TEXTUAL AND OTHER NOTES ON AESCHYLUS
(PART 2)*

(18) *Agamemnon* 214-7

παυσανέμου γὰρ θυσίας
παρθενίου θ᾽ αἵματος ὀρ-
γᾶι περιόργως ἐπιθυ-
μεῖν θέμις. εὖ γὰρ εἴη.

ὀργᾶι fere MVF (ὀργᾶν fort. M^{ac} sec. West, sed hoc negat Di Benedetto[42]): αὐδᾷ T ^{γρ}M περιόργως codd.: περιόργῳ σφ᾽ Bamberger ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις codd.: ἀπὸ δ᾽ αὐδᾷ Θέμις West

I have omitted all controversial punctuation.

The logic of West's argument (*Studies* 178-181), as it proceeds from point to point, seems irresistible; and yet he has reached an impossible conclusion. Punctuating after περιόργως, and printing in his text the above-mentioned conjecture in place of the next two transmitted words, he makes Agamemnon say "For they [the allies] are furiously eager for a sacrifice to stop the winds and for a maiden's blood; but Right forbids it. May all be well!"

This is the end of a reported soliloquy in which Agamemnon has worked his way to a decision to sacrifice his daughter, in obedience to Calchas' pronouncement that only thus can Artemis be placated, the contrary winds ended, and the fleet enabled to sail for Troy (198-202), to which his initial reaction had been to burst into tears (202-4). He is certainly fully aware of the enormity of the action, which he describes in graphic words (208-211). And yet he does it. In that case, as more than one scholar has pointed out since 1990[43], the *last* consideration that he takes into account must be one that can credibly be imagined as tipping the balance in favour of the sacrifice. In West's text, his last consideration is one that tells strongly *against* the sacrifice. Is there a parallel anywhere in drama, or in Homer either, for a person deliberating on whether to pursue course A or course B, ending his deliberations by stating plainly an obvious and powerful argument in favour of course B, and then (with or without a verbal crossing of the fingers, like εὖ γὰρ εἴη here) plumping for course A? I certainly know of none.

The text printed by Page (who follows M except that he accepts the one-letter emendation of Bamberger, see above) gives the sense "For it is θέμις[44] that they [the allies] should with great fury desire a sacrifice to stop the

* See the first part in "Prometheus" 36, 2010, 1-22.

[42] V. Di Benedetto, "RFIC" 120, 1992, 133-4.

[43] Di Benedetto (n. 42) 134; *id*. in J.A. López Férez (ed.), *La tragedia griega en sus textos* (Madrid 2004) 109; C.W. Willink, "QUCC" 77, 2004, 52.

[44] I leave this word untranslated for a reason that will appear in due course.

winds and a maiden's blood. May all be well!". Whatever problems this text may present (and we shall consider these forthwith), it does at least make Agamemnon end on a note that harmonizes with the action he proceeds to take, and thus serves, as West's text does not, to tell us what has caused him to take that action rather than any alternative: the fact that Agamemnon's allies[45] are fiercely eager for the sacrifice (because they are eager for the war: 225-6, 230) and that if he refuses to carry out the sacrifice, and abandons or disbands the expedition, the league of allies, of which he is the leader, will fall apart[46].

What then are the problems supposed to beset the conventional text and interpretation?

(1) *The alleged oddity of using θέμις in reference to the army's feelings:* "the burning question is not whether it is legitimate for them to feel like that, but whether it is legitimate for him to do the deed" (West, *Studies* 179). But θέμις need not mean "legitimate" or "right and proper"; in Homer it sometimes means no more than "natural", "the way of the world", as when Agamemnon says that it is θέμις for men and women to have sex (*Iliad* 9.134) – it is obviously not *legitimate* for any man and any woman to do so under any and all circumstances[47] – or Eumaeus that it is θέμις for a woman to grieve when her husband has perished abroad (*Odyssey* 14.130). Similarly when a character in an unknown play of Sophocles says that it is not θέμις for anyone except the gods to live without suffering (Soph. fr. 946), (s)he does not mean that it would be wrong to do so, but that that is not how the world is. If it is natural for the army to be eager for the sacrifice, then it can safely be assumed that they *are* eager for it; and if that is so, then they are likely to be indignant against Agamemnon if he refuses to perform it, and this may well

[45] That is, of course, the contingents (and their leaders) who have joined the expedition from cities other than Argos. Willink (n. 43) takes the reference to be solely to Menelaus; but for one thing Menelaus in this play is not Agamemnon's ξύμμαχος but his co-ruler in Argos, and for another we know, and Agamemnon knew, that Menelaus was *not* eager for the sacrifice – on hearing the words of Calchas, *both* the Atreidae burst into tears (202-4).

[46] For ξυμμαχίας ἁμαρτών (213) does not mean "failing in my duty as an ally" (E. Fraenkel [Oxford 1950] ad loc.); it means "losing my allies" (trans. H. Lloyd-Jones [London 1979]). I have argued the case for this interpretation in *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari 1996) 364-5; it has the further advantage that it does not require a surreptitious change in the meaning of ξυμμαχία from "the duties of an ally" (in which, on the Fraenkel interpretation, Agamemnon would have failed) to "the allies as a collectivity" (who, on any interpretation, are described as eager for the sacrifice).

[47] And one cannot suppose that Agamemnon, *more suo*, is arrogantly assuming that for him it *is* legitimate, because the skilful speaker Odysseus, who in reporting Agamemnon's words to Achilles suppresses the tactless conclusion of his speech (9.158-161), sees no harm in repeating this line (9.276) with only a slight change of form (see J. Griffin [Oxford 1995] on 158-161, 276, and 300).

lead to the untoward political consequences that he fears.

(2) *ἐπιθυμεῖν.* It has often been noted that this is a common gloss on ὀργᾶν (and that the scholia do in fact here gloss περιόργως with ἐπιθυμητικῶς). But that X is a common gloss on Y does not in itself prove that in any given passage – even a passage in which Y also appears – X is a cuckoo in the textual nest. The word itself is blameless: as Fraenkel pointed out, it appears in Sophocles' early *Trachiniae* (617) and in Euripides' early *Alcestis* (867).

(3) *The variant αὐδᾷ,* which appears with γρ. in M and was adopted by Triclinius in the copy he wrote himself. It has clearly been in or around the text for a long time, and must somehow be accounted for – and no one has satisfactorily accounted for it. Yet a very simple explanation is available. The variant originally referred, not to line 215, but to line 245, where MV read αὐδὰ (doubtless the paradosis), FT correctly αὐδᾷ; it was written to the left of the text there, and found its way across to the right side of the preceding column in a late antique or early medieval codex written, as many were, in double columns[48].

Thus Agamemnon's thought-process becomes clear. He is faced with the choice between disregarding Calchas' prescription (206) and staining his hands with his own daughter's blood (207-211); and he sees these alternatives as about equally bad (βαρεῖα μὲν... βαρεῖα δ', 206-7; τί τῶνδ' ἄνευ κακῶν; 211). Then a consideration arises which tips the balance. The army, he is sure, are passionately eager for war, and will not readily forgive him for denying it to them by refusing to perform the sacrifice[49]: the alliance will break up, and he will lose his position as the leader of Greece. He helps himself overcome any residual doubts by using prejudicial language. He speaks of the abandonment of the expedition as "desertion of the fleet" (πῶς λιπόναυς γένωμαι; 212), making it sound like the act of a coward and a serious crime – and commentator after commentator has been taken in by his spin; in fact it neither is nor ever was cowardly or criminal for a commander to abandon or discontinue a military enterprise when its material or moral cost

[48] Cf. perhaps Eur. *Hipp.* 867 where the words μὲν οὖν ἀβίοτος βίου have found their way into the text (in all mss.) from 821, displacing some genuine words and creating a meaningless sentence. I have argued in P. Thiercy and M. Menu (ed.), *Aristophane: la langue, la scène, la cité* (Bari 1997) 281-2 = Sommerstein, *Talking about Laughter* (Oxford 2009) 188-9 that a much-discussed scholium on Ar. *Clouds* 889, which asserts that the Better and Worse arguments were brought on "in wicker cages, fighting like cocks", is actually a displaced and corrupted version of a note on 847 where two domestic fowls were in fact brought on stage – probably in wicker cages.

[49] In fact, had he taken that course, he would have saved not only Iphigeneia's life but those of thousands of those enthusiastic warriors too – especially in Aeschylus' treatment, in which Agamemnon sails with a thousand ships (45) and comes home with one (650-673).

has clearly become too high to justify. (It might well, of course, be *imprudent*, as many a prosecuted Athenian general could bear witness[50].) And his use of the word θέμις, even though he is not actually using it in a moral sense (and is applying it to the army's feelings, not his own actions), will still in all probabililty help him to convince himself that what he is going to do is right; it is not for nothing that he is made to make this the last word of his deliberations. Prestige and political expediency triumph; Agamemnon "puts on the yokestrap of necessity" (219), abandons the restraints of reason and humanity (220-3), and slaughters Iphigeneia.

(19) *Agamemnon* 675-6

γένοιτο δ᾽ ὡς ἄριστα· Μενέλεων γὰρ οὖν
πρῶτόν τε καὶ μάλιστα προσδόκα μολεῖν.
εἰ δ᾽ οὖν τις ἀκτὶς ἡλίου νιν ἱστορεῖ
καὶ ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα, μηχαναῖς Διὸς
οὔπω θέλοντος ἐξαναλῶσαι γένος,
ἐλπίς τις αὐτὸν πρὸς δόμους ἥξειν πάλιν.

677 καὶ ζῶντα *f* : χλωρόν τε Toup, cf. Hesych. χ 553.

As the text stands, the Herald gives no remotely adequate reason why he should be so confident – after a storm in which thousands have perished and which, so far as he knows, only one ship got through safely – that Menelaus in particular will return home[51]. His remark about Zeus "not yet being willing to destroy the family completely" will not fill the bill: it is only a hopeful guess, and in any case, even if the Herald has divined Zeus's will correctly, that would not make Menelaus' safe return significantly more likely, since Agamemnon *has* come home and therefore, in the Herald's mind, the complete destruction of the family has been averted anyway[52].

The Herald's first statement about Menelaus certainly ought to be an optimistic one, since it is linked by γὰρ οὖν to the wish that things turn out for the best: proposals like μογεῖν (Sonny) and θανεῖν (Hartung) can be ruled out. The best suggestion so far has been that of Murray, who adopted H.L. Ahrens's conjecture μέλειν and posited a lacuna before 675 (though perhaps it would have been better placed *after* that line). To fill the lacuna, Murray tentatively offered ‹θεοῖς τ᾽ ἄνωθεν παντί τ᾽ Ἀργείων στρατῷ›. But while it will make a great deal of difference to Menelaus' chances of survival and of returning home whether the gods above are concerned for his welfare, the

[50] Including at least one under whom Aeschylus had fought (Hdt. 6.135-6).

[51] That, as Fraenkel shows, is what the bare μολεῖν would have to mean.

[52] Of course future events known to the audience but not to the Herald will prove him wrong about this; but that is a matter of dramatic irony.

feelings of the Argive people[53] can have no effect whatsoever on his prospects. (They cannot, for example, send out a rescue expedition, since they have no idea of Menelaus' whereabouts.) The Herald is more likely to have suggested a *reason* why the gods can be expected to care "first and especially" for Menelaus, and the most obvious reason had already been pointed out in the *Odyssey* (4.569): that he was a son-in-law of Zeus. Aeschylus may therefore have written something like ‹θεοῖσιν, ὧν δὴ παῖδα νυμφεύσας[54] ἔχει›.

(20) *Agamemnon* 838-842

εἰδὼς λέγοιμ᾽ ἄν, εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι
ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἴδωλον σκιᾶς,
δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρευμενεῖς ἐμοί· 840
μόνος δ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἑκὼν ἔπλει,
ζευχθεὶς ἕτοιμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος...

What Agamemnon is trying to say here is clear. He has been discoursing sagely on jealousy, and here tells the chorus that he knows all about it from his experience in the war when, he says, Odysseus was the only one of the leaders who was consistently loyal[55]. But the text we have hardly makes him say this, as the struggles of two careful translators may testify:

"With knowledge – for I am well acquainted with that mirror, intercourse – I may pronounce image of a shadow those who seem most devoted to me" (Fraenkel);

"I can speak with knowledge, for I well understand companionship's mirror; its image is a shadow's, persons appearing very well-disposed to me"

[53] I presume that Murray intended στρατός to bear the meaning "people" (as in *Eum*. 566, 569, 668, 683, 889) rather than "army", since most of the Argive army now consists of corpses floating in the Aegean (659-660); but in *Agamemnon* the word always means "army", with one very doubtful exception (547, where it refers, very confusingly, to the Argive home population, having been used in 538 and 545 to refer to the army; λεῷ Heimsoeth), and it has been so used no less than six times during the Herald's report of the disaster at sea (624, 627, 634, 639, 652, 670).

[54] In the Loeb edition I proposed this supplement with κηδεύσας at this point; this was wrong, since κηδεύειν is not used with a direct (or even an indirect) object denoting the bride.

[55] J.D. Denniston and D.L. Page (Oxford 1957) ad loc. pertinently ask what fault Agamemnon had to find with "Nestor, Diomede, and many others", and suggest that the allusion is to the *Nostoi* (Arg. §1 West), where these two are said to have sailed for home when Agamemnon wished to remain at Troy and make sacrifices to Athena. But according to the *Odyssey* (3.162-4) Odysseus too was among those who made this early departure, though he thought better of it at Tenedos and returned to Troy. More likely we are meant to perceive Agamemnon's judgement of his colleagues as being grossly unfair. Fraenkel, for whom the Aeschylean Agamemnon was a "great gentleman" (ii 441), skates over the whole problem.

(C. Collard, Oxford 2002).

Both these scholars are forced to treat δοκοῦντας as if it were τοὺς δοκοῦντας or ἄνδρας δοκοῦντας, and they also have difficulty with εἴδωλον σκιᾶς – both in effect making Agamemnon say that "those who seem most devoted to me" are an "image of a shadow", when what is unreal is not the men but their supposed devotion[56]. Even if the passage could be understood by an audience, it would give an impression of incoherence which would not surprise us if the speaker were the Herald, but is quite unlike anything else in Agamemnon's part.

In the Loeb edition I attributed the positing of a lacuna between 839 and 840 to H.D.F. Kitto[57]. In fact it goes back at least as far as B.H. Kennedy's second edition (Cambridge 1882), as I should have gathered from West's supplemental repertory of conjectures (*Studies* 391). Kennedy proposed, *exempli gratia*, ‹ἄνδρας φανέντας τῶν ξυνορμένων τινάς›. This deals with one, but only one, of the two difficulties mentioned in the previous paragraph; it still identifies the "image of a shadow" with the men instead of with their pretence of loyalty.

Probably, then, more than a single line has been lost. In the Loeb edition I did not suggest any specific restoration of the Greek text but offered what might be called a diagnostic translation:

«I can say with knowledge – for I am very well acquainted with the mirror of social relations – that ‹the loyalty of friends is› a mere shadowy phantom. ‹I know that many of the leaders of my army were really my jealous enemies, › though to all appearance they were very friendly to me. Only Odysseus...».

I now offer a very tentative restoration of the text, in the hope that others may be able to improve upon it:

εἰδὼς λέγοιμ᾽ ἄν, εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι
ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἴδωλον σκιᾶς 839
‹τὸ πιστὸν εἶναι τῶν φίλων τοῖς κρείσσοσιν.
σαφῶς γὰρ ἤδη τῶν ὑπ᾽ Ἰλίῳ πρόμων
πολλοὺς στυγεῖν με τῷ φθόνῳ κρατουμένους[58],›
δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρευμενεῖς ἐμοί· 840
μόνος δ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἑκὼν ἔπλει,
ζευχθεὶς ἕτοιμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος...

[56] As A.W. Verrall (London 1904[2]) saw when he translated 840 (his 831) as "the hypocrites' semblance of devotion to me" – as though Aeschylus had written τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι...

[57] *Form and Meaning in Drama* (London 1956) 23 n. 2.

[58] Cf. Eur. fr. 295 and *trag. adesp.* 535.

(20) *Agamemnon* 1005-7

καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν
ἀνδρὸς ἔπαισεν ἄφαντον ἔρμα.

If this had occurred in an astrophic lyric, it would probably have been judged sound. The antistrophe (1022-4), however, shows that something is missing; its text is itself uncertain at one or two points, but there is no reason to suspect interpolation, and no serious doubt that the metrical scheme is

– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –

However, while something has certainly been lost from 1005-7, it is almost impossible to determine *where* it has been lost. A seven-syllable lacuna could in principle be posited at any of six places in the sentence (at the beginning, or after any of the first five words) and has in fact been posited in at least four of these places. H. Weir Smyth (London and Cambridge MA 1926), G. Thomson (Cambridge 1938; Prague 1966[2]), and West have all favoured, and two of them have actually printed, H.L. Ahrens' supplement of ‹ἄφνω δυστυχίας πρὸς› after ἔπαισεν. This is good, but could, I think, be improved. One feels that ἀνδρός could do with an additional descriptor of some kind, and that this is needed more than ἄφνω is: if the voyage was proceeding smoothly, and the reef is invisible, we do not need to be told that the ship strikes it suddenly and unexpectedly[59]. I suggest that a preferable restoration would be

καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν
ἀνδρὸς ἔπαισ' ‹ἀφνεοῦ
δυστυχίας πρὸς› ἄφαντον ἔρμα.

As in the previous sentence (1001-4) it was the fittest, healthiest man who was particularly vulnerable to sickness, here it is the rich man who is liable to be ruined at any moment by the shipwreck of his fortunes – and we will gather presently that he is apparently rich enough to be able to "jettison" a substantial proportion of his wealth in order to save the rest (1008-13), as Clytaemestra proposes to do in the (vain) hope of buying off the *daimon* of the house of Pleisthenes (1568-76). The adjective ἀφνεός occurs twice elsewhere in Aeschylus, both times in anapaests (*Pers*. 3; fr. 96).

The whole image will be reprised by the Erinyes in *Eum*. 553-565, where the victim is twice described as wealthy (554 ‹ἄγον›τα πολλὰ παντόφυρτ', 563 τὸν πρὶν ὄλβον) and also as arrogant (561 τὸν οὔποτ' αὐχοῦντ' "the one who boasted ‹it could› never ‹happen to him›").

[59] Besides, ἄφνω is not found in any uncontroversially genuine work of Aeschylus (only in *Prometheus Unbound*, fr. 195.4).

(21) *Agamemnon* 1472-4

ἐπὶ δὲ σώματος δίκαν
κόρακος ἐχθροῦ σταθεὶς ἐκνόμως
ὕμνον ὑμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται ‹ ⏑ – ›. 1474

1473 σταθεισ᾽ Stanley ἐκνόμως Σ^{Tr} T^{pc}: ἐννόμως *f*
1474 disyllabum excidisse docet stropha (1454): ‹κακόν› Murray: ‹πικρόν› Page: ‹δίκης› Kayser: ‹᾽Αρᾶν› ante ἐπεύχεται Risberg: alii alia

The subject is the *daimon* of the house, which the chorus here half-identify with Clytaemestra (as she herself will do at 1500-4); she it is, after all, who is "standing over the body". "To try and recover the two syllables lost at the end would be useless guesswork", says Fraenkel; all the same, I venture to suggest ‹χαρᾶς›. Clytaemestra has made it very clear that she does rejoice in her murder of Agamemnon (1391-2) and Cassandra (1446-7), and in one of these passages she has used the verbs χαίρειν (1391, 1394) and ἐπεύχεσθαι (1394) in close proximity. This supplement also adds to the condemnatory force of the chorus's words: not only has Clytaemestra murdered her husband and king, not only does she take pleasure[60] in having done so, but she *publicly glories* in the killing and in the pleasure she has derived from it.

(22) *Agamemnon* 1649-53

ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὶ δοκεῖς τάδ᾽ ἔρδειν καὶ λέγειν, γνώσῃ τάχα. 1649
εἶα δή, φίλοι λοχῖται, τοὔργον οὐχ ἑκὰς τόδε.
εἶα δή, ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπιζέτω.
ἀλλὰ κἀγὼ μὴν πρόκωπος, κοὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν.
δεχομένοις λέγεις θανεῖν γε· τὴν τύχην δ᾽ αἱρούμεθα. 1653

1652 κοὐκ Fraenkel: οὐκ *f* : οὐδ᾽ Lobel
1653 γε Lobel: σε *f* αἱρούμεθα Auratus: ἐρούμεθα *f*
1649 Aegisthum dicere inter omnes constat 1650 choro tribuit *f* : Aegistho continuavit Stanley: praefecto satellitum dedit Verrall 1651 Aegistho tribuit F^{ac}: choro GF^{pc}: in T nulla nota: praefecto dedit Thomson 1652 Aegistho, 1653 choro tribuit *f* : vice versa Stanley

The textual problem here relates not to the words of the script (for which the restorations printed above are not now seriously disputed) but entirely to the attribution of lines.

West gives the five lines to Aegisthus and the chorus-leader in strict alternation, thus agreeing with the manuscripts[61] for the first two lines and with Stanley for the last two; he relies mainly (*Studies* 225-6) on the argu-

[60] Quasi-erotic pleasure, at that; see my discussion of *Ag*. 1372-1447 in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2002) 154-7.

[61] For what they are worth, which, as is nearly always the case in regard to speaker identification, is not much (J.C.B. Lowe, "BICS" 9, 1962, 27-42).

ments of Denniston/Page. So far as lines 1652 and 1653 are concerned, these arguments are indeed decisive. It cannot possibly be supposed that the chorus wear swords, so 1651 must be addressed not to them but to the guards confronting them[62]; from which it follows that 1652 must belong to the chorus-leader, 1653 to Aegisthus.

But what of 1650 and 1651? On 1650 West adopts Page's argument that φίλοι "is more appropriate as an expression of the chorus' solidarity than as Aegisthus' address to his subordinates". But it is, and always has been, common for military commanders to address their men with terms denoting or implying affection or protectiveness ("lads", *mes enfants*, etc.); in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* Cyrus can address his whole army as ἄνδρες φίλοι (2.3.2) and his subordinate Abradatas uses the same formula when ordering his men to charge (7.1.29). Sophocles has two choruses of humble sailors, both of which are addressed by their commanders as φίλοι (*Aj*. 349, 406; *Phil*. 825). In Aeschylus, the Persian Queen, whom the chorus hail with profound obeisances as "wife of a god and mother of a god" (*Pers*. 157), repeatedly addresses them as φίλοι (162, 206, 231, 445, 598, 619). And so far as armed guards are concerned, Pelasgus in *Suppliants* (954) tells the Danaids to take confidence from the escort of φίλοις ὀπάοσιν[63]. Aegisthus in particular has every reason to adopt "a studiously friendly attitude towards the underlings *on whose help he now depends*" (Fraenkel; emphasis mine).

Furthermore, as Medda rightly points out[64], λοχῖται is the word that Aeschylus chooses in *Cho*. 768 to denote these same guards, and on its only other occurrence in tragedy (Soph. *OT* 751) it likewise refers to the armed attendants of a ruler; the word appears twice elsewhere in classical Greek (Xen. *Anab*. 6.6.7, *Cyr*. 2.2.7), both times as a military term denoting a soldier or soldiers under the command of a particular λοχαγός. On this evidence, φίλοι would be far less inappropriate in the mouth of Aegisthus than λοχῖται would be in the mouth of the chorus-leader.

And if τοὔργον οὐχ ἑκὰς τόδε is spoken by the chorus-leader, what is it supposed to mean? What is the "job" that is at hand? If this is Aegisthus

[62] P. Judet de la Combe, *L'Agamemnon d'Eschyle: Commentaire des dialogues* (Villeneuve d'Ascq 2001) 759, and E. Medda, "Lexis" 19, 2001, 46-50, suggest that in 1651 the chorus-leader is addressing, not his colleagues, but "any Argive capable of fighting": it is not clear how the audience are supposed to know this (contrast Eur. *Or*. 1621-4 where Menelaus explicitly calls out to γαῖα Δαναῶν ἱππίου τ᾽ Ἄργους κτίται), and even if they did manage to work it out, it would leave them wondering why the appeal finds no response, either now or later.

[63] So M; on Schütz's φίλαις, still adopted by West, all that is necessary was said by O.P.Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford 1977) 233 n. 3 and by Johansen/Whittle ad loc.

[64] Medda (n. 62) 37-38.

speaking to his guards, the meaning is clear; he has just told the chorus, in effect, that if they want to oppose him they will learn (πάθει μαθόντες, as he might have put it) what are the consequences of doing so (1649, cf. 1619-23), and he now, inexplicitly but plainly, instructs the guards to inflict these consequences upon them. But if the speaker is the chorus-leader, there is nothing to be done yet – putting oneself in readiness to resist an attack whenever it may be launched is not an ἔργον – unless we are to suppose (which neither Page nor West does) that the old men are being urged to take the initiative themselves and attack the armed guards with their staffs.

Aegisthus, then, is the speaker of 1650 as well as 1649. Does he speak 1651 as well? Stanley thought so, and so more recently has E. Dettori ("Museum Criticum" 21/22, 1986/7, 28-31). But it would be pointless to make Aegisthus give two successive orders to the guards, only the second of which has any effect (why not just give the effective order in 1651?); nor, having attracted their attention once with εἶα δή, would he need to do so again immediately afterwards[65].

The proposal to introduce in this scene an additional speaking character in the shape of the captain of the guard was first made by Verrall[66], and that in itself has probably cost it some credibility; Verrall, moreover, gave the captain lines 1650 and 1653, which is certainly wrong – a tyrant's δορυφόροι are an instrument in his hands, and should speak or act only on his orders. But Thomson's proposal to have him speak 1651[67] deserved better than the almost complete neglect that has been its fate[68]. Aegisthus did not have the courage to kill Agamemnon in person but delegated the task to Clytaemestra (cf. 1633-5, 1643-6); now we see that he does not even have the guts to give an explicit *order* for the massacre of the Elders (and that is clearly what is envisaged, as Clytaemestra perceives at 1654-6). He gives them a vague order which may be paraphrased as "You see what your duty is", and which their captain then translates into a specific executive instruction. The chorus declare their intention not to yield, even at the cost of their lives, and Aegisthus grimly assures them that it *will* cost them their lives – at which point Clytaemestra intervenes and, as always in this play, takes command of

[65] See Medda (n. 62) 40-41.

[66] Verrall (n. 56) ad loc.

[67] In his 1938 edition Thomson appears to have been under the impression that this had been Verrall's proposal; in 1966 he silently retracted this and claimed the credit himself.

[68] Fraenkel gave it a mention, but clearly did not take it seriously. Denniston/Page, West, and Judet de la Combe ignore it completely; Medda (n. 62) 36 at least gives it the courtesy of a rejection backed by some sort of argument. The only scholar I know of, other than Thomson and myself, who has championed it in print is my former teacher A.D. Fitton Brown ("CR" 1, 1951, 133-5).

the situation, dominating all the two dozen or so males present.

That the Captain only speaks one line is neither here nor there. In the next play we shall meet a Doorkeeper speaking one line (*Cho*. 657), quite likely from behind a closed door without even coming on stage[69]; a Servant speaking a total of eleven (*Cho*. 875-884, 886); and, famously, Pylades who is constantly present with Orestes (at least up to 930) but speaks just three lines, though they are of enormous weight (*Cho*. 900-2)[70].

(23) *Agamemnon* 1672-3

μὴ προτιμήσῃς ματαίων τῶνδ᾽ ὑλαγμάτων· ‹ἐγὼ›
καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων ‹καλῶς›.

ἐγώ. φησί, καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντες τῶνδε τῶν δωμάτων διαθησόμεθα τὰ καθ᾽ αὐτοὺς καλῶς Σ^{T}, unde 1672 ‹ἐγὼ› Canter, 1673 ‹καλῶς› Auratus

So the last lines of *Agamemnon* are usually restored; but the absence of an object for θήσομεν καλῶς is worrying, and Fraenkel showed that it was indeed abnormal. Since τῶνδε is dispensable[71], he proposed καὶ σὺ δωμάτων κρατοῦντε ‹ › θήσομεν καλῶς, with ‹πάντα›, ‹ταῦτα›, ‹τἄλλα› as options for filling the gap. This, however, as Denniston-Page note, requires us to assume a complex and improbable process of corruption, and a simpler restoration would be καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε δωμάτων ‹καλῶς› τάδε. If καλῶς were lost, τάδε would find itself next to δωμάτων and might easily be assimilated to its case, afterwards being placed before δωμάτων either as a metrical "correction" (it not being noticed that the line was still two syllables short) or under the influence of the scholia.

(24) *Choephoroi* 71-74

θιγόντι δ᾽ οὔτι νυμφικῶν ἐδωλίων
ἄκος, πόροι τε πάντες ἐκ μιᾶς ὁδοῦ
†βαίνοντες† τὸν
χερομυσῆ φόνον †καθαί-
ροντες ἰοῦσαν ἄτην†.

71 θιγόντι Stephanus: οἴγοντι M

[69] So Taplin (n. 63) 341.

[70] There are eight speaking characters in *Choephoroi*, and four of them (the Doorkeeper, Aegisthus, the Servant and Pylades) speak a combined total of 29 lines. Medda (n. 62) 36 n. 10 rejects Pylades as a parallel because he is a much more significant character than the Captain would be, and rejects the Doorkeeper as a parallel because he is not a significant character at all; he really can't have it both ways! Very brief speaking parts like some of these are not found in the surviving plays of Sophocles or Euripides; perhaps they were an early, experimental exploitation of the possibilities provided by the availability of a third actor.

[71] Though the evidence is not sufficient to warrant Fraenkel's claim that it is actually contrary to Aeschylean usage.

73 βαίνοντεσ M, quo servato ἄλγη pro διαλγὴς (αἰανὴς H.L. Ahrens) in stropha (68) coni. Sier: διαίνοντες Lachmann: φοιβαίνοντες Tucker (hoc si verum est, glossema erit καθαίροντες): συμβάλλοντες Risberg χερομυσῆ Porson: χαιρομυσῆ M
74 ἰοῦσαν ἄτην M: ἴθυσαν Musgrave, μάταν post Scaligerum Heath

Given that some corruption is certain here (over and above those which have been corrected with general consent)[72], there may well be suspicion of the two participles with identical endings, so close to each other and neither coordinate nor in a clear relationship of subordination. In addition, as Sier (n. 72) has noted, πόρος does not normally mean "stream" unless words in the context make it clear that this is its sense. A.F. Garvie (Oxford 1986) ad loc. gives good reasons for adopting Tucker's φοιβαίνοντες; this verbal root is found twice again in Aeschylus (*Eum*. 237; fr. 148) and never in Sophocles or Euripides[73]. If φοιβαίνοντες is right, καθαίροντες will be a gloss on it, and may have displaced a word or words that would have provided the required disambiguation of πόροι, e.g. ‹ῥυτοῖς ὕδασιν› (cf. *Eum*. 452 ῥυτοῖς πόροις, also about the cleansing of blood-pollution). The fact that ὕδασιν and ἴθυσαν share five of their six letters may have contributed to the loss of the phrase.

(25) *Choephoroi* 160-3

ἰώ, τίς δορισθενὴς ‹εἶσ᾽› ἀνὴρ
ἀναλυτὴρ δόμων, Σκυθικά τ᾽ ἐν χεροῖν
ἐν ἔργῳ βέλη πιπάλλων Ἄρεως
σχέδια τ᾽ αὐτόκωπα νωμῶν ξίφη;

160 δορισθενὴς anon.: δορυσθενὴς M εἶσ᾽ add. Weil
161 Σκυθικά Robortello: σκυθιτά (sscr. ησ) M
162 παλίντονα ante ἐν ἔργῳ M: del. Paley Ἄρεως Blaydes: ἄρησ M
163 ξίφη Σ^{M}: βέλη M

So my Loeb text, which is identical to West's except that I have adopted ξίφη at the end: the scholium (αὐτόκωπα· τὰ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ἔχοντα τὴν λαβὴν ξίφη· σχέδια δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σχεδὸν φονεύοντα καὶ οὐ πόρρωθεν ὥσπερ τὰ

[72] I cannot include ἴθυσαν μάταν among these consensus corrections, since K. Sier, *Die lyrischen Partien der Choephoren des Aischylos* (Stuttgart 1988) ad loc. rejects ἴθυσαν on the ground that a gnomic aorist (he claims) is not possible here (I do not understand why not).

[73] Sier's objection that φοιβαίνω is "ein literarisch unbezeugtes Verbum" is utterly pedantic; its derivative ἀφοίβαντος appears in *Eum*. 237 and probably also in Aesch. fr. 148 (ἀφοίβατον cod., corr. Stephanus), and the lexical lemma φοιβᾶναι (Hesychius φ 678) must come from a literary (and presumably a lyric) source. V. Citti, "Philologus" 146, 2002, 210-5, adopts Lachmann's διαίνοντες "wetting", retaining the transmitted διαλγὴς in 68; quite apart from the dubious credentials of διαλγής (which is clearly not what the scholiast read, and whose later meaning was "suffering pain", not "causing pain"), what is the object of διαίνοντες supposed to be?

βέλη) cannot have been written to a text in which swords as well as arrows were referred to as βέλη.

An unsatisfactory feature of this text, however, is the juxtaposition (ἐν χεροῖν ἐν ἔργῳ) of two unrelated phrases introduced by the same preposition in different applications. Additionally, it may be noted that one does not "brandish" (πιπάλλων) a weapon while actually using it "in the work of Ares". I suggest ἐπ᾽ ἔργῳ "with a view to ‹warlike› action" (LSJ ἐπί B.III.2).

(26) *Choephoroi* 423-455

"Abnormis est dispositio et stropharum (7.8.9.9.7.8) et personarum (El. [429-433] – Or. [434-8] non interveniente choro)". So West's apparatus note on 434. Actually neither of these two 'abnormalities' is readily removable by any transposition.

Up to 422 we have had four cycles of stanzas, each comprising (i) choral anapaests, (ii) lyrics by Orestes, (iii) lyrics by the chorus, (iv) lyrics by Electra; (ii) and (iv) of each cycle have been in responsion with each other, and (iii) of the first and third cycles were in responsion with (iii) of the second and fourth cycles respectively. At 423 this pattern changes, the chorus leading off the fifth cycle with lyrics; this cycle contains six stanzas, and these are distributed asymmetrically – three to the chorus, two to Electra and one to Orestes[74]. There is no way to arrange these six stanzas so that the *dispositio personarum* will follow a pattern resembling that of 306-422; moreover, since 434-8 must necessarily have been preceded by at least one stanza referring to the degrading treatment of Agamemnon after his death, it is certain that the previously regular alternation between Orestes and Electra is broken at least once.

As to the *dispositio stropharum*, there are various logically possible ways of arranging the stanzas that would count as 'normal', depending on whether we chose to compare this passage with the earlier part of the *kommos*, with the regular pattern of tragic choral odes, or even with the triadic pattern familiar in Pindar, but there are certain quite stringent limiting conditions. 445-

[74] Internal evidence shows this unequivocally. The oriental lament of 423-4, accompanied by gashing and head-beating, whether performed or merely recalled, suits the chorus of war captives (75-77) who sang of similar actions when they first appeared (22-31). In 429-433 the singer is a child of Clytaemestra who knows how Agamemnon's funeral was conducted; so too in 445-450 where her identity is further confirmed by feminine adjectives. In 434-8 the speaker is male and is vowing to kill Clytaemestra with his own hands. In 439-444 he is being addressed, but not by Electra, since in 445 she refers to the singers of 439-444 in the second person. Lastly, 451-5 picks up and continues 445-450, but cannot be assigned to Electra, since strophe(s) 7 + 8 (lines 423-433) are divided between two voices and therefore, in accordance with invariable practice in all parts of this *kommos*, antistrophe(s) 7 + 8 (445-455) must be divided also.

450 and 451-5 certainly belong together, since the latter continues the advice to Orestes that began near the end of the former. 423-8 surely belongs at the beginning, since we would expect the cycle to begin with a choral stanza, as all the preceding cycles did, and this is the only choral stanza in the present cycle that is not a response to something said by another[75]. And 429-433 must precede 434-8, as noted above, and must also precede 439-443 (which, with its δέ γ', adds a new degradation to another or others previously mentioned), which in turn must precede 445-450 (whose opening shows that someone other than Electra has been singing about the aftermath of Agamemnon's death).

In other words, 423-433 (strophes 7 and 8) must come together, in that order, at the beginning of the cycle; 445-455 (antistrophes 7 and 8) must come together, in that order, at some later point; and 439-443 (antistrophe – or maybe strophe – 9) must come somewhere between these blocks. The only stanza whose position cannot be pinned down is 434-8 – which is also the one that has always attracted the most interest, because it is sung by Orestes and because in it he declares more specifically than ever before his intention of killing Clytaemestra.

Denoting Orestes' stanza 434-8 as 9or, and the choral stanza 439-443 as 9ch, the only arrangements that satisfy the conditions set out in the two preceding paragraphs are the following; in each case I give both the sequence of stanzas and the sequence of singers.

(a) 7. 8. 9or. 9ch. 7. 8 Cho. El. Or. Cho. El. Cho.
(b) 7. 8. 9ch. 9or. 7. 8 Cho. El. Cho. Or. El. Cho.
(c) 7. 8. 9ch. 7. 8. 9or Cho. El. Cho. El. Cho. Or.

Of these, (a) is the transmitted sequence; (c) was proposed by Schütz, was subsequently favoured by Weil, Wilamowitz and Lesky, and has recently again been argued for by Dawe[76]; (b) was mentioned in Gilbert Murray's apparatus (Oxford 1955[2]) as the view of unidentified *alii*[77], but has since sunk from view, neither Garvie nor Sier making any reference to it.

The nearest approach to a 'normal' sequence is (c), if the whole passage is regarded as one great strophic pair; but then we get a different kind of

[75] Sier (n. 72) 155-8 nevertheless transposes 423-8 to follow 429-433. Since he retains the transmitted order of the subsequent stanzas, this yields a strophic sequence 8.7.9.9.7.8, which he admits is "ohne genaue Parallel". Moreover, this emphatic assertion of the servants' extravagant grieving, coming *after* Electra's statement that Agamemnon was buried ἄνευ... πενθημάτων... ἀνοίμωκτον, will sound like a contradiction of it; the chorus, unlike Electra (445, 447, 449), never say that they were shut up in the house at the time. And, as Garvie noted ("JHS" 110, 1990, 215), 434 cannot directly follow 428; so Sier's transposition will necessarily entail at least one more!

[76] R.D. Dawe, "Eranos" 97, 1999, 24-44, at 28-31.

[77] I have not been able to track these nameless scholars down.

asymmetry, since the chorus will have two-thirds of the 'strophe' but only one-third of the 'antistrophe', and in addition Orestes, who on this hypothesis sang the last stanza of this fifth cycle, will also be singing the opening of the short sixth cycle[78] (456-465: one strophic pair, each stanza divided among Orestes, Electra and the chorus in that order). As to sequence (b), it does nothing at all to cure either of the 'abnormalities' with which we began.

I conclude that we cannot decide *on the basis of structural considerations* whether (a), (b) or (c) is correct; our only guide can be the sequence of thought. We will bear in mind, of course, that the one manuscript (and, at least *ex silentio*, the scholia) bear witness for (a); but there are other passages in Aeschylus where it is at least highly probable that lyric stanzas, or parts thereof, have changed places, sometimes across more than minimal distances[79], so that while, as always, the null hypothesis is that the transmitted text is correct, the presumption in its favour cannot be regarded as irrebuttable.

The key line is 434, which links Orestes' stanza to whatever preceded it: τὸ πᾶν ἀτίμως ἔλεξας, οἴμοι – a note which is then immediately struck again in the next line πατρὸς δ' ἀτίμωσιν ἆρα τείσει, the syllables ατιμωσ being repeated in the same position of a verse of the same structure. As οἴμοι shows, this must be an *immediate* and highly emotional reaction to an account of how Agamemnon was dishonoured. Garvie is right to argue that it cannot follow 455, at which point two stanzas have passed without any mention of the dishonouring of Agamemnon, and one without mention of the dishonouring of anyone at all. Thus (c) is ruled out, and we are left with the choice between (a) and (b).

In this choice the expression τὸ πᾶν seems to me crucial, and Garvie's discussion of the issue makes no mention of it. Whether the line means "your whole story is one of dishonour" (Garvie) or "wholly dishonoured, you say" (Collard), it is entirely out of proportion as a reaction to the statement that Agamemnon was buried without the participation of the citizenry and without mourning from his family. That was, no doubt, an act of great dishonour, but nothing like as great as the murder itself, and hardly sufficient to evoke the declaration of 435-8. Immediately after this, moreover, according to the transmitted text, the chorus tell Orestes of what really is a great horror, perhaps greater even than the murder – the mutilation of Agamem-

[78] Hence Wilamowitz proposed a lacuna before 456.

[79] See Dawe (n. 76). Instances accepted by influential recent scholarship include K.O. Müller's transposition of *Pers*. 93-101 to follow 114, Preuss's interchange of *Cho*. 623-630 with 631-8, and Westphal's interchange of *Supp*. 93-95 with 88-90 (each of these being half a stanza only). Compare also, in epirrhematic passages, Stavridès' interchange of *Pers*. 272-3 with 278-9 (see n. 7, in Part I of this paper) and Oberdick's of *Supp*. 872-5 with 882-4.

non's dead body, specifically intended by Clytaemestra, so the chorus say, "to make his death unbearable for you to live with" (441-2)[80] – and to this he does not react at all. This has got to be the wrong way round.

If we transpose 434-8 and 439-444, we get a coherent sequence. First Electra mentions Agamemnon's unseemly burial; then the chorus cap this by saying that she who performed this burial (440) also mutilated the corpse; then Orestes, picking up the chorus's last line κλύεις πατρῴους δύας ἀτίμους (444), says that the *whole* tale (i.e. what Electra has said *combined* with what the chorus has said) is one of utter dishonour and that his own hands will make Clytaemestra pay for it. Electra then adds the further, though milder, point that she herself was shut away inside the palace and not allowed to take part in the funeral, and both she and the chorus urge Orestes to absorb all this into his mind and to "enter the arena with inflexible will" (455). All then proceed to make a joint prayer, first to Agamemnon (456-460) and then to the gods (462).

Does this transposition *create* any difficulties? Garvie's defence of the transmitted sequence against Schütz's transposition [our (c)] raises one or two that are also relevant to the present proposal, to which I will presently add another.

(1) "The subject of τείσει (435) … is more obvious if it comes immediately after [429-433]". Garvie himself says that even after 455 the subject would "not [be] hard to supply"; and with the sequence proposed here, Clytaemestra has been the subject of a sentence occupying most of the immediately preceding stanza (439-442).

(2) "The anaphora at 436f. echoes that at 431f." (and, we may add, all the four cola concerned are metrically identical, even though the stanzas themselves are not in responsion). The echo will still be there, if at a slightly greater distance, if the transposition is accepted.

(3) A point not raised by Garvie because not relevant to the transposition he was arguing against: Electra's first words in 445, λέγεις πατρῷον μόρον, are most obviously taken to refer to 439-444, the only stanza in which the treatment of Agamemnon after his death has been described by anyone but Electra herself. However, by the end of this stanza (450) Electra is certainly addressing Orestes (so rightly Garvie), and she can perfectly well be addressing him already at 445: he too has been "talking about our father's

[80] Does this mean that Clytaemestra hoped that Orestes, on learning of what had been done to his father, would be unable to live with the thought of it and would commit suicide? (In fact, a moment later, he *will* wish for death – but on the condition that he has first killed Clytaemestra: 438.) Or are the chorus saying, ironically, that if Clytaemestra had been trying to make Orestes determined to take revenge at all costs, she couldn't have chosen a surer way to achieve this?

death" – the depth of indignity inflicted on him and the certainty that the perpetrator will pay for it.

I conclude that the best solution to the problems of sequence and coherence posed by this passage is to transpose 434-8 with 439-444. "The metrical pattern is indeed unparalleled, but so is the composition of this kommos as a whole" (Garvie). Like any other possible arrangement, this one keeps Orestes silent for a considerable time, in this case through five successive stanzas (antistrophes 5 and 6, strophes 7, 8 and 9); in effect, he misses one turn to sing. It may be significant that in the last words he did sing, he said that the remnants of the Atreidae were ἀμηχάνως ἔχοντα and asked πᾷ τις τράποιτ' ἄν, ὦ Ζεῦ; (407-9); that suggests that he may be falling into a state of despair and depression (which, as Garvie notes, seems to alarm the chorus, 410-4), and we may be meant to infer that this is what causes him to remain silent when next due to sing after 428. It is the account of Agamemnon's dishonourable post-mortem treatment, above all the bestial mutilation, that rouses him and makes him specifically confirm his resolve; and in the next cycle he will be the first to speak (456), taking the lead as the head of the family ought to. He was grieved that he had not been present to lament for Agamemnon's death (8) or to stretch out his hand at the ἐκφορά (9); what he had not known was that no one else, not even his sister, had been allowed to do so either, and that Agamemnon had been taken to his grave wearing a grisly necklace of his own bodily extremities.

(27) *Choephoroi* 785-7

δὸς †τύχας τυχεῖν δέ μου
κυρίως τὰ σωφροσυνευ†
μαιομένοις ἰδεῖν.

785-6 numeri, ut vid. collata antistropha, *2cr lec*[81]

The passage is thoroughly (if a little confusingly) discussed by Garvie, who offers various suggestions. A good starting-point for further consideration is his rejection of any restoration involving the root of σώφρων because "[such a] prayer is altogether too tame for an occasion [on] which extreme violence is demanded". This leads Garvie to suggest εὐτυχεῖν δὸς (Page) δόμου κυρίοισι(ν) (Bothe, slightly modified), followed by either εὖ φρονῶν or φῶς φέρων: the latter notion, as he points out, is thematic in the *Oresteia*, and it provides ἰδεῖν with an appropriate (understood) object. It would be preferable, however, if possible, not to have to shift δός and not to have to delete one of the two occurrences of τυχ-. This could be achieved if

[81] Though Sier (n. 72) 246-7, 251-3 makes major transpositions in the antistrophe which change the metre here to *lec 2cr*.

we were to read δὸς τύχας εὖ τυχεῖν (Bamberger) κυρίοις δόμου τὸ φῶς μαιομένοις ἰδεῖν "grant that fortune may fall out well for the masters of the house, who long to see the light". Garvie's and Sier's objection that at 658 the κύριοι δωμάτων were Clytaemestra and Aegisthus is, as Garvie at least evidently recognizes, not a strong one: when Orestes said that, both we and he knew very well that the real κύριος δωμάτων was himself[82]. But the corruption may lie deeper: κυρίως is a term much used by scholiasts giving what they consider to be the proper or primary sense of a word[83], and part of an annotation may well have been incorporated in the text.

(28) *Choephoroi* 802-5

κλῦτε, σύμφρονες θεοί·
ἄγετε ‹ – ˘ – ˘ – x ›
τῶν πάλαι πεπραγμένων
λύσασθ᾽ αἶμα προσφάτοις δίκαις.

The recent consensus is strongly in support of Wilamowitz's lacuna here, since the only alternative would be to make *two* deletions, of ἄγετε here and of the whole of 815 (on which see further below). Garvie is right to reject the usual interpretation of ἄγετε as a hortatory interjection on the grounds that Aeschylus does not use the plural form in this way (neither indeed do Sophocles or Euripides)[84] and does not follow up the singular ἄγε with an imperative[85]; but after ἄγετε in its normal imperative use he finds it "hard to see how the sentence might have continued". How about something like ἄγετε ‹δεσπόταν πάλιν, καὶ›? It is true that the master – Orestes – is actually already in the house; but he is not yet able to function as its master and is effectively still in exile, as he said at 252-4 that both he and Electra were even though Electra had lived all her life in the palace (cf. also 336).

(29) *Choephoroi* 815-8

πολλὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα †φανεῖ† χρῄζων {κρυπτά}
ἄσκοπον δ᾽ ἔπος λέγων
†νύκτα πρό τ᾽† ὀμμάτων σκότον φέρει,
καθ᾽ ἡμέραν δ᾽ οὐδὲν ἐμφανέστερος.

815 πόλλ᾽ ἄδηλ᾽ Wilamowitz φανεῖ (εῖ in rasura) M: ἔφανε Wilamowitz κρυπτά del.

[82] Sier's further objection against κυρίοις – that it would give δός two indirect objects (the first being μοι in 783), for which he could find no parallel in the language of prayer – would not apply to the text here proposed, in which κυρίοις is governed by τυχεῖν.

[83] It appears nine times in the Aeschylean scholia of M alone (*Pers*. 428; *Seven* 17, 251, 343, 857-860; *Ag*. 65; *Prom*. 54, 429, 499) and many times more in those of later mss.

[84] It is found three times in Aristophanes (*Peace* 469, *Lys*. 664, *Eccl*. 82).

[85] Hence Sier's supplement ‹τῶν μέλεσθ᾽ ἐναργῶς› is to be ruled out.

Hermann 816 ἄσκοπον κλέπος τελῶν West
817 νύκτωρ τ᾽ ὀμμάτων Heyse: νυκτὸς προὐμμάτων Bamberger

West discussed this passage briefly in "Gnomon" 59, 1987, 197, and more fully in *Studies* 254-5. His interpretation of πολλὰ δ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἔφανε as "he makes many things appear different" (sc. from what they really are) is not supported by any parallels; more importantly, φαίνω (unlike φαίνομαι) always implies that what is seen corresponds to reality – that is, it means not so much "cause to appear" as "reveal". West quite rightly points out that the passage relates to "Hermes' qualities as an ally in an enterprise involving deception", but the expression is a polar one[86] (what Garvie ad loc. calls a "foil-antithesis"). Just as Hermes is good at making manifest what without him would be concealed (for example in his roles as the guide of travellers [ἡγεμόνιος, cf. e.g. Theocr. 25.4-6] and as the patron of interpreters), so too he is good at concealing what otherwise would be visible. Hence Wilamowitz's πόλλ᾽ ἄδηλ᾽ can safely be accepted. The asyndeton presents no problem: these lines explain in detail the general statement that Hermes is φορώτατος πρᾶξιν οὐρίσαι θέλων (or whatever should actually be read in 813-4), as e.g. *Ag*. 836-7 explain in detail the preceding statement that one who suffers while another prospers has a double burden to bear.

Garvie does well to suspect that χρῄζων may be a gloss on θέλων (814), whose meaning it inelegantly repeats; if so, then together with that other gloss, κρυπτά (on ἄδηλ᾽), it must have displaced a genuine word of the form – ⏑ ; perhaps Aeschylus wrote something like πόλλ᾽ ἄδηλ᾽ ἔφανε ‹πράγματ᾽›.

I cannot see anything wrong with ἄσκοπον δ᾽ ἔπος λέγων, eloquently censured by West. Hermes pulls wool over people's eyes by saying things that are hard to see through, like the ἄσκοπα κρυπτά τ᾽ ἔπη of his great-grandson Odysseus (devised with the aid of Hermes Dolios, *Phil*. 133) of which Philoctetes complains in Soph. *Phil*. 1111-2[87]. Orestes, under Hermes' auspices (cf. 727-9, and Garvie on 583-4), did exactly that in order to gain entry to the palace[88], and may yet need to do more of it in order to complete his revenge. I do not know why Hermes' ability and readiness to lie should be thought "more appropriate to epic narrative than to drama" (West). Tragedy is full of liars[89], some of whom, as we have seen, invoke Hermes as

[86] Sier (n. 72) 260. L. Battezzato, "SCO" 42 1992, 86, objects against this that 816-8 is not antithetical to 815 in meaning; but this objection rests on a misrepresentation of the meaning of 816-8 (as "di notte non è visibile").

[87] A parallel noted by Battezzato (n. 86) 86. Odysseus' maternal grandfather Autolycus was a son of Hermes according to Hes. fr. 64.17-18 M.-W. = 65.17-18 Most and Pherecydes fr. 120 Fowler (though *Od*. 19.396-8 implies otherwise).

[88] As he also does in Sophocles' *Electra*, also with the aid of Hermes (*El*. 1395-6).

[89] And the *Oresteia* in particular: Atreus (*Ag*. 1590-3), Agamemnon (*Ag*. 1522-3, undoubtedly referring to the pretence that Iphigeneia was to be married to Achilles), Clytae-

their patron (or have him invoked on their behalf by others).

(30) *Choephoroi* 991-6

ἥτις δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἐμήσατο στύγος,
ἐξ οὗ τέκνων ἤνεγχ᾽ ὑπὸ ζώνην βάρος,
φίλον τέως, νῦν δ᾽ ἐχθρόν, ὡς φαίνει, κακόν – 993
τί σοι δοκεῖ; μύραινά γ᾽ εἶτ᾽ ἔχιδν᾽ ἔφυ,
σήπειν †θιγοῦσαν ἄλλον οὐ† δεδηγμένον 995
τόλμης ἔκατι κἀκδίκου φρονήματος;

992 ἐξ οὗ Robortello: ἐκ σοῦ M τέκνων—βάρος om. M, add. M^{s} ἤνεγχ᾽ (ἤνεγκ᾽) Turnebus: ην ἔχη M^{s}
993 κακόν] δακόν A.Y. Campbell
994 γ᾽ εἶτ᾽ Hermann: γ᾽ ἤτ᾽ M^{s}: τ᾽ ἤτ᾽ M
995 θιγοῦσ᾽ ἄν Robortello, Turnebus
996 κἀκδίκου H.L. Ahrens: κἀνδίκου West

Garvie in his note on 993 gives good reasons to be doubtful about almost every imaginable punctuation/construal of the line as transmitted, and also against A.Y. Campbell's ὡς φαίνει δακόν ("as it makes clear by biting her"). I suggest ἐχθρόν, ὡς φαίνει, δάκος: Clytaemestra's child (φίλον formally qualifies τέκνων βάρος) was once her φίλος (in infancy, before she had wronged him by first banishing him and then murdering his father) but is "now, as he has demonstrated, a deadly creature that is her enemy". The word δάκος will recall the snake to which Clytaemestra in her dream gave birth (called νεογενὲς δάκος in 530), as she herself recalled it in the last words we heard from her (928), and also the description of Clytaemestra herself as a noxious beast by Cassandra in the previous play (*Ag*. 1232-4: δάκος again, 1232), which Orestes will be reprising a moment later (994-6). That this emendation makes three consecutive lines end in -ος is not a strong objection to it: so do 291-3 and *Seven* 58-60, while *Pers*. 361-3, *Supp*. 476-8, and the four lines *Cho*.764-7 all end in -ον, *Ag*. 634-6 all end in -ῳ, *Ag*. 1183-5 all end in -ων, and *Cho*. 97-99 all end in -ιν. These sequences all seem to be purely casual; evidently Aeschylus made no effort to avoid them.

On 995 Garvie raises three "serious problems" which are presented by the text of that line – quite apart from the "particularly feeble" and surely corrupt ἄλλον: (1) "it is an odd way of emphasizing [Clytaemestra's] dangerous nature to say that *if* she had been a snake she would have been even more dangerous"; (2) the power of killing by a mere touch, without biting, is elsewhere ascribed to certain other creatures but not to the μύραινα or the

mestra, Orestes – and this chorus too, when, immediately before the ode now under discussion, they encouraged the Nurse to give Aegisthus a falsified version of Clytaemestra's message (*Cho*. 766-782).

ἔχιδνα; (3) Clytaemestra did "bite", i.e. stab, her victims, just as Orestes "bit" her (cf. above). There may be an excess of logic in this argument. Clytaemestra has previously been compared to a snake, but to Orestes at this moment that comparison seems inadequate to the horror of her character and actions, and he is fumbling for one that might be adequate – as Cassandra too did, as Orestes does when seeking something to which to compare the robe in which Agamemnon was trapped (997-1004), as the Pythia does when trying to describe the appearance of the Erinyes (*Eum*. 46-52), and as several other characters struggle for the right words on various occasions throughout the trilogy[90]. If she were a snake, she would have to be the exceptionally virulent kind of snake that can kill without biting; if such a snake does bite (and ps.-Aristotle's description of the Thessalian "sacred snake", *Mir*. 845b16-32, shows that some at least of them were believed to do so), it will be all the more deadly[91].

So we do not need to posit far-reaching corruption, and can concentrate on ἄλλον and perhaps also οὐ. We could do with a noun in place of ἄλλον, and if we have to fill the gap in the phrase "a serpent that can rot a ... without biting", the likeliest candidate for the position is certainly "man". The conjecture θιγοῦσ᾽ ἄνθρωπον (Groeneboom[92]) is thus tempting, with ἄλλον derived from the *nomen sacrum* abbreviation ANON: but we can't do without ἄν, since Clytaemestra is not a serpent and never was, nor was she in fact ever capable of shrivelling anyone up with a touch. One might think of σήπειν θιγοῦσ᾽ ἂν ἄνδρα μὴ δεδηγμένον: either negative is as good as the other here (to invert a remark of Garvie's, the participle is as likely to be conditional or generic as concessive). Possibly the first four letters of ΑΝΑΝΔΡΑ were corrupted into ἄλλαν, then ἄν was reinserted, δρα dropped as nonsensical and unmetrical, and finally ἄλλαν μὴ 'corrected' into ἄλλον οὐ.

(31) *Choephoroi* 1042-3

ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος
ζῶν καὶ τεθνηκὼς τάσδε κληδόνας λιπών

Thus M ends Orestes' last major speech. The sentence lacks a verb (φεύγω Weil); τάσδε κληδόνας is left unexplained; and the chorus's reaction (1044-7) shows that Orestes has ended his speech on a negative and ill-omened note. There can be little doubt that at least one line has been lost, in

[90] The "what shall I say?" theme of A. Lebeck, *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure* (Washington 1971) 103-4; cf. also *Ag*. 783-7, *Cho*. 87-99, 315-8, 418.

[91] To say that a dog can transmit rabies by a lick is not to say that rabid dogs never bite, nor that the bite of a rabid dog is no more dangerous than that of a healthy one.

[92] In his edition (Groningen 1949); he also changed σήπειν to σήπει.

which Orestes specified that the reputation (κληδόνες) he was leaving behind him was that of a matricide; the chorus reply in effect "no, of a tyrannicide". But where should the lacuna be? Hermann, followed by (e.g.) Page and Garvie, put it after 1043; Dindorf, followed by West, after 1042. The latter option must be rejected for the reason given by Garvie: it leaves 1043 as the conclusion of the speech, and 1043 is a very weak conclusion. If, as we would have to assume, Orestes said in the lost line "[I] am departing, a matricide" (with whatever elaboration was thought appropriate to fill out the line), 1043 would add only that this would be his reputation up to and beyond death.

If we place the lacuna after 1043, we can either leave the text of 1042-3 as it stands or accept an emendation like Weil's. In the former case we might restore something like ‹τὴν μητέρ᾽ ὡς ἔκτεινα, νῦν ἀπέρχομαι›; in the latter case it becomes easier to include a reference to Orestes' justification for the matricide, as he almost always does elsewhere whenever he mentions it (923-930, 974, 978-989, 1010-3, 1027-8; *Eum.* 458-464, 588-602), e.g. ‹ἄποινα πατρὸς μητέρ᾽ ὡς κατέκτανον›. This last option has the further advantage that it enables us to place the reference to the matricide right at the end and so maximize the motivation for the chorus's horrified reaction; for if the extra line follows 1043 and contains the main verb of the sentence (as it will if 1042 is left as transmitted), the sentence structure requires that the explanation of τάσδε κληδόνας take priority and the main verb come afterwards. I conclude that Weil's φεύγω is correct and that the repetition of *Ag.* 1282 (φυγὰς δ᾽ ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος) is about as close as it could possibly be. That line referred to Orestes' previous exile, only just ended; this sentence refers to his next, which is about to begin.

(32) *Eumenides* 861-3

μήτ᾽ †ἐξελοῦσ᾽ ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων†
ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀστοῖσιν ἱδρύσῃς Ἄρη
ἐμφύλιόν τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους θρασύν.

862 ἱδρύσῃς Ἄρη Stephanus: ἱδρύσηι κάρη M^{pc}: ἱδρυῃσῃ κάρα fere $M^{ac}f$

I have spread the obeli wide, since it is not agreed how far corruption extends. In my 1989 edition, noting the scholiast's gloss ἀναπτερώσασα, I printed Musgrave's ἐκζέουσ᾽, giving the sense "making ‹their hearts› seethe like the hearts of fighting-cocks"; but I do not now find myself convinced by the single parallel I cited for the order of the words that follow, and West

(*Studies* 290) bluntly calls this order "nonsense"[93] and makes a good case that the positioning of ὡς is metrically unacceptable too. He suggests ἐξεγείρουσ᾽ ὡς ἀλεκτόρων κέαρ, which likewise gives full value to the evidence of the scholium. Can (ἐξ)εγείρειν, though, bear the meaning here required? I cannot find a parallel for the metaphorical awakening of a heart; nearest is *Iliad* 5.510 Τρωσὶν θυμὸν ἐγεῖραι.

West considers and rapidly rejects a simpler solution, to delete ὡς without further change, leaving ἐξελοῦσα καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων: "the resulting sentence", he says, "is crude, with nothing to mitigate the apparent literalness of the heart transplant". Certainly, with 862-3 understood and punctuated as it usually is (and as shown above), this text of 861 would be intolerable: the galline hearts would be left on the operating table, without any indication of what was to happen to them, while a propensity to violence against compatriots was implanted into the Athenians. All that is needed, however, is for the actor to pause (and the modern editor to insert a comma, as Verrall and Podlecki have done[94]) after ἱδρύσῃς, separating it from ῞Αρη and encouraging us to understand καρδίαν as its object. "Do not", says Athena to the Erinyes, "take the heart out of fighting-cocks and implant it in my citizens, a spirit of internecine violence that emboldens them to fight each other". By thus treating ῞Αρη ἐμφύλιόν as the speaker's gloss on καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων, it is made clear that the "heart transplant" is metaphorical.

But are we now ignoring the scholium? Certainly ἐξελοῦσα could never be glossed as ἀναπτερώσασα. But consider the rest of the note: "For the bird is pugnacious, and whereas other animals respect their kin, this one alone does not spare them". The scholiast makes no distinction between fowl in a normal state and fowl in an 'excited' state; the species, according to him, is pugnacious *by nature*. Hence the understood object of ἀναπτερώσασα is not καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων but τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀστούς; it is glossing, not just the second word of 861, but the entire participial phrase which it introduces; and it is not in itself evidence that ἐξελοῦσ᾽ is corrupt.

And in fact ἐξεγείρουσ᾽ (or ἐκζέουσ᾽ for that matter) is not what the context requires. It is true that the owners of fighting-cocks tried to enhance their pugnacity by feeding them garlic (σκοροδίζειν): cf. Ar. *Ach*. 166, *Knights* 494, 946. But it is also true that the species was believed to be exceptionally pugnacious by nature, young males being eager to fight any opponent including their own fathers: cf. Ar. *Clouds* 1427-8, *Birds* 757-9,

[93] Not with specific reference to Musgrave's proposal or to my edition, which had appeared too late for him to use (it was published in November 1989, and the preface to *Studies* is dated in February of that year).

[94] A.W. Verrall, *The Eumenides of Aeschylus* (London 1908); A.J. Podlecki, *Aeschylus: Eumenides* (Warminster 1989).

1347-50. Athena's point is that Athenians are *not* like that by nature, but may become so if the Erinyes stir them up; the Erinyes would then be turning them, not from peaceful cocks into violent cocks (for peaceful cocks do not exist), but from *humans* into (inherently violent) cocks.

(33) *Eumenides* 1044-6

†σπονδαὶ δ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἔνδαιδες οἴκων†
Παλλάδος ἀστοῖς Ζεὺς παντόπτας
οὕτω Μοῖρά τε συγκατέβα.

1044 ἔνδαιδες M: ἔνδαδες *f.*
1045 ἀστοῖς Musgrave: ἀστοῖσι codd.

"Let us get to the essentials", as West says at the beginning of his discussion (*Studies* 294). An adjective ἔνδαϊς does not exist. There is a personal name Ἐνδαΐς, that of the mother of Peleus and Telamon (Bacch. 13.96; Pind. *Nem*. 5.12), but the second syllable of this name is long and its Attic-Ionic form is Ἐνδηΐς (Σ *Il*. 16.14, 21.184-5; Σ Pind. *Nem*. 5.12; Σ Eur. *Andr*. 687; [Apollod.] *Bibl*. 3.12.6; Plut. *Thes*. 10.3; Paus. 2.29.10)[95]. And the last seven letters of M's ἔνδαιδες are identical to a sequence of seven letters earlier in the line. We can at once infer that these seven letters are an intrusion, and have displaced the true text.

To make our prospects of restoring the text even worse, some suspicion must also surround ἐς τὸ πᾶν. It is certainly corrupt, as metre shows, but how likely is it that a phrase so characteristic of the *Oresteia* and especially of *Eumenides*[96] should have got here by a mere copying error? Might it not come from a parallel passage cited in the margin – 890-1 perhaps, where Athena invites the Erinyes to become residents of Athens, honoured εἰς τὸ πᾶν? In that case, these words too could have displaced just about anything.

Having said that, West's restoration σπουδᾷ δ' εἴσιτε πανδάϊδ' οἶκον would provide a more or less appropriate general sense, though πάνδαϊς is another word not known to exist (besides which, δαΐς "torch" is a very rare word in tragedy[97]) and one does not normally urge the participants in a solemn procession (and Awesome Goddesses at that) to "hurry" to their destination. In the Loeb I chose ("without much conviction") to translate this restoration, except that I left the epithet of οἶκος open; one might suggest πάνδικον οἶκον "the home that is justly yours" (cf. for the idea 890-1; for

[95] There was also a group of nymphs worshipped in Cyprus and known as Ἐνδηϊδές (Hsch. ε 2775).

[96] It occurs eight times in *Eumenides* (52, 83, 200, 291, 401, 538, 670, 891), three times in the rest of the *Oresteia* (*Ag*. 682; *Cho*. 684, 939), and once in all other tragedy (Eur. *Hcld*. 575).

[97] It appears only in Eur. fr. 472.13.

the word, 804 and *Supp*. 776).

Of other lines of approach, the most promising, often tried, has been to accept σπονδαί in the sense of "peace treaty" and link it with the unity between Zeus and Moira spoken of in 1045-6. When this unity is contrasted with the claims made earlier by the Erinyes that their role as avengers has been assigned by Moira (334-9, 392; at 961-2 the Moirai are their sisters) and that Zeus and his family have set Moira at defiance (171-2, 723-8), it is hardly an exaggeration to speak of a war (or at least a *stasis*) among the gods that is now ended. Combining this idea with Wilamowitz's and Headlam's suggestion that οἴκων might conceal some form or derivative of μέτοικος (cf. 1011, 1018), I proposed tentatively in my 1989 edition σπονδαὶ δ᾽ εἰσὶν ‹ἀεί σε μετ›οικεῖν Παλλάδος ἀστοῖς[98] "there is a treaty ‹which provides› that you shall for ever be resident among Pallas' citizens"; I now feel that I may have been too modest in suppressing this in the Loeb in favour of Headlam's σπονδαὶ δ᾽ εἰσόπιν ἐνδομετοικεῖν which introduces yet another word whose very existence is a matter of conjecture. For this sense of σπονδαί in Aeschylus cf. *Ag*. 1235 ἄσπονδον τ᾽ Ἄρη.

(34) *Prometheus* 235

ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἐτόλμησ᾽· ἐξελυσάμην βροτοὺς 235
τὸ μὴ διαρραισθέντας εἰς Ἅιδου μολεῖν.

δ᾽ ἐτόλμησ᾽ $^{\gamma\rho}\Sigma^{M}$: δὲ τόλμησ᾽ M D Lb: δὲ τολμῆς I^{ac} $^{\gamma\rho}\Sigma^{M}$: δὲ τόλμης or δὲ τόλμας O W V Q λ Σ^{Φ}: δ᾽ ὁ τόλμης cett. ἐξελυσάμην M α L Σ^{Φ}: ἐξερ(ρ)υσάμην cett.

Hutchinson ("CR" 34, 1984, 2) remarked that "to write ἐκ δ᾽ ἐλυσάμην would make ἐτόλμησ᾽ less abrupt" (Mark Griffith in his edition [Cambridge 1982] had complained of the "abrupt asyndeton"). To write ἔκ τ᾽ ἐλυσάμην, by tightening the bond between "I dared" and "I released" to make it almost a hendiadys (= "I dared to release"), would be a further improvement.

(35) *Prometheus* 354

Τυφῶνα θοῦρον, †πᾶσιν ὃς ἀντέστη† θεοῖς

πᾶσιν ὃς M α β δ λ: ὃς πᾶσιν γ ε κ

Attempts at emendation should focus on the superfluous πᾶσιν: ὃς is indispensable[99], and ἀντέστη is far more appropriate in sense than any alterna-

[98] For the shift from addressing the chorus in the plural (as is done consistently from 1033 to 1042) to addressing them in the singular (σε) cf. Eur. *Alc*. 215-7 where a similar shift is made within a sentence, and *Seven* 95-99 where the chorus twice ask each other whether they should clasp the images of the gods in supplication, once using the first person singular and once the first person plural.

[99] πᾶσι δ᾽ (Minckwitz) would leave it temporarily unclear that the narrative was going back in time, and would not explain how ὅς came to be added. The simple deletion of ὅς (first

tive that has been suggested. The front runners so far have been ‹θεὸς› ὅς (Headlam) and ὅσπερ (West). I propose ὅς ‹ποτ᾽›, signalling that we are going back into the past (in contrast with Typhon's present confinement, mentioned briefly in 353 and described more fully in 363-5).

(36) *Prometheus* 688-692

οὔποθ᾽ ‹ὧδ᾽› οὔποτ᾽ ηὔχουν ξένους
μολεῖσθαι λόγους ἐς ἀκοὰν ἐμάν,
οὐδ᾽ ὧδε δυσθέατα καὶ δύσοιστα
†πήματα λύματα δείματ᾽ ἀμφήκει 691
κέντρῳ ψύχειν ψυχὰν ἐμάν†.

688 οὔποθ᾽ ‹ὧδ᾽› οὔποτ᾽ Wecklein: οὔποτ᾽ semel λ, bis cett. ηὐχόμην M W^{pc} D ε
690 καὶ om. M I β
691 λύματα om. Q^{ac} δείματ᾽ om. D

West (*Studies* 303-4) has taken an important step by showing that Wilamowitz was right to propose τύψειν for ψύχειν, and if we also adopt Page's μοι ψυχάν, supposing ἐμάν to be due to the influence of 688, we have a good pair of dochmiacs to finish with, ἀμφήκει κέντρῳ τύψειν μοι ψυχάν. That leaves us with πήματα λύματα δείματ᾽ to make something of. Omissions of one word or another by individual mss. are not of much significance; but of the three words, it is λύματα that does not belong. The plural, until Roman times, belongs almost exclusively to epic (it appears once in tragedy, Eur. *Hel*. 1271), and denotes something unclean or polluting ("sufferings" only in *h*. *Orph*. 14.14 which may well be of Roman date). Probably λύματα is in origin a variant for δείματα which ended up alongside it in the text. Of the other two words, πήματα is clearly sound: Io's sufferings are indeed δυσθέατα καὶ δύσοιστα, hard (for her) to bear and hard (for the chorus – and also for Prometheus and the audience) to be spectators of. But the two-element asyndeton πήματα δείματα cannot be right; read δειμάτων (yielding another dochmiac), and construe it with κέντρῳ. Io's sufferings, sing the chorus, "strike my soul with a double-pronged goad of terror".[100]

University of Nottingham ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

proposed by an unknown early nineteenth-century scholar) leaves what Griffith, who adopts it, admits to be a particularly harsh asyndeton. Butler deleted the whole line, a solution that A.J. Podlecki (Oxford 2005) seems to favour; but a line built up from a gloss or paraphrase would never have included θοῦρον.

[100] I am most grateful to my colleague Patrick Finglass for some acute suggestions which have materially improved this paper at numerous points.