

SOME PROBLEMS IN THE *EUMENIDES* OF AESCHYLUS

In preparing an article on the Erinyes in the *Oresteia*, to be published in *JHS* 1983, I found it necessary to define my attitude to a number of subsidiary issues (whether or not I felt able to solve them). I shall discuss some of these issues here, under two general headings, by way of preface to the main article.¹

I. THE STAGING OF THE OPENING SCENE

I wish to consider three questions: when and how the chorus appears, where Apollo enters, and whether Apollo is accompanied by Hermes.

Most scholars have supposed that the chorus, or some of it, is seen by the audience immediately after the Pythia's second exit at 63. Oliver Taplin, however, in his admirable book on Aeschylus, has argued that none of the chorus becomes visible until 140, immediately before the Parodos.² His first argument for this later entry is that we have only one parallel, namely Euripides' *Supp.*, for the chorus's presence in the orchestra well before its first song. True enough, but how many parallels do we need? There are only three extant tragedies in which the chorus is so much a party to the action that its silent presence could possess some dramatic point; two of these are *Eum.* and Euripides' *Supp.*, and the third is Aeschylus' *Supp.*, which, since it begins with the Parodos, cannot affect the issue either way. So the anomaly, such as it is, will merely be a by-product of the totally anomalous character of the chorus of *Eum.*;³ one could just as well point out that this is the *only* extant tragedy in which the chorus is addressed before its first song in an extended rhesis.

Taplin's other argument is that delay would heighten suspense and would therefore increase the dramatic impact of the chorus's entry when it finally occurred. But delay does not always heighten suspense; it can also dissipate it, and, while this is a matter of subjective judgement, it seems to me evident that it would have the latter effect here. It is the Pythia's long description of the Furies at 46–59 that first arouses the audience's expectation of seeing them and its fear for the immediate safety of Orestes. If Orestes then enters at 64 under the direct protection of Apollo and *not* surrounded by the Furies, the tension will inevitably relax. And it will relax still further when he leaves at 93 under the protection of Hermes and with the Furies apparently no longer pursuing.

It is true that the Ghost Scene directs our attention back to the Furies' presence, but I find it impossible to debate whether this would raise the tension once more to, or beyond, its earlier level, since the scene seems to me virtually unplayable if the Furies are still concealed. Taplin does, indeed, recognise the difficulty here (366 f.), but it is surely greater than he realises. Either the ghost of Clytemnestra will have to be on stage and thus separated from the chorus whom she addresses, or the whole scene will have to be played within the skene out of sight of the audience. Faced with the former staging, which Taplin prefers, the audience will inevitably ask *why* the ghost remains outside the temple. Her only purpose in coming is to arouse the Furies in a dream, and the Homeric formula for such dream visitations (used, for instance, of the ghost of Patroclus in a passage which is reasonably thought to have influenced Aeschylus here) is $\sigma\tau\eta\delta' \alpha\rho' \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$

¹ I am most grateful to Mrs P. E. Easterling and Dr A. F. Garvie for generous help.

² *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford 1977) 369–74, with references to earlier discussions. (References to Taplin are to this book unless otherwise stated.) Taplin's view has now been accepted by S. Melchinger, *Die Welt als Tragödie I* (Munich 1979) 349.

³ The treatment of the chorus as a major party to the action, which we find in *Supp.* and *Eum.*, is likely to be a bold experiment rather than a survival from archaic

tragedy; see A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilog* (Cambridge 1969) 106–20. And certainly the non-human and unsympathetic character of the chorus of *Eum.* rules out most of the normal functions of a tragic chorus. There *may* always have been precedents in lost plays, but few known titles offer any scope for them; that the Phorkides (three in number by all accounts) could have formed the chorus of the play named after them (Garvie 114 n. 8) seems most improbable.

κεφαλῆς.⁴ At one place (*Od.* iv 802, 838) an εἶδωλον feels such need to stand beside the dreamer that it enters and leaves her bedroom by the keyhole; similarly at *PV* 645 f. Io talks of dreams πωλεύμεναι ἐς παρθενώνας τοὺς ἐμούς. The dream figure is imagined as standing where the dreamer would be able to see it if his eyes were open, and this enables his sleeping mind to see it even though his eyes are shut;⁵ this seems, indeed, to be what is said in *Eum.* 104, for if the line is genuine⁶ it must mean that the sleeping mind sees clearly with eyes of its own. In any case the previous line, whatever its exact text,⁷ is surely an instruction to the Furies to look at Clytemnestra's wounds, and so makes it clear that they *can* see her and not just hear her; and unless she is actually standing in the doorway⁸—an absurdly awkward device that would only draw still more attention to the dramatist's difficulties—Taplin's preferred staging gives them no means of doing so. Nor can it be said that the ghost's separation from the Furies has the slightest dramatic significance, so the audience will be forced to conclude that Aeschylus's reason for staging the scene in this contrived way was simply that he could not think of a means of bringing the chorus on earlier. He thus stands convicted of incompetent dramaturgy, although this is clearly far from Taplin's intention.

But the dramaturgy is still more incompetent if the whole scene is played off stage and simply overheard, so to speak, by the audience. Taplin admits that there is no parallel, and this time we are badly in need of one. He, of all people, can hardly need to be told that a dramatist who is writing for the theatre and not for radio and who wishes to hold the attention of his audience must make full use of the visual resources of his medium. One might think this particularly true of Aeschylus, who does not normally depict events that are not open to public view, and particularly true of scenes involving supernatural beings, whose appearance must possess great interest for an audience. Again, Taplin claims that such a staging 'might be rather effective', but surely no staging device will be effective unless it *means* something. And this device, like that of separating ghost and Furies, means nothing except that Aeschylus could not find a way of bringing his performers on stage at the proper time.

A final point against the later entry is provided by line 67, where Taplin claims that ὄρᾱς could mean 'you understand'; perhaps it could, but, since this is not the natural translation,⁹ the need to resort to such a shift cannot strengthen Taplin's case.¹⁰

It seems to me almost certain, then, that the chorus are somehow revealed to the audience after 63. But this 'somehow' conceals a difficulty: how are the chorus to be revealed while they are still asleep? We ought not, perhaps, to rule out absolutely some device, such as a curtained porch,¹¹ which is otherwise unknown to us, for, if a particular device existed in the first half of

⁴ *Il.* ii 20, xxiii 68 (Patroclus); *Od.* iv 803, vi 21; cf. *Il.* x 496. Similarly ἐπιστῆναι is regularly used of dream figures in Herodotus and elsewhere; see E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1951) 105.

⁵ See A. H. M. Kessels, *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature* (Utrecht 1978) 162.

⁶ The difficulty comes not in 104 but in 105, a line which is hardly translatable as it stands (even with ἀπρόσκοπος) and seems to imply that the chorus are βροτοί. But to delete 105 alone, with Prien, leaves 104 looking uncomfortably isolated. I am inclined to retain both lines, reading Hermann's φρενῶν (ἢ τῆς φρενός μοῖρα schol. M) for βροτῶν, despite the repetition, and regarding 105 as 'foil antithesis' to the main point in 104.

⁷ If 104 f. are retained, then καρδία σέθεν must be retained also, to motivate these lines. Only if both 104 and 105 are deleted should Hermann's ὄρατε . . . καρδίας ὄθεν be read (because καρδίαι σέθεν is barely intelligible without the explanation in 104, and because of the plural verb in 106).

⁸ So apparently G. Hermann, *Opuscula* vi (Leipzig

1835) 2.163; R. M. Hickman, *Ghostly Etiquette on the Classical Stage* (Cedar Rapids 1938) 32.

⁹ Hermann *loc. cit.* (n. 8) perhaps did better in claiming that 'You see, they're asleep' can naturally be said to someone who has just seen them. (The word νῦν cannot be pressed hard, since it may simply serve to contrast the particular instance in 67 with the general statement in 64–6.) But one would still expect the audience to be able to see what Apollo is pointing out.

¹⁰ I agree with Taplin, on the other hand, that no weight can be given to the schol. on 64 or to other secondary evidence; also that μαντικῶν μυθῶν at 180 must refer to the whole precinct and not to the interior of the temple. Nor can the Italian vase paintings of Orestes and the sleeping Furies provide even slight evidence that the scene was shown on stage, seeing that some of these vases also depict Orestes' purification.

¹¹ For a curtain see A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford 1946) 128–30. He reasonably concludes that it is not required in any of the scenes he discusses, but not that it is impossible.

the fifth century and then fell into disuse, could we expect to hear of it? The *Oresteia* contains, however, two scenes (*Ag.* 1372 ff. and *Cho.* 973 ff.) in which corpses are revealed to the audience, and these scenes so far resemble the scenes in later tragedy for which the ekkyklema seems typically to have been used¹² that they create, in my view (despite the doubts of Taplin¹³), a strong presumption that the device was available in 458. And if it was available, there must be a strong presumption that it was used whenever an interior scene had to be revealed, even if this scene was *not* of a typical kind.

Most scholars have assumed, however, that the ekkyklema could not have supported an entire chorus, so that, if it was used in *Eum.*, only a token few choreutae could have been revealed on it, the rest joining them through the door of the skene at 143. But Taplin can reasonably object that this is a distinctly unsatisfactory compromise. The chorus is a single, united body which ought not to be split up in this way, and the demands of *ἐκπληξίς* will not be well served if it is. If Aeschylus was forced to adopt such an expedient in production, it will be difficult to absolve him of a charge of demanding as *ποιητής* a scenic effect which he could not properly carry out as *διδάσκαλος*.

I prefer to make the more daring claim that, after all, the whole chorus did appear on the ekkyklema. T. B. L. Webster¹⁴ puts the size of the platform at not more than ten feet by six; this is based on the amount of room available in the Periclean theatre, but allows some 'room for manoeuvring inside the scene building', which is perhaps unnecessary. If, however, we accept the estimate of ten feet by six for the sake of argument, this does in fact seem sufficient space for twelve, or even fifteen, choreutae sitting on chairs¹⁵ together with Orestes and a representation of the Omphalos (for Apollo and Hermes see below).¹⁶ It is true that they would be cramped in a way that would seem comic *to us*, but then any use of the ekkyklema would probably seem comic *to us*: in matters of scenic convention the reactions of a modern audience can be no guide. A more serious objection is that the ekkyklema is nowhere else required to be as large as this or to bear so much weight,¹⁷ but here again we must remember that no other tragedy has a chorus that reasonably *could* be brought on in this way. Once we have swallowed, as we must, the wholly exceptional nature of the chorus of *Eum.* (n. 3 above), we need not strain at any gnats that may draw their life-blood from this particular camel. And I do not see why a specially enlarged and strengthened ekkyklema should not have been built for a single production; the expense would presumably not have been great, and certainly there would have been no technological difficulty for fifth-century craftsmen. This solution may not satisfy everyone, but, if it is accepted that the staging of any Greek play must be determined on the evidence of its text, a revelation of the whole chorus after 63 does seem to be what the text of *Eum.* indicates.

¹² I am assuming that Sophocles and Euripides did use the ekkyklema to reveal interior scenes, though even this is by no means undisputed; to Taplin's references (442 f.) add (in favour) S. Melchinger, *Das Theater der Tragödie* (Munich 1974) 192–4; H.-D. Blume, *Einführung in das antike Theaterwesen* (Darmstadt 1978) 67–9.

¹³ He accepts the device in Sophocles and Euripides but questions it in Aeschylus (325–7, 357, 442 f.). The only solid reason that he gives for these doubts is that the revelations in *Ag.* and *Cho.* are not signalled by any words about the doors being opened, such as tend to be found when the ekkyklema is used in later tragedy. But it would not be uncharacteristic of Aeschylus to be less explicit than Sophocles and Euripides in such a matter; cf. Taplin 280: 'Perhaps he [Aeschylus] thought it unnecessary to clarify entrances and exits from the new skene door . . .; though in that case he was not followed in this by Sophocles and Euripides.' The words about doors being opened are surely not required to explain the ekkyklema (it would have been understood well enough if it had been used even once before) but are a

matter of convention, which might have taken time to become established. Anyway, why should the use of stagehands to carry out the bodies (which is what Taplin favours) require any less explanation?

¹⁴ *Greek Theatre Production*² (London 1970) 9.

¹⁵ The chairs (line 47) are a curious detail, and one which the vase paintings of this scene understandably omit. It is tempting to explain them in terms of the staging of the tableau, as ensuring that the masks of the sleeping Furies are clearly visible, or even as saving space on the ekkyklema, since a body on a chair takes up less room than one lying on the ground.

¹⁶ If a seated man takes up, say, 15' × 24", then a 10' × 6' platform allows room for 3 rows of 8. If there were in fact 15 choreutae, this leaves 22½ sq. ft. to spare for Orestes and the Omphalos and for a less regimented seating plan.

¹⁷ I am leaving *PV* out of account here, since, even if the play is Aeschylean (and at the present stage of the debate we must assume that it is not), its staging is far too problematic to be used as a parallel for anything.

Let us now consider Apollo's entrance. Scholars seem almost without exception (but see nn. 22 and 23 below) to have assumed that he, with or without Hermes, is first seen at Orestes' side—forming part of the tableau if there is one, or otherwise walking with Orestes out of the temple. This seems to me out of the question. The Pythia at 34–59 gives a detailed description of the scene within the temple, which must be intended to draw attention to every significant feature of that scene, and which does not mention Apollo; and 60–3 make it all the clearer that she would have mentioned him if she had seen him. If, then, he appears within (or from within) the temple after 63, are the audience to suppose that he was invisible to the Pythia (of all people) when the Furies were not, or that she unfortunately failed to recognise him, or that he slipped into the temple by a back entrance at some point between 34 and 63? Any one of these solutions would in itself be entirely pointless in dramatic terms, and in any case it is not the dramatist's business to set such puzzles for his audience. If a scene is to be described to the audience and then revealed to them (the reason for this procedure will be discussed in my forthcoming article), the revelation must correspond to the description.

I suppose that the main reason why scholars have wished Apollo to appear at Orestes' side¹⁸ is that *οὔτοι προδώσω* at 64 sounds like a reply to something that Orestes has said. But Taplin has noted (364) that the entry of two characters in mid-conversation would be exceptional in Greek tragedy and would have little point here. There cannot be much doubt that the right solution to this problem is Burges's conjecture (accepted by Kirchhoff, Blass,¹⁹ Murray) that 85–7 belong before 64. In the position where the manuscripts place them these three lines serve only to interrupt Apollo's speech and to show that Orestes has not been listening to it, while before 64 they will provide exactly the cue that is needed for Apollo's entry and opening words.²⁰ The transposition has the further advantage of allowing the god's arrival to be a distinct event, slightly separated²¹ from the departure of the Pythia and the appearance of Orestes and the Furies.

If he does not enter on the ekkyklema, where does he enter? I have no very strong objection to his using a parodos (the one not used by the departing Pythia), though the implication that he has come from some distance away would not be very welcome. Mrs Easterling, wanting him to have been present somewhere in his temple all along, suggests to me that he does emerge through the door, though only after the ekkyklema has been rolled out, and that the audience will vaguely suppose that he has been in an inner sanctuary;²² this too is possible, though I feel that it might cause some confusion. But the place where his arrival would presumably have the greatest impact, and the place generally thought to be used for divine epiphanies in later tragedy, is the roof of the skene.²³ It is true that gods in prologues usually, as far as we can tell, have their

¹⁸ Another reason is perhaps their desire to provide an opportunity for Apollo's purification of Orestes; see below. There is also Apollo's action in putting the Furies to sleep, about which Aeschylus is oddly reticent (though *καὶ νῦν* at 67 shows that it *is* Apollo's work), but I suppose the god could achieve this from on high, just as madness is caused from on high by Athena in Sophocles' *Aj.* (see n. 24 below) and Lyssa in Euripides' *HF.*

¹⁹ But Blass's commentary still makes Apollo and Hermes appear within the temple. I cannot discover that anyone has made use of Burges's transposition in the way that I propose.

²⁰ The transposition leaves 88 looking obviously out of place (not that it is really any more appropriate as a reply to 87). The line doubtless belongs before 84 (Dawe), i.e. one line earlier; surely not between 87 and 64 (Maas).

²¹ Or more than slightly, if, as is possible, Orestes' prayer originally consisted of more than the three lines we now have. Against this it can be argued that Apollo's

entrance should follow soon after the Pythia's virtual invocation of him at 60–3. In any case I do not believe Taplin's 'wild speculation' (383 n. 3) that some lines of *Apollo's* have dropped out here, since 64 makes such a good response to Orestes' prayer (note also the echo of *Cho.* 269, which begins a speech).

²² Cf. H. W. Smyth's stage direction (Loeb *Aeschylus* ii 277): 'The interior of the temple is disclosed. Enter, from the inner sanctuary, Apollo. . . .' But, if Smyth means that there was actually a separate entrance within the skene, the audience could hardly have seen this properly.

²³ I see that this is also the view of Melchinger (n. 2) 115 (though there is much else in Melchinger's account of this scene that I cannot accept). Schol. vet. 64b, having talked of the epiphany of Apollo, refers to the revelation of the inside of the temple as a *δευτέρα φαντασία*; if this means that the scholiast placed Apollo on the mechane (Taplin 370) or the theologeion, he came closer to my view than most modern scholars.

feet on the ground, but then their entrances are not usually epiphanies to mortal characters; the only other instance of an epiphany in a prologue is in Sophocles' *Aj.*, and there Athena probably does enter aloft.²⁴ If the Watchman of *Ag.* is on the roof there can be no general rule against using the roof in a prologue. After 93 Apollo will descend behind the skene to reappear through its door at 179; the descent provides, indeed, a good reason for his exit and re-entry. Then by analogy the arrival of Athena at 397 will presumably also have to be at rooftop level; this is appropriate if she has been flying through the air,²⁵ and her absence from 490 to 565 means that she too has an opportunity to come down to earth. None of this is certain, though the case seems to me worth making; the point that I do insist upon is that Apollo is not to be placed on the *ekkyklema* after 63.

And is Apollo accompanied by Hermes? Most scholars think so; Taplin (364 f.) and some others think not, and one must agree that his presence in the scene seems somewhat superfluous. On Apollo's address to him at 89 ff. Taplin comments that 'one god can call on another when the latter is not present, just as humans pray to a god who is not present'; but the trouble is that Apollo does not so much *call on* Hermes as *turn to* him, with a transitional *σὺ δέ*, and if Hermes is not visible this seems difficult. I prefer to leave the question open. If Hermes does appear, he enters with Apollo before 64 and probably leaves with him at 93.²⁶

II. PURIFICATION AT DELPHI?

The issues surrounding Orestes' purification are some of the most difficult in all of Aeschylus. My forthcoming article will touch on the question of why the Erinyes continue to pursue Orestes even at Athens; here I shall dispose as best I can of the question of whether his purification takes place at Delphi or elsewhere.

The traditional view that it takes place at Delphi has been powerfully challenged by R. R. Dyer.²⁷ And anyone who reads the scene at Delphi in isolation and without prejudice will surely conclude that Dyer is right; the purification simply does not happen. The various ways which he considers (39 n. 5) of inserting it into this scene contain their own refutation, as they are doubtless meant to do; even if theoretically possible from the point of view of a Sherlock Holmes or a Verrall,²⁸ they make no sense in terms of dramatic technique.²⁹ What does happen, as the dramatist quite clearly indicates, is that Orestes comes to Delphi, prays to Apollo, is told how to

²⁴ See W. M. Calder, *CPh* lx (1965) 114–16. Taplin, indeed, thinks otherwise (*Greek Tragedy in Action* [London 1978] 185 n. 12; cf. *Stagecraft* 116 n. 1, 366 n. 1), but lines 14–17 must, I think, imply that Athena is invisible to Odysseus (R. G. A. Buxton, *JHS* c [1980] 22 n. 2), and, if this is so, then the parallel of Eur. *Hipp.* 1391 f. (where Artemis, presumably on the roof, is invisible to Hippolytus) suggests that both scenes were staged in the same way.

²⁵ 405 is doubtless spurious (Paley). Then, although 403–4 are probably meant to be more impressive than precise, it hardly seems necessary to specify that Athena has no wings unless some notion of flying is present; cf. *ἀπτέροις ποτήμασι* at 250. I am thus unconvinced by Taplin's vision (390) of the goddess skimming across land and sea while whirring her aegis, like a sort of hovercraft. For deities imagined as flying before they appear on the rooftop cf. Eur. *Andr.* 1226 ff., *El.* 1233 ff.

²⁶ If the gods are on the roof, Hermes cannot exit at Orestes' side at 93, but this is hardly a disadvantage, seeing that he will not re-enter with him at Athens. 89 ff. need only mean that he is to direct Orestes' steps from on high.

²⁷ 'The Evidence for Apolline Purification Rituals at Delphi and Athens', *JHS* lxxxix (1969) 38–56.

²⁸ Verrall's notion that the blood at *Eum.* 41 f. is that of sacrificed animals is actually accepted in the commentaries of Blass, Thomson, Groeneboom and even Lloyd-Jones. But, quite apart from the fact that any audience will assume the blood to be that which they have seen on Orestes' hands throughout the last scene of *Cho.*, any attempt (short of extensive and arbitrary textual alteration) to argue that Orestes is not polluted when the Pythia sees him is rendered futile by *θεομυσή* and *προστρόπαιον* at 40 f. Equally out of the question, though neglected by Dyer, is Thomson's belief that the purification is completed off stage during the Ghost Scene; Orestes cannot hang about at Delphi after 74–93.

²⁹ I have some sympathy with the suggestion of H. J. Dirksen, *Die aischyleische Gestalt des Orest* (Nuremberg 1965) 9 n. 15, that Apollo's presence and the power of his words form a substitute for an actual ceremony. But this will hardly account for the quite specific *χοιροκτόνοις* at 283 (cf. Dyer, *Gnomon* xxxix [1967] 189).

obtain relief elsewhere (normal Delphic practice, as Dyer shows), and leaves. And indeed, when he reaches Athens, he repeatedly says that his pollution has been worn away *during his wanderings* (238 f., 276 f., 286,³⁰ 451 f.). It would make little difference if I were prepared to place Apollo beside Orestes on the ekkyklema after 63, for can anyone seriously believe that the crucial action of purification is performed just off stage and just too soon to be witnessed by the audience (if only the ekkyklema had happened to roll out a few minutes earlier!),³¹ without even being reported to them afterwards?³² How are the audience to *know* that Orestes has been purified if nobody tells them?

There is, in fact, one answer that might be given to this last question: the audience will know this if Orestes appears without the bloody hands and drawn sword that were mentioned in 41–3. But anyone who has read Taplin's work (28–31 and *passim*) will surely be most wary of postulating a significant action that is indicated purely by visual means without assistance from the text. The principle put forward above, that the tableau must correspond closely with the Pythia's description, applies again here, for, if Orestes did appear with clean hands and no sword, the audience would merely be confused. It follows that he appears *visibly* polluted after 63 and departs from Delphi in the same condition; it is at Athens that he appears visibly purified, and then the change is immediately explained in the text (237 ff.).³³ This is fully in line with the fact³⁴ that he is described as *προστρόπαιος* not only at Delphi (41) but after his departure from there (234), while he claims *not* to be *προστρόπαιος* at Athens (237, 445), in contexts which prove that the word has its usual restricted meaning, 'suppliant for purification'.

Nor can *Cho.* 1059–60 be used as evidence against Dyer's account, for these lines, whatever their exact text,³⁵ talk of freeing Orestes from the Furies; since this will not happen at Delphi, the lines cannot in any case be prophesying a purification ceremony there unless the prophecy is to prove unfulfilled.³⁶

Real problems arise, however, when we come to *Eum.* 282 f. and 578, for, as Taplin notes

³⁰ Most edd. emend *καθαρούς* in 277 and delete or transpose 286 (for reasons that have to do with the immediate contexts rather than the whole purification issue), but the other passages are in no way suspect.

³¹ I suppose Aeschylus could have contrived, if only at the cost of some distortion of ritual practice, to show the essence of the ceremony without showing the pig-sacrifice. Anyway, the assumption that used (justifiably) to be made, that sacrifices were never shown on stage (P. Arnott, *Greek Scenic Conventions* [Oxford 1962] 53–6), is not borne out by the new anapaestic fragment plausibly assigned to Aesch. *Psychagogoi* (*Kölner Pap.* iii [1980] 11–23), unless we can believe that Odysseus goes off stage for the sacrifice of *ροῦδε σφαγίου* and then returns for his meeting with Tiresias (*fr.* 478 M). Note also the libations seen at *Cho.* 129–63 and the victims at *Eum.* 1007.

³² Even when we reckon with the possibility of lacunae in the exchange between Orestes and Apollo, it is not easy to insert a report of the purification (still less an enactment of it). E.g. after 87 (*cf.* n. 21 above), 'It is true that you have purified me, but this does not seem to have worked very well, so I still need your help'; surely not. Or after 73, 'And this sleep of the Furies is the effect of your recent purification'; but why should it have had such a *temporary* effect? And a reference to previous purification would not be in place any later than this.

³³ The subtle discussion of John Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* (London 1962) 105–8, is vitiated by neglect of the simple fact that whenever Orestes is on stage the audience can *see* whether his hands are bloody

or clean, and no ambiguity would be possible in production. The point has, indeed, been generally ignored (see, however, J. Dingel, *Das Requisit in der griechischen Tragödie* [Tübingen 1967] 43 n. 1), but the only way of evading it that I can see would be to claim that blood on the hands, like tears on the face, might be left to the audience's imagination. And this would not be convincing, for blood can be seen at a far greater distance than tears, and the proper comparison is rather with the bloody eyes of Oedipus and Polymestor, which, so everyone assumes, were physically represented.

³⁴ Pointed out by N. G. L. Hammond, *GRBS* xiii (1972) 442 f.

³⁵ Erfurdt's *εἰς σοι καθαρός* is plausible. M's *Λοξίου*, making Orestes 'touch' Apollo and not *vice versa*, is in some ways more attractive than Auratus's *Λοξίας*, but I doubt whether the anacoluthon can be defended. With *Λοξίας* I take Apollo's 'touch' to be metaphorical, since it is not mentioned in *Eum.* and since the chorus here cannot know that Apollo will be physically present at Delphi.

³⁶ I believe that the solution is to take *καθαρός* less literally, as referring to *any* process that can free Orestes from the Furies, and not necessarily to an actual ceremony. This usage is natural in the context of *Cho.*, where the Furies are closely associated with pollution, even if they will cease to be so in *Eum.* Taken in this sense the prophecy will be fulfilled, since Apollo, when once supplicated at Delphi, will indeed rescue Orestes—by sending him to Athens and defending him there.

(382 n. 1), it is very difficult in the context of the play to take these lines as referring to purification somewhere other than Delphi. But if they are not so taken, they flatly contradict what the audience has witnessed. To say that Aeschylus deliberately plays down the matter of purification *in general*, so as to present the trial at Athens as far more important, will not help to justify such confusion as to where the purification occurs. Nor can the contradiction be plausibly explained in terms of imperfectly assimilated reminiscences of older traditions;³⁷ even those who least admire Aeschylus should allow him to remember what has happened in the play that he is writing.

I think, then, that we must give serious consideration to the possibility, mentioned in passing by Taplin, that *Eum.* 282 f. and 578 are spurious. In their immediate context 282 f. are blameless but expendable;³⁸ 578 does not seem wholly blameless.³⁹ It may be, then, that these lines derive from a revised version of the play—one that is also reflected in the fourth-century vase paintings of the purification. My enthusiasm for this solution is somewhat muted, chiefly because it would hardly be explicable for an interpolator to insert references to Delphic purification into the scene at Athens and *not* into the scene at Delphi; but it is always possible, even if it is not a very tidy hypothesis, that our manuscripts are giving us the revised text at some points and the original at others.

A. L. BROWN

39 *Woodmere*,
London SE9

³⁷ So A. Lesky, *Hermes* lxvi (1931) 209 f. (= *Ges. Schr.* 106 f.).

³⁸ It could possibly be these lines that have ousted the misplaced 286 from its rightful position.

³⁹ The line creates an undue separation between *μαρτυρήσων* and *ξυνδικήσων*; and, if it were absent, we would be free to refer the words *ἔστι γὰρ νόμῳ*

ἰκέτης ὄδ' ἀνὴρ καὶ δόμων ἐφέστιος to Orestes' present supplication of *Athena*, thus taking account of the present tense and of the parallel at 669. We then have to ask whether this interpretation provides Apollo with an adequate reason for his intervention; perhaps so, if enough stress is placed on *νόμῳ*.