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](#)

Twenty Lines of the *Agamemnon*

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 04 / June 1912, pp 108 - 109

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199858, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199858

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1912). Twenty Lines of the *Agamemnon*. The Classical Review, 26, pp 108-109 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199858

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

are not), and then a more specific account of the second in vv. 143-144:

σὲ μὲν εὖ πρᾶσσοντ' ἐπιχαίρω·
σὲ δὲ κακῶς πρᾶσσοντα πεφύβημαι.

ὅταν πληγὴ ἐπιβῇ = χειμῶν' ἐπιβάντα, which is made more definite by τὸν ἱππομανῆ.

No other explanation seems to me possible, if ἱππομανῆ is sound. But is it not probable that Sophocles wrote ἱπομανῆ? If so, the text remains intact—with the sole exception of χ for λ. Struck (Lat. *ico*) by the καταιβάτης black tempest of frenzy, Ajax *θολερῶ κείται χειμῶνι* (207) *ἱπούμενος* (Aesch. *Prom.* 365). Cp. Lucian, *Peregr.* 43 *γνόφου καταβάντος*, *Char.* 3 *χειμῶν ἄφνω καὶ γνόφος ἐμπεσών*, Plut. *Pyrrh.* 2 *θολερὸν ὁμβρῶν ἐπιγινόμενων*, *Timol.* 27 *θολερὸς ἀήρ*, Polyb. 3. 55. 2 *ἐπὶ τῇν*

ὑποκάτω . . . ἐπιβαίεν. The storm came down on Ajax like an ἵπος, and μέγα ἵψατο αὐτόν (A 454), i.e. κατέβλαψε (Hesych.), whereas in O.T. 1299, where the image of the tempest's fury is absent, we have simply προσέβη *μανία*. Cp. *λυσσομανής, αἰνομανής, ἡμιμανής, πολυμανής, ξηλομανής, οἰστρομανής*. The chorus, like Tecmessa in 216 (*μανία ἄλous νύκτερος Αἴας ἀπελωβήθη*), is here asserting that Ajax was undone in the night just fled: *ὥς καὶ τῆς νῦν φθιμένης νυκτός . . . σὲ τὸν ἱπομανῆ χειμῶν' ἐπιβάντ' ὀλέσαι*, which, as shown by *ὥς*, is nothing more nor less than a direct explanation of *ὅταν πληγὴ ἐπιβῇ* in the preceding sentence, the meaning of the general statement being unfolded in the specific instance.

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

TWENTY LINES OF THE AGAMEMNON.

THE chorus of the *Agamemnon*, which comes in at line 40, chants in anapaests from that line as far as 82 to itself or to the audience in the ordinary way of a Greek tragic chorus. Lines 83-103 are addressed, also in anapaests, to Clytemnestra. At 104 the chorus passes into lyrics, which last down to 257 and are not addressed specifically to anyone. Finally in 258-263 it speaks (that is, the coryphaeus speaks) to Clytemnestra in iambics.

What is the exact relation of Clytemnestra to lines 83-103? Is she visible to the chorus and the audience or not? Three views may be held.

(1) Clytemnestra is taken to be on the stage (or at the back of the orchestra) engaged in lighting fires or offering sacrifices at the altars. If this is so, she takes no notice of the chorus' appeal to her, though they are somewhat urgent for information. They ask what tidings she has received, but they receive no answer. Her presence during the chanting of 40-82, or some of it, would be against the ordinary practice of Greek tragedy, in which a chanting or singing chorus usually has the boards to itself. Still more unusual

would be her presence throughout 104-257, and the editors who take view (1) do not seem to say explicitly whether they think she stays during the choral song or goes away without deigning a reply to the chorus and returns again at or before 257, where the chorus, apparently unconscious of her discourtesy, again addresses her.

(2) She may be not visible to the chorus and audience at all, but within hearing, although inside the palace. Such is probably the situation in *Ajax* 134 ff., where the chorus in anapaests and then in lyrics addresses the hero repeatedly. But the cases are not really parallel. Ajax is only in a tent or hut, and his sailor-companions may count with fair confidence on his hearing what they say or sing, just as at 89-91 he hears the call of Athena and comes out. The palace of Agamemnon is another thing, and it would be against dramatic propriety that the chorus should address twenty lines to someone supposed to be inside it, taking the chance of her hearing. We should have to conclude also either that she did not hear or that she would not take any notice.

(3) The chorus only apostrophises

the absent queen and does not really address her or expect her to hear. So for instance in *Hippolytus* 141 ff. the chorus apostrophises Phaedra in her absence. This too may be the case in the *Ajax* scene. Possibly Ajax is not supposed to hear. So at least some scholars seem to take it; Jebb is not explicit on the point. But in the *Agamemnon* the question in 85 and still more the very direct λέξασα κ.τ.λ. of 97 seem almost to preclude this possibility. Nor is it in itself probable. The queen is in no personal situation, like Ajax or Phaedra, to suggest an apostrophe. The chorus are not anxious about her.

The view which I wish to suggest is that lines 83-103 are out of their proper place and should be put after line 257. Clytemnestra appears at the end of the choral song, not before it or in the course of it, and the chorus addresses her first in anapaests and then in half a dozen iambs. So in 783-

809 it addresses Agamemnon in anapaests at the end of its lyrical song. So at the end of the lyrical song *Persae* 65-139, prefaced by an anapaestic parodos like *Agam.* 40-82, the chorus passes again into a few anapaestic lines and then addresses Atossa directly in four trochaic tetrameters.

The difficulties incidental to the three theories above stated are avoided by this suggestion. The address to the queen becomes one, not two: continuous, not intermittent: effectual, not at first disregarded. Also it should be noticed how effective is the immediate sequence of 104-107 upon 72-82, the contrast of what the chorus can still do with what they can do no longer. The μέριμνα κυκόφρων of 99 is also more in place after the long lyrical song, especially 165 ff., 249 ff., than before it. The anapaestic monotony of 43-103 is much reduced by the change.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXPLORER AND HIS METHODS.

IN a volume of miscellaneous letters and papers collected by Bishop Tanner, bound up in the beginning of the eighteenth century and preserved in the Bodleian Library, is a short paper concerning the discovery of ancient statues in Greece, which appears to be of sufficient interest to merit being printed in full. The notes or instructions for digging, for so they can best be described, cover about seven folio pages; they have no beginning, they come to an abrupt end, and there is no definite indication of authorship. The handwriting, firm and flowing in character, belongs to the early part—certainly to a period before the middle—of the seventeenth century, and from this evidence of date, and from the substance of the paper, it seems likely to be by William Petty, to whose genius and enterprise was due a great part of the collections of Thomas, Earl of Arundel. It is even possible that it is in his own handwriting. The point has not been decided, for the only specimens that

I have been able to trace are signatures,¹ which are obviously unsatisfactory as examples of the current script. Perhaps it would be a safer guess to assign the actual manuscript to the hand of a contemporary clerk. The reasons for attributing the Notes to Petty, to be drawn from internal evidence, are worth careful consideration. A good deal of information concerning his manner of searching for classical treasures can be found in Sir Thomas Roe's Correspondence, and the methods prescribed in the Notes are vividly suggested. No life of Petty is included in the Dictionary of National Biography, and as the slight notices of him that exist contain discordant statements, an outline of his career may be attempted.

Apparently there is no connexion between this William Petty and the well-known Sir William, who became the

¹ I owe tracings of Petty's signatures from the Audit Book of Jesus College, Cambridge, to the kindness of Dr. Foakes Jackson. The name occurs in 1613 and 1615.