ATHENA'S ENTRANCE AT *EUMENIDES* 405 AND HIPPOTROPHIC IMAGERY IN AESCHYLUS'S *ORESTEIA**

LEAH HIMMELHOCH

Many modern editions of Aeschylus's *Eumenides* either bracket or delete line 405, wherein Athena announces that she has traveled from Troy to Athens using a chariot.[1] Scholars justify this excision by claiming that the sense of verses 403–05 is jumbled unless a line is removed. As Oliver Taplin argues: "At first glance, [403] seems to say that she came on foot, [404] that she flew (without wings), and [405] that she rode in a chariot" (1977.388–89), an alleged inconsistency that, according to Peter Arnott (and others), cannot be "solved by juggling with meanings; no attempt to reconcile the discrepancies has been satisfactory" (1962.74–75). Of the three lines, 405 is generally believed to be the source of the most internal contradiction, and it is therefore the line most regularly removed as a later interpolation. However, the objections of sense raised against *Eumenides* 403–05 are unreasonable. Moreover, *Eumenides* 405's preservation is not just a minor staging matter relevant only to its immediate context within *Eumenides*. Chariot-related entrances and exits are used to great effect in *Agamemnon* and *Choephoroi* for both Agamemnon and Orestes. Restoring Athena's chariot entrance at *Eumenides* 405, then, reveals a significant parallelism of imagery

* I would like to thank Barbara Goff, Rebecca Ammerman, Robert Garland, Andrew Keller, Michael Armstrong, Elizabeth Harris, Elaina Bates, the editor, and my anonymous readers for their constructive criticisms and suggestions. Obviously, any errors of fact, argument, or stubbornness are entirely my own.

1 See, esp., Wakefield 1794, Hermann 1852, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1910 and 1914, Page 1972, Sommerstein 1989, West 1990. I use West's edition unless otherwise stated.

Arethusa 38 (2005) 263–302 © 2005 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

within the trilogy as a whole. Indeed, each chariot represents a "successive stage" in *Oresteia*'s development of hippotrophic imagery as it paces the trilogy's movement from the chaotic, despotic world of the *lex talionis* to the harmonious order of democratic Athens and its civilizing invention, the law-court system.[2]

I. RESTORING ATHENA'S CHARIOT ENTRY IN *EUMENIDES* 403–05

1. *Eumenides* 403–05: A History of Interpretive Confusion?

The lines in question, *Eumenides* 403–05, are as follows:

> ἔνθεν διώκουσ᾽ ἦλθον ἄτρυτον πόδα,
> πτερῶν ἄτερ ῥοιβδοῦσα κόλπον αἰγίδος·
> πώλοις ἀκμαίοις τόνδ᾽ ἐπιζεύξασ᾽ ὄχον.
>
> Driving/Pursuing an unworn/tireless foot, I came from there,
> fluttering the billow of my aegis apart from wings,
> having yoked this car to colts in their prime.[3]

It is worth noting from the start that the manuscript tradition gives us no reason to question the Aeschylean authenticity of these verses, nor is there evidence to suggest that ancient commentators considered these lines to be a problem. Indeed, the Scholia corroborate Athena's chariot-borne arrival with a laconic ἐπὶ ὀχήματος ἔρχεται (375).[4] Significantly, the complaints about this passage are comparatively recent and can be traced back to the commentaries of Wakefield, Hermann, Paley, and Wilamowitz.

---

2 I use the word *hippotrophic* instead of equestrian to maintain the ancient concept's nuance (more below). My analysis owes its strategy to Zeitlin 1965 and Lebeck 1971, who discuss how "the significance of a recurrent image unfolds in successive stages, keeping time with the action of the drama" (Lebeck 1971.1). The *Oresteia*'s hippotrophic imagery moves from "metaphorical expression to a concrete embodiment" (Zeitlin 1965.488), while its characters shift roles from acted upon to actor, "victim to villain" (Zeitlin 1965.482), only allowing us to see its final "auspicious" meaning at the trilogy's end (Lebeck 1971.131).

3 All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

4 Line numbers vary between editions. The comment above for verse 375 involves what most modern editions of the *Oresteia* identify as verse 405.

Gilbert Wakefield appears to be the first scholar to forcefully argue against 405's Aeschylean authenticity. In his commentary, Wakefield maintains that 405's chariot is illogical because 403's focus on Athena's foot ("pursuing an unworn/tireless foot, I came from there") suggests personal exertion on Athena's part, like walking. To remedy this supposed illogic, Wakefield emends the word πώλοις in 405 to κώλοις, giving: "having yoked this cart to my vigorous limbs." He then concludes that Athena flew from the Troad to Athens while dragging a cart behind her. Wakefield's revision was accepted by Johann (Gottfried Jakob) Hermann, who further argued to eliminate the car altogether. According to Hermann, the πτερῶν ἄτερ of 404 emphasizes the idea that Athena used a method of travel *normally* involving wings but in this case *apart* from wings, suggesting that she did not travel in a chariot at all but rather that she supported herself with her aegis alone. Although Hermann does not explain his logic, presumably he believes that if Athena were to fly in a chariot, she would only do so on a winged chariot. Hence, to Hermann, 404's insistence on the *absence* of wings excludes the possibility of a chariot in 405.

Both Wakefield and Hermann were later invoked by F. A. Paley, who also argued that 403's implied physical exertion is incompatible with 405's chariot and colts. Unlike Hermann and Wakefield, however, Paley kept the word πώλοις (colts), claiming that the τόνδ' of 405 suggests a car "was actually visible to the spectators. And thus the *horses* [his italics] must be left to the imagination of the spectators, who are to suppose that the goddess came in haste from Sigeum, with her aegis extended to assist in propelling the vehicle."[5] Hence, as Paley sees it, both the personal effort Wakefield identified for 403 and the billowing aegis mentioned in 404 suggest that Athena used the aegis as a sail for her chariot. Paley never explains why he believes the chariot's horses could not be on stage.[6]

As we have just seen, a domino effect of emendation has taken place, with one scholar using the work of another to legitimate his own confusion and subsequent revisions. Each commentator insists that 403 denotes "personal effort." To Wakefield and Hermann, "personal effort" requires walking and manual labor on Athena's part (even though she is

5 Paley 1879.620, n. 383. Paley cites the Scholia for 405 (Scholia's 375) as evidence that a cart was on stage. For another emendation of 405, see Weil 1861, who changes πώλοις to πνόοις.

6 Perhaps Paley ignores the possibility of prop horses and thinks *real* horses are unlikely.

flying), hence Wakefield envisions Athena yoking herself to a car and dragging it, while Hermann imagines Athena traveling without a chariot. Paley, on the other hand, uses the same logic either to put Athena back into the car or to have Athena pull the car behind herself as she sails through the air with her aegis. Yet each of these suggested revisions (Paley's in particular) would seem to eliminate personal effort, like walking, altogether. This leads us to question why these emendations are any more sensible (or appropriate to a goddess!) than the supposed discrepancies they were intended to remedy. Even their argument's starting-point—that the phrase "unworn/tireless foot" hints at personal effort like walking—is not self-evident, since an "unworn/tireless" foot could be an *unused* foot. These criticisms aside, however, it is also noteworthy that these commentators attempt to *emend* 405, not to excise it. To these scholars, 403–05's seeming illogic demanded an explanation, but the manuscript tradition itself did not provide the ammunition they needed to eliminate 405. Enter Wilamowitz-Moellendorf.

Wilamowitz also believed that 403–05 was confused, only he was willing to forge ahead where others hesitated. Wilamowitz deleted 405 from his 1914 edition of *Eumenides* on the grounds that, of the three lines, it caused the most internal contradiction. In order to reconcile this with the fact that 405 was unarguably part of the transmitted text, Wilamowitz maintained that 405's flying chariot was interpolated for a subsequent fifth-century production, the better to titillate the decadent, thrill-seeking sensibilities of a later audience (1910.154, n. 63):

> Aischylos in seiner einfachheit liess Athene von der Troas nach Athen durch die luft fliegen, ohn fittiche, aber so dass sich fittichgleich die Aegis blähte, πτερῶν ἄτερ ῥοιβδοῦσα κόλπον αἰγίδος, das genügte dem bedürfnis nach sinnenreiz nicht mehr, das die spätere zeit zu befriedigen wusste, und schien wol [sic] auch der göttin nicht würdig. So fuhr Athene anf [sic] ihrem streitwagen durch die luft auf die bühne, und dafür ward der vers eingefügt πώλοις ἀκμαίοις τόνδ' ἐπιζεύξασ' ὄχον.

But Wilamowitz's deletion is not just significant as the precedent most often cited in later texts to defend 405's removal. Wilamowitz's readiness to wield the textual scalpel also influenced the course future arguments over these lines would take. As the twentieth century progressed,

the debate moved away from how to make sense of the transmitted text to identifying which line should be eliminated as a later interpolation. For example, A. W. Pickard-Cambridge used the dating of the *mechane* to support Wilamowitz's deletion of 405 (1946.44–45). According to Pickard-Cambridge, 405's flying chariot requires the use of the crane, which likely postdates the *Oresteia*'s opening in 458 B.C.E. Likewise, in response to this argument—and in one of the few cases made for preserving 405—Arnott argues that if a choice must be made between the flight of 404 and the chariot of 405, then the history of Athenian theatrical convention indicates the elimination of 404.[7] According to Arnott, it is not the chariot itself but the idea of a *flying* chariot that is anachronistic in these lines.

This ongoing quest for anachronism, then, is problematic because it assumes the presence of suspect material and encourages scholars to identify and then eliminate said material, which is often only suspect because they do not understand it—a dangerous precedent to set. Currently, most modern editions of the *Eumenides*, like those of Page, Sommerstein, and West, accept Wilamowitz's argument for 405's deletion. Yet are 403–05 really illogical, or did later scholarship accidentally chain itself to an earlier series of interpretive errors? The convoluted tale of this passage's treatment suggests that we might wish to re-evaluate the current consensus.

2. Contextualizing Athena's Entrance

The argument for preserving *Eumenides* 403–05 does not hinge solely upon external considerations like the interpretive history outlined

---

7 Arnott believes in a teleology of stagecraft: "It is reasonable to assume that [a flying chariot was] substituted in later revivals when the *mechane* was available, and that a new line was written in to make this concession to spectacle plausible . . . The natural development of all drama, and of Greek drama in particular, is from the simple to the elaborate" (1962.74–75). Hammond 1972.440, n. 97: "I regard the entry by chariot as more appropriate to the production of 458 B.C. . . . If so, the chariot leaves at line 489; and it may have been the need to get it off which prompted Aeschylus to make Athena go and fetch the citizens rather than send for them." As we will see, there are other reasons to drive the chariot off stage at 489. Also Podlecki 1989.163, n. 397 and 164, n. 404/405: "It has been maintained by almost all edd. since Paley that either 404 or 405 can stand in the text, but not both . . . Efforts to interpret the lines metaphorically ('this car' = her aegis; 'swift horses' = wind), are more ingenious than convincing. My preference is to retain 405 over 404: Athena's use of her aegis as a sail seems misconceived, and her appearance in a horse-drawn chariot would have been iconographically appropriate (thus, vase-paintings and various epithets connecting her with horses)."

above, however. The *Eumenides* itself provides evidence in favor of keeping 405's chariot. Most notably, before Athena arrives on stage, the Erinyes also travel to Athens as they pursue Orestes. They even describe their journey in verses 244–54,[8] where they state the following (248–51):

> πολλοῖς δὲ μόχθοις ἀνδροκμῆσι φυσιᾶι
> σπλάγχνον· χθονὸς γὰρ πᾶς πεποίμανται τόπος,
> ὑπέρ τε πόντον ἀπτέροις ποτήμασιν
> ἦλθον διώκουσ᾽ οὐδὲν ὑστέρα νεώς.
>
> And with great, mortal-exhausting hardships [our] gut
> pants; for every area of the earth has been traveled by our herd,
> and across the sea with wingless flight,
> [we] came pursuing/rushing, in no way slower than a ship.

The Erinyes are worn out from their swift and broad-ranging pursuit[9] (a description consistent with the play's beginning, where we saw the Furies asleep, victims of Apollo's magic and their own exhaustion). They next characterize themselves as a herd that roams the earth in pursuit of wrongdoers (πεποίμανται).[10] Finally, they have rushed across the waters in a wingless flight whose speed is comparable to that of a ship.

---

8 Sometime between 566–76, as the jurors convene, Apollo reaches Athens in unexplained fashion. How the Furies and Apollo reach Delphi is also unspecified. Notably, only the Furies' and Athena's journeys to Athens merit description.

9 The Scholiast says the Furies are exhausted, but the lines also apply to their victims. Sommerstein 1989.126, n. 248–49: "ἀνδροκμῆσι 'that would exhaust a mortal' may be designedly paradoxical; for whereas the immortal Erinyes are puffing and panting (φυσιᾶι/σπλάγχον), the mortal fugitive Orestes betrays no sign of physical exhaustion in his calm utterances, long sentences and mostly end-stopped lines. Orestes . . . has suffered less than his pursuers." Verrall 1908.47–48, n. 248: "The 'labour' and the 'panting breast' are applicable both to pursued and pursuers; for since the Erinyes could sleep, they may also pant." Indeed, both the Furies and Athena possess traits they also transmit; the Furies tire themselves and others, Athena is tireless and relieves others of strain; see Lebeck 1971.3: "It should be a basic principle in interpreting Aeschylus that when language and syntax are most difficult, the poet has compressed the greatest number of meanings into the smallest possible space . . . That ambiguity characteristic of Aeschylus is not easy to achieve; it comes about neither by accident nor inability, but by design."

10 Line 249 literally says, "every area of earth has been traversed (by a shepherd or by flocks)." Do the Furies shepherd their victims or travel like a flock? They probably do both: the Furies shepherd Orestes, but their numbers and lesser divine status make them a herd. The Furies do implicitly treat themselves like animals elsewhere: they are driven by the goad and lash of Clytemnestra's reproaches (136, 141). (The Erinyes might even trace their

Notably, *Eumenides* 248–51's language, themes, and imagery anticipate those of *Eumenides* 403–05. The exhausted and exhausting Furies arrive "rushing/pursuing" (ἦλθον διώκουσ', 251), whereas Athena arrives driving or pursuing an unworn/tireless foot (διώκουσ' ἦλθον ἄτρυτον πόδα, 403). The Erinyes, who look like snaky-haired gorgons without wings (*Eum*. 51–52), and who are called goats without a goatherd by Apollo (ἄνευ βοτῆρος αἰπολούμεναι, 196), fly winglessly across the ocean (ὑπέρ τε πόντον ἀπτέροις ποτήμασιν, 250) with their guts gasping for air (φυσιᾶι σπλάγχνον, 248–49). Likewise, Athena flies winglessly over the sea with her billowing, puffed up aegis—a goat-hide cloak that, traditionally, is scaly and fringed with snakes or even adorned with the head of the gorgon Medusa—flapping in the breeze (πτερῶν ἄτερ ῥοιβδοῦσα κόλπον αἰγίδος, 404).[11]

The Furies and Athena, then, are comparable: both reach Athens via wingless flight, both describe the effort they expend to get there, both efforts involve gusts of air, and each party is goat-hided and wreathed in snakes. Yet 248–51 also create a foil against which Athena's entrance contrasts itself to suggest Athena's superiority (and eventual victory). To begin, while the Furies' serpents mark their allegiance to the *lex talionis*, Athena's foreshadow its successful dismantling. It has long been recognized that the Furies concretize the *Oresteia*'s thematic link between serpent imagery and the *lex talionis* (e.g., Whallon 1958, Lebeck 1971). But Athena's aegis, an artifact recalling Zeus's birth and ascendance, transforms the snakes associated with retributive violence into an auspicious image of universal justice and stability, foreshadowing the founding of the law courts and the Erinyes' change into the Eumenides. This same transformative strategy explains the puffs of air accompanying both snaky entrances. In the *Oresteia*, wind imagery reflects "a disharmony in nature parallel to the disharmony of human affairs" (Zeitlin 1965.500). This includes the characters' exhalations (Zeitlin 1965.499–501): Agamemnon snorts impiously as he decides to sacrifice Iphigenia (*Ag*. 187, 219); ruin overtakes mortals "breathing more than justly" (*Ag.* 375); the Furies exhale foulness (*Eum*.

---

origins to a horse divinity: Griffith 1995.101, n. 26.) Apollo calls them goats without a goatherd in 196–97, but Orestes is also "shepherded" by Hermes in 91. For the Erinyes as shepherds, see Podlecki 1989.151, n. 249 and 145, n. 196.

11 Taplin 1977.390; Podlecki 1989.151, n. 250; Sommerstein 1989.127, nn. 250–51 recognize that the Furies and Athena travel via a wingless flight, but they do not pursue this parallel.

53), snort as they awaken (*Eum*. 117, 118, 120, 129), and wither their victims with a fiery, "bloody gale" (*Eum*. 137–38). They also arrive in Athens panting, a sign of the chaos the *lex talionis* engenders and evidence that their institution is worn out. Athena, however, arrives with a favorable breeze swelling her aegis. Fortune's winds are changing for the better, bearing a goddess whose justice creates harmony, not strife.

But the thematic contrasts between 248–51 and 403–05 continue: the Erinyes appear as exile-inducing enemies and prosecutors, Athena as a proper host/guest-friend and defense lawyer;[12] the gorgon-like Erinyes are roving hunters who have been compared to goats, whereas Athena is a polis-focused protector who *wears* a snaky goat-hide trophy that possibly sports the head of a defeated gorgon. The puffing Erinyes travel as fast as a ship, but Athena travels swiftly and effortlessly with her aegis puffed up in the breeze like a sail. Furthermore, the older, virginal, undomesticated Erinyes compare themselves to herd animals, initially goaded/lashed out of sleep to begin their journey to Athens by Clytemnestra's reproaches (136, 141), reproaches that goad them as a charioteer goads his mount (155–61). Driven by the lash, the Furies pursue their "justice" with travails that exhaust themselves and their victims. Indeed, even when the Erinyes are not figuratively yoked, they are ridden down by the new ideas of the younger gods (καθιππάζομαι, 150; also 731, 779, 809). The younger, virginal Athena, on the other hand, drives domesticated, vigorous colts, noting that her energy is inexhaustible, before she frees Orestes (and mortals) from toil (see *Ag*. 1, *Eum.* 83).

The language and imagery surrounding the Furies' journey to Athens, then, support reading the energetic, inventive, youthful, and virginal charioteer Athena as a deliberate contrast with the Erinyes, an aging, exhausted virginal herd/institution that only continues because of the lash. Indeed, the Furies' primordial prerogative (the *lex talionis*) is about to be trampled (καθιππάζομαι) by Olympian innovation (the law courts), both literally and figuratively. The Furies further (implicitly) subordinate themselves to Athena's inventiveness when they compare themselves to one of her inventions, a ship. That is, Athena's aegis, fluttering in the breeze like a sail,[13] hints at her potential to incorporate snaky creatures into her civilizing

12 For Athena as an exemplary guest-host who honors *xenia* when she accepts Orestes as a suppliant, see Griffith 1995.100.

13 Athena's aegis rustles *like* a sail, but it is unclear whether she uses it *as* a sail (also Podlecki 1989.163, n. 397 and 164, n. 404/405).

mission. When Athena finally creates a cult for the Furies, turning them into the Eumenides, she harnesses their powers for the benefit of her city, Athens, in the same way that she created technologies like ships and the yoke to utilize the energies of the winds and wild animals.

Hence the diction and imagery of Athena's entry in 403–05 do not constitute an isolated, inexplicable jumble whose peculiar details—Athena's unworn foot, wingless flight, billowing aegis, chariot, and vigorous colts—point to a corrupted stage entry. Rather, Athena's description of her voyage from the Troad responds to the Furies' report of their journey to Athens (248–51 in particular). This parallel, along with the history of critical confusion outlined earlier, gives us good reason to re-evaluate the argument that Athena cannot enter in a chariot.[14]

3. A Close Reading of *Eumenides* 403–05

A close reading of 403–05 demonstrates that these lines are internally coherent. Let us start with line 403, "Driving/Pursuing an unworn foot, I came from there." As we saw above, scholars argue that the phrase "unworn foot" militates against Athena's chariot-borne entry because it indicates physical exertion, i.e., foot travel. It has also been noted that the phrase διώκειν πόδα describes foot travel in other plays.[15] Both of these observations have been taken to confirm that 403 refers to pedestrian locomotion and that, therefore, lines 403–05 are confused.

---

14 Although we have noted how Athena's wingless car makes her analogous to the wingless Furies, the emphasis on Athena's flight *apart* from wings could also suggest that her chariot's lack is unexpected. This possibility merits a quick discussion. Winged chariots appear in black- and red-figure vases after c. 510 B.C.E. for Triptolemos, Dionysus, and Hephaestus (although Dionysus's and Hephaestus's cars are not winged for long). The appearance of Triptolemos's winged vehicle coincides with the reorganization of the Eleusinian mysteries under the new democracy and possibly celebrates the cult's increasing pan-Hellenic importance (Clinton 1994.164–66, Hayashi 1992.56). But for all three gods, the wings likely represent the spread of their civilizing skills. Athena's *wingless* chariot could chauvinistically reflect the localized nature of her invention, the law courts. But it also reiterates her extraordinary power: her car flies (even without wings) because she *wills* it to.

15 See, esp., Taplin 1977.389, who cites Eur. *Or.* 1344: ἰδού, διώκω τὸν ἐμὸν ἐς δόμους πόδα; Aesch. *Septem* 371: σπουδῇ διώκων πομπίμους χνόας ποδῶν, and 92: διώκων ⟨πόδας⟩. See also the Greek maxim: ἀφεὶς τὴν ὑπέραν τὸν πόδα διώκει (Hypereides, Harpokration 69.9–12, Suidas a4582, Eustathius *Comm. Od.* 1.123). Yet even these examples underscore the *fact* of the character's arrival or departure as much as the mode of travel.

Yet 403's unworn foot (ἄτρυτον πόδα) does not forbid a chariot entry; rather, the specific mention of Athena's foot is perhaps better understood as a synecdochic marker of her arrival: a suppliant has called, and the goddess Athena has personally responded.[16] The question how to understand ἄτρυτον, however, is more complex. Rendered here as "unworn," ἄτρυτον is derived from the verb τρύω, "wear out, distress." The verb τρύω is most often seen in the perfect passive sense of "worn out, distressed," suggesting that ἄτρυτον can reasonably be construed as "not worn out, not distressed." But the ability of Greek verbal and compound adjectives to indicate either passivity or possibility also suggests that ἄτρυτον can mean "untiring, indefatigable," or even "limitless, unabating."

Contemporary examples of ἄτρυτον's use are of little definitive help, both because ἄτρυτον appears infrequently in fifth-century literature, and because the contexts are different. Even so, a pattern is discernible: in Bacchylides Ode 5.27, Zeus's eagle flies through the "boundless emptiness," ἐν ἀτρύτῳ χάει, whereas his fragmented Ode 9.80 claims that the victor's fame will be sung throughout "time unending," ἄτρυτον χρόνον. In Herodotus 9.52, the Persian cavalry cause the Greeks to suffer "incessant hardship," πόνον ἄτρυτον. Pindar's *Pythian* 4.178 reports that Hermes sends his sons to "endless toil," ἐπ' ἄτρυτον πόνον, i.e., to earn glory aboard the Argo. Finally, in Sophocles' *Ajax*, Tecmessa describes her troubles as "unending evils," κακῶν ἀτρύτων (788). Notably in each example, ἄτρυτον leans more towards its sense of possibility ("limitless, boundless"), than towards its passive sense ("unworn, undistressed"). This supports reading *Eumenides* 403's ἄτρυτον as "untiring, indefatigable" (although a final translation must rely upon context).

A careful consideration of this passage, however, suggests that Athena's foot is both unworn/undistressed *and* untiring/indefatigable. As a passive description, Athena's unworn foot can allude to the use of a vehicle: her foot is unworn because she has not used it ("Driving an unworn foot, I

16 E.g., Eur. *Or*. 1216–17: δόμων πάρος μένουσα παρθένου δέχου πόδα, a use of πόδα representing "a standard periphrasis/synecdoche for a person going or coming" (Willink 1986.282, n. 1217). Also Eur. *Hipp*. 661–62: θεάσομαι δὲ σὺν πατρὸς μολὼν ποδὶ πῶς νιν προσόψηι = ἅμα τῶι πατρὶ μολόντι; Barrett 1964.285, n. 661–62. Aesch. *Sept*. 92 (cited by Taplin, above), ἐπὶ πόλιν διώκων ⟨πόδα⟩, describes an army (both infantry and cavalry) attacking a city. For πόδα's reconstruction, see Hutchinson 1985.61, n. 91f. (cf. Weil). The foot in Eur. *Med*. 217–18: οἱ δ' ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς δύσκλειαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥᾳθυμίαν, describes a person's way of life. Athena's foot in *Eum*. 403 could also be a metaphor for her journey (see *Ch*. 182, 676, and, esp., Garvie 1986.230, n. 676, who argues this for *Eum*. 403), although 403 seems focused on the *fact* of her arrival.

came from there"). Athena's foot could even be unworn because, as a divine foot, it is unblemished. Finally, as I suggested earlier, the passive phrase "unworn foot" could indicate that Athena has expended no effort to make the swift journey to Athens. Then again, reading 403's ἄτρυτον as "untiring, indefatigable" also works with a chariot entry. Not only does a chariot ensure that Athena's foot is untiring, but, also, her foot is untiring because it is the foot of a goddess. Far from emphasizing personal effort, as some have argued, the adjective ἄτρυτον hints at the *limitlessness* of Athena's power and the ease with which she wields it.[17] But, perhaps most importantly, the adjective ἄτρυτον is a punning allusion to Athena's epithet Atrutone, "The Unwearied One, The Indefatigable One."[18] Athena's foot is indefatigable because it is the foot of the Indefatigable One, Athena herself. By describing Athena's magically efficient method of travel, then, the text also hints at her famed epithet, which, in turn, reminds us of the very quality that makes the indefatigable, virginal, Olympian Athena a fitting counterpart to the relentless (but tiring), virginal, primeval Erinyes.[19]

As for the argument that διώκειν πόδα refers to foot travel in other plays: *Eumenides* 403's context makes these other examples irrelevant. Deciding how to translate 403's διώκειν πόδα depends upon what the transmitted text says is happening on stage. Our text mentions a chariot, one that is anticipated by the play's preceding imagery and diction. And although διώκειν can indicate foot travel, it can also mean "drive a chariot" (διώκειν ἅρμα).[20] When commentators argued that the adjective ἄτρυτον ruled out a chariot arrival, their translation of διώκειν shifted accordingly. Our new conclusions about the *Eumenides*' imagery and Athena's tireless foot, however, suggest that our translation of διώκειν ought to acknowledge 405's chariot.

---

17 The ancient etymologies point to this understanding of ἄτρυτον, e.g., *Etymologicum Genuinum*, under Ἄτρυτος· οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρύχω, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ τρύω τρυτὸς καὶ ἄτρυτος· σημαίνει δὲ τὸν ἀκαταπόνητον ("inexhaustible").

18 See Wecklein at Verrall 1908.73, n. 406–08; Sommerstein 1989.153, n. 403.

19 Olympiodorus's commentary on Pl. *Alc.* adds that the epithet Atrutone means Athena is unworn (ἄτρυτος) *and* sleepless (ἀγρύπνος), an interesting point in light of the Erinyes' exhaustion.

20 Aesch. *Pers*. 84: Σύριον θ' ἅρμα διώκων; Hdt. 7.1.140: Συριηγενὲς ἅρμα διώκων; Hom. *Il*. 8.439–40: Ζεὺς δὲ . . . ἅρμα . . . δίωκε, and absol. *Il.* 23.344, 424, 499, 547 (also used for speeding a ship! *Od*.12.182: ῥίμφα διώκοντες). The *Oresteia* exploits διώκειν's different senses: hunting or pursuit (*Ag.* 394, *Eu.* 131, 226, 251), exile for crimes committed (*Ch.* 289), legal prosecution (*Eum*. 583), and, possibly, driving a "sailed" chariot (*Eum*. 403–05).

But in addition to 403's context, it cannot even be argued that the phrase διώκουσ' . . . ἄτρυτον πόδα is specific to pedestrian locomotion. Certainly, if Athena's tireless foot is periphrastic for Athena herself, she would merely be stating that she has driven herself to Athens. Yet there is also external evidence suggesting that 403 can describe more than foot travel: Aeschylus frag. 332 uses similar language, and although its context is unclear, it is generally believed to be an order given to a driver of horses: ἔλα, δίωκε μή τι μαλκίων ποδί, "Drive, pursue, in no way hesitant of foot" (Nauck 1926.101, n. 332). Hence, given that the manuscript tradition offers us no reason to suspect Athena's chariot entry, and given that Athena's tireless foot can function as a synecdochic allusion to Athena and her epithet, and, too, given the paralleled arrivals of the Erinyes and Athena at Athens, as well as *Eumenides*' consistent strategy of thematically contrasting the Erinyes and Athena (e.g., that the Erinyes are driven by the lash, ridden down by the Olympians, then, finally, domesticated for mortal benefit), it seems that 403's διώκειν might better be understood to mean "drive." Hence a final translation of 403 would be: "Driving my indefatigable foot, I came from there."

For line 404, "fluttering without wings the billow of my aegis," we see that the line suggests a wingless flight comparable to that of the Erinyes in 248–51, only the puffing, winded Erinyes have been replaced by the puffy billow of Athena's snaky aegis as she breezes across the oceans. The possibility that Athena has flown to Athens does not negate the sense of 403 proposed above ("Driving my indefatigable foot, I came from there"). Nor, for that matter, does flight preclude Athena's use of a chariot in 405. Divine chariots can fly if gods tell us they can. Moreover, the preservation of 405's flying chariot need not violate the historical evidence regarding the dating of the crane. Dramatically speaking, for Athena to have a flying chariot, all she need do is appear on stage in a car and announce that she flew there. Whether Athena's chariot team consisted of real horses or props is debatable. For the purposes of a live production, however, props seem more likely since they are easier to handle.

In sum, I see no inherent incompatibility between lines 403, 404, and 405, which describe Athena traveling, possibly even flying, effortlessly in a chariot across the oceans with such speed that her aegis billows like a sail in the wind.[21] Moreover, when read in light of *Eumenides* 248–51 and its

21 A final translation of 403–05: "Driving my indefatigable foot, I came from there, fluttering the billow of my aegis apart from wings, having yoked this car to colts in their prime."

immediately preceding imagery, Athena's chariot-borne arrival in 403–05 implicitly contrasts the founding of the law courts, a self-sustaining, innovative system of reason, with the self-destructive and tired *lex talionis* of the Erinyes, creatures dependent upon force and the vengeful, savage passions associated with animals. The diction and imagery of these two arrivals in Athens also suggests that Athena, the civilizing inventor of the ship, the chariot, the yoke, and the bridle, is the most suitable Olympian to domesticate the Erinyes.

II. CHARIOT ENTRANCES AND EXITS IN THE *ORESTEIA*

With the restoration of Athena's chariot in 405, we now see how Athena's chariot entry in *Eumenides* completes and reveals an interesting symmetry of chariot props and images within the trilogy. Specifically, Agamemnon, Orestes, and Athena each serve as charioteers, either literally or figuratively, at pivotal moments in the *Oresteia*. In *Agamemnon*, Agamemnon enters in a chariot, dismounts from the chariot, and enters the *oikos* to suffer Clytemnestra's justice, leaving the empty chariot on stage. In *Choephoroi*, Orestes enters the *oikos* (after dismounting from a metaphoric car, see below), commits matricide, then returns on stage to describe himself as a charioteer in a bolting chariot before he rushes off stage with the Erinyes in hot pursuit. Finally, in *Eumenides*, the goddess Athena arrives on stage in a chariot at a suppliant's behest, only to move off stage in the same chariot towards the polis, where she collects citizens to serve as a jury in the first homicide trial, ever. Noticeably, the chariot, charioteers, and justice/piety are regularly linked, and this series of associations merits closer attention. Indeed, as we shall see, Athena's chariot entrance in *Eumenides* culminates a trilogy-spanning reconfiguration of the aristocratic values traditionally associated with hippotrophy, the raising and racing of horses. Athena's chariot reprograms and rehabilitates the chariot's aristocentric valences, as it moves away from representing the aristocratically identified worldview of the *lex talionis* to celebrating the democratically identified institutions of Athena's city, Athens.[22]

---

22 I do not claim that *Oresteia* uses hippotrophic imagery alone to portray this progression, only that it is more important than has been recognized previously. For tragic royalty as a reflection of Athenian aristocrats, see Griffith 1995. True, Athenian "class structure" is complex, "but it would be perverse to deny the pervasiveness and force of the hierarchical relationships played out in every surviving tragedy, and remiss not to attempt to trace the ways in which those relationships affect our experience of the action" (Griffith 1995.75).

1. *Agamemnon*

Agamemnon makes his chariot entrance in ominous circumstances, to say the least.[23] Not only is he about to enter Clytemnestra's vengeful ambush, but the narrative preceding Agamemnon's arrival suggests that his so-called "just" vengeance on Troy has involved questionable behavior on his part, notably: the sacrifice of his daughter in a perverted sacrificial ritual to secure military power; a willingness to expend Greek lives for personal glory (in clashes characterized as unpropitious ritual, war's προτελείοις, "preliminary marriage offerings/clash of spears," *Ag*. 65);[24] the (mistaken) certainty that he can pursue a divinely condoned policy of genocide against the Trojans; and, as a crowning act of impiety, the razing of Trojan temples. Noticeably, too, as each of these atrocities is described, the text includes hippotrophic imagery. While Agamemnon contemplates or chooses his actions, he is implicitly harnessed to a figurative car composed of and driven by his temperament *qua* familial curse. Yet when Agamemnon *acts* and seals his fate, the text has him take up the horse's reins, both figuratively and literally.

When Agamemnon decides to sacrifice Iphigenia, thereby exhibit-

---

Nor do I blindly equate Agamemnon's "Persian" despotism with the attitude of certain Greek aristocrats: "Many of the negative attributes ascribed by Classical Greeks to 'barbarians' (especially Easterners; Persians, Medes, Lydians, Phrygians) were also attributed by Athenian democrats to aristocratic and oligarchic (or what Maitland terms 'dynastic') elements within their own city. Cf. Plato *Laws* 694d–695c, Hdt. 1.136, [Aristotle] *Ath. Pol.* 35.2, Plutarch *Pericles* 24, and Demosthenes' Meidias, etc., for representations of (upper-class) 'undemocratic' behavior that is tainted with 'Asiatic' . . . characteristics . . . the preoccupation with images of the barbarian 'Other' in tragedy and elsewhere . . . while it undoubtedly does reflect a burst of the chauvinistic consciousness following the Persian Wars and rapid growth of Empire, may also reflect the sharpened class conflict between rich and poor, elite and mass within Athens itself" (Griffith 1995.84, n. 80).

23 Although the language describing Agamemnon's car is vague, he is believed to enter on a chariot (see, esp., Taplin 1977.304–06). His vehicle is named four times. Clytemnestra twice calls it an ἀπήνη (907, 1039). In Homer, ἀπήνη can mean four-wheeled cart, but it describes chariots in later Greek (e.g., Soph. *OT* 753, 803; Str. 4.5.2). In 1054, the Chorus asks Cassandra to dismount from the ἁμαξήρη θρόνον, "wheeled throne" (more on this below). In 1070, the Chorus calls it an ὄχον, "cart" or "chariot." Similarly, Athena's chariot is called ὄχον in 405, perhaps deliberately recalling *Ag.* 1070. It seems, then, that Agamemnon and Athena drive similar vehicles, probably chariots, since he is a triumphant king and she is a goddess.

24 For προτελείοις as a veiled reference to preliminary marriage rites, see Fraenkel 1950.40, n. 65; Zeitlin 1965.465; Lebeck 1971.70; Seaford 1987.108–09; Rehm 1994.43; Wohl 1998.72.

ing "his father's predatory and 'teknophonous ἦθος'" (Peradotto 1969.256), the text marks his consonance with this familial predilection/curse by stating that he takes on the "yoke-strap of necessity" (*Ag*. 218). Agamemnon's assumption of this harness does not signal his powerlessness before fate, nor does it mitigate his responsibility for Iphigenia's murder, as some have argued (Denniston and Page 1957.88, n. 218; Lloyd-Jones 1983). Agamemnon dons this yoke-strap willingly, as the active verb ἔδυ indicates.[25] Hence Agamemnon, who initially bore the yoke of Zeus's justice along with his brother Menelaus (*Ag*. 43–44: διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δισκήπτρου τιμῆς ὀχυρὸν ζεῦγος Ἀτρειδᾶν), can no longer claim that his specific motives and actions are entirely representative of Zeus's will, even if his ultimate aim, the sack of Troy, is destined. Instead, Agamemnon uses the will of Zeus and the possible reproach of the other Greek leaders (*Ag*. 122–24) as pretexts for following an ambition that reflects and manifests his familial temperament—a shift the text marks when he takes on the "yoke" of a different car entirely. Agamemnon is literally driven (to destruction, as this play demonstrates) by his desires and his family curse. Indeed, as he puts on this yoke-strap of necessity, he snorts impious, impure gusts (φρενὸς πνέων δυσσεβῆ τροπαίαν ἄναγνον, ἀνίερον, *Ag*. 219–20), and his mind swerves so that he dares all and stops at nothing (*Ag*. 219–21). Agamemnon's single-minded devotion to his ambition leads him to be characterized as a menacing, uncontrollable racehorse. Agamemnon's decision also introduces the connection between hippotrophic imagery, winds, and the disharmonious effects of the *lex talionis*, a nexus later reversed by Athena's rustling aegis and chariot in *Eumenides* 403–05.

The moment Agamemnon *acts*, however, he takes on the role of a *hippotrophos* rider or charioteer. Agamemnon and his fellow generals silence the virginal Iphigenia with a "bridle" (a gag) as they sacrifice her (κατασχεῖν . . . χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει, 236–38), an eroticized description emphasizing their overwhelming exertion of power over the girl and hinting at Agamemnon's sadistic, "incestuous desire."[26] Bridling, chariot,

---

25 Fraenkel 1950.127–28 (vv. 218 and 219) and 136 (v. 238f.), Peradotto 1969, Dodds 1973.57, Lesky 1983.110–14, Winnington-Ingram 1983.82–83, Conacher 1987.13–14 and 85–96.

26 Wohl 1998.74. According to Wohl: "We might read the sacrifice of Iphigenia as a sort of failed marriage exchange . . . in which the father, rather than giving his daughter away, destroys her, and thus both loses her . . . and, paradoxically, keeps her for himself" (71). For more on this scene's sadistic eroticism, see Wohl 1998.74–75, Rehm 1994.50–51, Griffith 1995.83, n. 79.

and yoking imagery is also employed to depict Troy's obliteration and the razing of Trojan temples. This pattern begins with Calchas's reading of the eagle and hare omen in *Agamemnon* 127–33, when he describes the Greek army, led by Agamemnon, as a forged bit (προτυπὲν στόμιον, 132) to curb Troy, a curbing with especially dire overtones considering the Greek understanding of this oracle. Furthermore, when Clytemnestra ambivalently prays that Agamemnon and the Greek army not succumb to the desire to sack and destroy what is inviolable, she compares them to a chariot making the dangerous final turn in a race (*Ag*. 341–44):

> ἔρως δὲ μή τις πρότερον ἐμπίπτῃ στρατῷ
> πορθεῖν ἃ μὴ χρὴ κέρδεσιν νικωμένους·
> δεῖ γὰρ πρὸς οἴκους νοστίμου σωτηρίας,
> κάμψαι διαύλου θάτερον κῶλον πάλιν·
>
> But may some desire not fall upon the army,
> overcome by greed, to sack that which they ought not.
> For to obtain a safe return home, they need
> to make the turn back onto the final leg of the course.

Clytemnestra's use of the verb κάμψαι makes it unclear whether Agamemnon and the Greek army are analogous to the charioteer, the chariot team, or a combination of the two (with Agamemnon as the charioteer and the army as his steeds). The ambiguity seems deliberate, however, since it allows Clytemnestra to make her equivocal prayer in public without appearing to suggest that her husband (and Argos's king) might purposefully destroy sacred sites. The passage's fluidity also brilliantly embodies the Greek army's responsibility for their (willing) slide into destructive and libidinous behavior. To succumb to desire and greed is a decision in itself; both Agamemnon and his followers are the masters of their fates.

Clytemnestra, then, attributes failure in the final stretch of this metaphoric chariot race to desires of the flesh (ἔρως, 341), bloodlust, impiety, and greed—negative traits traditionally associated with Eastern despots and tyrants. The perverted desire "driving" Agamemnon to bridle and sacrifice Iphigenia already suggests that he will lose this race. But also, *Agamemnon*'s next hippotrophic allusion responds directly to Clytemnestra's ambivalent prayer (Denniston and Page 1957.120–21, n. 527): Agamemnon did not restrain himself or the army. When the Herald arrives on stage rejoicing that Troy has been razed to the ground with Zeus's mattock (525–26), that Troy's altars and temples have been made invisible (527), and that

Trojan seed has been wiped from the earth (528), he concludes with an all-inclusive yoking metaphor (*Ag*. 529–31):

> τοιόνδε Τροίᾳ περιβαλὼν ζευκτήριον
> ἄναξ Ἀτρείδης πρέσβυς εὐδαίμων ἀνήρ
> ἥκει,
>
> After having cast this kind of [crushing] yoke about Troy,
> the king, the son of Atreus, the revered, fortunate man,
> has arrived;

The Herald's yoking imagery implicitly incriminates Agamemnon, both as a response to Clytemnestra's comments in 341–44 and as part of a string of images that consistently associate Agamemnon the *hippotrophos* with the impious abuse of power.

But the Herald has not yet depleted his store of ominous hippotrophic images. As he converses with the Chorus, he admits that Agamemnon's expedition has harmed the polis. Not surprisingly, a chariot metaphor also figures prominently in this admission (*Ag*. 638–45):

> ὅταν δ' ἀπευκτὰ πήματ' ἄγγελος πόλει
> σμοιῶι προσώπωι πτωσίμου στρατοῦ φέρηι,
> πόλει μὲν ἕλκος ἓν τὸ δήμιον τυχεῖν,
> πολλοὺς δὲ πολλῶν ἐξαγισθέντας δόμων
> ἄνδρας διπλῆι μάστιγι, τὴν Ἄρης φιλεῖ,
> δίλογχον ἄτην, φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα,
> τοιῶνδε μέν τοι πημάτων σεσαγμένον
> πρέπει λέγειν παιῶνα τόνδ' Ἐρινύων.
>
> But when, with pained countenance, a messenger brings
> to his city the dreaded news of a fallen army—
> that a wound has befallen the city, one to the civic body,
> and [that a second wound is] the many men driven as
> victims from their many homes
> by the double horsewhip that Ares loves,
> his two-speared bane, his bloodstained pair of
> thoroughbreds—
> it is fitting that he, saddled by these sorts of woes,
> utters this paean of the Erinyes.

This passage's emphasis on doubles is said to reflect the double blow a city suffers when its soldiers die—one to the polity and one to its individual homes.[27] But the Herald's two whips, spears, and bloodstained steeds are also Atreus's sons, the yoked pair who led the Greek expedition (*Ag*. 44). Of course, when the Chorus portrayed the war as a just response to Troy's violation of *xenia*, they claimed the sons of Atreus were yoked to Zeus's justice. The Herald's image, however, describes war's horrific impact and, therefore, identifies Agamemnon and Menelaus as Ares' bloody pair of race-horses (φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα).[28]

Yet because Agamemnon and Menelaus also head the Greek expedition, they are Ares' double horsewhip and even charioteers themselves. Indeed, whether one understands δίλογχον ἄτην to be "two-speared bane," describing Homeric warriors, or "a bane furnished with two points / double-goad wielding bane,"[29] the image further characterizes Ares' horsewhip/steeds as charioteers. Once again, Agamemnon's destructiveness is tied to hippotrophic imagery. Noticeably as well, the Herald describes this bad news as a "paean to the Erinyes," a "blasphemous paradox" (Fraenkel 1950.649) that is, ironically, all too true: although Agamemnon thinks he will win this chariot race, his willingness to sacrifice others only secures victory for the Erinyes.

Up to this point in *Agamemnon*, then, hippotrophic imagery—the image of the chariot race in particular—is consistently linked with acts of impiety, brutality, and civic injury, either performed or led by Agamemnon.[30]

---

27 Fraenkel 1950.318–21, Denniston and Page 1957.128–29. My translation of this challenging passage follows scholarly consensus, although I translated σεσαγμένον as "saddled" (one of its meanings) to maintain the passage's thread of imagery.

28 Fraenkel 1950.320, n. 643 tentatively suggests that φοινίαν ξυνωρίδα alludes to Ares' war chariot and should not be read as a non-specific "bloody pair." Certainly, ξυνωρίς means "pair of racing horses," there is no reason to change it (despite what scholars say about translating ξυνωρίς in *Ch*. 982, see below).

29 For both suggestions, see Fraenkel 1950.320, n. 643. I agree with Fraenkel that δίλογχον ἄτην is not "a further illustrative detail of the μάστιξ. This is improbable, because the mention of Ares has introduced fresh images and ideas . . . The notion of 'twofold' is maintained, but the subject to which it is attached is now different."

30 Before Agamemnon's entry, there is one other possible hippotrophic allusion: in lines 367–84, the Chorus describes those who "trample on the grace of things not to be touched" and "kick the altar of Justice out of sight" (Fraenkel 1950) as mortals "panting/snorting more than is just" (376). The Chorus believes it describes the arrogance of Paris and Troy, but its language recalls Agamemnon "snorting impious gusts" when he dons his yoke-strap of necessity before Iphigenia's sacrifice, and, possibly, Clytemnestra's chariot racing metaphor in 341–44. It also anticipates the imagery transformed by Athena's entrance in *Eumenides*.

These images warn us to make special note of Agamemnon's car when it rolls on stage, as they also prime us to read Agamemnon's chariot entry in a negative light. Yet Agamemnon's chariot entry deserves special notice for other reasons as well. The first half of the play builds up to Agamemnon's arrival, and this alone suggests that we pay particular attention to any props or images associated with his appearance. Additionally, chariots in Attic drama were already props deployed to elicit a particular response from their audience: Attic stage convention reserves chariot entrances for kings and other highborn characters (Taplin 1977.75–79). An Athenian audience, then, would have recognized the chariot as a signifier of Agamemnon's monarchic power.

A. Hippotrophy and Aristocratic Self-Fashioning

The association between the charioteer, his chariot, and high birth is not limited to tragedy. This tragic practice may be part of a larger cultural and artistic convention dating back to the Archaic era, with the concomitant rise of the polis and the hoplite phalanx. As many have argued, the destabilization of aristocratic eminence during the Archaic era may have catalyzed what could be called a pan-Hellenic aristocratic obsession with identifying iconography and artifacts to promote a distinctive representation of aristocratic identity.[31] Hippotrophic imagery—that of the charioteer in particular—became a crucial part of this emerging symbolism.[32] To begin, horses and chariots implied extraordinary wealth. Additionally, the emergence of the hoplite phalanx made the horse and chariot an obsolete battle technology. This impracticality further contributed to the chariot's function as a

31 Detienne 1968.318, Donlan 1980. Starr 1977.121–30 argues that without the rise of the polis, there would be no Greek aristocracy as we understand it, since the archaic aristocracy's need to differentiate itself from others arose in reaction to the advent of polis culture; Kurke 1999.

32 Detienne 1968.318: "Si la fonction militaire devient dérisoire, sa valeur sociale ne fera que croitre: l'entretien des chevaux, la construction de la caisse, du timon, des roues, fabriqués non plus par les artisans du palais mycénien, mais par le démiurge du haut archaïsme, tout cela devait etre très couteux. C'est affaire de nobles pour lesquels le char est l'objet de prestige. A Athènes, les plus riches des citoyens sont appelés tantot *hippeis*, cavaliers-chevaliers, tantot *heniochoi*, cochers, parce qu' ils entretiennent une écurie de course. A Délion, une partie du corps d'élite des Thébains—et ce sont alors des combattants à pied—s'appellera encore ἡνίοχοι et παραβάται: ils porteront le titre anachronique de l'équipage du char homérique. L'histoire de ces titres illustre clairement et la valeur du char comme instrument de prestige et le déclin de sa fonction militaire." Also Starr 1977.37, Donlan 1980.52.

symbol of extravagant display, even as it provided the added bonus that only those of noble birth could claim to have had ancestors who fought using horses and chariots. Hence as the practical, martial value of a horse and chariot decreased, its social and symbolic value for the positive, exclusivist representation of the aristocracy skyrocketed.

And so, as the polis developed, hippotrophic practice, especially that associated with chariots, became recognizable across Greece as a signifier of aristocratic identity. Significantly, however, the figure's consistent ties to nobility and exclusivity took on a less categorically positive cast in democratic Athens. Although profligacy of any kind was usually frowned upon in Athens, apparently the average Athenian was particularly suspicious of the conspicuous consumption associated with chariot racing, because such display supposedly hinted at the charioteer's tyrannical aspirations.[33] For this reason, Thucydides' Alcibiades defends his entry of four-horse chariots at the Olympic games as evidence for his civic spirit, not, as his detractors would charge, as a basis for seizing power (6.16.1–4).[34] Hence the classical Athenian suspicion of chariot racing as the pastime of potential

---

33 For *hippotrophia* and chariot racing as a basis for political power and a sign of tyranny, see Davies 1981.94–105, esp. 98; Podlecki 1986.99–100; Gribble 1999.48–50, 55–60; Plato *Rep*. 566e; Aristotle *Pol*. 1313b28–1314b22. See also Brenne 1994's review of *ostraka* and ostracism (esp. p. 16). Many sherds (including pre-written, mass-produced sherds!) are inscribed with a noble's name and the term *hippotrophos* (e.g., *Megakles hippokratos hippotrophos)*. The title *hippotrophos* was apparently damning enough to justify a citizen's exile as a threat to democracy.

34 Even so, Alcibiades argues that his Olympic chariot victories give him the right to command other Athenians. Seager 1967 documents the characterization of tyranny and how Alcibiades matches it. Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970.246–48, nn. 16.1–4, also understand Alcibiades' speech to be a defense against "actual or potential accusations" (246), one of which is an aspiration to tyranny (246, n. 16.2); Hornblower 1987.6. Gribble 1999.48–50 notes that Alcibiades' Olympic chariot victories in 416 made his political ambitions suspect (50), adding that "the chariot race, which carried the most honour, was also the competition which was most clearly a contest of expenditure; it was this that was decisive for success, rather than mere physical effort" (48, n. 85). The extraordinary *time* and *kudos* won from a pan-Hellenic chariot victory "could bring the individual tremendous honour and status in the home city, which might be decisive for the pursuit of political office . . . It was perhaps the extra-civic character of athletic spending and the difficulty of controlling the status it brought which was responsible for the decline of competition at the pan-Hellenic games as a way of pursuing the leadership of the *demos* in Athens. As far as we can tell, no Athenian leaders of the second half of the fifth century mounted a conspicuous *theoria* at the pan-Hellenic games" (48–49) since it would hint at improper socio-political ambition. Ultimately, chariot racing was a means of garnering socio-political power that circumvented the avenues of opportunity available to average Athenians.

tyrants suggests that Clytemnestra's chariot racing metaphor in *Agamemnon* 341–44 (and any responding imagery) not only anticipates Agamemnon's chariot arrival but also specifically alludes to his improper, selfish, socio-political ambition.

Between the iconographic concerns of the Greek aristocracy and Attic stage convention, then, Agamemnon's chariot entrance marks him as a noble and a king. But Agamemnon's highly anticipated, dramatic arrival in his kingly chariot has been compromised by the *Agamemnon*'s consistently negative characterizations of hippotrophic practice and accoutrements—negative associations that were easily activated given the *Agamemnon*'s Athenian context (Griffith 1995.67, n. 17). This menacing atmosphere, along with Agamemnon's arrogant behavior after he drives on stage, turns Agamemnon's chariot into a powerful sign of despotism and destructive ambition, proof that absolute power corrupts absolutely.

B. Chariots and Weddings

Agamemnon's chariot entry is further darkened, however, by one final detail: the degraded and objectified Cassandra standing beside him in his car.[35] Cassandra is an enslaved victim of Greek conquest, impiously raped by Ajax on Athena's altar and given as a personal spear-prize and concubine to Agamemnon, the conqueror (Rehm 1994.44–45 and 172, n. 7; Rosenbloom 1995.109, 113–15). Yet for an Athenian audience, the appearance of a man and a woman together in a chariot is also highly suggestive of marriage ritual and iconography (most notably the standardized black- and red-figure pottery depictions of the newly married couple driving a chariot to the groom's home).[36] Furthermore, chariots were essential ingredients in

35 Nothing suggests Cassandra is in a separate vehicle (also Taplin 1977.304–06). Taplin adds that "simultaneous entries" are uncommon in tragedy, and "the audience is meant to notice Cassandra, and to notice that she is with Agamemnon. She is not explained, but she becomes yet one more element wrong in the homecoming, a disquieting presence seen out of the corner of the eye" (306). Also Fraenkel 1950.370–71, Griffith 1995.74, n. 51.

36 In fifth-century Athens, chariots were used in races and ritual, not as transportation or military technology. Whether one considers Agamemnon's chariot a reflection of fifth-century or heroic practice, however, chariots are essential ingredients for poetic descriptions of marriage ritual (Oakley and Sinos 1993.26–28) and marriage abductions (e.g., Pelops and Hippodameia in Pindar *O.* 1, Hades and Persephone in Hom. *HD*, etc.). For black-figure marriage iconography, see, esp., Lissarrague 1992.143–54, "The dominant theme in the 'black-figure style' was that of the wedding procession. The couple rode in a chariot, and often gods were present in the cortege, suggesting that in some cases the bride

mythic marriages and bride abductions. True, Agamemnon can be said to use his car as a platform for displaying his war prize, Cassandra. Nevertheless, the situations in which a man and a woman would travel together in a chariot were limited, both mythically and historically. The appearance of Agamemnon and Cassandra together in a chariot, then, might draw upon this traditional marriage imagery.[37]

If *Agamemnon*'s chariot entry does allude to marriage imagery, then the dissonance between the traditional iconography and Agamemnon's arrival adds to the play's brooding atmosphere. Indeed, Agamemnon's and Cassandra's entrance subverts traditional marriage expectations at every level: this chariot entry does not mark a festive wedding day with rites celebrating the (married) couple's return to their new home, instead it signals a day of death for an unmarried couple in a murderous ambush *qua* perverted sacrificial ritual. Nor, for that matter, does this chariot-borne couple represent the union of two *oikoi*. On the contrary, it represents the pillaging of the "bride's" home and the hostile dissolution of marital bonds within the "groom's" *oikos*, i.e., disunity between and within *oikoi*. (Perhaps *Ag*. 65's preliminary marriage offerings of dying soldiers [προτελείοις] do not just refer to the wedding of Paris and Helen but to the violent "wedding" of Agamemnon and Cassandra, and the impending, violent termination of Clytemnestra's and Agamemnon's marriage?) Agamemnon's chariot entry also underscores his marital and sexual impropriety. By driving his car on stage with Cassandra beside him, Agamemnon effectively acts as if he has two wives, a decidedly non-Greek practice reminiscent of barbaric Eastern despots.

And, significantly, as Agamemnon boasts of his triumph in his opening speech, he characterizes himself as a charioteer overseeing Troy's destruction, complaining that only Odysseus, of all his generals, served him well (*Ag*. 838–42):

---

and groom are to be taken as mythological figures" (144). For black-figure and red-figure iconography, see Oakley and Sinos 1993.28–34; Sinos 1998 notes that chariot procession scenes in black-figure pottery are "highly conventional and thus can be discussed generally by type" (75). When gods are not chariot occupants, "mortals ride in chariots in depictions of wedding processions and warriors' departures" (75). Also Jenkins 1983, Seaford 1987, and Rehm 1994.30, 44–45, 141–42. Only carts can be verified for historical marriage processions, but this does not rule out the possible use of chariots to "heroize" a married couple (also Sinos 1998.89, n. 14).

37 Also Griffith 1995.67, n. 17. Granted, this is a "false" marriage, but Cassandra's status as Agamemnon's concubine is hard to ignore. Clytemnestra certainly considers Cassandra a rival.

εἰδὼς λέγοιμ᾽ ἄν, εὖ γὰρ ἐξεπίσταμαι
ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἴδωλον σκιᾶς,
δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρευμενεῖς ἐμοί·
μόνος δ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἑκὼν ἔπλει,
ζευχθεὶς ἑτοῖμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος·

I could in full confidence—for I know
well the mirror-like nature of flatterers—
call those *seeming* to be wholly loyal to me
the mere reflection of a shadow;
Odysseus alone—yes, the very one who set sail
with me unwillingly—he alone,
once he was yoked, was my ready trace horse.

A charioteer overlord, Agamemnon treats his allies and social equals like a subordinate team of horses. Deprecating their decade-long efforts on his behalf, Agamemnon values only one steed, the trace-horse Odysseus,[38] presumably because Odysseus's Trojan horse allowed Agamemnon to sack Troy. The self-aggrandizing attitude of the *hippotrophos* Agamemnon, then, represents a despotic, Eastern, socio-political philosophy, not a Greek one. The Chorus even confirms an explicit connection between Agamemnon as charioteer and his despotic streak when, in apparent response to his attitude, they call his car a "wagon throne" (ἁμαξήρη θρόνον, 1054). Of course, this phrase corroborates a link between the chariot and Agamemnon's status. But if, as D. B. Thompson suggests, it also recalls the throne-wagon used by Xerxes in his invasion of Greece (his ἁρμάμαξαν in Herodotus 7.41), then Agamemnon the charioteer has genuinely "returned like an Oriental potentate from the fall of Troy" (1956.287).

Yet Agamemnon's language in 838–42 also recalls Clytemnestra's racing metaphor in 341–44: the trace horse's role is to help a car move around the track's bend towards the finish (Denniston and Page 1957.219–20, n. 1640). Ironically, however, even though Odysseus's Trojan horse facilitated Agamemnon's "final turn" (the Trojan war's end and his *nostos*), it also enabled the Greeks to vent their destructive desires during Troy's

38 Nothing suggests that Odysseus and Agamemnon are yoke mates. Indeed, when Aegisthus uses the term σειραφόρος in *Ag.* 1640, he means men yoked beneath his power (also Denniston and Page 1957.219–20, n. 1640), i.e., Aegisthus takes on the role of the *hippotrophos*.

sack, ending their chance for a safe homecoming.[39] Hence Agamemnon's brutal bitting of Iphigenia, the Herald's use of yoking imagery to describe the razing of Trojan temples, the Herald's later, implicit description of Agamemnon as one of Ares' bloody racehorses whipping the Greek army to their doom, Agamemnon's portrayal of himself as his army's charioteer and Odysseus as his trace horse, Cassandra's presence in Agamemnon's chariot, even the Chorus's description of Agamemnon's car as a wagon throne, all answer Clytemnestra's ambiguous prayer: Agamemnon's unrestrained desire (ἔρως) led him to drive recklessly along the final leg of his course. Agamemnon is a despotic *hippotrophos* who, overcome by his intemperance and self-importance, destroyed and desecrated what he ought never to have touched.[40]

C. Aegisthus and Clytemnestra as Charioteers

Agamemnon is not the only despotic individual in *Agamemnon* to be characterized as a *hippotrophos*, however. Agamemnon's excess might make him an unfit ruler, but Clytemnestra and Aegisthus are the *Oresteia*'s real tyrants. Not surprisingly, hippotrophic imagery is also used to characterize their oppressive behavior. Once Agamemnon dismounts and heads into the *oikos*, he leaves an empty chariot throne on stage. Clytemnestra and Aegisthus hope to be that chariot's next charioteer. And just as Agamemnon betrayed his destructive ambition when he first bitted and silenced Iphigenia during her sacrifice (χαλινῶν, 238), Clytemnestra reveals her tyrannical colors (and "masculine" personality) when she grumbles that Cassandra, who refuses to speak, does not know how to wear the bit of slavery (χαλινὸν, 1066)—the only other appearance of χαλινός in the *Oresteia*.

Likewise, after Agamemnon's murder, Aegisthus assumes the role of a metaphoric charioteer when he threatens the rebellious Chorus, de-

---

39 Incidentally, Agamemnon's description of his avenging army as the "offspring of the [Trojan] horse" (*Ag*. 825) adds to his self-designation as the Greek army's charioteer and *possibly* makes his soldiers analogous to the Erinyes (who are offspring of a horse divinity in some traditions).

40 Agamemnon mirrors *Persai*'s Xerxes, who also obliterated temples (*Pers*. 811) and impiously attempted to be a charioteer overlord for Greece and Asia (*Pers*. 176–200). That Agamemnon's chariot is called an ἁμαξήρη θρόνον (1054) adds to this comparison. Certainly, both Agamemnon's success in Asia and (despotic) role as Greek expedition leader match Xerxes' ambition.

manding that they not kick against his goads (*Ag*. 1624) and warning that continued resistance to his rule will carry dire consequences (*Ag*. 1639–42):

> τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθάνορα
> ζεύξω βαρείαις, οὔτι μὴ σειραφόρον
> κριθῶντα πῶλον, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ δυσφιλὴς σκότῳ
> λιμὸς ξύνοικος μαλθακόν σφ᾽ ἐπόψεται.
>
> but the disobedient man
> I will place beneath a crushing yoke, not as a barley-fed
> young trace horse, no, but hateful hunger,
> his companion, will visit him, broken, in darkness.

Aegisthus equates himself with the *hippotrophos* owner of the disobedient man who will not be treated like a valued trace horse (σειραφόρον, 1640)—the second and final appearance of σειραφόρος in the *Oresteia* after Agamemnon calls Odysseus a trace horse in 842. And like Agamemnon before him, Aegisthus's disregard for his trace horse hints that his "homecoming" to Argos will not fare well.

Hence the same hippotrophic diction surrounds Agamemnon, Clytemnestra, and Aegisthus when they assert their power over others. But there are also some significant differences between these *hippotrophoi*. Agamemnon may have been corrupt, but he was a true heir to power. Although his hippotrophic moments are violent and perverted, although his goals are twisted and his mounts seldom survive, still, Agamemnon can make his people do as he wishes and accomplish what he sets out to do. The unfortunate Iphigenia is successfully bitted and sacrificed, and both the Greek army and Odysseus fulfill Agamemnon's desires. Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, on the other hand, are usurpers who can only try to exercise their authority through intimidation and violence, and, even then, they cannot control their mounts: Cassandra does not wear Clytemnestra's bit, and the Chorus refuses to recognize the commands of the false *hippotrophos*-ruler, Aegisthus. A lack of proper political authority and experience makes Clytemnestra and Aegisthus ineffective *hippotrophoi*.[41]

---

41 Two further possible hippotrophic allusions remain: In 1070–71, the Chorus asks Cassandra to step out of the chariot (ὄχον) and take on her new yoke (of slavery). Although this is likely a beast of burden's yoke, the word's proximity to mention of Agamemnon's

2. *Choephoroi*

The *Choephoroi* continues to deploy hippotrophic imagery, especially the configuration of the chariot, the charioteer, and the yoked team, as a barometer of the subject's piety, culpability, and allegiance to the *lex talionis*. The *Choephoroi*'s figure even maintains its associations with monarchy, despotism, and tyranny, although, as we shall see, these associations become destabilized. So long as Orestes plans the matricide, he exists at the passive end of the chariot dynamic, described as a yoked colt harnessed to a chariot of toils (794–99) or a steed "goaded" by Apollo's oracle (*Ch.* 286–90, *Eum*. 427, 465–67).[42] When Orestes acts, however, he shifts to the active pole, a transition that begins when Orestes reaches his ancestral home's gates.

Upon his arrival, the disguised Orestes asks a servant to announce him immediately: Orestes wishes to enter the palace "since the dark chariot of Night speeds along" (ὡς καὶ νυκτὸς ἅρμ᾽ ἐπείγεται σκοτεινόν, *Ch*. 660–61). This metaphor has been dismissed as "purely ornamental" (Garvie 1986.226, n. 660–62), but in the *Oresteia*, night and darkness are associated with death and the code of vendetta (Lebeck 1971.43,100). Indeed, Night is not only the mother of the Erinyes (*Eum*. 416), she is herself an agent of vengeance: in *Agamemnon*, the Chorus reports that Friendly Night (Νὺξ φιλία) aided Zeus and cast her net about Troy to capture young and old (355–61). The Furies even invoke Mother Night when they complain that Apollo threatens their rights as avengers, rights that no Olympian cares for: "Mother, you bore me, Mother Night, as requital for the unseeing dead and the living who see the light . . . these offices [of vengeance] were appointed to us as birthright" (*Eum*. 321–23, 347–48). Hence the Furies' "claim to vengeance rests on birth" (Lebeck 1971.155). But Orestes' "claim to vengeance" also rests on his birthright (as Agamemnon's son and, ironically, Clytemnestra's baby "serpent"). In effect, this chariot metaphor hints at Orestes' imminent matricide, comparing him to Night and the Furies. But Orestes' role *within* this image is equally ambivalent. On the one hand, it

---

car could also refer to the eroticized image of a "yoked" filly. Finally, in 1245, the confused Chorus states that it understands some of what Cassandra says, but as for the rest, it "runs off the track" (τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἀκούσας ἐκ δρόμου πεσὼν τρέχω). This could also describe a hound losing a trail's scent (e.g., *Ag*. 120: βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρόμων; Fraenkel 1950.576–77, n. 1245; Denniston and Page 1957.183, n. 1245).

42 Also Peradotto 1969.259, Garvie 1986.335–36.

suggests that Night (vengeance) "drives" Orestes into the house; but because Night's chariot also represents Orestes' vengeance per se, he is the charioteer. This ambivalence encapsulates his transition from plan to action.[43]

Orestes' role does not remain ambiguous for long, however. After a servant fetches Clytemnestra, Orestes officially begins his deception, lying about his identity and his reason for visiting, and, as he does so, he uses a peculiar metaphor in relation to his trip to Argos: "Just as I unyoked my feet thither" (ὥσπερ δεῦρ᾽ ἀπεζύγην πόδας, *Ch*. 676), a phrase describing either the beginning of his journey or his arrival at Argos's gates (Garvie 1986.230–31, n. 676). Whichever interpretation one accepts, Orestes pointedly characterizes his feet as yoked animals. To be sure, it is unclear whether Orestes' yoking imagery refers to the glorified, aristocentric image of the chariot or the plodding, ignoble image of an ox-drawn cart. Given the *Agamemnon*'s consistent use of chariot-centered images, however, and, too, given the *Choephoroi*'s verifiable participation in this thematic thread elsewhere (especially the chariot of Night mentioned fourteen lines earlier), Orestes' comment likely draws upon this established pattern. Yet it would be wrong to deny the line's ambivalence. Indeed, 676's ambiguity neatly contributes to Orestes' disguise. After all, Orestes is an exiled prince concealing his royal identity. Both his journey to Argos on foot and the ambiguous comparison of his feet to a draft animal obscure his noble rank. This comment might even hint at Orestes' alienation from his paternal estate and standing. Line 676's ambivalence, then, plays with the established hippotrophic themes, allowing us (and, perhaps, Orestes) to recognize Orestes' latent nobility.[44]

Hence Orestes dismounts from a metaphoric chariot (or cart) before he enters his family's *oikos*. Moreover, right after he murders Clytemnestra

---

43 Incidentally, Orestes later says that because Night's chariot approaches, he would like to drop anchor in Argos (661–62), a conflation of chariot and ship imagery that has puzzled scholars (Garvie 1986.226, n. 660–62). We can now see, however, that it anticipates a similar conflation for Athena's entry in *Eum*. 403–05, and possibly even responds to the charioteer Agamemnon's role as Achaian *fleet* commander (for *Oresteia*'s unusual designation of Agamemnon as naval *hegemon*, see Rosenbloom 1995.106–08).

44 Orestes' metaphor also explains his later description of the restraints Clytemnestra used for Agamemnon's hands and feet. Orestes calls them "both manacles for his hands and a yoke/hobbles for his feet": πέδας τε χεροῖν καὶ ποδοῖν ξυνωρίδα (982). The noun ξυνωρίς normally means a pair of racing horses, but it probably means "yoke" here (Garvie 1986.321, n. 982), which recalls Orestes' yoked feet and parallels father and son. But this noun also creates an interesting reversal for Agamemnon: in *Ag*. 643, the racing horses Agamemnon and Menelaeus (ξυνωρίδα) destroy their soldiers; here, however, the term refers to Agamemnon's capture, degradation, and murder.

and Aegisthus, and as he begins to lose his mind, Orestes claims full responsibility for his actions, calling himself a charioteer whose wits, characterized as horses, are jerking him off the track to an unknown fate (1021–28):

> ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἂν εἰδῆτ᾽, οὐ γὰρ οἶδ᾽ ὅπηι τελεῖ,
> ὥσπερ ξὺν ἵπποις ἡνιοστροφῶ δρόμου
> ἐξωτέρω· φέρουσι γὰρ νικώμενον
> φρένες δύσαρκτοι, πρὸς δὲ καρδίαι φόβος
> ἄιδειν ἑτοῖμος ἠδ᾽ ὑπορχεῖσθαι κότωι.
> ἕως δ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἔμφρων εἰμί, κηρύσσω φίλοις
> κτανεῖν τέ φημι μητέρ᾽ οὐκ ἄνευ δίκης,
> πατροκτόνον μίασμα καὶ θεῶν στύγος.
>
> But I would have you know—indeed, I do not know how this will end,
> just like a charioteer, I am jerked off the track with my horses,
> for my rebellious wits carry me off, overwhelmed,
> and the fear before my heart is ready
> to sing and to dance about in its wrath—
> But while I am still sensible, I will proclaim publicly
> to my own: "I say that I killed my mother not without right,
> she who was a father-killing abomination and an object of hate before the gods."

Orestes' defining actions are framed by chariot metaphors. Like his father before him, Orestes "dismounts" from a car before entering his home, only now Agamemnon's killers become Orestes' victims. Following the matricide, Orestes likens himself to a charioteer in a bolting car—because his grip on his wits is loosening, and because his actions herald an uncertain future—before he runs off stage to Delphi.

Indeed, Orestes' ability to stay within his metaphoric chariot highlights a significant difference between the *hippotrophoi* Orestes, Agamemnon, Clytemnestra, and Aegisthus: the extent of their piety and restraint (Peradotto 1969.259–60). Agamemnon's arrogant, sacrilegious, and self-serving temperament makes him easy prey for Clytemnestra's manipulative speech, and once he appears on stage, his proclivities allow him to be lured out of his

chariot, beyond the dynamics of the figure. Likewise, Clytemnestra's false claims to justice and piety, her lust for power, and even Aegisthus's murderous weakness, keep both of them from legitimately or effectively co-opting Agamemnon's empty "chariot of state." Orestes, on the other hand, places his faith in Apollo's oracles, and so his actions do not deprive him of divine support as his fate unfolds. Although the repercussions of his act of matricide are unclear, he can still be said to struggle with his car as it careens between possibilities, as it were. Orestes' actions have not securely yoked him to a particular destiny. Noticeably, too, Orestes is not lured from his figurative vehicle by delusions of his own importance or by an overwhelming lust for power or vengeance. Even if Orestes does believe his actions to be justified, nevertheless, he understands the horror of his crime. His charioteering skills are being tested to the limit, but he has not wrecked his car yet.[45]

3. *Eumenides*

We have just compared the chariot imagery surrounding Agamemnon and Orestes in the first two plays of the *Oresteia*, and, in so doing, we have observed how hippotrophic imagery figures prominently in the representation of their piety, accountability, and relationship to the *lex talionis*. We have even noted how hippotrophic imagery is used to characterize Agamemnon's, Clytemnestra's, and Aegisthus's abuse of political power. With the restoration of Athena's chariot entrance in the *Eumenides*, however, we have the opportunity to discuss this imagery's development throughout the trilogy.

As we saw above, Clytemnestra's prayer in *Agamemnon* 341–44, which is preceded by multiple allusions to hippotrophic accoutrements, represents the *Oresteia*'s first completely developed chariot image. Specifically, Clytemnestra portrays the Greek army's *nostos* as a chariot race's final leg and predicts that the army's impious intemperance will deny them a safe return. But this thematic bundle does not just inform *Agamemnon*'s imagery; it represents one of the trilogy's chief metaphors for the *lex talionis*: Agamemnon expects that he will win this race, but his behavior suggests he

45 One remaining hippotrophic allusion might be found in v. 514: πυθέσθαι δ' οὐδέν ἐστ' ἔξω δρόμου. Since Orestes is seeking information, however, it can also be a hunting metaphor (see Garvie 1986.185, n. 514).

will not survive through the finish, and his arrival on stage, his *nostos*, is made on a chariot whose destructive valences rebound onto him. Likewise, when Aegisthus tries to replace Agamemnon as charioteer, his abuse of his trace horse dooms his *nostos*. In Clytemnestra's case, her adulterous attempt to destroy her old husband/home and create a new one, as well as her claim to represent divine justice, both end disastrously. Orestes' metaphoric car also signals a failed homecoming: his impious (yet pious!) act of matricide destroys the family and guarantees his exile (although his comparative lack of corruption allows him to struggle with his bolting car). Even the Erinyes characterize themselves as steeds, driven by Clytemnestra's reproaches as a charioteer lashes at his mount (*Eum*. 155–61). Granted, the Furies portray themselves as the injured party's horses (representatives), but this does not make them any less a part of the race. (Besides, we have also seen Agamemnon harnessed to metaphoric chariots and Orestes goaded to vengeance by fear of his father's spirit: *Ch*. 286–90.) And in their bloodlust for Orestes, the Erinyes "overstep even their bounds"; desiring to feast upon the purified, "technically innocent" Orestes, "they are the *kynes* glutting themselves on an unholy feast of the hare" (Zeitlin 1965.486).

Because of these various, impious desires, not one vengeful chariot will complete the course. *Oresteia*'s mortal charioteers lose the race because the code of vendetta's cyclic violence threatens their control of the car, indeed, their very lives. The Furies, however, do not so much lose the race as never see its end; their cosmic lot ensures that they are always on the move, perpetually driven to vengeance by the curses of the wronged dead. Athena's chariot, on the other hand, facilitates three successful *nostoi*. Of course, a journey to Athens is a *nostos* for Athena. But her arrival also means that Orestes will finally be able to return home (i.e., that mortals will no longer be driven from their homes by the Erinyes). Athena's chariot even precipitates one further, unexpected, *nostos*, that of the Furies. Before Orestes' trial, the Erinyes had no fixed home or cultic seat. After Athena's negotiation, however, the Furies, now the Eumenides, are incorporated into Athenian society as metic cult figures. In this way, the *Oresteia* relates the chariot-borne *nostos* to the dissipation of the *lex talionis* and the founding of a new, harmonious world order.

But the reinsertion of Athena's chariot entry also reveals the transitional function of Orestes' metaphoric car as it bridges the gap between the opposing socio-political systems represented by the chariots in *Agamemnon* and *Eumenides*. Indeed, the points of contact between the chariot entries or exits of each play are many, especially between the chariots of Agamemnon

and Athena. As we discussed above, Agamemnon's chariot is an artifact traditionally representative of wealth and nobility with especially negative overtones due to its narrative and Athenian context. This vehicle is later called a "wagon throne," an item reminiscent of that used by Xerxes during the Persian Wars. The enslaved, violated Cassandra stands beside him; she is his *geras*, the spear-prize awarded to aristocratic warrior-princes in heroic contexts as a sign of personal rank (Rosenbloom 1995.113–14). Agamemnon dismounts from the chariot and moves off stage into the *oikos,* where Clytemnestra exacts her questionable justice. In *Choephoroi*, Orestes dismounts from his metaphoric car (with his own aristocratic roots obscured), enters the *oikos*, commits matricide, and returns on stage to compare his wavering sanity to a charioteer barely restraining a bolting car. He next runs off stage towards Delphi and Athens to avoid the problematic justice of the Furies. For both Agamemnon and Orestes, then, the code of vengeance governing their actions and fates in the first two plays involves a chariot either literally or figuratively driving up to and out of the *oikos*, in this case, a palace. Hence the code of vendetta is identified with one-man rule and the palace, the site of monarchic, hereditary power. Noticeably, too, once Agamemnon moves off stage, his royal signifier, the chariot, remains on stage, empty. This empty car cries out that the king is dead. It also presents a cliffhanger ending: will the king be replaced? But, even more importantly, *should* he be replaced?

Does Agamemnon's chariot gain a new charioteer? Clytemnestra and Aegisthus attempt to fill the void as tyrants, but they are unfit to wield power over others. Agamemnon's heir, Orestes, is also a logical candidate, but, notably, he is never physically placed in a chariot. Additionally, when last we see the figurative charioteer Orestes, he is racing away from his ancestral home, a palace. To be sure, this metaphor of a bolting car neatly reflects the character's wavering mental state. Yet a figurative chariot and charioteer can also reflect the destabilization of the code of vendetta and the aristocentric political systems that practice it. Indeed, Orestes races his metaphoric chariot *away* from these very same socio-political systems and *towards* Delphi, a religious site that recommends and vindicates Orestes' ultimate destination: Athens, a democracy. The immateriality of Orestes' chariot could signal the (theoretical) end of monarchy, tyranny, and despotism as mortal institutions, i.e., the chariot, a signifier of hereditary, one-man, absolute power, is literally being removed from mortal possession.

Certainly, Orestes' spatial and symbolic movement away from aristocentric heredity-based rule to democracy could also allude to the

recent alliance between Argos and Athens in Aeschylus's contemporary world (Podlecki 1999.82–83). Whether or not this is the case, however, the symbol of the chariot, now removed from the mortal realm, physically reappears in Athena's hands at the trilogy's end, and when it does, the full impact of Agamemnon's earlier, despotic characterization is unveiled. The chariots of Agamemnon and Athena are responding images; Agamemnon's chariot of despotic corruption, impiety, and the *lex talionis* serves as a negative foil for Athena's chariot entry in *Eumenides*.

Both Athena and Agamemnon arrive in chariots from Troy; only Agamemnon is an impious, despotic, male mortal, a king who sacrilegiously accepts honors reserved for gods when he tramples the crimson tapestries, and whose notion of justice involves the perversion of religious ritual, the wanton destruction of his possessions, family, and people, sexual excess, and the desecration of temples. Athena, on the other hand, is a virginal goddess of wisdom, restraint, and civilization, a queen (ἄνασσα, *Eum*. 235, 288, 443) who heeds a suppliant's call as she is summoned to arbitrate a knotty legal case, that is, to establish a just means of handling severe internal disputes. Agamemnon yokes an originally unwilling trace horse (Odysseus) who cannot help him to return safely from Troy. Athena, on the other hand, yokes vigorous colts to her chariot to facilitate her (safe) return from the same site. Agamemnon arrives in his chariot with an ἐξαίρετον . . . δώρημα (*Ag*. 954–55), the violated, pathetic Cassandra, a spear-prize awarded to Agamemnon for his personal gratification and a sign of his princely rank. His chariot is later called a "wagon throne," like the vehicle used by Xerxes, an Eastern despot. Athena, on the other hand, arrives in a chariot with her own ἐξαίρετον δώρημα (*Eum*. 402) in tow (Podlecki 1989.164, n. 402; Rosenbloom 1995.113–14; Griffith 1995.99). She has been overseeing the just, equal allotment of Trojan land freely given to her and to the citizens of Athens in perpetuity. Athena's war spoils benefit the polis at large and do not aggrandize any one mortal over others.

Indeed, this parallel's implicit equation of Cassandra with Trojan territory suggests that the marriage imagery invoked by Agamemnon's chariot entrance might also inform Athena's chariot-borne announcement of Trojan lands freely given. But whereas Cassandra is an unwilling spear-prize who was never legally married to Agamemnon, Athena transforms this corrupted event into a positive one. Athena receives Trojan lands through a legal, mutually amenable, process of exchange. What is more, her decision to grant this land to her citizens draws her into the realm of marriage imagery and law, even subsuming her into the category of a (virginal) bride

to Athens.[46] In this case, the city receives her realms as a "dowry." Or Athena could be an *epikleros* to Trojan lands, i.e., these lands technically belong to her paternal *oikos*, but since Zeus is unavailable to rule mortal realms directly, Athena transfers the land to ("marries"?) Athens. Either way, the city of Athens becomes related to Zeus by "marriage."

But the parallel between Cassandra and Trojan territory is not the only reason to suspect that Athena's entry toys with marriage imagery. This reading is further corroborated by *Agamemnon* 341–44, our first fully explicated chariot image, which tells us that Agamemnon's failure to successfully negotiate his chariot race's final turn is attributable to ἔρως (341), desire—a desire to touch inviolable objects, to be sure, but desire nonetheless. Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia, an event motivated by his lust for power and rife with incestuous overtones, is just one example of his perverted desire (an example that, not coincidentally, also falls under the rubric of "violating things that ought not to be violated while overcome by greed": *Ag*. 342). Hence Agamemnon's arrival on stage with the unfortunate Cassandra merely culminates (and reifies) his established pattern of destructive desires, as it also mocks traditional marriage iconography.[47]

The pointed association of Agamemnon's *nostos* with corrupted ἔρως, then, supports reading Athena's chariot entry with an eye to Agamemnon's inappropriate desire: while Agamemnon's chariot reflects a selfish, destructive ἔρως that *dissolves* bonds within and between *oikoi* and countries, Athena's selfless distribution of land (and honor) to all Athenians makes her a bride who promotes bonds within *oikoi* (each home receives her dowry), between *oikoi* (no one home benefits more than another or at another's expense, so strife is avoided), and between countries (Athens and "Troy"). But also notably, the charioteer bride Athena reverses and heals the "twofold blow" dealt to the polis by Agamemnon and Menelaus, the bloody team of Ares (*Ag*. 640–43) that drove men to perish in war's προτελείοις (initial clash of spears/preliminary marriage rites, *Ag*. 65).

Athena's gift of land to Athens in perpetuity, then, is a transaction analogous to marriage. But paradoxically, her virginity is highlighted for

---

46 I would like to thank an anonymous reader for suggesting that I pursue a reading of Athena as a "bride to Athens," a suggestion whose results have tremendously influenced this section.

47 Aegisthus and Clytemnestra also lose their lives because of their adulterous desires (not to mention Clytemnestra's other perversions, see *Ag*. 1388–92, 1446–47).

this same reason. Notably, she emphasizes her paternally aligned and *unmarried* status as she casts her vote for Orestes: "I shall add this vote for Orestes' benefit, for there is no mother who gave birth to me and I approve the male principle in all things and with all my heart—except in the matter of marriage, and [I] am very much my father's child" (*Eum*. 735–38; Podlecki 1989.109). Athena's virginity forever aligns her with Zeus, but it also makes her perpetually supportive of Athenian interests. Athena is effectively virginal *and* a bride, allowing Athens to claim her dowry and protection without fear of future, competing claims. The above reading neither supports nor disproves the debate as to whether Athena's comments address the dispute between Athens and Mytilene over Sigeum.[48] It does, however, suggest that the Athenian governance of these lands is divinely condoned, a proposition with interesting implications for the justification of Athenian empire (Griffith 1995.99, n. 125). In fact, as I shall argue below, with this statement, Athena effectively binds together the two concepts of justice through a law court system (which is analogous to democracy) and the legitimized fifth-century Athenian possession of mythologized Trojan land (possibly a mythically justified Athenian empire).

After Athena arrives on stage (in Athens' and Troy's "wedding" car?) and apprises herself of the situation, both the Furies and Orestes agree to let her arbitrate their case. At this point, in contrast with the vengeful actions of the *Oresteia*'s mortal *hippotrophoi*, all of whom serve as personal judges, juries, and executioners for the alleged wrongdoer, the *hippotrophos* Athena drives her chariot off stage to Athens to locate a panel of jurors, i.e., to found a democratic law court system. (Nothing indicates that Athena would have dismounted during the previous exchange, and scholars generally agree that she exits at 489 to Athens: Taplin 1977.390, Sommerstein 1989.171, Podlecki 1989.170, n. 489.) Her controlled chariot departure also neatly culminates the progression we have seen from *Agamemnon*, where the empty chariot remained on stage (a sign of socio-political chaos), to *Choephoroi,* where Orestes erratically flees in a metaphoric, bolting chariot (a sign of indeterminacy), to *Eumenides*, where Athena, a goddess of ordered civilization, calmly drives a physical chariot (a symbol of civilization) off to Athens.

---

48 Dodds 1973.47: "Whether there were any contemporary goings-on in Chalcidice, where also Athena might have been (295 f.), or in the Troad, where she actually was (398), I do not know; the supposition can be neither proved nor ruled out"; Podlecki 1989.164.

Athena drives her chariot to the polis, not a palatial *oikos*, where she collects Athens' best citizens—note the status-neutral superlative τὰ βέλτατα (*Eum.* 488), not the aristocratically identified adjective ἄριστος[49]—to create a law court. Although I have no wish to downplay the importance of the Areopagus debate for this play, I concur with those who argue that the formation of a law court invites the audience to infer the establishment of democracy, not just the Areopagus court.[50] Even so, the importance of hippotrophic imagery to Athena's civilizing gift could also be an inclusive gesture that rehabilitates the Areopagus court's aristocratic, exclusivist associations and smoothes over any possible ill will resulting from Ephialtes' reforms. In this case, the *Eumenides*' ambiguously defined Areopagus court, founded by the *hippotrophos* Athena and analogous to her famed, hippotrophic civilizing technologies, celebrates both democracy and the importance of a legal institution essentially comprised of *hippeis*.[51] And just as Athenian democracy needs both the lower and the upper classes to function smoothly, so, too, does Athena the *hippotrophos* find a productive role for her poor cousins, the Erinyes, while keeping the aristocratic Olympians firmly in charge.[52] (The Erinyes are not *hippotrophoi*.[53] Indeed, as we saw earlier, they

---

49 Rose 1992.247–48: "As is clear from repeated addresses and references throughout the play (*Eu.* 566, 638, 681, 807, 854, 911, 927, 948, 997, 1010) . . . the judges are consistently represented as the *whole people* of Athens . . . In particular, the responses of the litigants . . . insist that the court stands directly for the whole Athenian people" (248). Dodds 1973 also notes the status neutral phrase τὰ βέλτατα, and adds that the scene's democratic/egalitarian atmosphere is underscored by King Theseus's absence, Athena's participation in the court's formation, and the fact that the members of the jury are anonymous. See also Taplin 1977.390.

50 Macleod 1982.127; Rose 1992.246: "The Athenian audience is invited to infer their democracy from the new institution established during the play, the court of the Areiopagos." Rose also suggests that, in light of the possible democratic reforms made by Ephialtes and his "followers," "Aeschylus, in making the Areiopagos in this role emblematic of the new democracy, is engaging in just the sort of political tact, or cooptation, that Athena engages in when she transforms the hostile Erinyes into the supportive Eumenides. Tactical ambiguity is the essential feature of this strategy" (247). That Athena's democratic chariot co-opts the values of an aristocratically identified artifact further supports this reading.

51 Members of the Areopagus court were drawn from the top two property classes (the *hippeis* and the *pentekosiomedimnoi*). Since the *hippeis* possessed the minimum property qualification for membership, all members of the Areopagus were "knights," or *hippotrophoi*.

52 Granted, the Erinyes are incorporated as metics, but the class distinction important to their characterization could also relate to relationships between groups of Athenian citizens.

53 As poor cousins to Olympian royalty, they lack access to accoutrements of privilege like horses and chariots. See Griffith 1995.101: "In addition to being female, ugly, and

complain that the newer gods "trample them down with their horses," καθιππάζομαι, 150, 731, and 779—an image that directly ties the *Oresteia*'s arc of hippotrophic imagery to the foundation of a law court system.) In sum, Athena the *hippotrophos* rehabilitates the negative valences tied to the hippotrophic practices and implements used by Agamemnon, Clytemnestra, and Aegisthus. Athena even co-opts the hero's *geras* and "redistributes" it amongst Athenians at large to symbolize the foundation (and principles) of democratic order. Athena's chariot does not signify the exclusivist, community-devouring powers of corrupt aristocrats but a divinely condoned and founded democratic community in which all classes work together for the greater good.

III. CONCLUSION

Eumenides, then, creates a democratic model of this hippotrophic figure to supplant the monarchic/despotic and tyrannical models presented in *Agamemnon*. This transformation is accomplished first by having *Agamemnon* exaggerate and amplify the negative associations already in place for the fifth-century Athenian reading of the *hippotrophos*'s aristocentric, exclusivist valences. In *Agamemnon*, the charioteer and his (or her) chariot exemplify the maxim that the absolute power of one-man (or one-woman) rule corrupts absolutely. After stripping the figure from its mortal monarchic/despotic and tyrannical contexts in *Choephoroi*, however, the figure is once again allowed to represent the legitimate, heritable, and cosmologically justified possession of socio-political power, only now this possession is transferred to a goddess, Athena, who makes all Athenian citizens her sanctioned representatives. Queen Athena's chariot vindicates Athenian empire and ennobles Athens' democracy, as it also implicitly validates the powers and privileges of the Athenian elite (the "good aristocrats" who work with and for the people, not for personal gain: Griffith 1995).

What does this figurative reprogramming accomplish? In its immediate narrative context, Athena's chariot completes a typically Aeschylean

---

barbarous, the Erinyes are presented in this third play as socially disadvantaged, even déclassées." Certainly the rare verb καθιππάζομαι conjures up images of pedestrians being run down by mounted aristocrats: Sommerstein 1989.110, n. 150; Podlecki 1989.142, n. 150. Again, Griffith adds that some trace the Erinyes' origins to a horse divinity (1995.101, n. 26).

transformation: chariots move from initially representing the corruption inherent in retributive violence (and one-man rule) to representing the justice inherent in arbitration (and democracy). Athena's chariot also helps to mythologize the foundation of Athenian democracy and contributes to the text's message that mortal democracy is the logical culmination of Olympian cosmology. In a larger, historical context, *Eumenides* provides a striking, Athenian revision of an aristocratic configuration in use throughout Greece. What once represented lawful, mortal monarchic/aristocratic power, now symbolizes a just, divinely condoned democratic empire. Athena's chariot could also symbolically resolve (i.e., explain and justify) the paradox inherent in the concept of a democratic empire, the rule of many city-states by one democratic city-state. Indeed, the *Oresteia*'s transformative strategy suggests that, unlike the despotic Agamemnon (or *Persai*'s Xerxes), Athens will succeed in "wedding" West with East under its intrinsically superior, uncorrupted, and civilizing style of government. Athena's chariot entrance, then, is far more than a question of props and tragic convention. Athena's chariot entrance is further evidence that Attic tragedy may have been reacting to the earlier mythological and epic tradition.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, D., and A. E. Hanson. 1986. "Two Notes on Greek Tragedy," *BICS* 33.97–100.

Arnott, P. 1962. *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B.C.* Westport.

Arthur, M. B. 1984. "Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude Towards Women," in *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers*. J. Peradotto and J. P. Sullivan, eds. Albany. 7–58.

Barrett, W. S. 1964. *Euripides:* Hippolytos. Oxford.

Brenne, S. 1994. "Ostraka and the Process of Ostrakophoria," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, W. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. Shear Jr., H. Shapiro, and F. Frost, eds. Oxbow Monograph 37.13–24.

Conacher, D. J. 1987. *Aeschylus's Oresteia: A Literary Commentary*. Toronto.

Clinton, K. 1994. "The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in Democratic Athens," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy*, W. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. Shear Jr., H. Shapiro, and F. Frost, eds. Oxbow Monograph 37.161–72.

Davies, J. K. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. Salem, N.H.

Denniston, J. D., and D. Page. 1957. *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon. Oxford.

Detienne, M. 1968. "Remarques sur le char en Grèce," in *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne,* J.-P. Vernant, ed. Paris. 313–18.

Dodds, E. R. 1973. "Morals and Politics in the *Oresteia*," in *The Ancient Concept of Progress and Other Essays on Greek Literature and Belief*. Oxford. 45–63.

Donlan, W. 1980. *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece.* Lawrence, Kansas.

Fagles, R. (trans.) 1966. *Aeschylus: The Oresteia*. New York.

Forde, S. 1989. *The Ambition to Rule: Alcibiades and the Politics of Imperialism in Thucydides*. Ithaca.

Fraenkel, E. 1950. *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon. Oxford.

Garvie, A. F. 1986. *Aeschylus:* Choephoroi. Oxford.

Goheen, R. F. 1955. "Aspects of Dramatic Symbolism: Three Studies in the *Oresteia*," *AJP* 76.113–37.

Gomme, A. W., A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover. 1970. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Oxford.

Gribble, D. 1999. *Alcibiades and Athens*. Oxford.

Griffith, M. 1995. "Brilliant Dynasts: Power and Politics in the *Oresteia*," *CA* 14.62–129.

Hammond, N. G. L. 1972. "The Conditions of Dramatic Production to the Death of Aeschylus," *GRBS* 13.387–450.

Hayashi, T. 1992. *Bedeutung und Wandel des Triptolemosbildes vom 6.–4. Jh. v. Chr.* Würzburg.

Hermann, J. G. J. 1852. *Eumenides*. Leipzig.

Hornblower, S. 1987. *Thucydides*. London.

Hutchinson, G. O. 1985. *Aeschylus:* Septem Contra Thebas. Oxford.

Italie, G. 1955. *Index Aeschyleus*. Leiden.

Jenkins, I. 1983. "Is There Life After Marriage? A Study of the Abduction Motif in Vase Paintings of the Athenian Wedding Ceremony," *BICS* 30.137–47.

Just, R. 1989. *Women in Athenian Law and Life*. London.

Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.

———. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton.

Lebeck, A. 1971. *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.

Lesky, A. 1983. *Greek Tragic Poetry* (trans. M. Dillon). New Haven.

Lissarrague, F. 1992. "Figures of Women," in *A History of Women in the West*, P. Pantel, ed.; A. Goldhammer, trans. Cambridge, Mass. 143–229.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. "The Guilt of Agamemnon," in *Greek Tragedy: Modern Essays in Criticism*, E. Segal, ed. New York. 57–72.

Macleod, C. W. 1982. "Politics and the Oresteia," *JHS* 102.124–44.

Nauck, A. 1926^2. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.

Oakley, J., and R. Sinos (eds.) 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. Madison.

Page, D. L. 1972. *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoediae*. Oxford.

Paley, F. A. 1879. *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*. London.

Peradotto, J. 1969. "The Omen of the Eagles and the ΗΘΟΣ of Agamemnon," *Phoenix* 23.237–63.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1946. *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*. Oxford.

Podlecki, A. 1986. "Polis and Monarch in Early Attic Tragedy," in *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, J. Euben, ed. Berkeley. 76–100.

———. 1989. *Aeschylus:* Eumenides. Warminster.

———. 1999^2. *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy*. London.

Rehm, R. 1994. *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.

de Romilly, J. 1995. *Alcibiade, ou les dangers de l'ambition*. Paris.

Rose, P. W. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth*. Ithaca.

Rosenbloom, D. 1995. "Myth, History, and Hegemony in Aeschylus," *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama*. B. Goff, ed. Austin. 91–130.

Seaford, R. 1987. "The Tragic Wedding," *JHS* 107.106–30.

Seager, R. 1967. "Alcibiades and the Charge of Aiming at Tyranny," *Historia* 16.6–18.

Sinos, R. 1998. "Divine Selection: Epiphany and Politics in Archaic Greece," in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds. Oxford. 73–91.

Sommerstein, A. 1989. *The Eumenides*. Cambridge.

Starr, C. 1977. *The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800–500 B.C.* Oxford.

———. 1992. *The Aristocratic Temper of Ancient Greece*. Oxford.

Taplin, O. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford.
Thompson, D. B. 1956. "The Persian Spoils in Athens," in *The Aegean and the Near East: Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman on the Occasion of her Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, S. Weinberg, ed. New York. 281–91.
Vellacot, P. 1984. *The Logic of Tragedy*. Durham.
Vernant, J.-P., and P. Vidal-Naquet. 1990. *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (trans. J. Lloyd). New York.
Verrall, A. W. 1908. *The* Eumenides *of Aeschylus*. London.
Wakefield, G. 1794. *Tragoediarum Delectus*. London.
Weil, H. 1861. *Eumenides*. Giessen.
West, M. L. 1990. *Aeschylus Tragoediae*. Stuttgart.
Whallon, W. 1958. "The Serpent at the Breast," *TAPA* 89.271–75.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. 1910. *Einleitung in die Griechische Tragödie*. Berlin.
———. 1914. *Aeschyli Tragoediae*. Berlin.
Willink, C. W. 1986. *Euripides:* Orestes. Oxford.
Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1983. *Studies in Aeschylus*. Cambridge.
Wohl, V. 1998. *Intimate Commerce: Exchange, Gender, and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy*. Austin.
Zeitlin, F. 1965. "The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus's *Oresteia*," *TAPA* 96.463–508.
———. 1984. "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*," in *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers*, J. Peradotto and J. P. Sullivan, eds. Albany. 159–94.