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The lemmata and critical apparatuses are based on information from Martin West’s Teubner edition, with additional material gathered from the collations of Dawe (1964), the repertories of Wecklein (ed. 1885, 1893), Dawe (1965), and West (1990, 378–400), and also, for the Supplices, from tables of unpublished marginalia put at my disposal by Professor Martin West. Where possible, I have supplied bibliographical references for the conjectures I mention: where not, I have simply listed the name of the critic in the bibliography with the note ‘reported by Wecklein’, etc. Editors and commentators on Aeschylus are usually referred to by last name only, other literature by last name and year of publication, or an abbreviation, as explained in the bibliography.

Septem contra Thebas 915–926

915 ὀφοῖν τῷ μᾶλλον ἀφόIGHLIGHTشير ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς προτέμπησε δᾶκτλήν· γάρ ὀνειρότερον αὐτοτήρων

926 δυσδαίμων σφιν ἀ τεκοῦσα πρὸ πιστῶν γυναικῶν ὑπόσαν τεκνιγόνων κάκληρτον

915 ὀφοῖν τῷ μᾶλλον ἀφό黑恶 τῇ αὐτοῖς codd.plur.: ὀφοῖν τῇ αὐτοῖς C=ΔΒΝδ:
ἀυτοῖς ἀφό黑恶 Ὑ=][: ἀφό黑恶 τῇ αὐτοῖς Q2,
ἡ (ἡ)(ἡ), Ἑς=αἰς): ὀφοῖν ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς O: ἀφό黑恶 ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς X:
ἀγάσασα τοὺς Μ (λαίτη τὸ προσπομά Μ3): ἀγάσασα τοῖς I (ἀγάσασα Π=ΠI)

926 δυσδαίμων σφιν ἀτεκοῦσα ὑπὸ δόμαιν codd.plur.: φὶ η̄ nonnulli (et M): αἱ Υ. om. Δ: μᾶλλοντα δυσδαίμων τοῖς ἀδήτῳ Hutchinson: ἀδήτῳ δυσδαίμων Dindorf: σφὶ αὐτοῖς Voss

I think Hutchinson is on the right track, when he says that the object of προτέμπησι ‘is perhaps more likely to have been a sound than the brothers’. There are some points worth considering, before approaching this problem closer.

(1) The image of the echo as an offering to the dead brothers is attractive. Aeschylus elsewhere uses images of sacrifice or libation metaphorically, usually in connection with death and destruction. The verb appears in this context in Ag. 820: συνθήκησαντα τὸ ἀναπήδημος πικνοῖς πικνοῖς, ‘the dying embers (of Troy) offer rich gusts of wealth’. The image is that of a burnt sacrifice to Ate, as explained by Walter Headlam ap. Thomson ad loc. Even bolder is the blasphemy of Clytemnestra later in the same play (1386–8), where she offers the ‘third’, sc. blood-shedding stab at Agamemnon, to ‘Hades [or Zeus] under the earth, saviour of the dead’ (the third libation of wine is usually offered to Zeus Soter; the saviour of the living, naturally).1

1 See, e.g., Garvie on Cho. 1. The motif of the corrupted sacrifice in the Orestes is treated in detail by Zeitlin (1963).
(2) δόμων ἀφίκω makes good sense, and seems to be Aeschylean. The genitive δόμων is perfectly appropriate with the echo, not the corpses; cf. Pers. 390–91 ἀιτητὰλάξε ... πάτρας ἰ ἄγος, and perhaps fr. 57.10, where one might read, with Bothe (pp. 570, 798), τεμέναντο ἵκον δ (..., ἰ ἄγος γαμοταμός). Another reason to connect δόμων with the echo and not the corpses is that the expression is reminiscent of the epic formulas δόμων ἄφθαστα and δόμων ἄφθαντες (Od. 4.72, Hom. hymn Dem. 104, Hes. Theog. 767, fr. 185.10, 185.16). In epic poetry, this formula signifies the wealth and power of the owner of a house so large that it can reverberate sound. This is appropriate here; note the stress on the rich heritage of Oedipus in the latter part of the drama (κτέανα, ἄλαξα, κτήματα, etc.: cf. 727–33, 769–71, 788–90, 815–19, 881–84, 902–10, 941–50). But note also the heavy doom that is attached to this heritage, the curse that it will be divided σὺν σιδήρῳ (727–30, 883–84). The house is rich, but the echo is no longer a symbol of wealth; instead it brings a note of chilly desolation, proclaiming the final extinction of the Labdacidae.

(3) προπίπτωμα in later Attic is often connected with attending a funeral, 'follow a corpse to the grave' (LSJ), but the word is not found with this meaning elsewhere in Aeschylus, nor does προπίπτωμα mean 'attendant of a funeral procession', except in the interpolated (see below) Sept. 1059 and 1069. In Aeschylus the verb, in a funerary context, usually means 'give an offering', 'sacrifice'; so in Ag. 820 and Pers. 622. In Pers. 530 it means simply 'conduct', 'send forth' without any notion of a funeral.

(4) The drama has been subject to the interpolation of a producer, in late classical or Hellenistic times. Part of the purpose has been to include Eteocles' sisters Ismene and Antigone in the closing of the drama. It has been shown beyond reasonable doubt that at least 861–74 and 1005–78 are interpolated, and that the sisters took no part in Aeschylus' original drama. M's ἀφάνσιν could be an emendation to make Antigone the instigator of a 'funeral escort' of the brothers—the very thing for which she was later condemned: 'wailing, she sends them forth.' ἀφάνεις may be either a further emendation to accommodate the adjective to the masculine γάς, or an independent conjecture. In any case, both adjectives have the air of conjectures with the aim of making the dead brothers the direct object of προπίπτωμα and removing the hiatus ἰ ἄγος ἐπτ. The adjective ἀφάνεις, incidentally, is not found outside epic and elegiac verse (or grammatical discussions thereof) before the fourth century AD, once (Epiph. Adv. haeres. 189.10 Holl), and after that not until late Byzantine times.

1 See Kainias (1977) 165 on echoes in Aeschylus; 163–74 on Aeschylean sound in general.
2 τεμέναντο δ ἵκον (vel ὑψίν), codd. Cf. also P. 133, 1081, and Soph. Phd. 1459 ἰ προπίπτον (παραπίπτον) in connection with an echo.
3 See West (1966) on Hes. Thog. 767.
5 See Hutchinson on 1005–78 with refs.
6 See, e.g., Dawe (1978) for bibliography on the subject, Hutchinson loc. cit.
7 Thus indeed the passage is interpreted by Young (1972, 32).
8 There are obvious signs of emendation almost everywhere in the 'verses' (Dawe 1964, 71): a look at the apparatus will convince us of this fact. ἀφάνεις seems too advanced a conjecture for the original scribe of M, and is differently interpreted by the scholiast in this ms.: λαῖται το προπίπτον. It would thus have entered the tradition earlier.
With these things in mind, we should have little trouble accepting the paraphrase of Φ as a basically sound reading of the passage: ἀλλὰ ἀρχικά ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλὰ χρῶν καὶ βουθιῶν προσέρχεται εἰς αὐτοῖς γρόσις καὶ διαίρεσιν διακόπτων τὰς φρένας, ὄψιν ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς καρπίοις, διακόπτων πάντας, αὐτόπημων, ἤτοι ἔφος ἁπάτων ἤχων τῶν κακῶν καὶ παλάμων.

The echo is the central matter of the scene. It should be noted that the adjective αὐτόπημως is connected with this echo: αὐτό- is not simply an amplifying prefix, but means that in echoing, the γρόσες takes on a life of its own; 'groans autonomously', as it were.

As for the constitution of the text, there are two obvious obstacles to the Byzantine vulgate: the deficient metrical response, and the hiatus. First, I think that 'the intractable μᾶλα.' (Dawe 1964, 110) must almost certainly be corrupt if we, as recommended, discard the adjective (ἀγάζεισθαι). μᾶλα προσέρχεται does not make sense (pace L.S., 'in earnest'), and the short syllable makes responson impossible. There is then one interesting emendation to take note of, overlooked in the repertoires of Wecklein, Dawe (1965), and West (1990); Gottlieb Schneider's μᾶν. The advantages are obvious: responson is restored in the beginning of the verse, which may be either a syncopated iambic or a dochmiac. Also, from a palaeographical point of view, the change could not be more simple (N > Λ). The disadvantage would be that the particle is rare in drama, except in the Attic combinations ὀλλα, μν, γα μν, ἢ μν, τι μν, ου μν, etc. When the single μᾶν occurs (usually in lyrical Doric), it is often in combination with an imperative: thus in Supp. 1018, Cho. 963, Soph. OC 182, Jr. Lys. 183. However, it does occur in drama without either of these reserves: Soph. Ant. 626, Eur. IT 889, and Jr. fr. 591.56 K-A. It also appears in Homer, and several times in Pindar. Since Aeschylus uses the single Doric μᾶν with the imperative, and since it is found with and without the imperative in both the younger tragedians as well as in Aristophanes, and also in Homer and Pindar, there is no reason to suppose that Aeschylus might not have used μᾶν without the imperative.

As for the hiatus, one possibility will be that it is sound. West (1982, 110) suggests that hiatus in dochmiaca might not always be connected with period-end; also (ibid. n. 87 and pp. 107–8) that a period-end in the strophe need not necessarily be answered by one in the antistrophe. Either assumption would be sufficient to explain Eur. Ion 688–707 as well as the present passage, where we have, with Schneider's μᾶν, a dochmiac and a syncopated iambic, with sufficient responson for the dochmiac, and exact for the iambics: ο --- II --- answers to --- ο --- II. The metrical sequence has parallels, although with word-end between the dochmiac and the iambic in strophe as well as antistrophe, in Sept. 346–358, 888–900, Eum. 156–163. This solution, however, is hardly supported by sufficient parallels for either of the cases suggested by West. Hiatus, except at period-end, appears to be allowed only in the case of exclamations. 13

10 Φ is a reconstructed eleventh- or twelfth-century commentary on the Byzantine triad, on which see Wilamowitz, xiv. West xxx. Here it is preserved in 915–21a.
13 As to whether hiatus and brevis in longi is ever allowed in drama without period-end (as it sometimes is in Pindar), see further Stinton (1977) 37–38 (Stinton 1990, 324), 51–52 (342), with refs. (Stinton himself is cautiously negative.)
If we take a look at the corresponding verse in the antistrophe (926), we find that a rather easy change of the paradoxis, together with Schneider’s μας, will restore responson. Remove the article α, and place it at the beginning of the verse, as an interjection & (cf. Dindorf’s Ια). For α δυσδαιμον cf., e.g., Bacchyl. 3.10 α τρισεταμον, 15.30, the use of α in Homer (invariably with δειλε, -οι, etc.), Theoc. Id. 1.85 α δεισεις της, Semon. fr. 7.76, Hipponax fr. 117.6. In the sentence α δυσδαιμον σφιν τεκοντα it is possible to understand the dative predicatively: 'ah, an ill-starred mother is theirs'. A scenario for the corruption is easily reconstructed: the exclamation was taken as an article, and moved to the position before the noun (simples ordo). The corruption would easily occur in a text with a colocmetrical arrangement of the verses:

<α> δυσδαιμον σφιν
[α] τεκοντα,
προ τασιων γυναικων

Note that the article α is absent in one ms., Δ. The metre becomes easy: one dochmiac, period-end, followed by syncopated iambics (bacchiacs). The hiatus after αξιον in the strophe is validated by period-end (perhaps without notable pause in the antistrophe,

---

14 The adnominal dative is in fact awkward here, notwithstanding S-D 189–90, who accept adnominal dative for genitive in the case of personal pronouns. (The defence of the dative by Wilamowitz (in the apparatus criticus), and by Verrall, n. on 923 (his 906, primarily defending πολταις), is certainly insufficient: the alleged parallels are all adverbials. In Wilamowitz’ case the dative σφιν in Pers. 807 goes with επιμαμεινυ, as rightly K-G p. 416; K-G i 429 (Anm. 1a) are stricter: ‘Der Fall, dass der Dativ eines Personalpronomens zwar bei einem Substantiv steht, aber auf den ganzen Satz zu beziehen ist, obwohl er oft, besonders bei Herodot, durch seine Stellung die Bedeutung eines possessiven Genitivus zu haben scheint.’ According to them, the dative goes with the entire clause in the examples given, and the adnominal quality is illusory. As for the present passage, σφιν is ambiguous, to say the least: normally one would take it as a predicative with δυσδαιμον, but it would then require, either an instrumental sense, ‘through them, she was unhappy’ or, with a true dative, ‘of’ for them she was unhappy’. The sense would be outright absurd if the dative were taken with the participle τεκοντα: ‘else who bore children for them’. Even if adnominal dative with the sense of a possessive genitive is admissible, the examples given by S-D loc. cit. seem less awkward than the present case. We find parallels to the present passage with the accusative or the genitive: Eur. Hyp. 1.15 ὡς μάξουσα σφιν ὢ τεκοντοι, ὢς της ποτ ποτ, Ἰον 308 ὃς σου τῆς τακοντα ἐλξεται, 324 πάλαιον ο' ὢ τεκοντοι ὢς, ὢς τῆς ποτ ποτε, 1378 ἀλταμόν ὃ ὢ τεκοντα ὢς (cf. also, e.g., Eur. I 472–75, LS s. v. πετοιστό Ι.5, b). The accusative has also been suggested for our passage, first, apparently, by Heinrich Voss, whose σφιν was adopted by several nineteenth-century editors (e.g., Hermann, Wehl, Paley). The genitive is also a possible alternative: the 2p. dual σφιν would easily be corrupted into the fasciculatio σφυν. The dual number would accord with the use of the dual in the previous 921 τοῦτον ... ἔκλεις, 923 ἄετατον τελλα ... πολταις, even if the third person is used elsewhere in the context. The second person address may, however, accord better with the exclamatory quality: ‘how unhappy your mother’, as in most Euripidean parallels.

15 West's assertion (1990, 327) that 'Ba and Δ are of use to the editor only insofar as their agreements with 1 permit him to infer the readings of a lost hyparchetype (α) earlier than 1', is an unproven hypothesis. According to Dawe (1964) 107–8, 116–18, Δ has independent value, sometimes being alone in preserving ancient readings, or even the truth. It appears to be especially independent from its family (BαΔ) in the latter half of the present drama (West 1990, 326).

a common phenomenon in dochmias). It is hardly a problem that the bacchius ἐπὶ αὐτῶς - τεκοῦσα would contain an entire (short) period, due to the brevis in longo that ends τεκοῦσα: apart from cases involving exclamations, a single iambic demonstrably constitutes an entire period in Pers. 638–645; cf. also, e.g., Eum. 511–520.

**Supplices 960**

καὶ δῶματ' ὅστι τὸπολύλα μὲν τὰ δέμα,
διδομάτωμαι ὡς ἀδίκ' ἐγὼ σμικρὸν χερί
ἐνδ' ἤμεν ἐστὶν εὐτύχοις ναιεῖ τῶν δόμων
πολλά μετ' ἄλλων: εἰ δὲ τὰς μείζονα χάρις,
πάρεστιν οἶκειν καὶ μονοπρόσωπος δόμως.


I shall not be concerned here with the emendation of 959, but assume that the text printed by Page is correct in the main (as adopted above with some minor changes of accentuation).

The matter of lodging for the Danaids, newly received as hostages in Argos, is dwelt upon at, as it appears, exaggerated length (also at 970–71, 1009–11). We may infer that the question is of importance for the action in the next play in the trilogy (so Friis Johansen–Whittle 1:42–43 and 957–61n.). The choice between two alternatives is stressed: there are the ‘public’ lodgings, and the ones owned by Pelagus, the king (957–58, 1009–10).

In 959–60 a further dichotomy is introduced, which confuses matters considerably. Pelagus has just stated that the choice stands between the public lodgings and his own. Then he offers a further choice, that between shared housing (πολλά μετ' ἄλλων) and ‘single rooms’, as it were (μονοπρόσωπος δόμως). ἐνδ' may refer to 957–58 as a whole, or only to one of the verses: in either case, the expression is problematic and awkward. In the former case, Pelagus must mean that both locations offer the alternatives of private and shared chambers (so that the total sum of alternatives adds up to four). If the adverb refers to 958, Pelagus infers that he can offer both alternatives at his own mansions, saying nothing about the nature of the public lodgings.

---

17 Stinton (1977) 46–48 (= 1990, 334–36). Stinton however formulates the rule (1977, 59 = 1990, 352) that ‘pause is almost always found in at least one place (strophe or antistrophe) at period-end’, which he claims ‘holds 96 times out of 100’. According to his criteria for pause (31–37), we might perhaps claim one after ἀδίκ', the phrase ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶς being sufficiently autonomous. Possibly also δοθεῖμα σεν ἡ τεκοῦσα admits pause after σεν; at least τεκοῦσα is very emphatic, and thus reminiscent of the examples of period-end discussed ibid. 62–63; e.g., Soph. El. 1074–75 πρῶτοτος δὲ μόνα σαλαῖα Ἡλέκτρα, Eur. Med. 6–7 δίστοιν' ἧρα | Μιδώνια, Pind. Ol. 6.49–50 θάνων γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡ γαγάλαι | παιδός.
18 On such ‘short short periods’, see Stinton (1977) 41 (= 1990, 328). Positional length of the last syllable of τεκοῦσα before πω might also be possible: West xxxv lists two examples in lyrical verse of positional length before μυραριμ' iuquid: Pers. 665, Cho. 607; cf. also Eum. 378. Neither of these examples is certain, however, and the discussions of the problem by Garvie on Cho. 606–7, Fraenkel in 826–27, and Barrett (1964) on Eur. Hipp. 760 (with Addenda p. 435) are all inconclusive.
19 The recommendations of Barrett (1964, 425–26) are followed, except as regards series of enclitics, on which see West xxxvii.
Instinctively one expects the two alternatives of shared and individual lodgings to be identical with the alternatives of public and private hospitality, so that the public lodgings are shared ones, and the kings are individual. The most prominent detail of the Danaid myth is the girls' killing of their husbands on the wedding night, in the privacy of their separate bridal chambers. It is hard not to make associations to this from the strange emphasis put on separate and shared lodging: are the girls to stay together with other people, thereby being prevented from doing harm, or are they to take up lodging alone and individually, in what is likely to become their fateful bridal chambers? 

ἔσοτο, must be taken as the demonstrative pronoun. Page and West take it as the relative, punctuating with a comma at the end of 958, but several others translate or punctuate so as to make it a demonstrative. Demonstrative ἕσοτο is found, somewhat rarely, elsewhere in tragedy and comedy: in Aeschylus at 34 in this play, and probably also in Pers. 490; in Euripides in a few more or less ambiguous occurrences.

Secondly, ἕσοτο refers exclusively to 957, i.e., to the public housing. The required sense may perhaps be attained by simple gestures from Pelagus. 'There are several public lodgings' (he points or gestures, perhaps symbolically, in one general direction), 'and I on the other hand am not ill provided myself' (he gestures in the other direction). 'At that place' (i.e., at the first mentioned place: ἕσοτο), 'there are nicely built houses to dwell in together with many others. But if the other alternative should be more pleasing, it is also possible to dwell in separate quarters there.' The paradoxos could perhaps by itself mean this, provided that Pelagus's gesturing is appropriate. There are, however, certain problems with it. τῆς may be suspect: 'preds. containing an adjectival τῆς in whatever sense combined with a...'

20 How will the Aegyptiads finally end up in the beds of the Danaids? There is of course a number of possibilities. If we presume that the girls choose Pelagus's own hospitality, and that this is the same as the separate and individual alternative (κανεῖναὶ καὶ δίαι need not mean anything other than separate quarters) in the palace, the plural meaning 'housing' rather than building—such quarters as the ones of Priam's sons and daughters, depicted picturesquely and not without erotic suggestiveness by Homer in H. 6.242–50—if so, they will fall under Pelagus's jurisdiction in case their father for some reason should lose or relinquish his own. One possible scenario, then, is that their father has to run an errand (cf. 776–980), perhaps being required to travel to secure allies in the case of an upcoming war with Aegyptus. He furnishes his daughters with daggers, to protect themselves from unwelcome suitors. While he is away, the Aegyptiads arrive, and Pelagus, being left in charge, decides to recognise their claim, giving away Danaus's daughters in marriage. They in turn slay his husbands with their daggers. Another possibility would be that Danaus stays, but that Pelagus, whether yielding to threats from Aegyptus or being actually defeated in battle, decides to relinquish the girls anyway, and arranges the marriage in his own house against the wish of the father. Danaus, slighted in this way, supplies his daughters with daggers and tells them what to do. There are several other possibilities, not including Pelagus at all, who in some versions of the myth relinquishes power to Danaus. Cf. Garvie (1969) 197 ff.

21 So in the translation of Friis Johansen (ed. 1970), and in the texts of e.g., Well, Tucker, Mazon, Smyth, Murray, Friis Johansen—Whittle. Friis Johansen—Whittle argue that ἕσοτο refers to both ἄνθρωποι ... τὰ ἄνθρωπα and the ἄνθρωποι ἰδίᾳ implied in 958, claiming that it cannot refer to the latter alone, since in 958 'there is no word other than γεγονός to which ἕσοτο can refer'. This might have been a valid argument if ἕσοτο had been a relative.

22 Editors disagree whether to take this as the relative or demonstrative. I think the latter: cf. Od. 5.110, 133, 436, etc.

23 Cf. Supp. 1105, And. 21. Phoen. 657, Rhes. 430, 930. Sophocles seems not to have used it in any of the surviving plays; in Aristophanes it is found at least in Pax 1276.

24 So in the translation of Smyth, who takes Pelagus's remark on his own house as parenthetical: '... there are plenty of public sort (and in no mean scale am I housed myself), where, in company with many others, ye may occupy abodes ....'. In the Greek text, Smyth also puts a full stop before ἕσοτο, so as to make it a demonstrative.

A preferable emendation would be δι' ἑκεί—ἑκεί referring to the last mentioned place, the house of Pelasgus, and standing in regular opposition to ἐκείνη, the public housing. 'There (ἐκεί), we have nice houses to live in together with many others: but if there be greater pleasure ἑκεί (ἑκεί) ...' The reminiscence of a line from Sophocles might perhaps have played a part in the corruption (Electra on honouring her dead father, El. 355–56):25

355 λατιώ καὶ τοίτων, ὑστε τῷ τεσσαρχῷ
timās προσάττετε, εἰ τίς ἔστι ἑκεί χάρις.

Supplies 1002

tέσσετο ὁ πόλις δὴ εὐφύλακτος ὑδαμώς:

1000 καὶ κνώδια καυτά τερεύσθη καὶ παροιτιθεὶ:

καρπόματα στάζουσα κηρύσσειν Κύτταρις

καλλωπισμοῦ ζηλώσα τῇ ὑστε κέρατον ἐρωτήτω

1002 ὡσιμένιν Με.: Ἀσσυμένιν Μ: κάμωρα καυτώστας ὄμοιοις ἑρως Portus καὶ ψύχα vel

1002 is corrupt to such a degree that almost no twentieth-century editor has dared to print a text without daggers. If Sept. 915 has been subject to much emendation, this passage has been positively showered, and only a few examples may be mentioned here (see Friis Johansen–Whittle for a few more examples and a discussion).

Many have supposed that a dichotomy between the ripe and the unripe fruit is intended, and have built on Portus' κάμωρα. I think that this may be leading on the wrong track—nowhere in the drama is it implied that the Danaids are too young to marry. Instead, I believe that the word ἐφόρος in some form would give an attractive sense.37 This noun may have suggested itself to Aeschylus after his περιφέρεσαι—παροιτεῖ dichotomy in 1000; it

25 The exact same verse seems to have played a part in a mistaken Byzantine emendation in Pers. 622 (Παρ. προσάττοιν τοῦ μήτωρ ποιον); see Dave (1964) 100.
26 Burges thus anticipates Voss (1812), who gets the credit for the devise in West's ed.
27 The word has been suggested by many; first, it seems, by Scaliger. Stanley (ap. Butler–Stanley) reports that a vir ducus suggested χ' ἀλουφ καυτώστας ὄμοιοις ἔρως Ἐρως, which makes no sense to me (Amor incitabit ad uxos eos qui prohibent prædàm' according to Stanley); if he wrote χαλέωρα (< καυτώστας) it might possibly be interpreted as 'Eros drives the resisting ones as prey', χαλέωρα being taken predicatively, agreeing with καυτώστας. Stanley also reports καὶ ψύχα (sic) as an emendation of the same vir ducus: these anonymous emendations are thus reminiscent of those made by Scaliger and Portus (see the critical apparatus above).
is, from II. 1.4 and later, regularly found with the traditional pair of carrion-eaters, birds and dogs (cf., e.g., Supp. 800–801). The dichotomy we are looking for may not be between the ripe and the unripe fruit; rather, Aeschylus may be contrasting the fruit that falls willingly, on its own accord, with the unwilling prey, the ἀλογόνος, that seeks to escape the hunter. Both are metaphors for the passive part in a sexual relationship. Perhaps this is what Danaus is trying to say: there is peril for the unwilling girl (in which category one would place the Danaids) as well as for the willing; the peril of rape.

These metaphors accord with the dichotomy expressed by Aeschylus in 1000: the ripe fruit is to be protected mainly from birds, while the game is in danger primarily from the πεδοτητῆς (one comes to think of the olive-plantations and the sheep-flocks of the agrarian Greeks, with their respective natural enemies). There is no perfect symmetry—there are of course omnivorous land-living animals as well as birds of prey—but it is good enough. One might then suggest γαλαγώς—καὶ ὄμοις μᾶλαν ἔρωτι: 'beasts devour it and mortals. Of course! Winged creatures as well as land-living. Cypris proclaims the ripe fruit as well as the ... prey to be a care of Love'. As for the three syllables in between, κινόμων, naturally suggests itself, but seems rather awkward, even if the stem does occur once in Aeschylus denoting resistance to sexual advances: in fr. 47a (Diktyon 401; 779) Danaé is threatening to tie a noose to hang herself, rather than be ravished by satyrs;26 she then speaks of a κυνοτήτων, apparently referring to a means of suicide, being a ‘hindrance’ against sexual assault.27

Unless we assume a lacuna after 1000 (Hermann), καὶ κινόμων ... πεδοτητῆς must be taken with the previous, and refer especially to the ἄρετας, which is unproblematic.28 The asyndeton in 1001 is also admissible, being explanatory:29 cf., e.g., 769, where asyndeton is also found in a metaphorical (gnomic) phrase which explains or justifies a former statement.

ἀρετή of the second declension is found in Homer, Hesiod, the lyrical poets and the other tragedians, and there is no reason to ban it from conjectures in Aeschylus. Nor is there much point in excluding the dative as especially ‘untragic’ (Friis Johansen–Whittle), since we lack the statistical material to make a judgement of this kind: the nominative and accusative in general are more common than the dative, and the noun appears only once.

26 Death before loss of chastity: the same motif as appears earlier in the present play (see 455–65).

27 Hugh Lloyd-Jones ap. Smyth p. 358–39 supplies and translates: ἄρετας ἄρες ἄλματι | [καὶ] πολύς στυλόπος κυνοτήτων ἢ ἄλματι | . . . I, ‘shall I then knot myself a noose, applying a desperate remedy against this torture?’

28 Friis Johansen–Whittle claim that κινόμων πεδοτητῆς ‘must either be identical with or include ἄρετας’, also, that ‘καὶ κινόμων is never used parenthetically’. As for the first assertion, ἄρετας may denote a living non-human creature in general (it is even used of a human, Orestes, in Eum. 147, but metaphorically; cf. also Ag. 1063, Cho. 998), and this must also be the natural interpretation of the word as it stands in opposite to ἄρετας (as also in Eum. 70). ἄρετας can hardly be less general than κινόμων, as it may include even satyrs (Eur. Cyc. 624) and (often) centaurs; it is rather synonymous to the latter word. Exact terminological consistency is in any case not to be expected in Greek poets, least of all in Aeschylus. Barrett (1964, 394), listing other examples of this τόπος (the power of love), notes the ‘untuneful’ that usually comes with lists of categories of this kind. As for τί μήν, it would not be strictly parenthetical: καὶ κινόμων ... πεδοτητῆς is a new clause, for which it is easy to supply another κυνόμων. Cf. Pl. Leg. 640c, where τί μήν can hardly be said to be less parenthetical: αὐτοῦ πρῶτον μὲν καὶ τούτων ἄρετας διῄ:—τί μήν: ὡς αὐτοὶ παρὰ πᾶσιν...

in Sophocles (nom.) and 6 times in Euripides (1 nom., 5 acc.). The dative is found in Od. 18.212.

We have to accept a mild anacolouthon: κηρήσει at first seems to mean 'announce', being constructed with acc. rei (i.e. the ripe fruit), as if Aphrodite were a seller on the market-place, but in the next verse, we find what is seemingly an acc. + inf., constructed somewhat like Cho. 124–25: ἔρχεται χθόνι, κηρήσεις ἐμοὶ ἱππὸς ἔνειρη δαίμονος κλέιον ἀμάς ἰνήχος. The altered construction as such is not remarkable in Aeschylus.

Agamemnon 557

μάχασθ' εἰς λέγουμι καὶ δυσανθίας
σπαραγάς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους, τί δ' οὐ
στάνουσες οὐ λαχθέτες ἦματος μέρος;

post 555 lacunam coni. Heyse 556 δ' del. Blaydes 556–57 τί ποι ἵ στάνουσες ἄν λάγοις μεν
Wecklein (ed. 1893, p. 353) 557 ἄν λάγοις Schwerdt (1863, 97)

The paradosis is defended by Denniston–Page and briefly by Murray and West in their critical apparatuses, but hardly conclusively. Schwerdt's emendation52 receives no mention in any commentary or apparatus criticus that I have seen (I cannot confess to have perused through them all, or even most of them). It has the advantage of making sense of the conditional εἰ λέγουμι in 555, removing the anacolouthon and the alleged need to posit a lacuna after this verse. ἦματος μέρος would refer (perhaps with some ambiguity) to the present day, which would be wasted if the messenger were to tell of all his sufferings. The sense is obviously appreciated by Wecklein, who suggests a worse emendation to the same effect. For the topos, cf. 563–67, 636–37, Pers. 429–30, Eum. 284.

For apodotic δ' after conditional protasis, albeit with οὖ δ', cf. Ag. 1061, Eum. 887.31 If the paradosis is retained in Eur. Hec. 1211, τί δ' οὖ in (temporal) apodosis is paralleled. Possibly deletion of δ' is necessary, however, here as well as in the Hecuba: for the hiatus τί οὖ cf. then Eur. Phoen. 878 with the note of Mastronarde (1994).

Choephoroi 155

ἀπείρχετον is awkward, as is ἄγος in bonam partem, which can hardly stand in apposition to δάκη. Sier's ἀγος is attractive. Another possibility would be that ἀπείρχετον is corrupt

52 Originally in Schwerdt (1863) 97, which I have not seen: repeated in Schwerdt (1886) 132.
for a third person imperative, e.g., ἀφενέτω, the idea being that the tear will wash away the stain: 'shed a tear ...., an averter of evil, and may it scorch the pollution with the libations poured', or something to that effect.

_Eumenides_ 490–91

νῦν καταστροφαι ἡνών

Ξηρωμών

ἡμῶν καταστροφαι θεῖν

On this passage, see the note of West (1990), who convincingly refutes Dover's claim that the words refer to an overthrow of Athena's new court. West's own suggestion that they might mean 'an overturning consisting of new Σήμειά' is less convincing, however. More economic than the conjecture by Weil repeated above would be καταστροφαι δ' ἡμῶν. For the postponed δ' (especially common in Aeschylus) see Denniston (1954) 187–88, Italie-Radt (1964) s.v. IX 1 f, IX 2 c. Here it would give proper emphasis to καταστροφαι.

Postscript

Reacting to a few off-hand comments in the submitted version of this paper, the Reader and the editor have asked me to explain my views on text-critical theory and method. While I do not profess to any novelties in the area, I will take the opportunity to state some of the principles on which the previous notes are based. I would like to widen the mandate to include a discussion of the general theoretical foundations of humanist scholarship, which are no longer things to take for granted, being ignored or denied by a now institutionalised Protagorean (or, vulgarly, 'post-modern') faction of scholars. In what claims to be an attempt at reconciliation ('Working Together') between the post-modernists and the increasingly estranged 'traditional' scholars, Stephen Harrison (2000, 3–5) complains about the lack of theoretical foundations in the latter camp. As a reluctant 'traditionalist', I will here try to re-state, briefly and on the most basic level, some important axioms. The brevity required will lend a somewhat magisterial tone to the following, for which I apologise in advance.

The existence of objective truth and the possibility of using language as a tool for its investigation are necessary pragmatic assumptions of any science or scholarly activity.

---

34 Dover (1957) 230–32.
35 'Traditionalist' is an unfortunate label as it savours of orthodoxy, which is the opposite of the traditional critical method of scholarship and science. Orthodoxy as a principle for determining relevancy is usually defended by the 'post-modern' camp, e.g. by Harrison (2000) 11, following the authority of literary theorist Stanley Fish: 'If objective interpretation of texts is (as I would hold) impossible since interpretation is simply never an objective activity, there remains the possibility of a significant and well-informed group of individuals agreeing on an interpretation, of intra-subjective acquiescence in particular readings.'
36 There is no essential difference between natural science and humanist scholarship. Both are varieties of the methodical quest for knowledge, and the methods are not so very different as is usually believed: see Popper (1972) 183–86, Popper (1994) 138–53. Internal critics may draw some much-needed courage from the following assertion (Popper 1972, 185–86, n. 36): 'There are few things as similar to certain procedures in theoretical physics as the conjectural reconstruction of a damaged text. A conjecture of this kind is even testable, and some have been refuted.'
They are not disproved, nor can they be, as the process of disproving presupposes them. The use of positive argument and objective criteria removes the subjective element in a critical discourse insofar as the arguments and the assumptions on which they are based are available for critical scrutiny (arguments based on fact can and should be judged in themselves, regardless of the presumed ideology or personality of their author). Authorial intention exists and the author-intentional meaning of a text (or of any artefact), while not being the sole conceivable meaning, is of primary interest to the scholar, and is possible to ascertain with more or less confidence by aids of methodical scholarship.

Authorial intention does not cover every aspect of the text that the editor or textual critic is trying to reconstruct; for instance, the received meaning of a particular reader or audience may be of interest. In no way, however, does this preclude the existence of author-intentional meaning; nor does the fact that there may be parts of a work that are unintentional, for instance errors made by the author; nor that the author has been influenced by society and by other authors. The author-text situation may be complicated: there are cases of interpolations and texts that have been finished and published by someone other than the original author, and authors like Aesop and Homer pose special problems (see, e.g., West 1998). Nevertheless, there exists in each case one particular text that we are trying to reconstruct. In the large majority of cases, the text has a single author, and has been published at one particular time. This text is not an abstract ideal, but a material fact: it existed once, in some form, and it is our job to try to reconstruct it as far as possible and to disentangle its semantics on every conceivable level. This cannot even be attempted without postulating authorial intention.7

This taken for granted, the pragmatics of conjectural criticism is another matter, which has been much discussed in the last century.8 A formidable defence of the practice is found in West (1990) 369–72, to which we may add (re-iterate) only a few matters of principle. It is true that we rarely, if ever, must suppose that our latter-day conjectural attempts on major canonical authors, such as Aeschylus, will be of the 'evident' category; i.e. that they will merit a position in the actual text, as opposed to the critical apparatus, of

---

7 Cf. also Gumbrecht (1998) 241–43 for a rather sophisticated vindication of the 'author-concept'. On the other hand Simon Goldhill (1999, 409): 'The model of language that assumes that meaning is intentionally encoded in a sentence by an author [...] is hopelessly flawed [sic] in a myriad ways. Not only does it reflect ancient ideas of language [...], but it has also been significantly challenged at every point [sic] by modern linguistics and by modern studies of the philosophy of language.' That is, not only is this model ancient (apparently a valid argument against it), but also it has been criticised by modern studies. However, modern or ancient, we all see language as if it has the capacity of expressing our intended meaning and the truth. One cannot believe that Simon Goldhill thought that his sentences quoted above did not mean what he intended them to, nor that he did not intend for the reader to understand this particular meaning. An assertion that 'meaning is not intentionally encoded in a sentence by an author' must either be a contradiction in terms or a denial of one's own (the subject's) existence, which I also hold is a contradiction in terms: it is certainly incorrect, and on a pragmatic level utterly useless metaphysics. ('Es gehört zur Logik unserer wissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen, daß Gewisses in der Tat nicht angewiesen wird.' Ludwig Wittgenstein, Über Gewissheit § 342). It is, by the way, odd that Goldhill (ibid.) should mention the Aristotelian common-sense man (J. L. Austin as a 'significant challenger' of author-intention, when his speech-act theory as far as I can see (and cf. Furberg 1997, 361, n. 383) relies very much on this concept. One may suspect that Goldhill rather has in mind Jacques Derrida's notorious misunderstandings of Austin, on which I refer to Furberg loc. cit., 363, 365–66.

8 A good place to start looking for bibliography may be Most (1998), especially the editor's preface.
a critical edition. This is not the same as to say that conjectural criticism in the major authors is useless. There are still a great many places (including most of those discussed above) which are demonstrably or probably corrupt and which have not been satisfactorily emended and explained, even if attempts, of various quality, have been made by several scholars. There are also certainly passages that are hardly regarded as suspect today, but which are nevertheless corrupt. If for some reason we think that a conjecture of our own is preferable to the transmitted variants—whether obviously corrupt or not—and also better than, or equal to, the best of the emendations which have already been suggested, we are obliged to try to have it published.

The central matter of textual criticism may not be the individual conjectures themselves as much as the directions, as it were, in which they point: which paths do deserve further exploration in the interest of textual improvement? Positive arguments pertaining to what ought to be the sense, style or exact wording of a corrupt passage will always be of interest, and while a conjecture as such may be suggested only exempli gratia (as most of the above), the arguments in its favour may have relevance. In other words, I endorse Paul Maas's concept of the 'diagnostic conjecture' as a necessary part of the examinatio of passages that are suspected to be corrupt.39
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39 In some cases the 'arguments' will be obvious and implicit in the conjecture itself: in such cases the absence of explicit reasoning should not be taken as subjectivism or impressionism, but as reluctance to state the obvious.
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