The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Aeschylu, *Agamemnon* 489–502 (Dindorf)

A. O. Prickard

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 09 / December 1900, pp 434 - 436

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00081944, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00081944

How to cite this article:

A. O. Prickard (1900). Aeschylu, *Agamemnon* 489–502 (Dindorf). The Classical Review, 14, pp 434–436 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00081944

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

γούνατα, and amenable to the same treatment:—

O 269 ὡς Ἐκτωρ λαμψήρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα

X 24. Cf. O 344 where also, as Dr. Leaf says, the two nouns 'form a single idea.'

It appears then that *πρόφρων* as a feminine form is by no means well established, is indeed of somewhat doubtful validity, for Homer.

The testimony of the Hymns which are called Homeric may be noticed. We have

Hym. Dem. 140 *πρόφρων, οἷα γυναικὸς ἀφήλικος ἔργα τέτυκται*

„ „ 226 *παῖδα δέ τοι πρόφρων ὑποδέξομαι*,—

'*πρόφρασ*' is metrically admissible in both examples. In Hym. xxx. 18 *πρόφρων δ' ἀντ' ᾤδης* no one would dream of making a correction; but even in the same Hymn it is transparently obvious that l. 7

ὁ δ' ὀλβιος, ὃν κε σὺ θυμῷ
πρόφρων τιμῆσης,

said of Gaea should be *πρόφρωνι τιμῆσης*, that is if © 40 and X 184 be not entirely forgotten.

But however matters stand with the Hymns, in our passage of Homer (v 359) the substitution of *πρόφρασσα* for *πρόφρων* *με* would be by no means improbable, apart from all question as to the position of the pronoun. No other inference can be drawn from the facts.

To pass now to the third and final point to be examined in connection with the couplet we are discussing, in *αὐτόν τε ζῶειν* the *τε* being followed by *καί* should mean *both*; but this can only be so, if the verb that comes after the *καί* be coordinate with *ζῶειν*, which unfortunately is not the case here either in sense or grammar. This difficulty has been felt of old, and accordingly some of the MSS. give *ἄέξειν*, which restores the grammatical balance, but makes

utter wreck of the sense. The modern inclination is rather to let grammatical exactness go by the board and to take refuge in some kind of anacoluthon. 'Rückkehr zum verbum finitum' (Ameis-Hentze). The fact of the matter is that if there were no *τε* after *αὐτόν*, the subjunctive is so natural that no editor would ever dream of noting it as a 'Rückkehr'; the *καί* would simply unite *ἔξ* and its belongings to *ἄέξει* and its belongings. The remark really implies that *ἄέξει* is for *ἄέξειν*, a disastrous and quite fatal consequence, which the presence of *τε* necessitates.

Having now seen that there is good cause for mistrust of the traditional reading, we may be more ready to consider a suggestion whereby all these difficulties may be removed. Accordingly I submit the following as a restoration of the original:—

αἶ κ' ἔῃ πρόφρασσα Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἀγελεύῃ
αὐτόν ἐμὲ ζῶειν καὶ μοι φίλον υἱὸν ἄέξει.

This reading has been in part at least anticipated by the suggestions of others; αἶ κε μ' ἔῃ *πρόφρασσα* was proposed by F. Schnorr v. Carolsfeld and αἶ κ' ἔῃ *πρόφρων* *με* is read by van Leeuwen and da Costa. The responsibility for the removal of *τε* and the substitution of *ἐμέ* I take upon my own shoulders.

If it be asked why *τε* ever got into the line at all, the answer is that it came naturally enough from the association of π 388 where it stands with unexceptional fitness:—

ἀλλὰ βόλεσθε
αὐτόν τε ζῶειν καὶ ἔχειν πατρώια πάντα.

Afterwards the temptation to find room for the ousted pronoun by changing the obsolete *πρόφρασσα* into the familiar *πρόφρων* would hardly be seriously resisted in spite of, or rather because of, the deep reverential respect for Homer, prevalent in classical times wherever the Greek language was spoken and understood.

T. L. AGAR.

AESCHYLUS, *AGAMEMNON* 489-502 (DINDORF)

THE manuscripts and all editors before Hermann assign 489-500 to Clytemnaestra, 501-2 to the Chorus. Hermann, following suggestions made by Scaliger and Wellauer (Tyrwhitt had also proposed the same

change), has removed the marks indicating a change of speaker, leaving all the lines to the Chorus, or rather to its leader. All later editors, so far as I know, have followed Hermann, with the notable exception of

Karsten and of Dindorf, who in *Poetae Scenici* 1869 retains the old arrangement; but Wecklein in his school edition (Leipzig 1888) gives the last two lines to a new member or section of the Chorus, and so does Dr. Verrall.

Is it too late to ask for a reconsideration of a conclusion approved by so many excellent judges, from whom it can be no pleasure, and may seem to be mere perversity, to dissent? I do so because the arguments in favour of the manuscript arrangement have always seemed to me to be decisive, so that each successive edition which has embodied the other view has been a fresh disappointment; and the question itself to be really vital to the reputation of Aeschylus as a delineator of character. Still I should have been silent if I had not known myself to be following the deliberate and clear opinion, not only of Karsten, whom I have already mentioned, but of one specially qualified by technical knowledge, poetical sympathy, and a rigorously judicial mind to be heard on this particular question, the late Professor Conington. For the argument which I shall set out, I must take the entire responsibility. I merely mention his name to clear myself of any apparent presumption in arguing the matter at all.

The MSS. (including M.) are not seldom at fault as to the assignment of speeches to speakers, or the marking of a change of speaker. Perhaps no one would now follow them in giving 613-4 to the Herald (Dr. Verrall gives them to the second speaker of the Chorus). Again the restoration of the *σχιχουβία* in *Prometheus* 255-7 and 966-970, where M. had omitted marks of change of speaker, appears to be right, and to do the greatest credit to Welcker and Hermann respectively. Still it is clearly for those who propose a change in any instance to make out a case for change; and I have tried to collect the arguments brought forward as to the lines now in question.

I am sorry to say that I have been unable, after a good deal of search, to find the reasons, if any, advanced by Scaliger. Tyrwhitt writes:—

‘τάχ’ εἰσόμυσθα κ.τ.λ. Haec vulgo Clytemnaestrae tribuuntur. Quod si recte fit, mirum sane est eandem tacitam in scena restare usque ad v. 596. Quae enim sub eius nomine leguntur ἀμοιβαία a v. 547 ad v. 559 sunt certe Chori. Mallem igitur haec tribuere Coryphaeo, qui, ut saepe alias, Chorum alloquitur. (T. Tyrwhitt: *coniecturae* in Aesch. Eur. et Aristoph. 1822.)

Wellauer (ed. 1824) has:—

“475 Haec non Clytemnaestrae sed Choregi puto: nam praeterquam quod Clytemnaestra per totam hanc scenam non loquitur, ad quem illud σοι v. 482 referendum sit non video. Praeterea solet Chorus procul advenientes primum aspicere propter eum quem in theatro occupabat locum. In textu autem nihil novare ausus sum.”

The points are three:—

(1) The prolonged silence of Clytemnaestra, if present from the beginning of the scene, is strange.

(2) The Chorus usually, and conventionally, announces the approach of fresh persons.

(3) The application of the sarcastic σοι is uncertain.

Paley adds (4) that Clytemnaestra ‘has no misgivings.’

I will take these points in order.

(1) The prolonged silence of a principal character has been recognised as a device, almost a mannerism, of Aeschylus. This is pointed out in Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 911. In *Persae*, 245 etc., the Chorus, who have here no doubt been the first to see the Messenger, question him for some time, until in 290, Atossa intervenes with an apology for her silence. The silence is not so prolonged as in the present instance, the compass and elaboration of the *Persae* being much more limited than of the *Agamemnon*. In both plays we have a Queen Regent and a Council of old men awaiting news of the army, so that the parallel is a somewhat close one. In both cases there may have been a feeling that αἰδώς (*Choeph.* 665) made it unseemly for a woman to begin the questioning of a man.

However it is not necessary to assume that Clytemnaestra is present throughout. It would be in accordance with her restless, highly-strung character to come in and announce the Messenger’s approach, then pass out, leaving the Chorus to go and meet the man, or to await his actual entrance, and to reenter as the Chorus speak 585-6. These two explanations cannot both be right, but either appears at least plausible.

(2) It is the case that the Chorus often notices the arrival of a fresh person. The instance already quoted from the *Persae* is in point, and, for the reasons given, is important. *S.C.T.* 369 is also in point; there are instances in the *Trachiniae*, and several in Euripides. But in the *Suppliants* (of Aeschylus) 180 Danaus sees and announces to the Chorus the approaching Argives, and at 716 the Egyptian ship. In Sophocles *Oed. Tyr.* 1110 Oedipus sees and tells the Chorus, immedi-

ately after the end of an Ode, of the coming of the herdsman. Still nearer to our case is *Antigone* 631, where Creon, again after the conclusion of an Ode, announces Haemon with the words,

τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα μάντεων ὑπέρτερον κ.τ.λ.

surely a recollection of the *Agamemnon*.

The rule then is not, and indeed it is not by any one stated to be, an absolute one.

(3) The difficulty about σοι I am not sure that I understand. If spoken by the Chorus leader, Clytemnaestra not being present, it is indeed difficult, as is observed by Hermann, and in Mr. Sidgwick's note on the passage in his edition. In the mouth of Clytemnaestra, it seems a natural sarcasm on the dull scepticism of the Chorus, in keeping with her words at 590, "I think I heard someone taunt me with a woman's credulity, fed up on bonfires and mountain-brushwood. Here is proof of another sort. What do you say to it?" In this connection the emphatic σοι in 315,

τέκμαρ τοιοῦτο ξύμβολόν τέ σοι λέγω,

where every syllable is a thrust, may be noticed. Peile, following an old suggestion of Klausen's, has another explanation of σοι.

(4) It is not in Clytemnaestra's character to feel, or express, misgivings. But the alternatives suggested in 498 (like those in Choeph. 195-200) emphasise the certainty of an ἄγγελος as contrasted with weaker evidence. And the unfavourable alternative is suppressed. Thus the spirit appears to be one of defiant certainty.

If these difficulties may be thus met, as to which I must leave others to judge, I would rest the affirmative case for the manuscript arrangement on just two grounds.

First on the character of the lines and the character of the Chorus. Like the Chorus of the *Persae*, but more markedly than in the *Persae*, the old men are throughout the play, until roused by Aegisthus, slow of understanding, feeble in expression (that is, in dialogue) with no initiation, and no resource. The lines are charged with quick thought and vivid imagery, the laboured imagery which is characteristic of Clytemnaestra's artificial

nature and reserve of intellectual power. Nowhere else in the play does the Chorus speak more than six consecutive iambic lines, seldom more than three or four, and its tone is dull and querulous.

Secondly, it is hard to believe that 501-2 are spoken by the same person as what precedes. Surely these two lines are the insipid conventional comment of the Chorus on words too highly pitched for them, and especially on the prayer, 'a terrible one in Clytemnaestra's lips, which fitly and powerfully, and in a manner wholly Aeschylean, concludes her speech, the prayer that the sequel may match the joy now realised.

εὖ γὰρ πρὸς εὖ φανέσει προσθήκη πέλοι.

As I have before mentioned, both Wecklein and Dr. Verrall have indicated that these lines belong, as the MSS. say that they do, to a different speaker from those which go before them.

The line just quoted leads me back to an earlier passage of the play. The line is identical in feeling with the wish of 349-350 :

τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν,
πολλῶν γὰρ ἐσθλῶν τὴν δῆσιν εἰλόμην.

The second line I understand to mean 'My choice is the enjoyment of many good things ; not of this or that good thing, but of all on which I have set my heart, of the present and [of the sequel.]' Clytemnaestra is great even in her wicked aspirations—'non humilis mulier.'

The emphasis falls on πολλῶν, much as in 963,

πολλῶν πατησὸν δ' εἰμάτων ἂν ἠξάμην.

Many editors, not Paley, nor Davies, nor Weil, nor Enger, follow Hermann in reading τῇδ' for τῇ. The interpretation given above I owe to Conington : it is consistent, not, I think, identical, with the rendering given by Klausen and others. The reference to 963 I have supplied. Conington's view on the main point discussed above will be found in his review of Hermann's *Aeschylus* in *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 100.

A. O. PRICKARD.