

and the splendid compound noun *πομφολυγοπαφλάσ-μασιν* (249) ends their last little song.

(c) 'The circumlocutions of *λιμναία κρηνῶν τέκνα* (211) and *ξύναυλον ὕμνων βοάν* (212) are pompous, and the parallelism of the lines is affected.' But a circumlocution of exactly this type occurs in the Initiates' song (347 *χρονίους τ' ἐτῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτούς*, 'the lengthy cycles of their ancient years'), where there is no question of pomposity;<sup>11</sup> and parallelism of phrases or lines is not uncommon in lyric especially in hymns: the Initiates begin one of their songs with *χωρεῖτε / νῦν ἱερὸν ἀνά κύκλον θεᾶς, ἀνθοφόρον ἀν' ἄλλος* (441). Besides, in the present passage *τέκνα* is vocative, *βοάν* accusative, so that the parallelism is not exact, and the listener's attention is carried on to the verb *φθεγξώμεθα* which completes the sense. The Euripidean line, *ἀλλ' ἴτω ξύναυλος βοὰ χαρᾶ* (*El.* 879), does not afford a parallel close enough to suggest parody.

(d) 'λαῶν (219a) has an archaic ring.' But archaisms too are at home in choral lyric.

(e) 'βυθός (247) belongs to elevated speech.' But the language of choral poetry in general is elevated.

Radermacher might have mentioned two other features of the high poetic manner, the use of *ἀμφί*+accusative in 215, common in lyric, especially Pindar, and the first person plural forms in *-μεσθα* for *-μεθα* at 242, 248, 252, 258.<sup>12</sup>

It is possible to interpret these data without reference to parody or satire of contemporary writers.<sup>13</sup> The term 'parody' in particular should be used with caution and reserve in connection with lyric poetry: dorisms, compound adjectives, elevated diction and archaisms are features of all Greek choral lyric, and they do not indicate parody any more than they indicate plagiarism.

Aristophanes, perhaps to compensate for the uncomic nature of his principal chorus, the Initiates,<sup>14</sup> hit on the idea of a short scene with a chorus of frogs. Trygaeus in *Peace* had achieved his flight to heaven without the help—or hindrance—of birdsong, but Dionysus will have company as he crosses the lake, and frogs will make the audience laugh by reason of their appearance, their antics and their noises as, for example, swans or water-nymphs could not. Moreover, the frogs will be a novel breed, *βατράχων κύκνων* (207), frogs but first-rate singers;<sup>15</sup> there is no need to link the

swan-singers with the idea of approaching death,<sup>16</sup> even if the scene is set in the underworld: the swans are simply beautiful singers, as in Alcman (*PMG* 1.101). Their songs are introduced as *κάλλιστα* and *θαυμαστά* (207), and with the exception of the croaking noise<sup>17</sup> this is exactly what they are. Their language scarcely drops from the lofty level of choral song: certainly the first element of the word *κραιπαλόκωμος* (218) denotes a hangover and is at home in comedy, but Hippocrates could use it in his medical writings;<sup>18</sup> *πομφολυγοπαφλάσμασιν* (249) is comic by virtue of its sound and length, and the comic poets liked the verb *παφλάζω*; but *παφλάζω* is also in Homer and Alcaeus, *πομφολύζω* in Pindar.<sup>19</sup> For the most part the Frogs' language is elevated: it is Dionysus who lowers the tone, notably at 221–2 and 236–8.

The comic quality of the scene is due in part to the incongruity of elevated lyric on the lips of frogs. The introductory words *βατράχων κύκνων* prepare the way by means of an oxymoron, and throughout the scene the high poetic utterance is juxtaposed with the croaking call. There is whimsy in the Frogs' description of their song as *εὐγηρως*, in the reference to the song they once sang about Dionysus, and in their claim that they are loved by the most musical of the gods, the Muses, Pan, Apollo himself. Humour dependent on the use of incongruous language can be found in non-comic choral lyric also: Simonides' greeting of the victorious mules,

*χαίρετ' ἀελλοπόδων θύγατρεις ἵππων* (*PMG* 515)

and Pindar's address to the Corinthian girls of Aphrodite,

*πολύξεναι νεάνιδες, ἀμφίπολοι Πειθοῦς* (*fr.* 122)

are in the same tone as *λιμναία κρηνῶν τέκνα*; but Aristophanes' singers are humorous at their own expense.

DAVID A. CAMPBELL

*University of Victoria*

answer); the frogs are as musical as swans; their songs will be astonishing.

<sup>16</sup> So L. Spatz, *Aristophanes* (Boston 1978) 122.

<sup>17</sup> I take it that all the *βρεκεκεκέξ* lines were shouted and not sung. At the beginning of the scene they are marked off also by their trochaic rhythm.

<sup>18</sup> *Aér.* 3.

<sup>19</sup> *Il.* xiii 798, *Alc.* 72.5 LP, *Pyth.* iv 121. On *παφλάζω* in comedy see Neil on *Eq.* 919.

<sup>11</sup> M. S. Silk, 'Aristophanes as a lyric poet', *YCS* xxvi (1980) 114 notes the appropriateness of the pleonasm: 'the laborious phrase *χρονίους . . . ἐνιαυτούς* gives the feeling of overwhelming senescence, which the mystae can shake off so easily.'

<sup>12</sup> On *-μεσθα* see Silk (n. 11) 125 n. 82.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Stanford on 210 ff.: 'There is no need to imagine (with Tucker) that any special parody is intended'; P. Rau, *Paratragodia* (Munich 1967) 13.

<sup>14</sup> The only humour that arises from their identity as Initiates lies in their references to their rags (404–6) and to the girl's peeping tit (409–12). Certainly the list of offenders in 354–71 begins and ends as a version of the proclamation that the uninitiated keep away, and the *σκώμης* of 416–30 can be seen as an example of the Initiates' *ἀκόλαστος φιλοπαίγμων τιμή* (331: cf. *παίσαντα καὶ σκώψαντα*, 392); but the spirit of both passages is little different from that of the parabasis in other plays. From 460 onwards the identity of the Chorus as Initiates is of no importance. Allison (n. 2) 18 n. 1 writes of 'the occasionally rather lack-lustre and anonymous character of the principal chorus of shabbily dressed initiates'.

<sup>15</sup> Charon gives three pieces of information in his answer to the question, 'Whose beautiful songs?': the songs are to be sung by frogs (if the play was 'billed' as *Frogs*, the audience will be ready for this

### BOD in Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Andromache*

What relationship exists in *Alcestis* and *Andromache* between O (Laur. 31.10, saec. xii ex.)<sup>1</sup> and D (Laur. 31.15, saec. xiv) and B (Par. gr. 2713, saec. xi) is a question which, for want of full and accurate collations, has long stood unresolved. The reports of these manuscripts offered by Kirchhoff<sup>2</sup> are inaccurate and

<sup>1</sup> Dated c. 1320 by A. Turyn, *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 333. But N. G. Wilson, *Scrittura e Civiltà* vii (1983) 161–76, has given reasons for assigning it to the second half of the twelfth century,

<sup>2</sup> Berlin 1855.

incomplete. In *Alcestis* Prinz–Wecklein<sup>3</sup> quote only occasional readings of OD and disdain to give a full collation even of B. In *Andromache* Wecklein<sup>4</sup> ignores O and reports only occasional readings of D. In *Alcestis* Murray<sup>5</sup> rarely reports OD, in *Andromache* he reports O (collated for him by Wilamowitz) from time to time, D rarely. In the Budé edition,<sup>6</sup> Méridier ignores OD in both plays.

A. Turyn gave a forthright answer to our question. 'In *Alcestis* and *Andromache*, the ms. O is copied directly from B' (*op. cit.* [n. 1] 334); 'In... *Alcestis* and *Andromache*, the ms. D is a direct copy of B' (336). Unfortunately Turyn's discussion is deficient in two respects. First, as W. S. Barrett remarked,<sup>7</sup> 'he cites no evidence—only coincidences which are merely compatible with his hypothesis'. Second, he qualified his positive statements that OD are direct copies of B with statements of a most unsatisfactory vagueness: 'It is to be added that... the ms. O occasionally corrected or modified the text taken from B by using other sources of the tradition' (335); '... the ms. D is a direct copy of B (with occasional corrections or changes)' (336). Turyn has left us as uncertain as before. And while V. Di Benedetto,<sup>8</sup> invoking Turyn, can bluntly assert that 'O è copiato direttamente da B', K. Matthiessen<sup>9</sup> more prudently writes that 'So scheint es mir... nicht erwiesen zu sein, dass O in Andr. und Alc. wirklich nur ein Apographon von B ist'. That O is a copy of B is also contested by A. Tuilier,<sup>10</sup> who cites a small number of inconclusive passages to illustrate its independence. The latest editor of these two plays, A. Garzya, offers no enlightenment. In his edition of *Alcestis*<sup>11</sup> he merely tells us that 'cum D fontem suum B ex toto fere expresserit, O et de B, maximam quidem partem, et ab aliis quoque libris rem [sic] deprompsit', and he scarcely ever mentions OD in his apparatus criticus. In his edition of *Andromache*<sup>12</sup> he merely tells us that 'ex B... DO maxima quidem ex parte... procedunt', and he reports OD only in the parts of the play where B is missing, but even there his reports are very incomplete.<sup>13</sup>

In order to give the right answer to our question, one must first collate the three manuscripts accurately. For *Alcestis* it might seem that the job has already been done by Giuseppina Matino in *Sic. Gymn.* xxx (1977) 619–30. But the very existence of this article (cited as if it were an authoritative treatment by Garzya) imperatively demands that the evidence should be presented afresh. Matino's collations of OD exhibit a degree of inaccuracy which almost passes belief. Reports of B and of all manuscripts other than OD, partly because they are taken from the Budé edition, are often inaccurate and are woefully incomplete. Since the printer has added a plethora of misprints, the article is a minefield of

misinformation. It is not surprising that one of the two conclusions which the author presents, that D was copied from B before B was corrected, is demonstrably impossible, while the other, that O was copied from a brother of B which had picked up readings from other sources, though not impossible, is not, I think, right.

I have collated OD from microfilms and B from the facsimile published by J. A. Spranger,<sup>14</sup> and I have checked all doubtful readings and all corrections in the original manuscripts. Reports of the other manuscripts are also given from my own collations. I use the following symbols:

- A<sup>c</sup> A after correction by an unspecified hand
- A<sup>ac</sup> A before correction (the correcting hand not specified)
- A<sup>2</sup> A after correction by the second hand
- A<sup>uv</sup> A ut videtur
- A<sup>s</sup> A supra lineam, by the first hand
- A<sup>?</sup> A's reading is probable or possible but not certain
- <A> A's reading is based on inference (inference either from the nature of the correction which obscures it or from the reading of related manuscripts)
- (A) A with some inessential variation
- A<sup>γ</sup> a variant in A accompanied by the sign γρ(άφεται)
- Σ<sup>a</sup> scholium in A
- lΣ<sup>a</sup> lemma of the scholium in A
- \*
- Tr Triclinius, corrector of L
- gV gnomologium Vatopedianum<sup>15</sup>
- gB gnomologium Barberinianum<sup>16</sup>
- gE gnomologium Escorialense<sup>17</sup>.

#### I. *Alcestis*

I need not quote all of the evidence which proves the close affinity of BOD. Here are some of their more striking agreements in error: 12 δέ μοι θεαί| θεαί δέ μοι BOD; 17–18 ἦτις... κείνου om. BOD; 43 δευτέρου νεκροῦ| νεκροῦ δευτέρου BOD; 128 διόβολον| διάβολον BOD; 141 θανούσαν ἔστι σοι| θανεῖν ἔξεστί σοι BOD; 283 ψυχῆς om. et φίλον post εἰσορᾶν add. BOD; 307 τοῖς σοῖσι κάμοις παισὶ| τοῖς σι (τοῖς σ Ο) σοῖσι κάμοις (om. παισὶ) BOD; 600 ποστ εὐγενές habent εὐγενῆς αἰδεῖται BOD et gV; 742 ὦ γενναία καὶ μέγ' ἀρίστη (-η V, -a LP)| καὶ μέγ' ἀρίστη ὦ γενναία BOD; 790–1 πλείστον... κύπριν| κύπριν... πλείστον BOD.

D is a direct copy of B, made after B had been corrected by B<sup>2</sup> and B<sup>3</sup>. Here is the evidence:

95 οὐκ αὐχῶ B<sup>c</sup>DVLP et Σ<sup>bν</sup>: οὐν καυχῶ BO; 117 παραλύσαι B<sup>2</sup>DV: -λύσαι BOLP; 118 ψυχάν LP: -ήν B<sup>3</sup>D<sup>v</sup>V<sup>s</sup>: -ῆς V: -ᾶς <B>: -ᾶς B<sup>3</sup>OD: et accus. et gen. Σ<sup>bν</sup>; 136 ἦδ' VLP: εἴ' <B>O: ἴν' B<sup>3</sup>D; 164 προσπίτνουσ' BO: -πιτνούσ' B<sup>3</sup>DVLP; 184 ὀφθαλμοτέγκτω(ι) B<sup>3</sup>ODL<sup>c</sup>P et gB: -τέκτω(ι) BVL; 198 οὐποτ' οὐ BOL: οὐποτε P<sup>uv</sup>: οὐ ποτ' οὐ (B<sup>2</sup>)DVL<sup>c</sup> (οὐ ποτ' οὐ B<sup>2</sup>); 199 κακοῖς B<sup>3</sup>DVLP: κακός BO; 200 εἰ LP: ἦι BO: ἦς B<sup>2</sup>DV; 256 τάδε τοί με

<sup>3</sup> Leipzig 1899.

<sup>4</sup> Leipzig 1900.

<sup>5</sup> Oxford 1902.

<sup>6</sup> Paris 1926, 1927.

<sup>7</sup> *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 65 n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> *La Tradizione manoscritta Euripidea* (Padua 1965) 102.

<sup>9</sup> *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* (Heidelberg 1974) 25 n. 24.

<sup>10</sup> *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide* (Paris 1968) 148 n. 3, 173.

<sup>11</sup> Teubner edn (Leipzig 1980) vi–vii.

<sup>12</sup> Teubner edn (Leipzig 1978) xiv n. 3.

<sup>13</sup> See my review in *CR* xxxi (1981) 4–6.

<sup>14</sup> Paris/Florence 1938.

<sup>15</sup> Ed. G. A. Longman, *CQ* ix (1959) 129–41.

<sup>16</sup> Ed. K. Matthiessen, *Hermes* xciii (1965) 148–58.

<sup>17</sup> Ed. K. Matthiessen, *Hermes* xciv (1966) 398–410.

B(O)V (τί pro τοί O): τάδε τοία με B<sup>3</sup>D: τὰδ' ἔτοιμα LP et (gB); 326 οὐχ ἄζομαι BOV et Σ<sup>b</sup>: οὐ χάζομαι B<sup>c</sup>DLP; 367 πλευροῖαι τοῖς σοῖς] πλευρῶν τῶν σῶν B<sup>3</sup>D; 498 ἄρεος B<sup>3</sup>DVLP: ἄρεως BOTr; 504 συμβαλῶν B<sup>2</sup>DL<sup>c</sup> et Σ<sup>1</sup>: -ὦν BOV<L<sup>3</sup>>P; 692 ἡ B<sup>2</sup>DLP: ἡ BOV: ἡν gV; 847 ἔμαῖν B<sup>3</sup>DVLP: ἔμα BO; 1074 πορσύναι ODVLP: προσσύναι B: πορσύναι B<sup>3</sup>; 1102 μὴ λαβες Q: μῆλαβές B<sup>3</sup>, μὴ λαβές D: μὴ λαβές BO: μὴ λάβες V: μὴ λάβους L: μὴ λάβης P.

There are a few passages where a correction in B does not appear in D. At least two of these are by a yet later hand, identified by Turyn ([n. 1] 334, 336) as the hand of Ianus Lascaris: 17–18 ἦτις . . . κείνου om. BOD, add. B<sup>4</sup>; 427 κουραῖ ξυρ BD ceteris omissis (suppl. B<sup>4</sup>); (ibid.) μελαμπέλω(ι) στολή(ι) B<sup>4</sup>LP: μελαγχίμοις πέπλοις OV (-χείμ- V). I judge that it was Lascaris also who added the variant δύσφορα (LP) for δυσμενῆ (BODV et gVgE) at 617. Probably it was also he who added σώσαι, omitted by BD (but not by O), in the margin at 840. And possibly he was responsible for the correction at 711 ἡβῶν<sup>τ</sup> B<sup>c</sup>OV<sup>2</sup>L: ἡμῶν τ<sup>τ</sup> BDVP. Here in B the left foot of the μ was erased in order to change μ into that form of β which closely resembles μ. Even if the erasure was made by an earlier hand, D may well have thought that he saw μ here.

There is no need for me to quote the passages where D is alone in error, for these may be attributed to careless copying of B. I have found only two insignificant cases of D agreeing with other manuscripts against B: 148 πράσσεται DVLP: -ετε BO; 1031 πάλην BOLV<sup>2</sup>: πάλιν D<V<sup>2</sup>>PQ. The conclusion that D is a copy of B is inescapable; and we may now dismiss D from consideration and turn to the more complex question of the relationship between B and O.

I quote first the passages where B is alone in error (I disregard the agreement of D with B):

95 θαρσύνει| θρασ- B; 118 μόρος OVL: μέρος P: μόνος B; 413 τὰ(ι)δ<sup>τ</sup>] τῆιδ<sup>τ</sup> B; 427 κουραῖ ξυρ B ceteris omissis; 434 μόνη OLP: μόνην V: λίαν B; 448 κύκλο\*5 B; 575 δοχμῶν VLP: -ἰαν O: -ἰών B; 589 ἐστῖαν OVLP et Σ<sup>b</sup>: οἰκῖαν B; 665 χειρὶ χειρὶ B; 716 τόνδ<sup>τ</sup>] τόν γ<sup>τ</sup> B; 739 οἰστέον κακόν] κακὸν οἰστέον B; 743 πρόφρων] προφέρων B; 749 προύθηκ<sup>τ</sup>] -θεικ<sup>τ</sup> B; 760 μέλη] μέλει B; 784 εἶ| οὐ B (ei B marg.); 798 μεθορμιεῖ σε VLP: μεθορμιεῖς O: -ορπιεῖ σ<sup>τ</sup> B; 809 ἔστ<sup>τ</sup> ἄγαν] ἄγαν ἔστ<sup>τ</sup> B; 840 σώσαι om. B; 893 γυναικα om. B; 986 δ<sup>τ</sup> LP: τόδ<sup>τ</sup> B: τὰδ<sup>τ</sup> OV: aut τόδ<sup>τ</sup> aut τὰδ<sup>τ</sup> ssc. tum del. Tr; 1074 πορσύναι] προσσύναι B (πορσύναι B<sup>3</sup>); 1143 τί| τίς B.

Here are the places where O is alone in error (the list is fairly complete, but I may have missed a few trifling slips):

hypoth. line 13 (Murray) ὑπομείνασα om. O; line 14 Θετταλῖαι| Θεσο- O; 62 συγγομῆνους] -νος O; 88 ὡς om. O; 96 τάφον] τάφω O; 140 om. O (χο. εἶτ<sup>τ</sup> οὐδὲ ὄλωλε add. O<sup>1c</sup> ceteris omissis); 145 οἶδε| εἶδε O; 169 γῆ| τῆ O; 172 om. O; 173–4 τοῦπιόν | κακόν] τοῦπιόν κακόν/κακόν O; 178 κορεύματ<sup>τ</sup>] κουρ- O; 184 πλημμ-| πλημ- O; 189 δέ om. O; 190 ἐς ἀγκάλας BV: ἐπ<sup>τ</sup> ἀγκάλας O: ἐν ἀγκάλας LP; 215 τρίχα| χεῖρα τρίχα O; 230 πελάσαι| πεπλ- O; 249 τε om. O; 260 νεκῶν]

νέων O; 292 κεῦκλεῶς| κοῦ κεῦκλεῶς O; 297 ὠρφάνευες] -ευσε O; 300 μὲν om. O; 312 προσερρήθη] -ρρήθη O; 318 θαρσύνει| θαρσύνει B, θρασύνει O; 360 οὐθ<sup>τ</sup>] οὐποθ<sup>τ</sup> O; 401 ἐγὼ σ<sup>τ</sup> ἐγὼ μᾶτερ PTr: ἐγὼ σε γὰρ μᾶτερ L: σ<sup>τ</sup> ἐγὼ μᾶτερ ἐγὼ BV: σ<sup>τ</sup> ἐγὼ μᾶτερ O; 402 καλοῦμαι| καλοῦ μέ O; 418 γί(γ)νωσκει| γινώσκω O; 429 τέμνετ<sup>τ</sup> BVL: -νεθ<sup>τ</sup> O: -νεῖν P; 446 μέλψουσι| μέμψ- O; 449 Καρνεῖου| -νίου O; 458 ρεέθρων BVP: ρέθρων O: ρείθρων L; 476 κωμήται| κομήται O; 511 ἐξεπίσταμαι| ἐπίστ- O; 519 μῦθος] μύθους O; 530 ὁ om. O; 542 ξένους LP: ξένους gB: φίλοις BV et gVgE: φίλους O; 543 οἶ| οἶς O; 578 σὺν| σὺ O; 633 χρῆν| χρῆ O; 633 ὄτ<sup>τ</sup>] ὄταν O; 638 ἔτικτε| ἔθικτε O; 638 δουλίου| δολίου O; 697 ὦ| ἄ O; 704–5 κακῶς/ἐρείς] κακῶς ἐρείς/ἐρείς O; 712 ψυχῆ(ι) μία(ι)] ψυχῆ μία O; 734 ξυνοικήσασι| οἰκήσα O; 735 ἄπαιδε VLP: ἄπαιδες B: om. O; 743 σε| τε O; 819 στολμούς] στολισμούς O; 829 βίαι| βίω O; 840 μέ| σε O; 881 ὠφελον] ὄφ- O; 923 στολμοῖ| στολισμοῖ O; 941 εἰσόδους] εἰς δόμους O; 952 οὐ γὰρ ἐξανέξομαι] οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνέξομαι O; 974 θεᾶς] θεᾶς O; 982 ἀποτόμου] ἀπότμου O; 1001 δοχμῖαν] δοχμῖαν O; 1003 δαίμων] δαιμόνων O; 1005 προσερούσι| -οὔσαι O; 1029 λαβῶν] λαχῶν O; 1054 προμηθῖαν] -εῖαν O; 1059 εὐεργέτιν] -έτην O; 1064 οἶμοι| ὄμοι O; 1068 κατερρώγασι] -ώγεσαν O; 1083 τίς| τίς σ<sup>τ</sup> O; 1125 μέ| γε O; 1134 δοκῶν] δικῶν O.

Here are the places where B and O have a different reading from each other and share that reading with other manuscripts:

(i) O shares the right reading, B the wrong reading: hypoth. line 4 (Murray) χρόνος OV: -νω BPTr; 173 ἄκλαυτος OL: ἄκλαυτος BVP et gE; 184 ὀφθαλμοτέγκτω(ι) B<sup>3</sup>ODL<sup>c</sup>P et gB: -τέκτω(ι) BVL; 267 ποσὶ OL: πόσι BVP et Σ<sup>b</sup>; 726 μέλει OLP et gV: μέλλει BV et gB; 737 χρῆν OV: χρῆν L: χρῆ BLP; 1085 μαλάζει OLPQ et Chrysippus (SVF fr. 478): μαλάζει σε fere BV et gVgE (σ<sup>τ</sup> B et gV).

(ii) B shares the right reading, O the wrong reading: 219 εὐχόμεσθα BTr: -όμεθα OV: -όμεθα <L>P; 249 ἰωλκοῦ BVL: -κοῦς OP; 481 πόνον BLP: πόνω(ι) OV; 593 ἱππόστασι BLP: ὑπό- OV; 692 πολύν γε BVLP et gVgB: γε πολύν O et gE (γε πολύν γε O<sup>c</sup>); 716 νεκρὸν BLP: νεκρὸν γ<sup>τ</sup> OV; 727 πλέων BVL et gB: πλέων OP et gE; 894 θνατῶν L, θνητῶν BVP: βροτῶν O et gE; 1034 μέλει BLPQ: μέλλειν OV; 1039 προσκείμενον BL: προκ- OVPQ et gE; 1122 εὐτυχῶν BL: -χῶν OVPQ.

There are two places where B alone preserves the truth: 546 τῶδε B: τῶνδε OVLP; 890 τίθης B: τιθεῖς OVLP. And there are two places where O alone preserves the truth: 379 χρῆν μ<sup>τ</sup> O: χρῆ μ<sup>τ</sup> BV: μ<sup>τ</sup> ἐχρῆν L(P); 552 μῶρος O: μωρὸς BVLP. Two other unique readings in O could be right: 71 τ<sup>τ</sup>] δ<sup>τ</sup> O; 909 πολιεῖς] πολιᾶς O, sicut coni. Lenting.

Two interesting divergences between B and O, where neither has the truth, are: 1045 μ<sup>τ</sup> ἀναμνήσης LPQ: με μι\*μνήσης B: με μισήσης O: με μιμνήσκεῖς V; 1106 ὀργαίνειν ἐμοῖ VLPQ: -νεῖ (-νεῖν B<sup>2</sup>) νέμειν B: -νεῖν μέλλειν O (νέμειν post μέλλειν add. O<sup>c</sup>).

There are three hypotheses which will account for all the readings of B and O: (i) O is a copy of a copy of B,

the intervening copy having picked up readings from other sources (so, in effect, Turyn); (ii) O is a copy of a close relation of B which had picked up readings from other sources (so Matino); (iii) O is a twin of B and it has not picked up any readings from other sources. Only hypothesis (ii) or hypothesis (iii) will satisfactorily account for the fact that B has errors which do not appear in O. On hypothesis (i), we have to suppose that in every place where B has a unique error O corrected it by chance, by conjecture, or by recourse to other manuscripts. This is simply not believable.

It may be argued that the fact that sometimes B and O each side with different manuscripts proves that contamination has occurred and that consequently hypothesis (ii) is to be preferred to hypothesis (iii). I do not rule out hypothesis (ii); but the assumption that contamination has occurred is not, in fact, necessary. The divergences between B and O which are at issue are comparatively few and can be otherwise explained:

(a) Several of the errors are such as could easily have been committed independently by more than one scribe: hypoth. 4 χρόνον (BPT<sub>r</sub>) for χρόνον (a simple error of assimilation after τῶι προτέρῳ); 173 ἄκλαυστος (BVP et gE) for ἄκλαυτος (or B copied correctly and O restored the preferred form); 184 ὀφθαλμοτέκτωι (BVL) for -τέκτωι; 219 εὐχώμεθα (OV) for -μεσθα (a constant slip); 249 ἰωλκοῦς (OP) for -κοῦ; 267 πόσι (BVP) for ποσί; 481 πόνωι (OV) for πόνον (influenced by the preceding datives Τυρινθίωι . . . Εὐρυσθεί; 593 ὑπόστασιν (OV) for ἱππ-; 726 μέλλει (BV et gB) for μέλει (the two verbs are constantly interchanged without regard for metre); 727 πλέον (OP et gE) for πλέων (the scribes did not recognise that πλέων is neuter); 737 χρή (BLP) for χρῆν (a constant slip); 1034 μέλλειν (OV) for μέλειν; 1039 προκείμενον (OVPQ et gE) for προσκ- (or B's reading is a lucky slip); 1122 εὐτυχῶν (OVPQ) for -χῶν (or B restored the right accent).

(b) Marginal or supralinear variants in the common ancestor will account for other divergences. At 716 (ἀλλ' οὐ σὺ νεκρὸν ἀντὶ σοῦ τόνδ' ἐκφέρεις;) OV add γ' after νεκρὸν, B has τὸν γ' for τόνδ'. In the common ancestor there was perhaps a γ (perhaps even -όν γ') suprascribed or in the margin, which B has incorporated in the wrong place. At 1085 the unmetrical σε (σ') in BV and gVgE is in origin a gloss, which must have begun life above the line; and above the line it may have stood in the common ancestor, to be incorporated in the text by B and ignored by O.

(c) The errors of O which are shared by gE (692 γε πολύν for πολύν γε, 894 βροτῶν for θνητῶν) admit two explanations: either they are independent errors (βροτός is a mistake for θνητός at *Med.* 128 in V and gV and at *Hipp.* 254 in V, and the two words are variants at *Hec.* 832), or the false reading is a genuine variant which was present in the common ancestor.

The few instances of unique preservation of the truth by B or O are similarly explicable: 379 χρή (BV) for χρῆν (O) (a simple slip: cf. 737 χρῆν OV: χρῆν L<sup>c</sup>: χρή BLP); 546 τῶνδε (OVL) for τῶδε (B) (assimilation by O, as by the other manuscripts, to the following δωμάτων); 552 μωρός (BVL) for μῶρος (O) (alternative accents in the ancestor, or O knew the right accent and so restored it); 890 τιθείς (OVL) for τίθης (B) (a common variation, and perhaps the

ancestor had both forms: cf. e.g. *Andr.* 210 τίθης AV<sup>3</sup>LP<sup>s</sup>: -ηίς MBO: -είς P: τιθείς V).

The places where B and O have different unique errors suggest that they may both have had difficulty in reading the script of the common ancestor: 1045 μι\*μνήσης B: μισήσης O (O's reading probably results from the incorporation in the wrong part of the word of a suprascript ση, which was intended to correct the ending -σκείς, as in V's μιμνήσκείς); 1106 -νεῖν ἐμοί] -νεῖ νέμειν B: -νεῖν μέλλειν O. Similarly 307 τοῖς] τοῖς σι B: τοῖς σ O.

In the very few places where O agrees with B<sup>2</sup> or B<sup>3</sup> the original reading of B is an error and the corrector restored the reading of the common ancestor: 118 ψυχάν LP: -ήν B<sup>3</sup>D<sup>3</sup>V<sup>5</sup>: -ῆς V: -ās <B>: -ās B<sup>3</sup>O; 184 ὀφθαλμοτέκτωι (i) B<sup>3</sup>OL<sup>c</sup>P et gB: -τέκτωι (i) BVL; 831 κᾶτα κωμάζω B<sup>2</sup>O: κᾶτα κ- B: κατακ- V: κᾶτ' ἐκώμαζον L(P).

In short, the divergences between B and O are not so many or of such a nature that we need invoke the hypothesis that O has suffered contamination, even though we may not rule out that hypothesis. There is nothing in the text of B and O which is incompatible with the simple hypothesis that B and O are twins; although we may, if we wish, postulate one or more intermediary manuscripts between O and the exemplar, in order to account for the greater frequency of unique errors in O.

## 2. *Andromache*

The following additional symbols should be noted: W = Ambrosianus F 205 inf. (uu. 1-102; see Turyn [n. 1] 341-2); Va = Pal. gr. 98 (an apograph of V; Turyn 91-2); Σ<sup>y</sup> = scholia in Vat. Ottob. gr. 339 (Turyn 355); Π<sup>78</sup> = P. Oxy. inv. 18 2B. 64/D(7)b (ined.).<sup>18</sup> I cite W, Va, and Σ<sup>y</sup> from my own collations.

The close affinity of BOD is proved by such passages as: 19 δέ νιν λέως] λαός δέ νιν BOD; 255 πόσιν μολεῖν] μολεῖν πόσιν BOD; 380 τῶνδ' ἀνακτόρων θεᾶς] τῶν θεᾶς ἀν- BOD; 426 οὐ φίλους ἀκούσεται] οὐκ ἀκούσεται φίλους BOD; 735 ἐπεξελεθῆν] ἐπελεθῆν οὖν BOD; 736 χ' ὑποχείριον λαβεῖν LP: καὶ ὑπο- λ- MAV: καὶ λαβεῖν ὑποχείριον BOD.

Just as in *Alcestis*, D is a direct copy of B, made after B had been corrected by B<sup>2</sup> and B<sup>3</sup>:

53 κτείνει BMVWL: τείνει OΠ<sup>8</sup>: τίνει AP et <sup>78</sup>Σ<sup>my</sup>: κτείνει B<sup>3</sup>D; 90 τί om. BO (habent B<sup>c</sup>D); 94 τὰ παρεστῶτα κακά B<sup>3s</sup>, τὰ παρεστῶτα D<sup>s</sup>; 99 δούλειον BOD<sup>s</sup>HMAVWLP: -ιον B<sup>c</sup>D; 174 μίγνυται B<sup>3</sup>ODMAVLP: μείγ- B; 199 αὐτῇ B<sup>3</sup>ODMLP et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>y</sup>: -τῇ BAV; 208 αἱ ἀρεταὶ MAV: αἱ ῥ- LP: αἱρ- B<sup>uv</sup>O: ἀρ- B<sup>3</sup>D; 213 πόσει δοθῆ(ι) MAVLP et gB: δοθῆ(ι) πόσει B<sup>3</sup>OD et gE: δοθεῖ π- B; 240 ἀλγήσεις BOMAVLP: -σης B<sup>c</sup>D; 272-3 γυναικῶν . . . κακῶν B<sup>3s</sup>D<sup>2</sup>; 284 οὐρεῖαν B<sup>3</sup>DM: -εῖαν BOAVP: -εῖων A<sup>s</sup>L et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>y</sup>; 313 ἦσσαν B<sup>3</sup>DAVLP: ἦσσαν (M)BO; 344 σὺ B<sup>3</sup>DAVLP: σοὶ BOM; 368 δ' om. BO (habent B<sup>c</sup>D); 383 ἀνάγκη V<sup>78</sup>LP<sup>2</sup> et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>y</sup> et Σ<sup>mbv</sup>: -καιν <P>: -καιν ἦ BOMAV (ἦ V<sup>3</sup>): -καῖον ἦ B<sup>3</sup>DM<sup>2</sup> (ἦ M<sup>2</sup>); 388 ποίαν B<sup>3</sup>DMAVLP: ποῖαν BO; 431 κρινεῖ B<sup>c</sup>DMAVLP:

<sup>18</sup> I am grateful to Mr P. J. Parsons for communicating the readings of this papyrus, and to the Egypt Exploration Society for permission to quote it (I do so once, at 53).

κρίνει BOV<sup>2</sup>; 441 ἦ B<sup>2</sup>DAV<sup>c</sup>L: ἦ BOMVP; 497 τλήμων B<sup>c</sup>DMAL: τλήμων BOVP; 522 οἰκων B<sup>2</sup>DMAVTr et gB<sup>c</sup>: οἰκων A: οἰκων BOLP et gB; 561 προθυμία(ι) B<sup>3</sup>DMAVLP: -ίαν <B>O; 581 ἦ B<sup>c</sup>DLP: ἦ BOMAV; 597 ξύν νέοισιν B<sup>c</sup>O<sup>c</sup>DALP et gE: ξυνέοισιν MV<sup>3</sup>: ξυνέοισιν BO: ξυνέοισιν V: ξυνέοισιν gV; 606 ἦγαγες B<sup>2</sup>DMVL<sup>c</sup>P: ἦγαγε BOAL; 626 ἔχης B<sup>2</sup>DL: ἔχεις BOMAVP; 750 θεοί σοι B<sup>c</sup>O(D)AVL<sup>c</sup>P<sup>2</sup> (θεοίσι D): θεοῖσι M: θεοῖσι BLP; 762 εἷς B<sup>2</sup>DMAVLP<sup>2</sup>: εἶ BOP; 763 πρέσβυς περ ὦν B<sup>2</sup>DAVLP: πρεσβυτέρων BOM; 770 εἶ τι B<sup>3</sup>DMAVLP: εἶσι B<sup>uv</sup>O; 784 ὀνειδέσιν ἔγκειται B<sup>2</sup>DHAVLP et gB: -σι νείκη τε BOM; 819 εὐπειθέστεροι B<sup>2</sup>D<H>MAVLP: εὐτυχέστεροι BO; 837 δαΐας MAVLP: δικαίας BO: δὲ βίας fort. uol. B<sup>2</sup> (δεμίας D); 898 μόνην B<sup>2</sup>DHAVL<sup>c</sup>P: μόνη BOML; 935 βλέπουσ' ἄν B<sup>2</sup>(D)HV<sup>2</sup>P (-σ' ἄν D): -ουσαν BOMAVL.

There is one correction in B which I confidently attribute to B<sup>4</sup> (Lascaris): 5 χρόνῳ om. BOD (add. B<sup>4</sup>). The same hand is possibly responsible for a few other corrections which do not appear in D: 341 καλεῖ BODM<A<sup>2</sup>>LP: κάλει B<sup>c</sup>A<sup>c</sup>V (cf. Σ<sup>mb</sup> et V<sup>3</sup> (ἀντι τοῦ) ἐκάλει); 409 εἴ ἦ B<sup>c</sup>; 437 εὐρώτα(ι) B<sup>c</sup>MAVLP: -ταις BOD; 443 τί om. BOD (add. B<sup>c</sup>); 443 σ' οὐ B<sup>c</sup>VL: σου BODMP: σου AV<sup>3</sup>mp; 659 δ' om. BODM et Σ<sup>v</sup> (add. B<sup>c</sup>; suprascript, possibly the first hand); 750 εὐ om. BOD (add. B<sup>c</sup>; suprascript, possibly the first hand).

B is alone in error at: 174 μίγνυται| μείγ- B; 213 δοθῆν| δοθεῖ B; 298 Πριάμου| Πριάμοιο B; 383 θατέρω(ι)| θάτερον B; 439 δ' ἦ B; 561 σε| σοι B; 646 φρονεῖν δοκοῦντας| δοκεῖν φρονούντας B; 661 θέλων| θέλω B; 856 τὰ(ι)δ' OMAVTrP<sup>2</sup>: τὰδ' LP: τῶδ' B; 887 ξυγγενοῦς| ξυνγενοῦς B; 942 τοῖς ἐμοῖς| τοῖς ἐμοῦς B. There are in addition several places where an error in B has been corrected by a later hand and the original reading is uncertain: e.g. 68 δύστηνος B<sup>2</sup> (-νε B<sup>c</sup>); 272 φάρ\*ακ' B (φάρμακ' B<sup>3</sup>); 340 ἀνέξ\*\*\*\*(-εται B<sup>3</sup>); 411 η̄δε B (ἦδε B<sup>3</sup>); 927 \*\*χίστουσιν B (αἰσχ- B<sup>2</sup>).

O is alone in error at: hypoth. line 1 (Murray) λαβῶν| λαχῶν O; line 6 ἐβουλεύετο| -εύσατο O; line 14 δέ om. O; 90 πάθω κακόν| κακὸν πάθω B, κακὸν πάθῃ O; 91 οἰσπερ| οἷς O; 93 ἐμπέφυκε| ἐκπ- O; 112 τε om. O; 114 ὑπο-| ἀπο- O; 117 ᾶ| ὦ O; 191 ἐμαυτῆν| ἐλλ' αὐτὴν O; 195 θ' ἦ δ' O; 313 Μενελέω| -λάου O; 324 στρατηγῶν| στρατηλατῶν O; 342 Πηλέως| -λέω O; 381 ἐκφεύγει| -φύει O; 384 μοι| τοι O; 385 λαχοῦσά γ' ἢ λαχοῦσ' O; 399 σφαγὰς| φαγὰς O; 423 ξύμβρασιν| ξύμβρασι O; 453 ὄλοισθ' ἢ ὄλοισθ' O; 588 γε| τε O; om. V (δὲ V<sup>3</sup>); 593 ἄδουλα| αἰδου O; 636 τοι| σοι O; 654 κοινουμένην| κιν- O: κιν- V<sup>ac</sup>; 656 ἦδ' ἦ θ' O; 664 om. O; 679 ἦ om. O; 692 ματαίων| μακραίων O; 715 ἄν om. O; 868 σου| σοι O: om. P; 873 οὐ μέσως| ἀμέσως O; 926 Φοίβου| φόβου O; 1220 πρόσω| πρόσω O.

Here are the places where B and O have a different reading and share that reading with other manuscripts:

(i) O shares the right reading, B the wrong reading: hypoth. line 12 ὁ om. BP; 151 σπαρτιάτιδος| σπαρτιάδος BL<sup>ac</sup>; 163 θέλη(ι)| θέλοι BL<sup>ac</sup>; 199 αὐτῆ B<sup>3</sup>OMLP et Σ<sup>v</sup>: -τῆ BAV; 240 αὐ OA et Σ<sup>m</sup>: ἄν BM<sup>uv</sup>VLP et Σ<sup>bv</sup> et gV; 496 κατακεκριμένον

OMA<sup>c</sup>VL<sup>c</sup>P<sup>c</sup>: -ιμμένον B<ALP>V<sup>3</sup>; 536 ἐξανύ-σωμαι| -ύσομαι BALP; 657 στέγος| τέγος MB; 750 θεοί σοι B<sup>c</sup>OAVL<sup>c</sup>P<sup>2</sup>: θεοῖσι M: θεοῖσι BLP; 810 κτείνουσα| -νασα BL; 868 αὐ τὸ OLV<sup>c</sup>: αὐτὸ (B)MAVP (αὐτὸ\* B); 922 προσωτάτω| -τάτω BM.

(ii) B shares the right reading, O the wrong reading: hypoth. line 2 δέ om. OVL<sup>ac</sup>; 53 κτείνει| τείνει OIT<sup>b</sup>: τίνει AP et η̄Σ<sup>mv</sup>; 167 χερὶ BHML: χερὶ O<sup>uv</sup>A<sup>uv</sup>V et Σ<sup>v</sup>: περι- P; 180 θέλοι| -ει O et Va (-οι O<sup>s</sup> et Va<sup>s</sup>); 244 τὰ γ' ἢ τὰδ' OP; 382 κτενῶ| κτανῶ OP; 399 τροχλητάτους| -του OM; 679 ὠφελοῖς BO<sup>s</sup>AVTrP<sup>2</sup>: -λεῖς OM<L>P; 810 κτανεῖν BMAV (et O marg.): θανεῖν OHLPV<sup>3</sup>mp; 1262 πόρου BO<sup>s</sup>MAV<sup>2</sup>LP: πόντου OVV<sup>3</sup>.

In the parts of the text where B is missing (957–1212, 1236–49, 1272–88) the readings of D are witnesses to the lost readings of B. Such readings are of interest only where they differ from those of O (D is itself missing from 1129–1219). There are only three such differences: 994 φοβηθῆς DAV<sup>3</sup>PTr: -θεῖς OMVL; 1034 ἀγαμεμνόσιος DM et Σ<sup>v</sup>: -νειος OAVLP; 1099 δόμοις DAVLP: δρόμοις OM.

There is no place where B alone preserves the truth. There is one place where O alone preserves the truth, and another where it may do so: 832 πέπλους O, sicut conii. Reiske: πέπλοις cett.; 833 πέπλοις| πέπλους O. I have discussed these lines in *Illinois Class. Stud.* vi.1 (1981) 95–8.

Here are three divergences between B and O, where both are in error: 185 τὸ μῆ| καὶ τὸ μῆ B et gV: καὶ τὸ O; 588 σὸν . . . κάρα| σὴν . . . κάραν B: σὴν . . . χέρα O (σὴν etiam V<sup>3</sup>); 791 σε καὶ HMLVLP: τε καὶ B: καὶ O<sup>2</sup>: om. A.

The picture which this evidence presents of the relationship between B and O is precisely the same picture as we found in *Alceste*. The hypothesis of contamination, although it cannot be ruled out, does not have to be invoked as an explanation of any reading where O differs from B. All of the readings which B or O, when they disagree, share with other manuscripts can be readily explained as the products of either (i) independent errors or (ii) the presence of occasional variants in the common ancestor.

JAMES DIGGLE

Queens' College, Cambridge

## Two notes on τέλος and related words in the *Oresteia*

### 1. τελεσφόρος at *Cho.* 663–4

For *Sho.*

ἐξελεθῆτω τις δωμαίων τελεσφόρος  
γυνὴ τόπαρχος, ἄνδρα δ' εὐπρεπέστερον.

τελεσφόρος in these lines is translated by LSJ as 'one having the management or ordering' and this sense of 'being in command', 'having authority' from the use of τέλος as 'authority', 'magistracy' (LSJ I 3 and 4) is followed by Sidgwick, Tucker, Verrall, Lloyd-Jones and others<sup>1</sup> going back to the scholiast who glosses the

<sup>1</sup> D. Holwerda, *TEΛΟΣ*, *Mnemos.* xvi (1963) 345 ff., and M. Bayfield, 'Some derivatives of τέλος', *CR* xv (1901) 445 ff. adopt the