

‘BARBARIC CRIES’ (AESCH. *PERS.* 633–639)

ἦ ῥ’ ἄτει μοι μακαρίτας
 ἰσοδαίμων βασιλεὺς βάρ-
 βαρα σαφηνῇ
 ἰέντος τὰ παναίολ’ αἰανῇ δύσθορα βάγματα;
 παντάλαν’ ἄχη
 διαβοάσω.
 νέρθεν ἄρα κλύει μου;¹

635

633 μοι MAP: μου P² cett.

636 ἰέντος MH; ἰέντος cett., edd.

634 βάρβαρά τε FTri: βάρβαρ’ ἀσαφηνῇ Headlam

638 διαβοάσω; Wordsworth: διαβοάσαι Hermann

MUCH space is devoted by Broadhead to the discussion of this strophe and its ‘various difficulties’.² The discussion centres on two main issues:

1. ‘If the Chorus say ἦ ῥ’ ἄτει μου; νέρθεν ἄρα κλύει μου; that implies there has already been some call he might have heard . . . But to Darius there has been no appeal at all; nor surely could the previous invocation have been described in these excessive epithets.’ So Headlam,³ who then proceeded, in the light of Luc. *Necyom.* 9 and other similar passages, to suggest that the strophe had been preceded in the production by ‘ἐπωδαί in unintelligible jargon’; whence his conjecture βάρβαρ’ ἀσαφηνῇ. Then Lawson,⁴ in a spirited criticism of this proposal, pointed to the use of βάρβαρος as = ‘Persian’ elsewhere in the play, and to the stress laid by Darius on the invocation’s plainness (686, 688). If anything was missing from the text, he declared, it had resembled ‘ὄτοτοτοί rather than *abracadabra*’. Might we not merely have lost a stage direction (cf. *Eum.* 117 f.), enjoining cries of grief? Broadhead’s own opinion is that, as the text now stands, we are in fact all but obliged by the wording of 633 to adopt one or other of these hypotheses; and that being so, he would prefer the second (for which Ar. *Ra.* 1028–9, as interpreted by Gow,⁵ is mentioned as further tentative support). But might it not rather be, he suggests, that the strophe is misplaced? Would it not more naturally follow the mournful invocation and cries of 672–80?

2. διαβοάσω. With the traditional punctuation this = διαβοάσσομαι, and has been accepted as such by several editors, including Wilamowitz, who comments apropos of the unusual future-form: ‘videtur aeolismus esse ut αἰέσω epicorum’.⁶ Others (Dindorf, Sidgwick, Prickard, Smyth, Murray), however, have preferred to follow Wordsworth⁷ in punctuating 638 with a question mark, thus making the verb an aorist subjunctive with a deliberative sense: ‘must I shout aloud?’ (or ‘through the earth’). On the ground that ‘shouting’ is what the Chorus is already doing, Broadhead here urges that if the text is sound our best expedient is to accept the future-form, explaining with Paley ‘Does he hear me . . .?’ (Pause) ‘I will then declare in louder voice . . . Does

¹ I have given here the virgin text of M.

² *The Persae of Aeschylus* (1960), pp. 166–8, 307–9.

³ *CR* xvi (1902), 57; cf. *ibid.* xviii (1904), 241.

⁴ *CQ* xxviii (1934), 82.

⁵ *JHS* xlvi (1928), 142.

⁶ He extends the same explanation to ἀναβοάσω in Eur. *Hel.* 1108 (regarded by some as a subjunctive of self-exhortation).

⁷ *Phil. Mus.* i (1832), 233. Dindorf’s proposal to alter further to διαμβοάσω need not be discussed. See Murray in app. crit. ad loc. and ad v. 645.

he hear me now?' But in the text he has little confidence. We should do better, he advises, to accept Hermann's emendation *διαβοᾶσαι*, not indeed with its author's interpretation (*ὥστε αὐτόν*, sc. *τὸν Δαρεῖον*, *διαβοᾶσαι*), but taking *ἄχη* to be in apposition to *βάγματα*: "utter grievous cries so as to pierce (lit. "shout through") the earth".

Now Broadhead's proposals lack none of his usual resourcefulness. But for all that I believe them wrongly aimed. The strophe's 'difficulties', it seems to me, are largely of modern making; there is no need to blame the text. Indeed, if due account be taken of two important matters which have passed unnoticed by the commentators, we shall find that they will quickly resolve themselves.

One is a matter of ritual custom. A belief which we often find expressed is that the dead, remote and half-asleep beneath the earth, were difficult to reach: Aesch. *Cho.* 315-19, Eur. *Heracles* 490-1, *Or.* 1231-2, 1241, Ar. *Ra.* 1175-6 (adding Pind. *O.* 14. 20-1, Soph. *El.* 1066-9). Hence it was considered necessary to address them in a shouting voice, with emphatic iteration of the essential words. This led in common practice to the triple cry, which was probably the standard form for invocations and brief formulaic addresses: *Od.* 9. 65 *πρὶν τινα τῶν δειλῶν ἐτάρων τρὶς ἑκάστον ἀνῆσαι*, referring to the final salutation, as also Theoc. 23. 44 *κῆν ἀπίης, τόδε μοι τρὶς ἐπάυσον*: "ὦ φίλε, κεῖσαι". and V. *Aen.* 6. 506 'magna manis ter voce vocavi'; Ar. *Ra.* l.c. *τεθνηκόσιν γὰρ ἔλεγεν* . . . | *οἷς οὐδὲ τρὶς λέγοντες ἐξικνούμεθα*; cf. *ibid.* 171 *οὗτος, σὲ λέγω μέντοι, σὲ τὸν τεθνηκότα*, 184, 271; Eur. *Heracles* 494 *ἄρηξον, ἔλθέ· καὶ σκυὰ φάνηθί μοι* (with Wilamowitz's note). For the same reason invocations and entreaties were frequently prefaced by iterated imperatives calling for attention: *Cho.* 4-5 *κηρύσσω πατρὶ | κλύειν, ἀκοῦσαι*, 156-7 *κλύε δέ μοι, σέβας, | κλύ' ὦ δέσποτ' ἐξ ἀμαυρᾶς φρενός*, Eur. *Troad.* 1303 *ὦ τέκνα, κλύετε, μάθετε ματρός αὐδάν*, *Or.* 1225 f., (where the triple cry is also represented) *OP.* *ὦ δῶμα ναίων νυκτὸς ὀρφναίας, πάτερ, | καλεῖ σ' Ὀρέστης παῖς σὸς ἐπίκουρον μολεῖν* . . . *HL.* *ὦ πάτερ, ἰκοῦ δῆτ', εἰ κλύεις ἔσω χθονὸς | τέκνων καλούντων* . . . *ΠΥ.* *ὦ συγγένεια πατρὸς ἐμοῦ, κάμας λιτάς, | Ἀγάμεμνον, εἰσάκουσον· ἔκσωσον τέκνα*. And in longer prayers the same command was used to reinforce the crucial words of the appeal: *Cho.* 138-9 *ἐλθεῖν δ' Ὀρέστην* . . . | *κατεύχομαί σοι, καὶ σὺ κλυθί μου, πάτερ*, 456-60 (well illustrating the various features we have noticed) *OP.* *σέ τοι λέγω, ξυγγενοῦ, πάτερ, φίλοις*. | *HL.* *ἐγὼ δ' ἐπιφθέγγομαι κεκλαυμένα*. | *XO.* *στάσις δὲ πάγκοιτος ἄδ' ἐπιρροθεῖ· ἀκουσον ἐς φάος μολών, | ξὺν δὲ γενοῦ πρὸς ἐχθρούς*; or to round off the whole: *Cho.* 500, Eur. *El.* 682, *Or.* 1238.

The second is a matter of artistic convention (Aeschylean especially, and Euripidean). For the representation of inarticulate or foreign utterances two alternative methods are employed. They may be reproduced more or less realistically by means of interjections and exotic words. Or instead they may be verbally suggested. The common means employed in the latter case are self-exhortations or statements to the effect that the speaker is wailing, groaning, or the like; these are often adjectival, and they generally include an element of onomatopoeia. Cf., for the self-exhortation, *Pers.* 280-1 *ἴν' ἄποτμον δαίτοις | δυσαιανῇ βοάν*,¹ 571-5 *στένε καὶ δακνά-|ζου, βαρὺ δ' ἀμβόασον | οὐράνι' ἄχη* . . . *τεῖνε δὲ δυσβάγκτον | βοᾶτιν τάλαιναν αὐδάν* (where the accumulation

¹ Hermann for M's *ἴν' ἄποτμον βοάν* n.s. viii (1958), 49, carries much less conviction. The alternative restoration proposed by A. H. Coxon, *CQ*

of adjectives is itself expressive, representing the long-drawn character of the wail), *Suppl.* 808 ἰὺζε¹ δ' ὀμφάν, *Cho.* 942 ἐπολολύξατ'; for the statement, *Suppl.* 112–13 (cited below), *Sept.* 78 θρεῦμαι φοβερά μεγάλη ἄχην, 873 κλαίω, στενομαι, *Cho.* 457 (cited above), *Eur. Heracles* 1065 ΧΟ. στενάξέ νυν—*ΑΜ.* στενάξω, *Or.* 1383–5 ὥς σ' ὀλόμενον στένω | ἀρμάτειον ἀρμάτειον μέλος² | βαρβάρῳ βοᾷ, *Ba.* 65–8 θαῶζω . . . Βάκχιον εὐαζόμενα. An instantaneous aorist replaces the present tense in *Phoen.* 678–80 Ἐπαφον . . . ἐκάλεσα βαρβάρῳ βοᾷ, | ἰώ, βαρβάρους λιταῖς. Further, when in the *kommos* of the *Persae* the Chorus declare (935–40) τὰν . . . κακοφάτιδα βοάν, κακομέλετον ἰὰν | Μαρνανδυνοῦ θρηνητῆρος | πέμψω πέμψω πολυδακρυν λαχάν, (944) ἦσω τοι τὰν πάνδυτον, (947) κλάγξω δὲ γόον ἀρίδακρυν, it would be possible, indeed, to take the future tense in a literal (i.e. temporal) sense, as pointing forward to the remainder of the song; but it is much more satisfactory to regard it as the statement of a resolution, whose fulfilment is coincidental with its expression. Such certainly is the interpretation needed at 1054 ff., where of a series of commands by Xerxes relating to the dirge as it is being performed, στέρν' ἄρασσε κάπιβόα τὸ Μύσιον . . . γενεῖον πέρθε . . . αὐτεῖ δ' ὀξύ . . . πέπλον δ' ἔρεικε κτλ., the fourth is answered by καὶ τάδ' ἔρξω. We may add *Eur. And.* 1197–9 θανόντα δεσπότην γόοις | νόμῳ τῷ νερτέρων κατάρξω ('I will begin') and *IT* 179–81 ἀντιψάλμους ᾧδὰς ὕμνων τ' | Ἀσιγητᾶν σοι βάρβαρον ἄχάν | δεσποῖνα γ' ἐξαυδάσω.

Now to come back to our strophe.

It is concerned entirely, as we see, with the calling of Darius' attention, as an essential preliminary to the prayer for his appearance in the upper world, which forms the kernel of the evocation-song. And this call is contained in the opening and closing questions, which, contrary to Headlam's supposition, are no true interrogatives, but effectively equivalent to imperatives. All that lies between is designed to reinforce the call with a variety of appeal, directed in part to Darius' ear and in part to his sympathetic feelings; each word makes its effective contribution. But if the strophe is addressed by the Chorus to Darius, it is also addressed by the poet to his audience. The appeal is cast into the form of a barbaric γόος, and a second function of the words is to create (in co-operation doubtless with the now lost vocal music) an aesthetic illusion of the supposed reality. Of particular import in this regard, as a means of detailed and vivid characterization, are the accumulated epithets. And to these we must add the highly-contrived onomatopoeic sounds (the iterated alphas, imitative of 'barbaric' speech, the whining *av*-sound, and the wailful *ai*; note too the richness of the vocalic texture generally), which parallel the effect of the description in the acoustic dimension of the style.

To turn now to the details.

The first sentence falls into three distinct parts: an emphatic initial question, 'Does he hear me?'; Darius' descriptive titles, given in the nominative in place of the usual vocative; and a participial phrase containing the description of the cries.

The third-person form of the appeal cannot be closely paralleled, and is probably therefore dramatic in intention, the indirect manner of their address according well with the degree of reverent fear which the elders feel towards their former king (cf. 694 ff., 700 ff.). Its interrogative form, paralleled in e.g.

¹ ἰὺζεν M, corr. Robortello comparing Σ εἰαυταῖς παρακελεύονται. See further Wilamowitz in *aph. crit.*

² Against bracketing off this verse as a stage-direction (Murray) see the good arguments of Benedetto in his commentary.

Sept. 92-3, *Eur. El.* 682, *Or.* 1238, all prayers of a highly emotional character, reflects their keenly agitated mood. The unusual verb *ἀτεῖν*, with its sharp internal vowel and diphthong clashes, replaces the normal *κλύειν* or *ἀκούειν* in order to achieve a harsher sound-effect.

For the next word the better MSS. give *μοι*, and their authority has rightly, I believe, been upheld by Groeneboom in face of the *v.l.* *μου*, which most other editors adopt on account of the following genitive. As Groeneboom observes, the case-change has good Homeric precedent, there being a particularly close analogy in *Il.* 16. 530-1 *γῆθησέν τε* (sc. *Γλαῦκος*), | *ὅτι οἱ ὦκ' ἤκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο*.¹ The *οἱ* we may there explain as a dative of interest, which combines with the verb of hearing to yield the sense 'heard him with favour'.² As further examples of *ἀκούειν* and its synonyms with the dative, a usage which belongs especially to the sphere of supplication, we may cite *ibid.* 515-16 *δύνασαι δὲ σὺ πάντοσ' ἀκούειν* | *ἀνέρι κηδομένῳ* (from the body of Glaukos' prayer), 24. 335 *ἔκλυες, ᾧ κ' ἐθέλησθα* (Zeus addressing Hermes), *Od.* 4. 767 *θεὰ δέ οἱ ἔκλυεν ἀργῆς*; the formulaic prayer-openings *κέκλυτε νῦν μοι* (*H.H.Ar.* 334) *κλυτέ μοι εὐχομένῳ* (*Sol.* 1. 2 D = *Crat. Theb.* 1. 2 D), *εὐχομένῳ μοι κλῶθι* (*Theogn.* 13), *κλῶθί μοι* (*O.H.* 2. 1; cf. *Cho.* 156 cited above);³ and *Hdt.* 1. 214. 1 *ὥς οἱ Κῦρος οὐκ ἐσήκουσε* (referring to the entreaty of Tomyris). *εὐξαμένοιο* we may either construe again independently with *ἤκουσε*, making it render now the purely physical side of the god's activity: 'heard him praying';⁴ or it could equally well be taken as an approach to a genitive absolute: 'as he prayed'.⁵ On account of the very close connection between the verb of hearing and the personal pronoun the construction is unlikely to have struck Greek ears as harsh in any way. In the present case, moreover, an additional justifying factor would be present in the wide separation of the pronoun and the participial phrase, and the virtually independent standing of the latter in point of sense ('I am uttering these . . . cries'). There would therefore seem to be no good enough reason for declining to follow the better tradition here. The *μου* can readily be explained as a copyist's false correction.

After the king's three laudatory titles, intended perhaps to represent the triple invocation, the sentence proceeds with what is essentially a descriptive expansion of the type of *εὐχομένῳ* (-*μένου*) formula exemplified in the preceding paragraph. The five epithets serve at once to convey a series of further emphatic pleas and, on another plane, to elaborate for the audience a distinctive and unusual sound-picture. We may render: 'as we utter clearly, with barbaric voice, these cries that range from high to low, long-drawn and mournful-sounding'.

¹ This comparison had already been made by J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, ii (1928), 77, who explained the syntax in accordance with his theory that the enclitics *μοι*, *σοι*, and *οἱ* are partially genitival. In view of expressions of the *τέκνον μοι* variety, this theory is not in itself implausible. But from *Il.* 16. 616 and *Od.* 4. 767, cited below, it is clear that their function in relation to verbs of hearing is that of genuine datives.

² See D. B. Monro, *Homeric Grammar* (1882), 98, § 143. 3; Kühner-Gerth, *Grie-*

chische Grammatik, ii. 1 (1897³), 359 n. 7, 419.

³ Cf. also *Il.* 5. 115, 10. 278, *Od.* 6. 239, 324, 15. 172, *Theogn.* 4. In these instances the MSS. are divided between *κλ. μοι* and *κλ. μου/μεν* (the version in which the formula occurs in *Il.* 1. 37, 451, *Cho.* 139, *al.*), the former being, in all cases except the second last, the better-attested reading. Similarly *H. Epigr.* 12 begins *κλ. μοι εὐχομένῳ* in *Vit. Hdt.* 415 Allen, *κλ. μεν εὐχομένου* in *Ath.* 592 a.

⁴ Cf. Munro, *op. cit.* 165, § 243. 4.

⁵ Cf. Leaf in note on *Il.* 14. 25.

While *σαφηνῇ* continues the appeal to Darius' ear, the remaining epithets diversify the attempt to rouse him. For *βάρβαρα* it has become customary to refer to the explanation of Mazon, who, comparing *Suppl.* 130 *καρβᾶνα δ' αὐδάν εἶ, γὰρ, κοινεῖς* remarks that a prayer 'n'a de succès que si elle atteint celui à qui elle s'adresse, et pour se faire écouter de lui, elle doit lui parler sa langue'; the Chorus are then implying that Darius 'peut comprendre ce que signifie leur appel'. I am not sure, however, that this explanation is entirely to the point. First, the elders' cries are something less than articulate words of prayer. And secondly, a linguistic reference would not here have the significance it has in the *Suppliants* passage. There the Chorus are addressing an ostensibly *alien* land, although one which they know to be primevally acquainted with their speech; it is only by calling that ancient memory into play that they can hope to secure an attentive hearing from it. Here, however, the question of language as such—king and Chorus are both Persian—could not possibly arise. It is a matter, rather, of familiar sound of voice; Darius is being called upon to recognize the cries as those of his own people; cf. *κλύετε, μάθετε, ματρός αὐδάν* in Eur. *Troad.* loc. cit. But having said so much, we may appreciate that the epithet is in fact a double-sided one, and that the principal reason for its use is that on the face it turns to the audience it = 'foreign', 'outlandish', being in that respect artistically significant in the direction mentioned above. We are also, I think, intended to be aware of its etymology, that is that it arose, according to Strab. 14. 2. 28, *κατ' ὀνοματοποιῶν ἐπὶ τῶν δυσεκφόρως καὶ σκληρῶς καὶ τραχέως λαλούντων*.¹ Worth noting in this connection is the unique word *βάγματα*, coined to exploit the point through alliteration and assonance.

With the remaining three adjectives the Chorus attempt to evoke a response of pity. *δύσθροα*, which requires the least comment, is used again in the same connection in 942 and 1076, and might in theory mean either 'ill-sounding', i.e. 'mournful-sounding' (the more usual interpretation) or 'sounding with difficulty', i.e. 'choked with grief' (so Murray in his translation, and Rose). The latter interpretation would agree with its use in Pind. *P.* 4. 63, *δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποινὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν*, of the stammering voice of Battus. But in view of *σαφηνῇ*, the former seems decidedly the more appropriate.

παναίολα presents the earliest instance of the transference of *αἰόλος* and its derivatives ('quickly-moving', 'sparkling', 'shot with varied hues') into the sphere of sound, in particular that of vocal and instrumental music. The meaning in these instances appears to vary somewhat with the context, though, except in Soph. *Ichn.* 319 *ἔξα[τ]ρει γὰρ αὐτὸν* (sc. τὸν Ἑρμῆν) *αἰόλισμα τῆς λ[ύ]ρας*, where some particular sound-attribute of the newly-discovered lyre is being referred to, and probably therefore its distinctive 'twanging' or 'quivering tones' (cf. Pind. *P.* 1. 4, 10),² the main basic idea is fairly certainly that of a melody which frequently alters its course or character, involving a diversity of pitch, rhythm, key, etc., as is appropriate in the given case. Compare with the

¹ This etymology has not been contested.

² Pearson's 'varied notes' is less good. Pindar, it is true, speaks of himself as mingling the *φόρμιγγα ποικιλόγαρον* and the *βοᾶν αὐλῶν* (*O.* 3. 8), but as the context shows, he is thinking less of these instruments' contrasting capacities than of their different roles in the orchestration of his ode. The *φόρμιγξ* (i.e. *κιθάρα*), we may sup-

pose, would have provided something in the nature of the *ἐτεροφωνία καὶ ποικιλία* described by Plato in *Lg.* 812d (though involving naturally less elaboration than the contemporary settings which he mainly has in mind), while the *αὐλός* underlined the word-rhythm. Similarly *O.* 4. 2 *ποικιλόφορμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς* 'a song embroidered with lyre-music'.

idea of mobility in the forefront, Ar. *Ra.* 247-8 χορείαν | αἰόλαν ἐφθεγξάμεσθα (the song conforms to the 'quickly-changing' dance-movements), Eur. *Ion* 498-500 συρίγγων | ὕπ' αἰόλας ἰαχᾶς | ὕμνων¹ (of the dance-tunes played by Pan); and with the emphasis rather on variety or on elaboration, Carm. Pop. 851/5 (b). 2 P ἀπλοῦν ῥυθμὸν χέοντες αἰόλω μέλει, *AP* 9. 584. 3 αἰόλον ἐν κιθάρᾳ νόμον ἔκρεκον ('an elaborate piece': Paton; cf. Pind. *N.* 4. 14 ποικίλον κιθαρίζων), and from later poetry notably the epithets αἰολόφωνος (Opp. *Hal.* 1. 728) and αἰολόδειρος (Nonn. *Dion.* 26. 211, 47. 31)² of the nightingale, with which we may compare e.g. *Od.* 19. 521 ἦ τε θαμὰ τρωπῶσα χέει πολυηχέα φωνήν, Eur. *Hec.* 337-8 πάσας ὥστ' ἀηδόνας στόμα | φθογγὰς ἱεῖσα and especially Plin. *NH* 10. 82 'plenus, gravis, acutus, creber, extensus; ubi visum est, vibrans, summus, medius, imus' (summing up his remarkable description of the song).³ In the present instance, as the hyperbolic prefix indicates, the principal connotation is that of 'varied', and we should undoubtedly be right in assuming with Broadhead that the reference is specifically to variety of pitch (rather than to pitch and rhythm, as Rose suggests; against this is the sense of βάγματα and the implication of παν-). For a precise illustration of what we are to have in mind we may cite *Suppl.* 112-15 τοιαῦτα πάθεα μέλεα θρεομένα λέγω | λιγέα βαρέα δακρυοπετῇ, | ἢ ἢ, | ἢλέμοισιν ἐμπρεπῇ. The βάγματα, then, are represented as ringing out 'now high, now low', the shrill notes of anguish mingling with the deep notes of despair. While this indicates to Darius the fulness and intensity of the Chorus' grief, it at the same times makes an effective contribution to the unusual sound-description, marking out a feature which, as being ἢλέμοισιν ἐμπρεπῇ, we may well suppose to have been especially prominent in the more passionate types of threnody associated with the East.⁴

αἰανῇ, used again of the Chorus' lamentations in 941, and with the prefix δυσ- in 281, is a word which occurs elsewhere in two quite different senses: (a) 'everlasting', 'eternal', in *Eum.* 572 ἐς τὸν αἰανῆ χρόνον, 672 αἰανῶς μένοι, and Lyc. *Al.* 928 αἰανῇ θεόν, and (b) a 'bad' but otherwise controverted sense

¹ ὕμνων has been much suspected and emended, the main objections to it, as they are given by Owen, being that (a) two genitives depending on ἰαχᾶς are awkward, and (b) Pan cannot simultaneously pipe and sing. But neither objection is valid. In regard to (b), we may note that words which properly signify human utterance are often used in poetry of musical instruments; so βοή in *Il.* 18. 495, Pind. *O.* 3. 8, and other passages cited by LSJ s.v.; ἀλαλητός in *AP* 6. 51. 5, ὕμνος in Telest. fr. 810/6. 5 P. and ᾠδή in *Pae. Delph.* 12. So ἰαχᾶς means here 'loud sound' and ὕμνων 'tunes'. That being so, συρίγγων will depend not on ἰαχᾶς but on ὕμνων, and will have an adjectival force, the two words expressing a single compound notion: 'syrinx-tunes'.

² Although LSJ recognize this epithet only as a colour-word, I think it hardly doubtful that it refers in these two passages to song. (Cf. Rose in his translation.) (a) It is a variation on ποικιλόδειρος (sc. ἀηδών)

in Hes. *Op.* 203; and whatever the Hesiodic epithet was in fact intended to signify (see Sinclair in note ad loc.), it was taken by later antiquity as = ποικιλόφωνος (so the scholiasts). (b) Observe the contexts, which show that in both instances the poet was thinking of the bird especially as a singer. The same interpretation should in all probability be extended to *Dion.* 12. 76 αἰολόδειρος . . . χελιδόν. For the general similarity of the epithets of the nightingale and the swallow see D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (1936²), 17, 315.

³ See further the use of αἰολο- in Telest. fr. 810/6. 5 P, *Pae. Delph.* 12, Limen. 14, Nonn. *Dion.* 8. 233, 19. 100, 40. 223. It may also be used of song with reference primarily to its content: Theoc. 16. 44 αἰδοῖς ὁ Κήτιος αἰόλα φωνέων ('his varied lays', Gow), Lyc. *Al.* 671-2 αἰόλω μέλει | πείσει (of the Siren, and so here perhaps shading over into the sense of 'shifty', 'devious').

⁴ Cf. *Suppl.* 69 with Tucker's note.

in Pind. *P.* 1. 83, *Eum.* 479, *al.* Sense (a) was derived by antiquity from αἰεί (*Σ Eum.* 572), and this derivation is accepted—as that which was valid, at any rate, for the users—in the modern dictionaries. Sense (b) is thought by LSJ to be derived from (a), and is defined by them as ‘wearying’, ‘persistent’.¹ Others, however, e.g. Boisacq, Frisk, and Chantraine, adhering more closely to the ancient glosses, take it as = ‘frightful’, ‘grievous’, ‘gloomy’, ‘mournful’, and suppose it to be of independent origin;² the proposal of Wackernagel³ to derive it from *σαιφ-ανής, ‘of frightful aspect’ (cf. Lat. *saevus* and the second element of ἀπηνής, προσηνής) is by all considered plausible. Here it has been interpreted on the one hand as ‘long-drawn’ (Headlam) and on the other as ‘dismal’ (Smyth), ‘gémissants’ (Mazon), ‘lugubri’ (Untersteiner), and so likewise by the majority. Clearly this question cannot be considered on a superficial level.

Excluding the passages cited under (a), the uses of the adjective outside the *Persae* are as follows:⁴ Archil. fr. 90 D προὔθηκε παισὶ δειπνον αἰνές φέρων (of the eagle who has seized the fox’s young), Pind. *P.* 1. 83 ἀπὸ γὰρ κόρος ἀμβλύνει | αἰανής ταχείας ἐλπίδας, 4. 236 κέντρον αἰ., *I.* 1. 49 λιμὸν αἰ., Aes. *Eum.* 416 Νυκτὸς αἰανῇ τέκνα (the Erinyes’ self-description), 479 πέδοι πεσῶν . . . αἰ. νόσος (the poison shed by the Erinyes; cf. 785–6 λειχὴν . . . ἄτεκνος . . . πέδον ἐπισύμενος, 941–2 μηδ’ ἄκαρπος αἰ. ἐφερπέτω νόσος (the Erinyes’ prayer; what they cause they can also prevent), Soph. *Aj.* 672 νυκτὸς αἰανὴς κύκλος, *El.* 504–15 ὦ Πέλοπος . . . ἱππεΐα, | ὥς ἔμολες αἰ. | τᾷδε γὰρ. | εὔτε γὰρ ὁ ποντισθεὶς | Μυρτίλος ἐκοιμήθη . . . | οὐ τί πω | ἔλιπεν ἐκ τοῦδ’ οἴκου | πολύπονος αἰκεία. From the lexicographers and scholiasts we have: *EM* 32. 26 αἰνές· τὸ δεινὸν καὶ πολύστονον. Ἀρχίλοχος (there follows the above-cited verse), Hesych. αἰνές· αἰδῖον, λάβρον, *ibid.* αἰνές· αἰώνιον, βλαβερόν, *Suda* αἰανὴς κύκλος· σκοτεινός, ἀδιάλειπτος. Σοφοκλῆς (*Aj.* loc. cit.), *ibid.* αἰανής· θρηνητικῆς. παρὰ τὸ αἰάζω, τὸ θρηνῶ, *ΣBT^r Pers.* 281 (on δυσαιανῇ) δυσθρήνητον (= *Σ^M*), αἰάζω γὰρ τὸ θρηνῶ, 636 σκοτεινά (*om.* *Σ^B*), ἀχλύς γέμοντα, 941 σκοτεινὴν, ἢ κατηφείας πλήρη, *Σ^M Eum.* 416 σκοτεινά. ἢ θρηνητικά, ἢ αἰάζειν ποιοῦντα, *Σ^L Aj.* 672 ὁ σκοτεινός κύκλος ἢ ἀδιάλειπτος.

The first thing that emerges with some clarity is that the ancient scholars were no better informed as to the real meaning of the word than we are, either in general or in particular passages. In the case of the dramatic scholia this needs no pointing out. From these the two *Suda* glosses are derived. In the case of the *EM* gloss, on which much weight is placed by those who follow Wackernagel, the truth is revealed by the two Hesychian glosses, which can only have to do with the same—evidently very variously interpreted—Archilochean verse. Secondly, we note that a number of these ancient interpretations have

¹ Reprehensibly they do not state what they take to be the earliest example of this sense. Archil. fr. 90 D? (But here it scarcely suits.) Or the Pindaric passages? How the uses in the *Persae* are to be taken is also left unclear. Note that *δυσαιανής* is rendered ‘most melancholy’, a sense not recognized s.v. *αἰανής*.

² While Boisacq, accepting the above-mentioned etymology of (a) as genuine, postulates two homonyms unconnected with each other, Frisk and Chantraine suppose that there was only one word which was later split into two through being falsely

connected with αἰεί. For this view of the adj. in general see also Kamberbeek in his note on *Aj.* 672.

³ *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde* (Basle, 1897), 7. For some other suggestions see Boisacq s.v.

⁴ A heteroclitite form αἰανός is presupposed by the *vv.ll.* in *Eum.* 416, 479, *Aj.* 672, *El.* 506, and Hesych. gives αἰανόν· χαλεπόν, δεινόν. But since in all four dramatic passages the form has only inferior attestation, and since there is no other literary evidence for it, it may safely be disregarded.

rather dubious foundations. Those for example of 'grievous' (πολύστονος, αἰάζειν ποιούντα) and 'mournful' (θρηνητικός, δυσθρήνητος) are due in large part to the notion that the adjective comes from αἰάι. And although such popular etymology can in fact be responsible, especially in poetry, for altering the meaning of a word (cf., perhaps, sense [a]), there is nothing to suggest that that has happened here. In the *Persae*, of course, the word has been selected on account, *inter alia*, of its mournful *au*-sound, as we have observed. But the same is true of numerous other words in all the dirges of the play. Their evocative sound-effect is plainly intended to be cumulative, and has nothing necessarily to do with sense. Again, it is apparent that the dramatic explanations have been influenced to some extent by the not uncommon scholiastic expedient of assimilating problematic words to others in whose immediate neighbourhood they occur.¹ Thus with θρηνητικός and δυσθρήνητος compare the δύσθροος of *Pers.* 637 and 942, and with the often-recurring σκοτεινός and its equivalents the νυκτός of *Eum.* 416 and *Aj.* 672. That the explanations have been so arrived at does not of course mean that they are wrong. But since they result in attributing tautology to the poets, misgivings would be justified.

If we now turn to the only safe guide there is, namely the texts themselves, the following conclusions, negative and positive, would seem to be permitted:

1. Archilochus' use of the word is indeed obscure. Was he thinking of the murderous nature of the meal? Or of its tragic consequences? Or did he have in mind such hyperbolic expressions as Homer's ἄσπετα κρέα (*Od.* 9. 162), and mean simply 'long-lasting', 'huge'?

2. With Pind. *ll.* cc., *Eum.* 479, 941, and *Soph. El.* 506 we are on firmer ground. Here an objective look at the things referred to—surfeit in relation to hopes, the goad, famine, canker, blight, the curse of Myrtilos—establishes as their common attribute the capacity to *wear out, waste, destroy*. And to these passages *Eum.* 416, though at first sight highly ambiguous, should certainly be added. There we expect the Erinyes' self-chosen epithet to denote their particular powers, and these, alluded to in their wider aspect in the expression αἰ. νόσος, were powers especially of physically wasting and exhausting the bloodguilty, to the point of death ([κατ-]ισχναίνειν 138, 267, μαραίνειν 139, ὀμαρτεῖν, ὄφρ' ἂν γὰν ὑπέλθῃ 338–9, μαυροῦν 359); note also, in comparison with 942 and Pind. *P.* *ll.* cc., the imagery in 331–3 ὕμνος ἐξ Ἑρινύων . . . αὐονὰ βροτοῖς, 238 ἀμβλὺν ἥδη προστετριμμένον τε (of their victim), *Cho.* 290 χαλκήλάτῃ πλάστῳ γυ λυμανθὲν δέμας (so again), and the obvious thematic link with the *Electra* passage. Further, although the idea of τὸ δεινόν is present by implication in a number of these uses, in others it is quite unwanted (e.g. Pind. *P.* 1. 83), and is nowhere certainly expressed. We may say the same of τὸ πολύστονον. There is no context, in other words, that is not completely satisfied by giving the adjective a material as distinct from emotive value. As to the further question, whether this and the temporal sense are related to each other, there can be, it seems to me, no simple answer. In *El.* 506 both senses are certainly intended to be felt, as the following γὰρ-clause shows;² and that the same is true of *Eum.* 416 is suggested especially by the strophe 333–40. It may be, however, that poetry has here deliberately drawn together two senses which were properly distinct, for the sake of richer meaning.

3. More difficult again is the *Ajax* passage. I think, however, that we must

¹ See Fraenkel in note on *Ag.* 1320.

² Cf. Jebb in note ad loc.

at all events, despite the two latest editors, rule out the interpretation *σκοτεινός*; this adds nothing that is not already expressed by *νυκτός*, and is too remote from any meaning we have been able to establish for the word. Besides, we ideally require a sense appropriate to *κύκλος*. Jebb renders 'night's weary round'. My own suggestion would be 'ever-returning cycle'; cf. *Ant.* 607.

4. That brings us back to the *Persae*. Enough will now have been said to suggest that the traditional interpretation is implausible, and we may with some confidence adopt the rendering of Headlam (though in a different sense from the one he had in mind; he was thinking of the repetitive nature of incantations). This fits in well with the hyperbolic tone of the description and it adds a precise and significant detail to it. The drawing out of syllables was a further way of expressing intensity of grief, and if we may judge from *Luc. Luct.* 13 *γοερὸν τι φθεγγόμενος καὶ παρατείνων ἕκαστον τῶν ὀνομάτων* it was another characteristic feature of the more abandoned types of lamentation. Note also *Pers.* 574, cited above.

The following sentence, 'I will shout aloud with all-pitiful cries of anguish',¹ continues in essentially the same spirit, and must be read as we find it in the MSS. To make it a deliberative question is to destroy the sense (the Chorus are insisting on what they are doing, not wondering what they should do), and to emend to *διαβοᾶσαι* is to produce a clumsier syntax, with less expressive force. Nor is alteration necessary. The active future-form may be Aeolic, as Wilamowitz suggested; or Aeschylus may have invented it himself on the model of *ἀείσω*. He has at any rate resorted to it for the sake of resonance, and in view of the artistic purpose of the strophe as a whole, that is all the justification it requires. As to the force of the future tense, it is explained by the similar examples given above: in expressing a resolve to cry aloud their grief the Chorus are simultaneously fulfilling it. Lastly, although the sense 'shout through the earth' would suit the context well enough, it is nowhere else attested for *διαβοᾶν*, which normally means 'shout aloud' or 'broadcast' (see the examples cited by LSJ s.v.). So it doubtless also has that meaning here. Compare especially the use of *κηρύσσω* in *Cho.* 4.

University College of North Wales, Bangor

JOAN A. HALDANE

¹ That *παντάλαν' ἄχη* is an internal accusative is rightly established by Broadhead. See further *Sept.* 78 with Tucker, ad loc.