TEXTUAL AND OTHER NOTES ON AESCHYLUS[*]

These notes are mostly designed to explain some of the textual choices made in passages from the seven surviving plays of the Aeschylean corpus in the first two volumes of my Loeb edition (Cambridge MA 2008). I intend subsequently to publish a further article containing notes on the fragmentary plays.

Reports of the manuscripts and testimonia are based on M.L. West's Teubner edition (Stuttgart 1990)[1], and the sigla are those set out on pp. lxxxi-lxxxv of that edition except that (i) some of the superscript abbreviations have been expanded, (ii) West's symbols for scholia – Σ, Φ, Θ, T^σ – are replaced by Σ^M, Σ^Φ, Σ^Θ, Σ^T referring to the four main classes of scholia which West describes on pp. xx-xxi, and (iii) West's siglum τ, denoting in effect the recension of Demetrius Triclinius, is replaced by "Tricl." in the plays of the Byzantine triad and by *f* in *Agamemnon* and *Eumenides* (where, except in *Ag*. 1-348, copies including emendations by Triclinius are our sole primary witnesses to the text other than M where available).

The passages discussed are printed at the head of each section, normally in a form as close as possible to the paradosis (on matters relevant to the discussion).

(1) *Persians* 162

εἰς δ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἐρῶ
μῦθον οὐδαμῶς ἐμαυτῆς οὖσ᾽ ἀδείμαντος, φίλοι,   162
μὴ μέγας πλοῦτος κονίσας οὖδας ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ
ὄλβον, ὃν Δαρεῖος ἦρεν οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινος.

162 οὖσ᾽] οὐδὲ Q^{sscr}: v.l. οὐκ noverat Σ^Φ ut vid. (εἰς ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴπω λόγον οὐδαμῶς ἐμαυτῆς οὖσα ἤτοι οὐδόλως ἐμαυτῆς κυρία τυγχάνουσα, οὐκ ἄφοβος).

The tenor of the speech, and of the whole scene, requires the Queen to be saying in 162 that she is *not* unafraid. L. Belloni in his commentary (Milan 1994[2]) tries to get this meaning out of the transmitted text by taking ἐμαυτῆς to be governed by οὐδαμῶς... ἀδείμαντος as a "genitivo di relazione" and translating "del tutto temendo in me stessa"[2]; but such a phrase would more

naturally suggest the absurd meaning "very afraid of myself" (cf. Pl. *Rep*. 386b "do you think that someone who believed in the terrors of the under-world would be θανάτου ἀδεῆ and would prefer death in battle to defeat and slavery?"). An alternative move has been to try and get rid of ἐμαυτῆς. D.L. Page (Oxford 1972) printed Lawson's οὐδαμῶς ἄμαντις οὖσα δείματος: but for one thing, as Belloni in effect points out, the Queen is not prophesying fear but *feeling* it, and for another ἄμαντις is not merely "a hapax in Aeschylus" (Belloni) but unknown before the Antonine age.

West was surely right to leave the first three words of 162 unchanged; the Queen's point is, as he saw, that the statement she is in effect making – that excessive wealth can lead to ruin – is not "her own", not new, but a piece of ancient wisdom[3]. Of the parallels he cites, the key one is Eur. fr. 484.1 οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος. But in that case the necessary negative for ἀδείμαντος must be found after ἐμαυτῆς instead of before, and the Φ-scholia with their οὐκ ἄφοβος encourage us to take this view. The superscript variant οὐδὲ in Q is not worth much as evidence, since it could easily be a conjecture based on the scholia or a mere error due to the presence of οὐδαμῶς a few words earlier or of οὖδας immediately below: it might still, of course, be a correct conjecture or a lucky error, but it does have two disadvantages. It forces us to get rid of οὖσ', making the construction rather harsh; and there is nothing in the first seven words of the sentence – in particular, no nominative adjec-tive or adjectival phrase – that would naturally be linked to ἀδείμαντος by a coordinating conjunction like οὐδέ.

The fact is that for the sentence to run smoothly, what we would really need is ‹οὐκ› οὖσ' ἀδείμαντος – which metre will not allow. What is more, it would be helpful if the second half of West's paraphrase, "sententiam non meam ipsius *sed a maioribus acceptam*", were spelt out in the text, as it wisely is by the Euripidean Melanippe (indeed the other two parallels West

---

Bacch. 40 ἀτέλεστος... τῶν ἐμῶν βακχευμάτων – suggest that by this he means that the Queen is saying she is not unafraid *so far as concerns* herself, i.e. is apprehensive of what may befall her personally. While this might seem a very reasonable state of mind for a person in the Queen's position, it does not in fact suit either the character or the context: both in this speech (168-9) and everywhere else in the play, her anxiety is consistently not for herself but for her son.

   [3] It is cited as such in *Ag*. 750-6. A.F. Garvie, "Lexis" 19, 2001, 6, "do[es] not understand why Atossa should want to emphasise so strongly that her μῦθος is not her own". The answer may be given in words of P.E. Easterling (in R.D. Dawe et al. [edd.], *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies… Presented to Sir Denys Page* [Cambridge 1978] 153) which Garvie himself had quoted elsewhere (on *Cho*. 313-4 δράσαντι παθεῖν, τριγέρων μῦθος τάδε φωνεῖ): "When special attention is drawn to a saying's… antiquity or fame we should assume that the poet thinks it particularly significant" (I would have added "and/or wants us to understand that the speaker does").

cites, *Ag*. 750 and *Cho*. 314, show that "an ancient saying" is the essential part of the expression and "not my own invention" is dispensable). In other words, we need a lacuna of at least one line between ἐμαυτῆς and the next surviving word. In the Loeb I printed that word as οὐκ, supposing that the Φ-scholia had preserved it correctly while in the direct textual tradition, after the passage had been damaged, οὖσ᾿ had been inserted to patch up the construction and then οὐκ had been lost by accident or in an attempt to mend the metre; but οὖσ᾿ or οὐδ᾿ (with a lost negative preceding) are also possible.

If it is only a single line that has been lost, one might speculatively restore

μῦθον οὐδαμῶς ἐμαυτῆς ‹ἀλλὰ τῶν παλαιτέρων·
οὐ γὰρ ἄφοβός εἰμι πάντως› οὐδ᾿ ἀδείμαντος, φίλοι...

But the lacuna may be longer than this.

(2) *Persians* 249-254

I think it is worth while to draw attention to the fact that the first six lines of the Messenger's opening seven-line speech all begin with an *o*-vowel. This is actually a favourite trick of Aeschylus at the beginning of a speech expressing distress. At the end of the Messenger's long narrative, the first six lines of the Queen's response (517-522) begin with an *o*- or *u*-vowel, and her first eleven lines begin with a vowel of some sort; similarly in her last speech in the play, after the departure of the Ghost of Darius, all seven lines (845-851) begin with a vowel. When Eteocles in *Seven against Thebes* learns that his brother is attacking the gate which he has reserved himself to defend, his first three lines (653-5) begin with ω,[4] after which he pulls himself together ("it is not proper to cry or lament"); when Clytaemestra learns of the supposed death of Orestes, her first three lines (*Cho*. 691-3) begin with an *o*-vowel. (In all cases, aspiration is ignored.)

As a control, I have sampled three 50-line iambic passages[5] from other parts of these three plays, with the following results:

	Lines	Initial vowel	Initial *o*-vowel	Initial *u*-vowel
Pers. 353-402	50	23	3	0
Seven 568-618	50	19	5	0
Cho. 535-584	50	19	3	1

[4] G.O. Hutchinson (Oxford 1985) *ad loc*. drew attention to this, and noted the four initial ω's in *Pers*. 249-253; but ω is not the only vowel that can serve this purpose, though it is evidently the vowel that serves it most emphatically.

[5] From the *Seven* passage I omit line 601, which like most editors I regard as spurious.

If we cautiously assume that normally 45% of all Aeschylean trimeters begin with a vowel and 10% begin with an *o-* or *u-* vowel, then the probability of seven successive lines beginning with a vowel by coincidence is 0.37%, of eleven such lines 0.015%, and of six successive lines beginning with an *o-* or *u-*vowel the chance probability is 0.0001% or one in a million.

Sophocles uses this device only once, I think, in his surviving plays: Oedipus' last three lines before he rushes into his palace to blind himself all begin with an *o-*vowel (*OT* 1183-5). Euripides may use it in a slightly different way in *Trojan Women*: when Andromache learns that her son is to be thrown to his death from the walls of Troy, of the first seventeen lines of her speech (740-758)[6] nine begin with an *o-*vowel, and there are never three successive lines which do not.

3) *Persians* 282-3 ~ 288-9

> ἴυζ᾽ ἄποτμον βοὰν
> δυσαιανῆ †Πέρσαις δαΐοις†,
> ὡς πάντα παγκάκως
> †ἔθεσαν†· αἰαῖ στρατοῦ φθαρέντος. ...   283
>
> στυγναί γ᾽ Ἀθᾶναι δαΐοις·   286
> μεμνῆσθαί τοι πάρα
> ὡς πολλὰς Περσίδων μάταν
> ἔκτισαν εὔνιδας ἠδ᾽ ἀνάνδρους.

282-3 Πέρσαις e v. 281 post πάντα transp. Page   ἔθεσαν codd. paene omnes: ἔθεσαν καὶ ἐποίησαν, οἱ θεοὶ δηλαδή Σ^Φ, unde ἔθεσαν θεοί Y: ‹θεοὶ› θέσαν Heimsoeth praeeunte Hermann
288   πολλὰς Περσίδων codd.: Π. πολλὰς Weil: πολλοὺς σπερμάτων West   μάταν codd.: del. Heimsoeth: ἄγαν Weil
289 ἔκτισαν εὔνιδας fere codd.: εὔνιδας ἔκτισσαν Boeckh

The strophe and antistrophe have to be considered together, as they are by West, *Studies* 80-82. I will here discuss only the last two lines of each, having nothing to add to West's treatment of the first two (except to note that I have adopted his ἀπότμοις in 280).

At the end, Boeckh's transposition in 289 enables us to keep the excellent αἰαῖ στρατοῦ φθαρέντος in 283, and has rightly won general acceptance[7]. In

---

[6] Omitting 742-3, which J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae*, II (Oxford 1981), S.A. Barlow, *Euripides: Trojan Women* (Warminster 1986), and M.J. Cropp (on Eur. fr. 62i in C. Collard et al., *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, II [Oxford 2004] 87) regard as an interpolation from Euripides' *Alexandros*.

[7] K. Sier, "Hermes" 133, 2005, 412-3, keeps the transmitted text in 289 while drastically emending 283 (replacing αἰαῖ by ἐν Σαλαμῖνι) because he thinks that 284 (ὦ πλεῖστον ἔχθος ὄνομα Σαλαμῖνος κλύειν) must be an immediate reaction to hearing the name of Salamis.

288, taken on its own, nothing needs to be done except to transpose πολλὰς Περσίδων; this gives sound metre and blameless sense. The adjective εὖνις lacks a defining genitive, but so it does in *Cho*. 247 and 794, unless we make it share one uncomfortably with a word meaning "son" (γένναν, πῶλον); there, as here, the context shows which lost loved one is meant. Also relevant is Soph. *Trach*. 563. Here εὖνις is usually understood as meaning "as his wife", a sense not otherwise attested before the last decade of the century (Eur. *Or*. 929; *IA* 397, 807). But the passage is a clear echo of the last lines of the preceding choral ode (*Trach*. 529-530)[8]. There it was said that after helplessly watching Heracles and Achelous fight for her, Deianeira "departed from her mother, like an abandoned calf" (πόρτις ἐρήμα – and note that ἐρῆμος can also mean "orphaned": Soph. *OC* 1719, Pl. *Laws* 927d). Here she speaks of herself, εὖνις, following τὸν πατρῷον στόλον with Heracles: as previously we saw her parted from her mother, so now we are reminded of her being "sent" away with Heracles by her father. She was indeed, in effect, bereaved of both – and she can hardly even be said to have gained a husband in exchange. To understand εὖνις here in its traditional sense powerfully reinforces the theme of Deianeira the unprotected, unsupported[9]. I conclude that in early tragedy εὖνις could mean simply "bereaved" and did not need to govern a genitive specifying which loved one had been lost; after about the middle of the fifth century[10] the word may for a time

This requires him to accept an otherwise unmotivated metrical pause between θέσαν and ἐν Σαλαμῖνι, and to suppose that an exclamation of the form αἰαῖ + exclamatory genitive, thoroughly at home in tragic lyrics (cf. 928, *Cho*. 1007; Eur. *Hipp*. 814, *Hec*. 182, *Supp*. 847, *HF* 899, *Hel*. 211-2), got into the text by accident. In any case, the Messenger has himself uttered the name of Salamis not very long ago (273); indeed, if we accept a transposition (interchanging 272-3 and 278-9; first proposed by J. Stavridès, *Quelques remarques critiques sur les Perses d'Eschyle* [Paris 1890] 11-14) which Sier himself in the same article champions on cogent grounds, the name was heard in the last sentence he uttered before 284.

[8] As was pointed out by D. Armstrong, "BICS" 33, 1986, 101-2 – though he takes the view, wrongly I think, that εὖνις here is to be taken as *ambiguous* between the older and the later sense.

[9] Literally unsupported, at the time she is referring to, by Heracles; when we hear of Nessus carrying Deianeira across the river "on his shoulders" (564), we are entitled to wonder why Heracles entrusted his bride to the centaur rather than carrying her himself on those shoulders which had once borne the weight of the sky.

[10] I would date *Trachiniae* close to 450. It is generally accepted that it must be later than Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (458), since *Trach*. 1051-2 is plainly designed to recall Aesch. *Ag*. 1382 + 1580; J.R. March, *The Creative Poet* (London 1987) 62-63, has shown that it is earlier than Bacchylides 16 – and the last datable poems of Bacchylides (6 and 7) belong to the year 452; and stylistic criteria, especially the frequency of interlinear hiatus, suggest that *Trach*. is the earliest of Sophocles' surviving plays (these are discussed in the introduction to P.J. Finglass's edition of Sophocles' *Ajax* [Cambridge, forthcoming]). Deianeira's prayer that none of her descendants may be taken captive like the women whom Lichas has brought

have dropped out of use entirely, to be revived by Euripides in his last years in the new sense "wife", as if it were a derivative of εὐνή. Quite possibly this innovation was inspired by *Trach.* 563 itself, misunderstood by Euripides as it has been by so many modern interpreters. The scholia, incidentally, though their interpretation of the sentence as a whole is an impossible one, do take εὖνις to mean ἔρημος.

As for the much-criticized μάταν in *Pers.* 288, it is to be understood from the Persian point of view: the husbands and sons of Persian women have been killed in a futile cause[11]. It is true, as West, *Studies* 82 says, that Persian men too have now lost their sons, and that we have been reminded of this at 63 and 245; but a specific reference to women here will direct attention to the Persian woman on stage, who has been silent since the Messenger entered (cf. 290-2) and who does not yet know whether her own son is among the dead. The male chorus, throughout the play, in the most marked contrast to the Queen, never once grieve explicitly for their own sons, as Aeschylus could easily have made them do, but only for the Persian nation as a whole.

Hence 288-9 is best read as ὡς Περσίδων πολλὰς μάταν εὖνιδας ἔκτισ-σαν ἠδ᾽ ἀνάνδρους (*2ia cho ith*). Can we, then, restore 282-3 to correspond? If we accept that αἰαῖ στρατοῦ φθαρέντος is sound, we will need to emend ὡς πάντα παγκάκως ἔθεσαν so that it will scan x – ˘ – x – ˘ – – ˘ ˘ and include the necessary (West, *Studies* 81) mention of the gods as subject of the clause. The first three words pose no problem, provided we take πάντα as neuter plural (desirable in any case to provide [ἔ]θεσαν with an object) rather than as a (spondaic) adverb. The favourite way to bring in the gods has been that of Heimsoeth, to insert a monosyllabic ‹θεοί› in place of the augment of ἔθεσαν; a further insertion will then be required in 282, e.g. ὡς πάντα Πέρσαις (transposed from 281 where it ruins the responsion) παγ-κάκως (Page). West *loc. cit.* rejects this unmentioned, presumably because, like Hermann's emendation of 280 which he discusses, it involves a breach of Porson's Law; in any case Πέρσαις is better explained as a gloss (*ibid.*)

The simplest solution for 282-3 is to remove the augment of θέσαν and then insert a single word not before the verb but after it – and for this word to be not ‹θεοὶ› but ‹δαίμονες›, which serves as its synonym in 724, 811, 1005, *Seven* 77, 96, 173, *Supp.* 217, 893, 922, *Ag.* 182, *Cho.* 214, *Eum.* 920, 1016, etc. That θεοί is used in the paraphrase offered by the Φ-scholia

---

home (*Trach.* 301-3) might have offended an Athenian audience at a time when Athens was at war with Sparta, whose kings traced their ancestry to Deianeira's son Hyllus; so the play was probably produced after the five-year peace treaty (σπονδαί) made in 451 (Thuc. 1.112.1).

[11] So H.J. Rose in his commentary (Amsterdam 1957): "It means, I take it, that all this distress and loss has been for nothing, since Xerxes is defeated".

proves nothing whatever; as the next word, δηλαδή, shows, the scholiast was working with a text that had already suffered loss. Hence read in 282-3:

ὡς πάντα παγκάκως θέσαν

‹δαίμονες›· αἰαῖ στρατοῦ φθαρέντος.

(4) *Persians* 548-550 ~ 558-560

νῦν γὰρ δὴ πρόπασα μὲν στένει   548

γαῖ᾽ Ἀσιὰς ἐκκενουμένα.

Ξέρξης μὲν ἄγαγεν, ποποῖ...

πεζούς τε γὰρ καὶ θαλασσίους   558

αἱ δ᾽ ὁμόπτεροι κυανώπιδες

νᾶες μὲν ἄγαγον, ποποῖ...

548 γὰρ del. Porson   δὴ om. GF

549 Ἀσιὰς codd.: Ἀσὶς Blomfield

550 μὲν D+ Lc (et sic codd. omnes in v. 560): γὰρ Tricl.: μὲν γὰρ cett.

558 τε om. Qᵃᶜ(?) GF: γὰρ om. Vᵃᶜ(?) λ: γάρ τε T

559 αἱ δ᾽ del. Brunck

Brunck's deletion in 559 restores both syntax and response, and can safely be accepted[12]. We are then left with the failure of responsion in 548 ~ 558 and an apparent surfeit of particles in both lines. 558 as transmitted would have been entirely satisfactory were it not metrically incoherent. Triclinius' transposition gives acceptable metre, but γάρ τε is not securely attested in tragedy[13]. Maas proposed γάρ σφε, and as so often his suggestion was adopted by Gilbert Murray (Oxford 1955²); it has no merit – σφε is too weak a pronoun to carry a load of one adjective, let alone two (πεζοὺς... καὶ θαλασσίους). The omission of γὰρ in family λ, though probably accidental, is likely to be right; it was inserted because a connective was thought to be needed. Its removal leaves the stanza beginning with four iambic dimeters, like *Seven* 989-992; *Supp.* 808-812 ~ 817-821, though corrupt, seems to begin with five.

In that case, 548 must sacrifice one of its particles. H.D. Broadhead

---

[12] Blomfield's minor emendation in 549 should probably be accepted also, though it is not strictly necessary. (Those who find the preceding sentence self-contradictory are referred to M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* [Stuttgart 1973] 55-59 and *Studies* 370-2). In the three tragic passages in which forms of Ἀσίς are metrically guaranteed (270, *Supp.* 547, Eur. *El.* 315), they are always corrupt in all or part of the ms. tradition; in the two passages in which forms of Ἀσιάς are metrically guaranteed (Eur. *Cycl.* 443, *Ba.* 1168) – for each of which only a single manuscript survives – they have been preserved unscathed.

[13] See J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954²) 532. Verrall's conjecture on Eur. *Ion* 1099 has long since vanished from apparatuses. Denniston presumably ignored the badly corrupt Eur. fr. 1019 (δούλοισι γάρ τε ζῶμεν οἱ ἐλεύθεροι).

(Cambridge 1960) ad loc. finds γὰρ redundant, saying that "the Chorus does not lament because the whole of Asia is groaning"; but γὰρ may be explaining, not the preceding sentence as a whole, but only its last two words – the statement that the fate of the departed is "truly a theme for mourning far and wide" (δοκίμως πολυπενθῆ). The really suspect particle in this line is μέν, which Denniston (*GP* 364) and Broadhead both struggle to explain (and on which Belloni makes no comment at all). I suggest that μὲν be deleted and δὴ transposed to fill its place (νῦν γὰρ πρόπασα δὴ στένει). Either μὲν has wandered here, via the margin, from 550 (where it must at some stage have been competing with γάρ before the two particles settled down to joint occupancy), or it owes its presence to ἐκκενου<u>μένα</u> directly below. When μέν arrived in 548 it bumped out δή, which was eventually restored in the wrong place; δή would go well with πρόπασα (cf. Denniston *GP* 205).

(5) *Persians* 858-860

> πρῶτα μὲν †εὐδοκίμου στρατιᾶς ἀπο-
> φαινόμεθ'† ἠδὲ †νομίματα πύργινα πάντ' ἐπεύθυνον†

εὐδοκίμου στρατιᾶς plerique: εὐδοκίμους στρατιὰς Nd² (στρατιὰς etiam Mᵃᶜ)   ἀποφ- plerique: ἀπεφ- Iˢˢᶜʳ O² λ   νομίματα vel νόμιμα τὰ plerique: νόμιμα OᵃᶜQ: νομίσματα Aᵃᶜ: νόμισμα τὰ L: πολίσματα Keiper   πάντ' ἐπεύθυνον (ἐπέθυνον Mˢ κ Tricl.) codd.: πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἰθύν West: πάντ' ἐπέρθομεν (sic) Pallis

   numeri *4da 6da*, ut docet stropha (852-4)

   Σᴹ: πρῶτα μὲν κατὰ πόλεμον διὰ στρατιᾶς εὐδοκιμοῦμεν καὶ ὁρμῶμεν κατὰ νενομισμένα ἔθη ταῖς πόλεσι ταῖς πορθουμέναις, οὐ τεμένη θεῶν πορθοῦντες, οὐ τάφους ἀνασπῶντες, ὡς Ξέρξης τολμήσας ἐποίησεν. ... τὰ νόμιμα πάντα τῶν τετειχισμένων πόλεων. οἱ δὲ δημωφελεῖς δῆμοι (θεσμοὶ Wecklein) πάντα ἐπολιτεύοντο.

   Σᶠ: πρῶτα μὲν καὶ πρωτοτύπως ἀπεφαινόμεθα στρατιᾶς εὐδοκίμου ἤτοι περιβοήτου καὶ τροπαιοφορούσης, τουτέστι διὰ στρατιᾶς κατὰ πόλεμον εὐδοκιμοῦμεν, καὶ ἐπεύθυνον ἤγουν κατὰ τὸ εὐθὺ ἐξήγοντο καὶ ἐπλατύνοντο πάντα τὰ νόμιμα καὶ ἔθιμα τῶν πυργουμένων καὶ τετειχισμένων πόλεων· καὶ ὁρμῶμεν κατὰ τὰ νενομισμένα ἔθη ταῖς πόλεσι ταῖς πορθουμέναις, οὐ τεμένη πορθοῦντες, οὐ τάφους ἀνασπῶντες, ὡς Ξέρξης τολμήσας ἐποίησε. λέγεται δὲ καὶ πύργινα νόμιμα τὰ πυργοῦντα καὶ συνιστῶντα τὰς πόλεις.

This passage consists of two statements conjoined by ἠδέ[14]. In the first statement West, Belloni, and E.M. Hall (Warminster 1996) are highly likely to be right in accepting three minority variants and reading εὐδοκίμους στρατιὰς ἀπεφαινόμεθ'. I am concerned here with the second.

I have quoted the scholia in full above to show that, while for the most part the scholiasts were merely thrashing about in a desperate attempt to make sense out of nonsense, they were sure of two things. One of these

___

[14] Unless with Page we emend ἠδέ away (he prints αἴτε, citing in support the reading αἰδὲ [sic] of a ms. (Δ) which is most unlikely to have preserved the the truth alone – see West *Studies* 324-330). West was perfectly justified in making no mention of Δ's reading, or of Page's conjecture, either in his apparatus or in *Studies* 90.

things, but only one, they could fairly easily have gathered from the context, namely that (as modern scholars also agree) the whole antistrophe is about Persian *military* activities under Darius and nothing else. The other thing they were sure of is that the corrupt words of 859-860 had something to do with the sacking of cities (note the phrase ταῖς πόλεσι ταῖς πορθουμέναις which appears in both versions of the note). The *capture* of cities, to be sure, is referred to at the beginning of the next strophe (865), but their *sacking* is not mentioned anywhere in this entire ode. The presumption must be that this feature of the scholia originates from a time when there was mention of the sacking of cities in the poetic text itself at this point. The root περθ-/πορθ- is used several times elsewhere in this play with explicit or implicit punning on Πέρσαι (65, 178, 348, 714, 1056; in 103-8 the punning goes in the opposite direction).

Being coordinate with ἀπεφαινόμεθ᾽, the verb concealed by ἐπεύθυνον must be imperfect and first person plural, and since ἐπορθοῦμεν will not fit the purely dactylic metre, it can hardly be other than ἐπέρθομεν (Pallis). The transmitted πάντ᾽ will not fit in before this[15], and must be a corruption or an intrusion; perhaps the whole phrase πάντ᾽ ἐπεύθυνον was originally part of a marginal quotation from another play. It will then be necessary to suppose that a word has been lost at the end of the sentence, and ‹ἄρδην› "utterly" would give appropriate sense (cf. Eur. *Hec*. 887, Pl. *Rep*. 421a).

As to the preceding words, on the argument here being pursued we need a mention of cities, and hence πολίσματα (Peiper). That leaves only πύργινα, which seems to be a hapax; if it is sound, and if the present proposal is otherwise on the right lines, it will have to be understood as a *metri gratia* substitute for πυργήρη.

Broadhead too has taken seriously the scholiast's interest in city-sacking, but argues that since Xerxes too sacked cities (or at any rate one very important city) this on its own would not be a point of contrast between him and Darius. Such a contrast, he argues, is provided in the interpretation of the scholia: Darius, when he sacked cities, behaved in accordance with νενομισμένα ἔθη and did not, like Xerxes, destroy temples[16]. Broadhead cannot find a restoration along these lines which will satisfy idiom and metre; his

---

[15] Unless one sacrifices the dactylic metre – which A. Sidgwick (Oxford 1903) was prepared to do, adopting the variant γηραιὸς in the strophe and scanning it – ⏑ – (a licence which, as it happens, is attested in tragedy for γεραιός, e.g. Eur. *Hipp*. 170, but never for γηραιός).

[16] Or tombs, adds the scholiast; but he has taken his eye off the ball – Xerxes is nowhere in this play said to have desecrated tombs. Probably the scholiast is thinking vaguely of the Greek battle-cry of 402-5, which calls *inter alia* for the liberation of θήκας προγόνων, and of the juxtaposition of temples and tombs in the denunciation of city-sackers in Eur. *Tro*. 95-97.

key phrase, νόμου μέτα, occurs (as μετὰ νόμου) only once before Philo (Pl. *Laws* 647c), and there it does not mean "in conformity with law" but "with the help of law". If this was what the chorus meant, we would have expected them to say something like νόμον κάτα – which Broadhead doubtless, and rightly, thought was too far from the paradosis to be a credible emendation. In any case, the chorus are not professing here to be illustrating the contrast between Darius and Xerxes; they are professing to illustrate the felicity of Persia under Darius (852-7), and recent disasters under Xerxes are not mentioned till the final lines of the final epode (903-7).

(6) *Persians* 948

> κλάγξω δ᾽ αὖ γόον ἀρίδακρυν.

I do not know what αὖ is doing here, and most editors and translators seem not to know either, since they treat the passage as if αὖ were not there. An exception is Seth Benardete[17], who distinctly over-translates it ("Again a wailing filled with tears I'll cry"; that would require αὖθις). Rather, δ᾽ αὖ ought to be contrasting the sentence, and its first word(s) in particular, with something that preceded, and this would be quite inappropriate; this sentence is in fact saying the *same*, in different words, as the previous sentence did. What is needed is δή, placing emotional emphasis on the verb (Denniston *GP* 214-5): the chorus will not merely lament (ἤσω 944, sc. πάνδυρτον δύσθροον αὐδάν), they will lament *loudly*.

(7) *Seven* 274-8

Eteocles vows to all the gods of Thebes

> εὖ ξυντυχόντων καὶ πόλεως σεσω{σ}μένης
> μήλοισιν αἱμάσσοντας ἑστίας θεῶν
> {ταυροκτονοῦντας θεοῖσιν ὧδ᾽ ἐπεύχομαι}
> θήσειν τροπαῖα †πολεμίων δ᾽ ἐσθήματα†   277
> λάφυρα δᾴων δουρίπληχθ᾽ ἁγνοῖς δόμοις.
> {στέψω πρὸ ναῶν πολεμίων δ᾽ ἐσθήματα.}   278a

276 del. Ritschl   ταυροκτονῶν τε I
277 θύσειν O   δ᾽] τ᾽ I Rb: om. X   ἐσθήματα Mˢ et plerique: ἐσθήμασι M Σᴵ: ἐσθήματων Y loco verborum corruptorum infinitivum desiderari monet Hutchinson
278a habent soli M Σᴵ Pᵃᶜ Ξaᵃᶜ, στέψω πρὸ ναῶν tantum Q Δ²: om. cett.

The text of this passage is well discussed by G.O. Hutchinson (Oxford 1985) ad loc., who concludes that "πολεμίων δ᾽ ἐσθήματα is, or arises from, an elucidation of λάφυρα δᾴων, and has displaced a half-line which

---

[17] In D. Grene and R. Lattimore, *The Complete Greek Tragedies: Aeschylus*, II (Chicago 1956) 80.

included a future infinitive". West thought of keeping πολεμίων and adding ‹κἀσθηκάσειν›; I have not been able to trace this verb. A compound of πήγνυμι would be appropriate (cf. Eur. *El*. 898), and one might think of ‹κἀναπήξεσθαι› "and to fix up", perhaps with ‹νεκρῶν› to follow[18].

(8) *Seven* 345-7

> κορκορυγαὶ δ᾽ ἀν᾽ ἄστυ, ποτὶ {πτόλιν} δ᾽ ὀρκάνα
> πυργῶτις, πρὸς ἀνδρὸς δ᾽ ἀνὴρ
> †δορὶ† καίνεται   347

345 ποτὶ πτόλιν (MI: πόλιν cett.) codd.: ποτὶ Hermann: περὶ Wilamowitz
347 ‹ἀμφὶ› δορὶ Hermann: δουρὶ ‹κατα-› Paley: numeri ut vid. *2cr*

For δορι I suggest δουρι‹κμῆς›. This adjective occurs otherwise only in *Cho*. 365, also in lyrics, and referring to Greeks killed in the Trojan war. It is possible that the sequence ΚΜΗ could be vulnerable to omission before ΚΑΙΝ.

(9) *Seven* 363-5

> δμωΐδες δὲ καινοπήμονες †νέαι
> τλήμονες† εὐνὰν αἰχμάλωτον
> ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχοῦντος, ὡς...

numeri, si fides strophae: *tr lec / 2tr / lec*

There is no significant variation in the mss., except that Triclinius (in T only) makes the facile metrical correction τλῆμον᾽. Hutchinson and West both rightly find suspicious the similarity between -πήμονες and τλήμονες: I find suspicious also the similarity of meaning between καινο- and νέαι. We need a verb, or equivalent, and the M-scholium (364a Smith), μεταστᾶσαι εἰς δουλείαν οἴσουσι τὴν τῶν πολεμίων εὐνήν, may well indicate what that verb should be[19]. If we remove νέαι τλήμονες, taking it to have originated in one or more glosses or variants, we must supply ⏑ – ⏑ : perhaps then ‹τάχ᾽› οἴσουσιν or διοίσουσιν "will endure" (LSJ διαφέρω I 4). The tense is future, not present, because at the time being described the women are just being led away captive (326-335); their forced submission to actual concubinage still lies in the realm of future expectation (cf. ἐλπίς ἐστι 367) – at present the enemy are much too busy killing the male population (340-1, 346-350), seizing plunder (351-5) and setting fire to buildings (323, 341-2).

---

[18] With ‹νεκρῶν› λάφυρα δᾴων cf. Eur. *Phoen*. 1474-5 οἱ δ᾽ ἀσπίδας συλῶντες Ἀργείων νεκρῶν | σκυλεύματ᾽ εἴσω τειχέων ἐπέμπομεν, and for δάιος as an adjective meaning "of the enemy" cf. in tragedy *Seven* 146, Soph. *OC* 699, 1044.

[19] But West's τλαμόνως ‹φέρουσιν› εὐνάν {αἰχμάλωτον} will not do, keeping as it does a highly suspect word while removing a blameless one.

(10) *Seven* 576-9

        καὶ τὸν σὸν αὖθις †πρὸς μόραν ἀδελφεόν,

        ἐξυπτιάζων ὄνομα, Πολυνείκους βίαν,   577

        δίς τ᾽ ἐν τελευτῇ τοὔνομ᾽ ἐνδατούμενος†   578

        καλεῖ

576 πρὸσμόραν vel sim. MA: πρόσμορον vel sim. cett. (πρόσμολον D[sscr], πρόσπορον [γρ]B D[sscr] W[sscr γρ]Σ[l]): προσμολὼν Ald[mg]: προσθροῶν Francken: προσδρακὼν Mazon   ἀδελφεόν] ἀδελφὸν γ: ὁμόσπορον Burges

577 ὄνομα] ὄμμα Schütz

578 versum del. Murray   δισσῇ τελευτῇ van Herwerden

There can be little doubt that ὁμόσπορον is correct at the end of 576; indeed, this word may well lie concealed in the meaningless πρὸσμόραν (or whatever) that precedes (on all this see Hutchinson). If so, the transmitted letters may be no good guide to what originally preceded ὁμόσπορον: but αὖθις indicates that Amphiaraus is being said to have treated Tydeus (571-5) and Polyneices in a parallel way, and Francken's προσθροῶν (cf. *Prom.* 595) cannot be far from the sense (προσμολὼν, despite its closeness to one medieval variant, is unlikely, since it could not form a parallel with Amphiaraus' treatment of Tydeus, to whom he cannot have "gone over" since Tydeus' station at the first gate was not adjacent to Amphiaraus' at the sixth).

What of 577-8? Clearly, in the first place, what Amphiaraus is here doing is drawing attention to the meaning of Polyneices' name and its appropriateness to the "great strife" that he has caused. Secondly, it is unlikely that Aeschylus wrote ὄνομα twice, merely to serve as object to two conjoined participles; so either the word is corrupt on one of its two occurrences, or else there has been interpolation. The only remotely plausible suggestion for getting rid of the repetition of ὄνομα has been Schütz's ὄμμα in 577, adopted by West; but as Hutchinson shows, it would not provide an appropriate sense[20]. Rather, we must posit interpolation.

It is tempting, with Murray, simply to delete 578, whose omission leaves perfect sense. But ἐνδατούμενος (cf. Aesch. fr. 350.1, Soph. *Tr.* 791) is not a word that an interpolator would be likely to use, and Πολυνείκους βίαν is suspect because Polyneices' name is the topic of the passage and if it was not originally mentioned in the text it might well soon come to be written above the line as a gloss (βίαν would have been added from 569, 571, 620

---

[20] C. Collard, "AC" 64, 1995, 185-6, comparing Aeschines 1.132, thinks that "haughty and distancing contempt" is an appropriate attitude for Amphiaraus to adopt. But Amphiaraus is not, like the man of whom Aeschines is speaking, despising his addressee as his social and/or intellectual inferior: he, the man with the blank shield, the only one of the Seven who utters no boasts, would be the very last person to do so. Rather, he is condemning Polyneices, as he did Tydeus, on *moral* grounds.

and 641 to fill out the verse, once the name had been mistaken for part of the text).

On any view, δίς τ' ἐν τελευτῇ presents a serious problem. If there has not been interpolation, what is the true reading of these words, and what do they mean? If there has been, how did the phrase get into the text? There has been no satisfactory answer to either question. M's paraphrase εἰς δύο δι-αιρῶν might be thought to point to a reading δίχ' (Groeneboom), but the scholiast has nothing to say about ἐν τελευτῇ. As to interpolators, they do not arbitrarily insert nonsensical phrases; but if a copyist thinks there is a gap in the text, he may well fill it with words or letters which look, from their position on the page, as though they might be meant as part of the text, even if he does not understand them – and perhaps that is what happened here. Δὶς and ἐν τελευτῇ may have been separate scraps of an annotation. But I am far from happy with *any* explanation that has been offered of this phrase.

Suppose, then, we do delete Πολυνείκους βίαν and δίς τ' ἐν τελευτῇ, and further assume that one of the two occurrences of ὄνομα is a duplicate of the other. We will then have removed a complete line, and a small adjust-ment to what remains yields ἐξυπτιάζων ὄνομα κἀνδατούμενος[21]. Aeschy-lus would thus be saying that Amphiaraus called out to Polyneices "turning his name upside down and dwelling on it" (the meaning of ἐνδατεῖσθαι in the two passages cited above). What would "turning his name upside down" mean? The scholia gloss ἐξυπτιάζων as ἀναπτύσσων "unfolding, unrolling", and Rose suggests that Aeschylus' metaphor is taken from the act of opening out a papyrus roll and laying it on its "back". While there is no direct evi-dence that ἐξυπτιάζω could bear this meaning, it is not a very obvious one for an ancient commentator to have dreamed up; it was probably therefore known to him, either from current usage or from earlier texts now lost. If the scholiast is right, what is being said is that Amphiaraus was disclosing the significance of Polyneices' name – which is, of course, "man of great strife"[22].

While not wishing to exclude this explanation, I would like to put for-ward another. This is that ἐξυπτιάζων ὄνομα means "inverting the name" in

---

[21] Another three-word iambic trimeter, in a play that already contains more of them (thirteen) than any other tragedy. See W.B. Stanford, "CR" 54, 1940, 8-10; M. Griffith, *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1977) 91-92. The others are 19, 29, 72, 243, 431, 449, 464, 496, 541, 614, 621, 635 and 798. *Prometheus Bound* has nine such lines; next, significantly, comes Euripides' *Phoenician Maidens* with eight.

[22] When there is such a play on the meaning of a name, it is usual for the name itself to be mentioned in the immediate context, but this is by no means invariably the case. At 536 the statement that a certain warrior's pride is οὔ τι παρθένων ἐπώνυμον precedes the mention of his name, Parthenopaeus, by at least eleven lines (eighteen, if Weil's transposition of 536-7 to precede 529 is correct).

the sense of reversing its *pitch-pattern*. When an oxytone adjective is used as a personal name, there is a strong tendency for the accent to be moved to the "recessive" position (i.e. to be placed as early as the rules of the language allow); thus to the adjectives γλαυκός and πολυκρατής (*Cho.* 406) correspond the personal names Γλαῦκος and Πολυκράτης[23]. I suspect that it may have become a popular jest to address a person with his name accented as though it were an ordinary vocabulary word, e.g. addressing a Glaucus as ὦ γλαυκέ "blue-eyes" or a Theorus as ὦ θεωρέ "tourist" – with the pitch rising instead of falling towards the end of the word – and that thus here the audience would readily understand that Amphiaraus had addressed the son of Oedipus not as ὦ Πολύνεικες but as ὦ πολυνεικές "man of great strife"[24]. It is not impossible that in *Seven* 658, where Eteocles in his turn emphasizes the appropriateness of his brother's name, the actor was instructed to pronounce it Πολυνεικεῖ; so too maybe at Eur. *Phoen.* 636.

(11) *Suppliants* 207

> μή νῦν σχόλαζε, μηχανῆς δ᾽ ἔστω κράτος.

This was very reasonably obelized by Page[25]; but I am surprised that no one has proposed the simple emendation μηχανῇ (though Bothe suggested μηχαναῖς). The meaning is "may victory attend this ploy", "may our stratagem be successful", the stratagem being that of occupying the shrine of the ἀγώνιοι θεοί with their suppliant insignia. For μηχανή or μηχάνημα in this sense cf. 459, 462, *Ag.* 1582, 1609, fr. 373; and for the form of the sentence, cf. 951 εἴη δὲ νίκη καὶ κράτος (κράτη M: corr. Nauck) τοῖς ἄρσεσιν.

---

[23] See P. Probert, *Ancient Greek Accentuation* (Oxford 2006) 298-300 and *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (London 2003) 112-3 (where she actually cites Πολυνείκης as an example of the phenomenon).

[24] In *Seven* as we have it this adjective is in fact used, in the plural, at 830; but Verrall was probably right (see R.D. Dawe in *Dionysiaca* [n. 3] 88-89) to regard 822-831 as spurious.

[25] Various attempts have been made to defend the transmitted text. W.J. Verdenius, "Mnemosyne" s. 4. 43, 1990, 429, seems to understand the words as meaning "let there be [i.e. make sure you have] command of a means", referring to the altar at which the Danaids are to assume a suppliant position; but nothing in the context specifies the end to which this "means" is to lead, unless indeed 209, with its μὴ ἀπολωλότας, is to be placed before 207 (not one of the more popular among the innumerable transpositions that have been suggested). G. Liberman, "SemRom" 1, 1998, 246-7, takes μηχανῆς ἔστω κράτος to be equivalent to μηχανῆς κράτει (citing as a parallel Eur. *Hec.* 883 where, however, the presence of the dative γυναιξὶν makes all the difference) and this to mean "take possession of your means ‹of safety›", i.e. of the altar. This is to treat a script composed for a mass audience as if it were a cryptic crossword. P. Sandin in his commentary (Göteborg 2003) tells us that "cunning and plans are of little value unless there is strength to carry them out", but does not explain the force of the genitive μηχανῆς (and in any case Danaus' plan to secure asylum does not depend on "strength" at all for its effectiveness).

(12) *Suppliants* 330-2

> ἐπεὶ τίς ηὔχει τήνδ᾽ ἀνέλπιστον φυγὴν
> κέλσει{ε}ν ἐς Ἄργος κῆδος ἐγγενὲς †τὸ πρίν
> ἔχει μετὰ πτοίουσαν† εὐναίων γάμων;

331 κέλσειν Robortello, Turnebus: κέλσειεν M 332 ἔχει] ἔχθει Turnebus

West, *Studies* 142-3 takes κῆδος ἐγγενὲς τὸ πρίν to mean "an old family connection"[26]; but, as was pointed out by H. Friis Johansen and E.W. Whittle (Copenhagen 1980) ad loc., κῆδος means a family connection *by marriage* (whence κηδεστής, the Attic word for any male affine), and that is absurd when the Danaids have just spent some thirty lines proving that they are kin to the Argives *by blood*. Rather, κῆδος ἐγγενές must mean "a marriage alliance within the family", i.e. the marriage with their cousins from which the Danaids are fleeing; and therefore it must be the object, not the subject, of the participle in line 332.

A subject for κέλσειν is badly needed, as Johansen/Whittle and West agree, and Schütz inserted μ᾽ after the infinitive, but that is not necessarily the only possible place for this pronoun.

I wish to revive a proposal considered, but not adopted, by Johansen/Whittle[27]:

> κέλσειν ἐς Ἄργος κῆδος ἐγγενὲς τὸ πᾶν
> ἔχθει μ᾽ ἀποπτύουσαν εὐναίων γάμων;

"For who ever supposed that I, on such an unexpected flight, should land at Argos, utterly rejecting with disgust [lit. spitting away] a marriage-tie with my kinsmen through loathing of the marital bed?"

The sense is exactly appropriate, and the corruptions not difficult. τὸ πᾶν occurs three times more in *Supp.* (594, 692, 781) and is extremely common in the *Oresteia* (as it also is in *Prometheus Bound* and, to a lesser extent, in several plays of Sophocles). For the sense in which ἀποπτύειν would be used here compare, in Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1192, *Cho.* 197, *Eum.* 191, 303.

(13) *Suppliants* 405-6

> τί τῶνδ᾽ ἐξ ἴσου ῥεπομένων †μεταλ-
> γεῖς† τὸ δίκαιον ἔρξαι;

---

[26] Sandin too takes κῆδος ἐγγενὲς as subject of κέλσειν and makes it mean, at least initially, "a blood-related grief" – or, as one might reasonably paraphrase, "your grieving kindred". Unfortunately, in post-Homeric poetry κῆδος means specifically the grief *of mourners*, and the Danaids, while they have experienced many afflictions, have never (so far as we are informed) experienced the affliction of a bereavement. "Being bullied by male cousins" (Sandin 179) is not a κῆδος.

[27] τὸ πᾶν is Johansen's conjecture, μ᾽ ἀποπτύουσαν is Whittle's. In their text, they let τὸ πρὶν stand and obelise ἔχει μετὰ πτοίουσαν.

405 τῶν δεξισ οὐ M: corr. Victorius

The oddest thing about this passage is its scholium, which seems to bear no relation at all to the text: τί ἀπορεῖς συμμαχῆσαι τῷ Διί; Probably this should be disregarded, as being an interpretation rather than a paraphrase. Valckenaer[28] managed to come fairly close to it with τί... μεταλλᾷς τί δί-καιον ἔρξαι; but only at the cost of introducing a verb not otherwise found in Attic poetry[29]. Sidgwick's μεταλγὲς gives good sense ("in what way… will doing the right thing cause subsequent grief?"), but quite apart from the fact that an adjective μεταλγής is not known to have existed, it is uncomfortable that the subject and complement of a verbless sentence are separated by a four-word genitive absolute. H. Friis Johansen, "SymbOsl" 50, 1975, 28-29, proposed τί... μεταλγοῖς (Johansen) τὸ δίκαιον ἔρξας (Headlam). This is satisfactory in every respect but one. The Danaids are constantly urging Pelasgus to consider the *consequences* of accepting and of rejecting their supplication. He who respects suppliants will never fall into want (362-3, as restored by Headlam on the basis of the scholia). Pelasgus should guard against pollution (375) and beware the wrath of Zeus Hikesios (381-6, 427). The effects of his decision on his "children and house" will be lasting (433-7). Hence "What future pain will you suffer, if you do what is right?" is an appropriate sense; and since there is no room for a future tense, this would have to be expressed in the potential optative, here in its short form (this is not otherwise found in contract verbs in genuine Aeschylus, but it appears in *Prom*. 978 and Soph. *Trach*. 1235, *OT* 1470, *Phil*. 895, 1044, *OC* 507). The one difficulty, which led Johansen and Whittle in 1980 to abandon the proposal, is that the absence of ἄν with the potential optative cannot be convincingly defended. But this difficulty is one that is very easily solved: read τί... μεταλγοῖς τὰ δίκαι᾽ ἂν ἔρξας;

(14) *Suppliants* 830
ὁρῶ τάδε φροίμια πράξαν πόνων βιαίων ἐμῶν
This is the longest piece of continuous text that M offers in the desperately corrupt passage 825-835, but it makes neither metre nor sense. West (see *Studies* 156), taking a hint from Turnebus who saw in πράξαν a corruption of some form of πρόξενος, boldly prints in his text ("I have no doubt that Aeschylus wrote…") ὁρῶ τάδε πόνων βιαίων ἐμῷ φροίμια προξένῳ

----

[28] Before Maas; see P.J. Finglass, "GRBS" 49, 2009, 195.

[29] Sandin also, at least tentatively, tries to provide a meaning close to that stated by the scholiast; he suggests that μεταλγεῖς may be sound and mean "hesitate, agonize", comparing Eur. *Med*. 996, *Hec*. 214 for the use of μετα-. But he comes nowhere near showing that a person hesitating over a decision can be said ἀλγεῖν: he cites only *Cho*. 1016, where Orestes has no more decisions to make and is grieving over things that have already happened.

"here I see the beginnings of troublesome violence for my protector [i.e. Pelasgus]"; but while the Danaids, once promised asylum and protection, certainly express their gratitude to the Argives and pray for their welfare, they never once elsewhere show any appreciation of the dangers to which, for their sake, the Argives are exposing themselves, and from the time when they first learn that the Egyptian fleet is in the offing (710-733) to the time when Pelasgus comes to their rescue (911) they have thoughts only for their own peril.

We can get nowhere with the line unless we make, at least provisionally, some hypothesis about its metre, and West is probably right to take it as dochmiac. We should also note that M leaves a gap before βιαίων ἐμῶν, thus treating these words as a separate verse – which tells somewhat against any suggestion of moving these words (whether or not emended) to an earlier position.

The likeliest explanation of the impossible πράξαν is not miscopying but loss. It is clear that an ancestor of M was badly damaged or partly illegible hereabouts, and a plausible restoration is πράξαν‹τας›, which gives us both an object for ὁρῶ and a good dochmiac.

From the middle of the line we move to the end, where πόνων... ἐμῶν is rightly objected to by West because the troubles, though imminent, are not yet actual. The diagnosis – assimilation of endings – is easy, the treatment almost equally so: read ἐμοί (dative of disadvantage). The sense is now beginning to become clear: "I see men who have performed a prelude to violent sufferings for me." The 'prelude' is the landing of their pursuers "from the ship… on the land" (νάϊος... γάϊος), to use what are probably the pursuers' own words (826a, b: ascribed by West, with their context, to the Egyptians).

There remains ὁρῶ τάδε φροίμια. This could just about pass as a dochmiac, but it is of a type unknown before Euripides' last decade (see M.L. West, *Greek Metre* [Oxford 1982] 109) and is surely corrupt; the simplest solution is to get rid of τάδε and read ὁρῶ φροίμιον.

While I would not venture to say that I have no doubt what Aeschylus wrote, I will at any rate, then, suggest that he *could* have written ὁρῶ φροίμιον πράξαντας πόνων βιαίων ἐμοί.

(15) *Suppliants* 872-3

ἴυζε καὶ λάκαζε καὶ κάλει θεούς·
Αἰγύπτιον γὰρ βᾶριν οὐχ ὑπερθορῇ.

How can the Herald be so confident? He knows that the Danaids and their father have risked the dangers of a long sea-voyage to escape marriage with their cousins; he thinks, rightly, that it will only be possible to get them

on to the ship by the most brutal use of force; they have repeatedly made it clear to us and the Argives that rather than accept the marriages they would prefer to die, and while the Herald has not actually heard them say so, there is no reason why he should suppose them totally incapable of suicide. And yet he is sure that once in the ship, they will not jump overboard. This can only mean that they will be physically prevented from doing so; in other words, that they will be chained or tied up during the voyage. But it is asking a bit much of the audience to expect it to make this inference without assistance. I conclude that the Egyptians accompanying the Herald are in fact holding ropes or fetters, and brandish them at 873. The Herald is claiming the Danaids as his property, as if they were runaway slaves; cf. 918, 924 (where ἐξαιρήσεται alludes to the procedure of ἐξαίρεσις/ ἀφαίρεσις εἰς ἐλευθερίαν exemplified e.g. in Lysias 23.9-12)[30]. Their fear that they might become δμωὶς Αἰγύπτου γένει, with their cousins in the role of "owners" (335, 337; cf. 38 σφετεριξάμενοι), was no exaggeration.

(16) *Suppliants* 957-961

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

958 post 961 transp. Burges
959 ἔνθ' ἔστιν ὑμῖν Weil: εὐθυμεῖν ἔστιν M   εὐτύκους Porson: ἐντυχούσῃ M   δόμους Turnebus: δόμοισ M
960 δέ τισ M: δέ τῳ Blaydes: δέ τοι Johansen: δέ πως vel δέ που Whittle: δ' ἐκεῖ Sandin
961 μονορρύθμους Md: μονορύθμους M

P. Sandin ("Eranos" 100, 2002, 150-2) has discussed this passage. He rightly argues, comparing the words of Danaus in 1009-11, that Pelasgus must be offering just two alternative forms of accommodation: the Danaids can either live "with many others" in buildings that are public property, or in quarters reserved exclusively for themselves in (one of) the king's resi-dence(s)[31]. The Danaids ask to be allowed to consult their father first before

---

[30] See D.M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 80.

[31] Johansen/Whittle, contrariwise, had argued that the superlatives of 962 (τὰ λῶστα καὶ τὰ θυμηδέστατα) imply that *more* than two kinds of accommodation are being offered to them. This need not, however, be the case; there is already a multiplicity of choice present (but not spelt out in detail) *within* each of the categories of public and private housing, indicated by πολλά (958) and οὐδὲ... σμικρᾷ χερί (959). Of each of the two types of accommodation, much more is available than the Danaids need, and therefore, whichever category they prefer, they will be able to take their pick of the best accommodation within that category.

deciding (968-971)[32]; Danaus, when he comes, does not actually say which option he prefers, but his anxiety about the preservation of his daughters' chastity, which takes up the greater part of his speech (991-1009, 1012-3), strongly suggests that he would like to minimize contact between them and the Argives and that he will accept the offer of exclusive accommodation in the palace. This in due course will facilitate a takeover of power by Danaus (who already has a personal bodyguard: 985-8) and also the plotting of the wedding-night murders.

However, as Sandin says, the text of 957-961 as transmitted fails to make it clear what options, or how many, are being offered. Indeed the most plausible interpretation of it is that *three* alternatives are put on the table, or more precisely two alternatives one of which is subdivided: (i) public housing, not further specified (957); (ii) accommodation in the palace (958) which may be either (a) shared (959-960a) or (b) exclusive (960b-961). It is also possible, though more difficult[33], to take ἔνθ' as referring to *both* the options presented in 957-8, in which case the Danaids are being offered the choice of public or royal accommodation and, *in either case*, the choice of it being shared or exclusive. Sandin rightly seeks a text that will reduce this confusion to a clear, straight choice.

Sandin's solution is to take ἔνθ' as a demonstrative pronoun ("there") rather than a relative pronoun ("where"), and to take it as referring "exclusively to 957, i.e. to the *public* housing", while emending the slightly suspect[34] εἰ δέ τις in 960 to εἰ δ' ἐκεῖ "referring to the last mentioned place, the house of Pelasgus". This will not work. Neither the Danaids nor the audience can be expected to divine that ἔνθ' is demonstrative and not relative (especially when, as Sandin admits, the demonstrative was rare), or that it refers only to the remoter, not the nearer, of its two available antecedents, or that ἐκεῖ, which normally refers to something relatively distant, here refers to "the last mentioned place". Sandin speculates that Pelasgus might disam-

---

[32] Probably 975-6 should be transposed to follow 971 (West), and κεἰ (Schwerdt) read in 972; the Danaids will then be saying that their father will need to consider "where we should reside so as to be well reputed, and spoken of without anger, by the native population", because "even if a country is friendly, everyone is ready to speak ill of people of alien language" (cf. 496-8, 994-5).

[33] Because if this was what Pelasgus wanted to say, he could have said it more clearly by not using a linking adverb at all in 959 but instead starting an entirely separate sentence, e.g. with ἔστιν δέ γ' ὑμῖν.

[34] Suspect because, in the words of Johansen/Whittle, "pred[icate]s containing an adjectival τισ… combined with a compar[ative] do not occur… 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": a very restrictive criterion, and a curiously selected corpus (why, for a start, is Euripides omitted from consideration?)

biguate his words by gesturing in different directions, but this would not work either. In this play the two directions that count, presumably represented by the two *eisodoi* respectively, are that of the sea (from which the Danaids come at the beginning of the play, and the Egyptians later on) and that of the city (to and from which Pelasgus, Danaus, and sundry groups of armed Argives travel at various moments, and to which everyone departs at the end of the play)[35]. Particularly with a war imminent, and the enemy already having landed, any possible safe accommodation for the Danaids must certainly be in the city, and indeed Pelasgus has just said so (955-6); therefore both alternatives lie in the same direction, and gesture cannot be used to distinguish between them.

It is very surprising that Sandin makes no mention at all of Burges's transposition of 958 to follow 961, which solves the problem completely. The μέν of 957 will now find its answering δέ not in 958 but in 960. On the one hand, says Pelasgus, there is plenty of public housing (957) where the Danaids can live in well-prepared accommodation with many others (959-960a); on the other hand, they can also live in exclusive quarters (961), for[36] he himself is housed on no mean scale (958).

(17) *Suppliants* 999-1002

> θῆρες δὲ κηραίνουσι [sc. τὴν τέρειναν ὀπώραν] καὶ βροτοί, τί μήν;
> καὶ κνώδαλα πτεροῦντα καὶ πεδοστιβῆ
> καρπώματα στάζοντα κηρύσσει Κύπρις
> κάλωρα κωλύουσαν θωσμένην ἐρῶ   1002

So M, except that it makes τί μήν; into one word (corr. apographus Guelferbytanus c. 1495), has παιδοστιβῆ at the end of 1000 (corr. Robortello) and that ειν has been written above the -ην of the penultimate word in 1002. Can anything be made out of this mess? The passage has been examined by West, *Studies* 165-7, and by Sandin, "Eranos" 100, 2002, 152-4. West takes 1000 as a *nominativus pendens* (probably rightly, I think[37]) and, by some quite simple emendations, makes 1002 emerge as κἄωρα μωλύουσ᾿ ἅμ᾿, ὡς μαίνειν ἔρῳ "also, at the same time, softening up the unripe, so as to madden them with desire". There are some difficulties with this. It makes a distinction between ripe juicy (female) fruit (the καρπώματα στάζοντα of 1001), *towards which* Aphrodite directs the desire of males, and unripe fruit,

---

[35] I have analysed the play's "significant movements" in *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari 1996) 159-162.

[36] ὁ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ γάρ, as scholiasts often say (Denniston *GP* 169, citing *inter alia* lines 190 and 651 of this play).

[37] Sandin takes 1000 to be in apposition to θῆρες in 999, but he can cite no passage in which θῆρες is clearly meant to include birds.

in which she implants desire – leaving it quite unclear which of the two corresponds to the Danaids. Nor is μωλύειν an entirely suitable verb here: when this verb has a living being as object, it normally refers to a *deterioration* in the creature's health or vigour[38].

Sandin takes a different line, suggesting (after Scaliger and others) that κάλωρα may conceal χάλωρα = καὶ ἔλωρα "and prey", and that the meaning of 1001-2 is "Cypris proclaims the ripe fruit and the ‹ › prey alike to be a care of Love (ὁμῶς μέλειν ἔρῳ)". This too is problematic. It makes a distinction between "fruit" and (animal) "prey" which brings in an entirely irrelevant dichotomy between vegetarian and carnivorous creatures[39], when the whole point is that sexual appetite is the same in all species alike; more importantly, ἔλωρ is not used to refer to a predator's *potential* victims but only to its *actual* victims – a creature does not become ἔλωρ until the predator actually takes it (as in 800-1 where κυσὶν... ἔλωρα is paralleled by ὄρνισι δεῖπνον); more importantly still, there is not one passage in any archaic or classical text in which ἔλωρ is used in reference to an animal – it always refers to a *person* who becomes "prey" either to dogs, birds, etc., or to his human enemies, except once where it refers to plundered property (*Od*. 13.208).

We know from 999 and from καὶ... καὶ (1000, 1003) that what is said about animals in 1000-2 must have been broadly parallel to what is said about humans in 1003-5, and West is right to infer from that passage that "the tristich about animals must likewise describe their susceptibility to mutual sexual arousal". When he goes on to say that "there should be some reference to the vulnerability of the immature in particular", this is also correct *provided* that we remember that in the human context, "immature" actually means "physically nubile but not yet considered by society to be ripe for marriage". West's desiderata would be satisfied, at the start of 1002, by ἄωρα, κωλύουσα (Wecklein)[40], giving the sense "Cypris advertises the availability of (κηρύσσει, see *Studies* 166) juicy fruits when they are not yet ripe, hindering them from..." When the maturing female is very young and "tender" (τέρειν᾿ 998), she already, says Danaus, has charms that attract the attention and desire of males; Aphrodite has contrived this, and it makes it harder for the female to... what? If ἔρῳ is the right interpretation of the last

---

[38] See T.H. Talboy and A.H. Sommerstein in Sommerstein et al., *Sophocles: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, I [Oxford 2006] 313-4, on Soph. fr. 693.

[39] Which itself, as Sandin admits, is far from matching the distinction made in 1000 between birds and beasts. Greeks knew all about birds of prey, and they are prominent in the imagery of *Supp*. itself (e.g. 62, 223-6, 510) as are scavenger birds (751-2, 800-1).

[40] The corruption of ἄωρα to κάλωρα probably had much to do with the fact that three surrounding lines (1000, 1001, 1003) begin with κα.

three letters of 1002, the answer must surely be "resist desire"; and hence an infinitive meaning "resist", governing a dative, and scanning (˘)–x–,[41] must be sought for this slot. If we assume that the superscript in M, which does provide us with an infinitive ending, is a true reading, the paradosis is (α)νθωσμένειν. Murray proposed τὼς μένειν ἔρῳ "remain as they are in face of desire", but the expression is weak and the use of the dative highly dubious. Going by sense alone, one might think of τἀντέχειν or μὴ ἀντέχειν (for the former construction cf. Soph. *Phil*. 1241, for the latter Eur. *Ion* 391, *Phoen*. 1268-9); but how does one explain the corruption? I cannot find a solution along this line; perhaps others will.

    (to be continued)

     University of Nottingham   ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

---

[41] The optional extra syllable at the beginning caters for the possibility that κωλύουσα was elided. If it had this extra syllable, the infinitive must have begun with a vowel; if not, with a consonant.