

Philologus	151	2007	2	207–229
------------	-----	------	---	---------

PÄR SANDIN

AESCHYLUS, *SUPPLICES* 86–95, 843–910, AND THE EARLY
TRANSMISSION OF ANTISTROPHIC LYRICAL TEXTS*

1.

The phenomenon of transpositions of lines in versified texts is well-known. A displacement of one or a sequential number of lines may be explained by the fact that these have been overlooked by the scribe in the process of copying, later added in the margin, and in a subsequent transcription inserted in the wrong place¹. I have discussed this phenomenon in the appendix to my doctoral dissertation². Within a limited area of text, it is extremely unlikely for more than one transposition of this kind to occur, seeing that, contrary to other types of corruption, there is no plausible rationale for a transposition causing further transpositions to occur in the vicinity. Multiple transpositions are therefore exponentially less likely than single ones. Such arrangements as are found in recent editions of the tragedians, e.g. A. *Supp.* 207–11 West (210, 208, 207, 209, 211), are unacceptable, unless one is able to demonstrate a plausible rationale for the multiple displacements.

I maintain that it is possible to emend or understand *Supp.* 207–11 as well as most other alleged examples of multiple displacements in text-critically more sound fashions³. However, a number of instances – all, I believe, to be found in the text of Aeschylus – present embarrassing obstacles to this line of reasoning. Most contentious is perhaps *Supp.* 86–95:⁴

* This paper is a revised and enlarged version of a lecture given at the St. Petersburg Classical Library, 8 Feb. 2006. I would like to thank the Director, Professor Alexander Gavrilov, and the auditorium from the Dept. of Classical Philology, St. Petersburg State University, for pertinent questions and observations. Due to the somewhat radical suggestions made here, I should add that my thanks does not necessarily imply the approval by these scholars of all of my ideas.

The article was conceived and completed under the generous auspices of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, which funds my present research fellowship at the FU Berlin.

¹ Cf. West (1973) 28, Broadhead (1960) 54, n. 1.

² Sandin (2003) 210–12.

³ See for instance Sandin (2003) 130–32 (and 25, n. 68) on *Supp.* 207–11, and 166–73 (and 28, n. 74) on *Supp.* 290–13.

⁴ The lemmata given in this paper represent my own provisional text of the *Supplices* (on 86–95 see Sandin 2003, pp. 93 ff.).

εὖ θεΐη Διὸς εἰ παναληθῶς	86	91	πίπτει δ' ἀσφαλὲς οὐδ' ἐπὶ νότω
Διὸς ἕμερος. οὐκ εὐθήρατος ἐτύχθη·	87	92	κορυφᾷ Διὸς εἰ κρανθῆ πρόγμα τέλειον.
δαυλοὶ γὰρ παρατίδων	93	88	παντᾶ τοι φλεγέθει
δάσκιοι τε τείνουσιν πόροι, κατιδεῖν	94–95	89–90	κάν σκότῳ κελαινῶ ξὺν τύχῃ μερόπεσσι
ἄφραστοι.			λαοῖς.

86 εὖ θεΐη Διὸς, εἰ Wilamowitz (1914) 30 (duce Hartung) : εἰ θεΐη Διὸς εὖ M 88–90 et 93–95 inter se transp. Westphal (1869) 158 89 κελαινῶ Schmidt (1863) 229 (nol.?), Tucker (-αίνω) : μελαίνα ΣΜ

In my dissertation I could not bring myself to argue against Westphal's arrangement, even while it flies in the face of what I asserted to be the statistical probabilities. Westphal, as we see, transposes two non-connected passages of text within close range (88–90 and 93–95). In my note ad loc. (p. 93), I write: "it may be significant that the displacement concerns two symmetrically corresponding blocks of text in a strophe-antistrophe complex"⁵.

Forty years ago, this and a number of similar alleged transpositions of a radical kind caught the eye of R. D. Dawe as he was studying the text of Aeschylus. He has discussed the matter in his seminal work "The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus" (Dawe 1964, 161–64), and in an article where he proposes a transposition of *Agamemnon* 160–83 ("The Hymn to Zeus") to a place following v. 217 (Dawe 1966, 12–13). As instances of similar transpositions, Dawe mentions *Pers.* 93–100 (should be moved to follow 114), *Cb.* 434–38 (to follow 455), 623–30 (interchanged with 631–38), and the current passage of the *Supplices*. He suggested "with the utmost diffidence" that "there was a time very early in the tradition of Aeschylus when the text was orally transmitted" (1964, 161), and later that "errors of this kind may have taken their origin at the time when the actors recited their parts to scribes" (1966, 13).

I will here try a somewhat different approach, or perhaps rather develop the idea in a more technical fashion (see further below, section 4, on Dawe's idea of oral transmission). While most of the transpositions listed by Dawe, if accepted, could be explained by conventional palaeography, being in fact simple transpositions of a sequential number of lines⁶, *Supplices* 86–95 remain baffling. It seems that this transposition has not before been placed in context with two alleged transpositions of the same kind which occur in the *amoibaion* towards the end of the play (843–910). As we will see, several scholars now agree that certain parts of this (notoriously corrupt) *amoibaion* – to be exact, of the interleaved iambic dialogue between the strophes – have suffered the same kind of symmetrical interchanges as have *Supp.* 86–95.

⁵ See also Friis Johansen–Whittle II. 87–88. A defence of the traditional order is found in Booth (1974), followed by Rash (1981) 214–16.

⁶ As for his transposition of *Ag.* 160–83, Dawe suggests that it "may have arisen mechanically, from a leaf in a MS being inserted in the wrong place" (1966, 13).

In *Supplices* 843–910 the Danaids, left alone on the shore of Argos, at last face their followers. Emissaries of the sons of Aegyptus – the cousins and rejected suitors of the Danaids – arrive with the purpose of returning the girls to Egypt. A lyrical dialogue takes place between the Danaids and the leader of the Egyptian deputation – the Herald (an Egyptian chorus of slave-henchmen may also join in at times: *v. infra*).

In the second strophe and antistrophe (866–84), Oberdick interchanged the order of the Herald’s trimeters that answer to the Danaids’ sung verses (872–75 ↔ 882–84).

Danaids:

αἰᾶ αἰᾶ,	866	867
εἰ γὰρ δυσπαλάμῳς ὄλοιο	867	877
δι’ ἀλίρρυτον ἄλλος,	868	878
κατὰ Σαρπηδόνιον χῶμα πολύψαμμον	869–71	879–81
ἀλαθεῖς ἱεῦρεῖαις εἰνὶ αὔραις.		

Danaids:

οἰοῖ οἰοῖ,	
ἱλυμασις ὑπρογαυλάσκοι	
περιχαμπτὰτ’ βουάζεις	
ἦδ’ ἐρωτᾶςτ’ ὁ μέγας Νεῖλος ὑβρίζοντά	
σ’ ἀποτρέφει ἱέναιστοντ’ ὕβριν.	

Herald:

βαίνειν κελεύω βᾶριν εἰς ἀμφίστροφον	882	872
ὄσον τάχιστα· μηδέ τις σχολαζέτω.	883	873
ὀλκῆ γὰρ οὐ τοι πλόκαμον οὐδάμ’	884	874–75
ἄζεται		

Herald:

ἴυξε καὶ λάκαζε καὶ κάλει θεοῦς.	
Αἰγυπτίαν γὰρ βᾶριν οὐχ ὑπερθορῆ.	
ἦἴυξε καὶ βόα, πικρότερον ἄχρων οἰζύοσ	
ὄνομ’ ἔχωντ’	

872–75 et 882–84 inter se transp. Oberdick.

This transposition has been accepted in the recent editions of Friis Johansen–Whittle and West. It is particularly attractive in regard of the antistrophe. The Herald’s callous ἴυξε καὶ λάκαζε καὶ κάλει θεοῦς is a perfectly fitting answer to 879–81, where the Danaids do indeed call on a god⁷. For further argumentation in favour of the transposition, see Friis Johansen–Whittle II. 204–5.

Friis Johansen–Whittle and West also adopt Heath’s (1762) similar transposition of the Herald’s trimeters (906–7 ↔ 909–10) in answer to the fourth “strophe and anti-strophe”, which consist of one verse only. This appears to be called for by the Herald’s ἀνακτᾶς in 906, which is hard not to take as a sarcastic answer to ἀναξ in 908⁸:

⁷ The mss. give the god’s name as Νεῖλος, which is suitable, this being a god that the Egyptian herald would actually recognise. Friis Johansen–Whittle and West would emend, the former believing that this answer makes light of the Herald’s own paternal god in an unacceptable way, the latter (West 1990, 162) giving a number of reasonable objections, few of which ought to have mattered much to Aeschylus, however. The answer contains no explicit disrespect of the god (unlike 893–94, which is an expressed disavowal of the Greek gods), and the Herald surely believes that the gods are on his side in this matter, which makes the Danaids’ invocation void.

⁸ Wilamowitz chose instead to switch places of 905 and 908. Friis Johansen–Whittle ad loc. list reasons to prefer Heath’s transposition.

– ἰὼ πόλεως ἀγοὶ πρόμοι, δάμναμαι.	905	908	– διωλόμεσθ'· ἄεπτ', ἄναξ, πάσχομεν.
– ἔλξιν ἔοιχ' ὑμᾶς ἐπισπάσας κόμης,	909	906	– πολλοὺς ἄνακτας, παῖδας Αἰγύπτου, τάχα
ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀκούετ' ὄξυ τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων.	910	907	ὑψεσθε· θαροεῖτ', οὐκ ἐρεῖτ' ἀναρχίαν.

906–7 et 909–10 inter se transp. Heath (1762): 905 et 908 Wilamowitz

I shall add yet another conjectural transposition to the list. It has not previously been suggested that part of the first strophe and antistrophe of the same amoibaion (843–65) may have suffered an interchange equivalent to the ones just mentioned. In my mind there is little doubt that -αιμον in 847 originally answered to αἶμα in 858, just as ἄνακτας to ἄναξ in 908–906. These kinds of catchwords are especially common in the amoibaia of the *Supplices*. We may compare 356–59, 375–76, 417–18, and 758–60 (cited in order):

– εἴη δ' ἄνατον προᾶγμα τοῦτ' ἀστοξένων,
μηδ' ἐξ ἀέλπτων κάπρομηθήτων πόλει
νεῖκος γένηται· τῶν γὰρ οὐ δεῖται πόλις.
– ἴδοιτο δῆτ' ἄνατον φυγὰν
Ἰκεσία Θέμις Διὸς Κλαρίου.

– πᾶν ἐπικραίνεις· ἄγος φυλάσσου.
– ἄγος μὲν εἴη τοῖς ἐμοῖς παλιγκότοις.

– μῶν οὐ δοκεῖ δεῖν φροντίδος σωτηρίου;
– φρόντισον καὶ γενοῦ πανδίκως
εὐσεβῆς πρόξενος.

– μεμαργωμένοι κυνοθρασεῖς, θεῶν
οὐδὲν ἐπαῖοντες.
– ἀλλ' ἔστι φήμη κρείσσονας λύκους κυνῶν
εἶναι.

If we suppose that the second, respondent parts of the first strophe and antistrophe, that is the parts sung by either the Herald or the chorus of Egyptians (*v. infra*), have been interchanged, we get a text in the manner of the following:

Danaids:

εἴθ' ἀνά πολύρρυτον
ἀλμήντα πόρον
δεσποσίω ξὺν ὕβρει
γομφοδέτω τε δόρει διῶλου.

843
844
845
846

Danaids:

μήποτε πάλιν σ' ἴδοι
ἀλφεισίβοιον ὕδωρ,
ἔνθεν ἀεξόμενον
ζῶφυτον αἶμα βροτοῖσι θάλλει.

854
855
856
857–58

Herald and/or Egyptian Chorus:

†άγειος ἐγὼ βαθυχαῖος	859
†βαθρείας βαθρείας γέρον†.	860
σὺ δ' ἐν ναῖ ναῖ βάση	861
τάχα θέλεος ἀθέλεος ἴβια βία τε,	862
πολλᾶι φροῦδα βάταε βαθυ-	863
μιτροκακὰ παθῶν	864
ὀλόμεναι παλάμαις†	865

Herald and/or Egyptian Chorus:

847	848	849	850–51	852	853

847–53 et 859–65 inter se transposui 859 ἄρειος West (1990) 157 : fort. *άγειρός? βαθύχᾶος West ibid. 854 σ' ὕδοι scripsi : εἶδοι M 847 δίαμον Weil, ἔσω σ' Paley : αἴμονεσός M : ἡμαγμένον σε καθίζω Σ ἐπ' ἀμάδα Schütz (accentus West l.c.) : ἐπάμιδα M

If we disregard the infernal corruptions, the resulting effectiveness of the lyric dialogue that remains tolerably sound – at least the respective first lines of the responses of the Herald/Egyptians in the strophe and antistrophe – indicates that this may be the correct arrangement. The Herald's callous retort to the invocation of ζώφυτον αἶμα (857) is perfectly suitable to context and character. We should note that the Danaids' language in these strophes is particularly high and "Grecian", with sacral-hymnic rather than Homeric notes in expressions like πολύροτον ἄλμῆεντα πόρον and ἀλφεισίβοιον ὕδωρ. There is an extreme contrast to the orkish blurtings of the previous (836–42: *v. infr.*) and to the barbarian song in the amoebaeic answers, which is likely to have been heightened further by the musical accompaniment⁹. Even so, the most shocking feature would have been the answer to the Danaids' solemn invocation of the "life-giving blood of mortals" – here with the conjectures of Paley and Weil: "bloody throughout I shall throw you into the ship". The barbaric retort expresses a complete disregard for the invoked holiness of human blood, and, which is the same thing, for its potentially disastrous unholiness – the ἄγος – if spilled in the wrong context (for instance, as here, in a holy sanctuary). This is in perfect agreement with the behaviour of the Herald elsewhere, on which I may cite Friis Johansen–Whittle 893n. (III. 222):

The Herald's contempt for the Argive gods (foreshadowed in 872 κἀλει θεούς, implied in 921, re-stated in 922–23, and condemned in 927) is akin to [...] the sacrilegiousness generally predicated of his masters in 750–59; cf. too 428–32n. His attitude – which, historically speaking, is characteristically Egyptian [...] – contrasts sharply with that of Danaus and his daughters (cf. 186ff., 204ff.), as well as with the religious behaviour expected by Greeks of themselves and of non-Greeks.

So far the antistrophe. The transposition may also yield an improvement of the understanding of the words in the strophe. The response in 859–60 should make sense if taken as a reaction to the Danaids' use of the adjective δεσποσίω in 845. The

⁹ On the contrast between "Hellenic civilisation" and "Egyptian barbarism" in the play, see Garvie (1969) 49, Hall (1989) Index s.v. *Supplices*; cf. also Friis Johansen–Whittle III. 173–74.

scholiast (Σ 859) interprets βαθυχαῖος as ἡ μεγάλως εὐγενής. χαοὶ γὰρ οἱ εὐγενεῖς. We may ignore the fact that he thinks that the Danaids are speaking (cf. West 1990, 157): if the scholiast is correct, and the words are intended as an assertion of nobility and high rank, they are very fitting as a response to δεσποσίω ξὺν ὕβρει, ‘the hybris of your masters’. The adjective δεσπόσιος is a *hapax*, but the stem δεσποτ- can take on a somewhat sinister quality in classical Greek, denoting a definitive, unfree power-relation, indeed that between a master and a slave (cf. *Pers.* 587, *Ch.* 942). Stung, the Herald ensures in lyrical verses that he is no lowly thrall like his stooges, at the same time volunteering what will serve as an introduction to his person, and, more importantly, clearly indicating to the audience that his masters – the δεσπόσιος ὕβρις – are not present. For the non-attested and irrelevant ἄγειος (‘without land’) in 859 one may suggest the likewise non-attested, but pertinent *ἀγειρός (on analogy with ἄγω – ἀγός), ‘collector’, ‘herder’¹⁰.

As becomes obvious from this line of argument, I think it is more likely that the Herald sings these verses solo, than that the entire Egyptian chorus joins in. There is in fact a marked contrast to the astrophic lyric of 836–42 (*v. infra*), and to what may have been anapaests in 825–26. Those passages have rightly been characterized as “satyric” (see West 1990, 152–53, Maas 1962, 54 [§ 76]) and would suit a chorus of “gelbe und schwarze Teufel” or “wilde Ägypter und Neger” – both characterizations by Wilamowitz, who, while his language may be displeasing to 21st-century sensibilities, has certainly hit upon the right note¹¹. However corrupt, the lyrics in 858–65 and 847–52 come forth as more “civilised”¹². One may imagine a scenario where the Herald sings the lead vocal against a backdrop of non-verbal harmony from the chorus, although there is no evidence for such an arrangement of Greek choral song¹³.

If one accepts the presence of three interchanges of the strophic and antistrophic parts of the Herald’s answers, out the total of four strophes and antistrophes in the amoibaion, it is reasonable to consider whether the respondent’s parts have not in fact suffered reversal *in toto*, having at some stage in the textual tradition been transcribed separately from those of the Danaids. Such a transposition would arguably be more economical than the three separate transpositions considered above, possibly presupposing only one actual instance of corruption (*v. infra*, section 2). With the Herald’s parts of strophe–antistrophe nos. 1, 2 and 4 reversed, only no. 3 remains:¹⁴

¹⁰ ἀγούρης, ‘mendicant (priest)’, is an attested verbal noun of ἀγείρω.

¹¹ Wilamowitz (1914) 8; Wilamowitz (1923) 315; cit. West (1990) 152.

¹² Taplin (1977) 216–17 argues that the Egyptians were not a chorus at all, but simply staffage, like the silent retinue of Pelagus in 234–503, and, accordingly, that the Herald sings also 839–42. But this passage cannot possibly have been sung by a herald, let alone by a person asserting to be βαθυχαῖος.

¹³ On the contrary, West (1992) 39 seems to suggest that Greek singing was always articulate and verbal. Then again, a non-verbal background vocal would in this case put further emphasis on the outlandishness of the chorus – as in the inarticulate ὄ ὄ ὄ ἄ ἄ ἄ of their first appearance, v. 825.

¹⁴ This being a provisional text (see above, n. 3), I venture to insert a couple of conjectures of my own without further comment. I intend to discuss these in a future edition of the *Supplices*.

Danaids:

οἰοῖ πάτερ, βρότεος ἄρος 885 895
 ματᾶ < > μ' ἄλαδ' ἄγει
 ἄραχνος ὡς βάδην
 ὄναρ ὄναρ μέλαν.
 ὀτοτοτοτοῖ, μᾶ Γᾶ μᾶ Γᾶ, βοᾶν ephymn. 890 900
 φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε·
 ὦ βᾶ Γᾶς παῖ Ζεῦ

Danaids:

αἰαῖ, πέλας δίπους ὄφις
 < μαιμᾶ >
 ἔχιδνα δ' ὄς † με
 τί ποτ' ἔν δάκος ἀχ†
 ὀτοτοτοτοῖ, μᾶ Γᾶ μᾶ Γᾶ βοᾶν ephymn.
 φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε·
 ὦ βᾶ Γᾶς παῖ Ζεῦ

Herald:

εἰ μή τις ἐς ναῦν εἴσιν αἰνέσας τάδε, 903 893
 λακίς χιτῶνος ἔργον οὐ κατοικτιεῖ. 904 894

Herald:

οὔτοι φοβοῦμαι δαίμονας τοὺς ἐνθάδε·
 οὐ γὰρ μ' ἔθρεψαν, οὐδ' ἐγήρασαν τροφῆ.

885 βρότεος ἄρος Abrisch 1763 e Σ : βροτιοα | ρος M : βρότεος ἄρος Eustathius 1422.20 886 ματᾶ Bamberger (1842) 710 (= 1856, 132) : αται M lacunam pos. West (1990) 164 μ' ἄλαδ' ἄγει Musgrave: μαλδαῖγει M 893–94 et 903–4 transposui 895 αἰαῖ scripsi : μαιμᾶ edd. : μαι μαι M post 895 lacunam posui

There is little either to recommend or to damn a transposition of the Herald's answers here. The talk about δαίμονας τοὺς ἐνθάδε in the strophe refers to the ephymnion, which of course is identical in the antistrophe. We might perhaps suggest one beneficial effect of the transposition, though: it makes the structure similar to strophe–antistrophe 2 and 4 (with the Herald's parts transposed). In the strophe we receive in each case a blunt threat of violence (to hair and clothes, respectively: 884 = 904, 909), in the antistrophe a somewhat more “thoughtful” and “reasoned” – i.e. sarcastic or dismissive – answer (873–75 = 893–94, 906–7).

2.

In the light of these alleged transpositions, we should consider the possibility that the antistrophic lyric of tragedy may occasionally have gone through cases of more complicated textual transcription, with regard to the graphic disposition, than the standard prose arrangement that the handbooks state that they were subject to before Hellenistic times¹⁵. In fact, different kinds of manuscripts existed for different pur-

¹⁵ E.g. Pfeiffer (1968) 186; Reynolds–Wilson (1991) 4–5. A handful papyri with lyrical content (i.e. melic poetry, not verse in general) have survived from the third century; only one, I believe, from the fourth: *PBerol.* 9875, containing a large fragment from Timotheus' *Persians* (on this famous papyrus see Hordern 2002, 62 ff.). A papyrus from the fifth century is reported to have been found in the grave of a professional singer in Attica, which would lead one to expect a lyrical or even musical content, but it has not been published even after twenty-five years (see Cockle 1983, 147; Pöhlmann 1994, 5 [with refs n. 50]; Hordern 2002, 65, n. 172). Some of the most important third-century examples are: *PStrassb.* W. G. 307 (ed. Crönert 1922, 17–26; Lewis 1936, 52–75; cf. Turner 1987, no. 30, p. 60), containing lyrical excerpts from tragedies of Euripides, including a large portion from *Phoenissae* (1500–1581); *PBerol.* 9771 (Schubart–Wilamowitz 1907, 79–84; cf. Schubart 1911, Tafel 4b and p. viii; Diggle 1970, Plate v and p. 34), containing most of the first choral ode of Euripides'

poses, which is shown to have been the case by the few papyrus fragments of tragedy which have been preserved with intact musical notation¹⁶.

The traditions of the craft, economical considerations, and/or *horror vacui* might not have let the early scribes endure the irregular emptiness on the right side of the columns that is the result of a colometric arrangement of complex lyrical poetry. However, in the case of antistrophic dramatic poetry, in particular an amoibaion with several lyrical voices, a regular prose arrangement will be very unmanageable and awkward. The customer who commissioned the copy might actually want more than so; the general reader probably, but without question the tragic director who would attempt a re-staging of the drama. One “primitive” solution might be to arrange the corresponding strophes on lines above each other, as verses in modern musical scores (also in the modern editing of musical papyri, loc.cit. n. 16). Musical notation for each strophe might be added above the lines in the following manner¹⁷:

Phaëthon, from another Euripidean florilegium; *PLeid.* Inv. 510 (= DAGM no. 4) containing lyrical excerpts from the *Iphigenia in Aulis* with musical notation; *PBerol.* 13270 (= *Carmina convivialia* 34 PMG, Schubart–Wilamowitz 1907, Tafel 8, pp. 56–62) containing anonymous Attic (?) drinking-songs – the so-called “Elephantine scolia” (cf. Hordern 2002, 65, text for n. 172). In all these cases the lyrical texts are presented as prose, without apparent consideration taken to metre and colometry, although the scribes prefer to let line-ends coincide with word-ends (Hordern 2002, 66). One exception was found in 1973: the “Lille Stesichorus” (*PLille* inv. 76a+73), a large fragment dated by Eric Turner (1980) to the mid-third century B.C., containing triadic choral lyric on internal grounds identified as Stesichorus’ *Thebaid*. The text is colometrically arranged, and the assigned date casts doubt on the tradition that Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257–180 B.C.) invented metrical colometry (D.H. *Comp.* 156, 211); see Turner (1980) 38; (1987)124.

¹⁶ DAGM nos. 3–5 (pp. 13–25). The musical papyri from Hellenistic and later times seem to have had a consistently different layout than normal literary papyri, with much broader columns: see Johnson (2000) 66–68 for a good account.

¹⁷ We know little to nothing of the pre-Hellenistic systems of musical notation and of the earliest transmission of the music of drama, notwithstanding the fact that the matter has been subject to a virtual flood of publications in recent years, mostly concerned with the controversy over the evidence value of the lyrical colometries preserved in medieval manuscripts. The seminal work appears to have been Fleming–Kopff (1992) who defended the medieval colometries and presupposed an unbroken tradition of musical notation as well as text from the fifth century B.C. to the Alexandrians. This was the start of an intense debate, the camps generally forming according to national provenience (with roughly the Italians being in favour of, the English being against the intrinsic value of medieval colometry). An attempt to sort out the question has just now appeared in Lucia Prauscello’s impressive monograph “Singing Alexandria” (2006). I fully support her cautious pessimism about the early textual and musical tradition (see, e.g., pp. 80–86 for something approaching a general picture), even if I do believe (as will be evident) that musical notation may have played a (fatal) role in the early tradition of the *Supplices*. See further section four below, and see, e.g., Pöhlmann (1976, 1986, 1988b, 1991, 2005), West (1992) 261ff., Fleming (1999) and Landels (1999) 218–21 for some different views on the musical papyri and musical notation and its tradition in antiquity. – “Musical notation was not highly regarded in antiquity” (DAGM p. 1, cf. West 1992, 269–73); on the other hand, the passage cited by West l.c. 271 from the theoretic Aristoxenus (cf. Pöhlmann 1976 [p. 61]) does imply that texts with musical notation were fairly common at the time (fourth century). *Harm.* 2.39 (p. 49 da Rios): οὐ γὰρ ὅτι πέρας τῆς ἁρμονικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἐστὶν ἡ παρασημαντικὴ, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ μέρος οὐδέν, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῆς μετρικῆς τὸ γράψασθαι τῶν μέτρων ἕκαστον· εἰ δ’ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τούτων οὐκ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τὸν δυνάμενον γράψασθαι τὸ ἱαμβικὸν μέτρον καὶ ἄριστά γε εἶδέναι τί ἐστὶ τὸ ἱαμβικόν, οὕτως ἔχει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μελωδομένων – οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖόν

843–45	ΕΙΘΑΝΑΠΟΛΥΡΡΥΤΟΝΑΛΜΗΝΤΑΠΟΡΟΝΔΕΣΤΟΚΙΩΙΞΥΝΥΒΡΕΙ ¹⁸
854–56	ΜΗΠΟΤΕΠΑΛΙΝΚΙΔΟΙΑΛΦΕΣΙΒΟΙΟΝΥΔΩΡΕΝΘΕΝΑΕΞΟΜΕΝΟΝ
846	ΓΟΜΦΟΔΕΤΩΙΤΕΔΟΡΕΙΔΙΩΛΟΥ
857	ΖΩΦΥΤΟΝΑΙΜΑΒΡΟΤΟΙΣΙΘΑΛΛΕΙ

Apart from the parallel antistrophic arrangement, the text is presented as prose, without consideration taken to colometry, as in most of the early papyri of lyrical texts (*v. supra*, n. 15). A regular “prose” arrangement is also found in all papyri with preserved musical notation, regardless of age (DAGM p. 15), and it is worth noting that in in one of them, the Vienna papyrus of Euripides’ *Orestes* 339–44 (DAGM no. 3, *PVind. G* 2315), “the layout of the notation has been copied mechanically from the strophe to the antistrophe” (DAGM p. 16). This is possible to ascertain from the fact that parts of the musical notation refer to features of the text that occur in the strophe, while the papyrus contains a fragment of the antistrophe only, where these features are absent, and the notation accordingly meaningless. This means that in the exemplar of this copy (or in an earlier ancestor), the musical notation was given only once, above the words of the strophe.

An early transmission of antistrophic lyric in this or a related form may begin to explain the peculiar transpositions discussed above. If we presuppose an exemplar of the text arranged in this manner, the corruption may take its origin in the scribe’s accidentally skipping a line. We use *Supp.* 86–95 as the paradigm:

ΕΥΘΕΙΗΔΙΟΥΣΕΠΑΝΑΛΗΘΩΣΔΙΟΥΣΙΜΕΡΟΣΟΥΚΕΥΘΗΡΑΤΟΣΕΤΥΧΘΗ	86–87
ΠΙΠΤΕΙΔΑΣΦΑΛΕΣΟΥΔΕΠΙΝΩΤΩΙΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΔΙΟΥΣΕΙΚΡΑΝΘΗΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ	91–92
{ΔΑΥΛΟΙΓΑΡΠΡΑΠΙΔΩΝΔΑΣΚΙΟΙΤΕΤΕΙΝΟΥΣΙΝΠΟΡΟΙΚΑΤΙΔΕΙΝΑΦΡΑΣΤΟΙ}	93–95
ΠΑΝΤΑΙΤΟΙΦΛΕΓΕΘΕΙΚΑΝΣΚΟΤΩΙΚΕΛΑΙΝΩΙΞΥΝΤΥΧΑΙΜΕΡΟΠΕΣΣΙΛΑΟΙΣ	88–90

The mistake is bound to be discovered, either by the scribe himself or later by a corrector; however, it is not easily amended. The remedy would have to be the addition of the line in the margin. This, in turn, might have prompted a reversion in

ἔστι τὸν γραψάμενον τὸ φρύγιον μέλος καὶ ἄριστά γε εἰδέναι τί ἐστὶ τὸ φρύγιον μέλος – δῆλον ὅτι οὐκ ἂν εἶη τῆς εἰρημένης ἐπιστήμης πέρας ἢ παρασημαντική. The reference must be to the fact that scribes copy metrical and musical notations without understanding them, which Aristoxenus uses as a sophistic argument against taking notation as proper to the art of musicology.

¹⁸ I use an uncial type for my hypothetical reconstructions of the early tradition. Even though the features of some glyphs may be anachronistic, an uncial will better approximate the kind of bookhands current in the fourth century B. C. than will a regular capital majuscule.

the next instance of transmission, which would eventually result in the text in the manner of M:

ΕΥΘΕΙΗΔΙΟΣΕΙΠΑΝΑΛΗΘΩΣΔΙΟΣΙΜΕΡΟΣΟΥΚΕΥΘΗΡΑΤΟΣΕΤΥΧΗ
 ΠΙΠΤΕΙΔΑΣΦΑΛΕΣΟΥΔΕΠΙΝΩΤΩΙΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΔΙΟΣΕΙΚΡΑΝΗΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ
 ΠΑΝΤΑΙΤΟΙΦΛΕΓΕΘΕΙΚΑΝΣΚΟΤΩΙΚΕΛΑΙΝΩΙΞΥΝΤΥΧΑΙΜΕΡΟΠΕΣΣΙΛΑΟΙΣ
 ΔΑΥΛΟΙΓΑΡΠΡΑΠΙΔΩΝΔΑΣΚΙΟΙΤΕΤΕΙΝΟΥΣΙΝΠΟΡΟΙΚΑΤΙΔΕΙΝΑΦΡΑΣΤΟΙ

The line 93–95 is wrongly inserted after 88–90:

ΕΥΘΕΙΗΔΙΟΣΕΙΠΑΝΑΛΗΘΩΣΔΙΟΣΙΜΕΡΟΣΟΥΚΕΥΘΗΡΑΤΟΣΕΤΥΧΗ	86–87
ΠΙΠΤΕΙΔΑΣΦΑΛΕΣΟΥΔΕΠΙΝΩΤΩΙΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΔΙΟΣΕΙΚΡΑΝΗΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ	91–92
ΠΑΝΤΑΙΤΟΙΦΛΕΓΕΘΕΙΚΑΝΣΚΟΤΩΙΚΕΛΑΙΝΩΙΞΥΝΤΥΧΑΙΜΕΡΟΠΕΣΣΙΛΑΟΙΣ	88–90
ΔΑΥΛΟΙΓΑΡΠΡΑΠΙΔΩΝΔΑΣΚΙΟΙΤΕΤΕΙΝΟΥΣΙΝΠΟΡΟΙΚΑΤΙΔΕΙΝΑΦΡΑΣΤΟΙ	93–95

Adapted into a regular textual arrangement, 88–90 and 93–95 will end up in the reversed positions they currently hold in the mss.:

εὖ θεΐη Διὸς εἰ παναληθῶς Διὸς ἕμερος. οὐκ εὐθήρατος ἐτύχθη·	86–87
παντᾶ τοι φλεγέθει κἄν σκότῳ κελαινῶ ξὺν τύχᾳ μερόπεσι λαοῖς.	88–90
πίπτει δ' ἀσφαλὲς οὐδ' ἐπὶ νότῳ κορυφᾷ Διὸς εἰ κρανῆη πρᾶγμα τέλειον.	91–92
δαυλοὶ γὰρ πραπίδων δάσκιόι τε τείνουσιν πόροι, κατιδεῖν ἄφραστοι.	93–95

The case of *Supp.* 843–910 is more complicated. If we are right, and these kinds of transpositions have affected all the Egyptian parts of the amoibaion, but not the songs of the Danaids to which they answer, the implication would be that the two at some stage in the tradition have been transmitted separately. A number of considerations might support such a premise. First, it is demonstrably the case that the lyrical sections of drama, including classical tragedy, were sometimes omitted in manuscripts and/or separately transmitted¹⁹. These parts would have been difficult already for the poets' contemporaries, and might have been of secondary interest to many readers

¹⁹ We possess papyrus fragments from a number of tragic mss. transmitted without the lyrical parts, alternately giving these on the reverse side of the papyrus. In *PSorb.* 2252 (c. 250 B.C.), a fragment of Euripides' *Hippolytus*, the lyrical passage 58–72 has been left out (see Barrett 1964, 438, Pöhlmann 1977 [p. 200]). In *PHib.* 14 (= *PLitLond* 80, possibly fourth century B. C.: Hordern 2002, 67, n. 177), which contains fragments of an unknown tragedy (*Trag. adesp.* 625: see Stephanopoulos 1988, 237–41 on the attribution), an editorial note between two iambic lines states χοροῦ μέλος, i.e. a choral song has been left out (see Kannicht 1981 ad loc.). A similar note is found in *PColon.* 241 (second century B.C.), an unknown tragedy featuring Achilles (*Trag. adesp.* 640b, ed. Kannicht 2004, II 1133): ἄλλα ὀπίσω χοροῦ μῆλ: “more on the back: choral song” (see Gronewald 1987, 6–7, 20, Kannicht ad loc., and also Pöhlmann 1977 [1995] for further examples of the note χοροῦ in tragic and (especially) comic papyri [1995, pp. 200–201 for the tragic examples]). In one of the musical papyri, no. 5 DAGM = *PAshm. Inv* 89B (third-second c. B.C.), we find iambic and anapaestic passages from Ἀχιλλεῦ[ε] Σοφοκλ[έου] on one side of a papyrus scrap, and lyrical fragments – not unlikely to be

in later classical times. Professionals, however – musicians, actors, directors, and scholars – would on the other hand want texts of the lyrical passages adapted to the purposes of their craft. We conjectured (*v. supra*) that the music accompanying the Egyptian parts of the amoibaion was of a different character from the Danaids' songs – “barbarian” and “Grecian”, respectively. This, together with the fact that the parts were sung or recited²⁰ by different actors and/or choreutae, may provide a reason for separate transmission (cf. *infra*, section 4)²¹.

[ – ΔΑΝΑΙΔΕΣ – α —————]	[ – ΚΗΡΥΞ – α —————]
ΕΙΘΑΝΑΠΟΛΥΡΡΥΤΟΝΑΛΜΗΝΤΑΠΟ 843–44a	ΑΓΕΙΟΥΣΕΓΩΒΑΘΥΧΑΙΟΣ†ΒΑΘΡΕΙΑΣΒΑΘ 859–60a
ΜΗΠΟΤΕΠΑΛΙΝΣΙΔΟΙΑΛΦΕΣΙΒΟΙΟΥ 854–54a	ΔΙΑΙΜΟΝΕΣΩΣΕΠΑΜΑΔΑ†ΗΣΥΔΟΥΠΙΑ 847–48a
[ —————]	[ —————]
ΡΟΝΔΕΣΠΟΣΚΩΙΣΥΝΥΒΡΕΙΓΟΜΦΟΔΕ 844–46a	ΡΕΙΑΣΓΕΡΟΝ†ΣΥΔΕΝΝΑΪΝΑΪΒΑΣΗΤΑΧΑ 860b–62a
ΔΩΡΕΝΘΕΝΑΕΞΟΜΕΝΟΝΖΩΦΥΤΟΝ 854a–56a	ΤΑΠΙΤΑ†ΚΕΛΕΥΩΒΙΑΙΜΕΘΕΣΕΘΑΙΙΧΑΡ 848b–50a
[ ————— β —————]	[ —————]
ΤΩΠΤΕΔΟΡΕΙΑΔΙΩΛΟΥ : ΔΙΑΙΑΙΕΙΓΑΡ 846b:866–67a	ΘΕΛΕΟΣΑΘΕΛΕΟΣ†ΒΙΑΓ† ΚΤΛ 862b–...
ΔΙΜΑΒΡΟΤΟΙΣΘΑΛΛΕΙ : ΟΙΟΙΟΙ†ΛΥΜΑ 856b:876–77a	ΦΡΕΝΙ†ΤΑΤΑΝΚΩΙΟΝ† ΚΤΛ 850b–...
[ —————]	[ ————— β —————]
ΔΥΣΠΑΛΑΜΩΣ ΚΤΛ 867b–...	†ΠΑΛΑΜΑΙΣ†:ΒΑΙΝΕΙΝΚΕΛΕΥΩ ΚΤΛ –865:882–
ΣΙΣΥΠΡΟΓΑΣ† ΚΤΛ 877b–...	†ΕΥΣΕΒΩΝ†: ΙΥΖΕΚΑΙΛΑΚΑΖΕ ΚΤΛ –853:872–
[ ————— γ —————]	[ ————— γ —————]
..... ΑΥΡΑΙΣ : ΟΙΟΠΑΤΕΡΒΡΕΤΕΟΣ –871:885– ΑΖΕΤΑΙ : ΕΙΜΗΤΙΣΕΙΣΝΑΥΝ –884:903–
..... ΥΒΡΙΝ : ΔΙΑΙΠΕΛΑΣΔΙΠΟΥΣ –881:895–	... ΟΝΟΜΕΧΩΝ : ΟΥΤΟΙΦΟΒΟΥΜΑΙ –874:893–
ΚΤΛ ...	ΚΤΛ ...

Here the respective parts of the amoibaion are ordered in narrow columns next to each other, but only for the sake of presentation: their interrelation and the width

from the same drama – on the other (see eds. ad loc, p. 25, and West 1999, 43–53). Separate lyrical excerpts from drama have also been found, with and without musical notation (some examples *supra* n. 15). The Orestes papyrus referred to above (*PVind.* G 2315, third-second c. B. C.) was found together with a number of smaller musical papyri (9–14 DAGM, see pp. 45–46), suggesting that this, too – indeed perhaps all fragments of tragedy preserved with musical notation – might have been transmitted separately from the iambic and anapaestic parts. – See Prauscello (2006) 118–21, 178–83 on “performance texts” of tragic lyrical passages in Hellenistic times (with a focus on *PVind.* G 2315 and *PLeid.* Inv. 510 = nos. 3–4 DAGM).

²⁰ The trimeters were most likely semi-lyrical, being recited to musical accompaniment in the manner of *parakatalogē* (Arist. *Pr.* 918a, [Plu.] *De musica* 1140f–1141a) or *anaboēma* (Psell. *De trag.* 9). See Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 156–64, West (1992) 40.

²¹ Indeed a case may be made for Dawe’s idea that at some point “the actors recited their parts to scribes” (*v. supra*, *v. infra* section 4).

of the columns are irrelevant to the argument, and the columns may represent separate papyri. Let us just assume that the Danaids' and the Herald's parts are not presented as a continuous text interweaved in an amoibaion, but separately from each other, perhaps with signs indicating which parts of the former answer to which of the latter.

Let us then concentrate on the Egyptian, that is, the right "papyrus". We assume that a copy is made where the musical notation is left out, but the separate transmission preserved. Here the scribe makes his crucial mistake: accidentally, he skips the first line, **ΔΓΕΙΟCΕΓΩ ΚΤΛ**. The beginning of the first two lines (of the right column) are in fact quite similar, in particular if we look at the text of M in the place where we would read Weil's conjecture (δίαμνον):

ΔΓΕΙΟCΕΓΩ
ΔΙΜΟΝΕCΩ

The slip may have been even easier if we assume that the beginnings of the strophe and antistrophe were labelled **Α** and **Β**, respectively:

Α ΔΓΕΙΟCΕΓΩ
Β ΔΙΑΙΜΟΝΕCΩ

The iota in **ΔΙ-** has been partly defaced in the exemplar. The scribe then effects two corruptions at the same time: while his eyes slide from the first line to the second, they at the same time pass over **ΔΙ-** in **ΔΙΑΙΜΟΝ**, perhaps reading the delta as an alpha indicating strophe as opposed to antistrophe:

Α ΔΓΕΙΟCΕΓΩ
ΔΙΑΙΜΟΝΕCΩ

As in our paradigm (*v. supra*), the former mistake is found out, and the line added in the margin:

		ΔΓΕΙΟCΕΓΩΒΔΕΥΧΑΙ 859–60a ΟCΤΒΑΘΡΕΙΑCΒΑΘ
847–48a	ΔΙΜΟΝΕCΩCΕΠΤΑΜΑΔΑΗCΥΔΟΥΠΙΑ	
860b–62a	ΡΕΙΑCΓΕΡΟΝ†CΥΔΕΝΝΑΪΝΑΪΒΑCΗΤΑΧΑ	
848b–50a	ΤΑΠΙΤΑ†ΚΕΛΕΥΩΒΙΑΙΜΕΘΕCΘΑΙΙΧΑΡ	
862b– ...	ΘΕΛΕΟCΑΘΕΛΕΟC†ΒΙΑΙ† ΚΤΛ	
850b– ...	ΦΡΕΝΗ†ΤΑΤΑΝΙΩΙΟΝ† ΚΤΛ	
–865 : 882–	†ΠΑΛΑΜΑΙC† : ΒΑΙΝΕΙΝΚΕΛΕΥΩ ΚΤΛ ...	
–853 : 872–	†ΕΥCΕΒΩΝ† : ΙΥΖΕΚΑΙΛΑΚΑΖΕ ΚΤΛ ...	
–884 : 903– ΑΖΕΤΑΙ : ΕΙΜΗΤΙCΕΙCΝΔΥΝ	
–874 : 893–	... ΟΝΟΜΕΧΩΝ : ΟΥΤΟΙΦΟΒΟΥΜΑΙ	

Adapting an antistrophic text with this kind of parallel arrangement into a regular sequential one, the scribe might first sort out the lines in a mechanical fashion, for

instance copying every odd line to one wax tablet (strophe), every even to another (antistrophe).

847–53 : 872–74 : 893–

ΛΙΜΟΝΕΣΩΣΕΠΑΜΑΔΑΗΣΥΔΟΥΠΙΑ
 ΤΑΠΙΤΑ†ΚΕΛΕΥΩΒΙΑΙΜΕΘΕΣΘΑΙΧΑΡ
 ΦΡΕΝΙ†ΤΑΤΑΝΙΩΙΟΝ† ΚΤΛ
 †ΕΥΣΕΒΩΝ† : ΙΥΖΕΚΑΙΛΑΚΑΖΕ ΚΤΛ ...
 ... ΟΝΟΜΕΧΩΝ : ΟΥΤΟΙΦΟΒΟΥΜΑΙ

860b–865 : 882–84 : 903–

ΡΕΙΑΣΓΕΡΟΝ†ΣΥΔΕΝΝΑΪΝΑΪΒΑΧΗΤΑΧΑ
 ΘΕΛΕΟΣΑΘΕΛΕΟΣ†ΒΙΑΙ† ΚΤΛ
 †ΠΑΛΑΜΑΙΣ† : ΒΑΙΝΕΙΝΚΕΛΕΥΩ ΚΤΛ ...
 ΑΖΕΤΑΙ : ΕΙΜΗΤΙΕΙΣΙΝΑΥΝ

Having done the same thing with the Danaids' parts, he makes his final transcript. However, as the first line of the Egyptian part of the amoibaion has been left out, the entire order of strophe and antistrophe has become reversed for the Egyptians. The scribe, noticing the missing line (859–60a) in the margin of his exemplar, will see that it belongs with the lines he has just copied into the antistrophic parts (to the right), but he will not realise the larger consequences. Accordingly, the strophic parts will be copied into the antistrophes, and *vice versa*.

3.

The reasoning is deplorably speculative, to be sure. However, we might be able to present something which approximates a proof, or at least an indication that we may be on the right track. Apart from the transpositions under discussion, a further two of the many desperate corruptions that disfigure this amoibaion could actually be explained by a textual arrangement in the early tradition similar to that discussed above.

At the end of the first strophe and antistrophe, 852 and 865 respectively (*v. supra*), we find, as more often than not in this amoibaion, baffling textual garbage. M gives ἀτιέτανα πόλιν εὐσεβῶν (852) and ὀλόμεναι παλάμαις (865). Friis Johansen–Whittle noted a certain resemblance between 864–65 βάττει βαθ- ... ὀλόμεναι and 842 σοῦσθε σοῦσθ' ... ὀλόμεν'. However, on a closer look at these two passages, a more remarkable resemblance will be that between 865 and 842 ὀλόμεν' ἐπαμίδα, even more so if we assume that ἐπ' ἀμᾶδα (Schütz, accent by West 1990, 157: cf. A. fr. 214) should be read in 842:

Egyptian chorus:

σοῦσθε σοῦσθ' ἐπὶ βᾶριν ὅπως ποδῶν
 οὔκουν; οὔκουν; τιμοὶ τιμοὶ καὶ σιγμοί,
 πολυαίμων φόνιος ἀποκοπὰ κρατός.
 σοῦσθε σοῦσθ' †ὀλόμεναι ὀλόμεν† ἐπ' ἀμᾶδα. 842

842 ἐπ' ἀμᾶδα Schütz (acc. περισπ. West 1990, 157) : ἐπαμίδα M

865 **ΟΛΟΜΕΝΑΙΠΑΛΑΜΑ(ΙC)** looks like a combined visual and phonetic corruption of 842 **ΟΛΟΜΕΝΕΠΑΜΑΔΑ**. If we now turn to the “corresponding” place at the end of the first antistrophe (852), **ΑΤΙΕΤΑΝΑΠΟΛΙΝΕΥΣΕΩΝ**, we find a similar resemblance to 843 **ΕΙΘΑΝΑΠΟΛΥΡΡΥΤΟΝ**. If not as conspicuous as the previous similarity, the repetition of ἀνὰ πόλυ- as -ανα πόλυ- is unlikely to be coincidental. In both cases one suspects an interpolation of some sort, followed by further corruption (including conjectural emendation or simple rewriting). This interpolation may be possible to explain, if not in complete detail, by the suggested theory of early antistrophic textual transmission. If the scribe copying a papyrus roll²² accidentally reads from the wrong column, a corruption could result in the manner of the following (I let **α** and **β** mark the beginning of strophe and antistrophe [*v. supra*]):

[		[	
ΤΙΛΜΟΙΤΙΛΜΟΙΚΑΙΣΤΙΓΜΟΙΠΟΛΥΑΙΜΩΝΦΟΝΙΟΣ	839–40		
[		ΒΑΤΕΑΙΒΑΘΥΜΙΤΡΟΚΑΚΑΠΑΘΩΝ	864
ΑΠΟΚΟΠΑΚΡΑΤΟΣΟΥΣΘΕΣΟΥΣΘΟΛΥΜΕΝΑΙ	841–42	ΚΩΙΟΝΛΕΙΦΕΔΡΑΝΑΚΙΕCΔΟΡΥ	850–51
[		[	
ΟΛΟΜΕΝΕΠΑΜΑΔΑ	842 →	ΟΛΟΜΕΝΑΙΠΑΛΑΜΑΙC	865
[		[	
α ΕΙΘΑΝΑΠΟΛΥΡΡΥΤΟΝΑΛΜΗΝΤΑ	843 →	ΑΤΙΕΤΑΝΑΠΟΛΙΝΕΥΣΕΩΝ	852
β ΜΗΠΟΤΕΠΑΛΙΝCΙΔΟΙΑΛΦΕCΙΒΟΙΟΝ	854		

A number of problems remain, such as the fact that this would entail an interpolation from the Danaids’ part of the amoibaion to the Herald’s, which we asserted ought to have been transmitted separately. Moreover, a corruption of this kind seems bound to be noticed by the scribe himself. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the alleged origin of the former interpolation (865) itself occurs in an apparently corrupt passage (842). Nevertheless, the probability of a coincidental and independent collocation of corrupt nonsense with this result is infinitesimal. I maintain that none of the mentioned obstacles is unsurmountable; in fact each is probably possible to explain in a variety of ways²³. I will refrain from elaborating further on the technical side of the matter, the issue being speculative and complicated enough as it is. I believe I have shown that the symmetrical transpositions discussed

²² Perhaps the *reader* rather than the scribe: we may need at least two people to copy a papyrus roll efficiently; one who holds the original and reads aloud, and one who copies the text unto a new roll. Or many, as in a “book factory”. On this “dictation hypothesis” see Pettimengin–Flusin (1984), Johnson (2004) 39–40; on book production in antiquity Johnson (2004) 157–60, being somewhat more positive to the concept of book trade and mass production than has been current lately in the scholarly debate.

²³ E. g., a) the separation of the Danaids’ and the Herald’s parts of the amoibaion came later in the tradition, for instance in connection with a re-enactment of the drama (cf. *infra*, section 4), or they were arranged separately but side by side on the same papyrus, making interpolation from the one part to the other possible; b) the scribe did not himself correct his mistake, leaving such details to his client, but a correction never took place.

above are theoretically possible, and that the theory of their origin in a special arrangement of antistrophic lyric in the text of the *Supplikes* could simultaneously shed a quantum of light on two (possibly further) individual corruptions in the same text.

4.

We should finally consider some of the external circumstances of the early textual history of tragedy²⁴. If we accept the notion that the official Athenian State copies of the tragedies are the ultimate archetypes of the traditions handed down to us, and that these copies through the concern of Ptolemaeus II came under the guardianship of the scholars at Alexandria²⁵, the question must be: were the errors suggested here present already in the official copy? Or if they were introduced later, how would this be possible?

In pseudo-Plutarch's *Life of the Ten Orators*, Lycurgus is said to have ordered the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides "to be publicly (ἐν κοινῷ) preserved, after having been written down"²⁶. This took place in the mid-fourth century, presumably 330 B.C., in connection with what seems to have been an intensified interest in the drama of the classical age²⁷. Reynolds–Wilson (1991) 5 argue that public copies

²⁴ The best account may be (and in the English language certainly is) Rudolf Pfeiffer's "History of Classical Scholarship" (Pfeiffer 1968, especially 25–29, 81–82, 132–33, 192–96 on the textual history of the tragedy up to and including the editions of Aristophanes of Byzantium). It is now complemented by the first two chapters in Prauscello (2006) 1–183, who takes into account the latest papyri and assesses the secondary evidence for the musical tradition. See especially pp. 68–83 on the "Athenian State texts" of tragedy (*v. infra* text for nn. 25–26). See also Pöhlmann (1994) 22–25, 28–29, 33–34, and, particularly interesting for our purpose, Pöhlmann (1986) and (1991). The "classic" account, still useful, is Wilamowitz (1889) 121–55. Wartelle 1971 is the most comprehensive, but seems to me too prone to take uncertain things for granted in order to produce continuous narrative. None of the accounts comes around the fact that the evidence is very scarce, and most of them speculate a good deal about probabilities. Pfeiffer is the most apt at keeping the primary evidence in sight.

²⁵ Gal. *In Hipp.lib.iii epidem.*, xvii 1, 607 (CMG V 10, 2.1): δοὺς γὰρ αὐτοῖς [sc. τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις] ἐνέχυρα πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντ' ἀργυρίου καὶ λαβῶν τὰ Σοφοκλέους καὶ Εὐριπίδου καὶ Αἰσχύλου βιβλία χάριν τοῦ γράψαι μόνον ἐξ αὐτῶν, εἴτ' εὐθέως ἀποδοῦναι σῶα, κατασκευάσας πολυτελῶς ἐν χάριταις καλλίστοις, ἃ μὲν ἔλαβε παρ' Ἀθηναίων κατέσχεν, ἃ δ' αὐτὸς κατεσκευάσεν ἔπεμψεν αὐτοῖς παρακαλῶν <κατα>σχεῖν τε τὰ πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντα καὶ λαβεῖν ἀνθ' ὧν ἔδοσαν βιβλίων παλαιῶν τὰ καινά.

²⁶ [Plu.] *Vit.X orat.* 841f (S. test. 156 TrGF) εἰσήνεγκε δὲ καὶ νόμους, τὸν μὲν περὶ τῶν κωμῶδων, ... τὸν δέ, ὡς χαλκᾶς εἰκόνας ἀναθεῖναι τῶν ποιητῶν, Αἰσχύλου Σοφοκλέους Εὐριπίδου, καὶ τὰς τραγωδίας αὐτῶν ἐν κοινῷ γραφισμένους φυλάττειν καὶ τὸν τῆς πόλεως γραμματέα παραναγινώσκειν τοῖς ὑποκρινομένοις· οὐκ ἐξεῖναι γὰρ παρ' αὐτὰς ὑποκρίνεσθαι. Others take ἐν κοινῷ in the sense 'together', i.e. all three tragedians together, e.g. Blum (1991) 83 (1977, col. 89, n. 175).

²⁷ Lycurgus is also said (*supra* n. 26) to have commissioned statues of the three tragedians to be erected, introduced new legislation concerning the accurate performance of their work, and ordered a major reconstruction of the Theatre of Dionysus (*ibid.* 841d). Pfeiffer (1968) 82 puts all this in connection with Aristotle's concern with the history of tragedy about the same time, in the *Poetics* and in particular in the three lost

ought to have existed at an earlier stage²⁸, referring to the attested pre-Lycurgean revivals of earlier tragedies (cf. *infra* n. 38): “if [the producers] had been obliged to obtain [texts] by a process of transcription from private copies it would be surprising that an almost complete range of plays survived into the Hellenistic age.” But did it really? Reynolds–Wilson do not present a reference, but the idea may be based on the common misconception that Callimachus’ bibliographical work, which may have listed some three hundred titles of dramas of the three tragedians, was a library catalogue, i.e. limited to the holdings of the library (cf. *ibid.* p. 7). In fact it rests beyond any doubt that the list of the dramas of the tragedians was a general bibliographical compilation, not by any means limited to the holdings of the library²⁹. The texts for Lycurgus’ archives are indeed likely to have been collected from private libraries

treatises περὶ τραγῳδιῶν, Νῆκαι Διονυσιακαὶ καὶ Λήναιαι, and Διδασκαλία. See Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 71, and especially Blum (1977) 47–92 (= 1991, 23–43) on these works of Aristotle, the titles of which are preserved in the list of his works given by Diogenes Laertius 5.26. Possibly Aristotle was involved on an official level: the *Didascaliae*, *On tragedies* and *Victories* could have been work undertaken on public behalf, intimately connected with the search for tragic texts for Lycurgus’ archive. We know that a public stele was erected soon after 346 B.C., containing an inscription of the record of the victories of the Great Dionysia: the so-called *Fasti* (IG II² 2318 + Capps–Raubitschek 1943, 1–11; TrGF I 22–25). See Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 71–72, 101–7; Blum (1977) 67–68 (= 1991, 31–32). Some have taken this to be in fact based on Aristotle’s Νῆκαι Διονυσιακαὶ καὶ Λήναιαι, but the evidence seems to speak against the relation (Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 103). We may note, however, that Aristotle undertook similar antiquarian research on the victors in the Olympian and Pythian literary contests, and that these lists were engraved in stone by public means (fr. 615–17 Rose; see Pfeiffer 1968, 80, text for nn. 5–6; Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 71, n. 1, Blum 1977, 48–49 [1991, 23–24, 71–72]). – Perhaps we should not take for granted that Aristotle’s research was conducted in the “public archives”, as the handbooks state. As Josephus once remarked (*Ap.* 1.8–27), public written archives were not one of the great virtues of the Greeks. In fact writing before Lycurgus seems to have been a very private business, unless it were on stone, recording important political events. Maybe we should look for archives somewhere else than in a public treasury, namely in the families and the tribes of poets, singers and actors. We may note that in the *Fasti* inscription mentioned above, the names of the choregos and of his tribe are noted for the victories in dithyrambic contests, but not that of the *didaskalos*. This may point to the source of information.

²⁸ A widespread assumption: recently Fleming (1999) who argues that even musical scores had to be archived in order to allow later re-enactments. *Contra*, rightly, Prauscello (2006) 70, n. 221, Pöhlmann (1986) [p. 24], text for nn. 20–22, Pöhlmann (1994) 24, text for n. 84, Blum (1977) col. 89, n. 175 (= 1991, 83). As for the re-enactments, the only thing that might have been needed was interviews with some of the original actors, musicians and members of the chorus. The music at any rate would be remembered by the latter (cf. Landels 1999, 218–19), and probably the lyrical content as well. Cf. Parker (2001) 36, Prauscello (2006) 73, text for n. 233.

²⁹ So the *Suda* s.v. Καλλιμαχος (κ 227), where Callimachus’ works are listed, two of which going by the name of Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμπάντων, καὶ ὧν συνέγραψαν (“Records of prominent persons of all kinds of liberal education, and of the books they wrote”) and Πίναξ [καὶ ἀναγραφή] τῶν κατὰ χρόνους καὶ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων (“Record of the dramatic producers from the beginning and onwards”). See Blum (1977) 198–208, 224–44 (= 1991, 137–42, 150–60) for a comprehensive study; also Pfeiffer (1968) 127–29, 131–32 (in particular 128). Works not extant in the library may have been marked οὐ σῶζεται: see Blum (1977) 206–8 (= 1991, 141–42), Pfeiffer (1968) 286–87 (Addenda to p. 128).

(cf. *supra* n. 27 *fin.*) – not least that of Aristotle³⁰ – and perhaps in some cases from the estates of the tragedians themselves³¹. The texts were later removed to Alexandria by Ptolemaeus II, according to Galen (*supra* n. 25)³².

Before this, throughout the second half of the fifth and the first half of the fourth century, texts of the tragedies may have circulated quite freely. This means that they probably suffered a great deal of distortion before Lycurgus' stabilizing measures were taken, seeing that people did not take written texts very seriously at the time. It seems clear that in the archaic and early classical age, the drama and to some degree literature in general were seen not primarily as "text" but as "performance", the written text being regarded as little more than an aid or tool for oral realization – at least in the case of versified literature. An increase in the status of books and literacy may not have taken place until the end of the fifth century, and even then their use was satirized and criticised³³.

Eric Havelock's ideas about the pervasiveness of oral as opposed to written literary culture in fifth-century Athens have not met with unanimous enthusiasm (see n. 33), but I find some of his arguments attractive. Many of his most significant observations concern Aeschylus' works. Havelock suggested (1980) that their structure and content indicate that they were principally oral compositions, claiming the same to be true for Sophocles, whereas Euripides' technique betrays a more intimate involve-

³⁰ On Aristotle's library, perhaps the first of any consequence in Athens, see Blum (1977) 109–34 (1991, 52–64), Pfeiffer (1968) 67 (text for n. 4), 70. On its later fate, Prauscello (2006) 77–78, text for nn. 245–46.

³¹ On the Athenian State texts see now Prauscello (2006) 68–78: on their origin and intrinsic value especially 68, n. 217 with refs.

³² On Galen's account, see Prauscello (2006) 74–77.

³³ The use and status of books and their relation to literature in the fifth century is a controversial and much-debated subject. In their respective handbooks on Greek literature and ancient textual history, Knox (1985) and Pöhlmann (1994) 18–25 argue for a wide-spread literary "book culture" extant already at the beginning of the fifth century. They adduce especially graffiti and vase-paintings as evidence indicating that writing was used widely, including in schools at that time (for the vases see Immerwahr 1964, 1973). On the other end of the spectrum is Eric Havelock, who has argued from literary evidence that the real breakthrough for literacy did not come until the end of the fifth century (Havelock 1976–77, 1980, 1982), and that the literary culture in fifth-century Athens was oral in its essence. A synthesis between the two extremes may be possible. In my view, literacy was probably quite widespread during most of the fifth century, being taught in schools and used for practical purposes – but it was seen primarily as a banausic utility, having little or nothing in common with the poetic art, which was oral and rested upon centuries of tradition of orally taught skills (cf. Aristoxenus on written musical notation, *supra* n. 17). The literary evidence suggests as much, for instance Plato who, famously, let Socrates describe books as destroyers of memory (*Phdr.* 275a–e, cf. Pöhlmann 1976, n. 11 [p. 81]). Aristophanes' portrayal of Dionysus reading Euripides to himself (*Ra.* 52–53) is well-known, and certainly intended as ridicule: see Sommerstein (1996) *ad loc.*, who further adduces *Ra.* 943, 1409, and *Ar. fr.* 506 PCG as examples of pejorative mentions of books in Old Comedy. If, as Pöhlmann claims (1988b, 132; 1994, 23), the dramatist Agathon is carrying a bookroll in his first appearance in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousai* (101 ff. – I find no direct reference to this in the text of the drama), it may only be adding to the picture of his inadequacy (see also Pfeiffer 1968, 24–30, 17).

ment with writing³⁴. To be sure, Havelock did not mean that Aeschylus was an-alphabetic or that he did not use writing at all, only that his technique indicates that the process of composition was an oral one: that is, presumably, that the dramatic speeches and songs were composed orally and only after completion committed to writing or dictated to a scribe. Indeed in the poetical tradition, metre and music had been the essential mnemonic tools for hundreds, even thousands of years. It is no wonder if the masters of the craft for a long period after the introduction of the letters would consider writing to be only a secondary, banausic utility for the recording of longer compositions.

In the case of tragedy we may note, with Havelock, that διδάσκαλος, ‘teacher’, the traditional term for a dramatic author/producer/director, denotes the oral producer-director role, not the actual authorship or writing³⁵. The central aspect of this role was that of helping the actors, chorus, and musicians to memorize their parts: their realisation of these parts upon stage, not written words on a papyrus or wax-tablet, constituted the actual poem.

It is conceivable that Aeschylus, to the extent that he used writing, did not do so with the aim of producing a continuous book-roll containing the entire drama but rather – more convenient for his purpose – separate working texts of the speeches, anapaests, and songs of the different characters of his tragedies. Pfeiffer notes that the “the traditional expression for writing material in tragedy remained δέλτος”³⁶, and this may indeed have been the way Aeschylus worked: writing down or dictating the text on separate tablets, then memorizing the entire thing before “teaching” the performers (who perhaps had tablets of their own). The idea that the written text of the drama should be presented in a continuous bookroll and preserved for posterity in this form may not have suggested itself to Aeschylus, or it may not have appealed to him³⁷. The peculiar way of presenting the amoebaic, antistrophic lyrical scores suggested above could thus represent Aeschylus’ own pragmatic method of recording

³⁴ Besides examining Aeschylus’ *Septem contra Thebas* [pp. 293–312], Havelock presents an ingenious reading of Aristophanes’ *Frogs* [pp. 269–92], (cf. *supra* n. 33), which is ignored by the latest English commentators (Dover 1993, Sommerstein 1996).

³⁵ See Havelock (1980) [p. 265].

³⁶ Pfeiffer (1968) 26. The only exception is in fact *Suppl.* 947, where however the mention is negated: ταῦτ’ οὐ πινυξίν ἐστιν ἐγγεγραμμένα | οὐδ’ ἐν πτυχαῖς βιβλῶν κατασφραγισμένα.

³⁷ Cf. Sommerstein’s (2002, p. 2 [n. 3]) speculations about the Old Comic poet Ekphantides, and the remarkable (“for a leading dramatist active from the 450s [...] to the 430s”) lack of preserved fragments or even titles from his work: “It is as though Ekphantides, late in his career, was unwilling to move with the times: he clung to a dated style, he was reluctant to let copies of his works go into circulation (only one play of his is ever quoted by later writers), and sometimes, in defiance of what had become established convention, he even insisted on leaving them nameless.” Another view on Aeschylus is taken by Wartelle (1971, 42 ff.), who believes that Aeschylus had written copies made for the actors as well as for himself, that he presented the archon with a copy petitioning for a place in the contest, and that he had one published before the production. For the petitioning or “application” of tragedians to enter in the contest, see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 84, who cites a relevant passage from Plato (*Lg.* 7.817d).

the songs, from which a copy later was made that included musical notation (assuming that Aeschylus did not himself make use of this, a controversial matter: see refs. *supra* n. 17).

Alternately, a master copy may have been taken down by scribes at a performance, or from private consultations with actors and choreutae (cf. Dawe cited *supra*, section 1). If the scribe consulted the actor who played the Egyptian herald separately, this would explain the separate transmission of his parts of the amoibaion, although we have to remember that in this case the corruptions suggested in section 3 must already have been present. In the worst-case scenario, then, the *Supplikes* was re-enacted sometime before Lycurgus' reform, with the aid not of the original author's autograph, but a defect copy (as per section 3 above) with musical notation. From this copy, separate copies were made for the different actors and choreutae, thus separating the Herald's part as described above. Finally, from these separate copies, the official State copy of Lycurgus was produced. Indeed this is not the *worst*-case scenario, which would include even more copying and an anarchic tradition already in the first hundred years of transmission. Aeschylus would have been particularly vulnerable to early corruptions, as he had been granted a special honour (or curse) after his death: it was permitted by decree to produce his dramas posthumously³⁸.

Perhaps one could make something of the order in which Galen enumerated the tragedians the texts of whom Ptolemaeus brought to Alexandria, "Sophocles, Euripides, Aeschylus" (*supra* n. 25). Why put Aeschylus last of the three? Because his texts were the hardest to come by – and also the least reliable? It is, by the way, not even certain that the Danaid trilogy was among the texts that Lycurgus had managed to collect: it may have reached Alexandria separately from the Athenian collection³⁹.

Regardless of Aeschylus' external methods of composition, I believe that the most likely scenario for the corruptions suggested in this paper is that they originated at an early stage, before Lycurgus' edition, perhaps in connection with one or several revivals of the drama in the late fifth and/or early fourth century. These corruptions are not likely to have been emended or even detected in Alexandria. In fact traces of Alexandrian critical work on tragedy are very scarce; apart from the hypotheses, some

³⁸ See *A. test.* m 72–77 TrGF. Quintilian (*Inst.orat.* 10.1.66 = *test.* 77) claims that they were produced *correctas* due to their coarseness, but this is without doubt a misunderstanding (Krüger 1888 ad loc. suggests that Quintilian misunderstands the expression δρώματα διεσκευασμένα). The decree may in fact have been an early attempt to make sure that his drama lived on. In the popular mind of the Athenians in the mid-fifth century, the idea that the written text in itself would preserve his work for posterity may not have rooted itself; at least not unless inscribed on stone (cf. *supra* n. 27).

³⁹ See Prauscello (2006) 77–78. The text of the *Prometheus Vincetus* is in a far better state than all other (genuine) dramas of Aeschylus, perhaps than all drama as such. Could this be because Lycurgus, and subsequently the Alexandrians, in this case actually got hold of the author's autograph? I.e. unlike Aeschylus (*v. supra*), the younger author of *Prometheus Vincetus* composed in the modern manner, with simultaneous and instant use of writing, and left his work in the form of a continuous text? At any rate the lack of deep-seated, apparently early corruptions in the *Prometheus* adds further to the evidence setting this drama apart from the other (genuine) Aeschylean ones.

of which may be attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, only a few notes of the variant readings and critical signs of the same scholar have been preserved in Euripidean scholia and Sophoclean papyri, and nothing whatsoever on Aeschylus⁴⁰. Nor does any trace remain of the work of Aristophanes' predecessor Alexander of Aetolia, who is said to have been appointed by Ptolemaeus to the office of correcting tragic texts⁴¹. For Homer's epics, Aristophanes' comedy, and the lyric poets, there are far more testimonies about and traces of the work of the Alexandrians. The reason for this is not easy to conjecture, but perhaps the tragic texts, or at least those of Aeschylus, were already in too bad a shape when they reached Alexandria to attract much in the way of systematic scholarly examination?

The possibility that the corruptions appeared later in the tradition should finally be mentioned for consideration. One could assume an ambitious revival of the drama on the stage in Hellenistic or Roman times. The Egyptian theme would not have been without interest in Alexandria at any time in history. The producers would have had copies made in the style described above to be used by the actors, chorus, and musicians, one of which then becomes the defect archetype of the subsequent tradition. It is true that no papyrus has been found with antistrophic lyric arranged in the fashion here described; on the other hand, to my knowledge only one papyrus with antistrophic tragic lyric has been found dating from the third century B. C. or earlier, this being part of a florilegium, not a working text of tragedy⁴². We do not know how antistrophic (not to speak of amoebaeic) tragic lyric was represented in general in the third and second centuries B. C., nor what was the standard (if any) for "performance copies" with or without musical notation⁴³.

References

Editions of the *Supplices*. Cited by the last name(s) of the editor(s) only.

Friis Johansen, H., and Whittle, E. W., *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*. i–iii, Copenhagen 1980.

Hartung, J. A., *Aeschylus' Werke*, vol. vii/viii, *Die Danaiden*, Leipzig 1854.

Oberdick, J., *Die Schutzflehenden des Aeschylus*, Berlin 1869.

Page, D., *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoedias edidit* –, Oxford 1972 (OCT).

Paley, F. A., *Αἰσχύλου Ἰκέτιδες: Aeschyli Supplices, Cambridge (etc.) 1844* (also issued as part of *Aeschyli quae supersunt omnia*, vol. ii/ii, *ibid.* 1847).

Schütz, C. G., *Aeschyli tragoediae quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta*. Ed. nova, vol. iii/v, *Choëphorae, Eumenides, Supplices*, Halle 1808.

Tucker, T. G., *Αἰσχύλου Ἰκέτιδες: The 'Supplices' of Aeschylus*, London 1889.

⁴⁰ Pfeiffer (1968) 192. On the hypotheses, see also Blum (1977) 55–57 (1991, 26–28).

⁴¹ *Tz. Proleg.com.* 1; 2.

⁴² *PBerol.* 9771 containing a large part of the *Phaëthon: v.supra* n. 15.

⁴³ For a survey of the evidence for such copies and a discussion about performances of tragic songs in the Hellenistic age and earlier, see Prauscello (2006) 83–121, and also her entire chapter two (123–83) on the Euripidean musical papyri in this context.

- Weil, H., *Aeschyli quae supersunt tragoediae*, vol. ii/ii, fasc. 3/4, *Supplices*, Giessen 1866.
 West, M. L., *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo*. Stuttgart (etc.) 1990 (Teubner, ed. corr. 1998; *Aeschyli Supplices* issued separately *ibid.* 1992).
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Berlin 1914.

Other literature

- Abresch, F. L., *Animadversionum ad Aeschylum liber tertius*, Zwolle 1763.
 Bamberger, F., *Coniectaneorum in Aeschyli Supplices pars altera*, *ZAlt* 9 (1842) 693–712 (rep. in Bamberger 1856, 113–35).
 –, *Opuscula philologica maximam partem Aeschylea*. Ed. F. W. Schneidewin, Leipzig 1856.
 Barrett, W. S., *Euripides: Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964.
 Blum, R., *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Biobibliographie*, Frankfurt a. M. 1977.
 –, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. Translated from the German by H. H. Wellisch, Madison, Wisconsin 1991 (translation of Blum 1977).
 Booth, N. B., *Westphal's Transposition in Aeschylus, Supplices 86–95*, *CQ* 24 (1974) 207–10.
 Broadhead, H. D., *The Persae of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, 1960.
 Capps, E. and Raubitschek, A. E., *Greek Inscriptions*, *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 1–96.
 Cockle, W. E. H., *Restoring and conserving papyri*, *BICS* 30 (1983) 147–65.
 CMG = *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, various editors, Berlin 1927.
 Crönert, W., *Griechische literarische papyri aus Straßburg, Freiburg und Berlin*, *NGG* (1922) 1–46.
 DAGM = *Documents of Ancient Greek Music*. Ed. E. Pöhlmann and M. L. West, Oxford 2001.
 Dawe, R. D., *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1964.
 –, *The place of the Hymn to Zeus in Aeschylus' Agamemnon*, *Eranos* 64 (1966) 1–21.
 Diggle, J. D., *Euripides: Phaethon*, Cambridge 1970 (*Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries*, 12).
 Fleming, T. J., *The survival of Greek dramatic music from the fifth century to the Roman period*, in: *La colometria antica dei testi poetici greci*, ed. B. Gentili and F. Perusino, Pisa 1999 (*Incontri e seminari*, 1), 17–29.
 Fleming, T. J. and Kopff, E. C., *Colometry of Greek lyric verses in tragic texts*, in: *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Antichità Classica della F.I.E.C.*, Pisa 24–30 agosto 1989 (= *SIFC*, ser. III, 10), 1992, 758–70.
 Garvie, A. F., *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy*, Cambridge 1969.
 Gronewald, M., *Kölner Papyri*, vol. vi, ed. M. Gronewald a.o., Cologne 1987 (*Papyrologica Coloniensis*, 7).
 Heath, B., *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, Oxford 1762.
 Hall, E., *Inventing the Barbarian*, Oxford 1989.
 Havelock, E. A., *The Preliteracy of the Greeks*, *New Literary History* 8 (1976–77) 369–91, repr. in Havelock (1982) 185–207 [cited from the latter work].
 –, *The Oral Composition of Greek Drama*, *QUCC* 35 (1980) 61–113, repr. in Havelock (1982) 261–313 [cited from the latter work].
 –, *The Literate Revolution in Greece and Its Cultural Consequences*, Princeton 1982.
 Hordern, J. H., *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, Oxford 2002.
 Immerwahr, H. R., *Book rolls on Attic vases*, in: *Classical, Mediaeval, and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed. C. Henderson Jr, vol. i, Rome 1969 (*Edizioni di storia e letteratura*, 93), 17–48.
 –, *More bookrolls on Attic vases*, *Antike Kunst* 16 (1973) 143–47.
 Johnson, W. A., *Musical evenings in the early empire: new evidence from a Greek papyrus with musical notation*, *JHS* 120 (2000) 57–85.
 –, *Bookrolls and scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto 2004.
 Kannicht, R., *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol. ii/v, *Fragmenta adespota*, ed. R. Kannicht & B. Snell, Göttingen 1981 (Kannicht's notes on the papyrus fragments).
 –, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol. v/v, *Euripides*, part 1–2, Göttingen 2004.

- Knox, B. M. W., *Books and readers in the Greek world, part 1, From the beginnings to Alexandria*, in: *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. i/ii, *Greek Literature*, ed. P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, Cambridge 1985.
- Krüger, G., *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae liber decimus*. 3rd ed., Leipzig 1888.
- Landels, J. G., *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*, London (etc.) 1999.
- Lewis, N., *Greek literary papyri from the Strasbourg collection*, *Études de papyrologie* 3 (1936) 46–92.
- Maas, P., *Greek Metre*. Transl. (with additional notes) by H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1962.
- Musgrave = S. Musgrave's marginalia in British Library C.45.c.21–22 (see West 1990, 366, 361 n. 23).
- Parker, L. P. E., *Consilium et ratio? Papyrus A of Bacchylides and Alexandrian metrical scholarship*, *CQ* 51 (1997) 23–52.
- Pettimengin, P. and Flusin, B., *Le livre antique et la dictée: Nouvelles recherches*, in: *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière: antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, ed. E. Lucchesi et H. D. Saffrey, Geneva 1984 (*Cahiers d'Orientalisme*, 10), 248–62.
- Pfeiffer, R., *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A., *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd ed., rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford 1968 (Reissued with a supplement and corrections *ibid.* 1988, 1991).
- PCG = *Poetae comici Graeci*. Ed. R. Kassel and C. Austin, i–viii, Berlin 1983– (Aristophanes' fragments in vol. iii part. 2, 1984).
- PMG = *Poetae melici Graeci*. Ed. D. L. Page, Oxford 1962.
- Pöhlmann, E., *Die Notenschrift in der Überlieferung der griechischen Bühnenmusik*, *Würzburger Jahrbücher*, N.F. 2 (1976) 53–73, rep. in Pöhlmann 1988a, 57–93 [cited from the latter work].
- , *Der Überlieferungswert der χοροῦ-Vermerke in Papyri und Handschriften*, *Würzburger Jahrbücher*, N.F. 3 (1977) 69–81, rep. in Pöhlmann 1995, 199–212 [cited from the latter work].
- , *Zur Frühgeschichte der Überlieferung Griechischer Bühnendichtung und Bühnenmusik*, in: *Festschrift Martin Ruhnke: zum 65. Geburtstag* (1986) 294–306, repr. in Pöhlmann 1988a, 23–40 [cited from the latter work].
- , *Beiträge zur antiken und neueren Musikgeschichte*, Frankfurt a.M. 1988a (*Quellen und Studien zur Musikgeschichte von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart*, 17).
- , *Sulla preistoria della tradizione di testi e musica per il teatro*, in: *La musica in Grecia*, ed. B. Gentili and R. Pretagostini, Roma-Bari 1988b 132–44.
- , *Die Überlieferung der Musik in der Antiken Welt*, *Die Musikforschung* 44 (1991) 1–9.
- , *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur*. Vol. 1, *Altertum*, Darmstadt 1994.
- , *Studien zur Bühnendichtung und zum Theaterbau der Antike*, Frankfurt a.M. 1995 (*Studien zur klassischen Philologie*, 93).
- , *Dramatische Texte in den Fragmenten antiker Musik*, in: *Ancient Greek music in performance: Symposium Wien 29. Sept. – 1. Okt. 2003*, ed. S. Hagel and C. Harrauer, Vienna 2005 (*WS Beiheft*, 30).
- Prauscello, L., *Singing Alexandria: Music between Practice and Textual Transmission*, Leiden 2006 (*Mnemosyne Suppl.*, 274).
- Rash, J. N., *Meter and Language in the Lyrics of the Suppliants of Aeschylus*, New York 1981.
- Reynolds, L. D. and Wilson, N. G., *Scribes and Scholars*. 3rd ed., Oxford 1991.
- Rose, V., *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1886.
- Sandin, P., *Aeschylus' Supplices: Introduction and Commentary on vv. 1–523*, Gothenburg 2003 (ed. corr. Lund 2005).
- Schmidt, M., *Ueber die Parodos der Hiketiden des Aeschylus*, *Neues Schweizerisches Museum* 3 (1863) 219–34.
- Schubart, W., *Papyri graecae Berolinenses*, Bonn 1911 (*Tabulae in usum scholarum*, 2).
- Schubart, W., and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, *Griechische Dichterfragmente, part 2, Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente*, Berlin 1907 (*Berliner Klassikertexte*, 5, part 2).
- Sommerstein, A. H., *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. ix/xi, Frogs, Warminster 1996.

- , The titles of Greek dramas, *SemRom* 5 (2002) 1–16.
- Stephanopoulos, T. K., *Tragica I*, *ZPE* 73 (1988) 207–47.
- Taplin, O., *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, Oxford 1977.
- TrGF = *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, i–v (in 6), various editors, Göttingen 1986–2004.
- Turner, E. G., Ptolemaic bookhands and the Lille Stesichorus, *Scrittura e cività* 4 (1980) 19–40.
- , *Greek manuscripts of the ancient world*. 2nd ed., London 1987 (BICS Supplement, 46).
- Wartelle, A., *Histoire du texte d’Eschyle dans l’antiquité*, Paris 1971.
- West, M. L., *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973.
- , *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 1).
- , *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.
- , Sophocles with music? Ptolemaic music fragments and remains of Sophocles (junior?), *Achilleus*, *ZPE* 126 (1999) 43–65.
- Westphal, R., *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien*, Leipzig 1869.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, *Euripides: Herakles*, vol. i, *Einleitung in die attische Tragödie*, Berlin 1889 (various reprints).
- , *Aischylos: Interpretationen*, Berlin 1914.
- , *Griechische Tragödien übersetzt von –*, vol. iv/iv, Berlin 1923.

Institutionen för religionsvetenskap,
teologi och klassiska språk

405 30 Göteborg, Schweden

Abstract

The symmetrical inter-displacements of corresponding blocks of text between strophes and antistrophes in lyrical odes, earlier proposed for A. *Supp.* 88–90 ~ 93–95, 872–75 ~ 882–84, and 906–7 ~ 909–10, have affected all parts sung or spoken by the Egyptian herald in the amoibaion in *Supp.* 843–910. An ancestral text similar to a modern musical score, in which the corresponding lines of strophe and antistrophe run parallel with musical notation, could explain this type of corruption. Such a hypothetical ancestor in the textual tradition would also explain apparent interpolations in *Supp.* 852 and 865 from 842 and 843. The corruptions may have arisen very early in the tradition, the hypothetical textual arrangement possibly being that of the author himself.