OBSEservations on the Activities of the Byzantine Grammartians of the Palaeologian Era. I. Demetrius Triclinius' Early Work on the Euripidean Triad. (Gamle Kongelige Samling 3549, 8° 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, 8°, 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 In my unpublished M.A.-thesis from 1967 I have tried to test Turyn's identification, mainly on palaeographical and codicological criteria, but I have obtained no definite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.


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 Orestes - professor Zuntz has demonstrated that Ryl, directly or indirectly, represents a preliminary stage in the working process which ends with the Roman Angelicus.

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 and Zuntz' corresponding remarks on the Rylands fragment. 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.
agreement between all MSS against modern conjectures or corrections which have been adopted in the OCT edition; 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, Tricipinius.

The first reading we select for a brief comment is v. 61 συμψοράδως for συμψοράν. 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. 1325 roughly contemporary of our MSS. The plural was accepted by Moschopoulos. 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. 108.

As to Moschopoulos 8 of the readings characteristic of his work come in for consideration; vv. 69, 116, 228, 286, 326, 327, 345, 373. In seven of these, our two MSS go together against the Moschopoulane conjectures, even in v. 373 where Moschopoulos correctly conjectured ἀλλὰτοκών for ἀλλατοκών. In v. 286 GKS reads ἔκτασις εἷς ἔργον, the Thomian modification of the Moschopoulane interpolation ἔκτασις ἔργον ἕς, whereas Ryl has ἔκτασις ἔργον.

11. "It must have been in the early Byzantine archetype, at least as a variant; its corruption was easily caused by the preceding singularis ἀδελφήνυ". Zuntz: Bul. Ryl. 1967 p. 506.
14. The reading of GKS (see my appendix I ad loc.) seems to be a mere slip.
15. Here GKS adds the variant ὁν s.l. in ἀλλακτυ. I have not been able to account for this variant.
Evidently neither MS is Moschopoluean in the examples quoted.

For Thomas we use the 8 readings characteristic of his text\textsuperscript{16} 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 ..."?\textsuperscript{17}

The spurious χαι after δγε or δγε in v. 81 is neither in Ryl nor in GkS. It is absent from the Moschopoluean MSS and from the MS representing the first Thoman recension\textsuperscript{18}. It is absent from VLP and O (Laur. 31.10) a carrier of the 'older' tradition. Finally the χαι is also omitted in Angelicus 14, Triclinius' working copy\textsuperscript{19}. The reading in v. 35 οδήγε for the correct δδε is practically confined to Thoman MSS\textsuperscript{20}. The Thoman GkS has δδε. Ryl shares οδήγε with Angelicus 14 (here Triclinius let it stand in his originally Thoman MS). It was introduced into L (Laur. 32.2) in rasura\textsuperscript{21}. This reading need not detain us further here. As to its occurrence in Ryl I refer the reader to professor Zuntz' explanation\textsuperscript{22}.

This brings us to Demetrius Triclinius. According to Zuntz "Triclinian features stand out markedly in Ryl"\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{16} Turyn: B.M.T. pp. 172-73.


\textsuperscript{18} According to Turyn: B.M.T. p. 180, Cambridge Nn.3.14.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{20} Turyn: B.M.T. p. 49 and p. 172.


\textsuperscript{22} ibid.

\textsuperscript{23} ibid. p. 509.
ad loc.) plus an "additional instance" v. 303, where the Triclinian χροός (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 readings\(^{24}\). In v. 335 Ryl has (post correcturam) the Triclinian ἠ made out of the non-Triclinian ἡ. The Copenhagen MS reads ἡ. Zuntz adds a "minor difference"\(^{25}\) v. 147 ἰξέροφο[ν] Ryl. Following Thomas Triclinius here has the correct ἰξέροφο[ν]-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 Moschopoulous features, but as regards Thomas - although some of the Thomian 'slips' mentioned by Zuntz (vid. supra) do not appear in Gks - the Copenhagen MS is indisputably a Thomian 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 Thomian 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 Thomian text (perhaps the Copen-


hagen MS) which he eventually discarded in favour of another re-
cension to return to a Thoman text (Angelicus 14 T² Turyn) as
basis for his final edition (Angelicus 14 T₉ Turyn). As to Tri-
clinius' earliest activities on the Euripidean Triad we may thus
conclude that the evidence of GkS is negative at least in re-
spect 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 indi-
cations of Triclinian activity in the division of cola, hardly
anything can be gathered from the present comparison
²⁶. In v. 142
GkS has one line (with the majority of the MSS, it seems) while
Ryl divides after ἔκτισε. In v. 147 Ryl agrees with P and Angeli-
cus 14 against BM in putting τὸ...βοῦν 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 ὑποθεσεῖον
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 noth-
ing can be gathered from a collation of Ryl with facsimilis of B
and N and P and (through Turyn) with Angelicus 14 as regards Tri-
clinean collometry in the section of the play contained in Ryl.

²⁷. Dindorf: Scholia Graeca in Euripidis Tragoedias ex codicibus
aucta et emendata editit 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. 49v. For other
examples (highly varied in content) see e.g. Upsal. Gr 15 fol. 45r
(pedigree and grammatica) - Brit. Mus. Arundel 522 fol. 104r (pedi-
gree) - Cambridge Mn.3.14 fol. 154r (pedigree) - Cambridge Mn.1.11
fol. 30r (pedigree). As examples of MSS where these ancillae do no
occur I refer to e.g. Vat. Ottobon. Gr 346 - Vat. Gr 908 - Vat. Gr

²⁹. i.e. like the argumentum of Ryl, which - as we have seen - i
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. 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 αὐτὸν for ἦν (vv. 36 and 119 but cf. v. 289 in my Appendix II) is missing in GkS as is also σφ (v. 29) while ἐλπὶδα for ἔσια 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. ἤπαττον for χλανιδήν: 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 ἀπειρήψε: 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 γὰρ....μεμνησθαί Gu (cf. Dindorf p. 42.8-9)
No gloss in GkS.
Or. 27 ἀσαφές: δόξηλον Gr (Dindorf p. 42.9 and cf. ibid. p. 21-22)
No gloss in GkS.
Or. 30 εἰκλεῖαν: τιμὴν δόξαν Gu (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 ἐξουσίωσα....γυνῇ Fl. 6...59 (Dindorf p. 44.18)
If I read GKS correctly, this reading is found also there, with two slight variations: ἐξουσίωσά and the ἄν following μετάσχοι instead of preceding it.

Or. 46 ἐδεξα: ἐκυμάθη Gr (Dindorf p. 49.4 cf. ibid. p. 47.25)
This is also the reading of GkS.
Or. 46 Ἀργεῖ: ἄντι τοῦ τοῖς Ἀργεῖοις
This is also the reading of GkS although the words ἄντι τοῦ are omitted.
Or. 46 στέγασι: οἶκοι Flor. 59 (part of the longer explanation
Dindorf pp. 48-49.1)
No gloss in GkS.
Or. 47 πυρί: ἐν ἄχοις (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: χαρεῖτες Gr (Dindorf p. 49.5)
This is also the reading of GkS.
Or. 47 ibid. προσκαλεῖν Gu Fl.6.....76 (Dindorf p. 49.2-3,5)
No gloss in GkS.
Or. 91 ἀπερίφερεν εἰν κάκοις: ἀπηγόρευσα Gu
No gloss in GkS.
Or. 91 ibid. ἐν ταῖσ δυστυχάισ 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 Copen-
hagen 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 (τ²) 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 group\(^{31}\): 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 Ryl\(^{32}\) and my own microfilm of Gks\(^{33}\). 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.

---

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. Guelferbytianus (Gudianus 15) a paper MS of the XIV century.34
Fl followed by ciphers denotes various Florentine MSS grouped together by Dindorf.35
I. = The edition of the scholia to the first seven plays of Euripides prepared by Arsenius Apostolis and printed in Venice in 1534.36
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 agreement.37)

34. The Dindorfian distinction Gr (Moschopoulean 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.

often confirm Moschopoulean 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
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:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gu</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;part of the I.-explanation&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other sigla from Dindorf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.M.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.C.M.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glosses not quoted by Dindorf</td>
<td>8 (with allowance for 2 cases of 'approximate agreement')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ryl 1689</th>
<th>Gks 3549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gu</td>
<td>ca. 18 (including a few cases of 'approximately Gu')</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;part of the I.-explanation&quot;</td>
<td>ca. 18 (including a few cases of 'approximately I.&quot; If we include another few cases of 'probably I.&quot; the total will be 22)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other sigla from Dindorf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glosses not quoted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Dindorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 metrika. 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 GkS\textsuperscript{38} I must admit that I for one have not been able to find them. Anyhow they cannot be metrica in the Triclinian sense\textsuperscript{39}.

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 editions\textsuperscript{40}.

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 glosses\textsuperscript{41}. But the general impression remains: while Ryl (cf. also the collation with the Cambridge MSS and the 3 Vatican) exhibits the Moschopouleo-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 Triclinium\textsuperscript{42} 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

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 étas 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. 12V = 7V of Zuntz' rearrangement) and vv. 206-7 (fol. 15f = 8f of Zuntz' rearrangement).

2) first stasimon vv. 316-47 (fol. 10V-11V = 12V-13V of Zuntz' rearrangement).

Fol. 7V is for the most part hardly legible while fol. 13V is the most illegible of all the folia of Ryl. Consequently I cannot guarantee that one éta or two may not have escaped my eyes. In Gks the parodus is found on foll. 54V - 56V while first stasimon is on foll. 60f - 61f. 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 étas except one, while there is only one out of seven in the first stasimon which has the éta) 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 palaeologistian 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 Triclinius\textsuperscript{43}, 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 century\textsuperscript{44}, 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.

\textsuperscript{43} Turyn: B.M.T. p. 181.

\textsuperscript{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 'Triclinianness' of GkS 3549.
APPENDIX I.

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

Ryl 1689                               Gks 3549

(13-14 legi nequeunt praeter
14 θες
15 δ' οὖν νῦν vid.)
18 text
20 μενέλαως
24 ἄρσην τ'
26 (ἐκτείνειν)
παρθένον: -θενω suprascr.man.2

(30 de φέρων: -ον non constat)
(31 άπειρασαι)
34 νόσω νοσεῖ
35 ὃδε (pro δις)
(42 χωλαντιδών)
45 ἄκο
(47 μῆτε)
51 άεισάται
53 εἰς
(54 ναυπλεύον)
56 ἀλαίσαι
(59 εἰς (quod non amplius notatur)
κέτρων ἐλήθη
60 ἔστι δ'
61 συμφορᾶς τε
(67 εἰσοδον)
(69 ύχομεθ' |
(71 κάγαμένων)
74 ἐξε (pro ἐξεί)    
75 προσφέραμας γάρ
77 χαλκαίμουν. (sic semper)
79 ἤξωσ δ'
(81 ἄνε παροδοτ'
82 ἐν συμψαίσι (οραίσ suprascr.man.rec.)
γύτον (pro δύμον)
(86 σὺ δ' εἶ)
(87 ἡπετο
88 δὲ δευνίσος (...δὲς)
91 άρειρηκέν
(93 ἂς)
(94 κασιγινήσω)
(96 ἐμίο)
97 φίλον (cum glossa φιλούμενον cf. p. 59.26 Dindorf sigl. I.) στείχειν
(100 ὀρθῶς ...δὲ μοι)

same reading
same reading
same reading
same reading
same reading
παρθένον sic! ipse
librianius corr.

φέρων
ἀπειράσαι
same reading
δὲς
χωλάντων
same reading
same reading
same reading
same reading

πέτρων δεξὶ γρ δὲλη
supra lineam
same reading
συμφορᾶν τε
same reading
οὐχομεθ'
same reading
same reading
same reading
same reading

same reading
συμψαίσι
same reading
same reading
same reading
same reading

same reading
συμψαίσι
same reading
same reading
same reading

same reading
same reading
same reading
same reading

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."
101 δὴ τεῖσ
102 ἡλίων νεκρ
(109 [τεύχη] ημύτα e corr?)
(110 ὀρθής)
111 πέμψωμαι
112 δωματίων (pro δὴμων)
(115 ἀξινὴ)
(116 και στας' ἔπε')
119 ἀργεῖων
eμενή
121 ἀπόλεσε θ.
122 de ἐμὲ - ἐμὴν non constat

126 ἐν ἀνόδοι σώσ
128 ἀπέθανεν τρ.
130 θεοί σεσήσειαν (μι add. ipse s.l.)
131 ἐλλάς' ἡ
(140 σύγα - σύγα - λεπτόν)
141 τιθέτει - μη κτενείτε - μηδ' ἐστω κτῆσιος
143 οἰκονομάτ' (de accent. non constat)
λέξους (pro κοίτας cum glossa τῆς κοίτης)

145-56 passim obliteratora
147 ὑπάρχον
(148 ὑδὸν)

150 post λόγον δ' minutum add. vid.
(154 τίνα bis)

b) Or. 206-375.

206 ἐπιν' ἀνέκυνος'
212 γε ἐν τε μυτ. corr.
(215 hab. δ')
217 εὔφρανον (? accent.)
(218 δέμοσ)
(221 ἀναιρεῖ: corr. ipse)
223 (κλεῖστα ὑπ).
(καθισμμὸν)

225 (ἐξελθέντα κάτα superscr. corr.)
227 μ' ἄνη
(228 μέλη)
(233 γάιος)
234 ἡν (pro γλυκύ)
238 ἔσω ἑσών γ' ἐσσ (vid.)
239 θερέσι οTHONV (trp.)
242 versum om. dum paginam vertit
(244 ὁμογενῆ καὶ, sed in fine

251 σῦ ως\n(254 χαῦς)
258 ἄρτρίσια ἐν σοῖς δ.
(261 ἀρπεῖαι a prima manu)
264 ἔρινυζον
266 σ' ἐγὼ (vid.)
270 ἐκφοβότεν μναίσασι λυσσήμασιν

(272 'εξαμελής)
(273 ἐςαχοῦσετ')
279 γαλήν' (cum glossa γαληνά)

(280 κλαέει)
(281 σε vid.)
(282 "text")
(286 ἐκάρασ ἔργον ἄνοσ.)
287 ἔφρανε
289 κτείνας με χρή
290 ἐκτίνας
(291 μητοτε)
292 ἔμελλε (? ex ἔμι-)
293 ἔγω δ'...ἐκπλησείν
294 κασάγνητον
298 ἵσχαν
(302 "text")
303 σύτον...ἐπὶ χρος (χρος vid corr.)
βάλε (vix βάλεν)

304 προλεύεις μ' ἢ προσεδρία νοσον

(307 καὶ θανεῖν)
314 δοσίζεις
315 γὼνει
322 ἀμπέλλεςθε
(323 τινομ βίο)
(326 γόνον ἔσσατ'-)
(327 μανιλάδος φ. φεῦ μόθαυν
328 οἶχων τάλας: ante τ. iser, δ. corr.
329 ἀδράταιν (cum glossa κακήν μανετέαν
cf. p.106.1 Dindorf sigl. I)
ἐλακτομελεῖ, sed ἐλακτομελεῖ add.man.2
marg (cf. 332)
331 μυκοι γας (sic, a prima manu)

332 δ' ξεῦ, sed ἰω marg.man.2 (cf. 329)
(334 φόλιοι)
335 δ' mut. in δ a corr.
337 εἰς δύμων (a manu prima: cum
glossa τον οἶχον: 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 οἶχον ἄλλον ἐτερον (lectio dubia)

349 ἄνεξ·τολλή ἄβροσύνη (lectio satis
certa)
(356 τῇ...τῇ vid.)
358 διλέος (vid.)
(360 "text")
(364 γαλόθοκος)
365 τῶν' (vid.): de κατα-(? παρα-)
stathes constat; extat glossa
πλησόν σταθείς; cf. p. 118.16 Dindorf
368 δὲ κέλκ.
(372 κερυβάλειν)
373 ἄλικτόκων
374 (pro ταῦτα) ὑγατρός
APPENDIX II

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

| Or. 255 above | gloss μὴ ἐπίθετε Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Cambridge Nn.3.14 cf. ἐπίθετε Gr.Fl.21
| μὴ 'πίσεις | ³ μὴ - Vat.gr.51 (μὴ ἐπίθετη? for μὴ ἐπίθετη)

| Or. 256 above | gloss ἄγοιας? in very clear letters; the rest I am not able to decipher. cf. ἄγοιας Gr. and I. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51
| δρακοντάδεις | no gloss

| Or. 256 above | gloss τάδα παρέθεναι no counterpart in Dindorf. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Vat.gr.51 part of the I. explanation. Cambridge Mm.1.11 Vat.gr.51 ³ τάδα
| κόρας | gloss ἄρινδας

| Or. 257 above the end of the line. | gloss κῦν or κῦνου--οινού this can hardly be anything else but κῦνου ἐπίθετη δρακοντάδεις(γ)
| | Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 cf. Dindorf II p.93 11.6-7. part of the I. explanation

| Or. 258 above | gloss ἐφικαλχω part of the I. explanation. - Cambridge Nn.3.14 Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 same gloss
| ἄτρεμω(κ) |

| Or. 259 above | gloss ὁμοῦσα 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
| σαφ' (ά) |

| Or. 259 above | no gloss
gloss ἄφ |
| ἄν | gloss γιαντικείν no counterpart in Dind. but cf. p.94 1.19-20.
| Or. 259 above | no gloss
Or. 260
above
ἀποκτένωνας

gloss φονεύσουσα part of the I. no gloss
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 260
above
κυνωπίδεσσ

gloss αἱ αναίδεσσα καὶ ἄχρια:
no gloss
part of the I. explanation, and
ἀἱ ἀγριὰ Vat.gr.908, Gr.
ἀναίδεσσα Gu, Cambridge Nn.3.14 -
Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 261
above
γοργάκεσσ

gloss κατακλητικά τοὺς
Gr.
ἀφαλμοί part of the Gu ex-
planation and cf. I. - Cam-
bridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 261
above
ἐνέρων

gloss νεκρῶν part of the Gu
no gloss
explanation. cf. also I. -
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.908 - Vat.gr.
2376

Or. 261
above
Ἅρεταί

gloss φονέαραί (sic!)
same gloss, but
placed with the
Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 -
Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr.908 (ut vide-
tur) and φονεύτριοι Gr.

Or. 261
above
δείγαλ
θεί

gloss φοβεραί part of the
same gloss
I. explanation.

Or. 262
above
μεθήσω

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

Or. 263
above
σχήσω

gloss κωλύσω
Gr.F1.6.9.17.21.56.59
(but omitting ἐφέσω ibid)
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 + σε - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.
gr.908 add σε and καὶ κρατήσω
(Fl.33)

Or. 264
above
μεθέσ

gloss ἄφεσ ἔχεν (sic!)
gloss ἄφες
cf. ἔχεν ἄφες I.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr.908 add ἔνες εἴσον solum Vat.gr.2376

Or. 264
above
τὰν
Or. 265
above
μ"δχυδὲςις
no gloss
gloss συνεχείς Gu
cf. A.B.M.I. - Cambridge Nn.3.14
Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.908
add. κινεῖς ἔνες - κουφάζεις Gr

Or. 265
above
ὡς
no gloss
gloss ίνα
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr. 908 adding καὶ.

Or. 265
above
βάλης
no gloss
gloss ρίψης
(no counterpart in Dindorf.)
Vat.gr.51

Or. 265
above
ἐν Τάρταρον
no gloss
(gloss ἐν ἀδήλειαν
(no counterpart in Dindorf.)
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 cf.
καὶ ἐν μέσον τοῦ Τάρταρον
Vat.gr.908

Or. 266
above
ἐπικουρίαν
no gloss
gloss ἀσθένεια Gu
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Or. 267
above
τὸ θεῖον
no gloss
gloss τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ τὰς ἐρινυώσ Gr and Gu.
tὰς ἐρινυώσ solum,habent
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51

Mm.1.11 Vat. Or. 267
above
δυσμενέα
no gloss
gloss ἔχαρδον Gr.
Fl.6.9.17.21.34.56.59.76

Or. 268
above
κερουλικὴ
gloss τα ἐκ κεράτων κατασκευα-
ζόμενα καὶ ἐλκυμένα 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 ἐλκυντα τὴν νευράν cf. A.B.C.M.
Or. 269
above
οία
Or. 269
above
ἐξαμύνασθαι
gloss ἢν?
gloss δὲ 'ἂν
same gloss

Or. 270
above
ἐὰν ἦν ἐκφοβοῦσθεν
no counterpart in Dindorf.
same gloss

Or. 270
above
μαυλίδουν
gloss μαυλικοῦ ποταμος of the
gu I. explanation cf. Cambridge
Nn.3.14 καὶ μαυλίδου (ut vides-
tur) and Vat.gr.51, Vat.gr.908
μαυλίδου

Or. 270
above
λυσθήσας
no gloss

Or. 270
above
καθαριστὴ
gloss τρωθήσεται
(no counterpart in Dindorf)
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51 - Vat.gr.
908. cf. τραυματισθήσεται
Vat.gr.2376

Or. 271
above
τίς θεόν
no gloss

gloss ἁν τοῦ

Or. 271
above
βρυτοσάφη
no gloss

Or. 271
above
χειρὶ
gloss χείρι ἄνθρωπε
part of the I. explanation.
cf. Vat.gr.908 ἐκ χρ., ἄνθρ.
same gloss

Or. 272
above
ἐὰν μὴ 'ξαμελψῃ
gloss τοξεύσθησεται
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 βεβλῆσθαι
Cambridge Mm.1.11 ναὶ βεβλῆσθαι
Vat.gr.51 ναὶ καὶ βεβλῆσθαι.
Or. 272 above 'ξαμεςφει gloss ἀποχωρήσω?
(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
(βεβαλήσεται) ἀποχωρέσας
no gloss

Or. 273 above χωρέσ gloss μακράν
part of the I.explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11 - Vat.gr.51
same gloss

Or. 273 above οὐχ ἐλεγχόμεν gloss ἢ ἐρύνουσ (sic!)
part of the I.explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 - Cambridge
Mm.1.11. cf. πρὸς τοὺς ἐρυνῶσ
Vat.gr.51
no gloss

Or. 273 above ἐκθίδλων gloss τῶν μακράθεν κεμάντων τὸ βέλη
tò βέλη
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Vat.gr.51
the same but with μακράν for
μακράθεν - Cambridge Mm.1.11
tῶν μακράν κεμάντων -
gloss τῶν μακράν
Vat.gr.908 the same
but with μακράθεν for μακράν.

Or. 274 above πτερωτας gloss τῶς ἐπτερωμένας
cf. τοὺς ἐπτερωμένους
οἰστοῦσ Gu. Cambridge Mm.1.11,
Vat.gr.51 and Cambridge Nn.3.14
tοὺς πτερωτοὺς οἰστοῦσ.
gloss βέλη part of the I.ex-
planation.
gloss το βελη
part of the I.ex-
planation

Or. 274 above ἐξορμωμένας gloss ἔξερομενας
part of the I.explanation.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
cf. τεμπομένας
Vat.gr.51 and Vat.gr.908
no gloss

Or. 275 above κ κ gloss ἐφεκτικόν
ἐπάρπημα
no gloss

Or. 275 above μελλετ gloss βραδύνετε M.
no gloss
Or. 275 above 
εἰπαρίζεται 
αἰθέρα 

gloss τῶν αρχῶν τοῦ 
ἀέρος ἑπιλαμβάνεσθε (?) 
Gu. cf. Cambridge Nn.3.14 and 
Vat.gr.908 (ut videtur) 
τῶν αρχῶν τοῦ αἰθέρος • 
τῶν αρχῶν τοῦ αἰθέρος ἑπιλαμ-
βάνεσθε Cambridge Mm.1.11 
gloss εἰς τον 
αἰθέρα τρέχετε 
Gr.Fl.6.9.17.21. 
34.56.59.76. adding ἀρχον before 
αἰθέρα

Or. 276 above 
ἀιτίασθε 

gloss αἰτία ἡγεῖσθε 
Gu. Cambridge Nn.3.14 and 
Mm.1.11 
gloss μεμφεσθε 
part of the A.B. 
C.M.I. explanation

Or. 276 above 
θέσσατα 

gloss μαντεύματα 
no counterpart in Dindorf. 
Vat.gr.908 — cf. κελεύσματα 
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 
same gloss

Or. 277 above 
ἐξ 

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

Or. 277 ibid 

gloss ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας 
part of the I. explanation 
gloss ἐκκλησίας 
 cf. A.C.M.

Or. 277 above 
τί χρήμα?

"ἀλύω 

gloss -οτο (or αυτό) τὸ κατ᾽ 
ἐμ τὸ κατεχόντα? (the last two 
letters seem to be written 
very faintly on top of the 
others) ἀκούον ἑστε 
part of the A.B.C.M.I. explanation, 
 cf. τό τοῦ ὁ τὸ κατ᾽ ἔγε 
ἀκούον Cambridge Nn.3.14 
ἀκούον σολμ Vat.gr.908 
ἀκούον μοι κακὰ δία τὸν 
πρόεκυ 
Cambridge Mm.1.11 
gloss τὸ πνεῦμα 
part of the I. explanation

Or. 277 above 
ἀνείσ 

gloss ἀνασκέψασθε 
 cf. τέκμοι Cambridge Nn.3.14 
and Mm.1.11 
gloss ἐν αἰκανίᾳ 
 cf. -----? 
part of the I. explanation

Or. 278 above 
ὑλάμεθα 

gloss ἑκκλησίας Gr 
 cf. ἑκκλησίας (Gu) — 
 cf. ἑκκλησίας Cambridge Nn.3.14 
and Mm.1.11 and Vat.gr.2376 
 ἑκκλησίας 
same gloss
Or. 279
above.

έκ κυμάτων

**gloss** έκ κυμάτων
κλόσων, must be έκ από τοῦ
tής μανίας κλόσων Cambridge
Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 (no
counterpart in Dindorf)

Or. 279
above.
γαλην'

**gloss** γαληνά - ήσυξα
no counterpart in Dindorf
ήσυξα solum Cambridge Nn.3.14

Or. 280
above.

σύγγονε

**gloss** ήλέκτρα.
no counterpart in Dindorf
cf. Cambridge Nn.3.14
πρός τήν ήλέκτραν

Or. 280
above.

κράτα

**gloss** τήν κεφάλην
same gloss
part of the I. explanation

Or. 281
above.

μεταδίδοσ
gloss μετέχειν διδούσ (ut videtur) Gr.F1.6.9.17.
21.54.56.59.76

Or. 282
above.

δχλον

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

Or. 282
above.

νάσοις

**gloss** διὰ τῶν ἐμαῖν νάσων
part of the I. explanation

Or. 283
above.

έκατι

**gloss** χάριν
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
Vat.gr.908 (there may be something before this. But I cannot
decipher it)

Or. 283
above.

συντήκου

**gloss** πάσχει,σαμάτου Gu.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
cf. συνδάμάτου Vat.gr.908

Or. 284
above.

έπενευσασ

**gloss** κατένευσασ Gu
Cambridge Nn.3.14 κατένευσασ
συνένευσασ
Cambridge Mm.1.11 κατένευσασ
έπενευσασ (?) Vat.gr.908 συνεβούλευσασ (Gu)

Or. 285
above.

φανθη λευχ

**gloss** ἐπενευσάσ Gu
Cambridge Nn.3.14 κατενευσασ
συνενευσασ
Cambridge Mm.1.11 κατενευσασ
έπενευσασ (?) Vat.gr.908 συνεβούλευσασ (Gu)
Or. 284 above 

tò tò kteiνai tìn

μητέρα Gr,
Gl.6.9.17.21.56.59.76

same gloss η

Or. 284 above

eirγασται

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

no gloss

Or. 285 above 

μητρῶν

gloss η της μητρός φόνος
no counterpart in Dindorf

same gloss η μητρός

Or. 286 above 

τάμω

gloss παρακληνήματος εἶναι τῆς γεων...? gloss δειγμάτας Gr
part of the I. explanation
cf. Gu παρακληνήματος solum,
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

same gloss

Or. 288 above 

κατ' άμματα

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

same gloss κατά πρόσ-
ωτον Gr and part
of the I. explana-
tion - Vat.gr.908
(ut videtur)

Or. 289 above 

ἐξιστάρον

gloss ἢρωτῶν B.M.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11

cf. ἔρωταν (sic!) Vat.gr.908

same gloss

Or. 289 above

νίν

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

same gloss

Or. 289 above 

ματέρι

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

no gloss

Or. 289 above 

χρη

gloss πρέπει
part of the I. explanation

no gloss

Or. 290 above 

γενελέον

gloss πρός
no counterpart in Dindorf

cf. Vat.gr.908 πρός τοῦ
(ut videtur)

same gloss

Or. 290 above 

ἐκτείναι λίτας

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

no gloss
Or. 291 above
gloss ἐμπαλεῖν
no counterpart in Dindorf
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11,
Vat.gr.908
gloss ἐὰς σφαγήν
κληρίσα -no counterpart in Dindorf,
cf. ἐὰς τὴν σφαγήν
Vat.gr.908

Or. 292 above
gloss ἐξειδίκ: part of the I. explanation.
Vat.gr.908, Vat.gr.2376
(ut videtur)
same gloss preceded by καί

Or. 292 above
gloss ἀναβίωναί
part of the I. explanation
same gloss

Or. 293 above
gloss ξυκλλον
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
same gloss (ut videtur)

Or. 293 above
gloss οία νυν κάσχω (ut videtur)
o no counterpart in Dindorf.
Cambridge Nn.3.14 (ut videtur)
Cambridge Mm.1.11 - gloss
ὑπομενεῖν part of the I. explanation. - Cambridge Nn.3.14
the same, adding gloss ξηράδοςειν
Cambridge Mm.1.11 the same two
glosses but reading ὑπομένειν

Or. 294 above
gloss σεαυτήν
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
same gloss

Or. 294 above
κασδγνητον
κάμα
no gloss
gloss ἥγους ἡξελφή?
no counterpart in Dindorf. cf. ἡξελφή
Vat.gr.908

Or. 295 above
gloss ἀξιστηθα (ut videtur)
part of the I. explanation
same gloss

Or. 295 above
gloss λίαν
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Mm.1.11
no gloss

Or. 296 above
gloss διακείμεθα
part of the I. explanation
Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11
same gloss
Or. 296 above διψαμήναν' gloss λειποθυμήσαντα ἦ μανέντα no gloss part of the I. explanation and Gu (Dindorf vol.II p.102, note 2)

Or. 297 above διαφθοράν gloss μανέν (ut videtur) no counterpart in Dindorf ἦ τὸ μανέν Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 part of the I. ex-

Or. 298 above ἵσχανε (ἵσχανε) gloss κάλυς part of the I. explanation. Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 same gloss adding gloss ἔκεχε

Or. 298 above παραμυθοῦ gloss ---καὶ---? no gloss

Or. 298 above στέννος gloss στενάζεια (ut videtur) no gloss cf. λυκεῖσαι? Vat.gr.908

Or. 299 above ἦμας gloss ἦ ἐμέ (ut videtur) no counterpart in Dindorf gloss ἐμὲ

Or. 299 above νουθετεῖν gloss παρακαλεῖν Gu. Cambridge Nn.3.14 and Mm.1.11 gloss παραμυθεῖσθαι Gr.

Or. 299 above φέλα gloss τὰ προσφιλῆ Gr and part of the I. ex-
gloss the same + ἀν + pl

Or. 300 above αἰδε gloss αὕται αἱ παρ’αλλήλων--- no gloss There is a hole in the text here; what can be read is part of the text: αὕται αἱ παρ’

Or. 300 above ἑτικουρίαι gloss δοκεῖοι no gloss
Or. 301 above Βάσα

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

gloss πορευθέντα
part of the I. explanation

Or. 301 above δωδεκάν έπω

gloss ω or ἔν??
no gloss

Or. 302 above διερρήσαν

gloss το ὅμων 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. 142 κοίτας</th>
<th>as the reading is λέχωνς</th>
<th>Ryl 1689</th>
<th>GkS 3549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 145 Τυοῦ</td>
<td>no η</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 146 Ἐ χλᾶ</td>
<td>no η</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 148 Βδᾶν</td>
<td>no η</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 153 δ Φίλα</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 154 τῦχαν</td>
<td>no η</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 206 ἀ</td>
<td>no η</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
<td>η on top of the α</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| v. 323 δίχαν | no η | η on top of the α | no η |
| v. 326 λύσσας | no η | η on top of the α | no η |
| v. 329 άν | η on top of the α | η on top of the α | η on top of the α |
| v. 331 γὰς | η on top of the α | η on top of the α | η on top of the α |
| v. 338 ματέρους | η on top of the α | η on top of the α | η on top of the α |
| v. 338 σᾶς | η on top of the α | η on top of the α | η on top of the α |
| v. 342 θοᾶς | no η | η on top of the α | η on top of the α |
Gks 3549, 8°, fol. 41r (Hecuba 1082-1098), cf. above p. 14, note 41. Only the 3 glosses signalized by arrows are written in red ink. NB. A "minigloss" (cf. above, p. 15) is seen over the last word on the page. (Photo Kgl. Bibli., København)