

Sarpedon's tomb at Xanthos after its destruction in a fire.¹⁷ This would be particularly noteworthy if the Athenians under Kimon were responsible for the burning of the acropolis at Xanthos.¹⁸ There may be other reasons for Aeschylus' reference, however; Roger Travis will in a forthcoming dissertation connect it with Herodotus' report (1.173.4–5) of Lycian matrilineality.¹⁹ Whatever the case, it is to be hoped that this paper has demonstrated exactly what it is to which Aeschylus refers.²⁰

The Queen's University of Belfast

ANTONY G. KEEN

¹⁷ Keen, *AS* 42, 55; *ibid.*, 'Identification of a hero-cult', p. 228.

¹⁸ As suggested by H. Metzger, *Fouilles de Xanthos* ii. (Paris, 1963), p. 81 and P. Demargne and H. Metzger, 'Xanthos', *RE* ix.A 1386–7, but disputed by T. R. Bryce, *The Lycians* i. (Copenhagen, 1986), pp. 103–4.

¹⁹ R. Travis, *Allegorical Fantasy and the Chorus in Sophocles' Oedipus Coloneus* (Ph.D. diss., Berkeley, forthcoming). My thanks to Roger Travis for discussing this matter with me and permission to cite this work.

²⁰ My thanks to P. W. G. Glare, Prof. P. J. Rhodes, R. Travis, Prof. D. Whitehead, and the referee of *CQ* for their comments on the ideas included in this note.

AESCHYLUS, *EUMENIDES* 174–8

κάμοί γε λυπρός, καὶ τὸν οὐκ ἐκλύσεται
 ὑπὸ δὲ γὰν φυγῶν οὐποτ' ἐλευθεροῦται,
 ποτιτρόπαιος ὦν δ' ἕτερον ἐν κάρᾳ
 μιάστορ' ἑκείνου† πάσεται.

The difficulty in this antistrophe is found mainly in its last line and is caused by ἐκείνου which, as it stands, does not make sense and is also unmetrical (υ--), instead of the required -υ-, cf. the last line [172] of the strophe). It is noticeable on the other hand that the basic meaning of the antistrophe is not really affected by omitting ἑκείνου†, and it looks as though the scholia did not pay any attention to it in commenting (on ἕτερον ἐν κάρᾳ) as follows: ὦν ἐναγῆς ἐν τῷ κάρᾳ ἑαυτοῦ ἕτερον μιάστορα λήψεται καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ δίκας ἡμῖν δώσουσιν.

Thus Orestes is never to be set free, even if he escapes under the earth, where the Erinyes cannot persecute him, since their activities extend only within the upper world, cf. 75–7, 334–40. It is then the god Hades who will succeed the Erinyes in pursuing Orestes by judging (and chastising) him, cf. 267–75, 339–40,¹ and he is the ἕτερος μιάστωρ, whom Orestes πάσεται ἐν κάρᾳ if he is still ποτιτρόπαιος. This being so, Orestes will be punished in the underworld—in the event that he escape there—whereas οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ δίκας δώσουσιν to the Erinyes, i.e. his due to them will be paid by his ἔκγονοι (this last in accordance with the scholia, supposing that the phrase οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ δίκας δώσουσιν is *perhaps* a hint concerning the *locus desperatus* ἑκείνου†).²

From the numerous conjectures what has actually prevailed is Kirchhoff's εἶσιν οὐ, adopted by many editors (Blass, Wilamowitz, Murray, Groeneboom, Page, Sommerstein), with West printing ἑκείνου†, and Podlecki including in *crucis* all the words from ἕτερον to the end.

¹ For a judgement in Hades of sins committed in life cf. *Suppl.* 228–31, 414–16; *Pi. O.* 2. 56ff.; *Ar. Ra.* 145ff.; *Pl. R.* 330d–331b, *Phd.* 113d ff., *Grg.* 523a ff.

² It could have been a consequence of such considerations that we have conjectures like ἐξ ἔθεν Wakefield, ἐκ τινος Wieseler, ἀντ' ἐμοῦ Kayser, ἐν γένει vel ἐγγενῇ Hartung, ἐκ γένους Weil, ἐκγονον Zakas (ἐκγόνου Wecklein). Two other conjectures seem to intend someone related to the Erinyes (Hades?): ἐξ ἐμοῦ Scholfield, ἐκ γ' ἐμοῦ Newman, whereas a different line of thought is ἐκ σίνους (Sauppe, Wecklein). Many other conjectures are listed in Wecklein's edition (Berlin, 1885).

Εἶσω οὖ is a simple correction, i.e. close to †*ἐκείνου*†³ and gives good sense. This also West admits, adding, however, 'even if it is not altogether clear why further mention of a move is needed after *ὑπὸ δὲ γὰν φυγῶν*'.⁴ Against this one might argue that *ὑπὸ δὲ γὰν φυγῶν* is hypothetical 'even if he escaped, he is never freed but goes where ...'. West ends the discussion with his own proposal *ἀντὶ τοῦ*, 'instead of that one', explaining that *ἐκείνου* could be a gloss on *τοῦ*.

My suggestion would be *ἔσθ' ὅπου* (cf. 517), and the text is now to be read as follows: 'Yes, Apollo is certainly causing pain to me, but him he shall not release: even if Orestes took refuge (i.e. supposing he might escape me) under the earth, there is no possibility that he be freed (since, there, Hades will undertake punishment); and so long as he has not yet been purified he will get, *somewhere*, *ἔτερον μιάστωρα* on his head'. This *ἔτερος μιάστωρ* could be someone of his own family (cf. Weil's *ἐκ γένους*),⁵ for Orestes is now to get *ἔτερον μιάστωρα* not *specifically* under the earth (viz. *Ἄδην*, as *εἶσω οὖ* obliges us to think) but *either* in the underworld, *in the event* that he escape there, *or else* (and perhaps more probably) somewhere on earth.

In favour of *εἶσω οὖ* one might adduce 267–8. But, apart from the fact that what the Erinyes are saying there is simply contemplative (see below), the position is now very different from 177–8, because (a) the scene has changed to Athens, and (b) Orestes has taken refuge in the temple of the goddess, where, presumably, he must be immune from any *human* 'avengers' (*ἔτερον ... μιάστωρα*), and (c) the Erinyes are now thinking in terms of his being punished down in Hades, with no alternative. Thus, they are now contemplating malevolently how pleasant it would be for them if they actually drank Orestes' 'half-clotted' blood (264–5) until he is drained, though still alive (267). This would be his punishment on earth, as a prelude to his punishment when he has submitted to a trial in Hades and been found guilty. In other words, seeing the different circumstances in Athens, where two Olympian deities are involved, the Erinyes have had to modify their threats.

University of Athens

N. GEORGANTZOGLU

³ *ἐκείνου* was *certainly* not written by Aeschylus. The only question is whether the corruption is due to the misreading of a similar word or words or to the intrusion of an explanatory gloss. Either seems possible.

⁴ M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), p. 276.

⁵ If Aeschylus actually wrote *ἐκ γένους*, which is an intelligent conjecture, †*ἐκείνου*† could have been a gloss on it. However, I should suggest that †*ἐκείνου*† could well be elucidatory *not* of the missing word(s), as scholars seem to take for granted, but of the expression *ἐν κάρῃ*, or else of the word *μιάστωρ*. Then *ἐκείνου*, originally written in a margin, entered the text later as a correction for the word(s) now lost.

ALCIBIADES VS. PHRYNICHUS

Thucydides' account (8.50–1) of the Athenian general Phrynichus' secret correspondence with the Spartan admiral Astyochus is both troubling and obscure. It may be summarized as follows: Phrynichus, having eloquently opposed Alcibiades' efforts to be recalled from exile and fearing that a repatriated Alcibiades would take vengeance on him, wrote to Astyochus revealing Alcibiades' pro-Athenian (anti-Spartan) activities. Astyochus handed the letter to Alcibiades, who then wrote to the ranking Athenians on Samos concerning Phrynichus' 'treason' and demanded his execution. Phrynichus then wrote again to Astyochus, now proposing to make it possible for the Spartans to destroy the whole Athenian force at Samos. But foreseeing that again Astyochus would pass on the letter to Alcibiades who would