

'MINI-GLOSS' OR VARIANT ? ¹⁾

Bjarne Schartau

Attic η (or inflected $\eta\nu$ $\eta\varsigma$) written over Doric α in lyric passages is a well known phenomenon in Byzantine manuscripts of the Greek dramatists. ²⁾ It seems, however, never to have been the subject of any special investigation.

In the present paper we shall be dealing with the following questions:

- a) the age of the phenomenon
- b) the uniformity/non-uniformity of the phenomenon
- c) the meaning of the phenomenon

(In a number of cases these η ($\eta\nu$ $\eta\varsigma$) could be considered a kind of 'mini-variant readings', but in most cases they are evidently 'mini-glosses'. ³⁾ In what follows it will be seen that the term 'mini-gloss' is being used indiscriminately.)

With the exception of a brief excursus into the field of Aeschylean manuscripts, we shall confine ourselves to the plays of the Euripidean triad (Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae).

The present paper was originally completed in 1976. The text here printed remains substantially the same as then, though a number of minor alterations (including the excursus on Aeschylean MSS) and corrections have been introduced. Thanks are due to Dr. Ole L. Smith, senior lecturer in the University of Copenhagen, for references, suggestions and for the loan of microfilms and photographs of the Aeschylean MSS quoted.

- 1) The term 'mini-gloss' was, as far as is known to the author of the present paper, coined by Dr. Jørgen Raasted, Copenhagen. Cf. Bjarne Schartau, *Observations on the Activities of the Byzantine Grammarians of the Palaeologian Era. I.*, CIMA GL, 4, 1970, 15 & 33.
- 2) Of course Attic η over Doric α also occurs in manuscripts of Pindar and Theocritus.
- 3) Other types of 'mini-glosses' may be variants: e.g. MS Sa (Vat. gr. 1345), Hec. 645 $\epsilon\delta\eta$ s.l. α ; Phoen. 315/6 $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$ s.l. $-\omega\nu$ --- $\chi\alpha\rho\mu\omicron\nu\alpha\nu$ s.l. $\omega\nu$, or they may be glosses: e.g. B (Paris. gr. 2713), Orest. 1399 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\delta\alpha$: sup. α scr. $\omicron\nu$ α (Spranger ad loc., cf. note 14 of the present paper). Such examples are legion.

First one word on papyri.

From publications of papyri containing lyric passages of the Euripidean triadic (or other) plays it appears that no 'mini-glosses' are to be found in this material. ⁴⁾

Before we embark on a brief investigation of the 'mini-gloss' η in a number of medieval manuscripts, it will be convenient to state in plain figures, in how many cases we are to expect 'mini-glosses' in the triadic plays. The figures have been based upon the text of Gilbert Murray's edition. ⁵⁾ It has, of course, been necessary first to eliminate all those cases, where a Doric α in the text is due to modern conjecture. We shall be noting *loci* where some of the MSS in the poetic text read α , while others read η ('var. lectio position'). It cannot be guaranteed that the figures are absolutely correct, but substantially they should be reliable.

For the *Hecuba* we count c. 170 potential 'mini-gloss-loci' (27 of these in 'var. lectio position'). For the *Orestes* c. 148 (c. 30 of these in 'var. lectio position'). For the *Phoenissae* c. 230 (c. 55 of these in 'var. lectio position'). The total for the three plays should thus be c. 548. ⁶⁾

- 4) Cf. R.A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, 2nd Revised and Enlarged Edition (Ann Arbor, 1965/7), where see references to publications of the papyri. The items of interest are: (Pack, no.) 389-402 - 410 - 411 - 414 - 416 - 417 - 418 - 421 - 422 - 423 - 426.
- 5) *Euripidis Fabulae I-III. Recognovit brevisque adnotatione critica instruxit Gilbertus Murray* (Oxford, 1902-09), (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis).
- 6) In the figures from the MSS we make no distinction between η $\eta\nu$ $\eta\varsigma$. It is further to be noted that $\acute{\alpha}$ (relativum) is often glossed by a $\acute{\eta}\tau\iota\varsigma$, not a simple $\acute{\eta}$, and that in many potential cases there is in the MSS no room for a η due to the use of compendia such as $\mu\beta\varsigma$ $\mu\beta\alpha$ $\mu\beta\iota$ (gen., acc., and dative of $\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$).

The dating of our oldest extant medieval witnesses of the Euripidean texts has for long been (and to a certain extent still is) a much disputed point, but the essence of the problem has been well stated by Kjeld Matthiessen: ⁷⁾ "We ... should get used to the idea that there are only four really old manuscripts M B H and Ga, ⁸⁾ all of them written before 1204 ... Then follows a gap, and all the rest of our Mss are written after 1261, when the Capital was recaptured by the Greeks." This will do, and we need not discuss the relative age of the four old witnesses, though there is apparently much sense in assigning the earliest date to the Jerusalem palimpsest (H).

H, Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library (Τάφου) 36, ⁹⁾ can now be

7) K. Matthiessen, Manuscript Problems in Euripides' Hecuba, GRBS, Vol. 10, Winter 1969, no. 4, 293-305 (in part. 300).

8) To these should be added Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 507, a gnomologium somewhat younger than Ga and according to G. A. Longman, Gnomologium Vatopedianum: The Eur. Section, CQ, N.S. 1959, 129-141, an apograph of Ga (but still a product of the 12th century). Cf. also A. Turyn, The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides (Urbana, Illinois, 1957), 93; A. Tuilier, Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide (Paris, 1968), 150-153 and K. Matthiessen, Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides (Heidelberg, 1974), 37, 130.

9) 10th to 11th century according to the editor (The Jerusalem Palimpsest of Euripides. A Facsimile Edition with Commentary by Stephen G. Daitz (Berlin, 1970), 1, n. 1; 4-10, 31-32). Cf. Matthiessen, Studien, 41; a review of Daitz' edition by N.G. Wilson, CR, N.S. 21, 1971, 349-351. Tuilier, Recherches critiques, 157, n. 3, quite unconvincingly suggests as the date of H c. 1160-65. See the reviews of Tuilier's book by O. Kresten, ByzZ, LXV, 1972, 400-406 (in partic. 400, where the hands ¹H and ²H are dated at the beginning of the 11th century), and by K. Matthiessen, Gymnasium, 1971, 78, 150-153 (in partic. 152). Cf. however also the review by H. Hunger, Gnomon, XLIII, 1971, 123-130 (in partic. 124), where seemingly the date of Tuilier is accepted.

Apart from H. all the MSS quoted have been collated in microfilm or photoprints. The following MSS have also been partly consulted in the originals: (Euripides) A, B. Zc. T, Brit. Mus. Add. 10 057 and Arundel 522.

studied in an excellent facsimile thanks to the efforts of Stephen G. Daitz. (In the case of H a digression has been made outside the triad and all lyric passages exhibited by the MS have been examined). No 'mini-glosses' have been found in Daitz' pictures (unless there is, after all, one η over Phoen. 811 ἄλλα (Daitz, plate 8)?).

Ga, the gnomologium (or rather 'anthology'), Athos, Barone-δίου 36, ¹⁰⁾ exhibits - as was to be expected - predominantly verses selected from the iambic and trochaic sections of the triadic plays.¹¹⁾ In fact only two lines from lyric passages can be found: Orest. 340 and 823, both of which offer no opportunity for 'mini-glosses'.

M, Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 471.¹²⁾ In this MS the 'mini-gloss' type occurs, but only very sporadically. It is difficult - on the basis of microfilm alone - to decide whether these entries were made by the original scribe(s) or they should be considered later additions. Furthermore, it is in a number of cases far from easy to ascertain whether what might be taken for a 'mini-gloss' η is in fact just a discoloured spot in the parchment! With this reservation we count a maximum of 8 occurrences for the Hecuba, 9 for the Orestes and 6 for the Phoenissae. A few of these were recorded as *variae lectiones* (or corrections) in Murray's apparatus: on Hec. 178, 207; Orest. 963, and Phoen. 649.

B, Paris, Bib. nat. A.f. gr. 2713, may be the oldest extant Euripidean MS next to H and is in any case the oldest extant manuscript in which the 'mini-gloss' η occurs with relative frequency.¹³⁾ (in the original portion of the volume that is.

10) Presumably from the beginning of the 12th century, cf. Matthiessen, Studien, 37.

11) Only these have been collated for the present paper. Ga further exhibits excerpts from the plays Hipp., Med., Andr., Alc., Rhes.

12) Perhaps to be assigned to the 11th century, cf. Matthiessen, Studien, 48.

13) Turyn and Tuilier would date this MS '12th century', while Vitelli, Allen, Irigoin and other assign it to the first half of the 11th century. (For references, see Matthiessen, Studien, 44).

We disregard the 15th century replacements - f. 1-16). Unfortunately, it has not been possible to the author of the present paper to count all the 'mini-glosses' in B - partly due to lack of complete microfilm material and partly due to lack of time for the inspection of the original MS (on a single day in January 1972) - but is it a general impression that the 'mini-glosses' in this MS (or at least the majority of them) may well be 'later additions'. This tallies with Spranger's observations in his collation of the *Orestes* in B.¹⁴⁾ He reports some 30 cases of η ($\eta\nu$ $\eta\zeta$) over α (only 2 of these in 'var. lectio position'), but he may have left out a limited number of 'mini-glosses' - on purpose or by accident. 17 (19?) of these 'mini-glosses' he attributes to 'a²' (a *manus recentior* in B), while in the remaining cases he gives no definite attribution, which does not necessarily imply that he would in these cases attribute the η 's to 'a¹'.

We now turn to some representatives of the enormous bulk of post-1261 manuscripts.

We first quote two manuscripts which may have been written in the period between the reconquest of the Capital and c. 1300, both of them much studied by scholars.

A, Paris, Bib. nat. A.f.gr. 2712.¹⁵⁾ In the triadic section (the non-triadic has not been collated) this MS seems to exhibit one 'mini-gloss' only: the η over $\delta\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ (Hec. 66), which was recorded in Murray's *apparatus* as a *varia lectio*.

14) J.A. Spranger, A New Collation of the *Orestes* of Euripides with Cod. Par. Gr. 2713, CQ, XXXIII, (January) 1939, 184-192.

15) Turyn (Euripides, 89, n. 146) dates this MS in the 14th century. This is supported by Ole L. Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (Leiden, 1975), 92, n. 70 (c. 1325 or earlier?). References to scholars favouring an earlier date (before 1300) will be found in Matthiessen, *Studien*, 43 f.

Sa, Bibl. Vat. gr. 1345,¹⁶⁾ exhibits c. 50 'mini-glosses' (c. 9 % of the potential) for the three plays. 14 of these occur in 'var. lectio position'.

(S, Salamanca, Bibl. Universitaria 31, a manuscript related to Sa, but somewhat younger (dated 1326)¹⁷⁾ exhibits c. 90 'mini-glosses' (c. 16.4 % of the potential).¹⁸⁾ In both Sa and S it appears that at least the majority of the 'mini-glosses' belong to the original product.)

From the first half of the 14th century shall also be mentioned Cambridge, Univ. Library, Nn. 3.14 (ff. 1-121 incl.), Turyn's Z and representative of his 'first Thoman recension'.¹⁹⁾ It is a manuscript presumably of the first quarter of the 14th century, written on Western paper.²⁰⁾ It exhibits 17 'mini-glosses' for the Hecuba (10 %), c. 20 for the Orestes (13.5 %) and 38 for the Phoenissae (16.5 %). (Total c. 75 or an average of 13.3 %).

Zb, Vat. gr. 51, presumably written c. 1320,²¹⁾ is Turyn's

16) Written on Oriental paper by one Theodorus and dated '14th century' by Turyn. Matthiessen, Studien, 47 finds a dating at the end of the 13th century equally possible.

17) Matthiessen, Studien, 45. The scribe is one John Calliandrus.

18) In this MS we find in a number of instances, instead of of a η a sign resembling η . There is, however, no doubt that the function is the same. There is at least one example of this sign also in Zb (Vat. gr. 51).

19) The existence of a recension (or two!) of the poetic text of the triad by Thomas Magister alongside with the scholia safely attributed to him by Triclinius in T (Angelicus gr. 14) has been questioned by several scholars. Cf. e.g. Matthiessen, Studien 95-100 and Smith, Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus, 8, n. 12, 81, n. 55, 132 f.

20) Dr. Ole L. Smith has now demonstrated the existence of watermarks in the Cambridge MS. See his paper, Notes and Observations on some Manuscripts of the Scholia on Aeschylus, C & M 31, 1970 (1976), 13-48 (in partic. 28-29). Matthiessen, Studien, 50 (following Turyn?), says: "Papier (westlich ohne Wasserzeichen)".

21) Matthiessen's date "etwa 1305" (Studien, 51) is odd, and in any case his characterization of the paper as "östlich" is quite off the mark. The paper is Western with clearly discernible watermarks. See Smith, Studies, 81, n. 56 with detailed information on the watermarks in Vat. 51 by Paul Canart, who concludes: "... le ms me semble à situer dans les années 1320-25."

main representative of his 'second Thoman recension'. It is interesting as far as the 'mini-glosses' are concerned. For the Hecuba and the Orestes are only found resp. 2 (3?) and 3 'mini-glosses' but in the Phoenissae section there are 32 (33?), i.e. c. 14 % of the potential. Most of the 'mini-glosses' are concentrated in the lyric passages from 672 ff. The majority of the 'mini-glosses' in Zb seem to have been written by the main scribe, while a few may have been added by one or more later hands.

Zc, Copenhagen, Kongl. bibl., GkS 3549, 8^o (early 14th century),²²⁾ one of Turyn's representatives of the 'second Thoman recension', exhibits a greater number of 'mini-glosses' than the preceding MSS. For the Hecuba c. 50 (29.4 %), for the Orestes c. 48 (32.4 %) and for the Phoenissae c. 50 (21.7 %). Total c. 148 (c. 28 %). Again, the majority of the 'mini-glosses' seem to be due to the main scribe.

T, Rome, Bibl. Angelica, gr. 14.²³⁾ As Turyn has demonstrated, this MS is to be considered the master copy of Demetrius Triclinius' final recension of the triad and large portions

22) On the dating of this MS and its possible connection with Demetrius Triclinius, see B. Schartau, Observations on the Activities of the Byzantine Grammarians of the Palaeologian Era. II. (Odense, 1973), 52 ff.; Matthiessen, Studien, 51; Smith, Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I., 99, n. 80. In spite of Dr. Smith's remarks to the effect that the question of the Triclinian authorship of the Copenhagen MS "now ought to be considered settled after the discussion in Schartau,", it should in all fairness be stressed that a substantial doubt still remains among a number of scholars. And it is a fact that none of the reviewers of Schartau's book (apart from Smith, *MustTusc* 23, 1974, 43-47) seem to have accepted his arguments in favour of the Triclinian authorship. (At least they have passed them over in silence). See REByz 32, 1974, 411 (Darrouzès); JOEByz 23, 1974, 357-358 (Trapp); Byzantion XIV, 1975, fasc. 1, 177 (D. DD.); CR, N.S. 26, 1976, 154 (Wilson); *Gnomon* 8, 1976, 811-812 (Irigoien). - See now also N. Wilson, *Miscellanea Palaeographica*, GRBS, 22, 1981, 395-404.

23) Turyn, op. cit., 23-24; Matthiessen, Studien, 52 f.; Smith, Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I, 43 f., 86 ff., 98 ff. & *passim*.

of it were written by himself. With this 'Triclinianity' in mind it is hardly surprising that this MS among all those examined for the present paper ²⁴⁾ has the greatest number of 'mini-glosses'. For the Hecuba 148 (87 %) (18 of these in 'var. lectio position'), for the Orestes 120 (81 %) (17 of these in 'var. lectio position'), and 195 for the Phoenissae (84.8 %) (38 of these in 'var. lectio position'). Total c. 463 occurrences (or an average of 84.3 %). It is our general impression that the 'mini-glosses' as a whole belong to the original product.

The figures on 'mini-glosses' in the Euripidean T are first and foremost to be compared to those of the Aeschylean T (for which see below).

(It is fairly natural that the MSS representing the Triclinian recension should exhibit a large number of 'mini-glosses' and e.g. Brit. Mus. Arundel 522, one of the late representatives (1489 A.D.) ²⁵⁾ has in fact some 300 (c. 54.7 %) of them: c. 100 for the Hecuba (58.8 %), c. 75 for the Orestes (50.7 %), and c. 125 for the Phoenissae (54.3 %). In one case only Arundel 522 has got a 'mini-gloss' where T has none: Phoen. 820 τδν. All the rest are in the same positions as in T.)

L, the famous 14th century MS, Florence, Laur. plut. 32,2 ²⁶⁾ seems to exhibit no 'mini-glosses' at all, at least in the triadic portion. This MS is a highly professional product of the Palaeologan epoch, but the absence of 'mini-glosses' in it may not be all too surprising considering the total lack of other philological paraphernalia (scholia, glosses) in the

24) Some further 15 Euripidean MSS have been examined for the present paper apart from those quoted.

25) It should be mentioned in passing that this was one of the MSS used by King for his famous edition of the triad (1726). See Matthiessen, Studien, 22.

26) Written between 1300 and 1320. Thoroughly analysed by G. Zuntz in his excellent monograph *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), *passim*. Cf. Matthiessen, Studien, 39 f. & *passim* and Smith, Studies, *passim*.

relevant section. It is as if there were some kind of connection between the absence/presence of the 'mini-glosses' and the absence/presence of the more elaborate type of the 'aids to the reader'. (Cf. however the conclusions, below).

A manuscript like Brit. Mus. Add. 10 057 (mid-14th century? in the original stock) exhibits few 'mini-glosses': c. 20 (11.8 %) for the Hecuba, 5 (3.4 %) for the Orestes, and 8 (3.5 %) for the Phoenissae.²⁷⁾

But again, the well known Wolfenbüttel, Gudianus gr. 15 (first half of the 14th century in the triadic portion)²⁸⁾ is well equipped with 'mini-glosses':²⁹⁾ 23 (13.5 %) for the Hecuba c. 50 (33.8 %) for the Orestes, and c. 95 (41.3 %) for the Phoenissae. (Total: 168 or an average of 29.5 % for the three plays).

From the 15th century we shall (besides Arundel 522, for which see above) mention two MSS as examples:

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 403, a late 15th century manuscript representative of the Moschopulean recension,³⁰⁾

27) In the Add. 10 057 the 'mini-glosses' in the Hecuba section are written in red ink like the other interlinear comments. Here, at least, the 'mini-gloss' η - in as far as it is used at all - clearly is part of the original layout. So too in e.g. the 15th century MS, Paris, Bib. nat., A.f.gr. 2598 (representative of Turyn's dyadic class ψ (Turyn, op. cit., 220 f.) and a number of other manuscripts that have been collated for the present article (not mentioned explicitly). But the same may well go for a good many other MSS, which have been consulted in microfilm only.

28) This was the basic manuscript for Wilhelm Dindorf's edition of the scholia: Scholia graeca in Euripidis tragoe-dias ed. G. Dindorf (Oxford, 1863).

29) The majority of the 'mini-gloss' η 's in Gudianus gr. 15 were written by the main scribe Gr. (who wrote the poetic text and the non-Thoman scholia) - though a few of them may be later additions by one or more *manus recentior(es)*, but a smaller number were added in the diminutive handwriting of the other 14th century scribe Gu. (who wrote the Thomano-Triclinian scholia).

30) This is another manuscript collated by King for his 1726 edition. (Cf. n. 25).

has a rather moderate number of 'mini-glosses': 31 (18.2 %) for the Hecuba, 20 (13.5 %) for the Orestes, and 35 (15.2 %) for the Phoenissae. (Total 76 or an average of 15.6 % for the three plays).

Finally, the late 15th century MS, Cambridge, Univ. Library, Nn. 3.13, Turyn's main representative of his dyadic class δ ,³¹⁾ exhibits 60 'mini-glosses' (35.3 %) for the Hecuba (5 of these in 'var. lectio position'), and 87 (37.8 %) for the Orestes (11 of these in 'var. lectio position'). The comparatively great number of 'mini-glosses' in J tallies well with the character of the MS as representative of an edition 'for the use of schools and colleges'.

For the sake of comparison we are now going to make a small excursus into the field of Aeschylean MSS before offering some concluding remarks.

There is at least one obvious reason for preferring Aeschylus to Sophocles or Aristophanes viz. that Demetrius Triclinius' own master copy of his recension of the five plays has come down to us, a fact which enables us to compare the equipment of 'mini-glosses' of his Euripidean MS to that of his Aeschylean.

We first quote the old manuscript M, Laur. plut. 32,9.³²⁾ This MS exhibits a very small number of 'mini-gloss' η 's: Prom. 431; Sept. 107, 131, 140, 294, 687, 748, 992, and Ag. 45-47.³³⁾ The η 's are very diminutive majuscules and are to

31) Turyn, op. cit., 206 ff.

32) Regarding the date of this manuscript see now A. Diller, The Age of some early Greek classical manuscripts. Serta Turyniana (Urbana, Illinois, 1974), 514-524 (in partic. 522). Diller's conclusion is: "I think the codex must be attributed to the middle of the tenth century". (cf. A. Dain, Les manuscrits (Paris, 1964), 29, where the MS is dated somewhat later " ... de la seconde moitié du X^e siècle ..."),

33) R.D. Dawe, The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus (Cambridge, 1964), as a rule left out the η 's written over Doric α 's from his collations (cf. p. x), but quoted the following from M: Prom. 431 (p. 216), Septem 107 (p. 252), 294 (p. 260) and 748 (p. 281). - The remaining 'mini-gloss' η 's in M are being quoted on the authority of Dr. Ole L. Smith, who has examined M for 'mini-glosses' for the author of the present paper.

be attributed to the scholiast M^S, a contemporary of the scribe of the poetic text.

As representatives of the great number of medieval pre-Tri-clinian manuscripts two have been collated:

A, Milan, Ambros. C 222 (c. 1280?³⁴) is interesting in a negative respect in as far as it exhibits very few 'mini-glosses', in spite of the fact that it is a manuscript with a full equipment of scholia (cf. above on L, Laur. plut. 32,2). This manuscript has the Septem and the Persae only. For the former play only one single 'mini-gloss' has been found: over οἶδαρος 730 (in a 'var. lectio position', cf. Dawe, op. cit. n. 33, p. 280). For the Persae are found 6 'mini-glosses'. Since the total number of potential 'mini-gloss-loci' is for the Septem in A c. 89 and for the Persae c. 63, this leaves us with a coverage of 1 % for the former play and 9.5 % for the latter!

B, Florence, Laur. plut. 31,3 & 86,3 (late 13th century)³⁵ has a high ratio of 'mini-glosses' exhibiting for the Prometheus as well as for the Septem c. 66 % of the potential. For the Persae, however, the percentage is only 11.5 %, B is a manuscript with a full equipment of scholia, interlinear glosses and notes.

34) A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York, 1943), 37 dates this MS "early XIVth cent." On p. 38, n. 47 he compares the script of A with that of Laur. plut. 32,16 (dated and subscribed A.D. 1280) and finds a "striking resemblance". Nonetheless he attributes A to a period a little later "on internal grounds with regard to its Pindaric portion". J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), 239-41, offers the information that the paper of the MS is Oriental (i.e. without watermarks) and discusses Turyn's arguments. Irigoin concludes that there is to him no palaeographical justification for at date later than c. 1280 for A as compared to Plut. 32,16.

35) D. Page (ed.), *Aeschylus septem quae supersunt tragoedias* (Oxford, 1972), p. xi: "saec. xiii ex.". The original stock of the MS was written and subscribed by one Manuel Spheueas in 1287. Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus*, 54 f. and Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I*, 185, n. 50.

T, Naples, II F 31, Demetrius Triclinius' master copy of the triadic plays, the Agamemnon and the Eumenides ³⁶⁾ exhibits an extremely great number of 'mini-glosses'; in fact an even higher ratio than the Euripidean T, Angelicus gr. 14. For the Prometheus c. 48 out of 57 potential *loci* (84.2 %). For the Septem 89 out of 96 (92.7 %). For the Persae 64 out of 67 (95.5 %). For the Agamemnon 99 out of 106 (93.4 %) and for the Eumenides 52 out of 66 (78.8 %), which would yield an average ratio of 88.9 % for all five plays against the 84.3 % of the Angelicus. If Turyn's conclusions concerning the sequence of the Triclinian recensions ³⁷⁾ are still to be considered valid, the Aeschylean recension should be later in time than the Euripidean. The fact that the 'mini-gloss' ratio is higher for the Aeschylean than for the Euripidean MS might corroborate this view.

Finally, we may quote P, Paris, Bib. nat., A.f.gr. 2787 ³⁸⁾ (early 14th century), a definitely post-Triclinian MS with selective readings and commentary (in some respects resembling the Euripidean Gudianus gr. 15). P has a ratio of c. 33 % of the potential 'mini-glosses' for the Prometheus, 33 % for the Septem and 20 % for the Persae (or an average of 28.7 %).

36) For the date of this MS see now Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I*, 34 ff. The watermarks would suggest a date c. 1330.

37) Turyn's basic conclusion was that the sequence was Euripides-Sophocles-Aeschylus and the Aristophanes after the Sophocles recension. See Turyn, *Euripides*, 32 ff. For a discussion and elaboration of this see Smith, *Studies*, 41 ff.

38) Page (cf. n. 35): "saec.) xiv". This MS was thoroughly analysed by R. Aubreton, *Démétrius Triclinius et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle* (Paris, 1949), see in partic. 137 ff. (Information on watermarks and dating: "C'est ... de la première moitié du XIV^e siècle, sinon du premier quart qu'il faut dater ce manuscrit, ..."). Ole L. Smith, *Notes and Observations ... etc.* (cf. n. 20 of the present paper), 35-36, offers some important corrections of Aubreton's watermark-information, which is seen to be far from accurate. He discusses the suggestion of a later date for the MS by some scholars (Irigoin and others) and concludes: "the early date given by Aubreton, though incorrectly based, seems to be correct."

Conclusions:

a) The use of the 'mini-gloss' η appears to be a genuine Byzantine phenomenon. When we exclude the unlikely possibility that all 'mini-glosses' in pre-Palaeologan manuscripts might be later additions by Palaeologan (or even Renaissance) scholars, the occurrence of the type in MSS M (Marc. 471) and B (Paris. gr. 2713) as well as the Aeschylean M (Laur. plut. 32,9) enables us to trace the 'mini-gloss' η back towards the μεταπαλαιολογισμός.³⁹⁾

b) On the other hand, a more extensive use of the 'mini-gloss' η is obviously characteristic of the scholarly activities of the Palaeologan Era⁴⁰⁾ culminating in the MSS of Triclinius. As we have seen, he for one employed the type wellnigh uniformly. As for the other MSS (including the post-Triclinian examples) we get the impression that there is often a marked fluctuation in the use of the type, from one manuscript to another and even within the single manuscripts themselves. It is furthermore worthy of note that none of the MSS examined - apart from the two Triclinian ones and the MS B for the first two plays of the Aeschylean triad - surpass a 'mini-gloss' ratio of 60 % of the potential, and that the majority as an average do not even reach one third of it.

When we take into consideration the Euripidean MS L (Laur. plut. 32,2) - as the most striking example among the MSS quoted - it might be tempting to see some connection between the absence/presence of the 'mini-glosses' and the absence/presence of the marginal scholia and the interlinear comments and glosses. Thus L would exhibit no 'mini-glosses' because in the triadic portion it offers no 'aids to the reader' (apart from the habitual abbreviations for γυναικόν, ὄρατον, σημείωσαι).

39) See Dain, Les manuscrits, 101 f. and 126-133.

40) The lack of manuscripts from the period c. 1150-1260 leaves a deplorable gap in our sources of information on the use of the 'mini-glosses' in the pre-Palaeologan period. We might just think of Eustathius' ϵ , the Vorlage of the manuscript A which became the model of L (Laur. plut. 32,2). Cf. Zuntz, An Inquiry, 185.

This hypothesis does not seem entirely unjustified, although it is certainly not corroborated, neither by Zb (Vat. gr. 51), where the only greater concentration of 'mini-glosses' (cf. on Zb above) is in fact to be found in that section of the Phoenissae which is totally lacking marginal comments and which offers only some stray interlinear glosses, nor by the MS A in Aeschylus which exhibits a full set of scholia and glosses, but next to no 'mini-glosses'. (A, however, may be a rather isolated case among the fully annotated MSS.)

c) It seems obvious that the 'mini-gloss' η ($\eta\nu$ $\eta\varsigma$) should on the whole be considered a type of 'interlinear gloss'. There is no good reason for forcing a distinction between the use of the type as on the one hand 'gloss' and on the other 'var. lectio'. The occurrence of the type in what has been styled 'var. lectio position' above is accidental. ⁴¹⁾

What matters simply is this: where a Doric α ($\alpha\nu$ $\alpha\varsigma$) occurs in a word in the poetic text, it was possible (but far from 'obligatory') to write over it an Attic η ($\eta\nu$ $\eta\varsigma$) as a pointer.

It would be sensible not to record such η ($\eta\nu$ $\eta\varsigma$) in a standard *apparatus criticus*. ⁴²⁾

41) See e.g. the *apparatus criticus* of Page's edition (cf. n. 35 of the present paper) on Prom. 145 (p. 294), 414 and 416 (p. 304), Ag. 45-47 (p. 140) (cf. n. 33 of the present paper), and Ag. 419 (p. 153).

42) Cf. now Donald J. Mastronarde and Jan Maarten Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai* (University of California Press, Berkeley - L.A. - London, 1982), 184.