THE VOCABULARY OF *PROMETHEUS BOUND*

I

Introduction

A few years ago, as part of an investigation of the authenticity of *Prometheus Bound*, I published figures for the occurrence of non-Aeschylean words in that play, as compared with two undisputedly Aeschylean plays (*Th.*, *Pers.*) and with one Sophoclean play (*Aj.*).[1] The figures showed that *Prom.* contained a greater number of words not found elsewhere in the surviving plays of Aeschylus (*Eigenwörter*);[2] and also that, like Soph. *Aj.*, but unlike the six undisputed plays of Aeschylus, it contained a relatively large number of *Eigenwörter* that occur more than once in the play, some of them quite common and familiar words. The discrepancy between *Prom.* and the two Aeschylean plays chosen for comparison was quite marked; and the high rate of repeated *Eigenwörter* for Soph. *Aj.* seemed to confirm that this criterion might be a good one for distinguishing unAeschylean characteristics in a non-Aeschylean play. But the sample was very small, and I was conscious that the criterion (or the particular application of it) was somewhat arbitrary; I was therefore not very confident of the value of my findings.

In the present article I provide a supplement to my previous figures, in the form of a study of Aesch. *Ag.*, Soph. *OT*, and Eur. *Med.*[3] As will be seen, these new figures confirm quite strikingly the validity of the old, and suggest that we really do have here some tangible evidence against the authenticity of *Prom.*[4]

Methods

The method used in compiling the lists of *Eigenwörter* for these three plays has been the same as that described in detail in my previous study.[5] Only the first 1100 lines of the three plays were examined, so that the sample would be of the same size as *Pers.*, *Th.*, and *Prom.* (Likewise, only *Aj.* 1–1090 had been examined.) In the case of *Ag.*, the 'Aeschylean corpus' against which it was measured was taken to be the other five plays, plus *Prom.*, plus *Ag.* 1101–1685.[6] For *OT* and *Med.*, the 'Aeschylean corpus'

---

[1] *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge, 1977), 157–72, 269–87 (henceforth *Authenticity*).

[2] The term is borrowed from F. Niedzballa, *De copia verborum et elocutione Promethei Vincti* (diss. Breslau, 1913) and W. Schmid, *Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus* (*Tüb. Beitr.* 9, 1929), 41–50; for discussion of their findings and criticism of their methods, see *Authenticity* 157–60, 269–71. Neither of them looked at any Sophoclean or Euripidean plays for comparison.

[3] Schmid's investigations (op. cit. 41–50) appear to show that, after *Pers.* and *Th.*, *Ag.* is likely to offer the highest rate of *Eigenwörter*, whereas *Supp.*, *Cho.*, and *Eum.* appear markedly lower (cf. *Authenticity* 167). *OT* and *Med.* were chosen because they are probably both relatively early (i.e. not later than 425 B.C.).

[4] Reviewers of *Authenticity* have not commented on the validity or value of the figures for *Eigenwörter*; nor have I seen any further investigation by anyone else along these lines. Hence my reluctant return to the subject here. The greater part of the labours of identifying and collecting the *Eigenwörter* in these three plays was performed by two research students, Andrea Shankman and Costas Yialoucas; I am most grateful to them for their help.

[5] *Authenticity* 161–4.

[6] It may seem perverse thus to divide *Ag.*, taking the first part as potentially nonAeschylean, and measuring it against an 'Aeschylean' second part. (The effect will be, if anything, to reduce slightly the number of *Eigenwörter*, since words are naturally liable to be repeated within the

was taken to be simply the six undisputed plays. Thus all three plays were measured against a corpus of almost exactly the same size. As in my previous study, occurrences of words in Aeschylean fragments were ignored.[7] The texts on which the figures are based are Gilbert Murray's OCT for Aeschylus, A. C. Pearson's OCT for Sophocles, Murray's OCT for Euripides; the evaluation of whether a word was indeed an *Eigenwort* (i.e. whether or not it was found to occur in the Aeschylean corpus) was based on Italie's *Index Aeschyleus*, with further reference to the OCTs of Murray and Page.[8]

Once again, I listed first all the *Eigenwörter*, and compiled figures, with and without proper names; then all repeated *Eigenwörter*, with and without proper names. Then I marked with an asterisk those repeated *Eigenwörter* whose occurrences all fell within a span of 100 lines,[9] and with a dagger all those whose repetition was due merely to lyric refrain or ritual anaphora. Then, in compiling my third category of 'significant *Eigenwörter*',[10] I eliminated first all proper names and all words marked with asterisk or dagger; and from the remaining list, I then removed those 'whose occurrence is due solely to their specialized sense...etc.',[11] and thus arrived at my final list of 'significant words' for each play: i.e. words which are used at least twice in the play's 1100 lines, more than 100 lines apart, but not found in the Aeschylean corpus (as defined above). Then, finally, I listed all those significant words which occur three times or more.

Results

The results of this process are given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Eigenwörter and 'significant' words (new figures)*

	Aeschylus *Ag.* 1–1098	Sophocles *OT* 1–1098	Euripides *Med.* 1–1090
Total no. of *Eigenwörter*	533	388	340
minus proper names	501	364	317
Repeated *Eigenwörter*	41	67	67
minus proper names	36	57	62
'Significant' words	15	41	42
occurring more than twice	5	16	17

Two features immediately spring to the eye. First, *Ag.* contains a much larger total of *Eigenwörter* than the other two plays. At first sight this might seem surprising, seeing that *Ag.* is a work of Aeschylus, and might therefore be expected to have fewer 'unAeschylean' words than the other plays. But a high proportion of the *Eigenwörter* in *Ag.* are rare and elevated words characteristic of Aeschylean *onkos*, some of them

same play.) But this seems preferable to measuring *Ag.* 1–1100 against a substantially smaller 'corpus' (*Pers., Th., Supp., Cho., Eum., Prom.*, i.e. six short plays) than any of the other plays (all of which were measured against five plus the much longer *Ag.*). In any case, the presence of *Prom.* in that 'corpus' will tend to work in the opposite direction, since the play appears, in vocabulary as in other respects, to be distinctly unAeschylean.

[7] See *Authenticity* 160–1, 269–71. Once again, I should make clear that I do not pretend that we can define 'Aeschylus' vocabulary' in any useful sense. I am merely isolating a large sample body of Aeschylean work against which to measure each of our chosen plays. The discovery tomorrow of a new Aeschylean play would immediately increase attested Aeschylean vocabulary by several hundred words; but it would not necessarily diminish the validity of this test.

[8] See further *Authenticity* 161–4.   [9] *Authenticity* 163, with n. 47.

[10] *Authenticity* 163–4, 167–71.   [11] *Authenticity* 163; cf. 167–8.

indeed *hapax legomena* (as a quick examination of the list of *Eigenwörter* will confirm).[12]

The second striking feature might not so easily have been predicted: both *OT* and *Med.* contain markedly more repeated *Eigenwörter* than *Ag.*, even though their *Eigenwörter* overall are fewer; and when the lists of repeated *Eigenwörter* are combed, and reduced to 'significant' words, the discrepancy is even more remarkable. Whereas *Ag.* has only a few (15) words that recur in this play but nowhere else in the Aeschylean corpus, and that are not particularly specialized in sense, *OT* and *Med.* have almost three times as many (41, 42). Lest it be suspected that the selection of 'significant' words may have been biased or inconsistent, I list here all the repeated *Eigenwörter* from the three plays, so that the reader may judge for himself whether every word that I have excluded as 'too specialized' in sense has indeed been properly so identified.

'*Significant words*' *in* Ag. (parentheses indicate number of occurrences): ἀκέλευστος (2), ἐκβαίνω (2), ἑρμηνεύς (2), ἔτος (2), καίω (2), νήνεμος (2), οἷόσπερ (2), προτέλεια (3), προφέρω (2), σίνος (3), σύμβολον (3), φάσμα (3), φθορά (2), φυλλάς (2), ψύθος (3).

Other repeated Eigenwörter in Ag. *that have been excluded* (because they are *either* proper names, *or* (†) occur only in ritual or refrain, *or* (*) occur only within a span of 100 lines): ἀγυιάτης†*, αἴλινον†*, αἶπος*, Ἀλέξανδρος, ἄπλοια*, Ἀχαικός, δίθρονος*, Ἰδαῖος, Ἴδη, Κάλχας, λέπας*, νεαίρετος*, ὅδιος*, πολύθρηνος*, πορφύρα*, σύμφυτος*, φιλόμαστος*.

Potentially '*significant*' *words in* Ag. (excluded because of their specialized sense):[13] ἀπήνη (2), δέκατος (2), εὐάγγελος (5), κλοπή (2), πολυκτόνος (2), πτολιπόρθης (2), τράπεζα (2), φρυκτός (3), φρυκτωρία (2).

Of these, perhaps four could easily have been included amongst the 'significant' words (δέκατος, εὐάγγελος, πολυκτόνος, τράπεζα); but in turn, three or four of those classed 'significant' might be regarded by others as too specialized (e.g. νήνεμος, προτέλεια, φυλλάς).[14] So the rough figures are not open to serious dispute.

By contrast, of the 67 repeated *Eigenwörter* of *OT*, no less than 41 qualify as 'significant'; and of the 67 of *Med.*, 42. Once again, the full lists of words follow:

'*Significant words*' *in* S. OT: ἄδηλος (3), ἀλέξω (2), ἀπωθέω (3), ἄρρητος (3), ἀρτίως (7), δῆλος (2), διεῖπον (2), διορίζω (2), ἐκτρίβω (2), ἐκφαίνω (3), ἐκφύω (5), ἐντρέπω (2), ἐξευρίσκω (2), ἐπίκλημα (2), ἔρομαι (2), εὐλαβέομαι (2), ζητέω (5), ἰσόω (2), καίτοι (2), λάθρᾳ (3), μαντεία (3), μῶρος (3), νοσέω (6), ὁδοιπορέω (2), ὁθούνεκα (2), ὀκνέω (6), πέρα (2), πέτομαι (2), πλούσιος (2), πορεύομαι (3), προδείκνυμι (2), προθυμία (2), προσαρκέω (2), προφαίνω (3), ῥᾳδίως (2), σαλεύω (2), συμμετρέω (2), συναλλαγή (2), τανῦν (4), φυτεύω (4), ὠθέω (2).

Other repeated Eigenwörter in OT (excluded as proper names or as above (*)): ἀμαξιτός*, ἀνορθόω*, βάσανος*, δυσφόρως*, ἐκστέφω*, ἔξοιδα*, Ἰοκάστη, Κορίνθιος, Κόρινθος, Λαβδακίδης, Μενοικεύς, Μερόπη, Ὄλυμπος, ὀργίζω*, Πόλυβος, Πυθώδε, σιωπάω*, σύμπας*, σύμφημι*, Τειρεσίας, τιμωρέω*, τυφλός*.

---

[12] To save space, time and money, I have not listed here all the actual *Eigenwörter* from these three plays. But I should be happy to supply copies of my lists to any scholar who might be interested.

[13] Here the degree of subjectivity is necessarily greater, and opinions may vary, but it is clear that the overall numbers would not be substantially different; see *Authenticity* 167-8, with nn.

[14] But in all three cases, at least one of the occurrences of the word is in a metaphor – which might have been used again elsewhere.

Potentially 'significant' words in OT (excluded because of their specialized sense): ἄρθρον (2), λῃστής (5), ποίμνιον (2), ὑπερπίμπλημι (2).[15]

'*Significant words' in E.* Med.: αἰσθάνομαι (3), ἀλγηδών (3), ἀλγίων/ἄλγιστος (2), ἅμιλλα (3), ἀποστέλλω (2), ἀποστροφή (2), ἀραρίσκω (3), ἀρετή (2), βασιλικός (2), δαί (2), ἐκπίπτω (4), ἐξελαύνω (3), ἐξευρίσκω (2), ἐρευνάω (2), εὐδαιμονέω (3), εὕρημα (2), ἡνίκα (2), ἡσυχαῖος (2), ἱκετεύω (3), καθυβρίζω (2), καλλίνικος (2), κατοικέω (2), κηδεύω (2), λίαν (4), λυπέω (4), μακάριος (2), μεθορμίζω (2), νεωστί (2), ὀνίνημι (3), πορεύω (3), πρόθυμος (3), προσλέγω (3), προτίθημι (2), σκαιός (2), σοφία (3), συγγνωστός (2), συγχέω (2), συνεργός (2), συντήκω (2), χόλος (5), χρίω (2), ὠθέω (3).

Other repeated Eigenwörter in Med. (excluded as proper names or (*)): ἀσθενής*, ἐξαμαρτάνω*, ἐφέλκω*, Ἰάσων, Ἰωλκία, κατάρατος*, κνίζω*, Κορίνθιος, Μήδεια, Μελίας, προσάντης*, στέφανος*, σύμφορος*, τεχνάομαι*, φυτεύω*.

Potentially 'significant' words (excluded because of their specialized sense): ἄσυλος (2), αὐθάδης (2), αὐθαδία (2), δέρας (2), δεσπότις (3), κακόνυμφος (2), κάλως (2), νυμφεύω (2), πάγχρυσος (2), (ἡ) τύραννος (2).[16].

These figures turn out to correspond quite closely with those for the plays previously studied, as Table 2 shows:

Table 2. *Eigenwörter and 'significant' words (combined figures)*

	Aeschylus				Sophocles		Euri-pides
	Pers.	Th.	Ag.	Prom.	Aj.	OT	Med.
Eigenwörter	610	516	533	690	506	388	340
minus proper names	483	469	501	653	479	364	317
Repeated Eigenwörter	86	66	41	105	64	67	67
minus proper names	50[17]	52	36	96	56	57	62
'Significant' words	20	14	15	67	40	41	42
occurring more than twice	5	2	5	28	11	16	17

Conclusions

The findings of the previous study are confirmed:

(*a*) *Prom.* contains many more *Eigenwörter* than we would expect from a play of Aeschylus, especially if we exclude proper names.

(*b*) *Prom.* also contains a far larger number of repeated *Eigenwörter*, and of 'significant' words, than any of the undisputed plays – indeed substantially more 'significant' words than the plays of Sophocles and Euripides used for comparison.

Judged by this criterion, the vocabulary of *Prom.* must be considered quite unAeschylean.

[15] Of these, only λῃστής is really a clear-cut case. Others might exclude e.g. μαντεία, ὁδοιπορέω.

[16] For αὐθάδης (a borderline case), see *Authenticity* 168 and n. 66. One might exclude also συντήκω, χρίω.

[17] *Persians* has an extraordinary number of proper names (*Authenticity* 166); one of these, Ἀθῆναι, occurring eight times, is counted as significant, since it could so easily have been used e.g. in *Eum.*

II

In a recent article (*CQ* 33 [1983], 1–5), Everard Flintoff has argued that several clear allusions to *Prom.* can be seen in *The Frogs*, and that Aristophanes regarded the play as undoubtedly, indeed quintessentially, Aeschylean.[18] Flintoff concludes that there 'cannot...be any serious doubt that Aristophanes was drawing upon *Prom.* as much as other Aeschylean plays – actually rather more', and describes his case as 'decisive' (pp. 4, 5).

Obviously, once it is granted that an Athenian dramatist and literary connoisseur in the generation after Aeschylus' death 'regarded *Prom.* not merely as part of the Aeschylean corpus, but as one of its most important parts', discussion of authenticity should cease forthwith: we should be fools to think that we knew better than Aristophanes. That *Prom.* was known to him has long been recognized: *Knights* (424 B.C.) and *Birds* (415 B.C.) both contain almost certain allusions.[19] But in neither play does Aristophanes give any indication as to whether or not *Prom.* is Aeschylean. The important novelty in Flintoff's argument is that he finds 'undoubted borrowing' from *Prom.* in contexts where Aristophanes is explicitly talking about Aeschylus, namely *Frogs* 837–8, 928–9, 1020, plus possible further allusions at *Clouds* 1367, *Frogs* 804/816, 821, 939–40 (he might have added *Frogs* 730, cf. *Prom.* 438?). His case is interesting, but by no means as clear-cut as he suggests.

For specific allusion, echo, or parody by author *y* of a passage from author *x* to be securely identified, we must be satisfied both that distinct verbal and/or contextual similarities between the two passages exist, and that no other, more likely, source than *x* may account for the word, phrase, or passage in *y*. In the case of Aristophanes' numerous tragic allusions and parodies, we are of course at a great disadvantage, inasmuch as we possess such a tiny fraction of fifth-century tragedy (roughly one tenth of Aeschylus' output, one fifteenth of Sophocles', one fifth of Euripides'; virtually nothing from the scores of other tragedians, unless *Rhesus* or *Prom.* is judged spurious); worse still, we have precious little contemporary prose which we can use as a criterion of normal Attic phraseology (only the Old Oligarch, Herodotus, some of the Hippocratic writings, Thucydides, some early oratory, and scraps of presocratic science and philosophy). In many cases, a faint echo between extant works may be interpreted by zealous modern readers as direct imitation, whereas to the original authors and audience the echo would not be noticed at all, or be drowned by other, far more obvious echoes from passages now lost to us. So we must take every precaution to check our subjective reactions ('*y* reminds me of *x*') against all available comparative material ('Are there more probable and economical ways – including chance – of explaining the apparent echoes?').

Throughout the *Frogs*, and at *Clouds* 1367, Aristophanes' characters are practising literary criticism, of a kind. By the late fifth century, a large and growing, semi-technical

---

[18] See Flintoff n. 1 for references to previous scholarship on Aeschylean echoes in Aristophanes. Of these, the most important, H. T. Becker, *Aisch. in der gr. Komödie* (Darmstadt, 1914), was written before the authenticity question had surfaced.

[19] *Birds* 685 ff. ~ *Prom.* 547 ff.; *Knights* 758 ~ *Prom.* 59, 308, *Knights* 836 ~ *Prom.* 613. Flintoff adds *Knights* 924 ~ *Prom.* 365; but the mere coincidence of the word ἱπούμενος is insufficient in itself to establish a connection, when context and language are in other respects so different. N.b. Pollux 7. 41 and 10. 155, with references to Archilochus (= fr. 235 West), Cratinus (= fr. 91 Kock), and other homely and appropriate sources; and especially Aristoph. *Plutus* 815 (?), and *Lys.* 291 ἐξιπόω. (*Prom.* 365 itself appears to be derived from Pind. *O.* 4. 8: see *Dionysiaca: Studies...Denys Page*, edd. R. D. Dawe etc. (Cambridge, 1978), 117–20, esp. 119.)

vocabulary for this already existed, thanks above all to the sophists, who emphasized analysis, interpretation, and criticism of the poets.[20] Aristophanes and the other comic playwrights were naturally quick to pick up on this vocabulary (as e.g. on the jargon of the scientists, in *Clouds*), sometimes mocking the new-fangled and over-elaborate terminology, sometimes borrowing it without qualms.[21] And even apart from such technical terms, it is clear that any educated man of this period who wished to characterize 'high' style (epic, lyric, or tragic) might talk of 'height', 'size', 'loudness', 'bombast', 'wildness', 'lack of control': terms which continue to be used right through Callimachus and the Greek rhetoricians to the Roman satirists and 'Longinus'.[22]

At *Clouds* 1367, Aeschylus is characterized as ψόφου πλέων, ἀξύστατον στόμφακα κρημνοποιόν. As Flintoff rightly notes (pp. 1-2) neither ψόφος nor στόμφαξ is found in the extant corpus of Aeschylus.[23] This in itself should suggest that no attempt is being made to reproduce 'the sort of verbiage with which people at that date associated the plays of Aeschylus',[24] and that it is therefore mistaken (and, as we shall see, unnecessary) to look too hard for Aeschylean allusions in ἀξύστατος or κρημνοποιός. In fact, συνίσταμαι, σύστασις are common in scientific and medical writers, and later in literary critics too.[25] Although ἀξύστατος (literally 'not holding together', 'incoherent') is not found before Aristophanes except at Aesch. *Ag.* 1467 ἀξύστατον ἄλγος, it seems already there to be used as a medical metaphor, i.e. to presuppose some familiarity with the term even as early as 458 B.C.[26] Nothing about the Aristophanic context is calculated to put us in mind of *Agamemnon*; it seems that the technical term is used without any intention of direct allusion.[27] Certainly its meaning here is quite different from its meaning in *Ag.* 1467, but in accordance with later literary critical practice.

[20] Plato, *Prot.* 338e-339a, 347b; further e.g. M. Pohlenz, 'Die Anfänge der gr. Poetik', *Akad. Gelehrt. Göttingen Nachr.* (1920), 142-78 (repr. in *Kl. Schr.*, Hildesheim, 1965), T. G. Rosenmeyer, 'Gorgias, Aeschylus and *apate*', *AJP* 76 (1955), 225-60, R. Harriott, *Poetry and criticism before Plato* [London, 1969], 92-104, 130-61); also n. 30 infra.

[21] See J. D. Denniston, 'Technical terms in Aristophanes', *CQ* 21 (1927), 113-21, C. T. Murphy, 'Ar. and the art of rhetoric', *HSCP* 49 (1938), 69-113, W. B. Sedgwick, '*The Frogs* and the audience', *C&M* 9 (1947), 1-9, as well as Pohlenz (supra n. 20). Of course, Aristophanes was not the first to introduce poetical discussions and contests to the comic stage: Pherecrates' *Krapataloi* and *Cheiron*, Cratinus' *Wineflask* and *Dionysalexandros*, Phrynichus' *Muses*, and titles such as *Hesiods*, *Homer*, *Sappho*, *Dramata*, *Poiesis* are recorded, as well as Aristophanes' own *Gerytades* and *Frogs*, all on literary themes.

[22] From the enormous literature, I should mention at least W. Rhys Roberts' editions (with useful glossaries) of Demetrius (Cambridge, 1902), Dionysius, *On Literary Composition* (London, 1910), and 'Longinus' (Cambridge, 1907); D. A. Russell's ed. of 'Longinus' (Oxford, 1964), xxx-xlii; F. Wehrli, 'Der erhabene und der schlichte Stil', in *Phyllobolia P. von der Mühll* (Basel, 1946), 9-34; C. O. Brink, 'Callimachus and Aristotle', *CQ* 40 (1946), 11-26, and *Horace on poetry* I (Cambridge, 1963); H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich, 1960), § 406, 1079. 3; A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (Heidelberg, 1965).

[23] ψόφος, ψοφέω are common words for non-verbal 'noise' (as early as *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 285, and not infrequently in Soph. and Eur.); for human speech, they are usually (always?) derogatory (as Soph. *Aj.* 1116, *Inachus* fr. 269c22 Radt, Eur. *Hks* 229, *Rhesus* 565); for later disparaging use in literary-critical context, see Callim. *Aetia* fr. 1. 19. στόμφαξ ('big-mouth'), στόμφος, στομφάζομαι, are rare and utterly unpoetical: see LSJ s.vv., and n.b. *Wasps* 721, 'Longinus' 3. 1, 32. 7.

[24] Nevertheless Flintoff argues for 'the imitation of [Aeschylean] tone' here.

[25] See K. J. Dover's n. *ad loc.*, LSJ s.vv. σύστασις B. II, συνίσταμαι IV and V (n.b. Parmenides fr. 4. 3-4, Emped. fr. 35. 6), and σύστημα.

[26] The interpretation is disputed. I am inclined to agree with Denniston-Page, Thomson, rather than Fraenkel; cf. A. Lebeck *The Oresteia* (Harvard, 1971), 86-91.

[27] So Denniston (supra n. 21), p. 119: 'technical jargon is being satirized'; cf. *Frogs* 1281 στάσιν μελῶν, and the heavily 'medical' 939-44.

Nor is there any reason to suppose that κρημνοποιός is intended to remind us of
Prom. 'Mountain' words, like other 'height' words (esp. ὑψηλός; cf. Homeric
ὑψαγόρης) are commonly used, in Greek as in English, to characterize 'high' style.
κρημνός is normal Greek for 'cliff' (found in Herodotus and Thucydides as well
as Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides); there is nothing distinctively
Aeschylean about it. (The rarer φάραγξ would much more effectively put one in mind
of *Prom.*, where it occurs four times.[28]) It is most unlikely that Aristophanes is here
making 'a striking allusion to [the] highly unconventional setting' of *Prom.*, any
more than at *Frogs* 929, where ἱππόκρημνος – an inflated and nonsensical word – is
vaguely 'Aeschylean' in its compound form, its 'horsey' (hence aristocratic-heroic)
beginning[29] and 'lofty' and 'rough' ending, but no particular echo can be intended. In
the case of κρημνοποιός, the suffix -ποιός provides further evidence that Aeschylus is
not being parodied, merely described. Words in -ποιός seem not to occur before the
fifth century; but then they catch on quickly. They are used primarily to denote two
kinds of activity, the second presumably derived from the first: (a) *manufacture*, and
(b) *literary creation*.[30] So we find (a) ἀγαλματοποιός (Hdt.), ἀνδριαντοποιός (Pind.),
Θαλαμοποιός (title of play by Aesch.), καρποποιός (Eur.), κελευθοποιός (Aesch.),
κρανοποιός (Aristoph.), λογχοποιός (Eur.), λοφοποιός (Aristoph.), λυχνοποιός
(Aristoph.), μαχαιροποιός (Aristoph.), ὀψοποιός (Hdt., etc.), σιτοποιός (Hdt.,
Thuc., Eur.), σκευοποιός (Aristoph.), φαρμακοποιός (Aesch. *Eleg.* 2 West), all of
these involving manufacture or production; and such terms lead naturally to further
formations such as αὐτοποιός (Soph.), γελωτοποιός (Aesch. fr. 180N, Xen.),
δολοποιός (Soph.), ἑλκοποιός (Aesch.), κακοποιός (Pind.), νεωτεροποιός (Thuc.),
οἰκοποιός (metaphorical, Soph. *Ph.* 32), χρηματοποιός (Aristoph.), ψηφοποιός
(Soph.) and also παιδοποιός (Hdt., Eur., etc.) and τεκνοποιός (Hdt.; cf. Aesch. *Ag.*
1207). The literary usage (b) is common: ἐποποιός, λογοποιός, μουσοποιός (Hdt.),
μελοποιός, τραγωιδοποιός (Aristoph.), ὑμνοποιός (Eur.), are followed in the fourth
century by διθυραμβοποιός, ἐλεγειοποιός, ἰαμβοποιός, κωμωιδοποιός, μυθοποιός;
and we should add Aristophanes' humorous coinings, πτωχοποιός, χωλοποιός (of
Euripides, 'creator of beggar-characters and cripple-characters'), and ἀγριοποιός
(*Frogs* 837, of Aeschylus, 'creator of wild-men'; contrast 901, 906 ἀστεῖος). On this
last word, Flintoff is misleading when he states (p. 3), 'Both ἀγριο- (*Pers.* 614 etc.)
and -ποιός (*Th.* 398) are found in the Aeschylean corpus'. Only the simplex, ἄγριος,
is found in Aeschylus (as it is found in most poets, from Homer on); and, as we have

---

[28] See Griffith, *Authenticity* (supra n. 1), 168, 284, and LSJ s.v. φάραγξ. Words suffixed in
-κρημνος are not common in any authors: according to C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse
Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago, 1940), 278, we find in the fifth century
ἀμφίκρημνος (Eur. *Ba.* 1051), ἀγχίκρημνος (Pind. fr. 82 Snell), ἀπόκρημνος (Hdt. three times,
Thuc.), βαθύκρημνος (Pind. *N.* 9. 40, *I.* 4. 56), πολύκρημνος (Bacch. 1. 121), plus *Prom.* 421
ὑψίκρημνος (also at Hom. *Epigr.* 6. 5), 5 ὑψηλόκρημνος, and Aristophanes' ἱππόκρημνος.

[29] See *Clouds* 60–74, and such Aristophanic fancies as ἱππόλοφος (*Frogs* 818, a variation on
Frogs 925 λόφους, 822 λοφιάς), ἱπποβάμων, ἱπποκάνθαρος, ἱππονώμας, ἱππαλεκτρύων (four
times – but no griffin or hippocamp, as in *Prom.*). So ἱπποβάμων (*Frogs* 821), which is found
in an unobtrusive context in *Prom.* (805), but also at Aesch. *Suppl.* 284, Soph. *Tr.* 1095, is unlikely
to be a specific allusion to any of those passages.

[30] The Greeks' use of terminology taken from crafts (weaving, carpentry, chariot-making,
pottery, etc.) and from sailing, riding, and driving, to describe the process of literary creation
and adaptation, is apparently inherited from Indo-European times: see R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und
Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1967), id. (ed.) *Indogermanische Dichter-
sprache* (Darmstadt, 1968), H. Maehler *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum*
(Hypomnemata 3, Göttingen, 1963), and L. Radermacher's ed. of *Frogs, passim.* The idea of the
poet as τεχνίτης and δημιουργός, which is as old as *Od.* 17. 382–6, underlies the whole
plot of *Frogs* (n.b. esp. 761 ff.). ποιητής = 'poet' is first found in Herodotus.

seen, -ποιός words can hardly be said or implied to be characteristically Aeschylean (if anything, they are characteristic of Herodotus and of Aristophanes himself, whom we find using such words some dozen times).

So the first two of the three ponderous, rolling words that fill up the line at *Frogs* 837 are not specifically Aeschylean. But what about the third, αὐθαδόστομον? Here the claim, not just of Aeschylean parody, but of direct allusion to *Prom.*, might seem stronger. It is well known that the formations αὐθάδης, αὐθαδία, αὐθάδισμα are strikingly frequent in *Prom.*, as are formations in -στομος (αἰολόστομος, ὀξύστομος (twice), σεμνόστομος; plus ἐλευθεροστομέω). Both sets of terms may indeed be called 'salient features' of the play (Flintoff, p. 3); but on closer inspection it becomes clear that neither is characteristic of Aeschylus in general, outside *Prom.* Words in -στομος, -στομέω, which are not particularly common in Aeschylus, are found also in several other authors, describing those whose style of speaking is under criticism – as at *Frogs* 837.[31] Likewise, αὐθάδης, αὐθαδία, κτλ. (which occur nowhere in Aeschylus outside *Prom.*) recur in several fifth-century contexts that show no sign of being influenced by *Prom.*, to describe headstrong and self-assertive individuals;[32] by the time of *Frogs* (and Plato's *Apology*, a few years later; cf. 34c–d), the words are in common parlance, and they are used in ethical and literary-critical writings for centuries to come.[33] It is unlikely, to say the least, that the words were coined first for *Prom.* (Flintoff, p. 3), and unlikely too that Aristophanes was the first to use them of literary style. His own usage at *Thesm.* 704 (this time in a Euripidean context!) and at *Lys.* 1116 should rule out the possibility that he expected such words to smack of *Prom.*, or indeed of high tragedy at all.

So, although the line (837) does undoubtedly suggest vaguely Aeschylean rhythm and style (3-word trimeter, compound adjectives), it cannot be said to parody any particular passage, nor to suggest any particular play. (If the intention had been to reproduce or exaggerate Aeschylean diction here, surely a loftier first word than ἄνθρωπον could have been found?) ἀγριοποιόν, αὐθαδόστομον sound more modern and technical than Aeschylean; and the rest of 836–9 can hardly be felt to sound much like the old tragedian: 838 has three ἀ- privatives and three resolutions – much more Euripidean than Aeschylean[34] – and 839 is made up of two monstrous words, few of whose component parts sound like Aeschylus at all, ἀπεριλάλητον κομποφακελορρήμονα. Nevertheless, Flintoff does argue that in 838 both ἀχάλινον and ἀκρατές are chosen in imitation of *Prom.*: 'ἀχάλινος is not found in Aeschylus [he does not mention that it is found twice in Euripides], but χαλινός is one of his favourite words...' (p. 3). In fact, though, four of Aeschylus' instances are straightforwardly literal and count for nothing (*Pers.* 196, *Th.* 123, 207, 393): they are no more

---

[31] See Buck and Petersen (supra n. 28) 199. Apart from *Prom.*, there are only four occurrences of such words in all Aeschylus: θρασύστομος (*Ag.*, *Th.*, and also Eur. fr. 3), στενόστομος (fr. 108N, satyric), χαλκόστομος (*Pers.*), plus the verbs εὐστομέω, θρασυστομέω, both found also in Soph. and Eur. In Sophocles we find ἄστομος (twice), ἑπτάστομος, δίστομος (twice), ἀμφίστομος, χαλκόστομος, ἀθυρόστομος, διχόστομος, εὔστομος; also κακοστομέω; in Euripides, ἑπτάστομος (three times), δίστομος (twice), ἑκατόστομος, θρασύστομος, ὀξύστομος; also ἐλευθεροστομέω (as in *Prom.*). N.b. too Herodotus ἀμφίστομος, εὔστομος, πεντάστομος, and [Homer] *Batram.* 295 ψαλιδόστομος. Aristophanes himself calls Euripides στοματουργός at *Frogs* 826; and see n. 36.

[32] N.b. especially Soph. *Ant.* 1028 (also 875 αὐτογνωτὸς ὀργά), *OT* 549, Eur. *Med.* 104, 223, 621, 1028, *El.* 1117, *Hks* 1243, etc.; and Hdt. 6. 92, Hippocr. *Airs* 24. 60 (where n.b. too ἄγριος).

[33] 'Longinus' 22. 3 (of Thucydides' style), Dion. Hal. *De comp. verb.* 22 (p. 228. 9 in Rhys Roberts' ed.; also of Thuc.), Dio Chrys. 52. 4; cf. Aristotle, Theophrastus, Xenophon etc. (of personalities); also Denniston (supra n. 21) 115.

[34] See W. B. Stanford's n. *ad loc.*

characteristic of Aeschylus than of other poets who have to speak of horses (including Sophocles and Euripides). More striking are *Ag.* 1066, an equine simile, and especially *Ag.* 238, a vivid metaphor of gagging a human mouth. The two occurrences in *Prom.* are less bold than *Ag.* 238: 672 is similar to *Ag.* 1066, and e.g. to Eur. fr. 463. 2, fr. 821. 4; whereas 562 χαλινοῖς ἐν πετρίνοισιν is indeed a 'powerful phrase', but bears no resemblance of language or context to *Frogs* 838, where, as at *Ag.* 238, it is unbridled *mouths* that are in question.[35] Here again, allusion may be discounted – especially since Aristophanes has already used χαλινούς a few lines earlier (826 f.) with reference to the tongue of Euripides.

What of ἀκρατές, 'a word which was anything but common in literary contexts during the 5th century [and] only found in the whole Aeschylean corpus...at *Prom.* 884...γλώσσης ἀκρατής' (Flintoff, p. 3)? The word is in fact found in Sophocles and Euripides (and cf. ἀκράτωρ, Soph. *Ph.* 486); but, more important, it was clearly, at least by the fourth century, a standard medical term (Hippocr. *On Joints* 48, *On Diseases* 1. 3, 2. 6; see further LSJ s.vv. ἀκρατής, ἀκρατέω, ἀκράτεια, ἀκρασία). We may note especially Thuc. (?) 3. 84. 2 ἀκρατής...ὀργῆς, Hippocr. *Diseases* 1. 3 ἀκρατὴς φωνῆς. This appears, then, to be another term taken from medicine for literary criticism.[36] Once again, there is nothing in the *Frogs* passage to put us in mind of Io and *Prom.* (it is much more likely that *Prom.* is also using preexisting terminology to describe Io's delusional frenzy and loss of control).[37]

There remain two passages to discuss, *Frogs* 1020 and 939–40. In 1020, Aeschylus is told: 'Speak out, and don't be all high-and-mightily wilful and angry!', (Αἰσχύλε, λέξον, μηδ' αὐθάδως σεμνυνόμενος χαλέπαινε). Of all Flintoff's examples, this is the only one that is at all likely to put many of us in mind of a specific context in *Prom.*, viz Prometheus' remark at 436–7: μή τοι χλιδῆι δοκεῖτε μηδ' αὐθαδίαι σιγᾶν με. Yet even here I suspect that the echo is accidental. As we have seen, αὐθάδης, αὐθαδία, κτλ. are not unusual words by the time of *Frogs*, and the contexts are not identical: in the *Prom.* passage, nobody is pressing Prometheus to speak; nor is it clear in *Frogs* that χαλέπαινε involves *silence* – it may as well mean an outburst of sullen abuse or complaint, i.e. a refusal to respond as invited. Furthermore, if we are supposed to have *Prom.* in mind here (and in all the other places suggested by Flintoff) it is all the more surprising that 'Euripides', in mocking Aeschylus' notorious silences (*Frogs* 911–25), refers to *Niobe* and *Achilles*, but not to *Prom.*[38]

Finally, at *Frogs* 939–40, Flintoff suggests that κομπασμάτων and ἐπαχθῶν are taken from *Prom.* 361 and 49 respectively. But κόμπασμα occurs twice in Aesch. *Th.*, a play explicitly mentioned in *Frogs* (1021–4) and also discussed by Gorgias, so probably one of Aeschylus' best known; and κόμπος is common throughout tragedy. ἐπαχθής is rather a prosaic word (though ἐπάχθομαι occurs at Eur. *Hipp.* 1260), found

---

[35] χαλινός is used in other metaphorical ways by Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides; see too Denniston (supra n. 21) 114–15. In *Prom.*, not surprisingly, words for 'harnessing, binding' etc., both literal and metaphorical, are particularly common, and not only of Prometheus' shackles: n.b. 5, 618 ὀχμάζω, 54 ψάλια, and my edition of the play (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 20–21; so the two instances of χαλινός do not stand out as being in themselves remarkable.

[36] It is notable too that in the same line Aristophanes uses either ἀθύρωτον or ἀπύλωτον (στόμα), for which cf. Eur. *Or.* 903 ἀθυρόγλωσσος, Soph. *Ph.* 188 ἀθυρόστομος, Simonides *PMG* 541. 2 ἄθυρον στόμα.

[37] The further echo which Flintoff finds between *Frogs* 816–17...ὄμματα στροβήσεται and *Prom.* 882 τροχοδινεῖται δ' ὄμμαθ' ἑλίγδην, seems again too faint to be significant, even with the 'bovine element' of *Frogs* 804 counted in (Flintoff, p. 4): Aeschylus 'staring like a bull' is a far cry from the tormented heifer-girl of *Prom.*

[38] See further O. Taplin, *HSCP* 76 (1972), 57–97.

in tragedy only at *Prom.* 49; its occurrence there is hardly remarkable enough to inspire imitation by a comic poet. In this case too Aristophanes appears merely to have used a normal word for 'oppressively heavy', with no allusion in mind.

In sum, not one of Flintoff's examples seems likely to be a genuine allusion; certainly none comes close to providing that combination of verbal and contextual similarity that we find between *Prom.* and the allusions and parodies in *Knights* and *Birds*. Of course, as Flintoff acknowledges, the evidence – once any of it is admitted to be evidence at all – will be cumulative in its effect: if one allusion is recognized, others less obvious may be accepted too. It would be a great boon to us all if we could know 'beyond any serious doubt' that Aristophanes believed *Prom.* to be thoroughly Aeschylean; our present state of uncertainty is frustrating indeed. But to my sceptical (I hope, not prejudiced) mind, serious doubts do remain.

University of California, Berkeley   MARK GRIFFITH