

lines do not show that he had loved Neobule, simply that he does not want her. He certainly counted himself as one of the *νέοι ἄνδρες* of line 9. It might seem surprising that no 'biographer' of Archilochus, a Critias or the like, seized on the passage to denigrate him as a teenage sex maniac; perhaps Critias felt that he had said enough when he called him *μοιχός, λάγνος*, and *ὕβριστής*; perhaps he saw nothing amiss in the fact that one so young should mention discussion of marriage; it was, after all, only discussion, and the suggestion, made to achieve a more pressing need, was for postponement of that discussion. It was poor farmers like Hesiod or philosophers like Plato who suggested thirty as the appropriate age for a man to marry.

University of Victoria

DAVID A. CAMPBELL

THE SO-CALLED 'VENETUS 8' OF PLATO

A number of enigmatic manuscripts of Plato have been identified during the last few decades. Thus Mercati (*Studi e Testi* 164(1952), 35) showed that *Angelicus* c.1.9 (w), which L. A. Post (*The Vatican Plato and its Relations*, pp. 73 f.) was unable to trace, is identical to *Rossianus* 17(558); N. G. Wilson (*Scriptorium* 16(1962), 393 n.2) proved that the long-lost *Hassistenianus* is no other than the *Lobcovicianus* in Prague University Library (this had already been suspected by H. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon*, p.237, n.3) Here is the solution of a third puzzle.

In the *Conspectus Siglorum* and three times in the apparatus of the Budé-edition of *Sph.* (ad 236 c 9; 239 b 1; 266 b 1), A. Diès quotes a manuscript which he calls 'Venetus 8' and assigns to the fifteenth century. Both Post (op.cit., p.80) and Wilson (op.cit., n.4) confess to their inability to identify it.

Yet inspection of the *Commentarius Criticus* of the Hermann-Wohlrab edition, Vol. i, would have shown them that a manuscript also called 'Ven. 8' was collated by Bekker for *Ap.*, *Phd.*, *Cra.*, *Tht.* and assigned the siglum Λ. For *Sph.* and *Plt.* the siglum Λ is given to Ven.app.class. 4. 54, which is a well-known manuscript, appearing in all the lists (Post, p.81; Wilson, no.239; R. S. Brumbaugh—R. Wells, *The Plato Manuscripts*, p.63). It contains the first three tetralogies up to *Phdr.* 253 a 6 and belonged to the well-known Venetian collector Francesco Barbaro (cf. H. Alline, op.cit., pp. 297 f.). Since Bekker (unlike Stallbaum and Schanz) always used the same siglum for the same manuscript, we are able to infer that 'Ven. 8' is in fact Ven.app.cl. 4. 54. Interestingly, Diès also used this manuscript for *Prm.*; there he gives it its correct library reference, calls it G (after Schanz and Burnet) and says that it is from the fourteenth century.

A fairly complete description of Ven.app.cl. 4. 54 given by Schanz (*Hermes* 10(1876), 174–7) explains the origin of the faulty designation 'Ven. 8'. A handwritten catalogue of the Biblioteca (Nazionale) Marciana consulted by Schanz describes our manuscript as 'Class. IV (philosophi) appendix 54. membr. in fo. saec. XIII. S. Michael de Muriano [sic] Nr. 8'. This obviously means that it was no.8 in the library of the monastery S. Michele in Murano, from where it passed to the Marciana (Alline, p.297; E. Mioni, *IMU* 1(1958), 317–43, esp. 330). But Bekker (who must have seen this catalogue as well) mistook the 'Nr. 8' for the library number of the Marciana itself, for in p. cliii of vol. i of his edition our manuscript (identifiable by both its siglum and its contents as given there)

parades as (Λ) 8 among the 'Veneti'.

It should be noted that Ven.app.cl. 4. 54 is traditionally dated to the thirteenth century. But E. Mioni has (loc.cit.; *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti* i. 2 (Rome, 1972), 244) placed it in the early fifteenth century.

Amsterdam, Free University

S. R. SLINGS

AESCHYLUS, *CHOEPHOROI* 275¹

It may be unlikely that a kingdom will ever be lost because of an error in the translation of a line in a Greek tragedy, but (as it is the purpose of the present note to show) a mistaken rendering of a single line can do much to disseminate doubt or misunderstanding about the dramatic intentions of the author.

ἀποχρημάτοις ζημίαις ταυρούμενον

This line, composed of only three words, occurs near the beginning of a speech in which Orestes, having revealed himself to his sister, is passing on to her and to a sympathetic chorus consisting of slaves in the royal palace at Argos, the gist of the instructions Apollo, through his oracle at Delphi, has given him about avenging his murdered father. The God, less merciful than the ghost of King Hamlet, has ordered him to kill his mother as well as her paramour.

Two of the best-known English translations of the *Oresteia* translate the line under discussion in completely different, one might almost say, in directly opposed senses. Which of these he accepts could make a significant difference to an attentive reader's understanding of the play.

The bifurcation is traceable to the Loeb edition of Aeschylus, where one translation of this line is given in the text and a different one is suggested in a footnote. The editor, Herbert Weir Smyth, renders the line 'infuriated by the loss of my possessions'. This has been accepted by various commentators and translators, including the author of one of the most applauded recent verse translations, Richmond Lattimore. In some quarters the rendering, or one similar to it, has been cited in support of a Marx-inspired interpretation which holds that Orestes (as Aeschylus, of course, intends us to understand) was inspired by no other motive than that of getting back his possessions and his position as lawful king. But it seems that Weir Smyth himself was not entirely happy about his version of the line because he adopted the very unusual course of printing an alternative rendering, that suggested by T. G. Tucker in a footnote: 'fiercely stern with penalties not to be paid with money' — in other words, the guilty pair are not to be allowed to escape suffering the death-penalty by offering to pay blood-money. This interpretation, which is followed by the translator of the *Oresteia* in the Penguin Classics, Philip Vellacott, suits the context a great deal better than does that given in the text of Loeb, for it is, surely, improbable that Apollo would have instructed Orestes to kill his mother as well as her lover out of anger at the loss of his possessions when the god had at his disposal and was just about to

1 The usual English title is 'The Libation Bearers'. It is doubtful whether this literal translation of the Greek title means much to the average English reader, since we do not

normally associate libations with death. 'The Mourners' or 'The Last Rites' would perhaps be better.