ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ

ἈΘΑΜΑΣ Δ AND Β

There are two famous stories connected with the name of Athamas, which are recorded by our authorities with great variety of detail. One of these, the escape of Phrixus and Helle, was the starting-point of the Argonautic saga; and, though the evidence of the tragedians is the earliest to which we can now appeal, it must have been related in the lost epics. Athamas, king of Thebes, by his union with Nephele, an immortal, had two children, Phrixus and Helle. He subsequently married Ino, who bore to him Learchus and Melicertes. Ino was jealous of the children of Nephele, and, when a drought occurred—produced, according to one version, by the cunning of Ino herself—she bribed the messengers who were sent by Athamas to consult the oracle at Delphi, and persuaded them to give a false report. They accordingly announced that the god required the sacrifice of Phrixus as an expiation. Athamas was obliged against his will to consent, but Nephele succeeded in saving her children by means of a ram with a golden fleece, which Hermes gave to her. This ram, placed among the flocks of Athamas, was not only endowed with the power of speech, so that it was able to warn Phrixus of his impending danger, but also rescued him and his sister by taking them on its back, and flying away with them across the sea. Helle, unable to keep her seat, fell into the sea, and gave her name to the Hellespont; but Phrixus escaped to Colchis, where he sacrificed the ram and presented its fleece to Aetetes. Such is the general tenor of the more or less discrepant versions of Apollod. 1. 80—83, Philiosteph. fr. 37 (FHG III 31), schol. rec. Aesch. Pers. 71, Zenob. 4. 38 and others; and there is some reason for supposing that Euripides made these events the basis of his Phrixus (TGF, p. 626), possibly with some of the variations recorded by Hygin. fab. 2.

Sophocles wrote two plays entitled Athamas, and, although the fragments preserved are almost entirely insignificant, we have direct evidence that one of them was concerned with a version of the story given above. But the central incident in
Sophocles was not the rescue of Phrixus, but the subsequent fate of Athamas. This appears from schol. V Ar. Nyh. 257 (ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἀθάμαντος ἀφομισθηκέναι τοῦτο πρὸς τόν ἄτερον Ἀθάμαντα Σοφοκλέους ἀποτελείονει λέγειν. ὁ γὰρ τοῦ Σοφοκλῆς πεποίηκε τῶν Ἀθάμαντα ἑστηκόμενον καὶ παρεστώτα τῷ βοώμῳ τοῦ Δίας ὡς σφαγασθηκόμενον, καὶ μέλλοντος (τα συν.) ἀποσφάττεσθαι αὐτοῦ πυραγενόμενον Ἡρακλέα, καὶ [τὸν] τούτον θανάτου ρυμομένον. The recent scholia, partly reproduced in Apostol. II. 58 (Pausan. v. 529 f.) under the lemma μὴ θέας ἄνδροπον ὡς Ἀθάμας, add (1) that the punishment of Athamas was brought about by Nephele on account of his conduct to her children; (2) that Heracles saved Athamas by announcing that Phrixus was alive. The latter point is also mentioned in Suid. s.v. Ἀθάμας, who omits the reference to Sophocles. The rejoinder of schol. R, to which some critics have attached too much importance, is merely an ignorant objection: ὡς ἄργωκος Ἀθάμαντα ἔπεψεν ἀπτὶ Φρίξου; ἀπτὶ τῶν ἐπείστων τὸν Φρίξον τὸν Ἀθάμαντα ἔπεψεν ὡς ἄργωκος ἀγωνίας ἱστορίας; οὐ γὰρ Ἀθάμας ἔφες <ὑπήθη>, ἀλλὰ Φρίξος. For the tradition that Athamas was sacrificed does not depend upon this evidence alone, but is recorded as a local legend, which was current at Alos in Thessaly, by Hdt. 7. 197. His narrative is not at all clear, but so much at least is germane to the present discussion, that Athamas was sacrificed καθαρμὸν τῆς χώρας ποιευμένον Ἀχαίων ἐκ θεουργίων, and that Cytissorus the son of Phrixus arrived from Colchis and rescued him. Several questions will at once suggest themselves in reference to the dramatic treatment which Sophocles may have applied to this material, but to most of them no answer is possible. It is, however, a legitimate observation that the means by which Nephele compassed the sacrifice of Athamas, together with the arrival of Heracles, the delivery of his message, and the release of Athamas, were amply sufficient to occupy the whole of the action. I infer that the history of the plot against Phrixus, with all its διάλογα, although ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν, to use Aristotle's language (poet. 15. 1454b 7), was nevertheless ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ. It seems to follow that Athamas must have supposed Phrixus to be dead, although he was not slain at the altar; and, since Helle actually perished, that she cannot have been included in the design aimed at her brother. The religious questions connected with the sacrifice of Athamas, which are discussed by Frazer (Pausan. v. p. 172) and others, do not concern us here. The date of this play must have been earlier than B.C. 423.

In the other story mentioned above Athamas was the apparently innocent victim of the wrath of Hera. She afflicted
him with madness, because Hermes by the command of Zeus had given Dionysus to Ino and Athamas to be reared as a girl: see Hygin. fab. 5, Apollod. 1. 84, 28, Pausan. 1. 44. 7. The result was that Athamas, believing that he was hunting on Cithaeron, mistook his elder son Learchus for a lion (or a stag) and killed him with his spear; and that Ino, distraught with frenzy and grief, took the other child Melicertes in her arms and threw herself into the sea. Hence the proverb Ίνος ἅχη in Xenob. 4. 38 and Horace’s flebilis Ino (A.P. 123). The story can be traced to Phercydes (Schol. Hom. Σ 486: FHG 1 84); and Seeliger (in Roscher 1 670), and more doubtfully Escher (in Pauly-Wissowa II 1931), identify it as the subject of the second play of Sophocles. Apart from the general probabilities of the case, it is possible that frs. 2 and 9 refer to the delusion of Athamas. Ov. Met. 4. 420 ff. elaborates this version of the story in his usual manner, but the following touches (512 ff.) appear to be taken from his Greek models: protinus Aeolidis media furtivus in aula clamat ‘io, comites, his retia tendite silvis! hic modo cum gemina visa est nisi prole leaena.’ See fr. 2 and Tr. fr. adesp. 1 βραχμόευσις λεαινης, which may just as well belong to Sophocles as to Aeschylus. Cf. Plut. de superst. 5. p. 167 c o δ’ ‘Αθάμας μείζονι (sc. ἕρητο δυστυχίᾳ) καὶ Ἡ Ἀγαίη βλέποντες (sc. τὰ τέχνη νεὶ τοις συμφήσεις) ὡς λέωντας καὶ ἐλάφους. There is nothing to show whether Athamas used his bow (Stat. Theb. 1. 12), or whether the scene was inside the house, as in Ovid, or on the mountain side (Stat. Theb. 3. 186), unless indeed ἐπιτάλλα fr. 8 has any significance. Further, as Welcker has observed, fr. 4 suits the final plight of Athamas restored to his senses and realising the extent of his losses. This would precede his withdrawal to another country, for which cf. Apollod. 1. 84. But none of these indications are so strong as that of fr. 5, where we can hardly fail to see an allusion to the miraculous power of Dionysus. Unless then the reference to the influence of the god is to be explained by his nurture in the palace of Athamas (cf. Lucian dial. mar. 9. 1), it would seem that in this play, as in the Ino of Euripides (Hygin. fab. 4), the wife of Athamas had joined the Maenads to share their mystic worship on the hills. It is generally believed that in that play Euripides introduced the story of Themisto, the third wife of Athamas, who plotted against the children of Ino as cruelly and as unsuccessfully as Ino had plotted against those of Nephele. There is nothing to connect Sophocles with this story, although the name of Themisto was freely used by later writers as the

1 Ahrens suggests that Cic. harusp. resp. 39 illa exsultatio Athamantis, whi follows a reference to tragedies, may be an allusion to the play of Sophocles.
cause of the ruin of Athamas' household: see Athen. 560 D, Westermann Mythogr. p. 345. The evidence which connects the play with the Dionysus-motive is clear enough, and allusions to the madness of Athamas and to the final catastrophe may fairly be inferred; but beyond this we cannot go. There is nothing to show that the fragments of Accius' Athamas can be legitimately used to elucidate the plot of Sophocles.

It should be observed that the progress of the Athamas-legend shows the gradual combination of at least three stories, which were originally entirely distinct, and belonged to different localities. The subject cannot be pursued here; but an illustration may be given from the fragment of Philostephanus (Schol. AD Hom. H 86, cf. Pausan. i. 44. 7), the pupil of Callimachus, who omits the Bacchic influence entirely, and attributes the death of Learchus to the retribution exacted by Athamas for Ino's treachery.

See also Introductory Note to the Phrixus.

Dindorf held that 'Αθάμας α' and β' were not separate plays, but different editions of the same play. He applies the same principle to other similar cases, but in the absence of specific evidence of revision the presumption is strongly against him.

1 καταγγώναι

1 Hesych. 11 p. 421 καταγγώναι· ἐπιγώναι, μείζοναι. Σοφοκλῆς Αθάματι α'.

A few lines before Hesych. has the gloss καταγγώνωκα· μείζοναι. Σπεύδωνω is added as an explanation, because the sense 'to find out' was common in later Greek: see e.g. Plut. Philop. 12 ἐπιγωνίτης τῆς σπεύδων. Thus καταγγώνωκα is, as observed by Neil on Αξ. Εξ. 45 οὕτω καταγγώνοι τοῖς κάρτιοι τοῖς τρόποις, 'to find out to another's detriment,' with various constructions. A good example is Thuc. 7. 51 καταγγώνωκας ἄλλη μείζονες κρατεῖσσας εἰς, where the inf. takes the place of the ace. of the thing. It should be observed that καταγγώνωκα occasionally appears without the infinitive, being precisely equivalent to Σπεύδωνωκα: Xen. Oec. 2. 18 καὶ κρέας καὶ βρῶν καὶ κεραλώτερον κατέγων πράττονται.

2 ἔρκεσι

2 Hesych. 11 p. 192 ἔρκεσι· δικτίων. Σοφοκλῆς Αθάματι β'. The same gloss occurs in Plut. lex. p. 14. 12 without the name of author or play.

Cf. Εὐμ. Μ. p. 375, 10 ἔρκεσι...σημαινεῖ καὶ τὰ δίκτυα ὅταν ὀτι δή περά λίνος ἔρκει ἐνυλήξωσι (a confused quotation of Hom. Χ 468). The same sense occurs in fr. 431, Αστ. Λευ. 528 ἔρκη, νεφέλας, δίκτυα, πηγάς, Pind. Πυθ. 2. 80 φέλλος ὅς ἐπὶ ἔρκει. For a possible explanation of the allusion see Introductory Note.

1 The conjectures that have been made as to Accius' sources are mutually destructive. It is now thought (Escher in Pauly-Wissowa 11 1934) that his play comprised the material of Hygin. poët. astr. 2. 20, which Sophocles may have used in the Phrixus.
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έψια


Outside the lexicographers, the word seems only to occur in Nic. Theor. 580 ἀστερίον ἐπάνω κθοσ, τηρ επί ἐπάνω κθοσ, where the schol. explains it by παι- 

γιον. The verb ἑψάθαι, with its com-

pounds ἐψ. καθι— and ἐφεσάθαι (fr. 138), is somewhat more common. There are also to be taken into account the gloss ἑψιαστικ. Ἐλάξιει (Hesych. i p. 347) and the compounds φελέος (a proper name in Ar. Plut. 177, where see schol.), προ-

εψάθι (Hesych.). The history of this obscure and obsolete word was much canvassed by the grammarians, although there is a general agreement as to its meaning ('amusement'). The authority whom Hesychius follows derived it from ἑσσάθαι tracing the transition (ἐφοδε) of the meaning to παιδά by way of ὁμιλια: for the transferred sense of ἐφοδε (aeans of passing), not clearly recognised by L. and S., see Plut. mor. 1058 F, Diog. L. 6.

31. There was, however, some wavering as to the breathing; and on this account an alternative derivation from ἔσωσκω was proposed: schol. Ap. Rhod. 1. 459 ἔσω-

σκω. παπα τὴν ἐψια, ἢ ἑτει δια λόγων παιδά: ἀν ἐφοδε τι μην εἶναι: παπα τὸ ἐσω, διὶ καὶ λοιπόν, ἢτο δὲ δακτυλια, ἀντί τοῦ ἀκολουθουσι. Το φελέος was distin-

guished as meaning φιλοταγμονω καὶ φιλο- 

λόγων, according as the second syllable was or was not aspirated (Etim. M. p. 406, 8; Sud. i. v. ἐψια). Some modern scholars have favoured the view that ἐ is prothetic, and that the word is to be con-

nected with φιλάθροι = ἱδιντ. in Ar. Lys. 1302: this was adopted by Curtius (G. E. ii p. 334 E. tr.), who however forbore to speculate on the derivation. Lobeck's (Path. El. 1 53) notion that ἐψια was 'a game played with pebbles' rests on the assumption that παπα was another form of παγία. Monro on Hom. ρ 530 takes an entirely different line, holding that ἐψιαμαι 'implies a noun ἐψια, from a root ἐπ-, Ἰνδικ. ἀπειρ. seen in Lat. iuvus.'
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ἐς ἦν ἀπαίς τε καργαύναις καλεστίος


νου εἴναι, ἐν δὲ τῇ συνθεσία ἑπεθαυ γίνεται ἀφρεσκο κένου, ἀναδεχεται τὴν εἰς αἰες καταλείπειν, ἢν ἦν ἀπαίς...ἀνδρείς παρὰ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀδάμαντος.—ἀγίναξι. 

Cf. Poll. 3. 48 Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 173) 1 169 K.) δε τον ἀγίναξις ἀγίναξις, Φρ. ιναγίναξις (fr. 19 1376 K.) δε τηλεκούστων γένους ἀγίναξις. The passage is not quoted for the use of νι, I do not know why Nauck should have shrunk from writing ἀρα. But in that case γαρ ἡμῖν must be wrong, and should probably be replaced by παρ' ἡμῖν (μόι). The
inferential use of ἀρα (for ἡ ἀρα) is clearly seen in O.C. 409, 858, and may be taken to be established: see on fr. 931, Eur. Helid. 895. Mekler (Eranos Vindob. p. 208) conjectured ἀρα ν. — The verse refers to the miraculous draughts of wine provided by Dionysus for his votaries: Eur. Bisch. 143 ἰδία δὲ γάλακτι πέδων, ἰδία δ’ ὕδωρ. ἤκ. 707 καὶ τὴν κρύτην ἔζωκε ἄνων νόσον. Such an allusion accords well enough

with the story of Ino: Hygin. fab. 4 postea exciit Inemon in Parnaso esse, quae (quam Muncker) bacchantia causae eo pertenisse. Nonn. 9. 247 ff. Cf. also Eur. Bacch. 229, Med. 1284. Thus, ἄχελ- φος is used for water, as in Eur. Bacch. 625 δομοῖο ἄχελφον φέρειν ἵνα ἐπιστήσῃς, and elsewhere.—ν. for derivatives from this root cf. fr. 270 ράπτορ, fr. 621 νάριον.
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λευκὴν ἠμέραν

6 Antiatt. (Bekk. apocd.) p. 106, 33 λευκὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἄγαθον. Σοφοκλῆς ΑΘΑΛΜΑΤΙ. Cf. Phot. lex. p. 217, 5 λευκὴ ἠμέρα ἡ ἀγαθόν. καὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνη. Ἐσχύλος Κόλας (fr. 174 1 306 K.). The same occurs in Suid. s.v., and in some MSS Σοφοκλῆς is substituted for Ἐσχύλου Κόλας: but Λε. 671 ff. follow immediately. Zenob. 6. 13 (Patroc. p. 165) καὶ Μεθοδεύσεις δ' ἤφησαν ἐν Λευκάδι (fr. 374 III 99 K.) τὸν ἄγαθον ἡμέραν λευκὴν καλεῖ- σθαι. Herod. Philoct. (in Moeris ed. Pierson, p. 477) λευκὴν ἡμέραν διαγγέλειν, τὸν φῶς καὶ Λαμάν. 'Λευκὴ ἡμέρα, λοικία (Eur. J. A. 156 λευκωνιῶν τῶν φῶν δὴ λειμαγον' Ηγ. λευκωσία, λευκόστερα, meant properly the silvery gleam of dawn in contrast to the night (Aesch. Ag. 673 ἐντεια δ' ὠνίαν τῶν περιφέργεις, | λεικών κατ' ἠμαρ κτλ.), and so might be said metaphorically of relief, cheer, comfort, as in Pers. 304 εἰς μὲν κτήσις δώσας φῶς μέγα, | καὶ λευκῶν ἠμαρ νικήτης ἐν μελαχθόμιοι: this is how Sophocles may have used it.' (H.) So λευκῶν εὐδάμων φῶς in Λε. 708. λευκὴ ἡμέρα is used proverbially much as we say 'a red-letter day' in Eum. fr. 28 Boiss., Arist. 1. 13. The purpose of the grammarians was to mark the metaphori-

cal usage, which is found also in Latin: Catull. 8. 3 falsere quondam candidi tibi soleat, as contrasted with Hor. Sat. 1. 9. 72 huncine solem tam nigrum surrexit mihi! There is no need to seek for any artificial explanation, such as that which Suidas (s.v. λευκὴ ἡμέρα, τὸν έτοιμαρ) quotes from Philarchus (PHG 135), based on an alleged custom of the Scythians to put a white stone into their quiver at night-time for a day spent happily, or a black in the other event. Plin. n. h. 7. 40 tells a similar story of the Thracians, and some such practice is alluded to in Hor. C. 1. 35. 10, Pers. 2. 1, Catull. 68. 148. Plin. ep. 4. 11. Plutarch gives another explanation, relating that Pericles during the blockade of Samos allowed such of his soldiers as drew by lot a white bean to be relieved from discipline and enjoy themselves as they pleased: δὴ καὶ διαφανές ὁ ἑαυτός της ἐπαναδιδαχὴς ποιεῖ γενικῶς λευκὸν ἡμέραν ἔκλεισε τὸν λευκοῖς κλάμοις προσταγραφείς (Per. 27). Is it merely a coincidence that Eupolis in the Κόλας referred to this siege (fr. 154 1 290 K.)? Horace speaks of Genius as albus et ater (Ep. 2. 2. 189), i.e. εἰδαλ

ρων or the reverse.

7 ἀγχύρης

7 Hesych. p. 26 ἀγχύρης (ἀγχύρη-

νης cod.) ἐγγύς. Σοφοκλῆς ΑΘΑΛΜΑΤΙ. The correct reading is preserved in Etym. M. p. 15, 33 ἀγχύρις ἐγγύς.

The termination, usually connected with ἀραιός, is the same as that found in τρύμνης, ποθήρης, κατήρης, πλευτήρης, μασήρης, τυμβήρης, κυσήρης, τεχχήρης, πυγχήρης, ἀσφάργα καὶ others. The history of some of these words is not free from doubt, but the force of -ήρη as an element of composition seems to have been reduced, so that in the time of the tragedians it had become productive as a merely adjectival suffix. See also Wilamowitz on Eur. Her. 243.
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έπιπλα

8 Harpocr. s.v. επίπλον p. 82, 10 τά κατά τήν οίκιαν σκεπή επίπλον λέγοντι, τήν ὁδὸν επίπλαιαν κτήσει καὶ μετακομίζεσθαι δυναμένῳ. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀδάμας (so Casaubon for Ἀκάμαστι). Hesych. 11 p. 104 goes more into detail: ἐπιπλασιομένα γυναικεία, ἡ χρύσαι, ἡ σκοτί, τὰ μὴ ἐγγεγεγομένα, ἄλλα επίπλαλα. Suidas, who has three separate glosses on the word, is much to the same effect, but gives alternative derivations from ἐπίνθανα or δυνατά πλοῦτεσθαι (‘to be put on board’). The word means moveable; but it is an elastic term, and is sometimes restricted to what we call furniture (dresses or jewels, as in Dem. 27. 10. Etymologically it may be connected with ὄνομο, sim.-plex and our three-fold: see Brugmann, Comp. Gr. III p. 50 E. tr. The fullest discussion of the word is in Pollux 10. 10 f.
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ἐπιστήγματα

9 Hesych. 11 p. 170 ἐπιστήγματα: ἐπικελέσματα. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀδάμας. Salmasius emended to ἐπιστήγματα, and so Hesychius must have written, as the alphabetical order shows: but that ἐπιστήγματα was the form used by Sophocles is proved not merely by Moeris p. 196, 34 ἐπιστήξας Ἀττικοί: ἐπιστήξας Ἑλληνες, but also by the evidence of early texts. Cf. Λτ. Ἐρ. 704 καθ' ὅλον αὐτόν γ' ἐπιστήξα, with the scholi. Δέκαφων καὶ οἱ περὶ Ἐρατοσθένη τὸ ἐπιστήμω τός κόσμος ἐπιστήξεις. Theocr. 6. 29 τίς ἐλκτεῖν τιν καὶ τά κυνί. Suid. ἐπιστήξεις: ποιῶν τινὰ ἤχον ἐπιστησάς. Euth. M. p. 363, 54 ἐπιστήσαντο τὸ συμμούριον ἐπιστήσαντο τοὺς κόσμοι ἐν τῷ ἐν τόις κυψελῶσι προσπότῳ καλεῖται. In Phil. 7:5 Bergk conjectured τοποστίγμα for τοποστίγμα. It is suggested that this refers to the death of Learchus, hunted as a stag by his father Athamas: Apollod. 3. 28 Ἀδάμας μὲν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παῖδα Λεόρχον ὑς ἔλαβον θυρειά τυχέσειν. See Introductory Note. It should be added that Hesych. 11 p. 167 has also ἐπιστήμα αὐτόν γ' ἐπιστήμα κυνί, and ἐπιστήματα ἐπιστήματα ἐπικόμη. ἡ ἐπιστήξεως.
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ἐχρωματίσθη

Ajax, Ὅιλῆς ταχὺς νιός, is introduced in Hom. B 527 as leader of the Locrians who dwelt opposite to the coast of Euboea. He is often mentioned in the Iliad in conjunction with the Telamonian Ajax; and, though inferior in strength as compared with his namesake, is nevertheless a distinguished warrior who comes especially into prominence at the battle round the wall (N 46). The circumstances of his death are related in δ 499 ff. He was one of the victims of the storm which overtook the Greeks on their return from Troy, and, when landing on the rocks at Myconus known as the Gyrae, was hurled back into the sea by Poseidon and drowned, in punishment for a boastful speech that he needed no divine aid to escape. Homer says that he was ἐχθρόμενος Ἀθηνῆς, without explaining the reason; but, if we accept the explanation of Strabo (600), this merely implies that he was involved in the common fate which befell the Greeks for abusing their victory in the sack of Troy. Homer, he says, has not mentioned any outrage committed against Cassandra, and knows nothing of her violation by Ajax. Yet, even in Homer, the character of Ajax showed traces of a cruel and savage disposition, and his arrogant contempt for the gods led to his destruction. It is clear, however, that an act of sacrilegious violence committed by him was described in the Iliuperis: see Proclus chrestom. (EGF p. 49) Κασσάνδραν δὲ Ἀἰας Ὅιλέως πρὸς βιάν ἀποστῶν συνεφάκεται τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ξώανν. ἐφ’ ὁ παροξυσθείτες οἱ Ἐλληνες καταλεύσαν βούλονται τῶν Ἀιαντ. οὐ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῶς βωμῶν καταφεύγει, καὶ διασώζεται έκ τῶν ἐπικειμένων κυνήγουν. To the latter part of this corresponds Apollod. ἐρ. 5. 25 ὡς δὲ ἐμελλὼν ἀποτλεῖν πορθήσαντες Τροίαν, ὑπὸ Κάλκαντος κατείχοντο, μηνεῖν Ἀθηνᾶν αὐτόν λέγοντος διὰ τὴν Αἰαντ. ἀσθενεῖαν. καὶ τὸν μὲν Αἰανα κτείνειν ἐμελλὼν, φεύγοντα δὲ ἐπὶ βωμὸν εἰσαχ. Cf. schol. Hom. γ 135. Welcker (p. 162) rightly observed that the Homeric story does not seem capable of dramatic treatment; but in the extracts just quoted the possibility of a tragic conflict is manifest. It can hardly be doubted that we have here part of the frame-

---

1 On the question relating to the overlapping of the Little Iliad and the Iliuperis and as to whether there were or were not two poems with the latter title, composed by Arctinus and Lesches respectively, see Frazer, Panhellen., v p. 362: T. W. Allen in Cl. Q. 11 84.
work of the Sophoclean plot, more especially as the account of Apollodorus explains Eur. Tr. 69—71: ΑΘΕ, ὥς ὅσθ' ὑμυρισθεῖσαν μὲ καὶ ναοὺς ἐμοῦς; | ΠΟ. ἄν ἥριξ' Αἴας ἐλκὲ Κασίνδραν βιλα. | ΑΘΕ. κοκέην γ' Ἀχαιῶν ἐπάθεν ὑμὸ ἥκουσ' ὕπτο. Further details are given by Pausanias in his description of the painting by Polygnotus in the Lesche at Delphi (10. 26. 3): 'Ajax the son of Oileus stands by the altar with his shield, taking an oath concerning the outrage on Cassandra; while Cassandra is seated on the ground clasping the image of Athena, as it seems that she overturned it from its pedestal, when Ajax dragged her from the sanctuary.' Robert (Die Iliupersis, p. 63) thinks that Ajax was swearing to atone for his crime by sending two Locrian maidens annually to the temple of Athena at Troy. He thus connects the oath with the temple-story (Toepffer in Pauly-Wissowa I 938) which sought to explain the historical custom by reference to a heroic legend. The chief authorities for the Locrian tribute, which lasted until shortly before the time of Plutarch, are Timaeus ap. Tzet. Lyocphr. 1141 (FHG I 207), and Callimachus ap. schol. AD Hom. N 66 (II 126 Schneider). See also Holzinger on Lyocphr. 1153. But Robert's explanation of the oath taken by Ajax is somewhat far-fetched, and it is simpler to suppose that there is a reference to the exculpatory oath which is prescribed as a mode of trial by primitive systems of jurisprudence: see Wyse on Isae. 12. 9. In any case, the trial of Ajax before the council of elders provided an occasion for a formal debate (ἀγῶν ἀγών) such as the tragedians loved. It is sometimes stated (as by Toepffer u.s.) that the erotic motive and the violation of the priestess did not belong to the original story, but were the invention of later writers (e.g. Dio Chrys. 11. 153). The conclusion is questionable; and it is worth notice that Apollod. ἐπι. 5. 22 Λίας δὲ ὁ Δαρκός Κασίνδραν ὀρόν περιπτελεμείην τῷ ξοάνῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς βινοεταί. δι' τούτο τὸ ξόανον εἰς οὐράνον βλέπειν, which is believed to derive from epic sources, agrees exactly in its account of the miraculous aversion of the gaze of the image with Lyocphr. 361 f. (cf. Strabo 264). The early appearance of the motive is also attested by Theog. 1223 f. ἀλετῶ δ' Ἀγετίδος Θησεύς μέγας ὡλετο δ' Λίας ἕσθλος Ὀμπαίδος σῆσαι (εἰς Ἐρωτος ἀπαθαλαίας, as well as by the evidence of early vase-paintings collected by Furtwängler and Reichhold, Griech. Vasenmal. München 1904, 1 p. 185, and summarized by Gruppe in Burjans Jahresb. cXXXVII 387.

The effect of the above discussion is to determine the outlines of the story as known to Sophocles: we are still as far as ever from being able to fill in the details, or to trace the
process by which the tragic περιπέτεια resulted. No doubt the outrage in the temple was outside the action of the play, and the two chief moments that fell within the time covered by it were the acquittal of Ajax by the Achaeans, and his subsequent death at Gyrae. It was impossible for the latter to be enacted on the stage, and it must either have been related by a messenger or foretold by a god. The former alternative is clearly to be preferred, but involves the assumption that Ajax sailed before the rest of the Greeks, and that his death was reported at Ilion before the other characters in the play had started. It is more difficult to conjecture how the acquittal of Ajax was procured. A possible suggestion, based on the lawless character of the accused and the oath mentioned by Pausanias, would be that he escaped death by a brazen act of perjury, but was required as being ceremonially unclean to withdraw from the rest of the army. The retribution of the offended deities was not long in coming; but even so the shadow of impending disaster hung over those who had connived at the crime of Ajax. It may be inferred from Pausan. 10. 31. 2 that the chief opponent of Ajax was Odysseus.

The version of the story adopted by Philostr. heroic. 9 presents certain features which suggest a dramatic origin, although we have no means of identifying it.

According to this, Ajax dragged Cassandra from the temple, but offered no violence to her, and kept her in his tent. Agamemnon saw the girl, fell in love with her, and took her from Ajax. When the spoils were divided, Ajax claimed her, but Agamemnon refused to give her up and accused Ajax of sacrilege. In order to excite odium against Ajax, he also caused a rumour to be spread through the camp that Athena was incensed in consequence of the outrage, and would destroy the army unless Ajax were put to death. But Ajax, fearing injustice and oppression, if he submitted himself to trial, secretly withdrew by night in a small boat and was drowned off Gyrae.

From Lucian de salt. 46 καθ’ ἐκαστὸν γοῦν τῶν ἐκεῖ (i.e. at Troy) πεσόντων δράμα τῇ σκηνῇ πρόκειται...ἡ κατὰ Παλαμήδους ἐπιβουλή καὶ ἡ Ναυπλίου ὀργή καὶ ἡ Αιαντος μανία καὶ ἡ θατέρου ἐν ταῖς πέτραις ἀπώλεια, Nauck is justified in inferring an allusion to the present play. Hygin. fab. 116 cannot be used in support of Hartung’s view that the story of Nauplius was combined with that of the Locrian Ajax in a single tragedy.