

ENRICO MEDDA

A Note on Aeschylus, *Choeph.* 68

ABSTRACT: This paper proposes a slight emendation at Aesch. *Choeph.* 68, which allows to rescue the transmitted adjective διαλγής by referring it to the sufferer instead that to Ate, and to recover at the same time a connective particle which many editors missed in the passage.

Keywords: Aeschylus, Choephoroi, Textual criticism, Ate, Guilt, Suffering

- 68a διαλγής ἄτα
68b διαφέρει τὸν αἵτιον
69 παναρκέτας νόσου βρύειν.

68a. δ' post διαλγής add. Eichstaedt et Hermann / αἰανής pro διαλγής H. L. Ahrens : ἄλγη δ' Sier / 68b. διαφορεῖ Blass

This is the text of Aesch. *Ch.* 68–9 as transmitted by the *codex unicus* M (Laur. XXXII 9). I shall focus here only on the first part of the sentence, leaving aside the issues raised by the unusual form παναρκέτας at l. 69.¹

At l. 68 διαλγής has been suspected for two reasons. The first is the apparent lack of responion with l. 73 βαίνοντες ~ ~ ~ ~ ~); the second that it does not recur in Greek literary texts before Plut. *Alex.* 75.5.3 διαλγής γενόμενος τὸ μετάρφρονον ὥσπερ λόγῃ πεπληγῶς and *De amore proliis* 496 d 8 ἔτι θερμὴ καὶ διαλγής καὶ κραδαινομένη τοῖς πόνοις (the subject is a new mother who, still hot and shaken with her pangs, turns anyway to her newborn child and smiles at it). In both these passages the compound has a passive meaning, 'who is affected by pain', 'full of pain', while in Aeschylus, where it qualifies ἄτα, it should be active/causative, 'who inflicts pain'.² A further difficulty was detected by EICHSTAEDT and HERMANN, who found a second asyndeton disturbing after the asyndetic phrase of ll. 66 f. δὲ αἵματ' ἐκποθέντ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς τροφῷ | τίτας φόνος πέπηγεν οὐ διαρρῦδαν.³ Both of them independently proposed to insert δ' after διαλγής.⁴

- 1 παναρκέτας could be a feminine nominative, or a genitive from the adjective πανάρκετος, not attested elsewhere. MURRAY 1955 and PAGE 1972 obelize the word, while WEST 1990, 233–34 prefers to delete βρύειν, as falsely repeated from 64 f. He also inserts <καὶ> at the beginning of the verse and corrects νόσου in νόσος, with παναρκέτας interpreted as nominative (his text is accepted by SOMMERSTEIN 2008 and BROWN 2018). GARVIE 1986, 65 considers παναρκέτας "suspicious in both its sense and its feminine termination", but for a defence of the transmitted text see SIER 1988, 43.
- 2 διαλγής is obelized by PAGE 1972 and, following him, by NENCI-ARATA 1999.
- 3 I am not convinced that at l. 66 BAMBERGER's emendation τὰ δ' αἵματ', which removes the first asyndeton, is necessary. The transmitted text is successfully defended by SIER 1988, 40–1 and CITTI 2006, 41–2.
- 4 EICHSTAEDT 1797, 117; HERMANN 1798, 198. The insertion of δ' has had a certain success: see the editions of SCHÜTZ 1808, DINDORF 1841, 437, FRANZ 1846, WECKLEIN 1888, WILAMOWITZ 1896 in the nineteenth

The second problem of the passage concerns the verb διαφέρει. *Schol.* 68b SMITH interprets it as διασπαράσσει ('rend in pieces'), a meaning well documented for διαφορέω but not so for διαφέρω. BLASS accordingly conjectured διαφορεῖ, an easy change which has been approved by some editors of the twentieth century.⁵ Moreover, it is disputed whether τὸν αἴτιον is the object of διαφέρει or not.

Let's start from διαλγής. The explanation of *schol.* 68a SMITH ἡ διαιωνίζουσα αἴτη ('Ate who perpetuates itself') seemed to PALEY, AHRENS and WEIL inconsistent with M's διαλγής αἴτα; so they suggested that the scholiast had a different text before his eyes, αἰανής αἴτα (the corruption ΑΙΑΝΗΣ > ΔΙΑΛΓΗΣ would have been easy in capital handwriting).⁶ Their emendation restores exact responsion with l. 73 by introducing a word whose meaning in Aeschylus oscillates between 'everlasting' (*Eum.* 572 εἰς τὸν αἰανῆ χρόνον and 672 αἰανῶς) and 'grievous', 'lamentable' (*Pe.* 635, 939, *Eum.* 479, 942).⁷ The emendation has won large acceptance, particularly among the most recent editors:⁸ the arguments against διαλγής, however, are not so strong as it might seem.

First of all, the metrical problem should not be overestimated. With M's colometry, διαλγής αἴτα (— — —) may be analyzed as a dochmius (cf. *Sept.* 135a σύ τ' Ἄρης φεῦ φεῦ and 101b ποτ' εἰ μὴ νῦν ἄμ-),⁹ and since at l. 73 βαίνοντες is suspect, it is possible to adopt an emendation in the antistrophe that restores the same metre (for example BAMBERGER's προβαίνοντες).¹⁰ Alternatively, διαλγής might be scanned as disyllabic, with consonantic ι: cf. *Pe.* 1007 διαπρέπον, οἶον δέδορκεν αἴτα (*ch ith*), 1038 δῖαινε δῖαινε πῆμα, πρὸς δόμους δ' ἴθι (3 *ia*), *Sept.* 289 γείτονες δὲ καρδίας (*cr ba*), *Suppl.* 72 ἀπειρόδακρύν τε καρδίαν (*ia tr*, ἀναξιδόρμιγγες ὕμνοι, with δᾱκ-, or *hag*, with δᾱκ-), 799 καρδίας γάμου κυρῆσαι (*ia ba*).¹¹

century, and SIDGWICK 1902, WILAMOWITZ 1914, WEIR SMYTH 1926, GROENEBOOM 1949, 114 n. 1, SIER 1998, WEST 1998 and BROWN 2018 in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

- 5 See for example THOMSON 1966, GARVIE 1986, 64, BROWN 2018. YOUNG 1971, 304 proposes διαφορεῖ ('grievous Ruin lets the guilty man pass through to become full of self-sufficing madness'); the rare verb is attested at Aristoph. *Av.* 193 and Thuc. 7.32. The corruption would be easy, but the sense of the resulting phrase is far from attractive.
- 6 The idea first occurred to PALEY in the first edition of his commentary (1855, 433; cf. PALEY 1879, 493); WEIL 1860, 11 printed αἰανής in the text, with the note "eandem conjecturam protulit H. L. Ahrens, qui reliqua tentare non debebat". However, in the 1884 Teubner edition WEIL returned to the transmitted reading, without even mentioning αἰανής in the apparatus (see also the second revised edition, 1907). As for AHRENS' conjecture, WEST in 1998 was not able to trace its original collocation, nor have I managed to find it so far.
- 7 The word was associated by ancient lexicographers alternatively to αἰεῖ or αἰαῖ, but its real etymology is unknown (see DEGANI 1962 and CHANTRAINE, *DELG*, s. v.). In the time of Aeschylus it had probably become one of the 'iconyms' studied by SILK 1983, i. e. words whose original meaning had been forgotten, but which were open to re-etymologization according to the intention of the author (see in particular pp. 304 and 314). DEGANI, who offers the most complete study of the word, at p. 46 rejects the emendation at *Ch.* 68.
- 8 See TUCKER 1901, THOMSON 1966, GARVIE 1986, 64, WEST 1998, SOMMERSTEIN 2008, BROWN 2018.
- 9 For further examples of this dochmiac form in tragedy see CONOMIS 1964, 26 f.
- 10 See BAMBERGER 1840, 14. For a compound of βαίνειν used for the movement of a river see Plato *Crit.* 118d τὰ δ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρέων καταβαίνοντα ... ρεύματα (quoted by Sier 1988, 44), Hdt. 1.193.1 αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀναβαίνοντος ἐς τὰς ἀρούρας, 2.13.7 (the Nile) οὐκ ὑπερβαίνει ἐς τὴν χώραν, 2.14.8 μήτε ὁ ποταμὸς οἷός τε ἔσται ἐς τὰς ἀρούρας ὑπερβαίνειν. The alternative διαίνοντες (LACHMANN 1819, 49) is less persuasive, since in tragedy διαίω is usually referred to crying, and τὸν χερομυσὴ φόνον does not seem an appropriate object for it.
- 11 On the consonantalization of ι in Greek poetry see WEST 1982, 14, and for tragedy in particular KAP-SOMENOS 1990. The disyllabic scansion of διαλγής was already suggested by LENHOFF 1844, 15, who analyzed διαλγής αἴτα διαφέρει as *sp do*.

διαλγῆς ἄτα (---) would then correspond to 73a βαίνοντες τὸν (this only requires moving the article to the preceding line in the antistrophe). The four long syllables may be interpreted as catalectic dochmiac (cf. *Eum.* 842 οἰοῖ δ᾽ αὖ φεῦ) or, less likely, as anapaestic monometer.¹² L. 68b, as transmitted in M, is *cr ia*, corresponding to what remains at l. 73b (χερομυσῇ φόνον καθαί-) after removing τὸν.

As for the late date of διαλγῆς,¹³ CITTÌ has repeatedly noted that the reappearing of rare Aeschylean words in late authors is not infrequent: for example, πολυθρέμων (*Pe.* 33) occurs again only in Greg. Naz. *Carm. mor.* 716.5, *Oracula Sybillina* 8.30 and *Orph. Hymn.* 51.3; ἑξαρκής (*Pe.* 237 and *Soph. Tr.* 333) only in Lib. *Decl.* 20.1.10 F. τοῦτο ἑξαρκες τὸ προελέσθαι.¹⁴ Moreover, CITTÌ observes that the two passages of Plutarchus are full of elevated ‘tragic’ words and echoes, of which διαλγῆς could be part (though a direct reprise of *Ch.* 68 is not demonstrable). The strongest argument he advocates in defence of the transmitted reading, however, is the clearly intentional assonance of the *tricolon* based on δια- (δὲ αἶματ’ / διαρρύδαν / διαλγῆς / διαφέρει), that should not be obliterated by correction.¹⁵ Aeschylus’ fondness for this kind of phonic effects is well known: see for example *Ag.* 1410 ἀπέδικες ἀπέταμες ἀπόπολις, 1552–3 κάππεσε κάτθανε | καὶ καταθάψομεν.¹⁶

I turn now to the interpretation of διαφέρει. KLAUSEN’s “acerba perniciēs administrat res auctoris” looks bizarre;¹⁷ HERMANN’s “graviter dolitura noxa differt auctorem (i. e. differt auctoris poenam), ut satietate malorum abundet”¹⁸ is slightly better, but, apart from the fact that it is not easy to find tragic parallels for this meaning (only *Eur. HF* 76 f. ἐγὼ δὲ διαφέρω | λόγοισι μυθεύουσα perhaps offers one), the shift from ‘differt auctorem’ to ‘differt auctoris poenam’ is patently strained. In his 1860 edition, WEIL interprets διαφέρει as absolute, and takes it as “perdurat” (cf. *Hippocr. Int.* 12 [VII 194.11–2 L.] ἡ δὲ νοῦσος διαφέρει μάλιστα ἐννέα ἔτεα and 40 [VII 264 L.] διαφέρει δ’ ἕως τῶν εἰκοσιτεσσάρων ἡμερέων); τὸν αἴτιον must then be regarded as the subject of the consecutive παναρκέτας νόσον βρύνει (“Pertinax Poena perdurat usque dum noxius satietate malorum sca-teat”).¹⁹ His approach is partially picked up by SIER, who prefers to introduce an object for the verb by writing ἄλγη δ’ ἄτα διαφέρει (“Ate ... trägt die Leiden über die Zeit hin, auf daß der Schuldige

12 See GALVANI 2015, 47 f. and GENTILI-LOMIENTO 2003, 240.

13 Searching for διαλγ- in the TLG database, I found a rather early occurrence of διαλγεῖν, apparently supporting Aeschylus’ adjective, at *Hippocr. Morb.* II 57.1 (VII p. 88 Littré) καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν διαλγέει καὶ τὰ βλέφαρα. However, the compound verb disappears in the edition of Jouanna 1983, which is based on the best Hippocratic manuscripts (M, *Marcianus gr.* 269, Xth century, and Θ, *Vindobonensis med. gr.* 4, XIth century). Jouanna’s text is καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν δὲ αλγεῖ καὶ τὰ βλέφαρα (δὲ αλγεῖ is a correction of the editor for δὲ αλγέει of MΘ). I have checked the reading of both manuscripts on the digital images available on the websites of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice and of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien.

14 See CITTÌ 1994, 27 n. 24, 30 n. 46, CITTÌ 2006, 43, and also MEDDA 2012, 43 for the cases of *Ag.* 382–3 λακτίσαντι μέγαν Δίκας βωμόν ~ Lib. *Or.* 17.7.2 F. βωμοὺς δὲ ἐφήκε λακτίζουσιν ἀνατρέπειν, *Ag.* 110 χερὶ πράκτορι ~ Lib. *Or.* 39, 9 F. πρακτόρων χέρας ἔφασκε διαφυγῶν μίαν ἔχειν ἐλπίδα.

15 SIER 1988, 42 suggests on the contrary that we have here a case of unconscious repetition by the scribe of letters soon to be copied (examples in JACKSON 1955, 223 ff.): in his opinion, the corruption to διαλγῆς was triggered by the presence of two other terms beginning with δια- in the same sentence. The argument is based on Sier’s own correction of διαλγῆς to ἄλγη δ’, which is far from certain (see below); the mechanism of repetition could not be applied as well to αἰανῆς.

16 The *tricolon* would be preserved by adopting διαρκῆς ἄτα (HEIMSOETH 1861, 35), which however would be disturbing before the immediately following παναρκέτας and has rightly not found acceptance.

17 KLAUSEN 1835, 91.

18 HERMANN 1859, II 510; see also PALEY 1879, 493 (“reserves for future punishment”).

19 WEIL 1860, 11.

von Krankheit voll werde”).²⁰ This involves removing διαλγής from the sentence, which, as shown above, does not seem a recommendable solution.

A better way to understanding the passage is represented by taking διαφέρει to be used in a figurative sense (‘pulls this way and that’) corresponding to the physical one it certainly has at Eur. *Ba.* 753 f. πάντ’ ἄνω καὶ κάτω | διέφερον and at Eur. *Suppl.* 715 f. ὀπισμα ... | δεινῆς κορύνης διαφέρων ἐσφενδόνα.²¹ The image of Ate continuously pulling the guilty one this way and that is perfectly appropriate here, and finds an illuminating parallel in the description of Andocides’ life in [Lys.] 6.20: ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ δέη πολλά καὶ κινδύνους ὁ θεὸς ἐπιπέμπει τοῖς ἀδικοῦσιν, ὥστε πολλοὺς ἤδη ἐπιθυμήσαι τελευτήσαντας τῶν κακῶν ἀπηλλάχθαι. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τέλος τούτῳ λυμηνάμενος τῷ βίῳ θάνατον ἐπέθηκε. The restless and painful life of the impious Andocides is attributed to divine anger, as well as his self-harming decisions: ἃ τούτῳ ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐπινοεῖν δίδωσιν, ἀλλὰ τιμωρούμενος τῶν γεγενημένων ἀσεβημάτων (6.31–2). It’s the same idea that we find at Ag. 179 f. στάζει δ’ ἄνθ’ ὕπνω πρὸ καρδίας | μνησιπτήμων πόνος, where the continuous pain inflicted on the guilty man is presented by the Elders of Argos as a manifestation of the violent χάρις of the gods.

Let’s now pull the threads together. In the glossary of his edition, BLOMFIELD translated διαλγής with “perquam aerumnosus”, giving intensive force to δια-.²² The parallel usually cited by the commentators for this meaning is Soph. *Trach.* 777 διώδυνος. But the prefix may also have temporal force, so that διαλγής could better be interpreted as ‘continuously inflicting pain’, as WILAMOWITZ and TUCKER argued.²³ διαλγής ἅτα, ‘Ate who continuously inflicts pain’ would be perfectly at home in the context reconstructed above: but here we come across a real difficulty, since we must take into account that elsewhere διαλγής means ‘suffering pain’, not ‘causing pain’, and that the same is true for all the known occurrences of διαλγεῖν: Pol. 4.4.2.3 ἐπὶ τε τοῖς γινομένοις καὶ τῇ παρεπιδημίᾳ τοῦ Δωριμάχου διαλγοῦντες, 16.34.10.2 διαλγῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς γινομένοις, Diod. 4.9.6.8 ἢ μὲν Ἥρα διαλγήσασα τὸ βρέφος ἔρριψε, Plut. *Ag. et Cleom.* 43.7 περιβαλοῦσα καὶ κατασπασαμένη διαλγοῦντα καὶ συντεταραγμένον, *Mor.* 70b.1, διαλγήσας ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ λύπης καὶ ὀργῆς. In view of these passages, the qualification διαλγής would better fit τὸν αἴτιον than ἅτα. It seems to me telling that WILAMOWITZ, although not altering the text, caught this nuance of the line in his paraphrase ὥστε διατελεῖν ἀλγούντας.²⁴ I think that a slight emendation can put all the pieces in place, by trans-

20 SIER 1988, 42.

21 The translation “jactat, agitat” was already suggested by HEATH 1762, 97. Attention to Eur. *Ba.* 753 f. was called by PEILE 1840, p. 71 and LENHOFF 1844, 16; to Eur. *Suppl.* 715 f. by WEST 1990, 234 n. 5; see also CITTI 2006, 43. Earlier commentators recalled the use of *differo* in latin, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.642–3 *Mettum in diversa quadrigae | distulerant* (STANLEY 1663), Plaut. *Pseud.* 359 *iam ego te differam verbis meis*; Poen. 156–7 *differor | cupidine eius* (DE JONGH 1856), to which add Ter. *Ad.* 486 *differor doloribus* and the absolute use at Plaut. *Cist.* 208 *feror differor distrahor diripior*. The scholiast’s διασπαράσσει is probably only an exaggeration of what may be considered the correct meaning. UNTERSTEINER 2002, 178 translates “Ate trascina fra continui dolori il colpevole sino alla fine”, but he also adds “differendo così la pena”, which seems influenced by HERMANN’s interpretation mentioned above (n. 18).

22 BLOMFIELD 1834, 117.

23 WILAMOWITZ 1898, 160; TUCKER 1901, 25 (though he adopts αἰανής); see further DEGANI 1962, 46. This meaning could perhaps justify the interpretation ἡ δαιωνίζουσα ἄτη of schol. 68a SMITH. The scholiast could have extracted the idea of the continuity of Ate’s action from διαλγής, choosing not by chance a verb with the same prefix δια-. It seems thus excessive to say that διαλγής ἅτα “is clearly not what the scholiast read” (SOMMERSTEIN 2010b, 108 n. 73).

24 WILAMOWITZ 1896, 160.

ferring the idea of continuous suffering on the victim of Ate and at the same time restoring the connective particle that many editors miss in the passage. I propose to write:

διαλγῇ δ' ἄτα
διαφέρει τὸν αἵτιον

'Ate pulls the guilty one who continuously suffers this way and that'. This correction would work equally well if one prefers to adopt BLASS' διαφέρει, though this further change, as I argued above, is not strictly necessary.²⁵

Bibliography

- F. BAMBERGER, *Aeschyli Choephoroi*, Gottingae 1840
 F. BLASS, *Aischylos' Choephoren*, Halle 1906
 C. J. BLOMFIELD, *Aeschyli Choephora*, Londini ³1834
 A. BOWEN, *Aeschylus. Choephoroi*, Bristol 1986
 A. BROWN, *Aeschylus. Libation Bearers*, Liverpool 2018
 V. CITTI, *Eschilo e la lexis tragica*, Amsterdam 1994
 –, *Studi sul testo delle Coefore*, Amsterdam 2006
 J. CONINGTON, *The Choephora of Aeschylus*, London 1857
 N. C. CONOMIS, 'The dochmiacs of Greek drama', *Hermes* 92, 1964, 23–50
 E. DEGANI, 'Αἰανῆς', *Helikon* 2, 1962, 37–66
 W. DINDORF, *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*, II, *Annotationes*, Oxonii 1841
 J. FRANZ, *Des Aeschylos Oresteia*, Leipzig 1848
 H. C. EICHSTAEDT, review of C. G. Schütz, *Aeschyli tragediae quae supersunt ac deperditarum fragmenta*, vol. III, Halae 1794–1797, *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 1797.3 (220–221), 113–122
 G. GALVANI, *Coefore. I canti. Eschilo*, Pisa-Roma 2015
 A. F. GARVIE, *Aeschylus Choephoroi*, Oxford 1986
 B. GENTILI, L. LOMIENTO, *Metrics and rhythmic: history of poetic forms in ancient Greece*, Pisa-Roma 2008
 P. GROENEBOOM, *Aeschylus' Choephoroi*, Groningen 1949
 B. HEATH, *Notae sive lectiones ad Tragicorum graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, Oxonii 1762
 F. HEIMSOETH, *Die Wiederherstellung der Dramen des Aeschylus*, Bonn 1861
 G. HERMANN, 'Commentatio de metris Pindari', in C. G. HEYNE, *Pindari Carmina*, Gottingae 1798, III 177–356
 –, *Elementa doctrinae metricae*, Lipsiae 1816
 –, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, I-II, Berolini ¹1859
 J. JACKSON, *Marginalia Scaenica*, Oxford 1955
 A. DE JONGH, *Aeschyli Choephora*, Trajecti ad Rhenum 1856
 S. G. KAPSOMENOS, 'Synecphonesis and Consonantalization of Iota in Greek Tragedy', in E. M. CRAIK (ed.), *Owls to Athens. Essays on Classical Subjects dedicated to Sir Kenneth Dover*, Oxford 1990, 321–330
 R. H. KLAUSEN, *Aeschyli quae supersunt*, I. *Oresteia*, sect. 2. *Choephoroe*, Gothae et Erfordiae 1835

25 Of course, leaving ἄτα without any qualification cannot be regarded as a problem: cf. *Pe.* 1007 οἷον δέδορκεν Ἄτα, *Ag.* 1024 ταχέια δ' ἄτα πέλει, *Ch.* 1075 f. ποῖ δῆτα κρανεῖ, ποῖ καταλήξει / μετακοιμισθὲν μένος ἄτης, *PV* 1072 πρὸς ἄτης θηραθεῖσαι, 1078 εἰς ἀπέρατον δίκτυον ἄτης.

- K. LACHMANN, *De choricis systematis tragicorum Graecorum*, Berolini 1819
- T. LEHNOFF, *Adnotationes ad Aesch. Choephororum parodum*, Neu-Ruppin 1844
- P. MAZON, *Eschyle, t. II. Agamemnon, Les Choéphores, Les Euménides*, Paris 1925
- E. MEDDA, 'Aeschylus, Agamemnon 78: No room for Ares', *CQ* 62, 2012, 39–44
- F. NENCI / L. ARATA, *Eschilo. Le Coefore. Fra genos e polis la scelta di Oreste*, Bologna 1999
- G. MURRAY, *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxonii 1955
- D. L. PAGE, *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxonii 1972
- F. A. PALEY, *The Tragedies of Aeschylus, re-edited with an English commentary*, London 1879 (first ed. 1855)
- T. W. PEILE, *The Choephoræ of Aeschylus*, London 1840
- H. J. ROSE, *A Commentary to the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, II, Amsterdam 1958
- C. G. SCHÜTZ, *Aeschyli tragoediae quae supersunt et deperditarum fragmenta*, III, *Choephorae, Eumenides et Supplices*; In *Aeschyli tragoedias quae supersunt et deperditarum fragmenta commentarius*, III, In *Choephoras, Eumenides et Supplices*, Halae 1808
- A. SIDGWICK, *Aeschylus. Choephoroi*, Oxford 1884
- , *Aeschyli tragoediae cum fabularum deperditarum fragmentis, poetae vita et operum catalogo*, Oxonii 1902
- K. SIER, *Die lyrischen Partien der Choephoren des Aischylos*, Stuttgart 1988
- O. L. SMITH, *Scholia in Aeschylum*, pars I, *Stutgardiae et Lipsiae* 1993
- M. S. SILK, 'LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism: from meanings to iconyms', *CQ* 33, 1983, 303–330
- A. H. SOMMERSTEIN, *Aeschylus*, II, Cambridge MA-London 2008
- , 'Textual and other notes on Aeschylus, part 2', *Prometheus* 26, 2010, 97–122
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG). A Digital Library of Greek Literature*, University of California, Irvine [<https://www.tlg.uci.edu>]
- G. THOMSON, *The Oresteia of Aeschylus, with an introduction and commentary, in which is included the work of the late W. HEADLAM*, Amsterdam-Praha 1966
- T. G. TUCKER, *The Choephoroi of Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1901
- M. UNTERSTEINER, *Eschilo. Le Coefore*, a cura di W. Lapini e V. Citti, Amsterdam 2002
- M. VALGIMIGLI / M. V. GHEZZO, *Eschilo. Le Coefore*, Messina-Firenze 1951
- N. WECKLEIN, *Äschylos. Orestie*, Leipzig 1888
- H. WEIL, *Aeschyli Choephoroe*, Lipsiae 1860
- , *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Lipsiae 1907 (1884)
- H. WEIR SMYTH, *Aeschylus*, II, Cambridge (MA)/London 1926
- M. L. WEST, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982
- , *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990
- , *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheo*, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1998 (1990)
- U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Aischylos Orestie. Zweites Stuck, Das Opfer am Grabe*, Berlin 1896
- , *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Berolini 1914
- D. C. YOUNG, 'Readings in Aeschylus' *Choephoroe and Eumenides*', *GRBS* 12, 1971, 303–330

ENRICO MEDDA

Università di Pisa

