CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

AESCHYLUS

SUPPLIANTS

EDITED BY ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

AESCHYLUS

SUPPLIANTS

EDITED BY
ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN
University of Nottingham

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107058330
DOI: 10.1017/9781107415621

First published 2019

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd. Padstow Cornwall

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-107-05833-0 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-107-68671-7 Paperback

For Pat

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I first became interested in Aeschylus' *Suppliants* as a result of the teaching preferences of the late Molly Whittaker, to whose post at Nottingham I succeeded on her retirement in 1974. In those days Nottingham Classics undergraduates began Part II of their degree course in April of their second year, and consequently, when I took over in the autumn, they had already studied *Suppliants* as the first component of their Tragedy special subject; the experience of teaching the play then stimulated my first significant publication on tragedy (Sommerstein 1977).

In the 40 years since then, and even in the 10 years since my Loeb edition of Aeschylus, I have changed my mind about many things, large and small, in this play. I have taken the view that readers are entitled to know why I am departing from my own previously expressed opinions, and I have accordingly referred more often than is customary to positions that I once held but hold no longer. On the other hand, by the advice of the series editors, I have restricted my references to other recent editions, and instead make a general acknowledgement here of the great debt this edition owes to the work of Holger Friis Johansen and E. W. Whittle, of Pär Sandin, and of A. J. Bowen.

I have learned much too from many other scholars over many years, and regret that I am not in a position to catalogue all those from whose assistance I have benefited or tried to benefit. One of my most recent benefactors, however, deserves a very special mention: Vittorio Citti, who not only made freely available to me, well in advance of publication, the edition of the play which he has created together with the late Carles Miralles, but also read through my near-final draft with great care and saved me from some serious errors. The differences between us on fundamental questions of text-constitution have in no way diminished his enthusiasm for our common goal of understanding this play and, so far as may be possible, the tetralogy of which it was part. His collaborator Liana Lomiento has likewise shared with me the results of her work on the lyrics, much of which might otherwise have proved hard to access.

I am most grateful for the assiduity, and the patience, of the current series editors, Richard Hunter and Neil Hopkinson. All their many suggestions for improvement have been worthwhile and thought-provoking, even those which after careful consideration I decided not to adopt. If some of those decisions were wrong, that, like all other errors, is my sole responsibility.

Nearly 30 years ago – it happened to be on that auspicious day when the Berlin Wall was broken down – I published in this series an edition of another Aeschylean play, *Eumenides*. I began my preface then with a

salute to Pat Easterling. I shall end this one in the same way. Through the half-century and more since I first came into contact with Pat, what she has done to help me, and to benefit our discipline, its scholars and its students in Cambridge and everywhere, is beyond measuring and can only be admired and praised. Let this book serve as another tribute to her name.

Alan H. Sommerstein
Nottingham, February 2018

ABBREVIATIONS

In general, abbreviations follow the style of LSJ (including its *Revised Supplement* (ed. P. G. W. Glare, Oxford, 1996)) or of *OCD*[4], though in some cases fuller forms are used.

Fragments of tragedy and satyr-drama are cited from *TrGF*; for Aeschylean fragments the numbering of Sommerstein 2008 is also given where it differs. Fragments of comedy and mime are cited from *PCG*. For other collections of fragments the editors' names or initials are normally given.

The Teubner edition of Aeschylus (M. L. West 1990a) and the editions of, or commentaries on, *Supp.* by Friis Johansen and Whittle 1980 ('FJW'), Sandin 2005, Bowen 2013 and Citti and Miralles 2018 ('Citti–Miralles') may be cited by editors' name(s) alone.

A.	Aeschylus
Ant.	Antiphon
Ap. Rh.	Apollonius Rhodius
[Apoll.]	Pseudo-Apollodorus (the mythographer)
Ar.	Aristophanes
Arist.	Aristotle
GL	D. A. Campbell, *Greek lyric* (5 vols.), Cambridge, MA, 1982–93
Hcld.	*Heracleidae* (Euripides)
h.Herm. etc.	*Homeric hymn to Hermes* (etc.) (*Hymns* 1–5)
h.Hom.	*Homeric hymns* 6–33
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones and R. Mackenzie, eds., *A Greek–English lexicon*, 9th edn, Oxford, 1968. Revised supplement, ed. P. G. W. Glare, Oxford, 1996.
OCD[4]	S. Hornblower and A. J. S. Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford classical dictionary*, 4th edn, Oxford, 2012
PSchubart	W. Schubart, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, Berlin, 1950
Radt	*TrGF* III
Σ	scholium/scholia
T	Testimonia in *TrGF* III 29–108
Thg.	*Theogonia* (Hesiod)
WD	*Works and days* (Hesiod)

Metrical Symbols[1]

–	a long (heavy) syllable[2]
⏑	a short (light) syllable
×	*anceps* (a syllable that may be of either kind)
o o	aeolic base (two syllables, at least one of which must be long)
||	pause
|||	end of strophe

an	anapaest (⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ –)
an˄	catalectic anapaests (last *metron* shortened to ⏑⏑ – –)
anacr	anacreontic (⏑⏑ – × – ⏑ – –)
ar	aristophanean (– ⏑⏑ – ⏑ – –)
ba	bacchius (⏑ – –)
ch	choriamb (– ⏑⏑ –)
cr	cretic (– ⏑ –)
D	– ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ –
d	– ⏑⏑ – (cf. *ch*)
D[2]	– ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ –
da	dactyl (– ⏑⏑)
doch	dochmiac (× ⏑⏑ ⏑⏑ × ⏑⏑)
doch˄	syncopated dochmiac (⏑ – – –)
dod	dodrans (– ⏑⏑ – ⏑ –)
E	– ⏑ – × – ⏑ – (cf. *lek*)
enn	enneasyllable (× – ⏑ – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ –)
gl	glyconic (o o – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ –)
hag	hagesichorean (× – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ – –)
hipp	hipponactean (o o – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ – –)
ia	iambus (× ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑)
ia˄, ˄*ia*	syncopated iambus (⏑ – – , – ⏑ –)
˄*ia*˄	doubly syncopated iambus (– –)
io	ionic (⏑⏑ – –)
io˄	catalectic ionic (⏑⏑ –)
ith	ithyphallic (– ⏑ – ⏑ – –)
kaib	dochmius kaibelianus (× ⏑⏑ × ⏑⏑ ⏑ –)
lek	lekythion (– ⏑ – × – ⏑ –)

[1] When, in the analysis of a particular passage of strophic lyrics, metrical symbols are placed one above another, the upper symbol or symbols relate to the strophe and the lower to the antistrophe. In the abstract description of a metrical pattern, on the other hand, a notation such as ⏑⏑ merely indicates the existence of alternatives.

[2] Before a pause, a short syllable may take the place of a long one; this phenomenon, known as *breuis in longo*, often helps to determine the position of pauses.

pher	pherecratean (o o – ⏑⏑ – –)
sp	spondee (– –)
¨	modified by anaclasis[3]
c	expanded by insertion of *ch*
d	expanded by insertion of *da*

[3] The term 'anaclasis' is applied to various kinds of 'redistribution of long and short positions within a colon or metron' (M. L. West 1982: 191). In the two instances recognized in this edition (the second and third cola in the strophic pair 58–62 = 63–7), it refers to the replacement of the sequence – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ – by – ⏑ – ⏑⏑ – or vice versa. The marker ¨ is placed before the abbreviated name of the colon if the double-short comes earlier than in the normal form of the colon, after it if the double-short comes later.

INTRODUCTION

1 AESCHYLUS

Aeschylus was born, probably at Eleusis, in or about 525/4 BC;[1] his father Euphorion is said to have been a member of Athens' ancient aristocracy, the Eupatridae (A. T 1.2 *TrGF*). He made his debut as a tragic dramatist between 499 and 496 (T 52), but he did not win first prize until 484 (T 54a); in 490 he had taken part in the battle of Marathon (T 1.10; 2.2–3; 11–13; 54; 162.3–4), where his brother Cynegeirus met a heroic end (Hdt. 6.114 = T 16), and a decade later he fought at Salamis and Plataea (T 1.11–12, partly confirmed by his younger contemporary Ion of Chios, *FGrH* 392 F7 = T 14).

From 484 to the end of his career A. won first prize 13 times in all; particularly after the death of his great rival Phrynichus about 473,[2] he must have been victorious almost every time he competed, though he is said to have been defeated by the young Sophocles in 468.[3] Probably in 470[4] he was invited to visit Sicily by Hieron, tyrant of Syracuse; on this visit he restaged *Persians* (T 56) and produced a specially composed play, *Aitnaiai*

[1] This was clearly the preponderant ancient tradition, as evidenced by statements that he put on his first production at the age of 25 (A. T 2.4 *TrGF*) in the 70th Olympiad (500/499–497/6) (T52), that he was 35 when he fought at Marathon in 490 (T 11), and that he died in 456/5 at the age of 69 (T 3) – though some sources (T 1.50, 2.9, 5.3) imply various later birth dates. The date 525/4 may be based on family tradition (A.'s family remained important in the Athenian theatrical world for two centuries) or may have been derived, via a common rule of thumb, by counting back 40 years from an important event in his life, in this case his first victory in 485/4; it cannot in any case be more than a few years out.

[2] The first line of *Persians*, produced in 472, is a near-quotation of the first line of Phrynichus' play on the same subject (Phrynichus fr. 8), and this is generally regarded as an honorific acknowledgement such as would not have been made to a living rival.

[3] T 1.28; Plut. *Cim.* 8.8–9 = T 57. Sophocles did win his first victory in 468 (*FGrH* 239 A 56), but the participation of A. in this contest may be later embroidery of the story (see Scullion 2002: 87–90). A. defeated Sophocles with the production of which *Supp.* was part (see §11).

[4] The date is inferred from the fact that A. wrote *Aitnaiai* for this occasion, combined with the fact that in 470 Hieron entered and won the chariot-race at the Pythian Games (a victory celebrated in Pindar's *First Pythian*) as a citizen of Aetna rather than of Syracuse. A.'s ancient biographer (T 1.33) links the production of *Aitnaiai* with an earlier visit to Sicily in 476/5, the year of the actual foundation of Aetna; but it is unlikely that Hieron would have chosen to invite A. at that time, when Phrynichus was still living and at the height of his fame.

(The Women of Aetna, or perhaps *The Nymphs of Mount Etna*[5]), in honour of the new city of Aetna recently founded by Hieron.[6]

About 80 plays attributed to A. were known to ancient scholars.[7] From almost all of them some textual material (though often very scanty) has survived in the form of ancient quotations, and from several we have fragments of actual ancient copies of the script ('papyri'); but after about AD 300 it appears that only seven of them were still being read, and it is these seven that survived through the Middle Ages and can be read and performed today. In the headnotes (ὑποθέσεις) prefixed to the texts in some ancient and medieval manuscripts, and sometimes in other sources, we are given some information about the original productions. The surviving plays, in their probable chronological order, are as follows:

1 *Persians* (Πέρσαι), which won first prize in 472 as the second play of a production which also included *Phineus, Glaucus of Potniae* and a satyr-drama about Prometheus (T 55); the χορηγός, who financed the production and shared the prestige of its success, was the young Pericles.

2 *Seven against Thebes* (Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας), which won first prize in 467 as the third play of a production which also included *Laius, Oedipus* and the satyr-drama *Sphinx* (T 58).

3 *Suppliants*: on its date see §11; on the accompanying plays see §3.

4–6 *Agamemnon* (Ἀγαμέμνων), *Choephoroi* (Χοηφόροι, 'Women bringing drink-offerings to a tomb')[8] and *Eumenides* (Εὐμενίδες), which together with the satyr-drama *Proteus* constituted the *Oresteia*[9] and won first prize in 458 (T 62–5); this was probably A.'s last production in Athens.

7 *Prometheus Bound* (Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης). No statement about its production survives, and on linguistic, metrical and other grounds this play is thought by many to have been composed and produced after A.'s death and falsely attributed to him.[10] It is generally supposed to have been produced together with *Prometheus Unbound* (Προμηθεὺς Λυόμενος); it has been suggested that both plays were actually the work of A.'s son Euphorion, who is known to have successfully produced a

[5] See Grassi 1956: 209; Poli-Palladini 2001: 304, 308, 311–13; Sommerstein 2010d: 193.

[6] He may also have produced one or more other plays, in particular *Glaucus of Potniae* which seems to have included at least one reference, and perhaps several, to Sicily and adjacent territory; see Sommerstein 2008: 1 7–10, 2012: 99–105.

[7] Details in Sommerstein 2008: 1 xxii–xxviii.

[8] This title is often rendered into English as *Libation-bearers*.

[9] Already known by that name in 405 (Ar. *Frogs* 1124).

[10] See Griffith 1977; M. L. West 1979, 1990b: 51–72; Sommerstein 2010a: 228–32; Ruffell 2012: 13–19. The authenticity of the play has been defended by (among others) Lloyd-Jones 2003 and Podlecki 2005: 195–200.

number of plays which he said were works of his father's not previously performed (T 71).

Five of these seven plays formed part of productions which – contrary to the usual practice of later tragic dramatists[11] – consisted of a series of three tragedies presenting successive episodes of a single story so as virtually to constitute one drama in three long acts, followed by a satyr-drama presenting another episode of the same or a closely related story. One other such Aeschylean 'tetralogy' is attested, the Λυκούργεια (T 68),[12] and there are so many other plays that can be plausibly grouped into tetralogies or at least 'trilogies' (connected sequences of three tragedies) as to make it likely that A. used this format more often than not.[13] It apparently enabled him, *inter alia*, to convert the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into dramatic form.[14]

A. is credited by Aristotle (*Poet.* 1449a15–18 = T 100) with increasing the number of individual actors in tragedy from one to two (before the end of his career, as in the *Oresteia*, the number had risen to three, an innovation which Aristotle credits to Sophocles); Aristotle also says that A. 'reduced the choral part and gave primacy to speech' (a generalization that does not apply very well to *Supp.*).

Some time after the production of the *Oresteia* A. made another visit to Sicily, and there, at Gela, he died in 456/5 (T 1.35–44; T 3). His epitaph (T 162)[15] made no reference to his art but only to the prowess he had shown on the field of Marathon. Two sons of his, Euphorion and Euaeon, became tragic poets, as did his nephew Philocles and several of Philocles' descendants, one of whom, Astydamas II, was the leading tragic dramatist of the mid fourth century.

[11] Though Euripides did in 415 stage a production in which the three tragedies (*Alexandros, Palamedes, Trojan Women*) presented in chronological order three episodes from the story of the Trojan War, with a key feature of the first play (the preservation of the life of Alexandros/Paris, which proved disastrous for his city) being recalled in the last (*Tro.* 919–22). An inscription of the early fourth century (*IG* ii² 3091) refers to a *Telepheia* by Sophocles, evidently a suite of plays about Telephus.

[12] A contemporary, Polyphrasmon (son of Phrynichus), also produced a Λυκούργεια (T 58).

[13] See Gantz 1979, 1980; Sommerstein 2010a: 32–44. A corrupt and garbled sentence in the *Suda*'s entry for Sophocles (σ815) may confirm this if, as seems to be the case, the writer (or his source) was trying to say that Sophocles was the first tragedian who preferred sets of separate plays to connected tetralogies.

[14] See Sommerstein 2010a: 241–53 and (for the Iliadic plays) Michelakis 2002: 22–57.

[15] The epitaph has been suspected of being a later composition (Page 1981: 131–2), but its language points strongly to a fifth-century date (Sommerstein 1996a = 2010c: 195–201; see also 508n.).

2 THE DANAID MYTH

The story of Danaus[16] and his daughters, with its antecedents, goes back to early archaic times;[17] it was already told, at least in part, in the earliest known text to attempt a complete account of the corpus of Greek myth, the *Catalogue of Women* ascribed to Hesiod,[18] and it had an entire epic of 6,500 lines, the *Danais*, devoted to it.[19] Like all Greek myths, this one was told in a variety of versions, but its core was stable, and almost every account known to us[20] is consistent with the following outline.

Zeus was attracted to the Argive maiden Io, who thereby incurred the jealousy of Hera; the outcome was that Io was wholly or partly transformed into a cow, and Hera set the 'all-seeing' Argus to watch over her until he was slain by Hermes.[21] Io was then harassed by a persistent gadfly which drove her through many lands until she reached Egypt, where Zeus restored her to human form and, by the touch (ἐπαφή) of his hand, made her pregnant with a son who was accordingly named Ἔπαφος.

The brothers Danaus and Aegyptus were great-grandsons of Epaphus. Aegyptus had 50 sons, Danaus 50 daughters. As a result of some kind of quarrel or suspicion between the two families, Danaus and his daughters fled from Egypt and made for their ancestral homeland of Argos; the sons of Aegyptus, in some versions accompanied by their father, followed after them, and in the end Danaus either agreed to a demand

[16] In the name Δαναός and all its derivatives, the suffix or ending that follows the stem Δανα- constitutes a separate syllable or syllables; thus Δαναή has three syllables and Δαναΐδες four.

[17] Beriotto 2016 provides a valuable study of the history of the myth, especially in archaic and classical times.

[18] [Hes.] frr. 124–9 M–W = 72–7 Most. Io and the Danaids also figured in the pseudo-Hesiodic poem *Aegimius* (frr. 294, 296–7 M–W = 230–2, 234 Most); and in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* (327) Heracles is addressed as 'descendant of far-famed Lynceus'.

[19] See M. L. West 2003: 34, 266–9. Only one quotation survives (*Danais* fr. 1 West); it speaks of the Danaids arming themselves, apparently for battle, beside the Nile. The Danaids likewise have masculine traits in a dithyramb (?) by A.'s contemporary Melanippides, in which they are described as hunting and driving chariots (*PMG* 757). These may be early evidence of the Greek belief that in Egypt gender roles were inverted (Hdt. 2.35.2–3, Soph. *OC* 337–41). The sources are discussed by Garvie 1969: 163–71, FJW 44–50, Gantz 1993: 199–208 and Beriotto 2016.

[20] One or two are eccentric, such as Σ Eur. *Hec.* 886, which places the quarrel between Danaus and Aegyptus in Argos, with Aegyptus being driven out, settling in Egypt, and later returning to Argos with his sons – an account incompatible with the well-established story of Io's flight to Egypt.

[21] Hermes' epithet Ἀργεϊφόντης was believed in antiquity to be derived from this exploit; see 305n.

for,[22] or himself proposed,[23] a multiple marriage between his daughters and Aegyptus' sons. On the wedding-night all but one of the Danaids murdered their bridegrooms;[24] the one who did not, Hypermestra, and her husband Lynceus became the founders of a famous heroic lineage (their grandson Acrisius was the father of Danae the mother of Perseus, and Perseus' son Electryon was in turn the father of Alcmene the mother of Heracles).

In the latter part of the story[25] this outline leaves a number of questions open, to which different authors supplied different answers.

(1) Why did Danaus and his daughters flee from Egypt? In *Supp.* the only motive mentioned is the desire to avoid an unwanted, indeed detested, marriage between the Danaids and the sons of Aegyptus.[26] Only one other source gives such prominence to this motive – and significantly, this source is another play of the Aeschylean corpus, *Prometheus Bound* (853–69), in which the role of Danaus is not mentioned at all. Whether or not *Prometheus* is A.'s work, it was at any rate composed within a generation of his death and quite likely by a member of his family,[27] and it is not surprising that it should keep closer than any other source to A.'s version of the Danaid story.[28] Elsewhere, several sources speak of a dynastic conflict between Danaus and Aegyptus;[29] but this could have caused Danaus' flight only if it had led to a war in which he was defeated or threatened with imminent defeat, or if he

[22] [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5; Hyginus *Fab.* 168.3; Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 10.497; Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 2.222**.** In some accounts the demand had already been made in Egypt, in others it is made for the first time at Argos.

[23] Σ Eur. *Hec.* 886; Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 6.290–1.

[24] Σ *Il.* 1.42 locates the marriages and the murders in Egypt; afterwards Danaus and his daughters flee to Argos, where Danaus becomes king. 'One or two' of Aegyptus' sons have survived (it is not explained how), but there is no mention of any attempt by them to avenge the death of their brothers.

[25] A.'s treatment of the Io story is considered in §8 below.

[26] *Supp.* 8–10, 328–41, 1006–7 (many other passages testify to the aversion, but these are the ones that specify it as the cause of the flight). The question whether Danaus has other motives, not openly avowed in *Supp.*, will be considered in §3 below.

[27] The likeliest candidate is his son Euphorion, who according to the *Suda* (ε3800) won four victories with previously unperformed plays which he presented as his father's work.

[28] Nothing in the *Prometheus* passage is inconsistent with what is known of the Danaid trilogy, and *Prom.* 857 blatantly echoes the hawk/dove image of *Supp.* 223–4.

[29] [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.4; Hyginus *Fab.* 168.1 (who says Aegyptus wanted to kill Danaus, and his daughters too, in order to obtain sole power); Σ *Il.* 1.42; Σ *Prom.* 853; Σ Eur. *Hec.* 886 (setting the quarrel in Argos, as noted above); Servius on *Aen.* 10.497.

was in fear for his life. The idea of a war is found in at least one early source, the epic *Danais* (fr. 1 West), which moreover implies that the daughters of Danaus themselves took part in the fighting (it speaks of them 'arming themselves' beside the Nile);[30] but no subsequent source mentions or implies a war in Egypt. Several, on the other hand, speak of Danaus being afraid of the Aegyptiads ([Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.4) or afraid of being killed by them.[31] When a specific reason for this fear is given, it is always the same: a warning given to Danaus by an oracle, which is reported in three forms:

(a) That the sons of Aegyptus, or one of them, would kill him (Σ *Prom.* 853, Σ *Iliad* 1.42, Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 6.290–1; cf. Σ Eur. *Or.* 872).
(b) That he would be killed by his son-in-law (Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 2.222).
(c) That he would be killed by the bedfellow of his daughter (implied by Σ *Il.* 4.171 which says he had told his daughters to kill whoever attempted to take away their virginity).

The question whether such an oracle figured in A.'s version of the story is bound up with the question whether *Supp.* was the first or the second play of its trilogy, and will therefore be discussed in §3 below. We can, however, note immediately that version (a) of the oracle, though reported by the majority of the relevant sources, cannot have been used by A.: an oracle in those terms might well cause Danaus to put as much distance as possible between himself and his brother's family, but it would not explain the more limited decision to reject a *marriage* alliance. Aegyptiads as rejected suitors, other things being equal, might well be even more dangerous than Aegyptiads as sons-in-law. An oracle in the form (b) or (c), on the other hand, would motivate Danaus to keep his daughters permanently unmarried (or, as the case might be, permanently virgin),

[30] This is probably the earliest evidence for the Greek belief that in Egypt the norms of male and female behaviour and activities were wholly or partly inverted (cf. Hdt. 2.35, Soph. *OC* 337–41). The Danaids' masculine temperament is likewise stressed by the lyric poet Melanippides, a contemporary of A., who speaks (*PMG* 757) of their fondness for hunting and chariot-driving. In two later Latin versions of the story of Amymone (see §3 below), which is set at Lerna near Argos, she is hunting (Hyginus *Fab.* 169) or practising with a javelin (Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 2.433) when she attracts the unwanted attentions of a satyr. There is little that can be called masculine, and nothing that is martial, about the Danaids in *Supp.*; on the contrary, they are terrified by the violence of the Aegyptiads and their agents (*Supp.* 734–63, 776–824).

[31] Σ *Il.* 1.42, Σ *Prom.* 853, Hyginus *Fab.* 168.1.

as his great-grandson Acrisius was motivated by a rather similar oracle to imprison Danaë.[32]

(2) Did Aegyptus come to Argos together with his sons? In A. he apparently does not; at any rate the Herald represents himself as the spokesman of the sons, not of their father (*Supp.* 928), and this is effectively confirmed by Σ Eur. *Or.* 872, which says that 'the majority opinion' (ἡ πολλὴ δόξα) is that Aegyptus did not come to Argos (citing [Hes.] fr. 127 M–W = 75 Most and Hecataeus fr. 19 Fowler) even though the text on which the scholiast is commenting, and the two other known tragic references (Phryn. trag. fr. 1, Eur. fr. 846), say he did.[33] A. clearly had a choice in this matter; we cannot tell whether he made the choice he did because he felt the presence of Aegyptus at Argos would be an unnecessary complication, or merely in order to vary from Phrynichus' treatment of the story.

(3) How did it come about that the marriages which Danaus, or his daughters, or both, were so determined to avoid, in the end took place after all? When the initiative for the marriages comes from Danaus (Σ Eur. *Hec.* 886; Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 6.290–1) it is as a ruse to destroy the Aegyptiads. More usually, however, Aegyptus or his sons make the demand, and Danaus accedes to it. In A. this is evidently the result of a war, which is anticipated through much of *Supp.* (first by Pelasgus at 342) and in effect declared by the Egyptian Herald at 950. The nearest approach to this in our other sources is in the account by Hyginus (*Fab.* 168.1–3),[34] according to whom Aegyptus' sons besieged Danaus in Argos and forced him to agree to the marriages, which had originally been proposed by Aegyptus as a ploy to facilitate the murder of Danaus. A similar motivation on the part of Aegyptus or his sons may be implied by some other accounts. In Servius (on *Aen.* 10.497) Aegyptus is afraid that Danaus may acquire new allies by making appropriate marriages for his daughters and so, 'devising a deception' (*fraude concepta*), proposes that they be married to their cousins; in pseudo-Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 2.1.5) the Aegyptiads profess to desire a reconciliation, and Danaus agrees, though 'not believing their promises and bearing a grudge against them because of his exile' (the last phrase is echoed by Hyginus, who speaks of Danaus as *dolorem exilii retinens*). We can thus say that while Danaus' enemies may

[32] He was told that he would be killed by his daughter's *son* (our first surviving source is Pherecydes fr. 10 Fowler).

[33] Eur. fr. 846 even says that this is the 'most widespread' version (ὡς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος).

[34] Cf. Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 2.222, who however does not state any motive for Aegyptus' proposal.

try to coerce him (with success) or to deceive him (without success), Danaus' eventual acceptance of the marriages is always insincere (but, in view of the force or fraud being practised on him, excusably so).

(4) Why did Hypermestra spare Lynceus? Prometheus (*Prom.* 865–6) is made to predict that μίαν … παίδων ἵμερος θέλξει τὸ μὴ οὐ | κτεῖναι ξύνευνον. This is formally ambiguous[35] (should παίδων be construed with μίαν or with ἵμερος?), but in view of the use of ἵμερος and θέλγειν in erotic contexts towards the end of *Supp.* (1005, 1040) it is overwhelmingly likely that the meaning is that Hypermestra fell in love with Lynceus[36] and spared him for that reason, and this is how the passage was understood by a scholiast (on *Prom.* 853). Some other late sources agree (Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 9.112 [195], Σ Eur. *Hec.* 886), and the same idea probably underlies Hor. *Carm.* 3.11.50–2, where Hypermestra urges Lynceus to make his escape *dum favet nox et Venus.* Others say that Lynceus was spared because he had respected Hypermestra's virginity (Eur. fr. 228a.1 (?), [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5, Σ *Il.* 4.171, Σ Pind. *Nem.* 10.6 [10]).[37] Of these two explanations the first would be much more appropriate for A. to use, since the couple Hypermestra–Lynceus would serve as a living example of the mutual desire on whose importance Aphrodite was made to insist so eloquently in *Danaids* (A. fr. 44.1–2).

(5) Did Danaus attempt to punish Hypermestra for her disobedience, and/or to find and kill Lynceus? (Any such attempts must necessarily in the end have been unsuccessful.) In [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5, and in Ovid (*Her.* 14.3–4, 131–2), Hypermestra is imprisoned; according to Pausanias (2.19.6, 2.20.7, 2.21.1), doubtless reporting an Argive tradition, she is prosecuted by Danaus before an Argive court but acquitted. Lynceus has meanwhile fled to Mount Lyrceia, north-west of Argos (Paus. 2.25.4), and apparently remains there until Hypermestra lights a beacon on the Larisa (the acropolis of Argos) to signal to him that she is 'no longer in any danger'. In a fourth-century tragedy (Theodectas' *Lynceus*; see Arist. *Poet.* 1452a27–9, 1455b29–32) Lynceus' escape appears to have remained undetected until Hypermestra gave birth to a son, after which Lynceus was discovered and condemned to death – but in the end, by what Aristotle regards as a classic περιπέτεια, it was Danaus who perished.

[35] At least to a reader; in performance it would be disambiguated by pause and intonation.

[36] See Winnington-Ingram 1983: 65–6.

[37] Ovid in *Heroides* 14 carefully avoids both these explanations, attributing Hypermestra's disobedience to *pietas* (4, 49, 64, 84, 129), which seems to mean that she shrank from incurring the guilt and pollution of murder, particularly the murder of one to whom she had pledged fidelity in the marriage rite (cf. 7–10).

(6) What becomes of Danaus and his other daughters? If Danaus has been told by an oracle that he will perish at the hands of his son-in-law or of a son of Aegyptus, that oracle must somehow have been fulfilled, and Servius (on *Aen.* 10.497) and Lactantius (on Stat. *Theb.* 6.290–1) duly state that Lynceus killed Danaus (cf. also above on Theodectas);[38] Σ Eur. *Hec.* 886 says he killed all Danaus' other daughters too. In Ovid (*Her.* 14.117, 121) the sisters have perished, in some unspecified way, while Hypermestra is still imprisoned and Lynceus a fugitive.[39] There were other accounts, however, in which Danaus and his daughters survived, with the latter being found new husbands, and at least one of these predated A.'s tetralogy. Pindar's ninth Pythian ode, according to its scholiastic headnote, celebrates a victory gained at the 28th Pythian games, which were held in 474 BC. Pindar tells how one of the victor's ancestors had been a suitor for the hand of the daughter of Antaeus of Irasa. Antaeus, he says,

> had heard of Danaus, how once in Argos he found a way to secure a swift marriage, before midday, for forty-eight maidens:[40] he forthwith had the whole band of them stand at the finish of a race-track, and ordered that the choice be made by a contest in fleetness of foot, whichever of them was taken as his own by one of the heroes who had come as their suitors. (*Pyth.* 9.112–16)

This account is followed by [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5 and elaborated by Paus. 3.12.2: the winner of the race took whichever of the Danaids he wished, the second to finish had his choice of the remaining 47, and so on.[41] A version of the remarriage story was known to Herodotus (2.98), who speaks of a son-in-law of Danaus named Archandros as if the name would be familiar to his readers.[42] In one account (Hyginus, *Fab.* 170.9–11) the

[38] The death of Danaus at the hands of Lynceus probably featured already in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*: fr. 129 M–W = 77 Most can be restored to speak of Lynceus avenging a 'great outrage' and then becoming the father of Abas (see Beriotto 2016: 20–2).

[39] Yet earlier in the same poem (15) Hypermestra expresses the hope that 'Danaus and my cruel sisters' may repent of their crime.

[40] That is, all except Hypermestra and Amymone (on the latter, see §3 below).

[41] In contrast with Pindar, however, Pausanias says that there were not enough contenders to take all the Danaids, so that 'those left over had to wait for another concourse of suitors and another race'!

[42] Cf. Paus. 7.1.6 who gives Archandros a brother Architeles, also a successful suitor, and says they came from Achaea Phthiotis and became powerful at Argos. There has probably been some confusion with the story of the expulsion of Peleus from Phthia (many generations later, at the time of the Trojan War), which in some accounts was perpetrated by Archandros and Architeles, sons of Acastus (Σ Eur. *Tro.* 1128), but the Herodotean reference still shows that an Archandros, son-in-law of Danaus, was known of in the fifth century BC.

remarriages (to Argives) follow Danaus' death, which is *not* caused by Lynceus and seems to have taken place long after the murder of Lynceus' brothers (for the news of the death is brought to Lynceus by his son Abas).

The most famous story about the ultimate fate of the Danaids (largely because of its adoption by Roman poets)[43] is that they were condemned to eternal punishment in the underworld by endlessly and futilely carrying water in leaky vessels. In classical times this was said to be the fate of the uninitiated (ἀμύητοι) (Polygnotus' painting in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi, Paus. 10.31.8 and 11; Pl. *Gorg.* 493a–c) or of 'the impious and unjust' (Pl. *Rep.* 2.363d); it is first associated with the Danaids in the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* (371e), a work of the Hellenistic period.[44] Even if the story is actually of earlier origin (which cannot be disproved, though there is no positive evidence in its favour), it is virtually incompatible with any version of the myth except those in which the Danaids die unmarried and unrepentant.[45]

We can thus see that there is wide variation in several crucial features of the myth. In the next section we shall consider, among other things, what evidence we have of how it was handled by A., particularly in the lost parts of his trilogy.

3 THE DANAID TETRALOGY

Suppliants dramatizes one short episode in the Danaid story: the arrival of Danaus and his daughters at Argos, their successful appeal to the Argive king and people for protection, and the unsuccessful attempt made by representatives of the Aegyptiads (a herald and a band of Egyptians) to seize them. It ends under the shadow of impending war between Argos and Egypt. Unusually, though not uniquely (consider *Eumenides*), the chorus (the Danaids) have a highly active and indeed leading role in the drama; unusually also (and in this case there is no known tragic parallel) there appear to be *two* subsidiary choruses, one of Egyptians and the other probably of Argive soldiers (825–910, 1034–51nn.); this high degree of

[43] Lucr. 3.1008–10; Hor. *Carm.* 3.11.25–32; Ov. *Met.* 4.462–3.

[44] Unless the young women who, in several South Italian vase-paintings datable to the mid/late fourth century (notably Policoro 38462 = *LIMC* Danaides 7) are seen pouring water into a large jar, are to be identified as Danaids *and* located in the underworld; in most recent discussions this is for various reasons regarded as unlikely (see e.g. Gantz 1993: 207; Papadopoulou 2011: 33–4; Beriotto 2016: 107–9).

[45] Unless, as was suggested by Keuls 1974: 56–7, 72–4 (cf. Papadopoulou 2011: 30–4), the task was imposed on them for a limited time as a purification rite (for the purification of the Danaids, preceding their remarriage, cf. [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5).

chorality, which carries with it a high ratio of sung to spoken verse, is one of the features that formerly persuaded most scholars to regard *Supp.* as A.'s earliest surviving play (see §11 below).

This episode – the reception of the fugitive family at Argos – is one that is at most implicit in other tellings of the myth, and one that places great emphasis on the role of the Argive king and people, whose acceptance of a supplication involved them in a dangerous war, a war in which they were certainly not victorious – for the marriages between the Danaids and the Aegyptiads, which the war was fought to prevent, in the end took place after all. Some of the main issues highlighted in the play will be discussed in §§4–8 below.

From the time when scholars first appreciated A.'s tendency to present his plays in connected tetralogies, it was regarded as obvious that *Supp.* must have been part of such a suite, and not the final tragedy, since its lack of 'closure' was blatant. As early as 1809[46] Δαναΐδες was identified as the third play of the suite: one ancient quotation (now A. fr. 43) showed that its action was set on the morning after the fatal wedding-night, and in another (now fr. 44) Aphrodite described the universality of her power over nature, implying – contrary to what the Danaids had assumed throughout *Supp.* – that they (except for Hypermestra) and their father had been acting in defiance of the divinely mandated natural order. In 1832 J. G. Droysen identified the associated satyr-drama as Ἀμυμώνη. Amymone was one of the Danaids, of whom pseudo-Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 2.1.4) tells the following tale:[47]

> Since the land [of Argos] was waterless, because Poseidon had dried up the springs in anger with Inachus because he had testified that the land belonged to Hera, [Danaus] sent out his daughters to fetch water. One of them, Amymone, while searching for water, threw a javelin at a deer and hit a sleeping satyr,[48] and the satyr rose and was eager to have intercourse with her. <She appealed for the help of Poseidon>,[49] and when Poseidon appeared the satyr took to flight and Amymone lay with

[46] By A. W. Schlegel. The various proposals regarding the structure of the trilogy/tetralogy, and their makers, are conveniently set out in *TrGF* III 112.

[47] Accounts similar in most essentials (but see next three footnotes) are given by Hyginus (*Fab.* 169, 169a) and Lactantius (on Stat. *Theb.* 2.433).

[48] This improbable tale (what was Amymone doing with a javelin when she had been sent to fetch water?) appears to be a blend of two versions preserved by Hyginus: that Amymone fell asleep from fatigue while searching for water (*Fab.* 169a) and that she had gone out to hunt (*Fab.* 169). Lactantius offers yet another variant, saying she was practising with the javelin (cf. §2 above on the Danaids as warriors).

[49] This clause, which is essential to the story, is omitted in (or lost from) the text of pseudo-Apollodorus, but is found in all the Latin sources.

(συνευνάζεται) Poseidon;[50] and Poseidon revealed to her the springs at Lerna.[51]

This reads like the outline of a satyr-drama plot, and one very well suited to be produced together with a Danaid trilogy. The remaining play of the four-play production was usually supposed to be Αἰγύπτιοι, though a minority supported Θαλαμοποιοί (assumed to be the second play of the four, and to be concerned with preparations for the multiple marriage);[52] no Aeschylean play outside the Danaid tetralogy, except the satyric *Proteus*, is known to have had any connection with Egypt.

The discovery of the papyrus Hypothesis (see §11) threw little new light on the structure of the tetralogy. It gratifyingly confirmed (line 3) that *Danaids* and *Amymone* were the third and fourth plays, but the titles of the first and second had been lost. Nor can anything be inferred from the one surviving fragment[53] of *Egyptians* (henceforth so called) (A. fr. 5), which merely reports that the lord of the underworld, Pluto, was called Ζαγρεύς in that play.[54]

We are thus left with the overwhelming probability that *Egyptians* was part of the tetralogy, and must ask whether it preceded or followed *Supp.* The majority of scholars have held, and continue to hold,[55] that *Supp.* was the first play and *Egyptians* the second. The strongest arguments for this order are the following:

[50] By making Amymone the subject, pseudo-Apollodorus implies that this union was consensual; two of the three Latin sources, however, say it was rape. In due course Amymone bore a son, Nauplius.

[51] Which bore her name (Callimachus fr. 66.7 Pfeiffer).

[52] In fact Θαλαμοποιοί was probably a satyr-drama. Several satyr-play titles refer to a servile or menial occupation being practised (often unwillingly) by the satyrs, here that of building-workers; cf. A.'s Δικτυουλκοί, Sophocles' (Πανδώρα ἢ) Σφυροκόποι, and Euripides' Θερισταί. In Euripides' *Cyclops* the satyrs have been forced to tend Polyphemus' flocks. See Seaford 1984: 33–6, O'Sullivan 2013: 31–3. A papyrus fragment (fr. 451l Radt = 78a Sommerstein) which refers to Priam and the Trojans (lines 12, 25) and to a θάλαμος (line 22) was assigned to Θαλαμοποιοί by Di Marco 1993 and independently by Sommerstein 1996b: 346 (= 2010a: 249).

[53] There is nothing to support the attribution of A. fr. 451h to *Egyptians* by Cunningham 1953; see Sommerstein 2010d: 211–12, who suggests it comes from Κρῆσσαι and refers to the supposed death of Glaucus and the misery of his father Minos.

[54] And even this is doubtful, since though the quotation appears in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* entry for Ζαγρεύς (p. 578.7–12 de Stefani) it does not, as transmitted, actually include the name Ζαγρεύς, and if it were not attributed explicitly to Αἰγύπτιοι it would be taken for a slightly corrupt version of *Supp.* 156–7 (five of its seven words are identical with those of the *Supp.* passage). See further 156n.

[55] See for example Garvie 1969: 185–6, 2006: xviii–xix; Sandin 2005: 9–12; Bowen 2013: 8–10, 27–31.

1 The elaborate *parodos* of *Supp.*, with its self-presentation of the Danaids, their situation and their feelings, is more appropriate to the first play of a trilogy than to the second (compare the *parodos* of *Agamemnon* with that of *Choephori*).
2 *Supp.* contains no less than three accounts of the story of Io and Epaphus (40–67, 291–324, 538–89), which between them cover the subject in such detail that it is hard to suppose that anything substantial could have been said about it in a preceding play.
3 'At the end of the *Supplices* we are still in the early stages of the action. It is impossible to see how the situation could be resolved in a single following play' (Garvie 1969: 186).

These are powerful arguments, though not wholly decisive (see below). If they are to be accepted, and *Egyptians* was the second play, it will most likely have been concerned with negotiations in the aftermath of the war which is about to break out at the end of *Supp.* If, as is widely supposed, Pelasgus had been killed in the fighting, Danaus might well have assumed power (whether by popular consent, or by force with the aid of the bodyguard which had been granted to him[56]) and made, on behalf of Argos, a peace which fulfilled the demand that had precipitated hostilities by accepting (of course treacherously) marriage between the daughters of Danaus and the sons of Aegyptus. The title given to the play strongly suggests that its chorus was Egyptian, whether composed of the sons of Aegyptus themselves[57] or of soldiers in their army (like the Egyptians who appear in *Supp.* 825–953). The action could have been set in or just outside Argos (with an Egyptian delegation coming to negotiate with Danaus) or, perhaps more likely, in the Egyptian camp (with Danaus coming there as the representative of the weaker party suing for peace).

This may not seem much material out of which to make a drama. In *Supp.* tension is created by the fact that the Danaids are asking the Argives to do something that is likely, and seen by Pelasgus as likely, to expose Argos to great danger, and later by the violent irruption of the Egyptian forces from whom the Danaids are saved in the nick of time. There would be nothing like this in *Egyptians*, where Danaus would be offering the Aegyptiads precisely what they had demanded all along, give or take, perhaps, a few stipulations about dowries and the like. Some

[56] *Supp.* 985–8.
[57] One might have expected that in that case the play would have been called Αἰγυπτιάδαι, but the titles of Aeschylean plays that formed part of connected trilogies are probably not original (Sommerstein 2002b: 4–5 = 2010c: 15–16) and sometimes do not match their content (e.g. the name Εὐμενίδες appears nowhere in *Eum.*).

tension, however, would be created by the ever-present possibility that the Aegyptiads[58] might see through Danaus' deceptions: the tragic dramatists love to play with the unrealizable possibility that a myth may fail to reach its known conclusion.[59] There might also have been other incidents to which we now have no clue, and Danaus' daughters could have appeared as a secondary chorus, perhaps before the arrival of the main chorus[60] (when Danaus could have concerted his murder-plot with them), perhaps in the final scene[61] (after which the play could have ended with a multiple wedding procession).[62]

But there are some features of *Supp.* which do suggest that it may *not* be the opening play of the trilogy but may have been preceded by another play, which had a chorus of Egyptians because it was set in Egypt.[63]

Danaus' last speech in the play (in particular its second half, 996–1013) betrays an almost desperate anxiety that his daughters shall at all costs preserve their virginity and value it 'more than life itself' (1013). This, to be sure, would be an anxiety that every Greek father would feel, to some degree, until he had got his daughters safely married; but no other father, in a surviving text, makes such a song and dance about the matter, and Danaus' tirade is all the more remarkable because his daughters have not given the slightest indication of any tendency to go astray. What is more, Danaus says in effect (1006–7) that if they do go astray, they and he will suffer precisely what they have endured much hardship, and a long sea-voyage, to avoid. We learn here, in other words, that when Danaus fled with his daughters from Egypt, it was not, or not solely, because he or they objected to a marriage alliance with Aegyptus' family in particular; it was because he, or they, or both, were determined that they should remain

[58] If they were not the chorus (see above), one of their number would have appeared as an individual character, to conduct the negotiations with Danaus; this might be Lynceus, the only one of the 50 who in our other sources is more than a name, or it might (perhaps preferably) be one of those who are unknowingly signing their own death-warrants. All 50 are named by [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5 and by Hyginus *Fab.* 170.

[59] See Sommerstein 2010c: 209–23. In two surviving plays from the last decade of the fifth century, Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and Euripides' *Orestes*, a myth actually does fail to reach its known conclusion until it is put back on the rails by a *deus ex machina*.

[60] Like the chorus of huntsmen in Eur. *Hipp.* 58–71, or the Frogs in Ar. *Frogs* 209–68.

[61] Like the secondary chorus who sing in *Supp.* 1034–61, or the προπομποί who sing at the end of *Eumenides*.

[62] In four of A.'s six undisputed surviving plays the final *exeunt omnes* takes the form of a procession (*Pers.*, mournful return of Xerxes to his capital; *Seven*, funerals of Eteocles and Polyneices; *Supp.*, the Danaids escorted into Argos; *Eumenides*, installation of the Erinyes – now *Semnai Theai* – in their new Athenian sanctuary).

[63] The following four paragraphs are adapted from Sommerstein 2010a: 102–3.

permanently virgin. Revealingly, too, Danaus seems more concerned with his own interests than with those of his daughters: he begs them not to put *him* to shame (996) and not to give pleasure to *his* enemies (1008–9).

The Danaids' own utterances, long before the reassuring reply they give their father (1014–17), suggest that they fully share his attitude.[64] They do, of course, frequently express their loathing of their cousins, but there is also ample evidence of a general detestation of men, sex and marriage. They equate marriage with slavery (335–7) and pray that they may never be 'subject to the power of males' (392–3). The very phrase 'the beds of men' prompts them to a cry of horror (142, 152),[65] they wish for death 'before an abominated man touches my flesh' (788–90, cf. 796–9, 804–7) and they frequently dwell on the miraculous conception of Epaphus (15–18n.). Such attitudes were not thought normal in women (cf. 1003–5, Eur. *Hipp.* 966–7): Danaus must have brought up his daughters to think and feel thus. In *Supp.* 996–1013 he is giving them, so to speak, a booster dose of the same medicine.

His attitude is at least as abnormal as theirs. For the father or guardian of a young woman deliberately to keep her unmarried was considered one of the most grievous wrongs that could be committed against her.[66] Even in myth, there are few who do this,[67] and they must have some very powerful motivation, normally fear for their own lives. And we know that in some versions of the myth, Danaus did have such a motivation (see §2), having received an oracle that he would be killed by his son-in-law or by the bedfellow of his daughter. But in *Supp.* itself there is no reference, direct or indirect, to any such oracle; nor can we assume that A. was able to take knowledge of it for granted as a regular part of the myth, for we know that in one quite recent poetic version of the story (Pind. *Pyth.* 9.112–16) Danaus not only survived but himself arranged new marriages for his daughters. Either, then, A. has deliberately left his audience mystified on this important issue, to be enlightened only much later in the trilogy (a common

[64] This has long been a controversial issue in scholarship on *Supp.*; the position taken here is similar to that of C. Turner 2001: 28–32, who gives many references to earlier studies, and of Citti–Miralles.

[65] And they pray that they may ἄγαμον ἀδάματον ἐκφυγεῖν, which – to judge by the usage of ἄγαμος elsewhere in archaic and classical poetry – should imply that they envisage remaining *permanently* unmarried (141–3n.).

[66] In Lysias 12.21 the four crimes of the Thirty 'Tyrants' singled out as particularly heinous are the expulsion of citizens from Attica, unjust executions (with denial of burial), deprivation of citizen rights and *preventing the marriage of many men's daughters.*

[67] The best known are Acrisius (see §2 above) and Aegisthus and Clytaemestra, who keep Electra unmarried (or, in Euripides' *Electra*, marry her off to a poor peasant) for fear that she might bear a son who would avenge the murder of Agamemnon.

technique of modern drama and fiction, but hard to parallel in anything we know of classical tragedy)[68] – or else they had been informed about the oracle in a *preceding* play. If so, that play can only have been *Egyptians*.[69] On this hypothesis, the first play would have been set in Egypt, with a chorus no doubt of Egyptian nobles or elders, and would have dealt with the earlier stages of the dispute between Aegyptus and Danaus. The oracle would be known only to Danaus himself, and he would not be able to mention it in public, so he would have had to do so in a prologue.

The hypothesis may be supported by certain allusions in *Supp.* to earlier events, allusions which are decidedly cryptic if we suppose that no play preceded *Supp.* The Danaids say to their father that the sons of Aegyptus are 'insatiate of battle' and add 'I speak to one who knows' (741–2). This implies that Danaus has waged war against them in Egypt – and this is the only reference in *Supp.* to this war. Why was it not mentioned at the beginning of the play? Because – it may be argued – the audience already knew, from the preceding play, that there had been such a war, and further reference to it at that stage was unnecessary. Again, two passages in *Supp.* imply that under Egyptian law the sons of Aegyptus have the right to claim possession of their cousins regardless of the latter's own wishes or of their father's – but this emerges in a strangely indirect way. First Pelasgus asks whether such a law exists (387–91) and receives an evasive answer; later the Egyptian Herald speaks of the Danaids as items of his (meaning his masters') lost property (916–20), and asks (932–3) 'who shall I say took away from me this group of cousin women?' as if, again, they belonged to him by right. Such a right

[68] Hose 2006 points out that there are several occasions in epic and tragedy when an oracle is mentioned for the first time after it has been fulfilled, citing for example *Pers.* 739–41, Soph. *Trach.* 1159–61 and *Od.* 9.507–9. In none of these cases, however, does the delay in revealing the oracle leave the audience mystified for a long period as to the explanation of actions or attitudes crucial to the plot, as would be the case in the Danaid trilogy.

[69] The originator of this hypothesis in recent times, Rösler 1993 (who was modifying a proposal by Sicherl 1986), based it mainly on a scholium on *Supp.* 37 which he, like Sicherl, took to mean that the Danaids were determined to resist marriage 'for fear of their father being killed' (διὰ τὸ μὴ θανατωθῆναι τὸν πατέρα), and in this he was followed by Sommerstein 1994. Garvie 2006: xviii–xix has shown that this was wrong. The scholiast is trying to explain why, according to the Danaids, 'Right forbids' their cousins to force them into marriage; and his explanation is that to do so is improper 'because their father has not <yet> been killed'. If Danaus were dead, his daughters, under Athenian law (see e.g. MacDowell 1978: 95–8, Schaps 1979: 25–47), would automatically be married to the nearest kinsmen who claimed them (in this case the sons of Aegyptus – Aegyptus himself, it may be presumed, would waive his own claim); as he is alive, he and he alone has the right to give them in marriage when, and to whom, he wishes. But the case for placing *Egyptians* first in the trilogy does not by any means depend solely on the evidence of this scholium. (What the scholium *does* tell us is that later in the trilogy Danaus *will* meet a violent end.)

was utterly alien to Greek society (in which no free woman whose father was alive and *compos mentis* could ever be taken in marriage without his consent) and requires far clearer explanation than it ever receives in this play; again, such explanation could have featured in *Egyptians*.

The main considerations telling against placing *Egyptians* before *Supp.* are the three arguments listed above in support of placing *Supp.* first.[70] Of these the third – that one play would not be enough to cover the events that follow the end of *Supp.* – is the weakest. Between the end of *Supp.* and the beginning of *Danaids* would come a brief war, the death of Pelasgus, the assumption of power by Danaus, a peace agreement, and the marriage of the Danaids to the Aegyptiads. This sequence of events is broadly comparable in extent to that which must have intervened between *Oedipus* and *Seven*, even if we assume that *Oedipus* included the original dispute between Eteocles and Polyneices and the latter's departure from Thebes: the main events passed over are the arrival of Polyneices at Argos, his marriage to the daughter of Adrastus, the persuasion of Adrastus by his two sons-in-law to attack Thebes (cf. *Seven* 572–5, 585), the mustering and march of the Seven and a siege of significant duration (cf. *Seven* 22–3). And it is as nothing to the gap that must have existed between the first and second plays of the Odyssean trilogy, namely *Psychagogoi* (based on *Od.* 11) and *Penelope* (set in the palace on Ithaca and based on *Od.* 17–23), which included events that in the *Odyssey* fill nine books (in chronological sequence, books 12, 5–8, and 13–16).

It is certainly true, on the other hand, that the Danaids, and the story of Io and Epaphus, are introduced in the *parodos* of *Supp.* in a manner that suggests that the audience have not had any significant previous acquaintance with them. Either, then, there was no play preceding *Supp.*, or if there was, the Danaids did not appear in it, and very little or nothing was said about them (except as the potential objects of a marriage transaction about which, as was usual, they themselves would have no say) or about Io. This may seem surprising, but is quite possible. In *Agamemnon*, for example, there is no mention of any daughter of Agamemnon except the dead Iphigeneia, though in the first half of the next play Electra will be a major focus of interest (and Iphigeneia will be faded out almost completely);[71] and the butchery of the children of Thyestes, which in *Ag.* 1090–7, 1217–22, 1583–1602 and *Cho.* 1068–9 is the beginning of the evils that beset the family of Agamemnon, is completely

[70] See further Kyriakou 2011: 65–76, a vehement rejection of the contention that an oracle given to Danaus featured in any way in the trilogy. The argument on which she lays most stress is that the Danaids never mention any such oracle; but this proves, at most, only that *they* know nothing of it. Beriotto 2016: 52 holds that the oracle story existed before A.'s time and was deliberately discarded by him – but her discussion of the subject (pp. 28–52) completely ignores *Supp.* 996–1013.

[71] After *Ag.* 1559 she is mentioned only once (*Cho.* 242).

absent from the first two-thirds of the opening play, where the ἀρχαὶ κακῶν are, rather, the abduction of Helen and the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Again, Athena, who will dominate *Eumenides*, is not mentioned at all in *Ag.* or *Cho.*, not even in connection with the capture of Troy, for which according to tradition (and indeed according to *Eum.* 457–8) she was largely responsible.

So much for the first and second plays of the trilogy. The third play was certainly *Danaids*. I have elsewhere offered a speculative reconstruction of this play,[72] and will confine myself here to cataloguing the elements of which we can be reasonably certain.[73]

1 The action took place on the day after the marriages and the murders (cf. A. fr. 43).
2 The Danaids again formed the chorus.
3 Danaus was killed (Σ *Supp.* 37; see above, p. 16 n. 69).
4 Aphrodite appeared and delivered a speech in which she described her universal power, of which A. fr. 44 was part:

> ἐρᾶι μὲν ἁγνὸς οὐρανὸς τρῶσαι χθόνα,
> ἔρως δὲ γαῖαν λαμβάνει γάμου τυχεῖν·
> ὄμβρος δ' ἀπ' εὐνάεντος οὐρανοῦ πεσὼν
> ἔκυσε γαῖαν, ἡ δὲ τίκτεται βροτοῖς
> μήλων τε βοσκὰς καὶ βίον Δημήτριον
> δένδρων τ' ὀπώραν[74]· ἐκ νοτίζοντος γάμου
> τέλειός ἐστι· τῶν δ' ἐγὼ παραίτιος.
>
> 'The holy Heaven passionately desires to penetrate the Earth, and passionate desire takes hold of Earth for union with Heaven. Rain falls from the brimming fountains of Heaven and makes Earth conceive, and she brings forth for mortals grazing for their flocks, cereals to sustain their life, and the fruit of trees: by the wedlock of the rain she comes to her fulfilment. Of this, I am in part the cause.'

We may add a few other points which, while not provable, are highly probable:

5 Lynceus, the surviving Aegyptiad, and Hypermestra, who spared him, are likely to have had individual roles.

[72] Sommerstein 1994: 123–30 = 2010c: 104–13.

[73] In addition to frr. 43 and 44 we now have in *POxy* 5160 II 37–40 (see Luppe 2013) a further fragment of *Danaids* which, however, throws virtually no light on the drama: a line beginning στυγῆι δὲ τοιούτο.[.]. (τοιούτοισι tent. Luppe), in the lost portion of which αὑτοῦ was used as a second (rather than third) person reflexive pronoun (cf. *Ag.* 1141, 1297, *Cho.* 111). Someone is being told that (s)he is hated, but we cannot tell who this was (Danaus? Hypermestra?).

[74] τ' ὀπώραν Diels: τις ὥρα δ' codd. Athenaei (13.600b).

6 If the story of an oracle given to Danaus featured in the trilogy (see above), Lynceus was responsible for Danaus' death, whether by direct violence or by other means.
7 After Aphrodite's speech, one would surely expect that new and more suitable marriages would be made for the Danaids (other than Hypermestra, who already has one). We cannot tell how it was done, but in view of the emphasis she places on *mutual* sexual desire (fr. 44.1–2, cf. *Supp.* 1003–5, 1038–42) the foot-race of Pind. *Pyth.* 9.112–16, in which the women are treated as mere objects, would be inappropriate (Keuls 1974: 70 n. 24).

And that is about all we can say with any degree of confidence.[75]

Two distinct traditions, one of which at least goes back to the fifth century BC, speak of a judicial proceeding of some kind following the murder of the sons of Aegyptus. In Euripides' *Orestes* (871–3) reference is made to a prosecution of Danaus by Aegyptus himself; a scholium states that Aegyptus came to Argos to avenge the death of his sons, but armed conflict was avoided by the intercession of Lynceus, and a trial held before a joint tribunal of noble Egyptians and Argives at the place called the Spur (Πρών) where assemblies of the Argive people were later held; the outcome of the trial is not stated. According to the Argive tradition reported by Pausanias (see §2 above), on the other hand, it was Hypermestra who was put on trial, at the instance of Danaus, but acquitted. We cannot tell whether or not A. staged a trial (as he staged a trial of Orestes in *Eumenides*), and if he did, who the defendant was;

[75] Bachvarova 2009 (cf. also Papadopoulou 2011: 22–3, 34) suggests that the trilogy foreshadowed a future (posthumous) destiny of the Danaids as water-nymphs, a myth and cult known to Callimachus (*Hymn* 5.45–8; fr. 66; cf. already Hes. fr. 128 M–W = 76 Most Ἄργος ἄνυδρον ἐὸν Δαναὰι θέσαν Ἄργος ἔνυδρον). It should, however, be noted that whatever may have been the case in *Amymone* (see above), in *Supp.* Argos is assumed to be already well-watered when the Danaids arrive (23, 497, 1020, 1026–9). The plot of an Aeschylean satyr-drama, even in a 'connected' tetralogy, need not be mythically compatible with that of the preceding tragic trilogy; in the Lycurgus tetralogy the first and fourth plays appear to have presented alternative and inconsistent versions of the story of Dionysus' arrival in Lycurgus' kingdom (Sommerstein 2008: III 126–7). Another suggestion that has often been made (see especially Zeitlin 1996: 163–9) is that the trilogy ended with the institution of the Thesmophoria, whose rites, according to Herodotus (2.171.3), were brought from Egypt to Greece by the Danaids and taught by them to 'the Pelasgian women'; but Herodotus was here merely indulging his penchant for claiming an Egyptian origin for all kinds of Greek religious institutions (cf. Hdt. 2.48–64). The Danaids, who had left Egypt as virgins, could not have brought with them knowledge of the secret rites of the Thesmophoria, which was a festival for married (or formerly married) women only (Callim. fr. 63.9–12 Pfeiffer; see R. Parker 2005: 270–1 with n. 4); the rituals would have had to be taught not *by* the Danaids but *to* them, and their instructor would have had to be not Aphrodite (who had no role in the Thesmophoria) but Demeter.

some may feel that it is unlikely that he would create *two* onstage trials, both with divine involvement, within a few years (on the date of *Supp.* see §11). The intervention of Aphrodite does not require us to posit a trial, since it could easily have been motivated in other ways.[76]

But Aphrodite's speech does help us to identify a major theme (if not *the* major theme) of the trilogy, and indeed of the tetralogy:[77] that while the union of the sexes is an essential part of the divinely mandated order of nature, its proper basis, also divinely mandated, is mutual desire (like that of Heaven and Earth in A. fr. 44.1–2), not unilateral seizure and possession (see further §5). The sons of Aegyptus, all but one, tried to seize the Danaids as if they were items of lost property (918), and probably intended to carry them back to Egypt in chains like the cargo of a slave-ship (873n.); they paid for it with their lives. Danaus, on the other hand, may have tried to keep his daughters permanently virgin; if he did, it cost him his life too. The one significant male who survives to the end of the trilogy, Lynceus, is the only one to have created a marriage in which ἔρως is reciprocal. The same pattern appears to have been grotesquely mirrored in the satyr-play *Amymone*, where the attempted rape of Amymone by a satyr was followed by a fruitful union with Poseidon; our knowledge of the play is too limited for us to be able to say that Poseidon inspired ἔρως in Amymone, but he must at least have inspired ample gratitude, having both rescued her from the satyrs and revealed to her the springs of Lerna.

4 SUPPLICATION[78]

Supplication (ἱκέτεια) was an important ritual feature of ancient Greek life, protected by strong religious sanctions, whereby persons in need or distress threw themselves on the mercy of a person or community that had power to assist them. It features, in one form or another, in a majority of surviving tragic dramas,[79] and is central to several of them, of which *Supp.* is the earliest.

One could make oneself a suppliant by performing one or more of a number of conventional acts, such as clasping, or at least touching, the knees of the person being approached (now often termed the

[76] For example, Danaus might have been about to inflict punishment on Hypermestra on his own authority as her father and/or as ruler of Argos; or Lynceus might have been about to take full revenge on the killers of his brothers.

[77] For other possible themes of the trilogy/tetralogy see Sommerstein 1994: 131 = 2010c: 114–15.

[78] On the matters discussed in this section, see Naiden 2006, which supersedes all previous studies; on supplication in tragedy, Grethlein 2003 and Tzanetou 2012.

[79] See the tables in Naiden 2006: 302, 315–16, 335.

supplicandus). Danaus and his daughters do so by sitting in a sacred place while bearing the classic emblem of suppliant status, the ἱκετηρία, an olive branch wreathed with wool. As the sanctuary is a public one, the *supplicandus* is not an individual but the *polis* of Argos, and Pelasgus rightly insists (365–9) that the people, not he, must make the final decision on how to respond to the supplication – though as that decision will be strongly influenced, if not absolutely determined, by the terms in which Pelasgus puts the family's appeal before the Argive assembly, his own view of its merits will be crucial.

For it is important that a *supplicandus* always has the choice of granting or rejecting the suppliant's plea (Naiden 2006: 129–65), of 'raising up' the suppliant (324n.) or refusing to do so. It had to be so, since otherwise no criminal who had the presence of mind to make himself a suppliant could ever have been punished. In general, a supplication will be rejected if the *supplicandus* believes it to be unjust, and rejection in itself normally carries no evil consequences for the *supplicandus* (Naiden 2006: 146). However, in fourth-century Athens, where supplications to the community were frequent and formed the main agenda item at 10 of the 40 scheduled assembly meetings in the year ([Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 43.6), it appears that any supplication thought to be 'lawful' would be approved,[80] and Pelasgus clearly thinks (346–7, 354–8, 378, 413–16, 439–40, 478–9) that rejection of a justified plea may very well have evil consequences for him and Argos. Accordingly, almost as soon as he learns the objective of the Danaids' supplication, he raises the issue of whether their cause is just (344). The Danaids assert that it is, because they are fleeing from persecution (350–3, 391–6, 422–37), but they conspicuously fail to meet Pelasgus' challenge (387–91) to show that their cousins do not have the legal right to insist on marrying them, and he long remains reluctant to recommend to his people a decision that is likely to involve them in a dangerous war (342, 379–80, 398–401, 412, 439–40, 449, 474–7). He agrees to do so only after the Danaids threaten to hang themselves in the sanctuary and thus pollute it (455–67).[81] Pelasgus' speech in response to this threat

[80] *IG* ii^{2} 218.24–5, 276.5, 337.34–5, 502.14, all using the formula ἔδοξεν ὁ δεῖνα ἔννομα ἱκετεύειν: see Naiden 2006: 173–83.

[81] I cannot understand Naiden's contention (2006: 84–5) that the Danaids' threat is ineffective and that Pelasgus sends Danaus, rather than his daughters, to Argos because his supplication, unlike theirs, has been 'mannerly'. For one thing, Danaus can hardly be said to have made a supplication at all: in the presence of Pelasgus, up to 479, he has said and done precisely nothing. For another, this argument does not explain why Pelasgus turns to Danaus *at this moment* and not earlier. The parallel (parody?) in Eur. *Hel.* 980–90 tells us little, since Menelaus' threat to kill Helen and himself is there unnecessary: Theonoe's response (998–1029) shows that she regards the supplication of Menelaus and Helen as justified and would have accepted it in any case.

(468–79) shows that he still sees himself as faced with a choice between two great evils, but that the threat has tipped the scales. It will still be for the Argive people to make the final decision, but Pelasgus ensures that the decision will go the way he wants. In advance of the assembly meeting he has Danaus place some of the wreathed olive-branches on altars in the city (482–5) so that 'all the citizens may see' that a formal supplication is being made to them, and in the assembly itself he makes a powerful speech (615–20) stressing the dangerous consequences of rejecting the appeal and saying nothing about the dangerous consequences of accepting it. The assembly duly votes to do the latter.

Once a supplication has been accepted, the *supplicandus* – here the Argive state – becomes absolutely bound to fulfil the obligation thereby incurred, and is liable to incur divine punishment for any breach; and breaches are notably infrequent (Naiden 2006: 122–8). In surviving tragedy, indeed, there are none at all, although one breach is prevented by a third-party intervention and another by a revulsion in the offender's own feelings.[82]

In at least a quarter of all surviving tragedies an onstage supplication, invariably at an altar or other sacred place, is a major feature of the action (many others have briefer supplications within particular scenes[83]). The motif is an especial favourite with Euripides, who makes it central to at least 5 of his 17 genuine extant tragedies (*Heracleidae*, *Andromache*,

[82] In Euripides' *Andromache*, Andromache leaves her suppliant position at the altar of Thetis after Menelaus has seized her son as a hostage, on Menelaus' promise (380–3) that if she sacrifices her own life, her son will be spared; as soon as she has done so, Menelaus announces (431–2) that his daughter Hermione, Andromache's greatest enemy, will decide the boy's fate. As mother and son are being taken to their death, however, Peleus arrives and rescues them. In Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, Neoptolemus accedes (524–9) to Philoctetes' suppliant plea (468–506) to be taken home; but he does so in treacherously equivocal language, not specifying the destination of his ship, and later, having gained possession of Philoctetes' bow, reveals that he intends to take him to Troy (915–26) – for which Philoctetes very reasonably curses him (961–2). Neoptolemus is extremely uneasy about what he is doing, and eventually returns the bow to Philoctetes, tries and fails to persuade him to go to Troy voluntarily, and finally agrees to take him home (1402–8); and home they would have gone, but for the *ex machina* intervention of the deified Heracles.

[83] To mention one play by each of the three major tragedians: the unsuccessful appeal by Clytaemestra to Orestes to spare her life, displaying to him the breast that once suckled him (*Cho.* 895–7; cf. *Il.* 22.79–91); the supplication by Ajax' son Eurysaces, with one hand resting on his father's corpse and the other holding locks of his own hair, of Teucer's and of Tecmessa's (Soph. *Aj.* 1171–81); and the two successful supplications of Medea, to Creon for permission to stay one day longer in Corinth, and to Aegeus for asylum at Athens – neither of which would have been granted if the *supplicandi* had realized that their purpose was to facilitate murder (Eur. *Med.* 324–56, 709–30).

Suppliants, *Heracles* and *Helen*). Sophocles has major supplication episodes in both his *Oedipus* plays: in one, representatives of the Theban people seek Oedipus' assistance in the crisis created by the plague (to find that their request had been fulfilled before it was made), while in the other the old, blind Oedipus begs Theseus, successfully, to allow him to remain, and die, at Colonus, and not to hand him over to the Thebans.

In A., outside *Supp.*, there are two important onstage supplications, both in *Eumenides*, both by Orestes, both effected by contact with sacred objects (the 'navel-stone' at Delphi, and the image of Athena Polias on the Athenian Acropolis), and both successful. Apollo instructs Orestes to supplicate Athena at Athens, and asks Hermes (*Eum.* 89–93) to 'shepherd' him on his way there; Athena, like Pelasgus, refers the decision to (the representatives of) her people, and at Orestes' trial gives the crucial vote that secures his acquittal.

It will be seen that four of the eight plays described above include a supplication, always successful, located in Athens or Attica: Athens in tragedy is the place above all others where suppliants are respected (three times at the price of war, once at the risk of the deadly hostility of the Erinyes), and her beneficence to the Heracleidae (ill rewarded by their descendants, the rulers of Sparta) and to the families of the Seven against Thebes were staples of Athenian patriotic oratory.[84] *Supp.* is the only play of the eight in which, in a city other than Athens, the decision on the fate of the suppliants rests with a democratic assembly such as classical Athens had; the city follows the Athenian pattern and accepts the supplication at the price of war.

5 MARRIAGE

In classical Athens, a marriage was essentially the transfer of a woman (or rather, in many cases, of a girl in her early teens[85]) from the guardianship (κυρι**ε**ία) of the head of her natal family (normally her father or, if he was dead, an adult brother) to that of another man who became her husband;

[84] Lys. 2.7–16; Pl. *Menex.* 239b; Dem. 60.8. The succouring of the families of the Seven was the subject of A.'s lost *Eleusinians* (in which, however, Theseus secured the release of the Seven's bodies by diplomacy, without bloodshed); the succouring of the children of Heracles may or may not have been the subject of his *Heracleidae*.

[85] What was the normal expectation may be seen from the will of the father and namesake of the orator Demosthenes. At his death, his son was 7 years old and his daughter 5 (Dem. 27.5), and the will provided that the girl was to be married to her cousin and joint guardian Demophon 'when she is of appropriate age' (Dem. 29.43); Demosthenes says (probably glossing rather than quoting the will) that this would be 'in the tenth year', i.e. when she was 14 or 15.

it was a transaction between the two men, for which the woman's consent was not required.[86] It was considered noteworthy, and a sign of the exceptional character of A.'s contemporary Elpinice (sister of Cimon), when, probably in the 470s, the very rich aristocrat Callias secured her agreement to marry him *before* asking her brother for her hand (Plut. *Cim.* 4.8).[87] It is thus striking when we find that both the principal male characters in *Supp.* use language implying that there is something improper about a marriage that is made without the bride's consent. Danaus asks rhetorically (227–8) how someone could be pure (ἁγνός) who 'married an unwilling woman <taken> from an unwilling <father>', and adds that such a person cannot escape punishment even after death. Pelasgus (940–1) goes even further: he tells the Egyptian Herald that he may take the Danaids if and only if they are willing to be taken, 'should pious words persuade them', making no mention of the willingness or unwillingness of their father. The same way of thinking is evident in other passages of *Supp.* (1038–42) and *Danaids* (fr. 44.1–2) in which Aphrodite is associated, or associates herself, with the ideas of persuasion (which implies willing consent) and of *mutual* (not unilateral) desire (ἔρως).

In this trilogy, then, the ideal marriage is one which is made by the willing agreement of all the parties concerned – very much including the bride – and in which the passionate desires of the male awake in the female a corresponding desire directed towards him. This is still, of course, a long way from the modern expectation that such mutual desire and love should be well established before marriage is even contemplated, but it is certainly also a long way from the norms of A.'s time – though not out of character for the creator of the *Oresteia*, in which Clytaemestra is much the most powerful personality (easily dominating every other character in *Agamemnon* with the significant exception of Cassandra), in which

[86] In New Comedy, a binding betrothal may be effected without the prospective bride even knowing of it, and it is never suggested that her κύριος has done anything wrong by so acting. Thus in Menander's *Dyskolos* (791–847) young Sostratos decides that Gorgias, whose sister he is about to marry, would make a fine husband for his own sister; he broaches the idea to his father, Kallippides, whose objections (on the ground of Gorgias' poverty) he eventually overcomes. Gorgias himself then raises objections (not wishing to 'luxuriate in the fruits of others' labour', 830), which Kallippides in turn overcomes, and Kallippides proceeds to betroth his daughter to Gorgias. Of all this she herself knows nothing; she will meet Gorgias, for the first time, at the feast which is forthwith held to celebrate the two betrothals.

[87] This attitude may have been to some extent traditional in Callias' family. His grandfather, also named Callias, had given his three daughters the 'most magnificent present' (Hdt. 6.122.2) of allowing each of them to marry any Athenian she might choose. It may or may not be significant that this family, the Kerykes, held an important hereditary priesthood (the position of δαιδοῦχος) in the Mysteries of A.'s home town of Eleusis.

Apollo's argument for male supremacy, though backed by the authority of Zeus, fails to win a majority vote of the (male) Athenian jury, and in whose last 270 lines no male says a word.

This ideal model of marriage was doubtless represented, in *Danaids*, by Hypermestra and Lynceus, whether or not they ever appeared together on stage, and quite likely also by new marriages made (perhaps by direction of Aphrodite) for the other daughters of Danaus. In contrast with it stand a range of flawed models of relations between the sexes, of which three can be identified.[88]

(1) *Polygamy.* That Danaus and Aegyptus have 50 children each implies that, like Priam of Troy (*Il.* 24.493–7), they had multiple wives and/or concubines. In [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.1.5 there is a catalogue of all the children and their mothers, perhaps derived ultimately from the *Danais*: the Danaids are said to have been born of ten mothers, the Aegyptiads of nine.[89] In *Supp.* this all lies in the past and is not mentioned; it may or may not have been mentioned in *Egyptians* if that was the first play. In the younger generation, as in the younger generation at Troy (*Il.* 6.244–50), it is taken for granted that marriage will be monogamous.

(2) *Marriage as ownership.* When Pelasgus asks the Danaids why they are making supplication, they reply (335) 'That I may not become a slave (δμωΐς) to the sons of Aegyptus', and immediately afterwards (337) speak of their prospective husbands as 'owners' (τοὺς κεκτημένους). When the Egyptians arrive on the scene, it becomes clear that this was no exaggeration. They threaten the Danaids with all kinds of bodily violence (837–40, 847, 884, 904, 909), and there is reason to believe that they have brought with them fetters to chain the abductees during

[88] The fact that the Danaid–Aegyptiad marriages would be *between first cousins* would not in itself have been thought objectionable. Such marriages were common in classical Athens, and an Athenian could also lawfully marry his niece, or even his half-sister (if born of a different mother). The successful marriage of Hypermestra and Lynceus is a marriage of first cousins; the divine patrons of marriage, Zeus and Hera (cf. 1035), were full siblings; while Heaven and Earth, whose union is treated by Aphrodite (A. fr. 44) as fundamental to the whole order of nature, are son and mother (Hes. *Thg.* 126–8). Seaford (2012: 149–57, 318–21) argues that the Danaids object to marriage with close kin (endogamy) because it gave the wife no adequate safeguard against abuse (cf. 339), and notes that in classical Athens *epikleroi* married to their next of kin enjoyed very strong legal protection. But this protection did not extend to the many women married to close kinsmen who were not *epikleroi*. It is in any case very improbable that a law of this kind was promulgated by Aphrodite at the end of the Danaid trilogy (Seaford 2012: 320): it would be inappropriate to throw a dark cloud over the marriage of Hypermestra and Lynceus by implying that it risked becoming abusive, while any new marriages for the other Danaids would not be endogamous in any case.

[89] The corresponding (but quite different) listing in Hyginus *Fab.* 170 does not name the mothers.

the voyage back to Egypt (873n.). The Herald, when challenged by Pelasgus, says he has found, and is taking, 'my own lost property' (918) unless someone prevents this by asserting that the women are free (924n.) – making it plain that he, as agent of the Aegyptiads, is claiming them as slaves. This claim is apparently based (933n.) on their blood relationship: Pelasgus was right to suspect (387–91) that by Egyptian law a woman's closest kinsman was entitled to take her in marriage regardless of her or her father's wishes. Such a law would have analogues closer to home: under Athenian law, a woman whose father was dead, and who had no living brother (such a woman was known as an ἐπίκληρος), was required to marry the closest relative who chose to claim her.[90] But this Athenian practice was very different from the supposed Egyptian practice. At Athens it was impossible to claim a woman in marriage as of right if she had a father living, as the Danaids do; even after the father's death, she could be taken only in pursuance of a court order (ἐπιδικασία); and if after her marriage she was maltreated in any way, her husband (or anyone else who wronged her) could be prosecuted either by the *archon* or by any qualified citizen, and the penalty on conviction was unlimited.[91] None of these safeguards is available to the Danaids: if their cousins succeed in forcing them into marriage, they will be able to do with their wives as they please, and the wives will have no redress – unless they use force themselves.

(3) *Permanent virginity.* We have seen (in §§2 and 3) that certain utterances of Danaus and his daughters definitely imply, and others strongly suggest, that both desire that the girls shall remain permanently virgin. This was not only contrary to the norms of Greek society but might well be seen as contrary to the will of the gods. To be sure, three of the six major goddesses were virgins – Artemis (*Supp.* 144–53, 1030), Athena and Hestia; but none of them expected permanent virginity even of their own priestesses, and at least two of them had functions related to marriage and motherhood – Artemis, as the Danaids themselves mention, was a protector of women in childbirth (676–7), and at Athens the priestess of Athena Polias visited new brides wearing the aegis of the goddess (Suda αι60). To Aphrodite (1001, 1032–42), on the other hand, permanent virginity is anathema – and even Io could not escape her influence, passing through 'the land of Aphrodite, rich in wheat' (554–5) on her way to Egypt; while Io's enemy Hera, and her benefactor Zeus, are at one in their patronage of matrimony (cf.

[90] See MacDowell 1978: 95–8; Schaps 1979: 25–47; Todd 1993: 226–31; Ireland 2010: 6–11.

[91] Cf. Isaeus 3.62, Dem. 37.46. The penalty ('what he is to suffer or pay') would be fixed by the jury making a forced choice between prosecution and defence proposals; the prosecutor could propose any penalty up to and including death.