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PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THIS edition of the *Agamemnon* is the second instalment of that edition of Aeschylus which I hope to complete in course of time. The present volume has occupied me for many years, having been commenced long before my edition of the *Septem*, and frequently re-written, as I gained more knowledge of the poet.

No one competent to undertake such a work can flatter himself much upon the little that he can possibly have achieved in comparison with the desirable ideal. It is not likely that, as long as there is any spirit of progress, there will ever be a final edition of Aeschylus. Certainly we are far enough from such a consummation at present. But with all the defects which I see, and the many which doubtless I do not see, I trust that this book is not unworthy of the place in which it has been written and of the great living scholars by whose teaching and encouragement it has been inspired.

Where my version merely follows tradition, the commentary is for the most part silent or brief; and in this sense only I may say that the bulk of it is the product of my own work. But indeed I have the less hesitation in saying so, as I fear that the bulk of it is not a merit.

The English editions of Paley, Kennedy, and Mr A. Sidgwick have been by me throughout; Enger's I have consulted often. Dr Wecklein's interesting and useful edition of the *Orestea* with notes (1889) appeared when this was in the press. This will, I hope, explain anything that may seem obscure in the
relations of the two. All will know the difficulty of dealing satisfactorily with such a case. I should explain that where 'Wecklein's Appendix' is referred to on critical questions, the reference is to the edition of the text with _apparatus criticus_ only (1885).

Since the appearance of my former volume Kennedy, Paley, and J. F. Davies have died, honoured and regretted, as I need scarcely say, by me as by all students of literature. To Paley in particular, whatever may have been said or thought of his defects, I shall always profess myself deeply indebted. It was easy to disagree with him and to see the weak points of his scholarship. But few men have done more for the spread of learning and literature in this country. He sent me a few days before he died a vigorous letter of adverse criticism. Most mournfully do I feel that I shall never receive another.

Beyond the editions of the play (my relations to which in general will appear from the several references) the writings most useful to me have been the editions of Sophocles by Professor Jebb (who has permitted me to express my admiration and gratitude by the dedication of this volume), the _Homerian Grammar_ of Mr D. B. Monro, Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, and an excellent article on the _Agamemnon_ by Mr A. E. Housman in Vol. XVI. of the _Journal of Philology_.

It is not easy to enumerate accurately the friends who have assisted me at various times by conversation and otherwise. But for particular suggestions my thanks are due to Mr R. A. Neil, who was kind enough to revise the whole of the Introduction, to Dr W. Leaf, Mr J. G. Frazer, Mr E. S. Thompson, Mr Wyse, Mr Duff, and Mr H. B. Smith. I have also taken some particular hints from Professor Mahaffy's books on the geography and customs of Greece and from a dissertation on the _Parados_ of the _Seven against Thebes_ recently published by Dr Fennell. Other references will appear in their places.

Continual study strengthens my conviction on one not unimportant point in relation to Aeschylus, the substantial integrity of the text. The greater part of what are called errors
of the MS. are merely normal variations of spelling, not affecting the authority of the tradition in the slightest degree. The errors properly so called are often such that their reproduction through long periods, from the time when by their nature they must have originated, bears speaking testimony to the conservative care of those by whom the text was handed down. Although this edition adheres more closely to the MSS. than its predecessors in modern times, my revision, were I to revise it now, would tend rather to closer adhesion than the other way.

Indeed the men who preserved Aeschylus through the long night of literature were protected as much by their defects as by their merits from tampering with the words. They were scholars, as can be proved out of their own mouths, of the narrowest type. In old words, old forms, and the like they were keenly interested. For the poet they did not care. Of the Agamemnon the MS. Introduction speaks with a reserve barely saved from disapprobation. And no wonder; for the editors had not read the play, as literature, at all. This is the simple fact. To a reader who wished to understand a drama, as well as make notes of the words in it, no point could be so essential as the fixing and distribution of the parts. The Byzantine scholars were entirely indifferent to the matter. If a modern editor were to adopt the dramatis personae of the Medicean manuscript, he would justly be thought a fool. Nor were the Greek commentators unaware that their scheme was dubious; but they would not be at any trouble about a thing of so little consequence to grammar and lexicography. The corrector of the Mediceus assigned the speech beginning ἥκω σεβίζων (v. 270) to a certain ἀγγεῖος of his own invention, perceiving that in the scene which follows there was some difficulty in finding speakers for all the speeches. To this ἀγγεῖος, as appears from the later copies, he assigned among other things the speech γύναι, κατ' ἀνδρα (v. 363), while to Clytaemnestra he gave τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα (v. 494). Now nothing is more certain than that
all these speeches are spoken, as all modern editors print them, by members of the Chorus, and that at v. 494 Clytaemnestra is not even on the stage\(^1\), and further that no one could have read the play with any consecutive attention from the beginning to this point without discovering these facts. But the Greek editor was looking for glosses, and having once ascertained the correctness of his copy (a work on which he can be proved to have spent very great pains), would not interrupt the true labour of scholarship for a question so trivial as the name of a particular speaker.

Consequently, so far as relates to the literary form and purpose of the drama, the makers of our MSS. bequeathed to their modern successors no more than the vague indication of a problem. In the Introduction our first concern will be with this problem, its nature and the material for a solution.

Trinity College, Cambridge,
27 September, 1889.

The present edition is in the main a reproduction of the first, corrected, I hope, and improved in many particulars by the criticisms of others and my own studies.

The translation, which in the former edition was printed separately at the end of the volume, is now placed opposite to the text. This arrangement will be adopted in the Eumenides (which is ready for the press) and in any other volumes of the series which I may be able to complete.

The commentary has been made briefer, and for this purpose questions of small importance have been sometimes suppressed, where my opinion, so far as I have one, has not changed.

Appendix III., dealing with certain ancient evidence, which I think important, respecting the dramatis personae and distribution of the play, is reproduced (with permission) from an article in the Classical Review.

\(^1\) See however note there, 1903.
In the text, the printing of letters in an uncial type different from the rest is used, as in my edition of the Choephorí, to mark what depends upon conjecture.

In the notes, the use of type does not profess to be consistent. Excerpts from the text adopted are generally distinguished by black type, but so also are conjectural readings, though not adopted, if for any reason they require special notice.

Not a few interesting observations on the play have appeared since this volume was so far advanced in printing, that notice of them, even inadequate, has been introduced with difficulty. Beyond the obligations expressly acknowledged I have received much help in details from friends and correspondents.

The final revision of the book has been done under some special hindrances and, I fear, imperfectly. For such exactness as may be attained the credit is due chiefly to the staff of the Cambridge University Press, who have given me, on this as on other occasions, all possible assistance.

Trinity College, Cambridge,
October 10, 1903.
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INTRODUCTION.

1. The Problem.

What is the plot of the Agamemnon? When the dramatist began his work, what was the story which he proposed to tell, or rather—the difference of phrase is not unimportant—which he proposed to illustrate?

To one familiar only with drama produced under modern conditions, it might well seem strange that this question should be propounded at all. Surely, it might be said, this ought to be a simple matter, to be settled at the first reading. If a drama does not convey its own story, entire and unmistakable, what does it convey? So we might argue, naturally enough, from the conditions of the theatre as we know them in modern times: but so would not argue those who have given much reflexion to the theatre of Athens, and especially of Aeschylus. Every one knows, even if the full significance of the fact is not always sufficiently estimated, that the tragedians of Athens did not tell their story at all, as the telling of a story is conceived by a modern dramatist, whose audience, when the curtain goes up, know nothing which is not in the play-bill.

The story of an Athenian tragedy is never completely told; it is implied, or, to repeat the expression used above, it is illustrated by a selected scene or scenes. And the further we go back the truer this is. Some of the plays of Euripides, such as the Hippolytus, are sufficiently complete in statement to be understood perhaps wholly without external aid; and Sophocles fills in his outline more than Aeschylus. Such was the natural result of altered circumstances, of that multiplication of literature and growth of literary education which was the chief characteristic of the fifth century. Before the close of the century the process had so rapidly advanced that literature was a
common occupation, and Athens was full of lads writing, as Aristophanes says, 'tragedies by the thousand.' On the other hand, at the commencement of the century writers were not many, and a literary public scarcely existed at all. One necessary effect of this movement, which took place chiefly in the second half of the period, was to multiply enormously the current varieties of the popular tales; until at last the Athenian playwright was brought, with respect to the foreknowledge of his story by the audience, nearly to the situation of the modern playwright, and found it convenient, if not to tell the whole of it, at least to mark in outline the version of it from which he started. But the original practice, dating from the time when the legends current at one time and in the same city were still fairly harmonious, was to presuppose the story as known; and as a fact there is perhaps not one play of Aeschylus or of Sophocles which would not puzzle a reader who should sit down to it, as to a drama of to-day, having no information on the subject, and expecting everything essential to be supplied by the author.

For a play of Aeschylus then the question, What is the story?, so far from being frivolous, is of the first importance; and so far from being necessarily easy, it is almost certain to offer some difficulties, and might very well prove unanswerable. To reconstruct stories in the exact form which prevailed at Athens in the days of Aeschylus, from the indications afforded by plays presupposing the stories, and from the indirect and ambiguous evidence of such other versions of the same legends as may be more or less perfectly preserved to us, is a task requiring the greatest care. It is not likely ever to be accomplished with all the success that might be wished, and is so far from accomplishment as yet, that in nothing which relates to the study of the poet is there left more room for improvement. We are now to enquire how the matter stands at present with regard to the story of the Agamemnon.

The reader who gradually becomes familiar with successive commentaries upon this play, will gradually become aware that they agree with one another in one remarkable peculiarity. As a rule, the first duty performed in the introduction to a drama is to give an accurate and straightforward account of the story. No edition known to me ventures to tell without disguise the story of the Agamemnon. I do not of course mean merely that the story told is not correct. This would be to assume the very point we are to discuss. I mean that the story, as it is commonly understood, is itself not told without concealment and practical misrepresentation. The reason for this will be only too apparent, when we have supplied the omission by telling the story
OUTRIGHT, AS IT WAS CONCEIVED BY THE BYZANTINE STUDENTS OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY AND IS STILL, WITH WHATEVER DISSATISFACTION, ACCEPTED.

Aramemnon, king of Argos, having sailed with a great armament to Troy, to avenge by the capture of the city the abduction of Helen, arranged with his queen Clytaemnestra, who governed at home in his absence, to transmit the news of his success, when it should be attained, by a series of beacons extending over the whole distance. At what time this arrangement was first made does not appear; but when after a war of ten years the city was taken, the beacons had been maintained, we learn, for at least a year. The chief part of the service, the transmitting of the message across the Aegaean Sea, was accomplished by beacons established on Mount Ida in the Troad, on Lemnos, on Mount Athos, and on the highest point of Euboea. Thence the news was to be signalled by comparatively short stages to Mount Arachnaeus, within a few miles of the royal fortress and visible from the palace, where a watch was nightly kept for the expected news. Accordingly on the night in which Troy was captured the system was put in operation, and worked so successfully that before morning the beacon upon Arachnaeus was duly seen by the palace-watch. (At this moment the action of the play commences.) The queen, being roused, at once sends out her commands for general rejoicing, without however disclosing either the receipt of the beacon-message or the purport of it, as appears from the fact that the elders of the state, who presently arrive before the palace to make enquiries, are not only ignorant of the event announced, but are still uncertain whether the nocturnal demonstration (for the fires of sacrifice are seen blazing in all directions) is made in honour of some good intelligence or not. After some time, and just upon daybreak (V. 291), the queen presents herself, and the elders respectfully ask whether it is her pleasure to enlighten them further.

The queen then informs them that Troy is actually taken. After a few moments of joyful amazement, their next question is, 'When did this happen?' 'This very night.' 'But how could the news possibly

1 Aeschylus knew her as Κλυταιμνήτρα Clytaemnestra—for I agree with those who hold that we have no reason to dispute the testimony of the Medicean Ms. But she must remain Clytaemnestra for us.

2 I have tried throughout so to speak of these 'elders' as to avoid the not very profitable dispute, whether they are to be regarded as councillors, a political γερουσία. It seems to me equally clear on the one hand that their character and behaviour would suggest such an idea to an audience imbued with Greek politics, and that on the other hand Aeschylus intentionally avoided precision on this and all points respecting the constitution of an imaginary state in the heroic times.
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arrive so soon? 'By a beacon-message,' replies the queen, and acquaints them with the arrangements above described, at which the elders are more astonished than ever. The queen makes some reflexions upon the appearance which Troy must present this morning after the ravages of the night, and expresses a hope that the victors will not abuse their triumph in such a way as to court divine punishment and so endanger their safe return. She then retires, leaving the elders to their thoughts.

But the stern satisfaction, which at first they feel for the punishment of the offending Trojans, soon passes away, as they consider the suffering which the war has cost and the deep discontents which it has bred; and they have already sunk again into melancholy and foreboding when the question arises—Is the news true after all? How doubtful is the interpretation of a beacon! How sanguine the imagination of an excited woman! The whole story may well prove to be a mere delusion. It will be best to wait.

They are in this frame of mind when they see approaching a herald, from whose appearance and from other visible indications (for the sun has now risen, v. 513) they at once perceive that he has come from the port and brings great tidings. Something grave then has really happened, and they will know in a few moments whether it is good, or what it is.

The herald—if it were possible to suppose the reader of this book absolutely ignorant of the play, I am certain that what I am now going to write would be set down by him as a manifestly absurd mistake or invention of mine—the herald enters and announces that Agamemnon has arrived.

But this staggering surprise is nothing to the miracles which remain. The conversation of the herald with the elders—if that can be called a conversation, in which the herald, almost beside himself with excitement and joy, speaks nearly all the time—is terminated by the brief reappearance of the queen, who bids the herald return with a message of welcome to his master. The elders beg him before he goes to satisfy them at least as to the safety of the king's brother, Menelaus. This leads him to disclose that the Greek fleet (which, be it remembered, must have traversed the whole Aegaean in a few hours at most) encountered on the way a tremendous storm and was thereby so completely scattered that those on Agamemnon's ship, which escaped destruction, know not even which, if any, of their companions are saved. And with this the herald departs on his errand. The elders, under the weight of this terrible and truly inconceivable disaster, not unnaturally forget for
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the moment to rejoice over the return of the remnant, and are still musing sadly upon the terrible and far-reaching consequences of the war and of the offence which caused the war, when the king himself appears to receive their welcome and that of the queen.

And now, it will be supposed, some light will be thrown upon the facts. The story up to this point presents nothing but an inexplicable contradiction. But when Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra meet, all will of course in some way become clear. Nothing of the sort. Though the rejoicings shortly before commanded by Clytaemnestra are still proceeding, and the sacrifices which were to be offered in the palace in honour of the beacon-message are scarcely begun, the queen, coming forth from the unfinished ceremony, addresses to the king a long and high-flown oration, in which there is not the slightest allusion to the events of the morning, nor a word from which it could be supposed that intelligence of the triumph had preceded the king’s arrival. Agamemnon, in his cold and brief reply, is equally silent on the subject. That affectionate anxiety for the queen’s peace of mind, which we should naturally conjecture to have been his motive, as there is no other apparent, for maintaining such a prodigious machinery of communication and transport, has suddenly given way to a repulsive state-liness. He rebukes severely the pomp of his reception, and there ensues an altercation on this matter between the royal spouses, in which the queen carries her point, and conducts her husband with triumph into the palace, leaving the elders in a puzzled and apprehensive condition of mind, with which the audience must certainly sympathize.

Thus ends the first part or act of the play, which occupies, we may observe, considerably more than half of it. In the tragic scenes or, to speak more properly, in the tragedy, which now commences, the whole of this vast and enigmatic prologue, except certain incidental narratives external to the main subject of it, seems to be simply forgotten. Nothing happens which might not have happened just as easily if the king had returned unannounced, or if he had announced himself in some ordinary manner, and followed his announcement after the expected interval of time. What is dark now remains so, if we accept the received interpretation, to the end of the play. Since therefore the remarkable action of the first part has no particular bearing upon that of the second, and its value in the estimation of the dramatist must be supposed independent, it will be convenient to pause at this point and to consider what that value may be.

And surely the first and most proper reflection is this:—Is it possible that the story above told really represents the intention of Aeschylus?

V. Æ. A.
that a man, who had spent most of his life in writing plays, when he came
to lay down the lines of his supreme masterpiece, should encumber
himself at starting with absurdities so glaring, so dangerous, and so
gratuitous, as this fable exhibits in all its parts? Let us look at it for a
moment from these three points of view.

And first, that the absurdities are conspicuous. If we assume, for
the sake of argument, that it was indifferent to Aeschylus and the
Athenian audience whether the story told was conceivable or not, we
may still wonder why the poet should so labour to be false. The first
‘act’ of the *Agamemnon* is constructed exactly as it would be, if designed
to show the monstrosities of it in the strongest light. It is one huge
contradiction. It is divided by a crisis, the entrance of the herald
(*v.* 508), into two nearly equal parts, the substance of which may be
summarised by the statements, (1) that from the fall of Troy to the com-
 mencement of the play is a period of two or three hours, (2) that in
this interval have occurred the events of several weeks. About this
there is not and cannot be any difference of opinion. It is certain, in
the first place, that the action is continuous, and falls within the early
hours of one morning. Language could not be clearer than that which
shows us that the herald arrives while the beacon-message is still in
process of becoming known (*vv.* 481—498). Even the progress of the
hour from darkness to daylight is duly noted, as we have seen. But it
is needless to labour the point. Had it been possible to suppose the
action divided (as in the *Eumenides*), or to assume anywhere a long
lapse of time (as in the *Suppliants* of Euripides), the modern readers
of the poet, who, as we shall see, are painfully conscious of the
puzzle, would have marked the interval long ago. And yet, on the
other hand, look at the necessities of the situation, as they are thrust upon
our notice by Aeschylus himself. That on the morning after the sack
of Troy the weary and famished Greeks would be making the most of
their comfortless repose, and be in no condition to think of anything
else, is obviously true. But if Aeschylus proposed to bring them that
very morning to Argos, why should he insist on reminding us, before
their appearance, that they must at this very moment be in Troy,

---

1 See also *vv.* 1040 foll.
2 The example of the *Eumenides* is indeed sometimes cited, as if it explained
and justified what would otherwise be surprising in the construction of the
*Agamemnon*. There is no resemblance between them. The *Eumenides* is simply
divided, like a play of Shakespeare, into
three scenes, confessedly separated by
gaps of time and changes of place. If
the *Agamemnon* were similarly divisible,
there would be nothing peculiar about it.
See further an Essay on ‘The Unity of
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hundreds of miles across the sea, taking their hard-won meal and looking forward to enjoy next night their first unbroken sleep (v. 342)? And the very next speech informs us that they are already returned to Argos! Even a happy carelessness might have been expected not to give itself the lie with so much art. Again, the size and general geography of the Archipelago were facts as familiar to an Athenian as those of the Atlantic or the Channel to a modern Englishman, indeed much more so; and he could scarcely, however willing, have imagined them other than they were. But if Aeschylus desired to present a story in which these facts were to be ignored, why should he aggravate his difficulties by prompting the imagination of the audience with a picture of the reality? The conversation between Clytaemnестra and the elders respecting the beacons signifies to us at any rate this, that a voyage over the region described was likely to take some time. A narrator who wished us, for the sake of his story, to suppose that someone had ridden from London to York in an hour, would scarcely begin by reminding us that it takes four hours to go by train.

Then look again at the other side of the picture. To what purpose, in any case, the poet introduced the herald, with his vivid description of the hardships suffered by the Hellenic army and of the awful tempest in which the greater part of it was finally lost, or what is the significance of these narratives to the story, is at present not too clear, as may be seen by reference to the books of authority. But nothing short of a contradiction in terms could be more grossly inconsistent with the preceding scene. If Aeschylus wished to obliterate, by an arbitrary fiction, the interval of time between the fall of Troy and the return of the Greeks, why does he not obliterate it? Why narrate the voyage and show that it was not rapid but disastrous? that it was not accomplished in one hour, nor in one day either? that after the capture, and before the return was even commenced, a considerable time was spent at Troy itself in the elaborate destruction of the city, the distribution of the spoil and captives, and other proceedings related or touched upon by the herald and the king? Of these indeed the audience were previously informed by many familiar narratives, but in the design attributed to Aeschylus they might at least have been left in all possible obscurity. Who could listen to the herald's description of the storm, following as it does close upon Clytaemnестra's account of the beacons, and not ask himself in bewilderment at what time all this is supposed to have happened?

This discrepancy of times, not lightly neglected by the poet but studiously obtruded, would, if it stood alone, make the first part of the
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Agamemnon a confounding problem. But it is combined with another mass of difficulty, less prominent perhaps to the eyes of us moderns, but at Athens and in the time of Aeschylus equally fatal to that temporary and conventional belief without which the imagination is helpless. The story of the beacons is in one sense a fine story; that is to say, it is told in fine verse, and the actual description, how the fiery signal was sped, is unsurpassed or unrivalled in its own style of eloquence. But for all that the story is in its whole conception and all its incidents incredible, and it is impossible that a popular audience in ancient Athens can ever have thought otherwise.

In the first place, looking at the matter generally, it is permissible, when we reflect that the Agamemnon was written by a grave man of long experience in peace and war, and to satisfy an audience which contained perhaps more men personally familiar with the conduct of great affairs than ever assembled elsewhere—it is permissible, I say, to wonder, that so much should be made of a transaction which, for any relation it has to life, is more worthy of an inventive schoolboy. Here is a great monarch, conducting a distant war of uncertain duration. He establishes between his camp and his capital a system of communication on a grand scale, far larger than anything of the kind actually existing, when Aeschylus wrote, in the Greek world. For what purpose? Naturally, we suppose, to aid his plans. Not at all. At the close of the war, as the ignorance of the elders requires us to suppose, no message had ever been sent, and no message but one was expected. The beacons were maintained and watched, night after night, simply that, if and when Troy should fall, this news, expected for ten years, might have a chance, if the weather were favourable, to reach Argos some weeks or some days sooner than it would do in any case. And as if this notion were not puerile enough, the natural facts are distorted so as to exaggerate the absurdity to the utmost. For in the result it seems to be by the merest accident that the beacon-message arrives before the king. But for the storm he would doubtless have got home first.

Again, if we admit the beacons as a conceivable scheme, what are we to say of the useless and impossible mystery with which they are surrounded? The Athenians were to suppose, that for a year at least there had been maintained on a hill close to Argos, night after night, a beacon forming part of a system of communication with the absent army, and that all this while, so strictly had the secret been kept, the

1 The generals of Persia were supposed to have projected something similar, though more practicable, at the time of their marvellous expedition (Herod. 9, 3). It does not appear how far they succeeded.
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elders of the city had not the least notion of it, nor had ever dreamed
of such a thing as possible!

But these general objections, though serious enough, are nothing to
the grotesque and wilful violations of nature which appear in the
details. It is here that the modern reader most easily deceives himself,
forgetting the local and contemporary point of view. No one disputes
indeed, so far as I am aware, that the story told by Clytaemnestra is
impossible; but most of those who write on the play ignore the subject
so far as they can¹; and hardly any one considers how the matter
would look to an Athenian of the Marathonian generation. Yet place
and time are the essential conditions.

Men are the willing slaves of imagination; and the inventor who
frankly transcends our range of experience may with moderate skill
carry us wherever he pleases. But so long as he purports to keep
within our experience, the ablest inventor has but a strictly limited
power. Not Shakespeare himself could have made the Londoners
content to suppose that a Spanish ship lying at the Nore had fired upon
an English ship lying at the Tower. They simply could not suppose it.
Yet this is the sort of fiction which the Athenians, a people singularly
severe in their criticism of the imagination, are supposed to have
accepted without demur, and honoured with their highest reward. The
description of the beacons (v. 293) is curiously complete and
careful. Every stage is marked and named beyond possibility of
mistake. The first three stages are, as above said, from Mount Ida to
the island of Lemnos, from Lemnos to Athos, from Athos to the highest
point of Euboea. The distances are for the first two stages about
sixty miles, for the third stage about a hundred miles. It is needless
to prove that beacons at these intervals would be useless generally,
useless even if we did not throw in, as Aeschylus would appear to
do, the special facility of a tremendous storm, raging in the very
region of the longest transit. Let it be assumed, that in the atmosphere
of the Mediterranean, on a clear night, a bonfire one hundred miles
away would be made out with ease and certainty². What would be the
use of a signal, intended to operate at some unknown time in the course
of the year, if it were so arranged as to be defeated by clouds at any
point in a traitor of one hundred miles? Did then the Athenian
audience not know these distances and their relation to the purpose

¹ Not however all; see Paley.
² It might possibly be seen, under these
circumstances, even much farther. See
Telegraphy of the Ancients (Merriam),

Papers of the Archaeological Institute of
America No. 1, Classical Series III. I
have modified accordingly what was said
here in the first edition.
of a beacon? How could they possibly fail to know the facts, and to have such a vivid consciousness of them as could not for an instant be put by? Euboea, the terminus of the most prodigious leap, was geographically and politically almost part of Attica itself. Athos, the starting-point of the leap, lay right in the eye of Athenian policy and trade, always specially directed to the north and north-west of the Aegaean. The people were essentially a people of seamen. When the Agamemnon was produced, they had been engaged for twenty years in a struggle for the naval dominion of those very seas, a struggle upon which depended most of their wealth and all their national importance.

They were familiar with beacons in peace and in war, and used them, as of course everywhere else, in Euboea, to signal to Skiathos, a distance of some twelve miles¹. The statement that a beacon-signal was transmitted in the midst of a storm from Athos to Euboea stood to the knowledge and habits of Athens then in much the same relation as the statement that a steamer ran across the Atlantic in one day would stand to the knowledge and habits of Liverpool now.

And here again, as in the matter of time, the story is not merely absurd in fact, but wilfully and as it were purposely absurd. If the geographical facts were to the poet indifferent, why is he at such pains to be precise? Nothing would have been easier or more natural, in a mere exercise of the imagination, than to leave the details in some obscurity, to start the signals upon a more or less practicable route, and then to fetch the matter off with generalities, as Macaulay does repeatedly in his Armada. But Aeschylus leaves not a loop-hole; and when he comes to the most miraculous part of the story (v. 298) he is careful to give our incredulity a jog.

But if the defects of the fable are glaring (and on this enough seems to have been said), they are also extremely dangerous. What is the real opinion of modern critics on this point, the critics themselves show by a testimony more telling than any direct condemnation, by ignoring and, as far as possible, concealing the facts. No one, as I have already said, ventures to tell, as it is received, the story of the play. As an example I purposely choose (for the criticism is in no way personal) a book to which I am much indebted, the edition of Mr Sidgwick. 'The action of the play in details' says Mr Sidgwick in his Introduction 'is as follows:—

Agamemnon has been absent for ten years at Troy. Meanwhile his wife Klytaemnestra has been ruling Argos in conjunction with her lover Aegisthos.

¹ Herod. 7, 182.
The news of the capture of Troy is daily expected, and the play opens with the appearance of the night-watchman on the roof, waiting (as he has been for a year past) for the beacon fire which is to announce the victory. While the watchman is complaining of his trouble, the flame flashes out, and he goes to tell his mistress (Prologue). The chorus enter and sing: meanwhile the queen comes out and is seen lighting the altar fires and preparing for a festal display in honour of the event. The leader of the chorus learns from her the tidings, and after describing the beacon-race, she imagines the scene in Troy and expresses a hope that all will end well (Scene 1). After another choric song the Herald appears, who describes first the sufferings before Troy, and finally the storm which scattered the fleet; the queen sends by him a welcome to her lord (Scene 2). In Scene 3 Agamemnon returns with Kassandra.

Now could it possibly occur to any one upon reading this—more especially if he happened to know that Aeschylus, like a modern dramatist, did not limit his plots to any special period of time—but with or without this information could any one suspect from the above, that all these events are represented as occurring within a few hours? Should we not assume, and is it not indeed tacitly implied, that the action of the Agamemnon, like that of its continuation, the Eumenides, is divided; and that the necessary lapse of time between these ‘scenes’ is either expressly noticed, as in the Eumenides, or left open to our imagination? But is this what the editor means? On the contrary, long afterwards in the course of the notes we come upon the following, ‘504. Observe that the herald arrives from Troy, announcing the landing of Agamemnon, immediately after the beacon fires, on the morning after the capture. Such violations of possibility were held quite allowable by the license of dramatic poetry’. This last statement shall be considered presently. But first let us ask why, if this violation of possibility is so simple and so common, it should not be exhibited in the commentary with the same frankness as in the play? Why is ‘the action of the play in details’ so described as to suppress a feature which we are to observe, and why is the like device adopted, as it is, by one writer after another? It is prompted by the instinct of self-preservation. The expositor, loyally identifying himself with the author, feels that, whatever he may say about dramatic license, the reader will as a fact be repelled at starting by the wanton perversity of the fiction; and he screens it accordingly. How is it that no similar apprehension occurred to the dramatist?

For as to the statement that on the Athenian stage ‘such violations of possibility were held quite allowable’, I must take leave to say that it is not only without evidence, but altogether contrary to the evidence. There is no example ‘such’ or approximately such; and the theoretic
treatise of Aristotle on the drama remains to prove, what the extant plays confirm, that the Athenian public, so far from being indifferent to consistency, attached to it an importance much greater than the moderns, and more perhaps than is reasonable. And observe further, that the successors of Aeschylus had a temptation, and so far an excuse, for taking liberties in the matter of time, which Aeschylus himself had not. After Aeschylus 'the unity of time', that is, the restriction of the play to an action within one day, grew into a practice and apparently into something like a rule. It is not always observed; the Supplices of Euripides, for example, does not conform to it. But there was a tendency to observe it; and the tendency produced, as it was sure to do, some questionable treatment of this artificial 'day', though neither Sophocles nor Euripides, nor any one else that I know of, ever presents us with a 'day' like that of the Agamemnon. But Aeschylus did not so straiten himself. The second scene of the Eumenides is separated from the first by an interval of months, if not of years. If therefore he wished to bring into one play the fall of Troy and the return of the Greeks, he had no need to appeal to any dramatic license, nor any temptation to distort the facts. His successors could not have done so consistently with their usual practice, and probably would not have thought it desirable. But to account for the supposed structure of the Agamemnon, we must assume that Aeschylus, who ignores the 'unity' in the third play of the trilogy, adopted it for the first play in this self-contradictory form, that the action of one play ought nominally to fall within one day, but that in this 'day' may happen whatever events we please. I think it may safely be asserted that such a theory was never professed by any author or critic whatever.

As I see no reason to think that the popular mind in the time of Aeschylus was in this respect different from the popular mind now, I will offer a Socratic parallel, not the less just because it is homely. —Scene: A room in London. Time: Early morning. Servants discovered preparing the room. From their conversation it appears that the master of the house has been for some time in Africa, and that the conduct of his wife, in relation to a person too often received, is causing them much anxiety and a strong desire for the master's return. They have learnt with satisfaction that their mistress is expecting soon to hear that he is on the way home. A telegram arrives for the lady, who presently appears and informs them that it is from her husband,

1 See above, p. xviii, note 2.
2 See the description of Orestes' inter-mediate wanderings, Eum. vv. 239—241, 284—5, 454—5.
and was despatched last night from Lake Nyanza. Being asked by a servant whether there is a telegraph at the Lake, she explains that the wires have just been extended so far by the result of her husband’s enterprise. He intends to return forthwith. She wonders what sort of breakfast he is having in Africa, and hopes that he will not meet with any accident on the road back. The table is laid, and the lady is sitting down to it, when there is a ring at the bell. Enter the husband’s courier, who announces that his master is detained for a few minutes at the terminus, but is coming immediately. He dilates upon the discomforts of the Overland route and the breaking-down of an Italian train. The husband follows accordingly. He describes the success of his explorations. The lady receives him with rapture but without any surprise. In conversation with him she says nothing of the telegram, nor he to her. And so ends the first scene.—Now at this point of the story we might either know the key to the riddle (if the author were dramatizing a popular novel) or we might wait for the solution in the sequel. But what would be the bewilderment and the dismay of the audience if it should prove that there was no solution, and that the mysterious telegram, introduced with so much circumstance, had no bearing on the story whatever! I submit that this is not the way in which the crowns of the drama may be won, and that the most rigorous proof should be required before we assume that it ever was.

And so we come to our third point, that these glaring and dangerous defects of construction are also useless and gratuitous. After all, this is perhaps the chief matter. The imagination will work for very moderate wages; but it does expect to be paid something, and a little extra for over-time. There is perhaps no limit, there is certainly no ascertainable limit, to what men will grant to a narrator in the way of supposition, so long as he justifies the concession by making use of it and gives interest for the loan, or in plain words, so long as the supposition is required by the story. A classical example is the story of Oedipus¹; but in fact almost every story illustrates in some degree this principle of criticism, and the readers of fiction are applying it every day. If a romancer were to declare that a whole fleet was wafted, spirited, or what you will, five hundred miles in five minutes, and if out of this fiction were developed incidents of interest requiring the supposition, it is quite possible that his audience or his readers might be perfectly content. But the wild

¹ See the remarks of Sir R. C. Jebb in his Introduction to the Oedipus Tyrannus, p. xlv.
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assumptions debited to the Agamemnon explain nothing, lead to nothing, serve nothing. If the circumstances of time and place were as natural as they are in fact prodigious, the supposed story would still be a marvel of discontinuity. Let any one suppose the opening scenes of the play, as far as the entrance of the herald, to have survived as a fragment; let him notice the striking incidents which centre upon the announcement of the beacon-message, the night alarm, the amazement of the elders, their vain attempt to get more information from the queen, their open incredulity; and then let him consider how he would have conceived the lost remainder. Why does the poet occupy us with the beacons at all? When with all this expense of falsehood the king is at last brought upon the stage, and the play, which is now nearing its middle, begins for the first time to be connectedly intelligible, all the preliminary apparatus, as we have already said, is simply neglected. Nay more, the only fact which emerges, if anything does, from the perplexity of the introduction—that the king in some unexplained manner came home with astonishing speed and arrived almost as soon as he was announced—, so far from accounting for the sequel, greatly aggravates the difficulties of a narrative, which, as we will show, could ill afford the increase.

Almost every fine story, and in particular almost every story suitable for the stage, contains a certain element of essential improbability. Contrast, so important in dramatic effect, will generally require surprising incidents, and what is surprising cannot be altogether likely. The story of Agamemnon and Clytemnestræ is no exception to this general rule. It is not impossible, but it is essentially improbable, that a powerful monarch, returning from a great and glorious expedition, should be murdered by his wife and her paramour, and that the murderers should not only escape immediate punishment, but should usurp the throne and establish themselves in possession. It would be much in such a case if the guilty pair could save themselves by a prompt flight from the vengeance of the triumphant husband. That in the very moment of his new strength and prestige they should actually overthrow him and take his place is a thing which only under the most peculiarly favourable circumstances could either happen or seem credible. The first task therefore of a narrator, who for the sake of the striking situation should undertake to present such a story, must be to adopt such circumstances; and upon his skill in doing this his success, if he were a dramatist, must in the first instance largely depend. For however it may be with the student or the reader, a popular audience cares first of all for the story, and is not to be put off with
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profundity of thought, or splendour of language, or sounding rhythm, or with all of these things together.

Now it will be allowed that in the Agamemnon, as commonly read, the mechanism of the story has received from the author no consideration at all. According to Aeschylus, it would seem that for an adulteress to kill her king and husband on a day of triumph, and to raise her paramour to the throne, is an enterprise too plainly facile to require any explanation of the means. Of course the returning monarch will have no suspicions and receive no warning; of course, however abruptly he may arrive, he will find all prepared for the deed; of course when he has fallen, any slight mutiny on the part of his soldiers or subjects will be instantly and easily suppressed. But that Aeschylus should have been content to treat the matter thus is remarkable, not only upon general considerations of theatrical art, but for two more particular reasons. It is odd that if he really did not care, and did not expect any one to care, how the events came about, he should become scrupulous in explanation just at the point where the story is simplest, at the actual striking of the murderous stroke. If, in defiance of likelihood, we once suppose the king to walk ignorant and unsuspicious into the palace where, to the knowledge of his faithful servants and subjects¹, his queen is living in adultery, we can imagine a hundred ways in which the wife, if so minded, might compass his death. Yet the poet exactly describes the very peculiar device by which the murderess made sure that her victim should have, as she says, 'neither defence nor escape' (v. 1380). Strange that he should have regarded this, and disregarded the only real and pressing questions, how she got her chance and how she secured her impunity! And again, even if the tragedian did not observe for himself that in such a case the preparatory conditions must be a vital part of the plot, it is odd that he should not have recognized this, when it had been emphasized long before by the original narrators of the story

The version of the legend current at the date of the Odyssey is there given incidentally several times². According to this, Aegisthus, the lover of Clytaemnestra, wooed her during the absence of Agamemnon, and with much difficulty induced her to quit the house of her husband for his own. Upon the return of the king, Aegisthus bade him to a feast, and there treacherously fell upon him and slew him, Clytaemnestra

¹ vv. 37, 620, etc.
² Od. i. 35 foll., 3. 247 foll., 4. 512 foll., 11. 405 foll.
assisting. The narration given in Book xi by the ghost of Agamemnon also introduces the presence and death of the captive Cassandra. Now we have but to read these references to see at once, that the epic poets in their construction of the story were principally occupied with the question, how such a thing could possibly come about, how the king could arrive at the house of Aegisthus uninformed of his wife’s infidelity, and why his death was not prevented or instantly avenged by his companions in arms. The two most elaborate recitals, those in the Third and the Fourth Book, relate almost entirely to these points; and in the Third Book the problem is formally propounded. ‘How’ asks Telemachus of Nestor very pertinently ‘was the imperial Agamemnon slain? Where was Menelaus? And by what cunning did Aegisthus contrive the death of one far mightier than himself?’ The first question, how the king came to be at the moment comparatively helpless, is thereupon answered by Nestor, who relates how a storm divided and in great part destroyed the returning host. Of this we need say little now, as this part of the story is adopted by Aeschylus and will appear presently in its place. The second and principal question, what means Aegisthus used and how they came to be successful, is answered by the narrative of Proteus in the Fourth Book. There we learn that Aegisthus after the seduction, lest Agamemnon should reach home unobserved and learning the facts should fall upon the seducer by surprise, set a watch to look out for him, whose vigilance was prompted by a great bribe. He continued to watch for a year before the king returned, when an accident rewarded this precaution with undesigned and extraordinary success. The same storm, which scattered the fleet, so carried the king’s ship out of its course, that he was thankful to land not at home but upon Aegisthus’ domain, near the very castle to which he had carried Clytaemnestra. (It is plain that in the circumstances supposed by Homer this accident offers the only condition under which Agamemnon could possibly be taken unawares.) Aegisthus, apprised by his watchman and seizing the opportunity, invited the king and his companions to a pretended feast of welcome, at which they were treacherously slain. It is noteworthy that the bard, so full is he of the feeling that to fall upon the veterans of Troy, with whatever advantage, was a hazardous feat, after saying that not one of the king’s followers was left, adds grimly that not one of the assassins was left either.

Now between Homer and Aeschylus the story, as we see, has essentially changed. In Aeschylus the murder takes place at the king’s house, where the queen is still ruling, and it is she who plays the deceptive part. Much has been said, and much that is true, on the moral and
spiritual aspects of this change, and on the motives of this kind which would commend it to the tragedian\(^1\). But there were also other reasons simpler and more imperative, why the Homeric version should not have been followed entirely by subsequent narrators, and especially upon the Athenian stage. Without a strong effort of historic imagination, such as no dramatist would willingly require of a popular audience, the Homeric tale could not have been realised. It might pass very well in the antique and consecrated epic, but to expose it in an unfamiliar dress to the 'faithful witness of the eye' would have been in the days of Aeschylus a bold effort indeed. The Homeric story demands for its reception the Homeric mind, and that in two respects. First, in the supposed condition of society and, if the word is applicable, of politics. As conceived by the bard, the whole issue lies between the households and retainers of two chieftains. The lady of Agamemnon leaves her husband's castle for that of Aegisthus. Between the two families this is a deadly breach, but there the rupture ends. What would become of Agamemnon's government upon the flight of his imperial regent, and how the state and the people would be affected and behave, are question which do not arise, simply because among the independent nobles, to whom the story was sung, no such questions would actually have arisen. But how should they not suggest themselves, if the story was to be presented visibly and in modernized language before a great democracy, to whom the administration of government was a daily familiar problem? And secondly, the epic tale depends still more strictly and necessarily upon the primitive isolation of places. To the bard and his hearers it seemed natural, or at any rate within the license of fiction, that Clytaemnestra in the Peloponnesse should have been living for a year in the house of her lover, and that her husband should still return from the Troad ignorant of anything wrong. And the audience of Homer might very well think so. With such communication between the places as they knew, they might well suppose that an expedition sent from Argos to Troy, if such a thing were to be imagined, would for the time be totally cut off from home and news of home. But how was this to pass in the middle of the fifth century? Would the mass of Athenian spectators, accustomed to hear news from Sigean every week, readily conceive this situation, and was it worth while to risk anything upon their readiness? Aeschylus at any rate makes no such attempt. On the contrary, by a natural compromise with the habitual ideas of his own time, he supposes such a possibility of communication

\(^1\) See for example the excellent introduction to Engler's edition.
between Troy and Argos that sometimes the very ashes of the dead were sent home for burial. It is needless to look further for reasons why he should not have placed the queen in the house of Aegisthus; and the same reflexion, we may add, should make us very slow to assume, as we commonly do, that he has placed Aegisthus in the palace or even in the realm of Clytaemnестra.

Aeschylus then, or the predecessors whom he followed, in adapting the Homeric tradition to the expectations of their public, could not but drop the incident upon which in Homer the whole mechanism of the story depends. But neither surely could they drop it without compensation. The story of Aegisthus and Clytaemnестra is essentially the story of a daring venture, which against all probability and by the favour of circumstances succeeded. The epic bard, after the fashion expected of him, provides the circumstances. With the change of manners and knowledge this fashion became unsuitable; and the difficulty of saving the situation at all was increased in many ways too obvious to be specified. The problem then standing thus, how does the Aeschylean narrative deal with it? The Homeric solution being discarded, what solution does Aeschylus provide? Absolutely, if we are to accept the interpretation of the Byzantine critics, no solution or attempted solution at all. It is hard to say whether the story, as they would reconstruct it, is more amazing in what it affirms or in what it ignores. To the question, the inevitable question, of the Homeric Telemachus, 'How was the imperial Agamemnnon slain, and by what cunning device was he overpowered?' the answer of Aeschylus, we are to understand, would have been this, 'Clytaemnестra entangled him in a bath-drapery made for the purpose!'

We will now rapidly follow the action, from the point where we left it to pursue this criticism. Our difficulties will not disappear or diminish as we proceed. It is true that all that part of the drama which lies between the entrance of Agamemnnon and the entrance of Aegisthus, though perplexing in the highest degree if considered in connexion with what precedes or in reference to the unprovided requirements of the situation, does not offer, if taken by itself, any obstacle sufficient to mar its magnificent and astounding effect. The exit of the king, the whole part of Cassandra, the whole scene between the queen and the elders after the murder are such as it would be impertinent to praise. Upon this part of the play, something less than half of it, regarded practically as an independent piece, now reposes

1 v. 448; see also v. 855 foll.
the whole reputation of the drama considered as a drama. Indeed the author of the Greek Introduction in the ms., whose ideas respecting the plot as a whole we are content to borrow, is on this point candid enough. 'This part of the play', he coolly says, after describing the exit of the king and of Cassandra, 'is admired as astonishing and very pathetic'. It would be easy to show that this significant expressio unius represents also the opinion of the moderns, and that, notwithstanding the rich beauties of the whole, every one more or less openly wonders, why the magnificent central picture and the exquisitely carven frame should be so ill fitted to each other.

For with the entrance of Aegisthus the difficulty begins again. It even becomes so great that it cannot be tolerated, and the knot has to be cut by change of the text. Nowhere is it more apparent than in the finale, how much the dramatist relied for the exposition of the story upon the visible action and upon the previous knowledge of the spectators, how imperfect as a narrative are the mere speeches and odes by themselves, and how serious a task for us, who have neither stage-directions nor authoritative preface, is the reconstruction of the indispensable remainder. We find Aegisthus speaking upon the stage; but how he comes there, where he comes from, and how his appearance is connected with the action up to this point, are questions not to be answered by the mere perusal of what is said. So much however is plain (and admitted), that language is used which cannot be reconciled with the current conception of the story. According to Aeschylus, it is supposed, the overthrow of Agamemnon is entirely the work of Clytaemnestra. Her paramour, being, as the Argives tell him, a dastard, remains hidden in the palace or neighbourhood, and appears only to exult when the deed is done. (Why he should have run the enormous risk of being there at all, if he had no part to play, and whether his conduct is not even more foolish than cowardly, are questions which might occur to us in passing.) But this being so, it is strange that Aegisthus should not only attribute the success to himself, but applaud himself vehemently for the ingenuity by which it was attained: and it passes comprehension that the Argive elders should take him at his own valuation as the principal agent, and should speak of the queen, the sole agent, as having merely 'joined in' the plan. 'It was I', says Aegisthus, 'who combined and contrived all the difficult plot'. What plot? There is no plot. There is no combination or contrivance at all. The king comes to his palace, the queen (how could she less?)

1 vv. 1604—1609.
pretending to welcome him. His first act, as a matter of course, is to take the accustomed lustral bath preparatory to sacrifice. The queen, attending him, envelopes him after the bath with an entangling drapery provided for the occasion, and then in this helpless condition butchers him with an axe. Where is the contrivance? The peculiar drapery? Truly a most ingenious combination. Is it not obvious that if we ignore all the real difficulties of the enterprise, if we suppose the king to arrive uninformed and unsuspicious in the kingdom where his queen had long entertained his bitterest foe, if we suppose that a victorious general had no friends in the country willing or able to avenge him, the actual killing might be done by anybody at almost any time and without the slightest difficulty? That his wife should slay him at the lustration, and should have his drapery so made as to entangle him, might show in her a fiendish cruelty and a cold-blooded precaution; but would he have lived and prospered if the drapery had been of the common make? Truly a profound and an admirable combination!

Yet the Argive elders are quite satisfied. They at once recognize Aegisthus as the contriver and prime agent of the scheme, and all they have to ask is, why then he did not act without the queen. 'Why, as it was thy plot, why, coward, didst thou not do the butchery alone? Why join his wife with thee? Why, to the desfilement of our land and our gods, must she be his murderer?'

\[ \text{τί δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς} \\
\text{οὐκ αὐτῶς ἡνάριξες, ἀλλὰ σὺν γυνῇ,} \\
\text{χῶρας μίασμα καὶ θεῶν ἐγχορίων,} \\
\text{ἐκτείνε;} \]

And here no disguise is possible. Every one sees that this language, with the emphatic σὺν, is not such as could reasonably be addressed to one who had merely lain by, while the wife directed and performed the whole. Accordingly σὺν is condemned as an error, to be replaced by σοι, νυ, or other palliatives. We will not here stop to discuss this device, nor will we go further, as might be done, in pressing the acknowledged difficulties which affect the received exposition of the drama as a whole. Sufficient, in my judgment, has been said to show that the text, as it remains to us, without the explanations furnished to the audience by the action upon the stage and by the current version of

1 vv. 1633—1646.

2 It is worth notice that we have the authority of the Venetus as well as the Florentinus for σὺν, which was therefore almost certainly in the Medicus. That it should have been wrongly inserted by a copyist is technically improbable.
the story, which they previously knew, presents a difficult problem, to be solved, if at all, by the reconstruction of the action and of the story which Aeschylus presupposed as known, and that as a solution of this problem the hypothesis of the ancient editors is unworthy of consideration, that it is in fact no solution whatever. It does not give a rational account of the facts or make the purpose of the author intelligible. We will turn rather to the positive and perhaps more fruitful side of the enquiry.

As a preliminary we will notice two or three salient points, which may serve to indicate the direction in which we should strike off. The first of these indications meets us, as if placed for the purpose (and indeed it is) at the very threshold of the play. The watchman upon the palace-roof, whose duty it is to look for the beacon announcing the fall of Troy, informs us in his first words that this outlook has been kept nightly for a year. Why for a year? Are we to understand that, when the war had already run eight or nine years, the king and queen, having hitherto thought the ordinary communications sufficient, suddenly established the beacons? It cannot be by accident that this 'year-long watch' exactly reproduces one feature in the story of Homer. In Homer the watchman of Aegisthus had been expecting Agamemnon 'for a year'. These words of Aeschylus, compared with the epic narrative, are in themselves enough to suggest and almost to raise a presumption, that in the Aeschylean narrative also the design of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra had been on foot for a year, and that the outlook kept by the watchman was closely connected with this design.

And for a second guiding-line, let us look again at the very remarkable speech of the queen which follows her description of the beacons and shortly precedes the entry of Agamemnon's herald. It is remarkable, as already observed, as directing our attention to the fact that, if the preceding story be true, the Greeks must be still in Troy. It is even more remarkable as showing, on the part of Clytaemnestra, a power of unconscious divination which Cassandra might have envied. She makes, it is true, the very natural mistake of supposing that the Greeks are in Troy; but on the other hand how wonderfully does she forecast the rest of their story! Except that she does not anticipate (small blame to her prophecy) the compression of the events into one night, her divination is perfect. She fears that the Greek army, not content with their legitimate triumph, may be tempted to plunder the sacred treasures of Troy. They have actually done so. She points out that

1 Od. 4. 526.  
2 v. 332.
such impiety might expose them to the chastisement of the gods in the course of the voyage home. They have actually suffered such a chastisement. The queen, in short, knows so much that it becomes an interesting enquiry how much exactly she knows, and what is the source of her knowledge.

And for the third indication let us turn to the continuation of the story, to the moment in the *Choephoroi*, when Orestes has entered the palace to execute his vengeance, when the murderers of Agamemnon are about 'to be slain by stratagem even as they slew'. It is thus that the chorus, expectant without, sum up the issue to be decided. 'Now either shall the bloody violence of the murderous *axes* make an end utterly and altogether of Agamemnon's house: or else Orestes, *burning a fire and a light for liberation and lawful rule*, shall win again the high prosperity of his fathers'. It is plain that in the first part of the alternative the metaphor of the axes is chosen for its reference to the manner of Agamemnon's death. What was it that suggested in the second alternative the choice of the *far from obvious metaphor of a fire*? Certainly nothing in the plan of Orestes himself as given us in the *Choephoroi*. Is it not at least a fair *prima facie* conjecture that this also refers to the former plan of his enemies; and that the restoration of the lawful monarchy is likened to the lighting of a fire for liberty, because by the lighting of a fire for tyranny it had been formerly overthrown? But if this is so, we must revise our reading of the *Agamemnon*.

Setting out upon the line thus indicated we might proceed in two ways. Either we might re-examine the play throughout and draw at each point conclusions as to the facts or the dramatic *action*, as distinct from the mere words, which the text assumes. Or, anticipating the conclusion, we may first sketch the story continuously, as we suppose it might have been told in outline, before the play was performed, by any one who knew the version current at the time in Athens, and may then justify our 'hypothesis' by explaining from it the construction of the play. We will take rather the second way, as putting the narrative and the dramatic version in their true order, and will begin with a hypothetical narrative. But in doing this we shall not attempt a distinction, for which there are no materials, between the general outline which the poet took from current literature and the minor details which he may have introduced himself.

1 *Cho. 853*; see also *ib. 887*.  
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*INTRODUCTION.*
2. The Narrative.

By Divine Providence it is appointed that sin shall tend to make more sin, and in the end that sin shall bring forth punishment. The fall of Agamemnon was the consequence of the sin of his father, seconded in its effect by further sin of his own. His father Atreus, by a horrible crime, brought upon his family an unappeasable enmity and the curse of heaven. Divine interference, punishing this crime in the son, exposed him to a temptation which he had not the virtue to resist. His sin provoked another enmity personal to himself, to reinforce the enmity bequeathed by his father, and the two joined together for his ruin.

The starting-point of the story is the Thyestean feast. Thyestes, brother of Atreus, having corrupted his wife and disputed his throne, and having been banished from Argos, endeavoured by throwing himself upon his brother's mercy to obtain restoration. Atreus pretended to welcome him and to celebrate his return by a feast, at which two of Thyestes' children were served as food to their father, and he was made to eat of it unawares. Thyestes, in the agony of the discovery, devoted the accursed house 'to perish in like manner', overturning the table with his foot as a symbol of his prayer. With his remaining child, Aegisthus, he was then sent again into banishment.

Upon Agamemnon, the son of Atreus, who with his brother Menelaus succeeded to the throne, the curse began to work its effect on the occasion of the expedition to Troy. The anger of heaven against the family delayed with contrary winds the assembled fleet¹, until the seers suggested to the kings as a propitiation the sacrifice of Agamemnon's daughter, Iphigenia. To this wicked act the father at last consented, and from this time was pursued by the hatred of his wife Clytaemnestra as well as that of the still-banished Aegisthus. During the expedition Argos was governed by Clytaemnestra, supported by those elders who necessarily remained at home.

Where Aegisthus was spending his exile, and at what time he first conceived that in the absence of the king and the wrath of the queen he might find the opportunity of restoration and revenge, we do not learn, nor is it material. It is implied that he did visit Argos, not of course openly, and so prevailed with the queen, that she was ready to be his accomplice, if occasion served. With many dramatists, with Euripides for example, it would have been a main point in such a

¹ See on vv. 139—144.
situation to show precisely how, in the union of Agamemnon's enemies, Love and Hatred became conspirators—

εὐνῶμοσαν γάρ, ὄντες ἔχοντο τὸ πρίν.

But the analysis of the passions was no part of the Aeschylean drama, and the apportionment of the two motives is left undetermined, the less intimate and sentimental being placed in the foreground.

But the guilty coalition of Agisthus and Clytaemnestra was so far from securing the punishment of their common enemy, that it was scarcely so much as a step towards it. It is needless to enquire, and perhaps the poet could scarcely have told us, exactly what institutions he represented to himself as the 'free and lawful government' of ancient Argos. Doubtless some such limited monarchy, supported and balanced by the influence of privileged councillors and by the popular will, as the Athenians attributed to their own Theseus, such as their stage exhibits, for example, in the Oedipus at Colomos, and as their historian asserts to have been the primitive model all over Hellas. But at any rate in no state, not even the rudest despotism,—and that the Argos of this drama is not a despotism, we are expressly told—could the alliance of the queen-regent with a broken exile give her the power, any more than the right, to assail with impunity the person or throne of the monarch, whether present or absent, so long as his subjects were loyal to him. A speedy success at Troy and a triumphant return would have made Agamemnon safe. But the vengeance of Heaven was not to be thus eluded. At the setting forth of the army it was prophesied, that though for the sin of Paris Troy was destined to fall, yet by the evil genius of the Atridae her fall should be long delayed. It was the length of the war which wrought the king's ruin, and made at last an opening through which his enemies struck home.

In two ways marked by the dramatist the authority of the royal brothers in Argos was shaken by this protracted contest. First, by the mere change of persons. The departing army left behind them those too old for war and those too young, the elders and the boys. During the ten years the elders were passing away or sinking into dotage, the boys were growing up, and all to the disadvantage of the house of Atreus. Among the elders naturally were to be found most personal devotion to the princes and most attachment to established power. It is this party, if we may so call them, Agamemnon's natural friends and

---

1 ἐλευθερία ἄρχαι τε πολισθοῦντο, Cho. 863. See also Ag. 835 foll.
2 Thuc. 1. 13 ἦσαν ἐπὶ μητοίς γῆραι πατρικοὶ βασιλεῖαι.
3 v. 1353.
4 vv. 125—145.
councillors, which is represented by the feeble and anxious remnant, who form the principal chorus of the play: and the poet has spared no pains to expose their weakness\(^1\). As we shall see, the very crisis of the action turns upon their inevitable defect in quickness, decision, and courage. Meanwhile the generation coming up was far from compensating in loyalty for the generation going down. As more and more lives were sacrificed to the revenge of Menelaus, discontent grew deeper and wider; until at last, before the end came, the friends of the king, seeing the course of affairs, yet not daring to interfere, acknowledged to themselves that all was ripe for an outbreak against the government. Powerless already, they lived in constant fear of some dark design, and began to look with desperate eagerness for the king’s return\(^2\).

Meanwhile the queen and the partner of her guilt were using and aiding the natural course of events. How much the king’s friends knew, or how much they suspected, of the queen’s unfaithfulness, the dramatist nowhere determines, nor would anything have been gained dramatically, but much lost, by doing so. In such a case the question of moment is not so much what is known or suspected, but rather what cannot be ignored and therefore is publicly acknowledged. It is plain from the whole course of the play that the correspondence and intimacy of Clytaemnestra with Aegisthus was, when Agamemnon returned, still a secret, not an open scandal\(^3\). Upon any other supposition the behaviour of the elders, the king’s devoted subjects, towards the queen in the early part of the play and towards the king at his coming, is inconceivable, and indeed the whole story is palpably impossible. We are directed to suppose that by the end of the war the repute of Clytaemnestra had reached that only too familiar stage, when a wife’s adultery is known to every one and proclaimed by no one, and when those know least or speak least of it who are most nearly interested, those who, expecting yet weakly dreading the discovery, still say to themselves with the Argive elders

\[\text{πάλαι τὸ σιγάν φάρμακον βλάβησ ἔχω.}\]

Down to the day of the king’s return Aegisthus was still nominally, as well as legally, a banished man, coming and going doubtless more and more frequently as the hopes of the exiles and the malcontents rose, die List gelingen soll, vor der Welt geheim gehalten werden\(^4\). Enger, Einleitung. This is perfectly true; but if Clytaemnestra had recalled from banishment her husband’s hereditary enemy, what concealment could any longer be pretended?

---

\(^{1}\) vv. 72–83 and passim.

\(^{2}\) vv. 437–480, and vv. 543–555, the first a passage of great importance, in which this part of the story is effectively summed up.

\(^{3}\) Aegisthos und Klytämnestra schliessen zwar einen Bund, allein er muss, wenn
while the other side still maintained the politic fiction of his absence. On the fatal morning itself he was actually not in the Argolid. Where he was, and where for a long while past he had spent the intervals between his visits, the story is presently to discover. Meanwhile all that the loyal elders knew and acknowledged to themselves respecting the dangerous state of the popular mind was naturally transmitted to their master\(^1\). Nor was it possible but that with these reports a messenger less discreet or more courageous than the rest should sometimes whisper a more dark insinuation. Both the knowledge and the suspicion thus communicated determine, and are necessary to account for, the language held by Agamemnon during his brief appearance before the palace-gate.

But the fears of the seniors would have been much more cruel, and their representations more outspoken, if they had known but half the truth. They perceived that the common indignation against the war offered a ready bond for a conspiracy\(^2\); they were not aware that the fiercer spirits were already bound in a plot, and waited only to determine by circumstances how and when they should strike. To explain the sequel we will state so much as the story presumes to be known respecting the geography of the place. The Argolid or \(\pi\;\omega\;\lambda\;\nu\;\varepsilon\;\Lambda\rho\gamma\;\nu\;\varepsilon\) is a plain opening southwards upon a deep bay of the sea, and enclosed on the other sides by mountains. The mountains to the N.-E. of the plain are continued southwards in a great promontory forming the eastern side of the bay, and northwards into a mass of hills which extends as far as the Isthmus of Corinth. This whole chain was a lonely region, and had an evil reputation in legend and fact as a haunt of outlaws and robbers\(^3\). Nearest to the fortified seat of the Atridae\(^4\), lay Mount Arachnaeus, the Spider-Mountain, whose quaint name suggested more than one fanciful application, and not improbably gave the first hint for the story which Aeschylus followed\(^5\). Here, amid the web of hills and spurs, upon the edge of the forbidden land, lay Aegisthus in hiding with such power as he could make, and fed himself, as he tells us, with the exile's bread of expectation\(^6\). Here

\(^1\) v. 821.  
\(^2\) v. 463.  
\(^3\) See the story of Theseus and Periphetes.  
\(^4\) See a note on the Argos of the dramatists by Prof. Mahaffy, \textit{Rambles in Greece}, chap. xiii. p. 355. It does not however appear in this play precisely where the 'fortress' is to be figured, whether at the historical city of Argos, or at Mycenae, or elsewhere. An Athenian audience, as appears very clearly in the opening of Sophocles' \textit{Electra}, would not be punctilious on such a point. My language here in the first edition was too definite.  
\(^5\) See the twice repeated v. 1493, and note.  
\(^6\) v. 1668.
was the fittest place from which to watch the communications of Argos by sea and land with the army in the far east; and hence it was easy, when the moment should come, to signal either by day or by night to his partisans in the castle and throughout the country. Supposing all for the best, a hard enough task lay still before him.

For it would have been madness to assume that because the Argives murmured against the absent princes, and because, while appearances were kept up, the malcontents seemed a formidable number, therefore all, or a majority, were ready to stand by while the queen disowned her husband and proclaimed her lover. In such a situation the very best restorative to loyalty is that the lawful authority should be assailed by violence one minute too soon. And so foul a treachery as that of Clytaemnestra must arm against it not only all those whose disaffection had spent itself in hot words, but every honest man. Only with the advantage of surprise and stratagem could her cause be won by such and so many as would support it when once proclaimed. The key to the country was its ‘sole fortress’, the city or rather the castle of the Atridae. To put it into the hands of the traitors would with some management not be difficult. But of what use was this, if the king were thereupon to return armed with all the strength of Achaia and of Hellas? Plainly the ultimate success or failure of Aegisthus must turn on the question whether Agamemnon came back, and in what circumstances he came. Meanwhile the conspirators resolved at least not to be surprised. The seas were carefully scanned (with what result hereafter appears); and that communication might be instantly opened, if necessary, between the principals, a watchman upon the palace kept outlook every night for a beacon upon the Mountain of the Spider. Here a small difficulty had to be overcome. The servants of Agamemnon’s household were devoted to their master. None of them could be trusted. Yet to introduce a stranger for such a special service would have attracted suspicion at once. Accordingly Clytaemnestra chose among the servants a fellow as simple as loyal, and, to explain to him his employment, pretended to be expecting a beacon-signal announcing the king’s success. His vigilance and silence were secured by threats and bribes. This arrangement was maintained during the

---

1 v. 267.
2 For some interesting remarks on this part of the story see Classical Review 11. 98. Prof. Platt observes truly that the Watchman, if the conspirators had, as must be supposed, other means of information, is no longer, as in Homer (see above) a necessary figure in the mechanism, though it is perhaps going too far to call him an inconsistent figure. He may, as Prof. Platt says, be regarded as a survival from the Homeric version, such as are found in all stories transplanted to new settings.
whole last year of the king's absence. The watchman, impatient of his
task and disposed to regard it as an absurd effect of feminine eagerness
or imagination, was for this very reason the less disposed to talk of it,
and had never connected it, as he had no apparent reason to do, with
that conviction about his mistress which he shared with the rest of the
world.

Such was the situation in Argos, when 'about the setting of the
Pleiads', by our calendar in the month of November, Troy was at last
taken. The occurrence of the event at this season was the be-
ginning of the conspirators' good fortune. The seas were closed.
Even in the historic times of ancient Hellas few voyages were under-
taken in the winter; and according to poetical tradition no one
after the 'setting of the Pleiads' expected to sail at all. Ordinary
communication being thus suspended, the party preparing for the
attack had the full advantage of their preparation. What precisely
were their arrangements for obtaining information respecting the army
does not appear in the play, nor was it at all necessary (the story being
known) that it should. There would be no insuperable difficulty in
getting information, when to be the first informed was a matter of
life or death. To bring any exhibition of the means within the
time covered by the action upon the stage would have been difficult,
and useless. For the purpose of the play it suffices that information
was obtained: and this much is exhibited clearly enough. We have
already seen that Clytaemnestra, at the very moment of receiving,
as she pretends, the first news of the triumph, is acquainted not
only with the outrages since committed in Troy by the victorious
army, but with the disaster at sea which they have suffered in con-
sequence.

Once more, the reckless and cruel pride of Agamemnon had betrayed
him to his ruin. Not content with the stern vengeance which the justice
of Hellenic war would have sanctioned, he had utterly ravaged and
literally destroyed the captive city, sparing not even the sacred places.
It was probably not unnoticed by the narrator, that by this brutality and
sacrilege the Greek army also destroyed the last possibility of remaining
where they were till a more favourable season, and forced themselves to
tempt the risks of the winter passage even while they forfeited the

---

1 See the prologue, in which the relevant points in the situation of the
Watchman are given with skill and force.
2 v. 817.
3 vv. 332—362.
4 vv. 353 foll., 530 foll. etc. The attribution of these sentiments to heroic
antiquity is of course an anachronism; and the Herald is made by Aeschylus to
express contrary sentiments, but in such a way as to condemn them even while
he utters.
INTRODUCTION.

protection of heaven. The neighbouring country they had already eaten up. They set sail at any rate, and fared as they had deserved. One fearful night of storm scattered the armament to the winds: and at sunrise the 'destroyer of Ilium' found himself, like Xerxes at sunset, 'a sovereign of the seas without a fleet.'

By this disaster the cause of the conspirators, hitherto almost desperate, was advanced to a fair chance of success. But the final enterprise was still very perilous. The king might have escaped. If he returned, the queen and her lover could triumph only by destroying him, which, if they declared themselves before he came, they would certainly not do without a bloody and doubtful contest against his veteran soldiers and those who would rally round his person. Completing therefore their plans to suit the new situation they waited still a short while for the event. When the moment should arrive, the signal from Mount Arachnaeus was to announce to those in the secret that their accomplices were ready. Fortune stood by them still, so far at least as that the king's ship, which by what seemed a happy miracle had survived the storm, was the first of the survivors to reach Argos. Still more propitious was the hour of arrival. It was in the dead of the winter night that this remnant of the great host came into the bay. By none but those in the plot was such an arrival expected, and they only were upon the watch. The news of the king's approach was instantly carried to the neighbouring eastern hills, and it was still night when the watchman from the palace saw the beacon upon Mount Arachnaeus, and carried to his mistress the news, as he supposed, that Troy had fallen, in reality that the king had come, that Aegisthus was ready, and that she and their partizans throughout the Argolid (for the light could be seen far and wide) were to act as had been pre-arranged.

1 v. 133. 2 v. 1226. 3 The story named the very night. It was the last of the year. That this was so will be seen by comparing the language of the watchman at the opening with the expression of the herald at his first entrance, δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τιθ' ἀφικόμεν ἐνος on this tenth dawn of a year (v. 509). It is an addition to the picturesque impressiveness of the circumstances that the day of the murder was a specially solemn day of religious rejoicing. Clytaemnestra also remembers the season, when she compares the return of a husband to the relief of a beneficent change in the weather (νν. 957—963).

It will be noticed that, while the other seasons are cited in the aorist tense of generality and associated with husbands in general, the 'coming in winter' is referred to Agamemnon personally and described in the present tense. The interval between the fall of Troy and the arrival would thus be something over a month, not at all too much for the repose of the army, the destruction of the city, the preparations for departure, the voyage up to the storm, and the bringing of the king's 'bare hull' from the point to which it was carried back to Argos.

4 The arrangement of the circumstances here is exceedingly skilful. The
The plot now to be executed had three objects, all familiar in the perpetual conspiracies and revolutions of Hellas, first to separate the king from his soldiers and murder him, before his friends could repair to him or open his eyes; secondly to secure the fortress; and thirdly to capture the principal persons of the loyal party. Given the extraordinary circumstances, this was now a hopeful project, though, as the sequel shows, by no means certain yet. Upon the report of the signal the queen at once sent out messengers announcing that she had received great news, and ordering a general feast in honour of the occasion, thus quieting and diverting the minds of all who were not better informed. At the same time she summoned the king's chief friends, the elders of the city, who in their anxiety at this nocturnal alarm and their eagerness for explanation were but too ready to come. On reaching the fortress and the place of council, which lay as usual before the palace doors, they waited for some time, as the queen, whose object was to detain and to mystify them for the necessary interval, was in no hurry to satisfy their curiosity. It was day-break when at length she appeared and in answer to their enquiry as to her news informed them that Troy had fallen that very night. It had been foreseen that some explanation must be offered, and this particular falsehood had the double advantage of tallying with the belief of the watchman and of removing all apparent need for immediate action of any kind. One question could not be escaped, by what means the intelligence had come; and the queen, with an eloquence which might almost persuade her auditors, traced for them the imaginary links between the visible beacon on Mount Arachneus and the king's beacon upon Mount Ida at Troy. It is true that in fabricating this story she betrayed a misconception of the region described, such as might be expected in a queen of Argos in the heroic times. Nor were her auditors contented. Though they

one chance for Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra was that they should strike immediately on the king's arrival. Every hour that he passed in communication with his subjects must make the queen's position more perilous and her success more improbable. It is manifest that the situation given by Aeschylus is just one, perhaps the only one, in which by vigilance the conspirators might have several hours of clear advantage. The dramatist probably assumed, as he does in the Supplicies, that the landing-place for 'Argos' was in ancient times uninhabited.

1 v. 270 implies that the elders had been sent for. But to repair to the castle would (as they say v. 267) have been their impulse. It is evident here and everywhere that, though suspecting or knowing the queen's infidelity, they have not the least glimpse of her treason.

2 v. 523.

3 Prof. Platt (article above cited) calls attention to the deceptive beacon of Nauplius as another incident of the Νόστου, which may have suggested the attribution of this stratagem to Clytaemnestra.
had not sufficient knowledge to expose the fraud, the mere circum-
stances were such as inevitably to prompt suspicion. They tried
to probe the evidence. But the queen had taken care to surround
herself with some of those in her secret; and by their professions of
belief and confidence she was enabled to evade enquiry. She added a
few words suitable to the supposed circumstances and withdrew.

All this time her partizans in the country, favoured by the darkness
and their knowledge of the facts, were using their advantage. One
party had hastened to the landing-place to receive the king and his
companions, and were now already on their way thence to the castle, a
distance of some miles, conducting him, his soldiers, and his captive
Cassandra as in triumph. Others were assembling in and at the
fortress itself, while Aegisthus with his band was descending from the
hills, ready to push forward at the last moment. It was no doubt one
of the merits in the 'combination' upon which he prided himself, that
personally he ran scarcely any risk at all, even in the event of failure,
still quite possible, as was soon to be seen.

Left to their own reflexions, the seniors could not fail to per-
ceive, even with such light as they had, the weakness of the evidence
laid before them. They remembered the state of the country and felt
vaguely uneasy. It was possible certainly that Troy was really taken,
but much more likely, considering all things, that the queen was the
victim of some imposture or delusion, which would soon be exposed.
They were in this mood when they perceived signs of the king's
company approaching in the distance, and at the same moment ar-
rived one who by his appearance seemed likely to know the truth.
The king had sent forward a herald.

This incident, probable as it was and not to be prevented, was
no part of the conspirators' design, and extremely dangerous to them.
With the first words of the herald, the queen's whole story fell to the
ground. Here was the crisis. If the elders had been sagacious,
prompt, and bold, if, putting together all that they knew, they had
argued from it to a remote consequence and acted instantly upon the
inference, they and the king might perhaps yet have been saved. But
criminal plots would seldom or never succeed, were it not for the weak-
ness or error of those concerned to prevent them. And in this case the
default was certainly pardonable. The queen could not be altogether

1 v. 363.
2 According to the Greek 'hypo-
thesis', the king enters in a chariot,
Cassandra and some of the spoil in a
second chariot. This is possibly a genuine
piece of theatrical tradition.
3 vv. 481—493.
right, not right at all as to the beacon-message. But so the elders had already presumed. And what did it matter, when as to what seemed after all the main fact, she was now confirmed? Troy was really conquered; the king was come; and the queen’s wild fancy about the beacon might well be perfectly innocent. If indeed they had had time first to consider and then to put questions! But the herald, mad with rapture, was in no mood to catch hints. While they were fumbling with vague suggestions of danger at home, he had darted off again upon the topic of his sufferings; and before they could recover the subject the queen was upon them and had promptly dismissed the herald with a message of welcome to his master 1.

The elders made indeed an effort to detain him by a question as to the safety of Menelaus, who had not been mentioned, a most unfortunate question, as the reply to it necessarily disclosed the destruction of the fleet, and by this news they were sufficiently distracted from more opportune reflexions until the king’s arrival. The king arrived, with the companions of his voyage and their escort, and the success of the plot was almost assured.

The king arrived at the fortress, and his loyal friends saw with surprise, that the triumphant crowd by which he, his soldiers, and they were now surrounded, seemed to consist of the very men whom they had most reason to suppose disaffected. So striking was this, that even in the moment of welcome they could not but remark upon it resentfully, and warn the king not to be deceived by this show of unanimous rejoicing 2. Agamemnon, putting their hint to previous reports 3, understood them perfectly. Indeed he had returned full of anger against his subjects and of suspicion against his wife, and spoke as if it had been his express object to aid the conspirators, by aggrieving any waverters among their party, or any loyalists who on the way from the sea to the castle had joined the company or were otherwise accidentally present.

1 The brief conversation between the elders and the herald (\textit{vv. 543–555}), the manner in which by their hesitation and his impatience the minute is lost, is an admirable stroke of dramatic art. Equally good is the dexterity and presence of mind shown by the queen at her re-entrance (\textit{v. 592}). Here the slip of a word might have been fatal. If she referred to the supposed message from Troy, she risked refutation by the herald; if she was seen to avoid the subject, she ran still more risk from the suspicion of the elders.

What she actually says is so adroitly turned, that while she seems to treat the matter with simple frankness, there is not a word which could suggest to the uninformed herald that there had been anything remarkable in her interpretation of the beacon which she mentions. To relish this kind of linguistic skill was a speciality of the Attic audience. It is the essence of their famous ‘irony’.  

2 \textit{vv. 774–800}.  
3 \textit{v. 821}. 
He and the gods of Argos had won a glorious triumph; but he had been ill served abroad and ill served at home, and so the offenders should find to their cost. Not a word of thanks, not a word, even after the wide-spread calamity just announced, of compassion\(^1\). Nothing could better lead up to the final stroke prepared by Clytaemnestra.

Advancing from the palace, she addressed her husband in a strain of extravagant and rapturous adulation, and then, bidding her attendants to strew rich tapestries over the approach, invited him to accept in the presence of the assembly the signs of that adoration which befitted the conqueror of Troy. Agamemnon, in great anger, replied to the address with a stern rebuke, and would gladly have escaped the malicious honour. But the queen by insistence and almost by violence compelled him to proceed, all the multitude beholding his act and many not aware of his reluctance. Thus with the symbol and show of an Asiatic tyrant did the victim of the new tyranny pass finally into the toils\(^2\).

The fate of Cassandra, though of immense importance in the tragedy, not only for its own pathos but as giving another direction to the compassion which would otherwise have centred, contrary to the purpose, upon the murdered king, is to the mere machinery of the story insignificant\(^3\). She perished with her enslaver and possessor, whose death was now near and inevitable. When he had gone within, his soldiers departed or dispersed through the fortress, and the throng broke up. But the elders, already unconscious prisoners, had no mind to go away. The strange events of the morning had produced in them, though they could not seize the clue, a vague but invincible sense of danger. Already repenting their reticence and consoling themselves as best they could with the hope of the feeble that 'something will intervene', they waited in perplexity to see what would happen\(^4\).

1 \textit{vv. 801—843.}
2 Surely it is impossible to reconcile this scene with the supposition, that Agamemnon had no suspicion of his wife's honour. What other motive could explain his brutality? He gives her no greeting, he will not even mention her title or her name. His language is full of insinuation. It is the daring and above all the resources of Clytaemnestra, which are unsuspected by Agamemnon, nor her unfaithfulness. The sarcastic \textit{ἀπονεικένεσσα μὴ εἴπεις εἰκόνεσσα ἐμὴ· μακρῶν γὰρ ἐξέγενον,} the husband's sole reply to his wife's affectionate greeting after a separation of ten years, is described by Enger as 'a mild reproof'. If this is mildness, what would be severity?

Whether in the end Agamemnon willingly consents to the use of the tapestry may be questioned. See Appendix R. My impression is that his mind is unchanged. The other view seems to prevail. But the question is of little importance. The tapestry is a mere detail, introduced chiefly for spectacular effect.
3 See the last words of Cassandra (\textit{vv. 1326—1329}), which expressly declare the part which she plays in the economy of the piece.
4 \textit{vv. 966—1018.} Perhaps no passage in the play is more completely irrecon-
What happened was this. In the palace the king found all in readiness both for sacrifice and lustration, for which preparation the festivities commanded in the morning had furnished a pretext. He went, as custom commanded, to bathe before the ceremony. Clytaemnestra, eager for the delight of taking her revenge with her own hand, had marked for herself this moment. She had even descended to plan the details of the bath so as to increase the helplessness of the victim. There with an axe she slew him, and his councillors, wrought by the agony of the foreseeing Cassandra to a paralysing terror, learnt his fate and theirs from his dying cry.

For now at last they began to realize the situation, and saw that the adulterers and their adherents had struck down not only the king, but with him the liberties of Argos. Resistance was impossible. The fortress was in the hands of the conspirators, the remnant of the king's army entrapped and overpowered, the country surprised, and the loyal without a leader, the young heir Orestes being absent and the elders themselves in the power of the enemy. Among the people, between the victory and the loss of the fleet, more hearts had perhaps been lost than gained. Nay, the elders themselves were forced to confess that, of the chief conspirators, Clytaemnestra at least had a foul wrong and a presentable cause, nay, even that their own cause was not clear, for what had they done to save the innocent Iphigenia? To the name of Iphigenia the queen instantly appealed, and the councillors could not but allow that as between her, the mother, and them, in some sort the slayers, it was a doubtful case. Thus does Aeschylus moralize at once both the personal and the public aspects of his story.

But whatever compunction even the friends of Agamemnon might feel in the presence of Clytaemnestra gave way to pure rage when Aegisthus, entering the fortress with his ruffians and joining the queen where she stood with her defenders around her and the dead bodies at her feet, exulted in his 'just restoration' from exile and boasted the

citable with the current theory of the story than this. If Aegisthus is living, by the queen's permission, in Argos, what can the elders possibly mean by speaking of their 'inexplicable fears'? Obviously on this supposition the danger of Agamemnon must be imminent and certain, and the elders, who do not warn him, are in fact nothing less than accessories to his death.

1 vv. 1040—41.

2 On the weapon of Clytaemnestra see an essay by the late Prof. Warr, *Classical Review* xii. 348. Aeschylus seems to recognize both axe and sword, and probably follows a story in which both were actually employed.

3 vv. 1354, 1495—97, and the concluding scene passim.

4 vv. 1410 foll., 1554—1560 etc.

5 vv. 1607. The language of Aegisthus here would of itself suffice to show that
skill with which he had conducted the successful design. At the sight of the mercenarys the friends of liberty, inflamed to madness, would even have provoked their death there and then, and Aegisthus, cruel as cowardly, would have taken their challenge. But the queen, more politic as well as less base, would not suffer her hostages to be massacred. Prisoners however they remained\(^2\), and thus, all power but that of the despots being dissolved, the land settled down under the adulterous tyranny until Orestes should come.

Thus, as the story was conceived at Athens in the fifth century, thus or somewhat thus was the imperial Agamemnon slain.

3. The Structure of the Drama.

We have now to show how the foregoing story, or a story like this in the main outline, was by Aeschylus shaped as a drama. The Byzantine story is condemned, first because it is absurd in itself, and next because, even if given, it still does not account for the construction and language of the play. The proof which we shall offer for the general truth (to no more than this ought any one in such a case to pretend) of our alternative hypothesis, is that it does explain and account for the drama with perfect simplicity.

But first it will be well to remind ourselves that it is a play of Aeschylus which we have before us, and to consider for a moment what Greek drama originally had been and, when Aeschylus took it in hand, was in its essence and main conception still. It is a familiar fact, that dialogue, the substance of a play as we conceive it, was first introduced into the drama by Aeschylus himself. Indeed to Aristophanes it seemed that the whole of 'tragedy', as a distinct style of literature, ought to be referred to Aeschylus as the first inventor\(^3\); and whatever the value of this opinion, which with our little evidence we should be slow to dispute, we know that the earliest rudiments of literary tragedy could be traced no higher than Aeschylus' immediate predecessors. But what was the stock upon which, whether by Aeschylus, by Phrynichus, or if it was so by Thespis, the literary tragedy was grafted? Whence came the name which was for some time bestowed upon the
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1 The character of Aegisthus' followers is sufficiently shown by v. 1638.

2 vv. 1656, 1659.

3 ὁ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργῶσας ἔρματα σεμνὰ καὶ κοσμησάς τραγικῶν λῆρων, says the Chorus of the *Frogs* (1069).
whole? What was drama? For whoever may first have used the word *drama* in its present sense, neither Aeschylus nor Thespis invented, or is supposed to have invented, the thing. Drama, as the name implies, it not properly a form of written literature at all, but something far older and more natural. It is *action*, the presentation of a picture, fact, or story by movement and pantomime. It exists or has existed everywhere for ages without any literature at all, and has often attained a high development without even any regular verbal composition. When indeed literature takes possession of it, the literary element by its deeper interest and greater permanence will surely conquer the rest, and in Athens during the fifth century this process, like all others, went on with amazing rapidity, so that we soon arrive at a species of *drama*, such as the *Medea* of Euripides or the *Oedipus at Colonus* of Sophocles, which is not essentially an *action* or performance at all, but a thing to be heard or read. The name in fact had already become, as it now notoriously is, a misnomer. But it was not a misnomer when it was given, and it is significant that the art which Aeschylus took up and turned into tragedy called itself *performance* or *action*. If we compare what was written, in ages when the book-drama was familiar, about the early dramatists of Athens, with what was said of them at the time when they were still remembered, we shall note a marked difference. We speak, and Suidas might have spoken, of Phrynichus as composing a tragedy on the taking of Miletus. But Herodotus does not say so. He says that he 'made a performance' or *action* of it. Aristophanes mentions Phrynichus often, and tells us that even in his own day the songs of Phrynichus were still the favourites of the older generation. But nowhere, I believe, does Aristophanes, or any one near that time, speak of the δράματα of Phrynichus as a kind of literature, which existed or could exist in a manuscript, like the *Andromeda* of Euripides, which Dionysus read on board ship before the battle of Arginusae. He speaks of them as things which had been. 'Phrynichus', says Agathon to Mnesilochus in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, 'whose work you have yourself heard, was fine in person and fine in dress, and that is why his actions were fine too'. Phrynichus, as he appears in the allusions of Aristophanes, is properly an artist in *pantomime*, inventor of gestures, figures, and movements, and author of popular songs; and the same character is given by all the first-hand evidence to the predecessors of Aeschylus.

Now as even the greatest innovator does not change everything in a

---

1 6. 21.
2 *Frogs* 53.
3 *Thesm.* 167.
moment, it is important to remember all this when we come to the work of Aeschylus himself. When we speak of ‘reading a drama’ we are using an expression which to Aeschylus would probably have been unnatural. What lies before us is not the ‘action’ but the words that were to go with the action; and we have only to read them to see how much the manuscript implies which it does not directly express. Take for instance the Seven against Thebes, and read what the ancient editors offer as a list of the dramatis personae: ‘Eteocles, Antigone, A spy, Ismene, Chorus of maidens, A herald.’ These are the persons who speak or sing, and therefore attract the exclusive attention of the bookman, but they are a mere fraction of the performers required by the ‘drama’. Besides the six champions who accompany Eteocles in the central scene, and without whose figures, dress, and behaviour the written dialogue could not be followed, we have a crowd of ‘Cadmean citizens’, upon whose playing, together with that of the maidens, would in performance depend the main effect both of the first scene and of the conclusion. It is they in fact, as much or more than the speakers, who conduct that ‘action filled with the spirit of war’ of which the Aristophanic Aeschylus speaks so proudly1. And this case is typical. The same applies in part to the Choephoroi, still more to the Eumenides, most of all to the Supplices and the Persae. In this last drama the poetry, for all its magnificence, is no more than a libretto. Except in the narrative of the battle, the literary element is nowhere independent and scarcely principal. The spectacular performance is the essence of the piece, of which a part, when divorced from the intended accessories, is scarcely readable. When Aeschylus in the Frogs vaunts himself to Dionysus upon the merits of the Persae, it is not the odes, the speeches, or even the thrilling narrative, which the name suggests to that typical representative of the Athenian theatre. What he recalls with pleasure is a striking pose of the performing company, a situation which has disappeared from the permanent literary form of the work, so that we actually do not now know where to place it2. In fact with the possible exception of the Prometheus, none of the extant plays of Aeschylus is a book-play, like the Medea, or the Oedipus at Colonus, or the dramatic poems of modern times. All are dramas proper, or representations in acting, and the Agamemnon is of the same type as the rest.

1 δράμα ποιήσας Ἀρεως μεστῶν...τοὺς Ἑτεόκλειδος Ἐντη Ἱθασα, Frogs 1021.
2 Frogs 1027 ἐγκάρπων γοῦν ἤνικος περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος, ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῷ χείρ' ὃδι συγκροβοῦσα εἶπεν, λαόι. There is some slight error in the text, but this is not here material.
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Even long after the time of Aeschylus, when drama as a purely literary type was fully established, and hundreds of tragedies were composed with scarce a hope of performance, and when, as inevitably happened, the importance of the non-literary elements had relatively much declined, even then the part of the 'supers', to use the familiar term, was larger than a hasty reading of the text might lead us to suppose. I will give one striking example of this, where we are made more than commonly sensible of the stage 'crowd' by the fact that some of them, at a particular point in the action, are converted from mutes into singers. The scene in the Hippolytus, where the hero is denounced by Theseus, takes place, as the situation demands and the text shows, in the presence of many persons, servants of the king, friends of Hippolytus, and so forth. It is followed by an ode, sung not by women only like most of the odes preceding, but by men and women in response, a fact which by a mere accident is visible in the text. The strophe speaks in the masculine, the antistrophe in the feminine, the second strophe in the masculine again: the second antistrophe does not happen to give grammatical evidence of sex, but is proved feminine by its substance. The text runs thus:

στρ. α'. ἦ μέγα μοι τὰ θεῖων μελεδήμαθ', ὅταν φρένας ἐλθῃ λύταις παραρεί. σύνεσιν δὲ τῶν ἐλπίδι κείθων λέστομαι ἐν τε τύχαις θνατῶν καὶ ἐν ἔργαις λέυσσων κτλ. ἀντ. α'. εἴθε μοι εὔζημένα κτλ.
στρ. β'. οὐκέτι γὰρ καθαρὰν φρέν' ἔχω, τὰ παρ' ἐλπίδα λέυσσων κτλ.

This alternation of gender admits but one reasonable explanation, that these singers are what they declare themselves, men and women respectively. And since the play has a chorus of men (v. 61) as well as a chorus of women, and an excellent opportunity has just occurred for bringing the men upon the stage as part of the crowd, the combination is quite simple. But the case is a good warning how easily we may miss the action in a text without supplemental directions. It is by mere chance that the language here betrays a change which is of no small dramatic importance.

1 Frgs 90 τραγῳδίας πιονήτα πλεῖον ἦ μυρίας κτλ. It will be noticed that Aristophanes does not say δράματα. I believe he would even then have felt the word in this context to be impossible.
2 Eur. Hipp. 1083, 1098.
3 ib. 1102.
4 The explanation of the scholia, that the masculine parts of the ode are spoken in the character of the poet, is more ingenious than rational. How could the same set of persons carry on a dialogue between themselves and another, and how should the author figure by this strange
And if this caution applies to the study of Euripides, it applies much more to Aeschylus. For between Aeschylus and Euripides, with the development of literary drama and the greater variety of written parts, the use of the mute players had much fallen off. ‘In my plays’ says the Aristophanean Euripides ‘no one was left without a part; there were speeches for the lady, for the slave no less than the master, for the young girl and for the old woman too’1. This is of course an exaggeration. There are silent persons in Euripides, not a few; we have just seen an example, and any one of his plays will furnish others. But the text of the dramatists fully corroborates the remark of Aristophanes taken generally. The drama of Sophocles and Euripides is primarily a drama of speeches; the silent players are generally unimportant. There are few instances, perhaps none, in Sophocles or Euripides, of such figures as the judges in the 

_Eumenides_ or the champions in the _Septem_, whose action is of the highest importance and upon whose persons and bearing the full attention of the audience is directed, while yet they have nothing to say. A writer who took much thought for readers would not be likely to introduce such parts. In Aeschylus, as his text and the observation of Aristophanes unite in showing, it was otherwise; and in the interpretation of Aeschylus we must add to the caution required by our imperfect knowledge of his story the further caution imposed by the fact that we have to supply the action, and that this supplement was a far more important matter with the ‘inventor of tragedy’ than with his more purely literary successors. Perhaps this consideration is too little regarded. No one can suppose that the plays of Aeschylus were performed entirely by the personages who speak and a ‘chorus’, in the modern sense of the word, who sang. The supposition is absolutely inconsistent with the texts. But the rest of the company, merged in the general and proper designation of _χορός_2, receive little attention now that their action can no longer be seen and no stage-directions survive to represent it: and

deputation in his own play? The modern suggestion that the language in the masculine is ‘more general’ is scarcely true, and, if it were, would not explain why a woman should speak of herself in the masculine singular, or why the ‘more general’ and the ‘more personal’ language should alternate in strophe and antistrophe.—

Mr Murray, in his recent text, divides the ode between the two _Chori_ as above suggested, 1903.

---

1 _Fraggs_ 948 ἐπειτ’ ἀπὸ τῶν πρῶτων ἐπών παρηκ ἄν οὐδὲν ἄργων, ἀλλ’ ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνὴ τέ μοι καλ. I give the reading of Lenting and Blaydes in preference to οὐδὲν παρηκ ἄν ἄργων mss. The meaning in any case is the same, and is explained by the antithesis.

2 We have no English term equivalent to the Greek _χορός_, which signifies ‘a number of persons executing prescribed movements’.

---

_d 2_
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dthis neglect, of little moment in the later poets, may well mislead us in
the case of dramas composed when performance was still the main
purpose and staple of the art. That there were not in some dramas of
Aeschylus passages (if the word is applicable) of pure mime, of music and
acting merely, such as are, or till very recently were, common upon the
popular stage of Italy, is by no means clear: from Aristophanes, as well
as from the probabilities of the case, we should rather suppose that there
were such passages, nor is the text without confirming indications, as
will in one case presently be seen. At all events the element of action
was still essential, and the picture was still presented essentially by means
of performance.

It is so presented in the *Agamemnon*. The ‘plot’ of the drama, a
plot both in the theatrical and in the more familiar sense of the word,
is performed before the audience: and we cannot properly read the
written tragedy without figuring to ourselves that performance, separate
from which it was never conceived by the author. The ‘crowd’, chiefly
those partisans of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra without whose support
their triumph would be visibly impossible, are naturally not for the
most part provided with speeches, any more than the followers of
Agamemnon, or the soldiers led by Aegisthus. But some of these
persons, as representatives of them, do speak, and in three places at
least, one very important, the mediaeval editors, by narrowing their
conception of the χορός to the elders who sing the regular odes, have
found and left pieces of the text unintelligible. For the most part
however their part is performance only, but that performance is
necessary both to the picture and to the understanding of what is
said. As in the foregoing story the action of the piece is anticipated,
the formal description of it shall now be made as brief as possible.
A list of the *dramatis personae* and a summary view of the divisions
will be found in Appendix III.

The scene represents the palace of Agamemnon in the fortress of
Argos. Before the entrance are statues of the gods, among them
Zeus and Apollo, and the place of council with its seats. The time is
night. A watchman is seen upon the roof. *Prologue* (1—39). The
watchman explains the supposed purpose of his employment. The
beacon appears and he gives the alarm within. He expresses his

1 *vv. 363, 618—621, 1522—1523*. See
also *vv. 506, 631, 1649—1653.*—It was
also suggested, as an alternative, that
one of the army from Troy might be the
speaker of *vv. 1625—1627*. This how-
ever, making *five* speakers, not *four*, in
the final scene, would not agree with the
important evidence from Pollux, given
in Appendix III.
delight in a dance (after v. 33), by way of prelude to the general rejoicings. Exit.

What here follows is not clearly indicated; but it can scarcely be supposed that the elders, who have still to be summoned (v. 270), enter at once. The text presumes some interval, and it is not likely that the action was arranged so as to contradict it. We may conjecture that the rousing of the palace, the sending out of the messengers, the kindling of fires upon the altar or altars before the entrance, and the rejoicing of the household, were typically represented in action with music, for which the words of the watchman (φορμὸν χορεύεται) seem to prepare the way. Enger, in his Introduction, makes, if I understand him rightly, some such suggestion (p. xviii). See also my edition of Euripides' Ion, Introduction pp. lix—lxxii, On the Parodos.

Enter the Elders (Chorus I), singing first a march (40—103) and then the First Stasimon or regular ode in responsion (104—268).

The great length of this ode is not an arbitrary or accidental circumstance. It calls attention to the delay of Clytemnestra in appearing, which is a proper part of the plot1.

The elders state the reason of their coming. They recall how the war was commenced with ambiguous omens, the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and the threatening prophecies thereupon. Doubtful as to the meaning of this nocturnal alarm, they have come, as invited by the queen, to assure themselves of the safety of the fortress.

First Scene in Dialogue (vv. 270—378). Clytemnestra, with Conspirators (Chorus II), comes from the palace. She informs the elders that Troy has been taken during the night, and the news announced by a chain of beacons, of which she gives an imaginary description. By the assistance of her followers she eludes further enquiry, and retires.

From this time forward the elders are carefully watched, as the situation of the plot requires, by those in the queen's interest, who continue to assemble. The proceedings of the elders, and even their actual words, are reported within the palace. This, which in the theatre would be manifest of itself, is accidentally indicated to us by the text in the next scene, when Clytemnestra makes a pointed allusion to the doubt which, during her absence, they have expressed as to the truth of her information. This deserves notice as an instructive example of the difficulties presented by a stage-play stripped of the necessary directions for action2. It is

1 As to the apostrophe addressed to her at v. 83 see note there.

2 I submit that the above is the only natural way of solving the question which the more careful commentators justly raise. "καὶ τὸν μὲ ἐνίτρων clearly refers to the incredulity of the chorus (485). How would K. know of this, it is asked, as she was not there? The answer is that the chorus only expresses the general feeling of the citizens, which she can naturally be supposed to learn". (Sidgwick on v. 595.) This answer seems to be an evasion. The question is not what other persons may have shared the feelings of the elders, but how did Clytemnestra know what feelings the elders had expressed? It is to their expressed in-
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scarcely necessary to point out, what opportunities are given in this scene and those that follow for effective contrasts of action between those who are in the secret and those who are not.

Second Stasimon (vv. 379—480). The elders, avoiding the topic of the alleged victory, pursue their reflexions upon the sin of Paris, and all the misery thereby caused to the princes and people of Argos, misery of which the end is yet obscure. The people are weary of their sufferings, and their anger, malignantly fomented, threatens the gravest danger; nor can the friends of the king appeal with a clear conscience to the favour of heaven. They fear an insurrection. Triumph and conquest they would gladly exchange for the security of their own freedom.

Their doubts still increasing, the elders in a brief lyrical dialogue are discussing not without contempt the alleged evidence for the victory, when they observe the approach of the herald and other signs of an arrival. Their hope that 'what is now happily believed may be happily increased', is 'echoed in a very different sense by those to whom it is addressed (vv. 481—507).

The dramatic effect of the situation here depends on the presence face to face of the elders and the objects of their suspicion.

Second Scene (vv. 508—685). The Herald, the Elders, Conspirators, and Clytaemnestra. The herald relates the destruction of Troy, the arrival of the king, and the storm.

The queen is summoned from the palace and comes hastily to put an end to the dangerous conversation which has commenced. The abruptness of her entrance and opening (v. 592) is accommodated to the situation. The favourable comment upon her speech (vv. 618—619) must be assigned to one of her party, as is shown by the reply from the other side. See note there.

Third Stasimon (vv. 686—773). The far-reaching consequences of crime are suggested by the fatal disaster just described. 'Again the application is apparently to Paris; again we feel that the sin of Agamemnon is present in the thought'.

March accompanying the Entrance of the King (vv. 774—800).

Here the effect of the scene depends entirely on the spectacular conditions. The king in his chariot, Cassandra, either with him or (according to the tradition) in a second chariot with spoils, and his following enter, accompanied by a crowd who seem to be giving them a triumphant welcome and expressing their sympathy credulity that, as Mr Sidgwick says, she clearly refers.

1 I have already noticed that the latter part of this ode is of the utmost im-
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(v. 781) with the sufferings which they have undergone. The elders, from their knowledge of the persons, cannot but suspect the honesty of the demonstration. It is this startling suspicion, as already noticed, which dictates the strange topics of their first address. At the close of the march, the scene is so arranged, we may presume, as to suggest a multitude entirely filling it and extending beyond it. This is one of the many passages of Athenian drama which might be cited against the view, formerly prevalent but now shaken by the archaeological discoveries of Dr Dörpfeld and others, that in the Greek theatre of the fifth century there was a high and narrow separate stage (λόγειον) for the speakers as distinct from the rest of the company. For such a theatre such a scene as the text here suggests could scarcely have been composed. Compare the final scenes of the Choephori and the Eumenides.

Third Scene (vv. 801—965). Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra. The king enters the palace, commending Cassandra, who remains without, to a kind reception. Clytaemnestra follows.

See the preceding narrative. Here also the general action is important, particularly as to the effect of Agamemnon's haughty and threatening address, and of the invincible honours which he is compelled to accept. The device of the tapestry in particular, the purpose of which is intelligible only in its relation to the feelings of the crowd represented on the stage, would have occurred only to a dramatist who considered his whole company not less than his principal personages. When the king and queen have withdrawn into the palace with their immediate attendants, the crowd of returned soldiers, conspirators, and others would for the most part disperse, the king's companions still watched by their pretended friends. The general appearance of the action is easily imagined, though it would be useless to attempt exact description. During these proceedings is sung the

Fourth Stasimon (vv. 966—1018). The friends of the king, though unable to fix their suspicions, are more anxious than ever.

Fourth Scene. Clytaemnestra, the Elders, Cassandra. Clytaemnestra orders Cassandra, who remains still in the chariot, to come within and join the intended sacrifice. Cassandra, whose appearance is that 'of a wild beast new-taken', pays no attention, and the queen instantly withdraws.

In this brief incident the chief point is the violent impatience of the queen, who here and here only loses her dignity and presence of mind. In truth her act in summoning Cassandra at this critical minute is an imprudent concession to her appetite for revenge (see v. 1448). Note also that, being now sure of her triumph, she can scarcely refrain from a sneer at the victims of her deception (vv. 1040—1042).

Cassandra, by her prophetic power, in a series of visions sees the history of the Atridae, the crime of Atreus, and the murder of Agamemnon now imminent. Declaring his fate and her own to be inevitable, at last in despair she enters the palace.
"In this astonishing scene Aeschylus seems to have touched the limit of what speech can do to excite pity and terror. The cries come forth to Apollo, repeated louder and more wildly as the inspiration grows upon her; she smells the 'scent of murder on the walls' of the bloody house to which she comes as a prisoner, and visions rise, first of the past wickedness, then of the present; and lastly she bewails in songs of 'searching and melting beauty' her own piteous fate. The chorus sustain the part of the Argive citizen, sympathetic and horror-struck, and finally bewildered and overpowered by her clearer and clearer prophecies of the bloody deeds that are imminent'. (Sidgwick.) Of the relation of this scene to the general effect of the play I have spoken already in the narrative. It should be observed however that here again the general action is essential to the comprehension of the spoken scene. Critics have objected (not unnaturally, if the play be read without reference to the action) to the helpless behaviour of the elders at the moment of the murder; and in fact long before this, as they are alarmed if not convinced (v. 1212) by Cassandra, their hesitation is only to be explained by a manifest impossibility of acting to any effect. But in truth they appear helpless because they are so and know it. From the previous incidents and the present situation of affairs it is plain that, if the king is truly in danger, then also they themselves are prisoners. They would not have been suffered either to enter the palace or to leave the fortress. It is not at all unnatural that old men in such a situation should be utterly paralysed, but it is by the action more than by the words that the situation is portrayed. (Prof. Tucker, in the Classical Review vi. 340, rejects the general assumption that the elders do show weakness. That they show also signs of spirit is true; but surely the very notion of a formal debate at such a moment is inconsistent with ability or intention to do anything.)

Fifth Scene (vv. 1342—1576). Clytaemnestra, the Elders, etc. The dying cry of Agamemnon is heard within, and while the elders are still pretending to consider the situation, the palace is thrown open and discloses Clytaemnestra standing over the bodies of her two victims.

From the language of the elders (vv. 1353—1356), it is evident that other signs, besides the king's cry, declare the triumph of the plot. In fact the stage, in Greek parlance the orchestra, rapidly fills again with the exultant crowd and the indignant few (see vv. 1400—1411). As to the remnant of fighting-men returned from Troy, we are manifestly to suppose them surprised and slain (as in Homer) at the moment of Agamemnon's murder. In an archaic Greek state a ship-load of veterans, if allowed fair play, would have been masters of the situation, and the tyrants dared not spare them, if they would. It is this which explains and justifies the prominence and pathos given to the character of the herald, whose part is in every way superior to that of the king. From his entrance to his exit (see vv. 508—512, 572—577, 655—657, 676—677) his language is ominous. And in truth he is actually near to death, and is thus a tragic character as much as the rest.

A curious question arises here as to the exact manner in which the king's death is represented. Modern readers infer from the text that the interior of the palace is not shown to the audience until Agamemnon and Cassandra are lying dead; and the inference seems natural though not necessary. On the other hand the Greek hypothesis says expressly that 'Aeschylus is peculiar in representing Agamemnon as
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killed upon the stage, ἵνα δὲ Ἀλεξύλος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναπείθει τοὺς: and as the text does not suggest this, it is one of the few points in the hypothesis which might appear to rest on some independent tradition. The truth is that our knowledge of ancient scenery is hardly such as to warrant positive assertion on details of this kind.

Clytaemnestra appears and fiercely justifies her act. She describes the manner of the king’s death with cruel detail, answers invective with invective, and declares her reliance upon her partizans and upon the loyalty of Aegisthus. She even forces the lamenting elders to admit that as between her and her husband the justice of the case is doubtful (v. 1569). But a fresh explosion of feeling is produced by the entrance of Aegisthus himself, with his band (λοχῶται v. 1650).

The meeting of the triumphant lovers is left entirely to action, as is necessary. Conversation between them at such a moment and in such a presence would have been altogether out of place. From the fact that Aegisthus’ speech is immediately preceded by a speech of Clytaemnestra it is clear that she does not leave the stage.

Finale. Aegisthus, Clytaemnestra, etc. Aegisthus claims to have merely procured his ‘just restoration’ to Argos (v. 1608), while avenging upon the son of Atreus the wrongs of his father and his own.

That Aegisthus does not come from the palace, but on the contrary has just entered the country, is shown not only by his address, but by the interval which occurs between the achievement of the murder and his appearance. Consistent in his ‘prudent’ plan, he does not enter the fortress till the deed is actually done and all is safe.

This is too much for the friends of the king. Stung by their taunts Aegisthus calls on his ruffians to commence a massacre, when the queen, with hypocritical clemency, interposes to prevent an impolitic cruelty which might yet have endangered the success. ‘Less’, she says, ‘than blood-shed will serve the occasion’ (vv. 1654—1664). Accordingly the elders are led away to imprisonment; and with this final triumph of Clytaemnestra the scene comes to an end.


I hope I am not rash in thinking that the preceding exposition of the play does in its general outline fulfil the conditions; that is to say, the story is itself intelligible, and it explains why the drama is constructed as it is, and what are the relations of its parts to one another. As to the details I do not pretend to offer more than conjecture; on the
contrary I maintain that this is the utmost which, in details, the state of our information permits, and that by better use of the materials others may, and certainly will, improve upon the suggestions here made. The outline will, 'I believe, be accepted after time for reflexion as right; and I will even go so far as to say that the play would never in modern times of good literary judgment have been interpreted otherwise, if we had not allowed the imagination of the eleventh century, criticized and for the most part contemptuously rejected on other points, to rule us unquestioned upon this. It is not in the least surprising that the annotators of the Medicean ms. should have lost or corrupted the genuine tradition here as elsewhere, and that they should be wrong about the story, as they are wrong more often than not about the language and the meaning of the poet. Indeed if there is any department of criticism in which the scholars of that time are manifestly incompetent, it is the artistic part. We owe our whole knowledge of Aeschylus to their diligence; but we do not and must not obey them 1. There is ancient authority, very far better than that of the existing mss., for part at least, an important part, of the interpretation here put forward (see Appendix III.).

But indeed the question is not one of authority at all. On no authority, under the author himself, should it be believed, that any man conceived such a plot as the Byzantine editors attribute to Aeschylus: and if Aeschylus could say that such actually was his conception, we with the Agamemnon before us might well reply, that accident had singularly improved his design. As it is, the text of the play is the sole and sufficient authority for the poet's intention.

Nor is it ground for demur, that the Medicean hypothesis has continued to pass current during the two centuries at most (we might largely reduce the time) during which Aeschylus from a literary point of view has been efficiently studied in the West. Even the fifteenth

1 In this matter, as in many others, the ms. commentary actually preserves traces of the truth, though not understood by those who copied them down. On the first line it is observed in the Medicean scholia that θεράστων Ἀγάμεμνον ὁ προ- λογιζόμενος, οὐκι ὁ ὑπὸ Ἀλγίσθου ταχεῖς. The comparison, as is noted by Hermann and others, is between the Watchman in Aeschylus, and the Watchman in Homer (see pp. xxviii, xxxiii). Now according to the story of Aeschylus as told in the Medicean hypothesis, there is no resemblance whatever between the functions of these persons, and the comparison is pointless. But as a fact their functions are exactly analogous: in Aeschylus as in Homer the 'year-long watch' represents the duration of Aegisthus' plot, of which the Homeric watchman is a conscious instrument, the Aeschylean an unconscious.
INTRODUCTION.

century murmured¹: and it would indeed have been strange, if the readers of Shakespeare and of succeeding dramatists had accepted such a plot with satisfaction. But they never have so accepted it. On the contrary they have transmitted it with manifest discontent, actually concealing its absurdity, so far as possible, by artifice. If we add that until times within living memory the exponents of Aeschylus were necessarily and properly engrossed by the preliminary difficulties of language and grammar (Paley's edition was actually the first exception in English), we shall not accuse our instructors of adding much authority to a tradition which they would have been only too glad to disbelieve.

In reality the plot of the Agamemnon is perfectly coherent and natural. In one detail it is judiciously improbable. When, by the announcement of the herald, the queen's interpretation of the beacon is disproved, the elders would have acted prudently if they had questioned him on the subject, and communicating their own suspicions: and we may therefore call it in a certain sense improbable that they should act otherwise. This 'improbability', as nothing would have been easier than to avoid it, the dramatist must be supposed to have sought. And he had good reason. It would have been a gross violation of the true and vital probabilities of the case, and a great loss to the dramatic interest, if he had represented the design of Aegisthus as never running near to failure. Only by the favour of circumstances, and of human blindness or weakness for one circumstance, could a design so audacious succeed at all: and Aeschylus has wisely chosen that this ingredient of necessary chance shall not be concealed but exhibited.

In one other matter the dramatist has disregarded, not indeed probability (very far from it), but a certain expectation, which we, accustomed to the modern conditions of the stage, might have formed from the course of the play. A modern playwright, having to tell all his story for himself, would have thought it desirable, by way of accenting the construction and rounding off the development, to introduce, after the triumph of the plot, a plain description of the artifice by which it was conducted, or at least an allusion to it, such as appears in the Choephoroi. The absence of any such allusion in the Agamemnon (for the passing glance of Clytaemnestra in v. 1436 is not sufficient to

¹ Schol. in Cod. Flor. to v. 509 τινς μελφώται τῷ ποιητῇ ὅτι αὐθήμερον ἐκ Τρολας ποιεῖ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἱκοντας.
suggest anything of itself) facilitated the error of the mediaeval editors and has made it more difficult of detection. But manifestly, in the matter of truth and nature, Aeschylus is right. In the first outbreak of anger and defiance neither victors nor vanquished would fall to discussing or describing the device by which the contest was lost and won. The first address of Aegisthus to his Argive supporters and subjects turns naturally upon what he alleges for the rights of his cause: and it is only because he is too violent and vain-gloryious to govern his tongue, that he touches at all upon the inopportune topic of his stratagem (v. 1609). Before a modern audience, who did not know the story, Aegisthus would necessarily have been made to narrate his plan and its success, although in real life he would not do so, simply lest some of the spectators should be left in the dark. Aeschylus, by the conditions of his art, was spared the necessity of this misrepresentation.

What points have been added to the story by the dramatist himself, we can scarcely guess and have little interest in knowing. But it is likely that those incidents, which would be effective on the stage only, were invented for the stage; and for this reason we may refer to this origin the whole apparatus of the king’s entrance, including the laying of the tapestry, the whole vision of Cassandra, and perhaps also the απετερων ἄμφιβλητρον, in which at the last moment the victim is enfolded. This curious device is to the plot of the Agamemnon so unimportant, that if the play had survived alone, we might well have wondered why it is introduced. But the question is answered in the Choephoroi, where one of the best scenes is the exhibition of the garment by Orestes, after he has avenged the murder which it served to commit. It is there used as Antony uses the robe of Caesar, and with similar dramatic effect. For the sake of this scene and of the closely connected reference in the Eumenides (v. 463), it is introduced and made prominent in the Agamemnon. It serves also, by its appearance in the sequel as evidence of the crime, to fix attention upon the part of Clytaemnestra, with whom only, and not with Aegisthus, the moral interest of the story is concerned. The stratagem of the beacon was, we may say, certainly not first introduced into the story by the tragedian. If it had been, it would not be presented as it is. Who was the inventor, it is useless to ask. Possibly some one not more deserving of remembrance than some of the romancers who supplied material to

1 Cho. 971 foll.
Shakespeare. To the essential originality of the poet such questions are of course immaterial.

Indeed it would be a grave mistake to exaggerate the importance, in a literary aspect, of the whole subject which has been set forth, at great but I trust not unpardonable length, in this introduction. Undoubtedly the main purpose of the poet, or at any rate his chief value for us now, lies in things almost independent of his story, in the majesty and beauty of his language, in the bold delineation of character, and in the deep moral feeling with which the whole subject is coloured. To the temporary object of winning the prize, which we may guess that Aeschylus did not undervalue, the difference between an absurd and an effective plot would be vital: nor can it be thought indifferent to the mere reader, whether the beginning of the play has or has not any intelligible connexion with the middle and end of it. But I would not for my own sake leave the impression, that I have proportioned the topics to my estimate of their permanent significance. The story of the Agamemnon, once understood, might with justice to Aeschylus be stated and dismissed in a brief summary. The critical discussion of it is required only by the present state of the subject. It is however required now; and for this reason only I hope to be excused, if I seem unduly to neglect other matters of not less moment, upon which I have nothing to say which has not been excellently said before.

I would draw attention to an adverse criticism upon my view of the plot by Prof. Lewis Campbell (Classical Review iv. 303), and would refer the reader also to further remarks of my own in the Introduction to my edition of Euripides' Ion, 'The Unity of Time'.

5. The Text.

The text of the Agamemnon depends mainly upon two MSS. The Mediceus (M) should be regarded as the sole authority for those parts which it contains (vv. i—322 and vv. 1051—1158). Only one MS. of any value, the Florentinus (f), contains the whole play, and for nearly one half of it (vv. 361—1050) this is necessarily the sole authority. One other MS., the Farnesianus (h), contains the whole play, but it is worthless. Its very numerous variations are, in the great majority of cases, manifestly conjectures upon a text derived from M. Before therefore any weight can be assigned to its variation in a particular place, it must appear that the reading cannot be merely conjectural,
that is, it must be such as the corrector could not have propounded for sense—a condition not easy to be fulfilled. All critics put the ms. very low, but the only logical course is to ignore it altogether. I have cited it only so far as seemed sufficient to show its character.

Two of the imperfect mss., *Marcianus Bessarionis* (a) and *Venetus* (g), include parts of the play not in M, the first a few lines (vv. 323—360), the second a large piece (v. 1159—the end), but neither gives much assistance which cannot be had from the *Florentinus*. The mss. are cited as in the apparatus of Wecklein (ed. 1885), to whom I would repeat the acknowledgments made in my edition of the *Septem*.
ΑΓΑΜΗΜΝΟΝΟΣ ΤΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ¹.

'Αγαμέμνων εἰς Ἡλιον ἀπιων τῇ Κλυταιμήστρα, εἰ πορθήσοι τῷ Ἡλιον, ὑπὲρκετο τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας σημαίνειν διὰ τοῦ πυρσοῦ. θεν σκοτόν ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ μισθῷ Κλυταιμήστρα, ἦνα τηροῦ τὸν πυρσόν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἰδὼν ἀπήγγειλεν, αὐτῇ δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλον μεταπέμπεται, περὶ τοῦ πυρσοῦ ἐρώτα: ἡς ὁ καὶ ὁ χορὸς συνίσταται: ὕπινες ἀκούσαντες παιανίζουν. μετ' οὗ πολὺ δὲ καὶ Ταλθύβιος παραγίνεται καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν διηγείται. Ἀγαμέμνων δ' ἐπὶ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐρχεται: ἐπετεο ᾗ αὐτῷ ἐτέρα ἀπήγγειλεν ὕπαρ ην τὰ λάφυρα καὶ ἡ Κασάνδρα. αὐτὸς μὲν ὁν προειρήξεται εἰς τὸν οἴκον σὺν τῇ Κλυταιμήστρᾳ, Κασάνδρα δὲ προμαντεύεται, πρὶν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια εἰσελθεῖν, τὸν ἑαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ 'Ἀγαμέμνονος θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἔξ' Ὀρέστου μητροκονίαν, καὶ εἰσπηθῆ ὡς θανομένην, ρύψαστα τὰ στέμματα. τούτῳ δὲ τῷ μέρος τοῦ δράματος θαμμέζεται ὡς ἐκπλησίᾳ ἔχον καὶ οἴκτον ἱκανῶν. ἰδίως δὲ Αἰσχύλος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἑπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναφεύγει τοιεὶ τὸν δὲ Κασάνδρας σωστῆσας θάνατον νεκρών αὐτὴν ὑπεδείξετεν, πεποίηκεν τε Αἰγισθόν καὶ Κλυταιμήστραν ἐκάτερον δισωμηνόμενον περὶ τῆς ἄναιρέσεως ἐνι κεφαλαῖς, τὴν μὲν τῇ ἀναφέρει Ἰφιγενείας, τὸν δὲ ταῖς τοῦ πατρὸς Θυέστον ἔς ἂτρέως συμφοραῖς.

Εἰδοκάθη τὸ δράμα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Φιλοκλέους διυφθόρος ὄγδοηκοστῇ ἑτε δευτέρῳ (Β. C. 458). πρῶτος Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι, Χοηφόροις, Ἐυμενίσι, Πρωτεῖ σατυρικῆ. ἑξορήγει Ξενοκλῆς Ἀφιδνέος.

¹ See the Preface and Introduction.
ΤΑ ΤΟΤ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ.  
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1 For the *dramatis personae* see Appendix III.
ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.
AIΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ΦΤΑΛΕ.

Θεούς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶν ἀπαλλαγῆ πόνων φρονῆ πτέρας ἐπείας μῆκος, ἢ κοιμώμενος στέγαις Ἀτρειῶν ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην, ἄστρων κάτωιδα νυκτέρων ὀμήγυνιν καὶ τόους φέροντας χεῦμα καὶ θέρος βροτοῖς, λαμπροῦς δυνάστας ἐμπρόσποντας αἰθήρι, ἄστέρας, ὅταν φθίνωσιν, ἀντολάς τε τῶν· καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τὸ σύμβολον, ἀνυγήν πυρὸς φέρουσαν ἐκ Τροίας φάτν 

1—322. Readings of M.

1. μὲν...καὶ νῦν (8)...νῦν δὲ (20) ‘I have long been praying for release, and still am watching, but this time I hope to be answered’.

2. κοιμώμενος στέγαις...ἄγκαθεν. See Appendix A.

4—7. ἄστρων...ἐμήγυνιν καὶ τούς φέροντας...ἀστέρας. ἄστρον as opposed to ἄστρων is properly a great star, and here stands for the great and familiar stars which mark the seasons. (This is substantially Hermann’s view.) For καὶ cf. Pers. 751 θεοῦ δὲ πάντων φετ’ ὁυκ εὐβοια καὶ Ποσειδώνος κρατήσειν (Housman J. Phil. xvi. 246.—To those (Valckenaar) who condemn ν. 7 as spurious, it is replied that τῶν is not the style of an interpolator (Housman). There is no evidence against the verse except the rarity of the initial dactyl, but it must
TRANSLATION.

(For the scenery and action see the Introduction.)

A Watchman. A whole long year of watch have I prayed heaven for release, a year that, like a dog, I have made my bed in the embrace of this palace-roof, till I know all the nightly company of the stars, and chiefly those chief signs that, marked by their brightness for the princes of the sky, bring summer and winter to man, all their wanings and the risings thereof. And still I am watching for the token-flame, the beacon-blaze which is to carry the news from Troy, the tidings of the capture! This it is to be commanded by a woman, who brings her quick hopes into the business of men! When I have found my bed, rain-wetted, restless, and safer than some are from the visit of

be marked as doubtful.—ἀντολᾶς τ' ἐτών Keck, where ἐτῷ would be the annual returns of the constellations to their positions for a certain season. This should be considered in connexion with inf. 509 and the Introduction.

10. ἀλώσιμον: news of the capture: cf. Theb. 622 ἀλώσιμον παίναν 'a cheer for the capture' (Wecklein).—δὴ κρατέ this it is to be commanded by, literally 'thus uses power'; see v. 942 τὸν κρατοῦντα μανθακὼς.

11. γυναικὸς...κλαρ 'one who meddles in the business of man with the sanguine feelings of a woman': cf. Theb. 182 μέλει γὰρ ἀνδρὶ, μὴ γυνὴ βουλευτώ τἀξιοθεν.—γυναικὸς is generic (not 'the lady' i.e. Clytaemnestra), and ἐλπίζων κλαρ a generic description of woman.—ἐλπίζων, wider than ἐλπίζω, includes fancy, imagination, etc. So ἐλπίζω often means to imagine.—Note that ἐλπίζω is a constant epithet, ἀνδρόβουλον (=ἀνδρό- βουλον ὅν) particular to the occasion, a common use of double epithets in Aeschylus.—The speaker is disposed to regard his strange occupation as due to some wild freak of the queen's capricious fancy and feminine imagination; hence the sarcastic allusion, which follows, to her 'dreams'. A similar thought occurs to the elders (v. 286); and see Clytaemnestra's pretended description of herself as dreaming anxious dreams about Agamemnon (v. 882).

12—19 is one period, the construction being εὖ θαν...ἐγὼ, θαν...δοκῇ, κλασα τότε. In v. 16 δὲ, like δ' ἐν, marks merely resumption after the parenthesis.

13. εὐθὺς...ἐμήν 'the couch where no dream visits me'. ἐμήν, emphatic in itself, is here emphasized strongly by position
in the sentence and verse, importing a contrast between the speaker and some one else, whom dreams do visit. The context points the allusion. The dreams of the mistress condemn the poor servant to a couch, where dreams would be only too welcome!—ἐμὴν is commonly treated as inexplicable and corrupt, but, as I think, without reason.

14—15. For, instead of sleep, I am haunted by the fear, that by sleep I might close my eyes for ever, that is, ‘might suffer death, if I missed the signal or were caught neglecting my watch’, the queen like Creon in the Antigone (οὐχ ἤμων Ἀιδης μοῦσ ἀρέσει 308) having, we may presume, threatened this penalty.—For the popular euphemism ‘lastin sleep’ for ‘death’ see v. 1450 τὸν αἰέλ ὑπνοῦ, v. 1293 ὅμα συμβαλω τόδε.—βεβαιῶσ lit. *permanently, lastingly*, as in πλουτώς δόκους ὃ βεβαιων etc. The use of the softer word instead of the more explicit ἐστὶ οἴει adds to the euphemism a touch of rough humour.—τὸ μὴ κτλ. This, meaning literally ‘the (thought of) not closing my eyes in sleep permanently’, explains the substantive φόβος. Cf. Eur. Med. 184 φόβος (ἐστὶν) εἰ πεῖσω, and for the form of the clause Plato Laws 943 D χρῆ πάνταν ἐπεφέροντα δίκην ἀνδρὶ πάντ᾽ ἀνδρα φοβείσθαι τὸ μὴ ἐπενεγκεῖν γειωθὲ τιμωρίαν, ‘in inflicting punishment a man should always have before him the fear of inflicting a wrong penalty’. (See contra L. Campbell Class. Rev. iv. 301, whose objection I have endeavoured to meet.)—The repetition ἀνθ᾽ ὑπνοῦ...

4 ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ

ἐμὴν (φόβος γὰρ ἀνθ᾽ ὑπνοῦ παραστατεὶ τὸ μὴ βεβαιῶς βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὑπνοῦ), ὅταν δ᾽ ἀείδειν ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ, ὑπνοῦ τὸδ᾽ ἀντύμολον ἐντέμων ἄκος, κλαίω τὸτ᾽ ὦκου τούδε συμφορὰν στένων, οὖχ ὂς τὰ πρόσθ᾽ ἄριστα διαπονομένου—νῦν δ᾽ εὐτυχῆς γένοιτ᾽ ἀπαλαγὴ πόνων εὐαγγέλου φανέρωσ ὀρφναίον πυρός. ὃ χαίρε λαμπτήρ, νυκτὸς ἠμερήσιον φάο πυραύσκων καὶ χορῶν κατάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν Ἀργεί, τῆς δε συμφορᾶς χάριν, ἵον ἵον.

Ἀγαμέμνονος γυναικὶ σημαίνων τορῶς, εὐνῆς ἐπαντείλθαν ὂς τάχος δόμοις ὀλολυμμὸν εὐφημοῦντα τῇδε λαμπάδι ἐπορθριάζεων, εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλις ἐάλωκεν, ὂς ὁ φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλλων πρέπει· αὐτός τ᾽ ἦγωγε φρούμων χορεύσομαι.

30 ἀγγέλων.
dreams (for instead of sleep comes the fear that sleeping might close my eyes for ever), and when the fancy comes to whistle or sing by way of a salve for drowsiness, then tears arise of sorrow for what hath befallen this house, now put to no such good work as in the old days. But ah, this time may the blessed release be given, the blessed beacon appear with its message from the dark.

O joy! O welcome blaze, that showest in night as it were a dawn, thou harbinger of many a dance, that shall be set in Argos for this good hap! What ho! Lady of Agamemnon, I cry you loud. Up from the dark couch, quick, up, and raise the morning-hymn of thine house in honour of thy fire, if, as the signal doth manifestly announce, Troy town is taken indeed. Aye, and myself at least will prelude the dancing; for my score

25. He calls as to awaken the slumbering house. Hence σημαίνω in v. 26. —σημαίνω rec. 27. δόμος 'for the house', i.e. on behalf of the household.

28. λαμπάδι, dependent on ἐπ-ορθριάζειν, 'upon' i.e. 'in honour of' its appearance.

29. ἐπορθριάζειν 'to sing as a morning song' (ὄρθρος), pursuing the train of metaphor suggested by ἰμερφιόν φῶς, ἕκαστειλασαν etc.—ἐπορθριάζειν rec. I cannot but think the modern editors wrong in generally adopting this change, probably a mere error. The associations of ὀρθρός, shrill, high, and of the ὀρθός νῦμος, are as foreign to the passage as ὀρθρός is appropriate.

30. ὁ 'the (expected) beacon': cf. τὸ σύμβολον in v. 8.

31. τὰ δεσποτῶν-εὐ-πεσόντα θήρσομαι 'my lord's good fortune I shall score to my game', i.e. regard it as my own: οἰκεύομαι schol. So vice versa χρηστώσας δούλοις συμφορὰ τὰ δεσποτῶν κακῶς πιτνοτα (Eur. Med. 54), apparently an imitation. Cf. στέγειν de τάκτειον καὶ δένθαι (accept and score) πρέπει (Soph. fr. 686), and Horace 'quod fors dierum cumque dabit, lucro appone'. So also
tà δεσποτῶν γὰρ ἐν πεσόντα θήσομαι
très ἐξ βαλοῦσης τῆςδέ μοι φρυκτωρίας.

γένοιτο δ' οὖν μολόντος εὐφιλῆ χέρα
ἀνακτος οἰκών τῆς βαστάσαι χερί.

tà δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ μέγας
βέβηκεν. οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι,
σαφέστατ' ἂν λέξειν· ὃς ἐκὼν ἐγὼ
μαθοῦσιν αὖδώ κοι μαθοῦσι λῆθομαι.

ΧΟΡΟΣ.

Δέκατον μὲν ἔτος τὸδ' ἐπεὶ Πριάμῳ
μέγας ἀντίδικος,
Μενέλαος ἄναξ ἦδ' Ἀγαμέμνων,
διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δισκήπτρου
tμῆς ὁχυρῶν ζεῦγος Ἀτρείδαιν,
στόλον Ἀργείων χιλιοναύτην
tῆς δ' ἀπὸ χώρας
ἡμαν, στρατιῶτων ἄρωγήν—
μέγαν ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες Ἀρη,
tρόπον αἰγυπτίων, οὔτ' ἐκπατίοις
ἀλγεσὶ παίδων, ὑπάται λεχέων,
στροφοδινοῦνται,
πτερύγων ἑρεμοῦσιν ἐρεοσόμενοι,
δεμνοτήρη
πόνων ὅρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες,
ὑπάτος δ' ἀίων ἦ τις Ἀττόλλων

44. Ἀττείδαιν.

Wecklein. Perhaps we should read ἐμοὶ
(Keck) in v. 33.—Others take ἐν πεσόντα
as predicate, 'I shall reckon fortunate';
but on such a question the Greek tradition
seems entitled to respect.

33. τρίς ἐξ: the best possible throw
with three cubical dice.—Here the slave
begins to dance, but presently remember-
ing the many anxieties which in any case
still remain, pauses and resumes (δ' οὖν)
his gloomy meditation.—For a proposed
re-arrangement, placing vv. 36—39 after
v. 19 (Herwerden, Earle) see Class. Rev.
XVII. 102. It is certainly smoother, but
less dramatic.

36. βοῦς...βέβηκεν 'I have weighty
shall profit by my master’s game, the treble-six, thrown me by you fire-signal.

Well, may the king return, may I clasp his welcome hand in mine. The rest shall be unspoken (my tongue hath upon it an ox-foot weight), though the house itself, if it could find a voice, might declare it plain enough; for I mean to be, for my part, clear to who knows and to him who knows not—blind. [Exit.]

Chorus of Elders. 'Tis now the tenth year since, to urge their powerful right against Priam, King Menelaus and King Agamemnon, the mighty sons of Atreus, paired in the honour of throne and sceptre derived from Zeus, put forth from this land with an Argive armament, a thousand crews of fighting men, summoned to their aid.

Loud rang their angry battle-cry, as the scream of vultures who, vexed by boys in the supreme solitudes where they nest, wheel with beating pinions round and round, when they miss the young brood whose bed it was their care to watch. And the shrill sad cry of the birds is heard by ears supreme, by

reasons for silence', i.e. the fear of punishment and of losing, if overheard, the reward of his service. This is the general meaning: παρομια ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ δυναμένων παρρησιαζέσθαι, Hesychius. So also θεός μοι ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ κρατερῷ τοδὲ λέξεις ἐπιθαίνων ἰσχεὶ κοτιλλεῖν κατερ ἐπιστάμενον Theogn. 850.—The origin of a proverb is an uncertain speculation. Of many conjectures, the latest (Wecklein), that it is an allusion to the ἵμας βοίων, or ox-leather scourge, with which slaves were punished, seems as probable as any.

37. He glances at the queen’s adultery.

39. It is my intention to have meaning for those (only) who understand, while those who do not may think that I do not see, literally ‘I am (willingly) unobservant for those who do not understand’. λόγομαι is here the passive answering to the active λαμβάνει με τούτο ‘I do not observe this’.

—On the interval here see the Introduction.

40. Πριήμου: the dative depends primarily on ἀντίδικος (cf. ἀντίπιστος, ἀντίπαλος etc.) and more generally, as dative of interest, on the whole following sentence.—Πριήμου recce.—The singular ἀντίδικος includes both brothers as one ‘party’ to the suit, Menelaus having precedence, as the wrong was strictly his (Sidgwick).

44. Ἀτρεδαῖος Dindorf.

45. χιλιοναύτην of a thousand crews.

49–51. See Appendix B.

54. τὸν οὐραλέκχον: gen. of equivalent, ‘the brood, their care’.

55. ὑπατος echoes ὑπατο in v. 50 and leads up to the figure μετοκών. The birds are ‘licensed dwellers’ in the high abodes of the gods.—Apollo as god of anger, Pan of animal life, Zeus of universal right (Schneidewin.)—The appearance of the humble Pan in the com-
pany of these great Olympians is a characteristic of the time. See on Theb. 132.

56. οἰωνόθρου...οξυβοαν: see on v. 11.

58. τῶνδε μετοίκων (ὅτων) 'of them, because they are their μέτοικοι', and entitled to their protection: "dieser, die ihre μέτοικοι sind, wie Soph. El. 790 πρὸς τῆς' ὑπὲργυ μητρός (von dieser, die deine Mutter sein will)" Wecklein.—The difficulty raised by Hermann against τῶνδε arises from not observing the predicative force of μετοίκων.—ὑπερόποιον 'punishing in after time' i.e. 'soon or late', in the end, though the vengeance may be deferred. Perhaps it was a popular belief that such youthful cruelties (note παιδῶν) were especially liable to be avenged in kind, by refusing children to the offenders or taking their children away. Cf. Soph. Ant. 1074 τῶνων σε λοβήτηρες υπερφηθόροι λοχώσιν "Αἰαδων καὶ θεῶν Ἐρμώνες, ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶι τοῖς ληφθήμαι κακοῖς.

60. ὁ κρείσσων...ἐξίνοις Ζεὺς their mightier Zeus, the guardian of hospitality (ὁ κρείσσων referring back to the Zeus of the birds, v. 56), mightier as representing a stronger claim, since the faith of the ἐξίνος, outraged by Paris, was the very strongest of obligations from a religious point of view.

61. Ἀλεξάνδρος the triumphant Paris. On the name Ἀλεξάνδρος see on vv. 708, 714.

62. πολυάνορος won (not woeed) by many, a woman that could not be faithful to one. For the contemptuous force of the epithet here cf. vv. 790 foll.

65. προτελείοις properly ritual preceding marriage, used here with irony, the war being the προτελεία through which Helen must be finally won.—As this comparison is clearly the point of the sentence, it is probably pursued in
Apollo belike or Pan or Zeus, who to avenge the licensed so-journers of their dwelling-place, sends soon or late on the offenders the ministers of punishment. Even such ministers are the sons of Atreus, sent to punish the triumph of Paris by their mightier Zeus, guardian of hospitality, that so for a woman whom many could win there should be wrestlings many and weary, where the knee is pressed in the dust and the shaft is snapped, between suffering Greek and Trojan suffering too.

The cause is this day no further: the end will be as it must. By no increase of fuel or libation, and by no tears, shalt thou overcome the stubbornness of a sacrifice that will not burn.

detail. The ‘breaking of the rod’, for example, may well have been a marriage-custom, having the common motive of averting the evil eye. To this motive is assigned a somewhat similar Indian custom, to which I am referred by Dr J. G. Frazer: “on déchire une toile en deux devant les yeux des deux mariés, et on en jette les morceaux des deux côtés opposés” Sonnerat, Voyage aux Indes et à la Chine, i. p. 78.—I have cancelled the reference here (ed. 1) to Raphael’s Sposalizio. Several critics have pointed out that, since the ‘breaking of the rods’ is explained in that case by a special legend, it does not prove a custom.

67. δέ refers to μέν in v. 40. ‘In all this time we see no accomplishment (the matter stands as it doth) though it will end as it must’.

69—71. παραθέλει, 2nd pers. sing. fut. mid., the 2nd person being used, as often in English and in Greek, for the indefinite. The schol. λείτει τὸ τίς, though bad in grammar, is right as to the meaning. The sentiment is general, and expands, in the form of a metaphor probably proverbial, the preceding words τελεσται ἐς τὸ πεπρωμένον. Without meta-phor the meaning is “if fate is against you, you may struggle in vain”. To which party in the present contest this doctrine applies, whether the sin of Paris or the sin of Agamemnon will most affect the event, the speakers do not determine.—ὑποκαλων Casanbon. ὑπο-expresses that the fire or fuel is put, and the oil poured in, under the sacrifice to be burnt.—ὀργάς: not precisely ‘anger’ but mood, almost caprice, as in Eur. Med. 121 χαλεπῶς ὀργάς μεταβῆλλον. and frequently.—As to the form παραθέλεις, the middle has its regular quasi-reflexive force (‘in commodum facientes’) as in παράγομαι, παράπταμαι, παραγγέλομαι, and other verbs of like meaning. Of this particular form θέλεις no other example is noted; but there is nothing to raise difficulty in this, as it will scarcely be supposed that our list of such futures is or could possibly become complete. The quasi-reflexive middle forms are always rare, from the nature of the case; thus of ῥήγνωμ, a far commoner verb than θέλεις, the examples in this mood and meaning are extremely few.—All the commentators assume παραθέλεις here to be 3rd pers. active; but the difficulties thus arising are acknowledged by all, and appear to me insuperable. There is no subject to the verb, and the context supplies none, ‘Paris’ and ‘Agamemnon’, which are proposed, being both too remote. If the sentence is general, we are released from the task of finding any particular allusion in ἄπυρον λέπαν.—Mr L. R. Farnell (Class. Rev. xi. 293) contends that the only possible meaning of ἄπυρα λέπα fireless sacrifice is ‘sacri-
fice offered without fire', such as a libation, presentation of fruits or the like, citing θυσίαν ἄπτερον (Eur. fr. 904.), ἄπτερος λεπός (Pind. Ol. 7. 89—90). This, if true, would disprove all proposed interpretations of this passage, and show it to be, as Mr Farnell infers, deeply corrupt. But the context seems to explain sufficiently the sense, doubtless exceptional, which is generally here assumed.—See also Prof. Robinson Ellis Class. Rev. 111. 132.

72. ἀτίται (διπές) if correct, is from ἀτίτης, ‘one who does not pay, a defaulter’; because with our outworn thews we made default, i.e. could not render our due service any more (Weil, H. L. Ahrens). But perhaps it should be read as dat. fem. sing, from ἀτίτος disregarded, unvalued, and corrected to ἀτίτη (Wecklein, comparing, for the feminine termination, Cho. 617 ἄθανάτας, Pers. 599 περικλώστα etc.). Then the dative at.

75. σαρκί παλ. is causal. It is not easy to choose.—σάρξ muscle, as in Theb. 609 γέροντα τὸν νον σάρκα δ' ἡμᾶσαν.

77.  ἰσόπαιδα ‘equal to that of a child’. The compounds of ἰσό- preserve in the classical writers almost always the true sense of the word and are applied only to that which, like force, can be measured. The use for mere resemblance (as in ἰσόπερπος etc.) becomes common only in late Greek.

76—79. τὲ...τὲ as...so.

77. ἀνάσσων Hermann. The word suggests the pushing and shooting of young growth or sap (compare ἀνέδραμεν ἐρει ἰδος), and answers to φυλλάδος κατακαρφομένης.

78. "Αρης δ' οὐκ ἐνί χώρα: this qualifies: the parallel, to the disadvantage of the old; note δέ. ‘The spirit of war’ not being ‘in the fort’; children do not miss the strength they have not known.
As for us, whose worn thews could not render their service, that martial gathering left us behind, and here we bide, on guiding-staves supporting our childish strength. For if the young breast, where the sap is but rising, is no better than eld but in this, that the spirit of war is not there, oh what is man, when he is more than old? His leaf is withered, and with his three feet he wanders, weak as a child, a day-lit dream.

But what of thee, daughter of Tyndareus, Queen Clytaemnestra? What calls? What news? On what intelligence, what convincing report, are thy messengers gone round bidding sacrifice? To all the gods that dwell in Argos, upper and

79. τι’ θ’ ὑπεργίρως; Enger. The rhetorical question is much more favoured in Greek than in English. For τι anticipating a verb (στέλει) see v. 926.—ὑπεργίρως is properly a predicate (ὑπεργίρως ὄν) what of it (or him) in sheer old age?—τὸ θ’ ὑπεργίρων Cod. Farn.

80. μὲν...δι: as if ‘three feet’ should have meant greater power.—πρόσδοσ i.e. ἐπὶ σκηπτροις.

81. ἀρέλων echoes to “Ἀρης in v. 78: Aeschylus probably connected the words in fancy.

82. ὅναρ ἡμερόφατον a dream in daylight. There seems to be no reason for rejecting ἡμερόφατος. It is sufficiently certified by the existence of φῶς to light, and is in form parallel to ἀκρατός. There are two forms of the stem, φᾶ and φα, as in φάνερος, φάνος: the preference of the long vowel in -φατος δι is natural, -φατος having two other meanings, said and slain.—ἡμερόφατον Farn. ἡμερόφατον Ahrens.

83. The speaker “apostrophizes Clytaemnestra, who remains within the house, as Ajax, lingering in his tent, is apostrophized in Soph. Αἴ. 134.” (Wecklein). The form of apostrophe in both cases indicates the like impatience for the presence of the person addressed. It must not be supposed that Clytaemnestra appears.—It is not without significance that the name of the queen is thus introduced together with that of her father. To be a daughter of this house was no good omen, and the speaker, as it were involuntarily, at the reproach put more plainly in v. 905.—Clytaemnestra (sic) Aeschylus passim.

87. πειθείν: literally ‘from conviction of what report?’ i.e. by what report convinced?—περίπεμπτα adverbial accusative, literally ‘by the way of sending round’. The directions for sacrifice were sent not only to public places but generally throughout the country. See v. 599. From v. 96, we see that what was ‘sent round’ on such an occasion was not merely the message or order to sacrifice but materials from the sender, the prince or master, to aid the offering. Hence the point of noticing that the ‘high flames’ are ‘persuaded’ to rise by the rich oil or incense from the palace. It is a species of religious communion between the prince and the subject. The word περίπεμπτα was probably technical. It may be noted that the usage gave the queen in this instance an excellent opportunity for communicating unsuspected with her partizans.—θύσις κυνῆς literally, ‘start’ sacrifice, ‘set it going’. I prefer this reading (Prien) to θυσικής (Auratus, Turnelhus, and the majority), both as adhering to the ms., and as more appropriate to the facts (see v. 599). The sacrifices are not exactly those of the queen, but of her commanding.

88. τῶν ἀστυνόμων. The ‘gods of the city’ generally.
υπάτων, χθονίων,
tῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἄγοραίων,
βωμοὶ δώροις φλέγονται·
ἀλλὰ δ' ἄλλοθεν οὐρανομήκης
λαμπάς ἀνίσχει,
φαιμασσομένη χρίματος ἄγνω
μαλακαῖς ἀδόλουσι παρηγορίαις,
pελάνις μνυόθεν βασιλείῳ.
tούτων λέξας ὁ τι καὶ δυνατὸν
καὶ θέμις αἰνεῖν
παῖων τε γενοῦ τῆς δικαίας
η νῦν τοτὲ μὲν κακόφρων τελέθει,
tοτε δ' ἐκ θυσιῶν ἠγανάθαι
ἐπίθε ἀμύνει φροντίδο ἀπλειστον,
tὴν θυμοθάρον λύπης φρένα.†
kύριος εἴμι θροεῖ—οἶδον κράτος
αἰσιον ἄνδρων

90. τῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἄγοραίων: a strange antithesis, apparently without parallel, as is also οἱ ἄγοραίως as a name for a class of gods. Όφραίως in Greek theology is an epithet of dignity, applying generally to the great Olympian deities. As applied to a single deity it signifies that the deity is viewed in a high religious conception. Thus 'Αφρο-
δίτη Όφραία is the patroness of chaste love, the great natural Right which san-
tions filial love is ἡ οὐραία Θέσις (Soph. El. 1064), and the object of Hippolytus’ mystic and ascetic devotion is ἡ Δίος
οὐραία Ἀρτέμις (Eur. Hipp. 59). Thus also in Eur. El. 1235 θεοὶ οἱ οὐράνιοι is contrasted with δαιμονίαι τινες, a lower term. There were everywhere vast num-
bers of 'deities', many of them much more popular than the exalted persons of the Olympian religion, who could not possibly have been termed οὐράνιοι, some of them mere idols, or something less. The so-called 'Hermae' of Athens are an instance. Since then ἄγοραίως is here opposed to οὐράνιοι, we must seek in it a meaning antithetic to sublimes, high-
exalted. I would suggest that ἄγοραίως, in this theological use, has not the local sense, but the secondary sense of popular or familiar, somewhat as in ἄγοραῖα
dομωματα familiar terms, οἱ ἄγοραῖοι the
commonality, and that τῶν τ' οὐρανίων τῶν τ' ἄγοραίων means 'deities of every degree, the great gods and the low'. This is a quite different division from ὑπάτων—χθόνων, 'gods of the upper and
the nether world'. It is no objection to this that we sometimes find the epithet Ἀγοραίως attached to the name of an
Olympian, a Zeus or Hermes Agorois. It was and is the policy of great poly-
theistic religions to attach to themselves the lower cults in this way, as may again be illustrated by the application of the name Hermes—τῶν
...τῶν: the articles are added because
nether gods, the high gods and the low, the altars blaze with gifts, while on all sides the flames soar up to the sky, yielding to the innocent spell and soft persuasion of hallowed oil, rich from the store of kings. All this (so far as thou canst and mayst consent) do thou explain, and thus cure my present care, which vexes me now anon, although at whiles the sacrifices call up a kindly hope, and drive from my mind the unsated thought that still returns to the prey (?).

It is my right to tell—it is an encouragement upon their way permitted to them whose vigour is past, that still at their years

ιπάτων, χρυσίων, οὐρανίων, ἀγοραίων would have the appearance of a fourfold division, instead of two antitheses, based on different principles.

94. ἀγνὸ hallowed, not merely ‘pure’.
The poet has in view those costly χρύσατα of foreign, chiefly Oriental, production, which even in his own time were scarcely used but for religious purposes.

95. παρηγορίαι: cf. παραθέλει εν. 71.—μαλακαίς ἀδόλουσι in whose softness is no deceit, contrasted epithets. Under this figure is suggested the hope, that the rejoicing, of which these things are a symbol, will not prove deceptive. But the speakers are unaware how very far from ἀδόλου the queen’s persuasions are.

97. ο τί...αἰνεῖν so far as thou canst and mayst consent (to tell), supplied from λέξασα, not ‘so far as thou canst and mayst tell (αἰνεῖν)’. In this sense αἰνεῖν for λέξαιν is not used. So also Wecklein, “αἰνεῖν, sich zu etwas verstehen, zu-sagen”.—λέξασα...παῖδων τι γενοῦ i.e. γενοῦ λέξασα παῖδων τε ‘be the informant, and so the healer’ etc. The periphrastic imperative, γενοῦ with aorist participle, is here seen in its original use, where it serves to express something not so easily put without it.—Others suppose that the clause corresponding to παῖδων τε γενοῦ is lost by anacoluthon (Wecklein); but this, in so short a sentence, seems unnatural.

100. τελέθαι properly ‘results in being’, i.e. ‘is on the whole’ or ‘on the balance’. So in Eur. Med. 1095 ἔλθῃ ἑπὶ βροτοῖς, εἰς’ αἰναρόν παῖδες τελέθουσι. Now gloom, now hope, ‘prevails’.

101—103. ἡτίς ἐστι πουραμότορος λάτη/της φρενός schol. on v. 103.—The reading is quite uncertain. ἀπληστοῦν f. ἀγάνη Karsten. φανθείως Pauw. As to the termination of ἀγανά, it is doubtful whether in such points poetry was regular, and there are traces of a certain tendency in ν to retain the α-sound, like that regularly exercised by ρ. Thus we have in Attic writing ναμέρης, ποινά-τωρ, εὐνάτωρ, νάιμα, εὐνάσιμος, κυναγός, ναός, ναός.—For the last two lines Housman gives ἐλπὶς ἀμώνει φροντίδ’ ἀπληστον ἥμου, λυπησάθρον ἄτην, which, as he shows (J. Ph. xvi. p. 250) might not improbably give rise to the ms. and schol.

104. κύριος εἰμ: they turn for relief to certainties, and to that which is still within their power, the narration of the past.

105. ὀδίον...ἐκτελέον (in apposition to τρωεῖν, or rather to the notion κύριος εἶναι τρωεῖν, ‘narration is the privilege and gift of old age’) an encouragement upon the way permitted to men whose vigour is past. ὀδίον and αἴσιον apply properly to a favourable omen on a march or journey. κράτος ‘strength’ i.e. ‘that which strengthens’, see on v. 299. The application of the metaphor to the journey of life is suggested partly by the
eforegoing thoughts (πρώτος ὁδὸς στείχει v. 80) but chiefly by the coming story, which relates to a ὁδὸν κράτος αἰών in the literal sense of the words. In ἀλών, which means both fortunate and permitted (see alōn), there is a double suggestion.—

ἐκτελής, here the opposite of ἐντελής, is a euphemism for aged: as ὁ ἐντελής is a man in his vigour or perfection, so ὁ ἐκτελής here is one who has passed that stage (cf. ἐγερθός). In Eur. Ion 786, by a different application of the notion 'finished' a young man is ἐκτελῆς νεάνιας as opposed to a boy.—I think it clear that the parenthesis begins with ὁδὸν, and not, as usually marked, with ἕτη. If ὁδὸν...ἐκτελῶν is referred directly to the omen afterwards related, there is no point in the epithet ἐκτελῶν, however interpreted: and moreover the other punctua-

tion is required by the general sense, for the speakers, as old men, have the right to narrate (or sing), not the right to tell this particular story.

106—108. For still their age draws from heaven inspired persuasion, which is the strength of song, i.e. in their eloquence the old retain a strength, when all other strength is gone. The thought of this passage, that mental and, as we might say, ‘literary’ gifts are the remaining consolation of old age, is closely illustrated, as well as the form of expression, by Eur. H. F. 673 foll. It may remind us that the poet was himself over sixty when the Agamemnon was composed.—

ἐκτελής ἀλῶν ὁ τεθεῖσθαι with them’ or ‘beginning from their birth’, i.e. ‘the age at which they are’; cf. ὁ ἐπευδόν ἔτερος for ‘the time of sleeping’ v. 885
they draw from heaven that winning inspiration, which is the
strength of song,—how the twin-throned Achæan Kings, con-
cordant leaders of Hellas' youth, were 'sped with avenging arm
and spear to the Teucrian land by a gallant omen, when to the
kings of ships appeared the black king of birds and the white-
backed king together, seen near the palace on the spear-hand
in conspicuous place, feasting on hares, then full of young, stayed
one course short of home.

(Enger). The abstraction 'age' is put
for 'the aged' according to a common
habit of the language.—καταπνεύει (or
καταπνεύει: the latter MSS. have καταπνεύει,
in M the letter is uncertain; both forms are
good) 'inhales, draws down breath'
not 'breathes down upon'. πνεύν and its
compounds (see ἐμπνεύσει, ἐσπνεύσει, ἀνα-
pνεύν) mean either 'inhale' or 'exhale'
according to the context.—The forms in
this passage are notably ambiguous: πνεθω, 
μολαται, ἀλκαι are all uncertain in case,
and the two last may easily be read as
datives (μολατας). Hence many corrections
(see Wecklein), but the traditional accentu-
ation appears to be correct.—Wecklein
interprets πνεθω to be the confidence or
trust which encourages them to tell the
following story. But the sentiment
should from the context be one applicable to old
men in general.

111. ήβαι: for the plural cf. Eur.
Ion 476 τέκνων νεανίδες ήβαι. An ab-
tract used in concrete sense is sometimes
singular, sometimes plural.—Ελλάδος
substantive.— Aristophanes (Frogs 1285)
citing the verse gives the singular, 'Ελ-
λάδος ήβαι.

112. ξύμφρονε τάγα (τάγης) or, as
Dindorf, ταγώ (ταγός). The schol. τὴν
ξύμφρονα περὶ τὰ τακτικὰ assumes the
abstract form ξύμφρονα ταγάν (ταγήν), con-
trary to the metre.—ξύμφρον' ἀρωγάν
(W. Headlam Class. Rev. XII. 245) is
certainly a more poetical expression.

113. πέμπει historic present.—καὶ χερι
dropped accidentally from recurrence of the
syllable -ρι, restored from Aristoph. 
Frogs 1288.

114. θύρος ὁρυς a gallant omen,
transferring to the omen the feeling it
produces.

115. οἰωνὸν βασιλείας...φανέρεται the
appearance of etc., in apposition to ὁρυς.
See on Theb. 611.

116. The difference between the birds,
the black and the white-backed, is
doubtless symbolical. The meaning must
depend on the reading and interpretation
of v. 126.

117. τε because the aptness of the
omen lay in the appearance of the two
different birds together.—δὲ (Hartung)
would be regular for 'one black and the
other' etc., but is here alien from the
meaning and inconsistent with the use
of the singular βασιλείας. With δὲ we
should expect, as some would write, the
plural βασιλῆς.—άργυλας white-marked :
the termination is common in words
describing the marks of animals: cf.
ἔρυθριας (ἐρυθρός), Ξανθίας the slave-name
(Ξανθός), both like ἄργυλας (ἄργυλος) from col-
ours, κοππιατικας, στεμματικας etc.—ἀγρίας
(ἀγρίες, ἀγρίες white) Thiersch, for
metre, rightly, if we may assume that
Aeschylus would not allow the pronun-
ciation argyas.

119. ἐκ δεξιὰς, ὡς ἐστὶν εὐσυμβόλως,
schol.—δορυφόλατον 'spear-shaking', gen.
of δορυφόλατης, cf. λαγοδίατης v. 128. δο-
ρυφόλατου Turnebus; but it is not proved
that the spelling of Aeschylus was always
consistent.

121. λαγίναν γένναν hares (not a hare).
For the periphrasis, in which γέννα means
stock or kind (not offspring) cf. ἀρετῶν
γέννα males (Eur. Med. 428), Κενταύρων
aἰλινον aἰλινον εἰπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.
κεδνὸς δὲ στρατόμαντις ιδὼν δύο ἀντ. α' 125
λήμασι δισσοῦς
Ἀτρέδας μαχίμους
ἐδάη λαγοδαίτας
πομπούς τ' ἀρχάς:
oūτω δ' εἰπε τεράζων:
χρόνω μὲν ἄγρεὶ
Πράμον πόλιν ἄδε κέλευθος:
pάντα δὲ πῦργον
cτήνη πρόσθε τὰ δημιουπληθῆ
μοῖρα λαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον.
oὸν μή τις ἄγα
θεόθεν κνεφάση προτυπῶν στό.
130
124. aἰλινον (once only) throughout. 134. προσθετα. 136. ἄτα.
128. λαγοδαίτας.

γέννα Centaurs (id. H. F. 365), γέννα Phrygians (id. Tro. 531), σὰν Ἀσιήτιδα γένναν thee, an Asiatic (id. Andr. 1010).—βοσκόμενοι θρόμων feeding on
hares, creatures full-teeming with young,
which they had caught in the moment
of escape, literally 'stopped from their
last runs'.—Mr. Platt (Class. Rev. xi.
p. 94) refers to Xen. Cyneis. v. 14 (of
hares) οἱ δὲ ἰὸς ἔτειον τάχιστα θέουν τὸν
πρῶτον θρόμον, τούτῳ δὲ ἄλλους οὐκεῖτο.—
ἐρικύματα from ἐρικύματος, cf. πολυπέρ-
ματος (Theophrastus); these forms are
rare in the older writers, but there is no
reason to fix any particular date for their
first appearance. The neuter plural
stands in apposition to the plural phrase
λαγίναν γένναν, the neuter (things, crea-
tures) being used for pathos.—δρόμων is
a true plural, the 'runs' of the hares
respectively. The fact expressed in βλα-
βείντα λοιπόν δρόμων is part of the
symbol. The Trojans were almost to
escape their enemies, and were at last
only caught by the pretence of abandon-
ing the attempt.—I think the text here
correct. The assumptions which have
created difficulty are (1) that ἐρικύματα
is an error, (2) that the two eagles have
but one hare, inferred apparently from
v. 142, where see note. As to (1), the
schol. gives the interpretation πολυκύμων,
but this no more implies that the text
had -κύμων than that it had πολυ-.
The interpreter naturally uses the commoner
form in both parts. On these assumptions
some read (with recc.) ἐρικύμων (fem.
sing.) φέρματι, and explain the gender of
βλαβείντα (masc. sing.) as referring to
the meaning (τὸν λαγίναν) of λαγίναν γένναν.
But this is to play fast and loose with
τὸ σημαινόμενον. The meaning of λαγίναν
γένναν is ex hypothesi feminine, and the
fact that Greek had no distinct word for
the female hare is nothing to the matter.
Others therefore (Turnebus, Hartung)
read ἐρικύμων φέρματα and interpret this
either of the mother-hare, which φέρμα
(fettes) will not admit, or of the unborn
offspring, which βλαβείντα δρόμων will not admit.
124. aἰλινον the burden of a dirige.
Be sorrow, sorrow spoken, but still let the good prevail!

Then the good seer, who followed the host, when he saw how the two brave Atridae were in temper (?) twain, took cognizance of those hare-devouring birds and of the princely captains, and thus he read the prodigy: 'After long time they that here go forth must win King Priam's town, though ere they pass the wall all their cattle, their public store, shall perforce be divided and consumed. Only may no divine displeasure fore-smite and overcloud the gathering of the host, whose might should bridle

In English we should make the first clause dependent, 'Though sad words must be said, yet let what is good prevail'. See on v. 360.

125—129. See Appendix C.
128. ἔδαῃ...ἄρχας lit. 'understood the hare-devourers and the conducting powers', i.e. understood the combination of the two pairs (see on τε in v. 117) and perceived the parallel.—λαγοδαίτας s.
133—135. The besieging army shall consume their provisions before Troy, and be reduced to the last straits. Calchas infers this from the fierce hunger of the typical eagles. (So also Wecklein)—πύργων...πρόοθε before i.e. outside the wall, so πρόοθε πυλῶν Theb. 512.—κτήνη beasts, here as always (Paley). κτήματα schol. here, and κτήνη κτήματα Hesych. The one note explains the source of the other.—μοῖρα division, distribution, 'partitio' (Klausen). For similar uses of μοῖρα in its concrete sense (part) see Eur. Med. 430 and note there. Sophocles describes these herds, the supply of the Greek host before Troy, as συμμετὰ λελα ἄνατα 'the mingled spoil of forage, not yet divided' (Ai. 54).—τὰ δημω-πλήθη: πλῆθος a mass is correlative to μοῖρα. By distribution the supply ceases to be δημω and to be a πλῆθος.—πρὸς τὸ βιάζων=πρὸς βίαν or βιάων perforce (not violently).—To refer κτήνη with the schol. to the wealth of Troy requires us to neglect μέν...δὲ and to mistranslate κτήνη and πύργων, and leaves unexplained how Calchas inferred from the portent that the enterprise would take a long time. See also v. 343.

136—144. A further suggestion from the portent. The cruel feast of the eagles is an offence against the kindly law of Nature, represented by Artemis Εἰλείθυα the patroness of the young and of pregnancy. The seer therefore cannot but recall that 'the house of the eagles', which is being interpreted 'of the Atridae', has affronted the same power by another unnatural banquet (the Thystean feast); and he forebodes disaster from this source. The allusion is guarded, but comes out more clearly below (v. 158 σπευδομένα βυσίαν ἐτέραν (a second) ἀνομόν τιν' ἄδαιτον. The prophet fears that the old sin may be made to 'breed another like itself' according to the doctrine of v. 755.—The question here, as Paley well puts it, is 'how Calchas infers the anger of the goddess against the Atridae from the destruction of a hare by the eagles, unless the Atridae had already committed some crime, of which that destruction was the symbol?' I suggest the above as the answer.—Sophocles (El. 566) gives another account of the matter; Agamemnon had offended Artemis by killing a sacred doe; and the change is interesting. The sin is thus small, so that Agamemnon, as is necessary from the point of view of the Electra, is not gravely compromised, while, such as it is, it is personal to himself, so that we are not driven to the characteristic doctrine of this play, that one man's sin tends to produce sin in others.

136. ἄγα Hermann. Only may no divine displeasure fore-smite and overcloud the gathering of the host, whose might
μιου μέγα Τροίας
στρατωθέν, οἰκὼ γὰρ ἐπι-
φθονος Ἀρτέμις ἄγνα
πτακά μεν πατρός,
αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου
μουραίνειν κυσὶ πατρός,
στυγεὶ δὲ δειπνὸν αἰτέων.
αιλινοι αἰλινοι εἰπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω.
τόσσων περ ἐνυφρων, καλά,
δρόσουσι αἴπτοις μαλερῶν ἑώτων
πάντων τ' ἄγρονόμων φιλομάστους
θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοισι τερπνά,
τούτων αἰτεὶ ξύμβολα κράναι·
δεξιὰ μὲν κατάμορφα δὲ
φάσματα στρουθῶν.

147. ἀέπτως. ὄντων.

should bridle Troy. Literally 'the as-
sembling of (what is to be) the mighty
curb of Troy'. Note the collision of
metaphors in κεφάλη στήμων: but in
thought the metaphors do not touch,
for what is really 'over-clouded' is not the
'bridle' but ἡ στρατωθείς, the gathering
of the host. Nevertheless the juxtaposition
is bold and more in the manner of
Pindar.—στρατωθείς in the camp at Aulis
before departure (Hermann).—προτυπέω
'smitten beforehand, too soon'.
139. οἰκὼ...κυσὶ πατρός: τῷ οἰκῳ
τῶν κυνῶν Δίων σχολ. For the two da-
tives, one in effect a possessive, see Θεόδ.
167 στρατῷ...πυργομενῆ πύλη, 621
πόργαι...χθόνι and notes there.—οἰκὼ
marks that the speaker refers to a
hereditary, not a personal, offence in the
Atridean.—οἰκῷ Scaliger—οἰκῳ γὰρ, 'for
I have misgivings' W. Headlam Class.
Rev. xiv. 115.
142. Who sacrifice a poor trembling
creature with all her unborn young. θυο-
μένουσιν. The middle form θύωμαι, signi-
fying properly 'to sacrifice for one's
purpose' or 'with a certain ulterior ob-
ject', is technical for sacrifices of divination.
(See L. and Sc. s. v.) It is
applied therefore naturally to the act of
the eagles, as Calchas expounds it. But
in θυμένουσιν, as in οἰκὼ and again in
δειπνὸν, the type and antitype are mixed
together. The 'house', the 'sacrifice',
and the 'banquet' (δειπνὸν, a word
proper to men, not animals, and applied
to the Thyestean feast in v. 1601) are
really those of the Atridean and of Atreus.
—πτάκα used not merely as a synonym
of λάγῳ, but in its full sense (see πτέρου).
—The use of the singular here is no
evidence that there was but one hare
(see v. 121). Whether there was one or
two, the singular in this generic
description is rhetorically proper. The wicked-
ness lay in killing a pregnant mother,
not in killing two animals.
144. δείπνων αἰτέων such a banquet
of eagles. So we must render it to give
the full effect. αἰτεῶν, being superfluous
Troy. For the wrath of holy Artemis rests on the house of those winged coursers of her sire, who sacrifice a poor trembling mother with all her young unborn. She loathes such a feast of eagles.

'Be sorrow, sorrow spoken, but still let the good prevail!

'Yea, fair one, loving though thou art unto the uncouth whelps of many a fierce breed, and sweet to the suckling young of all that roam the field, yet to this sign thou art prayed to let the event accord. Auspicious are these eagle-omens, but not with-

(for the possessive 'their' would be supplied from the context), is necessarily emphatic. 'The banquet' (see preceding note) was fit only for creatures of prey.

146—152. An appeal to the goddess not to interfere with the fulfilment of the portent such as it is. The portent, it is noted, does not promise unmixed good, but only good with evil, a victory after much suffering (see vv. 131—135), so that her displeasure may be satisfied without delaying the fleet and so causing the horrible sacrifice of Iphigenia.

146—148. See Appendix D. τόσσων an 'epic' form: τόσφων recce.—κάλλος fair one (if right) is a propriatory invocation, like the ω καλα and ἤγαθε of common conversation. Sidgwick and Wecklein also punctuate thus. ω καλά Weil. κάλλος recce.—κάκαλα (see ἄκαλας) Platt Class. Rev. xi. p. 95.—δρόσοισιν imitated, according to the schol., from ἔρπα (lamb) in Od. 9. 222. If so, it is an odd specimen of a poet's science. ἔρπα a lamb and ἔρη σε λέον have probably no connexion; but Aeschylus apparently took ἔρπα a lamb to mean properly 'that which is dropped' and extended the analogy to ὁρόσ. Cf. εἴπωλα for βάβαλα in Thesb. 442.—

άδεπτος rough, uncouth, from the stem ἐπι, primarily 'that which cannot be handled, or dealt with' (see Dr Leaf on ἐπεφθε and ἐπεσται in J. Phil. xiv. 231). Hermann rightly defends this word against proposed change.—Μ has ἀδεπτοις but the archetype seems to have had ἀδεπτοι, like f, for the schol. to Μ explains not ἀδεπτοις but ἀδεπτοι.—λόντων: see Appendix D. λέοντων Stanley, from Elum. Mag. 377 Ασπιλός ἐν Ἄγαμέμνων τούς σκύμνους τῶν λεωτῶν ὄρθως κέκληκε.

149. τερπνα sweet, delightful, because kindly; nom. fem.—If taken as a neuter with the next clause it spoils the emphasis.

150. Still thou art prayed, seeing what this portent is, to permit an answering accomplishment, a cumbrous version, but we cannot with much less effect what the Greek does simply by throwing the stress on τοῦτων, and thus giving it a predicative force, 'this, being what it is.'

—ξύμβολα: any two things which tally are ξύμβολα to each other; here the event is to tally with the sign, in which case, it is suggested, the goddess should be satisfied, because δεξιά μὲν (ἐστι) κατά-

μομφα δὲ φάσματα.—aiτεί: for the passive see Thuc. 2. 97 καὶ αισχροὶ ἦν αἰτηθέντα μή δούναι ἢ αἰτηθάντα μή τυχεῖ, and L. and Sc. s. v. As used here it has the same effect as in English. The speaker does not put his request directly but pleads that it is reasonable.—δεξιά μὲν κτλ., as an explanatory comment on τοῦτων (see above), has properly no conjunction.—The objections and conjectures made here seem to arise (1) from not perceiving that aiτεί is passive, (2) from mis-joining δεξιά...αιτηθῶν to the previous sentence.

152. φάσματα αἰτηθῶν the portents of the birds, i.e. the omen obtained by the eagles (see θυμένων), or in plain language, by the Atrides, in whose name he appeals. For the sense of the genitive
iēion δὲ καλέω Παιάνα,
μή τινας ἀντιπνοοὺς
Δαναοῖς χρονίας ἐχενήδας
ἀπλοίας τεῦξῃ,
σπευδομένα θυσίαν
ἐτέραν ἄνομον τω', ἀδαίτον,
νεικέων τέκτωνα σῶμφωτον,
oὐ δεισήνορα. μῦμνε
γὰρ φοβερὰ παλίνορτος
οἰκονόμος δολία,
μυάμων μῆνις τεκνόπωνος.
toιάδε Κάλχας ξὺν
μεγάλους ἀγαθόις ἀπεκλαγέν
μόρσιμ' ἀπ' ὀρνίθων
όδιων οἰκος βασιλείους·
tοῖς δ' ὀμόφωνον
αἷλυνον αἷλυνον εἰπέ, τὸ δ' ἐβ' νικάτω.
Zeús—ὁστίς ποτ' ἑστίν, εἰ τὸδ' αὐ-
στρ. α'.

165. ἀπεκλαίζεν.

see Eur. Eι. 710 τυράννων φάσματα, where the τυράννω are Atreus and Thyestes (so that the use may well be a reminiscence) and the φάσμα is the golden lamb.—στρωβῖν is generally declared (after Porson) corrupt, on grounds which I cannot help thinking unsubstantial. (1) The metre, it is assumed, must be dactylic. But as the passage is not strophic, the metre is unknown. There is nothing unrhymical in the text. (2) ἀγαθόν, since it meant a sparrow, could not mean an eagle'. The same argument would prove that it could not mean an ostrich or a dove. The variety of its meanings shows that originally it meant simply 'a bird', and like other synonymous words, was variously limited in various places. Here we find it in its proper sense. (3) The insertion of στρωβῖν is accounted for by recollection of the partly similar story about the serpent and the birds (στρωβῖν) in Homer (II. 2. 311). The likelihood of this we need not criticize. If the word could not be genuine here, we might enquire whence it came, but till that is shown, the fact that it might have been inserted is immaterial. The derivation itself seems far-fetched.

153. But oh, in the name of the Healing God, do not thou etc. The appeal is still to Artemis, who is entreated to remember her near connexion with Apollo the God of Mercy. τεῦξῃ 2nd pers. subj. from ἔπευξαμαι (for the form see L. and Sc. s. v.) not 3rd pers. from ἔπευξα. The middle voice has the same force as in σπευδομένα.—This was the ancient interpretation (ὡ 'Ἀρτεμι, schol. on. 156, does not imply the reading τεῦξῃ as Hermann infers) and seems
out a flaw. But oh, in the blessed name of the Healer, raise thou not hindering winds, long to delay from the seas the Argive fleet; urge not a second sacrifice, soul offering of forbidden meat, which shall put hate between flesh and bone and break marital awe. For patient, terrible, never to be laid, is the wrath of the wife still plotting at home revenge for the unforgotten child.'

In such wise Calchas darkened his chant of high promise to the royal house from the omens of the march; and so with according burden

Be sorrow, sorrow spoken, but still let the good prevail!

'Zeus'—Power unknown, whom, since so to be called is his preferable in feeling to the recent view that Apollo is asked to prevent the intention of Artemis. Moveover on such a point, if any, ancient tradition should be respected.

154. τινας, 158 τινα: the vagueness of foreshoding.

157. στευδούμενα the reflexive form (for ἑαυτός), not στευδούσα, because the ultimate object would not be the death of the victim but the satisfaction of Artemis' wrath.—θυσίαν ἐτέραν: that of Iphigenia.

—ἀδιατον: that may not, like an ordinary lawful sacrifice, be partaken of.

159. νέικεν τέκτωνα σύμφωτον: a difficult and obscure phrase, literally 'inbred maker of hatred', or maker of hatred in the very flesh. Some (as Wecklein) render it by 'creator of hatred between near friends', Stifter von Hader unter den Angehörigen, i.e. the husband and wife, Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra, comparing Soph. Ant. 794 νείκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναμον. This would be simple according to Greek habit of expression, if husband and wife were called σύμφωτοι, which however does not appear to be ascertained, though the examples given in L. and Sc. s. ν. σύμφωτος, σύμφωβα, especially the Platonic examples, will show that it is not unlikely.—Clinging, inseparable (Paley, Hermann, Klauser) comes to the same thing by a different road.

160. οὐ δεισήνορα rebelling against the husband: by a bold figure the act of sacrifice, personified, is treated as a living agent, and takes the qualities of the true agent (the wife) who carries out the effect of it. The language is intentionally obscure, language of prophecy, fully intelligible only in the light of the event. —μήνη: the subject is still the living crime, embodied in the avenging wife and mother.

164. τούδε takes an adverse sense from the opposition to ξύν μεγάλοις ἄγαθοι: with much good there was this; hence τοίς δ᾿ ὀμόφωνον, v. 158.—ἀπεκλαγέν (recc.) ἀπό: the preposition depends on μόροιμα, 'predictions deduced from'.

170. The narrative at this point comes face to face with a mystery, upon which the poet pauses. How shall the religious mind explain to itself such an event as the sacrifice of Iphigenia? On the one hand Agamemnon received divine warning against it; on the other hand he was fearfully tempted to commit it, and this by divine act and in consequence of sin not his own. Why should guilt be visited, as it is, beyond the guilty? Why does the Divinity permit, nay, sometimes seem to bring about, the evil which he denounces? In the last resort we can answer these questions only 'by casting off the burden of vanity in the name of the Almighty' (v. 175), that is, in the language of later theology, by faith. So much however we see, that evil itself is
τῷ φίλον κεκλημένῳ,
tούτῳ νῦν προσευνέπω.
οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι
πάντα ἐπισταθμώμενος
πλὴν Διός, εἰ τὸ μάταν
ἀπὸ φροντίδος ἄχθος
χρὴ βαλεῖν ἐτητύμως.
οὐδὲ ὅστις πάροιθεν ἤν μέγας,
παμμάχῳ θράσει βρύων,
οὐδὲ ἐλέγζεται πρὶν ὄν,
ὅς δ' ἐπειτ' ἐφύ, τριακτήρος οἰχεταί τυχῶν.
ζῆνα δὲ τις προφρόνως
ἐπινύκια κλάζων
τεύξεται φρενῶν τοπάνην.
τὸν φρονεῖν βροτοὺς οὐδόσαντα τῷ πάθει μάθος
θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν.
στάξει δ', ἐνθ' ὑπνώ, πρὸ καρδίας

175. τόδε. 180. οὐδὲν λέξαι. 184. κλάζων. 185. τὸ πάν. 189. ἐν θ' ὑπν. 176.

an instrument of moral discipline, perhaps the only possible, and, if so, a mercy after all (v. 192). Religious tradition shadows forth such a doctrine, when it tells us on the one hand that there is one Power over all, and on the other hand that this Power itself has been developed out of a struggle, and that the present order of things stands upon the ruin of previous experiments. Thus does Aeschylus spiritualize the uncouth legends of the ancient cosmogony with its strange succession of brutal deities.—The structure of the passage, though simple, is not perfectly continuous. Ἰεῶσ in v. 170 is the projected subject to the statement 'Zeus has decreed that wisdom should come by experience', but this statement is deferred, in order to set forth the legends and suggest the point of view from which they are to be regarded, and finally appears (v. 186) in a slightly modified shape.

'Zeus—meaning thereby that unknown Power, whose pleasure it is to be so called'. αὐτῷ to himself.

173. οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι...πλὴν Διός literally 'I can make no other guess for the purpose but Zeus' i.e. I can think of no other to trust, but in the one Almighty is my only resource. προσεικάζω here is not 'to compare', or 'liken to', but 'to conjecture with a view to' the purpose explained in vv. 175—177.—'I can liken none but Zeus to Zeus' (Wecklein). This is nearly the same, but leaves the dependence of εἰ κτλ. somewhat obscure.

174. πάντα ἐπισταθμώμενος in deep pondering upon all things. πάντα the
own pleasure, I by that name address. When I ponder upon all things, I can conjecture nought but ‘Zeus’ to fit the need, if the burden of vanity is in very truth to be cast from the soul. Not he, who perhaps was strong of yore and flushed with victorious pride, could now be so much as proved to have had being: and he that came next hath found his conqueror and is gone. But whoso to Zeus by forethought giveth titles of victory, the guess of his thoughts shall be right. And Zeus it is who leadeth men to understanding under this law, that they learn a truth by the smart thereof. The wound, where it lies dormant, will bleed, and its aching keep before the mind the memory of

universe as in Eur. Med. 411 δικα καὶ πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται nature and the universe are turned upside down, where see note.—τπ. over and over.

175. τὸ μάταν...ἀχώς the burden ‘in vain’, that is, the burden, in the language of The Preacher, of ‘vanity’, the oppressive sense of futility which must accompany a belief that the moral problem of the world is insoluble.—τὸ Pauw.

177. ἐπίτυμως in the fullest sense. As to the use here of this ‘etymological’ term, and the light which it may throw on the source from which Aeschylus drew the form of his thought, I have written in Appendix II. to my edition of the Seven Against Thebes. The etymological origin of the thought, even if it be, as I think, certainly traceable, has little effect on the present application of it. For an adverse criticism of the whole position see Dr W. Headlam On Editing Aeschylus, pp. 138 foll.

178—185. According to Greek tradition Zeus and the dynasty of Zeus were the third in succession to supreme power, having expelled Kronos, father of Zeus (ὅς ἐστει ἔφω), who had expelled his father Ouranos (ὅστις πάροικον ἄν). Aeschylus, relieving the legend of its grotesque details, reproduces it so as to mark the two points which he requires, that there is a Supreme Ruler, and that he won his position by a contest.

178. δότις vague, ‘he, whate’er he was, who’. This earliest power has almost ceased to be discernible even in tradition.

179. παμμάχω victorious: but the word is used, like ἑρακτήρ and ἐπινίκαι, to sustain the metaphor from gymnastic contests: πάμμαχος was specially associated with the παγ-κράτιος (see L. and Sc. s. v.).—βρύων. βρύω to teem, to sprout describes generally richness and fulness of life and is here applied to animal vigour: cf. the metaphor of the sap in ν. 77.

180. οὔεγξεταί πρίν ὅν (Margoliouth) will scarce be proved to have once been, literally ‘will not so much as be proved’, an expressive phrase for destruction which has left no trace.—ὅν: imperfect participle.—This seems the best restoration suggested. It is as near to the ms. as οὐδε λέγεται and better in sense.

181. τρικτήρος properly a wrestler who throws his opponent three times, thus winning the victory. See Eum. 592.

183—185. But he that by forecast giveth titles (κλάζων) of victory to Zeus, shall be right in the guess of his thought, or, if κλάζων be read ‘he that singeth the hymn of victory to Zeus.’ In plain words ‘Zeus may be trusted in all.’ See Appendix E.

186—188. Who leadeth men to understanding under this law, that they learn a truth by the suffering of it. This is one sentence, in which ὡδεσαντα is the principal verb and θέντα a subordinate
μνησιτήμων πόνος.
καὶ παρ’ ἄκοντας ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν.
δαιμόνων δὲ που χάρις βιαῖος
σέλμα σεμνὸν ἥμενων.
καὶ τόθ' ἤγεμων ὁ πρέ-
σβυς νεῶν Ἀχαικῶν,
μάντων οὖτιν ψέγων,
ἔμπαιοις τῦχαισι συμπνέων,
evin ἀπλοίᾳ κεναγ.
γεὶ βαρύνοντ' Ἀχαικὸς λεῶς
Χαλκίδος πέραν ἔχων παλιρρό-

participle, equivalent to δὲ ἠδώσε...θεὶς κτλ.—δώσαντα: gnomic aorist.—In the second and properly participial clause, the emphasis is on τῷ πάθει, constructed as instrumental with μάθος. The whole phrase τῷ πάθει μάθος (learning by the suffering) is the subject of κυρίως ἔχειν to be established.—τὸν...δόσαντα, τὸν...θέντα Schütz, a doubtful change, though attractive at first sight and followed in many texts. The clause τὸν...δόσαντα should not be a separate proposition; the point is not that Zeus teaches mankind, but that he has imposed upon them one universal condition of learning. See next note.

189—191. For it bleeds, where it lies dormant, an ache that keeps before the mind the memory of the hurt. The admonitory recollection of experience is compared to a wound which long afterwards will ache at times and even break out again, reminding the sufferer of the original hurt. The subject to στάξει is τὸ πάθος (as is clear if τῷ πάθει be retained in the preceding clause) which passes in the metaphor into the restricted sense of a hurt: cf. Eur. 499 πολλὰ παιδότρωτα πάθεα.—πόνος stands in opposition to the subject.—πρὸ καρδίας depends upon μνησιτήμων.—ἐνθ’ ὑπνῷ literally wherever it sleeps, i.e. wherever there is such a dormant hurt. ἀντὶ is the Doric contraction for ὑπνῷ (or for ὑπνοῖ indicative). The intransitive use of ὑπνῶ is Homeric, but like many other archaic forms and usages does not appear in prose until after the best age.—The language here is all taken from the poetical vocabulary of medicine, and may be illustrated from the Philocletes and elsewhere. For στάξειν to ooz, break out see Phil. 783 στάξει γάρ αὐ τοῖς φοίνοις τὸ ἔος ἀκατάκτων ἀμα: and for the application of the word to that from which the flowing comes see Chor. 1056 ἐξ ὑμήτων στάξων ἀμα διαφάλει. For the metaphor of sleep applied to a dormant pain which ceases and recurs see Phil. 649 φήλλων ὑπνοῖ κοιμῶ τόδ’ ἔος: for πόνος pain, ache Phil. 637 καύρος σπουδὴ πόνου λήκαντος: for πῆμα inf. 841, Soph. Ah. 582 τομῶν πῆμα a hurt that needs the knife.—ἐνθ’ ὑπνῷ (M) assumes the construction στάξει τε δὲ ἐν ὑπνῷ πόνον, καὶ ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν, when in sleep the wound smarted, then wisdom comes (τε καὶ = simul ac), where ὑπνός is or may be the real sleep of the sinner, night being the time of repentance. See Dr W. Headlam Class. Rev. xvii. 241.—ἄκοντας without their will rather than against their will, ἄκων being merely the negative of ἕκων. So θελόντος ἄκοντα κοινῶνει κακῶν take willingly thy part of
the hurt, so that wisdom comes to them without their will. And it is perhaps a mercy from a Power, who came by struggle to his majestic seat.

Thus it was with the Achæan ammiral, the elder of the twain. A prophet, thought he, is not to blame; so he bent before the blast; and when his folk began to weary of hindering winds and empty cask, still lying over against Chalcis, where the tides

suffering with him who hath no will (Theb. 1024). The point here is not so much that men will not be wise as that except through suffering they perhaps could not.

192—193. And it is perhaps a mercy from a Deity who came by struggle to his majestic seat. The subject is still πᾶλος, suffering regarded as a discipline.—βιαωθ ...ημένων 'to be seated by force' has two possible meanings, (i) 'to have taken a seat by force', (2) 'to have been forced to take a seat' ('to sit in might' is impossible). Here the context decides for the first.—δαμίωνων. The plural must not be pressed, and is in fact not correctly represented by a plural in English. Zeus only is in view, but the plural indicates (as usual) that the character or position rather than the person is described.—Note carefully the emphasis on δαμίωνων. The point is that heaven as well as earth is under the general law. This is the moral, or rather part of the moral, which the poet draws from the legendary theology which he has given in outline. The necessity of suffering as a discipline is perhaps taught by the tradition that the Deity itself has known progress and that 'Zeus' did not reign till he had first overcome.—σέλμα: the metaphor is perhaps from place in a ship (cf. v. 1615); ψείρασις γὰρ ὁ Ζεύς schol. see Hom. Il. 8. 69 (Wecklein). But the use of σέλμα does not necessarily imply this.—δι' αἰών (= αἰῶνος ?) H. V. Macnaghten, δι' αἰώ (αἰῶνα) J. A. Platt. βιαωθ or βιαια W. Headlam l.c.

194—227. The story is resumed, and proceeds in one sweeping period to the sacrifice of Iphigenia, the circumstances of which suggested the foregoing parenthesis. καὶ τότε so on that occasion etc. ἰγμένων ὁ πρέσβυς. The substance of the sentence here commenced is this, 'Agamemnon, in spite of the divine warning, resolved in the end to slay his child'. The verb comes in v. 215 (εἰπε), where, after long preliminary clauses, the main sentence is resumed with a δὲ, and for more clearness the subject is repeated almost in the same words, ἀναζ ὁ πρέσβυς. 196—197. Remembering that a prophet is not to blame (for his message) and bending to the buffet of fortune. The old men, though unable to excuse the king's crime, make the best of his case, and give to his acquiescence this courteous turn. μάντιν οὕτων ψέγων literally 'blaming no prophet', embracing this particular case under the general rule.—Wecklein contrasts Hom. Il. 1. 106 μᾶντι κακὸν, ὅ τι πτῶτε μοι τὸ κρητίνου εἴπα. αἰτε τοι τὰ κάκ᾽ ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσι μαντεῖησαι εκκ.). (Agamemnon to Calchas), and observes that such opposition would have been more in place at Aulis.—συμπνέων 'blowing the same way as...': the metaphor seems to be taken, by contrast, from the act of struggling against the wind. ἐπαυλούς: a unique and obscure word, perhaps to be connected with παυλο (ἐπαυλάμας schol.): seemingly 'disposed to yield to fortune as it might strike'. Wecklein refers the metaphor to the beating of waves upon a ship.

198. κεναγγεῖ. As an ancient army depended almost entirely on foraging for provisions, to be detained on their own shore threatened starvation.
After the paces of Aulidios' song:

πνοαὶ δὲ ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος μολοῦσαι κακόσχολοι, νήστιδες, δύσορμοι, βροτῶν ἄλαι, ναῶν καὶ πεισμάτων ἀφειδεῖς, παλιμμῆκη χρόνον τιθεῖσαι τρίβω κατέξανον ἀν- θος Ἀργείων· ἔπει δὲ καὶ πυκροῦ χείματος ἄλλο μῆχαρ βρυθύτερον πρόμοισιν μάντισ ἐκλαγῇ προφέρων Ἀρτεμιν, ὡς τε χθόνα βάκτροις ἐπικρούσαντας Ἀτρείδας δάκρυ μὴ κατασχεῖν·— ἄναξ δ' ὁ πρέσβυς τόδ' ἐπε φωνῶν· ἀντ. γ. 215 βαρεία μὲν κηρ τὸ μῆ πιθέσθαι, βαρεία δ', εἰ τέκνων δαιξω, δόμων ἀγαλμα, μιαίων παρθενοφάγουσιν ἔρημοι πατρίδας χέρας βωμὸν πέλας. τί τῶν' ἀνευ κακῶν; πῶς λιπόναυς γένωμαι ἐνμακία ἀμαρτῶν; πανσανέμου γὰρ θυσίας παρθενίου θ' αἵματος ὀργῇ περιόργως, ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις. εὖ γὰρ εἰη.

207. κατέξανον (ai im). 216. πείθεσθαι.

203. νήστιδες hungry, because they make to hunger.
204. βροτῶν ἄλαι doubtful. Mr Housman would refer this ἄλα to the stem of ἄλεω to grind, and render it by tribulation. This gives a perfectly simple sense and is very attractive, although the known derivatives of this stem seem to be literal only, not metaphorical. That this ἄλη should coexist with ἄλη wandering, itself extremely rare and only poetical, is quite likely.—Those who take ἄλαι here to mean wandering, explain it as meaning that the winds make the men wander, either literally in search of forage, or metaphorically in their minds, i.e. drive
of Aulis rush to and fro, while still the gales blew thwart from Strymon, stayed them and starved them, and penned them in port, grinding the men and making of ship and tackle a prodigal waste, and with lapse of time, doubled over and over, still withering the flower of Argos away; then at last, when the prophet's voice pointed to Artemis, and told of yet one more means to cure the tempest's bane, a means pressing more on the princes, which made the sons of Atreus beat their staves upon the ground and let the tear roll down:—the elder then of the twain found voice and said:

'Sore is my fate if I obey not, and sore if I must slay my child, the jewel of my home, staining paternal hands with virgin stream from the victim at the altar's side. Are not the two ways woeful both? How can I fail my fleet and lose my soldiery? For eager is their craving that, to stay the winds, her virgin blood should be offered up, and well they may desire it. May it be for the best!'

\[222. \tau e \pi \omicron \omicron \sigma \nu \alpha \omicron \upsilon \nu \sigma \tau e (text h).\]

them mad. But both explanations seem artificial.

205—208. On the metre see Appendix II. \(\nu e \bar{o} \nu \) Pauw, \(\tau e \ \kappa a l \) Porson.

208. \(\kappa e i : \) the subordinate clause commenced at \(e t e \) (v. 198) takes a fresh start.

211. \(\epsilon k l a \gamma e : \) for the tone of this word see on v. 184, Appendix E.—The lengthening of \(e \) before \(\pi r \) is epic. \(\epsilon k l a \gamma e n \) Porson.—\(\pi r o f e r o n \) 'Artemis putting forward Artemis', i.e. citing her demands as his reason and defence. See L. and Sc. s. v.

215. \(\delta i . \) See on v. 194. For \(\tau o \delta^\prime \) Stanley \(\tau o t^\prime \). The adverb would be effective as resuming the previous \(\tau o t e \) in v. 194. For \(\tau o \delta e \) see v. 418 (Wecklein).—\(e t e \ \phi o \nu o n \) 'spake in words', or 'with articulate voice' (the proper meaning of \(\phi o \nu o n \)), as contrasted with the 'unchecked tears' of the previous verse, in English found voice and said.

216. \(\tau o \ \mu \eta \ \pi \theta e o s \theta a i \) (Turnebus) to refuse obedience is more pointed than \(\tau o \ \mu \eta \ \pi \theta e o s \theta a i \) to hold out, and is favoured though not absolutely required by the metre.

220. \(\rho e i \theta o i o s \) pronounced \(\rho e i \theta o i o s \) and so written in h.—On the metre see Appendix II.

222. \(\pi \omega s \ldots \gamma e n o m a i ; \) 'how can I be?' i.e. 'how can I bear to be?'

224—226. For eager is their craving that to stay the winds her virgin blood should be offered up, and well they may desire it.—\(\delta r g \alpha \) (see \(\delta r g \alpha \)) has for subject \(\sigma \mu \mu \alpha \chi \alpha \), and takes the dependent genitives according to rule.—\(\epsilon p i \theta u \mu e i n \) \(\theta e i m s \) literally 'it being permissible that they should desire it'. The use in this clause of the weaker word (\(\epsilon p i \theta u \mu e i n \) as compared with \(\delta r g \alpha \)) aids the intended point, 'they crave it eagerly, and for desiring it cannot be blamed', that is, their 'desire, however keen, is not unreasonable'. Agamemnon endeavours to persuade himself that he yields from a sense of duty.—For the absolute use of \(\theta e i m s \) cf. the similar use of \(\chi r e o n \), a word parallel
in its uses throughout, e.g. οὗ χρεῶν ἀρχεῖ Thuc. 3. 40, and see L. and Sc. s. v.—I suggest that this punctuation and construction remove the objections properly made if πανταρέμου...θέμοι (καὶ) be taken as one sentence, viz. (1) that ἐπιθυμεῖν requires a pronominal subject to show that the sentence is not general, and (2) that ὄργα (itative of ὄργη) περι- ὀργῶς ἐπιθυμεῖν is verbose. For proposed changes see Wecklein, Appendix.—περι- ὀργῶς Blomfield, as from περιοργῆ. Either form is correct, and duplicate forms in both terminations are common.

230. γὰρ then (not for), in effect the English well.

230. τόθεν...μετέγνω from that moment he took to his heart unflinching resolve. Constr. μετέγνω τὸ παντάπτωμον ὄσε θρονεῖν αὐτό.—μεταγγυμνακὼ here has an acc. object of the feeling assumed, not as more commonly of the feeling quitted (μεταγγυμνακὼν δὲν το αποκομ. folly).

232—233. The reading is doubtful. M punctuates thus, ...μετέγνω βροτοῖς θρασύνει γὰρ..., and has a schol. to v. 230 ὅθεν ἕγρα πάντα τοὺς ἄνθρώπους τολμᾶτο, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης δῆλον ὅτι, which apparently assumes the same punctuation but, instead of βροτοῖς, the acc. βραστός, translated by τοὺς ἄνθρώπους. That the preceding sentence ends at μετέγνω seems certain. The text commonly received is that of Spanheim ... μετέγνω βροτοῖς θρασύνει γὰρ..., which is adopted provisionally in the translation, but is unsatisfactory because (among other reasons) the emphatic position of βροτοῖς is incorrect; it would seem to oppose mortals, who are emboldened by infatuation, to others (whom?) who are not.—In the former edition I read βρότοις (sic) θρασύνει γὰρ..., translating For to put faith in the shedding of blood is an obstinate delusion, literally, 'for by bloodshed takes confidence an obstinate delusion'. This, as further explained in my note, I still think possible; but it obviously depends on the assumption that the letters βροτοῖς
So, having put on his neck the harness of Necessity, his spirit set to the new quarter, impious, wicked, unholy, and from that moment he took to his heart unflinching resolve. For mortals (?) are emboldened by an obstinate delusion, whose base counsel is the beginning of sin. However he did not shrink from slaying a victim daughter, to aid war waged for a stolen wife, and to wed unto him his fleet!

Her prayers, her cries to her father, mere life-breath of a girl, the spectators, eager for battle, regarded not at all. Her father, after prayer, gave word to the ministers, while casting her robes about her she bowed herself desperately down, to lift her, as it can be trusted. In view of the schol., which, as Dr Headlam observes, I overlooked, this is so uncertain, that I should now prefer to leave the problem unsolved.—τάλανα hard, obstinate; see v. 396.

234. δ’ οὖν however, for good or ill.
235. θυγατρός, γυναικοτόλον. The antithesis is significant, ‘the daughter being a blood-relation, the wife a stranger’ (Sidgwick), and moreover exposes the moral monstrosity of supporting a cause, which rested on the sanctities of the family, by an offence against those very obligations.

236. ἀρωγάν in apposition to the action (τὸ θίειν) of the verb θύτηρ γενέσθαι.
237. προτέλεια: see on vv. 65, 249, and Lucretius 1. 96 foll. 'non ut scellemni more sacrorum perfecto posset (Iphigenia) claro comitari Hymenaeo, sed casta inceste nubendi tempore in ipso hostia concideret'.

238–240. For her prayers and appeals to her father, (mere) life-breath of a girl, the spectators, eager for war, cared not at all. βραβῆς: this word, of uncertain origin, seems to combine, like the Latin arbiter, the meanings of judge and spectator (Eur. Hel. 703, and see editor's note on Eur. Med. 274), the fundamental sense being probably witness. Here it means in full 'spectators on whom the decision depended'.—αἰώνα παρθένειον. These words, as placed, should be related as an explanation to παρ' οὖδὲν Θεντο. This is adverse to the corrections αἰώνα παρθένειον τι' (and her virgin life) Elmsley, αἰών τε παρθένειον (O. Müller). αἰώνα παρθένειον (Karsten) is admissible. But perhaps no change is required. That αἰώνα should stand in apposition to λυτᾶς καὶ κληθώσα seems unnatural to our ears because we (rightly as a matter of science) connect αἰών (αιων) life with aevum and take it to mean time, life-time. But the Greek poets apparently associated it rather with ἄμη and ἄιω to breathe, and took it to mean properly life-breath. Thus Euripides actually has άνεπτευαν αἰώνα (fr. 787 Dindorf) drew breath, and the same conception underlies such phrases as ψυχῇ καὶ αἰών, αἰὼν πέφαται, αἰὼνοι στέρεται, which ignore the idea of 'time'. If αἰώνα could mean, or even suggest, breath, the text here is not impossible, but expressive; and it must not hastily be dismissed.

243. τέποισα περιστη wrapped in (i.e. wrapping herself in) her robes: contrast v. 249.—προωνοτῆ: προοιοντευκάν schol. bent or bowed forward.—παντι...ἀρδήν variously interpreted: (1) drooping in all her soul (suggested by Paley), (2) to raise unalteringly the drooping maid (Sidgwick and the majority); 'the order of the words marks the sharp antithesis; they were to be eager, she was fainting with fear and grief' (S.), (3) to raise her bowed (over the altar) so as to
present her neck to the sacrificer' (Weckle
lein). None of these is quite satisfactory.
The order of the words πέπλωσι...προ
ωσθῇ suggests that παντὶ θυμῷ refers to
the victim, and in fact makes any other
interpretation seem artificial. An anti
thesis between παντὶ θυμῷ and προωσ
would have been satisfied just as well by
the order προωσθῇ παντὶ θυμῷ, and this
order would be natural, if παντὶ θυμῷ
were constructed with λαβεῖν. This
points to (1); but προωσθῇ, which de
scribes an attitude not a state of mind,
and παντὶ θυμῷ, which elsewhere means
ergetically, resolutely, will hardly bear
the interpretation required. As to (3) we
must note further that the sacrificer would
strike the throat, not the back of the neck
(see the sacrifice of Polyxena, Eur. Hec.
565—567, λαμάσ ἐντεπῆς οδε and τέσσει
πνεύματος διαρροάς).—I would suggest for
consideration the rendering desperately
bowed down: the victim struggles with
the energy of despair to retain her at
tude and not to be raised into the posture
for sacrifice with the throat exposed.
This satisfies the order, and makes the
two phrases πέπλωσι περιπετהתח, παντὶ
θυμῷ προωσθῇ parallel, as by their ar
rangement they should be: both mark
the struggle of the victim.
245. Constr. στόμα-καλλ.-φυλακάν κα
tασχεῖν φηβγγον κτλ., literally 'and, by
way of guard upon her fair lips, they
should restrain' etc. φυλακάν is acc. in
apposition to the action, see ἀρωγάν,
v. 236. It is unusual that an accusa
tive of this kind should stand before the verb
which it explains, but it seems to be so
meant here. Others make the acc. στόμα
depend on φυλακάν κατασχεῖν to keep
guard (Wecklein). But against this is
were a kid, over the altar, and, for prevention of her beautiful lips, to stop the voice that might curse his house with the dumb cruel violence of the gag.

And she, as she let fall to earth her saffron robe, smote each one of the sacrificers with glance of eye that sought their pity, and seemed, like as in a painting, fain to speak: and oft indeed had she sung where men were met at her father’s noble board, with pure voice virginally doing dear honour to the grace and blessing that crowned her father’s feast.

What followed I saw not, neither do I tell. The rede of Calchas doth not lack fulfiment. Yet is it the law that only to

κατασκέψις check.—φυλακὴ, Blomfield, cuts the knot, and is perhaps right.—καλλι
πρόφυς. See on Theb. 520.

248. βίον μένετ. This fine expression takes special emphasis from its position in the new strophe (Wecklein).

249. Her robe of saffron, the dress of a princess and a maiden. So Antigone unites ‘the saffron splendour of her robe’ στολίδος κροκόσκαιν τριφάν, Eur. Phoen. 1491 (Sidgwick). There is perhaps also an allusion to the hymenaeal associations of the colour (see on v. 237). It does not appear whether Aeschylus knew or followed the story of the pretended marriage (see Eur. Iph. Aul.) by which Agamemnon brought his daughter to Aulis.—δή: the position is natural, κρόκον βαφάς being inseparable and in effect one word.—χίουσα | εβαλλε: see Appendix II.

253. πρέπουσα τε: joined with χέωσα because both the action and the mute look make an appeal to their pity for her youth and beauty. See Eur. Hec. 558 foll. (Wecklein.)

254. They knew the voice that would have spoken, and had reason to associate it with pathetic remembrance of her proud and happy maidenhood.—The connection marked by ἐπεί is often much looser than with our conjunctions of inference. Unless we supply the connect’g link (as here ‘and her look was vocal to them, for’ etc.) we should render simply by ‘and’ or ‘and indeed’.

258. παίανα (Hartung, Enger). A banquet was followed by libations, usually three, the third to Zeus the Preserver (Σωτήρ). “With the end of the libations came the paean or song. So in Plato’s Symposium, ἐδείκτησαντες στοιχέας παίανας καὶ ἔσωμας τὸν θεόν ...” (S.). The whole in fact was a sort of ‘grace’. In all ritual acts, especially those connected like the paean with the worship of Apollo, personal purity was of great importance (see Theb. 156, 251, 254, Eur. Ion 130 δοσὶν ἀδίκ’ εἰναὶ ἄν ...Φοίβῳ λατρείαν). Hence the emphasis here on ἀγνά ἀταίρων αὐτῷ. Whether the custom here implied, that the children, and particularly the virgins, of the family should sing or join in singing the ‘grace’, subsisted in Aeschylus’ time, there is nothing to show positively. But it is natural and probable.

259. τὰ 8' ἐνθυμ what followed, i.e. the sacrifice itself.

260. τέχναι science, i.e. his divinations as a seer by profession. Cf. Soph. O. T. 380 τέχνη τέχνης ὑπερφέρωσα. The immediate reference is to his suggestion of the sacrifice (v. 211), but the accomplishment of this raises also fears as to the threatened sequel (v. 160). Hence what here follows.

261. It is the law, that to experience wisdom should fall, i.e. that men should learn by their own sufferings, and seldom by anything else.—δίκα properly ‘wont’
‘way’ and here ‘nature of things’; for this use see on Eur. Med. 411 καὶ δίκα καὶ πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται. The metaphor in ἐπτετέουσι (literally ‘inclines’) suggests a comparison between the laws of the moral world and those of the physical. Wisdom ‘gravitates’ (if we may use the anachronism) to experience. The rendering ‘justice’ should be avoided. The ‘law’ is far from being manifestly just; on the contrary it raises, as Aeschylus has shown above, moral difficulties.

263—265. ἔτει later mss.—πρὸ χαρέτω H. L. Ahrens.—As for the future, one may hear it when it comes to pass, ere that, I care not for the hearing: ‘tis but anticipating sorrow. κλώος ἄν is the principal verb, γένοιτο optative indefinite assimilated to κλώος. The subject of χαρέτω (literally ‘let it be hidden good-bye’ i.e. ‘let it keep at a distance’) is τὸ κλώον supplied from κλώος ἄν. πρὸ is adverbial. The same τὸ (πρὸ) κλώον is the subject of ἵσον (ἵστι) τῷ προστένειν ‘hearing of it before is equivalent to lamenting it before’.—The sentiment is directed against the uselessness of divination.—After μέλλων in M a later hand has inserted τὸ δὲ προστένει. These words, excluded by the metre, have arisen from a marginal explanation of the following clauses.

266. For it will come clear and right, when the science itself comes clear and right; literally ‘clear it will come, made right together with the divination itself’. The subject is still τὸ κλώον. When the thing is accomplished, it will be told clearly and rightly. Till then the prophecy itself is never clear and cannot therefore be known to be right.—ἀὐταίς emphatic. In Aeschylus this pronoun generally is so. We supply ταῖς τέχναις from v. 260; as the intervening sentences contain nothing to which ἀὐταῖς could be referred, and divination is the topic of the whole passage, this does not seem impossible, though it is obscure.—Prof. Goodwin also retains the text, and refers αὐταίς to τέχναι, but renders thus ‘the future will come clear in accord with them (the prophecies)’.—The received emendation σύνορθρον αὐγαίς (Wellauer, Hermann) is possible, but unsafe. The subject is taken to be τὸ μέλλων, and the sentence explained thus: ‘as the rising sun suddenly lightens the darkness, so will the fulfilment of the prophecy bring first and at once a clear confirmation’ (Wecklein). But surely this sense is hard to extract from the words ‘for the future will come clear, dawning together with the light’.—If the text is not sufficiently clear, I would read αὖταίς (dati ὑ of αὖτα, which is often used thus independently for ‘the matter in question’), translating thus: ‘for it (the hearing of events) will come clear and true when the events
experience knowledge should fall: when the future comes, then thou mayst hear of it; ere that, I care not for the hearing, which is but anticipating sorrow; it will come clear, hearing and prophecy both true together. Enough: let us pray for such immediate good, as present act requires. Here is our next concern, this fortress, sole protection of the Argive land.

themselves come'. This however I do not think necessary or desirable.

267—269. Let us pray then for such immediate good, as the present occasion needs. Our nearest concern is this fortress, sole protection of the Argive land. Dismissing (δ' οὖν) useless speculation as to the future, they turn to what is near and practical, the present safety of the fortress, exposed to special danger by the absence of its lord and, as hereafter appears, from the state of the country (vv. 463—466). It must be remembered that the elders are at present, as the following question shows, wholly ignorant as to the meaning or purpose of the nocturnal alarm. They do not even know whether, as the celebration suggests, good news has actually been received.—The antithesis of present and future is marked in three ways: (1) τὰπι τοῦτουίν 'the immediate sequel', literally 'what comes next to this present': (2) πράξις ὡς θελεί literally 'as practical action (business) demands'. πράξις is here = τὸ πρασόμενον, the matter in hand, the thing to be done, as opposed to what can only be matter of guessing or speculation. Cf. Soph. Ant. 1334 μελοντα ταῦτα: τῶν προκειμένων τι χρή πράσσειν. The stress upon πράξις, and its pregnant force, are marked by the position of the word in its clause. Somewhat similar is the Homeric use of οὖ τις πράξις πέλεται γόος 'nothing practical comes of lamentation' (and see L. and Sc. s.v. πράξις): (3) τὸδ' ἄγχυστον (ἐστὶ here is our nearest concern; for ἄγχυστον 'nearest (in concern)' cf. ὁ ἄγχυστος 'the person most nearly concerned', Soph. El. 1105. It is best to take this as a separate sentence, but possible also without change of the meaning to take τὸδε...ἔρκος as in apposition to τὰπι τοῦτουίν 'the immediate matter, our nearest concern' etc.—'

'Απλας γαλασ...ἔρκος: the fortress, citadel, or castle of the Atridae. Where precisely in the Argolid we are to suppose this, whether at the site of Argos or elsewhere, Aeschylus does not determine. The example of Sophocles (see commentaries on the prologue to the Electra) shows that such details were not within the knowledge of the audience (perhaps not of the poets) and would not have been appreciated. The play assumes nothing but such general facts, as could not but be intelligible, the plain, the sea, the mountains, and a fortress. For 'Απλας γαλασ Argolis see L. and Sc. s.v.: for γαλασ ἔρκος cf. Eur. Heracl. 441 ποῖον δὲ γαλασ ἔρκος (city) ὡς ἀφθυμεθα;—These lines are generally given (by those who do not alter the words) thus: πέλοςτο...ἐνπράξις, ὡς θελε...ἔρκος 'let good fortune follow, as is the wish of this one sole defence of Argos, bound by close ties', the last words being taken to describe either the speakers or Clytaemnestra. But (1) εὐπράξις or εὐ πράξις for εὐπραγια, is an incorrect form: this objection has been frequently raised and many emendations are based on it; and further (2) γαλασ ἔρκος is not a proper or intelligible description of a person or persons; in translation this is partly concealed by the use of the abstract 'defence', but ἔρκος is prima facie material, and could not, I think, be otherwise understood without more explanation than is here given.
ήκω σεβίζων σοιν, Κλυταιμνήστρα, κράτος. δίκη γάρ ἐστὶ φωτὸς ἀρχηγοῦ τίνευ
gυναίκ' ἐρήμωθεντος ἀρσενοῦ θρόνου.
σὺ δ' εἶτε κεδνὸν εἶτε μὴ πεπυσμένη
εὐαγγέλωσιν ἐλπίσιν θυητολεῖς,
κλύουμ' ἀν εὐφραν· οὐδὲ σιγώσῃ φθόνος.
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ΚΑΤΤΑΙΜΗΣΤΡΑ.
eὐαγγέλοις μὲν, ὡστερ ἡ παρομία,
ἐὼς γένοιτο μητρὸς εὐφρόνησ πάρα.
πεύσει δὲ χάρμα μείζων ἐλπίδος κλύειν·
Πρίαμου γὰρ ἑρήκασιν Ἀργεῖοι πόλει.
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ΧΩ. πῶς φής; πέφευγε τοῦτος ἐξ ἀπιστίας.
ΚΑ. Τροιάν Ἀχαϊῶν οὐσαν· ἡ τορώς λέγω;
ΧΩ. χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει δάκρυν ἐκκαλουμένη.
ΚΑ. ἐδ γὰρ φρονοῦντος ὀμμα σοι κατηγορεῖ.
ΧΩ. τί γὰρ τὸ πιστῶν; ἔστι τῶνδε σοι τέκμαρ;
ΚΑ. ἔστων, τί δ' οὐχί; μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ.
ΧΩ. πότερα δ' ὀνειρόν φάσματ' εὐπιθη σέβεις;
ΚΑ. οὐ δοξαν ἀν λάβοιμ βριζουσης φρενός.
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273. δ' εἰ τὸ corr. to text.

285. εὐπειθῇ corr. to εὐπείθη.

270. σεβίζων...κράτος i.e. in obedience to her command. Here Clytai-
mmestra comes forth-attended (see v. 363).
273—275. Whether tidings good or not
good prompt thee to celebrate this cer-
emony of hopeful announcement, I would
gladly learn; though, if thou wouldst
keep the secret, I am content. κεδνὸν
literally 'a good thing', cf. δαμαστὸν
ποιεῖς, ἄτοστων λέγεις, etc. Kühner Gr.
Gr. § 403.—With μὴ supply κεδνὸν. The
elders, as persons worthy of the queen’s
confidence, wish to know whether her
rejoicing is genuine or a feint. She has
implied that she has good news; but as
she has not disclosed it, they feel a
natural doubt whether in reality she is
not merely trying to forestall and dis-
credit a bad report which has reached
her and may get abroad. This explains
the addition οὐδὲ σιγώσῃ φθόνος. Only
on the supposition that the news was
really bad could the queen have any
motive for such concealment. The
elders, preoccupied with the dangers near
home, attribute their fears to the queen;
she herself had pretended to share them
(see v. 874).—εὐαγγέλωσιν ἐλπίσιν, da-
tive (Latin ablative) of circumstance,
literally 'with fair-announcing hopes',
i.e. with promising announcement; see
v. 101 ἐκ θυητῶν φαύνων ἐλπίς.—δ' τι
(Auratus) is widely adopted, and perhaps
right.—Another possible interpretation is
'But whether thou hast heard some good
news, or hast not heard any, but art
sacrificing in the hope of such' etc. But
the mere expectation of news would be
no probable motive for the ceremony.
276—278. She corrects their expres-
Enter Clytaemnestra, Conspirators, etc.

I am come, Clytaemnestra, in observance of thy royalty. 'Tis right to render respect to the sovereign and queen, when the husband's throne is empty. Now whether tidings good or not good have moved thee by this ceremony to announce good hope, I would gladly learn from thee: though if thou wouldst keep the secret, I am content.

Clytaemnestra. For 'good', as says the proverb, may the kind morn announce it from her kind mother night. But 'hope' is something short of the joy thou art to hear. The Argive army hath taken Priam's town.

An Elder. How sayest thou? I scarce caught the words, so incredible they were.

Cl. I said that Troy is ours. Do I speak clear?
Eld. 'Tis joy that surprises me and commands a tear.
Cl. Yes, 'tis a loyal gladness of which thine eye accuses thee.
Eld. And what then is the proof? Hast thou evidence for this?
Cl. I have indeed, if miracle deceive me not.
Eld. Is it a dream-sign that commands thine easy credence?
Cl. No fancy would I accept from a brain bemused.

sion εὐαγγέλουν ἐπίσκοπον, accepting εὐαγγέλας with the remark that, according to the proverb, men look for good news in the morning, but rejecting ἐξίστι, as her news leaves nothing further to hope.—The proverb plays upon the ambiguity of εὐφροσύνη, night and kindness (Hesych. cf. δυσφροσύνη), signifying 'May Night, according to her kind name, send her child Morning with a kind message!' (Sidgwick). This εὐφροσύνη echoes the elder's εὐφροσύνη.—μείζον...κλαύει importing more than hope, literally 'greater than hope to the hearing'. It is μείζον εὐπρεπὸς also in another sense 'greater than could be imagined', but this sense is only for the queen and the audience.


282—3. Emphasis on χαῖρε and on εὖ. 'My tear is the tear of joy'. 'Yes, it is, loyal gladness (not disloyal sorrow) of which thine eye accuses thee'.—κατηγορέω: the misapplication of the word sounds like a kindly jest, but is grim earnest. The loyalty of the elders is their crime, as they are soon to find.

284. This punctuation (Prien, Sidgwick) is demanded by the form of the answer ἐστιν.—τὸ πιστὸν 'what you rely on', the proof:

286. εὐπρεπῆ Blomfield, the correct form according to analogy.—εὐπρεπῆ σέβεστι together, 'pay the respect of an easy credence to': εὐπρεπῆ literally 'easily believed'.—ἀνεφρον, suggested by μὴ δολωσαντος θεοῦ: a false dream would be a 'miraculous deceit'.

287. 'No fancy would I accept, no fancy of a mind asleep'. So we may perhaps justify the order of the words; but the reading must not be considered certain.—λάβομι, ἵ. ἐκείμεν, sed quaere:
λάκωνα Karsten (not satisfactory).—On the note here cancelled (ed. 1) see Cho. 532 and note there.

288. ἐπιανέν has cheered or encouraged thee, from επι-αινος, where επι- has the same force (up to a certain point) as in επιαρχω, and αἰνω its usual meaning (see L. and Sc. s.v. αἰνω).—This aorist is commonly referred to παιων to fatten, taken in the sense of puffing up, but see Toup on Hesychius, cited by Blomfield ad loc. The use of παιων and connected words does not support the supposed metaphor. See further Appendix F.—

άπτερος φάτις. The context shows that this was some superstitious proof yet lower in the scale than a dream, probably something like 'a vague presentiment' (Paley, Kennedy). The meaning and origin of the phrase are unknown. It may or may not be derived from πετερω (either in the sense of wing or of open), or connected with the Homeric τῇ δ’ ἄπτερος ἐπλητο μῦδος, which in its turn is doubtful.—

'A report not winged' like the dream-god, i.e. brought without any dream (Wecklein).—An unspoken rumour', cf. ἄπτερος μῆδος word unspoken (Sidgwick).

290. ποιοῦ χρόνου literally 'within what time lies the capture of the city?' i.e. how far back is it to be put?—ποιοῦ as compared with πῶσον or τίνος (what sort of time) gives the question the air of incredulous wonder. Compare the common use of πῶσον in contempt (L. and Sc. s.v.).—καί, emphasizing, assumes the fact, 'Since it is taken, since when is it?'

291. She points to the dawn just breaking.

294. ἁγγάρου Canter (Διασχίζεις γοῦν ἐν Ἀγαμέμνον τὸν ἐκ διαδοχῆς πυρόν 'ἀπ' ἁγγάρου πυρός' έφη Ετ. Μ. p. 7), a Persian word describing the couriers who transmitted orders by successive stages. Herodotus (8. 98) like Aeschylus compares it to the Greek λαμπαδηφορία (τ. 324).—On the story which follows see the Introduction § 1.

296. πανῶν Casaubon. πρὸτερος δὲ τοῦτων Διασχίζεις ἐν Ἀγαμέμνον μέμνηται τοῦ πανῶν, Athen. xv. p. 700 E.—φανῶν is also good and classical; probably both are very ancient readings in this passage.

296—300. The subject of ἐξεδέξατο is the whole phrase Αθῶν...πεῖκη, 'Athos and its beacon' (a 'hendiadys'). Note carefully that the conjunction is τε not δέ.
Eld. Yet canst thou have taken cheer from a voice that bore no sign?

Cl. Thou holdest my sense as low as it were a babe’s.

Eld. And what like time is it since the city fell?

Cl. It fell, I say, in the night whence yonder light is this moment born.

Eld. But what messenger could arrive so quick?

Cl. The fire-god was the messenger. From Ida he sped forth the bright blaze, which beacon after beacon by courier flame passed on to us. Ida sent it first to Hermes’ rock in Lemnos; and to the great bonfire on Lemnos’ isle succeeded third Zeus’ mountain of Athos, with such a soaring pile of wood upon it as might strengthen the travelling torch to pass joyously over the wide main; and this, with the golden light as it were

The periods of this narration are joined throughout by δέ. Here τε couples not periods but words.—ὑπερτελής rising above all.—πόντον...ήδονήν. This explains and gives the ground for ὑπερτελῆς. Clytaemnestra, vaguely aware that in this leap of the Aegaean she must be making a strong demand upon the faith of her hearers, enforces her statement with an explanation as to the size and height of this particular beacon.—πόντον properly ‘the open sea’ with emphasis.—λάχθις, in apposition to πεύκη, ‘strength to the flame’ for ‘strengthening the flame’; cf. Ἀγ. 265 δόλαιοί, θάρσος φίλος ‘the cry which encourages friends’, Ἀγ. 566 δρόσος, αἰώνιον ἐνθάματω ‘water, mischievous to garments’ etc.—πορευόντω...πρὸς ἠδονήν ‘travelling unreluctantly’ (οὔ πρὸς βιαν), not fearing the distance, as it were. This is in effect a predicate; the flame ‘travelled gladly’ because ‘strengthened’.—πεύκη: usually a ‘torch’ of pine-wood, but here extended, like λαμπάς etc., to a ‘bonfire’ of the same.—See also next note.

300—301. Which, with the golden light as it were of a sun, biased on the message to the outlook on Makisos. τὸ χρυσοφεγγίσ...γῆλος literally ‘as a sun its golden light’, the verb (sends) being supplied from παραγγέλλωσα. This is better than to join τὸ χρυσοφεγγίσ with σέλασ, as accounting better for the article τὸ.—σκοπάς. Commonly this accusative of place is found only with verbs of ‘motion to’, and not with verbs such as παραγγέλλω: and for this reason some read σκοπάς. But considering the metaphorical language of this passage, which represents the beacons throughout as a series of couriers, actually travelling with the message from post to post (so πορευόντω in this very sentence), the accusative seems intelligible and even advantageous: παραγγέλλω here means not ‘to give a message’ but ‘to go with a message’ and therefore takes the construction of a verb of motion.—παραγγέλλωσα. The tense is parallel to that of ἐξεδέξατο, and continues the story.

Recent editions treat this passage as corrupt, on the ground that ὑπερτελής τε...σκοπάς, being a fresh clause with a fresh subject, requires a fresh verb. On this view, which is of long standing, Hermann remarked: ‘Nam δέ si legeretur, requireretur verbum pro nomine πέυκη...Nunc vero, τε posito, ἐξεδέξατο etiam ad sequentia refertur’. The text expresses the meaning better than divided clauses would do. The high mountain and the vast beacon are coupled, as jointly accomplishing the prodigious task.
σέλας παραγγείλασα Μακίστου σκοπάς·
δ' δ' οὔτε μέλλων οὔδ' ἀφρασμόνως ὑπνω
νικώμενος παρῆκεν ἀγγέλου μέρος·
ἐκάς δὲ φρυκτοῦ φῶς ἐπ' Εὐρίπου ῥόας
Μεσσατίπου φύλαξ οἰμαίνει μολόν.

οἷ δ' ἀντέλαμψαν καὶ παρήγγειλαν πρόσω
γραίας ἐρείκης θωμὸν ἄψαντες πυρὶ.
σθένουσα λαμπτὰς δ' οὐδέπω μαυρουμένη,
ὑπερθοροῦσα πεδίων...ωποῦ, δίκην
φαίδρας σελήνης, πρὸς Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας,
ἤγειρεν ἄλλην ἑκδοχὴν πομποῦ πυρὸς.
φάος δὲ τηλέπομπον οὐκ ἴμανετο
φρούρα, πλέον καίουσα τῶν εἰρημένων·
λίμνην δ' ὑπὲρ Γοργώπιν ἐσκηψεν φάος
ὁρος τ' ἐπ' Αἰγίπλαγκτον ἐξικούμενον
ἀτρυνυ θεσμὸν μὴ χαρίζεσθαι πυρός.
πέμπτοι δ' ἀνδαίοντες ἀφθόνῳ μένει
φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα, καὶ Σαρωνικοῦ

309. παιδίων ὁποῦ.

301. Μακίστου· ὁρος Εὐβοιάς schol.
Mr Sidgwick says ‘in southern Euboea’,
Wecklein ‘probably in the north’ (as the
nearer part to Athos). The question is
of little moment; but the mountain by its
name would seem to have been ‘the
highest’, or so supposed, in the island;
the highest part is about the centre, near
Chalcis.

302. δ' δ': Makistos, i.e., in the lite-
ralness of prose, the watchers thereon.—
Here the story becomes comparatively
reasonable. Of the country between
Argos and Aulis Clytaemnestra and the
elders might naturally be supposed to
have some knowledge. The distances are
indeed, as the queen says, full long (ἐκάς
...πρόδου), running up to about 25 miles;
in a real system other stages would pro-
bably have been interpolated for safety;
but her conception is conceivable.

303. παρῆκεν neglected.—The render-
ing ‘sent on’ (Paley) lacks authority.

305. Μεσσατίπου: in N. Boeotia.

308. σθένουσα taking strength afresh
from the fuel of Messapios; cf. ἱσχὺς in
v. 299.

309. πεδίων......οποῦ. The defective
word may be read either ὀρωποῦ, as by
Turnebus, or Ἀσωποῦ, as by the writers
of the later MSS. The first reading has
the technical advantage of accounting
better for the loss of the letters by
similarity of syllables. On the other
hand the later MSS. may represent a
tradition. The ‘plain of the river Asopus’
is the better description, having regard
to the geography. But on the other
hand ‘the plain of Oropus’, properly the
maritime part of the plain of the Asopus;
of a sun, blazed on the message to the outlook on Makistos. Nor he for any delay, or for overcoming sleep, neglected heedlessly his messenger-part. Far over Euripus’ stream came his beacon-light and gave the sign to the watchers of Messapios. These raised an answering light to pass the signal far away, with pile of withered heath which they kindled up. And the torch thus strengthened flagged not yet, but leaping, broad as a moon, over Asopus’ plain to Cithaeron’s scar, roused in turn the next herald of the fiery train; nor there did the sentinels refuse the far-heralded light, but made a bonfire higher than was bid, whose flying brightness lit beyond Gorgopis’ water, and reaching the mount of Aegiplanctus, eagerly bade him not to slack the commanded fire. They sped it on, throwing high with force unstinted a flame like a great beard, which could even overpass,

was claimed and generally possessed by Athens, so that to name the whole from Oropus would have a popular sound to Athenian ears.

313. φρονώ: the watchers on Cithaeron.—πλέον καλώσα τῶν εἰρημένων ‘making a fire larger than was enjoined’ (Weil), literally ‘more than what was hidden them (τὰ εἰρημένα)’. These words confirm and extend the phrase of the previous line ὅς ἥρανετο, ‘denied not’ or ‘disowned not’. In their enthusiasm the watchmen of Cithaeron, so far from showing reluctance, actually exceeded their instructions. See further Appendix G.

314. Τοργώτιν: apparently a bay or estuary in the territory of Megara, N. E. of the Corinthian gulf.—Λημνη φασίν εἶχαί ἐν Κόριπτῳ, Hesychius; but the description must be very inaccurate, if it refers to the Λημνη here mentioned.

315. Αλιγάπλαγκτον: obviously part of Geranea in the Megarid. ὁρός Μεγαρίδος schol.

316. Urged him to exact strictly the commanded fire. The fire from Cithaeron strives to rouse an enthusiasm like its own in others less ready. The receiving mountain is personified, like Μάκαρος in v. 301, but with a difference of character.

—θεσμῶν μὴ χαριζέσθαι πυρός literally ‘not to remit (to himself or his watch) the commandment of fire’. The use of χαριζέσθαι here is generally condemned, and is difficult, though perhaps defensible. The sense and common constructions of the verb are closely similar to those of προέσθαι, and of such Latin verbs as indulgere, remittere, concedere, etc. We have on the one hand χαριζέσθαι τί τινι ‘to give up, surrender, sacrifice’, and on the other hand χαριζέσθαι τίνι ‘to be indulgent to, not strict with’, as in χαριζεσθαι ἵππῳ indulgere eum. From these it is not far to such a phrase as χαριζέσθαι θεσμῶν remittere imperium ‘to let an order be neglected’, and we are scarcely entitled to reject the extension when it occurs.—μὴ χρωιζέσθαι Paley (making θεσμῶν the object of ὄτρων), μηχανήσασθαι Margoliouth: μὴ χατιζεσθαι Heath, ‘not to be wanting’, assumes a doubtful word. See further Wecklein, Appendix.

318—322. κατόπτην W. Headlam; κατοπτὸν Canter. The genitive is governed by the preposition.—The ‘headland’ should be ‘the high coast on the S. side of the bay of Cenchrea’ (Wecklein).—καλ...ὑπερβάλλειν, i.e. οὔτε αὐτήν καὶ ὑπερβάλλειν, a consecutive infinitive depending on the whole previous sentence,
and specially upon μέγαν.—φλέγουσαν feminine, not masculine, because φλογός is the really substantive word, μέγαν πώγονα being merely descriptive and adjectival, and therefore αὐθή, not αὐθήν, is the pronoun supplied (Paley, Sidgwick).—εἶτ' ἐσκηψεν, εἶτ' ἀφίκετο. In a sentence of symmetrical and prosaic form these clauses would be parallel with the infinitive, as thus, ὅστε πρῶνα μὲν ὑπερβάλλειν, εἶτα δὲ σκύψαι καὶ ἀφικέσθαι κτλ. (The point made is that the courier-fire, eager to finish the long journey, 'ran in home' as it were, and would not after Aegiplanetus make an unnecessary stop.) But the second parallel clause is turned for variety into an independent sentence, and the effect is further strengthened by the omission of μὲν...δέ, and by the rhetorical repetition of εἶτα in place of the simple copula καί.—ἔπιστα in ν. 322 points back to εἶτα in ν. 320, 'then... after then': they mark as it were the last stage and the very last.—τό γε i.e. τοῦτο γε: τό demonstrative, several times used by Aeschylus. The particle γε (literally 'to the roof of the Atridae this at least') gives to the close the animation of poetic feeling. This time at least, after being often set on, the far-travelled messenger had indeed arrived.—τόδε recce.—ἐστ' ἐσκηψεν, εἴτ' ἀφίκετο 'till it lighted, when it arrived' Hermann. The repetitions φλογός...φλέγουσαν...ἐςκηψεν...ἔπιστα σκύψαν' are not negligent but calculated.

323. The light there, which shows a pedigree from the beacon upon Ida. φαός τοῦδε: she points to Arachneus, behind which, to add effect to her words, the elders might now see the beginning of day. It is the place of the beacon which helps to suggest the comparison of it, on its first appearance, to the dawn, ν. 22.—οὐκ...πυρός literally 'not without an ancestor in the beacon of Ida'. The genitive depends on the privative force of the adjective.—The negative turn of this jesting phrase is for the ears of the audience. As a fact, the beacon was ἀπαππόν, and had no 'ancestry' at all, but it has supplied the defect, as others
so far it flamed, the headland that looks down upon the Saronic gulf, alighting then, and only then, when it reached the outlook, nigh to our city, upon the Arachnaean peak; whence next it lighted (at last!) here upon our royal roof, yon light, which shows a pedigree from the fire of Ida. Such are the torch-bearers which I have ordained, by succession one to another completing the course:—of whom the victor is he who ran first and last. Such is the evidence and token I give thee, my husband's message sped out of Troy to me.

_Eld._ My thanksgiving, lady, to heaven shall be presently paid; but first this story—I would fain satisfy my wonder by hearing it repeated, in thy way of telling, from point to point.

_Cl._ Troy is this day in the hands of the Achaeans! Me-

will do, by a little invention, ἐφως πᾶππος in the phrase of Aristophanes (Birds 765), and so is ἀπαππόν no longer.

324. τοιοίδε τοι μοι Schütz. τοιοίδ' ἑτουμα α.—λαμπαδηφόρων. In the race called λαμπαδηφορία a chain of runners, posted at intervals, passed a lighted torch from the start to the goal. The chain won which accomplished this in the shortest time, provided that the torch was kept alight. (There were several forms of the race, but this is the method meant here.) The custom was specially popular at Athens.—ἀλλος...πληροῦμενοι. The expression is not clear, since grammar suggests ἀλλος νόμος, while sense requires ἄλλος λαμπαδηφόρος (F. B. Jevons Class. Rev. vi. 327, proposing ἄλλου for ἄλλος). But it is not incorrect, since ἄλλος (λαμπαδ.) παρ' ἄλλου may stand in apposition to λαμπ. νόμοι, and seems practically intelligible. The two genitives ἄλλος...ἄλλου, though grammatically right, do not come well to the ear.

326. See Appendix H.

329—331. The elders are so astonished that they scarcely know what to think or say, and one of them tries to draw from the queen some 'more details' (Sidgwick) on the subject of the beacons, putting the request delicately in the form of a compliment to her narration. Naturally he does not succeed. The thoughts of the queen are gone away to the absent ones 'in Troy'!—θεοῖς...προσεύξομαι: this is to guard, so far as may be, against the appearance of disbelief. He will act upon the queen's testimony presently, when he has heard it again.—αὖθις later, afterwards.—ἀποθαυμάστε to admire fully.—διηνεκῶς: both 'clearly' and 'continuously', without anything omitted.

—ὡς λέγοις as you would tell it. The mood of λέγοις follows that of θελώμ' ἂν on the same principle which determines ἐπει γένοιτ' ἂν κλωσ (v. 264), the whole action lying in the same hypothetical time. Sidgwick compares Plato Men. 92 C πῶς ἂν εἴδεις περὶ τοῦτον οὐ ἄπειρος εἶπς: 'how could you know that of which (ex hypothesi) you have no experience?'

—ὡς λέγεις a, et λέγεις Blomfield, οὖς λέγεις Bothe.

332. On the significance of this speech see the Introduction. The scene at this point, the contrasted attitudes of the two parties (see on v. 363), and the painful interest with which, for different reasons, they all mark the words and behaviour of the queen, make an effective moment.
οἱμαὶ βοὴν ἄμικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν. ʿόξος τ᾽ ἀλειφά τ᾽ ἐκχέας ταύτῳ κύτει διχοστατοῦντ᾽ ἀν οὐ φίλως προσενετοὺς καὶ τῶν ἀλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων δίχα φθογγὰς ἀκούειν ἔστι συμφορᾶς διπλῆς. οὐ μὲν γὰρ ἀμφὶ σώμασιν πεπτωκότες ἀνδρῶν κασιγνητῶν τε καὶ φυταλιῶν, παιδες γερόντων, οὐκέτ᾽ ἐξ ἐλευθέρον δέρμα ἀπομάζουσι φιλτάτων μόρον· τοὺς δ᾽ αὐτὲ νυκτιπλαγκτος ἐκ μάχης πόνος νῆστις πρὸς ἀρίστοισιν ὅν ἔχει πόλις τάσσει, πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐν μέρει τεκμηρίων, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἑκάστοις ἐσπασέν τύχης πάλον ἐν αἰχμαλωτοῖς Θριωκοίς οἰκήμαις ναιόουσιν Ἡδη, τῶν ὑπαιθρίων πάγων δρόσων τ᾽ ἀπαλλαγέντες ὡς δυναῖσθεν· ἀφύλακτον εὐδήσουσι πᾶσαν εὐφρόνην.

333. ἄμικτον that will not blend.
334—336. ὃξος τε...καὶ τῶν ἀλόντων: either τε and καὶ here answer to each other (‘as...so’), or τε...τε. The first is preferable.
334. ἐκχέας ταύτῳ κύτει shouldst thou pour out oil and vinegar with the same vessel, i.e. put them into the same vase or bottle and pour them from it together. The dative is instrumental.—It is not clear that this should be changed (Canter and others) to ἐκχέας. The repulsion of the two ingredients would be more conspicuous in the pouring out of a mixture (as upon a plate) than in the pouring in.
335. Thou wouldst exclaim at their unfriendly parting, literally ‘wouldst accost them as (persons) parting not like friends’, an expression of studied irony for a violent mutual repulsion.—The use of προσενέτειν (to name, apostrophe) διχοστατοῦντε is natural in a language which used the participial apostrophe (e.g. Eur. Tro. 1168 ὡ μείζον ὕγκον δόρος ἔχοντες ἢ φρενῶν).—The expression διχοστατεῖν οὐ φίλως suggests perhaps that διχοστατεῖν φίλως would have a meaning. In Teth. 918 (where see note) we have the term διάσωμα φίλαι (and οὐ φίλαι) for a partition, friendly or unfriendly, between joint occupiers of land. Possibly a similar metaphor lies behind the language here, and διχοστατεῖν φίλως meant a ‘friendly dissolution’, as of partnership or marriage.—οὐ φίλω (Auratus and others).
336. τῶν ἀλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων: not here exactly equivalent to τῶν ἀλόντων καὶ τῶν κρατησάντων. The comparison is between the compound of oil and vinegar (which will not blend) and the ensemble of victors and vanquished.—δίχα with ἀκούειν: ‘distinctly’, ‘separately’.
338. οἱ μὲν: the living captives would be chiefly or solely (particularly in the case of Troy) women and girls; but the generic description of them as the vanquished party (οἱ ἀλόντες) is nevertheless naturally not feminine.
339. Husbands, brothers, fathers and
thinks there must be sound there of voices that will not blend. Pour with the same vessel vinegar and oil, and thou wilt exclaim at their unfriendly parting. Even so their tones, the conqueror and the conquered, fall different as their fortunes upon the ear. These on the ground clasping the dead, their husbands, brothers, fathers, sons, young children weeping for gray sires, themselves enslaved, are wailing for their beloved. Those the hungry weariness of fighting and a restless night hath set to break their fast upon what is in the town, not billeted orderly, but lodging themselves forthwith, by such chance as falls to each eager hand, in the captured houses of Troy, to escape as they may the miseries of the open air, the frosts and the dews. With no watch to keep they will sleep the whole night long.

sous. The gender of ἀνήρ is to be extended throughout. φυταλιῶν is here a substantive. The word means properly 'connected with geniture'; so in Soph. Ο. C. 150 ἄλαων ὑψάτων ἄρα καὶ ἴσα φυταλιῶν; wasst thou sightless even from birth? Here it means 'relations by geniture' (i.e. parents, children, etc.). So κασυγνήτου is properly 'collaterals', brothers, cousins, etc.

340. παιδες γερόντων children bewailing aged; not that all the captives were children, or all the slain aged. The phrase signalizes the most pathetic figures, among the captives the orphan children, among the slain those whose years might have saved them, but did not, from the indiscriminate massacre.—Another punctuation joins φυταλιῶν παιδες γερόντων (or φυταλιῶν παιδῶν γέροντες Weil). A better correction is that of Karsten παιδῶν γερόντων both young and old, i.e. of all ages.

341. δέρης, both neck and throat (Eur. Or. 41 ὅπετε σίτα διὰ δέρης ἐδέξατο Wecklein), here combines the two meanings. With ὦνεκτ' ἐλευθέρου it is neck, the metaphor being that of the yoke, with ἀπομωζούσι: throat. No English word will exactly fit.—ἀπομωζοῦσι: not bewail loudly (L. and Sc.), but bewail away, i.e. 'bewail desperately, as lost'. Cf. Antiphan 134. 15 ἀπομωζοῦσιν ἐμὲ τε καὶ αὐτὸν ὡς ἀπολλυμένους, and Aeschyl.

fr. 128 'Ἀντίλοχ' ἀπολιμαζών με τοῦ τεβην-κόστος τὸν ζῶντα μάλλον.

343. νηστεῖς hungry toil, i.e. 'making hungry'.—νηστεῖς (many texts) is strongly favoured by the grouping of the words. But is it clear that Aeschylus would have used the form νηστεῖς and not rather νηστίδαις or νηστίαις?—ὅν ἔχει πόλις.

The besiegers are starving (see v. 132), and the long-beleaguered city offers but little.

344. Not in order according to billet. The casual banquet of the famished plunderers, establishing themselves in the first house where they find food, is contrasted with the orderliness of a well-appointed army distributed to quarters by 'token' or 'billet'.

345—347. Rather by such chance as falls to each eager hand they are installing themselves forthwith in the captured houses of Troy. ὑο ἐκαστος...πάλου literally 'as each has snatched a lot' i.e. according to the fortune of each plunderer.—ἀἰκαλατοῦς: the epithet, like ὅν ἔχει πόλις, denotes the misery of the comforts to which the victors fly. The houses are such as they would be when carried after a desperate night of fire and sword. It will be remembered that in the time of Aeschylus the private buildings of the Greeks, even in great cities, were poor and slight in construction.

347—349. Glad of such poor delivery
from the frosts and dews of the open air. With no watch to keep they will sleep the whole night long. απαλλαγέντες ὡς δυσδαίμονες, literally ‘ridding themselves as poor wretches may’, where ὡς has the same qualifying sense as in ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ ὡς Λακεδαιμὼν ‘a good man for a Lacedaemonian’ and the like.—τῶν ὑπαιθρῶν neuter, gen. of τὰ ὑπαίθρια, to which πάγων ὅρκον τε stands in apposition, ‘the conditions of the open air, frost and dew’; cf. τῶν ποικίλων ν. 917: the article is therefore necessary.—ἀφύλακτον...... εὐφρόνην ‘a night being watchless, they will sleep it all’. ἀφύλακτον is a predicate and equivalent to ἀφύλακτον οὖσαν. This explains further the meaning of ὡς δυσδαίμονες: after the exposure of the camp and the weariness of the watch the soldiers are not nice enough to disdain the wrecked houses. The mere security will give them an unbroken night.—ὑπερ πρότερον ὑπαίθρια ὑστεριχεὶς ὑπὸ ἀμέρισμα εὐθείας (schol. on ν. 348) assumes the punctuation ἀπαλλαγέντες, ὡς...εὐφρόνην which is that of the mss., but apparently lacks a conjunction.—ὡς δ’ εὐθείας Stanley, gives the same sense in another way.—ἀπαλλαχθέντες a, perhaps rightly. 350. εὕσεβοι Scaliger and Porson, εὕσεβοι MSS. The first accentuation is the safer, as the evidence for the transitive εὕσεβεῖν is not conclusive.—εἰ...σέβοι, not ἦν σέβοι. The English if they observe, standing for both, easily misleads. The captors are doing as they should, or otherwise, while Clytaemnestra speaks (according to her pretended assumption). 353. οὐ κἀν. The emphasizing kal, if correct, belongs to ἑλώντες (even after conquest), ‘they will escape a ruinous ending of their victory after all’.—οὐ πάν Hermann.—οὐκ ἀνέλωντες a, οὐκ ἂν γ’ ἑλώντες f h (a correction).—ἀναλαλεῖν Auratus. ἀνθάνειν a. 353. ἔρως μὴ τίς...ἐμπίπτη the desire, it is to be feared, may come upon them. On μὴ with the present subjunctive, as a principal sentence, expressing an anticipation or suspicion about the future, see on Th. 183.—An imperative sense is not admissible with this tense.—The sin of the victors in this respect (ν. 532) is doubly connected with the sequel; it was punished by the disaster of the fleet, and it led to the capture of Cassandra, who was torn from sanctuary. 354. τὰ μὴ χρή a, ἃ μὴ χρή f. For the relative τὰ cf. ν. 531 Δίος μακάλλη, τῇ κατέλυμαι πέδων. The substitution of the familiar ὃ is of no significance. 355. The genitive σωτηρίας and the infinitive κάψωμαι both depend upon δεῖ, the infinitive clause translating the literal
Now must they pay due respect to the gods that inhabit the
town, the gods of the conquered land, or their victory may end
in their own destruction after all. Too soon belike for their
safety, the soldiery, seized with greed, may yield to their
covetousness and lay hands on forbidden spoil. They have still
to bring themselves home, have still the backward arm of the
double course to make. And if no sin against heaven rest on
the returning host, there is the wrong of the dead that watches.
Evil may find accomplishment, although it fall not at once.

But for all these my womanish words, may the good prevail,

357—358. ‘And if the army return without offence against the gods, the
wrong of the dead is on the watch’. There is an antithesis between the words
placed first and last. The primary meaning is this: the ruin of Troy and
the slaughter of her population naturally cry for vengeance and expose the victors,
according to the doctrin of Nemesis, to especial danger at this time. They have
therefore little need to increase this danger, which is already ‘watching its
opportunity’, by plundering the sanctuaries and thus incurring the avoidable
anger of the gods. For the queen herself, who proposes to avenge her daughter,
and for the conspirators, infuriated by the sacrifice of lives in the war, ‘the
wrong of the dead’ has another meaning.

—The apodosis to εἰ μὴν, ‘they may suffer the vengeance of the dead’, is not
expressly stated in the following clause but implied.—ἐγρήγορον. The misformed
adjective ἐγρήγορος (whence the late verb ἐγρήγορεῖν) can scarcely be as old as
Aeschylus. Either ἐγρήγορος (Porson) or ἐγρήγορεν should probably be read;
if the first, we still supply ἔστι—For the metaphor cf. Eur. Ἐλ. 41 εἴδοντι ἀν
ἐξηγείρει τὸν Ἁγαμέμνωνος φῶν (Paley), for the use of πήμα Soph. Ἐλ. 258 πατρῶα
πήματα ‘my father’s wrongs’.

359. Evil may find accomplishment,
if it fall not at once, i.e. ‘postponed is not prevented’, ‘the victors will be in
danger for some time yet’.—γένοιτ’ ἄν
‘may be accomplished’, cf. v. 264 ἐτεὶ
γένοιτο ‘when it is accomplished’.—
πρόσπαυσα ‘sudden, off-hand’, a secondary
predicate.—In this and the preceding
clause εἰ is concessive and equivalent to
the more exact καὶ el of common use (see
Kühner Greek Grammar § 578, note 2).
For further discussion of νν. 357—359
see Appendix I.

360—361. Conscious of the thoughts
covered by this pretense of solicitude for
the absent, she breaks off and dismisses
it with a light self-reproach. It will
prove, she trusts, no more than the
nervousness of a woman.—κλόες. κλῦεις
a (as in ν. 331 λέγεις for λέγουσι), to get
a construction simpler in appearance.
But the optative is right. The mistake
arises from stopping off ν. 360 as a
separate sentence. It is related as a
concessive clause to ν. 361 and would in
common parlance require μὲν, thus:
τοιοῦτα μὲν κλῦεις τὸ δ’ εὖ κρατοῖν, i.e.
literally ‘I pray that thou mayest hear
such words and yet the good triumph’,
or in English form ‘I pray that, though
thou hearest such words, the good may
triumph’. The propriety of the optative
may be made more clear, according to
English conceptions, by paraphrasing
the second clause; οὕτω τὰ τοιοῦτα κλῦεις
ὡςτε κρατεῖν τὸ εὖ. A precise parallel
is αὐλον εἰπε, τὸ δ’ εὖ νικᾶσι (Anglice
‘though the dirge must be uttered, let the good win’).

362. For this choice gives me the enjoyment of more blessingsthan one. ‘Den Genuss von vielen Guten erwähle ich mir damit’ (Wecklein, reading τήνδε). The construction is εἰλήμην τὴν (i.e. ταύτην τὴν δύναςιν) ἄνησιν (οὔσαν) πολλῶν ἐσθλῶν. The demonstrative follows the gender of the predicate δύναςιν. Ostensibly this phrase means no more than that τὸ εὖ covers everything desirable: to Clytaemnestra it means that more senses than one can be put upon τὸ εὖ.—εἰλήμην: the aorist refers to the moment before, and to the preceding wish.—τήνδε’ Hermann; but the archaic demonstrative is defensible.—Another possible rendering is ‘I prefer that my enjoyment should be an enjoyment of many blessings (not few), i.e. ‘of what is good one would have as much as may be’. The remark will then refer specially to μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν. The victory is a sure ἐσθλῶν: if all turns out well, so much the better. Yet other renderings may be suggested; but the first interpretation is prevalent and seems the best.

373. ΧΟΡΟΣ β’. On the question who are the speakers here, and how the following scene is to be conceived, see Appendix J.

365. προσειπεῖν εὖ to praise.

366. For there hath been wrought (by the gods) a return in full for our pains. οὐκ ἄτιμος ‘not inadequate’ (Paley), literally ‘not without the value’ of the trouble spent.—πόνων depends directly
plainly, I say, and undoubtfully; for choosing so, I choose more blessings than one.

A Conspirator. Lady, no man could speak more kindly wisdom than thou. For my part, after the sure proof heard from thee, my purpose is now to give our thanks to the gods, who have wrought a return in full for all the pains.

[Exit Clytaemnestra.

Conspirators. Hail, sovereign Zeus, hail, gracious night; high is the glory thou hast won, thou night, that hast cast over the towers of Troy meshes so close, that none full-grown, nay, nor any young could pass the wide enslaving net, one capture taking them all. Zeus, god of host and guest, I confess him great, who hath wrought this vengeance, with aim upon the ravisher taken long, that so neither heaven-high the bolt might idly go, nor short of the mark might fall.

Elders. Zeus' stroke it is which they dare proclaim. This upon χάρις, though relative in sense to ἄτιμος.

367—378. Clytaemnестra retires. During this anapaestic march, sung by the sub-chorus, the principal chorus of elders are moving into their position for the following hymn.—νυξ φιλα. All this passage takes a poignant irony from the fact that it is really Argos and the elders, not Troy and her people, who are enslaved by the work of this 'gracious night'.

370. οτεγανόν...όσ i.e. óστε, so close that etc.—μέγαν full-grown.

371. μήτ' οὖν 'nor if it comes to that': this is the full force of the expression, but we have no English equivalent that is not cumbersome.—μήτ' οὖν...τινά. Here the irony of the situation turns against the singers. The conspiracy which enthrones Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus is the work of the younger generation (νεαρός, see the Introduction). Their own language here might remind them that tyrants are seldom grateful, and that those who set up cannot always pull down.

373. ἀτὴς παναλότου genitive 'of equivalent' or 'of quality' depending upon the whole phrase μέγα δ. γάμαμον (not in apposition to δουλείας).

374. μέγαν αἰδούμαι: the adj. is a predicate, 'I bow before his greatness'.

375. ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ with τεινωτα (with πράξαντα ed. 1, but wrongly). On the name see v. 60, 714.

376. ὅπως ἄν...σχήματα: practically here final, and not distinguishable from ὅπως σχήματα. For the history of these constructions (in which, however, many points are open to dispute) see Kühner Greek Grammar §§ 552—553.

377. πρὸ καιροῦ before (i.e. short of) the mark: cf. v. 778. ὑπὲρ ἄστρων hyperbole for 'too high'.—This is the usual interpretation of πρὸ καιροῦ. Mr Sidgwick prefers 'before the time', which is an equally possible sense of the word and gives, divested of metaphor, the real meaning. But ὑπὲρ ἄστρων seems scarcely intelligible without the assisting contrast of πρὸ καιροῦ in the local and metaphorical sense.

378. ηλθόν predicate, to be taken with the verb.

379. It is a stroke of Zeus which they are able to proclaim. This thought it is permissible to follow out. The elders themselves οὐκ ἔχωσι (are not able) to join
πάρεστι τούτ' ἐξεχνεύσαι.
ἐπραξεν ὡς ἔκρανεν. οὐκ ἔφα τις
θεοὺς βροτῶν ἀξιοῦσθαι μέλειν
ὅσοις ἄθικτων χάρις
πατοῖθ᾽ ὅ δ᾽ οὐκ εὐσεβῆς.
πέφανται δ᾽ ἐγγονοῦ-
σα τόλμη τῶν Ἀρη
πνεόντων μεῖζον ἡ δικαίως,
φλεόντων δωμάτων ὑπέρφευ
ὑπὲρ τὸ βέλτιστον. ἔστω δ᾽ ἀπῆ-
μαντον ὡστ᾽ ἀπαρκεῖν
eῦ πραπίδων λαχόντα.
οὐ γὰρ ἔστω ἐπαλέτις
πλούτου πρὸς κόρον ἀνδρὶ
lακτίσαντι μέγαν Δίκας
βωμὸν εἰς ἀφάνειαν.

381. ὡς ἐπραξεν ὃς. 385—6. ἐγγόνωσι ἀτολμητῶν. 394. μεγάλα.

in the celebration, inasmuch as they are
more than doubtful of the fact to be
celebrated. But there is an opportunity
(πάρεστι), they say, to pursue the sug-
gested truth, that Zeus does watch and
does punish: and this accordingly they
do, in general terms and without reference
to the supposed capture of Troy. This
dubious and somewhat feeble distinction
is prompted by their peculiar and em-
barrassing situation. They cannot accept
Clytaemnestra’s proof, yet will not commit
themselves to a denial. Naturally they
soon quit the subject altogether.—ἀνε-
τείν: see ἀναγορεύω, a word proper to
proclamation of a victory.

380. On the metre see Appendix II.
381. He (i.e. Zeus) accomplishes as he
determines.—The convenient aorist, ac-
cording as it is taken as past definite or as
gnomic, does or does not imply a specific
reference to the present case. In English
the ambiguity can scarcely be preserved.
—ἐπραξαν (Hermann).—The omission of

 didFinish
thought we may pursue. As He determines, so He accomplishes. It was said by one that the gods deign not to regard sinners, when they trample upon the grace of sacredness. But impiously was it said. It is manifested, how pregnant is the insolence of a too defiant pride, when the fulness of the house grossly exceedeth the best. Which best shall be so much, as will let a man blest with sense live of it undistressed.

For there is no defence for that man, who in the pride of wealth doth spurn the mighty fixed foundation of Right, whereby he may be unseen: though strong is that obstinate

best commentary upon the present passage, παλαιφάτος γέρων λάγος…μέγεγαν τελεοφθέντα φωτός δίσβου τεκνούσαίει…εκ δ' ἀγάθαι τίχαι γένει βλαστάνειν ἀδόρεστων οἷςν κτλ.; see notes there. Here the familiar train of thought is merely touched by a passing allusion.—As to the division of the words here I follow Hartung (ἐκτίνουσα τόλμα τῶν), but keep the letters of the MS. ἐγγονοῦσα, which the MS. offers, is clear both in form and meaning. The verb is formed like ἐνεργεῖν, and means ‘to be ἐγγονος’; ἐγγονος is capable of two senses, either ‘in-bearing, containing offspring’ (a synonym of ἐντοκος), or ‘in-born, being contained as offspring’. The second sense occurs in Aristotle (see Lex. s.v.); from the first is derived ἐγγονοῦσα. τόλμη irregular for τόλμα, which perhaps should be read; but there may have been good literary reason for the Ionic form here.—πέφανται δ' ἐκγόνους ἀπολιμήως Bothe.—πέφανται δ' ἐκγόνους ‘even the descendants of the wicked perish’ (root φεν-) S. J. Warren, Class. Rev. II. 182.

389—391. Which shall be, so much as will permit a man of sense to meet his needs without distress. The subject of ἔστω (‘let it be, let us put it at this’) is τὸ βέλτιστον ‘the standard’ of wealth, which this sentence defines by the limiting clause ὡστε κτλ.: literally and let this be, ‘so that a man may’ etc.—ἀπῆμαντον: masc. and passive, not vexed. Also rendered ‘harmless’ and construed, as neuter, with ἔστω, the subject being, less naturally, supposed to be ‘wealth’.—ἀπαρκεῖν literally ‘to suffice from it’; for the preposition cf. ἀποζηῦν (ὅσον ἀποζηῦν enough to live upon Thuc. i. 2), ἀφορί- a fund or capital, etc. For the personal use of ἀρκῶ ‘I am sufficient (to myself)’, there appears to be no other example. Even P. V. 648 τοσοῦτον ἀρκῶ σοι σαφηνιαί μόνον ‘I can only inform you as far as this’ (cited by S.) is materially different. But it is natural and justifies itself.—πραππίδων: cf. the genitive with ἔχειν πως, as ὡς ἔχει ποδῶν ‘with his best speed’ (S.).—λαχντι: Auratus.

392—395. For there is no defence for the man, who in the pride of wealth doth haughtily spurn the foundation of Right, whereby he may be hid. πλοῦτον may be taken either as above or with ἐπαλίς (‘there is no protection in riches’ etc. Sidgwick: ‘What defence are riches’ etc. Kennedy).—μεγάλα (?), cf. Theb. 339 ἀλοιβ’ ὃς πὸλει μεγάλ’ ἐπείχεται. But μέγαν (Canter) is probably right. See Appendix II.—βωμόν foundation, pedestal (not altar); the notion of fixity, solidity (cf. βέβαιος), is here more prominent than that of sanctity.—ἐἰς ἀφάνειαν: difficult. The explanations given are (1), as the majority, λακτησαντι ἐἰς ἀφάνειαν ‘spurning out of sight’, or ‘into destruction’. The objection to this is that the metaphor thus becomes grotesque and inconsistent with the notion of a βωμός, which the wicked may spurn, but could not shun away. (2) As Hermann and others, ἐπαλίς ἐἰς ἀφάνειαν ‘protection
against destruction'. But ἀφανῆς means not destroyed, but invisible, secret, concealed, and ‘είς is the wrong preposition (S.). (3) ἐπάλξις εἰς ἀφανείαν 'protection for concealment', whence the translation above. εἰς for the purpose of. —ἀφανείαν. See the sequel οὐκ ἐκρύφθη, πρέπει δὲ κτλ., v. 398. This connexion may explain why the words are separated from ἐπάλξις and placed at the end of the sentence; they strike the keynote of the passage following.

396. Yet irresistible is that obstinate persuasion, the self-persuasion, that is, of the wicked, that his wealth will in some way protect him. πειθώ means both persuasion to believe (conviction, as here, cf. Eur. Hel. 796 τύχες τοῦτος πειθώ;) and persuasion to do (temptation). The second sense may be taken here (‘Temptation forces him on’ S.), but the other makes a better connexion. The strength of temptation is not here the question.
persuasion, servant of Blindness and shaper of her decree. Remedy is all vain. Unhidden the mischief glows with a baleful light. Like base metal beneath the rub and touch, he shows the black grain when brought to justice (for his pursuit is idle as the boy’s who follows the flying bird), and leaves upon his people a fatal mark of the touching. Deaf to supplication, the gods condemn for wicked whosoever is conversant with such.

Such was the sin of Paris, who came to that house of the Atridae and dishonoured the hospitable board by theft of the

quality but a function, a relative function. A πρόσβουλος is πρόσβουλος to another or others. These facts suggest that in this compound παίς also is a term of function, and means not child but servant or handmaid, and that we should translate by servant of Infatuation who prepareth her decrees, literally ‘the counsellor-servant of Até’. Self-deception, to drop the metaphor, prepares the way for judicial blindness. Such metaphors from occupations and functions are in the style of the poet; see his προχαλεκέβεν Ἀτη φασγανούργος, his πρόσπολος Φώνος, his προβατογνωμόν, and the like.—προβαλλον παίς... δεις. Hartung, πρόσβουλος παίς Karsten: see Appendix II. —ἄφερτος ‘tyrannous’, lit. ‘insupportable’.

398–408. Remedy is all in vain.... Like base metal at the rub and touch he shows the black grain under justification ...and sets upon his people a fatal mark of his touch. Deaf to supplication, the gods condemn for a wicked man him who is conversant with such. The general meaning is that, as wealth will not serve, so neither will power, such as the power of a mighty state, to avert the punishment of the wicked. He will only ruin those who adopt his guilt.—ἐπελε .. ὅρνυν is a parenthesis, and the metaphor of the rubbed metal is pursued after it as before it. προστριμμα, lit. ‘that which is rubbed on to’ a thing, being correlative to ἄφθασον. It is additionally recommended by the use of προστριβεν to inflict a punishment (Aesch. P. V. 345 Paley).—δικασώμεισ when justified, i.e. ‘brought to justice’ or ‘to punishment’. (?) This (see L. and Sc.) is the meaning which δικαίων seems to have, where it is used with a personal object. It suits with the words τρίβω ... ξύλοι, but not well with πόλει προστριμμα ... θέλει, which, however, need not be closely connected with it.—The rendering ‘tested’ is not supported, so far as I can discover, by any example or analogy.—πόλει, i.e. πολίται, see Thed. 57, 1021 etc.—ἄφερτον θέλει. This metre though not impossible (see Appendix II) is harsh. Perhaps the order should be changed to προστριμμα θέλει ἄφερτον. The Cod. Farn. has a conjecture, ἄφερτον ένδει, but ἐν- is not good: ἐνδεί (from ἀνατεναί) προς ὑπὸν is possible; but the correct preposition is already given by πρόστριμμα and no compound would be quite satisfactory except προσθελε. —ἐπελε .. ὅρνυν for his pursuit is that of the boy after the flying bird; the hope of the malefactor and his friends that they may escape punishment is futile.—προσβολαῖς Pearson.—τῶν δὲ better taken not as neuter but as masculine, as in the Homeric phrase ἐπιστρυφος ἦν ἄνθρωπων (Od. 1. 177). The plural includes the whole company of the wicked with the original malefactor.—ἄδικον predicate with καθαιρεῖ, which probably has its judicial sense, ‘to condemn’ or ‘sentence’ (not ‘to destroy’ though this is indirectly implied), as in ἡ καθαιροῦσα ψῆφος (Lysias) etc.—Dr. Headlam suggests, but with hesitation, that τῶν (for τῶνδε, see v. 390) may anticipate ἄδικων, ‘those, the wicked’ more Homerico.—On the metrical points see Appendix II.
λιπούσα δ' ἀστοίσων ἀσπίστορας
κλόνους λογχίμους τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλισμούς,
ἀγουσά τ' ἀντίφερνυ 'Ιλίῳ φθορᾶν
βέβακε ρύμφα διὰ πυλᾶν,
ἀτλητα τλάσα. πολύ δ' ἀνέστενον
tὸδ' ἐννέποντες δόμων προφήται;
"ἰω ἰω δῶμα δῶμα καὶ πρόμοι,
ἰω λέχος καὶ στίβοι φιλάνορες.
πάρεστι σιγᾶς ἄτιμος ἀλὸιδορος
ἀδιστος ἀφεμένων ἵδειν.
πόθω δ' ὑπερποντίας
φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν.
εὑμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν
ἐχθεταί χάρις ἀνδρί,
ὁμοτὰν δ' ἐν ἄχναιας
ἔρρει πάσα ' Ἀφροδίτη.
όνειρόφαντοι δὲ πειθήμονες
ἀντ. β'.
pάρεισι δόξαι φέρουσαι χάριν ματαίαν.
μάταν γὰρ εὕτε ἄν ἐσθλά τις δοκῶν ὅραν...

419. ἰω and δῶμα not repeated. 420. πειθήμονες.

413. ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λογχίμους
tε the din of shield and spear, καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλισμούς and the arming of fleets.
tε couples the adjectives ἀσπίστορας and λογχίμους, καὶ couples ναυβάτας ὀπλισμούς
to the whole phrase preceding. See Appendix II.

415—422. See Appendix K.

416. βέβακε. The vowel is lengthened by the following β.

417. πολύ δ' ἀνέστενον: for metre see Appendix II.

423. πόθω...ἀνάσσειν so pining for her that is far beyond sea, the lord of the house may pass for a mere phantom: 'den Herrscher des Hauses wird man nicht für einen machtvollen Herrscher, sondern für ein Schattenbild halten' (Wecklein). The tone, as in the preceding sentence, is still mocking. — I am sorry to abandon for this interpretation the old and familiar one 'in his longing for the lost wife a phantom of her will seem to rule his home'. But this, however poetical, is not in the Greek. It is not naturally conceivable that the subject of δόξει should be other than ό ποθώ. It will no doubt seem to many, as to me, that Dr Wecklein's rendering destroys what they most admire in the passage. And yet it may be indisputably right.

427. ὀμοτὰν ἐν ἄχναιας in the want of the eyes. The question is raised whether the 'eyes' are those of the husband, or of the lost wife, or of the blankly-gazing statues, a question which cannot and must not be answered. The eyes of the husband seek, but no longer
wife. Leaving to her countrymen the din of shield and spear and the arming of fleets, and bringing to Ilium ruin for her dower, she had passed with light step, careless of sin, through the gates. And oft they sighed, the interpreters of the home, as they said, ‘Ah for the home! aha, for the home! Aha, and ah, for the princes thereof, for the husband’s bed yet printed with her embrace. We can see him there, his curses mocked with silence, the parted spouse, the sweetest sight of them all! He shall pine for her that is far beyond sea, the lord of the house, till he seems but a phantom lord. Grace of beautiful idols the husband hateth: in the want of the eyes all the passion is gone. Dream-forms stay with him a while, convincing semblances, and offer delight in vain; for lo, when seeing his joy he vainly would embrace, the vision escapes through his arms,

find, the eyes that were wont to answer, and, for lack of this response, love is for him no more. It is the advantage of the language here that it is ambiguous between ‘absence of eyes’ and ‘hunger of eyes’.—Prof. Bury (Class. Rev. ii. 182) points out that to a Greek ear κόλοσσος (κόλος, δοσο) would suggest eyeless, and supposes the exceptional word to be chosen for this reason. This, for Aeschylus, is quite possible and would even be characteristic.

429. πενθήμονες ... δόξαι persuading visions or ‘convincing’, i.e. visions which compel belief in their reality, cf. Propertius 4. 11. 8t (a departed wife is addressing her husband) ‘sat tibi sinit noctes, quas de me, Paule, fatiges | somniaque in faciem credita saepe mean; | atque ubi secreto nostra ad simulacra loqueris | ut responsurae singula verba ince’, Meleager Anth. Gr. 5. 166 ἀρι μὲν εὐτρήσ τὴν ἀγαμή πόλις | μυθάτον ψυχρά θάλαπτεν ἐν εἰκασία; | ἂρα γ' ἔχει σύγκοντα τὰ ἀδικρα, κατὰυξὶ βελτίων | τυχαπατὴν στήριν ἀμφιβαλλοῦσα φιλεῖ; (Housman, Journal of Philology xvi. 269).—πενθήμονες ms. ‘mournful’.

The alternative interpretations of this, (1) sad-looking, (2) causing sadness, are both unsatisfactory. (1) is pointless, and (2) is contrary to fact and the context. It cannot be said of the visions that πενθήμονες πάρεσι: on the contrary φέρουσι χάριν, though ματαιωσ.—There is perhaps a third possible interpretation, visions of mourning, i.e. visions which arise before the disturbed mind of the mourner. We might cite Propertius for this also: the ghost of Cynthia appears to her lover ‘cum mihi somnum ab exsequiis penderet’ (4. 7. 5). This explanation I should take, if πενθήμονες be retained.

431. ‘For vainly, when, dreaming that he beholds his joy (he would embrace her), the vision slips through his hands and is gone’. The construction, which has given much trouble, is an ellipse, the verb being suppressed εὕφημαι ἔνεκα’ ; Dr Headlam (Class. Rev. xii. 246), citing Theocr. i. 105 άνο λέγεται τάν Κότρυν δ βοικόλοις, Simon. Amorg. 7. 110 κεχυρότος γάρ ἀνθρόπο—οἱ δε γελίνον χαλρε ὁρῶντες, and many passages from the lighter literature. Since this accounts not only for the defective grammar, but also for the vagueness of ἐσθλα (‘the Attic ἄγαθα’, Headlam), the evidence in favour of it is very strong indeed. But it is then imperative to suppose that this whole passage, ν. 419—434, is satirical
or semi-satirical in tone, and is to be assigned to speakers who could use such a tone; which however is probable on other grounds; see Appendix K. All Dr Headlam’s examples (except Soph. O. T. 1288, a peculiar case) are from comedy or the like, and indeed such an apoiosis is plainly incompatible with pure pathos or perfect dignity. Nothing like it appears to occur in Attic tragedy elsewhere.—ευτ’ ἄν ἐς διφασιν δικαίον ὀρᾷ, when he looks to touch the phantom, Housman, citing Eur. frag. 162 ἀνήρ δ’ ὄροντος ἐς Κύπρῳ περιέφυλακτος ἡ τήρησις. The form διφασις is assumed, legitimately, from διφασις.

434. With swings that follow the passing of sleep. The dative κελεύθος, depending on ὁπάδος (cf. ἐπομαι), may be right, though perplexing to the ear. ὁπάδος (Auratus) is the simplest change: the adjectival ὁπάδως might well in Aeschylus take περεός as an instrumental dative.—περεός ὁπαδοῦσα (a) Dobree.—κελεύθος, commonly δοδα, cf. v. 131.

435. ἐφ’ ἐστίας. ἐφεστίας (Voss). This merely expresses the same sense in a more ordinary way. But a poet is at liberty to prefer an unusual way, and we may even think that the cumulation of ἐφ’ ἐστίας (the more intimate expression) upon κατ’ ὁλκόν has a poetical effect.

436. τὰ δ’ ἐστὶ. — 438. πένθεια ἀτησικάρδιος. 441. γὰρ ἐπεμπότεν.
and is gone that instant, on wings that follow the passing of sleep'.

Such the home-sorrow before they parted hence; and other woes they have, woes surpassing yet beyond these. And in every home of those who set forth together from Hellas' land the hearts of their women-folk ache, as ache they must, with all they have to wound them. Whom they sped forth, them they know; but it is not the man they know that comes to his home; it is but an urn and ashes. A merchant in gold is Ares, and bodies of men are his gold: in battle he holdeth his scale. He

sense of ὑπέρβατος, and a redundant, or rather inaccurate, use of the comparative formation, where 'surpassing these' would be logical.

437. τὸ πᾶν δὲ generally, universally, i.e. 'in reference to the commons', as opposed to τὸ ἐρ' ἑταῖς, the domestic concerns of the princes. Cf. τὸ πολύ, τὸ πλεῖστον, etc.—συνορμένοις 'since they (the princes and their army) went away together'. For this 'dative absolute', as it may almost be called, see on Theb. 217 and hereafter on v. 1277.—Ἔλλαδος.

"Ellanov Bamberger for metre, perhaps rightly, but see Appendix II.

438—440. πίνθεα. Formerly translated grief, mourning. But πίνθεα, as from an adjective πνεῦθα, would be a word of irregular formation. Adjectives in -ης are properly formed from words such as πνεῦθος, πνεῦθαι by composition, e.g. δυσπνεῦθης. So τέλος, τελεῖν, ἐντελῆς, but not τέλεια perfection. Nor is the genitive δύσων well constructed.—Translate: there is and must be heart-ache for the women of every house, literally, 'the kinswoman of each man's house is heavy at heart of course'. See Appendix L. ἀληθικάρδιος broken-hearted (Headlam) is preferable to πληθυκάρδιος enduring. —πρέπει is naturally. This is the force here rather than 'is conspicuously'. The use of the verb is akin to its common impersonal use (πρέπει it is fit), and may be approximately illustrated by Pers. 242 πάσης γὰρ τούρκος αἰχμὴ διὰ χερῶν αὐτοῖς πρέπει; 'Is the bow the weapon natural to their hands? and Soph. O. T. 9 πρέπειν πρὸ τῶν θερίων, 'marked as their natural spokesman'. It is this πρέπει to which γοῦν in v. 440 refers: 'she is sad naturally, for indeed she has much to grieve her'.

440. θυγάνει (αὐτῆς) πρὸς ἦπαρ wounds her to the heart.

441. παρέπαυεν (Bothe) those whom she sped on, sent away with cheer and encouragement. The preposition, bearing the same shade of meaning as in παρακελεύων, adds to the irony of the contrast. The loss is accounted for by the similarity of γάρπαρ.—τις ἐπέμψεν Porson (and many texts); but this has less graphic probability. It has been recommended by the necessity of supplying a subject to ἐπέμψεν, which is already supplied under the foregoing interpretation.—See further Appendix II.

442. "Notice the beautiful effect in this pathetic line of the implied antithesis to οἴδει; instead of the familiar and loved face comes back the unknown urn and ashes" (Sidgwick).

445. "The 'dust in the urn' suggests a bold figure to the poet. 'War is a gold-merchant dealing in bodies; he has his balance (holding the scales of fight, a Homeric idea from II. 8. 69, where Zeus weighs fates); he sends back ὑγιακά dust, πυρωθέν and βαρύ burnt and heavy (grievous), like gold-dust, but in another sense; he fills the jar with ashes in place of men'" (Sidgwick).
πυρωθὲν εξ Ἰλίου
φίλουσι πέμπτε βαρὺν
ψῆγμα δυσδάκρυτον, ἄν-
tήνορος σποδοῦ γεμί-
zων λέβητας εὐθέτου.
στένουσι δὲ εὖ λέγοντες ἄν-
δρα τὸν μὲν ὡς μάχης ἔδρις,
tὸν δὲ ἐν φωναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ’—
ἀλλοτρίας διὰ γυναικός·
tάδε σιγά τις βαΐζει,
φθονερὸν δὲ ὑπ’ ἄλγος ἔρπει
προδίκοισιν Ἀτρέιδαις.
οὐ δ’ αὐτὸν περὶ τεῖχος
θῆκας Ἰλιάδος γᾶς
eὔμορφοι κατέχουσιν· ἔχ-
θρά δὲ ἐχοντας ἐκρυφεῖν.
βαρεία δ’ ἀστῶν φάτις σοῦν κότῳ·
δημοκράτου δ’ ἀρᾶς τίνει χρέος.

450. γεμίζων (?) 455. διὰ.

451. εὐθέτου literally ‘convenient’; the old translation ‘easily stowed’ is not far from the implied sense, but a little more than the meaning of the word. The general notion is ‘convenience’, as comes out clearly in εὐθεῖαν to be convenient, handy (εὐθεῖα πᾶσι χρήσασθαι Theophras-
tus), and specially the convenience which comes of being in small compass. So in Hesiod (Thèog. 541) Prometheus, binding the bones of an ox in fat to deceive Zeus, first packs them together, εὐθείας κατέ-
θηκε καλύφας ἄργυτας δημῖ. So in Aesch. frag. 238. shoes for running are termed εὐθεῖοι ἄρθδαι from their ‘convenient’, lightness and other adaptation. (The word appears, as a conjecture of one of the later copyists, in Thèb. 629, but see note there.) Here it is an epithet bor-
rowed from the merchant’s gold-dust, whose convenience of small bulk, ready exchange etc., is a chief part of its value. To the ashes it is applicable only in bitter irony, because, as compared with the living man, they are so small in bulk and so quickly disposed of.—εὐθέτουs (Auratus) is a mistaken change. The ‘convenience’ of the goldsmith’s vessels (i.e. the urns of the dead) is not to the point; still less that they are ‘well-ordered’ (as the word is sometimes rendered).

455. διὰ Hermann.

456. τάδε, i.e. the last words ἄλλοτρι-
as διὰ γυναικός, not of course the praises of the dead. Wecklein marks the natural pause.—βαΐζει sniffs; the word signifies the tones of the dog.—τις some one; this differs from βαΐζουσι and is more pic-
turesque. When the praises of the dead are sounded, some one (an emissary for example of the conspirators) will generally put in the malicious suggestion.—σίγα in
sends from Ilium dust out of his fire, a heavy gold to weeping love, powder that once was a man, now pressed into the compass of a jar.

And they lament them, telling their praises, how skilled was the dead in battle, or how bravely he shed his blood—'And all through another's wife', snarls some one in a whisper: and so there spreads a resentful anger against the quarrel of the sons of Atreus.

Others there by the town, in their own shapes, possess graves in Trojan earth, which hating them doth hide its fair possessors away.

Now when one anger moves a people, there is danger in their talk; it is a bond no less than a covenant sworn.

a whisper. In this and the like passages (see L. and Sc. s.v.) the word retains the effect of its origin and its connexion with σίζω (stem σίζ-) to hiss.

457. φθορέων... 'Ατρείδαις there spreads an indignant grief against the sons of Atreus as foremost in the quarrel. ύπο...ἐρπει i.e. ὑψεῖσθαι. This intransitive use is to be distinguished from that in ν. 282 χαρά μ' ὑψεῖσθαι. For ἐρπεῖν to grow see on Theb. 17.—πρόδικος: cf. ἀντίδικος in ν. 41. The δίκη is the cause of the Atridae against Troy. But the exact sense of πρόδικος is hard to fix, from the rarity of the word and of similar words. It seems here to be invidious; a laudatory or neutral epithet would cumber the sentence. As πρόμαχος is forward in battle, πρόχειρος handy, πρόκειτο ready with the sword, and πρόλεος too ready with talk, so πρόδικος may be forward or too ready in suit, in short litigious, and this would fit well, the point being that the princes are too eager in urging their private interest.—Or it may be 'as the chief persons in the quarrel' (als die Führer des Rachezugs, Wecklein). This has practically the same effect.

460. Others possess graves there by the town in Trojan earth, which hating them doth hide its fair possessors away. The Greek feeling for the beauty of the body is here touched with a strange pathos. εὐμορφοι, though joined with κατέχουσιν, takes force from its antithesis to ἐκρυψεν. —There is irony in κατέχουσιν...ἐχονται, words used naturally of conquerors who occupy land (Sidgwick).—ἐκθρά δ' ἐχοντας Orelli.

463. βαρέα dangerous.—Read συγκότων when united in anger, possessed by a common feeling of indignation. The compound σύγκοτος is similar to συμπάθησι united in feeling, σύναψιν united in blood, σύνορκος bound by a joint oath, and σύμφρων one in mind (ν. 112). It answers to ἀλλόκοτος (properly differing in humour) as συμφρονεῖν answers to ἀλλοφρονεῖν. For the union with a preposition we have ὑπέρκοτος and ἐπίκοτος. The point is that when there is among the people a common indignation (not indignation simply), a conspiracy, or something like it, grows up naturally out of daily intercourse and conversation (φάτις).—With σὺν κότω the meaning must be the same (see next verse), but it is not well expressed.

464: it performs the obligation of a sworn conspiracy: the subject is φάτις, the talk by which malcontents are drawn together.—δημοκράτου δρᾶς a popular conjuration, a curse by which the people bind themselves together; see νν. 1234, 1396. The metaphor κράσις mixture, ap-
μένει δ' ἀκοῦσάι τί μου μέρημα νυκτηρεφές.
τῶν πολυκτόνων γὰρ οὐκ ἀπόσκοποι θεοί. κελαν-
ναί δ' Ἐρινύες χρόνῳ τυχηρῶν ὅπτ' ἀνευ δίκας
παλατικὴ τριβά βίον τιθεῖον ἅμαιρόντω, εὖ δ' ἄι-
στοις τελέσωνος οὕτως ἀλκά·
tὸ δ' ὑπερκόπως κλύειν εὖ
βαρύ. βάλλεται γὰρ ὁσσοις
Διόθεν κεραυνός.

474. ὑπερκόπως.

plied to a league, covenant, or bond, is
foreign to modern language but conse-
crated and characteristic in Greek; and it
is specially applicable to a conjuration or
religious bond. It was in fact more than
a metaphor; it was an actual symbol;
see the ritual of Atlantis as described in
Plato (Critias p. 119). The ten kings
annually renewed their compact with
each other and with the law by first
shedding the blood of a bull over a
pillar, on which was written, together
with the laws, ‘an oath invoking great
curses on whoever should break them
(ὄρκος μεγάλας ἀρὰς ἐπευχὴ ῶνομος τοῖς ἁπει-
θοῦσι),’ and then mixing drops of
the bull’s blood, one for each of them, in a
bowl from which they drank, swearing as
they did so to deal truly with each other
according to the law (κρατήρα κερασαντες
ὕπερ ἐκάστου ὁμμίσον ἐνβαλλον ἁμαρτος
κτλ.). Hence in Herodotus (4. 152) the
beginning of a commercial league is ex-
pressed by the dedication of a κρατήρ, and
we are told that Ἡραλίως ἐς Σαμίων
ἀπὸ τοῦτον τοῦ ἔργου πρότα φιλίας μεγάλαι
συνεργήσαν. So in the Seven a-
gainst Thebes (43) the forlorn hope of
the besiegers bind themselves together till
death by putting their hands while they
swear into blood poured in a shield,
which serves for the occasion the func-
tion of a κρατήρ. See also the oaths of
Priam and Agamemnon II. 3. 269 and
notes there. From this ritual and sym-
bolism came many familiar terms of
compact, such as συγκεράσασθαι φιλίαν,
συγκεκράσατο τω (to be united with an-
other), συμμείξαι συμβόλαια etc. Hence
δημόκρατος ἀρὰ properly describes a ‘con-
juration’ of the people, a covenant of
rebellion solemnized with imprecation;
and the point here is that the bond of a
common indignation irregularly communi-
cated from mouth to mouth may be as
dangerous to authority as a sworn con-
spiration. It will be observed that what
the speakers fear is not the unimaginable
thing which happens, but a popular out-
break against the representatives of the
king.—τίνει χρῆσι ʼit performs (literally
‘pays’) the obligation’. The φάτις
is said itself to do that which it causes to
be done. The metaphor pursues the idea
of a covenant suggested by δημοκράτον.—
δημοκράτον (Porson) gives the sense ‘a
curse decreed by the people.’ The public
curses upon offenders were an important
part of early Greek legislation and were
regularly registered with the laws (see a
And I am expecting in trouble of hearing of some secret of the dark.

For whosoever are guilty of lives, upon them God’s eyes are fixed. The time comes when fortune unmerited turns to misfortune at a touch, when the dark Chastisers take the man’s strength away: and once he is gone, no help for him. Glory too high is dangerous; it is upon the peaks that the bolt of specimen from Teos in Roberts’ Greek Inscriptions No. 142). δημόκρατος ἀρά is therefore a very good expression in itself; but no change is required.

465: μένει...νυκτιρεῖς: apparently intended, notwithstanding the order, to be construed as μέριμνα μοι μένει ἀκούσα τι, ‘my anxiety expects news.’—The order suggests that μοι depends on ακοῦσα, and in ed. I adopted this, with the rendering and I await with boding a voice from the darkness of my thoughts (literally ‘and anxiety waits to hear from me something, which darkness covers’), but I now think this too difficult.

467: οὐκ ἀπόσκοποι ‘they do not look away from them,’ i.e. they watch them with fixed eyes.—ἀπόσκοποι Cod. Farm., but see Appendix II.—τῶν πολυκτῶνων: including those who, like the Atridae, reckon lives lightly in the pursuit of their ends.

471: παλιντυχῇ...βίου when in the course of life his luck is reversed, but the metaphor in τρίβη is uncertain.—παλιντυχεῖ (Scaliger) does not alter the sense.


474: ὑπερκόασις (Grotius) κλάειν εῦ to be praised too much.

475: βαρὺ dangerous, see v. 463.—δροσοῖς: a difficult word, as appears from the thirteen proposed corrections cited by Wecklein. The order and rhythm indicate that the dative depends upon βαλλεια. With βάλλεια, as with many verbs, simple cases sometimes express in poetry relations usually and in prose more accurately given by prepositions. Thus here βαλλεια is used like ἐπιβάλλεια, and the dative stands for the object of aim. Cf. Eur. Phoen. 1385 λάγχαν ἐνώμα στῆματι, Eur. Med. 1285 χέρα βαλεῖν (i.e. προσβαλεῖν) τίκνους and note there. So πρέπειν (Theb. 117) takes the genitive proper to διαπρέπειν. On the other hand that ‘the bolt of Zeus strikes the eyes’ is neither true as a fact nor significant as a figure. To make sense, we want some type of greatness or height, the peaks for instance, which ‘the thunder strikes’, as Horace says illustrating the same topic. Hence the suggestions ὁσσο (Lobeck), ὅσσαν and ὅσσοις (Weil), ὅσαρκοι peaks (Ahrens), κρόσσαι pinnacles (Schneiderwin) etc. But how do we know that ὅσσοι itself does not mean peaks? Not because it means ‘eyes’: every language has many words of double and treble signification. Not by its form, for the very word ὅσος, eyes, is evidence for the likelihood of a word ὅσος (or ὅσον) point, being derived from the stem ὅ-, of which the original notion was sharpness (cf. ὅρας a point and the cognate Latin ac-ies ac-tus). The fact that acies means point or edge, does not prevent it from meaning also sight, line of battle, etc. In such cases of ambiguity, one meaning tends to outst the rest; and so it appears to have been in this case, if the present ὅσσοι is the only extant example of the meaning points or peaks. The meanings discarded from common use will nevertheless be preserved here and there. I would therefore retain ὅσσοι and translate, after Horace, for the bolts of heaven fall upon the peaks, ‘seriuntque summos fulgura montes.’—κάρανα Tucker, Class. Rev. vii. 340.
κρίνω δ' ἀφθονον ὄλβον·
μὴ δ' εἰην πτολιπόρθης
μὴ τ' οὖν αὐτὸς ἄλοις ὑπ' ἄλλων βίον κατίδοιμι.

πυρὸς δ' ὑπ' εὐαγγέλου
πόλιν διῆκει θάνατος·
βάξις· εἰ δ' ἐτητύμως,
τίς οἶδεν; ἦ τοι θεόν ἐστιν, μὴ ψύθος.
Τίς ὡδε παιδιώς ἥ φρενῶν κεκομμένοις,
φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν
νέοις πυρωδέντα καρδιὰν ἐπείτε
ἀλλαγῆ λόγου καμεῖν;
'Ἐν γυναικὸς αἰχμὰ πρέπει
πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ἐυναϊνέσαι.

477. κρίνω: properly 'separate' or 'silt out', and so prefer, choose.—ἀφθονον unenvied: not as commonly 'unstinted, abundant'.

478. μὴ δ' εἴην need not be altered to μὴ τ' εἴην. The connexion is this: 'I choose an unenvied prosperity; and (δέ) I would fain not (μὴ) be a conqueror, nor yet (μὴ τ' οὖν) etc.

480. μὴ τ'...κατίδοιμι: 'nor may I ever know the life of a captive' (?) is said to be the meaning; literally, 'nor may I, myself subdued, see my life subject to another'.—βίον κατίδοιμι, 'eat the bread (βίος sustenance, nourishment) of captivity', Valckenæer; but neither is this satisfactory.


481—493. The alleged 'message of the beacon' must be spreading, though it is quite uncertified and probably false.

483. ἐτητύμως: supply ἀγγέλλωντος διήκει κτλ., ἀγγέλλωντος being supplied from εὐ-ἀγγέλου. The antithesis is between the adverbs εὖ and ἐτητύμως: the signal gives good news, but does it give true?—ἐτητύμως (ἴστιν ἡ βάξις) Auratus.

484. ἦ τοι θεῶν ἐστιν, μὴ ψύθος (sc. ὁ) it is indeed miraculous,—if not false. An expression of contemptuous disbelief. The subject of the sentence in Greek, as in the English, is the general subject, τὸ πράγμα 'the thing'. The force of θεῶς is illustrated by Herodotus (2. 66) on the behaviour of the Egyptian cats, which leap into a fire, πυρκαῖας δὲ γενομένης θεά θρήγματα καταλαμβάνει τοὺς αἰελάορους. The supplement of the verbal ὅ from ἐστι in the principal clause is similar to that of the adjectival ὅ in such cases as Plato Phaedr. 240 D ὤρντι ὅψιν πρεποντέραν καὶ ὅσκ ἐν ὃρᾳ (οἴσαι). It is irregular but seems not impossible. See v. 547.—Of the many changes proposed, that of O. Müller, ἦ τοι θεῶν ἐστιν ἡ ψύθος, is the nearest to the ms. and gives the same sense as the text. Many (e.g. μὴ τι θεῶν ἐστι ἡ ψύθος; Weil) introduce
heaven strikes. Nay, let my happiness challenge no jealousy: and let me be no conqueror, nor see myself a conquered slave.

First Elder. The beacon hath spoken fair, and the report is spreading swiftly among the folk; but hath it spoken true? Who knows? It is indeed miraculous,—if not false.

Second Elder. How can one be so childish, so crazed of wit, to fire with hope at a sudden message of flame, and risk the pain of altered news?

Third Elder. With woman’s impulse it is natural to give indulgent credit before the proof.

the suggestion that the signal is a ‘deception of the gods’ (θεῖον ψάθος). But if the speaker suspects any one, it is the queen: see the next lines.

485—488. τίς ὁδε παιδὸς κτλ. ‘Who is so childish’ etc. i.e. ‘Is there any one so childish?’ This second speaker takes up the hint of the preceding and gives it a stronger turn. The rashness of the queen, in acting upon such an uncertified report, is more than natural. Does she really believe? To which the next speaker answers that it is possible in a woman.

487. νήσις, i.e. νίσις οὖσα ‘when they are fresh’. Why not await confirmation? —πυρεθέντα: for heat as a figure of sanguine rashness cf. Soph. Ant. 87 θερμῇ ἐπὶ ψυχρίσας καρδίαν ἔχεις.—πυρεθέντα...ἔπειτα καμέν i.e. ‘to let his feelings take fire at the first, when he must suffer if the news should change’. For the relation of sense between the participle and the verb, cf. Eur. Med. 1412 οὐς μὴντ' ἐγὼ φόρος ἄφελον πρὸς σοῦ φθορίων ἐπιδείξας ὧν I would I had never beheld, to see them slain by thee.—The clause is consecutive (ὡςτε καμέν) following ὅδε.

489. ἐν...αἰχμα πρέπει ‘with woman’s impulsiveness it is natural’ etc., literally ‘in (a case of) a woman’s impulse’, i.e. where a woman’s impulsiveness comes in. In Latin the corresponding use of in is common; in Greek it is rare, but see Antiphon 5. 59 σὺ δὲ με ἐν ἄφανει λόγῳ (when you have no proof) ζητεῖς ἀπολέσαι.

—To omit ἐν (Scaliger) is simple, but unsafe.

489. αἰχμα impulse or natural temper, regularly formed from the stem of ἀδίσω. For the sense compare θυμὸς spirit with θῶν to rush. Other words of like formation and meaning are ῥομή, ῥόμη. The word occurs also in P. V. 418 Ζεὺς ὑπερρᾳ̣ςα̣ν ἐνδεικνύων αἰχμήν, and Cho. 638 γυναικεῖαν ἀτολμόν αἰχμάν (Blomfield, Paley, and see L. and Sc. s. v.). Here the primitive notion of impulse is more prominent; the same variation occurs in ἀργή, meaning sometimes anger sometimes merely mood.

490. χάριν ἣμνιστεία to give indulgent assent, an assent which is not merited but conceded from the inclination of the hearer. The acc. χάριν is related to ἣμνιστεία as an adverbial or ‘quasi-cognate’ accusative, and expresses that the ‘assent’ is a ‘favour’ or act of partiality.—πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος before proof, where τὸ φανέν ‘the thing being proved’ stands for ‘the proving of the thing’. This use of the participle, though logical, is very rare, having been expelled by the article with the infinitive (πρὸ τοῦ φανέραι).

Similar (if correct) is Thucydides 1. 142 ἐν τῷ μὴ μελετῶμεν ἑξενητώτεροι ἔσωνται ‘from not practising they will have less knowledge’.—Others translate by ‘instead of what is evident’, but the context indicates that πρὸ here is temporal.
491. ἐπινέμεται, lit. ‘is occupied-over, is encroached upon’, an irregular ancient passive: cf. ἐπικρυφθεῖς ‘having a price set upon him’ in Theb. 621, and examples there cited. The application of ἐπινέμεται to flocks which feed (νέμομαι) on a neighbour’s land illustrates the use (Donaldson, Paley); but the metaphor is taken directly from νέμον or νέμεσθαι to occupy land.—ὁ θῆλυς ὄρος i.e. τὸ θῆλυ (woman) regarded as a ὄρος.—γυναικογυρητόν. γυρίω, generally used of sounds sharp and shrill, here suggests the female tone.

494. The herald is seen approaching.

494—5. λαμπάδων ... φρυκτωρίων ... πυρὸς. The accumulation of synonyms has a certain contemptuous effect. ‘We shall not depend on that sort of intelligence any more’.

496. εἰτ’ οὖν ‘whether, as we will suppose’.

498. κατακάρκιοι κλάδοις ἐλαιάς ‘with shade of olive-branch’, i.e. with small branches of olive bound as a wreath upon his head. Cf. Eur. Hipp. 130 λεπτά φάρη ξανθάν κεφάλαν σκίάζεω, and Simon. 150 σκίάζειν ἔθειραν of a chaplet. The speaker does not infer from the wreath the nature of the news (as the priest in Soph. O. Τ. 82 infers the success of Creon’s mission to the oracle from his wreath of bay). What is inferred is that he comes ἀπ’ ακτῆς. The herald is wreathed, as the ship itself was wreathed, in sign of gratitude to the gods for the safe conclusion of a voyage. See Propertius (3. 24. 15) ecce coronatae portum tettigere carinae, | traiectae Syrtes, ancora iacta mihi est. A similar description (κλάδοις νεοδράκτοις κατάκαρκιν διμολο) is given of the newly arrived refugees in the Suppliants (358), the scene of which is laid on the coast of Argolis.

498—504. The thirsty dust, sister of the mire and neighbour, testifies to me this, that...he will either explicitly bid us rejoice or—etc.—What dust is meant, and how does it show that the herald brings some important news which will presumably throw light upon the recent report? The answers may be divided thus: (1) the dust is that which the herald raises; this shows his haste and therefore the im-
Fourth Elder. She is too ready of belief, a boundary quickly passed and encroached upon; but quick to pass away is the rumour that women cry.

First Elder. 'Twill not be long ere we know of this line of torch-bearers, this beacon-chain of succeeding fires, whether they be true, or whether this gladding light, a dream-like visitor, hath beguiled the sense. Yon herald comes from the shore, I see, with his shade of olive branch. And the information of the thirsty Dust, sister and neighbour to the Mire, assures me of this, that with something more than dumb signals of fire-smoke, more than a bonfire of wood burnt you upon a hill, he with a plain word will either explicitly bid us rejoice, or else—but the other word, for the sake of these, shall remain unspoken. May the fair appearance receive a like addition!

The herald's first act, according to custom (see v. 801), will be to salute the town. If his salutation is a χαίρε, as it is (v. 513), well; if not,—. See the same thought differently turned in Soph. Trach. 225 χαίρειν δὲ τῶν κήρυκα προσνεόντως χρόνῳ | πολλῷ φανέρα, χαρτῶν ἐλ ὁ καὶ φέρεται. For the ἀντίστοι λόγος see the entrance of the Persian messenger announcing the battle of Salamis (Pers. 252), ὥ γῆς ἀπάσης Ἀσιάδος πολλῶσι, ... ὡς κακὸν κτλ.

504. ἀποστέργω dislike, i.e. shrink from. But the word is weak, and reasonably doubted. ἀποστερυγώ, Karsten. Perhaps ἀποστέγω i.e. ἀποστυγώ, 'I suppress, I leave unsaid,' by an ἀποστυγειος, στεγειω properly to hold in (of a net, a vessel etc.) is a poetic equivalent for συγγαν or συστάσαν τι to refrain from saying. See Soph. Phil. 136 τί χρῆ στέγειν, ἢ τι λέγειν; what should be said or suppressed?, O. T. 341 ἢ σει γὰρ αὐτὰ κἀν ἐγώ στίγ εἰς τὸν ἀντίον λόγον: the alternative of disappointment.—τοῖς δὲ either (1) with ἀντίον, 'the opposite of this', which however makes the word superfluous; or (2) with ἀποστέγω (if that be read), 'out of respect for these' i.e. τοῖς θεῖοι, the
XO. β', ὃστις τάδ' ἄλλως τῇ ἐπεέχεται πόλει, 
αὐτὸς φρενῶν καρποῦτο τὴν ἀμαρτίαν.

ΚΗΡΤΕ.

ἰὼ πατρῶν ὁδός Ἀργείας χθονός,
δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τῷ ἀφικόμην ἔτους,
πολλῶν ῥαγεισῶν ἐλπίδων μᾶς τυχῶν·
οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἡνχον τῇ ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονὶ
θανῶν μεθέξειν φιλτάτου τάφον μέρος.

νῦν χαῖρε μὲν χθόνι, χαῖρε δ' ἡλίου φαός,
ὑπατός τε χώρας Ζεὺς ὁ Πυθίως τ' ἀναξ,
τοξοὺς ἰάστων μηκέτ' εἰς ἀμακίαν ἐβληθ'.

ἀλς παρὰ Σκάμαυδρον ἐλθον ἀνάρσιος·

νῦν δ' ἀντε σωτηρ Ἰσθι και παϊώνοις,
ἄναξ Ἀπολλον. τοὺς τ' ἀγωνίους θεούς
πάντας προσανδῶ, τὸν τ' ἐμὸν τιμάρον
Ἐρμήν, φίλον κήρυκα, κηρύκων σέβας,

517. παγώνιος.

gods who stand before the palace and to
whom the herald addresses himself below
(vv. 514, 524). The pronoun is explained
by a gesture. For the ‘ethic’ dative
see σωτῷ in Ar. Ran. 1134 ἐγὼ σωτῷ
τῷ δε; ‘am I to pay him the respect of
silence?’ and id. Lys. 530. To abstain
from words of ill omen was a duty in a
religious place or presence (see e.g. Theb.
234).

506—7. ὃστις. Whosoutterthis prayer
with other intentions toward Argos (than
ours), etc. These lines should be given
(as in the ms. and by Wecklein) to a
new speaker. They have most point if
assigned to one of the queen’s partizans
(see on v. 363), accepting the prayer of
the elder but tacitly putting his own sense
upon it.—The ms. gives vv. 494—505 to
Clytaemnestra, vv. 506—7 to the chorus,
and this is defended by Mr Prickard
(Class. Rev. xiv. 434).

508. The herald enters, so utterly
overcome by past suffering and present
emotion that it is some time before he
thinks to tell his news (v. 530), and
indeed till he is addressed (v. 543) he
scarcely seems to be aware that any one
is present. From his first words (ὁδός)
it would seem that he throws himself
down, like Shakespeare’s Richard II.,
to salute the beloved earth, and he thinks
for the moment that he will die on the
spot (μᾶς τυχῶν v. 510). The whole
speech is marvellously powerful.

509. δεκάτῳ φέγγει τῷ ἔτους with
this tenth annual dawn, if the expression
may pass. φέγγεσ ἔτους is an imitation
of the common phrase φέγγεσ ἡμέρας.
See the Introduction p. xl. The present
‘light’ is the dawn of the year as well as
of the day. It is important here and
throughout this scene to remember the
supposed hour, just after sunrise.

510. ῥαγεισών: the metaphor in-
tended is doubtful. A schol. refers it to
anchors, one of which may hold when the
rest break. Others (see L. and Sc. s.v.
A Conspirator. If there be any that agrees not in this patriot prayer, let him reap himself the consequence of his mistake.

[Enter a Herald.]

The Herald. O native earth, O Argos, my country, hail! With the dawn of this tenth year I am come to thee, at last. Many a hope hath broken, but one I have grasped; for I never thought I should die here, in this land of Argos, and have my plot in her well-beloved soil. But now I bless the land, I bless the bright sun, blessed be our Zeus supreme, and blessed he, the lord of Pytho; may he shoot his shafts not upon us any more. Long enough he came in enmity to Scamander's plain. But now be Saviour, O king Apollo, and Healer again! And the gods assembled here, I salute them all, him too, mine own protector, Hermes the Herald, whom heralds love and

render it by wrecked, as a ship, but in the passage cited for this (Demosth. p. 1289) ἅγνυμι does not mean 'to be wrecked', but 'to spring a leak'. Probably the tradition of the scholia is correct.—τυχῶν belongs in any case not to the metaphor but properly to ἄπιθος.

514. ὑπατός ὁ Ζεὺς: supply χαίρετο. The images of these and other deities are before the palace.

515. βέλτι: τίσειαν Δαναοί εἶμαι δάκρον σοισι βλέσσου, prayer of Chryses to Apollo in II. 1. 42.

516. ἄλις...ήλθε long enough he came in enmity to Scamander's plain, as for instance on the occasion just mentioned, βῆ δὲ κατ' ὀπλώματοι καρθέων χωδέως κῆρ, τὸς ἰματισμὸν ἠχων...δ' ἦν νυκτί ἑοκώς. The descents of the gods upon the scene are a striking feature of Homeric story.—The deflexion into the third person, prepared by the nominatives in v. 514, is natural when referring to one not actually present, and has the advantage of sharpening the contrast between the hostile Apollo in the Troad and the friendly Apollo in Argos, the Apollo of the past and the Apollo of the present, by the return to the form of invocation in the next line, where the resumption is marked by a fresh vocative (ἀναξίς Ἀπολλον) inserted for the purpose.—The change of ηλθ' to ησθ' is undesirable.

517. παιώνιος Dobreel.

518. τοὺς ἄγωνιος θεοὺς these assembled gods or gods in assembly. This term occurs also in the Supplices (195 and 248) for 'gods assembled in one place, and having one common worship', κονοβώματι Supp. 228. No other sense is there possible, since the deities are recognized as collectively ἄγωνιοι by newly arrived foreigners, who have not yet identified any of them. There, as here, the reference is to the religious custom of Argos, and among the gods, there as here, are Zeus, Apollo, and Hermes. Probably therefore the sense here is the same and a similar κονοβώματι is represented before the palace of Agamemnon (Wecklein).—Others interpret by ἄγοραι 'the gods of an agora' (ἄγορα). But ἄγοραι was not to Aeschylus the necessary sense, for the κονοβώματι of the Supplices is not in an agora but in a lonely place near the sea.

519. τὸν τε καὶ him. τὸν, like τοὺς in v. 518, is demonstrative (not 'and my defender'). τυμάροιπ: 'defender' because of the religious inviolability attaching to the persons of heraldis, of whose office Hermes, the divine ἱππος, was patron.
524. θάκοι: seats for the king and probably for his councillors before the gate of the palace. Wecklein refers to Hom. Od. 2. 14, 3. 406.—δαίμονες τ' ἀντήλιοι κτλ. and ye deities that look eastward (ah, what a while!), with this bright gladness in your eyes welcome fitly the long-absent king. ἀντήλιοι 'eastward-looking', as in Soph. Αἰ. 805 φάνεροι ἄγκώνας οἱ δ' ἀντήλιοι γητείτε. — ἦ ποι πάλαι: literally 'surely methinks a long while', a parenthetic comment upon ἀντήλιοι, from which the same adjective in a participial sense, quasi ἀντήλια ὄντες, is to be supplied. It must be remembered that in Greek πάλαi eli represents the English 'I have long been'; in English it would be more natural though not absolutely necessary to repeat the verb in the perfect, 'ye that look eastward—and ah! how long ye have looked'. — φαίνονται bright both literally and in the derived sense of 'glad'; a predicate.—τοιούτo ὄμμασιν 'these eyes' i.e. 'your eyes as I now see them'. — κόσμω, dative of manner, combines the ideas of what is due and decent (cf. κοσμίως and see Pind. Pyth. 3. 82 τα μεν ὄν (πῆματα) οἱ δύνανται ἑντοι κόσμῳ φέρεις) and of honour. — The herald has come up from the port by the eastern road, and the king is coming from the same direction. The palace and the gods before it look towards the approach, and at this moment the faces of the statues are full-lit by the level morning rays. They beam (so thinks the man) with joy for the sun-like return of the king (v. 527), as if, through the night of his absence, they had themselves felt it long to be looking seawards and Troywards in vain expectation.—εἴ τοι πάλαι if ever ye did before (Auratus). For other suggestions see Wecklein's Appendix. The text should not be suspected.

527—528. For our prince is returned,
revere, and all the deified, them who sent forth the host, I bid them now receive it, so much as the spear hath spared. Hail royal palace, mansion beloved, and solemn seats, and deities eastward looking (and oh, how long ye have looked!); with this bright gladness in your eyes welcome fitly the king so long away. For our prince is returned, bringing light in darkness to impart unto all that are here, even Agamemnon our king.

But ye must greet him observantly, as is his due, having digged Troy out of the earth with the mattock of Zeus the Avenger, which hath broken her soil to dust. Her foundations cannot be found, or her fixed religious fanes, and all she might grow from is perishing out of the ground. So strong compulsion hath the elder son of royal Atreus put upon Troy, and happiest of mankind he comes home. None hath such claim to requital,

---

bringing light in darkness to impart unto all that are here; he is come, Agamemnon the king. ἡμῖν, a dative possessive or of the person interested (commodi), stands for Argos and the Argives generally, but also more particularly for the army, whom the κῆρυξ specially represents. — καὶ τοῖοι θεῖοι ἄπαντες κοινοὶ literally ‘(to be) shared with all here also’. The words are joined as a ‘proleptic’ predicate with φέρων. The ‘light’ of the victory has come to the army already; now the king is bringing it to Argos, that those at home may have their share. — ύμῖν (Cod. Farn.) is an obvious conjecture and may be right, but it is not necessary.

531. κατείργασαι πέδον her ground has been broken up. For the intensive κατα- cf. καταλέγω destroy, ‘loose to its atoms’, κατάγωμα break to pieces, καταλέγω burn up, etc.

532. Her foundations are undiscoverable and her fixed fabrics of religion, and the seed of her is perishing altogether out of the earth. βωμοί in the full sense (see v. 395) including altars but not these only. We may be reminded that except the religious buildings, a Greek town or fort in the heroic age, and for the most part even till the fifth century, contained little which would not rapidly perish of itself. See the remarks of Thucydides (1. 10) on an imaginary abandonment and decay of Sparta and of Athens, where τα ἔρημα καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τὰ ἑδήφη is a prose equivalent for βωμοί καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματα. — σπέρμα... χθονὸς: lit. ‘and the seed of all the land is dying out of it’. σπέρμα is metaphorical, not literal. The plant is Troy itself, so destroyed that there is nothing to restore. — ἔπατολλυται χθονός. Note the tense. The metaphorical conception, not strictly possible but sufficient for poetry, is that of a soil so pulverised that there is left in it nothing capable of growth, and the vegetable fragments can only decay. ‘Seeds’ could not really be so destroyed, but an olive-yard or a vineyard could. The elaborate devastations of these, practised as a method of war, has perhaps suggested the image. — The whole of this passage is closely imitated from the account of the destruction of Athens by Xerxes (Pers. 811 foll.), put by the poet into the mouth of Darius. The ghost of the king continues thus, τοιγάρ κακῶς δράσαντες οὐκ ἠλάσσονα πάσχοισι, words which lend an ominous significance to the herald’s boasts in vv. 537—538.
τῶν νῦν. Πάρις γὰρ ὁυτε συντελής πόλις ἔξευχεται τὸ δράμα τοῦ πάθους πλέον.

δφλών γὰρ ἄρταγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς δίκην τοῦ ῥυσίου θ' ἡμαρτε καὶ πανώλθησον αὐτόχθων ὅν πατρῶν ἐθρισεν δόμον. 

διπλὰ δ' ἔτισαν Πριαμίδαι βαμάρτημα.

ΧΟ. κηρυκτικόν Ἀχιλλεύ χαίρε τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ. 

ΚΗ. χαίρω· τεθνάναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ θεοῖς.

541. αὐτόχθων.

537—538. τῶν νῦν. Πάρις γὰρ κτῆ.

By the destruction of Troy Agamemnon is left the most glorious of men. The ominous effect of these lines (see on v. 532) is aided by their ambiguity. The intention is that Agamemnon, having more than avenged his honour upon Troy, has now no rival in the world. But it is so worded as rather to suggest that, since Troy has paid in full, it is against her cruel devastator that the balance of sin now lies. For πάροδαι is an indecisive word, limited conventionally to reward or honour, but easily reverting to its proper sense of payment.—Πάρις γὰρ ὁυτε ὁυτε Πάρις ὁυτε. Wecklein suggests ὁδὲ, ὁδὲ Πάρις ὁδὲ, as in Cho. 293, Soph. Phil. 74 etc.—συντελής literally 'joined with him in payment' or 'liability to payment'. Troy in receiving him adopted his act and has shared his punishment. See vv. 405—408. The metaphor suggests a police-custom, such as is common in ancient law, by which a certain society, as a kinship or the inhabitants of a district, is held to payment in property or person for crimes of a member.

539. ἄρταγης τε καὶ κλοπῆς of rape as well as theft, i.e. 'theft aggravated by rape', ἄρταγη meaning violent robbery as contrasted with κλοπῆ, simple stealing. The aggravation naturally increased the penalty and perhaps, under the law or custom to which Aeschylus alludes, also involved the extension of the responsi-

540. τοῦ ῥυσίου θ' ἡμαρτε κτῆ. 'he has not only lost the reprisal'. τὸ βοσίων 'what is taken by way of reprisal', i.e. the stolen thing itself or an equivalent and something besides by way of satisfaction. This would be the penalty for mere theft. For this sense of βοσίων see Soph. Phil. 954 θανών παρεξώ δαίδ' ἄρ' ἐφερομένω...φόνον φόνον δὲ βοσίων τίς τάλας.—It was also specialised to 'that which is taken as a pledge, ενέχυρων', but that idea is here irrelevant.

541. τὸ καὶ πανώλθησον...δόμον 'but hath also ruined and razed his own father's house, it and the place thereof together'. This penalty is to be understood literally and not merely in the metaphorical sense that the fine would ruin the συντελῆς, the family of the criminal. For a heinous act of rapine, a barbarous custom might well prescribe not only, as a matter of course, the extinction of the robber-family, but also the actual literal destruction of their house.—We need not press the parallel to details or ask what was the βοσίων in the case of Troy, whether Helen herself or what else. The point is simply to palliate the sacrilegious barbarities exercised upon Troy by a precedent from private law, showing that when the crime is aggravated, the penalty may be (1) made very severe and (2) extended beyond the offender. The
not one in the live world. As for Paris and his people, bound with him to payment, they cannot boast a balance of damage done. Sentenced for theft and rape too, he hath not only lost the reprisal, but also hath ruined and razed his very father’s house, it and the place thereof together. Two-fold the loss the sons of Priam have paid.

An Elder. Joy to thee, herald of the coming Achaean host!

Herald. .................

custom cited is itself barbarous and antiquated, and the plea would appear to an audience of Aeschylus’ day, as the purpose requires, worthless. It is in fact self-condemnatory, for the real object of the sacrilege committed at Troy was ἄρτατη (see vv. 350 foll.).—αὐτόκοθον’ ὅν or αὐτόκοθονον (?). I prefer on the whole Blomfield’s reading.—ὅν ‘his own’ is surely not, as Hermann says, superfluous but much to the point.—αὐτόκοθονα: here ‘even to the site on which it stood’, literally ‘ground and all’; cf. αὐτῷπρομνος, αὐτῷπρομς etc.—For αὐτόκοθονον Hermann makes the subtle defence that the form αὐτόκοθονος is used deliberately in order to distinguish this meaning from the common αὐτόκοθων indigenous. But the poet saw, for instance, no such difficulty in ἀφόνος not invidius, v. 477.

541. διπλά ἐτσαν θαμάτια they have paid the double of the loss, another analogy from the law of theft, but from a more humane jurisprudence. The anticlimax is noticeable and betrays the weakness of the plea.—ἐτσαν θαμάτια: θαμάτιον seems to occur only here and perhaps in Pers. 679 where both reading and interpretation are uncertain. For the rendering loss argues here the occurrence of ήμαρτε lost just above.—Another interpretation, τὸν μισθὸν τῆς θαμάτιας, is given by the schol. and would resemble εὐαγγέλια reword for good tiding (Sidgwick), though εὐαγγέλια is a regularly formed secondary adjective from εὐαγγέλος, so that the analogy is imperfect. —The herald, who, it will be observed, has not addressed any one except the gods, stops abruptly and remains absorbed in his feelings till one of the elders addresses him.

543. τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ i.e. τῶν στρατευομένων. The preposition is used in the pregnant manner which may be called regular in Greek: the description of the army itself is coloured by the fact that the herald comes from it.

544. This line is hopeless. οὐκέτ’ ἄντερῳ (h and its scholia) is probably conjecture; τεβνάαι (for τεβνάω) is a pigment.—As it is hard to see a reason for θεοῖς, we may affirm perhaps (with Hermann, Weil) that part of the line was χαῖρω...τεβνάαι δ’ ὦκ ἄντερῳ, and that θεοῖς is merely a patch.—The modern restorations seem to assume that τεβνάαι οὐκ ἄντερῳ or οὐκέτ’ ἄντερῳ could mean I will not refuse to die. But τεβνάαι, though for some purposes interchangeable with θανεῖν, should in this connexion give the meaning I will not deny that I am dead. This however is not an impossible meaning, for the point may turn on the use of χαῖρε (in funerals, epitaphs etc.) as an address to the dead. The poets often play with the senses of this word. Thus e.g. χαῖρω; τί χαῖρω; τὸ τεβνάαι δ’ οὐκ ἄντερῳ (where χαῖρο is deliberate subjunctive) would mean ‘Be glad! Thou needst not say be glad. Though indeed the greeting of the dead suits me well enough’, being thus exhausted with past misery and present joy. Both the play on χαῖρε and the play on τεβνάαι may be illustrated from the farewell scene between Polyxena, going to her death, and Hecuba (Eur. Hec. 426 foll.): Pol. χαῖρ’ (farewell), ὄ τεκνοσά, χαῖρε Κασ-
XO. ἔρως πατρῶς τῆς δε γῆς σ’ ἐγύμνασεν. 545
ΚΗ. ὠστ’ ἐνδακρύειν γ’ ὄμμασιν χαρᾶς ὑπὸ.
XO. τερπνῆς ἀρ’ ἰστε τῆςδ’ ἐπῆβολοι νόσου.
ΚΗ. τῶς δῆ; διδαχθείς τοῦδε δεσπόσω λόγου.
XO. τῶν ἀντερώτων ἰμέρῳ πεπληγμένος.
ΚΗ. ποθεῖν ποθοῦντα τήνδε γῆν στρατόν λέγεις. 550
XO. ὡς πόλλ’ ἀμαυρᾶς ἐκ φρενός σ’ ἀναστένειν.
ΚΗ. πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον; τοῦτ’ ἐπὶ στύγος στρατῷ;
XO. πάλαι τὸ σιγὰν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω.
ΚΗ. καὶ πῶς; ἀπόντων κοιράνων ἐτρεῖς τινάς;
XO. ὡς νῦν—τὸ σὸν δὴ—καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴν χάρις. 555

551. φρενός ἀναστένειν.
554. τυράννων.
555. ὅν.

σάνδρα τὲ ὤ. Ἔχε. χαίρονσον ἄλλοι, μητρὶ δ’ οὖκ ἔστω τοῦτο (others may take comfort, but not a mother)... Pol. ζῆ (Πολιδώρας) καὶ δακρύσις ἐμα συγκληθεῖ τὸ σὺν. Ἔχε. τέθυκ’ ἐγώει πρὸ τιν ναίν κακῶν ὑπὸ. See also Eur. Heli. 286 τὸς πράγμασιν τέθυκα, id. Or. 1028 ἀλὶ ἀπ’ Ἀργείας χερὸς τέθυκα (I have been tortured). This, or something like it, would also give its proper sense (I admit) καὶ οὐκ ἀντερώ. It must not however be taken as certain even if ἀντερῶ stands for ἀντερῶ. It may equally stand for ἀντερῶ, signifying to be jealously in love with death, 'jealous of the buried dead', and the reply rather points to something of this kind.

545. ἐγύμνασεν hath tortured thec: see P. Υ. 605 πυρὶ με φλέξων ἡ χθωὶ καλυψαν, μηδὲ μοι φωνῆσις εὐγλατῶν. ἅδην με πολύπλανο πάλαι γεγυμακασι, and Soph. Trach. 1083.

546. ἐνδακρύειν: literally 'weep into it', i.e. the earth. The man is still kneeling.

547. Then learn that it is a sweet anguishing which ye have taken; because, as they explain, love returned is sweet.—τερπνῆς predicate.—τῆςδὲ νόσου: ἔρωτος.—ἐπῆβολοι: cf. v. 825 τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσων.—Hermann defends ἑστε, taking ἐπῆβολοι as equivalent to a participle (ἐπῆβολοι ὄντες) and it is characteristic of Aeschylus to use adjectives participially.—ἡστε (twre, irregular form, Ahrens), ἔτε h.

549. πεπληγμένος. As this line explains and continues v. 547, consistency would require πεπληγμένοι (Tyrwhitt). But according to the practical grammar of speech and poetry, as distinguished from logical theory, there is no objection to the singular. From the singular σε of v. 545 the speaker deflects, without any reason except the caprice of thought, into the plural λεστε of v. 547 and then back again to the singular in v. 549. Either might have been used throughout indifferently. The re-appearance of the singular gives the feeling a more personal turn. To change it is to stiffen the movement of life. See also next note.

551. 'Aye, and oft sighed for thee from a weary heart'. φρενὸς σ’ (Boissonade) is preferable technically and in sense to φρενός μ’ (Scaliger).—ἀναστένειν to sigh for (cf. ἀνακαλέω) is commonly used of the absent or the dead. Supra 417 and Eur. Or. 156 ἤτι μὲν ἐμπυνήει, βραχ’ δ’ ἀναστένει are among the few examples in tragedy of an intransitive use: in id. Hec. 186 ἴ με δισφημεῖς...
Eld. Hast thou longed for thy native land with a torturing love?
Her. Aye, so that for joy mine eyes weep tears upon it.
Eld. Then learn that 'tis a sweet languishing ye have taken.
Her. How so? I need a lesson to master thy saying.
Eld. As being struck with a passion not returned.
Her. Argos, thou sayest, pined for her pining soldiers.
Eld. So pined, as oft to sigh for thee from a weary heart.
Her. Whence this melancholy? Was there yet this distress reserved for us that have fought?
Eld. For long past I have used silence to prevent hurt.
Her. But how so? Wast thou, the kings being away, in fear of some one?
Eld. So much that now, as thou sayest, e'en death were grateful.

τι ποτ' ἀναστέεις; the object (με) is continued and the verb means (see the context) to call as if dead.—For the interchange of στρατῶν and σε, see previous note.

552. The herald, at first merely puzzled, begins to perceive that something is wrong.—ποθέν...στρατῷ; Whence this melancholy? Was there yet in this reserve to distress us that have fought?, an exclamation of disappointment, 'Have we come home only to find more trouble here?' For ἐπινάω 'to be destined, appointed' see Hesiod, Ὀ. 114 (the subject is mankind in the golden age) ὡστε θεοὶ δ' ἔξων ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχωτε, | νοσάμων ἀπερ τε πάνων καὶ δίζωσι, οὐδὲ τι δειλῶν | γῆρας ἐγὼ (no miserable old age awaited them), αἰεὶ δὲ πίθας καὶ χείρας ὑμῶν | τίρτωσι' ἐν θάλασσα κτλ. See also the cognate ἐφεστάναι in Hom. Ι. 12. 322 foll. (if to shun war had been to live ageless and deathless, it would have been well to shun it), νῦν δ' ἐμπιστή γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστάναι θανάτου | μυριαί, ἣς ὅλις ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν ἄδικ' ὑπαλώκας, | ἰμεν.—στύγος (cf. v. 563) is a further predicate, and upon this rather than upon the verb depends στρατώ.—If this line be taken (so ms.) as one sentence, στρατῷ means the people, i.e. the Argives at home, a use possible in itself but hard to reconcile with this context.—ποθέν see further Wecklein, Appendix.

553. I have long used silence to prevent hurt (φάρμακον βλάβης like ἀκος ὑπνοῦ in v. 17), a reply ambiguous between the senses 'Least said is soonest mended', and 'Things have been so with us that we dared not even speak'. It thus answers, while it avoids, the question ποθέν τὸ δίσφρον;

554. καλ πώς; In what sense? See preceding note.—κοράνων h, probably by conjecture. τυράννων (f) may have sprung from a gloss.

555. 'So that now, in thine own phrase, I would right gladly even die' (?).

—τὸ σῶν δὴ alluding to τν. 510—512, and, perhaps also to v. 544 as it originally stood.—ὡς (Scaliger) seems probable. The general sense is fairly clear.—Here the herald, eager to be rid of a disagreeable subject which seems to lead to nothing definite, breaks off into a more congenial theme. One plain word might have saved the king. But the elders cannot make up their minds.
KH. εὖ γὰρ πέπρακται, ταῦτα δ’ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ.
τὰ μὲν τις εὖ λέξεις εὐπτετῶς ἔχειν,
τὰ δ’ αὐτὲ κατιμομφαῖ. τίς δὲ πλὴν θεῶν ἀπαντᾷ ἀπῆμων τὸν δι’ αἰῶνος χρόνον;
μόχθους γὰρ εἶ λέγομι καὶ δυσανίας (τί δ’ οὖν στένοντες οὐ λαχώντες ἦματος μέρος;).

556—587. This remarkable speech is irregular throughout, even extremely irregular, but not with the irregularity of accidental defacement. Its aberrations are all such as distinguish popular rhetoric from educated rhetoric, and should be compared with the speeches of the Nurse in the Choephoroi (where see notes). We have a man of the people wrought to the highest pitch of emotion, pouring out in a voice half choked with sobs and tears a story which is pathetic just because the misery of it is vulgar and commonplace. We should not expect from him the stateliness of Agamemnon or the subtlety of Clytemnestra.

556. Aye, all is well, well with allowance for the time, literally 'but that in a long time'. This is irregular, but precisely analogous to the common use of καὶ ταῦτα 'and that'.—It gives a better point to take these words separately, though if they are attached, as usual, to the next line the meaning is practically the same.

557—559. A man must speak well of his fortune, though some of it be not so good. Only a god can be without trouble all his time: literally, 'Let a man praise some things, that they are fortunate, and other things, though objectionable', i.e. if he gets good, let him take the worse with it and call it all good together.—εὖ λέξεις: the optative is used as a kind of imperative. In the older language this is common both in general and in particular injunctions, e.g. Od. 18. 141 τῷ μῆτις ποτὲ πάμπαν ἀνήρ ἀθεμίστος εὖ, | ἄλλ’ ὅγε στιγὴ δόρα θεῶν ἤχοι I would have a man not be lawless, Od. 4. 735 ἀλλὰ τις ὄρθρως Δαλόν καλέσει γέφοντα, etc. (See Monro, Homeric Grammar, § 299; Kühner, Gr. Gramm. II. § 395-7.) It survives in later writers chiefly in maxims, such as this, v. 1375, and Aristoph. Vesp. 1431 ἔρεις τις ἦν ἔκαστος εἰδεῖ θέχην.

In Pindar Pyth. 10. 21 θέδω εἰς ἀπῆμων κέρα it must be left to a god to have an untroubled heart we have a construction somewhat similar, and Pindar may be quoting the latter part of the same proverb, which Aeschylus (vv. 558—559) here turns in his own language.—εὖ λέξεις εὐπτετῶς ἔχειν: literally 'say in their praise that they are fortunate'; cf. v. 453 εὖ λέγοντες τὸν μὲν ὡς μάχης ἀδίς (στίς).—εὖ...εὐπτετῶς. The assonance of εὖ is a favourite with the Attic poets, occurring not only where the word is repeated in exactly the same sense (as in v. 505, and Supp. 225 εὖ τ’ ἐπεμψε εὖ τε δεξασθῶ), but also where the sense is only imperfectly parallel, as here and in Eum. 869 εὖ δρώσων εὖ πᾶσχονον εὖ μιμωμένη, and even where it is not parallel at all, as in Soph. Trach. 296 διός δ’ ἐνίκη τοῦτοι εὖ σκοπούμενοι ταρβεῖν τὸν εὖ πράσασσων μὴ σφαλη ποτε.—ἀν λέξειν Auratus.

560—572. The gist of this long period is this, 'We have suffered much, but all's well that ends well'. Paraphrased in logical form, it might run thus: 'For if I were to reckon all our miseries and privations, whether in the ships (560—562), both by night (560—561) and by day (561—562), or on land (563—567), where the neighbourhood of the enemy
Her. Yes, we have done well every way, well, for the length of time. A man must speak well of his fortune, though part be not so good. Only a god can be without trouble all his time. For were I to count our sufferings in bad quarters, the narrow and comfortless berths (and in the day-time miserable for want of

aggravated (563—564) the pains of exposure to the damp of the ground and the air (565—567), if I counted up our various distresses from extreme cold to extreme heat (568—571), [it would make a heavy total: but] why complain of what is past (572)? etc. But the hypothetical clause loses itself in parentheses and calculations, starting again more or less in its track at v. 568, and the answering clause disappears altogether in the abrupt transition at v. 571.

560. δυσεύαλδας bad quarters for sleeping; see αὐδίσεσθαι. He divides these under the heads of ‘ship-quarters’ and ‘land-quarters’, marking this by the antithesis τὰ δ’ αἴτε χέρωφ. The ships, drawn up on shore and protected by a rampart, formed part of the camp. It is of this use that he speaks as well as of the voyage.

561. The miseries of the ships are again divided into ‘night’ and ‘day’, night appearing in κακοστρώτοις (uncomfortable as beds) and day being thrown in parenthetically.—παρίξεις (?): apparently something like ‘berths’, from παρήκειον to pass into (?). The interpretation of the scholia παραδομαί (passes) does not seem to suit the context.—παρίξεις (Wecklein) is a better form.

id. τι δ’ οὐ...μέρος; Two questions must be distinguished: (1) the construction irrespective of the case of the participles, (2) the nominative case. Irrespective of the case, if, that is, we assume the reading στένοντας οὐ λαχώτας, there is no difficulty: the context supplies both ἐλ Μέγαμα and the pronoun ἡμᾶς, and the translation is ‘while in the day-time we had—every privation to lament’. The negatives, as Wellauer perceived, are not parallel, nor are the participles. τι οὐ; stands as usual for πᾶν, and the rest of the sentence is constructed exactly as if πᾶν were written. οὐ λαχώτας is literally ‘not having got’ i.e. ‘being without’ as in Eur. Andr. 385 λαχώδα τ’ ἀβλια καὶ μὴ λαχώδα δυστυχίας καθισταμαι with what is offered I must be miserable and without it unhappy. For the use of the negative term where English would prefer a positive (privation) see Demosth. 19. 17 μη οὖν...ὦν οὔτοι ἐξπατήσει μὴ δῶτω δίκην Let him not escape punishment for the deceptions practised on you. The accusative τι οὐ (i.e. πᾶν) depends not upon στένοντες but upon οὐ λαχώτας. For the order of the words see P. V. 601 τί ποτε ταῖσθα ἐνεπεκαίνατο οἰνούς ἀμαρτώσαν ἐν πημονάις: Of what sin didst thou convict her (τί-ἀμαρτώσαν οἰνοὺς) that thou hast reduced her to this misery? Thus τι οὐ στένοντες οὐ-λαχώτας stands for πάντων στένοντες ἀμαρτώσαν bewailing the privation of everything. Doubtless a disciplined stylist could not have used so uncouth a form of words, but neither would he have spoken any one of the sentences justly and artistically placed in this speech. Lastly in ἤματος μέρος the accusative is perhaps that of duration (like βίων in v. 1141), and the genitive ἤματος is not partitive but the adjectival genitive ‘of equivalent’ as in Eur. Med. 430 ἄμετραν ἄνδρων τε μοῖραν ‘our (i.e. the female) division [of mankind] and the male’. So ἤματος μέρος is ‘the diurnal portion’ of time (υἱ. 556, 559), and is contrasted with ἐνυκτὸς μέρος ‘the nocturnal portion’, implied but not expressed in what precedes, as τὰ δ’ αἳτε χέρωφ is contrasted with the unexpressed τὰ μὲν ἐν ναυοῖς.—Mr W. R. Paton (Class. Review, Vol. VII. p. 150) citing Plutarch de Defectu Oraculorum, p. 414 A, takes ἤματος μέρος...
tos μέρος as ‘(it is) the work (portion) of a day’ or ‘a day’s work’, the apodosis to εἶ λέγομι. This seems more than possible, but would leave τί...λαχώντες more abrupt than ever; see Mr Paton’s further remarks.—There remains the deferred question as to the nominative case in the participles. The English editors mostly retain it, Paley adding boldly and truly that it is “used without regard to any regular construction”. For a special purpose, artistic speech follows real speech and defies grammatical analysis. It is an extreme case of construction ‘according to the sense’. The soldiers, as subject of the sufferings, are thought in the nominative, if we may so express it, throughout: the whole period, if reduced to symmetry, could naturally be turned so as to have ήμας for the general subject, thus: εἰ λέγομι δοσα εμοχθούμεν ἐν τε ταῖς ναυσὶν αἰλιζόμενοι, στρώματα ἔχοντες οὐχ ἴκανα, εἰπᾷ τῇ γῇ ἐτὶ δευτέρα, ὡς πρὸς τῇ πόλει στρατοπεδεύμενος, κτλ. Therefore, in the one place in which the soldiers are mentioned, the appropriate nominative is put in simply κατὰ όναμος, and we have a specimen, perhaps unique, of Greek as it was actually talked.

563. τά δ' αὐτε χέρσω: supply εἰ λέγομι,—καὶ προσήν...τείχεσιν: a parenthesis, such as in a more regular style would be expressed by a relative clause, ‘where there was the additional distress of constant danger from the neighbouring enemy’.

565. ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ κτλ. We go back to τά χέρσω.

565—567. Another clause radically inaccurate in logic and grammar, though perfectly intelligible. The remark of Schneidewin on the masculine τιθέντες, that it relates in the speaker’s mind to ὅμβροι (rain), is true, but only part of the truth: εἰ οὐρανός relates to this same ὅμβροι, and so does κατέφεκαζον (drizzled down), and the whole sentence, except the words κατὸ γῆς λειμώναι ὅμβρου. The rain is from first to last the subject in the mind, and the sentence would have run regularly thus, εἰ οὐρανός γὰρ ὅμβροι κατέφεκαζον κτλ. But the words εἰ οὐ- ρανός suggest by antithesis ‘the dew from the earth’, which is thereupon thrust in interjectionally; and after this, the subject ὅμβροι being by the antithesis sufficiently given to thought, the sentence proceeds without it, literally thus, ‘from the sky (and off the earth marsh-dew too) it drizzled down’ etc. In such a fashion
everything), and other miseries by land (and there it was worse, our camp being close to the enemy's wall), how the sky rained, and the dews from the marshy ground, ever rotting our garments and 'breeding foul life, upon us: or were one to count the winter's cold, made so intolerable by the snows of Ida that the birds fell dead, or the heat, when in his noon-day rest the sea sank windless and waveless to sleep—but what need to grieve for these things? The pain is past; so past for the dead, that they care not so much as to rise up any more. Ah why should we count the number of the slain, when the living suffer by

mutatis mutandis men frequently speak in every language, but do not generally write.

566. ἐμπέδων σίνως ἱσθημάτων. The rotting of the dress from constant wetting is mentioned not so much for itself, as for the horrible diseases to which it leads and which are specified more particularly in the next words. 

tιθητες ἐνθηρον ἀράχα putting evil life into the hair, or in plain words 'breeding vermin'. As in Soph. Phil. 698 (ἐνθηρος ποτός εὐνεωντομ foot) ἐνθηρος is a poetic equivalent for the medical term τεθηρωμένος (see L. and Sc. s. vn.), so here it represents the same term in another sense (see L. and Sc. s. vn. τρηπω, ἠλατω). The θρις is the hair of the whole body, not merely of the head and face.—The interpretation 'shaggy, beast-like' (1) does not satisfy the formation, and (2) is here out of place. The man is speaking of real, not fanciful, miseries. As to the dignity of tragedy, Aeschylus treats it on proper occasions with perfect indifference, and lets his soldier describe the torments of the camp, as his nurse the plagues of the nursery (Cho. 753), for what they are, without attempting to conceal what it is his very purpose to express.

568—572. See above on v. 560.

572. The abruptness of these exclamations is aided by the rhythm, the punctuation acting against the caesura.

573. τοῖς µέν: to this irregularly answers ἦµιν δὲ...µικὰ τὸ κέρδος, v. 578, quasi παροίχεται δ' ἡµῖν ὡστε µικὰν τὸ κέρδος. The trouble is over for all, for the dead completely, for the living, in that they can balance against it their triumph.

574. τὸ...µέλεν so that they care, or in the sense that they care, grammatically an 'accusative in apposition to the verbal action' of παροίχεται. That 'they care not' and that 'the trouble is over' are two aspects of the same fact.

575—577. Another parenthesis. The dead have their gain, and perhaps an advantage over the living.—Why should we count up the number of the slain, when the living must suffer the persistence of fortune's cruelty? The two clauses are correlative and make up one conception between them. In English we indicate such a relation by making one clause dependent. The point is that the inevitable pain of the living is inconsistent with the lamenting of the dead or, as it is put, with the counting of the number of them: and the question τι χρή; protests against the unreasonableness of the two things taken together.—τόχησ παλιγκότου literally 'from fortune being persistently cruel', gen. absolute. παλιγκότου has its full signification (see L. and Sc. s. vn.). Fortune is the harassing disease from which we escape by death. The living ἄλγει, because such is the law of fate; the question is why, this being so, we should ask 'how many are dead?' and not rather 'how many are living to feel?'
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τὸν ζωντα δ' ἀλγεῖν χρῆ τύχης παλιγκότου; καὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν συμφοράς καταξιῶ. 580

ημῖν δὲ τοὺς λοιποῖν Ἀργείων στρατῶν νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρεῖν ὦς κομπάσαι τῷ εἰκὸς ἥλιον φαίει ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης καὶ χθονὸς ποτομένως,

“Τροίην ἐλότης δῆτορ’ Ἀργείων στόλος θεοῖς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ’ Ἐλλάδα δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν ἀρχαῖον γάνος”. 585
tοιαῦτα χρή κλύντας εὐλογεῖν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς: καὶ χάρις τιμήτεται Δίὸς τάδ’ ἐκπράξασα. πάντ’, ἔχεις λόγον.

ΧΟ. νυκώμενος λόγουσιν οὐκ ἀναίνομαι.

αἰ γὰρ ἦβα τοὺς γέροντας εἰ μαθὲν.

δόμοις δὲ ταῦτα καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρα μέλεν εἰκὸς μάλιστα, σὺν δὲ πλονὔζειν ἐμὲ. 590
dομοι δε ταυτα και κλαμανηστρα μελεν eikos malista, sun de ploountizein eme.

590. Κλυταιμνήστρα.

577. To have done with chance is itself, methinks, right acceptable. πολλὰ χαίρειν συμφοράς, literally ‘to receive the dismissal of chance’, πολλὰ χαίρω being the passive corresponding to the formula of dismissal πολλὰ χαίρω οἱ πολλὰ χαίρειν ἔλεγο I dismiss, will have no more to do with; cf. Soph. Ο. Τ. 556 νῦν πᾶι χαίρω now all wish me joy. What is said there by Prof. Jebb, that “the phrase has been suggested by χαίρε μου, but refers rather to the meaning than to the form of the greeting”, is true here also; ‘to be dismissed to happiness’ is the meaning in full.—καταξιῶ Ι hold acceptable, like ἡξιῶ I do not refuse (Soph. Ο. Τ. 944), only stronger. It is the opposite of ἑπαξιῶ I reject. See Theb. 654.—καὶ also: those who live are happy in one way, χαίρουσι συμφοράς in one sense, but the dead, who πολλὰ χαίρουσι, are happy too.—συμφοράς. The interpretation ‘I bid fortune begone’ is possible only if we read, with Blomfield, συμφοράς, and would rather require κελεῦω.

578. ‘And we that remain, though we have suffered more and longer than the dead and have not received their complete discharge, may still rejoice on the whole, when we consider the everlasting and world-wide glory which redounds to our city’.

580—587. These lines are difficult and, if correct, must have been explained by something conventional in the connotation of the language. For a discussion of the details, see Appendix N.—ὡς causal, since, considering how, as in Theb. 351 διώκουσι δὲ κανονισμῶν, ὡς ἐλπὶς ἐστὶ νῦκτερον τέλος μολὼν.—καταξαμα, as the style and honours of a person might be announced before him.—τοῦτο: for the dative with εἰκός, which is comparatively rare, cf. Eur. Σιμφ. 40 πάντα γὰρ δέ’ ἀφεῖνας γνωστὲ πάσσεσθε εἰκόσ.—ποτῳμένοι, if correct, agrees with the dative ἦμῖν
fortune's persistency? A full release from chance is also, say I, something worth. And for us who are left of the Argive host, the gain on the balance overweighs the hurt, seeing that you bright sun may proclaim in our honour, winging our fame over land and sea, 'Troy in old time was won by an Argive armament: and these are the spoils which, to the glory of the gods throughout Hellas, they nailed upon the temples for a monumental pride'. Hearing this, men must needs praise Argos and them that led her host; and the grace of Zeus that wrought it all shall be paid with thanks. And so I have said my say.

Eld. Defeat in argument I do not deny. To be teachable is a thing that ages not with age. But the household and Clytaemnestra, whom this news should most nearly interest, must share the gain with me.

supplied from v. 578 and constructed as a dative of ‘the person interested’, literally ‘may proclaim for us flying’. For the metaphor cf. Pind. Nem. 6. 50 πέτασαι δ' ἐπὶ τε χεθάνα καὶ διὰ δαλασσας τηλθεῖς δυν' αὐτῶν. Here by a bolder figure the subject of the fame is said to ‘fly abroad’ as the fame is spread, a stretch of language which may be illustrated from Pindar Isthm. 3. 28 ἀντεβείς δ' ἐσχάταιον ὁλοθέν στάλασιν ἀπ' τοὺς’ Ἡρακλαίας ‘by their high feats of valour they have reached from home to the ends of the world’, i.e. their renown has gone so far (and Theognis 237 σοι μέν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἐδωκα σὺν οἷς ἐπ' ἀπελόνα πάντων πωτής καί γῆν Wecklein).—Τροιην κτλ. Offerings from the spoil would be dedicated in places of religion with inscriptions, of which the sense is here paraphrased, naming the dedicators and the occasion. These the sun will proclaim, that is to say, they will be read with each returning day, as those on the palace are now legible in the light of this present morning. Thus the name of Argos will ‘fly over land and sea’ to the end of time.—Τροιην: the archaic (Ionic) form may be intentional in the language of an ‘ancient’ inscription. See on Theb. 259, 447, 519, 590.—δήποτε (ali quando) may mean either ‘at last’ or ‘formerly’ as Paley says. The last seems the better.—ἀρχαῖον γάνος literally ‘an ancient pride’; the praise is worded as it will be spoken a long time hereafter.—πάντ' ἔχει λόγον a formula of conclusion, indicating here that the thesis εὐ πέπρακτα (v. 556) is made out. The elders assent.—See further Appendix N.

588. νικάμενος λόγοστιν. The eloquent proof of the herald that ‘all is well’ has of course not really touched τοῦ δύσφρον (v. 552), which he does not understand; but this is not the moment to explain, as Clytaemnestra is seen approaching.—The words and context require us to refer νικάμενος λόγοστιν to the argument of the herald, not to the proof of the victory, though this may also be in the speaker's mind.

589. ‘The capacity for learning is not one of the faculties which is lost with age’. εὕ παθεῖν docility (cf. εὐμαθῆς) is the subject of ἣσθ—τοῖς γέρουσιν for, as we should say in, the old.—ἡσθ (ἐστι) τοῖς γέρουσιν (Margoliouth).

591. σοῦ δὲ πλουτίζειν ἐμὲ and my gain should be shared with them, literally ‘and it (the tale, τάσιά) ought (έκδοσι) to enrich me with them (and not alone)’. The emphasis is on σοῦ and the clause
ΚΑ. ἀνωλόλυξα μὲν πάλαι χαρᾶς ὑπὸ,
ὅτ' ἡλθ' ὁ πρῶτος νύχιος ἄγγελος πυρός,
φράζων ἄλωσιν Ἰλίου τ' ἀνάστασιν.
καὶ τίς μ' εὑρίστων εἰπεν. "φρυκταρῶν δίᾳ
πεισθείσα Τροίαν νῦν πεπορθῆσθαι δοκεῖς;
ἡ κάρτα πρὸς γυναικὸς αἴρεσθαι κέαρ".
λόγοις τουότοις πλαγκτὸς οὐ' ἐφαυνύμην.
οἷς δ' ἔθνοις καὶ γυναικεῖς νόμοι
δολολυγμὸν ἄλλος ἀλλοθεν κατὰ πτόλιν
ἐλασκον εὐφημοῦντες ἐν θεῶν ἔδρας
θυνήφαγον κοιμῶντες εὐώδη φλόγα.
καὶ νῦν τὰ μάσσω μὲν τί δει ὦ' ἐμοὶ λέγειν;
ἀνακτος αὐτοῦ πάντα πεύσομαι λόγον.
οἴπως δ' ἁρίστα τὸν ἐμὸν αἰδοῖον πόσιν
σπεῦσω πάλιν μολόντα δέξασθαι (τί γὰρ
γυναἰκὶ τοῦτον φέγγος ἦδον δρακεῖν,
ἀπὸ στρατείας ἄνδρα σώσαντος θεοῦ
πύλας ἀνοίξαι;), ταύτ' ἀπάγγειλον πόσει.

593. εὐππων.
601. εὐθέων.

equivalent to πλουτίζειν μὴ μόνον ἐμέ.—
There is a certain irony in this language.
Not knowing the situation, the elders
suppose that the herald's news, if wel-
come to the queen, cannot be altogether
welcome.

592. On the situation here, and on
the queen's language, see the Introduct-
ion.—ἀνωλόλυξα μὲν. The antithesis to
this does not follow regularly but is sub-
stantially given in καὶ νῦν v. 603. 'This
is not the moment either for exultation
(592—602) or for further enquiry (603)'.

594. Ἰλίου τ' ἀνάστασιν. Observe
that this phrase, thrown in as it were
carelessly, utterly changes the character
of the supposed beacon-message. As it
was represented to the elders above, it
reported the 'taking' but did not and
could not possibly, under the supposed
circumstances, report the 'destruction' of
Troy, which had not occurred and, if
Clytaemnestra spoke honestly (v. 353),
was not to be expected or desired. But
it is of vital moment that the herald
should not catch a glimpse of the sup-
posed 'beacon-system'. Nor can he from
what the queen here says, simple and
frank though it seems to be. It implies
what he must already suppose, that the
beacon had signalled the arrival of him-
self and his companions, and this is in
fact the truth. On the other hand the
fact that the queen refers to the beacon
is enough to convince the elders that,
however absurd her notion may be, there
is no trick in it.

595. τις: i.e. the elders in vv. 481
foll., whose language she quotes almost
verbatim, though she was not then pre-
Clytaemnestra. My joy was uttered some while ago, when the first fiery messenger came in the night, telling that Ilium was taken...and destroyed. Then there were some who found fault with me, and said, ‘Art thou for a beacon persuaded to think that Troy is taken now? How like a woman’s heart to fly up so high!’ Thus they argued, proving my error. But for all that I would sacrifice; and by womanly ordinance the countryfolk one and all took up the loud cry of holy gladness, and in the sacred temples stilled with feeding incense the fragrant flame.

And now, for the fuller tale, what need I to take it from thee? From the king himself I shall learn it all. Rather, that I may bring my revered lord with swift return to my loving reception—what light more sweet to the eyes of a wife than this, when she opens the gate to her husband, restored by heaven safe from war?—take thou back to my lord this message: let sent. This however and the arrival of the herald have been reported to her from time to time by those in her interest, as on the stage would be manifest. Plainly she dares not at this crisis lose sight of the elders for a moment; nor is she unwilling to give them a hint that her eye is upon them. The hint is not lost, for when she retires, their language (v. 620) is more guarded and unintelligible than ever.—See further the Introduction.

598. ἐφιπόμην: ‘they tried to prove me deluded’ is the signification of the tense.

600. γυναικεῖος νόμῳ with the woman’s ritual.—ἄλλος ἀλλοθεν one after another, masculine (although the ἄλλος or sacrificial cry was actually uttered by women, as the text declares), because it is the behaviour of the people, not of the women in particular, which is in view. Cf. Théb. 253 ἐμὸν ἄκοςαν σὺν γυμάτων ἡπείτα σὺ (the maidens of the chorus) ἄλλογνωμον...παίασον.—“Perhaps she is keeping up her satire, ‘like women, as you would say, the whole city joined in the cry’” (Sidgwick).—γυναικέιοι νόμοι (Wecklein) gives a simpler construction. —νόμῳ. Cf. νόμισμα Théb. I.c.—πτάλιν: the Argolid, not ‘city’ in the modern sense.

602. κοιμώντες quieting, i.e. piling the incense upon it so that it burned unseen within the heap, instead of blazing. The flame is compared to a creature crying for food till it is stilled.

603. τα μάσων the fuller story.—σ’ ἐμοί. Both pronouns are emphatic.

605. ὅπως...δέξασθαι that I may bring my revered spouse with swift return unto my loving reception, literally ‘that I may hasten the kind receiving of him returned’. As often (cf. v. 487, v. 611, v. 970) the Greek puts what is principal in the sentence into the participle, not the verb, and it is μολωνά, not δέξασθαι, which is mainly affected by σπέσω.—Not ‘that I may hasten to welcome him’; see vv. 609—610.—ἀριστα with all kindness, the superlative of ἀριστο, kindly, belongs to δέξασθαι: cf. Supp. 225 εὖ τ’ ἐπερχέν εὖ τε δέξασθο.
610—611. ἥκειν...εὑροι: the construction varies from the oblique to the direct.
—ἐρασμον πόλει...γυναικα πιστὶν δὲ: these are antithetical in meaning though not exactly in form. 'Let him come swiftly to find his people loving and his wife faithful' is the sense. It is this antithetic emphasis on πιστὶν which justifies the position of δέ.—εὑροι μολὼν: see on v. 605.—πιστὶν...οιαντερ οὖν ἔλευσ: 'faithful to him as he left her' is the sense to the ear, 'faithful to the revenge which she has meditated ever since' the sense to Clytemnestra's thought. The ambiguity runs all through the following lines, ἐκείνῳ, τοῖς δυσφροσιοι etc.

614. σημαντήριον οὐδὲν διαφθείρασαν having never broken seal at all in this long while, i.e. 'having guarded his property and honour', or to herself 'still keeping my resolution, as it were a covenant'. For the association of the word διαφθείρω with this secondary sense see v. 923.—σημαντήριον is properly an adjectival form, meaning 'anything in the nature of a seal (σημαντήριον)'. There is no reference to literal 'seals'. Such seals would naturally be used in the house (Paley cites Eur. Orest. 1108), and naturally also it was guarded by dogs: hence the metaphors: but it is not of these things that Clytaemnestra is thinking or speaking: σφονγία τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα εἰναι says the schol. correctly.—Still fearing not to be understood she speaks more clearly. —hostily tell? 616. These declarations, which are full of suspicion and peril, are forced upon her by the necessity of the situation. It is an obvious fear that the king may know too much, or before he reaches the fortress may learn too much, for Clytaemnestra's purpose. She thinks it safer therefore to accept the position of one accused and to take the line of defying slander, in the hope that this may be sufficient for the necessary moment.

616—617. τέρψει...ἀνδρὸς I know of pleasure or of scandalous address from any other man no more than etc. For φάτις in the sense of speech or converse see Soph. Phil. 1045 βαρείαν φάτιν τήν’ ἑλπις, id. El. 329, 1213 (L. and Sc. s.v.). She is so far from sin that she has let no man speak to her unbecomingly. φάτιν is parallel to τέρψιν, and both words are related in the same way to ἄλλον πρὸς ἄνδρος.—ἐπίθυμον 'liable to reproach', cf. ἐπίθυμοφος, ἐπικινδυνός.—φάτις may also be taken in the common sense of rumour,
him come with all speed to the people that love him, come to
find in his home the wife faithful, even such as he left her, a very
house-dog, loyal to one, and an enemy to his foes; aye, and in
all else unchanged, having never broken seal at all in this long
while. I know of pleasure or scandalous address from any
other no more than of dyeing bronze.           [Exit.

A Conspirator. Self-praise like this, filled full with its truth,
it doth not misbeseen a noble wife to sound.

An Elder. What she hath said looks well, if by their plain
interpretation thou readest it.

But herald, say thou—I would know of Menelaus, our well-

report, with the translation ‘scandal arising from’ i.e. ‘connected with’ an-
other; but this does not so well satisfy πρὸς and the form of the sentence. The
hint given to the ear by the parallelism of τῆρφων οἶδε...φάτω would sufficiently
explain an exceptional use of the word.

617. χαλκοῦ βαφᾶς dipping, i.e. dying, of bronze, an unknown mystery.
Probably the expression referred to some artistic secret (Blomfield). Others
suppose it to mean merely ‘an impossibility’. The sinister suggestiveness which
it takes from metaphors such as ἵππος ἡγοσ thou hast dipped thy sword Soph.
AI. 95, γνητ ἐν σφαγαί̇ βάψασα ξῖφος P. Β. 889, has possibly influenced the
poet (Wellauer) but must not be pressed. Between ξῖφος and χαλκός there is for
this purpose a wide difference.—Here Clytaemmestra, having so far as possible
secured the silence of the elders and the prompt departure of the herald, retires as
if to make her preparations.

618—621. Here again (see v. 363) is a passage defying arrangement or expla-
nation with the traditional list of dramatis personae. The ms. gives vv. 618—19 to
the herald, Hermann transfers them to Clytaemmestra. Whichever be adopted,
it is impossible to give any legitimate sense to ἐρμηνευŏνι in v. 621. Where
are the commentators on the queen’s address, the interpreters of it, to whom
the elders refer? The ἐρμηνεῖς are the speakers of vv. 618—19, who eke out
the queen’s suspicious exculpation with an approving comment which it very
much needs. In fact the Second Chorus, supporting their spokesman, here act a
part precisely similar to that in v. 363 foll. They play to the character which
the queen assumes. The elders confine themselves to the dry remark that with
this interpretation the herald no doubt comprehends.—τοῦτος (ἄν): ‘when it
is like this’, i.e. ‘being the natural overflow of genuine feeling’. Self-praise
is unseemly in itself; that a wife should praise herself in the language of Clytae-
mestra is suspicious in itself; but as she did so (evidently) only under the over-
powering desire to assure the king of her devotion, it is not unseemly or suspicious
in her.—οὕτως as she has.—μανθάνοντι
...ἐυπρέπειος speciously if you understand
what has been said by their clear inter-
pretation. σοι depends on ἐυπρέπειος,
ἐρμηνεύον (instrumental) on μανθάνοντι.
—See on this passage Headlam, Class.
Rev. XVII. 242.

622. ὅ ἢ ἐπέ, κηρύ. They detain
him, as he turns to go. He is unwilling
to be questioned, having only bad news
to tell. Seeing this, they add hastily
‘But I would know about Menelaus’, and
then more pressingly ‘just (γε) whether
he is with you’.

V. Ε. Α. 6
625. ‘I could not tell false tidings to seem fair’, kalad being predicative.—λέξαμι ‘remote deliberative optative’, a variation from the deliberative subjunctive found in interrogative sentences both direct, as Ar. Plut. 438 πολί τις φόγοι; and indirect, as this and Eur. Alc. 52 ἐστ’ οὖν ὅπως Ἀλκηντῆς εἰς γῆς μόλοι; “The difficulty is, not why ἄν is omitted, for the sentences are not conditional, but why the remote form (optative) is used instead of the primary form (subjunctive) when the sentences are all of a primary character. The answer is that the optative expresses the remoteness, not as usual of pastness, but of possibility: the instinct is to express by the optative something more out of the question than the subjunctive would have expressed. Thus in Ar. Plut. 438 πολί φόγοι would be in ordinary circumstances the expression... but φόγοι, the ms. reading,... is the exclamation of supreme terror, treating escape as in the last degree unlikely” (Sidgwick).
loved king,—this only, whether he hath returned safe and will arrive with you.

Her. It were impossible, if I told a false tale fair, that unto long time your love should enjoy it still!

Eld. Oh, that thy true tale might be happily told! 'Tis not easy to hide, when good and true are parted.

Her. The prince is gone from the Achæan host, himself and his ship also. It is the truth.

A Conspirator. Did he put forth in your sight from Ilion? Or was he snatched from the rest by a storm which fell upon all?

Her. Thou hast, like a master bowman, hit the mark, and put a length of trouble in a brief phrase.

Eld. What then of the prince? Did the general rumour of the voyagers declare him living or dead?

Her. None can tell that for certain, save one only, the Sun that sustaineth life over all the earth.

Eld. And what from first to last was the story of the storm, thus sent on the fleet by angry gods?

Her. A day sacred to joy should not be fouled by the tongue of evil tidings. Religion sunders the two. When one with sad countenance brings to a people heavy tidings of an army fallen,

627. τύχος Porson. 'Would that thou couldst speak truth to be good!' i.e. 'would that thy news could be both pleasing and true!' The form of expression imitates (Klausen, Kennedy) that of the herald's speech preceding.—ἀν εἰπῶν τύχος properly 'be so happy as to speak'.

629. ἄνηρ Hermann.

631—632. Best assigned to the speaker of vv. 618—619. The herald is surprised, as well he may be, at the rapidity with which the questioner, out of all the possibilities, lights upon the exact truth. But in truth this questioner has the same knowledge of the facts which Clytemnestra exhibits before the Herald's arrival (vv. 350 foll.), and his question is put merely in the hope of cutting the dangerous conversation short.—ἐμπανώς visibly, i.e. so that it was known when he went, as contrasted with the unperceived disappearance in a storm.

635. αὐτοῦ Menelaus himself, as opposed to the ἄλλοι. They suppose that something may have been heard of Menelaus' ship, and ask what was the latest news of the prince.

638. φῶςιν in the full sense of the word (ὁι φθειραι) 'all that growth on earth,' i.e. all life.

640. δαμόνων: the gods of Troy presumably; see v. 350.

642. χώρις ἡ τιμή θεῶν the functions belong to different gods, literally 'the religious province (τιμή θεῶν) is distinct in the two cases', the one belonging to joyous or friendly gods, the other to gloomy or adverse gods. Not 'the worship of the gods is to be kept dis-
 jóvenes diáforos en el diómetro τυχεῖν,
pollous de pollōn ἐξαγιόθεντας δόμων ἀνδρας διπλὴ μάστιγι, τὴν Ἀρης φιλεῖ, δίλογχον ἀπό, φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα, τοιᾶς μὲν τοι πημάτων σεσαγμένον πρέπει λέγειν παίνα τόν Ἐρυνών· σωτηρίων δὲ πραγμάτων εὐάγγελον ἥκουτα πρὸς χαίρουσαν εὔεστοι πόλιν— πῶς κεδνὰ τοῖς κακοῖς συμμίσχω λέγων χειμῶν', Ἀχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμήνιτος θεοί; ἔννομοσαν γάρ, ὅντες ἔκθεστοι τὸ πρῖν, τύρ καὶ θάλασσα, καὶ τὰ πίστ' ἐδειξάτην φθειρότε τὸν δύστην 'Αργείων στρατον, ἐν νυκτί, δυσκύμαντα δ' ὄροπει κακά. ναῦς γὰρ πρὸς ἄλληλησι Θρηκίαι πνοαὶ ἡρεικον· ἀν δὲ κεροτυποῦμεναι βία.

649. σεσαγμένον.

648. σεσαγμένον.

647. ἀνδρας 'men' i.e. men singly as opposed to πόλις. Cf. the opposition of ἄνδρας...Ἀνὴρ in Theb. 584—599.
650. τοῦδε, either (1) 'such an ἄγγε-
the state wounded with one great national grief, and many a home robbed of its single victim by Ares’ fork, his weapon beloved, two-headed, horrible, red in both prongs with blood; he that beareth such a pack of woe may well say a hymn to Those who punish. But when one cometh with tidings of deliverance to a folk rejoicing in happiness—how shall I mingle this good with that ill, with tale of the storm, at which our national gods must needs be displeased?

A conspiracy there was between two that had been utter foes, between fire and sea; and for pledge and proof of their league they destroyed the hapless men of Argos. In darkness it was done, which swelled the agony to its height; for the ships were dashed one against another by Thracian winds, till butting

λος’ a resumptive pronoun: ‘he, the messenger of disaster, may naturally say a triumph-song to the Erinyes’, the agents of punishment, but the messenger of good owes his duty elsewhere: or (2) with παίδων, but as the statement is general, the pronoun, so construed, seems out of place.

653. He turns abruptly from the general case to himself as an instance of it.—How can I mix good with bad, with a tale of the storm, which cannot but displease our nation’s gods?—’Αχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμὴντον θεοί, literally ‘a thing not unprovoking to the gods of the Achaeans’: the emphasis on ’Αχαιῶν being given by position. οὐκ ἀμὴντον (neuter) is an accusative in apposition to the verbal action (τὸ τού χειμῶνα λέγειν). θεοί: dative of the person whose judgment or view is in question.—The present hour of triumph is properly devoted to the gods of Argos: to narrate now a disaster inflicted by powers hostile to Argos and to them (v. 630) as it were to interrupt their service (vv. 642—650) and risk their displeasure. Prof. Tucker (Class. Rev. vii. p. 341) defends the text nearly in the same way. Difficulty has arisen from taking ἀμὴντον as masculine. The reading of Dobree ’Αχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμὴντον θεῶν, com-

monly adopted, is not satisfactory: θεῶν can be explained as an extension of this primitive use with negative adjectives; see οὐκ ἀπατεῖν πτώσα (v. 323); but (1) the dative ’Αχαιῶν, and (2) the stress on ’Αχαιῶν are questionable.

655—657. See Appendix O.

655. Imitated by Milton Par. Reg. iv. 412 ‘Water with fire in ruin reconciled’ (Paley.)

658. In darkness, which swelled the agony to its height, literally ‘in darkness, and terribly swollen was raised the distress’. Night aggravated the situation; the ships could not then be kept clear of each other and soon became unmanageable. This verse well illustrates the pregnant use of words in poetry. δυσκόμαντα is formed from the transitive κυμαῖνω, meaning properly make to swell, from κῦμα, originally that which is pregnant, then anything swollen, then specially a wave. All the meanings here merge in a triple suggestion of increase, labour, and tempest.

659. ἄλληλησι: irregular archaism for ἄλληλαισι.

660. κεροτυπούμεναι: ποιμένοι: the comparison is to a herd of cattle driven wild and scattered by a storm.
661. 'Under the storm of the hurricane and by the beating rain of the surge'. súv instrumental. The line may be variously taken without difference, but this way (Sidgwick, Wecklein) is the simplest.—

663. ποιμένοι στροβοῦ lashed round by their cruel driver. στροβοῦ: a unique word, literally, it would seem, meaning spin: στροβεῖσ to spin. ποιμένοι: the storm itself in a new metaphorical aspect.

664—665. ἀνθνοῦ: a last glimpse of the metaphor from the herd; the sea is the plain or field which in the morning is seen to have broken out in flowers after the rain. νεκροῖς...ἐρεπίων: 'with dead things, Achaean men and wreckage of ships'. The genitives define νεκροῖς. For the style of Aeschylus, it does not seem unnatural to suggest poetically that ships as well as men were 'dead'.—ναυτικὸς τ' ἐρεπτος Auratus, but the corruption is not easily explained.

666. σκάφος: the stripped vessel was a hull entire but no more.

667. "Stole us away or begged us off from destruction: a bold but quite characteristic phrase, requiring no emendation". Sidgwick.

669. Fortune, to save us, was pleased to ride on board her. θελοῦσα: their miraculous escape must be put down to the caprice of fate.—The objection to this is,
violently beneath the storm of the hurricane and the beating rain of the surge they fled away and away, lashed round by their cruel driver. And when the bright dawn rose, we saw on the Ægean, thick as flowers, the wrecks of men and of ships. As for ourselves and our ship, yet whole in hull, we were stolen away or, may be, were beggared off by some one more than human, who took her helm. Fortune, to save us, was pleased to ride aboard of her, and keep her at like from taking in the surging water between her planks and from running upon rocks. So having escaped a watery grave, there in the white day, scarce sure of our good fortune, we brooded melancholy upon our altered case, our host undone and utterly breaking to pieces. And at this moment if any of them is living and draws breath, they are doubtless speaking of us as lost, while we imagine the same case for them. But let us hope the best.

For Menelaus then, be it first supposed and soonest, that

that οὐ should rather be supplied than expressed. — υποστολούς (Casaubon) is good, but hazardous, and θέλουσα is in itself effective.

670. So that she took not in the surging water between her planks. ἐν ἀρμῷ (Wecklein) literally 'at a joining'. This brilliant suggestion may be accepted provisionally. It makes good sense, and without something of the kind κύματος ἔλεγεν ἔσχεν is incomplete. The rarity of ἄρμος and the familiarity of ὄρμος account for the error. ἐν ὄρμῷ, in the roads, at mooring, seems unintelligible. Can it be conceived that in the circumstances described the vessel should be moored at all? The two obvious dangers were springing a leak and running upon island or rock.—ἔχεων to take, get: see on v. 724.—ἐν ὀλκῷ κύματος (G. F. Abbott, Class. Rev. XLI. 401, citing οἴδαμος ὀλκῶι Ap. Rhod. 1. 1167). But is ἔλεγεν ἔσχεν by itself intelligible?

674. ἰβουκολοῦμεν: literally 'ruminated', i.e. brooded on.

675. σπεδούμενον: a strong word from popular language. See on Thes. 794.

676. εἰ τις ἔστιν ἐμπνευσάμενον 'if any is in being and draws breath'.—For ἔστι cf. the phrases ὑπέρτε 'is no more, he is dead, theoί αἴνεν ἔοντες 'goods that live for ever' etc.—ἔστιν ἐμπνευόμενον, Ms., quasi 'is breathing, is alive.' For other conjectures see Wecklein's Appendix.

679. Μενέλαυν γὰρ οὖν As for Menelaus then. γὰρ οὖν marks that the narrative has now been brought to the point at which the question which drew it (v. 622) can be fully answered.

680. πρῶτον...μολεν be it first and soonest supposed that he got home. προσ-δόκα: προσδόκαν and ἐκπίθεν, like the English expect, are used in reference not only to the future, but also, with the sense suppose, to the present and past, and in that sense take the same tense in the sequent infinitive as other verbs of thinking. For examples see L. and Sc. s. νῦν.—μολεν that he arrived, i.e. that his ship, like that of Agamemnon, got home, that he reached the Peloponnesse after the storm, only, being carried to a greater distance, at some other part of the coast. He would make for the nearest accessible point, not necessarily for Argos. It is natural that this not improbable and con-
ei δ' οὖν τις ἀκτὶς ἥλιου νῦν ἰστορεῖ,
χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα, μηχαναίς Διός
οὕτω θέλοντος ἐξαναλῶσαι γένος,
ἐλπίς τις αὐτὸν πρὸς δόμους ἥξειν πάλιν.
τοσαύτ' ἀκούσας ἰσθι τάληθη κλύων.

ΧΟ. τίς ποτ' ὄνομαζεν ὃδ'
ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἑπτύμως
(μὴ τις οὖν οὐχ ὁρῶμεν προνοιαὶ
tοῦ πετρωμένου
γλῶσσαν ἐν τῷ ξα νέμων ;)
tὸν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινει-
κὴ θ' Ἐλέναι; ἐπεὶ πρεπόντως
ἐλένας, ἐλανδρος, ἐλέπτολις,
ἐκ τῶν ἄμβροτιμῶν
προκαλυμμάτων ἐπλευσεν
ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὖρᾳ,
pολυνάνδροι τε φεράσπides κυνα-
γοὶ κατ' ἱχνος πλατᾶν ἄφαντον

682. καὶ ζώντα. 686. ὄνομαζεν. 689. ass. 698. πλάταν.

soling supposition should be entertained, till it is disproved.—Not ‘expect him to return’ or ‘that he will return’. This sense of the aorist, if it be possible in itself, is inadmissible here. The supposition put forward in ν. 680 is manifestly something distinguished from ἐλπίς τις ἥξειν in ν. 684.

681. ei δ' οὖν and, supposing the contrary (οὖν), still if, supposing, that is, he has not got in.—τίς...ἰστορεῖ any ray of the sun is discovering him. Again here the language is coloured by a natural suggestion of the morning hour.

682. χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα: ἄντι τοῦ ζώντα Hesychius; whence Toum restored it here. It is not certain that the gloss relates to this passage, but it is highly probable, and the improvement is great.—μηχαναίς Διός: join with ἥξειν.

683. γένος: his offspring, the family of the Atridae, descended from him.—οὕτω θέλοντος: ‘whose will it never is’, i.e. ‘who may be presumed not to will’.
684. αὐτὸν emphatic; ‘for him, if for any, there is a hope’.
685. This is all that I can tell you for fact, literally ‘so far you may know that you have been told the facts’.—Exit the Herald. For the situation see the Introduction.

686. ὄνομαζεν ‘proposed to name’, ‘suggested the naming’.—The ms. has the aorist, in the Doric form ὄνομαζεν. The tense is more suitable, but the forms in -εω, -εα are not commonly used in tragic chorus. We are perhaps not in a position to determine what subtleties of literary association might guide a poet in the use of such a composite and artificial
he got home. And at worst, if anywhere the sun's ray is discovering him, Zeus, we may hope, who cannot mean to destroy his offspring quite, will contrive to bring him alive and well to his home again. So much is all I can warrant you for fact.

The Elders. Who can have given that name, so to the very letter true? Was it some unseen power, who by foreknowledge of fate guided his tongue aright, that named the woman woed with battle and spear by the name of Helen? She proved her name indeed upon ships and men and peoples, when from the delicate veils of her costly bower she passed over sea, before the gale of the felon West, and after her a great hunt of shielded soldiers, following by the vanished track of the oar a quarry

language; see v. 1508. The Doric form would here prepare the way for ἐλένας v. 693, and the whole art of interpreting ἥσματα seems to have been in its origin Sicilian; see Journal of Philology ix. p. 197. But it is likely that ὑφώματιν is an error; in v. 450 the reading of f is 'apparently γεμίζων', and see v. 776.

687. ὁδ' ἐστὶν τὸ πᾶν ἐπιτύμως 'with such entire and literal truth'. On ἐπιτύμως and its etymological associations see the Seven etc., Appendix II.—ἐστὶν τὸ πᾶν, or ἐστὶν τὸν ἐπιτύμως i.e. 'with such literal truth in respect of his divination'? For the reasons in favour of ἐστὶν τὸν ἐπιτύμως see Appendix E and the Journal of Philology ix. pp. 128—141. The traditional reading is admissible.—Mr Sidgwick objects that the word ἐπιτύμω ἀποτίμων, meaning not 'prophecy' but 'conjecture' as opposed to 'knowledge', is here unsuitable. But I submit that what was supposed to be 'divined' by the μάντις at the naming of a child was its yet undeveloped character (φύσις, see the article cited), and that this was 'divined' or 'conjectured'.

688. μη...; Can it have been etc.—τις δύναν, studiously vague, 'an unknown some one'.

690. εν τῷχα 'right', 'so as to hit the mark', literally 'with hit', or 'with rightness', εν indicating circumstance. The phrase is very probably technical.

692. Ἔλεναν predicate with ὑφώματιν: τὰν δοργαμβρον ἄμφωνική τε is substantial.

693. ἐλένας destroyer (see ἐλεός, αἰ-ρέω) of ships, a Doric form from ἐλένας, as Ἐρένθως from Ερένθως Erenlaus (re-tained by Salmasius, Enger and Sidgwick). Here the use of the exceptional form could hardly be avoided, if the point was to be made at all. With the Attic ἐλένας (Blomfield), which does not suggest the accusative ἐλέναν, the coincidence disappears.

694. τῶν those, as if they were famous, as in legend they probably were.—ἀβροτύμων delicate-costly, ἀβρῶν καὶ τυμῶν.

695. ἐκ προκαλλιματῶν.....ἐπλευσεν she left her curtained bower to sail the sea, imitated by Euripides, speaking of Meade flying with Jason (Med. 431), ἐκ μὲν οὖκ ἐπλευσας thou didst quit for the sea thy father's house.—For πλεύσαι to take to sea cf. Eur. Hec. 1295 πλευσάντες αὖθις.

696. γλαντός: implying not merely strength, but fierce, uncontrolled strength, the γλαντός being characteristically rebels against the divine law. In fact the wind itself typifies the wild and monstrous passion.

698. πλαταν Heath, the better accentuation; in the oars' unseen track.—Supply ἐπλευσαν.
κελσάντων Σιμώεντος ἀκτῶς ἐπ’ ἀξιφύλλους δ’ ἐρὼν αἰματόσεσσαν.

ἀντ. α.’

705 'Ιλίῳ δὲ κῆδος ὅρθωνυμον τελεσσίφρων μήνις ἡμασί, τραπέζας ἀτίμωσιν ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ καὶ ἔνειστίον Διὸς πρασσομένα τὸ νυμφότιμον μέλος ἐκφάτος τίοντας, ἥμέναιον, ὅς τὸν ἐπέρρεπεν γαμβροῦσιν ἀείδειν.

710 μεταμανθάνουσα δ’ ὑμνον Πριάμου πόλις γεραιᾶ πολύθρην πού στενεῖ, κικλήσκουσα Πάρῳ τῶν αἰνόλεκτρον, πάμπροσθ’ ἡ πολύθρην αἰών’ ἀμφὶ πολιτῶν μέλεον αἱμ’ ἀνατλάσα.

704. ἀτίμως ὑ’. 715. παμπρόσθη. 716. πολιτάν.

699. κελσάντων of them who had put in or reached land, i.e. Paris and his company.—Σιμώεντος ... αἰματόσεσσαν to the banks of Simois, whose woods must be wasted by their bloody fray, literally ‘because of’ it. ἀξιφύλλοις: a ‘proleptic’ epithet describing the result of the hunt, means literally ‘with leafage broken’ and is formed from the stem of ἀγρυνναί. For the sense of the verb see II. 11. 145 ἀγροτέρουσι σέσεων ἐκκέντε, τῷ τ’ ἐν δρεσσῳ ἀνδρῶν ἡδὲ κυνῶν δέχαται κολοσσῶν ἰόντα, ὅσιμῳ τ’ ἀύοσσον περὶ σφέειν ἀγρυννον διην, which passage or others like it Aeschylus probably had in his mind. In the metaphor Paris is the wild beast and Helen his spoil; the avenging Greeks are the huntsmen, who track their prey to the lair (Troy); the war is the fight which, as in Homer’s picture, there ensues, and which devastates the surrounding wood or, without metaphor, causes the destruction and razing of Troy. —ἀξιφύλλοις (leafy) is the conjecture of Triclinius (Cod. Farn.). If this be adopted, it is better (since ἀξιφύλλοις δ’ ἐρὼν αἰματόσεσσαν ‘whose forests will grow because of the bloody fray’ is hardly sense) to join δ’ ἐρων with the main verb; the pursuers come ‘prompted by a bloody feud’. But there is no ground for change. —The antistrope (v. 716) gives no evidence between ἀξιφύλλοις and ἀξιφύλλοις, for it does not correspond exactly to either; and see further Appendix II.

702. κῆδος ὀρθώνυμον: a marriage or bride deserving the name in its other sense of sorrow. Cf. the play on κῆδομαι —κηδεσθής in Th. 112.—Τίλῳ depends on κῆδος in the second sense.
landed on Simois' banks, whose woods must be wasted by their bloody fray.

A bride? A sorrowful bride she was to Ilium, pursued by sure-remembering wrath, destined one day to avenge the dishonour of the board, and of Zeus the sanctifier of the feast, upon those that gave expressive honour to that bridal music, the marriage-hymn of the groomsmen, their vantage of an hour. The aged city of Priam hath learnt an altered song, a burden surely of loud lamentation, and finds for the wedded Paris an evil name; for burdened with lamentation have been all her weary days till this for the miserable slaughter of her people.

704. ἠλασε chased, an echo of the metaphor of the hunt (7).—ήμουσ Head- 

lam (Class. Rev. xiv, 116) with ὅρθως- 

μον, accomplished the meaning of the name citing Soph. Ant. 1178 τοῦτος ὡς ἀρ οἴδ ημος ἡμοτας etc.—τραπεζαί ἀτίμωσιν καὶ ἦν. Δίος: the offence of Paris against the laws of hospitality (v. 374). But by the reference to the ‘table’ and the description of Zeus as ἔνωτος (‘of the shared feast’) for the more precise ἥνος, the speakers involuntarily touch another and ominous memory, the ‘outraged table’ of Atreus and his brother. See on vv. 136 foll., 1601.—ἀτίμωσιν Canter.

707. πραγματεύει to avenge, with ac-

cusatives of the offenders (τοὺς) πιῶτας and the crime ἀτίμωσιν, literally ‘extacting it of them’.—τό (ἐκάνω) that.

708. ἐκφάω. ἐκφάωθαι means ‘to speak out, articulate’, Hom. Od. i0. 246 οἴδε τι ἐκφάωθαι δύνατο ἐποὶ ιέμενος περ, ἔδ. 13. 308 μνήσε κατ’ ἐκφάωθαι...ἀλλά σιωπῇ πάρχειν ἄλγεια πολλά. Accordingly ἐκφαω should mean expressively (rather than loudly, Paley). According to legend, the alternative name of Paris, Ἀλέξανδρος (repelling the husband), was bestowed upon him for the rape (see Eur. fr. 65 Dindorf). From what follows (v. 713) it is likely that ἐκφάωθαι refers to this; the Trojans found a significant expression for their admiration of the robber’s feat.—πιῶτας (impf. tense) did honour to it, i.e. celebrated it with zeal (cf. παίαν ἐτύμα v. 238, Wecklein).

709. ἐπιέρσεν fell to them, inclined to them as a scale, which now is turned the other way.—γαμβρότων ἀείδεις to sing as kinsmen of the groom.

713. πολῖθρηνον predicate with στενει. Supply αὐτήν, i.e. τὸν ὤμον.—μέγα, or μετά (Schneiderin), i.e. μεταστένει, ‘chants with repentant change’?—κυλιή- 

σκόποι...αἰνόλεκτρον: finding for Paris names very different from the triumphant Ἀλέξανδρος (see on v. 708). In choosing the contrasted name αἰνόλεκτρος Aeschylus is guided perhaps by a certain similarity, with transposition of sounds, to Ἀλέξα-

νόρος.

715—717. For full of lamentation have been all her weary days till now for the miserable slaughter of her people, liter-

ally ‘she who sustained all-before a life full of lamentation for’ etc.—πάμπροσθ' 

ἡ Blomfield: πολιταῖ Αuratorus. This sentence takes up the word πολῖθρηνον from v. 713, echoing and explaining it after Aeschylus’ manner.—πάμπροσθ... 

ἀίωνα...ἀναπλάσα. The adverb, though joined in construction with the verb ἀπα-

τλάσα, qualifies in effect the substantive ἀίων. For the ‘Ionic’ ἦ see vv. 428, 1104 etc.—ἀίμα: so αὐτάκελπον αἴμα the slaying of a brother, Theb. 705, and see L. and Sc. s. v. αίμα.—The difficulties found in this passage arise from the hypo-
thesis of syllabic correspondence between strophe and antistrophe. Apart from metre the readings (not changes) of Blomfield and Auratus are satisfactory. As to the metre see Appendix II.

718. λέοντος ἵνων Conington.

719. ἀγάλακτον (ὑντα), the dam being killed by the huntsmen who took the whelp.—Dr Wecklein reads ἀγάλακτα βοῦτας (see below) ἀνὴρ φιλομάστων, translating ἀγάλακτα φιλομάστων by "as foster-brother of the sucklings" in his herd. Cf. Hesych. ἀγάλαξ: ἄμφιτοθος, Ἑἰγυμ. Μ. III. 42 ἀγάλακτας οἱ ἀδελφοὶ, παρὰ τὸ α

σμαίνων τὸ ὁμοίον, ὀμογάλακτες τινες ὄντες, Suid. ἀγάλακτες· διαμαίον, ἀδελφοὶ".

720. οἴτως ἀνὴρ a shepherd: οἴτης from δίς, as βοῦτης from βοῦς. βοῦτας Heusde, βοῦτας Wecklein. Something like this, some description attached to ἀνὴρ, is to be sought in οἴτωσ. But οἴτας is closer, and permits the retention of ἀγάλακτος.—οἴτας would be closer still, but seems not to be a possible formation from ἀφης.

723. Making dignity itself to smile. ἐπιχαρτον. For χαρὰ and the cognate words see on Theb. 429.—καὶ even, not
A shepherd man in his house brought up a lion's whelp, weaned from the teat, a hungry suckling. Gentle it was in its infant days of love, made friends with youth, drew smiles from gravity's self. And many a thing it got when, like a nursing-child embraced, it fixed a bright eye on the hand and fawned for its belly's need. But after a time it showed the way that was born in it; for it paid thanks for its rearing by bloody ravage of the flock, making a feast unbidden; and the house was dabbled with gore, and the house-folk helpless in agony, and wide was the murderous waste. By God's will it was taken into that dwelling, to do rites of ravage therein.

At first, would I say, to Ilium came what seemed to fancy a windless calm, a darlink of rich indolence, whose gentle eye

etc., for metre; but see Appendix II.

734. ἀμαξον ἄλγος: accusative in apposition to the conception ἀμαξι... ἐφέρθη. The conjunction δὲ in f is due to mistake of the construction.

736—737. ἐκ θεοῦ: 'providentially, by divine suggestion', the divine power avenging the lions, as the eagles in v. 57.—δόμος προσεθέρφη 'was reared as an additional inmate of the house', was added to the household (Dr Headlam, On editing Aeschylus p. 108); not 'was reared in the house'.—προσεθέρφη Heath.—προσετέρφη (Ionic aer. of προστέρφω) 'was directed to the house', ed. 1.; but I would withdraw this, being satisfied that my objections to προσεθέρφη were mistaken.—ιερεύς τις ἄτας: 'as a minister of ruin', i.e. to be such. iereus, properly 'sacrifier to ruin'.—προσεθέρφη, 'was inflicted upon', Prof. Bury (Class. Rev. xi. 448), using against προσεθέρφη, my own argument, that metre would have protected it; but see Headlam l.c.

738. πάραυτα at first, παραχθήμα (Hesychius), derived from παρ' auta 'just upon the event'. So in Eur. fr. 1064 pàravta δ' ἡσθεῖσ ὀστερον στένει μέγα (Wecklein).—ἀθέων: the real subject is Helen, the aspects or effects of whose presence are personified.

739. φόνημα μὲν νηκίμου γαλάνας the imagination or presumption of a wind-
άκασκαίον ἄγαλμα πλούτου,
μαλθακόν ὄμματων βέλος,
δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἅρθος,
παρακλίνασ' ἐπέκρανεν
δὲ γάμου πικροῦ τελευτάς,
δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος
συμένα Πριμιδιάων
πομπᾶ Δίως Ἑκίνου,
νυμφόκλαντος Ἐρυνύς.
παλαίφατος δ' ἐν βροτοῖς γέρων λόγος
τέτυκται, μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὀλβον
τεκνοῦσθαι μηδ' ἀπαίδα θυήσκεν,
ἐκ δ' ἀγαθᾶς τύχας γένει
βλαστάνειν ἀκόρεστον οἰζύν.
δίκα δ' ἄλλων μονόφρων εἰ-
μί: τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον
μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει,
σφετέρα δ' εἰκότα γέννα.
οἴκων γὰρ εὐθυδίκων
καλλίπαίς πότμος αἰεῖ.
φιλεῖ δὲ τίκτειν ὑβρὶς μὲν παλαία νεά-
ζουσαν ἐν κακοῖς βροτῶν
ὑβριν τὸτ' ἢ τόθ', ὅτε τὸ κύριον μόλη

755. γὰρ δυσσεβὲς. 761. ὅταν.

less calm, i.e. 'what was presumed a secure enjoyment’. This seems to be the meaning (rather than that the spirit (?) of Helen was like a windless calm). φρόνημα is to be understood as qualifying the whole description in vv. 739—742; hence the position of μὲν. For the sense of φρόνη-

μα, ‘proud thought’, ‘presumptuous imagination’, see L. and Sc. s.v.

740. ἱπεκρανεν τ' Hermann (see v. 751) may be right, though the conjunc-
tion is not desirable. Nothing can be
determined without more certainty as to the meaning and use of ἱπεκρανεν. The ms. points rather to ἱπεκρανοῖν.—ἡσύχως, μαλακῶς, βραδέως Hesychius.—The accumulation here of terms in appo-
sition admits in English only a paraphrase.

743. ἵπεκρανεν, ‘accomplished’, marks what happened in the result.—She made such end to the marriage that it cost them dear. πικρᾶς is suggested by f as a cor-
rection, but πικροῦ as a proleptic epithet expresses the same thing. For the use
shot that soft bolt, which pricks from the heart the flower of
love. But swerving from that, she made them repent in the end
that she was won, blasting with her companionship the ruined
house of Priam's sons, whither the god of guest-plaint sped and
conducted her, a fiend to wed and to rue.

It is an ancient maxim, made long ago among men, that
wealth of man, grown big, gets offspring of its body before it
die, and that of good fortune the natural scion is unappeasable
woe. But I think not with the generality. It is in truth the
impious deed, which after begetteth more, and like to its own
kind. The house that keepeth righteousness, fair is the gener-
ation thereof for ever. But it is the way of old pride to beget in
the wicked, soon or late, when the destined hour arrives for the
youthful birth, a young pride, and the kindred spirit (?) of inso-
of πικρος see Eur. Med. 398 πικρος ἢ' ἐγὼ
σφω καὶ λυχνος θησο γάμους, Bacth. 357,
Supp. 832 etc.

745. δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος an ill
companion in the ruined home, a poetic
exaggeration of language such as might
apply to an ill-assorted union; the con-
ception of Helen as a bride wedded to
Troy is pursued throughout.

747. πομπά, still a bridal term, the
πομπα or religious procession which
brought the wife to her new home.

748. νυμφόκλαντος Ερινός a fiend to
wed and to rue. νυμφόκλαντος: literally
'bewept as a wife', i.e. one whose wed-
ing costs tears of repentance. Some
render νυμφόκλαντος 'bewailed by brides',
i.e. causing the Trojan women to weep.
But see the preceding context.—Eine
Thränenbraut’ Wecklein, rightly.

749. "Aeschylus is rejecting the old
Greek superstition that Prosperity or
Wealth brings woe; it is not wealth, he
says, but always Sin” (Sidgwick). This
later doctrine had also been embodied
in a proverb older than Aeschylus. See
on v. 760.

750. μέγαν τελεσθεντα when it
comes to its full growth, adultum. See
v. 370.

751. τεκνοῦσθαι metaphorically; the
'child' is calamity; see next verses.

752. γένει by kind, according to
nature.

754. μονόφρων alone in my way of
thinking.

755. τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ Pauw, on
metrical grounds; see v. 744.

756. μετὰ afterwards.

759. καλλίταις πότμος combines in
one phrase the ideas that the prosperity
of the house is reproduced in successive
generations, and that this prosperity is
itself the child of righteousness, as misery
is of sin.

760. φιλεὶ δὲ τίκτειν ὑβρις...ὑβριν.
Similar language with slight variations
occurs in an ancient oracle cited by
Herodotus (8. 77), in Pindar (Ol. 13. 9),
and elsewhere in Aeschylus (Eum. 536);
it was evidently consecrated by religious
tradition. For some remarks upon the
origin of it see Seven against Thebes, Ap-
pendix II. p. 142.

762. τότε ἡ τότε at this time or that,
i.e. sooner or later.—ὁτε...μάλα; archaic
and poetical construction, for which the
ms. has substituted the regular ἄτρον,
added originally as an explanatory note
(Klausern).
νεαρὰ φαύς κότον, δαίμονα τε τὸν ἄμαχον, ἀπό-
λεμον, ἀνίερον θράσος, μελαί-
νας μελαθροισίν ἄτας,
eἰδομέναν τοκεύσων.†
dίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν δυσκάπνοις δώμασιν, ἀντ. δ'.
tὸν δ' ἐναισιμον τίει.
tὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἐδεθλα σὺν πίνω χερῶν
παλιντρόποις ὄμμασι λυποῦσ' ὅσια προσεβάτο, 770
dύναμιν οὐ σέβουσα πλού-
tου παράσημον αὐνῳ.
pάν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμά.

ἀγε δῆ, βασιλεῦ, Τροίας πολίτωρ',
'Ατρέως γένεθλον,
pῶς σε προσεῖπω; πῶς σε σεβίω
μήθ' ύπεράρας μήθ' ύποκάμψας
καιρὸν χάριτος;
pολλοὶ δὲ βροτῶν τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι
προτίουσι δίκην παραβάντες.
tῷ δυσπραγιόντι δ' ἐπιστενάχειν
πᾶς τις ἐτοιμος· δείγμα δὲ λύπης

768. τει βιων. 769. ἐσθλα. 770. προσβα τοῦ. 771. σεβίω.

763—766. Injured, and not to be re-
stored with any certainty. The general
sense is that ἐβρυς (the parent) gives birth
to ἐβρυς (the child) and also to ἰράσως, an
offspring like the progenitors.—In ν. 763
something extraneous has been incor-
porated with the text: I translate the
readings (1) δῦτε τὸ κύριον μῆλῃ νεαρὰ φάους,
when the young one (the young ἐβρυς)
comes to the appointed hour of light (τὸ
κύριον φάους), i.e. of birth, and (2) δαίμονα
τ' ἦταν (ἐταν Wecklein) and a kindred
spirit. In vv. 764—766 either the plural
eιδομένας, or else the dual throughout
μελαϊνα...ἀτα...ειδομένα, seems correct,
the second better (Donaldson). For a
great number of suggestions see Weck-
lein's Appendix.

768. τὸν ἐναισιμον the virtuous man.—
βιω (omitted by Ahrens) is a mistaken
completion.

769. ἐδεθλα abodos, Auratus. The
ms. error is due to the omission of re-
peated letters in ἐδεθλα; hence ἐθλα,
corrected to ἐσθλα.

770. ὅσια προσεβάτο, supply ἐδεθλα: she
goes to the holy (gnomic aorist).—I
see no reason to doubt that it is this
aorist προσεβάτο which appears, slightly
concealed, in the ms., part being read
lence, godless, resistless, masterless, black curses both to the
mansion and like their parents both.

But righteousness shineth in sooty dwellings, and prizeth the
modest man. If the palace is gilt but foul the hands, with eyes
averted she goes thence to the pure home, disdaining the might
of wealth mis-stamped with praise. And she guideth all to the
goal.

[Enter Agamemnon and Cassandra, a multitude following.]

See now, O sovereign, Troy’s conqueror, Atreus’ son, how
shall I address thee? How pay thee homage neither above nor
short of due complaisance?

Many rate semblance above reality, and do injustice so.
Sighs for the suffering all have ready, although of the outward

as the usual form προσέβα, and the termination corrected into the appearance
of a possessive genitive. For analogous forms compare ἐφη—ἐφάμην, ἐφήν—
φθάμενος, ἐπη—ἔπημην, ἐκατο—ἐκατάρο, etc. Some of these aorists actually ex-
tant are extremely rare (φθάμενος for instance); so are other analogous forms
from the stem βα—itself (e.g. ὑπέρβαν
for ὑπερβάσατα II. 12. 469); and it is
probably the merest accident that the small fraction of archaic Greek literature
now remaining does not, if it does not, exhibit any example but this of the middle
form ἐβάμην, which must, it would seem, have been at the command of any archa-
est writer who chose to employ it. The
corrections proposed here, προσύμολι
Hermann, προσέντο Ahrens, etc., do not
account for the mis. reading. If we sup-
pose an explanatory gloss, the author of
a gloss would naturally have used the
common vocabulary (e.g. προσηλθε) not a
poetic word like προσέβα. The presump-
tion in favour of the existence of the
‘middle’ aorist may be measured by
considering how very few would venture
to say, without consulting books, whether
it is extant or not.

772. παράσημον αὖν mis-stamped
with praise, like a forged coin bearing an
untrue mark of value.

774—800. Agamemnon enters in a
chariot, followed by Cassandra, also in a
chariot, attended by his soldiers, and
surrounded by an applauding crowd.
The elders are only too well aware that
this apparently unanimous enthusiasm
is by many pretended, and their first
thought is to suggest suspicion and ap-
prise the king that he is being deceived.
See the Introduction.

776. σεβίζω: σεβίζω I., Doric aorist
subj., here impossible. But the fact that
such an unfamiliar form was regarded as
possible and not at once corrected is
perhaps some evidence that Aeschylus
did occasionally employ it. See on
v. 686.

777. ὑπεράρας ‘over-aiming’, a met-
aphor from the raised bow, ὑποκάμψις
‘turning short of’, from the chariot race.

780. προσλοῦι τοῦ εἶναι, ‘value above
(reality)’, supplied from τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι
the appearance of reality. The πολλοί
who like to be deceived are contrasted
with the ἀγαθὸς προσβατογνώμων. Not
‘many prefer to deceive’. The elders,
who are expecting recognition as the
‘faithful found’, are vexed by the flat-
tering demonstration going on around
them; but they rely, they say, on the
fairness (δίκη) and judgment of the king
to acknowledge his true friends and detect
imposture. See on v. 785.

782. δεῖγμα δὲ κτλ. when the display
of grief reaches not at all to the heart.  

of grief reaches not at all to the heart.  

The motive of the change may have been to give *ōdēn* its common adjectival sense, ‘no sting of grief’. But *dēigma* spoils the sense. The point is not that the grief does not wound, but that there is no grief at all. — For a defence of *dēigma* λυπής as a ‘periphrasis for λυπή’ see Dr Headlam, *On editing Aeschylus* p. 102.

784. καὶ ξυναίρουσιν (τῷ χαίροντι) ὁμοιοπρεπέσι and they copy the looks of him that is glad. χαίρω (see on v. 723) refers originally to the look, not to the feeling, of happiness. — It is debated whether ξυναίρουσιν is finite verb or dative participle depending on ὁμοιοπρεπέσι ‘seeming like sympathizers’. If it is the participle, the verb must have been contained in the line which may be lost after v. 785. The objection to this is that τῷ διασπραγόντι κτλ. raises ex-

pectation of an antithetic καὶ τῷ χαίροντι ξυναίρουσι, so that ξυναίρουσι, when heard, would naturally be understood as a verb. — See however Dr Headlam, *Class. Rev. xiv.* 116 and xvii. 244.

785. βιοάμενοι | ὧστε. The break is contrary to the rule of this metre. If it is not an oversight, we may suppose either (with Hermann) that something is lost, or that some interval (perhaps a change of voices) protected the hiatus. There is at any rate a strong break in the sense; ὧστε δὲ κτλ. is antithetic not to what immediately precedes, but to vv. 779—780; see note there. It is possible that the hiatus was made deliberately in order to mark this.

786. προβατογυμνῶν: one who, like a good herdsman, ‘knows the points’, as it were, of men. Probably some particular deceptive symptom in the animal suggests the ὑδαρῆς φιλότης.

787. οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν it cannot escape (him). The object of λαβεῖν is τοῦτον from the relative clause. — ὁμοματα φωτός: the human eyes (φωτός antithetic to προβατο-) of hypocrites who pretend to weep tears of sympathetic joy.
grief none touches the heart; and they copy the looks of him that laughs, putting force upon faces where no smile is. But he that knoweth the points of a man is sure to detect, when the human eyes, which pretend to glisten with kindness, are flattering him with a love that is but water.

Thou in past time, while warring still for Helen's sake, (frankly be it said) didst make an ungracious figure in mine eyes, didst seem an undexterous steersman to thy wits, that thou for a willing wanton wouldst spend the lives of men. But

or sorrow.—δοματα...φιλότητι. This whole substantival clause is the subject of λαθεῖν; 'the man of judgment will detect that those eyes, which pretend (to glisten) with kind feeling, are flattering him with a love that is but water', when such is really the case. The word παινεῖν, in relation to the expression of the eye, signifies merely the look of kindness (Soph. O. C. 319), though it easily takes the sense of flattery. Here it is to be supplied with τὰ δοκίμα from the main verb of the sentence.—If παινεῖ (Casabon) be read, τὰ becomes relative and nominative, the subject of παινεῖ, the infinitive being supplied with δοκίμα as before.

790. τὸτε before, i.e. during the continuance of the war, στέλλων στρατιῶν.

791. Perhaps οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς for I will speak out (what I am thinking), literally 'will not suppress speech'. The singular (κεφαλὴν ἔπος) is common in Homer, see L. and Sc. s. v. κεφαλή, ἐπικεφαλέω.—Or οὐκ ἐπικεφαλεῖ (Hermann) absolutely, I will make no concealment, also Homeric.

792. Thou hadst no pleasing figure to my eyes, 'wast in my view pictured un pleasingly'.

793. I.e. as not showing a full command of your judgment.

794—95. ἀνδράτικα ψηφικοῦσι κομίζων 'in spending the lives of men to recover (Helen)'. For κομίζων in this connexion see Eur. Iph. A. 770 ἡλκαστικὴ Ἀρης 'Ἐλένην ἐκ Πρακτών κομίζαι θέλων ἐτοίμα Ἐλλάδα, id. Or. 1614 (Menelaus speaks) ὡ τλῆμων Ἐλένη...σὲ σφάγων ἐκκύως ἐκ φρυγών, and for numerous examples L. and Sc. s. v.—ἀνδράτικα ψηφικοῦσοι: instrumental dative, as with words signifying purchase, literally 'with dying men'. The complaint here is the same as in v. 455 foll.—θάρσος ἐκούσιον (θάρσος Cod. Farn.) should not be hastily condemned. What the context requires is some description of Helen such as to mark the folly of spending lives to win her back (Weil, cf. v. 62). Now ἐκούσιον consenting is to the point and may be illustrated by Eur. El. 1065 ἡ μὲν γὰρ (Helen) ἀρ πασθείων ἐκούσι' ἀπόφη, and id. Tr. 370, which paraphrases and expands ἐκούσιον here, ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς (Agamemnon) ὁ σφόδρος ἐχθράτων ὑπὲρ τὰ διδατά ὄλεις', ἡδονάς τὰς οἰκήθες | τέκνων ἄδελφῳ δοῦς γυναικὸς οὐκετα, | καὶ τὰ δι' ἐκούσις κοὐ βιὰ λελθομενης: a woman who surrendered herself to the sieducer was not worth recovery at all, much less at such a cost. Nor is θάρσος difficult in itself. Like μῦσος and στῦγος, so θάρσος οὐ θράσος is used in a personal sense (e.g. Eur. Andr. 261 ὃ βαρβαρον σὺν θρήμα καὶ σκηνᾶν θράσος), and it is common as a synonym of ἀνάδεικν. The form θράσος is more frequent in this sense (in fact seldom has any other, which accounts for the reading of δι' here), but θάρσος is used so also. There is no reason therefore why θάρσος here should not mean a wanton, that is Helen herself. The question then is whether θάρσος in this particular sense was sufficiently established in popular
νῦν δ’ οὐκ ἄπ’ ἀκρασ φρενὸς οὐδ’ ἀφίλως.
εὐφρων πόνος εὖ τελέσασιν.
γνώσει δὲ χρόνῳ διαπενθόμενος
tὸν τε δικαίως καὶ τὸν ἀκαίρως
πόλιν οἰκουροῦντα πολιτῶν.

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

πρῶτον μὲν Ἀργος καὶ θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους
dίκη προσεπείν, τοὺς ἐμοὶ μετατίους
νόστου δικαίως θ’ δὲν ἐπραξάμην πόλιν.
Πριάμου. δίκας γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ γλῶσσης θεοὶ
κλύνοντες ἀνδροθυτὰς, Ἰλίου φθοράς,
ἐς αἰματηρὸν τεῦχος οὐ διχορρότως
ψήφους ἔθετο. τῷ δ’ ἐναντίῳ κύτει
ἐλπὶς προσῆλε τειρὸς οὐ πληρουμένω.
κατνυξὸ δ’ ἀλούσα νῦν ἔτ’ εὐσημος πόλις.
ἀτῆς θυέλλαι ζώσι. συνθυήσκουσά δὲ

use to make θάρσου ἐκοῦσων intelligible,
with this context, in the sense a consenting
wanton. The text is some evidence for
the affirmative, and the parallel passages
from Euripides above cited suggest that
such language, applied to the case of
Helen, was a traditional commonplace.
See further, in support of this view, Dr
Headlam, Class. Rev. xiv. 116.—What the
elders have in their minds is the recent
(and in truth unappeased) indignation of
the people for the loss of life in the war.

796. νῦν δ’...ἀφίλως. But now our
picture of thee is not (thus) superficial
and unkind. The verb is γεγραμμένος el
‘thou art represented’, or something to
the same effect, supplied from the anti-
thetic clause τότε...ἡθα γεγραμμένος.
‘Now that the suffering is over and the
end won, we can revise our hasty judg-
ment and make fair allowance’.—ἄπ’
ἀκρας φρενὸς literally ‘with the surface
(only) of the mind’. Cf. Eur. Hec. 242
οὐ γὰρ ἄκρας καρδίας ἐφανεῖ μου ‘it made a
more than superficial (deep) impression on
me’. The term ἄπ’ ἀκρασ φρενὸς is taken
or imitated, like ἀπομομοιως, from the
vocabulary of criticism.

797. εὐφρων...τελέσασιν men think
happily of their sufferings, when they
have won success, literally ‘a toil is happy
in the view of those who have well ac-
complished it’. Probably a proverb:
for the favourite play on εὖ see on
v. 557.—This is commonly joined as one
sentence to v. 796, but it is almost uni-
versally admitted (see conjectures in
Wecklein’s Appendix) that so taken it
gives no satisfactory sense.

801—845. Agamemnon’s speech has
two divisions: (1) 801—820 Salutation to
the gods and thanks (not very becomingly
expressed) for his victory, (2) his answer
to the hints of the elders ; he is on his
guard and intends to treat all according
to their deserts. In the first part, not-
withstanding the proud tone, there is a
hint of exculpation in reference to the
destruction of Troy; he insists upon the
share of the gods in the work and the
now we figure thee with deeper judgment and less unkind. Happy
the labour that is happily done. Thou wilt learn by inquisition
hereafter, who here at home hath done his duty, and who hath
mis-spent the time.

Agamemnon. To Argos first my salutation is due, and to
the gods that inhabit here, who have aided me to my home-
coming and the justice which I have taken of Priam’s town.
For they, having heard the mortal argument which with main
force we pleaded for Troy’s destroying, put their votes undivided
into the vase for blood, while to the opposite urn hope of the
hand came nigh, yet it was not filled. By her smoke the con-
quered city is conspicuous even yet. Life in the ruin pants,

profits of vengeance. In the second
part his selfish and imperious nature is
fattily exhibited, when, with every mo-
tive to be complaisant, he takes occasion
to make a bitter attack upon those to
whom he owes his triumph. The whole
harangue is haughty and repulsive.

802. δίκη: both custom and justice.
—τοὺς ἐμοὶ μεταιτόνοις who with me
have contributed to etc., a strange form
for the expression of religious gratitude.

803. τόλιν: the gods approved
the destruction of the city. See v. 815.

804. δικαίον ἀπὸ γλάυστης our
cause argued not with the tongue, but
with the sword. Cf. δίκην ἀπείω to plead
a cause.

805. ἀνθρωποκτόνος (δίκας) a mortal arg-
ument, i.e. one in which was demanded
the penalty of death.—ἲλιον φθορᾶς im-
porting the destruction of Troy, literally
‘a destruction to Troy’, in apposition to
dίκας, as ἰσχύς to πεῦκη in v. 299, and
with the same adjectival force. The
phrase translates the metaphor of ἀν-
θρωποκτόνος into the literal fact.—φθορᾶς
(Dobree) gives the same sense, a suit
of (i.e. for) destruction.—The construction
φθορᾶς ψῆφος-θεντο (ψηφίσαντο), ‘they
voted the destruction’ (Paley), is embar-
rassed by the words ἐκαταριψν τεῦχος.

806. αἰματηρὸν τεῦχος the bloody ves-
sel, that which was to receive votes for
the penalty of death.

807. “But to the opposite urn hope of
the hand came nigh, yet it was not filled,
a quaint and fanciful but quite character-
istic way of saying that the other urn
expected votes but did not get them”
(Sidgwick). ἐπὶς with emphasis, hope
only, and no actual hand with a vote.—
’Ἐπὶς προσεῖτε χεῖρας, ‘Hope waved
her hand before it’ as if to put votes
there (Margoliouth), is so close to the
ms. that it must almost be called an
alternative reading of it. But the asso-
ciations of σέλευν, προσείειν do not seem
pertinent, and the common text is sat-
factory.—The ‘hope’ refers to the long
postponement of the capture by the dis-
sensions of Olympus.

809. A bitter jest; the city may
boast itself ‘conspicuous’ still. καπνὸς
with εὐσημος.

810 Life in the ruin pants, while
from the expiring ash is breathed a reek of
richness. ἄτης θεῦλας ζωον, literally
‘in the ruin are living blasts’: for ἄτης
see v. 731. θεῦλα, usually ‘blast’ of a
storm, is used here as a sort of gigantic
term for a ‘gasp’, the glowing heap
being compared to a dying animal.—
σύνθεισκονούσα σποδός. When the ash
is cold, the gasps of life will cease; with
them therefore the ash is dying.—πλούσιος
πλοῦτου πνεος. The chief symbol of
Eastern wealth to a Greek mind was the
costly perfume imported from Asia for
purposes of religion and luxury: this idea has coloured the picture here.—Hence the suggestion θηνλατι censors (Hermann), but by this what is gained to the figure in consistency is lost in picturesque force.

812. For all this there must be paid to the gods a memorable return, even as the fine is great, which our wrath hath taken. ταγάς M. Schmidt. The form of the sentence, 'we should pay largely, since a great (...) also we have exacted', demands some word signifying 'payment exacted'. ταγή (extant in other senses) is here an archaic synonym of τάξις, an 'assessment', or 'payment imposed', as by a victor upon the conquered, from τάσσειν 'to prescribe'. The abstract nouns in -σεις, answering to the aorist in -σε, steadily encroached in common use upon the abstracts in -η, corresponding to the strong aorist; but in the older language λαβάς, λαχή etc. were used with the same freedom as in the later λῆψις, λεξίς etc. They were simply the abstract nouns answering to the verbs and admitted the same range of meaning.—

πάγα...ἐφραζόμεθα Hermann we fenced a shake.—ὑπερκόπον Heath.

815. Ἄργειον δάκος: the 'foal of the horse' would not usually be described as δάκος, but the expression comes down from the time when the Argive horse inspired the strange terror depicted in the Seven against Thebes (see the Introduction to that play, § 2). The legends of the mares of Augæas and Diomedé, which were fed on human flesh, is a similar testimony to the formidable renown of the horse of the north.

816. ἵππον νεοσσός may perhaps allude to the wooden horse and the soldiers who came out of its belly; but this does not well account for the description of the Argive people generally as 'the foal of the horse'. More probably both the horse here and the lion of ν. 818 are emblematic animals, perhaps heraldic. The horse was certainly characteristic of Argos, and according to the Argive legends was created there by Poseidon. The lion on the other hand would belong rather (as witness the gates)
and from the expiring ash is breathed a reek of richness. For 
all this there must be paid to the gods a memorable return, 
even as the fine is great, which our wrath hath taken, since 
for one woman stolen a city hath been laid level by the fierce 
beast of Argos, the foal of the horse, the folk of the shield, 
that launched himself with a leap in the season of the Pleiads' 
fall. Over the wall he sprang and, like a lion fleshed, lapped 
his fill of proud princes' blood. 

Now, having given to religion this ample precedence, I come 
to thee and thy feelings. I remember what I have heard. I 
am with thee, and support thine accusation. Rare among men 
are they to whom it is natural to love and admire the fortunate

to Mycenae. Aeschylus has perhaps combined types belonging to different 
layers of legend. In Eur. Supp. 1223 the sons of The Seven, who under 
the name of the Epigonii avenged their fathers upon Thebes, are called ἐκτεθραμμένοι 
σκύμοι λέοντων, but it does not appear whether this description is applied to 
them specially as Argives. See Paley's note. 

ib. ἀπιδηστρήφος λέως. On the shield of Argos and the Argives see 
Theb. 89 and the Introduction to that play p. xxi. The title points to a time 
when in metal work, especially armour, the Achaeans of the Argolid were much 
in advance of their neighbours.—For 
-στρήφος (wielders of the shield) Weck- 
lein refers to Soph. Ai. 575 διὰ τολυρρά-
φον στρέφων πόρπακος ἐπτάβοιον ἄρρηκτον 
σάκος.

817. ἄμφι Πλεάδων δύσιν i.e. in late 
autumn, early in November. "The time 
(Klausen observes) is mentioned which 
would best account for the storm before 
described, since between the setting and 
the rising of the Pleiads it was not the 
sailing season; see Theocr. 13. 25, and 
Hesiod. Ὀμ. 617. Demosthenes (p. 1214) 
speaks of the tempests which usually 
followed the former event." Paley. See 
the Introduction.—On the interpretation 
'at midnight' see Appendix P.

819. αὐματός τυραννικοῦ: an ex-
pression significant to some of his 
hearers. 

820. θεοῖς μὲν ἔξετενα: 'so far my 
first word to the gods, which I have 
not scanted'. See v. 907.

821. τὰ...φρόνημα but as to the mat- 
ter of your own feelings (see vv. 776— 
800).—μέμνημαι κλίνω I remember what 
I have heard, that is, intimations of the 
disaffection at home which had reached 
him before his return and on his first 
landing. That he should have heard 
something would naturally be supposed, 
and is in fact required to account for his 
bearing. This allusion gives the key. 
(We need not suppose him to mean that he 
remembers what was said a few minutes 
ago.)

822. συνήγορόν μ' ἔξεις you have in 
me a supporter of your accusation, a 
συνήγορον in the narrower sense of the 
term (see L. and Sc. s.v.). Not merely 
'agreeing with you'. What the elders 
have spoken is an accusation, not the 
less menacing because general, against 
their compatriots (see particularly vv. 798—800). The king declares himself on 
their side, determined to investigate and 
to punish (v. 839), and his threats do 
not fall to the ground.

824. φλον: a predicate: φλον σέβετον 
to admire kindly.—φλόνων envious feel- 
ings, envious, inclination to envy. The 
plural φλόνων makes a class-term 'what
δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὸς καρδιὰν προσήμενος 825
ἀχθος διπλοῖει τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσου,
τοῖς τ' αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ πήμασιν βαρύνεται
καὶ τὸν θυραῖον ὀλβον εἰσορῶν στένει.
εἴδως λέγομι ἂν· εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι
ὅμιλιας κάτοπτρον, εἴδωλον σκιᾶς,
δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρεμενεῖς ἐμοί.
μόνος δ' Ὀδυσσεύς, ὀσπερ οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐπλει,
ζενχθεὶς ἐτοιμὸς ἂν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος·
ἐῖτ' οὖν θανῶντος εἴτε καὶ ξώντος πέρι
λέγω. τὰ δ' ἀλλα πρὸς πόλιν τε καὶ θεοὺς
κοινοὺς ἀγώνας θέντες ἐν πανηγύρει
βουλευσόμεσθα. καὶ τὸ μὲν καλῶς ἔχον
ὅτως χρονίζον εὖ μενεὶ βουλευτέον·
ὀτι δὲ καὶ δεὶ φαρμάκων παιωνών,
ητοί κέαντες ἢ τεμόντες εὐφρόνω
πειρασόμεθα πήματος· τρέψαι νόσουν.
νῦν δ' ἐσι μέλαθρα καὶ δόμους ἐφεστίους
ἐλθὼν θεοῦ πρότα δεξιῶσομαι,
οὕτε πρὸς πέμψαντες ἡγαγὼν πάλιν.
νίκη δ' ἐπείπερ ἐσπετ', ἐμπέδως μένοι.

825. πεπαμένῳ.

is like envy', as in Plato, Philebus 40 E.
πέρι φόβων καὶ θυμών καὶ πάνω τῶν
τοιουτών.—φθάνον h, ψάγον Stobaeus.
826. τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσου him that has
ought amiss with him. νόσου covers both
distress and vice.—πεπαμένῳ Porson.
830. ὅμιλιας κάτοπτρον the mirror of
friendship, i.e. the false friendship which
is to the genuine as the reflection to the
reality, or, as he puts it with angry ex-
aggeration, as the reflexion of a shadow
to the shadow itself.—δοκοῦντας: the
example (the pretended friends of Aga-
memon) is put in apposition to the
general conception which it illustrates.—

All this, though ostensibly directed against
the absent, and in this aspect forcibly
exhibiting the character of the man, is full
of menace for those about him: δοκοῦντας
eἶναι refers expressly to v. 780.
832. ὀσπερ κτλ. If you would have
good service from men, you must ride
them hard. Such is the suggested moral.
—Odysseus was entrapped by Palamedes
into accompanying the expedition.
834. εἰτ' οὖν...λέγω. λέγω is properly
a separate clause in itself; with εἰτ' οὖν...
πέρι another λέγω is supplied; that I
will say for him, living or dead.—Another
unhappy remark. It is not the moment
without envying. The poison of ill-will settles to the heart and
doubles the load of him that has aught amiss: at once his own
sorrows press upon him, and he sighs to see the other's happi-
ness. I may speak with knowledge, having learnt thoroughly
that mirror of friendship, image of a shadow, the hypocrites'
semblance of devotion to me. Odysseus only, Odysseus, who
joined the fleet against his will, I found, being once in harness,
mine own right horse. That I will say for him living or dead.

[Enter Clytaemnestra.]

And for the rest, the affairs of state and of religion too in
general assembly summoned together we will debate; where we
must take such counsel that what is well may endure so and
abide, while as for what must have medicinal remedy, we will
do our kind endeavour with lancet or cautery to defeat the
mischief of the sore.

For the moment, I go to mine house and private chambers,
where my hand's first greeting must be to the gods, who sent
me forth and have brought me back. May victory, as she hath
attended me, constantly abide with me still!

to remind the people, especially without
a word of sympathy, that after all the
losses of the war most of the returning
army has probably perished at sea.

836. ἄγωνας: ἄγως, meetings.
839. ὅτω δὲ καὶ δὲ. ὅτω is neuter,
what must have remedy, answering to τὸ
καλὰς ἔχων. What 'kind lancet or cau-
tery' may be needed, to remove the
peculant humours of the body politic, will
not be spared. With εὐφρόνωσ compare
Antony's ironical question to the mur-
derers of Caesar, 'Who else must be let
blood, who else is rank?'

841. πῆλατος τρέψαν νόσουν to defeat
the mischief of the sore, or (as Porson)
πῆλα ἀποστρέψαν νόσουν to avert the harm
of the ailment. The Ms. reading is not
impossible. νόσουν πῆλατος the ailment
or mischief of the sore. For πῆλα see
Soph. Αἰ. 582 τῶν πῆλα, a tumour
that 'craves the knife'. The metaphor,
as the previous line shows, is from surgery
not from medicine. τρέψαν to defeat (see
τριπή) is a metaphor within a metaphor,
falling back in the direction of the literal.
When the king speaks of 'lancing or cauterizing' the state, what he really
means is that with the support of his
friends he will 'defeat' his enemies and
theirs. It is natural therefore that the
word defeat should come into his mind.
843 points to the 'illustration' and
Clytaemnestra's bath.

845. Significant again. He is aware
that ἐτ᾽ ἐξ ἀγῶνες, that he has still
enemies to encounter at home.—The
last part of the speech is vividly dramatic.
All the auditors are agreed that τὸ καλὰς
ἔχων ὅπως χρονίζων εἰ μὲνεὶ βουλευτῶν (cf.
v. 362), and on the necessity of 'surgery'
for the good of the state, only there is a
difference of opinion as to the sense of
these expressions. The king speaks as
he does because, not having a glimpse of
the plot, he believes himself irresistible
and gives the rein to his indignation.
ΚΛ. ἀνδρὲς πολίται, πρέσβος Ἀργείων τόδε, οὐκ ἁισχυνόμαι τοὺς φιλάνορας τρόπους λέξαι πρὸς ύμᾶς· ἐν χρόνῳ δὲ ἀποφθίνει τὸ τάρβος ἀνθρώποις. οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα μαθοῦσα· ἐμαντής δύσφορον λέξω βίον τοσοῦτο δοσοπερ οὕτος ἦν ὑπ’ Ἰλιῷ. τὸ μὲν γυναῖκα πρῶτον ἀρσενὸς δίχα ἦσθαι δόμοις ἔρημον ἐκπαγλον κακῶν, πολλὰς κλύουσαν ἥδονας παλαικότους... καὶ τὸν μὲν ἤκειν τὸν δ’ ἐπεισόφερεν κακὸν κάκιον ἄλλο πῆμα λάσκοντας δόμοις. καὶ τραυμάτων μὲν εἰ τόσων ἐτύχχανεν ἀνήρ ὁδ’, ὡς πρὸς οἶκον ὦχετεῦτο φάτις, τέτρωτα δικτύον πλέω λέγειν· εἰ δ’ ἦν τεθνηκὼς, ὡς ἐπλήθυνον λόγοι, τρισώματος τὰν Γηρυῶν ὁ δεύτερος πολλὴν—ἀνωθεν, τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω—

859. φάσις (?) τέτρωτα.

846. As the king makes to enter, the queen attended by her women (v. 899) comes from the palace. Her address, like her message by the herald, is a self-defence, better prepared but not more successful. The very depth of her respect (she says) prevents her from addressing the king, so she turns to the assembly and principally to the elders, with whom long association has made her familiar.

849. οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα μαθοῦσα ‘my own witness to my conduct will not be hearsay, such as that by which I am perhaps accused’.

852. ἀρσενὸς...ἔρημον alone without the man fill the throne of the house (cf. v. 271) bearing the weight of the sole responsibility. See also next note.

854. Hearing many persistent flatteries, i.e. besieged by tempters. ἡδονᾶς douceurs, compliments, πρὸς ἡδονῇ λέγομεν, ‘what is spoken to please’. Herodotus (7. 101 κόσμον ἄληθὴν χρήσομαι ἢ ἡδονῇ; shall I use frankness or flattery?) has the word in a sense nearly approaching this. It properly meant sweetness, agreeableness or something agreeable like the French equivalent. παλαικότους: unwelcome but irrepressible.—Clytemnestra just glances at the firmness of her virtue. Then, feeling the peril of the subject, she passes rapidly to another, and presently (v. 865) contrives to bring in her words again with a slight but transfiguring change, as if it were κληδόνας, and not really ἡδονᾶς at all, which she had said, precisely as in v. 866 she twists to a new meaning the words of v. 862. In both places the explanation is the same. At this last fearful crisis she really is afraid of her own words and unable for some minutes to steady her mind.—κληδόνας Anaratus. Others more plausibly omit the verse.

855. While one comer after another brought to the house loud tidings of we
Clytaemnestra. Townsmen of Argos, her noblest present here, what love I have practised toward my husband, my modesty will let me declare to you. With time men lose their fear.

Upon no witness but mine own I can say, how weary were my days all the long while my lord lay before Ilium. A sore grief it is in itself, for a woman without a man to sit in the empty throne of the house, with ever persistent flatteries at her ear,...and one coming after another with loud tidings of woe to the house each worse than the last. As for wounds, if my lord was wounded as often as the conduits of fame brought news of it, he hath holes in him more in number than a net. And had he died, as report thereof multiplied, he might, with three bodies like another Geryon, have boasted many times three—not beds,
863. ἔξυχε λαβὼν: ‘he might have boasted a triple mantle of earth assumed’. λαβὼν literally ‘having taken it on him’.
—λαβεῖν Paley.
865. παλιγκότων persistent. See on vv. 576, 854.
866. πολλάς ἀνωθεν ἀρτάνας many a hanging noose: ἀρτάνα properly ‘thing suspending’, ‘that by which something is hung (ἀρτηραί)’, like other quasi-verbal nouns can take an adverb construed with the implied verbal notion: ἀνωθεν ἀρτάνα literally ‘a thing which hangs up’. But the expression is cumbrous, and due only to the artificial parallel with πολλά πάνω: see on v. 862.—δέρης 'from my neck', ἔλαυναν taking the construction of ἀπέλυσαν.
867. πρὸς βιαν λελημένης (ἔμοι), preventing my eagerness, i.e. my desperate desire to die, literally ‘in despite of me eager’. (Ahrens, Blomfield.) Cf. Theb. 367 μάχης λελημένος, and Λιπτομαι. In Theb. 342 λελημένοι is written for λελη-

μένοι.—Of two proposed renderings for πρὸς βιαν λελημένης, (1), supplying ἔμοι, ‘of me violently seized (by them)’ would require “ληφθέλησα the act, not λελημένης the state” (S.), and (2), supplying δέρης, ‘my neck, caught violently in the noose’, gives λαβεῖν a forced meaning.
868. The manner in which Clytaemnestra uses this circumstance, the absence of her son Orestes, is skilful. Here at least, she says, there can be no doubt of her honesty (τοιάδε σκῆψις ὑπὸ δόλον φέρει): if she had been disloyal to the king, she would never have sent his heir out of her control. The argument is sound; the flaw is in the assumed facts, as to which she trusts that the king is not yet informed. The true facts about Orestes, as supposed by Aeschylus, have to be gathered from indications, for us slight and obscure, in the Choephoroi; see the Introduction to that play pp. xiv foll.
869. ἔμοι...πιστευμάτων who should best make confidence between me and thee. Κύρος followed by a genitive signifies ‘having power over’, or ‘qualified in’ the
but coverlets rather of earth taken on to him, if he had had one death for each of his shapes. Such, ever present at mine ear, were the rumours that put me many times to the hanging nose, which others, preventing my eagerness, loosened from my neck.

This is indeed why the boy Orestes, he who might best make confidence between thee and me, is not, as he should be, here; be not surprised. He is in the special care of our ally, Strophius of Phocis, who warned me of double mischief, the danger first of thee before Ilium, and the chance that noisy rebellion from below might risk a plot against us, as it is native to man to spurn the more him that is down. The excuse however is such as cannot have guile in it.

mater described. See L. and Sc. s. v. Thus κύριος πιστευμάτων is literally ‘qualified in the matter of confidence’, ‘powerful over confidence’, where πιστευμα confidence is the abstract from πιστεύω to trust.—πιστωμάτων pledges Spanheim, Hermann. Orestes was himself a πιστωμα between his parents, but being a πιστωμα he was κύριος πιστευμάτων. The proper meaning of κύριος πιστωμάτων would be ‘qualified to give a pledge’, ‘qualified to deal with a pledge’, or the like.

871. αὐτόν: perhaps an example of this pronoun used without emphasis, which in Aeschylus is rare. But an emphasis is possible ‘he is under the special (separate) care’.

872. ἀμφιλέκτα...προφωνῶν suggesting to me future trouble in two shapes. ἀμφιλέκτα properly ‘divided into two counts’ in the sense of ‘heads’ or ‘divisions’ in a subject, as in the technical phrase ‘counts of an indictment’. (So also Wecklein.)

873. τὸν τε...ἐξ τε. These are two dangers, not parts of the same: (1) Agamemnon might die at Troy, in which case his youthful heir would need protection; (2) his mere absence and the weakness of the regency might encourage the unruly ‘to risk a plot’. To the last enterprise especially the impossibility of seizing the heir would be a discouragement.

875. βουλὴν καταρράφειν should hazard a plot against (κατά) me; Blomfield. Cf. βίπτειν κύρινον, a metaphor from the throwing of dice, βίπτειν κύβευμα. For βουλή, cf. Andocides 9. 4 διὰ ταύτα εἶπον τῇ βουλῇ (I told the council) ὅτι εἰδέλθην τῶν ποιήσων, καὶ ἔξηλεγξα τὰ γενόμενα, ὅτι εἰσηγήσατο μὲν πυθόντων ἡμῶν ταύτῃ τῆς βουλῆς (proposed this plot) Ἐφήδησος, ἀντίκον δὲ ἐγώ κτλ., a passage which shows that this sense was not affected by the technical use of ἡ βουλή at Athens. ῥίψαι βουλὴν for ῥίψαι κύρινον βουλῆς is an extension of the ‘inner’ or cognate accusative.—Others translate ‘should throw down the council’, i.e. overthrow the government of the queen and her advisers, but (1) βουλή without explanation could not bear this technical meaning; (2) the play does not give the explanation, nor suppose a formal Council of regency; the elders never speak of themselves as such; (3) we should expect rather καταλύσαι or possibly καταβαλέων.

—βουλὴν καταρράφειν Scaliger, ‘should devise a plot’.—ὡς τε: ὡς, as indeed.

877. μέντοι however; ‘though his presence would be our best assurance, the explanation of his absence is transparently honest and an assurance in itself’.
878. μὲν δὴ dismissing irrelevancies and coming to the gist of the matter.

880. βλάβας Triclinius (Cod. Farn.) obviously and perhaps rightly, but κλάβας eye-sores cannot be disproved. The representation of the s by b in the Doric and Aeolic dialects frequent and regular (φάβος = φάβος, ἀβέα = ῥάβεα φά etc.). From κλασ- (cf. κλαύμα) a regular formation in these dialects would be κλάβ-α. The language of poetry often preserves dialectic forms, because the words came into literature from a dialectic source. A similar instance is νέβρος, commonly referred to the root (νεβ-) of νέος. The nouns in -η from verb-stems, originally abstracts, describing a process, are regularly extended to the effect of the process, e.g. πλοκή plaiting, wreath, δίκη pointing, way, etc.: and κλάβα therefore might be the sore produced in running eyes.—γλάμας Platt, Class. Rev. xi. p. 95.

881. τάς ἀμφί σοι... λαμπτηροχέας. From the analogy of other like words (δόδοιχα, λαμπαδούχια etc.) we should suppose that λαμπτηροχέα was the function of λαμπτηρούχοι or torch-bearers and ἡ ἀμφί των λαμπτηροχέων attendance upon a person as a torch-bearer. Many words of this type, e.g. σκηπτοῦχοι, κληροῦχοι, εύνοιχοι, describe offices and officers. Here it seems to mean ‘attending the king with torches’ to his chamber, the distinctio, as a state-ceremony. ἀτμηλήτους, neglected, would, as applied to a ceremony, mean ‘disused’. The queen wept that the king came no more with the accustomed state to his chamber.—Other explanations offered are (1) that the beacons (v. 203) were neglected, i.e. not lit, for want of cause to light them, (2) that the watch-fires lighted in the house in expectation of the king’s return ‘were disregarded’, i.e. he did not come (Sidgwick), (3) that Clytaemnestra’s lamp (really lit for Aegisthus) did not bring back her husband (Headlam, Class. Rev. xvii. 244).
But as for me, the fountains of my tears have run themselves dry, and there is no drop there. With watching late mine eyes are sore, with weeping for thine attendance of torch-bearers neglected still. The droning gnat with lightest flutter would wake me from dreams, in which I saw thee pass through more than the time of my sleep.

Now, after all this misery, in the relief of my soul, I would hail this my husband as a watch-dog to the fold, the ship’s securing stay, the high roof’s grounded pillar, as a child sole-born to a father hopeless, or land espied by mariners in despair, dawn as it looks most beautiful after storm, a flowing spring to the thirsty wayfarer,—but everywhere escape from distress is

But do these adequately render λαμπτηροικία?

883. λεπταίς, emphasized by displacement in the sentence, lightest.—υπαλ κώνυπος together; ἔπαθοι with τοῦσσοντος. The construction of ὑπαλ with dative of agent is not certified in Aeschylus (Wecklein mentions Theb. 915, but justly holds that that case is distinguishable).

885. τοῦ...χρόνου i.e. the time of my sleeping. “The personifying instinct pervades the language of Aeschylus” (Sidgwick).

886. ἀπενθήτω is distinguishable from ἀπενθής. The passive form, in its full force, means ‘relieved from grief’ (disgrieved so to speak, ‘made ἀπενθήτω’).

887. τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα, literally ‘of the fold a dog’, i.e. what a dog is to the fold. The article should in strictness have been repeated throughout the catalogue, τῶν μὲν σταθμῶν κύνα, τῆς δὲ ναὸς πρότον, τῆς δὲ στέγης στύλων, κτλ., and so a prose-writer would have written. But in poetry the logical completeness of this is naturally sacrificed to euphony: with σωτῆρα ναὸς πρότον we supply τῆς ναὸς, and so on.

889. στύλων. Μ had probably the mis-spelling στούλων.—στύλων h.

890. καὶ “connects 887—889, which describe the protection and security afforded by the master, with 890—892, which describe the delight of his unhoped-for return. The transition from one set to the other is marked by καὶ”. Sidgwick.

—Mr S. J. Rowton suggests to me as a simpler explanation that καὶ couples only γῆ and τέκνον, joined because φανεῖον παρ’ ἐλπίδα belongs to both, ‘an only child coming to a despairing father, or land appearing to despairing sailors’. So also Dr Headlam (Class. Rev. xvii. 244) comparing Pind. Ol. 10. 86 χρόνῳ μὲν φανεῖον, αὖ ὥτε παῖς...πατρὶ ποιεῖν νῦν κτλ. I adopt this.—This artificial catalogue betrays the speaker, as indeed does most of the oration. No one could make a successful speech in such a situation, though it is natural enough that the queen should try. As the king severely and truly remarks, she is much too long. But she attains the real object of her appearance before the palace, when he is compelled to accept the perfidious compliment of the tapestry.

891. Ηλιον as it looks the fairest, after storm. The superlative, though much criticized, seems correct.

893—4. Literally ‘but relief is sweet in everything; such like then are the titles with which I express my praise’, i.e. ‘as the types of deliverance, such as the foregoing, are infinite in number, I take them in the sum and mean them all’. The cardinal point is the emphasis on τοῦσδε, emphasized in respect of its difference from τοῦδε. The queen’s
copiousness, as is the danger of unreal
elegance, has overrun itself and reached
a point at which it is equally ineffecti
to go on or to stop. With πηγαίον ἱέος
her catalogue is in no way rounded off,
and yet one or two more προσφέματα
would carry her over the edge of the sub-
lime. Perforce therefore she generalizes,
and concludes in fact with an et cetera.
Thus a fine piece of verse is spoiled,
but it was made for the purpose. Aes-
chylus could afford to purchase a piece of
truth at the cost of a few big words.—ἄξιον:
‘to hold in value’, then ‘to pronounce
valuable’, and so, as here, ‘to praise,
honour’, both of things and persons,
cf. Eur. Or. 1210 καλότιν ἱμανατόσν
ἄξιωμένη, Hec. 319. The verb is used,
as any transitive verb may be, absolutely;
see e.g. v. 1182 φρενέσων δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἔξ
αινεματών my teaching shall be no longer
enigmatic; so here, my praise bestows
titles like these. But in effect the object
is ἄνδρα τῶν ἐς supplied from the fore-
going period (v. 887) of which this line is
really a part.—See further Appendix Q.

895. ϕθόνοι δ’ ἀπέστω, i.e. the excess
of my joy, after what I have suffered,
does not deserve rebuke. According to
Greek religious feeling the display of
human happiness was itself a provocation
to fortune.

896. At a sign from the queen the path
to the house is strown with crimson
embroidered tapestries, properly used for
religious processions and ceremonies, over
which the king is invited to walk. The
urgency of Clytaemnestra in forcing him
to accept this homage has a motive more
direct and simple than the chance of ex-
posing him to the jealousy of Fate. It
is designed for the people, upon whose
conduct in a few minutes the lives of the
queen and her partisans will depend.
To stimulate discontent and discourage
loyalty is of vital moment. By the
queen’s arrangement, what the murmurs
and spectators see is that the returned
τάραννος enters his palace with a kind of
pomp shocking to Hellenic eyes (see on
v. 938). His reluctance, even if taken
for genuine, could be appreciated only
by the immediate bystanders. It is like
Gracchus pointing to his head, only that
in this case the ill effect is designed. To
Aeschylus the scene may perhaps have
sweet; in such-like titles then would my praising run. And let jealousy refrain, seeing how much was the woe we endured before.

But now, I pray thee, beloved, step from this car—but not on the earth, king, set that foot of thine, which has humbled Troy. Slaves, why delay ye to do your commanded office, and strow the ground of his way with coverings? In a moment let the laid path be turned to purple, that to a home unexpected he may have conduct due.

'And for the rest', a vigilance never laid asleep shall order it as just providence, I trust, intends.

Ag. Daughter of Leda, who hast my house in charge, if to the measure of my absence thou hast stretched the length of

been suggested by the fate of Pausanias, one of whose gravest offences was his adoption of Oriental ceremony.

898. τὸν σὸν πόδα. Elision of substantives and adjectives having the quantity - is rare in tragic verse, and by Aeschylus and Sophocles scarcely allowed except under peculiar conditions. Their regular use is as in v. 887 κῶνα, v. 895 καδά. As to the details see Journal of Philology xi. p. 136. The exceptions are about 3 per cent. In the iambic verse of Aeschylus this is the only one sufficiently attested. (On P. V. 335 δώσεων Δί', and Enni. 902 κατὰ χθὸν' ὤδα, see the article cited.) What justifies it to the ear will appear to be this, that in the phrase τὸν σὸν πόδα following χαμαί τίβεις the noun, being anticipated and so to speak 'discounted', has no weight, while on the other hand what is lost by curtailment to πόδα goes to increase the stress upon σὸν, on which the meaning depends,—that foot, O king, which thou hast set upon Troy.

902. ἀδελπον...δίκη with ironic intention, meaning ostensibly scarce hoped for...due ceremony, but for those informed unexpected...vengeance.

903. φροντὶς ὅχι ὑπνῷ νικωμένη an expression not lost upon those privy to the secret of the queen's night-watch. Ostensibly it is a compliment to the 'open eyes' of the king, and τὰ δ' ἄλλα in fact recalls the conclusion of his speech (v. 835), which she hears as she enters.

ib. Literally 'shall order it, being, I trust, justly fated', an expression of pious reliance upon heaven to show the right in the king's threatened investigation. So the words should be grouped, if the reading is right.—θεοῖν ἄρμενα Meineke, Wecklein, where θήσει ἄρμενα is 'shall order them fittingly'.

905. Agamemnon dismisses the queen's salutation with a sarcasm, and sternly rebukes her for the untimely pomp, of which he divines the malicious motive (v. 912). Of his danger he has not a glimpse, nor does it lie in any of the facts which he knows or suspects, but in the undiscovered plot and preparations of the conspirators. See the Introduction.—Δῆθας γένεθλον: a significant opening. Clytemnestra was the daughter of one false wife and the sister of another, and her husband, who calls her by no other name or title but this, neither 'wife', nor 'queen', nor even 'Clytemnestra', gives her to know that he has not forgotten the fact. Cf. Ov. Her. 16. 291 (Paris to Helen) vix fieri, si sunt vires in semine avorum, | et Iovis et Ledaes filia, casta totes. Euripides (if it be he,
μακρὰν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας· ἀλλ’ ἐναισίμως αἴνειν, παρ’ ἄλλων χρῆ τὸ δ’ ἐρχεσθαι γέρας. καὶ τάλλα μὴ γυναῖκός ἐν τρόποις ἐμὲ ἄβρυνε, μηδὲ βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην χαμαιπέτες βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοί, μηδ’ εὑρασί στρώσαο’ ἐπίφθονον πόρον τίθει· θεοὺς τοι τοίσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεῶν, ἐν ποικίλωσι δὲ θυντὸν ὄντα κάλλεσιν βαίνειν ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἀνευ φόβου.

λέγω κατ’ ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, σέβεις ἐμὲ. χωρίς ποδοψήστρων τε καὶ τῶν ποικίλων κληδῶν ἀντεί· καὶ τὸ μὴ κακῶς φρονεῖν θεοῦ μέγιστον δῶρον. ὅλβισαι δὲ χρῆ βίον τελευτᾶντ’ ἐν εὔεστοι φιλή.

καὶ μὴν τὸ δ’ εἶπε, μὴ παρὰ γυνῶμην, ἐμοί,—

Ἄτοίγος γυνώμην μὲν ἅσοι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ’ ἐμὲ.

καὶ ήὐξω θεοῖς δείσας ἀν ὅδ’ ἔρθεν τάδε;

910. βαρβάρου.

Iph. A. 686) makes Agamemnon use the same title, among others, without special intention; but that he should select it at such a moment as this, and avoid every other, is not to be supposed accidental.

909. ἐµὲ...ἐµοί: 'me, who have no taste for such things, however the habits of my house may have been changed for the worse in my absence'. See on ν. 918. —ἐν τρόποις: ἐν of circumstance, with.

911. Literally 'make open-mouthed grovelling clamour in honour of me'.

913. τὸπει with emphasis, 'do not invite jealousy'.

915. ἐμοὶ μὲν 'to me at least'.

916. Ambiguous; 'I would have the honour of a man—and husband—not of a god'.

917. τὸ καλ: 'without carpets for the feet as without refinements generally'.

τῶν ποικίλων includes both 'decoration' and 'subtlety, fraud'. The artificial phrase τὸ ποικίλα is chosen to bring out this malicious suggestion.

918. Κουμέρ εἰρεν loud, another formidable phrase. Κουμέρ sufficiently proclaims the glory of Agamemnon—and the modesty of his wife? She has dwelt on the κληδῶνες that came from Troy (v. 865): what of the κληδῶν that went there? (Propertius, who has imitated this play elsewhere, seems to have had this passage in mind in 2. 18. 35 'ipse tuus semper tibi sit custodia lectus, nec nimirum ornata fronte sedere velis: credeam ego narrant, noli committere, famae: et terram rumor transit et maria'.)

921. 'And that I shall act on this principle always is the assurance for me', literally 'and I am confident inasmuch
thy address, still for a modest praise, the honour should proceed from some other lips. For the rest, offer no womanish luxuries to me, nor before me, as before a king of the East, grovel with open-mouthed acclaim, nor with vesture drawn draw jealous eyes upon my path. To the gods these honours belong. To tread, a mortal, upon fair fineries is to my poor thoughts a thing of fear. Give me I say the worship not of thy god but of thy lord. No foot cloths, no false refinements, need proclaim what rumour cries. An unpresumptuous mind is God's greatest gift: happy let him be called, who has come prosperously to the end. And that such will be ever my rule is the assurance for me.

Cl. Come answer, saving thy judgment, one question from me—

Ag. My judgment, be assured, is fixed beyond change by me.

Cl. Didst thou bind thyself belike, in some hour of terror, to this observance?

as I should do all things after this fashion'.—εἰ πράσσομεν ἄν. The optative with ἄν, standing in a conditional clause, has the same meaning that it would have in a principal sentence, i.e. it expresses what would happen or is likely to happen, under conditions expressed or implied. (It is grammatically an apodosis.) Here the implied condition is the universal condition 'whatever the circumstances', and is in fact contained in πάντα. See on Thesb. 504.—πράσσομεν ἄν 'I should do' (Paley), not 'I should fare'.—ὅσ ἰθώς, 'with the moderation and propriety that I show in this refusal'. The remark, or rather promise, is for the benefit of the bystanders.—I follow Mr Sidgwick in holding that this verse is correct. εἰπον τάδ', ὡς Weil.

922—933. On the effect of this alteration see Appendix R.

922—923. καὶ μὴν see, marks a new turn.—τὸδ' εἰπὲ...μοι differs from the usual formula for asking a question, εἰπὲ μοι, only in the appealing emphasis thrown upon μοι.—τὸδὲ: the question (v. 924), which follows the king's interruption.—μὴ παρὰ γνώμην: literally 'not against judgment', an afterthought and parenthesis, as is shown by the imp. aor. εἰπὲ (not subj. as required in prohibition). For παρὰ γνώμην λέγειν see Eur. Med. 577 κεῖ παρὰ γνώμην ἐρώ though it be an ill-judged thing to say. The parenthesis here is thrown in just to get a hearing, and means 'you may, without sacrifice of judgment, answer a question'.—The alternative rendering, 'yet order this not contrary to my purpose', scarcely satisfies either τὸδ' εἰπὲν καὶ μὴν.—γνώμην...μὴ διαφθεροῦντα 'that I shall not alter my judgment (resolve) for the worse'. Eur. Hippi. 388 ταύτα...προγνοσθ' ἐγὼ, οὐ διαφθείρεω οἷμολον (Paley).

924. You vowed perhaps in some hour of terror so to perform this act? i.e. to make a humble entrance, propitiating the gods by renunciation. She tries a taunt of cowardice (Sidgwick).—ἡμέω... ἄν 'you must have vowed': for this conjectural use of the past indicative with ἄν see on Thesb. 696. The sentence is in
form a statement with interrogation.—

ερθειν, properly of the performance of a
ritual.—διετασαν Hermann; ‘have you
vowed to the gods that I should make
such a sacrifice (of costly decorations) only
in fear of your life?’

925. τελος final decision. He ignores
her question.

926. δοκεί Stanley.—τι represents a
verb to be filled in by the answer, ἐν
ποικίλοις βῆναι. So in ἓν τι; with what
object? τι represents a verb in the sub-
junctive.—Priam is no argument; it is the
king’s very ground of objection that the
ceremony is βαρβαρον. Clytemnestra is
merely talking down resistance.

928. τὸν ἀνθρώπησεν: ‘if it is not
fear of the gods, then fear not men’.

929. See on ν. 918.

932. They may submit (let themselves
be conquered) with grace.

933. ἓρετε you plainly, no less
than I, think the point worth contest.
She has spoken as if it were beneath
his dignity to contest such a trifle. He
retorts that the matter does not seem
indifferent to her. νίκην τὴνδε ‘having
the best in this matter’. δήρους τίς:
the genitive is that of price. For the
archaic use of τι, ‘to value at, rate
at’, see Hom. II. 23. 703, 705.—Or we
may join δήρουs with νικην, do you your-
self find a victory so won to your taste?
Here νικην τὴνδε means τὸ νικάθαι (see
preceding verse). But δήρουs seems then
superfluous.

934. Yield: I constrain you; let it
be with consent. In μὲν τοι, each par-
ticle has its separate force. For μὲν,
‘force at all events’, cf. ν. 915. The
antithesis implied in μὲν, but not formally
completed, is between κράτος and ἐκών,
force and consent. See also Theb. 736
γελώται μὲν μόρον αὐτῷ he begat a son only
to be his death, and note there.—τοι ‘you
know’, an appeal to common sense, must
generally be omitted in English for want
of a compendious equivalent.—κρατείς
Ag. Never was last word spoken on better reflexion than this.

Cl. What had Priam done, thinkest thou, if he had achieved the same?

Ag. He had made him a fine fair path, I am very sure.

Cl. Then let not blame of men make thee ashamed.

Ag. But the voice of the multitude is a mighty thing.

Cl. Aye, but who moves no jealousy wins no envy.

Ag. To love contention is not a woman’s part.

Cl. Nay, but the great may e’en yield a point with grace.

Ag. Thou plainly, no less than I, thinkest the point worth fight.

Cl. Yield: I constrain thee; let it be with consent.

Ag. Then, if this be thy will, quick, let one loose my shoes, these trodden slaves to the serving foot.—Even with these bare soles, as I walk the sacred purple, I hope no distant eye may give me an evil glance. It is shame enough to stain with the stain of human feet textures of price, purchased for silver.

936. λύοι for the usual λυέω. See on v. 557.—τάχος adverbial, with speed.—The unusual pause after the second foot adds abruptness to the abrupt command. The king is impatient to have done.—πρόδολον, servant to a servant (vicarius), meaner even than the foot (Schütz).—Here his shoes are taken off.

937. καὶ τοιοῦτο even with these if I tread etc., i.e τοὺς ποσῖν, with his bare feet, see v. 939. The demonstrative pronoun is explained by look and gesture. Even thus he fears to provoke ‘the evil eye’ by his act.—τοιοῦτο may be taken with ἀλομρήγιον, but it is then superfluous, whereas by position it should be emphatic.—θεῦ belongs to ἀλομρήγιοι (sacred tapestries proper only for divine service).

—ἀλομρήγιον. The substantival use of ἀλομρήγιον is irregular. Probably we should read therefore ἀλομρήγιον.

938. μὴ βάλοι I hope no distant eye may give me an evil glance. πρόσωπον marks the point. See Appendix R. To supply θεῶν is not necessary. According to the superstition, the eye of human jealousy is as dangerous as the divine. See on v. 942.

939. σωματοφθορεῖν ποσῖν φθείροντα to stain with the stain of human feet. For φθείρειν spoil see Cho. 1011 φόνου κηκίς...πολλὰς βαφὰς φθείρουσα τοῦ ποικλομάτος.—σωματοφθορεῖν should not be rejected. For σωματοφθόρος ‘staining (or stained) with the body’ cf. χειρομάχος, δακτυλοδέκτης etc. Garments stained by wearing would be σωματοφθόρα, the person wearing them σωματοφθόρος εἰμάτως, and his act σωματοφθορεῖν εἰμα. The word therefore distinguishes the bare feet (‘feet of the body’) from the shod.—For corrections (εἰματοφθορεῖν, στρωματοφθορεῖν, σωματοφθορεῖν) see Wecklein’s Appendix.

940. πλούτων ᾑργυρωμῆτος θ’ ὑφάσ what is wealth, textures bought for silver’. πλούτων: in a restricted sense, as we speak of the precious metals. ἀρ—
τούτων μὲν οὕτω. τὴν ξένην δὲ πρεμενὼς τήν ἑσκόμιζε. τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλθακῶς θεὸς πρόσωπεν εὐμενῶς προσδέρκεται: ἐκὼν γὰρ οὐδεὶς δουλίῳ χρῆται ξυγῷ, αὕτη δὲ πολλῶν χρημάτων ἔξαιρετον ἀνθός στρατοῦ δῷρημ' ἐμοὶ ξυνέσπετο. ἐπεὶ δ' ἀκούειν σοῦ κατέστραμμαι τάδε, εἰμ' ἐς δόμων μέλαθρα πορφύρας πατῶν.

ΚΔ. ἔστω θάλασσα, τίς δέ νυν κατασβέσει: τρέφουσα πολλής πορφύρας ἱσάργυρον κηκίδα παγκαίνιστον, εἰμάτων βαφάς. οἶκος δ' ὑπάρχει τῶνδε σὺν θεοῖς, ἄναξ, ἔχεων' πένεσθαι δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται δόμος. πολλῶν πατησμῶν δ' εἰμάτων ἂν ηυξαμὴν, δόμοις προνεχθέντος ἐν χρηστηρίοις ψυχῆς κόμιστρα τῷ σε δυχανωμένη. ῥίζης γὰρ ὀυσίς φυλλάς ἱκτέ' ἐς δόμους, σκιὰν ὑπερτεύνασα σεριόν κυνός. καὶ σοῦ μολόντος δωματίων ἐστίν, θάλπος μὲν ἐν χειμώνι σημαίνεις μολὼν: οὖταν δὲ τεῦχη Ζεὺς ἀπ' ὄμφακος πικρᾶς οἴνον, τότ' ἡδ' ψῦχος ἐν δόμοις πέλει

945. αὕτη. 948. δόμοις.
950. εἰς ἱσάργυρον. 954. δεμάτων. 956. μηχανωμένη.
961. τῶν.'

γυρωμῆτος: the ordinary dress, tapestry etc. of a Greek household were not bought, but made there.—τε is not necessary, but is often used where simple apposition would be admissible.

941. τούτων μὲν οὕτω: literally ‘of this thus’, a formula impatiently dismissing the subject. There is an ellipse of something (e.g. ἀπαλλαχθώμεν), but of what, a native Greek might have been unable to say. Nothing parallel seems to occur elsewhere, for such a genitive as τοῦ κασιγνήτου τι φύς, ἔξωτος ἢ μέλλωτος; (Soph. El. 317) may, as Wecklein says, be distinguished. τούμον Emperor, Wecklein.—τὴν ξένην δὲ: see Appendix R.

942. τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλθακῶς: see on v. 10. Whatever may be the effect on other ‘distant eyes’ (see v. 938), divine eyes at least will be propitiated by his humanity.

945. αὕτη Auratus.—“She therefore, as a delicate princess, will feel slavery
the most keenly." So rightly Headlam,  
Class. Rev. xvi. 245.  
949—953. 'There is purple enough in 
the sea, and enough within'. As the 
king proceeds along the path of crimson 
ποικίλματα, it is to the eye of the queen, 
who foresees the εἰμάτων βασάς that are 
to follow (v. 1382), as though already he 
walked in blood. There is also in the 
mere sound and imagery of the opening 
verse the feeling of her hatred, deep, 
cruel, and inexhaustible. But no com-
mentary can exhaust the significance of 
this marvellous scene, which for spec-
tacular writing, if the phrase may be used, 
has probably never been rivalled.—θά-
λασσα: see Appendix O.  
950. ἵσαργυρον (Salmasius) worth its 
weight in silver: ἵσαρσις γὰρ ἦν ἡ πορ-
φύρα πρὸς ἄργυρον ἑξασαμεῖν (Theopom-
pus ap. Athenaeum xii. 526 c, cited by 
Hermann).—κηκίδα παγκαίνοντον purple 
οοε ever fresh and fresh. κηκίδα, because 
the dye is the juice or oooe of a shell-fish. 

But it is the underlying thought, not the 
surface-meaning, which determines the 
expression.  
952. There is a store, I trust, from 
which to take thereof. τῶνε (i.e. εἰμάτων) 
depends on ἑξευ as partitive.—οῖν θεῖος: 
see v. 904.—There is difficulty in οἶκος. 
But perhaps οἶκος may stand in the sense 
of 'household goods', 'store'.—οῖκοι 
Headlam, οἶκοι Porson.  
954. δ' εἰμάτων Canter.  
955. προμενεχθέντος τοῦ εὐξασθαι. — 
δόμοιο...ἐν χρηστηρίοισ together.  
956. μηχανωμένη Abresch, Hermann.  
957. ἵκτε, gnomic aorist, comes. The 
comparison and the thing compared mix 
together, 'thy life is the root of the 
house, and thy safe coming as the putting 
forth of the shading leaves'.  
957—963. The artificial manner re-
calls ὡς. 887 foll.  
958. σκιά...κυνός shade against: see 
ὕπνου ἄκος v. 17.  
960. ἐν χειμώνι. See Introduction.
ανδρὸς τελείου δῶμεν ἐπιστρωφιμένου.—
Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐρᾶς εὐχὰς τέλειε,
μέλοι δὲ τοι σοὶ τῶνπερ ἄν μέλησι τελεῖν. 965

ΧΟ. τίπτε μοι τὸν ἐμπέδως
δείγμα προστάτηριον
καρδίας τετρασκόπου ποτᾶται,
μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλενστος ἀμύσθως άοιδά;
οὐδ' ἀποπτύσας δίκαν
δυσκρίτων ὑνειράτων
θάρσος εὐπεθὲς ἕξει,
φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον; χρόνος δ' ἐπὶ
πρωμησίων ἔνυεμβόλους
ψαμμὶ' ἀκτῆς παρῆψηνεν,
ἐὖθ' ὑπ' 'ἴλιον
ἀρτο ναυβάτας στρατός.
πεὐθομαὶ δ' ἀπ' ὁματῶν
νόστον, αὐτόμαρτυς ῆν.' 970

972. εὐπεθὲς. 973. ἐπελ. 975—76. ψαμμὶς ἀκάτα παρῆψηνεν.

963. τελείου a grim word. As applied to the husband or master of the house, it means governing, ‘bearing τέλος’ i.e. authority or office (see on Θέμ. 152). But it is also a ritual term, applied to the perfect victim, fit for the sacrifice (cf. ἀνδροσφαγεῖον v. 1077 and note the ritual term τελείον, to accomplish a rite, in v. 964).

964. Agamemnon has passed within; Clytaemnestra turns at the door.—τέλειον ‘supreme’ and over all, as the man over the house (cf. the title Ἡρα τελεία given to the goddess of matronhood). Clytaemnestra conceives herself, as avenger of Iphigenia, to have a claim upon the god of family-life, if it is his pleasure to interfere at all.—τέλειον, μέλοι δὲ accomplishments my prayers, and then thy providence may accomplish even what thou mayst intend: i.e. ‘give me vengeance, be the sequel what it may’. μέλοι. This use of the optative, to signify acquiescence, belongs to the same archaic syntax as the imperative optative (936). See Hom. II. 21. 359 λῆγ' ἐρῶς, Τρῶας δὲ καὶ αὐτίκα δίοι 'Αχιλλευς ἄστεος ἔσηλάς, cease strife, and I consent that etc. (see Monro, Homeric Grammar § 299 for more illustrations).—For μέλεν of moral providence see v. 381 οὗκ ἐφ᾽ θεοῦς βροτῶν ἀξίονθαι μέλεν ὅσις ἀλκτῶν χάρις πατώτοι.—V. 965 may be taken as merely a repetition of τέλειον, but this does not satisfy the generality of τῶνπερ ἄν μέλησι. —τῶνπερ (for τῶν τάπερ) is an example, said to be unique, of the Attic ‘attraction’ occurring in a relative of this archaic form. It could be removed by reading either μέλης or μέλη πέρι (Maehly).

965. Clytaemnestra enters the house,
to the home like a sudden coolness to be visited by the crowned lord thereof.  

[Exit Agamemnon.

Zeus, Zeus, who crownest all, crown but my prayers, and let thy providence do even what thou wilt.

[Exit Clytaemnestra; the crowd disperses.

The Elders. Why is it that so constantly my auguring soul shows at the door this fluttering sign, and the prophet-chant offers itself without bidding or fee? Canst thou not spit it away, like an unexplainable dream, and reach such willing trust as the mind is glad to rest upon? Yet time hath heaped the sands of the shore upon the anchor-stones (?), since the naval host set forth to Troy: and they are returned, mine own eyes tell me

leaving Cassandra seated in her chariot. As to the scene generally at this point see the Introduction.

967. δείγμα sign, i.e. 'advertisement' or 'warning' of something that is to come. For a not dissimilar use, see Eur. El. 1174 (Orestes and Electra, after slaying Clytaemnestra, come from the house with blood upon their feet) τροπαία δείγματα ἄθλων προσφέρειμάτων 'a victorious advertisement of the unhappy salutation (they will pronounce').—δείμα Cod. Farn.; see Appendix S.

970. οὔδ' ἀποτύπωσας...θρόνον; i.e. 'why not dismiss at any rate for the time forebodings too obscure to be of any use?' He expostulates with himself.—οὔδι: literally ' wilt thou not even...?' or 'not so much as...?'—ἀποτύπωσας...ἰξεῖ: for the relation of the participle and verb see vv. 606, 611, 1031, 1052 etc. The principal notion is in ἀποτύπωσα, ἦμα συν ἀποτύπωσεις, ὡσε ἰδέατα; —ἀποτύπωσα literally, the act being a magic prevention. If a dream can be interpreted, well; if not, you 'spit it away', and think no more about it. The object of ἀποτύπωσα (it, the forebodings) is supplied from the previous sentence.—εὔπεθες (Jacob) 'easy-believing', see on v. 286, i.e. a voluntary trust.—φρενὸς φιλόν θρόνον: in apposition to θάρσος, literally 'a welcome seat to the mind'.—If this sentence is taken as one with the preceding, there is no subject for ἀποτύπωσα...ἰξεῖ. Hence ἀποτύπωσαν...ἰξεῖ (Scaliger, cf. v. 776) 'while confidence does not spit it away...and sit on the seat of my mind'. But the metaphors clash.

973—979. 3c. 'it is so long since the sacrifice at Aulis, and the prophecies thereof (v. 160) are so far refuted by the king's safe return, that we might well be re-assured'.—The text is given merely as possible. ἐπι and ἀκτάς Cod. Farn.: ἀκτασ Wellauer. φαμμακτας is a combination of letters likely to produce error from confusion of φαμμα (from φαμμακ) with the adjective φάμματος. παρῇμησιν: cf. v. 1420 βιοματων Codex Venetius for μισματων. For παραμαύω to heap as a cooter see ἰμαύω, and compare παραμπήσχω, παρακαλύπττω etc.—πρυμνησιων ξυμεββόλου: a ξυμεββολον is by etymology 'what is thrown in with' something, here with the cables (πρυμνήσια). It seems to describe the large stones which the Greeks used as anchors. The lapse of time since the fleet was moored (v. 205) at Aulis is marked by the fact that 'the mooring-stones have disappeared in the sand'.—ἔσει since in the temporal sense, as Sophocles occasionally (O. C. 84) uses it for since in the causal sense. Cf. the uses of ἐπεί.—χρόνοσ παρῆµησεν 'time has passed his youth' does not seem to bear any natural sense. The tense at any rate should be perfect (παρῆµησεν Headlam).
τὸν δ’, ἀνευ λύρας ὀπως, ὑμνφδει
θρήνον Ἐρινύοις αὐτοδίδακτος ἐσωθεν
θυμό, οὐ τὸ πᾶν ἔχων
ἐλπίδος φίλον θράσος.
σπάγχνα δ’ οὕτωι ματάζει,
πρὸς ἐνδίκωσ φρεσίν τελεσφόροις
dίνας κυκλούμενον κέαρ.
εὐχομαι δ’ ἐξ ἐμᾶς
ἐλπίδος ψόδη πεσεῖν
ἐς τὸ μὴ τελεσφόρον.
μάλα γάρ τοι τάς πολλάς ύγιείς
ἀκόρεστον τέρμα· νόσος γάρ
γείτων ὁμότιχος ἐρέιδει.
καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν
ἀνδρὸς ἐπαισέν ἀφαντόν ἐρμα.
καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων
κτησίων, ὅκνοις βάλον
σφενδόνας ἁπτ’ εὐμέτρουν,
οὐκ ἔδω πρότας δόμος
πλομονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν.

981. ἐρυνῶς.

980. τὸν, demonstrative, that strain (ὧν), ἠρην Ἐρινύος a further description as in Homer (Monro, Hom.-Gr. §§ 258, 259).—ἀνευ λύρας ὀπως ‘sings without the lyre as it were’ i.e. unbidden, uninvited, ἀκλεντος (v. 969), an expression apparently arising from the Greek habit of passing the lyre in company. To receive the lyre was to be asked to sing; ἀνευ λύρας ὀπως therefore ‘to sing unasked’. Sad (see ἀναιρεσ, ἀφόρμικες) is also part of the meaning.—Ἐρινύος Porson.—ὁμος Auratus.

982. οὐ τὸ πᾶν not to the full. The misgiving recurs in spite of the encouraging circumstances.

984. σπάγχνα. The metaphor passes from the ἡμέρες to the inward parts of the victim from which he draws his conclusions.

985. The throb that with meaning recurrence the heart repeats to the unmistakable breast, literally ‘the coming round of the heart with portentous revolution against the truth-telling breast’.

987. But I pray my false expectation may lose itself in void, literally ‘that out of my expectation may come falsehood falling into non-accomplishment’.—ψόδη is part of the predicate, like a ‘proleptic’ epithet. (The form may be right: ψόδος may have existed as well as ψόδης. The stem ψόδ- is warranted by ψευδής.)

990—991. Doubtful in reading; compare the antistrophe (vv. 1004—1005). The general meaning is clear in both
so. But yet, as without the lyre, my bosom repeats that dirge of Doom, unlearned and self-inspired, unable to grasp in full the welcome assurance of hope. It cannot be for naught, the throb that with meaning recurrence the heart repeats to the unmistakable breast. But I pray my false expectation may lose itself in void.

Too true it is, that the health which abounds encroaches; for sickness is its neighbour right up to the wall: and human fortune, running straight, will strike on a hidden reef. And as to the saving of goods, fear, discharging the measured scale, may keep the whole house from sinking under an over-freight places. On the metre see Appendix II.—ιοοο3 are not a fresh illustration, but a parenthetic remark upon the foregoing illustration. See Housman, Journal of Philology, xvi. p. 271.

995. τὸ μὲν answers to τὸ δὲ in v. 1004, on the one hand...on the other.

995—1000. A ship may be saved if not overloaded.—τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων κτησίων: literally ‘so far as concerns the preservation of wealth’: πρὸ on behalf of. (We can scarcely separate πρὸ from χρημάτων, or make χρ. κτ. mean ‘the main cargo’ as opposed to part of it.)—πρὸς βαλῶν (χρήματα) if apprehension discharges it: for the ‘pendent’ nominative participle cf. Supp. 455 καὶ γλώσσα ποτεύσασα μὴ τὰ καλὰ, γένοιο χοῦδον μύθοι ἀν χελτήρως: it is really ‘in opposition to’ the main sentence, like the much commoner accusative (v. 236); the ‘casting-off’ is the ‘not-sinking of the house’.—σφηνόνας ἄπ’ εὐρέτρον: from the duly-weighted sling, i.e. from the loading-scale: see Appendix T.—δόμος is not part of the metaphor of the ship, but is the thing metaphorically compared to a ship, the house (cf. v. 388), which by liberality desires to escape the penalty of too much. παμονᾶς γέμων ἀγαν over-fraught with riches (Housman). For παμονῆ, from πάω, to possess, a synonym of πάμα, compare the parallel forms πημονῆ—πῆμα, χαμονῆ—χάμα, πλησμονῆ—πλῆμα: so also πᾶσις κτῆσις
οὐδ’ ἐπόντισε σκάφος.
πολλὰ τοι δόσις ἐκ Δίως ἀμφιλαφής τε, καὶ ἐξ ἀλόκων ἐπετειαν
νηστίων ἀλεσεν νόσον.
τὸ δ’ ἐπὶ γὰν πεσόνθ’ ἀπαξ θανάσιμον ἀντ. β’.
πρόπορ ἀνδρὸς μέλαν αἰμα τίς ἄν
πάλιν ἄγκαλεσαί ἐπαείδων;
οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθόδαχη
τῶν φθιμέων ἃν ἐπ’ ἀβλαβεία.
εἰ δὲ μὴ τεταγμένα
μοιρὰ μοῖραν ἐκ θεῶν
eἰργε μὴ πλέον φέρειν,
προφθάσασα καρδιά
γλῶσσαν ἄν τάδ’ ἐξέχει.
νῦν δ’ ὑπὸ σκότῳ βρέμει
θυμαλγῆς τε καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπελπομένα ποτὲ
καίριον ἐκτολπεύεσεν
ζωπυρομένας φρενός.

ΚΛ. εἰσώ κομίζου καὶ σὺ, Κασάνδραν λέγω,

1007—9. φθιμέων ἀνάγειν | Ζεὺς αὐτ’ ἐπανο’ ἐπ’ αὐλαβεία.
1015. βλέψει cōpt. το βρέμει.

Hesychius, πάτορες: κτήτορεσ Photius. See Journal of Philology L.C.: πηνοβῆς mischief, damage, does not fit the sense.
1001—1003. Rich, we know, and abundant is the gift of Zeus, and rids the plague of hunger out of the annual field, i.e. the produce of each year supplies the year’s food. As Heaven gives man year by year in plenty what is needful for him, the eagerness for more than plenty is inexcusable. Agriculture, as usual, is the type of natural prosperity, and commerce (the impiae rates of Horace Od. 1. 3) that of avarice and excess.—ἀλίτιν νόσον, as if hunger were some weed or other mischievous thing in the soil (cf. ἄφερτος αἰανής νόσος Eumn. 482, 943) which Zeus, by his bounty, destroys.—ἡλασεν Schütz.
1004. τὸ δὲ: see on v. 995.—πεσόν Auratus, probably; but see Appendix II.
1005. μέλαν: see on Theb. 43.
1007. οὐδὲ...ἀβλαβεία nay, to revive the most straitly virtuous were a sin: literally not even the straitly virtuous of the dead may one recall from the dead with innocence.’—ἄν, supply ἀνακαλέσαι—τό τις, the elliptical ἄν marking, as usual, that the verb of the previous sentence, as well as the subject, is continued.—τὸν ὀρθόδαχη literally ‘the rightly schooled’, cf. the Homeric δαφρων ν. virtuos. The allusion is to the
of riches, as a boat from going down. (Rich we know and abundant is the gift of Zeus, and rids the plague of hunger out of the annual field.) But as for a man's red blood, once shed from his dying body upon the ground, who with incantation may call it back? Nay, not the straitest in virtue may be called from the dead without sin!

And were it not that one god's purpose doth check and limit another's decree, my heart outrunning my tongue would have poured these bodings forth: but now she mutters in darkness, vexed and hopeless ever to wind off her task in time, and stirring the fire within me.

[Enter Clytaemnestra.]

Clytaemnestra. Come in with thee, thou also, Cassandra,
ἐπεί ὁ ἐθήκε Ζεὺς ἀμηνίτως δόμοις κοινωνῶν εἶναι χερνίβων, πολλῶν μετὰ δούλων σταθείσαν κτησίου βωμοῦ πέλας. ἐκβαν̣ ἀπήνης τῆςδε, μηδὲ ὑπερφρόνει. καὶ παῖδα γάρ τοι φασίν Ἀλκμήνης ποτὲ πραθείντα πλὴναι δουλίας μάζης βία.

ei δ' οὖν ἀνάγκη τῆς δ' ἐπιρρέοι τύχης, ἀρχαιοπλούτων δεσποτῶν πολλή χάρις· οὐ δ' οὖποτ' ἐπίσταντες ἡμᾶςαν καλῶς, ὦμοι τε δούλωις πάντα καὶ παράσταθμοι. ἔχεις παρ' ἠμῶν οἰάπερ νομίζεται.

ΧΟ. σοὶ τοι λέγουσα παῦται σαφῆ λόγον. ἐντὸς δ' ἄν οὖσα μορφίμαις ἀγρευμάτων πείθοι ἄν, εἰ πείθοι' ἀπειθοῖς δ' ἴσως.

ΚΛ. ἄλλ' εἴπερ ἐστὶ μὴ χειδόνος δίκην ἀγνώτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη, ἔσω φρενών λέγουσα πείθω νυν λόγω.

ΧΟ. ἐπον: τὰ λόγστα τῶν παρεστῶτων λέγει. πιθοῦ λιποῦσα τῶν ἀμαξήρη θρόνον.

ΚΛ. οὔτοι θυραίαν τῆν ἐμοὶ σχολὴ πάρα

1025. δουλείαι. βία. 1029. παραστάθμων. 1038. πείθου.
thou: since Zeus of his mercy hath set thee in a house, where thou mayst share the holy water in thy place with the crowd of slaves at the altar of stead and store. Descend from the car, and be not proud. They say that Alcmena's son himself was sold, and still bore up in spite of the slave's low fare. If it so fall that one needs must take that state, masters not new to wealth are a thing to be thankful for. They to whom a rich pile hath come by surprise are to their slaves cruel always and over-strict. From us thou art receiving what custom bids.

An Elder. 'Tis to thee she speaks, and plainly. She waits for thee. And maybe, since thou art in the toils of fate, thou shouldst obey, if it may be,—though maybe thou wilt not.

Cl. Nay, if her foreign tongue is anything less uncouth than a swallow's twitter, my reason urged is spoken within her understanding.

Eld. Go with her. She urges what, as things are, is best. Obey, arise, and leave the chariot.

Cl. I have no leisure, you may know, to be thus dallying

This sense of ἀμώ (sweep together) is more common in the compounds ἐπαμώμας, συμαμώμας, etc., but occurs also in later literature for the simple verb (see L. and Sc. s.v.).—εἰκ θερσιμοῦ (schol.) has the advantage of giving to ἀμώ an older sense. But a harvest is not a likely type of sudden and unexpected gain.

1029. ἀμῶι τε...καὶ παραστάθμοι κρυδλ and over-exacting; 'exceeders of the proper standard': cf. παράνομος.—Cod. Famn. παρὰ στάθμην.

1030. Thou art receiving from us the treatment due by custom, in being invited to share the family worship. See on v. 1030.

1031. σηλ...πανταί. The participle is principal, πανταί adding only the notion that she waits for compliance.—σαφή: only too plain, as they think.

1032. ἀν...πέλθος ἀν. The optative with ἀν is a gentle imperative, properly a suggestion of something which may be done. The courtesy of the speaker throws into relief the harshness of the queen, and is emphasized by the anticipatory ἀν.—ἀλῶδεα (C. G. Haupt).

1033. εἰ πέλθος: a further qualification, if thou wouldst (obey); see v. 1393. ἀπευθύνει δ' ἀν ἑνω: i.e. though I can understand it if you do not. ἀν is carried on as in Soph. O. T. 937 ἤδον μὲν, πῶς δ' οὐκ ἄν; ἀςχάλλου δ' ἑνω: literally 'perhaps thou mayst disobey'.

1034. μὴ χελιδώνος δικήν ἐγνώτα lit. 'not as a swallow's unintelligible'. The negative belongs to χελιδώνος δικήν, not to φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένην. The queen holds an opinion, which still, though not professed, is often betrayed, that her own language is essentially rational, and that any human speech must bear so much analogy to it, as to make it intelligible, if spoken simply and clearly.—For the swallow, cf. Aristoph. Frogs 688, Birds 1681.

1036. The persuasions I urge are spoken within her understanding. Again the participle is principal, as in v. 1031.


1039. θυραῖν is a substantive, like τροπαῖα (see δυσσεβῆ τροπαῖα v. 229)
and εὑραία (= εὑρή). An ellipse of τρίβην can scarcely be supposed, when the verb τρίβεων, from which it is to be supplied, follows, and at such a distance. But apparently the ellipse became stereotyped and thus formed a popular substantive θυράλα gadding, staying out of the house. For a parallel see Thes. 692 τροπαία χρώμα ὑσσὼς ἀν ἔλθει γελοιωτέρῳ πνεύματι, where πνεῦμα, lost by fixed ellipse in τροπαία, reappears in πνεύματι, as here τρίβην in τριβεων.—σχολὴ Dobbie.

1040. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἔστις μεσομφάλου κτλ. literally ‘for as to the matters of the central hearth, the sheep are already placed’, i.e. ‘the state of our sacrifice within is that the sheep’ etc.—For τὰ ἔστις μεσομφάλου, grammatically in a loose apposition to the sentence ἔστηκεν κτλ., cf. v. 995 τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων and v. 821 τὰ δὲ ἐστὶν ὧν φρόνησα. So Peile and others rightly; but μὲν nevertheless answers to δέ in v. 1043 (Hermann).—

The alternative is to take τὰ as a demonstrative anticipating μῆλα (Monro, Hom. Grammar §§ 258, 259) and ἔστις as a locative with ἔστηκε. But the locative uses of the genitive (see Monro, Hom. Grammar § 149) do not seem to justify this; ἔστις ἔστηκε should mean ‘stand on the altarside’ or ‘in the altar part’ of something.—μεσομφάλου refers here to the position of the altar in the centre of the ἁπλη, or court of the palace, within. But since the word occurs in the tragedians repeatedly as the title of the sanctuary at Delphi (Thes. 732 etc.; Eur. Ion 461 has the exact phrase μεσόμφαλος ἔστια), and this is the only place where it is applied to anything else, we should look for some intention. Cassandra (see the sequel) is wearing her robes and insignia as prophetess of Apollo, is dressed in fact as the Pythia. To this, apparently, Clytemnestra mockingly refers: ‘as for a ἔστια μεσόμφαλος, that is all ready; if
abroad. For the hearth, ‘the central hearth’, hath its victims already placed, for the sacrifice of the fire—since of the present joy there was no expectation! And thou, if thou wilt take part in this, must not delay. If for want of understanding thou takest not what I say, then with thy foreign hand converse instead of voice (?)

**Eld.** An interpreter, and a plain one, the strange lady doth indeed seem to want. She hath the air of a beast new-taken.

**Cl.** ‘Aye, mad she is, and listens to her folly. She comes here from a new-taken town, and yet she has not the sense to bear the bridle, until she foam her humour away in blood! But I will waste words no more, to be so scorned!

**Eld.** And I, for I pity her, will not be angry. Come now, unhappy, come down from where thou ridest, and take on thee willingly the new yoke of hard fate.

---

**you, the prophetess, mean to take your part, you must come at once’.**

**1041. πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρὸς:** perhaps for the sacrifice of the fire, i.e. for the feast which they were already holding in honour of the beacon (πυρ as in vv. 481, 593). This, says the queen, they had commenced before, not expecting (naturally) to have the present joy of seeing the king arrive close after his message. τῇδε has an emphasis.—The received interpretation of πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρὸς, so far as any is received, has been ‘to be slain for the fire’, i.e. for burning on the altar. But there is a long list of corrections, παρος before (Musgrave) the least unsatisfactory. As taken above, the words are certainly obscure, but may not this be intentional?

**1042. ὥσ ὁποτ’ ἀπείσασθε as it was never expected, literally ‘as for persons not having any expectation’.** The absence of a defining pronoun gives the same force as the English passive.—Some take v. 1042 to mean ‘as for an unexpected triumph’. But surely this could not account for the fact that the victims were ready.

**1043. έλ since.** Clytemnestra explains her command by gesture.

**1045. Doubtful. Neither the apodotic δέ nor the emphatic σοῦ is satisfactory; Eum. 888 is not parallel. And how should Cassandra answer without understanding? Wecklein refers σοῦ to the elder, who is to explain Clytemnestra’s words by signs. In that case we should suppose that the sentence is impatiently broken off at λόγου.—φράσει signify your meaning. See Herod. 4.113 καί φωνήσας μὲν οὖν εἶχε, οὖ γὰρ συνέσαν ἀλλήλων, τῇ δὲ χεὶρ ἐφράσε (Wecklein).

**1046. i.e.** Cassandra takes no notice of the queen, but her bearing and gestures begin to express a great horror. The elders understand nothing: Clytemnestra understands only too well. Perceiving her imprudence and danger, she quits the stage hastily as if in indignation at the captive’s perversity.

**1048. κλέει listens to, obeys.**

**1051. αἰματηρόν predicate, in blood.**

**1055. Take on thee without resistance the new yoke of this necessity.** ἀνάγκη a possessive dative. The ἀνάγκη is personified as imposing the yoke. For the antithesis ἵκουσ’ ἀνάγκη (do willingly what must be done) see v. 934.—εἰκοὺς’ Robortello.
ΚΑΣΑΝΔΡΑ.

οτοτοτοτοί ποποί δᾶ.  
ὡπολλον ὧπολλον.

ΧΟ. τί ταύτ' ἀνωτότυξας ἀμφὶ Δοξίου; 
οὐ γὰρ τουοῦτος ὀστε θρηνητοῦ τυχεῖν.

ΚΑ. οτοτοτοτοί ποποί δᾶ.  
ἀντ. α'. 1060
ὡπολλον ὧπολλον.

ΧΟ. ἡ δ' αὔτε δυσφημοῦσα τὸν θεὸν καλεῖ 
οὐδὲν προσήκοντ' ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν.

ΚΑ. Ἀπολλον ᾽Απολλον 
ἀγυιατ', ἀπόλλων ἐμός. 
ἀπώλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον.

ΧΟ. χρήσεν ἔοικεν ἀμφὶ τῶν αὐτῆς κακῶν. 
μένει τὸ θεῖον δουλία παρ' ἐν φρενί.

ΚΑ. Ἀπολλον ᾽Απολλον 
ἀντ. β'. 1065
ἀγυιατ', ἀπόλλων ἐμός. 
ἀ ποι ποτ' ἡγαγές με; πρὸς ποίαν στέγην;

ΧΟ. πρὸς τὴν ᾽Ατρειδῶν. εἰ σὺ μὴ τὸδ' ἐννοεῖς, 
ἐγὼ λέγω σοι. καὶ τάδ' οὐκ ἔρεις ψύθη.

ΚΑ. ἃ ἃ 
μισόθεον μὲν οὖν, πολλὰ συνήστορα, 1075
ἀυτοφόνα κακὰ κάρτα. ναὶ, 
ἀνδροσφαγεῖον, παῶοιραντήριον.

ΧΟ. ἐοικεν εὔρις ἦ ξένη κυνὸς δίκην

1076. καρτάναι.

1077. ἀνδρός σφάγιον καὶ πεδορραντήριον.

1056. Cassandra leaves the chariot and comes forward, away from the palace.
The prophetic frenzy is upon her, and she sees both the past and the future of the bloody house.—ποποί δᾶ. The origin and original meaning of these exclamations is uncertain. δᾶ is commonly identified with a form for γα.—τοτοί Dindorf: πότοι others.

1057. Ἀπολλον. The story is given below, v. 1201.

1062. ἰ ἴετ, where prose would use ἄλλα.

1065. ἀπόλλων ἐμός· ἀπώλεσας γαρ, bringing out the suggestion of the name. οὐ μόλις 'more than enough' to deserve the name.—ἀγυιατα, voc. of ἀγυιάτης; addressing (as a new-comer to the house?) the guardian Apollo before the door in the street (ἀγών). So Polychnes leaving his father’s house addresses his farewell specially to the Φοῖβος ᾽Αγών (Eur.
Cassandra. Ah!... O God!... Apollo, O Apollo!

Eld. What means this sad cry on the name of Loxias? It suits him not to meet a singer so melancholy.

Cass. Ah!... O God!... Apollo, O Apollo!

Eld. Once more the ill-omened cry, and upon that god, one all unfit for a scene of lamentation!

Cass. Apollo, God of the Gate, a very Apollo to me! Thou hast more than proved thy name, before and now again.

Eld. She will prophesy, methinks, upon her own miseries. The soul retains that gift, when all but that is slave.

Cass. Apollo, God of the Gate, a very Apollo to me! Ah, where, where hast thou led me? Oh, what house should this be?

Eld. The palace of Atreus sure it is. That, if thou conceivest it not, I tell to thee: and thou canst not say it is false.

Cass. Ah no, ah no, an abominable place, full of guilty secrets... yea, of unnatural murders... aye verily, a place of human sacrifice, sprinkled with blood of babes!

Eld. The strange woman doth indeed seem keen as a hound

Phoen. 631, see also Ar. Vesp. 869).

1066. ἀπολέσας thou hast been a destroyer.

1067. Χρήσειν: i.e. she is about to 'declare' in the style of inspiration. The first effect of this is to diminish their sympathy; they are even disposed to sneer (ἐν 1072—73). Their attitude towards μαντική is the common attitude, a dislike between fear and contempt.

1068. The soul retains inspiration, when all is slave but that. Σουλία παρ' ἐν literally 'slave-like save one thing' or 'with one exception'; for the use of παρά see L. and Sc. s. v. The Greeks viewed the δούλος as something in nature different from the ἐλεύθερος, something between the complete man and the mere animal, and also held that, as Homer says, enslavement changed the nature, brutalizing and debasing it to the new condition. Of this the elders suppose themselves to be witnessing a signal illustration: Cassandra, they think, is scarcely rational; she can neither understand nor signify her thoughts. But a slave might be 'possessed' no less than the free. 'The spiritual faculty is the last to go.' But the sarcasm recoils, as is the intention, upon the speakers.—δούλη περ ἐν Schütz.

1071. ἡγαγες: as ἀγ-νυάρης.—πολαν; (1) to what a house (this is meant), (2) to what house (hence the reply).

1072. 'If thou (the prophetess) perceivest not that, I can tell it thee; and thou wilt not find it untrue'.

1075. πολλὰ συνίστορα full of guilty secrets: συνίστορα acc. sing. (from συνε-'deixti kai to have a thing upon the conscience) takes the construction (πολλὰ) of a participle. Kühner, Gr. Grammar § 409, note 4 a.—κακά, in apposition to πολλὰ.

1076. See Appendix U.

1077. ἄνδροφαγεῖον Dobree: πα-διοραντήριον: compare παῖδον (M) for πεδίον v. 309. The word is a compound like ἄνδροφαγεῖον, made by the poet for the occasion: a place where human beings are sacrificed, where bakes are bled for the sprinkling, both φάγεω and ἰανεῖω being used as terms of ritual. The
ei

KA. μαρτυρίουσι γὰρ τοῦτο ἐπιπείθομαι. ἀντ. γ. 1080
κλαιόμενα τὰ βρέφη σφαγὰς ὀπτάς τε σάρκας πρὸς πάτρος βεβρωμένας.

XO. ἤμεν κλέος σου μαντικὸν πεπυσμένοι, ἤμεν· προφήτας δ' οὕτως μαστεύομεν.

KA. ὦ ποτοί, τί ποτε μήδεται; ὀστ. δ. 1085
tί τόδε νέον άχος μέγα
μέγ' εν δόμουι τοῖσδε μήδεται κακὸν ἀφετοῦν φίλουσιν, δυσιάτον; ἀλκα δ' ἐκάς ἀποστατεί.

XO. τούτων αἰδρίς εἰμι τῶν μαντευμάτων.
ἐκεῖνα δ' ἔγνων· πᾶσα γὰρ πόλις βοῦ.

KA. ὦ τάλαινα, τόδε γὰρ τελεῖς; ἀντ. δ.
tὸν ὀμοδέμνον πόσων λοντροῦσι φαίδρωνασα—πῶς φράσω τέλος; 1095
tάχος γὰρ τόδ' ἔσται. προτείνει δὲ χεῖρ' ἐκ χερὸς ὅρεγομένα.

XO. οὕτως ἐκείνη· νῦν γὰρ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων ἐπαργύρωσι θεσφάτοις ἀμηχανό.

KA. ἐ ἐ παπαὶ παπαὶ,
tί τόδε φαίνεται;
ἡ δίκτυν τι Ἀίδου,
ἀλλ' ἄρκυς ἡ ἕξυνευνος, ἡ ἕξυναιτία.

1079. μαντεύει. ἀν εὐφρησθ. 1080. μαρτυρίουσι. τοῦσδε πεπείθομαι.
1081. τάδε. 1084. ἤμεν.
1084. ἤμεν. 1086. ἄχθος (ἄχος ἵππ).
1097. χεῖρ corr. to χείρ'. 1098. χείρος. 1103. τι γ'.

Children of Thyestes (v. 1081) were slain as Agamemnon is about to be slain, under the pretext of a sacrificial feast (see v. 1592).—πεδορραντήριον 'a place where the floor is sprinkled' is generally allowed to be faulty; the MS. reading may have come from an attempt to restore the metre, destroyed by the mis-spelling πεδορραντήριον.

1079. εἴναι: with emphasis as in 1047.
upon a scent. She is on a track of murder where she will find.

Cass. Yes, there is the evidence that I trust upon! See yonder babes, weeping their sacrifice, their flesh roasted and eaten by their sire!

Eld. We had heard of thy fame as prophetess, had heard of it: we seek none to speak for thee.

Cass. O God!... What is this, what purpose of strange woe, horrible, horrible, that she purposeth here within? Woe to her nearest, woe beyond remedy, and no help nigh!

Eld. This prophesying is beyond my knowledge. The other I knew, for all the town is loud with it.

Cass. O cruel! Wilt thou do it? The partner of thy bed, wilt thou cleanse him with lustration, and then—oh, how can I say it? Aye, soon it will be done. She is reaching forth, she is stretching hand after hand!

Eld. I understand not yet. Then hints, now oracles blind perplex me still.

Cass. Ah!....

What appeareth now? Surely a net of Death! Nay, rather the snare is she, who shared the bed, who shares the crime.

—ματευα: literally 'she is seeking the blood of those of whom she will find the blood'. The elders, at first not impressed, become grave at the definite allusion (παιδορρανήρου) to the crime of Ateus.—ματευα f, h, ἀνεφησει Porson.

1080. μαρτυρίοισι Pauw, τοῖσδ' ἐπιπέθομαι Abresch.
1084. προφητασ i.e. μάρτυρας, literally τοῖσδ' ἐξωτας ἤμων περὶ σοῦ (schol.) or rather ὑπὲρ σοῦ. The word by itself does not mean μάντις, though a μάντις is προφητης θεω.—μεν may be right, as an emphatic repetition of the verb. The speakers, displeased, wish to silence Cassandra, whom they take to be merely displaying her powers, with the assurance that they know them by reputation. ημεν (Housman) is not improbable, nor τὸ μὲν for ημεν in v. 1083 (Headlam).—τοῦτων προφητασ Weil: 'prophets (?) of these things'.

1085—1147. She sees in vision from point to point the murder of Agamemnon and her own death.
1092. ικεῖνα: τὰ περὶ Θυεστον schol. See v. 1075.
1097. She, 'the murderess'.—Χερός later MSS.—Χερός ὑρέγματα Hermann, but see Appendix II.
1099. To the perplexity of hints has succeeded that of oracles blind. Vv. 1093—98 are less vague than vv. 1085—90, but stop short (v. 1095), as if the seer could not see her way.
1102. She sees the enrolling of the king in the robe (v. 1381).
1103. τὴν Ἀιδοῦ Dindorf.
1104. The murderess herself is the true snare: δικανω properly a cast-net, ἀρκευς a stake-net, but the distinction must not be pressed.—ἡ ξενευνος, ἡ ἕναυτικα the
φόνου στάσις δ' ἀκόρεστος γένει κατολοξατώ θύματος λευσίμου.

XO. ποίαν Ἐρυνώ τήν δώμασιν κέλει ἑπορθαίζειν; οὐ μετ' φαιδρύνει λόγος· ἐπὶ δὲ καρδίαν ἐδραμε κροκοβαφης σταγών, ἀτε καιρίᾳ πτώσιμος ξυνανύτει βίον δύντος αὐγαίς· ταχεῖ-α δ' ἄτα πέλει.

KA. ἄγον ἰδοὺ ἰδοῦ· ἀπεχε τῆς βοὸς τὸν ταύρον· ἐν πέπλοισιν μελαγκέρῳ λαβοῦσα μηχανήματι

καὶ δόρλα.

partner of the bed, the partner of the crime. ἧνευς : wife or paramour? Rather both.—ξυνατία is also explained to mean 'accomplice of the δίκτων, of the fatal robe'. This cannot be the whole meaning, as it does not satisfy the correspondence of ἧνευς...ξυνατία, but it is perhaps suggested also. In such a scene we must not seek explanations too precise. The language is not meant to be clear.—Others punctuate thus... ξυνατία φόνου. στάσις...: but see next note.

1105. φόνου στάσις Chorus of Death. φόνου is necessary; without definition στάσις would not suggest the following question ποίαν Ἐρυνώ; —ἀκόρεστος(φόνου) γένει: literally 'insatiable of blood, to the race'. —ἀκόρεστος Bothe, perhaps rightly, though the form is not extant, nor (in my opinion) proved. See Appendix II.

1107. κατολοξάτω θύματος λευσίμου raise the solemn cry over sacrifice to be slain by stoning. The context suggests that θύμα λευσίμου should mean the murder, called so metaphorically, but why, or what to a Greek θύμα λευσίμον would suggest, is very obscure. Sacrifice by stoning is traceable in tradition. Thus at Condylea in Arcadia the name of the local goddess Artemis the Strangled (Ἀπαγχομένη) was explained by a story that some children, having in play pretended to strangle the image with a rope, were stoned, and the people suffered plagues in consequence, till they consulted the Πυθία, who condemned the stoning of the children and imposed expiations (Pausanias 8. 23. 6). At Troezen again a feast called Αἰθοβόλα was celebrated in honour, it was said, of two virgins from Crete, who in the confusion of a riot were stoned by the opposite faction (στασισάντων δὲ ὁμολογῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιστασιώτων καταλαυθήνας Paus. 2. 32. 2). These stories apparently refer to former customs of human sacrifice; and at Troezen the persons by whom the rite was performed were called a στάσις (at least this would account for the story about στασίωται), which may throw light upon στάσις here. In human sacrifices
Now let the Chorus of Death, who thirst for the blood of the race, raise their ritual cry over their victim stoned.

_Eld._ What fiend is this, whom thou biddest sing triumph over the house? Thou lookest not glad thyself at the word. Gone to thy heart is the pale drop, even such as from a mortal wound drips slow and slower, when life's light sets and death is coming quick.

_Cass._ Ah! Ah! See, see!......

Keep the bull from the cow! She hath caught him in a vesture, and goes him with her black, crafty horn. He falls in

stoning would be a technical way of avoiding the pollution of bloodshed (since the act is not done by any one hand and does not necessarily shed the blood as _σφαγή_ does). It seems therefore not impossible that the murder is compared to a 'sacrifice by stoning' or human sacrifice, over which the ring of fiends, who perform it, are bidden to rejoice.—

To refer θόμα λέβασμον to the imagined stoning of _Clytemnestra_ by the people is unsatisfactory. The death of Clytemnestra is not here relevant, and a false prediction would spoil the effect.

—_λοιτίμον_ (an allusion to the bath)


1109. _οὐ μὲ_: see next note.

1110—1114. _καπία πτώσιμος_ Dindorf, literally 'shed so as to be mortal', see _v._ 1342: _καὶ δορὶ πτώσιμος_, 'even such as from a spear-wound', is also possible.—_εὐναντεῖ πτώσιμοι_... _ἀφγαι_ literally 'ceases (dripping) as the light ceases', the wound ceasing to bleed as the eyes close in death.—_ταχεῖα δὲ ἀτά πέλει_. For the independent clause see _v._ 1089 ἀλκά δὲ κτλ. 'while help is far'.—The description is of one seized with intense horror and turning, as we say, 'pale as death'. The paleness of the dying face is attributed to 'pale' blood.—With _οὐ μὲ_ _φαινότως_, this description might seem to refer to the speaker himself. The transition to such terrible emotion on the part of the Chorus would be strangely sudden, nor does their next speech (_v._ 1122) show any such feeling, but expresses as before merely bewilderment and vague apprehension. Perhaps therefore we should read _οὐ σὲ_, 'thou lookest not glad _thyself_ at what thou sayest'. And in any case the description must refer to Cassandra, to whom the vision now begins to show the striking of the murderous stroke.

1118. _With her crafty weapon, her black horn._—_μηχανήματι_: the axe.—_μελαγκέρω_ does not mean that the _μηχανήμα_ is black-horned, but that it is, as it were, a black horn.—Dr Wecklein, reading _ἐν πέπλων νῦ μελαγκέρω κτλ_, takes the _μελαγκέρω_ _μηχανήμα_ to be the enveloping robe, which, as Agamemnon stretches out his arms in it, 'has an appearance as of something black-horned'. In favour of this it must be admitted that _λαβοῦσα_, if not constructed with _μελαγκέρω_ _μηχανήμα_, is irregularly placed. Nor is the grotesqueness of the conception objectionable. But it is difficult not to suppose that the horn which goes is the axe which strikes.—It has also been referred to 'the murderess advancing with her head bent down and shrouded in the black robe which she holds outstretched in her protruded hands', Class. Rev. v. p. 388.—The scholia record both _μελαγκέρω_ and _μελαγκέρω_ (i.e. _τῶν μελαγκέρων ταύρων_).
τύπτειν: πῦτνει δ’ ἐν ἐνύδρῳ τεῦχει.
δολοφόνον λέβη-
tos τύχαν σοι λέγω.

XO. οὐ κομπάσαμ’ ἀν θεσφάτων γνώμων ἄκρος
εἶναι, κακῷ δὲ τῷ προσεικάζῳ τάδε. 
ἀπὸ δὲ θεσφάτοις τίς ἀγαθὰ φάτις
βροτοῖς στέλλεται; κακῶν γὰρ διὰ
πολυπεῖς τέχναι
θεσπισμὸν φόβον
féroun mun mabèiwn.

KA. ἰῷ ἰῷ ταλαίνας
kakópotmòi týchak.
tò γὰρ ἐμὸν θροῦ
páthos ἐπεγξέασα.
ποὶ δῆ με δεῦρο τὴν ταλαίναν ἡγαγες,
oúdeon pot’ ei μὴ ἐξυνθανομένην. τί γάρ;

XO. φρενομανής τις εἰ θεοφόρητος, ἀμ-
φὶ δ' οὐτὰς θροεῖς
νόμων ἄνομων, οἷα τις ἔσθα
ἀκόρεστος βοᾶς, φεῦ,
tαλαίναις φρεσὶν
'τινω 'τινω στένουσ' ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοὶς
ἀγδῶν βίον.

KA. ἰ numberWith νογείας
μὸρον ἀγδόνος.
περέβαλον γὰρ οἱ

1119. Omits ἐν. 1125. διά. 1143. ἀγδόνος μὸρον.
1144. περέβαλοντο γὰρ οἱ.

1119. ἐν ἐνύδρῳ: Schütz.—τεῦχει: kûtei Blomfield. See Appendix II.
1123. εἶναι: see vv. 1047, 1079, 'A very good judge of the oracular I cannot boast that I am, but' etc.
1125. κακῶν διαλ(Hermann): 'through woes' i.e. 'in woe throughout'.—τέχναι: the 'science' or 'skill' of the μάντες: cf. τέχναι Kályxántos in v. 260; the reference is particularly (as πολυπεῖς shows; see ἐπος, ἐπη) to the phraseology and metrical form of prophetic utterance. The art of the μάντες was just beginning to decline in repute among the educated in the time of Aeschylus.
1132. ἐπεγξέασα: 'as a drop' or
a vessel of water. In a treacherous murderous caldron is done the thing I tell thee.

Eld. I cannot boast high skill in judging words inspired; but these I judge to figure some ill. But by this way what good word ever is sent to man? It is all ill, a skill of manifold phrases, offering for knowledge a terrifying chant.

Cass. Alas, alas, for the hapless doom of a wretch, for mine own fate! It shall have its drop in the lament.

Where is this thou hast brought me, a hapless wretch, just only to die with thee, and nothing more?

Eld. Thou art in some sort crazed by the god who hurries thy thoughts, and wailest thyself in a wild tune, like some brown nightingale, that with singing never sated laments, alas, heart-sore, for Itys, Itys, all her sorrow-filled days.

Cass. O, but to die as a musical nightingale! For her the

'ingredient more' added to the lament for the king. See a somewhat similar metaphor in v. 17.—Of the corrections proposed to adjust the metre to the antistrophe, ἐπεγχέαι 'so as to pour it on' (Campbell, Sidgwick) is the least violent, but the grammar is dubious. ἐπεγχόδαν Headlam (Class. Rev. XII. 247), supposing the participle to be an explanatory note, and citing ὁδ διαρρόων ἀντι τοῦ ὁδ διαρρέων Cho. 65 schol., etc. See however Appendix II.

1133. An apostrophe to Agamemnon (Paley), not to Apollo: the king is already in her mind, τὸ ἐμὸν in v. 1131 being antithetic to τὸ τοῦ Ἀγαμήμονον: and note ἔνθανομένη (σοι). On the stage, action would explain.—ἡγαγε points to the name Ἀγ-ἀμήμων: see v. 1071.

1134. τι γὰρ; what else?
1135. ἀκόρετος Ald. See on v. 1105.
1136. ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοῖς together, sorrow-filled.

1144—1147. περάβαλον, the 'Aeolic' form for περιβάλον, should be retained (Weeklein, comparing Enum. 637 περισκόπον M.).—γὰρ (?). Perhaps τὸ γε, the article, or rather demonstrative pro-noun, used to mark the antithesis. For examples in Homer, where this use of the anticipatory pronoun with various particles is characteristic, see Monro, Homeric Gramm. §§ 258—259, and for the combination with the dative pronoun see e.g. Herod. 3. 65 τὸ μὲν ὁδ ἔργων ἐξισθασαι μοι...οι δὲ ὑμῖν Μάγοι κρατέουσι τῶν βασιλείων.—The middle περ-βαλόντο can hardly be right, meaning naturally 'to put on oneself'.—ἀγώνα: literally 'a struggle', used, as in Euripides frequently, for what is terrible, critical, or both at once, e.g. Hec. 229 παρέστηκεν ὃς οὐκ ἄγων μέγας, Med. 366 ἐτ' εἰσ' ἄγων' τοῖς νεωτόι νυμφίων, Supp. 71 ἄγων δὲ ἄλλοις ἔρχεται. So also ἀγώνισμα Eur. El. 987 πικρον τε χίθο τάγωνισμα μοι. Here ἁγον, the quitting of life; cf. ἁγωνία ἁγονία. The transformation to a bird was a γλυκὸς ἄγων.—τε, if right, expresses apposition, 'and there-with a sweet passage'. But perhaps we should read γε.—αἰώνα is a conjecture suggested in M, but the antithesis is between the death which awaits Cassandra and the painless transformation of Philomela (Enger); and the 'sweet life' is not the point.—σχισμὸς clearing, sundering,
πτεροφόρον δέμας
θεόι, γλυκὺν τ’ ἀγῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ·
ἐμοὶ δὲ μίμησι σχισμὸς ἀμφήκει δορί.

ΧΟ. πόθεν ἐπισυνότους θεοφόρους τ’ ἔχεις
ματαιόνς δύας,
τὰ δ’ ἐπίφοβα δυσφάτῳ κλαγγά
mελοτυπεῖς ὅμοι τ’ ὀρθοῖος ἐν νόμοισ;
πόθεν ὅροις ἔχεις θεσπεσίας ὀδοῦ
κακορρήμονας;

ΚΑ. ἵω γάμοι γάμοι Πάριδος ὀλέθριοι
φίλων. ἦω Σκαμάνδρου πάτριοι ποτῶν,
τότε μὲν ἄμφι σᾶς ἀιώνας τάλαυ
ἡμιόμαν τροφαῖς;
νῦν δ’ ἄμφι Κωκυτόν τε κάχερουνοίς
ὀχθοὺς ἑικα θεσπερδήσεων τάχα.

ΧΟ. τὶ τόδε τορὸν ἅγαν ἐπος ἐφημίσω;

νεογνος ἄνθρώπων μάθοι.

πέπληγμα δ’ ὑπὸ δήγματι φοινίω
τὺχα μυρὰ θερμέλας,
θραύματ’ ἐμοὶ κλίειν.

ΚΑ. ἵω πόνοι πόνοι πόλεος ὀλομένας
τὸ πᾶν. ἵω πρόπυργοι θυσίαι πατρὸς
πολυκανεῖς βοτῶν ποιονόμων· ἀκος δ’
οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν

1159—the end. Readings of f. 1164. μυρὰ κακὰ.

combines the actual wounding with the parting of soul and body.

1148. πόθεν ἐπισυνότους θεοφόρους τε, whence sent, and by whom imposed, literally 'god-brought'.—Hermann omits τε.

1151. ὅμοι τε, and at the same time, marks an anithesis. They had called her utterance νόμον ἄμομον (v. 1137), a wild tune, literally 'an unordered order', νόμος being properly the order or arrangement of notes in a tune. But they are forced to admit that there is 'method in it'.—ὁρθὸς signifies both raised in tone and straightforward, and was applied with both associations specially to military march music. The second meaning is here most prominent and suggests the following metaphor of the road and the bourns or guiding-stones.

1162. A man new-born might under-
gods did clothe in a winged form, a sweet passage and a tearless, while I must be parted by the steel’s sharp edge.

Eld. Whence sent, by what power imposed, is thy vain agony, that thou shapest that fearful song with words so hard and harsh and yet with a march so clear? How findest thou the terms of woe which guide thine inspired way?

Cass. Alas, for the bridal of Paris, the doom of his kin! Ah, sweet Scamander, my native stream! Once on thy banks, ah me, was I nursed and grew. But now by the River of Wailing, aye, and of Woe, my prophet-voice, methinks, will be uttered soon.

Eld. What is this word thou hast spoken, only too plain? A man new-born might understand. I bleed beneath the wound of the piteous singer’s breaking misery, which shatters me to hear it.

Cass. Alas, for the labour of Troy, Troy destroyed utterly! Alas, for my father’s sacrifices in her behalf, so many grazing victims slain! They served not at all to save the town from

stand. The grammar of this sentence is archaic, but, in a proverbial phrase, not inadmissible (see on v. 557). νεογνός is a substantival adjective, ὁ νεόγνος. The partitive genitive, or rather genitive of distinction from', is the same which survives in the vocative phrases διὰ γυναικῶν, φίλα γυναικῶν etc., in ἀριθμέω κακῶν (II. 11. 248), and in the forms of emphasis κακὰ κακῶν (things evil among evils) etc. (Kühner, Gr. Grammar § 414, 5, b): νεογνός is treated (according to the meaning, ὁ νεώτατος ἀνθρώπων) as a superlative; ‘a new-born one among human beings’ is, in modern phrase, ‘the youngest human intelligence’.—Lastly μᾶλις falls under the following use. ‘From acquiescence or willingness that something shall happen, the optative passes to admission of possibility, i.e. willingness to suppose or believe that the thing will happen...Od. 3. 231 μέα θεός γ’ ἐθέλων καὶ τηλιθεν ἄνδρα σαῦραν. This is said as a concession: ‘we men must allow that a god can save even from afar’’ (Monro, Homeric Grammar § 299 f.). Precisely so here: the meaning of the proverb is not this is intelligible, but this must be allowed to be intelligible or I can no longer complain of obscurity. See further Appendix II., and for proposed changes Wecklein’s Appendix.

1163. ὅπο (ὅποι, δόπος Hermann) may conceivably be an imitation of the Homeric ὅπο δεῖος etc., which though really explained by the digamma (ὅπο δεῖος) must have seemed to Aeschylus an arbitrary lengthening by the ictus.—ὅπο is adverb, quasi ὑποστήλημα.

1164. Perhaps δυσαγεῖ. For the metaphors in δυσαγεῖ...θραύματα cf. the Homeric ἐτεκλάσθη φιλὸν ἤτορ.—For δυσαγός from ἀγῆ breaking (ἀγωμί) cf. δυστυχής, τύχη.—δυσαλγεῖ Canter.—θραύματα...κλέειν literally ‘a shattering to hear’,—μυστικά θρομένας Schütz: κακὰ appears to be an explanation.

1167. πρὸπυργοῖ before the town or on behalf of the town (Blomfield)? Probably it would be truest to say that the first meaning is first intended, and then
τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν ὀσπερ ὦν ἔχειν παθεῖν, ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνυς τάχ’ ἐμπέδω βαλὼ.

Χ.Ο. ἐπόμενα προτέρους τάδ’ ἐπεφημίσω.  ἀντ. β’. καὶ τίς σε κακοφρονεῖν τίθη-σι δαίμων ὑπερβαρῆς ἐμπίτων, μελίζειν πάθη γοερὰ θανατοφόρα· τέρμα δ’ ἀμηχανώ.

Κ.Λ. καὶ μὴν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ’ ἐκ καλυμμάτων ἔσται δεδορκῶς νεογάμου νύμφης δίκην, λαμπρός δ’ ἔοικεν ἥλιον πρὸς ἀντολᾶς πνέων ἐσῆξεν, ὡστε κύματος δίκην κλύειν πρὸς αὐγὰς τοῦδε πύρματος πολὺ μείζον· φρενώσω δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων. καὶ μαρτυρεῖτε συνδρόμος ἱχνός κακῶν ῥωγηλατοῦσῃ τῶν πάλαι πεπραγμένων. τὴν γὰρ στέγην τήν’ οὖποτ’ ἐκλείπει χορὸς ἕμφασις οὐκ εὐφωνος: οὐ γὰρ εὐδέλει. καὶ μὴν πεπωκός γ’, ὡς θρασύνεσθαι πλέον, βρότειν αἷμα κόμος ἐν δόμοις μένει, δύσπεμπτος ἔξω, ἤγυγγόνων Ἐρυνύνων. ὑμνοῦσι δ’ ὑμνον δῶμασιν† προσήμεναι· πρώταρχος ἄτην ἐν μέρει δ’ ἀπέτυπον, εὐνάς ἀδελφὸν τῷ πατοῦντι δυσμενεῖς.

1172. ἐφημίσω.  1178. νύμφας.  1186. σῦ φωγγος.

the second assumed by a tacit shifting of thought.

1170. τὸ μὴ κτλ. As the principal sentence (οὖδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν) is negative, regular usage would require in the consecutive clause μὴ οὖ.—Ὡσπερ οὖν ἔχειν παθεῖν: ι.ε. ἔχειν παθεῖν ὡσπερ οὖν (ἔχει παθεῖν), ‘to save the city from receiving such treatment as in fact she is receiving’. This sentence, if rightly given by Florentinus and Venetus, is analogous to the use of ὅτις δήστοτε, e.g. ἔπαθε δ’ τι δήστο (ἔπαθες) ‘you have been treated as you have been’: but no parallel use of ὡσπερ οὖν seems to be found.—The Cod. Farn. offers the conjecture ὡσπερ οὖν ἔχει παθεῖν. Dr Wecklein objects that we should require either ὡσπερ οὖν ἔχει ἔχειν or ὡσπερ οὖν ἔπαθε παθεῖν, as in v. 1287 πράξασαν ὡς ἐπράξαν, Soph. O. T. 1376 βλαστοῦντ’ ὡς ἐβλαστεῖν etc. He suggests ὡσπερ οὖν ἔχει ἔχει (i. e. ἔχειν ὡσπερ οὖν ἔχει).

1171. See Appendix V.
1172. ἐπεφημίσω Paley.
1173. τίς: ‘and there is some power
such fate as now it hath; and I, the sick-brained, I shall soon be sent after the wise.

Eld. Thy latter words go along with those before. Some power there is who with over-bearing press maddens thee to sing of sorrows tending to death, though the end I cannot see.

Cass. See now, my prophecy shall not any more be like a bride new-wed looking forth from a veil. It shall come in bright as a fresh wind, blowing toward sunrise, and rolling wave-like against the light a woe far higher than this now. My teaching shall be by riddles no longer. And be ye witnesses with how close a scent I run in the track of the crimes done long ago.

For out of that house there never departs a choir of voices in unison not sweet, for the words are not fair. Aye, and they have drunk, to be the bolder, of human blood, and in the house they abide, hard to be turned away, a rout of sister-fiends. They besiege the chambers (?) and sing their song, with still-repeated burden denouncing the hated sin of him who defiled a brother’s bed.

which’ etc., i.e. there is inspiration in this and not mere wildness.—κακοφρονείν τίθηναι...μελίζειν maddens thee...to sing, quasi κακοφρονείν τίθηναι, ὡστε μελίζειν, the infinitives being accumulated, which, separated as they are, is not objectionable. For the construction of τίθημι see L. and Sc. s.v. B. 1. 4.—κακοφρονών, in malice, Schütz.—τέρμα goal, the same metaphor as in v. 1153.

1179. The metaphor changes to that of a strong wind at morning, under which the rolling waves of the sea are seen against the light of dawn. Cassandra, it may seem, recalls her recent voyage and the opening of this day. οὖν αὐτερός: the Greeks called a strong wind bright, so here in any other language two words are required, one to be in antithesis to ἐκ καλομαμάτων, the other to suit the new metaphor of wind’’. Sidgwick.

1180. ἐσήθεῖν: ‘its coming in’ or ‘entry shall be as of a clear fresh wind’. The expression is influenced by the remembrance marked in the previous note.—ἐσάζειν Bothe.

1181. κλύειν, i.e. κλύζειν, and perhaps an alternative form: cf. the analogous pairs βλύω—βλύζω, φλύω—φλύζω.—Πλευρ. J. A. Platt, Class. Rev. xi. p. 96.

1187. ὡς: ὡστε.

1189. κῶμος ‘Ερυνών...βρότειον αἴμα...ὑμνον: the figure foreshadows the Chorus of the Eumenides.

1190. δώμασιν προσήμεναι besieging the chambers (cf. πύργοις προσήθαι) not ‘sitting in the house’. ἐν δώμαις (v. 1188) therefore apparently means ‘in the forecourt (άλθη)’, or perhaps in the hall (μέγαρον), δώματα being the inner rooms. But there is probably some error.—πώμασιν προσήμεναι, sitting at their cups (cf. κώπη προσήμενος v. 1617), is possible.—αἴμασιν προσήμεναι or δώμασιν προσήμεναι (with ἦσαν v. 1191) Weil.

1191. πρώταρχος...ἐν μέρει δὲ i.e. πρώταρχος μὲν ἐν μέρει δὲ, literally ‘beginning and in succession’ or ‘in succession from the first beginner’. The term ἄρχειν (ὑμνον, ἀοίδης, etc.) was conventional and almost technical; see e.g. Pindar, Nem. 3. 4—τὸ μένοντι (σε) μελι...
γαρ τῶν τέκτων κώμων νεανίας...Ἀρχέ δ' οὐρανός πολυπέλαδον κρέοντι, θύγατερ, πολυδόκιμον ήμων: especially where as here there was a repetition and a burden to the song; so in Theocritus 1. Ἀρχέτε βοκολικάς, Μώιαι φίλαι, Ἀρχέτι άδιάς. — ἄτην·ἀπέπνυον they abominate the sin, cry against it. The common formula of disgust was not ἀποντώ αλλα ἀπέπνυα. — εἰνάς ἀδελφόν may be taken in apposition to ἄτην, the accusative to παρούσι being supplied from it, or, perhaps better, simply with παροῦσι, the defiler of a brother's bed, the order being arranged to emphasize the words εἰνάς ἀδελφόν. — δυσμενεῖς "can be nominative or accusative, but it is better nominative, being (as Enger and Schneidewin observe) a grim allusion to their name Εὔμενίδες" (Sidgwick).—The reference is to the adultery of Thystes with the wife of Atreus; Atreus avenged himself by the 'banquet', for which in return vengeance is now about to be taken. — πρῶταρχον ἄτην, depending on ἦμων, they sing of the original crime, the conjecture of Triclinius (Cod. Farn.), seems to distinguish between the 'original' crime and the succeeding (ἐν μέρει) sin of Thystes, and is generally explained by reference to earlier legends. But for the purpose of this play Atreus and Thystes are the starting point. We should not introduce here an obscure reference to stories which Aeschylus does not notice.

1193. τηρώ 'watch for an opportunity' is used with phrases expressing the nature of the opportunity (a favourable moment, a wind, a dark night, etc.), and here absolutely, the nature of the opportunity, the time to shoot, being implied by the context. The metaphor is the same as in 'to speak circumspectly'. The second question (τηρῷ τῷ;) corrects the metaphor of the first (ἡμαρτων;). 'Missing' implies 'aiming', conjecture, or taking a shot. But Cassandra knows (v. 1195): and this, she says, may be seen in the manner of her affirmation. The quack will be vague at first and not hazard anything till he gets a hint; he will 'watch, like one that shooteth'. Not so Cassandra, who in εἰνάς ἀδελφόν has gone without hesitation to a fact ancient, secret, and definite. Therefore she knows. The eagerness of the prophetess that her reputation should be attested is not the least pathetic feature in the situation.—εἰδέναι opposed to τοποδεικνύειν as in v. 1368 and P. V. 947 ἐγὼ τάδ' οἶδα.—λόγῳ παλαίας old in story. —If the emphatic meaning of εἰδέναι be missed, there is no connexion here. Hence the suspicion of τηρῷ (κυρῳ Ahrens), it being supposed that v. 1193 should mean 'Do I miss or hit?' Hence also τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι λόγῳ
Have I missed? Or do I at all take observation, like one that aimeth a shot? Or am I a false prophet, who babbles from door to door? Bear witness, swearing first, that I do verily know the ancient sins in the story of this house.

Eld. And how could an oath do good, being framed in its nature to hurt? But I find it strange in thee, that bred beyond the sea thou shouldst be as right about an alien city, as if thou hadst been there present.

Cass. The prophet-god it was who gave me this power, for...The time hath been when I dared not speak of it....

(Hermann), translated 'that I do not know by report' (τὸ μ’ εἰδέναι μὴ λόγῳ?). But Cassandra has done nothing to disprove, if it be supposed likely, that she knew the facts λόγῳ.

1197. πῆμα γεννάως παγέω framed naturally to be a hurt. γεννάως: 'according to its γέννα or nature', cf. Aristotle, Hist. An. 1. 1. 14 τὸ γεννᾶδι ἀταὶ τὸ μὴ ἐξωτάμενον ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ φόσσεως, and Hom. Il. 5. 253 ὅσοι γενναῖοι ἀλυσάκαζον μάρθεθαι (L. and Sc. s.v.). The meaning is this: the essence of a ὄρκος is that it causes the person swearing falsely to suffer certain penalties; so Hesiod (Theog. 792) calls the Styx, as ὄρκος θεῶν, μέγα πῆμα θεοῦ: except in the case of falsehood it does not act at all, and in that case, as was and still is the belief of superstition, it acts mechanically and without regard to qualifying considerations, such as bona fides. No one therefore should swear to a thing unless he is compelled to do so or has an object to gain. The speaker therefore prudently declines to swear to Cassandra's supernatural knowledge (which is not exactly proved after all), as the oath, he says, could do no good and would only expose the swearer unnecessarily to the danger of falsehood.—παλώνιον 'a thing of remedy'; the neuter better suits the antithesis between παλώνιον and πῆμα.—πῆμα γεννάως παγέω (a compact (?) honestly ratified), Auratus.

1198. θαυμάξω δέ. They admit that her accuracy is surprising.—σου: construed as in θαυμάξω τί τινος 'to wonder at something in a person'. Here the accusative is represented by the following sentence κυρείν κτλ.—σε Auratus.

1199. ἀλλόθρουν ...... ὀσπερ κτλ.: 'should be as right on the subject of an alien town as if' etc.—κυρείν absolutely, to hit.—ἀλλόθρουν πόλιν. The object of λέγουσαν (the theme spoken of, cf. λέγων χειμῶνα v. 653) is accommodated by a bold compression of phrase to εἰ παρεστάτησ: quasi λέγουσαν τὰ ἐν ἄλη ὀπλὶ γενναῖα, ὀσπερ εἰ παρεστάθα ὀσπερ ἑγένετο.

1201. For better warrant of her prophetic power, she begins to relate from whom and how dearly she purchased it, but pauses in an agony of shame. The Argives, who have heard the story by rumour (v. 1083), prompt her with a question, observing, as an excuse for pressing her, that delicacy was better suited to her former condition than her present! In spite of their sympathy they insist on gratifying their Greek (perhaps rather Athenian) curiosity. We may compare the scene in which the men of Colonus insist on forcing a confession from the reluctant Oedipus (Soph. O.C. 510 foll.). Here the woman sacrifices her modesty to her intense desire for belief.—On the text and explanation of the story see Appendix W.
ΧΩ. μῶν καὶ θεός περ ἵμερος πεπληγμένος;  
αὐθρώτετα γὰρ πᾶς τις εἰ πρᾶσσειν πλέον.

ΚΑ. ...ἀλλ’ ἤν παλαιστῆς κάρτ’ ἐμοὶ πνεύων χάριν. 1205
ΧΩ. ἢ καὶ τέκνων εἰς ἐργον ἠλθετον νόμῳ;  
ΚΑ. ξυνανείσασα Δοξίαν ἐγενσάμην.
ΧΩ. ἡδη τέχναισιν ἐνθέους ἠημένη;  
ΚΑ. ἡδη πολίταις πάντ᾽ ἐθεσπίζον πάθη.
ΧΩ. τῶς δῆτ᾽ ἀνακτός ἢσθα Δοξίου κότῳ; 1210
ΚΑ. ἐπειθον οὐδέν’ οὐδέν’, ὡς τάδ’ ἡμπλακον.
ΧΩ. ἡμῖν γε μὲν δὴ πιστά ἐθεσπίζειν δοκεῖς.
ΚΑ. ἵνα ἵνα, ὡ ὡ κακά.

ὑπ’ αὐὶ με δεινὸς ὁρθομαντείας πῶνος  
στροβεῖ ταράσσων φρομίους—ἐφημένους... 1215
ὀράτε; ...τούσδε...τοὺς δόμοις ἐφημένους...
νέοις, ὅνειροι προσφερέις μορφώμασιν.
παίδες θανόντες ὡσπερεί πρὸς τῶν φιλῶν,
χεῖρας κρεών πλήθουσε οἰκείας βορᾶς  
σὺν ἐντέροις τε σπλάγχν’, ἑπούκτιστον γέμος, 1220
πρέπουσ' ἑχοντες, ὡν πατήρ ἐγεύσατο.
ἐκ τῶνδε ποινὰς φημὶ βουλεύειν τινὰ  
λέοντ’ ἀναλκὼν ἐν λέχει στρωφώμενον  
οἰκουρόν, οὐμοί, τῷ μολότῳ, δεσπότη  

1220. Ἐξ.
Eld. For Apollo's self desired thee. Was it so? We are all more delicate in prosperity.
Cass. Yea, then, he wrought with me, and mighty was his charm.
Eld. And came ye too to the deed of kind in natural course?
Cass. I promised, but kept not faith with Loxias.
Eld. And had he won thee with inspiration already given?
Cass. Yes, already I prophesied to my people all that befell them.
Eld. How could the wrath of Loxias retrieve thee then?
Cass. After I did that wrong, I could never make any believe me.
Eld. To us however thou seemest a prophet worthy belief.
Cass. Ah!...Oh agony!
Again the fearful pangs of present vision grow on me, whirling my soul in a confused beginning of—There!...Sitting there!...do ye see them? Sitting before the house!...young children, like forms in a dream.
As infants slain by their parents they appear, their hands full of that meat of which he ate, whose own flesh it was, carrying, oh pitiable burden!, the hearts and inward parts, of which their father tasted.
And hence the vendence, plotted, I tell you, now by a certain lion of a craven sort, who haunting the couch hath watched at home for him, alas, who is come, who is lord—for

1216. ὁρᾶτε; best taken (with Hermann) as a question.—δόμοις ἔφημένους 'sitting before' the house, i.e. as suppliants at the door, or at the altar before the door; see ἑρέτας ἔφημενος, Lut. 412. For the construction cf. ἐφεστάναι πῦλος to stand at a gate, ἐφεστάναι πύλη to lie before a city (of an army), and see Theob. 535.
1218. Like children slain by those that should love them. This, with the reference to dream-phantoms, seems to presume a belief that the children of infanticides haunted the house in this way, a belief very natural where, as in the historic age of Greece, infanticide was permitted but disliked.—τε couples πλήθωντες with ἔχοντες, and παιδείς...φίλοι is a separate clause, qualifying the whole sentence and explained by what precedes.
1219. οἰκείας βορᾶς: because the flesh of the children was the flesh of the father himself.
1224. διστότη...ζυγόν. The appellation and humble acknowledgment have here a bitterly ironical effect.
έμω· φέρειν γάρ χρῆ τὸ δοῦλιον ζυγὸν. 1225
νεῶν τ' ἀπαρχὸς Ἡλίου τ' ἀναστάτης
οὐχ οἴδειν ὁδα γλώσσα μισθῆς κυνός,
λέξασα κακτείνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην
ἀτης λαβραίου, τεῦξηται κακὴ τύχη.
τοιάδε τόλμα, θῆλυς ἀρσενος φονεύς.

1230 ἕστιν—τί νυν καλοῦσα δυσφίλες δάκος
τύχομι' ἂν; ἀμφίσβαται, ἡ Σκύλλαν τινὰ
οίκον ἐν πέτραιοι, ναυτῖλων βλάβην,
θύουσαν Ἄιδου μητέρ' ἂσπονδόν τ' ἀράν
φίλοις πνέουσαν; ὡς δ' ἐπωλολύζατο
ἡ παντότολομος, ὠσπερ ἐν μάχης τροπῆ,
δοκεῖ δὲ χαίρειν νοστίμῳ σωτηρία.
καὶ τῶνδ' ὄμοιον εἴ τι μὴ πείθω· τί γάρ;
τὸ μέλλον ἤξει. καὶ σὺ μὴν τάχει παρὼν
ἀγαν γ' ἀληθόμαντι οἰκτείρας ἐρείς. 1235

1238. καὶ κτεῖνασα. 1230. τόλμα. 1231. δυσφίλευς.

1226. νεῶν ... ἀναστάτης: literally ‘being at once discommanded of his fleet
and destroyer of Troy’. The conjunctions τε ... τε mark the connexion of the
facts; he is ἀναστάτης Ἡλίου and νεῶν ἀπαρχὸς therefore also. The two descriptions
are linked by the Trojan captive in bitter satire: the dispersion of the
fleet was the direct consequence of the sacrilegious razing (ἀνάστασις) of Troy
( vv. 350, 640), and on the dispersion of the fleet in turn depended the fate of
Agamemnon himself (see the Introduction). Here (as at v. 532) the poet has
in mind the destruction of Athens and its punishment at Salamis.—ἀπαρχὸς: from
ἀρχή, cf. ἀποτόλω, ἀποστάτησις etc., a private governing νεῶν. Cf. Cho. 660
γνῆ τ' ἀπαρχὸς and note there and (a pre-
cise parallel) Pers. 330 Κιλίκων ἀπαρχὸς,
having lost the Cilicians whom he com-
manded, the Cilician squadron having
been destroyed or very severely damaged
by the Athenians at Artemisium (Herod. 8. 14). ἀπαρχὸς has been wrongly con-
jectured in all three places.

1227—1229. κακτείνασα Canter. oia
adverbial accusative, equivalent to ὅπως,
qualifying the whole sentence. λέξασα...
λαβραίαν describes the queen’s reception
of Agamemnon. The expressions are
loaded, indeed over-loaded, with double
meaning. (1) In relation to γλώσσα...
λέξασα, the word δίκην means primarily
πλεα (cf. λέγειν δίκην and δίκας ὧν ἀπὸ
γλώσσης v. 804): Clytemnestra’s address
(v. 846) is a δίκη in this sense, an excul-
pation of herself. In this connexion
ἐκτείνασα means lengthening, and refers
to the artificial length of her address,
noted by Agamemnon (v. 907) in similar
terms. But (2) in ἐκτείνασα δίκην...τεῦξ-
ται there is also involved another sense of
δίκη, connected with δίκη justice very
remotely if at all, namely a cast (as of
a net) from δίκειν to throw (cf. βῆλος from
βάλλειν, and δίκειν). To δίκη in this
sense ἐκτείνειν to reach forth is literally
the slave must bear the yoke—of me. Little he knows, the
destroyer of Ilium, captain of a lost fleet, how the tongue of
that lewd creature hath spoken and ‘stretched’, with joyful
thoughts, her ‘plea’ (and cast!) of treacherous death, which
fatally shall reach him! So bold the crime, a woman to slay
the man!

She is—ah what should the loveless monster be fitly called?
A dragon, a Scylla housed in the rocks, the mariner’s bane,
a mother of death (?), offering her fell sacrifices even while
in the prayer of her soul her husband hath no part. And how
the bold wretch raised her cheer, as at the turn of battle, pretending
to be glad of the safe coming-home!

And of this how much is believed, it matters not. What is
to be will come, nay, soon thou, present thyself, wilt say with
compassion ‘A prophet only too true!’

applicable, and in this metaphor the
allusive phrases meet.—ἀτις λαβραίον
defines δίκην, and also determines the
meaning of τεθήκασι will reach (the object).
—I unite the explanations of (1) Mr
Macknighten (Journal of Philology, xvi.
p. 213) and (2) Prof. Bury (Classical
Rev. i. 241). See further Appendix X.

1230. τοιάδε: so daring, that he cannot
suspect it.—θῆλυς...φωνεύς, where
θῆλυς is in effect subject and φωνεύς
predicate, stand in loose apposition to τῶλμα,
as in the English.—Others join together
θῆλυς...ἐστίν, but see next note.—τῶλμα
H. L. Ahrens.

1231. ἔστιν—τι νῦν κτλ. She pauses
for words.

1234. θυσσαν refers primarily to the
sacrifices which play so important a part in the
plot. (See particularly vv. 592—
599 ἰνώλοθυα...δῶμε δῆθνον and note ἐπωλολίζομεν below.) But "Αἰδοῦ
suggests also the sense raging (from the other
θῶο). The point lies in the ambiguity: her
sacrifice is the ritual of a Fury.—
"Αἰδοῦ μητέρα (?): a strange expression.
Mr Sidgwick translates it by Dam of
Death, which sounds well; but Hades
is strictly a personal name, the deity of
the lower world. λήτορα O. Müller,
followed by Wecklein (from Hesychius,
λέιτορες: lêteiá, and λήτειρα: lêteiá τῶν
σεμνῶν θεῶν: cf. v. 736 lêreis atas),
priestess of Hades.

ib. τε couples θύσσαν to πέθανας, con-
trasting them as things which should not
come-into existence.—δαιπονόν ἄριν φιλοις. The
dative depends on δαιπονόν. An ἀρά
created a bond (see v. 464) between those
who joined in the στουνδαλ (libation)
by which it was typified. An ἀρά which is
dαιπονός τοι is a prayer in which that
person cannot share. The prayers, with
which Clytaemnestra secretly accompanied
her pretended sacrifice for her hus-
band’s return, were curses upon his head
and vows for the success of her plot.—
φιλοί: regularly used in tragedy of the
husband or wife.—Δην, "Δην conj.

1236. ἄθαντι...τροπῇ as at the moment
of victory. The figure is from women
watching a fight and raising the ἀλου-
γῶμος when they see the enemy fly.

1238. Literally ‘it is all one if I am
as to any point herein not believed’.

1239. μὴν but marks a climax. The
fact can scarcely be called ‘future’: the
elders are there to see it.—καλ empha-
sizes σύ, thy very self.

1240. γε. As for confirmation of her
truth, that at least will be only too com-
plete. The object (με) is apparently
ΧΩ. τὴν μὲν Θεόστου δαίμα παίδείων κρέας
ξυνήκα καὶ πέφρικα, καὶ φόβος μ´ ἔχει
κλύνοντ´ ἀληθῶς οὐδὲν ἐξηκασμένα·
tὰ δ´ ἀλλ´ ἀκούσας ἐκ δρόμου πεσὼν τρέχω.
ΚΑ. Ἀγαμέμνονος σε φήμ´ ἐπόψεσθαι μόρον. 1245
ΧΩ. εὐφήμων, ὥ τάλανα, κοίμησον στόμα.
ΚΑ. ἀλλ´ οὕτι παιῶν τοῦ δ´ ἐπιστατεῖ λόγω.
ΧΩ. οὐκ, εἰ παρέσται γ´. ἀλλ´ μη γένοιτο πως.
ΚΑ. σὺ μὲν κατεύχει, τοῖς δ´ ἀποκτείνει μέλει.
ΧΩ. τίνος πρὸς ἄνδρος τούτ´ ἄχος ποροῦνεται;
ΚΑ. ἡ κάρτ´ ἁρ´ ἀν παρεσκόπεις χρησμῶν ἐμῶν.
ΧΩ. τοῦ γὰρ τελοῦντος οὐ ξυνήκα μηχανή.
ΚΑ. καὶ μὴν ἄγαν γ´ Ἐλλῆν´ ἐπίσταμαι φάτων.
ΧΩ. καὶ γὰρ τὰ πυθόκραντα· δυσπυθή δ´ ὦμως.
ΚΑ. παπαί, οἶνον τὸ πῦρ· ἐπέρχεται δὲ μοι.
οτοτοί, Δύκει´ Ἀπόλλων, οἰ ἐγὼ ἐγώ.
αὐτὴ δύσποις λέανα συγκοιμομένη
λύκῳ λεόντος εὐγενοῦς ἀποσύρα.
1241. παιδείων. 1251. παρεσκόπεις.
1254. δυσπαθῆ. 1257. δίπλους.

supplied from ei πείθω: but perhaps we
should read μ´ ἐν (for μὴν Αurator) or μ´
(for ἐν Pauw).

1241. παιδείων Schütz.
1243. ἀληθῶς...ἐξηκασμένα what is in
truth no mere likeness. They admit that
her utterances have as she asserts (v. 1193)
all the precision of reality. Cf. Theb. 432.
1244. ἐκ...τρέχω I am thrown off the
track, at a loss.
1246. εὐφήμων. The presence of the
gods of the house, in whose honour a
sacrifice is now being performed, makes
abstinence from ominous words a reli-
gious duty. From the reference to Παιῶν
(Apollo) in the answer it appears that
they point specially at the Agyrieus
(v. 1065).
1247. Nay, it is not as saviour that
he governs this speech, but as ἀπόλλων
(see v. 1065, and contrast v. 517 νῦν...
τοῦ παιῶνος).—λόγῳ: what she has said.
1248. No indeed, if he means to ap-
ppear; but I trust it shall not be so, i.e.
I trust it is an idle prediction which the
god does not inspire, and will not see
executed. But presently Cassandra be-
holds the god himself (v. 1268). It is
to be remembered that Agamemnon, as
well as Cassandra, was a sinner against
Apollo in having violated his sanctuary.
The apparition of the god here at the
crisis is a forecast of his leading part in
the following plays.—εἰπερ ἐσταὶ, Schütz,
assuming that the subject of the verb
is ὁ λόγος.
1250. They are thinking of Aegisthus;
hence ἄνδρος.
1251. Thou must indeed have missed
Eld. Thyestes’ feast of children’s flesh I understood, and shudder. Truly ’tis more than semblance, and it makes me afraid to hear it. But in what else was said I am thrown out of the track.

Cass. I say that thou wilt see Agamemnon dead.

Eld. O hush, poor creature, hush thy profane lips!

Cass. Nay, it is not as a Saviour that He directs this sentence.

Eld. No indeed, if He will be present; but I trust it shall not be so.

Cass. While thou prayest against them, they are busy to slay.

Eld. Who is the man who is contriving this woe?

Cass. Thou must indeed have looked far wide of what I showed!

Eld. ’Tis that I understand not the plan of him who should do it.

Cass. And yet I know the speech of Hellas, only too well.

Eld. Greek are the Pythian oracles, and yet hard to the seeker.

Cass. Oh, this burning fire!...It is creeping over me!...Ah mercy, Apollo Lycèus, mercy upon me!

See the lioness two-footed, that couches with the wolf while the noble lion is away! She will slay me, wretch that I am!

clean the purport of my revelation, literally ‘must have looked much wide of (παρά).’ For the tense with ἀν see v. 924 and note there.—By the caesural division of παρεσκόπησις an emphasis may be thrown upon παρά (as an adverb); cf. Theb. 535. In fact παρεσκόπησις is not one word but two. See however the observations of Dr Headlam, On editing Aeschylus, p. 16. I hope to return to the subject in connexion with the Persæ.—ἡ κάρα τάρα παρεσκόπησις Hartung.

1252. Literally ‘of the person likely to perform it I do not understand the instrument’, i.e. ‘I do not see how he, whom I should naturally suspect of the design, has any means of executing it’. ὃ τελῶν is Aegisthus, as in v. 1250. It would be impossible that the elders, knowing what they do, should not have their minds turned in this direction by Cassandra’s words. But as they say, what they do not comprehend is how the adulterers can act. The μηχανή is the conspiracy.

1253. ἀγαμ νις: by the fatal inspiration of Apollo, which adds a point to the next verse.

1254. δυσποθὴ hard to enquire of, hard to learn, from ποθέω: cf. εὐποθης.

—δυσμαθῇ Stephanus.

1255. ἐπέρχεταί it is coming, the prophetic seizure.

1257. δίπος Victorius.—ἅυτη See there...! It is better to stop the sentence at ἀπονοσία.
κτενεῖ με τὴν τάλαναν· ώς δὲ φάρμακον
τεύχουσα κάμου μισθὸν ἐνθήσει κότῳ.
ἐπεῦχεται θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον
ἐμῆς ἀγωγῆς ἀντιστασθαί φόνον.
τί δὴ ἐμαυτῆς καταγέλωτ' ἔχω τάδε,
καὶ σκῆπτρα καὶ μαντεία περὶ δέρη στέφη;
σὲ μὲν πρὸ μούρας θῆς ἐμῆς διαφθεῖν.
ίτ' ἐς φθόρον πεσοῦν' ἀγαθῶ δ' ἀμείβωμαι.
† ἀλλην τυν ἀτὴν ἀντ' ἐμοὶ πλουτίζετε.
ιδοὺ δ' Ἱππόλλων αὐτὸς ἐκδόνω ἔμε
χρηστηρίαν ἐσθητ'· ἐποπτεύσας δὲ με
κάν τοίςδε κόσμως καταγελωμένην μετά,
φίλων ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως, μάτην
(καλομένη δὲ, φοιτᾶς ὦς, ἀγύρτρια
πτωχὸς τάλανα λιμοθινὴς ἥνεσχόμην),
καὶ νῦν ὁ μάντις μάντων ἐκτράξας ἐμὲ
ἀπήγγαλ' ἐς τοιάδε θανασίμους τύχας.

1260. See Appendix Β.

1265. Literally 'enrich another kind of
destruction in return for the destruction
of me'. ἀτὴν πλουτίζετε enrich Destruc-
tion, i.e. 'be destroyed', as in Soph. Ο. Τ.
30 Λοίδος στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις πλουτίζεται,
but here with more point in so far as the
notion of πλοῦτος is literally appropriate
to the insignia. — ἀλλην τινά (in prose
usage ἐτέραν τινά) marks the fanciful
analogy. If the insignia cannot be
killed, like Cassandra, they can at least
be spoiled. — ἀντ' ἐμοί, as in the com-
paratio compendiaria, for ἀντὶ τῆς ἐμῆς
ἀτής. She expresses more precisely the
idea of ἀμείβωμαι in v. 1266.—Suggested
changes (Ἀτής Hermann, etc.) assume the
meaning 'Bestow yourselves on another'.
But the insignia are not to go to another;
they are to be destroyed.

1270. Lit. 'mocked even in this
dress along with it'. As in v. 591 and
Brewing as it were a medicine for her wrath, she will add to it also the recompense for me. She vows as she sharpens her man-slaying sword, to take of him for the bringing of me a bloody revenge.

Why then in derision of myself do I bear these, the sceptre of divination, and the stole about my neck?

Thee at least I will destroy ere I perish myself!

Down, cursed things, to the ground, where thus I take vengeance upon you! (?) Because ye have been my ruin, die ye too, so as ye may.

But see, Apollo himself, stripping from me the prophet's vesture! He hath had the spectacle of me exposed, even in and along with this sacred garb, to the derision of friend and foe alike, and in vain—yes, 'mountebank, beggar, starveling' were the names, alas, that vagabond-like I had to bear: and now the Seer hath finished my seership, and brought me to die like this, where there awaits me not the altar of my home, but a

v. 1644, the adverbial preposition is emphasized by separation. So long as Cassandra was mocked, Apollo cared not if the sacred emblems of his own religion were exposed to indignity 'along with' her. μετά here means οὐκ ἀνευ τοῦτον as σῶ in v. 591 means μη ἀνευ τῶν ἄλλων. — μέγα Hermann.

1271. φιλον...δικρόπτως by friends and foes indifferently disbelieved, that is, in Argos just as formerly in Troy (Hermann, Peile, Conington etc.). The absence of a copula between φιλον and ἐκθρῶν depends on the same principle of antithesis as ἀνω κατω ἐρ and ἐρωτηματικόν Soph. Ant. 1079, δάκτυλον δάκτυλος ἐρ. Soph. Trag. 861 (Kühner, § 546, 5, e, d).—Others join φιλον as an adjective, to ἐκθρῶν, or vice versa, or take together μετα and φιλον 'by foes with (as well as) friends'. In favour of this last see Headlam, Class. Rev. xiv. 117, citing somewhat similar uses of σῶν ἐκθροῖς καὶ φιλοῖς, in which however σῶν does not seem to mean as well as but simply with.

—μάτην. As the prophecies were still disbelieved, the mockery was borne in vain.—The pause after δικρόπτως gives sharp emphasis to the final word.

1272. τάλαινα Alas!—'Like a vagabond, I endured beggary, wretchedness, hunger', T. C. Snow, Class. Rev. ii. 319, supposing an actual wandering: but καλομένη is a difficulty.

1274. καὶ νῦν resumes the main sentence. As he has followed with revengeful delight her sufferings as prophetess, so now also he has come to witness the last penalty.—μάνιν ἐκπαρά-ξας ἢμε 'having finished my seership', 'having done with me as a seer'.

Finished here is not quite the same thing as destroyed (Soph. O. C. 1659); Cassandra the μάνις is 'finished', as having completed her punishment so far as it was to be inflicted through the prophetic gift. In sign of which the god by her own hands has stripped off the fatal emblems.

1276—1277. κοπείσις, possessive, depending on ἐπίξηνος, literally 'the block of one struck', 'the victim's block'. That κοπείσις is strictly general in sense explains the use of the timeless aorist.
θερμώ κοπείσης φοινίω προσφάγματι.  
οῦ μὴν ἂτιμοὶ γ' ἐκ θεῶν τεθνησομεν.  
ήξει γὰρ ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμάρος,  
μητροκτόνον φίτυμα, ποινάτωρ πατρός:  
φυγάς δ' ἀλήθης τήσει γῆς ἀπόξενος  
kάτεισιν ἀτας τάσδε θρυγκόσων φίλους:  
ἀξει νῦ ὑπτίασμα κειμένου πατρός.  
τί δὴτ' ἐγὼ κάτοικος ὅδ' ἀναστένω;  
ἐπει τὸ πρῶτον ἐδον Ἰλίου πόλιν  
πράξασαν ὧς ἔπραξεν, οἱ δ' εἶχον πόλιν  
οὕτως ἀπαλάσσοσιν ἐκ θεῶν κρίσει,  
ἰοῦσα πράξι, τλήσομαι τὸ καθανεῖν  
ὁμόμοια γὰρ ὅρκος ἐκ θεῶν μέγας.  
Αἰδον πύλας δὲ τάς ἐγὼ προσενέποι,  

1278. ἄτιμων (corr. to ἄτιμοι).  
1283. ἄξειν νῦν.  
1290. τὰς λέγω.

θερμώ is a predicate to φοινίω προσφάγματι, quasi τῷ φοινίῳ προσφάγματι. Literally ‘upon the before-shed (or first-shed) blood being warm’. The dative is that which, on the analogy of the genitive, is sometimes called ‘absolute’. The πρόσφαγμα is the blood of Agamemnon. See further Appendix Z.

1278. τεθνησομεν we, strictly plural, Cassandra and Agamemnon.

1283. ἄξει νῦν g, h. Hermann retaining ἄξει (f) inserts here ν. 1289, but see note there.—Of ὑπτίασμα only a conjectural explanation can be given. It means literally ‘the turning of a thing upside down’. Thus the position of the hands in prayer with the palms upwards is ὑπτίασμα χειρῶν. Here it refers to the overthrow of the fallen (κειμένου) Agamemnon. But it can scarcely be supposed that the poet, without special reason, would describe so simple a matter by such a far-fetched and unnatural word, or that ὑπτίασμα κειμένου πατρός is merely an equivalent for κειμένου παθῆρ. As this verse is in form a commentary on the preceding, it is there we should look for the explanation. The only expression likely to suggest remark is θρυγκόσων. With this metaphor therefore ὑπτίασμα should be connected; the ὑπτίασμα of Agamemnon’s fall will bring or lead to the θρυγκός of Orestes’ vengeance. The θρυγκός was the finish of a piece of building, such as the coping stone of a wall, the abacus of a capital, etc.: and ὑπτίασμα therefore, to suit the metaphor, should be what comes before, i.e. below, the θρυγκός. In all building, unless on a very small scale, the projection of the θρυγκός is secured and connected with the vertical by an inward slope; and this slope is effected by a stone or piece which is a ὑπτίασμα in the proper sense, having a larger end and a smaller, and standing upon the smaller, i.e. upside down. More particularly in the capital of a pillar, the inward-sloping part (in Doric architecture the echinus), which carries the abacus or flat top, is a ὑπτίασμα. We may conjecture therefore that to this part of a wall or column was applied the term ὑπτίασμα, or some term (e.g. τὸ ὑπτίον) suggesting this. For
butcherly block for a victim struck before the last blood is cold.

Yet not unregarded of heaven shall we die. For there shall come another yet to requite for us, one born to slay his mother, to avenge his sire. Exiled from this land, a wanderer disowned, he shall return, to put on this tower of unnatural crimes that pinnacle, whereto his father's death is the leading spire.

I am come to my 'home', and why thus wail? Since I saw first Ilium meet the fate it hath, and now they, who were her captors, are brought by the gods of their choice to their present pass, I will go meet fate, will take death patiently, because the gods with a mighty oath have sworn it!

Only I greet this door as the portal of Death, and my prayer

the same architectural metaphor with the same application see v. 1339.

1284. κατοικος means 'one who settles' or takes up his abode in a place. In bitter irony she identifies herself as she has been hidden to do (v. 1020) with the house of Agamemnon, and chides herself for delaying to enter where she is to abide.—κατοικος Scaliger.

1286. είχον. The imperfect tense is used in contrast to the succeeding present ἀπαλλάσσομαι: cf. v. 709 ἐμένων δι
τόστε ἐπέρρεπην γαμήλιοις ἀδείου. ωδ' είχον is literally 'those who (then) were the takers (of the town)'. As σχείν is to take, so είχον is to be taking, as in v. 670.—πάλιν Keck, for πόλιν, i.e. on the contrary or in their turn. The object to είχον (αὐτήν) would naturally be supplied, and πάλιν improves the point.

1287. 'Are brought by their choice of gods to their present pass', literally 'are coming off thus by choice of gods'. ἐκ θεῶν, out of or among gods, depends upon κρίσει (choosing, from κρίνω choose); cf. v. 1363, θεοὶ καθαρίζων φόνῳ etc. ἐν θεῶν κρίσει (g, h) is perhaps only a conjecture to simplify the construction, but the meaning is not altered.—The thought is this: from the triumph of Agamemnon and the Greeks it might have appeared, and it was argued, that the Trojans had chosen their patrons ill, and in particular that they erred in adopting the κρίσις, the judgment or choice, of Paris: but now it seems that Zeus Xenios (v. 374, 705 etc.), Hera, and the other vaunted patrons of the Greeks, have no mind to protect the victors. Evil destiny therefore is omnipotent, and nothing remains but to submit to it.—ἐν θεῶν κρίσει may also be rendered 'under the decision of the gods'.

1288. λοῦσα πράξῳ 'I will go to my own fate (faring)'. The sense of πράξῳ is explained (Paley) by πράξασαν in v. 1286 to which it refers.—ταλήσωμαι τὸ καθαρισεῖ defines πράξῳ. The abrupt asyndeton is intentional for effect.

1289. For have not the gods sworn a mighty oath? i.e. what I am to suffer is fated, as was the destruction of Troy, as is the impending death of Agamemnon, as is the future vengeance of Orestes. The divine oath, the Homeric symbol of certain destiny, is used here with a general application, summing up the fatalistic argument of the passage.—Hermann places this verse before v. 1283.

1290. 'But in my salutation this gate shall be the gate of Death'. She contrasts her conscious going-in to death with the confident salutation of Agamemnon, τεύσεις ἐγχώρους δική προσεπείν (v. 801), and again ἐς μελαθρα ἐλάσων θεοὶ δεξιώσομαι (v. 843). The parallel is in-
ἐπεύξ. ομαὶ δὲ καυρίας πληγῆς τυχεῖν, ὃς ἠσφαδᾶτος, αἰμάτων εὐθηνοσίμων ἀτ ὁρρηντῶν, ὄμμα συμβαλὼ τόδε.

XO. ὡ πολλὰ μὲν τάλανα, πολλὰ δὲ ἦσσοφῆ γύναι, μακρὰν ἑπεναι: εἰ δ' ἑπτήμως μόρον τὸν αὐτῆς οἰσθα, πῶς θελάτων βοῶς δίκην πρὸς βωμὸν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς;

ΚΑ. οὐκ ἔστ' Ἀλυξίς, οὐ, ἔξον, χρόνῳ πλέω.

XO. ὡ δ' ὄστατός γε τοῦ χρόνου προσβεβείται.

ΚΑ. ἢκει τόδ' ἡμαρ' σμικρὰ κερδανὼ φυγή.

XO. ἀλλ' ἵσθι τλήμων οὖσ' ἀπ' εὐτόλμον φρενός.

ΚΑ. οὐδείς ἀκούει ταῦτα τῶν ευδαιμόνων.

XO. ἀλλ' εὐκλεῶς τοι καθανεῖν χάρως βροτῷ.

ΚΑ. ἰῶ πάτερ σου τῶν τε γενναῖων τέκνων.

XO. τί δ' ἐστὶ χρήμα, τίς σ' ἀποστρέφει φόβος; 1305

ΚΑ. φεῦ φεῦ.

XO. τί τοιτ' ἐφευξάς; εἰ τι μὴ φρενῶν στύγος.

ΚΑ. φόβων δόμοι πνέουσιν αἰματοσταγῇ.

XO. καὶ πῶς; τόδ' ὤξει θυμάτων ἐφεστίων.

ΚΑ. ὀμοιος ἄτμος ὁσπερ ἐκ τάφου πρέπει. 1310

1298. πλέω.

1294. Read perhaps σχεβραί: very miserable, but very patient (see the following lines). σχεβρός or σχεβρός is given by Hesychius, with the interpretation τλήμων πατείως, which this passage (see ν. 1301) suggests. For the derivation from σχειν to bear, cf. ἀνασχετός.—δ' αὖ

Cod. Farn. with σοφή, which, if retained, should be understood, as the context indicates, ironically. But it may be an explanation of σχεβραί, arising from the confusion of σχεβρός and σκεβρός.

1295. 'You have by long speaking deferred your fate for some time, it is true, but if you really foresee it, why go to it at all?' This is the tone.

1296. θηλάτου. If a victim came to the place of sacrifice willingly, it was supposed to indicate the divine choice.

1297. εὐτόλμως literally 'with easy courage', carelessly rather than bravely. See on Eur. Med. 496.

1298. χρόνως πλέω. When the time is full, there is no escape. For the dative see Appendix Z. Here it may be quasi-causal, by fulness of time there is no escape, or quasi-possessive, a full time hath no escape, the χρόνως being personified as in ν. 885; see the note cited, and particularly Theocr. 13. 29. But it is unnecessary to decide the exact relation, as the case like the genitive signifies merely accompanying circumstance. —χρόνοι πλέω (Weil) the times are full, a separate clause.
is to receive a mortal stroke, that the blood-stream may flow
easy, and I may not struggle but close mine eyes.

Eld. O woman patient as miserable! When all this is
spoken, yet now, if verily thou dost know thine own death, why
goest thou to it, enduring as the ox, which the god moves
toward the altar?

Cass. There is no escape, friends, none, when the time is
full.

Eld. Yea, but the last of the time is best.
Cass. The day is come. Little shall I gain by flight.
Eld. Then be assured, that thou hast a stubborn patience!
Cass. So praised is never any save the unhappy.
Eld. Yet a mortal may be glad to die with honour.
Cass. Ah father, to think of thee and those, thy genuine
children!...

Eld. What is it? What horror turns thee back?
Cass. O foul, O foul!
Eld. What callest thou foul, if the loathing be not in thy
fancy?

Cass. 'Tis the horror of dripping blood, that the house
exhales.
Eld. Nay, nay: it is the scent of the hearth-sacrifice.
Cass. It is such a reek as might come out of a grave.

1399. Two constructions are possible:
(1) τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεύται he that is
last (to undergo the inevitable) has the
advantage in respect of time; Hermann,
Paley and others: and (2) ὁ ἀυτός τοῦ
χρόνου the last of the time is best, El-
berling cited by Hermann. (2) seems
preferable, since (1) introduces a com-
parison of different persons, which is
scarcely to the point. Either way the
meaning is that an inevitable evil may
at least be put off to the last.—τοῦ
χρόνου: 'the time' of the preceding verse.

1301—1303. They attempt to console
her with praise, but she answers with
sad resignation. Although impressed
they are determined not to be convinced
(see v. 1305), and their consolation is but
half serious.—Against the rearrangement
of this passage by Heath and Hermann
(thus, 1301, 1303, 1302) see Paley, Sidg-
wick, Kennedy, Conington. To Cassand-
dra the sentiment ἄλλο εὐκλέως κτλ. is not
suitable.

1304. With this cry of misery and
repentance, suggested partly by εὐκλέως
cαθάνειν, she moves to enter, but starts
back in an agony of physical horror.—
tῶν. Degraded as she is, she does not
count herself among τὰ γενναία τῶν τέκ-
νων. There is no εὐκλέως καθάνειν for
her.—σῶν Auratus.

1308. φόβον of that which terrifies,
as in v. 1305 and Theb. 487. See
Tennyson, Maud i. 1 'The red-ribb'd
ledges drip with a silent horror of blood'.
With φόβον πυόνειν cf. κλάζοντι φόμον
Theb. 373.—φόνον Cod. Farn.
ΧΩ. οὖν Σύμεων ἀγλάσιμα δῶμαις λέγεις.
ΚΑ. ἀλλ' εἰμι καὶ δόμοις κωκύσουσι' ἐμὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος τε μούραν. ἀρκείτω βίος.
ὡς ἔρωι.
οὕτω δυσοίζω θάμνον ὡς ὄρνις φόβω νὰ
ἀπειθεῖτέ μοι τὸ δέ, ὅταν γυνὴ γυναῖκος ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θάνη,
ἀνὴρ τε δυσδάμαρτος ἀντ' ἀνδρὸς πέση.
ἐπιζευγόμαι, ταῦτα δ' ὡς θανομένη.
ΧΩ. δ' τλῆμον, οἰκτείρω σε θεσφάτον μόρον.
ΚΑ. ἀπαξ ἐτ' εἰπεῖν ῶνοσιν—ἡ θρήνον θέλω ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτής; ἢλίῳ δ' ἐπεύχομαι,
πρὸς ύστατον φῶς, τοῖς ἐμὸις τιμαόροις
ἐχθροίς φόνευσιν τοῖς ἐμοῖς τίνειν ὤμοι δούλης θανούσης εὑμαρόν χειρόματος.
ὡς βρότεια πράγματ', εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν
σκία τις ἂν τρέψειν· εἰ δὲ δυστυχή,
βολάν ὑγρόσωσών στόγγος ὠλέσεν γραφήν.
καὶ ταὐτ' ἐκείνων μᾶλλον οἰκτείρω πολύ.
ΧΩ. τὸ μὲν εὖ πράσσειν ἀκόρεστον ἔφι
πᾶσι βροτοῖσιν· δακτυλοδείκτων δ'

1316. ἀλλ' ὡς. 1324. ἐχθροὶς φόνευσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς (originally τοις).
1327. ἀντρέψειν.

1314. She turns back again.
1316. ἀλλ' ὡς θανούσῃ Hermann.
1319. ἰ. e. 'if I make a claim upon you as my new ἔνοι, it is my first and my last', literally 'I claim ἔνδεια, but that as one about to die': cf. καὶ ταῦτα 'and that', and see v. 556.—The verse may also be taken as one clause, with the same sense.
1320. This is the only speaker who expresses full conviction and sympathy, and the one touch of relief to the horror of the scene. One ἔνοι responds to her last appeal, and with that she turns from them for ever.
1321. I would speak one speech more, or is it mine own dirge? She has spoken ὡς θανομένη (v. 1391), yet she will speak once more, if it be but ὡς θανοβά. It is the last stage in the conflict between her terror and her despair.—ῥήσω, ὡς θρήνον (Hermann).
1322—1325. The sense is 'I make to the sun my last prayer, that when revenge comes, my wrongs may not be forgotten'. In the words there is some error, and many corrections (see Wecklein) are more or less plausible.—ἐχθροῖς...τοῖς ἐμοῖς Pearson; φόνευσιν Bothe, cf. φόνευ, φόνεμα: 'that my enemies may simul-
Eld. Thou canst not mean the sweet incense of the palace.
Cass. Yet I will go, and within, as here, will wail the fate of me and of Agamemnon. Enough of life!
Oh friends, my friends!
I do not clamour for naught as a bird that dreads a bush. Bear this witness to me dead, when some day for my death another woman shall die, and for the hapless husband another fall. This office I ask of you at the point to die.
Eld. Ah miserable, I pity thee for thy death foretold!
Cass. I would speak one speech more—or is it mine own dirge? To the sun I call, unto the last I see, that those my avengers may take of these my enemies a bloody vengeance also for the easy conquest of a poor slain slave.
Alas for the state of man! If happiness may be changed as it were by a shade, misery is a picture which at the dash of the wet sponge is gone. And this I say is the more pitiable by far.

The Elders. Prosperity in all men doth naturally crave more. Though the palace be pointed at by jealous fingers, tanenously pay to my avengers the slaying of a slave. Between τοῖς ἔμοίς and ὰμοῦ (at the same time with the vengeance for Agamemnon) there is no doubt a logical inconsistency: logic would require τοῖς τῶν βασιλεῶν τιμάον or the like. But what is lost in logic is perhaps gained in effect: she says once too often that which she wants to say, that the wrong is hers also, the avengers hers also.—Mr Housman, Journal of Philology xvi. p. 287, proposes τοῖς νέοις.—ἡλίῳ...πρὸς ὑστάτον φῶς are cumulative, one repeating the other.
1326—1329. In ἀν πρέψειεν (Porson) πρέπω has the sense analogous to τροπὴ change.—ταῦτα the latter, the destruction of the miserable, ἔκεῖνων the former, that of the prosperous.—She is still protesting against neglect of her part in the injury. The murder of the poor slave may count for little beside the murder of the great king; and vulgar opinion may esteem the overthrow of prosperity a more tragic thing than the extinction of misery which is only just on this side of nothing. But this, not that, is truly the more pitiable case.—σκῖα τις ἀν πρέψειεν (one may liken them to a sketch) Conington, from Photius πρέψαι ὁμοιόσαμα. But is this gloss likely to be right? πρέψαι εἰκασ-μένοι, εἰκασθείς (Hesychius) is no doubt correct, but does not support the other.—σκῖα...γράφειεν Rauchenstein, σκῖα...γράφειεν H. Richards (Class. Rev. vii. 19).—δυστυχή Victorius, δυστυχῶι Blomfield. Either is possible in poetry. But δυστυχή is also possible and expresses the point better; the conditional sentence is then elliptical, the verb (πρέψειεν or something of the same general sense) being supplied from the preceding πρέψειεν. The change, which to prosperity is an overshadowing, is to misery obliteraton. Whichever be read, the meaning is practically the same.
1333. μηκέτι ἐσθάνης Hermann. The verse has been wrongly completed to a full dimeter.
οὕτις ἀπειπῶν εἰργεῖ μελάθρων,
μηκέτ' ἐσέλθης, τάδε φωνῶν.
καὶ τάδε πόλιν μὲν ἐλεῖν ἐδοσάν
μάκαρες Πριάμου,
θεοτύμητος δ' οἶκαδ' ἰκανεῖ.
νῦν δ' εἰ προτέρων αἰμ' ἀποτίσει
καὶ τούσι θανοῦσι θανῶν ἄλλων
ποιώς θανάτων ἐπικρανεῖ,
τίς τίνι ἄν εὐξαίτο βροτῶν ἀσινεῖ
δαίμονι φύναι τάδ' ἄκοινων;

ἈΓ. ὁμοί, πέπληγμα καιρίαν πληγήν ἔσω.
ΧΟ. σίγα· τίς πληγήν ἀντεί καιρίας ὀυτασμένοις;
ἈΓ. ὁμοί μᾶλ' αὕθεις, δευτέραν πεπληγμένος.
ΧΟ. τοῦργον εἰργάσθαι δοκεῖ μοι βασιλέως οἰμώγ-
μασίν.

Ἄλλα κοινωσώμεθ' ἄν πως ἁσφαλὴ βουλεύματα.

1. ἐγώ μὲν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην λέγω,
πρὸς δώμα δεῦρ' ἀστοῖσι κηρύσσειν βοήν.

2. ἐμοί δ' ὅποσ τάχιστα γ' ἐμπεσεῖν δοκεῖ
καὶ πράγμ' ἑλέγχειν σὺν νεορρύτῳ ξέφει.

1335. ἐπικρανεῖ. If right (as it may be) it is the
present of ἐπικράνειν, a verb formed from
ἐπικραίνον the capital of a column (and
from the stem κραῖνον head, whence κράνων
skull etc.), as ἐπικέλεω from τέλος. The
present tense is used, as often in prophecy
(Kühner, Gr. Gramm. § 382, 5 and 6),
of that which is on the way to be done.

1340. τίς τίνι ἄν εὐξαίτο...; a double
interrogative, who could affirm that any
mortal...?—tis, tis Musgrave.

1342. καιρίαν mortal. On the history of
this word, which, though formed from
καιρός, seems to have been influenced in
use by a resemblance to κήρος from κήρ,
see Leaf on Hom. II. 4. 185.
none forbidding shuts fortune out with these words 'Enter no more'.

And so to the king the gods have given to take the town of Priam, and he comes honoured of heaven to his home: yet now if he must pay for the blood of those before, if adding death to deaths he is to crown the pile with yet other deaths in revenge, who hearing this could affirm that any mortal is born with fortune beyond harm?

Agamemnon (within). Oh, I am struck, deep-struck and mortally!

Eld. Silence! Who shrieks as wounded with a mortal stroke?

Ag. Again, oh again! Another stroke!

Eld. The deed, I doubt, is done, from the cries of the king. But let us give each other safe counsel, if we may.

The Elders in succession.

1. I give you mine own judgment, that we summon a rescue of the folk to the palace.

2. Nay, I think we had best dash in at once, and prove the deed by the dripping sword.

1346. κοινωνώμεθ' ἀν πῶς κτλ: i.e., to render the full force, 'we will, if we may, give to one another safe counsel'.—ἀν with the imperatival subjunctive is contrary to rule, and generally rejected. But if we may reason from analogy, such a use should occur occasionally. It exists in Homer with κερ, as the expression of a conditional purpose (Monro, Hom. Grammar § 275), and may be supposed to have disappeared gradually, being retained meanwhile in poetry like other archaic syntax. The effect of ἀν would be to give a tentative tone, suggesting subjection to the condition of possibility. This is the account usually given of final ὡς with ἁν and without, and it appears to be correct, so far as any difference is strictly observed. We can understand why in the imperative the like variation should be extremely rare. Between the tentative and the imperative there is a natural inconsistency. But here it would be not out of place.—The proposed corrections, ἑμπαται, Ἰπν πῶς, ἀν πῶς etc., are not satisfactory.

1347. On the distribution of these speeches see Wecklein. The text points, as observed by Bamberger and O. Müller, to a chorus of 12 elders, and this is probably the intention, although a tradition (schol. to Aristoph. Knights 589) gives to this play the larger tragic chorus of 15. —On the scene in general at this point see the Introduction.

1348. βοήν i.e. βοήθειαν: to cry a rescue.
3. καγώ τοιούτου γυνώματος κοινωνός ἄν
ηφιξίομαι τι δράν: τὸ μὴ μέλλειν δ' ἀκμῆ.
4. δράν πάρεστι: φροιμιάζονται γὰρ ὡς
τυπανίδος σημεῖα πράσσουσι τόλει.
5. χρονίζομεν γὰρ: οἴ δὲ μελλούσης κλέος
πέδοι πατοῦντες οὐ καθεύδουσιν χερί.
6. οὐκ οἶδα βουλῆς ἡστινος τυχῶν λέγω.
τοῦ δραστός ἐστι καὶ τὸ βουλεύσαι πέρι.
7. καγώ τοιούτος εἰμ', ἐπεὶ δυσμηχαῖν
λόγοις τὸν θανόντ' ἀνιστάναι πάλιν.
8. ἢ καὶ βίον κτέινοντες ὃδ' υπείξομεν
δόμων καταπερουθήσοι τῷ δ' ἠγουμένους;
9. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄνεκτόν, ἀλλὰ καθανεῖν κρατεῖν
πεπαιτερά γὰρ μοῖρα τῆς τυπανίδος.
10. ἢ γὰρ τεκμηρίωσεν ἐξ οἰμωγμάτων
μαντευσόμεσθα ταῦτα δ' ὡς ὀλολότος;
11. σάφ' εἰδότας χρή τῶμε μυθοῦσαι πέρι
τὸ γὰρ τοπάζειν τοῦ σάφ' εἰδέναι δίχα.
12. ταύτην ἐπαινεῖν πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι,
τρανῶς Ἀτρείδην εἰδέναι κυρωνθ' ὡς.

ΚΛ. πολλῶν πάροιτεν καιρίως εἰρημένων

1355. τῆς μελλούσης. 1356. πέδον.

1355. μελλούσης: supply from the previous line ἀντῆς, i.e. τῆς πόλεως, the city or citizens. 'From the way they begin', says the last speaker, 'it would seem they mean to enslave the city'. 'Because we delay', answers this one impatiently. 'They, while she hesitates, trample her glory down and work unresting!' The πόλει, as he conceives, is represented by themselves.—Various ancient writers (among them Trypho, of the time of Augustus, peri τρόπων III. p. 196), cite, as an Aeschylean example of μελλόν delay, χρονίζομεν ὃδε τῆς μελλούσης χάριν. If this refers to our passage, it points to τῆς μελλούσης (Hermann). μελλόν will then be a personification for od melloste, while they, trampling on the glory of Delay, i.e. 'of those who delay'. It may be suspected however that τῆς μελλούσης is no more than a conjecture upon a text exhibiting, as ours does, τῆς μελλούσης, where τῆς may be a note, indicating that a prose-writer would have used the article.—οἴ δὲ, μελλούσης, Cod. Farn. explaining μελλούσης by τῆς τυπανίδος ἡλιοντί. See further Prof. Tucker, Class. Rev. VII. 342, who strengthens
3. And I too am with this judgment so far, that my vote is for act. It is no moment for delay.

4. There is occasion to beware. Their beginning betokens a plan to enslave the state.

5. Yes, because we linger! They, while she hesitates, tread her honour down and work unresting.

6. I know not what advice I may find to say. To a doer it belongs to advise about the doing.

7. I too am of like mind, for I see not how with words to raise up again the dead.

8. Are we to make death of life, thus yielding to the rule of those that have defiled a house?

9. Nay, 'tis intolerable, nay, death is better. It is a milder fate than to be enslaved.

10. Are we then indeed by inference from a cry to divine that the prince hath perished?

11. Best know the facts before we hear one another talk. Guessing and knowing are two things.

12. All sides support me in assenting to this, to have clear knowledge how it is with Atreus' son.

_Clytemnestra_. If now I contradict all that to suit the

(indulge anger._μυθουσαι:_ literally 'to be-talk one another’ (the mutual use of the passive voice) formed from μυθος in its depreciatory sense (talk, mere words). We had best know the facts before we hear one another talk. The verb μυθοῦμος is not extant elsewhere, but the analogy of πιστῶν, χρυσῶν, ‘to be-pitch, be-gold’ etc., is quite as close as is required, when a word is invented to make a point. In such a case the strangeness of the formation is its merit.

1369. ταύτην (τὴν γρώμην) see v. 1347.—πάντοθεν πληθυνωμεί lit. I am multiplied from all sides, i.e. From all sides I find support to approve this vote. Somewhat similar is the use in Supp. 612 δῆμον κρατοῦσα χειρ δην πληθυνωμεί (Sidgwick). The previous speaker is received with general signs of approval.

1371. See the Introduction.
1373—1375. How should one [be ashamed of serviceable falsehood], who plots hostility against a foe? i.e. 'All is fair in war'.—πῶς γὰρ τις ἐπαυχωνυή- στατι κτλ., supplied from the previous sentence. For examples see L. and Sc. s.v. πῶς, III.—ἐχθραὶ ποροῦνεν, literally 'contriving hostility'.—φίλοις... ἐκαίνα: 'with what pretends to be friendship', instrumental neuter, antithetic to ἐχθρά ἡμιοικία, not to ἐχθροῖς.—πημωνὴν ἀρκύστατον (adjective), literally 'mischief set as a snare'.—φράζειν: the optative imperative, as in v. 936 and v. 557 where, as here, it is joined with τις.—ὑψος accusative, defining the extent of the action φάσσειν.—These verses are commonly punctuated as one sentence and variously corrected. 'With πημωνῆς (Auratus) and ἀρκύστατον ὅν (Elmsley) they are rendered, 'for how else (than by deceit) could one, devising ill for foes who seem friends, fence the snares of woe too high to leap over?' But the 'semblance' or 'pretence' of friendship on the part of the assailed has nothing to do with the situation. What is to be excused is the pretence of friendship on the part of the assailant. This will apply to any explanation which makes φίλοις masculine.

1376. ἄγων...νίκης struggle for victory: ἄγων in its proper agonistic sense, a contest in the games.—παλαι...παλαίας: a sort of assonance or play, in the use of which Aeschylus resembles Shakespeare,
moment I said before, I shall feel no shame. What shame should he feel, who plots as a foe against a foe? With the semblance of friendship let him make his dangerous snare too high to be overleaped.

For me, I have had long enough to prepare this wrestle for victory, though it has come at last. I stand where I struck, over the finished work. Even the slaying I wrought (I own it) so as to forbid escape or resistance to the death, a net unpassable, like the fisherman's round a shoal, a rich robe deadly dyed. Twice I smote him, and with two shricks he there sank down. And when he had fallen, I gave him yet a third stroke, an offering of thanks to the nether gods, to Hades, safe keeper of the dead. With that he lay, and himself gasped away his breath. And as he blew the spurs of his running blood, he rained upon me a crimson gory dew; and I rejoiced no less than beneath the sweet rain of heaven doth the corn when it bursts from the labouring sheath.

on the two possible senses of παλαιός, ancient from πάλαι, and in wrestling from πάλη. See Cho. 865 τοιάνδε πάλης μόνος ἄν εφεδρος δισοίοι μέλλει...‘Ορέστης ἄγειν’ εἶναι ὁ ἑπι νίκη, where έφεδρος, meaning 'a third champion who waits to contend with the victor in a preliminary contest', implies that the victory of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra was itself a νίκη παλαιά, and is in fact an allusion to this passage. The metaphor of the πάλη leads up to the picture in v. 1378. On the Aeschylean use of equivocation in general see Appendix II. to the Seven Against Thebes and the Indices to that play, this and the Choephoroi, under Verbal Equivocation.

—veikos Heath, a supposed equivalent of veikous, this fighting out of an old quarrel. The form veikós for veikos is not very well attested (see Blomfield ad loc. and Eur. Or. 1679), and in any case is not requisite here.

1379. καὶ τὰς this also. Even the very blow, like the rest (v. 1376) had been carefully thought out. This punctuation (Headlam) is preferable to joining καὶ...ἀρνησόμαι.

1380. μόρον death here signifies the means or instrument of death, as in Cho. 1072 σωτήρ, η μόρον εἶτο; Theb. 736 ἐγείνατο μόρον αὐτῷ, inf. 1495 ὀδή μόρῳ δαμέλες etc. See also the uses of ἄτη.—ἀμφιβληστρων in apposition to μόρον.—ὡς...περιστιχίζων (g), literally 'as one that sets (his net) about fish': the object of περιστιχίζων is supplied from ἀμφιβληστρων.—πλοῦτον ἐλ.ματος: see on v. 949, v. 1101.

1384. αὐτῷ 'then and there' illicio (Hermann).—αὐτῷ Voss.

1385. The third blow is compared to the third libation usually poured to Σωτήρ or Ζεὺς Σωτήρ (see v. 257), with an ambiguity in σωτήρ. Hades, the god of the lower world, is 'the savior of the dead', in the sense that he 'keeps them safely'.—τοῦ κατὰ χθόνις, 'the subterranean power', is a separate substantive, to which Ἀδών νεκρῶν σωτήρος is added as an explanation.

1387. ὄργανει spec, with the secondary suggestion of panted forth (see on Theb. 381).—ὁργάνει Hermann (from Hesych. ὄργανει ὑφεύρεται), belched.

1390. διοσβότρυ γάει Porson.
ὁς ὅδ' ἔχοντων, πρέσβεος Ἀργείων τόδε, χαίροιτ' ἀν, ei χαίροιτ', ἔγω δ' ἐπεύχομαι. ei δ' ἦν πρεπόντων ὁστ' ἐπιστεύδειν νεκρῷ, τάδ' ἄν δικαίως ἦν, ὑπερδίκως μὲν οὖν. τοσῶνδε κρατήρ' ἐν δόμοις κακῶν ὁδὲ πλῆσας ἀραίων αὐτὸς ἐκπίνει μολὼν.

ΧΟ. θαυμάζομεν σου γιλώσσαν, ὡς θρασύστομος, ἢτις τοιόν ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ κομπάζεις λόγον.

ΚΑ. πειράσθη μου γυναικὸς ὡς ἀφράσμονος.

ἐγὼ δ' ἀτρέστῳ καρδίᾳ πρὸς εἰδότας λέγω· σὺ δ' αίνειν εἴτε με ὕψειν θέλεις ὁμοιον· ὦτὸς ἐστὶν Ἄγαμέμνων, ἔμοι πόσις, νεκρὸς δὲ τῆς δέξιᾶς χερὸς ἐργον, δικαίως τέκτωνος. τάδ' ὅδ' ἐχεὶ.

ΧΟ. τι κακὸν, ὅ γυναι, χθονοτρέφες ἐδανῶν ἢ ποτὸν πασαμένα ρυτᾶς εἴ ἀλὸς ὀρόμενον τόδ' ἐπέθουν θύους δημοθρόους τ' ἀρᾶσ; ἀπέδικες, ἀπέταμες· ἀπόπολις δ' ἐσεῖ, μῖσος ὀμβριμον ἀστοίς.

ΚΑ. νῦν μὲν δικάζεις ἐκ πόλεως φυγῆν ἐμοὶ

1408. ρύσας. ὀρόμενον. 1410. ἀταλίς.

1392. She repeats with mockery the respectful form of address used at v. 846: so in the following χαίροιτ' ἂν, el χαίροιτε the echo of their implied rebuke (see vv. 1031—1033) is probably not accidental.

1394—1395. el ἢν...ὡτε if it had been a possible thing, cf. Eur. Hippi. 705 ἂλλ' ἐστι κάκ τῶν ὡτε σωθήναι, τέκνων, Soph. Phil. 659 ἄρ' ἔστιν ὡτε κάγυδεν θέαν λαβέθεν; et c. (Paley)·—πρεπόντων (τῶν πραγμάτων), under fit circumstances, with good cause, is an adverb to ἐπιστεύδειν. but placed before ὡτε as taking the emphasis. It is a genitive absolute like ὅδ' ἔχοντων in v. 1392, and the subject of it is the same, circumstances, τῶν πραγ-μάτων. In fact it is this ὅδ' ἔχοντων which guides the construction of the sentence.—τάδ' ἄν ἦν πρέπουσα πράγματα these would be fitting circumstances.—The grammar is clear and correct if we observe the construction of πρεπότων. πρεπότως Stanley, τῶδ' for τάδ' Tyrwhitt. We should avoid the translation if it had been a fitting thing to pour libations, which does not satisfy ὡτε·—ἐπιστεύδειν νεκρῷ: if ever, that is, a death might justly be the subject of religious exultation.

1396. κρατήρα...κακῶν ἀραίων. The
So stands the case, ye nobles of Argos here; be glad of it, if ye will; for me, I triumph upon it. And could there be case fit for a libation over the dead, justly and more than justly this would it be. With so many imprecations of suffering homes this man hath filled the bowl which himself returning hath drained.

_Eld._ We are astonished that thy mouth bears so bold a tongue, to boast over thy dead lord in such terms.

_Cl._ Ye challenge me, supposed an unthinking woman. But I speak with unshaken courage to those who know, indifferent whether thou choosest to praise or blame. This is Agamemnon, my husband, wrought to death by the just handicraft of this my hand. So stands the case.

_Eld._ What poison hast thou taken, woman, what drug born of the earth or draught from the great water, that thou hast brought on thyself the fury and the loud curses of yon folk? Thou hast cut off, cast off: and cast from communion shalt thou be, as a load on the people's hate.

_Cl._ Yes, now thou wouldst award to me exile from my

_bowl_ 'full of the imprecations of suffering homes,' which Agamemnon had filled for himself and now had returned to drink, is the _conjunction_ against him, provoked by the sacrifice of Argive lives. See vv. 464, 1234, which interpret both the imagery and the meaning of this passage. This appeal to the real or supposed wrongs of the people is for the queen's applauding partisans. See next note.—ἐν δόμοις κακῶν together; see v. 439.

1401. ἐλθότας...σὸ δέ: contrasted, not the same. σὸ is the last speaker representing the elders. The _ἐλθότας_ to whom she appeals are her own fellow-conspirators. On the other hand some receive her with execrations (v. 1409).

1408. ἄρτας (Stanley) ἐς δλός: the sea serves as the type of water and _liquid_ generally as opposed to _solid_ (Paley). So _μισθος_ in Soph. O. T. 1428, where see Jebb's note. This generic sense seems to exclude such an epithet as _πυρᾶς_ wrinkled (see ms.), which however is defended by Prof. Tyrrell (Class. Rev. xiv. 363), and is not metrically objectionable.—ἀπότολος Abresch.

1409. ἑος fury, cf. ἰδει to rage (Wecklein), not sacrifice, incense, parallel to the _θεος_.—τῆς. They point to the crowd, which now includes many who have no connexion or sympathy with the conspiracy. But as an unprepared minority they are helpless.

1410. These exclamations seem sufficiently intelligible though not exactly constructed. 'As thou hast broken all bands, so shall all bands be broken with thee'.—ἀπότολος Seidler. On the metre see v. 1430 and Appendix II. ἀπέδωκε σ', ἀπέταμεν σ' Wieseler, perhaps rightly. ἄρμαλι_ i.e. ἄρμαλι, but the irregular form (with a _phonic _μ_) may be correct. —μισος 'object of hate'. ἀρσοι depends both on μισος and on ἄρμαλι 'heavy to these people', _i.e._ a thing against which their hatred will rise and throw it off.

1412. ῆν μὲν yes, now. The guilt of taking life is a discovery which they have made in her particular case.
καὶ μίσος ἀστῶν δημόθρους τ’ ἔχειν ἁράς, 
οὐ σὺν τὸν ἀνδρὶ τῷ ἐναντίον φέρων. 1415 
διὸ οὐ προτιμῶν, ὡσπερεῖ βοτοῦ μόρον, 
μήλων φλεόντων εὐπόκοις νομεύμασιν, 
ἐξισεμ αὐτοῦ παῖδα, φιλτάτην ἐμοί ἄδιν’, ἐπίθεσιν Θηκῆ ἀκμάτων. 
οὐ τούτων ἐκ γῆς τῇ ἡρδαὶ χρῆ σ’ ἀνδρηλατεῖν, 
μιασμάτων ἀποιν’; ἐπήκοος δ’ ἐμῶν 
ἐργῶν δικαστῆς τραχὺς ἐλ. λέγω δὲ σοι 
τοιαύτ’ ἀπειλεῖν ὃς παρεσκευασμένης, 
ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων χειρὶ νυκτίσαν’ ἐμοὶ 
ἀρχεῖν, ἐὰν δὲ τούμπαλιν κραίνῃ θεὸς, 
γνώσει διδάχθεῖς ὑπὲ γοῦν τὸ σωφρονεῖν. 1420 

ΧΟ. μεγαλόμητες εἰ, 
περίφρονα δ’ ἐλακεῖ, ὡσπερ οὖν 
φονολιβεῖ τῦχα φρῆν ἐπιμαίνεται. 1425 
λίπος ἐπ’ ὁμμάτων αἷματος εὐ πρέπει. 
ἂντίετον ἐτὶ σὲ χρῆ στερομένων φίλων 
τύμμα τὐμματι τίσαι. 

ΚΔ. καὶ τῇν ἄκουεις ὀρκίων ἐμῶν θέμιν· 
μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς δίκην, 
"Ατην Ἐμοῦν θ’, ἀἰς τὸντ’ ἐσφαξ’ ἐγὼ, 
οὐ μοι φόβου μέλαθρον ἔλπὶς ἐμπατεῖ, 1430 

1414. οὐ σὺν corr. to οὐδὲν. 1418. τε λημμάτων. 1431. τύμμα τίσαι. 

1413. ἔχειν to bear, explanatory infinitive. 
1414. σὺν adverbial (v. 591), and 
joinest not in laying that reproach against 
my husband here. For φέρειν to allege see 
Demosth. 1328, 22 πάσας αἰτίας ὄλεων 
cited by L. and Sc. s.v. φέρω.—Or ‘not 
alleging against him as well as against 
me’, ‘together with me’; but the arrange-
ment of the words is against this.—τόδε: 
the reproach of murder.—From οὐδὲν τὸν 
(correction in ms.) comes οὐδὲν τὸν’ (Voss), 
suggested by νῦν μὲν in v. 1412. This 
antithesis is implied, but need not be 
explicitly completed. See further on 
v. 1419. 1418. ἄθραμαν Canter.—Θηκῆ: 
see v. 202. 1419. ‘Shouldst thou not banish 
him?’ This is not merely or altogether 
ironical. According to archaic law 
and religion, a corpse (as in the case of Poly-
nces; see the Seven Against Thebes) 
could be both condemned and punished. 
—χήμ (Porson) corresponds to the read-
ing οὐδὲν τὸν’ in v. 1414.—βισμάτων 
g, 
perhaps rightly. 1421—25. ‘Threaten if you please,
country, the hate of the people and their loud curses to bear. Thou dost not join in laying that reproach against him who lies here, against him who, caring no more than for the death of a beast, though his fleecy herds had sheep enough, sacrificed his own child, the darling born of my pains, to charm the winds of Thrace. Is it not he whom thou shouldst banish from Argive soil for his foul crime? No, it is in judgment of me that thou art an auditor severe! But I warn thee, threatening thus, to think that I am prepared, ready that he who conquers me in fair fight should rule me; but if fate intends the contrary, thou wilt be taught, too late, the lesson of prudence.

Eld. Thou art proud of thought, and presumptuous is thy note; for indeed the murderous stroke is maddening thee. The blood-fleck in thine eyes is right natural. For all this, thou shalt find thyself friendless, and pay retaliatory stroke for stroke.

Cl. This also for thy hearing I solemnly swear. By the accomplished justice for my child, by Doom and Revenge, to whom I offered this dead man up, my hope doth not set foot in

but remember that I am prepared to fight the contest fairly and abide by the event'. ἐκ...σωφρονεῖ expresses, by sequent infinitive equivalent to ὥσπερ, the conditions for which she is prepared, namely 'that he who conquers me' etc. The second alternative, which for symmetry should have run in the infinitive, is turned into an independent clause.—ἐκ τῶν ὄμολον (with νικήσαντα) on fair terms is contemptuously ironical. She has her opponents at her mercy.—νικήσαντα for the prose τῶν νικήσαντα.—κράγη Herwerden.

1427. ὥσπερ...ἐπιμαίνεται, literally 'as indeed with the blood-shedding stroke thy mind is frenzyed', i.e. 'this outrageous defiance already displays the maddening fury, which sooner or later will bring thee to punishment'.

1429. The blood-fleck on thine eye doth well beseech thee or 'is right natural', referring not to a stain of blood from the murdered man (which does not suit ἐπ' ὄμματον) but rather to the bloodshot eye, which they see, or suppose themselves to see, in the furious face of the murderer. It is the bloody mind which shows there.

1430. ἀντίλετον, if right, is a parallel form to ἀντίτον (cf. ἀπέλεξες, ἀπευθυντός) meaning retributive, paid back, from ἀνα-πλεω to pay back, and is a predicate to τῆμα.—ἀντίλετον (Cod. Farn.) is a similar equivalent for ἀπίτον unavenged, a predicate to σε.—See Appendix II.

1431. τῆματι I. Voss.

1432. ὄρκιον...θέλων 'solemnity of an oath'; i.e. solemn oath.—ἀκονεας, for what is to be heard, is inaccurate and irregular, though perhaps not impossible. ἀκοΰει γ' Herwerden, ἀκοουει γ' Headlam.

1434. "Ἀθν Ἐρινων θ' in apposition to δίκην.

1435. "My hope walks not in the house of fear. A fine picturesque phrase, surely not too imaginative or metaphorical for Aeschylus: she means 'My hope does not approach fear; my confidence is dashed with no misgivings.'" Sidgwick.

—ἐμπαιτεῖν Victorius.
ēws ἂν αἰθή πῦρ ἐφ' ἑστίας ἐμᾶς
Αὐγισθος, ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν εὐ φρονῶν ἐμοί.
οὐτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀστις οὐ σμικρὰ θράσους
κεῖται γυναικὸς τῆς διε λυμαντήριος,
Χρυσηδίων μείλιμα τῶν ὑπ’ Ἱλίῳ,
ἡ τ’ αἰχμάλωτος ἢδε καὶ τερασκότος
καὶ κοινόλεκτος τοῦδε θεσφατηλόγος,
πιστὴ ἥψευνος ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων,
ἰστοτρῆβης. ἀτιμα δ’ οὐκ ἐπραξάτην.
δὲ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως, ἡ δὲ τοῦ κύκνου δίκην
tὸν υστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον
κεῖται φιλήτως τοῦδ’, ἐμοὶ δ’ ἐπήγαγεν
εὐνής παροπώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς.

XO. φεῦ, τίς ἂν ἐν τάχει, μὴ περιώδυνος,
μηδὲ δεμυστηρίας,
μόλοι τὸν αἰεὶ φέρονσ’ ἐν ἡμῖν
Μοῖρ’ ἀτέλευτον ὑπνον, δαμέντος
φύλακος εὑμεστάτου καὶ
πολλὰ τλάντων γυναικὸς διαῖ,
πρὸς γυναικὸς δ’ ἀπέθεθεν βίον.

1436. Kindles fire for the lighting of mine altars, i.e. shares my home and power. The form of expression is adapted to Aegisthus' last exploit, the beacon-fire and the consequent 'sending round' of sacrifice (περπερεψις ὑπ. 87—96) to the houses and altars (v. 600) of Argos, in fact to the whole successful conduct of the conspiracy. See the Introduction. For the plural ἑστίας, see Eur. Her. 145 πολλῶν ἑστίας. In thus speaking of Argos as hers Clytaemnestra significantly assumes on behalf of herself and Aegisthus the place of the dead king.—For the use of ἐπὶ see L. and Sc. s. v. C. III. 1.—ἐμῆς Porson.

1438. Literally 'he there (a broad shield of confidence to us) lies as the outrager of his wife here...and she also' etc. The words ἀστις...θράσους are in apposition not to οὐτος but to the whole statement οὐτος κεῖται...λυμαντήριος, ἡ τ’ κτλ. Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra can face the world, when they can point to the husband laid beside the mistress whom he proposed to place in his house (see Eur. El. 132).

1439. τῆςδε: she points to herself.
1443. πιστὴ ... σελμάτων, literally 'faithful bed-partner, though of the ship's bench': σελμάτων depends upon ἥψευνος as a word 'of sharing'. δὲ, antithetic, as if to πιστὴ μὲν: this will still apply if we take together ναυτίλων...ἰστοτρῆβης.
1444. ἱστοτρῆβης. It is best to leave this, even if we cannot explain it. We have not that knowledge of sailors' lan-
the house of fear, so long as fire be kindled for the lighting of my hearths by Aegisthus, still devoted as ever to me.

For there, as our broad shield of confidence, lies, outraged his wife, my husband—the darling of each Chryseis in the Trojan camp!—and with him his captive, his augress, his oracle-monger mistress, who shared with him faithfully even the ship’s bench and the canvas! But they did it not unpunished! For he lies as ye see, and she, having sung swan-like her last sad song of death, lies by him loveably, adding to the sweet of my triumph a spice of sex.

_Eld._ Ah, could some death come quick, which without agony, without pillowed watch, might bring to us the endless sleep, now that our kindest protector is laid low, who, having much endured for a woman’s sin, hath by a woman lost his life!

guage in Aeschylus’ time, which would enable us to say what terms a woman like Clytaemnestra might borrow from it to apply to a woman like Cassandra, or what those terms might mean.—_istoriēs_ (Pauw): _nαντίλων σεμιάτων ἱστοριές_ is variously translated, ‘nautis aequo cum transtriis trita’, or ‘sharing alike with him the mariner’s bench’; _sed quæra._

1445-1447: _δὲ μὲν τοῦθεν_ for he lies as ye see, and she like his beloved, literally ‘she lies loveably to him (as he to her)’. The adverbs _όπους_ and _φίλητος_ are parallel. The genitive _τοῦθεν_ (if right) is modelled on the genitive of _relation in place_, as in Thuc. 1. 36. 2 τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Σικελίας καλῶς παράπλινος κειται (ἤ Ἐκρυπα), Herod. 2. 112 τοῦ Ἡφαιστηνίου πρὸς νότων ἄνωμον κειμένον: cf. the genitive with _ἀγχις_, _ἐντὸς_, _ὀπισθῶς_ etc., and see Kühner, _Gr. Grammar_ § 418. 8 a. The dative _πρὸς_ would be simpler (see v. 1581)._—_φίλητος_ (lover, from _φιλέω_); _v._ (and _Cod. Farn._) has the appearance of a conjecture, and, if such, does not account for the reading _φιλήτως_.

1447: To the joy of revenge for her daughter, and other satisfactions of the moment, the coming and death of Cassandra have added the sweetness of re-

venge for her injuries as a woman and a wife. _εὐνῆς_ stands to _παροφώνημα_ in the relation of a qualifying adjective, ‘concerned with _εὐνή_’ i.e. with the relations of sex, while _χλιδῆς_ is an objective genitive depending on _παροφώνημα_ in its verbal aspect, ‘an extra-dish added to’. For the combination of genitives cf. Soph. _Ajax_. 308 ἐν ἔρεντλαυσ-νεκρῶν ἄρελον φόνου, literally ‘in the corpse-wreckage of slain sheep’, id. _Trach._ 1191 τὸν Ὀλυμπὸς ζαυγὸς _πᾶγον_, Eur. _Phoen._ 308 _βοστρόχων...χαῖτας-πλάκαμον_ ‘hairplait of locks’, and see Kühner, _Gr. Grammar_ § 414, 4, note 3.—_χλιδῆν_ Headlam, _Class. Rev._ XIV. 117, XVII. 245, taking _εὐ_ _πῆς_ _εὔμης_ (nominative) as a description of Cassandra.

1451. _ἐν ἡμῖν_: dubious, but defended by Conington and others and perhaps justifiable in the sense ‘bringing into us’; cf. Eur. _Med._ 424 ἐν ἀμέτρῳ γνώμῃ ὁ-π' θεσίν αὐτοῦ put into our minds the gift of inspired song._—_φρόνου_ _ἐν ἡμῖν_ (Emperius) ‘to bring us perchance eternal sleep’.

1455. For the change from the participial (τὸλοντος) to the independent construction (ἀπέθανεν δὲ) see v. 1287, and _vv._ 1457—1460 below.
iadon. l Elen, 
mu tás pollás, tás pán polllás 
ψυχάς ὄλεσας ὑπὸ Τρόια, 
νῦν δὲ τελείαν 
polúmnastou ἐπηνθίσω δί αἷμ’ ἀνίπτον. 1460
η τις ἦν τότ’ ἐν δόμους
ἐρις ἐρίδματος ἀνδρός οἷς.
KL. μηδὲν θανάτου μοίραν ἐπεύχου 
toίσδε βαρυθεῖς:
μηδ’ εἰς ‘Ελένην κότον ἐκτρέχης†, 
ὡς ἀνδρολέτειρ, ὡς μία πολλῶν 
ἀνδρῶν ψυχὰς Δαναῶν ὄλεσας’ 
ἀξιόστατον ἄλγος ἐπραξεν.
XO. δαιμόν, ὡς ἐμπίπτεις δώμασι καὶ διφύ- 
οισι Τανταλίδαισιν,

1461. ητς. 1467. ὄλεσαν.
1469. ἐμπίπτεις. διφυείσαι.

1456—1462. These lines are probably to be repeated as an ‘epheumium’ or burden in the antistrophe after v. 1475 as there indicated (Burney, followed by Wecklein; cf. vv. 1450 and 1514). They may however be recitative not included in the strophe.—The suggestion of Hermann that these lines were originally antistrophic to vv. 1539—1549 is not probable. There is no appearance here of such injury to the text (loss of several verses and other damage) as we must on that theory suppose.

1456 was perhaps originally anapaestic (though παρανομοῦσα is good in sense, Alas for the transgression of Helen!). If so, ἴν παρὰ πῦρ δόμου ὤσ’ ‘Ελένα (Housman) has some probability, literally ‘Ah thou, named Helen from fire’, i.e. ‘whose name is a symbol of destruction’, the derivation indicated being from ἔλανθος ‘fire-brand’. ‘I think I find the same etymology in Euripides. In Pro. 891 sqq. Hecuba is warning Menelaus against the charms of Helen ὅπως ὑπὸ ἐφεύγε, μὴ ὑ’ ἔλη γόβῳ ’ ἀρεί γὰρ ἀνδρῶν δοματ’, ἐξαιρεὶ πόλεις—so far the ἔτυμον is ἔλειν (see n. 693); but then she goes on—πιθυριαὶ δ’ οἴκους: surely that is a glance at ἔλανθος’ (I. Ph. xvi. p. 282). The facility of the supposed corruption is obvious.—ἵν ὁ παρόνυμος ὤσ’ ‘Ελένα Wecklein.

1457—1460. Literally ‘and now thou hast crowned thyself with (the destroying of) a final life, (a destruction) memorable because the blood cannot be washed off’. ὄλεσασκ…νῦν δὲ ἐπηνθίσω. For the syntax see v. 1455.—With τελείαν the words ψυχὰν ὄλομένων are supplied from the previous sentence.—ἐπηνθίσων ψυχὰν ὄλομενα: Helen is compared to a conqueror whose glory is the lives he takes; ἐπανδίσεσθαι is ‘to take on oneself as a crown’ or ‘glory’, a metaphor from ἄνθος a wreath. See Thed. 933 ἴν πολ—
Oh...Helen, who didst alone destroy that multitude, that
great multitude of lives at Troy, now, for thy final crown, thou
hast destroyed one, the stain of whose murder shall not be
washed away! Surely there hath been in this house a hard-
fought rivalry of fatal wives.

Cl. Nay, pray not for death in indignation at this. Nor
turn thine anger on Helen, as if alone in destruction she had
destroyed that multitude of Argive lives and wrought incom-
parable woe.

Eld. Oh Curse, how hast thou fallen on Tantalus' house in

λοίς ἐπανδησαντες πῶνοις γενέαν Oh with
many a gallant feat have ye crowned your
lineage, and for illustrations see the note
there. For the representation of the
deed as a crown see πῶνοι in Thesp. l.c.
and an exact parallel in Thesp. 705 δὲ λ'
αιτώδελφον αἷμα δρέψασθαι θέεις; Is the
blood of a brother the prize thou wouldst
pluck?, where also see note.—πολύ-
μναστον (feminine, agreeing with ψυχάν)
δι' αἷμα ἀνιπτον together.—There is no
irregularity in these lines, nor any reason
to suspect them. They are thoroughly
Aeschylean both in thought and ex-
pression.

1461—1462. Ἡ τις Schütz: Surely
there must have been erewhile between the
houses a hard-fought rivalry for the misery
of their lords, literally 'of the husband'.
Evil powers might seem to have played
a match for the ruin of Agamemnon and
Menelaus by means of the two wicked
sisters, their wives, Clytemnestra and
Helen. The parallel has been suggested
already in vv. 1454—55 and is further
pursued below, v. 1469.—τότε formerly,
in the past, at the time of the marriages.—
ἐν δῷμοισ in the house, i.e. between
the two branches of the Atridae.—ἐρισ...
ολίσσ: literally 'contention contention-
surpassed, a misery to the husband'; for
the apposition of ὀλίσσ in the sense
'causing misery' see on v. 298. ἐρισ
ἐριδματος is an artificial but not unnatural
figure of poetry for 'a contest in which
effort surpasses effort'. In this fatal
rivalry it were hard to say which of the
sisters had done better.

1463. μηδὲν: emphatic negative, see
v. 783.

1465. ἐκτρέχης ἐκτρέχης g and Cod.
Farn. It is more likely that ἐκτρέχης
covers some less familiar word or form.

1467. ὀλέαν agreeing with ἀλγος,
f. g. ὀλέας Cod. Farn.

1468. ἀξῦστατον (1) incomparable
Klausen, Paley, unexampled Kennedy;
literally 'that which cannot be weighed
or balanced with' an equal. Cly-
tae-mnestra ironically affects to deprecate
Helen's superiority in the mere number
of her victims.—(2) incurable 'not to be
healed' or 'closed', as a disease or
wound. This is a possible sense, but
not much to the point. It should be
noted (Sidgwick) that in Aristoph. Clouds
1367 ἀξῦστατος is applied in some sense,
which is apparently not that of this pas-
sage, to Aeschylus himself. But the
word admits by etymology many mean-
ings, and like other poetical compounds,
it would follow the context.

1469. δαιμον: an apostrophe or ex-
clamation, not an address. ἄμπτνευς
Canter. δυνατορ Hermann. The
Chorus correct their judgment so far as
that they attribute the fatal work of
Helen and Clytemnestra in the last re-
sort to the evil genius of the race, and
put the two sisters on the same level of
triumph or shame.
κράτος τ' ἵσοψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν
καρδιώδηκτον ἐμὸν κρατύνεις.
ἐπὶ δὲ σώματος δύκαν μοι
κόρακος ἐχθροῦ σταθεῖς ἐννόμως
ὑμνον ὑμνεῖν ἐπεῖχετ' εὐχεταί.
<ἰῶ παρανόμους† Ἐλένα κτλ.>

ΚΛ. νῦν δ' ὀρθωσας στόματος γνώμην,
τὸν τριπάχυνον
daίμονα γέννης τῆς γε κυκλήσκων.
ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἔρως αἰματολοιχὸς
νείρα τρέφεται, πρὶν καταλήξαι
tὸ παλαιὸν ἄχος, νέος ἰχώρ.†

ΧΟ. ἦ μέγαν οίκους τοῦδε
daίμονα καὶ βαρύμην αἰνεῖς,
φεύ πεύ, κακὸν αἰνον ἀτη-
ρᾶς τύχας ἀκορέστον·
ἰδὼ ἰῆ, διὰ Δίὸς
παντατιον πανεργέτα.
τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἀνευ Δίὸς τελεῖται;
τί τῶδ' οὐ θεόκρατον ἔστων;
ἰδὼ βασιλεὺ βασιλεὺ,
πῶς σε δικρύσω;
φρενὸς ἐκ φυλίας τί ποτ' εἴπω;
κεῦσαι δ' ἀράχνης εὖ ὑφάσματι τῶδ'

1471. Ομίτσ τη. 1472. καρδία δηκτον. 1475. ὑμνεῖν ἐπεἰχεται.
1480. νεῖπει. 1487. πανεργέταν.

1471—1472. τ' Hermann. καρδιώ-
δηκτον Abresch. Literally 'and winnest
a victory, equal in lives on the part of the
(respective) wives, that wounds me to the
heart'. κράτος ἱσοψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν.
This bold phrase is explained by the pre-
ceeding context. In τ.ν. 1457—60 Helen
was ironically praised as a victor who
had destroyed many lives (ψυχάς). Cly-
taeemneta, accepting and retorting the
irony, disputes the superiority accorded to
Helen (v. 1466 μια πολλῶν ψυχάς). Here
the Chorus, still in the same strain, divide
the credit, as it were, saying that fate has
won by means of the two wives a victory
(κράτος) equal in lives as between them;
i.e. one in which they may share the
destruction equally. — ἱσοψυχον like-
minded Paley; but the compounds of
ἑο- rarely, if ever, have this sense (like) in
classical Greek but only that of equality
or equivalence, nor does this meaning fit
either branch, and shared between two women a life-destroying victory for which my heart is sore! Lo, on the body, methinks, like a foul bird of prey she stands, boasting to celebrate a triumph lawful and just.

Oh...Helen, who didst alone etc.

Cl. Nay, now thou hast mended the judgment of thy lips, in that thou callest upon the fat-fed Curse of this race. For therefrom is bred this craving of the maw for blood to lick, ever new gore (?), ere the old woe be done.

Eld. Verily mighty he is and malignant, the Curse of this house, of whose never-sated cruelty thou dost, alas, so grievously testify. And oh, and oh, it cometh by Zeus, the cause of all, the doer of all! For what without Him is accomplished upon men? What of all this is not of divine appointment?

O king, O king, how shall I weep for thee? Out of my heart's love what shall I say? And thou didst lie in this spider-

the context.

1473. δίκαιν μοι κόρακος together: like a foul bird of prey, methinks.
1474—1475. σταθείς i.e. the δαίμων in the shape of Clytaemnestra.—σταθείς' Schütz.—ἐννόμως...εὔχεται, literally 'boasts that lawfully he celebrates a (theme) proper for exultation', referring to Clytaemnestra's words (v. 1393) ἐν' ἐπεύχταις μέν ἔτι ἔπεύχται: ἐν τῷ κτλ.—ἐπεύχται matter for boasting over is object to ἐπεύχταις ὑμεῖν. For the form see ἐπεύχταις and cf. χαρόθα matter for rejoicing, as in Soph. Trach. 228 χαρόν εἶ τι καὶ φέρες.—I suggest this as a simple restoration of the metre; see v. 1455.
1476. νῦν δὲ Αἰε, but now thou hast corrected thy saying, etc.
1477. τριπάχυνον: perhaps created on the false analogy of such forms as δίφωνος.—τριπάχυνον Bamberger.
1479. The apposition of the description πριν...ἐξώρ to ἐξώρ αἰματολοχώς τρέφεται is a very bold extension of the Aeschylean use noted on v. 1462 and elsewhere. Nor is the use of ἐξώρ beyond suspicion. Dr Headlam (Class. Rev. xii. 247) proposes νίτον ἵξαρ a fresh appetite, or νιότο ἵξαρ fresh in appetite, forming ἵξαρ from ἵξαναν (= ἱξαναν q.v.) on the analogy of μηχαρ and μηχαναν. I think this probably right. See also ib. xiv. 119.—νεῖρα Casaubon, Wellauer, on the evidence of Hesychius, νειρη' κοιλα ἐσχάτη, perhaps rightly. But there is no proof against the existence of the form νεῖρος.
1482. On the metre see Appendix II.
1483. αλεῖς thou dost celebrate, i.e. testify to his power.
1484. κακῶν...ἀκορεστοῦ: literally 'a fatal praise of him as never tiring of deadly stroke'. The genitive τίχας depends on ἂκορεστοῦ (masculine).
1487. πανεργέτα Cod. Farn. Doric genitive of πανεργέτας.
1490. ἔν ἔν Cod. Farn.
1493. κεῖσαί δ'...ἐκπένων And to think of thee lying, etc. From ἐκπένων, which (by the tense) cannot refer to the corpse, it is seen that κεῖσαί is a historic present. —ἀπράχυνης ἐν ὕφασματι i.e. the enveloping ἀμφίβασματον: but in relation to the whole plot the term has more significance than the speakers know, a favourite device with Aeschylus and with the Attic poets generally. See v. 321 Αράχναίοιν αῖτος, and the Introduction.
άσβεσθε θανάτω βίον ἐκπνέων,
ἀμοι μοι, κοίταιν τάνδ' ἀνελεύθερον,
δολίω μόρῳ δαμείς
ἐκ χερὸς ἀμφιτόμω βελέμνω.

ΚΑ. αὐχεῖς ἐίναι τὸδε τὸῦργον ἐμὸν;
μηδ' ἐπιλεξθης
'Αγαμεμνονίαν εἶναι μ' ἄλοχον.
φανταξόμενος δὲ γυνακὶ νεκρὸν
tοῦδ' ο παλαιὸς δρμὸς ἀλάστωρ
'Ατρέως χαλεποῦ θωνατῆρος
tοῦδ' ἀπέτυσεν
tέλεον νεαροὶς ἐπιθύμας.

ΧΟ. ὡς μὲν ἀναίτιος εἶ
τοῦδε φόνον τίς ὁ μαρτυρήσων;
πῶ πῶ; πατρόθεν δὲ συλλή-
πτωρ γένοιτ ἀν ἀλάστωρ.
βιάζεται δ' ὁμοσπόροις
ἐπιρροαῖτοι αἰμάτων
μέλας Ἀρης ὁ πλειδικά προσβαίνων
πάχνω, κουροβόρῳ παρέξει.
ἰὼ βασίλειβα βασίλειβι,
πῶς σε δακρύσω;
φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας τί ποτ' εἶπω;
κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν υφάσματι τῶδ'

1512. ὅποι δὲ καλ. 1513. πάχνα.

1495. κοίται ϕαντατνάτω βίον ἐκπνέων, accusative 'cognate' to κοίται.—ἀνελεύθερον unfree i.e. of a slave, a peculiar and significant expression. ἀνελεύθερος is a term proper to legal, political, or social relations. A fly in a spider's web would not be called ἀνελεύθερος, nor a man merely because his limbs were entangled. But the fall of Agamemnon is properly ἀνελεύθερος, because the murder is the first act and sign of the new τυφώνεις. See v. 1354 and contrast the description of Orestes' enterprise in Cho. 862 φῶς ἐπ' ἀνελεύθερος βαλὼν ἀρχαῖς τε πολισσόμοις (free and lawful government). It is not so much the man who is lamented as the legitimate royalty and liberties of Argos, destroyed in his person. The implied thought is put explicitly by Shakespeare's Antony (Jul. C. 3. 2. 194) 'Great Caesar fell. O, what a fall was there, my countrymen! Then I and you and
web, dying by a wicked death, ah me, on this couch of slavery struck down by a crafty arm with a weapon of double edge! →

Cl. Darest thou say this deed was mine? Imagine not that I am Agamemnon's spouse. No, in the shape of this dead man's wife, the bitter fiend, long since provoked by Atreus the cruel feaster, hath made by this full-grown victim payment for those slain babes.

Eld. That thou art guiltless of this murder, who shall aver? It cannot, cannot be: though perchance the fiend of his sire might be thy helper. He riots in fresh streams of kindred gore, the red Manslayer, drawn to the infant blood-slot of the child-flesh served for meat.

O king, O king, how shall I weep for thee? Out of my heart's love what shall I say? And thou didst lie in this spider-

all of us fell down, Whilst bloody treason flourish'd over us'.

1499. μὴ δ' ἐπιλέξθης κτλ.: literally 'do not even suppose that this is I at all'. For the deponent meaning of the tense ἐπιλέξθην (for which ἐπιλεξάμων would be more regular) cf. προσδέχθης Π. V. 53, ἐποδεξθέας Eur. Her. 757, ἐφράσθη id. Hec. 546, διελέξθην frequently, etc. (Paley).

1503. θουνατήρος: to Thystes; see ν. 1590 foll.

1504. τόνδ' ἀπέτισεν hath made him to be payment for the slain children (Con-ington); not punished (ἀπείρατο).

1505. Literally 'making the full-grown victim follow the young'; for τέλεος in the ritual sense see ν. 963.

1508. πὸ; Doric form of ποῦ where? used, like πῶς; and πίθευν; in the sense How should it be? Impossible. Cf. πώ μιλα not at all. (Hermann.) Weck-lein cites Athen. 9 p. 402 c 6τι Ἀθηνᾶς διατηρήσαι ἐν Σικελίᾳ πολλάις κέχρηται φωνὰς Σικελικὰς οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν; a mistak-en explanation, but noticeable, as to the matter of fact, both here and in connec-tion with ν. 686.—πατρόθεν by heredity.

—συλληπτώρ γύνωτ' άν might be found assistant (in the deed). The fiend, punish-ing the crime inherited from Atreus, might be thought to have part in the act, which yet is the queen's.

1510—1512. For the conception of Ares as a man-devouring fiend, see on ν. 647.—μέλας: see Thel. 43.—πάχνα (corrected to the dative by Hermann) is locative. With προβαινῶν (Canter, on metrical grounds) πάχνα would be instru-mental, meaning 'drawn on by the blood'. πάχνα is properly the clot, or blood congealed (see πήγμα, πεπηγώς), and the notion (whether with προβαινῶν or προβαίνων) is that the old crime is a lure which brings the fiend of murder again to the house. On the metrical question see Appendix II.—παιδία: see ν. 1593 παρέχει δαίτα παιδείων κρεών, and for parallel uses of the form in -ικος cf. ικών δέρμα skin of a pig, ἱππικα φυνάκματα neighing of horses, ἀνθρώποι ιδρώς sweat of a man, etc.—κουρσόβορος παρέξει in apposition, literally 'the serv-ing of children as meat', i.e. 'children served as meat', the abstract πάρεξει (from παράσχειν, see ν. 1593 above cited) being used for the concrete, serving for that which is served.—For other cor-rections suggested see Wecklein's Appen-dix.
and the elders right: Clytemnestra could stand only by the suppression of all law and opinion. Her behaviour is already ominous, and before the end of the play the situation defines itself beyond mistake.—These lines, which cannot be spoken by any one of the dramatis personae noticed in the ms. list, are generally struck out as an interpolation (Seidler), but see notes on v. 363 and v. 1649, and Appendix III.

1524. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος κτλ.: literally 'Then did not he either (or 'he on his part') commit treachery against his house?' i.e. 'It is hard forsooth that he should suffer treachery (v. 1520), for he did not practise it!'
web, dying by a wicked death, ah me, on this couch of slavery, struck down by a crafty arm with a weapon of double edge!

A Conspirator. His death, methinks, is not a death of slavery, nor—

Cf. And did he not then himself do a crafty crime against his house? Nay, for the thing he did to the blossom born of me and him, my long-wept Iphigenia, justice is done upon him! Let him not boast in Hades, for he hath paid, as he sinned, with death.

Eld. My mind is blank and I find no ready thought, which way to fly from the tottering house. The storm will strike it, I fear, and wreck it quite, the storm of blood. The rain is ceasing; yet Justice is but whetting once more, on the whetstone of impediment, her sword to punish again.

Elmsley's τὴν πολυκλαυστον, ἀνάξια δράσας, ἡ ἄξια πάρχων, ἡ μηδέν, or with τὴν πολυκλαυστον η' ἡ ἄξια δράσας (Hermann, Pauw), or πολυκλαυστον Ἡφιγενεαν (paroemiac verse; Headlam) ἡ ἄξια δράσας κττ. The last seems preferable, as accounting best for the corruption through ignorance of the exceptional feminine, and the filling up of the paroemiac.—ἄξια...Türkiye will then be correlative and pleonastic. The deed is worthy of the punishment, the punishment of the deed. (Sidgwick).


1532. 'There are indeed injuries on both sides. It is a fatal story of wrong and retribution. And we must look for more to follow. The family is accused'. The bold figure, a man expelled from his ruined cottage by a storm and vainly seeking shelter, must not be pressed too closely (the 'falling house' typifies vaguely the accused family, yet the speaker is not himself exposed to the curse), but it is impressive.

1532. ἀμηχανῶ φροντίδος together, I am 'at a loss for thought', εὐπάλαμον μέριμναν with στερέθηκε 'deprived of'.—δέδοικα δέ...ψεκάς δέ...Δίκα δέ. After the fashion of the archaic λέξεις ειρομένη, the sentences are simply strung together, their exact relations being left to the understanding. In the two last clauses the δέ is slightly adversative; after each outburst of the storm there is indeed a pause, but it is the pause of preparation for the next stroke, or as the poet puts it, changing the metaphor, Justice is sharpening her sword. Such a time of pause between stroke and stroke is actually now just beginning; but ψεκάς λήγει is rather general than particular. The same sense might have been put thus, when the rain ceases, then etc.—The former interpretation of ψεκάς λήγει (no longer it comes in drops, i.e. the rain begins to be heavy) is incredible. In no language could the shower be ceasing' stand for 'there is falling more than a shower'.—πράγμα exaction, punishment, not deed: the association of πράσσεων with δίκη in this sense is so common, that πράγμα takes colour from the juxtaposition.—θηγάνει Hermann.—βλάψης...θηγάναις whetstones of hindrance; the interval during which crime (as in the case of Clytaemnestra) may hold off punishment serves Justice.
ιὼ γά γά, εἴθε μ' ἐδέξω,
πρὶν τόντι ἐπίδεικν ἀργυροτοῖχου
δρόιτας κατέχοντα χαμεύναν.
τίς ὁ θάψων νῦν; τίς ὁ θρηνήσων;
ἡ σὺ τὸ δό ερξαί τλήσῃ, κτείνας'
ἀνδρα τὸν αὐτής ἀποκωκύσαι
ψυχήν, ἀχαριν χάριν ἀντ᾽ ἔργων
μεγάλων ἀδίκως ἐπικράναι;
τίς δ᾽ ἐπιτύμβιος αἴνος ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὶ θείῳ
ξὺν δακρύοις ἱάπτονων
ἀληθεία φρενῶν πονῆσει;

ΚΛ. οὐ σὲ προσήκει τὸ μέλημ᾽ ἀλέγειν
τοῦτοι. πρὸς ἡμῶν
κάππεσε, κάθανε, καὶ καταθάψωμεν,
οὐχ ὑπὸ κλαυθμῶν τῶν ἐξ οἴκων,
ἀλλ᾽ Ἠφιγένεια νῦν ἀσπασίως
θυγάτηρ, ὡς χρή,
πατέρ᾽ ἀντιάσασα πρὸς ἠκύπορον
πόρθμενυ᾽ ἀχέων
περὶ χείρα βαλοῦσα φιλήσει.

ΧΟ. ὅνειδος ἥκει τὸδ᾽ ἀντ᾽ ὅνειδους.
δύσμαχα δ᾽ ἐστὶ κρῖναι.

φέρει φέροντ᾽, ἐκτίνει δ᾽ ὁ καίνων.
μέμνει δὲ μέμνοντος ἐν χρόνῳ Δίος
παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα· θέσμον γάρ.
τίς ἄν γονὸν ἀραίον ἐκβάλοι δόμων;
κεκόλληται γένος προσάφαι.

1539. 'hemichorii notam habent f g'.
1550. μέλημα λέγειν.
1558. ἵφλησῃ.
1562. χρόνω (i.e. χρόνον).
1564. βάνον.

to prepare the stroke. For βλάβη hinderance, from βλάπτων hinder, see on Thes. 183.—It is possible also to take βλάβης with πράγμα in the sense dead of harm.—μοῖρα covers some accusative, signifying the instrument which Δίκη whets. θηγάναις μάχαιραν Musgrave, θηγάναισιν ἄρ Housman. Possibly it is a word unknown.—Or we may correct δίκα to δίκαν, Fate sharpens Justice.
O earth, earth, would that thou hadst received me, before I had seen my lord laid thus low in the silver-sided bath! Who shall bury him? Who sing his dirge? Wilt thou dare to do it, thou, that hast slain thy husband, dare to lament his parted soul? The compensation will scarce atone the offence! But who will stand over the hero's grave, and pour forth the tearful praise with heart that truly aches?

Cl. It belongs not to thee to regard this care. By us he fell, he died, and we will bury him, not with weeping of his household, no, but Iphigenia his daughter, as is fit, will meet her father with joy at the swift passage of the sorrowful ford, and fling her arms around him, and give him a kiss.

Eld. Thus is reproach answered with other reproach! 'Tis a hard case to judge. The spoiler spoiled, the slayer amerced! And it abides, while Zeus abides in time, that to him that doeth it shall be done: for lawful is it. Who can expel the cursed breed from the house? It is a kind that sticketh fast.

1539—1540. Apparently a burden to be repeated after v. 1565 (Burney).

1543. ἄχαριν κτλ. A thankless compensation to award for an injury not fairly proportioned to it! an ironically moderate expostulation.—μεγάλων ἀδίκως, literally ‘unfairly great’, are to be taken together (not ἀδίκως ἐπικράταν). 1547. ἐπιτυμβίος, a participial adjective agreeing with τίς: cf. δρόμος, καλρος ποιεῖν τι, etc.—αινος. May not this be neuter accusative, a parallel form to αἰνον, like the comparatively rare εἰρός beside εἰρένει;? The word had certainly two forms (see αἰνη) and might well have a third. Moreover the forms αἰνεῖ-σαι, αἰνεῖ-τοι would lead us to expect a corresponding substantive form aῖνος (genit. αἰνεις): cf. εἰρος, ἀπεἰρος, τέλος, τελέω, γένος, γενετής etc.—ἐπιτυμβίων αἰνον Voss.

1549. τοῦτος will suffer. On the relation of the verb and participle, see v. 970 etc.

1550. μὲλημ' ἀλέγειν (Karsten) to regard this duty.—If these anapaests were originally antistrophic to vv. 1566—1576, two lines have been lost here or inserted there. But there is no trace of this in the text.

1557. ἄχαλων (originally ἄχαιων) g.

1558. φυλής Stanley.

1562. μιμοντός ἐν χρόνῳ Δίος so long as Zeus abides in time, i.e. for ever, the notion that Zeus might have an end being suggested only as inconceivable.—θρόνος Schütz. The erroneous substitution of χρόνος for θρόνος is supposed to occur also in Eum. 18 and Eum. 1001; and in the former edition these examples were allowed, but wrongly, as I propose to show in commenting on the Eumenides. Nor should the change be made here.

1564. γονάν ἄρατον Hermann, the accursed breed of successive sins.

1565. It is a sort that sticketh fast, literally ‘the kind is glued for the fixing on’, where ‘fixing on’ is transitive. The metaphor is excluded from poetry in English, but this is accidental. προσάψαι is an explanatory infinitive. The word is from the same vocabulary as κεκόλληται itself. γένος is a variation for γονά (see previous verse), the words
<ἰώ γὰ γὰ κτλ.>
Κ.ℓ. ἐσ τόνδ εἶνεβη ἐξεν ἀληθείᾳ
χρησμόν, ἐγὼ δ' ὁν ἐθέλω δαίμονι τῷ Πλεισθενίδαν ὀρκους θεμένη τάδε μὲν στέργεσιν, δύστητά περ ὅνθ', ὃ ὁ δὲ λοιπόν, ἵνα ἐκ τών τοῦ ρω ἀλλην γενεὰν τρίβεσθαι θανάτωις αὐθένταιον.
κτέανων τε μέρος
βαιὼν ἑχουσὴ τάν, ἀπόχρη μοι δ' ἀλληλοφόνους
μανίας μελάθρουν ἀφελοῦσῃ.

ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ.
wód fεγγος εὐφρον ἡμέρας δικηφόρου, φαίνων ἄν ἧδη νῦν βροτῶν τιμαόρους
θεοὺς ἀνωθέν γῆς ἐποπτεύεν ἄχη
ἰδῶν ύφαντοι ἐν πέπλοις Ἐρμίνων
τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε κείμενον φίλως ἐμοί,
χερὸς πατρὸς ἐκτίνοντα μηχανάς.

1570. δύστητα.

being practically synonymous.—πρὸς ἄτα
Blomfield, 'the family (of the Atridae) is
fastened (glued) to calamity'.

1566. ἐσ τόνδε literally 'up to this
man' i.e. Agamemnon, to whose corpse she points: he is the last at present in the fatal series (see vv. 1561—
1565).—ἐνέβη: the subject is δαίμων 'the
fate' or 'curse' of the family, expressed in the following clause.—χρησμόν: accusative of space with ἐμβαθὺν walk in, as
a verb of motion; cf. Eur. Suppl. 989
ὑπὸ ἐμβαθύνονα κέλευθον, walking this
way. The χρησμός is the path which so
far fate has walked or trodden. The
prophecy of Calchas (vv. 153 foll.) traces
events up to the death of Agamemnon
and only so far; and the allusion may be
to this or to some other like prophecy.
It is not however necessary to suppose
any prophecy more particular than the
general sentence against the house.
'This', concedes the queen, 'has so far
been fulfilled; let us hope that so far
will be far enough'.—ἐνέβης Canter,
χρησμὸς Casaubon.

1568. Πλεισθενίδαν and Πλεισθένους
gένος v. 1602. The origin of this family
name is uncertain.

1570. δύστητα g.—τάδε στέργεσιν,
'that I submit to this (the past)', ἵνα
τὸν δαίμονα: 'and that he depart and
vex' etc. The relation of the clauses
would in later style be more exactly in-
dicated; 'to say nothing of the past if he
will now depart elsewhere'. The notion,
O earth, earth, would that etc.

Cl Up to this death it hath truly followed prophecy, but I now am ready to swear a compact with the Fortune of the house of Pleisthenes, that we accept, hard though it be, what is done, if henceforth he will leave this house, and harass with kin-murder some other race. A part of the wealth is not much to me who have it all, and moreover I am content if I but rid the palace of this internecine frenzy.

[Enter Aegisthus with Soldiers.]

Aegisthus. Hail, kindly dawn of the day that brings justice! This hour I will confess that from above earth gods look upon and avenge the woes of men, now that I see in a robe of the Furies’ weaving this man lying as I would, and paying for what the hands of his father devised.

of such a bargain and the reasonable air of Clytaemnstra’s proposal is of course but a ghastly jest.

1573—1576. βαιόν (ἐστι): ‘is a little thing to give’.—Pursuing the figure of a bargain with fate, she declares herself ready to make sacrifices! If the departing δαίμων will take with him some of the εὐδαιμονία, he is welcome to take it; she can afford it now, and would besides readily spend something for the peace of this unfortunate house. Clytaemnstra not being herself of the Pelopid family is pleased to speak as one who has suffered much by connexion with it, and would gladly, even at some cost, have done with its boasted but unhappy genius. For the εὐδαιμονία of the Pelopidae see Eur. Or. 972 ὁχεῖαι πρόπασα γέννα. Πλέοντος δ’ ἐπὶ μακαρίους ἥλιος ὦν ποτ’ οἶκοι, and so frequently.—τε...δὲ: not merely...but: the substitution of δὲ for τε in the second of two clauses, when τε has been promised, marks a rise or climax: see Thes. 571 and references there given. —ἀπόρρηθι is impersonal.—Difficulty has arisen here from want of punctuation. Supposing the four verses to be one sentence, Auratus changed τε in v. 1573 (as in that case would be proper) to δὲ, and Canter struck out δὲ in v. 1574. This makes hiatus (μοι ἄλληλοφόνους) and accordingly Erfurdt rearranged the words thus, μαριὰς μελάθρων ἄλληλοφόνους. But in the supposed sentence κτείνων μέρος βαιόν ἱπτομαχή πᾶν ἀπόρρηθι μοι ‘it suffices me to have a small part’ the word πᾶν is superfluous (see Housman, J. Ph. xvi. 277). Nor is the sense suitable: Clytaemnstra does not offer, even in jest, to accept little: she only says with mock generosity that she would sacrifice something.—ὑποταξία πανεπαρκεῖς ἐμοῦ... Headlam, Class. Rev. xiv. 119, where see discussion.

1577. See the Introduction. The speech of Aegisthus sets forth (1) his claim or pretended claim to the throne (v. 1585, 1605),(2) his hereditary feud with the dead king, (3) his own skill in directing the conspiracy.

1578. ἕντε νῦν, whereas hitherto ὦκ ἐφην. He has long vainly waited for justice. See v. 381.

1579. γῆς depends on ἀνωθεν: with ἀχις is to be supplied αὐτῶν, i.e. βρυτῶν. 1580. πέπλους: the ἀμφιπληστρον, standing as in v. 1495 for a type of the plot.—Ερυνών: i.e. of just vengeance. 1581. φίλος ἐμοὶ ‘in a way welcome to me’.
᾽Ατρέως γὰρ ἄρχων θύσας γῆς, τοῦτον πατήρ, πατέρα Θνέστην τὸν ἐμόν, ὡς τορῶς φράσαι, αὐτοῦ τ’ ἀδελφὸν, ἀμφίλεκτος ὃν κράτει, ἣν ῥηητήσειν ἐκ πόλεως τε καὶ δόμων. καὶ προστρόπαιος ἐστίς μολὼν πάλιν τλήμων Θνέστης μοῖραν ήὗρετ’ ἀσφαλῆ, τὸ μὴ θανῶν πατρὸφον αἰμάξαι πέδον. αὐτοῦ ἕξειν δὲ τοῦδε δύσθεος πατήρ ᾧ ἀκόμη πολλά. γεγονός κρεοῦρ ημαρ εὐθύμως ἁγείν" δοκῶν, παρέσχε δαίμα παιδείων κρεῖν. τὰ μὲν ποθήρῃ καὶ ἁρών ἄκρους κτένας ἔθρυπτ’ ἀνωθεν ἀνδρακάς καθήμενος. ἂσημα δ’ αὐτῶν αὐτίκ’ ἀγνοίᾳ λαβὼν ἔσθει βορᾶν ἀστωτον, ὡς ὅρας, γένει. κατει’ ἐπιγυνοὺς ἐργον οὐ καταίσιον τοῦτον καὶ τοῦτον καὶ τοῦτον καὶ τοῦτον.

1585. αὐτοῦ τε: τε is irregular. Usage (as pointed out by Elmsley) requires in such a case either πατέρα τε... ἀδελφὸν τε (cf. Soph. Trach. 406) or πατέρα...ἀδελφὸν δὲ. But the inaccuracy may be the poet's own.—ἀμφίλεκτος ὃν κράτει being questioned in his sovereignty. For the quasi-local dative see Thesp. 683. The more deadly offence of Thyestes (v. 1192) is suppressed by his son.

1586. τε καὶ from his house and from the city as well.

1588. μοίραν ἦπερ’ ἀσφαλῆ τὸ μὴ κτηλ. found a partial safety so far as that he did not..., literally 'obtained the saving part'. For μοίρα in its proper sense of part (μελομακ., μέρος) see Cho. 237, Thesp. 563, Eur. Med. 430.

1590. αὐτοῦ ἕξεια literally 'as an arrival-feast to (Thyestes) himself', accusative in apposition to the whole act following. The impiety of Atreus showed itself first in making the home-coming of his reconciled brother the pretended occasion for the abominable feast. τοῦδε: pointing to the corpse.—The close connexion of αὐτοῦ ἕξεια, and the separation of αὐτῷ from τοῦδε, are made more plain to the hearer by the position of δὲ.—It is possible also to join αὐτοῦ (on the spot) to the previous sentence.—For the metre of ἕξεια cf. Cho. 1 (Wecklein).—προθύμως...τοῖν: lit. 'eagerly more than to my father welcome'; φίλως as in v. 1581. The celebration of the feast was forced upon the suppliant, who had no motive for feigning this enthusiasm over the reconciliation, and regarded it rather with suspicion. Aeschylus is probably referring summarily to some known version of the story.—If προθύμως μᾶλλον ἢ φίλως be stopped off separately, the text cannot be defended. "More zealous than friendly is only possible as a joke, when applied to a man who under cover of a banquet murders his brother's children; and Aegisthus is not joking" (Sidgwick).

1594—97. Very uncertain. We have
For Atreus, ruling in Argos, this man’s father, being questioned in his sovereignty by Thyestes, who was (to make all clear) father to me and brother to Atreus himself, banished him from his house and from the country also. And Thyestes, having returned as a suppliant to the heath, found, unhappy man, safety so far, that his life-blood was not shed upon his father’s floor. But taking the very occasion of his arrival, Atreus, the impious father of this slain man, pretending, with eagerness to my father little welcome, to hold a glad day of festival, served him a banquet of his children’s flesh. Of the extremities, the foot-parts and fingered hands, he put a mince on the top, sitting down with tables apart (?). And not knowing it at the moment for what it was, he took of the meat disguised, and ate of a meal, which, as thou seest, his race have found unwholesome. And when he perceived the monstrous thing he had done, he shrieked and fell

no independent knowledge of the story followed by Aeschylus, and the words are obscure. The sense seems to be that Atreus made from the flesh of the extremities a broth, which being spread over (ἀνθνηθεν) the roasted bodies prevented Thyestes from recognizing them for what they were until he had eaten of the θρόμ-ματα.—δομα. ὅ δ’ (Dindorf for δομα δ’) is perhaps right: ἐβεζ ο as it stands should have for subject Atreus: but for a similar obscurity see αὐεξελανείν in v. 1606.—

άδρακάς καθήμενος viritum sedens is strictly speaking a solscism; the word άδρακάς man by man, singly, requires a plural subject, and the company, not the host, should be said καθόθαι άδρακάς. On the other hand such expressions are not unknown where a single person has a representative character: thus we might say in English, ‘One commander advanced in large divisions, the other in small’, where the phrase in large divisions applies properly to the army. Similarly it is not impossible that a host should be said καθόθαι άδρακάς with the meaning that his company sat so.—

άνευθεν άδρακάς καθήμενον apart from the company seated singly Wecklein (ed. 1887).—The object of mentioning the arrangement of the company (according to an archaic fashion) at separate small tables is to show how the fatal mess was safely served to Thyestes only: see the account of the similar feast of Harpagos in Herod. 1. 119, and cf. Eur. Iph. T. 949 ούνα μωβρατεία (Wecklein).—

αὐτών αὐτικ’ ᾄνοια best taken together, with emphasis on αὐτών, ‘because he did not recognize the actual bodies at the moment’. Or αὐτῶν (without emphasis) may go with λαβὼν, ‘taking of them’.—The adverb αὐτικα belongs to the verbal substantive ᾄνοια.—I still think the text here not disprovable, and therefore give it under reserve. But there is much probability in the suggestion of Hermann, revived and amplified by Mr J. A. Platt (in Class. Rev. XI. 96), that Aeschylus followed a story similar to that of Seneca’s Thyestes; Atreus cooked the bodies only and kept the recognizable extremities, to prove what had been eaten. In that case something is lost after v. 1594, and the passage must be otherwise injured.—Mr Brennan (Class. Rev. VII. 18) supports Casaubon’s καθημένου, joining it with δομα.
1599. ἀμπίττει Canter.—ἀτό σφαγῆν ἔρων (Auratus) i.e. ἀπερῶν σφαγῆς, disgorging the (sacrificial) meat.

1601. “It is perhaps simplest to construe this ‘spurning the banquet to aid his curse’, σύνδικος being properly one who pleads with you, an aider in the cause. σύνδικος governs ἄρα......The violent crash of the banquet was the symbol (of) the invoked destruction of the family” (Sidgwick).—οὐτως. The analogy intended is more close than that of mere overthrowing. The death of Agamemnon has been achieved, like the outrage of Atreus, under the pretence of a sacrificial feast in honour of a home-coming. With the Homeric version (see the Introduction) the similarity would be even closer, since the feast of Aegisthus was properly ἔφεινa. Probably when the Thyestean story was first grafted on to the legend, the λάκτισμα δειπνοῦ also played a part in the revenge, being perhaps the signal for the treacherous assault.

1605. ἐπίδικα...πατρὶ in satisfaction of my unhappy father’s claim, literally ‘as what was liable to his claim’. In mockery of Thyestes’ claim to share the royal inheritance (v. 1585) Atreus pretended to have discharged all obligations by sparing and banishing along with him the third child. If the Aeschylean legend agreed with the common version in giving to Pelops three sons (Atreus, Thyestes, Chrysippus), the parallel extends to τρίτων, me, as his lawful third. The word ἐπίδικα was specially applied to a disputed inheritance and (with δίκαιος in v. 1603 and ἡ δίκη in v. 1607) marks the point upon which Aegisthus naturally insists, that he is of the royal family and
back vomiting the sacrifice, and called a terrible doom on the house of Pelops, aiding his imprecation by the spurning of the banquet, that thus might perish all the race of Pleisthenes.

This is the cause which has laid this man where ye may see. And it is a justice that I am the maker of this murder. Me whom, for my miserable sire’s ‘just third’, he sent, a swaddled babe, into exile along with him, that justice hath brought back again as a man. Even from beyond the border I reached my victim, contriving and combining the whole hard plan. And now I can even die with honour, having seen him in the toils of this just revenge.

_Eld._ Aegisthus, I care not to insult a wretch; but dost thou confess unasked to be this man’s slayer, to be the sole contriver of this pitiable murder? I say that thou before justice wilt not escape, be sure, ‘the people’s dangerous imprecation’ of stones.

represents a _legal_ claim to the succession, the story of the ‘banquet’ being brought in chiefly _ad invidiam_. Aegisthus finds a proper answer to the cruel jest of Atreus in the fact that ‘the child sent away with Thyestes as representing his right has now come back to avenge that right’.—The ms. _ἐν ἔξω_ (thirteenth child) is absurd, and without _επιθέμα_, or something of this kind, vv. 1604—1607 lack connexion.

1608. ἰψήμων θυραῖος ζῶν _I have reached him from my exile_, literally ‘while abroad’. He compliments himself upon the skill with which he has drawn together the threads of the conspiracy and ‘contrived’ the execution of it, under all the disadvantages of one who dared not openly appear in the country.

1611. ἱδόντα: for the acc. agreeing with _με_ the subject of _κατάξεων_, notwithstanding _ἐως_, see _P. V._ 234, _Soph._ _Ai._ 1006, _Eur._ _Med._ 814. (Sidgwick, Wecklein.)

1612. ὑπερθέν... _τεύσω_, _σὺ δὲ κτλ._ Aegisthus—_not that I care to triumph over the wretched.—dost thou etc._ They think, or try to think, not recognizing the full extent of their calamity and putting their own sense upon Aegisthus’ talk of dying (_v._ 1610), that the murderer has run to his own destruction. At the same time they reflect obliquely upon the ὀβρύς of Aegisthus himself.

1613. _φῆς ἐκόν professed unasked, ‘volunteer the statement’ in modern phrase. The use of _φᾶμι_ extends to admission as well as assertion; see _v._ 1578. They profess surprise that he should anticipate justice (_ἐν δίκῃ_ _v._ 1615) by admitting complicity.

1616. _Imprecations which the people, trust me, shall hail on thee in shape of stones, i.e. ‘their curses which will doom thee to the death of stoning_. The point of this expression, and of the emphasis on the word _δημορρφεῖς_, lies in the contrast between these _δημορρφεῖς_ ἁράλ and the plot (also a _δημορρφής_ ἁρά in a totally different sense of the words; see _v._ 464 and 875), of which Aegisthus has just boasted. His language brings home to the elders, for the first time, the consciousness that the _‘popular conspiracy_’, which they dreaded, has been in actual existence all this while, and that the murderers are supported by a powerful party. They still hope however that it may be outnumbered, a hope quickly dispelled by Aegisthus’ contempt.
AI. σὺ ταῦτα φωνεῖς νετέρα προσήμενοι κῶπην, κρατοῦντων τῶν ἐπὶ ζυγῷ Δορὸς; γνώσει γέρων ὃν ὡς διδάσκεσθαι βαρὺ τῷ τηλικοῦτῳ σωφρονεῖν εἰρήμενον. δεσμῶν δὲ καὶ τὸ γῆρας αἰ τε νήστιδες δύαι διδάσκειν εὖ οὐκόταται φρενῶν ἰατρομάντεις. οὐχ ὃ ὅρας ὅρῶν τάδε; πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε, μὴ παίσας μογῆς.

XO. γύναι, σὺ τοὺς ήκοντας ἐκ μάχης νέον οἰκουρὸς εὐνὴν ἀνδρὸς αἰσχύνουσα ἀμα— ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ τῶν ἐβούλευσας μόρον.

AI. καὶ ταῦτα τάπη κλαυμάτων ἀρχηγενῆ· Ὁρφεὶ δὲ γλώσσαν τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔχεις· 
1625 ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἦγε πάντ’ ἀπὸ φθογγῆς χαρᾶ, 
1630 σὺ δ’ ἔξορυκας ἰτίοις ὑλάγμασιν ἀξεῖ· κρατηθεὶς δ’ ἡμερίωτερος φανεί.

XO. ὃς δὴ σὺ μοι τύραννος Ἄργεων ἐσεί, 
1635 ὃς οὐκ, ἐπειδῆ τῶν ἐβούλευσας μόρον, δράσα τόδ’ ἐργον οὐκ ἐτλῆς αὐτοκτόνως;

AI. τὸ γὰρ δολῶσαι πρὸς γυναικὸς ἦν σαφῶς· ἐγὼ δ’ ὑποπτος ἐχθρὸς ἡ παλαγενής. 
1617 νετέρα. 1621. δεσμῶν. 1637. ἦ. 1624. πῆςας. 1638. τῶνδε.

1617. νετέρα. The reading of f (νετέρα) points perhaps to the form νετέρα (νετέρα): cf. νῆσσα· ἐκάστα· κατάστα, Hesychius.—The two parties are compared to the ἐνυχταί (rowers of the upper tier) and θαλαμίται (lower tier) in a bireme ship (Klausen).

1619. διδάσκεσθαι...σωφρονεῖν εἰρήμενον to have impressed upon him the lesson of prudence, literally ‘to take teaching, when prudence is enjoined’. εἰρήμενον is acc. absolute.

1621. δεσμῶν...αἰ τε νήστιδες δύαι the pains of imprisonment and the pains of hunger.—δεσμῶς (Cod. Farn.) does not well account for the reading of f (and g, and presumably therefore M), and would suggest that τὸ γῆρας is nominative.—καὶ τὸ γῆρας...διδάσκειν to teach even that age. The infinitive is explanatory, depending on ἐξοῆς, ἐκὼν λαρπ.

1623. Doth not this sight warn thee? literally ‘dost thou not beware, seeing this?’ a play on two senses of the word. —τᾶδε the whole scene.


1625. The interrogative sentence γύ-
Aeg. Speakest thou so, thou, whose place is at the lower oar, while they of the deck are masters of the ship? Thine age will learn how grievous it is for one of thy years to be schooled in the dictate of prudence. Yet the pains of bonds and the pains of hunger are most surpassing mediciners to school the oldest mind. Doth not this sight warn thee? Kick not against the pricks, lest hitting thou hurt thyself.

Eld. Thou woman! Thou, who abodest at home, helping to defile a brave man’s bed! To thee then shall warriors fresh returned from battle—? It is a captain of soldiers whose death thou hast thus ‘contrived’.

Aeg. These words again will prove the fathers of weeping. Thy tongue is the opposite of Orpheus’: for whereas he drew all things along with the joy of his voice, thy soothing bark will provoke, till thyself art drawn along. But once mastered thou wilt prove tamer.

Eld. And shall I think that thou shalt be despot of the Argives, who, being the ‘contriver’ of the king’s death, didst not dare to do the deed of murder thyself?

Aeg. The part of deceit fell manifestly to the wife: I, as a hereditary foe, was open to be suspected. In the wealth of the

\[\text{ναὶ...ἀμα—;}\] which requires to complete it a verb such as κρατήσεις or καταστρέψει, is broken off in the violence of indignation, and the point of it is expressed in another shape. Similarly the translation requires the completion yield or submit: the change of form is made necessary by the order of words in an uninflected language.—\[\text{ἀλχϊνουρα}\] participle of the imperfect.—\[\text{ἀμα—;}\] with another woman, the wife. The elders threaten the murderer with the vengeance of the veterans. But these are already slain or overpowered, which is part of Aegisthus’ meaning in his reply.

1630. ἀπὸ φθογγὴς χαρᾶ: see vv. 1365, 1412 etc.

1631. ἤπιοι soothing, properly applicable to the music with which Orpheus tamed the beasts, is transferred to the ἦλαιματα in irony.—νπιοι Jacob.

1632. ἤπιε: i.e. ἄπαξει, passive, will be haled to prison.

1633. ὡς δὴ...ἴσους thou forsooth shall be etc.: another elliptical phrase of indignation for ‘(do you mean forsooth) that you shall be?’ This ellipse became fixed in the language and occurs also in Eur. Andr. 234, Soph. O. C. 809 (where see Jebb’s note) and elsewhere.

1634. ἰβουλευσάς: see vv. 1609, 1614, 1627. They harp in scorn upon his own language.

1635. ἀυτοκτώνως: here ‘as a sole murderer’, a good example of freedom in the new application of compound words.

1637. ἥ Porson.

1638. ἰς he will apply the treasure and spoils of Agamemnon in payment of his hireling followers.—ἐκ τῶν δὲ Jacob.
ἀρχευν πολιτῶν· τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθάνορα
ζεύξῳ βαρείας οὔτη μὴ σειραφόρον
κριθώντα πόλον· ἀλλ’ ὁ δυσφιλής κότω
λιμός ἔνυοικος μαλθακὸν σφ’ ἐποθεται.

ΧΟ. τί δὴ τῶν ἀνδρά τῶν’ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς
οὐκ αὐτὸς ἴναρίζες, ἀλλὰ σὺν γυνῆ,
χώρας μίασμα καὶ θεῶν ἔγχρωιν,
ἐκτευ’; ὁ Ὀρέστης ἀρά ποὺ βλέπει φάος,
ὅπως κατελθὼν δεῦρο πρεμυμενεῖ τύχη
ἀμφοῖν γένηται τοῦδε παγκράτης φονεύς;

ΑΙ. ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ δοκεῖσ τάδ’ ἐρδευν καὶ λέγειν, γυνώσει τάχα.

ΔΟΧ. εἶα δὴ, φίλοι λοχίται, τοῦργον οὐχ ἐκὰς τόδε. 1650

ΑΙ. εἶα δὴ, ξύφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπτέτω.

ΧΟ. ἀλλὰ μὴν κἀγὼ πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν.

ΔΟΧ. δεχομένους λέγεις θανεῖν σε· τὴν τύχην δ’ ιρούμεθα.

ΚΑ. μηδαμῶς, ὁ φίλτατ’ ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ δράσωμεν κακά.

1652. κἀγὼ μὴν. 1653. ἐφούμεθα.
dead man I shall seek the means of control. On the disobedient subject I shall lay a heavy yoke, and give him, I warrant you, less than a tracer’s provender. Yes, hunger, which doth not mate peaceably with wrath, shall not leave him till he is mild.

**Eld.** Why then of thy cowardice didst thou not butcher the victim alone? Why, to the defilement of our country and our country’s gods, join the wife with thee in the murder? Oh, doth Orestes haply live, that by grace of fortune he may return to this land, and slay this pair victoriously?

**Aeg.** Nay then, if thou wilt so say and do, thou shalt have a lesson at once!

*A Soldier of Aegisthus.* Come on, comrades! Our work is not far off now.

**Aeg.** Come on! Make ready! Draw every man his sword!

**Eld.** Nay, I too, sword in hand, am prepared to die.

**Soldier.** ‘To die!’ An acceptable word! We take the moment.

**Cl.** Nay, dearest, let us do no more ill. What is done is

---

1645. *Χώρας...ἐγχωρίων* in apposition to the notion ἁκ τὴν γυναῖκα κτείναι.

1649—53. There is some uncertainty here as to the distribution of the parts. The tradition, as originally given by f, divides them thus: 1649 Aeg., 1650 Cho., 1651 Aeg., 1652 Aeg., 1653 Cho. At 1651 the mark is corrected to Cho. and the arrangement so corrected agrees with g and h. The arrangement now generally prevalent gives 1649—50 and 1652 to Aegisthus, 1651 and 1653 to the elders; some further suppose that a verse is lost before 1650. The difficulty has arisen, I believe, from the fact that there are really not two parties, as commonly supposed, but three, Aegisthus, the elders, and the λοχιταί (mercenary guards) of Aegisthus. One of these λοχιταί speaks. The distribution above given is to be understood thus: seeing the turn which the alteration is taking one of Aegisthus’ impatient troop (1650) exclaims with joy to his comrades that they will not have to wait much longer. At Aegisthus’ order (1651) they draw their swords, whereupon the elders and the few who are with them draw also and prepare to sell their lives dearly (οὐκ ἀναλτων ἀνεῖν). The others eagerly accept their defiance and are at the point to fall on when Clytaemnestra interferences.—For ancient evidence supporting this view see Appendix III.

1649. *γνώσει τάχα* ‘thou shalt have an immediate lesson’, contrasted with the long discipline of imprisonment. The emphasis is on τάχα.


1653. *αἱρούμεθα* Auratus. *δεχομένοις* and *τὴν τίχνην αἱρούμεθα* mean the same thing, that they accept the favourable omen of the others’ despair.

1654. The motive of Clytaemnestra in this interference, in spite of her edifying piety, is not scruple or mercy, but interest. It is essential to the tyrants that the elders should remain prisoners and hostages, and therefore that they should not be killed. As to liberating them, there is no question of it. See on τῇ. 1656, 1659.
1655. "The order of the words points to taking *polll* as predicate, *Even these are many to reap*, a bitter harvest. The commoner rendering *Even to reap these many woes is a bitter harvest* is possible, but would rather require *tosautra*.”

Sidgwick.—*ερός* Schütz.

1656. *πημονής* δ' άλις γ' ὑπάρχει let punishment at least begin with what is enough: let us shed no blood, literally ‘as to punishment, make beginning of it at all events to a sufficient extent’. *πημονής* pain but with the secondary suggestion of punishment (cf. our *pains and penalties*), as in Ρ. Β. 6οι ἐνέξεις ἀμαρτούσαν ἐν πημοναῖσ and in that play frequently. For the construction of the genitive with ὑπάρχειν see L. and Sc. s.v. — The disciplinary imprisonment, which Aegisthus has promised, may prove sufficient to subdue rebellion, so that to inflict death would be premature. The point is put still more clearly in ν. 1659.—*ὑπάρχει* Scaliger.

1657—58 are beyond restoration: *ἐρξαντα* g, h: M probably had *ἐρξαντας*, as Mr Housman infers, but it is doubtful even whether this *ἐρξαντας*, or the word which it represents, is from *ἐρδω, ἐξω* or from *ἐργῳ*. The general sense may be *στείχετ' ἤδη τοὺς γέροντας πρὸς δόμους πεπρομένους | πρὸς παθεῖν ἔρξαντες ἀρκεῖν χρὴν τάδ' ὄς ἐπράξαμεν*, ‘go at once and take them to prison before they come to harm; we should have been content with what was done’, an order addressed to her attendants and spoken as if she would gladly save the elders from their own folly. The expression *δόμους πε- προμένους destined dwelling-place* is perhaps not inapplicable to a prison. All however is uncertain.
much to reap, a bitter harvest. Begin pain with enough; but let us have no bloodshed. Go ye at once and confine these old men to their destined dwelling-place before they come to harm (?). With our work, as it was accomplished, we should have been content (?). And if we should find that enough has been inflicted, there we will stop, sore smitten as we have been by the heavy heel of fate. This is a woman’s lesson, if any deigns to learn.

Aeg. And must they thus flaunt the folly of their tongues against me, and tempt fate with a fling of such high words?

Cl. (?) And when they lose their senses, must he who is master of them do the like?

Eld. It is not the way in Argos to fawn upon a villain!

Aeg. Well, I will come up with thee one of these days yet.

Eld. Not if heaven guide Orestes back to the land.

Aeg. I know myself how exiles feed upon hopes.

Eld. Go on, make thee fat; and befoil the good cause, as thou canst.

Aeg. Be sure thou shalt make me amends for this kind insolence!

1659. And if we find that this suffering has gone far enough, we will stay our hand, literally ‘if of these sufferings there should prove to have been enough’ (ye throws the emphasis upon ἄλης), if, that is, confinement and starvation produce submission.—μόχθων. This word like πυχμή is applied in the Prometheus repeatedly to the punishment of the hero.—ἐξοιμεθ’ ἄν ‘we will refrain or stop and inflict no more’. For this sense of the verb see examples in L. and Sc. s.v. C, iv.—ἐξοιμεθ’ Martin.

1660. Smitten as we have been by the grievous spur of fate. She speaks of the murders already done as an unhappy necessity.—χηλή. Wecklein compares Pers. 518 ὡ δυσπόνυτε δαίμον ὡς ἄγαν βαρύς | τοῦδε ἐνήλλον παντὶ Περσικῷ γένει.

1662. ματαίαν γλῶσσαν...ἀπανθήσαμεν flaunt the folly of their tongues, literally ‘make a foolish tongue break out in bloom’. Cf. R. Browning, Caliban upon Setebos, ‘letting the rank tongue blossom into speech’. This, rather than ‘call the flower’ of the tongue, is the sense which the context suggests.—The infinitive is the exclamatory infinitive of indignation.

1663. δαίμονος Casaubon.

1664. If δ’ is correct, the verse is not a continuation of the foregoing, which would require either καὶ or τε. Perhaps therefore it should be given to Clytemnestra and written thus, σῶφρονος γρόμης δ’ ἀμαρτή τῶν κρατοῦν ἀμαρτάνειν, literally ‘But that he who is master of them should lose his senses along with them! ’ i.e. ‘If they are foolish, need you therefore let yourself be provoked into the folly of killing them?’ The assurance of ἀμαρτή...ἀμαρτάνειν is in the poet’s manner, and on the other hand ἀμαρτάνει may drop off as a supposed double reading.

1665. Aegisthus is with difficulty restrained from putting the elders to death, and they are led away, answering with
ΧΟ. κόμπασον θαρσῶν, ἀλέκτωρ ὡσε θηλείας πέλας.
ΚΛ. μὴ προτιμήσῃς ματαίων τῶν ὑλαγμάτων ἔγω καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων καλῶς.


defiant taunts his threats of executing his purpose another time.

1670. τῆςδε μωρίας χάριν a periphrasis for τῆςδε μωρίας, but not quite synonymous with it. It has an ironical force, as in English we might say, ‘I will thank you another time for these insults’.
Eld. Brag, brag with boldness, like a cock beside his hen!
Cl. Care not for this idle barking. I and thou will make good order, masters we of this house.

1671. ὁστε Scaliger.
1672. προτιμήσῃς...ολαγμάτων: for the loose construction, imitating that of φροντίζεων, is cited Eur. Alc. 761.
ib. ἐγώ, φησί, καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντες τῶν τῶν δωμάτων διαθησόμεθα τὰ καθ᾽ αὐτοὺς καλῶς schol., whence the words ἐγώ and καλῶς are supplied in the text (Canter, Auratus).
APPENDIX I.

A.

v. 2. κοιμώμενος
στέγας Ἀτρειδῶν ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην.

Two interpretations have been suggested: (1), reading στέγας and taking ἄγκαθεν for ἄνέκαθεν, sleeping above (on?) the roof. A gloss in Hesychius shows that this interpretation is ancient. But ἄγκαθεν is not a legitimate contraction for ἄνέκαθεν, nor does ἄνέκαθεν mean on, but above or from above. This therefore is generally abandoned.

(2), couched on the roof, resting dog-like upon my arm (Hermann). This is provisionally accepted; but (a) the use of the dative is dubious; there is nothing in κοιμώμενος to determine the dative (which in itself signifies merely relation of some kind) to the meaning on: κοιμώμενος στέγας, if the dative were taken as quasi-local, should mean sleeping in the house, as στέγας δέχεσθαι (Eur. Or. 46) means to receive in the house, under (not on) the roof, and σώζεσθαι στέγας (Eur. Hec. 1014) to be kept in the house: (b) ἄγκαθεν does not mean on the arm but in the arms: ἄγκα-ς, ἄγκα-θεν, ἄγκα-λη etc. are regularly used of the inside of the bent arm, and to describe the act of embracing (see Aesch. Eum. 80). Hermann, to forestall this objection, points out that ἄγκα-ς means both the hollow and the angle of the arm. But the difference of stem is not immaterial. Moreover here κοιμώμενος itself suggests that ἄγκαθεν has its proper sense: κοιμάσθαι γυναικὶ ἄγκαθεν and βρέφος μητρὶ ἄγκαθεν κεκοίμητο would be natural and regular expressions in the language of poetry for the babe was sleeping in its mother’s arms, etc., the datives being common datives of relation: (c) a man could hardly describe himself as having lain in a certain posture for a year.

The words κοιμώμενος στέγας ἄγκαθεν can, I believe, mean nothing but κοιμώμενος στεγῶν ἐν ἄγκαλαις lulled in the embrace of the roof. Is
this a conceivable expression? For this speaker and in this situation I think it is. In the _Prometheus_ (1049) Hermes says to the hero

φάραγγα βροντὴ καὶ κεραυνία φλογὶ  
πατὴρ σπαράξει τὴνδε, καὶ κρύψει δέμας  
τὸ σὸν, πετραία δὲ ἄγκαλη σε βαστάσει,

comparing the sufferer ironically to a child carried softly in the arms. If the sentinel were represented lying in an angle of sloping roofs (and no position would be more natural) he might well describe himself, with an irony like that of Hermes but differing as the persons differ, as ‘cradled in the roof’s embrace’. The metaphor is not more strong than κυμάτων ἐν ἄγκαλαις cited from some poet (probably Aeschylus) by Aristophanes (Ran. 704). The words κυνὸς δίκην do not affect the question. There is no need to join them specially with κομψόμενος... ἄγκαθεν: and they may mean no more than that the man is made to pass the night, like a watch-dog, in the open air.

B.

v. 49—51. τρόπων ἀγωπιῶν οὖν ἐκπατίοις  
ἀλγεσι παιδὼν, ἕπατοι λεξέων,  
στροφόδονοῦνται κτλ.

Like vultures, who, vexed by boys in the supreme solitudes where they nest, wheel round and round, etc.

All the commentaries on this passage start from the assumption that παιδὼν means the ‘children’, that is, the ‘young’ of the birds. I think this doubtful: παῖς prima facie does not mean ‘offspring’ but ‘a young human being’; the word meaning ‘offspring’, and as such common to men and beasts, is τέκνον (see Aesch. _Theb._ 278 etc.), and the distinction is supported by many examples from every kind of poetry. Apparent exceptions (at least in writers whose usage may properly be supposed to illustrate the instinct of Aeschylus) either prove nothing to the point or prove the strength of the rule. Thus in Aesch. _Pers._ 580 fish are called ἀνανθεῖν παῖδες τὰς ἀμαίνου, of which course proves nothing. The nightingale is παιδολέτωρ (Rhes. 549), because she is Philomela, mourning for her _son_: Medea (Eur. _Med._ 1407) is παιδοφόνος λέωνα. These are for the rule. In Eur. _Ion_ 175 the birds are commanded μῆ παιδουργεῖν in the temple, an expression proper to the human relation being borrowed for decency and to avoid a coarser term. How naturally human, to the ear of Aeschylus, was the word παῖς is shown by _Ag._ 722,
where the lion-whelp is εὐφιλόπαις: the epithet would be unintelligible, if there could be any doubt that παῖς means a human being.

Doubtless the human word might be transferred to animals, if the context disproved the ordinary interpretation and compelled the other; but there is nothing in the present passage to exclude the ordinary meaning; on the contrary, the purpose of the simile naturally requires the mention of the offenders; and indeed without this, how does it appear that the young birds are stolen? The words πόνον ὀρταλῆχων ὀλέσων, which have suggested the other rendering, come too late to preclude the natural and prima facie interpretation of παίδων. We must take then παίδων in its proper sense for the boys, who rob the nest, answering to the ἄγρόται, not to the τέκνα, of the Homeric simile which Aeschylus is imitating (cited by Bochart, Hermann etc.) κλαῖον τε λυγέως ἀδινώτερον ἡ τί ὦ ὁινοῦ, φήναι ἡ λυγνῖοι γαμφώνυχες, οὐαὶ τε τέκνα ἄγρόται ἐξείλοντο, πάρος πετειμνα γενέσθαι (Od. 16. 216). The genitive will then be that of the subject or origin, and ἄλγει παίδων will be literally ‘in grief from boys’.

For ἐκτάτοσ the old interpretation of Hesychius, ἐκτάτον· τὸ ἐξω πάτος, ‘that which is solitary, away from the haunts of man’, is correct. The word πάτος tread seems to have gone out of use in its primary sense as early as Homer, who has it several times in the same restricted meaning haunt of man, as opposed to solitary places, such as hills and deserts. Thus Poseidon (II. 20. 137) invites the gods to retire ἐκ πάτου ἐς σκοπίην, and Bellerophon wanders in the Aleian plain, ὦν θυμὸν κατέδω, πάτον ἀνθρώποι ἀλεινου (II. 6. 202). Here the word applies properly to the birds themselves\(^1\), but is transferred to their feelings (ἀλγη) by a usage in which Greek poetry is peculiarly bold. The present case is little if at all more different from our habit of language than e.g. Soph. Ant. 794 νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ἐναίμον, for ‘a strife between kinsmen’. The epithet is to the point; it is an aggravation of the complaint that the robbers are also invaders.

So far I do not find any difficulty. But there remains a real difficulty in ὑπατοί λεχέων, commonly rendered ‘high above their nest’. Mr Housman (J. Ph. xvi. 247) justly rejects this. “The learner of Greek, in quest of probable or even plausible reasons for believing that ὑπατοι λεχεων summi cubilium means ὑπὲρ λεχεων super cubilia, is dismissed to these references ἐσχάτη χθόνος Prom. 865, ὑστάτου νεώς Suppl. 607, ὑπατος χώρας Zeus Ag. 492’. The first two of these passages πόλις ἐσχάτη χθόνος and οἰκακος ὑστάτου νεώς prove to him

\(^1\) Or perhaps to the boys, truants out of their own place, as suggested by Prof. Campbell (Class. Rev. iv. 301), who however adheres to the usual view of παίδων.
what he could well believe without proof, that such a phrase as θρηγκός ὑπατος τεῖχος a coping which is the highest part of a wall is Greek; but since vultures on the wing are not the highest part of their eyries the information does not help him. Had he been referred, say, to a passage where a fish following a ship is called ὑπατος νεώς, then he would have been helped; but Greek literature contains no such passage: such a fish is ὑπερος νεώς”. The third reference, meaning properly ‘Zeus highest in the land’ and therefore ‘supreme over’ it, makes for the same argument. I think it unanswerable, and conclude that if ὑπατοι λεχέων be taken with στροφοδινοῦνται it is unintelligible. Mr Housman concludes that it is altogether unintelligible; but this I do not yet accept.

If ὑπατοι λεχέων is correct, the genitive must, as Mr Housman says, be of the partitive kind. But why not? No one would demur to Ὑρώπιοι ναόνσων (or εἰσών) ἕσχατοι τῆς Βουωτίας, or to a description of the Athena of the Acropolis as ἥ ὑπάτη θυσα ιερῶν she whose sanctuary is highest, literally she who is highest among sanctuaries, the name of the people or the goddess standing for the place of abode. On such analogy, I submit, is formed ὑπατοι λεχέων, literally highest of nests (not of their nests), for nesting highest of all birds. And this reinforces the point marked by ἐκπατίοις, that the injured parents are invaded in their own solitudes. A prose writer, if in prose such an expression could have been used at all, would have written ὑπατοι δντες λεχέων: but it is equally certain that Aeschylus would not insert the participle; his style abounds in these participial adjectives (e.g. Ag. 58).

I should translate then literally, ‘who, in grief among-the-solitudes inflicted-by-boys, being-highest-nested, wheel round and round with stroke of their wings’ etc., to which the paraphrase above given comes as near as our language permits.

τρόπον αἰγυπτίων οἱ τ’ ἐκπάγλους ἀλγεσί παιδῶν ὑπατηλέχεων | στροφοδινοῦνται κτλ. (Dr Headlam, Class. Rev. xiv. 113) is unexceptionable, if the tradition must be rejected, as most assume. But I find it difficult to believe that the adjective ἐκπάτιος (ἐκπάγλους Blomfield) has been brought into this context by a blunder.
From the difference (δῶ') which Calchas saw between the royal brothers, he perceived that they were typified by the two different eagles, and that the appearance was ominous. The writer of ἤμαστι conceived the difference to lie in the tempers of the princes, Agamemnon being conspicuously brave, Menelaus μαλθακός αἰχμητής (Il. 17. 588, cited by Plato Symp. 174 C). The eagle with white feathers in the tail and wings was commonly called πύγαργος (Schol. on v. 117 ὁ ἔξοπεός λευκός, ὁ ἐστιν ὁ πύγαργος), and the word, whether because this species though larger than others was not so strong or for other reasons, was applied to cowards: πύγαργος ἐπίδος ἄτομο. Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ δείλου. ἀπὸ τῆς λευκῆς πυγῆς (Soph. fr. 692 a). Cf. the proverb 'showing the white feather', and see L. and Sc. s.v. πύγαργος.

Such is the ancient and traditional explanation, but it is far from satisfactory. For first Menelaus was not generally recognized as a coward or unwarlike and does not so figure in the extant Ερως, though the dramatists, and perhaps some of their predecessors, invented for variety a cowardly Menelaus, similar to their mean Odysseus. In our Homer he is βοήν ἅγαθὸς and his prowess is frequently celebrated. Plato, who requires for the sake of a jest to suppose him unwarlike, makes the most of a single expression divorced from the context, which shows it to be a mere insinuation made for the purpose of the moment. In this very passage of Aeschylus the epithet μαχιμως forbids such a conception. Secondly if the fact were so, it would be strange that Calchas should imply such an ignominy in the presence of Menelaus and his army. Thirdly ἰδὼν points to visible difference. Fourthly part of the present symbol, or at least something closely resembling it, is found in Sophocles (Ant. 113) with an explanation. There 'the eagle with snow-white wings’ stands for the Ἀργίες distinguished by their white shields. Note also that in the passage before us not only does the word πύγαργος not occur, but there is nothing definitely referring to the tail at all. The words are 'white-marked at the back'.

Putting this together, we may well believe that the difference which

---

1 Dr Headlam (Class. Rev. xiv. 114) points out that δῶ is predicate ('twain by tempers') and δισσούς epithet ('the two'), not vice versa as commonly taken, arguing rightly from the order of the words.
Calchas 'saw' was not in the characters of the brothers, but in *the shields slung upon their backs*, and consequently that ημαςι is a false correction of some word unknown. These considerations or some of them led Haupt to propose λημματι and Pleitner σημασι. But no known or credible meaning of λημμα will fit, and it is not the *emblems* (σηματα) of the shields to which we are directed by the passage in Sophocles, but their colours. Certainty in such a matter is impossible, but a word which would fit all the conditions is the derivative, whatever it should be, not of λα- but of λεφ- to paint—λίμμα, ἁλίμμα, λεῖμμα, or ἂλειμμα. That this stem (like the Latin *linere*) originally had this sense is shown by the use of ἀλείφεων (μίλτῳ, ψυμβίῳ etc., see L. and Sc. s.v.): δύο λιμματι different in their tincts gives the sense we should seek. Critically it is little less probable than λημματι itself. The type of error is common (see e.g. Ag. 867).

D.


vii. 146—149. τόσσων περ εὐφρων, καλά,
δρόσουσιν ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν ἔντων
πάντων τ' ἀγρονύμων φιλομάστοις
θηρῶν ὀβρίκαλουσι τερπνά, κτλ.

Kind as thou art, fair goddess, to the uncouth offspring of the many creatures fierce, as well as sweet unto the suckling young of all kinds that range the field, etc.—μαλερῶν ἔντων (θηρῶν) literally 'of fierce creatures, though they are fierce'. For the use of the form ἔων in the lyrics of tragedy cf. Eur. *Andr.* 124 ἅμφι λέκτρων διδύμων ἐπίκουνον ἐώσαν. The reference to fierce animals is, strictly speaking, irrelevant, as the sympathy of the goddess had been evoked, in the case of which Calchas is speaking, by hares. But the suggestion, that her universal love (note τόσσων, πάντων) extends to the savage kinds as well as the rest, is very much to his present purpose, which is to persuade her not to involve in the punishment of the Atridae the hapless Iphigenia, and to propitiate her on behalf of the 'house of the eagles'.

I have ventured to write ἔντων for ὀντων (M), and not λεόντων, in spite of the testimony that λεόντων was actually an ancient reading. The objection to λεόντων is mainly critical.

In the first place λεόντων is inconsistent with τόσσων. But further, if the original reading was δρόσουσιν ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν λεόντων, it is hard to account for the reading of M, δρόσουσιν ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν ὀντων, descended, as the scholium suggests, from a ms. which had ἀέπτοις. No editor would invent, except upon some supposed evi-
dence, a reading so absurd as ὁρόσουσιν ἀδέπτως, and none would be likely to mistake a word so common as λεόντων. On the other hand, if ἐόντων was the original, the history is simple. To the line as it originally stood were appended two marginal notes, ὀντων and λείπει τὸ λ, the first explaining ἐόντων, the second on the contrary proposing the correction of it given by the Etym. Mag., λεόντων. The two notes indicated in fact the two ancient opinions about the reading. The scribe of Μ, or some preceding scribe, took the gloss ὀντων as a correction into the text: as the note λείπει τὸ λ had so lost its application, he or some other put the λ into the wrong word, thus manufacturing ἀδέπτως. The existence of the reading λεόντων is perfectly well accounted for as a slip of memory. The quotations of the ancients are even more inaccurate than those of the present day; nothing would be more likely than that a writer, who was concerned only with the use of ὁρόσος, should be misled by μαλακῶν into the false quotation of the etymologist.

It may be added that λιόνς have nothing to do with the matter, either directly or indirectly.

E.

vv. 183—185. Ζήνα δὲ τις προφρόνως ἑπινίκια κλάζων τείζεται φρενῶν τοπάν.

MS. κλάζων...τὸ πᾶν.

Scholia. 184 ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι νίκης. 185 δοσχερῶς φρόνιμος ἔσται.

The general meaning here is clear, 'trust in Zeus will not be misplaced, his strength is invincible'. Upon the words three questions arise:—(1) as to the sense of προφρόνως, (2) as to the reading κλάζων, (3) as to the reading τὸ πᾶν. It will be convenient to take (3) first.

In a paper in the Journal of Philology, Vol. ix., it was pointed out that the existence and use of the words τοπάζω, ὑποτόπεω, ἀτόπος and others, warranted, under the general laws of Greek formation, the assumption that there also existed the corresponding words τοπῇ (or τοπά) and τόπος a conjecture, guess, and τοπάω to guess, a parallel form to τοπάζω: that these words are very liable to be confused with others: and that they should be borne in mind in interpreting our mss., especially those of the tragedians. These positions, in their general and a priori bearing, have not, so far as I know, been disputed; and are approved by (among others) Mr A. Sidgwick.1 In the paper

1 See his edition of the Agamemnon, App. II. 'The a priori probability' etc.
mentioned were collected the passages which seemed to require consideration from this point of view, among them vv. 185, 687, 982 of this play, each exhibiting the ambiguous letters τοπαν. Mr Sidgwick prefers το παν in each and, as will be seen from my text, I agree with him as to the two last, though as to v. 687 with much hesitation. In the present passage I believe that το παν cannot be interpreted, and that τοπαν is right. Mr Sidgwick (with modern editors generally) accepts the explanation of the scholia, and translates 'shall find wisdom altogether'. But the sense put upon τευξεται φρενών cannot be got from the words. Φρένες (or φρήν) does not mean 'wisdom', it means a mind: φρένας έχειν is not 'to be wise' but to have a consciousness or be conscious, as in the address of Philoctetes to his bow (Soph. Phil. 1130) ἦ που ἐλευνόν ὄρας, φρένας εἰ τινας έχεις, κτλ.: φρένων ἐπήβολος is a synonym not of σοφός but of εὔνοος and means possessed of his intellect, marking the difference between the man and the infant (P. V. 460): φρενών κενός (Soph. Ant. 754), ἀποσφαλείς (Aesch. P. V. 488), ἀμαρτάνει (Eur. Alc. 327), are all, as the context will show, very strong expressions, importing the absence or loss not of wisdom but of sense or the faculty of thought. The exact expression τυγχανειν φρενών I cannot find, and am not surprised, for in its proper sense it would require a very peculiar context to justify it: the nearest approach is Soph. El. 992, εἰ φρενών | ἐτύγχαν' αὐτή μὴ κακῶν, ἐσφέκτε' ἄν | τῆν εὐλάβειαν, had she been blessed with a mind not mischievous, where the qualification μὴ κακῶν would be needless and injurious, if τυγχανειν φρενών could bear the meaning assumed for the present passage. Abundant evidence, positive and negative, goes to show that τευξεται φρενών το παν could mean only 'will find wits' or 'will be blessed with a mind altogether', and therefore for the present purpose has not a meaning at all. On the other hand τευξεται φρενών τοπαν will be right in the guess of his thought is simple, and has a special fitness here from its correlation with the preceding passage (προσεκάσαι v. 173) and, as will be immediately shown, with the words προφρώνως επινίκια.

Next as to προφρώνως:—πρόφρων, literally 'forward-minded' or 'fore-minded', means elsewhere willing or zealous. But ancient tradition was right in saying that here the poet has used προφρώνως so as to suggest the meaning (equally admitted by the form of the word) forecasting, prophetically, by anticipation. That this was the ancient tradition is shown by the note in the scholia 'in expectation of his victory', which has nothing to go upon except προφρώνως thus interpreted. The difference is very small, in substance indeed none, but the purpose of the poet is indicated by the antithesis of for and
after in προφρόνως-ἐπινίκια (properly 'such as follow a victory'), and by the correspondence between προφρόνως and φρενῶν τοπᾶν. Such development of latent capacity in a word is the very essence of poetical expression, and here saves the word προφρόνως from being flat and superfluous. The point of the whole passage and of this sentence is that Zeus' power is supreme and his triumphs therefore certain beforehand. The certainty of an event cannot be put more strongly than by saying, that 'he who guesses it will be so will be right'. Whether πρόφρων was often used by the poets in this sense, we are not in a position to say, nor is it material. The prevalence of another sense is no argument to the contrary, as may be seen from many other compounds, e.g. πρόδικος, πρόγονος, προείδον, προείπον, προγίγνομαι, προδίδωμι, all of which have various meanings.

Lastly as to the reading κλατζῶν ἐπινίκια singing songs of victory or κλατζων (the quasi-Doric equivalent for κλητζων) ἐπινίκια giving titles of victory. The ms. offers the choice, for the presence or absence of the iota subscript is nothing. My reasons for preferring κλατζων are (1) that the name of Zeus is the topic of the passage (v. 170) and the significance of that name has already been hinted (see v. 175 and the reference given above); (2) that κλατζων, which applies properly to harsh discordant sounds, such as the screaming of birds (v. 48), always, even in its looser applications, signifies the quality or tone of the sound, as deep or harsh or repellent or terrible or the like (see vv. 165, 211), whereas here no such suggestion can be intended. The only apparent cases I can find to support the view that κλατζων could mean merely to sing are Soph. Trach. 206, and Eur. Ion 905. But in the first there is an antithesis between the treble voices of women and ἀρσενῶν κλειγγά the masculine bass; and in the second the terms κιβάρα κλάζεις, addressed to Apollo, are purposely offensive (see the context) and suggest a comparison between the 'song' of the cruel god and the 'screams' of a bird of prey.

F.

v. 288. ἐπιάνεν.

Dr Headlam, defending the derivation of this word from πιάνω, writes as follows (On editing Aeschylus, p. 34).

"The metaphorical uses of πιάνω may be studied from the following:—

Lycophr. Alex. 1200 οὕτ' ἐπιάνεν βορᾶ νηδόν (so Babrius cvii)."
APPENDIX I.

Xenophanes 2. 22 οὐ γὰρ πιάνει ταύτα μυχοὺς πόλεως (cf. Hesych. πιάνει: ὀφελησαί, αὐξήσαι).
Agathias A.P. v. 294 μάστακα πιάνων χείλεσι εἰσφέρῃ.
Opp. Hal. v. 620 πιάνων ἐσ άεθλα λυγυφθόγγου μέλος αύθης.
Pind. P. Π. 55 βαρυλόγους ἔχθεσι πιανόμενον.
Themist. Οr. vii. 90 θρήνων ἐρώντες καὶ στεναγμῶν, οἰμωγῆς ἀκορεῖς, δάκρυσι πιανόμενοι.

The reader will consider whether these examples are parallel to the supposed use of πιάνω by Aeschylus here. To me they appear essentially different, all natural, or easily derivable from the primitive sense to fatten, as the other is not. I would not however deny that the use attributed to Aeschylus is conceivable. The question is not this, but whether it is preferable in probability to the alternative supposition that we have here the compound ἐπι-παινω, which, as Blomfield remarks, ‘fits the sense excellently’. Why should this compound be rejected or suspected because it does not occur elsewhere? Many verbs, and very many compounds, are now represented by single examples. Why not this one?

I take this opportunity of acknowledging generally my debt to Dr Headlam’s pamphlet, which has suggested many corrections (one for example in the note here) beside those which are acknowledged specially.

G.

v. 313. πλεόν καίουσα τῶν εἰρημένων.

Weil’s translation is preferable. The alternative ‘raising a fire larger than those before mentioned’ is prosaic and inappropriate. The beacon on Cithaeron, which has the smallest distance of all to light, cannot be meant to be represented as larger than that of Athos, which was to ‘pass the wide main’. But that it should be ‘greater than was commanded’ is natural enough.

It may be thought that there is a particular intention in this compliment paid to the enthusiasm shown upon the occasion of the triumph of Hellas over Asia by ‘the watchers upon Cithaeron’. On the north slope of Cithaeron, the side to which the message came, lay the little town of Plataea, the whole of whose fighting force, unsolicited and
alone, came over the mountain to join the Athenian army just before the battle of Marathon, while all the other Greek cities delayed and made excuses. This service, which produced the deepest impression upon the Athenians and was constantly commemorated in their public prayers, cannot, I think, have been forgotten by the writer or any Athenian hearer of these lines. For the facts and an eloquent commentary upon them see Grote, *Hist. Greece*, Part II., Chap. 36. From this point of view the text is more than defensible, and the alternative reading to be next mentioned derives no support from any difficulty in the ms.

προσαιθρίζουσα πόμπιμον φλόγα.

*Raising to the skies a massive flame.* These words are cited, without name of author, by Hesychius. It was proposed by Dindorf to place them here after φρονεία, and though not so pointed and apposite as the ms. reading, they fit the place with an exactness surprising if accidental. On the whole it seems probable that the quotation of Hesychius really is a very ancient reading of this passage, and it is possible that both readings descend from the poet himself.

H.

v. 326. νικά δ’ ο πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμὼν.

*But the winner is he who ran first and last.* Two questions arise here: (1) What did this expression mean as commonly understood, in reference to an ordinary torch-race? and (2) What is the point of it here? Why, and in what sense, is it specially applicable (as it must be, or it would not be introduced) to the metaphorical 'torch-race', the chain of beacons?

The answer to the latter question is obvious. In this *pretended* λαμπαδηφορία of beacons 'the victory is won', *i.e.* the queen's design is accomplished, 'by the runner who ran first and last', or in other words, by the only one who 'ran' at all, the beacon upon Arachnaeus. It is a piece of 'irony', signifying to those in her confidence (and to the audience acquainted with the story) that in this case the 'head of the chain' is the whole chain.

The first question has been variously answered, but all suggestions (except that mentioned below) may be reduced to two heads: (1) 'the victory is won by the first and last runners', *i.e.* by the runners from first to last, by the whole chain: and (2) 'by the first runner, who is also the last' or 'although he is the last', *i.e.* by the runner who comes in sooner than the final runner of any other chain (and in this sense *first*) though he is the *last to run* in his own chain.
But a view, simpler at least and less artificial than these, has recently been propounded by Professor Phillimore (Classical Review xvn. 105).

"In analysing word for word we may break up some organic unit of phrase.... Such... there is in the words πρώτος—καὶ—τελευταῖος.

(1) Herod. ix. 28 τελευταῖοι δὲ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτασσομεν in the order of battle at Plataea; (2) Xen. Memor. Γ i. 8 (cf. also 9); (3) Charito Chaereas and Callirrhoe, i. 5 (p. 419 in Didot's Erotici): Χαρίας δ' ἐπὶ τῷ θυμῷ ζέων δὲ ὁλης νυκτὸς ἀποκλείσας ἑαυτὸν ἐβασάνιζε τῆς θεραπανίδας, πρώτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἄβραν.

In (1) it means on the extreme wing; in (2) [the same]; in (3) apparently, by a metaphor, as a prime and final test" [or perhaps simply first and chiefly]. "From which I conclude that... the phrase characterizes the nearest-to-Argos of the chain of λαμπαδηφορία; and (doubtfully) that Clytaemnestra's meaning is .... and the winner in the race is my first-hand watchman, the fugleman of the array on whom all depends".

If this is right, the popular meaning, as commonly applied to a λαμπαδηφορία, will be that the 'head and end' of the chain, he who runs in, is the most important man and has the most brilliant place, a remark natural to the Graii laudis avari, and suiting well with the special intention here.

I.

v. 357—359. θεοῦς δ' ἀναμπλάκητος εἰ μόλοι στρατός,
ἐγρηγορῶς τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὀλωλότων
γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ πρόσπασιν μη τύχοι κακά.

So this passage has commonly been punctuated. Those who retain it, as for example Mr Sidgwick, interpret it thus: "'But if the army returned without such offence to the gods, the woe of the dead might yet wake, if sudden ills did not befall'. The second 'if' is a repetition of the first in other words... 'if they kept free of such offence (and accordingly) if no... sudden judgment befell'." The sense of this is, I conceive, right, and the accumulation of parallel hypothetic clauses is not in itself objectionable. But where, as here, the clauses are separated, the result is great obscurity. And there are other objections. It does not appear why the judgment of the gods should be distinguished from the Nemesis of the dead as necessarily 'sudden'; either danger might fall at once or fall later.
Of emendations, the majority have for object to get rid of the negative in ἀναμπλάκητος, the earliest being apparently Canter's θεοὶς δ' ὁδ' ἀναμπλάκητος, the simplest that of Pauw θεοὶς δ' ἄν ἀμπλάκητος (a word however not unimpeachable), and the best ἐναμπλάκητος (adopted by Dindorf). The sense would then be, 'if the army return having offended the gods, the woe of the dead may wake, though no sudden mischief should occur'. But this is still unsatisfactory. The last clause still comes too late, as an awkward afterthought, and its relation to the whole is still difficult to perceive.

Dr Headlam (Class. Rev. xii. 245) rejects the general assumption that an emphasis can be thrown upon τῶν ὀλολότων. Without a stop there, the objection has force; but the final word in a Greek sentence can and often does receive emphasis, though often it has none. He would throw the sole emphasis on some word (to be substituted for ἐγρήγορον) signifying harmless or assuageable.

J.

v. 363. ΧΩ. β'. γύναι, κατ' ἄνδρα σώφρον' εὐφρόνοις λέγεις.
ἐγὼ δ' ἄκοισας πιστά σοι τεκμήρια
θεοὶς προσεπείν εὐ παρασκευάζομαι. κτλ.

Here for the first time a question presents itself, which will occur several times hereafter in the play. What is the character of the speaker?

It is commonly assumed that every speaker, who is not one of the principal actors, is one of the elders, by whom are sung the great odes of the play. But there is no ground for assuming this. In the Eumenides certainly, in the Choephori perhaps, there is not one Chorus only, but two. And in the Agamemnon the assumption that there is only one Chorus and only one class of χορευταί makes great and hopeless difficulties.

Here we have two speeches, neither of which can be assigned to any of the principal actors, separated by a speech from Clytaemnestra (viv. 329—366). The attitude of the two speakers towards the subject before them is not merely different but diametrically opposed. The first speaker (v. 329) treats the queen's proffered 'proof' of the Greek victory with a reserve which is barely saved from discourtesy. He declines to act upon it at once, and requests that the amazing story may be repeated again 'in full detail'. His behaviour is in fact distinguished from the open incredulity of the speakers at the close of
the following ode (v. 481) only by such a decent disguise as the queen’s presence necessarily commands.

On the other hand the second speaker, he of the lines now before us, is entirely satisfied with the queen and her statement. Contra-
dicting the other almost in his own terms, he says that after the sure
proofs which he has heard ‘he for his part (ἐγὼ) will thank the gods
for the victory’, which is exactly what the first declines to do, till he has
heard something more.

Now if these two speakers are the same person (or persons in like
situation) what explains this change of mind? What has Clytaemnestr
said to satisfy his curiosity and remove his hesitation? He asked for a
repetition, with details, of the statement about the beacons. The queen
has not taken the least notice of his request. Her reflections may or
may not be very laudable and wise, but what have they to do with the
‘evidence’ of the victory?

I am by no means the first to notice these difficulties, though they
have been little considered. Thus on v. 331 Dr Wecklein says, that
the speaker ‘desires a repetition, a wish which Clytaemnestr satisfies
to this extent, that she gives in v. 332, Τρούαν Ἀχαϊοι ἔλθεν ἔν
ἡμέρα, the substance of the beacon-message, and appends to it
reflections’ etc. If the speaker is content with this measure of satis-
faction, he might surely have spared his request. The question which
Clytaemnestr has professed to answer in the foregoing description of
the beacons is the question of v. 292, ‘What messenger could possibly
come so quick?’ Here is the ‘amazing’ circumstance which provokes
further enquiry. And the queen satisfies this enquiry by stating that
the victory is this day won?

It would be hard, I think, for two speeches to offer stronger internal
evidence that they do not proceed from the same lips, than is contained
in the two before us. We shall not look far for external confirmation.

It is plain that the second speaker, whoever he is, is also the singer,
or one of the singers, of the hymn in anapaestic march-time which
immediately follows. He proposes to praise the gods for the victory,
and he does so accordingly. But are these the singers of the following
strophic ode? If so, what is the meaning of the first line of that
ode (v. 379)?

Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσ’ ἀνειπεῖ. 

‘Τis a stroke of Zeus which they are able to proclaim. The ms. (f)
has ἔχουσαν εἴπεῖν with the word ἔχουσαν corrected to ἔχουσ’. It seems
certain that ἔχουσ’ ἀνειπεῖ is the tradition thus represented. Yet the
suggested emendations ἔχεις ἀνειπεῖ (Schmidt), ἔχοις ἂν εἴπεῖν (Karsten),
έχωνων εἰπεῖν (Cod. Farn., i.e. Triclinius) etc., and the forced explanation of this last, Δῶς πλαγῶν έχωνων εἰπεῖν, by 'they (the Trojans) have the blow of Zeus to tell of'—all these are testimonies to the impossibility, upon the current assumption as to the course of the preceding scene, of reading and translating the verse in this obvious way.

But give up the attempt to assign all the speaking and singing to the same persons, and there is no difficulty. The queen comes naturally not unattended; and from the course of the play both before and afterwards it is evident (as is shown in the Introduction) that by this time there have gathered about her many of those who are in her secret. It is they who here interfere to rescue her from an embarrassing and dangerous situation. She has partly missed her effect. Those who are to be deceived have found her story more wonderful than convincing. They believe her to be the victim of a delusion (v. 489) and have shown a desire to press enquiries impossible to satisfy and perilous to elude. Her accomplices take up the cue and, to cover her escape, play the required part of plain citizens, who feel none of these doubts. They admire her wisdom and good feeling. They think her evidence certain. They will offer thanks to heaven accordingly. While they perform this mockery, the queen retires, and the elders are left to act as they may.

They act as might be expected, so as, if possible, not to commit themselves in any event. To the victory which the others 'can proclaim', they refer in brief, vague, and carefully guarded terms (vv. 379—381). Then glancing off into generalities they pursue the reflexions with which they are themselves pre-occupied, the miserable cause for which the war has been waged, the sufferings which it has caused, and the menacing discontents which are the result of those sufferings.

It then occurs to them (v. 481) that the news of the victory, unproved as it is, must be spreading; and in the vexation of this thought their disbelief breaks out openly, whereupon (see v. 595) this new turn is reported within by their observant enemies. What they might have done next we do not discover, for at this moment the herald appears and the situation is completely changed.

As to ms. authority on the distribution of these speeches, there is none. The ms. (following probably M itself) assigns vv. 363—366 to a certain άγγελος, first introduced in M as the speaker of vv. 270—275. The modern editors have properly dismissed this personage to limbo. The fact is that the company commonly assigned to the Αγαμέμνων does not provide characters enough for this scene and others. The designation XO. for v. 363 is correct, though not complete. I have
distinguished the accomplices of Clytaemnestra (who here both speak and sing) by the designation ΧΟ. β'.

K.

_vv. 417 foll._

πολ' δ' ἀνέστενον
τόδ' ἐννέποντες δόμῳ προφηταὶ·
'ἰὼ ἦν δῷμα δῷμα καὶ πρόμοι,
'ἰὼ λέχος καὶ στίβοι φιλάνορες·
pάρεστι σιγᾶς ἀτιμὸς ἀλοίδόρος,
ἀδιστὸς ἀφεμένων ἰδεῖν.'

I am almost unwilling to vex these lines, beautiful even in the doubt and obscurity which rest upon them, with any further attempt at exact interpretation. Whether it is worth while to do so must depend on the view we take as to the nature of the responsion in metre between strophe and antistrophe used by Aeschylus. If the last two verses originally corresponded syllable by syllable to _vv. 437—8_,

tὸ πᾶν δ' ἀφ' Ἐλλάδος αἰας συνορμένοις
πένθει' ἀτλησικάρδιος κτλ.

the accidental injury must be greater than we can repair. By writing 'Ἐλλάνος (Bamberger) in _v. 437_ and _σιγᾶς ἀτιμοὺς ἀλοίδόροι_ (Hermann) in _v. 421_ we may make these verses correspond with changes singly slight but not really probable. The case of _v. 422_ is still harder: ἀπίστος ἐμφανῶν ἰδεῖν (Margoliouth), _not believing what is before his eyes_, though not beyond suspicion in point of grammar, is a very striking suggestion and the best made: but it is too far from the tradition to be trusted.

But since I hold, for reasons explained in the Appendix to my edition of the _Septem_ and in Appendix II. to this, that, as far as the metre is concerned, both strophe and antistrophe may be right as they stand, and as I see no reason to doubt the sense of the antistrophe, I think it worth while to consider further the sense of this.

The first question is, Who are the speakers, the δόμῳ προφηταὶ? Opinion was divided between 'the seers of Menelaus' house' and 'the seers of Priam's house,' till it was pointed out independently by Bamberger, H. L. Ahrens, and Housman that προφήτης does not mean a seer, but one who interprets or speaks on behalf of some one either named or implied in the context¹, and that προφηταὶ δόμῳ must mean

¹ _Theb._ 596 is no exception to this. The context sufficiently suggests the genitive θεῶν.

V. Ε. Α.
'those who interpreted the house' or something of this kind. The
'interpreters of the house' then, it is said, will be those who at the
time of the flight of Helen represented the scene in the house of
Menelaus to the elders, who would not otherwise know of it, 'purveyors
of gossip about the royal family' (Housman). It is however difficult
to believe that a word closely associated with supernatural powers
would be applied, without explanation, to such a function as this, even
if we assume that the elders would have required 'a revealer' or
'interpreter', being themselves, it would seem, as likely as any one to
have had the king's confidence. I must hold therefore that the meaning
of δόμων προφήτας is still to seek.

In truth this appears to be one of those passages, which, from the
loss of knowledge, familiar at the time of writing, about the terms used
and the story told, cannot, except by guess-work, be explained at all.
From the way in which δόμων προφήτης is here used it would seem
to have had some fixed conventional significance, connected, as the
general use of προφήτης would indicate, with divination. For instance,
a person, who professed to report or communicate to one absent from
home what was said in the house which he had quitted, might not
unnaturally be called δόμων προφήτης, being an intermediary between
the enquirer and his house, as the προφήτης θεοῦ between the enquirer
and the god. If we may further suggest that such services were used
by women, when they quitted one δόμως for another upon marriage, we
should account for the mention of the προφήτας here; for the bitter
comparison of the rape to a marriage is pursued in this play repeatedly
and in this very passage (v. 415). The 'home-interpreters' will then
be the seers who at Troy revealed to Helen and Paris what was passing
at Argos, sighing, in spite of their intention to mock, at the suffering
which they could see. The elders put into their mouths what they
know to have been the facts. The picture (whether this be the true
account of it or no) was probably based upon some scene existing in
literature, by reference to which it could be understood and completed.

Now as to vv. 421—422. One thing I consider certain, that ἄδιστος
ἄφεμένων ἰδεῖν, by whomsoever written, was not written accidentally but
deliberately. The nominative to πάρεστι is of course ἄνὴρ, the husband,
supplied from φλαναρεῖς. Ἀφεῖσθαι γυναῖκα (see L. and Sc. s. v.) is 'to
put away a wife', and οἱ ἄφεμένων therefore in this context means
Menelaus, by whom Helen, in the language of the robbers' irony,
has been dismissed or divorced. Take this with the use of ἓνωτος in
Soph. Αἰ. 105 ἓνωτος, ὁ δέσποτα, δεσμωτής ἐσώθακε, He sits, my most
delightful prisoner, within, and we see that πάρεστιν ἄδιστος ἄφεμένων
Ωειν is an appropriate and idiomatic description of Menelaus, as the Trojans might describe him in mockery of his rage and grief. Precisely as in the Αιας, ἡδοςτος describes the object of a malicious joy. Such words were never thrown casually together by a blundering pen. They were written either by the poet or by some learned and cunning editor, making poetry for Aeschylus after a conception of his own. I believe they were written by the poet. They represent the feelings which the προφήται δόμων, speaking to the taste of their Trojan auditors, desired to express, sharply contrasted with the pathos, which they felt in their own despite. The words σεγάς ἄτιμος δλοοδορος (if they may mean 'unregarded, unsold on the part of the silence', i.e. 'with none to answer his contemned invectives') are conceived in the same spirit¹: and the ambiguity of ἰώ, expressing either triumph or grief, is also adapted to the purpose. See also the note on v. 431.

We might translate the whole then somewhat thus: And oft they sighed, the interpreters of the home, as they said: 'Ah, for the home! Aha, for the home! Aha! and ah! for the princes thereof! for the husband's bed yet printed with her embrace! There he stands, his curses mocked with silence, the parted spouse, the sweetest sight of them all!'

L.

v. 438. πένθεια.

If πένθεια is a word (and we are not entitled to assume that it was not, merely because we do not easily recognize its origin and meaning), it should be a feminine of the type of βασιλεια, ἱέρεια etc. There is no reason why it should not be this, and from the context and other evidence we can fairly infer its meaning. We have a suitable stem in that of πενθ-ερός, connected according to the etymologists with the English bind, and signifying at all events the idea of connexion or relationship. The termination -εις (feminine -εϊα) is also proper to a word of this class, as in ἀγγέατειος (a kinsman), γονεός, etc. Thus formed, πένθεια (with a presumable ancient masculine πενθεός) would mean kinswoman, strictly perhaps 'connexion by affinity', but likely to be so used as to include either kinship or connexion generally. Now this fits the context well. It is the women left behind, the mothers, wives, sisters, daughters of the absent men, who are most naturally taken as types of the anxiety at home; nor is there difficulty in the use

¹ To render δλοοδορος unreprouachful is scarcely in accordance with the use of λοιδορία, λοιδορείν.
of the person for the class, 'the kinswoman' for 'the kinswomen'. And
to this πένθεια the genitive δόμων 'kinswoman of the house' attaches
itself naturally. I would therefore retain the text, with the inter-
pretation, 'heavy in each house must be the hearts of the women-folk'.
Another trace of this archaic group of words may be found in Πενθεώς.
Proper names in Greek (e.g. Medon ruler, Mnester wooer etc.) are
often words gone out of common use. It is not to be supposed that the
name of Pentheus was given with consciousness of the evil significance
found in it by fates (ἐνδυστυχήσαι τοῦνομ' ἐπιτήδειος el Eur. Bacch. 510):
this intention would take all the point out of the coincidence. The
name of 'kinsman' is happier and more likely.

For proposed corrections see Wecklein. None is satisfactory, and
indeed if πένθεια be given up, there is no sufficient foundation.

M.

vv. 498 foll. κήρυκ' ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τόνδ' ὄρῳ κατάσκιον
κλάδους Ἕλλαις· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ μοι κάσις
πηλοὺ ξίνωπος δυώς κόνις τάδε,
ὡς οὔτ' ἀνανδός οὔτε σοι δαίων φλόγα
ὑλῆς ὤρειας σημανεῖ καπνῷ πυρᾶς,
ἀλλ' ἡ τὸ χαίρειν μᾶλλον ἐκβαζεῖι λέγων κτλ.

On the difficulty of this passage and of current interpretations
I have spoken above. The only remedy proposed by way of correction
(see Wecklein) is to read in v. 501 ὅς (Stanley) or ὅ δ' (Keck) for ὅς.
It is easy to see why this has not been found satisfactory. It makes
sense of the second clause, 'who (or 'he') will give us the news better
than by beacons', but only to raise another question—What then is τάδε
in v. 500? What does the dust testify? But a wholly new suggestion
has been made by Mr Housman (Journal of Philology xvi. 264), which
deserves to be stated in full:

The coryphaeus catching sight of the herald sees also in the distance a cloud of dust
which he supposes to be raised by the returning army; and the return of the army
means something decisive, either victory or defeat. The crew of Agamemnon's ship, if
Aeschylus followed Homer, would be 120 men; and these together with an ἀμαξήριος
θρόνος for Agamemnon and Cassandra, would raise in clear dry southern air a cloud of
dust to be seen a great way off. No doubt to us the allusion seems obscurely worded;
but I fancy the Attic audience recognized an old friend. Of the plays of Aeschylus
only a tithe has come down to us, but in that tithe we find Supp. 186 ὄρῳ κόνις, ἀνανδόν
ἀγγελον στρατοῦ, and Sept. 79 μεθείται στρατός στρατόπεδον λιπὰν | ...αιθερια κόνις με
πεῖθεν φανείον | ἀνανδόσ σαφῆς ἐτύμος ἀγγελος. It may be guessed that by the time the
poet wrote this play—three years before his death—he had so familiarised his hearers with the conception of κόνις as an ἄγγελος στρατοῦ that he could dispense with an explicit reminder. The addition κασὶς πτηλοῦ ξύνουρος is mere ornament, like the ἀδήλην πυρὸς κάσιν of Sept. 481.

Now it will, I think, be admitted that this explanation, in referring the 'dust' to the approach of the king and his company, offers a conception intelligible and natural, if we can fairly find it in the words. The difficulties which Mr Housman leaves are those which he has himself perceived. First, although it is probable enough that the notion of 'dust' as 'announcing' the approach of a large body was familiar to the audience of Aeschylus, we still feel the want here of some indication that the dust is actually seen in the distant landscape. Secondly, we are still without light upon κασίς πτηλοῦ ξύνουρος διψία. Mr Housman justifies this as mere ornament by the traditional reference to Sept. 481. But the parallel will not bear examination. To describe the red smoke which proceeds from the mouth of a fire-breathing monster as 'smoke akin to fire' is ornament indeed, and appropriate ornament. But is it equally appropriate, is it ornamental at all, to describe the dust-cloud raised by men marching as thirsty dust, sister and neighbour to mire? Thirsty, though not very suitable to dust in the air, might pass as a mere epithet of dryness, but sister and neighbour to mire gives just the suggestions which are not appropriate. Here then are the points to which we should direct our attention.

Considering so, it will occur to us that the obscurest point of all, so far, is the word ξύνουρος. I have used above the common rendering 'neighbour'. But ξύνουρος really means conterminous, bordering upon, marching with, and is applied to contiguous territories or other figures of space. Now if we should grant that dust, as such, whether on clothes or in the air or wheresoever, might be called akin to mire, as being a thing of the same class (?), yet why should these kinsmen be contiguous? The idea of 'dust contiguous to mud' is simple enough; the dust of a road, for example, is 'contiguous' to the mud of the ditch: but dust in the air is not contiguous to mud, nor is dust in general. In short, to have a satisfactory sense, the description πτηλοῦ ξύνουρος κόνις must be not metaphorical at all, but local.

Now the speakers are looking out towards the sea over Argolis, a land so notorious for its dryness as to have been named from Homeric times The Thirsty (πολυδύσων Ἀργος, cf. Ἀργοὺς διψία χθῶν Eur. Alc. 563). The streams are scantly and in the summer fail entirely, so that

---

1 Some confirmatory evidence as to this will be found in my edition of the Septem, Appendix II.
the Argives had a legend that Poseidon, defeated in a contest with Athena for the possession of the land, avenged himself by cutting off the water (Pausanias 2. 15. 5). For this reason in the Supplices (784) the swarthy fugitives from Egypt, who have found refuge in Argolis, seeing that their pursuers are near, call upon the land to hide them, and wish that they might themselves be turned into dust and mix indistinguishably with the black clouds which are sweeping over the downs. In reference therefore to the plain of Argos the description δαφνία κόνις is not merely appropriate, but almost sufficient of itself in the circumstances to suggest the local use. But this dust is 'sister to the mire, contiguous to him'. Why so? Here is the more exact description of the plain of Argos: "The eastern side is much higher than the western; and the former suffers as much from a deficiency as the latter does from a superabundance of water. A recent traveller (Mure) says that the streams in the eastern part of the plain are all drunk up by the thirsty soil, on quitting their rocky beds for the deep arable land......The western part of the plain, on the contrary, is watered by a large number of streams, and at the south-western extremity near the sea there is besides a large number of copious springs, which make this part of the country a marsh or morass (the marsh of Lerna)......In the time of Aristotle this part of the plain was well-drained and fertile, but at the present day it is again covered with marshes' (Mure, abridged in Smith's Dictionary of Geography 1. p. 200). A glance at the map will show the situation; and see also the account in Pausanias (2. 36. 6—7) of the journey from Argos to Lerna. Now the mud or ooze of watery land, of the Egyptian Delta for instance, is called among other things πηλώς (see L. and Sc. s. v.). From these facts and the evidence of the context here it is a reasonable conclusion that the brother and sister whose lands lie side by side, the Dust and the Mire, is simply an ancient and traditional description of Argolis, parched in its eastern part, drenched in its western. The speakers are looking eastwards towards the sea, across the waterless region; and it is therefore the Sister, the Dust, which tells them that a large body of men is approaching from the port. Even if the conception of dust announcing an army was not, as it is likely to have been, an Aeschylean commonplace, the local description is quite sufficient to show what is meant, especially if interpreted, as on the stage, by the gestures of the actors. On seeing the herald they naturally look out over the country to see what comes behind. The sight of the dust assures them that he is followed by a crowd, and that his news therefore must be important and is probably decisive. As we have seen in the Introduction, the
party with the king would be large, consisting not only of his own soldiers and companions, but of those who had gone to meet him and bring him as rapidly as possible to the fortress. This indication that they are now in sight is important to the plot. The critical situation created by the arrival of the herald could not possibly have been maintained for any great length of time.


N.

vv. 578—584. ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖσιν Ἀργεῖων στρατοῦ νικᾶ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὖκ ἀντιρρέτει.

ὡς κομπάσαι τῶδ' εἰκὸς ἡλίον φάει ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης καὶ χθονός ποτωμένοις,

'Τροίην ἐλόντες δήποτε Ἀργεῖων στόλος θεοὺς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα δόμους ἐπασφάλευσαν ἀρχαῖον γάνος'.

The difficulty in vv. 580—581 is well known, and perhaps cannot be solved with certainty on the present materials. The points to observe are these: (1) the κόμπος or κομπάσμα is to be made throughout future time, as is shown by the expressions δήποτε and ἀρχαῖον, which would only become applicable long after. 'To such a case as this the use of an anticipatory (proleptic) predicate does not fairly extend, as the λάφυρα did not become an ἀρχαῖον γάνος by being nailed to the temples. It is natural that, in making the most of the triumph, the man should speak of eternal, not of immediate, fame. This indicates that it is the sun, and not any human person, who is the agent and herald of the κομπάσμα, as the grammar itself also suggests: for (2) the order of the words in v. 580 favours decidedly the close connexion of τῶδε...ηλίον φάει with εἰκός.

Another construction is indeed possible: we may take τῶδε φάει with κομπάσαι, either as temporal or as object (*boast to the sun, doubtful Greek but conceivable*), and make ἡμῖν, supplied from v. 578, depend on εἰκός. So it appears to be taken by all who retain the text, e.g. Paley “The sense is 'the Argives, as they joyfully speed on their way, may boast of having fixed up Trojan arms' etc.”

But those who reject this (Weil, Wecklein and others) are in my opinion so far right; for (i) the usual construction after εἰκός ἔστι is the accusative (not the dative) and infinitive, and in the accusative (ἡμᾶς) the pronoun, if the subject of κομπάσαι, would naturally be
thought; ποτωμέινος therefore (Stanley) not ποτωμένοις would have been written, especially as the accusative would have been free from ambiguity; and (ii) to speak of an army or of messengers as ‘flying over land and sea’, in the sense of ‘moving rapidly’, is not according to the habit of Greek metaphor. At least I can find nothing like it.

Of the suggestions made on the assumption that the text is unsound, the most probable is that of Merkel, that after v. 580 a verse is lost by which ποτωμένοις was explained. Against all the mere corrections (such as ποτωμένῳ Heath, τάδε...ποτώμενα Weil) there is this general objection, that they do not account for the reading we find. If the text is not sound, though I believe it is, we had better suppose a lacuna.

O.

v. 655. ἔννομοποι γάρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρὶν,
πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα, καὶ τὰ πίστει ἐδειξάτην
φθείροντε τὸν δύστην Ἀργείων στρατόν.

As to the primary meaning of these lines there is no difficulty. The only question to be raised is whether we are to look beyond this. It will be recognized as suitable to the genius of Greek tragedy that one who is unconsciously in imminent danger should unconsciously use expressions signifying his danger to the audience better informed. I believe that Aeschylus has here sought that effect. ‘A conspiracy’, says the man, ‘was made between utter foes, πῦρ and θάλασσα, and for pledge of their league they destroyed the hapless army of Argos’.

Now the speaker himself and the remnant that has returned are about to be ensnared, and some if not all of them to be slain, by ‘a conspiracy’ between two that had been utter foes’, Clytaemnestra, that is, and Aegisthus, the hereditary enemy of Agamemnon’s house. If then the parts of these two conspirators are properly symbolized by πῦρ and θάλασσα, the coincidence is not likely to be accidental.

Of the πῦρ it is unnecessary to say more. More than half of this play is occupied with the part which, under the direction of Aegisthus, ‘the fire’ contributes to the plot by which Agamemnon fell. It remains then to ask whether θάλασσα is in like manner a symbol of the part contributed by Clytaemnestra.

1 Cf. Cho. 976 ἔννομο improv μὲν θάνατων ἀθλίων πατρί καὶ ἔνθετων ταῦτα καὶ τάδ’ εὐφρός ἔχει, an allusion to details in the foregoing history which we have now no means of tracing. See note there; the doubtful reading does not affect the present question.
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Now if we read the strange and thrilling speech which the queen pronounces while her husband passes along the purple-strown pathway to his death (v. 949)

ἐστιν θάλασσα—τίς δὲ νῦν κατασβέσει;—
τρέφονσα τολλῆς πορφύρας ἢσάρυγνον
κηκίδα παγκαίνιστον, εἰμάτων βαφάς...

and compare it with her description of the bloody bath-robe folded about his corpse (v. 1382)

πλούτον εἴματος κακών,

and again with the description of the same as it is produced long after by Orestes (Cho. 1008)

μαρτυρεὶ δὲ μοι
φῶρος τόδε ὡς ἐβαψεν Ἀγάμεμνον ἕφως.
φόνον δὲ κηκὶς ἔστα χρόνῳ ἐνυμβάλλεται
τολλᾶς βαφᾶς φθείρωσα τοῦ ποικίλματος,

and again with the narrative of Orestes in the Eumenides (464)

ποικίλως ἀγρεύμασιν
κρύψας, ᾧ λουτρῶν ἐξεμαρτύρει φόνον,

we shall feel that the ‘sea (θάλασσα) full of welling crimson’, of which in the lines first quoted the murderess is really thinking, is the bloody bath, in which the colours of the fatal robe would be blotted out in one tint more precious than them all. Is there then reason to believe that the term θάλασσα was so applied to a bath as to make the phrase πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα in the passage before us intelligible as an allusion to it? I think there is. There is evidence that for a lustral bath of ceremony, such as was that which Agamemnon took, the term θάλασσα was technical. This supposition will explain a passage in Aristophanes, where the rites are described which are practised in curing the blind Plutus at the temple of Asclepius (Plut. 656),

πρῶτον μὲν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ἔγομεν,
ἐπειτ' ἔλούμεν.

There is nothing in the circumstances there described to make it likely that the real sea was accessible, and the abrupt appearance of this θάλασσα in the description has caused perplexity. But the difficulty disappears if the water of purification as such was called θάλασσα. And this is probable enough in itself. That mysterious qualities of purification were attributed to sea-water is shown by the proverb

θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τάνθρώπων κακά (Eur. Iph. Ῥ. 119).

There is nothing in the circumstances there described to make it likely that the real sea was accessible, and the abrupt appearance of this θάλασσα in the description has caused perplexity. But the difficulty disappears if the water of purification as such was called θάλασσα. And this is probable enough in itself. That mysterious qualities of purification were attributed to sea-water is shown by the proverb

θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τάνθρώπων κακά (Eur. Iph. Ῥ. 119).

1 Eum. 636 δροτγα περώτα λουτρά. It journey and from war would properly was the bath which one coming from a take as preliminary to sacrifice.
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Where the sea was accessible it was for lustral purposes preferred (Soph. *Ai. 654*), and for the purpose of lustration salt water was artificially made (Theocr. 24. 96). From this belief to a ritual use of the term for the water of ceremonial lustration, whether actually drawn from the sea or not, is a natural process of language; and that this step was actually taken is indicated by the gloss of Hesychius *θαλασσωθείς· ἄγνοιαμενός*.

We may conclude then that this ‘conspiracy of fire and sea-water, utter enemies before’ is a phrase intentionally ominous. It is manifest what an excellent opportunity for dramatic effect is given, when the man is made to speak in a manner so apt to startle the guilty consciences of those about him who are apprised of the deadly secret and at this moment are in the agony of suspense.

P.

*ν. 817. ἀµφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν.*

"About midnight, at which time the lion goes to his prey and Troy was taken. The poet naturally marks the hour according to the time of the representation of the play; for in the second half of March, when the Great Dionysia were celebrated, the setting of the Pleiads occurs for observers in Greece between ten and eleven at night (Keck, *Neue Jahrb. 1862, p. 518*)". Wecklein.

I mention this explanation, because the traditional interpretation, which I accept, is in my view of the play not unimportant to the plot. But I do not think the alternative possible. The passages cited by previous commentators (see the note) indicate that the setting of the *Pleiads* had a fixed conventional significance, established before the time of Aeschylus and still familiar; it marked the season of the winter storms and the end of the season for sailing. And apart from this, how, without specification of the time of year, could the setting of a constellation be used to mark an hour of the day? Surely the audience could not be expected to bethink themselves, or indeed to know, at what hour the Pleiads set at the time of the Great Dionysia; and even if they could, would it not be strange to make a character on the stage, suddenly and without indication of the purpose, use language not

---

1 My attention was directed to this gloss by Mr H. B. Smith, who also observes that in later Greek at least the term *θαλασσα* was used also for certain religious vessels; see e.g. Sophocles *Lexicon s.v. θαλασσιδων*. 
intelligible except under the particular circumstances of the representation? What, we may ask, did the poet intend to be done when the speech should be recited at other times of the year?

Nor is it clear why Agamemnon should recall the fact that Troy was taken at midnight. He had only too good reason for remembering at this moment that it was taken just before the season of storms. The details of the capture have no connexion with this play and are never mentioned in it. It is possible indeed to detect in this passage an allusion to the 'wooden horse', but it is doubtful and at any rate not essential.

Q.

vv. 887—894. λέγομεν ἄν ἄνδρα τόν ὑπέ τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα,...

διδούσα τηρεύσαι πηγαίον πέος,—

τετρανεύον ἔτος ἀναγκαῖον ἐκφυγεῖν ἀπαρχήν τοιοῦτοι τοῖνν αἰών προσφέρομασιν.

If this passage has been rightly explained above, much of the difficulty of it has been made by the specious emendation of Schütz, τοὶ νῦν for τοῖνν in v. 894. As I understand the words, τοῖνν is indispensable. The majority of recent texts have τοὶ νῦν, with full stops at πέος and at ἀπαρχή. Well however and others are justly dissatisfied, and for myself I scarcely think Mr Housman too trenchant when he says of this reading and punctuation "That Aeschylus did not put v. 893 where it now stands, severing v. 894 from the προσφέρομασιν to which it refers, is evident to every one who understands, I do not say the art of poetry, but I say the art of writing respectable verse" (Journal of Philology xvi. p. 269). Nor is the matter much mended if we move v. 893 to some other place. If the catalogue is supposed to be properly ended at πηγαίον πέος, there is no excuse for the addition of τοιοῦτοι τοί νῦν αἰών προσφέρομασιν as a separate remark. The fact is that v. 893—894 are feeble, irremediably feeble, both in themselves and in contrast to the noble lines which precede them; and if we are really to explain the passage, we must accept this bathos for part of what we have to explain. What the ms. gives us is certainly not successful eloquence; but was it meant to be?

To omit the two verses (one is not enough) is a simple method, but arbitrary. Mr Housman carries off vv. 890—893 (interchanged and slightly altered) to the end of the speech, and places them after v. 902.
R.

v. 922—933.

It has been noticed in the Introduction that this altercation between Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra may have different effects according to the manner in which we suppose it to be delivered and acted. Does the king willingly change his purpose? The general opinion, which in such a matter has much weight, seems to be that he does, that he is pleased by the pomp which he pretends to dislike, and gladly submits to the pretended compulsion.

Undoubtedly the words admit this, and the scene might be so acted. But it should be pointed out that neither the words nor the circumstances require it. Whatever the king’s wishes, he could not escape the scene prepared without a scandalous and ridiculous disturbance which the matter in itself was not worth. Mr Sidgwick (Introduction, p. xvii) speaks of ‘the almost pathetic futility of his pious caution in taking off his shoes, when at last he agrees to tread the purple’. The futility is apparent; and the act seems to be that of a man who dislikes what he is doing but cannot help himself. Clytaemnestra’s object in the whole demonstration is to exhibit the king to the gazers in an unpopular light, to make it appear that he has come back from Asia with his soldiers to assume (like some Pausanias) the state and manners of an Asiatic tyrant. He takes off his shoes by way of a counter-demonstration. But, as he remarks with vexation, he is still at a disadvantage (v. 937). Every one could see that his servants were prostrating themselves and spreading the pavement with carpets, while those at a distance could not appreciate or perceive his reluctance.

Our reading of the scene will depend on the view we take of the king’s state of mind in relation to his wife. The impression which his language makes upon me is that he hates her, or rather is prepared to hate her, as cordially as she hates him, that he suspects her to be the chief thing ἐσοφ ὑπὲρ φαρμάκων πιστεύω, and that if he had lived another day, she and her abettors would have assisted at a memorable demonstration of his ‘kindly surgery’. If he does not fear her, that is because he is ignorant of all that makes her formidable.

There is another point in this scene which is worth notice, as illustrating the supposed relations between the pair. If the king has the slightest regard for his wife or attributes to her any affection for him, why does he insult her by his behaviour to Cassandra? Would
an Athenian audience have thought it decent in a returning husband to bring a δορίκτητον λέχος along with him in state to the door of his own house, and give to the mistress of it a public order to receive her kindly? Contrast the behaviour which Sophocles attributes in like circumstances even to the Heracles of the *Trachiniae* (225 foll.), the indignation of the spectators when his purpose is discovered, and the bitter feelings of Deianira herself. The language of the king respecting Cassandra, and the manner in which he puts her forward, has but one possible meaning; and if anything is required to perfect the outrage, it is the canting phrase with which it is accompanied. There is at any rate no doubt that this is the view of Clytaemnestra (see v. 1438 foll.).

S.

vv. 966—969. τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπέδως
δεύμα προστατήριον
καρδίας τερασκόπον ποτάται,
μαντιπολεῖ δ’ κτλ.

The question of the possibility of the reading δεύμα, as against δείγμα the conjecture of Triclinius, depends upon our conception of the metaphor by which this passage holds together. The boding heart is a τερασκόπος, i.e. α μάντις, a professional interpreter of signs, prodigies etc. What may be the relation to this figure of the words δεύμα προστατήριον ποτάται?

Firstly προστατήριος, a word of well-marked associations, signifies *standing before* or *set before a door* or *gate*, and applies usually to images of the gods there placed (as in this scene). Secondly, we observe that the speakers have not a definite anticipation but only a vague surmise of something wrong; or, to put the same thing in terms of the metaphor, the heart is not actually prophesying but only offering to prophesy. Thus, to satisfy the context, δεύμα προστατήριον τερασκόπον should be something *set before the door of a μάντις* to advertise him as such: and this something, it would seem, ποτάται, *i.e. hovers or flutters*.

It is a coincidence odd, if accidental, that in another place we find again the word δεύμα associated with similar expressions. In the *Acharnians* (989) Dicaeopolis has retired into his house to prepare a feast of the birds which he has bought from the Boeotian; and the Chorus outside perceive traces of the preparations in the feathers which are flung out before the door. This they describe in the odd phrase
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tou bion δ' εξέβαλε δείγμα τάδε τα πτερά πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν. The words tou bion δείγμα, as an advertisement of his way of living, are not such as would first occur, but must be recommended by some familiar association. The two passages suggest, I think, that the professional μάντις used a δείγμα or sign before his door, and that this sign was a feather or feathers (πτερά), a rebus explaining itself by the fact that πτέρον means an omen. (Aristophanes perhaps borrowed from this custom the notion of a dealer in πτέρα (wings) which is used in the Birds; see v. 1330 σ' ἐν δὲ τα πτερὰ πρώτον διάθες τάδε κόσμω. τα τε μονόχρονοι τα τε μαντικά καὶ τα βαλάττα κτλ.) If this were so, the meaning of Aeschylus would be simple, Why doth my heart, prophet-like, still set in front this fluttering sign?

At any rate here is reason for retaining δείγμα provisionally and on the chance of more certain information: δείμα, obvious as it is, does not well satisfy the other words, especially προστατήριον.

Τ.

τυ. 995—1000. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων
κτησίων, ὄκνος βαλὼν
σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου,
οὐκ ἐδυ πρόπας δόμος
παμονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν,
οὐδ' ἐποντίσε σκάφος.

"...Σφενδόνη, as the Lexicon will show, has many meanings, and this passage demands one more......The main idea of the word, as of the English sling, seems to be not throwing but suspension. Thus 'a sling for the arm', 'a suspending bandage', and the 'bezel', which contains the jewel of a ring, are called σφενδόνη. It is possible that some kind of instrument for suspending and weighing heavy goods was called a sling; and εὐμέτρος points to something like this. In that case ὄκνος βαλὼν would be not the terror which flings away a cargo in a storm, but the prudent apprehension which rejects and refuses to embark part of a load found to be too heavy for the boat, though it would always be more profitable to take more. This would not be open to the just objection of Mr Housman against the common view, that ὄκνος means properly not terror but shrinking, hesitating: ὄκνος would not suggest but prevent such prompt action as throwing away cargo in a storm. And we have then also a better explanation of ἀπό, discharging
from the scale. This would give the sense adopted in the translation” (ed. 1).

Since this was written, an almost exact parallel has been pointed out by Mr W. Wyse (Class. Rev. xiv. 5). “One of the inscriptions discovered by the French at Delphi proves that a σφευδόνη was part of an ‘elevator’ (tollendo) used in unloading vessels. The document...was first published by Bourquet (Bull. de Corr. Hell. 20, 1896, p. 197 sqq.) and is now to be found in Michel, Recueil d’Inscriptions Grecques, n. 591, Dittenberger, S. I. G.² n. 140, Baunack, Sammlung d. Griech. Dialekt-Inscrisifen, Bd ii. Hft 6, n. 2502, p. 652”. By this positive evidence (q.v.) the above guess is raised, I think, to a fair degree of certainty.

U.

v. 1076. αὐτοφόνα κακὰ κάρτα: ναι, ἀνθρωσφαγεῖον κτλ.
v. 1081. κλαίομενα τὰ βρέφη σφαγᾶς ὅπτας τε σάρκας κτλ.

M 1076 καρτάναι, 1081 τάδε.

In spite of the scholium ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄγγλον, which assumes that καρτάναι stands for καὶ ἀρτάνα, they are right who hold that the word ἀρτάνη did not here occur. Hanging was to the Greeks a type of suicide (v. 866), and with neither hanging nor suicide have we anything to do. Most of the bolder suggestions, e.g. καράτομα (Kayser), proceed on the assumption that the metre of v. 1076 should be corrected to that of v. 1081. But the error is rather in v. 1081.

In v. 1076 Cassandra, as the elders observe, is ‘tracking the scent’ of the Thyestean crime, coming nearer to it with each word: Nay, it is an accursed house, full of guilty secrets, yea, of murders unnatural, aye verify, a place where human victims bleed, where babes besprinkle the altar. The asseverations μὲν οὖν, κάρτα, and ναι mark the growing clearness and certainty, till it rises (v. 1080) to actual vision. The word κάρτα, here qualifying αὐτοφόνα, is a favourite with the poet.

In v. 1081 on the other hand we should adopt for τάδε the archaic demonstrative τα, in which reading the later mss. (Florentinus, Venetus, Farnesianus) agree. It would almost seem as if they must have been guided by some note or tradition, independent of M, which has now disappeared. At any rate it is likely enough that τάδε, a correct explanation of τα, should have come wrongly into the text of M, as τάδε (a not very correct explanation) has for τα in v. 175.
The question presented by this last line does not perhaps admit a complete answer. But I would call attention to a consideration overlooked. It is commonly assumed that ἐμπέδω is wrong. But it is, I submit, certain that ἐμπέδω is right. Let us consider what the context requires: ἔγω δὲ κτλ. answers to πόλιν μὲν κτλ., the second part of a dependent antithesis being turned, as often in poetry (e.g. v. 1287), into an independent sentence; 'Alas! how many a victim from his rich herds did my father sacrifice on behalf of his town! Yet they availed not at all to save the city from receiving such fate as it hath, while I' etc. In spite of Priam's offerings, he and his are utterly destroyed, all but Cassandra, and she will soon be added to the rest. Such is the connexion of thought.

Now we must not suppose that by error the ms. could offer exactly what is wanted to round off the period effectively, that is to say, an antithesis bringing together Cassandra and Priam. That θερμόνος hot-brained, rash-witted is in itself a good word is not disputed, nor that it fitly applies to Cassandra, as she was regarded by her incredulous countrymen. But ἐμπέδως (τὸν νοῦν) solid or sound (of judgment) is not only a good antithesis to θερμόνος, but is applied in Homer as a characteristic description to Priam, e.g. II. 20. 183 εἰσὶν γάρ οἱ (Πράμω) παῖδες, δὲ ἐμπέδως οὐδὲ ἁσίφρων. The contrast of the epithets here (ἔγω θερμόνος, ἐμπέδως αὐτῷ), when the prophecies of the 'sick-brained' Cassandra have been realized in the ruin of her 'wise' father and all his kin, is surely not accidental. Whoever wrote ἐμπέδω meant to oppose it, as the Homeric epithet of Priam, to θερμόνος. Neither is it in the manner of ancient editors, so far as we know them. Indeed an editor capable of it must have known more about Aeschylus than is known now, and have had better material for his text.

From this antithesis then we should start, whether for interpretation or correction. Nor is there room for much variation of meaning: ἔγω δὲ θερμόνος τάχα πρὸς ἐμπέδων αὐτῶν ἔρρησον—something like this is what we should look for. But again, in the verb at least this is what we have; for that the intransitive βάλλειν to fall, to go was used for
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\[\text{225}\]

\[\text{\varepsilon\rho\rho\varepsilon} \text{ appears in the popular phrases \text{\beta\alpha\lambda} \varepsilon \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha, \text{\beta\alpha\lambda} \varepsilon \kappa\omicron\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\varepsilon \text{ etc.: nor are we in a position to say that the popular use might not find a parallel in poetry.}\]

The question then narrows itself to this, whether the case of \text{\varepsilon\mu\pi\acute{e}\vdot{u}} could be constructed with \text{\beta\alpha\lambda\dot{w}} in the sense required. An ordinary locative dative would offer no difficulty. In the older grammar of poetry \text{\beta\alpha\lambda\nu\nu} (in the sense of \text{going to}) would naturally take that case, on the analogy of \text{\pi\acute{e}\dot{i}\nu \pi\acute{e}e, \sigma\delta\epsiloni \iota\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta, \theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\gamma \\epsilon\lambda\sigma\omega \iota' \text{\'A\chi\omega\nu\sigma\nu} \text{ etc.} \text{(Kühner, Gr. Gramm. \S 423. 4; Monro, Homeric Grammar \S 145. 4) and of the transitive \text{\beta\alpha\lambda\nu\nu} \text{(Eur. Med. 1285 etc.)}. The extant \text{locative datives of persons} \text{'(Monro, H. G. \S 145. 4) do not offer a parallel, and we should not expect it. But there is perhaps reason here for a construction not exactly proper to a personal object. The ruined city, the slaughtered Trojans, and the dead king, who is the type of the whole, are not here truly conceived as personal. They are, if we may mark the latent metaphor more precisely, the heap \text{on which the survivor will soon be flung}. In these circumstances a locative case is not to be hastily condemned. If there is error, it should be in \text{\beta\alpha\lambda\dot{w}}.}\]

The elision of \text{\tau\acute{a}x\dot{a} is noticeable, being generally confined in Aeschylus to set phrases such as \text{\tau\acute{a}x\dot{a} \acute{\iota}n, \tau\acute{a}x\dot{a} \epsilon\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\alphai (see on v. 898), but it is not a ground for objection.}\]

\[\text{W.}\]

\[v. 1210. \ \text{XO.} \ \text{\pi\omega\varsigma \delta\eta\gamma \acute{\alpha}n\acute{a}kt\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha \ \text{\Deltao\xi\iota\omicron \k\acute{o}t\acute{w};}\]

\[\text{KA.} \ \text{\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omicron\nu \sigma\delta\epsilon\dot{e}n\nu \sigma\delta\epsilon\dot{e}n \\dot{\omega} \text{\tau\acute{a}d \ \eta\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron.}\]

All texts here adopt some conjectural reading, for the most part one of these two:

\[\text{\pi\omega\varsigma \delta\eta\gamma \acute{\alpha}n\acute{a}kt\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha \ \text{\Deltao\xi\iota\omicron \k\acute{o}t\acute{w}; Wieseler:}\]

\[\text{\pi\omega\varsigma \delta\eta\gamma \acute{\alpha}n\acute{a}kt\acute{o} \ \acute{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha \ \text{\Deltao\xi\iota\omicron \k\acute{o}t\acute{w}; Canter:}\]

both assuming the sense to be \text{How then did Apollo punish thee?} From the first, though \text{\acute{a}n\acute{a}kt\acute{o}\varsigma} is weak and the use of \text{\acute{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha \text{ (didst thou feel) doubtful, the sense sought can perhaps be obtained. The second, though largely supported, seems impossible. The words could only mean \text{How then didst thou escape the anger of Loxias?}, to which the answer does not correspond\text{;} nor can the Elders, who know the story by}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1} On the alleged parallel in Cho. 539 see note there.}\]

\[\text{V. \AE. A.}\]

\[15\]
rumour (v. 1083) and are drawing it out by leading questions, possibly assume that Cassandra did escape.

But further there is error in the assumption, common to both suggestions, as to the sense required. There is nothing in the foregoing narrative to prompt the question *How then did Apollo punish thee?* The god might have taken vengeance in a hundred ways. From the emphasis laid upon ἡλίθινος in vv. 1208 and 1209 the point appears to be this. Before Cassandra proved false, Apollo had already conferred the prophetic gift. Now it was the established rule that "the gods themselves cannot recall their gifts". How then, asks the enquirer, could he undo what had been done? Cassandra answers that he did so, and shows how. He left the prophetic gift (which he might not take away) but yet effectually annulled it by causing her never to be believed.

From this point of view we shall see that there is in v. 1210 no error at all, or at most an error of accentuation. Ἄνακτος is not the genitive of ἀνακτήσις but the verbal adjective from ἀνάγεω, represented in Latin by *revocabilis*. That which is ὅποι ἄνακτόν τινα, alicui non revocable, is that which he cannot bring back or which, as we should say, 'has escaped beyond his recall'. Cassandra, having received the stipulated reward upon a mere promise and before performance, might have seemed to be beyond the recall of Loxias' wrath; and the question asked is, how then the angry god could bring her back. The use of the word was probably suggested by the legal associations of ἀνάγεω and ἀναγωγή as applied to the process for the recovery of what was paid by mistake or fraud.

In vv. 1205—1208 there is dispute as to the meaning of παλαιστής, νόμως, and ἡδημένη, upon which I shall only say that I believe the text to be sound.

**X.**

vv. 1227—1229. οὐκ οἴδεν οἷα γλῶσσα μιστηῆς κυνός,

λέξασα κακτείνασα φαίδρονος δίκην

ἄτις λαθραίον, τεύξεται κακῇ τύχῃ.

The explanation which I take from Mr Macnaghten and Prof. Bury (partly anticipated many years ago by Mr E. S. Thompson) is open to one objection. There is undoubtedly great boldness of metaphor in saying that ‘a tongue...reaches forth a cast’. But there is no mixture of metaphors, for there is only one metaphor: γλῶσσα is not meta-

---

1 On the question of accentuation see ἔπακτος or ἔπακτός.
phorical; neither is κυνός, being simply an opprobrious term for the adulteress. Except in ἐκτείνασα δίκην (secondary sense) there is no metaphor, and to this metaphor τεῦξεται is adapted. The words γλώσσα and δίκην are far from each other, and the transition is smoothed by the intermediate steps λέξασα and ἐκτείνασα. The real subject being Clytaemnestra, γλώσσα easily drops out of view. Also the allusive force of ἐκτείνασα and of δίκην would palliate what otherwise might not please. When a writer wishes to make verbal points of this kind (and Aeschylus loved them), he often does some violence to his language. The transition supposed is different in kind from the unthinkable imagery of γλώσσα κυνός λείξασα κάκτεινασα φαιδρόν οὐς (Ahrens and Madvig) 'a tongue licking and pointing a joyful ear'.

It is no objection to Prof. Bury's view that we have no other specimen of δίκη (or δικη) = βόλος. Δίκη necessarily meant cast in Greek, as long as the verb δικεῖν existed and was known, and might have been used in that sense, for such a purpose as the present, even if no one had done so before or did so afterwards.

The reading adopted by Dr Wecklein is

οὐκ οἶδεν οἶαν γλώσσα μυστή, κυνός
λείξασα κάκτείνασα φαιδρόν οὐς δίκην,
ἀταν λαθραίον κτλ.

The suggestion to separate κυνός from the preceding words and to write μυστή is attributed to Kirchhoff. I mention this as being the only version adopting the readings λείξασα (Tywhitt) and φαιδρόν οὖς (Ahrens, Madvig), which appears tolerable. But it does not really avoid the fatal phrase γλώσσα...ἐκτείνασα οὕς: and moreover the positions of the words κυνός...δίκην make it difficult to suppose that they mean like a dog.

Y.

v. 1266. ιτ' ἐς φθόνον, πεσόντα θε' ὅθ' ἀμείβομαι, (?)

With diffidence I repeat here the conjecture offered in the Appendix to my edition of the Medea (and adopted by Mr Sidgwick) ΠΕΚΟΝ-ΤΑΘΩΔ for ΠΕΚΟΝΤΑΓΑΘΩΔ, literally 'and now ye are down, thus I requite you', to be explained by the action of trampling upon them, whence ἄλλην ἀτην in the next verse. It has the advantage of accounting perfectly by repetition of letters (ΤΑΤΑ whence ΤΑΓΑ), for the corruption: see a parallel in v. 222 ΤΕΓΕ for γε. I retain however ἀμείβομαι, the original reading of f, not the future ἀμείψαμαι, easily
explained as an alteration to suit διαφθερῶ. Hermann's ἐγὼ δ' ἄμ. ἐψομαί is followed by Dindorf, Wecklein and others. But v. 1267 points to retaining the verb ἀμείβομαι.

See however Munro (J. Ph. xi. p. 139) and Mr R. A. Nicholson (Class. Rev. xiii. 272). Mr Nicholson objects that πεσόντα is weak, and suggests κάτω γὰρ δδ' ἀμείβομαι I pass to the world below thus (without adornment). I still think my conjecture possible and even probable, but prefer not to place it in the text.

Z.

vv. 1276—1277. βωμοῦ πατρὸς δ' ἀντ' ἐπιλείψον μένει θερμῷ κοπείσης φοινίῳ προσφάγματι.

These verses have been interpreted as if θερμῷ φοινίῳ προσφάγματι were an instrumental dative, with hot and bloody sacrifice. For πρόσφαγμα is cited Eur. Τro. 624, where προσφάγματα is used of Polyxena slain at the tomb of Achilles, Eur. Hec. 41 (of Polyxena), id. Hel. 1255, id. Alc. 845. The meaning of προ- in the compound, as in other compounds, probably varied. In general it meant on behalf of (προ- = ὑπ' ὑπ'); thus while the living chiefs received their allotted captives, Polyxena was slain on behalf of the dead Achilles. So in Eur. Iph. Τ: 458, the victims of Artemis are πρόσφαγμα θεᾶς slain for the goddess, where the object of the preposition is expressed. But Eur. Hel. 1255, προσφάζεται μὲν αἷμα πρώτα νερτήρως, shows that προ- easily lent itself to the temporal sense, 'the blood shed first', the 'opening sacrifice', and that is perhaps rather the meaning here. At the same time the meaning 'a sacrifice for the dead' is not inappropriate, since Agamemnon and his paramour are 'wedded in death' according to the grim conception of Clytaemnestra (v. 1447) and each therefore slain for the other.

But θερμῷ should be a predicate and equivalent to θερμῷ ὀντί. In Aeschylus, where two adjectives are used, one is usually a predicate (see on Theb. 850), and here the separate and emphatic position of θερμῷ marks it as such.

The construction of the dative is that which with strictly personal subjects is found even in the older prose, and might be called a dative 'absolute' with as much or as little propriety as the corresponding genitive (Gildersleeve, Pindar Ol. and Pyth., Preface p. xciii). The genitive 'absolute' indicates that the act or condition described by it stands in a relation to the main act conceived as resembling that of the
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origin or 'point from which', or some other relation expressed by this case. Where the relation to be described resembles rather that of the dative, the older language uses that case also with freedom. Most common are datives 'absolute' modelled on the personal dative 'of interest' e.g. Herod. 6. 21 ποιήσαντι Φρωνίωρ δράμα Μιλήτου άλωσιν είς δάκρυα ἐπειτο τὸ θέτρον, Thuc. 4. 120 ἀποστάσει δ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Βρασίδας διέπλευε: but there are also datives 'absolute' resembling the instrumental, as Theocr. 13. 29 Ἐλλασπόντων ἰκόντο νότῳ τρίτον ἄμαρ ἄετη, and others again where, as with the genitive, special relation disappears in the general relation of circumstance, Xen. Ages. 1. 2 τοῖς προγόνοις ὑμοζομένοις, ἀπομηνυμενεθαὶ ὑποστός ἀψ 'Ἡρακλέους ἐγένετο, Pind. Ol. 2. 76 λείψῃ Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέτη Πολυνείκει etc. (See for a large collection of examples Kühner, Gr. Gramm. § 423, 25, f, and also note on Theb. 217.) The use is very seldom found in the fully developed prose style, having been driven out partly by the genitive, partly by the more precise though more cumbrous use of prepositions or of dependent clauses with conjunctions. So in Eum. 592 οὗ κειμένω πω τόνδε κομπάξεις λόγον the dative represents what a prose-writer would more accurately have expressed by ἐπί, or, if he had used a simple case at all, by the genitive κειμένων. See also Ag. 1298, and note there. Here the relation of the dative, so far as it is specialized, is partly that of 'interest', extended to a subject not strictly personal, partly that of mere succession to, as in vv. 1171, 1338 and Soph. O. T. 175 ἄλλον δ' ἄν ἄλλῳ (one after another) προσίδως ὁμοιν, where see Prof. Jebb's note. Either way the meaning is that the slain Agamemnon will immediately receive another victim in Cassandra.

The use of this dative 'absolute' is particularly natural here (and for a similar reason in Theb. 217) where the genitive case is appropriated, so to speak, by κοπείσης. As to this genitive itself, which is sometimes suspected, it would seem that no other case could be used: κοπεὶσαν with μένει would hardly be correct; a present or future participle would be required. But κοπείσης as explained in the note is really general and therefore properly in the aorist.
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On the correspondence of Strophe and Antistrophe.

On this subject, which is happily not very important to the play before us, I shall be as brief as possible, referring the reader to my edition of the Seven against Thebes, Appendix I., the conclusions of which I shall here assume. “Upon the whole review, we see that three types of variation from strict syllabic correspondence are common in the Seven against Thebes—for we are not justified in assuming that an equal strictness must be found in all the works even of the same poet—(1) a ‘syncopated’ foot answering to a complete foot¹; (2) the trochaic or ‘cyclic’ dactyl answering to a trochee proper; (3) a long syllable in ‘thesis’ answering to a short syllable”. I have reason to believe that the evidence offered for this has been found satisfactory, and as to (1), the only part of the statement likely to cause surprise, I may now cite the express agreement of Dr Fennell².

The case of the Agamemnon is different. The tradition presents indeed not a few departures from syllabic correspondence. They are of exactly the same kind as those which are common in the Septem and, taken in connexion with them, are not open to reasonable suspicion. But they are exceptional; and in general this play exhibits a much nearer approach than the Septem to the stricter treatment which seems to have been approved by Sophocles. This fact, we may observe, so far from diminishing the strength of the evidence for these variations, increases it very greatly. If Aeschylus had always used the stricter system, and if the departures from it in the ms. text were the result of erroneous copying, we should expect to find them on the average

¹ = --, in musical notation ↓ = \(\text{\Large \{}\text{\Large \}}\).

² The Parodos of Aeschylus’ Septem etc. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1889.
equally prevalent in different plays. And the contrary fact points to the contrary inference.

I will now simply enumerate in classes the variations which may be called regular, and add a few words on some cases of more peculiarity or difficulty.

§ 1. \(-\rightarrow(\downarrow,\downarrow,\downarrow)\).

\{205. \(\nu\nu\) | \(\omega\nu\) | \(\kappa\nu\) | \(\pi\epsilon\sigma\mu\) | \(\tau\nu\) \}
\{218. \(\tau\kappa\) | \(\nu\nu\ \delta\nu\) | \(\epsilon\nu\) | \(\omega\ \delta\nu\mu\) | \(\omega\nu\) \}

The vertical lines mark the divisions of the feet. The mark \(\rightarrow\) indicates the ‘holding’ of the preceding note.

\{380. \(\pi\rho\) | \(\epsilon\sigma\tau\) | \(\tau\nu\tau\) | \(\epsilon\chi\) | \(\nu\nu\sigma\tau\) \}
\{397. \(\pi\rho\) | \(\beta\nu\lambda\nu\) | \(\pi\alpha\sigma\ \alpha\) | \(\phi\epsilon\tau\sigma\) | \(\alpha\tau\sigma\) \}
\{384. \(\pi\sigma\tau\) | \(\omicron\theta\ \delta\) | \(\omicron\nu\kappa\) | \(\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\beta\) | \(\eta\) \}
\{401. \(\tau\rho\mu\) | \(\omega\) | \(\kappa\nu\) | \(\pi\rho\sigma\beta\) | \(\lambda\alpha\sigma\) \}
\{387. \(\pi\nu\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\) | \(\mu\epsilon\iota\zeta\nu\) | \(\eta\ \delta\kappa\) | \(\alpha\omega\) \}
\{404. \(\delta\) | \(\omega\) | \(\kappa\nu\) | \(\pi\alpha\sigma\) | \(\pi\tau\alpha\nu\) | \(\omicron\rho\nu\nu\) \}

\{388. \(\phi\epsilon\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\) | \(\delta\omega\mu\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\ \nu\) | \(\tau\nu\) | \(\phi\nu\) | \(\phi\nu\) \}
\{405. \(\tau\nu\) | \(\epsilon\nu\) | \(\pi\rho\sigma\) | \(\tau\mu\mu\) | \(\alpha\) | \(\phi\nu\) | \(\tau\nu\) | \(\theta\epsilon\) \}

\{390. \(\mu\alpha\nu\tau\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\sigma\ \alpha\pi\) | \(\alpha\rho\kappa\) | \(\epsilon\nu\) | \(\epsilon\nu\ \pi\rho\alpha\pi\) | \(\delta\omega\nu\) | \(\lambda\alpha\) | \(\chi\omega\tau\) \}
\{407. \(\tau\nu\delta\nu\) | \(\pi\nu\sigma\tau\rho\) | \(\phi\nu\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\) | \(\phi\omega\ \alpha\delta\kappa\) | \(\omicron\nu\) | \(\kappa\nu\) | \(\alpha\nu\rho\) \}

\{414. \(\kappa\nu\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\) | \(\lambda\nu\chi\nu\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\nu\ \tau\nu\) | \(\kappa\nu\nu\) | \(\nu\nu\ \nu\nu\) | \(\nu\nu\) \}
\{430. \(\pi\rho\) | \(\epsilon\sigma\iota\) | \(\delta\xi\) | \(\alpha\) | \(\phi\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\nu\) | \(\alpha\) | \(\chi\nu\) | \(\nu\nu\ \nu\nu\) | \(\alpha\nu\nu\) \}

\{449. \(\psi\gamma\mu\mu\) | \(\delta\nu\sigma\delta\kappa\) | \(\rho\nu\nu\) | \(\alpha\nu\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\) | \(\omicron\) | \(\sigma\nu\sigma\) | \(\omicron\nu\) | \(\gamma\nu\) | \(\mu\nu\) \}
\{467. \(\tau\nu\nu\ \tau\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\nu\) | \(\nu\nu\ \gamma\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\nu\) | \(\pi\nu\nu\) | \(\nu\nu\) \}

\{699. \(\kappa\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu\) | \(\tau\nu\) | \(\Sigma\mu\mu\) | \(\epsilon\nu\tau\sigma\) | \(\alpha\kappa\tau\) | \(\alpha\epsilon\) | \(\alpha\xi\) | \(\alpha\xi\) | \(\phi\nu\nu\) | \(\nu\nu\) \}
\{715. \(\pi\sigma\mu\rho\pi\rho\sigma\) | \(\eta\ \tau\nu\nu\) | \(\theta\rho\nu\nu\) | \(\alpha\nu\) | \(\alpha\nu\nu\) | \(\alpha\mu\nu\pi\nu\) | \(\omicron\nu\tau\nu\) \}
\{1482. \(\eta\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\nu\) | \(\omicron\kappa\sigma\iota\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\) | \(\delta\nu\mu\mu\nu\) | \(\kappa\nu\beta\nu\) \}
\{1506. \(\omicron\nu\mu\nu\) | \(\alpha\nu\nu\) | \(\alpha\iota\iota\iota\iota\) | \(\iota\) | \(\tau\nu\nu\) | \(\omicron\) | \(\omicron\tau\nu\) | \(\omicron\) \}

Some of these variations may, as we should expect, be reduced to syllabic regularity by such expedients as the insertion of \(\tau\nu\) or \(\gamma\epsilon\). But others cannot. No objection, except that grounded on metre,

1 But see note \(ad\ \text{loc.}\).
2 Not that these insertions are justified by the usage of the poet. Both in

205 and in 401 the inserted \(\tau\nu\) is otiose and undesirable.
lies against ὄκους τοίοςδε in v. 1482. In v. 414 the supposed metrical difficulty has led to criticisms and proposals, which without it would not have been entertained. In the order of the words ἀσπίστορας κλόνως λογχὴμος τε (i.e. κλόνως ἀσπίστορας λογχὴμος τε δίν of shield and spear) there is nothing irregular: τε follows according to rule the word (λογχὴμος) which it serves to couple on: and where adjectives are thus coupled by τε, some other word frequently stands between them, e.g. in Eur. Hec. 267 αἰχμάλωτον χρῆ τιν' ἐκκριτον θανεῖν κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν (i.e. ἐκκριτον...κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν). On the other hand the double change proposed for the sake of syllabic responson (ἀσπίστορας κλόνως τε καὶ λογχὴμος ναυβάτας θ' ὑπλισμοίς) makes an arrangement not only irregular but obscure. The first τε, however it be taken, is both useless and misplaced.

§ 2. — = in the unaccented part of the foot.

This (the 'unnatural' long syllable of H. Schmidt's terminology) is found in almost all poets and in every kind of metre. It occurs in the strophae of the Agamemnon with moderate frequency.

{192. χαρ | υς βι | αως | σέλμα
   200. ἐξ | ον παλ | ἵρρο | θοις εν

{207. τριβ | ω κατ | εξ — | αινον | ανθος | Ἀργει | ον.
   220. ρεεθ | ροις πατ | ρο — | ονς χερ | ας βω | μον πελ | ας.

Here, as is not uncommonly the case, the feet interchange. All the feet are equal, most of them true trochees, the second in each set (not counting the anacrusis) a 'syncopated' trochee, while the trochaic — appears in the fifth foot of the first set, and in the fourth foot of the second. So also in the first feet of vv. 392, 3, 4 compared with vv. 409, 10, 11 and in the last foot of v. 393 compared with that of v. 410. So in vv. 426, 27, 28. So in v. 1105 γενει by 1119 τείχει: see Soph. O. C. 1557 and 1568. So in the first syllable (anacrusis) of v. 1162 νευγνός compared with v. 1173 καὶ τίς σε.

One or two more cases are doubtful. In v. 1469 the correction ἐμπιτνεῖς is probable, in v. 1512 προβαίνων is not improbable. In v. 462 Orelli's conjecture ἔχοντας would give an instance, but the ms. ἔχοντας is better.

1 According to the ms. there would be a 'syncopated' foot in v. 441 ουσ — | μεν γαρ ε | πεμψεν: but see note there.
§ 3. \( \text{Apple} + + \text{Pear} + + \text{Apple} \). 

This, which in the *Septem* is scarcely less frequent than (1) and (2), is in the *Agamemnon* rare. Two examples are close together:

\[
\begin{align*}
&718. \quad \varepsilon & \theta \rho \varepsilon \psi & | & \epsilon \nu \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon & | & \omega \nu \tau o \sigma & | & \iota & - \\
& & \nu \nu \nu \delta \omicron & | & \omicron \omicron \alpha \gamma \alpha & | & \lambda \alpha \kappa \tau \omicron \nu & | & \omicron \iota & - \\
& & \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu & | & \gamma \rho \phi \lambda \omicron & | & \mu \alpha \sigma \tau \omicron \nu & \\
& & \epsilon \nu \beta \omicron & | & \tau \omicron \nu \pi \tau \omicron \tau \epsilon & | & \lambda \epsilon \omega \iota \omicron & | & \epsilon \tau \omicron \omega \iota \omicron & | & \epsilon \tau \omicron \omega \iota \omicron & | & \epsilon \tau \omicron \omega \iota \omicron
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&728. \quad \chi \rho \omicron & | & \nu \omicron \sigma & | & \theta \omicron \epsilon \iota \delta \alpha \tau \epsilon & | & \delta \omicron \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu \epsilon & | & \eta & - \\
& & \theta \omicron \sigma \tau \omicron & | & \pi \rho \omicron \tau \omicron \kappa \epsilon & | & \omega \nu \chi \alpha \rho & | & \iota & - \\
& & \gamma \alpha \tau \rho \omicron \phi & | & \alpha \iota & | & \mu \epsilon \beta \omega \omicron & \\
& & \mu \eta \lambda \omicron \phi \omicron \nu & | & \omega \omicron \iota \nu & | & \alpha \tau \omicron \omega \iota \omicron & | & \epsilon \tau \omicron \omega \iota \omicron & | & \epsilon \tau \omicron \omega \iota \omicron
\end{align*}
\]

Both the last lines have been variously emended, but the suggested changes in v. 730 (e.g. τροφάς ἀπαμείβων) are doubtful and those in v. 731 (see note there) more so. The mere fact that the same peculiarity occurs in two successive lines is a reason for thinking that there is no error. Such variations are naturally often grouped together. See also v. 715, as given in § 1 above. In v. 412 we should perhaps retain κλοπαῖς, and in v. 458 προδίκουσιν.

§ 4. \( \text{Apple} + + \text{Pear} + + \text{Apple} \).

This, the ‘resolution of a long syllable’, is not unfrequent.

\[
\begin{align*}
&734. \quad \lambda \alpha \kappa \tau \omicron & | & \alpha \omicron \tau \omicron \mu \epsilon \gamma & | & \alpha \lambda \alpha \delta \iota \kappa & | & \alpha \iota & - \\
&741. \quad \eta \omega \chi \nu & | & \nu \epsilon \xi \epsilon \nu & | & \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \pi \tau \epsilon & | & \epsilon \zeta & - \\
&747. \quad \alpha & | & \tau \lambda \omicron \sigma \tau & | & \tau \lambda \alpha \sigma & | & \pi \omicron \lambda \nu \delta & | & \alpha \iota & | & \epsilon \omicron \iota & | & \nu & - \\
&743. \quad \beta \epsilon & | & \beta \alpha \kappa \nu \epsilon & | & \omega \omicron \iota \phi \iota \iota & | & \omega \nu & | & \mu \omicron \epsilon \theta & | & \nu \sigma \tau \epsilon & | & \omicron & - \\
&7109. \quad \epsilon \kappa \alpha \sigma & | & \pi \omicron \sigma \tau \omicron \tau & | & \epsilon \iota & - \\
&71098. \quad \chi \rho \omicron \iota \omicron & | & \rho \epsilon \gamma \omicron & | & \omicron & - \\
\end{align*}
\]

See also vv. 422, 1110, 1162, 1454, and 1482. Some of these can be removed by plausible changes, some not without violence.

I have reserved for separate consideration one or two places of special character or special importance.

\[
\begin{align*}
&742. \quad \pi \alpha \rho & | & \epsilon \iota \iota & | & \sigma \gamma & - & | & \alpha \iota & | & \tau \iota \omicron \omicron \alpha & | & \lambda \omicron \iota \omicron \delta \omicron & | & \omicron & - \\
& & \alpha & | & \delta \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron & | & \alpha \omicron \phi \epsilon \omicron \omicron \epsilon & | & \omicron & - \\
&743. \quad \tau \omicron & | & \pi \omicron \delta & | & \alpha \omicron \phi & | & \epsilon \omicron \lambda \alpha \delta & | & \omicron & - & | & \alpha \iota & | & \epsilon \omicron \iota & | & \omicron & - \\
& & \pi \omicron \iota & | & \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha & | & \tau \lambda \omicron \sigma \iota & | & \kappa \alpha \delta & | & \omicron & - \\
\end{align*}
\]

It will be seen that there is here no variation other than those
which have been illustrated above, except the lengthening of the last syllable of ἀλωδὸρος by the ictus of the verse and by the rhythmical or musical break between ‘line’ and ‘line’. This is found again at v. 436
tων ὑπ’ | ερβατ | ω τερ | ᾠ – |
and is in fact too familiar to require further notice. In 422 = 438 there is one variation, in 421 = 437 there are two, all of common types. And I would ask the reader to notice, as a testimony in favour of the ms. text, the balance of vv. 421 and 437. The metre of both verses is trochaic. Each verse exhibits two variations or quasi-trochees, and the same two (see above, §§ 1 and 3), differently disposed in the verse, so that the total quantity, so to speak, of each verse is exactly the same. That this balance has been produced by blundering I cannot believe, and I therefore hold both verses correct.

A more doubtful problem is presented by the following:

990. μάλα γάρ τοι τάς πολλάς ὁμείας
   ἀκόρεστον τέμα· νόσος γάρ
   γείτων ὄρμοτιχος ἐρείδει.
1004. τὸ δ’ ἐπὶ γὰν πεσόνθ’ ἧπαξ θανάσιμον
   πρόπαρ ἀνθρώπος μέλαν αἰμα τίς ἄν
   τάλιν ἀγκαλέσαι επείκειον;

Here there is undoubtedly some error, since v. 1004 has no construction. The correction commonly received (πεσόν Αuratorus) is facile but far from certain. It is perhaps as likely that ἐπὶ γὰν, which could well be spared, covers some neuter adjective or participle to which πεσόν τε was attached. The rhythm of 990, compared with 1004, is or appears to be exceptional and unsatisfactory. It is not probable that the correspondence here was strictly syllabic, but no positive conclusion is to be reached. I will note merely that the parts which can be construed as they stand can also be sung as they stand,

991. ἀκόρ | εστον | τερμα νυσ | ὁς – | γαρ γει | των ομο
   τοιχος ερ | ειδε
1005. προπαρ | ανδ – | ρος μελαν | αιμα τις
   αν παλιν | αγκαλεσ
   αιτ επα | ειδων,

1 The principle extends to the case of v. 1410 ἀπείδεικ, ἀπέταμες· ἀπόσιλε δ’ ἔσει, where to produce the appearance of regularity we ought to print ἀπόσιλε κτλ. in a separate line. But the arrangement of lines, which is purely arbitrary, does not really affect the question. The break of music and rhythm, correspond-

2 The remarks on vv. 743, 754, which here follow in ed. 1, have been cancelled in deference to the objections of Dr Headlam and others.
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and that they exhibit the same kind of balance which has been noticed in vv. 421 and 437.

In vv. 249 and 1132 we have metrical irregularities which, though at first sight widely dissimilar, may perhaps be referred to the same principle. In v. 249 there is apparently a strange hiatus

\[ \text{kρόκων βαφός δ' ες πέδον χέουσα} \]

\[ \text{έβαλλε κτλ.} \]

and in v. 1132 a hypermetric syllable, \( \text{πάθος έπεγχεása} \) answering to \( \text{πτεροφόρον δέμας} \). In neither place does the sense give any hint of error. In the first, the solution is, I believe, that the short vowel actually is elided as usual, the scansion being this:

\[ \text{kροκ | ov βαφ | as δ- | εs πεδ | ov χε | ovο- | ε | βαλ etc.} \]

\[ \text{ answering to} \]

\[ \text{260} \]

\[ \text{τεχ | vαι δε | Καλ- | χαντοs | ouκ a | κραντοι | δικ | a etc.} \]

If so, the case really falls under § 1 (see above), and it may throw some light upon v. 1132. In principle there is nothing surprising in the occurrence of such a ‘hypermetric’ syllable as we find in \( \text{πάθος έπεγχεása} \). If it were common, every one would regard it as natural, and the wonder is that it is not. The final trochee of \( \text{πάθος έπεγχεása} \) answers to the final long syllable of \( \text{πτεροφόρον δέμας} \), or to put the same thing otherwise, the musical bar is completed by a note in the first and by a rest in the second. When the Romans first began to imitate Greek metres, they abounded in such ‘hypermetric’ lines, as well as in lines with a superfluous ‘anacrusis’, and the same thing is true \emph{mutatis mutandis} of many modern metres. It is not likely \emph{prima facie} that the most severe treatment would avoid an occasional lapse (if such it be) of this kind.

Lastly in those parts of the play which are written in \emph{dochmii}⁴, or

\[ ^1 \text{Note that a hiatus of this kind has no resemblance to those cases where at the end of the line a short syllable taking the stress of the rhythm is treated as long. This is quite common; while the examples of the other are rare and unsatisfactory.} \]

\[ ^2 \text{249 βαφάς...πεύ̧̂νας Keck, χέουσα' δdi Herrmann, χέουσα' άδ Kennedy, βα-λούσ' έκαστον Karsten, βάν ών έκαστεν} \]

Ahrens.—1132 \emph{θροείς...έπεγχεása} Franz, and see \emph{ad loc.} \]

\[ ^3 \text{As to the superfluous ‘anacrusis’ see on S. c. \( \text{Th. v. 723, Appendix} \) p. 136.} \]

\[ ^4 \text{An interesting discussion of the \emph{dochmius} will be found in the paper of Dr Fennell already cited, pp. 6 foll. With most of what he says I entirely agree.} \]
in metre for practical purposes not distinguishable from the dochmiac, there are a few noticeable variations. In v. 1408 ἐκ ἄλος ὀρόμενον (ms. ὀρόμενον) may be correct, though exact correspondence is restored by ὀρόμενον. In v. 1164 (if κακά, as seems probable, be omitted) we have μινυρὰ θρεωμένας answering to γοερὰ θανατοφόρα. The first is a not uncommon variety of dochmius, in which the first and second ‘long’ syllables are ‘resolved’. The second would be an iambic trimeter with ‘resolved’ syllables (γοερὰ | θανατο | φόρα): on the iambic trimeter as a variation in this metre see on the Septem 206, 219 etc. (Appendix I. p. 133 in my edition). The same variation is exhibited by M in Ag. 1143 ἀθόνος μόρον, answering to v. 1130 κακόποτμοι τύχαι: it is not certain therefore, though probable, that Hermann was right in changing the order to μόρον ἀθόνος.

A small question, partly metrical partly linguistic, is presented by the word ἀκόρεστος (vv. 1105, 1138), where it is usual to substitute the (assumed) equivalent form ἀκόρετος. But the metrical evidence is dubious, and perhaps the form. In v. 1105 there is already exact responsion, if the second syllable of ἐνδρῷ (v. 1119) be scanned as long. In v. 1138, the scansion intended, since in the dochmii of this scene the metre is generally continuous, may be ἔσοβὰ κόρεστος: that κόρεστος might answer to μέλοτυπεῖς all would admit.
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On the Parts of the Conspirator (v. 1522) and the Soldier (v. 1650)\(^1\).

It happens that we have from Pollux a note on the *dramatis personae* of the *Agamemnon*, which, though it deals directly only with a detail, presupposes and necessarily implies a certain view of the whole play. The passage runs as follows (Poll. iv. 109): ὅποτε μὴν ἀντὶ τετάρτου ὑποκριτοῦ δέοι τινὰ τῶν χορευτῶν εἰπεῖν ἐν ὁδῇ, παρασκήνιον καλεῖται τὸ πράγμα, ὡς ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι Αἰσχύλου· εἰ δὲ τέταρτον ὑποκρίτης τι παραφθέγ-ξαίτο, τούτῳ παραχορήγημα ὁνομάζεται, καὶ πεπραχθαὶ φασὶν αὐτὸ ἐν Μέμνονι Αἰσχύλου. 'But where, in place of a fourth actor, one of the chorus-performers was required to speak in lyric, this is called a *παρασκήνιον*: see for example the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. If there was something *extra* spoken by a fourth actor, this is termed a *παραχορήγημα*: it is said to have occurred in the *Memnon* of Aeschylus'.

The meaning of this is clear and undisputed. For the performance of a play there were commonly provided, in addition to the regular chorus, three actors trained for spoken parts; and as a general rule this number was the limit, and the plays were so written that not more than three persons (besides the *choreutae*), having parts to speak, should be before the audience at the same time. Pollux is here treating of the rare exceptions to this rule. He divides them into two kinds. The ordinary function of the three *ὑποκριταί* was to deliver the dialogue. The most natural conception therefore of a 'fourth actor' would be a person speaking in ordinary dialogue (*ἐν λόγῳ*) in a scene in which all the three regular *ὑποκριταί* were already occupied. Of this however, which is the case put second by Pollux, he seems not to have known by his own observation a single instance. 'It is said', he writes, 'to have

occurred in the Memnon of Aeschylus', which play he had plainly not seen. His care in marking that he is here speaking at second hand is worthy of notice, and enhances the authority of what he states without such a limitation. The other, the first-mentioned exception, is of a very peculiar kind. It is where, in a scene requiring the simultaneous presence of the three regular actors, there is found another speaker who, being a choreutes and speaking in lyric, is not exactly a 'fourth actor', but, as Pollux words it, 'in place of a fourth actor'. For this he refers, as if the case were plain and notorious, to the Agamemnon.

It will be seen on reflexion that there is a little difficulty in understanding the nature of this peculiar case. The 'quasi-actor', says Pollux, is 'one of the choreutaει'. Why then, it might be asked, should not his part be delivered by the ordinary chorus-leader? And why, since the choreutaει for the purpose of this rule were not counted as 'actors' at all, should this case be regarded as exceptional or noticeable in any way? We shall see the reason presently.

We are not now concerned with the question how far the technical terms παρασκίνων and παραχοριγμα, as here used, were either correct in themselves or generally recognized. As Pollux uses them they are in a way correlative, the chorus in the first case supplying something extra to the 'stage', the fourth actor in the second case being a sort of addition to the chorus 1. We however are concerned only with the facts to which the terms are applied.

In order to show the bearing of this testimony on the structure of the Agamemnon, I will now set out (1) the dramatis personae and distribution of the play as commonly printed; (2) the dramatis personae and distribution according to this edition. Those of the mss. it is scarcely worth while to discuss. Nobody defends or is likely to defend them.

(1) Dramatis personae.

A Watchman.
Chorus of Elders.
Clytaemnestra.
A Herald.
Agamemnon.
Cassandra.
Aegisthus.

1 For a comparison of the various uses of these terms, see Mr Haigh, The Attic Theatre, note on p. 212, by which note my attention was called to the passage.
These characters are distributed in the play as follows:

1. *Prologue.*
   Watchman.

2. *Parodos and Stas. 1.*
   Chorus.

3. *Episode 1.*
   Clytaemnestra.
   Chorus.

4. *Stas. 2.*
   Chorus.

5. *Episode 2.*
   Clytaemnestra.
   Chorus.

6. *Stas. 3.*
   Chorus.

7. *Episode 3.*
   Agamemnon.
   Clytaemnestra.
   Cassandra (silent).

8. *Stas. 4.*
   Chorus.
   Clytaemnestra.
   Cassandra.
   Chorus.

   Clytaemnestra.
   Cassandra.
   Chorus.

10. *Interlude (1330—1370).*
    Agamemnon (behind the scenes).
    Chorus.

11. *Episode 5 and Finale.*
    Aegisthus.
    Chorus.

It will be seen that there is here not the least trace of the ‘fourth actor’ found in the play by Pollux. Indeed it can scarcely be said that the play absolutely requires three. Very little ingenuity, certainly not more than the ancients employed, as we are told, to preserve their limitations in other places, would be required to allow the mute Cassandra of Episode 3 and the speaking Cassandra of Episode 4 to be taken by different maskers; and except at this point two actors, with the Chorus, could easily perform the whole.

(2) *Dramatis Personae.*

A Watchman.

*Chorus of Elders.*

Clytaemnestra.

A Conspirator, leading the

*Chorus of Conspirators.*

A Herald.
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Agamemnon.
Cassandra.
Aegisthus.
A Soldier of Aegisthus.

By these the different portions of the play are spoken or sung as follows:

1. **Prologue.**  
   Watchman.

2. **Parodos and Stas. 1.**  
   Chorus of Elders.  
   Clytaemnestra.  
   Conspirator.

3. **Episode 1.**  
   Chorus of Elders.  
   Chorus of Conspirators.

4. **Stas. 2.**  
   Chorus of Elders.  
   Conspirator.  
   Herald.

5. **Episode 2.**  
   Clytaemnestra.  
   Chorus of Elders.

6. **Stas. 3.**  
   Chorus of Elders.  
   Agamemnon.

7. **Episode 3.**  
   Clytaemnestra.  
   Cassandra (silent).

8. **Stas. 4.**  
   Chorus of Elders.

9. **Episode 4.**  
   Clytaemnestra.  
   Cassandra.  
   Chorus of Elders.

10. **Interlude.**  
    Agamemnon (behind the scenes).  
    Chorus of Elders.  
    Clytaemnestra.  
    Conspirator.

11. **Episode 5 and Finale.**  
    Aegisthus.  
    Soldier.  
    Chorus of Elders.

Now if this was the arrangement known to Pollux, we can not only see at once the application of his remark, but can explain it with precision down to the minutest peculiarity. The greater part of the play, all but the last scene, can be performed by the regular three actors. But in the last scene there is a small fourth part, which answers exactly to the description of the ancient scholar. The scene
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consists of two sections, (1) a dialogue, partly λόγος but chiefly lyric, conducted mainly by Clytaemnæstra and the Coryphaeus (1371—1576), and (2) the finale, in iambic and trochaic λόγος, mainly conducted by Aegisthus, Clytaemnæstra, and the Coryphaeus. These two sections are perfectly continuous. There is no interval between them, and no legitimate opportunity for an exit. Now from the evidence of the text it appeared to me that in the finale one of the soldiers accompanying Aegisthus must have spoken twice, on each occasion one trochaic verse (1650 and 1653), and also that in the preceding lyric dialogue, at 1522, the words

οὐτ’ ἀνελεύθερον οἶμαι βάνατον
tôde γενέσθαι,

which are usually struck out as inexplicable, must have been spoken by a partizan of Clytaemnæstra, that is to say, by the Conspirator. I did not observe, what I ought no doubt to have observed, that, as it would hardly be practicable for the performer here taking the person of the Conspirator to quit the scene before the entrance of Aegisthus and his troop, I had thus made, to this small extent, a demand for a fourth actor. But all the more striking, I think, is the undesigned coincidence between the independent inference and the statement of Pollux.

For the parts of the dialogue were commonly assumed to be distributed among the actors in the order of their importance. In the Agamemnon the protagonist would of course play Clytaemnæstra in the last scene as throughout. The deuteragonist would take Aegisthus. Of the two remaining parts, the Soldier, not the Conspirator, would be given to the regular tritagonist, as having two speeches to make instead of only one, and also as occurring in common dialogue (λόγος). We should therefore naturally hold, as Pollux and his authorities held, that the speech of the Conspirator (1522—1523) must be regarded as the exceptional fourth part. It is in lyric metre (anapaests), not in the metre of the ordinary dialogue; and so it is described by Pollux. And, most remarkable of all, it is spoken by a person whose ambiguous character, between choreutes and actor, makes the peculiar language of his description quite simple and natural. The Conspirator is 'one of the choreutæ'. He stands to the secondary chorus (see vv. 363 foll.) in the same relation as that of the regular Coryphaeus to the regular chorus; and in fact in my text I have, upon this analogy, marked his parts (as well as the one song of the sub-chorus) by the sign XO. β'. On the other hand he is no member of the regular chorus but, in the common technical sense, a ὑποκριτῆς. When therefore, as at this place, he recites

V. Α. Α. 16
anapaests in a scene otherwise requiring the simultaneous presence of three speakers (in addition to the regular chorus), he is what Pollux calls him, 'one of the choreutae speaking in lyric in place of a fourth actor'.

I cannot but think that this absolute agreement between an inference drawn from mss. of the fourteenth century and a statement dating from the second not only substantiates the inference, but also strongly fortifies the authority of our traditional text. The makers of our mss. had, it is needless to say, not a notion of illustrating the observation of Pollux. The words to which his note refers are in the mss. tacked, in defiance of grammar, to the following speech of Clytaemnestra, while in modern texts, as I have already said, they are desperately struck out. Yet there they stand in the Codex Florentinus, as they must have stood in the Aeschylus of Pollux, having survived the copyists of more than a millennium, to illustrate and justify the true tradition.

What, it may be asked, have we done with the testimony of Pollux so long as we have endeavoured to distribute the Agamemnon so as to accord with the Byzantine story? It has been set aside. The copyist of Pollux, it is said, introduced the reference to the Agamemnon by error, because a few lines after came a reference, quite differently worded, to the Memnon. There is no one who will not gladly be relieved of the supposed necessity for such a hypothesis as this.
INDEX I. GREEK.

(The numbers are those at the head of the notes indicated.)

A.

a, retained in place of η after ν, 101
άλαβελη, 1007
άβροιμος, 694
άγκαθεν, App. A
άγιναι θηρ, 699
άγοραῖοι θεοί, 90
άγνώρης, 1065
'Αγορίστος, 253
άγών, άγωνα, 1144
άγών, meeting, 836
άγωνιοι θεοί, 518
άδιστος, App. K
άετος, 146
-ας, elision of (?), 381 (see App. II.)
αίνειν, 97
αίνιδελεκτος, 714 and Addendum p. 253
αΐνοι, neuter (?), 1547
αίτομαι, I am asked, 150
αίμη, impulse, 489
αίων, 238
αίκασκαίος, 740
άκορεστος, 990
άκρας ἀπὸ φρενός, 796
ἀκων, without will, 189
άλεγεῖν, 1550
'Αλέξανδρος, 61, 375, 708, 713
άλη, 204
ἄλλος τις for ἄτερος τις, 1267
ἄλοιδορος, App. K

άλουργής, άλουργίς, 937
άμάρτιον, 541
άμάω, 973, 1028
άμφιλεκτος, 872
ἀν, anticipatory, 1032
ἀν, with past tense of indicative (conjunctural), 924, 1251
ἀν, with subjunctive, as modified imperative (?), 1346
ἄνακτος, or
ἄνακτος, App. W
ἀναστένειν, 551
ἀνδρακάς καθόθθαι, 1594
ἀνείπειν, 379
ἀνελεύθερος, 1495
ἀνήρ = βρατός, 994
ἀνθείν, 664
ἀνθος, wreath, 1457
ἀντῆλιος, 524
ἀξιφυλλος, 699
ἀξιστατος, 1468
ἀπ (?), 1532
'Απαγχόμενη, 1107
ἀπανθιζεῖν, 1662
ἀπαπνος, 323
ἀπαρκέων, 389
ἀπαρχος, 1226
ἀπενθητος, 886
ἀπέμαντος, 389
ἀπουμάζω, 341
ἀποπτώσας, 1191
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Δ.

δέ, apodotic with resumptive pronoun (σὺ δέ), 1045
δέ (and γάρ), postponed in the sentence, 232, 308, 743, 954, 1290, 1573, 1590
δέ, resumptive, 12, 194
δέ, for ἀλλά, 1062
δεῖγμα, sign, App. S
δεῖγμα, display, 783
δείπνον, 142
δέκατον φέγγος ἔτους, 509
δέρη, 341
δημόκρατος, 464
δημόκρατος, 464
δημοορφής, 1616
diaπονεισθαί, 19
dικαίος, 398
dική (δικείν), 1227, App. X
dίκη, wont, custom, 261
dικηφόρος, 530
dιψία χθών, App. M
dρόμος, 121
dρόσος and ἔρση, 147
dυσάγης, 1164
dυσπυθής, 1254

Ε.

ἐβάλων, 770
eγγυοιείς, 385
eγγυοιος, 385
eγρήγορος (?), 358
eί, concessive, 357, 359
eἰ 8' ὄνω, 681, 1026
eἰ ποι, 524
eἰκός, with dative, 580, App. N
Βλειθύνα, 136
eἰργὼ (ἐργόω), 1657
eἰρμένα, τὰ, what was commanded, App. G
eἰσ (ἀφάνειαν), 392
ἐκονίσιος, 794
ἐκπάτιος, App. B
eκτείνεις, 820, 1227
eκτελές, 105
eκφάτως, 708
eκχείω, 334
eκὼν φάκα, 1613
eλαλα, 498

Γ.

γάρ, 227
gάρ, justifying (not proving) what was previously said, 1204
gέννα, as a plural term, 121
gενναίος, by nature, 1197
gεννοῦ, periphrastic imperative made with, origin of, 97
gεραφός, 722
gίγας, 696
gνώμην, παρά, 922
gυμή, term of abuse, 1625
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θάκοι, 524
θάλασσα, ritual meaning of, App. O
θάφος, 794
θαυμάζειν, construction of, 1198
θεός, miraculous, 484
θέμις, absolutely, like χρεών, 224
θερμόνους, 1171
θηριώνθαι, 566
θιγγ, 431
θυσία (τέθνηκα), 544
θράσος, 794
θραύμα, 1164
θρηγκός, θρηγκόω, 1283
θόειν, 1234
θύελλα, 810
θυηλη, 810
θύομαι, 142
θόος, furious, 1409
θυραία, substantive, 1039

I.

-ιας (άγριας), 117
-ικος, adjectives in, 1510
ινις, 718
ιο-, in compounds, 75, 1471
ισοτρίβης (?), 1444
ισοψυχος, 1471
ισοτρίβης, 1444
ιχαρ (?), 1479
ιχώρ (?), 1479

K.

καθαύρειν, condemn, 408
καί=and particularly, 4
καλός, mortal, 1342
καλά, as invocation, 146
κάρτα, App. U
καταξιώ, 577
καταπἰνειν, 107
καταρριπτεῖν, 875
κατεργάζεσθαι, 531
κάτοικος, 1284
κέλευθος=δόσις, going, 132, 434
κεράννυμι, metaphorical application to contracts, 464
κινεῖν, 88
κλάβῃ (?), 880
κλάξω, App. E
κλάξω, App. E
κλώ=
κλώ, 1181
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κολλάω, metaphorically, 1565
κομίζω, 794
κώνις κάπις πηλοῦ, App. M
κόσμῳ, 524
κράτηρ, figure for a bond or league, 1396
κράτος, victory, 1471
κρίνω, prefer, 477
κρίσις, choosing, 1287
κτήνος, 133
κτήσιος, 1022
κύριος, 869
κώνις, ἥ, term of contempt, 1227, App. X

A.
λάκτισμα δείνου, 1601
λαμπτροπιά, 881
λέσβιον βύμα, 1107
λήθομαι, 39
λήτερας, 1234
λήτωρ, 1234
λίμμα (ἀλίμμα, λείμμα, ἀλείμμα?), App. C
λιπτομαι, 867
λοιπορέω, λοιπορία, App. K
λόπας, ἄνευ, 980

M.
μάζα δουλια, 1025
μάντις, use of sign by, App. S
μάστιγα, 647
μεγάλα, adv. (?), 392
μέλας, red, 1005, 1510
μελλόν (?), 1355
μέν, position of, 739
μέν, not always inserted where admissible, 1191
μέν τοι, separate force, 934
μεσομπαλός, 1040
μῆ, with pres. subj., as independent sentence, 353
μητέ...μητ' οὖν, 371
μήτηρ Αἰδου (?), 1234
μοιρα, division, 133
μοῖρα, part, 1588
μόρος, 'means of death', 1380
μυθούσθαι, 1367

N.
ναῦ, App. U
νεῖκη = νεῖκος (?), 1376
νεῖρα (?), 1480
νεῖρος (?), 1480
νέον, adverb, 1625
νήστης, plural νήστες (?), 343
νύτερος (?), 1617
νυκὰ δ' ὁ πρώτος κτλ., App. H
νύμος ὅρθιος, 1150

Ξ.
ξω-, etc., see σω-, etc.
-ξω, -ξα, tenses in, 686

O.
δ੉, emphatic, the present, the last, 1041
δ੉, explained by gesture, 504, 937, 1566
δῶς, metaphorically for the journey of life, 105
δο, how, 1227
δόδα, emphatic sense, 1193
δοκ, store (?), 953
δότας, δοτη, 720
δόκνος, App. T
δράπ, beware, 1623
δραγ, 69
δρότοι νύμος, 1150
δρόσοι, 1197
δρωμαλευν, 1387
δρασ, δοσον, feak, 475
δε = δεν, 762
οὐδὲ γάρ..., 1524
οὐδὲν, emphatic negative, 783
οὐ ποτὲ, οὐδὲν ποτὲ, emphatic negative, 1042
οὐδὼ, never, as strong negative, 683
οὐφαντοι θεόι, 90
Οὐρανός, Κόρων, Ζεύς, 170, 178
-ουχος, 881

II.
παίαν, 254
παύλοραρτήριον, 1077
παύς, 722
παῖς, servant, 397
παῖς and τέκνον, App. B
παύων, 1246
πάλαιος (from πάλη), 1376
παλικοτος, 865
παλον (παλομαι), etc., 995
πάντροσθε, 715
παρά in παρά τοσοῦτον, παρ' ἐν, etc., 1068
παραμάδω, 973
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τί, representing a verb, 79, 926
τί γάρ; 1134
τί οὖ; 561
τίθεσθαι, to score, as in a game, 32
tίω = δέξω, with genitive, 933
tό, etc., as demonstrative, 322, 362
tό, etc., as relative, 354, 531
tό μεν...τό δέ, 995
tό μη, with infinitive, depending on φο-βείσθαι, φόδος, 14
tοτά, τοτή, etc., App. E
tό τάν, 437
tό τάν, οὖ, 982
tόσος, 146
tότε, before, 790
tούτων μεν οὕτω, 941
tρέπειν νόσον, 841
tριβή, 471

Τ.

δύναι ἄρχεσθαι, etc., 1191
ὑπάρχειν (τιμώ), to make a beginning of,
1656
ὑπνῶ, 189
ὑπό (?), 1163
ὑπό, with dative, 883
ὑπταίσμα, 1283

Φ.

φά-, φα-, 82
φάναι ἐκών, 1612

Φάνης, address, 616
φθειροι, 824
φιλῆτωρ (?), 1445
φιλως ἐμοι, 1581
φόδος αἰματοσταγής, 1307
φόνευς, 1321
φην, App. E
φρόνημα, presumption, 739
φυτάλμος, 339
φωκῶν (εἰπε), 215

Χ.

χαίρε, 544
χαίρειν, with dative, 577
χαίρειν, τό, 503
χαλκοῦ βαφαί, 617
χαρά, 722
χαρήσθαι τι, 315
χάρις, charm, 383
χειλιδών, 1034
χηλή, 1660
χρέος, obligation, 464

Ψ.

ψαμμίων, 973
ψίδος, 987

Ω.

ὡς, in limiting or qualifying sense, 347
ὡς (ἐστιν ὡς), 1394
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(Only such references are given in this Index as could not conveniently find a place in the foregoing.)

A.

Abstract for concrete (παρεξία = τὸ παρε-
χέμαν), 1510
Accusative in apposition to the action, 653, 734
in apposition to the action, preceding
the verb, 245
of duration of time (μέρος), 561
of 'motion to', extension of, 300
Actor, fourth, App. III
Adjective, verbal, with construction of
verb, 1075
neuter used as substantive, 273
treated as participle, 726
Adverb with dependent case, 1581, 1590
'Aeolic' form of περί- in compounds, 1144
Anapaests, hiatus in, 785
Aorist in Oratio Obliqua with future
sense (?), 680
participle expressing action contempo-
raneous with that of aorist verb, 300
Apollo, image of, worn by priestess (?),
1265
Apollo and Cassandra, 1201
Apostrophe to the absent, 83, 1133
to the speaker's self, 970
Apposition, 105, 296, 740, 805, (τὰ μὲν
γὰρ ἐστίν) 1040, 1230, 1380, 1461,
1479, 1645

Ares, cannibal rites of, 647
Ares, cannibal god, 1510
Argolis, natural division of, App. M
Argos, emblems of, 815, 816, 817
Artemis 'Ἀπαγχομένη, 1107
Article, 90, 187, 300, 336, 347, 519, 694,
887, 980, 1144, 1621
Asyndeton between contrasted terms
(φιλῶν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν), 1271
Attraction of relative in form το etc., 964

B.

Bathos, intentional, 893, App. Q
Betrothal, ritual of, 65
Broken sentence (indignation), 1625
Burden, repetition, in singing, 1191, 1456,
1490, 1539
Burial, 'to cloak oneself in earth', 860

C.

Caesura, affecting the sense, 1251
Capital of pillar, 1283, 1339
Chorus, number of, 1347
Second, 363, 506, 618, 631, 1522, 1649,
App. J, App. III
Clause, coordinate, where English would
have subordinate, 360, 575
independent for dependent, 1110
INDEX II.

Clause, independent for dependent in antithesis, 1421
with finite verb instead of participle, 1287, 1455
Colour of shields, interprets a symbol, App. C
Column, 1283, 1339
Composition of adjectives in ἡς etc., 439
of substantives and adjectives, 397
Condylea, ritual of, 1107
Council (place of), 524

D.

Dactyl, initial, 4
Dative 'absolute', 437, 1298, App. Z

_ethic, 504
_ethic, indefinite (σοι), 501
'of interest', 27, 580, App. A
_of interest in relation to the sentence, 737, 1259
instrumental-local with προβαινω or προσβαινω, 1510
instrumental, with ἐκχεῖν, 334
instrumental of purchase, 794
personal instrumental, 618
'possessive' or 'of interest', 1055
possessive, combined with another dative, 139
quasi-local of person, App. V
signifying succession (τοῖοι θανόσι θανῶν). 1337
_of 'thing affected', 1585
Doric forms, 686, 693, 1508

E.

Elision of words having the quantity ◯ ◯, 898
Ellipse of optative with ἂν, supplied from foregoing clause, 1007
_of part of the subject, irregular, 565
(of indignation), 1625, 1633
_in one clause of antithesis, 855
_of verb with πῶς; 1373
_of verb to be supplied from verbal adjective, 483
_of verb supplied from previous clause, 1328
_of verb common to two opposed clauses, 796

Ellipse in τοῦτων μὲν οὖν, 941
_of substantive in τροπαία, θυραία, 1039
_of ὲν, 484
_of ὲν with εἴθεναι and adjective, 547
_with ὡσπερ ὠν etc., 1170
Ephymnium, 1456, 1490, 1539
'Epic' forms in Chorus, 189, 724, 737, App. D
Epithet, personal, transferred to feelings etc., App. B
transference of, 159
Epode, recitative, not strophic, 165
Espousal, ritual of, 65
Etymologicium Magnum, false citation by, App. D
Evil eye, App. R

F.

Fork or flesh-hook, 647
Future, second person of, in place of the general τις, 69

G.

Gender in partitive expression (ὁ ὅστατος τοῦ χρόνου), 1299
partitive in ὅστατος λεκέων, App. B
Genitive of agent following negative adj., App. K
adjectival 'of equivalent' (ἡματος μέρος), 561
after adjectival substantive δια γνωστῶν etc., 1162
_of definition, combined with another genitive, 1447
local, 1040
_of local or quasi-local relation with adverb (κεῖται φθίνει τοῦδε), 1445
_of person with θαυμάζειν, 1193
Geryon, 860
Gods, first salutation to, 801
Goldsmith, metaphor of, 445

H.

Heracles as a slave, 1025
Hermes, patron of heralds, 519
Hesychius, origin of false gloss in, 133
Hiatus, as a method of punctuation, 785
_after τι, 1103
Hippolytus, 1007
Horse, as the type of Argos, 815, 816
Hunger as a symbolical portent, 133
Husband and wife, App. R
Hyperbole (νπερ ἀστρων), 377

I.
Imperative, periphrastic with γένος, origin of, 97
Imperfect tense in antithesis to present, 1286
Infanticide, 1218
Infinitives, consecutive, one depending on the other, 1173
Interrogative, double, 1340
Ionic form, irregularly used, 659

L.
Law, ancient criminal, 537
Leda (Λήδας γένεθλον), 905
Legends of mythology morally interpreted, 170
Lyre at feasts, 980

M.
Masculine gender of collective, notwithstanding feminine gender of individuals, 338
Medicine and surgery, terms of, in poetry, 189
Metaphor of the ‘falling house’, 1531 of the woman working at night, 1015
Metaphorical language, crossed with literal, 841
Metaphors, bold combination of, 137
Middle voice, 142, 153

N.
Negative phrases, in the same sentence, collision of, 561
Neuter, dative substantival (φιλος with friendliness), 1373
‘Nominativus pendens’, 995, 1479

O.
Oath, superstitious view of, 1197 of the gods, 1289
Olive-wreath, use of, at Argos, 498, App. M
Optative, in coordinate clause (quasi-concessive) for English indicative, where main clause is optative, 360 in dependent clause (temporal, modal etc.), where principal clause is optative, 264, 331
archaic, imperative use of, 557, 936, 1373
deliberative, 628
expressing acquiescence in result, 964
expressing admission of probability, 1162
with ἄν in hypothetical clause, 921
with ὅτως ἄν, 376
Orphic discipline, 1007

P.
Participle with substantive, as Latin capta urbs, the taking of the city, 118, 645
use of, το φανερ, proof, 490
subordination of, to another participle, 186, 561
with λέγειν, 281
and verb, 418, 605, 610, 970, 1031, 1036, 1052, 1548
κατὰ σῶσειν, irregular construction of, 561
with τῆς ὑπαί, 1025
passive, use of, 867
Pause after first foot of senarius, used for emphasis, 13, 537, 835, 912, 1047, 1079, 1083, 1123, 1225
after second foot of senarius, 1444
after fourth foot of senarius, 1215
Pelopidae, wealth of, 1573
Persians, destruction of Athens by the, 532
Personification, 160, 807, 885, 973, 990, 1025, 1055, 1416, 1435, 1641
Philonela, 1144
Pillar, 1283, 1339
Plataea, allusion to, App. G
Pleiads, setting of, 817, App. P
Plural and singular, variation between, 549
of a single subject, representing English indefinite article, 192
of words of feeling, φθάνον etc., 824
Preposition as adverb, 263, 591, 756, 1270, 1358, 1414, 1644
Present tense in prophecy, 1339
Pronoun, obscurity arising from omission of, 1594
    demonstrative (ὁδε), resuming subject with emphasis, 650
Purple dye, value of, 950

R.
Relative, attraction of, 964

S.
Sacrifice (δώατος θυσία), 157
    by ἁρπαγμα, 88
    by stoning and by strangulation, 1107
Salt water, ritual use of, App. O
Sea, as a type of water, 1408
Seal, metaphor of, 614
Shield, as a symbol, App. C
'Sleep' of a dormant pain, 189
'Spear-hand' = right, 119
Stoning as a method of sacrifice, 1107

Subjunctive with ἀρ, as imperative (?), 1346
Substantive, construction depending on, as upon a verb, 186, 804, 866, 1287, 1365, 1630

T.
Theft, ancient law of, 537
Thyestean feast, 136, 1075, 1583
Tmesis, 1599
Troeezen, ritual of, 1107

V.
'Vanity' (τὸ µατάρ), 175
Verb, finite, instead of participle, 1287, 1455
-clause (independent) substituted for participial or other dependent clause in antithesis, 318
Verbal adjective governing case, 434
equivocation, 276, 530, 702, 1376, 1456, 1623

ADDENDUM.

In v. 714 the point of αἰνὸλεκτρον may turn most simply upon the two possible meanings of the word, (1) whose marriage is a glory (αἰνὸς) and (2) whose marriage is horrible (αἰνὸς). Troy, μετ'αυτοῦ, will now apply the second. This however would not exclude a reference to 'Αλέξανδρος.
PA
3825
A8
1904
Aeschylus
Agamemnon. [2d ed.]