



Finglass, P. J. (2009). Orthographica Sophoclea. *Philologus*, 153(2), 206-228. <https://doi.org/10.1524/phil.2009.0016>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1524/phil.2009.0016](https://doi.org/10.1524/phil.2009.0016)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via De Gruyter at <https://doi.org/10.1524/phil.2009.0016>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

## ORTHOGRAPHICA SOPHOCLEA

The following notes originate in my recent work on an edition of Sophocles' *Ajax*. They contain discussions of orthographical questions which require more detailed discussion than can be accommodated even within the generous limits of the 'Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries' series. Most are relevant to Sophocles as a whole, not just this one play; and several have implications for editorial method too.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. ὤμοι or ὄμοι?

---

I am grateful to Professor M. L. West and the Editors of *Philologus* for helpful comments.

<sup>1</sup> I cite Sophoclean manuscript readings from the following sources. L from facsimile (Thompson and Jebb 1885); Λ from Scheltema (1949), supplemented by Scheltema's notes in the University Library at Leiden (Lugd. Bat. Gr. 60A II); K from a microfilm lent me by Nigel Wilson; A from Bodley MS Film 1866; R from Bodley MSS Film 1871 (*Ant.*) and 1873 (the other plays, excluding *Tr.*); C from Bodley MS Film 1867; F from Bodley MS Film 1858; Zf from Bodley MS Film 1869; other manuscripts from Dawe's edition. The microfilms were deposited in the Bodleian library by Roger Dawe via Nigel Wilson. Collations of all these manuscripts (excluding KUY) for the triad are found in Dawe (1973-8) II, but orthographical points are not all consistently signalled in that work. Hence wherever possible I have preferred to rely on my own collations. Throughout symbols for Sophoclean manuscripts are those of Turyn (1952), while my line numeration is based on Brunck (1786) except for *Electra*, where I use the numeration in my own edition (editions of the other plays which I hope to publish will use Brunck's numeration). Some of the questions which I discuss (e.g. §6) are not strictly orthographical in a narrow sense of the term, but since they all require the same kind of analysis it is sensible to consider them together under this heading.

Across the seven plays, there are twenty-five<sup>2</sup> places where this word for ‘alas’ is well-attested with an omega.<sup>3</sup> Lloyd-Jones and Wilson in the Oxford Classical Text<sup>4</sup> print ὦμοι twenty times, οἴμοι five times, ὦμοι never.<sup>5</sup> Of these twenty-five instances, there is an entry in the apparatus for eight; among these eight, evidence for the form ὦμοι<sup>6</sup> is given in four.<sup>7</sup> A reader may reasonably conclude that ὦμοι enjoys some manuscript support (at least among the

---

<sup>2</sup> I disregard the following instances, where modern editors adopt Triclinius’s ὦμοι in place of transmitted ἰώ μοι: *Aj.* 609/10, 900, 901, 908/9, *Ant.* 1265, *OC* 519a, 1712/13. I also disregard the following cases, where οἴμοι is corrupted into ὦμοι in a few manuscripts (given in brackets): *Aj.* 791 (V), 1002 (GR), *Tr.* 986 (Zgt), *Phil.* 788 (GR). I do include cases where οἴμοι is the majority reading when ὦμοι is found in L or K, as the oldest and most important complete manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> The Attic alphabet represented long and short o by O, and so both ὦμοι and οἴμοι would have appeared as OIMOI in that script. But the Ionic alphabet was already frequently used in private inscriptions well before its official adoption by the Athenian state in 403/2 (see Thraette (1980) I 33-45, who identifies c. 480-430 as the period of transition). We should presume that Sophocles distinguished the vowels in his script. As a result, it is possible that our manuscripts, which ultimately descend from what Sophocles wrote, reflect his spelling. Since it would be easy for Sophocles’ original orthography to be corrupted in the course of transmission, we would do well not to have to rely on manuscripts alone when deciding what to print. But they provide at least a starting point, which it is important to get right, even if we end by rejecting their testimony.

<sup>4</sup> Henceforth LI-J/W, OCT.

<sup>5</sup> ὦμοι: *Aj.* 227/8, 233, 340, 946, 980, 1205/6, *El.* 1415, 1416, *Ant.* 1317, 1341, *Phil.* 796, 934, 1086, 1229, 1265, *OC* 202, 213, 216, 529, 982. οἴμοι: *Aj.* 367, *Tr.* 971, 972/2, 1241, *OC* 820.

<sup>6</sup> LI-J/W cite the reading as ὦιμοι rather than ὦμοι, although elsewhere in their text and apparatus they prefer iota subscript.

<sup>7</sup> *Aj.* 228/9 (L), 367 (L), and *Tr.* 971 and 972/3 (LUY). The other apparatus entries refer to the forms ὦμοι and οἴμοι (*Tr.* 1241, *Phil.* 1086, *OC* 820), or cite a γράφεται variant ἰώ μοι (*Aj.* 946).

manuscripts regularly cited in the OCT) in a mere 16% of cases (four out of twenty-five, two of which are in consecutive lines).

I have checked the twenty-five instances in the manuscripts L, K, A, and R, and the nine instances which occur in the triad in the manuscripts C and F (which contain only those plays).<sup>8</sup> It turns out that ᾠμοί is far better attested than the OCT leads us to believe. Below I list the twenty-five instances and the manuscripts offering ᾠμοί in each case.

*Aj.* 227/8 LK  
233 LKC  
340 LKA  
367 LZc<sup>9</sup>  
946 LK  
980 L  
1205/6 LKA  
*El.* 1415 K  
1416 none  
*Ant.* 1317 LA  
1341 LA  
*Tr.* 971 LKAUY  
972/3 LKAUY

---

<sup>8</sup> None of these instances overlaps with any Sophoclean papyri.

<sup>9</sup> Other manuscripts here have οἴμοι, not ᾠμοί.

1241 K<sup>10</sup>  
*Phil.* 796 L  
 934 LK  
 1086 L  
 1229 LKA  
 1265 LK  
*OC* 202 LKA  
 213 L<sup>11</sup>  
 216 LK  
 529 LAK  
 820 LKAY  
 982 LA

L has ᾠμοί in twenty-two cases (88%), ᾠμοί in only three (12%): the opposite of the picture presented by the OCT. K has ᾠμοί sixteen times out of twenty-four (67%), while it appears in A eight times out of twenty-five (32%). C has only one instance out of nine (11%); R and F have none. In only one of the twenty-five cases is ᾠμοί absent from all these manuscripts.

The information provided in the OCT is thus misleading. But other recent editors have hardly done much better. In his apparatus Dawe cites evidence for ᾠμοί in only 6 cases (24%),<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> L has ᾠμοί here, other manuscripts οἴμοι.

<sup>11</sup> K has a small lacuna here and is missing this word.

<sup>12</sup> *Aj.* 227/8, 367, *Tr.* 971, 972/3, 1241, *OC* 820.

even though he recorded four more in his collations of the triad;<sup>13</sup> while my own edition of *Electra* fails to cite the evidence provided by K at *El.* 1415, despite my claim in the introduction (p. 15) to cite this manuscript regularly throughout. The key virtue which an orthographical question of this kind demands is consistency, and editors can satisfy this demand in one of two ways: by either (i) recording the evidence for ᾠμοι and ᾠμοι in the apparatus in every place where the word occurs or (ii) making it clear in the introduction that one of these forms will be printed throughout, and then refraining from mentioning any such discrepancies in the apparatus.<sup>14</sup> Problems begin when manuscripts are cited erratically, since the reader will then, reasonably enough, assume that the absence of an entry in the apparatus means that the tradition is unanimous. We will encounter this difficulty throughout this article.<sup>15</sup>

So much for the apparatus: what should we put in the text? The manuscript evidence cited above is especially significant, despite the ease with which iotas can be inserted or omitted

---

<sup>13</sup> Dawe (1973-9) II: *Aj.* 233, 340, 946, 980.

<sup>14</sup> Ll-J/W do make a statement on orthography in their introduction, as follows (pp. xiii-xiv): ‘For some other orthographic questions we have followed the paradosis or the better representatives of the tradition even at the expense of appearing to be inconsistent.’ This suggests that where no information is given to the contrary, the editors are following a unanimous (or at least overwhelming) manuscript tradition.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the inconsistency noted by Kopff (1993) 157 in his review of the OCT: ‘In four places the editors report the manuscript spelling οἰκτεῖρω (*Ph.* 169, *Tr.* 1070, *OC* 109) and ἐποικτεῖρειν (*Ph.* 318), falsely implying that the manuscripts give the correct spelling in the other places (twelve and eight, respectively) where they appear.’

Similiary Gerber (1985) 8 (after surveying similar inconsistencies in the Teubner text of Pindar): ‘Such inconsistencies are misleading, since they prompt the reader to assume that if nothing is said in the apparatus, the text printed must be that of the MSS.’

in error, because of the readings taken from L and K. The former manuscript, our oldest and best complete source for the text of Sophocles, often appears particularly reliable in orthographical matters, preserving data (presumably through access to a particularly good grammatical tradition) which other manuscripts have lost.<sup>16</sup> K is our second-oldest and second-best complete source, and provides an independent witness to the part of the *paradosis* which is best represented by L: it thus sometimes preserves what we presume is an older reading that L has lost.<sup>17</sup> Their combined testimony, assisted by further evidence from later manuscripts, provides an initial presumption in favour of  $\zeta\mu\omicron\iota$ .

A similar picture emerges from the manuscript traditions of other Greek poets:<sup>18</sup>

(i) In Aeschylus the word occurs six times.  $\zeta\mu\omicron\iota$  is found in M at *Pers.* 253, and in Ba at *Sept.* 655, but in no manuscripts at *Ag.* 1343, 1345, 1494 = 1518, *PV* 980. M in Aeschylus is the same manuscript as L in Sophocles (alternatively ‘Medicean’ and ‘Laurentian’), with the same importance in orthographical matters,<sup>19</sup> so its support for  $\zeta\mu\omicron\iota$  is especially welcome;<sup>20</sup> West

---

<sup>16</sup> See my notes on Pind. *P.* 11.35 and Soph. *Aj.* 101.

<sup>17</sup> For the importance of K for the text of Sophocles see Finglass (2008).

<sup>18</sup> For these authors I have not checked manuscripts myself and rely on editions as indicated. I have, however, checked all relevant references in the following facsimiles: Rostagno (1896) for M in Aeschylus, Spranger (1938) for B in Euripides, White and Allen (1902) for V in Aristophanes, van Leeuwen (1903) for R in Aristophanes, Comparetti (1901) for A in Homer.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. West (1990) 322: ‘M preserves ancient spellings which have become modernized or vulgarized in the rest of the tradition’, with examples.

<sup>20</sup> Most editors nevertheless fail to record it, Wilamowitz and West being honourable exceptions.

generalises ᾠμοί throughout his text.<sup>21</sup> The absence of ᾠμοί from four of the instances is less significant than at first appears, since three of them come from that portion of *Agamemnon* which has survived in only the Triclinian recension (manuscripts FGT).

(ii) From the editions of Diggle and Kannicht I count 34 examples in Euripides of ᾠμοί where ᾠμοί is not mentioned in the apparatus.<sup>22</sup> In five cases ᾠμοί is found in some manuscripts: *Med.* 1399 (unspecified manuscripts), *Hipp.* 817 (BOA), 844 (OA), *Phoen.* 1493-4 (BO), 1551-2 (BOR). B and O are two of the oldest Euripidean manuscripts: the former is ‘11<sup>th</sup> century, or even late 10<sup>th</sup>’ (Diggle (1991) 5), the latter (the same manuscript as K for Sophocles) is from the late 12<sup>th</sup> century (see Finglass (2008) n. 4). A (the same manuscript as A for Sophocles) is from c. 1300, R from the middle or late 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>23</sup>

(iii) An anonymous tragic fragment (fr. 656.20 Kannicht–Snell, from a papyrus of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.) reads ᾠμοί.

---

<sup>21</sup> In support of his decision, West (1990), liii cites *CEG* II 718.1 Hansen (Giza, before 300 B.C.?) and Sappho fr. 94.4 Voigt (P. Berol. 9722, 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> c. A.D.), as well as *Et. Mag.* 822.33 Gaisford. At (1997) 263 n. 143 he supplements this by referring to the evidence of ‘the best manuscript of ... Sophocles’ (i.e. L) at *Aj.* 227, 367, and *OC* 820.

<sup>22</sup> Again (see n. 2), I disregard the following instances, where ᾠμοί is the result of emendation of e.g. ἰώ μοι: *Her.* 1065, *Tro.* 251, *Ion* 1473, *Hel.* 540.

<sup>23</sup> Diggle (1991) 7, 9. For the significance of these manuscripts in *Hippolytus* and *Phoenissae* see respectively Barrett (1964) 63-8, Mastronarde and Bremer (1982) 1, 3-4, 8-9.



(iv) The word is much rarer in comedy, which overwhelmingly prefers οἴμοι, but it is found six times: ᾠμοι in R at *Nub.* 925 (*bis*), 1473 (where V has οἴμοι in all three), and *Thesm.* 222, while ᾠμοι is the reading of the papyrus of the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries A.D. which contains Ar. fr. 591.67 Kassel-Austin, and is also found in RV at *Nub.* 1462.

(v) Homer uses the word seventeen times in the *Iliad*.<sup>24</sup> Papyri generally read ᾠμοι, though there are three examples of ᾠμοι.<sup>25</sup> In the mediaeval manuscripts, ᾠμοι is twice the majority reading.<sup>26</sup> Of the remaining fifteen instances, fourteen show ᾠμοι in the tenth-century manuscript A,<sup>27</sup> whose excellence in preserving ancient orthography is well recognised.<sup>28</sup> All fifteen examples show ᾠμοι in some of the oldest Homeric manuscripts, from the tenth (D), eleventh (CBET), and twelfth (W) centuries. The oldest mediaeval manuscript, which only survives in part, happily coincides with one of our instances and reads ᾠμοι.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> I have not examined the *Odyssey* because we lack a modern edition which gives the necessary details.

<sup>25</sup> *Il.* 17.91 P. Berol. 16007 (1<sup>st</sup> c. B.C./A.D.; see Poethke (1998) 10), 18.54 (*prius*) P. Bibl. Brit. Inv. 107 (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> c. A.D.), after correction, 18.54 (*alterum*) the unedited and undated papyrus P. Oxy. inv. 70/3(d) (1424 in West's numeration).

<sup>26</sup> 24.201, 24.255.

<sup>27</sup> 1.149, 1.414, 4.370, 7.96, 8.152, 11.404, 16.433, 17.91, 18.6, 18.18, 18.54 (*bis*), 21.553, 22.99. The remaining example is 16.49.

<sup>28</sup> West (2001) 139-40 describes its text as 'meticulously corrected, with careful attention to orthography and accentuation'.

<sup>29</sup> *Il.* 4.370. For this manuscript see Politis (1980) and Apthorp (1999).

In the above authors, we find that especially old and reliable manuscripts are usually more likely to read ὦμοι.<sup>30</sup> This strengthens considerably the presumption in favour of this form which we had formed above on the basis of the Sophoclean evidence.

The ancient grammarians are aware of the form ὦμοι, but offer us nothing to guide our decision as to what to print. Indeed, some of their own discussions appear to be afflicted by corruption, and it is not always clear whether they are describing ὦμοι or ὠμοι. The relevant passages are as follows:

(i) *Et. Mag.* 822.33-8 Gaisford ὦμοι· ἔστιν ἀναφώνημα λύπης δηλωτικόν. ἐκ τοῦ οἴμοι, κατὰ ἕκτασιν τοῦ ο εἰς ω, ὦμοι.<sup>31</sup> εἴρηται γὰρ καὶ οἴμοι δι' ἑνὸς μ.<sup>32</sup> εἰ δὲ γράφεται χωρὶς τοῦ ι, γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ω, ὠμοι. τὸ δὲ ὦ, σχετλιαστικόν ἐστίν ἐπίρρημα· ὅπερ καὶ εἰς α συστέλλεται ὡς τὸ, ἄ δειλέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ ἄθλιε. τοίνυν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὦ κατ' ἐπέκτασιν.

(ii) *Et. Mag.* 618.11-16 Gaisford οἰμῶζειν· τὸ θρηνεῖν· παρὰ τὸ οἴμοι θρηνητικὸν ἐπίρρημα. ἢ ἔστιν ὦ, σχετλιαστικὸν ἐπίρρημα· ὅθεν τὸ ὠμοι· ὅπερ οὐκ ἔχει

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. West in West and Latacz (2000) xv: 'ὦι μοι (statt ὠ μοι, ὠμοι) ... steht noch in den besten mittelalterlichen Handschriften von Homer, Aischylos und Sophokles.'

<sup>31</sup> The explanation given here suggests that the word being discussed is ὦμοι, as Reisig (1820) cxvii saw; yet Gaisford prints ὠμοι, the transmitted reading, here and in the lemma.

<sup>32</sup> This needs to be specified because as early as the Septuagint οἴμοι is sometimes written with a double mu.

προσγεγραμμένον τὸ ἰῶτα. ἐκ γοῦν τοῦ ὦμοι ἐπιρρήματος γίνεται καθ' ὑπερβιβασμὸν οἰμῶζω· ὁ παρατακτικὸς, οἰμῶζον καὶ ὦμωζον, διαφορεῖται.

(iii) *Et. Gud.* 578.34-8 Sturz (~ Orion 171.4-7 Sturz) ὦμοι, παρὰ οἴμοι, σχετλιαστικὸν ἐπίρρημα, τροπῆ τοῦ ο εἰς ω, ὦμοι· οὐ γὰρ, ὡς τινές, ὦ ἐμοί ἐστι, καὶ συναλοιφῆ ὦμοι· πῶς γὰρ τῆ δοτικῆ ἐπιφέρεται εὐθεία; ὦμοι ἐγώ τι πάθω· τὸ δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ ἰῶτα, ἀπὸ τοῦ ω σχετλιαστικοῦ, κατ' ἐπέκτασιν τοῦ μοι.<sup>33</sup>

(iv) *Lexicon Messanense* 283v.22-5 (p. 314 Rabe) ὦμωγμένον σὺν τῷ ι· οἰμῶζω γάρ. Εὐριπίδης Βάκχαις [καὶ ὦ]μοι· [π]αρ[ὰ γὰρ] τὸ οἴμοι. τὸ δὲ ὦμοι, [ὃ γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὦ,] οὐκ ἔχει· οὐδ[ὲ] γὰρ οἰμωκτικὸν ἐν[ ] ὦμοι [ἀ]λλ[ὰ] ἠθικῶ[ς] κεῖται τὸ μοι.

The best we can say is that the grammarians were aware of the form ὦμοι and were no more able to account for its existence alongside ὦμοι than we are. They could be right to see it as a longer form of οἴμοι. This word is not found in Homer, and indeed is not attested until some inscriptions of the sixth century (cf. Renehan (1975) 147). The manuscripts of Theognis vary between οἴμοι and ὦμοι (cf. 527, 891, 1107, 1318a), though the principle *utrum in alterum* suggests that οἴμοι is an intruder here, and West (in *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*) is probably right to

---

<sup>33</sup> Again, the mention of lengthening the omicron of οἴμοι, with no reference to the removal of an iota, suggests that the discussion begins with ὦμοι, not ὦμοι. This seems to be confirmed by τὸ δὲ χωρὶς, which appears to signal the move to new word (ὦμοι). On the other hand, the reference to the derivation from ὦ + ἐμοί suggests that ὦμοι may be at issue.

reject it. Apart from that, we do not encounter it until Aeschylus. οἴμοι might be a shorter form of ᾠμοι,<sup>34</sup> though this is hardly certain, and both may be early. Whatever their origins, οἴμοι appears to have edged out ᾠμοι, which became fossilised and increasingly vulnerable to the alternative ᾠμοι, a form which could have arisen at any time as a combination of the interjection ᾠ with the ethic dative of the personal pronoun. Whether or not the above scenario is correct, it is much harder to imagine a convincing account in which original ᾠμοι was corrupted to οἴμοι. Interference from οἴμοι will hardly do as an explanation: the ᾠ in ᾠμοι was easily recognisable as an exclamatory particle, so there would have been no temptation to assimilate it to the οἴ in οἴμοι.

Editions up to about 1800 generally print ᾠμοι throughout.<sup>35</sup> But in his edition of 1805/6,<sup>36</sup> Elmsley prints οἴμοι throughout; in 1814 he comments ‘We prefer οἴμοι to ᾠμοι, which we wish to see entirely banished from Attic poetry’.<sup>37</sup> Four years later Blomfield noted on Aesch. *Ag.* 1314 (where he read ᾠμοι) ‘Stephanus ᾠμοι. Recentiores ᾠμοι vel ᾠμοι. Sed nescio unde adscitum sit iota. Vel scribendum οἴμοι, vel ᾠμοι.’ But Reisig (1820) cxvii and (1823) 117 rejects Blomfield’s case, pointing out that at *OC* 820 ᾠμοι ‘in antiquis exemplaribus

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. West (1997) 263 n. 143: ‘The later form οἴμοι is presumably derived from it by shortening of the long diphthong.’

<sup>35</sup> Many of these early editions print the first letter of each line as a capital, which causes them to omit the iota subscript of line-initial ᾠμοι. Since they print ᾠμοι elsewhere, we can assume that ᾠμοι stands for ᾠμοι.

<sup>36</sup> On this see Finglass (2007b).

<sup>37</sup> Elmsley (1814b) 471, on *Aj.* 900; he repeats this sentiment on *OC* 820.

legitur'. The evidence assembled above shows that Reisig's assessment of the manuscript evidence should be preferred to Blomfield's. As for Elmsley, he does not explain the reason for his generalisation of οἴμοι, and so we may reject it as an arbitrary decision.<sup>38</sup>

The evidence of the manuscripts, both of Sophocles and other poets, together with the probable antiquity of the form, lead me to generalise ᾠμοι throughout Sophocles. I do not understand why modern editors have preferred ᾠμοι; nor why they have suppressed all, or almost all, of the evidence for ᾠμοι.<sup>39</sup>

## 2. εἶς or ἔς?

Both εἶς and ἔς derive from \*ένς, which, after compensatory lengthening caused by the loss of the nasal, became either εἶς (if the following word began with a vowel) or ἔς (if it began with a consonant). Attic generalised the former, Ionic the latter (cf. Willi (2003) 234). In comedy

---

<sup>38</sup> For the distinction between ᾠμοι and οἴμοι cf. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 799 'In the mss. of Eur. and Soph. οἴμοι (vernacular Attic) is much the commoner, with ᾠμοι (literary) showing a preference for lyric passages' and Austin and Olson on Ar. *Thesm.* 222-3 'ᾠμοι or ᾠμοι appears to be the high poetic form of the word, whereas ... οἴμοι is colloquial Attic'.

<sup>39</sup> ᾠμοι provides a better parallel for comparable Near Eastern forms, cited by West (1997), 263. On the possibility of a connexion here he writes (p. 262): 'horizontal influence between neighbour languages may have been as important as ancient inheritance ... It is therefore entirely possible in principle that some Greek interjections should show correspondences with Semitic ones, whether because they came into Greek from a semitic language or because both derived them from an East Mediterranean substrate.'

we find only εἶς, except in fossilised expressions and paratragic passages.<sup>40</sup> In tragedy there are metrically guaranteed cases of both forms: in Sophocles, εἶς occurs sixty-three times, ἕς thirteen times.<sup>41</sup> But what do we print when an instance is not secured by the metre? And how should editors present the reasons for their decisions?

Let us again begin with the manuscripts. There are so many instances of εἶς and ἕς that it makes sense to concentrate on a single play. In *Ajax* there are sixteen places where either would

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Bachmann (1878) 87-8, Willi (2003) 234-5. Similarly, comic poets do not use εἶσ- in compounds (cf. Austin (1973b) 133, citing Sobolewski (1890) 35) or ἕσσω (Elmsley (1814) 180, on Ar. *Lys.* 1053/4, a corrupt lyric passage where ἕσσω is transmitted). Henderson on *ibid.* 1050-4 claims that they do; but of the passages he cites, Soph. *Aj.* 105 is from tragedy and therefore irrelevant, while Hermippus fr. 8.1 Kassel–Austin, Phrynichus fr. 1.1 K–A, and Eubulus fr. 39 K–A = 40 Hunter are all from irremediably corrupt passages. Henderson misses Men. *Kolax* fr. 163.19 Austin ἕσσω, which has not yet been edited as part of *Poetae Comici Graeci*; in their note on Eubulus fr. 39, Kassel and Austin advocate emending it to ε<ι>σσω. As for the *Lysistrata* passage itself, Henderson is joined by Sommerstein and Wilson in printing ἕσσω (thus Coulon, for transmitted πολλ' ἕσσω). Sommerstein comments ‘This word is not otherwise securely attested in comedy (which regularly uses *endon* in this sense), but its meaning fits the context well and no plausible emendation of it has been preserved.’ But given that we know from the metre that the text is corrupt here, we should not print a text which simultaneously involves morphology and semantics which are unparalleled for comedy.

<sup>41</sup> εἶς: *Aj.* 37, 60, 79, 149 (anap.), 399/400 (lyr.), 514, 876, 1018, 1138, 1254, *El.* 24, 215 (lyr.), 374, 436, 454, 598, 606, 835 (lyr.), 1393 (lyr.), *OR* 62, 222, 430, 519, 706, 719, 744, 847, 876/7 (lyr.), 1010, 1137, 1138, 1146, 1254, 1372, 1489, *Ant.* 226, 340/1 (lyr.), 1110, *Tr.* 4, 20, 489, *Phil.* 83, 98, 490, 522, 623, 716 (lyr.), 748, 826, 1076, 1309, 1349, 1403 (troch.), *OC* 577, 968, 1195, 1297, fr. 271.3 (anap.), 314.280, 378.4, 583.10, 811, 844.1 Radt.  
 ἕς: *Aj.* 1168, *El.* 14, *OR* 50, 320, *Ant.* 307, *Tr.* 697, *Phil.* 311, 1211 (lyr.), *OC* 1424, fr. 271.5 (anap.), 583.6, 593.2 (lyr.), 837.3 Radt. Cf. Ellendt–Genthe (1872) 213: ‘Certum est igitur, quibus propter metrum opus sit forma productiore, *triplo plura* esse exempla, quam quibus brevioris formae usus sit’.

fit the metre.<sup>42</sup> LI-J/W print εἶς twice (1006, 1083), ἐς fourteen times. Three times they accompany their editorial decision with a note in the apparatus (1006, 1083, 1285): the implication is that for the other thirteen cases, the manuscripts unanimously attest ἐς. I have examined the manuscripts LKARCF for these sixteen cases.<sup>43</sup> They yield the following data:

Unanimous εἶς nine times (63, 128, 437, 729, 751, 1090, 1109, 1249, 1278)

Unanimous ἐς four times (305, 679, 680, 1185)

Divided testimony three times (1006 εἶς LKAC, ἦ RF; 1083 εἶς LKARC, ἐς F; 1285 ἐς LKACF, εἶς R); of these, one (1006) is the result of textual error rather than orthographical variation.

There are also two places where εἶσ–/ἐς– occurs as a preverb where it is not guaranteed by the metre (55, 260): LI-J/W print εἶσ– in both these cases with no comment in the apparatus.

From the manuscripts we learn the following:

Unanimous εἶσ– once (55)

Divided testimony once (260 εἶσ– RC, ἐσ– LKAF)

---

<sup>42</sup> *Aj.* 63, 128, 305, 437, 679, 680, 729, 751, 1006, 1083, 1090, 1109, 1185, 1249, 1278, 1285.

<sup>43</sup> Dawe (1973-8) II does provide evidence for this orthographical point for all these manuscripts (except K) and more. I have preferred to cite only manuscripts which I have checked myself, although the picture is not changed if we include more.

I have also examined the evidence of the same manuscripts for εἶσῶ/ἔσῶ across all seven plays, a word which occurs ten times, excluding several metrically secure instances of both. The results are below. L1-J/W print εἶσῶ seven times (*El.* 1337, *OR* 461, *Tr.* 202, 492, 693, 900, *OC* 18), ἔσῶ three times (*Aj.* 296, 685, *Ant.* 491). They have one comment in the apparatus, at *Aj.* 685, where they note that εἶσῶ has minority support. The manuscripts give the following picture:

Unanimous εἶσῶ six times (*OR* 461, *Tr.* 202, 492, 693, 900, *OC* 18)

Unanimous ἔσῶ twice (*Aj.* 296, *Ant.* 491)

Divided testimony twice (*Aj.* 685 εἶσῶ A, ἔσῶ LKRCF; *El.* 1337 εἶσῶ LKARC, ἔσῶ F)

With εἶσῶ/ἔσῶ L1-J/W follow the manuscripts, and provide information in the apparatus when these are divided.<sup>44</sup> With εἶς/ἔς and εἶσ–/ἔσ– they do not, but I do not know what alternative principle they adhere to, or why they give information about some of their decisions in the apparatus and not on others. Nor is it clear why they think that the manuscripts must be followed scrupulously when they deal with εἶσῶ/ἔσῶ, but can be set aside in the cases of εἶς/ἔς and εἶσ–/ἔσ–. As was the case with ὤμοι/ὠμοι above, poor decision-making is combined with inconsistent presentation.

In all three cases we must either follow the manuscripts, printing the majority reading in each separate case, or generalise one of the two forms throughout. The former course implies

---

<sup>44</sup> They do not note the variant at *El.* 1337, but as this is limited to a single, later, manuscript it is fair to omit it.



that the manuscripts enjoy some authority (however small) in this matter. We must now investigate whether or not this is the case.

Threatte (1980–) I 172-3 summarises the inscriptional evidence as follows. The long vowel [e:] which arose from compensatory lengthening was originally different from inherited [ei], and was written Ε in the old Attic alphabet. That script thus used ΕΣ to represent the two forms which we know as εἶς and ἔς. Over time [e:] and [ei] merged, with the result that [e:] came to be written ΕΙ. This latter process has begun to happen as early as the last quarter of the sixth century, when we begin to find ΕΙ for [e:] in private inscriptions; the first public inscription with ΕΙ for [e:] is just before 468. Over the next century ΕΙ for [e:] takes over, and Ε for [e:] dies out. Given the early date of the first written representation of this sound change, it is on balance more likely than not that Sophocles distinguished between [e:s] and [es] in his script, writing the former ΕΙΣ, the latter ΕΣ. As a result, we cannot dismiss manuscript authority on this question. On the other hand, we would ideally not want to have to depend on it too much, as corruption from one of these forms to the other would be easy indeed, and is attested, in both directions, even for metrically-guaranteed instances of εἶς and ἔς.<sup>45</sup>

Perhaps influenced by such considerations, Dawe in his editions prints the majority manuscript readings throughout; he also scrupulously records the variants in his apparatus.<sup>46</sup> Peter Elmsley, on the other hand, in his edition of 1805/6 printed εἶς everywhere except when the metre required ἔς. He pointed out that there were many more metrically guaranteed instances

---

<sup>45</sup> ἔς corrupted to εἶς: *Ant.* 307, *Phil.* 1211 (lyr.); εἶς corrupted to ἔς: *El.* 835 (lyr.), 1393 (lyr., but an iambic trimeter), *OR* 519, 1489.

<sup>46</sup> With two exceptions: *Aj.* 260 and *El.* 1337. Cf. Kühner–Blass (1890-2) II 248.

of the former than of the latter; and argued that ε̇ς was a poetic form which the tragedians used only when compelled by the metre.<sup>47</sup> But we would expect that, of the two forms, ε̇ις should be metrically guaranteed more often. Excluding cases of resolution, which are not frequent enough to affect the overall picture, the iambic trimeter contains twice as many places where a long syllable is guaranteed than where a short syllable is; when we leave the final two places of the trimeter out of consideration (since this preposition cannot stand at the end of a line, and could only most exceptionally stand in penultimate position), the ratio is 5:2. When we remove non-iambic instances from those gathered in n. 38, we get 53 ε̇ις, 10 ε̇ς; adjusted to take account of the above, the figures are 53 versus 25. This is still a decisive preference for ε̇ις, but the minority ε̇ς now appears considerably more substantial. As for the argument that ε̇ς was avoided because it was poetic, in that case we would not expect to find ε̇ις in lyric: yet we do, a full seven times. Indeed, there the ratio of ε̇ις to ε̇ς is 7 to 2 (no adjustment being possible in this case), which is a stronger preference for ε̇ις than in the spoken sections. Finally, I am unhappy with the idea of the tragedians being ‘compelled by the metre’ to include ε̇ς in certain cases. If the comic poets could avoid it except in fossilised expressions, the tragic poets could have done so too.

I conclude that Dawe’s position is the best given our current state of evidence. The second-best approach would be to generalise ε̇ις and ε̇ισ– wherever possible, as advocated by Elmsley, with at least a note in the introduction to this effect, if not a mention each time in the

---

<sup>47</sup> ‘Ubicunque per carminis rationes fieri potuit, ε̇ς in ε̇ις mutavi’ (p. 9 of his (first) edition of *OR*); ‘sunt autem formae communes ε̇ις et ε̇ισω, poeticae vero ε̇ς et ε̇ισω, quas comici non omnino usurpant, tragici non nisi metro coacti’ (on Eur. *Med.* 88). He is followed by Rutherford (1881) 432 n. 1: ‘The tragedians employed ε̇ς when the metre required it’.

apparatus as well. The least preferable option is to follow the practice of the Oxford editors, which, regrettably, is what I did in my edition of *Electra*. I would now follow the manuscripts and print εἶς instead of ἔς in the following places: 615, 681, 954, 958, 1120.

### 3. δορί or δόρει?

The dative of δόρου occurs in S. eleven times, always in iambic trimeters: *Aj.* 515, 764, 1056, 1270, *Ant.* 195, *Tr.* 240, 478, *OC* 620, 1304, 1314, 1386. All manuscripts read δορί throughout, except for a few at *Aj.* 1056. There the nonsensical variant ἔλοιδόμεναι is consistent with original ἔλοι δόμεναι, but hardly requires it; while ἔλοι δόμεναι in G<sup>2pc</sup>Q is so late that it probably reflects contamination of ἔλοι δορί and ἔλοιδόμεναι.

At *OC* 620, 1314, and 1386 the dative occurs at the start of a trimeter, and so δορί must be emended on metrical grounds to δόμεναι (thus Hermann *ap.* Erfurdt on *Aj.* 1109). In the eight other instances, metre allows either form. Dindorf emended them all to δόμεναι in his 1825 edition (at *Aj.* 1056 he was anticipated by Reisig (1818) 251), presumably because the text of Sophocles offers a few metrically guaranteed instances of δόμεναι, but none of δορί.

In Aeschylus and Euripides, δορί is again transmitted throughout. In trimeters, δορί is metrically guaranteed at Eur. *Hec.* 5, *Tro.* 479, and 868; elsewhere δόμεναι is possible but never required. In lyrics, δορί is guaranteed in several places (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 111, Eur. *Hcld.* 378); while δόμεναι is required at Aesch. *Suppl.* 846 (lyr.).

Metre indicates that manuscript evidence on this question is unreliable, as should be expected: the archaic dative in –ει (or rather, instrumental: cf. Schwyzer (1938) = (1983) 738) tended to be displaced by the form in –ι familiar to scribes. But the metrical evidence must also be handled with care. Resolution apart (which is less common in Sophocles than Euripides), there are no places in the trimeter which will take δορί but not δόρει; and all our Sophoclean evidence comes from trimeters. Hence the lack of a guaranteed instance of δορί in S. is not especially illuminating. Moreover, we do know that δορί was used by Aeschylus and Euripides, that the latter (at least) used it in trimeters, and that the former (at least) used it as well as δόρει. For these reasons I do not follow Dindorf in printing δόρει throughout. Perhaps Sophocles normally used δορί, but substituted δόρει when a long second syllable was required.

#### 4. ἔρκειος or ἔρκιος?

This word occurs twice in Sophocles, at *Aj.* 108 and *Ant.* 487, both times in the genitive singular. In the former passage, all manuscripts read ἔρκιου, with one possible exception;<sup>48</sup> this is the majority reading in the latter too, but there ἔρκειου is found in KZf and Eustathius<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>48</sup> Dawe (1973-8) I 130 writes ‘It almost looks as though A intended Elmsley’s ἔρκειου’. Examining a microfilm did not enable me to improve on this assessment.

<sup>49</sup> Eustathius 1390.29-30 = II 285.6-8 Stallbaum καὶ ἔστι τὸ ἔρκειος ὅμοιον τῷ ἑταιρείος κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν τῆς παραληγοῦσης, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔρκος ἔρκεος ἔρκειος ἔρκειος, καθὰ Κείος Κεῖος ἀπὸ Κέω τῆς νήσου. χρήσις δὲ ἔρκειου Διὸς καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ, ἔνθα ἔρκειον Δία ἐκεῖνος τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ πάντας δηλοῖ.

Modern editors print ἔρκειου in both places: in the former this is an emendation by Burges,<sup>50</sup> while in the latter Erfurdt was the first to adopt the text advocated by Eustathius.<sup>51</sup> But editors decline to explain why they reject the majority readings. Three criteria can help us evaluate the decision: metre, philology, and manuscript evidence.

(i) The other tragic instances of this adjective (Aesch. *Cho.* 561, 571, 653, Eur. *Tro.* 17, 483, Tr. Adesp. fr. 71 Kannicht–Snell = Ar. fr. 256.1 Kassel–Austin) do not provide a metrically secure instance either way. But in Cratinus iunior (4<sup>th</sup> century) fr. 9.5 Kassel–Austin the word occurs at the start of a trimeter, which guarantees ἔρκειος; this is also the metrically guaranteed form of the sole Homeric instance of the adjective (*Od.* 22.335). Furthermore, the fifth-century examples all contain a long vowel or diphthong in their final syllable, meaning that they scan either — — — or — ∪ —. Yet they are limited to the two places in the trimeter where — — — can fit. A word scanning — ∪ — has three more possible locations, yet we never find the adjective in any of them.

(ii) ἔρκειος is the form we would expect from ἔρκος on the analogy of ἄργος, ἄργειος (< \**-es-io-*).<sup>52</sup> The scholia on *Aj.* 108 πρὶν ἂν δεθεῖς πρὸς κίον ἔρκιου στέγης take ἔρκιου as the genitive of a noun ἔρκιον which is otherwise unattested in tragedy, and which

---

<sup>50</sup> In his edition of *Troades*, p. 175. He claims to be following Bothe, but the form is not found in his edition of 1806, and Burges's citations are so erratic that he could easily have given credit erroneously. He anticipates Elmsley (1814b) 352-3; the conjecture is not found in Elmsley (1805/6).

<sup>51</sup> In his *editio minor*, teste Elmsley (1814b) 352: i.e. his second edition of 1809 (it is not in his first). Elmsley points out that Erfurdt surprisingly fails to advocate the same change at *Aj.* 108 in his edition of 1811.

<sup>52</sup> Thus Eustathius (n. 49); cf. Lobeck (1835) 119 = (1866) 99.

would form an uneasy pair here with the other genitive noun *στέγης*;<sup>53</sup> such a noun would be impossible at *Ant.* 487 τοῦ παντὸς ἡμῶν Ζηνὸς ἑρκείου κυρεῖ.

(iii) We have already seen that ἑρκίος is the dominant, but not exclusive, form in the Sophoclean tradition.<sup>54</sup> At Aesch. *Cho.* 561, Eur. *Tro.* 17, 483 only ἑρκίος is attested. But ἑρκέϊος is found in M (= L for Sophocles) at Aesch. *Cho.* 571 (proparoxytone, and before correction by the scholiast) and 653, while at Tr. Adesp. fr. 71 Kannicht–Snell = Ar. fr. 256.1 Kassel–Austin the witnesses are split between the two forms (see the apparatus in Kassel–Austin). In any case, the corruption of εἰ to ι is very small.<sup>55</sup>

In the light of the strong evidence provided by (i) and (ii) we should prefer ἑρκέϊος. It is gratifying to see that some manuscripts (especially M in Aeschylus) appear to have preserved the correct form in some instances as well; but if they had not, this would not be sufficient to counter the testimony of metre and morphology.

## 5. πίτνω or πιτνώ? ῥίπτω or ῥιπτῶ?

---

<sup>53</sup> Σ 108b = p. 41 Christodoulou; cf. Suda ε 3015 = II 410.24-6 Adler.

<sup>54</sup> In what follows I rely on the standard editions, but I have also checked the *Choephoroi* passages against Rostagno (1896).

<sup>55</sup> See Dawe (1973-8) I 130. In the Hesychius manuscript the lemma ἑρκίου διός is printed ἑρκείου Διός by Latte (ε 5928 = II 195) and Schmidt (ε 5946 = II 192); alphabetical order and the content of the entry suggest that they are right. Cf. Apoll. Soph. 76.22-3 Bekker.

πίτνω/πιτνώ and its compounds (ἐμ-, προσ-, προ-) occur nine times in extant Sophocles, at *Aj.* 58, 185, 300, *El.* 453, 1380, *Phil.* 485, *OC* 1732, 1740, 1754. The Teubner and OCT print all nine forms as parts of πίτνω: that is, πίτνων, πίτνειν, ἔπιτνε rather than πιτνών, πιτνεῖν, ἐπίτνει. But in only three of these do they include a comment in their apparatus which indicates that some manuscripts have an alternative accentuation.<sup>56</sup> The results of my collations are given below. In some cases a word has two accents and it has not been possible to determine which was written first.

- Aj.* 58 ἐμπιτνών A, ἐμπίπτων LKCFZf, ἐμπίπτειν R, ἐμπεσών L<sup>γρ</sup>  
 185 πίτνων K, πίτνών L, πιτνών RACFZf  
 300 πίτνων L, πιτνών KRACZf
- El.* 453 προσπίτνουσα LK, προσπιτνούσα RACFZf  
 1380 προσπίτνω LA, προσπιτνώ RCFZf
- Phil.* 485 προσπίτνώ LK, προσπιτνώ RA
- OC* 1732 ἔπιτνε LKRA  
 1740 πίτνειν LKR, πιτνεῖν A  
 1754 προσπίπτομεν LKA, -ωμεν R

Sophocles would not have written accents on the words, and so the marks we find in our manuscripts are the result of later interpretations and do not enjoy authority. It is nevertheless

<sup>56</sup> *Aj.* 58, *El.* 1380, *OC* 1754. Pearson also tells us that at *Aj.* 185 πιτνών is found in ‘L<sup>2</sup>A rec.’

worth noting that our two oldest manuscripts, L and K, show a marked preference for πίτνω, since, as noted above, they often preserve orthographical niceties via the grammatical tradition.

Metre does not allow us to distinguish between the majority of these forms, and of the occurrences of these forms in other poets. Nevertheless, a definite tendency can be observed. At *OC* 1732 only ἔπιτνε, not ἐπίτνει, fits the metre; since the verb is imperfect, and the imperfect is built on the present stem, the present must be not πιτνέω but πίτνω.<sup>57</sup> At *OC* 1754 προσπίπτομεν is unmetrical, and editors emend to προσπίτνομεν, a reading found in the sixteenth-century manuscript Parisinus graecus 2886 and attributed as a conjecture to its scribe, Aristobulus Apostolides. The change is very likely: at *Aj.* 58 πίτνω has been corrupted to the commoner πίπτω in many manuscripts, and the latter is often used as a gloss on the former (e.g. in C at 185). Crucially, however, προσπιτνούμεν would not fit the metre. I therefore include *OC* 1754 as a second metrically guaranteed instance of πίτνω in Sophocles. To these two we may add Aesch. *Sept.* 759 and Eur. *Tro.* 762 from tragedy, and [Hes.] *Scut.* 291<sup>58</sup> and Bacchyl. 17.6

---

<sup>57</sup> Elmsley justifies his identification of this verb as imperfect in his note *ad loc.* (expanding on briefer notes on Eur. *Hcl.* 77 and *Med.* 55) by pointing to other verbs with a nasal present, such as δάκνω, κάμνω, τέμνω which have aorists ἔδακον, ἔκαμον, ἔτεμον; by analogy, the aorist of πίτνω must be ἔπεσον (< \*ἔπετον), and so ἔπιτνον can only be an imperfect. Hermann (1819) 284-7 = (1828) 164-8 attempts to show that instances of this form are aorists, without success.

<sup>58</sup> That is, if the text is correct. The line reads οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἐν ἑλλεδανοῖσι δέον καὶ ἔπιτνον ἀλωῆ in most manuscripts, but the sudden change of subject is odd (as in Most's translation 'others were tying the sheaves with bands, and these were falling onto the threshing-floor'), and Sittl's ἔπιτνον (giving 'and spread them on the floor') has much to commend it.



from other poetry. There are no metrically guaranteed instances of  $\pi\iota\tau\nu\hat{\omega}$  in archaic or classical poetry known to me.

The strong implication of this is that only  $\acute{\pi}\acute{\iota}\tau\nu\omega$  should be written, and in his edition of 1805/6 Peter Elmsley printed  $\acute{\pi}\acute{\iota}\tau\nu\omega$  throughout. In 1810 Hermann claimed that both  $\acute{\pi}\acute{\iota}\tau\nu\omega$  and  $\pi\iota\tau\nu\hat{\omega}$  were tragic, and differed slightly in meaning, just as is the case with  $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$  and  $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ .<sup>59</sup> But not only does this go against the evidence of metre and manuscripts, it also introduces a new, unsupported, linguistic datum. Hermann does not attempt to justify his argument with reference to the semantics of metrically guaranteed instances (or, indeed, any instances), and so his argument can be ignored.

With this in mind we can go on to consider the related question of  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$  and  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\hat{\omega}$ . This verb or its compounds ( $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha-$ ) occurs six times in extant Sophocles, at *Aj.* 239, *Ant.* 131, *Tr.* 780, 790, fr. 380.1, 555.5 Radt. The four occurrences from the seven plays occur as follows:

*Aj.* 239  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$  LKRACF:  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\iota$  JbZf<sup>60</sup>

*Ant.* 131  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$  LKA:  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$  R

*Tr.* 780  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$  LKA

*Tr.* 790  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omega\nu$  LKA,  $\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  P. Oxy. 1805

---

<sup>59</sup> In his note on Eur. *Her.* 1371: ‘Graeci non temere ... gravare et prolongare formas praesentium amabant, sed ista formarum varietate tenues quasdam significationum diversitates verbis adiungebant.’

<sup>60</sup> Jb *teste* Erfurdt; Zf I checked from a microfilm.

ῥίπτει was conjectured at *Aj.* 239 by Elmsley in his edition of 1805/6 (so before Erfurdt's publication of the reading of *Jb* in 1811), at *Ant.* 131 by Erfurdt and Bothe in their editions of 1806, and at *Tr.* 780 by Elmsley (1805/6).

The recent OCT and Teubner editions of Sophocles both follow the same practice for this verb. At *Aj.* 239 they print ῥιπτεῖ without comment in the apparatus. At *Ant.* 131 they print ῥιπτεῖ while noting that Erfurdt advocates ῥίπτει (Bothe is not mentioned). At *Tr.* 780 they print ῥίπτει, specifying it as Elmsley's, and record that manuscripts have ῥιπτεῖ. At *Tr.* 790 they print ῥίπτων and mention the papyrus variant in the apparatus. Nowhere, so far as I can find, do they explain why they follow such a course, which neither follows the manuscripts nor generalises one form throughout (as does e.g. Pearson, who consistently prints ῥίπτω). The use of the apparatus is also erratic. Let us consider the three places where ῥιπτεῖ is the sole or majority reading of the manuscripts. Why should ῥίπτει be worth putting in the text at *Tr.* 780, worth mentioning in the apparatus at *Ant.* 131, but worth neither at *Aj.* 239?

As noted above, manuscripts do not enjoy authority in matters of accentuation. Our first consideration must be the evidence of metre. Each of the six Sophoclean cases is metrical whichever verb is read. Elsewhere in drama, forms of ῥίπτω is metrically guaranteed at *Eur. Her.* 941, *Tro.* 256, 774, 778, *Ba.* 741,<sup>61</sup> 1097, *Ar. Pax* 962; ῥιπτῶ at *Ar. Eccl.* 507.<sup>62</sup> There are also cases where the stem attested by the manuscripts is visible (i.e. not simply from the accent),

---

<sup>61</sup> Here ῥιπτῶ would give an anapaest (and a split one) in the second half of the first metron, a very rare phenomenon only permissible with a proper name (cf. West (1982) 82).

<sup>62</sup> For the existence of both forms in comedy Willi (2003) 250 compares the comic variations βαλλήσω/βαλῶ, δοκήσω/δόξω, δραμοῦμαι/θρέξομαι.

in forms such as ῥίπτουτᾶ or ῥίπτουντᾶ: we find ῥίπτω at [Aesch.] *PV* 992, Eur. fr. 402.7 Kannicht, and Ar. *Vesp.* 1530, ῥίπτῶ at Eur. *Hclid.* 149, *Hel.* 1096, Achaeus 20 F 26.2 Snell, and Ar. *Vesp.* 59.<sup>63</sup> Testimony is divided at [Aesch.] *PV* 1043.<sup>64</sup>

As with πινῶ, Elmsley banished the contracted verb from his 1805/6 edition of Sophocles;<sup>65</sup> in 1813 he declared that the form was alien to tragic usage.<sup>66</sup> Hermann rejected this view four years later in 1817, arguing that ῥίπτω and ῥίπτέω were both tragic, and that the distinction between them was similar to that between Latin *iacere* and *iactare*.<sup>67</sup> Matthiae later championed Elmsley's argument, and deprecated the semantic distinction drawn by Hermann as

---

<sup>63</sup> In ῥίπτουντᾶ the οῦ represents a long vowel [o:] arising from contraction, which in the Attic script was originally written Ο. Over time [o:] merged with inherited [ou], and [o:] came to be written ΟΥ. This process, similar to that for [e:] discussed above, has begun to happen as early as the end of the sixth century (see Thraette (1980-) I 238-41). So it is legitimate to refer to manuscripts for this question, although one would not want to place much weight upon them.

<sup>64</sup> Here M alone has ῥίπτείσθῶ; on that basis West prints –ει– here and at line 992.

<sup>65</sup> The exception, *Ant.* 131, should probably be regarded as one of the many typographical errors in that book: see Finglass (2007b) 108-10.

<sup>66</sup> In his note on Eur. *Hclid.* 150: ‘Ῥίπτοντες P.E. Mihi quidem ῥίπτουντες non magis tragicum videtur quam πινούντες.’

<sup>67</sup> In his note on *Aj.* 235 (in his first edition; repeated with only minor variations in subsequent editions): ‘Ex Mosc. b. dedi ῥίπτει pro vulgato ῥίπτει, non quod verbum ῥίπτειν plane a tragicis alienum putem, quae Elmsleii sententia est ad Eurip. Heracl. 150. sed quod ei hic non videtur locus concedendus esse. Nam, nisi fallor, significatione differunt haec verba, quorum ῥίπτειν est *iacere*, ῥίπτειν autem *iactare*.’

unsupported by evidence.<sup>68</sup> In his second and third editions of *Ajax* (on line 239), Lobeck argues at length ‘that such variations of form probably corresponded to varying shades of sense, but to shades which the extant evidence does not enable us to define’ (Jebb 1868, on *Aj.* 239, summarising Lobeck’s position). Lobeck also cites a late scholium to *Aj.* 239 (p. 204.34-5 Dindorf) ῥίπτειν τὸ ἀπλῶς ῥίπτειν, ῥιπτεῖν δὲ, τὸ μετὰ σφοδρότητος. Few modern editors have explicitly argued the issue. Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 1095-6 is against generalising ῥίπτω, citing Ar. *Eccl.* 507 and pointing to how Apollodorus *ap. Athen.* 2.66a uses ῥίπτουῦντα to paraphrase *Tr.* 780; but the latter is a weak argument, as there is no reason why the later writer should have attempted to preserve Sophocles’ orthography in a paraphrase even if he could tell what it was. Wilkins on Eur. *Hcl.* 149 is cautiously in favour of generalising ῥίπτω, but cites only two of the metrically guaranteed cases of ῥίπτω, and wrongly states that ῥιπτῶ is required at Ar. *Vesp.* 59.

The metrical evidence provides overwhelming support for ῥίπτω being the only tragic form. Ease of corruption from one form to the other should lead us to place as little weight as possible on the instances which are not metrically guaranteed. The semantic distinctions urged by the scholia and Hermann do not correspond to anything in our texts, and Lobeck’s failure to come up with a significant distinction of meaning is not encouraging. The parallel with πίτνω reinforces our preference for the uncontracted form.

---

<sup>68</sup> In his note on Eur. *Hcl.* 150: ‘ῥίπτουτες Elmslei. recte puto: nam quod discrimen Hermann. ad Soph. *Aj.* 235. interesse statuit, id locis iis, ubi ῥιπτεῖν legitur, non comprobatur; et quam proni fuerint librarii in ῥιπτεῖν, apparet ex Herc. f. 921. ubi Ald. ἐγγεῖτε πηγὰς, ῥιπτεῖτ’ ἐκ χειρῶν κανῶ.’

## 6. καχάζω or καγχάζω?

At *Aj.* 199 the great majority of manuscripts (including K and the Suda) read καγχάζόντων.<sup>69</sup> Dindorf conjectured καχάζόντων (1825 ed., p. lvi; cf. 1830 ed. p. x), which is printed by Nauck (1860 ed. onwards), Pearson, and Dawe<sup>1-3</sup> (the latter pair unhelpfully attributing it to ‘rec.’: i.e. an unspecified late manuscript). Again, three criteria could help us decide: metre, philology, and manuscript evidence.

(i) With the gamma, the colon πάντων καγχάζόντων lasts for six long syllables (eleven, counting those that come before and after the colon), which is not paralleled elsewhere in the epode or the parodos as a whole. Without it, we get an iambic dimeter with double syncopation in the second metron, as at 194b and often in Sophocles (see the *Metrical Analysis of lines 504-15* in my edition of *Electra*), and a colon ending in three long syllables, as throughout the epode. The latter is much preferable.

(ii) Slings (2005) 6-7 argues that original καχάζω (<\*χαχάζω, ‘to say χὰ χὰ’) gives κακχάζω (his preferred form in Plato) by expressive gemination (on which see Skoda (1982) 54); whereas καγχάζω ‘is a late form, perhaps the result of contamination with epic καγχαλάω [*Il.* 3.43 etc.]’. Szemerényi (1971) 671 = (1987-91) III 1589 prefers to see a repeated element χαν, which gives κακχάζω, καγχάζω, and καγχαλάω (<\*χαν-χαν-άω, with dissimilation of the nasal element: Skoda (1982) 58 has reservations): he compares how βαμβαίνω (*Hom. Il.*

---

<sup>69</sup> For this verb see Tichy (1983) 223-5, Arnould (1990) 161-3. The minority variant βακχαζόντων (so L<sup>ac</sup>GQ, with βαγχ- in L<sup>pc</sup> and βακχε- in R) is printed by Ll-J/W, but gives inferior sense, as well as being less well attested: see further my n. *ad loc.*

10.375) probably derives from \*βαμ–βαμ–γο (cf. Lochner-Hüttenbach (1962) 166). καχάζω will then presumably be a simplification of the consonant cluster.<sup>70</sup> It is not easy to decide between these approaches; and indeed others are no doubt possible. There is too much uncertainty here, both regarding the sound changes themselves and their chronology.

(iii) This verb does not occur elsewhere in tragedy. It might be found in a satyr-play, at fr. 314.357 Radt (*Ichneutae*) ]χαζε καὶ τέρπου φρένα, where Wilamowitz restored [κά]χαζε; but [κάγ]χαζε would also be metrically possible. Evidence from comedy is more forthcoming. At *Ar. Eccl.* 849 καχάζων and *Nub.* 1073 respectively καχάζων and καχασμῶν are metrically guaranteed.<sup>71</sup> At Eubulus fr. 7.2 Kassel–Austin = 8(c).2 Hunter the witnesses give καγχαζετε and κακχαζετε (the first syllable is anceps). Hunter prefers the former without enthusiasm ('It may be wrong to impose uniformity [i.e. with Aristophanes] and, somewhat hesitantly, I leave the καγχ– form'), but Kassel and Austin print καχάζετε (*coni.* Dindorf), as does Chantry in his edition of the scholia from which the fragment is taken (Σ *Ar. Plut.* 1129d = p. 181).

καχαξῶ is metrically guaranteed at Theocr. 5.142. At *Pl. Resp.* 337a manuscripts are split between ἀνεκάκχασε (A), ἀνεκάγγχασε (DF), and ἀνεκάχασε (Phot. *Lex.* α 1829 = p. 180 Theodoridis; Photius stresses χρῆ δὲ δι' ἑνὸς κ τοῦτο γράφειν), while at *Euthyd.* 300d they divide into ἀνακαχχάσας (B), ἀνακκαχάσας (T), and ἀνακακχάσας (W *teste* Slings (2005) 7, from a microfilm). Σ *Ar. Nub.* 1240b (p. 226.4 Holwerda) offers ἔκκαγχαζέει (VENp), ἔγκ– (M), and ἔκκαχάζεει (R, the oldest manuscript). Two entries from Hesychius run as follows: κ

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Schwyzer (1934-71) I 315 'in der Überlieferung schwankt hier öfter einfacher Konsonant und Geminata', citing ἰα(κ)χή and πι(π)πίζω alongside our instance.

<sup>71</sup> For the variant κιχλισμῶν in the latter passage, see Dover.

369 = II 397 Latte κακχάζει· ἀτάκτως (v.ll.) γελα̂ and κ 45 = II 387 Latte καγχάζει (Cyril: καγγλ– cod.)· ἀθρόως γελα̂. In other prose texts the form with gamma appears to dominate, as at Xen. *Symp.* 1.16 ἐξεκάγγασεν and Arist. *EN* 1150b11 ἐκκαγγάζουσιν (v.l. –γγλ– in one manuscript): but as this orthographical point is one which could easily be neglected by collators, the absence of variants in an apparatus must be treated with caution.

From this farrago the metrically guaranteed forms in Aristophanes are perhaps the best guide, though they are by no means decisive. The chaos of the prose evidence indicates how easy it was for one form to be corrupted to another, and raises the possibility that καχ– could well be attested in one of the many manuscripts of *Ajax* which are still uncollated. Indeed, that is what Pearson and Dawe claim, but their identification of this manuscript simply as ‘rec.’ makes it impossible to check or evaluate their assertion.

Overall I place most weight on the metrical evidence, which leads me to omit the gamma. This gives a result consistent with the forms in Aristophanes, which is desirable, if not necessary.

### 7. ἡρείφθην or ἡρίφθην?

ἐν δ' ἐρειπίοις

νεκρῶν ἐρ\*\*\*θείς ἔζετ' ἀρνείου φόνου (*Aj.* 308-9)

The second word of *Aj.* 309 is variously presented in the manuscripts as follows:

ἐρειφθείς L<sup>2pc</sup>AXsXrF<sup>?</sup>OT (ἐρρειφθείς Zc)

ἐριφθείς KRQDCNPV (ἐρριφθείς in GH and the Suda ε 3002 = II 409.23 Adler)

ἐρεφθείς L<sup>?</sup>

ἐρεισθείς L<sup>γρ</sup> and the Suda ε 3002 = II 409.25-6 Adler οἱ δὲ ἐρεισθείς γράφουσιν

We may begin by dismissing two of these possibilities on semantic grounds. The original reading of L is not certain, but if it was ἐρεφθείς (aorist passive of ἐρέπτω ‘crown, pluck’, attested only at Bacchyl. 13.70), this is presumably a slip; while the variant ἐρεισθείς (aorist passive of ἐρείδω ‘cause to lean, support’) would deny us Ajax’s dramatic fall amid the animals.

This leaves ἐρειφθείς and ἐριφθείς, both of which would be aorist passives of ἐρείπω ‘throw, dash down’. As both forms are metrically sound, let us consider first manuscript testimony and then philology.

(i) The oldest manuscript to contain the aorist passive of ἐρείπω, from the third century B.C., reads ὑπερείφθη (Lyr. Adesp. fr. 925(d).10 Page).<sup>72</sup> The other instances known to me are as follows:

Honestus *A.P.* 9.250.1 = 2422 Gow–Page κατηρείφθη P<sup>I</sup>, κατηριφιην P<sup>ac</sup>, κατ’ ἠριφίην P<sup>2pc</sup>.

Appian *BC* 2.90 κατηρείφθη (thus Schweighaeuser II 299, Mendelssohn and Viereck p. 227.14).

---

<sup>72</sup> P. Hibeh. Mus. Brit. inv. n. 693, 280-240 B.C.



Arrian *An.* 1.21.4 ἠρίφθη.

Arrian *An.* 2.22.7 κατηρίφθη.<sup>73</sup>

Josephus *BJ* 3.263 ἐρειφθέντων M, ἐκριφέντων PAL<sup>1</sup>, ἐκριφθέντων L<sup>2</sup>, ἐρριφθέντων VRC.

Josephus *BJ* 4.20 ἐρειφθέντων AM, ἐρριφθέντων PL, ρίφθέντων VR, ρίφέντων C.<sup>74</sup>

A further variant aorist passive ἠρίπην is attested only at Pind. *O.* 2.43 ἐριπέντι, where the short iota is metrically guaranteed.<sup>75</sup> Given the extreme rarity of this form, it is unlikely that ἠρίφθην is the result of confusion between ἠρείφθην and ἠρίπην, and so we should leave it out of consideration.

(ii) On the analogy of λείπω ~ ἐλείφθην we would expect ἐρείπω to give ἠρείφθην. Subsequently the latter, and not ἐλείφθην, would lose its epsilon, perhaps because of the visual and lexical similarity with the aorist passive of ρίπτω (originally ἐρρίφθην, later ἐρρίφην: see my note on *Aj.* 1019-20). Such confusion is evident in the Josephus passages.<sup>76</sup> The noun

---

<sup>73</sup> In both these passages van Lennepe (1777) 19 emends to –είφ–. Roos I 49 remarks in a footnote ‘aor. pass. in pedestri oratione alibi non occurrit, mutare igitur nolui; v. tamen ἐρειφθείς Soph. *Ajax.* 309.

<sup>74</sup> The readings of the manuscripts of Josephus are taken from Niese’s edition (VI 30, 349); for the former passage they are more precise than those given by Naber (V xlii, xlix).

<sup>75</sup> The v.l. in the secondary tradition ἐριπόντι will have arisen through the unfamiliarity of the form.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Herwerden (1893) 256 ‘Idem error saepe cum apud Iosephum tum apud alios commissus videtur. Nam ἐρείπειν et κατερείπειν sollemni usu adhibentur de muris et aedificiis, et ubicumque sic ρίπτειν et καταρρίπτειν usurpantur librariorum nos ludificari suspicor.’

ἐρείπιον is also sometimes corrupted to ἐρίπιον.<sup>77</sup> The perfect mediopassive forms of λείπω and ἐρείπω also show ι–vocalism in Homeric papyri, although there is some evidence for –ει– with both verbs (see West’s edition, vol. i p. xxxii; he adds *Il.* 23.523 to the passages cited there).

The scant manuscript evidence is inconclusive. I marginally prefer –ει– because of the analogy with λείπω and the plausible scenario for corruption via the analogy of ῥίπτω, but as just noted, that is far from proving the case.

\*\*\*

It is not always possible or desirable to be consistent in orthographical matters. Sometimes the evidence does not allow us to prefer one form over another, and we may suspect that in at least some of these cases more than one option was available to the tragedians.<sup>78</sup> There are areas, however, where consistency is vital for a modern editor:

---

<sup>77</sup> As it is at Aesch. *Ag.* 660, Eur. *Tro.* 1025; these and the other tragic instances are all metrically guaranteed. See also Cratinus fr. 160 Kassel–Austin. ἐρίπιον is explicitly preferred by Didymus (p. 338 Schmidt), who comparing ἐρίπνη ‘crag’, but metre tells against this, at least for tragedy.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Wilson (2007) I vii: ‘Questions of orthography cause editors difficulty ... It may be that attempts to formulate rules for every word are doomed to failure. In particular I note Sir Kenneth Dover’s remark on *Clouds* 92 “Possibly Attic was not consistent.” It is notorious that English orthography was far from fixed in early times.’ This presumably refers simply to spelling, however, when the problems discussed above all relate to what was actually (meant to be) spoken by an actor.

(i) An editor should either generalise a form throughout, or not generalise at all and follow the manuscripts. Partial and apparently random generalisation, as for example with εἶς/ἔς in the Sophocles OCT and my *Electra*, falls between two stools.

(ii) An editor should be consistent in the presentation of orthographical matters. For any given question, there should either be a note in the introduction stating the policy to be enforced, or an entry in the apparatus each time that the orthographical question arises. In general the former will suit most medium-sized editions, the latter editions conceived on a grander scale. A policy of mentioning orthographical variation in the apparatus erratically and at random is of no use to anybody, and obscures rather than illuminates the true state of affairs.

Or put another way: whatever inconsistency that the readers of an edition encounter should be intrinsic to the evidence itself, not imposed by the carelessness of a modern editor.

Department of Classics

University of Nottingham

University Park Campus

N o t t i n g h a m, NG7 2RD

United Kingdom

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. Adler (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. (*Lexicographi Graeci* 1), Leipzig 1928-38.
- M.J. Apthorp, New light from Mount Sinai on the text of the Iliad, *ZPE* 127, 1999, 141-8.
- D. Arnould, *Le rire et les larmes dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon* (Collection d'études anciennes 119), Paris 1990.
- C. F. L. Austin (ed.), *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin and New York 1973. [1973a]
- C. F. L. Austin, review of D. M. MacDowell (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Wasps* (Oxford 1971), *CR N.S.* 23, 1973, 133-5. [1973b]
- C. F. L. Austin and S. D. Olson (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Thesmophoriazusa*, Oxford 2004.
- O. Bachmann, *Conjecturarum Observationumque Aristophanearum Specimen I*, Göttingen 1878.
- W. S. Barrett (ed. comm.), *Euripides. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964.
- I. Bekker (ed.), *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum*, Berlin 1833.
- C. J. Blomfield (ed., comm.), *Aeschyli Agamemnon*, Cambridge 1818<sup>1</sup>, 1822<sup>2</sup>.
- F. H. Bothe (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Tragoediae*, Leipzig and London 1806.
- R. F. P. Brunck (ed., comm., transl.), *Sophoclis quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols., Strasbourg 1786.
- G. Burges (ed., comm.), *Euripidis Troades*, Cambridge 1807.
- M. Chantry (ed.), *Scholia in Aristophanem, Pars III. Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas; Ranas; Ecclesiazusas et Plutum. Fasc. IVa continens Scholia Vetera in Aristophanis Plutum*, Groningen 1994.

- G. A. Christodoulou (ed.), Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους (Βιβλιοθήκη Σοφίας Ν. Σαριπολου 34), Athens 1977.
- D. Comparetti, *Homeri Ilias cum scholiis. Codex Venetus A, Marcianus 454 phototypice editus* (Codices graeci et latini photographice depicti 6), Leiden 1901.
- R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, 3 vols., Leiden 1973-8.
- R. D. Dawe (ed.), *Sophoclis Tragoediae*, Leipzig 1975-9<sup>1</sup>, 1984-5<sup>2</sup>, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1996<sup>3</sup>.
- J. Diggle (ed.) *Euripidis Fabulae*, 3 vols., Oxford 1981-94.
- J. Diggle, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes*, Oxford 1991.
- K. W. Dindorf (ed.), *Sophoclis Tragoediae*, Leipzig 1825.
- K. W. Dindorf (ed.), *Poetae Scenici Graeci. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, Leipzig and London 1830.
- K. W. Dindorf (ed.), *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias septem ex codicibus aucta et emendata. Volumen II*, Oxford 1852.
- K. J. Dover (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Clouds*, Oxford 1968.
- F. T. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum*, Königsberg 1835<sup>1</sup>, Berlin 1872<sup>2</sup> (rev. H. Genthe).
- P. Elmsley (ed.), *Edition of Sophocles*, Edinburgh 1805/6: the sole surviving copy is now in the British Library, shelfmark C.28.i.12. See Finglass (2007c).
- P. Elmsley (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus*, Oxford 1811<sup>1</sup>, 1825<sup>2</sup>.
- P. Elmsley (ed., comm.), *Euripidis Heraclidae*, Oxford 1813<sup>1</sup>, 1828<sup>2</sup>.

- P. Elmsley, *Carmen antistrophicum ex Aristophanis Lysistrata*, *Museum Criticum* 2, 1814.<sup>79</sup>  
[1814a]
- P. Elmsley, *Notes on the Ajax of Sophocles*, *Museum Criticum* 3, 1814, 351-69 and 4, 1814,  
469-88. [1814b]
- P. Elmsley (ed., comm.), *Euripidis Medea*, Oxford and London 1818<sup>1</sup>, Oxford 1828<sup>2</sup>.
- P. Elmsley (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus*, Oxford 1823.
- C. G. A. Erfurdt (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Antigona*, Leipzig 1806<sup>1</sup>, 1809<sup>2</sup>.
- C. G. A. Erfurdt (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Ajax*, Leipzig 1811.
- P. J. Finglass (ed., comm.), *Sophocles. Electra* (*Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries*  
44), Cambridge 2007. [2007a]
- P. J. Finglass (ed., comm., transl.), *Pindar. Pythian Eleven* (*Cambridge Classical Texts and*  
*Commentaries* 45), Cambridge 2007. [2007b]
- P. J. Finglass, *A newly-discovered edition of Sophocles by Peter Elmsley*, *GRBS* 47, 2007, 101-  
16. [2007c]
- P. J. Finglass, *Laurentianus 31.10 and the text of Sophocles*, *CQ* N.S. 58, 2008.
- P. J. Finglass (ed., comm., transl.), *Sophocles. Ajax*, forthcoming.
- T. Gaisford (ed.), *Etymologicum Magnum*, Oxford 1848.
- D. E. Gerber, *Emendations in the Odes of Pindar: an historical analysis*, in O. Reverdin and B.  
Grange (eds.), *Pindare, Entrétiens sur l'antiquité classique* 31, Geneva 1985, 1-25.

---

<sup>79</sup> The eight issues of this journal were reprinted in a two volume work, also called *Museum Criticum*, published Cambridge 1826, reprinted Bristol 2004. Elmsley's article appears in the first volume, pages 177-80. For the dates of the original eight issues see Stray (2004) 298-9.

- A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds., comm., transl.), *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1968.
- P. A. Hansen (ed.), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols. (Texte und Kommentare 12,15), Berlin and New York 1983–9.
- J. J. Henderson (ed., comm.), *Aristophanes. Lysistrata*, Oxford 1987.
- G. Hermann (ed., comm.), *Euripidis Hercules Furens*, Leipzig 1810.
- G. Hermann (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Ajax*, Leipzig 1817<sup>1</sup>, 1825<sup>2</sup>, 1848<sup>3</sup>, 1851<sup>4</sup>.
- G. Hermann, review of P. Elmsley (ed., comm.), *Euripidis Medea* (Oxford and London 1818),  
*The Classical Journal* 19 no. 38, 1819, 267-89. [= (1828) 143-71]
- G. Hermann, *Opuscula Volumen Tertium*, Leipzig 1828.
- H. van Herwerden, *Commentationes Flavianae duae*, *Mnemosyne* N.S. 21, 1893, 225-63.
- D. Holwerda (ed.), *Scholia in Aristophanem, Pars 1. Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes; Fasc. III 1 continens Scholia Vetera in Nubes*, Groningen 1977.
- R. L. Hunter, (ed., comm.), *Eubulus. The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 24), Cambridge 1983.
- R. Kannicht (ed., comm.), *Euripides. Helena*, 2 vols., Heidelberg 1969.
- R. Kannicht (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 5. Euripides*, 2 parts, Göttingen 2004.
- R. Kannicht and B. Snell (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 2. Fragmenta Adespota*, Göttingen 1981.
- R. Kassel and C. F. L. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. to date, Berlin 1983–.

- E. C. Kopff, review of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) and M. Davies (comm.), *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Oxford 1991), *AJP* 114, 1993, 155-63.
- R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erster Teil: Elementar- und Formenlehre*<sup>3</sup>, 2 vols., rev. F. Blass, Hannover 1890-2.
- K. Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon [A – O only]*, 2 vols., Copenhagen 1953-66.
- J. D. van Lennep (ed.), *Phalaridis Epistolae*, ed. L. C. Valckenaer, Groningen 1777.
- J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Comoediae undecim cum scholiis. Codex Ravennas 137, 4, A phototypice editus (Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti 9)*, Leiden 1904.
- P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (eds.), *Sophoclis Fabulae*, Oxford 1990, revised 1992.
- C. A. Lobeck (ed., comm.), *Sophoclis Ajax*, Leipzig 1835<sup>2</sup>, Berlin 1866<sup>3</sup>.
- C. A. Lobeck, *Pathologiae Graeci Sermonis Elementa Pars II, Regimontii Borussorum* 1862.
- F. Lochner-Hüttenbach, *Griech. βᾰμβᾰίνω und ital. bambino*, *Glotta* 40, 1962, 165-8.
- D. J. Mastronarde and J. M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai* (University of California Publications in Classical studies 27), Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1982.
- A. Matthiae (ed., comm.), *Euripidis tragoediae et fragmenta, Tomus Octavus*, Leipzig 1824.
- L. Mendelssohn and P. Viereck (eds.), *Appiani Historia Romana [Bellum Civile only]*, Leipzig 1905.
- G. W. Most (ed., transl.), *Hesiod, The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments* (Loeb Classical Library 503), Cambridge, MA and London 2007.
- S. A. Naber (ed.), *Flavii Iosephi Opera Omnia*, 6 vols., Leipzig 1888-96.



- J. A. Nauck (ed., comm.), Sophokles. Erstes Baendchen: Allgemeine Einleitung. Aias. Philoktetes. Vierte Auflage, Berlin 1860. [Revision of F. W. Schneidewin's edition]
- B. Niese (ed.), Flavii Iosephi Opera, 7 vols., Berlin 1887-95.
- D. L. Page (ed.), Poetae Melici Graeci, Oxford 1962.
- A. C. Pearson (ed.), Sophoclis Fabulae, Oxford 1924.
- G. Poethke, Ilias-Handschriften aus der Berliner Papyrus-Sammlung (V), APF 44, 1998, 1-11.
- L. Politis, Nouveaux manuscrits grecs découverts au Mont Sinai. Rapport préliminaire, Scriptorium 34, 1980, 5-17.
- H. Rabe (ed.), Lexicon Messanense de iota ascripto, RhM n.F. 47, 1892, 404-13.
- S. L. Radt (ed.), Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 4. Sophocles, Göttingen 1977<sup>1</sup>, 1999<sup>2</sup>.
- C. K. Reisig, review of Hermann's first edition, Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung 15/4, 1818, 249-63.
- C. K. Reisig, Sophoclis Oedipus in Colono, Jena 1820.
- C. K. Reisig, Commentarii in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum criticis commentationibus addita enarratione integri, Jena 1823.
- R. F. Renehan, Greek Lexicographical Notes. A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddel-Scott-Jones (Hypomnemata 45), Göttingen 1975.
- A. G. Roos (ed.), Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia, 2 vols., Leipzig 1907-28.
- E. Rostagno, L'Eschilo Laurenziano, Florence 1896.
- W. G. Rutherford (ed., comm.), The New Phrynichus: being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus, London 1881.

- H. J. Scheltema, De codice Sophocleo Lugdunensi, *Mnemosyne* 4<sup>th</sup> ser. 2, 1949, 132-7.
- M. Schmidt (ed.), *Didymi Chalcenteri Grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig 1854.
- M. Schmidt (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 5 vols., Jena 1858-68.
- J. Schweighaeuser (ed.), *Appiani Alexandrini Romanarum Historiarum quae supersunt*, 3 vols., Leipzig 1785.
- E. Schwyzer, Einige griechische Dativformen, *KZ* 65, 1938, 183. [= (1983) 738]
- E. Schwyzer (rev. A. Debrunner), *Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik*, 4 vols., Munich 1934-71.
- E. Schwyzer, *Kleine Schriften* (ed. R. Schmitt; *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 45), Innsbruck 1983.
- F. Skoda, *Le redoublement expressif: un universal linguistique. Analyse du procédé en grec ancien et en d'autres langues*, Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France 15, Paris 1982.
- S. R. Slings, *Critical Notes on Plato's Politeia* (ed. G. Boter and J. van Ophuijsen; *Mnemosyne Supplementa* 267), Leiden and Boston 2005.
- B. Snell (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 2. Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum*, Göttingen 1971<sup>1</sup>, 1986<sup>2</sup>.
- S. Sobolewski, *De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo*, Moscow 1890.

- A. H. Sommerstein, (ed., comm.), *The Comedies of Aristophanes*. Vol. 7. *Lysistrata*, Warminster 1990.
- J. A. Spranger, *Euripidis quae in cod. Par. Gr. 2713 servantur*, 2 vols, Paris and Florence 1938.
- G. Stallbaum (ed.), *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1825-6.
- C. Stray, *From one Museum to another: the Museum Criticum (1813-26) and the Philological Museum (1831-33)*, *Victorian Periodicals Review* 37, 2004, 289-314.
- F. W. Sturz (ed.), *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum edita*, Leipzig 1818.
- F. W. Sturz (ed.), *Orionis Thebani Etymologicon*, Leipzig 1820.
- O. J. L. Szemerényi, review of P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, fascicles 1 and 2 (Paris 1968-70), *Gnomon* 43, 1971, 641-75. [= (1987-91) III 1589]
- O. J. L. Szemerényi, *Scripta Minora. Selected Essays in Indo-European, Greek and Latin*, 5 vols., ed. P. Considine and J.T. Hooker, Innsbruck 1987-91.
- C. Theodoridis (ed.), *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon [A–M only]*, 2 vols. to date, Berlin and New York 1982–.
- E. M. Thompson and R. C. Jebb, *Facsimile of the Laurentian Manuscript of Sophocles*, London 1885.
- L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, 2 vols. to date, Berlin and New York 1980–.
- E. Tichy, *Onomatopoetische Verbalbildungen des Griechischen*, (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 409,

- Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung 14),  
Vienna 1983.
- A. Turyn, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* (Illinois Studies in  
Language and Literature 36.1-2), Urbana 1952.
- E.-M. Voigt (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta*, Amsterdam 1971.
- M. L. West (ed.), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols., Oxford 1971-2<sup>1</sup>, 1989-  
92<sup>2</sup>.
- M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982.
- M. L. West (ed.), *Aeschylus. Tragoediae*, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1990, corrected 1998.
- M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 1), Stuttgart 1990.
- M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford  
1997.
- M. L. West (ed.), *Homerus. Ilias*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, Leipzig and Munich 1998-2000.
- M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich and Leipzig 2001.
- M. L. West and J. Latacz (eds.), *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Band I: 1. Gesang. Faszikel 1:  
Text und Übersetzung*, Munich and Leipzig 2000.
- J. W. White and T. W. Allen, *Ἀριστοφάνου Κωμωδίαι. Facsimile of the Codex Venetus  
Marcianus 474*, London and Boston 1902.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Aeschyli Tragoediae*, Berlin 1914.
- J. Wilkins (ed., comm.), *Euripides. Heraclidae*, Oxford 1993.

A. Willi, *The Languages of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*, Oxford 2003.

N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Aristophanis Fabulae*, 2 vols., Oxford 2007.