*Classical Quarterly* 59.2 335–352 (2009) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838809990036


# INTERPOLATION AND RESPONSION IN SOPHOCLES' *AJAX*

The two corresponding lyric stanzas at Soph. *Aj.* 879/80–914 and 925/6–960 are each followed by a block of lines delivered by Tecmessa. The text offered by the manuscripts is as follows:[1]

Τεκ. οὗτοι θεατός· ἀλλά νιν περιπτυχεῖ 915
φάρει καλύψω τῷδε παμπήδην, ἐπεὶ
οὐδεὶς ἄν, ὅστις καὶ φίλος, τλαίη βλέπειν
φυσῶντ' ἄνω πρὸς ῥῖνας ἔκ τε φοινίας
πληγῆς μελανθὲν αἷμ' ἀπ' οἰκείας σφαγῆς.
οἴμοι, τί δράσω; τίς σε βαστάσει φίλων; 920
ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ὡς ἀκμαῖος εἰ βαίη μόλοι
πεπτῶτ' ἀδελφὸν τόνδε συγκαθαρμόσαι.
ὦ δύσμορ' Αἴας, οἷος ὢν οἷως ἔχεις·
ὡς καὶ παρ' ἐχθροῖς ἄξιος θρήνων τυχεῖν. (*Aj.* 915–24)

Τεκ. οἱ δ' οὖν γελώντων κἀπιχαιρόντων κακοῖς
τοῖς τοῦδ'· ἴσως τοι, κεἰ βλέποντα μὴ 'πόθουν,
θανόντ' ἂν οἰμώξειαν ἐν χρείᾳ δορός.
οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ γνώμαισι τἀγαθὸν χεροῖν
ἔχοντες οὐκ ἴσασι πρίν τις ἐκβάλῃ. 965
ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς,
αὑτῷ δὲ τερπνός· ὧν γὰρ ἠράσθη τυχεῖν
ἐκτήσαθ' αὑτῷ, θάνατον ὅνπερ ἤθελεν.
τί δῆτα τοῦδ' ἐπεγγελῷεν ἄν κάτα;
θεοῖς τέθνηκεν οὗτος, οὐ κείνοισιν, οὔ. 970
πρὸς ταῦτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὑβριζέτω.
Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται. (*Aj.* 961–73)

Recent editors and translators have adopted widely divergent views of how much, if any, should be deleted here. I will first examine each section in isolation, looking for anything which might suggest interpolation. Then I will consider whether the two passages need to respond, and if so, what consequences that has for our decision.

## PROBLEMS IN 915–24

There are two significant textual problems in these lines.

(i) The deletion of lines 918–19 by Nauck in his 1867 edition ('aut depravati sunt aut ab Sophocle alieni') is approved by West (1978), 121, who compares *OT* 1278–9 *φόνου μυδώσας σταγόνας, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ μέλας | ὄμβρος χαλάζης αἵματος ἐτέγγετο* as another 'obvious interpolation in the interests of goriness'.[2] We may add *Tr.* 781–2

* I am grateful to Professor James Diggle and to the *Classical Quarterly*'s anonymous referee for helpful comments.

[1] Textual variants, where significant, will be discussed below.

[2] West (1977), 267 had already called the *Oedipus* passage 'surely spurious'; see also the notes of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) and (1997) ad loc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

κόμης δὲ λευκὸν μυελὸν ἐκραίνει, μέσου | κρατὸς διασπαρέντος αἵματός θ' ὁμοῦ, which 'may constitute a gory concession to an audience's degenerate taste by some actor'.[3] Sophocles' plays do contain vivid descriptions of physical trauma (e.g. *OT* 1276–7, *El.* 752–3), but such a picture would be out of place in the immediate context of 918–19. Tecmessa is covering the body because no friend could bear to look upon it (916–17): to describe that body in such lurid terms would frustrate that purpose on a linguistic level, by revealing in her words the physical horror which she aims to conceal. Accepting 918–19 as genuine, Burton (1980), 33 argues that they provide 'an exact description of [the corpse's] appearance, which prepares us for the moment at 1003 f., when Teucer orders it to be revealed for all to see'. But that passage, despite its high emotion, and its length, conspicuously avoids sanginuary description (even at 1002–5, where Teucer first sees the body). The emphasis there, as here, is on the sort of person Ajax was, and the consequences of his loss for his dependants – not on a detailed physical account of his corpse.

In both *OT* 1278–9 and *Tr.* 781–2 there are serious linguistic problems which excite suspicion quite independent of the goriness; defending *Aj.* 918–19, Holford-Strevens claims that there are none such here.[4] This understimates the difficulty of the phrase ἀπ' οἰκείας σφαγῆς. It cannot mean 'out of the self-inflicted wound' (with σφαγή 'wound', as at *Tr.* 572–3, 716–18) because of πληγή earlier in the sentence: the two nouns cannot refer to the same thing.[5] The phrase must rather be causal (cf. *Aj.* 1078, *El.* 65, *Ant.* 695), with σφαγή referring not to a wound but to an act of sacrifice: namely, the suicide.[6] It could go closely with ἔκ … φοινίας πληγῆς or μελανθὲν αἷμ', giving 'the bloody wound [or "black gore"] which was the result of his self-inflicted slaughter'.[7] But the connexion of two nouns in this way is odd, and not paralleled by anything in Diggle (1981), 28–9, 69 or Moorhouse (1982), 100: it is as if *θάνατος ἀπὸ πολεμου could mean 'a death caused by war'. The only alternative is to take it with the entire phrase φυσῶντ' … αἷμ', giving '[the body is] spurting blood up to the nostrils and out of the wound, as a consequence of his self-inflicted slaughter'. This is something of a mouthful, however, and no translation which I have consulted renders the lines in this way: contrast e.g. *Ant.* 694–5 ἀναξιωτάτη | κάκιστ' ἀπ' ἔργων εὐκλεεστάτων φθίνει, where the causal phrase introduced by ἀπό simply and clearly accompanies the main verb.[8]

[3] Davies ad loc. This deletion is owed to Meineke (1861), 42 n. *.

[4] Holford-Strevens (1999), 243–4 n. 71: 'these verses are linguistically unimpeachable; they also describe what the audience could not see'.

[5] Jebb (1896; similarly 1868) renders 'no man who loved him could bear to see him, as up to nostril and forth from red gash he spirts the darkened blood from the self-dealt wound', happily accepting the tautology. Raeburn's translation 'no | True friend of his could bear to see the blood | That's spurting up to his nostrils, streaming black | From his deadly wound, the wound he dealt himself' evades the problem by introducing an anadiplosis which, though effective in itself, does not correspond to anything in the Greek.

[6] Perversion of sacrificial terminology pervades the play: see Finglass (2009a), 123–4.

[7] The former is preferred by Lloyd-Jones, in his translation cited above ('the deadly wound inflicted by self-slaughter'), the latter by Mazon ('le sang noir de son suicide') and Garvie ('his blackened blood, the result of his self-inflicted slaughter').

[8] I once saw difficulty in the use of φυσάω to denote blood pumping out of the nostrils and seeping from a wound; the verb normally refers to the blowing of air, and so seems more appropriate to the former than the latter. But (i) [Aesch.] *PV* 720 ἔνθα ποταμὸς ἐκφυσᾷ μένος provides a parallel for (compounded) φυσάω used of the movement of liquid which does not involve the motion of air; (ii) contemporary respiratory theory often assumed that blood and air travelled in the same tubes (cf. Diogenes of Apollonia, D–K 64 B 6, Empedocles, D–K 31 B 100, Harris (1973), 26–7, Furley and Wilkie (1984), 3, 9–11); (iii) the text can be defended as an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The combination of linguistic oddity and intrusive bloodiness leads me to believe that 918–19 are probably interpolated. As in the case of *OT* 1278–9, a further motivation for their insertion may have been the perceived need to supply a direct object for a verb at the end of the preceding line (βλέπειν, ἀνίεσαν) which was mistakenly thought to require one. A possible model for the interpolation is not hard to find: *Aj.* 1411–13 ἔτι γὰρ θερμαὶ | σύριγγες ἄνω φυσῶσι μέλαν | μένος contains the same verb and adverb, next to each other.[9]

(ii) Whereas most editors are content to keep 918–19 unchanged (though few are equally happy to explain them), line 921 has excited more suspicion. Potential μόλοι cannot do without ἄν, although that has not stopped a distinguished set of scholars from asserting that it can.[10] Elmsley understands the paradosis as a wish,[11] translating 'if he comes at all, I wish that he may come in time to compose his brother's body'.[12] But taken as a wish, the text could only mean 'I wish that he would come in time, if he were to come', which is awkwardly expressed and raises the question of whether Teucer is in fact going to return, which elsewhere is not subject to doubt (cf. Lobeck[2–3]).

ἄν is inescapable. The two most plausible ways of inserting it are ἀκμὴν ἄν and ἀκμαῖ' ἄν.[13] In both cases we might imagine that ἀκμαῖος was used to gloss the expression in the text, and then found its way into the text. Since the adverb ἀκμήν is unparalleled in drama, I prefer Wakefield's text: for a possible instance of a similar corruption, with an adverbial neuter plural replaced by a nominative singular, see my forthcoming note on *Aj.* 197–8.

Whichever option we choose, the problem is limited to one word and can be remedied by appropriate emendation. There is no reason to think that 921–2 as a whole are interpolated.

instance of zeugma; (iv) for the picture cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.90–1 *corruit extremisque animae singultibus errans | alternus nunc ore venit nunc vulnere sanguis*. Nor do I take the noun ῥίς, unattested elsewhere in tragedy, as evidence for interpolation. S. has it at fr. 171.2 Radt in a satyr play; we also find ῥινηλατέω at fr. 314.94 (satyr play) and Aesch. *Ag.* 1185, and ῥινηλάτης at Tr. Adesp. fr. 426 Kannicht–Snell. Although in general 'the tragedians of the fifth century are remarkably fastidious in their use of words to denote parts of the human body' (Page on Eur. *Med.* 30–1), they do occur (Page cites examples). The word may have been inspired by Hom. *Od.* 22.18–19 αὐτίκα δ' αὐλὸς ἀνὰ ῥῖνας παχὺς ἦλθεν | αἵματος ἀνδρομέοιο (resulting from a wound to the throat).

[9] I do not accept Nauck's deletion of these lines (in his seventh or eighth edition), recently adopted by Dawe in his third edition: see further my forthcoming commentary ad loc.

[10] Thus Schneidewin[1], Bellermann[4–6], Campbell and Dain, as translated by Mazon.

[11] Elmsley (1814), 366–7. For ὡς introducing a wish see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 407–9.

[12] Elmsley (1814), 366–7; *prob.* Wunder[1–3], Schneidewin[3]. Hermann[2] quibbles about the detail but ends up supporting a wish.

[13] The former is conjectured by Vauvilliers (1781) 2.60 and approved by Wolff[1–2] and Dawe (1973–8) 1.157 and in his editions; the latter is conjectured by Wakefield (1790), 127 and approved by Hermann[3–4], Schneidewin[2], Jebb and Pearson. Piderit (1855), 170 objects to the latter on the ground that we need a masculine singular, not a neuter plural, but for the latter used adverbially with a verb of motion see my forthcoming note on *Aj.* 197–8. An *im*possible solution is ἆν βαίη μολών (*coni.* Bothe (1806) 2.380, *prob.* Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, who attribute the conjecture to Pantazides (1872), 404–5), which gives the tautologous 'How timely would he come, having come' (or '… as he comes', with coincident aorist participle). Lloyd-Jones in his Loeb translates 'How timely would be his coming', which ignores the participle which his text embraces.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## PROBLEMS IN 961–73

I begin by discussing six discrete difficulties, before turning to problems in the overall sense of the passage.

(i) In place of *τἀγαθόν* in 964 the Jena group of manuscripts have *τἀγάθ' ἐν* (cf. Turyn [1952], 91), which was conjectured by Reiske (1753), 7 and is printed by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson. The question of which reading we should prefer has no implications for the authenticity of 964–5.

(ii) Line 966 is in asyndeton. This phenomenon is found throughout tragedy and classical literature, but always as a particular stylistic feature. To give just two examples, it can introduce a brief maxim as an explanation,[14] or juxtapose brief statements at moments of high emotion to give a pathetic effect.[15] There is no such feature which could justify it here.[16] Nor is a remedy from emendation to hand. Yet most editors have felt no need to explain it. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990), 31 (on 966) attempt to do so, by claiming that asyndeton 'is not uncommon after a sharp break in the thought, so that there is no strong case for a lacuna here; after delivering 965 the actor will have paused for a moment'. In their text they signal this by marking a new paragraph at 966. They do not, however, cite parallels for the 'not uncommon' practice which they allege. And even if they are right in asserting a break in the sense, this would not justify the asyndeton.[17] The question of whether or not the sense is continuous will be considered below. For the moment, it does not bode well for defenders of the line that the only attempt to explain this severe syntactic problem does so by claiming that there is no connexion of thought between 965 and 966 – something which, if true, brings an additional charge against the lines without cancelling the initial one.

(iii) There is a further difficulty in 966. As written in our manuscripts, the line means either 'For me his death is bitter than sweet for them' or 'For me his death is bitter or sweet for them'. Since neither makes sense, editors who keep the transmitted text have generally adopted one of three alternatives, none of which is plausible. (a) Most have followed the scholia in taking *ἤ* as the equivalent of *μᾶλλον ἤ* 'rather than',[18] but as Pearson notes, elsewhere *ἤ* in this sense is accompanied by a verb such as *βούλομαι* in which 'the idea of preference is implicit'.[19] (b) Moorhouse (1982), 173–4 follows Kamerbeek in arguing that that the contrast of the two adjectives is so marked that they as it were stand for comparatives, giving an expression like Ar. *Ach.* 1078 *ἰὼ στρατηγοὶ πλέονες* [Scaliger: *πλεί-* codd.] *ἢ βελτίονες* (where see Olson for further parallels). But his translation 'his death is painful to me instead of joyful to them'

[14] See Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 951.

[15] See my note on *El.* 924–5, 1115, 1151–3.

[16] Ziel (1846), 13 sees an example of adversative asyndeton, writing 'Aj. 966 *ἐμοί* opp. vv. antecedd. *οἱ γὰρ κακοί*, quare *ἐμοί* etiam in initio positum est non *μοί* in media oratione'. But an emphatic adversative personal pronoun in first position demands a following *δέ*.

[17] Cf. Reeve (1973), 161 n. 35: 'except at the start of a speech, Greek does not mark a lack of connexion by a lack of connective'.

[18] Cf. *Σ* 966 = p. 210 Christodoulou *μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν, ἤπερ ἐκείνοις γλυκύς*; 'magis quam' in the translations of Camerarius (*ap.* Stephanus 1568), Johnson, Brunck; and also Jebb ('To my pain hath he died more than for their joy') and Mazon ('sa mort m'est une peine, plus vive que leur joie, à eux').

[19] Pearson (1919), 122; cf. Kühner–Gerth 2.303 Anm. 2, where our passage is explicitly excluded from examples of this construction, and Dawe (1973–8), 1.160–1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reveals the absurdity of this interpretation, quite apart from the stress under which he puts the language. Tecmessa might say that her pain is equivalent to her enemies' joy, or even that her pain is greater than that joy. But she could not deny that her enemies experience joy at Ajax's death, not least because she has only just defiantly encouraged them to persevere in their merriment.[20] (c) Campbell's preferred translation (supported by Stanford) is 'Be his death joy to them or grief to me, to him it brings content'. But even if ἤ was repeated (which it is not), it could not mean 'whether … whether …' in a priamel-like dismissal of competing themes; while δέ breaks the syntactic structure which Campbell desiderates (he is forced to label it 'in apodosi'). Furthermore, the sense supposedly thus attained is undesirable: we do not want Tecmessa raising as hypothetical possibilities what we and she know are all too present realities.

Because of the problem of the paradosis, a variant preserved by the secondary tradition has won some support. The text of this line offered by the manuscripts of Eustathius also reads ἤ, but Schneidewin (1849), 472–3 identified that Eustathius's paraphrase indicates that he actually read ἦ.[21] The Suda probably read this too, as Pearson (1919), 123 saw. The lexicon cites *Aj.* 966 under the lemma γλεῦκος (γ 284 = 1.526.27–8 Adler), a word which replaces μέλι as the contrary of ἀψίνθιον at Σ Nic. *Alex.* 298 (p. 119 Geymonat), and so could have featured in a proverb such as the one in Eustathius. The author of what is now a garbled note will have cited *Aj.* 966 as a parallel to such an expression (there is no other way to account for the presence of the line under this lemma), and so probably read ἦ. This means that the variant is at least as old as the tenth century, and thus perhaps ancient.[22]

Schneidewin was the first to reintroduce it into the text of Sophocles, in his first edition; since then, it has been printed by Wolff[1–2], Bellermann[4–6], Pearson, and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson. The last-named translate 'His death is bitter for me as it is sweet to them.'[23] But they do not supply a parallel for this sense, and Reeve has denied that one exists.[24] Elsewhere in tragedy ἦ can denote place whither (cf. *Ant.* 444 σὺ μὲν κομίζοις ἂν σεαυτὸν ἦ θέλεις), place where (*Tr.* 779 μάρψας ποδός νιν, ἄρθρον ἦ λυγίζεται), or manner (*El.* 947 ἄκουε δή νυν ἦ βεβούλευμαι τελεῖν).[25] It can be coordinated with another ἦ, or with τῆδε, to give the same senses: cf. *El.* 338–9 τὸ μὲν δίκαιον οὐχ ἦ 'γὼ λέγω, | ἀλλ' ἦ σὺ κρίνεις ('justice lies not in what I say, but in what you judge': Lloyd-Jones) and *Tr.* 553–4 ἦ δ' ἔχω, φίλαι, | λυτήριον λύπημα, τῆδ' ὑμῖν φράσω ('I will tell you how it is that I …'). To wring anything from ἦ in our

[20] 961–2; cf. 367, 382, 957–8.

[21] Eustathius 1521.41–2 (1.197.7–9 Stallbaum) ὡς καὶ εἰ τις εἴποι, τόσον ἡδὺ τὸ μέλι, ὅσον ἀηδὲς τὸ ἀψίνθιον. τοιοῦτον σχῆμα καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ, ἐν τῷ, ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἤ κείνοις γλυκύς. It is incorrect to refer to this as a conjecture by Schneidewin, as many editors do. The posited corruption would be similar to that in Aesch. *Pers.* 791 μηδ' εἰ στράτευμα πλεῖον ἦ τὸ Μηδικόν, where ἦ has become ἤ in several manuscripts (see Dawe [1964], 332) under the influence of preceding πλεῖον.

[22] Pearson (1919), 123 n. 1 also claims that 'The first hand of L may have written ἦ' (so also Schneidewin (1849), 472–3), but even if this is correct, it need not reflect ἦ in its source. The facsimile (Thompson and Jebb [1885]) does not allow us to judge either way: the letter has a circumflex and an acute accent, with no breathing.

[23] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990), 31, on 966. Cf. Lloyd-Jones (1978), 218 'His death tastes bitter to me just as it tastes sweet to them', Mazon (p. 43 n. 1) 'sa mort m'est amère par ce qui la rend douce aux adversaires d'Ajax' ('The thing that makes his death so sweet to Ajax's enemies is the very thing that makes it bitter for me'), and similarly Garvie.

[24] Reeve (1973), 161: 'no use of ἦ … is remotely like the one introduced by Schneidewin here'.

[25] See further Ellendt (1872), 551.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

passage, we would have to understand τῇδε with ἐμοὶ πικρός and translate 'His death is a sorrow to me in the same manner as it is a source of joy for them', a tortured expression at which Dawe (1973–8), 1.161 rightly bridles, and which cannot be watered down into '(just) as', as in the translations cited above.[26]

(iv) 969 was deleted by Schneidewin.[27] The line has no caesura because a single word takes up the whole of the second metron (and indeed extends into the third), a severe abnormality[28] which cannot be securely paralleled. The six other tragic passages where this occurs in our manuscripts are as follows:

(a) *OC* 372 εἰσῆλθε τοῖν τρισαθλίοιν ἔρις κακή is the only other Sophoclean instance. It disappears if we write τρὶς ἀθλίοιν with Porson (1802), xxviii; as the change involves only word division, it does not even count as an emendation.

(b) Aesch. *Pers.* 501 στρατὸς περᾷ κρυσταλλοπῆγα διὰ πόρον is called by West (1982), 83 the most plausible case of a verse with no caesura in the second metron at all. He retains this text in his edition, as do Page, Sommerstein and (with misgivings) Garvie. But Porson (1802), xxviii advocates κρυσταλλοπῆγα διὰ πόρον στρατὸς περᾷ, an easy change requiring one transposition. As Headlam (1902), 247 points out, στρατός could have been moved to the beginning of the line to make clear that it governed the verb in the previous line (ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλὰ θεοκλυτῶν ἐπαύσατο); such a change would also have produced a more prosaic, and therefore more familiar, word order in 501. There are thus good reasons independent of the metrical problem to support such an emendation; Broadhead adopts it, as modified by Hartung (i.e. with περᾷ στρατός).

(c) Aesch. *Suppl.* 244 καὶ τἄλλα, πόλλ' ἐπεικάσαι δίκαιον ἦν is easily healed by Martin's ἔτ' εἰκάσαι, which is adopted by Friis Johansen and Whittle (who cite parallels for the error, caused by visual confusion between *Π* and *T*), West and Sandin. (Page obelizes the passage.) Moreover, ἔτι is no mere metrical stopgap. The speaker, Pelasgus, has just been attempting to guess the identity of the women he sees in front of him on the basis of their appearance. He now says 'It would still be justified to make many conjectures' – in other words, the sight before him is so strange that even after several lines he has not yet exhausted his curiosity. The prefix in ἐπεικάζω does not appear to have this nuance, and so Martin's change gives improved sense as well as restoring the metre. We may thus reject the remark of Friis Johansen and Whittle that 'there is … no ground for emendation other than the metrical anomaly'.

(d) Aesch. *Ag.* 1252 ἦ καρτ' ἄρ' ἄν παρεσκόπεις [v.l. -πης] χρησμῶν ἐμῶν is corrupt. παρασκοπέω is attested only (excluding an instance in Themistius) at Pl. *Symp.* 221b; whatever it means there, it would make no sense here. ἄν is unwelcome too (Cassandra's rebuke of the chorus demands a regular statement, not a potential one), as is the combination of κάρτα and ἄρα. Editors generally adopt Hartung's παρεκόπης for the verb, citing the Suda α 3363 = 1.300.23–4 Adler ἀποκοπῆναι τῶν ἰχνῶν τὴν κύνα λέγουσιν, ὅταν μηκέτι εὑρίσκῃ τὰ ἴχνη; the parallel from hunting is

[26] Emendations which have not won support include εἰ, ἦν (Reiske [1753], 7), and κεἰ (Dawe [1968], 12–13); Reeve (1970), 286–7 n. 8 objects to the unparalleled 'ugly sequence' – κε κεἰ κεί – which the latter creates.

[27] In his first edition and in (1849), 473; in his second and third editions, however, he retains the line. The deletion was approved by Maas (1929), 24; though in the English translation (Lloyd-Jones (1962), 67), Maas's 'interpoliert' has become merely 'suspect'.

[28] Lloyd-Jones (1978), 218 remarks that 'to say that 969 has no caesura understates its metrical abnormality', but does not elaborate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appropriate for a passage which contains other such metaphors. For the corruption at the beginning of the line Fraenkel ad loc. suggests *κάρτα μακράν*, which is printed by Page, West and Sommerstein; Denniston–Page prefer Mazon's *κάρτα λίαν*.

(e) Eur. *Andr.* 397 *ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτ' ὀδύρομαι, τὰ δ' ἐν ποσίν* 'requires little *ἀγχίνοια* to set right' (Diggle [1973], 263 = [1994], 82): that is, we should read *ταῦτα δύρομαι* with Porson, assuming the same small error as at Eur. *Med.* 159, further illustrated in my note on Soph. *El.* 1077. In any case, 397–8 are out of place as transmitted: in his edition Diggle follows Hartung in deleting them, while Kovacs follows Musgrave by swapping them round with 404–5.

(f) Eur. *IA* [1586] *φάσμ', οὗ γε μηδ' ὁρωμένου πίστις παρῆν* should be left out of consideration (cf. Diggle [1982], 130), since it is Byzantine in date.

Without a secure parallel for this extraordinary phenomenon, we must declare the line either corrupt or interpolated.[29] Emendations, however, are unpersuasive. Porson (1802), xxviii tries *τοῦδέ γ' ἐγγελῷεν*, but the *γε* is unwelcome; and in addition to inserting the particle, Porson is forced to emend the prefix to avoid an illicit anapaest at the start of the second metron (only four instances in Sophocles, according to West [1982], 82, all of which – he tells me – involve proper names). The remedy offered by Meineke (1863), 284, *τοῦδ' ἔτ'*, is not as attractive as Martin's similar change in (c) above. 'How could they still laugh over him?' wrongly implies that something has happened since they started laughing which now makes their laughter inappropriate, when it is the simple fact of their laughter which Tecmessa finds offensive. Lloyd-Jones (1978), 218 suggests *τί δῆτ' ἐκεῖνοι τοῦδ' ἐπεγγελῷεν ἄν;* which is ungrammatical, since the verb, when unaccompanied by a preposition, takes not a genitive but a dative. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990), 31 modify that proposal by changing *τοῦδ'* to *τῷδ'*, but a third successive, unmotivated, change in one line (after the deletion of *κατά* and the insertion of *ἐκεῖνοι*) is unenticing.

Three further, non-metrical grounds, for suspecting the line are not compelling. (i) Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990), 31 argue that 'the sentiment which it expresses is at variance with that of 961–2, not to mention 971'. This objection, raised before them by Enger (1859), 477, is too literal-minded. In the passages to which they refer, Tecmessa's 'Let them laugh' is not a granting of permission, but a statement of defiance: they may laugh *now*, but when Ajax's absence causes them to suffer, they will regret their laughter (cf. 962–5). It is thus consistent with a question asking 'Why should they laugh?' in another context; whether the overall thought of that context makes sense or not will be discussed below. (ii) Dawe (1973–8), 1.159 complains about 'the peculiar phenomenon of *κατά* used with a verb that already has a double prepositional prefix'; cf. however *El.* 835–6 *κατ' ἐμοῦ … | … ἐπεμβάσῃ*, where the doubly prefixed *ἐπεμβαίνω* takes a further preposition instead of a regular bare dative (as at *El.* 456 *ἐχθροῖσιν … ἐπεμβῆναι*), *OC* 1339 *καθ' ἡμῶν ἐγγελῶν*, *Phil.* 328 *κατ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαλῶν*. (iii) The separation of the preposition in anastrophe from its noun, while rare, can be paralleled. Moorhouse (1982), 94–5 compares *Aj.* 792–3, *El.* 553, 578–9, *OT* 857–8, and see further Wackernagel (1926–8), 2.199–200 ≈ (2009), 650.

But removing bad grounds for suspecting a line does not make it more likely to be genuine if there is already an overwhelming reason to delete it which cannot be removed (cf. Barrett [2007], 322–3). On its own, the absence of any caesura in the

[29] Jebb comments that attempts to heal the verse are 'needless' because 'the stress on *τοῦδ'* mitigates the harshness of the verse'; I do not know what this means.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

second metron indicates corruption or interpolation. The lack of a plausible emendation makes the latter diagnosis attractive.

(v) 970 was deleted by Nauck.[30] Editors and translators dispute the sense of the datives. There are several instances of verbs for dying accompanied by this case in tragedy where the exact sense requires careful thought. As Pearson (1922), 126 writes, 'in the consideration of any particular example … there exists a range of possible meanings extending from the material instrument at the one end to the loosest possible application of the dative of interest at the other.'[31] They are as follows (arranged according to semantics, not authors, in a sequence suggested by Pearson's statement):

(a) Eur. *Andr.* 334 (Andromache to Menelaus) *τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καί μ' ἀπώλεσεν* 'I have died at your daughter's hand and she has destroyed me.' Agency: the construction is formally parallel to a transitive verb whose subject is the same person denoted by the dative in the preceding clause.

(b) Soph. *El.* 1152 (Electra, addressing the supposed ashes of Orestes) *τέθνηκ' ἐγὼ σοί* 'I have been killed by you'. Agency: cf. her address to Orestes (1163–4, in the same speech) *ὥς μ' ἀπώλεσας, | ἀπώλεσας δῆτ', ὦ κασίγνητον κάρα*. The phrase must have a similar force to that of the statements which enclose it (1151 *οἴχεται πατήρ*, 1152 *φροῦδος αὐτὸς εἶ θανών*), which suggests that Jebb's 'I am dead in relation to thee' is not strong enough; *αὐτός* in 1152 further supports my preferred interpretation ('I have been killed by you; you yourself have departed in death').[32]

(c) Eur. *Her.* 191–2 (Amphitryon, on the hoplite) *καὶ τοῖσι συνταχθεῖσιν οὖσι μὴ ἀγαθοῖς | αὐτὸς τέθνηκε δειλίᾳ τῇ τῶν πέλας*. Weaker agency: the hoplite is not killed *by* his cowardly comrades, but *because of* them. The parallel dative *δειλίᾳ* clarifies the instrumental sense of 191. See further Bond's note; he compares Soph. fr. 921 Radt *σκαιοῖσι πολλοῖς εἷς σοφὸς διόλλυται*.

(d) Soph. *Aj.* 1128 (Menelaus, referring to Ajax's attempt to kill him) *θεὸς γὰρ ἐκσώζει με, τῷδε δ' οἴχομαι*. Somewhere between agency and interest: 'so far as his efforts went, I am no more' (Pearson [1922], 127). The dative marks both Ajax's perspective (interest) and his attempted action (agency).

(e) Soph. *Phil.* 1030 (Philoctetes to Odysseus, Neoptolemus, and their companions) *ὅς οὐδέν εἰμι καὶ τέθνηχ' ὑμῖν πάλαι*. Interest (or rather, the lack of it): 'you have long treated me as dead' (Pearson [1922], 127), 'as far as you are concerned, I am long dead'.

Where do *θεοῖς* and *κείνοισιν* fit on this spectrum? Some take them as datives of interest, as in (e) above.[33] But the statement 'his death concerns the gods, not them' is demonstrably false. Ajax's death is very much a matter of concern to his enemies, and Tecmessa's denial of this serves no rhetorical purpose.[34] The meaning of 'his death concerns the gods' is also obscure.[35] Passage (d) is inapplicable too, since attempted

[30] In his 1860 edition; he also followed Schneidewin in deleting 969.

[31] Fraenkel (1950), 3.629 n. 2, refers to our line and *El.* 1152 as 'the well-known passages in Sophocles where a not easily definable dative is used with the perfect *τέθνηκα*', but the idiom is not limited to Sophocles. He does not offer a translation of *Aj.* 970.

[32] The above discussion, and this section as a whole, supersedes the note on this passage in my commentary.

[33] Thus Campbell, Jebb (1868 and 1896), Stanford, Moorhouse (1982), 84, Raeburn.

[34] Cf. Reeve (1973), 161: it 'flatly contradicts 961–65 and 971–72'.

[35] Campbell's gloss 'The gods have required this sacrifice, and the will of the Atreidae has had no part in it' suggests not interest but agency. Jebb's note is a muddle.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

killing and its consequences have no parallel here; while the idea of 'weak agency' in (c) is inappropriate in a play where so much is made of the power of the gods and their direct intervention in Ajax's life.

This leaves us with direct agency, as in (a) and (b), which yields 'Ajax is the gods' victim, surely not theirs' (Pearson [1922], 127) or 'It is the gods that killed him, not they, no!' (Lloyd-Jones).[36] Tecmessa has put great stress on the involvement of the gods in the death of Ajax in the lyric following his death,[37] so this statement is unobjectionable, at least in isolation. Whether it makes sense in this context is another question – but that will have to wait until my discussion of the overall sense of the passage, below.

The line contains no further linguistic points which require explanation; the repeated, isolated negative *οὔ* is well paralleled in tragedy and elsewhere.[38]

(vi) 971–3 were deleted by Schöll.[39] The traditional interpretation is exemplified in Jebb's translation: 'Then let Odysseus revel in empty taunts. Ajax is for them no more: to me he hath left anguish and mourning – and is gone.' There are two problems here:

(a) *ἐν κενοῖς* 'vainly, fruitlessly' is a remarkable locution. Editors compare *OT* 287 *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ἀργοῖς οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἐπραξάμην*,[40] where *ἐν ἀργοῖς* is usually taken to mean *ἀργῶς*, as translated by Moorhouse (1982), 106: 'I did not perform even this task sluggishly'. But an alternative rendering is available, which gives *ἐν ἀργοῖς* its expected sense: 'I saw to it that not even this act should be among things neglected', which sounds more awkward in English than it is in Greek. The further parallels which Moorhouse cites, such as adverbial *ἐν βραχεῖ* (*El.* 673) or *ἐν τάχει* (*OT* 765), are in the singular and thus not comparable.[41]

(b) *αὐτοῖς* is taken to refer to Ajax's enemies. It thus picks up *κείνοισιν* in 970, although it not clear how an audience could tell that that word and not *θεοῖς* was at issue. This interpretation fits awkwardly into the train of thought (cf. Dawe [1973–8], 1.160). It must be a dative of interest (*οὐκέτ' ἐστίν* could hardly be accompanied by a

[36] Pearson cites earlier commentators who take this view. Garvie and Budelmann (2000), 184 are unsure whether to prefer agency or interest. Kamerbeek's note is confused: although he translates 'He has fallen a victim to the gods, not to them', he comments 'This is preferable to taking *θεοῖς* and *κείνοισιν* as a "dativ. auctoris"', which is precisely how his rendering interprets the dative.

[37] Cf. 950 *οὐκ ἂν τάδ' ἔστη τῇδε μὴ θεῶν μέτα*, 952–3 *τοιόνδε μέντοι Ζηνὸς ἡ δεινὴ θεὸς | Παλλὰς φυτεύει πῆμ' Ὀδυσσέως χάριν*.

[38] Cf. *OC* 587 *ὅρα γε μήν· οὐ σμικρός, οὔχ, ἁγὼν ὅδε*, fr. 846.1 Radt *οὐ κόσμος, οὔκ, ὦ τλῆμον*, Aesch. *Ag.* 1299, perhaps Aesch. fr. 78a.24 (see Radt's apparatus), Eur. *Cycl.* 49, Ar. *Ach.* 421, *Nub.* 1470, *Ran.* 1308 *αὕτη ποθ' ἡ Μοῦσ' οὐκ ἐλεσβίαζεν, οὔ*, Pl. *Hp. Mai.* 292B, Dem. 19.97, 19.186, 19.232, 19.255, 21.112, 25.50, 25.87. A vase attributed to the painter Douris, and thus from the first half of the fifth century (Munich 2646, from Vulci; Beazley [1963], 437.128, 1653, [1971], 375, Carpenter *et al.* [1989], 239), depicts a reclining man declaring *οὐ δύναμ' οὔ* (*sc.* *πλέον πίνειν*; thus Kretschmer [1894], 87).

[39] Schöll (1842), 161–2 n. *: 'Diese drei Verse hätte man längst aus dem Texte streichen sollen. Denn mit ihnen hat die fremde Hand die schöngeschlossene Rede der Tekmessa mit nur theilweiser Wiederholung des bereits viel besser Ausgesprochenen unnöthig und nachtheilig vermehrt. Das sie aber ein unächter Zusatz sind, liegt am Tage. Denn in diesem Theil unserer Tragödie bilden die Chorverse und Reden von Vers [879] bis [924] ein System, dessen Gliederung in Gesang und Rede sich ganz gleich wiederholt von V. [925] bis [970]; blos diese drei schlechten Verse sind überzählig.'

[40] *ἐπράξαμεν* Shilleto (1859), 311 (*prob.* Lloyd-Jones and Wilson), but see my forthcoming note on *Aj.* 45.

[41] He also cites *El.* 486 *ἅ νιν κατέπεφνεν αἰσχίσταις ἐν ἀκείαις* but, as I say in my note, *ἐν* here 'denotes situation or circumstance generally', and can be translated 'amid'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dative of agent, which would in any case be inconsistent with 970), but the sense is obscure, as is the nature of the opposition with *ἐμοί* demanded by the syntax. I do not understand the force of 'Ajax is for them no more' in Jebb's translation. His paraphrase 'It is all *loss* for them; nothing remains but the anguish which becomes my portion' does not help me, and certainly cannot be wrung out of his translation. Raeburn's rendering (in his appendix, p. 275 n. 67) 'Mock, then, Odysseus, in your empty pride! | Ajax is merely gone for you and them; | To me his loss brings grief and lamentation' is a paraphrase of Jebb's paraphrase rather than a translation of the Greek (which contains no word for 'merely', the fulcrum of Raeburn's version).

There is a means of resolving both these difficulties which does not involve textual intervention. An anonymous scholar *ap.* Pearson (1922), 127 n. 1 took *ἐν κενοῖς* to mean 'against those that are helpless'. Although he does not adopt it, Pearson comments 'This suits admirably the opposition of *Αἴας* and *ἐμοί* in the following line', and notes that it strengthens the connexion with the next scene, where at 986–7 Eurysaces is described as a *κενῆς | σκύμνον λεαίνης* ('the whelp of a widowed lioness'). Lobel *ap.* Lloyd-Jones (1971), 344–5 = (1990), 457 refines this suggestion to give 'at the expense of us who are left unprotected'. As Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990), 31 point out, *αὐτοῖς* in 972 now refers to Ajax's friends, not his enemies. This meets the objections above, as follows:

(a) The use of *ἐν* is now a standard idiom: cf. 1091–2 *μὴ … | … ἐν θανοῦσιν ὑβριστὴς γένῃ*, 1315 *ἐν ἐμοὶ θρασύς*, Eur. *Hipp.* 1320 *σὺ δ' ἔν τ' ἐκείνῳ κἀν ἐμοὶ φαίνῃ κακός* with Barrett.

(b) *αὐτοῖς* now picks up the referent of *ἐν κενοῖς* without ambiguity, and *Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν* makes sense as an explanation of *κενοῖς*,[42] with the dative of interest *αὐτοῖς* marking the people affected by Ajax's death. In the clause introduced by *ἀλλά* Tecmessa highlights the particular anguish which she experiences. This same opposition is expressed at 942, when Tecmessa tells the choregus *σοὶ μὲν δοκεῖν ταῦτ' ἔστ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἄγαν φρονεῖν*.[43]

We may thus translate the lines 'In the face of that let Odysseus abuse the bereaved with contempt! For Ajax is for them no more, while for me he has left pain and lamentation by his death.'[44] Two additional and unexpected advantages arise from this interpretation. (i) *ὑβριζέτω* forms a better parallel to the opening third person imperatives *οἱ δ' οὖν γελώντων κἀπιχαιρόντων*, since both now have an explicit object (*ἐν κενοῖς, κακοῖς τοῖς τοῦδ'*) which constitutes an improper target for abuse (the bereaved, the wretchedness of a dead man). (ii) The presentation of Odysseus becomes much more negative. His *ὕβρις* is not merely fruitless – it is directed against people already in a desperate plight, as emphasized by the juxtaposition of *κενοῖς* and *ὑβριζέτω*. This provides an exact parallel with the chorus's final words before Tecmessa's speech, which run (954/5–960) *ἦ ῥα κελαινώπαν θυμὸν ἐφυβρίζει | πολύτλας ἀνήρ, | γελᾷ δὲ τοῖσδε* [Elmsley (1814), 472: *τοῖς* codd., *τοῖσι* Triclinius] *μαινομένοις ἄχεσιν | πολὺν γέλωτα, φεῦ φεῦ, | ξύν τε διπλοῖ βασιλῆς | κλύοντες Ἀτρεῖδαι*. The focus here is on the laughter and mockery (*ἐφυβρίζει*) of Odysseus and

[42] Cf. Denniston (1952), 80 on how a statement with *γάρ* 'sometimes refers to a subordinate clause, or individual word, in the preceding speech'.

[43] 'It is for you to imagine this, but for me to know it all too powerfully.' For *φρονέω* 'realize, understand' cf. *OT* 1319–20 *καὶ θαῦμά γ' οὐδὲν ἐν τοσοῖσδε πήμασιν | διπλᾶ σε πενθεῖν καὶ διπλᾶ φρονεῖν* [v.ll. *φορεῖν, φέρειν*] *κακά*.

[44] Lloyd-Jones's translation 'In the face of that let Odysseus insult us who are bereft! For they no more have Ajax, but he is gone, leaving pain and weeping for me' spoils the effect by the insertion of 'us' in 971 and relegation of 'for me' to the end of 973.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Atridae against not Ajax himself, but the lamentation of his bereft companions (*γελᾷ δὲ τοῖσδε μαινομένοις ἄχεσιν*). Finally, Lobel's interpretation has the further effect of accentuating the irony of his later exchange with Agamemnon, when he is asked *οὐ γὰρ θανόντι καὶ προσεμβῆναί σε χρή;* (1348), and disclaims any wish to treat the vulnerable in this way.

Understood correctly, the three lines do not present a problem. 972–3 are paralleled by *Tr.* 40–1 *κεῖνος δ' ὅπου | βέβηκεν οὐδεὶς οἶδε· πλὴν ἐμοὶ πικρὰς | ὠδῖνας αὐτοῦ προσβαλὼν ἀποίχεται*.[45] It is conceivable that an interpolator could have used that passage as a model for his own creation here: if so, he did a good job.[46]

(vii) The sequence of thought of the passage raises two problems:

(a) As Lloyd-Jones and Wilson admit – on (ii) above – there is a break of sense between 965 and 966. In 961–5 Tecmessa describes how Ajax's enemies do not realize, for all their laughter, that they will one day miss his presence in battle. In 966–8 she explains that Ajax's death is bitter to her, sweet to them, and pleasant to him. There is no attempt to connect this with the preceding section: it comes across as a new reflection on her part which does not grow out of what she has just been saying.

Dawe (1973–8), 1.159 suggests that 'Tekmessa is … contrasting her own attitude with those of people who do not appreciate the value of what they have until they have lost it': but this forces on the *κακοὶ γνώμαισι* of 964–5, in addition to an explicit equivalence to Ajax's enemies, an additional, implicit contrast with Tecmessa. Such an interpretation is artificial. Garvie on 961–73 claims that 'the development in her thought is natural enough', before paraphrasing 'let them laugh – they will not do so for long – I suffer and they are temporarily pleased, but Ajax has got what he wanted – why then should they laugh? – they can take no credit for his death – so let Odysseus laugh if he wants to, but it is empty laughter – I am the one who suffers.' But in his third section, the word 'temporarily' is inserted to connect with 'for long' in the preceding section, although it does not correspond to anything in Sophocles' text.

(b) The purpose of 970 is obscure. 969–70 can be paraphrased 'They should not laugh at him, because it was the gods, not them, who killed him'. Such a sentiment is inconsequential: 'the other Greeks are not laughing at Ajax because they imagine they have killed him themselves' (Reeve [1973], 161). In a context describing the power of the gods and the weakness of Ajax's mortal enemies, line 970 would fit well enough. But this is not such a context – indeed, in the whole speech this is the sole mention of the divine. Garvie's summary, above, tellingly omits any reference to the gods in his paraphrase of 970.

* * *

961–5 and 971–3 are faultless verses in their metre, language and content; 966–70 fail in each of these three areas. The sheer density and variety of problems is striking, and suggests that we are dealing with something more than occasional corruption. Nauck's deletion of 966–70 seems unavoidable.[47] With the offending lines gone, the

[45] Reeve (1970), 283–6 deletes lines 43–8 of that play (after Wunder, who deleted 44–8), but see Davies on 43 ff. and 47 for an adequate defence.

[46] Burton (1980), 33 describes 972–3 as 'two lines that emphasise most poignantly her sorrow and desolation and form a fitting close to the whole dialogue'.

[47] In his 1867 edition. 'Few interpolations are so unworthy of their surroundings' (Reeve [1973], 161; cf. his comments on p. 171; he had earlier advocated this deletion at [1970], 286–7 n. 8). Before Nauck, the following groups of lines had been deleted: 969, 972–3 by Schneidewin (1849), 473–4 and in his first edition; 968–73 by Bergk (1851), 242 (writing *ἠράσθη 'τύχεν* in 967); 966–8 by Leutsch (1855), 167; 969–70 by Enger (1859), who arranged the remaining lines 971–2, 966–8 (emending 966 to *πικρὸς τέθνηκεν μᾶλλον ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

connexion between 965 and 971 is faultless: πρὸς ταῦτα refers to the maxim expressed in 964–5, with which it achieves a more effective link that with the irrelevant distinction about whether the gods or the Greeks killed Ajax in 970.

The two most recent critical editions have dealt with only part of the difficulties in this passage. Dawe (1968), 13, (1973–8), 1.161, and in his editions posits a lacuna after 966; while this solves problems (ii) and (iii) (cf. Reeve [1973], 161), it leaves (iv)–(vii) untouched. In the Oxford Classical Text, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson delete only 969; as for problems (ii)–(iii) and (v)–(vii), they either ignore them or try unsuccessfully to explain them away. Moreover, their textual choice introduces fresh difficulties. The development of thought from 968 to 970 requires 969, as Mazzoldi (1999) notes; while the explicit subject οὗτος in 970 works better if it does not come straight after 968, where Ajax is already the subject (cf. Dik [2007], 48 n. 10).

## RESPONSION

If I am right to delete 918–19 and 966–70 for the reasons set out above, Tecmessa's two speeches end up with exactly the same number of lines. Is this necessary, desirable, or of no importance? With reference to our passage, Lloyd-Jones (1978), 218 argues that 'when speeches in trimeters inside or following on a strophe and antistrophe are as long as ten or twelve lines, we are not justified in demanding that they should contain exactly the same number of lines; Aesch. *Ag.* 1412–25 and 1431–47 supply a case in point'. Let us begin by considering the Sophoclean evidence, and then relevant passages from the other tragedians.[48]

(a) *Ant.* 1261–1347 contains two strophic pairs. The first strophe and antistrophe (1261–305) consist of lyric sections followed by passages of trimeters (1270–83, 1293–305), of which the former is one line longer than the latter. But line 1301 in the latter passage is corrupt and the sense is incomplete, so most editors (e.g. Dawe, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, Griffith) accept the lacuna after this line printed by Brunck. This gives exact responsion of number and speakers, with one exception. In the first passage, Creon interrupts the Messenger's speech with a question three lines from the end (1281), whereas in the second there is no such interruption. This shows that responsion, at least in terms of speaker change, need not be exact in these iambic tailpieces.[49]

In the second strophic pair the initial lyric sections are followed by passages of trimeters (1312–16, 1334–8), which correspond exactly in number and speaker change. After a further lyric section, the strophe concludes with two trimeters from the chorus (1326–7), whereas at the end of the antistrophe come the anapaests which close the play (1347–53). These should probably be taken as a separate closing section, which means that 1326–7 do not correspond to anything: just as with *OC* 1486–90 (see (b) below) or with the trimeters at *OT* 669–77.

(b) *OC* 1447–99 contains two strophic pairs. The first strophe and antistrophe are both followed by five trimeters (1457–61, 1472–6), which correspond in speaker division (Antigone speaks the middle line, Oedipus the rest) as well as in number. The same pattern recurs at 1486–90 after the strophe of the second strophic pair. This

[48] I only discuss passages where at least four consecutive iambics trimeters are at issue: this excludes e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 203–44, 686–711, Eur. *Supp.* 990–1033.

[49] Contrast the exact responsion of speaker change in lyric, for which see my note on *El.* 1398–441 (also 1430–2) and Finglass (2009b), § II.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

time, however, there is no corresponding section after the antistrophe.[50] The effect is nevertheless one of strict responsion: the same iambic pattern occurs three times through the lyric.

(c) Aesch. *Supp.* 348–437 begins with two strophic pairs; after each lyric section, sung by the chorus, Pelasgus speaks five trimeters. After the third strophe he has another set of five trimeters; but after the third antistrophe he has a full eleven lines. Two further strophic pairs follow, where the chorus sing and Pelasgus has no part. Pelasgus then begins the next scene in iambics. The responsion is obvious, but there is a break in the third strophic pair.[51]

(d) Aesch. *Ag.* 1407–47 begins with a strophic pair; after each lyric section, sung by the chorus, Clytemnestra has a speech in trimeters. This lasts fourteen lines after the strophe, seventeen after the antistrophe. There is no reason to suppose interpolation or lacunae. From the second strophic pair onwards, Clytemnestra abandons iambic trimeters and uses anapaests.

(e) Aesch. *Eum.* 778–915 begins with a strophic pair; after each lyric section, sung by the chorus, Athena has a speech in trimeters. This lasts fourteen lines after the strophe, thirteen after the antistrophe. There is no reason to suppose interpolation or lacunae. After the second strophe, Athena has a speech lasting twenty-two lines, while after the antistrophe her speech of eleven lines leads straight into a stichomythic exchange with the chorus.

(f) [Aesch.] *PV* 574–612 contains one strophic pair; after each lyric section, sung by Io, Prometheus speaks four trimeters. His second speech leads straight into the following scene, but is properly regarded as part of the responding passage: for after it ends, Io addresses Prometheus in elaborate terms appropriate to the opening of a new section.

Only in (d) and (e) is no effort made at responsion: both involve long speeches. The passages which do respond are all four and five lines long – except in (a), where we see probable responsion in a passage of fourteen lines. This single instance from a very small sample indicates that responsion can apply to longer speeches. On the other hand, (d) and (e) show that it need not: indeed, Aeschylus appears so unconcerned about responsion in (e) that he is happy to tolerate a difference of one line between speeches, when it would not have been hard to avoid this.

(d) and (e) are uncomfortable parallels for our passage, however. The non-corresponding speeches in Aeschylus are found in the first part of a lyric, whereas Tecmessa's speeches come at the end of a strophe and antistrophe in which she has already been delivering iambic trimeters which respond. Unlike Clytemnestra and

[50] Lloyd-Jones and Wilson print a gap after Theseus' five-line speech at 1500–4, as if to indicate that this corresponds to 1486–90. But Theseus' entry marks the beginning of a new scene and thus the end of the responding section. Moreover, although (a) establishes that speaker change is flexible in such passages, it would be odd, after three occurrences of the same pattern, for the fourth instance to be so different, in terms of both speaker and speaker change.

[51] The break nevertheless gives a pattern, although it is not one of responsion: the longer speech by Pelasgus is followed by the long lyric section by the chorus, which in turn is followed by Pelasgus' major speech describing his dilemma. The exposition thus follows a crescendo pattern which would not have been possible if Pelasgus had been limited to five-line speeches throughout the lyric.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Athena, she is already established as an integral part of the epirrhematic structure.[52] On that basis, and noting the other passages which do involve responsion of iambic speeches, I believe that it is desirable for Tecmessa's speeches to show responsion. Since it is only desirable, and not necessary, it would not be appropriate to intervene textually on this basis alone. But when we have found independent grounds to doubt sections of the speeches, the fact that responsion emerges as a side effect strengthens the case against them.[53]

* * *

Several scholars have taken the view that responsion is required in our passage, but have effected in it different ways from mine (which is originally Nauck's). The first to do so was Triclinius.[54] He labels 915–24 as a 'Systema' and 961–70 as an 'Antisystema', before marking (as is his wont) the resumption of 'normal', non-responsive spoken verse with the word IAMBOI before 971; he attributes 971–3 to the chorus.[55] In this way he as it were has his cake and eats it: he gets responsion, but without deleting any lines. The first printed edition to adopt Triclinius's arrangement was that of Canter in 1579;[56] he was followed by subsequent editors, such as P. Stephanus (1603), Johnson (1705) and Vauvilliers (1781), until Brunck abandoned this presentation in 1786. A similar course to Triclinius's was advocated by Pearson (1922), 125–7 (though apparently without consulting any of these earlier editions or the metrical scholia). He gave all of 961–73 to Tecmessa, but argued that 971–3 were transitional and somehow separate from 961–70. But this approach, whether in Triclinius's version or Pearson's, is a subterfuge. πρὸς ταῦτα at 971 is a strong backward-looking connector: it demands a preceding referent. Nor is there a parallel for a single speech, all in the same metre, of which part responds with an earlier speech, and part begins a new section of the play. Transitions in Greek tragedy do not work in such a confusing manner.[57] The real point of transition is obvious: at 974, when Teucer's cry is heard. Dawe (1973–8), 1.159 rightly rejects Pearson's case.

[52] For the unity of the whole cf. Taplin (1977), 385 n. 1 'the two speeches should respond … Tecmessa enters between the choral and the dialogue part of the first strophe, which is most unusual, and effectively integrates her re-entry in the lyric structure before Teucros' arrival' and Burton (1980), 33 'The strophe and antistrophe are separated and rounded off by two iambic speeches from Tecmessa, each of which picks up and develops a theme she has just heard from the chorus … The commos from 866 to 973 is a carefully integrated piece of writing in which communication is established first between the two halves of the chorus and then between them and Tecmessa.'

[53] One further passage worth mentioning here is *Aj.* 1142–58, in which Menelaus and Teucer deliver a pair of αἶνοι. In his note on these lines, Campbell (1881) remarks: 'These two speeches are obviously antiphonal or antistrophic in a general sense, and yet the latter exceeds the former by a line. This may warn us against requiring exact antistrophic correspondence in other iambic passages, where the absence of it has occasioned doubt.' The absence of numerical correspondence is especially noteworthy because these speeches come at the end of a long section of stichomythia (1120–41), which is reprised immediately after the speeches are over (1159–62). Yet because this is a purely iambic passage, not a lyric one, I do not believe that it invalidates the tentative conclusion reached above.

[54] See Tessier (2005), 20–1 for the relevant scholia.

[55] Manuscripts XrXsZrCNOPZc attribute 969–73 to the chorus, while GR$^{ac}$J give them 923–4. Neither attribution has anything to commend it, despite the support of Dawe (1973–8), 1.157 (and in his editions) for the latter. The Aldine gives 915–24 and 961–8 to Tecmessa and 969–73 to the chorus.

[56] Cf. West (1990), 358: 'Canter was the first editor [*sc.* of a printed edition] to pay attention to lyric metre and responsion'; Diggle (1984), p. v; Pfeiffer (1976), 125.

[57] Contrast (f) above, where a new speech begins at [Aesch.] *PV* 613.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Responsion could also be achieved through Schöll's deletion of 971–3, which is accepted by Taplin and Raeburn.[58] Taplin points to the division of 915–24 and 961–70 into two parts of five lines each. But that is not a necessary characteristic of responsion, and cannot withstand the numerous linguistic problems of 966–70. Neither Taplin nor Raeburn says anything about the language of 918–19 or 966–70. Happily, Taplin's second preference appears to be for the deletion of 918–19 and 966–70.[59]

## CONCLUSION

It would be inappropriate for a textual Procrustes to chop off lines from Tecmessa's speeches (or even to add them) if lack of numerical responsion was the sole justification for the change. But when considerations of metre, language and content have pointed the way to a text which happens to achieve responsion, we may welcome the latter fact as independent support for the original deletions.

Shorn of later accretions, Tecmessa's speeches will originally have been delivered as printed below. Since they correspond in terms of the number of lines, we may imagine that the actor was accompanied by the *aulos*-player throughout;[60] perhaps a suitably mournful melody helped to bring out the sorrow and passion of Tecmessa's final words in the play.

*Τεκ.* οὗτοι θεατός· ἀλλά νιν περιπτυχεῖ
φάρει καλύψω τῷδε παμπήδην, ἐπεὶ
οὐδεὶς ἄν, ὅστις καὶ φίλος, τλαίη βλέπειν.
οἴμοι, τί δράσω; τίς σε βαστάσει φίλων;
ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ὡς ἀκμαῖ' ἄν, εἰ βαίη, μόλοι,
πεπτῶτ' ἀδελφὸν τόνδε συγκαθαρμόσαι.
ὦ δύσμορ' Αἴας, οἷος ὢν οἵως ἔχεις·
ὡς καὶ παρ' ἐχθροῖς ἄξιος θρήνων τυχεῖν.

*Τεκ.* οἱ δ' οὖν γελώντων κἀπιχαιρόντων κακοῖς
τοῖς τοῦδ'· ἴσως τοι, κεἰ βλέποντα μὴ 'πόθουν,
θανόντ' ἂν οἰμώξειαν ἐν χρείᾳ δορός.
οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ γνώμαισι τἀγαθὸν χεροῖν
ἔχοντες οὐκ ἴσασι πρίν τις ἐκβάλῃ.
πρὸς ταῦτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὑβριζέτω.
Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν· ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται.

*University of Nottingham* P. J. FINGLASS
patrick.finglass@nottingham.ac.uk

[58] Taplin (1977), 385 n. 1 'in my view Schoell was probably right to regard 971–3 as a three-line interpolation which disturbs the epirrhematic structure'; Raeburn (2008), 275 n. 67 'A further three lines (971–3) of Tecmessa's speech are omitted as another, almost certain interpolation. They spoil the symmetry of her longer iambic speeches at the end of the strophe and antistrophe.' This is strong language, especially from someone who elsewhere retains *Aj.* 433, the second part of 714, 812, 854, almost all of 839–42, and 1416. For Schöll's own justification for the deletion see n. 39.

[59] Burton (1980), 33 n. 52 remarks that 'we certainly expect her two speeches to be of equal length', but without making it clear what type of intervention he prefers.

[60] Martin West suggested this to me in conversation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, A. (1928–38), *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. Lexicographi Graeci 1 (Leipzig).
Aldine: *Sophoclis tragaediae* [sic] *septem cum commentariis* (Venice, 1502).
Barrett, W.S. (1964), *Euripides.* Hippolytos (Oxford).
—— (2007), *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism. Collected Papers*, assembled and edited by M.L. West (Oxford).
Beazley, J.D. (1963[2]), *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
—— (1971[2]), *Paralipomena: Additions to* Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters *and* Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford).
Bellermann L. (1887[4], 1889[5], 1913[6]), *Sophokles Aias* (revision of Wolff; Leipzig[4–5], Leipzig and Berlin[6]).
Bergk, T. (1851), review of Wunder's *Philoctetes* (Gotha and Erfurt, 1848), Hermann's *Ajax* and *Trachiniae* (Leipzig, 1848) and Dindorf's Sophocles (Oxford, 1849), *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 61, 227–50.
Bond, G.W. (1981), *Euripides.* Heracles (Oxford).
Bothe, F.H. (1806), *Sophoclis Tragoediae* (Leipzig and London).
Broadhead, H.D. (1960), *The* Persae *of Aeschylus* (Cambridge).
Brunck, R.F.P. (1786), *Sophoclis quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols. (Strasburg).
Budelmann, F. (2000), *The Language of Sophocles. Communality, Communication and Involvement* (Cambridge).
Burton, R.W.B. (1980), *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies* (Oxford).
Campbell, L. (1881), *Sophocles*, vol. 2 (Oxford).
Canter, W. (1579), *Sophoclis tragoediae VII* (Antwerp).
Capperonnier, J. and Vauvilliers, J.-F. (1781), *Sophoclis Tragoediae septem, cum interpretatione Latina et scholiis veteribus ac novis*, 2 vols. (Paris).
Carpenter, T.H. *et al.* (1989), *Beazley Addenda*[2] (Oxford).
Christodoulou, G.A. (1977), *Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους* (Athens).
Dain, A. and Mazon, P. (1958), *Sophocle. Tome II* (Paris).
Davies, M. (1991), *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Oxford).
Dawe, R.D. (1964), *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge).
—— (1968), 'Emendations in Sophocles', *PCPhS* NS 14, 8–18.
—— (1973–8), *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, 3 vols. (Leiden).
—— (1975–9[1], 1984–5[2], 1996[3]), *Sophoclis Tragoediae* (Leipzig[1–2], Stuttgart and Leipzig[3]).
Denniston, J.D. (1934[1], 1954[2] [rev. K. J. Dover]), *The Greek Particles* (Oxford).
—— and Page, D.L. (1957), *Aeschylus.* Agamemnon (Oxford).
Diels, H. (1951–2), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*[6], 3 vols. (rev. W. Kranz; Berlin).
Diggle, J. (1973), 'The *Supplices* of Euripides', *GRBS* 14, 241–69 (= [1994], 59–89).
—— (1981), *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford).
—— (1982), review of Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980), *CR* NS 32, 127–34.
—— (1984), *Euripidis Fabulae. Tomus I* (Oxford).
—— (1994), *Euripidea. Collected Essays* (Oxford).
Dik, H. (2007), *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford).
Ellendt, F. (1835[1], 1872[2] [rev. H. Genthe]), *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Königsberg[1], Berlin[2]).
Elmsley, P. (1814), 'Notes on the Ajax of Sophocles', *MCr* 3 and 4 (reprinted in *Museum Criticum* [Cambridge, 1826 = Bristol 2004], 1.351–69 and 469–88: for the original date see Stray [2004], 298).
Enger, R. (1859), 'Zu Sophokles', *RhM* n.F. 14, 475–8.
Finglass, P.J. (2007), *Sophocles.* Electra. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 44 (Cambridge).
—— (2009a), 'Two amputations in Sophocles', *MD* 62, 19–26.
—— (2009b), 'Sophocles' Tecmessa: characterisation and textual criticism', *Eikasmos* 20.
—— (in progress), *Sophocles.* Ajax.
Fraenkel, E.D.M. (1950), *Aeschylus.* Agamemnon, 3 vols. (Oxford).
Friis Johansen, H. and Whittle, E.W. (1980), *Aeschylus.* The Suppliants, 3 vols. (Copenhagen).
Furley, D.J. and Wilkie, J.S. (1984), *Galen on Respiration and the Arteries. An Edition with English translation of* De usu respirationis, An in arteriis natura sanguis contineatur, De usu pulsuum, *and* De causis respirationis (Princeton).
Garvie, A.F. (1998), *Sophocles.* Ajax (Warminster).
—— (2009), *Aeschylus.* Persae (Oxford).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Geymonat, M. (1974), *Scholia in Nicandri Alexipharmaka cum glossis*. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 48 (Milan).
Griffith, M. (1999), *Sophocles.* Antigone (Cambridge).
Harris, C.R.S. (1973), *The Heart and the Vascular System in Ancient Greek Medicine. From Alcmaeon to Galen* (Oxford).
Headlam, W.G. (1902), 'Transposition of words in MSS', *CR* 16, 243–56.
—— (1922), *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*, ed. A.D. Knox (Cambridge).
Hermann, J.G.J. (1817[1], 1825[2], 1848[3], 1851[4]), *Sophoclis Aiax* (Leipzig).
Holford-Strevens, L. (1999), 'Sophocles at Rome', in J. Griffin (ed.), *Sophocles Revisited. Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford), 219–59.
Jebb, R.C. (1894), *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments. Part VI:* The Electra (Cambridge).
—— (1896), *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments. Part VII:* Ajax (Cambridge).
Johnson, T. (1705), *Sophoclis Tragoediae, Ajax et Electra* (Oxford).
Kamerbeek, J.C. (1953[1], 1963[2]), *The Plays of Sophocles. Part I. The* Ajax (Leiden).
Kannicht, R. and Snell, B. (1981), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 2. Fragmenta Adespota* (Göttingen).
Kovacs, P.D. (1994–2002), *Euripides*, 6 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
Kretschmer, P.W. (1894), *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften, ihrer Sprache nach untersucht* (Gütersloh).
Kühner, R. (1898–1904[2]), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, 2 vols., rev. B. Gerth (Hannover and Leipzig).
Leutsch, E. van (1855), review of T. Mitchell (ed.), *The Tragedies of Sophocles*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1844), *GGA*, 161–83.
Lloyd-Jones, P.H.J. (1971), review of J. Diggle, *Euripides.* Phaethon (Cambridge, 1970), *CR* NS 21, 341–5 (= [1990], 452–7).
—— (1978), review of Dawe (1975–9), vol. 1, (1973–8), vols. 1–2 and A. Colonna, *Sophocles. Fabulae I* (Turin, 1975), *CR* NS 28, 214–21.
—— (1990), *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
—— (1994, rev. 1997), *Sophocles.* Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Tyrannus (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
—— and Wilson, N.G. (1990), *Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford).
—— —— (1990, 1992 [rev.]), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford).
—— —— (1997), *Sophocles. Second Thoughts*. Hypomnemata 100 (Göttingen).
Lobeck, C.A. (1835[2], 1866[3]), *Sophoclis Aiax* (Leipzig[2], Berlin[3]).
Maas, P. (1923[1], 1929[2]), *Griechische Metrik* (Leipzig and Berlin).
—— (1962), *Greek Metre*, tr. P.H.J. Lloyd-Jones (Oxford).
Mazon: see Dain and Mazon.
Mazzoldi, S. and Ciani, M.G. (1999), *Sofocle. Aiace* (Venice).
Meineke, J.A.F.A. (1861), *Beiträge zur philologischen Kritik der Antigone des Sophokles* (Berlin).
—— (1863), *Analecta Sophoclea* (in an appendix to his edition of the *OC*) (Berlin).
Moorhouse, A.C. (1982), *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden).
Nauck, J.A. (1860[4]), *Sophokles. Erstes Baendchen: Allgemeine Einleitung. Aias. Philoktetes* (Berlin).
—— (1867), *Sophoclis Tragoediae* (Berlin).
—— (1877[7] [non vidi], 1882[8]), *Sophokles. Erstes Baendchen: Allgemeine Einleitung. Aias.* (Berlin).
Olson, S.D. (2002), *Aristophanes.* Acharnians (Oxford).
Page, D.L. (1938), *Euripides.* Medea (Oxford).
—— (1972), *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae* (Oxford).
Pantazides, I. (1872), *Κριτικὰ καὶ Ἑρμηνευτικά*, *Ἀθήναιον* 1.401–22 (pp. 409–22 are mistakenly numbered 469–82).
Pearson, A.C. (1919), 'Some glosses in the text of Sophocles', *CQ* 13, 118–26.
—— (1922), 'Sophocles, Ajax, 961–973', *CQ* 16, 124–36.
—— (1924), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford).
Pfeiffer, R. (1976), *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford).
Piderit, K.W. (1855), 'Zu Sophokles', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 71 = *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 1, 168–76.
Porson, R. (1797[1], 1802[2]), *Euripidis Hecuba* (London[1], Cambridge[2]).
Radt, S.L. (1977[1], 1999[2]), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 4. Sophocles* (Göttingen).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

—— (1985), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 3. Aeschylus* (Göttingen).
Raeburn, D.A. (2008), Electra *and Other Plays* (London).
Reeve, M.D. (1970), 'Some interpolations in Sophocles', *GRBS* 11, 283–93.
—— (1973), 'Interpolation in Greek tragedy, III', *GRBS* 14, 145–71.
Reiske, J.J. (1753), *Animadversiones ad Sophoclem* (Leipzig).
Sandin, P. (2003, 2005 [rev.]), *Aeschylus' Supplices. Introduction and Commentary on vv. 1–523* (Göteborg[1], Lund[2]).
Schneidewin, F.W. (1849), 'Sophokleische Studien', *Philologus* 4, 450–77.
—— (1849[1]. 1853[2]. 1855[3]), *Sophokles. Erstes Baendchen: Aias. Philoktetes* (Leipzig[1–2], Berlin[3]).
Schöll, A. (1842), *Sophokles Aias* (Berlin).
Shilleto, R. (1859), 'Aristophanes', *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* 4.12, 308–17.
Sommerstein, A.H. (2008), *Aeschylus*, 3 vols. LCL 145, 146, 505 (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
Stallbaum, G. (1825–6), *Eustathii, Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols. (Leipzig) (copy of the Rome 1549 edition; reprinted Hildesheim, 1960).
Stanford, W.B. (1963), *Sophocles.* Ajax (London and New York).
Stephanus, H. (1568), *Sophoclis tragoediae septem* (Geneva).
Stephanus, P. (1603), *Sophoclis tragoediae septem* (Geneva).
Stray, C. (2004), 'From one Museum to another: the Museum Criticum (1813–26) and the Philological Museum (1831–33)', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 37, 289–314.
Taplin, O.P. (1977), *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
Tessier, A. (2005), *Scolii metrici alla tetrade sofoclea*. Hellenica 16 (Alessandria).
Thompson, E.M. and Jebb, R.C. (1885), *Facsimile of the Laurentian Manuscript of Sophocles* (London).
Turyn, A. (1952), *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* (Urbana).
Valk, M. van der (1971–87), *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, 4 vols. (Leiden).
Vauvilliers: see Capperonnier and Vauvilliers.
Wackernagel, J. (1926–8), *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, 2 vols. (Basel).
—— (2009), *Lectures on Syntax with special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*, tr. D.R. Langslow (Oxford).
Wakefield, G. (1790), *Silva Critica: sive in auctores sacros profanosque commentarius philologus*, vol. 2 (Cambridge).
West, M.L. (1977), review of Dawe, *Studies* vols. 1–2, *CPh* 72, 264–7.
—— (1978), 'Tragica II', *BICS* 25, 106–22.
—— (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
—— (1990), *Studies in Aeschylus*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 1 (Stuttgart).
—— (1990, 1998 [rev.]), *Aeschylus. Tragoediae* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
Wolff, G.A. (1858[1], 1867[2]), *Sophokles Aias* (Leipzig).
Wunder, E. (1837[1], 1845[2], 1857[3]), *Sophoclis Tragoediae. Vol. II. Sect. II. continens Aiacem* (Gotha and Erfurt[1,3], Gotha[2]).
Ziel, E. (1846), *De asyndeto apud Sophoclem* (Progr. Celle).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990036 Published online by Cambridge University Press