

AESCHYLUS AGAMEMNON 511-512

ἄλις παρὰ Σκάμανδρου ἦσθ' ἀνάριστος·
νῦν δ' αὖτε σωτήρ ἴσθι καὶ παιώνιος.

In my review¹ of M. L. West's Teubner *Aeschylus*, I rejected his proposed deletion² of the particle δ' in the above passage. I did so on the ground that the lines represent an inversion of the familiar prayer-pattern 'you were favourable to me in the past, be favourable to me now', which therefore required the paradosis' strongly adversative δέ to ram home the inversion³. I would now argue that in reality a different prayer-pattern is more directly reflected in the simple-seeming word ἄλις, and that this pattern makes the deletion more likely than I – or, for that matter, even West himself – stated.

The pattern in question is the one helpfully identified and discussed by Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace *Odes* 1.2.37⁴ and Tarrant on Seneca *Agamemnon* 519 ff.⁵, whereby the deity invoked is requested *to be sated* with inflicting woes and to adopt a more benign attitude (the antiquity of the formula is proved by the first part of the appeal featuring in the famous Hymn of the Arval brethren v. 3 *satur fu, fere Mars*). Note in particular the Senecan passage just referred to *quisquis es nondum malis / satiate tantis caelitem: tandem tuum / numen serena*. Note also from Seneca, *Medea* 668-9 (the chorus alluding to Jason) *iam satis, divi, mare vindicastis: / parcite iusso*. In both passages, as in the Aeschylean passage, the deity or deities addressed are said to have done enough and more than enough⁶ harm in the past. And, as in the Aeschylean text as emended by West, the contrast⁷ between past infliction of suffering and hoped for future respite is conveyed by asyndeton.

Fraenkel's book *Horace*⁸ quotes other instances of the formula *iam satis, satis iam* etc., and, although these do not directly represent the relevant prayer pattern, it is significant that some of them also involve asyndeton.

¹ "Cl Rev" 42, 1992, 258.

² Advanced in *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990) p. 191 f.

³ E. Medda too, in his recent edition with commentary (*Eschilo. Agamemnone*, Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento, Roma 2017), maintains δέ and quotes my reasons (pp. 306-307).

⁴ Oxford 1970, p. 32.

⁵ Cambridge 1976, p. 274.

⁶ See Fraenkel on Aesch. *Agam.* 1659, Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace *Odes* 1.2.1 for this nuance of ἄλις, *satis* etc.

⁷ The connection between the two parts of the statement is not seen by, for instance, S. Pulleyn, *Prayers in Greek Religion* (Oxford 1997), p. 9, who quotes 519 f. as if it were the start of a prayer, unrelated to the previous verse.

⁸ *Horace* (Oxford 1956) p. 243 f.

