

SHORTER NOTES

AESCHYLUS, *EUMENIDES* 522–5*

ABSTRACT

Eumenides 517–25 contains a centrepiece of Aeschylean ideology—the role of punishment and fear in the ruling of the city. However, the text is vexed by serious issues at lines 522–5. This paper reassesses the main problems, reviews the most influential emendations, and puts forward a new hypothesis. It argues in favour of circumscribing the corruption, offering a new interpretation that permits retention of parts of the text that most editors have deemed impossible to restore.

Keywords: Aeschylus; *Oresteia*; *Eumenides*; fear; lyric; textual criticism

I

On the eve of the trial against Orestes, the chorus of *Eumenides* remind the audience about the risks of allowing impunity, and conclude that fear is a useful principle for any community.¹ The Erinyes advance this notorious thesis by means of a rhetorical question (*Eum.* 522–5), which is thus transmitted:

τίς δὲ μηδὲν ἐν φόβῳ
καρδίαν ἀνατρέφων
ἢ πόλις βροτῶς θ' ὁμοί-
ως ἔτ' ἄν σέβοι δίκαν;

525 οἱ supra lineam pro εἰ M

The core of the argument here seems intelligible. Since in the previous lines (517–21) the Chorus praised the deterrent action of fear, we now expect that the Erinyes will ask: ‘what city or mortal would still revere Justice’, *sc.* if they did not feel fear? This principle is later reiterated by Athena: τίς γὰρ δεδουκῶς μηδὲν ἔνδικος βροτῶν; (699). However, the text of lines 522–3, which should supply the concept of fear, appears highly problematic.

1. ἀνατρέφων offers an unsatisfying meaning. The word occurs only once in fifth-century poetry (Ar. *Ran.* 944), in a long medical metaphor, and most of its

* Although this paper was conceived collectively by the authors, part I should be attributed to Francesco Morosi, and part II to Guido Paduano. We are grateful to Elena Fabbro, Alessandro Grilli, Maria Chiara Martinelli and Maria Pia Pattoni for having read previous versions of this paper, as well as to *CQ*'s referee and to the Editor for their precious comments.

¹ Among the most recent editions and commentaries of *Eumenides*, see A.H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus. Oresteia. Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides* (Cambridge, MA, 2009); M.L. West, *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1990, corrected edition 1998); A.H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus Eumenides* (Cambridge, 1989); D.L. Page, *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae* (Oxford, 1972). On *Eum.* 522–5, see G. Avezzu, ‘Eschilo, Eumenidi 522–525’, in M. Garbari (ed.), *Miscellanea in onore di Franco Sartori per il suo 80° compleanno* (Trento, 2003), 75–7; F. Ferrari, ‘Eschilo Eumenidi 522–523’, *Hermes* 106 (1978), 248–50.

- occurrences in pre-Hellenistic prose are also medical; the verb must mean “‘feed up’ the patient in the stage of convalescence’,² or ‘feed again’, according to one value of the preposition ἄνᾶ.³ This meaning seems hardly suitable.⁴
2. ἀνατρέφων is also suspect for metrical reasons: to produce respiration with line 514, 523 must be a lekythion.⁵ To this end, the second syllable of ἀνατρέφων requires a syllabic lengthening in semi-initial position before mute and liquid, something extremely rare—though perhaps not impossible⁶—in Aeschylean odes.⁷
 3. Most interpreters find ἐν φάει unclear, or even plainly meaningless⁸—although, as we shall see, without cause.
 4. As the text stands, lines 522–3 fail to supply the necessary condition for the realization of εὐσέβεια implied by the main clause.

At present, then, the paradosis is unanimously considered corrupt, deemed beyond sure restoration by most editors; they have nevertheless intervened to insert the notion of fear (problem 4) while simultaneously addressing problems 1–3. Some supply the idea of fear by correcting ἐν φάει: so Auratus conjectured ἐν δέει (‘nourishing the heart on fear’),⁹ and Schütz proposed ἐν φόβῳ.¹⁰ The majority, however, have preferred to emend ἀνατρέφων.

(a) It is possible to emend the second part of the participle: the concept of fear can be supplied by emending –τρέφων to –τρέμων¹¹ or –τρέων, ‘shiver’.¹² Both verbs are close to the paradosis; however, they require a further intervention, to find a solution for the prefix ἀνα-. Herein lies the greatest liability of this line of emendation. The least invasive hypothesis is Mazon’s καρδίαν ἄνα τρέων, ‘shivering in the heart’, which involves no further change to the paradosis.¹³ However, while the anastrophe is plausible, the resulting expression ἀνὰ καρδίαν does not look idiomatic. Other hypotheses look equally unconvincing, and less economic than Mazon’s. Murray’s ἄνηρ τρέμων, for instance, requires further emendations: to avoid a repetition with ἡ πόλις βροτός θ’ (524), we need to change βροτός to βροτῶν,¹⁴ thus creating the unwelcome phrase πόλις βροτῶν (a useless redundancy and an uncommon *iunctura*),

² G. Thomson, *The Oresteia of Aeschylus* (Amsterdam and Prague, 1966), 1.77. See also Ferrari (n. 1); M.L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 286; Avezzù (n. 1).

³ LSJ s.v. F.3; cf. ἀναβλαστάνω, ἀναγεννάω.

⁴ Even when the verb occurs in metaphorical contexts (e.g. Xen. *Cyr.* 5.2.34 ἀναθρέψαι τὸ φρόνημα), the concept of restoration or improvement introduced by ἀνα- still stands.

⁵ Sommerstein (n. 1 [1989]), 290; West (n. 1), 501.

⁶ Tragic lyric is ‘shy’ of syllabic lengthening in initial and semi-initial positions (W.S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos* [Oxford, 1964], on Eur. *Hipp.* 760). However, we find Aeschylean parallels for initial position (*Eum.* 378, widely accepted by editors; *Cho.* 606 and *Pers.* 665, disputed) and perhaps for semi-initial position (*Cho.* 44, *Supp.* 880, both disputed).

⁷ To solve the metrical problem, Lachmann proposed to add a syllable (καρδίαν <ἀν> ἀνατρέφων) and to have νεοπαθῆς at 514 scan ∪ ∪ ∪ —, to create a respiration that does not require syllabic lengthening. Frietzsche’s καρδίαν <ἀν> ἀνατρέων and Ahrens’s καρδίας ἄνα τρέων also address the metrical problem as well as that of the meaning of ἀνατρέφων; see also Casaubon’s ἀναστρέφων for ἀνατρέφων.

⁸ Page (n. 1), ad loc.: ‘non intellegitur’; Sommerstein (n. 1 [1989]), ad loc.: ‘ἐν φάει can be assigned no relevant meaning’.

⁹ Approved by G. Hermann, *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Berlin, 1859), vol. 1 (see also 2.611–12).

¹⁰ C.G. Schütz, *Opuscula philologica et philosophica* (Halle, 1830), 22–8. See e.g. Eur. *Ion* 1498–9 (ἐν φόβῳ | ... καταδεθεῖσα); Or. 1419 (πεσῶν ἐν φόβῳ).

¹¹ H. Weil, *Aeschyli quae supersunt tragoediae*, vol. 1, sect. 3 (Giessen, 1858).

¹² G.F. Schoemann, *Des Aeschylus Eumeniden* (Greifsbaden, 1845), 220.

¹³ P. Mazon, *Eschyle. Tome II: Agamemnon – Les Choéphores – Les Euménides* (Paris, 1925).

¹⁴ F.H.M. Blaydes, *Aeschyli Eumenides* (Halle, 1900), 38.

and reshaping the opposition between individual and community as follows: τίς ... | ἀνὴρ τρέμων | ἢ πόλις βροτῶν.¹⁵

(b) We might also supply fear as an object of τρέφων, by emending ἀνα-. Paley's δέος τρέφων—with μηδέν (522) referring to δέος, 'not nourishing any fear'—supplies the concept of fear, restores normal scansion, and creates a phrase acceptable in Greek verse (for example Soph. *Trach.* 28 αἰεὶ τιν' ἐκ φόβου φόβον τρέφω).¹⁶ Ferrari's φόβον τρέφων is along the same lines, with μηδέν' as a masculine accusative qualifying φόβον.

However, if we introduce an object for τρέφων, we must then correct καρδίαν, the original object of ἀνατρέφων. Campbell, Ferrari and others follow Canter in emending καρδίαν to καρδιάς, a genitive governed by ἐν φάει ('in the light of the heart').¹⁷ This emendation raises serious semantic and stylistic issues.¹⁸ Recent editors assign ἐν φάει | καρδιάς two different meanings. Ferrari translates it as 'cum laetitia cordis', comparing two Aeschylean passages in which light is related to joy.¹⁹ Metaphors involving light are common in Greek poetry,²⁰ but Canter's emendation would produce an expression different both from the Aeschylean metaphors cited by Ferrari and from the Aeschylean passages in which the imagery of light is applied to emotions (for example *Cho.* 565 φαίδρᾳ φρενί): in the former cases, light is mentioned with no direct reference to a person's soul, while in the latter the light side of a person's soul is always described by an adjective related to the noun which in turn designates the seat of feelings.²¹ The relationship between φάος (or a synonym) and emotion, then, is anything but obvious in fifth-century drama,²² and Canter's emendation introduces an expression that is not idiomatic in Aeschylus. Moreover, the association between fear and the mental attitude implied by Ferrari's 'cum laetitia cordis' seems an unnecessary stretch.²³ West's interpretation of the phrase looks even less persuasive: on the basis of a textually problematic parallel,²⁴ West argues for the meaning "'in his dreams", when the mind sees by its own light'.²⁵ This interpretation seems too dense, while also implying that terror only emerges in dreams—a notion detrimental to a universal statement such as that of *Eumenides*.

II

None of these hypotheses is satisfying, and it remains difficult to determine where the corruption lies. It may be useful to try to restrict it to a specific point.

¹⁵ G. Murray, *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae* (Oxford, 1955²); thus Sommerstein (n. 1 [2009]).

¹⁶ F.A. Paley, *Aeschylus translated into English Prose* (Cambridge, 1871²), 233 n. 1.

¹⁷ e.g. H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Eumenides by Aeschylus* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970); West (n. 1); Avezzù (n. 1). Blaydes (n. 14) accepts καρδιάς, but also emends ἐν φάει to ἐν βάθει.

¹⁸ We do not consider the scholium at M—glossing ἐν φάει with λαμπρότητι, ὀρθότητι φρενῶν—a reliable witness (*pace* Ferrari [n. 1], 248 and West [n. 2], 286): the genitive φρενῶν in the scholium is oriented by the metaphorical interpretation of ἐν φάει given there.

¹⁹ Ferrari (n. 1); *Pers.* 300, *Ag.* 23, to which add *Ag.* 522.

²⁰ For a general overview of the metaphor of light, see E. Fabbro, 'La luce in Pindaro: una metafora strutturale', in S. Lavecchia (ed.), *Immagini della luce. Dimensioni di una metafora assoluta* (Milan and Udine, 2019), 13–56.

²¹ For other parallels, see Ferrari (n. 1), 248.

²² For an extensive overview of the semantics of φάος and its cognates, see M.G. Ciani, *Φάος e termini affini nella poesia greca. Introduzione a una fenomenologia della luce* (Florence, 1974).

²³ Avezzù (n. 1), 76.

²⁴ Heraclitus B26 DK.

²⁵ West (n. 2), 286.

While, as we have seen, ἀνατρέφω carries an undesirable meaning, ἐν φάει does not look problematic at all. Editors have neglected a fundamental poetic meaning of φάος, that of ‘vital light’: since Homer, whoever sees the sunlight is alive.²⁶ Accordingly, ‘to come to light’ means ‘to come (back) to life’: Agamemnon’s return to life in Clytemnestra’s dream in Sophocles’ *Electra*, for instance, is described as a return to light (419 ἐλθόντος ἐς φῶς). Analogously, the condition of being alive is frequently described in Greek tragedy by means of the prepositional expression ἐν φάει: see, for example, Eur. *Hec.* 415 ὦ θύγατερ, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἐν φάει δουλεύσομεν.²⁷

In light of this, ἐν φάει in *Eumenides* seems anything but unintelligible, and certainly does not need to be expanded or specified by the genitive καρδίας. At *Eum.* 522–3, ἐν φάει has its most common meaning, that of ‘alive’, referring to τίς ... | ἢ πόλις βροτός θ’; this interpretation, then, restores a widespread tragic idiom. If ἐν φάει need not be suspected, then nor does καρδίαν, and the accusative can retain its role of object for the participle.

As a consequence, we can conclude that the corruption concerns only ἀνατρέφω, or even better the prefix ἀνα-. The expression resulting from the removal of ἀνα-, namely καρδίαν τρέφω (‘nourishing the heart’), creates a metaphor suitable in tragic diction: verbs related to nourishment are frequently allowed figurative meanings (see, for example, Soph. *Aj.* 1124 for a similar image, ἡ γλώσσά σου τὸν θυμὸν ὡς δεινὸν τρέφει).²⁸ At *Eum.* 522–3, then, the emendation should concern only two syllables.

The only missing element is thus the concept of fear, which can be supplied by emending the two corrupt syllables of ἀνατρέφω. Since τρέφω already has an object, what the heart is fed with must be expressed by a dative indirect object, as often with τρέφειν.²⁹ We may think, with Thomson, of φόβω,³⁰ or of δέει.³¹ As a result, the neutral pronoun μηδέν should be interpreted as an adverb, functioning as a negation of τρέφω.³²

This hypothesis assigns to ἐν φάει an autonomous meaning that occurs frequently in tragedy, solves the problem with the sense of ἀνατρέφειν, creates a perfectly intelligible metaphor, introduces the concept of fear, and avoids an extremely rare metrical scansion.

²⁶ e.g. Hom. *Od.* 4.540; Fabbro (n. 20), 13–14. The expression is well known to tragedy: e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 746; Eur. *Hipp.* 4.

²⁷ cf. Eur. *Hec.* 169, 415, 707, 1214; *Supp.* 200; *El.* 1145; *Ion* 726; *Hel.* 530; *Phoen.* 1281, 1339; Soph. *Phil.* 415, 1212; Aesch. *Cho.* 62 (discussed in L. Bruschi, ‘Chi ha paura della giustizia? A. Choeph. 55–65’, *Hermes* 133 [2005], 139–62, at 148).

²⁸ See also Soph. *Ant.* 1088–9 γνῶ τρέφειν τὴν γλώσσαν | ἥσχωτέραν; *Trach.* 108 δεῖμα τρέφουσαν; Tr. *Adesp.* fr. 18 *TrGF* σιωπή δ’ ἐστὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ τροφή; for synonyms, see e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 26–7 δι’ αἰῶνος δ’ ἰυμοῖσι βόσκεται κέαρ, with C. Moussy, *Recherches sur ΤΡΕΦΩ et les verbes grecs signifiant ‘nourrir’* (Paris, 1969), 17–18, 70–2.

²⁹ LSJ s.v. τρέφω III. Cf. βόσκειν: e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1246 (ἐλπῖσιν δὲ βόσκομαι); Eur. *Bacch.* 617 (ἐλπῖσιν δ’ ἐβόσκετο); Aesch. *Cho.* 26–7 (n. 28 above).

³⁰ Thomson (n. 2), 1.78. Thomson, however, considered ἐν φάει corrupt, and φόβω ‘too weak to have stood alone’, and conjectured ἐμφυεῖ | καρδίαν φόβω τρέφω, ‘nourishing the heart with inborn fear’. He probably derived the notion of innate terror from a mistaken interpretation of *Eum.* 691 (φόβος τε ζυγγνής), where ζυγγνής means not ‘inborn’ but rather ‘cognate’ (with σέβας, line 690) — it is the kinship between worship and fear that will lay the foundations for the Areopagus.

³¹ The corruption may be due either to a gloss (Thomson [n. 2], 1.77 shows that ἀνατρέφω was often used as a gloss for τρέφειν) or to a corruption caused by confusion between A and Δ.

³² Both μηδέν and οὐδέν can be assigned the role of negations, and despite West (n. 2), 286 the former can be ‘satisfactory as an equivalent of μή or μηδαμῶς’: LSJ s.vv. οὐδεῖς III and μηδεῖς III (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.412, 24.370; Aesch. *Eum.* 730).

III

To sum up, the text that we propose is:

τίς δὲ μηδὲν ἐν φάει
καρδίαν δέει τρέφων
ἢ πόλις βροτός θ' ὁμοί-
ως ἔτ' ἄν σέβοι Δίκαιον;

523 δέει vel φόβω

Which may be translated as follows: 'What city or man who never in their life nurtured their heart on fear would still revere Justice?'

University of Pisa

FRANCESCO MOROSI
francesco.morosi@fileli.unipi.it

University of Pisa

GUIDO PADUANO
guido.paduano@unipi.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838822000118

ARISTOPHANES, *CLOUDS* 327: GROATS GET IN YOUR EYES*

ABSTRACT

In Aristophanes' Clouds, Socrates vents his frustration at his new pupil Strepsiades' inability to see the eponymous chorus with the line 'You would see them unless you have drops of rheum in your eyes as big as gourds (κολοκύνταις).' This line is problematic, because gourds relate to eyesight in no obvious way. However, Aristophanes might have ended the verse by referring to Socrates' initiation of Strepsiades sixty-five lines earlier by a liberal sprinkling of barley, and written 'or you're blear-eyed with barley-groats (σύλοχύταισι)'. If some reader added κρομ(μ)ύους 'with onions' to his text as a more universally valid explanation for an eye-affliction, a later scribe might have thought this an attempted correction, and substituted κολοκύνταις, which is both metrically correct and palaeographically closer to σύλοχύταισι than is κρομ(μ)ύους.

Keywords: Aristophanes; eyesight; initiation ritual; onions; proverbs; textual criticism

In Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Socrates invokes the eponymous chorus, and is distressed when his new pupil Strepsiades only barely sees them, even once told to look at the εἶσοδος. The latter has just been initiated into the school by a liberal sprinkling of barley in the manner of a sacrifice (σύλοχύται); as he says, καταπαπτόμενος γὰρ παιπᾶλη γενήσομαι 'for being sprinkled, I'll turn into fine flour' (262) and, later, ὑπ' ἀλφίταμοιβοῦ παρεκόπην διχονίκω 'I have been cheated of two quarts by a dealer

* I am grateful to *CQ*'s reader for much help with an earlier version of this note.