

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 *Vat.gr.* 1824 figures in A. Turyn's great work on Euripidean manuscripts² in two places. On p.359 he lists the contents of folios 81^r–87^v, 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.86^{r-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.54^r–80^v = **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.31^r–53^r, 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 37^v and 38^r 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

¹ See P. Canart, *Codices Vaticani Graeci. Codices 1745–1962 I* (Vatican City 1970) 240–50.

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.

⁴ D. J. Mastronarde and J. M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai* (=University of California Publications: Classical Studies 27 [Berkeley 1983]), henceforth *Text. Trad.*

⁵ See also A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (=Polish Institute Series 2 [New York 1943]) 71; O. L. Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (=Mnemosyne Suppl. 37 [Leiden 1975]) 22 n.49, and *Scholia graeca in Aeschylum* II.2 (Leipzig 1982) vi.

⁶ *NJbb* 125 (1882) 826, where the contents are listed as 296–1766 and the separate *Phoen.* fragment on f.86^{r-v} is not noticed.

(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 *Zv*¹ the hand(s) that wrote the text, some scholia in brownish black ink, and the *personae notae* in red; I designate *Zv*² 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?]⁷ 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 ὑπὸ Μνασέου οὕτως ἀναγράφεται . . . αὕτη ἡ ἱστορία ὀπισθεν: *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 ὅπερ εἶπας: *ZmZuZv* (not in *ZT*) [=Dindorf 138.10]

415 gloss εἰς τὰ προπύλαια: *ZZmZuZvT*; add. ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πᾶν ἤγουν τὰς πύλας *ZmZuZv* (om. *ZT*) [=Dindorf 140.16f]

441 gloss ἀναρίθμητον: *Zv* (not in *ZZmZuT*)

448 τοῦτο τὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸ πόλιν συνάπτεται (*ZmZv*)/σύναπτε (*Zu*): *ZmZuZv* (not in *ZT*)

448 λόχος κυρίως ἢ ἔνεδρα, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ τάξις· ὁ δὲ λόχος διὰ πεζῶν ἀνδρῶν γίνεται: *Zv* (not in *ZZmZuT*) [Dindorf 144.19f]

⁷ Smith, *Scholia* (*supra* n.5) vii, in describing the Aeschylean portion of this codex (=Fc): "ineunte s. XIV scriptus."

1228 προστακτικόν: **ZmZuZv**; add. ὁ γὰρ ἀπαγορευτικὸς μὴ οὐ μόνον πρὸς ὑποτακτικὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς προστακτικὸν **Zv** (not in **ZT**)

The colon-divisions of **Zv** also point to a close relationship with **ZmZu**, and particularly with **Zm**. The following divisions that are unique to **ZmZu** among the manuscripts studied in *Text. Trad.* are shared by **Zv**: 1351 κράτα τε/, 1502 τάδε/, 1528 πρὸς/, 1535 μακρόπνου/, 1577 νεκρῶν/, 1578 δέ/, 1580 δόμοισιν/, 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 τόνδε/ **ZmZv**+ vs μάτερ/ **Zu**+. **ZmZv** also share a false division of trimeters at 951f (... ἕτερον/ ... πόλιν/).

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 **ZmZuZv** we may mention 440 ἀνθρώποισιν, 581 νύμφας, 622 κτανῶν (*sic*), 953 ταῦτ', 1047 δέ, 1113 ὠγίγνα, 1234 νύσεσθε,⁸ 1337 διττῶς, 1363 ἀλκῆ (**Zv**^{1pc}), 1580 ἀματέροισι.⁹ Then, among conjunctive errors of **ZmZv** we may mention 305 μυρίασιν (τ' om.) (**Zv**¹ in *rasura*), 348 λουτροτρόφου, 368 ἐντράφην **Zv**² ἐν-τράφην **Zm**^{uv}, 376 μον, 1020 ἐχρίδας a.c., 1038 ἐπεττότυζε, 1158 ἄμαξ-, 1558 γρ. φοινίαις, 1697 ἔτεοκλ-, 1715 ἀθλίω (also **GX**^s**Xa**^s), 1755 accents on στολισαμένά ποτε. Both **Zv** and **Zm** contain corrections by the first hand(s) and by a second hand, and all sorts of combinations of agreement can be found:

Zv^{ac} ~ **Zv**^{1pc}**Zm**: 305 (above), 369 ἀπελασθεῖς **Zv**^{ac}, 426 δεῦρ' ἐπεσθαί σοι στρατόν (**Zv**¹ in *ras.*, **Zm**), and about 20 other passages

Zv¹ ~ **Zv**²**Zm**: 368 (above), 382 αὐτὰρ **Zv**¹, 407 δύναιμ' ἂν **Zv**¹, and 8 other passages

ZvZm^{ac} ~ **Zm**^{pc}: 349 εἴσοδοι **Zm**^{pc}, 405 μὴ ἔχειν **Zm**², 408 ἔσχεθες **Zm**², 950 ὄμμασιν **Zm**², and 14 other passages

ZvZm^{pc} ~ **Zm**^{ac}: 312 πᾶν **Zm**^{ac}, 322 λευκόχρωα **Zm**^{ac}, 500 ἀφίλεκτος **Zm**¹, 1002 πάτρις **Zm**^{ac}, 1299 τάλαινες **Zm**¹, 1628 πέρσω **Zm**¹, and 3 other passages

⁸ In νύσεσθε, **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. Comparison 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 ἔτεοκλ- in 443, 1223, 1390, 1407; γρ. πρόδρομος in 296; 368 ἐν-τράφην ut vid.; 636 -νείκην in *ras.*; 982 ἐς οὐδας **Zm**¹ (ἐς eras. **Zm**²); 1006 φόμιον. At 583 **Zu** has κείνων, like **PZmZv**; at 612 σῆ is in **Zu**, not **Zm**; at 1012 read **Zu** for **Zn**.

⁹ There are a few conjunctive errors of **ZmZu** not shared by **Zv**: 1367 ἐμάν; 1530 ὀτοττοῖ; also the errors at 1060, 1259, and 1466 cited *infra*.

$Zv^{ac}Zm \sim Zv^{pc}$: 608 *μηκύναις* $Zv^{ac}Zm$, 966 *αὐτοῦ* Zv^1Zm , 977 *πῆ*
 Zv^1Zm , 1063 *λιθοβόλον* Zv^1Zm , and 5 other passages
 $Zm^{ac}Zv^{ac} \sim Zm^{pc}Zv^{pc}$: 331 *ἀνῆξε* a.c., *ἀνήϊξε* p.c., 449 *πόλιν* om.
 a.c., s.l. add. Zm , in ras. Zv^2 ; 569 *εἶσ'* a.c., *εἶς σ'* p.c., and 6 other
 passages
 $Zm^1Zv^2 \sim Zm^2Zv^1$: 1228 *ἀπεμπολεῖτε* Zm^1Zv^2 , *-ᾶτε* Zm^2Zv^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 *γενήμεθ'*, 1259 *ῆ*, 1466 *προμυθ-*, 1698 *ἀμοῦ*, 1724 *ἔς* a.c.), but it is even harder to find significant uncorrected errors in Zv where Zm is correct (1065 *ἐπέσσυτο* Zv hardly counts). Nevertheless, at 1284 Zm has /____*αἶ αἶ*, reflecting an erasure of part of *αἶ αἶ αἶ αἶ* in its *Vorlage*, which here cannot be Zv , which has simply /*αἶ αἶ* (cf. 1590: Zm has *τειρεσίας* ** *οὐ μήποτε*, Zv *τειρεσίας οὐ μήποτε*).¹⁰ 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** as 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.*).¹¹ Diggle has recently shown that for *Hipp.*

¹⁰ At 938 Zv has *βρό-τειον*, Zm has either *βρό τειον* (space) or *βρό*τειον* (erasure). At 610 Zv has *ῥε*, Zm has *ῥε*.

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.

Hn is a *gemellus*, not a copy of **Vr**.¹² 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 **AbRMnSVrW**, which will appear in my forthcoming Teubner edition as Θ (in *Text. Trad.* the siglum ρ_2 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 91^r–92^r contain various items of prefatory material of *Phoen.* (arg. 1–5, 12, and 9: see *Text. Trad.* 78–88); 92^v–124^v contain the text of the entire play; 125^r–126^r contain further *argumenta* (13, 10, 14–17) followed by old scholia (which continue to f.139^v). 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 $\gamma\eta\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\omega\nu$ **MnSHn** [**Vr**]; 20 $\sigma\delta\varsigma$ om. **AbMnSHn** [**Vr**]; 198 $\theta\eta\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\nu$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\nu$ **MnSVrHn**; 408 δ' om. **B**, Θ **Hn**; 413 $\tau\eta\nu$ om. Θ **Hn**; 478 $\alpha\upsilon\theta\iota\varsigma$ om. **FSa**, **MnSVrHn**; 778 δ' om. **RVrHn**; 1196 $\omicron\upsilon\nu$ om. **MnSVrHn**; 1277 $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ om. Θ **Hn**; 1317–1318 $-\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ add., $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$ et $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha\nu$ om. **MnSVrHn**; 1500 alterum $\hat{\omega}$ om. **RMnSVrHn**; 1622 γ' om. **RSVrHn** + [**Mn**]; 1626 σ' om. **SVrHn** + [**Mn**]; 1706 $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ 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 $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ **VrHn**, **CRw**; 460 $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}$ **VrHn** ($\sigma\phi\hat{\omega}$ **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 $\hat{\omega}$ -/ $\delta\epsilon$, 1061 $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ -/ $\kappa\nu\omicron\iota$, 1062 $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu$ -/ $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in **VrHn** only; also 209 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\rho$ -/ $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\nu$, 673 $\xi\nu\nu\eta\psi\epsilon$ / in **AbVrHn** only; 1510 $\pi\rho\omicron\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\iota$ -/ θ' in **RVrHn** only; 249 $\mu\omicron\iota$ / and 686 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ / $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$ 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 $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ **Vr^{pc}** (**ZbZmZu**); 199 $\epsilon\iota$ Θ ($\eta\nu$ **S^{pc}Hn**); 253 $\omicron\iota\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$

¹² J. Diggle, "Five Late Manuscripts of Euripides, *Hippolytus*," *CQ* 33 (1983) 34–43.

AbMnSVr+; 285 πόλει R Vr; 399 ἠδείαν θεόν Vr (Mn^{γρ}S^{γρ}Sa^{γρ}); 432 στρατεύουσι Vr; 444 ἦκει Vr, AaPRfRw (γρ-variant in rest of Θ); 464 μηδαμῶς AbMnVr+; 512 ἄν om. Vr; 979 σέ om. Vr; 1033 versum om. SVr; 1185 καὶ om. Vr.¹³ Errors in Hn not found in Vr include 88 θάλλος Hn+; 99 τοῖσδ' ἐγχριπτεται Hn+; 114 χαλκόδετ' ἔμβολα OHn; 127 αἶ αἶ MnSHn+; 234 ἐλίσσων Hn+; 246 φοίνισσα χώρα MnSHn+; 262 εὐτετείας Hn (εὐπετείας fere MnS); 267 τῶδε τῶδε χεῖρα (transp.) Hn; 428 ἐστ' ἐμοὶ MnSHn; 432 ἐπὶ γὰν MnSHn; 439 τὰ ante τιμώτατα add. Hn; 452 τὴν χάριν ἔχει Hn; 478 ὥστ' αὐτῆς Hn; 479 φόβον Hn; 502 τῶν δ' ἔργων MnSHn; 1185 κωλες ἐς κύκλωμ' MnHn; 1223 προνηήρξε RSHn, VRfRv.

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 νάματά 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 ἦγουν τὴν δῖρκην, which also appears in the copies.¹⁴ νάματά τ', if not an unbelievably lucky accident, must be viewed as an emendation that creates responsion between 640 μόσχος ἀδάμαστον πέσημα (--- ---, or, as Triklinios describes it, hypercatalectic ionic a maiore dimeter composed of first paeon + third epitrite + syllable) and 659 νάματά τ' ἔνυδρα καὶ ῥέεθρα (--- ~ ---).¹⁵ As such, the emendation ought to be Triklinios', and his failure to write νάματά τ' in T must be due to an oversight (just as in 250 Triklinios himself wrote πόλιν even though he analyzed 239=250 as a lecythion, which required πτόλιν). 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.

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 ἄλλοισι in the trochaic tetrameter 1338 (ἄλλοις **T**) and by unmetrical χεῖρα in 1711 (ὄρεγε 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 descendants 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 **T**^z, *Arundel* 522, *Vat.* 897, *Vat.* 2241 ante corr.: φάτιν **Ta**, *Vat.* 2241 post corr., *Pal.* 223
 228 βακχείων **T**^t, *Arundel* 522, *Pal.* 223, *Vat.* 897: βακχείων **Ta**: βακχειῶν *Vat.* 2241
 475 ἐφθέξατ' **T**^z: ἐφθέγξατ' **Ta**, *rell.*
 659 *νάματ'* **T**^t: *νάματά τ'* **Ta**, *rell.*
 725 σφαλείς **T**^t, *Vat.* 2241 s.l., *Vat.* 897: σφαλείς **T**^z**Ta**, *Arundel* 522: σφαλής *voluit Ta*^s (ἦ s.l. scr.), *Vat.* 897 s.l., *Vat.* 2241 (ἦs p.c.; ἦ a.c.): σφαλήεις (*sic*) *Pal.* 223.
 759 ἐγγέγγυον **T**^z: ἐχέγγυον **Ta**, *rell.*
 1155 κατασκάψων **T**^z, *Vat.* 897, **Ta**^{ac}: -σκάψω **Ta**^{pc}, *Vat.* 2241, *Pal.* 223
 1388 ἄλλοις **T**^t: ἄλλοισι **Ta**, *Vat.* 2241, *Pal.* 223: ἄλλοισιν *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.

1364 ἐς T^t: εἰς Ta, rell.

1403 ἄπ^εστερημένοι T^{pc}: ἀπεστερημένοι Ta, rell.

1473 μυρίων T^z, in linea Ta, rell.: μυρίον s.l. Ta, rell.

1711 χέρα T^t: χεῖρα Ta, rell.

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 κλήζομαι T in rasura; 98 ἐνθένδε T^z, ἐνθένδ' T^t; 310 μόλις T^{ts}; 378 πλήμονος T^{ts} (coni. Markland); 407 ἔστι T^z, ἔστιν T^t (so too a final *nu* is added by T^t at 542 διάρισε, 733 ἄρμασι, 905 ὄστι, 950 ὄμμασι, 1115 ὄμμασι, 1166 αἰτωλίσι, 1174 ἐκόμπασε, 1194 ἄξοσι, 1650 κυσί); 424 οὖν εὐτυχεῖς transp. T^{zac}, corr. T^z; 438 οὖν om. T^{zac}, corr. T^z; 472 αὐτῶ T^{ac}, αὐτῶ T^{pc}; 504 ἀνατολὰς T^{zac}, ἀντ- T post rasuram; 522 πῖμπλασθ' T^z ante rasuram; 548 τῶδ' ἀπονέμειν T^{yp}; 559 λόγους T^s; 591 σκῆπτρον T^t; 596 οὐ T^{yp}; 603 φημὶ T^z, φήμ' T^t; 606 δώμαθ' T^t in rasura; 623 τέκν' T^{pc}; 720 ἔσω T^z, εἴσω T^t; 724 προβάλομεν T^z, προσβάλομ' ἄν T^t; 734 πολεμίοισι δῶ T^z, -ίοις δώσω T^t; 739 πύλαις T^z, πύλας T^t; 748 ἐλθῶν . . . πόλιν T^z, (ἐλθ. om) . . . πόλιν μολῶν T^t; 755 ἐλθεῖν T^z, ἐλεῖν T^t; 792 ἀλλ' ἄρμασι in rasura T^t; 851 κάπος T^z, κάπος T^t; 865 κληῖσας T^z, sed s.l. συνίζησις scr. T^t (idem s.l. ad 945 ἡίθεος, 1041 πόλεως); 881 περὶ T^{yp} et νεκρούς T^{ts}; 884 πόλει T^{pc}, πόλις T^{zac}; 902 μ' ἄλλο δεῖ T^{yp}; 924 -πίπτεις T^z, -πιτνεῖς T^t; 931 θαλάμοις T^z, -μαις T^t; 933 φόνιον T^z, φοίνιον T^t; 939 ἡμῖν T^z, ὑμῖν T^t; 964 προῖθῆναι T^z, -θεῖναι T^t; 980 δελφοῦς usque ad 983 δῆτ' rescr. in ras. T^t; 982 θεσπρωτῶν T^{iac}, -τὸν T^{pc}; 983 ἔγνωσ fort. omiserat T^z; 983 ἔρῦμά T^t; 985 παρέξω T^{yp}; 986 νῦν T^z, νυν T^t; 1084 λεύσσει (non λεύσει) T^{uv}; 1100 -λείπ- T^{ac}T^s, -λιπ- T^{pc}; 1120 ἀσπίδος fort. T^z, T^{ts}, ἀσπίδι T^{uv}; 1124 ἄρη T^z, ἄρην T^t; 1140 προσφέροντι T^t in rasura; 1188 καθῆσεν T^{ts}; 1218 μηνῦσαι T in rasura; 1352 τοῦ βίου T^t in rasura; 1404 ἀρπάσαντες T^{ac}, -αντε T^{pc}; 1425 οἰδίπους ὅσον T in rasura; 1428 ἐλιπέτην T^{zac}, -λειπ- T^{pc}; 1431 τετραμένω T^{zac}, -μένους T^{pc}; 1464 πέλοι T^zT^{ts}, πέλει T^t; 1506 ξυνητὸς T^{ts}; 1603 ἄθλιον T^z, ἀθλίαν T^t; 1689 ὠλβισεν ἐν T^z ante rasuram; 1701 (ἄθλι' om.) ἀθλίου πατρὸς τέκνα fort. etiam T^z ante rasuram; 1707 δώμαθ' T^{ac}, δῶμά θ' T^{pc}.

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 V¹ or by the later scribe V² (whom Murray re-

ferred to as *v*, Wecklein as *b*). The distinction is an important one in the case of this manuscript, because V¹ (whatever the date of V) seems to me to be a relatively accurate transmitter of a *Vorlage* which probably antedates 1200, whereas V² 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 V¹ and V^{pc} is V²: 98, 223, 224, 244, 276 (?), 277, 412, 451, 463 (?), 578, 596 (οὐ), 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 V²'s, but a darker black ink. This hand I shall henceforth term V³; V³'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 V² or V³: 489, 571, 606, 713. The rubricator (V^r) 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 τ' V¹ in rasura; 82 δουρός (not δερός) V¹; 103f delete entry;²¹ 145 τοῦ in rasura V¹; 209 περιρρύτων V¹ (*i.e.*, the spacing of the letters and the appearance of the ink suggest to me that V¹ wrote the whole word thus all at once and did not first write περιρρύτω and then change to περιρρύτων by adding a *nu* [without deleting the subscript]); +245 ἐπτ- V¹, ἐπτ- V²; +271 ποῦς V¹, πούς V²; 295 φ̂ (with subscript) V^{ac}, φ̂ V^{pc}; 299 (misprint) ὑπάροθα V¹;

¹⁸ *Text. Trad.* 33, 113. It was the connection of V² 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 *fortasse* 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.

529 ἤμπ- V¹, ἡ ἔμπ- V²; +539 αἰεὶ in rasura V¹ (ἀεὶ V^{ac}?); +584 ἀμαθία V^{2s}; +585 ταῦθ' V¹, ταυθ' V²; +625 οὐκέθ' in rasura V² (fort. οὐκ V¹); 683 αἰ vel αἶ V¹, ᾠ V^{pc} (rasura facta), αἶ V^{2mp}; 715 οἶδ' V¹, οἶ δ' V²; 778 corr. V^{2s} (not V^{1s}); 787 λότου V^{2s} (not V^{1s}); 795 γέννα V¹, γέννα V²; 811 ἄλλω V^{ac}, corr. V^{1s}, ἄλλη V^{2s}; 870 corr. V^{2s} (not V^{1s}); 885 τίς habet V; 927 delete entry κατακτενοῖς; +1098 nullum punctum V¹, punctum post ἀλκή V²; 1113 delete "(et fortasse . . . V)"; +1114 ἔστηχ' V¹ in rasura (ἔστειχ' a.c.); +1299 ἀντίκ' (et αἰμ-) V¹, ἀντίχ' (et αἰμ-) V^{1pc}; +1391 ἰππόδρομον ut vid. V¹, ὑπόδ- V²;²² +1396 κᾶν V¹, corr. V²; 1496 κρανθείς/σ' V¹ (ut vid.), κρανθείς V², delete "(et voluit . . . delevit)"; 1505 τὰς V^{ac}, τᾶς V^{1pc}; 1515 τίς habet V, nulla correctione facta; +1534 ἀεροσκότον V^{ac}, corr. V^{1pc}; +1564 ὀμμάτων V^{2s}; 1575 φοινίαν V^{2s} (not V^{1s}); 1649 ἦν V¹, ἦν V²; 1649 (add subscript to lemma ἦ) ἦ V¹, ἦ (sic) V²; 1687 θανῶν V^{2s} (not V^{1s}); 1697 σῶμα V^{1s} (not V^{2s}); +1725 ὁ τλᾶς V^{2s}.

Sa (*Vat.gr.* 1345) and R (*Vat.gr.* 1135)

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 ὦ, written by the rubricator in an ink that is invisible on copies (likewise the heading ὑπόθ. φουιν. is present in arg. 1: *Text. Trad.* 393), and μξοπάρθενος 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.18^v of this manuscript. When I inspected the manuscript itself, I found f.18^v 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.²³

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 V^{ac}, not L^{ac}, 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 ὑπόδρομος, is in fact a cursive *alpha*, which, together with the *beta* over ἰχνους and the *gamma* over κῶλον, 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. Philippson, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 259f. 38f (last line and first line): read $\rho_2 = \mathbf{AbMnRSVr}$ and $\rho_3 = \mathbf{AaPRfRvRw}$. 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^{yp}** as a witness of *ἦκει*.