

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 , ou ; ϵ , η , $\epsilon\iota$, $\alpha\iota$, $o\iota$, v , and ι .

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-

graph (Murray's Tri) by T. I abbreviate the plays as A (= *Agamemnon*), X (= *Choephoroi*), 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* Ε, *theta* Θ, *omicron* Ο, and *sigma* Σ. A useful mnemonic for this group is the word *ἔθος*. Examples: A 1655 *θέρος*] *ὄ ἔρος*. X 56 *φρενός*] *φρένες*. X 71 *θιγόντι*] *οἴγοντι*. X 74 *ἴθυσαν*] *ιοῦσαν*. X 374 *φωνεῖς· δύνασαι*] *φωνεῖ ὀδυνᾶσαι*. X 438 *ὀλοίμαν*] *ἐλοίμαν*. X 718 *βουλευσόμεσθα*] *βουλευόμεθα*. E 46 *λόχος*] *λέχος*. E 137 *σὺ δ'*] *οὐδ'*. E 450 *νεοθήλου*] *νοθήλου* M, *ὀθνείου* FT. Here round *epsilon* has been dropped by a near-haplography in the proximity of *omicron*. The initial *nu* has been attached in later Mss to the end of the preceding verbal inflection, *καθαιμάξωσι* (-ουσι FT).

Some words show confusion of uncial forms of *alpha*, *delta*, *lambda*, *mu*, and *nu*, A Δ Λ Μ Ν. A 1014 *Διός*] *λιός* F. A 1291 *τάσδ' ἐγώ*] *τὰς λέγω*. A 1418 *ἀημάτων*] *λημμάτων*. X 45 *μ' ἰάλλει*] *μιλλεῖ*. X 252 *Ἡλέκτραν λέγω*, with loss of Λ after N, or possibly after -AN in the form \bar{A} with overstroke for *nu*. X 424 *ἱαλεμιστρίας*] *ἱλεμιστρίας*. X 474 *δι' ὠμᾶν ἔριν*] *αιωμαναιρειν*. Here confusion of vocalisation accompanies the graphic confusion of uncial *delta* and *alpha*. X 566 *δέξαιτ'*] *λέξαιτ'*. E 54 *λίαν* (in the form $\Lambda\bar{A}$) 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 *πνέοι*] *πλέοι* FT.

Gamma and *tau* were liable to confusion in uncials. X 48 *λύτρον*] *λυγρόν*. X 137 *μέγα*] *μέτα*. X 353 *γάς*] *τὰς*. X 399 *Γᾶ*] *τα*. E 398 *γῆν*] *τῆν*. A 768 *δαίμονά τε τὸν* of Mss may be derived from an original *δαίμονα τεγῶν*, "a demon of the house."

What some find odd is the occasional emergence of a *kappa* from the misreading of uncial *iota* and *sigma* juxtaposed. This certainly occurred at X 897, where M's *ὠκὺ* must be from an uncial form of $\omega\sigma$ *σὺ*, OICV. So too E 177 *εἰσιν οὐ*] *ἐκείνου*. E 862 *ἰδρύσης Ἄρη*] *ἰδρύση κάρη* M¹] *ἰδρύση κάρα* M²FT. At A 985 a brilliant insight by Professor Denys Page shows us how F's *ψαμμίας ἀκάτα* derived from an original *ψαμμίας^{αις} ἄτα* through an assumed intermediate stage *ψαμμίας ἄτα*. At E 119, for †*φίλοις γὰρ εἰσιν οὐκ ἐμοῖς προσίκτορες*, I would have Klytimestra's ghost say, *φίλοις γὰρ εἰσιν οὐκ ἐμοῖς πρὸς ἱστορας*, "With friends not mine he is going to judges" (cf. 81, *δικαστὰς . . . εὐρήσο-*

μεν). She had seen Orestes go out with Apollo and Hermes. ΠΡΟCIC-
TOPAC became ΠΡΟCΚTOPAC and, with EICIN taken as from εἰμί
sum, a nominative προσίκτορες.

Uncial *gamma*, carelessly written, was apt to be confused with the
round uncial *sigma*. Thus, at A 101, the original ἄς ἀναφαίνεις postulated
by Ahrens could, with misdivision, give rise to M's ἀγανὰ φαίνεις.
X 542 συγκόλλως] συσκόλλως. 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] καρδίας. X 519 μείω] μέσω. X 691 ἔνπας ὡς of M may
have resulted from the adverb ἐμπαίως, formed from the adjective
used at A 187, with internal correption.

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 A 186, μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων, where the scholiast
remarks: περισσεύει τὸ πνεῦμα. Clearly someone had read the com-
pendium πῆνα for τινα. That is to say, *tau*+*iota* was read as *pi*. The same
mistake may lie behind X 958, where M offers κρατέεται πῶς. The
omega would originally have been an *o simpliciter*, which could also be
interpreted as *ou*. Assuming the *pi* derives from *tau*+*iota*, and re-
dividing, we get 958f thus: κρατεῖ τ' αἰτίους τὸ θεῖον παρὰ τὸ μῆ /
ὑπουργεῖν κακοῖς, meaning: "And the divine (power) masters guilty
persons by not subserving evils." In dochmiacs exact responson is
not required, and, with internal correption of θεῖον, we get a doch-
miac in the form υ υ — υ υ υ —.

At E 1044 a misreading of *iota*+*tau* as *pi* could have led to M's
σπονδαὶ δ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἔνδαιδες οἴκων. I suggest Aeschylus wrote σπονδᾶ δ'
εἴσιτ' ἄν' ἔνδαιδ' οἴκων: "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*
ΕΣΠΑΝ, to the common ἐς τὸ πᾶν. σπονδᾶ, dative singular, written
ΣΠΟΝΔΑΙ, was misinterpreted as the nominative plural σπονδαί,
made subject of a sentence with the relevant part of the verb *to be*
supplied mentally, *viz.* εἰσιν. Then the adjective in the nominative
plural ἔνδαιδες was evolved from ΕΝΔΑΙΔ which originally stood
for ἔνδαιδ(α). ΟΙΚΟΝ, originally meaning οἶκον, was made into a
genitive plural οἴκων, 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] νεκροῦ FT. E 246 νεβρόν] νεκρόν. A 1024 ἀβλαβεία] ἀλαβεία 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 *mu*, as at A 1420, μιασμάτων] βιασμάτων in G, a manuscript I am not here normally citing.

Gamma occurs for *delta* at A 310 τόδε] τόγε M and E 752 ὄδ'] ὄ 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 Αἰγίσθου γὰρ οὐ ψέδω μόρον, cf. ψέδειν · ἐντρέπειν, φροντίζειν in Hesychios: "I do not care about Aigisthos's 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] νεορενές suggests that M's minuscule antigraph had a blotchily written *gamma* looking like a *rho*.

Theta is lost after *phi* at A 1187 σύμφθογγος] σύμφογγος F and E 371 ἐπιφθόνοις] ἐπιφόνοις.

Theta develops into *rho* at A 919 βαρβάρου] βαρβάθου in F¹ (and E¹, which I usually neglect here).

Theta is deaspirated to *tau* at A 946 ἐμβαίνονθ' ἀλουργέσιν] ἐμβαίνοντ' ἀλουργέσιν.

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

At A 1595, for the Mss' ἀνδρακάς καθημένος Professor A. J. Beattie has a brilliant, as yet unpublished suggestion, ἄνθρακας καθ' ἡμμένους,

“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 ἔλακε] ἔλαχε. X 39 ἔλακον] ἔλαχον. X 180 χαίτην] καὶ τῆν. X 215 ἐξηύχου] ἐξηύκου. E 170 μυχόν] μυκόν M, where F and T displace the word with the gloss σὸν οἶκον. Confusion of κ/χ, as of π/φ, is an “ear” mistake.

Mu sometimes develops to *lambda*, as at E 881 καμοῦμαι] καλοῦμαι FT. Maybe this happened at X 814, where I would read *Ευλλάβοι δ' ἐνδίκως παῖς ὁ Μαΐας, ἐπεὶ φορώτατος πράξιν οὐρίαν θέμεν· πολλὰ δ' ἄλλα φανεῖ χρήζων κρύπτ'*, . . . “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 . . .”

M offers ^ωθελεν, the suprascript *omega* meaning that the reading should be θέλων, doubtless influenced by χρήζων below in line 815.

Mu seems to have given rise to *pi* at A 1255, in F’s δυσπαθῆ for T’s δυσμαθῆ. But Verrall’s *hapa*x δυσπυθῆ deserves consideration with reference to the foregoing πυθόκραντα.

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

Pi and *phi* are liable to interchange. Thus X 418 φάντες] πάντες. E 523 ἀνατρέπων] ἀνατρέφων. I read 522–525:

τίς δὲ μηδὲν ἐν φάει (= ἐν βίῳ)
καρδίαν ἀνατρέπων, (= φοβούμενος)
ἢ πόλις βροτός θ' ὁμοί-
ως, ἔτ' ἂν σέβοι Δίκαν;

Comparing such phrases as Theocritus 8.90, ἀνετρέπετο 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 δύσπλητά περ] δύσπλητά περ F. X 600 ἀπέρωτος] ἀπέρωπος M¹. E 356 τιθασὸς] πίθασος M, πίθασσος FT. E 914 πρεπτῶν] τρεπτῶν FT.

Tau evolves to *psi* once, at A 1566, πρὸς ἄται] προσάψαι.

Pi + *tau* develops to double *pi* at A 590, ἐνίπτων] ἐνίππων.

Tau develops from *sigma* + *tau* at A 143, φιλομάστοις] φιλομάτοις M¹, and at A 145, where the paradosis has unmetrical στρουθῶν, the original reading may have been the dialectal form τρουθῶν. 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.

Misdivision of the originally continuous text was a pregnant source of error, usually entailing subsidiary errors of non-graphic types, for example: A 254 σὺν ὀρθοναύταις] σύνορθον αὐταῖς MV, σύναρθρον αὐταῖς FT. A 340 ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν] ἄν θάνοιεν ἄν V, αὐ θάνοιεν ἄν FT. A 374 ἐγκουοῦσα τολμητῶν] ἐγγόνους ἀτολμήτων. A 702 ἀτίμωσιν] ἀτίμως ἴν' F, ἀτίμως T. A 1091 κακάθαρτα· ναί] κακὰ κάρτάναι F, κακὰ κάρτάνας T. A 1392 γανεῖ] γᾶν εἰ. A 1551 μέλημ' ἀλέγειν] μέλημα λέγειν. A 1595 ἄνθρακας καθ' ἡμμένους] ἀνδρακὰς καθημένους. X 197 εὐ σάφ' ἦν ἦ] εὐ σαφηνῆ. X 230 σκέψαι, τομῆ] σκέψαιτο μῆ. X 262 δ' ἄν ἄρειας] δαναρίας. X 510 ἀμεμφῆ τόνδ' ἐτείνατον] ἀμόμφητον δέ τινα τόν. X 532 οὐθαρ ἦν ὑπὸ στύγους] οὐχαρην ὑποστύγος. X 675 οἰκείαι σαγήνῃ] οἰκείαις ἄγῃ. X 742 ἐκεῖν' ὄν] ἐκεῖνον. X 956 ἐγχρονισθεῖσαν] ἐν χρόνοις θεῖσαν. X 1021 ἀλλ' ὡς ἄν εἰδῆτ', οὐ γὰρ] ἀλλοσᾶν εἰ δὴ τοῦτ' ἄρ. E 224 δὲ Παλλὰς] δ' ἐπ' ἄλλας. E 435 ἄξι' ἀντ' ἐπαξίων] ἄξιαν τ' ἐπαξίων. E 890 τῆσδε γαμόρω] τῆδε γ' ἀμοίρου.

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 ἄ FT. A 145 τῶν FT. X 325 ἦ. E 256 ὄ. Bearing in mind this tendency one may take a new look at A 102f:

ἐλπίς ἀμύνει φροντίδ' ἄπληστον,
τὴν θυμοφθόρον 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, θυμοφθόρου λύπης φρενί. Some may prefer to interpret the residual paradosis, by adding an *iota* subscript, as θυμοφθόρον λύπης φρένα. "Hope wards off insatiable anxiety, soul-destroying with griefs my heart," where the verbal compound θυμοφθόρον governs a direct object, φρένα, cf. X 23, χοὰς προπομπὸς . . . Some might prefer the form λύπαις.

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

is effective). A 448 γε T. A 1418 τε FT. E 121 γ' FT. E 546 γε T. E 378 γάρ. A 387 ὡς T (probably *metri gratia*, cf. 369). A 1340 ἄγαν T (again probably from some metrical theory Triclinius had).

Copyists were liable sometimes to drop particles and other small words, e.g. A 81 δ' V. A 154 γάρ FT. A 539 γε (restored by Enger before τεθνάναι). A 741 τ'. A 546 σ' (by haplography after φρενός). E 550 ὦν T. In A 410, for ἰὼ ἰὼ δῶμα δῶμα, F negligently writes each word singly, ἰὼ δῶμα.

Fairly abundant are non-graphical “ear” mistakes, including confusions involving the vowels and diphthongs ο, ω, ου, ε, η, ει, αι, οι, υ, ι. A 87 πειθοῖ] πυθοῖ F. A 262 ἐλπίσιν] ἐλπίσειν M. A 297 πεδίον Ἀσσωποῦ] παιδίον ὠποῦ MV. A 312 ἔτοιμοι] ἔτυμοι F. A 959 ἰσάργυρον] εἰς ἄργυρον. A 1602 ὀλέσθαι] ὀλέσθη. A 1624 παίσας] πήσας. A 1652 πρόκωπος] πρόκοπος F, πρόκοπτος T. X 26 δ' ἰγμοῖσι] διοιγμοῖσι M. X 73 χειρομυσῆ] χαιρομυσῆ. X 74 καθιεροῦντες] καθαίροντες. X 87 τί φῶ] τύφω M¹, οἶμαι τύμβω M². X 126 δωμάτων] δ' ὀμμάτων. X 172 κείραιτό νιν] κείρετό νεῖν. X 291 κρατήρος] κρατερός. X 380 οὖς] ὡς. X 563 ἦσομεν] οἴσομεν. X 653 αὖ, τίς] αὖθις. X 783 παραιτουμένα μοι] παραιτουμέν' ἐμοί. X 992 ἐξ οὖ] ἐκ σοῦ. E 40 θεομυσῆ] θεομυσῆ M, θεομισῆ FT. E 113 ἐγκατιλλώψας] ἐκκατιλλώψας. E 186 οὖ καρανιστήρες] οὐκ ἄρ ἀνυστήρες T. E 257 αὖ τεγῶν] αὖτέ γ' οὖν. E 406 καινήν] καὶ νῦν. E 409 ξένω] στένω FT. E 519 δεῖ μένειν] δειμαίνει. E 656 προσδέξεται] προσδέξαίτε M.

At X 482 the paradosis 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):

κἀγώ, πάτερ, τοιάδε. σοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχω.
† φυγεῖν μέγαν προσθεῖσαν Αἰγίσθω† . . .

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 προσθεῖσαν Αἰγίσθω <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.” φύειν 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

φυγεῖν με γᾶν . . . "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 ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΙ.

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 *σιγῶντι* and *φρονούσης* with changed genders. At A 680 F² and T offer the infinitive *κλύειν* for the participle *κλυών* after *ἴσθι*, probably as a construction more normal in the innovator's conception. Datives in *-οις* or *-οισι(ν)* are interchanged too often to notice. The following will serve as examples of types of inflectional error: A 26 *σημαίνω* M] *σημανῶ* VFT. A 48 *κλάζοντες*] *κλάξαντες* FT. A 80 *τρίποδας*] *τρίποδος* FT. A 109 *ἦβας*] *ἦβαν*. A 222 *βροτοῦς*] *βροτοῖς*. A 236 *φυλακαῖ*] *φυλακᾶν*. A 336 *ἀπαλλαχθέντες*] *ἀπαλλαγέντες* FT. A 736 *προσεθρέφθη*] *προσετράφη* FT. A 833 *φθόνων* F] *φθόνου* T, *ψόγου* Stobaeus. A 1146 *ἀηδοῦς*] *ἀηδόνοσ*. X 15 *μειλίγματα*] *μειλίγμασιν*. X 136 *φεύγων*] *φεύγειν*. X 144 *δίκη*] *δίκην*. X 202 *δίκη*] *δίκη*. X 217 *ἐκπαγλουμένην*] *ἐκπαγλουμένης*. X 222 *ἐμοῖς*] *ἐμοῖσιν*. X 360 *ἦσθ'*] *ἦν* M¹, *ἦς* M². X 365 *ἄλλως*] *ἄλλων*. X 366 *τεθάφθαι*] *τέθαψαι*. X 480 *αἰτουμένωι*] *αἰτούμενοσ*. X 556 *κτείναντες*] *-ασ*. X 727 *Ἐρμῆν*] *ἐρμῆα* M (? **Ἐρμέα* is possible). X 867 *θείοσ*] *θείοισ*. X 1004 *φρένα*] *φρενί*. X 1057 *πληθύουσι*] *πληθύουσαι*. E 435 *σέβουσαι γ'*] *σεβόμεναι* F¹, *σέβομεν* T (F² *ferē*). E 445 *ἐφεζόμεν*] *ἐφεζομένη*, implying an intermediate stage ^η *ἐφέζομεν*.

Collators are often in doubt how far to take note of the presence or absence of the ephelekytic or facultative *nu* and of *iota* adscript or subscript. The lability of non-facultative *nu* is, however, worth observation. Sometimes it is lost internally, as at A 82, where M and V have *ἡμερόφατον* for *ἡμερόφαντον*. E 138 *κατισχναίνουσα*] *κατισχαινουσα*. E 267 *ἰσχάνας*] *ἰσχάνασ'* FT. (*ἰχνάνας'* M). E 705 *εὐδόντων*] *εὐδότηων* M¹.

Conversely, *nu* is found intruding into the middle of a word: A 84 *κλυταιμήστρα* M] *κλυταιμνήστρα* VFT. A 110 *ταγάν*] *τᾶν γᾶν* M. A 310 *τόδε σκήπτει*] *τόδ' ἐνσκήπτει* V. X 55 *ἀδάματον*] *ἀδάμαντον* (a common variant). E 253 *βροτείων*] *βροντείων* M¹.

Non-facultative *nu* may be added at word-end: A 170 *οὐδὲ*] *οὐδὲν*. A 1284 *ἄξει*] *ἄξειν* F (*νιν* follows). A 1486 *πανεργέτα*] *-έταν* F. X 764

στείχω] στείχων. E 230 ἄγει] ἄγειν M. E 787 βαλεῖ] βαλεῖν. A 1068 οὐ μὴ M] οὐ μὴν M²FT is a dubious instance.

More often, *nu* is lost at the end of a word: A 1325 φόνευσιν] φονεῦσι. A 1419 χρῆν] χρῆ. X 177 ἦν] ἦ. X 282 ἐπαντέλλειν] ἐπαντέλλει. X 612 ἄλλαν δ' ἦν] ἀλλὰ δὴ. X 641 οὖν] οὐ. X 650 τίνειν] τείνει. X 726 δολίαν] δολία. X 949 δ' ἐν μάχα] δεμάχα. X 1003 νομίζων] νομίζω. A 304 μὴν] μὴ is a doubtful case. A 984 ἐπῆν] ἐπεῖ F, ἐπὶ T may be historically true.

Iota adscript is confusingly dropped at A 77 ἀνάισσων] ἀνάσσων, and A 431 δόμωι ᾽ν] δόμων.

At X 715, M offers in Klytimestra's speech:

αἰνώ δὲ πράσσειν ὡς ἐπευθύνωι 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.

A high proportion of errors in the *Oresteia* transmission involve only one single letter, whether added, dropped, or altered: A 29 ἐπορθιάζειν] ἐπορθριάζειν MV. A 45 χιλιοναύταν] Ἰλιον αὐτὰν M γρ, F γρ. A 64 ἐρειδομένου] ἐρειπομένου F¹T. A 69 ὑποκαίων] ὑποκλαίων. A 94 χρίματος] χρίσματος FT. A 104 ὄδιον] ὄσιον Ar. *Ran.* 1276 plerique. ὄς δῖον Ar. Ravennas, presumably from an intermediate

stage *ὄδιον. A 115 ἀργᾶς] ἀργίας. A 127 λαγοδαίτας] λογοδαίτας M. A 137 πτάκα M] πτώκα FT; V's πτάωνκα is an odd development. A 141 ἀέπτοις] ἀέλπτοις M. A 246 εὐποτμον M²V] εὐπόταμον M¹F, εὐποτον T. A 247 παιῶνα] αἰῶνα. A 292 Εὐρίπου] εὐρίππου MV. A 448 διαῖ] διὰ F, γε διὰ T. A 655 ἦρεικον] ἦρειπον T. A 898 στῦλον] στόλον F. A 976 δεῖγμα F] δεῖμα T. A 1093 εὔρις] εὔρος M¹. A 1143 βοᾶς] βοᾶς M, βορᾶς T. A 1148 ἀγῶνα] αἰῶνα M γρ. A 1166 θραύματ'] θαύματ' T. A 1258 δίπους] δίπλους. A 1411 ὄβριμον] ὄμβριμον. A 1414 τότ'] τόδ'. A 1504 νεαροῖς] νεκροῖς T. A 1565 ἀραῖον] ῥᾶον. X 68 διαφρεῖ]

διαφέρει. X 182 ψαύσει] ψαύδει. X 221 τᾶρα] ταρρα. X 224 τᾶρ'] τᾶδ'. X 240 σε] τε. X 443 δύας ἀτίμους] δυσατίμους. X 553 μέν] δ' ἐν. X 807 κτίμενον] κτάμενον. X 1067 πνεύσας] πνεούσας. E 450 βοτοῦ] βροτοῦ FT. E 452 βοτοῖσι] βροτοῖσι F. E 907 βοτῶν] βροτῶν. E 505 ὑπόδοσιν] ὑπόδησιν F, ὑπόδυσιν T. E 800 δ' ἔατε] δέ τε. E 842 ὑποδύεται] ὑπόδεται M.

προ- and *προσ-* in composition seem to be interchangeable: A 391 *προσβολαῖς*] *προβολαῖς*. A 1511 *προβαίνων*] *προσβαίνων*. X 647 *προχαλκεύει*] *προσχαλκεύει*. X 805 *προσφάτοις*] *προφάτοις* M¹. E 445 *προστρόπαιος*] *προτρόπαιος* M¹. E 718 *προστροπαῖς*] *προτροπαῖς* FT.

Many corruptions affect only a single syllable of a word, thus: A 87 *θυοσκεῖς*] *θυοσκινεῖς* Mss *fere*, *θυοσκνεῖς* M *olim*, *δύος κινεῖς* VT, *θυοσκοεῖς* ΣΤ. A 141 *λεόντων*] *όντων* MV, senselessly, so that FT omit. A 165 *λέξεται*] *λέξαι*. A 229 *αἰῶ τε*] *αἰῶνα*. X 350 *αἰῶ*] *αἰῶνα*. A 416 *δὲ*] *γάρ* T. A 714 *παμπορθῆ*] *παμπρόσθη*. A 766 *ὄτε*] *ὄταν*. A 1414 *οὐδὲν*] *οὐ σὺν* F¹. A 1430 *τύμματι τεῖσαι*] *τύμμα τίσαι*. A 1471 *καρδιόδηκτον*] *καρδίᾳ δηκτὸν* FT. X 8 *παρὼν ᾤμωξα*] *παρώμωξα* the scholiast on Eur. Alc. 768, cod. Vatican. gr. 909. X 160 *εἶσ'* dropped out after *δορυσθενῆς*. X 233 *μὴ κπλαγιῆς*] *μῆκπλαγιῆ*. X 590 *πεδάοροι*] *πεδάμαροι*. X 607 *καταίθουσα*] *κ' αἰθοῦσα* (perhaps the preposition had been contracted). E 225 *λίπω ποτέ*] *λίπω πάποτε* M¹. E 702 *οὔτις*] *οὔποτ'* FT. E 746 *νῦν*] *ναῦ* M. E 754 *σώσσασα*] *σώσα* M¹. E 798 *ὁ χρήσας*] *ὀρθήσας* M, *ὁ θήσας* M². E 802 *σταλάγματα*] *στενάγματα* M γρ. E 812 *ἀντιπενθῆ*] *ἀντιπαθῆ* M. E 816 *ἐπισύμενος*] *ἐπεσσυμένος*. E 849 *καίτοι τὰ μὲν*] *καίτοι μὲν* M, *καίτοι γε μὴν* FT. E 908 *εὐθνεοῦντα*] *εὐστενοῦντα* FT. E 954 *κρυερὸν*] *κρύων* MF, *δακρύων* T by mere conjecture, I fancy. My own conjecture makes better sense and explains the corruption better. In the above examples some are simple cases of haplography or ditto-graphy, or simple negligence; but others reveal a more or less subconscious ecdotic attitude.

Metathesis and anagrammatism in various degrees occur, thus: A 234 *λαβεῖν*] *βαλεῖν* T. A 1088 *μὴ τόδ'*] *τὸ μηδ'* F, *τό περ μηδ'* T. A 1205 *ἀβρύνεται*] *βαρύνεται* T. A 1594 *χερῶν*] *χρεῶν* F. X 23 *κτύπῳ*] *κύπτωι*. X 232 *ἔσιδε*] *εἰς δὲ*. X 391 *κραδίας*] *καρδίας*.

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 *πόλις βοᾶ*] *βοᾶ πόλις* FT. A 210 *πέλας βωμοῦ*] *βωμοῦ πέλας*, in a syn-copated 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 responsion, regardless of quantities, to 129 as they had it). At A 153, V has *συμμενεῖ φυτόν*,

where other Mss have *σύμφυτον*. (Read rather *νεικέων τέκτονα συμφύτων*, a glyconic in astrophic rhythm.) V has conflated *σύμφυτον* with a gloss *μένει* written over *μίμνει* in the line below, 154. A 1143 *φιλοίκτοις*] *ταλαίνοις* M, *φιλοίκτοις ταλαίνοις* F, *φιλοίκτοισι* T. A 1174 *τίθησι δαίμων*] *δαίμων ποιεῖ* T. A 1454 *ἀπέφθισεν βίον* appears in the Mss (F and T only here), but the antistrophe would then lack a final iamb, though its sense is complete as it stands. At A 857 Aeschylus uses *ἀποφθίνω* intransitively, and he could do so again at A 1454 (making the clausula there a hypodochmius, or anaclastic dochmius). I suggest *βίον* is an intrusive gloss by a scribe who took the verb as causal, as it mostly was. At X 32 the gloss *Φοῖβος* has been unmetrically intruded in front of *ὀρθόθριξ δόμων ὄνειρόμαντις*, having originated in some mistaken process of reasoning. At E 560 the right reading is clearly *θερμῶ*, and the glossing process has been at work, as appears from the collation: *θερμοεργῶ* MF] *θερμῶ, ἤγουν θερμοεργῶ* T. Simpler examples of gloss-intrusion include: A 198 *αἰνεῖν*] *εἰπεῖν* FT. A 282 *ἄγγάρου*] *ἄγγέλου*. A 400 *ἐς δόμον*] *εἰς οἶκον* T. A 549 *κοιράνων*] *τυράνων* F. E 170 *μυχόν*] *σὸν οἶκον* FT. E 448 *ἄφθογγον*] *ἄφωνον* FT. E 934 *ἀπλακῆματά νιν*] *ἀμπλακῆματά νιν* M, *ἀμαρτήματα* FT.

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

*ὦ, τίς δορυσθενῆς <εἶς> ἀνὴρ,
ἀναλυτῆρ δόμων, Σκυθικά τ' ἐν χεροῖν
παλίντον' ἐν ἔργῳ ἑπιπάλλων Ἄρης
σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νωμῶν βέλη;*

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 *βέλη* at the end of 163 goes equally with *Σκυθικά . . . παλίντον(α)* and with *σχέδιά . . . αὐτόκωπα*. In the paradosis an unmetrical *βέλη* has been intruded before *ἑπιπάλλων* probably from an interlinear gloss, and some editors, following Pauw, have extruded the final word *βέλη* in favour of *ξίφη*, which is part of the scholiast’s explanation of Aeschylus’s phrase. *βέλη* can mean either missile weapons, as arrows, or others, as swords. If the paradosis’ *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 *Oresteia*.

Thus, at A 512, for *καὶ παιώνιος* we find *καὶ παγώνιος* F, *κάπαγώνιος* T. Some scribe's eye had strayed to the line below, ending with τ' *ἀγωνίους θεούς*. At E 507 the unmetrical *δέ τις*, deleted by Schwenk and Pauw, arises from a scribe's eye having caught in the next line the same letters in *μηδέ 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 φρεσσὶν (with synizesis making a dochmiac)
 <πέρθε> *καρδίαν σχεθῶν, . . .*

"Keeping in your midriff the heart of Perseus, destroy (her) . . ." In uncials with round sigma to which the theta of ΠΕΡΘΕ was assimilated, the imperative fell out below uncial ΠΕΡΘΕΟC. This is not the place to argue what should be read at 819ff in the strophe; but in 819 the paradosis 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 *θυμαλγῆς τε καὶ οὐδὲν 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:

*ῥοπή δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ δίκαν,
 ταχεῖα τοῖς μὲν ἐν φάει,
 τὰ δ' ἐν μεταιχμίῳ σκότου
 μένει χρονίζοντα βρύει,
 65 τοὺς δ' ἄκραντος ἔχει νύξ.*

"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 χρονίζοντ' ἄχει* (altered to

ἄχη) βρύει. I 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 ἄχει, at ἄχη, 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.

To conclude this paper I list a few miscellaneous errors in the manuscripts that involve more than one syllable. A 23 φάος] νῦν φῶς FT. A 119 ἐρικύμονα] ἐρικύματα M. A 119 φέρματι] φέρβοντο FT. A 217 θέμις. εὖ γὰρ εἶη] θέμις γὰρ εὖ FT. A 1030 βλέπει F¹] βρέμει F²T. A 1041 δουλίας μάζης βίαν] δουλείας μάζης βία F, καὶ ζυγῶν θιγεῖν βία T. A 1356 τῆς μελλοῦς κλέος] τῆς μελλούσης κλέος F, μελλούσης κλέος T, τῆς μελλοῦς χάριν Trypho. Aeschylus' holograph may have had variants. X 164 γαπότους] ἀπό του. X 319 ἀντίμοιρον] ἰσοτίμοιρον (from ^{ισο} ἀντίμοιρον as the presumed intermediate stage). X 797 κτίσαι] τίς ἄν. X 896 δ' αἰδεσαι] δήσεται. X 954 ἐπωρθίαξεν] ἐπ' ὄχθει ἄξεν. E 259 περὶ βρέτει πλεχθεῖς] περιβλέπει πλαγχθεῖς FT. E 286 γηράσκων] γε διδάσκων F²T (influenced by a parallel at PV 981). E 343 παραφορὰ] παράφρονα (330 παραφρονὰ FT). E 476 οὐκ εὐπέμπελον] οὐκοῦν εὐπεπλον FT. E 567 εἶτ' οὐρανόνδε διάτορος] ἦ τ' οὖν διάτορος M, ἦ τ' οὖν διάκτορος πέλει FT. $\overline{\text{οὐν}}$ for οὐρανόν by compendium was the source of the trouble. E 832 κοίμα] καὶ κύμα FT. κύματος later in the line influenced the start. In many corruptions one can readily see the adjacent influencing factor. E 845 τιμᾶν δαναϊᾶν] ^ατιμῶν ^αδαμῶν *ων M, τιμᾶν δαμέαν FT. In the repetition at E 879, M switches to τιμᾶν δαμίαν, and F to τῖτᾶν δαμέαν.

In A 1493, F had ἀσεβεῖ θανάτω, but in the repetition at A 1517 changes to εὐσεβεῖ θανάτω, 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.)

X 247 γένναν εὐνιν] γέννανιν M¹, with ευν lost by near haplography after αν, 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:

	τόδ' ἄγχι πλευμόνων ξίφος	στρ. δ
640	διανταίαν ὄξυπενκὲς οὐτᾶ διαί Δίκας τομῆ. θέμις γὰρ οὖν. λάξ πέδοι πατούμενον τὸ πᾶν Διὸς σέβας παρεκ-	
645	βάντ' ἐσᾶ θεμιστῶς.	
	Δίκας δ' ἐρείδεται πυθμῆν.	ἀντ. δ
	προχαλκεύει δ' Αἴσα φασγανουργός· τέκνον δ' ἐπεισφέρει δι' ἀλλαγῆς δωμάτων παλαιότερον	
650	τίνειν μύσος χρόνῳ κλυτῆ βυσσόφρων Ἑρινύς.	

"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, τόδ' Young. 640 σοῦται M, οὐτᾶ Hermann. 641 τὸ μῆ M, τομῆ Young; οὐ M, οὖν A. Ludwig. 645 παρεκβάντες ἀθεμίστως M¹, παρεκβάντ' ἐσᾶ θεμιστῶς Young. εἰσάω would be a correct formation from the Homeric verb ἀάω, which LSJ attest in the aorist from Aeschylus and Sophocles. It would mean "fill with Ate," cf. εἰσανδρόω, "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 προσχαλκεύει M, corrected by Jacob *metri gratia*, resulting in bacchius+palimbacchius+ 2

cretics. 648–9 *διμασε δωμάτων* M (*σ in rasura*) is an unlikely corruption from *δόμοις αἰμάτων*, the original assumed by editors who follow the readings of Schuetz (after Pauw) and Stephanus, who got the idea of *αἰμάτων* 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 *αι*, and to imply *αἰμάτων*. Even if this were by the first hand and ink, it would have no more authority than the uncomprehending scholiast's comment *ἐπισφάρι δὲ τοῖς οἴκοις τέκνον παλαιῶν αἰμάτων, ὃ ἐστι, τίκτει ὁ 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 *διμασε* is meaningless, but looks like a conscientious effort to reproduce a difficult antigraph, for M corrects a letter. Putting *διμασε* into uncials we get ΔΙΜΑΣΕ, and we need a diamb for respension. The sense is suited by *δι' ἀλλαγῆς*, which originally would have been ΔΙΑΛΛΑΓΕC. 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 *παλαιότερον*. 650 *τείνει* M, *τίνειν* Lachmann. M's form *κλυτή* at 650, where editors change to the lyric *alpha*, supports the *eta* forms of 641 *τομῆ*, and 648 *δι' ἀλλαγῆς*, 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' ἀλλαγῆς* for M's *διμασε*, 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.