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PREFACE

THE production of this book has been delayed by various causes, which require particular notice on the occasion of its appearance. It is well known that Sir Richard Jebb intended ultimately to include the Fragments in his edition of Sophocles; and in pursuance of this intention he delivered at Cambridge in the Michaelmas Term of 1895 a course of lectures on 132 selected fragments. The Ajax, the last to be published of the seven extant plays, appeared in the autumn of 1896; and it was then anticipated that the publication of the Fragments would be undertaken in due sequence. But the discovery of the Bacchylides papyrus drew the editor’s attention in another direction, and, during the remainder of his life, the time which he could spare from public duties was mainly devoted to the preparation of a comprehensive edition of the Poems and Fragments of Bacchylides, which was published by the Cambridge University Press in 1905. Thus it fell out that, when after Sir Richard Jebb’s death the task of completing the edition of Sophocles devolved upon Dr Walter Headlam, the material available for his use consisted solely of the notes prepared for the lectures already mentioned.

Once again misfortune attended the prosecution of the scheme, in consequence of the premature death of Dr Headlam before he was able to put into shape the preliminary labour which for a number of months he had expended upon the text. Towards the end of 1908 I was entrusted by the Syndics of the University Press with the papers of both scholars, in order that the work so long deferred might be brought to a conclusion. I will frankly admit that, though conscious of having assumed
vi
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a serious burden, I did not at first adequately realize either the magnitude or the difficulty of the task.

I am afraid that, after these preliminary remarks, readers will be disappointed to find how small a share in the contents of these volumes has been contributed by my predecessors. Headlam, according to his wont, set to work thoroughly to explore the ground which he was preparing to develop, but he left very little evidence of the results at which he had arrived, and hardly anything in such a shape as could be adapted readily for publication. Yet even the adversaria of so eminent a scholar are of considerable interest, and not a few instances will be found where his insight has pointed out the way leading to the solution of a puzzling problem. Jebb's notes were of an entirely different character. Although well fitted to introduce to an undergraduate audience the salient features of some of the most interesting fragments, they were obviously unsuitable for reproduction as containing the matured judgement of their author upon the critical and exegetical questions which these fragments raise. They were chiefly the record of first impressions drawn up with the skill and taste which we have learnt to expect from such a source, but made without much exercise of independent research, or a full recognition of the departmental literature bearing upon the subject, so far as it was at that time accessible. To have printed any considerable portion of these notes would have been both misleading and unfair. Indeed, I am doubtful if I have not gone too far in including so much as will be found below; and it is with the greatest reluctance that I have in several cases quoted Jebb's notes, where I felt bound to argue in favour of a different conclusion. But my guiding principle has been this. The obscurity of the text of these fragments is so great, and so little has been done to dispel it, that we can only hope to arrive at the truth by a patient sifting of the clues suggested by competent authorities; and an editor may often best recommend the solution which he considers probable by canvassing the views of other workers in the same field. Anyhow by this method the reader is the better enabled to form his own judgement on the issues submitted to him: securus iudicat orbis terrarum.

It will now be apparent that not only the responsibility for
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everything that appears in these volumes is entirely my own, but also the bulk of the commentary itself. I must therefore explain the lines upon which I have worked. The general plan, modified only so far as was required by difference of subject-matter, was prescribed by the character of the earlier volumes, and, although my predecessors had not advanced far in the appointed track, they had at least made it plain that the chief feature of the book should be a thorough and searching exegesis. Translation was less essential than in the complete plays and often impossible; but in some of the longer fragments I am fortunate in being able to quote renderings made by Jebb and Headlam. In the elucidation of fragmentary and corrupt texts criticism and interpretation are complementary of each other. I have therefore endeavoured to present the critical data in as accurate a form as possible, taking Nauck's edition as my basis, and verifying, supplementing, and correcting its results so far as my opportunities permitted. It has not been possible for me to obtain unpublished information concerning the readings of the MSS of authors which have not been edited in accordance with the requirements of modern criticism; but I have endeavoured to make myself acquainted with published results, although I cannot feel confident of having surveyed every part of so wide a field. In this respect not much has been done since the appearance of Nauck's second edition. It is true that editions of Stobaeus and Plutarch's *Moralia*, two of our most important sources, have been completed by Hense and Bernardakis. But Hense's results had been already communicated to Nauck, and the character of Bernardakis's edition is such that it is almost entirely useless for the present purpose. Our knowledge of the most important scholia is still imperfect, although progress has been made, especially in regard to Aristophanes and Pindar. Wendel's edition of the scholia to Theocritus appeared while this book was passing through the press. Much might be learnt from a critical edition of Eustathius, which is scarcely to be expected at present. But the lexicographers are the most

1 The letters J. and H. have been attached to the notes of Jebb and Headlam now first printed, and their full names are retained in references to their published writings.
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promising field of all, and, though a good deal of work has been done in sifting their records, very little of it has seen the light. Bethe's Pollux and de Stefani's Etymologicum Gudianum are both incomplete. Here too the recovery of fresh material from unedited sources which may be still preserved in the libraries of Europe has been shown to be more than a possibility by the labours of Reitzenstein, Rabe, and others.

The actual increase of material that has accrued in the last twenty-five years is not completely measured by the fact that this edition contains almost exactly 100 more fragments than were published by Nauck. A considerable proportion of the accession comes from the recently discovered commencement of Photius, published by Reitzenstein in 1907. But the most important addition of all was of course the fragments of the Ichneutae and Eurypylus contained in the ninth volume of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. The discovery was made at a time when the greater part of the present commentary was written, and I am glad to be able now to express my thanks to Prof. A. S. Hunt, who was kind enough to allow me to inspect the sheets of the new fragments before publication, and has more than once replied to my queries concerning the actual readings of the MS in doubtful cases. I must also acknowledge my indebtedness to the Committee of the Egypt Exploration Fund and the Delegates of the Clarendon Press for permission to include the Oxyrhynchus fragments in the pages of this edition.

In the General Introduction I have endeavoured to describe the literary history of Sophoclean tragedy, to estimate the extent and variety of its activity, to discover the vestiges of the material with which it worked, and to show how its monuments were transmitted to posterity until they passed into oblivion and how finally its scanty relics were preserved for the instruction of our own times. In this way I have tried to answer the questions, why the majority of the plays were lost, and by what means their fragments survived. It will be evident that the third section follows in the main the lines which have been sketched in various writings by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. In dealing with the sources of our existing fragments I have entered at some length into the history of Greek philological literature
during the Roman and Byzantine ages, confining myself particularly to its connexion with the study of Sophocles. This is an arid region; yet I am convinced that those who make themselves acquainted with its chief features will return not only with a clearer understanding of the limits within which the criticism of the Greek poets must proceed, but also with a deeper respect for the honest labours of generations of workers who struggled against the forces of barbarism to keep alive the purity of the classic speech. So much misconception prevails as to the significance of quotations made by these writers that no apology is needed for the space which has been devoted to them. The only work of reference in English which touches this branch of literature is Sir J. E. Sandys’s History of Classical Scholarship.

Shortly after the printing had commenced, it was decided to take advantage of the occasion by the preparation of a comprehensive index to the whole of the ten volumes. For this purpose Prof. Jebb’s seven volumes have been carefully re-read, the old indexes have been consolidated, corrected, and considerably enlarged, and the entries so collected have been incorporated with those relating to the three volumes of Fragments. The work was at first undertaken by Mr G. V. Carey of Gonville and Caius College, who re-indexed the Ajax and Antigone; but, when he obtained a commission in the Army on the outbreak of the European War, the responsibility for the remaining portions passed into my hands. It is hoped that the new indexes will be of service to students not only as a better means of access to the information which the volumes contain, but also as a register of Sophoclean usage for anyone who may attempt further researches in the sphere of tragic vocabulary and grammar. At the same time their users should be warned that they do not pretend to be anything more than a record of the material comprised in the commentaries; for an attempt to provide by this means a complete digest of the language would have involved an enormous addition to a labour which was already sufficiently arduous.

I have elsewhere discussed and tabulated the researches of those modern scholars who since the close of the eighteenth century have laboured directly on the fragments of Sophocles,
and it is unnecessary to repeat here the nature of my obligations to them. Most of this literature is scattered in various periodicals or contained in dissertations which are even more difficult of access. In this connexion my thanks are due to Prof. R. Reitzenstein of Freiburg for supplying me with information respecting the contents of one of his dissertations which I had been unable to procure. Nor must I forget to mention the singular kindness of the late Dr Siegfried Mekler of Vienna, the editor of Dindorf's Sophocles in the Teubner series, who, hearing that I was engaged on this work, sent me a number of notes bearing on various points of difficulty. This will explain the occasional references to Mekler's unpublished views. Dr J. B. Pearson and Mr R. D. Hicks have kindly permitted me to print extracts from certain notes formerly communicated to Prof. Jebb in reference to frs. 776 and 1128. Notwithstanding the considerable output of labour directed to the criticism of the fragments, the attention which they have received is scanty in comparison with the mass of comment which has accumulated upon the extant plays. Hence I have been often compelled to rely largely on my own resources. This is, in fact, the first systematic effort that has been made to put together a continuous commentary, though I have the best of reasons for knowing that its imperfections are not due to that cause alone. I must warn readers that the printing of the book was seriously delayed by the stress of recent events and that it went to the press at the beginning of 1913. Everyone knows the difficulties and inconsistencies that are apt to occur in such cases, and that they cannot be satisfactorily cured by the list of corrigenda.

I desire to acknowledge the generous support which I have throughout received from the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, although the work has grown to a size which neither they nor I contemplated at the time of its inception.

A. C. P.

February, 1916.
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GENERAL INTRODUCTION

§ 1. The number of the plays.

The anonymous Life of Sophocles\(^1\) records on the authority of Aristophanes of Byzantium that 130\(^2\) plays were attributed to Sophocles, but that 17 of these were spurious. The statement is entitled to credit, as coming from Aristophanes; and it has been referred with high probability to his work entitled πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου πίνακας\(^4\). Not much is known of the book in question, but it may be taken to have contained corrections and enlargements of the well-known πίνακες of Callimachus, which was not merely a catalogue of the books contained in the Alexandrian library, but included biographical details concerning the various authors, and in the case of the Attic drama the dates of the production of the several plays, as well as other points of interest drawn from the διδασκαλία of Aristotle\(^5\).

Suidas, however, reports that Sophocles produced 123 plays, and according to some authorities considerably more. This information may be reconciled with the Life in two ways, i.e. by the adoption either of Boeckh’s\(^6\) correction of Suidas, which makes the total 113 (ρυγ’ in place of ρεγ’), or of Bergk’s\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) xi p. liv Bl. έχει δὲ δράματα, ζέ φησιν Ἀριστοφάνης, ἀκατώ τριάκωντα, τούτων δὲ νεώθεσαν δεκαετία.

\(^2\) ρν’ cod. A. Other MSS give ρδ’, which is the vulgate: There was clearly a confusion of the uncial A and Δ, and the evidence of Suidas indicates that the number intended was 130 rather than 104.

\(^3\) έχει implies a reference to an established authority. The vulg. έγραψε should be rejected.

\(^4\) By Dindorf and others. For the work itself see Susemihi, Al. Lit. I 392, 443; Nauck, Ar. Byz. p. 243 ff.

\(^5\) See schol. Ar. Nub. 552; Susemihi, I 327 ff.; O. Schneider, Callim. II 306.

\(^6\) Tr. Gr. prince. P. 110.

\(^7\) In the Preface to his text of Sophocles (1858), p. xxxix.
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substitution of 7 for 17 (ζ' for ζ) in the Life. The latter proposal is palaeographically the easier, and the number 123 agrees better than 113 with the remaining data, as will presently appear.

The number of his victories is also variously recorded. According to Suidas, they were twenty-four; according to the Life, which followed the authority of Caristius of Pergamum, twenty; and, according to Diodorus, only eighteen. The last-mentioned statement is now confirmed by the evidence of a recently discovered inscription. Further, we are informed by the Life that, in addition to the twenty victories, he several times gained the second prize, but never the third. Cratinus intimates that on one occasion at least Sophocles was refused a chorus altogether; but, even if the statement is literally correct, it is impossible to determine whether the plays written for that occasion were or were not included in the total number assigned to Sophocles by Aristophanes. It is conceivable, though not very probable, that the number of victories recorded by Suidas included occasions on which Sophocles received the second prize. Others have thought that the inclusion of Lenaean victories is the cause of the discrepancy; and a parallel has been found in the case of Cratinus, who, though credited with only three victories at the Lenaia in the inscription already quoted, reaches the total attributed to him by Suidas by means of six others gained at the City festival. This view is sufficiently plausible, and it would perhaps be unnecessary to look further, if it were not for the comparative unimportance of the Lenaea

1 He belongs to the second century B.C. The reference is to his treatise περὶ διδασκαλίας (Athen. 235 E: FHG iv 359).
2 1. 103.
3 CIA 11 977 a, where [Σωφ]ορολήτη ΔιΠ. was restored by Bergk (Rh. Mus. xxxiv 298).
4 v p. li Blaydes.
5 fr. 15 (116 K.).
6 Cf. the use of πειρα in the fifth Argument to the Νυκτος (Arist. fr. 621 Rose).
7 The explanation was first put forward by Bergk in Rh. Mus. xxxiv 298. It is accepted by Haigh, Attic Theatre, pp. 28, 46; but by a curious slip the number of the victories won by Cratinus at the two festivals is inverted. The text is thus at variance with the inscriptions quoted on pp. 363, 364. See also Wilhelm, Urkunden, p. 106.
in the history of tragedy\(^1\). At the same time, where numerals are concerned, we must not neglect their constant liability to suffer corruption\(^2\). However this may be, eighteen victories at the City Dionysia, where tetralogies were always produced, involved the performance of seventy-two plays. Of the remaining fifty-one in the Alexandrian list, it is reasonable to suppose, even when we bear in mind Sophocles’ extraordinary popularity, that at least nine tetralogies—if not more—consisted of plays which obtained the second prize. The calculation leaves little room for exhibition at the Lenaeae, so that, if performances at that festival are used to account for the twenty-four victories mentioned by Suidas, it would follow that the titles of many of the plays which Sophocles produced were unknown to the Alexandrians.

Objection has been taken\(^3\) to the number 123 on the ground that it cannot be divided into tetralogies. But several explanations are possible. Thus, since the evidence concerning the Lenaeae seems to establish the fact that tragedies were produced in groups of three rather than of four, the inclusion of such plays might account for the odd number. Or, again, since we know that the *Oedipus Coloneus* was not produced until after the death of its author, it is possible, as Dindorf suggested\(^4\), that he left only three plays ready to be included in his thirty-first tetralogy, and that Sophocles the younger added the fourth. Further, it is almost certain that the *Archeelus* and *Andromache* of Euripides\(^5\) were not included in the official lists of tetralogies (*διασκαλίαι*); and it is quite possible that similar exceptions were known to exist among the authentic works of Sophocles.

---

\(^1\) For the fifth century we have no evidence except the record of Agathon’s victory (Athen. 217 A; cf. Plat. *Symp.* 173 A), and the inscription relating to 419 and 418 (*CIA* 11 974). From the latter it is inferred that each poet submitted three plays. The Lenaeae was perhaps reserved for inexperienced or mediocre playwrights (Haigh, *op. cit.* p. 28).

\(^2\) Bergk thought that η’ in the *Life* might be an error for κ’.

\(^3\) See Christ-Schmid, *Gr. Litteraturgesch.* p. 3158, where the statement of Aristophanes is now accepted.

\(^4\) ed. 1860, p. xxxv.

xvi
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In the next place, it will be observed that, whereas in the case of Euripides we have a definite statement that 78 plays out of a total number of 92 were extant at Alexandria\(^1\), no similar information is available in relation to Sophocles. Yet the general probabilities of the case, as well as the analogy of the history of the other tragedians, forbid us to believe that Aristophanes had access to copies of all the plays whose titles were taken into account in his calculation of the total. The conclusion is assisted by the fact that losses of certain dramas are actually recorded in some of the extant Arguments\(^3\). Elmsley has shown\(^3\) that satyr-plays in particular often failed to survive, so that their existence was only known from their appearance in the ἔδεικνυσθαι: whether his criticism is applicable to the Sophoclean tradition will be considered later.

A further question arises in regard to the puzzling statement in the Argument to the Antigone, that the play is reckoned as the thirty-second\(^4\). The figures recorded for the Aëtesis, the Aves, the Dionysalexandros of Cratinus, and the Imbrians of Menander, 17, 35, 8 and some figure between 71 and 79 respectively, require examination in the same connexion\(^5\); but for the present purpose we must confine ourselves to the Antigone. The extant Aeschylean catalogue suggests that the figure might refer to the alphabetical order, and some critics have inclined to this view\(^6\). Inasmuch, however, as some twenty-three titles beginning with Α are known, in order to satisfy an alphabetical arrangement we should be obliged to assume that at least nine others were lost, and to place the Antigone last in

---

1 For an elucidation of the tradition see Dieterich in Pauly-Wissowa vi 1247.
2 On Eur. Med. p. 239.
3 See the Arguments to the Medea, the Phoenissae, and the Acharnians.
4 See Jebb’s Introduction, § 23. For λεκται as indicating a reference to a catalogue see Wilamowitz, Anal. Eur. p. 133.
5 There is a discussion of the whole subject by R. C. Flickinger in Class. Phil. v 1–18. But the data have since been enlarged by the publication of Oxyr. Pap. 1235 (x p. 81 ff.), containing Arguments of Menander’s plays. From this it appears that the Imbrians was numbered εδεικνυσθαι κα….\(^3\)
6 So approximately Susemmil, i 338 ff., who professes to follow Wilamowitz (Anal. Eur. p. 135). The latter, however, thinks that the library arrangement was based on a compromise between alphabetical order and similarity of subject (Einstellung in d. gr. Tr. p. 150).
order or nearly so. The improbability of the double assumption is so great that we must look elsewhere for an explanation of the numeral. But the chronological solution is also open to objections of considerable weight. As the plays were produced in tetralogies, it is strange that the Antigone rather than a satyr-play should have been reckoned as the last play of the eighth tetralogy. Further, if Sophocles only produced thirty-two plays in the first twenty-seven (or twenty-six) years of his dramatic career, it is surprising that he should have written as many as ninety-one in the last thirty-five (or thirty-six). However, the latter argument is not entirely convincing; since several reasons are conceivable which might favour an increased productivity in the poet’s later life. Flickinger, who has made the most recent examination of the problem presented by these dramatic numerals, seems to be justified in concluding that their original function was to record the arrangement of the volumes in some library,—presumably the Alexandrian. If each play of which the library possessed a copy was distinguished by a numeral, it is unlikely that their arrangement was arbitrary rather than according to some rational system. For the purpose supposed a chronological basis becomes the more probable, since several of the early plays may have been lost; but we should still be obliged to infer that Sophocles increased the rate of his output subsequently to the date of the Antigone. It should be added that the recently discovered evidence respecting the Imbrians of Menander entirely confirms this conclusion. An alphabetical solution is absolutely excluded by the remaining titles, and moreover, since the roll to which the fragment belonged seems to have contained an alphabetical series of Arguments, the fact that the numerical order of the plays was also recorded clearly points to some other principle

---

1 The Lenaean hypothesis will not serve here, since tragedies were not performed at that festival until after 440 (Capps, A.J.A. iv 86). Bergk avoided the difficulty by reading in the Argument to the Antigone: διδῖσκαται δὲ τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦ τριακοστῶν δεύτερον <ἡ>. Jebb has given good reasons for rejecting his proposal.

2 Flickinger is perhaps right in seeking to minimize the importance of this increase, if it actually occurred; but why does he assume (p. 13) that only one hundred of Sophocles’ plays were known to the Alexandrians?
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of arrangement. On the other hand, although the date of the Imprians may be open to argument, the chronological solution would not involve any serious difficulty.

Now that we have examined the external evidence bearing on the number of the plays, we must enquire how far the number of titles actually known to us from quotations corresponds with the total of 123 plays said to have been recorded by Aristophanes. The number of actual or ostensible titles of which we have information, including those of the seven surviving plays, is at least 132, but there is hardly any doubt that this total must be reduced for the purpose of ascertaining the correct number of the plays which the titles represent. Five certain cases of double titles have been counted as single plays in the reckoning adopted above, i.e. Ἀτρέδης ἡ Μυκηναία, Μάντεις ἡ Πολύδωρος, Ναυσικάα ἡ Πλάντρια, Ὀδυσσεύς ἀκανθοπηλής ἡ Νίπτρα, Πανδώρα ἡ Σφυροκόπτω. These double titles were chiefly, if not entirely, a device adopted by the grammarians in order to distinguish plays bearing the same title but written by different authors. It will be observed that in each case, except Ὀδυσσεύς ἀκανθοπηλής ἡ Νίπτρα, the name of a leading character is combined with a name taken from the chorus; and in view of the prevalence of the latter among the titles of Aeschylus, it may be conjectured that the chorus-names Μυκηναία, Μάντεις, Πλάντρια, and Σφυροκόπτω, were the original designations chosen by Sophocles. It sometimes happens that this practice of the grammarians, instead of tending to precision, is actually a source of confusion, when quotations are made by means of one or the other of the alternative titles, so that, unless there is independent evidence of the combination, two different plays appear to be cited. Thus it is highly probable that the Αθλίστων should be identified with the Μέμων (I p. 22), the Κάμικοι with the Μίνως (II p. 4), and the 'Ἡρακλῆς (but not the 'Ἡρακλείδες) with the ἔπι Ταυνάρφι σάτυροι (I p. 167). The probable identity of the Ἐπίγονοι with the 'Ερφύλη (I p. 129) only differs in so far as Ἐπίγονοι is not a name given to the chorus, but serves, like Ἐπτά ἔπι Ὑβης, as a succinct description of the subject-matter.

1 Oxyg. Paph. x p. 83.
2 Haigh, Tragic Drama, p. 399 f.
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—the second expedition against Thebes. The proposed identifications of the Δόλοπες with the Φοίνιες (I p. 120), of the second Φωέος with the Τυμπανισταί (II p. 313 f.), and of the Θιώτιδες with the Ίμμιόνη (II p. 306), are much more disputable. A still more frequent source of error was the substitution for the true title of the name of one of the principal characters; but, though scholars seem sometimes tacitly to approve such combinations as Οίνομασι ή Ιπποδάμεια¹, they are not really instances of double titles deliberately adopted by author or critic, but the results of lapse of memory, carelessness of citation, or confusion by a copyist. The matter is of so much importance not merely to the present investigation, but also to the arrangement and interpretation of the Fragments themselves, that we must first establish beyond the possibility of dispute that such errors are not infrequent. Now, the Orestes of Euripides is sometimes entitled Electra in late MSS (see e.g. C.R. II 172), just as conversely Longinus περὶ ευρέσεως (Walz, Rhet. Gr. IX 589) refers to El. 1122 as spoken by Electra in the Orestes. Similarly, the Phoenissae appears as the Oedipus (C.R. II 172), the Bacchae as the Pentheus⁴, the Hippolytus as the Phaedra⁵, and the Troades as the Hecuba⁴. Hence we are not surprised to find that the Oenomaus is cited once as the Hippodamia⁶, the Daedalus once as the Talos⁶, the Heracles once as the Cerberus⁷, and the Tyro once as the Pelias⁸. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Ion was an alternative title for the Creusa (II p. 23), and Clytaemnestra either for the Iphigenia or the Aegisthus (I p. 219); but hesitation is pardonable before we accept the identification of the Theseus with the Phaedra (or the Aegaeus: I p. 184), of the Acrisius with the Danae (I p. 38), of the Aletes with the Erigone (I p. 173), of the Andromache with the Pastores (I p. 78), or of the Tyndareus with the Aletes (II p. 268). It happens occasionally, though much less frequently, that a play is cited by the name not of a character, but of a person who is described

¹ Welcker, Gr. Trag. p. 486.
² fr. 472.
³ fr. 161.
⁴ fr. 224.
⁵ fr. 648.

The title is so printed by Dindorf and Nauck (JGF p. 233).
So cod. L and the codd. of Stob. Flor. 36. 9 and 74. 8.
So cod. L and Eustath. II. p. 490. 23.
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or referred to by one or more of the speakers. We do not know enough about the *Licymnios* of Euripides to feel sure that the misquotation of fr. 472 in Bachm. *anecd.* I p. 412, 7 as coming from the *Heracles* is an error of this kind; but there can be no doubt in regard to schol. Plat. *rep.* 361 β, where Aesch. *Theb.* 579 ff. are cited as *Αίσχυλον ἐξ Ἀμφιαράου*. A similar example is probably to be found in Soph. fr. 731, where, following Hartung, I have suggested that ἐν Ἰάμβλης covers a reference to the *Triptolemus*, and the mysterious title Σωκρηφόρος (fr. 452) may perhaps be explained as an allusion to a particular scene in the *Laocoon*. An error more easily detected is the ascription of a play to the wrong author, that is to say, to Aeschylus or Euripides instead of to Sophocles, or to Sophocles instead of to Aeschylus or Euripides. In the result there may be occasional difficulties respecting the genuineness of individual fragments, but the discovery of the mistake seldom affects the removal of a title from one tragedian to another. Relying on the existence of this source of error, scholars have refused to credit the statement that Sophocles wrote a *Prometheus*; and similarly Welcker conjectured that the titles *Ixion* and *Sisyphus* belonged exclusively to Aeschylus and Euripides. Important additions to the text of Sophocles, which result from the recognition of an error in the statement of authorship, will be found in frs. 581 and 684. Another cause of disturbance is the doubt which exists as to the number of plays corresponding to the titles *Atreus* and *Thyestes*, and *Phineus* and *Tympanistae*; and it is uncertain whether the titles Ἐλένη, Ἐλένης ἀπαίτησις, and Ἐλένης ἀρταγη, imply the existence of three, two, or only one play.

When we have made allowance for all these disquieting considerations, we shall probably be disposed to deduct some twenty titles from the 132 mentioned above, so that of the 123 known

---

1 For examples see on frs. 14, 1080, Eur. frs. 474, 515, schol. Hom. τ 471 (attributing Aesch. *Ag.* 281 to Sophocles), Hesych. I p. 277 ἀπαρέθετα ὁ γε πρόποντα παρθένου. Σοφοκλῆς ἑγεμνεία τῇ ἐν Αδηλίδα (i.e. Eur. *I.A.* 993). Hence frs. 583, 769 and 941 have been assigned by some to Euripides.

2 Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 5. 35, where however Schroeder suspects that a reference to the Καλχθη (fr. 340) has fallen out.

3 See 1 p. 213, II p. 185.
to Aristophanes of Byzantium we are still able to identify about 112. Of all these there is, so far as I can see, only one, the Iberes, of which it might be thought that it no longer existed in the Alexandrian epoch; and even of it we can only say that there is no positive indication of its survival. It has already been remarked that we have no record of the number of Sophoclean plays which were preserved in the Alexandrian library. Now, if Boeckh’s hypothesis were correct, it would follow that we are still able to trace practically all the genuine plays as having passed into the keeping of the Alexandrians. But it is in the highest degree improbable that copies of every one of them survived throughout the interval between the fifth and third centuries. On the other hand, if we accept 123 as the actual total of the genuine titles, we are now in a position to say that some 110 of the plays to which they belonged were known to the students of Alexandria. It is reasonable to infer that there are very few indeed of which Alexandria has left us no trace, and the result is a very remarkable testimony to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of our sources.

The information available respecting the satyr-plays is not such as to disturb the previous calculation. There are sixteen plays universally admitted or strictly proved to be satyric. To these we need not hesitate to add Δαιδάλος and Ἡρακλείσκος. The Ἰνάχος and Σύννεφονθεν were either formally satyr-plays, or at least belonged to the same category as the Alcestis, so that they might have served as substitutes for satyr-plays in the last place of the tetralogy. Of the other titles those which seem most suitable for inclusion in a list of satyr-plays are Μοῖσαι, Σίσυφος, and Φαίακες; and, since the return of Perseus after his adventures was a favourite subject in this kind of drama, there

1 The relevance to Sophocles of this title is now disputed: Christ-Schmid, op. cit. p. 318.
2 See p. xiii.
3 It is possible that we know them all, just as we can identify all those of Euripides which were preserved: see Dieterich in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1248.
4 The names are as follows: Αμφίκτον, Ἀμφιθέα, Ἀχτίλεος ἑραται, Διονυσίες, Ἐλένη γάμος, Ἐρις, Ἡρακλῆς, Ἰχνευταῖς, Κηθαλίων, Κρίτος, Κωφοί, Μάμος, Παιδάρα, Σαλμωνεία, Τύφευς, Τύβαρ.
5 Haigh, Tragic Drama, p. 393.
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is perhaps more to be said for Meineke’s conjecture concerning the Δαυάθ than the particular evidence relating to it seems to suggest.1 It is possible that we should add the Chryses, for reasons given in the Introductory Note. Satyr-plays were not produced at the Lenaea; but even if we make a liberal allowance for the inclusion in the list of plays performed at this festival, it seems clear that several satyr-plays were lost before the time of Aristophanes. This is no more than might have been expected, in view of the scantiness of the information concerning them which we owe to the Alexandrians.2

§ 2. The subjects of the plays.

The subjects chosen by Sophocles for the composition of his plays were taken exclusively from ancient legends. When we seek to analyse and arrange them, various methods of classification are possible. Thus the locality to which each particular story belonged might be adopted as the guiding principle of division; and such a course would be justified, if the dramatic stories rested chiefly upon oral tradition, gathered directly or indirectly from different quarters of the Hellenic world. But, except incidentally or when belonging to Attica itself, the material of tragedy is not drawn from myths of merely local circulation. It was shaped from the κλέα ἀνδρών which rhapsodes had sung from time immemorial throughout the length and breadth of Greece—καθ’ Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος. Not that local associations are entirely to be neglected: the dramas whose scenes were laid in Attica, Boeotia, or Aetolia, tend to be grouped together, even where some other link has been chosen for their connexion. Genealogical affinity is a more promising point of departure. Every noble family could trace its descent,

1 I pp. 38, 115.
2 The effect of schol. Ar. Ran. 1124 seems to be that Aristarchus and Apollonius disregarded the satyr play in speaking of Aeschylean tetralogies (or trilogies) like the Orestae. The Proteus itself was familiar ground to the Alexandrians (TGF p. 70). They knew of only eight of Euripides’ satyr-plays, including one of doubtful authenticity. The marginalia to the Ichneutae are very meagre. See also p. xvii.
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through generations of heroic ancestors, back to Dorus, Xuthus, and Aeolus, the sons of Hellen. The cherished unity of race was maintained by a network of relationships stretching from Thessaly to Sparta, and from Elis to Orchomenus. It would be easy, with the information at our command, to distribute among the chief houses the tales of the sufferings and achievements of their successive representatives. To this aspect of the matter we shall presently return. But the mythical past was not merely treasured in family chronicles; it supplied the record of the glorious beginnings of Greek history. ‘Pelops’ line’ was linked indissolubly with ‘the tale of Troy divine.’ The orderly disposition of the early saga, which preserved it as the common heritage of later ages, was mainly the work of the epic poets. To Sophocles the legends of Hellas were permanently embedded in its poetry; and the task of cataloguing his plays will only be adequately performed, in so far as we succeed in discovering their literary sources.

Although the data available for the reconstruction of the lost plays are lamentably scanty, we are generally in a position to recognize the chief features of the stories which Sophocles adapted for the stage. The surviving titles entirely confirm the testimony of Zöllus, the speaker in Athenaeus¹, that Sophocles delighted in the epic Cycle to such an extent that throughout the whole of a play he would follow closely the epic narrative. To the same effect the author of the anonymous Life²: ‘His plots follow in the tracks of Homer, and in several of his plays he produces an exact copy of the Odyssey.’ But it was not merely in the structure of his plots that Sophocles was considered a follower of Homer. In the delineation of character and in the artistic expression of his thought the writings of Sophocles seemed to revive the charm of Homer’s poetry³. Aristotle had compared the art of Sophocles with that of Homer⁴; and Polemo

1 277 π. For Casaubon’s note on this passage see § 4.
2 XII p. liv Bl. The words which precede (τό παύν μέν οὖν Ὄμηρως ὄφρα) καὶ τερικός ὄσειμένα τερικός ξαφνίατο. Bergk proposed οἰκομένης ὄφρα: one might also suggest Ὄμηρως ὄσειμένα καὶ Ὄμηρως ξαφνίατο.
4 poet. 3. 1448a 26.
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the Academic took an equal pleasure in Homer and in Sophocles, declaring that Homer was an epic Sophocles, Sophocles a tragic Homer. It was chiefly in respect of his diction that Sophocles was called 'the most Homeric' of Attic poets; but his most intimate point of contact with the Homeric spirit was his refusal to employ his art for the purpose of fostering religious enthusiasm, of promoting a purer morality, or of freeing the mind from conventional shackles, while he laboured to create afresh the heroic figures of ancient legend, and to present under new conditions the majesty of the life which Homer had first portrayed.

The Homeric element in Sophocles' style is easily recognizable, but the evidence which establishes his close adherence to Homeric models must not be taken to imply that, as a dramatic poet, he was deficient in inventive power. We infer simply that, in erecting the framework of his plays, Sophocles selected Homeric material to a larger extent than his fellow tragedians. For this purpose no distinction need be drawn between 'Homer' and the poems of the epic Cycle. Down to about 500 B.C. no doubt had arisen that the latter were actually written by Homer, and the popular conception remained unshaken until a much later date. When Aeschylus said that his tragedies were slices from Homer's ample feast, it is beyond question that he was not referring to the Iliad and Odyssey alone. Indeed, it is extremely unlikely that the phrase 'epic Cycle' or even the notion which it expressed had come into existence during the lifetime of Sophocles. What then precisely was the epic Cycle? The answer is given by certain extracts from the chrestomathia of Proclus the Neoplatonist, which are preserved partly in the

1 Diog. L. 4. 20, Suid. s.v. Πολιομοι.
2 See T. W. Allen in C. Q. 11 88; the evidence is given by Christ-Schmid, op. cit. p. 92.
3 Athen. 347 E.
4 Monro, Hom. Od. p. 346, pointed out that there is no evidence of κόλασις ἔτων, or any such phrase, having existed before the time of Aristotle. Christ-Schmid, op. cit. p. 92, now take the same view. The inferiority to Homer of his rivals in the same field is asserted in Isocr. 12. 263, and the transferred sense of κυκλαδη at Alexandria (Callim. ap. A. P. 12. 43) indicates that the notion of 'cyclic poetry' had been taken over from the Peripatetics.
5 A considerable controversy has arisen in recent years over these extracts.
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bibliotheca of the patriarch Photius (f. 318 b 21) and partly in MSS of Homer, i.e. chiefly in Ven. A supplemented by the Escorial and other less well known copies. What is called the epic Cycle commenced, according to Proclus, with the fabled union of Uranus and Gaia, and contained all the myths relating to the gods as well as such historical facts as emerged in the course of the description. It was the work of various poets, and came to an end with the landing of Odysseus on the coast of Ithaca, when his son Telegonus unwittingly slew him. Proclus adds that the preservation and currency of the epic Cycle were to be ascribed not so much to its merit as to the orderly sequence of events which it contained (τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων). The later extracts, which are on a larger scale, relate to the subject-matter of the Cycle, and comprise what purports to be an abstract, beginning with the Cypria and ending with the Telegony, of six epics covering the period of the Trojan war. The character of Proclus’s evidence and the value to be attributed to it were materially affected by the discovery of its affinity to the mythographical handbook which, though known as the bibliotheca of Apollodorus, was certainly not the work of the famous grammarian of the second century B.C. The bibliotheca, as formerly known from the available MSS, broke off abruptly in the course of a description of the adventures of Theseus, but the discovery in 1885 and 1887 of an abbreviated form of the conclusion in two separate but parallel fragments proved that it originally extended as far as the death of Odysseus. Now these fragments, so far as they comprise the Trojan story, agree so remarkably both in substance and in

1 The fragments were published respectively by R. Wagner from a Vatican MS (1560) of the fourteenth century, and by Papadopoulos-Kerameus in Rh. Mus. XLVI 161 ff. from a Jerusalem MS. They will be found, together with the extracts of Proclus, in the first volume of the Teubner Mythographi Graeci (ed. R. Wagner), 1894.
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language with Proclus's epitome of the six Cyclic epics that there can be no hesitation in attributing to them a common origin. The inference is drawn that there lay at the basis of the mythographical compendium which was produced, whether by Dionysius the Cyclograph\(^1\) or another, in late Alexandrian times, and was the common source of the extant mythographical literature, a composition known as the ‘cycle of the events described by the epic poets’ (κύκλος ὑπὸ τῶν ἔποιοτῶν ἱστοριημένως). From the inclusion of their works in this cycle the term Cyclic was transferred from the handbook to the poems themselves\(^2\). The Alexandrian κύκλος was not intended to serve a literary purpose, that is to say, the provision for readers of the old epics of detailed information about them, but rather to supply people of ordinary education with a succinct digest of mythical history based upon the writings of the ancient poets. Proclus indicates that the poems themselves were valued chiefly as authoritative records of the events which they described\(^3\). We should not therefore be surprised if the ostensible epitome, particularly in the form in which it has come down to us, is found to contain some elements foreign to the original sources, or even at variance with the other vestiges of our fragmentary knowledge concerning them\(^4\). Now, it will be observed that,

---

\(^1\) Diod. 3. 66 is a passage often quoted: Διονυσίως τῷ συνταξάμενῳ τὰς παλαιὰς μυθοταξίας ὁδὸν γὰρ τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τὰ Ἀμαζώνας, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς Ἀργαναῦς, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τῶν Πλακάν τόδερον πραγμάτων, καὶ πόλις ἔτη των συντάγματα, παρατίθεται τὰ ποιήματα τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, τῶν τε μυθολόγων καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν. This quotation however refers to Dionysius Scolobichion, the writer (among other works) of a ‘romance’ Argonautica, who is frequently cited by Diodorus and the scholia on Apollonius, and is sometimes confused (e.g. by Christ-Schmid, op. cit. p. 93) with Dionysius the Cyclograph. See Susseini, Π 45, 57; E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa ν 928, 932. There were of course several such κύκλοι, among others that of a certain Theodorus, whose account was followed in the Tabula Italic.

\(^2\) This account chiefly follows the article by E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa ν 1875–886. No apology is needed for the prominence given to the subject; for some understanding of the development of mythological literature between Hesiod and Hyginus is necessary to a correct appreciation of the evidence touching the subject-matter of the several plays.

\(^3\) The reference must be assumed to be to the time when the ἐπιδόσε κύκλος was put in circulation, perhaps in the first century B.C.

\(^4\) These discrepancies were used by Bethe to assail the trustworthiness of Proclus. A flagrant instance is the statement in the epitome of the Cypria that Paris captured
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although we have in Proclus a complete summary of the tale of Troy, we know nothing whatever about the epics from which the beginning of the cycle was made up. The analysis of the poems which covered the period stretching from the marriage of Uranus and Gaia to the opening of the 

Cypria is entirely lost. It is unfortunate that the gap cannot be filled up with material drawn from other quarters: for even though we might learn but little of their distinctive versions, it would be instructive to discover the names of those poems which Alexandrian Scholarship regarded as the most authoritative documents concerning the early myths. The reference in Athenaeus to Sophocles’ fondness for the epic Cycle follows immediately upon a quotation from the 

Titanomachia, which suggests that that poem was included in the Cycle. But the first place in order of time is claimed for a Cyclic Theogony, which is to be distinguished from Hesiod’s work of the same name. The only other poems which by general consent are assigned to the epic Cycle are the 

Thebais, its sequel the Epigoni, and its precursor the Oedipodea. The relation of the Ἀμφαίρεως ἔξελασις to the other Theban epics, and consequently to the Cycle, is quite uncertain. The rest is guesswork: some favour the inclusion of the Ὀξαλίας ἀλασις, of the Phocais, and of the Danais, but the supposed antiquity of their origin is the only reason for their selection. There is a general impression that the Trojan series was the longest and most important part of the Cycle, but it rests upon no other evidence than the accidental preservation of Proclus’s abstract. The Ionian epic, it is true, culminated in the Τροικά; but, if the ἐπικίς κύκλος was such as we have supposed, it must have taken notice of Heracles and Dionysus, of the Argonauts, of Perseus, and of Theseus. Epics, in addition to those named above, on these and other subjects were written by Eumelus,

Sidon after the abduction of Helen, notwithstanding the evidence of Hdt. 2. 117. The version of Homer was preferred for the handbook here as in other cases.

1 EGF. p. 5. There is no direct evidence of the existence of this work. See now Dietze in Rh. Mus. LIX 522.

2 τὴν κυκλοφορίαν Ὑπαίδα, Athen. 465 Ε.


4 Christ-Schmid, op. cit. p. 100, treat these as outside the Cycle, owing to their non-Ionic character.
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Cinaethon, and Asius; and these, as well as the anonymous Phoronis, Alcmeneis, and Naupactia, must have exercised some influence upon Sophocles and the other tragedians. We may add the Aegimius, which is sometimes ascribed to Hesiod; but in their bearing upon Attic tragedy the most important of the Hesiodic poems was the γνωστῶν κατάλογος.

It appears from this discussion that, except in the case of the Trojan epics, and of these only in so far as we can rely on the statements of Proclus, it is impossible to make a list of Sophocles’ literary sources so as to map out under each the plays whose plots are derived from them. The alternative has been adopted of arranging the plays according to the ‘sequence of events’ (ακολούθια τῶν πραγμάτων) as established by the handbook of pseudo-Apollodorus. It is true that this does not rest either directly or at all upon a series of abstracts or arguments (ὑποθέσεις) of poetical literature; and even where it seems to follow particular tragic authorities, it merely reflects the influence of tragedy upon the current conception of mythical history¹. But the general outline which it presents corresponds in the main with the order in sequence of the myths as it was apprehended in the fifth century; and the genealogical framework by which the various episodes were held together must ultimately be traced to the influence of Hecataeus, of Acusilaus, and above all of Pherecydes of Leros, the somewhat older contemporary of Sophocles. The genealogies, again, though fixed and distributed by these chroniclers, were derived from them from early heroic poetry, perhaps above all from the κατάλογος of Hesiod².

I. Theogony. In the earliest age of the world, before the power of the Olympians was firmly established, was set the scene of the Pandora, the Cedalion, the Triptolemus, the Thamyris, and the Ixion.

II. Issue of Deucalion: the Aeolids. The Aetolian princes traced their origin to Aeolus through several generations descending from his daughter Calyce. The Aetolian plays are

¹ The πραγματικά of Asclepiades of Tragulus was just such a handbook of tragic mythology. The fragments indicate that if it had been preserved it would have contributed little to our knowledge of the works of the tragedians.

² Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 1124. Christ-Schmid, op. cit. p. 113, describe the κατάλογος as ‘a versified text-book of heroic history.’