THE *APPARATUS CRITICUS* TO THE *SUPPLICES* IN PAGE'S AESCHYLUS OCT

MARSH McCALL

Stanford University

Page's OCT of Aeschylus (1972) has become the standard critical edition. However, the presentation of the *Supplices* at least is much impaired by a flawed *apparatus criticus*. More than a quarter of the reports are erroneous, misleading, or incomplete, and it is hard to feel confident that matters are different with the other plays, particularly those outside the triad. Of course, these errors are not usually such as to affect a casual reader. But a scholar concerned with exact information in an *apparatus* will be severely disappointed. "Accuracy," said Housman, "is a duty and not a virtue,"[1] and with accuracy may be paired consistency.

The following notes have to do broadly either with Page's reports of MS readings, especially those of M, or with his attributions of editorial corrections and conjectures. In the former category there is first a sizeable group of items in which clear mistakes can be set right. Then there is a large class of items in which Page has done some kind of orthographical cleaning up before reporting M or one of the other MSS. Here he risks, on the one hand, misleading his readers every time he fails to record the exact orthography of a reported MS reading (see, for an early and striking example, the entry to 26); and, on the other hand, since there are a number of instances in the *app.* in which Page manifestly *is* being careful to give the exact orthography of a MS (see, e.g., his *app.* at 15, 518, 727), an inquiring reader is left entirely in doubt as to which MS reports are indeed exact and which have been regularized. By this form of inconsistency an editor gains nothing, and often confuses, and I supply, in all cases where Page's reports have not done so, the precise reading of the MSS.

A particular area of inaccurate reporting of MSS is to be found in Page's treatment of suprascript variants and corrections. He has a simple way, noted in his *sigla*, to indicate a supralinear reading: *sscr.*, and at times his *app.* is absolutely precise in recording the suprascript letters (see, e.g., his entries at 122 seqq. and 1001-2). In most cases, however, he does not make clear exactly what is suprascript; in several cases he does not even

---

[1] In his addenda to Manilius, Bk. I, printed in the ed. of Bk. V (London 1930) 105.

show that the variant *is* a suprascript;[2] and in some cases he neglects to show that there is a variant or correction at all. Thus, Page has a convenient and exact system at hand but employs it only erratically.

In the category of editorial attributions, Page's most common failure is a misleading and unjustifiable silence. There are close to fifty instances in which, having printed a correction of M in his text, Page records M's reading (whether accurately or not) in the *app.* but does not identify the corrector. And yet in many other comparable places he *does* specify the corrector and allows him his moment of glory in the *app.* A reader will be forced to the conclusion that in the first group the corrections for some reason cannot be pinpointed; but for the *Supplices* this is simply not the case, and the missing attributions must be filled in (many, though by no means all, Page could have culled from the editions of Wecklein and Friis Johansen). Again, Page will frequently mention an emendation that has moved the reading part way toward the truth, but equally frequently, and in similar situations, he will not. I add, therefore, a number of partial corrections, particularly those found in M's apographa and the earliest editions.

The editions of Robortello and Turnebus pose a special problem. Both were published in 1552, and although Robortello's appeared a few months earlier than Turnebus' the two editions are absolutely independent of one another.[3] Therefore, corrections found in both of them should be treated as concurrent and should be ascribed to both editors. Page never does this and thus, while usually giving priority of mention to Robortello, creates situations like that at 344 and 345 where—in consecutive verses—he first attributes to Sophianus (a learned friend who contributed several conjectures to Robortello's ed.) a correction found also in Turnebus and then attributes to Turnebus a correction found also in Robortello. I note about two dozen cases of concurrent emendation in the editions of Robortello and Turnebus.

Except in a fairly small number of instances (about twenty-five in all) I do not comment on readings for which Page has no entry at all in his *app.*; that is, I accept for present purposes his own *app.* and simply seek to add a further element of precision and helpfulness to it. I want to emphasize that I am not attempting to impose new standards on Page's *app.* Every OCT *app.* intends to be accurate and consistent in the reporting of MSS, in the description (and the system of description) of supralinear variants, in the

---

[2] That is, he will ascribe a variant that is in fact supralinear to M^s even though in his *sigla* M^s denotes nothing more than *manus . . . eadem quae scholia scripsit*. For M, this hand is that of the reviser who copied the scholia and entered most of the corrections and variants, suprascript and otherwise, but only M^{sscr} specifies a *supralinear* variant.

[3] See M. McCall, "The Sources of Robortello's Edition of Aeschylus' *Supplices*," forthcoming in *BICS* 28 (1981); see also M. Haupt's *Praefatio* to Hermann's 2nd ed. (1859) xvi.

attribution (and the system of attribution) of corrections and conjectures. My hope is to contribute to these goals.[4]

The MSS referred to, and their approximate dates are:

> M, Florentinus Laurentianus 32.9 (*c.* 1000)
> Laur., Laurentianus Marcianus 222 (14th cent.)
> Bon., Bononiensis 2271 (late 15th cent.)
> Guelf., Guelferbytanus Gudianus Graecus 88 (*c.* 1495)
> Par., Parisinus Graecus 2886 (*c.* 1520)
> Scur., Scurialensis T.I.15 (*c.* 1545)[5]

In addition to the various editions and other bibliography referred to by the name of the editor or scholar alone,[6] I also draw on the careful (though not perfect) transcript of M's text of the *Supplices* by Merkel.[7] For each of the following entries I first give Page's text and/or *app.* (sometimes there is no need to give the text; sometimes only part of the *app.* is relevant) and then my correction, supplement, or comment.

Sigla: Par. = Parisinus Graecus 2286
The MS number is 2886. The error is made also in Friis Johansen's "Codex Scurialensis T.I.15 and the Transmission of Aeschylus' *Suppliants*," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 360, 367, an article referred to in Page's *sigla* and from which he unfortunately reproduces the misprint.

2: *app.*, ἀρθέντ᾿ Turnebus: ἀρόεντ᾿ M
The very first entry in Page's *app.* is mistaken. Turnebus reads ἀρθέντα. The first editor to print ἀρθέντ᾿ was Victorius.

4: text, λιποῦσαι   *app.*, λειποῦσαι M
The correction was made by Turnebus.

---

[4] I am well aware of Page's disclaimer (*Praefatio* xii): *haec si errant nunquam vel raro notantur: spiritus, accentus, puncta, nu mobile, iota adscriptum vel subscriptum, ...* It may be that, in view of this statement, my entries at least at 35, 178, 211, 281, 374, 568, 639, 685, 699, 783, 793, 824, 936 may seem to some unfair. I have thought hard before including them.

[5] One particular editorial decision by Page I wish to support strongly, namely his denial of a regular position in the *app.* to Scur., the Escorial MS which H. Friis Johansen, in his important recent ed. (Copenhagen 1970), argues is at least semi-independent of M and which, therefore, is accorded in Friis Johansen's *app.* equal status with M. The new evaluation of Scur. has been accepted by almost all reviewers (e.g., R. D. Dawe, *Gnomon* 44 [1972] 121–27; A. F. Garvie, *CR* 23 [1973] 21–22). For a point by point refutation and for detailed collations of all the MSS of the *Supplices*, see M. McCall, *The Manuscripts and Scholia of Aeschylus' Supplices* [in preparation]. As witnesses to the poetic text of the *Supplices*, we have, as Page clearly states, a *codex unicus* and five apographa.

[6] For a thorough bibliography, see Friis Johansen's ed., 44–48.

[7] R. Merkel, *Aeschyli quae supersunt in codice Laurentiano veterrimo . . . typis descripta* (Oxford 1871). I have myself studied M and the other MSS both on microfilm and *in situ*.

5: text, σύγχορτον   app., no entry

M reads σύνχορτον. The correction was made by Par. and Scur.

8: app., αὐτογενῆ Turnebus: αὐτογένητον M

Turnebus does not eliminate M's -τον but prints αὐτογενῆ τὸν. The first scholar to conjecture just αὐτογενῆ was Hermann.

13: text, ἀχέων ἐπέκρανεν   app., no entry

M reads ἀχαιων, with the correction made as a suprascript: ἀχαίων. M also reads ἐπέκρανε, and the first scholar to add the moveable ν was Heath.

14: app., διακυμ∘αλέον (fort. διακυμβαλ-) M

The reading of M^{pc} is not just "perhaps" but quite clearly διακυμβαλέον, as Friis Johansen's app. reports.

17: text, ἐπιπνοίας   app., ἐπι∘νοίας M, eraso ut vid. π

It is a reasonable guess that the reading of M^{ac} was ἐπιπνοίας, but all that can be *seen* of a letter is the extreme left portion of a horizontal stroke, i.e., ἐπι--. Indeed, so illegible is the erased letter that none of M's apographa writes anything but the incorrect ἐπινοίας. Thus it would be helpful for an *app.* not only to report, as Page's does, that M^{ac} *may* have read ἐπιπνοίας, but also to mention the scholar who first realized this to be the *required* reading, namely Turnebus.

19: app., τίν' ἂν οὖν Burges: τίνα∘οὖν M

This is to some extent the opposite situation from 17. Here too the beginning of the erased letter is visible, i.e., -ᾳ, and it is very likely to have been ν (as Murray [2nd ed.] notes in his *app.*), with the mistaken erasure arising from the scribe's dismay at seeing the apparent and anomalous accusative τίναν. Thus, while Page rightly credits Burges for restoring the phrase, there is at least as much reason as in 17 for mentioning that M^{ac} may contain the correct lettering (if not the correct articulation).

26: text, Ζεὺς σωτήρ   app., Ζεῦ Scur.

Scur. reads not Ζεῦ but Ζεὺ. This is not a trivial distinction, since Ζεῦ falsely suggests that the scribe consciously changed to a vocative, while Ζεὺ points to a simple case of scribal haplography, Ζεὺ σωτήρ for Ζεὺς σωτήρ, which should not be reported in the *app.* at all.

29–30: text, δ᾽ ἐσμὸν   app. no entry.

Twice in the play (223, 684) M offers the reading δεσμὸς and once (here) δεσμὸν, all of which have had to be articulated: here by Turnebus (who prints the not quite right δ᾽ ἐσμὸν; the first to print δ᾽ ἐσμὸν was Dindorf), at 223 by Auratus (δ᾽ ἐσμὸς; Dindorf δ᾽ ἐσμὸς), and at 684 again by Turnebus (again δ᾽ ἐσμὸς; Dindorf δ᾽ ἐσμὸς). In the latter two cases, Page's *app.* assigns credit, though incompletely, q.v.; it is inconsistent, then, to have no entry here.

35: text, ὀμβροφόροισίν   app., no entry

Neither M nor any apograph contains the metrically necessary ν. The first editor to add it was Pauw, but it had already been suggested by Bentley.

38: text, πατραδέλφειαν   app., -δελφίαν M

The emendation was made by Pauw.

40: app., ἐπικεκλομένα Turnebus: -ναι M

M reads not ἐπικεκλομέναι but -όμεναι.

41 seqq.: app., ἀνθονομούσας Porson: -νόμους τᾶς M^{ac}, -νόμου τᾶς M^{pc} ἐπιπνοίας Robortello: -πνοίαις M

Murray (2nd ed.) and Friis Johansen tell the reader, more helpfully, that M's correction is not, as Page implies, by simple erasure but by deletion points: -νόμους τᾶς (cf. 775). The ascription of ἐπιπνοίας illustrates another sort of inconsistency. Here, at 124 (q.v.), and at 1070 (q.v.) occur readings favored by Page which are first *printed* in Robortello's edition but which first can be *seen* in the scholia. Robortello knew and used the scholia, indeed made the *editio princeps* (1552). Thus each of these three entries should read: *Robortello e* Σ; yet here the ascription goes just to Robortello, at 124 just to M^{Σ}, and at 1070 again just to Robortello. The entries are neither consistent nor wholly accurate.

45 seqq.: app., δ' ἐγέννασεν· ὅν τ' Porson (τ' ἐγ-): δὲ ἐγέννασε / ὄντ' ut vid. M^{ac}, δ' ἐγεννας ἐ/όντ' ut vid. M^{pc}

Page's entry shows well the obscurity of M's readings. It would be slightly more exact, however, to report them: δ' ἐγέννασε ἐ/όντ' *vel fort.* δ' ἐγέννασε / ὄντ' M^{ac}, δὲ γέννας ἐ/όντ' M^{pc}. Some support for this interpretation of M^{pc} comes from the fact that three of the apographa (Laur., Bon., and Par.) so read, as also does Merkel's transcript of M.

59: app., οἶκτον Schwenk: οἶκτον οἰκτρὸν M

A misprint for Schwenck, who was anticipated by Bothe.

60: app., τιν' I. Pearson: τις M

M reads interrogative τίς.

63: text, ἅ τ' ἀπὸ   app., no entry

Despite Page's silence, this is not M's reading. M^{pc} is ἀτοπο, while M^{ac} is probably, but not certainly, ἀταπο (a very slight trace of an α may possibly still be seen on the right side of M's erasure). Robortello improved the reading to ἅ τἀπὸ, and Victorius made the final articulation.

69: text, νομοῖσι   app., νομοῖσι hoc accentu Whittle

M's own accentuation, which Page leaves to be guessed, is νόμοισι.

80: text, †ἥβαι μὴ τέλεον†   app., τῆνδε M^s marg., quod ad ἥβαι refertur

 ⟨ Daggers should enclose an exact report of M, but the reading of M is
ᾔβαι μητέλεον, with the reference mark answered in the margin by
⟨τῆνδε (a precise report of which would have rendered Page's *quod . . .
refertur* unnecessary).

81: *app.*, ἐτύμως Arnaldus: ἐτοίμως M
The reading of Guelf., ἐτύμως, is very close to the truth and should be
mentioned, especially since Arnaldus' actual conjecture, ἐτυμῶς, did not
include the correct accent.

83: *app.*, ἔστιν Enger: ἐστὶ δὲ M
M reads ἔστι δὲ.

84: *app.*, ἄρης M
So also Merkel, Wecklein, and Murray (2nd ed.). But the reading of M
is almost certainly ἄρης (thus also Friis Johansen), and it is noteworthy
that three of the apographa read ἄρης, one ἀρής, and one ἀρῆς; none has
a rough breathing.

86: text, εἴθ' εἴη   *app.*, εἰθείη M
M reads not εἰθείη but εἰ θείη, i.e., the scribe took τίθημι, not εἰμί, to be
the verb. Pauw emended to εἴθ' εἴην, but the correct articulation was
made first by Heath.

90: text, τείνουσιν . . . κατιδεῖν   *app.*, κατειδεῖν M
M reads τείνουσι. The first editor to print the metrically necessary ν
was Porson, and the correction to κατιδεῖν was made in two of the apo-
grapha, Par. and Scur.

104: text, εἰς   *app.*, ἐς M
The correction was made by Dindorf.

110–11: *app.*, ἄται (ι in ras.) M: ἄταν Guelf.
Guelf.'s ἄταν (which Wecklein and Friis Johansen, among others, ac-
cept in the text) is only the reading *ante correctionem*. Guelf.^{pc} is, like
M, ἄται. The first editor to print ἄταν was Asulanus, for whose Aldine
edition Guelf. was the source.

113: *app.*, λέγω Casaubon: -γων M
The correction was made first by Canter.

116: *app.*, ζώσατο οις με τιμᾶι M^s marg.
The marginal variant reads: . . . οἶς μὲ. . . .

117–21: text, ἱλέομαι . . . καρβᾶνα δ' αὐδὰν . . . Σιδονίαι καλύπτραι
app., ἱλέομαι Turnebus: ἱλέωμαι hic et 129 M   Σινδον- utroque loco M^{ac}
129–32: *app.*, vid. 117–21
M reads ἱλέωμαι at 117, ἱλ- at 129. Only M^{ac} reads καρβᾶνα at 118;
M^{pc} reads καρβάνα; and at 130 M reads καρβάν (-βᾶν M^{ac}) ἄδ' (the

breathing has been crossed out) αυδαν. The first editor actually to print
καρβᾶνα δ᾽ αὐδὰν in both lines was Dindorf (Stanley suggested καρβᾶνα
δ᾽ αὐδὰν in his commentary, but printed καρβάνα . . . in his text). Lastly,
the reading of M^ac in both lines is not, as the *app.* suggests, σινδονίαι
καλύπτραι but σινδονία καλύπτρα.

122 seq(q).: text, †. . . ἐπίδρομ᾽ ὁπόθι . . . ἀπῆι†   *app.*, ἐπιδρόμῶ-
πόθι M   ἀπῆι M^Σ: ὅπηι M

M's exact reading is ἐπιδρόμῶ πόθι. The first editor to articulate prop-
erly was Hermann. On ἀπῆι see 41 seqq.

136: text, ἀχείματόν . . . σὺν πνοαῖς   *app.*, ἀχίμ- M   πνοαῖς Por-
son: πνοαῖς M

The correction to ἀχείμ- was made by Par. M reads not σὺν πνοαῖς but
συνπνοιαῖς.

146 seq.: *app.*, σθένει Casaubon: σθένος M^ac, σθένουσι M^pc
The emendation was made first by Canter, in his note on 126. Neither
M^ac nor M^pc bears any accent.

156: text, τὸν γάιον   *app.*, γάιον Wellauer: ταιον M
M reads τὸνταιον as one word. Turnebus, while botching the article,
was the first to emend ταιον, printing τοὔγγαιον.

162–3: text, ἆ Ζήν, ᾽Ιοῦς † ἰὼ μῆνις   *app.*, ἀζηνιουσιω μῆνις M
The first scholar to articulate the entire phrase correctly was Salvinius.
Robortello did part of the work, however, as well as in part moving back-
wards, with his reading: ὧ ζεῦ ἰοῦς, ἰώ.

164: text, κοννῶ δ᾽ ἄγαν   *app.*, ἄγαν Bamberger: ἄταν M
M reads not κοννῶ δ᾽ ἄταν but, in a single meaningless word, κοννωδά-
ταν. Turnebus corrected as far as κοννῶ δ᾽ ἄταν.

176: text, ΔΑΝΑΟΣ   *app.*, Δαναός Scaliger, πρεσβύτης praefixit M
To be consistent with his own *sigla*, Page should give the full ascription
of speaker to M^s. M's scribe wrote just a marginal πρες, which M^s, the
diorthotes who revised the text and wrote the scholia, "improved" by
adding, further into the margin, πρεσβυτης.

178: text, προμηθίαν   *app.*, no entry
M reads προμήθειαν. The first editor to print the correct accent was
Dindorf.

194: *app.*, γοεδνὰ Robortello: γοειδηα M
M, though meaningless, does have an accent, γοείδηα, partially con-
cealed as the top stroke of the ει ligature: **𝓠** . The correction was made
concurrently by Turnebus (actually, he prints γόεδνα and Robortello γοέ-
δνα, with the first editor to print the correct accent being Hermann).

197: text, φθογγῆι   app., φθογγὴ M
Almost the full correction was made by Scur., φθογγῆ; the first editor
to add iota was Pauw.

202: text, εἰ ξένη φυγάς   app., εἶξεν ἡ φυγάς M
The articulation was first effected by Sophianus (in Robortello's ed.)
and Turnebus concurrently.

204: app., φρονούντως M^{pc}: -τος M^{ac} πρὸς φρονοῦσαν Dindorf
M^{ac} reads not φρονούντος but φρονοῦντος. Porson anticipated Dindorf.

211: text, οἴκτιρε   app., no entry
M reads οἴκτειρε, and the correction was not made until Kirchhoff.

212: app., κικλήσκετε Scur.^{s}: -ται M
The correction in Scur. is a suprascript: κικλήσκετᾷ. Thus, the ascrip-
tion should be to Scur.^{sscr}, since Scur.^{s} simply denotes *manus . . . eadem
quae scholia scripsit.*

216: text, συγγνοῖτο   app., σύνγνοιτο M^{s}; σύγν- M
Here too the correction is a suprascript: σῡ́γνοιτο. Further improve-
ment to σύγγνοιτο was made by Par. and Scur., and Stephanus made the
final correction to συγγνοῖτο.

217: text, κικλήσκω   app., κικλίσκω M
The correction was made by Par. and Scur.

223: app., δ' ἐσμὸς Auratus: δεσμὸς M
Auratus conjectured δ' ἐσμὸς. Dindorf was the first to print δ' ἐσμὸς;
see 29–30.

224: app., ἵζεσθε κίρκων Robortello: ἵζεσθε M^{s}, ἵζεσθαι M: κέρκω M^{s},
κρέκω M
The full correction was made concurrently by Turnebus, and ἵζεσθε
appears first in Scur. Page's *app.* fails to show that ἱζεσθε (not ἵζ-) κέρκω
appears in M as a single phrase written by the reviser in the margin. Thus,
the *app.* should read (following the format Page adopts at, e.g., 116 where
the reviser similarly enters a marginal variant): ἵζεσθε κίρκων *Robortello,
Turnebus* (ἵζεσθε *iam Scur.*): ἱζεσθε κέρκω M^{s} *marg.,* ἵζεσθαι κρέκω M.

230: app., τἀμπλακήμαθ' ὡς Victorius (τἀπλ-): ταπλα ἐν μαβως M
The first small step toward the full correction was made by Robortello,
who printed ὡς. The final step, τἀμπλ-, was effected by Stephanus.

237: text, ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος   app., ἀφ' M^{s}: ἀπ' M   τὸ πᾶν Blaydes
The scribe of M wrote ἀπελλάδος. The reviser's corrections were a
suprascript φ' and an initial rough breathing: ἀ⟨φʼ⟩ελλάδος. Tucker antici-
pated Blaydes.

240: *app.*, ἀτρέστως Sophianus: ἀκρ- M
The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.

248: *app.*, ἱερόρραβδον post Bothe Whittle
Bothe's conjecture, ἱερόραβδον, was anticipated by Schütz.

254: *app.*, αἶαν ἧς Turnebus (et αἶαν Guelf.[sscr]): ἀἴδνης M
Guelf.'s suprascript is not αἶαν but αἴαν, or perhaps αἴας. In M the
breathing is indeed more over α than ι, but M's scribe is not making a
trisyllabic word. This is shown in part by the fact that none of the apo-
grapha copies the word as trisyllabic and in part by the frequency of just
such spacing in M between breathing and accent in cases where there is
no syllabic question. For instance, in this same verse ἔρχεται is written in
M ἐρχ-; in 252 ἄνακτος is written ἀνακ-; in 314 εὔχεται is written εὔχ-.
M's reading, then, is αἴδνης (thus also Friis Johansen).

259: *app.*, τἀπὶ τάδε Canter: τ' ἄπειτα δὲ M
Much of the correction appeared first in Turnebus' ἐπὶ τάδε.

264: text, βροτοφθόρων   *app.*, -φθόρων M[s]: -φόρων M $_\theta$
The reviser's correction was a single, supralinear θ: βροτοφόρων.

269: *app.*, ἀμέμπτως Ἄπις Robortello: μεμπτῶς ἄπεισ' M
Both conjectures were made concurrently by Turnebus.

270: text, ποτ' ἀντίμισθον ηὗρετ' ἐν   *app.*, ποτ' ἀντίμισθον Turne-
bus: πονταντινεισθον M
Turnebus reads πότ'. Victorius first printed ποτ'. More importantly, M
reads not ηὗρετ' ἐν but εὑρετεν. Guelf. and Par. made the proper word
division, but it was left until Dindorf for an editor to move from εὗρετ'
ἐν to ηὗρετ' ἐν.

272: *app.*, γένος τ' . . . λέγοις πρόσω Robortello: γένοιτ' . . . λέγοι
προσως M
Par. made the improvement to πρόσω.

273: text, γε μὲν δὴ ῥῆσιν   *app.*, μὲν M[ac]: μιν M[pc]   δὴ ῥῆσιν
Sophianus: δηρίσιν M
Page assigns the correct μὲν to M[ac]. I can see no trace of this in M's
ỹ€ĵ/ν (which all the apographa copy as -μιν), and the correction then
goes to Robortello (thus also Friis Johansen). Further, Page's *app.* gives
the inaccurate impression that M reads γε, whereas it reads γέ. The cor-
rection to δὴ ῥῆσιν was made concurrently by Turnebus.

277: text, ἄπιστα   *app.*, ἄπειστα M
The correction appears in the 1540s as a suprascript in Scur., ἄπειστα,
but was made first by Asulanus in the Aldine ed. (1518).

281: text, θρέψειε   *app.*, no entry
M reads θρέψειεν. Par. and Scur. remove the ν. This is not so minor a variant as, for instance, moveable ν at line end, since -ειε here restores meter in the fourth foot.

284: text, ἀκούων . . . ἱπποβάμοσιν   *app.*, ἀκούω Robortello   -βά-μοισιν M
ἀκούω, which is accepted by many editors, was conjectured concurrently by Turnebus, and he was the first to make the correction to ἱπποβάμοσιν.

292: *app.*, τῆιδ᾽ ἐν Sophianus: τῇ ἰδεῖν M
Merkel and Friis Johansen also report M as τῇ, but the reading is τὴ (as seen by Wecklein and Murray [2nd ed.]). The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.

295: text, μειχθῆναι   *app.*, μιχθῆνα (sic) M
Guelf., Par., and Scur., all improve to μιχθῆναι. The first editor to print μειχθῆναι was Wilamowitz.

298: text, βασιλέωιν   *app.*, no entry
The reading of M, which many editors adopt, is not βασιλέωιν but -έων. Wecklein proposed -έοιν. Page follows Murray (2nd ed.), who in preferring this form of the dual cites the discussion by W. Schulze, "Zum Griechischen Dual," in his *Kleine Schriften* (1934) 324.

299: text, βοῦν τὴν   *app.*, βούν∘την Mᵃᶜ, βού∘∘την Mᵖᶜ
Mᵃᶜ clearly reads βουνίτην (thus also Friis Johansen). Page ignores the easily discerned ι and as a result makes Mᵃᶜ appear in all essentials to preserve the true reading, which actually was first conjectured by Canter.

302: *app.*, ταῦτ᾽ ἄλοχος ἰσχυρὰ Robortello: ταῦτα λόχοις χυρα M
Robortello does not read ἰσχυρὰ at all, but an unrelated ἦρα. The correction to ταῦτ᾽ ἄλοχος was made concurrently by Turnebus, and ἰσχυρὰ was conjectured first by Pauw.

308: *app.*, πέλας Turnebus: πέδας M, οἶμαι παῖδες Mˢ
The reviser's variant is entered in the margin, and Page's *app.*, as it does elsewhere (e.g., 248, 386), should so indicate: οἶμαι παῖδες Mˢ *in marg.*

309: *app.*, τῶι γάρ Bothe: τοιγάρ M
M reads τοῖ γάρ; the presence of the two accents suggests that the corruption of τῶι γάρ is not much older than M itself.

321: *app.*, πεντηκοντάπαις Heath: -κοστόπαις M
The reading of Par., πεντηκοντόπαις, which Friis Johansen accepts in his text, should be mentioned as a significant step on the way from M to Heath.

331: *app.*, κέλσειν Robortello: κέλσειεν M
The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.

332: text, μεταπτοοῦσαν   app., -πτοοῦσαν Whittle: -πτοίουσαν M
M reads not μεταπτοίουσαν but a somewhat more mistaken μετὰ πτοίουσαν.

337: *app.*, ὄνοιτο Robortello: ὤνοιτο M et M^Σ
The *app.*, though Page could not have known this, should read: *ed. Robortelli.* That is, ὄνοιτο is a reading that appears in Robortello's edition but is not to be ascribed to Robortello himself as a conscious conjecture. In fact, it is an accidental miscopying of ὤνοιτο; see M. McCall, "Robortello's 'Conjecture' at Aeschylus, *Supplices* 337," forthcoming in *CQ* (1982); see also the entry to 1055.

341: text, μὴ 'κδοὺς   app., 'κδοὺς Schütz: 'κδῶις M
M reads not μὴ 'κδῶις but μῆκδῶις.

342: *app.*, ἄρασθαι Scur., Laur., Par.: αἴρασθαι M
The apographa should be credited in chronological order: Laur., Par., Scur.

344: *app.*, κοινωνὸς Sophianus: κοινὸς M
The emendation was made concurrently by Turnebus.

345: *app.*, πόλεος . . . ἐστεμμένην Turnebus: πόλεως . . . -νη M
ἐστεμμένην was conjectured concurrently by Robortello.

346: text, λεύσσων τάσδ' ἕδρας   app., λεύσων M   τάσδ' ἕδρας
Bon.: τὰς δέδρα M
The correction to λεύσσων appears in both Guelf. and Par. Page's attribution to Bon. is thoroughly misleading. Far from reading τάσδ' ἕδρας, it has τὰς δέδρας. Bon. is the most doggedly loyal of all the apographa of M, and here was attempting only to reproduce M's τὰς δέδρα but mistook the tail on the final alpha (looking like ✍) for an additional sigma. Page seems to be drawing from and expanding upon Friis Johansen's report of Bon.'s reading as τάς [accent thus] δέδρας, which Friis Johansen (ed., "Introduction," p. 25) oddly describes as "a tolerably good, although not very striking, conjecture." In fact, no conjecture of any sort crossed the scribe's mind, only a desire to record M faithfully, and Page's *app.* both misrepresents Bon.'s reading and unfairly ignores Robortello who actually made the conjecture.

374: *app.*, θρόνοις Sophianus (-οισι): χρόνοισι M
The first editor to propose the fully correct θρόνοις was Pauw.

380: *app.*, μὴ δρᾶσαί τε Scur.: μηδράσητε M
Scur. did not do all that Page attributes to it, nor in fact was it the first to start improving M. Each of the other four apographa (all earlier than Scur.) articulated correctly as far as separating μὴ from δράσητε, and Bon. placed a circumflex on δρᾶ- half a century before Scur. It is true

that Scur. effected by far the most significant improvement, to δρᾶσαι, but even here the accents were wrongly put: μὴ δρᾶσαι τὲ. The first editor to print the final μὴ δρᾶσαί τε was Bothe.

386: *app.*, δυσπαράθελκτος Schütz: ὦ δυσπαραθέλκτοις M, δυσπαρενθή- τοις M[s] in marg.

Both reports of M are wrong (perhaps misprints). M reads ὦ δυσπαρ- θέλκτοις, and the reviser's marginal entry is δυσπαρθενήτοις.

389: text, τίς . . . θέλοι   *app.*, τίς Victorius: τίς δ᾽ M   θέλει M[ac]

δ᾽ was deleted first by Turnebus. M's correction to θέλοι is in the form of a suprascript: θέλ$\overset{οι}{ει}$.

392: text, ὑποχείριος   *app.*, -χείριος Robortello: -χέριος M
The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.

401: text, ἐπήλυδας   *app.*, ἐπήλ- Robortello: εἰπηλ- M
M reads not εἰπηλυδας (or, as Friis Johansen reports, εἰ ᾽πήλυδας) but εἴ πήλυδας. The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.

405: text, τῶνδ᾽ ἐξ ἴσου   *app.*, no entry
M reads τῶν δεξις οὐ, and none of the apographa offers any improvements. Although the correction is only one of articulation, the required rearrangement is considerable, and since Page's *app.* elsewhere includes recognition of comparable instances of articulation, e.g., at 86, 162–3, 202, 352, it should record here that the first editor to print the words correctly was Victorius.

409: *app.*, ὠινωμένον Salvinius: ὠνωμένων M
M has no breathing.

416: *app.*, ὃς οὐδ᾽ ἐν Stephanus: ὡς οὐδὲν M
Stephanus did indeed conjecture ὃς, but the first editor to articulate οὐδ᾽ ἐν was Asulanus.

422: text, ὀρομέναν   *app.*, ὀρμέναν Pauw
The reading of M is ὀρ$\overset{ω}{ο}$μέναν, i.e., only M[ac] is ὀρομέναν.

432: *app.*, ἐπιλαβαῖς Dawe
Dawe was anticipated by H. Voss.

435: *app.*, Ἄρει ᾽κτίνειν Seidler: δρεικτείνειν M
Part of the correction appears in Guelf., δρει κτίνειν.

443: text, χρήμασιν   *app.*, χρημάτων M[s] in marg.
M reads not χρήμασιν but χρήμασι. The ν was first added, and meter restored, by Victorius. Page's *app.* labels χρημάτων a marginal variant introduced by the reviser, but this is not so. It is an adscript scholium to M's πορθουμένων (the reviser's own variants are generally in a smaller

script and are placed much nearer the outer edge of the margin), and as
such is rightly included in editions of the *Supplices* scholia. Friis Johan-
sen's *app.*, from which Page should have profited, records the situation
correctly: χρημάτων *in margine cod. M ut variam lectionem positum
esse falso affirmant editores; scholium est iuxta vocem* πορθουμένων
solito more adscriptum.

445: text, †ἄτην   *app.*, ἄτης Scaliger
The first editor to conjecture ἄτης was Turnebus.

448: *app.*, θελκτήριος Guelf.: -ρίοις M
Page rightly notes that the correction, whose vulgar ascription has been
to Turnebus, appears in Guelf. But the reading in Guelf. is only *ante
correctionem*; Guelf.^pc reads with M in error; cf. 458. Furthermore, Par.
carries the correction in unaltered form and should probably (since
Guelf.^ac may be nothing but a *felix error*) receive at least equal credit.

449: *app.*, ὅμαιμον M^s: ὁμαίμων M
The reviser corrected only to ὁμαῖμον; Victorius was the first to print
ὅμαιμον.

458: text, †τύχαν† . . . πέλοι   *app.*, aptum foret τί γάρ; . . . πέλει
(illud Zakas, hoc Guelf.)
The reading in Guelf. is only *ante corr.*; Guelf.^pc reads πέλοι with M;
cf. 448.

459: *app.*, καλή Turnebus: καλεῖ M
Bon.^ac probably was the first to read καλή. The last part of the word in
Bon. is written: ▬ 𝘨, with an apparent η changed into an ει ligature, and
an acute accent changed to a circumflex.

461: text, ὑποστήσεις   *app.*, -στήσεις Wellauer: -στήσει M
M reads not ὑποστήσει but ὑπὸ στήσει.

471: text, ἐσβέβηκα   *app.*, ἐσβέβ- Turnebus: ἐσέβ- M
Turnebus did not conjecture ἐσβέβηκα but ἐσβέβηκε. Spanheim was
the first to read ἐσβέβηκα.

485: text, ἐμοῦ κάτ᾽ ἀρχῆς   *app.*, κάτ᾽ ἀρχῆς Headlam: κατ᾽ ἀρχῆς M
The point of contention is whether to punctuate with Headlam or with
M and the great majority of editors (ἐμοῦ· κατ᾽ ἀρχῆς), but Page's *app.*
does not show clearly what the alternative to Headlam is. In addition, M
reads καταρχῆς (κατάρχῆς Guelf., κατ᾽ ἀρχῆς Robortello, Turnebus).

491: *app.*, εὑρεθέντα Porson: εὑρ᾽ ἐόντα M, εὖ ῥέοντα M^s   πρόξενον
Canter: πρὸς ξένον M
M *ante corr.* reads not εὑρ᾽ but εὗρ᾽. Again, M reads not πρὸς ξένον but
προσξένον, and an exact report would serve to buttress Canter's correction,

both because the reading in M is a single word and also because it so clearly reflects an intermediate stage in the corruption of πρόξενον to πρὸς ξένον (four of the five apographa, Bon., Guelf., Par., and Scur., indeed move on to πρὸς ξένον).

495: *app.*, ἄστεως M: -εος Mˢ
The *app.* does not make clear that the reviser's (erroneous) correction is supralinear, nor does -εος show that the suprascript is simply o: ἄστεω̇ς.

510: *app.*, ἁρπαγαῖς Turnebus: -γὲς M
M reads ἅρπαγες.

519: *app.*, ποῖα Par.ˢˢᶜʳ: τοῖα M
The *app.* does not make clear that in Par. only π is suprascript: τ̅͞οῖα.

522: text, πορσυνῶν   *app.*, no entry
M reads πορσύνων. Valckenaer made the correction.

531: text, <δ'>   *app.*, 532 δ' suppl. Wecklein
A misprint for 531.

536: *app.*, Δῖαί Pauw: Δίας M
Pauw makes the suggestion in the *Notae* placed at the end of his edition, and as is usual has no accents at all: *an forte legendum*, Διαι τοι γενος ευχομεθ' ειναι? The first editor to print Δῖαί was Wecklein.

550: *app.*, τ' ἂν Hermann
Hermann proposed τ' ἂγ.

551: *app.*, ὁρῶν: ὁρῶν M, ὅρων Mˢ
M reads ὁρῶν. Page gives to the reviser the suprascript breathing and accent (without showing that they are suprascript), but it is impossible, I think, to tell whether they were added by the reviser or simply by the scribe. Three of the apographa, Guelf., Par., and Scur., read the correct ὁρῶν.

556: *app.*, εἰσιχνουμένου Mᵖᶜ, εἰσικνουμέν⁎ Mᵃᶜ
In Mᵃᶜ there may be two letters rather than one *in ras.*, i.e., -μέν⁎⁎; in Mᵖᶜ the χ is supralinear and a rough breathing has been added: εἰσἴ̇χνουμένου.

568: text, μειξόμβροτον   *app.*, no entry
M reads μιξ-, and it was not until Wilamowitz that the correction was made.

570: text, δ' ἐθάμβουν   *app.*, δὲ θαμβοῦν M
The correction was made by Turnebus.

574: text, κρέων   *app.*, no entry
Page, like Friis Johansen, neglects to mention the reviser's κραίνων, added in the margin, but the addition is of exactly the same type as those which

occur at 80, 116, 224, 255, 324, 386, and 698, all of which Page's *app.* does record (though at 224, q.v., he fails to note that the addition is marginal).

597: *app.*, οὖτινος Scur., Laur.: ὅστινος M
The chronological order is Laur., Scur. Page's report of M conceals the fact that this is the reading *post corr.* The reading *ante corr.* is hard to decipher, but seems to be either οὖτινος or οὖτ- or οὐτ-.

602: text, ἀγγέλλων   *app.*, no entry
M reads ἀγγέλων, with the correction made as a suprascript: ἀγγέλ^λῶν.

603: *app.*, ἔνισπε δ᾽ Robortello: ἐνόσπερ M, ἔνεπε Guelf.
Page, like Friis Johansen, wrongly reports Guelf., which in fact reads ἔνεπε δ᾽, a not inconsiderable difference since Guelf.'s true reading is an intelligent anticipation of Robortello.

604: *app.*, χεὶρ ὅπηι Casaubon, πληθύνεται Hermann: χειροπληθύεται M
Turnebus corrected as far as χεὶρ ὅπωσ.

608: text, λόγον   *app.*, no entry
M reads λόγων, with the correction made as a suprascript: λόγῶν.

610: text, κἀρρυσιάστους   *app.*, καρυσ- M
Turnebus corrected as far as κἀρρυσ-; Dindorf was the first to print κἀρρυσ-.

615: *app.*, τοιάνδ᾽: τοιαῦτ᾽ Friis Johansen
Page thinks τοιάνδ᾽ questionable enough to mention Friis Johansen's τοιαῦτ᾽, but fails to record M's exact reading, τοῖάνδ᾽, even though M's accents may suggest corruption and, before corruption, τοιαῦτ᾽. Bon., Par., and Scur. all read τοιάνδ᾽.

619: text, πρὸς πόλεως   *app.*, πρὸς Bothe: πρὸ M
M reads προπόλεως. The Aldine ed. articulates as far as πρὸ πόλεως.

622: *app.*, ἔκραν᾽ ἄνευ κλητῆρος Turnebus: ἔκλαναν εὐκλήτορος M
Asulanus' Aldine ed. (1518) moved a little toward the correction with its reading, ἔκλαν ἀνευκλήτορος, and Par. (*c.* 1520) somewhat further: ἔκρανεν εὐκλήτορος.

631 seqq.: text, εὐκταῖα γένει   *app.*, γένει Mᵃᶜ: γένῃ Mᵖᶜ
The (erroneous) correction in M is suprascript, γενε^η (thus, with no accent; Robortello and Turnebus were the first, concurrently, to print γένει). In addition, Page should state that the preceding word also contains a supralinear correction, -κτε^{αι}; Laur. reads -κτε^{αι}α and Scur. -κταῖα.

639: text, ὤικτισαν   *app.*, no entry
M reads, with a suprascript correction: ὤκτ^ιισαν. Guelf. and Scur. read the fully correct ὤικτισαν.

656 seqq.: text, ὑποσκίων   app., ὑπὸ σκιῶν ut vid. M^{pc}
M reads ὑπὸ σκι̊ῶν. Thus M^{ac} is not ὑποσκίων but ὑπὸ σκιῶν (Page's
M^{pc}), and M^{pc} is ὑπὸ σκίον. Three of the apographa, Bon., Par., and
Scur., correct to the desired ὑποσκίων.

670: text, πόλις   app., πόλεις M
The first editors to print πόλις were concurrently Robortello and Tur-
nebus.

671: text, Ζῆνα μέγαν   app., μέγαν Aldina: μέγα M
M reads ζῆν ἀμέγα. Three of the apographa, Guelf., Par., and Scur.,
correct as far as ζῆνα μέγα.

673: app., ὃς M^{ac} ut vid.: ὣς M^{pc}
I do not see any trace at all of ὃς and agree with Friis Johansen's app.:
ὡς M (sine corr.). All the apographa also read ὡς (Guelf. reads ὣς). The
correction to ὃς was made by Turnebus.

680: app., δαΐζων Aldina: δαΐξων M
It looks as though Asulanus, the Aldine editor, has been preceded, wheth-
er by intention or chance, by Laur., where the letter is shaped 𝟐 , not quite
like the scribe's regular ζ, which is 𝟐 , but far less like the scribe's ξ, which
is 𝟑 . The app. should read: δαΐζων Laur. ut vid., Aldina.

681 seqq.: app., δ᾽ ἐσμὸs Turnebus: δεσμὸς M
Turnebus printed δ᾽ ἐσμὸς. The first editor to print δ᾽ ἐσ- was Dindorf;
see 29–30.

685: text, κρατὸς   app., no entry
M reads κράτος. The correction was made by H. Voss.

686: text, Λύκειος   app., Λύκιος M
The correction was made by Arnaldus.

687: text, νεολαίαι   app., νεολέαι M^{sscr}
The suprascript consists of the single letter ε: νεολᾶ́ίαι. In addition, the
reviser appears to have added the correct iota adscript as well as the
incorrect suprascript. The reading of M^{ac}, then, is not νεολαίαι but νεολαία
(thus also Friis Johansen).

691 seqq.: app., εὔφημον Turnebus: -μοις M
M reads not εὔφημοις but εὐφήμοις.

699: text, δάμιον   app., no entry
M and all the apographa read δήμιον. The first editor to print δάμιον was
Dindorf.

700: app., προμαθὶς Hermann: προμηθεὺς M^{ac}, -μαθεὺς M^{pc}
This entry, together with that nearby at 687, illustrates especially well
Page's inaccuracy in recording supralinear variants. Here he gives no

indication at all that the correction is a single suprascript *a*, and no reader would be able to know that M has the same general look in both verses: προμηθεὺς here (the mark over π is a reference sign to the scholium), νεολάίαι at 687.

705: *app.,* ἐγχωρίοις πατρωίας M[ac], ἐγχωρίους πατρωίαισ M[pc]
M[ac], as both Merkel and Murray (2nd ed.) report, reads ἐνχ-.

706: text, δαφνηφόροις   *app.,* δαφνηφ- Par.: δαφνοφ- M - φόροισιν M[ac]
An almost completely inaccurate entry. M reads δαφνοφόροισιϊ. Thus, after the correction by deletion points the reading is not δαφνοφόροις but -φόροισι. The reading of Par. is not δαφνηφόροις but δαφνηφόροισι. The first editor to print the metrically necessary δαφνηφόροις was Schütz.

718: *app.,* τοῖσιν Herwerden: τῶσ ∗ὰν M
Page is too cautious about M here, whose reading before erasure looks to be τῶσ᾽ ὰν. The fact that two of the apographa, Bon. and Guelf., so read lends considerable support. Thus, the *app.* should probably record: τῶς ὰν M[pc], τῶσ᾽ ὰν ut vid. M[ac].

720: text, γυίοισι   *app.,* γύοισι M
The correction was made by Scur.

727: text, πρέσβη μόλοι   *app.,* πρέσβη suspectum; πρέσβυς Turnebus (πρεσβύήμολοι Scur.)
Since Page is precise here in recording Scur.'s reading, it is all the more inconsistent for him not to be exact with M, which reads not πρέσβη μόλοι but πρεσβήμολοι, and also with Turnebus, who reads not πρέσβυς μόλοι but πρεσβὺς μόλει. Lobeck was the first to propose πρέσβη μόλοι.

729: *app.,* τρέσητέ M[sscr]: -αιτέ M
Only η is suprascript, and the reading of M *ante corr.* is not τρέσαιτέ but τρεσάιτέ: τρέσὰίτέ.

743: text, δοριπαγεῖς   *app.,* δορυπ- M
The first editor to print δοριπαγεῖς was Dindorf.

744: *app.,* ἐπιταχεῖ Boissonade: ἐπεὶ τάχει M; ἐπιτυχεῖ Turnebus (ἐπὶ τύχει Guelf.)
Just as Page records Guelf.'s reading as a partial step toward Turnebus, so also should he record the reading of Laur., ἐπὶ ταχεῖ, as a step toward his own preferred reading, Boissonade's ἐπιταχεῖ.

745: *app.,* μελαγχίμωι Turnebus: μελαχείμω M
Asulanus, Par., and Scur. all partly anticipate Turnebus, Asulanus by printing μελαχίμω and Par. and Scur. by correcting as far as μελαγχείμω.

748: text, πρόλειπε   *app.,* πρόλιπε M
The metrical correction was made by Scur.

750: text, οὐλόφρονες   app., οὐλο- Valckenaer: δουλο- M
The app. should read οὐλό- and δουλό-.

751: text, φρεσίν   app., φρεσσὶν M
The correction was made by three of the apographa: Laur., Bon., and Par.

753: text, τάδ᾽, ὦ   app., τάδ᾽ Elmsley: ταῦτ᾽ M
M reads ταυτω. Guelf. and Scur. advanced the reading to ταῦτ᾽ ὦ.

760: app., κρείσσους M^sscr: κρείσσων M
Only ους is actually suprascript: κρείσσ^ους_ων.

764: app., ταχεῖα Par., Guelf.: -εῖαι M
The chronological order of the apographa is: Guelf., Par. This would also
be the proper order for the significance of their corrections. Guelf. usually
retains iota adscript or subscript when M has it; thus the change to ταχεῖα is
likely to be true emendation. Par., on the other hand, virtually never retains
it; thus *its* "correction" to ταχεῖα is likely to be undeliberate.

765: app., πεισμάτων Turnebus, σωτήρια Salvinius: πισμάτων σωτηρίου
M; ἀντὶ πείσματα σωτήρια M^Σ, qui πεισμάτων σωτηρία legisse videtur
Turnebus does not read πεισμάτων but πισμάτων. The first editor to print
πεισμ- was Victorius, but the correction was first made by Par. Turnebus
anticipated Salvinius almost entirely by emending as far as σωτηρία. M^Σ
reads not πείσματα but, as one would suspect from M itself, πίσματα.

768: text, ἄλλως τε   app., ἀλλ᾽ ὥστε M
The articulation was done by Par.

775: text, εὐγλώσσωι   app., εὐγλώσσως M^ac
M reads εὐγλώσσως. Thus the impression left by Page's text and app. that
the reading of M^pc is εὐγλώσσωι is not quite accurate (the first editor to
print εὐγλώσσωι was Robortello). Also, it would be helpful to show that the
correction in M is by deletion points rather than erasure (cf. 41 seqq.).

780: text, νέφεσσι   app., νέφεσι M
The correction was made by Arnaldus.

783: text, ἄτερθε   app., no entry
M reads ἄτερθεν. The scribe of Scur. removed the ν.

785: app., κελαινόχρως Pauw: μελανόχρως M
Pauw does not at all emend to κελαινόχρως but to μελανόχρως. κελαινό-
χρως was first conjectured by Lachmann.

788: app., ἀρτάναις Par.
A printing omission. The entry in the *app.* is not preceded by a line
number and thus appears to belong to the line number of the previous entry,
786.

790: text, τῶιδε χριμφθῆναι χροΐ   app., χριμφθῆναι χροΐ Scur.
(-φθῆναι etiam Guelf.): -φθῆν χροῖν M

M reads not τῶιδε χριμφθῆν χροῖν but τῶδ' ἐχριμφθῆν χροῖν. Guelf.
reads τῷδ' ἐχριμφθῆναι χεροῖν. And Scur. reads not what Page prints but
τῷδ' ἐγχριφθῆναι χροὶ. In order, then, to get from M to Page's text, one
must use—accurately—three of the apographa: Guelf. for the infinitive
ending, Scur. for χροΐ (and both Guelf. and Scur. for the addition of ι to M's
τῶδ'), and Par., which Page does not mention at all, for the word division
τῶδε χρ-. The first editor to put all this together and actually print τῶιδε
χριμφθῆναι χροΐ was Hermann.

793: text, γίγνεται   app., no entry
M reads a fairly distant γείνεται. The correction was made by Porson,
with Asulanus' γίνεται an initial step.

801: text, ὄρνισι δεῖπνον   app., δεῖπναν M
M reads not ὄρνισι δεῖπναν but ὄρνισιν δεῖπναν. The Aldine ed. first
corrected to ὄρνισι, and Guelf. to δεῖπνον.

817 seq.: app., ὕβρει Hermann (ὕβρι): ὕβριν M
The first editor to print ὕβρει was Bothe. Hermann's ὕβρι should be
dropped from the app.

823: app., τί δ' ἄνευ Robortello: πιδανευ M
Par. was the first to correct as far as ἄνευ, but the scribe could not fathom
M's πιδ and simply left a blank space. The full correction was made
concurrently by Turnebus.

824: text, θνατοῖσι   app., no entry
M reads θνατοῖς. The first editor to print θνατοῖσι was Bothe.

825–902: Page remarks in the app.: *foedissime depravati; hic illic versus
sani, ut ait Tucker, apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto.* Of 825–35
specifically he states: *hunc textum, haec intervalla praebet M.* For these
verses, then, his text will give in effect a transcript of M. The following six
entries except for 827 and part of 828 derive from this expectation.

825: text, ό ό ό
M reads ό ό ο.

827: app., ἰόφ: ἐστὶ ἀποπτυσμοῦ μίμημα M$^{\Sigma}$
The reading of M$^{\Sigma}$ is ἐπὶ ... μίσημα. C. G. Haupt corrected to ἐστὶ, and
the scribe of Scur. made a supralinear correction to μίμημα: μίθ῀η̄μα.

828: text, ὀμ . . . κάκκας   app., ὀμ: ὅμου Scur.   κάκκας: καββὰς Vic-
torius
M reads ὄμ. Victorius' text very clearly reads κάκκασ.

829: text, δυΐαν   app., δυίαν
The accurate report of M is in Page's text, not the *app.*

832: text, πρὸς
M reads προς.

834: text, δύσφορα . . . κἀν
M reads δυσφορα . . . κᾶν.

836–7: *app.*, ὡς ἔχετε τάχους ποδῶν M^Σ
M^Σ reads τάχος. Scur. made the correction.

842: text, †ὀλύμεναι ὀλόμεν᾽   *app.*, ὀλόμεναι Schütz, deleto ὀλόμεν᾽
The first editor to print ὀλόμεναι was Turnebus; the first not to print ὀλόμεν᾽ was Robortello.

846: text, δόρει.   *app.*, δορὶ M
The first scholar to correct to δόρει was Hermann.

847: *app.*, ἠιμαγμένην σε καθίζω M^Σ
The reading of M^Σ is ἠμαγμένον. C. G. Haupt made the correction.

849: text. †. . . βία   *app.*, βίαι Robortello
The emendation was made concurrently by Turnebus.

851: text, ἕδρανα   *app.*, ἵδρανα M
The first editor to print ἕδρανα was Robortello.

852: text, †ἀτιετανα
Page's dagger should mean that he is recording the precise reading of M; this, however, is ἀτιέ-.

854: *app.*, ἴδοι M^{sscr}: εἰδοι M
Only ἴ is suprascript: ἔιδοι.

861: text, †. . . βάσηι
M reads βάση; see on 852. Turnebus made the correction.

868: text, ἁλίρρυτον   *app.*, ἀλλί- M
M reads not ἀλίρρυτον but ἀλλίρυτον. The correction was made by Scur.

877: text, †. . . ὑπρογασυλάσκοι   *app.*, -υλάσκοι M^{sscr}, -υλάσκει M
Only o is suprascript: -υλάσκ^{o}ει.

879: text, ἐρωτᾶις†
The precise reading of M is ἐρωτᾶς; see on 852.

880–81: text, σ᾽ ἀποτρέψειεν ἄιστον   *app.*, no entry
M reads σε ἀπὸ τρέψει ἔναιστον. The correction to σ᾽ was made by Pauw, that to ἀποτρέψειεν ἄιστον by Turnebus.

884: text, οὐδάμ᾽ ἄζεται   app., οὐ δαμάζεται M
The first editor to emend to οὐδάμ᾽ ἄζεται was Pauw. It is illustrative of
Page's haphazard methods that here he allows an entry (albeit incomplete)
involving nothing more than articulation (that is, no addition or deletion of
letters), whereas he makes no entry at all for such a phrase as that at 880–81,
even though both articulation *and* letter-change are involved.

890: *app.*, βόαν Oberdick
Stanley proposed βόαν long before Oberdick.

892: text, ὦ βᾶ   *app.*, ὦ μᾶ Turnebus, ὦ πᾶ Pauw
Pauw, in his *Notae*, does suggest πᾶ but only to reject it: βᾶ *hic pro* πατερ
positum putant, ut μᾶ *pro* ματερ *paulo ante:* . . . *Sic saltem scribere
debuissent* πᾶ, *ut simile esset commentum: Quod tamen non magis ideo
probassem: Ego* βα *pro* βαθι *a* βαω *positum puto.* The first scholar both to
suggest πᾶ and to believe it was H. Voss.

895: text, μαιμᾶι   *app.*, μαι μαι M
The first editor to print μαιμᾶι was Robortello.

896–8: text,   ἔχιδνα δ᾽ ὥς με[
            τί ποτ᾽ ἐν[
            δάκος ἄχ[
app., eadem linea in M, spatiis inter με et τι, ἐν et δάκ- relictis
Page is concerned here to be precise about M, but he should then show
that M reads not δάκος ἄχ but δακοσάχ (in addition, the *app.* misprints τι for
τί).

907: text, θαρσεῖτ᾽, οὐκ ἐρεῖτ᾽ ἀναρχίαν   *app.*, θαρσεῖ τοῦ χερεῖ
ταναρχίαν M
Guelf. started the process of correction by writing . . . χερεῖτ᾽ ἀναρ-
χίαν. The first editor to print the fully correct phrase was Robortello, but
Turnebus was concurrent except for ἐρεῖτ᾽: θαρσεῖτ᾽, οὐκ ἐρεῖ ἀναρχίαν.

908: text, διωλόμεσθ᾽· ἄεπτ᾽, ἄναξ   *app.* -μεσθα ἐπτάναξ M; ἄελπτ᾽
Robortello
M's breathing, written ἐπτ-, is hard to identify. Of the five apographa,
four copy it as a rough breathing; only Guelf. takes it as smooth.
Robortello articulated and emended to διωλόμεσθ᾽ ἄελπτ᾽ ἄναξ. The
first scholar to replace ἄελπτ᾽ with ἄεπτ᾽ was H. L. Ahrens.

910: *app.*, οὐκ ἀκούετ᾽ ὀξὺ Porson: οὐ κακοῦ ἔξυ M
The first step toward correction was taken by Asulanus in the Aldine
ed., who printed οὐκ ἀκοῦ ἐξυ.

915: *app.*, ὤρθωσας Robortello: -ωσα M   φρένα Blaydes: -νεὶ M, -νὶ Par.
The correction to ὤρθωσας was made concurrently by Turnebus. φρενὶ
first appears in Guelf.^ac: φρενὶ.

918: *app.*, τἄμ' ὀλωλόθ'. . . ἄγω Porson: τἀπολωλόθ'. . . ἐγώ M
M reads τ' ἀπο-.

920: text, †προξένωι†
The precise reading of M is προξένω; see on 852.

925: text, κλαίοις   *app.*, κλάοις M^S: κλάεις M
The correction is supralinear: κλάεἶς. The first editor to print κλαίοις
was Robortello.

931: text, ἀπαγγέλλειν   *app.*, -έλειν M
Three of the apographa made the correction: Guelf., Par., and Scur.

936: text, γίγνεται   *app.*, no entry
M reads γίνεται. Scur. made the correction.

939: *app.*, ἴσθι γ' αὐτὸς χοἱ M^S in marg.
The first word is written: ἴ$\mathfrak{c}$. This is not ἴσθι but ἴσως (thus also, e.g.,
Wecklein, Murray [2nd ed.], Friis Johansen). In addition, the reviser did
not stop his marginal entry at χοἱ (written χ'οἱ) but continued: . . .χ' οἱ
ξυνεμ̄ (=-ποροι).

947: text, βύβλων   *app.*, βίβλ- M
The correction was made by Scur.

949: *app.*, 948 ἀπ' ὀμμάτων Burges
A printing slip for 949.

956: text, κεκλημένην   *app.*, no entry
M reads κεκλῆμένην, i.e., M^{pc} is not κεκλημι- but κεκλι-. The first editor
to print κεκλημιμένην was Dindorf.

961: text, μονορρύθμους   *app.*, μονορύ- M
The correction was made by Scur.

966: text, ἀγαθοῖσι   *app.*, ἀγαθοῖς M
The first editor to print ἀγαθοῖσι was Porson.

976: *app.*, ἐγχώρων Hermann: ἐν χώρωι M
Three centuries before Hermann the scribe of Par. emended to ἐγχώ-
ρων, then to his shame "corrected" to ἐγχώρω. The *app.* should give pri-
ority of mention to Par^{ac}.

984: *app.*, φίλως M^{sscr}: -λου M   αὐτανεψίοις Scaliger: -ίους M
Only ως is suprascript: φίλοῡ^{ως}. M reads not αὐτανεψίους but ἀτανε-
ψίους. Par. made the correction as far as αὐτανεψίους.

985: *app.*, ἐμοὶ δ' Par.: ἐμοῦ δ' M^{pc}, ἐμοὺς M^{ac}
M^{pc} reads not ἐμοῦ δ' but ἐμοὺ δ', which looks like𝕲ὸ 𝕯. Thus the
correct emendation by Par. may actually be no more than the scribe's
attempt to copy M.

991: text, γεγραμμένοις   *app.*, -μένοις Turnebus: -μένους M
Turnebus, like M, reads -μένους. Robortello made the correction.

993: *app.*, ὅμιλον M^{sscr}: -λος M
Only *ν* is suprascript: ὅμιλο$\overset{ν}{\varsigma}$.

1000: text, πεδοστιβῆ   *app.*, παιδο- M
The correction was made by Robortello.

1003: text, χλιδαῖσαν
A misprint for χλιδαῖσιν.

1009: text, οἴκησις   *app.*, οἰκήσεις M
The correction was made concurrently by Robortello and Turnebus.

1012: text, φύλαξαι   *app.*, φυλάξαι M
The first editor to print φύλαξαι was Victorius.

1014: text, Χο. τἄλλ᾽ . . .   *app.*, non hic sed ante 1015 paragraphus praefixa
The first editor to put the change of speaker at 1014 was Turnebus.

1023: *app.*, τάνδε Hermann: τήνδε M
M reads τῆνδε. The first editor to print τάνδε was Dindorf.

1024: text, μηδ᾽ ἔτι   *app.*, μηδέ τι M
Guelf. advanced the articulation as far as μηδ᾽ ἔτι, and the first editor to print μηδ᾽ ἔτι was Turnebus.

1025: *app.*, προχοὰς Robortello: πρὸς χοὰς M
The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.

1032 seq.: *app.*, ἔλθοι Scur., Par.: ἔλθει M   Κυθερείαι στυγερὸν Burges: Κυθερείας· στύγειον M
The chronological order is: Par. (*c.* 1520), Scur. (*c.* 1545), and the correction was also made, probably first of all, by Asulanus in the Aldine ed. (1518). The first editor to print στυγερὸν was Turnebus.

1034: in the margin of the text a printing slip has resulted in [στρ. rather than [στρ. β.

1040: text, θέλκτορι Πειθοῖ   *app.*, θέλκτορι Bothe: θεάκτορι M πιθοῖ M
M has no accent: θεακτορι. The correction to πειθοῖ was made by Par.

1041–2: text, †ψεδυρὰ   *app.*, sententiae aptius foret Ἀρμονίας μοῖρ᾽ Ἀφροδίται   ψεθυρα M^{sscr}
Page's suggestion was anticipated by Hartung. The precise reading of M is ψεδυρα; see 852. The *app.*, while removing the accent, does not make clear that only θ is suprascript: ψε$\overset{θ}{δ}$υρα.

1055: *app.*, θέλγοις Stephanus: -γεις M

The *app.*, though Page could not have known this, should read: *ed. Stephani*. That is, θέλγοις is a reading which appears in Stephanus' ed., but is not to be ascribed to Stephanus himself as his own conscious conjecture. It can be shown, in fact, to be an accidentally correct miscopying of M's θέλγεις; see M. McCall, "A Problem of Attribution at Aeschylus *Supplices* 1055: Stephanus' Source," *Arktouros. Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox* (Berlin 1979) 109–14. See also on 337.

1062: *app.*, Ζεὺς Aldina: Ζεῦ M

The correction was first made not by Asulanus, the Aldine editor, but by Guelf., the MS that was Asulanus' source.

1063: *app.*, γάμον Par.: -μου M

A rare instance in which Page (perhaps following Wecklein or Smyth) assigns a correction to a source that is too early rather than the reverse. Par. placidly copies M's γάμου. The correction was made concurrently by Robortello and Turnebus.

1067: *app.*, εὐμενῆ βίαν Valckenaer: -νεῖ βίαι M
M reads βία.

1070: *app.*, τὸ Robortello: τε M

Robortello drew on the scholia for his reading, and the *app.* should so state: *Robortello e* Σ; see 41 seqq. The correction was made concurrently by Turnebus.[8]