Notes on Some Manuscripts of Euripides’ Phoenissae

Donald J. Mastronarde

1. An almost-forgotten Thomano-Triklinian manuscript

Together with Vaticanus graecus 1825, the manuscript Vaticanus graecus 1824 contains a miscellany of poetic texts, some of which apparently derive from a single scriptorium.1 Vatican gr. 1824 figures in A. Turyn’s great work on Euripidean manuscripts2 in two places. On p.359 he lists the contents of folios 81r–87v, pages from a fourteenth-century3 codex unrelated to other portions of the miscellany: Or. 1385–1557 and 1558–91 are extant with a single leaf of Phoen. (lines 802–42) bound among them (f.86r–v). For Phoen. this page is a worthless witness, showing no consistent affinities with any of the families identified by Mastronarde and Bremer,4 and carrying no new readings of interest. Turyn (254 n.238) mentions the Aeschylean portion of the manuscript (ff.54r–80v = Fb)5 to record that Triklinios himself seems to have worked briefly with this codex. What is not reported in either of Turyn’s studies is the fact that on ff.31r–53r, on the same paper and written by some of the same hands as the Thomano-Triklinian Aeschylus that follows, is a copy of Phoen. 296–673 and 937–1766 (between 37v and 38r five leaves containing 674–936 have been lost), which is also Thomano-Triklinian. This section of the manuscript was recorded by K. Ziegler in 18826 but not by others.

2 A. Turyn, The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides (=Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 43 [Urbana 1957]).
3 So Canart (supra n.1) 245f, correcting Turyn’s ascription of these pages to the fifteenth century.
6 NJhb 125 (1882) 826, where the contents are listed as 296–1766 and the separate Phoen. fragment on f.86r–v is not noticed.
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(editors of Theocritus and scholia) who have discussed the manuscript, until in 1970 Canart provided a full description of the manuscript. As he notes, the Phoen. and the Aeschylean portion of Vat.gr. 1824, together with a section of Hesiod in Vat.gr. 1825 and pages of Theocritus divided between the two manuscripts, probably reflect the work of a single scriptorium. Canart also mentions that Turyn identified the text and scholia of Phoen. as “Thoman” in a private communication of 1 January 1959.

The Phoen. section of Vat.gr. 1824 may suitably be given the siglum Zv. The paper used for Zv and for other sections of the related miscellany is western, with watermarks identified by Canart as known from the years 1297–1318. This span of years agrees with the presence of a few Triklinian corrections in the Aeschylean portion. There is one column of text per page, usually containing 24–27 lines. I designate as Zv¹ the hand(s) that wrote the text, some scholia in brownish black ink, and the personae notae in red; I designate Zv² the hand that used a lighter brown ink to make corrections in the text and to add most of the scholia.

Zv should be of interest to editors of the “Thoman” scholia, since it shares with Zm (Milan, Ambros. I 47 sup.; middle [or early?] 14th cent.) or with ZmZu (Uppsala, Gr. 15; first half of 14th cent.) elements absent from Z (Cambridge, Nn. 3.14) and sometimes from the published “Thoman” Gu-scholia in Dindorf. ZmZv have a fuller set of scholia than Zu, and Zv contains some items not in Zm or any other source that I know of. I record a few examples to illustrate the relationships:

409 (marginal genealogy of Adrastus): ZmZv (not in ZZuT) [=Dindorf 137.15f]
409 ὁ χρησμός ύπο Μνασέου οὕτως ἀναγέγραπται ... αὕτη ἡ ἱστορία ὁπάσθεν: ZZmZvT (not in Zu) [=Dindorf 138.12–139.3 and app. ad 139.4] (likewise, e.g., schol. 1185 [=Dindorf 317.1–9], 1188 [=Dindorf 317.15–25])
410 gloss ὀπέρ εἶπας: ZmZuZv (not in ZT) [=Dindorf 138.10]
415 gloss εἰς τὰ προσπύλαια: ZZmZvT; add. ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πᾶν ἔγχυν τὰς πύλας ZmZuZv (om. ZT) [=Dindorf 140.16f]
441 gloss ἀναρίθμητον: Zv (not in ZZmZuT)
448 τούτο τὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸ πόλιν συνάπτεται (ZmZv)/σύναπτε (Zu): Zm ZuZv (not in ZT)
448 λόγος κυρίως ἡ ἐνεδρα, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ τάξις· ὡ δὲ λόγος διὰ πεξῶν ἀνδρῶν γίνεται: Zv (not in ZZmZuT) [Dindorf 144.19f]

¹ Smith, Scholia (supra n.5) vii, in describing the Aeschylean portion of this codex (=Fe): “ineunte s. XIV scriptus.”
1228 προστατικών: Zm Zu Zv; add. ὁ γὰρ ἀπαγορευτικὸς μὴ οὐ μόνον
πρὸς ὑποτακτικῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς προστατικῶν Zv (not in Z T)

The colon-divisions of Zv also point to a close relationship with
Zm Zu, and particularly with Zm. The following divisions that are
unique to Zm Zu among the manuscripts studied in Text. Trad. are
shared by Zv: 1351 κράτα τέλ. 1502 τάδε/ε, 1528 πρὸς/ε, 1535 μα-
kρόπινου/ε, 1577 νεκρόν/ε, 1578 δέ/ε, 1580 δόμωσι/ε, 1717 δῆτα/
(Zm only, Zu not extant). In 296–354 Zv’s division is like that of
Zm (and other mss.) and unlike that of Zu (and other mss.); e.g.,
298 τὸνδε/ε Zm Zv + ν μάτερ/ε Zu +. Zm Zv also share a false
division of trimeters at 951f ( . . . έτέρον/ . . . πόλην/).

The readings of Zv also show that it is very closely related to Zm,
so close that a superficial inspection might lead to the conclusion
that one is a copy of the other. First, among conjunctive errors of
Zm Zu Zv we may mention 440 ἀνθρώπους/ν, 581 νύμφαι, 622 κτα-
νών (sic), 953 ταῦτ', 1047 δε, 1113 ὠγύγα, 1234 νύσσεθε, 1337
dιπτώσ, 1363 ἀλκή (Zv1pc), 1580 ἀματέρουσιν. Then, among conjunc-
tive errors of Zm Zv we may mention 305 μνημίασων (τ' om.) (Zv1
in rasura), 348 λουτροτρόφου, 368 ἐντράφην Zv2 ἐν-τράφην Zm,w,
376 μον, 1020 ἔχνιδας a.e., 1038 ἐπεπτότυκε, 1158 ἀμεξ-, 1558 γρ.
φοινίκας, 1697 ἐτεοκλ-, 1715 ἀθλῶ (also GXs Xa4), 1755 accents on
στόλισμαένα ποτέ. Both Zv and Zm contain corrections by the first
hand(s) and by a second hand, and all sorts of combinations of agree-
ment can be found:

Zv ac ~ Zv1pc Zm: 305 (above), 369 ἀπελασθεὶς Zv ac, 426 δεῦρο ἐπε-
σθαί σοι στρατόν (Zv1 in ras., Zm), and about 20 other passages
Zv1 ~ Zv2 Zm: 368 (above), 382 αὐτῷρ Zv1, 407 δύναμι ἄν Zv1,
and 8 other passages
Zv Zm ac ~ Zm pc: 349 εἰσοδος Zm pc, 405 μὴ ἔχειν Zm2, 408 ἐσχέθες
Zm2, 950 ὄμμασιν Zm2, and 14 other passages
Zv Zm ac ~ Zm ac: 312 πᾶν Zm ac, 322 λευκόχρωα Zm ac, 500 ἀφι-
λεκτός Zm1, 1002 πάτρις Zm ac, 1299 τάλαντο Zm1, 1628 πέρσω
Zm1, and 3 other passages

In νύσσεθε. Zm has a very angular ligature of upsilon and acute accent that I
wrongly treated as i in the collation of Text. Trad. Zm is written in tiny letters in a
faint-colored ink, and it is often hard to read the smallest details on microfilm. Com-
parison with Zv led me to re-examine the film of Zm and to discover a few details
missed earlier: e.g., the second accent in 622; the rough breathing on ἐπεκλ- in 443,
1223, 1390, 1407; γρ. πρόδρομος in 296; 368 ἐν-τράφην ut vid.; 636 -νείκην in ras.;
982 ἐς οὖδες Zm1 (ἐς eras. Zm2); 1006 φῶνον. At 583 Zu has ἱείνων, like PZm Zv;
at 612 σῆ is in Zu, not Zm; at 1012 read Zu for Zn.

There are a few conjunctive errors of Zm Zu not shared by Zv: 1367 ἐμὰν; 1530
ὄτοπτοι, also the errors at 1060, 1259, and 1466 cited infra.
SOME MANUSCRIPTS OF EURIPIDES' PHOENISSAE

$Zv^{ac}Zm \sim Zv^{pc}$: 608 $\mu\nu\kappa\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota\nu\alpha Zv^{ac}Zm$, 966 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\nu Zv^{1}Zm$, 977 $\tau\eta$
$Zv^{1}Zm$, 1063 $\lambda\iota\beta\omega\beta\delta\omicron\upsilon Zv^{1}Zm$, and 5 other passages
$Zm^{ac}Zv^{ac} \sim Zm^{pc}Zv^{pc}$: 331 $\alpha\nu\eta\chi\epsilon\xi$ a.c., $\alpha\nu\eta\chi\epsilon\xi$ p.c., 449 $\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$ om.
a.c., s.l. add. $Zm$, in ras. $Zv^{2}$; 569 $\epsilon\upsilon\nu^{*}$ a.c., $\epsilon\upsilon\nu^{*}$ p.c., and 6 other passages

$Zm^{1}Zv^{2} \sim Zm^{2}Zv^{1}$: 1228 $\delta\pi\epsilon\mu\mu\rho\omega\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon Zm^{1}Zv^{2}$, $-\alpha\tau\epsilon Zm^{2}Zv^{1}$

These instances present too complicated a pattern to allow the hypothesis that one codex might have been copied from the other at a time when some, but not all, corrections had been made in the Vorlage. $Zv$ is obviously not a copy of $Zm$ since $Zv^{1}$ has written horizontal strokes (copied from strokes written from one end of an erasure to another in its Vorlage) in the line at 445, 959, and 1583, where $Zm$ has no erasure, no line, and no empty space; and in some passages $Zv$ ante rasuram clearly had a longer text than what we find in $Zv$ post rasuram = $Zm$ (e.g., $Zv^{ac}$ had a longer exclamation in 1530). The passages in which $Zv$ is correct and $Zm$ in error are not very significant (e.g., $Zm$ has 1060 $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\theta'$, 1259 $\bar{\eta}$, 1466 $\pi\rho\omicron\mu\mu\theta$-, 1698 $\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon$, 1724 $\epsilon\upsilon$ a.c.), but it is even harder to find significant uncorrected errors in $Zv$ where $Zm$ is correct (1065 $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\omicron\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu\nu\nu Zv$ hardly counts). Nevertheless, at 1284 $Zm$ has $/___\alpha\upsilon\alpha\upsilon$, reflecting an erasure of part of $\alpha\iota^{*}$ $\alpha\upsilon$ in its Vorlage, which here cannot be $Zv$, which has simply $/\alpha\iota^{*} \alpha\upsilon$ (cf. 1590: $Zm$ has $\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ $\omicron\nu \mu\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$, $Zv$ $\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ $\omicron\nu \mu\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$). $Zm$ may be later than $Zv$, and it is impossible to prove that it does not descend from $Zv$ via a corrected/corrupted intermediary. But for all practical purposes, an editor may assume that $ZmZv$ are gemelli and be content with citing $Zm$ alone (the more complete witness), if a generous citation of Thomano-Triklinian manuscripts is desired.

2. A new member of the family $AbRMnSVrW$

Copenhagen, Gr. 417, known under the symbol $Hn$ (Hauniensis), was first used by A. Matthiae in 1814, and its readings were made known to the scholarly world in Matthiae's volumes of critical notes to his edition published from 1821 on. Turyn regarded the Phoen. and Hipp. portions of $Hn$ has an apograph of $Vr$ (Vatican, Pal.gr. 343), made when $Vr$ was still complete ($Vr$ has lost the argumenta to Phoen. and most of Hipp.). Diggle has recently shown that for Hipp.

10 At 938 $Zv$ has $\beta\rho\delta$ $\tau\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron$, $Zm$ has either $\beta\rho\delta$ $\tau\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron$ (space) or $\beta\rho\delta^{*}\tau\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron$ (erasure). At 610 $Zv$ has $\gamma\epsilon$, $Zm$ has $\gamma\epsilon$.
11 Turyn (supra n.2) 329–33. See also K. Matthiessen, Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides (=Bibliothek der kl. Altertumswissenschaften N.F. II.52 [Heidelberg 1974]) 42 (where first use of the manuscript is wrongly ascribed to Kirchhoff). On $Vr$ see Text. Trad. 14 and (for its relation to the Aldine edition) 20.
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Hn is a gemellus, not a copy of Vr. I shall now show that Hn and Vr are gemelli for Phoen. as well, and that Hn is accordingly an additional member of the family Ab RMSVrW, which will appear in my forthcoming Teubner edition as Θ (in Text. Trad. the siglum ρ2 was used).

Hn is dated by Turyn to "around 1475," a date that already makes it unlikely that it is a copy of a manuscript written ca 1500. It is written on western paper, with one column of 25 lines on each page. There are very few corrections and no glosses or scholia on the same pages as the text. Folios 91r–92r contain various items of prefatory material of Phoen. (arg. 1–5, 12, and 9: see Text. Trad. 78–88); 92v–124v contain the text of the entire play; 125r–126r contain further argumenta (13, 10, 14–17) followed by old scholia (which continue to f.139v). Though divided into two sections in Hn, the prefatory items are the same as those found in the subfamily MnS, and their order is identical to that in S (where, after arg. 9 [= dramatis personae], the text is begun, but then abandoned so that the remaining items can be added).

The vast majority of Hn's errors are conjunctive with Θ or with several codices in the family and not just with Vr. For example, if we confine ourselves to omissions and additions, we may cite: 5 γῆν θεῶν MnSHn [Vr]; 20 σος om. AbMnSHn [Vr]; 198 θηλεῖων γένος ἔφοι MnSVrHn; 408 δ' om. B, ΘHn; 413 τῆν om. ΘHn; 478 αὖθες om. FsA, MnSVrHn; 778 δ' om. RVrHn; 1196 οὖν om. MnSVrHn; 1277 δε om. ΘHn; 1317–1318 -στελλὰν add., γέρων et γράαιν om. MnSVrHn; 1500 alterum ὧ om. R MnSVrHn; 1622 γ' om. RSVrHn+ [Mn]; 1626 σ' om. S VrHn+ [Mn]; 1706 ποῦ om. MnSVrHn. Conjunctive errors uniting Hn and Vr alone (or alone among Θ) are very few, but one is striking: versus 74, 73, 75 hoc ordine, sed numeris β, α, γ adscriptis, habent VrHn; 407 δύναμι' ἄν VrHn, CrWv; 460 σφῶν VrHn (σφῶν P); 556 δ' om. VrHn, L. Furthermore, the colon-divisions of Hn are identical to those of Vr (which are often like those of other members of Θ, which are not uniform among themselves). In particular we may cite 1060 ὥ/-δε, 1061 εὐτε-κνοι, 1062 δράκων/-τος in VrHn only; also 209 περιρ-/ρύτων, 673 ξυνήψει in AbVrHn only; 1510 προπαρου/-θ' in RVrHn only; 249 μου/ and 686 πάντων/ αναστα in MnSVrHn only.

Nevertheless, there is abundant evidence that Hn is not a copy of Vr, nor Vr a copy of Hn. Errors in Vr not found in Hn include 156 ποῦ ποῦ VrPc (ZbZmZu); 199 ει Θ (ην S PcHn); 253 οὐσεται
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AbMnSVr+; 285 πόλει RVr; 399 ήδειχν θεόν Vr (MnSaSa); 432 στρατεύοντοι RVr; 444 ήκεi Vr, AaPRfRw (γρ-variant in rest of Θ); 464 μηδαμός AbMn Vr+; 512 ἀν om. Vr; 979 σε om. Vr; 1033 versum om. SVr; 1185 καὶ om. Vr.13 Errors in Hn not found in Vr include 88 θάλλος Hn+; 99 τοῦσδ’ ἐγχριπτεταί Hn+; 114 χαλκόδετ’ ἐμβολα ΟHn; 127 α’ α’ ΜnShn+; 234 ἕλπισων Hn+; 246 φοίνισσα χώρα MnSHn+; 262 εὔσεβείας Hn (εὔσεβείας fere MnS); 267 τὼδε τῶδε χείρα (transp.) Hn; 428 ἐστ’ ἐμοὶ MnSHn; 432 ἐπὶ γὰν MnSHn; 439 τὰ ante τιμώτατα add. Hn; 452 τὴν χάριν ἔχει Hn; 478 ὡστ’ αὐτῆς Hn; 479 φόβου Hn; 502 τῶν δ’ ἔργων MnSHn; 1185 κώλες ἐς κύκλωμ’ MnHn; 1223 προπηρήξει RSHn, VRFVr.

In sum, the readings of Hn are closest to those of the subfamily MnSVr within Θ, and in several passages Hn maintains the error of MnS that the tradition of Vr seems to have removed by collation with another tradition. In addition, Hn has some curiosities of its own (262, 267, 478, 479). Whereas Vr has some interest for its relation to the Aldine edition (see supra n.11), Hn makes no further useful contribution to our knowledge of Θ and may safely be dispensed with even in a generous apparatus criticus. For the prefatory material it may be cited as an additional witness for the items peculiar to (or almost peculiar to) MnS.

3. T and its descendants

One of the few readings of any substance in which descendants of T differ from T itself in Phoen. is 659 νάματα τ’, where the transmitted text νάματ’ was written in T by Triklinios himself. Autopsy confirms that T contains no correction or supralinear addition, only the gloss ηγοῦν τὴν διρκήν, which also appears in the copies.14 νάματα τ’, if not an unbelievably lucky accident, must be viewed as an emendation that creates responson between 640 μόσχος ἀδάμαστον πέσημα (------ or, as Triklinios describes it, hypercatalectic ionic a maiore dimeter composed of first paeon + third epitrite + syllable) and 659 νάματα τ’ ἐνδρα καὶ ἰέθρα (------).15 As such, the emendation ought to be Triklinios’, and his failure to write νάματα τ’ in T must be due to an oversight (just as in 250 Triklinios himself wrote πῶλων even though he analyzed 239=250 as a lecythion, which required πτόλων). It is

13 This list is based on collation of over 500 lines of Hn and selective checking of omissions in the remainder of the play.
14 I examined T twice during a visit to Rome in October 1984.
15 In modern editions, ἀδάμαστον in 640 (Elmsley on Soph. OT 196) convincingly solves the same problem.
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hard to believe that the scribe of, say, Ta carefully compared Triklinios’ metrical scholia with the text and made adjustments: no such adjustment was made at 250, and Triklinios’ intentions were frustrated by an unmetrical álloosá in the trochaic tetrameter 1338 (álloosá T) and by unmetrical χειρα in 1711 (órege χέρα φίλαν T = iambic penthemimer in Triklinios’ analysis).

The metrical emendation νάματά τ’ is also found in four other manuscripts containing the Triklinian Phoenissae: London, Arundel 522, Vat.gr. 2241, 897, Pal.gr. 223.16 Of these, Turyn argued that Vat.gr. 2241 was copied from T directly rather than via Ta, but suggested that the others descended via Ta.17 Turyn’s hypothesis would compound the problem of explaining νάματά τ’, since we would have to posit two scribes reading the scholia with care and arriving at the same solution. Since this is so improbable, we must ask instead whether there was not an intermediary between T and Ta that Triklinios himself had revised in minor details.

This intermediary would have served as a conduit to Ta and to Vat.gr. 2241, and even manuscripts identified as copies of Ta may have descended from it rather than from Ta, since there are a few other agreements of these descendents with T rather than with Ta (see list below: 23, 228, 725, 1155). T is a hybrid production, containing pages of different appearance and sometimes cramped scholia. It would not be surprising if, after completion of his work on the Euripidean triad, Triklinios had a more presentable copy made by another scribe and then acted as diorthotes, making a very few alterations or additions. I list here the most significant cases where it might be appropriate to posit such alterations or unnoticed errors:

23 φάτην Tz, Arundel 522, Vat. 897, Vat. 2241 ante corr.: φάτην Ta, Vat. 2241 post corr., Pal. 223
228 βακχειῶν T1, Arundel 522, Pal. 223, Vat. 897: βακχειῶν Ta: βακχειῶν Vat. 2241
475 ἐφθέξατ’ Tz: ἐφθέξατ’ Ta, rell.
659 νάματα τ’ Ta, rell.
725 σφαλεῖς T1, Vat. 2241 s.l., Vat. 897: σφαλεῖς TzTa, Arundel 522: σφαλεῖς voluit Ta (η s.l. scr.), Vat. 897 s.l., Vat. 2241 (츈 p.c.; ἦ a.c.): σφαλεῖς (sic) Pal. 223.
759 ἐγχέγγυνον Tz: ἐγχέγγυνον Ta, rell.
1155 κατασκάψων Tz, Vat. 897, Ta: -σκάψω Ta, Vat. 2241, Pal. 223
1388 ἄλλους Ti: ἄλλους Ta, Vat. 2241, Pal. 223: ἄλλους Vat. 897

16 The other Triklinian manuscripts of Phoenissae, which I have not seen, are Milan, Ambros. A 104 sup. and A 115 sup.; Paris 2812; Salamanca 243.
17 Turyn (supra n.2) 194–202.
I take this opportunity to report a few further details that are visible in T in the original but not legible on microfilm (and so not contained in the collation of Text. Trad.). T^z is the other, original scribe of the iambic portions of the play; T^t is Triklinios himself, writing the lyric portions or correcting the iambic portions; T is used when (on pages written originally by T^z) it is impossible to determine which hand made a change.

10 κληροματι T in rasura; 98 ἐνθέντε T^z, ἐνθέντε T^t; 310 μόλις T^w; 378 τλήμωνος T^z (coni. Markland); 407 ἐστι T^z, ἐστιν T^t (so too a final μ is added by T^t at 542 διώρισε, 733 ἀρμασι, 905 'στι, 950 ἄρμασι, 1115 ἄρμασι, 1166 αἰτωλία, 1174 έκόμπασε, 1194 ἀδος, 1650 κνεί); 424 οὖν εὐντιχεῖς transp. T^z, corr. T^t; 438 οὖν om. T^z, corr. T^t; 472 αὐτῷ T^z, αὐτῷ T^w; 504 ἀνατολᾶς T^z, αντ- T post rasuram; 522 πύμπλασθ T^z ante rasuram; 548 τῷ ἀπονεμέων T^w; 559 λόγους T^t; 591 σκύπτρον T^t; 596 οὖ T^w; 603 φήμι T^z, φήμι' T^t; 606 δώμαθ' T^t in rasura; 623 τέκν' T^w; 720 έσω T^z, είσων T^t; 724 προβάλλομεν T^z, προσβαλομ' αν T^t; 734 πολεμοῦσι δό T^z, -ίους δύσω T^t; 739 πόλιας T^z, πόλις T^t; 748 ἐλθὼν ... πόλιν T^z, (ἐλθ. om.) ... πόλιν μολὼν T^z; 755 ἐλθειν T^z, ἐλειν T^t; 792 ἄλλ' ἀρμασι in rasura T^t; 851 κάποιος T^z, κάποιος T^t; 865 κληρομας T^z, sed s.l. συνίζησα scr. T^t (idem s.l. ad 945 ήθεος, 1041 πόλεως); 881 peri T^w et νεκρος T^z; 884 πόλει T^w, πόλις T^z; 902 μ' ἄλλο δει T^ions; 924 -πτερεις T^t, -πτερεις T^t; 931 θαλάμους T^z, -μας T^t; 933 φόνον T^z, φοίνον T^t; 939 ἥμιν T^t, ύμιν T^t; 964 προβοθηναι T^z, -θείαιν T^t; 980 δελφοις usque ad 983 δηγ' rescr. in ras. T^t; 982 θεσπρωτων T^w, ῥεων T^z; 983 ἐγυως fort. omiserat T^z; 983 ἐρωμα T^t; 985 παρέξω T^w; 986 νου T^z, νουν T^t; 1084 λεύσει (non leύσει) T^w; 1100 -λειπ- T^z, -λειπ- T^w; 1120 ἀστιδος fort. T^t, T^z, ἀσπίδει T^w, 1124 ἀρη T^z, ἀρην T^t; 1140 προσφέρομεν T^t in rasura; 1188 καθηγειν T^z, 1218 μνηματι T in rasura; 1352 τοι βιων T^t in rasura; 1404 ἀρπάζαντες T^w, -αντε T^w; 1425 οἰδίπους ὄσον T in rasura; 1428 ἐλπιότητιν T^z, -λειπ- T^z; 1431 τετρωμένον T^z, -μένους T^w; 1464 πέλεις T^z T^t, πέλει T^z; 1506 ἐπινεῦ T^z; 1603 ἄθλοι T^z, ἄθλιαν T^t; 1689 ὁλιομεν εν T^z ante rasuram; 1701 (ἀθλι' om.) αθλιον πατρός τέκνα fort. etiam T^z ante rasuram; 1707 δωμαθ' T^z, δωμα θ' T^w.

4. Notes on other manuscripts

V (Vat.gr. 909)

In the collation of Text. Trad. I was unwilling in many passages to assert on the basis of microfilm whether the correction was made by the original scribe V^1 or by the later scribe V^2 (whom Murray re-
ferred to as \( v \), Wecklein as \( b \)). The distinction is an important one in the case of this manuscript, because \( V^1 \) (whatever the date of \( V \)) seems to me to be a relatively accurate transmitter of a Vorlage which probably antedates 1200, whereas \( V^2 \) seems to reflect Palaeologan scholarship to the extent that he draws readings from other sources, some of which may be the product of contemporary conjecture.\(^{18}\) I was able to examine the original manuscript in October 1984 and would now like to report the results in as brief a fashion as possible.

I record first a number of items by line number only. By referring to the published collation, the reader will find a single entry under each number that involves \( V^{ac} \) and \( V^{pc} \) (or only one of the two when it is implied that the other agrees with the lemma). In the following lines \( V^{ac} \) is in fact \( V^1 \) and \( V^{pc} \) is \( V^2 \): 98, 223, 224, 244, 276 (?), 277, 412, 451, 463 (?), 578, 596 (\( o\tilde{v} \)), 632, 658, 702, 763, 844, 902, 1246, 1415, 1632, 1643. In the following lines \( V^{pc} \) is \( V^{1pc} \): 90, 169, 190, 327, 417, 629, 1018, 1460, 1490, 1530, 1687, 1689, 1721. At 738 and 1095 corrections were made by a hand that Wecklein’s collator called manus recentissima: this hand uses a thin stroke like \( V^2 \)’s, but a darker black ink. This hand I shall henceforth term \( V^3 \); \( V^3 \)’s corrections are earlier than the copy of \( V \) made in the fourteenth century, Vat. Pal. gr. 98 (Va).\(^{19}\) In the following lines the corrector was either \( V^2 \) or \( V^3 \): 489, 571, 606, 713. The rubricator (\( Vr \)) is responsible for \( V^{pc} \) at 101, 618, 687.

Some addenda (marked +) and corrigenda to the published collation based on autopsy of \( V \) may be recorded here:\(^{20}\)

35 \( \tau' \) \( V^1 \) in rasura; 82 δοῦρος (not \( \delta\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\)s) \( V^1 \); 103f delete entry;\(^{21}\) 145 \( \tau\omega \) in rasura \( V^1 \); 209 \( \pi\epsilon\rho\rho\iota\nu\tau\omega \) \( V^1 \) (i.e., the spacing of the letters and the appearance of the ink suggest to me that \( V^1 \) wrote the whole word thus all at once and did not first write \( \pi\epsilon\rho\rho\iota\nu\tau\omega \) and then change to \( \pi\epsilon\rho\rho\iota\nu\tau\omega \) by adding a \( nu \) [without deleting the subscript]); +245 \( \varepsilon\pi\tau\cdot V^1, \varepsilon\pi\tau\cdot V^2, +271 \pi\omega\varsigma V^1, \pi\omega\varsigma V^2 ; 295 \tilde{\phi} \) (with subscript) \( V^{ac} \), \( \tilde{\omega} V^{pc} \); 299 (misprint) \( \nu\pi\acute{a}r\rho\rho\omicron\alpha \) \( V^1 \);

\(^{18}\) Text. Trad. 33, 113. It was the connection of \( V^2 \) with Palaeologan scholarship that prompted the use of the derogatory lower-case italic siglum in Wecklein and Murray.

\(^{19}\) On Va see Turyn (supra n.2) 91f; Matthiessen (supra n.11) 45f.

\(^{20}\) In several places a foriasse can be removed (e.g. 74, 981, 1216).

\(^{21}\) The scribe wrote the text through line 102 (in darker, fatter script), then wrote the scholia (in lighter, thinner script) and, finding that the scholia did not fill the lower margin, then added 103f as the last lines of the page, but without changing the style of his writing. Hence, these two lines appear lighter, but were not really omitted; nor were the other lines rewritten, only written in a heavier style by the same scribe. The same occurred in the ms. \( Vr \) at lines 73–78, which were not omitted, but added when extra space was found available after the writing of the scholia.
Several points of uncertainty in these two interesting manuscripts have been cleared up by autopsy, and corrected readings will be apparent from the Teubner apparatus. Here I mention only that in Sa, line 1 does in fact contain δ, written by the rubricator in an ink that is invisible on copies (likewise the heading λεοκετικος is present in argo 1: Text. Trad. 393), and μεξοπάρθενος is the reading in 1023; and in R λοχαγόν was omitted from 131f by R1, but added in the margin by R2.

Rv (Vat.gr. 1332)

In Text. Trad. 9 I mention Livadaras’ report of a date on f.18v of this manuscript. When I inspected the manuscript itself, I found f.18v to be blank. The alleged date may be somewhere else in this many-page manuscript, but I did not find it in a brief perusal. Additional ‘Moschopoulean’ manuscripts

Inspection of Vat.gr. 56, Vat.gr. 50, and Pal.gr. 42 confirms that all are faithful carriers of the χ-tradition (cf. Text. Trad. 169). The latter two have the Moschopoulean version of the epitome (arg. 1), but

---

22 A. Tuilier meant to record Vκ, not Lκ, in his Étude comparée du texte et des scholies d’Euripide (=Études et commentaires 77 [Paris 1972]) 86. What Tuilier reports as a sigma above the line written by V2, implying (he thinks) a variant ύπόδρομος, is in fact a cursive alpha, which, together with the beta over ξυνος and the gamma over κάλον, is a guide to the prosaic order of the words. Similar schoolmasterly guidance is given in the same way in other lines.

23 I was able to clarify many obscure readings of this damaged manuscript, but the points are all so minor that I refrain from reporting any here. The collation in Text. Trad. will not mislead. Likewise, inspection of Zb (Vat.gr. 51) revealed that the correctors are even more numerous than I supposed on the basis of microfilm, but it is not worthwhile to publish here the details of this relatively unimportant witness.
other prefatory items as well (arg. 4–6 plus the iambic trimeter epitome from the tradition of Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus* are found in *Pal.gr.* 42; arg. 2–6 in *Vat.gr.* 50).24

**The University of California, Berkeley**

*February, 1985*

---

24 I take this opportunity to correct a few oversights and errors in *Text. Trad.* 11 (and 186): Z contains *Phoen.* 1–333 and 377–1766, not the whole play. 18 and 425 (line 1175): *P. Herc.* 1609 I (127, p. 48 in Gomperz, *Herkulanische Studien II: Philodem über die Frömmigkeit* [Leipzig 1866]) should be added as carrying a testimonium to line 1175; cf. Philipppson, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 259f. 38f (last line and first line): read ρ2 = Ab M n RS V r and ρ3 = A a P R f R v R w. Collation, line 229: add S as a witness of καθημέριον; line 297f: the space in the papyrus is probably ca 18–20 letters (not ca 15); line 444: add S V as a witness of ηοκεί.