

Marcus Musurus and Pindar

Guillermo Galán Vioque

SOME DECADES AGO Jean Irigoín and Brigitte Mondrain¹ concluded that ca. 1509, four years before the appearance of Aldus Manutius' *editio princeps* in neighboring Venice,² Marcus Musurus (ca. 1475–1517)³ used a manuscript with the second edition of Pindar by Demetrius Triclinius (ca. 1280–1335) while teaching the epinicia at the University of Padua.

Their study was based on notes by the German humanist Johannes Cuno (ca. 1462–1513), one of Musurus' students in Padua, transcribed by his friend and disciple Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) and preserved in the manuscript *Sélestat, Bibliothèque Humaniste* 102, ff. 167–174. Among other entries, this codex contains a Latin translation of the first five *Olympian Odes* with

¹ “Marc Mousouros et Pindar,” in D. Harlfinger (ed.), *ΦΙΛΟΦΡΟΝΗΜΑ. Festschrift für Martin Sicherl* (Paderborn 1990) 253–262 (repr. J. Irigoín, *La tradition des textes grecs* [Paris 2003] 627–638).

² ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ Ὀλύμπια. Πύθια. Νέμεα. Ἴσθμια. Καλλιμάχου ὕμνοι, οἱ εὐρισκόμενοι· Διονυσίου Περιήγησις· Λυκόφρονος Ἀλεξάνδρα, τὸ σκοτεινὸν ποίημα, Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi et Andreae Asulani soceri, 1513. On Pindar's *editio princeps* see Jean Irigoín, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952) 399–408; Konstantinos Sp. Staikos, *Charta of Greek Printing. The Contribution of Greek Editors, Printers and Publishers to the Renaissance in Italy and the West* (Cologne 1998) I 343; Luigi Ferreri, *L'Italia degli Umanisti: Marco Musuro* (Turnhout 2014) 55, 261–266, 439; and Douglas F. Bauer, “Problems in the Aldine Pindar,” *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 76 (2015) 419–446. For Musurus' lessons in Padua see Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1962) 133; Martin Sicherl, *Johannes Cuno. Ein Wegbereiter des Griechischen in Deutschland. Eine biographisch-kodikologische Studie* (Heidelberg 1978) 87–106; Ferreri 47–52 and 430–447.

³ On his birthdate see S. Pagliaroli, “Giano Lascari e il Ginnasio Greco,” *Studi medievali e umanistica* 2 (2004) 224 n.2; Ferreri, *L'Italia* 33, esp. n.1.

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 62 (2022) 239–254

Article copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the
Creative Commons Attribution License

CC-BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

explanatory notes in the margin and a transcription of the end of *Olympian* 6 (lines 96–106). Irigoín and Mondrain proved beyond doubt that Musurus was familiar with Triclinius' second recension.⁴ This finding is relevant because it removes the main obstacle to confirming Musurus' involvement in the preparation of the *editio princeps*, which contains undeniable traces of Triclinius' recensions.⁵

In this study I review additional evidence that both confirms Musurus' knowledge of Triclinius' second recension and suggests that he also had at his disposal the first recension that comprised all the epinicians. I also tentatively identify the manuscript source that made the second recension available to Musurus. Finally, I show that Musurus also depended on the ancient Pindaric scholia, specifically, on the version that survives in *Vat.gr.* 1312 (B).

Before Irigoín and Mondrain's article, it was known that Musurus had only two Pindar manuscripts at his disposal, one with the so-called Vatican recension (*Vat.gr.* 41 [H], dated to the first quarter of the 14th century), and another with the edition of the prolific Byzantine monk and scholar Maximus Planudes

⁴ In addition to Irigoín and Mondrain's article, see Sicherl, *Johannes Cuno* 100–101 and 152. On Triclinius' editions see Irigoín, *Histoire* 331–364.

⁵ See Tycho Mommsen, *Pindari carmina* (Berlin 1864) XLIII n.*; Irigoín, *Histoire* 399–408, and in *ΦΙΛΟΦΡΟΝΗΜΑ* 262; Ferreri, *L'Italia* 439; and Bauer, *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 76 (2015) 434. Musurus' involvement in the editing of the *editio princeps* has been discussed at length without reaching any definitive conclusion (see Julius Schüick, "Aldus Manutius und seine Zeitgenossen in Italien und Deutschland," in *Anhänge: die Familie des Aldus bis zu ihrem Ende* [Berlin 1862] 79; Elpidio Mioni, "La biblioteca greca di Marco Musuro," *Archivio Veneto* 93 [1972] 7; Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars* 146 n.133; Sicherl, *Johannes Cuno* 101 n.73; Irigoín, *Histoire* 401 n.1; Ferreri 265–266; and Staffan Fogelmark, *The Kallierges Pindar: A Study in Renaissance Greek Scholarship and Printing* [Cologne 2015] I 10–11 n.16, and 367–370). For arguments against Musurus' involvement see Rudolf Menge, "De Marci Musuri Cretensis uita, studiis, ingenio narratio," in Mauricius Schmidt, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Jena 1868) V 33; Martin Sicherl in Dieter Harlfinger et al., *Griechische Handschriften und Aldinen* (Brunschweig 1978) 144–145; and Bauer 431–432.

(Venice, *Marc.gr.* IX.8 [1039] [W], transcribed by Kaisar Strategos at the beginning of the 16th century). Both bear Musurus' ex libris and contain the *Olympian* and *Pythian Odes* with ancient scholia. However, it seems that Musurus acquired these manuscripts after Aldus Manutius' edition of *Pindar*.⁶

In 2004, Annaclara Cataldi Palau brought to light that sometime between 1509 and 1516 Musurus owned one of Pindar's now lost manuscripts that later, in the 18th century, belonged to the Royal Library of Madrid (today's Spanish National Library), as noted by Juan de Iriarte (1701–1771), the first cataloguer of its Greek manuscripts and one of the most prominent Spanish intellectuals of the eighteenth century.⁷ The first volume of his catalogue was published in 1769 (*Regiae bibliothecae Matritensis codices Graeci manuscripti*, Matriti: Ant. Pérez de Soto, 1769), while the second remained unpublished (Madrid, BNE 4655-4656).⁸ From this unpublished volume (4656, ff. 343–345), one can infer that the missing manuscript belonged to Georgius Corinthius (ca. 1485–1555) and probably contained Triclinius' second edition of Pindar's *Olympian Odes* with *scholia recentiora*,⁹ a descrip-

⁶ See Alexander Turyn, *De codicibus pindaricis* (Cracow 1932) 36–37 and 49; Mioni, *Archivio Veneto* 93 (1972) 17 (n° 15) and 25; *Codices Graeci manuscripti bibliothecae divi Marci uenetiarum* (Venice 1972) III 11–12; Irigoín, *Histoire* 176–180, 370, and 378–379; Martin Sicherl, “Musuros-Handschriften,” in *Serta Turyniana. Studies in Greek literature and paleography in honor of Alexander Turyn* (Urbana 1974) 566 and 591; Speranzi, *Marco Musuro* 236 n.24 and 254–255 n.56; Ferreri, *L'Italia* 569–570; and Bauer, *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 76 (2015) 431–432 n.25. On the Vatican family of Pindar manuscripts see Turyn 14–15; Irigoín 108–115, and on Planudes' edition, 247–286.

⁷ Annaclara Cataldi Palau, “La vita di Marco Musuro alla luce di documenti e manoscritti,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 45 (2004) 330–331; cf. Speranzi, *Marco Musuro* 131 and 244 n.39, and Ferreri, *L'Italia* 576.

⁸ See José María Fernández Pomar, “La catalogación del fondo griego de la Biblioteca Nacional,” *Helmantica* 14 (1963) 348–355; Gregorio de Andrés, “El bibliotecario Juan de Iriarte,” in Hipólito Escolar Sobrino (ed.), *Homenaje a Luis Morales Oliver* (Madrid 1986) 598–601.

⁹ According to Iriarte (4656, f. 343), this manuscript contained the shorter

tion that matches Irigoin's reconstruction of the manuscript used by Musurus: "un exemplaire de la seconde édition de Triclinios, limitée aux *Olympiques*."¹⁰

version of the *Life of Pindar* (Drachmann, *Scholias uetera* I 4–8 [probably 4, 8–6, 9, as in the appendix of Florence, *Laur.* 32.35 [Q^b]), and the list of the nine lyric poets in a form found only in the appendix of Q^b (f. 89^v) and in the Aldine (ff. *iiii^v–v) and Kallierges' editions (*Ὀλύμπια, Πύθια, Νέμεα, Ἴσθμια, μετὰ ἐξηγήσεως παλαιᾶς πάνυ ἀφελίμου, καὶ σχόλιων ὁμοίων*, Romae: per Zachariam Calergi Cretensem, 1515, f. α ii^v) (see Drachmann, *Scholias*, I 11, 12–13; Irigoin, *Histoire* 234–235 and 401). Q was used by Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) (see Lucia Cesarini Martinelli, "Un ritrovamento poliziano: il fascicolo perduto del commento alle *Selve di Stazio*," *Rinascimento* 22 [1982] 192–193); and may be no. 1032 in the 1495 inventory and no. 302 in Fabio Vigili's list (see Edmund B. Fryde, *Greek Manuscripts in the Private Library of the Medici 1469–1510* [Aberystwyth 1996] I 341, 577–578). It is not known to have been used by Kallierges for his edition (see Folgelmark, *The Kallierges Pindar* I, 178 n.61). The scholia to Pind. *Ol.* 1 began thus: φησὶ τῶν ἄλλων στοιχείων. ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ συγκρίσει ταύτῃ ἐτέραν ποιεῖ λέγων· ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς διαπρέπει καὶ διαλάμπει ἕξοχα καὶ ἐξόχως καὶ ὑπερτάτως τοῦ μεγάνορος (= *schol. rec.* on *Ol.* 1.1.10–13 [Th.]); and ended thus: πανταχοῦ εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ· δέ[ον] οὕτως εἰπεῖν πρὸς μετοχὴν τὸν λόγον ἔτρεψε καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν εἶναι, ὄντα εἶπεν (*schol. rec.* on *Ol.* 1.1.187.5–7 [Th.]). Undoubtedly Triclinian is the beginning of the scholia to *Ol.* 14.1.1–2, also reproduced by Iriarte (f. 343): Ἀσπίχῳ τῷ ἀπὸ Ὀρχομενοῦ νικήσαντι τὴν ὡς Ὀλυμπιάδα. ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὰς Χάριτας (see Eugenius Abel, *Scholias recentia in Pindari Epinicia* [Budapest 1891] 423).

¹⁰ Irigoin, in *ΦΙΛΟΦΡΟΝΗΜΑ* 259. This manuscript, which is absent from the catalogue of the library of George of Corinth published by David E. Pingree, "The Library of George, Count of Corinth," *Studia Codicologica* (Berlin 1977) 351–362, could be the same one that Erasmus borrowed from Musurus during his nine-month stay in Venice from January to September 1508, hosted by the so-called New Academy of Aldus, as he stated in an excursus to his adage "Festina lente" (*Adagia* II.1.1) in the 1526 Basel edition of his *Adagiorum opus* (pp.338–340); there he described this manuscript as a *Pindarus cum accuratis commentariis* (*Adagiorum opus*, Basileae: apud Ioannem Frobenium, 1526, 340 [*Adagia* II.1.1; LB II 405; ASD II 3.24; CWE 33.14]). Cataldi Palau has suggested instead that the manuscript was *Paris.gr.* 2709, which belonged to Gian Francesco d'Asola and was used by Kallierges for his edition (A. Cataldi Palau, *Gian Francesco d'Asola e la tipografia aldina* [Genoa

We also know now that the young Musurus had access to another Pindar manuscript. Recent handwriting analysis and a monogram¹¹ on the upper margin of f. 9 have revealed that, while he was still in Candia (Crete), his birthplace, shortly before his arrival in Italy in 1492,¹² he was one of the copyists of the manuscript El Escorial, *BMon.* X-IV-18 (413), which contains Pindar's *Olympians Odes* with Moschopulean scholia (ff. 62–123).¹³

Studies of Musurus' scholia to the *Planudean Anthology* corroborate that he may indeed have had in Padua at the beginning of the 16th century one or more copies of Triclinius' recensions. These scholia come from his lessons at the University of Padua during 1505–1506. They have remained largely unpublished in the margins of various incunables of Janus Lascaris' edition¹⁴

1998] 420; cf. Irigoien, *Histoire* 381–382). See Edward H. R. Tatham, "Erasmus in Italy," *English Historical Review* 10 (1895) 649–655; Deno J. Geanakoplos, "Erasmus and the Aldine Academy of Venice. A Neglected Chapter in the Transmission of Graeco-Byzantine Learning to the West," *GRBS* 3 (1960) 122–123 n.68, and *Greek Scholars* 264–265 (esp. n.44); and John N. Grant, "Erasmus' Adages," in William Barker (ed.), *Prolegomena to the Adages* (Toronto 2017) 56–57. Bauer (*Princeton University Library Chronicle* 432–433) erroneously suggested that Erasmus borrowed from Musurus a copy of the Aldine edition at a later date.

¹¹ This monogram consists of two capital M's with a cross above them. This page has been reproduced in Speranzi, *Marco Musuro* 420, pl. 17. There is a similar monogram of Musurus in Vienna, *phil.* 185 f. 1 (see Speranzi 235).

¹² See Pagliaroli, *Studio Medievali e Umanisti* 2 (2004) 221–222; Ferreri, *L'Italia* 35–36 and 42.

¹³ Speranzi, *Marco Musuro* 27–42, 197–198. See also D. Speranzi, "Vicende umanistiche di un antico codice. Marco Musuro e il *Florilegio* di Stobeeo," *Segno e testo* 8 (2010) 345 n.110; and "La soluzione di un 'enigma cretese'. Marco Musuro e il Par. gr. 2964," *Studi medievali e umanistici* 13 (2015) 278–294. Cf. Ferreri, *L'Italia* 514–515.

¹⁴ *Ἀνθολογία διαφόρων ἐπιγραμμάτων*, Florentiae: apud Laurentium Francisci de Alopa, 1494. Thirteen copies have been identified to date: Bern (MUE Inc. III 87) (Be); Cambridge (Trinity College *Grylls* 11.313 [Aldus Manutius' personal copy]) (Ca) (see David Speranzi, "La scrittura di Aldo e

and in manuscripts unaccompanied by the text of the epigrams.¹⁵ As I will show, in the making of these scholia Musurus not only evinces a considerable debt to Pindar's *scholia uetera* but also demonstrates knowledge of the first Triclinian *recensio*.

il suo ultimo carattere Greco (con uno sconosciuto esemplare di tipografia),” in N. Vacalebre [ed.], *Five Centuries Later. Aldus Manutius. Culture, Typography and Philology* [Florence 2015] 30–31 and 41–42; and Guillermo Galán Vioque, “On Two Missing Witnesses of the Scholia on the *Anthologia Planudea*,” *MusHelv* 77 [2020] 221–228; Città del Vaticano (*Inc.* III 78 [Xe], 79 [Vu], 80 [Ve], and 81 [Musurus’ autograph copy] [Va]); Leipzig (*BU Rep.* I.56-a [with scarce notes that end at f. Γi^v] (Le); Naples (*BN S. Q.* IX. C.8) (Na); Naples (*BN S. Q.* IX.C.7 [with scholia only at ff. Ai^v–Aiii]; see Luigi Ferreri, “Scoli umanistici all’ *Antologia planudea*. Un nuovo testimone posseduto dalla Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli e la formazione del corpus di scoli confluiti nell’edizione wecheliana (1600),” *Medioevo e rinascimento* 19 (2005) 97 n.72]) (Na²); Oxford (*Auct.* K 4.2) (Ox) (Guillermo Galán Vioque, “On a New Witness of the Scholia on the *Planudean Anthology*,” *Mnemosyne* 72 [2019] 1041–1045); Paris (*Rés.* Yb 484) (Pa); Troyes (*Inc.* 277) (Tr); and Venice (*Marc.gr.* IX 38) [Mr]. These scholia were partially edited in *Florilegium diuersorum epigrammatum* (Frankfurt: apud Andreae Wecheli heredes, 1600) (We); Hugo Stadtmüller, *Anthologia graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea* I–III (Berlin 1894–1906); and Anastasios C. Lolos, “Antike Scholien zu *Anthologia Graeca-Palatina*,” *Ελληνικά* 33 (1981) 374–381. We use λ when Be, Na, Ox, Pa, Tr, We, and Xe agree, which are the witnesses of the so-called *recensio lascariana*; μ for Va and its apographs Ve, Vu, and Ca; and Ω for the consensus of all witnesses. Ferreri, *Medioevo e rinascimento* 103, already used λ for the common ancestor of Na and Xe. On the nature of these scholia see Carlo Gallavotti, “*Planudea* III,” *Bolletino dei Classici* N.S. 2 (1981) 3–27; Elpidio Mioni, “L’*Antologia Greca* da Massimo Planude e Marco Musuro,” in *Scritti in onore di Carlo Diano* (Bologna 1985) 263–307; Anna Pontani, “L’*Antologia Greca* fra codici e incunaboli,” *JÖB* 23 (1982) 165–172, and “Per l’esegesi umanistica greca dell’*Antologia Planudea*: i marginalia dell’edizione del 1494,” in V. Fera et al. (eds.), *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print* (Messina 2002) II 557–613; and Ferreri, *Medioevo e rinascimento* 81–114.

¹⁵ Milan, *Ambros.gr.* F 30 sup., ff. 1–102^v (ca. 1511–1520) (= A), and D 137 suss. 12–13, ff. 1–10 (16th cent.); El Escorial, *BMon. deperditus* 286 (E I 17) (16th c.); Città del Vaticano, *Vat.gr.* 1408, ff. 162–213^v (16th cent.), and 1464, ff. 119–213 (16th cent.) (V); Madrid, *BNE gr.* 4715, ff. 1–59^v (Rome, 1552), and its apographs (on them see Guillermo Galán Vioque, “Notas sobre las copias manuscritas de Andrés Darmario de los escolios de la *Antologia Planudea*,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 76 [2014] 281–300).

These scholia expressly mention Pindar twenty times in all.¹⁶ We exclude the scholium to *AP* 16.305.4, where a portrait of Pindar is described and Musurus adds Paus. 9.23.2–5 as a parallel,¹⁷ and two indirect quotations. The first of these involves the scholia to *AP* 7.45.3.¹⁸ Here, Musurus cites almost verbatim a paragraph from Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (187.D3–E1), which quotes from Pindar (fr.76.2 M.), *AP* 7.45, and a fictitious Delphic oracle (Q198 Fontenrose [P.-W. 171]). The second, in the scholium to *AP* 11.137.4,¹⁹ quotes Eustathius on Dion. Perieg. 467.6–13 and 47–50²⁰ and mentions an otherwise unknown fragment by Pindar (fr.322 M.).²¹ Irrelevant for tracing the manuscripts used by Musurus are also four scholia which mention Pindar but no text;²² and the eight times which quote his epinicia without scholia,²³ although these attest to Musurus' deep

¹⁶ Counted only once when mentioned twice in the same scholium. Additionally, *Ol.* 2.7–8 is quoted in an unidentified scholium that Musurus copied at f. 2^v in Va (cf. Pontani in *Talking to the Text* 576 n.3 and 583–585).

¹⁷ Va, f. IT i^v; We, p.506 (in addition to the folium in Musurus' copy of Lascaris' edition, or in its apographs when the folium is missing in Va, I add the page in *Epigrammatum Graecorum annotationibus Joannis Brodae nec non Vincentii Obsopoei et Graecis scholiis illustratorum libri VII*, Francofurti: apud Andreae Wecheli heredes, 1600 [We], which is the most complete edition of these scholia to date).

¹⁸ Va, f. Yiii^v; We, p.395

¹⁹ Ve and Vu, f. M viii; We, p.240. This scholium is absent from Va, since ff. Aviii–Nviii^v are missing.

²⁰ See also Steph. Byz. 19.190 s.v. Τρινᾶκία.

²¹ Although here Πίνδαρος may stand in error for Καλλίμαχος. See Theodor Bergk, *Anthologia Lyrica*² (Leipzig 1868) 145 (*ad Callim. Aet.* 1.36); Rudolf Pfeiffer, *Callimachus I* (Oxford 1949) 8; Heruicus Maehler, *Pindarus II* (Berlin 1989) 167; and Annette Harder, *Callimachus Aetia* (Oxford 2012) 120.

²² Scholia to *AP* 5.179.7 (Ve and Vu, f. Iiviii^v; We p.612; absent from Va, which ends at f. ΘΘviii), 6.71.1–2 (Va, f. ZZvi; We, p.557), 9.151.8 (Va, f. Θiii; We, p.147), and 11.404.5 (Va, f. Aiii^v; We, p.206).

²³ *AP* 6.101.1 (Va, f. HHvi^v; We, p.571; in Va Musurus added καὶ Πίνδαρος ... εἴρηκε at a later date); 7.702.5 (Xe, f. Oi; We, p.286; absent from μ; Tr

knowledge of Pindar as early as 1505–1506.²⁴

More useful to us are the notes in which Musurus used without acknowledgment both ancient and Byzantine scholia on Pindar.²⁵ On one occasion, in the scholium on *AP* 9.287.2,²⁶ he follows the *scholia uetera* on *Pi. O.* 7.71–74, 131c, agreeing with the text of manuscripts H, Q and Firenze, BLM Plut. 32.37. This suggests that Musurus owned H around 1506, before the publication of the Aldine (see above). Musurus largely follows the *scholia uetera* also in his scholia to *AP* 9.266.3²⁷ and *AP* 16.13.4.²⁸

But it is the scholia to the epigram that begins Maximus Pla-

and We omit the quotation); 9.189.4 (Va, f. Hvii^v; We, p.135); 9.266.4 (Va, f. Aviii^v; We, p.23; text defective in Va; folium missing in Ve and Vu); 9.322.9 (Va, f. Aiii^v; We, p.6); 9.557.1 (Va, f. Aii^v; We, p.3; except for Xe, λ abbreviates and suppresses the quotation); 11.364.1 (Va, f. Θviii^v; We, p.157); and 16.110.2 (Va, f. Ψiii^v; We, p.452; absent from Tr; We reads Περὶ τοῦτου μέτιθι τὸν Πίνδαρον).

²⁴ Musurus had already quoted Pindar twice as early as 1499 in the preface to Kallierges' edition of the *Etymologicum Magnum* (Venetiis: impens. Nicolai Blasti et Annae Notaras, 1499, f. Aα^v, lines 17 [Pind. *Ol.* 6.1–3] and 34 [*Ol.* 1.114]), and also in his correspondence (see Fogelmark, *The Kallierges Pindar I* 10 n.16). On Pindar in the Renaissance before Musurus see Ralph Hexter, "Aldus, Greek, and the Shape of the *Classical Corpus*," in David S. Zeidberg (ed.), *Aldus Manutius and Renaissance Culture. Essays in Memory of Franklin D. Murphy* (Florence 1998) 148–150; Paul Botley, *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529* (Philadelphia 2010) 108–109; Francesco Tissoni, *Le Olimpiche di Pindaro nella scuola di Gaza a Ferrara* (Messina 2009), and his "Pindarus," in Greti Dinkova-Bruun et al. (eds.), *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum X* (Toronto 2014) 13–14.

²⁵ For the scholia to Pindar we follow Drachmann, *Scholia*, and Tycho Mommsen, *Scholia recentiora Thomano-Tricliniana in Pindari Nemea et Isthmia* (Leipzig 1865); Eugenius Abel, *Scholia uetera in Pindari Nemea et Isthmia* (Berlin 1884), and his *Scholia recentia*.

²⁶ Va, f. Hiii^v; We, p.123.

²⁷ Va, f. Aviii^v; We, p.23 (folium lost in Ve and Vu). Here he follows the ancient scholia to Pind. *Pyth.* 12.9, 15b before quoting *Pyth.* 12.23–24.

²⁸ Va, f. Bviii^v; We, p.41. Here he tracks the *scholia uetera ad Pyth.* 4.230, 410b–c.

nudes' *Anthology*, *AP* 9.357, that prove most helpful in identifying the manuscripts used by Musurus. Once again without acknowledgement, these scholia feature almost verbatim quotations from Pindar's ancient scholia. Reference to Pindar is unsurprising, for the epigram deals with the gods and men in whose honor the most famous athletic games in ancient Greece were held, and with the nature of the prizes awarded.

Unfortunately, the marginal scholia to *AP* 9.357 start with line 4. Scholia to 1–3 have been preserved only on a guard folium (f. Ai) of Xe,²⁹ and with minor discrepancies in Madrid, BNE *gr.* 4715 (164) (M) (ff. 1^{r-v} and 45–46^v), which Camillo Zanetti copied in Rome in 1552, and in its apographs by Andreas Darmarios (1540–1596). This Madrid manuscript contains Musurus' annotations without the text of the epigrams. Its copyist must have started with the scholia to line 4 present in his source³⁰ and, after finding the beginning in another incunable,³¹ later added this material in the margins of f. 1^{r-v} (M¹) (starting with a note to *AP* 9.357.1: Τέσσαρες εἰσιν ἀγῶνες...); then it was copied again from f. 45 onwards (M²).³² Presumably, the copyist realized that the scholia in the margin differed from those in the main body of the manuscript and a decision was made to copy them again at the end.

²⁹ This witness is missing the first line of these scholia (Τέσσαρες εἰσιν ἀγῶν παρὰ τὸ ἄγω ... ὄχλησιν, ἦ). It begins with ὁ κυκλοτερὴς καὶ γωνίαν and ends on the same folium with ὁ δὲ πῆχυς πόδας ἕνα καὶ ἥμισυ. The scholia continue in the margins of f. Aii (Σέλινά πρὸς τὸν Παλαίμονα...).

³⁰ Given their shared characteristic features, this incunable could be Pa or one with similar notes. In the scholium to *AP* 9.357.4, for example, both Pa and M read ἐκ Κρήτης ἀνεκομίζετο ἐν Δήλῳ μνήμην, omitting in error between the last two words ἀγῶνα ποιησαμένου τῷ Απόλλωνι, καὶ τοὺς νικῶντας τῷ φοίνικι στεφανώσαντος. τοῦ δὲ φοίνικος τοῦ ἐν Δήλῳ (so also in A, copied from Pa, and V).

³¹ This incunable has not been identified but its notes are similar to those in Xe.

³² M¹ ends with a note on *AP* 6.3 (f. 1^v) and a transcription of *AP* 6.49 copied from Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 23.512 (IV 774) (see also M² and Xe).

Since therefore the scholia to the first lines of *AP* 9.357 are absent from Musurus' autograph version (Va) and its apographs (Ve, Vu, and Ca) one cannot be sure that they preserve Musurus' exact wording. However, because they come from Musurus' milieu, in all likelihood, like the scholia he himself wrote in his copy of Lascaris' edition (Va), they can be traced back to his lessons at the University of Padua.

As noted above, the author of the scholia to the *Planudean Anthology* added without acknowledgment numerous ancient scholia to Pindar to the scholia to *AP* 9.357. These closely follow the wording of the ancient Pindaric scholia. Thus, for example:³³

Arg. schol. uet. *Isthm.* a1–5

Ἐτελοῦντο μὲν οἱ παλαιοὶ πάντες ἀγῶνες ἐπὶ τισὶ τετελευτηκόσιν. ἔτελεῖτο γὰρ ὁ μὲν Ὀλυμπικὸς τῷ Διὶ διὰ τὸν Πέλοπα, ὁ δὲ Πυθικὸς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι διὰ τὸν δράκοντα, ὃν ἀπέκτεινεν ἐν Πυθοῖ, ὁ δὲ Νεμεακὸς κατὰ τινὰς τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ λέοντος ἀναίρεσει ὁ δὲ Ἴσθμικὸς

schol. *AP* 9.357.1–3: 9–12³⁴

Σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι ἐτελοῦντο οἱ παλαιοὶ πάντες ἐπὶ τισὶ τετελευτηκόσι³⁵ ἔτελεῖτο γὰρ ὁ μὲν Ὀλυμπιακὸς τῷ Διὶ διὰ τὸν Πέλοπα· ὁ δὲ Πυθικὸς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι διὰ τὸν δράκοντα, ὃν ἀπέκτεινεν Πυθοῖ· ὁ δὲ Νεμεακὸς κατὰ τινὰς τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ λέοντος

³³ I have omitted instances where the influence is less clear. The manner of borrowing without acknowledgement recalls Musurus' use of Kallierges' dedication to Musurus in his own dedication to Janus Lascaris printed on the second page of his *Descriptio Graeciae, ex recensione M. Musuri*, Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi, et Andreae soceri, 1516. Kallierges' dedication survives in the sole copy of his edition of *Pindar* (1515) in Jesus College Library, Cambridge (Call number E.4.27) (see Fogelmark, *The Kallierges Pindar* I 374–391). A copy of this edition not listed by Fogelmark can be found in the Library of the Seminario Mayor de San Julián (Cuenca, Spain) with callmark CU-BSC 3-N-20. It does not contain Kallierges' dedicatory letter to Musurus (the author thanks the librarian Vicente Malabia for providing a picture of the relevant page).

³⁴ Line numbers follow A. Lolos' edition, but the texts are quoted directly from Xe (f. Ai) and from M (*in margine* at f. 1^{r-v} and in the main text from f. 45 onwards). For the scholia to *AP* 9.357.4 the text is taken from the other incunables.

³⁵ τετελευτηκόσιν M¹ M².

τῷ Ποσειδῶνι.

Arg. schol. uet. *Isthm.* c 4–19

ἄλλως. τὸν τῶν Ἴσθμιονικῶν ἀγῶνα
 τεθῆναι φασὶ δι' αἰτίαν τοιαύτην.
 Ἴνῶ ὑπὸ Ἀθάμαντος ἀναιρεθῆναι
 μέλλουσα, κατὰ μανίαν προανηρη-
 μένου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς Λεάρχου καὶ
 αὐτῆ μανεῖσα τὸν λοιπὸν παῖδα Με-
 λικέρτην ἀρπάσασα διὰ Γερανείας
 τοῦ ὄρου τοῦ Μεγαρικῶ φυγοῦσα
 καὶ στᾶσα ἐπὶ τῆς καλουμένης Μο-
 λουρίδος πέτρας ἤλατο σὺν τῷ βρέ-
 φει εἰς τὴν ὑποκειμένην θάλασσαν.
 αὐτοὺς μὲν οὖν λόγος ἔχει ἀποθε-
 ῶσθαι καὶ τὴν μὲν μετωνομάσθαι
 ἀντὶ Ἴνους Λευκοθέαν, τὸν δὲ ἀντὶ
 Μελικέρτου Παλαίμονα. τὸ δὲ τοῦ
 παιδὸς σῶμα ἐκκομισθὲν ὑπὸ δελ-
 φῖνος εἰς τὸν Ἴσθμὸν εὗρε Σίσυφος
 ὁ τότε Κορίνθου βασιλεύων καὶ
 ἔθαψε διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν ἣν γὰρ
 Ἀθάμαντος παῖς· ἕτεροι δὲ Σίσυφός
 τε καὶ Ἀθάμας Αἰόλου παῖδες τοῦ
 Διός, ἐκάλεσαν δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα
 Ἴσθμια ἀπὸ τοῦ διείργεσθαι τὰς
 δύο θαλάσσας ἰσθμοῦ. στέφος

ἀναιρέσει³⁶ ὁ δὲ Ἴσθμιακὸς

schol. *AP* 9.357.1–3: 26–37

Ἴσθμια· τὸν Ἴσθμικὸν ἀγῶνα
 τεθῆναι φασὶ δι' αἰτίαν τοιαύτην·
 Ἴνῶ ἀπὸ Ἀθάμαντος ἀναιρεθῆναι
 μέλλουσα κατὰ μανίαν προανηρη-
 μένου καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς Κλεάρ-
 χου, καὶ αὐτῆ μανεῖσα, τὸν λοιπὸν
 παῖδα Μελικέρτην ἀρπάσασα διὰ
 Γερανείας τοῦ ὄρου τοῦ Μεγαρι-
 κοῦ φυγοῦσα καὶ στᾶσα ὑπὲρ τῆς
 καλουμένης Μολουρίδος πέτρας
 ἤλλετο σὺν τῷ βρέφει εἰς τὴν ὑπο-
 κειμένην³⁷ θάλασσαν. αὐτοὺς μὲν
 οὖν λόγος ἔχει ἀποθεῶσθαι, καὶ
 τὴν μὲν μετωνομάσθαι ἀντὶ Ἴνους
 Λευκοθέαν, τὸν δὲ ἀντὶ Μελικέρ-
 του Παλαίμονα· τὸ δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς
 σῶμα ἐκκομισθὲν ὑπὸ δελφίνος εἰς
 τὸν Ἴσθμὸν εὗρε Σίσυφος ὁ τότε
 Κορίνθου βασιλεύων καὶ ἔθαψε
 διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν· ἣν γὰρ Ἀθά-
 μαντος παῖς· ἕτεροι δὲ Σίσυφός
 τε καὶ Ἀθάμας Αἰόλου παῖδες τοῦ
 Διός, ἐκάλεσαν δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα
 Ἴσθμια ἀπὸ τοῦ διείργεσθαι τὰς

³⁶ This sentence (ὁ δὲ Νεμεακὸς ... ἀναιρέσει) is missing from the manuscripts of the scholia to Pindar. It seems that Kallierges added it in his edition and it was later reproduced by most of the editors (for instance, Henricus Stephanus, *Pindari Olympica. Pythia. Nemea. Isthmia*, [Geneuae], Oliva Pauli Stephani, 1599, 433. Abel prints a lacuna here [in *Scholia vetera* 349; see the same suggestion in an anonymous note in Munich, BSB gr. 492, f. 44]; and Drachmann relegates it to his *apparatus criticus* [in *Scholia* II 192]). This sentence is present in Xe (f. Ai), M¹ (f. 1) and M² (f. 45^v), and both Musurus and Kallierges probably took it over from the same unknown source. Furthermore, Bravo, in reference only to the scholia to *AP* 9.357, states that this passage is “confused because it occurs in the context of demonstrating the statement that all the old games were founded for the dead”: Jorge J. Bravo III, *Excavations at Nemea IV* [California 2018] 133–134 n.170).

³⁷ κειμένην M¹ M².

δέ ἐστι τοῦ ἀγῶνος πίτυς, τὸ δὲ ἀνέκαθεν σέλινα, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν στέφανος·

Arg. schol. uet. *Nem.* b 1–8
 ἄλλως. οἱ ἐπτά ἐπὶ Θήβας παραβαλόντες τῇ Νεμέᾳ διψήσαντες συνέτυχον Ὑψιπύλῃ τῇ Λημνία φερούσῃ τὸν Λυκούργου τοῦ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερέως καὶ Εὐρυδίκης παῖδα Ὀφέλτην ἢ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀφηγήσατο εἷς τινα πηγὴν, καταλιπούσα τὸν παῖδα ἔν τινι λειμῶνι ὃν δράκων περιεληθεῖς ἢ ἰὸν ἀφείς ἀνεῖλεν. οἱ δὲ ὑποστρέψαντες καὶ τὸ πάθος θεασάμενοι τὸν τε δράκοντα ἀνεῖλον καὶ ἀγῶνα ἦγον ἐπιτάφιον τριετηρικόν

Arg. schol. uet. *Isthm.* a 5–13
 ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἱστορία αὕτη. Ἴνους καὶ Ἀθάμαντος παῖδες Λέαρχος καὶ Μελικέρτης· τὸν μὲν δὴ Λέαρχον μανεῖς ὁ Ἀθάμας ἀπέκτεινεν, εἶτα ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καθῆκεν αὐτὸν εἰς λέβητα ὕδατος ζεστοῦ, μανεῖσα δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τὸ τελευταῖον ἤλατο μετὰ τοῦ Μελικέρτου εἰς θάλασσαν, καὶ ἐγένετο μὲν ἡ Ἴνῳ μία τῶν Νηρείδων, ἧς καὶ ὁ ποιητῆς μέμνηται (*Od.* 5.461) ἔστι δὲ αὕτη Λευκοθέα· ὁ δὲ Μελικέρτης μετεβλήθη εἰς δαίμονα· ἔστι δὲ οὗτος Παλαίμων.

δύο θαλάσσας δι'³⁸ Ἴσθμοῦ. στέφος δὲ ἐστι τοῦ ἀγῶνος πίτυς· τὸ δὲ ἀνέκαθεν σέλινα καὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν ὁ στέφανος.

schol. *AP* 9.357.1–3: 90–96³⁹
 Οἱ Ἐπτά ἐπὶ Θήβαις παραβαλόντες τῇ Νεμέᾳ διψήσαντες συνέτυχον Ὑψιπύλῃ τῇ Λημνία φερούσῃ τὸν Λυκούργον τοῦ Διὸς ἱερέως καὶ Εὐρυδίκης παῖδα Ὀφέλτην, καὶ Ἀρχέμορον λεγόμενον. ἢ δὲ ἀφηγήσατο αὐτοῖς εἷς τινα πηγὴν καταλιπούσα τὸν παῖδα ἔν τινι λειμῶνι, ὃν δράκων περιεληθεῖς ἰὸν ἀφείς ἀνεῖλεν. οἱ δὲ ὑποστρέψαντες καὶ τὸ πάθος θεασάμενοι τὸν τε δράκοντα κτείνουσι καὶ ἀγῶνα ἐπιτάφιον ἰσθῶσι τριετηρικόν πίτυϊ τὸν νικῶντα στεφανοῦντες.

schol. *AP* 9.357.1–3:97–103
 Ὁ Ἴσθμικὸς ἀγὼν γέγονεν οὕτω·⁴⁰
 Ἴνους καὶ Ἀθάμαντος παῖδες Λέαρχος καὶ Μελικέρτης. τὸν μὲν δὴ Λέαρχον μανεῖς ὁ Ἀθάμας ἀπέκτεινεν εἶτα ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καθῆκεν αὐτὸν εἰς λέβητα ὕδατος ζεστοῦ, μανεῖσα δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τὸ τελευταῖον ἤλλετο μετὰ τοῦ Μελικέρτου εἰς θάλασσαν. καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ Ἴνῳ μία τῶν Νηρείδων, ἧς καὶ ὁ ποιητῆς μέμνηται. ἔστιν αὕτη Λευκοθέα· ὁ δὲ Μελικέρτης μετεβλήθη εἰς δαίμονα· ἔστι δὲ οὗτος ὁ Παλαίμων, σελίνῳ τὸν νικοῦντα στεφανοῦντες.

³⁸ δι' ἰσθμοῦ B schol. Pind. Xe : ~~εἰς~~ ἰσθμοῦ *δια* *supra* τοῦ M¹: τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ M².

³⁹ Lines 90–103 of these scholia are present only at M¹, f. 1^v (*in margine*), and M², ff. 47^{r-v}.

⁴⁰ οὕτω M¹ M²: οὕτως Lolos.

Several parallels with the peculiar readings of *Vat.gr.* 1312 (B) lead to the conclusion that this was also the manuscript used in the making of these scholia.⁴¹ This copy was once owned by Petrus Bembo (1470–1547) and was in Venice around 1500, where it was copied at least three times⁴² and later used extensively by his friend Zacharias Kallierges (1499–1523) for his edition of Pindar (1515).⁴³

It is in these very scholia on *AP* 9.357 that we find the first traces of the *scholia recentiora* to Pindar. Since these include allusions to the scholia to Pindar's *Pythians* and *Nemeans*, we can infer that Musurus had access to the first Triclinian *recensio* that comprised all the epinicians. Consider lines 62–65:⁴⁴

Σημείωσαι^a δὲ ὅτι Πίνδαρος τὰ ἐν Σικυῶνι Πύθια ποιητικῆ τιμῆ^b
ἀδεία τὸν Ἄδραστον θῆναί φησι,^c καὶ ὁ μὲν Κλεισθένης διέθηκεν.
Ἄδραστος δὲ ἐνδοξότερα ἐποίησε^d καὶ ὅτι ἐν Πελλήνῃ τοῖς νικη-
σασιν ἀθληταῖς χλαῖνα ἐδίδοτο· ἐτελεῖτο δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς θεοξένια.

^a Λέγεται We | ^b τιμῆ om. Tr We | ^c φησι We | ^d Ἄδραστος ... ἐποίησε om. Tr We

At the beginning of this scholium there are several telling coincidences with the Triclinian *scholia recentiora* to *Nem.* 9.20, Ἄτε

⁴¹ Of particular relevance are: the parallels between B and Xe, M¹, and M² at line 26 τὸν Ἴσθμικὸν (τῶν Ἴσθμιονικῶν D); the presence at 92 of καὶ Εὐρυδίκης, attested only in manuscript B; the position of αὐτοῖς after ἀφηγήσατο (93), present also only in B; the omission of ἦ at 94; the wording of 95–96 κτείνουσι καὶ ἀγῶνα ἐπιτάφιον ἰστώσι τριετηρικόν, also exclusive of B; the use of ἤλλετο (B) instead of ἤλατο (D) at 30 and 100; and the reading Νηρεΐδων (B) instead of κρειδῶν (D) at 101.

⁴² Its apographs are Munich, BSB *gr.* 492 and 565, and Heidelberg, UB *Pal.gr.* 353 (see Irigoin, *Histoire* 367).

⁴³ See Mommsen, *Pindari carmina* XLIII n.*; Irigoin, *Histoire* 157–165, 412–420; in *Les scholies métriques de Pindare* (Paris 1958) 109–114; Francesco Tissoni, “Zaccaria Calliergi e la Vulgata di Pindaro,” *Sileno* 18 (1992) 173–175; Staikos, *Charta of Greek Printing* 413; and Fogelmark, *The Kallierges Pindar* I 54 and 265–294. For the academic and personal relationship between Musurus and Kallierges see Fogelmark I 7, 10 n.16; and Giambattista D’Alessio’s review, *BMCR* 2017/07/27.

⁴⁴ Xe, f. Aii, We, p.1; only present in λ Na², M¹, M², and V.

Φοίβω: ποιητικῆ ἄδεια τὰ ἐν Σικυῶνι πύθια τὸν Ἄδραστον τεθεικέναι φησίν.⁴⁵ Its last sentence, on the other hand, is doubtless transcribed from the *scholia recentiora* to *Nem.* 10.82: Ἐκ δὲ Πελλάνας. ὅτι ἐν Πελλήνῃ τοῖς νικῆσασιν ἀθληταῖς χλαῖνα ἐδίδοδο. ἐτελεῖτο δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ θεοξένια.⁴⁶

The same occurs with lines 84–90, in which the *scholia recentiora* to *Olymp.* 3.53, lines 9–17, are reproduced word for word:

schol. rec. <i>Olymp.</i> 3.53, 9–17 ⁴⁷ Ταῦγέτα δὲ ἡ Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ Διὸς ἐρασθεῖσα μετεβλήθη εἰς ἔλαφον ὑπ’ Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ οὕτω τὸν γάμον ἐξέφυγεν, ὕστερον δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς πάλιν ἐπανήλθεν εἰς ἀνθρω- πον. τούτων οὖν ἀμειβομένη τῇ Ἀρ- τέμιδι ἔλαφον ἀνατίθησιν αὐτῇ χρυσῶ κεκοσμημένην τὰ κέρατα, ἐν οἷς ἐπέγραψε· Ταῦγέτα ταύτην ἀφιεροῖ Ἀρτέμιδι· ἦν ἀγαγεῖν ὑπ’ Εὐρυσθέως Ἡρακλῆς ἐπετάχθη· ὅθεν διώκων αὐτὴν μέχρις Ὑπερ- βορέων ἀφίκετο, ἀφ’ οὗ τὴν ἐλαίαν εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἤγαγε.	84–90 ⁴⁸ Ταῦγέτη ἡ Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ Διὸς ἐρασθεῖσα μετεβλήθη εἰς ἔλα- φον ὑπ’ Ἀρτέμιδος, καὶ οὕτω τὸν γάμον ἐξέφυγεν· ὕστερον δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς πάλιν ἐπανήλθεν ἀμειβομένη εἰς ἀνθρώπους. τούτων οὖν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ἔλαφον ἀνατίθησιν αὐτῇ χρυσῶ κεκοσμημένην τὰ κέρατα, ἐν οἷς ἐπέγραψε· Ταῦγέτη ταύτην ἀφιεροῖ Ἀρτέμιδι, ἦν ἀγαγεῖν ὑπ’ Εὐρυσθέως Ἡρακλῆς ἐπετάχθη, ὅθεν διώκων αὐτὴν ἀφίκετο, ἀφ’ οὗ μέχρις Ὑπερβορέων ἀφίκετο, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ τὴν ἐλαίαν εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἤγαγεν.
---	---

⁴⁵ Mommsen, *Scholia recentiora* 24. Cf. *schol. uet.* to *Nem.* 9.20 a and b and to *Nem.* 7.156a; *schol. Soph. OC* 712.

⁴⁶ Mommsen, *Scholia recentiora* 26.

⁴⁷ Abel, *Scholia recentia* I 162–163. This scholium was edited by Kallierges in a selection of the *scholia recentiora* (f. λ III) that, according to Irigoien (*Histoire* 411–420), belonged to Triclinius’ second edition. Following Abel, in some Pindar manuscripts and editions it is preceded by Ἰστορία or similar expressions like Ἰστορία ὡς ἀνετέθη (in codex z = Copenhagen, DKB *GkS* 1979,4^o [*olim Rostgaardensis*]): ἱστορία, ὅπως ἀνετέθη ἡ χρυσοκέρως ἔλαφος τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι... (in μ’ = Vienna, ONB *gr.* 219, a. 1337; and in φ’ = *Paris.gr.* 2787). According to K. Lehrs, *Die Pindarscholien. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur philologischen Quellenkunde* (Leipzig 1873) 88–91, scholia with such beginnings come from Triclinius’ edition.

⁴⁸ This scholium survives only in M¹, f. 1^v (*in margine*) and M², f. 47.

Finally, the scholium to *AP* 9.230.⁴⁹ confirms Musurus' use of the *scholia recentiora*:

ὄρθιος] ὑψηλός, οὐκ ἀνέμβατος. μετενήνεκται δὲ παρὰ τὸ Ἡσιόδου· ‘μακρὸς γὰρ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐπ’ αὐτήν’. Πίνδαρος δὲ ‘ὄρθια κνώδαλα’ τοὺς ὄνους εἴρηκεν, ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπλᾶ καὶ ἄκακα, ὡς τισιν ἤρεσε διὰ τὸ ἀφελὲς καὶ ὑπομονητικὸν τοῦ ζώου καὶ ἄκακον, ἢ μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ σπερμογόνον τῶν ζώων μορίον, διὰ τὸ συνεχῶς ὀρθιάζειν. Λάγνον γὰρ τὸ ζῶον μάλιστα καὶ ἀκόλαστον.

Musurus begins by quoting almost verbatim from Hes. *Op.* 290–291; he then adds a reference to Pind. *Pyth.* 10.36, which he later quotes in his scholium to *AP* 6.101.1 (mentioned in n.22 above); and he ends by reworking the following Triclinian scholium to *Pyth.* 10.56:⁵⁰

Ἐγὼ ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων φημι τῶν ἀπλῶν καὶ ἀκάκων ὄνων. ἀφελῆ γὰρ τὰ ζῶα ταῦτα καὶ ἄκακα, μαστιγούμενά τε καὶ ἀχθοφορεῖν ἀναγκαζόμενα. εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀνάξιον εἶη τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὸ ῥηθισόμενον ἢ μᾶλλον εἰ ἀστειευόμενος τοῦτο εἴρηκεν, ὀρθίαν ὕβριν φημι τὸ σπερματογόνον τῶν ζώων μόριον, διὰ τὸ συνεχῶς ὀρθιάζειν· λάγνον γὰρ τὸ ζῶον μάλιστα.

From the evidence reviewed we can conclude that, while composing the scholia to the *Planudean Anthology* in Padua around 1506, Musurus had a copy of Pindar with the *scholia uetera* at his disposal. This was most likely B, since they share with it numerous unique readings. Furthermore, it is clear that he also had access to one or more copies with the Triclinian recensions, a fact that clarifies Musurus' involvement in the production of Pindar's *editio princeps*, as Irigoien and Mondrain had suggested. Finally, it is very likely that his manuscript with the Triclinian scholia on the *Olympian Odes* is the now lost one from the

⁴⁹ Va, f. Avii'; We, p.21.

⁵⁰ Mommsen, *Scholia recentiora* 24.

National Library of Spain mentioned above. The other manuscript sources remain unidentified.⁵¹

June, 2022

Universidad de Huelva
vioque@uhu.es
orcid.org/ 0-0001-7251-8798

⁵¹ This research has been funded by the *Centro de Investigación en Patrimonio Histórico, Cultural y Natural* (CIPHCN); and by the *Junta de Andalucía* through the projects “Los escolios a la *Antología Planudea*. Manuscritos e incunables, fuentes literarias y edición crítica (P20_01022)” and “Estudio y edición de textos griegos inéditos: los escolios de la *Antología Planudea* (UHU-202004)” (FEDER 2020). The author wishes to thank *Murray Edwards Language Solutions* for proofreading and editing the English text of this article.