

Author(s): John J. Peradotto

Reviewed work(s): The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus by R. D. Dawe

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 87, No. 1, (Jan., 1966), pp. 95-99

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

only occasionally rose en masse against their condition, as in the revolts of the *Bagaudae* in Gaul or the *Circumcelliones* in North Africa. The final chapter discusses the various ways in which individuals sought to escape from oppression, by placing themselves under the protection of the powerful or by joining the Christian Church, which enjoyed increasing immunities and favor. Gagé concludes that the gloomy picture of general disinterest in the fate of the empire presented by Salvian is fully justified.

A brief conclusion (pp. 442-8) reviews various explanations of the "Fall" and concludes, against Piganiol, that the real weaknesses were internal: over-expansion, over-organization, and fundamentally the failure of the emperors (i. e. the state), as the largest land-owners, to make the condition of the cultivators anything but worse (p. 447). Ordinary people no longer looked to the emperor, as they had during the early period, as their "patron" but sought refuge from the oppressive imperial administration in local protection. Thus the transition, particularly in the west, from the late empire to the early Middle Ages, with its separatist and localized society, was easy, gradual, and logical.

The book closes with a chronological summary of emperors to 395, outlining their families and chief achievements, and indices of proper names and of administrative and social categories. A map of the empire under Trajan precedes the conclusion.

Those familiar with Roman history will find the value of this book not in any startlingly new interpretations but in the organized presentation of material usually treated in broader contexts and less coherently. The chapters are supported by valuable footnotes which supplement the opening bibliography, though their references are likewise largely to French scholarship. This survey of the social structure, classification, and conditions throughout the Roman empire is thorough, informative, well documented, and characterized by both imagination and good sense. It should prove stimulating to scholars and to students.

MASON HAMMOND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

R. D. DAWE. *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1964. Pp. x + 352. \$13.50.

In another book Professor Dawe calls the text of Aeschylus "so very problematic that it is difficult to discuss any aspect of his art for long without being compelled to touch on textual problems." Editorial neglect of manuscript evidence can issue in seriously flawed interpretations and worse translations. One or two letters altered can in some cases have drastic effects on criticism (e. g., Soph., *O. T.*, 376: Brunck's *σε μοῖρα πρὸς γ' ἐμοῦ* for MSS' *με μοῖρα πρὸς γε σοῦ* and Aesch., *Ag.*, 144: Lachmann's *αἰνεῖ*, Gilbert's *αἰνει*, or Schutz' *αἰτῶ* for MSS' *αἰρεῖ*). In the present work Dawe, a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, surveys textual edifices reared on the shifting sands of random evidence and sets about the work of demolition. The complete collation of 16 manuscripts of the Byzantine triad,

presented in an *apparatus criticus* covering nearly half the book, constitutes the scholarly spine of the investigation. Written in an engaging style belied by its austere title, the rest of the book is an impassioned plea, painstakingly documented, for an end to stemmating and excessive emendation before the unglamorous but necessary work of manuscript collation is complete.

In his introductory chapter, Dawe charges modern editors of Aeschylus (especially the "committee" responsible for the O. C. T.) with evading their proper task: too much effort has been exerted on conjectural emendation and too much value ascribed to it at the expense of thorough manuscript investigation. Excessive faith has been put in the assumed superiority of the oldest manuscript, M (= Laurentianus 32.9), and in a too eager exercise of *Stemmatik*. As a result, with nearly 150 manuscripts extant, hasty affiliations have been contrived on the basis of a few significant errors and a mere handful, deemed worthy of adequate collation, have served as substructure for editions of the poet. That so shaky a substructure should evoke universal acceptance "could be better explained," says Dawe, "by the moralist than by the scholar" (p. 2). Dissenters like Friedrich Heimsoeth with his *Die Wiederherstellung der Dramen des Aeschylus* and *Die indirecte Überlieferung des aeschyleischen Textes* were derided or ignored by the Establishment.

Also ignored by editors were the more scrupulous (though still mistaken) attempts to clarify the Aeschylean *Textgeschichte*, Turyn's *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (1943) and a 1953 doctoral dissertation dealing with Thomas Magister's work on Aeschylus by one of his students, Miss Elizabeth Bryson. This is the authoritative picture of the transmission in Miss Bryson's own words (quoted by Dawe, pp. 12-13):

The mediaeval manuscript  $\omega$  was the ultimate source of all our extant manuscripts. From this the immediate descendants are  $\mu$  and  $\phi$ , the hypothetical redactions from which are derived the two main families of the old tradition. The scribe of  $\mu$  drastically abridged and revised the scholia which he found in  $\omega$ ; in  $\phi$  these scholia were preserved in a much fuller form.  $\mu$  has only one extant representative, M; but  $\phi$  was the source of  $\beta$  and  $\pi$ , and from these two manuscripts are descended all the remaining extant manuscripts of the old tradition.  $\theta$ , the recension of Thomas Magistros, used multiple sources from both the  $\mu$  and the  $\phi$  groups. The edition of Demetrius Triclinius,  $\tau$ , was based for the triad on the Thoman recension, but also drew independently on old sources.

The editor, if this picture is valid, would be expected to take the following tack; collate the members of the  $\phi$  group to reconstruct  $\phi$ , using it and M to reconstruct  $\omega$ . The occasional interpolations introduced into the *veteres* under the "horizontal" influence of the then popular Byzantine texts could easily be purged by our knowledge of the Thoman and Triclinian recensions. As Turyn puts it, "if we know what were the Byzantine readings carried by the Byzantine recensions, then we can detect them as being just interpolations whenever they appear sporadically in the old manuscripts."

But the rub lies in knowing what readings to ascribe to Byzantine conjecture when they are not labeled as such, as they are not in the so-called Thoman group. It is at this point (chapter II) that Dawe suggests the inadequacies of the Turyn-Bryson construct, especially the latter's analysis of interpolation in the Thoman recension. Furthermore, his comparison of the so-called "decadent Byzantine" manuscripts QK with O, one of the more respectable *veteres* of the  $\phi$  group in Turyn's stemma, shows that any value judgment based solely upon the distinction between "Byzantine" and "ancient" is meaningless: "Too often we are invited to draw the line between ancient manuscripts which are heavily interpolated, and heavily interpolated manuscripts whose original stock must of course be ancient" (p. 22).

In chapter III Dawe sets before the reader sample lists of significant errors drawn from the apparatus to demonstrate that, while broad affiliations are evident, "almost all manuscripts constantly show the influence of groups to which they do not themselves belong" (p. 23). For example, in BCH $\Delta$ , the most well disciplined group, the number of times they all agree is but a small fraction of the times only two or three of them agree. The fallibility of stemmata based on incomplete collation is especially verified when Dawe shows that A, assigned by Turyn to the  $\pi$  branch of the  $\phi$  group, barring  $\beta$  affinities for *Pers.* 1-ca. 214, actually has more than twice as many affinities with M and I (Mt. Athos, Iviron 209) than with  $\pi$  or  $\beta$  manuscripts. Thus all the manuscripts violate the most fundamental assumption of *Stemmatik*, "that the copies made since the primary split in the tradition each reproduce one exemplar only, i. e., that no scribe has combined several exemplars (*contaminatio*)" (Maas, *Textual Criticism*, p. 3). And Dawe shows that, while in minor matters scribes are content to follow their main exemplar, the greatest divergency among members of a group occurs at major *cruces*, where we need them most. This evidence of such widespread shopping about for true readings by "thinking" scribes renders an Aeschylean stemma impossible at least until all the manuscripts have been collated completely. In this chapter Dawe also introduces the first bits of evidence to disprove the uniqueness of M in preserving ancient readings, and recommends that for the textual criticism of Aeschylus "the only thing which can profitably be said of a manuscript is that it is good or bad, not that it belongs or does not belong to group x, with or without an admixture of readings from y and z" (p. 42), a course of action long advocated for many other classical authors by Giorgio Pasquali (*Storia della tradizione e critico del testo*, 1934).

Since, according to Dawe, Miss Bryson had not sufficiently articulated the unique character of "Thoman" interpolation, in chapter IV he takes each manuscript in turn and tries, in his own words, "to catch the scribes in the act of emending, and endeavor, where possible, to understand their motives and the way their minds worked." In a venture of this kind, the tares are every bit as precious as the wheat, for detailed knowledge of Byzantine philological capability can then be used later to gauge whether unique readings in one or a few manuscripts are genuine ancient preservations or merely emendations. In the first section of the chapter Dawe deals with

metrical emendation, i. e., addition or deletion to give a twelve-syllable line, insertion of the *vitium Byzantinum* (both attempts to fit the classical tragic trimeter to the Procrustean bed of the contemporary Byzantine dodecasyllable), real restorations of meter, and avoidance of hiatus. In the second and more important section, he weeds out emendations motivated by misunderstanding the text or by the desire to clarify it. His conclusions are rather startling. All the manuscripts show emendation, some of it apparently from periods much earlier than that of the Palaeologi. Scribes demonstrate remarkable familiarity with the text but shallowness in critical, especially metrical, matters. And finally, "for every instance of emendation one could cite several places where scribes have refrained, for whatever reason, from making an obvious and correct alteration" (p. 102).

In chapter V this new found knowledge of what scribes do and can do is applied to each *prima facie* case of unique ancient preservation to determine whether it is a genuine preservation, an emendation, or sheer accident. By discovering unique preservations of an ancient reading in almost all of the 16 manuscripts, Dawe bursts the bubble  $\phi$ , certifies an open recension, and pushes the ultimate source  $\omega$  too far into the past to be a useful critical tool. "Byzantine," as a designation for the triad, is clearly a misnomer.

Dawe examines the scanty *external* evidence, chiefly the papyri, in chapter VI and finds nothing in it to disprove the conclusions reached by internal evidence and some things impossible to prove except on his theory. On the evidence of dislocation in line order he reservedly proffers the suggestion that at a very early period the Aeschylean tradition may have been transmitted orally.

Chapters VII and VIII are miscellanies containing explanatory notes to the apparatus, suggestions on topics related to the study of the manuscripts, and some excellent emendations by Dawe himself. The final chapter surveys the hitherto uncollated Salamanca manuscript (E) of the *Eumenides* and its relationship with FGT. Once again he finds unique preservations of the truth in each—a picture, in miniature, of the situation of the triad manuscripts. His collations further disclose that the hitherto discredited G—its value, according to Denniston-Page, "could not be less than it is without entirely ceasing to exist"—actually represents the earliest stage of Triclinius' editorial work on the *Oresteia*, and should, therefore, no longer be neglected by editors.

The overwhelming quantity of Dawe's incontestible evidence is more than enough to outweigh the isolated instances where, as he himself freely admits, he may encounter difference of opinion. A few examples may be cited. *P. 83*: Dawe sees "no detectable motive" for O's substitution of  $\xi\tau\iota$  for  $\mu\omicron\iota$  at *P. V.*, 80. Could not O's scribe have thought (wrongly, of course) that  $\mu\omicron\iota$  was pleonastic after  $\xi\mu\lambda\eta\eta$  in the previous line?  $\xi\tau\iota$  would make good sense (though bad meter) if he were reading these lines as the angry limit of Kratos' patience at being twice (42, 78) abused by Hephaestus. (Alteration of  $\tau\rho\alpha\chi\upsilon\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  to  $\theta\rho\alpha\sigma\upsilon\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  by PKΔ, to bring it in line with  $\theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  in 42, may have had the same motive.) *P. 85*: Dawe calls  $\Upsilon$ 's  $\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma/\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  for  $\tau\upsilon\chi\alpha\varsigma/\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  at *P. V.*, 302-3 "arbitrary substitution." It was more likely the unconscious slip of a scribe who,

when he was writing *θεωρήσων τύχας/ἐμὰς ἀφίξαι*, still had in mind its mate in meaning *πόνων ἐμῶν/ἦκεις ἐπόπτης* from three lines above. P. 89: Dawe calls Ya's *πατρίδι* for *πατρίαι* at *Pers.*, 932 "substitution of a near-synonym." Why not attribute it more simply to A-Δ confusion, a common enough "mechanical" error?

For a book that must have been a nightmare for proofreader and typesetter alike, their peccadillos are understandable. On p. 50, line 11, for *τοιούτος* read *τοιόσδε*. On p. 66, line 21, ". . . giving reasonable sense and a hiatus" should read ". . . giving reasonable sense and *avoiding* a hiatus." On p. 83, lines 14-15, "the mess made of 246": the apparatus shows no mess in O at *P. V.*, 246; presumably 244 (very messy!) is meant. On p. 92, line 20, for 1006 read 1005. On p. 120, line 1, for 923 read 924. On p. 155, line 9, for *προσγίγνεται* read *προσγίνεται*. On p. 316 of the apparatus, the line number 446 is missing.

JOHN J. PERADOTTO.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY.

ERIC A. HAVELOCK. Preface to Plato. Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1963. Pp. xii + 328. \$5.75. (*A History of the Greek Mind*, I.)

Havelock's book is written with verve, eloquence, and a vividness appropriate to the great cultural drama that he tries to unfold before us. Wishing to get at the core of Plato's thought, he turns, like others before him in similar endeavors, to the *Republic* but insists from the onset that its political content is of secondary importance. Plato's true subject is education, and from the dual attack on poetry (in Books II-III and X) it should be evident what enemy stands in the way of his educational reforms and proposals. The objective which Plato pursues is to break the exclusive hold that poetry had on the Greek mind. The peculiar strength of this hold was due to the powers inherent in the oral tradition. Havelock is convinced that this tradition had continued with unbroken force to Plato's day, writing and "the advantages of literacy" being still a monopoly of the poets (p. 46). Mobilizing a maximum of visual and acoustic resources, poetry demanded and achieved the total surrender of the listener's personality. The listener (or pupil) responds through a mechanism of irrational reflexes, he becomes emotionally identified with what he hears, the rhythms take possession of his mind, impressing upon his memory paradigmatic situations, with the result that throughout his life he remains in bondage to the "poetised statement." Obviously this kind of education cannot produce individual minds; its cultural function is to enforce conformity with the *mores* of the social group. For poetry is a codification of these *mores*; epic poetry in particular represents a *summa* of all knowledge useful and essential for the preservation of the social organism. Havelock likes to speak of Homer as the "tribal encyclopaedia." The content as well as the form of the epic must be understood in the light of this cultural function. Now if such was the role of poetry