

CARLES MIRALLES†, VITTORIO CITTI, LIANA LOMIENTO, *Eschilo: Supplici*, Supplemento al Bollettino dei Classici 33, Roma: Bardi Edizioni, 2019, €40.00, 500 pp., ISBN: 978-88-218-1188-3

Inevitably, The *Supplices* of Aeschylus has finally attracted substantial and persevering attention from editorial scholars, three commented editions appearing in the second decade of this century.¹ None of them is an *editio maior* on the scope of FJW or even the average Orange CUP, though.² The work under review, published last of the three, in December 2019, contains an introduction of 27 and commentary of 311 pages, printed in 11p type, being equal in size to Sommerstein's more compactly printed Green-and-Yellow appearing earlier the same year. It includes also the Greek text with apparatus criticus and an Italian translation (pp. 39–131), a *conspectus metrorum* (pp. 133–51), 30 pages of bibliography, and a Greek word index and Italian subject index. The book is the second instalment of a worthy and ambitious project, prepared for many decades: a series of commented critical editions of the entire preserved work of Aeschylus under the auspices of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.³ But the preface of Vittorio Citti, who despite appearing [223|224] second in the authorial line-up is the principal responsible editor, has a note of resignation. The ambitions of the editorial team were originally higher, but tragically curtailed by the premature death, in 2015, of Carles Miralles of Barcelona.⁴ While Citti is a philologist with expertise in textual criticism and transmission, Miralles, a poet and a scholar, had been charged with responsibility for the broader literary and historical interpretation of the drama. According to the preface, he had time to contribute a major part of the introduction, interpretational notes on the parodos and vv. 176–233, and individual exegetical notes on passages up until v. 347. The third member of the editorial team, Liana Lomiento, has analysed the metres and written the translation of the lyrical passages in cooperation with Citti.⁵

¹ Apart from the work under review, A. J. Bowen, *Aeschylus: Suppliant Women*, Oxford 2013 (Aris & Phillips, also reviewed by me in *CR* 65, 2015, 29–31), and A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus: Suppliants*, Cambridge 2019 (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). My own editorial project, the preliminary result of which was a PhD dissertation in 2003 comprising half a commentary (P. Sandin, *Aeschylus' Supplices: Introduction and Commentary on vv. 1–523*, Gothenburg 2003, ed. corr. Lund 2005), has obviously been stalled, but I hope to be able to complete it in my lifetime. (These editions and commentaries, as well as other easily identifiable editions of the plays and fragments of Aeschylus, are referred to in the following by last name of editor only.)

² FJW = H. Friis Johansen & E. W. Whittle, *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*, [Copenhagen] 1980.

³ See *QUCC* 90, 2008, subtitled *Per un'edizione del teatro di Eschilo*, for a collection of mission statements and preliminary scholarly investigations with regard to this project, tracing its roots back to the nineties. The first offering was E. Medda, *Eschilo: Agamennone*, I–III, Roma 2017 (Supplemento al Bollettino dei Classici, 31). A caustic and meddling critic might not be able to suppress the observation that these editions belong to an Italian national series of Greek and Latin Classics ominously begun in the thirties, with editions of Virgil (R. Sabbadini, 1931), Livy's Roman-Macedonian war (C. Giarratano, 1937), *Res gestae divi Augusti* (C. Barini, 1937), and the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus (A. Colonna, 1938). See https://www.lincci.it/sites/default/files/documenti/Commissioni/Comitato_Classici_edizioni_naz.pdf (seen by the reviewer 27 Aug 2021). The original series title, scandalously featuring the name of the dictator, was cancelled, however, and the outlook of the present editors towards a “Renaissance of the Classical spirit” was defined in explicit opposition to fascist imperialism, “greco forse più che latino”, in what was initially perceived by many as a decade of liberation. See V. Citti, “Carles Miralles, filologo e poeta”, *Lexis* 33, 2015, 1–2.

⁴ Citti, “Carles Miralles”.

⁵ With respect to the lyrical metres, the edition is informed by scholarship from the last three decades that has taken a more appreciative stance than the immediately preceding generations of metrical scholars towards the colometries and metrical scholarship preserved from the Hellenistic era. See T. Fleming and

The literary and politico-historical analysis of the play as part of a mostly lost trilogy is as difficult a problem as the notoriously corrupted text, the compact Aeschylean idiom, and the ancient lyrical metres. The original mythical narrative, centred on the infamous Wedding Night Murder, seems essentially amoral and apolitical, in addition to being absolutely horrifying. How this scenario could possibly have been spun to make sense to the religious and ideological preconceptions of Aeschylus and his contemporary audience is an enigma. The attempt of Miralles consists in identifying an alleged *hybris* of the Danaids, expressed through gamophobia and through the exclusive appropriation of the γένοϋς of Zeus for themselves, resulting ultimately in the violence of the wedding night, as the central tragic theme of the trilogy (pp. 10, 29, 156, 174–75). This line of argument has not been developed and followed to its logical conclusions, though. Many readers and critics have had the intuition that for all their eccentricity and foreign culture, the Danaids, like Danaus himself, but unlike their cousins as described, are predominantly positive characters, for the successful escape and future prosperity of which the ancient audience will have rooted. I do not believe that this is a modern misconception. However that may be, surely [224|225] the thematic endorsed by Miralles should by necessity lead to a finale in which the girls face *justice*, that is, are executed for murder? If they are thus justly executed, the tragic victory of Eros and Aphrodite becomes dark and Pyrrhic indeed. If, on the other hand, the murders are enabled by way of deception and betrayal on the part of Danaus, but the murderesses are still allowed to live and “punished” by having to marry Argive men, then the tragedy turns into a bloody farce, even with old Danaus acting as the scapegoat, which does not seem to have been the idea of Miralles (cf. pp. 17–19, 174, 216–17). Neither the depressing horror show, nor the amoral farce seems like a work of art that should have been awarded victory in the contest of the Festival of Dionysus.⁶ Moreover, should this alleged *hybris* and factual ominous and polluting bloodbath ultimately result in the heroic Danaan people, which according to Aeschylus’ contemporaries descended from the headstrong girls? To the Athenian generation of Aeschylus, formed by the sense of Pan-Hellenic self-worth and belief in Divine Justice conceived and invigorated by the victory over the Persians, the ancient Danaans remained, for all the tragic shortcomings of their nobility, a glorious paradigm. The ominous horror of their *ethnogenesis* from murderous Egyptian women must be added to the many problems of the reconstruction of an Aeschylean trilogy that in my opinion could not have avoided to showcase this *aition*.

Miralles was not given time to ponder these problems properly, the introduction as completed only vaguely suggesting a finale celebrating the victory of Love and emphasizing its fundamental importance for the State (pp. 20–22, 26–27). Then follows an argument that seems somewhat separate from this theme, according to which the trilogy

E. C. Kopff, “Colometry of Greek lyric verses in tragic texts”, *SIFC* 10, 1992, 758–70; T. Fleming, *The Colometry of Aeschylus*, Amsterdam 2007 (Lexis: Supplemento, 45); B. Gentili and L. Lomiento, *Metrics and Rhythmics: History of Poetic Forms in Ancient Greece*, Pisa 2008 (Studi di metrica classica, 12; transl. of *Metrica e ritmica: Storia delle forme poetiche nella Grecia antica*, Milano 2003); and the articles on metre published in the “Tavola rotunda” section in *QUCC* 90, 2008, 119–96, beginning with L. Lomiento, “Metrica e critica del testo” (119–30). Apart from noting that this approach has affected the colometry in a retrograde fashion, the editors accepting the line divisions of the medieval manuscript (M) in the text and endorsing remarkably free metrical respension in 59~64 (see 64n.), 101~109 (100–103n.), 431~436 (431n.), 634~647 (646–647n.), 700~706 (not commented upon by the editors; see below), I will not address this issue here, as informed criticism will require dedicated study of a comprehensive kind that I have yet to undertake.

⁶ *P Oxy.* 2256.3; Aesch. *test.* 70 Radt.

“in all likelihood” (p. 30) highlighted a conflict between γένος and πόλις similar to the one showcased in the *Oresteia*, being at the same time related to the contemporary politics of Athens and Argos in the 460s B.C., taking the side of democracy (pp. 29–31). But the victory of the *polis* and democracy over the ancient familial traditions of *genos* should also demand the decisive retribution of democratic *polis justice* against a familial crime that is not even, as in the case of Orestes, an act of righteous vengeance. And if the democratic state triumphs in concord with Eros and Aphrodite, how on earth could the defeated enemy be conceived of as *genos*? By Aeschylus, in the 460s B.C.? The hypothetical outcome of the trilogy resulting from these alleged themes is left unaddressed by Miralles and Citti, though.

Rather than a conflict against *genos* and familial tradition, a positive political aspect of the drama that the editors might have explored is the fact that democracy and the *polis* clearly and emphatically do take the side of Danaus and his daughters in their conflict with their nephews and cousins (vv. 600–624). Unless all the enthusiasm and positive acts committed by the Argives [225|226] and Danaids in the play should turn out to be delusion and mistake, perhaps the major theme of the trilogy must have been another than the error of the women, despite the notorious later events of the myth. A *vindication* of the case of the Danaids against their followers, simultaneously highlighting the valorous and chivalrous defence of the returning daughters of Hellas against foreign aggression, would make more sense of what is said and done in the extant drama, as well as of the fact that the trilogy was awarded the first prize by a generation of judges, whose philosophical and political outlook had been formed by the experience of the Persian wars. I have recently suggested a reading that takes into account these considerations, according to which the rejection of marriage to the impious cousins is the right thing to do.⁷ In the hypothetical reconstruction, the later deeds of Danaus and his daughters may be construed as acts of justice and self-defence, without involving treachery and lies.

There is virtually no chance of us ever knowing how Aeschylus did handle the problems of the second and third part of the trilogy, though. Citti, on whom fell the responsibility to finish the edition after the demise of Miralles, has concentrated on the philological reconstruction of the text, remaining largely non-committal as to the broader aspects of interpretation in his notes on the greater part of the drama. A programmatic aspect of the edition in this important respect, calling for some extended excursive attention, is expressed in the preface and introduction. Here (p. 5, cf. p. 34), the work is described as part of an “enlightened conservative” (*conservativismo illuminato*) tendency formed among predominantly Italian scholars in the decades surrounding the millennium.⁸ While I know that some of the finest textual critics alive would disagree, I believe that there is a freshness to a such an approach today. We should distinguish between good and bad textual conservatism, though. The acceptance and tortuous defence of impossible and nonsensical Greek found in manuscripts should not be endorsed. However, in a spirit of *enlightened* conservatism, the textual critic should consider that simplicity of a kind that seems elementary to one schooled in Greek prose composition from the age of twelve; grammar that diverts from the rules of Attic prose style and syntax

⁷ P. Sandin, “Aetiology and justice in the Danaid trilogy”, *Dramaturgias* 17 (ano 6), 2021, 126–67.

⁸ See also Citti in V. Citti and L. Lomiento, “Aesch. Suppl. 776–824 (str/ant 1, 2, 3)”, in G. Cavallo and M. Medaglia (ed.), *Reinterpretare Eschilo: verso una nuova edizione dei drammi*, Roma 2019 (Supplemento al Bollettino dei Classici, 32), 189–211, at 189–92. This conservative approach is programmatically related to the school of metrical scholarship followed by Lomiento, Fleming, Gentili *et al.* (n. 5 above); cf. V. Citti, “Introduzione”, *QUCC* 90, 2008, 12–13.

formulated in Kühner–Gerth;⁹ and features of metre that deviate from the statistical median, are all sometimes acceptable [226|227] and indeed desirable in poetry, in particular lyrical poetry. In these respects, learned critics have occasionally strayed, allowing their immense accumulated knowledge to trump an intuitive sense of style that, unsuppressed, might well have approved of some peculiar, even unparalleled manuscript readings.¹⁰

My melancholy intuition is that with respect to ancient Greek literature and style, both immense learning and refined abilities are on the wane. We forget more than we learn, and the things that we do learn may not always be that useful. An increasing number of academic institutions in Western civilisation decide that they will no longer hire people to work on these matters, which have now shed the last remnants of prestigious appeal in established society. This is true of the Classics in general and textual philology in particular. For this reason, too, critical conservatism in practice may be aligned with a sense of responsibility for the future, furthering the aim to produce editions that will be useful and not misleading to the scholars that will succeed us. I refer now to a kind of conservatism that I do endorse, which is defined not by positivistic eagerness to defend manuscript readings, but by Socratic scepticism towards the possibility of certain knowledge. I believe that we should hesitate to introduce new conjectures in the main texts, as opposed to the critical apparatus, of high-end canonical authors such as Aeschylus. Even if one is certain to be correct, it is likely that only a small minority of scholars will ever agree, and indeed that there might not exist a consensus-forming majority with the competence to judge the matter adequately. In the absence of the unlikely discovery of new papyrial evidence pertaining to the severely corrupt passages remaining in the canonical texts, the *cruces desperationis* may remain the best alternative.¹¹ I seem to remember to have seen a description of the OCT Aeschylus of Page as “austere” in this respect, its abundance of “daggers”, but this kind of austerity is probably what is needed for the future.

The matter of consensus-forming leads on towards a third and perhaps the worst kind of “conservatism”, the faux conservatism of intuitive pro-establishment sympathy that results in authoritarian radicalism. I speak now of the tendency to uncritically accept conjectures in the text for the simple reason that most prestigious authorities have done so before. Here, a competent critic may still have work to do on the actual texts, as opposed to the critical apparatus, of the major canon. For however good the reasons for some emendations may originally have seemed, it may be that upon scrutiny [227|228] they turn out to be superficial. The very competent critics who accepted them after they first were proposed may not always have thought it worth their time to consider the matter carefully. Ideally, editors should check every emendation accepted into the text scrupulously against the primary evidence, rather than against the number and names of critics who endorsed them before. Today, when memory capacity and inherent knowledge sometimes fail us, digitalized, indexed databases and texts are an immense help with such scrutinies. And here, Citti and the Italian conservative school are certainly on the right track.

⁹ R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Hannover (etc.) 1898–1904, e.g., I, 607–8 (see below, n. 16).

¹⁰ Such have been the arguments of the “enlightened conservative” school of critics, to which may be counted A. F. Garvie, “Aeschylus: When to emend and when not to emend”, *Lexis* 19, 2001, 1–13.

¹¹ An additional sign, for instance a question mark, might be helpful for the margin of passages that are suspect but not indisputably corrupt. James Diggle’s introduction of four degrees of confidence with respect to authenticity vs. interpolation (*Euripidis fabulae*, III, Oxonii 1994, vi, 358–425) should also be standard practice for the editions of the Greek drama.

For instance, Citti rightly keeps 63 χώρων ποταμῶν τ', a general lyrical reference to the exile of Procne, later clarified by ἠθέων, the Danaids projecting their own situation (so Page, but hardly any other editor of the last half-century). I am also pleased to see that the present edition (like Sommerstein and Bowen) has understood vv. 162–67 as a mesode, rather than an ephymnion, thus refraining from repeating the verses after 175, which had been done by most critics after Canter, including Hermann, Wilamowitz, Page, West and FJW, and that in 206–12 and 293–16 it has refrained (unlike Sommerstein and Bowen) from multiple, non-consecutive line-transpositions and lacunae.¹² 544–45. διχῆτι and ἐν αἰσῶι are rightly kept, in opposition to the recent consensus of obelization and emendation of the former in particular. For the local adverb with ὀρίζει, cf. Eur. *Hel.* 128 χειμῶν ἄλλοσ' ἄλλον ὄρισεν, Pl. *Soph.* 267a διορίζομεν δίχα. ἐν αἰσῶι is a more pregnant lyrical variation of κατ' αἴσαν, innovatively derived from the adjective ἐναίσιμος and referring, as Citti rightly notes, to the aetiological naming of the Bosphorus. 560. Τυφῶ μένος is rightly kept in place, but insufficiently understood. The expression is indeed metonymic for the wind, but not in a bad way, but more specifically alluding to the widespread theory of natural philosophy according to which “the Etesian winds” helped cause the Nile inundation, either alone or, functioning as cloud-gatherer, in combination with melted snow from the Ethiopian mountains.¹³ Aeschylus follows the combined theory here and in fr. 300 Radt (cf. also fr. 303a), which is cited by Citti 559n., but he fails to see the significance of v. 3 πνευμάτων ἐπομβρίαι (which ought to be ἐπομβρίας, as [228|229] in the best ms.; Radt's edition of this particular fragment is not palmary). 576. βία ... πάυεται is indeed unexceptionable and should never have been doubted, despite the misleading scholium. “[L]a violenza di Hera contro l'infelice Io ha fine con il tocco divino di Zeus”, exactly right (Citti, p. 335). The language is medical; cf., e.g., Hippoc. *Morb.* 1.20 πάυεται ἡ νοῦσος, 3.5 ἡ ὀδύνη πάυεται, *VM* 18 πάυεται ... τό γε καῶμα, *Mul.* 7.15 πάυεται ἡ πνίξ. The reading is thus confirmed by 586–87 κατέπαυσεν Ἥρας νόσους.¹⁴ Medical style is a repeated feature of this part of this ode, the intrusive pain afflicting Io being a central motif, contrasted with the role of Zeus as healer and protector. Cf. 561 νόσοις ἄθικτον, and 556 εἰσικνουμένου, rightly kept by Citti, a rare word that may also have belonged to or been inspired by medical terminology.¹⁵ 616. Ἰκεσίου Ζηνός: I believe the word order is correctly retained and well defended. There may be a stylistic point to the reverse order of name and epithet here, namely, to present, in the indirect speech, the impression of a mirror version of the original expression. The less standard word order with attribute preceding noun is found in two other instances in this account of Pelasgus' speech: 619 διπλοῦν μίασμα, 620 ἀμήχανον βόσκημα.

¹² Cf. Sandin, 117–18, 210–12.

¹³ Thales DK 11 A 16; Euthymenes *ap. Sen. Q Nat.* 4.2.22 and *De incremento Nili* 5 (*FGh* 647 F 1.5); Thrasylcalces *ap. Lydus, Mens.* 4.107; Democr. DK 68 A 99; Arist. fr. 686 Gigon ~ 246A Rose. See Sandin, “Aesch. fr. 300 R.”, *Eikasmos* 28, 2017, 37–45.

¹⁴ If the εὐμενεῖ βία of Zeus in 1067 is a reminiscence, it must be considered as the benign opposite force of that of Hera. I now suspect that the entire last ode of the *Supplices* is interpolated.

¹⁵ Cf. εἰσματέομαι (Hippoc. *Art.* 32, etc.), εἰσαφάσσω (Hippoc. *Nat.Mul.* 11, etc.; cf. Aesch. fr. 204 Radt), εἰσηθέω (Hdt. 2.87), εἰσφλάω (Hippoc. *VC* 2, etc.), and εἰσωθέω (Hippoc. *Art.* 34, *Nat.Mul.* 5, etc.), most of which verbs are unattested outside of the Hippocratic corpus and all of which employ the prefix εἰσ- with reference to human bodies.

In a fair number of instances from the first half of the drama (not included in the above list of approval), Citti has cited arguments from my commentary as support for conservative readings, which naturally makes me benignly disposed. While I am also opposed to some of the conservative choices made, cases where I believe emendations should indeed have been adopted, these will not be addressed here. The matter of correct style is notoriously hard to argue; there is little gain in merely professing diverging intuition; and “unparalleled” (for instance in the case of verbs coordinated with τε καί having different, unexpressed subjects, as 527 πιθοῦ τε καί γενέσθω) is an argument of limited validity, and often difficult to verify. Instead, I will indicate some instances where I believe an enlightened conservative policy ought to have been upheld in opposition to editorial consensus:

[229|230]

554. Citti prints Hermann’s τὰν, following consensus. But the emendation is detrimental. The style τὰς Ἀφροδίτας πολύπυρον αἶαν is unexceptionable. If any noun at all, the name of the goddess will have the definite article in lyrical poetry, not this land in contrast to all other places mentioned before. Citti miscites FJW, who despite accepting Hermann’s emendation correctly state that “αἶαν cannot be said to need the article”.¹⁶ For the article with the personal name in similar expressions, usually involving gods, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 402–3 ἰκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον, νᾶσον τὰς Ἀφροδίτας, Pind. *Pae.* 8 fr. 52i.65 Maehler τοῦ (Hunt:¹⁷ TON) δὲ παντέχ[νοις] Ἀφαιστου παλάμαις, Eur. *IA* 169–70 ἀγγιγάλων ὑδάτων ... τὰς κλεινᾶς Ἀρεθούσας, Aesch. fr. 47a II 34 Radt (*Dikt.* 832) δαί]σιν λαμπραῖς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης. 584. φυσίζοου γένος τόδε: this contains two emendations but should have been printed as M, with Headlam’s minuscule amendment of word division:¹⁸ φυσίζοον γένος τόδ’ ἦ (τὸ δὴ M). βοᾷ is construed with an internal accusative object γένος, followed by a direct quotation of the βοή, in which the internal object becomes subject, as in Eur. *Hel.* 1107–11.¹⁹ “All the Earth proclaims (of) this life-engendering *genos*: ‘verily, truly it is of Zeus.’” The reference of the adjective is not to the person of Epaphus, but to the family that descends from him, the fabulously fertile and prosperous “Inachids” (conventionally named after the father or ancestor of Io). This *genos*, descended from Zeus, Io, and their son Epaphus (Inachus is irrelevant to Aeschylus), is *life-engendering*, as it populates the world, its heroes and heroines giving names to peoples and countries, for instance Libya, Egypt, Phoenicia, Arabia, the Danaans. The epithet φυσίζοος suits γένος but is degrading as an epithet of Zeus, belonging to the impersonal sphere of nature, being used of fertile land in epic poetry.²⁰ [230|231] 619. Citti prints Bothe’s πρὸς πόλεως without comment, following consensus. But FJW are right, the emendation is

¹⁶ FJW II, 433. To Citti’s defence, the convoluted argument of FJW regarding the text of 550–555 is difficult to follow. On the question of the article in 554, they mistakenly cite the Attic prose conventions mentioned by Kühner–Gerth, *Griechische Grammatik* I, 607–8 pertaining to the limited use of the article with personal names in the genitive, according to which the usual style is (τὴν) Λέσβου ἄλωσιν. But this (1) does not apply to lyrical poetry, and (2) conflicts with the very strong tendency to use the article with names of gods, also in poetry (Kühner–Gerth I, 598, §461 8c; G. L. Cooper and K. W. Krüger, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*, Ann Arbor 1997–2002, I, 381).

¹⁷ B. P. Hunt, “1791. Pindar, Paean”, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 15, 1922, 84–86.

¹⁸ W. Headlam, “Notes on Aeschylus”, *CR* 18, 1904, 241–43.

¹⁹ On the use of the internal accusative with βοάω and similar verbs, see J. Diggle, *Euripidea*, Oxford 1994, 437–39.

²⁰ Hom. *Il.* 3.243, 21.63; *Od.* 11.301; *Hymn.Hom.Ven.* 125. Only very late does the word appear as a personal epithet (*Anth.Pal.* 11.400; Nonnus, *Dion.* 39.146).

detrimental, πρὸ (M) correct. The threat stands before the *polis*, that is looms against it, not comes from it. Bad things appearing πρὸ πόλεως, πρὸ δωμαίων, etc., is a literary trope: cf. Soph. fr. 799.5–6 Radt πρὸ Θηβῶν ὠμοβρῶς ἐδαίσατο | τὸν Ἀστάκειον παῖδα διὰ κάρα τεμών, Eur. *Phoen.* 239–42 πρὸ τειχέων | θούριος μολὼν Ἄρης | αἶμα δάϊον φλέγει | τᾶιδ’, ὃ μὴ τύχοι, πόλει, Didym. in *Demosthenem* col. XIV 12–15, an exegetic commentary on Aesch. fr. 53a Radt: ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ τῆς Καδμείας νεκρῶν. The reference of μίασμα is somewhat ambiguous in *Supp.* 619, but the mechanism of pollution is to affect the environment, here the city, *directly* with malady, not to make the gods angry so as to send punishment. (Apollo does not punish the Thebes of Oedipus but stands apart; the pollution gives rise to disease.) 699. τὸ δάμιον: in this case, as in 370, the Attic form δῆμιον should have been retained; see FJW and my commentary on 370. The profound political significance of the Attic concept of δῆμος is lost, indeed arguably perverted, with the Doric alpha. The mss. of *Cho.* 57 and *Eum.* 160 do transmit δαμίας and δαμίον, but in both cases wordplay is involved, with ἀδάματον and δαίον respectively, not to mention a δῆμος that is actually in its current state perverted. In these cases, the transmitted lyrical alpha is significant; but in *Supp.* 370, 699 and *Sept.* 177, the transmitted η seems equally significant and should accordingly be retained. There is no justification for barring from Aeschylus (of all people) a sophisticated play on lexicographical conventions and demand mechanical consistency of pronunciation of words in lyrical poetry. Curiously, Citti retains δῆμιον in 370 but prints δάμιον in 699, in both cases without comment. 1014. τᾶλλ’ εὐτυχοῖμεν πρὸς θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων: this line is given to the Danaids, following Turnebus and editorial consensus, but in opposition to M, which takes it as the conclusion of the speech of Danaus. The issue is not addressed in the commentary. The authority of medieval mss. in such matters is doubtful at best, but M is right. τᾶλλα similarly stands in opposition to a previous μόνον in 243–44, and in Eur. *Hipp.* 522–24 (adduced by FJW, who nevertheless adopted the emendation). Danaus is consistently portrayed as pious, referring to the Greek gods in every single one of his rheses in the play.²¹ He has spoken of the Olympian gods [231|232] in the beginning of the speech (981); accordingly the matter of ring-composition, which has been used as an argument in favour of the transfer of the line to the Danaids (Sommerstein with reference to 991–92/1012–13), favours Danaus more strongly, who begins and ends this speech with a reference to the Olympian gods. Moreover, Danaus *consistently* adds a cushioning finish after concluding imperatives in his speeches; cf. 202–3, 232–33, 498–99, 600–601, 732–33, 739–40, 772–75. He never allows the imperative to be the last finite verb in a speech. δ’ introducing the answer of the Danaids is idiomatic; cf. 222, 514, 746, 748. FJW’s argument that it is not sufficiently adversary is wrong; the contrast is partly produced by the possessive pronoun ἐμῆς in relation to the catalogue of actors summed up by Danaus in the finish of his speech: his Enemies (1008), Pelasgus (1010), the *polis* (1010), himself (1012 πατρός), and the Gods (1014). To this dire ensemble of powerful men and gods, ἐμῆς δ’ ὀπώρας, “my ripe virginity” (as LSJ *s.v.* ὀπώρα would have it), stands in remarkable contrast; indeed, it is *the* contrast that constitutes the burning heart of the narrative. In addition, δ’ points back to the long, specific admonition of Danaus with respect to the issue of “ripe virginity” in 994–1005. The girls for good measure and safety then repeat mention of the last two actors mentioned: πᾶτερ (1015), θεοῖς (1016).

²¹ Cf. 191–231, 492–95, 616–17, 725, 730–33, 753–54, 773, 980–83; cf. Sandin, “Aetiology and justice” 134–37.

Citti's careful philological discussions of most passages are very useful, especially in the first half of the drama. But some of the examples above, the erroneous citation of FJW, the lack of comment concerning the adoption of dubious emendations, the unexplained inconsistency concerning the spelling of δῆμιον, are symptomatic of a less fortunate tendency. There are signs of the mild resignation and sorrow of the chief editor as expressed in the preface coming sometimes close to resigned indifference, or rather serene retirement, which would certainly not be untimely or undeserved in the case of this extraordinarily highly merited nonagenarian gentleman. But the final editing of the work, which is not done by Citti (cf. p. 6), ought to have been done more carefully, so as to update it to the standard of philological precision and consistency to be expected, not least with regard to the professed enlightened conservative policy. Errors and imprecisions now remain in places where they should not be countenanced, in particular in the Greek texts.

[232|233]

The citations of external Greek texts, notably the fragments of Aeschylus, are presented in a state that suggests work in progress. Major conjectural emendations are adopted in the texts of for instance fr. 43–44, 300 Radt (pp. 16, 330–31), but without discussion of the corruptions or a critical apparatus. I believe this laxness is unworthy of the professed policy of enlightened conservatism. Another issue is that the communication and cooperation between the editors seem not always to have functioned optimally. Lomiento is cited in the third person in the commentary, indeed sometimes as opposed to the text adopted by Citti, for instance on v. 806. In that case, the metrical schema on p. 144 has been adapted to Citti's preference, but in 535, where πολυμνήστωρ is correctly retained, rather than the impossible vocative introduced by Hermann for spurious metrical reasons, the metrical scheme on p. 140 presupposes πολυμνήστορ in 535 and double-short ὕβριν in 528. The text and metre are not discussed in the commentary on these verses. On p. 9, for Δαμ[αίσι] read Δαγ[αίσι]. On p. 42, *ad* 3b: the emendation of Miralles must surely have been intended as λεπτῶν τ' ἀμάθων (printed ἀμαθῶν here and in the commentary p. 157). On p. 74, v. 397, for μή 'μ' read μή 'μ', similarly in the apparatus. On p. 58, the synecphonesis μάπολωλότας ought to have been spelled as μη ἀπολωλότας (or possibly μη 'πολωλότας) to conform with general convention *and* with the spelling of Citti in 725 and 773 (cf. also 228, 341, 721), and indeed with the reading of M, which is not indicated in the apparatus criticus here. On p. 82, v. 486 for εἰς ἰδὼν read εἰσιδὼν. On p. 126, v. 1016, for εἰ γὰρ τι read εἰ γάρ τι. On p. 143, the text of 700 as printed should give the metre ∪ – – – – ∪ – – – –, not ∪ – – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – –. The very free responsion with 706 is not discussed in the commentary. On p. 158, for αἵματι τινι read αἵματί τινι, for ἀπελαννούσης read ἀπελαννούση. On p. 182, 63n. for ἄ τ' read ἄτ'. On p. 329, the citation of PMG III, 496, for ὅτι read ὄτι (and the lacunae in the papyrus should have been indicated by brackets). On p. 328, l. 4 for χθῶν Ἀσιῆτιν read χθῶν Ἀσιῆτις. On this page, the same passage of the *Prometheus vincetus* (732–34) is cited twice in full within the space of 12 lines, to illustrate the same point, the *aition* of the naming of the Bosphorus. On p. 332, 566n., for χλορὸν δέος read χλωρὸν δέος.

The current systems of international, national, and institutional academic management encourage one to be finished and publish, rather than continue [233|234] painstaking studies, nuancing, and correcting, in the face of daunting complexities. “Finish and

publish” is also, sadly, the young scholar’s only viable strategy for securing a living from “academia”. On the other hand, the venerable age of Citti, and the premature loss of Miralles, might have suggested with some justification that this adventure, as the edition is referred to in the preface (p. 5), must come to an end, even if all goals could not be reached. There is the opposite risk, as one delays finishing and ages together with Greek literature, and perhaps with Aeschylus in particular, that a feeling will grow, that however much one studies, one will never learn enough to adequately comment on the meaning of these texts. The more one studies, the more one understands how little one knows, and how inadequate is that knowledge.

In particular, the meaning of the Greek religion, so fundamentally important, as has been appreciated lately, is at the same time so excruciatingly difficult to understand. The generalised understandings that previous generations have reached, on the other hand, including those of Citti and Miralles, have often been determined by their contemporary ideological preferences. In the present drama, the complexity of the matter is increased by the foreign culture of the Danaids, which informs their religious discourse, but to which degree, and in a bad way or good? My intuition is that the most important feature of the *ēthos* of Danaus and his daughters is that they, still after several generations in foreign exile, unlike their adversaries (see especially vv. 872–927) have retained good and proper religion. Their religion is nevertheless tinted by a foreign mode of spirituality as perceived by Aeschylus, “Levantine” or “Asiatic”, if you will. This is not necessarily a bad thing, but harmonizes to a degree, and in some respects, the positive ones, with the personal religious instincts of the author, whereas in other aspects, negative ones, the Danaids may sometimes conduct themselves improperly from the point of view of Greek convention. But they will be reassimilated into Greek culture, at the same time changing it, bringing with them some positive aspects of foreign spirituality, perhaps, but most importantly, the seed of Zeus, which will spread and transform the Pelasgian Greeks into the glorious Danaan people. This is my personal verdict, or guess, concerning the meaning of the drama, after only 20 years of intermittent studies.

Citti, while typically non-committal in respect of broader interpretational matters, once expresses a general verdict on the religion of Aeschylus, which will be the last point of contention here, apart from some notes on the production of the book. On the first stasimon, 524–99, famously starting with an address of Zeus in the “Asiatic” mode, ἄναξ ἀνάκτων, “Lord of Lords”, Citti cites some magical papyri (see above) and refers to the Orphic hymns, but then argues, with reference to the magical thinking according to which knowledge of names gives power over the divine (pp. 320–21):

[234|235]

La religione di Eschilo è assolutamente lontana da questi modi di spiritualità che assai sono posteriori a lui, ma che hanno molto probabilmente assunto modelli arcaici; pure il nostro poeta ha assunto queste strutture formali esclusivamente come forme di *ornatus*, in una prospettiva profondamente legata al quinto secolo ateniese e alle sue vicende culturali e politiche.

The religion of Aeschylus and his contemporaries was not fundamentally subordinate to the politics of the democratic *polis*, but a deeper, ancient matter, that in many respects was adversative to the tendency of those politics, complicating things. The ideological project of Aeschylus, though, was to harmonize and reconcile the two, the new democratic politics and the ancient religion, a project that made him immensely popular

in his lifetime, but outdated and difficult to understand, not only with respect to the compact phrases of his language, to later generations. No aspect of the lyrical expression of religious sentiment in Aeschylus' songs, influenced by archaic Greek religious styles as well as, sometimes, Egyptian and Asiatic models, is merely ornamental. Our late-twentieth-century secular political paradigms are not helpful when it comes to understanding Greek, nor any ancient religion.

This national series is now printed by the commercial publisher Bardi (with the costs partly or fully born by the Italian Ministry of Culture). Unfortunately, I can confirm, looking at a copy of Barini's *Res gestae divi Augusti* of 1937 (cf. above, n. 3), that the artisan production of the Regia Officina Polygraphica was infinitely superior to what we get today. The pages of the present book soon come loose when used in the manner a commentary must be used, and the traditional beauty and daring elegance that characterized Italian typography is a thing of the past, although admittedly the layout of the Bardi editions is not below average compared to the standard now to be expected from academic publishers (but below that of the present journal). On pp. 52 and 54, the ephymnia of 128–33 and 151–53 have been printed as continuous parts of the *following* strophes. On p. 128, the apparatus criticus did not fit the space allotted beneath the text, and one line of the apparatus has accordingly been moved to p. 130. A couple of hours of typographical fine-tuning with modern digital instruments would have been enough to rectify these blemishes.