

SHORTER NOTES

A NOTE ON AESCHLYUS, *AGAMEMNON* 403–5 ≈ 420–2

Aeschylus' constant metrical practice shows that either *Ag.* 404/5 κλόνους λογχίμους τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλιsmούς (v- - v-v- -v- v- -) in the strophe, or 421/2 πάρεισι δόξαι φέρουσαι χάριν ματαίαν (v-v- -v- -v- v- -), correspondingly in the antistrophe, is corrupt in the manuscript tradition.¹ G. Hermann observed this and proposed to read πάρεισιν δόκαι in 421/2.² Most editors after Hermann agreed that there was corruption, but not about where it was or how to repair it. H. L. Ahrens proposed reading κλόνους τε καὶ λογχίμους ναυβάτας θ' ὀπλιsmούς in 404/5.³ R. Enger proposed τε καὶ κλόνους λογχίμους ναυβάτας θ' ὀπλιsmούς.⁴ Most editors adopted one of these three emendations before Fraenkel's edition of the play appeared.⁵ Fraenkel's chief contribution was to show that neither Ahrens nor Enger had solved the problem. But he also argued that 403–5

λιποῦσα δ' ἄστοίειν ἀσπίστορα
κλόνους λογχίμους τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλιsmούς. . .

was the locus of corruption. He inferred this from the fact that the word order ἀσπίστορα κλόνους λογχίμους τε (attributive adjective + substantive + attributive adjective + τε) is found nowhere else in Aeschylus or Sophocles. He did not investigate Euripides.

Fraenkel's analysis suggested an impasse, but A. J. Beattie shortly after found a way out.⁶ He proposed simply replacing λογχίμους in 404/5 with λοχιsmούς, hinting, very plausibly, that the sight of ἀσπίστορα evoked λόγχη in the mind of the copyist as he reached λοχιsmούς so that he misread it. Then P. Maas argued that λόγχιsmος was not only a *hapax*, but perhaps in itself suspect.⁷ He also pointed out that Theodor Heyse had already hit upon λοχιsmούς some years before.⁸ Thereafter λοχιsmούς has often been adopted by editors, including Fraenkel.⁹

The weight of opinion now in favour of λοχιsmούς might seem to have closed the matter. But questions remain. If λοχιsmούς is right, does it mean 'marshalling

¹ See M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 103f.

² In the emendations appended to Wilhem von Humboldt's translation (Leipzig, 1816), and in *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae* (Leipzig, 1816), p. 162. The point is elaborated in his *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1859). W. Dindorf otherwise followed Hermann, only correcting the accent to δοκαί, in *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Leipzig, 1860).

³ In J. Franz (ed.), *Oresteia* (Leipzig, 1846). See also *Philologus*, Supplbd. 1 (1860), 519–20.

⁴ In his revised edition of R. H. Klausen's *Agamemnon* (Leipzig, 1863).

⁵ (3 vols.; Oxford, 1950). In the absence of any further indication attributions to Fraenkel refer to this edition. ⁶ *CR N.S.* 2 (1952), 71.

⁷ *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli* (Florence, 1955), pp. 505–6.

⁸ In Heyse's *Oresteia* (Halle, 1884) the text is κλόνου λοχιsmούς. J. Mähly, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 5 (1888), 859, commended λοχιsmούς only. In the *Addenda* (Berlin, 1893) to the Appendix (Berlin, 1885) to his Aeschylus N. Wecklein actually reports 'κλόνου λογιsmούς [sic] Heyse, κλόνους λογιsmούς Mähly'.

⁹ (2nd edn with corrections; Oxford, 1962). G. Murray accepted it in Aeschylus, *Tragoediae* (2nd edn; Oxford, 1955); Sir Denys Page in John Dewar Denniston and Denys Page (edd.), Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1957) and in Aeschylus, *Tragoediae* (Oxford, 1972); and M. L. West in Aeschylus, *Tragoediae* (Stuttgart, 1990). For references to dissenting views see Jean Bollack, *Agamemnon* 1, 2^{ème} partie (Lille, 1981), pp. 420–2.

companies' here or 'lying in ambushes'?¹⁰ The consensus seems to follow Beattie in choosing the former. But in an ode that works by alluding to evocative details, I do not find the marshalling of companies notably evocative. Surely some analysis of the context is in order before deciding which sense fits best. Also, Fraenkel's argument against the soundness of 404/5 does not hold up. There is nothing obviously impossible about the word order Fraenkel questioned, and Euripides uses it at least twice, perhaps four times.¹¹ This shows that it is a possible word order, even if rare, and cannot be excluded in Aeschylus. So further investigation is required to determine whether there is anything else in 404/5 open to well grounded suspicion, and it may be useful to reconsider Hermann's proposal to emend 421/2. I shall take up the sense of *λοχιμοὺς* first.

The preference for 'marshalling of companies' without further analysis seems to rest on the tacit assumption that what Helen 'left to the men of the city' must be some business that was carried on in the city after her departure. This assumption is questionable.

Two interpretations of *ἀσπίστορας* and two interpretations of *κλόνους* can be found. Thomas Stanley's translation 'clypeales turbas' represents one combination of these interpretations.¹² The explanation of C. J. Blomfield, who glosses *ἀσπίστορας κλόνους* 'strepitus clypeatorum', represents another.¹³ Blomfield's choice of 'clypeatorum' over 'clypeales' was sound, but his choice of 'strepitus' rather than 'turbas' was unfortunate. Beattie's 'clattering foot-soldiers' is a fair interpretation of Blomfield's Latin but doubtful as a rendering of Aeschylus' Greek. Beattie in turn seems to have influenced Fraenkel. In his 1950 translation Fraenkel rendered *ἀσπίστορας κλόνους* 'bustling stir of men with shield'. In so doing he evidently agreed with Stanley about the general sense of *κλόνους*; but since he did not believe that the Chorus was talking about the fighting before Troy, he chose words that might be applicable to the mustering at Argos. In 1963, having accepted *λοχιμοὺς*, he followed Beattie with 'clattering of foot soldiers'. Even worse, some have combined Stanley's 'clypeales' with Blomfield's 'strepitus'.¹⁴ The interpretation of *κλόνους* as denoting a clattering sound or the like, however it arose, is highly questionable.

κλόνος (6× *Iliad*) should be interpreted in 404/5 with an eye to Homeric usage. Homer uses *κλόνος* only in accounts of battle. In five passages it denotes the situation of rival forces pressing each other in close combat and it has a sense of locality, the 'press' or 'turmoil' of battle as a location.¹⁵ In its other occurrence it denotes the state of troops driven back in disorder.¹⁶ The Homeric use of the denominative *κλονέω* is

¹⁰ It means 'ambushes' in Plut. *Phil.* 13.9, the only place where it is attested. But it could also mean 'marshalling companies', as Beattie shows, citing *λοχίζω* in Hdt. 1.103.

¹¹ It is certain in *Med.* 825–6 and 1037. The text is in doubt for other reasons in *El.* 1262–3 and *Hel.* 1484–5.

¹² In the translation accompanying his edition (London, 1663).

¹³ *Agamemnon*² (Cambridge, 1822), Gloss. 394.

¹⁴ John Conington gives 'clang of shields' in his verse translation (London, 1848), Lewis Campbell gives 'clashing of shields' in his (Oxford, 1906), and Arthur Platt 'clanging of shield' (London, 1911) in his; H. W. Smyth in his Loeb Classics version gives 'clang of shield' (London, 1926), A. Sidgwick in his commentary (4th edn; London, 1890) and A. Verrall in his (2nd edn; London, 1904) 'din of shield', L. MacNeice in his verse translation (London, 1936) 'clanging of shields', and Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones in his prose version (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970) 'din of shields'.

¹⁵ Cf. *Il.* 5.167 = 20.319 ἄν τε μάχην καὶ ἀνὰ κλόνον ἐρχεῖσθαι. 16.331, 713, 789, 21.422 κατὰ κλόνον.

¹⁶ *Il.* 16.728–30 αὐτὰρ Ἀπόλλων δύνεθ' ὄμιλον ἰών, ἐν δὲ κλόνον Ἀργεῖοισιν ἦκε κακόν.

quite consistent with this interpretation.¹⁷ So is the other occurrence of the word in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 107), ἰπποχάρμας . . . κλόνου. It is also consistent with the sense in Triclinii Sch. 404a. κλόνου] παραχάς . . . μάχας.¹⁸ Thus Stanley's 'turbas' is a fair approximation, but Blomfield's 'strepitus' and its progeny are mistaken.

Perhaps someone will object that Aeschylus could have understood κλόνου differently in Homer from the way modern scholars explain it. The Homeric Scholia do not support this. There are two D Scholia.¹⁹ Sch. D *Il.* 5.167 ἀνά κλόνον: κατὰ τὸν θόρυβον καὶ κατὰ τὴν παραχὴν. Sch. D *Il.* 16.713 κλόνον: παραχὴν, θόρυβον. There is also a scholium on papyrus referring to *Il.* 5.167, viz., P. Strasb. inv. 1015 κλόνον: τὸν παλμόν. τὴν κίνησιν.²⁰ And there are Sch. Vet. *Il.* 21.422a. κλόνος· ἐν ᾧ κλίνεται τὰ πράγματα, and 21.422b. κλόνος ἢ μάχη. ἐν ᾧ κλονοῦνται οἱ πολεμοῦντες.²¹ θόρυβος, which can mean the 'uproar' made by a crowd, may have been the source of Blomfield's 'strepitus', but the commentators on Homer were more likely to be thinking of the 'confusion' of battle than simply of the noise of the combatants.²² And why, indeed, should the mustering of troops in Argos have been made so memorably noisy by the clattering of shields or their bearers?

ἀσπίτωρ, moreover, is not an adjective meaning 'of shield(s)'. It is properly a noun equivalent to the more usual ἀσπιστής, 'man armed with shield', 'warrior'.²³ Used as an adjective, here it has the same sense as if it were used as an adnominal genitive, and Blomfield's 'clypeatorium' captures the sense perfectly.²⁴ Thus ἀσπίστορας κλόνου means 'shield men's battle turmoil'. But the battles took place at Troy, not at Argos.

This interpretation of ἀσπίστορας κλόνου is quite compatible with the sense of λιπούσα as the following passages show.

Iliad 5.155–8:

ἐνθ' ὃ γε [sc. Διομήδης] τοὺς ἐνάριζε, φίλον δ' ἐξαίνυτο θυμὸν
ἀμφοτέρω, πατέρι δὲ γόον καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ
λείπ', ἐπεὶ οὐ ζῶντε μάχης ἐκνοστήσαντε
δέξατο· χηρωσταὶ δὲ διὰ κτήσιν दाτέοντο.

Here Diomedes takes away the lives of Xanthos and Thoon, and 'leaves wailing and a wretched funeral for their father'.

S. *Ai.* 971–3:

πρὸς ταῦτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὕβριζέτω.
Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται.

Tecmessa says 'That being so, let Odysseus do outrage among those who are [lit.]

¹⁷ Hans Trümper, *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos* (Freiburg, 1950), pp. 157–158, and *LfgE* s.vv.

¹⁸ Ole Smith (ed.) (Leipzig, 1976).

¹⁹ J. Lascaris (ed.) (Rome, 1517).

²⁰ O. Plasberg (ed.), *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 2 (1903) p. 202. παλμόν here = 'pulse', a later medical usage without bearing on the Homeric passage.

²¹ H. Erbse (ed.) (Berlin, 1969–88).

²² In Thucydides and Herodotus θόρυβος is regularly used of the confusion and disorder of battle.

²³ Aeschylus also uses ὑπασπιστήρ once, Sophocles and Euripides ἀσπιστήρ once each in the extant plays. For these tragic coinages see Ernst Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)* (2 vols.; Strassburg, 1910–12) I 22, 137, II 1–2, 29.

²⁴ Cf. also Ernst Fraenkel, I 22, n. 2.

emptied [of Aias]. For they have Aias no longer, but he has gone and has left me grief and wailing’.

Similarly in *O. C.* 1705–8 Antigone says of Oedipus:

ἄς ἔχρηξε γὰρ ἐπὶ ξένῳ
 ἔθανε· κοίταν δ’ ἔχει
 νέρθεν εὐσκήαστον αἰέν,
 οὐδὲ πένθος ἔλιπ’ ἄκλαυτον.

‘He died in the land where he wished, and he has a resting place beneath it, forever well shaded, nor has he left a mourning without tears’ (where the last clause is litotes for ‘and he has left us tearful mourning’).

In the same way in *Ag.* 402–7 we have ‘Leaving for the men of the city ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λοχιμούς τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλιμούς . . . she was gone (βεβάκει 407)’. To put it schematically, in each of these passages A either departs or removes something and as a result what B has left is some form of affliction C.²⁵ In the present passage Helen = A, the ἀσπιοί = B, and C = ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λοχιμούς τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλιμούς with the emended text, or ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λογιμούς τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλιμούς without the emendation. The point made in each example is that B is afflicted with C, not that B is afflicted with C in a certain location. What Helen left for the men of the city was the whole expedition to Troy, the sailings, the battles, the casualties. These she left ἀσπιοίς, but obviously not ἐν ἄσπρῃ.

If this is so, then Aeschylus is not likely to have mentioned so relatively minor an inconvenience as ‘marshalling of companies’ alongside ‘the battle turmoil of shield men’. He must have been thinking of ‘lying in ambushes’ or ‘ambush parties’. Ambushes are represented in the *Iliad* as an important and dangerous part of the warrior’s work. In *Il.* 1.227–8 Achilles rebukes Agamemnon for leaving ambush parties to others, and in 13.276–91 Idomeneus speaks at some length about lying in ambush as a special test of courage and spirit. ἀσπίστορας then goes with both κλόνους and λοχιμούς, and the sense is ‘the battle turmoil of shield men and their lying in ambush’.

It follows that ναυβάτας ὀπλιμούς most likely also refers to something that can stand alongside open battle and lying in ambush as a frequent part of the hardships of the expedition.²⁶ ναυβάτης means lit. ‘shipfarer’, and used as an attributive adjective with ὀπλιμούς it corresponds to the use of ἀσπίστορας with κλόνους and λοχιμούς. But ὀπλιμούς is somewhat obscure. It cannot mean ‘armings (with weapons)’ since sea battles are not likely to be in question, and Aeschylus could easily have said ναυμάχος ὀπλιμούς if that is what he intended. ὄπλον has the primary meaning ‘tool’, ‘implement’, and its other meanings are specifications, e.g. ‘arms’ = ‘tools of warfare’. This is especially evident in the epic use of the word and its derivatives. I suggest that ὀπλιμούς means here ‘work with implements’ and is specified by ναυβάτας, so that ναυβάτας ὀπλιμούς means lit. ‘shipfaring work with implements’, i.e. ‘shipfarers’ work with (ships’) implements’. The men of the Greek expeditionary force must have often had to use their ships over the ten years to travel here and there for supplies and on raids. This will have entailed much hard work. Aeschylus would have assumed this. The phrase stands for all the πόνος of using ships to travel, not as a passenger but as a worker launching the ship, on board the ship, beaching the ship.

²⁵ The lexica do not make this clear.

²⁶ I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for *CQ* for a helpful suggestion on this point.

A conservative critic may still object: 'I accept your reinterpretation of 403–5, but why not retain λογχίμους? The metre can be repaired with Hermann's πάρεειν δόκαι (or better δοκαί with Dindorf). And there are parallels supporting λογχίμους, viz. *Suppl.* 182–3 ὄχλον δ' ὑπασπιστήρα καὶ δορυρσόνον λεύεω ξὺν ἵπποις καμπύλοις τ' ὀχήμασιν, and *Il.* 5.167 = 20.319 κλόνον ἐγγειάων.'

I would first reply that λογχίμος is at least an unusual formation. Maas pointed out that it is a *hapax*, and he knew of no adjectives in -ίμος formed from a noun designating a concrete object. The only exception anyone has offered is ζύγιμος alongside the normal ζύγιος.²⁷ Actually adjectives meaning 'of spear(s)' are very rare all together, and none are clearly attested elsewhere in the classical period.²⁸ λοχισμός, in contrast, is impeccably formed, and several similar formations are first attested in Aeschylus.²⁹

As to sense, ἀπίστορας κλόνους λογχίμους τε, 'battle turmoil of shield men and spears', is not truly parallel to *Suppl.* 182 ὄχλον δ' ὑπασπιστήρα καὶ δορυρσόνον, 'a crowd of shield men and spear brandishers'. Moreover there is an important difference in setting. In *Suppl.* 182–3 Danaus is describing for his daughters in iambic dialogue what he can see and they do not, and so he gives full details. 'A crowd I see with shields before them, brandishing spears, with horses and curved chariots.' In the lyric setting the Chorus is alluding to some salient points in a familiar story in a way designed merely to be suggestive of the whole. From this point of view the mention of spears would have added much less than a reference to lying in ambush alongside open battle as a hardship. As for the Homeric κλόνον ἐγγειάων it might be represented in lyric by κλόνους λογχίμους, as Fraenkel had suggested in his Commentary, but this would be more plausible were it not paired with ἀπίστορας.

Finally, as to metre, certainly Aeschylus might have used the unfamiliar δοκαί to mean 'illusory appearances' since Euripides (*El.* 747) used the equally unfamiliar δοκῶ once in the same sense. But would he have used it here? He had just used δόξαι in this exact sense, also referring to dreams, in 275, and he uses δόξαι in a closely related sense in *Cho.* 1051, 1053. He uses δόξα nowhere else in this unusual sense.³⁰ The use of a word in an unusual sense more than once in the same work and nowhere else is not uncommon. It is as if the sense were on the poet's mind for a time.³¹ But having used δόξα in an unusual sense in 275, is the poet likely to have used the unfamiliar δοκή so soon after to express the same idea, especially when he was still thinking of this range of sense for δόξα in the *Choephoroi*? It is at least improbable, and consequently so is Hermann's conjecture. In sum, every consideration favours the view that λογχίμους was a copyist's slip for λοχισμούς.

Bedford Hills, New York

JOSEPH F. GANNON

²⁷ M. Marcovich, *Emerita* 42 (1974), 126 cites ζύγιμος and several other adjectives as counterexamples to refute Maas, but all the others are formed from collective nouns, as Bollack (n. 9) points out. Searching with the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Irvine, 1992) I found ζύγιμος only in Polyb. 34.8 and Ath. 8.1.

²⁸ λοχχαῖος is attested only in the *Suda*. δουράτεος and δούρειος ἰδούριος are attested, but they mean 'of planks' or 'of beams'. Aeschylus (*Pers.* 137) uses αἰχμαῖε but it probably means 'warlike' rather than 'with spear(s)'.

²⁹ According to C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago, 1948), ἀπολακτικμός, οἰκτικμός, ὄπλιςμός, χηρικμός, and ὕβριςμός are first attested in Aeschylus.

³⁰ Elsewhere in tragedy only *Rhesus* 780.

³¹ Cf. Euripides' use of δόκησις in the same unusual sense in *Hel.* 36 and 119.