

Alle diese Erscheinungen, vor allem die Omphalebilder selbst, sind aber in Unteritalien besonders deutlich greifbar und nachweisbar. Dies ist ein weiteres Indiz dafür, daß die kaiserzeitliche Bildwelt in größerem Maß von Großgriechenland abhängt, als dies gemeinhin angenommen wird. Ich hoffe, an anderer Stelle auf diese wichtige Frage zusammenfassend eingehen zu können<sup>94</sup>).

Bonn

Konrad Schauenburg

### THREE NOTES ON AESCHYLUS' AGAMEMNON

#### 1. 126 ff.: —

“χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ Πριάμου πόλιν ἄδε κέλευθος,  
πάντα δὲ πύργων  
κτήνη πρόσθε τὰ δημοπληθῆ  
μοῖρα λαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον . . .”

129 προσθετὰ M πρόσθε τὰ VFTr

Should we read πρόσθε τὰ or πρόσθετα (Pauw, adopted by Hermann)? Unlike all other modern editors, Denniston-Page adopt the latter reading; but they admit that it is very difficult. “The sense “additional”, they observe, ‘is out of place, and the only other possibility is “given up”, “made over” (by debtor to creditor), a sense attested in an inscription of the mid-fourth century from Mylasa (SIG 167. 12 = Schwyzer 746 A 12)’. It is enormously improbable that so prosaic an expression should occur in early poetry, and the sense it gives would be exceptionally feeble. They also point out that on this view πύργων would have to mean the fortress as a whole without reference to its fortifications, which is abnormal, and κτήνη would have to mean not ‘cattle’, as it normally does, but ‘possessions’. The second of these objections is I think graver than has been realised. It is true that Hesychius explains κτήνη as meaning χρήματα: but no passage in any extant author gives definite support to his allegation (not even Hesiod fr. 94 Rzach = G 5 Merkelbach, l. 49, where we can by no means exclude the possibility that

94) Vgl. vorläufig BJbb. 155/56, 1955/56, 84.

κτῆνεςσι means 'cattle'), and it may well be mistaken. Denniston-Page argue further in support of πρόσθετα that 'the interruption of πύργων πρόσθε by the subject of the sentence is very harsh'. This is true; but I do not agree that the different nature of the words inserted between genitive and postposition in Fraenkel's two Homeric parallels (Il. IV. 54 and XII. 445 f.) robs them of all their force, especially since it is generally agreed that Calchas' prophecy is expressed in harsh and crabbed oracular language.

In sum, I come very near to agreeing with Fraenkel that πρόσθετα is 'impossible'. But Denniston-Page give one other reason for accepting it that at first sight seems formidable. This is that if we read πρόσθε τὰ we must assume that κτῆνη means 'cattle'; and in such a context the mention of cattle seems absurdly trivial. Further, the cattle are to be destroyed *outside the walls*. Everyone who has read the Iliad knows that the Trojans did not do anything so foolish as to keep their cattle in such a place; they kept them on the slopes of Ida, and when the Greeks managed to carry off any, they did not indiscriminately slaughter them.

There is one way of keeping the reading πρόσθε τὰ and at the same time getting out of the text the reference to the slaughter of the human inhabitants of Troy which all likelihood demands. This is to assume that we have here one of the instances, so common in oracular language, in which human beings are referred to by the names of animals. We all know that an individual person can be referred to as, say, a cow or a lion, as at 1127, 1223 f. and 1258 f. of this play (see Fraenkel's notes on these passages). Similarly, collectivities may be so described. One recalls, for instance, the oracle of Amphilytus at Herodotus 1, 62, 4:

ἔρριπται δ' ὁ βόλος, τὸ δὲ δίκτυον ἐκπεπέτασται,  
θύννοι δ' οἰμήσουσι σεληναίης διὰ νυκτός

(verses which strikingly recall the language of *Agam.* 355—61). Even in non-oracular language, such words as ἀγέλη or ἔσμος are not infrequently used of humans. The word δημοπληθῆ has been rightly explained since Hermann as equivalent to πολλὰ δῆμια, that is to say, as meaning 'many and of the people'. The first half of this compound may just as well correspond to a defining as to a possessive genitive; in other words, the phrase might mean 'the many herds of the people' in the sense that the herds are the people's property; but it might equally well

mean it in the sense that the many herds *are* the people. I can see no linguistic objection to this way of understanding the compound.

This view has the advantage of enabling us to take κτήνη in its normal sense, of getting rid of the objectionable πρόσθετα, and of allowing us to suppose that by means of an oracular license highly consonant with the character of the context, κτήνη is being used to make the expected reference to the Trojan people. It also enables us to understand why the 'cattle' are to be slaughtered *before the walls*. The men of Troy took their stand against the invader πυλάων . . . πρόσθε (II. XII. 445, where εἰστήκει, as Fraenkel points out, is inserted between these two words); it is their fate δλέσθαι εὐκλειῶς πρὸ πόλης (II. XXII. 110, a passage that may have been in Aeschylus' mind when he wrote *Agam.* 1304). This interpretation seems to me to have considerable advantages over any other that has been suggested.

2. 1055—7 οὔτοι θυραία τῆδ' ἔμοι σχολή πάρα  
 τρίβειν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστίας μεσομφάλου  
 ἔστηκεν ἤδη μῆλα πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρός.

'All is darkness here', say Denniston-Page of 1056—7; both they and Fraenkel clearly summarise the difficulties. Both they and he agree that the notion that ἐστίας μεσομφάλου is what Sidgwick calls 'a loose local genitive . . . vaguely indicating the region' is highly unconvincing. This is not a construction that we expect to meet with in such a context. Moreover Fraenkel is right when he says 'the obvious way of constructing the passage is to take τὰ μὲν γὰρ . . . μῆλα together'; but how can we effect this without leaving in the air the intervening words ἐστίας μεσομφάλου? There is a second difficulty. Fraenkel has given good reason for treating the words πρὸς σφαγὰς πυρός as a crux; and Denniston-Page agree with him.

I suggest that the clue to the understanding of ἐστίας μεσομφάλου is given by the well-known fact that the Greeks when sacrificing began and ended with an offering to the goddess Hestia. The evidence is well summarised by F. Schwenn, *Gebet und Opfer* (Heidelberg, 1927), 120 f.; cf. A. Preuner, *Hestia-Vesta* (1864), and in Roscher, *Myth. Lex.* I, 2614 f.; W. Süß in *R.-E.* VIII. 1272 f.; P. Stengel, *Die Griechischen Kultusaltertümer*, p. 114, n. 15; A. C. Pearson on Sophocles. fr. 726 (vol. II, p. 329). ἀφ' Ἐστίας ἀρχεσθαι was a common proverb (see Leutsch-Schneidewin on Zenobius 1, 40 in *Paroem. Gr.*, vol. 1, p. 14); in the present connection, it is particularly relevant to mention

that at Olympia they sacrificed to Hestia before sacrificing to Olympian Zeus (Pausanias V, 14, 6).

Suppose we write Ἑστίας with a capital E, and take it as referring not to the hearth but to the goddess: the genitive will then be a simple possessive, and the difficulty of taking τὰ μὲν γὰρ with μῆλα will vanish. The sense resulting will be good; for since it was generally known that one sacrificed to Hestia first, to say 'Hestia's oxen are ready' will have been a natural way, at least in poetry, of saying, 'The sacrifice is ready to begin'.

What is the meaning of μεσομφάλου? In the only other place where this epithet is attached to the noun ἑστία the reference is to the sacred hearth near the ὀμφαλῶς at Delphi (Euripides, *Ion* 462); but I see no reason why it should not also be an epithet of the goddess. It could conceivably have reference to her special position at Delphi; cf. *Hymn. Hom.* 24, 1—2, Aristonous II p. 164 Powell (Diehl vol. 2, 2nd. edn., p. 301) (Ἑστίαν . . . ἃ καὶ Ὀλύμπου καὶ μυχὸν γαίας μεσόμφαλον αἰεὶ Πυθίαν τε δάφναν κατέχουσα γαδὸν ἀν' ὑψίπυλον Φοίβου χορεύεις). But she may well have the epithet simply because of the central position which her shrine occupies in each household: cf. *Hymn. Hom.* 5, 30 καὶ τε μέσῳ οἴκῳ κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο, Simias fr. 9 Powell = fr. 5 Diehl Ἴστία ἀγνά, ἀπ' εὐξείνων μέσσα τοίχων, *Hymn. Orph.* 84, 1 f. Quandt<sup>2</sup> Ἑστία, . . . ἢ μέσον οἶκον ἔχεις πυρὸς ἀενάοιο μεγίστου. In this context the adjective would function both as a solemn epithet of the goddess and as an indication of the spot at which the sacrifice was to take place. We certainly ought to print Ἑστίας with a capital E; but the truth is that in such a case the Greeks did not distinguish sharply between the god and the sacred object; compare Ἥφαιστος as the first word of the Beacon Speech at 281.

What of the crux at the end of l. 1057? Plutarch *Mor.* 703 D says that Hesiod (*Op.* 748) is right to warn people against eating or washing from vessels over which sacrifice has not been offered; they should eat, says he, ἀπαρχὰς τῷ πυρὶ καὶ γέρα τῆς διακονίας ἀποδιδόντας. This notion of rewarding the fire for its services may very well lie at the root of the custom of sacrificing first to Hestia; and this consideration seems to me somewhat to strengthen the case for the conjecture προσφαγαὶ πυρὸς, which Denniston-Page tentatively put forward (p. 163). 3. 1652: — ἀλλὰ κἀγὼ μὴν πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναλνομαι θανεῖν.

This is what the manuscripts offer, and what most editors have printed. They have taken it to mean, in Paley's words,



'But I, too, be assured, do not object to die with my hand on my sword'; but we require the sense, 'But I am ready with sword advanced, and do not shrink from death'. E. Lobel (ap. Fraenkel, p. 788) obtains this by changing οὐκ to οὐδ': Denniston-Page follow him: Fraenkel has preferred κοῦκ. Either of these suggestions might be right; but I had rather be more economical and simply insert a colon after πρόκωπος, leaving οὐκ alone.

There is no reason to be afraid of the asyndeton. A similar case is that of *P. V.* 54, where all editors print a single sentence: —

καὶ μὴν πρόχειρα ψάλια δέρκεσθαι πάρα.

This is not impossible, but I should much prefer to insert a colon after ψάλια. Ellipse of the verb 'to be' is especially common with ἔτοιμος and its synonyms (such as πρόχειρα at *P. V.* 54) and virtual synonyms (such as πρόκωπος at *Agam.* 1652<sup>1</sup>); see A. C. Pearson on Euripides, *Hel.* 1523, J. D. Denniston on Euripides, *El.* 37). With δέρκεσθαι πάρα as an independent sentence, compare ὄραν πάρεστι at *Agam.* 1354 and Sophocles, *Ant.* 1293 and ὄραν πάρα at PSI 1211 (= Aeschylus, fr. 225 Mette = fr. 286 Lloyd-Jones), l. 28. After it had occurred to me that it would be better to place a colon after ψάλια, I looked up Rostagni's facsimile of M, where a colon is plainly visible in this place.

Another place in Aeschylus where editors have been insufficiently alive to the possibility of asyndeton is Suppl. 926. M offers

ἦκουσα τοῦπος οὐδαμῶς φιλόξενον,

which Wecklein, Mazon and Murray in his first edition followed the older editors in keeping unchanged. Headlam made a step in the right direction when he wrote

ἦκουσα, τοῦπος<δ>οὐδαμῶς φιλόξενον:

Wilamowitz, Weir Smyth, Vürtheim, Murray in his second edition and Kraus all followed suit. But we need only to place a colon after ἦκουσα; then there is no need to insert δ'.

Oxford

Hugh Lloyd-Jones

1) πρόκωπος may well have found its way in from the preceding line, displacing some other adjective. Herwerden suggested ξιφήρης, A. S. F. Gow (in *C. Q.* VIII, 1914, 6) ξιφουλκός. I should not dare to change the text; but I think it possible that Aeschylus may have written πρόχειρος.