

VI.—The Sophocles Recension of Manuel Moschopoulos

ALEXANDER TURYN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Several Byzantine recensions of Sophocles are identified separately as those of Manuel Moschopoulos, Maximus Planudes, Thomas Magistros, and Demetrius Triclinius. The Moschopulean recension is analyzed systematically, and its characteristic readings are recorded. A list of Moschopulean manuscripts of Sophocles is presented.*

In continuing my study of the text transmission of Sophoclean tragedies,¹ I examined most of the Sophocles manuscripts either in full or in partial samples. As a result, I came to the conclusion that it would be methodically correct and useful to report, first of all, the typical contents and the characteristics of the Byzantine interpolated manuscripts.

The overwhelming majority of the Sophocles mss. is affected by the activities of the Byzantine interpolators who flourished during the reign of Andronicus II Palaeologus (1282–1328).² For the philological activities of those Byzantine critics we should set as a *terminus post quem* approximately the year A.D. 1290.³ With

* I am under great obligation to the University of Illinois Research Board whose generous grants enabled me to secure ample photographic material for conducting this study.

¹ Cf. A. Turyn, "The Manuscripts of Sophocles," *Traditio* 2 (1944) 1–41. To the list of Sophocles mss. published there, one ms. has to be added, Vatic. gr. 2221 (see below, p. 171). Then, the two Dresden mss. Da. 21 and Da. 22 are to be written off as destroyed during the last war (according to a communication of the Sächsische Landesbibliothek). Hereafter, I do not quote in every single case references to my *Traditio* paper, where the reader may find bibliographical data pertaining to a given ms. — Information on printed catalogs of Greek mss. now can be found conveniently in Marcel Richard, *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits grecs* (*Publications de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* I [Paris, 1948]).

² Cf. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Einleitung in die attische Tragödie* (*Euripides Herakles* erklärt von U. v. W.-M., Band I [Berlin, 1889]) 193 f.; idem, *Geschichte der Philologie* (Alfred Gercke und Eduard Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* I³.1 [Leipzig-Berlin, 1921]) 4.

³ Cf. the chronological discussion in A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (*Polish Institute Series* No. 2 [New York, 1943]) — hereafter quoted Turyn, *Aeschylus* — p. 103, note 89. For Moschopoulos, a valuable biographical contribution will be found in a forthcoming paper by Thor Ševčenko, "The Imprisonment of Manuel Moschopoulos in the Year 1305 or 1306."

the exception of the Laurentian ms. 32, 9 (= L), and its closest relative, the Leiden palimpsest⁴ Bibl. Publ. Graec. 60 A (our symbol Λ) — both of them of the X/XIth cent. —,⁵ and the ms. Florence, Laur. Conv. Soppr. 152 (= G) subscribed A.D. 1282, every Sophoclean ms. seems to fall into the later period, posterior to that critical date A.D. 1290. Many of them simply follow some Byzantine recension. Others, even if affiliated with the "old" text tradition, are sporadically interpolated with readings invented by the Byzantines. Therefore; it seems to me that we have, first of all, to turn our attention to the Byzantine editions of Sophocles and to identify them separately, in order to learn what were the Byzantine readings peculiar to each of those recensions. The knowledge of specific Byzantine readings — especially those supported by the authority of the famous Byzantine scholars — will enable us to detect also occasional Byzantine contaminations in the later "old" mss. (the *veteres*) which were written (with very few exceptions) mostly after A.D. 1300, and to explain the most puzzling inconsistencies of their texts which were caused by the wide infiltration of Byzantine readings. For this reason, a thorough examination of the Byzantine texts must precede the systematic analysis of the old or ancient tradition, which will be my ultimate task.

Byzantine editions of classical poets as a rule distinguished themselves not only by a peculiar revision of the poetic text but also by a special set of glosses and a running marginal commentary, i.e., scholia. There is a natural and normal connection between the text, glosses, and scholia of a given recension. Since a distinct character of the scholia is a most obvious feature of a manuscript, I shall try to separate related groups of manuscripts by using their scholia as a significant criterion, in accordance with my usual method.⁶ A survey of past publications of Sophoclean scholia will prove quite useful in this connection.

⁴ Cf. now the highly illuminating collation published by H. J. Scheltema, "De codice Sophocleo Lugdunensi," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4.2 (1949) 132–137.

⁵ Cf. a very interesting discussion of the minuscule mss. of the Xth cent. by Aubrey Diller, "Notes on Greek Codices of the Tenth Century," *TAPhA* 78 (1947) 184–188.

⁶ Cf. A. Turyn, *De codicibus Pindaricis* (*Archivum Filologiczne* No. 11 [Cracoviae, 1932]) 7; Turyn, *Aeschylus* 13; Raffaele Cantarella, *Dioniso* N.S. 10 (1947) 147.

1. THE PRINTED EDITIONS OF SOPHOCLES SCHOLIA

The Aldine *editio princeps*⁷ of Sophocles (1502) did not include any scholia.⁸ Among various sets of Sophocles scholia,⁹ we should mention, above all, the ancient scholia exemplified by the Laurentian scholia of L. They were first published by Janus Lascaris¹⁰ in 1518 from the L and became subsequently known as *scholia Romana* or *editio Romana*.¹¹ These Laurentian scholia were repeated in the Iunta¹² edition (1522), but some additions from Byzantine (Moschopulean, as we shall see) scholia were there inserted into the Lascaris scholia.¹³ The Lascaris scholia along with

⁷ Σοφοκλέους τραγωδίαι επτα μετεξηγησέων. *Sophoclis tragaediae septem cum commentariis*. (in verso of the penultimate leaf:) Venetiis in Aldi Romani Academia mense Augusto. M.DII. The book is described by Emile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles* 1 (Paris, 1885) 77-79.

⁸ Though their eventual edition was considered. In the dedicatory letter of Aldus Romanus to Ioannes Lascaris (*Sophoclis tragaediae* [1502], verso of the title), we read: τὰ δὲ εἰς αὐτὰς εἰρισκόμενα σχόλια οὐπω μὲν ἐτυπώθη· τυπωθήσεται δὲ θεοῦ σώζοντος ὅσον οὐκ ἤδη· πρὸς δὲ, καὶ ὅσα ἐς ἀνάπτυξιν μέτρων ἦκει. Atque utinam id ante habuissem· quam ipsae tragoediae excusae forent nam, etsi res est quam laboriosissima tamen singulos quosque uersus in choris praesertim, siqui perperam digesti sunt· curassem in suum locum restituendos. Thus Aldus mentioned also metrical scholia: would it mean that Triclinian metrical scholia, like those of Venice 470 (cf. below, p. 112), were intended to be included in that scholia edition? Cf. also Benešević, *PhW* 46 (1926) 1148 ff.

⁹ Cf. Richard Jebb, *Sophocles. The Text of the Seven Plays* (Cambridge, 1897) xxvi ff.

¹⁰ *Commentarii in septem tragedias Sophoclis: quae ex aliis eius compluribus iniuria temporum amissis, solae superfuerunt*. (on the last page:) Ετυπώθη ἐν Ῥώμῃ. ἐν τῷ παρὰ τὸν κυρίον λόφον γυμνασίῳ. οὐκ ἄνευ προνομίου. Ἐτεῖ ἔκτῳ τῆς ἀναρρήσεως Λέοντος δεκάτου, τοῦ ἄκρου ἀρχιερέως. τῆς δὲ ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας, Χιλιοστῷ, πεντακοσιοστῷ, δεκάτῳ ὁγδόῳ (Rome, 1518). In verso of the title page a poem: Λασκάρεως. Εἰς Σοφοκλέα. Scholia are headlined: Σχόλια παλιὰ τῶν πάνυ δοκιμῶν εἰς τὰς σωζόμενας τῶν Σοφοκλέους τραγωιδίων. The book is described by Legrand, *op. cit.* 1.164 ff. Cf. Börje Knös, *Un ambassadeur de l'hellénisme — Janus Lascaris — et la tradition gréco-byzantine dans l'humanisme français* (Collection d'histoire de l'humanisme publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé [Uppsala-Stockholm-Paris, 1945]) 154; on Lascaris in general, cf. Legrand, *op. cit.* 1.cxxxii-clxii.

¹¹ Of course, Lascaris corrected the scholia by using also other mss., and it would be an interesting task to investigate systematically the sources of the non-Laurentian readings in the Roman edition. Cf. Vittorio De Marco, "Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii sofoclei," *SIFC N.S.* 13 (1936) 4, 39 ff.

¹² Σοφοκλέους Τραγωδίαι Επτα μετὰ σχολίων παλαιῶν καὶ πάνυ ὀφελίμων. *Sophoclis Tragoediae Septem. Cum interpretationibus uetustis & ualde utilibus*. (on the end page:) Florentiae per haeredes Philippi Iuntae: anno Domini M.D.XXII. sexto Kal. Nouembris. The scholia are headlined after Lascaris: Σχόλια παλαιὰ τῶν πάνυ δοκιμῶν εἰς τὰς σωζόμενας τῶν Σοφοκλέους τραγωιδίων.

¹³ In the preface of the Iunta edition, headlined *Antonius Francinus Varchiensis, Ioanni Baptistae Egnatio Veneto. S.*, we read: Sophoclis tragoedias a nobis castigatas,

those Moschopulean additions (from the set *οικείως*, see p. 109) were then reprinted in the subsequent Sophocles editions of the XVI–XVIIIth centuries, but Brunck detected those additaments of the Iunta edition and marked them, in his reprint of the scholia, with an asterisk prefixed.¹⁴

Among the more important Sophocles editions of the next time, the Brubach¹⁵ edition (1544), being an exact reprint of the Iunta edition, repeated the Iunta scholia (i.e., Lascaris' Laurentian scholia + Iunta's Moschopulean additions). Then came the famous Turnebus¹⁶ edition (1552–1553) which represented the Triclinian recension both in text and in scholia, on the basis of the ms. Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2711 (= T), and of some unknown manuscript.¹⁷ Turnebus relegated to a special appendix¹⁸ three sets of scholia all of which he supposed to be Triclinian, to judge from the title he gave

una cum glossematis, quia id nobis aptius uisum est, quam separatim, quod alii ante nos fecerunt excudere, additis insuper quam plurimis ex uetustissimis excerptis codicibus, quae magno adiumento futura sunt hunc poetam intelligere uolentibus, nomini tuo dicauimus.

¹⁴ Rich. Franc. Phil. Brunck, *Sophoclis quae exstant omnia cum veterum grammaticorum scholiis* (folio edition, Argentorati, 1786) 1.1 p. v.

¹⁵ Σοφοκλέους τραγωδίαι επτα μετὰ σχολίων παλαιῶν καὶ πάνν ὠφελίμων. *Sophoclis tragoediae septem, cum interpretationibus uetustis & ualde utilibus*: Anno XLIII. (on the end page:) Francofurti, ex officina Petri Brubachii, Anno M.D.XLIII.

¹⁶ Σοφοκλέους Τραγωδίαι. Δημητρίου του Τρικλινίου Περί μέτρων οἷς ἐχρήσατο Σοφοκλῆς, Περί σχημάτων, Σχόλια. (Parisii, M.D.LII: Apud Adrianum Turnebum.) But all the scholia are printed in an appendix with the following title page: Δημητρίου του Τρικλινίου, Εἰς τα του Σοφοκλέους επτα δραματα, Περί μέτρων οἷς ἐχρήσατο Σοφοκλῆς, Περί σχημάτων, καὶ σχόλια (Parisii, M.D.LIII: Apud Adrianum Turnebum). This appendix hereafter is cited: Turnebus, *Scholia*.

¹⁷ Turnebus, in his dedicatory preface addressed to Aimar de Ranconet, mentioned a Triclinian ms. of Ranconet which he used for his edition in these words: βιβλίον γάρ παρὰ σοῦ εὐτυχῆσαντες Δημητρίου τοῦ Τρικλινίου σημειώσεσι, στιχογραφίαις, ἐξηγήσεσι, διορθώσεσιν εἰς εὐρύθμον καὶ ἐμμελὲς εὖ μάλα διεκριβωμένον. On Ranconet (1498–1559), cf. Pierre Larousse, *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX^e siècle* 13 (Paris), 683; Léopold Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale* 1 (Paris, 1868) 90. The identity of the Ranconet ms. with Paris T, suggesting itself by the fact that T is the only full Triclinian ms. of the seven tragedies now in existence in Paris, was denied by Brunck (*Sophoclis quae exstant omnia* 1.1 pp. III, VI), but then asserted by Elmsley (*Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* e recensione Petri Elmsley [Oxonii, 1823] pp. III f.). It is absolutely certain that Turnebus could not make his edition on the basis of T only, for the simple reason that many exegetic scholia which he published do not appear at all in T. He must have had another Triclinian ms. with complete Thomano-Triclinian scholia. The fact that the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris does not possess that missing ms. of Ranconet may be due just to the fact that after the tragic end of Ranconet's life his library was dispersed. After all, only 3 mss. from Ranconet's collection (two Latin mss. and one French) enriched the library of Fontainebleau (cf. Delisle, *loc. cit.*).

¹⁸ See above, note 16.

to the appendix. In that appendix, metrical Triclinian scholia have a prefix METP.; short notes (metrical, prosodical, explanatory) are prefixed with the mark ΣXHM. Then, exegetic scholia are printed in longer groups which have a prefix ΣXOA. They begin in Turnebus (*Scholia* p. 1) with the scholium on *Ajax* 2: Η πειραθῆναι τῶν ἐχθρῶν κτλ. (we shall afterwards use this opening — or rather more correctly, ἡγουν πειραθῆναι — of those scholia as a distinctive feature). With regard to *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, and *Antigone*, for the convenience of the reader I wish to refer him to Dindorf's edition of the scholia¹⁹ where those scholia ἡ πειραθῆναι are reprinted on the basis of Turnebus with some modifications by Brunck and Dindorf himself. Now, these exegetic scholia ἡ πειραθῆναι are labeled Triclinian by Turnebus. This is false with regard to the tetrad (*Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antigone*), because — as we shall see below — these scholia are actually Thoman. Yet this erroneous idea of their Triclinian authorship, initiated by Turnebus, has been propagated up to now and is at present accepted generally. Also with regard to *Oed. Col.*, *Trachin.*, *Philoct.*, marking their scholia as printed in the Turnebus edition as Triclinian was a mistaken idea, for they agree with ancient scholia and are clearly headlined, even in Triclinian manuscripts, as *ancient* scholia. E.g., scholia on *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, are headlined in Paris 2711 (T) fol. 149^r, 194^r, 226^v, and in Venice 470 (Ta) fol. 180^r, 222^v, 240^r, respectively, in this way: ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν σχολίων.²⁰

Thus, the ancient character of the scholia on *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, exhibited in Triclinian manuscripts is entirely clear. It remains only to be wished that future editors of ancient scholia on Sophocles use as additional evidence not only T, but also the other complete Triclinian manuscript, viz., Ta. But the authorship of the scholia ἡγουν πειραθῆναι on *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antigone* — in spite of the current view that they are Triclinian — has to be solved, and this will be done in the course of the present investigation.

After Turnebus, the Sophocles vulgate was enriched by the Turnebian scholia added to the scholia Iuntina. By Turnebian

¹⁹ G. Dindorfius, *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias septem ex codicibus aucta et emendata* 2 (Oxonii, 1852) — hereafter quoted as "Dindorf" — 278 ff.

²⁰ Henricus Stephanus (1568), *op. cit.* (below, note 21) p. *II^v, observed that with regard to the scholia on *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, Turnebus was wrong in attributing their authorship to Triclinius. Also Brunck, *Sophoclis quae exstant omnia* 1.1.vi, questioned Turnebus' statement in this respect.

scholia I mean the scholia of the Turnebus edition, i.e.: the exegetic scholia ἡ πειραθῆναι on the tetrad and the ancient scholia on the remaining plays from a Triclinian manuscript, and the metrical Triclinian scholia, all of them as printed in Turnebus' *Scholia*. And by *scholia Iuntina* I mean the Laurentian scholia of Lascaris with the Moschopulean additaments of the Iunta edition. In the editions of Henricus Stephanus (1568)²¹ and of Paulus Stephanus (1603),²² a special set of distinctive marks was used. In Henricus Stephanus (1568), scholia Iuntina are printed without any mark; exegetic scholia from Turnebus are marked with the prefix ΣΧΟΛ. ΤΡΙΚ(ΑΙΝ).; metrical Triclinian scholia from Turnebus have a prefix ¶ Σχημ. Τρικλ. Then, in Paulus Stephanus (1603), scholia Iuntina have likewise no mark; exegetic scholia from Turnebus have an asterisk * prefixed; metrical Triclinian scholia from Turnebus have a paragraph ¶ prefixed.

The edition of Thomas Johnson²³ marks a notable contribution to the common knowledge of Sophoclean scholia on the triad. Johnson included in his edition Byzantine scholia on the triad with the characteristic beginning on *Ajax* 1 οἰκέως (cf. Dindorf 196.9) from²⁴ two Bodleian mss., Laud Greek 54 (Johnson's *L*) and Auct. F.3.25 (Johnson's *B*). The authorship of these scholia οἰκέως, marked by Johnson with the symbols *L* and *B*, will be discussed below. Moreover, he included in his edition a peculiar Byzantine set of scholia on *Ajax* and *Electra* exhibited in the Bodleian ms. Barocci 61, with the characteristic beginning ὦ νιέ (Johnson's symbol *Bar.*) — let us call them *scholia Barocci*. In Johnson, scholia Iuntina are printed

²¹ Σοφοκλέους αἱ ἐπτὰ τραγωῖαι. *Sophoclis tragoediae septem. Vnà cum omnibus Graecis scholiis, & cum Latinis* Ioach. Camerarij. *Annotationes* Henrici Stephani in *Sophoclem & Euripidem, seorsum excusae, simul prouident.* (Anno M.D.LXVIII.)

²² Σοφοκλέους αἱ ἐπτὰ τραγωῖαι. *Sophoclis tragoediae septem. Vnà cum omnibus Graecis scholiis, & Latina* Viti VVinssemij *ad verbum Interpretatione. Quibus accesserunt* Ioachimi Camerarij, *neon* Henrici Stephani *annotationes.* (Excudebat Pavlus Stephanvs. Anno MDCIII.)

²³ On Thomas Johnson (fl. 1718), cf. *The Dictionary of National Biography* 10 (London, 1937/8) 936. For his editions, see: *Sophoclis Tragoediae, Ajax & Electra, Nova versione donatae, Scholiisque veteribus, tam antehac quam nunc primum Editis, illustratae.* Opera Thomae Johnson (Oxoniae, 1705); *Sophoclis Tragoediae, Antigone & Trachiniae, Nova versione donatae Scholiisque veteribus illustratae.* Opera Thomae Johnson (Oxoniae, 1708); a complete edition came out later: *Sophoclis Tragoediae septem Tribus Voluminibus comprehensae, Nova versione donatae, Scholiisque veteribus (tam antehac quam nunc primum editis) notisque perpetuis, & variis Lectionibus illustratae.* Opera Thomae Johnson. vol. I (*Aj., El.*), II (*Ant., Tr., Oed. Col.*), III (*Oed. Tyr., Phil.*). (Londini-Etonae, 1746.)

²⁴ Cf. Turyn, *Traditio* 2 (1944) 3.

without any prefix in the edition of 1705 and with the prefix SCHOL. in the editions of 1746 or 1758; Turnebian exegetic scholia have the prefix ΣΧΟΛ. ΤΡΙΚΛΙΝ.; Triclinian metrical notes from Turnebus have the prefix ¶ Σχήμ. Τρικλ. Then, under a comprehensive headline SCHOL. INED., Johnson printed: the scholia ὧν ὑπὲρ with the symbol *Bar.* at the end; and the scholia οἰκείως — with the symbols, at the end, *L. B.* jointly or separately, as the case might be. Of course, for *Antigone*, the same system was followed, except for the fact that there were no *scholia inedita* on these plays. For *Trach.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Phil.*, Johnson followed the Stephanus edition and printed the scholia Iuntina (not the Turnebus scholia), while adding only occasionally some Turnebus scholia that gave a fuller Triclinian wording of an ancient scholium (e.g., on *Trach.* 1) or some original scholium of Triclinius (e.g., on *Trach.* 154 Johns. = 151 vulg.) or some metrical Triclinian scholium.

Brunck (1786)²⁵ reprinted the traditional Lascaris-Iunta as well as the Turnebian and Johnsonian scholia, but applied some critical treatment to that mass of material. Under the traditional headline Σχολια παλαια των πανν δοκιμων εις τας σωζομενας των Σοφοκλεους τραγωιδων (in 1.2.5 and 2.2.3), Brunck printed as the main body the Lascaris scholia. Below this text he gave, in smaller type, the Iuntine (Moschopulean) additaments, with asterisks prefixed, and Johnson's Byzantine scholia (i.e., scholia οἰκείως and the scholia Barocci) which he revised on the basis of some manuscripts available. From Turnebus, Brunck reprinted only the exegetic scholia ἡ πεираθῆναι and headlined them (1.2.157; 2.2.137) Δημητρίου του Τρικλινιου σχολια, thus propagating Turnebus' assumption that they were Triclinian. As to the metrical scholia and Σχήματα of the Turnebus edition, Brunck omitted them entirely. Of course, ancient scholia in Turnebus on *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, were not repeated by Brunck in his reprint of the "Triclinian" scholia; only a few actually Triclinian scholia on those three plays were reprinted from Turnebus along with the group ἡ πεираθῆναι of the Brunck edition.

Early in the XIXth century some new Byzantine scholia on *Ajax* and *Electra* were published by L. Purgold²⁶ from the ms. Jena

²⁵ Brunck, *Sophoclis quae exstant omnia* 1.2 and 2.2.

²⁶ Ludovicus Purgold, *Observationes criticae in Sophoclem, Euripidem, Anthologiam Graecam et Ciceronem: adiuncta est e Sophoclis codice Ienensi varietas lectionis et scholia maximam partem inedita* (Ienae-Lipsiae, 1802). Some of those scholia which had been known before from other sources and appeared in Brunck were marked by Purgold

Bos.q.7. This is a peculiar, though unimportant, Byzantine recension, the scholia of which draw heavily on the scholia *οικείως*. Most mss. of this group — we shall call it Jena family — have at the beginning of the scholia on *Aiax* a peculiar scholium on *Aiax* 1 which begins with the word *ἀναρμοστίαν* (it is missing just in the Jena ms.; I am quoting it from the ms. Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2598 fol. 269^r): *ἀναρμοστίαν ἐμφαίνει μετὰ τοῦ παρακειμένου συνταττόμενον τὸ ἀεί· μετὰ γὰρ ἐνεστῶτος φιλεῖ μάλιστα λέγεσθαι*. Let us call those scholia of Purgold *Jena scholia* or *scholia ἀναρμοστίαν*.

To conclude this survey of printed publications of Sophoclean scholia, I should like to mention the present situation. For the ancient scholia, an edition of the Laurentian scholia (from L) by Peter Elmsley²⁷ came out in 1825. Then Dindorf²⁸ published, in 1852, with a useful preface, an edition of Byzantine scholia based on the Brunck collection. Dindorf repeated uncritically the traditional setup of those scholia. He divided them into two groups: *Σχόλια νεώτερα*, and *Δημητρίου τοῦ Τρικλινίου σχόλια*. In the former group, Dindorf gives the scholia *οικείως* (i.e., Johnson's scholia *L. B.*) and the scholia Barocci (Johnson's *Bar.*), indiscriminately without using any distinctive marks, and in this regard Dindorf's edition is a regress if we compare it with Johnson. Then, under the Triclinian headline, Dindorf reprinted the Turnebian exegetic scholia on *Ai.*, *El.*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antig.*, i.e., the scholia *ἡ πεираθῆναι*, and those few Triclinian scholia from Turnebus on *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, which were reprinted by Brunck. Of course, ancient scholia on these three plays from Turnebus are omitted in Dindorf's edition of Byzantine scholia. In sporadic cases, Dindorf corrected Turnebian scholia on the basis of other Triclinian sources.

The ancient scholia were then published²⁹ by Papageorgius (1888) who recollated the Laurentian L and sporadically used also some other *veteres*. The importance of G, stressed already by Din-

with an asterisk prefixed. The Jena scholia were reprinted, in smaller type, in the first edition of Carolus Gottlob Erfurdt, *Sophoclis tragoediae septem ac deperditarum fragmenta*, vol. 6: *Aiax* (Lipsiae, 1811) 137 ff.; vol. 2: *Electra* (1803) 125 ff.

²⁷ *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoediis septem. E codice ms. Laurentiano descripsit Petrus Elmsley* (Oxonii, 1825). This is a posthumous edition by Thomas Gaisford.

²⁸ See above, note 19.

²⁹ *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoediis vetera e codice Laurentiano denuo collato* edidit Petrus N. Papageorgius (Lipsiae, 1888). — Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Einleitung in die attische Tragödie* 203, note 165, rightly criticized the idea of editing the Sophocles scholia from L only.

dorf³⁰ who also pointed out its agreement with Suda,³¹ was recently revealed in the very fruitful research of Vittorio De Marco.³² He proved that the mss. G, M (Modena a.T.9.4, once II B 4), and R (Vatic. gr. 2291, once Chigi R VIII 59), form one family related to the source of Suda's Sophoclean quotations (both in text and scholia), and independent from L. We shall call this family *Roman* tradition, to distinguish it from the *Laurentian* tradition. It is worth while to note that in the scholia the Roman family shows traces of some intervention by Tzetzes — probably Ioannes Tzetzes.³³

2. IDENTIFICATION OF THE MAIN BYZANTINE RECENSIONS

I shall now leave aside the rather unimportant scholia Barocci (ὧ νιέ) and the Jena scholia (or scholia ἀναρμοστίαν), and shall concentrate on the very popular and widespread scholia οἰκείως, and on the scholia ἡ περπαθῆναι, and endeavor to detect their authors. I shall have to determine the rôle of Demetrius Triclinius and his predecessors Manuel Moschopulus and Thomas Magistros whose activities in the field of Sophoclean studies have been mentioned on several occasions on the basis of manuscript evidence.³⁴ Let us proceed carefully with the analysis of the different sets of scholia without being unduly influenced by the traditional statements concerning their authorship.

First, we shall subject to our analysis the scholia ἡ περπαθῆναι extending in Turnebus through the tetrad (*Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antig.*). It is very important to note that these exegetic scholia appear in the ms. T only for *Antigone*, while the three plays *Aiax*,

³⁰ Dindorf pp. v and 75 ff. (collation of G for the scholia).

³¹ Cf. also Guilelmus Kausch, *De Sophoclis fabularum apud Suidam reliquiis* (Diss. Halis Saxonum, 1883); Paulus Jahn, *Quaestionum de scholiis Laurentianis in Sophoclem prima pars qua agitur de ratione quae inter Suidam et librum Laurentianum intercedit* (Diss. Berolini, 1884). Cf. below, note 71. For Suda, references are made to the edition: *Suidae Lexicon* edidit Ada Adler (*Lexicographi Graeci* vol. 1) 1–5 (Lipsiae, 1928–1938).

³² Vittorio De Marco, "Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii sofoclei," *SIFC* N.S. 13 (1936) 3–44; De Marco, "De scholiis in Sophoclis tragoedias veteribus," *MAL* Anno 334 (1937) ser. VI, vol. 6.2 (= pp. 105–228) (Roma, 1937), with a collation of the mss. GMR for the scholia.

³³ Cf. Dindorf 37, 46, 98; De Marco, *SIFC* N.S. 13 (1936) 11. A scholium of Tzetzes on *Aiax* 694 ff. appears in the ms. Naples II.F.9 (see below, p. 116), fol. 154^v. This scholium is written by a different hand and has an authorship mark τζέρζου in the margin. For new publications on Tzetzes, cf. Carl Wendel in *RE* s.v. "Tzetzes"; Silvio Giuseppe Mercati, "Giovanni Tzetzes e Michele Hapluchein," *Byzantion* 18 (1946–1948) 197–206.

³⁴ Cf. Dindorf 404 ff.; Turyn, *Traditio* 2 (1944) 2.

Electra, *Oed. Tyr.*, are accompanied in T by Triclinian metrical scholia and actually Triclinian scholia mostly resulting from metrical considerations, and only sporadically with some exegetic scholia from that set ἡ πεираθῆναι printed in Turnebus. I looked for manuscripts with exegetic scholia ἡ πεираθῆναι and did find some of them. As I said before, their correct beginning is ἡγουν πεираθῆναι (Turnebus did not know and misread the abbreviation for ἡγουν). Perhaps the best of those mss. supplied with the scholia ἡγουν πεираθῆναι is:

Z = Venice graec. 472 (No. di collocazione 766). Paper, XIVth cent., 23 × 14 cm., 216 foll.³⁵ — 93^r *Aiax*; 120^v arg. to *El.* (ὀπóκειται) by a later hand; 121^r *Electra*; 150^v–183^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 184^r–187^v blank; 188^r–212^v *Antigone*. Exegetic (marginal and interlinear) scholia on the four plays which begin thus:³⁶ schol. *Ai.* 2 ἡγουν πεираθῆναι κτλ.; schol. *El.* 1 αὐτη ἡ γενικὴ κτλ.; schol. *Oed. Tyr.* 2 εἰκότως ἐνταῦθα εἶπε τὸ μοι· διὰ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκάθηντο. 3 ἐστεφανωμένοι· οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν χερσὶν ἔφερον κτλ.; schol. *Antig.* 4 πάντα τὰ οὔτε τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν τῷ οὐδὲν κτλ. I should like to name a few more mss. which are closely related to Z.

Za = Florence, plut. 31, 8. Paper, XIVth cent., 138 × 127 mm., 244 foll. — 129^r *Aiax*; 160^v–182^v *Electra* (1–895). Scholia on the two plays begin *Ai.* 2 ἡγουν τὸ πεираθῆναι.

Zb = Munich graec. 500. Paper, XV/XVIth cent., 215 × 145 mm., 183 foll. Written by the same hand as the ms. Munich graec. 313, i.e., by Adolphus Probus Phrisius.³⁷ — 1^r *Aiax*; 26^r *Antig.*; 47^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 73^r–97^v *Electra*. Scholia on the four plays begin *Ai.* 2 (ἡγουν πεираθῆναι — προλαβεῖν om.) ζητοῦντα τῷ πρὶν κτλ.

Zc = Vatic. graec. 1333. Paper, XIVth cent., 215 × 140 mm., III + 179 + III foll. The ms. shows two portions written by different hands. The former one, 1^r–7^r, contains *Aiax* 1–227 (with-

³⁵ Cf. C. O. Zuretti, *Scolii al Pluto ed alle Rane d'Aristofane dal Codice Veneto 472 e dal Codice Cremonese 12229*, L. 6, 28 (Torino, 1890) 11 (= *RFIC* 18 [1890] 411). The Aristophanes portion in Venice 472 is also Thoman: cf. Zuretti, *Scolii* 84 ff. (= *RFIC* 18 [1890] 524 ff.). For Aristophanes scholia from this ms., cf. also W. I. W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanis Plutum et Nubes vetera, Thomae Magistri, Demetrii Triclinii nec non anonyma recentiora partim inedita* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1927).

³⁶ In quoting texts from manuscripts, I add iota subscript if it is missing. Proper nouns are capitalized; meaningless differences in accentuation, breathings, and punctuation, and meaningless differences or errors in spellings are disregarded (unless for some reason I want to reproduce the ms. most closely). For critical signs, see below, p. 130.

³⁷ Cf. Marie Vogel und Victor Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 33 [Leipzig, 1909]) 8.

out scholia) with a text related to the Moschopulean recension; it was probably intended to supplement the missing beginning of the main codex and can be, therefore, disregarded as an extraneous addition. The main body of the codex, written by another hand, contains: 8^r–37^v *Aiax* (227–end); 39^r–78^r *Electra*; 79^v *Oed. Tyr.* 1–15 supplemented by a different hand; 80^r–117^v *Oed. Tyr.* (16–end); 118^r–150^v *Antigone*. This main Sophocles portion of the codex has scholia of the group ἡγουν πειραθῆναι beginning with the scholium on *Aiax* 232 τοὺς τὰ ποίμνια φυλάσσοντας κύνας κτλ.

Zd = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2795. Paper, XVth cent., 215 × 130 mm., 255 foll. The beginning is missing. — 1^r–37^v *Aiax* (31–end); 37^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 38^r–78^r *Electra*; 79^r–120^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 121^r–122^v *Antig.* 1–68. There are, on the three plays, scholia of the group ἡγουν πειραθῆναι, which begin with the scholium on *Aiax* 32 κατὰ τινα μὲν σημειοῦμαι κτλ.

Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2812 A. Paper, XVIth cent., 220 × 148 mm., 295 foll. — 100^r *Vita*; 101^v arg. to *Aiax*; 103^r *Aiax*; 144^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 144^v–190^r *Electra*. Byzantine scholia. A different hand supplemented the folios 141–148 (*Aiax* 1326 — *Electra* 132). The ms. divides into two parts. The former one, extending *Aiax* 1–1355, follows the recension ἡγουν πειραθῆναι and is marked by me with the symbol Ze (only for this part). The latter part comprising *Aiax* 1356 — *Electra* embraced the Jena family. The scholia of Ze begin with the scholium on *Aiax* 2 ἡγουν πειραθῆναι. In the latter part, scholia begin with the Jena scholium on *Electra* 137 ἀλλὰ οὐδαμῶς, φησὶν, ἀναστήσεις κτλ. (cf. Erfurdt, *Sophocles* 2 [1803] 159).

I shall use the ms. Venice 472 (Z) as the best representative of the scholia ἡγουν πειραθῆναι. In our search for clues which may lead to the discovery of the authorship of these scholia, we should examine some cross references in this group pointing to other Byzantine scholia.³⁸ Thus, in the group ἡγουν πειραθῆναι, we read in a scholium on *Oed. Tyr.* 21 (cf. p. 279.11 Dindorf; for reasons of documentary reliability, I quote from Z fol. 150^v): ὅπως δὲ ἐποιοῦν τὴν μαντείαν διὰ πυρός, ἐν Αἰσχύλῳ ἐρρέθη εἰς τοὺς Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβαις. Then, in a scholium on *Oed. Tyr.* 866 (cf. p. 298.25 Dindorf; Z fol. 168^v): τινὲς ἀγνοοῦντες οὐρανίας λέγουσι διὰ τὸ διὰ τὸ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁμοιον τῷ

³⁸ Two of these cross references were noticed by Cornelius Marinus Francken, *De antiquarum Aeschylī interpretationum ad genuinam lectionem restituendam usu et auctoritate* (Diss. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1845) p. XII. However, Francken did not evaluate properly the problem of the authorship of the scholia in question.

παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ (Aesch. *Septem* 206) "ἱππικῶν τ' αὐπνῶν πηδαλίων διὰ στόμα." ἔφαμεν δὲ ἐκεῖ τὸν περὶ τούτου λόγον. Finally, we read in a scholium on *Antig.* 1009 (cf. p. 322.17 Dindorf; Z fol. 207^r): ὅτι δὲ μετὰ τῶν μηρῶν καὶ τὴν χολὴν τοῦ ζώου καὶ τὴν κύστιν παρετίθουν, ἀκριβῶς ἐν Αἰσχύλῳ εἶπομεν εἰς τοὺς Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβαις.

It is entirely clear that the author of the scholia refers to his own commentary on Aeschylus which he wrote previously. We know of two famous scholars of the Palaeologi era who made commented editions of Aeschylus:³⁹ Thomas Magistros and Demetrius Triclinius. This narrows down the authorship of these cross references to those two names. Now the scholium on *Oed. Tyr.* 21 refers⁴⁰ obviously to a scholium of the ⁴¹ class B on Aesch. *Septem* 25 — to a Thoman scholium, which I shall, just for reasons of documentary evidence, quote from a Thoman codex⁴² of Aeschylus (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Selden Supra 18 fol. 35^v): τὸ ἐν ὥσὶ καὶ φρεσὶ λέγει, ἐπειδὴ τυφλὸς ὢν ἡρώτα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα, πῶς οἱ ὄρνιθες ἵπτανται, καὶ παρ' αὐτῆς ἀκούων ἐλογίζετο κατὰ νοῦν καὶ τὰς μαντείας ἐποίει. τὸ δὲ πυρὸς δίχα εἶπε πρὸς τὸ συναγόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν ὥσὶ καὶ φρεσὶ νωμῶν χρηστηρίου ὄρνιθας, ἔν' ἧ ὁ δι' ὄρνιθων μαντενόμενος καὶ οὐ διὰ πυρὸς.⁴³ The next scholium on Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 866 refers manifestly to the likewise Thoman scholium on Aesch. *Septem* 206 (p. 160 line 11 from the bottom Schütz; *Schol. Aesch.* p. 324.24–325.2 Dindorf) which I quote here from the ms. Selden Supra 18 fol. 40^v (it refers to the line ἱππικῶν τ' αὐπνῶν πηδαλίων διὰ στόμα): τῶν (ita legendum: τοὺς cod.) μὴ τοὺς ἵππους ἐόντων ἡρεμεῖν ἀλλ' ἐλαυνόντων πρὸς δρόμον {τῶν ἵππων}, καθάπερ τὴν ναῦν τὰ πηδάλια· ἔστι δὲ τὸ διὰ στόμα πρὸς τὸ πηδαλίων (-άλιον cod.).^{43b} (This construction with accusative — διὰ στόμα — is quoted to support the reading οὐρανίαν δι' αἰθέρα in Sophocles.) Finally, the scholium on *Antig.* 1009 refers⁴⁴ probably to the Thoman scholium on Aesch. *Septem* 230 (p. 163 line 8 from the bottom Schütz; *Schol. Aesch.* p. 327.10 Dindorf) — ms. Selden Supra 18 fol. 41^r: Τὸ σφάγια καὶ χρηστήρια ἐκ παραλλήλων· οὐ γὰρ μόνον χρηστήρια τὰ μαντεύματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ θύματα· ἢ ὅτι θύοντες τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ αὐτῶν περὶ του δεόμενοι

³⁹ Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 13, 67 ff., 102 ff.

⁴⁰ Cf. Francken, *loc. cit.*

⁴¹ Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 13.

⁴² Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 73.

⁴³ Cf. Chr. Godofr. Schütz, *Aeschyli Tragoediae* 4 (Halaë, 1821) 139 line 5 from the bottom; G. Dindorf, *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites* 3 (Oxonii, 1851) 303.28.

^{43b} Cf. below, note 47.

⁴⁴ Cf. Ludovicus Casp. Valckenaer, *Euripidis tragoedia Phoenixae* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1802) 378 f.

τὰς μαντείας δεχόμεθα, ἥ ὅτι μέρος μαντικῆς ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ διὰ σφαγίων τὰς μαντείας ποιεῖσθαι, ὁρῶντας τὴν τοῦ ζῶου χολὴν καὶ τὸ ἥπαρ καὶ τὴν κύστιν.

On the basis of this evidence, we can claim with positive certainty that the man who wrote the Sophoclean scholia ἤγουν πειραθῆναι and referred in them to some Thoman scholia on Aeschylus as to his own was nobody else but Thomas Magistros himself. This is a very momentous inference, for it corrects the fallacy initiated by Turnebus — and lasting up to now — that the scholia ἤγουν πειραθῆναι (last reprinted by Dindorf as Triclinian) are Triclinian. The above demonstration at last identifies concretely or palpably the Thoman ἔκδοσις of Sophocles, which included a commented edition of *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Antigone* — and the remaining plays without scholia, as we shall see later. Hitherto we knew, by some indirect references, that Thomas Magistros made an edition of Sophocles, but only now we are in a position to lay our hands upon it.

I should like to corroborate the above proof by some additional discussion, in order to forestall any possible attempt to confuse the issue. E.g., the scholia on Aesch. *Septem*, quoted above, actually appear⁴⁶ also in the famous codex T of Aeschylus,⁴⁶ the Naples autograph of Triclinius, ms. Naples II.F.31, on fol. 44^v, 51^r, 51^v, respectively, with some interesting changes, as was customary with Triclinius.⁴⁷ It is generally known that in his Naples ms. of Aeschylus Triclinius incorporated, in the Aeschylean triad, the Thoman scholia on *Prometheus*, *Septem*, *Persae*, into his edition and distinguished them as Thoman by an initial capital projected from the left vertical line of the scholia column.⁴⁸ Now all those three scholia on Aesch. *Septem*, referred to above, are written in the Naples ms. in that special way (with an initial capital projected

⁴⁶ This was guessed correctly by Francken p. xii f., but with erroneous implications.

⁴⁶ Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 102 ff., especially 106; Lidia Massa Positano, "Osservazioni sull'edizione eschilea di Demetrio Triclinio," *Dioniso* N.S. 10 (1947) 247 ff.; Positano, *Demetrii Triclinii in Aeschyli Persas scholia* nunc primum editum — (*Collana di Studi Greci* diretta da Vittorio De Falco [Napoli, 1948]) 5 ff.

⁴⁷ E.g., in the scholium on Aesch. *Septem* 230, Triclinius inserts after τὰ θύματα the following words (Naples II.F.31 fol. 51^v): ὡς καὶ παρὰ σοφοκλεῖ (Soph. *Ai.* 220) · κείνου χρηστήρια τάνδρος. The scholium on Aesch. *Septem* 207 is quoted by Triclinius in a corrected and enlarged form (Naples II.F.31 fol. 51^r): 'Αύπνων· τῶν μὴ τοὺς ἵππους ἐώντων ἡρεμεῖν· ἀλλ' ἑλανόντων πρὸς δρόμον καθάπερ τὴν ναῦν τὰ πηδάλια. ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ διὰ στόμα πρὸς τὸ πηδάλιον· οὐ πρὸς τὸ χαλινῶν ὡς οἰονταί τινες.

⁴⁸ This was observed by Herbert Weir Smyth, "The Commentary on Aeschylus' *Prometheus* in the Codex Neapolitanus," *HSPH* 32 (1921) 93. Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 106.

to the left) which is characteristic for *Thoman* scholia. Thus we have here an additional proof that the Aeschylean scholia to which the author of the scholia *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι* refers as to his own are actually *Thoman*. There will be, in the further course of our discussion, some more confirmation of the fact that the Sophoclean scholia *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι* on the four plays are *Thoman*.

As a matter of fact, Thomas' authorship for the most scholia on *Electra* of the Turnebian group was correctly stated, on stylistic grounds, by Theodor Hopfner⁴⁹ who analyzed those scholia on *Electra* with stylistic criteria — a method which was originally initiated by Karl Lehrs and then elaborated in a more correct way by Konrad Zacher and Hopfner.⁵⁰

Let us turn our attention to another Byzantine (i.e., different from LGMR) recension of Sophocles which exhibits a peculiar conglomeration of the *Thoman* scholia *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι* with the group *οἰκείως* and some other scholia. We are going to examine the most important and fullest manuscript of these joint scholia.⁵¹ It is a manuscript which strangely enough went almost unnoticed up to now:

Ta = Venice graec. 470 (No. di collocazione 824). Parchment, XVth cent., 35 × 24 cm., 303 foll. — 119^r Triclinian *Vita* (i.e., agreeing with T), headlined *γένος σοφοκλέους καὶ βίος· διωρθώθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου*; 119^v *ὑπόθεσις τοῦ δράματος* — argument to *Aiāx*, Triclinian, incomplete because the following folio is missing (the argument ends at the bottom of fol. 119^v [p. 26.21 Dind.]) *ἐξ ὁργῆς καὶ λύπης ἄκρας, οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπονται. ὃ δὴ καὶ*;

⁴⁹ Theodor Hopfner, *Die thomano-triklinischen Scholien zu Sophokles Elektra* (*Jahresbericht des k. k. Staats-Gymnasiums mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache in Prag-Neustadt, Graben über das Schuljahr 1912–1913* [Prag, 1913] 3–28); cf. especially 25–28. An analogous idea was implied in a general way, for the Turnebian scholia on Sophocles, by Zacher, *op. cit.* (below, note 50) 600.

⁵⁰ Cf. K. Lehrs, *Die Pindarscholien. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur philologischen Quellenkunde* (Leipzig, 1873); Konrad Zacher, "Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband 16 (Leipzig, 1888) 501–746, especially 615 ff.; Theodor Hopfner, "Thomas Magister, Demetrios Triklinios, Manuel Moschopoulos. Eine Studie über ihren Sprachgebrauch in den Scholien zu Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Hesiod, Pindar und Theokrit," *SAWW Phil.-hist. Kl. 172. Band, 3. Abhandlung* (Wien, 1912); also cf. Karl Holzinger, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu den spätbyzantinischen Aristophanesscholien," *Charisteria Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht* (Reichenberg, 1930) 58–85; Holzinger, "Vorstudien zur Beurteilung der Erklärertätigkeit des Demetrios Triklinios an den Komödien des Aristophanes," *SAWW Phil.-hist. Kl. 217. Band, 4. Abhandlung* (Wien-Leipzig, 1939).

⁵¹ Cf. Dindorf 404–407; Koster, *op. cit.* (above, note 35) 51 ff.

120^r *Aïax* headlined σοφοκλέους· αἴας μαστιγοφόρος, with scholia headlined τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ θωμᾶ τοῦ μαγίστρου, καὶ τοῦ μοσχοπούλου κυροῦ μαρουήλ, σχόλια· ὅτι ἔνθα ἐστὶ σταυρὸς, εἰς τοῦ μοσχοπούλου:— 140^v ὑπόθεσις ἡλέκτρας· διωρθώθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου (inc. ὑπόκειται); 140^v *Electra* with scholia headlined τοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου καὶ μοσχοπούλου σχόλια. In the text of *Electra*, lines 704–744 are omitted in the middle of 150^r, and *El.* 1006–1045 are omitted in 153^v, in both cases without any indication of the omission; probably in each case a leaf was missing in the source, which consequently we assume to have had 20 lines to a page. 159^v ὑπόθεσις οἰδίποδος διὰ στίχων, ἀριστοφάνους γραμματικοῦ, and ἄλλως (argument III to *Oed. Tyr.*); 160^r *Oed. Tyr.* with scholia headlined τοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου καὶ μοσχοπούλου σχόλια; 180^r ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ἐπὶ κολωνῷ οἰδίποδος· διωρθώθη δὲ καὶ αὕτη παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου (arg. I to *Oed. Col.*); 180^r *Oedipus Coloneus* with ancient scholia headlined ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν σχολίων; 203^v ὑπόθεσις ἀντιγόνης· διωρθώθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου (arg. III to *Antig.*); 204^r *Antigone* with scholia headlined τοῦ αὐτοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου σχόλια (inc. πάντα τὰ οὔτε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν τῷ οὐδέν); 221^v ἐκ τῆς ἀπολοδώρου βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ δράματος ἡ ὑπόθεσις (excerpt on *Trach.*); 222^r poem on *Labors of Heracles* (p. 24 Dindorf; *Anthol. Planud.* 16.92 [2.544 Dübner]); 222^v *Trachiniae*, with ancient scholia headlined ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν σχολίων; 239^v ὑπόθεσις τοῦ δράματος (prose argument to *Philoct.*); 240^r ἡ ὑπόθεσις ἔμμετρος (metrical argument); 240^r–258^v *Philoct.*, with ancient scholia headlined ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν σχολίων.

The poetic text of Ta agrees most closely with T, except for a part of *Philoctetes* where it follows another source. The ms. T is notoriously Triclinian, has the name of Triclinius marked on many scholia, and its text is boldly interpolated, especially in lyrical lines, which also points to Triclinius. The *Vita* in Ta is the same as in T (cf. *Vita Sophocl.*⁵² line 24 Westermann *ισχυροφωνίαν* TTa), the headlines of the arguments agree in TTa (only to the headline of the metrical argument to *Oed. Tyr.* the ms. T adds in the margin *διωρθώθη καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου*). The ancient scholia on *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Philoct.*, are headlined in the same way in TTa. *Exegetic* scholia if any on the other plays in T have no headlines.

First we shall consider in Ta the scholia on the tetrad: *Aïax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antigone*. According to the headline of the

⁵² I quote the lines of the *Vita* as they are numbered in Antonius Westermann, *Βιογραφοί. Vitarum scriptores graeci minores* (Brunsvigae, 1845) 126–132. Extremely valuable is the edition of the *Vita* by Otto Iahn — Adolf Michaelis, *Sophoclis Electra*³ (Bonnae, 1882) 1–22.

scholia on *Aiāx*, the commentary in that manuscript consists of Thoman and Moschopulean scholia, and Moschopulean scholia are said to be distinguished by a cross.⁵³ Though this explicit statement on the use of cross appears only at the beginning of the ms., it appears originally to hold good not only for *Aiāx*, but also for *Electra* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*, because actually throughout the triad crosses are used in the scholia of this ms. Offhand we should say that mistakes in the marking of scholia with a cross are very likely to have occurred among the copyists, and we should not be surprised if those marks oftentimes conflict with our findings on the authorship of a given scholium.

The joint scholia on the triad, which are stated to be Thomano-Moschopulean, consist mainly of a concatenation or connection of two sets of scholia. One set is the group *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι*, i.e., Thoman scholia. The other set appears to be the scholia *οἰκέως* (which we know from Johnson's edition where they are marked *L. B.*), the most frequent type of Byzantine scholia. A simple deduction will suffice to complete the analysis: if we subtract from the Thomano-Moschopulean mass of scholia the Thoman group *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι*, naturally the remainder — the scholia *οἰκέως* — will appear as the *Moschopulean* scholia. And this solves a very important problem of the authorship of the scholia *οἰκέως*.

We have, however, to note that in Ta there are — over the joint Moschopulean and Thoman scholia — also some Triclinian scholia: metrical ones and critical ones dealing with textual problems on the basis of metrical considerations. They appear likewise in T.

I am taking now the scholia of Venice 472 (my symbol Z) — the Thoman scholia *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι* — and, e.g., the Moschopulean scholia *οἰκέως* of the ms. Florence, Bibl. Laur., Conventi Soppressi 71 (my symbol X; for the description of the ms., cf. below, p. 128), as basis for identifying the components of the amalgamated scholia of Ta. Of course, Z, as I made it clear before, is a Thoman ms., while X by virtue of its scholia appears to be Moschopulean. The reader will notice immediately that the scholia of Ta tally exactly with the Turnebus scholia, not with those of T (this is a proof that Turnebus used another Triclinian ms. beside T). Now I shall quote below the scholia on *Aiāx* 1–33 from Ta marking at the same

⁵³ On the use of cross for distinction of authorship in Byzantine scholia, cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 106 note 92; Turyn, *Traditio* 2 (1944) 2.

time their appearance in X and Z, as the case may be. I am copying also crosses from Ta as they are marked there.

Schol. *Aiax* 1. + οἰκείως ἔχουσιν οἱ παρακείμενοι ἀντὶ ἐνεστῶτων λαμβάνεσθαι. οὐ μὴν πάντες οἱ^a παρακείμενοι οὕτω λαμβάνονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ μὲν οἱ ἐπὶ σημασίας ἐνεστῶτος λαμβάνονται ἀεί,^b ὡς ὁ δέδοικα, δέδρακα,^c πέφρικα, καὶ ἕτεροι· εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ ἐνεστῶτος λαμβάνονται, ἀλλ' ἀεί ἐπὶ παρεληλυθότος, ὡς ὁ πέπονθα, καὶ^d πεποίηκα, καὶ ἕτεροι. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἐνίστε μὲν ἐπὶ ἐνεστῶτος, ἐνίστε δὲ ἐπὶ παρεληλυθότος λαμβάνονται, ὡς ὁ πεποίημαι· οἶον πεποίημαί τινα φίλον· ἀντὶ^e τοῦ ποιοῦμαι ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐποιήσασθαι Ta; (*οἱ om.; ^bἀεί λαμβάνονται; ^cὡς ὁ δέδοικα, δέδοικα; ^dκαὶ om.; ^eἢ ἀντὶ) X. — Cf. Johnson, *Schol. Ined. L*(aud 54), *B*(odl. Auct.F.3.25); Dindorf 196.9–16. Scholia οἰκείως, Moschopulean.

2. + πεῖράν τιν' ἐχθρῶν:^f ἡγουν πειραθῆναι^g τῶν ἐχθρῶν καὶ ὧν κατὰ σοῦ μηχανῶνται προλαβεῖν ζητοῦντα τῷ, πρὶν ἢ παθεῖν, μαθεῖν καὶ φυλάξασθαι. ἢ οὕτως· ἀρπάσαι καὶ συντόμως λαβεῖν πείραν τῶν ἐχθρῶν, τί κατὰ σοῦ μηχανῶνται (^g τὸ πειρασθῆναι) Ta; (^flemma om.) Z. — Cf. Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 1; Dindorf 329.5. The cross prefixed in the scholium in Ta is, of course, false, because the scholium is Thoman (not Moschopulean). Scholia ἡγουν πειραθῆναι, Thoman.

2. + πειρώμαι σου καλοῦ· ἀντὶ τοῦ διὰ πείρας σε καταλαμβάνω καλόν.^h καὶ πειρώμαι τῆς γνώμης σου εἰⁱ μεταβέβληκεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ θέλω διὰ πείρας καταλαβεῖν αὐτήν. καὶ πειρώμαι βλάπτειν σε· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιχειρῶ. ἀφ' ὧν πείρα ἦν δίδωσί τις τινι ἢ λαμβάνει· καὶ ἡ προσβολὴ καὶ ἡ ἐπιχείρησις, καθὸ λέγεται ἐνταῦθα (^h κακόν) Ta; (ⁱ εἰ μὴ) X. — Cf. Johnson, *Schol. Ined. L.B.*; Dindorf 196.17–22. Scholia οἰκείως, Moschopulean. The cross prefix is correct.

3. + σκηνὴ ἢ πρόσκαιρος κατοικία, ἣν Ὅμηρος κλισίην λέγει· ἡ^j ἢ τῶν δραματουργῶν σκηνή,^k ἡγουν τὰ προσωπεῖα, καὶ^l οἱ ἐμβάται,^m καὶⁿ αἱ τοιαῦται^o στολαὶ καὶ τᾶλλα. ἀπὸ τούτου^p σκηνὴ καὶ^q πᾶσα ἡ^r ὑπόκρισις καὶ ὑπουλότης (^mἐμβάται in spatio vacuo om.) Ta; (ⁱἡ] καὶ; ^kσκενή; ^lκαὶ om.; ⁿκαὶ om.; ^oτοιαίδε; ^pκαὶ ἀπὸ τούτων; ^qκαὶ om.; ^rἡ om.) X. — Cf. Johnson, *Schol. Ined. L.B.*; Dindorf 196.24–26. Scholia οἰκείως, Moschopulean. The cross prefix is correct.

4. τάξιν ἐσχάτην:^s ὅτι ἐν μὲν τῷ^t ἐνὶ μέρει Ἀχιλλεύς ἦν τοῦ στρατοῦ, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄλλῳ Αἴας οὐτοσί, ἵνα ὡς κρείττους τῶν ἄλλων τὴν ἰσχὺν φύλακες ὦσιν· ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταξύ Ἀγαμέμνων καὶ Μενέλαος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ στρατηγοί Ta; (^slemma om.; ^tscholium incipit ἐν γὰρ τῷ) Z. — Cf. Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 1; Dindorf 329.6–9. Scholia ἡγουν πειραθῆναι, Thoman.

(Scholia of the group οἰκείως on *Aiax* 10 [p. 197.3–8 Dindorf],

and on *Aiax* 12 [p. 197.13–18 Dindorf] ἔργον ἢ πρᾶξις κτλ., which are extant in X, are missing in Ta.)

17. *Τυρσηνικῆς*: τούτων γὰρ αἱ σάλπιγγες κρείττους τῶν παρ' ἐτέροις εὐρημένων ἢ ὅτι πρῶτοι Τυρσηνοὶ τὴν σάλπιγγα εὗρον. αἱ τῶν Τυρσηνῶν σάλπιγγες ἐξαιρετόν τι τῶν παρ' ἐτέροις εὐρημένων ἀπετέλουν^u μέλος, ὡς μόνον ἀκούσαντά τινα γινῶναι Τυρσηνικὴν εἶναι τὴν ἡχοῦσαν σάλπιγγα. λέγει οὖν καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐνταῦθα πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηναίαν ὄντως ἀκούω τὸ σὸν φῶνμα εὐμαθὲς καὶ εὐκατάληπτον, καὶ ὁξέως νοῶ ὅτι σὸν ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ ἀθάνατος ὑπάρχεις, ὥσπερ καταλαμβάνω τὸ φῶνμα τῆς Τυρσηνικῆς σάλπιγγος, ἀκούων ἡχοῦσαν αὐτὴν δηλονότι Ta (^uἀποτελεῖ Ta: ἀπετέλουν Vienna philol. gr. 163, Turnebus). Similarly Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 1 (Dindorf 329.18–26). This scholium is much shorter in Z: (lemma om.) τούτων γὰρ αἱ σάλπιγγες κρείττους τῶν παρ' ἐτέροις εὐρημένων ἢ ὅτι πρῶτοι Τυρσηνοὶ σάλπιγγας εὗρον Z. — The scholium, which originally belonged to the Thoman set ἡγουν πειραθῆναι, is quite enlarged in Triclinius.

19. τὸ σακεσφόρῳ: οὐχ ὀπλοφόρῳ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐξοχὴν ἐξαιρετον γὰρ εἶχεν ὁ Αἴας τὸ σάκος Ta; (^v lemma om.) X. — This scholium should have been marked with a cross, because it is a Moschopulean scholium of the group *οἰκείως*, since it appears in X. Johnson, by mistake, printed it among the Triclinian scholia (after Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 2), and did not quote it in the group *οἰκείως* of his *Schol. Ined.* (as he should have done, considering that this scholium is extant in his mss. *L.B.*). That is the reason why it appears only among the Turnebus scholia in Dindorf 329.27–28.

21. ἄσκοπον: ἀνέλπιστον, ἀκατάληπτον· οὐ γὰρ ἔστι συνιέναι τίνας χάριν ἐποίησεν Ta; (^w lemma om.) Z. — Cf. Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 2; Dindorf 329.29–30. *Scholia* ἡγουν πειραθῆναι, Thoman.

22. περαίνειν τὸ τελειοῦν καὶ τὸ συνουσιάζειν Ta. The scholium in X, pertaining to ἔχει περάνας, is fuller: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπέρανεν περαίνειν τὸ τελειοῦν καὶ τὸ συνουσιάζειν X. — Cf. Johnson, *Schol. Ined. L.B.*; Dindorf 197.21. *Scholia* *οἰκείως*, Moschopulean (this scholium should have been marked with a cross in Ta).

23. + ἀλῶμαι τὸ πλανῶμαι· ἀφ' οὗ ἄλη ἢ πλάνη· καὶ ἀλύνει τὸ ἐν τινι χρεῖα γενόμενόν τινα ἀπορεῖν. καὶ ἀλύουσα κόμη ἢ ἀτακτοῦσα καὶ πλανωμένη TaX. — Cf. Johnson, *Schol. Ined. L.B.*; Dindorf 197.27–29. *Scholia* *οἰκείως*, Moschopulean. The presence of the cross prefix confirms the Moschopulean authorship of the scholium.

24. + ὑπεξύγην: ὑπῆλθον· ἀπὸ τῶν ζώων τῶν ὑπὸ τῷ ζυγῷ δουλευόντων Ta; (^x lemma om.; ^yἡγουν ὑπῆλθον) X. — *Scholia* *οἰκείως*, Moschopulean. The cross is prefixed correctly. The scholium was errone-

ously printed only among Triclinian scholia by Johnson (after Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 2), and by Dindorf 330.4–5.

32. καὶ τὰ μὲν² κατὰ τινα μὲν σημειοῦμαι ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ δράσας, κατὰ τινα δὲ εἰς ἔκπληξιν πίπτω καὶ ἀπορίαν, οὐ δυνάμενος συνιέναι τὸν δράσαντα. σώφρων γὰρ Αἴας. τὸ δ' ἔργον τουτὶ μαινομένου καὶ^a παραπλήγος. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὰ μὲν τῶν ἰχνῶν οὐ καλῶς λέγουσιν^b Ta; (^alemma om.; ^aμαινομένου καὶ om.; ^bοὐ καλῶς λέγουσιν] ψεύδονται) Z. — Cf. Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 2; Dindorf 330.6–10. Scholia ἤγουν πειραθῆναι, Thoman.

33. + οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποτακτικοῦ ἄρθρου τῆς γενικῆς τῶν ἐνικῶν τοῦ οὐ καὶ ἀντὶ^c ὑποτακτικοῦ τῆς δοτικῆς τοῦ ᾧ, τὸ ὅτου λέγουσι καὶ τὸ ὅτω, συντιθέντες τὰ προτακτικὰ ἄρθρα, τὸ τοῦ καὶ τὸ τῷ, μετὰ τοῦ ὁ. τοῦτοις ἀκολουθήσαντες ποιηταὶ^d καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πληθυντικῶν τοῦτο ποιοῦσι· λέγουσι γὰρ ὅτων ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦντινων· ^δο μόνον καὶ παρὰ ῥήτορσιν εὔρηται^e καὶ ὁτέοις ἀντὶ τοῦ οἴσισιν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν αἰτιατικῶν οὐδέποτε τὸ τοιοῦτο γίνεται, οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς (^eδ Turnebus, Vienna philol. 163: οὐ Ta)Ta; (^cἀντὶ τοῦ; ^dοὶ ποιηταί; ^eδ μόνον — εὔρηται om.) X. — Cf. Johnson, *Schol. Ined. L.B.*; Dindorf 197.34–198.7. Scholia οἰκείως, Moschopulean. The cross prefix in Ta is correct.

I am concluding here my sample test. To be sure, there are, within the portions analyzed, many more Moschopulean scholia in the group οἰκείως and many more Thoman scholia in the group ἤγουν πειραθῆναι, appearing, e.g., in X or Z respectively — scholia which were not included in the scholia Ta. But the basic situation is this: the ms. Ta gives a conglomeration or concatenation of selected — and occasionally modified — scholia from the group ἤγουν πειραθῆναι and the group οἰκείως. The combined mass is presented as Thomano-Moschopulean scholia. Since we know that the group ἤγουν πειραθῆναι represents Thoman scholia, the scholia οἰκείως obviously are Moschopulean, and the numerous manuscripts with scholia οἰκείως are just vehicles of the Moschopulean recension.

I should like to make a few more remarks on the ms. Venice 470 (Ta). Its agreement, in the poetic text, with T, the well-known representative of the Triclinian tradition, is striking. Ta has likewise, as does T, those famous Triclinian metrical scholia, e.g., on *Aias* 134: Τελαμῶνι παῖ: τὰ τοιαῦτα εἶδη τῶν χορῶν καλεῖται συστηματικὰ ἐξ ὁμοίων κτλ. (Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 4; Dindorf 383 f.). Ta also has scholia on textual criticism of a given passage based on metrical considerations which are a Triclinian feature, e.g., the scholium on *Aias* 160 (Turnebus, *Scholia* p. 4; Dindorf 334.19–26):

this scholium appears both in T and Ta. The text reading *Aiax* 161 μικρῶν or the deletion of ἀναξ in *Aiax* 166 — as announced in that scholium — appear both in T and Ta. The inference is clear: the edition represented in Ta is the Triclinian edition. Triclinius not only made up, in his commentary, the combination of Thoman and Moschopulean scholia, he also selected and modified them occasionally. He used the Sophocles *Vita* of Thomas and the arguments from the Thoman edition, according to the headlines of Triclinian mss., but he modified or retouched them here and there. Triclinius also included metrical scholia and notes in his well-known style⁵⁴ and supplied the text — as shown both in T and Ta — with his metrical signs, like παράγραφος, διπλῇ, κορωνίς.⁵⁵

Our basic conclusion that the scholia ἤγουν πειραθῆναι are Thoman is corroborated also by the fact that in Ta the scholia on *Antigone* which agree with those of Z — i.e., which belong to the group ἤγουν πειραθῆναι — are headlined in Ta fol. 204^r: τοῦ αὐτοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου σχόλεα (inc. πάντα τὰ οὔτε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν τῷ οὐδὲν TaZ). Of course, Moschopulus commented only the triad, so that for *Antigone* Triclinius could rely only on the scholia of Thomas. Let us note that Thomas, according to the evidence quoted, commented the tetrad: *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antigone*.

In connection with the type of edition represented in Ta, I should like to mention that, of course, there are some other Triclinian mss. of similar appearance, with Thomano-Moschopulean scholia (though Ta is unique in its completeness). One of those Triclinian mss. was

Tb = Dresden Da. 21. Bombycine, XIVth cent., small 4to, 192 foll. Cf. Dindorf 404–408. This ms. contained: Triclinian metrical introductory matter; *Vita*; *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Antigone* — with Thomano-Moschopulean and Triclinian scholia. The ms. was destroyed during the last war.⁵⁶ It had an additional distinction (through color of ink) for Triclinian scholia (I quote the following from Dindorf): 6^r τὰ περὶ τῶν μέτρων Δημητρίου ἐστὶ Τρικλινίου καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα διὰ μέλανος ἔχουσι κεφάλαια.⁵⁷ Then: κυροῦ

⁵⁴ Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 112 note 105.

⁵⁵ Cf. Dindorf 386.

⁵⁶ Cf. above, note 1.

⁵⁷ Probably this word (illegible to Dindorf) stood there. On Triclinian scholia on Pindar beginning with black capitals, cf. Πινδαρου, Ολυμπια. Πυθια. Νεμεα. Ισθμια. Μετὰ ἐξηγήσεως παλαιᾶς πάνυ ὠφελίμου, καὶ σχολίων ὁμοίων. *Impressi Romae per Zachariam Calergi Cretensem* (Rome, 1515), fol. κ1^r Σχόλια νεωτέρων, beginning;

Θωμά τοῦ Μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου κυροῦ Μαγίστρου (by mistake, instead of Μανουήλ) σχόλια: ὅτι ἔνθα ἐστὶ σταυρὸς εἰσὶ τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου. This is an explicit statement on Triclinius' contribution to this comprehensive edition of the same type as represented also in Ta. There are a few other mss. of the same recension:

Tc = Vienna philosoph. philolog. graec. 163. Paper, XIVth cent., 222 × 145 mm., 341 foll. — 109^r *Aiax*. Scholia are headlined τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ θωμά τοῦ μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ μοσχοπούλου κυροῦ μανουήλ σχόλια: ὅτι ἔνθα ἐστὶ σταυρὸς εἰσὶ τοῦ μοσχοπούλου. 160^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 161^r–192^v *Electra* (1–1017); 193^r–237^r *Oed. Tyr.* (60–123; 174–557; 590–end). Thomano-Moschopuleo-Triclinian scholia on the three plays. Cross mark used in the scholia.

Td = Vienna philos. philol. gr. 209. Paper, XIVth cent., 221 × 145 mm., 75 foll. — 1^r *Aiax*. Scholia are headlined τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ θωμά τοῦ μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ μοσχοπούλου κυροῦ μανουήλ σχόλια: ὅτι ἔνθα ἐστὶ σταυρὸς εἰσὶ τοῦ μοσχοπούλου. 36^r ὑπόθεσις ἡλέκτρας· διωρθώθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου (arg. to *El.*, inc. ὑπόκειται); 36^v τοῦ αὐτοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ μοσχοπούλου σχόλια; 37^r–75^v *Electra*. Thomano-Moschopuleo-Triclinian scholia on both plays (scholia end on 42^v and extend through *El.* 221).

Thus, with the aid of the Triclinian edition and its references to the authorship of scholia, we have succeeded in identifying separately the Thoman and the Moschopulean scholia. We shall see afterwards that while the Thoman edition commented only the four plays, it embraced most probably the text of all the seven plays. The argument to *Oed. Col.* is mentioned in manuscripts as revised by Thomas Magistros. And also *Trachiniae* and *Philoctetes* appear in a specific recension which points manifestly to Thomas Magistros' editorial activity.

There is an additional source which, on top of the previous evidence, once more confirms explicitly our statement on the Thoman authorship of the scholia *ἡγουν πειραθῆναι* and the Moschopulean authorship of the scholia *οἰκέως*. This is the ms. D, a very important manuscript permeated with the scholarship of the Planudean circle. It originated most probably among Planudes' disciples:

D = Naples II.F.9 (No. 165 in Cyrillus).⁵⁸ Paper, early XIVth

Eugenius Abel, *Scholia recentia in Pindari epinicia* 1 (Budapestini-Berolini, 1891) p. 49/50 footnote; Zacher, *op. cit.* (above, note 50) 622.

⁵⁸ Cf. Carlo Gallavotti, *SIFC* N.S. 11 (1934) 309 f.; Aubrey Diller, *ByzZ* 37 (1937) 297; Carl Wendel in *RE* s.v. "Planudes, Maximus" § 26; Hermann Schultz, *Die*

cent., 31 × 23 cm., 237 foll. — 141^r *Vita*; 141^v arg. to *Aiax*; 142^r *Aiax*; 167^r arguments to *Electra* (ὑπόκειται, and the metrical argument εἰπὲ ποῦ); 167^r *Electra*; 184^r arguments II and I, and enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 184^r–196^v *Oed. Tyr.* There are scholia on the three plays, being a collection of scholia of Manuel Moschopulus, Maximus Planudes, and Thomas Magistros, according to marginal authorship marks, the author's name marking a given scholium or a series of scholia. The scholia of Moschopulus and Planudes are written by the same hand as the poetic text, while Thoman scholia are added by a different hand. If in a given margin there appear simultaneously scholia both of Moschopulus and Planudes, they are then arranged separately in vertical columns so that the Planudean scholia are mostly in the outer column. Of course, as it happens in manuscripts of this kind, authorship marks are often omitted by inadvertence. It seems pertinent to describe with more detail the composition of the Naples scholia in some passages.

E.g., at the beginning of *Aiax* (142^r), in the upper margin above the scholia, we read: κυ(ροῦ) μα(νουήλ) τοῦ μοσχοπ(οῦ)λλ(ου). The first scholium (on *Aiax* 1) is: οἰκείως κτλ. It is followed by a few Moschopulean scholia (of the same group οἰκείως). Then, in reference to *Aiax* 14–19, there is a series of scholia marked — against their beginning line, in the outer margin — with μαξ, and — along their vertical side — with the word ὅλον written vertically. The explanation is clear: we have to understand μαξ as Μαξ(ίμου τοῦ Πλανούδη), in the same way as it happens in other texts carrying Planudean scholarship.⁵⁹ And, indeed, those scholia do not appear in *purely* Moschopulean manuscripts, and we have no reason to doubt the veracity of those marks, especially in a manuscript which originated, as it seems, in the school of Planudes. Some of the Planudean scholia appear, however, in a special branch of the Moschopulean tradition which we shall call Moschopuleo-Planudean family on account of those selected Planudean additions in the scholia.

On the next page (142^v), first we have the mark μα(νουήλ)

handschriftliche Überlieferung der Hesiod-Scholien (AGWG Philol.-hist. Kl., N.F. 12.4 [Berlin, 1910]) 16, 88; Carl Wendel, *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien* (AGWG Philol.-hist. Kl., N.F. 17.2 [Berlin, 1920]) 18, 22 f. On Planudes, cf. Carl Wendel, "Planudea," *ByzZ* 40 (1940) 406–445; Wendel in *RE* s.v. (I owe an offprint [1942] to the courtesy of the author; the pertinent volume of *RE* is due to appear in 1950). I had the benefit of discussing Planudes with two excellent experts on Planudes: Professor Ben E. Perry, my learned colleague at the University of Illinois, and Professor Aubrey Diller, of Indiana University.

⁵⁹ Cf. Gallavotti, *loc. cit.*; Diller, *loc. cit.*

opposite the Moschopulean scholium on *Aiax* 23 (p. 196.27–29 Dindorf ἀλωμαι κτλ.). Then follows the mark τοῦ αὐτοῦ (i.e., by Moschopulus) opposite the scholium on *Aiax* 33 (p. 197.34–198.7 Dindorf οἱ ἀττικοὶ κτλ.). Thereafter, there are marks μαξ opposite new scholia on *Aiax* 32 (on καὶ τὰ μὲν σημαίνομαι) and *Aiax* 34 (on τὰ τ' οὖν πάρος). On 143^r, there is the mark μα(νουήλ) against the Moschopulean scholium on *Aiax* 40 (p. 198.11–14 Dindorf) καὶ πρὸς τί' οἶον πρὸς ποῖον σκοπὸν κτλ. There follow two scholia: closer to the text, an unknown (Planudean?) scholium on *Aiax* 42 — and, on the outer side of the margin, the Moschopulean scholium on *Aiax* 42 (p. 198.16–20 Dindorf) ποίμναις ἐπεμπίπτει· ἀντὶ τοῦ κτλ., marked τοῦ αὐτοῦ (viz., by Moschopulus); also scholia pp. 198.30–31, 199.1–5 Dindorf (εὐφορον κτλ.). Then, written closer to the poetic text, there appears the ancient scholium on *Aiax* 52 (p. 6.23–7.5 Papageorgius) with a cross prefixed. Then, the name θωμ(ᾶ) μαγίστρου marks the scholium on *Aiax* 54 (p. 330.28–30 Dindorf) which actually belongs to the Thoman set ἤγουν πειραθῆναι and is exhibited in Z fol. 94^r. An ancient scholium on *Aiax* 56 follows with the mark μαξ. The Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 57 (p. 330.31–32 Dindorf) αὐτοχείρως — ἐπήνεγκε is written after this scholium, but lacks any mark. As I mentioned before, Thoman scholia are written in this ms. mostly by a different hand. The same hand added even from Tzetzes a scholium on *Aiax* 694 (154^v), with a marginal mark τζέτζου.⁶⁰ There is (142^v) a scholium on *Aiax* 34 written by the main hand in the inner part of the margin, enveloped in the outer part by a Planudean scholium, but marked in the margin with an illegible mark, which may be σημ(είωσαι) τζ(έτζου), though this reading is not entirely certain.⁶¹ The main hand wrote (153^r) a scholium on *Aiax* 596 marked πρόκλ(ου).

A similar condition prevails throughout the whole codex, although quite often authorship marks are dropped. The poetic

⁶⁰ Cf. above, note 33. Cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* (above, note 58) 88.

⁶¹ This reading of the marginal mark is tentatively proposed by Gallavotti (in a letter addressed to me). The scholium itself (on *Ai.* 34) reads (D fol. 142^v): ἀποροῦσί τινες ἐνταῦθα λέγοντες πῶς εἰπὼν τὰ τ' οὖν πάρος ἤγουν τὰ παρελθόντα τὰ τ' εἰσέπειτα ἤγουν τὰ μέλλοντα, τὰ ἐνεστώτα παρήκεν ὁ ποιητής. καὶ λέγομεν τοιάνδε λύσιν· ὅτι διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὸ πάρος ἐδήλωσε τὸν παρελθόντα χρόνον, διὰ δὲ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὸ ἔπειτα ἐδήλωσε τὸν μέλλοντα, προσθεὶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ἐδήλωσε τὸν ἐνεστώτα· καὶ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ ἔννοια τετελεσμένη ἢ μηδὲν ἐλλείπεις ἔχουσα (ἐχοντα D). λέγουσι δὲ ἄλλως τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν· ὅτι τοῦ πάρος, ἤγουν τοῦ παρελθόντος χρόνου, τὰ ἔπειτα τούτου τὰ ἐνεστώτα δηλοῖ καὶ ἀποδίδωσι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο πρὸς αὐτό. ἡμῖν δὲ οὐ λίαν ἀρέσκει τοῦτο. (Cf. Gustav Wolff, *Zeitschrift für Alterthumswissenschaft* 13 [1855] 71.)

text of the Naples ms. is quite peculiar. While it follows in many readings the Moschopulean text, yet it is not consistent and shows interpolations from many sources.

We even do not know what was the relative succession of Moschopulean and Planudean studies in Sophocles. Though Planudes was older and Moschopulus was his pupil and assistant, it is quite possible that Planudes wrote his commentary after Moschopulus as a kind of corollary to the Sophoclean work of his disciple.⁶² We can easily dismiss the *poetic* text of the Naples ms. from our consideration, especially so since we have no certainty that it represents *the* Planudean text of Sophocles, but we should dwell longer on the scholia of this manuscript. As the sample analyzed above shows, the Naples scholia represent a corpus of Moschopulean, Planudean, and Thoman scholia, with occasional admixture of scholia from other sources. It seems that it must have been compiled by some disciple of Planudes, a scholar who was thoroughly conversant with the Sophoclean research of that time. This corpus, through its authorship marks, provides us also with additional confirmation of our previous identification of Moschopulean and Thoman scholia.

It may be of interest to the reader to get some knowledge of at least a few samples of Planudean scholia. I should like to state again that some of the Planudean scholia were incorporated in a family of Moschopulean mss. — we shall call that family Moschopuleo-Planudean. A specimen of Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia was published, from the ms. Milan, Ambros. N 166 sup., by Dindorf pp. xvi–xviii. A very characteristic feature of those scholia is the Planudean scholium on *Aiax* 14 ἡ σύνταξις κτλ. — we shall therefore identify the mixed Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia with the term: scholia οἰκείως + σύνταξις. In the following, I quote Planudean marginal scholia as marked with the sign μαξ (unless I make a different statement) from the beginning of the ms. D:

Aiax 14. ὦ 'Αθηνᾶ, φιλάττη τῶν θεῶν τὸ ὑπερθετικὸν οἰκείουται τὴν γενικὴν τῶν πληθυντικῶν, τὴν δὲ δοτικὴν τὸ ὄνομα κατὰ φύσιν. φίλος μοι γάρ φαμεν οὕτω καὶ φιλατός μοι.

ἡ σύνταξις αὕτη· ὦ 'Αθηνᾶ, κἂν ᾗς ἄποπτος, ὅμως ἀκούω τὸ φώνημά σου εὐμαθές. εὐμαθὴς ἀκροατῆς ὁ τὰ μαθήματα εὐκόλως ἀναλαμβάνων. καὶ εὐμαθὴς λόγος ὁ εὐκόλως εἰς γνῶσιν ἐρχόμενος. ἐκ τούτου καὶ εὐμαθὲς φώνημα (φρόνημα D) τὸ ῥαδίως εἰς γνῶσιν ἐρχόμενον.

⁶² Cf. Wendel, *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien* 23.

15. ἀποπτος ὁ πόρρω τοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι. καὶ ἀποπτος τόπος, ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν στάντα πόρρω. οὕτως καὶ περίβλεπτος ὁ περιβλεπόμενος. καὶ περίβλεπτος, ἐξ οὗ ἔνεστι καὶ περιβλέπειν τοὺς ἐστῶτας.

16. ξυναρπάζω φρενί: καὶ οὐχὶ ἄλλω τινί: αὕτη γὰρ τῆς γνώσεως κριτήριον. τὸ ξυναρπάζω σημαίνει τὸ ἐτοίμως νοῆσαι.

17. ὅτι οἱ Τυρρηνοὶ πρῶτοι εὐρεταὶ τῆς σάλπιγγος, καὶ ὅτι ἐκεῖ χαλκὸς εὐήχος.

18. ἐπέγνωσ με κυκλοῦντα βάσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιοῦντα βάσιν, τουτέστιν ἐρχόμενον ὁδὸν περιοδικῶς, πολλάκις τὴν αὐτὴν περιοδεύοντα. τὸ κυκλοῦντα πρῶτης συζυγίας νοητέον καὶ οὐχὶ τρίτης. τὸ κυκλῶ κυκλῶ εἰς ἄλλην σημασίαν θετέον, οἷον ἐκύκλωσαν οἱ πολέμοι τὴν πόλιν. κυκλέω δὲ τὸ πολλάκις τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπαναστρέφω.

32. καὶ τὰ μὲν σημαίνομαι: ἀντὶ τοῦ σημειοῦμαι καὶ οἰονεὶ διὰ σημείων τούτων ἐνάγομαι πρὸς τὸ φονέα εἶναι τὸν Αἴαντα. τὰ δὲ ἐκτέπληγμαι: εἰς τινα δὲ ἀπορῶ, διστάζω τίς ἄρα εἴη ὁ τάδε δράσας καὶ οὐκ ἔχω μαθεῖν τίνος. ἐγκαίρως δὲ ἐπέστης μοι ἀποροῦντι λύσουσα τὴν ἀπορίαν. σῇ γὰρ χειρὶ τὰ πρόσθεν κεκυβερνηταὶ καὶ νῦν κυβερνῶμαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς κυβερνηθῆσομαι.

42. τίνος ἔνεκεν ἐρχόμενος ἐνέπεσε τοῖς ποιμνίοις; ἐμπίπτει γάρ, φαμέν, τὸ δεινόν. καὶ ἐμπίπτει ἄνθρωπος τοῖς πολεμίοις. τὸ δὲ ἐμπίπτει ἄνθρωπος βάσιν, παράλογον.⁶³

68. μηδὲ τὸν ἄνδρα δέχου συμφορὰν: τουτέστι μὴ τὸν ἄνδρα ἰδὼν συμφορὰν οἰκείαν δέξῃ. ἀντὶ τοῦ βλέπων μὴ λυπηθῆς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἢ συμφορὰν δέχου τὸν ἄνδρα. ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ οἰηθῆς παθεῖν τι ἐξ αὐτοῦ.⁶⁴

74. ἐκκαλῶ τὸ ἐξάγω τινά. εἰσκαλῶ δὲ τὸ εἰσάγω.

75. ὅρα ὅπως μὴ δειλίαν ἀρεῖς (ita D^s: ἄρης Dⁱ). καὶ ἔοικε τῷ (τὸ D). (Aesch. *Prom.* 68) “ὅπως μὴ σαυτὸν οἰκτιεῖς.”

83. κατὰ ἀντιστροφὴν τοῦ μὴ μετὰ τοῦ οὐ.

112. ἔγωγε, Ἀθηνᾶ, κατὰ τὰ ἄλλα, ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃς πράξαί με δηλαδὴ, ἐφίεμαί σε χαίρειν, τουτέστι χαρῆσθαι ἐμοῦ ταῦτα πράττοντος. τὸ δὲ μὴ δοῦναι τοιαύτην δίκην τὸν Ὀδυσσεά οὐκ ἂν σοι (σε D) πεισθῇεν.

I limit myself here to these few specimens. Let me only add one more sample — a scholium in which Planudes quotes his own name: *Aíax* 574 ἐπώνυμον τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ὀνομαζόμενον. τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα κατὰ τῆς οὐσίας κατηγορεῖται, ὥς εἴρηται πρὸ μικροῦ (*Aíax* 430) “τίς ἂν ποτ' ᾤθ' ὧδ' ἐπώνυμον τοῦμὸν ξυνοίσειν ὄνομα τοῖς ἐμοῖς κακοῖς;”

⁶³ Planudean mark for this scholium is missing in the Naples ms., but a marginal μαξ in the ms. Bremen b.23 seems to refer to this scholium.

⁶⁴ This scholium was taken over, in a substantially similar form, by the Barocci family (Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Barocci 61 fol. 15^v). From the Barocci ms., it was reported by Johnson; hence it appears in Dindorf 199.21–24.

καὶ ὡς ἐνταῦθα. ἐπώνυμον τὸ ἐπιλεγόμενον τῷ κυρίῳ ὀνόματι, οἷον ὁ Πλανούδης Μάξιμος.

I am planning to publish eventually, for the first time, a complete edition of Planudes' scholia on Sophocles. For the time being, I have to content myself with the above samples. It is to be recorded here that — so far as I know — there is only one more manuscript of Sophocles which exhibits the Planudean authorship marks in the scholia: it is a Moschopuleo-Planudean ms., Bremen, Staatsbibliothek, b. 23.

As I stated above, the *poetic* text of D is of little consequence, and I doubt whether it represents the final shape of a *text* edition of Sophocles by Planudes, if he ever made that systematic effort of establishing a Sophocles text supplied with his scholia. It is rather puzzling to see how little popularity or diffusion the poetic text represented in the Naples ms. had. I know only of one ms., Vatic. gr. 44, which parallels the poetic text of D. However, with the scholia of Planudes the situation is entirely different. The Moschopulean recension of Sophocles (our symbol ξ) divides into two groups of mss. which have substantially the same poetic text, specifically Moschopulean. But in one family ξm, we find the normal Moschopulean scholia *οἰκέως* only, while in the other family ξp the scholia *οἰκέως* are enriched with additaments from Planudean scholia, so that we call these Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia of the family ξp the scholia *οἰκέως* + *συνταξις* (after the initial word of the Planudean scholium on *Aïax* 14: see above, p. 117). Of course, there are also some specific features in the poetic text which (in addition to the difference in scholia) divide the Moschopulean recension into the two branches mentioned. Yet the poetic text of the family ξp is in no relation to the poetic text of the Naples ms. I shall deal in detail with characteristic differences of ξm and ξp in the further course of the present study.

A very important problem has to be settled with regard to the chronology of those Sophoclean studies and editions of Maximus Planudes, Manuel Moschopulus, Thomas Magistros, and Demetrius Triclinius. It is impossible to gain absolute chronological data on those editions, and chronological elements of the biographies of those Byzantine scholars are also somewhat deficient.⁶⁵ The

⁶⁵ Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 103, note 89; Wendel, *ByzZ* 40 (1940) 406 ff.; Wendel in *RE* s.v. "Planudes" § 1; Carolus Gallavotti, *Theocritus quique feruntur Bucolici Graeci (Scriptores Graeci et Latini consilio Academiae Lynceorum editi* [Romae, 1946]) 261, 273.

Sophocles ms. Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2884, provides us with a certain *terminus ante quem*. This ms., subscribed ⁶⁶ by 'Αθανάσιος ὁ Σπονδύλης on February 24, 1299, is in some parts Moschopuleo-Planudean and in some parts Thoman (and also Thoman in Aeschylus).⁶⁷ As we shall see below, Thomas made his edition of Sophocles after Planudes and Moschopulus. Accordingly, the year A.D. 1299 is the *terminus ante quem* for the Moschopuleo-Planudean and Thoman editions of Sophocles. We cannot establish any certain absolute dates except for a general statement that those studies and editions were made towards the end of the XIIIth century, and the Triclinian edition may fall already in the early XIVth century. However, we can settle rather certainly the *relative* chronology or succession of those editions, and the discovery of their sequence will prove very essential for an adequate evaluation of the priority (or authorship) and succession of Byzantine text readings in Sophocles.

Toward this purpose, we shall look for some clues in the form of polemics in the scholia. Of course, the polemist was later than the person against whom the polemics were directed. I begin with the Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 10 (p. 329.10 Dindorf; I quote Z fol. 93^r): τοῦτο καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος· τὸ μὲν στάζων ὅλον, τὸ δὲ κάρα καὶ τὸ χεῖρας μέρος· καὶ οὐχ, ὥς τινὲς φασί, στάζων καὶ σταζόμενος. καὶ ἔξωθεν τὸ ἔχων λαμβάνουσι λέγοντες οὕτω· σταζόμενος τὸ κάρα καὶ ἔχων τὰς χεῖρας ξιφοκτόνους. πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα λήρος καὶ οὐδὲν ὑγιές. The scholium against which this polemic is directed appears as an interlinear scholium in the Planudean ms. D fol. 142^r (on *Aiax* 9/10): ἔχων τὴν κεφαλὴν ἰδρῶτι περιρρεομένην καὶ στάζουσιν τούτῳ κάτω. Then, above the line *Ai.* 10, there are these glosses: σταζόμενος ὑπὸ ἰδρώτος, ἔχων δὲ διὰ ξίφους κτείνουσας, τὰς διὰ ξίφους φόνον ἐργασάμενας. We can safely assume that the interlinear scholium just quoted from the Naples ms. is a Planudean one, and that Thomas directed his statement against Planudes.

The Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 32 (cf. p. 330.6 Dindorf; I quote Z fol. 93^v): κατὰ τινα μὲν σημειοῦμαι ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ δρᾶσας, κατὰ τινα δὲ εἰς ἐκπληξιν πίπτω καὶ ἀπορίαν, οὐ δυνάμενος συνιέναι τὸν δρᾶσαντα. σὼφρων γὰρ Αἴας· τὸ δὲ ἔργον τουτὶ παραπλήγος. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὰ μὲν τῶν ἰχνῶν ψεύδονται. Manifestly this statement is directed against

⁶⁶ Cf. Gallavotti, *RFIC* N.S. 12 (1934) 558; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 252. See below, p. 165.

⁶⁷ Cf. Turyn, *Aeschylus* 76.

Planudes, author of the scholium on *Aiax* 32 which I quoted above, p. 118.

There is a Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 42 (cf. p. 330.16 Dindorf; I quote Z fol. 94^r): οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὸ ἐπεμπίπτει ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεμβάλλει, ἵνα συντάξωσι τὴν αἰτιατικήν, τὰληθὲς ἀγνοοῦσιν. ἀλλ', ὥσπερ φαμέν, πολεμῶ σοι πόλεμον, καὶ ἦλθον ἐνταῦθα καλλίστην πορείαν, τὸ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν ἐνταῦθα καλλίστην πορείαν λέγω, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἐπεμπίπτει ταῖς ποίμναις τήνδε τὴν βάσιν· τουτέστι, τίνος ἕνεκα ὁρμᾷ ὁρμὴν τήνδε ἐπὶ ταύταις, τὸ διαφθεῖραι (-φθαρήναι Z) λέγω αὐτάς. The construction of ἐπεμπίπτει was discussed among Byzantine scholars of that time: cf. the scholium (probably Planudean) on *Aiax* 42, from D (see above, p. 118): τὸ δὲ ἐμπίπτει ἄνθρωπος βάσιν, παράλογον. Thomas argues with Moschopoulos' scholium on *Aiax* 42 (cf. p. 198.16–20 Dindorf; I quote the ms. Florence, Bibl. Laur., Conventi Soppressi 71 [= X] fol. 9^r): ποίμναις ἐπεμπίπτει· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ ταῖς ποίμναις, τουτέστι κατὰ τῶν ποιμνίων ἐμπίπτει. ἐμπίπτει βάσιν· ἐποίησατο ὥφειλεν εἰπεῖν· ὁ δέ, καὶ τὴν ἐπίθεσιν αὐτοῦ θέλων δηλώσαι, ἐμπίπτει λέγει. τοιοῦτο καὶ τὸ (*Ai.* 55) ἔκειρε φόνον, καὶ τὸ (*Ai.* 19) κυκλοῦντα βάσιν.

With reference to *Aiax* 87 νῦν (so accented in Z), there is the following Thoman scholium (p. 332.8–10 Dindorf) in Z fol. 95^r: τοῦτο εἰ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ δὴ ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἔχει καὶ τινα ἔμφασιν καιροῦ,^{67b} ὥσπερ φαμέν καὶ τὸ ὅτε τὸ αἰτίαν δηλοῦν. τοῦτο γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεῖ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καιρὸν δηλοῦ. It seems to be directed against Planudes' gloss on the word (D fol. 144^r): ἀντὶ τοῦ δὴ, ἀργόν. The Moschopulean mss. (like X) give the bare gloss δὴ.

There was a problem of punctuation in *Aiax* 122, discussed in Byzantine scholia. Thomas punctuated δύστηνον ἔμπης, καίπερ κτλ. — and the Thoman scholium states (cf. p. 333.5–8 Dindorf; I quote Z fol. 95^v): τὸ ἔμπης οὐ πρὸς τὸ ὀπισθεν νοητέον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἐποικτεῖρω· ἔστι γὰρ ἐναντιωματικὸς σύνδεσμος. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁ λόγος τοιοῦτος, οἶον, εἰ καὶ ἐχθρὸς ἐστίν, ὅμως οὕτως ἔχοντα αὐτὸν ἐλεεῖν ἄξιον ἢ μισεῖν. This is directed against the characteristic punctuation of the Moschopulean mss. (δύστηνον· ἔμπης καίπερ κτλ. X) and the Moschopulean scholium (X fol. 11^r): ἔμπης καίπερ ἐκ παραλλήλου.

Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 141 (cf. p. 333.30 Dindorf), Z fol. 96^r: μὴ λάβης εἰς τὸ νυκτὸς ἔξωθεν τὸ ἐπὶ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ θόρυβοι σύντασσε. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ταῦτα νύκτωρ γέγονεν, ἄριστ' ἂν ἔχοι λέγειν τῆς νυκτὸς τουτουσὶ τοὺς

^{67b} Cf. Thomae Magistri sive Theoduli monachi *Ecloga vocum Atticarum* ex recensione et cum prolegomenis Friderici Ritschelii (Halis Saxonum, [1832]) 249.9: χρώνται δὲ οἱ τραγικοὶ τε καὶ κωμικοὶ καὶ ἑτέρω νῦν, λαμβανομένων μὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ δὴ, ἔχοντι δὲ ἔμφασιν τινα χρόνου, ὥς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Αἴαντι· (*Ai.* 87) "σίγα νυν ἐστώς."

θορύβους κτλ. Thomas argues here with Planudes in whose scholium on *Aiax* 139 we read (D fol. 145^r): ὡς καὶ νῦν με κατέχουσι φόβοι ἐπὶ τῆς παρελθούσης νυκτός. The normal Moschopulean gloss on *Aiax* 141 is (X): καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς.

Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 154 (cf. p. 334.10 Dindorf), Z fol. 96^r: μὴ λάβῃς ἔξωθεν τὸ κατὰ, ὡς τινες τῶν ἀμαθῶν, ἀλλ' οὕτω λέγε· οὐ γάρ τις δηλονότι ἀμάρτοι τῶν μεγάλων ψυχῶν, εἰς καὶ πέμπων κατ' αὐτῶν λόγους ἐχθίστους κτλ. This is directed against Moschopulus: in X fol. 4^v, there is a gloss κατὰ above τῶν, and above εἰς a gloss (which involves the words *Ai.* 155 κατὰ δ' ἂν τις) reading thus: ἤγουν τοξεύων τις· ἢ κατὰ καὶ τὸ τις ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

In a longer Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 172, we find a discussion of the accusative *Ai.* 176 χάριν (cf. p. 335.27 Dindorf), Z fol. 96^v: μὴ λάβῃς δὲ ἔξωθεν εἰς τὸ χάριν τὸ διὰ, ὡς τινὲς φασιν ἀπατώμενοι πρὸς τὴν αἰτιατικὴν. οὐ γὰρ μόνον "ἐψεύσθημεν τοῦδε" φαμέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τόδε, ὥσπερ καὶ "μέτεστί μοι τοῦδε," ἀλλὰ καὶ τόδε. οὐ μόνον δὲ τὸ ψεῦδεσθαι οὕτω φαμέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς δοτικὴν πλαγιάζομεν, ὡς ἔχει κἀνταῦθα. πρῶτον γὰρ εἰς αἰτιατικὴν {ἐ}συνέταξε ψευθεῖσα χάριν ἀκάρπτωτον λέγων, εἴτα πρὸς δοτικὴν ἐπλαγίασε κλυτῶν ἐνάρων ψευθεῖσα δώροις. This argument against διὰ aims at Moschopulus. For there is a gloss διὰ above χάριν in X, and the Moschopulean scholium on *Aiax* 172 reads in the pertinent passage (cf. p. 203.14 Dindorf), X fol. 5^r: ἡ δὲ ἀ χάριν τινὸς νίκης ἀκερδῆ κτλ.

A momentous conclusion is to be drawn from these polemics: Thomas' edition was *later* than those of Planudes and of Moschopulus. The last edition was that of Triclinius who incorporated into his *ἔκδοσις* the scholia of Moschopulus and of Thomas and made occasionally, in his edition, polemic remarks against Thomas. E.g., *Aiax* 57 the (erroneous) reading of the *veteres* is ἐμπίπτων L¹GQ (ἐμπίπτειν R by mistake): ἐμπιτνῶν X is the Moschopulean correction represented by Moschopulean mss. Thomas stuck to the "old" reading: ἐμπίπτων Z. Triclinius, who embraced the Moschopulean correction, reproved Thomas in a scholium (cf. p. 330.33–34 Dindorf) which I quote from T and Ta (prefix ἡμέτερον in T, Moschopulean cross erroneously prefixed in Ta): οἱ γράφοντες "ἐμπίπτων στρατηλατῶν" οὐ καλῶς γράφουσι· βραχὺ γὰρ ὀφείλει εἶναι τὸ πῖ ὡς ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ δν χώρᾳ TTa. There are, of course, many more statements of this kind in Triclinius, and it seems that he was rather mild in the polemic condemnation of some readings of Thomas, whom he respected as a predecessor in many editorial projects. Thomas

used a very sharp tone in his arguments with Moschopoulos. As to Planudes, it seems that both Thomas and Triclinius highly respected this older scholar who enjoyed a great reputation in that period. There is a very interesting proof of that attitude of Thomas and Triclinius toward Planudes in the following case. In a Thoman scholium on *Aiax* 1085, Thomas acknowledged a correction of Planudes without naming him specifically. Then Triclinius paid tribute to Planudes by name in the same Thoman scholium which he modified correspondingly while integrating it into his edition. Here is the evidence:

First, I shall quote that scholium on *Aiax* 1085 (cf. p. 352.18 Dindorf) in the Thoman wording as exhibited in Z fol. 113^r: ἐφ η τ ι ς ἐν τ α ὕ θ α τ ῶ ν ἐν λό γ ο ι ς μ ᾶ λ α δ ε ι ν ῶ ν, ὅτι ἀμφοτέρω τῷ ἄν οὐ μόνον σύνδεσμοί εἰσιν, ἀλλὰ δύο μέρη τοῦ λόγου, ἃ ἄρθρον καὶ ἄν σύνδεσμος· ὅθεν κατὰ κρᾶσιν ἄν γέγονε. λέγει δὲ τοῦτο ἀπὸ τοῦ μέτρου εὐρεῖν. ὁ γὰρ ἄν σύνδεσμος βραχύς ἐστι παρὰ τοῖς μετρικοῖς, ἐνταῦθα δὲ μακρόν ἐστι τὸ ἄν, ὥστε δύο μέρη τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶ κραθέντα εἰς ἓν κτλ.

Now, Triclinius made some changes in this scholium when he incorporated it into his edition, in order to name Planudes explicitly instead of repeating Thomas' reference to one of τῶν ἐν λόγοις μᾶλα δεινῶν. Here I quote the Triclinian (= Turnebian) wording of the same scholium, from its beginning on, from Ta fol. 135^v: ὅτι ἀμφοτέρω τῷ ἄν οὐ μόνον (μόνοι codex) σύνδεσμοί εἰσιν, ἀλλὰ δύο μέρη τοῦ λόγου, ἃ ἄρθρον καὶ ἄν σύνδεσμος· ὅθεν κατὰ κρᾶσιν ἄν γέγονεν, ὡς τῷ σ ο φ ω - τ ᾶ τ ω ἐ π ε ν ο ῖ ῃ θ ἥ⁶⁸ Π λ α ν ο ὕ δ η. ὁ γὰρ ἄν σύνδεσμος βραχύς ἐστι κτλ. (as above). In both versions I spaced the passages by which they differ. It is very characteristic that Thomas refers to Planudes' explanation of that correction, but there is no scholium in the Planudean ms. D covering specifically this problem. Yet, there are in D and in Moschopulean mss. (e.g., X), for *Aiax* 1085 and 1086, the readings ἄν and corresponding glosses ἃ ἄν. Moreover, the Moschopulean scholium *Ai.* 1085 (p. 229.21–23 Dindorf) is introduced in Moschopulean mss. (X, and also in D) by the full line *Aiax* 1085 as lemma in which the pertinent word is written explicitly ἃ ἄν.

⁶⁸ ἐπινοεῖν here is *conicere*. I should like to stress the following desideratum: we need a comprehensive study of the history of technical terms in textual criticism as used from the Alexandrian times down to the Renaissance. Cf. Paul Maas, *ByzZ* 36 (1936) 27 ff.

The scholium analyzed above shows that Planudes made the corrections in *Ajax* 1085 and 1086, and Moschopulus, who had the benefit of studying with him, took them over. Thomas acknowledged the corrections of the learned scholar, and Triclinius then quoted the name of Planudes.

The succession of Byzantine Sophocles editions is clear: Planudes — Moschopulus (or *vice versa*) — Thomas — Triclinius. Wherever a correction is carried by more than one Byzantine edition, we shall have to give credit for it to the earliest of those scholars. For practical purposes, the Planudes text of Sophocles is unknown, for we cannot identify with Planudes the *poetic* text of D. The Naples ms. was a compilation made in Planudes' school at a time a little later than the teaching of Planudes himself, because it is posterior to the editions of Moschopulus and Thomas, but does not show yet traces of the Triclinian text or scholia. Probably Planudes taught Sophocles to his disciples, wrote scholia, occasionally corrected the poetic text. Moschopulus made use of the Planudean teaching, but we cannot discover exactly how much of Planudean work he integrated in his recension. On the other hand, it is possible that Planudes wrote his scholia after his pupil Moschopulus already completed his own edition. As a result of this unknown relationship, we shall dismiss from our consideration of Byzantine text readings the possible rôle of Planudes. Accordingly, in our analysis of textual changes made in Sophocles by Byzantine scholars, we shall take into account the editions of only three of them, viz.: Moschopulus — Thomas — Triclinius.

3. THE MOSCHOPULEAN RECENSION

The Moschopulean edition was the most important contribution of Byzantine philology to the Sophoclean text criticism, and Moschopulean manuscripts exceeded in popularity the rest of Byzantine editions, to judge from the proportion of manuscripts preserved.

This edition embraced the triad: *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The most characteristic feature of Moschopulean manuscripts, if supplied with scholia, is their set of scholia which begin with the scholium on *Ajax* 1 p. 196.9 Dindorf (I quote from the Moschopulean ms. X) οἰκείως ἔχουσιν οἱ παρακείμενοι κτλ. The scholia on *Electra* begin: *El.* 4 (p. 244.6 Dind.) τὸ παλαιὸν ἐνίοτε κτλ. The scholia on *Oed. Tyr.* begin with interlinear glosses on *Oed. Tyr.* 1

(p. 145.3 ff. Dind.) ἐμὰ δηλονότι and Κάδμου τοῦ πρὸ μακροῦ γεγονότος ἀπόγονοι νῦν βλαστήσαντες, and the marginal scholium on *Oed. Tyr.* 1 ἀνατροφή ἦν ἀνατρέφει τις τινα κτλ. On the whole, the reader may find the Moschopulean scholia in Johnson's edition under *Schol. Ined.*, with the symbols, at the end of a scholium, *L.B.* for *Aiax* and *Electra* — and under *Schol. Ined.*, with no symbol, for *Oed. Tyr.* Of course, there are some mistakes and misplacements of scholia in Johnson and Dindorf, and I cannot help expressing a desideratum for a reliable and comprehensive edition of all the Byzantine scholia on Sophocles.

The whole Moschopulean recension ξ divides into two families: ξm with purely Moschopulean scholia οἰκείως, and ξp with the same Moschopulean scholia and some Planudean scholia added (scholia οἰκείως + σύνταξις). I want to quote a few characteristic readings of ξ: *Aiax* 488 τινὲς, *Electra* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, *Oed. Tyr.* 50 στάντες τ'. The mentioned families have, moreover, in addition to general readings of the whole recension, some peculiar readings. For the family ξm, there is a very characteristic reading (transposition of words) *Electra* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν. For the family ξp, I quote *Oed. Tyr.* 652 οὐποτε.

The Moschopulean text abounded in some valuable metrical corrections and other textual innovations which, in some cases, were followed by both Thomas and Triclinius or by either of them. Some Moschopulean readings seem to have been so attractive that they even were adopted by many *veteres* which were written after that Moschopulean edition was diffused. It is quite possible that at times Moschopulus used some readings invented by an anonymous contemporary. It is not so very important to have in every case the name of such a predecessor, whom we may occasionally deprive of credit due to him by considering Moschopulus the initiator of a given reading. Anyway, Moschopulus was the earliest of the authoritative Sophocles editors of that period, and his chronological priority grants him the title to the authorship of the Byzantine readings exhibited in his edition. Then, some readings of Moschopulus reappear in Thomas or Triclinius, or in both of them. Consequently, it would be at times misleading to determine the character of a Byzantine ms. on the strength of one reading from our list of characteristic readings of the Moschopulean edition. Only a joint incidence of several characteristic readings shows conclusively that a given ms. belongs to a certain family.

Let us also mention here a certain matter of theoretical character. Normally, in textual criticism, we pay attention to the so-called significant errors as characteristic features which are indicative of the filiation of mss. But in investigating the elements of Byzantine editions we should consider rather significant *changes* in relation to the vulgate text of the *veteres*. Those changes sometimes happen to be errors, but sometimes they are corrections. The essential fact is to establish that a significant Byzantine reading is a departure from the vulgate text of the *veteres*.

Below, I am going to record systematically the coverage of Moschopulean readings by a few representative manuscripts of that recension. As a rule, I use symbols containing X (like X, Xa, etc.) to symbolize Moschopulean mss., unless for some reason I use a different symbol.

Byzantine followers of Moschopulus will be involved in the evidence given below, for I shall be anxious to show at once which readings of Moschopulus were followed by Thomas Magistros or Triclinius. Symbols of Thoman mss. contain Z (like Z, Za, etc.). Triclinian mss. are marked T, Ta, etc.

Now, a specific Moschopulean reading or a textual innovation by Moschopulus can appear as such only against the background of a different reading of the *veteres* from which Moschopulus is to be shown to depart. Accordingly, in order to make this situation appear clearly, I shall have to quote, for a given critical unit affected by Moschopulus, first the *ancient* reading covered by some representative *veteres*, then the different reading of Moschopulus. As I have just said, I shall also quote Thomas and Triclinius if they are involved in a given variety of readings.

Let me restate a few essential facts about the ancient tradition, for a clarification of these points is necessary for arranging a proper coverage of the ancient readings in our tabulation of Moschopulean readings presented below.

The ancient tradition divides⁶⁹ in two families: the Laurentian family (λ) and the Roman family (ρ). The Laurentian tradition λ is represented by the famous Laurentian 32, 9 (L) and its relative, the Leiden palimpsest⁷⁰ Bibl. Publ. Graec. 60 A (our symbol Λ).

⁶⁹ Cf. De Marco, *SIFC* N.S. 13 (1936) 3 ff., especially 21 ff.; Aristide Colonna, "De codice quodam Sophoclis antiquissimo," *Athenaeum* 18 (1940) 270 ff.

⁷⁰ Cf. J. Vürtheim, *Der Leidener Sophoklespalimpsest zum ersten Male vollständig untersucht* (Leiden, 1926); Walther Kranz, *Gnomon* 3 (1927) 424-427; H. J. Scheltens, "De codice Sophocleo Lugdunensi," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4.2 (1949) 132-137. Professor

The Roman family ρ (which I call so because of one of its members, the Vatic. gr. 2291, once Chigi R VIII 59) is represented by: the Florence, Conventi Soppressi 152 (G), for *Ajax*, *Oed. Tyr.*, *Electra*, *Philoct.* (the ms. was subscribed A.D. 1282); Vatic. gr. 2291 (R) for the seven plays (*Trach.* is incomplete); Modena a.T.9.4 (once II.B.4; No. 41 in Puntoni), fol. 4^r–138^v (symbol M), only for the *scholia* on the seven plays (*Trach.* incomplete), therefore M is not quoted below. And I add to this group a closely related manuscript of the Roman family, Paris, Supplément grec 109 (my symbol Q), for *Ajax*, *Philoct.*, *Oed. Col.*⁷¹ Of these manuscripts, only LAG are, by virtue of their chronology, exempt from Byzantine interpolations, while QR occasionally follow the Byzantines by adopting sporadically their readings. It should be noted here that the mss. of the Roman tradition GQMR often agree with Suda in readings particularly carried by the Roman family and differing from the Laurentian family.⁷²

It is a fact observed especially by De Marco that there is in the ancient tradition a split along the Laurentian and the Roman traditions. Whenever Moschopoulos follows one or another ancient family, I shall not record such Moschopulean readings since they were not invented by Moschopoulos but taken over from the one or the other ancient family.

I shall use below the evidence (whenever available) of LAGQR for the attestation of ancient readings. The evidence of Conv. Soppr. 71 (X), Vatic. gr. 50 (Xa), Vienna philos. philol. gr. 161 (Xr), Vienna suppl. gr. 71 (Xs), will attest Moschopulean readings. X and Xa represent the purely Moschopulean group ξm, while Xr and Xs represent the Moschopuleo-Planudean group ξp.

Scheltema, of Groningen, made a systematic examination of the Leiden palimpsest with the aid of an ultraviolet lamp and deposited a report on the results of his study at the Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijks-Universiteit, where it is listed as ms. B.P.G. 60 A¹¹ (I have studied a copy of it). Scheltema's collation published in *Mnemosyne* is very valuable. To be sure, a full collation of the preserved text with explicit positive statements on readings of every word which is affected by a divergence in any other ms. would be even more helpful. I owe to Prof. Scheltema an ultraviolet picture of a folio containing ancient scholia on *Oed. Col.* 1541, 1542, 1547 (p. 459.16–24 Papageorg.). These scholia are written in a manner very similar to that of L; the script also shows closest resemblance. Most probably the Leiden palimpsest A is a close relative of L.

⁷¹ Cf. *Ajax* 176 δίκης GQR; 257 (ἀρετ om.) ἀστεροπᾶς GQR, Suda (sub Σ 1059) codd. AF, στεροπᾶς Suda V; 259 ἰσχει GQR; 413 καὶ om. GQR, Suda sub N 172 (excepto Suda cod. G); 827 φέροντα τεύκρω GQR; 864 ὕστατον ἔσχατον GQR; *Phil.* 11 στενάζων ἡύξον G, ὕξον QR; 123 (νυν om.) ἐκείνον GQR; *Oed. Col.* 7 ξυνῶν χρόνος QR; 16 δ' om. QR, Suda (sub I 600).

⁷² Cf. above, p. 102.

The mss. Venice 472 (Z) and Vatic. 1333 (Zc) cover the Thoman readings. However, I should like to point out that there seem to have been two successive drafts of the Thoman edition, both with identical Thoman scholia. The earlier Thoman text is represented by Zc, while the later text (the one on which Triclinius relied heavily) is to be found in Z. They sometimes diverge so that we have to assume that Thomas in several cases changed his mind as to a certain reading after he already completed his first edition.

The mss. Paris 2711 (T) and Venice 470 (Ta) will be used for attesting the Triclinian readings.

This is a description of the Moschopulean mss. used as text witnesses in the subsequent list of Moschopulean readings.

X = Florence, Bibl. Laur., Conventi Soppressi 71. Paper, XIVth cent., 225 × 139 mm., 246 foll., 18–22 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 5^v *Vita* (Triclinian); 7^r arg. to *Aiax*; 8^r *Aiax*; 35^v arg. to *Electra* (ὀπόμεται); 35^v *Electra*; 75^r arg. I to *Oed. Tyr.*; 75^v–114^v *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopulean scholia οἰκέως on the three plays. (Cf. Dindorf, *Sophoclis tragoediae* [Lipsiae, 1825]; Dindorf, *Ad Sophoclis tragoedias annotationes* [Oxonii, 1836]; Dindorf's symbol was Θ.)

Xa = Vatic. gr. 50. Paper, XIVth cent., 266 × 166 mm., IV + 231 foll., 27–29 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 91^r *Aiax* 1–8 (no scholia); 91^v arg. to *Aiax*; 116^r arguments to *Electra* (ὀπόμεται, and another argument ἡ ὑπόθεσις — εὐρήσεις by a different hand; the latter argument was published from the Laur. 32, 51 by G. Wolff, *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* 13 [1855] 45 f.); 116^v *Electra*; 143^r arg. I and oracle to *Oed. Tyr.*; 143^v–170^r *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopulean scholia οἰκέως on the three plays. Some ancient scholia were added by a later hand.⁷³

The mss. Xr and Xs represent the Moschopuleo-Planudean tradition ξp. Their Moschopulean scholia are enlarged with Planudean additaments (scholia οἰκέως + σύνταξις).

Xr = Vienna philosophicus philologicus graec. 161. Paper, A.D. 1412, 222 × 141 mm., 339 foll., 15 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Written by Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Κερζᾶς. — 181^r *Vita*; 183^v arg. to *Aiax*; 185^r *Aiax*; 232^v arg. to *Electra* (ὀπόμεται); 232^v *Electra*; 284^r arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 285^v–336^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 337^r arguments I and III to *Antig.*; 337^v–339^v *Antigone*

⁷³ Cf. S. Peppink, *Mnemosyne* ser. 3.1 (1934) 159.

1-67. Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia *οικείως* + *σύνταξις* on *Aiāx*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*; ancient scholia on the fragment of *Antigone*.

Xs = Vienna philol. supplem. graec. 71. Paper, XIVth cent., 217 × 140 mm., 213 foll., 20-25 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r-32^v *Aiāx* (1-1380); 33^r blank; 33^v arg. to *El.* (*ὕπκειται*); 34^r-66^r *Electra*; 66^r arg. II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 66^v-102^v *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia *οικείως* + *σύνταξις* on the three plays.

I have to make a few remarks in reference to my list of Moschopulean readings which is to follow. In quoting line or verse numbers in Sophocles, as a matter of practical principle I follow the numbers of the Brunck vulgate. Brunck's numbers appear also in Dindorf, Pearson, Masqueray — inasmuch as this is feasible. However, in lyrical lines the line division has been in many cases changed quite considerably since Brunck's time, and it is therefore often impossible to indicate, correctly and unequivocally, the location of a word by quoting the verse number as given in a recent edition. Therefore, I consistently quote the numbers of Brunck, and in case of doubt the reader should determine the location of a Sophoclean quotation in reference to the Brunck edition; this is important for lyrical lines. Otherwise, so far as the text itself is concerned, Pearson's edition may serve as basis for comparison.

The reader will notice concerning the corrections L² (basically, such notation means corrections made by any corrector later than the original writer of the text or the writer of the scholia) that in most cases they agree with Moschopulus. I shall deal with those corrections L² afterwards (see below, p. 140). Of course, they do not affect the evidence of ancient manuscripts and are, practically, meaningless, since (as it is shown below *loc. cit.*) they were, for the most part, written by the scribe of Paris 2712 (A) who, in the triad, followed a Moschopuleo-Planudean source.

The reader will observe that, among the ancient mss., the mss. Q and R sometimes embrace a Byzantine reading. We ought to keep in mind that chronologically they were exposed to that danger of being interpolated occasionally. At any rate, the agreement of LG or LAG is most significant and as a rule represents the ancient reading. To be sure, some differences among ancient mss. may be a result of double readings⁷⁴ written in the archetype in the line

⁷⁴ Cf. Antonius Seyffert, *Quaestiones criticae de codicibus Sophocleis recte aestimandis* (Diss. Halis Saxonium, 1863) 5; Carolus Meifert, *De Sophoclis codicibus* (Diss.

and above the line, or in the line and with a prefix γρ(ἀφεται) above the line or in the margin.

In the arrangement of the manuscript evidence in the subsequent list, the ancient reading will come first, covered by ancient manuscript witnesses and possibly by some Byzantine followers, if any. Then, in opposition to it, will come the Moschopulean reading attested by Moschopulean manuscripts and possibly by some other Byzantine followers, if any. Readings of Thomas and Triclinius will be indicated to show whether they agree, in the cases quoted, with the ancient readings or with those of Moschopulus. The reader should watch the manuscript symbols: those with X refer to Moschopulean mss.; those with Z, to Thoman mss.; those with T, to Triclinian mss. Consequently, the reader may translate the evidence quoted below into the following relationship: *veteres* — Moschopulus — Thomas — Triclinius, according to the symbols exhibited. Variant readings are considered in reference to the Oxford text of Pearson. A lemma from the Pearson text is sometimes prefixed if a misunderstanding is likely to arise without such a definition of the text unit involved. Then it means that instead of this text unit as printed in Pearson and repeated by me with a bracket at the end (]), the subsequent readings are exhibited in the mss. indicated. Meaningless differences of accentuation and aspiration are disregarded. In inflectional forms, I write iota subscript if it is missing in mss. (as it mostly is), or if it appears as iota adscript (as it mostly happens in L). Below, I quote direct evidence from manuscripts, instead of giving general family readings deduced from my specific findings. No conclusions *ex silentio* as to respective manuscript readings are allowed (or needed, for that matter). For I have full photographic reproductions of the manuscripts in question (except A),⁷⁵ and I shall give the data explicitly. The following notation is used throughout this paper:

A^{ac} = A ante correctionem. A^{pc} = A post correctionem. Aⁱ = A in linea. A^s = A supra lineam. A¹ = A by first hand (of the original scribe). A² = A by any later hand. A^{γρ} = variant in A with a prefix

Halis Saxonum, 1891) 22 f.; Friedrich Blass, *Aischylos' Choephoren* (Halle a.d.S., 1906) 22 f.; Ewald Bruhn, *Sophokles erklärt* von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. II: *König Oedipus*¹¹ (Berlin, 1910) 227; Felix Jacoby, *Hesiodi carmina* I: *Theogonia (Auctarium Weidmannianum* [Berolini, 1930]) 73 ff.; Peppink, *Mnemosyne* ser. 3.1 (1934) 67 ff.; Turyn, *Aeschylus* 109.

⁷⁵ It is anyway incomplete, and I rely for it on the collation of Scheltema (see above, note 70).

γρ. or γρ. καὶ. A^{lem} = A in lemmate. A^{g1} = gloss in A. A^{ms} = A in margine. a.c. = ante correctionem. p.c. = post correctionem. i.l. = in linea. s.l. = supra lineam. m.pr. = manus prima. m.post. = manus posterior. Square brackets [] enclose letters lost in the manuscript and restored by an editor, double square brackets [] letters deleted in the ms. Dots indicate illegible letters. α = illegible trace of a letter is tentatively read α. Angular brackets < > enclose letters not extant in the ms. but added by an editor, braces { } letters extant in the ms. but expelled from the text by an editor, parentheses () the extension of an abbreviation. ἀλλὰ] ἀλλοις A means that instead of the vulgate (usually printed) reading ἀλλὰ, there is the reading ἀλλοις in A.

The list of Moschopulean readings follows here:

- Aiax* 58 ἐμπίπτων L¹GQZ, ἐμπίπτειν R: ἐμπιτνῶν XXaXrXsL²TTa.
Ai. 61 φόνου LGQRZX^{rp}XrTTa: πόνου XXaXr^{rp}XsTa^{rp}.
Ai. 75 ἄρης L¹GQRX^{rp}Z: ἀρεῖς XXaXrXsTTa (ἀρεῖς et ἀρή L²).
Ai. 80 ἐς δόμους L¹ εἰς δόμους GQRZTTa: ἐν δόμοις XXaXrXsL².
Ai. 112 ἔγωγέ σ' ἐφίεμαι LGZTTa: ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι XXaXrXsQR.
Ai. 169 ὑποδδείσαντες L¹GR: ὑποδείσαντες XXaXrXsQL²ZTTa.
Ai. 222 αἰθωνος L¹ αἰθωνος GQRXrZ: αἰθωπος XXaXsL²T αἰθωπος Ta.
Ai. 227 ὦμοι L ὦμοι L^{1em}GQRZZcTTa: οἴμοι XXaXrXs.
Ai. 235 ἔσω σφάξ' L, ἔξω σφάξ' GR, ἔξω σφάξ' Q, ἔσω σφάξ' XrZZc, εἶσω σφάξ' TTa: (ἔσω om.) ἔσφαξ' XXaXs.
Ai. 245 ἦδη τοι κρᾶτα LGQRXXrZZc^{po}, ἦδη τὰν κράτα Xa: ἦδη (τοι om.) κρᾶτα XsZc^{ac}: ἦδη κᾶρα TTa.
Ai. 259 φρόνιμος L¹GQRXaZZcTTa: φρόνιμον XXrXsL².
Ai. 301 ἀπαῖξας L¹QR: ἐπαῖξας GZZcTTa: ὑπαῖξας XXaXrXsL².
Ai. 307 διοπτρεύει L¹GQRTTa: διοπτρεύοι XXaXrXsZZc: διοπτρεύει L².
Ai. 488 τινος L¹GQRXa²XrZZcTTa: τινες XXa¹XsL².
Ai. 496 εἰ LAGQRZZcTTa: ἦν XXaXrXs.
Ai. 499 δούλιον L¹GQRZ^s, δούλειον ZiZc: δουλίαν XXaXrXsL²TTa.
Ai. 519 πᾶσιν L¹AGQRZZcTTa: πᾶσ' XXaXrXsL².
Ai. 524 γένοιθ' ἔθ' οὗτος LQR^sZZc: γένοιθ' οὗτος GRⁱ, Suda codex B (cf. integrum versum in Suda sub M 1169 [praeter cod. B] οὕτως γένοιτ' ἂν οὗτος κτλ.): γένοιτό ποθ' οὗτος XXaXrXsTTa.
Ai. 534 τ' ἂν ἦν LGQRZZc: τ' ἦν ἂν XXaXrXsTTa.
Ai. 557 δείξῃς L¹AGQRZZc^{po}: δείξεις XXaXrXsZc^{ac}TTa (cf. schol. Moschop. p. 213.12–13 Dindorf).
Ai. 565 εἰνάλιος LAGQRZZcTTa: ἐνάλιος XXaXrXs.
Ai. 569 δείξῃ LAGQRZZcTTa: δείξει XXaXrXs.

Ai. 582 *θρηνείν* LGQR, Suda sub E 2833 (excepto cod. T) et sub Θ 480, Zc: *θροείν* XXaXrXsZTTa, Suda sub E 2833 codex T.

Ai. 634 *κρείσσων* L¹GQRZTTa, *κρείσσον* Zc: *κρέσσων* XXaXrXsL².

Ai. 689 *ὕμῶν ἅμα* LAGQRZZc: *ὑπέρμεγα* L⁷⁰: *ὕμῶν ἅμα* XXaXrXsTTa.⁷⁶

Ai. 705 *ξυνείη* L¹AGQRZZcT: *ξυνείης* XXaXrXsL²Ta.

Ai. 717 *μεταγεγνώσθη* LGRZZcTTa, *μεταγνώσθη* Q: *μετεγνώσθη* XXaXrXs.

Ai. 727 *ξύναιμον* LGQRZZcTTa: *σύναιμον* XXaXrXs.

Ai. 780 *τοιαῦθ'* LGQRZc: *τοσαῦθ'* XXaXrXsZTTa.

Ai. 780 *εἶπεν* L¹GQRZZc: *εἶφ'* XXaXrXsL²TTa.

Ai. 805 *ἐσπέρους* LGXrZZcTTa: *ἐσπερίους* XXaXsQR.

Ai. 877 *οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ* LG¹QRZ¹ZcT¹Ta, *οὐδὲ μὴν δὴ* Z⁸: *οὐδ'* ἐμοὶ δὴ XXaXrXsG²T⁸.

Ai. 951 *ἄγαν ὑπερβριθὲς* LGQRZ: *ἄγαν γ' ὑπερβριθὲς* XXaXrXsZc: *καὶ μὴν ἄγαν ὑπερβριθὲς* TTa.

Ai. 969 *τί* L¹GQRZZcTTa: *πῶς* XXaXrXsL².

Ai. 994 *ἀπασῶν* L¹AGQRZZc: *πασῶν* XXaXrXsL²TTa.

Ai. 1008 *ἐμός τ' ἴσως* L¹AGQR, Suda sub II 3069: *ἐμός θ' ἅμα* XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

Ai. 1011 *ἰλεων* L¹AGQR: *ἡδιον* XXaXrXsL²⁷⁹TTa: *ἴδιον* ZZc (glossa Thomana *οἰκείον*).

Ai. 1019 *ἀπορριφθήσμαι* L¹GRXs: *ἀπορριφῆσμαι* XXaXrL²QZZcTTa.

Ai. 1031 *ἐκνάπτει'* L¹GQRZ, *ἐγκνάπτει'* Zc: *ἐγνάμπει'* XXaXr, *ἐγνάπτει'* XsL²TTa.

Ai. 1036 *οὖν* LGRTTa: *ἄν* XXaXrXsQZZc.

Ai. 1070 *λόγων τ'* LGQR: *λόγων (τ' om.)* XXaXrXsZZcTTa.⁷⁷

Ai. 1081 *παρῇ* L¹GQRZZcT¹: *πάρᾳ* XXaXrXsL²T⁸Ta.

Ai. 1113 *ἐπώμοτος* L¹GQRXrZZcTTa: *ἐνώμοτος* XXaXsL².

⁷⁶ Thomas attacked the reading of Moschopolus in a very poor scholium (which was subsequently dropped by Triclinius from his commentary and, therefore, was not published by Turnebus and has been unknown up to now): Z fol. 105^v *μή πλανηθῆς ὑπὸ τινων βιβλίων καὶ γρά(ψ)ης ὑμῶν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ δοκεῖ λόγον ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐσφαλμένον ἐστὶ πρὸς τὸ μέτρον. πέμπτος γὰρ ποῦς ἐστίν· οὐχ εὐρηται δὲ ἐν τῷ ε' πυρρίχιος· τὸ γὰρ ὑμῶν βραχέα ἔχει ἀμφότερα.*

⁷⁷ In cases like this one we should re-examine carefully the manuscript evidence and explore the possibility of keeping τ' = τοι. As to such elisions, cf. Paul Maas, *Sokrates, Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen*, N.F. 8 (1920) 21; Maas, *Griechische Metrik* (Gercke-Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* 13.7 [1923]) 27 § 121. — Cf. *Ai*ax 534, 1127, *Electra* 309, *Oed. Tyr.* 294. — It seems that Moschopolus was anxious to eradicate what he considered to be a superfluous τε: cf. Moschop., Schol. Hesiod. *Op.* 3 (Thomas Gaisford, *Poetae Minores Graeci* 2 [Lipsiae, 1823] p. 39.10–12).

Al. 1127 δεινόν τ' L: δεινόν (τ' om.) GQR: δεινόν γ' XXaXrXs ZZcTTa.

Al. 1146 ναυτίλων LGQRX^{po}ZZcTTa: ναυτίλω XXa^{ao}XrXs.

Al. 1154 ὠνθρωπε LAGQRXrZZcTTa: ἄνθρωπε XXaXs.

Al. 1160 παρῇ L¹AGQRZZc: πάρα XXaXrXsTTa.

Al. 1214 ἄγκειται L¹: ἔγκειται GQRZZc: ἀνέιται XXaXrXsL²Z^{rp}TTa.

Al. 1230 ἐφρόνεις L¹GQR, Suda (sub τ 747), Z^{rp}Zc: ἐφώνεις XXaXrXsL²: ἐκόμπεις Schol. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 638 (p. 18.27 Dübner), ἐκόμπους Z scripturae errore, ἐκόμπεις TTa.

Al. 1236 κέκραγες LGR: κέκραγας XXaXrXsQZZcTTa.

Al. 1253 πλευρᾷ L¹G: πλευρὰ QRTTa, -ρὰ ex -râ correctum Zi: πλευρᾶς Z^sZc: πλευρὰν XXaXrXsL².

Al. 1284 ἦλθ' ἐναντίος LGQRZZc: ἦλθεν ἀντίος XXaXrXsTTa.

Al. 1339 οὐκ ἂν ἀτιμάσαιμ' L¹AGQRZc: οὐκὸν ἀτιμάσαιμ' XXaXrXsL²: οὐκ ἂν γ' ἀτιμάσαιμ' ZTTa.

Al. 1369 γ' om. L¹GQRZc:⁷⁸ γ' habent XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.

Al. 1419 πρὶν δ' ἰδεῖν οὐδεῖς LAGQRZZc: πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ' οὐδεῖς LXXaXrTTa.^{78b}

Electra 42 χρόνῳ μακρῶ LGRZZcTTa: μακρῶ χρόνῳ XXaXrXs.

El. 55 μοι L¹GRZⁱZcTTa: που XXaXrXsL²Z^sT^{rp}Ta^{rp}.

El. 61 μὲν ὥς οὐδὲν LAG^rR, Suda (sub Λ 843 et sub T 557), XsZc: μὲν (ὥς om.) οὐδὲν XXaXrG²ZTTa.

El. 96 ἐξέτισε(ν) L¹AGR, Suda (sub E 1629 et sub Ξ 26): ἐξέτισε(ν) XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

El. 99 φοινίῳ LAGRxcZc: φονίῳ XXaXrZTTa.

El. 123 ἀκόρεστον LGRXaZZc: ἀκόρεστον XXrXs: ἀκόρεστ' TTa.

El. 132 οὐδ' αὖ θέλω L¹AGRZZc: οὐδ' ἐθέλω (vel οὐδέ θέλω) XXaXrXsL²TTa.

El. 139 οὔτε λιταῖσιν LAGR, Suda (sub Π 14), -σι ZZc: οὔτε λιταῖς XXaXrXs: οὐ λιταῖς TTa.

El. 169 ἔπαθεν LGRXsZc: ἔπαθ' ΛXXaXrZTTa.⁷⁹

El. 197 ἔρωσ L¹GRZZc: ἔρος XXaXrXsL²TTa.

⁷⁸ γ' is also omitted by Thomas Magistros, *Ecloga vocum Atticarum* p. 410.8 Ritschl, as it is omitted by Zc, a manuscript of the earlier Thoman edition.

^{78b} It seems that πρὶν δ' ἰδεῖν οὐδεῖς was the corrupt reading of the *veteres* in general and that this was corrected by Moschopolus (whom Triclinius followed). Among the *veteres*, only L had the necessary metrical knowledge to straighten out the old corruption, but the correct reading of L was an individual departure from the general corruption of the *veteres*.

⁷⁹ ἔπαθεν seems to be a general corruption of the *veteres*. Therefore, ἔπαθ' in Λ may be quite accidental.

El. 198 *προφητεύσαντες* L¹GRZZc: *προφυτεύσαντες* ΔXXaXrXsL²TTa.⁸⁰

El. 218 *αἰ* LGRZZcTa: *αἰεῖ* XXaXrXsT.

El. 279 *ἐμόν* L¹GRXrZcTa: *ἀμόν* XXaXsL²ZT.

El. 314 *ἦ δ' ἂν* L¹GRZZc: *ἦ κἂν* XXaXrXsL²TTa.

El. 422 *τῷ* L¹G¹RZc: *ῶ* XXaXrXsL²γ^pG²ZTTa.

El. 433 *ἀπό* om. L¹GRZZc: *ἀπό* habent XXaXrXsL²TTa.

El. 496 *μήποθ'* (semel) LAGRZ^{ac}Zc: *μήποτε μήποθ'* XXaXrXsZ^{pc}TTa.

El. 528 *εἶλεν* κούκ L^{ac}, *εἶλε* κούκ L^{pc}GRZZcTTa: *εἶλεν* οὐκ XXaXrXsL².

El. 534 *δέ* LAGR: *δῆ* XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

El. 554 *θ'* om. LAGRZc: *γ'* habent XXaXsZ: *θ'* XrTTa.

El. 588 *ἐμόν* L¹ΔGRZc: *ἀμόν* vel *ἀμόν* XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.

El. 618 *προσηκότα* LAGR, Suda (sub E 1846, excepto *προσήκοντα* Suda codice G), Zc: *προσεικότα* XXaXrXsZTTa.

El. 671 *τὸ ποῖον* LGRXrZZcTTa: *ὁποῖον* XXaXs.

El. 676 *πάλαι* λέγω L¹GR, Eustathius (*Il.* 702.4), ZTTa: *τότ'* ἐννέπω XXaXrXsL²γ^pZ^pZcT^{γp}.

El. 691 *πένταθλ'* LGR (cf. Suda sub B 511), XsZZc: *πεντάεθλ'* XXaXrTTa.

El. 713 *ἐν* LG¹RZZcT: *ἐκ* XXaXrXsG².

El. 809 *φρενὸς* οἴχη L¹GRZc, *φρενὸς* ὄχη Δ: *οἴχη φρενὸς* XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.

El. 825 *ἄελιος* LAGRXrZZc: *ἄλιος* XXaXsTTa.

El. 890 *λοιπὸν μ' ἢ* LGXrZc, *λοιπὸν μὴ* R: *λοιπὸν ἔν' ἢ* XXa, *λοιπὸν* [..] ἢ Xs: *λοιπὸν ἢ* ZTTa.

El. 903 *ψυχῆς* L¹GRZ^{ac}: *ψυχῇ* XXaXrXsL²Z^{pc}ZcTTa.

El. 947 *ποιεῖν* L¹GRZc¹ (*ποιεῖν* Zc²): *τελεῖν* XXaXrXsL²γ^pZTTa.

El. 985 *μὴ* 'κλιπεῖν LAGRZZcT^{pc}Ta (*μὴ* ἐκλιπεῖν T^{ac}): *μὴ* λιπεῖν XXaXrXs.

El. 991 *καὶ τῷ κλύοντι* L¹GRZc: *καὶ κλύοντι* ΔXXaXrXsL²ZTTa.⁸¹

El. 1024 *τοιαύτην* οὖν L¹GRZ^{γp}Zcⁱ: *τοιαύτη* νοῦν XXaXrXsL²ZZc^sT.

El. 1029 *μάθης* L¹GRXa^sZZc^sT: *πάθης* XXaⁱXrXsL²Zcⁱ.

⁸⁰ It is a situation analogous to the preceding one (see note 79). *προφυτεύσαντες* in Δ departs from the general reading of the *veteres* either by accident, or perhaps there was a double reading, and Δ adopted *προφυτεύσαντες*.

⁸¹ This case recalls the situation in *Ai.* 1419 (see above, note 78^b). Probably *καὶ τῷ κλύοντι* was the general corruption of the *veteres*, shared also by L. Moschopoulos found the right correction, but much earlier Δ had anticipated this correction due to his metrical knowledge. The same situation seems to appear in *Oed. Tyr.* 322.

El. 1094 ἐν om. LGRZ^{ac}Zc^{ac}: ἐν habent XXaXrXsZ^{pc}Zc^{pc}: ἐπ' habent TTa.

El. 1124 ἐπαιτεῖ L¹GR: ἐπαιτεῖται XXaXrXsL²ZTTa: ἀπαιτεῖται Zc.

El. 1124 τόδε L¹GRZTTa: τάδε XXaXrXsL²Zc.

El. 1141 ξένησι LGRZTTa: ξέναισι XaXrZc ξένοισι X ξαίνεσι Xs.

El. 1163 κελεύθου L¹AGRZZcTTa: κελεύθους XXaXrXsL².

El. 1193 σ' om. L¹GR: σ' XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

El. 1226 χερσὶν L¹GRZ: χερσὶν XXaXsZcTTa, χερσὶ XrL²^{γρ}.

El. 1232/3 γοναὶ (semel) L¹GRZ^{ac}Zc: γοναὶ γοναὶ XXaXrXsL²Z^{pc}TTa.

El. 1260 τίς οὖν ἀντάξι' ἂν Pearson: τίς οὖν ἀξίαν L¹GRZ^{ac}: τίς οὖν ἂν ἀξίαν XXaXrL², τίς ἂν οὖν ἀξίαν Xs: τίς οὖν ἀναξίαν Z^{pc}Zc: τίς δῆτ' οὖν ἀξίαν TTa.

El. 1310 τοῦμόν φαιδρόν LGRZc: φαιδρόν τοῦμόν XXaXrXsZ^s: φαιδρῶ τοῦμόν Z¹TTa.

El. 1324/5 οἶαν — ἀπώσεται' L¹G: οἶ' ἂν — ἀπώσεται' XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa, οἶαν — ἀπώσεται' R.

El. 1343 ἐν LAGRZc: οὖν XXaXrXsZTTa.

El. 1365 κυκλοῦνται L¹GRTTa: κυκλοῦσι XaXrXsL²ZZc, -σιν X.

El. 1375 ὅσοι πρόπυλα LGRZc: ὅσοιπερ πρόπυλα XXaXrXsZ: ὅσοι προπύλαια TTa.

El. 1380 προσπιτνῶ L¹GR, Suda sub E 1862, Suda sub A 582 codex A, Xr^sXs^{pc}ZZc: προπιτνῶ Suda sub A 582 (excepto codice A), XXaXrⁱXs^{ac}TTa.

El. 1414 φθίνει φθίνει LGRZZcTTa: φθίνει (semel) XXaXrXs.

El. 1456 μ' LAGRZZcTTa: μ' om. XXaXrXs.

El. 1502 ἔρπε L¹GRZc: ἔρφ' XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.

El. 1506 θέλοι L¹GRZc: θέλει XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.

Oedipus Tyrannus 29 καδμεῖον LGRZZcTTa: καδμεῖων XXaXrXs.

OT 34 συναλλαγαῖς L¹G, Suda (sub Σ 1430 in lemmate et in textu), ZZcTTa: ξυναλλαγαῖς XXaXrXsL²R.

OT 42 ἡμῖν εὐρεῖν L¹AGRZZc, ἡμῶν εὐρεῖν Suda (sub Π 2832) codex V: εὐρεῖν ἡμῖν XXaXrXsL²TTa, Suda codex A.

OT 43 του L¹GR: που XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

OT 50 στάντες (τ' om.) L¹GRXaXsZZc: στάντες τ' XXrL²: στάντες γ' TTa.

OT 77 ὅσα (ἂν om.) LAGRXa^{pc}ZZc: ὅσ' ἂν XXa^{ac}XrXsTTa.

OT 105 εἰσιδὼν L¹GRZc: εἰσεῖδων XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.^{81b}

^{81b} Cf. Moschopolus, Schol. *Batrachomyom.* 11 (Arthur Ludwich, *Die homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase* [Leipzig, 1896] p. 211.19).

OT 117 κατείδεν L¹AGRZZc: κατείδ' XXaXrXsL²TTa.

OT 130 τὸ L¹GR, Suda (sub Π 3083), ZZcTTa: τὰ XXaXrXsL².

OT 134 πρὸς L¹GRZZc: πρὸ XXaXrXsL²TTa.

OT 159 κεκλόμενος LXRⁱZZcTTa, κεκλημένος G, κυκλόμενος R: κεκλο-
μένω XXa¹Xr^sXs, κεκλημένω Xa^s.

OT 250 γένοιτ' ἂν ἐμοῦ L¹AGRZZcTTa: γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ XXaXrXsL².

OT 250 ξυνειδότος LGRZZcTTa: συνειδότος XXaXrXs.

OT 281 δύναται L¹GZc: δύναιτ' XXaXsL²ZTTa: δύνατ' XrR.

OT 297 οὐξελέγχων L¹GRZTTa: οὐξελέγξων XXaXrXsL²Zc.

OT 322 ἔννομον L¹GRZc: ἔννομ' ΔXXaXrXsL²ZTTa.⁸²

OT 525 τοῦ πρὸς δ' LZc¹: τοῦπος δ' GR: πρὸς τοῦ δ' XXaXrXsZZc²
TTa.

OT 528 ἐξ ὁμμάτων ὀρθῶν τε καὶ L¹TTa, Suda (sub O 571) codex G:
ἐξ ὁμμάτων δ' ὀρθῶν δὲ καὶ GR, Suda codd. AS: ἐξ ὁμμάτων δ' ὀρθῶν τε
καὶ Suda M, ἐξ ὁμμάτων δ' ὀρθῶν καὶ Suda F: ἐξ ὁμμάτων ὀρθῶν δὲ καὶ
XXaXrXsL²ZZc.

OT 549 τήνδ' LGR(Z^{ac?}): τήν Suda (sub Eι 339), XXaXrXsZZc
TTa.

OT 637 οὐκ εἶ σύ τ' ἐς οἴκους σύ τε κρέων κατὰ στέγας L¹GRZc: οὐκ εἶ
σύ τ' οἴκους σύ τε κρέων (κρέον Xr) κατὰ στέγας XXaXrXsL²: οὐκ εἶ σύ τ'
εἰς (ἐς Z) οἴκους σύ τε κρέων (κατὰ om.) στέγας ZTTa.

OT 657 λόγων L¹GR: λόγω XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

OT 659 φυγείν L¹GRXrⁱZZc: φυγῆν XXaXr^sXsL²TTa.

OT 660/1 θεῶν θεὸν LGRZ²ZcTTa: θεῶν (θεὸν om.) XXaXrXs:
(θεῶν om.) θεὸν Z¹.

OT 697 δ' L¹GRZZcTTa: τ' XXaXrXsL².

OT 752 ἐν αὐτοῖσι δ' ἦν LGR, ἐν αὐτοῖς δ' ἦν Zc: ἐν δ' αὐτοῖσιν ἦν
XXaXrXsZTTa.

OT 763 οἶ'] ὃ γ' L: ὃδ' GRZZc: ὃδε γ' XXaXrXsTTa.

OT 773 λέξοιμ' LGRTTa: λέξαιμ' XXaXrXsZZc.

OT 779 μέθη L¹GR: μέθης XXaXrXsL²ZZcTTa.

OT 792 δηλώσοιμ' LGRX^sXaTⁱTa: δηλώσαιμ' XiXrXsZZcT^s.

OT 804 ξυνηγντίζον LGRXsZZcTTa, ξυνηγντίζε Suda (sub Π 2162)
codex A: συνηγντίζε Suda cod. V, συνηγντίζον XXaXr: ἐπηγντίζε
Suda cod. F.

OT 815 τοῦδὲ γ' ἀνδρὸς νῦν ἐστ' L¹GRZc: τοῦδὲ γ' ἀνδρὸς ἐστίν
XXaXrZTTa, τοῦδὲ γ' ἀνδρὸς ἐστ' L², τοῦ γ' ἀνδρὸς ἐστίν Xs.

OT 836 τοσοῦτόν (γ' om.) L¹GRZc: τοσοῦτόν γ' XXaXrXsL²Z:
τοσοῦτό γ' TTa.

⁸² Cf. above, note 81.

OT 935 παρὰ L¹GRZc: πρὸς XXaXrXsL²TTa.

OT 966 ὑφηγητῶν δ' ἐγὼ L¹GRZc: ὑφηγητῶν ἐγὼ XXaXsL²ZTa: ὑφ' ἡγητῶν ἐγὼ XrT.

OT 976 λέχος οὐκ ὀκνεῖν LGRZc: λέκτρον οὐκ ὀκνεῖν XXaXrXsZTTa.

OT 1046 ὑμεῖς γὰρ LGRZc: ὑμεῖς γ' XXaXrXsZ: ὑμεῖς (γ' om.) TTa.

OT 1064 δρᾶ L¹GRZZc: δρᾶν XXaXrXsL²TTa.

OT 1225 αἰρεῖσθε LAGRZc: ἀρεῖσθε XXaXrXsZTTa.

OT 1231 αἰ L¹AGRZZcTTa: αἰ ᾧ XXaXrXsL² (glossa Moschopulea αἰ ἄν).

OT 1242 εὐθὺς πρὸς L¹GRZZc: εὐθὺ πρὸς XXaXrXsL²: εὐθὺς ἐς TTa.

OT 1250 ἄνδρα L¹GRZZcTTa: ἄνδρας XXaXrXsL².

OT 1252 εἰσέπεισεν L¹GRZZc: εἰσέπαισεν XXaXrXsL²TTa.

OT 1265 ὅπως δ' ὀρᾷ LGRZc: ὅπως ὀρᾷ XXaXrXsZTTa.

OT 1266 ἐπὶ L¹GRZZc: ἐπεὶ XXaXrXsL²TTa.

OT 1267 ἔκειθ' ὃ L¹GRZZc, ἔκειθ' ἡ Xr: ἔκειτο XXaXsL²TTa.

OT 1299 τίς ᾧ L¹AGRZc: τίς σ' ᾧ XXaXrXsL²ZTTa.

OT 1306 ποίαν L: οἴαν GR: τοίαν XXaXrXsZZcTTa.

OT 1348 ποτ' ἄν LGRZZcTTa: ποτέ (ἄν om.) XXaXrXs.

OT 1351 ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπὸ τε L¹: ἔλυσέ μ' ἀπὸ τε GRZc, ἔλυσ' ἔμ' ἀπὸ τε Z: ἔλυσεν ἀπὸ τε XXaXrXsL²: (ἔλαβε aut ἔλυσε om.) μ' ἀπὸ τε TTa.

OT 1422 οὐθ' L¹GR, Suda (sub Γ 109), ZZcTTa: οὐχ XXaXrXsL^{2mg}, οὐ L².

OT 1423 οὐθ' L¹AGR, Suda (sub Γ 109), ZcTTa: οὐδ' XXaXrXsL² Z, οὐχ L^{2mg}.

OT 1446 γε L¹GRZZcTTa: τε XXaXrXsL².

OT 1459 ἀρσένων L¹GRZZcTTa: ἀρρένων XXaXrXsL².

There are a few more variants which appear in Moschopulean mss., but since the consistency of their incidence is not so steady I prefer not to mention them.

We have one more question to illustrate with regard to the Moschopulean recension, namely: the division of that tradition ξ into the two families (see above, p. 125): ξm which is purely Moschopulean, with scholia οἰκέως, and ξp, with Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia οἰκέως + σύνταξις. The poetic text of the two families has certain specific readings, in addition to the basic Moschopulean readings. I shall quote below the more important of those characteristic features in such a way that readings XXa will characterize the Moschopulean group ξm, while readings XrXs will characterize the Moschopuleo-Planudean group ξp.

These are the peculiar readings of the Moschopulean family ξm, as exemplified by XXa:

Aiax 725 ἔνθεν κᾶνθεν οὔτις LGXrXs: ἔνθεν κᾶνθεν καὶ οὔτις XXa: ἔνθεν κᾶνθεν κοῦτις ZZcQR: ἔνθεν κᾶνθε κοῦτις TTa.

Ai. 1368 σὸν ἄρα L¹GQRXsZZc, σὸν ἄρα XrL²TTa: σὸν γὰρ ἄρα XXa.

Electra 222 οὐ LGRXrXsZZcTTa: οὐ γὰρ XXa.

El. 454 αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς LGRXrXsZZcTTa: εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν XXa.

El. 575 μόλις LGRXrXsZZcTTa: μόγυς XXa.

El. 644 νυκτὶ τῇδε LGRXrXsZZcTTa: τῇδε νυκτὶ XXa.

Oed. Tyr. 630 μέτεστι τῇσδ' οὐχὶ σοὶ LGRXrXsZZc: μέτεστι τῇσδ' οὐ σοὶ XXa: μέτεστιν οὐχὶ σοὶ TTa.

OT 906/7 γὰρ λαῖτον θέσφατ' L¹G¹, Suda (sub E 1583), γὰρ λαῖω θεόφατ' R: γὰρ παλαιὰ λαῖτον θέσφατ' XXa: γὰρ λαῖτον παλαιὰ θέσφατ' XrXsL²G²ZZc:⁸³ δ' ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τὰ λαῖτον θέσφατ' TTa.

OT 1213/4 χρόνος δικάζει LGRXrXsZZcTTa: χρόνος δς δικάζει XXa.⁸⁴

These are the peculiar readings of the family ξp, which is supplied with Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia οἰκείως + σύνταξις (if any), as exemplified by XrXs:

Aiax 1369 πανταχῇ LGQRXXaXsZZc: πανταχοῦ XrTTa.⁸⁵

Electra 238 ἔβλασεν LGRXXa: ἔβλαστ' XrXsZZcTTa.

Oed. Tyr. 652 οὔτε L¹GRXXaZZcTTa: οὔποτε XrXsL².

OT 722 θανεῖν LGRXXaXsZZcTTa: παθεῖν XrL²γρ.

OT 797 χρησμῶν ὀνείδη LGXXaXs^{pe}ZcTTa: χρησμῶν γ' ὀνείδη XrXs^{ae}?RZ.

OT 840 ἐκπεφενυγίην LGRXXaXs^{pe}ZZc: ἐκπεφενυγίμην XrXs^{ae}.

OT 906/7: see above.

OT 1355 ἄχθος LGRXXaZc: ἄχος XrXsZTTa.

In view of the broad manuscript evidence presented above, there is no need of commenting specifically on the merits of Moschopulean readings. We had known before that Moschopulus was a

⁸³ This shows that, while introducing the word παλαιὰ into the text was a Moschopulean innovation, the divergent *sequence* of words is characteristic for the two Moschopulean families respectively.

⁸⁴ Yet occasionally the text of this family ξm is kept clean of this interpolation. δς was originally a gloss.

⁸⁵ There is a certain inconsistency with regard to the variation πανταχῇ and πανταχοῦ in Moschopulean and Moschopuleo-Planudean mss., but πανταχοῦ is decidedly prevalent in the family ξp.

textual critic of great abilities. I want only to stress that he made in Sophocles many felicitous *metrical* corrections. Some forty of them will be kept forever in the Sophocles text and will have to be credited to the name of Moschopulus. Cf. especially *Ai.* 58, 112, 169, 499, 519, 565, 780, 994, 1369, *El.* 61, 99, 132, 169, 197, 279, 422, 534, 588, 809, 1094, 1124, 1193, 1226, 1232/3, 1324/5, *OT* 42, 50, 77, 117, 250, 281, 322, 637, 752, 976, 1046, 1242, 1252, 1266, 1299. For other Moschopulean corrections, cf. also: *El.* 1024, *OT* 1225.

4. THE MS. PARIS 2712 (A) AND RELATED MANUSCRIPTS

Readers familiar with modern editions of Sophocles have probably noticed the startling agreement, in the triad, of the famous ms. Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2712 (= A), with the Moschopulean text, as revealed above. Quite intentionally, I avoided any reference to Paris A in my discussion of the Moschopulean text, for I did not want to inject into my systematic presentation of the Moschopulean readings this issue which might offhand have seemed controversial to some scholars with deeply ingrained (but nevertheless erroneous) ideas about the supposed authenticity of the A text.

It is to be recalled that since Brunck shifted the Sophocles text from the Triclinian basis of the Turnebus vulgate to the A basis, even after Elmsley practically rediscovered the L text, the A text was considered — next to L — an equal representative of the *ancient* tradition.⁸⁶ The reason of that unduly respectful evaluation of A was the fact that it offered in quite many cases readings more correct than those of L, but those improvements were (as we see it now) only conjectural corrections of Moschopulus whose text was followed, in the triad, by the codex A.

This fact — as unorthodox or heretic as it may seem to those who believe in conventional views in this respect — is absolutely obvious from the joint incidence of the Moschopulean readings in A. This I shall corroborate below in a survey of the A readings and shall also analyze the text of the codex A in the remaining plays of Sophocles.

⁸⁶ E.g., cf. Georg Kaibel, *Sophokles Elektra* erklärt von —. (*Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern* [Leipzig, 1896]) p. vii. Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Einleitung in die attische Tragödie* (*Euripides Herakles* I) 203. Still some scholars had grave doubts about the authenticity of the text represented by A: cf. Πέτρος Ν. Παπαγεωργίου, *Σοφοκλέους δράματα τὰ σφῶδμενα* I: *Ἡλέκτρα* (Ζωγράφειος Ἑλληνική Βιβλιοθήκη 13 [Ἀθήνησιν, 1910]) p. σπς'.

I should like to mention a certain consideration which enhanced — unwarrantedly — the prestige of A. There is a long series of later corrections in L (all later corrections in L are symbolized by me L^2) which agree with A, this agreement occurring mostly in Moschopulean readings (or rather in Moschopuleo-Planudean readings of the family ξp). There was a great deal of speculation made by many scholars⁸⁷ as to the relationship of A and L^2 . The whole problem is entirely meaningless, for that agreement refers to Moschopulean readings and thus lacks any authority whatsoever. Moreover, we can elucidate the relationship of A and L^2 , wherever they agree, in an absolutely definite way: *the writer of A himself corrected the codex L* and introduced his own A readings into L in case of difference between L and A.

The examination of the handwriting of those corrections in L proves the point beyond any doubt. It is enough to have a look at the line *Oed. Tyr.* 800 supplemented in the margin of the codex L (fol. 41^v)⁸⁸ and to compare it with the handwriting of A (this line appears in A on page 146), and the identity of that corrector of L with the scribe of A will appear with positive certainty. This means that codex L was available in the XIVth century in that same scriptorium where codex A was being written.

The above explanation explodes all the theories of the past century about the import of the agreement AL^2 and liquidates those erroneous beliefs about the various possible relationships of A and L, and about the value of L^2 : the value of L^2 — so far as those Moschopulean corrections in the triad are concerned — is *nil*. That agreement of AL^2 simply results from the identity of the readings L^2 with the Moschopuleo-Planudean text of A.

There is a *gemellus* of A in the ms. Venice 467 (my symbol U). The ms. U gives a text entirely parallel to that of A throughout its whole contents so that it parallels the codex A not only in the triad, but also in the remaining plays. Of course, in the triad, the ms. U is likewise Moschopulean. I shall demonstrate below the

⁸⁷ Cf. Paul Masqueray, *Sophocle. Texte établi et traduit par* —. 1^a (Paris, 1946) p. xvii.

⁸⁸ This page is reproduced, of course, in the *Facsimile of the Laurentian Manuscript of Sophocles*. With an Introduction by E. M. Thompson and R. C. Jebb (London, 1885: Printed for the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies), and also in Guilelmus Wattenbach, *Scripturae Graecae specimina*³ (Berolini, 1897) plate xxvi. On the corrector in question, called C⁷ by Lewis Campbell (*Sophocles* 1² [Oxford, 1879] xxvi), cf. Thompson in Thompson-Jebb, *Facsimile*, introduction p. 11.

character of AU, but first I wish to give a description of the two mss.

A = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2712. Parchment, XIVth cent., 298 × 235 mm., 324 pages, 3 columns to a page for the text of Sophocles, 30–49 lines to a column. — Page 115 *Vita*; 116 arg. to *Aiax*; 117 *Aiax*; 127 arg. to *El.* (ὕπόκειται); *Electra*; 139 arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; *Oedipus Tyrannus*; 152 arguments III and I to *Antigone*; 153 *Antigone*; 165 arguments I and IV to *Oed. Col.*; *Oedipus Coloneus*; 183 arg. to *Trach.* (from Apollodorus); 184 *Trachiniae*; 198 prose argument to *Philoct.*; 198–212 and 225 *Philoctetes*. Sparse Moschopulean scholia on *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*; sparse ancient scholia on *Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Philoct.* Among the Byzantine scholia on the triad, I have noticed also a Planudean scholium⁸⁹ on *Aiax* 733. This ms. was extensively used in Sophocles editions since Brunck, with the symbol A. A collation of A with L was published by Justus Hermann Lipsius, *Apparatus Sophoclei supplementum* (*Programm des Nicolaigymnasiums in Leipzig* [Leipzig, 1867] 3–16).

U = Venice graec. 467 (No. di collocazione 764). Paper, XIVth cent., 228 × 140 mm., 336 foll., 16 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Written by one Θεόκτιστος (fol. 143^v): θ(εο)ῦ τὸ δῶρον καὶ πόνος θεοκτίστου. At the end of the codex, there is a subscription, but the name of the copyist is covered with ink (fol. 336^v): † ἐγράφησαν τὰ παρόντα ἑπτὰ δράματα τοῦ σοφοκλέους, διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ [] τοῦ [] καὶ ἐτελειώθησαν, κατὰ μῆνα ὀκτώβριον τῆς δεκάτης ἰνδικτιῶνος. — 1^r arg. to *Aiax*; 2^r *Aiax*; 48^r arg. to *El.* (ὕπόκειται); 48^v *Electra*; 96^r arguments I and II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 97^r–143^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 145^r arguments III and I to *Antig.*; 146^r *Antigone*; 188^r arguments I and IV to *Oed. Col.*; 189^r *Oed. Col.*; 246^v arg. to *Trachin.* (from Apollodorus); 248^r *Trachiniae*; 288^v prose argument to *Philoct.*; 289^r–336^r *Philoctetes*. Different hands wrote the scholia. Those on the triad are almost exclusively Planudean scholia (preserved in Naples II.F.9 with authorship marks or without). In this regard, the scholia of U are an additional confirmation of the distinct authorship of those scholia. The scholia on *Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trachin.*, *Philoct.*, are sparse ancient scholia, like those of A.

⁸⁹ It is marked accordingly in D fol. 155^r. Since it happened to be included also in the scholia of the Triclinian edition (T fol. 23^r and Ta fol. 131^r), it found its way in the Turnebian scholia (p. 18) and is reprinted among the "Triclinian" scholia in Dindorf 347.6–19. I did not find this scholium in the Moschopuleo-Planudean mss. Xr and Xs.

This ms. U was probably used by Aldus in *Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, and *Phil.*, for his *editio princeps* of Sophocles (1502).⁹⁰ While it agrees in general with concurrent readings of AU in these plays, in case of disagreement between A and U the Aldine edition coincides with the peculiar reading of U (cf. *Antig.* 196 ἀφαγνίσαι A: ἀφανίσαι U Aldus; *Oed. Col.* 110 τὸδ' LRA: τὸ γ' U Aldus).⁹¹

The close relationship of A and U as *gemelli* appears even from a cursory examination of both codices: cf. *Ajax* 196 οὐρανίων AU¹; 198 ὀρμάτ' ἐν δ' ἀνέμοις AU¹; versum 836 om. Suda (sub A 632), AU^{ac}; *OT* 46 versum om. A^{ac}U¹; 851 καὶ τρέποιτο AU¹; 1291 ὥς om. AU¹; *Ant.* 340 παλλομένων AU; 432 χ' ἡμεῖς δ' ἰδόντες AU; 837^b ζῶσαν — θανοῦσαν om. AU; *Philoct.* 559 ἅπερ γ' ἔλεξας AU; 562 φοῖνιξ θ' ὁ AU; *Oed. Col.* 408 γε om. AU; 426 πόλιν AU; *Trach.* 143 παρούσα AU; 163 νέμου] μένειν AU. The poetic texts of the two mss. cannot be transcripts of each other, since they have peculiar errors which are not repeated in the other manuscript: *Ajax* 569 τι om. A (habet U); *El.* 549 οὖν om. Suda (sub Δ 1642), U: habet A. Of course, there are many more cases of this kind.

The text exhibited by the two mss. in the triad is a clearly Moschopulean text. It would suffice to quote a few significant readings to prove the point, but in view of the fact that the A text has been hailed, since Brunck's time, as a highly important *ancient* witness of the Sophocles text, I feel that I have to perform the process of devaluating the ms. A, and its *gemellus* U, with a wider array of proofs. It seems to be worth while to do so, for in this way we shall eliminate in the triad, once for all, the individual evidence of A and divest it of any semblance of authoritative strength. Therefore, I quote below characteristic Moschopulean readings in which both manuscripts A and U share. The reader is requested to compare these readings of AU with those readings listed above (p. 131 ff.) which we have definitely established to be Moschopulean, and to observe the joint incidence of the same readings here and there.

Occasionally there is a divergence between A and U so that either of them follows Moschopulus while the other one departs from

⁹⁰ Cf. Campbell, *Sophocles* 2 (1881) ix; Ivstvs Hermannvs Lipsivs, *De Sophoclis emendandi praesidiis* (Progr. Misenae, 1860) 23.

⁹¹ On the asserted use of the Leningrad 731 by Aldus for *Ajax*, *El.*, *Oed. Tyr.*, see below, p. 157. At any rate, the triad in the Aldine edition is *not* consistently Moschopulean, though it has quite many Moschopulean readings, especially if they were to be preferred for metrical reasons. Cf. Lipsius, *loc. cit.* (above, note 90).

Moschopulus. It still seems that in such a case the common source of AU did have the Moschopulean reading, but then one of our transcripts departed from Moschopulus by following another source, e.g., some *veteres*, or Suda, or some other Byzantine interpolations. Here is the list of Moschopulean readings in AU:

Aiax 58 ἐμπιτνῶν AU; 75 ἀρεῖς A¹U¹ (ἄρης A^oU^oX^{7p}); 80 ἐν δόμοις AU; 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι AU; 169 ὑποδείσαντες AU; 222 αἰθωπος AU; 227 οἶμοι AU; 245 ἡδὴ κραῖτα AU; 259 φρόνιμον AU; 301 ὑπαίξας (quamquam ← incipiebat scriba, at statim ipse litteram correxuit, ut ὑ-evaderet) A, U; 307 διοπτέου U, sed διοπτέει A; 488 τινες AU; 496 ἦν AU; 499 δουλίαν AU¹ (δουλείαν U²); 519 πᾶσ' AU¹ (πᾶσιν A²); 524 γένοιτό ποθ' οὗτος AU; 534 τ' ἦν ἂν AU; 557 δείξεις AU; 565 ἐνάλιος AU; 569 δείξει AU; 634 κρέσσων AU; 689 ὑμῖν ἅμα AU; 705 ξυνείης AU; 717 μετεγνώσθη AU; 727 σῖναιμον AU; 780 τοσαῦθ' AU; 780 εἰφ' A^{ao}U (εἶπεν A^{po}); 877 οὐδ' ἐμοὶ δὴ A^{po}U (οὐδ' ἐμοὶ A^{ao}); 951 ἄγαν γ' ὑπερβριθὲς U, ἄγαν δ' ὑπερβριθὲς A; 969 τί] πῶς AU; 994 πασῶν AU; 1008 ἐμός θ' ἅμα AU; 1011 ἡδίων AU; 1019 ἀπορριφήσομαι AU; 1031 ἐγνάπτει' AU; 1036 οὖν] ἂν AU; 1070 λόγων (τ' om.) AU; 1081 πάρα AU; 1113 ἐνώμοτος AU; 1127 δεινόν γ' AU; 1146 ναυτίλῳ A¹U (-λων A²); 1159 ἄνθρωπε AU; 1160 πάρα AU; 1214 ἀνείται AU; ἐφώνεις A¹U (ἐφρόνεις A²); 1236 κέκραγας AU; 1253 πλευρὰν AU; 1284 ἦλθεν ἀντίος AU; 1339 οὐκουν AU; 1369 γ' habent AU.

Electra 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ U, χρόνῳ μακρῷ A; 61 μὲν οὐδὲν AU; 96 ἐξείνισε AU; 99 φονίῳ AU; 123 ἀκόρετον AU; 132 οὐδ' ἐθέλω AU; 139 γοῖσι οὐτε λιταῖς AU; 169 ἔπαθ' AU; 197 ἔρος AU; 198 προφυτεύσαντες AU; 218 αἰεὶ AU; 279 ἁμόν A, (ex ἐμ- factum) U; 314 ἡ καὶν AU; 422 ᾧ AU; 433 ἀπὸ habent AU; 496 μήποτε μήποθ' AU; 528 εἶλεν οὐκ AU; 534 δὴ AU; 554 θ'] γ' AU; 588 ἁμόν AU; 618 προσεικότα U, προσήκοντα A (cf. cod. G Suda sub E 1846); 676 τότε ἐννέπω AU; 691 πεντάεθλ' AU; 809 οἷχη φρενὸς A^{po}U (φρενὸς οἷχη A^{ao}, sed ab ipso scriba ilico correctum); 825 ἄλιος AU; 890 λοιπὸν ἔν' ἡ AU^{ao} (λοιπὸν [. . .] ἡ U^{po}); 903 ψυχῇ AU; 947 τελεῖν AU; 985 μὴ λιπεῖν AU; 1024 τοιαύτη νοῦν AU; 1029 πάθης AU; 1094 ἐν AU; 1124 ἐπαιτεῖται AU; 1124 τὰδε AU; 1141 ξέναισι U, sed ξένησι A; 1193 σ' habent AU; 1226 χερσὶν AU; 1232 γοναὶ γοναὶ AU; 1260 τίς οὖν ἂν ἀξίαν AU; 1310 φαιδρὸν τοῦμόν AU; 1324/5 οἳ' ἂν — ἀπώσαιτ' AU; 1343 οὖν AU; 1365 κυκλοῦσι AU; 1375 ὅσοιπερ πρόπυλα U, ὅσοι πρόπυλα (ex -λον correctum) A; 1380 προπιτνῶ AU; 1414 φθίνει (semel) AU; 1456 μ' om. AU; 1502 ἔρφ' AU; 1506 θέλει AU.

Oed. Tyr. 29 καδμείων AU¹ (-ον U²); 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς AU; 42 εὐρεῖν

ἡμῖν AU; 43 που AU; 50 σtάντες τ' AU; 77 ὅσ' ἄν AU; 105 εἰσεῖδον AU; 117 κατέιδ' AU; 130 τὰ AU; 134 πρὸ AU; 159 κεκλομένῳ A^sU, -μενος Aⁱ; 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ AU; 250 συνειδότος AU; 281 δύναιτ' AU; 297 οὐξελέγξων AU; 322 ἔννομ' AU; 525 πρὸς τοῦ δ' AU; 528 ἐξ ὁμμάτων ὀρθῶν δὲ κάξ AU; 549 τὴν AU; 637 σύ τ' οἴκους AU; 657 λόγῳ AU; 659 φυγὴν AU; 660/1 θεῶν (θεὸν om.) AU; 697 τ' AU; 752 ἐν δ' αὐτοῖσιν ἦν AU; 763 ὁδε γ' AU; 773 λέξαιμ' AU; 779 μέθης AU; 792 δηλώσαιμ' AU; 804 συνηντίαζον AU; 815 τοῦδ' γ' ἀνδρὸς ἐστίν AU; 836 τοσοῦτόν γ' AU; 935 πρὸς AU; 966 ὑφηγητῶν ἐγὼ AU; 976 λέκτρον οὐκ ὀκνεῖν AU; 1046 ὑμεῖς γ' AU; 1064 δρᾶν AU; 1225 ἀρεῖσθε AU; 1231 αἱ ἔν AU; 1242 εὐθὺ πρὸς AU; 1250 ἄνδρας AU; 1252 εἰσέπαισεν A, sed εἰσέπεσεν U; 1265 ὅπως ὀρᾷ AU; 1266 ἐπεὶ AU; 1299 τίς σ' ὦ AU; 1306 τοίαν AⁱUⁱ (ποίαν A^sU^s); 1348 ποτέ (ἄν om.) AU; 1351 ἔλυσεν ἀπὸ τε AU; 1422 οὐχ AU; 1423 οὐδ' AU; 1446 τε AU; 1459 ἀρρένων AU.

I have pointed out above the Planudean influence in the scholia of A, and the fact that almost exclusively Planudean scholia were added in U, though by different hands. Still the adding of the scholia may have happened at the same time when the codex U was written. No wonder that we discover that the Moschopulean text of AU belongs to the Moschopuleo-Planudean family ξρ: cf. *Aiax* 1369 πανταχοῦ AU; *Electra* 238 ἔβλαστ' AU; *Oed. Tyr.* 652 οὐποτε AU; 722 παθεῖν A^{rp}U^{rp}; 797 χρησμῶν γ' ὀνείδη AU; 840 ἐκπεφυγοίμην A, Uⁱ? (-οίην U²); 906 γὰρ λαῖον παλαιὰ θέσφατ' AU; 1355 ἄχος AU.

The picture is entirely clear and conclusive: the mss. A and U represent consistently the Moschopulean text recension, strictly speaking the Moschopuleo-Planudean text ξρ, and the evidence quoted above proves it beyond any doubt. I did not, as a matter of principle, indicate in my general list of Moschopulean readings, or in the above list of Moschopulean readings in AU, those cases in which the *veteres* are split by adopting different old variants and the Moschopulean recension follows the one or the other branch (i.e., the Laurentian or the Roman branch) of the ancient tradition. In such cases, the mss. AU quite naturally follow the variant embraced by Moschopulus: e.g., *Aiax* 1000 δύστηνος LAQZZcTTa: δέιλαιος GR, Moschopulus, AU; 1059 ἀθλίῳ GQR: αἰσχίστῳ LG^{rp}Qst¹, Moschopulus, AU, Z^{pc}Zc: ἐχθίστῳ Z^{ac}TTa.

To be sure, occasionally the mss. AU or one of them depart from the Moschopulean text and stick to the "old" readings — especially in cases where also some other Moschopulean mss. show

a lesser discipline in keeping in line with the Moschopulean text: e.g., cf. *Aiax* 61 φόνου *veteres*, AU, but also X^{7p}Xr (πόνου Moschopulus); 235 τὴν μὲν ἔσω σφάξ' L, τὴν μὲν ἔξω σφάξ' GR, τὴν μὲν ἔξω σφάξ' Q, τὴν μὲν ἔσω σφάξ' AU, but also Xr: τὸν μὲν ἔσφαξ' XXa, τὸ μὲν ἔσφαξ' Xs; 582 θρηγνέειν *veteres*, AU: θροεῖν Moschop., A^{7p}U^{7p}; *Electra* 671 τὸ ποῖον *vett.*, AUXr (ὄποῖον Moschop.); 713 ἐν *vett.*, AU (ἐκ Moschop.); 1163 κελεύθου *vett.*, AU (κελεύθους Moschop.); OT 1267 ἔκειθ' ὁ *vett.*, AU (ἔκειτο Moschop.). Sometimes, departures of AU from Moschopulus are influenced by other sources. E.g., the omission *Aiax* 836 om. AU^{ac}Xr^{ac} was probably suggested by the quotation in Suda sub A 632. — The reading *Electra* 486/7 αἰσχίσταις εἰν αἰκίαις AU appears also, e.g., in the old mss. Venice 468 and Ambros. G 56 sup.ⁱ (it was probably a conflation of two readings αἰσχίσταις ἐν and αἰσχίσταισιν). — *Aiax* 546 πον τόνδε AU, but also ZZc (= Thomas): accordingly, the reading of AU was influenced by Thomas. — *Oed. Tyr.* 786 αἰὲ *vett.*, Moschop., ZZc (= Thomas): αἰεὶ TTa (= Triclin.), AU: the reading was then suggested by Triclinius.

As I have just stated above, either one of these two mss. AU sometimes shows departures from Moschopulus, while the other twin manuscript clings to the Moschopulean text of their common source. As a matter of fact, U departs from Moschopulus less frequently than A, and is in general more disciplined. I should like to quote a few examples to illustrate this situation (of course, examples from A are more numerous): *El.* 549 οὖν om. U (extant in A and in Moschopulean mss.); this omission, which occurs in some mss., seems to be influenced by Suda sub Δ 1642.

Now, there will be more examples from A: *Aiax* 150 γὰρ σοῦ vulgo codd., U: σοῦ γὰρ A, but also Ambros. G 56 sup. — *Ai.* 472 γ' om. A¹ (habet U). This reading of A¹ (which appears, e.g., also in the Madrid 4677, Leiden Voss. Q 6, and Paris 2795), may have been prompted by Suda sub A 4213. — *El.* 137 τὸν γ' *veteres*, Moschop., U, Z¹Zc, TTa: τόνδ' Z^aA (and some other mss.). This Thoman variant may have influenced, among other mss., also the ms. A. — *El.* 569 τι om. A (habet U), om. G, Venice 468, Ambros. G 56 sup., D. — *El.* 618 προσεικότα Moschop., U: προσήκοντα A (cf. codex G of Suda sub E 1846). — *El.* 991 καὶ τῷ κλύοντι *vett.*, A: καὶ κλύοντι Moschop., U. — *El.* 1141 ξένησι *vett.*, A: ξέναισι Moschop., U. — *El.* 1198 ἦν γὰρ L, Moschop., U: γὰρ ἦν GRA. — *El.* 1375 ὅσοι

πρόπυλα *vett.*, (ex -λον) A: ὄσοιπερ πρόπυλα Moschop., U. — OT 523 δὴ om. A, Venice 468, Z¹ (habet U).

As I mentioned above, the writer of A had in his hands the Laurentian ms. L and while comparing L with his own text he corrected many divergent original readings of L and introduced his, i.e., Moschopulean readings into L. This accounts for the frequent appearance of the symbol L² behind the Moschopulean readings in our list of Moschopulean readings (see above, p. 131 ff.). The writer of A wrote also some Moschopulean scholia into L, marked in L even some erroneous peculiar readings of A only, and *vice versa* the scribe of A was led by this comparison to record in A some readings which he saw in L. A few examples will suffice. The hand of A transcribed in L some Moschopulean scholia from A, e.g., on *El.* 197 (p. 249.31–33 Dindorf) ἔρος — ἐντο (A page 129, L fol. 19^r); on *El.* 199 (p. 250.1–2 Dind.; A p. 129, L fol. 19^r); on *El.* 363 (p. 253.19–21 Dind.; A p. 130, L fol. 21^r); on *El.* 410 (p. 254.29 κατὰ–31 Dind.; A p. 130, L fol. 21^v).

There is a very characteristic case of that interrelationship of A and L in *El.* 948 (A p. 134, L fol. 27^r). The scribe A wrote in his text καὶ σύ που φίλων (with an interlinear scholium ἡγουν καὶ πόθεν σοι ἔσονται φίλοι). The codex L had in the text καὶ ποῦ σοι φίλων. Then, the hand A wrote in L, in the margin, γρ καὶ σύ που φίλων and continued ἡγουν πόθεν σοι ἔσονται. Back in A, the same hand A marked the reading of L in the margin of A thus: γρ καὶ ποῦ σοι.

At. 1160 κολλάζων AL²: most probably the hand of A intruded the erroneous reading of A into L while correcting the latter codex. On the line OT 800 omitted by L¹ and supplemented by the hand of A in the margin of L, see above, p. 140.

Corrections by the hand of A are visible throughout the whole codex L. Of course, there were several different correctors⁹² of L, but most of the Moschopulean corrections in the triad of L, or of the A-like corrections in L, have to be credited to the hand of A.

The results of the above discussion are very important for the evaluation of the manuscript evidence and its use for textual criticism in Sophocles. First of all, L² in the triad is meaningless, because it is only a duplication of the A readings. Then, AU in the triad are just ordinary representatives of the Moschopulean text lacking any special authority which some scholars were led to

⁹² Campbell (*Sophocles* 1².137; 2.vi) distinguished several correctors in L. The hand which I have identified as that of A was marked by Campbell with the symbol C⁷. Cf. above, note 88.

grant them just because of the fact that both A and U include a complete text of the seven plays.

The whole theory of Brunck concerning the value of A is upset by the results of this analysis. In general, Brunck displayed good judgment in abandoning the Triclinian vulgate of Turnebus. Yet, he erred when he thought that the ms. A, which he chose as his basis, represented an authentic ancient text and when he failed to see its Byzantine interpolated character.

Let us recapitulate the past vicissitudes of the printed text of Sophocles and the future outlook for it with regard to the triad. Aldus gave a very eclectic text which occasionally adopted, in the triad, some Moschopulean readings and, at any rate, was free from Triclinian interpolations in lyrical lines. Turnebus simply reproduced the Triclinian text distorted by many interpolations in lyrics. Then, as we see it now, Brunck abandoned the Triclinian, or Turnebian, vulgate, and put the Sophocles text on the A basis, i.e., in the triad he simply adopted the Moschopulean text of A without realizing that he followed a Byzantine recension.

Elmsley initiated the use of the Laurentian ms. L which scholars of the XIXth century rightly accepted as the most venerable witness of the Sophocles text. Now the ms. L is paralleled by the partial evidence of the fragmentary Leiden palimpsest Δ. The assertion that L was the exclusive source of all the other extant mss. of Sophocles was, of course, a fallacy. The mss. L and Δ represent only one branch of the Sophoclean text tradition. Other *veteres* have to be taken into account. The study of GMR by De Marco enriched our knowledge of the Roman family.⁹³ But only now, after the above disclosures of the Byzantine recensions, we are beginning to recognize concretely the Byzantine readings and the range of Byzantine interpolations, which invaded even the *veteres* after ca. A.D. 1300. My presentation of the Moschopulean text is the initial part of a larger investigation which will reconstruct other Byzantine texts of Sophocles. Their knowledge will enable us to gauge properly the extent and intensity of Byzantine interpolations in the *veteres*. Thus the main task toward a correct constitution of a future text of Sophocles is to know the complete repertory of Byzantine readings, to eliminate them from our consideration (also if they appear in the later *veteres*), to examine the specific readings of both the families, the Laurentian λ, and the

⁹³ Cf. above, note 32.

Roman ρ . Of course, the scholia of the *veteres* will often give us proper guidance in that study, whenever the picture offered by the poetic text of a given manuscript is not sufficiently clear.

In accordance with the scope of the present study, I do not deal here with the text character of A and U in the remaining four plays of Sophocles: *Antigone*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trachiniae*, *Philoctetes*. I shall take up this problem in due course in my later investigation of the *veteres*. Suffice it to state here that the two codices AU represent, in the remaining plays of Sophocles, an *old* text originally affiliated with the Roman family (GQR), but strongly interpolated and corrected from every available source, i.e., drawing also from the other Laurentian family and from Thomas and Triclinius, with addition of some corrections or changes invented by the common source of AU. The relationship of AU to the Roman family GQR was not discussed before, for the simple reason that the text of QR was not known or disclosed adequately.⁹⁴ In this respect, I content myself with indicating here a few characteristic situations: *Philoct.* 1037 $\xi\zeta\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha$ δ' LA, Thomas, Triclinius: $\xi\zeta\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha$ γ' GQRAU; 1209 $\nu\omicron\sigma$ L, Thomas, Triclinius: $\nu\omicron\sigma\sigma$ GRAU (part of the line is missing in Q); *Trach.* 67 $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ εἰ L, Thomas, Triclin.: $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ γ' εἰ RAU. Yet considering the eclectic and erratic character of AU in these plays, we should give more attention to this problem on a future occasion.

Apographs of the Codex A (Paris 2712)

It seems pertinent, in view of the importance which has been so long attached to the codex A, to list here a few apographs of A. Since their source, the ms. A itself, does exist, those copies are practically without any value. In these apographs of A, the text of *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Oedipus Tyrannus*, is, of course, the same Moschopulean text as that of A in the triad. Here is the list of the manuscripts which I have identified to be transcripts of A.

El Escorial Ω .I.9. Paper, XVIth cent., 37 × 26 cm., 208 foll., 2 columns to a page, 27 lines to a column for the text of Sophocles. — 89^r *Vita*; 90^r arg. to *Ajax*; 91^r *Ajax*; 104 *Electra*; 118 *Oed. Tyr.*; 143 *Antig.*; 166 *Oed. Col.*; 182 *Trachin.*; 195–208 *Philoctetes*. This ms. is a direct copy of the Paris 2712 with which it shares, e.g., these errors: *Ai.* 119 $\pi\rho\omega\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, 150 $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ γὰρ, 198 $\delta\rho\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau'$ ἐν δ' ἀνέμοις (also U¹), 317 ἀνώμωξεν.

⁹⁴ Cf. Colonna, *Athenaeum* N.S. 18 (1940) 270–280 (about the codex R = Vatic. 2291). On the scholia GMR, cf. De Marco, *op. cit.* (above, note 32). The codex Q (Paris, Supplément grec 109) is first used in Sophocles by myself (cf. above, p. 127).

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 34. Paper, end of the XVth or early XVIth cent., 283 × 208 mm., 269 foll., 20 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Written by Zacharias Callierges.⁹⁵ — 1^r *Vita*; 2^r arg. to *Ajax*; 3^r–36^r *Ajax*; 38^r arg. to *Trach.* (from Apollodorus); 39^v *Trachiniae*; 72^v prose arg. to *Philoct.*; 73^r–111^r *Philoctetes*; 112^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται) and scholium ἀπειρόκαλον (p. 97.2–12 Papageorg.); 112^r–147^r *Electra*; 148^r arguments III and I to *Antig.*; 149^r–182^r *Antigone*; 186^r *Oed. Col.*; 232^r arguments I and II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 233^r–269^r *Oed. Tyr.* In this ms., *Trachiniae*, *Philoct.*, *Antigone*, *Oed. Col.*, were directly transcribed from the Paris 2712. *Ajax* and *Electra* belong to the Jena family (cf. above, p. 100). *Oedipus Tyrannus* is mostly Moschopulean.

The agreement of *Trach.*, *Philoct.*, *Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, with A is obvious. I shall content myself with quoting a few concurrent errors which appear identically both in A and in Riccardi 34 (unless differences are specified): *Trach.* 82 τέκνω, 151 τόδ', 257 καὶ om.; *Phil.* 34 ἐρήμα] ἔρ A, ἔργ' Riccardi 34; 52 φ; 136 ἀπόπταν A, ἀπόπταν Riccardi 34; *Antig.* 47 ἀντιρρηκός; 69 (εἰ om.) ἐέλους; 102 πρότερον; *Oed. Col.* 36 τῆς (-δ' om.); 41 σεμνὸν] σκαιδόν; 48 πρὶν (γ' ἂν om.).

For *Ajax* and *Electra*, to prove the affiliation of the Riccardi 34 with the Jena family, I shall report concurrent readings from Riccardi 34 and Paris 2598, which is an excellent representative of the Jena family (supplied with the scholia ἀναρμοσίαν: cf. above, p. 101). These are a few identical readings of Riccardi 34 and Paris 2598: *Ajax* 159 ῥῦμα πύργου; 183 γ' om.; 265 δ' ἂν αἴρεσιν νέμοι (ita Paris 2598^s, Riccardi 34: νέμη Paris 2598ⁱ) τις; *Electra* 49 πυθικοῖς; 76 ἐργάτης Paris 2598 et Riccardi 34¹ (ἐπιστάτης Riccardi 34^{2γρ}); 139 γόοισιν οὔτε λιταῖσιν.

In *Oed. Tyr.*, the Riccardi text at first is Thoman: OT 18 οἱ δ' ἡθέων Riccardi 34 and ZZcZd; 30 ἀτδας Riccardi 34 and ZZd. But from OT 77 on it is Moschopulean: the ms. reads OT 77 ὅσ' ἂν, 130 τὰ — though it is not entirely consistent.

On the whole, Riccardi 34 is devoid of any value and can be completely disregarded.

Berlin graec. 185 (*olim* Phillipps 1588). Paper, end of the XVth or early XVIth cent., 277 × 197 mm., 190 foll., 20 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. I have recognized the handwriting to be that of Zacharias Callierges, who wrote also Riccardi 34 (see above). The Berlin ms. resembles most closely Riccardi 34, which was tran-

⁹⁵ Cf. Vogel-Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber* 125.

scribed from A. — 1^r–33^v *Trachiniae*; 35^v–72^v *Philoct.*; 73^r–110^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 111^v–156^v *Oed. Col.*; 157^r–190^r *Antigone*. The number of lines to a page is the same here as in Riccardi 34. Text portions on single pages are identical in the two mss. The text of the two mss., to judge from my samples, is identical — only Riccardi 34 gives seven plays as against 5 plays in the Berlin ms. and seems to have more arguments. A close connection between the Berlin Phillipps ms. (once referred to as Middlehill 310) and Riccardi 34 was noticed by Campbell (*Sophocles* 2.VIII) who pointed out that the two mss. share a transposition of lines in *Antigone* (477–584 after 691). I have collated the beginning of *Trachiniae* in Paris 2712 (A), Riccardi 34, and Berlin 185. Peculiar mistakes of A reappear in Riccardi 34 and Berlin 185: *Trach.* 151 τδδ', 257 καὶ om. Then, there are — against A — identical errors in the two mss. Riccardi and Berlin: *Trach.* 11 ταῦρος A: τράγος Ricc., Berlin; 15 προσδεγμένη A: προδεγεμένη Ricc., Berlin; 63 εἶρηκεν A: εἶρηκε Ricc., Berlin; 81 εὔαιων' A: εὔαιων Ricc., Berlin; 87 πάλαι A: πάλιν Ricc., Berlin; χρόνῳ A per compendium: χώρῳ Ricc.¹, Berlin (χρόνῳ Ricc.²); 205 δόμοις A: δήμοις Ricc., Berlin. Then, the Berlin ms. has additional errors against A and Riccardi: *Trach.* 17 ἐμπελασθῆναι A Ricc.: ἐμπλασθῆναι Berlin; 42 προσβαλὼν A Ricc.: προβαλὼν Berlin. Thus it appears that Callierges first copied the ms. A in Riccardi 34, and then transcribed the four plays mentioned from Riccardi 34 in Berlin 185.

In view of these facts, Berlin 185 is also to be considered valueless. It is an indirect copy of A in *Trach.*, *Philoct.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Antig.*; and in *Oed. Tyr.* it gives a Byzantine text (cf. above what was said on Riccardi 34).

London, Harley 5743. Bombycine, XVth cent., 213 × 150 mm., 113 foll., 24 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r arg. to *Trach.* (from Apollodorus); 2^v *Trachiniae*; 29^v prose argument to *Phil.*; 30^r–62^v *Philoctetes*. Sparse ancient scholia. This is a direct copy of A. The following peculiar readings appear in both mss.: *Trach.* 1273 πάντων] θανάτους A and Harley 5743; *Phil.* 34 ἐρῆμα κοῦδέν] ἔρ κοῦδέν A, ἔρκ' οὐδέν Harley 5743; 52 ᾤ A and Harley 5743.

5. LIST OF MOSCHOPULEAN MANUSCRIPTS OF SOPHOCLES

After I have demonstrated above the characteristic features of the Moschopulean text recension, I shall give below a general comprehensive list of Sophoclean manuscripts which are, totally or partially, Moschopulean. I have analyzed samples or entire con-

tents of almost all Sophoclean manuscripts now in existence, and with the aid of the criteria indicated above — i.e., scholia and characteristic text readings — I was able to establish clearly the affiliation of a given ms. with the Moschopulean family.

The main purpose of this list is to indicate, once for all, the Byzantine character of the pertinent mss. and to establish the proper value of the text evidence given by those mss.: their textual innovations are merely conjectures, and should be treated as such in future editions of Sophocles. It is the aim of this list to eliminate the mss. in question from any possible individual use in the critical apparatus of any future edition. Their variants, being inventions of Moschopulus, should be quoted — only in cases where they deserve it — as conjectures of Moschopulus. In general, future critical apparatuses must not be unduly encumbered with superfluous symbols of *single* Byzantine manuscripts.

The list of Moschopulean manuscripts to be presented below is arranged in the alphabetical order of their geographic locations. It did not seem to be worth while to arrange them on other principles, as, e.g., mss. with or without scholia, or mss. of the family $\xi\mu$ or those of the family $\xi\rho$. Then, I did not pursue systematically the interrelationships of possible apographs to their extant sources, for this does not deserve a special effort in the case of Byzantine mss.; in some cases, however, such a relationship was so obvious that I did record it.

Although in a former study (*Traditio* 2 [1944] 10–41) I described every Sophocles ms. with many bibliographical references, I am giving below an essential description of every Moschopulean ms., for I was able, in many cases, to revise it on the basis of photographic reproductions and new information obtained from the libraries concerned. For bibliographical information and some details, the reader will still have to look to my general list in *Traditio*.

On the basis of photographs, I was in a position to determine the character of the scholia, if any, in each ms., and this was a constructive consideration in determining the character of a given ms. The selection of characteristic Moschopulean readings which I quote for every ms. often depends on the extent of the photographic material which I have at hand. No conclusions *ex silentio* are allowed about a reading which is not quoted explicitly. Sometimes I omit or disregard a reading if it occasionally departs from the usual reading of the family. On the whole, the readings quoted

below are based on my personal inspection of photographs. Sometimes I supplement my collations with collations published before which then are referred to explicitly — or with additional information and readings obtained from foreign friends, colleagues, and librarians, with regard to some mss. in Escorial, Madrid, Milan, Naples, Rome, Vatican City.⁹⁶

If the photographic material at my disposal (or information gained from other sources) shows some characteristic features of a specific family (ξm or ξp, as the case may be), then I indicate also the family affiliation of a given ms.

Here is the list of the Moschopulean mss. of Sophocles:

Berlin, Oeffentliche Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek (formerly Preussische Staatsbibliothek)

graec. 185 (*olim* Phillipps 1588). In this ms. (being an apograph of the Ricc. 34), only *Oed. Tyr.* is probably Moschopulean: cf. above, p. 149.

Bremen, Staatsbibliothek

b. 23. Bombycine, XIVth cent., 208 × 147 mm., 239 foll., 21–24 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 4^r *Aíax*; 34^v *Electra*; 65^v–95^v *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia *οἰκείως* + *σύνταξις* (with Planudean authorship marks). For the Moschopulean character of the text, cf.: *Aíax* 58 ἐμπιπνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρεῖς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 222 αἰθοπος, 227 οἶμοι, 301 ὑπαίξας, 307 διοπτρέου.

Cambridge, Emmanuel College Library

I.2.11. Paper, XV/XVIth cent., 206 × 152 mm., 232 foll., composed of various fascicles. Item ix (Sophocles) has four leaves, 9 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles, and contains: *Aíax* 522–

⁹⁶ I wish to express my sincere thanks for it to: Raffaele Cantarella (Milan), Valentino Capocci (Vatican), Manuel F. Galiano (Madrid), Carlo Gallavotti (Naples), Ciro Giannelli (Vatican), Agostino Pertusi (Milan). I also acknowledge my obligation to librarians and scholars who helped me by procuring photographs and information on Sophocles manuscripts. My thanks are especially due to: Dom Anselmo M. Albareda, O.S.B. (Vatican), Thomas E. Benner (Urbana), Otto Brechler (Vienna), Bernhard Bruch (Bremen), Luigi Ferrari (Venice), Msgr. Giovanni Galbiati (Milan), Guerriera Guerrieri (Naples), W. O. Hassall (Oxford), R. W. Hunt (Oxford), Teresa Lodi (Florence), Irma Merolle-Tondi (Florence), Eugen Meyer (Berlin), Msgr. Walerian Meysztowicz (Vatican), P. N. Morata, O.S.A. (Escorial), Linos Politis (Athens, now Salonika), Jean Porcher (Paris), Albert Predeek (Jena), Edith Rothe (Leipzig), Paul Ruf (Munich), H. J. Scheltema (Groningen), Karel Svoboda (Prague), Zofia Trenkner (Cambridge, England).

539, 584–600, 540–548, 557–583. The text of these passages is Moschopulean: cf. *Aiax* 524 γένοιτό ποθ' οὗτος, 534 τ' ἦν ἄν, 565 ἐνάλιος, 582 θροεῖν.

El Escorial, Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo

T.III.15. Paper, XVth cent., 210 × 135 mm., 224 foll., 15 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. On fol. 224^v, there is a note referring to A.D. 1476. — 1^r *Vita*; 3^v arg. to *Aiax*; 5^r *Aiax*; 52^v arg. to *Electra* (ὑπόκειται); 52^v *Electra*; 102^r arg. to *Oed. Tyr.*; 103^v–153^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως + σύνταξις on the three plays. Readings: *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 80 ἐν δόμοις. This text most probably belongs, on account of its Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia, to the family ξρ.

Ω.I.9. This ms., being an apograph of A, is accordingly Moschopulean in *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.* See above, p. 148.

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana

plut. 31, 9. Paper, XVth cent., 209 × 144 mm., 294 foll., 16 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 155^r *Aiax*; 201^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); *Electra*; 246^v–293^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως. Readings: *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 75 ἀρεῖς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 169 ὑποδείσαντες, 222 αἰθοπος, 227 οἶμοι. Family ξμ: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτόν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

plut. 32, 32 + plut. 32, 51. Both volumes belong together, they were written by the same hand of the XVth cent., on paper of the same size, 14 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Cod. 32, 32, size 222 × 168 mm., 50 foll., contains: 1^r arg. to *Aiax*; 1^v–50^v *Aiax*. Cod. 32, 51, size 225 × 166 mm., 109 foll., contains: 1^r two arguments to *Electra*, one ὑπόκειται, and the other ἡ ὑπόθεσις — εὐρήσεις, which appears also in Vatic. 50 (cf. above, p. 128). It was published by G. Wolff, *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* 13 (1855) 45 f. Fol. 1^v *Electra*; 55^r–109^v arg. 1 and oracle to *Oed. Tyr.*; *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays. Readings of the two mss., respectively: *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι; *Electra* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 55 που, 61 μὲν οὐδέν. Family ξμ: *Electra* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτόν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

plut. 32, 34. Paper, XIVth cent., 215 × 140 mm., 179 foll., 11 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Ownership entries: (fol. 3^v) ἀνδρέου τοῦ μπάλτζα τοῦ μοραήτου; (131^v) γεωργίου δυσπηά[]

τοῦ γαλησιώτη (-ου supra lin.).⁹⁷ — 1^r *Vita*; 2^v–3^r arg. to *Aiax*; 4^r *Aiax*; 64^r arg. to *El.*; *Electra*; 133^r–179^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως. Readings: *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν (-τν- ex correctione); 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

plut. 32, 49. Paper, XVth cent., 289 × 210 mm., 95 foll., 15 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r *Aiax*; 48^r–95^v *Electra*. Some scholia of the οἰκείως family (not the full set). Readings: *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι. Family ξm: *El.* 454 ἡμῖν ἄρωγόν εἰς ἐχθροὺς μολεῖν αὐτὸν, 644 τῇδε τῇ νυκτὶ (in both cases there are additional changes over the usual readings of ξm).

plut. 32, 51. See above under plut. 32, 32.

Conventi Soppressi 66. Paper, XIVth cent., 243 × 157 mm., 81 foll.; mostly in 2 columns to a page, 32 lines to a column for the text of Sophocles. — 41^r *Electra* (755–end); 46^v arg. II and oracle to *Oed. Tyr.*; 46^v–48^v *Oed. Tyr.* (1–311). No scholia, except sparse notes added occasionally. The text of *Electra* is inconsistent and draws from different sources: *El.* 809 οἴχη φρενός, 890 λοιπὸν ἦ, 947 ποεῖν (γρ. τελεῖν), 985 μὴ 'κλιπεῖν. But in *Oed. Tyr.* the text is Moschopulean: *Oed. Tyr.* 29 καδμείων, 42 εὐρεῖν ἡμῖν (some correcting was done here), 43 πού, 50 στάντες τ', 77 ὅσ' ἄν.

Conventi Soppressi 71. Symbol X. Family ξm. See p. 128, 138.

Conventi Soppressi 98. Paper, XIVth cent., 222 × 145 mm., 322 foll., 19–21 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. On fol. 211^v, a note by a different hand referring to A.D. 1372. — 207^r *Vita*; 208^v–211^v arguments and notes on *Aiax*; 213^r–314^v *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως. Readings: *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

Conventi Soppressi 172. Parchment, XIVth cent., 305 × 210 mm., 130 foll., 2 columns to a page, 27 lines to a column for the text of Sophocles. This ms. Conv. Soppr. 172 and Vatic. Palatin. gr. 287 belong together and once formed one codex.⁹⁸ Conv. Soppr.

⁹⁷ This ownership entry is written by the hand of Georgius Galesiotes who subscribed the ms. Mount Sinai 152 in 1346 (cf. William Henry Paine Hatch, *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Mount Sinai* [American Schools of Oriental Research. Publications of the Jerusalem School, vol. 1. Paris, 1932] plate LVIII; Vogel-Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber* 72).

⁹⁸ Cf. C. Robert, "Zur Geschichte der Euripides-Handschriften," *Hermes* 13 (1878) 133 ff.; Turyn, *Aeschylus* 70.

172 contains: 84^r *Aiax*; 96^v arg. to *El.* (ὕπνκειται); 97^r *Electra*; 110^r–123^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 123^v arguments III and I to *Antigone*. The immediate continuation is to be found in the Palat. 287, written on parchment by the same hand, in the same size 315 × 215 mm., 237 foll., with the same arrangement of columns and the same number of lines, and the following contents in Sophocles: 3^r *Antigone*; 14^v arg. I to *Oed. Col.*; 15^r *Oed. Col.*; 31^r arg. to *Trach.* (from Apollodorus); 31^v *Trachiniae*; 43^v prose argument to *Philoct.*; 43^v–57^r *Philoctetes*. Here I shall not deal with the Sophoclean portion of Palat. 287 which is Thoman, but I limit my attention to Conv. Soppr. 172.

In the Conv. Soppr., there are sparse scholia mostly in the beginning of *Aiax*, drawn mainly from the Moschopulean set. For a large part of *Aiax*, this ms. is Thoman: *Aiax* 84 ὀφθαλμοῖς (γε om.) Conv. Soppr. 172^{ac}: ὀφθαλμοῖσι (γε om.) ZZaZbZd; 148/9 πλάττων [...] εἰς Conv. Soppr. 172: πλάττων ἀεὶ εἰς ZZa; 499 γ' ἔξειν Conv. Soppr. 172, Ze: δ' ἔξειν Zd; 644 οὐπω τ' Conv. Soppr. 172¹ οὐποτ' ZaZe (οὐπω τις Conv. Soppr. 172²). At the same time, this ms. used quite many Moschopulean readings even in its Thoman portion, e.g.: *Aiax* 303 ὑπαῖξας, 519 πᾶσ', 524 γένοιτό ποθ' οὗτος, 565 ἐνάλιος. It seems that from about *Aiax* 1368 on the ms. begins to follow a Moschopulean source: *Ai.* 1368 σὸν γὰρ ἄρα (also XXa). In *Electra* and *Oed. Tyr.*, the ms. on the whole agrees with Moschopoulos (with exceptions like *El.* 42 χρόνῳ μακρῷ): *Electra* 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *Oed. Tyr.* 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 42 εὐρεῖν ἡμῖν, 77 ὅσ' ἂν, 117 κατεῖδ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότης. This Moschopulean text belongs to the family ξm: cf. *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν a.c. (αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς p.c.).

—, **Biblioteca Riccardiana**

34. Only *Oed. Tyr.* is Moschopulean in this ms. See above, p. 149.

77. Paper, A.D. 1496, 210 × 155 mm., 198 foll.; 12 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles in *Aiax*; 25 lines in both texts of *Electra* and in *Antigone*; 24 lines in *Philoct.* and *Oed. Col.* Written by Aristobulus Apostolides (the later Arsenius of Monembasia), except for fol. 183^v–198^r written by a different hand. — 1^r arg. to *Aiax*; 2^r–50^r *Aiax*; 51^r–61^r *Electra* (1–567); 65^r–94^r *Electra* (complete); 101^r–117^v *Antigone* (1–839); 161^r arguments to *Phil.* (inc. ἀπαγωγή, and inc. Ἡρακλῆς μετὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένην ἀνακάθαρσιν κτλ.), and excerpts from Schol. Hom. *Il.* 2.721–

723; 162^r–178^r *Philoctetes*, with ancient scholia; 179^r arg. to *Oed. Col.*; 179^v–198^r *Oed. Col.* (1–854), with ancient scholia on *Oed. Col.* 1–172.

This is a composite manuscript so far as its sources are concerned. *Ajax* and the former *Electra* (1^r–61^r) are Moschopulean: cf. *Ajax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 169 ὑποδείσαντες; *Electra* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 55 πον, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 132 οὐδ' ἐθέλω, 139 οὔτε λιταῖς. The Moschopulean text of this former *Electra* seems to belong to the family ξρ (because it is free from the mistake of ξμ in *El.* 454, where it reads correctly αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς). — The latter *Electra* (65^r–94^r) is Thoman: *Electra* 129 τοκῆων Ricc. 77ⁱ, ZZc (πατέρων Ricc. 77^s). This portion is an apograph of Vatic. 1333 (Zc): cf. *El.* 63 δόμοις Zc and Ricc. 77; *El.* 143 κακοῦ Zc and Ricc. 77. The same goes for *Antigone* which is Thoman and is copied from the Thoman ms. Vatic. 1333 (Zc): cf. *Antig.* 18 ἥδειν in faded ink (possibly added later) in Zc and omitted in Ricc. 77; *Antig.* 51 αὐτοφόρων Zc and Ricc. 77; *Antig.* 104 διρκέαν Zcⁱ and Ricc. 77ⁱ, διρκέων Zc^s and Ricc. 77^s. — The text and scholia of *Philoctetes* are ancient in this manuscript. *Oed. Col.* is obviously transcribed from Laurentian 32, 9 (L) together with some glosses and shorter scholia.

Glasgow, University, Hunterian Museum

U.7.18. Paper, XVIth cent., 165 × 89 mm., 70 foll., 21 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r–69^v *Ajax*, *Electra*. No scholia. Readings: *Ajax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι.

Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek

Rep. I.4.44.a (No. II in Naumann). Bombycine, XIVth cent., 235 × 170 mm., 92 foll., 21–23 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r *Ajax*; 32^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 32^v–62^r *Electra*; 62^v dramatis personae to *Oed. Tyr.*; 63^r–92^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκέως on the three plays. There are also Thoman scholia ἡγουν πειραθῆναι on *Ajax* 2–399 (cf. Dindorf 329–340.23) added by a different hand (cf. Dindorf 396 note b). The Moschopulean character of this ms. appears in readings formerly published in Erfurdt-Hermann with the symbol *Lips. a* (cf. especially the collation for *Ajax* in Erfurdt-Hermann, *Sophoclis Tragoediae* 3² [1825] VIII–XVIII) and by Elmsley for *Oed. Tyr.* (*Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus* [Lipsiae, 1821] XVII ff.). I have examined photographic samples from which I quote some characteristic Moschopulean readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν,

61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 222 αἴθοπος, 227 οἶμοι, 259 φρόνιμον; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 55 που, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 99 φονίῳ, 123 ἀκρόρετον; *OT* 29 καδμείων, 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 43 που, 50 στάντες τ'. Family ξm: the ms. reads (according to Erfurdt-Hermann) *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

Rep. I.4.44.b (No. III in Naumann). Paper, XIVth cent., 280 × 205 mm., 216 foll. — 72^v *Ajax*; 120^v arg. to *El.* (inc. ἀπόκειται); 121^r *Electra*; 171^r–216^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκέως on the three plays. This ms. is Moschopulean also in Hesiod and in Theocritus.⁹⁹ Its Moschopulean character in Sophocles appears in readings formerly published in Erfurdt-Hermann with the symbol *Lips.b* (cf. especially the collation for *Ajax* in Erfurdt-Hermann 3².viii–xviii) and by Elmsley for *Oed. Tyr.* (Lipsiae [1821] xvii ff.). Readings (quoted from photographs): *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 222 αἴθοπος, 227 οἶμοι, 259 φρόνιμον, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 307 διοπτρεύοι; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 55 που, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 99 φονίῳ, 123 ἀκρόρετον, 132 οὐδὲ θέλω, 1502 ἔρφ'; *OT* 29 καδμείων, 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 43 που, 50 στάντες τ', 77 δσ' ἄν, 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. Family ξm: the ms. reads (according to Erfurdt-Hermann) *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

To judge from the collation in Erfurdt-Hermann, a portion of *Ajax*, extending about *Ai.* 1270–end, was taken from some different source.

Leningrad, Gosudarstvennaia Publichnaia Biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina

graec. 731 (cf. W. Benešević, *PhW* 46 [1926] 1145–1152; this is my only source of information). Paper, XVth cent., 206 × 143 mm., 125 foll., 16 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 3^r–48^r *Ajax*; 49^v–94^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); *Electra*; 100^r–125^v arguments I and II, enigma, oracle, to *Oed. Tyr.*; *Oed. Tyr.* (1–1033). Scholia οἰκέως on the three plays. Benešević believed this ms. to have been the printer's copy for the Aldine.¹⁰⁰ To judge from the scholia, this ms. should be Moschopulean.

⁹⁹ Cf. Schultz, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Hesiod-Scholien* 10; Wendel, *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien* 180 f.; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 274.

¹⁰⁰ I doubt it, for the Aldine is not Moschopulean in the triad (see above, p. 142). It would be worth while to follow the pattern of C. O. Zuretti's (*Analecta Aristophanea* [Torino, 1892] 35 ff.) analysis of the manuscript components of the Aldine edition of Aristophanes.

London, British Museum

Burney 106. Paper, XVIth cent., 293 × 203 mm., 111 foll., 28 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 2^r *Aiax*; 25^v arg. to *El.* (ὕποκειται); 26^r *Electra*; 51^r arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 51^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 77^r arguments I and II to *Antig.*; 77^v *Antigone* (1–10). No scholia. This ms. is a direct apograph of Paris 2884 (see below, p. 165) with which it agrees exactly unless it gives extra errors resulting often from a misreading of the original. These are, e.g., common errors of Paris 2884 and Burney 106: *Aiax* 287 ἐμέαιτ', 300 πίμναις, 323 νῦν δὲ (ἐν om.), *Antig.* 7 τί om. — Sometimes Burney 106 misreads its source: cf. *Aiax* 241 μέγαν ἱπποδέτην Paris 2884: μίαν ἱπποδέτην Burney 106. The character of the text in Paris 2884 has been analyzed below (p. 166). The same text is, of course, repeated in Burney 106. Accordingly, the text of Burney 106 is Moschopulean in *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.* 1–1301 — and Thoman in *Oed. Tyr.* 1302–end and *Antig.* 1–10.

Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional

4617 (*olim* N 75). Paper, XIVth cent., 213 × 135 mm., 239 foll., 21 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Written by Georgius Cinnamus who subscribed the Sophoclean portion on Dec. 26, 1333 (fol. 99^r): ἐτελειώθη ὁ παρῶν σοφοκλήης, διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ, γεωργίου, τοῦ κιννάμου· ἐν ἔτει, ,σ^ω,μβ'. ἰν(δικτιῶνος) β̄. μηνὶ δεκεβρίω κ'ς', ἡμέρα σ'· τῆς ἀγίας ὀσιομάρτυρος, εὐγενέας. The same hand wrote also the subsequent Aeschylus portion of the codex. On fol. 99^v there is a note referring to the Aeschylus portion: ὁ αἰσχύλος: † οὗτος ὁ ποιητῆς ἤρχεθην· ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· δημητρίου τοῦ τραχανειώτη· μηνὶ ἰουνίῳ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου μεγαλημάρτυρος θεοδοσίας. The same Demetrius Trachaneiotēs, who probably only *read* the ms., made a note at the beginning of *Aiax* (fol. 3^r): ὦ χ(ριστ)έ βοήθει, τῷ σῷ δούλῳ δημητρίῳ τῷ τραχ[ανειώτῃ]. — 1^r *Vita* (beginning missing); arg. to *Aiax*; 2^r *Aiax* (because of the transposition of a leaf, the present sequence is: 168–210, 1–167, 211–end); 34^v arg. to *El.* (ὕποκειται); 35^r *Electra*; 70^r–99^r *Oed. Tyr.* (1–802, 1064–end). Sparse scholia οἰκείως by the first hand; Thoman scholia supplemented by a different hand. The text is Moschopulean: cf. *Aiax* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 227 οἶμοι, 259 φρόνιμον. Family ξρ: *Oed. Tyr.* 652 οὔποτε.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ The Madrid 4617 is Moschopulean also in Hesiod and in Pindar: cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 11; Car. Ioh. Tycho Mommsen, *Pindari carmina* (Berolini, 1864) p. xxviii.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana

A 105 sup. Paper, XVIth cent., 227 × 169 mm., VIII + 142 + II foll., 14 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r *Aiax*; 48^r–142^r *Electra*. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου i.l.: φόνου s.l., 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ; *OT* 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 1231 αἶ 'ν φανῶσ'. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτόν. In this Moschopulean ms., some small portion of the text (end of *Electra* and beginning of *Oed. Tyr.*) seems to be Triclinian: *OT* 50 στάντες γ'.

B 97 sup. Paper, XIVth cent., 255 × 169 mm., I + 227 foll., 20 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — I^v *dramatis personae* to *Aiax*; 1^r *Aiax*; 35^r *Electra*; 69^v arg. I to *Oed. Tyr.*; 70^r–105^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπείν m. pr. (μὴ ἐκλιπείν m. post.); *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 1231 αἶ [. . .] φανῶσ'. This Moschopulean text belongs to the family ξm: cf. *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτόν.

C 24 sup. Paper, late XVth cent., 220 × 165 mm., III + 214 foll. It seems that *Aiax* and *Electra* were written by Michael Suliardus¹⁰² who subscribed fol. 96^v on July 26, 1481; then, *Oed. Tyr.* was written by a different hand, and *Antigone* by another hand. — 1^v *Vita*; 2^r arg. to *Aiax*; 3^r end of *Vita*; 4^r end of arg. to *Aiax*; 6^r *Aiax*; 50^r arg. to *El.*; 50^v *Electra*; 98^r arguments I and II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 100^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 161^r–211^v *Antigone*; 214^v enigma to *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on *Aiax* and presumably on *Electra*; Thoman scholia on *Oed. Tyr.* and *Antigone*.

Only *Aiax* and *Electra* are Moschopulean in this ms.: cf. *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν p.c. (ἐπαπιτνῶν a.c.), 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπείν. This Moschopulean portion belongs to the family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτόν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

The portion containing *Oed. Tyr.* and *Antigone* is accompanied by Thoman scholia and is Thoman in its poetic text: *Oed. Tyr.* 18 οἱ δ' ἡϊθέων (also ZZbZcZd), 86 φέρων φάτιν (also ZZbZd), φάτιν φέρων Zc; 411 προστάτης (also ZZbZcZd); *Antig.* 97 μὴ (οὐ om.) this ms. and also ZZb, other Thoman mss., TTa.

E 77 sup. Paper, XVth cent., 218 × 139 mm., III + 256 foll. — 1^r *Aiax*; 46^v *Electra*; 103^v arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 104^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 161^r–208^v *Antigone*. The ms. is written by

¹⁰² Cf. Vogel-Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber* 318.

different hands. In my sample of *Aiax*, a different hand added some Moschopulean scholia. *Antigone* is supplied with Thoman scholia written by the same hand which copied the text. Only *Aiax* is Moschopulean: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρεῖς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 565 ἐνάλιος.

But *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, and *Antigone* are Thoman: cf. *El.* 129 γενναίων τοκῆων (also ZZc), 721 δεξιὸν τ' (also ZZc); *OT* 18 οἱ δ' ἠθέων (also ZZbZcZd), 86 φάτιν (γρ φήμην) φέρων (φάτιν φέρων Zc, φέρων φάτιν ZZbZd), 411 προστάτης (also ZZbZcZd); *Antig.* 84 προμηνύσεις (also ZZcTTa), 152 παννυχίους (also ZZc).

G 43 sup. Paper, XIVth cent., 223 × 139 mm., 300 foll. — 145^r *Vita* (beginning missing); 146^v arg. to *Aiax*; 148^v *Aiax*; 196^r arg. to *El.*; 197^r *Electra*; 248^v arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 249^r–300^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρεῖς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ. This Moschopulean text belongs in *Aiax* and *Electra* to the family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῆδε νυκτὶ, but in *Oed. Tyr.* it shifts to the family ξp: *OT* 652 οὐποτε, 797 χρησμῶν γ' ὀνειδέη.

H 105 sup. Paper, XVth cent., 295 × 220 mm., III + 104 foll. — 1^r–4^v are written by a different hand.¹⁰³ 1^r *Vita* (Triclinian); 3^r argument (Triclinian) to *Aiax*; 5^r *Aiax*; 35^v arg. to *El.*; 36^v *Electra*; 69^v arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 70^v–104^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρεῖς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῆδε νυκτὶ.

L 39 sup. Bombycine, XIVth cent., 224 × 151 mm., III + I + 314 foll. — 232^v *Vita*; 233^v arg. to *Aiax*; 234^r *Aiax*; 259^v arg. to *El.* and ancient scholium p. 97.2–12 Papageorg.; 260^r *Electra*; 285^v arg. I, oracle, enigma, arg. II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 286^r–313^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays (cf. Dindorf p. XIII ff.). Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου m. pr. (φόνου m. post. supra lin.), 75 ἀρεῖς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 1231 αἶ 'ν φανῶσ'. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῆδε νυκτὶ.

¹⁰³ It is not the hand of Ioannes Rhosus, as it was asserted by Vogel-Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber* 192.

N 166 sup. Paper, XIVth cent., 225 × 149 mm., vi + 119 foll., 12 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Written by Andreas Nomicopulus. — 1^r *Aiax*; 45^v *Electra*; 83^v–119^v *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia οἰκείως + σύνταξις on the three plays; cf. samples of the scholia in Dindorf p. xvi ff. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες; *El.* 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 1231 αἰ' ὅν φανῶσ'. In accordance with its Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia, the text likewise shows the Moschopuleo-Planudean character ξρ: cf. *OT* 652 οὔποτε. It seems that parts of *Aiax* and *Electra* in this ms. departed from its Moschopulean source: cf. *Ai.* 565 εἰνάλιος, *El.* 42 χρόνῳ μακρῷ, 61 μὲν [ὥς] οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν κοῦκ.

Modena, Biblioteca Estense

α. U.9.19 (olim III C 20; No. 99 in Puntoni). Paper, XIVth–XVth cent., 217 × 145 mm., 238 foll. — 85^r *Aiax* (312–1390); 109^r *Electra*; 142^v–178^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia of the οἰκείως family on the three plays. Readings: *El.* 42 ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 55 που, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 99 φονίῳ, 123 ἀκόρετον, 132 οὐδ' ἐθέλω, 139 οὔτε λιταῖς; *OT* 29 καδμείων, 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 50 στάντες τ', 77 ὅσ' ἄν. Accordingly, the Sophocles text of this ms. is Moschopulean. Also the Hesiod, Pindar, and Theocritus portions of this ms. are likewise Moschopulean.¹⁰⁴

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek

graec. 494. Paper, XVth cent., 225 × 162 mm., 66 foll., 12 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 52^r arg. to *Aiax* (Dindorf 27.11–28.4); 53^r–58^v *Aiax* (1–143). The text is Moschopulean: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι.

graec. 507. Bombycine and paper, XIV/XVth cent., 225 × 105 mm., 241 foll. — 6^r *Aiax*; 46^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); *Electra*; 96^r–136^v arg. 1 and enigma to *Oed. Tyr.*; *Oed. Tyr.* The portion *Aiax* 1–476 on fol. 6–18 was supplemented later by two different hands and has no scholia. The main body of the original Sophocles text begins on 19^r with *Aiax* 476. There are scholia from Byzantine sources (from Moschopulus and from the scholia Barocci) on the three plays. The added beginning of *Aiax* is Moschopulean: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι. The main text is also Moschopulean: cf. *Ai.* 689 ὑμῖν ἅμα, 705 ξυνείης, 717 μετεγνώσθη.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 14; Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. xxviii; Wendel, *op. cit.* 186; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 274.

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III

II.F.9 (No. 165 in Cyrillus). Our symbol is D. This is the important source of the Planudean scholia. The poetic text of this ms. exhibits quite many Moschopulean readings, but is not consistent in any respect. See above, p. 114.

II.F.34 (No. 191 in Cyrillus). Paper, XVth cent., 280 × 183 mm., 255 foll., 19 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r arg. to *Aïax*; 1^v *Aïax*; 39^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); *Electra*; 79^v arguments I and II, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 80^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 121^r ὑπόθεσις ἀντιγόνης διωρθώθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου (arg. III to *Antig.*); 122^r *Antigone*; 157^v ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ἐπὶ κολωνῷ οἰδίποδος διωρθώθη δὲ καὶ αὕτη παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου (arg. I to *Oed. Col.*); 158^v *Oed. Col.*; 205^r ἐκ τῆς ἀπολοδόρου βιβλιοθήκης, τοῦ δράματος ἢ ὑπόθεσις; 208^r *Trachiniae*; 241^v ὑπόθεσις τοῦ δράματος (prose arg. and metrical arg. to *Philoct.*); 241^{bis}^v–253^v *Philoctetes* (1–472 by the first hand; 473–476 added by the scholiast); 254^r–255^v γένος σοφοκλέους καὶ βίος· διωρθώθη δὲ περὶ (παρὰ corrigendum) τοῦ σοφωτάτου μαγίστρου (*Triclinian Vita*). Scholia (but not in a complete set) on *Aïax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, drawn mainly from Moschopulus (but there are also some Thoman scholia), written by a later hand. The text of the triad is Moschopulean, but the remaining plays are Triclinian and agree with T, as has been well known since the time of Elmsley.¹⁰⁵

For the Moschopulean triad in this ms., cf. the following readings: *Aï.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. This Moschopulean triad belongs to the family ξρ: *OT* 652 οὔποτε, 797 χρησμῶν γ' ὀνειδή, 840 ἐκπεφευγόμην.

II.F.35 (No. 192 in Cyrillus). Paper, XVth cent., 21 × 12 cm., 114 foll., 12 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r *Aïax* (24–end); 50^r arg. to *El.*; *Electra*; 86^r–114^v *Oed. Tyr.* (1–1275). Sparse Moschopulean scholia. This ms. is Moschopulean in *Aïax*; cf. *Aï.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 227 οἶμοι, 301 ὑπαῖτας, 565 ἐνάλιος, 1230 ἐφώνεις. The text character of *Electra* and *Oed. Tyr.* remains to be ascertained.

II.F.36 (No. 193 in Cyrillus). Paper, XVth cent., 220 × 147 mm., 63 foll., 15 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r arg. to *Aïax*; 2^r *Aïax*; 34^r–63^v *Antigone*. There is an old scholium and a Moschopulean one on *Aïax* 1 only. But *Antigone* has complete

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Petrus Elmsley, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* (Oxonii, 1823) p. iv.

Thoman scholia. The text of *Aiāx* is Moschopulean: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνων, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 227 οἴμοι, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 565 ἐνάλιος. As to *Antigone*, it is Thoman and is copied from Vatic. 1333 (Zc). The two mss. have, e.g., these errors in common: *Ant.* 52 ἀρέξας, 74 πανουργήσας τ'.

Oxford, Bodleian Library

Auct. F.3.25. Bombycine, XIVth cent., 242 × 165 mm., 289 foll., 21–24 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 2^r *Aiāx*; 32^v–63^r *Electra*; 64^r–96^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays (published in Johnson, *Schol. Ined.*, with the symbol *B* for *Aiāx* and *Electra*, and with no symbol for *Oed. Tyr.*). Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνων, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 123 ἀκόρετον, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 29 καδμείων, 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 50 στάντες τ', 77 ὅσ' ἄν, 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.¹⁰⁶

D'Orville 72. Paper, A.D. 1441, 220 × 145 mm., II + 338 foll., 14 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Written by Demetrius Xanthopoulos. — 200^r *Aiāx*; 250^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 250^v–309^v *Electra*. Sparse Moschopulean scholia. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνων, 61 πόνου, 75 ἄρεις, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 55 που, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 132 οὐδὲ θέλω, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ. Family ξp: *El.* 238 ἔβλαστ'.

Laud Greek 54. Paper, XVth cent., 280 × 195 mm., 301 foll., 24 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Once owned by Niccolò Pasqualigo, A.D. 1606 (fol. 107^r ἐμοῦ νικολάου πασχαλίου ,αχς'). — 79^r *Aiāx*; 107^r arg. to *El.*; 108^r *Electra*; 140^v arguments I and II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 141^r–173^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays (published in Johnson, *Schol. Ined.*, with the symbol *L* for *Aiāx* and *Electra*, and with no symbol for *Oed. Tyr.*). Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνων, 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 222 αἰθοπος, 227 οἴμοι, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 132 οὐδ' ἐθέλω, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 29 καδμείων, 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 50 στάντες τ', 77 ὅσ' ἄν, 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. This Moschopulean text belongs to the family ξm: cf. *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς

¹⁰⁶ The Oxford Auct. F.3.25 is Moschopulean also in Hesiod, Pindar, and Theocritus: cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 18; Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. xxvi; Wendel, *op. cit.* 189; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 274.

αὐτὸν, 644 τῆδε νυκτὶ — though in *Oed. Tyr.* there appears some influence of the family ξp: e.g., *OT* 652 οὐποτε.¹⁰⁷

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale

Ancien fonds grec 2712. Symbol A. This ms. is Moschopulean in *Aïax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*, and belongs in these plays to the family ξp. See above, p. 139 ff.

Ancien fonds grec 2796. Paper, XVth cent., 220 × 145 mm., 213 foll., 11 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r *Electra* 396–406 (the same text appears with glosses, in due course, on 88^r); 1^v *Vita*; 3^r arg. to *Aïax*; 4^r *Aïax*; 68^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 69^v *Electra*; 139^v arg. 1 to *Oed. Tyr.*; 140^v–213^r *Oed. Tyr.* No regular marginal scholia; only occasionally there appear some scholia, e.g., a Moschopulean scholium on *El.* 1460 (p. 276.7–12 Dindorf).

The text of this ms. divides into three portions: *Aïax* 1–193 is ancient. Then, *Aïax* 194–end, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.* 1–36, are Moschopulean. Finally, *Oed. Tyr.* 37–end is again ancient (and related to the mss. Laur. plut. 32, 40 and Laur. Conv. Soppr. 41).

As to the Moschopulean portion of this ms., I quote the following characteristic readings: *Ai.* 222 αἴθοπος, 227 οἷμοι, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 307 διοπτέουι, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 1163 κελείθους; *OT* 29 καδμείων. This Moschopulean text belongs to the family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

Ancien fonds grec 2797. Paper, XVIth cent., 220 × 167 mm., 152 foll., 16 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^v *Vita*; 3^v arg. to *Aïax*; 5^r *Aïax* (1–200, 402–429, 230–401, 201–229, 430–end); 48^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 48^v Triclinian metrical note on the beginning of *Electra*; 49^r–94^v *Electra*. A similar confusion in the sequence of lines appears in the Paris, Supplément grec 498 (see below, p. 166). No scholia. The text is Moschopulean in *Aïax* and *Electra* 1–639: cf. *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν (made from ἐμπιτ- by the scribe), 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ. This Moschopulean portion belongs to the family ξp: *Ai.* 1369 πανταχοῦ.

From about fol. 68^r (beginning with *El.* 640), the manuscript shifts to a Triclinian source: *El.* 649 ἐκβαλεῖν μ' (also ZZdT^TTa); 831 ἀπολείς με (also T^Ta).

¹⁰⁷ The Oxford Laud 54 is Moschopulean also in Hesiod, Pindar, and Theocritus: cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 18; Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. xxvi; Wendel, *op. cit.* 188 f.; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 274.

Ancien fonds grec 2805. Paper, XVth cent., 207 × 140 mm., 289 foll., 16 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. Some missing pages of the original were replaced by Ioannes Rhosus.¹⁰⁸ — 157^v arg. to *Aiax* (supplemented by Rhosus); 146^r–152^r and 158^r–193^v *Aiax*; 194^r arg. to *El.* (ὕπόκειται); 194^v–240^v *Electra*; 242^v–289^r *Oed. Tyr.* — The following pages were supplemented by Rhosus: 157^v (arg. to *Aiax*); 242^v (*Oed. Tyr.* 1–11); 288^r–289^r (*Oed. Tyr.* 1490–1530, probably from a Moschopulean source). Scholia οἰκείως on *Aiax* and *El.* 1–104; Thoman scholia on *El.* 119–end and *Oed. Tyr.* The ms. divides in two parts. The Moschopulean portion extends through 197^v (*Aiax*, *Electra* 1–113), while the Thoman portion extends 198^r–287^v (*Electra* 114–end, and *Oed. Tyr.* 12–1489). For the Moschopulean portion, cf.: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν. This text belongs to the family ξm: *Ai.* 725 ἐνθεν κἀνθεν καὶ οὗτις, 1368 σὸν γὰρ ἄρα.

Ancien fonds grec 2820. Paper, XIVth cent., 220 × 153 mm., 258 foll., 22 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 89^r *Aiax*; 120^r arg. to *El.* (ὕπόκειται); 120^r–151^v *Electra*; 152^v–185^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia οἰκείως on the three plays (with occasional additaments from the Planudean scholia corpus by a different hand). Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

Ancien fonds grec 2884. Bombycine, A.D. 1299, 167 × 126 mm., 248 foll. Subscribed¹⁰⁹ by Athanasius Spondiles on Febr. 24, 1299 (fol. 247^v): κ(ύρι)ε βοήθει μοι τῷ σῷ δούλῳ ἀθανασίῳ τῷ σπονδίλῃ τῷ γράψαντι ταύτην τὴν βίβλον· ἐτελειώθη γούνη ἢ παροῦσα βίβλος κατὰ τὴν εἰκοστὴν τετάρτην τοῦ φευρουαρίου μηνὸς ἔτους σωζ'. Once owned by Michael Xanthopoulos. This is the earliest dated ms. of a Byzantine text of Sophocles, partly Moschopulean and partly Thoman, and its date A.D. 1299 is, therefore, a *terminus ante quem* for both the earlier Moschopulean and the subsequent Thoman editions of Sophocles.

¹⁰⁸ But Rhosus did not write the original text, as it was erroneously stated by Henri Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Introduction (Paris, 1898) p. XLIII; cf. Vogel-Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber* 92.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Gallavotti, *RFIC* N.S. 12 (1934) 558; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 252. An old facsimile of the subscription is to be found in: (J. B. Gail, *Theocriti quae exstant omnia* III:) *Theocriti Atlas* (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1828). My reading of the subscription, which differs somewhat from that of Gallavotti, is based on a photostat of the page in question. On this ms., cf. also Wendel, *op. cit.* 194; Turyn, *Aeschylus* 76 f.

— 2^r *Vita* (beginning missing); arg. to *Aiax*; 3^r *Aiax*; 36^v arg. to *El.* (ὕποκειται); 36^v *Electra*; 73^r arguments I, II and enigma to *Oed. Tyr.*; 73^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 110^v arguments I and II to *Antig.*; 110^v–142^r *Antigone*. Ancient scholia on the beginning of *Aiax*, written by the main scribe of the Sophocles text, extend from 2^v through 4^v (through schol. *Ai.* 77 p. 8.24 Papageorg.), with some alien additions inserted; these scholia are in faded ink. Then, later on, different hands added scholia (marginal and interlinear) and glosses which are: Thoman on 4^v–54^r (on *Aiax* 75 — *Electra* 728); Moschopulean on 54^r–66^v (on *El.* 729–1239); Thoman on 68^r–92^v (on *El.* 1240 — *Oed. Tyr.* 803); Thoman on 113^v–115^v (on *Antig.* 101 p. 310.21 Dindorf — *Antig.* 161). All these scholia are sparse and do not represent complete sets of scholia.

It results from the comparison of the text character of this ms. with the scholia added that the scholia are here an extraneous addition which is not indicative of the character of the poetic text. My analysis of the poetic text of Paris 2884 reveals that it is a composite text drawn from two sources.

The first portion, on 3^r–105^v (*Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.* 1–1301), is Moschopulean: cf. *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν a.c. (ἐμπίπτων p.c.), 80 ἐν δόμοις, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 227 οἷμοι, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 519 πᾶσ', 780 εἶφ'; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος, 815 τοῦδ' ἄνδρός ἐστιν, 1231 αἱ ἄν, 1242 εἰθὺς πρὸς, 1266 ἐπεῖ. This Moschopulean text is affiliated with the family ξρ: *OT* 652 οὐποτε, 797 χρησμῶν γ' ὀνειδή, 840 ἐκπεφευγοίμην.

The second portion of the poetic text, on 105^r–142^r (*Oed. Tyr.* 1302–end, *Antigone*), is Thoman. We shall mark this Thoman part only of Paris 2884 with the symbol Zf. It shows agreement with Z and other mss. of the Thoman recension: cf. *OT* 1311 ἐξήλω ZZf; 1320 φέρειν ZZd^{pe}Zf (also TTa); 1326 τῇδε ZZbZd^{pe}Zf; 1446 προτρέπομαι ZZbZdZf; 1487 τὰ πικρὰ τοῦ λοιποῦ βίου ZZbZdZf; *Antig.* 152 παννυχίοις ZZcZf; 210 ἔκ γ' ἐμοῦ LR: ἐξ ἐμοῦ ZZcZf (also TTa); 379 δύστηνε ZZf.

There is an apograph of the poetic text of the Paris 2884 in the Burney 106 (see above, p. 158).

Supplément grec 498. Paper, XVth cent., 215 × 145 mm., 225 foll., 16 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 5^r–44^v *Aiax*, with some confusion in the sequence of lines resulting from some transpositions in the source and from transposition of leaves here. The present contents and sequence of lines are: 1–131, 402–429,

230–324, 585–627, 325–401, 201–229, 430–584, 628–828, 861–end. The lines 132–200 and 829–860 are missing. (A similar confusion appears in the Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2797: cf. above, p. 164.) Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia οἰκίως + σύνταξις. Readings: *Αἰ.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σε φέμαι, 227 οἶμοι, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 307 διοπτέοι, 519 πᾶσ', 565 ἐνάλιος. It would seem, to judge from the scholia, that the ms. at first belonged to the Moschopuleo-Planudean family ξρ, but then shifted to the family ξμ: cf. *Αἰ.* 1368 σὸν γὰρ ἄρα. This ms. is Moschopulean also in Hesiod¹¹⁰ and contains some Planudean works.¹¹¹

Supplément grec 1229. Paper, XVth cent., 222 × 155 mm., 237 foll., 19 lines to a page for the Sophocles text written continuously with no regard for division of verse lines. — 88^r *Aïax* (40–end); 110^r arg. to *El.* (πρόκειται ὧδε κτλ.); 110^v *Electra*; 134^r–157^v *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopulean scholia on *Aïax* and *Electra*; no scholia on *Oed. Tyr.* At the beginning, on 88^{r–v} (*Aïax* 40–106), the text is ancient: *Αἰ.* 58 ἐμπίπτων, 80 εἰς δόμους. But beginning with 89^r through 133^v, in *Aïax* 107–end and in *Electra*, the text is Moschopulean (as the accompanying scholia are, too): *Αἰ.* 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφέμαι, 227 οἶμοι, 259 φρόνιμον, 301 ὑπαῖξας, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν. This Moschopulean text belongs in *Aïax* to the family ξμ (cf. *Αἰ.* 725 ἐνθεν κἄνθεν καὶ οὔτις), while in *Electra* it seems to descend from the family ξρ (*El.* 238 ἐβλαστ'; it has the correct reading *El.* 454 αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς and is free from the usual transposition which characterizes there the text of ξμ). — As for *Oed. Tyr.*, its text is ancient.

I should like to recall that this ms. is Moschopulean in Hesiod, and Moschopuleo-Planudean in Theocritus,¹¹² and represents a Moschopulean sylloge of Greek poetry.¹¹³

Supplément grec 1247. Paper, XVIth cent., 300 × 195 mm., 346 foll., 14 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 197^r arg. to *Aïax*; 198^r–242^v *Aïax*. The text is Moschopulean: *Αἰ.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφέμαι, 519 πᾶσ', 524 γένοιτό ποθ' οὔτος, 705 ξυνείης, 717 μετεγνώσθη. Family ξρ: *Αἰ.* 1369 πανταχοῦ.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 22.

¹¹¹ Cf. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire* 3 (1888) 270.

¹¹² Cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 23; Wendel, *op. cit.* 195; Gallavotti, *SIFC* N.S. 11 (1934) 295; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 269.

¹¹³ Cf. Turyn, *Traditio* 2 (1944) 6.

Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense

1243. Paper, XVth cent., 205 × 140 mm., 151 foll., 9 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r arg. to *Aiax*; 2^r *Aiax*; 74^v–150^r arg. to *El.*; *Electra*. Scholia *οικείως* on the two plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 61 πόνου, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος m.pr. (εἰνάλιος m.post.); *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν. Family ξm: *Ai.* 1368 σὸν γὰρ ἄρα, *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν, 644 τῇδε νυκτὶ.

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ottoboni gr. 183. Paper, XIV/XVth cent., 212 × 134 mm., 119 foll., 18 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 4^r *Aiax*; 42^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); *Electra*; 81^r–119^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia *οικείως* on the three plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 132 οὐδὲ θέλω, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

Palatin. gr. 335. Paper, XVth cent., 218 × 145 mm., 120 foll., 12 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^v a few Thoman scholia on the beginning of *Aiax*; 2^r–60^r *Aiax*; 61^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 61^v–120^v *Electra*. Scholia *οικείως* on both plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

Urbinas gr. 140. Paper, XIVth cent., 258 × 168 mm., 263 foll., 24–26 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. The initial 7 folios are from another manuscript. — 4^r *Vita*; 5^r arg. to *Aiax*; 5^v *Vita*; 5^v–6^r scholia on *Ai.* 1–65 (partly similar to those of the Ambros. E 103 sup., published by Dindorf pp. x ff.); 9^r *Aiax*; 37^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 37^v *Electra*; 66^r arguments I and II, oracle, enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 66^v–94^v *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia *οικείως* on the three plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγώ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος, 1113 ἐνώμοτος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 132 οὐδ' ἐθέλω; *OT* 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν. The entire ms. reveals a Moschopulean character.¹¹⁴

Vatic. gr. 40. Paper, early XIVth cent., 231 × 159 mm., 1 + 129 foll., 24 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 37^r *Aiax*; 66^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 67^r *Electra* (two last lines *El.*

¹¹⁴ Cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. xxx; Gallavotti, *RFIC* N.S. 12 (1934) 352; Wendel, *op. cit.* 202.

1509–1510 are missing); 99^r–129^v *Oed. Tyr.* (1–1491). Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia οἰκείως + σύνταξις on the three plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. This text belongs, as it should be expected in view of its Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia, to the family ξρ: *Ai.* 1369 πανταχοῦ, *OT* 652 οὔποτε, 797 χρησμῶν γ' ὀνειδή, 840 ἐκπεφευγοίμην.¹¹⁵

Vatic. gr. 44. Paper, XIV/XVth cent., 223 × 146 mm., IV + 238 foll., 20–23 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 2^r *Aiāx*; 35^r arg. to *El.* (ἀπόκειται); 35^v *Electra*; 77^r–109^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia of the Moschopuleo-Planudean set οἰκείως + σύνταξις on *Aiāx*; Moschopulean scholia on *Electra* extending through 44^v (through *El.* 393). The beginning of the *Aiāx* text (*Ai.* 1–100: fol. 2^r–4^r) is Thoman: cf. *Aiāx* 58 ἐμπίπτων; 82 ὀκνῶ] ἰδεῖν; 84 ὀφθαλμοῖς (γε om.). Then, from *Aiāx* 101 on, the text agrees closely with that of D, the important Planudean ms. (see above, p. 114). Vatic. 44 shares with D some peculiar readings and defects: *Ai.* 257–259 om. D and Vat. 44^{ac}; 292 βαιὰ μὲν D^{ac} and Vat. 44 (this reading appears in the codex A of Suda sub X 477); both mss. read *Ai.* 320 ἐξηγείτ' ἀνδρὸς, 527 κάρτ' ἂν ἐπαίνου, 531 φόβοισιν (γ' om.). As I stated before with regard to the poetic text of D, it is quite Moschopulean though on the whole not consistent, and the same goes, of course, for the major portion of *Aiāx* in the Vatic. 44: cf. its readings like *Ai.* 112 ἐγὼ σε φίεμαι, 227 οἶμοι, 519 πᾶσ'. Towards the end of *Aiāx*, a different source is followed by Vatic. 44: cf. *Ai.* 1409 πατὴρ δσον. — For *Electra* and *Oed. Tyr.* 1–799, the ms. has a well-disciplined Moschopuleo-Planudean text of the family ξρ: cf. *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλε οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος, 779 μέθης, 797 χρησμῶν τ' ὀνειδή (just a mistake instead of χρησμῶν γ' ὀνειδή, the characteristic feature of the family ξρ). From about *OT* 800 on, the text follows some ancient source: cf. *OT* 804 ξυνηγνῖαζον, 815 τοῦδ' γ' ἀνδρὸς νῦν ἐστ', 1294 κλειθρα γε m.pr. (κλήθρα γὰρ m.post.), 1351 ἔλαβέ μ' (γρ ἔλυσεν), 1480 ἴτ' om. (also om. L¹Δ).

Vatic. gr. 45. Paper, XVth cent., 222 × 197 mm., II + 136 foll., 17 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r arg. to *Aiāx*; 2^r *Aiāx*; 45^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 46^r *Electra*; 91^r arg. I and enigma to *Oed. Tyr.*; 92^r–136^v *Oed. Tyr.* (1–1523 ἀ κράτῃσας). Scholia

¹¹⁵ The Vatic. 40 is Moschopulean also in Pindar and Theocritus: cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. xxx; Wendel, *op. cit.* 196 f.; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 269, 273.

οἰκείως on the three plays. This is a very correct representative of the Moschopulean recension (family ξm). Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ; *OT* 29 καδμείων, 34 ξυναλλαγαῖς, 77 ὅσ' ἄν, 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

Vatic. gr. 48. Paper, XIVth cent., 217 × 144 mm., II + 187 foll. — 1^r arg. to *Aíax*; 2^r *Aíax*; 43^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 44^r *Electra*; 86^r arguments I, II, and enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 87^r–132^r *Oed. Tyr.* Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia *οἰκείως* + σύνταξις on the three plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν; *OT* 50 στάντες [[τ']], 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. This text belongs, of course, to the Moschopuleo-Planudean family ξp: *OT* 652 οὔποτε, 797 χρησμῶν γ' ὀνειδή, 840 ἐκπεφευγοίμην.

Vatic. gr. 50. Our symbol Xa. Family ξm. See above, p. 128, 138.¹¹⁶

Vatic. gr. 911. Paper, XVth cent., 212 × 143 mm., I + 138 + II foll., 14 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. On fol. 3^v, there is a note referring to A.D. 1443: ἡρξάμην τὸν σοφοκλήν ἐν μηνὶ φεβρουαρίῳ κη' ἡν(δικτιῶν)ος ς^{as} τοῦ ς^{oo} Ζη^{oo} να' ἔτους. — 2^r arg. to *Aíax*; 4^r *Aíax*; 54^r arg. to *El.*; 54^v–108^r *Electra*. Scholia of the *οἰκείως* family on both plays. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.¹¹⁷

Vatic. gr. 1363. Paper, XVth cent., 280 × 208 mm., 377 foll., in two parts (part I: fol. 1–173; part II: fol. 174–377), 17 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 143^v *Aíax*; 184^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 184^v *Electra*; 229^v arguments I, II, and enigma, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 230^r–272^r *Oed. Tyr.* Scholia *οἰκείως* on the three plays. Short Triclinian metrical notes at the beginning of each play. Readings: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 519 πᾶς, 534 τὴν ἄν, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδέν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπεῖν (ex -λυπ-factum); *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 250 συνειδότος. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ The Vatic. 50 is Moschopulean also in Hesiod and Theocritus: cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 24 f.; Wendel, *op. cit.* 197; Gallavotti, *Theocritus* 275.

¹¹⁷ The Vatic. 911 is Moschopulean also in Hesiod: cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 25.

¹¹⁸ The Vatic. 1363 is Moschopulean also in Hesiod and Theocritus: cf. Schultz, *op. cit.* 26; Wendel, *op. cit.* 199.

Vatic. gr. 1826. Paper, XVIth cent., 211 × 147 mm., 481 foll., 21–23 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles, 27–30 lines for the scholia. — 123^r arg. to *Aiax*; 123^v–154^v *Aiax* (no scholia); 155^r *Vita* (incomplete); 209^r–218^r Moschopulean scholia on *Oed. Tyr.* The poetic text of *Aiax* is Moschopulean: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος, 1127 δεινόν γ'. Family ξm: *Ai.* 1361 σὸν γὰρ ἄρα.

Vatic. gr. 2221 (cf. Aristide Colonna, *Dioniso* N.S. 10 [1947] 57). Paper, XVth cent., 220 × 165 mm., 316 foll., 12 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 1^r *Vita*; 2^v arg. to *Aiax*; 4^r *Aiax*; 62^r arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 62^v *Electra*; 124^r arg. I, III, end of arg. II, to *Oed. Tyr.*; 124^v–187^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 188^r oracle and λύσις τοῦ αἰνίγματος to *Oed. Tyr.* This is a composite manuscript. In its poetic text, *Aiax* 1–504, *Electra* 403–end, *Oed. Tyr.* 1–176, are Triclinian; *Aiax* 505–end, *Oed. Tyr.* 177–end, are Moschopulean; *Electra* 1–402 is ancient (and related to the ms. Ambros. G 56 sup.). The scholia throughout the ms. are Moschopulean, except for some ancient scholia on *Ai.* 1–17 and some Moschopuleo-Thomano-Triclinian scholia on *El.* 1–35. For the Moschopulean portion of the poetic text, cf. *Ai.* 519 πᾶς', 565 ἐνάλιος, 1146 ναυτίλῳ; OT 250 γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ, 1231 αἶ' ν φανῶς. This Moschopulean portion belongs to the family ξm: OT 630 μέτεστι τῇσδ' οὐ σοί, 1213/4 χρόνος δς δικάζει.

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana

graec. 467 (No. di collocazione 764). Our symbol U. The ms. is Moschopulean in *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.* (family ξp). See above, p. 141.

gr. 616 (No. di collocazione 663). Parchment, XVth cent., 320 × 215 mm., 123 foll., 2 columns to a page, 30 lines to a column for the text of Sophocles. Several original leaves (fol. 38, 40, 41, 45, 46, 49, 52, 55, 58, 59, 62, 68) are missing and replaced by blank folios; this accounts for the present gaps in the Sophocles text of this ms. as indicated below. 1^v *Aiax*; 12^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 13^r *Electra*; 23^v *Oed. Tyr.*; 35^v arguments III and I to *Antig.*; 36^r–44^v *Antigone* (1–243, 373–494, 744–1261); 47^r–60^r *Oed. Col.* (122–379, 500–745, 869–1109, 1232–1474, 1724–end); 60^v arg. to *Trach.* (from Apollodorus); 61^r–70^v *Trachiniae* (1–102, 227–961, 1093–end); 70^v prose argument to *Phil.*; 70^v–82^v *Philoctetes*. No scholia, except for a few notes at the beginning of *Aiax* (mostly from Moschopulus). This ms. resembles so closely Venice gr. 617 that

I believe Venice 616 to be an apograph of Venice 617. It displays the same text character in every detail and repeats some peculiar readings of Venice 617. These are, e.g., some common readings of Venice 617 and Venice 616: *El.* 124 ἀθλιωτάτας, 197 ἔπος ἦν ὁ κτείνας, 279 σὺν δόλῳ; *OT* 208 ἐπεννέπεις. In Venice 616, the triad (*Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*) is Moschopulean, while the remaining plays (*Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trachin.*, *Philoct.*) are Thoman. The Moschopulean part of Venice 616 belongs — as that of Venice 617 does — to the family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν. I shall deal with the Thoman part of Venice 616 later on in a study of the Thoman recension.

gr. 617 (No. di collocazione 810). Paper, XVth cent., 222 × 150 mm., 242 foll., 20 lines to a page for the text of *Aiax*, *El.*, *Oed. Tyr.*; 29–32 lines for the remaining plays. Ownership entry on fol. 242^r: *Laurentij Lippi καὶ τῶν φίλων*.¹¹⁹ — 36^r *Aiax* (lines 248–291 missing); 67^v arg. to *El.* (ὑπόκειται); 68^r *Electra*; 103^r *Oed. Tyr.*; 139^r arguments III and I to *Antig.*; 139^v–168^r *Antigone*; 168^v arg. I to *Oed. Col.*; 168^v–195^v *Oed. Col.*; 195^v–196^r a few lines from *Aiax* by a different hand; 197^r arg. to *Trach.* (from Apollodorus); 198^r *Trachiniaiæ*; 218^r prose arg. to *Phil.*; 218^r–241^v *Philoctetes*. Scholia οἰκείως on *Aiax*, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*; no scholia on the remaining plays. The ms. is Moschopulean in the triad, and Thoman in the remaining plays (*Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trachin.*, *Philoct.*). Here I deal only with the Moschopulean part: cf. *Ai.* 61 πόνου, 75 ἀρείς, 80 ἐν δόμοις, 227 οἶμοι, 301 ὑπαίξας m.pr. (ἐπ- m.post.), 307 διοπτεύοι, 488 τινες, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 55 που, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 132 οὐδέ θέλω, 139 οὔτε λιταῖς, 528 εἰλεν οὐκ, 985 μὴ λιπέιν; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 77 ὅσ' ἄν, 130 τὰ, 297 οὐξελέγξων. This Moschopulean triad belongs to the family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν.

Most probably Venice 616 is a copy of this Venice 617: see above, p. 171 f.

Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek

philosophicus philologicus graec. 161. Our symbol Xr. This Moschopulean ms. belongs to the family ξp. See above, p. 128, 138.

philos. philol. gr. 302. Paper, XVth cent., 196 × 155 mm., 297 foll., 14 lines to a page for the text of Sophocles. — 110^r epigrams on Sophocles, *Anth. Pal.* 7.20 and Dioscorides, *Anth. Pal.*

¹¹⁹ On Lorenzo Lippi (fl. 1478), cf. Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* 6.2 (Modena, 1790) 834; 6.3 (1791) 1116.

7.37 (4.65 and 4.74 Waltz); 110^v arg. to *Aiax*; 112^r *Aiax*; 155^v arg. to *Electra*; 156^r–205^r *Electra*; 206^v arguments I and II to *Oed. Tyr.*; 208^r–243^v *Oed. Tyr.* Sparse excerpts from ancient and Byzantine scholia. The text is Moschopulean: *Ai.* 58 ἐμπιτνῶν, 112 ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι, 524 γένοιτό ποθ' οὗτος, 565 ἐνάλιος; *El.* 42 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 61 μὲν οὐδὲν, 528 εἶλεν οὐκ; *OT* 50 στάντες τ', 77 ὅσ' ἄν. Family ξm: *El.* 454 εἰς ἐχθροὺς αὐτὸν ante corr.

philol. supplem. gr. 71. Our symbol Xs. This ms. is Moschopulean and belongs to the family ξp. See above, p. 129, 138.

Symbols of Manuscripts and Manuscript Groups Used in This Paper

A = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2712.

D = Naples II.F.9 (No. 165).

G = Florence, Laur. Conv. Soppr. 152.

L = Florence, Laur. 32, 9.

Λ = Leiden B.P.G. 60 A.

M = Modena a.T.9.4.

Q = Paris, Supplément grec 109.

R = Vatic. gr. 2291.

T = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2711.

Ta = Venice gr. 470.

Tb = Dresden Da. 21 (destroyed).

Tc = Vienna philos. philol. gr. 163.

Td = Vienna philos. philol. gr. 209.

U = Venice gr. 467.

X = Florence, Laur. Conv. Soppr. 71.

Xa = Vatic. gr. 50.

Xr = Vienna philos. philol. gr. 161.

Xs = Vienna philol. suppl. gr. 71.

Z = Venice gr. 472.

Za = Florence, Laur. 31, 8.

Zb = Munich gr. 500.

Zc = Vatic. gr. 1333.

Zd = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2795.

Ze = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2812 A (in *Aiax* 1–1355).

Zf = Paris, Ancien fonds grec 2884 (in *Oed. Tyr.* 1302–end, and in *Antigone*).

veteres = *vett.* = LAGMQR (or most of them).

λ = the Laurentian family (ΛA) of the ancient tradition.

ρ = the Roman family (GMQR) of the ancient tradition.

Symbols with X refer to Moschopulean mss.; those with Z, to Thoman mss.; those with T, to Triclinian mss.

ξ = Moschopulean recension. ξm = Moschopulean family, with Moschopulean scholia *οἰκείως*. ξp = Moschopulean family, with Moschopuleo-Planudean scholia *οἰκείως* + *σύνταξις*.

For critical signs, see above, p. 130.