Readings in Aeschylus'
Choephoroe and Eumenides

Douglas Young

In this essay I offer some suggestions for the interpretation or emendation of passages in the two later plays of the Oresteia. The essay is in some sense a sequel to two articles published in 1964, “Some Types of Error in Manuscripts of Aeschylus’ Oresteia” (GRBS 5 [1964] 85–99) and “Gentler Medicines in the Agamemnon” (CQ N.S. 14 [1964] 1–23). In a later essay I hope to offer proposals for the text of the Byzantine triad of Aeschylus.

I

Conservative Cures in Choephoroe

After examining all the supposed corruptions in the text of the Oresteia, I concluded (GRBS 5 [1964] 85) “that errors involving more than one letter or one syllable are relatively a trifling proportion of the total of errors.” In approaching the constitution of a text of Choephoroe, for which Dr R. D. Dawe lists more than thirty pages of conjectures made since Wecklein’s repertory in 1885, I find a good many places where cures more conservative than most hitherto proposed may prove acceptable. Some of these I mentioned in 1964, and Dawe duly listed them in the Addendis Addenda (p.179) to his valuable Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus (Leiden 1965). Some others may be worthy of consideration also, starting with the third strophe and antistrophe of the parodos, which I incline to constitute thus:

\[
\text{(Line 66) } \delta\iota\; \alpha\iota\mu\alpha \nu\varepsilon \; \epsilon\kappa\pi\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu \; \upsilon\delta\omicron\nu\omicron\zeta\; \tau\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron \; \sigma\tau\rho\nu \; \gamma \; \tau\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma \; \phi\omicron\omicron \nu \; \pi\epsilon\omicron\pi\gamma\iota\nu \; \omicron \; \delta\iota\alpha\rho\omicron\rho\omicron\delta\omicron.
\]

1 For helpful discussions of numerous points I am most grateful to Professor Kenneth J. Dover of the University of St Andrews, Dr Alex F. Garvie of the University of Glasgow, and to my colleagues Professors Philip A. Stadter and David Sider of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
A version might run: “Through bloodshed drunk up by fostering Earth, avenging slaughter is fixed indissolubly. Grievous Ruin lets the guilty man pass through to become full of self-sufficing madness. But for a man who touches the abodes of a bride [i.e. who violates the sanctity of marriage as Aigisthos had done] there is no remedy, and all the streams coming from a single course to purify the slaughter that rejoices in pollution speed on in vain.”

Older conjectures that remain acceptable are: 66 Schütz’s ἔκποθένθ’ for M’s ἔκποθεν; Heath’s deletion after v.69 of the repetition of v.65; Stephanus’s θιγόντι at 71 for M’s οἶγοντι; and Musgrave’s Ίθυσαν μάταν at 74 for M’s Ίδοκαν ἀτήν. At 68 I propose, for M’s ἀτη διαφρέι, "Ατα (Rogers) διαφρεῖ. The colon scans as a polyschematist choriambic dimeter, what P. Maas dubbed a 'wilamowitzianus'. Such a colon does not require exact syllabic responsion with its counterpart at 73. The verb διαφρέω, 'to let through', found at Ar. Av. 193 and Thuc. 7.32, might well be unfamiliar to a copyist, who would substitute the common verb διαφέρει. The sense is that Ruin gives a guilty man enough scope to incriminate himself thoroughly, enough rope to hang himself.

In 72, for πόροι relating to liquids, cf. Cho. 366, Eum. 293; and for ὕδωρ of the course of a stream Xen. Cyr. 7.5.16. In 73 only Wellauer of former editors appears to entertain M’s χειρομυσί, and that doubtfully; but it seems a plausible enough coinage to mean ‘rejoicing in pollution’. If alteration be needed the metrical equivalent nearest in spelling would be another hapax, χειρομυσί (Pauw) ‘hand-polluting’.

At 74 we need an iambic trimeter for responsion with 69, and there is no need for every syllable of the trimeter to correspond to 69. M’s καθαίροντες does not scan and is probably in the wrong tense, and Murray is on the right lines with his suggestion of a future participle.
indicating purpose, ‘to purify’ καθαγνιοῦτες. Aristophanes and Plato use a compound of Μ’s verb καθαίρεω, and perhaps Aeschylus wrote διακαθαροῦτες. Scribes quite often omit prepositions in composition.3 Denniston found resolved feet corresponding to unresolved nineteen times in lyric iambics.4

For the epode 75–83, Μ’s readings are metrically and otherwise acceptable with the following colometry, where no problem of responsion arises:

75 ἐμοὶ δ’ (ἀνάγκας γὰρ ἀμφιπτολίνθεοι προσήνεγκαν  ἐκ γὰρ ὀίκων πατρωῶν δοῦλων ἐδῶγον αἰλαν) 79α δίκαια καὶ μὴ δίκαια 79β πρέποντ’ ἀρχάς βίοι 80 βία φερομένων αἰνέσαι πικρῶν φρενῶν εὐγός κρατούσης δικρῶν δ’ υφ’ εἰμάτων, ματαιοίς δεσποτάν̣ τύχαις, κρυφαίοις πένθεσιν παχνουμένην.

syncopated iambic trimeter syncopated iambic trimeter syncopated iambic dimeter syncopated iambic dimeter iambic pentasyllable iambic trochaic dimeter

“But for me—since the gods applied constraint to my city: for from my paternal home they brought me to a slave’s apportionment— it is fitting to acquiesce in deeds just and unjust of men winning for themselves sovereignties by doing violence to life, while I suppress the hatred of my embittered heart. And I bewail beneath my robes, because of my masters’ senseless fortunes, a girl chilled with secret griefs.”

At 77 an accusative pronoun can be supplied mentally, and Conington’s δοῦλον <μ’> is not needed. For the iambic trochaic dimeter at 79α the best known parallel is the start of Pind. Ol. 2 ἀναξιφόρμενον εἶμι.

At 79β the construe is: ἐμοὶ πρέποντά ἐστιν αἰνέσαι δίκαια καὶ μὴ δίκαια, κρατούσῃ ἐμέγας φρενῶν πικρῶν =πρέπει μοι . . . “It befits me to approve . . .” Slaves were not supposed to voice opinions. The phrase βίον βία, ‘in spite of life’, implies ‘by murder’, the means by which Aigisthos had acquired his share of sovereignty.

At 80, for the sense of φερομένων, cf. LSJ s.v. φέρω A.vi.3. At 81, for the sense of πικρῶν, ‘embittered’, cf. Theb. 358 πικρῶν δ’ ὄμμα θαλαμηπόλων,

3 Cf. GRBS 6 (1965) 264.
4 J. D. Denniston, in Greek Poetry and Life, Essays Presented to G. Murray (Oxford 1936) 142f.
and Soph. Ant. 423 πικράς ὄρνιθος ἐξὺν φθώγγον. In 82η ματαιοίς... τύχας is a dative of cause. At 83 παξνουμένην is the object of διακρώ, cf. Ag. 1490 πῶς σε διακρύω; It refers to Elektra, to whom the chorus presumably turn or point; and she immediately begins to speak. There is probably no need to alter the forms with eta, 81 κρατοῦση, 83 παξνουμένην, to forms with the lyric long alpha. It is a questionable assumption that Aeschylus always pedantically inserted lyric alpha forms in lyrics wherever possible, and totally avoided them in marching anapaests.

Not a single letter of Μ need be changed at 152-57, with proper colometry and punctuation, thus:

152A ἵπτε δάκρυ — — — — — — — — iambic monometer
152B καναχές ὀλόμενον — — — — — — — — — — dochmius
153 ὀλομένω δεσπότας, — — — — — — — — — syncopated ia. dim.
154A πρὸς ἔρυμα τὸδε κακῶν, — — — — — — — — — — dochmius
154B κεδνῶν τ' ἀπότροπον. — — — — — — — — dochmius
155 ἄλγος ἀπεύχετον κεχυμένων χοάν. — — — — — — — — 2 dochmii
κλέε δὲ μοι, κλύε, — — — — — — — — — — dochmius
cέβας, ὡ δέσποτ', εὖ
ἀμαύρας φρενός. — — — — — — — — — 2 dochmii

152A is also interpretable as — — — — — — — —, an Adonean; but the iambic monometer analysis is supported by the iambic dimeter syncopated at 153. The rest of the passage is dochmiac, with various resolutions, as is the continuation, to 163, for the text of which see GRBS 5 (1964) 95.

One might render: “Let go a tear, plashing, perishing for the master perished, upon this defence against evils and averter of good things [i.e. the tomb]. Grief is removed by prayer with the pouring of drink-offerings. Now hear me, hear, Your Majesty, O master, from your darkened soul.”

At 152B ὀλόμενον is a coincident or synchronous aorist participle. At 154A, for ἔρυμα τὸδε κακῶν, 'a defence against evils', cf. Eur. Med. 1322 ἔρυμα πολεμίας χερὸς. The tomb is also a 'turner away of κεδνά' because its incumbent is denied most possibilities of enjoyment. At

---
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155 ἀπεύχησεν, proparoxytone, has the force of a perfect participle passive. The genitive absolute here expresses cause and/or attendant circumstances. For an asyndetic gnome as hinge in a transition from one theme to another compare ἐκτις διῶν τίς at Alcman 1.35 (Page). Here the Chorus, having lamented, as requested by Elektra, take a new initiative of their own by proceeding to conjure Agamemnon to speed his avenger, whom they envisage at 160–63 as armed with bow and sword.

At 224 Elektra, still astonished at seeing Orestes, asks him, “Then are you really Orestes that I am talking to?” He replies with what is perhaps best printed with a question-mark, and in the form offered by M’s first hand and ink, according to Murray: ὁδὸν μὲ νῦν ὀρέως δυσμαθεῖς ἔμε; “Seeing me myself, do you have difficulty in recognising me?”

M’s second hand has μὲν νῦν, which Turnebus changed to μὲν οὖν. μὲ νῦν was printed by Portus, Schütz, Hermann, Franz, Blass and Groeneboom, most of them apparently thinking it a conjecture; but no one seems to have taken the sentence as interrogative.

At 277 Orestes relates that Apollo had threatened him with πολλά δυστερῆς κακή, ‘many evils hard to enjoy’, if he should fail to execute a capital sentence upon his mother; and Orestes proceeds to enlarge upon the warning at 278ff. M’s text at 278–79 needs only punctuation and one reinterpretation of a letter to be intelligible, thus:

>, , , ,
Ta I-ECT yap EIYCTC, OVC"pOVWV I-ECXTEC
βροτοίς, πιθαύκων εἰπ’, ἐτὰς δεινῶν νόοις,—

279 εἴπε τάςδε M νονούς M, ante corr. νὸν, νόοις M post corr.

On the principle that Aeschylus probably wrote ε meaning ε, η and ει, and that the choice of which one was to come down to posterity was that of a copyist interpreting as best he could, which often meant in the most familiar words, it seems no real departure from the paradoxis to re-divide into εἴπ’, ἐτὰς δεινῶν νόοις. The sense is: “For things from the earth, malign powers’ gifts to mortals, revealing he spoke of, exaggerating real diseases,—”

μειλίγματα, from μειλίσσω, has, like μείλω, a considerable range of meanings, and can refer to gifts in general as well as to propitiatory

---

7 Cf. Smyth, op.cit. (supra n.6) § 425. c.n.
8 Cf. Smyth, op.cit. (supra n.6) § 2070.b.
offerings to the dead. It would here be said ironically. It is accepted by quite many, including Bothe, Klausen, Peile, Conington, Paley, Verrall, Pauw, Tucker, Blass, Weil and Werner. In 279 ἐτὰς would be a form of ἐτές, cf. LSJ s.v. ἐτός (B). δεινῶ, 'exaggerate', is used at Thuc. 8.74. Orestes goes on to state the exaggerated descriptions at 280ff.

At 418f Elektra asks:

τί δ᾽ ἄν φάντες τύχοιμεν; ἡ τάπερ
πάθομεν ἄχθεα πρός γε τῶν τεκομένων;

"What could we speak of to succeed? Those oppressions we suffered from our parents?" (meaning the mother and stepfather). Blass accents ἡ peripomenon, followed by Headlam, Groeneboom, Thomson. The fact that ἄχθεα is glossed τὰ ἄχη is not a reason for changing it to ἄχεα with Schwenk and most editors. It scans perfectly well in dochmiacs. Exact responsion at 406 is not needed, ἰδετε πολυκρατεῖς ἀραί φθινομένων, but can be secured through reinterpretting πολυκρατεῖς as πολυκρατεῖς. For the epicism cf. Agam. 723 πολέα. Allowing synizesis in ἄχθεα the verses can also scan as syncopated iambic trimeters.

At 452 M offers ἰσώχῳ φρονῶν βάσει, 'thinking with calm movement', and there is a scholion understanding this as προέξων καὶ μὴ ἀποπλανώμενον. Turnebus' change to φρενῶν does not gain anything in intelligibility, 'with the calm movement of your wits'. The notion of φρονεῖν as a process akin to walking is latent in such expressions as Eur. Bacch. 853 ἔξω δ᾽ ἐλαύνων τοῦ φρονεῖν, Soph. OT 617 φρονεῖν γὰρ οἵ ταχεῖς οὐκ ἀσφαλεῖς ('not liable to slip'), Thuc. 2.89 τὸ βέβαιον (from the root of βαίνω) τῆς διανοίας. Euripides puts it explicitly at Hec. 744 ἐξιστορήσαί εὖν ὀδὸν βουλευμάτων, and Hipp. 391 λέξῳ . . . τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ὀδόν.

At 455 M's original reading πρέπεις may be right, in the line πρέπεις δ᾽ ἀκάμπτω μὲνε καθήκειν. The final sigma was erased, perhaps by the scholiast who interpreted thus: πρέπει δὲ καὶ ἀμετακινῆτω δυνάμει ὑμῶν κατ' αὐτῶς. The second singular could mean either (1) 'But you appear to be entering the struggle with inflexible force', or (2) 'But you are fit to enter . . .' Aeschylus uses πρέπειν much like φαίνεσθαι, in the sense 'appear', at Pers. 247 τοῦτο γὰρ δράματα φωτὸς ΠερΣικῶν πρέπει μαθεῖν, and at Supp. 719 πρέπουσι δ᾽ ἀνδρεῖς νήσοι μελαχρίμοις γυνίσχιοι λευκῶν ἐκ πεπλωμάτων ἱδεῖν. For the sense 'be fit, be fitting' cf. Soph.
It is not the main purpose of the conjuration of Agamemnon's spirit to raise the morale of Orestes, but it would have that side effect; and the Chorus' address to him with the personal πρέπεις would be more encouraging than an admonition with the impersonal form πρέπει.

Line 544 must refer back to the detail of Klytaimestra's nightmare described at 529, ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ παιδὸς ὀρμίσκας δίκην, "(and she thought that) she berthed (the snake) in swaddling clothes like a child." For 543–44 the paradosis offers: εἰ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν χῶρον ἐκλυτὸν ἐμοί | τούθεν επάσα εὐαγγελία πλείζετο, with ζτ in the margin. Perhaps 544 should run: οὕφις (Porson) ἐν ἀμα εὐαγγελίῳ (Klausen) ἐπλωίζετο or ἐπλοίζετο: "the snake sailed into my swaddling clothes." The verb πλωίζω is Hesiodic, Ὀρ. 634; cf. Thuc. 1.13. Its middle form is Hellenistic, often spelt πλοίζ-. Of verbs with the notion of a ship's movement, continuing the image of 529 ὀρμίσκα, none comes so close to the paradosis letters ἐπλείζετο.

For the strophe 623–30 the paradosis needs only small routine adjustments of accents, punctuation, and common small errors of spelling or misinterpretation of the ambiguous spellings of Aeschylus, thus:

623 ἐπιμνασάμαν Dindorf, ἐπιμνάσαμεν M linea, ἐπιμνάσαμεν M supra. 624 πόλων, ἀκαίρως δὲ, interpuncturunt Pauw et Wilamowitz. 626 φρενοῦ Young, φρενῶν M. 627 post τευχεσσόρῳ plene interpunctit Young. 628 ἐπεικότως Vir Doctus apud Scholefield, ἐβας Verrall, ἐπικῶτος σέβας M. 629 τίω Stanley, τίων M. 630 γυναικεῖαν Schoene, γυναικεῖαν M. αἰχμᾶν M ante corr.

In 602–22 the Chorus had mentioned Althaia, who caused the death of her son Meleagros, and Skylla, who killed her father Nisos. Now they proceed to consider a woman who killed her husband and married her paramour, Klytaimestra. One may translate: "But, since I mentioned cruel distresses, but irrelevantly—the household has
[supply ἐκτικ with δόμοις as dative of possessor] an odious mating, abominated, namely (τε) one that prompted [φρενοῦν is participle, neuter, of φρένοι] wife-plotted schemes against an armour-wearing husband." The Chorus then turn and point at the palace. “Against your husband you [meaning Klytaimestra] proceeded in a manner like enemies. But I honour a household’s hearth not heated (by passion), free from the boldness of wifely weapons.”

624 ἀκαίρως. Althaia and Skylla exemplified crimes that women may commit under the influence of love, cf. 596–601. But they are not fully relevant to the present καρός, where an adulterous wife has slain her husband and espoused her preferred bedfellow.

626 τε here is appositive or explanatory, as at Agam. 10 ἐκ Τροίας φαύν | ἀλῶσιμον τε βάζων, “a report from Troyland, namely news of its capture.”

626 φρενοῦν is a mere re-interpretation of the paradosis φρενῶν, which derives from some copyist’s attempt to understand Aeschylus’ ambiguous ΦΡΕΝΟΝ. The verb occurs at Agam. 1183 φρενῶς δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἐξ αἴνυμάτων. Cho. 116, PV 335.

630 For genitives of relation dependent on an adjective compounded with alpha privative, cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar§ 1428.

At 631–38 the Chorus pursue their train of thought in the foregoing strophe, and compare Klytaimestra’s crime to the most notorious example of female criminality known to Greek tradition, the massacre of their husbands by the women of Lemnos. Redividing and interpreting the paradosis at 632, the text might run thus:

631 κακῶν δὲ πρεβεβεῖται τὸ Λήμνων  
λόγῳ. γοῦται δ’ ἐδὴ ποθῇ κατά-
633 πτυστον. ἠκα纵深 δὲ τις  
634 τὸ δεινὸν αὖ Λήμνιοις πῆμας.

632 δ’ ἐδή ποθῇ Young, δὲ δὴ πόθει Μ.

This might be rendered: “Of evil deeds the Lemnian takes the first place in tradition. But this house in yearning bewails an abominable act. And someone compared the atrocity in its turn to the Lemnian woes.”

632 ἐδή. Aeschylus uses the word ἐδὸς several times, in the plural at Pers. 404. Like δόμος, δόμοι, at Cho. 13, 625, 776, 841, 942, 963, it can doubtless mean ‘household’ as well as ‘house’.

* Cf. J. D. Denniston, Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954) 502.
The Homeric form, = πόθω, is the easiest reinterpretation of Μ's original πόθει. A form with the lyric alpha seems not to be found anywhere. That apart, it does not seem that Aeschylus rigorously eschewed Homeric forms in his lyrics. The household are yearning for their slaughtered master, Agamemnon, and for the vengeance to be exacted by his heir, Orestes.

At 698f the paradoxis runs:

νῦν δ' ἢπερ ἐν δόμοις βακχεῖας καλῆς
ἰατρός ἐλπίς ἢν παροῦσαν ἐγγράφει.

At 699 I am inclined to redivide and punctuate to make the line this: ἢπερ ἐλπίς ἢν παροῦσ' ἂν, ἐκγραφέ. The final imperative seems first to have been suggested by Schwerdt. The sense of 698f then becomes: "But now, that hope which, if present, would have been a midwife of lovely bacchic revelry for the household—strike it out.”

Klytaimestra means Orestes, probably without sincerity.

ἰατρός can mean, according to Hesych. s.v. μαἰά, ‘midwife’, for which office a later Greek term was ἵατρίνη. Conversely, Galen uses the word μαἰά for a lady doctor, at 14.641. Also the word ἵατρόμαια emerged. In calling hope ‘a midwife of lovely bacchic revelry’ Klytaimestra is recurring to the strained conceits of her insincere utterance at Agam. 896–901.

ἡν παροῦς' ἂν = ἡν ἂν παροῦσα ( = εἰ παρῆν), an ‘unreal’ conditional complex. For the position of ἂν cf. Agam. 933 ἡδῶθε θεοίς δεῖες ἂν ὃθ᾽ ἑρδεῖν τάδε;

ἐκγραφέ means ‘strike out, delete, expunge, write off’. Cf. the decree in Andoc. 1.77. Compare Cassandra’s image at Agam. 1329 εἰ δὲ δυστυχῶ, βολαίς ὑγρώσσων επάγγελος ὀλέειν γραφήν. The change of spelling from ἔκγραφο to ἐγγραφ- is found already in the third century B.C. at IG V² 357.14. ἐκγραφέ is equivalent to the scholiast’s τάξον αὐτὴν ἀφανείωσαν, ‘classify it as disappeared’.

For strophe 783–88 the most conservative treatment that makes sense may involve emendation and punctuation as follows:

νῦν παρατουμένα μοι, πάτερ
Ζεῦ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων,
The sense would be: "Now for me as I petition, Zeus, father of Olympian gods, grant fortunate results. And may my pious behaviour (μου ... τα εὐφρονα), as is due (κυρίως), have good success (τυχεῖν ... εὖ). For those who yearn to see (ιτ), make a settlement according to justice. I have spoken my whole utterance. Zeus, may you guard him."

785 τύχαι, accusative plural of τύχη = 'examples of good fortune', 'happy events'.

785f τυχεῖν εὖ τα εὐφρονα μου is an accusative and infinitive construction expressing a wish, like Sept. 253 θεόι πολίται, μη με δουλείας τυχεῖν. Cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar 2 §2014.

787 διαδικάσσω is imperative aorist infinitive of διαδικάζω, 'to settle by δίκη'. There is a metrical problem here, and at v.798, where I interpret the paradosis as τοῦτ' ἰδεῖν, δαπέδων ἄνομένων, scanning -ο- | -ο- | οοο- | οοο-, making two cretics and a fourth paean. At 787 we have οοο- | οοο- | οοο-, fourth paean+ palimbacchius+ fourth paean. The two cola are thus equivalent, on the principle that, in cretico-bacchio-paemonic rhythm, cretic, any sort of paean, bacchius and palimbacchius can each be substituted for any other pentachronous unit of the series. The strophe is mainly syncopated iambic, but 786b = 797b is a dochmius (in dodrans form), and the final colon is an ithyphallic.

This brings us to the first antistrophe of the stasimon, which may most conservatively be set out thus:

795 νιν ζηγεῖν' ἐν ἄρματι
796 πημάτων. ἐν δρόμῳ
797α προστιθεῖσι μέτρων κτίσαι
797β εὐζόμενον ρυθμόν.
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τούτ’ ιδεῖν, δαπέδων ἀνομένων,
βημάτων ὅρεγμα.

797A κτίσαι Young, τίς ἄν M. 798 δαπέδων Young, δάπεδον M.

The sense is: “And realize that the orphaned colt of a man dear (to you) is yoked in a chariot of woes. In the course, applying due measure, cause the observing of rhythm. May you behold such an out-stretching of paces as plains are traversed.”

795 M’s singular ἀρματεί is preferable to the scholiast’s plural ἀρματεῖ, because Aeschylus always uses the singular where the chariot of an individual is concerned, at 660, Pers. 84, Sept. 50, PV 465, and the plural only where several chariots are involved.

796 Here a doubly syncopated iambic dimeter responds to the singly syncopated iambic dimeter at 785. The asyndeton is immediately paralleled at 798, in another petition.

797A κτίσαι is the aorist infinitive active of κτίζω used imperatively. This is rather a favourite verb of Aeschylus: cf. 351, 441, 1060, Pers. 289. Schömann proposed κτίσαν, but κτίσαι seems more likely to have been corrupted to M’s τίς ἄν.

797B εὐζόμενον ῥυθμόν is in the ab urbe condita construction, commoner in Greek than is usually recognized. Cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar2 §2053.

798 τούτ(o) has the sense of τοιοῦτο, cf. LSJ s.v. οὐτος, C.III. ιδεῖν is another imperative infinitive, like 797A κτίσαι.

The long alpha in δαπέδων is paralleled by PV 829, where δάπεδα of the paradosis is kept by Mazon, Paley, Wecklein, Wellauer and Pauw. ἀνομένων has here a short alpha, as at fr.279a2 Mette (= 161 Nauck). Cf. LSJ s.v. ἄνω (A) fin.

The lyrical passage from 819 to 837 can be intelligibly adjusted with much less alteration than current editions present. Because of the problems of responsion it is convenient to take the mesode last, after the strophe and antistrophe, which go thus:

ṣtr. Γ

820 καὶ τότε δὴ πλωτῶν
δωμάτων λυτήριον,
θῆλων οὐριο-
ɕtάταν ὀμοκρεκτῶν
γοὴτῶν νόμων

- ∅ - ∅ -
dochmious
sync. iambic dimeter
hypodochmious
dochnious (in Reig-ianum form)

dochnious
Aeschylus' Choeophoroe and Eumenides

From 800 to 818 the Chorus invoked the gods of the hearth and household, and Apollo and Hermes, to aid in the actions of Orestes. What they say from 819, in the third strophe and antistrophe, may be rendered thus: "And then indeed, setting the house free to sail, female creator of a favourable wind, woven together, a tune of enchanters we will utter: 'For the state these acts are well. My gain, mine, is growing here. And Ruin stands away from my dear ones. . . . And keeping in your midriff the heart of Perseus, slay (her), for those here below the earth and for the dear ones above (it) proceeding to perform favours by causing the bloody ruin of the grievous Wrath inside, namely (δ') by utterly destroying the guilty Doom.'"

The Chorus anticipate the song of triumph they will sing as Orestes completes his mission, which is at the same time a magical chant to help on the anticipated triumph.

819 Πλωτὼν Young, πλοῦτον M. 822 ὄμωκρεκτὸν Young, ὄμοι κρεκτὸν M ex corr. 833 <πέρθε> supplement Young. 834A φιλοικί τ' Young, φιλοικιν τοίς τ' M. 834C χάριτας Schütz, χάριτος M.

825 μεθέρσομεν: "τόλει τάδ' εὖ. \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0} \overline{0}-\overline{0} \overline{0} \overline{0} \overline{0} \overline{0} \overline{0}\) iambic dimeter

eμόν εμόν κέρδος αδεται τάδ', "Α- ta δ' ἀποστατεὶ φιλων." \(\overline{0}\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) sync. iambic trim.

832 Περσέως τ' ἐν φρεσκίν \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) dochmius (with synizesis)

<τέρθε> καρδίαν εχειλών, \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) sync. ia. dim.

τοῖς' ὑπὸ χθονὸς \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) hypodochmius

834B φιλοικί τ' ἀνωθεν \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) dochmius (in Reizianum form)

834C προπράξασιν χάριτας \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) dochmius

835 Ὀργάς λυγρᾶς ἐνδοθεν \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) sync. iambic dim.

φοινίκαν ἄταν τιδεῖς, τὸν αὖτιον δ' \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) sync. ia. trimeter

ἐξαπολλύει Μέρον. \(\overline{0}-\overline{0}-\overline{0}\) sync. ia. dimeter

819 M's irrelevant πλωτὼν may derive from a trivializing misinterpretation of the dramatist's original ΠΛΟΤΟΝ, by which the context, with 814 having probably πρᾶξιν οὐριαν θέμεν (cf. GRBS 5 [1964] 89), suggests that he meant πλωτὼν, genitive plural neuter of πλωτός,
'capable of sailing', agreeing with δωμάτων and expressing proleptically the result of the superordinate adjective λυτήριον. The Chorus would regard the house as tied up by the usurpers.

821 οὐριοστάταν is a hapax, and must refer to a νόμος, incantation, δὲ οὐριον ἀνεμον ἵστησιν. Cf. 814 πράξων οὐρίαν θέμεν.

822 δόμοι κρεκτών of M, where the letters όμοι are in an erasure, will represent an original ΟΜΟΚΡΕΚΤΩΝ, another hapax, from the roots of ὀμοί + κρέκω, 'woven together' = 'sung in unison'.

In 824–26 the Chorus consider first the πόλεις, which is their concern also at 1046; then their personal prospects; and thirdly their dear ones, principally Orestes and Elektra.

833 ἑπέθε might have dropped out below original ΠΕΡΣΕΣ of Περσέως in 832. 834b I have deleted τοῖς, as an interlinear article miscopied into the text, and removed as unmetrical the facultative ν of φιλοις.

835 Ὀργᾶς and 837 Μόρον both refer to the personified Wrath or demon of the house, cf. Agam. 1477, 1501, 1569, the daimon of the Pleisthenidae or Pelopidae, cf. Agam. 1600–02, which had caused the series of deaths starting with the twelve elder children of Thyestes. Cf. Agam. 768 Κότων, δαίμονα τεγών.10

836 δ' here links expressions in apposition, cf. 190, 841, Agam. 1405: Denniston, Greek Particles p. 163.

On metrical points here, it is important to bear in mind the multiplicity of forms of the dochmic colarion, any one of which can respond to any other, including the anacastic form, the hypodochmius. In lyric iambic dimeters and trimeters there are over twenty places in Aeschylus where syncopated forms are found responding to unsyncopated forms, or singly syncopated cola to doubly syncopated, or cola syncopated in one metron to cola syncopated in another metron. The frequency and subtlety of Aeschylus' handling of syncopation have been obscured by the meddlesome innovations of doctrinaire straitjacketing editors since about 1800. The freedoms of responson in the final three cola of these stanzas should be relished, not abolished.

Regarding my suggestion to delete an article at 834b as intrusive, it seems to me the most economical way of adjusting the colometry; but instead one might add a syllable in the strophe at 822, e.g. thus:

821–22 θῆλυν οὐριοστάταν δόμοι <τε> κρεκτών, γοήτων νόμον . . .

10 Cf. ΟQ N.S. 14 (1964) 9.
These would make trochaic trimeters. The version would be: “... a female and together-woven creator of a favourable wind, a tune of enchanters...” Adjustments in 822 and/or 834 do not affect my view of the last three cola of the stanzas.

The third mesode, at 827-31, seems acceptably intelligible if thus colometrized and punctuated:

\[ \text{εὐ δὲ θαρεὼν, ὅταν ἤχη μέρος} \]
\[ \text{ἐπαύσας πατρὸς ἐργὼν, } \]
\[ \text{θροεούσα πρὸς σὲ “Τέκνον”, } \]
\[ \text{“Πατρός” αὐθὰν, καὶ περαί- } \]
\[ \text{νων ἐπίμομφον ἀταν. } \]

Also possible would be to add \( \thetaροεοὔσα \) to 828, making a second ionic trimeter, and then continue thus:

\[ \text{829-30 πρὸς σὲ “Τέκνον,” “Πατρός” αὐθὰν, καὶ περαίνων trochaic trimeter} \]
\[ \text{831 ἐπίμομφον ἀταν. aepochal Aristophaneous [or iambic pentameter, with resolved anceps]} \]

The sense would be: “But do you, with confidence, whenever the turn for deeds comes, raising a shout for your father’s deed, to her when she cries ‘Child!’, say ‘Of my father!’, while actually carrying through the ruin, censurable though it be.”

At 830 αὐθὰν is an imperatival infinitive, and καὶ emphatic. At 831 ἐπίμομφον is perhaps active, ‘fault-finding’, as at Eur. Rhes. 327; but it may be passive, ‘censurable, capable of being found fault with’, as Agam. 553.

A general stylistic problem of some interest, and of long-standing controversy, is involved in consideration of a proposed interpretation of the paradosis at 907. The problem is the limit of the use by tragedians of the imperfect, and other past tenses of the indicative, without addition of the syllabic augment.

Ending his dispute with his mother at Cho. 929-30, Orestes, as agent for the Delphic oracle, of which Pylades had at 900 broken his prolonged silence to remind him, utters the oracular statements:

\[ \text{ἡ κάρτα μάντις οὖς ὀνειράτων φόβος.} \]
\[ \text{930 κάνες γ’ ὅν οὐ χρήν, καὶ τὸ μὴ χρεῶν πάθε.} \]
Hermann defended the paradosis reading of the unaugmented aorist κανει, and θετο at Cho. 738 is a good parallel for an unaugmented aorist in initial position in an iambic trimeter of dialogue. At the end of a trimeter in a messenger’s speech cf. Pers. 313 . . . ναός ἐκ μμᾶς πέσων, which Broadhead ad loc. defended, remarking: “Aeschylus’s language is constantly redolent of epic.” He also accepts elsewhere in Persae unaugmented imperfects in messengers’ speeches, which tend to have epic flavours: 376 τροποῦτο, 458 κυκλοῦτο, 506 πίπτειν. In Sophocles, manuscripts give us several relevant examples: OT 1245 καλεί (initial); 1249 γοατό (initial); El. 715 φορεῖθ; Trach. 904 βρυγάτο; 915 φρουρων: all so far initial; and in final positions Trach. 767 προσπύγκετο, and Phil. 371 πλησίον γὰρ ὠν κυρεί. Examples in Euripides include: Alc. 839 Ἡλεκτρύωνος γείνατ ’Αλκμήνη; Ba. 1066 κυκλοῦτο (initial); 1134 γυμνοῦτο δὲ (at line-end), where see Dodds ad loc. Other discussions are in Kühner-Blass § 199 pp.18–19, and Jebb on Soph. OT 1249. Many examples are readily removable by assuming prod elision of an initial augment following a final long vowel or diphthong in the preceding line, by interpreting as a historic present, or otherwise; but there remains an intractable group, mostly in passages of epic flavour, that suggest the general admissibility of the non-addition of the syllabic augment. If we had all the plays of the great tragic trio, instead of about a tenth of them, we would doubtless have hundreds of examples of imperfects without added augment.

Applying all this to an earlier part of the exchanges between Orestes and his mother, I incline to read at 907–08:

τοῦτω θανοῦσα ξυγκάθευδ’, ἐπεὶ φιλεῖς
τὸν ἄνδρα τούτου, ὅτα ἑχρῆν φιλεῖν στύγεις.

“Sleep with him here in death, since you love this man; but him whom it was your duty to love you used to hate.” M actually has the perispenomenon στύγεις, according to reports; but I suspect that may be an accent set on without due consideration, under the influence of φιλεῖς immediately above. Orestes is no ordinary messenger, but an envoy of Apollo, delivering the verdict of the Olympians on Klytaimestra: so that an unaugmented imperfect would be stylistically quite in order.

New interpretations of the paradosis at 968 and 969 involve less alteration than has commonly been thought necessary to emend a
stanza in which M has several lapses. The antistrope may go thus:

965 τάχα δὲ παντελῆς Χρόνος άμείβεται
πρόθυρα δωμάτων, ὅταν ἂφ᾽ ἑκτίας
μύσος πᾶν ἐλάσση,
καθαρμοίσων Ἄταν ἐλατήρ ἰών.
Τύχα δ᾽ εὑπρόσωπ᾽ οἰκοὶ ταῦτα πάντ᾽
970 ἰδείν, θρεμένοις
"Μέτοικοι δόμων πεσοῦνται πάλιν."

The strophe is wholly dochmiac, with a variety of forms of the colarion, to which strict responsion is not required.

The sense runs: "For soon all-accomplishing Time will pass the doorways of the halls, when from the hearth he drives every pollution, coming as a driver-out of Ruin-Fiends with purges. But may Fortune settle them (the υπόλατα) to be altogether fair of front to behold, for us as we shout aloud 'The alien settlers in the house shall be cast forth again'. We can see the light now."

In 968 M's έλατήριον probably derives from an original ΕΛΑΤΕΠΙΟΝ, by which the poet meant here έλατήρ ἰῶν.

In 969 the optative form οἰκοὶ (=οἰκοῖ) fell victim to a misdivision, which also affected the first syllable of ταῦτα. As Aeschylus uses τὸ πᾶν or ἐκ τὸ πᾶν several times, a corrector then evolved M's final τὸ πᾶν. Sophocles uses εὐπρόσωπος at Ajax 1009. It is here used proleptically, of the hoped-for result of the superordinate verb οἰκοῖ.

At 1059–60 the paradosis is most conservatively interpreted thus:

εἰς κοῦ καθαρμός, Λοξίου δὲ. προσθιγῶν
ἐλεύθερόν εἰ τῶν δημάτων κτίσει.

εἰςω ὧν ante corr. εἰςε' ὧν M post corr.

The sense is: "There is one method of purging of you, and it belongs to Loxias. With a touch he will make you free from these woes." The asyndeton is explanatory.
II

Minimal Mendings in *Eumenides*

In the manuscript tradition of Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* quite many passages appear in which a minimal change may mend the sense acceptably, or indeed a new interpretation of the paradosis may obviate the need for any change at all. Queen Victoria’s uncle, the Duke of Cambridge, is reported to have said, when Commander-in-chief of the British Army, “Any change at any time for any purpose is most highly to be deprecated.” That ducal gnome would be an unsafe guide for contemporary military planners, but is perhaps not the worst of maxims for editors of ancient Greek texts, in which far more harm has been done by innovation than by conservation.

At Eum. 175 the paradosis may have suffered nothing worse than a misdivision. But first the context should be recalled. The Erinyes are in Apollo’s temple at Delphi, venting their wrath that Apollo has sent off his suppliant Orestes, under the guidance of Hermes, to Athens, to seek sanctuary beside the ancient statue of the goddess Athena which stood in the Erechtheion. The third antistrophe may most conservatively be presented thus:

\[
\text{κάμοι τε λυπρός, καὶ τὸν οὐκ ἐκλύσεται.}
\]

\[
175 \text{ ὕπὸ τέγαν φεύγων οὗ ποτ’ ἐλευθεροῦται.}
\]

\[
\text{ποτιτρόπαιος δ’ ὄν ἔτερον ἐν κάρα μᾶστορ’ ἐκ κείνου πάσεται.}
\]

This stanza is probably best distributed to individual voices, as Murray treats early parts of the parodos. “And to me also (he, Apollo, is) offensive, and he shall not get him (Orestes) set free. —By fleeing under a roof (i.e. into a shrine) he is never liberated. —But by being a protector of suppliants he (Apollo) will acquire another polluter on his head after that one.” (i.e., he will have to take responsibility for another murderer in consequence of helping Orestes.)

The new proposal here is to read at 175 ὕπὸ τέγαν for the manuscripts’ ὕπὸ τε γάν. The interpretation τέγαν is in reciprocal support with a similar interpretation at 257, where the Erinyes have come
panting into the Erechtheion and found Orestes clutching Athena's statue, where I would interpret the paradosis this way:

257 δ' αδ' τέγων ἄλκαν ἔχων.
258 περὶ βρέτει πλεξθείς θεάς ἀμβρότου
259 ὑπόδικος θελεί γενέθραν χερῶν.

"Here he is again having the succour of a shrine (literally 'of roofs'). Entwined around the statue of the immortal goddess he wishes to submit to trial for his hands" (i.e. his deeds: cf. LSJ s.v. χελόν iv). At 257 the manuscripts offer ὁ δ' αδ'τε γονδ, on which Denniston, Greek Particles p.448, comments: "neither γ' οὖν nor γονδ is easy to explain." The words can only represent some copyist's interpretation of an original writing ὅΔΑΥΤΕΓΟΝ, on the assumption that Aeschylus used the letter Ο to mean ο, ω or ου. The word τέγων is Homeric, Od. 1.333 al., and Pindaric, Pyth. 5.41, Nem. 3.54; and probably Aeschylean also at Agam. 768 Κότον, δαιμονα τεγων, an interpretation defended at CQ N.s. 14 (1964) 9. Headlam suggested ὁ δ' αδ' τέγεον ἄλκαν ἔχων.

Some other readings in the two passages may be noted. At 174 καμοὶ τε of the paradosis is kept by Hermann, Wellauer, Mueller, Verrall and Mazon. For καὶ ... τε in Aeschylus cf. Eum. 713. Denniston (p.535) warns against the suggestion that the combination occurs in Thucydides with the sense 'and also'.

At 175 the paradosis form φεύγων gives a dochmiac scanning ω—or——, which is licit, as is its equivalence to the form ω—or—or—or—in the strophe at 170. Exact syllabic responion in this highly variable colarion was clearly not practised by Aeschylus. Likewise at 176 the paradosis word-order ποτιρόταιοις δ' οὖν gives a dochmiac scanning ω—or—or—or—responding to 171 ω—or—or—or—or. At 177 Bothe's ἐκ κεῖνον is the best correction of the manuscripts' ἐκεῖνον. At 257, for τέγων ἄλκαν, 'a temple's defence', compare Il. 15. 490 ἰεία δ' ἀρίγνωτος Διός ἀνδράς γίγνεται ἄλκη, Soph. Phil. 1150 οὐ γὰρ ἔχω χεροῦν τὰν πρόθεν ἐβελέων ἄλκαν, Eur. Phoen. 1098 ὥς τῷ νοσοῦντι τειχέων εἴη δορός | ἄλκη δι' ἄλγου.

The antistrophe at 334–40, which has been much amended, seems to need no more than an appropriate colometry and a single letter change, Meineke's τοῖς σῶν at 336 for the manuscripts' τοῖς.
A literal version could run: “For this assignment all-penetrating Destiny spun out for me to possess continually, that men who in their folly become messmates of criminal acts of kindred slaughter, such men I should accompany until each goes below earth. And after dying he is far from free.”

At 337 the manuscripts offer, separatim, ξύμπας ως, which may be joined and reaccented to make ξυμπάςως, which would be the third plural aorist subjunctive active from a not otherwise attested verb συμμετέω, a compound of the verb normally found in the middle as πατέομαι, but also known in the active to LSJ from Orion 162.20. The word συνδαίτωρ occurs immediately below, at 351, meaning generally a ‘sharer’, though specifically a ‘sharer at a feast’. ‘To eat along with’ is to partner, befriend or keep company with on intimate terms. θανάτων . . . αὐτουργία probably carries the double notion of a fatal act wrought by a man in person, as an αὐτουργός, and also committed against a kinsman or kinswoman, as with the word αὐτοκτόνος at Theb. 681, 805. For the shift from plural to singular at 337-38 cf. Fraenkel on Agam. 1521ff (iii. 717 n.3), and a very odd example at Hes. Op. 533-34.

In the strophe the colometry would fall to be adjusted thus:

Such syncopated trochaic dimeters as 324b and 337 are rare. In 324a a dochmius in the form - - - - responds with another at 336 in the ‘Reizianum’ form - - - - - - , which need occasion no misgivings.

A line has fallen out after 352, which is best amended, with Rau-chenstein, to παλλεύων δὲ πέπλων πανάμοιρος ἄκληρος ἐτύχθην, and before 354, which runs δωμάτων γὰρ εἴλομαι | ἀνατροπάς. If the lost

line were δῶμ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ὑπὸ χρυσός, the loss would be explicable in terms of homoeoarcton with 354.

In the refrain at 372–76 current editions print more than one needless change. The most conservative interpretation and colometry might well be as follows:

372 μάλα γὰρ οὖν ἄλομένα
373 ἀγκαθεὶς βαρυτετῆ
374 καταφέρω ποδὸς ἀκμάν.
375 εφαλερὰ ταυνδρόμοις
376 κῶλα δυσφόρων Ἀτᾶν.

372 ἄλομένα M, sed altero λ erad. 376 δυσφόρων Ἀτᾶν Young, δύσφορον ἄταν codices.

The sense is: “For truly, with a mighty leap from on high, with heavy weight I bring down the strength of my foot. Causing stumbles for swift runners (are) the legs of the Ruin-Fiends hard to be borne.”

Metrically 372–74 can be analysed as paeno-cretic or as syncopated iambic dimeters. Line 375 is a dochmius, or a resolved hypodochmius, and 376 either a trochaic dimeter catalectic or a syncopated iambic dimeter. For the scansion of Ἀτᾶν with the short first syllable cf. Archil. fr. 73 D. (= 84 L.-B.), and Agam. 131, 730, discussed at CQ N.S. 14 (1964) 2.

Sir Denys Page, in the Denniston-Page commentary on Agam. 3, defends ἀγκαθεὶς at 373 here, citing Schneidewin’s explanation of it as a contraction from *ἀνάκαθατεν. Pauw printed it in his text. βαρυτετῆ is kept by Wilamowitz, Smyth, Mazon, Paley, Hermann and others; and εφαλερὰ ταυνδρόμοις by Hermann, Mueller, Wecklein and Verrall. For the close association of Atai with Erinys cf. Agam. 1433 ἤ μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην, | Ἀτην ἔρνην θ’, αἰεὶ τόνδ’ ἐφαξ’ ἐγώ, and Cho. 402–04, βαδα γὰρ Λογιγὸν Ἐρνης [Paley’s spelling of Μ], | παρά τῶν πρότερον φθελένων Ἀτην, | ἐτέραν ἐπάγουσαν ἐπ’ ἄτη. “For the Erinys calls on Havoc, a Ruin-Fiend from those formerly slain, who brings up another (Ruin-Fiend) with a view to ruin.”

At 393–94 the manuscripts can be kept if one supplements thus: ἐπι δὲ μοι | γέρας παλαιὸν <αἰέν> . . . The loss would have been by near haplography, ΑΙΕΝ falling out after ΑΙΟΝ. For the sense of ἐπι = ἐπετεί cf. Homer’s Hymn to Demeter 150 ἀνέφας οἶδω ἐπετεί μέγα κράτος ἐνθάδε τιμής. “My ancient privilege belongs to me always.”
At 430 the consistent presentation of Athena in this play as a model of tactfulness would be best preserved by a terminal question-mark, as indeed most of her lines in the stichomythia here are questions:

κλέων δίκαιος μᾶλλον ἢ πράξις θέλεις; “Do you wish to be called ‘Just’ rather than to act as a just person?”

δίκαιος Dindorf, δικαίοις M linea (ov in rasura), δικαίως M supra F Tri

dίκαιος can be of two terminations, cf. LSJ s.v. init. Dindorf is followed by Wilamowitz, Smyth, Mazon, Thomson, Paley, Weil and Wecklein. Murray prints the adverb. For the adjective with πράξις cf. 223 τὰ δ’ ἐμφανῶς πράσσουσαν ἣσυχατέραν, where the manuscripts’ reading is kept by Hermann, Smyth, Mazon, Thomson and others. Athena’s next remark, at 432, answering the Coryphaeus’s appeal for clarification of 430, is ὄρκοις τὰ μὴ δίκαια μὴ νικῶν λέγω. The most tactful translation is perhaps, “I declare that unjust causes should not win through oaths.” Brusque and offensive would be such a rendering as “I order you not to win unjust causes by oaths,” an attitude that would not incline the Coryphaeus in the next line to remit the case to Athena to judge.

At 455 there is a problem about the exact relevant meaning of a verb that may affect the accent to be given to the form, where Orestes has been instructed by Athena, at 437, λέξας δὲ χώραν καὶ γένος καὶ ἐμφοράς τὰς εἴς, and eventually answers:

455 Ἀργείδός εἶμι, πατέρα δ’ ἱστορεῖς καλῶς,
Ἤγαμέμον’, ἀνδρῶν ναυβατῶν ἄρμοστορα,
πῶς καὶ ἰδοὺ Τροίαν ἅπαλιν Ἡλίου πόλιν ἐθηκας.

LSJ s.v. ἱστορέω 1.2 class this place under the meaning ‘to be informed about, know’. And Italie, in his special lexicon to Aeschylus, groups it under the sense nosse. That seems to suit for Pers. 454, where Xerxes gives optimistic orders to his fleet, κακῶς τὸ μέλλον ἱστορῶν. Mazon translates, “C’était bien mal connaître l’avenir.” With the sense ‘know’ perhaps we should print here the paroxytone imperfect form ἱστορεῖς, “you used to know him thoroughly well” (as a comrade in arms against Troy).

But there are those who think that the verb at 455 means not ‘know’, but ‘enquire about’. Thus Smyth renders, “fittingly dost thou make enquiry concerning him.” Verrall on similar lines writes, “. . . to whom thy question aptly leads.” Even then, as the question
was some time ago, the imperfect may be the appropriate tense. It is a matter of nuances; but Orestes is putting the best face on his case to the goddess, and a *captatio benevolentiae* is suitable. For such he does not compliment her on the appropriateness of her question, a mere routine enquiry such as *πῶθι τοι πόλει ἣδε τοκῆς*; He reminds her of the good old days when she personally knew Agamemnon on their common campaign. On the other hand, if the true shade of meaning is ‘know of’, then the present accentuation can well stay.

With appropriate punctuation the paradosis may be acceptable at 480–81. Athena, having accepted the purified suppliant Orestes as a blameless resident of her city (475), views with apprehension the threatening Erinyes, and begins to detail the dire results if they are frustrated of their desire. She sums up thus:

\[\text{τοιαύτα μὲν τάδ' ἐκτίν. ἀμφότερα, μένειν}
\[\text{πέμπεων δὲ, δυσπήμαντ' ἀμηχάνως ἐμοί.}\]

*δυσπήμαντ* (α) is Scaliger’s emendation for the manuscripts’ *δυσπήματ*. Cf. *δυσκήμαντα* at *Agam.* 653. The sense seems to be: “Such then is the situation here. Both alternatives,—that they should stay and that I should send them away,—(would be) accompanied by evil injuries for which I have no remedy.” For *δὲ* connecting single words cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² p.162 n.3, where he concludes: “The delimitation of the functions of connective *δὲ* and *τέ* is a difficult matter, requiring further investigation.” Athena’s hesitant utterance, on the verge of aposiopesis, is appropriate to the context dramatically. The elliptical way of saying *μένειν πέμπειν δὲ* without the relevant pronouns might be eased in performance by gestures, if Athena pointed to the Erinyes when saying *μένειν* and to herself when saying *πέμπειν*.

Punctuation alone may suffice to render the paradosis intelligible at 690–92. After giving the history of the Areopagus Athena goes on:

\[\text{ἐν δὲ τῷ σέβας}
\[\text{ἀκτῶν φόβος τε ἔγγεγεν ἔτο μὴ ἀδικεῖν}
\[\text{εχθεὶ τόδ', ἦμαρ καὶ κατ' εὐφρόνην ὁμῶς, ...}\]

The sense is: “But towards it (there is) reverence of the citizens. And (their) inborn fear (of it) will keep this innocent conduct here, by day and night alike, ...”

For the sense of *ἐν* cf. *LSJ* s.v. i.7 ‘in respect of, towards’. Cf. Soph. *Aj.*
1315 ἐν ἐμοὶ θραύσει, 1092 ἐν θανοῦσιν ὑβριστής. For τε connecting finite clauses cf. Denniston p.499.

M's original reading at 697 is defensible, perhaps especially in connection with the Chorus's command at 526–28: μῆτ' ἀναρχον βίον μῆτε δεσποτούμενον αἰνέσης. Recalling this, Athena says at 696–98:

τοῦ μῆτ' ἀναρχον μῆτε δεσποτούμενον
ἀκτοίς περιστέλλοις βουλεύω σέθεν
καὶ μή το δεινὸν πᾶν πόλεως ἐξω βαλεῖν.

697 σέθεν M linea, σέβειν M marg. F Tri.

The sense may be: “To the citizens who maintain your principle 'Neither anarchy nor despotism' I give advice also not to expel all terror outside of the city.” M’s σέθεν must go with the quoted phrase τοῦ μῆτ’ ἀναρχον μῆτε δεσποτούμενον. Corruption of an original σέβειν to σέθεν is most improbable; whereas in the Palaeologean age, or even the XI century, a student not understanding how σέθεν fitted in might well alter it to σέβειν and make καὶ μή ... βαλεῖν a parallel clause.

With ἐπεὶ so accented in 731 current editions present a startling non sequitur in 731–33:

Χο. ἐπεὶ καθιστάζῃ με πρεσβύτιν νέος,
δίκης γενέσθαι τῆς' ἐπήκοος μένω,
ὡς ἀμφίβουλος σῶσθαι θυμοῦσθαι πόλει.

The Coryphaeus is replying to an insult of Apollo’s. Smyth renders, “Since thou, a youth, would'st override mine age, I wait to hear the verdict in the case, for that I am still in doubt whether or not to be wroth against the town.” There is no logic in this train of thought. Apollo’s rough-rider attitude is not the reason why the Erinyes are waiting to hear the verdict. Already at 150 one of them had complained to Apollo, νέος δὲ γραίως δαιμόνως καθιστάζω. Logic and dramatic propriety are secured if we reaccent to ἐπεί paroxytone. “Verbally you, in your youth, ride down me in my age.” There is an aposiopesis pregnant with the thought, “But ἔργω, in reality, you do me no harm.” The contrast is in Aeschylus at Supp. 598f πάρεστι δ' ἔργον ὡς ἔπος | σπεύσαι τι τῶν βούλουσ φέρει φήν. The contrast is also in prose, Pl. Leg. 879c ἔργω τε καὶ ἐπεί. With this reading one may suppose a pregnant pause after 731, before the Coryphaeus passes to her further thought, that, while waiting, she has not made up her
mind about her eventual attitude to the city,—a thought not at all comforting to Athena or the audience as Athena begins her decisive speech at 734.

In GRBS 5 (1964) 93 I printed the conjecture δ' ἐὰτε (for the manuscripts' δὲ τὲ) at v. 800: ὑμεῖς δ' ἐὰτε τῇδε γῇ βαρὸν κότον. "But give up your heavy wrath against this land." I was not then aware that the conjecture had previously been made by John Jackson, and published posthumously in his Marginalia Scenica (London 1955) 198. It seems to be one of the few emendations that escaped the net of the vigilant and chalcenteric Dr Roger Dawe.

In the next verse, 801, perhaps no emendation is needed if εκήψησθε of the paradosis can be accepted as an example of a rare construction classified by the syntactician Goodwin,12 namely an affirmative exhortation employing the subjunctive in the second person, where the imperative became regular. Goodwin cites Soph. Phil. 300 φέρ', ὃ τέκνου, νῦν καὶ τὸ τῇς νῆς μᾶθης. Jebb hesitantly accepts it, with the erroneous comment that "it can be defended only as an irregular equivalent for φέρε . . . φράσω or the like." Goodwin was right, in his Appendix I at p.385, in stating: "Although the Greek which is best known to us did not use the second and third persons of the subjunctive in a hortatory sense, there can be little doubt that such a use existed in the earlier language, as appears from the use in Sanskrit and in Latin, and from the Greek prohibitions with μη." There is perhaps another example in Aeschylus, at PV 791, where the manuscripts offer ἥλοςτιβε ἰς, and I am tempted to read πρὸς ἀντολὰς φλογῶπας ἥλιοι στιβῆς, | πόντον περῶς ἀφλοεβὼν . . ., hortatory 2 sg. subjunctive of στιβέω, "tread'.

At Eum. 801 with εκήψησθε one can mentally supply, from 800, τῇδε γῇ, to give the sense: "Take (this land) for your support." Cf. LSJ s.v. εκήπτω 1.1, and Dem. 34.28 εῦ δὲ ἐνε ἐκῆπτει μάρτυρι αὐτῷ τῷ εὐναδικοῦντι.

At 858–63, twice reinterpretting a transmitted οὖ as ω, I would print thus:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{εῦ δὲ ἐν ἄτοις ἔμοιprep μη βάλης} \\
μηθ' αἰματηρᾶς θηγάνας, εὐφάνην θλάβας \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{νεὼν, ἀοίνως ἐμμανεῖς θυμόμασιν,} \\
\text{μηθ', ἐξελώσ' ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων,} \\
\end{align*}\]

12 W. W. Goodwin, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb (Boston 1890) § 258.
“But do not put in any places of mine bloodstained whetstones, mischiefs to the spirits of the young men, unvinously intoxicating with passions; and do not, by forging as it were a heart of (fighting) cocks, establish among my citizens civil war that makes them bold against one another.”

In 860 οὖνος of the manuscripts is perhaps just possible if taken with βλάβας; but it implies an original ΑΟΙΝΟΣ in the spelling of Aeschylus, and that can equally well be interpreted as οὖνος, which goes well with what follows, and is a step nearer the paradosis than Robortello’s much favoured οὖνος. Aeschylus might well think of young men’s passions being normally stimulated by wine, and so think of civil broils as a teetotal type of intoxicant.

In 861 the manuscripts’ ἐξελοῦς is explained by the scholiast with ἀναπτερῶσας ‘setting on the wing, exciting’, which cannot apply to the aorist participle of ἔξαερέω. The presumed original ΕΞΕΛΟΣ could be interpreted as ἐξελῶς(α), from ἐξελάω, an Epic compound from the poetic present ἔλαω = ἔλαινω, in the sense ‘forging’. Cf. LSJ s.vv. ἔλαινω π.1, ἐξελαίνω π. The latent image is that of the Homeric κιόθρειον...ἵτωρ: cf. Il. 24.205. Compare Cho. 646ff, where Destiny whets Orestes as a swordblade on the anvil of Justice.

Punctuation is specially important for the clarification of 938–40, where I incline to print the following:

938 δενδροτήμων δὲ μὴ πνέωι βλάβα —
939A τὰν ἐμάν χάριν λέγω —
939B φλογμοῦς ὀμματοσπειρής φυτῶν. τὸ
940 μὴ περάν ὅρον τόπων.

939B φλογμοῦς ὀμματοσπειρῆς Wilamowitz, φλογμός (φλογμός Μ) ὀμματοσπειρῆς codices.

“And may the tree-damaging mischief not blow forth—my favour I declare—burnings that deprive plants of their buds. Let that not cross the boundary of the regions.”

At 938, for a direct object with πνέω cf. LSJ s.v. π.1; for a cognate accusative, ibid. v. It is uncertain which is relevant here. At 939B Wilamowitz merely interprets the transmitted spellings. For
infinitival constructions of wishing cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar 2 § 2014. For a nominative + infinitive construction of wish cf. Cho. 363ff. Here $\tau o$ is the neuter article used as a demonstrative, probably in the nominative, as at Eum. 261 $\tau o \delta' \ oiv \ p\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$. It refers to the $\beta l\alpha\beta\alpha$ of 938. At 940 for the vague use of $\tau o\pi\omega\nu$ cf. 858 $\tau o\pi\omega\iota\iota\iota \tau oic' \ \epsilon\mu\omicron\omicron\iota$. At 946 Hermann’s plausible supplement $<\delta \ \gamma \acute c>$ perhaps makes an allusion that has been overlooked by the learned.

$\gamma\omicron\omicron\omicron <\delta \ \gamma \acute c>$
$\pi\lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu$
$\delta\alpha\imath\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \ \delta\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \tau o.$

“And may the offspring (of the land), having wealth in the earth, honour the unexpectedly gainful gift of the deities.” The reference to the silver and other mines of Laurion has long been recognised, but scholars seem not to have taken the expression $\gamma\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \gamma \acute c$ to allude to the claim of the Athenians to be in a special sense ‘offspring of the land’, $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ cestes. Cf. Eur. Ion 29 $\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu \ \epsilon\imath\epsilon \ \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\nu \ 'A\theta\eta\omicron\omicron\nu.$

In 996–1002 there are problems of reference, for the solution of which some help may be had from abandoning the currently most favoured punctuation. One might do best to print thus:

$996 \ <\chi\alpha\omicron\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron,> \ \chi\alpha\omicron\rho\epsilon' \ \epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\omicron \ \pi\lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron.$
$\chi\alpha\omicron\rho\epsilon' \ \alpha\omicron\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\omicron \ \lambda\epsilon\omicron\omicron,$
$\iota\kappa\tau\omicron \ \eta\mu\epsilon\nu\iota \ \Delta\iota\omicron\omicron$,
$\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu \ \phi\iota\alpha\omicron \ \phi\iota\omicron\iota,$
$1000 \ \epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \epsilon\nu \ \chi\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron.$
$\Pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \delta' \ \upsilon\omicron\omicron \ \pi\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$.
$\omicron\nu\tau\omicron \ \alpha\omicron\zeta\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \pi\alpha\tau\omicron.$

“Farewell, farewell, with favourable omens of wealth. Farewell, folk of the citadel, seated near to the maiden daughter of Zeus, dear to you as you to her, exercising wisdom in your time. And being as you are under the wings of Pallas, (her) father (Zeus) has regard for you.”

At 996 M has $\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\omicron$, and Weil printed $\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron$, taking note of Hesychios: $\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron: \ \delta\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$. At 997 Erotianus s.v. $\iota\kappa\tau\omicron$ offers the variant ‘$\alpha\omicron\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\omicron \ \lambda\epsilon\omicron\omicron$, adopted here by Bothe and Blaydes, perhaps rightly in view of Athena’s address at 681, which is not confined to the members of the Areopagus court alone.

In 998–99 who is the ‘maiden of Zeus’ near whom the Athenians are seated? Probably not Athena, because at 1001 they are described as
being under her wings, which is commonly taken to imply the image of chickens under a hen, or a mother bird of some sort. Cf. Eur. HF 71f (Megara) οι θ’ Ἡράκλειοι παιδες, ούς ὑπὸ πτεροῖς | σφαξ ἀνακοῦντες ὅρνες δὲ ὑφεμένη, Andr. 441 (Andromache) ἥ καὶ νεοκόν τόνδ’, ὑπὸ πτερῶν επάκας; But it may also be used of a male, as indeed male birds can sit on nestlings; cf. Iolaos at Eur. Heracl. 10f τὰ κείνου τέκν’ ἐχων ὑπὸ πτεροῖς | σφαξω τάδ’.

In the trilogy another deity is specifically emphasized as being a maiden daughter of Zeus, at Cho. 949: ... Διὸς κόρα — Δίκην δὲ νῦν προσεγορεύομεν ... Aeschylus had expounded the same notion strongly at Theb. 662: εἰ δ’ ἥ Διὸς παῖς παρθένοις Δίκη παρῆν ... The Erinyes are speaking in a courtroom, and there may well have been a statue of Dike on view. There is almost certainly a statue of the goddess Peitho, Persuasion; cf. 970, when the grateful Athena turns to it, as I think, and says, στέργω δ’ ὁμοιὰ Πειθω, δι’ μοι γλῶσσαν καὶ στόμ’ ἐπώπα ... At 885 she appeals to the Erinyes by the ‘majesty of Peitho’ or the ‘respect due to Peitho’, ἀλλ’ εἰ μὴν ἀγνὸν ἐκτί σοι Πειθως σέβας ... On the general business of statues on stages there has been much dispute. The clearest example is in the Hippolytus of Euripides, where there must be statues of both Artemis and Aphrodite. In Agam. 509ff, especially 519, there must be various statues; and at Cho. 1 Orestes probably addresses a statue of Hermes. If there is to be a statue of Peitho at Eum. 970, there might also be one close by of Zeus Ἀγοραῖος, who is mentioned at 973 as having prevailed. If so, that makes possible, apart from other reasons, the punctuation at 998 with a comma after Διὸς. The sense then is ‘seated near to Zeus’. But at 1002 Zeus is referred to in the last word of the strophe, by a climax of divine favour. If we accept the idea that Διὸς παρθένου refers to Justice, Δίκη, then the strophe gives the following sequence: wealth, Justice, wisdom, protection by Athena, regard from Zeus.

To be sure, it can be argued that the image of Athena as a bird sitting on nestlings is wrong, and that Aeschylus visualized her as standing up with wings, in the form of the statue made by Pheidias two years earlier, Ἀθηνᾶ Νίκη. And some might contend that Athena appears in this form, or that a replica of the Pheidias statue is on view. Against this one may mention the phrase at 404, πτερῶν ἀπὸ ῥοιβδοῦσα κόπτων σαλίδος. There it is manifest that Athena is not wearing wings, and that only the speed of her approach in her four-horse-power car makes her aegis rustle. It would indeed emphasize the
protection of Athens by Zeus and Athena if it were stated twice, at 998–99 and 1001–02. But the Athenians believed that their Areopagus was the oldest human lawcourt in the world, and a reference to the goddess of Justice is much to be desired here. I believe we have it if we read Διός παρθένος. The phrase is itself ambiguous, and could also refer to Artemis, as at Supp. 145 ἐπιδέτω Διός κόρα. But in the specific context of the Eumenides, and at this point in the plot, the ambiguous reference surely applies best to the goddess Δίκη. If her statue is there they point to it, and all is clear.
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