

Repetitions and their Removal by the Copyists of Greek Tragedy

Peter Pickering

IT IS BEYOND DOUBT that what Jackson in *Marginalia Scaenica* calls “unconscious repetitions by the copyist” occur.¹ (By “unconscious” Jackson means little more than “erroneous”; he is not considering changes deliberately introduced by a copyist.) I present here the results of an attempt to examine those instances where verbal repetitions found in manuscripts of Greek tragedy are due to scribal error, and to assess some of the circumstances in which such errors appear.² An unexpected discovery was that besides introducing repetitions scribes can be detected (or perhaps rather some scribes can sometimes be detected) removing repetitions.

Editors quite frequently emend away repetitions found in

¹ J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford 1955), Addenda B, 223. Jackson wittily depreciates the value of listing the large number of examples, and does not therefore attempt any systematisation. There are frequent allusions to scribal repetition in editors’ discussion of individual cruces. Repetitions due to the author rather than a copyist are surveyed in my article “Verbal Repetition in Prometheus and Greek Tragedy Generally,” *BICS* 44 (2000) 81–99.

² The research was undertaken as part of work for a Ph.D. at University College London. My thanks are due especially to my supervisor, Professor Janko, and to my examiners, Dr Dawe and Professor Carey, for their many helpful comments on my thesis, to Professor Easterling for her comments on an earlier draft of this article, and to the anonymous referee. The collations on which the research was based were: for the alphabetic plays of Euripides, Murray’s OCT (I 1902, II 1913, III 1907); for Aeschylus *Supplices* H. Friis Johansen and E. W. Whittle (Copenhagen 1980); for Aeschylus *Septem contra Thebas* Page’s OCT of 1972 and R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1964; Dawe reports a number of variants relevant to this study which are not in Page, presumably because they are not significant in the constitution of the text); for Sophocles *Trachiniae* the third edition of Dawe’s Teubner *Sophocles Tragoediae* (1996); and for Euripides *Hippolytus* Diggle’s OCT of 1984: cited below by editors’ names.

texts as transmitted, and in doing so must be assuming that those repetitions were the result of copyists' errors. Sometimes, also, the manuscript tradition presents alternative readings, one with a repetition and one without. Among the considerations an editor must have in mind in choosing which to prefer is whether a copyist has introduced into a text a repetition not originally there or has removed, deliberately or inadvertently, a repetition the author had written.

1.1 Apographs: Erroneous repetitions

Any rigorous study must attempt to separate out erroneous repetition by an individual copyist from other sources of error, especially ones due to contamination in an open recension. Only if we can be sure that one manuscript is a pure apograph of another extant manuscript can we be sure that errors in the first are due to its copyist and to him alone. Where the reading of the copy is different, it must be either by mistake (and "mistake" is the right word even in the unlikely but possible circumstance that it produces the original words of the author), or by deliberate conjecture. There are many apographs in the libraries of the world, but the labour of collating them is not normally undertaken once their totally dependent status has been demonstrated; and even when they have been collated, those collations are rarely published.

Fortunately, however, the Euripidean manuscript usually denoted **P** (one half being *Palatinus gr.* 287 and the other *Laurentianus conv. soppr.* 172) was fully collated before it was generally accepted to be totally dependent (in the so-called "alphabetic" plays)³ on the manuscript usually denoted **L** (*Laurentianus plut.* 32.2).⁴ The readings of **P** are thus reported alongside those of **L**

³ *Cyclops, Heraclidae, Supplices, Electra, Hercules, Iphigenia Taurica, Ion, Helena, and Iphigenia Aulidensis.*

⁴ Diggle in the preface to vol. II of his OCT says "[Zuntz] controversiam illam diuturnam, quam necessitudine L et P inter se coniuncti sint, omnino diremit" (p.vi). Diggle refers to G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965) 13–15, where Zuntz describes how a mark in **L** copied as a colon in **P** proved to have been a tiny piece of straw.

in earlier apparatuses, such as that of Murray; a large number of them are also discussed by Zuntz.⁵

Another, and more recent, published collation of an apograph is that by Friis Johansen and Whittle of *Aeschylus Supp. Scurialensis* T.1.15, which they denote by **E**. They published this collation in the belief that the manuscript was not a descendant of *Mediceus Laurentianus* 32.9; that contention is generally discredited.⁶

A study of the apparatuses in Murray and Friis Johansen was made.⁷ All instances where a substantially different word is read in the apograph from that in its exemplar were examined (differences of accent or breathing, or simply of inflection, were passed over, as were all but very striking differences in non-lexicals).⁸ Something like 125 substantial differences were found.⁹

Table 1 lists the 17 instances where a significant divergence in the readings of apograph and exemplar is certainly, probably, or possibly to be ascribed to the influence of a nearby word.¹⁰

⁵ Zuntz (*supra* n.4). On p.136 he lists the types of error to which **P** was prone: dropping single letters, especially consonants; changing or adding letters; writing a wrong but similarly pronounced vowel; and repetition.

⁶ M. L. West, *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Teubner 1990), says in his preface "Quod H. Friis Johansen et E. W. Whittle contenderunt, Md [sc. their **E**] non a M genus habere sed auctoritate sua aliquid valere, non magis mihi persuaserunt quam aliis viris doctis" (p.XVII) There may, of course, have been a manuscript intermediate between **M** and **E**.

⁷ Murray's readings quoted in this article have all been checked against the published facsimiles of **L** and **P**: J. A. Spranger, *Euripidis quae inveniuntur in Codice Laurentiano* (Florence 1920) for **L**, and *Euripidis quae in codicibus Palatino graeco inter Vaticanos 287 et Laurentiano Conv. Sopp. 172* (Florence 1939–46) for **P**.

⁸ With the alphabetic plays of Euripides, despite the total dependence of **P** on **L** care is necessary when looking at each particular case, since corrections in **L** (whether or not by Triclinius) may or may not have been carried into **P**.

⁹ Proportionately more divergences were found in Aeschylus' *Supplices* than in the alphabetic plays of Euripides; that may be because its text is much more corrupt in all respects.

¹⁰ In general the simplifying, but plausible, assumption is made that influence, if there is any, is from the closest word, whether it precedes or follows. What may be an eighteenth instance is cited by L. von Sybel, *De repetitionibus verborum in fabulis Euripideis* (diss. Bonn 1868) 35. He claims that **P** originally had τύχης for δίκης in *Heraclidae* 933 following τύχην in 930 and preceding τύχην in 935. This is not reported in Murray, nor is it discernible in the

Play & line			
Euripides	L reading	P reading	Nearby word
<i>Heracl.</i> 282	ἦβην	ῥβριν	ῥβριν 280 (p)
<i>Supp.</i> 374	ἔς αἰεῖ	εὐσαεῖ	εὐσεβῆς 373 (p)
<i>Supp.</i> 539	χρῆν	δῆ altered to δεῖ	δεῖ 536 (p)
<i>HF</i> 74	πατήρ	σωτήρ	σῶζω 72 (p)
<i>HF</i> 1368	καλῶν	κακῶν	κακά 1366 (p)
<i>Ion</i> 545	νέου	λόγου	λόγων 544 (p)
<i>Ion</i> 1453	ἔλαβες	ἔβαλες	ἀπέβαλον 1453 (p)
<i>IT</i> 503	φθονεῖς	φρονεῖς	φρονεῖς 503 (f)
<i>IT</i> 637	λάβης	βάλης	βαλῶ 635 (p)
<i>IT</i> 733	ὁ τήνδε	ὅταν δὲ	ὅταν τε 730 (p)
<i>Hel.</i> 864	φάσγαν’	βάρβαρ’	βάρβαρ’ 864 (p)
<i>Hel.</i> 1186	χροῶς	χθονὸς	χθονὸς 1179 (p)
<i>Hel.</i> 1618	χρησιμώτερον	σωφρονέστερον	σώφρονος 1617 (p)
Aeschylus	M reading	E reading	nearby word
<i>Supp.</i> 334	λευκοστεφεῖς	νεοστεφεῖς	νεοδρέπτους 334 (f)
<i>Supp.</i> 353	βοτήρι	βατήρι	ἠλιβάτοις 352 (p)
<i>Supp.</i> 606	ἄν ἠβήσαιμι	ἄν ἠγήσαιμι	γηραιᾶ 606 (f)
<i>Supp.</i> 632	γένει	χενεῖ	χεούσαν 632 (f)

Table 1: Scribal Errors of Repetition in Apographs¹¹

facsimile; Wecklein (*Euripides Heraclidae* [Leipzig 1898]) merely reports δίκ *in rasura* in 933. Sybel supports his contention by the observation that an apograph in Paris has τύχης. Sybel’s thesis was that all the (to his mind) pointless and burdensome repetitions (“molestae” in his terminology) found in the received text of Euripides were due to copyists, and he was looking hard for cases where that could be demonstrated. The evidence for P’s reading is not strong enough to use here.

¹¹ There was nothing relevant to repetition in *Cyclops*, *Electra*, or *Iphigenia Aulidensis*. “Nearby word” gives its line-number and whether it (p)recedes or (f)ollows the word it seems to have influenced.

Most of the divergences do not need this influence to explain them (being the errors in single letters to whose prevalence Zuntz has drawn attention, or errors due to metathesis of $\beta\alpha\lambda$ - and $\lambda\alpha\beta$ -),¹² though several indubitably do.

There are in Table 1 six cases where the apograph has certainly repeated whole or part of a previously occurring word instead of the word actually in the exemplar:

Heraclidae 282, *Hercules* 74, *Ion* 545,¹³ *IT* 733, *Helena* 864, *Helena* 1618.

There are seven cases where a divergent reading in the apograph is possibly due, at least in part, to influence from a previously occurring word:

Eur. Supplices 374, *Eur. Supplices* 539,¹⁴ *Hercules* 1368,¹⁵ *Ion* 1453, *IT* 637, *Helena* 1186, *Aesch. Supplices* 353.

There are four instances—three in the *Scurialensis* of Aeschylus—where the word influencing the repetition is a later one in the same line. Two of these are certain: *IT* 503, *Aesch. Supplices* 334. Two are no more than possible: *Aesch. Supplices* 606, 632.

¹² An assumption behind all the work reported here is that scribal errors are not purely random events. However careless a scribe—and by common consent the scribe of **P** was a particularly careless one—there is a pattern in his carelessness, which a systematic study would reveal. In this article it is only patterns relating to repetition that are studied.

¹³ The inflexional form is that required by the context, but the word is found in the previous (tetrameter) line.

¹⁴ W. S. Barrett, however, *Euripides Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 164–165, draws attention to the general tendency for $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ to replace $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}$ in transmission.

¹⁵ Although the confusion of $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ and $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$ is common it may have been influenced here by $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ also at line-end two lines earlier. **L** writes consecutive lines in adjacent columns, while **P** goes straight down the column. If the cause of the error is a mechanical slip of the scribe's eye, then a scribe copying **P** from **L** would be particularly liable to repetition from two lines back. But erroneous repetitions may be due rather to the retention in the scribe's mind of a word encountered recently. (There is extensive psychological literature on this "priming" effect.)

The conclusion so far is: a copyist is found introducing a repetition into a text from up to three (or possibly seven) lines earlier or from later in the same line.¹⁶

1.2 Apographs: repetitions removed

Besides the cases of erroneous complete or partial repetition, there are five cases in the alphabetic plays of Euripides¹⁷ where **P** removes a repetition in **L** within three lines; in three of these the repetition is one that we would recognise as a figure of speech:

Heraclidae 27: **L**'s καὶ σὺν κακῶς πράσσουσι συμπράσσω κακῶς is destroyed by **P**'s συμπάσχω.¹⁸

Hercules 1100: the first hand of **P** destroys ἔσφζε πλευράς ἐξ ἔμοῦ τ' ἐσφζετο by writing ἔδοξε.¹⁹

IT 669: ἔφθης με μικρόν· ταῦτά δὲ φθάσας λέγεις is destroyed by φράσας in **P**.

In two cases **P** removes a repetition which we would not recognise as a figure of speech, and which obtrudes:

IT 1018: λαθεῖν for λαβεῖν after λαβεῖν in 1016.

Helena 739–740: **P** reads μέλλουσιν for μένουσιν in μένειν τ' ἐπ' ἀκταῖς τούς τ' ἐμούς караδοκεῖν | ἀγῶνας οἱ μένουσιν.²⁰

This occasional removal of a repetition does not seem to have been noticed in discussions of the relationship of **L** and **P** in the alphabetic plays. There are indeed three other possible exam-

¹⁶ Line distances are calculated according to the standard numeration of modern texts. Such a line is not, of course, an exact unit of measurement, since many lyric lines are shorter than trimeters; but the only practical alternative, the word, varies more in length than the line.

¹⁷ There is no similar case with the manuscripts **M** and **E** of the *Supplices* of Aeschylus.

¹⁸ In *Andromache* 462 **P** very similarly reads πάσχω for the πράσσω of all other manuscripts in εἰ δ' ἐγὼ πράσσω κακῶς, | μηδὲν τόδ' ἀύχει· καὶ σὺ γὰρ πράξειας ἄν.

¹⁹ ἔδοξε is not clear on the facsimile.

²⁰ μένουσιν is usually emended to μένουσί μ' following Musgrave.

ples,²¹ though since the original repetitions are neither obviously figures of speech nor particularly obtrusive the removal is not striking.

It is worth drawing attention in this context to four instances where an alteration or variant in **L** (that is, not in its copying by **P**) removes a repetition, whether or not that was the purpose:

Electra 311: **L** and **P** have ἀναίνομαι δὲ γυμνὰς οὐσα παρθένος, following γυμνὸν in 308. Triclinius writes ναίκαας above (γυ)μνὰς.

This alteration (which is printed by most modern editors, omitting the preceding δὲ) is ascribed by Zuntz to Triclinius's use of another manuscript to correct an error that **L** had found in his exemplar.²² Kovacs however retains γυμνὰς, regarding γυμναίκαας as a conjecture by Triclinius in order to provide ἀναίνομαι with an object (Kovacs himself does this by emending παρθένος to παρθένους); avoidance of repetition just might have been a subsidiary motive.²³

Electra 435: **P** and, apparently, **L** in its original state read ἴν' ὁ φιλάδελφος ἔπαλλε δελφίς. φιλάδελφος is emended by Triclinius to φίλαυλος.

Triclinius, who was aware of the need for strophe and antistrophe to respond, would have been attracted by an alteration (coming from Aristophanes *Ranae* 1317) which secured response, as well as making better sense.

Ion 648–649: In καλῶς ἔλεξας, εἶπερ οὐς ἐγὼ φιλω̄ | ἐν τοῖσι

²¹ In Eur. *Supplices* 217 τὸ γὰρ δ' ἐν φρεσὶν κεκτημένοι **P** has χερσὶ for φρεσὶν; but confusion between φρεσί and χερσί in manuscripts is curiously common, and no influence from φρόνησις in the previous line is needed to account for it here. In *Hercules* 829 Ζεὺς νιν κακῶς δρᾶν **P** has νῦν for νιν. These words are easily confused through itacism, and νιν in the previous line is unlikely to be relevant. In *IT* 329 **P**'s λαβῶν for βαλῶν in οὐδεὶς τὰ τῆς θεοῦ θύματ' εὐτύχει βαλῶν is another example of the frequent confusion of the strong aorists of βάλλω and λαμβάνω, and nothing to do with περιβαλόντες in line 331.

²² Zuntz (*supra* n.4) 107. There seems to be little evidence for this other manuscript.

²³ P. D. Kovacs, *Euripides* III (Loeb 1998). There is, incidentally, no repetition in Kovacs' text, since he deletes 308.

σοῖσιν εὐτυχήσουσιν φίλοις L gives λόγοις as a γράφεται variant for φίλοις.

This alteration could have been motivated by failure to realise that φίλοις is neuter, and the repetition irrelevant.

IT 553: In ὦ πανδάκρυτος ἡ κτανούσα χὼ κτανών Triclinius seems to have emended κτανών to θανών.

This alteration is as striking a removal of a repetition as any noted above. Triclinius' motive was perhaps however nothing to do with repetition, but that he was reading the line, with Diggle in his OCT, in the simpler way (Orestes has just told Iphigenia that Agamemnon was killed by γυνή, and she laments the slayer and the slain); Diggle would presumably explain κτανών as an erroneous repetition by a copyist somewhere in the transmission.

2.1 More complex traditions: erroneous repetitions

The degree of analytical rigour possible where one manuscript is an apograph of another is not attainable in a more complex tradition, where there is no uncontaminated stemma. But study of the manuscript tradition of other plays should help to reinforce or refine the conclusions set out above. Three plays were therefore studied—*Septem, Trachiniae*, and *Hippolytus*—with the aim of examining every significant variant (that is one where different dictionary words are read, not where there is a different inflectional or orthographical form of the same dictionary word) and of separating out all cases where repetition might be relevant to the observed difference in readings.²⁴

Tables 2, 3, and 4 below set out the instances in each of the traditions where a difference in readings may with a high degree

²⁴ Variants that turn only on interjections or on the presence or absence of anadiplosis have not been covered. For the collations on which the studies were based see *supra* n.1. Some manuscript variants turning on repetition have been gleaned from Sybel (*supra* n.10); they are not mentioned in Diggle's apparatus, presumably as being what Diggle calls "manifestos singuli codicis errores" (I p.xiv).

line	Page, OCT	Variant	Nearby word	In line	Variant found in
46	κατασκαφᾶς	καταφαγᾶς	ταυροσφαγοῦντες	43 (p)	P
86	ὀροτύπου	ὀρ(ρ)οκτύπου	ὀλόκτυπ-	83 (p)	all but Iγ M
121	ἀρηίων	ἀργείων	Ἄργεῖοι	120 (p)	Δ
126	πύλαις	πάλαις	πάλαφ	126 (f)	M ac
240	ταρβουσύνφ	ταρβοσκύφ	βόσκεται	244 (f)	Υ
267	εὐγμάτων	ὀλυγμάτων	ὀλολυγμὸν	268 (f)	Υ
333	ἀρτιτρόποις	ἀρτιδρόποις	ὠμοδρόπων	333 (f)	Pγρ M s.l.
333	ὠμοδρόπων	ὠμοτρόπων	ἀρτιτρόποις	333 (p)	YBHPγρ var in OQ
350	ἀρτιτρέφεις	ἀρτιβρέφεις	βρέμονται	350 (f)	CaPV
359	θαλαμηπόλων	θαλαμηπόλλων	πολλά	360 (f)	C
386	φόβον	λόφον	λόφους	384 (p)	Υ
410	στυγοῦνθ'	τιμοῦνθ'	τιμῶντα	410 (p)	Nd
497	Ἄρει	ἄθεος	ἔνθεος	497 (p)	Δ ac
787	πικρογλώσσους	πικρονόμους	σιδαρονόμφ	788 (f)	Pγρ
881	δωμάτων	δόμων	δόμων	880 (p)	HKNAVY Pγρ
906	τέλος	μένος	μένει	902 (p)	Υ , var in ΒΔ
928	τεκνογόνοι	παιδογόνοι	παῖδα	929 (f)	Q, P s.l.
1048	χώραν	πόλιν	πόλις	1046 (p)	Υ

Table 2: Scribal Errors of Repetition in *Septem*

line	Dawe	Variant	Nearby word	In line	Variant found in
143	παθοῦσα	πάρει	παροῦσα	141 (p)	AUY
182	κάκ	καὶ	καὶ	182 (p)	R
240	εὐχαίς	εὐκταί'	εὐκταῖα	239 (p)	AUY
339	ἐπίστασαι	ἐπίστασαι	ἐπιστήμην	338 (p)	all but Lpc KA s.l. Y s.l.
558	φόνων	φθόνων	φθίνοντος	558 (p)	Zo
673	μαθεῖν	λαβεῖν	λαβεῖν	670 (p)	L
744	μαθῶν	παρῶν	πάρ'	744 (p)	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 1805 ac
947	πρότερ-	πότερ-	πότερα	947 (p)	all but LT
965	φορεῖ	φωνεῖ	ὀξύφωνος	963 (p)	K
1008	ἀπολείς	ἀπολείς μ'	ἀπολείς μ'	1008 (p)	Lac
1212	γενήσεται	φθονήσεται	φθόνησις	1212 (p)	ZgZo
1273	πάντων	θανάτους	θανάτους	1276 (f)	A

Table 3: Scribal Errors of Repetition in *Trachiniae*

of plausibility be ascribed to erroneous repetition of, or influence from, a nearby word. The summary of the manuscript evidence in them does not lay claim to completeness—corrections and γράφεται variants may be ignored; the sigla used are those of Page, Dawe, and Diggle respectively. It must always be remembered that there are very many variant readings in texts without there being any word in the vicinity at all like the intruder. The tables must be read with that *caveat*.

line	Diggle	Variant	Nearby word	In line	Variant found in
57	βλέπων	είσορων	είσορῶ	51 (p)	<i>P.Sorb.</i> 2252
107	χρεῶν	θεῶν	θεῶν	106 (p)	Vpc test. Sybel et Wecklein
255	μυελὸν	φιλίας	φιλίας	254 (p)	<i>P.Sorb.</i> 2252
271	ἐλέγγουσ'	ἐννέπουσα	ἐννέπειν	271 (f)	M
301	πόνους	λόγους	λόγοις	299 (p)	O
303	ἐτέγγεθ'	ἐπείθεθ'	πείθεται	303 (f)	scholia in several MSS.
520	τόκῳ	τέκνω	τέκνον	517 (p)	L
628	σπείρας	θρέψας	θρέψας	628 (f)	gnomologium E
630	φυτὸν	κακὸν	κακοῦ	629 (p)	OVCDELP Mγρ
658	πατρί	κακά	κακός	654 (p)	M
688	δῆ	δεῖ	δεῖ	688 (p)	OV ; CD omit
776	δόμων	δρόμ-	βοηδρομεῖτε	776 (p)	BCDEP
1038	καὶ	ὦ	οὐκ	1038 (p)	A
1039	εὐοργησίᾳ	εὐορκ-	ὄρκους	1038 (p)	DE & 2nd-hand in BAVL etc.
1089	φυγῆς	χθονός	χθονός	1087 (p)	D teste Sybel
1323	παρέσχες	ἔνειμας/ἔμεινας	ἔμεινας	1322 (p)	DLPHE

Table 4: Scribal Errors of Repetition in *Hippolytus*

2.2 More complex traditions: repetitions removed

It is important to see if the tendency found in the apograph study for repetitions to be removed in transmission is peculiar to the scribe of **P** in the alphabetic plays or if it is a more widespread, if little noticed, phenomenon.

The manuscript tradition of *Septem* has only one compelling example:

1005: δοκοῦντα καὶ δόξαντ' ἀπαγγέλλειν με χρῆ
 where **Q** has μέλλοντ' for δόξαντ'. The scribe may have thought the context demanded a future (just as Headlam conjectured δόξοντ'), or been affected by -ελλ- in the next word. It is nevertheless remarkable that these feelings should have counteracted the influence of δοκοῦντα two words earlier.

The tradition of *Trachiniae* is much more interesting. Despite sharing with **Zg** the introduced repetition in 1212, and introducing one of its own in 558, the manuscript **Zo** appears to remove repetitions on as many as five occasions, on one with the approval of modern editors:

187: καὶ τοῦ τόδ' ἀστῶν ἢ ξένων μαθῶν λέγεις
 In the light of the tendency the following cases will demonstrate in **Zo**, it is tempting to see ἔχεις for λέγεις as a way of varying from λόγον in 184.

330–331: μηδὲ πρὸς κακοῖς
 τοῖς οἴσιν ἄλλην πρὸς γ' ἑμοῦ λύπην λάβη

The line is read thus by Dawe and by Easterling,²⁵ and (with οἴσιν and λάβοι) by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson in their OCT of 1990. But ἄλλην is in **Zo** alone. **LKR** have λύπην twice; **AUY** λύπην ... λύπη; **Zg** and **T** have λοιπὴν ... λύπην, which is a γράφεται variant in **Y** and (as λοιπεῖν) in **U**. Easterling describes the line with the repetition of λύπην as “obviously corrupt,” with **Zo**'s ἄλλην removing the main difficulty. Davies says “the

²⁵ P. E. Easterling, *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Cambridge 1982).

λύπην ... λύπην offered (or presupposed) by most manuscripts is that common phenomenon, an error of anticipation."²⁶ λύπην ... λύπην is no doubt wrong, but these editors give the impression that ἄλλην was the reading of which λύπην was a corruption; more likely the exemplars from which Byzantine scholars and scribes were working had λύπην twice; λοιπὴν and ἄλλην for the first λύπην and λύπης for the second were differing attempts to make sense of it. **Zo**'s mild aversion to repetition has led it to a good conjecture (supported by the fact that all MSS have οὔσιν (or οἴσιν) with paragogic ν, which is unmetrical before λ). But it almost certainly is a conjecture, like Schenkl's καινήν, and F. W. Schmidt's διπλήν for the *second* λύπην.

472–473: ἐπεὶ σε μανθάνω

θνητὴν φρονοῦσαν θνητὰ κοῦκ ἀγνώμονα;

This is an effective polyptoton, which Sophocles must have written and which no modern editor would think of destroying. But for θνητὰ **Zo** reads ὀρθὰ. Even if this started life as a gloss, whether on θνητὰ or on οῦκ ἀγνώμονα, its displacement of θνητὰ is odd.

965: πᾶ δ' αὖ φορεῖ νιν ...

Zo's φρονέει can be seen as an attempt to get away from the φορεῖ of LAUYT and the φέρει of the common parent of **Zg** and **Zo**; there is φέρει in 967 and φέρεται in 968.

1182–1183:

ΥΛ ὡς πρὸς τί πίστιν τήνδ' ἄγαν ἐπιστρέφεις;

HP οὐ θᾶσσον οἴσεις, μηδ' ἀπιστήσεις ἐμοί;

Picking up a word in a stichomythic line is very common, and indeed both natural and rhetorical in dialogue. But for ἀπιστήσεις **Zo** reads ἀπειθήσεις.

²⁶ M. L. Davies, *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Oxford 1991).

There is one separate example:

963: In all manuscripts but the Triclinian T ξένων is preceded by ξένοι; Triclinius' correct emendation was no doubt made to secure responsion with the strophe rather than to remove the repetition.

The phenomenon is also found in the tradition of *Hippolytus*:

797: Haun. (*Hauniensis* 417) has δίκη for τύχη at the end of this line, with τύχης at the end of 801.²⁷

984: The natural καλὸς is replaced by πολλὸς in six manuscripts (VCDELP), thus avoiding repetition with καλὸν in 985—not a repetition Euripides himself would have shunned.

992: In the apparently figural and Euripidean πρῶτα δ' ἄρξομαι λέγειν | ὅθεν μ' ὑπῆλθες πρῶτον ὡς διαφθέρων, VCDELP replace πρῶτον with πρότερον.

1178: P has φέρων for ἔχων following ἔχων in 1177.

1311: γραφὰς ἔταξε for γραφὰς ἔγραψε in A is a striking avoidance of *figura etymologica*.

3.1 Conclusions: erroneous repetitions

The analysis above helps answer the question how far the influence of one word on another can be shown to extend. Common sense suggests that influence would diminish over distance, and that that distance would be less where the influence is from a later word than where it is from an earlier word (since a word once read might persist in a scribe's mind indefinitely, while his eye is unlikely to run far ahead of his pen).²⁸ Data would be useful, for instance in assessing claims that a word read in all manuscripts is a corruption due to the

²⁷ This and 1178 are reported by Sybel (*supra* n.10), whose concern was repetition, and by N. Wecklein, *Euripides Hippolytus* (Leipzig 1900 [Teubner]) but not by Diggle.

²⁸ In a particular case there may be another explanation of a repetition from a word which follows in modern texts—there might have been a dislocation of lines at some time in the transmission so that what is now a following was once a preceding word.

Distance in lines	Influence precedes	Influence follows
0	13	8
1	11	4
2	8	0
3	5	1
4	2	1
5	0	0
6	1	0

Table 5: Distances between Erroneous Repetition and Apparent Source of Influence

influence of a nearby word and should be emended. Table 5 brings figures from *Septem*, *Trachiniae*, and *Hippolytus* together with those from the apograph study.²⁹

It appears from this table that most errors in transmission that could be attributed to the influence of another word (*i.e.* that could be described as “unconscious repetitions” by the copyist) are within a few lines of the apparent source of the influence.³⁰ Overall, influence from preceding words is much commoner than influence from subsequent ones, the only apparent exception being partial repetitions in *Septem* (where a word is not replaced, but corrupted by a later one, often to a

²⁹ Excluding those described as “possible” rather than “certain” in the apograph study. Since many manuscripts are being looked at in the studies of the three plays, while there was only one apograph in each of the apograph studies, there are likely to be more examples found in each of the three plays than in any play of the apograph studies.

³⁰ There is danger of circularity here; the nearer a similar word is to the error, the more its influence suggests itself as the source of the error.

non-existent or totally inappropriate word).³¹ Where the putative influence is a *subsequent* word, it is usually very close to the error. Only *Septem* 240 (ταρβοσκήω for ταρβοσύνω with βόσκεται four lines later) and *Trachiniae* 1273 (θανάτους for πάντων with θανάτους in 1276) are plausible examples of influence over an interval of more than one line.

3.2 Conclusions: removal of repetitions

The study of differences between manuscripts other than direct copies found enough convincing cases of removal of a repetition during transmission to support the surprising findings of the study of apographs. These cases are not evenly distributed among manuscripts. In the *Hippolytus* tradition four out of five are found in, and only in, manuscripts of the **VCDELP** group.³² In all but one *Trachiniae* case the manuscript without the repetition is **Zo**; it is striking but probably co-incidental that **Zo** is, physically, the same as **P** for Euripides,³³ where as shown above there were at least five instances of the removal of a repetition read in **L**.

What emerges from all this is a discernible tendency in some manuscripts of tragedy to remove repetitions that must have been written by the poet. I cannot, at present, explain this. It is not a natural error like repeating a word one has just come across, and it seems at first sight unlikely that Byzantine scholars, let alone scribes like the one who copied **P**, had the aversion to repetition of nineteenth-century scholars like Sybel,

³¹ Such a corruption is almost always in a single manuscript, whether in its text or as a variant; the corruption probably does not spread because a copyist is likely to notice, and do something about, a nonsensical word in his exemplar. The apparent concentration of such corruptions in *Septem* may be an illusion, produced by the comprehensive nature of Dawe's collation.

³² **V** is, according to Barrett (*supra* n.14) 74, closely associated with **CDE** in that part of the play where the instances are found.

³³ That is, the early-fourteenth-century manuscript that was divided into two portions, *Palatinus gr.* 287 and *Laurentianus conventi soppressi* 172.

and made occasional emendations accordingly.³⁴ It would be worthwhile looking at the manuscript traditions of other Greek authors to see if any similar tendency is observable there also.

September, 2001

3 Westbury Road
Woodside Park
London N12 7NY
U.K.
pe.pickering@virgin.net

³⁴ The Hellenistic scholars Zenodotus and Aristophanes, according to the *scholia vetera* (III 600 Erbse), read καὶ μεγάλους for ἀμβροσίους in *Iliad* 14.177 because that adjective occurs three other times in nine lines.