

meaning 'a sacrifice for the dead' is not inappropriate, since Agamemnon and his paramour are 'wedded in death' according to the grim conception of Clytemnestra (*v.* 1447) and each therefore slain *for* the other.

Secondly, θερμῶ must be a predicate and equivalent to θερμῶ ὄντι. In Aeschylus, where *two* adjectives are used, one almost always is a predicate (see on *Theb.* 850), and here the separate and emphatic position of θερμῶ marks it clearly as such. As an epithet moreover it has no point.

The construction of the dative is that which with strictly personal subjects is not uncommon even in the older prose writing and might be called a dative 'absolute' with as much or as little propriety as the corresponding genitive (Gildersleeve, *Pindar Ol. and Pyth.*, Preface p. xciii.). The genitive 'absolute' indicates that the act or condition described by it stands in a relation to the main act conceived as resembling that of the origin or 'point from which', or some other relation expressed by this case. Where the relation to be described resembles rather that of the dative, the older language uses that case also with freedom. Most common are datives 'absolute' modelled on the personal dative 'of interest' e.g. Herod. 6. 21 ποιήσαντι Φρυνίχῳ δράμα Μιλήτου ἄλωσιν ἐς δάκρυα ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον, Thuc. 4. 120 ἀποστᾶσι δ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Βρασίδης διέπλευσε: but there are also datives 'absolute' resembling the instrumental, as Theocr. 13. 29 Ἑλλάσποντον ἴκοντο νότῳ τρίτον ἄμαρ ἀέντι, and others again where, as with the genitive, special relation disappears in the general relation of *circumstance*, Xen. *Ages.* 1. 2 τοῖς προγόνοις ὀνομαζομένοις, ἀπομνημονεύεται ὀποστὸς ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους ἐγένετο, Pind. *Ol.* 2. 76 λείφθη Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέντι Πολυνείκει etc. (See for a large collection of examples Kühner *Gr. Gramm.* § 423, 25, *f.*, and also note on *Theb.* 217.) The use is very seldom found in the fully developed prose style, having been driven out partly by the genitive, partly by the more precise though more cumbrous use of prepositions or of dependent clauses with conjunctions. So in *Eum.* 592 οὐ κειμένῳ πῶ τόνδε κομπάζεις λόγον the dative represents what a prose-writer would more accurately have expressed by ἐπί or, if he had used a simple case at all, by the genitive κειμένον. See also *Ag.* 1298, and note there. Here the relation of the dative, so far as it is specialized, is partly that of 'interest', extending itself after Aeschylus' manner to a subject not strictly personal, partly that of mere succession *to*, as in *vv.* 1171, 1338 and Soph. *O. T.* 175 ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλῳ (*one after another*) προσίδοις ὄρμενον, where see Prof. Jebb's note. Either way the meaning is that the slain Agamemnon will immediately *receive* another victim in Cassandra.