Critical Notes on Aeschylus

By Pär Sandin
University of Gothenburg

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of Wecklein (ed. 1885, 1893), Dawe (1965), and West (1990, 378–400), and also, for the *Supplices*, from tables of unpublished marginalia put at my disposal by Professor Martin West.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	δόμων †μάλ' ἀχὼ ἐπ' αὐτούς	926	δυσδαίμων σφιν ἁ τεκοῦσα
	προπέμπει δαϊκτήρ		πρὸ πασᾶν γυναικῶν
	γόος αὐτόστονος αὐτοπήμων		ὁπόσαι τεκνογόνοι κέκληνται

915 δόμων μάλ' Ω: ἀχὼ ἐπ' αὐτούς codd.plur., Φ: ἐπ' αὐτούς ἀχὼ Wᵖᶜ: ἀχὼ αὐτούς CᵃᶜΔBNd: αὐτούς ἀχὼ WᵃᶜD: ἀχὼ ἐς αὐτούς Qλ, Ya (ἠχὼ), Hˢˢᶜᵗ(εἰς): ἀχὰ ἐπ' αὐτούς Oᵃᶜ: ἀχὰ ἐς αὐτούς X: ἀχάεσσα τοὺς M (λείπει τὸ προπομπά M²): ἀχάεις τοὺς I (ἀχήεις PⁿᵉIˢˢᶜᵗ): δόμων edd.plur.: post μὰν Schneider: μάλ' ἀχὰν ἐς οὓς Elmsley (1818, 147n.): ⟨νιν⟩ μάλ' ἀχάεσσα [τοὺς] Wilamowitz: ⟨μὲν⟩ μάλ' ἀχήεις τοὺς Mazon: ἀχάεσσα τοὺς ⟨αὐτὴ⟩ Murray: τοὺς μάλ' ἀχάεσσα Young (1972, 32): [μάλ'] ἀχάεσσ' ἰὰ τοὺς Untersteiner post Weil ([δόμων] μάλ' ἀχάεσσ' ἰὰ τοὺς) et Westphal (1869, 137: μάλ' ἀχάεσσ' ἰὰ δόμων τοὺς): δεινὰν μάλ' ἀχὼ δ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς Schütz: τοὺς δαίμων μάλ' ἀχέεσσα Maas (1915): ἀχάεις δόμων μάλ' αὐτούς West (1990)

926 δυσδαίμων σφιν Ω (nisi -δαιμόνων Iᵃᶜ): ἁ codd.plur.: ἡ nonnulli (et M): οἱ Y: om. Δ: ⟨μάλιστα⟩ δυσδαίμων Murray: ⟨ἀλλὰ⟩ δυσδαίμων Hutchinson: ⟨ἰὼ⟩ δυσαίων Dindorf: σφ' ἁ Voss

I think Hutchinson is on the right track, when he says that the object of προπέμπει '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: συνθνήσκουσα δέ | σποδὸς προπέμπει πίονας πλούτου πνοάς, '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 Clytaemnestra later in the same play (1386–87), 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 *Oresteia* is treated in detail by Zeitlin (1965).

(2) δόμων ἀχώ makes good sense, and seems to be Aeschylean.[2] The genitive δόμων is perfectly appropriate with the *echo*, not the corpses: cf. *Pers.* 390–91 ἀντηλάλαξε ... πέτρας | ἠχώ, and perhaps fr. 57.10, where one might read, with Bothe (pp. 570, 798), τυμπάνου ἠχὼ δ᾽ (... φέρεται βαρυταρβής).[3] Another reason to connect δόμων with the echo and not the corpses is that the expression is reminiscent of the epic formulas δώματα ἠχήεντα and δόμοι ἠχήεντες (*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.[4] This is appropriate here: note the stress on the rich heritage of Oedipus in the latter part of the drama (κτέανα, ὄλβος, 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 σιδάρῳ (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) προπέμπω 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 προπομπός 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':[5] 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.[6] 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.[7] M's ἀχάεσσα 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'.[8] ἀχήεις may be either a further emendation to accommodate the adjective to the masculine γόος, 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 προπέμπει and removing the hiatus ἀχὼ ἐπ'.[9] The adjective ἠχήεις, incidentally, is not found outside epic and elegiac verse (or grammatical discussions thereof) before the fourth century AD, once (Epiph. *Adv.haeres.* III 189.10 Holl), and after that not until late Byzantine times.

---

[2] See Kaimio (1977) 165 on echoes in Aeschylus; 163–74 on Aeschylean sound in general.
[3] τυμπάνου δ᾽ ἠχώ (vel εἰχών), codd. Cf. also *PV* 133, 1081, and Soph. *Phil.* 1459 for -πέμπω (παραπέμπω) in connection with an echo.
[4] See West (1966) on Hes. *Theog.* 767.
[5] 'De donis quae inferis offeruntur', Italie–Radt (1964).
[6] See Hutchinson on 1005–78 with refs.
[7] See, e.g., Dawe (1978): for bibliography on the subject, Hutchinson loc. cit.
[8] Thus indeed the passage is interpreted by Young (1972, 32).
[9] 'There are obvious signs of emendation almost everywhere in the *veteres*' (Dawe 1964, 71): a look at the apparatus will convince us of this fact. ἀχάεσσα seems too advanced a conjecture for the original scribe of M, and is differently interpreted by the scholium in this ms.: λείπει τὸ προπομπά. 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:[10] δόμων μάλ' ἀχώ· ἀπὸ τῶν δόμων ἠχὴν καὶ βοὴν προπέμπει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς γόος καὶ θρῆνος δαϊκτὴρ καὶ διακόπτων τὰς φρένας, οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς χαίρων, διακόπτων πάντας, αὐτοπήμων, ἤτοι ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔχων τὰ κακὰ καὶ πολέμια.

The echo is the central matter of the scene. It should be noted that the adjective αὐτόστονος is connected with this echo: αὐτο- is not simply an amplifying prefix, but means that in echoing, the γόος 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 responsion, and the hiatus. First, I think that 'the intractable μάλα' (Dawe 1964, 110) must almost certainly be corrupt if we, as recommended, discard the adjective (ἀχάεις/-εσσα). μάλα προπέμπει does not make sense (pace LSJ, 'in earnest'), and the short syllable makes responsion impossible. There is then one interesting emendation to take note of, overlooked in the repertories of Wecklein, Dawe (1965), and West (1990): Gottlieb Schneider's μάν. The advantages are obvious: responsion is restored in the beginning of the verse, which may be either a syncopated iambic or a dochmiac.[11] 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 ἀλλὰ μήν, γε μήν, ἦ μήν, τί μήν, οὐ μήν, etc.[12] When the single μάν occurs (usually in lyric Doric), it is often in combination with an imperative: thus in *Supp.* 1018, *Cho.* 963, Soph. *OC* 182, Ar. *Lys.* 183. However, it does occur in drama without either of these reserves: Soph. *Ant.* 626, Eur. *IT* 889, and Ar. fr. 591.56 K-A. It also appears in Homer, and several times in Pindar. Since Aeschylus uses the single Doric μάν 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 μάν without the imperative.

As for the hiatus, one possibility will be that it is sound. West (1982, 110) suggests that hiatus in dochmiacs 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 μάν, a dochmiac and a syncopated iambic, with sufficient responsion for the dochmiacs, and exact for the iambics: ∪−−−− ||∪−− answers to −−−∪− ∪−−||. 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 xx. Here it is preserved in Σ 915–21a.

[11] Possible examples of initial molossus responding to bacchius in syncopated iambics are 356–368, *Pers.* 281–287, Soph. *OC* 1670–1697, Eur. *Tro.* 580–585, *Phoen.* 1026–1049.

[12] Denniston (1954) 329–30.

[13] As to whether hiatus and brevis in longo 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 paradosis, together with Schneider's μὰν, will restore responsion. Remove the article ἁ, and place it at the beginning of the verse, as an interjection ἆ (cf. Dindorf's ἰώ). For ἆ δυσδαίμων cf., e.g., Bacchyl. 3.10 ἆ τρισευδαίμων, 15.30, the use of ἆ in Homer (invariably with δειλέ, -οί, etc.), Theoc. Id. 1.85 ἆ δύσερώς τις, Semon. fr. 7.76, Hipponax fr. 117.6. In the sentence ἆ δυσδαίμων σφιν τεκοῦσα it is possible to understand the dative predicatively: 'ah, an ill-starred mother is theirs'.[14] A scenario for the corruption is easily reconstructed: the exclamation was taken as an article, and moved to the position before the noun (*simplex ordo*). The corruption would easily occur in a text with a colometric arrangement of the verses:

⟨ἆ⟩ δυσδαίμων σφιν
[ἁ] τεκοῦσα,
πρὸ πασᾶν γυναικῶν

Note that the article ἁ is absent in one ms., Δ.[15] The metre becomes easy: one dochmiac, period-end, followed by syncopated iambics (bacchiacs).[16] The hiatus after ἀχώ in the strophe is validated by the 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 πολίταις), is certainly insufficient: the alleged parallels are all adverbials. In Wilamowitz' case the dative σφιν in *Pers.* 807 goes with ἐπαμμένει, as rightly K-G ɪ 416.) K-G ɪ 429 (Anm. 1c) are stricter: 'Der Fall, dass der Dativ eines Personalpronomens zwar bei einem Substantive steht, aber auf den ganzen Satz zu beziehen ist, obwohl er oft, besonders bei Herodot, durch seine Stellung die Bedeutung eines possessiven Genitivs 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 δυσδαίμων, but it would then require, either an instrumental sense, '*through* them, she was unhappy' or, with a true dative, '*to*' or '*for* them she was unhappy'. The sense would be outright absurd if the dative were taken with the participle τεκοῦσα: 'she 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. *Hyps.* 1.i.5 ὦ μάκαιρα σφῶν ἡ τεκο[ῦσ', ἥ]τις ποτ' ἦν, *Ion* 308 ὥς σου τὴν τεκοῦσαν ὤλβισα, 324 τάλαινά σ' ἡ τεκοῦσ' ἄρ', ἥτις ἦν ποτε, 1378 τλήμων δὲ χἠ τεκοῦσά μ' (cf. also, e.g., Eur. *IT* 472–75, LSJ s.v. τίκτω I.5.b). The accusative has also been suggested for our passage, first, apparently, by Heinrich Voss, whose σφ' was adopted by several nineteenth-century editors (e.g., Hermann, Weil, Paley). The genitive is also a possible alternative: the 2p. dual σφῶν would easily be corrupted into the *facilior lectio* σφιν. The dual number would accord with the use of the dual in the previous (921 τοῖνδε ... ἀνάκτοιν, 923 ἐρξάτην πολλὰ ... πολίτας), 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 I permit him to infer the readings of a lost hyparchetype (a) earlier than I', 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 (IBaΔ) in the latter half of the present drama (West 1990, 326).

[16] The 'double-drag' dochmiac (−−−−−) occurs elsewhere in Aeschylus: *Pers.* 657, *Supp.* 892 = 902, *Ag.* 1494 = 1518, two of which cases involve exclamations. It is common in Euripides. See Conomis (1964) 25–26.

a common phenomenon in dochmiacs).[17] It is hardly a problem that the bacchius ἐπ' αὐτούς ~ 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.[18]

Supplices 960

καὶ δώματ' ἐστὶ πολλὰ μὲν τὰ δήμια,
δεδωμάτωμαι δ' οὐδ' ἐγὼ σμικρᾷ χερί·
ἔνθ' ὑμῖν ἐστὶν εὐτύκους ναίειν δόμους
960   πολλῶν μετ' ἄλλων· εἰ δέ τις μείζων χάρις,
πάρεστιν οἰκεῖν καὶ μονορρύθμους δόμους.

960 εἰ δέ τῳ Blaydes: εἰ δέ τοι Friis Johansen (ap. Friis Johansen–Whittle): εἰ δέ πως vel που Whittle (ap. Friis Johansen–Whittle)

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).[19]

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 I 42–43 and 957–61n.). The choice between two alternatives is stressed: there are the 'public' lodgings, and the ones owned by Pelasgus, the king (957–58, 1009–10).

In 959–60 a further dichotomy is introduced, which confuses matters considerably. Pelasgus has just stated that the choice stands between the public lodgings and his own. Then he offers a further choice, that between shared housing (πολλῶν μετ' ἄλλων) and 'single rooms', as it were (μονορρύθμους δόμους). ἔνθ' 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, Pelasgus 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, Pelasgus 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 ἀχώ, the phrase ἐπ' αὐτούς being sufficiently autonomous. Possibly also δυσδαίμων σφιν | τεκοῦσα admits pause after σφιν: 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 πρόδοτος δὲ μόνα σαλεύει | Ἠλέκτρα, Eur. *Med.* 6–7 δέσποιν' ἐμή | Μήδεια, Pind. *Ol.* 6.49–50 Φοίβου γὰρ αὐτὸν φᾶ γεγάκειν | πατρός.

[18] On such 'short short periods', see Stinton (1977) 41 (= 1990, 328). Positional length of the last syllable of τεκοῦσα before πρό might also be possible: West xxxv lists two examples in lyrical verse of positional length before muta cum liquida: *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 III 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 xxxii.

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 king's 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?[20]

ἔνθ' 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.[21] Demonstrative ἔνθα is found, somewhat rarely, elsewhere in tragedy and comedy; in Aeschylus at 34 in this play, and probably also in *Pers.* 490;[22] in Euripides in a few more or less ambiguous occurrences.[23]

Secondly, ἔνθ' refers exclusively to 957, i.e., to the *public* housing.[24] The required sense may perhaps be attained by simple gestures from Pelasgus. '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: ἔνθα), '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 paradosis could perhaps by itself mean this, provided that Pelasgus' gesturing is appropriate. There are, however, certain problems with it. τις may be suspect: 'preds. containing an adjectival τισ 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 Pelasgus' own hospitality, and that this is the same as the separate and individual alternative (μονόρρυθμοι δόμοι 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 *Il.* 6.242–50)—if so, they will fall under Pelasgus' 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 Pelasgus, being left in charge, decides to recognise their claim, giving away Danaus' daughters in marriage. They in turn slay their husbands with their daggers. Another possibility would be that Danaus stays, but that Pelasgus, 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 Pelasgus 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., Weil, Tucker, Mazon, Smyth, Murray, Friis Johansen–Whittle. Friis Johansen–Whittle argue that ἔνθ' refers to both δώματ' ... τὰ δήμια and 'the δώματα ἐμά implied in 958', claiming that it cannot refer to the latter alone, since in 958 'there is no word other than χερί to which ἔνθ' can refer'. This might have been a valid argument if ἔνθ' 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, *Andr.* 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 Pelasgus' remark on his own house as parenthetic: '... 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 ἔνθ', so as to make it a demonstrative.

compar. do not occur either in Aeschylus, in Sophocles, in Aristophanes, in Pindar, in the first four books of Herodotus, in Lysias, in Isocrates, or in the first volume of the Oxford text of Plato' (Friis Johansen–Whittle). Suggested remedies are τῳ (adopted in the text of Friis Johansen, ed. 1970), τοι, πως and που.

A preferable emendation would be δ᾽ ἐκεῖ—ἐκεῖ referring to the last mentioned place, the house of Pelasgus, and standing in regular opposition to ἔνθα, the public housing. 'There (ἔνθ᾽), we have nice houses to live in together with many others: but if there be greater pleasure *there* (ἐκεῖ) ...' 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   λυπῶ δὲ τούτους, ὥστε τῷ τεθνηκότι
        τιμὰς προσάπτειν, εἴ τίς ἐστ᾽ ἐκεῖ χάρις.

Supplices 1002

    τέρειν᾽ ὀπώρα δ᾽ εὐφύλακτος οὐδαμῶς·
    θῆρες δὲ κηραίνουσι καὶ βροτοί, τί μήν;
1000 καὶ κνώδαλα πτεροῦντα καὶ πεδοστιβῆ·
    καρπώματα στάζοντα κηρύσσει Κύπρις
    †καλωρα κωλύουσαν θ᾽ ὡσ μένειν ἐρῶ†

1002 θωσμένειν M^scr: θωσμένην M: κἄωρα κωλύοντας ὁρμαίνειν ἔρως Portus: καὶ φῶρα vel χ᾽ ἄλωρα Scaliger: χ᾽ ἄλωρα [χἄλωρα?] κωλύοντας ὁρμαίνει γ᾽ Ἔρως anon. ap. Butler–Stanley: ὥρας κελεύουσ᾽ ἄνθος ἀποδρέπειν ἔρον Mazon post Welcker (1854, 186–87: ἄνθος), Wecklein (ἔρον): κἄωρα μωλύουσ᾽ ἅμ᾽, ὡς μαίνειν ἔρῳ West (1990) post Kayser (ἅμ᾽ ὡς), Burges (1811, 419–20: ἔμην᾽ ἔρῳ)[26]

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' κἄωρα. 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 ἔλωρ in some form would give an attractive sense.[27] This noun may have suggested itself to Aeschylus after his πτεροῦντα – πεδοστιβῆ dichotomy in 1000; it

---

[25] The exact same verse seems to have played a part in a mistaken Byzantine emendation in *Pers.* 622 (Ἰ^ω προσάψω for προπέμψω): see Dawe (1964) 100.

[26] Burges thus anticipates Voss (1812), who gets the credit for the dative 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 doctus* suggested χ᾽ ἄλωρα κωλύοντας ὁρμαίνει γ᾽ Ἔρως, which makes no sense to me ('Amor incitat ad rixas eos qui prohibent praedam' according to Stanley): if he wrote χἄλωρα (< καὶ ἔλωρα) it might possibly be interpreted as 'Eros drives the resisting ones as prey', χἄλωρα being taken predicatively, agreeing with κωλύοντας. Stanley also reports καὶ φῶρα (sic) as an emendation of the same *vir doctus*; these anonymous emendations are thus reminiscent of those made by Scaliger and Portus (see the critical apparatus above).

is, from *Il.* 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 ἕλωρ, 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 πεδοστιβῆ (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 χἄλωρα –×– ὁμῶς μέλειν ἔρῳ: '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, κωλύονθ' naturally suggests itself, but seems rather awkward, even if the stem does occur once in Aeschylus denoting resistance to sexual advances: in fr. 47a I 15 (*Diktyoulkoi* 779) Danaë is threatening to tie a noose to hang herself, rather than be ravished by satyrs;[28] she then speaks of a κωλυτήριον, apparently referring to a means of suicide, being a 'hindrance' against sexual assault.[29]

Unless we assume a lacuna after 1000 (Hermann), καὶ κνώδαλα ... πεδοστιβῆ must be taken with the previous, and refer especially to the θῆρες, which is unproblematic.[30] The asyndeton in 1001 is also admissible, being explanatory:[31] cf., e.g., 769, where asyndeton is also found in a metaphorical (gnomic) phrase which explains or justifies a former statement.

ἔρος 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

---

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

[29] Hugh Lloyd-Jones ap. Smyth II 538–39 supplies and translates: ἀγχόνην ἄρ' ἅψομαι | [τῆς αἰκίας τεμοῦσα κωλυτήριον | [ἄκεσμ' ...;], 'shall I then knot myself a noose, applying a desperate remedy against this torture?'.

[30] Friis Johansen–Whittle claim that κνώδαλα πεδοστιβῆ 'must either be identical with or include θῆρες'; also, that 'τί μήν is never used parenthetically'. As for the first assertion, θήρ 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 βροτός (as also in *Eum.* 70). θήρ can hardly be less general than κνώδαλον, 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 *topos* (the power of love), notes the 'untidiness' that usually comes with lists of categories of this kind. As for τί μήν, it would not be strictly parenthetical here: καὶ κνώδαλα ... πεδοστιβῆ is a new clause, for which it is easy to supply another κηραίνει. Cf. Pl. *Leg.* 640c, where τί μήν can hardly be said to be less parenthetical:—οὐκοῦν πρῶτον μὲν καὶ τούτοις ἄρχοντος δεῖ;—τί μήν; ὡς οὐδενί γε πράγματι.

[31] Cf. K-G II 344.

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 anacoluthon: κηρύσσει 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: Ἑρμῆ χϑόνιε, κηρύξας ἐμοί | τοὺς γῆς ἔνερϑε δαίμονας κλύειν ἐμάς | εὐχάς. The altered construction as such is not remarkable in Aeschylus.

Agamemnon 557

555   μόχϑους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαυλίας
       σπαρνὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους, τί δ᾽ οὐ
       στένοντες οὐ λαχόντες ἤματος μέρος;

post 555 lacunam coni. Heyse 556 δ᾽ del. Blaydes 556–57 τί που | στένοντες ἂν λήγοιμεν Wecklein (ed. 1893, II 353) 557 ἂν λάχοιμεν 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 emendation[32] 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 λέγοιμι in 555, removing the anacoluthon and the alleged need to posit a lacuna after this verse. ἤματος 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 δέ after conditional protasis, albeit with σὺ δ᾽, cf. *Ag.* 1061, *Eum.* 887.[33] If the paradosis is retained in Eur. *Hec.* 1211, τί δ᾽ οὐ in (temporal) apodosis is paralleled. Possibly deletion of δ᾽ is necessary, however, here as well as in the *Hecuba*: for the hiatus τί οὐ cf. then Eur. *Phoen.* 878 with the note of Mastronarde (1994).

Choephori 155

       ἵετε δάκρυ [...]
       πρὸς ἔρυμα τόδε κεδνῶν, κακῶν τ᾽
155   ἀπότροπον †ἄγος ἀπεύχετον†
       κεχυμένων χοᾶν.

154 ῥεῦμα Weil κεδνῶν κακῶν τ᾽ Schütz: κεδνὸν κακῶν [τ᾽] Schömann (1877, 9): κακῶν κεδνῶν τ᾽ M: δ᾽ Butler (ap. Butler–Stanley) 155 ἀποτρέπον Thomson ἄγος Σ: ἄλγος M: ἄκος Sier 28, 78, n. 16

ἀπεύχετον is awkward, as is ἄγος *in bonam partem*, which can hardly stand in apposition to δάκρυ. Sier's ἄκος is attractive. Another possibility would be that ἀπεύχετον is corrupt

---

[32] Originally in Schwerdt (1863) 97, which I have not seen; repeated in Schwerdt (1886) 132.
[33] See Denniston (1954) 180–81.

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 καταστροφαὶ †νέων
θεσμίων

ἐμῶν καταστροφαί Weil

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.[34] West's own suggestion that they might mean 'an overturning *consisting of* new θέσμια' is less convincing, however. More economic than the conjecture by Weil repeated above would be καταστροφαὶ δ᾽ ἐμῶν. 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 καταστροφαὶ.

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',[35] 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.[36]

---

[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 variants 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. Textual 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.[37]

This taken for granted, the pragmatics of conjectural criticism is another matter, which has been much discussed in the last century.[38] 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

---

[37] 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 *use* 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 unsrer wissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen, daß Gewisses *in der Tat* nicht angezweifelt 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.

[38] 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.[39] 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.[40]

University of Gothenburg
Department of Classical Studies
Box 200
SE-405 30 Gothenburg
Sweden

---

[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.
[40] Maas (1958) 53–54, cf. 11–17; West (1973) 55–59.

References

Editions and commentaries on Aeschylus

BOTHE, F. H., *Aeschyli dramata quae supersunt et deperditorum fragmenta*, 2 vols, II, Leipzig 1805.

BUTLER, S., after STANLEY, T., *Aeschyli tragoediae quae supersunt*, 8 vols, Cambridge 1809–16.

DENNISTON, J. D., and PAGE, D., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, Oxford 1957.

DINDORF, W., *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*, 3 vols, II, *Annotationes*, Oxford 1841.

FRAENKEL, E., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, 3 vols, Oxford 1950.

FRIIS JOHANSEN, H., *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*, C&M Dissertationes 7, Copenhagen 1970.

FRIIS JOHANSEN, H., and WHITTLE, E. W., *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*, 3 vols, Copenhagen 1980.

GARVIE, A. F., *Aeschylus: Choephori*, Oxford 1986.

HERMANN, G., *Aeschyli tragoediae*, 2 vols, Leipzig 1852.

HEYSE, T., *Die Orestie des Aeschylus*, Halle 1884.

HUTCHINSON, G. O., *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas*, Oxford 1985 (repr. corr. 1987).

MAZON, P., *Eschyle*, 2 vols, I, *Les Suppliantes, Les Perses, Les Sept contre Thèbes, Prométhée enchaîné*, G. Budé, Paris 1920.

MURRAY, G., *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxford 1937 (2nd edn 1955).

PAGE, D., *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoedias edidit D. Page*, Oxford 1972.

PALEY, F. A., *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*, 4th edn, London 1879 (prev. eds 1855, -61, -70).

SCHNEIDER, G. C. W., *Aischylos: Tragoedien*, 4 vols, II, *Die Sieben gegen Thebai*, Weimar 1834.

SCHÜTZ, C. G., *Aeschyli tragoediae quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta*, 3 vols, I, *Prometheus Vinctus et Septem adversus Thebas*, Halle 1782; III, *Choephorae, Eumenides, Supplices*, Halle 1794.

—, *In Aeschyli tragoedias quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta commentarius*, 3 vols, I, *In Prometheum Vinctum et Septem adversus Thebas*, Halle 1782; III, *In Choephoras, Eumenides et Supplices*, Halle 1797.

SIER, K., *Die lyrischen Partien der Choephoren des Aischylos*, Palingenesia 23, Stuttgart 1988.

SMYTH, H. W., *Aeschylus*, 2 vols, Appendix by H. Lloyd-Jones, Loeb Classical Library, London (etc.) 1922–57.

THOMSON, G., *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*, 2 vols, London 1938.

TUCKER, T. G., *The 'Supplices' of Aeschylus*, London 1889.

UNTERSTEINER, M., *Eschilo: Le tragedie*, 2 vols, II, Milan 1947.

VERRALL, A. W., *The 'Seven against Thebes' of Aeschylus*, London 1887.

VICTORIUS, P., *Aeschyli tragoediae VII*, Geneva 1557.

WECKLEIN, N., *Aeschyli fabulae*, 2 vols, Berlin 1885 (with *auctarium* in two vols 1893).

WEIL, H., *Aeschyli quae supersunt tragoediae*, 2 vols, Giessen 1858–66.

WEST, M. L., *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo*, Stuttgart 1990 (repr. corr. 1998).

WILAMOWITZ-Moellendorff, U. von, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Berlin 1914.

Other literature

BARRETT, W. S., ed., 1964. *Euripides: Hippolytos*, Oxford.

[BLAYDES] F. H. M. Blaydes's conjectures reported by Dawe (1965).

{BURGES, G.} 1811. 'Emendationes in Aeschyli Supplices', *CJ*, vol. 3, no. 6, 414–22.

CONOMIS, N. C. 1964. 'The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama', *Hermes* 92, 3–50.

DAWE, R. D. 1964. *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, Cambridge.

— 1965. *Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus*, Leiden.

— 1978. 'The End of *Seven against Thebes* Yet Again', in *Dionysiaca ... Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday*, Cambridge, 87–103.

DENNISTON, J. D. 1954. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn, Oxford.

DOVER, K. J. 1957. 'The Political Aspect of Aeschylus' Eumenides', *JHS* 77, 230–37, repr. in id., *Greek and the Greeks*, Oxford 1987, 161–75.

ELMSLEY, P., ed., 1818. *Euripidis Medea*, Oxford (2nd edn, Leipzig 1822).

FURBERG, M. 1997. *CaOx: Språkanalytisk filosofi i Cambridge och Oxford till 1970*, Stockholm.

GARVIE, A. F. 1969. *Aeschylus' Supplices*, Cambridge.

GOLDHILL, S. 1999. 'Wipe Your Glosses', in Most (1999) 380–425.

GUMBRECHT, H. U. 1998. 'Play Your Roles Tactfully! About the Pragmatics of Text-Editing, the Desire for Identification, and the Resistance to Theory', in Most (1998) 237–50.

HARRISON, S. J. 2000. 'General Introduction: Working Together', in id., ed., *Texts, Ideas and the Classics*, Oxford, 1–18.

[HOLL] K. Holl, ed., *Epiphanius*, 3 vols, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 25, 31, 37, Leipzig 1915–33.

ITALIE, G., and RADT, S. L. 1964. *Index Aeschyleus*, 2nd edn, Leiden.

[K-A] R. Kassel and C. Austin, eds, *Poetae comici Graeci*, 8 vols, III, fasc. 2, *Aristophanes: Testimonia et fragmenta*, Berlin (etc.) 1984.

KAIMIO, M. 1977. *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 53, Helsinki.

[KAYSER] (W. K.?) Kayser's conjecture reported by Wecklein II, 135.

[K-G] R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 2. Teil, *Satzlehre*, besorgt von B. Gerth, 2 vols, 3rd edn, Hanover (etc.) 1898–1904.

[LSJ] H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart-Jones a.o., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, With a revised supplement, 9th edn, Oxford 1996.

MAAS, P. 1915. 'Textkritisches zu Aeschylus', *JPhV* 41, 234–37, 312–14, repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften*, Munich 1973, 35–41.

— 1958. *Textual Criticism*, Oxford (originally published in German as *Textkritik*, 3rd edn, Leipzig 1957).

MASTRONARDE, D. J., ed., 1994. *Euripides: Phoenissae*, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29, Cambridge.

MOST, G. W., ed., 1998. *Editing texts: Texte edieren*, Aporemata 2, Göttingen.

—, ed., 1999. *Commentaries: Kommentare*, Aporemata 4, Göttingen.

POPPER, K. R. 1972. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*, Oxford.

— 1994. 'A Pluralist Approach to the Philosophy of History', in id., *The Myth of the Framework: In Defence of Science and Rationality*, London (etc.), 130–53.

[PORTUS] F. Portus' conjecture, in his unpublished commentary on Aeschylus, also in the margin of his copy of Victorius (Leiden Univ. Libr. B. P. L. 180 and 756 D 22, respectively: see West 1990, 360).

[SCALIGER] J. J. Scaliger's conjectures in the margin of his copy of Victorius (Leiden Univ. Libr. 756 D 21: see West 1990, 359); also attributed to him by Casaubon in his copy (Cambridge Univ. Libr. Adv. b. 3.3: West 1990, 360, 362).

SCHÖMANN, G. F. 1877. 'Zu Aischylos Choephoren', *NJPhP* 115, 1–24, 81–105.

SCHWERDT, F. I. 1863. *Probe einer neuen Horaz-Rezension*, Philologische Studien zumeist für Kritik und Erklärung 1, Münster.

— 1886. *Methodologische Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung der griechischen Tragiker*, Leipzig.

[S-D] E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, 4 vols, II, *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, vervollständigt und herausgegeben von A. Debrunner, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.1.2, Munich 1950.

STINTON, T. C. W. 1977. 'Pause and Period in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy', *CQ* 27, 27–66, repr. in id., *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* , Oxford 1990, 310–61.

[TLG CANON] L. Berkowitz and K. A. Squitier, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, 3rd edn, New York (etc.) 1990.

[VOSS] H. Voss's conjecture reported by Wecklein I 183; possibly in Voss (1812), which I have not seen.

VOSS, H. 1812. *Curarum Aeschlearum specimen* I, Heidelberg.

WELCKER, F. G. 1854. 'Aeschyli tragoediae. Recensuit G. Hermannus' (review of Hermann), *RhM* 9, 179–216.

WEST, M. L., ed., 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford.

— 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart.

— 1982. *Greek Metre*, Oxford.

— 1990. *Studies in Aeschylus*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 1, Stuttgart.

— 1998. 'The Textual Criticism and Editing of Homer', in Most (1998) 94–110.

WESTPHAL, R. 1869. *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien*, Leipzig.

YOUNG, D. C. C. 1972. 'Readings in Aeschylus' Byzantine Triad', *GRBS* 13, 5–38.

ZEITLIN, F. I. 1965. 'The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *TAPhA* 96, 463–508.