

# 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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:

66 δι' αἵματ' ἐκποθένθ' ὑπὸ Χθονὸς τροφοῦ      στρ. γ  
τίτας φόνος πέπηγεν οὐ διαρρῦδαν.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

διαλγῆς Ἄτα διαφρεῖ  
τὸν αἴτιον παναρκέτας νόσου βρύειν.

~71 θιγόντι δ' οὔτι νυμφικῶν ἐδωλίων ἀντ. γ  
ἄκος, πόροι τε πάντες ἐκ μιᾶς ὁδοῦ  
βαίνοντες τὸν χαιρομυσῆ  
φόνον †καθαίροντες † ἴθυσαν μάταν.

*Sensui et metro satisfaceret διακαθαροῦντες.*

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 ἐκποθένθ' for M's ἐκποθεν; Heath's deletion after v.69 of the repetition of v.65; Stephanus's θιγόντι at 71 for M's οὔγοντι; and Musgrave's ἴθυσαν μάταν at 74 for M's ἰούσαν ἄτην. At 68 I propose, for M's ἄτη διαφέρει, Ἄτα (Rogers) διαφρεῖ. The colon scans as a polyschematist choriambic dimeter, what P. Maas dubbed a 'wilamowitzianus'.<sup>2</sup> Such a colon does not require exact syllabic respension 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 ὁδός of the course of a stream Xen. Cyr. 7.5.16. In 73 only Wellauer of former editors appears to entertain M's χαιρομυσῆ, 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 *hapaχ*, χειρομυσῆ (Pauw) 'hand-polluting'.

At 74 we need an iambic trimeter for respension 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

<sup>2</sup> P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, transl. H. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford 1962) § 54.

indicating purpose, 'to purify' *καθαγνιούντες*. Aristophanes and Plato use a compound of M's verb *καθαίρω*, and perhaps Aeschylus wrote *διακαθαρούντες*. Scribes quite often omit prepositions in composition.<sup>3</sup> Denniston found resolved feet corresponding to unresolved nineteen times in lyric iambs.<sup>4</sup>

For the epode 75–83, M's readings are metrically and otherwise acceptable with the following colometry, where no problem of respension arises:

75	ἐμοὶ δ' (ἀνάγκαν γὰρ ἀμφίπτολιν θεοὶ προσήνεγκαν· ἐκ γὰρ οἴκων πατρῶϊων δούλιον ἐσᾶγον αἴσαν)	<i>syncopated iambic trimeter</i> <i>syncopated iambic trimeter</i> <i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i> <i>iambic pentasyllable</i>
79A	δίκαια καὶ μὴ δίκαια	<i>iambo-trochaic dimeter</i>
79B	πρέποντ' ἀρχὰς βίου	<i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i>
80	βία φερομένων ἀινέσαι πικρῶν φρενῶν στύγος κρατούση. δακρῦν δ' ὑφ' εἰμάτων, ματαίοισι δεσποτᾶν τύχαις, κρυφαίοις πένθεσιν παχνουμένην.	<i>iambic trimeter</i> <i>iambic trimeter</i> <i>syncopated iambic dimeter</i> <i>iambic trimeter</i>

“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 δούλιον <μ'> is not needed. For the iambo-trochaic dimeter at 79A the best known parallel is the start of Pind. *Ol.* 2 ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι.

At 79Bf the construe is: ἐμοὶ πρέποντά ἐστιν ἀινέσαι δίκαια καὶ μὴ δίκαια, κρατούση στύγος φρενῶν πικρῶν = πρέπει μοι . . . “It befits me to approve . . .” Slaves were not supposed to voice opinions. The phrase βίου 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 πικρὸν δ' ὄμμα θαλαμηπόλων,

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *GRBS* 6 (1965) 264.

<sup>4</sup> J. D. Denniston, in *Greek Poetry and Life, Essays Presented to G. Murray* (Oxford 1936) 142f.

and Soph. *Ant.* 423 *πικρᾶς ὄρνιθος ὄξυν φθόγγον*. In 82f *ματαίοισι . . . τύχαις* is a dative of cause. At 83 *παχνουμένην* is the object of *δακρύω*, cf. *Ag.* 1490 *πῶς σε δακρύω*; 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 *κρατούσῃ*, 83 *παχνουμένην*, to forms with the lyric long *alpha*.<sup>5</sup> 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 **M** need be changed at 152–57, with proper colometry and punctuation, thus:

152A	<i>ἴετε δάκρυ</i>	– $\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\cup$ x	<i>iambic monometer</i>
152B	<i>καναχῆς ὀλόμενον</i>	$\cup$ $\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\cup$ x	<i>dochmius</i>
153	<i>ὀλομένῳ δεσπότη,</i>	$\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\cup$ –   – $\cup$ –	<i>syncopated ia. dim.</i>
154A	<i>πρὸς ἔρυμα τόδε κακῶν,</i>	$\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\cup$ –	<i>dochmius</i>
154B	<i>κεδνῶν τ' ἀπότροπον.</i>	– – $\overline{\cup\cup}$ $\cup$ x	<i>dochmius</i>
155	<i>ἄλγος ἀπεύχεται κεχυμένων     χωᾶν.</i>	– $\overline{\cup\cup}$ – $\cup$ –   $\cup$ $\overline{\cup\cup}$ – $\cup$ –	2 <i>dochmii</i>
	<i>κλύε δέ μοι, κλύε,     κέβας, ὦ δέσποτ', ἐξ     ἀμαυρᾶς φρενός.</i>	$\cup$ $\cup\cup$ – $\cup$ x  $\overline{\cup\cup}$ – – $\cup$ –   $\cup$ – – $\cup$ x	<i>dochmius</i>  2 <i>dochmii</i>

152A is also interpretable as –  $\cup\cup$ – x, 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.<sup>6</sup> At 154A, for *ἔρυμα τόδε κακῶν*, ‘a defence against evils’, cf. *Eur. Med.* 1322 *ἔρυμα πολεμίας χερός*. The tomb is also a ‘turner away of *κεδνά*’ because its incumbent is denied most possibilities of enjoyment. At

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ed. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus, Agamemnon III* (Oxford 1950) 727 n.3, *ad Agam.* 1535f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. H. Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge [Mass.] 1956) § 1872. c.2.

155 ἀπεύχεται, proparoxytone, has the force of a perfect participle passive.<sup>7</sup> The genitive absolute here expresses cause and/or attendant circumstances.<sup>8</sup> For an asyndetic gnome as hinge in a transition from one theme to another compare ἔστι τις θιῶν τίσις 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: αὐτόν με νῦν ὀρώωσα δυσμαθεῖς ἐμέ; “Seeing me myself, do you have difficulty in recognising me?”

M’s second hand has μὲν νῦν, which Turnebus changed to μὲν οὖν. με 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 πολλὰ δυστερπῆ κακά, ‘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:

τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ γῆς, δυσφρόνων μελίγματα  
βροτοῖς, πιφαύσκων εἶπ’, ἐτὰς δεινῶν νόσους,—

279 εἶπε τάδε M νωνόσους M, ante corr. νῶν, νόσους 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 paradisis to re-divide into εἶπ’, ἐτὰς δεινῶν νόσους. The sense is: “For things from the earth, malign powers’ gifts to mortals, revealing he spoke of, exaggerating real diseases,—”

μελίγματα, from μελίττω, has, like μείλια, a considerable range of meanings, and can refer to gifts in general as well as to propitiatory

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Smyth, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) § 425. c.n.

<sup>8</sup> 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 *ἐτάς* would be a form of *ἐτεὰς*, cf. *LSJ* s.v. *ἐτός* (B). *δεινώω*, 'exaggerate', is used at Thuc. 8.74. Orestes goes on to state the exaggerated descriptions at 280ff.

At 418f Elektra asks:

τί δ' ἂν φάντες τύχοιμεν; ἢ τάπερ

πάθομεν ἄχθεα πρὸς γε τῶν τεκομένων; υ Ὡ - Ὡ - | υ - Ὡ υ -

"What could we speak of to succeed? Those oppressions we suffered from our parents?" (meaning the mother and stepfather). Blass accents ἢ *perispomenon*, 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, ἴδετε πολυκρατεῖς ἀραὶ φθινομένων, but can be secured through reinterpreting πολυκρατεῖς as πουλυκρατεῖς. For the epicism cf. *Agam.* 723 πολέα. Allowing synizesis in ἄχθεα the verses can also scan as syncopated iambic trimeters.

At 452 M offers ἡσύχω φρονῶν βάσει, 'thinking with calm movement', and there is a scholion understanding this as *προσέχων καὶ μὴ ἀποπλανώμενος*. 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 οἱ 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 ἐξιστορῆσαι εἰς ὁδὸν βουλευμάτων, and *Hipp.* 391 λέξω . . . τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ὁδόν.

At 455 M's original reading *πρέπει* may be right, in the line *πρέπει δ' ἀκάμπτω μένει καθήκειν*. The final *sigma* was erased, perhaps by the scholiast who interpreted thus: *πρέπει δέ σοι ἀμετακινήτω δυνάμει ὀρμᾶν κατ' αὐτῶν*. 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 τοῦδε γὰρ δράμημα φωτὸς Περσικόν *πρέπει μαθεῖν*, and at *Supp.* 719 *πρέπουσι δ' ἄνδρες νῆιοι μελαγχίμοις γυίοις λευκῶν ἐκ πεπλωμάτων ἰδεῖν*. For the sense 'be fit, be fitting' cf. Soph.

OT 9 *πρέπων ἔφυσ* | *πρὸ τῶνδε φωνεῖν*. 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 *πρέπει* 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 σπαργάνοις παιδὸς ὀρμίσει δίκη*, "(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 ἐκλιπὼν ἐμοὶ | τ' οὐφείδ' ἐπᾶσα σπαργανηπλείζετο*<sup>†</sup>, with ζτ in the margin. Perhaps 544 should run: *οὐφίς* (Porson) *ἐπ' ἀμὰ σπάργαν'* (Klausen) *ἐπλωίζετο* or *ἐπλοίζετο*: "the snake sailed into my swaddling clothes." The verb *πλωίζω* is Hesiodic, *Op.* 634; cf. *Thuc.* 1.13. Its middle form is Hellenistic, often spelt *πλοιζ-*. Of verbs with the notion of a ship's movement, continuing the image of 529 *ὀρμίσει*, none comes so close to the paradosis letters *ηπλείζετο*.

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:

*ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμνασάμαν ἀμειλίχων  
πόνων, ἀκαίρως δέ, — δυσφιλὲς γαμή-  
625 λευμ' ἀπεύχετον δόμοις,  
γυναικοβούλους τε μήτιδας φρενοῦν  
ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ τευχεςφόρῳ.  
ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ δῆοις ἐπικότῳ ἔβασ.  
τίῳ δ' ἀθέρμαντον ἐστίαν δόμων,  
630 γυναικειᾶν ἄτολμον αἰχμᾶν.*

623 *ἐπεμνασάμαν* Dindorf, *ἐπεμνήσαμεν* M lineā, *ἐπεμνάσαμεν* M supra. 624 *πόνων, ἀκαίρως δέ*, *interpunxerunt* Pauw et Wilamowitz. 626 *φρενοῦν* Young, *φρενῶν* M. 627 *post τευχεςφόρῳ plene interpunxit* Young. 628 *ἐπικότῳ* Vir Doctus apud Scholefield, *ἔβασ* Verrall, *ἐπικότῳ* *ἔβασ* M. 629 *τίῳ* Stanley, *τίων* M. 630 *γυναικειᾶν* Schoene, *γυναικείαν* 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 ἐστὶν with δόμοις as dative of possessor] an odious mating, abominated, namely (τε) one that prompted [φρενοῦν is participle, neuter, of φρενόω] 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 καιρός, 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 φάτιν | ἀλώσιμόν τε βάξιν, "a report from Troyland, namely news of its capture."<sup>9</sup>

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 φρενώσω δ' οὐκέτ' ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων. *Cho.* 116, *PV* 335.

630 For genitives of relation dependent on an adjective compounded with *alpha* privative, cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> § 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 πρᾶξεται τὸ Λήμιον  
λόγῳ. γοᾶται δ' ἔδη ποθῆ κατά-

633 πτυστον. ἤκαεν δέ τις

634 τὸ δεινὸν αὖ Λημνίοισι πῆμασιν.

632 δ' ἔδη ποθῆ Young, δὲ δὴ πόθει M.

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 ἔδη. Aeschylus uses the word ἔδος 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'.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>3</sup> (Oxford 1954) 502.



ποθῆ. The Homeric form, = πόθω, is the easiest reinterpretation of M'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 paradosis runs:

νῦν δ' ἤπερ ἐν δόμοις βακχείας καλῆς  
ιατρὸς ἐλπὶς ἦν †παροῦσαν ἐγγράφει†.

698 δῆπερ M, corr. edd. βακχίας M, corr. Turnebus. 699 M has the gloss ἡ ιατρὸς and the scholion τάξον αὐτὴν ἀφανισθεῖσαν ἀρᾶ. ὡς πρὸς τὸ ἐλπὶς δ' ἀπέδωκεν.

At 699 I am inclined to redivide and punctuate to make the line this: ιατρὸς ἐλπὶς ἦν παροῦς' ἄν, ἔκγραφε. 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." Klytimestra means Orestes, probably without sincerity.

ιατρὸς can mean, according to Hesych. *s.v.* μαῖα, 'midwife', for which office a later Greek term was ιατρίνη. Conversely, Galen uses the word μαῖα for a lady doctor, at 14.641. Also the word ιατρόμια emerged. In calling hope 'a midwife of lovely bacchic revelry' Klytimestra is recurring to the strained conceits of her insincere utterance at *Agam.* 896–901.

ἦν παροῦς' ἄν = ἦν ἂν παροῦσα (= εἰ παρῆν), an 'unreal' conditional complex. For the position of ἄν cf. *Agam.* 933 ηὔξω θεοῖς δείσας ἂν ᾧδ' ἔρδειν τάδε;

ἔκγραφε means 'strike out, delete, expunge, write off'. Cf. the decree in *Andoc.* 1.77. Compare Cassandra's image at *Agam.* 1329 εἰ δὲ δυστυχῆ, βολαῖς ὑγρώσων σπόγγος ὤλεσεν γραφήν. The change of spelling from ἐκγρ- to ἐγγρ- is found already in the third century B.C. at *IG V<sup>2</sup> 357.14*. ἔκγραφε is equivalent to the scholiast's τάξον αὐτὴν ἀφανισθεῖσαν, 'classify it as disappeared'.

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

νῦν παραιτουμένα μοι, πάτερ  
Ζεῦ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων,

785 δὸς τύχας. τυχεῖν δέ μου  
 786A κυρίως τὰ σῶφρον' εὔ.  
 786B μαιομένοις ἰδεῖν  
 διαδικάσσαι. πᾶν ἔπος ἔλακον.  
 Ζεῦ, σὺ νιν φυλάσσοις.

783 παραιτουμέν' ἐμοί M, corr. Hermann. 786A τὰ σῶφροσενε M, corr. Hermann. 787 διαδικάσαι M, corr. Young. 788 Ζεῦ, σὺ δέ νιν M, δέ del. Hermann.

The sense would be: "Now for me as I petition, Zeus, father of Olympian gods, grant fortunate results. And may my pious behaviour (μου . . . τὰ σῶφρονα), as is due (κυρίως), have good success (τυχεῖν . . . εὔ). For those who yearn to see (it), make a settlement according to justice. I have spoken my whole utterance. Zeus, may you guard him."

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

785f τυχεῖν εὔ τὰ σῶφρονά μου is an accusative and infinitive construction expressing a wish, like Sept. 253 θεοὶ πολῖται, μὴ με δουλεία τυχεῖν. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> §2014.

787 διαδικάσσαι is imperatival 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, δᾶπέδων ἀνομένων, scanning –υ–|–υ–|υυυ–, making two cretics and a fourth paeon. At 787 we have υυυ–|–υ|υυυ–, fourth paeon+ palimbacchius+ fourth paeon. The two cola are thus equivalent, on the principle that, in cretico-bacchio-paeonic rhythm, cretic, any sort of paeon, 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:

ἴσθι δ' ἀνδρὸς φίλου πῶλον εὔ-  
 795 νιν ζυγέτ' ἐν ἄρματι  
 πημάτων. ἐν δρόμῳ  
 797A προστιθεὶς μέτρον κτίσαι  
 797B σωζόμενον ρυθμόν.

τοῦτ' ἰδεῖν, δαπέδων ἀνομένων,  
βημάτων ὄρεγμα.

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 outstretching of paces as plains are traversed."

795 M's singular ἄρματι is preferable to the scholiast's plural ἄρμασι, 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 κτίσον, but κτίσαι seems more likely to have been corrupted to M's τίς ἄν.

797B *αὐζόμενον ῥυθμόν* is in the *ab urbe condita* construction, commoner in Greek than is usually recognized. Cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> §2053.

798 τοῦτ(ο) has the sense of τοιοῦτο, cf. *LSJ* s.v. οὗτος, C.III. ἰδεῖν is another imperatival 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 respension it is convenient to take the mesode last, after the strophe and antistrophe, which go thus:

	στρ. Γ		
820	καὶ τότε δὴ πλωτῶν	- ∪ ∪ - - -	dochmius
	δαμάτων λυτήριον,	- ∪ -   ∪ - ∪ -	sync. iambic dimeter
	θῆλυν οὐριο-	- ∪ - ∪ -	hypodochmius
	στάταν ὀμοκρεκτὸν	∪ - ∪ ∪ - -	dochmius (in Reiz- ianum form)
	γοήτων νόμον	∪ - - ∪ -	dochmius

	μεθήσομεν: "πόλει τὰδ' εἶ. 825 ἐμὸν ἐμὸν κέρδος αὔξεται τόδ', "A- τα δ' ἀποστατεῖ φίλων." ἀντ. Γ'	υ-υ- υ-υ- υυυ- -υ- υ-υ- -υ- υ-υ-	<i>iambic dimeter</i> <i>sync. iambic trim.</i> <i>sync. ia. dim.</i>
832	Περσέως τ' ἐν φρεσσὶν 〈πέρθε〉 καρδίαν χεθῶν, 834A τοῖςδ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς 834B φίλοις τ' ἄνωθεν	- - - - - -υ- υ-υ- -υ-υ- υ-υυ--	<i>dochmius (with syni- zesis)</i> <i>sync. ia. dim.</i> <i>hypodochmius</i> <i>dochmius (in Reizian- um form)</i>
834C	προπράσων χάριτας	υ- - υυ x	<i>dochmius</i>
835	Ἵργᾶς λυγρᾶς ἔνδοθεν φοινίαν ἄταν τιθείς, τὸν αἴτιον δ' ἐξαπολλύς Μόρον.	- - -   - - υ - -υ-  - - υ - υ-υ- -υ-  - υ -	<i>sync. iambic dim.</i> <i>sync. ia. trimeter</i> <i>sync. ia. dimeter</i>

819 πλωτῶν Young, πλοῦτον M. 822 ὄμοκρεκτὸν Young, ὄμοῦ κρεκτὸν M *ex corr.* 833 〈πέρθε〉 *supplet* Young. 834B φίλοις τ' Young, φίλοις τὸις τ' M. 834C χάριτας Schütz, χάριτος M.

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 M's irrelevant πλοῦτον may derive from a trivializing misinterpretation of the dramatist's original ΠΛΟΤΟΝ, by which the context, with 814 having probably πρᾶξις οὐρίαν θέμεν (*cf.* GRBS 5 [1964] 89), suggests that he meant πλωτῶν, 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, *ὄς οὐριον ἄνεμον ἴστησιν*. Cf. 814 *πρᾶξιν οὐρίαν θέμεν*.

822 *ὄμοῦ κρεκτόν* of **M**, where the letters *ομο* are in an erasure, will represent an original *ΟΜΟΚΡΕΚΤΟΝ*, another *hapax*, from the roots of *ὄμοῦ*+ *κρέκω*, ‘woven together’= ‘sung in unison’.

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

833 <πέρθε> might have dropped out below original *ΠΕΡΣΕ* of *Περσέως* in 832. 834<sub>B</sub> I have deleted *τοῖς*, as an interlinear article miscopied into the text, and removed as unmetrical the facultative *ν* of *φίλοιςιν*.

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 Pleisthenidai or Pelopidai, cf. *Agam.* 1600–02, which had caused the series of deaths starting with the twelve elder children of Thyestes. Cf. *Agam.* 768 *Κότον, δαίμονα τεγῶν*.<sup>10</sup>

836 *δ’* here links expressions in apposition, cf. 190, 841, *Agam.* 1405: Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> p. 163.

On metrical points here, it is important to bear in mind the multiplicity of forms of the dochmiac colarion, any one of which can respond to any other, including the anaclastic form, the hypodochmius. In lyric iambic dimeters and trimeters there are over twenty places in Aeschylus where syncopated forms are found responding to un-syncopated 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 respension in the final three cola of these stanzas should be relished, not abolished.

Regarding my suggestion to delete an article at 834<sub>B</sub> 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 ὄμοῦ <τε> κρεκτόν, | γοήτων νόμον . . .*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *CQ* n.s. 14 (1964) 9.

834 τοῖσδ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς φίλοιςιν τοῖς τ' ἄνωθεν . . .

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:

	κύ δὲ θαρσῶν, ὅταν ἦκη μέρος		
	ἔργων,		<i>ionic a minore trimeter</i>
	ἐπαύσατο πατρός ἔργω,	υυ-- υυ--	<i>ionic dimeter</i>
	θροεούσα πρὸς σὲ “Τέκνον”,	υυ-- --υυ--	<i>polyschematist ionic dimeter</i>
830	“Πατρός” αὐδᾶν, καὶ περαίνων ἐπίμομφον ἄταν.	--υ-- --υ-- --υυ-- υ--	<i>trochaic dimeter catalectic Aristophanean</i>

Also possible would be to add *θροεούσα* to 828, making a second ionic trimeter, and then continue thus:

829–30	πρὸς σὲ “Τέκνον,” “Πατρός” αὐδᾶν, καὶ περαίνων		<i>trochaic trimeter</i>
831	ἐπίμομφον ἄταν.		<i>acephalous Aristophanean [or iambic penthemimer, with resolved anceps]</i>

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 *αὐδᾶν* 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:

ἦ κάρτα μάντις οὐξ ὄνειράτων φόβος.  
930 κάνες γ’ ὄν οὐ χρεῖν, καὶ τὸ μὴ χρεῶν πάθε.

Hermann defended the paradosis reading of the unaugmented aorist *κάνεις*, and *θέτο* 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 . . . *ναὸς ἐκ μιᾶς πέσον*, 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 *κυκλοῦντο*, 506 *πίπτων*. In Sophocles, manuscripts give us several relevant examples: *OT* 1245 *κάλει* (initial); 1249 *γοᾶτο* (initial); *El.* 715 *φορεῖθ'*; *Trach.* 904 *βρυχᾶτο*; 915 *φρούρουν*: all so far initial; and in final positions *Trach.* 767 *προσπτύσσετε*, and *Phil.* 371 *πλησίον γὰρ ὦν κύρει*. Examples in Euripides include: *Alc.* 839 *'Ηλεκτρύωνος γείνατ' Ἀλκμήνη*; *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 prodelision 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:

*τούτῳ θανοῦσα ξυγκάθευδ', ἐπεὶ φιλεῖς  
τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὃν δ' ἐχρῆν 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 perispomenon *στυγείς*, 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 antistrophe may go thus:

965 τάχα δὲ παντελής Χρόνος ἀμείψεται  
 πρόθυρα δωμάτων, ὅταν ἀφ' ἐστίας  
 μύκος πᾶν ἐλάσῃ,  
 καθαρμοῖσιν Ἄτᾶν ἐλατήρ ἰών.  
 Τύχα δ' εὐπρόσωπ' οἰκοῖ ταῦτα πάντ'  
 970 ἰδεῖν, θροομένοις  
 "Μέτοικοι δόμων πεσοῦνται πάλιν."  
 πάρα τὸ φῶς ἰδεῖν.

967 ἐλάσῃ Hermann, ἐλάσει<sup>η</sup> **M**. 968 καθαρμοῖς **M**. corr. Hermann, ἄπαν **M**, ἄτᾶν Schütz, ἐλατήριον **M**, ἐλατήρ ἰών Young. 969 τύχα δ' εὐπροσώπῳ κοίται τα uel τῷ **M** ante corr. (τὸ **M** post corr.) πᾶν **M**, εὐπρόσωπ' Weil, οἰκοῖ ταῦτα πάντ' Young. 970 ἀκοῦσαι post ἰδεῖν **M**, delet Hermann.

The strophe is wholly dochmiac, with a variety of forms of the colarion, to which strict respension 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 δώματα) 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 ἐλατήριον probably derives from an original ΕΛΑΤΕ-ΡΙΟΝ, by which the poet meant here ἐλατήρ ἰών.

In 969 the optative form οἰκοῖ (= οἰκοίη) fell victim to a misdivision, which also affected the first syllable of ταῦτα. As Aeschylus uses τὸ πᾶν or ἐς 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:

εἷς σοῦ καθαρμός, Λοξίου δέ. προσθιγῶν  
 ἐλεύθερόν σε τῶνδε πημάτων κτίσει.  
 εἶσω **M** ante corr. εἷς' ὁ **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:

κάμοί τε λυπρός, καὶ τὸν οὐκ ἐκλύσεται.  
 175 ὑπὸ τέγαν φεύγων οὐ ποτ' ἐλευθεροῦται.  
 ποτιτρόπαιος δ' ὦν ἕτερον ἐν κάρᾳ  
 μιάστορ' 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 ὑπὸ τέγαν for the manuscripts' ὑπὸ 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 ὄδ' αὖ τεγῶν ἀλκὰν ἔχων.

258 περὶ βρέτει πλεχθεὶς θεᾶς ἀμβρότου

259 ὑπόδικος θέλει γενέσθαι 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. χεῖρ IV*). At 257 the manuscripts offer ὄ δ' αὖτε γονδ, on which Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> p.448, comments: "neither γ' οὖν nor γοῦν is easy to explain." The words can only represent some copyist's interpretation of an original writing ΟΔΑΥΤΕΓΟΝ, on the assumption that Aeschylus used the letter O to mean ο, ω or ου. The word τέγος is Homeric, *Od.* 1.333 *al.*, and Pindaric, *Pyth.* 5.41, *Nem.* 3.54; and probably Aeschylean also at *Agam.* 768 Κότον, δαίμονα τεγῶν, an interpretation defended at *CQ N.S.* 14 (1964) 9. Headlam suggested ὄ δ' αὖ τέγεον ἀλκὰν ἔχων.

Some other readings in the two passages may be noted. At 174 κάμοι 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  $\cup \widehat{\cup\cup} - - -$ , which is licit, as is its equivalence to the form  $\cup \widehat{\cup\cup} - \cup -$  in the strophe at 170. Exact syllabic responsion in this highly variable colarion was clearly not practised by Aeschylus. Likewise at 176 the paradosis word-order ποτιτρόπαιος δ' ὦν gives a dochmiac scanning  $\cup \widehat{\cup\cup} - - -$  responding to 171  $\cup \widehat{\cup\cup} - \cup -$ . At 177 Bothe's ἐκ κείνου is the best correction of the manuscripts' ἐκείνου. At 257, for τεγῶν ἀλκὰν, 'a temple's defence', compare *Il.* 15.490 ρεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτος Διὸς ἀνδράσι γίγνεται ἀλκή, *Soph. Phil.* 1150 οὐ γὰρ ἔχω χεροῖν τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων ἀλκὰν, *Eur. Phoen.* 1098 ὡς τῷ νοσοῦντι τειχέων εἴη δορὸς | ἀλκή δι' ὀλίγου.

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 τοὶ σὺν at 336 for the manuscripts' τοῖσιν.

334A τοῦτο γὰρ λάχος διαν-

*trochaic dimeter catalectic*

334B ταῖα Μοῖρ' ἐπέ-

*dochmius*

335	κλωσεν ἐμπέδωσ ἔχειν, θανάτων τοὶ σὺν αὐτουργίαις ξυμπάσωσιν μάταιοι, τοῖς ὀμαρτεῖν, ὄφρ' ἄν γῶν ὑπέλθῃ. θανῶν δ'	<i>hypodochmius</i> <i>two dochmii</i> <i>syncopated trochaic dimeter</i> <i>doubly sync. troch. dimeter</i> <i>doubly sync. troch. dimeter</i>
340	οὐκ ἄγαν ἐλεύθερος.	<i>trochaic dimeter catalectic</i>

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 ωσιν, which may be joined and reaccented to make ξυμπάσωσιν, which would be the third plural aorist subjunctive active from a not otherwise attested verb *συμπατέω*, 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 . . . αὐτουργίαι* 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 :

322	μᾶτερ Νύξ, ἄλα-	<i>dochmius</i>
323	οἴσι καὶ δεδορ-	<i>hypodochmius</i>
324A	κόσιν ποινάν, κλύθ'. ὁ Λατοῦς γὰρ ἔ-	<i>two dochmii</i>
324B	νίς μ' ἄτιμον τίθησιν	<i>syncopated troch. dimeter</i>

Such syncopated trochaic dimeters as 324B and 337 are rare.<sup>11</sup> In 324A a dochmius in the form  $\cup - - -$  responds with another at 336 in the 'Reizianum' form  $\cup - \widehat{\cup} - -$ , which need occasion no misgivings.

A line has fallen out after 352, which is best amended, with Rauchenstein, to *παλλεύκων δὲ πέπλων πανάμοιρος ἄκληρος ἐτύχθην*, and before 354, which runs *δωμάτων γὰρ εἰλόμαν | ἀνατροπάς*. If the lost

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Soph. El.* 1282, and A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup> (London 1968) 92.

line were δῶμ' ἔχουσ' ὑπὸ χθονός, 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 ἀλομένα	
373	ἄγκαθεν βαρυπεσῆ	
374	καταφέρω ποδὸς ἀκμάν.	
375	σφαλερὰ τανυδρόμοις	υ̅υ̅υ̅υ̅υ̅-
376	κῶλα δυσφόρων Ἄτᾶν.	-υ̅-υ̅-υ̅-υ̅-

372 ἀλλομένα **M**, sed altero λ eraso. 376 δυσφόρων Ἄτᾶν 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 paeono-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 Ἄτᾶν 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 ἄγκαθεν at 373 here, citing Schneidewin's explanation of it as a contraction from ἀνάκαθεν. Pauw printed it in his text. βαρυπεσῆ is kept by Wilamowitz, Smyth, Mazon, Paley, Hermann and others; and σφαλερὰ τανυδρόμοις by Hermann, Mueller, Wecklein and Verrall. For the close association of Atai with Erinyes cf. *Agam.* 1433f μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην, | Ἄτην Ἐρινύν θ', αἷσι τόνδ' ἔσφαξ' ἐγώ, and *Cho.* 402–04, βοᾷ γὰρ Λοιγὸν Ἐρινύς [Paley's spelling of **M**], | παρὰ τῶν πρότερον φθιμένων Ἄτην, | ἑτέραν 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: ἔπι δέ μοι | γέρας παλαιὸν <αἰέν> . . . The loss would have been by near haplography, AIEN falling out after AION. For the sense of ἔπι= ἔπεστι cf. Homer's *Hymn to Demeter* 150 ἀνέρασ οἶσιν ἔπεστι μέγα κράτος ἐνθάδε τιμῆς. “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: κλύειν δίκαιος μᾶλλον ἢ πρᾶξι θέλεις; “Do you wish to be called ‘Just’ rather than to act as a just person?”

δίκαιος Dindorf, δικαίους M *linea* (ou in rasura), δικαίως M *supra* F Tri

δίκαιος 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 πρᾶξι cf. 223 τὰ δ’ ἐμφανῶς πράσσουσιν ἤκυχαιτέραν, 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 νικᾶν 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 ξυμφορὰς τὰς κάς, and eventually answers:

455 Ἄργεῖός εἰμι, πατέρα δ’ ἱστορεῖς καλῶς,  
Ἄγαμέμνον’, ἀνδρῶν ναυβατῶν ἀρμόστορα,  
ξὺν ᾧ σὺ Τροίαν ἄπολιν Ἰλίου πόλιν | ἔθηκας.

*LSJ s.v. ἱστορέω* I.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 ἱστόρεις, “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 *πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες*; 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:

*τοιαῦτα μὲν τάδ' ἐστίν. ἀμφότερα, μένειν  
πέμπειν δέ, δυσπήμαντ' ἀμηχάνως ἐμοί.*

*δυσπήμαντ(α)* is Scaliger's emendation for the manuscripts' *δυσπήματ'*. Cf. *δυσκύμαντα* 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 *δέ* connecting single words cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> p.162 n.3, where he concludes: "The delimitation of the functions of connective *δέ* and *τε* 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 δέ* 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:

*ἐν δὲ τῷ céβας  
ἀστῶν· φόβος τε ξυγγενῆς τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν  
σχῆσει τόδ', ἡμαρ 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.* 1.7 'in respect of, towards'. Cf. *Soph. Aj.*

1315 ἐν ἐμοὶ θρασύς, 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: μήτ' ἀναρκτον βίον μήτε δεσποτούμενον αἰνέσης. Recalling this, Athena says at 696–98:

τὸ μήτ' ἀναρχον μήτε δεσποτούμενον  
ἀστοῖς περιστέλλουσι βουλεύω θέθεν  
καὶ μὴ τὸ δεινὸν πᾶν πόλεως ἔξω βαλεῖν.

697 θέθεν M lineā, θέβειν 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 θέθεν must go with the quoted phrase τὸ μήτ' ἀναρχον μήτε δεσποτούμενον. Corruption of an original θέβειν to θέθεν is most improbable; whereas in the Palaeologean age, or even the XI century, a student not understanding how θέθεν fitted in might well alter it to θέβειν and make καὶ μὴ . . . βαλεῖν a parallel clause.

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

Χο. ἐπεὶ καθιππάζη με πρεσβῦτιν νέος,  
δίκης γενέσθαι τῆσδ' ἐπήκοος μένω,  
ὡς ἀμφίβουλος οὔσα 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 γραίας δαίμονας καθιππάσω. Logic and dramatic propriety are secured if we reaccent to ἐπει 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 | σπεῦσαι τι τῶν βούλιος φέρει φρήν. The contrast is also in prose, Pl. *Leg.* 879c ἔργω τε καὶ ἔπει. 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' ἔατε (for the manuscripts' δέ τε) at v. 800: ὑμεῖς δ' ἔατε τῆδε γῆ βαρὺν 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 Scaenica* (London 1955) 198. It seems to be one of the few emendations that escaped the net of the vigilant and chalcenic Dr Roger Dawe.

In the next verse, 801, perhaps no emendation is needed if *κῆψηθε* of the *paradosis* can be accepted as an example of a rare construction classified by the syntactician Goodwin,<sup>12</sup> namely an affirmative exhortation employing the subjunctive in the second person, where the imperative became regular. Goodwin cites Soph. *Phil.* 300 φέρ', ὦ τέκνον, νῦν καὶ τὸ τῆς νήσου μάθησ. 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 μή." There is perhaps another example in Aeschylus, at *PV* 791, where the manuscripts offer ἡλιοστιβεῖς, and I am tempted to read πρὸς ἀντολὰς φλογῶπας ἡλίου στιβῆς, | πόντον περῶς ἄφλοισβον . . ., hortatory 2 sg. subjunctive of *στιβέω*, 'tread'.

At *Eum.* 801 with *κῆψηθε* one can mentally supply, from 800, τῆδε γῆ, to give the sense: "Take (this land) for your support." Cf. *LSJ s.v.* *κῆπτω* I.1, and *Dem.* 34.28 *cū* δὲ ἐνὶ κῆπτει μάρτυρι αὐτῷ τῷ *συναδικοῦντι*.

At 858–63, twice reinterpreting a transmitted *ου* as *ω*, I would print thus:

*cū* δ' ἐν τόποισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι μὴ βάλῃς  
 μῆθ' αἵματηρὰς θηγάννας, *σπλάγχων* βλάβας  
 860 νέων, αἰνῶς ἐμμανεῖς θυμώμασιν,  
 μῆτ', ἐξελῶς ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων,

<sup>12</sup> W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*<sup>2</sup> (Boston 1890) § 258.



ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀστοῖσιν ἰδρύσῃς Ἄρη  
ἐμφύλιόν τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους θρασύν.

860 ἀοίνους *codd.* 861 ἐξελοῦς' *codd.*

“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 ἀοίνους 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 ἀοίνως, which goes well with what follows, and is a step nearer the paradosis than Robortello's much favoured ἀοίνοις. 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 ἀναπτερώσασα 'setting on the wing, exciting', which cannot apply to the aorist participle of ἐξαιρέω. The presumed original ΕΞΕΛΟΣ could be interpreted as ἐξελωσ(α), from ἐξελάω, an Epic compound from the poetic present ἐλάω = ἐλαύνω, in the sense 'forging'. Cf. *LSJ s.vv.* ἐλαύνω III.1, ἐξελαύνω III. The latent image is that of the Homeric *σιδήρειον . . . ἦτορ*: 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     δενδροπήμων δὲ μὴ πνέοι βλάβα —  
939A     τὰν ἐμὰν χάριν λέγω —  
939B     φλογμοὺς ὀμματοστερεῖς φυτῶν. τὸ  
940     μὴ περᾶν ὄρον τόπων.

939B φλογμοὺς ὀμματοστερεῖς Wilamowitz, φλογμός (φλοιγμός M) ὀμματοστερεῆς *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.* II.1; for a cognate accusative, *ibid.* v. It is uncertain which is relevant here. At 939B Wilamowitz merely reinterprets the transmitted spellings. For

infinitival constructions of wishing cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup> § 2014. For a nominative + infinitive construction of wish cf. *Cho.* 363ff. Here τὸ is the neuter article used as a demonstrative, probably in the nominative, as at *Eum.* 261 τὸ δ' οὐ πάρεστιν. It refers to the βλάβη of 938. At 940 for the vague use of τόπων cf. 858 τόποισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι.

At 946 Hermann's plausible supplement <δὲ γᾶς> perhaps makes an allusion that has been overlooked by the learned.

γόνος <δὲ γᾶς>  
 πλουτόχθων ἐρμαίαν  
 δαιμόνων δόσιν τίοι.

“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 γόνος γᾶς to allude to the claim of the Athenians to be in a special sense ‘offspring of the land’, αὐτόχθονες. Cf. Eur. *Ion* 29 λαὸν εἰς αὐτόχθονα κλεινῶν Ἀθηνῶν.

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 <χαίρετε,> χαίρετ' ἐναισιμίαισι πλούτου.  
 χαίρετ' ἄστικὸς λεώς,  
 ἕκταρ ἤμενοι Διὸς  
 παρθένου φίλας φίλοι,  
 1000 σωφρονοῦντες ἐν χρόνῳ.  
 Παλλάδος δ' ὑπὸ πτεροῖς  
 ὄντας ἄζεται πατήρ.

“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 ἐναισιμίαις, and Weil printed ἐναισιμίαισι, taking note of Hesychios: ἐναισιμία· διοσημία. At 997 Erotianus s.v. ἕκταρ offers the variant Ἀπτικὸς λεώς, 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) οἷ θ' Ἑράκλειοι παῖδες, οὐς ὑπὸ πτεροῖς | σὺζω νεοσσοὺς ὄρνις ὡς ὑφειμένη, *Andr.* 441 (Andromache) ἡ καὶ νεοσσὸν τόνδ', ὑπὸ πτερῶν σπάσας; 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' ἔχων ὑπὸ πτεροῖς | σὺζω τάδ'.

In the trilogy another deity is specifically emphasized as being a maiden daughter of Zeus, at *Cho.* 949: . . . Διὸς κόρα — Δίκαν δέ νιν προσαγορεύομεν . . . Aeschylus had expounded the same notion strongly at *Theb.* 662: εἰ δ' ἡ Διὸς παῖς παρθένος 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' ὄμματα Πειθοῦς, ὅτι μοι γλῶσσαν καὶ στόμ' ἐπόπα . . . At 885 she appeals to the Erinyes by the 'majesty of Peitho' or the 'respect due to Peitho', ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἄγνόν ἐστὶ σοὶ Πειθοῦς ἐβασ . . .

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 Διός. 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 ἄτερ ροιβδοῦσα κόλπον αἰγίδος. There it is manifest that Athena is not wearing wings, and that only the speed of her approach in her four-horsepower 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 *Διὸς παρθένου*. The phrase is itself ambiguous, and could also refer to Artemis, as at *Supp.* 145 *ἐπιδέτω Διὸς 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.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

May, 1971