σκιά; see E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1979, 41.

<sup>20</sup> R. Lattimore, *Themes*, 161-4; E. Irwin, *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry*, Toronto 1974, 173-5 and 218-9. The words used are always κελαινός, στύγιος, κελαινοφαεῖς, μύχος, οὐλπος, νῦξ, ὀρφνά, σκοτίας, ζοφερόν, never σκιά: Cf. A.M. Véritlac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, 270-1 and 364-6. See also *Od.* 12.383, *A. Sept.* 859, *Pr.* 1028, *S. fr.* 533.1 R., *BMI* 4, 1113, *Ps. Pl. Axio.* 371a, *G.V.* 662 (Rheneia, 2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> B.C.) ἀλάμπετον οὖδας Αἰδέω | κρύψεμ' ὑποσκοτίην, *G.V.* 1912 (Ptolemais, 4<sup>th</sup> A.D.), *G.V.* 1598 (Cyprus, 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> A.D.), *SEG* I 571, 3-4 (Leontopolis, Augustan age) εἰς μυχὸν αἰώνων ἐν σκοτίᾳ διάγειν, *Verg. Aen.* 6.534 *ut tristis sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires?*

<sup>21</sup> The conception that Hades, assimilated to the Pythagorean Anti-earth, is placed somewhere in the Moon dates from Hellenistic times, not earlier. See e.g. P. Kingsley, *Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic. Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*, Oxford 1995, 186-7. On the topography of the Moon as explained by Sulla’s eschatological myth in Plutarch, and its Pythagorean and Platonic roots, see A. Pérez Jiménez, “Plutarco y el paisaje lunar”, in J. García López-E. Calderón (eds.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Paisaje y naturaleza*, Madrid 1990, 316.

τηνικαῦτα διὰ τῆς σκιᾶς ὀδυρόμεναι <καὶ> ἀλαλάζουσαι προσφέρονται. Intriguingly, the phrase σκιὰ θανάτου, shadow of death, in the sense of ‘hell, realm below the Earth’, appears to be a typically Hebrew stylistic trait. It is first attested, aside from direct Greek translations from Hebrew texts, in Philo of Alexandria (first century B.C.)<sup>22</sup>. The only parallels from non-Christian and non-Jewish writings for σκιά as a metonym for ‘Hades’ seem to be *G.V.* 651 (Moesia superior, 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> A.D.) “Αἰδας δ’ ἐπεσκίασεν, *E.G.* 253, 5-6 (Mesambria, late) κείμεθα] ... ἐν σκιεροῖς θαλάμοις, *G.V.* 1912 (Ptolemais, 4<sup>th</sup> A.D.) πορθμίδος εύσελμου μεδέων γέρον, / ὃς διὰ πάντα νυκτὸς ὑπὸ σκιερᾶς πείσατα πλεῖς ποταμοῦ, Plot. 1.6.8.15 τυφλὸς ἐν Ἀΐδου μένων καὶ ἐνταῦθα κάκει σκιαῖς.

Notice how all the examples of σκιά in the non-classical meaning of ‘Hades’ I have been able to collect are either contemporary with, or later than Plutarch. Likewise, *umbra* as a metonymy for ‘Hades’ appeared in Latin at roughly the same time as well<sup>23</sup>.

Therefore, Ps. Plutarch may have misinterpreted the maxim Ἀΐδην δ’ ἔχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς, in all likelihood taken from a compendium that did not supply the context of the quotation, possibly because of two causes: a) σκιά had developed a new meaning, unattested in the classical Tragic corpus, in the vocabulary of the age (first to second century A.D.) in general, and in the author he was imitating (Plutarch) in particular; b) there were other, specialized words from Epic and Tragic diction (σκότος, κνέφας, ζόφος), that, while retaining the basic meaning of ‘darkness’, were prototypically susceptible of conveying by metonym the sense

<sup>22</sup> Cf. e. g. *Ps.* 22.4, 43.20, 87.7, 106.20, 106.14, *Job* 3.5, 12.22, 24.17, 28.3, *Is.* 9.1, *Jer.* 13.16, *Phil. Plant.* 27.4, *Heres.* 290.5 βούλεοθαι βιῶναι μετ’ ἀρετῆς ἡ μυρία ἔτη ἐν σκιᾷ θανάτου, *Ev. Luc.* 1.79.1 ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, *Clem. Rom.* 4.4. 2-3; *Clem. Alex. Protr.* 11.114.1.6, *Orig.* 6.5.23.

<sup>23</sup> E. g. *Verg. Aen.* 4.660 *sic, sic iuvat ire sub umbras*, 6.264-5, 268, 404, 619, 12.881, 952, *Ov. met.* 10.12 *ne non temptaret et umbras*, *Sen. HF* 677-9; *Mart.* 5.34.3. Cf. M. Billerbeck, *Seneca. Hercules Furens. Einleitung. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*; Leiden-Boston-Köln 1999, 429, *OLD s.v. umbra* 7b.

'dark places under the earth, Hades'. The sliding in meaning of σκιά from 'shadow' to 'Hades' might have been modelled on such words. Ps. Plutarch, thus, would have interpreted Ἀιδην δέ έχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς to mean 'I do not fear the dark of Hades', when in point of fact the expected sense according to the original author was 'I do not fear ghosts'<sup>24</sup>. A clearer instance of the fluidity and equivalence between σκοτίας and σκιερός is the Athenian grave-epitaph Ἀιδης οὗ σκοτίας ἀμφέβαλεν πτέρυγας (3<sup>rd</sup> B.C.), an echo of the epigram *A.P.* 7.713.3-4 Νυκτὸς ὑπὸ σκιερῆς κωλύεται πτέρυγι<sup>25</sup>. A concrete parallel, roughly contemporary with Ps. Plutarch (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> A.D.), of the near-synonymy between σκότος and σκιά as metonym for 'Underworld' is *Ev. Mat.* 4.16 ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει / φῶς εἶδεν μέγα, / καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.

## 2. Provenance of the fragment: Aeschylus' *Psychagogoi*?

Despite the unpromising brevity of the fragment, certain reasonable conjectures about the outline of the play to which it would belong might still be made. The speaker of the fragment, for undisclosed reasons, must descend to the world of the dead. Since he stated that only the protection he expected to be granted by the god of the Underworld was strong enough to free him from the terror of the ghosts who would unstoppably assault him there, it follows that the speaker must be a mortal. Among all the mythical characters whose *katabaseis* are known, only Heracles, Theseus, Peirithous, Orpheus, and Odysseus belonged in that category: Demeter and Dionysus, both protagonists of less well-known descents into Hades, were obviously immortal<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. e. g. *Od.* 11.36-43 οἱ δέ ἀγέροντο / ψυχαὶ ὑπὲξ Ἐρεβευς νεκύων κατατεθνητῶν / .... / οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ βαθρὸν ἐφοίτων ἄλλοδεν ἄλλος / Σεσπεσίη ἴαχη ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἥρει, 495 τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀίσσουσιν.

<sup>25</sup> A. M. Véritlac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ, 370.

<sup>26</sup> All literary and artistic sources for these *katabaseis* can be found in R. J. Clark, *Catabasis. Vergil and the Wisdom-Tradition*, Amsterdam 1979;

Once both gods have been eliminated from consideration, let us examine Heracles and Theseus, protagonists of the most famous *katabaseis* in Greek literature and art. The speaker of the line could not possibly be Heracles on the following grounds: a) Heracles, because of his great strength and superhuman courage, was precisely singled out among the rest of visitors to Hades for his lack of fear when he had to go down there in order to retrieve Cerberus (*Bacch.* 5.71-84, *Apoll.* 2.5.12). The contrast with Odysseus' attitude could not be stronger: the latter felt terrified by the apparition of the wandering and bloodless souls, and the threat of the dreadful Gorgon head (*Od.* 11.42-3, 633, cf. Aeneas' panic in *Verg. Aen.* 6.290-1), whereas Heracles strode on undisturbed and unperturbed. b) There is a well-attested mythological tradition that would have Heracles' visit to the Underworld be a very unpleasant and violent one. The rulers of the Underworld would not have agreeable memories of Heracles' sojourn among the denizens of Hades, since the son of Alcmena dared to deal very harshly with Hades himself and his servants<sup>27</sup>. Therefore, Hades, unlike his wife Persephone, would hardly agree to grant Heracles any special protection ( $\betaοηθός$ ) under the circumstances.

Theseus and Peirithous should also be ruled out: the impious and reckless nature of their enterprise, namely to abduct none other than the Queen of the dead (cf. *Minyas* fr. 6.24-7 Bernabé, D.S. 4.63.1-2, *Verg. Aen.* 6.392-6), would not have found too much favour and complacence with the injured husband, Hades himself<sup>28</sup>. It would be unlikely, then, that Hades should have felt especially moved to protect them from the terrors of the Underworld.

---

G. Camporeale, *LIMC* s.v. ‘Odysseus’, 961; W. Felten-I. Krauskopf, *LIMC supplementum*, s.v. ‘nekyia’, 871-8; T. Ganz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore-London 1993, 125-8, 131, 291-5, 413-6, 476-7 and 722-51; A. Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, Madrid 1982<sup>2</sup>, 238-9 and 384-6.

<sup>27</sup> Arist. *Ra.* 465-78, E. fr. 383 N<sup>2</sup>., Sch. *Od.* 11.605, *Apoll.* 2.5.12, *Verg. Aen.* 6.392-6, Sen. *HF* 560-5, 804-6.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 628-9 *thalami remittet ille raptorem sui? / nisi forte amori placidus et Pluton sedet.*

Therefore it will be found, by a process of elimination, that the candidates for the speaker of the fragment should be restricted to Orpheus and Odysseus.

Regarding the possibility that the speaker of *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* was Orpheus, it must be stressed that there is not a single shred of hard evidence pointing to the existence of a fifth-century play on the subject of Orpheus' descent into the Underworld, a dating suggested by the metric analysis of *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* The remaining fragments of Aristias' *Orpheus* (*TrGF 1, 9 F 5*) are so scarce as to make hypotheses about its plot impossible<sup>29</sup>. Aeschylus' *Bassarae* apparently dramatized a very different part of the myth (namely, Orpheus' death, *cf.* Eratosth. *Cat. 24*), although Orpheus' *extra fabulam katabasis* might have been reported in the play<sup>30</sup>. Nothing at all is known about the argument of Polyphrasmon's *Lycurgea* (7 T 3 Sn.-K.), not even whether it included Orpheus in the cast of characters. Certainly, some vase paintings might be taken to imply the loss of a no-longer extant tragedy with this very argument<sup>31</sup>. However, two reservations to this interpretation must be made. First, these vase paintings all date from the fourth century B.C., not from the fifth, and none of them are of Athenian provenance<sup>32</sup>. While this does not necessarily rule out the possibility that they preserved memories of the revival of an old play, it seems just as probable that they represented a contemporary drama. Second, it must always be taken into consideration, as A.W. Pickard-Cambridge warned, that this group of vases may not reflect any theatrical reality, and need not be theatrically-inspired<sup>33</sup>. Be that as it may, the

<sup>29</sup> D. F. Sutton, "A Handlist of Satyr-Plays", *HSCP* 78, 1974, 115–6, believes the mythical area explored in this satirical drama had nothing to do with Orpheus' *katabasis*.

<sup>30</sup> M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990, 39, "in Aeschylus' play Orpheus could recall the descent only in retrospect (most likely in a prologue)". On the argument of *Bassarae* see e.g. *TrGF 3*, 138–9.

<sup>31</sup> T. B. L. Webster, "South Italian Vases and Attic Drama", *CQ* 42, 1948, 17; *cf.* *TrGF 2*, 17.

<sup>32</sup> Most come from Apulia and are dated between 350–310 B.C. *Cf.* M. X. Garezou, *s.v.* 'Orpheus', *LIMC*, 99 and 102.

<sup>33</sup> *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*, Oxford 1946, 98–9; *TrGF 2*, 17; M. X. Garezou, *s.v.* 'Orpheus', *LIMC*, 102. G. F. Else, *Aristotle's Poetics*:

fact remains that no single literary testimony or notice about such a play, if it existed at all, has been preserved<sup>34</sup>. Not even the bare title. Indeed, to posit the existence of an unattested lost play about Orpheus' *katabasis* dated to the fifth century B.C. in order to accommodate *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* seems unlikelier and less economical than the alternative Odysseus hypothesis.

Expanding on this conjecture, I would venture to suggest a new hypothesis. From among all tragedies and satyric plays preserved, either partially or in their entirety, featuring Odysseus as the main character, only Aeschylus' tragedy *Psychagogoi* would seem to comply with all the conditions the fragment seems to impose on any attempt at ascription: a) the play did deal with Odysseus' descent to the Underworld; b) the scenes were set in Hades; c) Hades (*cf. fr. 406 R.*) and Persephone (*cf. fr. 277 R.*) played some part in Odysseus' endeavour<sup>35</sup>. It follows that the small *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* might belong to this particular Aeschylean tragedy. Surprising though it may sound, the *neygia* narrated in book eleven of the *Odyssey* did not seem to be much of a popular theme among Athenian playwrights and artists, in stark contrast to Heracles' or Theseus' *katabaseis*<sup>36</sup>.

---

*The Argument*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1963, 529–30 similarly does not include Orpheus' *katabasis* among the plays ἐν ᾿Αἰδον mentioned by Ar. *Po.* 1456a2–3.

<sup>34</sup> *Adesp.* 129 e, *adesp.* 597 K.-Sn., and Diogenes 88 F 7, 10–12 Sn.-K., all of which mention Orpheus, have nothing to do with his *katabasis*.

<sup>35</sup> On the plot and the scene of Aeschylus' *Psychagogoi*, *cf.* U. von Wilamowitz, *Aischylos. Interpretationen*, Berlin 1914, 246 n.1; Th. Gelzer, “Neue Kölner Papyri”, *MH* 38, 1981, 122; J. Rusten, “The Aeschylean Avernus”, *ZPE* 45, 1982, 34–5.

<sup>36</sup> It was not very popular among 5<sup>th</sup> century Athenian vase painters, either: J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red Figure Vase Painters*, Oxford 1963<sup>2</sup>, 1045.2 and L. D. Caskey-J. D. Beazley, *Catalog of Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston, Oxford 1963, 87–8 record only two illustrations (*ARV*<sup>2</sup> 690.2, 717.1) of Odysseus' *neygia* from 5<sup>th</sup> cent. Athens. By way of contrast, notice the relatively high number of vase paintings from 5<sup>th</sup> century Athens depicting the adventures of Odysseus and Circe (eighteen entries in J. D. Beazley's on-line archive at [www.beazley.ox.ac.uk](http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk)) or Polyphemus (fifty-eight entries in J. D. Beazley's archive). See additionally G. Camporeale, *LIMC* s.v. ‘Odysseus’, 961; W. Felten-I. Krauskopf, *LIMC supplementum*, s.v. ‘neygia’, 871–8.

On the general subject of Odysseus, Aeschylus composed a tetralogy, comprised of *Psychagogoi*, *Penelope*, *The Bone-Gatherers*, and *Circe*. Sophocles composed *Nausicaa*, *Phaeacians*, *The Footwashing*, *The Madness of Odysseus*, *Odysseus Wounded by the Spine* and *Euryalus*. Euripides, on his part, contented himself with *Aeolus* and *Cyclops*. Among the fragments of minor and anonymous authors, there are scarce fragments and testimonia of *Aeolus* and *Telegonus* by Lycophron, *Odysseus Wounded by the Spine* by Apollodorus of Tarsus and Chaeremon, and *Scylla* and *Odysseus the False Messenger* by unknown playwrights (*adesp.* 7b, 8m Sn.-K.). Except for *Psychagogoi*, none of these plays dealt with Odysseus' *nekyia*<sup>37</sup>.

It could be objected that the fact that the speaker of *Adesp.* fr. 370 K.-Sn. should declare he fears no ghost would be directly incompatible with *Od.* 11.42-3, two lines in which Odysseus, unlike Heracles, showed his terror of the ghosts<sup>38</sup>. Even worse, the protection the infernal gods are expected to extend over him in the Tragic fragment would contradict *Od.* 11.633-5<sup>39</sup>. It follows, then, that the character on whose lips *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* would be found should never be Odysseus.

However, before blindly accepting such objections as definitive blows, it must always be taken into account that, at least in this play, Aeschylus made quite free with the Homeric *nekyia*. One very remarkable example should suffice: neither the cause nor the manner of Odysseus' death are the same in the *Odyssey* and

<sup>37</sup> Maybe *adesp. fr. 660 K.-Sn.* did, but the papyrus is so damaged that R. Kannicht-B. Snell (*TrGF* 2, 244) must state 'et metrum et argumentum ignotum'. Sophocles might have included a description of Odysseus' *nekyia* in *Odysseus Wounded by the Spine* or in *Phaeacians* (*cf. frs.* 748, 832, 861 R.), but it would probably have been in a reported speech (i.e., not on the actual stage). Apparently, Bacchylides (*fr. 29 Sn-M.*), Timotheus (*Elpenor fr. 779 PMG*) and an unknown lyric poet (*fr. lyr. adesp. 925 PMG*) composed lyric poems on Odysseus' *nekyia*, but hardly anything of value is known about them.

<sup>38</sup> οἳ πολλοὶ περὶ βοῶρον ἐφοίτων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος / θεσπεσίη ἰαχῆ· ἔμε δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἥρει.

<sup>39</sup> ἡχῆ θεσπεσίη· ἔμε δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἥρει, / μή μοι Γοργείην κεφαλὴν δεινοῖο πελάρου / ἐξ Ἀΐδος πέμψειεν ἀγαυὴν Περσεφόνεια.

*Psychagogoi*. *Psychagogoi* fr. 275 R. is not compatible with *Od.* 11.134<sup>40</sup>. In all likelihood, Aeschylus contaminated the Homeric version with that narrated by the shadowy Epic poem *Thesprotis*<sup>41</sup>, believed to be the original source of Teiresias' prophecy about the manner of Odysseus' death (Paus. 1.17.5). Furthermore, Athenian playwrights thought nothing of markedly altering the most venerated passages from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (a source of complaint for Plato *Smp.* 180a<sup>42</sup>), and did not consider themselves barred from contaminating them with data extracted from other Epic poems. Two examples of this practice should suffice. Sophocles himself, despite the general praise for his fidelity and devotion to Homer (*Vit. Soph.* 80-7 R.), employed for *Ai.* 661-5 and 1029-31 versions of the aborted duel between Ajax and Hector (*Il.* 7.303-5), and of the mistreatment suffered by the latter at Achilles' hands (*Il.* 22.395-404, 464-5), that are in absolute disagreement with the data supplied by the *Iliad*. More to the point, even such a staunch philhomerist as Sophocles was reputed to have contaminated *Od.* 11.100-36 with the *Telegonia* for his play *Odysseus Wounded by the Spine*<sup>43</sup>. Thus, if neither Aeschylus nor Sophocles felt obliged to respect one of the main points in Homer's *neygia*, namely the real cause of Odysseus' death, then it is hardly to be expected that either of them slavishly followed all minor details.

<sup>40</sup> *Sch. Od.* 11.134 pointed out that Aeschylus turned away from the most common version of the manner of Odysseus' death, that is, the one made popular by the *Telegonia*, preferring instead to invent his own version: οἱ νεωτέροι τὰ περὶ Τηλέγονον ἀνέπλασαν τὸν Κίρκης καὶ Ὁδυσσέως, ὃς δοκεῖ κατὰ ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρός εἰς Ἰσάκην ἐλθὼν ὑπ' ἀγοίας τὸν πατέρα διαχοήσας τρυγόνος κέντρῳ. Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἐν Ψυχαγωγοῖς ιδίως λέγει κτλ. (A. fr. 275 R.). Cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *Aeschylus II*, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 1957, 474.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry From Eumeles To Panyassis*, Cambridge (Mass.), 169, *TrGF* 3, 373.

<sup>42</sup> Αἰσχύλος δὲ φλυαρεῖ φάσκων Ἀχιλλέα Πατρόκλου ἐρᾶν, ὃς ἦν καλλίων οὐ μόνον Πατρόκλου ἀλλ' ἄμα καὶ τῶν ἡρώων ἀπάντων, καὶ ἔτι ἀγένειος, ἐπειτα νεωτερος πολύ, ὃς φησιν "Ομηρος".

<sup>43</sup> Cf. A. F. Garvie, *Sophocles. Ajax*, Warminster 1998, 221; D. F. Sutton, *The Lost Sophocles*, Lanham-New York-London 1984, 90-1; J. M<sup>a</sup> Lucas de Dios, *Sófocles. Fragmentos*, Madrid 1983, 232-3.

It could also be countered that *fr. 370 K.-Sn.* does not fit Aeschylus' *Psychagogoi* any better than any other underworld play. There appears to be no reason one would think that Odysseus had Hades as his ally, or had direct dealings with the god. In this respect, it must be pointed out that all the fragment says is 'having Hades as my ally, I fear no ghosts'. That is to say, prior to undertaking his *katabasis*, Odysseus allayed his own fears, and those of his companions, by stating that the person who enjoyed the protection of Hades need not dread the approach of the infernal shades. Thus, Hades and Persephone were invoked deliberately to act as protectors against the onslaught of the bloodless ghosts. It must be noted that this was exactly what Homer's Odysseus did: before embarking on his journey to the realm of the dead, he performed animal sacrifices and made prayers to the King and Queen of the dead, in order to be granted safe passage through their dominion (*Od. 11.42-7* οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ βοῶν ἐφοίτων / ἄλλοι θεοῖς ὑπερσείη ἵαχῆ· ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἥρει. / δὴ τότ’ ἔπειδ’ ἐτάροισιν ἐποτρύνας ἐκέλευσα μῆλα, /... / δείραντας κατακῆαι, ἐπευξασθαι δὲ θεοῖσιν, / ἰψήμω τ’ Ἀΐδη καὶ ἐπαινῇ Περσεφονείῃ<sup>44</sup>). Not surprisingly, this behaviour on Odysseus' part was repeated in one of the very scarce fragments still extant from Aeschylus' *Psychagogoi*, *fr. 273a.9-10 R.*, where the chorus of ghost-raisers advised Odysseus to implore Hades to send forth the swarm of ghosts ([αἰ]τοῦ χθόνιον Δία γυγτιπόλων / ἐσμὸν ἀνεῖναι ποταμῷ στομάτων). Notice that Persephone was addressed by name in the play, as well (*fr. 278 R.*). Therefore it does not seem far-fetched to assume that, in this context, invoking Hades' aid ('Αἴδην δ' ἔχων βοηθὸν ~ [αἰ]τοῦ χθόνιον Δία) would assuage Odysseus' natural fear of the shades (οὐ τρέμω σκιάς ~ ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἥρει).

Thus it is not fanciful to suggest that *fr. 273a R.* from *Psychagogoi*, and its Homeric predecessor, are compatible with the idea of Hades as soother of Odysseus' terror of the ghosts, or that of his men, as expressed by *fr. 370 K.-Sn.*

<sup>44</sup> Cf. besides *Od. 10.533-4*, *Verg. Aen. 6.251-3*.

*Psychagogoi* was apparently a popular play in postclassical antiquity. A. fr 275a R., a fragment from this tragedy, was found in a school lexicographic exercise dated to the first to second century A.D. (*Pap. Colon.* 3.125)<sup>45</sup>. Quotations from it still regularly surfaced in late lexicographers (Poll. 10.10, *Sch. Hom. Od.* 11.134, *Sch. A.R.* 3.846, Hsch. δ 2465). Plutarch and his imitator, as A. Wartelle<sup>46</sup> proves, did not routinely and explicitly identify the title and the play they were quoting from or the name of its author. Quite often, when the lines in question were sufficiently famous, they did not bother to name the playwright who had composed them, as if by doing so they would be insulting the intelligence of their cultivated readers (something Men. Rh. 2.413.30-2 pointed out<sup>47</sup>). That is, this procedure did not indicate an ignorance of the author and provenance of the quotation<sup>48</sup>. Plutarch and his imitators offered thirty-three quotations from fragmentary plays by Aeschylus, from which as few as thirteen belong to plays whose title is known thanks to other ancient writers. From among those thirteen quotations, Plutarch was moved to identify title and provenance in only five quotations: *Cabiri* (*Q.C.* 632f), *Men of Eleusis* (*Thes.* 29.4), *Prometheus Unbound* (*Pomp.* 1.1), *Philoctetes* (*Non posse suav.*

<sup>45</sup> The school exercise might have been taken from an anthology of Tragic quotations on the subject of offerings for the gods, rather than from the text of the tragedy itself, in the opinion of Th. Gelzer, “Neue Kölner Papyri”, *MH* 38, 1981, 123-4.

<sup>46</sup> *Histoire du texte d’Eschyle*, Paris 1971, 227-51.

<sup>47</sup> ἀ φησιν ὄριστος ποιητὴς Εὔριπιδης .... οὐ θήσεις δὲ ἐξ ἀπαντος τὰ ιαμβεῖα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ συνηθῆ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ γνώριμα, ἀλλὰ παρῳδήσεις μᾶλλον.

<sup>48</sup> A. Wartelle, *Histoire du texte*, 241. As is well known, this was also the procedure of Aristophanes, Plato, and, at times, even Aristotle: Plato, for instance, never states the provenance and authorship of fragments as famous as A. *Telephus* fr. 239 R (*Phd.* 107e) and *Niobe* fr. 162 R (*Resp.* 391d). The very famous and often quoted A. fr. *inc. fab.* 350 R., imitated by Xen. *An.* 3.2.4, *Hell.* 2.3.28, Lys. 12.68, Athenag. *Pro Christ.* 21.104, Plu. *De aud. poet.* 16e, was quoted by Pl. *Resp.* 383a and *Polit.* 268a without ascription.

vivi sec. Epic. 1087f) and *Psychostasia* (*De aud. poet.* 16f). In the whole *corpus plutarcheum* ninety-two quotations from unknown Tragic plays are found (gathered by R. Kannicht- B. Snell in their edition of *TrGF 2 Tragica adespota*), three of them culled from the *Consolatio*. Simple statistics and popularity would seem to indicate that the majority of the dramatic fragments transmitted without the author's name would no doubt belong to Sophocles and Euripides, both these playwrights being much more widely read and quoted oftener than Aeschylus ever was<sup>49</sup>. Be that as it may, it should never be forgotten that it would be impossible to rule out with any certainty the possibility that some of these anonymous Tragic fragments may present us with an unknown Aeschylean fragment<sup>50</sup>. Aeschylus, it should always be remembered, had his own little corner (little, indeed, if we make comparisons with the greater popularity evidenced by sheer number of quotations from Euripides' and Sophocles' plays, but still a corner) in ancient florilegia, compendia and anthologies compiled to aid rhetors in finding relevant examples, arguments,

<sup>49</sup> M. Griffith, *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound*, Cambridge 1977, 234 and 241.

<sup>50</sup> Pursuing this hope, some of the anonymous Tragic fragments from *TrGF 2* have been ascribed to Aeschylus: frs. adesp. 291 (*Bassarae*), 375 (*Glaucus of the Sea*), 238, 636, 730 (*Danaides*), 416a (*Net-Draggers*), 323a, 645 (*Men of Eleusis*), 108 (*Edonians*), 126 (*The Children of Heracles*), 110 (*Thracian Women*), 425 (*Priestesses*), 73, 145, 663 (*Iphigenia*), 210 (*Callisto*), 36, 569, 289 (*Mirmydons*), 683 (*The Award of the Arms*), 410, 410a (*Prometheus Unbound*), 10 (*Philoctetes*), 162, 560 (*Phrygians*) (see *TrGF 2 ad locc.*). It could be objected that Ps. Plutarch might be quoting, at this point, a minor playwright, not a member of the famous Tragic triad. Needless to say, as D. L. Page, *Select Papyri III: Poetry*, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 1942, 139 and 171 suggests, there is always this possibility to bear in mind, but an examination of the quotations would convince us that it would be, while possible, highly improbable: against the thirty-three quotations from Aeschylus, fifty-six from Sophocles, and a hundred and seventy-six from Euripides, Plutarch quoted five times from Ion, six times from Critias, and only twice from Diogenes of Sinope, Dionysius of Siracuse, Achaeus, and Melanthius I or II. See *TrGF 1 ad locc.*

and maxims for their compositions<sup>51</sup>. The following passages are instances documenting Plutarch's (and his imitators') habit of quoting famous lines by Aeschylus without going to the trouble of identifying play title or even playwright: *De tranquil. anim.* 476a~A. *Philoctetes* fr. 250 R., *Amat.* 770a~A. *Danaides* fr. 44 R. (very famous passage), *De exil.* 603a~A. *Niobe* frs. 158–9 R., *Thes.* 1b-c~A. *Sept.* 395–6, 435 (with slight modifications), *Amat.* 758f~A. *Supp.* 681–2, *De fac. orb. lun.* 937f and *De curiositate* 517e-f~A. *Supp.* 937, *De cohibenda ira* 456a~A. *Pr.* 575–6, *De inimic. util. cap.* 88b~A. *Sept.* 593–4. In none of the preceding cases did Plutarch state that he was quoting from Aeschylus<sup>52</sup>: obviously, he considered that his readership was sufficiently well equipped to discern the provenance of the quoted verses. Notice how the author of the treatise that has preserved *fr.* 370 K.-Sn., *Cons. ad Apoll.* 102b, quoted A. *Pr.* 378–9 as well without mention of the poet's name or the title of the play. Similarly, he also paraphrased A. *Ag.* 848 in 118c 5 (*παιωνίοις λόγου φραμάχοις*) with no allusion to authorship and provenance.

<sup>51</sup> Stobaeus quotes A. *frs.* 75, 90, 100, 151a15, 161, 176, 177, 181a, 239, 255, 266, 301, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 456, 466, 472, 480 R. (see *TrGF* 3 *ad locc.*). The chapter devoted by the anthologist to the subject ἔπαινος Θανάτου, in all likelihood quite similar to the one consulted by Ps. Plutarch to find arguments to further his thesis that death means respite after the trouble of Life, featured twelve Tragic quotations out of a total figure of thirty-five poetic quotations. Of these twelve Tragic passages, one is a quote from Aeschylus (*fr.* 255 R. = Stob. 4.52b 42). Other Aeschylean passages quoted by Stobaeus are *frs.* 90, 161 and 239 R. (also quoted by Pl. *Phd.* 107e, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 4.7.45.1, D.H. *Rh.* 6.51). On Aeschylean verses alluded to in Greek grave epigrams see A. M. Véritdhac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩPOI, 442–3 s.v. 'Eschyle'.

<sup>52</sup> A. Wartelle, *Histoire du texte*, 245–6. Similarly, Plutarch quoted often-repeated lines by Sophocles so famous as to have reached proverb status in their day, without identifying authorship of the verses: S. *fr.* 88 R (Plu. *De am. prol.* 497b), *fr.* 187 R. (Plu. *De aud. poet.* 35d), *fr.* 566 R (Plu. *De adul. et amic.* 74a), *fr.* 373 R. (Plu. *De virt. et vit.* 100d), *fr.* 662 R. (Plu. *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 184a), *fr.* 149 R. (Plu. *De garrul.* 508c), *fr.* 477 R (Plu. *Q.C.* 718a), *fr.* 636 R (Plu. *Aem. Paul.* 1.3).

Metrically speaking, ‘Αἰδην δ’ ἔχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς suits Aeschylean patterns well: the line lacks resolutions, it has neither the penthemimeral caesura (35.5% Aeschylus vs. 46% Euripides), nor caesura after sixth element or position (twenty-five instances between Aeschylus and Sophocles vs. a hundred in Euripides), nor caesura after second *breve* (13% Aeschylus, 6% Sophocles, 18% Euripides) or fourth *longum* (2.7% Aeschylus, 9% Sophocles, 2 % Euripides). On the other hand, it does show the hephthemimeral caesura (25.5% Aeschylus, 22% Sophocles, 12% Euripides) and caesura after fifth *longum* (Aeschylus 4%, Sophocles 8%, Euripides 0%). In keeping with Aeschylean practice, there is no sense pause after the first element or position<sup>53</sup>. As for the vocabulary, there is nothing in the fragment that seems to be incompatible with Aeschylus<sup>54</sup>: σκιά in the sense of ‘spectre’ appears in *Sept.* 976, 987 and *Eum.* 302 as well<sup>55</sup>. τρέμω as a transitive verb can be found in *Sept.* 419<sup>56</sup>. βοηθός, although more frequent in prose, belongs, under the earlier form βοηθόος, to the vocabulary used by writers in the main poetic genres<sup>57</sup>, a

<sup>53</sup> P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, tr. Oxford 1962, 66–8, A. Guzmán Guerra, *Manual de métrica griega*, Madrid 1997, 75; M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, 84.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. G. Italie-S. Radt, *Index Aeschyleus*, Leiden 1964<sup>2</sup>, 4, 275, 304, 48 ss.vv. Αἴδης, σκιά, τρέμω, βοηθέω, LSJ s.v. βοηθός.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Sch. A. Ch. 157, 2 σκιατ· οἱ νεκροί.

<sup>56</sup> τρέμω δ’ αίματη· / φόρους μόρους ὑπὲρ φύλων / ὀλομένων ιδέοθαι. Obviously, the object of τρέμω is an infinitive clause introduced by ιδέοθαι, not an accusative, but this is still a transitive construction that functions, as a whole, as a direct object for τρέμω. That is, the verb is used transitively, which is the grammatical parallel that was sought. Furthermore, it should be noted that τρέμω and τρέω belonged to the same root, with τρέμω appearing only in the present and imperfect tenses, and τρέω covering the other tenses (P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris 1999, 1131–2, s.v. τρέμω, τρέω; LSJ s.v. τρέμω). Notice that τρέω plus an accusative as its object is attested in Aeschylus: *Supp.* 729, *Sept.* 397, *Eum.* 426.

<sup>57</sup> Il. 13.477, 17.481, Bacch. 12.103, Ps. Bacch. Epigr. 2.3 (=A.P. 6.53), Theoc. 22.23, Call. Del. 27, Apoll. 22. On the other hand, fr. tr. adesp. 302a K.-Sn and Call. Apoll. 153 used βοηθός.

fact that would make it a suitable candidate for inclusion in the Tragic lexis. Aeschylus himself used βοηθέω in *Supp.* 613<sup>58</sup>. In addition, it would be possible to reconstruct βοηθός in a line by Sophocles (quoted by Plu. *Amat.* 760d 12-e 3): τῶν μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους Νιοβιδῶν βαλλομένων καὶ θνητούντων ἀνακαλεῖται τις οὐδένα βοηθὸν ἄλλον οὐδὲ σύμμαχον ἢ τὸν ἐραστήν, ‘ὦ ... ἀμφ’ ἐμοῦ στεῖλαι’ (S. *fr.* 410 R)<sup>59</sup>. The meaning ‘god of the Underworld’ for Αἴδην is used the majority of the time in Aeschylus: this meaning appears nine times<sup>60</sup>, as opposed to four in which it means ‘Underworld’<sup>61</sup>, and only two (possibly one) in which it is used as a metonym for death<sup>62</sup>.

As to the fragment’s conjectured position within the plot of *Psychagogoi*, it doubtlessly should be placed in the vicinity of *fr.* 273a R., since the latter contains the directions given by the chorus of ghost-raisers to Odysseus in order to help him invoke the dead. It could easily come from somewhere in the prologue, in which Odysseus would state, for the benefit of the audience, his identity, his business, and all that pertains to Circe’s advice (*Od.* 10.504-40, 561-5-A. *fr.* 99 R., *Sept.* 1-38, *Ch.* 1-21). Similarly, it might be part of a dialogue with the coryphaeus (*cf. Pers.* 597-622) or the chorus (*cf. Ch.* 315-31) during the first episode,

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, 183, s.v. βοή ‘composés de sens technique et militaire: βοηθός ..., en prose: βοηθός...; la forme βοηθός doit s’expliquer par dérivation inverse de βοηθέω’. Notice that βοηθέω was used by Aeschylus; therefore, the possibility that βοηθός was available to him should not be ruled out.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol. 4: *Sophocles*, Göttingen 1977, 372 ad S. *fr.* 448 R.: “videtur haud fortuitum esse quod verba οὐδένα βοηθὸν ἄλλον οὐδὲ σύμμαχον trimetrum efficiunt, quem trimetrum verbis ‘ὦ ... ἀμφ’ ἐμοῦ στεῖλαι’ praefixerunt Mekler, Steffen, probavit Johansen (*Lustrum* 7, 1962, 284).

<sup>60</sup> *Eum.* 273, *Supp.* 228, 416, 791, *Ag.* 1291, 1527, *Pr.* 236, *Sept.* 322, *fr.* 239 R.

<sup>61</sup> *Pers.* 923, *Pr.* 152, 433, 1029.

<sup>62</sup> *Ag.* 667, 1115. Notice, though, that the construction ‘X Ἀΐδου’ as a periphrasis for ‘hellish X’ still keeps its original sense of ‘belonging to the god Hades’; cf. E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus’ Agamemnon*, Oxford 1950, 569.

before the stasimon is sung as an evocatio of the ghosts (*cf. Pers.* 623-80, E. *fr.* 912 N<sup>2</sup>).<sup>63</sup>

### 3. Conclusions

*Adesp. fr. 370 K.-Sn.* "Αἰδην δ' ἔχων βοηθὸν οὐ τρέμω σκιάς, preserved by Ps. Plutarch, *Consol. Apollon.* 106d 5 with no indication of either author or play title, might belong to Aeschylus' *Psychagogoi*, a tragedy famous and recognizable enough in antiquity to admit of being quoted without its title<sup>64</sup>. The content of *fr. 370 K.-Sn.*, despite its brevity, seems to suit well what we know about this tragedy. The evidence supplied by both vocabulary and metrics is compatible with what is found in Aeschylus. The manner of quotation is consistent with *Consol. Apoll.* 102b, a clearer example of how Plutarch's imitator quoted anonymously from famous tragedies by Aeschylus.

MIRYAM LIBRÁN MORENO  
Universidad de Huelva  
miryam.libran@dfint.uhu.es

<sup>63</sup> Arist. *Av.* 1553-64 is used here for the reconstruction. See the slightly different hypothesis of Th. Gelzer, "Neue Kölner Papyri", *MH* 38, 1981, 122.

<sup>64</sup> It must always be borne in mind that Ps. Plutarch probably took his quotes from anthologies.

