

gesehen und von dem richtigen *στεφανήφωρον* mit einem orthographischen Fehler *στεφαν. ἐνιφώρον* abgeschrieben, woraus *ἐνιφώρον* als eine weitere Glosse in dem Codex von Hesychios entstanden ist.

Folglich hat das Fragment Nr. 172 (Page), von dem man annimmt, daß es von Alkman stammt, keinerlei Beziehung zu diesem Dichter, denn es dürfte hiermit bewiesen sein, daß es sich um eine von Euripides Hipp. 230 stammende Glosse mit ihrer Erläuterung handelt.

Athen

Nikolaos A. Livadaras

SILENT HERALDS

(Aeschylus, Fr. 212a² Mette)

Dindorf's edition of the *scholia recentiora* on Aeschylus included the following scholium on *Prometheus* 440 (441 in Wilamowitz' numeration):

ἡ σιγή ἔχει πολλὰς μεθόδους, οἷον συννοούμενος καθ' αὐτὸν σιγῶ· ἢ δι' ὀργὴν βασιλέως φοβοῦμαι καὶ σιγῶ· ἢ καὶ ἄλλως· ὡς ἡ Νιόβη διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν λύπην ἐσιώπα, καὶ οἷον τὸ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως, ὅτε ἐστάλησαν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Γαλθύβιος καὶ Εὐρυβάτης, καλοῦντες εἰς μάχην, ἐσίγησεν¹). Dindorf cited a single manuscript, P (Paris. gr. 2787, saec. xiv), as his source for this passage. In his apparatus criticus he noted that ὅτε (before ἐστάλησαν) was his "correction" for the MS reading ὅταν.

For almost a century now the latter part of this scholium, in the form published by Dindorf, has played a considerable rôle in certain scholars' reconstructions of Aeschylus' *Mirmidons*. Mette admitted it to his collection, as Fr. 212a², though he added a word of caution in the companion volume²). More recently Di Benedetto, in a thorough and learned article³), has

1) W. Dindorf, *Aeschylus*, Vol. III, Oxford 1851 (repr. Hildesheim 1962), p. 225.

2) H. J. Mette, *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*, Berlin 1959, p. 72; *Der Verlorene Aischylos*, Berlin 1963, p. 114.

3) V. Di Benedetto, "Il Silenzio di Achille nei *Mirmidoni* di Eschilo", *Maia* 19 (1967) 373-386. The article includes a discussion of the controversy's history.

argued with great confidence that the scholium should be accepted as evidence for the contents of the *Myrmidons*. In that case, as he well shows, a majestic episode is to be added to the lost drama (and to our understanding of Aeschylus' tragic art). Early in the action – presumably just after the parodos, and certainly before the interview with Phoenix in which Achilles finally broke silence⁴) – Talthybius and Eurybates will have appeared on the scene to plead in vain before the obdurate hero.

Unfortunately the whole construction seems to rest on a misreading of a single Greek character. Recently, in preparing an edition of the scholia on the *Prometheus*, the present writer noticed that cod. P did not read ἐσίγησεν in the final word of our scholium, but the plural form ἐσίγησαν. The plural is also read by six out of the seven other manuscripts in which the present writer has found the scholium: B, Nc, Sj, W, Xc, Ya⁵). The reading ἐσίγησεν seems to be merely a peculiar error of the seventh manuscript, Pa, which is a page-by-page transcript of P dating from the sixteenth century. The appearance of this reading in Dindorf's edition is no doubt to be explained by the fact that Dindorf relied in part upon the excerpts from Pa published by Francken⁶).

Thus our scholium does not mention the silence of Achilles, but merely the silence of the two Achaean heralds. It can therefore no longer be brought into connection with the well known group of ancient references to a silence on the part of Achilles in one of Aeschylus' Achilles-dramas (either the *Myrmidons* or the *Phrygians or Ransoming of Hector*)⁷). The question must now be posed whether, under the changed circumstances, there

4) This evidently crucial moment in the play has been restored to us in the fragment published by V. Bartoletti (*American Studies in Papyrology* 1 [1966] 121–123), and further discussed by Di Benedetto (*op. cit.* in Note 3).

5) The sigla are those of A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus*, New York 1943. Details of the manuscripts concerned may be found there; for our present purpose it is enough to note that B and Nc are dated to the end of the thirteenth century, the rest to the fourteenth and fifteenth.

6) Dindorf, preface to his edition, pp. viii–ix. The error is the more understandable since Dindorf knew that Pa (= Q in his notation) was in general a faithful transcript of P. He had not personally collated either manuscript.

7) Aristophanes, *Frogs* 911; scholia on that passage (Aeschylus, Fr. 212a¹ Mette); *Vita Aeschyli* 5–6 (Fr. 243 a); perhaps also the scholium on *Prometheus* 436, as emended (Fr. 243 d, to be discussed further at the end of this article).

remains any reason at all for referring the scholium to the *Myrmidons*, or even to Aeschylus. To this the new manuscript evidence provides an answer that may well be conclusive. The majority of the witnesses suggest a further significant change in the received text; their version runs as follows:

σιγαῖν [*Prom.* 437]: ἡ σιγή ἔχει μεθόδους πολλὰς· οἷον συννοούμενος καθ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ· καὶ ἄλλως, ὡς ἡ Νιοβή διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν λύπην ἐσίγα· καὶ ἄλλως, οἷον δι' ὀργὴν βασιλέως φοβοῦμαι καὶ σιγῶ· καὶ οἷον τὸ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως· ὅταν ἐστάλησαν πρὸς ἐκείνον ὁ Ταλθύβιος καὶ Εὐρουβάτης καλοῦντες εἰς μάχην, ἐσίγησαν.

Apparatus criticus: The lemma is found only in W, but P and S_j also assign the scholium to 437 σιγαῖν by means of reference-marks. B assigns it to 441; the remaining MSS give no indication on the point.

2 ἐγὼ *plerique*, σιγῶ PYa, *recte*. 3 ἐσίγα *plerique*, ἐσιώπα PYa. 3-4 καὶ ἄλλως ... σιγῶ *plerique*; PYa omit at this point, but insert similar words after καθ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ (σιγῶ) in line 2, exactly as in Dindorf's version (see beginning of this article)⁸).

In this form the scholium does not seem to need conjectural emendation at any point. Dindorf's ὅτε for ὅταν in line 4 was never justifiable; the unclassical use of ὅταν (and also ἐάν) with the indicative mood can be paralleled from many passages of the later scholia on Aeschylus⁹). At the same time, the conjectures that were based on the false reading ἐσίγησεν become superfluous¹⁰). Above all, the new location offered by the majority of the manuscripts for the clause about "the wrath of a king" makes far better sense than the old, and allows the general drift of the scholium to become perfectly clear. We have an enumeration of the psychological motives for silence, with examples, as follows: (1) Anxious meditation, τὸ συννοεῖσθαι [the implied example is the present passage of the *Prometheus*,

8) I have omitted from this apparatus several verbal variants, peculiar to one or two witnesses, of the kind that swarm in the manuscripts of the scholia; but none of them affect the sense. An example is B's φόνον (for μάχην of all the other witnesses) in the penultimate word.

9) Examples are given by Di Benedetto (*op. cit.*, p. 375, n. 6), and more will be found in Index V to the present writer's edition of the *Prometheus* scholia (Leiden 1972). It should be stressed that this phenomenon seems to be an almost infallible indication of relative lateness; there are no instances in the Medicean scholia on Aeschylus.

10) See Di Benedetto, *op. cit.*, p. 375, end of n. 6. He proposed to read ὅταν γὰρ ἐστάλησαν. Mette would insert ὄ δ' before the final word in Dindorf's version, ἐσίγησεν.

where line 437 actually contains the word *σύννοια*]. (2) Grief; example: Niobe. (3) *Fear of a king's wrath*; example: "the (case) of Achilles, when Thalthybius and Eurybates were sent to summon him to battle, *and they were silent*." Now it is surely unnecessary to search outside extant Greek poetry for an occasion on which Thalthybius and Eurybates stood silent in fear of the anger of a king. In *Iliad* 1. 320ff. those two heralds are sent by Agamemnon to seize Briseis from Achilles, and on their arrival at the hut —

τὼ μὲν ταραβήσαντε καὶ αἰδομένω βασιλῆα
στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἔρεοντο (331-2).

There remains, of course, a difficulty: in the *Iliad* episode the heralds were not sent, as the scholium puts it, *καλοῦντες εἰς μάχην*, but to take Briseis. Two solutions are possible. Either our scholiast is a careless and ignorant man, who has confused the purpose of the heralds' missions in Book I with the purpose of the Embassy in Book IX; or else he is an exceptionally learned man, who has somehow acquired authentic information about an otherwise unrecorded passage in lost Greek literature. Clearly the time has arrived to scrutinize his credentials.

The scholium is found only in a relatively small and heterogeneous group of those manuscripts of the Aeschylean scholia that have been examined by the present writer. It does not belong to the oldest extant commentary on the *Prometheus*, the Medicean scholia; nor yet to what appears to be the second oldest, the "A-commentary"¹¹). It is in fact one of those innumerable stray notes that have found their way into the margin of some Aeschylus manuscript from an unknown source at an unknown date, and have later been copied into one or two other manuscripts by industrious scribes. Notes of this kind cannot be generally classified; they range from unique quotations of ancient works to the idiotic jottings of nameless Byzantine students. The latter are commoner than the former, in this writer's unhappy experience. There is no way to evaluate a given example except by considering its internal merits, and by comparing it with other scholia whose dates and affiliations are

11) So I name the body of scholia (largely paraphrastic) that is carried by the majority of the *codices veteres* of Aeschylus. It partly, but by no means entirely, coincides with the scholia labelled "A" in the editions from Stanley through Dindorf.

more or less known. By neither criterion does our scholium inspire any confidence. It has none of the marks of great antiquity (of which the most decisive is the naming of sources by author and title); on the contrary, it shows one syntactical feature, *ἔταν* with the indicative, that suggests a relatively late date (see Note 9). It also bears a suspiciously close resemblance to an undoubtedly ancient note on the preceding line of the *Prometheus*, found in both the Medicean scholia and the "A-commentary"¹²): "Characters in the poets are silent either [1] because of obstinacy, like Achilles in the *Pbrygians* of Sophocles [*sic*; Menagius conjectured 'Aeschylus']; or [2] because of calamity, like Niobe in Aeschylus; or [3] because of reflection, like Zeus in the Poet [*Iliad* 1. 511 ff.], with regard to the request of Thetis." In this, too, we are offered three motives for silence, with examples drawn from tragedy and from the first book of the *Iliad*. But there is a significant difference in style and method: the Medicean/A scholium is concise, direct, and careful to indicate its sources. Finally, if we ask how the writer of our stray scholium came to select *Iliad* 1. 331-2 as *his* Homeric example, the answer may well be that he vaguely recollected the Homer-commentaries there; these suggest that in scholiastic circles the lines were a *locus classicus* for "silence in the poets"¹³).

The conclusion can hardly be avoided that Fr. 212a² Mette should be deleted from the fragments of Aeschylus. It is merely a feeble attempt by a late annotator to go one better than the received commentary.

Stanford University

C. J. Herington

12) This was published by Dindorf (pp. 21-22) as schol. Med. 436 (= Fr. 243d Mette). Dindorf had a misleading habit of simply deleting from his "A-scholia" any matter that happened to be identical with the Medicean scholia, and he has done so in this case. In all my manuscripts of the "A-commentary" the same material appears just before the scholium printed in Dindorf (p. 224) as schol. *Prom.* 435.

13) Compare schol. *Il.* 1. 332b Erbse, and in particular Eustathius on *Il.* 1. 332 (p. 174. 22 Van der Valk): ἔτι πολλὰ τῶν προσώπων ὁ ποιητῆς σιωπῶντα εἰσάγει ... ἐδρῆσεις δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πρόσωπα σιωπῶντα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ, τὰ μὲν διὰ φόβου, τὰ δὲ διὰ πένθος ἢ διὰ θάμβου.