The following notes on a number of MSS containing scholia on Aeschylus are presented here in order to demonstrate a number of facts of some importance for scholars working on the transmission of Aeschylus and for a correct evaluation of the MSS of the poet. First of all I wish to show that some MSS have been overlooked because they have been thought to be of no value on very slender evidence; secondly, that the basic distinction between the MSS of Aeschylus according to the type of commentary breaks down as soon as the material is analysed in more detail than has hitherto been possible; thirdly, that we need much closer analysis of the MSS in order to build up a theory of the transmission of Aeschylus.

As we all know, serious investigation of the MSS of Aeschylus began with Turyn's book on The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus (New York 1943). Before this epoch-making study, most scholars were groping in the dark among the numerous and unclassified MSS of the poet. If most of what I have to say here directly or indirectly argues against Turyn's work this is only as it should be, and I am sure that no one will understand my position better than Turyn himself.

Since 1970 I have been working on an edition of the scholia on Aeschylus¹ and have by now collated almost all MSS known to contain scholia plus a few more on which nothing was known and therefore ought to be checked.² It goes without saying that I have only been interested in the scholia; accordingly, what I have to say here can only pertain to the scholia, if the poetic text is not expressly mentioned. This caveat is necessary all the more since I am not convinced that scholia invariably follow the poetic text in the transmission. As is wel
known, the axiom that text and scholia were copied by scribes from the same exemplar was a foundation for Turyn's work on Aeschylus.$^3$

I shall begin with a MS that demonstrates the danger inherent in any attempt to classify the MSS of Aeschylus. The MS Sj (Vat. gr. 58) was classified by Turyn as partly "old," partly "Thoman."$^4$ He found that Prometheus and Septem in Vat. gr. 58 were Thoman (this part only was called Sj), while Persae was old and belonged to the σ class (= Ne). However, he expressly stated that the scholia were composite, both old and Byzantine material were mixed up. This ought to have put the classification in doubt since one would have expected that the scholia were divided along the same lines as the poetic text, if the axiom "poetic text and scholia from the same exemplar" was to hold good. The fact that there is a difference between the parts established by Turyn is corroborated by his true observation that the Persae has been written by a different scribe. As can be seen from the scholia, however, there can be no doubt that the MS is not made up of different parts; the whole of the Aeschylus part has been written during a single term of work.

In any case, Sj would not seem to be a MS that had anything to offer the prospective editor either in the scholia or in the poetic text. The Thoman scholia are known from a number of good and respectable contemporary MSS, and in the Persae the MS does not come very high in the list. However, the editor of the Prometheus scholia, C.J. Herington, found that Sj had a majority of A scholia on this play, and that the Thoman scholia seemed in this MS to be mostly additions occurring at the bottom of the page. But he also observed that the regularity of the lay-out and script in Sj were indications that Sj in itself should be considered a copy of a composite MS, in which various additions from several sources had been made.$^5$ Because he only concerned himself with the Prometheus, Herington did only touch the surface of the problems in Sj. The analysis of this MS is, I think, much more complicated, and I will therefore go into some detail in order to illustrate the problems facing any investigator of the scholia of Aeschylus.
It is true that the scholia on the first play are mainly A scholia; though if Herington had collated Sj throughout in this play, I believe he would have noticed that the last scholium on the *Prometheus* is quite different from the preceding ones. While the other A scholia on the *Prometheus* follow the regular A version, the scholion 1080 H. in Sj f.42v follows the version in P and Pd, adding αἰ καὶ τὸν τάξιν ἐν before αἰ ἐξίσεις and reading ἡμιτετάρακτα (line 8) instead of τετάρακτα. And in the next play, the *Septem*, Sj basically exhibits the Ppd version of the A scholia. 6) The same is true for the *Persae*, as was first seen by Prof. Zabrowiski. 7) Thus we have in Sj instead of a run-of-the-mill "Thoman" MS, a very welcome further witness to the important recension of scholia until now only known from P and Pd. I cannot here deal with the complicated questions that now arise about the relation between Ppd and Sj, especially since there are traces of further witnesses in the MSS Na (Vat. Ottob. gr. 346) and R (Vat. gr. 57), on which see below.

On the other hand, there are considerable foreign elements, mostly Thoman, in Sj. As was emphasized by Herington, the MS does not look as having been reworked and added to. But the fact remains that the Thoman elements in the scholia on the *Septem* have all been written at the bottom or the top of the pages, where one would normally find additions entered after the main column of scholia had been written. Moreover, there seems to be differences in ductus between the Thoman scholia and the A (Ppd) scholia. 8) In addition to this, all Thoman scholia have initial capital letters, which the A scholia do not have. This latter feature may of course go back to the exemplar, but the difference in ductus cannot be explained in this way. If it were not for a single case on f.51v, where the old scholium on *Septem* 224 (Dindorf 326,22-26) 9) has been written immediately after the Thoman scholium (Dd. 326,28-30) on the same line, I would not doubt that the Thoman scholia on the *Septem* were to be regarded as additions to the original first state old scholia.

There is a somewhat similar case on f.59r, where one might think that the Thoman scholium on *Septem* 438-439 (Dd. 349,24-27) was written together with the following old scholium on *Sept.* 437 (Dd. 349,10-17); this could be corroborated by the fact that after the lemma of the old scholium αἱ τοῦ σοῦ κερεῖ (as usual, the old scholia in Sj lack the initial capital letter) the beginning of the preceding Thoman scholium ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁδὸ τῆς γαλακτίτης has been written by the scribe who seems not to have noticed his mistake. This blunder would hardly have been possible if the Thoman scholium was not before him when he copied the old scholia.
An explanation of this situation could be that the scribe of Sj copied an exemplar in which old scholia and Thoman scholia were mixed, but where the Thoman scholia were additions and not placed in the regular column. Our scribe would then from time to time write the Thoman scholia into his own column, as it happened on ff.51\textsuperscript{v} and 59\textsuperscript{r}, but most often he did not copy the Thoman scholia until later, when he added them at the top and the bottom of his MS. The exemplar from which he copied was defective, the initial capitals were missing in the A scholia, while the scholia added in his exemplar from a Thoman source had initials. This might have been plausible enough if it were not for a small irritating detail.

Until now I have only spoken of one scribe in Sj. There is, besides the hand that wrote the Persae, at least one other hand in the scholia on the Septem, probably the same hand as that found in the Persae. He would seem to be a contemporary of the main scribe, since he takes over from the main scribe e.g. on f.55\textsuperscript{v}, where he is first found.\textsuperscript{10} A few pages later, on f.57\textsuperscript{v} he is found again, and this time he continues on f.58\textsuperscript{r}, where he writes all scholia except the Thoman scholium at the top of the page, schol. Septem 415 (Dd. 347,23-27). The remarkable fact is, however, that the Thoman scholium clearly was written before the second hand wrote the following scholia 412, 414 and 415, all of which are old. It is far-fetched to suppose that the original scribe had returned just to write this Thoman scholium at the top of f.58\textsuperscript{r} and let his colleague continue with the old scholia. The explanation suggested here is that the Thoman scholia are not additions but the original first state scholia in the MS. The A scholia were then added later and written by the two scribes jointly. The fact that the Thoman scholia were written where they are now found, would seem to indicate that the scribes intended to add a full commentary and not the few Thoman scholia.

But if we take a look at the scholia on the Prometheus on the first few pages of Sj, where we also have Thoman scholia, two facts strike us. First, the Thoman scholia and the old scholia are here written together in such a way that it is quite impossible to imagine that one set was written before the other. Second, the old scholia on these pages have initials until f.6\textsuperscript{v} from which point only the Thoman scholia keep their rubrication. But then later on in the play on f.15\textsuperscript{v}, the situation in the Prometheus definitely resembles that in the Septem. For on this page we have first a row of Thoman scholia covering the whole of the poetic text on the page, and then a row of old scholia covering the same amount of poetic text.
The same arrangement can be found on f.28\textsuperscript{V}. So here the Thoman scholia came first. If we now return to the *Septem*, there is one case where the priority of the Thoman commentary is certain. On f.62\textsuperscript{V} the scribe had to use the space between the last line of poetic text and the scholia at the bottom of the page in order to find room for the old scholia. On this page the bottom was already occupied by a Thoman scholium.

What is the explanation of these facts? I have tried to discuss the more obvious solutions, but as far as I can see there is only one explanation that can account for all the facts, and that is *simultaneous use of two exemplars*. The scribes of Sj used two different sources for the scholia and tried to use them simultaneously. At the beginning of the MS the scribe (here it is the original one) wrote his two sources into one continuous column of scholia. This was difficult and was soon given up.\textsuperscript{11} Then the first took what material he could use in his Thoman source and added to this old scholia from a different exemplar. When he came to write the scholia on the *Septem*, he had grown so tired from using two exemplars at a time that he took very little Thoman material (this can also be seen from the last play, where no Thoman scholia are found) and entered this first; then he added the much more copious material from his old source. This is why there are differences in ductus between the two sets in the *Septem* but not in the *Prometheus*, and this also explains why a part of a Thoman scholium has crept into the A scholium on f.59\textsuperscript{R}. The scribe for a moment forgot which of his two sources he was copying. The fact that the old scholia from f.6\textsuperscript{V} lack rubrication, while the Thoman do not, also presupposes the use of two different exemplars, one unfinished and one with the usual capital initial letters. Finally, this explanation (simultaneous use of two different exemplars) also accounts for the single Thoman scholium by the original scribe in a section written by his colleague on f.58\textsuperscript{R}; the original scribe had already written this scholium in Sj before he left his work to be carried on by his colleague.

If the result of this lengthy discussion is correct, we have in Sj an interesting case of contamination taking place so to say before our eyes and in such a way that only a close palaeographical analysis may recover the facts. Herington was deceived by the regularity of the script and thought the contamination to have taken place in an ancestor of Sj. It remains to be seen which of the two exemplars was used in the poetic text.
As mentioned above, we have in Sj a partial further witness to the PPd recension of the scholia. There is another MS which has hitherto been overlooked that has also been influenced, though in a much lesser degree, by this recension. The MS Otto.gr. 346 (Na) was regarded by Turyn as a copy of Matr. gr. 4677 (N). Turyn said that the scholia are omitted in Na, but this is not quite true. There are a few scholia and many glosses, most of which closely resemble glosses known only from P. Moreover, there is a genuine PPd (and now also Sj) scholium in Na (schol. Septem 412) which Na has in the characteristic form given by PPdSj. Since text and scholia in Na are by the same hand, it is possible that Na is not just a copy of N.

A further isolated PPdSj scholium can be found in another MS that has been discarded because it was thought to be of no value. The MS R (Vat. gr. 57) was used by Wilamowitz in his Aeschylus edition of 1914 and has since been forgotten. According to Turyn, the MS is Thoman with glosses and no scholia. The fact is, however, that in its commentary, which mostly consists of glosses, R is certainly not Thoman but old. The Thoman element in R is secondary; a later hand has entered a number of Thoman glosses and one or two scholia, the most important of which is the rare exegetic scholium on Sept. 7, which I have so far only found in Lh, Ua and Sb inc. δημιουργεί τόν (not in Dindorf). But this second hand R^2 is quite obviously a foreign element. This can be seen most effectively from the beginning of the Septem, where R^2 adds Thoman glosses above line 2 in between the original R^1 material which is definitely old. R^1 wrote above this line the old glosses εξελικτικόν and εξικτικά. At a later occasion the space between these glosses was used to accommodate the longer Thoman note on this line ἡγούμεν δότες ἀρχήν καὶ εξουσίαν ἐξει κτλ. (Dd. 300,12-14). At Septem 29, R^2 added the Thoman explanation καὶ ἀγείρεσθαι to the old gloss ἐν υἱοῖς ἤλευσθαι. In addition to the rare and presumably Thoman scholium on line 7, R only has a few scholia proper. One of these (schol. Sept. 139) follows the PPdSj version of the A scholium. In the next scholium in R, on Sept. 145, there is partial agreement between R and PPdSj so that in one of the crucial passages R follows PPdSj, in the other it follows the regular A scholia. The last two scholia in R are regular A scholia.

The case of R is another reminder that Turyn's class ρ of Thoman MSS falls apart. Elsewhere I have tried to show that
too many of the MSS in this group are rather to be regarded as Triclinian\textsuperscript{17} and some of the other cannot easily be distinguished from old MSS.

I should perhaps explain here what I mean by Thoman MSS. In contrast to Turyn, who argued for the view that Thomas made a recension of the poetic text and composed a commentary to accompany that recension, I have been persuaded by Dawe and by my own experience, that Thomas only wrote a commentary, explicitly ascribed to him by Triclinius. Thus the inference from scholia to text is no longer valid. The existence of a Thoman commentary in a given MS says absolutely nothing about the character of the poetic text in the particular MS. This is not to deny that we can draw a line between old MSS and the Byzantine vulgate, for we know that Triclinius distinguished between the text current in his time and the old MSS. But this Byzantine vulgate must not be ascribed to any particular individual - and moreover shows little sign of ever having been the work of an individual, but rather of a mindless plurality of different scribes.\textsuperscript{18} Thus I mean by Thoman MSS manuscripts carrying the Thoman commentary, which is a quite definite quantity. I should emphasize that the A commentary too, as far as I can see, was not composed to accompany a particular recension. The only commentary written on Aeschylus to elucidate a particular recension is the Triclinian one.

We saw above that a comparatively undistinguished MS Sj revealed treasures surely not to be despised by a conscientious editor of the scholia. It is a lesson that we have to investigate practically every MS of Aeschylus in toto, since MSS may change character any time, in order that nothing of value for our total view of the history of the text may escape notice due to a low placing in the stemma. There are two MSS that I should like to mention especially for this reason, Nd (\textit{Laur. plut.} 31,38)\textsuperscript{19} and Wa (\textit{Vat. Reg. gr.} 92).\textsuperscript{20} The scholia in these two MSS clearly form a group with C (\textit{Par. gr.} 2785)\textsuperscript{21} and Xa (\textit{Ambr. N} 175 sup.).\textsuperscript{22} These four MSS go together so often that we must regard their scholia as a special recension the characteristics of which I intend to deal with on another occasion.

Here I only wish to point out that Nd and Wa resemble each other so often and so closely that one of them must be a copy of the other. The proof of their true relation is found in schoI.\textit{Septem} 788, where a blot of ink in Nd (f.20\textsuperscript{v}) after the word \(\sigma\varphi\alpha\gamma\nu\xi\) (Dd. 388,4) has been read as the
article by the scribe of Wa (f.134V) with the result that the following gibberish now can be read in the latter MS: ἦλ οὐσαγής ὄ νῦν δὲ ὄφοςομαι. Since text and scholia in Wa is the work of one single scribe throughout I venture to guess that Wa was copied wholesale from Nd. Though this guess will have to be corroborated by a closer look at the poetic text in Wa, my provisional conclusion on the basis of the scholia will have some consequences for our view of the group CWWaPpNd and Xa.23)

A final note on Nd: The scribe of this MS has been stated by Vogel-Gardthausen to be Akindynos Perdikes, according to a subscription on f.27f + ὧ χέ βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ ἄκινδυνῳ τῷ περδίκη (on f.12r the same note is found but written in a much lighter ink, or has been erased).24) The fact is, however, that this note is not in the hand of either of the two scribes found in Nd, of which the first one wrote the poetic text on ff.1-8v, the second all scholia and the poetic text ff.9r until the end. This second scribe I would identify with Georgios Chrysokokkes (I) on the basis of the ductus. I have compared the writing in Nd with the published facsimile specimen of his hand in Turyn's collection of dated Vatican MSS.25)

What I have said so far has been very critical of the analysis in Turyn's book on the Aeschylus MSS. It is therefore paradoxical that I now have to criticize other scholars who have been equally sceptical about Turyn's results. But in the case of the MS Δ (Moscow olim Synod. Bibl. gr. 508) Turyn was right in stating this MS to be a partial apograph of Ba (Vat. Ottoh. gr.160). The Moscow MS was among the MSS collated by Dawe, but he does not mention that Turyn found evidence that it was a copy of Ba in Prometh. and Septem 1-789,26) and in Page's Oxford text the Moscow MS is reported in the apparatus as if it were an independent witness. Turyn rightly saw that Δ changed its character at Sept. 790; what happens here is that there is a change of hands and the new scribe (on f.62r) uses a new exemplar.27) Until that point Δ is obviously a copy (also in the commentary) of Ba, which MS has not been collated by Dawe or by Page. Unfortunately, it is only possible to compare the Moscow MS with Ba until Sept.518, for at this point the original part of Ba has been repaired and the pages ff.116 ff. are a later replacement for folios now lost.28) Thus we cannot see whether the lack of glosses in Δ after Sept.608 corresponds to a similar defect in Ba at this point. However, the glosses in Δ are of the same type until line 608; they are Thoman. This means that we have basically "old" text furnished with Thoman commentary and my point that we
cannot rely on the type of commentary to determine the character of the poetic text once again is shown to be correct.

Another case of a MS insufficiently investigated and therefore misplaced in the classification is Par. gr. 2786 (Ab + La). In 1943 Turyn concluded that this MS was a composite one, partly Thoman (La) and partly old (Ab). In the Prometheus, Septem and Persae 1-239 the MS was regarded by him as Thoman, while from Pers.240 on it was old. 29) In fact, the scholia on Prometheus are A scholia and those on Septem are sufficiently abnormal to put the MS in a class apart. The MS is obviously a curious mixture of old and Byzantine comments and needs a thorough investigation. I can only point here to some of the most extraordinary features. Unfortunately, the MS is partly illegible and I am not certain that I have been able to read everything of value.

The scholia on the Septem are partly Thoman, partly very rare notes. The glosses are also mixed; some are doubtless old and some are Thoman. The state of the MS makes it almost impossible to distinguish between the original stratum of the MS and subsequent additions, and there may have been more than one hand at work *ab initio*. Still I would say with some confidence that both old and Thoman commentary can be found in the original first state of the book. The Thoman scholia do not call for comment, but there are some extraordinary scholia which deserve mention. On Septem 121 we have a scholium quoting Sophocles and Euripides (f.36 R): τοῦτο δὲ ζει παθητικός γινεται ὥς καὶ Εὐρυπίδης πόνοι γὰρ καὶ πόνων ὕπαρκαι κρείσσον- ες κυκλοῦνται (Hea. 639). καὶ Εὐρυπίδης πολλαὶ κυκλοῦνται νύκτες ἡμέρας τῷ ἔσοι (El. 1365). This note is not found from any other MS. Then on Septem 250 (f.38 v) Ab exhibits the rare note on σύγα which I have published from the MS Par. suppl. gr.110 (Ea). 30) This scholium came, as I have shown, from Triclinius’ commentary on Soph. Ai. 75 remodelled to suit the Aeschylus passage. I took this note, together with the other notes of a learned nature in Ea, to be the work of Karbones, who is also attested as a commentator on Sophocles. 31) The connection between Ab and Ea is further strengthened by another rare scholium appearing in both MSS, the reworking of Triclinius’ note on Sept.332, which Ab has on f.40 v. 32) Since Ea has a number of scholia not found in Ab and the text of the last two scholia are correct in Ab as against Ea, both MSS are independent of each other. In view of the fact that the above scholium on 121 resembles the learned scholia in Ea I would suppose that Ab got this note from the same source as was used for the scholia on 250 and 332, which I am inclined to regard as Karbones.
There is a MS closely resembling Ab, though lacking the scholia mentioned above. The Matr. 4617 (Ha) is clearly a gemellus, at least in the commentary, to Ab, and further the MS Na (Ottob. gr. 346) is a close relative to Ha and Ab, at least in the glosses.

Finally, I would like to mention a MS which calls for much closer analysis than I have been able to undertake as yet. The main problems, however, are sufficiently clear to be set out here. The MS in question is Vienna, phil.gr. 279 (Yb), which usually has been taken to be a gemellus to Ya (Vienna, phil.gr. 197). Yb has not been given much attention no doubt because of this opinion about its nature, though there is no reason why Ya should be collated and Yb not. In the scholia, however, Yb is not a gemellus. There are at least two contemporary hands in the poetic text and the scholia in the Septem and they seem to have used two different sources. The original scribe of the poetic text used in his scholia the source common to Ya and Yb, while the other hand -- and here I must emphasize that I am only speaking of the part of Yb containing the Septem (ff. 40r-82v), since still another hand wrote the Prometheus part ff. 1-39v -- used a Thoman source related to the Thoman source employed by Sj, in addition to an old source resembling B and Y. I have still not carried through a detailed analysis of the hands and their sources, but what I have found so far clearly demonstrates that Yb cannot be a simple gemellus of Ya, at least in the scholia.

It has been argued in recent years that the transmission of the text of Aeschylus is an open one, and these rather eclectic notes on the scholia seem to confirm the diagnosis. I hope to have made it clear that the scholia have been transmitted independently and that the character of the scholia of a given MS may not be used to determine the character of the poetic text. For two reasons: the transmission does not follow the clear-cut rules of our manuals, and apart from the Triclinian edition, no set of scholia on Aeschylus was composed to explain a definite text. I will give one more example of how the MSS actually defy our preconceived notions about how they ought to behave themselves: the MS Z (Athens Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη 1056) has been written off as a worthless post-Thoman recension, but the few pages I have seen contain almost exclusively old glosses and some not found elsewhere.
But let us not forget that it was Alexander Turyn who started all this back in 1943. Without his pioneering work, we would still have been in the dark.
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NOTES


2) For the scholia on the Septem I have seen and collated the following MSS (I use Turyn's symbols): AAbBaCDDaEFPdGHaKLLeKMLnNaRbSgSjTTuAvVWaxXbYxYyYbZjAbAcAeAe. I have only made soundings in Sb2Zf. I have not yet collated IH and U, which are all important MSS; furthermore, I intend to investigate Ferrara 116, Napoli II.F.31 bis, II.F.33, Perugia H 56, Vat. gr. 59, 912 and 920. For my work on the non-triadic plays I have also seen the apograph of M.

3) For Turyn's position see op. cit. 13 with n.10. I have argued against his view in Museum Tusculanum 34-35 (1979) 16 ff. (in Danish).

4) Turyn, op. cit., 41 and 86. See also C.J. Herington, The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound, Leiden 1972, 17. I use the symbol Sj for the whole of the Aeschylus part; of course, this is also the symbol used by Herington.

5) Herington, loc. cit.

6) For the basic distinction between regular A scholia and the PPd recension see Herington, op.cit., 22 ff.; I have discussed some aspects of P in Cl. Med. 31 (1970 = 1975) 35 and 32 (forthcoming).


8) The Thoman scholia on the Septem have been written with larger letters and more spacing than the A scholia.

9) Until my own edition appear, I have to use Dindorf's unreliable text for reference purposes; where the exact wording comes into question, it is to be understood that I quote from my own collations.

10) I have not been able to identify any of the two hands in Sj.

11) It would seem that already from f.5r on the scribe had given up coordinated use of two sources; on this page we have first schol. vet. Prom.57a, 60a and 64ad, then schol. Thom. 54 and 62. On the following pages he seems to have carried on this procedure of first copying a row from one source, then from the other. On ff.5v-6v he began with the old source, on f.7r he began with the Thoman one. The arrangement can be seen most clearly on ff.15v and 28v, as mentioned above.

12) On Na see Turyn, op.cit., 46.

13) I have not analysed the glosses and scholia on the other plays in Na. On Na's relation to Ab and Hb see below.


16) The scholiwm can be read in Dindorf 317,26-30. After ἡμιος (line 30) PPdSj add a paraphrase which is not found in the regular A scholia nor in R.
On the other hand, R follows PPdSJ in reading ὑποκατοῦσις τῆς νυκτὸς (29) against τῆς νυκτὸς ὑποκατοῦσις (CNdWYYaYbXa) or τῆς νυκτὸς ὑποκατοῦσις (BDNcXc).

17) See my paper mentioned above (n.3) and also Cl. Med. 31 (1970) 18.


19) On this MS see Turyn, op. cit., 41. 20) See Turyn, op. cit., 39.


23) On the group PVNNdc see Dawe, op. cit., 32 ff., and on CWWa, Turyn 61f.

24) M. Vogel-V. Gardthausen, Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, Leipzig 1909, 12, based on Bandini's Catalogue and accepted by Turyn, 41.


26) Turyn, 57 f. Dawe 16 says that "Δ seemed to be of central importance in the other half of the Phi tradition," but though he reproduces Turyn's stemma from which it appears that Ba was the source of Δ₁ (Prom. - Septem 1-789) he does not even mention Ba in his discussion of Δ.

27) Turyn noticed that Sept. 790 is the first line on a new recto page (f.62⁵), but he seems to have overlooked the change of hands.

28) The analysis given by Turyn 56 f. is not correct, since there is a clear break in Ba between ff.115 and 116. On f.116⁵ beginning with line 519, until f.130⁷, we find a scribe very much resembling Demetrius Moschos. Until that point f.116⁵ Ba is clearly Thoman in the commentary. On Ba see also Turyn, Codices graeci Vaticani, 159 f.


33) See Turyn 62.


35) The original scribe wrote the marginal scholia as far as f.50⁷ agreeing with Ya. The last scholium on this page has been written by a different hand (schol. 239 Dd. 328,13-16) and seems to be related to B (Laur. 31,3). In the next scholium 242 on f.51⁵ (Dd. 328,21-24) Yb quite obviously sides with B against Ya. There are also many Thoman scholia belonging to the first state of Yb; I emphasize this because some Thoman scholia in Yb evidently are additions, e.g. on f.52⁷. The original scribe of the poetic text returns to write scholia on f.75⁶ and agrees again with Ya.

36) Turyn, 93. I have only seen ff.167⁷-170⁵, containing Septem 795-919.