

instances in Attic inscriptions down to *circa* 100 B.C. where forms of the verb are spelled with iota and forty-nine instances where they are spelled without it.

Having now corrected the two iota-less readings that Kirchner printed in *IG* II². 774, I was curious to see how many, if any, published Athenian decrees from *s. III* a. (the century of *IG* II². 774) reveal occurrences of ποιέω without iota. Of the fourteen spellings of ποιέω that I found in the decrees (excluding restorations and substantives derived from the verb, but including the readings in lines 7, 16, and 20 of *IG* II². 774), twelve

were with iota and significantly only two were without iota.

IG II². 774, therefore, like most published Athenian decrees from *s. III* a., maintains a scribal consistency in the spelling of forms of ποιέω. The large majority of Athenian inscriptions in this category constitutes an important exception to the *usus duplex* that Lademann detected in his over-all survey of Attic inscriptions and their spellings of ποιέω.

BLAISE NAGY

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, BOSTON

AESCHYLUS *AGAMEMNON* 513–14

τοὺς τ' ἀγωνίους θεοὺς / πάντας προσαυδῶ

None of the interpretations offered of the expression ἀγώνιοι θεοί in this passage is wholly satisfactory. Denniston and Page¹ list three interpretations and object to all of them. They finally decide in favor of “gods of the Assembly” (ἀγών occurs with its Homeric sense in line 845), though they admit Fraenkel’s objection that passages in the *Supplices*² make this meaning most improbable. Fraenkel himself³ adopts the meaning “gods in assembly,” i.e., the assembled gods. This fits the *Supplices* passages, since there the gods’ images are assembled on the πᾶγος. In the *Agamemnon*, however, they are not assembled in view, nor are we supposed to imagine their images present.⁴ With Fraenkel’s interpretation, then, we should apparently have to take “assembled” as meaning “if they were assembled,” or simply “all” the gods. But this would then make πάντας redundant—and the fact that this is poetry does not really excuse the pleonasm.

There is, however, another possible meaning, which may have been dismissed too

hastily. In the passages elsewhere in which the meaning of ἀγώνιος is quite certain, it can only mean “concerned with the ἀγῶνες,” in the sense of “games” or “contests.” Thus Pindar describes Hermes as ἀγώνιος in this context,⁵ and when the adjective does not refer to a god it refers to prizes in the games.⁶ The same meaning is clear in Plato *Laws* 783A, as it is in Sophocles *Trachiniae* 26. This is why most ancient commentators explained our passage as “the gods presiding over the games.” But the word ἀγών, like our “contest,” was ambiguous in another respect: it could mean “contest,” but it could also be used as a metaphor for “battle.” There is one example of this use in classical tragedy. In Sophocles *Trachiniae* 26, Ζεὺς ἀγώνιος decides the outcome of the contest between Acheloüs and Heracles, but this is an ἀγών μάχης (*Trach.* 20). The metaphor is common elsewhere.⁷ This secondary meaning of ἀγών has been generally overlooked by commentators,⁸ but that is not surprising, as there was at least one occasion in ancient times when it was similarly overlooked.

1. *Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1957), p. 119.

2. Especially *Supp.* 189.

3. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, II (Oxford, 1950), 260–63.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 262.

5. *Isthm.* 1. 60.

6. *Isthm.* 4. 7; cf. also *Ol.* 10. 63.

7. For other battle ἀγῶνες see Hdt. 8. 3. 2, 142. 2, *et al.*; Thuc. 2. 89. 8, *et al.*

8. One exception is Fraenkel, who describes this interpretation as “obviously arbitrary” and attributes it to Hermann. But Hermann says “Dii ἀγώνιοι propriè sunt gubernatores certaminum . . . ideo potissimum invocantur, ut victoriam praebeant”—the meaning as in, e.g., *Trach.* 26.

According to Herodotus (9. 33), Tisameneus, an Elean, was told by the Delphic oracle that he would win five great ἀγῶνες. He thereupon entered for the Olympic Games and managed to come second in the wrestling, but was otherwise unsuccessful. The Spartans, however, then realized that the oracle had referred οὐκ ἐς γυμνικοὺς ἀλλ' ἐς ἀρηίους ἀγῶνας, and persuaded Tisameneus to become their military commander. He did so, and they were duly successful in five battles.

If we now return to our passage with ἀγῶνες μάχης in mind, the appropriateness of ἀγῶνιοι θεοί is striking. The messenger

9. Admittedly, Hermes is next invoked, but that is specifically in his capacity as κῆρυξ, as in *Supp.* 220–21.

returning from Troy calls upon “the gods of battle,” by which he would presumably mean those who took a particular part in the Trojan War. He mentions two by name: Zeus and Apollo, perhaps the two most prominent in the battles related by Homer—and indeed he describes Apollo here as τόξοις ἰάπτων μηκέτ' εἰς ἡμᾶς βέλη (510).⁹ In the *Agamemnon*, then, the meaning, “the gods of battle,” fits the context better than its rivals and is, I suggest, free from the difficulties that other interpretations face.

NICHOLAS REED

LONDON

COMMUNICATION ON *L'ANNÉE PHILOLOGIQUE*

Volume XLIII (1972) of *L'Année philologique* was not published until September, 1974, with a delay of three months in projected time of publication beyond that of the preceding volume. It also had 110 additional pages. Growth of this magnitude is due principally to the steady increase in the number of journals covered and proliferation of *acta* of congresses and colloquia, of honorary collections and miscellanies; but it poses a serious problem for those responsible for the timely appearance of bibliography. The task of abstracting and indexing on cards original articles, books, and reviews requires more time, and the abundance of material so assembled has repercussions as well upon the time needed to compile the indexes. These, of course, can be undertaken only when the volume is in proof. Considering that a bibliography renders the greatest service to its users by appearing regularly, without delay, and in a single, easily manageable volume, the directors of the three offices of *L'Année philologique*, in Paris, Chapel Hill, and Heidelberg, have decided, with the approval of M. P. Wuilleumier, administrator of the Société internationale de Bibliographie classique, to take the following measures:

(1) In order to avoid prolonged repetition, occasionally in ten successive volumes, of the

title of a book which is reviewed again and again, notation of reviews which appear more than five years after the date of publication of the book will be discontinued. Exceptions will inevitably have to be made for certain long and important reviews. This step will be taken in Volume XLIV (1973), which will appear in 1975.

(2) As students of the Old and New Testament have at their disposal the excellent and exhaustive *Elenchus bibliographicus Biblicus* of Father P. Nober, *L'Année philologique* will reduce its coverage in this area to a single rubric, “Testamenta,” which will include editions of Greek and Latin texts, research tools, and studies relating to the language of the Testaments, including the Apocrypha. The rubric, “Publications relatives aux manuscrits de la Mer Morte,” will be discontinued, beginning with Volume XLV (1974), which will appear in 1976.

These measures were unanimously approved by the members of the Société internationale de Bibliographie classique, at their quinquennial meeting, held in Madrid, on September 1, 1974. The committee considers it worthwhile to draw the attention of the users of *L'Année philologique* and the editors of journals of classical studies to the consequences of these measures. It observes, furthermore, that very short notes are occasionally published, as if to fill out the bottom of a page, or that a number of such notes, of diverse nature, are often grouped