

A. Y. CAMPBELL: METHOD IN MADNESS OR MADNESS IN METHOD?

Dicebamus hesternam 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 has passed since our Cagliari 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 Aeschylus 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 Prof. 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 same crux, 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 τρυφή for what appears as τύχη in the sentence ἡ δέ τοι τύχη / κακῆ μὲν αὐτῆ γ, ἀλλὰ συγγνώμην ἔχει, τρυφή corresponding closely to the χλιδῆ in Prometheus's μή τοι χλιδῆι δοκεῖτε μήδ' αὐθαδίαι / σιγᾶν με.

That was not his only success in Sophocles, but his primary passion was Aeschylus, and in particular *Agamemnon*. West cites Campbell in the following

places: v.7 τηρῶν (but τηρῶ θ' Bergk and ἀθρῶν Kennedy: in his 1936 edition Campbell had attributed τηρῶ θ' to himself and τηρῶ δ' to Bergk), in his interleaved copy citing to himself Aristotle *De caelo* 292a. 8 οἱ πάλαι τετηρηκότες τοὺς ἀστέρους. At v. 153 West records <Κῆρα>, at v. 196 - μάκη; at v. 828 ἄδην; at v. 1215 πνόος and 1216 δυσχειμέροις; at 1313-315 a transposition of lines to follow 1305; at v. 1389 αἰμάδα σφαγῆς; and at v. 1484 τύχας <τ>. Not a lot then. For τηρῶν 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 Enger; and at 1484 the addition of a τ' will not, as we say in English, set the Thames on fire. So we are left only with πνόος at 1215 for the divine *afflatus* looking good with στροβεῖ ταράσσω, and with αἰμάδα σφαγῆς at 1389, where certainly an issue of blood connected with a σφαγή makes an easier object for ἐκφυσίων 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, Blaydes, this is a meagre haul. By way of contrast Wilamowitz scores 25, and, surprisingly perhaps, Headlam 15, and Margoliouth 5. 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, Fraenkel scores 7 at best, and Page only 4, the same number as another scholar whom Campbell professed to admire, and with whom, I suspect, he felt himself to be in rivalry, Lawson. The despised Blaydes is streets ahead with 24: at vv. 103, 122, 425, 446, 545, 566, 605, 615, 868, 917, 943, 959, 1042, 1225, 1261, 1263, 1286, 1293, 1363, 1389, 1428, 1447, 1640, 1659.

So much for the comparison with others. But what of the comparison with himself, as seen through the ξηροῖς ἀκλαύτοις ὄμμασι 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 recanted very little of what is to be found there - we find his *apparatus* extending from p. 69 to p.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 1.5%. I repeat that that figure relates to the book alone, and excludes the myriad other conjectures published separately, or just written as notes by Campbell for himself. Of course West may 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 μεγαίρεις 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 Stadtmueller 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 ointment 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, comparing Hom. δ 220-21 and Ap. Rhod. 4. 712, conjectured ἀχόλοισι. The two passages read as follows:

- a) αὐτίκ' ἄρ' εἰς οἶνον βάλε φάρμακον ἔνθεν ἔπινον
νηπενθέε τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἀπάντων.
- b) ἡ δ' εἶσω πελανοῦε μείλικτρά τε νηφαλίησι
κατέν ἐπ' εὐχλωήησι παρέστιοι, ὄφρα χόλοιο
σμερδαλέας παύσειεν Ἐρίνυα.

Another idea which Campbell rescued from near oblivion comes at vv. 237-38. Unlike Pindar, Aeschylus 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 τε 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 strophe to antistrophe 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 175-76 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 *parodos*. It seems to have been *suo Marte* rather than his anticipation by Wilamowitz that led Campbell to the text offered by Triclinius in his final version: βίαι χαλινῶν δ' and βαφάε [δ]. 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 Maas's ὡσπερ οὖν ἐχρήην is generally accepted. But earlier Campbell had argued for Lawson's ἔχρων παθεῖν. Consider the facts, first literary, then grammatical. At 1083 we have the chorus saying χρήσειν ἔουκεν, and Cassandra does indeed do just that, which leads to disparaging remarks from the chorus about the mantic arts at vv. 1132-135.

ἀπὸ δὲ θεσφάτων τίς ἀγαθὰ φάτις
βροτοῖς τέλλεται; κακῶν γὰρ διαί
πολυπετεῖς τέχνηαι
θεσπιωιδοὶ φόβον φέρουσιν μαθεῖν.

At 1160-161 most vitally Cassandra says νῦν δ' ἀμφὶ Κωκυτόν τε ΚΑΧΕΡΟΥΣΙΟΥΣ / ὄχθους ἔοικα θεσπιωδῆσειν τάχα: virtually equivalent to Ajax's τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐν Ἴαιδου τοῖς κάτω μυθήσομαι. All of this is in the same key as Lawson's ἔχρων and indeed in the same key as the χρήσιν which I conjectured in the days of my youth for ῥήσιν 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 ὡσπερ οὖν should mean «just as in fact» as it does at *Cho.* 888 δόλοισι δούμεθ ὡσπερ οὖν ἐκτείναμεν. As Denniston 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 θερμόν ῥοῦν 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 herself a sacrificial animal, like those slaughtered in vain at 1168-169 above; and cf. 1297-298 πῶς θεηλάτου / βοός δίκην πρὸς βωμόν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς; Just above that, αἰμάτων ἀπορρύντων would be a close parallel in sense, if not in phraseology, to θερμόν ῥοῦν. 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 929-57. This proposal was itself subject to further tinkering by Campbell both in itself and even in what preceded. He read lines in the order 965, 968, 966, i.e.

ψυχῆς κόμιστρα σῆς γε μηχανωμένη.
 σοῦ δ' αὖ μολόντος δωματίῳ ἐστίαν
 ῥίξης παρουσίας φυλλάς ἕκετ' ἐς δοκοῦς (sic)

and in pencil in his edition (not that this is relevant to the major transposition) he put 925 λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, σέβειν ἐμέ so as to follow 929. At the end, after 972, Campbell put another line of his own composition: <εἴσελθ', ἀλουργῆ λάξ πατῶν ἄνευ δέους> As for 973-974, Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει. / μέλοι δέ τοί σοι τῶνπερ ἂν μέλλῃς τελεῖν, these were placed after an <ἐλελεῦ, ἐλελεῦ> inserted as 957a. Now this arrangement is so complicated that even if it were, by some chance, right, it would be irresponsible to adopt it, because the mathematical odds against it are piled up in a way that would leave Ossa and Pelion looking like molehills. But since I have been rebuked in print for failing to make any mention of this proposal in my own work - though in fact I did - I shall take it seriously, and as an *advocatus diaboli*, so to give Campbell that unflattering 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:

ὡς δ' ἐπαλολύξατο
τὴ παντότολμος, ὥσπερ ἐν μάχῃς τροπή.
δοκεῖ δὲ χαίρειν νοστήμῳ σωτηρία.

Now Cassandra's description of Clytaimestra's joyful cry of triumph does not correspond to anything in our texts. Therefore our texts must be deficient, and the conscientious editor owes it to his author to supply that deficiency. Hence the <ἔλελεϛ, ἔλελεϛ> coming at exactly the μάχῃς τροπή when Clytaimestra has succeeded in getting her husband to walk on the purple whatever-they-are. Cassandra'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? Fraenkel p. 572-73 notes that Murray in his *Aeschylus* p. 219 had an ὀλολυγμός from Clytaimestra and her handmaids which Cassandra hears (1236), and Blass inserted a stage direction <ὀλολύζει> after 974 f. The *Papiri della Società Italiana* 1194 has an ὀλολυ<γμός> not in the MSS. although already known to the Ravenna scholia, so the idea is not in itself outrageous. Campbell rejected this position for it, on the grounds that «It would be the height of impropriety, 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 Cassandra saying what she does say unless it is true. Or so it appears to the strictly logical mind. There is perhaps a doctoral 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 putative 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 von Wilamowitz would have agreed, there is no harm in an allusion being made in the interest of character-drawing to something we have not actually heard about earlier. After all, as Prof. Jouanna reminded us at Cagliari, we can have the exact opposite, of an elaborate scheme being dangled before the spectators eyes which in 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: at v. 944 Agamemnon has asked for some one to remove his shoes, and he wants it done quickly (τάχος 945). At 956-57 he says «Since I have been flattened into listening to you on this point, I shall go into the palace, treading on the purple». In the papers which he read to various classical societies, Campbell asked, with many a rhetorical flourish, if we could really hear Clytaimestra 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 poised half way between chariot and

ground. «If Agamemnon really steps upon the carpet after 957, and if Clytaimstra 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 dramatist 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 flattery which is no longer necessary. Its tone is not different at 966-72 from the equally highly-wrought language of 896-901. Indeed the imagery of 900-01 (fair 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:

Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει.
μέλοι δέ τοί σοι τῶνπερ ἄν μέλλῃς τελεῖν.

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 Clytaimstra 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 Clytaimstra's ὀλολυγμός as in 957 he is now calling it, is equivocal. «Everybody, on stage as well as in the audience, is at first taken by surprise. Agamemnon stops. 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 badgering is «surprisingly weak. In 16 lines he says he won't, and gives his reasons. Then, after a stichomythia of only 13 lines he is suddenly converted.» With the transposition «his arguments are first met and rebutted in a speech which is even more eloquent than his, and is far more subtle and insidious.» It may be added that with the transposition Agamemnon's speech of 914-29, some 16 vv., is numerically balanced with Clytaimstra's, once, that is, you allow in Campbell's own creation, v. 957a..

«This is a very fine speech». Yes. My Cambridge colleague James Diggle, 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 punctuation bracketing off τίς δέ νιν κατασβέσει makes clear. It is therefore with some amusement that we find from Wecklein's invaluable *Appendix coniecturas minus probabiles continens* that H. Diels regarded the whole speech as an

actor's interpolation. I do not know where Diels argued his case, but can dimly guess at his reasons, principally the Campbell point that Clytaimestra has already achieved her aim. However, if you try to reconcile the two opposing viewpoints, the one holding that it is Aeschylus at 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 Clytaimestra's speech with its emphasis on the wealth of the household and its inexhaustible source of supply is an answer to πολλή γὰρ αἰδῶς δωματοφθορεῖν ποσίην / φθειρόντα πλοῦστον ἀργυρωνήτους θ' ὑφάς (948-49). The sequence cannot be the reverse, because Clytaimestra cannot herself raise the question of expenditure which, would only put a weapon into her husband's hand. More immediately πολλῆς πορφύρας is obviously the instant response to the criticism implicit in πορφύρας πατῶν. We should eschew the more familiar argument that τελείου is all of a piece with τέλειε, τέλει and τελεῖν, 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 Diels-like verdict, it is 950-55, notwithstanding the fact that it contains the couplet (951-52) enshrined in Terence Rattigan's play *The Browning Version* (i.e. Robert Browning's translation). Our reasons would not be literary or based on any theory that Aeschylus needed to stress that Cassandra was Agamemnon's concubine in order to provide some justification for Clytaimestra's attitude, expressed with most clarity at vv. 1440-447. They would rather be that the κατέστραμμαι 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 with me». Κατέστραμμαι could have been chosen by Aeschylus because it continues the symbolism of the strewn vestments (στρώσασ' 921), and if so the closer it stands to ὑφάς the better. Clytaimestra 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. 850, the statement of mild policy that Agamemnon will adopt now on his return. That mildness will extend to Cassandra. If τούτων μὲν οὕτω 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. Clytaimestra 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 Fraenkel, wrongly, as her husband's mistress, and this would give special point to her virtuous and hypocritical οὐκ ἀλσχυνοῦμαι τοὺς φιλανόρους τρόπους / λέξαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς and her tacit contrast between

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 Clytaimestra's failure to allude 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 concedes Priam would have done, he may be lapsing into the Oriental (though his sarcastic κάρτα at v. 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 οὐχ ὡς τὰ πρόσθ' ἄριστα διαπονουμένου. If the offence of walking on the purple is really only one of balancing the household budget, giving in to your wife after a long and tiring journey, ending in a shipwreck, is not really the momentous decision in 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:

τάχ' εἰσόμεσθα λαμπάδων φαεσφόρων
 φρυκτωρίας τε καὶ πυρὸς παραλλαγίας
 εἴτ' οὖν ἀληθεῖς εἴτ' ὄνειράτων δίκην
 τερπνὸν τόδ' ἔλθὼν φῶς ἐφήλωσεν φρένας.
 κήρυκ' ἀπ' ἀκτῆς τόνδ' ὄρω κατὰσκιον
 κλάδοις ἐλαίας· μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι βάσις,
 τηλοῦ ξύνουρος διψία κόνει, στόλου,
 ὡς οὐκ ἄναυδος οὗτος οὐδ' αἴθων πυρὰς
 ὕλης ὀρείας σημανεῖ καπνὸν Φρυγία,
 ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ χαίρειν μάλλον ἐκπράξει λέγων·
 τὸν ἀντίον δὲ τοῖσδ' ἀποστέγω λόγον·
 εὐ γὰρ πρὸς εὐ φανεῖσι προσθήκη πέλοι·
 ὅστις δ' ἂν ἄλλως τῆιδ' ἐπεύχεται πόλει,
 αὐτὸς φρενῶν καρποῖτο τὴν ἀμειξίαν.

Now this is not all bad, though most of it is. Wilamowitz's φρυκτωρίας was also strongly advocated by Fraenkel, and earns a place in West's *apparatus*. In v. 492 in one of his copies Campbell had substituted τότ' and first argued for it and then

against it. Before v. 489 he had printed *Intervallum Aliquot Dierum*, and his own private note reads: «τόδ' 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 - series if he had written τότ'. But I think the demonstrative is required.» So far, all intelligent diagnosis. But then thirsty dust, brother of the next thing to it, mud, disappears entirely. The fastidious Campbell would not talk like this himself, as if he were part of a Housman parody, and so out it goes, to be replaced by, of all things, the tread of a detachment of men, far off, next to thirsty 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.» Yes, but what can τηλοῦ ξύνουρος mean? At v. 496 Campbell has got in the οὔτος which we do rather need, but has persuaded himself that the last words of vv. 496 and 497 have first interchanged themselves, and then got corrupted, and for his arrangement cites Eur. *Ion* 1134-135 where A. Schmidt switched βολάας and φλογός. But what on earth is the translation supposed to be? «He will indicate that the Phrygian is smoke»? 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 μόνιμον to go with his εκπράξει, and can be seen persuading himself by writing in the margin the sequence μόνιμον, μόμιμον, μῶμιμον, μᾶλλον. His next word εκπράξει is not in itself foolish: ἐκβάξει, 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 pungent, even if the *utrum in alterum* argument will in the minds of most of us rule it out. And then ἀποστέγω, a good Aeschylean word (*Sept.* 234), coming from the noted eccentric of an earlier generation, Verrall, is even less derisory, 'disfavour' being, we may think, a less good word in the context than one signifying the '*absit omen*' idea. Of course the chorus do not *like* the opposite: they keep it at arm's length. Hence ἀποπτύω Arnoldt and ἀποστρεφθῶ Hense. Then at the end ἀμειξίαν 'unsociableness' is merely peculiar, and Campbell did in fact withdraw it in one of his own copies. None the less it prompts thought, for ἀμαρτίαν, a mistake, error, mild crime, does not seem the *mot juste*. If only there were such a word, ἀναρτίαν, 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 πανῶι 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 where there 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 Page's, reads like this:

895 νῦν ταῦτα πάντα τλάσ' ἀπενθήτωι φρενί
λέγοιμ' ἄν ἄνδρα τόνδε, τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα,

σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς στέγης
 στῦλον ποδῆρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί,
 καὶ γῆν φανείσαν ναυτίλοις παρ' ἐλπίδα,
 900 κάλλιστον ἡμᾶρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χεῖματος,
 ὀδοιπόρωι διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος·
 τερπνὸν δὲ τἀναγκαῖον ἐκφυγεῖν ἅπαν.

At v. 899 the καὶ is jarring since all the lines before, and the one coming, are in asyndeton. Blomfield's γαῖαν, cited by Page and accepted by Fraenkel, is a great help. At *Pers.* 922 there is the reverse corruption, γαῖα δ αἰάζει for γᾶ δ αἰάζει, where the origin of the error is manifest. At *Eum.* 755 γαῖας is Dindorf's popular solution of the MSS's καὶ γῆς and Nauch proposed γαῖας τῆσδ for γῆς τῆσδ at *Helen* 1643. At *Eur. Electra* 678 Musgrave gives us καὶ γαῖ for καὶ γῆ τ', and at 1177 Denniston cites Nauch's γαῖα for γᾶ. At *Phoen.* 818 γαῖ' is conceivably in one MS for γαῖ (dative) or γᾶ. This alteration may then take care of one technical problem, but after land sighted by sailors unexpectedly «a very fair day to look at after a storm» overdoes the nautical aspect, and Fraenkel rightly sees that the expression is merely pictorial, or as he calls it «almost sentimental», whereas the other comparisons «indicate not only a characteristic of the object concerned, but one which is definitely connected with what is here its special function, i.e. protection, preservation, and the keeping from destruction», and he takes κάλλιστον 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 Fraenkel's point about protection and preservation by conjecturing εἴλαρ for ἡμᾶρ. We find the word at *Hom.* η 257 κύματος εἴλαρ ἔμεν, and again used in ship contexts at H 338 and 437, and Ξ 56 and 68. In his pencilled notes Campbell reminded himself of *Eur. Andr.* 891 ὦ ναυτίλοισι χεῖματος λιμῆν φανείς and *Bacch.* 902-03 εὐδαίμων μὲν ὄς ἐκ θαλάσσης ἔφυγε χεῖμα, λιμένα δ ἔκιχεν.

We may even be able to add to the arguments adduced by the author of this emendation, by urging that ἡμᾶρ does not in itself mean 'fine weather', and if κάλλιστον is predicate then ἡμᾶρ needs another adjective to go with it. If it is *not* predicate, then εἰσιδεῖν is a strange expegetic infinitive, not at all like the εἰσιδεῖν which the excellent Bergk so rightly conjectured for the aorist participle at *Ajax* 1152: ἔμπερῆς εἰσιδεῖν (not -ών). 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 vacuous v. 902 which Fraenkel and Page both ejected, following Blomfield, by his reordering of the whole, thus:

900 κάλλιστον, εἴλαρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χεῖματος,
 902 τερπνὸν δὲ τἀναγκαῖον ἐκφυγεῖν ἅπαν.
 895 νῦν ταῦτα πάντα ἔλασ' ἀπενθήτωι φρενί
 896 λέγοιμ' ἄν ἄνδρα τόνδε, τῶν σταθμῶν κῦνα,

897 σωτήρα ναός πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς στέγης
898 στύλον ποδῆρη, μονογενές τέκνον πατρί,
901 ὄδοιπόρῳ διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος,
899 γαῖαν φανείσαν ναυτίλοις παρ' ἐλπίδα.
903 τοιοσδε τοί νιν ἀξιώ προσφθέγμασιν.

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 *Theogonia*, how *sententiae* tend to attract others, and in the present case deletion is a cleaner remedy than transposition. It is wiser to do what Fraenkel does: delete vv. 900 and 902, and accept γαῖαν. As for v. 900, although it will now be cast off into the void, its original wording may very well have included what Campbell surmised, the word εἶλαρ.

To move further on: at v. 1225 μολόντι appears. «War-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 returned master is to get our time-scales mixed up. If only there were such a form, a future participle μολούσντι would fit the bill very neatly. But there isn't. Weil evidently realised the problem too, conjecturing οἰκουρὸν ἐκ μόθου μολόντι δεσπότη, which certainly absolves us from the necessity of weighing the merits of οἴμοι (wrong), ὠμόν (wrong) and οἴμοι (right); but it is pure re-writing, and if one is to re-write Aeschylus it is best to credit him with lines which observe the caesura. The diagnosis is, however, correct, and Campbell may well have accomplished with greater simplicity and elegance what Weil wanted, by reading μογοῦντι. μογέω 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 Campbell'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 aberration the replacement of ἰοῦσα πράξω by γόους παρήσω. πράξω is, however, insoluble, and the reason it is insoluble may be because there is nothing to solve. It could be sound, but a verse be missing which would have supplied something to go with πράξω. This solution is not simply the product of despair. One reason for supposing the text to be deficient lies in v. 1287, ἐπεὶ δὲ πρῶτον, which can only mean «as soon as». When Fraenkel says that the usage «when once» is «predominantly epic» he speaks disingenuously: it is in fact confined to epic and prose and never occurs in tragedy. So we start our sentence with «As soon as I saw the city of Troy meeting the fate it did, and those who captured it in their turn (πάλιν

Keck) coming off like this in a judgement of the gods....». Now, what followed? Not a future tense, so not πρόξω. It must have been something like «I realised that there was a chain of destruction of which I am but part. Very well then, now it is my turn, and I shall go, bereft of friends, and πρόσσω, as Troy did, fatally: 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 purer 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 where criticism, from Fraenkel, had stung 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 *marginalia*. Readers of this paper will not easily guess which highly distinguished scholar was dismissed as an 'imbecile'. When we set 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 offshoot 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 recollections of the man himself, and indeed of his contribution to Horatian 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 put into it whatever he felt would make good sense. He did not hesitate to 'improve'; the word *Verschlimbesserung* 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 letters, as we saw with the μόνιμον to μάλλον sequence, when 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: «*lectiones codicum affero collatis his editionibus*, Hermann, Vitelli-Wecklein, Wilamowitz, 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 Aeschylus 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