

τὰ μὲν ποδήρη καὶ χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας
ἔθρυπτ' ἄνωθεν ἀνδρακάς καθήμενος. 1595
ἄσημα δ' αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοία λαβῶν
ἔσθει βορὰν ἄσωτον, ὡς ὄρας, γένει.
κᾶπειτ' ἐπιγνοὺς ἔργον οὐ καταίσιον
ᾧμωξεν, ἀμπίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγῆν ἐρῶν,
μόρον δ' ἄφερτον Πελοπίδαις ἐπεύχεται, 1600
λάκτισμα δείπνου ξυνδίκως τιθεὶς ἀρᾶ,

1594. χρεῶν.

1599. ἄν· πίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγῆς.

1594—97: uncertain. There is perhaps some error in the reading, but as we have no independent knowledge of the story followed by Aeschylus, alteration is hazardous. The sense seems to be that Atreus made of the extremities a mince or broth, which being spread over (ἄνωθεν) the roasted bodies prevented Thyestes from recognizing them for what they were until he had eaten of the θρύμματα.—ἄσημ'. δ δ' (Dindorf for ἄσημα δ') is perhaps right: ἔσθει as it stands should have for subject *Atreus*: however such obscurity is found in Greek as in other languages (e.g. v. 1606).—ἀνδρακάς καθήμενος *viritim sedens* is strictly speaking a solecism; the word ἀνδρακάς *man by man, singly*, requires a plural subject, and the company, not the host, should be said καθῆσθαι ἀνδρακάς. On the other hand such expressions are not unknown or very uncommon, where a single person has a representative character: thus we might certainly say in English, 'One commander preferred to advance in large divisions, the other in small', where the phrase *in large divisions* applies properly to the army. Similarly it is not impossible that a host should be said καθῆσθαι ἀνδρακάς with the meaning that his company sat so.—καθημένοις (Casaubon) will not pass, as it would certainly imply that the human flesh was served to the whole company.—ἄνωθεν ἀνδρακάς καθημένων *apart from the company seated singly* Wecklein (ed. 1887).—The object of mentioning the arrangement of the com-

pany (according to the archaic fashion) at separate small tables is to show how the fatal mess was safely served to Thyestes only: see the account of the similar feast of Harpagos in Herod. i. 119, and cf. Eur. *Iph. T.* 949 ξένια μονοτράπεζα (Wecklein).—ἄνωθεν ἀνδρακάς καθημένων *over kindled coals* (Housman *J. Ph.* xvi. 285) bears a striking resemblance to the MS., but it seems improbable that a word so peculiar and appropriate as ἀνδρακάς is a penman's error. No absolutely certain objection lies against the text, and I prefer to leave it under reserve.

1596. αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοία *not knowing the meat at the moment for what it was*: αὐτά, as usual, has an emphasis, literally 'the meat itself'. The adverb αὐτίκα belongs in sense to the substantive.

1599. ἀμπίπτει Canter.—ἀπὸ σφαγῆν ἐρῶν (Auratus) *i.e. ἀπερῶν σφαγῆν, disgorging the (sacrificial) meat.*

1601. "It is perhaps simplest to construe this 'spurning the banquet *to aid* his curse', σύνδικος being properly *one who pleads with you, an aider in the cause.* συνδίκως governs ἀρᾶ.... The violent crash of the banquet was the symbol (οὕτως) of the invoked destruction of the family" (Sidgwick). I prefer this to the alternative rendering of συνδίκως *generally, or in common*, which has little point and is not sufficiently supported by the use of the word.—οὕτως. The analogy intended is more close than that of mere overthrowing. The death of