Manuscripts of *Scholia Ulpiani* on Demosthenes, *Orations* 1, 3 and 4

Mervin R. Dilts

Scholia attributed to Ulpian are extant for eleven of the deliberative orations of Demosthenes (1–4, 10, 11, 13–17) and seven of the forensic orations (18–24). As even brief perusal of Dindorf's edition of Demosthenic scholia will reveal, *Scholia Ulpiani* (usually indicated by the sigla TCV) constitute a preponderance of, if not virtually all, scholia on these orations (cf. 10–14, 16, 17). In fact the editio princeps of Demosthenic scholia (Aldus, Venice 1503) is actually an edition of *Scholia Ulpiani*, for scholia from independent recensions were scarcely known until 1770 when scholia were published from *Monacensis gr.* 485 (A, saec. 10) and *Monacensis gr.* 85 (B, saec. 13), which is an apograph of *Marcianus gr.* 416 (F, saec. 10).¹ Eighty-one years later Dindorf made the first attempt at a complete edition of Demosthenic scholia,² and he included scholia from A and B as well as two other recensions independent of *Scholia Ulpiani*: (1) *Parisinus gr.* 2935 (Y, saec. 10), *Laurentianus gr.* 59.9 (P, saec. 10)³ and (2) *Parisinus gr.* 2934 (S, saec. 9/10).

Although Dindorf accomplished more than previous editors, his edition derives from inadequate ms. evidence. Thus of the four mss. Dindorf used in editing *Scholia Ulpiani*, only one, T (*Paris.gr.* 2940, saec. 13), is a primary witness for *Scholia Ulpiani* on the Olynthiacs and first Philippic. A recent study of mss. of *Scholia Ulpiani* on Or. 24 has brought to light another primary ms. for these orations, Be (*Bonon. 3564, saec. 13*).⁴ In addition, *Scholia Ulpiani* are found in seventeen

---


² *Demosthenes ex recensione Gulielmi Dindorfii*, VIII, IX: *Scholia graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata* (Oxford 1851). All references to scholia are from this edition.


⁴ On T and Be, see M. R. Dilts, “The Manuscript Tradition of the *Scholia Ulpiani* on *Demosthenis in Timocratem*,” *TAPA* 105 (1975) 39–41. For the orations discussed here, T, Be...
previously unexamined mss.; it is these which are considered in this article.

When compared with T and Be, mss. scrutinized here will be shown to differ in several respects. Thus when Scholia Ulpiani are cognate with scholia of F (B) YA, these mss. agree variously with T Be and with F (B) YA, and at times these mss. contain scholia from F (B) YA while T Be contain only Scholia Ulpiani. In other cases these mss. contain scholia and correct readings found neither in F (B) YA nor in T Be. In studying these mss. my objectives have been to establish stemmatic relationships and to determine which mss. will be of practical use in editing Scholia Ulpiani.6

I

The following mss. appear to derive from a common exemplar by virtue of conjunctive errors:7

Ca, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 229, saec. 14
Fu, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, conv.soppr. 168, saec. 14/15

contain separative errors such as the following:
32.27 λυπηρός Be λυπηρά T
65.2 αὐτὸ T, om. Be
66.19 περιγενόμεθα] περιγενόμεθα Be περιγενόμεθα T
113.16 βορθήκαι Be βορθήκαι T
114.4 ἄλλως T ἔστιν αὖν τὸ Be
140.27-29 T, om. Be
142.2 Χαλκιδικῶν Be Χαλκιδονικῶν T

Most of these were first edited by Morelli (Δημοκρήτων λόγοι...καὶ τὰς ἐξηγήσεις ὀφελομοιτάτας τοῦ Οὐλπιανοῦ ῥήτορος...διὰ φιλοσοφίας καὶ ἐπιμελείας τοῦ Γουλέλλου Μορέλου...Lutetiae 1570 ap. Io. Benetatum). The editio princeps of Scholia Ulpiani (Editio Aldina, Venice 1503) lacks these scholia, which Dindorf identifies with the siglum P. 8 This article is based on a collation of the following pages of Dindorf’s edition: (Or. 1) 31.1–33.19, 54.24–55.8, 56.3–57.4, 58.13–59.16, 64.13–65.2, 66.15–67.6; (Or. 3) 112.3–114.5; (Or. 4) 139.1–19, 140.27–142.15, 142.24–143.13, as well as a comparison of scholia found in each ms. and further collations of selected scholia. Collations by students in a seminar in Greek palaeography and textual criticism show that findings reported for Orr. 1, 3 and 4 are also valid for Orr. 2. I have not observed Scholia Ulpiani in mss. which contain only Or. 2.

6 32.7 εἰδόθε—8 εἰμίφερον T Be Wd Af Vb εἰδόθε ἄν αὐτοὶ (αὐτὸς Ca) ἀντὶ πολλῶν χρημάτων τὸ εἰμίφερον ἤπατήσῃ Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc, Σ om. Vd Ah
.15 ἐπικαθηγήθη T Be Wd Af Vb ὡς ἐπικαθηγήθη Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd, Σ om. Ah
.18 λυπηρῶν T Be Wd Af Vb τοῦτο δὲ ἦν λυπηρῶν Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd, Σ om. Ah
Scholia and readings in copies of this exemplar also appear in codex F:\8

44.26–45.5  F B Oi Mf Sc Vd Ah, Σ om. Ca Fu Mm T Bc
56.11  χρήσιμα  F B Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd Ah χρήσιμα  έστιν  T Bc
58.13  μικτόν  F B Ca Fu Vd Ah μικρόν  T Bc, Σ om. Mm Oi Mf Sc
64.16  προς  F B Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd Ah εὶς  T Bc
67.6  γνωρίζειν  T Bc χαρακτηρίζειν  F B Ca Fu Vd Ah, Σ om. Mm Oi Mf Sc

In addition Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf have further evidence of contamination:

136.23  ἐν τοις ἀνω  H R S\9 Ca Fu Mm εὐτάκτως  F B

---

33.4  ἵππορίδειν  T Bc Wd Af Vb ὑπεριδεῖν ἔθελησειν (-αιν Ca Fu Mm)  Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd, Σ om. Ah
58.20  ἐξεί (ἐξεῖν Vb)  T Bc Wd Vb, om. Ca Fu Vd Ah, Σ om. Mm Oi Mf Sc Af

The sigla Wd (Vindob.phil.gr. 105), Af (Ambrosianus C 235 inf.) and Vb (Vatic.gr. 68) are introduced here as representative of recensions discussed in sections II and III of this article. Conjunctive errors occur only for Or. 1, since Sc lacks scholia on 3 and 4; Vd derives from Vb for 3 and 4; Ah derives from T for 3 and 4; Oi Mf contain an identical selection of scholia on 3 and 4, but not those collated. References to catalogue descriptions of mss. discussed in this article are to be found in M. Richard, Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs\3 (Paris 1958) and Supplément I (Paris 1964).

\8 See Dilts, op.cit. (supra n.1). Some of these scholia also occur in other mss., but agreements in readings indicate that these mss. derive from F (B). Moreover the following readings make it clear that Ca Fu Mm derive from F, not B:

126.8  τὰ  B εἰ  τις  τὰ  F Ca Fu Mm
129.17  τοῦ\8  B, om. F Ca Fu Mm
137.5  πλέοντοι  εἰν  F Ca Fu Mm πλεῖον  τὰ  B

\9 Readings for H R S are reported by Dindorf. H (Paris.gr. 2508, saec. 15) appears to be a copy of R (Paris.gr. 2936, see Dindorf[p.viii] and M. R. Dilts, “Apographs of Lost Codex
MSS. OF SCHOLIA ULPIANI ON DEM. 1, 3 AND 4

.25 μεθοδοράς H R P Ca Fu Mm μεθοδοράς F B S
145.14 ἀποδείξας αὐτὰς T Bc αὐτὰς ἀποδείξας Pr\textsuperscript{10} Oi Mf, Σ om. F
   B Ca Fu Mm
146.9 ἀν Pr Oi Mf, Σ om. T Bc, Σ om. F B Ca Fu Mm
.11 ἐχθροῖς T Bc ἐναντίοις Pr Oi Mf, Σ om. Ca Fu Mm

Conjunctive and separative errors in Ca Fu Mm indicate that these mss. derive from a lost hyparchetype, codex f:

33.5 ἀντὶ τὰ δὲ τὰ δ. τ. χ. Ca Fu, Σφ om. Mm
112.8 ὑπέτελει om. Ca Fu Mm
.10 ἀλαττεῖ Ca Fu Mm
113.6 ῥίκειοιοι] ἰδίῳ Ca Fu Mm
31.1–10 Fu (31.1–8 Mm) Mm, om. Ca
57.10–16, 58.8–11 Ca Fu, om. Mm
122.12 πολέμου Ca Mm πολλῶν Fu
130.15 ἀκόντων Ca Mm ἀκόν ἀν Fu

When Fu has scholia of F, these appear in the text in a numbered sequence for Orr. 1, 3 and 4, and Scholia Ulpiani appear in the margins for Orr. 1 and 3.\textsuperscript{11} Ca and Mm combine both sets of scholia (Ca in a section containing only scholia, and Mm on folios after the text of each oration). For Orr. 1 and 3 codex Fu may preserve the format of lost codex f. For other orations Ca Fu Mm do not contain scholia (e.g. 10, 13, 14, 16, 17) or appear to derive scholia from Parisinus gr. 2935, Y (e.g. 11, 15, 22).

Codex Vallicellianus 36 C34, Re, is a composite codex of which the second part (ff. 286–373, saec. 15 exeunt.) contains excerpts from scholia on Or. 4 (ff. 354\textsuperscript{v}–363\textsuperscript{v}). The following evidence indicates that these are derived in part from lost codex f and in part from other mss. (viz. 140.1–25 R S Re, om. Ca Fu Mm; 142.17–21 A H Re, om. Ca Fu Mm):

139.1 Ζητοῦσι] Ζητοῦσι γὰρ T Ζητοῦσι δὲ τινὲς Bc Ζητοῦσι τινὲς Ca
   Mm Re, Σ om. Fu
.2 κατηγορεῖ T Bc ἢ κατηγορία Ca Mm Re, Σ om. Fu

\textsuperscript{r} for Demostenes in Timocratem," Prometheus 3 [1977] 204–10). The siglum P refers to the edition of Morelli; see further nn.5 and 17.

\textsuperscript{10} Dindorf refers to Pr (Paris.gr. 2995, saec. 14) as F, a siglum normally used for Marcianus gr. 416.

\textsuperscript{11} For Or. 4 Fu lacks marginal scholia, and all doublets of Scholia Ulpiani and F agree with F in error.
142.13 πρώτον λέγειν F B Ca Fu Mm Re λέγειν πρώτοι T Bc

Codex Re contains a number of careless errors which verge on illiteracy:

141.12 ἐμμεμενηκώς] ἐμμεμενηκὸν Re
142.11 πῶς λεληθώτως] περιλεληθώτως Re

Such readings and the brief selection of scholia render this ms. of no value.

Codices Oi Mf Sc are shown to derive from a lost hyparchetype since all three mss. contain the same scholia on Or. 1, and Oi Mf the same scholia on Otr. 3 and 4 as well as conjunctive and separative errors:

31.1–8 δεινὸς praebb. post 31.14 χρημάτων Oi Mf Sc
33.5 ἵστεον—19 πεποιήκας om. Oi Mf Sc
32.22 ἐν τ. θ. . . . ὀβολον Oi Mf ἐν τ. θ. transp. post ὀβολον Sc
47.28 οἶ—48.2 ἀναχωρήσεων (ὁμ.) Oi Sc, om. Mf
                             .28 καὶ—48.1 ὀὕτως Sc, om. Oi

Scholia contained in these mss. constitute a selection from Scholia Ulpiani and are found on folios following the text of Otr. 1, 3 and 4. Other orations in Oi Mf contain scant excerpts from scholia, which do not merit consideration (Or. 10) or scholia from Y (Or. 11). Oi has scholia from Y on Otr. 15 and 22; 13, 14, 16 and 17 lack scholia (Mf lacks these orations).

Conjunctive and separative errors indicate that Vd and Ah derive scholia on Or. 1 from a common exemplar:

55.4 ὥς om. Vd Ah
     .7 ἐκτιν om. Vd Ah
57.1 μῆ om. Vd Ah
58.8 <καὶ τοῦτο τῷ> Vd Ah
31.10 τὸ—32.3 πέπειμαι Vd, om. Ah
57.22 χρήσθαι—58.2 Ah, om. Vd

Scholia on other orations appear in both mss., but Vd derives these scholia from Vb (see n.7 and section III below) and Ah from Parisinus gr. 2940, T. Codex Ah is dated to the year 1525 and consists of selected scholia copied by Lazarus Bonamicus,12 who doubtless composed several scholia not known from other sources (e.g. 1.9 νῦν δὲ καρος ἥκει] ὄρα δὲ πῶς ἀθυμίας αὐτοῖς πληρώσας διὰ τοῦ καταλόγου

12 See M. E. Cosenza, Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists... I (Boston 1962) 644–45.
In sum, Oi Mf Sc and Vd Ah contain a briefer selection from Scholia Ulpiani than Ca Fu Mm, which in turn lack many scholia found in T Be. One notable feature of these eight mss. is that they do have from codex F readings which preserve the truth when T Be are in error. In addition, the samples of text collated for this article have brought to light accepted readings found neither in T Be nor in F:

56.12 ἀπὸ Ca Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd Ah ὑπὸ T Be
113.20 ὅτι πλείους eicί Ca Fu Mm ὅτι eicί πλείους T Be, Σ om. Oi Mf
141.12 τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον Ca Fu Mm τὸν ἄλλον χρόνων (¬νον T<ac>) T<ro> Be, Σ om. Oi Mf
141.15 ἄγορευειν Ca Fu Mm ἄγορευει T ἄγορευνων Be, Σ om. Oi Mf

These involve minor corrections of the text of T Be and could be interpreted merely as felicitous conjectures. However obvious this conclusion may be, it is based on a collation of a portion of scholia on Ostr. 1, 3 and 4 (see supra n.6), and further collation might well produce readings which derive from a source of equal or greater value than T Be. Moreover, since Ca (saec. 14) is nearly coeval with T Be (saec. 13) and since Ca contains a more complete text of scholia than its cognate mss., it seems prudent to collate all scholia in Ca and weigh the results. Meanwhile codices Fu Mm Oi Mf Sc Vd Ah can be dismissed from further consideration.

II

Conjunctive errors indicate that the following mss. derive scholia on the Olynthiacs and first Philippic from a common exemplar, lost codex w:

13 Note, for example the following readings cited above (pp. 57, 59) 56.11, 58.13, 64.16, 142.13.
14 33.16 μὸνον T Be Ca Af Vb μάλλον Vf Wd Vs, Σ<ro> om. P<o> Ao
56.10 Φίλιππου F B T Be Ca Af Vb Φίλιππου πράγματα Vf Wd Vs P<o> Ao
58.24 ξένων F B T Be Ca Vb ξένων τὸν λόγον Vf Wd P<o> Ao, ap. Vs Σ desunt post 58.5, Σ<ro> om. Af
25 συμφέροντι προσήκει F B T Be Ca Vb προσήκοντι συμφέρει Vf Wd P<o> Ao, Σ om. Af
Apographs of codex w contain scholia not found in T Bc:
 29.5 ἤθικόν—11 θεραπεύει F B Vf Wd Vs Pv Ao, cf. 31.1–7
 156.19–21 F B Wd Vs PAVo, Σ om. Vi T Bc
   .28–157.2 F B Wd Pv Ao, Σ om. Vi T Bc
 143.26–144.2 P Wd Vs PAVo Vi, Σ om. F B T Bc
 144.7–9 P Wd Vs PAVo Vi, Σ om. F B T Bc
   .10–12 P Wd Vs PAVo Vi, Σ om. F B T Bc
Like mss. represented by Ca, readings and scholia in apographs of w point to contamination from F (B). In addition w contained scholia found neither in F (B) nor in T Bc (e.g. the last three scholia listed above). These were first edited by Morelli in 1570, and he probably derived them from P v.¹⁷
Three mss. (Vs Pv Ao) derive still more scholia from recensions independent of T Bc. Vs contains scholia which doubtless derive from codex A, Monacensis gr. 485, saec. 10:
 156.8–10 A H Vs, om. Wd Pv Ao Vi
   .11–14 A H R Vs, om. Wd Pv Ao Vi
   .21–24 A Vs, om. Wd Pv Ao Vi
Similarly Pv Ao contain scholia found in the recension of F (B), which are lacking in T Bc Vf Wd Vs: 41.11–12, 44.17–24, 26–45.5;

¹⁵ Vf, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, gr. 76, saec. 14
¹⁶ Wd, Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 105, saec. 14
¹⁷ Vs, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, gr. 2207, saec. 14/15
¹⁸ Pv, Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, gr. 2999, saec. 15
Ao, Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Q 12 sup., saec. 15
¹⁹ Vi, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, gr. 1367, saec. 15.

113.11 περί ποιότητος προσώπων A H R Wd Vs (? ) P v Ao περί ποιότητα προσώπου T Bc Ca Vb, Σ om. Af
142.2 τριάκοντα δύο F B T Bc C a A f V b λέ ή Wd P v A o τριάκοντα τό εξ Vi, Σ om. Vs
16 Vi contains scholia only for Or. 1, ff. 5°–13°. These folios are part of the first of two recensions of Demosthenic scholia in this codex; see Dilts, opp.citt. (supra n.4) 37–39 and (supra n.9) 207.
17 112.11 διὰ τῶν ἔργων δείκνυ τις Wd Vs ἀμα γάρ δεινόν χρῆσαι πράγματι τούτων δείκνυ τις P v. Morelli attributes this reading to codex η, the seventh of the mss. he used (α–θ); see further J. T. Voemel, ed. Demosthenis contiones quae circumferuntur (Halle 1857) 183. Scholia first edited by Morelli also appear in Af and Vb (see section III).
135.4–10, 15–18; 138.5–6, 8–11; 144.3–5, 14–18; 147.8–18. These scholia appear to derive from a comparison of F and B, since Pv Ao sometimes agree with F but not B (e.g. 134.16 κ. τ. c. Β τ. c. κ. F Pv Ao) and vice versa (e.g. 154.13–17 B Pv Ao, om. F), and at other times Pv Ao combine readings in F and B:

136.11 ὡς ἐπανορθωτικόν F ἐπανορθωτικῶς B ὡς ἐπανορθωτικῶς Pv Ao

137.5 πλείονα ἐν F πλείων τὰ B πλείουν τὰ ἐν Pv (πλείω Αο) Ao

The following separative errors indicate that codex Vf is an independent copy of lost codex w:

32.12 εἰπεῖν Wd Vs Pv Ao εἰπεῖν διὰ Vf

54.26 γὰρ Wd Vs Pv Ao γὰρ ὁ ῥήτωρ Vf

56.4 μέλλει Wd Vs Pv Ao τὸ μέλλον Vf

Three readings for scholia on Or. 1 aver a common source for Wd and Vs:

32.26 ὁ π. ὁ πρ. Φ. ΤΒc ὁ Φ. ὁ πρ. π. Wd Vs ὁ πρ. Φ. π. Vf (32.24–33.19 om. Pv Ao)

55.3 δείκνυσι T Βc Wd Vs δείκνυσι μιμοῦσαι γὰρ ἀεὶ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων φύσιν Vf Pv Ao

57.3 παρ’ ἀλλου καὶ ἀναγκαζόμενος B Β καὶ ἀναγ. παρ’ ἀλλου T Βc Wd Vs καὶ ἀναγ. ᾗπ’ ἀλλων Vf Pv Ao

and the following separative errors indicate that each of these mss. is independent of the other:

Σ post 58.5 τόκῳ om. Vs

113.3 Ὁλυνθίοις Vs δ" (sc. ἀθηναίοις) Wd

.20–114.5 Wd, om. Vs

Wd contains Scholia Ulpiani for Orr. 1, 2, 3 and 4; other orations lack scholia (cf. 13, 14, 16, 17) or contain scholia from Y (cf. 11, 15, 20, 21, 22, 24). Vs has selections from Scholia Ulpiani on Orr. 1, 3 and 4; other orations are without scholia or contain scholia from ARY (cf. Or. 22=ARY, Or. 24=A Y, see further n.9).

Codex Pv contains excerpts from Scholia Ulpiani with numerous scholia from F and B. For Orr. 1, 3 and 4 Ao is shown to derive from Pv, since Ao shares the scholia as well as errors of Pv with omissions (no separative errors have been noted for Pv):

32.24 οὐδὲ—33.19 πεποιήκασιν Vf Wd Vs, om. Pv Ao

18 Some of these scholia are also attributed by Dindorf to codices HRS (see supra n.9) as well as to Π, the edition of Morelli, but readings indicate that Pv Ao derive from the tradition of F (B).
139.8 εὐπορίας Wd Vi ἀπορίας Pv Ao  
141.3 Ἀρι—τῷ Wd ("Ορι om. Vi) Vi οὔτω Pv Ao  
34.27–28, 46.8–9, 69n8 Pv, om. Ao  
For Or. 4 Pv (Ao) and Vi clearly derive from a lost hyparchetype. Thus Pv (Ao) and Vi have conjunctive errors against Wd (Vs omits scholia cited):  
141.3 περιβ. Wd περιβ. λόγων Pv Vi παραβ. λόγων Ao  
.4 προτάσεως Wd προτάσεως καὶ κέχρηται τούτῳ τῷ παραδείγματι  
Pv Ao Vi  
142n13 πολλάκις Wd ὅτι πολλάκις Pv Ao Vi  
and Pv (see 139.8 and 141.3, supra and Vi have separative errors:  
142.1 λέγ. πρ. Pv Ao πρ. λέγ. Vi  
.10 θέλει—γεροῦτων Pv Ao λέγει τ. γ. εἰπεῖν Vi  
Pv Ao contain Scholia Ulpiani only on Orr. 1, 2, 3 and 4; for scholia on other orations in Vi see n.16.  
Of the apographs of lost codex w, Wd contains the most complete text of Scholia Ulpiani. (Vf has Scholia Ulpiani only for Or. 1, Pv Vi contain a scant selection of scholia,19 and scholia in Vs end at 58.5 τόκῳ for Or. 1 while Orr. 3 and 4 have selected scholia,) Accordingly, readings of this recension can be practically mustered from Wd. Like Ca and other mss. discussed in section I, Wd does preserve accepted readings when T Be are in error. Two of these are also found in Ca (see 56.12 and 141.12, cited on p.60), and they may result from conjecture or archetypal variants (see p.65). In addition Wd contributes one accepted reading not found in other mss.: 139.1 Ζητοῦσι εἰ Wd Pv Vi Ζητοῦσι γὰρ T Ζητοῦσι τινὲς Ca Ζητοῦσι δὲ τινὲς ὅτι Bc, Σ om. Af Vb. Given these readings and the fact that Wd is independent of T Bc Ca, this ms. merits full collation with the expectation that it will yield further unique readings or at least a more complete picture of the archetype.  

III  
Codices Ambrosianus C 235 inf., Af (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, saec. 13/14) and Vaticanus gr. 68, Vb (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, saec. 14 init.), contain Scholia Ulpiani on Orr. 1, 2, 3 and 4.  

19 Pv does have several scholia from F (B) lacking in Wd, but these are not relevant for editing Scholia Ulpiani.
MSS. OF SCHOLIA ULPANI ON DEM. 1, 3 AND 4

Af and Vb lack scholia on other orations, with the exception of 15, 21 and 24, for which Vb has scholia from Y. Some scholia in these two mss. derive readings from recensions which are independent of T Bc:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.11-12</td>
<td>ἐπὶ Φιλίστπων πλέον τὴν ἀπιστίαν ήν ἡπείρας</td>
<td>Af Vb Wd, cf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.3-4</td>
<td>F B Af Vb Wd, om. T Bc Ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.15-16</td>
<td>πανταχόθεν τ. Φ. F B Af Ca τ. Φ. πανταχόθεν T Bc ἀπὸδ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.11-12</td>
<td>A F B Vb, om. Af T Bc Ca Wd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.1-2</td>
<td>F B Vb, om. Af T Bc Ca Wd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.23-24</td>
<td>F B Af Vb Ca Wd, om. T Bc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.17</td>
<td>δύναμιν T Bc Wd δύναμιν ἢν ἐχει ὁ Μακεδών Pr Af Vb, Σ om. Ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although some of the scholia cited above appear in Ca and Wd or Wd, Af Vb are clearly independent of Ca (see 64.11-12, 65.3-4 etc.) and Wd (see 66.15-16). Moreover, the following readings indicate that Vb does not derive from Af and vice versa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115.26</td>
<td>ῥήτορας Af T Bc Ca Wd ῥήτορας &lt;116.2 ἤτι—3 γκοπεύω&gt; Vb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>σαν, τινὰς Af T Bc Ca Wd τινὰς σαν. Vb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus far we have seen that Af Vb are independent witnesses, and at this point it is appropriate to determine whether or not these mss. are of value in establishing the text of Scholia Ulpiani. While Af Vb lack some scholia contained in T Bc, these two mss., like Ca Wd, sometimes preserve correct readings when T Bc are in error:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>δ. ἀντ. αὐτοῖς εὐθυς Y Af Vb δ. ἀντ. εὐθυς αὐτοῖς Wd ὕφορμοῦντα T Bc ὕφορμοῦντα Ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.12</td>
<td>ἀπὸο Αf Vb Ca Wd ὑπὸ T Bc 56.12 ὁλον—57.1 τοιοῦτων om. FBHRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>ἄλλως hab. F B Af Vb Wd, om. T Bc Ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>μετατίθειν Vb μετατίθειν T Bc Ca Wd, Σ om. Af</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.18</td>
<td>προθυμία Af Vb βοηθεῖς T Bc ἐπουδείς Wd (ut apparet), Σ om. Ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In three instances (31.7, 66.9, 113.2) Af Vb or Vb preserves correct readings variously found in FYA. Since these readings do occur in independent recensions, they do not alone justify full collation, but in other cases Af Vb preserve the truth for Scholia Ulpiani not found
in independent recensions. At 56.12 Af Vb have the correct reading along with Ca Wd. This could derive from independent conjecture in all four mss. or from a double reading in the archetype. The case for archetypal doublets becomes more cogent in light of 118.18, where Af Vb alone preserve the accepted reading and T Bc Wd variants. In addition, the following variants are most readily explained as double readings in the archetype:

66.15–16 πανταχώθεν... τ. Φ. Ca Af τ. Φ. πανταχώθεν T Bc
ἀποδ. πανταχώθεν τ. Φ. Wd Vb

139.1 Ζητούσι εἰ Wd Ζητούσι γὰρ T Ζητούσι τινες Ca Ζητούσι δὲ τινες ὀτι Bc, Σ om. Af Vb

141.23 οὖτω μὲν οὖτος T Bc οὖτος μὲν οὖτω F B Wd οὖν μὲν οὖτω Ca Af

142.2 πολλή F B T Bc Vb πολὺ Ca Wd Af

Af Vb date at least to the beginning of the fourteenth century, and they are therefore, after T Bc, the oldest witnesses to the text of the archetype. This fact, as well as the correct readings found in Af or Vb or both, justify collation of these mss.

* * * * *

Contrary to the closed tradition established for Scholia Ulpiani on Demosthenis in Timocratem (Or. 24), mss. of Scholia Ulpiani on the Olynthiacs and first Philippic contain readings and scholia from independent recensions. Thus of the eleven mss. containing Scholia Ulpiani on Or. 24, none contains a text contaminated from independent recensions, but an average of 50.6 per cent of the mss. containing Scholia Ulpiani on Orr. 1, 3 and 4 show signs of contamination. This is all the more remarkable since in both Orr. 24 and 1, 3 and 4 Scholia Ulpiani are often cognate with independent recensions (e.g. A Y F B). Clearly the mss. considered here reflect a stage in the text tradition of Demosthenic scholia in which interest in comparing Vorlagen for scholia on orations at the beginning of the corpus was greater than for subsequent orations. This is borne out by the fact

20 On Vb, see J. Irigoin, “Les filigranes de Fabriani...,” Scriptorium 12 (1958) 46, 47.
21 See Dilts, op.cit. (supra n.4) 35–50.
22 For Or. 1, 48 % (15 of 31 mss.) are part of the contaminated tradition; for Or. 3, 50 % (12 of 24 mss.); for Or. 4, 54 % (13 of 24 mss.).
that contaminated mss. contain *Scholia Ulpiani* only for the beginning of the corpus, and other orations (13, 14, 16, 17, 24) lack scholia or contain scholia from other mss., most notably Y.

The *terminus ante quem* for such philological activity is the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century, since Af is dated *saec. 13/14*, Vb has been dated to the beginning of the fourteenth century, and the lost exemplars of Ca and Wd (both *saec. 14*) were doubtless as old. In other words, these mss. date from a period coeval with or slightly later than T Bc.

Fifteen of the seventeen mss. discussed in this article have been shown to derive from two hyparchetypes, which can be cited adequately from Ca and Wd. Af Vb together with Ca Wd represent a branch of the ms. tradition which is independent of T Bc, as can be seen from the following simplified stemma for *Scholia Ulpiani* on Orations 1–4:

```
FBYAS
  /\   /
 T  Bc
   |
 Ca Wd Af Vb
```

Prior to Dindorf, editions of *Scholia Ulpiani* were based primarily on the Aldine edition of 1503 with accretions of readings from mss. in Paris collected by Morelli (1570). Frequently the Aldine edition departs from the paradosis, and one of Dindorf’s contributions was to eliminate some of these aberrations; but many remain in his text, regrettably without any account of the paradosis. Moreover Dindorf used an imperfect collation of only one primary ms. (T).<sup>23</sup> A new edition is clearly in order, and for *Scholia Ulpiani* on the first four orations of Demosthenes it should be based on Bc Ca Wd Af Vb as well as T. Making use of these six primary mss. will result in a text

<sup>23</sup> He also used two apographs *Paris.gr. 2944* (D) and *Paris.gr. 2946* (C). Dindorf (viii) did recognize that D is a copy of T, but he reports to excess readings from C, which preserves an interpolated version of *Scholia Ulpiani*; see Dilts, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 42–45.
which conforms to modern critical standards and contains a full account of *Scholia Ulpiani* not found in T²⁴ and variant readings.²⁵
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²⁴ These include several scholia in Bc, which have not been edited as well as those edited by Morelli (see *supra* nn.5 and 17).

²⁵ A grant from the American Philosophical Society has facilitated purchase of microfilm copies of Demosthenic mss., and travel grants from the American Council of Learned Societies (1973 and 1977) and the Arts and Science Research Fund of New York University (1975) have made possible inspection of mss.