

AESCHYLUS, *AGAMEMNON* 984–6, 998¹

Χο. τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπεδῶς	στρ. α
δεῖμα προστατήριον	976
καρδίας τερασκόπου ποτᾶται;	
μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλευστος ἄμιθος αἰοιδά,	
οὐδ' ἀποπτύσαι δίκαν	980
δυσκρίτων ὄνειράτων	
θάρος εὐπειθές ἴ-	
ζει φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον.	
†χρόνος δ' ἐπεὶ πρυμνησίων ξυνεμβόλοις	
ψαμμίας ἀκάτα παρή-	985
βησεν† εὐθ' ὑπ' Ἴλιον	
ᾧρτο ναυβάτας στρατός.	
πεύθομαι δ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων	ἀντ. α
νόστον αὐτόμαρτυς ὦν	
τὸν δ' ἄνευ λύρας ὅμως ὑμνωιδεῖ	990
θρήνον Ἐρινύος αὐτοδίδακτος ἔσωθεν	
θυμός, οὐ τὸ πᾶν ἔχων	
ἐλπίδος φίλον θράος.	
σπλάγχνα δ' οὔτοι ματαί-	995
ζει πρὸς ἐνδίκους φρεσίν,	
τελεσφόροις δίναις κυκλοῦμενον κέαρ	
εὐχομαι δ' ἐξ ἐμᾶς	
ἐλπίδος ψύθη πεσεῖν	
ἐς τὸ μὴ τελεσφόρον. ²	1000

About the extent of the trouble and the suitability of the remedies that have been advanced, there have been some differences of opinion; everyone, however, has recognized that there is something amiss in the lines 984–6. At the very least few would deny these difficulties:

- (1) ξυνεμβόλοις is suspect.
- (2) ψαμμίας ἀκάτα must be regarded as seriously corrupt.
- (3) χρόνος...παρήβησεν must be emended as a whole so that either the indispensable constituents of two complete clauses appear or ἐπεὶ disappears.
- (4) ψαμμίας ἀκάτα παρή- and εὐχομαι δ' ἐξ ἐμᾶς (998) must be brought into metrical correspondence.

Few of the many remedies put forward to cure these difficulties appear ever to have gained a large following. One proposal, however, did at least at one time have impressive support. U. von Wilamowitz edited thus: χρόνος δ', ἐπεὶ πρυμνησίων ξύν

¹ I am indebted to C. W. Willink who as referee for the *Classical Quarterly* read this paper and raised a number of useful points.

² The text is D. L. Page's O.C.T. (Oxford, 1972), which at 984–6 is actually the text of the Cod. Florentinus Laur. 31.8. Triclinian variants will be mentioned when the occasion warrants.

ἐμβολαῖς [I. Casaubon] ψάμμος [N. Wecklein] ἄμπα [Wilamowitz], παρήβησεν.³ And among subsequent editors first P. Mazon adopted this text, then P. Groeneboom, who credited Wilamowitz 'audaci sed uenusta coniectura', did the same, and finally Ed. Fraenkel, to whom ἄμπα seemed 'emendatio palmaris'.⁴ The Denniston–Page edition, however, so far from following its distinguished predecessors, took a quite opposite view, insisting that: 'Sand does not "fly up" when mooring cables are "thrown in"; [and that] the deficiency of sense [in the emended text] is as great as the disregard of palaeographical probabilities.'⁵ However even these incisive objections did not at once eradicate all support. I. C. Cunningham undertook to defend Wilamowitz's text against Denniston–Page by reinterpreting it.⁶ While he conceded that sand may not 'fly up' when ships depart, he maintained that this is because on such occasions the ropes are 'hauled in'; and he suggested that, alternatively, if the reference here was not to the departure from Aulis but to the landing at Troy, then one could suppose the sand would indeed 'fly up' because it would be disturbed by the mooring ropes as they were thrown on the shore. So far so good, one may perhaps say, but the linchpin of Cunningham's argument is the contention that ὑπ' Ἴλιον must mean 'beneath the walls of Ilium', and that, accordingly, ὥρτο ναυβάτας στρατός can only refer to the advance of the Greeks from the beach, after they have already crossed the Aegean and landed near Ilium, and not to the departure from Aulis.⁷ But the evidence of usage does not lend this view any support. Quite the contrary, in the *Iliad* (the expression does not occur in the *Odyssey*) ὑπὸ Ἴλιον, while occurring on five occasions, is never used to mean, graphically, 'beneath the walls of Ilium' in descriptions of assault; it is used of someone's coming to Ilium as a part of the Greek army and means little, if anything, more than 'to Ilium'.⁸ So also in tragedy there is no reason in any context to doubt that ὑπ' Ἴλιον is used for 'to Ilium', just as correspondingly ὑπ' Ἰλῖωι (very common in tragedy although it is not found either in the *Iliad* or in the *Odyssey*) appears to mean 'at Ilium'.⁹ Consequently it seems that there is no necessity to take the expression ὑπ' Ἴλιον ὥρτο as Cunningham insists it must be taken. And he offers nothing to diminish the palaeographical difficulties of ἄμπα on which Denniston–Page had quite properly insisted.

These difficulties, however, are not all. There is the question of the sense of χρόνος δ' ἐπεὶ ... παρήβησεν. Ed. Fraenkel renders 'Time has grown old since ...' He suggests that it 'might perhaps be assumed that it [the phrase] was coined as an equivalent to a χρόνος παλαιός (or πολὺς) ἐξ οὗ...', and he has no doubt that it is an 'Aeschylean ... phrase' and should not be altered. But is this equivalence plausible? Can we say that 'Time has grown old since ...' or, more precisely, that 'Time has

³ First in his bilingual edition (Greek–German) of *Agamemnon* (Berlin, 1885) and again in his *editio maior* of Aeschylus (Berlin, 1914).

⁴ Mazon in his edition of Aeschylus in the Collection des Universités de France (Paris, 1925); Groeneboom (Groningen, 1944) and Fraenkel (Oxford, 1950) in their respective editions of this play.

⁵ This edition (Oxford, 1957), begun by J. D. Denniston and completed by D. L. Page, is referred to throughout as Denniston–Page.

⁶ Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 984–6', *JHS* 86 (1966), 166–7.

⁷ H. Lloyd-Jones takes the clause the same way in his prose version of the play (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970), but without endorsing the text adopted by Wilamowitz. F. Paley in his edition of Aeschylus (3rd edn; London, 1870) also interprets the clause in this way.

⁸ *Il.* 2.216, 249, 492, 673 and 23.297. The phrases λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τείχος (*Il.* 4.407), ὑπὸ τείχος ἰόντας (12.264), and ὑπὸ πτόλιν αἰπύ τε τείχος ἵζεσθαι (11.181–2) do suggest assault, but they also occur in rather different contexts and make explicit reference to the τείχος.

⁹ For ὑπ' Ἴλιον cf. *E. Or.* 648. For ὑπ' Ἰλῖωι cf. *A. A.* 860, 882, 1439, *Ch.* 345; *E. Andr.* 1182, *El.* 881, *Hec.* 764, *Hel.* 288, *Or.* 58, 102.

passed its prime since ...' amounts, prosaically, to 'There is much time since ...' or to 'A long time has passed since ...'?¹⁰ Surely not. Expressions such as these latter refer to abstract time-in-general. Aeschylus might well personify abstract time-in-general, and in fact Sophocles and Euripides are known to have done so.¹¹ But by doing so here Aeschylus could not get the sense attributed to him by Fraenkel. To say 'Time-in-general has passed its prime (or 'grown old') since [a comparatively recent event]' is to say something very odd indeed, and it is not even to say that much time has passed since the event. What then? Might Aeschylus have used 'The time since (ὁ χρόνος ἐξ οὗ ...) the war began has passed its prime' as equivalent to 'Much time has passed since the beginning of the war'? Possibly, but it requires an attributive force for the clause referring to the beginning of the war which is not obviously in, and not easily read into, the transmitted text. If the phrase is to be kept, it is likely that we should take it as one of those expressions, found elsewhere in Aeschylus and also in Sophocles, in which the time in question is the time span of some particular thing that is, or can by personification be thought of as, living.¹² In such locutions to say 'the time of *x* has passed its prime since ...' is to say '*x* has passed its prime since ...' What is called for, then, is a particularization of χρόνος by reference to some person or personification that is appropriate to the context, and not a verb with a resemblance to ἀκάτα.¹³

There is also the question of the general sense of these lines, which has perhaps received less attention than it needed. For, however much they have differed otherwise, most interpreters seem to have taken it as given that the prosaic sense of the passage approximates to: 'A long time has passed since the beginning of the war.'¹⁴ Yet this assumption not only lacks a firm foundation in the text as transmitted,¹⁵ it is also, although it has been widely entertained, not very probable in itself. In fact it can be made plausible only if it is supplemented. Thus Hermann says: 'Defloruisse dicit tempus, quia, si quid aduersi secundum Calchantis uaticinium

¹⁰ Lloyd-Jones, *op. cit.*, gives 'Time has passed its youth since ...', and Denniston-Page hesitates between 'Time passed its prime when ...' and 'Time has passed its prime since ...' (but also wonders whether χρόνος is to be construed with παρήβηκεν at all).

¹¹ S. O.C. 618 and E. *Heraclea*. 900, *Supp.* 787, *Antiope*. fr. 222 N². See J. de Romilly, *Time in Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca, NY, 1968), p. 37. Whether or not they are by Aeschylus, neither *Pr.* 981 nor *Eu.* 286 ought to be taken as referring to abstract time-in-general. In *Pr.* 980-1: 'Ἐρ. τὸδε Ζεὺς τοῦπος οὐκ ἐπίσταται. | Πρ. ἀλλ' ἐκδιδάσκει πάνθ' ὁ γηράσκων χρόνος, the sense, as the preceding verse, which is often omitted in citations, shows, is ὁ γηράσκων χρόνος (sc. ἡμῖν), i.e. 'the time that ages for us teaches everything = as we grow older we learn everything [and Zeus is no exception]' (see Romilly, p. 45). *Eu.* 286 is an interpolation and so out of its context, but nothing about it indicates a reference to time-in-general and similar passages suggest supplementing it: χρόνος καθαιρεῖ πάντα γηράσκων ὁμοῦ (sc. ἡμῖν), i.e. 'The life span that ages at the same time as we do destroys all'. Cf. especially S. O.C. 7-8, and more generally the material cited in n. 12 below.

¹² For this way of personifying the time of living things see Ed. Fraenkel on *A.* 105f.; J. de Romilly, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-9; and H. Fraenkel, 'Die Zeitauffassung in der frühgriechischen Literatur', repr. in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich, 1968), pp. 21-2.

¹³ H. Fraenkel seems to have noticed this difficulty; he renders 'wir sind alt und sorgenvoll geworden durch diese Ausfahrt', i.e. he takes the χρόνος to be the χρόνος of the members of the Chorus. But this is most unlikely. After all the Chorus were already old when the expedition left, too old to join it.

¹⁴ G. Thomson in his edition of the *Oresteia* (2nd edn rev.; Amsterdam and Prague, 1966) is one editor who does question this assumption, but his own version of the passage requires a rewriting too extensive ever to be convincing.

¹⁵ Not only is it impossible to get this sense from χρόνος ... παρήβηκεν, but any supposition that χρόνος ἐπεὶ alone could convey it here was refuted by Ed. Fraenkel in his note on the passage.

accidere oportebat, effluxisse uidetur spatium quo id euenire erat consentaneum'.¹⁶ But this is a good deal to extract merely from *παρήβηεν*. Denniston–Page, with more caution, give as a possible general sense for 984–9: '(1) A long time has passed since the army went to Troy, and (2) now they are safe home again, and (3) nothing disastrous has occurred [the numbers are mine].' But the editors still have had to supply (3) speculatively, since it is hardly obvious from the context; and if, setting (3) aside, we concentrate our attention on (1) and (2), we must wonder what the Chorus is supposed to be getting at.

Actually there is a train of thought running through strophe and antistrophe and falling into five parts of which (1), (3), (4), and (5) are quite clear:

- (1) 'Why do I feel foreboding? I have a presentiment of evil which I did not invite and cannot dismiss' (975–83).
- (2) '... when (or else 'since') the war began' (984–7).
- (3) 'I see the return for myself' (988–9).
- (4) 'Nevertheless I feel terrible foreboding' (990–7).
- (5) 'I pray that it should prove false' (998–1000).

How, then, should we expect (2) to be filled out? '*Much time has passed* since the war began' is likely to be beside the point. The Chorus, after having rehearsed its forebodings (975–83), is likely to be turning to something consoling and reassuring in 984–7 as it certainly does in 988–9. What we should expect is a reference to past danger which the Chorus takes to have abated, and so to be no longer a cause for concern.

All the difficulties cited so far, both textual and interpretative, could be solved, if we were to assume that Aeschylus wrote:

χρόνος δέ τοι πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς
φαμμίους ἄγαι παρή-
βηεν εὐθ' ὑπ' Ἰλίων
ὥρτο ναυβάτας στρατός.

985

Denniston–Page had already suggested that *ἀκάτα* might have had its origin in *AK+ATA*, after *AIC* had first been written above the line to correct the termination of *ΨAMMIAC* and then wrongly incorporated into the text, and *AK* had arisen from *AIC* by a transcriptional error of a sort well known to occur in uncial scripts. In the main I accept this account of the origin of *ακ*, although I am inclined to think that *AIC*, later to be misread, came into the text in a slightly different way. But for reasons of sense, metre, and syntax, as will appear shortly, I much prefer *ΑΓΑΙ* to *ΑΤΑ*, where again the change is easy to account for transcriptionally, since scribes often omit the final *ι* in the dative singular where after *α*, *η*, and *ω* it had ceased to be pronounced, and the confusion *Γ/T* is easy enough especially when the result is a more familiar word.¹⁷ Next, since these changes leave no possibility of discovering a clause for *ἐπει*, the conjunction must be got rid of, and Hermann's suggestion *δέ τοι* is a neat way of disposing of it since the confusion *TO/ΠΕ* is relatively easy in uncial writing.¹⁸ In the correction of *πρυμνησίων ξυνεμβόλοις φαμμίας*, however, the

¹⁶ In his posthumous edition of Aeschylus (2nd edn; Berlin, 1859). This view has been very influential; a recent instance is J. Hogan, *A Commentary on the Complete Greek Tragedies: Aeschylus* (Chicago, 1984).

¹⁷ J. Davies had earlier conjectured *ἄτα* (as reported by N. Wecklein in the Appendix to his edition of Aeschylus [Berlin, 1885–93]). Hermann restored *ἄγαι* for *ἄτα* earlier in the play (131) in the list of emendations appended to W. von Humboldt's translation (Leipzig, 1816). So far as I know, no one has proposed *ἄγαι* here, although H. L. Ahrens did suggest *ἀγὰ* in 'Studien zum Agamemnon des Aeschylus', *Philologus* 1. Supplbd. (1860), 593–4.

¹⁸ In his posthumous edition of Aeschylus; the same emendation was incorporated by E. A. J.

consideration of transcriptional probabilities is less helpful. While Casaubon's ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς has been widely accepted, and the error could have arisen from the similarity of α and ο in minuscule writing, this does not help much with ψαμμίας, whose assessment has remained elusive. On the face of it the phrase as a whole might originally have appeared in any one of three possible forms:

- (1) πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίων
- (2) πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίαις
- (3) πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίοις.

If the original was (1), it seems most likely that first ψαμμίων became ψαμμίαις by assimilation of endings, and then the process leading to the transmitted text would have been the same as that leading from (2), i.e. ψαμμίαις became ψαμμίας, and later ἐμβολαῖς became -εμβόλοις, independently. If the original was (3), then -εμβόλοις might have come about from the influence of ψαμμίοις by assimilation of endings, and ψαμμίοις will have then independently become ψαμμίας. While (2) and (3) seem distinctly preferable to (1) in that they do not require a step which (1) presupposes, neither (2) nor (3) is obviously superior to the other, and in neither of them is the change to ψαμμίας especially easy, unless one can suppose that the succession of α-sounds in the context affected a copyist's short-term memory.¹⁹ If ψαμμίοις is to be preferred, as I think it is, the reasons for the preference are, as will be seen, essentially stylistic.²⁰

Finally, before continuing, there is one more change to be made, in order to bring strophe and antistrophe into correspondence. If 985 is a lecythion, then we should expect 998 to be also. Denniston–Page in fact recommends a change to εὐχομαι <τά>δ' ἐξ ἐμάς there as plausible on two grounds: (1) since ψύθῃ is predicative, πεσεῖν needs a subject; and (2) the strophe suggests that a syllable is missing in 998.²¹ The recommendation should be accepted.

We may now proceed to matters bearing on the text that go beyond transcriptional probabilities and extend to interpretation generally.

τοί, 'after all', is an example, to employ some of Denniston's categories, of the persuasive or soothing use of that particle, and as such it quite fits the context if we understand that it is itself that the Chorus is trying so earnestly to persuade that there is no reason to worry.²² For although Denniston notes that τοί is most commonly used in direct appeals to another person or persons, he also points out that it is not

Ahrens in his text of the plays (Paris, 1842). Triclinius has ἐπι, to which there are metrical objections (see Denniston–Page) nor is it otherwise attractive. Willink suggests that ΕΠΕΙ might have first come on the scene as a gloss on ΕΥΤΕ.

¹⁹ The change from -αις to -ας is not especially difficult in itself, but the change from ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίαις to ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίας is rather less easy because it involves dissimilation of endings; likewise the change from -εμβόλοις ψαμμίοις to -εμβόλοις ψαμμίας cannot be regarded as an easy slip. And Triclinius' reading ἀκάτας, being almost certainly an emendation of his own, is of no help in explaining the preceding -ας.

²⁰ C. J. Blomfield, F. H. Bothe, A. Emperius, W. Kayser, H. Weil, and S. Preuss have at one time or another favoured ψαμμίαις or ψαμμιαίειν; and D. S. Margoliouth proposed ψαμμίοις (all as reported by Wecklein). No one appears actually to have proposed ψαμμίων.

²¹ The supplement is not printed in the text of their edition probably because of the uncertainty of the corresponding line in the strophe, which they leave obelized. Denniston–Page, perhaps relying on Wecklein's Appendix, attribute <τά>δ' to C. J. Blomfield, but he himself in his edition of the play (Leipzig, 1823) attributes it to J. Dorat (as well as to Th. Stanley and R. Porson), so that it must come, if not from Dorat, at least from some other scholar of his time (cf. Fraenkel, *Prolegomena*, p. 35). The loss of ΤΑ may have been eased by the sequence ΙΤΑΔ, in which Ι resembles Τ, and Α resembles Δ; but there are enough cases in which a letter or two disappears without apparent help from its surroundings, in this play, e.g. (according to Page's text) at 195: <τε>, 434: <τις>, 546: <μ'>, 1252: <μακ>.

²² See *Greek Particles*², p. 540.

unusual for an Aeschylean chorus to use *τοι* even when it is not speaking to another person.²³

χρόνος... ἄγαι παρήβησεν I take to mean literally ‘for the begrudging ill-will the period of duration passed its youth’, or more freely ‘the life span of the begrudging ill-will [of the divinity] passed its period of vigour’.²⁴ The *ἄγα*, which certainly had a beginning, is itself personified and so thought of as having its own *χρόνος* or life span. The expression is unusual but not unlike Aeschylus. It hardly needs to be shown that Aeschylus makes frequent and daring use of personification. And to see that Aeschylus might think of *ἄγα* as having a life span one need only compare *Th.* 682: οὐκ ἔστι γῆρας τοῦδε τοῦ μιάσματος, where the Chorus is saying that the pollution has not suffered the decline of force associated with growing old; or *Ch.* 806: γέρων φόνος μήκετ’ ἐν δόμοις τέκοι, where γέρων is not merely a decorative variant for ὁ παλαιός, but deliberately chosen for the personified φόνος in connection with τέκοι. It is not a much greater step to an expression in which a *χρόνος* is associated with the personified *ἄγα*, and what is properly predicated of the *ἄγα* can by extension be predicated of the *χρόνος*.²⁵ The Chorus is thinking of the words of Calchas which it cited earlier in the play (131–7):

οἶον μή τις ἄγα²⁶ θεόθεν κνεφά-
 σι προτυπὲν στόμιον μέγα Τροίας
 στρατῶθέν’ οἰκτῶι γὰρ ἐπίφθονος Ἄρτεμις ἀγνὰ
 πτανοῖσιν κυσὶ πατρός
 αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου μογεράν πτάκα θυομένοισιν
 στυγεῖ δὲ δειπνον αἰετῶν.

135

There is no need to repeat *θεόθεν* because the choice of the word *ἄγαι* suffices to make the backward reference clear. The choice of metaphor in *παρήβησεν* reflects the Chorus’s keen sense that one who has passed his prime is less likely to take vigorous action of the sort that inflicts harm on enemies. The Chorus is trying to reassure itself by reflecting that Calchas’ fear was realized, but that the force of the goddess’s ill-will has now long passed and so there is no longer anything to worry about. In fact, of course, this is a mistake because Clytemnestra is just about to kill Agamemnon in revenge for his killing Iphigenia to appease Artemis; just as immediately after (988–9) the Chorus is also wrong to think that Agamemnon’s return is a reason no longer to worry about his safety. It is neatly ironic that the Chorus should hope to find reassurance in the dismissal of a force that in its effects is about to show itself far from spent. But then the recrudescence and continued effect of past ills is a major theme of the *Oresteia*.

²³ op. cit., p. 538. He cites a number of passages in which this occurs. For *δέ τοι* as an allowed collocation, in which, however, each particle seems to retain its own force, again see Denniston, pp. 548–9, 552.

²⁴ For the construction cf. 584: αἰεὶ γὰρ ἦβαι τοῖς γέρονσιν εὐμαθεῖν, ‘To be a good learner always retains its youth for old men’.

²⁵ See the references in n. 12 above. There are, of course, other possibilities than *χρόνος... ἄγαι*. There is *χρόνος... ἄγας*, which is slightly less likely palaeographically (and of course Triclinius’ *ἀκάτας* cannot be counted in its favour); and there is *χρόνωι... ἄγα*, which is also inferior palaeographically. I have also considered variations with *ἄται* (or *ἄτα* or *ἄτας*). They are easier palaeographically, but all involve the objection as to sense that while *ἄγα* might be thought to have lost its force when the expedition got away from Aulis, there is no obvious reason for saying the same of *ἄτα*. They would also be at odds with what we know of the metrical practice of Aeschylus, who in the extant plays, although he makes frequent use of the lecythion, rarely uses the form with long middle anceps – – – – –, and never in a strophe, only in an antistrophe in response to – – – – – (see *Supp.* 385 = 374, 803 = 795; *Ch.* 616 = 606, 74 = (?)69).

²⁶ For *ἄγα* here see n. 17 above.

πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίους ... εὖθ' ὑπ' Ἴλιον ὤρτο ναυβάτας στρατός is a characteristic piece of Aeschylean language. Aeschylus speaks of the same thing, in this case an event, first with an expression that concentrates the thought in one highly concrete and highly allusive image that literally touches only a small part of what is thus indirectly referred to; then a second time more directly and obviously in language that has a more expanded sense and one that more approximates the actual scope of the event spoken of. This is how the two expressions are interrelated. We must now look at the characteristics that each has separately.

πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίους is an instance of the figure enallage, i.e. the adjective which we would logically expect to be attached to the dependent genitive πρυμνησίων has instead been attached to the noun on which it depends ἐμβολαῖς.²⁷ It is not surprising, as Bers has shown, that enallage should be found in Aeschylus nor is it unusual that it should be found in a lyric passage of this character.²⁸ On the contrary it is quite understandable that Aeschylus should use ornate diction, of which Bers has shown enallage to be a feature, to give heightened colour to the description of an event that in itself must have been commonplace enough, i.e. the stowing of mooring ropes in a ship about to sail.²⁹ The only oddity, if such it is, in this instance of enallage, is that the figure is more usually associated with certain *Wortfelder*, with none of which can this particular expression be shown certainly and directly to be connected.³⁰ Since, however, there are other cases of enallage that do not fall within established *Wortfelder*, this consideration should not by itself prevent us from accepting the presence of enallage here.

Having now paved the way, we may return to the question: ψαμμίους or ψαμμίαις? The adjective is ἄπαξ λεγόμενον, and many adjectives in -ιος are used, either sometimes or all the time, with two endings. From these considerations alone we might conclude that either form might have been written here.³¹ But it is possible to go further. Bers showed that the tragic poets used enallage, especially but not exclusively in certain *Wortfelder*, to contribute to ornateness of diction. Kastner had earlier shown that the same poets used the morphologically archaic declension of adjectives in -ος, -ον to the same effect, and again especially but not exclusively in certain *Wortfelder*.³² Thus, despite some uncertainty about the presence of an identifiable *Wortfeld*, it seems reasonable, if we accept language that involves enallage here, on the same grounds and in the absence of decisive evidence from the transmitted text, to prefer ψαμμίους as what Aeschylus is more likely to have written.³³

²⁷ For the definition of enallage and the related concept hypallage see V. Bers, *Enallage and Greek Style* (Leyden, 1974), pp. 1–5, 70–1.

²⁸ op. cit., pp. 49–58.

²⁹ H. L. Ahrens, op. cit. p. 592, showed that ἐμβολαῖς can mean 'stowings', and this seems the only possible interpretation in this passage. The stowings, or rather the ropes, are 'sandy' in particular because of the sand that has accumulated about the moorings piled up by the on-shore winds during the long delay before departure.

³⁰ Bers adopts the expression *Wortfelder* from W. Kastner, *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -ΟΣ* (Heidelberg, 1967). One might try to connect this expression with the *Wortfeld*: Water, but admittedly this is open to question. However, Kastner, p. 72, does connect the expression ναίειν ἐμβολαῖς (A. Pers. 297, 336) with this *Wortfeld*. One might also try to find in the adjective ψάμμιος a link with Kastner's *Wortfeld*: *Geographische Bezeichnungen und Verwandtes*.

³¹ I owe particular thanks to C. W. Willink for pointing this out to me.

³² op. cit., p. 114: 'Adjektive, die an sich schon poetisch waren, wie δόλιος, φόνιος etc., werden durch die Motionslosigkeit stilistisch noch gehoben.'

³³ Enallage is not found in a few of the *Wortfelder* in which adjectives of two endings are found, but the discrepancy is minor and of no significance for the argument here.

εὐθ' ὑπ' Ἴλιον ὤρτο ναυβάτας στρατός, as explication of *πρυμνησίων ξὺν ἐμβολαῖς ψαμμίοις*, can hardly be taken otherwise than as referring to the departure from Aulis. Moreover, if it is the *ἄγα* of Artemis that the Chorus is talking about, it seems far more likely that the Chorus would have considered the *ἄγα* to have 'passed its prime' with the departure from Aulis than with the landing at Troy, since it must also know that there was no recurrence of adverse winds on the voyage.

The verses in question, then, may now be literally translated so:

After all, with the sandy stowings of the stern ropes, when the army set off aboard ship for Ilium, the life span of begrudging ill-will passed from its time of vigour.

And the train of thought in strophe and antistrophe now can be clearly seen:

- (1) 'Why do I feel foreboding? I have a presentiment of evil which I did not invite and cannot dismiss' (975-83).
- (2) 'Artemis' begrudging ill-will was effectively over when the army departed' (984-7).³⁴
- (3) 'I see the return for myself' (988-9).
- (4) 'Nevertheless I feel terrible foreboding' (990-7).
- (5) 'I pray that it should prove false' (998-1000).

New York

J. F. GANNON

³⁴ In view of the close connection in thought between (2) and (3) Willink suggests, I think correctly, that a colon rather than a full stop would be desirable in the Greek text after 987.