

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE BYZANTINE GRAMMARIANS OF THE
PALAEOLOGIAN ERA. I. DEMETRIUS TRICLINIUS' EARLY WORK ON THE EURI-
PIDEAN TRIAD. (GAMLE KONGELIGE SAMLING 3549,8⁰ AND RYLANDS HEBREW
1689.)

Bjarne Schartau.

In his monumental book on the medieval tradition of the plays of Euripides professor Alexander Turyn has tentatively identified the Copenhagen MS Gamle Kongelige Samling 3549,8⁰, containing the Euripidean Triad, as a product of the young Triclinius, probably written about A.D. 1305; this would make the Copenhagen MS our earliest preserved testimony to Triclinius' work on the Triad¹. In his review of Turyn's book J. Irigoin rejected this identification². Later on, professor Günther Zuntz has also expressed his doubts as to the plausibility of Turyn's identification³. In my unpublished M.A.-thesis from 1967 I have tried to test Turyn's identification, mainly on palaeographical and codicological criteria, but I have obtained no definite result⁴.

1. A. Turyn: The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides (Urbana, Illinois Univ. Press 1957), in the following quoted as Turyn: B.M.T. For GKS 3549 see in particular pp. 180-81, where it is grouped among MSS of the second Thoman recension.

2. Revue de Philologie 3 serie XXXII fasc. 1958 pp. 320-23. Among other arguments Irigoin uses the arbitrary watermark criterium, dear to the Dain-school.

3. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. 49, no. 2, Spring 1967 p. 516 note 3. - This publication supersedes the same author's short announcement in Latinitas, October 1966 pp. 284-88. In the following quoted as (Zuntz): Bul. Ryl. 1967 and (Zuntz): Latinitas, Oct. 1966.

4. The title was (translated from the Danish) "A Codicological Analysis of the Euripides MS GKS 3549 with particular regard to the Number of 'Hands' Including a Critical Estimation of Alexander Turyn's Identification of the MS as a Work of Demetrius Triclinius." English synopsis in Museeum Tusculanum nr. 1, Copenhagen November 1967 and Danish in Extracta nr. 1 (Akademisk Forlag, Copenhagen 1968). I wish to thank my friend and former teacher dr. phil. Jørgen Raasted for his kind encouragement and for many pieces of good advice. My English has been revised by my wife, stud.mag. Anne Schartau; needless to say that I alone take the responsibility for any inadequacies and shortcomings.

In his publication of the MS Rylands Hebrew 1689, - a fragment of an Euripides MS containing some 300 verses of the Orestes⁵ - professor Zuntz has demonstrated that Ryl, directly or indirectly, represents a preliminary stage in the working process which ends with the Roman Angelicus 14⁶.

In the present article I shall attempt a new approach towards an understanding of the Copenhagen Euripides. My starting point will be Turyn's analysis of the working process in Angelicus 14⁷ and Zuntz' corresponding remarks on the Rylands fragment⁸. My question is: what can a similar investigation tell about GkS 3549 and will it tell anything about the relationship between this MS (on the hypothesis that it was written by Triclinius in his youth) and the Rylands fragment (considered a preliminary stage towards the Triclinean edition in Angelicus 14)?

In this article I shall try to demonstrate that the Rylands MS (Ryl) cannot be derived from the Copenhagen MS (GkS) neither directly nor indirectly. Other problems connected with the Copenhagen MS will be separately treated in a series of articles which I plan to write on the subject.

First I give my statistics from the collation of the poetical text as found in the two MSS, and a brief comment on some of the readings. The collation itself is printed below, APPENDIX I. My calculations yield the following statistics (with allowance for the definition of a few cases as respectively 'cases of agreement' or 'cases of possible or approximate agreement'):

Or. 13-156 and 206-374:

75 cases of agreement

9 cases of possible agreement

45 cases of disagreement

45 cases of disagreement versus 84 cases of certain or possible agreement at first seem to suggest quite an intimate relationship between Ryl and GkS. But once we consider the trite character of the majority of cases where the two MSS agree, the statistics become less impressive. In fact, at least 6 of these cases show

5. See note 3.

6. Bul. Ryl. 1967, in particular pp. 515-16.

7. Turyn: B.M.T. pp. 31 f.

8. Bul. Ryl. 1967 pp. 515-16 and passim.

agreement between all MSS against modern conjectures or corrections which have been adopted in the OCT edition⁹; 13 cases exhibit agreement with the OCT with no comment in the apparatus; and as to the remaining cases of agreement, these, too, seem to be devoid of interest for the present investigation. The cases of disagreement are far more interesting. In commenting some of them I shall treat these selected readings in the traditional order of veteres, Moschopoulos, Thomas, Triclinius.

The first reading we select for a brief comment is v. 61 συμφορὰς for συμφορὰν¹⁰. Here Ryl has the plural, which both Turyn and Zuntz show to be the original reading against the singular of all the old MSS and many recent: among these GkS 3549. The plural occurs in Pap. Ox. 1616 of the fifth century A.D. and cod. Salamanca 31 of A.D. 1326 roughly contemporary of our MSS. The plural was accepted by Moschopoulos¹¹. This reading is not mentioned by Murray in the OCT.

Neither Ryl nor GkS have the spurious verse, which many 'recentiores' (i.e. late descendants of the 'old' tradition) add after Or. 108¹².

As to Moschopoulos 8 of the readings characteristic of his work come in for consideration¹³; vv. 69¹⁴, 116, 228, 286, 326, 327, 345¹⁵, 373. In seven of these, our two MSS go together against the Moschopouleian conjectures, even in v. 373 where Moschopoulos correctly conjectured ἀλιτύπων for ἀλιτύπων. In v. 286 GkS reads ἐπάραις εἰς ἔργον, the Thoman modification of the Moschopouleian interpolation ἐπάραις ἔργον ἐς, whereas Ryl has ἐπάραις ἔργον.

9. Euripides, *Fabulae* ed. G. Murray (Oxford Classical Texts), vol. III

10. Turyn: B.M.T. p. 109. Zuntz: *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge U.P. 1965) p. 155. Zuntz: *Latinitas* Oct. 1966 p. 286 and *Bul. Ryl.* 1967 p. 506.

11. "It must have been in the early Byzantine archetype, at least as a variant; its corruption was easily caused by the preceding singularis ἀδεληνύ". Zuntz: *Bul. Ryl.* 1967 p. 506.

12. For the text of this interpolation vid. Turyn: B.M.T. p. 321 and *ibid.* p. 308 for the place of the recentiores in the stemma.

13. *ibid.* p. 109.

14. The reading of GkS (see my appendix I ad loc.) seems to be a mere slip.

15. Here GkS adds the variant ων s.l. in ἄλλον. I have not been able to account for this variant.

Evidently neither MS is Moschopouleian in the examples quoted.

For Thomas we use the 8 readings characteristic of his text¹⁶ vv. 42, 47, 97, 142, 282, 286, 289, 326. Our MSS seem to agree on 6 of the readings i.e. against the Thoman 'slips' in spite of the fact that GkS is a Thoman MS. In v. 42 and v. 286 (as we have already seen) GkS has the Thoman readings. As Ryl opposes all 8 it is obviously not Thoman in character. But how about "the two or three instances which could seem to militate against the conclusion that Ryl is unrelated to this variety (the Thoman) of the Byzantine text ..."?¹⁷

The spurious καί after ἄγε or ἄγε in v. 81 is neither in Ryl nor in GkS. It is absent from the Moschopouleian MSS and from the MS representing the first Thoman recension¹⁸. It is absent from VLP and O (Laur. 31.10) a carrier of the 'older' tradition. Finally the καί is also omitted in Angelicus 14, Triclinius' working copy¹⁹. The reading in v. 35 οὐδέ for the correct ὅδε is practically confined to Thoman MSS²⁰. The Thoman GkS has ὅδε. Ryl shares οὐδέ with Angelicus 14 (here Triclinius let it stand in his originally Thoman MS). It was introduced into L (Laur. 32.2) in rasura²¹. This reading need not detain us further here. As to its occurrence in Ryl I refer the reader to professor Zuntz' explanation²².

This brings us to Demetrius Triclinius. According to Zuntz "Triclinian features stand out markedly in Ryl"²³. He lists 7 Triclinian conjectures (all of them due to metrical considerations): Vv. 143, 258, 328, 332, 335, 337, 349 (see my Appendix I

16. Turyn: B.M.T. pp. 172-73.

17. Zuntz: Bul. Ryl. 1967 pp. 507-8.

18. According to Turyn: B.M.T. p. 180, Cambridge Nn.3.14.

19. "The obvious conclusion seems to be that this true reading was transmitted, from of old, by some other MSS and thus reached Thomas and Triclinius and Ryl, while most of the surviving carriers of the 'old' tradition were infected with the interpolation." Zuntz: Bul Ryl. 1967 p. 508.

20. Turyn: B.M.T. p. 49 and p. 172.

21. Zuntz: "Inquiry ..." p. 127, n.1. Bul. Ryl. 1967 p. 508.

22. *ibid.*

23. *ibid.* p. 509.

ad loc.) plus an "additional instance" v. 303, where the Triclinian $\chi\rho\omicron\delta\sigma$ (the original reading of Ryl) was 'improved' by the corrector into the dative, which is also in GkS. None of these Triclinian readings are shared by GkS 3549.

Some Triclinian readings of the very same kind as those quoted above do not appear in Ryl. Our MSS agree in vv. 153, 261, 331 against the Triclinian readings²⁴. In v. 335 Ryl has (post correcturam) the Triclinian δ made out of the non-Triclinian δ . The Copenhagen MS reads δ . Zuntz adds a "minor difference"²⁵ v. 147 $\delta\pi\delta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\nu$ Ryl. Following Thomas Triclinius here has the correct $\delta\pi\delta\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\nu$ which is also in GkS.

Summing up: The absence in GkS 3549 of any of the Triclinian readings found in Ryl precludes a direct relationship between our two MSS. Furthermore none of the cases of agreement seems to be significant. Neither MS shows markedly Moschopouleian features, but as regards Thomas - although some of the Thoman 'slips' mentioned by Zuntz (vid. supra) do not appear in GkS - the Copenhagen MS is indisputably a Thoman MS which Ryl is not. Cod. Angelicus 14 contains per definitionem all Triclinian readings. Ryl has some of these (one post correcturam). The date of Ryl excludes the possibility of its actually being an ancestor of Angelicus 14, but as professor Zuntz has shown, it must descend from a MS in which Triclinius was working on the Triad before he took up the originally Thoman Angelicus 14 and reshaped it into his final edition of the Triad. (Hence the presence of some and absence of other Tricliniana in Ryl.) GkS has no Tricliniana in the relevant section (for the one or two possible Tricliniana found in another section of the MS vid. infra in my conclusive remarks), but if it was really written by Triclinius already about A.D. 1305, this is not at all surprising. At that early age he would not yet have become the mature Triclinius, the Triclinius Metricus. As to the textual basis we must bear in mind that the Triclinian edition need not have had the same basis in all its various stages. Triclinius may have started with a Thoman text (perhaps the Copen-

24. For an explanation of this vid. Zuntz: Bul. Ryl. 1967, concluding section pp. 516-17.

25. ibid. p. 510 n. 4. Turyn: B.M.T. p. 172.

hagen MS) which he eventually discarded in favour of another recension to return to a Thoman text (Angelicus 14 T^z Turyn) as basis for his final edition (Angelicus 14 T^t Turyn). As to Triclinius' earliest activities on the Euripidean Triad we may thus conclude that the evidence of GkS is negative at least in respect to the poetical text. If written by Triclinius, our MS shows that at the time Triclinius had not yet begun to take an active interest in textual criticism. Concerning possible indications of Triclinian activity in the division of cola, hardly anything can be gathered from the present comparison²⁶. In v. 142 GkS has one line (with the majority of the MSS, it seems) while Ryl divides after ἐκέλευε. In v. 147 Ryl agrees with P and Angelicus 14 against BM in putting ἴδ'...σοδν on one line. GkS is in agreement with BM (and, in fact with the majority of the MSS?).

We then turn to the explanatory matter - argumenta, scholia, glosses. Whether or not that MS of which nothing survives but the deplorably few Rylands Folia originally contained more ὑποθέσεις than the Thoman Argumentum IV²⁷, we shall never know. Taking other MSS into our consideration, we find nothing improbable in the idea that there were several argumenta in the MS. GkS has Dindorf's argumentum I and II plus a pedigree of Orestes accompanied by rhetorical and/or grammatical diagrams. Ryl has no pedigree etc.²⁸ Scholia and glosses of Ryl are ... "not those which the older MSS exhibit, but again²⁹ products of Palaeologian scholarship. Nearly

26. Zuntz: *Bul. Ryl.* 1967 p. 515 n. 2 shows that virtually nothing can be gathered from a collation of Ryl with facsimilies of B and M and P and (through Turyn) with Angelicus 14 as regards Triclinean collometry in the section of the play contained in Ryl.

27. Dindorf: *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis Tragoedias ex codicibus aucta et emendata edidit Gulielmus Dindorf vols. I-IV (Oxonii 1863 vol. 1 pp. XV-XX, description of Gudianus 15, from which Dindorf edited Arg. IV.*

28. Such diagrams seem to be part of the apparatus philologicus of the era. Pedigrees and diagrams in GkS 3549 fol. 49^v. For other examples (highly varied in content) see e.g. Upsal. Gr 15 fol. 45^r (pedigree and grammatica) - Brit. Mus. Arundel 522 fol. 104^r (pedigree) - Cambridge Nn.3.14 fol. 154^r (pedigree) - Cambridge Mm.1.11 fol. 30^r (pedigree). As examples of MSS where these ancillae do not occur I refer to e.g. Vat. Ottobon. Gr 346 - Vat. Gr 908 - Vat. Gr 2376 - Brit. Mus. ADD. 10057 - Brit. Mus. Ar. 540.

29. i.e. like the argumentum of Ryl, which - as we have seen - is substantially the argumentum IV of Dindorf's edition.

all of them recur almost ad verbum, among those which Dindorf (after Matthiae) edited from the cod. Gudianus and from the compilation published by Arsenius in 1534."³⁰ The marginal scholia can be summarily dismissed. GkS has none in this section of the Orestes and no collation is possible. As to the glosses, Zuntz states that many of those in Ryl have no counterpart in Dindorf's edition. The same goes for GkS. Dindorf's edition is selective and leaves out many of the most trite examples. To illustrate this class of glosses Zuntz quotes a few of which αὐτόν for νιν (vv. 36 and 119 but cf. v. 289 in my Appendix II) is missing in GkS as is also σφ' (v. 29) while ἐλθοῦσα for βᾶσα in v. 301 is superseded by another gloss (Appendix II ad loc.). Another group of glosses in Ryl is constituted by single glosses recurring in a longer context in Dindorf's edition. Zuntz' example does not occur in GkS. (v. 42 gl. ἱματίων for χλανιδίων: Dindorf vol. II p.47.10 where the gloss is quoted as part of the longer Gu explanation.)

Let us collate the GkS 3549 material with the few selected examples quoted explicitly by Zuntz from Ryl 1689.

Or. 25 ἀπεύρω: κυκλοτερεῖ Gr (cf. Dindorf II p. 39.19)

This is also the reading of GkS.

Or. 25 περιβαλοῦσα: περικαλύψασα Gu (part of the longer explanation, Dindorf 41.24-25)

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 26 οὐ γάρ.....μεμνησθαι Gu (cf. Dindorf p. 42.8-9)

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 27 ἀσαφές: ἄδηλον Gr (Dindorf p. 42.9 and cf. ibid. p. 21-22)

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 30 εὐκλειαν: τιμὴν δόξανGu (Dindorf p. 43.29)

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 30 ibid. καλὴν φήμην Gr (Dindorf p. 43.29)

This is also the reading of GkS.

Or. 32 ἐκοινώνησα.....γυνή Fl. 6...59 (Dindorf p. 44.18)

If I read GKS correctly, this reading is found also there, with two slight variations: ἐκοινωνήθησ and the ἄν following μετὰσχοι instead of preceding it.

30. Bul. Ryl. 1967 pp. 511 ff.

Or. 46 ἔδοξα: ἐκυρώθη Gr (Dindorf p. 49.4 cf. *ibid.* p. 47.25)

This is also the reading of GkS.

Or. 46 Ἀργεῖ: ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦ Ἀργεῖοιο

This is also the reading of GkS although the words ἀντὶ τοῦ are omitted.

Or. 46 στέγαισ: οἴκοισ Flor. 59 (part of the longer explanation Dindorf pp. 48-49.1)

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 47 πυρί: ἐν θυσίαισ (cf. Fl. 59, Dindorf p. 49.2)

No gloss in GkS.

As noticed by Zuntz all glossation in the vv. 46-47 in the Ryl ultimately comes from the paraphrasis (Planudes) (Dindorf pp. 47.25-48.18 sigl. I.)

Or. 47 προσφωνεῖν: χαίρειν Gr (Dindorf p. 49.5)

This is also the reading of GkS.

Or. 47 *ibid.* προσλαλεῖν Gu Fl.6.....76 (Dindorf p. 49.2-3,5)

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 91 ἀκέρηκ' ἐν κακοῖσ: ἀπηγόρευσα Gu

No gloss in GkS.

Or. 91 *ibid.* ἐν ταῖσ δυστυχίαισ Gr (Dindorf p. 57.21-22)

This is also the reading of GkS.

Of the above 15 readings in Ryl, 7 are shared by GkS. It is a remarkable fact that 5 out of these are "agreement on Gr", while none of the Gu glosses appears in GkS (cf. *infra* my statistics from the Appendix II). Not in a single of the above cases does GkS exhibit a glossation different from that of Ryl; the Copenhagen MS is either in agreement with Ryl or it has no glosses at all. Concerning the absence of Gu in GkS it should be borne in mind that the Angelicus 14 ante Triclinium (T²) had very few Gu glosses. Gu material was added to the MS by Triclinius as part of his apparatus philologicus to his final edition of the Triad.

As we have seen, the poetical text of Ryl is to be derived from a MS in which Triclinius was working on the Triad prior to his final edition in Angelicus 14. Similarly, the glossation of the Rylands MS shows him at work, introducing a certain amount of that Gu material which he later on made use of in his final edition. Consequently it is not surprising that GkS exhibits so little Gu - nothing in the above section and in my selection Appendix II, and

even in the other sections of the Triad less Gu than Gr. On the contrary it would have been surprising if it had contained many Gu glosses (on the hypothesis that it was really written by the young Triclinius about A.D. 1305).

To put the glossation of our MSS more in relief I adduce glosses to Orestes 255-302 from Ryl and GkS and from the following MSS, all textually belonging to Turyn's Thoman group³¹: Cambridge Nn. Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 (only partially Thoman) - Vat.Gr.51, for the section Or. 255-74 only (the folia comprising the following section are lost, fol. 39^r takes up anew at verse 368) - Vat. Gr.908 - and occasionally Vat.Gr.2376. Of these the two Cambridge MSS are almost identical as regards scholia and glosses which are predominantly Thoman (Gu Dindorf). Vat.Gr. 51 is also predominantly Gu in scholia and glosses. Vat.Gr. 908, while sharing a few of the readings of these three MSS, mostly lives a life of its own. So does Vat.Gr. 2376, to an even larger extent, being but sparsely glossated and following, as it seems, a different tradition for its few glosses. (Unless quoted explicitly a MS does not share the reading in question. But I have occasionally quoted the deviating reading from one or other of the MSS for the sake of comparison.) It will be seen that Ryl shares the readings of the two Cambridge MSS (mainly Gu) to a higher degree than GkS does. This will not surprise us when we consider the above remarks about the Copenhagen MS and Angelicus 14.

I wish to point out that my collations of Ryl and GkS were not made from the original MSS but from professor Zuntz' photographs of Ryl³² and my own microfilm of GkS³³. As professor Zuntz has not published his transcript of any of the Ryl glosses quoted in my selection, I alone am responsible for misreading any of them. The collation will be found as my Appendix II.

31. Turyn: B.M.T. pp. 165-187.

32. I wish to thank professor Zuntz for lending me the photographs.

33. I have used microfilms also of the other MSS quoted in the collation.

The sigla used are those employed by Dindorf:

Gr = part of the explanatory matter attributed to Manuel Moschopoulos.

Gu = part of the explanatory matter attributed to Thomas Magister. (The sigla denotes various hands in the cod. Guelferbytanus (Gudianus 15) a paper MS of the XIV century³⁴.

F1 followed by ciphers denotes various Florentine MSS grouped together by Dindorf³⁵.

I. = The edition of the scholia to the first seven plays of Euripides prepared by Arsenius Apostolis and printed in Venice in 1534³⁶.

Other sigla occurring in a few places are:

A = Vat. Gr. 909 (Murray sigl. V)

B = Parisinus 2713

C = Monacensis 560

M = Marcianus 471

Bar. = Oxford Barocci 74

Provided that my calculations are correct (and I cannot guarantee that they are) the selection yields 35 cases of agreement (with allowance for 3 cases of 'approximate agreement', which for the sake of convenience have been considered full agreement³⁷.)

34. The Dindorfian distinction Gr (Moschopouleian material) Gu (Thoman material) is predominantly correct but should be taken cum grano salis. See Turyn: B.M.T. p. 63 ff. for a clear exposition of the real state of this material in Gudianus 15. cf. further ibid. p. 164, bottom.

35. cf. Zuntz: Bul. Ryl. 1967 p. 513. The Florentine parallels often confirm Moschopouleian origin. cf. further Turyn: B.M.T. p. 65 and p. 128.

36. The Arsenian 'paraphrases' often represent Planudean activity. cf. Dindorf's preface pp. XXI-XXIII. For Arsenius Apostolis vid. D. J. Geanakoplos: Greek Scholars in Venice pp. 167-200. For this edition ibid. p. 184 note 65 and in particular pp. 197-98. cf. Turyn: B.M.T. pp. 19, 66 ff, 158.

37. The reader may have a look at the collation (my Appendix II) and judge for himself, whether or not he will consider all my cases of 'approximate agreement' worthy of being reckoned among the cases of agreement. A few trite alterations in this respect will not change my overall picture of the nature of the glossation in this section.

These 35 cases of agreement can be tabulated thus:

Gu	0
Gr	9
Fl	4
"part of the I.-explanation"	16
other sigla from Dindorf	B.M. 1
	A.B.C.M. 1
glosses <u>not</u> quoted by Dindorf	8 (with allowance for 2 cases of 'approximate agreement')

As to the cases of non-agreement we get the following statistics:

	Ryl 1689	GkS 3549
Gu	ca. 18 (including a few cases of 'approximately Gu')	0
Gr	4	8
Fl	2	2
"part of the I.-explanation"	ca. 18 (including a few cases of 'approximately I.' If we include another few cases of 'probably I.' the total will be 22)	9
other sigla from Dindorf	5	2
glosses not quoted by Dindorf	16	9

I have had to leave out 6 cases in Ryl as 'non-liquet'.

As will be seen the cases of agreement on glosses that are "part of the I.- explanation" are the most numerous. Next comes agreement on Gr while there are no cases of agreement on Gu. We find only 2 cases of agreement on glosses quoted by Dindorf with other sigla, (one case with B.M., one with A.B.C.M.). Cases of agreement on glosses not quoted by Dindorf are 8. This is not very surprising. They seem to belong to that category of glosses which Dindorf excluded from his edition. We thus find that our MSS predominantly contain Gr, Gu (only Ryl), Fl, and I. glosses.

The figures of the second part of the above statistics - i.e. the cases where our two MSS do not agree as to their glossation - are interesting, since they clearly show that Ryl is provided with far more glosses than GkS (approximately 30 against more than 60 in Ryl). For the highly interesting fact that no Gu glosses appear in this section of GkS I refer the reader to my remarks above concerning the collation of the glosses quoted explicitly by Zuntz.

We know that Triclinius even in his mature period took over practically all non-metrical scholia (and most glosses) from his predecessors and concentrated his efforts on metricala. Ryl outside the poetical text seems devoid of Tricliniana and as regards the "very few sporadic remarks by Triclinius himself" which professor Turyn claims to have detected in GkS³⁸ I must admit that I for one have not been able to find them. Anyhow they cannot be metricala in the Triclinian sense³⁹.

It must, however, be borne in mind that the combination of predominantly Moschopoulean and Thoman glosses and scholia is a characteristic feature of the Triclinian editions⁴⁰.

From our collation of glosses we have seen that of our two MSS Ryl is the most Triclinian in this respect, in so far as only Gr and no Gu are found in GkS to the relevant section. However, collation of the glossation in other parts of GkS has yielded a fair amount of Gu glosses⁴¹. But the general impression remains: while Ryl (cf. also the collation with the Cambridge MSS and the 3 Vaticanani) exhibits the Moschopouleio-Thoman glossation, the Copenhagen MS seems to be predominantly Moschopoulean in glosses. Considering professor Turyn's remarks about the scholia and glosses in Angelicus 14 ante Triclinium⁴² we would not be surprised if Triclinius' first MS of the Triad did not contain many Gu glosses. Therefore, while the collation of the glosses (as well as the collation of the poetical text) seems to preclude a direct relationship between

38. Turyn' B.M.T. p. 181.

39. For Triclinius metrical prolegomena vid. Zuntz: "Inquiry..." p. 27 ff. and Turyn op. cit. p. 37 ff.

40. ... glossae partim Moschopuli partim Thomae (Gr et Gu Dindorf) quam commentariorum conjunctionem Tricliniarum editionum insigne esse nemo nescit ... Zuntz: Latinitas, Oct. 1966 p. 288. cf. Bul. Ryl. 1967 p. 514.

41. Within the present section Orestes vv. 13-374 I have come across at least two Gu glosses. I have examined the glossation to the entire Phoenissae in GkS and I have found the amount of Gr to be about 47 against 37 Gu glosses.

Dr. Raasted has drawn my attention to a curious detail which may deserve a more thorough investigation: On some folios, different colours of ink seem to coincide with the distinction into Gu and Gr glosses. Thus, on fol. 41r practically speaking all grey glosses are Moschopoulean, whereas the three red ones are not; these red glosses are written in the original rubrication ink and evidently belong to the MS as originally planned. Fol. 41r, which contains Hecuba 1082-1098, is reproduced below, p. 35.

42. Turyn: B.M.T. p. 31 f.

GkS and Ryl, the overall picture of the glossation in GkS might be taken in support of Turyn's suggested identification.

Addendum: Doric alphas glossated with attic ētas in GkS and Ryl.

Under normal circumstances only lyrical passages will exhibit this type of glosses (if these single letters are worthy of that name). Ryl comprises two lyrical passages of the Orestes:

- 1) a fragment of the parodus i.e. vv. 140-156 (fol. 12^V = 7^V of Zuntz' rearrangement) and vv. 206-7 (fol. 15^r = 8^r of Zuntz' rearrangement).
- 2) first stasimon vv. 316-47 (fol. 10^V-11^V = 12^V-13^V of Zuntz' rearrangement).

Fol. 7^V is for the most part hardly legible while fol. 13^V is the most illegible of all the folia of Ryl. Consequently I cannot guarantee that one ēta or two may not have escaped my eyes. In GkS the parodus is found on foll. 54^V - 56^V while first stasimon is on foll. 60^r - 61^r. The collation will be found as my Appendix III.

From this collation we clearly see that if such 'miniglosses' (a term suggested by dr. Raasted) are an established part of some edition, Ryl and GkS do not represent the same edition. Their employment of the 'miniglosses' is too different.

GkS, however, is highly inconsistent within itself (all doric alphas in the entire parodus vv. 140-207 are glossated with ētas except one, while there is only one out of seven in the first stasimon which has the ēta) and so is Ryl (4 out of 7 alphas glossated in the latter section against only one out of 6 in the former). Consequently the present collation will probably tell more about the arbitrary nature of the most primitive part of the 'aids to the reader' in the MSS of the palaeologian Renaissance than about the relationship between our two MSS. (The question of the true nature of these 'miniglosses' will of course be clarified only after the investigation of a far more extensive material.)

In the light of the evidence of the preceding investigation, let us now return to the question of the relationship between GkS and Ryl, raised at the beginning of the present article. We have seen that as regards the poetical text, nothing Triclinian can be gathered from GkS in the section investigated. Consequently a collation of the Copenhagen MS with Ryl will be of no use in deciding

the 'Triclinianity' of the former. If the two corrections Phoen. vv. 1357 and 1359 are in fact by Triclinius⁴³, the presence of just one or two Triclinian corrections/conjectures in the entire Copenhagen MS against 7 or 8 in Ryl, which comprises less than a fifth of the Orestes, should be taken as a proof among others that GkS is older than the Triclinian MS from which Ryl descends.

In his final analysis of the Rylands MS Zuntz (Bul. Ryl. 1967, pp. 515-16) assumes that Triclinius changed his textual basis while working on the Triad; Angelicus 14 was, in its primitive form, a Thoman MS, whereas Ryl (and its ancestor) had no specific Thoman readings. Provided that Turyn is right in identifying GkS as a product of the young Triclinius, we are led to the conclusion that Triclinius changed his textual basis several times; for GkS, too, belongs to the Thoman MSS (cf. above p. 5, bottom).

6 out of 8 Triclinian readings in Ryl are original readings, not corrections made by the scribe himself or a later corrector. Of the remaining two, the one in v. 303 was (as we have seen) altered by a later corrector into a non-Triclinian reading while in v. 335 the originally non-Triclinian reading was made into a Triclinian by a corrector. The two instances in GkS (vid. supra) are corrections made in the MS itself by means of erasure. They may have been entered at a later collation with another MS, but they may as well have been made 'on the spot' as a conjecture introduced by the scribe himself; the latter explanation - which is Turyn's - is not contradicted by palaeographical observations. Corrections for metrical reasons, made in a MS which on palaeographical criteria must be dated not much later than the first quarter of the XIV century⁴⁴, can hardly have been made by any other scholar than the future Triclinius Metricus. Although this evidence is not conclusive in deciding the Triclinian nature of GkS, it is a strong case in favour of Turyn's identification - provided that there were no other true Metrici before Triclinius.

43. Turyn: B.M.T. p. 181.

44. This I have tried to demonstrate in chapter 4 of my unpublished M.A.-thesis. Some of the criteria employed there were my own. For other criteria see W.J.W. Koster: *Autour d'un Manuscrit d'Aristophane Ecrit par Demetrius Triclinius*. Groningen/Djakarta 1957. In the same chapter I have criticized Koster's criteria in some detail.

As for the 'aids to the reader' (argumenta, scholia, glosses) we have seen that neither MS contains metrical prolegomena or scholia and that they are incomparable as to the argumenta: The Copenhagen MS does not exhibit the Thoman hypothesis (Dindorf.Arg. IV); on the other hand Ryl may have contained the argumenta I and II (Dindorf) found in GkS, but as the folia, on which they may have been, are lost no evidence can, of course, be gathered from this material.

In evaluating the total lack of scholia in the relevant part of GkS, we must not forget the inequalities of this MS. In some parts the scholia and glosses are abounding, in other parts there are no scholia but a fair amount of glosses, and in the last play of the Triad (Phoenissae) the scholia, which are at first crowded, stop abruptly while the glosses are in gradual decline till scarcely one or two are found to a page. It is in fact this unevenness of lay-out that constitutes the real interest of the Copenhagen MS. We have noticed that the amount of glosses (identifiable as well as unidentifiable) in Ryl is higher than in GkS. This in connection with the scholia found in Ryl leaves us the impression of the more finished state of Ryl. We have here another argument in favour of placing GkS earlier than the Triclinian ancestor of Ryl, to be combined with the exceedingly few Triclinian corrections or conjectures which are to be found in GkS (cf. above, p.14), and with the interpretation of the palaeographical data which I have elaborated in my M.A.-thesis, following in more details the ideas of professor Turyn. Again and again the Copenhagen MS appears to be the more primitive and immature of the two.

This brings us back to Turyn's identification of GkS as a product of the young Triclinius, written for his private use. Are we to see in the uneven, inharmonious lay-out of the Copenhagen MS a reflection of Triclinius discarding his MS in favour of another textual basis before he had filled in all those 'aids to the reader' with which he wanted to provide his copy of the Euripidean Triad? Or does the unfinished state of GkS simply indicate that there was a break in Triclinius' work on the Triad, after which he - for reasons unknown - never returned to the incomplete product of his youth? These questions I intend to take up at some

later occasion. In the present article my sole concern has been to show that the Manchester fragment cannot be deduced neither directly nor indirectly from the Copenhagen MS. And that conversely Ryl is of no help in deciding the question of the 'Triclinianity' of GkS 3549.

APPENDIX I.

a) Or. 13-156 (The left column is from Zuntz Bul. Ryl. 1967 pp.501-4.
'text' means Murray OCT¹)

Ryl 1689

GKS 3549

(13-14 legi nequeunt praeter

14 θεσθ

(15 δ' οὖν νιν vid.)

(18 text)

20 μενέλεωσ

24 ὄρησιν τ'

26 (ἐκτείνεν)

παρθένον: -θενω suprascr.man.2

(30 de φέρων: -ον non constat)

(31 ἀπειθήσας)

34 νόσῳ νοσεῖ

35 οὐδε (pro ὅδε)

(42 χλανιδίων)

45 ἀπό

(47 μήτε)

51 θήξαντας

53 εἰς

(54 ναυπλίου)

56 ἄλλαισι

(59 εἰς (quod non amplius notatur)

πέτρων ἔλθῃ

60 ἔστι δ'

61 συμφορὰς τε

(67 εἴσοδον)

(69 οὐχούμεθ')

(71 κάγαμέμν)

74 ἔφθ (pro ἔχει)

75 προσφθέγμασι γάρ

77 κλυταίμν. (sic semper)

79 ὅπως δ'

(81 ἄγε παροῦσ')

82 ἐν συμφοαῖσι (ορατο suprascr.man.rec.)

γόνον (pro δόμον)

(86 συ δ' εἶ)

(87 ἦκετον)

88 δε δεινλοῖσ (...ὅδε)

91 ἀπερρηκέν

(93 ὥς)

(94 κασιγνήτης)

(96 ἐμῆς)

97 φέλον (cum glossa φιλούμενον cf.

p. 59.26 Dindorf sigl. I.) στελεχειν

(100 ὁρθῶς ...δε μοι)

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

παρθένον sic! ipse
librarius corr.

φέρων

ἀπειθήσας

same reading

ὅδε

χλανιδίων

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

ναυπλίου

same reading

πέτρων ἔξει γρ ἔλθῃ
supra lineam

same reading

συμφορὰς τε

same reading

οὐχούμεθ'

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

συμφοαῖς

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading

same reading includ-
ing glossa

same reading

1. Zuntz op.cit. pp. 500-01

"In view of the damaged state of Ryl, its agreement with Murray's text (quoted "text") is stated explicitly, in brackets, for passages where Murray, Wecklein or Turyn quote variants of some relevance. If, in passages of this kind, Ryl is illegible, this, too is stated: "vid." means that the reading is uncertain but probable."

(273 εἰσακούσεται)
 279 γαλήν' (cum glossa γαληνᾶ)
 (280 κλαίεις
 (281 σε vid.)
 (282 "text")
 (286 ἐπάρας ἔργον ἄνοσ.)
 287 εὐφρανε
 289 κτεῖναι με χρή
 290 ἐκτεῖναι
 (291 μήποτε)
 292 ἔμελλε (? ex ἡμ-)
 293 ἐγὼ δ'...ἐκπλήσειν
 294 κασίνγητον
 298 ἴσχανε
 (302 "text")
 303 σῖτον...ἐπὶ χροός (χροός vid. corr.)
 βάλε (vix βάλει)

304 προλείψεις μ': ἡ προσεδρία νοσον

(307 καὶ θανέτω)
 314 δοξάζεις
 315 γίνεταί
 322 ἀμπάλλεσθε
 (323 τινύμ bis)
 (326 γόνον ἑάσας)
 (327 μανιᾶδος φ. φεῦ μόχθων
 328 οἶων τάλας: ante τ. iser. ὁ corr.
 329 ἀπόφατιν (cum glossa κακὴν μαντεῖαν
 cf. p.106.1 Dindorf sigl.I)
 ἔλακ()semel, sed ἔλακεν add.man.2
 marg (cf. 332)
 331 μυχοὶ γᾶς (sic, a prima manu)

332 ὦ ζεῦ, sed ιω marg.man.2 (cf. 329)
 (334 φόνιος)
 335 ὦ mut. in ὁ a corr.
 337 εἰς δόμον (a manu prima: cum
 glossa τον οἶκον: cf. p.111.1, ib.15:
 112.5 sq. Dindorf)
 339 post 338 et ante 340
 (340-51 male habita)
 de 344 et 347 non constat
 346 οἶκον ἄλλον ἕτερον (lectio dubia)

349 ἀναξ·πολλῇ ἀβροσύνη (lectio satis
 certa)
 (356 τῇ...τῇ vid.)
 358 ἄθλιος (vid.)
 (360 "text")
 (364 γλαῦκος)
 365 τὸδ' (vid.): de κατα-(? παρα-)
 σταθεῖς non constat; extat glossa
 πλησίον σταθεῖς; cf. p. 118.16 Dindorf
 368 δὲ ἔπλ.
 (372 περιβαλεῖν)
 373 ἀλικτύπων
 374 (pro παιδός)θυγατρός

εἰσακούσεται
 same reading (sine
 glossa)
 same reading
 σοι
 same reading
 ἐπάρας εἰς ἔργον
 ηὐφρανε
 same reading
 ἐκτεῖναι
 same reading
 ἐτ'ἡμελλεν
 same reading
 same reading
 same reading
 same reading

σῖτον (ut videtur)...
 ἐπὶ χροὶ βάλε
 same reading + i sub-
 scr. in προσεδρία.
 κατθανεῖν
 same reading
 same reading
 ἀμπάλλασθε
 same reading
 same reading
 same reading
 οἶων ὁ τάλας
 ἀπόφασιν cum
 glossa κ.μ.

semel
 same reading with
 "minigloss" η on top
 ὅφ γᾶς.
 ἰω ζεῦ
 same reading
 ὦ
 εἰς δόμοις (sine
 glossa)

same arrangement

same reading, but
 above ἄλλον ὧν is
 added by the main
 scribe (ut videtur).
 πολλῇ δ' ἀβροσύνη

πῇ...πῇ
 same reading
 same reading
 same reading
 τὸδ'---κατασταθεῖς,
 (sine glossa)

δ'ἔπλησεν
 same reading
 same reading
 παιδός

APPENDIX II

The selection comprises Orestes vv. 255-302 incl.
 (Ryl fol. 13^r-14^v = fol. 10^r-11^v of Zuntz' rearrangement and
 Gks fol. 58^r-59^v).

	Ryl 1689	Gks 3549
Or. 255 above μη' πρίσειε	gloss μη' ἐπύφερε Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Cambridge Nn.3.14 ÷ μη' - Vat.gr.51 (μη' ἐπύφορε? for μη' ἐπύφερε)	gloss μη' ἀπείλει cf. ἀπείλει Gr.Fl.21
Or. 256 above δρακοντώδεισ	gloss ἀγρίαι? in very clear letters; the rest I am not able to decipher. cf. ἀγρίαι Gr. and I. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cam- bridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51	no gloss
Or. 256 above κόρασ	gloss τὰς παρθένας no counter- part in Dindorf. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Vat.gr.51	gloss ἐρινύας part of the I.explanation. Cambridge Mm.1.11 Vat.gr.51 ÷ τὰς
Or. 257 above the end of the line.	gloss κινω or κινου---ωσιν this can hardly be anything else but κινούονται ὀρμῶσι(ν) Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 cf. Dindorf II p.93 ll.6-7. part of the I.explanation	no gloss
Or. 258 above ἀτρέμα(σ)	gloss ἡσύχωσ part of the I.- explanation. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51	same gloss
Or. 259 above σαφ'(ά)	gloss σαφῶσ part of the Gr.Fl. 6.9.17.21.56.59.explanation Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51	same gloss
Or. 259 above δν	no gloss	gloss ἀφ'
Or. 259 above εἰδέναι	no gloss	gloss γινώσκειν no counterpart in Dind. but cf.p.94 1.19-20.

Or. 260

above

ἀποκτενοῦσι

gloss φονεύσουσι part of the I. no gloss
explanation.

Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge

Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 260

above

κυνώπιδες

gloss αἱ ἀναιδεῖς καὶ ἄγριαι no gloss

cf. αἱ ἄγριαι καὶ ἀναιδεῖς:

part of the I. explanation, and

αἱ ἄγριαι Vat.gr.908, Gr.

ἀναιδεῖς Gu, Cambridge Nn.3.14 -

Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 261

above

γοργώπες

gloss καταπληκτικαὶ τοῖς
ὀφθαλμοῖς part of the Gu ex-
planation and cf. I. - Cam-
bridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.
1.11 - Vat.gr.51gloss γοργώπιδες
Gr.

Or. 261

above

ἐνέρων

gloss νεκρῶν part of the Gu
explanation. cf. also I. -
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.908 - Vat.gr.
2376

no gloss

Or. 261

above

λέρεται

gloss φονέτριαι (sic!)
cf. φονεύτριαι I. Cambridge
Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 -
Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr.908 (ut vide-
tur) and φονεύτριαι Gr.same gloss, but
placed with the
following at the
end of the line.

Or. 261

above

δεινὰ

θεαὶ

gloss φοβεραὶ part of the
I. explanation.

same gloss

Or. 262

above

μεθήσω

gloss ἀφήσω Gr
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 add σε

same gloss

Or. 263

above

σχῆσω

gloss κωλύσω
Gr.Fl.6.9.17.21.56.59
(but omitting ἐφέξω ibid)
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 ÷ σε - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.
gr.908 add σε and καὶ κρατήσω
(Fl.33)

same gloss

Or. 264

above

μεθέσ

gloss ἄφεσ ἴασον (sic!)
cf. ἔασον ἄφεσ I.

gloss ἄφεσ

	Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr.908 add ἐμέ ἔασον solum Vat.gr.2376	
Or. 264 above τῶν	no gloss	gloss ἀπό
Or. 265 above μ' ὀχμᾶζεισ	gloss συνέχεις Gu cf. A.B.M.I. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.908 add. κινεῖς ἐμέ - κουφίζεις Gr	gloss κουφίζεις Gr
Or. 265 above ὦσ	no gloss	gloss ἵνα Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr. 908 adding καί.
Or. 265 above βᾶλησ	gloss ρίψησ (no counterpart in Dindorf.) Vat.gr.51	same gloss
Or. 265 above ἔσ Τάρταρον	gloss εἰς ἀπόλειαν (no counterpart in Dindorf.) Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 cf. καὶ εἰς μέσον τοῦ Τάρταρον Vat.gr.908	no gloss
Or. 266 above ἐπικουρίαν	gloss βοήθεια Gu Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51	no gloss
Or. 267 above το θεῖον	gloss τοὺς θεοὺς ἢ τὰς ἐριννύας Gr and Gu. τὰς ἐριννύας solum, habent Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51	no gloss
Mm.1.11 Vat Or. 267 above δυσμενέσ	gloss ἐχθρόν Gr. Fl.6.9.17.21.34.56.59.76	no gloss
Or. 268 above κερουλκά	gloss τα ἐκ κεράτων κατασκευα- ζόμενα καὶ ἐλκυόμενα cf. Gr.Fl. 6.9.17.21.33.56.59.76 Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr. 908 all read τὰ διὰ τῶν κεράτων ἔλκοντα τὴν νευράν cf. A.B.C.M.	gloss τα ἐκ κεράτων κατεσκευασμένα Gr.Fl.6.9.17.21.33. 56.59.76. ÷ καὶ ἐλκυόμενα

Or. 269 above οἷσ	gloss δυν?	gloss δὲ 'ἔν
Or. 269 above ἐξαμύνασθαι	gloss τιμωρήσασθαι Gr (ut videtur) Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 all read μάχεσθαι	same gloss
Or. 270 above εἰ μ' ἐκφοβοῦεν	gloss εἰς φόβον ἄγοιεν no counterpart in Dindorf.	same gloss
Or. 270 above μανιάσιν	gloss μανικοῦ part of the Gu I.explanation cf. Cambridge Nn.3.14 καὶ μανιάσι (ut vide- tur) and Vat.gr.51, Vat.gr.908 μανικοῦ	no gloss
Or. 270 above λυσσήμασιν	gloss μανία part of the Gu I.explanation and B. and M. Vat.gr.51 νουσήμασι Vat.gr.908 φοβήμασι	no gloss
Or. 271 above βεβλήσεται	gloss τραπήσεται (no counterpart in Dindorf) Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr. 908. cf. τραυματισθήσεται Vat.gr.2376	gloss τοξευθήσεται part of the I. explanation.
Or. 271 above τίς θεῶν	no gloss	gloss ἀπὸ τοῦ
Or. 271 above βροτησίᾳ	gloss --- ἥ---	no gloss
Or. 271 above χειρὶ	gloss χειρὸς ἀνθρωπίνης part of the I.explanation. cf. Vat.gr.908 ἐκ χρ.ἀνθρ.	same gloss (ut videtur)
Or. 272 above εἰ μὴ 'ξαμείψει	gloss τοξευθήσεται part of the I.explanation Cambridge Nn.3.14 βεβλήσεται Cambridge Mm.1.11 ναὶ βεβλήσεται Vat.gr.51 ναὶ καὶ βεβλήσεται.	gloss ναὶ τοξευθήσε- ται

Or. 272

above

ἔξαμείψει

gloss ἀποχωρήσω?

no gloss

(written in a darker ink than the surrounding glosses)

cf. Cambridge Nn.3.14

ἀποχωρήσει - Cambridge Mm.1.11

ἀποχωρήσει (sic!) and Vat.gr.51

(βεβλήσεται) ἀποχωρέσας

Or. 273

above

χωρῶ

gloss μακράν

same gloss

part of the I.explanation

Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge

Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 273

above

οὐκ εἰσακούετ'

gloss ὧ ἐρίνυες (sic!)

no gloss

part of the I.explanation

Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge

Mm.1.11. cf. πρὸς τὰς ἐρίνυας

Vat.gr.51

Or. 273

above

ἐκηβόλων

gloss τῶν μακρόθεν πεμπόντων

gloss τῶν μακρὰν

τὰ βέλη

βαλλόντων

Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Vat.gr.51

Vat.gr.908 the same

the same but with μακρὰν for

but with μακρόθεν

μακρόθεν - Cambridge Mm.1.11

for μακρὰν.

τῶν μακρὰν πεμπόντων -

Or. 274

above

πτερωτας

γλυφίδας

gloss τὰς ἐπτερωμένους

gloss τὰ βέλη

cf. τοὺς ἐπτερωμένους

part of the I.ex-

οἷστούς Gu. Cambridge Mm.1.11,

planation

Vat.gr.51 and Cambridge Nn.3.14

τοὺς πτερωτοὺς οἷστούς.

gloss βέλη part of the I.ex-

planation.

Or. 274

above

ἐξορμωμένας

gloss ἐξερχομένας

no gloss

part of the I.explanation.

Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

cf. πεμπομένας

Vat.gr.51 and Vat.gr.908

Or. 275

above

ἄ ἄ

no gloss

gloss ἐφεκτικόν

ἐπίρρημα

Or. 275

above

μελλετ'

gloss βραδύετε M.

no gloss

Or. 275

above

ἐξακρίζετ'
αἰθέρα

gloss τῶν ακρῶν τοῦ
ἀέρος ἐπιλαμβάνεσθε(?)
Gu. cf. Cambridge Nn.3.14 and
Vat.gr.908 (ut videtur)
τῶν ακρῶν τοῦ αἰθέρος.-
τῶν ακρῶν τοῦ αἰθέρος ἐπιλαμ-
βάνεσθε Cambridge Mm.1.11

gloss εἰς τον
αἰθέρα τρέχετε
Gr.Fl.6.9.17.21.
34.56.59.76. add-
ing ἄκρον before
αἰθέρα

Or. 276

above

αἰτιᾶσθε

gloss αἷτια ἡγεῖσθε
Gu. Cambridge Nn.3.14 and
Mm.1.11

gloss μέμψεσθε
part of the A.B.
C.M.I. explanation

Or. 276

above

θέσφατα

gloss μαντεύματα
no counterpart in Dindorf.
Vat.gr.908 - cf. κελύσματα
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

same gloss

Or. 277

above

ἐα

gloss φεῦ
no counterpart in Dindorf.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

no gloss

Or. 277

ibid

gloss ἐπὶ ἐκπλήξεωσ
part of the I. explanation

gloss ἐκπληκτικόν
cf. A.C.M.

Or. 277

above

τί χρῆμα
"ἀλύω"

gloss -οὔτο (or αὐτό) τὸ κατ'
ἐμὲ ἀδemonῶν? (the last two
letters seem to be written
very faintly on top of the
others) ἀδemonῶν part of the
A.B.C.M.I. explanation.
cf. τί τοῦτο τὸ κατ'ἐμὲ
ἀδemonῶν Cambridge Nn.3.14
ἀδemonῶν solum Vat.gr.908
ἀδemonῶν μοὶ κακὰ διὰ τὸν
πρέποντα? Cambridge Mm.1.11

gloss τὸ πνεῦμα
part of the I.ex-
planation

Or. 277

above

ἀνεῖς

gloss ἀναπέμπων
cf. πέμπων Cambridge Nn.3.14
and Mm.1.11

gloss ἐν αμηχανίᾳ
εἰμι -----?
part of the I. ex-
planation

Or. 278

above

ἡλάμεθα

gloss ἐπηδήσαμεν Gr
cf. ἐπλανήθημεν (Gu) -
ἐκινήθημεν Cambridge Nn.3.14
and Mm.1.11 and Vat.gr.2376
ἐκινήθημεν

same gloss

Or. 279

above
ἐκ κυμάτων

gloss --- τῆς μανίας
κλύδωνος, must be ἡ ἀπο τοῦ
τῆς μανίας κλύδωνος Cambridge
Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 (no
counterpart in Dindorf)

no gloss

Or. 279

above
γαλην'

gloss γαλινά - ἡσυχά
no counterpart in Dindorf
ἡσυχά solum Cambridge Nn.3.14

same gloss

Or. 280

above
σύγγονε

gloss ἡλέκτρα.
no counterpart in Dindorf
cf. Cambridge Nn.3.14
πρὸς τὴν ἡλέκτραν

no gloss

Or. 280

above
κράτια

gloss τὴν κεφαλὴν
part of the I. explanation

same gloss

Or. 281

above
μεταδιδούσ

gloss μετέχειν διδούσ
(ut videtur) Gr.Fl.6.9.17.
21.54.56.59.76

no gloss

Or. 282

above
ὄχλον

gloss ὄχλησιν (ut videtur)
part of the I. explanation.
Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.
908 - Cambridge Nn.3.14
ὄχλησις

no gloss

Or. 282

above
νόσοις
ἐμαῖς

gloss διὰ τῶν ἐμῶν νόσων
part of the I. explanation

no gloss

Or. 283

above
ἐκατι

gloss χάριν
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
Vat.gr.908 (there may be some-
thing before this. But I can-
not decipher it)

same gloss

Or. 283

above
συντήκου

gloss πάσχε, δαμάζου Gu.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
cf. συνδαμάζου Vat.gr.908

gloss ἐν σαυτῇ
φθείρου Gr.

Or. 284

above
ἐπένευσας

gloss κατένευσας Gu
Cambridge Nn.3.14 κατένευσας
συνήνευσας
Cambridge Mm.1.11 κατένευσας
ἐπίνευσας (?)
Vat.gr.908 συνεβούλευσας (Gu)

gloss συνήνευσας Gr

Or. 284

above

τάδε

gloss ἢ τὸ κτείνει τὴν
μητέρα Gr,
Gl.6.9.17.21.56.59.76

same gloss ÷ ἢ

Or. 284

above

εἰργασται

gloss ἐπράχθη.
no counterpart in Dindorf
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

no gloss

Or. 285

above

μητρῶν
αἶμα

gloss ἢ ὁ τῆς μητρὸς φόνος
no counterpart in Dindorf

gloss τῆς μητρὸς
ὁ φόνος

Or. 286

above

ἐπάραι

gloss παρακινήσας εἰς ἐ(ργον)..? gloss διεγείρας Gr
part of the I. explanation
cf. Gu παρακινήσας solum,
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

Or. 288

above

κατ' ὄμματα

gloss ἐνώπιον cf. ἐνώπιον
πρὸς πρόσωπον. ἐνώπιον solum,
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

gloss κατὰ πρό-
σωπον Gr and part
of the I. explana-
tion - Vat.gr.908
(ut videtur)

Or. 289

above

ἐξιστόρουν

gloss ἡρώτων B.M.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
cf. ἐρωτῶν (sic!) Vat.gr.908

same gloss

Or. 289

above

νιν

gloss αὐτὸν
part of the longer A.B.C.M.
explanation. Cambridge Nn.3.14
Vat.gr.908

same gloss

Or. 289

above

ματέρ'

gloss? there may be something
here. But I cannot decipher it

no gloss

Or. 289

above

χρή

gloss πρόπει
part of the I. explanation

no gloss

Or. 290

above

γενεῖου

gloss πρὸς
no counterpart in Dindorf
cf. Vat.gr.908 πρὸς τοῦ
(ut videtur)

same gloss

Or. 290

above

ἐκτείνει λίτας

gloss δοῦναι παρακλησάεισ??)
no counterpart in Dindorf
cf. δοῦναι solum, Cambridge
Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.
908 has καράκλησιν above λίτας

no gloss

Or. 291

above

εἰς σφαγὰς
ῥῶσαιgloss ἐμβάλεῖν
no counterpart in Dindorf
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11,
Vat.gr.908gloss εἰς σφαγὴν
κινῆσαι -no counter-
part in Dindorf.
cf. εἰς τὴν σφαγὴν
Vat.gr.908

Or. 292

above

εἰ μήτ'

gloss ἐπειδὴ: part of the
I. explanation.
Vat.gr.908, Vat.gr.2376
(ut videtur)same gloss preceded
by καί

Or. 292

above

ἀναλαβεῖν φῶς

gloss ἀναβιβῶναι
part of the I. explanation

same gloss

Or. 293

above

τλήμων τοῖαδε

gloss ἔμελλον
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11same gloss (ut vi-
detur)

Or. 293

above

ἐκπλήσειν

gloss οἷα νυν πάσχω (ut videtur)
no counterpart in Dindorf.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 (ut videtur)
Cambridge Mm.1.11 - gloss
ὑπομένειν part of the I. ex-
planation. - Cambridge Nn.3.14
the same, adding gloss πληρώσειν
Cambridge Mm.1.11 the same two
glosses but reading ὑπομένεινgloss ἀναπλήσειν^{???}
no counterpart in
Dindorf.

Or. 294

above

ἀνακάλυπ'

gloss σεαυτήν
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

same gloss

Or. 294

above

κασίγνητον
κάρα

no gloss

gloss ἡγουν ἡδελφή?
no counterpart in
Dindorf. cf. ἀδελφή
Vat.gr.908

Or. 295

above

ἀπελθε

gloss ἀπόστηθι (ut videtur)
part of the I. explanation

same gloss

Or. 295

above

κεῖ μαλ'

gloss λείαν
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Mm.1.11

no gloss

Or. 296

above

ἐχομεν

gloss διακεῖμεθα
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

same gloss

Or. 296

above
ἀθυμήσαντ'gloss λειποθυμήσαντα ἢ μανέντα
part of the I. explanation
and Gu (Dindorf vol.II p.102,
note 2)

no gloss

Or. 297

above
διαφθορένgloss μανέν (ut videtur)
no counterpart in Dindorf
ἢ τὸ μανέν Cambridge Nn.3.14
and Mm.1.11gloss διαφθορέν
part of the I. ex-
planation

Or. 298

above
ἰσχναινε
(ἰσχνανε)gloss κώλυε
part of the I. explanation.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
adding gloss ἔπεχε

same gloss

Or. 298

above
παρὰ μυθοῦ

gloss ---καί---?

no gloss

Or. 298

above
στένησgloss στενάζεισ (ut videtur)
no counterpart in Dindorf.
cf. λυπεῖσθαι? Vat.gr.908

no gloss

Or. 299

above
ἡμᾶςgloss ἡ ἐμέ (ut videtur)
no counterpart in Dindorf

gloss ἐμέ

Or. 299

above
νοθετεῖνgloss παραινέειν Gu.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11gloss παραμυθεῖσ-
θαι Gr.

Or. 299

above
φίλαgloss τὰ προσφιλή
Gr and part of the I. ex-
planation.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
÷ τὰgloss the same ÷
τὰ

Or. 300

above
αἶδεgloss αἴται αἶ παρ' ἀλλήλων---
There is a hole in the text
here; what can be read is part
of the text: αἴται αἶ παρ'
ἀλλήλων πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐγκαίρως
γινόμεναι Gu. Bar.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

no gloss

Or. 300

above
ἐπικουράει

gloss βοηθεῖ

no gloss

Or. 301

above

βᾶσα

gloss ἐλθοῦσα
 no counterpart in Dindorf.
 Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11,
 Vat.gr.908. cf. εἰσαλθοῦσα
 Vat.gr.2376

gloss πορευθεῖσα
 part of the I. ex-
 planation

Or. 301

above

δωμάτων ἔσω

gloss ω or ἐν??

no gloss

Or. 302

above

βλεφάρων

gloss το ὄμμα Gu
 Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

no gloss

Or. 302

above

ἐκταθεῖσα

gloss ἀνακληθεῖσα πρὸς τὴν
 κλίνην. cf. πρὸς τὴν κλίνην
 ἀνακληθεῖσα Gu. Cambridge
 Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

no gloss

APPENDIX III

Ryl 1689

GKS 3549

v. 142	κοίτας	as the reading is λέχουσ gloss τῆς κοίτης (cf. textual section) no η is to be expected.	η on top of the α
v. 145	πνοά	no η	η on top of the α
v. 146	ῶ φίλα	no η	η on top of the α
v. 148	βοάυ	no η	η on top of the α
v. 153	ῶ φίλα	η on top of the α	η on top of the α
v. 154	τύχαν	no η	η on top of the α
v. 206	ά	no η	η on top of the α

v. 323	δίκαν	no η	no η
v. 326	λύσσασ	no η	no η
v. 329	ᾶν	η on top of the α	no η
v. 331	γᾶσ	η on top of the α	η on top of the α
v. 338	ματέροσ	η on top of the α	no η
v. 338	σᾶσ	η on top of the α	no η
v. 342	θοᾶσ	no η	no η

GkS 3549,8^o, fol. 41r (Hecuba 1082-1098), cf. above
p. 14, note 41. Only the 3 glosses signalized by ar-
rows are written in red ink. NB. A "minigloss" (cf.
above, p. 15) is seen over the last word on the page.
(Photo Kgl. Bibl., København)

Γ' πὶ τὸν δὲ σὺ 940

ἢ ἐν τῷ πύλῳ

τεκνὶ μ' ἐφύλαξεν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὠκίσταται.

ὡ τὰ μὲν αὖ σοι διόφορος ἔραται καὶ

δὲ δὸν τι δαΐσχα, δηγὰ τ' ἐπὶ τῇ

δαίμων ἔδωκεν ὅτι ἐπὶ σοι βδρῶ.

αἰ αἰ αἰ αἰ ἰὼ θρακῆς

λοχοφόρον εὐόπλον.

ἔπειτα δὲ κλέωνος ἄνθρωπος.

ἰὼ ἄχαιοι, ἰὼ ἀπείροισι.

βόδι βόδι αὐτῷ βόδι.

ὦ ἰτε μάλιστα ποσειδῶν

κλέωνος, ὁ δὲ θεὸς δέκεται μάλιστα.

γυναικὶς ὡς ἂν ἔσθῃ ἡμεῖς ἀνδράσιν.

δηγὰ δηγὰ τε ποσειδῶν.

ὦ μοι ἐμὰς λαοβασίαν.

