

Author(s): John Peradotto

Reviewed work(s): Aeschylus' "Supplikes": Play and Trilogy by A. F. Garvie

Source: *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 67, No. 1, (Oct. - Nov., 1971), pp. 85-87

Published by: The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.

Aeschylus' "Supplikes": play and trilogy, by A.F. GARVIE. New York: Cambridge University Press 1969. Pp. vii,279. \$11.50.

IN 1952 THE PUBLICATION of *Pap. Oxy.* 2256, fr. 3, containing a fragmentary *didascalia* of Aeschylus' Danaid tetralogy which appeared to date the *Supplikes* in the 460's, inflicted profound embarrassment upon Aeschylean scholarship. Earp summed up the sentiments of many of his colleagues when he said, "If we now consent to put [the *Supplikes*] late it makes all attempts to study literature futile" (*G & R* 22 [1953]). Some scholars, like die-hard Ptolemaists resisting Galileo's telescope, still refused to question the essentially genetic criteria that had issued in a judgment like Murray's in his *OCT* edition of Aeschylus (p. 2): "Fabula non multo post 01. LXX (500-497 A.C.) cum Aeschylus primum chorum obtinuit, certe ante Persas (497 A.C.) acta esse videtur."

Garvie, after a painstaking commentary on the papyrus fragment, discusses alternative explanations of it: that fragment 3 does not belong to the others grouped under 2256; that the Sophocles mentioned as second-prize winner is not the great tragedian; that the *Supplikes* does not necessarily belong to the same tetralogy as the *Danaides* and *Amymone* named in the fragment; that the hopeless confusion of three lines of the fragment makes the rest of it suspicious; that it refers to one of those posthumous revivals of Aeschylus' plays mentioned by Philostratus (*V.A.* 6.11) and in the *Vita*; that it refers to a late performance of an early composition. All but the last two are easily dismissed. That these are not impossible hypotheses leads Garvie to the more fundamental question of the genetic criteria of dating by style, content, and historical allusion used in concluding to an early date. To each of these three he devotes a chapter.

Under the heading of style Garvie rightly cautions against inflated expectations. Only for Plato among Classical authors has dating on stylistic grounds yielded satisfactory results, mainly because we possess all thirty of his dialogues, and these written over a period of some fifty years, while of Aeschylus' output only seven plays survive, one undated and of disputed authenticity, three from 458, and all that are dated falling within a mere fourteen-year period. Even if we had more and from a larger span of time, consistent straightforward development of style would be surprising. Despite its improbabilities Garvie assumes the possibility of the "straight-line" theory to determine if, and to what extent,

the *Supplikes* is in fact stylistically distant from the other plays. In the exhaustive survey which follows, he bombards the reader with statistics on such matters as spoken and choral metrics, characteristic words, idioms, and expressions, the *δῆλος* so traditionally associated with Aeschylus, imagery, ring-composition, sentence structure, and points of grammar and syntax. He concludes that, even on the shaky basis of style alone, dating the *Supplikes* as early as the 490's or 480's would not be consistent with the evidence. Barring the *Pt.*, two broad groups can be distinguished: the *Oresteia* as against the three earlier plays. "And just as with the Platonic Dialogues," Garvie observes, "it is by no means easy to settle the order of composition within each group, so with Aeschylus it is impossible on stylistic grounds alone to settle the order of composition of *Supplikes*, *Persae* and *Septem*, while even within the trilogy itself there are considerable differences of style" (p. 85 f.).

In chapter 3 Garvie takes up the matter of dramatic structure, which, prior to the discovery of the papyrus, had appeared even more than style to serve the argument of the early daters. The chorus as virtual protagonist, the heavy predominance of lyrics over spoken passages, and seemingly amateurish use of the second actor were all thought to be signs of primitive drama closer in spirit to Thespis than to the *Oresteia*. Once again Garvie discounts the straight-line theory of development, but allows it in order to reassess the extent to which our evidence for the origins of tragedy and for the work of Aeschylus' predecessors permits us to classify the structure of the *Supplikes* as archaic. Even apart from its function in the argument on the *Supplikes*, this part of Garvie's study is surely one of the finest surveys of this thoroughly complicated problem and the extensive bibliography on it. Even though on the basis of the evidence he considers it reasonably established that tragedy originated in some sort of performance by chorus alone, over which actors only gradually prevailed, he still insists that choral lyric, pre-tragic or tragic, is not inherently dramatic and that the least of its functions is to be a character in the action. If a chorus does participate in the action, or, even more, if, like the chorus of the *Supplikes*, it is itself the protagonist, it must surely be a late development. The unparalleled dramatic role played by this chorus further accounts for the curtailment of dramatic interest in the role of Danaus, who provides, as Garvie observes, "a contrast of mood . . . that so often is provided by the stasima of the chorus," and whose stylized and

archaic speeches, loaded with proverbs and *γνώμαι*, remind one of the platitudinous temper of normal tragic choruses. Garvie also cites two other morphologically younger elements in the *Supplices* not yet present in the *Persae* or *Septem*: the presentation of inner conflict, here in Pelasgus,¹ and the *agon* between two opposed and hostile parties, here in the confrontation between the Danaids and their enemy and in the quarrel between Pelasgus and the herald. In the long run it is not the *Supplices* but the more static *Persae* that shows the earmarks of what seems to have been the early norm for tragedy: a messenger who brings news about the main character; an anonymous chorus which comments, questions, laments; a main character who arrives on the scene later.

As for purported allusions within the play to contemporary events, Garvie concludes in chapter 4 that there is simply no reliable internal evidence, political or otherwise, for dating the play. He treats a number of theories here, ranging from the merely possible (as that Pelasgus' anachronistic constitutional monarchy means democracy in Argos at the time of the play) to the nearly preposterous (as that the simpler, less fabulous version of Io's wanderings in the *Supplices* proves its chronological priority to the *Pv*). After rebutting these with perhaps more courtesy than many of them deserve, he submits that at most a date in the 460's is implied, "the only period in which we know for certain that there was a climate of opinion at Athens favourable to Argos."

The matter of dating now settled, Garvie devotes a final chapter to the examination of all the evidence on which reconstructions of the Danaid trilogy have been based. After listing the sources for the myth and recording the variants, he stresses the enormous disagreement among them on practically every detail. Neither comparative mythology, nor the work of other authors, early or late, or Prometheus' prophecy concerning the fate of the Danaids at *Pv* 853 f. offers any solid ground for a reconstruction. Even hints of the future which

one may find in the *Supplices* itself are rather few and indeterminate, e.g., the likelihood of conflict between Egyptians and Argives in the second play (or between the first and second), and of the coerced marriage of the Danaids to the sons of Aegyptus. Garvie accepts little more than that *Αιγύπτιοι* (not *θαλαμοποιόι*) was the title of the second play, and that it dealt with the events leading up to the murder of the sons of Aegyptus. M.L. Cunningham's attribution of *Par. Oxy.* 2251 to the *Αιγύπτιοι* (which would make the chorus female) he finds doubtful, and rejects elaborate reconstructions, like Tittler's and Stoessl's, as wholly gratuitous.

The final play, Garvie concludes, was entitled *Δαναίδες*, even if this name may have doubled as a designation for the whole trilogy. Reconstructing this play is more difficult than reconstructing the *Αιγύπτιοι* since it touches more closely the hypothetical meaning of the whole trilogy. Garvie takes us through all the proposed resolutions of the trilogy and finds their substantiation flimsy. If the *Αιγύπτιοι* led up to the murder of the Danaids' husbands, then the consequences of that murder must have had a place in the final play, and it is probable that Hypermestra's fate was dealt with. But what was her motive for sparing Lynceus: maternal instinct or sexual passion (*μίαν δὲ παίδων ἴμερος θέλει*, *Pv* 865)? Was she right and her sisters wrong, or *vice versa*? Was there a trial? If so, whose? And the most crucial question: Why were the Danaids resisting marriage to Aegyptus' sons? Were they justified to do so? What does *αὐτογενεῖ φυξανορία* (*Supp.* 8) mean? A systematic scrutiny of the evidence and arguments leads Garvie to deny that these and related questions can be answered at all. All we can say is what frag. 44N² allows: "Somewhere in the *Δαναίδες* Aphrodite appears and makes a speech praising the power of *ἔρως*" (p. 233).

That kind of conclusion, and the earlier one involving date, may perhaps strike some readers as meager gains for 233 pages of close argument. But this book is much more than that. It is a complete critical history of the questions one may ask about the *Supplices*. In the way that Garvie's argument takes us like a machete through thickets of conjecture,

¹ Garvie follows Lesky (*JHS* 86, 79 f.) in seeing a close parallel between the situation of Pelasgus and that of Agamemnon in the parodos of that play. This, I think, is debatable. I have argued elsewhere (*Phoenix* 23, 237 f.) that there is a considerable difference between honoring a suppliant at one's peril and avenging a violation of hospitality at one's peril. Zeus clearly *obliges* the first; he supports, but does not, so far as our evidence goes, oblige the second. Orestes and Pelasgus are closer parallels, while Agamemnon falls more easily into a class with Xerxes.

² Garvie rightly concludes that we must look for their motivation in their character rather than in presumed obedience to any social, moral or political principle. He might have cited the *Oresteia*, where the different characters of Agamemnon, Clytemnestra, and Orestes are more important in assessing their motivation than the relative moral gravity of child-killing, husband-killing, and parent-killing.

it implicitly constitutes perhaps a more important statement about methodology in Classical studies than about the date of the *Supplices*. What Garvie says about the papyrus fragment is true of his own book: "If it makes us turn . . . to the study of each play for its own sake, if it allows us to see the earlier plays not just as steps towards the perfection of the *Oresteia*, and Aeschylus himself not just a stage in the direction of Sophocles, its service to Aeschylean scholarship will be out of all proportion to its size" (p. 140).³

JOHN PERADOTTO

State University of New York at Buffalo

The outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, by DONALD KAGAN. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1969. Pp.xvi,420. \$10.00.

UNLIKE PROFESSOR KAGAN'S *The great dialogue*, this big book on a complex subject is not written primarily for a layman. It is laced with Greek quotations and topped by a learned bibliography, an index of sources, and eleven appendixes. Its purpose is to make a scholarly detailed contribution to the study of the origins, remote and proximate, of the Peloponnesian War.

But this is pretty well-trodden territory, as Kagan points out, and the footprints of giants like Grote, Beloch, Busolt, and Meyer are still to be seen. Much new evidence, however, has come to light since they wrote, chiefly in the form of Attic inscriptions; and the work of Gomme, the authors of *The Athenian tribute lists*, and Mme. de Romilly has transformed the study of Thucydides: "It therefore seems desirable to treat the questions once again in a thorough and detailed manner, taking account of the new epigraphical evidence and the great mass of modern scholarship" (p. vii). In his preface and at frequent intervals throughout the book Kagan also stresses a theme which pervades his other work: the close interaction of domestic politics and foreign policy. Finally, "as a historian" Kagan is often struck by parallels

between the Peloponnesian War and other, more recent, events and situations, especially those before the First World War. He invites the reader to judge for himself whether or not the latter can illuminate the former.

Kagan has tried to take into account the mass of modern scholarship on his subject and, since in a work of this scale some omissions are inevitable, I list at the end of this review only those which seem crucial.

On the epigraphic side, however, all is not well. Most of the important stones are brought into the argument but they are treated in a very curious manner. Although pitifully few Attic inscriptions of the fifth century are intact and despite the fact that there are major disagreements about how they should be restored, Kagan presents the reader with translated "quotations" from these documents as if all the text were there in every case. Thus on p. 117-118 there are full paragraphs from the Kleinias and Kolophon decrees that are printed in the same way as a paragraph of Plutarch, although on the first inscription less than half the letters in each line have survived, and in the Kolophon decree the highest survival rate is twelve out of thirty-nine letters in line 45! Square brackets, which appear in Kagan's translation of the Strasbourg papyrus on p. 115-116, should also have been used for the inscriptions, and this is no mere quibble over epigraphic conventions since the restored contents of these texts play a substantial role in Kagan's interpretation of Athenian imperialism.

When Kagan quotes in Greek from a document, there are other, if related, problems. On p. 382 he reproduces the Merritt/Wade-Gery text of lines 5-10 of the "Papyrus decree" but the eleven letters which these scholars printed with dots to indicate their uncertainty appear in Kagan's version as certain. Again, this is no pedantic matter since in two of the five lines the uncertain letters are from the beginning of crucial words on which the immediately following restorations depend.¹

Kagan's treatment of the documentary sources raises an important point in historical method. For the dating and the content of the inscriptions, which form a large proportion of his primary evidence, the author appears to be almost completely dependent on the conclusions of others. We all build, of course, on the work of our predecessors and colleagues, and it is not reasonable to expect an historian

³ Errata/corrections: p. 62 γνωσθείσαν/γνωσθείσαι; p. 74 σεσωφρονισμένας/σεσωφρονισμένως; p. 101, n. 1 dityramb/dithyramb; p. 127, line 13 is/in; p. 177 περί/περί; p. 232 πλῆγῆι/πληγῆι. Also on p. 232, line 17 of Gigante's restoration of Heidelberg Papyrus 186 is missing.

¹ In his treatment of this document Kagan fails to take account of the important paper of R. Sealey, *Hermes* 86 (1958) 440-446, who showed that, even if one accepts the Merritt/Wade-Gery readings, it is still possible to suggest radically different restorations.