

ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΙΝ IN THE AESCHYLUS SCHOLIUM

DAVID K. HUTTAR*

In the current debate between the egalitarian and the complementarian¹ interpretations of Scripture's teaching regarding the role of women in church and family both sides in the debate agree that 1 Tim 2:12 looms large. The complementarian view draws on Paul's injunction in that verse that a woman not "teach or hold authority over a man," while the egalitarian view is concerned to show that the verse teaches no such thing. The egalitarian position argues for this conclusion either through emphasizing aspects of the context that might be used to relativize the effect of the verse, or by defining some of its key terms in such a way as to favor an egalitarian interpretation.

One of the key points of disagreement in the debate is Paul's use of the word ἀυθεντεῖν. Numerous articles have been written on this word, trying to establish whether it may have a general sense of holding authority over or whether its predominating sense is that of a certain kind of authority (illegitimate, violent, abusive, etc.). Unfortunately, many of these studies, particularly ones written by egalitarian interpreters, have drawn too heavily on the meanings of the related noun ἀυθεντης rather than centering on the verb ἀυθεντεῖν itself.

Much of this situation has been remedied as more careful and rigorous methodology has been applied. Particularly significant has been the publication by H. Scott Baldwin of a study of all known occurrences in ancient and Byzantine Greek literature of the verb in question.²

Nevertheless, in most of the studies, including that of Baldwin, there is cited one passage where ἀυθεντεῖν is used, in which it is claimed that the meaning is unambiguously "to commit murder." That passage is the scholium on Aeschylus's *Eumenides* 42.³ What is not often realized, however, is

* David Huttar is professor of Bible and Greek at Nyack College, 1 South Boulevard, Nyack, NY 10960.

¹ I use "egalitarian" to describe the view that the NT teaches that there is no distinction in role between male and female in the church and/or husband and wife in the family. Conversely, "complementarian" describes the view that the NT does teach such distinctions.

² H. Scott Baldwin, "A Difficult Word: ἀυθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church* (ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995) 65–80.

³ Actually, there are two scholia for line 42—one written in the left margin, and a totally unrelated one in the right—sometimes therefore distinguished as 42a and 42b. But since I will use a and b in another sense, I will refer to the relevant scholium simply as 42, as it is referred to in the LSJ lexicon under ἀυθεντέω.

that the edited text, upon which all these discussions are based, is a reading arrived at through conjectural emendation. Thus the critical edition reads: *στάζοντα*] ἐμφαντικῶς (διὰ) τούτου (τὸν) νεωστὶ ἠῤῥθεντηκότα παρίστησιν, which would bear the translation: “dripping] vividly through this he describes the one having just then committed murder.”

The purpose of this article is to examine the basis for this emended text to determine whether the emendation is justified and whether the emended text has influenced the understanding of *ἀθεντεῖν* in the passage.

Through this investigation we will conclude: (1) that the earliest retrievable form of this scholium is not as is found in the critical edition but is: *ἐμφαντικῶς τοῦτο νεωστὶ ἠῤῥθεντηκότα παρίστησιν*; (2) that the appropriate translation of this is “vividly he describes one having just then initiated this thing”; (3) that this understanding of the scholium does not involve the meaning “murder” for the verb *ἀθεντεῖν*; and (4) that therefore the inclusion of the meaning “murder” for this verb should be avoided until a convincing example of such a meaning is found.

There is no claim being made here that this study solves all the problems in the debate over the meaning of 1 Tim 2:12. Surely neither of the interpretive positions stands or falls on the success or failure of our argumentation and conclusion. Rather, the study seeks simply to address one very small issue in the current discussion over the meaning of *ἀθεντεῖν*. Nevertheless, if the reasoning is sound, appeal to this scholium and its use of *ἀθεντεῖν* to support the meaning “murder” will no longer be a tenable option for those arguing the egalitarian viewpoint.

I. AESCHYLUS'S *ORESTES* TRILOGY

The primary datum from Aeschylus's plays that may appear to have impact on our concern is the fact that Orestes murdered his mother. In the three plays traditionally included in the *Orestes* cycle (*Agamemnon*, *Libation Bearers*, *Eumenides*) Aeschylus analyzes Orestes's struggle to achieve atonement for his deed. For our purposes, we can take up the story at the point in *Eumenides* where Orestes has fled into the temple of Apollo in Delphi and is praying at the altar. The Pythian priestess enters, sees Orestes, and immediately exits, crying out in terror.⁴

Things terrible to tell and for the eyes to see
 terrible drove me out again from Loxias' house 35
 so that I have no strength and cannot stand on springing
 feet, but run with hands' help and my legs have no speed.
 An old woman afraid is nothing: a child, no more.

See, I am on my way to the wreath-hung recess
 and on the centrestone I see a man with god's 40
 defilement on him postured in the suppliant's seat
 with blood dripping from his hands and from a new-drawn sword,

⁴ The translation is that of Richmond Lattimore in David Grene and Richmond Lattimore, *Aeschylus*, vol. 1 of *The Complete Greek Tragedies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959) 136.

holding too a branch that had grown high on an olive tree, decorously wrapped in a great tuft of wool, and the fleece shone. So far, at least, I can speak clear. (34–45) 45

While some scholars understand the blood dripping from Orestes's hands to be the blood from a pig sacrifice to atone for the matricide, most see it as deriving from the matricide itself.⁵ Furthermore, the emphasis seems to be on the freshness of the blood, indicating that the scene with Orestes in the temple takes place shortly after he has murdered his mother. The phrase "new-drawn sword" points in a similar direction, that Orestes has only relatively recently withdrawn the sword from the fatal wound. The actual moment of the matricide is, of course, never narrated in the *Oresteia*. It took place behind the scenes between line 930 of *The Libation Bearers*, where Orestes pursues Clytaemnestra into the palace, and line 973, where Orestes is pictured as already having accomplished the act. Indeed, the intervening lines depict the Chorus extolling the matricide. Be that as it may, the language here in *Eumenides* 34–45 seems clearly to indicate that it was of recent occurrence.

The same sense of timing is evident later in the play at line 282.

I have been beaten and been taught, I understand
the many rules of absolution, where it is right
to speak and where be silent. In this action now
speech has been ordered by my teacher, who is wise.
The stain of blood dulls now and fades upon my hand. 280
My blot of matricide is being washed away.
When it was fresh still, at the hearth of the god, Phoebus,
this was absolved and driven out by sacrifice of swine.

So there is no question in our discussion about whether Orestes is being portrayed by Aeschylus as a murderer; surely he is. That in itself, however, does not prove that the use of ἀθεντεῖν in the scholium points to "murder" as the meaning of the word in the context of the scholium. For that we must turn to the scholium itself.

II. THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF THE SCHOLIUM

The scholia on the plays of Aeschylus are edited by Ole L. Smith.⁶ In this edition there are actually two scholia that are relevant to this discussion. One is a scholium on line 40 of *Eumenides*, the other explicitly on the word στάζοντα in line 42. These two scholia, however, are found in two different families of manuscripts; no Aeschylean manuscript has both scholia.

The main testimony for the scholium to line 42 is the Medicean manuscript (M) in Florence (R. Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, cod. 32, 9),

⁵ D. J. Conacher, *Aeschylus' Oresteia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987) 140, 149, 174 n. 2.

⁶ Ole L. Smith, ed., *Scholia Graeca In Aeschylum Quae Exstant Omnia*, vol.1 (Leipzig: Tübner, 1976) 45.

which according to Smith is to be dated around AD 1000. In addition to this manuscript there are eight direct or indirect copies.⁷ It is not clear to me whether these copies also contain the scholium, but I have found no indication that they do not or that they have it in a different form. In any event, their evidence, if any, is not likely to change the picture presented by the evidence of M itself. In any case, we may take the reading of the scholium found in M as the point of departure in this discussion, although we will shortly see that the situation has been unnecessarily complicated by a proposed emendation on the part of the editor. M reads ἐμφαντικῶς τοῦτο νεωστὶ ἠϋθενηκότα παρίστησιν. I argue that this is best translated, “vividly he describes one having just then initiated this thing.”

Because the evidence of M is so crucial to my argument and because access to the facsimile edition of M is relatively difficult, in what follows I try to replicate lines 40 to 43 of that manuscript as closely as possible. The text of the drama is on the right, that of the scholium on the left. In the manuscript the Aeschylus work is in miniscule script, while the scholium is uncial. The spelling of the manuscript has been retained, even when it is grammatically incorrect. Accents and breathing marks have been omitted from the uncial writing, even though they are there in the manuscript. Note how the symbol ÿ is used to show that the scholium is a comment on στάζοντα.

	ὄρῳ δ' ἐπ' ὀμφαλῶ τ μὲν ἄνδρα θεομουσῆ ἰκέτην
	ἔδραν ἔχοντι ⁸ προστρόπαιον αἵματι
ÿ	ÿ
ΕΜΦΑΤΙΚΩΣ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΝΕΩΣΤΙ	στάζοντα χειῖρας. καὶ νεοσπαδὲς ἕξιφος
ΑΥΘΕΝΗΚΟΤΑ ΠΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΙΝ.	ἔχοντ'. ἐλαίας θ' ὑψιγέννητον κλάδον

The other form of the scholium, which is attached to line 40, is found in two manuscripts: E (Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, cod. 233), dated to the fifteenth century, and T (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, cod. II. F. 31), assigned to around AD 1325. Once again, these may be supplemented by other subsidiary manuscripts, but there is no reason to think that any such evidence would alter the picture given in ET. The scholium in this form reads ἐμφαντικῶς παρίστησι τὸν νεωστὶ ἠϋθενηκότα, οἶονεὶ τὸν φονεύσαντα· αὐθέντης γὰρ λέγεται ὁ φονευτής. The translation is given below. Yet before addressing this issue, perhaps a word is in order concerning the relationship in general between the longer and the shorter forms of the scholium.

In spite of the fact that the scholium in the M group is somewhat different in wording and placement from that in the ET-type manuscripts, it is better to assume that there is a literary relationship between the two scholia than to conclude that they are more widely separate traditions. The main difference in wording is the fact that the ET version, containing an extra explanatory clause, is longer than that found in M, although there are

⁷ For a full description of manuscripts and their relationships see Aleksander Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1943).

⁸ M has ἔχοντι instead of the proper ἔχοντα.

other differences in word order and word form as well. Still, the two forms of the scholium should be seen as having a definite relationship.

In M the scholium is clearly related to the word *στάζοντα* in line 42, but there is nothing specific in line 40 that prompts the attachment of the longer form of the scholium at that point. The longer form is, of course, germane to the general context and in fact addresses the issue raised by *στάζοντα* in line 42, but it is not particularly pertinent to anything in line 40.

Some might wish to see the longer form of the scholium as a comment on the word *θεομυση* ("detested by the gods" or "with god's defilement") in line 40, but this is at best only a remote possibility. On this construction of the scholium's relationship, the word *νεωστί* ("just then") in the scholium would not be particularly appropriate, since there is nothing in *θεομυση* that draws attention to the matricide's recentness. Moreover, the close similarity in wording between the first half of the longer form of the scholium and the shorter form would be difficult to explain if the two forms have such independent origins, one commenting on *θεομυση* and the other on *στάζοντα*. Consequently, we should conclude that the longer form is only generally related to line 40 and essentially commenting on line 42, as is the shorter form.

As far as the readings of the scholium are concerned, virtually all scholars accept certain minor emendations as valid, as, for example, reading *ἐμφαντικῶς* where the manuscript may have *ἐμφαντικῶς* and *ἠθθεντηκότα* where the manuscript has *αἰθθεντηκότα*. But apart from these kinds of ordinary adjustments, the reading of ET is straightforward: *ἐμφαντικῶς παρίσθησι τὸν νεωστί ἠθθεντηκότα, οἶονεὶ τὸν φονεύσαντα· αἰθθεντης γὰρ λέγεται ὁ φονευτής* (vividly he describes the one having just then committed murder, that is, the one slaying, for "murderer" means "the slayer").⁹

The reading of M, however, has not always been correctly represented. The correct form is: *ἐμφαντικῶς τοῦτο νεωστί ἠθθεντηκότα παρίσθησιν*.¹⁰ This reading is what is found in the facsimile edition,¹¹ and it can be reconstructed from the text and apparatus in Smith's edition. In an earlier article, however, Smith had misrepresented the reading of M, and that representation should not be followed.¹²

III. SMITH'S EMENDATION

As far as can be ascertained, the modern discussion of this scholium in connection with the meaning of the verb *αἰθθεντεῖν* has been based solely on Smith's edition, which, as we have noted, represents an emended text.

⁹ Instead of using "murder" to translate both *αἰθθεντεῖν* and *φονεύειν*, I have somewhat arbitrarily used "murder" for the former and "slay" for the latter, so that the distinction in Greek words comes through more clearly in the English translation.

¹⁰ Since this scholium to line 42 is parallel to the first half of the scholium to line 40, I will refer to that half of the longer scholium as 40a and to the explanatory section of the longer scholium as 40b.

¹¹ Enrico Rostagno, ed., *L'Eschilo Laurenziano: Facsimile* (Firenze: R. Bibliotheca Medico-Laurenziana, 1896) 42.

¹² Ole Langwitz Smith, "Textual Notes on the Scholia to Aeschylus, Oresteia," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 30, 53-54.

Starting with M's actual reading (slightly edited in accordance with the regular principles of normalization given above) ἐμφαντικῶς τοῦτο νεωστὶ ἠῦθεντηκότα παρίστησιν ("vividly he describes one having just then initiated this thing"), Smith recommends reading ἐμφαντικῶς διὰ τούτου τὸν νεωστὶ ἠῦθεντηκότα παρίστησιν ("vividly through this he describes one having just then committed murder").

But is this emendation warranted, in view of the fact that it involves adding two words (διὰ and τόν) and changing the case form of another (from τοῦτο to τούτου)? Let us consider the reasons given by Smith in a separate article in support of the emendation.

The note in M ἐμφαντικῶς (*Thompson*, ἐμφατικῶς M) τοῦτο παρίστησιν νεωστὶ ἠῦθεντηκότα (*Blass*, ἀῦθεντηκότα M) should be emended on two accounts. In the first place we need the article τὸν ἠῦθεντηκότα and in the second place παρίστησιν normally is used by scholiasts with the poet as the subject. Thus I should be inclined to read ἐμφαντικῶς διὰ τούτου τὸν νεωστὶ ἠῦθεντηκότα παρίστησιν. In support of this text I may refer to the version in E and T ἐμφαντικῶς παρίστησιν τὸν νεωστὶ ἠῦθεντηκότα.¹³

In response to this reasoning it may be noted that it is difficult to see the force of the first argument; it is difficult to see how the presence or absence of the definite article would have any significant impact on the sense.

As to the second argument, Smith's hidden premise appears to be that, given the normal usage of scholiastic tradition, in which the poet rather than τοῦτο is the grammatical subject of παρίστησιν, the reading preserved in M is not coherent, yielding the incomprehensible translation "vividly this thing he describes one having just then murdered." Therefore, the wording of M, according to Smith, needs emendation.

However, this argument appears to contain a second hidden premise, namely, that ἀῦθεντεῖν means "to murder." It is this hidden premise that needs to be called into question, especially since the work of Baldwin has collected a number of passages where ἀῦθεντεῖν means something like "to be primarily responsible for or to instigate something" (Baldwin's meaning #4).¹⁴ Baldwin gives three passages (Eusebius, Leo I, Scholium on Homer) that support this meaning,¹⁵ but, mistakenly in my opinion, does not consider the possibility that the Aeschylus scholium is another such example.¹⁶ Once that meaning is accepted as a possible meaning for the verb ἀῦθεντεῖν in the scholium, one of the premises of Smith's argument for emendation is taken away, since with the meaning "instigate" rather than "murder" the word τοῦτο can be used as the direct object of ἀῦθεντεῖν rather than left dangling as in the "incomprehensible" translation.

¹³ Smith, "Textual Notes" 53–54. In passing, note how Smith, probably influenced by the word order in ET, actually misrepresented the reading of M by giving it in a different word order from what actually occurs in M. Fortunately, this mistake is corrected in his edition of the Aeschylean scholia.

¹⁴ Baldwin, "Difficult Word" 73.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 79.

¹⁶ Baldwin does show awareness that at least some scholars have questioned the significance of "murder" in the Aeschylus scholium. See *ibid.* 77 n. 30.

Furthermore, how do E and T really support the text that Smith proposes? They may support it in some ways (by having τόν instead of M's τοῦτο, as Smith desires) but do not support it in other ways (by having παρίστησιν in a considerably different position from where Smith wants it).

IV. THE DIRECTION OF DEPENDENCE

Having tried to establish the accurate wording of the shorter form of the scholium, we now turn to a more detailed discussion of the relationship between the shorter form and the longer form to seek to determine which version was more original and which derived.

In his study of the Aeschylean manuscript tradition, Aleksander Turyn maintained that where what appears to be the same scholium exists in a longer and shorter form and M preserves the shorter, the reading of M should be seen as an abbreviation of the longer version.¹⁷ But while this may be correct in regard to the Aeschylean scholia in general, there are significant reasons why it is not the case in this particular instance.

First, if M's version of the scholium were an abbreviation, it would not be simply that; in the process of abbreviating it would have made other changes as well. That is, M not only would have deleted the explanatory clauses of 40b, but also would have changed τόν to τοῦτο and shifted the placement of παρίστησιν. It is not, therefore, entirely accurate to call M's reading merely an abbreviation.

Furthermore, if one were to revert to the supposition that Smith's emended form of the scholium is what the author of the short form actually wrote, the theory that it is an abbreviation of the longer form fares little better. For one thing, if the short form is an abbreviation, it seems strange that in the process of abbreviating, the author of the short form would have added the phrase διὰ τούτου (according to Smith's emended text). It is not that adding a phrase is in itself entirely inconsistent with abbreviating; it would not be inconsistent if the added phrase somehow compensated for the deleted material. But in this case the added phrase ("through this") is so self-evident and unnecessary as to be for practical purposes inconsistent with the process of abbreviation.

Second, the version of the scholium found in ET has earmarks of being an expansion. Recall that ET's version may be easily translated: "Vividly he describes the one having just committed murder (ἠϋθενηκότα), that is, the one slaying (φονεύσαντα); for murderer (αὐθέντης) means slayer (φονευτής)." One would think that if this long form of the scholium were all of one piece, it would not have made its point in such a roundabout way. It would seem strange indeed for the scholiast to have used in his explanation of the word in the play (στάζοντα) a rather rare word (ἠϋθενηκότα), which he then felt compelled to explain further. It would seem more natural to dispense with the form of αὐθεντεῖν and explain στάζοντα directly in terms of φονεύειν. The fact that the scholium does not read that way is indication that a short form

¹⁷ Turyn, *Manuscript Tradition* 14–15.

of the scholium containing ἡθθεντηκότα was expanded, rather than a long form abbreviated.

In fact, antecedently it would seem to be in the nature of scholiastic activity, given the limitations of space and the desire to be concise and to the point, for the scholiast to refrain from being as expansive as would appear to have been the case if the long form of the scholium were seen to have been composed as a whole.

Instead of the long form in 40ab being seen to have been composed as a whole, the long form of the scholium is more easily seen as taking place in two stages. Starting with the short form or something like it, the author of the last part of the scholium was, we might suppose, not able to make sense out of the short form as it stood and so emended it and then added an explanatory portion to clarify the meaning further. That is, not recognizing the rare meaning "initiate" for the rare verb αἰθεντεῖν, the author of the long form adopted a meaning for αἰθεντεῖν based on an etymological interpretation of the verb, made adjustments in the syntax to accommodate this interpretation, and then added an explanation to justify his interpretation.

A comparison of scholium 40a and scholium 42 points to the same conclusion that scholium 40 is an expansion rather than 42 being an abbreviation. That is, it is easier to explain ἐμφαντικῶς παρίστησι τὸν νεωστὶ ἡθθεντηκότα (40) as derived from ἐμφαντικῶς τοῦτο νεωστὶ ἡθθεντηκότα παρίστησιν (42) than to envision the change developing in the opposite direction.

On the one hand, if we assume that the flow is from 40 to 42, the alterations can hardly be fully accidental, since they would involve a seemingly conscious extensive relocation of the word παρίστησιν. Moreover, the whole reputed process of abbreviation indicates a conscious intention to alter, rather than something that took place accidentally. But if the process is a conscious and intentional one, it would be hard to see any motive for changing τὸν (40) to τοῦτο (42). Of course, it is theoretically possible that there is a mixture of influences at work, such that the change in word order is intentional whereas the substitution of one word for another is inadvertent. However, on the whole it seems preferable not to resort to this less likely explanation for the changes.

On the other hand, it can be much more plausibly argued that an original τοῦτο would be simplified to τὸν. This would be especially understandable if the author of the longer form did not completely understand the shorter form, as was suggested above.

While complete certainty on the question of the direction of dependence may be elusive, perhaps enough has been said to substantiate the position that it is at least marginally better to see the dependence flow from the shorter form of the scholium found attached to line 42 to the longer form attached to line 40 rather than the other way around.

V. THE MEANING OF THE SCHOLIUM

If, as has been argued in the two previous sections, the reading of the scholium found in M is the closest we can get to the original form of the

scholium, what is its meaning? As I have suggested, it would seem that the obvious translation would be something like: “vividly he [the poet] describes one having just then initiated this thing.” This translation draws on the recognized meaning for ἀθεντεῖν “to initiate, instigate.” In so doing, it provides an alternative for understanding ἀθεντεῖν in the scholium as meaning “murder.” In fact, given the text of M, the meaning “murder” is ruled out as an option, because it does not make sense to translate “murder this thing.”

It is illustrative to examine in some detail what may be in many ways the closest parallel to the Aeschylus scholium. I am referring to a scholium on part of a line in the *Iliad* (9.694), which is parallel to the Aeschylus scholium in its scholium genre as well as in its use of ἀθεντεῖν. The main point of this Homeric scholium is that the major part of the line in the *Iliad* does not belong in the context in which we now find it, but has been erroneously entered here on the analogy of its use in other generally similar contexts.¹⁸

The line in question reads: “He had spoken to them very strongly.”¹⁹ The scholiast’s point is that this kind of statement was customarily used to introduce or follow a person’s speech when the speech contained something remarkable, but presumably not otherwise. Rightly or wrongly, the scholiast judged it to be inappropriate at this point.

The relevant part of the scholium on *Iliad* 9.694 reads: τότε γὰρ εἴωθεν ἐπιφωνεῖσθαι, ὅταν ὁ ἀθεντῶν τοῦ λόγου καταπληκτικά τινα προενέγκηται. This Baldwin translates as: “For then it was wont to be mentioned when the one originating the writing had set forth something astounding.”²⁰ Here “originating” is substantially the same as “initiating” in my proposed translation of the Aeschylus scholium. In both cases the meaning of ἀθεντεῖν borders on the sense “producing.” But since this meaning (“producing”) for ἀθεντεῖν has not been claimed in the scholarly literature, I hesitate to introduce yet another meaning for the word; in any event, “initiating” (or “originating”) seems close enough for our purposes.

The differences between the Aeschylus scholium and the Homer scholium are not sufficient to destroy the overall sense that they are strikingly parallel in their usage of ἀθεντεῖν. True, the verb takes a genitive object in the Homer scholium and an accusative object in my construal of the Aeschylus scholium. Furthermore, the item produced is in one case the spoken word and in the other a nonverbal act. But these superficial differences should not detract from the similarity in the way the verb ἀθεντεῖν is used. In each case it designates the initiation of an act and perhaps merely the doing of an act.

There is thus no reason why the translation “vividly he describes one having just then initiated this thing” should not be accepted as a proper

¹⁸ In fact, some traditions (Zenodotus, Aristophanes, Aristarchus) do not have the line at the place.

¹⁹ Translation by Richmond Lattimore, *The Iliad of Homer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951) 216. The Greek reads: μάλα γὰρ κρατερῶς ἀγόρευσε.

²⁰ Baldwin, “Difficult Word” 303. I would translate “speech” in place of “writing,” since the reference is to Odysseus’s oration, not to Homer’s composition as such. However, nothing in the main argument is affected, whichever way it is translated.

translation for the oldest form of the Aeschylus scholium we have. It explains the word *στάζοντα* as showing that the act was recently done; it makes sense grammatically; it can be supported lexically, especially by the Homer scholium parallel; it is based on a sound text; it employs a somewhat rare sense of a somewhat rare word, and that becomes the basis for later misunderstanding on the part of the person that tried to make sense out of the scholium by expanding it. Surely it has much to commend it as a legitimate translation.

VI. THE DATE OF THE SCHOLIUM

We have seen that it is likely that the earliest form of scholium accessible to us is that preserved in M. It is further likely that the form we encounter in M is the original form of the scholium: M is the earliest and generally the best manuscript;²¹ its reading is understandable and needs no emendation; and its reading explains the other reading found in ET better than the assumption that the reading of M is derived from that of ET. So the scholium is as early as the tenth century (the date of M).

However, Aeschylus scholars maintain that the manuscripts ET are not derived directly from M but from an earlier common source of both M and ET. This source (ω) is no longer extant, but its existence at one time seems secure because of textual corruptions found in M but not in ET. Thus the earliest form of the scholium can be pushed back to the ninth century, the approximate date assigned for ω .²²

How much earlier than the ninth century the scholium existed is, of course, impossible to say. However, it may be very old, as is implied by the statement, "The extant scholia (or, rather, sets of scholia) on Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes are all indebted ultimately to Didymus; but in every instance there are probably several intermediate stages between him and them."²³ Ultimately, there is no way of knowing, but it is possible that this employment of *ἀθροεῖν* in the sense "initiate" goes back to the first century.

In contrast to this state of affairs regarding the M reading, the manuscripts in which the ET reading is found are associated with the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and are in one way or another influenced by the work of Demetrius Triclinius. T was written by Demetrius himself and, according to Turyn, E is a copy of an earlier (lost) edition of Demetrius's work on Aeschylus. The scholia in these manuscripts are treated as "old" rather than designated "ours," that is, scholia originating from the late Byzantine period. These Triclinian editions of Aeschylus are claimed by Demetrius to be based in part on an "old" manuscript, but what this term "old" refers to

²¹ In his Praefatio to the edition of the Aeschylus scholia, Smith describes M as easily holding first place among the manuscripts of Aeschylus.

²² Turyn, *Manuscript Tradition* 14.

²³ James Frederick Mountford, "Scholia," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. M. Cary et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949) 814.

appears to be a manuscript of the thirteenth century (ψ , now lost).²⁴ Thus the longer form of the scholium cannot be dated with confidence earlier than that.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Our investigation has called into question the existence of the meaning "murder" for ἀθεντεῖν in the ninth century. According to our reconstruction of the Aeschylean scholia transmission, there still remains one place (the longer scholium) where ἀθεντεῖν unequivocally means "murder." Yet even this undisputed example remains under a cloud of suspicion.

First of all, it is so late (probably not earlier than the thirteenth century) as to be almost worthless in giving support to what might have been meant by ἀθεντεῖν in a first century document (1 Timothy).

In the second place, if our estimate of the dependence of the longer form of the scholium on the shorter form is correct, the meaning "murder" for ἀθεντεῖν in the longer form is based on misunderstanding. As we have argued, the author of the longer form did not understand the meaning of the somewhat rare word ἀθεντεῖν and so created what was to him a plausible meaning through the process of etymologizing. The author's etymologizing attempt at definition is what is expressed in the clauses added to the shorter form. That is to say, the meaning "murder" for ἀθεντεῖν is not attested in any living, natural Greek used in ordinary discourse, but only in the ingenuity of an etymologizing hypothesis on the part of some comparatively late Byzantine scholar.

But once again we must stress that this conclusion is only a small part of a much larger picture. It merely removes one instance, albeit the only instance, in which it is claimed that ἀθεντεῖν bears the meaning "murder." This conclusion perhaps makes it more difficult for egalitarian interpreters to sustain their case as to the meaning of this verb, though it does not in itself render that view completely untenable. The egalitarian case rests on more than this one item—or any other single item, for that matter. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to have clarified an area of investigation that has not had the attention it deserves.

²⁴ Turyn, *Manuscript Tradition* 107, 112–13.