

Planudes and Triclinius

N. G. Wilson

THE RELATION, if any, between two Byzantine scholars who were contemporaries or whose careers overlapped is often obscure. A famous case is the suggestion that Arethas was a pupil of Photius; despite the intrinsic likelihood that a promising young churchman should have belonged to the circle of Photius, there is no tangible evidence to support the idea.

Triclinius is generally thought to have derived benefit from contact with Thomas Magister, of whom he speaks with respect.¹ The purpose of the present note is to suggest that there is now a certain amount of evidence to show that he was at least aware of the work of Planudes.

First of all a discovery of Professor Turyn should be mentioned.² He has identified the hand of Triclinius in ms. *Paris.gr.* 2744, which is the earliest surviving copy of the Planudean edition of the Greek Anthology in its unified form, in other words incorporating Planudes' addenda in their proper place.³ Triclinius' part in the production of the book is confined to a few marginal notes and corrections, but this does not exclude the possibility that he was responsible for ordering the copy; in fact it is more than likely. What must remain hypothetical for the time being is the further possibility that Triclinius himself was the moving force in preparing the unified version of Planudes' Anthology.

A second link is that Triclinius owned and made notes in the margin of a book containing Planudes' version of Ovid's *Heroides* (ms. *Escorial* Y-III-13). When I reported to Professor Turyn my impression that this was so, he was kind enough to confirm it and to add an interesting further fact: the Escorial manuscript is part of a larger original book, the other section being ms. *Laur. Conventi Soppressi* 105, which contains Planudes' version of the *Metamorphoses*. This too has marginalia by

¹ Cf. W. J. W. Koster, *Autour d'un manuscrit d'Aristophane* (Groningen/Djakarta 1957) 16 with n.2 and frontispiece.

² *Epet* 39-40 (1972-73) 403-50.

³ Pace E. Mioni in *Scritti in onore di Carlo Diano* (Padua 1975) 266-67, who declares that mss. *Marc.gr.* XI.1 and XI.15 are to be dated to the last twenty years of the thirteenth century.

Triclinius. It does not seem to be the case that this transcript in the possession of Triclinius was made direct from the Planudean master copy of the translations, mss. *Reginenses gr.* 132 and 133 (*Metamorphoses* and *Heroides* respectively, the former being largely in Planudes' own hand). Professor Turyn expressed some doubts on this point,⁴ and a similarly negative conclusion has been reached by M. Papathomopoulos in his edition of the *Heroides* paraphrase.⁵ In this instance therefore we must content ourselves with assuming an interest on the part of Triclinius in Planudes' work rather than a direct contact between the two.

There are also two laudatory references to Planudes by Triclinius. In the text of Aratus' *Phaenomena* Planudes had revised some passages in the light of improved astronomical knowledge, composing verses of his own to substitute for the original text. His autograph copy with Aratus' lines deleted and his own added has recently been found,⁶ but before it came to light his activity was known from a scholium explicitly attributed to Triclinius, in which Planudes is mentioned with respect.⁷ A similar mention is found in the scholia to Sophocles, *Ajax* 1085–86, where Planudes is given credit for understanding the crasis of the relative and the particle ἄν.⁸

Yet another connection between the two men is found in an unexpected place. In Paris there is a fragmentary copy of Theocritus, ms. *Paris.gr.* 2722, written by the scribe otherwise known as the main copyist of ms. *Laurentianus* 32.2, the uniquely important L of Euripides. It should be made clear that we are dealing only with folios 6–15 of the Paris volume, which contain the Theocritean text; the remaining leaves are fragments of other manuscripts and with one dubious exception are irrelevant to the present discussion. That exception is folio 33, a stray leaf from ms. *Paris.gr.* 2744, the Anthology mentioned above. It seems rash, however, to regard this fact as more than circumstantial evidence in support of what follows. What is important

⁴ Private communication.

⁵ *Μαξίμου Πλανούδη μετάφρασις τῶν Ὀβιδίου Ἐπιστολῶν*, ed. M. Papathomopoulos (*Peleia* 1, Ioannina 1976) viii–ix.

⁶ I. C. Cunningham, *Scriptorium* 24 (1970) 367–68 with pl.24, which establishes the identification of the hand.

⁷ L. D. Reynolds/N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*² (Oxford 1974) 272 with pl.6.

⁸ W. Dindorf, *Scholia in Sophoclem* II (Oxford 1852) 352.20. No indication of source is given, but my colleague Michael Reeve has kindly confirmed that the note is found in ms. *Marc.gr.* 470 (= 824), one of the best sources of the Triclinian recension.

for my purpose is that on examining the book in Paris in January of 1976 I discovered to my amazement that five pages, folio 13 *verso* to folio 15 *verso*, appear to be written by Planudes himself.

Planudes' hand changed slightly over the years. The script on the five pages with which we are concerned is not of the type seen in, e.g., his Plutarch, *Moralia* (ms. *Ambr.* C 126 *inf.*). It is in a less calligraphic style, and as Professor Turyn has kindly suggested to me, it is probably closest to the Nonnos-paraphrase in ms. *Marc.gr.* 481 or the fragment of an Anthology in ms. *Laurentianus* 32.16 folios 3–6. The interested reader may compare PLATE 3 with the published specimen of the first of these hands.⁹

Various questions arise out of the proposed identification. It may be best to begin by considering the variant readings in the part of the Theocritus text which I believe to be written in Planudes' hand, *Idylls* 15 (line 5 to the end), 14, and 2 (lines 1–112). It should be noted that whereas the text of the other *Idylls* was declared by Gallavotti to be a direct copy of ms. *Laurentianus* 32.37 (P),¹⁰ the text of *Idylls* 2, 14 and 15 seemed to him to be a product of contamination.¹¹ My collations confirm this view, and as they bring to light a few other facts a list of the main variants may be of some use.

Idyll 2

- 4 τάλαν (= Pap.3 WANS)
- 21 ὄστέα (= ANS)
- 31 κείνος (= WANS)
- 46 λαθέμεν
- 51 ἵκελον (= WANS)
- 55 ἀνιηρέ (= KW)
- 61 δέδεμαι (= NS)
- 64 μούνη (= K² ANS)
- 65 ἄρξωμαι (= Pap.3 S)
- 72 θεάσασθαι (= KWA)
- 100 μάθοις (= WNS)
- 107 κοχύεσκεν (= WANS)

⁹ A. Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy* (Urbana/Chicago/London 1972) pl.72.

¹⁰ Theocritus, ed. C. Gallavotti (Rome 1946) 253; doubts were expressed by A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 235 n.213a.

¹¹ Gallavotti, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) xxxii.

Idyll 14

- 1 ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτός (perhaps a conjecture)
 10 ἄκυρος (= ANU)
 12 κήγῶ (= Pap.3 W)
 34 τήμος (= Pap.3 KLW)
 39 ἀηδών (an unfortunate piece of ornithology)
 46 οὔ (= KW)
 51 ποθ' ὡς φαντί with μῦς *supra lineam* (cf. Tr ANU)
 66 λῶπον (= Tr ANU)
 71 οἶς (= ANU)

Idyll 15

- 18 ταῦτ' (= K)
 20 ῥύπος (= ANU)
 23 θακόμεθα (= LWTr)
 25 εἶδες (= KTr) εἶπεε (= KLWTr)
 33 πῆ (= K)
 36 Γοργοί (= PG)
 60 παρενθεῖν (= P)
 68 δμώϊς (= GP)
 72 ἀθρόως (= LANU)
 76 θλίβεται (= LWTr N)
 81 ζωογράφοι (= S² V²)
 105 φέροισαι (= Pap.3)
 106 θνατᾶς (= Pap.3 KWTr)
 107 ἀνθρώπων (= Pap.3 LWTr)
 118 πετεηνὰ (= Pap.3 KANU)
 121 οἶον ἀηδονίδες συναεξομένων ἐπὶ δένδρων
 128 ῥοδόπηχυς (= Pap.3 ANU)
 141 πρότερον (= LWTr)

The most important readings in this list are at 15.105, where the *Parisinus*, perhaps by conscious emendation, restores the proper dialect form that is otherwise known only from the papyrus, and the agreements at 2.61 and 65, and 15.81, with S, ms. *Laurentianus* 32.16, the edition of the poets prepared under the direction of Planudes in 1280.

Although this may be held to be corroborative evidence for the idea that Planudes' hand is to be recognised in the Paris fragment, there is a difficulty. Professor Turyn showed that the Theocritean text in the Paris book is identical in format and written on paper with the same

watermarks as **L** of Euripides. He inferred that it is a detached portion of that manuscript, which originally contained a larger poetic corpus. That is the result of calculations based on the quire signatures in what is now **L** and on one quire signature in the Paris leaves.¹² He was also the first to point out that the corrector of **L** is none other than Demetrius Triclinius, who wrote *inter alia* the quire signatures, which would suggest that he was “supervising the completion of the volume or at least arranging the sequence of the gatherings for the binding.”¹³ But if that is so, and the inference would normally be accepted without question, what was Planudes doing writing five pages of this large manuscript, especially as one must presume him to have been much the senior of the two men in age and standing?

The simple hypothesis is that Triclinius studied for a while with Planudes, who for some reason wrote a few pages of a collection of poets that was being compiled at the time. If the collection were fully extant it might be discovered that he had taken a bigger part in the transcription, but it may be noted that he wrote no more than a small amount of his Plutarch *Moralia* (ms. *Ambrosianus* C 126 *inf.*) and his Plato (ms. *Vindob.phil.gr.* 21).¹⁴ Triclinius became the owner of the book, perhaps on Planudes’ death, and worked over the Euripidean text carefully. In the Theocritean part there is no sign of his handwriting except for a gloss on 5.2 which is perhaps to be assigned to him. An incidental result of this reconstruction is to cast doubt on the idea, which might otherwise be regarded as plausible, that the survival of the so-called alphabetic plays of Euripides is due to a find made by Triclinius in a neglected library in Thessalonica.

But notwithstanding Occam’s razor, the simple solution is not necessarily better than others. One could imagine for instance that the main scribe of **L** began work on a copy of Theocritus under Planudes’ direction, and then when his master died he moved to Thessalonica to study with Triclinius. We do not know much about the movements of scribes or students, but one can cite the example of John Zarides, who was in the Planudean circle in 1294/5 when the copy of Plutarch’s *Moralia* was prepared and later seems to have been in Thessalonica.¹⁵

¹² Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 234.

¹³ Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 238.

¹⁴ Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 83 and 214.

¹⁵ Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 140.

However, it is best not to speculate further when the evidence is so incomplete, and to content ourselves with noting that the evidence of Planudean influence on Triclinius is substantial.

LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD

April, 1978

