

wenn Kore bei jenem nicht eine hundertfältige Märchenblume (hymn. H. II, 8 ff.; vgl. 425 ff.), sondern konkret Narzissen zum Verhängnis werden (Paus. IX, 31, 9), die, vorgriechischen Namens, samt Krokusflor den beiden „Großen Göttinnen“, d. h. chthonischen Mächten heilig waren (Soph. Oed. Col. 682 ff.), und wenn Pamphos schließlich der älteste Gesang auf die Chariten ohne deren zahlenmäßige oder namentliche Fixierung zugeschrieben wird (IX, 35, 4), was ihn ebenso auf homerische Stufe stellen könnte wie das Wissen um Poseidon als *ἵππων δωτήρα* (VII, 21, 9; vgl. ebd. Hom. Il. XXIII, 584), so sind das zwar in keinem Punkte zwingende Beweise, doch immerhin Indizien für altes Überlieferungsgut, das, zu Unrecht oder Recht, unter einem ehrwürdigen Namen auf uns gekommen ist. Es scheint, daß auch der Name Pamphos in jene Frühzeit weist, da Linos noch nicht Musenheros, sondern Gott in Tod und Auferstehung war, und Lust mit Leid vermischt im Lied des sterbend Künftigen sich löste.

Düsseldorf

Reinhard Häußler

THE PROBLEM OF MOTIVATION
IN THE
SUPPLICES OF AESCHYLUS

With the publication in 1952 of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2256 fr. 3 one of the outstanding problems of Aeschylean studies, the dating of the *Supplices*, was at length resolved to the satisfaction of the great majority of classical scholars. Yet despite this the play continues to prove a source of fundamental difficulty not least to those who have attempted to reconstruct the trilogy to which it is generally accepted to have belonged¹). Reconstructions after all which, in the absence of direct indications from the lost plays, are built upon foundations as variable

1) A full and critical survey of available external evidence and possible restorations of the Aeschylean myth is given by Garvie: *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy* Cambridge 1969 ch. 5.

and often as selfcontradicting as those of the Danaid myth must inevitably be governed, once they have moved beyond the most basic of details, by the individual's assessment of the only indisputable material at his disposal, in this case the surviving play, and if this is at fault there can be little hope for any realistic understanding of the trilogy as a whole. It is unfortunate that on this very point the *Supplices* gives so much trouble, for the flight of the Danaids from Egypt to the land of their ancestress Io, and in particular the motivation which prompts it will colour the action not only of one play but also of those to follow, in which we might expect some working out of the problem set before us. The question therefore is: do the Danaids flee because they refuse the advances of the sons of Aegyptus, or because the whole idea of marriage is abhorrent to them? If the former is the case then the murder of the suitors contained in the myth and thought to have taken place in the second play or in the interval between the second and third, removes the cause of their grievance if not their guilt. If, on the other hand, they are totally adverse to marriage we should expect the matter to extend even further before any dénouement.

At the beginning of his book *The Motif of Io in Aeschylus' Suppliants*²⁾ R.D. Murray summarises the various ideas held by scholars on the question of motivation, but it may be worthwhile to repeat the most notable here. Wilamowitz³⁾ writes: "Er (i.e. der Chor) erklärt der Ehe mit den Ägyptern *αὐτογενεῖ φῦξανοῦσα* entflohen zu sein aus angeborener Männerfeindschaft. Und daß ich dies durch das ganze Drama verkennen konnte, ist mir wirklich beschämend, denn überall spricht der Chor von seinem Abscheu gegen die Verbindung nicht bloß mit diesen Freiern, sondern überhaupt mit dem Manne." This general aspect of the Danaids' motivation is emphasised too by Vürtheim⁴⁾, who refers to "die absolute Männerfeindschaft solcher lebensvollen Kinder.", by Mazon⁵⁾: "Mais les Danaïdes n'ont pas horreur seulement des prétendants brutaux qui veulent les prendre de force; elles ont horreur du mariage lui-même.", Robertson⁶⁾: "The real issue seems to be the right of

2) Princeton 1958.

3) *Aischylos Interpretationen* Berlin 1914, p. 15.

4) *Aischylos' Schutz flehende* Amsterdam 1928, p. 4.

5) *Eschyle* Paris 1958, p. 7.

6) *The End of the Supplices Trilogy* Classical Review 1924 p. 51-3.

women to refuse to be forced into marriage. The Danaids' hatred of marriage is indeed meant to be fanatical – their constant harping on Epaphus' virginal conception is a significant symbol, – but fundamentally they are justified. The crime of the sons of Aegyptus is their determination to force themselves on unwilling brides.”, and by Spier⁷): “It is tempting to interpret the Suppliants' aversion to the Egyptians as the flight from marriage in general. The threat to their virginity may be considered to be the real issue at hand.”. In contrast to this in that they postulate a more specific cause for the actions of the Danaids are those like Weir-Smyth⁸): “To my thinking this much is clear – the very style of their vehement and passionate detestation proves that the maidens fear and hate the brutality of their cousins because they are the object of their wanton pursuit.”, Thomson⁹): “Why are the Danaids opposed to marriage with their cousins? It is not merely that their suitors are proud and violent... The objection of the Danaids is of a more concrete nature; it is that the match is unlawful, unholy, what we would call incestuous.”, and Ridgeway¹⁰): “Clearly then, when the Danaids complain that their cousins are forcing on them an unnatural union, they take their stand on the doctrine of exogamy.”. A third group of scholars, it may be noted, accepts the basic ambiguity and either leaves it at that, or else considers it of lesser importance than the actual fact of fleeing. These include Lattimore¹¹): “The girls are fleeing from marriage. That they are fleeing is more important than why.”, Lesky¹²): “In the course of the play we sometimes get the impression that they simply fled from brutal suitors, whereas other passages suggest a general aversion to the marriage bond.”, and most recently Garvie¹³) who can see no fully acceptable solution to the problem.

Throughout all this, however, there runs a definite tendency on the part of the commentators to regard every statement made by those involved in the action of the play regarding motivation as being of uniform interpretative importance, and

7) *The Motive for the Suppliants' Flight* Classical Journal 1962 p. 315-17.

8) *Aeschylean Tragedy* Berkeley 1924 p. 58.

9) *Aeschylus and Athens* London 1966 p. 289.

10) *Origin of Tragedy* Cambridge 1910 p. 193.

11) *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy* Baltimore 1958 p. 19.

12) *Greek Tragedy* trans. Frankfort London 1965 p. 69.

13) *Op. cit.* p. 221 ff.

consequently a failure on their part to recognise what I hope to show is a definite ambivalence in the very nature of the role played by the Danaids. No one will deny the singularity of the *Supplices* as a play. The chorus, present as it is throughout, must fulfil the functions not only of a chorus proper, but also those of the protagonist. The result certainly is impressive; it led many to misinterpret the portrayal of Danaus as indicative of primitive technique emerging out of the single-actor period, instead of the natural result of taking the initiative for action out of the hands of the actors; and it produces a situation, unequalled in Aeschylus, of one element in the play having so great a degree of influence as to dominate every scene. No actor, except perhaps Prometheus, can command so large a portion of the audience's attention, and only the Erinyes of the *Eumenides* come anywhere close to equalling them in chorus-actor relationship. The Danaids then fulfil a twofold role, the one controlling through the stasima much of the emotional content of the play, the other through the trimeters of the coryphaeus and the lyric sections of such features as epirrhematic scenes the direction the action is to take. In this sense the differentiation of roles is based not on metre but rather on the dramatic function the chorus fulfils. The problem is whether their statements form a concerted whole or are divided into definite parallel strata coinciding with the role they happen to be playing at any particular time. This is what I hope to demonstrate is in fact the case: that their statements, and what comes out of their statements, their attitude towards marriage, is multiple, depending on whether they are portraying the protagonist of the action or chorus proper, and includes that period at the beginning and end of the play when one might expect a synthesis of the two.

As protagonist the Danaids are anything but forthcoming in the disclosure of their motives, and indeed the main passage to be included in this section, 330-40, is renowned for the difficulties it provides for both understanding and interpretation, so much so that Wilamowitz was led to suggest a lacuna before and after 337. That such a course, however, would destroy the obvious antithesis which exists between 336 and 337 has been amply demonstrated by Garvie¹⁴). The basis for the coming dialogue is the statement of the chorus at 330-32:

14) *Op. cit.* p. 221.

ἐπεὶ τίς ἠὔχει τήνδ' ἀνέλπιστον φυγὴν
 κέλσειν ἐς Ἄργος κῆδος ἐγγενὲς τὸ πρῶν,
 ἔχθει μεταπτοιοῦσαν εὐναίων γάμων;

Here the Danaids describe the wonder they feel at their return to the land of their ancestress "out of hatred for the marriage bed". Certainly *εὐναίων γάμων* is sufficiently vague to be taken as indicative of a general loathing of marriage on their part, but such a view would be to misinterpret the reason it was included by the poet in the first place. Its function is not so much to explain the motivation of the Danaids as to serve as an inducement for Pelasgus to enter upon a period of rapid dialogue. This he does with the question that they stipulate the exact reason they came:

τί φῆς ἰκνεῖσθαι τῶνδ' ἀγωνίων θεῶν,
 λευκοστεφεῖς ἔχουσα νεοδρέπτους κλάδους;

The reply brings us close to something specific, perhaps as close as we can fairly hope to get at this stage without an actual statement on their part that it is the marriage with the sons of Aegyptus that they will not accept, 335:

ὥς μὴ γένωμαι δμῶις Αἰγύπτου γένει.

What they fear is that they become subject to their cousins, not that they do not relish the idea of marriage. It is interesting to note here the use of the word *δμῶις*; taken in the sense found at *Septem* 363 it could mean a woman taken in war, and this would be in keeping with that version of the myth supposedly given in the epic 'Danaïd', of a war in Egypt before the flight to Argos. The absence, however, of any development of this idea is a powerful argument against its acceptance. On the other hand, following *Supplices* 977 and *Choephorae* 719, it need mean no more than a serving woman, and this is probably the case here, though it does remain a possibility that it has inherent within it the thought of what the Danaids consider will be their treatment if ever they fall into the hands of their cousins: that they will be treated as little better than slaves. This would certainly be in accord with what we have heard of the sons of Aegyptus as brutal and licentious suitors, but there is little supporting evidence for the suggestion except the impression produced by the play as a whole. What is certain is that they will not accept their

cousins as masters. The answer, however, does not satisfy Pelasgus and again he seeks clarification, this time of the reason for their independent attitude: whether this stems from hatred or is a legal issue, 336:

πότ' ἄν ἔχθραν, ἢ τὸ μὴ θέμις λέγεις;

As such the question is somewhat redundant in view of ἔχθει in 332, but if the discussion is to proceed rationally as Pelasgus wants it to, he must discover to his own satisfaction the motivation behind the reply he has just received rather than assume any connection between 332 and 335¹⁵). What follows may be taken in several different ways. The responses given to Pelasgus' enquiries can hardly be termed answers as such, and it is perhaps this very fact that led Wilamowitz to suggest lacunae, but such a course, like that of Hiltbrunner who rearranges the text¹⁶), is not absolutely essential to sense. If we accept the actions of the chorus as the product of a purely emotional approach to their situation¹⁷), then it would be natural for them to pay little attention to any attempts to rationalize the problem. They know that they hate their suitors and this is all they are willing to consider; all else they brush to one side. So it is that the question of 336, instead of being answered, is countered by another, 337:

τίς δ' ἂν φιλοῦσ' ὄνοιτο τοὺς κεκτῆμένους;

The text, that of Murray's second edition, differs from that found in M on two points, one more important than the other for the present enquiry. Whether the reading *φίλους* the adjective or noun, or *φιλοῦσ'* the participle, proves the more acceptable depends on which side the action implicit in the word is seen as stemming from; in either case the emotion remains the same, and this is the important point. Its function is to answer and

15) To interpret *θέμις* as indicative of the match being incestuous cannot be seriously considered unless the Aeschylean myth omitted the eventual union of Hypermnestra and Lynceus, cf. Garvie p. 216.

16) *Wiederholungs- und Motivtechnik bei Aischylos* Gött. Diss. Bern 1950 p. 19ff.

17) For the emotional role of the chorus throughout Greek tragedy see Dale *The Chorus in the Action of Greek Tragedy in Classical Drama and its Influence: Essays Presented to H. D. F. Kitto* London 1965 p. 15-27.

confirm the *ἐχθραν* of the previous line, and to achieve this by the sense of sarcasm that is dominant throughout. More fundamental are the remedies proposed for the *ὄνοιτο* of *ΜΣ*. Wilamowitz and Murray follow Robortellus in retaining the accent and emending the word to *ὄνοιτο*; Wecklein on the other hand, followed by Mazon, changes the accent to produce *ὄνοϊτο*. The alternatives thus produced might be taken as: “Who would find fault with masters that one loved?” and “Who would purchase masters that were dear/related to one?”. Of these the first seems admirably to suit the question that prompts it: “Do you mean through hatred or a legal objection?”, to which the essence of the Danaids’ reply is: “What objection would we have to this marriage if our reason for shunning it were not hatred?”. On the other hand the exchange of property implicit in *ὄνοϊτο* does seem to be in accord with what follows, Pelasgus’ statement at 338:

σθένος μὲν οὕτως μεῖζον ἀΐξεται βροτοῖς.

In this sense the arguments are balanced, and it is perhaps unreasonable to hope that a definite answer to the problem will ever be advanced. Again the reply of the Danaids is enigmatic, 339:

καὶ δυστυχούντων γ’ εὐμαρῆς ἀπαλλαγῆ

Do we take *ἀπαλλαγῆ* as divorce or merely escape, and is *δυστυχούντων* a genitive of separation or a genitive absolute meaning “when things go badly”?¹⁸) It may be that this is less important than the fact that here too one statement is countered by another, and indeed ambiguity at this point was possibly the express aim of the poet in order to emphasise the rift that separates the approach of the two parties to the problem. The Danaids continually refuse to be drawn into a logical discussion and reveal in a clear form the true motives for their actions, with the result that Pelasgus’ next statement has all the air of coming from one giving up in exasperation the line he has so far followed in favour of one that may bring a better response, 340:

πῶς οὖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐσεβῆς ἐγὼ πέλω;

18) The interpretation of this line is discussed by Garvie p. 219f.

In all of this then there is little that one can point to with any certainty as motivation; only 335 comes close to providing the answer we seek, and here the reason is specific – they do not want to be subservient to their cousins.

Elsewhere, the theme of motivation appears in the anaepastic passage at 966 ff., in which the chorus, acting as a corporate protagonist, ask that their father might return so as to advise them on the type of accomodation they should choose in the city. Note the lines 975 ff.:

ξύν τ' εὐκλείᾳ καὶ ἀμηνίτῳ
βάξει λαῶν ἐγγύρων
τάσσεσθε, φίλαι δμῳίδες, οὕτως
ὡς ἐφ' ἐκάστη διεκλήρωσεν
Δαναὸς θεραποντίδα φερνήν.

Taking ἐφ' ἐκάστη as referring to the Danaids themselves and not as Weir-Smyth does, to the handmaidens, *θεραποντίδα φερνήν* can only mean “as a dowry consisting of handmaidens” as it does in LSJ. As such can one really believe that Danaus would give a dowry to his daughters knowing them to be adverse to marriage in general as opposed to the specific marriage with the sons of Aegyptus, or that the Danaids would recognise such a dowry if their objection were general instead of specific?

Less clear on the other hand are their statements in the epirrhematic exchange with Pelasgus, 392 f.:

μή τί ποτ' οὖν γενοίμαν ὑποχείριος
κράτεσιν ἀρσένων.

and 426:

γνώθι δ' ὕβριν ἀνέρων

At first sight it would appear that these are expressions of generalised opposition to the very idea of marriage itself, though they occur in places where, given the validity of the present thesis, one would have expected references to something more specific. However, while the possibility of their being exceptions to the general tendency so far observed cannot be ruled out, it would be as well to bear in mind the words of Elisei¹⁹): “E caratteristico alla natura umana, nei momenti di forti ten-

19) *Le Danaidi nelle Supplici di Eschilo* Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica 1928 p. 207.

sione psichica di preferire l'espressione generica alla particolare". On both occasions the chorus is nearing a climax in its efforts to persuade Pelasgus to accept their position as suppliants, and undoubtedly the transference of their objections to marriage from the specific to the general is a forceful means of increasing the vehemence of their arguments. Yet even without this explanation in dramatic terms of the passages involved, the specific mention of the sons of Aegyptus at 387 ff., immediately prior to the first instance, and the reference at 423 ff. to the possibility of the abduction of the Danaids from the altars, again only feasible in the context of the sons of Aegyptus, do much to set these 'general' statements of the chorus in a specific frame of reference, in this way lessening and even reversing their overall impact as such.

As a chorus proper the Danaids are not merely a continuation of their role of protagonist, and we cannot rightly expect them to be so. True they are the same persons, caught in the same dramatic situation, but their function must of necessity grow wider so as to produce the backcloth as it were against which the action is highlighted. In this respect the Supplices is not unique among the plays of Aeschylus; in the Eumenides too the Erinyes are at one time actor and at another chorus. It is for this reason that at 526 ff. they can sing in praise of moderation, warn against *ὑβρις*, and advocate reverence for *δίκη*; in other words the very morality towards which the action of the play is proceeding, while but sixty lines later, at 585 ff., their sole objective is the relentless prosecution of their victim regardless of his motives or duty in the act of avenging his father. I do not wish to place too great emphasis upon this comparison; what contrast there is is temporary and not representative of the play as a whole. The difference indeed may be no more than one of degree rather than actual inconsistency, but the difference does exist. Similarly, a widening of outlook is at work in the *Supplices* also, a widening of the specific objections of the Danaids against their cousins to the general one of objection to marriage itself.

The first stasimon they open with an appeal to their ancestor, Epaphos born of Zeus, and to Zeus himself on whom they call to witness the *ὑβρις* of man, 104 ff.:

*ιδέσθω δ' εἰς ὑβριν
βρότειον, οἷα νεάζει
πυθμῆν δι' ἄμὸν γάμον τεθαλῶς*

Though it is the sons of Aegyptus from whom they have sought protection in the land of Apia, the complaint they utter is not specifically against them, but rather against a fault which they impute to all men²⁰). At this point at least the observation made by Winnington-Ingram²¹) is certainly valid: "If we want a formula that will cover all the facts, we can do no better than to say that the violent approach of the sons of Aegyptus has warped the feminine instincts of the Danaids and turned them against marriage as such." Later in the ode they appeal to Artemis, the virgin goddess, 144 ff.:

θέλουσα δ' αἶ
 θέλουσαν ἀγνά μ' ἐπιδέτω Διὸς κόρα
 ἔχουσα σέμν' ἐνώπι' ἀ-
 σφαλέα, παντὶ δὲ σθένει
 † διωγμοῖσι δ' ἀσφαλέας
 ἀδμηῆτος, ἀδμηῆτα
 ῥύσιος γενέσθω.

The sentiments they express here, the idea of virginity, which they derive ultimately from Io despite the fact that at 293 ff. they admit her violation by Zeus from the very beginning, are reinforced by the refrain that surrounds the antistrophe, 141 ff. = 151 ff.:

σπέσμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνὰς
 ἀνδρῶν, ἔ' ἔ,
 ἄγαμον ἀδάματον ἐκφυγεῖν.

The reference is to themselves; they ultimately are the *σπέσμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός*; their wish is that they remain unwedded. It goes without saying that the occurrence of *ἀδμηῆτος, ἀδμηῆτα, ἄγαμον* and *ἀδάματον* within so short a distance is a forceful indication of their insistence upon this point.

Similar to the first ode the second, 524-599, after Pelasgus leaves to consult the Argive people, contains an appeal. On the previous occasion it was Zeus who was called upon to witness

20) Significantly the word *βροτούς* occurs in a general sense six lines earlier.

21) *The Danaid Trilogy of Aeschylus* Journal of Hellenic Studies 1961 p. 141-52.

ὑβρον βρότειον; here it is again Zeus and *ἀνδρῶν ὑβρον*. In both the idea of revulsion against the advances and wantonness of males in general is the prime focus of interest; the cousins throughout are lost from sight.

As the play proceeds and the tension rises with the sighting of the Egyptian fleet, so the feelings of the Danaids become increasingly violent and extreme. Their threat in the third ode at 788 ff. is again general:

*θέλωμι δ' ἄν μορσίμον
βρόχον τυχεῖν ἢ ἐν σαργάναις ἢ,
πρὶν ἄνδρ' ἀπευκτὸν τῷδε χρομφθῆναι χροῦ.*

as is 798 f. and 804 f.:

*πρὶν δαῖκτορος βία
καρδίας γάμον κνηῆσαι, ...
πρὸ κοίτας γαμηλίον τυχῶν.*

Among the best indications that the Danaids as chorus are more than a mere extension of their role as protagonist is perhaps the way in which they are made to fulfil a common purpose of the tragic chorus: that of wishing blessings upon their hosts. At 674 ff., in apparent disregard of everything they have so far said, they call upon Artemis, who as virgin they have already invoked for their own protection, to watch over the childbirth of the Argive women. Certainly the person of the goddess throughout antiquity was one marked by complexity, the fact that she was at the same time Semele, Hecate, and the Huntress, but it is questionable whether this is sufficient to explain the inclusion of such an aspect here while retaining any claim to a consistent treatment of the chorus. Surely it is a clear indication that Aeschylus never regarded the character or function of the chorus in this play as a unity, but rather that he deliberately altered the slant and tone of their words to fit the role they were to play at any one moment.

Only one aspect of the Danaids' role remains to be examined: that of the *parodos* and *exodos*. In both of these the chorus is charged with the task of either setting out the basic situation or bringing the play to some sort of conclusion, and as a result one might expect the double theme of aversion to the specific marriage with the sons of Aegyptus and aversion to marriage in general to be here synthesised into one.

The processional anapaests of the parodos contain two passages which may be considered in this respect. The first is beset with difficulties of both text and interpretation, 8 ff.:

ἀλλ' αὐτογενεῖ φυξανορία
γάμον Αἰγύπτου παίδων ἀσεβῆ τ'
ὄνοταζόμεναι (διάνοιαν).

φυξανορία as well as being a correction of *φυλαξάνορον* in M is also *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, and although it has found acceptance with the vast majority of scholars, the fact that it does produce a word found nowhere else in extant Greek literature should be borne in mind. More important, however, is the meaning of *αὐτογενεῖ* which, though a correction of M, is the more acceptable by virtue of its occurrence elsewhere. Conceivably it may be taken as either “kindred”, i.e. sprung from the same stock, or “self-produced”, but the analogy of other words compounded with *αὐτο-* makes the latter interpretation almost certain, that is their shunning of men is innate and natural to them. As such the reference is undoubtedly to be taken as general and perhaps for this very reason the more acceptable in that line 8 would then give the overall picture to be immediately defined by what follows as the marriage with the sons of Aegyptus that is shunned²²).

The second passage, 37–9, is more specific in that the Danaids pray that their cousins may be destroyed before they have the opportunity of forcing a wedding upon them:

πρίν ποτε λέκτρων, ὅν θέμις εἶργει,
σφετεριζόμενοι πατραδέλφειαν
τήνδ' ἀκόντων ἐπιβῆναι.

The complaint is not against marriage as such; true the mention of *λέκτρων ἀκόντων* may seem to indicate something very close to this idea, but it surrounds a point that is truly specific, the *σφετεριζόμενοι πατραδέλφειαν*, and which itself introduces two themes. First there is the idea of appropriation inherent in the participle; the cousins will be taking something that is not right-

22) Garvie op. cit. p. 222 interprets the function of the passage as providing an antithesis between the forced banishment of lines 6–7 and the voluntary escape from marriage conceived by the Danaids themselves.

fully theirs, the *πατραδέλφειαν*²³), a word which sets out not only the relationship between the two parties but also the source of this relationship, Danaus, and it is he who stands at the centre of the fundamental unwillingness with which the match is viewed. Further, the clause *ὄν θέμις εἶργει* need not refer to any specific point of law, but to the very fact that one side is acting against the wishes of the other.

The exode is somewhat different; here the Danaids are able to maintain the vehemence of their feelings because of balance provided by a second chorus of handmaidens. Yet despite this the basic ambiguity of their feelings towards marriage remains. At 1030 they appeal to Artemis once again, but this is followed immediately by the wish that marriage, when it does come, will not be one forced upon them, a curious mixture of specific and general, and the result perhaps of a desire on the part of Aeschylus for a contrast between Artemis and Aphrodite at the end of this play, a contrast which looks forward to developments in the following plays:

*ἐπίδοι δ' Ἄρτεμις ἄγνὰ
στόλον οἰκτιζομένα, μηδ' ὑπ' ἀνάγκας
γάμος ἔλθοι Κυθερείας·*

Later come the lines 1052 f. and 1062 f.:

*ὁ μέγας Ζεὺς ἀπαλέξαι
γάμον Αἰγυπτογενῆ μοι...
Ζεὺς ἀναξ ἀποστεροί –
ἠ γάμον δυσάνορα*

This time the passages agree in outlook; the Danaids are fleeing a marriage being forced upon them, but again it would be unwise in these closing lines of the play to look for too great a degree of agreement between the attitude taken here and what has gone before. If what we know of the rest of the trilogy is correct, these lines are probably prospective, a reference to the eventual marriage of the Danaids with their cousins and the act of murder.

23) For the question of endogamy v. exogamy and the status of the Danaids see Thomson *Aeschylus and Athens* p. 289 f., and Macurdy *Had the Danaid Trilogy a Social Problem?* *Classical Philology* 1944 p. 95–100.

In addition to the information given by the chorus itself concerning the motivation that lies behind its flight there remains one source of information so far untouched, Danaus himself, the shadowy father figure almost eclipsed dramatically by his daughters yet providing them at both the beginning and end of the play with detailed instructions that go far in adding shape to the action. At 223–8 he tells them to sit at the common altar of the gods, and by an image taken from nature describes their flight:

ἐν ἀγνῶ δ' ἔσμός ὡς πελειάδων
 ἴξεσθε κίρκων τῶν ὀμοπτέρων φόβῳ,
 ἐχθρῶν ὀμαίμων καὶ μαινότων γένος.
 πῶς δ' ἂν γαμῶν ἄκουσαν ἄκοντος πάρα
 ἄγνός γένοιτ' ἄν;

With the picture of the pursuer and pursued firmly established it is easy to interpret the words *μαινότων γένος* as an indication of attempted incest on the part of the cousins, and to attribute this to the Danaids as a motive for fleeing Egypt. More acceptable, however, is to take the image as a whole. The predominant impression is one not of defilement by incest but of violence pure and simple. The dove and hawk are *ὀμόπτεροι* and even *ὀμαίμοι*, but at the same time *ἐχθροί*, the quality which becomes paramount when one attacks the other. This is then transferred to the case in point; *ἐχθροί* becomes *ἄκουσαν ἄκοντος πάρα*. Just as one bird is savaged and eaten by another, so the Danaids are being sought in marriage by force. What is in dispute is not marriage between cousins but forced marriage. The image of one bird attacking another becomes a reference not to marriage within the *γένος* but to violence within the *γένος*, in this case violence seen as arising from a specific source.

A final passage occurs at 996 ff. Danaus instructs his daughters as they prepare to enter the city, just as at 176 ff. he advised them in their behaviour at the approach of Pelagus:

ὕμᾱς δ' ἐπαινῶ μὴ κατασχύνειν ἐμέ,
 ὄραν ἐχούσας τήνδ' ἐπίστρεπτον βροτοῖς.
 τέρειν' ὀπώρα δ' εὐφύλακτος οὐδαμῶς·
 θῆρες δὲ κηραίνουσι καὶ βροτοί – τί μῆν; –
 καὶ κνώδαλα περοῦντα καὶ πεδοστιβῆ.
 † καρπώματα στάζοντα κηρῶσει Κύπρις

*κάλωρα κωλύουσαν θωσμένειν ἔρω, †
 καὶ παρθένων χλιδαῖσιν εὐμόροφιοι ἐπι
 πᾶς τις παρελθὼν ὄμματος θελκτήριοι
 τόξευμ' ἔπεμψεν, ἰμέρον νικώμενος.
 πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ πάθωμεν ὧν πολὺς πόνος
 πολὺς δὲ πόντος οὐνεκ' ἠρόθη δορί,
 μηδ' αἴσχος ἡμῶν, ἠδονήν δ' ἔχθοις ἐμοῖς
 πράξωμεν.*

Were one to argue that the Danaids were hostile to all marriage there would seem little point to Danaus' words here. Against this on the other hand has to be balanced the fact that it is not so much the actions of his daughters that inspires the concern here expressed as the reaction their beauty may produce in the citizens of Argos. Certainly the image of 998 ff. would suggest the possibility of seduction with all the attendant complications and dangers this would produce for non-citizen residents, and indeed Danaus has already stated the ease with which metics can come into disfavour, 994f.

*πᾶς δ' ἐν μετοίκῳ γλῶσσαν εὐτυκον φέρει
 κακήν, τό τ' εἰπεῖν εὐπετέες μύσαγμα πωσ.*

Once again the possibility of a double interpretation arises, and again the probability is that the passage was designed not so much to give significance to the present play but to those that were to follow.

Throughout the present paper I have attempted to suggest that the question of motivation, like many of the problems of interpretation in the *Supplices* stems from the unique position held by the chorus. In view of this I have tried to show that a unified approach is not in fact feasible, but that rather it is possible to discern within what the Danaids say a definite and deliberate stratification of themes running parallel to the dramatic force they are required to fulfil at any particular moment, now general now specific. The question remains to be asked, however, which interpretation is to be taken as most relevant to the action of the drama as a whole, and by extension to the trilogy. Are the Danaids adverse to marriage as a whole or only to that with their cousins? In answer, given the validity of the present thesis, there can be little doubt that the principal interest of the play lies with the Danaids as protagonist. As such their objec-

tions are specific; they will not marry their cousins, and it is almost certainly the resolution of this aspect of their nature that provided the main theme of the two plays that were to follow.

University College, Cardiff

S. Ireland

TIME AND THE HERO:
THE MYTH OF *NEMEAN 1*

Nemean 1. 46–7 is a notoriously difficult passage:

ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος
ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων.

Time caused the life to be breathed out of the (snakes') unspeakable limbs as they were being strangled.

In 1962 Gerber took up again the defence of the manuscript reading *χρόνος* against Roell and Hartman's emendation *βρόχος*, accepted by Bowra in the Oxford Text. Gerber pointed out, as had Hermann Fränkel, the active force which Pindar attributes to time¹). More recently Vivante, following up Fränkel's approach, has stressed Pindar's tendency to conceive of time not in terms of a chronological sequence of days, months, or years, but in terms of the fulfilment and achievement which time brings (see especially *O.* 10. 51–9 and *N.* 4. 41–4)²). Time, then, is the expression of a "mythical design" which is "laid over the time of nature. What stands out are signs showing the way to some crowning achievement"³). This view of time Vivante calls "mythical time".

1) D.E. Gerber, "What Time Can Do (Pindar, *Nemean 1*. 46–7)," *TAPA* 93 (1962) 30–33 who provides a survey of earlier scholarship; Hermann Fränkel, "Die Zeitauffassung in der frühgriechischen Literatur," in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1960) 10–11, who describes *chronos* in *N.* 1. 69 as "der eigentliche Vollstrecker der Tötung" (10). Gildersleeve also favored the ms. reading: see *CJ* 49 (1953/4) 219: "Chronos is personification: Time has its hands." Bowra has now gone back to the ms. reading in his book, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) p. 381, with note 1.

2) Paolo Vivante, "On Time in Pindar," *Arethusa* 5 (1972) 107–31.

3) *Ibid.*, 111.