OBSERVATIONS ON THE COMMENTARY ON EURIPIDES' PHOENISSAE IN THE MSS PARMA 154 AND MODENA, a. U.9.22

BJARNE SCHARTAU

In his monumental and fundamental work *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1957) Alexander Turyn, among hundreds of other MSS, also examined the Codex Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Fondo Parmense 154. As a result of his analysis he was able to suggest that the highly interesting metrical commentary found in that MS might have something to do with the work of Demetrius Triclinius, and that it could indeed represent an earlier commentary than the one exhibited by Triclinius' final master-copy of the Euripidean triad (*Heoubia, Orestes, Phoenissae*) in the MS gr. 14 of the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome.

As far as the metrical commentary of Parma 154 and its gemellus Modena, Biblioteca Estense, a. U.9.22 (= gr. 93) goes, Dr. Ole L. Smith has made an exhaustive examination of it in his book *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (Leiden, 1975), 81ff.¹

But the interesting features of the Parma and Modena MSS do not end with the purely metrical commentary. On the contrary, the exegetic scholia too are worthy of a much closer examination than has as yet been bestowed upon them. They will be seen to represent a *Mischkommentar* of a very peculiar nature.

Due to the pioneer work of Alexander Turyn, scholars have for the last twenty or more years been able to distinguish the recensions of Manuel Moschopulus, Demetrius Triclinius, and to some extent even a recension of Maximus Planudes, while the case of Thomas Magister in the capacity of editor
does not seem to have been settled by Turyn.

The Euripides-recension of Moschopulus in the shape of a full edition of the poetic text of the triad with scholia and interlinear comments and glosses can be found represented in some 90 extant MSS, though we do not seem to be in possession of the autograph of the Moschopulean recension.2)

As for Triclinius, his own final copy of his recension, in part written by himself, is - albeit without subscription - indisputably extant in the Angelicus gr. 14, which has been analysed comprehensively and conclusively by Turyn.

As far as Planudes is concerned, his activities on the plays are represented in the scholia and preliminary matter (Vita Euripidis, Ὡποθετοῖς) exhibited by the MS Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, II.F.9 (Turyn's Y)3) which also has a number of Moschopulean scholia.

Finally, Turyn's original suggestion of not only one, but two recensions of the poetic text by Thomas Magister has since then been questioned by a number of scholars.4) On the other hand, of course, there is not the slightest doubt that Thomas wrote an extensive commentary on the triadic plays, to be identified expressly by Triclinius' work in the Angelicus gr. 14, where he writes that all scholia with a capital initial are those of the Magister, while those with a cross prefix are by Moschopulus.

While Moschopulus' scholia will be seen to be exhibited by a great number of MSS, those of Thomas do not seem - apart from the Angelicus and its 'Triclinian' descendants5) - to be found in a complete and 'pure' state in other MSS but the Cambridge, University Library, Nn.3.14 (Turyn's Z) of the early 14th century6) and its gemellus British Museum, Arundel 540 (Turyn's Za) of c. 1440-50.7)

Many MSS of the Euripidean triad do indeed, more or less, represent a somewhat mixed scholia-material, but none of those as old as the Parma MS (on its date, see below) seem to be doing it in the same degree as that MS.

In what follows will be offered an edition of the exegetic commentary as exhibited by Parma 154 and Modena, a. U.9.22. For practical reasons (I am at present working on a full
edition of the _Phoenissae_-scholia in the recension of Thomas Magister, later to be followed up by the Thomian scholia on the _Hecuba_ and the _Orestes_ the inquiry has been limited to encompass the third drama only of the triad.

It should be stressed that the examination of the material has been carried out exclusively with the help of microfilms of the MSS, a fact which is particularly to be regretted in the case of the Parma MS that has been filmed very unsatisfactorily.

The Parma MS is succinctly described by Dr. Smith in his Aeschylus-book (p. 82) and in his (later) edition of the metrical scholia. He attempts a more precise dating of the MS than the laconic "14th century" in Martini's catalogue repeated by Turyn in his Euripides-book.

Unfortunately information on watermarks in the Parma MS does not seem to be very helpful. Dr. Smith does not quote any watermark(s) in his two publications where he deals with the Parma 154, though he has informed me privately that he is indeed in possession of a letter from the Biblioteca Palatina supplying information on the presence of a watermark with no correspondence in Briquet in the paper of the Parma Codex.

Smith however made the important observation already in his Aeschylus-book "... that the scribe of this MS is identical with that of the Paris Aristophanes Par. gr. 2821... and since Par. 2821 can be assigned to the middle of the 14th cent.... the same date should be given to our Parma MS." Later on Dr. Smith has convincingly demonstrated that the MSS Parma 154 and Par. gr. 2821 once made up a single codex.

On the same page(s) of the Aeschylus-book (82ff.) Dr. Smith gives his description of the Modena MS. According to the watermarks a date c. 1430-35 should be reasonable for this MS. Since however the Modena MS represents a particular category of 'scholia only MSS' (it exhibits exegetic, prosodic, and metrical scholia written as continuous prose without the poetic text proper), this early date could perhaps be questioned, in as far as that very type of MS otherwise does not seem to make its appearance till the end of the 15th century. Now, since the publication of Dr. Smith's Aeschylus-book and his edition of the Parma-Modena metrical scholia to the Euripidean triad, Dr. Ernst Gamillscheg has suggested the identification of the scribe of the Modena MS with Andronicus Callistus, a specimen of whose hand can be seen in Dr. Dieter Harlfinger's collection of 15th century Greek hands. There is, however, considerable doubt about this identification, and perhaps the most
that can be said is that the scribe of the Modena MS at any rate is identical to the hand published in Leporace-Mioni's catalogue. \(^{15}\) Whether the identification of the Modena scribe with Callistus is accepted or the scribe should rather for the time being remain an *anonymus Mutinensis*, there can hardly be any doubt that this copyist should be placed in the circle of cardinal Bessarion. As is common knowledge, Bessarion died in the year of 1472, and it is on the cards that the scribe will have executed the Modena MS prior to that date. In view of this and of the watermark-evidence one should, presumably, not argue for a date later than c. 1450-60, in which case the Modena MS could well prove to be one of, if not actually the oldest known MS(S) of the category of scholia only preceding e.g. the first printed edition of scholia to the Euripidean tragedies by Arsenius (1534).

At this point it should be stressed that the Parma MS is basically just an ordinary representative of the Euripidean triad in Manuel Moschopulius' recension. Turyn's examination of the poetic text of the MS has, however, demonstrated that it exhibits quite a substantial portion of readings of the 'vetus'-tradition, as well as readings representative of the 'Byzantine Vulgate' of the texts. (The designation 'Byzantine Vulgate' should now, it seems, be considered a more suitable name of the recension(s) which were by Turyn classified as 'first and second Thoman recensions'). Thus it will be seen that the Parma 154, in spite of its basically Moschopulian character, is in fact even in the poetic text itself - as well as in the scholia and other 'aids to the reader' - a mixed product.

In the following edition we shall exclude entirely from our consideration two categories of scholia (and interlinear comments and glosses):

1) The purely metrical commentary which has already been dealt with exhaustively by Dr. Smith.

2) The Moschopulian 'standard' commentary.

Our concern will be just those scholia that are exhibited by the Modena and Parma MSS in unison. For it appears that the Modena scribe copied only the metrical and exegetical scholia which constitute the 'peculiar' section of the commentary exhibited by the Parma MS. Thus none of the Moschopulian 'standard' scholia are to be found in the Modena MS. One reason for this fact - apart from the possibility, of course, that the common *Vorlage* did not exhibit them, and that the Parma scribe copied them from elsewhere - might well be that they were already available in
one or more MS(S) accessible to the Modena copyist and his readers.

To be honest to truth, I have not checked the entire Phoenissae-section of the Parma MS down to the slightest interlinear gloss, to guarantee that every single piece of the Parma commentary not exhibited by the Modena MS is actually Moschopulean 'standard', i.e. the marginal scholia and interlinearia marked with a cross prefix by Triclinius in the Angelicus gr. 14. I have, however, made a fair number of Stichproben which have made it clear to me that I might with a sufficient degree of 'safety' confine my research to the scholia exhibited by the Modena MS. Besides, it ought to be stressed that the non-existence of a modern critical edition of Moschopulus' scholia to the Euripidean triad and the bad condition of the microfilm of the Angel. gr. 14 accessible to me, has made it almost impossible to carry out a complete collation of the 'aids to reader' in the MS Parma 154. For all that it should be pointed out that Wilhelm Dindorf's old and rather unreliable edition of the Euripides-scholia (Oxford, 1863) is still of some use in identifying the Moschopulean scholia. Most of the scholia marked by Dindorf with the siglum 'Gr.' will in fact be seen to be identical with those marked with a cross prefix in Angel. gr. 14 as being Moschopulean. Also Dindorf's siglum 'I.' (Arsenius' editio princeps of the scholia to Euripides, 1534) will in a large number of instances be found to represent Moschopulean (and even Planudean) commentary-work. (Unfortunately Dindorf's edition has not been accessible to me for the final revision of this article, though a few references based on older notes have been given below).

The scholia of Thomas Magister (or rather the Thomano-Trialinian scholia in view of Angel. gr. 14) are being quoted from the autograph copy of my forthcoming edition of these texts.

Finally, as we are facing a mixed tradition of scholia, even the standard edition of the Scholia Vetera by Schwartz (Berlin, 1887ff.) has been consulted.

Before we proceed to the edition of the scholia, it should be mentioned that the Argumentum Phoenissarum (Ὑπόθεσις) exhibited by the Parma 154 but not by the Modena MS is the 'old' or rather the Moschopulean argumentum (cf. Schwartz, I, 242, 1-23) in a somewhat altered, if not actually 'distorted' version. Following the final words... παρά την δυστυχίαν ἑλεήσας an addition is found which is not exhibited neither by the 'vetus' nor by the Moschopulean MSS: (Parma 154, 73v)
'Επιγράφεται δὲ τὸ δράμα Φοίνισσας διὰ τὸ τόν ἐν τῷ δράματι χρόνῳ ἐκ γυναικῶν συνιστάναι Φοίνισσῶν, αἰτίνες ἀπὸ Φοίνικης τῆς καὶ Συρίας λεγομένης οὕσα πρὸς τὴν Ἐλλάδα μετήφησαν, καὶ ἐν τῷ παρὰ τοῖς δελφοῖς νεό τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὑπηρετεῖν κατεστάθησαν:— (The punctuation is mine).

The Modena MS exhibits a total of 37 scholia to the Phoenissae all of which are to be found in the scholia-complex of the Parma MS. 13 out of these scholia should be considered as Thomano-Triclinian, and we shall print them separately below. The remaining 24 scholia have no Thomano-Triclinian correspondence. One of them should evidently be considered a 'vetus' scholion; 4 others are exhibited by the Planudeo-Moschopulean MS Naples, Bibl. Naz., II.F.9 (Y), if not actually verbatim at least almost so, and 3 further scholia have some correspondence with texts found in Dindorf's or Schwartz' editions.

SIGLA

P Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Fondo Parmense, cod. 154
M Modena, Biblioteca Estense, cod. α. U.9.22
Y Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, II.F.9
Z Cambridge, University Library, Nn. 3.14 (ff. 1-121)
Za London, British Museum Library, Arundel 540
Zb Vatican, Biblioteca Vaticana, gr. 51
T Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 14
Ta Vatican, Biblioteca Vaticana, Urbinas gr. 142

Scholia PM

46. Ἡ φυλής τερατοθές τι ζῶον ἦν, σύμα μὲν γὰρ κυνὸς ἔλεγον αὐτήν ἔχειν, κεφαλὴν δὲ καὶ πρόσωπον κόρης, πτέρυγας δὲ δρονίδος, φωνήν δὲ ἀνθρώπου. καθόσασα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ φυσικοῦ δροσος πλησίον ὄντως θηβῶν ἀνυιγμά τι ἐκάστω τῶν ποιητῶν προτείνουσα

5 ἔλεγεν. ἢν δὲ τὸ αἰνίγμα τόδε "ἐστι δίπους ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τρίπους, οὗ μία φωνή καὶ τετράπους." ἔθησε δὲ τὸν ἀνθρώπον. τούτο μὴ δυναμένους τοὺς θη-

10 βαῖους διαλύσασθαι ἀνήρει. τοῦ δὲ οἰδίποδος διαλυσμένου, ὑψασα ἐαυτὴν ἀνείλειν:—

lemma Σφίγξ M

As will be seen, the Thomano-Triclinian scholion is much shorter than
that of PM. Cf. the latter with Schwartz, I, 255f. The verse quotation in the PM text is, of course, the opening of the 'riddle' in hexameters (Schwartz, I, 243, 20-21 and 256, 20-21):

ο έστι δίπουν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τετράπον, οὐ μία φωνή, καὶ τρίπον... κτλ.

(Smith, Scholia Metrica, 60, col. a’)

203. Ἄκροθίνια: κυρίως αἱ τῶν καρπῶν ἀπαρχαί, παρά τὸν χίνα, ὃ ἐστὶ τῶν σωρῶν τῆς ἄλκους: καταχροστικός

5 δὲ λέγονται καὶ αἱ ἀπαρχαί τῆς λείας ή ἄλλων τινῶν εἰδῶν ἀπαρχαί, ως ένταθα:-

From the Thomano-Triclinian scholion we quote the following... διὰ τούτο φοινικοῦ εἰσιν αἰχμαλώτιδες, ... δε καὶ "ἄκροθίνια"

Εὔριπιδές λέγει "Λοξία". glossema Ἄκροθίνια] ἀπαρχαί.

The PM-scholion is from κυρίως to λείας incl. almost verbatim the 'vetus' scholion (Schwartz, I, 277, 3-4).

(Smith, Scholia Metrica, ibid., col. ε’)

208-09. Ἐλάτη η κόπη λέγεται. ένταθά δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς, ηδὲ παρεἴπηται. διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ άμα εμφαίνει, δι᾽

5 ξεφύρου πνεύσαντος, δοτές εἰ δυσμῶν πνέων ἀντιβαίνει τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἀνατολῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δυτικὰ ἐρχομένους, κοππαῖς χρησάμενοι οἱ ναῦται τὴν πορείαν

10 ἐποίησαντο. Ἱδίων δὲ πάντων φησίν τὸν τῆς Βενετίας κόλπων:-

------

lemma Ἐλάτα Μ 11 ἐνετίας Μ

For lines 4-7 cf. Schwartz, I, 278, 5-7. As will be seen, no Thomano-Triclinian correspondence.

(Smith, Scholia Metrica, 61 col. λδ’: Smith, Aeschylus, plate 6 [P, 79v; Phoen. 248-271])

248. Δέγεται καὶ ἡ Ἰνδος, τῆς Ἰνδος καὶ Ἰνδους καὶ Ἡ Ἰνδος, τῆς Ἰνδος καὶ Ἰνδος, καὶ Ἐνταθα. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία τῆς Ἰνδους ποικίλη ἐστι, περὶ δὲ καὶ πλατύτερον διαλαμβάνεται ἐν τῷ Ἀισχύλῳ Προμηθέα. Ἐνταθα δὲ μέμνηται ταύτης η ποιητῆς, 5 δι᾽ ὧν τοῦ κάδου μοι παθὴ Ἀγήνωρ, ὡς τῆς Φοίνικης βασιλεὺς ἦν, ἐκ τῶν γένους ταύτης κατάγεται:-

------

lemma Ἰνδους Μ, qui sic inc. ἡ ἱστορία τῆς Ἰνδους... κτλ.


Scholion Y

274. Ἐσκάραι ἔνθα τὸ πῦρ Ἐσκάραι ἔνθα τὸ πῦρ ἤπτετο. ἤπτετο. βῶμον δὲ τὸ περίεχον βωμὸς δὲ τὸ περίεχον τὴν
 Illinoi Classical Studies, VI.2

1-3 Ἐσχάραι... οἰκοδόμημα
om. M, qui sic inc. Ἀλκή
πλησίον τῶν πυλών... κτλ.
5 τῶν θηβῶν Ἀθηνᾶς ιέρδην ξύρο-
to, ἐν φ' οί καταφεύγοντες
οὐστηράς ἠτύχανον. ἐκάλεῖτο
δὲ ἢ 'Αθηνᾶ παρ' ἑκέννοις
Ἀλκή κατὰ τὴν τῶν Φοινίκων
10 γλώσσαν:-

28 Ἐσχάραι... οἰκοδόμημα
om. M, qui sic inc. Ἀλκή
πλησίον τῶν πυλών... κτλ.
5 τῶν θηβῶν om.  P 9 Ἀλκή
an vol. Ὀγκα vel Ὀγκαί? cf. schole.

334. Στενάζων ἁράς τέκνοις: ἔγουν μετά στεναγμοῦ ἐπαρό-
μενος τοῖς τέκνοις, ὡς καὶ άκολουθότερον τοῖς ἄνω,
στενάζων διά τὰς ἁράς, ὡς ἐπήγαγε τοῖς τέκνοις, τούτοις,
ὅτι μετεμελεθείς διά τὰς ἁράς στενάζει:-

1 ἔγουν] ἢ P 2 διπορ καὶ άκολουθότερον (vid.) M

420. Φασίν, ὡς ἢ 'Αδραστὸς θεασάμενος Τυδέα μὲν ἡμιφεσμένον
δορᾶν συός, Πολυνείκην δὲ λέοντος, ἐντεῦθεν συνέβαλε τὸν
χρυσόμον τὸν λέγοντα καπωλλέοντι συζεύξει τὰς δυγατέρας: ὡς
καὶ ἐποίησε Τυδέα μὲν δοῦς διοπύλην, Πολυνείκης δὲ ἢ Ἀργείαν.
5 καὶ γάρ καὶ ἀλλὰ πολλὰ εἰσίν, ἀλλὰς μὲν ἱστοροφυμένα παρὰ
τῶν παλαίων, ἀλλὰς δὲ παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀραματι
πλαττόμενα. ὡς καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πολυνείκους' οὗ φασίν
αὐτόν ἐλείθεν εἰς θῆβας κατὰ τὸν Εὐσπείδην, ἀλλὰ μένοντος
ἐν Ἀργείᾳ τοῦ Τυδέως παρεγένετο προσβελέας χάριν, καθὰ καὶ
10 τῷ ὘υμήρῳ δοκεῖ [cf. Δ 386]:-

lemma Ἀδραστὸς εἰκάσε M 8 τῶν om. M

(Smith, Scholia Metrice, 63, col. ia')

649. Βρόμιος ὁ διόνυσος, ὡς ὁ μετὰ τυπαόνων καὶ ήχων ἐ-
tέλους αὐτός τὰ μυστήρια αἱ βάκχαι, ὡς ὁ βρόμιος καὶ ἢχος
βροντῆς καὶ κεραυνοῦ βληθέται ή σεμέλη ἔγκυος οὔσα τοῦτον
ἐξῆμβλωσεν:-

lemma Βρόμιον M 2 αἱ βάκχαι om. M 3 έγκυος] ἔγγυος M
No Thomano-Triclinian correspondence. Cf. Schwartz, I, 316, 16-18
(on v. 651).

733. ἢ καὶ οὕτως' πέφρακται ὁ λαὸς ἔγουν ὡς στρατιὰ κύκλω
ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρμάτων, τούτοις ὧτι κατὰ τὴν νόκτα οὖ ἄπλως
διάκειται τὸ στράτευμα, ὅστε ἀφύλακτον εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀρματα ἤγουν τὰς ἀμάξας κύκλω τοῦ στρατοπέδου περιβαλ- 
ῶτες ὡς τεῖχος ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ διάγουσιν:—

lemma Κάκει πέφρασει ὦ καὶ οὕτως ὁμ. Ὁ

840. Ἰστὶ ἰδίως τὸ κάθημα, ἐξ οὐ δ νόμιμα ἡθὸν, ὡς τὰς καὶ τὸ ὡς ἐς ὅ ἐγεῖται ἡθὸν, 
καὶ στέρησιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὡς ἡθὸν, ὡς ἐνταῦθα:—

lemma Θάκοισιν Μ

871. Τοῦτο λέγεται, ὅτι ἀπό- 
δεξιός γέγονε ταῦτα τῆς τοῦ ἡθὸν 
λατου παρακοῆς. ὑπεδείξαν γὰρ 
ὁ θεὸς δίῳ τοῦτοι πάσιν, ὅτι 
τοιαύτα πάσχουσιν ἀπαντεῖς ὁ 
θεοὶ ἀπειδοῦντες:—

lemma Κάπιδεξιοὶ Μ

921. Τὸ χαρέτω, ἐπειδὰν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑρρέτω λαμβάνει, ἔχει 
τινὰ πρὸς τὸ ἑρρέτω διαφορὰν. τὸ γὰρ ἑρρέτω ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμο- 
λογουμένων κακῶν λέγομεν, οἶνον ἑρρέτω φθάνοις, ἑρρέτω φιλο- 
νικίᾳ, τὸ δὲ χαρέτω ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν εἶναι δοκοῦντων κατ’ 
εὐφημισμὸν λέγεται, ὅτι μὴ χρὴ φανερῶς δισφημεῖν κατὰ τῶν 
τοιούτων, οἶνον ἐστὶ τὸ χαρέτω φιλία, χαρέτω λόγος, 
ἐπειδὰν ἡπάξ τις ἐχῃ πρὸς ταῦτα:—

lemma Χαίρων Μ

960. Ἡ σιγὴ διὰ τρία τάτα γίνεται: ἢ διὰ φόβον ἢ διὰ 
πένθος ἢ διὰ θάμβος καὶ ἐκπλήξειν, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Κρέων ἡμ- 
βηθεὶς σιωπᾷ:—

lemma Ἐρέου τὸ σιγᾶς Μ 2 ὥ ὁμ. Μ

1255. Τὰς ὀξύτατας τοῦ πυρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐμπύρων ἤγουν τῶν 
ὁλοκαυτώματος ἀναφερομένας, ἀφ᾿ ὧν ἐσημειοῦντο οἱ μάντεις 
καὶ ἐσκόπουν τὰ μέλλοντα:—

Scholion habet Y lemma ἐμπύρους τ᾿ ἀκμάς Μ 1 καὶ τὰς ὡς. Ὁ
3 explicit καὶ ἐσκόπουν Ὁ
1256. τὸ νωμὰν ἀπὸ τοῦ νέων γίνεται παρὰ ποιηταῖς. γρά-
νεται δὲ διὰ τοῦ ὦ μεγάλου, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ στρεφάν ἀπὸ τοῦ
στρέφως γινόμενον ὡς παρ' ὅμηρῳ "Βετωρ δ' ἀμφιπεριστρώμα
καλλίτριχας ἀποθεω." [Θ 348]. καὶ ἄλλα δὲ τοιαῦτα πολλά
5 παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐστιν εὑρεῖν:

M sic inc. παράγεται δὲ τὸ νωμὰν ἀπὸ τοῦ νέων· καὶ ἐστὶ
ποιητικόν· γράφεται δὲ... κτλ. 2 ὦ om. P 5 τοῖς om. P

These two scholia and the Thomano-Triclinian scholion on 1256 (for
which see below) are written in M as one continuous scholion intro-
duced by the lemma to the scholion on 1255 (cf. above).

1258. Ἐπίρρημα τὸ πάρος παρὰ ποιηταῖς ἐν χροσεὶ, ἐν-
νίστε μὲν τοπικὸν ὡς ἐνταῦθα, ἐνύνιστε δὲ χρονικὸν. τὰ γάρ
5 χρονικὰ καὶ τοπικὰ ἐπιρρήματα οἰκείοττα ἐχεῖ πρὸς ἄλληλα·
καὶ διά τοῦτο καὶ καταλλήλως λέγονται, οἷον τὸ ἄνω καὶ
κάτω τοπικὰ δυτικά ἐπιρρήματα


1264. Ἐπίρρημα τὸ πάρος παρὰ ποιηταῖς ἐν χροσεὶ, ἐνύ-
νιστε μὲν τοπικὸν ὡς ἐν-
ταῦθα, ἐνύνιστε δὲ χρονικὸν.
καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ παροίτητον καὶ
τοῦ παροίτατον:


1347. Τὸ εἰδείς καυνοτίζεται καθ' ὄμοιως τοῦ τιθείς οὕτω
εἰδείς, εἰδὼ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ παράγεται ὅμως εἰς μίαν εἰδήμιν,
15 ὁ παρατατικὸς εἰδήν, ἡ μετοχὴ ὁ εἰδείς τοῦ εἰδέντος, ἢ
eἰδών ἀπαντά χρηστὰ, καὶ τὸ εὐκτικὸν εἰδείν εἰδείς:

lemma Δόμων πάρος M 2 τοῖς ποιηταῖς M
Bjarne Schartau

lemma Eideīṇs κακὰ M, qui sic inc. ὡσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ τιθέω, τιθῶ, τίθημι, οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰδέω, εἰδημι· ὁ παρατα-


1348. Μὴ ἀπδεῖ, πῶς διώθην μικρὸν ἐν τῇ βαρυποτιστάτας (1345) τῆς μὲ συλλαβής διὰ τοῦ δ ῶ μικρὸ γραφομένης ἐν-

tαύτά δὲ δυσποτιστέρα διὰ τοῦ ὧ μεγάλου γράφεται. τῆς γὰρ

5 ὅπο συλλαβῆς κοινῆς οὖσας διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι δῶ ὁσύμωνα,

ὁτὲ τὸ μὲν ἐν ὃψων τὸ δὲ ἔτερον ἀμετάβολον, ἐν μὲν τῷ

βαρυποτιστάτας μικρὸν ἔστι τὸ πό, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ μὲ διὰ τοῦ ὧ μικρὸ γράφεται· ἐν δὲ τῷ δυσποτιστέρα βραχεῖα ἐστίν

η πό καὶ μὲ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ μὲ μέγα γράφεται:-

5 lemma Δυσποτιστέρα M 3 δυσποτιστέρα M 6 ἐστὶ] λαμβάνεται

M 7 δυσποτιστέρα M ἐστὶν] λαμβάνεται M 8 μῷ] μὲ M
cf. ὅτι... ἐπεὶ καὶ ὡς ἀυτοῦ συλλαβή δύναται μικρὰ εἶναι

ὁ δὲ καὶ βραχεῖα:-


1406. Τὸ ἀμφιβαλλεῖν οὐ πανταχοῦ τὸ σκέπειν καὶ βοηθεῖν

δηλοῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ καταλαμβάνειν ὡς τὸ ἐπεὶ ἐπο τὸ πό-

νος ἀμφιβῆκεν" παρ" ὁμήρῳ [Ζ 355], καὶ ἦὲλιος μέσου

ουρανὸν ἀμφιβῆκει διὰ [Θ 68], καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐν τῷ "πολὺν

5 ταραχοῦν ἀμφιβάγει εἶχον μάχης" ἦγους ἀμφοτέρωθεν βάντες

καὶ ἀλλήλων:-

lemma ἁμφιβάγει εἶχον M


1504. Ὁειάνος Ὁείνοδος κοινὸν· Ὁειάνος Ὁείνοι ἀττυκῶν·

Ὅεινόδης δὲ ὕσοτες ποιητικῶν, καὶ κλῖνεται Ὁεῖνοι, καὶ

ὡριμῶς Ὁειμόδο, καὶ ὑοιμωκῆ Ὁειμόδου· ὅι κλητική κοι-

νῶς μὲν Ὁεῖνοι, ἀττυκῶς δὲ Ὁεῖνοις, ποιητικῶς δὲ Ὁεῖ-

5 πόδη ὡς Πέρσης, Πέρσου, καὶ ὁῳμικῶς Ὁειμόδο:-

lemma Ὁειμόδου M 2 ὕσοτες] Ὁειμόδοι M καὶ κλῖνεται

Ὀείνοι om. M 5 ὡς Πέρσης, Πέρσου] ὡς Ἀτρεάδης, ἡ κλη-

τική Ἀτρεάδῆ M


Dindorf, III, 357, 13-14.

1504. Πρόπαυ: τὸ πᾶν βραχύ ἐστιν ἐνταῦθα, ἐσικε δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ

πρόπαντα γίνεσθαι κατὰ ἀφαίρεσιν τῆς τὰ συλλαβῆς· ἐν γὰρ

5 τοῦ πρόπαντα μακρὰς οὔσης θέσει τῆς πᾶν συλλαβῆς καὶ τῆς

τὰ ἀφαιρεθῆσις, καταλείπεται καὶ πᾶν βραχεία ὡς ἔχει ἐν τῷ

"ὁ Ἀλαν, ὁ Δέον", καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις:-

3 καὶ om. M


1533. Ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁείνοις Ὁειμόδου ποιητικῶς, ὃ κλητικὴ Ὑ

Οειμόδος, καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ δὰ βραχυ. αἱ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ἣς
Obviously the Thomano-Triclinian scholion in a form slightly deviating from the 'pure' text printed in the right column (so too in all the following instances). No exact correspondence in Schwartz, I, 246.

5. 'Ακτίνα δυστυχώς λέγει ού δι' ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ διὸτι ἡ αὐτή ἐγένετο ἡ ἄρχῃ καὶ ἡ αἰτία τῆς δυστυχίας αὐτῆς. Ἀγνώρω

1707. Κολωνός ὑψηλός τις τόπος ἐν Ἀδηναις, ἑωθὰ καὶ ἐρδόν Ποσειδώνος. ἦκεν γὰρ ἢν ταῦτα τῶν Ποσειδώνος ἰπποστάσεως, ἃς ὁ μύθος:

Obviously the Thomano-Triclinian scholion in a form slightly deviating from the 'pure' text printed in the right column (so too in all the following instances). No exact correspondence in Schwartz, I, 246.
joumou ejoujv xal akwvtofrjiv, ev o h Hpa etjvmodo. ev tojtv yadv vadd xn Hpa, o kai kaveti leimavna

14. dvexas: houjv eterouv xal akwvtofrjiv, ev o h Hpa etjvmodo. ev tojtv yadv vadd xn Hpa, o kai kaveti leimavna

Again, obviously, a somewhat distorted form of the Thomano-Triclinian scholion. No correspondence in Schwartz, I, 250, 19-25.

(Smith, Saholia Metrica, 61, col. 13')

222. Kavatilva penh ev tiv Pe-tvij, ev o elouvnto ai ierodvoulai paradei, ai melolou-sai theopodpia vediugvedai par
5 toj tvtopoq, evkei kadaledmenei proteron. eumvedownto dte, dte kai avto tiv tiv Kavatilva

"Eti dte Kastallas: Kavatilva penh ev Pudw, par' h ev-

lemmas K
dem 1-4 'Avtina

Again, albeit less directly, the Thomano-Triclinian, or rather the

Trielinian scholion, since both ZbTTa and PM end with 'the giants

being born', excluding the last relative clause exhibited by Zza.

No exact correspondence in Schwartz, I, 246, 5-9.

14. dvexas: houjv eterouv xal akwvtofrjiv, ev o h Hpa etjvmodo. ev tojtv yadv vadd xn Hpa, o kai kaveti leimav-
δῶρο λάλον ἵνα, ἑπτάδεμοι τούτο, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαλεῖν 10 ἐκείνο - ἀδύνατον γὰρ - ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιεῖν τοὺς ἄλλους μαντικοὺς καὶ λέγειν δυναμένους τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνγούμενα καὶ διασαφεῖν.

5 τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ νοεῖν χρῆ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν δωδώνῃ ὀρυδὲς:

κασταλίας δῶρο λάλον ἤν, πλασάμενοι τούτο οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαλεῖν ἐκείνο - ἀδύνατον γὰρ - ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιεῖν τοὺς ἄλλους μαντικοὺς καὶ λέγειν δυναμένους τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνγούμενα καὶ διασαφεῖν.

τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ νοεῖν καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν δωδώνῃ ὀρυδὲς:

scholion om. Zb lemma om. TP 1 PM sic inc. "Εὐδος εἰκον οἱ παλαιοὶ, ὡς ἡνίκα τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἀντιπάλους ἐνίκων, ἀνιστάν...κτλ. 2 ἐνταῦθα] ἐν αὐτοῖς PM κατὰ τοὺς] κατὰ τῶν ἐναντίων PM 5 ὁ Πολυυένιος PM 6 τοῦτο ποιήσει] ποιήσειν οὕτω PM ἐπιγράψει] ἐπιγράψειν PM 8 τῆς... συμβολῆς om. PM 10 σκυλεύσαντες M 11 εἰς αὐτάς] αὐτάς PM

1108. Τούτον τὸν κάπρον ἐπηγάγει ποτὲ τοῖς Αἴτωλοῖς ὡς Ἀρτεμίδι. οὕτως λυμαίνει θήνα χάραν αὐτῶς, 5 ὁρείγετον οἰνείς τῷ τοῦτὼν ἄρχοντες ὑπόσαντες τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς καὶ οὗ τῇ Ἀρτεμίδι. ἀπέκτεινε δὲ τούτον τὸν κάπρον οὖν τῷ Μελέαγρῳ ἔχων καὶ τὴν ἐκατον τοῦτον Ἀταλάγηγην συνεργόν. οὗτος δὲ γενόμενος ἐπεξέγερσε τῇ Ἰάσι ἐποίησε τῇ Διότι τῶν ἔρωτα, διὸ δραμάτεις, ὅσας αὐτῶν ἔγαγεν 5 ταχυτάτῳ τροσφρ. ἀσηκρην δὲ ἅγειον περικυλλήσατι καὶ δίκην οὐδὲν γένοις ἡ ἁμόλογον γύμνη βούσας ὡς "χρή τούς εὐ- ἐργάτες τιμᾶν." ἐκ δὲ τῆς ποδοῦ τῆς νεφέλη τοῦ Ἰελὼν μίξεως γέγονεν ὁ Ἰσποκένταυρος, κεφαλή μὲν στήθος καὶ χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου ἔχων, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν οἶχα ἢππο, ὅπως ἔδων 10 τὴν ἄρχην οὐτως ἀπότοπανος θέαμα εἶπεν. ἀνθρώπος ἀποπέρ- δεται ἢππο, καὶ ἢππος ἀπερεύθυνε ἀνθρώπον:-

scholion om. ZaZb lemmà om. TP lemmà Ἡς κύκλωμι Ἰελὼν M 2-3 νεφέλην] νεφέλη (i.e. νεφέλη) PM 3 τῇ Ἰοή] τὴν Ἰοήν] τὴν Ἰοήν PM 3 δ' οἷς Τ 4 τοῖς ΤPM 5 περικυλλήσατι] περιλειπέτεσθαι PM 8-9 στήθος καὶ χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου ἔχων] καὶ στήθος ἀνθρώπου ἔχων καὶ χεῖρας PM 9-10 δ' τις ἔδων... θέαμα εἶπεν) περὶ 11 οὗ ηὐσὶ τοῖς ὁσφών οὗ PM 11 καὶ ἢππος] ἢππος δ' ἢππον] ἢππον] ἢππα τ' Τ cf. Schwartz, 175, 11-20

1256. ὡρρηττῆ ἐναντίαν: σφάξοντες οἱ μάντεις πρόβατον, ὅποτε τινὰ διέθειν ξύλη τῶν αὐτῶν στρατευμῶν ἐβοῦλοντο σημειοσάζοντες τέμνοντες τοῦτο, τὸν μὲν μηρὸν εἰλιδότες πι- μελὴ ἐπὶ πῦρ ἐπέτινον. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἔξηκε τὸ πῦρ, νυκάν ἐ- 5 λεγον, μὴ τούτου δὲ γενομένου, νυκαδόσαι. οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κύριον μεσθὴν ὁδρὸν ἐν τῷ στόματι ἑρῶ δεια- μονῆς ἐπέτινον τῷ πῦρ καὶ ἐπέστησαν, πῶς δαχθεῖται καὶ ποῖ ἀνοίξει τὸ ὄρος. καὶ εἰ μὲν εἰς αὐτοῦς, νυκτᾶς ἔ- αυτοῦς ἐκκλάν: εἰ δ' εἰς τοὺς ἐναντίους, καταβολὴν ἐκατ' 10 ἐμπρότερον. τὴν οὖν ἀκούσαν τοῦ ὀρὸς ἐναντίαν ὑγρότητα λέγει. ἐπετῆσαν δὲ ἀπλῶς καὶ τὸ ἄκρον μόνον τοῦ πυρός, τὴν μὲν ἔξω εἰσέβαλε τοῦτον νύκην, τὴν δ' εἰς τούναντιον ὑμῆν ἀπώ- λειαν καὶ φθορὰν σφῶν αὐτῶν λογιζόμενηι. τὸ δ' ἔνωμιν"
κατά συνεκδοχήν εἰς τὰ τρία λάμβανε· εἰς τὸ "ἀκμάς", 15 καὶ εἰς τὸ "δῆξεις", καὶ εἰς τὸ "ἄκραν":—

Scholion om. 2b lemma om. TPM M sic inc. ὥστε δὲ ὅτε τινὰ δέλθρον ἢ νίκην τῶν ἰδίων στρατευμάτων ἐβούλοντο σημείωσασθαι Ἑλληνες, σφαξόντες πρόβατον καὶ τοῦτο τέμνοντες, τὰς μὲν μηδέν... κτλ. ὥστε δὲ τινὰ δέλθρον ἢ νίκην τῶν ἰδίων στρατευμάτων... κτλ. ut M 3 εἰσελθοῦσας τῇ τε 4 ἐπὶ πῦρ ἐπετίθεντες εἰς πῦρ ἐνετίθεντο PM ἐπὶ τὸ οὐρὸν τὸ δύωρ οὐρὸν PM 11 ἄπλως om. PM μένον om. TPM 11 τοῦ πυρὸς PM 11—12 τὴν μὲν καὶ τὴν μὲν PM 12 ἔξωθιν τοῦτο τοῦτο ἔξωθιν PM post νίκην hab. έστοχάζοντο PM τοῦν αὐτὸν τῇ τεντίνῳ PM 13 λογιζόμενοι] λογιζόμενον PM


1377. Πρὸν εὑρέθηναι τὴν σάλπιγγα πρὸς τούς πολέμους, λαμπάσιν ἔχρωντο σημείος τοῦ κατάχρησαι τῆς μάχης, ὥστε 5 ἐφερον δῷ ἑρείς Ἄρεος ἐξ ἑκάτερον μέρους, οὐς καὶ μόνους ἄδωνας ἐν μάχαις εἰῶν. δὲν καὶ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρδην ἀπολλυμένων λεγομένη.

10 "οὔδε πυρόφορος ἔσωθη." ὅστερον δὲ τῶν Τυρσηνῶν τὴν σάλπιγγα ἑσφράσθησθαι — διὸ καὶ Τυρσηνικὴν ὄνομαζεται ἡ σάλπιγξ — ἀντὶ λαμπάσιν τῇ 15 σάλπιγγι ἔχρωντα. έοικε δὲ ὡς ἐν τοῖς χροίς Ἐτεοκληεῖς δὲν καὶ ἀμφότερας ἐχρωντο. δὴκων δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πρὸδευον εἰρημένου τῷ ποιητῇ.

20 "παίαν δὲ καὶ σάλπιγγες ἐκελάδουν": (1102).

---

Lemma 'Ἐπεὶ δ' ἀφείδη: πρὸν εὑρεθηναι τὴν σάλπιγγα πρὸς τοὺς πολέμους, λαμπάσιν ἔχρωντο σημείος τοῦ κατάχρησαί τῆς μάχης, ὥστε ἐφερον δῷ ἑρείς Ἄρεος ἐξ ἑκάτερον μέρους, οὐς καὶ μόνους ἄδωνας ἐν μάχαις εἰῶν. δὲν καὶ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρδην ἀπολλυμένων λεγομένη: "οὔδε πυρόφορος ἔσωθη". ὅστερον δὲ πρὸς τοὺς Ἐταλικοὺς πολέμους Τυρσηνοὶ τὴν σάλπιγγα ἑσφράσθησαν, δὲν καὶ Τυρσηνικὴ σάλπιγξ κέκληται:

9 ἡ παροιμία τ Τ

---

Lemma 'Ἐτεολέξης: ἐν γάρ τῷ πεδίῳ ἐν ὁ ἐμονομάχουν, κείμενον ἅθος καὶ τὸν Ἐτεολήν ἐμποδίζοντος, ἐπειράθη ὁ Ἐτεολῆς

5 διὰ τοῦ ποδὸς κυνηγοῦσα αὐτὸν· δέν καὶ ἐπικαθήσασθαι ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ἀσπίδος τοῦ πόλα· ὅλον Πολυνεικὴς εὐθὺς ἐπιτρώσειν:—

---

Lemma Μεταφαίρων· ἤγουν

1407-08. Θετταλικὸν σόφισμα ή δ' ποιεῖν έξ ἐνδοὺς ἔχουσι Θετταλοὶ ἐν πολέμοις. ή ἔπειδὴ πανούργοι ἐστὶν οἱ 5 Θετταλοὶ. άντι τοῦ εἵπεν ἄπλως, δι' πανουργίαν ἐποίησε δ' Ἑτεοκλῆς, "Θεο- σαλὸν" εἰσήγηε "σόφισμα". ἦγουν μηχανήν ἔγαγε τῇ 10 μάχῃ, ἦν δὲν Θετταλὸς ἐπεν- νόησε(ν), ἀφ' οὗ παροιμία τὸ "Θετταλικὸν σόφισμα":

---

lemma τὸ θεοσαλὸν M 9-12

cf. schol. Y: ἦγουν εἰς μάχην εἰσήγαγε τῇ μάχῃ (sic), ἦν δὲν Θετταλὸς ἐπενόησεν, ἀφ' δὲν παροιμία τὸ Θετταλικὸν σόφισμα: ...

The PM scholion seems to be related to the Thomano-Triclinian as well as to the Y scholion. Cf. Also Dindorf, III, 357, 14-17; Schwartz, I, 392,2-393,15.

* 

The above presentation of the 'peculiar' exegetic scholia to Euripides' Phoenissae exhibited by the gemelli - the mid-14th century Parma 154 and the mid-15th century Modena, a. U.9.22 - in a sense confronts us with an almost unique situation as far as the Byzantine scholia to Euripides are concerned.

As stated in the introductory remarks of the present article, the Mischkommentar of the Parma 154 (Moschopulean 'standard', some Thomano-Triclinian, and a fair number of comments that are neither Moschopulean, nor Thoman, nor 'vetera' according to Schwartz' edition - though 3 or 4 of them may be Planudean) seems to be unparalleled in the entire 14th century tradition of the Euripidean triad. Triclinius' work in the Angel. gr. 14 does not offer a strict parallel, in as far as his recension comprises only the Moschopulean and the Thoman exegetic scholia and his own metrical commentary. The Parma 'edition' is indeed far more heterogeneous in nature.

If Dr. Smith is right in assigning the metrical Parma-Modena commentary to Demetrios Triclinius, i.e. a younger
Triclinius than the experienced metrician represented in the Angel. gr. 14 (Euripides) and the Naples, Bibl. Naz., II.F.31 (Aeschylus), would the fact that a number of Thomano-Triclinian scholia in a form somewhat deviating from the one exhibited by the Angel. gr. 14 (T) and the Cambridge, U.L., Nn. 3.14 (Z) is actually to be found in connection with the metrica be an argument in favour of the 'proto-Thomano-Triclinian' nature of these exegetica in the Parma-Modena complex?

Tempting as this hypothesis may be, I am most inclined to reject it. Indeed, the very occurrence of a limited number of Thomano-Triclinian along with a greater number of 'peculiar' scholia points to the conclusion that the Thomano-Triclinian scholia of the Parma-Modena complex are rather to be considered 'distorted' or 'corrupted' versions of the 'pure' Thomano-Triclinian exegetica of T and Z.

Now, would it perhaps be possible to suppose that the scribe of the Parma 154 himself used several Vorlagen, or at least that his Vorlage did so?

Or, to put the matter differently: was the scribe of the Modena MS or his Vorlage selective in his choice omitting the Moschopulean 'standard' scholia (which would be readily at hand in other MSS), or did the common source of the Parma and Modena MSS not exhibit the Moschopuleana which the Parma copyist then took from his Moschopulean 'standard' Vorlage that supplied the majority of his exegetic scholia and interlinear comments and glosses?

Be that as it may: the presence of an extensive metrical commentary, some Thomano-Triclinian scholia, a large number of Moschopulean and a fair amount of other, obviously Byzantine, scholia in the Parma 154, inevitably leads us in the direction of a scholarly environment that was connected with, or formed part of, the circle of Palaeologan scholars to which belonged Maximus Planudes, Manuel Moschopulus, Thomas Magister and Demetrius Triclinius.

The existence of both the Parma and the Modena MSS representing, presumably, the activities of all of those famous names but in a somewhat 'degenerated' shape could maybe show us a glimpse of the activities of other grammarians than those
notable four.

 Needless to say, there must have been, at Constantinople as well as in Thessalonica, scores of other men taking a scholarly interest in the works of the ancient playwrights. And the work of one or more such people making his/their own 'edition' of the triad using rather freely the scholia of the celebrated philologists, could be represented in the mixed scholia of the Parma-Modena complex.

 I do not shrink from the hypothesis of the existence of 'anons.' among the scholars of the Palaeologan era, and would find it advisable to label the 'peculiar' Parma-Modena exegetic 'scholia anonyma in Euripidem' in analogy with the title of Dr. Smith's edition of the metrica.

 Much work remains to be done on the exegetic scholia, not only of the Parma-Modena complex, but of a number of other Euripidean MSS of the 14th and 15th centuries.

 The present article does not claim to solve the riddle of the Parma-Modena exegetica. On the contrary: its edition of a representative section of these texts should be considered a modest attempt to further the study of these interesting Byzantine scholia.

 The aim of this article is not to answer, but rather to put questions. Whether the next step in the direction of the full elucidation of the problems raised by the existence of the Parma-Modena MSS will be taken by me or by someone among my readers, is left to the future to decide.

 The above presentation of part of the evidence is offered as a small tribute to the great master of the study of the Byzantine manuscript tradition of the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides - Alexander Turyn.

 University of Copenhagen

NOTES

 1) That the metrical commentary exhibited by the Parma and Modena MSS represents an earlier version of Triclinius' metrical scholia found in their final shape in the Angel. gr. 14, has been questioned in rather
strong terms by Professor Holger Friis Johansen (University of Århus). See Museum Tusculanum 36-38 (Copenhagen, 1979), 166-169 (in Danish). In the prolegomena to his edition of the Parma-Modena metrical scholia Scholia metrica anonyma in Euripidis Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissae. Edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Appendix, and Index by Ole Langwitz Smith (Copenhagen, 1977), Dr. Smith concludes rather cautiously: "We know nothing about metrical scholia on any scale on Euripides before Triclinius, and his work as it is preserved in Angel. gr. 14 and to a much lesser extent in Laur. 32,2 seems to have no relation to what is found in the present commentaries. Still I think that he may be regarded as the author, but I admit that the reasons I have given in my Studies are not cogent proofs, but verisimilia." (xxv). In his review of Smith's edition (BZ, 73, 1980, Heft 1, 44-45) J. Irigoin seems to be rather positive as to the possibility of identifying the author of the 'anonymous metrica' with the young Triclinius.

2) Main representatives of the Moschopulean recension: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. 3.25 (X); ibidem, Barocci 120 (Xa); Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, conv. soppr. 71 (Xb) - all of them 14th century.

3) Other characteristic MSS of this category: Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, conv. soppr. 98 (Yf); Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, II.F.37 (Yn) - both of them 14th century, and Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Gr. 469 (Yv) written A.D. 1413.

4) Cf. e.g. R.D. Dawe, The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus (Cambridge, 1964), 21, and Smith, Aeschylus, 132-33. - The MS Vat. gr. 51 (Turyn's Zb) should certainly not - as by Turyn - be considered a (main) representative of a 'second Thoman recension' of the poetic text and the scholia. See Smith, Aeschylus, 81 (note 56), and Kjeld Matthiessen, Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides (Heidelberg, 1974), 51, 95-101. Furthermore this MS is, especially in the Phoenixae-section, very defective in omitting a large number of the scholia. It is quoted in a few cases in that part of the present article that deals with the Thomano-Triclinian scholia. In one very characteristic instance (schol. Thomano-Triclin. in Phoenix. 5) it will be seen to follow Triclinius' own T and its apograph Ta against ZZa.


6) On this MS see especially Smith, Aeschylus, 225-228 (note 109); Turyn, Euripides, 44ff. et al. (and his Plate III); Matthiessen, Studien, 23, 35f., 50, 95-100, 101, 117-124.

7) On this MS see Turyn, Euripides, 99f.; Matthiessen, Studien, 22, 50f., 95-100, 101, 119f., Smith, Aeschylus, 23 (note 50). The information on watermarks quoted in Matthiessen, Studien, 50 differs somewhat from the information supplied to me by Mr. T. S. Pattie of the British Museum, Department of Manuscripts (letter of 27th October 1972). There is however agreement on at least Briquet 3668 [c. 1450] and 12414 [c. 1440-48], and this should suffice to sustain a date c. 1440-50 with the usual margin of +/- 10-15 years. - The dates in brackets have been supplied by me.

8) Smith, Sphologia metrica anonyma, ix-x with references to Martini and Turyn.

9) Smith, ibid., xii, and the same author's note in Mnemosyne, Ser. iv, 27, 1975, 414f.

10) Smith, ibid., xiii, with reference to Koster, Sphologia in Aristo-
phanum, i,3,2,1xi f. - J. Irigoin in his review of Smith's edition (cf. above n. 1) apparently accepts a date c. 1430 for the Modena MS based exclusively on the watermark-evidence.

11) Smith, ibid., xiii (note 17). - A celebrated representative of the 'scholia only'-category is the Triclinian MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barocci 74, early 16th century (Turyn, Euripides, 197).


14) Neither I, nor Dr. Jørgen Raasted, nor Dr. Smith can accept the identification of the Modena scribe with Andronicus Callistus. Dr. Smith is preparing an article on the problem of this identification.


16) Scholia Graea in Euripidis tragoidias, edidit W. Dindorf (Oxford, 1863), 4 vols. The Phoenissae-scholia are to be found in the third.
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