

THE FIRST STASIMON OF AESCHYLUS' CHOEPHORI

Orestes has revealed himself to Electra and sworn with her to avenge Agamemnon. He outlines his plan and leaves the stage with a prayer to his father, after warning the chorus against indiscretion (581–2). They begin:

Earth nurtures many dread hurts and fears; the sea's embrace is full of monsters hostile to man; lights in mid-air between earth and heaven also harm winged things and things that tread the earth; and one might also tell of the stormy wrath of tempests.¹

But who could tell of a man's unruly will, and of ruthless woman's unbridled passions, that share her heart with evil powers ruinous to mankind?² But surpassing all is the wicked female passion whereby wedded union is worsted, among beasts and men alike.³

Two mythical examples follow: first Althaea, burning up the torch which measured the span of Meleager's life; then Scylla, daughter of Nisus king of Megara, who betrayed him to Minos king of Crete for a bribe, by cutting off while he slept the lock of hair on which his life depended, and so he died ('Hermes came for him'). They continue:

But since I have called to mind cruel pains, not untimely do I mention (?) the hateful union, an abomination on the house, and the crafty counsels of a female heart against her warrior husband * * * ; but I honour the hearth that is not inflamed by lust and a woman's spirit that is not ruthless.⁴

The return to Clytemnestra and the play's action follow naturally enough on the examples. But now comes a further example, worse than the others:

But of all crimes the Lemnian ranks first in story, and is decried as abominable by the folk; men compare any frightful deed to the Lemnian ills. But by god-hated pollution a race perishes dishonoured of men; for none reveres what is hateful to the gods. Which of these things do I not rightly bring together?

¹ I follow Page's text and punctuation in this stanza. βλαστοῦσι (codd.) cannot be excised, since πλήθουσι does not fit λαμπάδες and πλάθουσι does not fit κυωδάλων. Hermann's [βροτοῖσι] βρύουσι [πλήθουσι] could be right, but is uneconomical. ἄν is necessary, κἀνεμοέντων impossible: Blomfield's κἀνεμοέντ' ἄν seems certain, and, if ἄν is to have its normal position, must be preceded by sense-pause (cf. E. Fraenkel, 'Kolon und Satz, II', *NGG* (1933), 319 ff. = *Kleine Beiträge* i. 93 ff.; *JHS* 97 (1977), 128 n. 11), τις being understood as subject to φράσαι (see Fraenkel on *Ag.* 71). Then πανὰ τε καὶ πεδοβάμονα need to be governed by a transitive verb, and Butler's βλάπτουσι is best.

² The intensive repetition of ὑπέροτλον, τλημόνων, παντόλμους is not brought out in the translation here (cf. n. 22 below).

³ Reading Enger's ξυζύγου δ' ὁμαυλίας, governed by θηλυκρατής with active sense (cf. *PV* 860 θηλυκτόνος). παραινικᾶ = 'wins past', 'outstrips (all) in victory' (so Blass). See Appendix. In ἀπέρωτος, here rendered 'wicked', the privative ἀπο- is pejorative rather than negative (see D. Fehling, *Hermes* 96 (1968), 150–5, esp. 152, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren vor Gorgias* (1969), p. 288, cf. E. *Or.* 163 ἀπόφυνον φόνον. For Scylla this means illicit love; for the Lemnian women, with whom the correspondence here is closest (see pp. 253 ff. below), it means a love which frustration and jealousy have turned to hatred.

⁴ Reading ἄκαιρ' οὐδὲ for ἀκαίρως δὲ in 624, τίω for τίων in 629, and assuming a verb meaning 'I mention' or the like to have been displaced by the second ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ in 628. See Appendix.

The men of Lemnos abandoned their wives on account of their offensive smell, a visitation of Aphrodite,⁵ and took other partners for themselves from the mainland. So the women in revenge killed all the men on the island. Herodotus (6.138) adds that the Pelasgian men of Lemnos (descended from these women), who settled for a time in Attica, killed the women and children they had abducted, and that from this and the former deed a 'Lemnian crime' became proverbial for any frightful act.

There follow two stanzas on the sword sharpened for the wrongdoer on the anvil of justice. 'And to purge the stain of ancient bloodshed a child is being brought into the house by the far-famed, deep-scheming Erinys.'

The ode was taken by Wilamowitz⁶ to be a form of consolation, but with a sting in the tail: the frightfulness of Clytemnestra's act, and of the Lemnian crime which best illustrates it, made consolation after all impossible. But consolation has no place here.⁷ In this context the examples with which Clytemnestra's crime is compared can only be designed to heighten the horror and justify the retribution predicted at the close: there is no hint of mitigation. On the face of it the Lemnian women are closest to her in their act, though Althaea and Scylla both commit crimes of blood within the family, one to avenge her kin, the other for a bribe from her lover—both motives recall Clytemnestra. (Aeschylus does not mention Scylla's illicit love for Minos, her motive in another version which may well be early,⁸ but neither does he rule it out.) The examples show a progressive intensification. Althaea kills deliberately, but in anger, for a motive not in itself bad. Scylla kills treacherously by stealth, for a lover's bribe. The callous treachery of the Lemnian women, with its multiple crime, is a byword for horror. But the stanza which implicitly refers to Clytemnestra is misplaced: instead of coming as a climax after the three examples, the climax actually follows it.

One explanation given is that Clytemnestra's act is itself here a type of example, a paradigm from home (*οἰκεῖον παράδειγμα*),⁹ an illustration taken not simply from past history but from near at hand in the family; as Achilles, in his encounter with Priam, cites the example of his father Peleus, or Cadmus reminds Pentheus of his cousin Actaeon.¹⁰ But Clytemnestra's act cannot here be simply an illustration: the whole context of the action—the return of Orestes, Clytemnestra's dream, the final threat of retribution—makes it clear that her deed is the focus of the examples. Others hold that with the words *ἀκαίρως δὲ* in 624 the chorus reject the first two examples as not strictly apposite: 'since I have recalled cruel ills, but unfittingly, . . .' The actual crime of Clytemnestra points the way to a true parallel, the crowning example of the Lemnian women. But this will not do. The interpretation of *ἀκαίρως δὲ* is awkward, and the sequence of thought in the ode would be unique. When a series of mythical examples is invoked, the point to be illustrated always comes before or after them, or both—never in the middle.¹¹ Here the examples are introduced, as

⁵ For this curious story see W. Burkert, *CQ* N.S. 20 (1970), 1–16.

⁶ *Das Opfer am Grabe* (1896), p. 213; *Herakles*² (1895), ii.20 ff.

⁷ As is remarked by R. Oehler, *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (1925), p. 81, though he does not do justice

to Wilamowitz's interpretation.

⁸ The romantic motivation; first found in Ovid, but not necessarily Hellenistic.

⁹ Cf. Oehler, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 79.

¹⁰ *Hom. Il.* 24.535 ff.; *E. Ba.* 337–40.

¹¹ There is no such example to be found in Oehler's careful survey.

often, by a general reflection, that the unbridled passion of women is the most noxious of all evils; and their particular application, the climax of present horror on which they converge, should follow them. This is confirmed by 638 *τί τῶνδ' οὐκ ἐνδίκως ἀγείρω*; ; 'which of these things do I not rightly assemble?' *ἀγείρω* makes sense only if *τῶνδε* refers to *all* the preceding examples.¹²

The only convincing answer to this problem, suggested more than once,¹³ is to reverse the order of the third strophe and antistrophe so that the Lemnian crime comes *before* the allusion to Clytemnestra. Then all falls into place. The words 'which of these things do I not justly assemble?' follow directly on the examples to which they refer, *ἐνδίκως* being picked up (in my version) by *ἄκαιρ' οὐδέ*.¹⁴ The crime of Clytemnestra leads directly to the threat of its impending retribution.¹⁵ 'No one reveres what is *bateful* (*δυσφιλές*) to the gods' is picked up by the *bateful* (*δυσφιλές*) union of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. And above all, the climax comes in its proper place at the end.

An ingenious account of the traditional order has indeed been given by the late Anne Lebeck.¹⁶ The ode comes at the very centre of the *Oresteia*, so that we might expect its themes to relate to the whole trilogy. The murder of a son by a mother, and of a father by a daughter, stand for the acts they mirror: the sacrifice of Iphigeneia by Agamemnon in the previous play, and the killing of Clytemnestra by Orestes which is to follow. The act of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus explains itself. The 'Lemnian crime' applies not simply to the killing of the men by the Lemnian women, but also to the killing of the Athenian women by the Lemnian men. It is the combination of these two, Herodotus says (6.138.4), which became proverbially the 'Lemnian crime', and this combination is the perfect paradigm of a crime of violence begetting its like—the central theme of the *Oresteia*.

This subtle explanation has much to recommend it. The 'mirror image' of filial and parental murder is plausible enough, and the 'Lemnian crime', according to Herodotus' account, is a fair illustration of violence begetting its like. This is not exactly what Herodotus makes it illustrate: it is proverbial, he says, for frightfulness (*τὸ δεινόν*), and this is what Aeschylus says too. The same word is used by Hecuba, with a quite different emphasis, when she is persuading Agamemnon, in Euripides' play, to make possible her revenge on Polymestor, the murderer of her son (883 ff.):

¹² Hence *ἐγείρω*, 'awake' (Erfurdt), *ἀείρω*, 'take up' (M. L. West, *BICS* 24 (1977), 99): but neither is particularly appropriate.

¹³ Pruss, followed by Wecklein, Blass, Groeneboom, and Rose. Cf. *Pers.* 93–100, where a comparable transposition is required in lyrics, and *ibid.* 552–61, where a whole stanza (or its equivalent) is omitted in the text of M and added in the margin, showing how the error might have occurred. The text of the *Choephoroi*, which depends on M alone, is still more vulnerable to such errors, as is that of the *Supplices*, where 88–90/93–5 are commonly transposed. There may also be some dislocation in *Cho.* 429–55 (cf. R. D. Dawe, *The collation and investigation*

of manuscripts of Aeschylus, [1964] 161–4, and *Eranos* 64 [1966] 1–21, esp. 6–13).

¹⁴ See Groeneboom's note. Cf. *Ag.* 785–9 (Groeneboom), PV 30, 507. On the systematic connection between *δίκη* and *καίρος* see L. R. Palmer, 'The Indo-European origins of Greek justice', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1950 (1951), pp. 153–65.

¹⁵ E. R. Holtzmark (*CW* 59 (1966), 251) argues that the destruction of the Lemnian women implied by 636 *οἵχεται γένος* leads directly to the idea of retribution in the last strophic pair. But the retribution awaiting Clytemnestra follows more naturally on her crime.

¹⁶ CP 62 (1967), 182–4.

Ag. And how can women gain the mastery over men?

Hec. In numbers we are terrible (*δευός*), and our guile makes us hard to beat.

Ag. Terrible indeed; but I find your whole sex wanting.

Hec. Well, did not women make away with the sons of Aegyptus? Did they not rid Lemnos utterly of men?

Hecuba is so far gone in her lust for revenge that she can cite the Lemnian women as an example to be followed. Note however that the exemplum concerns only the Lemnian women; though it is true that the sequel in Attica has no place in the argument here. Nor is the Lemnian story, even in Herodotus' augmented version, a case of crime and retribution. It is not obviously a model for the chain of retributive crimes in the house of Atreus, and if Aeschylus means this he might perhaps have made his meaning clearer. The fate of the women in 635–6 *θεοστύγηται δ' ἄγει | βροτοῖς ἀτιμωθέν οἶχεται γένος*, a detail evidently added by Aeschylus to match the vengeance of Orestes foreshadowed in the close,¹⁷ is not indeed inconsistent with such an allusion, but does nothing to clarify it either. None the less, the allusion is certainly no more remote than others which Miss Lebeck has convincingly brought to light in her brilliant book on the trilogy,¹⁸ and she may well be right to see a deeper level of significance here.

The traditional order, however, is still impossible. The context shows that at its first acceptance the ode must refer primarily to Clytemnestra, as its closing lines make clear.¹⁹ The remoter references to Agamemnon, Orestes, and the whole house of Atreus may be there to be divined, but they are at another level, below the surface. In the highly traditional forms of Greek poetry, the rhetorical pattern of a passage must reflect in the first place its primary, surface meaning, and with the ode in its present order this is not so; so that even if the second level of meaning with its remoter significance is intended by Aeschylus, the third strophe and antistrophe must still be transposed to accommodate the rhetorical pattern required by the primary meaning. If then the example of the Lemnian women alludes at a deeper level to crime begetting retributive crime, the reference must be not only to the act of Clytemnestra which immediately follows, but also to the last two stanzas, the vengeance of Orestes.

I add two formal arguments in confirmation. Firstly, it has been well observed²⁰ that the ode begins with a priamel: earth's monsters, sky-borne lights, and the wrath of storms are all harmful; most harmful of all is the ruthless spirit of men and the ruthless loves of women. This climax is now illustrated by a priamel of mythical examples: the guilty but pardonable Althaea, the guilty and unpardonable Scylla, and—if the transposition advocated is correct—the ultimate horror of the Lemnian women, leading up to the climax of the dreadful

¹⁷ On the tendency of Greek poets to invent new features in mythical exempla to suit the case they are illustrating, see Oehler, *op. cit.*, p. 7; J. T. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (1949), pp. 86 ff.; M. M. Willcock, *CQ N.S.* 14 (1964), 141 (nn. 1, 2).

¹⁸ Anne Lebeck, *The Oresteia: a study in language and structure* (1971).

¹⁹ In particular, the primary reference of

623–4 is to Clytemnestra, not Aegisthus, as Verrall and others have held (see below, p. 259 and n. 29); though Aegisthus' partnership is implied by *δυσφιλές γαμήλευμα*, and perhaps by *γυναϊκόβουλοι μήτιδες*.

²⁰ Oehler, *op. cit.*, p. 78; Holtsmark (*op. cit.* (n. 15), pp. 215–16), who also points out that the exempla exhibit the same pattern.

present, the crime of Clytemnestra. The climax of the opening priamel is itself a priamel, with three terms in ascending order of evil: the ruthless spirit of men, the ruthless passions of women, and above all the unnatural female passion which destroys marriages (husbands). With my interpretation of 599–601, the pattern is all the clearer: the last term 'surpasses all', *παρανικᾶ*, as the last example 'ranks first', *πρεσβεύεται* (631). The examples are indeed related to the first antistrophe in several ways: most generally, they illustrate *τὸ δεινόν*;²¹ in particular, they illustrate the evil of female passion; and they also illustrate *τόλμα*, the ruthlessness whereby human beings harden their hearts to commit inhuman crimes. Given the remoter allusion suggested by Lebeck, the example of Althaea illustrates not only the *τόλμα* of the *τάλανα γυνά* who killed her own son, but the *τόλμα* of Agamemnon, who, when he had put on the yoke of necessity, *τὸ παντότολμον φρονεῖν μετέγνω . . . ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτῆρ γενέσθαι | θυγατρὸς* (Ag. 221–5).

I am not suggesting that a simple correspondence between the exempla and the terms of the first antistrophe, men's *ὑπέρτολμον φρόνημα* being illustrated by Agamemnon, women's *πάντολμοι ἔρωτες* by Scylla, and *ξυζύγου ὁμαλίας θηλυκρατῆς ἔρωτος* by the Lemnian women, exhausts their significance. If Lebeck is right, the treacherous female passion of Scylla is mirrored by the vengeful male *τόλμα* of Orestes; while the Lemnian crime, inspired by female jealousy, has male overtones, like the *θηλυκτόνος Ἄρης* of the Danaids (PV 860–1; cf. E. *Hec.* 883 ff.), or the murder of their husbands by the Amazons (Hdt. 4.110). All three examples, and their duality of theme, converge on Clytemnestra. She acts, like Althaea, to avenge her closest kin, like Scylla, because of an illicit love, and like the Lemnian women, through jealousy of her husband's mistress; and the female passions that inspire her are matched by a male ruthlessness of spirit (cf. Ag. 11 *γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον . . . κέαρ, Cho.* 629–30 *τίω δὲ . . . γυναικεῖαν τ' ἄτολμον αἰχμάν*, 'but I honour a woman's spirit that is not ruthless'). The real theme of the ode is neither women's passions nor *τόλμα* nor yet *τὸ δεινόν*, but that distortion of the norm which pervades the first two plays of the trilogy.

At 623 *ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμνασάμην . . .*, 'since I have called to mind cruel sufferings, not untimely <do I abominate> a loathsome marriage', the chorus comes to the point. We may recall the priamel, identified in the analysis of the late Elroy L. Bundy, at the opening of Pindar's tenth Pythian: *Ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων, μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία . . .* 'Prosperous is Lacedaemon, blessed is Thessaly'; Heracles is common to both; *τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν*; 'why this irrelevant vaunt?'²² With these words Pindar dismisses his foil, the preparatory terms of the priamel, and homes in on his climax: the games, the victor's patrons, and finally the victor himself.²³ Just so, according to my text, Aeschylus homes in on *his* climax with the words *ἄκαιρ' οὐδὲ*, 'not untimely either': the notion of *καιρός* is

²¹ Holtsmark (loc. cit. (n. 15)) makes *τὸ δεινόν* the focus of the whole ode, and thereby seeks to justify the traditional order. I do not think he succeeds, though I gladly accept much of what he says.

²² E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (University of California Publications 18.2

(1962), 38. 'What do I boast beside the mark?', i.e. 'My boast is relevant', is a possible rendering, but it fits the context less well.

²³ The structure is similar to that of the opening of our ode: the climax of the initial priamel is itself a priamel.

invoked at precisely the same point in the pattern.²⁴

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly: the climax of the opening priamel is the *ruthless* spirit of men, *ὑπέρτολμον φρόνημα*, and the *ruthless* loves, *παντόλμους ἔρωτας*, of *ruthless* women, *γυναικῶν τλημόνων*.²⁵ At the end of the third antistrophe—given again the transposition—come the words: ‘but I honour a hearth not fired by passion, and a woman’s spirit that is not *ruthless*’, *γυναικεῖαν τ’ ἄτολμον αἰχμάν*. *ἄτολμον* echoes *ὑπέρτολμον*, *παντόλμους*, *τλημόνων* in the first antistrophe. That is, the whole central section of the ode, after the introductory strophe and before the closing strophic pair, is marked off by the ring-form typical of mythical paradigm.²⁶ But if the example of the Lemnian women *follows* the climax, this pattern is lost. This is a final argument, if any is needed, for the transposition which the rhetorical structure clearly demands.

APPENDIX: NOTES ON THE TEXT

594–601

ἀλλ’ ὑπέρτολμον ἀν-
δρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγει
καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσὶν τλημόνων
παντόλμους ἔρωτας, ἄ-
ταισι <--> συννόμους βροτῶν,
ξυζύγου δ’ ὁμαυλίας
θηλυκρατῆς ἀπέρωτος ἔρωσ παρὰ νικᾶ
κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν.

599 ξυζύγου Enger: ξυζύγους 600 ἀπέρωτος M²: ἀπέρωπος M¹ et Σ

With the reading *πλήθουσι · βλέπουσιν* in 588–9 (see n. 1) there is a lacuna in 597, probably to be filled by an epithet for *ἄταισι*. *ξυζύγους τ’ ὁμαυλίας* has been taken (1) as co-ordinate with *ἔρωτας*, (2) as the object of *παρὰ νικᾶ*, with δὲ linking sentences. With (1) the sense is not general enough. The phrase cannot apply to all family relationships, as Schütz supposed; it must mean ‘wedded unions’, which unduly narrow the scope of *ἔρωτας* at this point, limiting the reference too soon to the Lemnian women, and consort less suitably than *ἔρωτας* with *ἄταισι*. (2) gives possible sense: ‘and wedded unions are wrested (perverted) by a passion which masters women, among beasts and mankind

²⁴ The point holds good for any text giving the sense *καυρώς* here, which as Page says is the sense required (app. crit. ad loc.).

²⁵ The intensive repetition can be brought out only at the cost of some freedom in translation. ‘Ruthlessness’ conveys the idea of *τόλμα* better than the usual equivalent ‘daring’.

²⁶ On ring-form as a frame for mythical exempla see Oehler, op. cit., p. 7; Willcock, op. cit. (n. 13), p. 142, with n. 2; A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (1971), pp. 66–8, 123–50. Mr. Peter Pickering

suggests that *ἄτολμον* may simply be a further case of intensive repetition. We might compare the repetition of *στένω* and cognates in the first stasimon of the *Prometheus Vincitus* (cf. *Euripides and the Judgement of Paris*, *JHS Suppl.* 11 (1965), 18 n. 2). That *στένω* occurs at the beginning and end of the ode, however, is hardly accidental there either. (We might also regard the verbal echo in *Cho.* 630 as marking a corresponsion between the climax of the exempla and that of the opening priamel, cf. n. 20.).

alike'. The force of *παρ*- in *παρ*ανικᾶν, 'amiss', 'awry', 'in malam partem', can perhaps be supported by e.g. *παρά*γω, *παραβιά*ζεσθαι. But 'mislead' and 'force awry' are normal expressions, 'misconquer' is not. It would be rash to claim that Aeschylus *could* not have coined the word *παρ*ανικᾶν to mean 'pervert by conquest', but the prefix should at least give one pause. A more straightforward sense for *παρ*ανικᾶ is 'win past' (others), 'surpass in victory', and this has a close analogy in *παραφθάνω*, cf. *Il.* 10.346 εἰ δ' ἄμμε παραφθαίησι πόδεσσιν, 22.197 τοσσάκι μιν προπάρειθεν ἀποτρέψασκε παραφθᾶς, 23.515 οὐ τι τάχει γε παραφθάμενος Μενέλαος: the image is that of a race. (So in effect Blass, who understands *παρ*- as comparative.) *παρ*ανικᾶ is then absolute, as in *Eum.* 741 νικᾶ δ' Ὀρέστης, *S. Ant.* 795, Diphilos fr. 60K εὖ γ' ὁ κατὰ χρυσος εἶπε πολλὰ Εὐριπίδης · | νικᾶ δὲ 'χρεία', κ. τ. λ. (see Fraenkel, *Glotta* 39 (1960), 4). Blass punctuated after ὁμαυλίας, an interpretation already rejected. Enger's ξυζύγου δ' ὁμαυλίας, governed by *θηλυκρατής*, gives excellent sense at little cost: *συζύγου ὁμαυλίας κρατῶν θηλὺς ἀπέρωτος ἔρω*ς (Wecklein, ed. 1885), 'a wicked female passion whereby wedded union is worsted' (or 'a wicked passion whereby wedded union is worsted by women'). For the active sense of the compound cf. *PV* 860–1 *θηλυκτόνῳ* | Ἄρει,²⁷ 'a war of women that kills' or 'a war where women kill', with *ἐγκρατής*, *ἐπικρατής*, *δημοκρατεῖν*, etc. It makes little difference whether we read *ἀπέρωπος* 'shameless',²⁸ the meaning given by the lexicographers who alone attest the word, or *ἀπέρωτος*, 'wicked' (see n. 3 above). *-πος* was written first in M, and was not just a slip, since it is glossed in the scholia; but *-τος* was also an old reading. The figure *ἀπέρωτος ἔρω*ς is a favourite of Aeschylus, and slightly preferable here. We might expect *ἀπέρως* (like *δυσέρως*) rather than *-τος*, since this would be the only adjective in *-τος* derived from *ἔρω*ς (Lobeck, *Paralipomena* (1837), p. 258), but cf. *ἀχάριτος* as against *ἄχαρις* (esp. *Cho.* 42 *χάρῳ ἀχάριτον*, where Elmsley's conjecture is certainly right).

The particularity of 'wedded union' is now in place: the climax of the priamel, 'human *τόλμα*', has itself a climax, the destruction of the husband through female passion; which is also the climax of the mythical examples, the Lemnian crime (631 *πρεσβεύεται*) which homes in on the crime of Clytemnestra and the action of the play (see pp.253–4 above).

623 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμνασάμην ἀμειλίχων
 πόνων, † ἀκαίρως δὲ † δυσφιλὲς γαμή-
 λευμ' ἀπεύχετον δόμοις
 γυναικοβούλους τε μήτιδας φρενῶν

²⁷ Cited by Wecklein in his Greek edition (1910). Wecklein himself took *παρ*ανικᾶ to govern the following genitives, a usage not justified by the comparative genitive with *νικῶμενος* (see Blass's note, and cf. *JHS* 96 (1976), 134 n. 53).

²⁸ This is one of the meanings given by Phrynichus ap. Bekker, *Anecdota* i.8.8. The word evidently existed, since it is cited in

more than one inflection, but it is not clear that the lexicographers or the scholiast knew what it meant, nor why a negative adjective derived, as it presumably is, from *περιωπή* should mean 'shameless'. Possibly 'incautious', 'rash' would be nearer the mark, cf. *ibid.* ἀπερίβλεπτος and the normal use of ἀπερίσκεπτος.

ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ τευχεσφόρῳ
 † ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ δῆοις ἐπικότῳ σέβας†·
 τίῳ δ' ἀθέρμαντον ἐστὶαν δόμῳν
 γυναικεῖαν τ' ἄτολμον αἰχμάν.

624 ἀκαίρως: ἀκαιρον Heath: post ἀκαίρως commate interpunxit Abresch, nota interrogationis Groeneboom δέ: δ' ὁ (. . . σέβων) Hermann, (. . . φρονῶν) Murray: τὸ Herwerden 625 ἀπεύχεται: ἀπεύχεται (δόμος) Weil: ἀπεύχομαι Firnhaber 626 γυναικόβουλοι τε μήτιδες Heath 628 ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ alterum ex altero repetitum indicat Page δῆοις ἐπικότῳ ἔβαν Scholfield (ἔβας Verrall, ἔβα Murray) 629 τίῳ δ' Stanley: τίῳν δ' M: τίους' olim, τίῳν postea Weil.

The stanza is corrupt. There is no main verb, ἀκαίρως prima facie gives the wrong sense, and τίῳν has no subject. To take the last point first: τίῳν cannot refer to the chorus (so Wilamowitz, but see Barrett, *Hippolytus* 366–9); nor to Aegisthus (Verrall and others), since the main emphasis in the stanza must be on Clytemnestra. The following words therefore mean not 'a cowardly hearth within the house, and a womanish rule without daring' (Verrall,²⁹ after Σ) but 'a hearth unwarmed by (illicit) passion, and a woman's spirit that is not ruthless'. The sense of ἀθέρμαντον is confirmed by Ag. 1434–6: Clytemnestra will not fear the townsfolk while Aegisthus kindles a fire upon her hearth, ἔως ἂν αἴθῃ πῦρ ἐφ' ἐστίας ἐμῆς | Αἴγισθος; that of ἄτολμον by the clear reference to the first antistrophe: there the chorus condemn τόλμα, especially in women, so here a woman's spirit that is ἄτολμον must be something they approve.³⁰ Stanley's τίῳ is certain, and it means 'I honour', not 'I am forced to honour'.

Attempts to make ἀκαιρία relevant to the context have been various. (1) Understand μνήσομαι or the like, which is impossible. (2) Read ἀκαιρον (predicative, sc. ἐστί) and γυναικόβουλοι μήτιδες (Heath). Then δέ must be treated as apodotic, which is very hard, or emended e.g. to τὸ (Herwerden), or anacoluthon assumed. On similar lines is ἀκαιρος δ' ὁ . . . σέβων (Hermann),

²⁹ Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* (1894), Appendix, §17. Blass shares his view, despite Ag. 1435, which he prays in aid, citing θερμός in *Sept.* 603, *Eum.* 560 (cf. also S. *Trach.* 1046); for the positive force of ἀθέρμαντος he cites θερμός in *Sept.* 603, *Eum.* 560 (cf. also S. *Trach.* 1046). Lloyd-Jones, reading τίουσα (with ἔβας, of Clytemnestra: see below), renders 'honoring the hearth of the house that lacked warmth' (*The Libation Bearers*, by Aeschylus (1970), p. 45). He also compares Ag. 1435–6 and explains: 'a hearth that had only a man like Aegisthus to light it lacked proper warmth'. So Fraenkel on Ag. loc. cit.: the hearth is normally kindled by the legitimate lord of the house; Clytemnestra is there accepting Aegisthus as such, the chorus here mean that he is a usurper. We might compare Ag. 968–9 καὶ σοῦ μολόντος δωματίῳ ἐστίαν | θάλπος μὲν ἐν χειμῶνι σημαίνει μολόν, κ. τ. λ. But that is part of an elaborate complimentary metaphor from which Aegisthus

is naturally excluded, while the obvious erotic overtones of 1435–6, with δυσφιλές γαμήλευμα in *Cho.* 625, make it very difficult to take ἀθέρμαντον in this way.

³⁰ Lucian, *Nigrinus* 57 βίον τῷ τούτου γυναικῶδῃ καὶ ἄτολμον, cited by Groeneboom to support the contrary view, merely suggests that Lucian made the same error. Fraenkel, in his note on Ag. 483–4 γυναικὸς αἰχμᾶ πρέπει | πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάρις ξυναυέσαι, insists that αἰχμᾶ means 'authority', 'rule', and so also here and at *PV* 405. This could be the sense with my interpretation: the chorus honour a queen who does not yield to πάντολμος ἔρως, or kill the rightful lord on his return from war. But the word could mean 'will' or 'spirit' in any or all of these places: the extension from the sphere of war is easy enough (cf. πρευμανής < μένος < μαίνομαι), and the analogy of δόρυ meaning 'authority' in E. *Hipp.* 975 etc. is not conclusive.

but the break before the participle is too long. (2) ἀκαίρος δ' ὁ . . . φρονῶν, with ἔβα (Murray). (3) Take ἀκαίρως δέ with ἐπεμνασάμην, punctuating with a comma or colon after δέ, either (a) because the reality is different from the previous examples, and worse (Abresch, Wecklein, Wilamowitz, Verrall, Blass), or (b) with reference to Orestes' warning (581–2 γλώσσα εὐφημον φέρειν | σιγᾶν θ' ὅπου δεῖ καὶ λέγειν τὰ καίρια (Lebeck): the chorus reproach themselves for their indiscretion, which they then proceed to compound, giving an effect of *praeteritio*. This last is the most plausible, but I know of no stasimon where the chorus, like the prisoners in *Fidelio*, pull themselves up in this way, and the tragic convention allows them to speak freely when alone: they show their feelings openly enough in the parodos.

The sense needed, as Page remarks in his apparatus, is *καιρίως*, which will then pick up ἐνδίκως two lines above (see p. 254, with n. 14). Groeneboom punctuated ἀκαίρως δέ; 'num inepte?'. This gives the right sense without change, but the question is too abrupt. The same applies to Headlam's suggestion that ἀκαίρως δέ is an interruption by another speaker.³¹ The right sense is also given by the easy change ἀκαιρ' οὐδέ, 'not untimely either', which is made vulnerable to corruption both by the adverbial neuter plural and by the word-order. Aeschylus favours neuter plural adverbs, and ἀκαιρα occurs as an adverb in Euripides (*Hel.* 1082). For the word order cf. S. *Trach.* 124–8 φαμί γάρ οὐκ ἀποτρέφειν | ἐλπίδα τὰν ἀγαθὰν | χρῆναί σ' · ἀνάληγτα γάρ οὐδ' | ὁ πάντα κραίων βασιλεὺς | ἐπέβαλε θνατοῖς Κρονίδας, 'not painlessly either did Zeus the fulfiller of all things impose them on mortals (in general)'.³² For the general sense cf. Athen. 565 A οὐκ ἀκαίρως δέ . . . μνήσομαι, ἐπειδήπερ ἐμνήσθην τοῦ κιθαριστοῦ Στρατονίκου λέξει τι περὶ τῆς εὐστοχίας αὐτοῦ (Headlam). We then need a verb meaning 'I mention' or perhaps 'I condemn', 'I abominate'. ἀπεύχομαι (Firnhaber) would serve, but it involves changing what is *prima facie* sound and leaving what is not. Page reasonably locates corruption in the second ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ in 628: the repeated phrase is not unaeschylean, but it may well be intrusive, and the line makes no sense as it stands. ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ may have displaced e.g. ἀπέπτυσ' or στύγησα. ἐπικόττω(ι) is irrelevant with or without δήοις, and some have introduced a verb by reading δήοις ἐπεκόττως ἔβαν (Scholefield, with μῆτιδες as subject), or ἔβας (Verrall), ἔβα (Murray), with Aegisthus as subject (reading φρονῶν), giving the wrong emphasis. If ἀπεύχομαι were read, δ. ε. ἔβας (or ἔβα), followed by τίω δέ (or τίουσ'), could indeed refer to Clytemnestra (cf. 429 f.). But σέβας looks right. In the antistrophe (or strophe, given transposition) the chorus say (637): σέβει γάρ οὐτις τὸ δυσφιλές θεοῖς, 'no one reverences what is hateful to the gods'; so here it is fitting that they should say they have no reverence for the δυσφιλές γαμήλευμα of the murderers. This echoes their

³¹ It has also been suggested that ἀκαίρως δέ has intruded from a scholion. This is possible, but since *καιρίως* gives the right sense, it is more likely that some derivative of *καιρός* stood in the text.

³² Strictly the logic is: 'You too, Deianeira, should have good hope, since it is no painless lot Zeus has laid on mortals' (see Denniston, *GP*, p. 195); and so in *Cho.*

623 'since I have recalled cruel pains, not untimely do I mention also . . .'. For the postponement of οὐδέ with this sense, cf. e.g. *Trach.* 280, 1275, *O. T.* 1409. (Denniston's interpretation of *Trach.* 127–8 is rightly followed by subsequent editors; the sense 'not even Zeus' suits neither the logic of the passage nor the classical concept of Zeus.)

words in the parodos (55): *σέβας . . . τὸ πρὶν . . . νῦν ἀφίσταται*, 'the former reverence is now departed'. Anger is also appropriate to their attitude. In the kommos (391) they say they have 'wrathful hatred', *ἔγκοτον στύγος*, in their heart, as in the parodos they have *πικρὸν . . . στύγος* (80). So the appropriate sense is 'through anger, reverence is departed', e.g. *ἀπέπτυσ' ἡδ' ὥλετ' ἐπὶ κότῳ σέβας*, or *στύγησα, κοῦκ ἔστω ἐπὶ κότῳ σέβας* (these suggestions are of course *exempli gratia*).

How then did the corrupt *δήοις* get there in the first place? I suggest that it may be due to a marginal variant *δαίσις* (or *-αις*) on *δαεῖς* in 604; not so distant, since if 604 came half-way down the left-hand column of a 24-line page, 628 would be immediately opposite in the right-hand column. The intrusion would be assisted by the apparent need of *ἐπικότῳ* for a complement. (Who was Agamemnon angry with? His enemies, naturally.) There may indeed be more to it than this. The second strophe runs as follows:

602—7
ἴστω δ' ὅστις οὐχ ὑπόπτερος
φροντίσω †δαεῖς
τὰν ἁ παιδολύμας τάλαω Θεοσιάς μήσατο
πυρδαῆς γυνὰ πρόνοιαν . . .

603 *δαεῖς* Codd.: *δαίαις* Franz: *χαύναις* Wilamowitz 607 *πυρδαῆς* M^Σ: *-δαῆ* M *τινα* corr. Page

δαεῖς has often been suspected (Wilamowitz and Murray obelize). The text as it stands would mean: 'let him know (this truth), whoever is not borne aloft on his thoughts, having learnt . . .' (*δαεῖς* = *μαθῶν*). The sense is not impossible; for *ἴστω* cf. e.g. S. *Aj.* 417. *τοῦτό τις φρονῶν ἴστω*; for the form of *δαεῖς* cf. *ἐδάη(ν)* in *Ag.* 122, S. *El.* 169, E. *Hec.* 78. But (1) 603 *φροντίσω* *δαεῖς* = 613 *φονίαν* *Σκύλλαν*, -ο-ο-. This responsion is found at E. *Andr.* 834 = 983, but that is clausular to a prosodiac compound, and the licence is in order.³³ It would presumably be possible in a hypodochmiac, though I know of no example.³⁴ But a hypodochmiac is out of place in this otherwise purely iambo-trochaic context: - ο - - - is clearly a syncopated trochaic dimeter. This means that the strophe must be emended, not the antistrophe (*φονίαν* *κόραν* Merkel). (2) *ὑπόπτερος φροντίσω* must be equivalent to *μετεωρηθεῖς φρονήματι* or to *ὑψηλὸς φρεσίν*.³⁵ But *φροντίσω* is not quite *φρονήματι*, 'by arrogance', nor

³³ Cf. A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (1968), p. 168; though her examples are of the type . . . ο - ο - ο - ο, whereas - ο - - - as prosodiac-enoplian clausula is usually interpreted as a catalectic form of ithyphallic, which one would not expect to correspond with - ο - ο - ο. Schroeder conjectured *ἀνδράσω* in 839, giving - ο - ο - ο in both places; Maas, in his copy of Schroeder's *Cantica* now in my possession, accepted the licence in responsion.

³⁴ Cf. N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 31. *Andr.* loc. cit. is also usually taken to be a hypodochmiac. Pace Conomis (op. cit., p. 32), there are certainly dochmiacs in the vicinity, and this might justify the licence in a prosodiac clausula.

³⁵ Some follow the scholia in taking

ὑπόπτερος φροντίσω to mean *κουφόνοος*, 'vain of thought', or 'volatile', 'unstable' in mind, cf. Hesychius *ὑπόπτερος* · *κουφός*. The thought would then be very like that of S. *Aj.* 416 *τοῦτό τις φρονῶν ἴστω*. This could be right, but the evidence for this meaning is not very convincing: we should expect *ὑπόπτερος* to be positive rather than negative. *ὑποπτεροῖς φροντίσω* is also recognized in the scholia, but the meaning of the epithet is still a difficulty, and the simple dative could not stand by itself: *δαεῖς* must be altered to give it a construction. (Emperius' *δμαθεῖς* introduces an ellipse of the copula with a participle, which is extremely rare except with participles regularly found in the accusative absolute, e.g. *πρέπων* (cf. K—G. ii. 40 f.).

φρεσίν, 'in his heart'; as Wilamowitz argues (*ad loc.*), it needs an adjective. δάαις (Franz), or δάοις,³⁶ is an easy change: 'whoever is not borne aloft by hostile thoughts', i.e. not δυσμενής (cf. 429 f. δαΐα . . . μᾶτερ, δαΐαις ἐν ἐκφοραῖς . . . ἔτλης ἄνδρα θάψαι). The word has a further point. In Homer, δῆϊος is a standing epithet of fire, and ancient scholars connected it with δαίω 'burn', perhaps rightly.³⁷ So φροντίσω δάαις (-οις) means 'hostile fiery thoughts'; just such thoughts, in fact, as inspired 'burning, fiery' Althaea, πυρδαῆς γυνή, when she contrived her plan: the epithet δᾶος anticipates the exemplum. That is, the variant δάοις postulated above as the possible source of the corrupt δῆοις in 628 is in fact the correct reading, corrupted to δαεῖς and reappearing, as often, in the margin.

Wadham College, Oxford

T. C. W. STINTON

³⁶ δᾶος has three terminations elsewhere in Aeschylus, but is found with two in Sophocles (*Ichneutae* 239) and Euripides. It is normally trisyllabic in tragedy, but (1) δάων occurs at *Pers.* 985, and δάαν is generally read *ibid.* 271; (2) *Sept.* 278 ff. is corrupt, but the phrase λάφυρα δάων seems sound, and δάων cannot be trisyllabic without drastic surgery such as Murray's;

(3) it is pretty certainly disyllabic at S. *Ichneutae* 239: this is a satyr-play, but as δᾶος is not a comic word, it is fair evidence; (4) the disyllabic form is implied by *Sept.* 72 δηάλωτον, S. O. C. 1533 ἀδῆοις.

³⁷ So Frisk, s. v., with references to other views (see esp. G. Björck, *Das Alpha impurum* (1950), pp. 340–2).