I have recently been reading with great interest the volume of the Proceedings of a Conference held in this University and at Rovereto in 1999 to mark the centenary of the birth of M. Untersteiner. Some of the papers delivered at that Conference dealt sympathetically with Untersteiner’s conservatism as a textual critic of Aeschylus, and I have a great deal of sympathy for that myself, so I have always considered myself to be at least moderately conservative when it comes to textual criticism. R. Dews has estimated that between Wecklein’s 1865 edition with Appendix and the publication of his own book in 1965 some 20,000 conjectures has been published, of which only 0.1% might be thought ‘so have hit the truth’. Since 1965 emendation has continued unabated, and there is no good reason to suppose that the proportion of successful or at least generally accepted, conjectures has grown any higher. We can all see critics who endeavored a text simply because they were clever enough to think of what seemed to them to be an improvement. In a very few cases these improvements may really be improvements, and Aeschylus, if he has access to modern editions of his plays in the library of the Bilt, may well be regretting that he did not think of them himself. I agree entirely with A. Cassavola and V. Citi, that the difficulties experienced by scholars often derive from their failure to recognize that modern sensibility may be alien to that of a fifth-century B.C. poet, so that the logic of poetry, and especially of Aeschylus, may be different from that of rational prose discourse, and that the richness of Aeschylus imagery and the density of his language are not to be smoothed out by attempts at simplification and normalisation. So, for example, G. Ieromel is quite right to defend κτύπον δέλοσας αυτες ιερας against κτύπον δέλοσας, which Askew conjectured, and Murray printed, on the grounds that you can be afraid of a noise but you cannot see one. The transmitted reading is to be accepted as a perhaps extreme example of the kind of synthetic imagery which is so effective at Pers. 395, where the Greek trumpet «inflamed» the whole area of Salamis with its blast. The noise seemed to take visible form. And at the same time, since κυγίαν δέλος has been ambiguous, the trumpet metaphorically exciet the whole Greek fleet. There should be no doubt that Aeschylus is a difficult writer, and it is clear from Ar. Ran. that he was already seen to be so at least by the end of the fifth century. We do him no service by trying to eliminate all of the difficulties in his text.  

3 A. Cassavola, Mario Untersteiner editore e interpreti dei ‘Persiani’ di Eschilo, in Della lirica, 69-95.
4 V. Citi, Le ‘Colonne’ di Mario Untersteiner, Italy, 95-106.
5 G. Ieromel, La musica del caso: il teatro dei nomi nel ‘Sete contro Tebe’ di Eschilo, in Della lirica, 336 n. 33.

LEXIS 19:2001
It is therefore tempting to rely upon our manuscripts when there is consensus among them, although, of course, when they disagree, choices have to be made. It is here, however, that my worries arise. Anyone who considers the numerous occasions in the Byzantine trial on which the Medicus gives an inferior reading to other manuscripts will feel that in Sulpicius and Chospori, where it is the only manuscript, it is unlikely to be a reliable guide. But in the other plays too, where there is manuscript disagreement, there is no logical reason why any of them must have preserved the truth. They may all represent attempts to make sense of a deep-seated corruption. And even a consensus among the manuscripts does not necessarily mean that they preserve the truth. The whole tradition may still be corrupt. Of course our starting-point must be the manuscript tradition, but we sometimes, I think, forget that our primary duty as textual critics is not to make sense of the tradition at all costs, but to determine what Anschylus in fact wrote. Often it will be impossible to do this with any certainty, but that does not set us free from the obligation to attempt it. I see no point, then, in denying that, while it is true that Anschylus is a difficult writer, at the same time his text is highly corrupt. To some extent the latter is a consequence of the former. It is often the difficulties that have led to the corruption. In his interesting Commentary on the parodos of Chospori, first published in the 1919 Centenary volume, Untersteiner himself remarks (p. 423) of the very difficult episode (75-83) that in his opinion one must (my italics) follow substantially the manuscript text with only one or two minor modifications. In my own Commentary on 78-81 I remarked that "some sort of sense can be extracted" from M's text, but went on to argue that that sense was unsatisfactory and the language excessively strained. Many of us, and I include myself, have found ourselves writing something like "emendation here is unnecessary". We should ask ourselves what we mean by this. If we are saying not only that the transmitted text makes sense, but also that it makes the best sense in its context and that of the play as a whole, that it is in accordance with everything that we know about Anschylus style, and so is probably what Anschylus wrote, then we are justified in saying it. If, however, we mean that because it is the transmitted text it is ipso facto preferable to a conjecture that makes better sense, we are on much shakier ground. The question that we should be asking is not "how can we save the manuscript reading, but how hard should we try?" Nor is it safe to assume that corruption is always clearly betrayed by a text that makes no, or inadequate, sense, or is simply written in bad Greek. Many, perhaps not all, copies were perfectly capable of writing respectable Greek and could be at least iambic trimeters. They wrote what, in most cases, seemed to them to make sense, but that does not necessarily mean that it was the sense which Anschylus intended. For all we know, there may be lines in our texts which have never been suspected, but which are nevertheless corrupt.

5 See n. 1, 379-435.
There is nothing much that we can do about this sort of problem. The real difficulty arises when in any particular case we are required to determine what is the best possible sense, and what, therefore, Anchylus is likely to have written. How do we find the right balance between those on the one hand who assert that Anchylus is a difficult writer, whose style does not obey the logic of prose, so that emendation is to be practiced as rarely as possible, and on the other hand those who assert that his style seems difficult only because his text is corrupt? There are degrees of unintelligibility, but a what point do we decide that this passage is so unintelligible that Anchylus cannot have written it? I have read many helpful studies of Anchylus’ style, but I still cannot share the optimism of F.R. Epp, who wrote that after such study Anchylus and Sophocles and Euripides are of distinct to the mind as their bodily presence would be. They become three old friends whose little ways we know. I suspect that it is those scholars who pride themselves most on their knowledge of Anchylus that are sometimes most likely to set out to ‘improve’ his text.

With these considerations in mind I turn to a few passages in Pausanias, the first of which may seem to raise a very minor problem.

(1) Pausanias 8.11
οὐκ ἐὰν νόησα τὴν θεσείαν
εἰς παλαιότερα σπηλαία δὴ
cοιλιομένης-θανεὶς ἄρασινκορεῖν

The Chorus, in the opening anapaests, is anxious about the return of Heracles and his army, and according to the MSS tradition that army is described as 'rich in golds'. The authenticity of the epitaph has occasionally been questioned. Weil proposed to replace it with πολυχρυσός (for which cf. 83), while H. Stadtmüller emended it to πολυχρυσόν, a conjecture which was independently repeated by O. Skutsch in 1965P. Wecklein in his apparatus criticus remarked 'flaut. Πολυχρυσόν', and now M. West in his Teubner edition actually prints that conjecture in his text. We might reject the alteration straightforwardly on the grounds that it is 'unnecessary', and that the text makes perfectly good sense in its transmitted form. But that would be too hasty. On palaeographical grounds it is quite possible, as West says, that the corruption arose from an accidental repetition of πολυχρυσόν in line 3. Our duty is to consider which of the two epitaphs, πολυχρυσόν or πολυχρυσόν, Anchylus is

8 H. Weil, Anchylus argonautar, Leipzig 1919, 61f.
more likely to have employed. On strictly logical grounds it is quite true that the former appears purely ornamental and without points (West), and that one might expect the emphasis to be on the size rather than the wealth of the army. Moreover, πολύχρυσος is used three times later in the play, at 73 as the beginning of the lyric part of the parodos), 533, and 899. If the MSS had presented us with πολύνετερον here, I doubt if anyone would have questioned it. The surprising and tragic loss of this huge army is undoubtedly one of the major themes of the play. So, however, is the loss of Persian wealth. According to Herodotus (7.4.1, 9.80) Xerxes’ expedition was equipped with great quantities of gold. Ασσώνα, on her first entrance at 159-72 (a passage which I shall discuss below), is worried about both Persian wealth and manpower. The Messenger, on his appearance at 245 first gives the land of Persia, the great harbor of wealth (τοιοῦτος), then reports that at one stroke the great prosperity (δῆμος) of Persia has been struck down, and that the flower of Persian youth has fallen (with wealth and men again going together). The ghost of Darius at 751-52 is afraid of what is going to happen to the wealth which he himself had so laboriously acquired. The logic for which West is looking is not necessarily the logic of poetry. It is a well-known fact that at the beginning of his plays Aeschylus likes to introduce themes and motifs which are going to be important later in the drama. Only at line 12 will be begin to develop the theme of the size of the Persian forces. He begins with the theme of Persian wealth, and rounds this off by repeating πολύχρυσος in a kind of ring-composition, at 9. And, in a more elaborate ring-composition, he repeats the epithet again towards the end of the anapaestic section, at 45 and 53. As for the «purely ornamental» nature of the epithet, one could say the same of almost all the many epithets in the section. Ears, indeed, opined that Persae is particularly rich in «ornamental» compound epithets, and some have been tempted to attribute this to Aeschylus’ supposed immaturity in 472 B.C. We should remind ourselves that he was probably over 50 years of age when he wrote the play. Any of the epithets, seen in isolation, may be regarded as «ornamental». But it is the cumulative effect that matters. Together they contribute to the effect of a mighty army going to war, backed by all the resources of a wealthy empire. I conclude that πολύχρυσος fits perfectly into all that we know of Aeschylus’ poetic technique, and that it should therefore not be changed. Belloni is right to defend the transmitted reading. (2) Persae 63 καὶ καταγείγοντας μεταφρασμένης Ομήρου μεταφρασμένης Ομήρου μεταφρασμένης καὶ μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης καὶ μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης καὶ μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμένης μεταφρασμέ

As with most of the Persian names in this play the MSS provide a great variety of spellings, and it is difficult to place trust in any of them. It is well known that even with

12 See n. 7, 15-16.
Greek proper names "papyrii in general tend to make what may seem to us to be elementary mistakes. In the case of Persian names in Persae, some of which are no doubt genuine, but transliterated by Anæchylus into Hellenized forms, while others were probably invented by Anæchylus himself, it is often a hopeless task to recover what he originally wrote, and one has to make a more or less arbitrary choice among the readings which have been transmitted. Here Sidgwick and Broadhead favor the papyrii, but most editors print Mytrpyrôgîn, and it may seem to be hardly worth the trouble of questioning it. West, however, has done so, and in this case I am inclined to agree with Belloni and Hall that he is right. Aside from all the names in the Catalogue Mytrpyrôgîn would sound Greek rather than Persian, and some editors indeed have relied on its first element to the Greek word for the Aryan mother goddess, Cybele. But then the second element, as West says, is "unexplainable as Greek". It looks very like the corruption of a scribe who thought that he recognised some form of the word for "mother", and perhaps supposed that the second element had something to do with the familiar θέρσις or perhaps ἱερος. Some of the earlier editors had already accused Mytrpyrôgîn of (Masius) Mytrpyrôgûn. So, by a simple change of accents in the superscript reading of Θ and Θ West restores a more plausible-sounding Persian name, "she by whom Mithra is hymned" (Old Persian *Mihrgatha, with a long i in the penultimate syllable). It is only from the time of Xenophon that names derived from Mithras are commonly spelled Μίθρας. In Herodotus the predominant form is Μιθρας."

(3) Persae 159-69

στὶν δὲ λισίαν λινῶν χρυσοτελίδους δάμων κατὰ καθαρά εἰς τὴν καθάρινα σύμφωνας καὶ κατὰ καθαρὰν όμοιον φροντίας καὶ ἐν θείῳ μόνῳ σφάζων χαριτίζει τοὺς ἄληπτους, τόλμων, τῆς θεοφράστου κοινοῦν κόσμου πολύμερῳ καθάρινας ἐνδόν, τοῦτος δὲ μεῖλης ἐμέρος φροντίας ἐν τῷ λοιπῷ, τῆς θεοφράστου συνάφειας κάλλους τοῖς ναι θείοις τοῖς φρόνιμοις, λοιπὸν φύσις καθάρινας, τοὺς οἰκονομικῶς, ἐκ τῆς θεοφράστου γιορασίας, ἦν ὡς ἐκφάθος φρόνιμος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ νεότητος χαριτομοῦντος.

50 ἦσθε, ὁ άριστος ὡς ἐβιβάζοντος ἃς ἄληπτοι ὀφθαλμοὶ ταύτας ἐπεμβάλλοντος Λεμνοῦ Μεθύρατος Ἐδ. ἦσθε διόλου ἡμοῦ πάντως ὑπὸ Q φόρει μέτ.


16 Studies, 76.

My main concern is with lines 166-68, and I shall comment only briefly on the problems in the earlier part of this passage. They have all been fully discussed by Broadhead and Belloni. The Queen Mother Atossa has just arrived on stage, and this is the first speech that we hear her utter. Her first word τρελλο, for this reason, apparently picks up the previous line in which the chorus-leader has voiced the fear that the ancient fortune of the Persian army may now have changed for the worse. Atossa too is worried, and she will shortly go on to explain the cause of her anxiety, the bad dream which she has had in the previous night, and the omen of the eagle and the falcon which followed the dream. I am inclined to agree with those who think that ἐμνήσθης at 162 is corrupt. In this play which presents the double tragedy of Persia and its king, while the chorus represents Persia as a whole, Atossa’s role throughout is to represent her son, so that her fear should be, not for herself, but for Xerxes. She might, I suppose, mean that, while the chorus’s anxiety concerns the fate of Persia and the army, hers is a more private one which concerns herself, i.e. her family, but it would be an odd way of saying this. West, followed by Hall, takes ἐμνήσθης with μῖσος, and changer odō to odis, comparing the παλαιότερος κλήρος of Ag. 750, and the τρελλόμενος μῆλος of Cho. 314, but I do not understand why Atossa should want to emphasize so strongly that her μῆλος is not her own. I should prefer Lawson’s ἐμνήσθης οὔδε δείκτος, which Page adopts18, but while what Atossa is about to say may be prophetic of evil, and so may arouse fear, not unprophetic of fear is a slightly strange expression. Fear should be the result, not the object, of prophecy.

Lines 163-64 have caused particular difficulty for commentators, and have been variously explained and emended. πλοῦτος (or πλοῦτος) has been altered, for example, to δικαίων (Heimhofer), δόμιοι (Skutsch and Lawson), στόλος (Well), πολύς with μήκος (A. Y. Campbell), πλοῦτον with δῖος (Casalducci). In what sense can wealth be said to overtop the virtuously synonymous δῖος? I agree with Belloni that there is nothing wrong with the text here, and that the association of δῖος and πλοῦτος should not be eliminated. Atossa picks up the vital theme of Persian wealth and prosperity, which, as we saw, was introduced by the chorus in the opening speech. I argued in my paper at the 1998 Cagliari Conference19 that the whole of the first part of the play is dominated by the amoral idea that wealth and success are dangerous, that they attract the resentment, the φιλος of the gods, and that it is not until the Darius-scene that the fall of Persia and Xerxes is seen in moral terms of punishment for ἀκρίβεια. These lines seem to me to be entirely consistent with that view. What worries Atossa is not, despite Broadhead, that the Persians may have wrongly used their wealth, and that the expedition has been «conceived in ἄρρητος» (p. 262). There is no criticism here of Xerxes at all. It is not Atossa’s role to criticize, but

to represent and to support, her son. What worries her, as it worried the chorus, is quite simply that Persia may have become too rich and prosperous. All the emphasis is on μετάνοια at the beginning of the clause. We should translate, not «great wealth», but «wealth when it has grown too great». In other words, when you have grown too rich, your prosperity is liable to desert you. Perhaps, as Belloni argues (111-20), the two nouns are not in fact synonymous: πλούς may describe something less permanent than ἄξιος, and therefore suggest the transient wealth enjoyed by Xerxes, whereas the prosperity of Persia under Darius was god-given and therefore more permanent. I am not so sure about this. At 751 Darus uses πλούσιος, not ἄξιος, of the wealth which he himself had so laboriously acquired, and at 755-56 the two words seem to be synonymous. In any case, thanks to Salamis, his prosperity has turned out not to be so permanent after all. At 799-12, when Atossa greetsthe ghost of her dead husband, she praises him because he surpassed all men in prosperity and was envied while he was alive. Now she envies him only because he died before he saw the disaster of Salamis. That, however, does not stop her from spoiling his happiness down below by ensuring that he knows all the details of that disaster. The metaphor has been variously explained as drawn from the collapse of a building, or a column, or the overturning of a table as a symbol of bankruptcy, or from wounding in the palaistra. Broadhead wanted to emend κόμης ἄξιος to κόμης τὸν πολύτρον, and no εἰς πόσον. I prefer the usual view that the metaphor is derived from a horse which, like the Greek horse in Atossa's shortly to be related dream, opens the chariot and rushes off it with across the plain in a cloud of dust (cf. Soph. Ant. 1275). As my old teacher A. S. C. Colson pointed out, κόμης τὸν πολύτρον went at Hom. 2 145 (cf. N 120) implies rapid and ignominious flight.

So far, despite the problems of detail, the thought is more or less straightforward. Atossa's fear concerns Persian wealth and prosperity. But 165 introduces a development, when she explains that her inexpressible anxiety is in fact twofold. The lack of disanniasis in the middle of the trochaic tetrameter in 165 is worrying. It is paralleled elsewhere in tragedy only at Soph. Phil. 1472. I am not convinced by the argument that such oddities are only to be expected in an early play (why, then, in the late Phil.?). Once more we should remind ourselves that Perseus was produced only fourteen years before the Orestes. Porson, followed by many more recent editors, may have been right to transpose δοξα to the end of the line, while C.G. Haury, followed by Sidgwick, proposed μετάνοια γρατίτες («in ponderibus»), γρατίτες, however, does not seem to occur in extant literature.

The sense of 165, however, is not in double, and it is certain that in the two apparently parallel μετάνοιαι clauses of 166-67 Atossa explains the source of her double anxiety. She seems to be saying that on the one hand a large quantity of wealth without

20 A. H. Cowley, Persia, CQ 8, 1958, 47.
men should win no honour or respect, while on the other hand men without wealth are not likely to be as successful as their strength might lead one to expect. Both wealth and manpower are required. For the thought Groenewoudt compares Call. Hy. i. 94-96. But can the Greek really mean what editors want it to mean? As Sidgwick pointed out long ago, the two προτάκτων clauses may be parallel in form, but the function of the two infinitives is apparently different. The first seems to indicate Ateossa’s anxious resolve not to honour wealth, while the second appears to be a statement of her belief, with which the negative would be normally oī rather than προτάκτων. Hall, like Mason and Podlecki, takes both infinitives as expressing indirect statement, with ηπιοτάκτων as subject of τοιαύτην (I believe that the masses will not hold in respect wealth in the absence of men), but I do not understand how κράτησαν διὰ τοῦ προτάκτων, which ought then to be the object of τοιαύτην, can be best construed as a negative absolute. As for 167, I have little confidence in the rendering, If I am anxious) also that light (i.e. presumably the light of success) does not shine for men without money in proportion to their strength [literally as in accordance with how much strength is available to them]; men without money normally have no strength. Podlecki emends ματάκια to κράτησα, and renders the light of popular favour does not shine in proportion to their (intrinsice, former) power; but his verbal bracketed supplement is not in the Greek. It is possible that έπιοτάκτων refers not to strength in general but more specifically to the size of an army, to its manpower, so that the meaning is that even a large army may be defeated if it is not backed by financial resources. For this sense cf. οίποτος cf. perhaps Hom. Σ. 274 and Soph. Αι. 438, and the English forces, as in an armed force. By the end of the play the οίποτος, which under Darius had remained indefinable (901), will have been cut off by Xerxes (1035). But the Greek does not say even a large army. If this is the required sense, it would be better, with Blaydes, to change διὰ τοῦ προτάκτων as that light does not shine for those who have an army, but are without money διὰτοῦ, διὰ τοῦ could easily have been corrupted to διὰ τοῦ before the following οίποτος. But the relevance of all this to Xerxes’ army, which was backed by splendid financial resources, is highly dubious. Denny Paps once suggested that the reference is not to the Persians but to the Greeks, and that έπιοτάκτων is the indirect form of a direct optative with: only light not shine for the moneyless Greeks in proportion to their strength; i.e. the Greeks may turn out to be stronger than their lack of resources would lead one to expect. But this indirect wish is far from convincing, and in my case it is clear from the dialogue between the Queen and the chorus-leader at 221-45 that Ateossa is not supposed to know anything about the strength of the Greek forces.

Even if we tolerate the difficulties in the Greek, we have still to attempt to analyse

21 P. Groenewoudt, Archelpho’s Persae, met leiding, critische noten en commenataris, Groningen 1930, on 165-67.
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the development of Atossa's thought in the speech and in the context of the play as a whole. The combination of anxiety concerning wealth with anxiety concerning manpower need cause us no surprise. We have already noted 33 as other points in the play. And it is undeservedly effective thus, while work-dead and at 166 evidently suggests the absence of the Persian army, and thus picks up the chorus's fear that the men may never return, by 168-69 it has become clear that only one man is really in Atossa's mind, namely her son. Similarly at 295-98 she enquires of the Messenger as to who is not dead, and for which of the commanders she is so moved. The Messenger understands her psychology, and replies quite simply that 'Xerxes himself is alive and sees the light.' At 300 Atossa picks up the metaphor of light from 167, but it is now the light that has come to the house. She forgets her own warning here at 167 that light does not shine for those who have no money, and the Messenger has already remarked (255-57) that the wealth of Persia has been destroyed. Her son will return, but he will have lost both his army (cf. the theme of exgcdp /st/ at 118, 716; also 549, 716, 718, 761) and his wealth, and there will be no light for anyone at the end of the play.

In terms, then, of the later development of the plot lines 166-67 must good sense. It is only when we examine the immediate context that problems arise. I remarked at the beginning that the logic of poetry may well be different from the logic of prose discourse, but that does not mean that Hesychus gave to his characters speeches which were totally illogical. Atossa begins by saying that she is worried about the possible loss of Persian wealth and prosperity. It then occurs to her, not consciously, that her anxiety is in fact twofold: to have men without money is as bad as to have money without men. It is her conclusion that is astonishing: 'for I have no fault to find with our wealth; it is for my darling son that I am afraid.' If Atossa had said, 'I am even more worried about the loss of men (or the man) than I am about the loss of wealth,' we might understand her. But how can this, in the space of only a few lines, have moved from expressing her worries about wealth to this categorical statement that she is not worried about wealth at all? And what is the logic of ydp, which, I think, it is illegitimate to take in any other sense than causal? It cannot have alternative force: 'I am not actually worried about wealth.' But after 167, in which Atossa is still expressing her fear about the loss of wealth, this makes no sense at all. Wilmowszn24 thought that it followed on rather from 166, with 167 providing a mere pole antithesis for the main idea of money without men. One might compare 598 ff., where a similar pole antithesis is followed by a ydp clause which picks up only the first part of that antithesis, and the second part is largely irrelevant. But here the emphasis on Atossa's double anxiety surely indicates that the two ydp clauses should have equal weight. There is therefore, I believe, no convincing alternative to

33 See p. 3 above.
34 V. von Wilmowszcz, Stoiskendoff, Aischylische Interpretationen, Berlin 1914. 52.
accepting A. Ludwig's transposition of 166 and 167, which at least preserves some intelligible logic. Alonza's anxiety about the loss of wealth leads naturally to 167. Then she reveals her second worry which concerns the loss of men. And in the yelp clause at 168 she explains that it is this second anxiety which is uppermost in her mind. There may then be tragic irony in her conclusion that there is no need at all to worry about the loss of wealth; only the son is in danger. Ludwig's transposition is, then, on the right lines, but I suspect that, despite the consensus of the manuscripts, the corruption goes deeper. Alonza's change of mind is really too abrupt to be convincing. There have been many emendations, particularly of strömer, but I know of none that solves all the problems of this difficult passage. So I have some sympathy for Stauder's desperate delection of 166-67—the easy, but often, I think, wrong, way of eliminating difficulties. I am not even sure that my translation of E1.17 yd ploutot y diaditos, «for I have no fault to find with our wealth», is correct. It might mean, «for our wealth, at any rate is not such as to attract the attention» of others «of the god»—i.e. Stauder, it is taken by Meiser and Bellows who translate the word by «wealth» (Bellows explaining that it is «wealth» because it is «except from blame», and by Hall who renders «we have sufficient wealth», and explains «improachable» [as to amount]. Rather we should compare Ec. 491, where the chorus expresses a preference for χρηστος, wealth which does not attract the χρήσις of other people or of the gods, in other words wealth only in moderation. In earlier poetry (e.g. Her. Op. 118. Locr. 750. 536. Sol. 30.5 W) such expressions with χρήσις mean something quite different. They describe prosperity given unobtrusively or ungrudgingly by the gods. Homeric man wants as much prosperity and success as he can get, but by the 5th century excessive prosperity is often seen as something that is undesirable because it may attract divine resentment. So here, if Alonza is claiming that Persian wealth is not so great as to attract the notice of the gods, she is clearly deferring herself. But, after all that we have heard in the parodos about the boundless wealth and prosperity of Persia, it would be a surprising claim for her to make.

(4) Pers. 579-83

κατὰ τοὺς τιμὸς ἀνάντες
κατὰ τοὺς τιμὸς ἀνάντες
διὰ τῶν ἔργων
διὰ τῶν ἔργων

580 τιμοὶ τιμῶν μὴ διαφέρουσαν ἀλλὰ ἐποίησεν τὰ ἐργατὰ τὰ γείτονα τοὺς γείτονα τοὺς
581 ἄνδρας ἄνδρας
582 λόγοι μὴ διαφέροντες το τὸ πλῆθος χρηστοῖς ἄνευ χρήσεως μὴ διαφέροντες

This is a case where the generally accepted text, incorporating Herennius's deletion here of the superfluous word at 580, can be made to render possible attack: and every house mounts, deprived of its man, while childless parents, lornning, also, their
heaven-born woes, in their old-age tears of all their pains. For the emotional state of the parents at 60. The oxymoron of 'childish parents' is reminiscent of the wife who is μουσίας, 'yoked all alone' at 139, while the detail that these parents are old reminds us that all the young men have been lost at Salamis. It is not clear to me that anything is gained by Page's change of τον πατον to τον πατον. Presumably he meant to correct γούνατον with γούνατον. Nor I conceived by West's explanation in his apparatus that τον πατον δε γως, not with άγος, but with χολοσίαν (seems rather late Arist.). This is to lay too much stress upon the old age of the parents. The transmitted text, then, makes sense, but is a satisfactory sense, and is it what Aeschylus wrote? The problem lies in Κλίμοσον άγος, which a scholiast explains by Κλίμοσον καιδαλόσον άγος, when near and dear to their woes. άγος, however, means not woes but pains and, so judge from EST, it is only late Greek that can describe the cause of pain. To bear of troubles is natural (as at 333), but to bear of pain is much less so. The moderns, as they lament they come to understand the extent of their pain (the full measure of their anguish), Tuck27: cf. Siddons and Manzoni), is, I think, to strain the Greek (beyond what it can bear. I agree with Rembrandt that 'sin a context that is concerned with lamentations...and especially in the concluding line of the stanza, one expects some more forcible word than Κλίμοσον. One might accept (with P. J. Rhodes) that we have here a not uncommon case of a sentence in which the principal idea is expressed, not in the main verb, but in a participle γος is placed emphatically at the beginning of the clause: 'it is with lamentation that they bear of their pains.' Hall translates, '...bewail...as they bear of the full measure of their afflictions. But the problem of hearing πατον remains. There have been many emendations, and Broadhead himself proposed Κλεισον, 'give full vent to their pain.' He compared Ag. 1029, where that verb governs γούνατον, and Ag. Thm. 354 άγος, δοίοντας. The sense is attractive, but the corruption difficult to express. It suggests me that nobody does seems to have taken much notice of Boeth. 'Κλίμοσον, with pleading: 'in lamentation they yield their pain.' So, at Soph. Ag. 1125 it is clear to Teucer thatMetalias is about to 'embrace his strophe' (βιβλιον τομον). Alternatively, and more subtly, the expression may imply that is lamentation the old men find some relief from their pain. Cf. Eur. Pho. 605 μεγας Κλίμος, where Maenadon commends, 'καλόντις...γοί ας the tension/intensity of?, so 'put an end to'. I

28 R. J. Burn, A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus I, Acharnians 1951, on 581-583.
Finally I turn to a line of scholymytha in which the last two words, which are the reading of all the MSS. have, despite Sidgwick's remark that there is no need for emendation, nevertheless been widely suspected by commentators. I do not believe that they have ever been satisfactorily explained. Blomfield's28 *ne ean an old man survives* is impossible without the vial verb *survives*, and in any case it is clear from the whole play that only the young men have been killed in the battle; not old men. I find the chorus (thesis.) survive to pour out the young, as we have seen in the passage which I have just been discussing. Hence, therefore, is Sidgwick's *ne is any old man among them*, which gains some support from the scholion in M, δὲ ἐναὶ πάντες: κῦκα, and from scene. Byz. A. τοιοῦτοι πάντες οἰοῖ, ἐπιστασεῖν. With this we have to supply ἐξερχόμενοι from the first half of the line. In the next line, δὲ (or ἀ) µεῖκοι, ἔχουσι δὲ ὁ γάρ ἄρματον ἐπιστασεῖν, Duris duly laments the loss of the allies' youth, and Bottom rightly points out that this contrast between youth and old age is a recurring theme in the play. The role of the young men in this tragedy is to be cut down prematurely, because of the folly of the young Xerxes, while that of the old man, like Duris himself, is, as we have seen, to mourn their loss. I am not, however, convinced that this justifies the transmitted reading. At 729 Duris has asked whether the whole Persian people (τόλης Ὀλίcai) has been destroyed, and Bottom in effect answers *yes*, the whole city of Susa mourns its emptiness of men. So here the people of the Bactrians has been utterly destroyed, and, although Cassiopea's29 flash in the notes an effective witticism, it seems to me that Bottom would only, and disarmingly, weaken his point by adding, *but not of course the old men*. That there were no old men in the battle should be obvious enough. The contrast between old and young is sufficiently implied in Duris' response, and it does not depend upon the presence of the word *youth* in 732. I am not even sure that the scholiast in M presupposes that reading. It could be the comment of someone who felt uncomfortable with the obvious, though, I think, natural, exaggeration in ἐξερχόμενοι, παραλίας τῆς Φιλίδος. Broadhead, indeed, supposed that *Filidos* was corrupt, and, in the light of the next line, explained that Bottom must be referring only to the youth.
Gomperz:31 ἄριστον γι' ἡγίασεν is in many ways attractive: the people of the Bactrians has perished in total destruction, and no one survives. The polarization of expression, in which the same thing is stated first positively and then negatively, is too common to need illustration. But, although ἄριστον regularly stands for ἄριστοτε, there is no evidence apart from Heyesch, that ἄριστον was ever used in the sense of ἄριστοτε. ἄριστοτε itself does not seem to occur in tragedy. More promising perhaps is the approach of Willamowitz, who, after Zulas, restored a second ethion same by changing οὐδὲ τῆς ἡγίασεν to οὐδὲ ἄριστοτε. Why the Bactrians are singled out for special mention here is not entirely clear. Elsewhere in the play they, or rather individual Bactrians, appear only at 306 and 347. But Hall may be right to suppose (on 730–32) that Sussa (730) and Bactra represent the western and eastern parts of the empire. So here, as Willamowitz argued in his apparatus criticus, Egypt might represent the west. The corruption into τῆς ἡγίασεν is, however, highly improbable. I should prefer ἄριστον, largely because I thought if it myself before I discovered from Dawe's Repertory of conjectures that it had already been proposed by Bouteras. The qualifying Bactrians would then be paired with the heartland of the empire. As we have seen, the proper names in this play have caused great trouble to copyists. Over 1.10 has been corrected to the familiar τῆς, a scribe, heed with the meaningless οὐδὲ, might have invoked the antithesis between old and young to make sense of his text. I would, however, not go so far as to claim any certainty that this is what Aeschylus wrote. I am sure only that, despite the connubial of the manuscript, he did not write τῆς ἡγίασεν. The correct procedure here is, with most modern editors, to obelise. Sometimes think that it is a procedure which editors should adopt more often. On that note of ἄριστοτε or ἄριστον I end.

Glasgow
Alex F. Garvia
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