Some Types of Error in Manuscripts of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*

Douglas Young

While conducting a seminar in Greek palaeography in the University of Minnesota I happened to illustrate some of the corruptions that occur in transmission by specimens taken from the *Oresteia*, which I was engaged at odd moments in turning into English verse. It having been suggested by colleagues elsewhere that my collection of examples might be of wider interest, I revised it and added a few comments. I have not aimed to set down every instance of every type of corruption: for example, I take here no account of errors in the ascription of speakers, arguably a field in which manuscript authority is worthless; and I have usually neglected singling or doubling of λ, μ, ν, ρ, and σ, and confusion of vowels and diphthongs, such as of o, ω, ov; η, ει, αι, οι, ι, and τ.

My main sources for variants have been the editions of Murray (1955), Headlam-Thomson, and Groeneboom; and I limited my interest to the manuscripts M, V, F, and Tri, agreeing substantially with the evaluation of them by Fraenkel in the prolegomena to his *Agamemnon*. I did not have available complete facsimiles of all the extant manuscripts of the *Oresteia*, thorough collation of which would be needed if one were to attempt a rigorous quantification of the varying percentages of different types of error. But a general conclusion emerges, that errors involving more than one letter or one syllable are relatively a trifling proportion of the total of errors. This conclusion should be stressed, in view of the fact that very many so-called emendations published involve changes of several letters, syllables, or even words, and all too often fall into the category of what Professor W. L. Lorimer terms “immendations.” Most of the innovations found in Tri, the holograph of Demetrius Triclinius, are such “immendations,” often motivated by his metrical notions; and I have not listed all of them; nor have I paid exhaustive attention to variants found or implied in the scholia.

For convenience, besides the usual sigla, I denote Triclinius' holo-
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graph (Murray's Tri) by T. I abbreviate the plays as A (= Agamemnon), X (= Choephori), and E (= Eumenides). The assumed genuine reading precedes the bracket.

Some confusions of letters in the extant manuscripts M V F T, or some of them, appear to derive from the uncial stage of transmission. Thus there are confusions involving the round uncial letters epsilon E, theta Θ, omicron O, and sigma σ. A useful mnemonic for this group is the word EOos.

Examples:


Some words show confusion of uncial forms of alpha, delta, lambda, μ, and ν, A Δ Λ Μ Ν. A 1014 Διός] λιῶς F. A 1291 τάσι] ἐγὼ ] τάς λέγω. A 1418 ἀμάτων ] ημυμάτων. X 45 μ᾽ ἀόλλει ] μυλλεῖ. X 252 Ἡλεκτραν λέγω, with loss of Λ after N, or possibly after -AN in the form Α with overstroke for Π. X 424 ἱλεμυστρίας] ἱλεμυστρίας. X 474 δ δ᾽ ὁμᾶν ἔρν ] αὐωμαναρεν. Here confusion of vocalisation accompanies the graphic confusion of uncial delta and alpha. X 566 δέξωρ ] λέξωρ. E 54 λίαν (in the form ΛΙΑ) may be the original reading, leading to δία M, whence βίαν of F and T would be a mere conjecture of some savant of the Palaeologan renaissance. E 938 πνεοῦ ] πλέον FT.


What some find odd is the occasional emergence of a καπα from the misreading of uncial iota and sigma juxtaposed. This certainly occurred at X 897, where M's ὑκόν must be from an uncial form of ὑ κόν, OICV. So too E 177 ἐλθών οὐ] ἐκείνου. E 862 ἱδρύσης “Ἀρη] ἱδρύση κάρη Μ." ἱδρύση κάρα M²FT. At A 985 a brilliant insight by Professor Denys Page shows us how F's ψαμμίας ἀκάτα derived from an original ψαμμίας. ἀκ ατα through an assumed intermediate stage ψαμμίας ἀκατα. At E 119, for ἕφιος γὰρ ἐλθών οὐκ ἐμός προσίκτορες, I would have Klytaimestra’s ghost say, ἕφιος γὰρ ἐλθών οὐκ ἐμός πρὸς ἰστορας, “With friends not mine he is going to judges” (cf. 81, δικαστὸς . . . εὐρήσο-
DOUGLAS YOUNG

She had seen Orestes go out with Apollo and Hermes. ΠΡΟΣΙΤΟΠΑΣ became ΠΡΟΣΚΤΟΠΑΣ and, with ΕΙΣΙΝ taken as from εἰμί sum, a nominative προσίκτορες.

Uncial gamma, carelessly written, was apt to be confused with the round uncial sigma. Thus, at Α 101, the original ἐς ἀναφαίνεις postulated by Ahrens could, with misdivision, give rise to Μ’s ἀγανὰ φαίνεις. X 542 συνκόλλως] συνκόλλως. E 58 ἦ τις αἶα] ἦτι γαῖα, where there is also some glossing mentality at work.

To the uncial period belong the confusions of round sigma and iota. X 183 καρδίαι] καρδῖας. X 519 μεῖω] μέσω. X 691 ἐνπᾶς ὡς of Μ may have resulted from the adverb ἐμπαῖως, formed from the adjective used at Α 187, with internal corretion.

Confusion of gamma and pi is an uncial error, as at X 835 λυγρᾶς] λυπρᾶς. Confusion of pi and the juxtaposition of iota and tau (either way) is more likely to be uncial than minuscule. There is a curious instance in the scholia at Α 186, μάντιν οὕτως ψέγων, where the scholiast remarks: περισσεύει το πνεῦμα. Clearly someone had read the compendium πνεῦμα for πνα. That is to say, ταυ+ιτα was read as pi. The same mistake may lie behind X 958, where Μ offers κρατεῖται πῶς. The omega would originally have been an ο simplexter, which could also be interpreted as ου. Assuming the pi derives from ταυ+Ιτα, and redividing, we get 958f thus: κρατεῖ τ’ αἰτίας τὸ θείον παρὰ τὸ μῆ/ ὑπουργεῖν κακοῖς, meaning: “And the divine (power) masters guilty persons by not subserving evils.” In dochmiacs exact responsion is not required, and, with internal corretion of θεῖον, we get a dochmiac in the form

At Ε 1044 a misreading of ιοτα+ ταυ as πι could have led to Μ’s σπονδαί δ’ ἐς το πᾶν ἔνδαιδες οἴκων. I suggest Aeschylus wrote σπονδαί δ’ εἰσιν’ ἀν’ ἔνδαδ’ οἶκον: “With a libation enter in, along the torch-filled dwelling.” He would write this in the form ΣΠΟΝΔΑΙΔΕΣ ΙΤΑΝΕΝΔΑΙΔΟΙΚΟΝ. ΙΤ, misread as Π, led from ΕΣΙΤΑΝ, via ΕΣΙΠΑΝ, to the common ἐς το πᾶν. σπονδαῖ, dative singular, written ΣΠΟΝΔΑΙ, was misinterpreted as the nominative plural σπονδαί, made subject of a sentence with the relevant part of the verb το be supplied mentally, viz. εἰσων. Then the adjective in the nominative plural ἔνδαιδες was evolved from ΕΝΔΑΙΔ which originally stood for ἔνδαδ(α). ΟΙΚΟΝ, originally meaning οἶκον, was made into a genitive plural οἶκον, depending on the new subject σπονδαί. A relatively small number of corruptions involve more than a
one-stage evolution, as this one does; but the original cause of error was a simple graphical confusion.

Turning to errors arising from graphical confusions in minuscules of various dates, one may note the occasional confusion of a form of beta with a form of kappa. Thus A 889 βλάβας [κλάβας F. X 936 βαρύδικος] καρύδικος. E 110 νεβροῦ [νεκρῶν FT. E 246 νεβρόν] νεκρῶν. A 1024 ἄβλαβεία [αιλαβεία F shows the reinforcement of the graphical confusion by a Byzantine assimilation in pronouncing the diphthong, with the upsilon consonantalized.

Beta is sometimes found for μυ, as at A 1420, μασάματον βμασάματων in G, a manuscript I am not here normally citing.

Gamma occurs for δελτα at A 310 τόδε [τόγε M and E 752 δσ'] δ γ' M. But here it may be mere confusion of common particles. At X 989 M offers ψέγω and Σ λέγω; but I suspect Aeschylus may have written Ἀλυσίθων γὰρ ὅθω, φόβῳ μόρον, cf. φέδεων ἐντρέπειν, φροντίζειν in Hesychios: “I do not care about Aigisthos’ doom.” The scholiast’s λέγω could mean “I do not reckon in . . .”; but so common a word is little likely to have been corrupted to M’s ψέγω. In minuscules the high gamma sometimes has a loop at the foot which makes it very like a delta of which the lower part is skimped and the flourish above is drawn to the right. But this tendency is hardly evidenced before the date of M, around A.D. 1000; and it may be we have here merely a substitution for a rare word of a commoner one, itself in turn supplanted in the scholia by a very common one.

X 530 νεογενές νεορένες suggests that M’s minuscule antigraph had a blotchily written gamma looking like a rho.

Theta is lost after φι at A 1187 σφυρογγος σφυρογγος F and E 371 ἐπιφθόνοις ἐπιφόνοις.

Theta develops into ρο at A 919 βαρβάρου βαρβάρου in F and E, which I usually neglect here.

Theta is despirated to ταύ at A 946 ἐμβαίνοντ' ἀλουργέων ἐμβαίνοντ' ἀλουργέων.

One would expect interchange of theta and delta, as possibly at A 1089, where we find ψόδη emerging as ψόδη in T; but as the form ψόδη occurs at A 999 a one cannot be sure that Triclinius was not merely conforming to that earlier place.

At A 1595, for the Mss’ ἀνθρακός καθημένος Professor A. J. Beattie has a brilliant, as yet unpublished suggestion, ἀνθρακός καθ' ἦμμενος,
“around kindled coals” (burning charcoal), which would involve confusion of *theta* and *delta* in Byzantine pronunciation.

*Kappa* is liable to confusion with *chi*, as at X 35 ἐλακε [ἐλαχε. X 39 ἐλακον] ἐλαχον. X 180 χαίτην] καὶ την. X 215 ἐξηύχου] ἐξηύκου. E 170 μυχὸν] μυκὸν M, where F and T displace the word with the gloss σὸν όικον. Confusion of κ/χ, as of π/φ, is an “ear” mistake.

*Mu* sometimes develops to *lambda*, as at E 881 καμῳδια] καλῳδιαι FT. Maybe this happened at X 814, where I would read Ἑνλαβοι δ’ ἐνδικος παις ὁ Μαιας, ἐπει φορωτατος πραζιν ουριαν θεμεν· πολλα δ’ ἄλα φανει χρηζων κρυπτ’, . . . “Let Maia’s son duly take a hand, for he is most furthering to make an operation favoured (by wind); and many things else he will show forth, at his will, though hid . . .”

Μ offers θελευ, the superscript omega meaning that the reading should be θελων, doubtless influenced by χρηζων below in line 815.

*Mu* seems to have given rise to *pi* at A 1255, in F’s δυσπαθη for T’s δυσμαθη. But Verrall’s ἑραξ δυσπυθη deserves consideration with reference to the foregoing πυθδκραντα.

Graphical confusion of minuscule *nu* (the type not “on a leg”) and *upsilon* may occur, as at A 529, where F has τοιουδε (sic) for τοιουδε. So too E 77, πόντον] πόντου. E 136 ἀντικεντρα] ἀντικεντρα F. E 670 χρόνου] χρόνον M¹.

*Pi* and *phi* are liable to interchange. Thus X 418 φαντες] παντες. E 523 ἀνατρέπων] ἀνατρέφων. I read 522-525:

\[

tiω δε μηδεν εν φαει ( = εν βιω) \\
καρδιαν ἀνατρέπων, (= φοβούμενος) \\
η πολις βροτος θ’ όμοι- \\
wς, ζτε δαι σεβαι Δικαι;
\]

Comparing such phrases as Theocritus 8.90, ἀνατράπετο φρένα λύπα, I would render this: “Who that not at all in life upsets his heart (= has his heart upset, gets terrified)—either a city or a human likewise,—would still reverence Justice?”

Confusion of *pi* and *tau* is more likely to occur in minuscules than in uncials. A 1571 δυσπλητα περ] δυσπλητα περ F. X 600 ἀπερωτος] ἀπερωτος M¹. E 356 τιβασος] πιβασος M, πιβασος FT. E 914 πρεπ- 

tων] τρεπτων FT.

*Tau* evolves to *psi* once, at A 1566, προς άται] προσάμαι. *Pi* + *tau* develops to double *pi* at A 590, ἐνίπτων] ἐνίπτων.
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Tau develops from sigma + tau at A 143, φιλομάστος | φιλομάτος M1, and at A 145, where the paradosis has unmetrical | | | τροθοῦν, the original reading may have been the dialectal form τροθῶν. Here there is vulgarisation more than graphical confusion. Indeed, merely graphical error is less common than error involving some thought, or lack of thought, by the scribe, who would normally be familiar with some sort of Greek.


X 325 ἦν | ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν Παλαίς | δ' ἦν ἦ

E 890 τῆς καμάρῳ | τῆς γ' ἀμοίρῳ.

The Oresteia exemplifies the tendency for articles to be added by scribes, who were habituated to Attic prose usages: e.g. A 116 οἱ F. A 140 δ' FT. A 145 τῶν FT. X 325 ἦ, E 256 δ. Bearing in mind this tendency one may take a new look at A 102f:

εἰλεῖσ οἰμύνει φροντιδ' ἀπληστον,
τὴν θυμοθόρον λύπης φρένα.

Wilamowitz thought that an iambic dimeter clausula could stand to conclude the anapaests, rightly deleted the article, and then printed for 103, with two changes, θυμοθόρον λύπης φρένα. Some may prefer to interpret the residual paradosis, by adding an iota subscript, as θυμοθόρον λύπης φρένα. “Hope wards off insatiable anxiety, soul-destroying with griefs my heart,” where the verbal compound θυμοθόρον governs a direct object, φρένα, cf. X 23, χοάς προπομπῶς... Some might prefer the form λύπας.

Particles and other small words added include: A 2 δ' MV. X 87 δ. X 788A δ. X 960 δ' (after ἀξιών, which should be kept, as the asyndeton

Copyists were liable sometimes to drop particles and other small words, e.g. A 81 δ’ V. A 154 γὰρ FT. A 539 γε (restored by Enger before τεθνάμαι). A 741 τε. A 546 σ’ (by haplography after φρενόσ). E 550 ὄν T. In A 410, for ἰώ ἰώ δώμα δώμα, F negligently writes each word singly, ἰώ δώμα.


At X 482 the paradoxos may result from an “ear” mistake. After Orestes, at Agamemnon’s grave, has prayed for sovereignty over his palace, Elektra is given by M these words (481f):

κάγώ, πάτερ, τοιάδε. σοὶ χρείαν ἔχω.

† φυγεῖν μέγαν προσθείσαν Αἰγίσθῳ† . . .

Orestes then refers to Agamemnon’s future participation in the palatial banquets, and Elektra, at 486ff, promises to give her father libations from her marriage portion. Accordingly, at 482, some have thought she had some reference to marriage. I would make 482 an accusative and infinitive of wish, in this form:

φύειν μέγαν προσθείσαν Αἰγίσθῳ <τίσιν>.

“I too, father, am of such a mind. I have need of you. May I bear a great (son) after inflicting on Aigisthos revenge.” φυγεῖν could evolve to the commoner word φυγεῖν by a slight aural confusion in the mind’s ear. Further, the copyist might have obscurely in mind the notion
“May I go into exile from the land after inflicting on Aigisthos (?).” Such a wish would not be wholly absurd in view of Orestes’s wish at X 438 to die after killing his mother. ΤΙΣΙΝ might fall out by a near haplography after the element ΓΙΣ in ΑΙΠΙΣΘΟΙ.

The transmission offers samples of errors in inflection, some of them due to the normalizing tendency of scribes or to metrical theory. At A 263 and 271, F and T, to suit changed ascriptions of speakers, offer the participles σεγώντι and φρονούσης with changed genders. At A 680 F² and T offer the infinitive κλέων for the participle κλωνών after ἴσθι, probably as a construction more normal in the innovator’s conception. Datives in -οις or -οις(ν) are interchanged too often to notice. The following will serve as examples of types of inflectional error:


Collators are often in doubt how far to take note of the presence or absence of the ephekystic or facultative ν and of iota adscript or subscript. The lability of non-facultative ν is, however, worth observation. Sometimes it is lost internally, as at A 82, where M and V have ἡμερώφατον for ἡμερώφατον. E 138 κατισχαίνουσα ] κατισχαί
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Iota adscript is confusingly dropped at A 77 ἀνάσσων] ἀνάσσων, and A 431 δόμων] δόμων.

At X 715, M offers in Klytaimestra’s speech:

αίνῳ δὲ πράσσειν ὡς ἐπευθύνως τάδε.

Here I suspect an iota has been adscripted on the assumption that there is a dative adjective. I would print ἐπευθύνω and render: “I bid you do these things as I direct.” She is instructing her majordomo, rather fussily.
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Many corruptions affect only a single syllable of a word, thus:
A 87 θυσικεῖς | θυσικέεις Mss fere, θυσικεῖς M olim, δίος κυνεῖς VT, θυσικεῖς ΣΤ. A 141 λεόντων | δύντων MV, senselessly, so that FT omit.

Metathesis and anagrammatism in various degrees occur, thus:

There are examples of the Byzantine tendency whereby words are transposed to make a verse end with a paroxytone word: A 5 θέρος βροτοῖς | βροτοῖς θέρος FT. A 1064 κλύει φρενῶν | φρενῶν κλύει F1E. A 1106 πόλει βοῖ | βοῦ πόλει FT. A 210 πέλασ βωμοῦ | βωμοῦ πέλας, in a syncopated lyric iambic trimeter, may be influenced by the same factor.

Glosses have sometimes been added to a line or have replaced the original word in it: A 111 δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι | δορὶ δίκας πράκτορι. (Possibly, however, here δίκας is a stopgap, not a gloss, to make up for καὶ χερὶ lost by homoeoteleuton. It would make up ten syllables, which Byzantine editors might think a correct responson, regardless of quantities, to 129 as they had it). At A 153, V has συμμενεὶ φιτῶν,
where other Mss have \textit{σύμφυτον}. (Read rather \textit{νεικέων τέκτονα συμφύτων}, a glyconic in astrophic rhythm.) V has conflated \textit{σύμφυτον} with a gloss \textit{μένει} written over \textit{μίμει} in the line below, 154. A 1143 \textit{φιλοίκτοις} \textit{ταλανως Μ, φιλοίκτοις ταλανως F, φιλοίκτοις Τ. A 1174 τίθησι δαιμων} \textit{δαιμων ποιει} Τ. A 1454 \textit{ἀπέβλεψεν βίον} appears in the Mss (F and Τ only here), but the antistrope would then lack a final iamb, though its sense is complete as it stands. At A 857 Aeschylus uses \textit{ἀποφθίνω} intransitively, and he could do so again at A 1454 (making the clausula there a hypodochmius, or anaclastic dochmius). I suggest \textit{βίον} is an intrusive gloss by a scribe who took the verb as causal, as it mostly was. At X 32 the gloss \textit{Φοῖβος} has been unmetrically intruded in front of \textit{ὀρθόθρις δόμων ὀνειρόμαντις}, having originated in some mistaken process of reasoning. At E 560 the right reading is clearly \textit{θερμῷ}, and the glossing process has been at work, as appears from the collation: \textit{θερμοφερῷ MF} \textit{θερμῷ, ἦγον θερμουργῷ} Τ. Simpler examples of gloss-intrusion include: A 198 \textit{αινεῖν} \textit{ἐπείειν FT. A 282 ἀγγέλου} \textit{ἀγγέλου}. A 400 \textit{ἐς δόμοι} \textit{ἐς οἶκον Τ. A 549 κοιράνων} \textit{τυράννων F. E 170 μυχῶν} \textit{σὸν οἶκον FT. E 448 ἄφθογγον ἄφθογγον FT. E 934 ἀπλακήματὰ νῦν} \textit{ἀμπλακήματα νῦν Μ, ἀμαρτήματα FT.}

At X 160–163 the text probably ought to run:

\begin{align*}
\text{i} & \omega, \tau\zeta \deltaορυθεν\zeta \epsilon\zeta\zeta \epsilon \alpha tηρ, \\
\alpha\alphaλυ\zeta \tauηρ δόμων, \Sigma\kappaυ\nuικά τ’ \epsilon ν χεροίν \\
pαλίντων’ \epsilon ν \epsilonργῳ’ πιπάλλων’ Αρης \\
sχεδία τ’ αυτόκωπα νωμᾶν βέλη; \\
\end{align*}

It is an astrophic run of dochmiacs, variously resolved, and means: “Ho! What man will come, strong with the spear, liberator of the household, and what warlike force brandishing in its hands Scythian weapons bent back in action (= bows), and wielding at close quarters weapons grasped by the hilt (= swords).” The \textit{βέλη} at the end of 163 goes equally with \textit{Σκυθικά} . . . \textit{παλίντων(α)} and with \textit{σχεδιά} . . . \textit{αυτόκωπα}. In the paradosis an unmetrical \textit{βέλη} has been intruded before \textit{πιπάλλων} probably from an interlinear gloss, and some editors, following Pauw, have extruded the final word \textit{βέλη} in favour of \textit{ξήφη}, which is part of the scholiast’s explanation of Aeschylus’s phrase. \textit{βέλη} can mean either missile weapons, as arrows, or others, as swords. If the paradosis’ \textit{βέλη} in 162 be not from a gloss, then it is an example of influence from a word in the following line, of which I can see some more in the \textit{Oresteia}. 
Thus, at A 512, for καὶ παυόνος we find καὶ παγώνος F, κακαγώνος T. Some scribe’s eye had strayed to the line below, ending with τ’ αγωνίους θεούς. At E 507 the unmetrical δὲ τις, deleted by Schwenk and Pauw, arises from a scribe’s eye having caught in the next line the same letters in μηδε τις. (The intrusion is not from scholia, as suggested by Groeneboom and Murray.)

The influence of an adjacent line may be negative, thus: at X 832f the Chorus, inciting Orestes to slay his mother, say, as I supplement the lacuna,

Περσέως τ’ ἐν φρεσοῖν (with synizesis making a dochmiac)

<πέρθε> καρδίαν σχεθῶν, . . .

“Keeping in your midriff the heart of Perseus, destroy (her) . . .” In uncial with round sigma to which the theta of ΠΕΡΘΕ was assimilated, the imperative fell out below uncial ΠΕΡΣΕΟΣ. This is not the place to argue what should be read at 819ff in the strophe; but in 819 the paradigm can be interpreted as a dochmiac, καὶ τότε δὴ πλωτῶν (original ΠΛΟΤΟΝ taken wrongly as πλοῦτον).

The influence of lost words in a strophe may cause loss in its antistrophe, as the lacuna in A 1006f induced Triclinius to eject at A 1031 the syllables θυμαλητ’ τε καὶ οὐδέν ἐπ. Fortunately the Oresteia paradosis seems not to have suffered substantially from such free ecdotic interventions before Triclinius, who was about as irresponsible as many scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Iron Age of Aeschylean corruption.

Influence from the line below seems to have been the root of the trouble at X 64, the only corrupt place in lines 61-65, which can be read thus:

ροπη δ’ ἐπισκοπεῖ δίκαιον,
ταχεῖα τοῖς μὲν ἐν φάει,
τὰ δ’ ἐν μεταίχμιῳ σκότου
μένει χρονιζοντα βρύει,
65 τοὺς δ’ ἀκραντος ἔχει νῦς.

“A turn of the scale controls justice, swift for some in the light; and other events in the frontierland of darkness abound in power as they delay; and other men night without fulfilment holds.” The chorus is oracularly discussing the varying rates and manners in which guilty persons are punished. The above text is exactly as in M, our sole authority, except that in 64 M wrote μένει χρονιζοντ’ ἔχει (altered to
suggest the scribe’s eye had taken in the χει of ἔχει in the line below, and, having mistaken the dative of the noun μένος for the third singular of the verb μένω, he was expecting a noun in the neuter to go with the preceding τὰ, and thus arrived, via ἔχει, at ἔχη, which made nonsense of metre and of the ensuing βρύει. Line 64 in the restored form was adopted by Hermann (at one time), Weil, Verrall, and Groeneboom.

The foregoing brief discussion is a reminder of the infinite guerrilla of interpretation that would face anyone who should attempt to evaluate in rigorous percentages all the types of error in the Aeschylean paradosis; for it is often impossible to satisfy oneself, much less anyone else, what the true reading can have been from which a given manuscript variant has deviated.


In A 1493, F had ἀσεβεί ἡθανάτω, but in the repetition at A 1517 changes to εὐσεβεί ἡθανάτω, whether by a monkish thought about a pious death, or from a graphical confusion whereby a form of alpha was read as the Byzantine ligature for ευ. (This same confusion happened in the paradosis at Theognis 1044, in XPD and some later Mss.)
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X 247 γένναν εὖν] γένναν M, with εὖν lost by near haplography after αὐ, may be an example of the same graphical confusion of alpha with a medieval ligature. But this type of corruption seems to be extremely rare in the Aeschylus tradition, which is distinguished, on the contrary, by errors deriving from uncial confusions.

Uncial confusion may be at the back of the crux in X 649, which involves, as so many problems do, strophic responson. The mildest cures being applied to M’s readings, we find this:

\[
\text{τὸδ’ ἄγχι πλευμόνοιν ξίφος} \quad \text{στρ. \delta}
\]

\[
640 \text{διανταλὼν ἄντευεκές οὐτᾷ διαὶ Δίκας τομῇ. θέμας γὰρ οὖν. λᾶ πέδοι πατούμενον τὸ πᾶν Δίας σέβας παρεκ-}
\]

\[
645 \text{βάντ’ ἐσῳ θεμοστῶς.}
\]

\[
645 \text{Δίκας δ’ ἐρείδεται πυθμῆν.} \quad \text{ἀντ. \delta}
\]

\[
640 \text{προχαλκεύει δ’ Αἰσα φασγανουργός· τέκνον δ’ ἐπεισφέρει δι’ ἄλαγής δωμάτων παλαίτερον}
\]

\[
650 \text{τίνειν μύσος χρόνῳ κλυτὶ βυσσόφρων Ἔρινῳ.}
\]

“Here near the lungs the sword, keen-timbered, strikes a straight-through (blow), through, by the surgery of Justice. For it is right. Trampled underfoot to the ground entirely, the majesty of Zeus fills with Ruin a transgressor, righteously. The anvil of Justice is firm fixed; sword-worker Destiny continues her smithy-work; and the famous deep-minded Fury in time brings in a child to requite in turn the older pollution of the household.” The Chorus’s sentiments are suited to the moment where Orestes is about to enter the palace and avenge his father. Changes from the paradosis are these: 639 τὸ δ’ M, τὸδ’ Young. 640 σοῦτα M, σουτά Hermann. 641 τὸ μὴ M, τομῇ Young; οὐ M, οὖν A. Ludwig. 645 παρεκβάντες ἀθεμίστως M, παρεκβάντ’ ἐσῳ θεμοστῶς Young. εἰσώ would be a correct formation from the Homeric verb ἐαώ, which LSJ attest in the aorist from Aeschylus and Sophocles. It would mean “fill with Ate,” cf. εἰσοσιδρῷ, “to fill with men.” When a redivision of the paradosis offers acceptable sense, no other remedy should be sought for a crux. Here all that is needed is the addition of an iota subscript. 647 προχαλκεύει M, corrected by Jacob metri gratia, resulting in bacchius+palimbacchius+2
cretics. 648–9 δυμασε δωμάτων M (ο in rasura) is an unlikely corruption from δόμως αἴματων, the original assumed by editors who follow the readings of Schuetz (after Pauw) and Stephanus, who got the idea of αἴματων from the scholiast, who misunderstood the passage. Murray reports an epsilon in M above the δω of δωμάτων, which he takes to have the value αυ, and to imply αἴματων. Even if this were by the first hand and ink, it would have no more authority than the uncomprehending scholiast’s comment ἐπεισφέρει δὲ τοῖς οἶκοις τέκνων παλαιών αἰμάτων, δ ἔστι, τικτεί δ φόνος ἄλλον φόνον. The child brought by the Fury is Orestes, just as at A 1607 Aigisthos claimed to have been brought home by Justice to avenge his murdered brothers and sisters. M’s δυμασε is meaningless, but looks like a conscientious effort to reproduce a difficult antigraph, for M corrects a letter. Putting δυμασε into uncials we get ΔΙΜΑΣЄ, and we need a diamb for responsion. The sense is suited by δι’ ἄλλαγης, which originally would have been ΔΙΑΛΛΑΓЄ. I suggest that ΑΛ became M (cf. Thomson-Headlam on X 995 [their 1001]), and the uncial gamma was taken for sigma, as at A 101 and X 542 (with the converse phenomenon at E 58). Then we have loss of uncial sigma after round uncial epsilon (standing for eta). The suprascript epsilon in δωμάτων may be someone’s alternative interpretation of the first O of an old ΔΟΜΑΤΟΝ somewhat illegible, which had been primarily interpreted as for omega. At 649, on my view, M’s παλαιτέρων should be re-interpreted as παλαιτέρων. 650 τείνει M, τίνει Lachmann. M’s form κλυτῆ at 650, where editors change to the lyric alpha, supports the eta forms of 641 τομῆ, and 648 δι’ ἄλλαγης, as do M’s forms at 22, 386, 430, 467 and, with suprascript alphas, at 383, 388, 468, 623 and 646 (cf. Fraenkel on A 1535f [III, p. 727 n. 3]). Contrariwise, there are Doricisms in anapaests, e.g. at A 1569. Why suppose Aeschylus more pedantically consistent in dialectal purism than Homer, Pindar or Burns?

In sum, though in this passage, as in many, there are several slight adjustments of the paradosis to be made, most of them are routine remedies of slight normal errors. Even the less obvious remedy, δι’ ἄλλαγης for M’s δυμασε, will not appear very difficult to those who have familiarized themselves with what has actually happened in the transmission of the Aeschylus text to us.
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