REVIEWS

ΣΜΑΡΩ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΪΔΟΥ–ΑΡΑΜΠΑΤΖΗ, *Η Λυκούργεια τετραλογία του Αισχύλου. Δοκιμή ανασύνθεσης*, Athens 2010. 115 pp.

To reconstruct a fragmentary play is a notoriously demanding philological task; even more so, when one is confronted with the challenge of reconstructing a whole lost tragic tetralogy. Smaro Nikolaidou-Arabatzi (henceforth N.-A.), in her recent book on Aeschylus' *Lykourgeia* accepts the challenge to revisit the multiple riddles surrounding the structure and plot of this lost tetralogy. Her study begins with a general overview of the main problems and solutions offered by eminent philologists (Hermann, Deichgräber, West, et al.) and then proceeds with a detailed exposition of the proposed structure of each play: *Edonoi*, *Bassarai* (or *Bassarides*), *Neaniskoi*, and *Lykourgos* (satyr play). It is worth outlining N.-A.'s reconstruction of the tragedies, play-by-play, in order to juxtapose her own suggestions on key problems with those proffered by other scholars.

Edonoi

At the beginning of the play N.-A. posits a parodos, sung by a chorus consisting of Edonians, worshipers of the goddess Kotyto.[1] The members of the chorus exalt their orgiastic cult, presumably with the accompaniment of the flute: fr. 57 R finds here its expected place. Lykourgos appears next, accusing Dionysos for the foreign customs he introduces (fr. 59 R); the pronoun *ὅστις* implies, however, that Dionysos himself is

1. Following Deichgräber (1938-1939), 249; on the rapprochement between the cults of Kotyto and Dionysos, see also Allan (2004) 139-140. Though rightly printed *Κοντοῦς* on the citation (that is, unless we accept Hartung's *Κότνος*), the genitive is misspelled as *Κοτνούς* in the Modern Greek text (N.-A. 42-43).

not present during the first episode.[2] N.-A. assumes an exchange between Lykourgos and the Coryphaeus, whereby the latter would distance himself from the king's religious stance; in response, Lykourgos would invoke Orpheus' devotion to Apollo-Helios, in order to reinforce his case against the Dionysiac cult. The king would then order the arrest of Dionysos' worshipers, not of the god himself though: N.-A. is reluctant to ascribe to Lykourgos a Pentheus-like denial of the very *existence* of the god.[3]

After the first stasimon, the Edonians would express their sharp disagreement with Lykourgos; in the second episode, the followers of Dionysos would be arrested and would possibly appear on stage in two groups: one consisting of maenads and one of satyrs.[4] Fr. 62 R (*μακροσκελὴς μέν· ἆρα μὴ χλούνης τις ἦν;*) is regarded as a derisive comment targeting the satyrs, set within an exchange between the king and one of his attendants.[5]

Fragments 61 and 61a R are read as comments directed by Lykourgos against the male leader of the semi-choir of maenads, a Corypheus who would, in fact, be the god himself in human guise. Basing herself on

2. See N.-A. 44 and n. 46. *Contra* West (1990) 28: "Lycurgus then turned to Dionysus and questioned him [...]".
3. N.-A. 47.
4. The possibility of a satyric chorus in the *Lykourgeia* was first raised by Welcker (apud Hermann 1831, 22-23), who identified them with the *νεανίσκοι* of the third play; *contra* Hermann (ibid.), who considers their equine form as incompatible with a tragic play. N.-A.'s is, certainly, a bold suggestion, yet not one to be readily rejected, not least keeping in mind the role of Satyrs in the satyr plays themselves: a complicated and meaningful role, far from being merely 'comic': see Griffith (2002). Moreover, as Sansone (1978) has shown, satyric elements can be detected even in a 'serious' Dionysiac play such as the *Bacchae*.
5. See N.-A. 48-51: *μακροσκελής* is read as a comment on their goat-feet, while *χλούνης* is taken to denote their 'evil' behaviour (following the prevailing interpretation since Hermann). An explanation of *χλούνης* as 'eunuch', in the context of the description of an effeminate Dionysos (see Devereux 1973), is rejected since it would lead, in tandem with *μακροσκελής*, to a rather negative image, certainly not one suggesting beauty (like Dionysos' description in Eur. *Ba.* 453-549): it is not clear how such a picture would have inspired Aristophanes' mocking of Agathon's 'effeteness' at *Thesm.* 136-145. On this fragment, one could also cite Mureddu (1996), who, rather implausibly, understands *μακροσκελής* as 'him who runs swiftly', reading it as a derisive comment on Dionysos (alluding *inter alia* to the agility of the Satyrs).

τί φῃς; τί σιγᾷς; (61.9 R), N.-A. also claims that the male leader remained silent for a considerable time: a stance intended to convey his utter contempt for the king and which would be followed by a severe reprimand of Lykourgos. The much-contested fr. 60 R (*τίς ποτ' ἔσθ' ὁ μουσόμαντις †ἄλλος ἀβρατοῦς ὃν σθένει†*) can be understood in the context of exactly such an address: a disparaging remark directed by the god against Orpheus (i.e. "so… inspired by the Muses, he elected to dissent!").[6] Such a remark would presumably answer a renewed reference to Orpheus within Lykourgos' vindication of his dismissal of Dionysiac worship (the story of Orpheus' recantation should have already been related) and would also return Lykourgos' scornful comments on Dionysos.

After the male leader's invective, Lykourgos would then order the imprisonment of all Dionysiac worshipers, the leader himself included. The next important moment in the play would be the Messenger's announcement to the chorus that the whole group has been miraculously set free. The chorus would then pray for Dionysos' epiphany, which would forthwith ensue: it can be, effectively, regarded as forming the central dramatic event of the fourth episode in a scene analogous to the palace miracle in the *Bacchae*. The famous line *ἐνθουσιᾷ δὴ δῶμα, βακχεύει στέγη* (fr. 58 R) finds its incontestable place here. The king would

6. N.-A. 55 regards the trochaic metre as particularly apt for a momentous utterance succeeding a long silence – having pointed out (54) that prolonged silences must have been a characteristic Aeschylean technique, as one may infer from Ar. *Ra*. 909-923. In her reading of the line as an insult uttered by Dionysos against Orpheus, N.-A. follows Hermann (1831) 16-17; by contrast, West (1990) 29 considers it as a reference to Orpheus, yet one uttered by Lykourgos (Orpheus still being then a follower of Dionysos). Sommerstein, in an article published in the same year as N.-A.'s book (2010b, 195-196), reads *ἁβροβάτης* (Hermann), instead of *ἀβρατοῦς*, and, after observing that the line would thus be too long to fit into a trochaic tetrameter, he follows Mette (1959, 27) in placing *ὃν σθένει* at the beginning of the next line (cf. his Loeb text: 2008, 64). Then, after *μουσόμαντις*, Sommerstein posits *γύννις* (the whole utterance being read, following West, as an attack by Lykourgos against Orpheus). On this fragment, see also analysis by Di Marco (1993) 131-133; in my view, N.-A.'s study would have profited by taking into account Di Marco's article: particularly on the relation between Dionysiac and Orphic religiosity, since, otherwise, Di Marco refrains from offering concrete propositions on the reconstruction of the lost plays (cf. West's [1995, 468] overly dismissive verdict).

most probably come out in terror, yet N.-A. is reluctant to allocate the line to the king; the ritual terms (*ἐνθουσιᾷ, βακχεύει*) suggest, instead, to her the chorus of the Edonians as its speaker.[7] Then, the god himself, following an exchange with the chorus, would predict the king's punishment. N.-A. conjectures that the fourth stasimon would probably be more extensive than the previous choral parts and would, moreover, possess a pointedly ritual character. In the Exodos, a Messenger would narrate the final (and failed) attempt of Lykourgos to incarcerate the followers of Dionysos. The king finally exits humbled.[8]

In suggesting such a conclusion for the *Edonoi*, N.-A. agrees with Deichgräber,[9] who relies considerably on the fragments of Naevius' *Lycurgus*, which provide no hint whatsoever for the murder of Dryas (the punishment inflicted on the king by Dionysos, as related in Apollodorus 3.5.1).[10] By contrast, West considers Lykourgos' slaying of Dryas as the climax of the play. In opting for this solution, he follows closely on the structure of Euripides' *Bacchae*; according to his schema, upon the *exangelia* announcing the death of Dryas, there would follow a choral song and then Lykourgos would appear on stage or would be wheeled out with his son's body in order to engage with the chorus in a lament. In the same play, Orpheus, prior to his recantation (see further), or Dionysos himself, would instruct the Edonians to take Lykourgos to be confined on Pangaion.[11] West's reconstruction certainly produces a more 'self-sufficient' first play, yet one could invoke against his schema the example of the *Suppliant Women*: an Aeschylean tragedy whose dramatic action does not attain its climax until the next play of the trilogic sequence.[12]

7. Similarly West (1990) 30.
8. N.-A. 56-58.
9. Deichgräber (1938-1939) 260-261.
10. See also Sutton (1971) 396-398 (following a broad consensus on *Lycurgus* codified by Mette [1964] 53-54). See now the analytical discussion of the fragments by Lattanzi (1994); specifically 263-265 for his construal of the plot (in essential agreement with previous scholarship).
11. West (1990) 31. Sommerstein (2008), in his notes on the plays of the *Lykourgeia*, follows West's reconstruction.
12. On the problems involved in the reconstruction of this tetralogy, see Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 40-55. Another open question is, of course, Euripides' debt to

Bassarai

The chorus of this play would self-evidently consist of maenads (*Βασσάραι* or *Βασσαρίδες*), while its central event would be the slaying of Dryas by his own father, Lykourgos. In the first episode, Dionysos would probably castigate the king for his impiety and declare his punishment. The king would then flee and Dionysos would call upon Mania or Lyssa to arrive: homicidal madness would get grip of Lykourgos, most probably while he would be preparing a sacrifice to Apollo-Helios. Fr. 23 R (*ὁ ταῦρος δ' ἔοικεν κυρίξειν· τίν' ἀρχὰν* and *φθάσαντος δ' ἐπ' ἔργοις προπηδήσεταί νιν*) can be understood, in this context, as a comment on Lykourgos' behaviour uttered by the chorus: Dionysos would be likened to a bull about to attack his opponent (a parallel inspired by the ghost-fight between Pentheus and the bull in Eur. *Ba.* 618-622).[13] N.-A. considers this possibility,[14] yet, prompted by the Sophoclean fr. 668 R (*Διονύσου τοῦ ταυροφάγου*) she prefers to read the "bull" as a characterization not of Dionysos, but of Lykourgos, who would thus be scorned in Dionysiac ritual terms: Lykourgos is supposed to be regarded as rushing forwards like a bull, eventually to kill Dryas.[15] N.-A. also suggests that it was probably Aeschylus who invented this mode of punishment for Lykourgos, by modifying the epic tradition according to which the Thracian king was afflicted by Zeus with blindness (*Il.* 6.139). The murder of Dryas would not, of course, happen on stage: it would be signalled by the cries of the young man heard from inside after the second stasimon. West, on the other hand, allocates the fragment to Orpheus: the bard,

Aeschylus' *Pentheus* (a debt asserted by Aristophanes of Byzantium; see *TrGF* v. 3, p. 299); on the "Pentheus" tetralogy, see Gantz (1980) 154-158, Jouan (1992), 76-79, and Sommerstein (2010a) 35-36. Our knowledge concerning Aeschylean trilogies points to a variety of structural patterns, not necessarily conforming to the schema of the *Oresteia* or, presumably, the *Oidipodeia* (i.e. one key dramatic event per play): one may recall, for instance, the "Achilles" trilogy where the stance of the hero does not undergo any significant shift throughout; see Sommmerstein (2010a) 40. Generally on Aeschylean tetralogies, see ibid. 32-44 and Gantz (1979 and 1980).

13. So Deichgräber (1938-1939) 265-267.
14. Thinking, however, that Lykourgos himself would, in that case, be the most likely speaker (67).
15. N.-A. 68-69.

on stage again after the exit of the Bassarai, along with a chorus dressed as Thracians and some in animal guise, would, all of a sudden, face the attack of an aggressive bull and would at once exit in haste.[16]

Returning to N.-A.'s reconstruction, in the third stasimon the maenadic chorus would celebrate Dionysos' victory in an euphoric state. Moreover, they would probably extend the ambit of their hymn with a 'choral projection' to the mount Pangaion where other maenads would be dancing and where the chorus, too, would very much wish to be. Within such a 'projection', fr. 23a (*Παγγαίου γὰρ ἀργυρήλατον / πρῶν' †ες τὸ τῆς ἀστραπῆς† πευκᾶεν σέλας*) would find its rightful place in the midst of an exaltation of Bacchic worship.[17] Regarding the discussion of the enigmatic fr. 24 R (*σκάρφει παλαιῷ κἀπιβωμίῳ ψόλῳ*), N.-A. should be accredited with an original suggestion: granting that we must be dealing with a ritual procedure (*ἐπιβωμίῳ*), she places the fragment within the context of a quest by Lykourgos' wife to find a herb to cure his madness;[18] her desperate moves may, actually, be understood as a significant dramatic event of the fourth episode. What is supposed to follow is the exit of a now sane Lykourgos from the palace and his lament – most probably in the form of *amoibaion* with the chorus. In the Exodos, Dionysos foretells that the king will be enclosed for a long time in a rocky prison on Pangaion, in order to become his attendant and prophet. In the end, Dionysos would announce how he could come in reconciliation

16. West (1990) 43-44.

17. N.-A. 70-71 aptly explains *πευκᾶεν σέλας* as a reference to the torches of the maenads; Seaford (2005) 604-606 reads in this expression an allusion to the torchlight as a feature of mystic initiations. [N.-A. 40 mentions Seaford's article, but chooses not to delve further into the question of the presence of mystic elements in the *Lykourgeia*.]

18. N.-A. 62 refers to the much-discussed vase-painting (*ARV*^{2} 1121.17), depicting the slaying of Dryas, where the boy's mother is pictured in a desperate stance, unable to prevent the killing. We could well imagine her staging a ritual in which dry branches are burnt: their ashes would be used for the preparation of a drug, given that *σκάρφη* is also a name for the drug *ἑλλέβορος* (LSJ s.v.) which was regarded as a cure for madness (N.-A. 73). According to Deichgräber (1938-1939) 286, fr. 24 R refers to the tattooing of Thracian women, which some later sources aetiologize as a sort of punishment or mortification for having killed Orpheus. West (1990) 45 withholds verdict, while Sommerstein (2008) 23 notably suggests a possible reference to the ingredients for some concoction to be used in ritual (*σκάρφει* as wood-chips).

with Lykourgos. The word *εἰλλόμενον* (fr. 25 R) is fitted in this context: given its glossing as *εἰργόμενον* by ancient sources,[19] it can be regarded as indicating a prophecy of Lykourgos' exile, uttered by Dionysos himself as N.-A. conjectures (following Eur. *Ba.* 1330 ff.). The banishment of the king would eventually save the Edonian land from the aridity inflicted to it as a punishment for the king's impiety.[20]

N.-A. departs from Deichgräber in postponing Orpheus' death till the *Neaniskoi* and avoiding, thus, the enactment of a double punishment (and the existence of two protagonists) in the central play. On the contrary, West's reconstruction, having placed the killing of Dryas in the first play, posits Orpheus' death as the central event of *Bassarai*. The divine bard is supposed to have undergone a shift from a prime exponent to an adversary of Dionysos, as we move from the first to the second play. This dramatic change of religious outlook is attributed to his journey to the Underworld (following Ps.-Eratosthenes[21]), an event which West suggests that it would occur *extra scaenam* during the interval between the plays.[22] Therefore, in the *Bassarai*, it is Orpheus who would speak the prologue, a salutation to Apollo-Helios; the maenadic chorus would follow, possibly lamenting his departure to Hades and still ignoring his shift in religious attitude. Then, Dionysos himself would appear and would be involved in an exchange (following the model of the *Eumenides*) with Apollo, whereby the latter would express his support for Orpheus' outlook. Finally, Orpheus would be killed by the maenads, who are supposed to return on stage after the exit of Orpheus and his followers, that is, the Thracians along with animal-choreuts; we can then imagine the maenads announcing the killing of Orpheus and possibly, afterwards, showing remorse, since they would not have realized what they did at the time.[23]

A prime argument raised by N.-A. against West's reconstruction is

19. See references in *TrGF*.
20. See N.-A. 77-78; the conjectured plot follows again Apollodorus 3.5.1.
21. *Cataster.* 24 (p. 29.3 Olivieri = 577,10 Maass]; see now the edition by Pàmias and Geus (2007).
22. West (1990) 38-42. *Contra* Di Marco (1993) 119-124, who considers the mention of the *κατάβασις* as a motive for Orpheus' apostacy spurious.
23. West (1990) 44-45.

that it fails to adequately account for the title *Lykourgeia*, which seems to presuppose the elevation of Lykourgos' story to a dominant position within the trilogy.[24] On the other hand, West, by allocating the slaying of Dryas to the first drama, manages to retain Orpheus' dismemberment in the *Bassarai*, thus staying faithful to the connection of Orpheus' death with 'the Bassarids' in Ps.-Eratosthenes' account: *ὅθεν ὁ Διόνυσος ὀργισθεὶς αὐτῷ* [i.e. *Ὀρφεῖ*] *ἔπεμψε τὰς Βασσαρίδας, ὥς φησιν Αἰσχύλος … αἱ διέσπασαν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ μέλη διέρριψαν χωρὶς ἕκαστον. αἱ δὲ Μοῦσαι συναγαγοῦσαι ἔθαψαν ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις Λειβήθροις*. However, according to N.-A., there is no compelling reason to restrict the role of the Bassarid maenads to the homonymous play: they could well make an appearance in the third play, the *Neaniskoi*, as well. A further argument, certainly not decisive, raised by N.-A. against West is that in no fragment of the *Edonoi* do we find the slightest allusion to murder, while fr. 23 R (*ὁ ταῦρος δ' ἔοικεν κυρίξειν …*), expressly attributed to the *Bassarai*, could well suit a fit of rage that would provide the fatal impulse to a deluded Lykourgos in order to slay his son.[25]

Neaniskoi

In the third tragedy, Dionysos' ascendancy in Thrace culminates in the defeat of his apostate Orpheus. According to N.-A., the fate of Orpheus, as related by Ps.-Eratosthenes, should form the principal theme of the *Neaniskoi*. At the beginning of the play one may imagine the Bassarai worshiping Dionysos on the mount Pangaion, where also Lykourgos

24. N.-A. 30-32. Although the surviving Aeschylean material attests to a predilection for a *narrative* linking of plays within tetralogies (see Gantz 1979, 293), there are cases where connections between the plays were thematic or imagistic. Flintoff (1992) 72, for instance, posits a thematic link between the *Persae* and the other plays of its tetralogy; on this problem and the main solutions offered, see now Garvie's overview (2009, xl-xlvi).

25. It is worth mentioning here Jouan's schema (1992, 72-76): he also considers it improbable that the punishment of Lykourgos was exacted in the first play, but he retains Orpheus' dismemberment in the *Bassarai*, postponing Dryas' murder until the *Neaniskoi*.

would be operating his oracle.[26] The *νεανίσκοι* of the chorus would form a group of young men, being devotees of the newly established Dionysiac cult;[27] moreover, their age would recall Lykourgos' innocent son, now in an honourable way. The central event of the play is Orpheus' dismemberment by the Thracian maenads on Pangaion. As it is the case with the *Bacchae*, this thiasos would not appear on stage (as the Theban maenads on Cithaeron). The event is announced by a Messenger, in whose narration we may include two fragments: 146b and 147 R.[28] Orpheus' death in the hands of the Bassarai is thought by N.-A. to be an Aeschylean version/innovation which departs from the inherited story of the killing of the divine bard by armed women of Thrace. His inspiration might have been the tradition about the head of Orpheus which utters prophecies.[29]

At the end, N.-A., following Hermann's influential conjecture, posits the arrival of the Muses on stage carrying the dismembered body of the poet.[30] In their search for a place for burial on Pangaion they would arrive at Lykourgos' mantic seat: a meeting that would supply the proper ground for a final reconciliation. Lykourgos would recommend Leibethra for Orpheus' torn body to be buried, and would, probably, himself lead the funerary procession. In the end of the play, N.-A., in accord with a broad scholarly consensus, places a ritual of reconciliation, similar to the one concluding the *Eumenides*. The seal of reconciliation is borne by fr. 341 R (*ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ βακχειόμαντις*), which proclaims the rapprochement of the two gods. According to N.-A., the second half of the line refers to Dionysos (not to Apollo as well, as several scholars have suggested),[31] and it would most probably have

26. As indicated by [Eur.] *Rhes.* 972-973: see West (1990) 32.
27. As Hermann (1831) 22 first saw.
28. As regards the choriambic fr. 146a (*πρὸς δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀμφιλαφῆ πήματ' ἔχων ἀθανάτων*), N.-A. 80 deems preferable to connect it with the punishment of Lykourgos: the chorus of *Neaniskoi* may reflect on the kings' fate in a 'positive' way, exalting the justness of divine revenge.
29. N.-A. 87-90. *Contra* Marcaccini (1995) esp. 245-246, who suggests the temporal precedence of the Bacchic connection of the Thracian women who kill Orpheus.
30. Cf. West (1990) 45.
31. According to Deichgräber (1938/1939) 267-268, the whole line refers to Dionysos and exalts him.

been uttered by the chorus.[32]

N.-A. reasonably links fr. 146 R (*αὔρας ὑπηκόοισιν ἐν ψυκτηρίοις*) with the maenadic meadows of Pangaion (referring to Eur. *Ba*. 38); yet, this fragment, along with fr. 148 R (*ἀφοίβατον*) could also be connected with the Underworld imagery found in the 'Orphic' gold tablets,[33] a link that would further strengthen the parallels between the 'reconciliation' effected at the end of the *Lykourgeia* and the connection between Orphic and Bacchic mysteries attested in fifth-century literary sources.[34]

Finally, a note on *Lykourgos*, the satyr play: regarding fr. 124 R (*κἀκ τῶνδ' ἔπινε βρῦτον ἰσχναίνων χρόνῳ / κἀσεμνοκόμπει τοῦτ' ἐν ἀνδρείᾳ τιθείς*), N.-A. is inclined to accept Hourmouziades' interpretation, whereby, instead of *τῶνδ' ἔπινε, τῶνδε πῖνε* is read, coupled with *καὶ σεμνοκόμπει* (an imperative again) instead of *κἀσεμνοκόμπει*.[35]

To sum up, N.-A.'s book succeeds in offering an accessible and unitary account of the notoriously opaque group of fragments that have been left of the *Lykourgeia*.[36] Certainly, the pitiful meagerness of our knowledge of the trilogy does not allow us to move beyond the level of, sometimes bold, conjecture. Nevertheless, N.-A.'s reconstruction follows a sensible schema, which needs to be taken into serious consideration alongside the reconstructions offered by Deichgräber and West. Her edge over West is that her schema accounts better for the title *Lyk-*

32. See N.-A. 85, aptly adducing Eur. *Ba*. 298: *μάντις δ' ὁ δαίμων ὅδε…* West (1990) 45-46, following Nauck, reads *ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων ὁ Βακχεὺς ὁ μάντις*, suggesting that the whole line could refer to Dionysos, though in a negative manner.

33. See Di Marco (1993) 150-152; a key testimony is Hdt. 2.81.2.

34. Discussed by N.-A. in pp. 84-85.

35. Hourmouziades (1984) 36; N.-A. 95 (it is not made clear that Hourmouziades reads *καὶ σεμνοκόμπει* though). *τῶνδε πῖνε* belongs to Mette, but was later retracted (*olim* in Radt's apparatus). Note that *κἀσεμνοκόμπει* was Dindorf's conjecture, accepted by Hermann; Mette suggested *καὶ σεμνοκόπτει* (following the ms. *A* of Athenaeus, whence the lines), before again revoking it (*olim*).

36. In terms of linguistic choices, may I register some reservations: *ανώνυμος στίχος* (53), *δυσκολονόητο* instead of *δυσνόητο* (65), *φαγοποσία* (94); also, in the phrase *Λυκούργεια / Ορέστεια τριλογία* we could perhaps invert the order of words. Regarding the bibliography: the Teubner edition of Pindar is attributed to Maehler, instead of Snell-Maehler; also, Sutton (1971) is omitted.

ourgeia, while her advantage over Deichgräber is that the *Bassarai* is spared an overloaded plot. We are dealing with a contribution which revisits thoughtfully the problem of the *Lykourgeia* and provides, to the very least, a renewed stimulus for the further attentive study these fragments deserve.

AGIS MARINIS

REFERENCES

Allan, W. (2004), "Religious Syncretism. The New Gods of Greek Tragedy", *HSCP* 102, 113-155.

Deichgräber, K. (1938-1939), "Die Lykurgie des Aischylos. Versuch einer Wiederherstellung der dionysischen Tetralogie", *Gött. Nachr.* N.F. I/3, 231-309.

Devereux, G. (1973), "Le fragment d'Eschyle 62 N^2. Ce qu'y signifie *χλούνης*", *REG* 86, 277-284.

Di Marco, M. (1993), "Dioniso ed Orfeo nelle *Bassaridi* di Eschilo", in A. Masaracchia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'orfismo. Atti del seminario nazionale (Roma-Perugia 1985-1991)*, Roma, 101-153.

Flintoff, E. (1992), "The Unity of the *Persians* Trilogy", *QUCC* 40, 67-80.

Friis Johansen, H. and E.W. Whittle (1980), *Aeschylus. The Suppliants*, v. 1, Copenhagen.

Gantz, T. (1979), "The Aischylean Tetralogy: Prolegomena", *CJ* 74, 289-304.

Gantz, T. (1980), "The Aischylean Tetralogy: Attested and Conjectured Groups", *AJP* 101, 133-164.

Garvie, A.F. (2009), *Aeschylus. Persae*, Oxford.

Griffith, M. (2002), "Slaves of Dionysos: Satyrs, Audience, and the Ends of the *Oresteia*", *ClAnt* 21, 195-258.

Hermann, G. (1831), "De Aeschyli Lycurgia dissertatio", in id., *Opuscula*, v. 5, Lipsiae 1834 [New York 1970], 3-30.

Hourmouziades (Χουρμουζιάδης), N. (1984), *Σατυρικά*, 2nd ed., Athens.

Jouan, F. (1992), "Dionysos chez Eschyle", *Kernos* 5, 71-86.

Lattanzi, L. (1994), "Il *Lycurgus* di Nevio", *Aevum(Ant)* 7, 191-265.
Marcaccini, C. (1995), "Considerazioni sulla morte di Orfeo in Tracia", *Prometheus* 21, 241-252.
Mette, H.J. (1959), *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*, Berlin.
Mette, H.J. (1964), "Die römische Tragödie und die Neufunde zur griechischen Tragödie (insbesondere für die Jahre 1945-1964)", *Lustrum* 9, 5-211.
Mureddu, P. (1994), "Le 'lunghe gambe' di Dioniso (Aesch. fr. 62 R.)", *Eikasmos* 5, 81-88.
Pàmias J. and K. Geus (2007), *Eratosthenes. Sternsagen (Catasterismi)*, Oberhaid.
Sansone, D. (1978), "The *Bacchae* as Satyr-Play?", *ICS* 3, 40-46.
Seaford, R. (2005), "Mystic Light in Aeschylus' *Bassarai*", *CQ* 55, 602-606.
Sommerstein, A.H. (2008), *Aeschylus. Fragments*, Cambridge Ma.
Sommerstein, A.H. (2010a), *Aeschylean Tragedy*, 2nd ed., London.
Sommerstein, A.H. (2010b), "Notes on Aeschylean Fragments", *Prometheus* 36, 193-212.
Sutton, D.F. (1971), "Aeschylus' *Edonians*", in *Fons Perennis. Saggi critici di filologia classica raccolti in onore del Prof. Vittorio d'Agostino*, Torino, 387-409.
West, M.L. (1990), "The Lycurgus Trilogy", in id., *Studies in Aeschylus*, 26-50 [rev. version of *BICS* 30 (1983), 63-71, 81-82].
West, M.L. (1995), Review of A. Masaracchia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'orfismo. Atti del seminario nazionale (Roma-Perugia 1985-1991)*, Roma 1993, *CR* 45, 468-469.