

- ὅς οὐκ, ἐπειδὴ τῷδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον,
 δρᾶσαι τόδ' ἔργον οὐκ ἔτλης αὐτοκτόνως; 1635
- ΑΙ. τὸ γὰρ δολῶσαι πρὸς γυναικὸς ἦν σαφῶς·
 ἐγὼ δ' ὑποπτος ἐχθρὸς ἦ παλαιγενής.
 ἐκ τῶν δὲ τοῦδε χρημάτων πειράσομαι
 ἄρχειν πολιτῶν· τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθάνορα 1640
 ζεύξω βαρείαις οὔτι μὴ σειραφόρον
 κριθῶντα πῶλον· ἀλλ' ὁ δυσφιλής κότῳ
 λιμὸς ξύνοικος μαλθακὸν σφ' ἐπόψεται.
- ΧΟ. τί δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ' ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς
 οὐκ αὐτὸς ἠνάριζες, ἀλλὰ σὺν γυνή,

1637. ἦ.

1638. τῶνδε.

fixed in the language and occurs also in Eur. *Andr.* 234, Soph. *O. C.* 809 (where see Jebb's note) and elsewhere.

1634. ἐβούλευσας: see *vv.* 1609, 1614, 1627. They harp in scorn upon his own language.

1635. αὐτοκτόνως: here 'as sole murderer' a good example of freedom in the new application of compound words.

1637. ἦ Porson.

1638: *i.e.* he will apply the treasure and spoils of Agamemnon in payment of his hireling followers. ἐκ τῶν δὲ Jacob.

1640. ζεύξω βαρείαις (ζεύγλαις). Similar ellipses are πληγῆναι πολλὰς (πληγὰς), γνῶναι τὴν νικῶσαν (γνώμην) etc.—οὔτι μὴ...κριθῶντα *not, be assured, with high feeding, like a horse for the trace.* The horse which ran with a separate trace (σειραφόρος) is contrasted with those driven under the yoke. The strength of the trace-horse was of great importance at the turns of the chariot-race: hence κριθῶντα (Wecklein).—The appearance of irregularity in this sentence (οὐ μὴ or οὔτι μὴ being properly constructed with finite verbs, subj. or future indicative) is an appearance only. In reality the negative applies by relation to the verb ζεύξω.—οὔτι μὴν Karsten.

1641. ὁ δυσφιλής κότῳ λιμὸς ξύνοικος *hunger that will not dwell at peace with*

rage, literally 'hunger, that is to rage ill-friendly as a housemate', so called because where hunger comes rage is 'turned out of doors', or in plain words the angry spirit is tamed.—This picturesque and characteristic personification is in my opinion undoubtedly genuine. The prevalent alteration *δυσφιλεῖ σκότῳ* (Scaliger) spoils the point and reduces the significant *δυσφιλής* to a feeble and inappropriate epithet.

1643. The haste, with which Aegisthus drops the topic of his part in the exploit and falls back upon threats (*vv.* 1636—42), shows that, notwithstanding his plausible reply, he is sensitive to the taunt of cowardice and care for his own safety. Accordingly his enemies instantly urge it again.—*Vv.* 1643—48 are placed by Heimsoeth after *v.* 1627 on the ground that it is useless to ask a question already answered. But a furious altercation of this kind is not subject to the rules of logical debate.

1644. σὺν *with thee also*: see *vv.* 591, 1270, 1358. *Why must his wife join with thee in the murder?*—There is no error here: it is the cue of the speakers to treat Aegisthus as primarily responsible, according to his own declaration. The reading has been suspected only from the misrepresentation of the plot, which gives Aegisthus no part to play