Codex Scurialensis T.I.15 and the Transmission of Aeschylus’ Suppliants

H. Friis Johansen

The most famous and most precious manuscript of Aeschylus, as everybody knows, is the old Medicus (M = Medicus Laurentianus 32.9),¹ which, together with Sophocles and Apollonius Rhodius, contains the text with scholia of the seven preserved Aeschylean tragedies, with the exception of most of Agamemnon and the beginning of Choephoroe, which have been missing at least from the beginning of the XV century. Even though its privileged position as a witness for the text of Aeschylus has been seriously shaken, particularly as far as the plays of the so-called Byzantine triad (Prometheus, Septem and Persae) are concerned,² no one can possibly deny that it is by far the most important manuscript of Aeschylus which we possess today. This will remain true even if, as I hope, I succeed in reducing its importance a little on a point where, up to now, it has generally been assumed to be unassailable.

For more than a hundred years it has been regarded as an established fact that Choephoroe and Supplices have been transmitted solely through M,³ or in other words, that all other existing manuscripts of these plays are copies of M and that all good readings in these manuscripts which are not found in M are due to conjecture. As a natural consequence of this view, these manuscripts make only a very sporadic appearance in modern apparatuses, and when they do appear they are usually collectively treated and labelled ‘apogr.’ The contempt of modern editors for manuscripts which, justly or unjustly, they regard as being of no use for the recension of their text, in this as in so many cases goes

¹ For a description of the Laurentianus, see Rossignol’s introd. to the facsimile edition, L’Eschilo Laurentiano, Facsimile pubblicato sotto gli auspizi del Ministero delle Istruzioni Pubbliche (Florence 1886); Wilamowitz, introd. to his ed. maior (Berlin 1914) pp. x–xiv; A. Turyn, The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus (New York 1943) 17–19, with bibliography. Turyn has a description of the apographs on pp. 20–23.
² See now, above all, R. D. Dawe, The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus (Cambridge 1964). Knowledge of the methods applied and the results arrived at in this splendid book is presupposed throughout the present paper.
³ See, e.g., M. Haupi’s preface to Fierung’s posthumous edition (Berlin 1852) pp. vi–ix.
so far that they do not think it worthwhile to ascertain whether conjectures ascribed by them and their predecessors to editors of the XVI century may not in fact be found in one or several late manuscripts. It may reasonably be doubted whether the laborious task of checking the ascription of conjectures is always worth undertaking, but as long as the names of Robortello, Victorius, Turnebus and others loom large in apparatuses, thanks to what are often rather insignificant corrections, the more or less anonymous scribes of XV and XVI century manuscripts may justly claim their part as well.

When, fairly recently, I started preparing a new edition of the Suppliants, such considerations as these moved me to undertake a complete (re)collation not only of M but of all the existing manuscripts of the text and scholia of this play. Their number is small: excluding M, we possess today five manuscripts of the text, of which four contain scholia,4 and in addition four manuscripts of scholia alone.5 I may add at once that my harvest of readings commonly ascribed to editors of printed editions or to other scholars but anticipated in late manuscripts was comparatively rich, and this alone would seem to have repaid my trouble. But also I found some reason, as far as Suppliants is concerned, for sharing the doubts expressed a few years ago by Dr R. D. Dawé6 as to whether the question of the relationship of the younger manuscripts to M can be regarded as finally closed with such dicta as that of Wilamowitz, "Choeophoros et Supplices uni debenti Mediceo dudum constat."7 Four of the five text manuscripts—Laurentianus Marcianus 222, Bononiensis 2271, Guelferbytanus Gudianus Gr. 88, Parisinus Anc.f.gr. 2286—undoubtedly are direct copies of M; of the manuscripts containing only scholia, one (Parisinus Anc.f.gr. 2070) was directly copied from M, two (Vaticanus Gr. 1476 and Monacensis Gr. 91) are copies of Paris 2070, and one (Vaticanus Palatinus Gr. 51) is a copy of Laur. Marc. 222.8 But the last

4 The fifth, Parisinus 2886, contains only two or three scholia, all of them very short.
5 The number of scholia in each manuscript varies considerably. Not one of them contains all the scholia which are in M; some have less than half the total number.
6 Op cit. (supra n.2) 12 n.: "This question should not be regarded as finally closed until all the alleged apographa have been fully collated. One or two of the reported readings (e.g. Suppl. 788-900) give one grounds for wondering whether they may not be offspring of a genealog of M: the question is however not likely to be one of great practical importance." It is not, indeed.
7 Introdc. to ed. maior (supra n.1) p. xxii.
8 At least as far as the scholia to the Suppliants are concerned. Turyn's statement (op cit. [supra n.1] 22) that this manuscript is a direct copy of M is at best only partially true.

This manuscript, which I have collated first from a photostat copy and later from the original, is a paper manuscript dated by Turyn to the XVI century; I am not in a position to query this dating, which goes back at least to Hermann9 and rests on palaeographical evidence alone. In 154310 the manuscript was in Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza's collection,11 which after his death in 1575 passed to the Escorial. It was probably acquired by Mendoza in Italy, where during the 1540's he collected most of his Greek manuscripts.12 It contains Nonnus' Dionysiaca and, by the same hand, one play by Aeschylus, the Suppliants, with scholia. It was recorded by Hermann as E, a symbol which I shall retain in the following discussion. A first collation quickly showed me that this manuscript could not have been copied from M. The proof is as follows.

Lines 994-95 in the Suppliants run like this in all modern texts:

πόν δ' ἐν μετοίκῳ γλώσσαν εὐθυκόν φέρει κακὴρ, τό τε εἰπέων εὐθείας μισάγμα πισ.

(eὐθυκόν is Spanheim's correction for εὐθυκόν, which is in all Mss; this does not affect my argument.) E has the following text:

πόν δ' ἐν μετοίκῳ γλώσσαν εὐθυκόν φέρει κα κακήρ, κα τε, κτλ.

There is a blank space of one letter between κα and κα; evidently the scribe here could not read what was in the manuscript from which he copied his text, and he did not possess the minimum of intelligence necessary to choose between the alternatives κα κακήρ and κα κακήρ in this context. M here has κα κακήρ, with a clearly visible and unmistakable κ,
written by the original hand and never exposed to corrections, blots, or any other kind of injury. A man who copied M, no matter how foolish, could not possibly miss this κ, which moreover is part of one of the most frequent words in the Greek language, and one which causes no difficulties at all in the context.

And there are three similar cases elsewhere in E. One occurs a few lines further on. Line 988 runs:

τέρειν ὑπάρχα δ' ἐφοβολακτος οὐδαμός.

Here E has δ' ἐφοβολακτος, with a space of one letter; M has δ' ἐφοβολακτος by the original hand; no corrections, no blots, no faded or vanished letter (see plates 6 and 7). Apart from these two cases, there are two more in the scholia: 71 θερμωθείσαν Μ: θε[ ]θείσαν E, 717-18 ἱμῶ M: ἱμ[ ] E. The possibility that, if not the text, at least the scholia of E were copied from M, is thus precluded.

If E is not a copy of M, there are, a priori, three possibilities: it represents a tradition which is not derived from M,—presumably it is then derived from a gemellus of M, in view of the very close general similarity between the text of E and that of M; or it is an indirect copy of M; or it combines independent material and material indirectly derived from M. The evidence for deciding between these three possibilities is, as was to be expected, extremely scarce. I can say at once that if E is an indirect copy of M, the manuscript from which it was copied no longer exists. This is as far as one can get by way of strict proof; but there are a few readings in E which to me seem to create a strong presumption against the idea that E is wholly dependent on M. Whether it is wholly or partly independent of M is a matter of small practical consequence.

348. τέκος Μ²: τόκος Μ² Ε.

In M the o is only faintly visible beneath the e. The correction, made either by the scribe himself or by the διορθωτής, is such an obvious improvement that it is not easy to see why the source of E should have chosen the false reading when it was so much more difficult to get out of M than was the correct one. It may be added that if E is derived from a gemellus of M, then at least one of the M² readings which seem to be corrections of individual errors made by the scribe of M can with great probability be classified as the correction of an error which was already in the source of M.

421. ἐκβολαίς Μ: ἐμβολαίς Ε.

This may just be the misreading of a κ; but it should be noted that ἐκβολαίς creates considerable difficulties for the commentator: the girls have not been 'cast out', they have fled away, led by their father, and are being pursued by the Egyptians. If ἐμβολαίς is not due to a visual error, it may claim to be taken seriously, as a reading which implies a kind of violent action on the part of the Egyptians, which resulted, directly or indirectly, in the flight of the Danaids; cf. 742 καὶ λέγει πρὸς εἶδότα. Euripides has ἐμβολή of a bull's charge (Hē 869) and of a lion's charge (fr.689.4); it may not be irrelevant to recall the image of the heifer pursued by the wolf in Suppl. 350ff and to remember that images of wild animals pursuing or attacking innocent victims occur repeatedly in this play. Certainly it is imaginable that the man who here misread a letter in his source was not the scribe of E but the scribe of M. The possibility that ἐμβολαίς in E is due to conjecture can of course be ruled out; no mediaeval or renaissance scribe, however learned, would find fault with ἐκβολαίς. Finally, I want to draw attention to the marginal scholion on this line, διωγμος ἔκλοκος, which would seem to fit ἐμβολαίς better than ἐκβολαίς, the usual meaning of διωκει and διωγμος in classical and Byzantine Greek being closer to the idea of pursuit than to that of expulsion. This argument, however, cannot be pressed as long as we do not possess exhaustive concordances of scholiasts' language.

549. μονοῖν Μ: μοῦσον Ε.

The reading of E is commonly ascribed to Turnebus; it is evident that it is nearer to the truth—perhaps either Μοῆς (Paley) or Μοῦσοι (Newman)—then is the reading of M. A scribe might know Teuthras' city, Teuthramia, or Teuthras himself from a number of sources, e.g. Herodotus, Xenophon, Apollodorus, Strabo, Plutarch;13 but it may be doubted whether it would occur to him that there was anything wrong with μοῦσον. Why should not King Teuthras' city be of musical renown? To the best of my knowledge there are no other 'learned conjectures' either in E or in the other late manuscripts of the Suppliants but only attempts at correcting the language. A purely fortuitous omission of an omicron on the part of E cannot of course be

13 See the articles Teuthrania 2 (W. Ruge) and Teuthras 1 (G. Türk) in RE 5A (1934) col. 1139-63.
ruled out, although I have not come across other cases of ou becoming o by way of mechanical error.

576. βία M: βία E.

This difference between M and E at first glance seems very insignificant, but closer inspection will, I think, show that it is of some importance. The sentence as it is transmitted in M, βία δ' ἀπημάκτω σθενεὶ καὶ θελας ἑπτάκιοι παίκται, construes smoothly enough with βία as a nominative, and this is how it has been taken by most editors, including Wilamowitz and Murray, irrespective of the fact that the scholiast on this line, λέεται δ' καί, is then completely unintelligible. The text of E, however, βία δ' ἀπημάκτω σθενεὶ κ. θ. παίκται, on a superficial view, with its three datives suffers from just that lack of a connecting particle which the scholiast points out. βία therefore, if it is not due to case assimilation nor an improbably shrewd conjecture, represents an older stage in the history of the text than does βία—and from this older stage there is a short and easy step to Headlam's brilliant conjecture βία δ' ἀπημακτοσθενεῖ, which (1) does justice to the scholiast, (2) avoids an awkward change of subject, (3) gives us a compound adjective with the true Aeschylean ring, and (4) receives strong support from line 1067 εἰμεν ἑλαίον κτῆσις (it is worthwhile comparing the entire passages 574–79 and 1062–67 in order to see the force of this argument). The scribe of M may have intended the dative, but those who copied M could not read his thoughts, and what they saw was βία plus παίκται. All the apographa have βία.

828. ὀδύς κάκκοις M: ὀδύς κάκκας E.

This, as far as I can see, makes the nearest possible approach to a proof that at least some readings in E are independent of M. Both readings, that of E as well as that of M, are absolutely devoid of meaning; if E or his source had tried to supplement the ὀδύς of M by conjecture they would presumably have written ὀμαῖα or something else which was interpretable as a Greek word, and not ὀδύς. The possibility that the source of E misread the ὀδύς of M as an ou is, I think, out of the question: the alpha in M is a clear and normal one, and the breathing and accent could not easily be overlooked. Moreover, E everywhere in this passage has the same spaces between 'words' (or whatever we would prefer to call them) as M has. If he respects these spaces, would he use the first letters after such a space for supplementing the last letters before it? The only natural conclusion must be that the source of E read, or thought he could read, two letters more than M could in the manuscript from which both he and M copied their text.

To the cases now presented in detail I add a few others which in themselves might easily be cases of conjecture or of fortuitous change. But if the evidence adduced above be taken to prove the complete or partial independence of E, this will add something to the possibility that these readings too contain elements of independent tradition.

TEXT

256. περραίβων M: παρραίβων E
747. θάλατσι βρασχίων M: θάλατσι βρασχίων E
790. τῶν ἐχαρμοδην χρών M: τῶν ἐξχαρμοδην χρώ E
883. ὅρω M: ὅρον E
1041. δείκτηρι M: δείκτηρι corr. in δείκτηρι E

SCHOLIA

98. δ ἄντι M: ὧρων E
135. ράπτοσι M: ράπτοσι (sic) E
863. πεπαραμένα M: πεπαραμέναι E

In order to check the results arrived at by the study of E, it will not be out of place to list here the 'good readings' found in the other young manuscripts. I shall confine myself to text variants; by 'good readings' I understand readings which are either clearly superior to those of M or at least worth thinking over as possible alternatives to difficult or faulty readings in M. My obvious purpose will be to make it probable that all these readings are easy to explain as due either to conjecture or to chance. If they are not, the whole of my previous

14 Paul Mazon here showed his superior sense of style by printing Headlam's conjecture instead of, like most editors, acquiescing in a reading whose only virtues are that it will construe and that it stands in M.

15 The point of interest is the last word. It needs no extraordinary critical acumen to supply an infinitive ending in the preceding word.

16 The word ἰδυτεκτα, 'a woman who stitches', which lies behind the reading of M, occurs in Bostathius (see LSJ s.v.). I have not found ἰδυτεκτερα elsewhere. The prefix was probably interpolated from ἰδυτεκτερα earlier in the same scholion; but the important thing is that, in this rare word, E has the τ which M has not.
argument has been proved false. Besides being useful for our purpose, the list will also, I hope, be of some interest in itself.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Laurentianus Marcianus 222}

74. φωγές M: φωγές
83. πτολέμου M: πολέμου
89. ευστήξα M: ευστήξα
136. συμπηνοῖας M: συμ πηνοῖας
322. τοῦ δακαλοῦ M: τοῦ δακάλος
339. δυστυχώτων M: δυστυχώτων
342. αἴρωσθαι M: αἴρωσθα (also in E)
597. ὀστίους M\textsuperscript{2}: ὀστίους (also in E)
744. ἐπεὶ τόχει M: ἐπὶ τόχει
751. φρεσόλυ M: φρεσόλυ (φρεσάτι E)

Obviously there is nothing here which falls outside the categories of easy corrections and changes due to mere chance.

\textit{Bononiensis 2271}

346. τᾶς δέορα M: τᾶς δέορας
527. σεῖθου M: σεῖθοῦ
751. φρεσάλυ M: φρεσάλυ (φρεσάτι E)

The same remark applies here. This scribe was a remarkably dull fellow.

\textit{Guelferbytianus Gudianus Graecus 88}

48. δὲ M\textsuperscript{2}: τε
110. ἄταυ M: ἄταν
254. σεῖθου M: σεῖαν suprascr.
295. μιχήλη Μ: μυχήλη (also in E)
342. αἴρωσθαι M: αἴρωσθα
346. λεύσων M: λέυσων
566. χλωροδειμακτικόν M: χλωροῦ δείμακτι θημάτων (cf. E)
629. ἀμέμπτων M: ἀμέμπτως
744. ἐπεὶ τόχει M: ἐπὶ τόχει
753. ταυτο M: ταὐτὸ ὁ (also in E)
790. τοῦ ἐχρυμφθήνχ ἄροι M: τῶν ἐχρυμφθήνχ ἄροι (cf. E)

\textsuperscript{17} For the principles followed in the collations, cf. p. 371.

\textit{H. Friis Johansen 367}

796. πέτραβαθυ M: πέτρα βαθύ (also in E)
907. χερεὶ ταναρχήων M: χερεῖ ταναρχίων
931. ἀπαγγέλειν M: ἀπαγγέλειν
999. τιμὴ M: τί μυρ
1032. ἐδεί M: ἔδη

ἀφαν 254 is a good conjecture; it is possibly by a younger hand. τε at line 48 was conjectured by Heath and may be correct; τε and δὲ being often confused in manuscripts, nothing can be built on this variant reading. ὀμέμπτως 629 may be due either to chance or to attentive and intelligent reading of the scholion; whether it is the correct reading is far from certain. ἐπὶ τόχει 744 is the only really remarkable reading; it is practically identical with Turnebus’ ἐπείτε. In itself it might be due either to chance, conjecture or transmission. The other readings do not call for comment.

\textit{Parisinus Graecus 2286}

74. δεμαίνωνα φίλοι M\textsuperscript{2}: δεμαίνωνα ἀφόλοι
95. κατεδεῖ M: κατεδεῖ (also in E)
109. μεῖκόλω M: μοιάλω
217. κυκλήκω M: κυκλήκω
247. ἔτην M: ἔτην
272. λέγων πρόσω M: λέγων πρόσω
295. μυχήλη Μ: μυχήλη (also in E)
306. ἐτευχέ δ’ ἄλλο M: ἐτευχέ ἄλλο
311. καλ’ ἔτο M: καλ’ (also in E)
314. τι ὄν Μ: τι ὄν corr. in τις ὄν
321. συντηματικότατω M: συντηματικότατος
339. δυστυχώτων M: δυστυχώτων
342. αἴρωσθαι M: αἴρωσθα (also in E)
346. λεύσων M: λεύσων
519. τοῦ M: ἄνω
530. μελανδευσάτω M: μελανδευσάτω (also in E)
566. χλωροδειμακτικόν M: χλωροῦ δείμακτι θημάτων (also in E)
603. κεκάρτεω M: κεκάρτεω
617. εἰσίν M: εἰς ὄν (cf. E)
622. ἐκλειοτορός M: ἐκραίοτορος
635. βοῦν M: βοῦ (also in E)
706. δολοφόροι M: δολοφόροι

3—G.B.B.
bear out the conclusion that the Scurialensis 1.15, although very close to M, is of some value as an independent text witness. The most economical way of accounting for the fact that a manuscript which is so close to M as to have deceived all modern editors into regarding it as an apograph still contains a few readings which can hardly be conjectural or fortuitous, would be to regard it as derived from a gemellus of M. This hypothesis would not be disproved by the treatment in E of certain readings which in M are presented as the conjectures of the biopoiôthês. For instance, at lines 308 and 428 M has marginal readings prefixed by the word φυμα; E has these marginal readings or something very close to them in the text, and no trace of the readings which are in the text of M. If we discount the theoretical possibility that the biopoiôthês presented readings which he had found elsewhere as his own conjectures, there are two ways of explaining this and similar occurrences in E: either (1) these readings are derived from M itself through one or several lost intermediate sources which combined M readings with readings from a lost manuscript which was independent of M—and this is perfectly possible—or (2) they too come from the lost gemellus, which had been corrected by the same biopoiôthês as has M, and therefore contained the same, or nearly the same, variants and conjectures as does M. E or his source in many cases—not invariably.

This manuscript was written by an able man, Arsenius of Monemvasia (1465–1535), who made a great number of corrections in the fields of orthography (95, 109, 217, etc.), accentuation (247, 635), word division (74, 530, 617, etc.), elementary syntax (306, 314, 519, etc.), and still more of the same order. Some of the corrections in the last group specified above really command respect, but there is no reason to believe that they are anything but corrections. He also successfully tried his hand at a number of nonsensical words or forms of words in M, some (272, 295, 339, 342, etc.) very easy to correct, others (603, 622, and in particular 788) considerably less so. But there is nothing to indicate the existence of an otherwise unknown text witness accessible to Arsenius. Everything is understandable as due to either conjecture or chance.

The decisive difference between the good readings of these four manuscripts (and most of the good readings in E as well) on one side and a few readings in E on the other is simply this: that the really remarkable readings of the former category occur at places where the text of M is so patently corrupt as to present a strong invitation to every sensible scribe to make use of his critical ability (254, 306, 519, 622, 764, 788, 790, 985); whereas the readings of the second category either occur where M would not at first glance seem to be at fault (421 ἐκβολοῦν, 549 μορφῶν, 576 βία) or are in themselves as meaningless as those of M (828 δὲν—ὁμιᾶ).

The comparison with the other young manuscripts thus seems to

---

18 See Turyn, op. cit. (supra n.1) 21, with bibliography.
19 Cf. G. Pasquali, Storia della tradizione e critica del testo (Firenze 1962) 27, end of first paragraph.
20 This is a very polite way of putting it. There is no reason to believe that any editor after Hermann ever saw this manuscript; and Hermann himself relied on the collaboration of Fr. Dietz (Haupt's preface, op. cit. [supra n.3] p. viii).
21 Such things certainly did happen in the XV and XVI centuries. The Bononiensis copies out an ομα at lines 308 and 428, and so does E itself at line 248.
22 There are four or five faulty readings in E which to a reader who has M at his elbow look very much like misinterpretations of letters in M which are correct but can easily be misread. The most remarkable cases are: 319 αἰγόλοκες MP, αἰγόλοκος E; 843 πολύγορος M, πολύγορος E; 1043 πέπορος MP, ψέβος E; I do not find this evidence conclusive (cf. in general Pasquali, op. cit. [supra n.19] 35); but naturally it must be taken into account. If R combines M readings with readings derived from a lost independent manuscript, the stemma would be this:
—followed the normal practice of late copyists in choosing between such alternatives instead of reproducing both of them. For my part, without believing that it is the only possible solution, I shall prefer the simpler alternative, viz. that the minuscule exemplar of Μ was copied at least twice at the same place and at the same time (about or soon after a.d. 1000), and that the copies were controlled and corrected by the same man, our famous διόρθωτος. The transmission of the text of Aeschylus’ Suppliants could then be visualized by means of the following stemma:

```
  o
M     μ
  4

apographa
```

Whether it is possible to detect traces of the lost μ in existing manuscripts of the Byzantine triad, Agamemnon, and Eumenides, I do not know; as for Choephoroe, unfortunately, there is no hope. The three existing late manuscripts of this tragedy—Laur. Marc. 222, Bon. 2271, Guelf. 88—copy the text of Μ for Choephoroe as they do for Suppliants; this is proved already by the fact that they all lack the beginning of the prologos. About the vicissitudes of μ, where it was kept, when and where it was copied, whether at that time it contained more than Suppliants, and when and how it was lost, nothing can be known at present.

II

The practical consequences of this new evaluation of Ε for the constitution of the text will be infinitesimally small. Only ἐβροκαῖς 421, βλαυ 576, and perhaps διοῦ 828, have a claim for consideration as new readings preferable to the vulgate readings. But future apparatuses to the Suppliants will have to be supplemented in several places. Since we can no longer be sure that what looks like a conjecture in Ε is really one, we shall have to communicate in the apparatus all deviations of Ε from Μ except quite trivial ones. Consequently, although I am playing the cards out of my own hand, I shall end this article by subjoining collations as complete as humanly possible of the text and scholia of

---

24 A good example of minuscule error in Μ is κακεσ at line 828.

E, for the use of editors who feel convinced by my argument. In order not to leave any questions unanswered, I have included so to speak everything, even the most insignificant differences in accentuation, word division and orthography. The outcome is a rather dull and lengthy list, full of silly mistakes, and where the pearls are few and far between; but I know myself the feeling of frustration evoked by the use of incomplete collations made by others. There will be enough mistakes and omissions in my own, even so.25 The collations are made against the text of Μ. I have checked the readings of Μ as meticulously as I have those of Ε, so that, allowing for human frailty, I do not think it will be far off the truth to say that where my readings differ from those adduced in the apparatuses of current editions, I am usually right and the editions are wrong. The symbols used in the collations will not need explanation; I only want to make it clear that the symbols Μ1 (Ε1) and Μ2 (Ε2) signify primary and secondary readings and do not imply any attempt at ascribing readings to different scribal hands. In most cases, that is, Μ2 will mean the reading of the διόρθωτος, but it need not do so. Finally, I add the precaution that whereas all cases of Μ2 against Μ1 have been recorded, cases of Μ2 against ΜE have been omitted except where I found special reason to mention them. The line numbering is that of the Oxford text, second edition (Oxford 1953); in the collation of the scholia, the numbers in brackets are the line reference numbers in Dindorf’s edition (Oxford 1851). Where there is no such number, the scholion is not included in Dindorf’s edition.26

E= Scurialensis τ.1.15, collated against Μ= Mediceus Laur. xxxii 9

**TEXT**

2. ἢμητέρον Μ: ἢμητέρον Ε (sic saepius)
2-3. νῖκον... προστομίων om. E, sed add. in marg. dextro post

leptomεθεῖν
8. αὐτογλύφητον Μ: αὐτογλύφητον Ε

25 There would, however, have been many more if I had not been able to draw on the valuable assistance of Mrs Bodil Due, M.A., for whose cooperation in making collations I hereby express my warmest gratitude.

26 Bad as Dindorf’s edition is, he cannot be blamed for all these “omissions.” For practical reasons I have included variant readings and conjectures in Μ, which Dindorf omitted in principle, among the scholia.
12. σταυλαρχος Μ: σταυλαρχος Ε
13. ἐπέκρυψε Μ: ἐπέκρυψε Ε
14. διακυβ.καλέων Μ1: διακυβερνέων Ε: ακαβμαλέων Ε1, spatio ii v. iliii
litteratur recitc: δίπλα in spatio sed paulo superius add. E*
22. κλάδοιασ Μ: κλάδοιασ Ε
26. Ζεῦς Μ: Zeů E
36. ὄλεοντο Μ: ὄλεωντο Ε
47. εὐλόγως ομ. Ε
48. δ' ἐγένετο αυτ' Μ1: δ' γένετος εἰς τιν' Ε: δ' ἐγένετο εἰς τιν' Ε
59. ἦγεος Μ: ἦγεος Ε
63. ἀπεκλαίη Μ: ἀποκλαίην Ε
70. ἀτέλειον Μ: ἀτέλειον Ε
75. φυγός Μ: φυγύς Ε
79. ἦμπι Μ: καὶ E
83. ἐστι Μ: εῖτα Ε
καί Μ: καί E
89. πάντα Μ: πάντα Ε
90. μερόποισα Μ: μερόποισα Ε
95. κατεικείν Μ: κατεικείν Ε
107. θέλει Μ2: θέλεις Μ1: θέλλος Ε
108. διακατεβαίνοις θρεπτοί: διαπαραβαίνοις θρεπτοί Ε
109. μενόλιον Μ: μενόλιον Ε
110. ἢτα Μ: ἢτα Ε
117, 128. paragr. habet M, om. E
120. λάνσασθι Μ: λάνσασθι Ε
120, 130. ἐμπίπτειν Μ: ἐμπιπτεῖν Ε
124. ἐπιδρόμοι πάθε Μ2: ἐπιδρόμη πάθε Μ1E
126. διαδόχηται Μ: διαδοχηται Ε
127. ποί Μ: ποί Ε
132. αἶδος Μ: αἶδος Ε
136. ἐπεμπεί Μ: ἐπεμπεῖ Ε
συμπονείας Μ: αἰμπονείας Ε
137. τελευτᾶς Μ: τελευτᾶς Ε
142, 152. ἐς Μ: ἐς Ε
155. ἡδόκτυπον Μ: ἡδόκτυπον Ε
162. ἀγαμούσιον Μ: ἀγαμήρι αἰσθ. Ε
172. ἐκτισθεὶς Μ: ἐκτισθείς Ε
178. προμηθείας Μ2: προμηθείας Μ1E
183. ἀγάμοια Μ: ἀγαμίατι Ε
190. κρείσσον Μ2: κρείσσον Μ1E
198. μετάτοιον Μ: μετάτοιον Ε
208. θέλομεν οὐ Μ: θέλοι μᾶς Ε
212. κικλόσκευται Μ1: κικλόσκευται Ε: κικλόσκευτα Ε
215. εὐγίον Μ: εὖ γιόν Ε
216. αὐγόντο Μ: αὐγόντο Ε
217. κικλόσκευσκος Μ: κικλόσκευσκος E
224. ἔσεθα Μ1: ἔσεθο Μ1E: ἔσεθε Ε
235. πηκυνόμασι Μ: πηκυνόμασι Ε
240. ἀκρᾶστος Μ: ἀκράστος Ε
248. ἔτηροι ήρωι Μ: ἔτηροι ήρωι Ε
254. ἀυλός Μ: ἀυλος Ε
255. πρὸς δύναμιν Μ: πρὸς δύναμιν Ε
256. πυραιδεύοντες Μ: πυραιδεύοντες Ε
257. ἀπέφερεν Μ: ἀπέφερεν Ε
277. ἀπείστα Μ: ἀπείστα Ε
282. χαρακτήρ θ' Μ: χαρακτήρ τε Ε
285. στρατιζώσκασις Μ2: στρατιζώσκασις Μ1E
287. κρεισσόμενοι Μ: κρεισσόμενοι Ε
290. τὸ σε αὐτῷ Μ: τὸ σε αὐτῷ Ε
293. Ἡ Μ: Ἡ Ε
295. μυχθήρ Μ: μυχθήρ καί E
303. ἔπεττα Μ2: ἔπεττα Ε
305. κατέκταν Μ: κατέκταν Ε
308. πεδάς Μ: πεδάς Ε: πεδάς Μ1E: πεδάς Ε
309. ἔκλειψε Μ: ἔκλειψε Ε
310. συγκάλλος Μ1E: συγκάλλος Ε
311. καὶ τι Μ: καὶ τι Ε
322. ἀφθάνον M: ἀφθάνον Ε
327. κατακτήθηκε Μ: κατακτήθηκε E
332. μεταπτομηκόμενοι Μ: μετὰ πτολκόμενοι Ε
333. paragr. om. M, habet E colore rubro additam φόρος Μ: φόρος Ε
334. λείκωστεθές Μ: λείκωστεθές Ε
335, 337. paragr. om. M, habet E colore rubro additam
342. ἀραγαθεί M: ἀραγαθεί Ε
345. ἑτεμείγε Μ: ἑτεμείγε Ε
346. λείσσω Μ: λέσσω Ε
348. τόκος Μ2: τόκος Μ1E
351. πέτρας Μ2: πέτρας Μ1E: πέτρας Ε
353. βατηρία Μ: βατηρία Ε
354. ἀρωμ Μ: ἀρωμ Ε
361. γεραφόφων Μ: γεραφόφων E
378. αὖ τῶς Μ: αὐτὸς δ' Ε
380. μηδράσῃε Μ: μη δράσαι τε Ε
389. ἔχονσιν Μ: ἔχον Ε
401. εἰ πετῶνις Μ: εἰπετῶνις Ε
409. ἄγαν εὐαμώμων Μ: ἀγαναμώμων Ε
411. ἡμῖν Μ: ὑμῖν Ε
eκτελευτήσας Μ: εκτελευτήσῃ Ε
413. δρομέας Μ: δρομέας Ε
421. ἔκβολαις Μ: ἔμβολαις Ε
422. δυσθέας Μ: δυσθέας Ε
ἀρμένας Μ: ἀρμένας Μ: ἀρμένας Ε
428. μῆς τ’ ἀδόκης ἱκέτην Μ: οἴδαμε μῆς πλαίς τῶν ἱκέτην Μ: μῆ δὲ
λαῖς τῶν ἱκέτην Ε
432. τέπλων Μ: τέπλων Ε
449. ὀμάδων Μ: ὀμάδων Μ: Ε
462. αὐξαμάτων Μ: αὐξαμάτων Ε
463. πίναξιν Μ: πίναξι Ε
469. ἐπέχρεται Μ: ἐπέχρεται Ε
472. ὑμῖν Μ: ὑμῖν Ε
475. μάχης Μ: μάχης Ε
486. εἰσδών Μ: εἰσδών Ε
489. ἦσοσιν Μ: ἦσοσι Ε
498. φίλαξι Μ: φίλαξι Ε
500. στηρίζει: Μ: στηρίζει: Ε
507. paragr. om. M, habet E
510. ἐκδύσασομεν Μ: ἐκδύσασομεν Ε
516. οὐτί Μ: οὐτί Ε
518. πετω Μ: ἐπιέω Ε
529. ἐμβαλλε Μ: ἐμβαλλε Ε
530. μελανάζησαν Μ: μελανάζησαν Ε
532. πολάφεσθαι Μ: πολάφεσθαι Ε
536. εὐχῶμεθα Μ: εὐχῶμεθα Ε
543. διαμεθύμεθα Μ: διαμεθύμεθα Ε
549. μοσαίον Μ: μοσαίον Ε
551. ὄροι Μ: ὄροι Ε
552. γέγονε Μ: γέγονε Ε
556. εἰσαγουμένων Μ: εἰσαγομένων Ε
559. ὅτ' Μ: ὅτ' Ε
566. χλωροδειμακτηθέντων Μ: χλωρῳ δειμακτηθήθην Ε
568. μεδομήτων Μ: μεδόμητων Ε
576. βίας Μ: βίας Ε
578. ἀποστάζει Μ: ἀπό στάζει Ε
584. φωτίζουν Μ: φωτίζουν Ε

Codex Scurialensis T.115 [E], fol. 380 (Aeschylus, Supplices 982–1011)
The arrows mark lines 995 and 998
883. ἢρας Μ: ἡρὰς Ε
μοῖμεν τί Μ: μηδ' ἔτι Ε
885. βροτίσσα Μ: βροτίσσα Ε
889, 890. ο ο το το το Μ: οὐτοτοτοι Ε
893–902. οιμ., add. in marg. dext. Ε
893. paragr. habet M, om. Ε
895. μια μια Μ: μιαμια Ε
898. διακόσιχ Μ: διακόσιοι Ε
902. χρεί Μ: χρει Ε
910. έχει τών Μ: εὖ τών, ετασο το inter n et τ, Ε
920. ἐρμή Ε: ἐρμή Ε
923. κέρατο ΜΕ: κέρατοι Ε
927. άπαγγέλλειν Μ: άπαγγέλλει τοις Ε
932. φῶς Μ: φῶς Ε
936. αἰκεναρχήρου Μ: αἰκὴν ἐν ἀργάροις Ε
938. γίνεται Μ: γίγνεται Ε
938. τόπως έκ Μ: τόπως έκ Ε
939. εἰδοκυντίοις χοί Μ: ἡσύσ τ' αὐτὸς χοί Ε
941. λόγος Μ: λόγοι Ε
945. πίναξ Μ: πίναξ Ε
949. βίβλοι Μ: βίβλοι Ε
951. ἐξελευθεροστόμου Μ: ἐξελευθεροστόμου Ε
954. ἀπάσω Μ: ἀπάσων Ε
958. ημικράτι Μ: ἡμικράτ Ε
959. βίβλου Μ: βίβλου ΜΕ
965. ἱμαος Μ: ἵμαος Μ: ἵμαος β' Ε
ἀγαθοῦ Μ: ἀγαθοῦ Ε
980. ἀνερὲ Μ: ἀνερχέται Ε
983. ἰδιοκτήτου Μ: τοις Ε
987. ἰδιοκτήτου Μ: ἰδιοκτῆτου Ε
990. τιμιστήρα Μ: τιμιστήρας Ε
994. μετοίκων Μ: μετοίκων Ε
999. κατὰ Μ: κατὰ Ε, σπασίτως unius litterae relictio, Ε
999. εὐφήλεκτος Μ: εὐφήλεκτος, spatio unius litterae relictio, Ε
1002. ἀπομείνη Μ: ἀπομείνη Μ: θεωρητὴν Ε
1010. τελεσχογί Μ: τελεσχογί Ε
1018. ἵππος Μ: ἵππος Ε
1019. μέχριος ΜΕ: μέχριος Ε
1021. ἀποδί Μ: ἀποδί Ε
1027. πάμε Μ: πάμε Ε
χίνου Μ: χίνου Ε
1028. γαίς Μ: γαίς Ε
1029. οδος: Μ: ου οδος: Ε
1032. ἠθει: Μ: ἠθει: Ε
1038. μητρι: Μ: μητρι: Ε
1041. θεοκτορι: Μ: θεοκτορι: Ε¹: θεοκτορι: Ε²
1042. φεδεμα: Μ¹: φεδεμα Μ²: φεδεμα Ε
1047. ἀστιν: Μ: ἀστι: Ε
1048. ἀστ: Μ: ἀστ: Ε
1052. ἀστάλαξι: ΜΕ²: ἀστάλαξι: Ε¹
1055. θήλεις: Μ: θήλεις: Ε
1057. φεδεμα: Μ: φεδεμα: Ε
1064. διώκοντερμα: Μ: διώκοντερ: ου: Ε
1065. διώκοντε: Μ: διώκοντε: Ε
1068. γενεια: Μ: γενεια: Ε
1073. μηκαναίς: Μ: μηκαναίς: Ε

Scholia
2 (3). αἰγώπτου: Μ: καὶ γάμπτου Ε
τῆς πρό: Μ: τῆς πρὸ προβείεσι: Ε
6 (7). ψήφων πόλεως: Μ: πόλεως ψήφων: Ε
8¹ (9). φοβεράνων: Μ: φοβεράνων: Ε
8². γράψεται φοβεράνων: Μ: γράψεται φοβεράνων: Ε
12¹ (13). ἐπταὐτῶν: Μ: ἐπὶ τοῦτων: Ε
26 (27). εἴπε: Μ: εἴπεν: Ε
31¹-² (32¹-²) continua in Ε
πτηλίων: Μ: πτηλίων: Ε
ψαμμίων: Μ: ψαμμίων: Ε
ψαμμι: Μ: ψαμμι: Ε
ἂς ὅ: Μ: ἄς ο: Ε
βροντῆ: Μ: βροντῆ: Ε
άλεωτος: Μ: ἀλεωτο: Ε
38 (39). τῶν ἐκ τοῦ: Μ: τοῦ: Ε
45 (45). ἐπέπνεουσιν: Μ: ἐπέπνεουσιν: Ε
49 (48). ἐπικαλομένη: Μ: ἐπικαλομένη: Ε
52 (52). ἡγά διηγουμένη: Μ: διηγουμένη: Ε
58 (57). οἰανων: Μ: οἰανων: Ε
γιορκικοῖντων: Μ: γιορκικοῖντων: Ε
60 (59) om. Ε
69 (69). ἄλλων: Μ: ἄλλων: Ε
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71 (71). ἐπιγένεσαν: Μ: ἐπιγένεσαν: spatio duarum litterarum relictō, Ε
73 (73). ἐπιγένεσαν: Μ: ἐπιγένεσαν: Ε
75 (75). ὁκοτεῖνης: Μ: ὁκοτεῖνης: Ε
77 (77). ἀλλ: Μ: ἀλ: Ε
79. τῆς: Μ: om. Ε
83 (82). Ἰέν τό: Μ: Ἰέν τό: Ε
85. λείπει: Ή δει: Μ: om. Ε
87 (86). νόον: Μ: νόον: Ε
91¹ (90). τούς παλαιώτας: Μ: παλαιώτας: Ε
98 (96). ἀξίων: Μ: ἀξίων: Ε
101² (100). (ἐπὶ τῶν) ἁγνῶν: (ἐπὶ τῶν) ἁγνῶν: Μ: ἁγνῶν utroque: Ε
108-108. ἐκτο: Μ: ἔκτο: Ε
119 (118). γῆ: Μ: γῆ: Ε
127 (126²) om. Ε
135¹ (134¹). τρισώντες τὰς ναδίς: Μ: τὰς ναδίς τρισώντες: Ε
ομήρως: Μ: ὁμήρως: Ε
ἀκιδόμενον: Μ: ἀκιδόμενον: Ε
ῥάπτας: Μ: συρράπτας: Ε
ἐγώ: Μ: ἐγώ: Ε
135² (134²). ἑργαζόμενα: Μ: ἑργαζόμενα: Ε
138-40 (138) om. Ε
143 (143) om. Ε
145-46 (146) om. Ε
156 (157) om. Ε
166 (168). τῶν Μ: τῶν: Ε
179 (179). ἐπιγεγραμμένα: Μ: ἐπιγεγραμμένα: Ε
191 (191). ἐπικεκλημένα: Μ: ἐπικεκλημένα: Ε
200-01²-1 (200¹-²) continua in Ε
209 (209). μετὰ τά Μ: μετὰ: Ε
ὁλκερισθέντα: Ημᾶς Μ: ἡμᾶς: ὁλκερισθέντα: Ε
212 (212). ὁ ἀλκερτος: Μ: ἀλκερτος: Ε
220 (220). αὐτών: Μ: αὐτών: Ε
224. Σκόρω μέρκη: Μ: om. Ε
225 (225⁴). ἡμῖν: Μ: ἡμῖν: Ε
247 (247) bis scriptum in Ε, supra ἔτη 247 et supra πόλεως ἀγών
248. sed hic linea per litteras ducta rursus deletum
248. αἰών: Μ: ἀγών: Ε
THE TRANSMISSION OF AESCHYLUS' SUPPLIANTS

251 (251) om. E
254 (254). ἀντὶ M: ἀντὶ τοῦ E
αἰσθ M: αἰσθ E
255 (255). μέρος M: μέρο E
οτρυμόνοις M: οτρυμόνοις E
270 (270). ἀντὶ M: ἀντὶ τοῦ E
276 (276). ἀντὶ M: ἀντὶ τοῦ E
284 (284). ἐσκεφτα χαὶ χαὶ E
285 (285). νοτοφόρος M: νοτοφόρος E
287–89 (287) om. E
298 (298). τὴ νεῖκι M: τὴ νόση E
eἰς M: εἰς E
308. οἶμαι παῖδες M: om. E
παῖδες εἶναι M: εἶναι παῖδας E
333 (332). διὰ τὴ M: διὰ ὑ E
ἐλθόναι M: ἐλθόναι E
336 (332). αἵματος M: αἵματος E
344 (341). συνήπρασον M: συνήπρασον E
346 (345). πεπληρωμέναις M: πεπληρωμένοις E
359 (359). τὴν μὴ M: ἡ E
361 (361). νεκτήρας M: νεκτήρας E
γέρως M: γερω E
376 (377) om. E
381–84 (383). ἄτεχούς M: ἄτεχούς E
385–86 (385). πασχοῦντων M: πασχοῦντων E
386 (386) om. E
393–95 (394). ἀντὶ M: ἀντὶ τοῦ E
405–6 (406). ἄνευ ηῶς E
428. οἶμαι μηδὲ πλαίσι τῶν ἱκετῶν M: om. E
433 (434) om. E
438, 439 (438, 439) continua in E
444 (444). ἐμπυγνοῦντος M: ἐμπυγνοῦντος E
454 (453) om. E
463 (463). κανών M: κανῶς E
465 (465). ἔξευρετα M: ἔξευρετα E
466 (465). μακαρία ἰόν M: om. E
492 (492). φράσοντας M: φράσοντας E
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501 (501). τὰς ἔσεας M: ἔσεας E
502 (502). αὐτηγιακάρας M: ἀυτηγιακάρας E
505 (505). τοῦ παῖ M: τοῦ E
509 (509). ἑρῴ M: ἑρῶ E
528 (528). ἀντὶ M: ἀντὶ τοῦ E
530 (530). ἐν ἡ M: ἡ E
532 (532). πολυβάστων M: πολυβάστων E
535 (535). ἐφάπτορ E: ἐφάπτο E
540 (540). ἑξακομπτό M: ἑξακομπτό E
541 (541). ἀκουμεῖνι M: ἀκουμεῖνι E
547 (547). λείπει M: λίπει E
559 (559). χάμος M: χαϊδός E
561 (561). ἀνὴρ M: ἀνὴρ E
567, 568 (567, 568) continua in E
574 (574). κραίνων M: γράφεται κραίνων E
576 (576). λείπει M: λίπει E
588–89 (588). κυρήφης M: κυρήφη E
607–8 (608). χείρας M: χέρας E
612 (612). τὸ τὰς M: τὰς E
616–18 (617). αὐξάζεις M: αὐξάζεις E
619 (619). οἰκεῖοτε M: οἰκεῖοτε E
621–22 (621). ἐπέκρασεν M: ἐπέκρασεν E
tοῦτα M: τοῦτα E
630 (630). ἀντὶ M: ἀντὶ τοῦ E
636 (635). κατασκεφή M: καταφερῇ E
646–47 (647). Δίς οἰκοτάτα τῶν Δίας M: τοῦ Δίας E
651 (651). ἀράτα M: ἀράτει E
652 (652). συναπτών M: συναπτών E
655 (655). ἀράσιμα M: ἀράσιμα E
667–69 (667). τοῖς γέρουσι αἱ θυμήλαι M: αἰθύμελαι τοῖς γέρουσι E
671–72 (671). σεβόντων τὸν Διὸ M: τοῦ Διὸ σεβόντων E
674 (674). om. E
693 (693) om. E
695 (695) om. E
698 (698) om. E
700 (700). ὠπὸ M: ὡ ὁπὸ E
715 (715) continua in E
717–18 (718). ἡμῶν M: ἡμῖν E
731 (731). καταφιγή M: κατά φιγή E
735 (735). τοῦτοι: Μ: συμ τοῦ Ε
736–38 (736). ἠνθάδε: Μ: ἄνταθα Ε
7371 (7571). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε
764 (764). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε
765 (765a). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε

πιάματα: Μ: πειάματε Ε
785 (785). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε
786 (786). ἐπόραζον: Μ: ἐπόραζεν Ε
802 (802). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε
808–09 (808). ἰσαμαία: Μ: ἰσαμαία Ε
810 (810a). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε
820 (820). ζητίσαι: Μ: ζητίσει Ε
826a (826a). πρόην: Μ: πρὼν Ε
νῦν δὲ: Μ: νῦν Ε
8271 (8271). μάρπτι: Μ: μάρπτι Ε
828 (827a). μάρμη: ΜΕ: μάρμη Ε

ἐποίησε: Μ: ἐποίησεν Ε

τῷ ὑπότρεων: Μ: τοῖς ὑπότρεοις Ε
829–30 (830). παρὰ: Μ: περί Ε
832 (832). ἐπηρεάσεσθαι: Μ: ἐπηρεάσασθαι Ε

παρὰ τῷ: Μ: περὶ τὸ ἐπὶ Ε
835 (835). πρὸ: Μ: πρὸς Ε
837 (837). ἔχετε τάχυς: Μ: ἔχετε τάχυς Ε
838 (838). ἄντι: Μ: ἄντι τοῦ Ε
852 (852). κατάλειπεν: Μ: κατάλειπε Ε
toῖς: Μ: τῶν Ε
852 (8557). ἐντιμον: Μ: τῷ ἐντιμον Ε
859, 859–60 (858–3) continua in Ε
863. πεπερασμένα· Μ: πεπερασμένα· Ε
875 (875). ὑπὲρ Μ: ὑπὲρ Ε
885–86 (885). ἐπεὶ βλασσόντως αὐταῖς: Μ: βλασσόντως τοῖς Ε
888 (888). μηδὲν: Μ: μηδὲν Ε
890 (890) om. Ε
900. ὁ μῆκεν γῆ: Μ: om. Ε
915 (915). ὑδαῖρ: Μ: ὑδαῖρ Ε
934–36 (934). ἐν δείξει: Μ: ἐνδείξει Ε

κρίνει τῷ νείκῳ: Μ: δικαίως τὸν εἶκος Ε
939. ήσας γ' αὐτοὺς ξοὸν αὐνῆ: Μ: om. Ε
946–49 (946) om. Ε
969 (969). ποιοῖναν: Μ: ποιοῖναν Ε
991–93 (992). καταγγειαζόμενη: Μ: καταγγειαζόμενη Ε
1006–09 (1006) om. Ε
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1034 (1034). ἰμετέρων: Μ: ἰμετέρας Ε
1070 (1071). ἔστι: Μ: ἔστιν Ε

ἀπαλλαγῇ: Μ: ἀπαλλαγῇ in fine lineae Ε
dν Μ: ἐν Ε.
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