Dicebamus hesteria die said Luis de Leon as he resumed lecturing in the University of Salamanca after five years in prison, and although only half that time had passed since our Cauteritan conference, and I have not been in prison during it, I might well echo his words, since today, as then, I shall be much concerned with a transposition in the text of Anschylus which most scholars will find unacceptable. But this time the transposition is not my own, and most scholars will be right. But not all: for Pref. W. M. Edwards in a letter to the author of this suggestion, A. Y. Campbell, dated 22 Nov. 1941, wrote: «Your arrangement is essentially right, I think; the more so, as it gives a transposition of a complete page of a 15 (?) line original.» The suggestion which Campbell made was one by which members of his family set great store. It is embedded in his 1936 edition of the play, but was never, I think, given any support in print. I do, however, know what his arguments were, because some forty years ago I was handed Campbell’s Nachlaß, and urged to see if there were any ideas there deserving of a wider public. His notes contained two or three versions of the same paper, given to various societies, and I have used that material to remedy what now amounts to some forty years of negligence in the execution of that duty. But before then, and after then, we shall have other things to say.

Campbell is the most extreme example of unbridled conjectural criticism known to me. The only person with whom any comparison can be made is Blaydes. But there are two important differences: first, Blaydes knew perfectly well that in any given case he was more likely to be wrong than right. If, after all, he made 14 different emendations on the samecrux, simple arithmetic dictates that not less than 13 of them must be wrong, Blaydes acknowledged this, Campbell on the other hand used, as we shall see, extravagant language insisting on the merits of his own proposals, frequently telling himself in his pencilled notes that his conjecture was «absolutely certain». Secondly, although Blaydes, through the very number of his emendations, has come to be regarded in certain quarters with something near contempt, the plain fact is that his successes were numerous enough for his name to appear often in the standard editions of Greek Tragedy today. But with Campbell the picture is rather different. His name does not figure at all in a list compiled some years ago of scholars whose conjectures are cited above 20 times in the apparatus criticus of current editions. It is not that Campbell was stupid. To take only one example, he made excellent sense of a crux in Sophocles Trachiniae (v. 327) by suggesting τροφή for what appears as τύχη in the sentence ἦ δὲ τοῦ τύχη / κατὰ μὲν Ὀδυσσία γ, ἄλλα συγγενήν ἑξίτι, τροφή corresponding closely to the χιλιδί in Prometheus’s μη τοῦ χιλιδί δεικτεί μη διέβασιν / σύμβα χ. 

That was not his only success in Sophocles, but his primary passion was Anschylus, and in particular Agamenon. West cites Campbell in the following
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places: v.7 ἑρμον (but ἑρμον Ὡ Bergk and ἑρμον Ὡ Kennedy; in his 1936 edition Campbell had attributed ἑρμον Ὡ to himself and ἑρμον Ὡ to Bergk), in his interleaved copy citing αὐτὸν Aristotle De carlo 292a. 8 ὢν μέλαν τεταρτοκόστας τοῖς διὰ τὰς ἀλήθειας. Al. v. 155 West records λέξεως; at v. 196 - δέκτης; at v. 828 δήμου; at v. 1215 νῦνως and 1216 ἐντυγχάνεις; at 1313-315 a transposition of lines to follow 1305; at v. 1389 οὐδέποτε σφυρώτατος; and at v. 1484 τὰς τρίτων ἐκ σοφίας. Not a lot then. For ἑρμον the credit is minimal; 153 and 1216 are guesswork supplements; 196 is a change of dialect: at 828 a rough breathing for smooth; at 1313-315 all the real work had been done already by Ringer; and at 1484 the addition of a έτος will not, as we say in English, set the Thames on fire. So we are left only with νῦνως at 1215 for the divine affianced looking good with ς τρίτων τοῖς διὰ τὰς ἀλήθειας, and with οὐδέποτε σφυρώτατος at 1389, where certainly an issue of blood connected with ὑπέταττε makes an easier object for ἐντυγχάνεις than a slaughter of blood does: possible then, and worth a second thought, but still far from the instantly convincing. Set against the record of the person with whom we instinctively compare him, Blydes, this is a menage hazl. By way of contrast Wilamowitz scores 25, and, suspiciously perhaps, Headlam 15, and Margoliouth S. Maas scores another 5, though in places where his suggestions do more good. But Campbell could fairly point out that of the two most famous commentators of recent times, Fransen scores 7 at best, and Page only 4, the same number as another scholar whom Campbell preferred to admire, and with whom, I suspect, he felt himself to be in rivalry, Lawson. The despised Blydes is streets ahead with 24: at vv. 103, 122, 423, 446, 545, 566, 905, 615, 868, 917, 943, 959, 1042, 1225, 1261, 1286, 1293, 1363, 1389, 1428, 1467, 1640, 1659.

So much for the comparison with others. But what of the comparison with himself, as seen through the ἐντυγχάνεις, διὰ τὰς ἀλήθειας of M. L. West? I have not counted all of Campbell’s suggestions, which came out in a variety of places, but if we take his 1936 edition - and he meant very little of what is to be found there - we find his apparatus extending from p. 69 to n.122, and on average some four suggestions of his own on each page; a total, say, of about 200 emendations, giving us a success rate of significant original proposals of 1.9%. I repeat that this figure relates to the book alone, and excludes the myriad other conjectures published separately, or just written as notes by Campbell for himself. West must have been harsh. It is easy to lose patience with conjectural criticism of this kind, and every editor has to decide for himself what he will or will not include. Thus at Suppl. 405 we find Maas in a letter to Campbell dated 11/6/56 writing that the latter’s ἐντυγχάνεις was agreed by him and Murray to be ‘by far the most probable solution’. In West’s edition it lodges only in the apparatus, where the priority of Stadthausler is heartlessly recorded.

We shall return to severe criticism of Campbell before this paper is over. But in the meantime we could do worse than look at some of this scholar’s other conjectures, to see if that very low figure of 1.5% can be raised. We may start with v. 95: the gentle guileless persuasion of holy eloquence in connexion with a flame is never going to be
an easy expression to swallow, and it may seem pointless to tinker with minor parts of it, but Campbell, computing Hom. 8 220-21 and Ap. Rhod. 4. 712, conjectured ἐξόμιλον. The two passages read as follows:

a) αὐτῶι ἐπὶ τε οὖν ὅλης φόρμους ἔχουν ἔννοις ἡμῶν

νυκτέρις: τῇ δὴ τοι, κακός ἐκπίπην ἂν ἦτοι.

b) ὃς ὁ πεδίων γεράρχης τοῦ πολέμου

εὐτυχῶς τὸ τυχαῖον παράγει, ἐπιτιθέτω ὑπερήφανοι καυσόμενοι ἔπινοι.

Another idea which Campbell rescued from near oblivion comes at vv. 237-38. Unlike Pindar, Anacharsis almost always completes a unit of sense at the end of a stanza, usually with a full stop or a question mark. Even at 726-27, 987-88, or 1016-017, which West punctuates very reasonably with a colon, a full stop would be entirely acceptable, and in the first of those cases it is the τώς which West retains that dictates the need for a colon: his apparatus records how easily that need can be obviated. Campbell treated this question of the run-over from simile to antithesis in Hermes 82, 1954, 246-50. He cited Suppl. 581-82, Pers. 119-20 (not valid), 871-72 (also not valid), 879-80 (a new category introduced) and Sept. 749-50. Actually the nearest thing we see to Agam. 237-38 is 172-76 and 204-05, and some may argue that the very proximity of these examples supports the traditional punctuation. The difference is that in the alleged parallels there may be something like a substantial temporal clause in one stanza. There is nothing that corresponds with the Pindaric run-over of 237-38. Explanations that the enjambement gives the initial line of the second stanza special weight founder on the fact that that line is no more special than any other in the parados. It seems to have been Soph. Hym. rather than his anticipation by Wilamowitz that led Campbell to the text offered by Triclinius in his final version: βίον γιούλου δὲ καὶ βουκάριον [8]. West records this in his apparatus in a way which makes it clearer than the Oxford text does that the two items belong together.

Another acute observation of Campbell's, but again one for which he cannot claim priority, comes at the notorious v. 1171. Today Maass's ἔπειτα αὖν ἔχουσα is generally accepted. But earlier Campbell had argued for Lawson's ἔπειτα παρεῖν. Consider the facts, first literally, then grammatical. At 1083 we have the chorus saying χρῆσθεν ἔμοικον, and Cassandra does indeed do just that, which leads to dispensing remarks from the chorus about the manic acts at vv. 1132-135.

αιότε καὶ περιπλεύτω τε ὑμῶν φίλοι.

μόνον τινί νυκτιν' ἐν ὑποθελὼν

τευχάδῳ φίλοις ἔρωτον μαρτύριν.

- 121 -
At 1160-161 mosually Cassandra says νῦν ὁ ἀδήλιος Καρδυνός τὸ κακονυμίας ἢ ἐνσώος ἡσυχίας ἢ πτωτικῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, virtually equivalent to Aias's τὸ πάθος οὗτος τοῦ ἀδήλιος στήνει τοὺς κακονυμίας. All of this is in the same key as Lawton's ἔργον and indeed in the same key as the χειρότον which I conjectured in the days of my youth for ἔργον at 1322, only to find that Campbell, none other, had anticipated me. So much for the literary side. Now for the grammar. Campbell argues that δὲντραννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννοννον

as Dennistone puts it, there is, with these particles, a correspondence between idea and fact, the objective reality which in the main clause is merely supposed... As for the popular ἐνσώος ἢ πτωτικῶν which Campbell hit on independently of Musgrave (though it seems strange that he can ever have been in ignorance of it), this is to be seen as if Cassandra were a sacrificial animal, the choice slaughtered in vain at 1168-169 above; and if 1297-298 πονὲ νυκτόνων / πονὲ δίκην πρὸς απολέονεστίνων πεμπτης. Just show that, φωναίνων περιποιονταὶ would be a close parallel in sense, if not in etymology, to τῆμπυν ὁμοιοτάτων. So Campbell argued, and I put his arguments forward not because I agree with them—for I don't—but simply to show that here, at any rate, there is indeed Method in his—well, we can no longer say Madness. We come now to the momentous transposition. The proposal to move 958-72 so as to follow 929-37. This proposal was itself subject to further tinkering by Campbell both in itself and even in what proceeded. He read lines in the order 965, 968, 966, i.e.

πῦρ ἡμέρας ἡμέρας τὸν Καρναρβοντών

and in pencil in his edition (not that this is relevant to the major transposition) he put 955 ἤκειν ὄλαθε δὲ πρὸς, ὃ ἐνέκει, ὃν ὑπῆκοι as so to follow 929. At the end, after 971, Campbell put another line of his own composition: <ἐΩξεῖν, ἐν τούτῳ τὰ μεγαλογικά παρειόλον δένονται> as for 973-974, 25εὶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὸν ἀδήλιόν <τῶν> ἀλήθειαν, these were placed after an ἐξαίρεσις, ἐξελισσόμενη inserted at 957a. Now this arrangement is so complicated that even if it were, by some chance, right, it would be impossible to adopt it, because the mathematical odds against it are piled up in a way that would leave Marso and Pelion looking like molehills. But since I have been rebuffed in print for failing to make any mention of his proposal in my own work—though in fact I did—I shall take it seriously, not as an advocate diabolical, so to give Campbell that unlettering description. I shall put the arguments for it as persuasively as I can. Campbell's angle of approach was not the one I would have chosen myself. His point of departure was 1236-238.
Cassandro's description of Clytemnestra's joyful cry of triumph does not correspond to anything in our texts. Therefore our text must be deficient, and the consonantia ratio owes it to his author to supply that deficiency. Hence the phrase coming at exactly the μικρή τρέχον, when Clytemnestra has succeeded in getting her husband to walk on the purple whatever they are, Cassandro's reference to a cry of triumph is very specific, and the question is, how specific does a reference have to be before we take positive action in the light of it? Frankie p. 272-73 notes that Murray in his Aeschylus p. 219 had an ἄλογον χέριον from Clytemnestra and her haremmaids which Cassandro bears (1230), and Blairs pointed out a stage direction ἄλογον χέριον after 974 f. The Peiraeus della Società Italiana 1/94 has an ἄλογον χέριον not in the MSS. although already known to the Ravenna scholar, so the idea is not in itself outrageous. Campbell rejected this position for it, on the grounds that it would be the height of improbability, following thus immediately upon a prayer to Zeus. At the same time we must concede that a prophetess cannot be wrong, and there is no point in Cassandro saying what she says unless it is true. Or so it appears to the strictly logical mind. There is perhaps a doctor's dissertation to be written, if it has not been already, on the category of things in Greek tragedy which are brought into play only when the dramatist has a use for them, after being passed over in silence at a time when the considerations of real-life would suggest they should have been mentioned. To take an extreme, if not exactly close parallel, when Oedipus tells Jocasta who his paternal mother and father were, the Queen does not say 'Why, darling, why did you not mention this earlier', but takes it all in her dramatic stride. Equally, as Tycho says Wilanowska would have agreed, there is no harm in an illusion being made in the interest of showing how something we have not actually heard about earlier. After all, as Prof. Joanna reminded us at Cagliari, we can have the exact opposite, of an elaborate scheme being delayed before the spectators eyes in which the event is simply allowed to fade from view. For this reason we should not adopt this approach to the question of where 958 ff. should be placed, but rather proceed down the other avenue opened up by Campbell, namely this: m. v. 944 Agamemnon has asked for some one to remove his shoes, and he wants it done quickly (Virgoc 945). At 956-57 he says 'Since I have been flattened into listening to you on this point, I shall go into the palace, tearing on the purple'. In the papers which he reads to various classical societies. Campbell notes, with many a rhetorical flourish, if we could really hear Clytemnestra deliver a speech of 17 lines precisely at the moment when she has succeeded in getting Agamemnon in her power and secured his acceptance, while his foot is pulled half way between Charlie and
ground. ‘If Agamemnon really steps upon the carpet after 957, and if Clytemnestra really declaims a 17 or 15 line speech while he is treading on the carpet, why then, in my submission, this is the very grossest, the most ruinous theatrical blunder that was ever committed by any dramatist. Anybody with even the most elementary theatrical instinct knows that the step must take place in silence, and equally silent must be the doomed man’s progress across the carpet through the dreadful door. This is a very fine speech. What sort of dramaist would write a speech like that and arrange for some other character to steal the limelight while it was being delivered?’ We may add that the speech is full of a kind of flatness which is no longer necessary. Its tone is not different at 966-72 from the equally highly-weighted language of 896-901. Indeed the imagery of 900-01 (far weather after a storm, and fresh spring water to a thirsty traveller) is remarkably like the shade from the heat and the warmth in winter and cool in summer at 966-68. But sharply different are the last two lines 973-74.

Zéïr Zéïr fêtés, tût a pla cícêr, tût în. ñen ñê ñe as ñam pü ñuìp ñuìp turt.’

Here we may find ourselves faced with a problem. We can hardly speak of double meanings (contrast 615-16). Any pleasant sense is ruled out by the fact that Clytemnestra has already expressed her (untruthful) satisfaction that all her desires have been fulfilled, and so her words cannot be ostensibly directed at Agamemnon. Their true meaning is their only meaning— or so one might think. But Cassandra at v. 1238 says that we are wrong: and in the light of that explicit statement Campbell was driven to saying that Clytemnestra’s ñuìp ñuìp turt. as in 1957 he is now calling it, is equivocal. «Everybody, on stage as well as in the audience, is at first taken by surprise. Agamemnon steps. The next moment they are re-assured. She is giving the victory sign.»

Not many of us will swallow this. But Campbell has some more persuasive arguments to offer. On the traditional ordering Agamemnon’s reaction to his wife’s bedragging is ‘surprisingly weak. In 16 lines he says he won’t, and gives his reasons. Then, after a sycophancy of only 13 lines he is suddenly converted.» With the transposition «his arguments are first met and rejected in a speech which is even more eloquent than his, and is far more subtle and ingenious.» It may be added that with the transposition Agamemnon’s speech of 914-26, some 16 vv., is numerically balanced with Clytemnestra’s, once, that is, you allow in Campbell’s own creation, v. 957a.

‘This is a very fine speech. Yes. My Cambridge colleague James Diggie, the editor of the Oxford text of Euripides has told his pupils (erroneously!) that the first line is the best thing in tragedy: not that you can have the first line without the second, as West’s translation brackets off τις ἐν ἄνω μετάξειν makes clear. It is therefore with some amusement that we find from Wecklein’s invaluable Appendix connectivus minus probabilitas continent that H. Diels regarded the whole speech as an
actor's interpolation. I do not know where Delis argued his case, but can dimly guess at his reasons, principally the Campbell point that Clytemnestra has already achieved her aim. However, if you try to reconcile the two opposing viewpoints, the one holding that it is Aeschylus in his best, the other that it has been foisted on him by actors, you might well come to the conclusion that the speech is indeed excellent, and therefore genuine, but is misplaced, betraying itself as such by the way it paints the lily.

It is with real regret that, for all our admiration of Campbell's ingenuity, we find it necessary to let the cold winds of countervailing textual arguments blow upon and shrivel up this burgeoning plant. It is, alas, all too plain that Clytemnestra's speech with its emphasis on the wealth of the householde and its inexhaustable source of supply is an answer to πολυτόπον (590). The sequence cannot be the reverse, because Clytemnestra cannot herself raise the question of expenditure which, would only put a v-weight into her husband's hand. More immediately πολυτόπον is obviously the instant response to the criticism implicit in πολυτόπον τῶν. We should eschew the more familiar argument that τελείως is all of a piece with τέλος, τέλος and τελείως, since this association could as well have led to the error as be proof of deliberate continuity by Aeschylus.

If there is anything in this scene which might qualify for a Delis-like verdict, it is 950-55, notwithstanding the fact that it contains the couplet (951-52) enshrined in Thomas Ratigan's play The Borrowing Version (i.e. Robert Borrowing's translation). Our reasons would not be literary or based on any theory that Aeschylus needed to stress that Cassandra was Agamemnon's conscience in order to provide some justification for Clytemnestra's attitude, expressed with most clarity at vv. 1440-447. They would rather be that the κατατήρωμα at v. 956 takes up the last words of 949. «But since» does not follow on easily from «the choice gift of the army has come» and κατατήρωμα could have been chosen by Aeschylus because it continues the symbolism of the strenum vestiments (στρενουσα 921), and if so the closer it stands to ἱδίκ, the better. Clytemnestra has thrown down the vestments, and now she will throw down Agamemnon.

If, instead of deletion, we were to adopt the alternative strategy of transposition, we might think of moving vv. 950-55 so as to follow v. 839, the statement of mild policy that Agamemnon will adopt now on his return. That mildness will extend to Cassandra. If τοίχων πάντων is not corrupt - and it certainly needs a hard look - the transitional formula - «so much for my public treatment of these matters, now for the specific question of the treatment of this girl captive here» - is much more at home here than where it stands at v. 950. Clytemnestra will not of course regard the sympathetic treatment of Cassandra with the same indulgence as her husband, but think of her rightly or, if we are Freinkel - wrongly, as her husband's mistress, this would give special point to her virtuous and hypocritical πολυτόπον τῶν κατατηρῶν τῶν / ἱδίκ, and her tacit contrast between - 125 -
the temptations she has resisted and the ones her husband has not. If we keep the lines where they stand, we have to account for Clytemnestra’s failure to allure to them even indirectly.

Campbell was right of course to exercise his mind on the reasons why Agamemnon does in the end, and rather suddenly, give in to his wife. But possibly we make rather too much of this. Agamemnon cannot be accused of acting above his station, and it is much to his credit that he wishes to decline the customary honours. In behaving as he consoles Priam would have done, he may be lapsing into the Oriental (though his sarcastic Kρόνε with 936 indicates otherwise), but he is not lapsing into the impious.

At worst he is guilty of being over-cautious with his wealth, a trait which the watchman might have had in mind at v. 19 when he spoke of the house only οὐκ τί βρέχεις οἰκονόμων τόν Θεόν. If the offence of walking on the purple is really only one of balancing the household budget, giving it to your wife after a long and tiring journey, ending in a shipwreck, is not really the momentous decision is real life, though it may be symbolically in a clash of wills, that it is so often represented as being.

I shall not spend longer on this scene, except to say that whatever we may think of the merits of the transposition advocated by Campbell, the cavalier way in which he has altered the actual text of vv. 958-72 is bound to make us question his authority and credentials to be doing any such thing.

With such a wealth of evidence before us, it is difficult to know which other examples to choose to show Campbell in characteristic vein, as simultaneously the acute observer of difficulties and the wild man of textual criticism. But we may take vv. 489-502 as a case in point. In Campbell’s text the passage reads like this:

Now this is not all bad, though most of it is. Wilamowitz’s Φατοντίζεται was also strongly advocated by Frankel, and earns a place in West’s apparatus. In v. 492 in one of his copies Campbell had substituted τότε and first argued for it and then
against it. Before v. 489 he had printed Intermediam Alliqua Dierum, and his own private note reads: 'còs' may refer to 489-90 = 'the said' (as O. [identity unknown] suggests to me). Yes, cf. anyway 542. Still, what a help re questions of 'plot' and time - 'since' if he had written 'tôr'. But I think the demonstrative is required. So far, all intelligible diagnosis. But there dusty dust, brother of the next thing to 'lud', disappears entirely. The fastidious Campbell would not talk like this himself, as if he were part of a Houseman parody, and so out it goes, to be replaced by, of all things, the stead of a detachment of men, far off, next to dusty dust. In a pencil note stands the comment that the army is at least part of the envisaged detail of this picture is shown by 517. Yet, but, what can τηλοσ ἔχουμενοι μετα;? As v. 496 Campbell has got in the οἶκοι which we do rather need, but has persuaded himself that the last words of vv. 496 and 497 have first interchanged themselves, and then get corrupted, and for his arrangement cites Eur. Ion 1134-135 where A. Schmidt switched Bολίδες and σκοιδές. But what on earth is the translation supposed to be? 'He will indicate that the Phrygian is smokes?' Mercifully in one of his copies there is a pencil line through this. But in another copy, a little further on, again in pencil, Campbell conjectured μῶνοιν to go with his ἔχοντες, and can be seen persuading himself by writing in the margin the sequence μῶνοιν, μῶνον, μῶνον, μῶλον. His next word ἔχοντες is not in itself foolish ἔχετεπις, as well as being unique, would most naturally imply that the herald is speaking of an existing state of general rejoicing, whereas the emendation would give us 'bring about more rejoicing by his words'. The second sense is more pertinent, even if the arsine in aliterus argument will in the minds of most of us rule it out. And then ὁμοταγόρυ, a good Aeschylean word (Sept. 234), coming from the noted ecstatic of an earlier generation, Versall, is even less denizable, 'disfavor' being, we may think, less good word in the context than one signifying the 'ahit aníei' sense. Of course the changes do not like the opposite: they keep it at arm's length. Hence ὁμοταγόρυ ἀριστος and ὁμοταγορίζεις Ilissus. Then at the end διερώτων 'unassociation' is merely peculiar, and Campbell did in fact withdraw it in one of his own copies. None of the less it seems prompt, for διερώτων, a mistake, cæro, mild crime, does not seem the most juste. If only there were such a word, διερώτων, the quality of not being at one with the city, of being out of step with one's colleagues, would do very nicely.

In all this it is surprising that Campbell did not even mention, let alone adopt, Starkie's version at v. 497, an emendation hard to resist in a speech which is not about Red Indian smoke signals but a chain of light. Now for another place wherever is this maddening mixture of the perceptive and the imperceptive. It involves another of Campbell's transpositions, at vv. 895 ff. West's text, for once more conservative than Pap's, reads like this:

895 νὰρ τὰ μέτρα τέχνης ἔχετεπις ὁμοταγόρις ἐποτι ἔχετεπις ἐνδοκήν τινὲς συμβασίεσαν. - 57 -
As v. 899 the κραίνει is jarring since all the lines before, and the one coming, are in asyndeton. Bloomfield's γεγονός, cited by Page and accepted by Franks, is a great help. As Phere. 922 there is the reverse corruption, γεγονός & αὐτός for γεγονός & αὐτός, where the origin of the error is manifest. At Hom. 715 κραίνει is Dindorf's popular solution of the MSSs' κραίνει and Nauck proposed γεγονός for γεγονός as αὐτός at Helen 1643. At Eur. Electa 678 Mursieve gives us κραίνει γεγονός for κραίνει γεγονός and at 1177 Demosthenes cites Nauck's γεγονός for γεγονός. As Phere. 818 γεγονός is conceivably in one MS for γεγονός (active) or γεγονός. This alteration may then take care of one technical problem, but after land sighted by sailor unequipped «as very fair day to look at after a storm» overshadows the nautical aspect, and Franks rightly sees that the expression is merely pictorial, or is as he calls it «almost sentimentally», whereas the other comparisons «indicate not only a characteristic of the object concerned, but ones which is definitely connected with what is here its special function, i.e. protection, preservation, and the keeping from destruction»; and he takes κραίνειν as a predicate: «it is a fine thing to see after a storm...» Campbell had already taken the same line, as before him had Headlam. But Campbell went further, and had anticipated Franks's point about protection and preservation by conjecturing ἀπαλός for ἀπαλός. We find the word at Hom. τ. 257 κραίνεται ἀπαλός ἑκάστην, and again used in ship contexts at I. 338 and 437, and Σ. 56 and 66. In his posthumous notes Campbell reminded himself of Eur. Andr. 891 ἀπάλατος γεγονός κραίνεται λυπή νοῦς καὶ. Βουκ. 902-903 κόλπασιν ἄραν ὕπον ὤν ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀπαλός. λέγεται ἢ ἐκηκέν.

We may even be able to add to the arguments adduced by the author of this emendation, by arguing that ἀπαλός does not in itself mean 'fine weather', and if κραίνειν is predicate then ἀπαλός needs another adjective to go with it. If it is as our predicate, then ἀπαλός is a strange epexegetic infinitive, not at all like the κραίνειν which the excellent Bergk so rightly conjectured for the aorist participle at Ajax 1152: ἐφίσθην κραίνειν (not κραίνειν). As for the objection just raised about too much emphasis being laid on ships, Campbell avoided that and at the same time gave some relevance to the various v. 902 which Franks and Page both quoted, following Bloomfield, by his recording of the whole, thus: 900 κραίνειν, ἀπαλός ἐκ θαλάσσης, 902 τοιοῦτον ἀπαλός ἐκ θαλάσσης ἑκάστην. 895 τὸν τεράστιον κοῦνα τὸν πλειστὸν μεγάλον. 896 λέγεται ὅτι τὸν πλειστὸν κοῦνα, - 126 -
This arrangement still falls short of the expected standards of style and logic, quite apart from the inherent improbability of such shuffling about of lines. On this sequence the tone of the first two lines would be: "The finest thing is to spot shelter from the storm, but it is nice to escape from every pressure (or from pressure in its entirety)."

We know from the latter part of Hesiod Works and Days, or the Theogonie, how sentiments tend to affect others, and in the present case deletion is a cleaner remedy than transplantation. It is wise to do what Frankel does: delete vv. 900 and 902, and accept γοῦν. As for v. 900, although it will now oc cast off into the void, its original wording may very well have included what Campbell surmised, the word εἴδησ.

To move further on: at v. 1225 ποιῶνται appears. "Was-gone" was Murray's translation, but it is over-ambitious so to translate a familiar participle. However, we can see his point. What we need here is an Aegisthus who is running the house as he plots against the day of the true master's return. Plotting and looking after the house for the resumed master is to get our timescales mixed up. If there only were such a form, a future participle ποιῶνται would fit the bill very neatly. But there isn't. Well evidently realized the problem too, conjecturing νοῶντων for εἰς ἑαυτὸν ποιῶντα δοκεῖσθαι, which certainly absolves us from the necessity of weighing the merits of νοῶν (wrong), νοῶν (wrong) and νοῶν (right); but it is pure m-writing, and if one is to re-write Anchylus it is best to credit him with lines which observe the casus. The diagnose is, however, correct, and Campbell may well have accomplished with greater simplicity and elegance what Well wanted, by reading ναγοῦντος. ναγοῦς is almost a technical term in Homer for those who went through the hardships of the Trojan war, and its use here, opposing the life of Aegisthus with the life of Agamemnon, soft with hard, is certainly appropriate.

The wildness of so many of Catullus's suggestions will often force us to try a different and more conservative line of approach. Thus at v. 1289 we will all dismiss as a regrettable alternation the replacement of ἱερὰς προΐς by γάφος προϊς. προϊς is, however, insoluble, and the reason it is insoluble may be because there is nothing to solve. It could be sound, but a verse in missing which would have supplied something to go with προϊς. This solution is not simply the product of despair. One reason for supposing the text to be deficient ies in v. 1287, ἔχει καὶ προϊς, which can only mean "as soon as," When Frankel says that the usage "when once" is "prominently epic" he speaks disproportionately: it is in fact confined to epic and prose and never occurs in tragedy. So we set our sentence with "as soon as I saw the city of Troy moving the face did, and those who captured it in their turn (Νότιος)."
Keech coming off like this in a judgment of the gods.... Now, what followed? Not a future tense, so not πολλά. It must have been something like I realized that there was a chain of deception of which I am but part. Very well then, now it is my turn, and I shall go, bereft of friends, and μπορούνε, as they did, finally. I shall go and face my doom. We must not be too unkind on the huge amount of irresponsible re-writing which is Campbell's hallmark. He was, after all, engaged on the same quest as the rest of us, the search for a pure text, and if he was intolerant of criticism in private, he seems to have accepted it more equably in public: I only know of CR 51, 1937 when criticism, from Freinkel, had sung him into a reply. Since what a man writes in notes to himself is his own affair, it would not be appropriate for me to exemplify at length some of the juicier verdicts on other scholars which are to be found in Campbell's handwritten marginia. Readers of this paper will not easily guess which highly distinguished scholar was dismissed as an 'imbicile'. When we see this kind of comment against his confirmation of some of his own more spectacular conjectures as 'absolutely certain' we are bound to ask whether this approach to textual criticism was the offspring of a general eccentricity, or whether it was just an isolated trait. I have asked three scholars who knew him personally, and in the light of their quotations of his name himself, and indeed of his contribution to Homeric studies, the 'isolated trait' alternative seems to be the right one. So if we look for the reasons which led to Campbell's extraordinary behaviour as a critic, we shall not find them in his character, but in two aspects of his method. First, he tended to treat a corrupt text as if it were blank, and trust into it whatever he felt would make good sense. He did not hesitate to 'improve'; the word Verschlimmserung might almost have been coined with him in mind. Second, he seems to have had no first-hand acquaintance with MSS, in their raw state, no real idea of what sort of corruptions occur in actual practice. He played with variants, as we saw with the πόνος of πολλῶν sequence, where even to play with sounds would have been an improvement. His knowledge of the MSS of the play he was treating was entirely second-hand: declensiones codicium affero collatit his editionibus, Hermann, Vieilli-Wekklein, Wilmotzow, Weir Smyth. Not even the M facsimile.

It is, on the whole, a sad story. Campbell had a critic's eye for the incongruous. He was sound on language, and well read in Greek literature. He passionately wanted Aischylos to speak to us with a clear voice. Posterity will judge his performance with the sort of awe with which men regard huge natural disasters such as earthquakes. But perhaps after the earthquake rebuilding can be done on sounder foundations.

Cambridge Roger Dawe
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