

# THOMAS MAGISTER AND THE TEXT OF SOPHOCLES' *ANTIGONE*\*

E. CHRISTIAN KOPFF

*University of Colorado*

Fundamental work in the analysis of the text tradition of Sophocles was done by and under the direction of Alexander Turyn (*TAPA*, *Soph.*, Dietz).<sup>1</sup> The "recension of Thomas Magistros" consists of

\* Parts of this paper have appeared in my Chapel Hill dissertation (below, note 1), the Preface of which contains some acknowledgments. It has benefited from two subsequent summers in Europe. My studies in the summer of 1975 were in part financed by the generous aid of the American Philosophical Society and the American Council of Learned Societies. This draft has been improved by the advice of two anonymous referees and by the generous and frank Dr. R. D. Dawe. Any remaining errors and originality are to be laid at the author's door.

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations will be used:

**Aubreton:** Aubreton, Robert, *Démétrius Triclinius et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle* (Paris 1949);

**Dain:** Dain, A. et P. Mazon, *Sophocle I* (Paris 1967);

**Dawe, Aes.:** Dawe, R. D., *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1964);

**Dawe:** Dawe, R. D., *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Leiden 1973);

**Dietz:** Dietz, Hans Peter, *Thomas Magistros' Recension of the Sophoclean Plays Oedipus Coloneus, Trachiniae, Philoctetes*, U. of Illinois diss., 1965;

**Kopff:** Kopff, E. Christian, *A Collation and Description of the Manuscripts of Sophocles' Antigone*, Chapel Hill diss., 1974;

**Mervyn-Jones:** Mervyn-Jones, D., review of Turyn, *Soph.*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 46 (1953) 371-73;

**Turyn, Aes.:** Turyn, A., *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York 1943);

**Turyn, TAPA:** Turyn, A., "The Sophocles Recension of Manuel Moschopolus," *TAPA* 80 (1949) 94-173;

**Turyn, Soph.:** Turyn, A., *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* (Urbana 1952);

**Turyn, Eur.:** Turyn, A., *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1956);

**Zuntz:** Zuntz, G., *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965).

The references to MSS and their readings are taken from Turyn, *Soph.* 1-10, with one exception. Turyn's *A* = our *P*, as in Dain. Lemmata are from Dain.

those MSS designated by Turyn with the initial siglum Z, e.g., Z, Zb, Zc, etc. I intend to examine critically the results of Turyn's theories in the specific case of the Z or "Thoman" MSS and to suggest the importance of the various Z MSS for the text of the *Antigone*, using my own researches into the text of that play, which at this stage include a complete collation of the extant MSS (with a partial exception for the Leiden Palimpsest, P) and an initial survey of the scholia.

The best summary of Turyn's method was made by him at *TAPA* 94-95. The most incisive criticisms of his Sophoclean work are by Mervyn-Jones and Dawe 3-35. A rare response to theoretical objections to his methodology can be found at Turyn, *Soph.* 46, note 33, where he counters Pasquali's praise of Eduard Schwartz' eclectic editing of the heavily contaminated tradition of Eusebius with the assertion that "of course, in poetry and with regard to a late Byzantine edition, the situation is quite different."<sup>2</sup> Now, although in the *Aes.* Turyn found only one branch of the Thoman family subject to heavy contamination and in the *Soph.* only the two Thoman editions lacked "the strict discipline and consistency of the Moschopulean recension as well as of the Triclinian recension," in the *Eur.* he had to admit that "filiation of MSS in Euripides is more difficult to discover and less disciplined than we should expect it to be in the case of a classical text." In fact, "it appears that, within the genuine 'old' tradition, no stemmatic preferability of certain readings can be deduced from the entire picture of the MS tradition."<sup>3</sup>

As the next section will show, many of the technical objections to Turyn's work can be confirmed from his own discoveries.

## I

Let us use the analysis of the "Thoman recension" as a touchstone with which to evaluate Turyn's results. The scope of his method and

<sup>2</sup> See also Turyn, *Soph.* 125 with note 143. I cannot agree with E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text* (Berkeley 1974) 142, when he says that "important as were the results obtained by Dawe in his . . . *Aeschylus* (1965), the scorn and indignation which he reserves for those he describes as 'stemmatists' is perhaps excessive; the door at which he is thundering has for some time stood ajar." "But," as John Greenway said of Joseph McCabe, "it does no good to be famous if no one has ever heard about you." (Cf. Dawe, *Aes.* 157 and note.) A more appropriate reference than Bénévot would be A. E. Housman, *PCA* 18 (1922) 84 = *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* III (Cambridge 1972) 1069.

<sup>3</sup> Turyn, *Aes.* 68-81; *Soph.* 31-68, quote from p. 46; *Eur.* 307; 323.

the precision of his attributions put his predecessors to shame. (They usually ended by deciding that such and such a MS had a text "somewhere between" L and A.)<sup>4</sup> The identification of the text recension of Thomas Magister, however, has been questioned both in Aeschylus and Sophocles. Dawe has suggested that Thomas did no work on the text but wrote a commentary, on the order of what we know of the tragic work of Maximus Planudes.<sup>5</sup>

I believe that Thomas searched out what he took to be the best text of the *Antigone* and wrote a commentary on it. There is no reason to deny, but equally little to assert, that he made corrections of what he took to be errors on the basis of his grammatical and lexical studies, his collection and editing of scholia, and his collation of other MSS. The basis of his text was a MS in the tradition of L, which may be substantially represented by the mid-fourteenth century MS Zc and its Cretan apographs.

The rest of the Z MSS, which I prefer to call the Palaeologan Vulgate, do show occasional signs of scholarly attention. None of them reveal the same comprehensive re-handling of text and scholia that we see in the MSS of Demetrius Triclinius, whose text was derived from the Palaeologan Vulgate. Although there are several clusters of related MSS, in general, the Z MSS vary so greatly among themselves in their readings that it is impossible to draw up their relationships in the form of a stemma.<sup>6</sup>

The gist of Turyn's method is to enable us to distinguish "genuine 'old' readings" in our contaminated late MSS by determining what are "Byzantine interpolations," and eliminating the latter from consideration. "Thoman readings," as Dietz puts it (p. 3), "can be arrived at by taking those readings from the Thoman MSS that differ from concordant readings of the 'old' MSS."

The crux of the method is the identification of Thoman MSS. Now Thoman scholia have been identified as such by Demetrius Triclinius. The obvious assumption is that where text and scholia

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Arminius Metlikovitz, *De Sophoclis codice Laurentiano Plut. XXXI. 10* (Dissertationes Philologiae Vindobonenses 2; Leipzig 1890) 301; R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles: The Text of the Seven Plays* (Cambridge 1897) xvi; Aubreton 103.

<sup>5</sup> J. Irigoin, *REG* 64 (1951) 383, note 1, thought that Thomas worked only on the tetrad; Dawe, *Aes.* 21; Dawe 60-80. Sir Denys Page agrees with Dawe, "Notes on Manuscripts of Aeschylus," *Serta Turyniana* (Urbana 1974) 234.

<sup>6</sup> As Turyn says, *Soph.* 46.

generally agree, there we have the recension of Thomas Magister. The majority of Z MSS, however, contain texts whose readings consistently *disagree* with Thoman scholia. Furthermore, for the plays *Trachiniae*, *Philoctetes*, and *Oedipus Coloneus*, there are no Thoman scholia at all.

The situation as adumbrated by Turyn and accepted and explicated by Dietz is the following:<sup>7</sup> Thomas did an edition of the tetrad, i.e., *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Rex*, *Antigone*, with running commentary on the plot and exegetic scholia and glosses on the words, whence Zc. "I somehow feel that perhaps in his first draft of the tetrad Thomas omitted the *Vita* and arguments to the tetrad" since they are not present in many important MSS, e.g., Zc and Z, although attested by Triclinius. Thomas then put out a second edition of all seven Sophoclean plays with extensive textual changes. He did not change the scholia he had written for the first edition, but he did contribute a revised argument to the OC, again attested by Triclinius.

There are a few mss. which exhibit at the same time, in one volume, some or all plays of the tetrad in the Thoman version (as certified by the Thoman scholia in several other mss. of the tetrad) and all or some plays of the remaining group in that peculiar version which we assume to be likewise Thoman. E.g., the ms. Laur. Conv. Soppr. 172+ Vatic. Palat. 287 (symbol Zo for the Thoman part only) shows *Ai* ca. 1-668 and *Antigone* in the admittedly Thoman recension and, then, OC, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, in that peculiar interpolated recension which I have just mentioned. The Laur. 32,2 (symbol Zg) shows *Ai.*, *El.*, OT, *Ant.*, in the Thoman version and *Trach.*, *Phil.*, in the recension in question. The Venice 617 (Zp) has *Antig.* in the Thoman recension and OC, *Ph.*, *Tr.*, in that Byzantine tradition in question. The Paris 2787 (Zn) has OT in the Thoman version and OC, *Ph.*, *Tr.*, in that Byzantine recension. . . . Since the commented tetrad in that tradition is Thoman, also the remaining three plays—OC, *Tr.*, *Ph.*,—as represented in the pertinent mss., are to be considered likewise Thoman. . . . Of course, we rely on the assumption that these mss. followed basically the same source throughout the whole given ms.<sup>8</sup>

The chalcenteric reader who works his way through Turyn's own descriptions of MSS in the *Aes.*, *Soph.*, and *Eur.* will learn that the basic

<sup>7</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 31-68; Dietz, *passim*. The quote on the *Vita* is from *Soph.* 35.

<sup>8</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 34.

assumption is refuted by the practice of medieval scribes. Let us examine only the MSS chosen by Turyn himself.

Zo. . . . The text of *Aiæx* at the beginning—Conv. Soppr. 172, fol. 84<sup>r</sup>–89<sup>v</sup>: *Aiæx* 1–668—is Thoman. Then, the rest of the triad—Conv. Soppr. 172, fol. 90<sup>r</sup>–123<sup>v</sup>: *Aiæx* 669–end, *Electra*, *Oed. Tyr.*—is Moschopulean. . . . The other plays obviously revert to the Thoman source. . . . No scholia, except for a few sparse notes.

Zg. . . . Once owned by Symeon, bishop of Gerace, 1348 . . . Fol. 1<sup>v</sup> peculiar argument to *Aiæx* (by second hand, that of Symeon) . . . 11<sup>v</sup> peculiar argument to *Electra*, and another one . . . , both added by Symeon . . . On the whole, no scholia. However, Symeon added some sparse scholia. And a different hand wrote a few Moschopulean scholia on the beginning of the *Electra*.

Zp. . . . The triad is Moschopulean and has Moschopulean scholia. But *Antig.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Trach.*, *Phil.*, are Thoman. They have no scholia.

Zn. . . . No scholia, but there are Thoman glosses and interlinear scholia on *Oed. Tyr.*, which agree with those found in other Thoman mss.<sup>9</sup>

The real foundation, however, of the conclusion that the MSS of the Palaeologan Vulgate represent a text recension by Thomas is the belief that "the origin of scholia indicates *eo ipso* the origin of the accompanied text." It is this belief that leads Dietz to assert (p. 8) that "the most cogent proof for two Thoman Sophocles texts, however, is furnished by the disagreement in manuscripts of the second Thoman edition between scholia and poetic texts, while the same scholia appearing in Vat. 1333 [= Zc] are in complete harmony with the poetic texts." Now historians of classical texts know that scribes sometimes copied scholia written for one type of text on the margins of another text. In this case, *habemus confidentem reum*, Dietz on the Triclinian text of the OC, *Tr.*, *Ph.* (p. 14): "This situation, a poetic text in a Triclinian recension with many Thoman interpolations accompanied by scholia of the ancient tradition, conflicts with the general assumption that the origin of scholia indicates *eo ipso* the origin of the accompanied text." The most famous and most securely established Palaeologan text recension is that of Demetrius Triclinius. This recension also refutes definitively the idea of the unity of text origin and scholia in the Byzantine world.

<sup>9</sup> Turyn, *Soph.*; Zo: pp. 42–43; Zg: p. 41; Zp: p. 43; Zn: p. 42.

The arguments supplementary to these for the Thoman recension of the heptad have been reviewed and rejected by several scholars.<sup>10</sup> One argument involves the assumption just refuted, i.e., that "obviously a conspicuous reference by Triclinius to Thomas' revision of the argument did imply Thomas' editorial role in the text, too."<sup>11</sup> All of the discussion on this point can not disguise the truth that Triclinius, despite his care to attribute scholia and even the argument to the OC to Thomas, never refers in his voluminous scholia to a text revision or conjecture of any kind which was the work of Thomas Magister.

In addition to the documentary basis for the attribution of certain readings to Thomas, there is the stylistic. Thoman interpolations are known, not only because of their presence in MSS containing Thoman scholia or MSS related to MSS containing such scholia, but also by "a strong similarity in the character of the textual changes in the tetrad . . . and those of the three remaining plays . . .—a situation which implies a common source for the interpolation of both groups of plays, *viz.* the editorship of Thomas Magister." It is true, concedes Dietz, that sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between Thoman variant readings and scribal errors. "Most variants, however, are easily discerned."<sup>12</sup> That this power of facile discernment is not an attribute of Turyn and Dietz is not my opinion alone. Günther Zuntz discussed Turyn's similar lists for the text of Euripides.

The vast majority of the "Byzantine" readings listed by Turyn are faults, mostly of an elementary kind and indeed plain scribal errors . . . all the standard types of such slips can be fully instanced from Turyn's lists . . . the pen refuses to detail all these elementary lapses. Far from being the invention of editors, they betray the very opposite of scholarly care. Nor would it be fair to ascribe the whole bulk of the corruptions just sketched to the individual scribes whose products Moschopoulos and Thomas happened to adopt as a basis for their exposition; they are the accumulated result of a long process of copying.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See note 5 above, esp. Dawe 60, 66–68.

<sup>11</sup> Dietz 10. See Dawe 60.

<sup>12</sup> Both quotes from Dietz 9.

<sup>13</sup> Zuntz 157–59 with notes not cited here. The "Specific features of the Thoman text" uncovered by Zuntz 162–64 are ignorance of meter and familiarity with the schoolroom grammatical doctrine of the day. Both "features" must necessarily have

Turyn devotes more than four pages of his Sophocles monograph to listing distinctive Thoman readings in the *Antigone*.<sup>14</sup> Only nine out of 109 are technically "distinctive," if by that we mean "appearing in all Z MSS." If we discount the divagations of Triclinius in the choral lyrics, and the witness of Zc (the "first edition") and Zf, which often diverges from the Thoman norm, we would add about thirteen more, and if we ignore Zh, we could get five more.

The great majority of all these readings is composed of scribal errors, i.e., misprints, or "schoolmasterly" corrections. A few (although a high percentage of the "distinctively" Thoman ones) are correct old readings. One is very revealing.

*Ant.* 235. *πεπραγμένος* LP: *πεφραγμένος* RZcZZbZg<sup>yp</sup>ZoZp<sup>yp</sup>: *δεδραγμένος* Z<sup>yp</sup>Zb<sup>yp</sup>ZfZgZhZp, scholia Thomana, TTa. Cf. *Suda* (sub Δ162) *δεδραγμένος*: *πεπραγμένος*. The reading *δεδραγμένος* may be an ancient variant preserved by Thomas.

There are several problems raised by this line and its treatment in the manuscripts. Let us here concentrate on Turyn's admission that "the reading . . . may be an ancient variant preserved by Thomas." How does he imagine that a "Byzantine," a "Thoman," a "late, interpolated" MS came to preserve an ancient variant? The answer is by collating older witnesses to the truth, now lost. And leaving that aside, and granted that it did come to pass, what has happened to the confidence that "our knowledge of the Byzantine recensions proves to be a powerful reagent which, in our analysis of the 'old' mss., will precipitate interpolations and leave in these mss. for our consideration only their proper features as a basis for recognizing the interdependence of those genuine text witnesses" (Turyn, *Soph.* 15)? It is shown to be a snare and a delusion.

Let us examine some of the "distinctively Thoman" passages. I will occasionally supplement Turyn's reports with the readings of the *veteres*.

210. *ἐκ γ' ἐμοῦ* LPR: *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* ZcZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa

Most editors go along with the reading of the *recentiores*, which is

---

been characteristics of almost any contemporary capable of copying or reading a text of the Greek tragedians.

<sup>14</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 60-65.

also that of L<sup>90</sup>, against that of Turyn's Laurentian, Roman and Paris families. If they are right, Thoman (and most other) manuscripts have preserved tradition. The L reading is a remembrance of v. 207.

242. *σημαίνων* LR, Pap. Oxyrh. 875: *σημανῶν* SZcZZbZfZgZoZpTTa: *σημαινῶν* Zh.

*σημανῶν* is in all Z MSS, S, and Ub<sup>ac</sup> (until 310 a gemellus of AUy). It is accepted by many editors and is more idiomatic. At first glance, it appears a standard correction, well within the competence of the average medieval scholar.<sup>15</sup> The *scholia vetera* to *Ajax* 1225, however, seem to indicate that Didymus in the first century read *σημανῶν*. It seems dogmatic to deny that this might be tradition. Also relevant here is *Ant.* 34.

34. *προκηρύσσοντα* L<sup>ac</sup>PVR: *προκηρύξαντα* L<sup>pc</sup>ZcKSAZZbZfZhZoT<sup>i</sup>: *προκηρύξοντα* ZdZgZpT<sup>s</sup>TaUY

I have expanded Turyn's report to make a point. L<sup>pc</sup> may well be by the hand of A. Note that L, despite its great and many virtues, is by no means faultless. The rest of the tradition has the truth or an easy trivialization of the truth. The corruption split apart many MSS that are typically a unit, separating Zg from T, T from Ta, Zo from Zp, and even breaking up the Paris family (AUy). This is preservation of inherited truth, not conjecture. Even if it were conjecture, there is no reason to attribute it to Thomas.

247. *χρή* LR: *χρήν* KSZcZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa

A model "schoolmasterly" correction, well within the grasp of any pedantic reader.

420. *ἐνθ'* LR: *ἐν δ'* ZcZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa

All other codices, and not just the "Thoman" ones, are correct here against LR. Trivializations are common in L. (See now H. Dietz, *RCCM* 16 [1974] 286.)

<sup>15</sup> Present in M for Aeschylus (=L for Sophocles) where later MSS have future at *Pers.* 819; *Ag.* 26. H. D. Broadhead, *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1960) lxi, calls *Pers.* 819 a case of "letter inserted." [Cf. also *OC* 366; *Tr.* 870; *Eur. Hec.* 512; *IT* 237; *Held.* 799: I owe these parallels to Dr. Dawe.]



486. *ὄμαιμονεστέρα* L<sup>pc</sup> (-*ραις* L<sup>ac</sup>) PRZf<sup>ac</sup>Zh<sup>ac</sup>: *ὄμαιμονεστέρας*  
ZcZZbZf<sup>pc</sup>ZgZh<sup>pc</sup>ZoZpTTa

This is an easy trivialization, not a conjecture, found in most MSS, not just "Thoman" ones.

493. *κλοπεύς* LRZp<sup>yp</sup>: *κλοπαῖς* VZcZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa

Either a real conjecture, or more likely an intrusive gloss, indicating that the noun in the nominative is to be taken adverbially.<sup>16</sup>

520. *ἴσος* LR: *ἴσον* ZcZZbZfZgZh<sup>i</sup>ZoZpTTa: *ἴσων* Zh<sup>a</sup>

*ἴσον* is one of the rare readings, which is confined to Z MSS. I find it more powerful and natural than *ἴσος*. It was conjectured by Bergk and accepted by Nauck and Pearson. The reading of all other MSS is probably an intrusive gloss, corrupted from *ἴσως*, by the reverse process to the one we see at work in Zh. See *Ant.* 134:

*ἀντίτυπα* codd.: *ἀντιτύπως* supra lin. in e.g. L: *ἀντίτυπος* TTaZh<sup>a</sup>

Those who with Jebb prefer Nauck's *ἴσους* will think the "old" reading closer to the original and due to the omission of one letter, also a common occurrence.

An instructive parallel may be found at *Ant.* 446.

446. *συντόμως* LRZc<sup>i</sup>K<sup>s</sup>: *σύντομον* Zc<sup>a</sup>ZZbS: *σύντομα* rel.

Zc would seem to indicate that *σύντομον* is a gloss on *συντόμως*. We do not, however, gloss the familiar with the unfamiliar, and both *-ως* and *-α* are common endings for adverbs in modern Greek, while *-ον* is not. L has preserved an intrusive gloss.<sup>17</sup> An example with the old MSS in the right can be found at OT 1347:

*ἴσον* LGRZf<sup>s</sup>ZgTTa: *ἴσως* AZcZZbZdZf<sup>i</sup>Zn

Note that Zf here preserves the truth *supra lineam* in what could be mistaken for a gloss if we did not know better.

<sup>16</sup> The late Professor Douglas Young had suggested a phonetic error: *κλοπεύς* (pronounced *clopefs*) > *κλοπαῖς*. See *Ant.* 136. *βακχεύων*] *βακχέων* Zr; 87. *πᾶσι*] *παῦσι* N; 107. *πανσαγίαι*] *πανσανγία* R.

<sup>17</sup> A. C. Pearson, CQ 13 (1919) 118. Dawe *per litt.* considers "*σύντομον* easier following odd-looking adverb = substantive *μήκος*." This suggests the variant explanation of an original text with *σύντομα*, glossed by *συντόμως* as in K, and "corrected" to *σύντομον* so as to agree with *μήκος*.

635. μου LVK<sup>ac</sup>R: μοι rell.

The “old” manuscripts show a common corruption, the replacement of the obsolete dative with the current genitive (cf. *δόσε μου* in modern Greek). Although the transition tends to favor dative to genitive, Palaeologan scholars were aware of the problem and a correction is not out of the question here.<sup>18</sup>

727. ὑπ’ LR: πρὸς ZcZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTaKAUY: παρ’ VUb<sup>19</sup>

LR again presents us with a *lectio facilior* intrusive gloss. It is difficult to believe that a “Byzantine” scholar or anybody else would conjecture *πρὸς* when confronted with the perfectly acceptable *ὑπ’*. This is another clear case of direct tradition which by-passes L.<sup>20</sup>

Let us note several points. Every one of these variants (with the possible exception of 493) is due to trivialization, not conjecture. In the passages discussed the Z MSS preserve the truth more often than does L, but this is not true of the tradition as a whole. In several passages what Turyn reports as a “Thoman” reading is in fact found in most MSS and there is no special reason to have assigned the reading to Thomas Magister.

386. εἰς μέσον LRZc: εἰς (vel ἐς) δέον ZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa (Primitus haec erat glossa Thomana, velut Zc<sup>81</sup>.)

So Turyn. We would prefer the following presentation.

386. εἰς μέσον LPRZc: εἰς (vel ἐς) δέον rell. (Zc<sup>81</sup>)

The second reading is clearly superior in context and has been preferred by every scholar who has not assumed L to be the sole fount of Sophoclean readings. It is a variant reading in Zc,<sup>21</sup> not a gloss since *μέσον* could never at any stage of the Greek language have been glossed by the word *δέον*. *εἰς δέον* might be due to memory or

<sup>18</sup> Examples of the accusative or genitive changing to the dative are given in Kopff 40, note 94, e.g., 70. ἐμοῦ] ἐμοὶ K (fort. recte); 80. τάφον] τάφω Zf; 335. πόντου] πόντωι L<sup>ac</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> I have corrected one of the few misreportings I have ever found in Turyn.

<sup>20</sup> Intrusive glosses in the “old” tradition are discussed by Mervyn-Jones 372 and Pearson (note 17, above) 118–28.

<sup>21</sup> The last part of the line in Zc is written *εἰς μέσον περῶ. εἰς δέον ἐκβαίνει* is written above the line in red ink. This is the usual place for glosses: 362 *φεύξιν* Zc<sup>1</sup>: *φυγὴν* Zc<sup>8</sup>; 370 *ἀπολις* Zc<sup>1</sup>: *ἀτυχῆς* Zc<sup>8</sup>. There are exceptions: 387 *ἐξέβην* Zc<sup>ac</sup>: *ἐξέβη* Zc<sup>pc</sup>; 77 *προῦβην* Zc<sup>8</sup>; 27 *φήσιν* Zc<sup>1</sup>: *φασὶν* Zc<sup>8</sup>.

collation of OT 1416, but more likely the common phrase *εἰς μέσον* (4 × in Sophocles: *Ai.* 1285; *Tr.* 514; *Ph.* 609; fr. 876.2 P.) has slipped into the old tradition. Compare the confidence of the analysis of 386 with this passage (Turyn, *Soph.* 60):

OT 1178. *ὥς* LGRZcZ<sup>i</sup>ZbZd<sup>i</sup>ZgZk<sup>i</sup>Zn: *εἰς* Zc<sup>s</sup>l'Z<sup>s</sup>Zd<sup>s</sup>Zk<sup>s</sup>TTa (In Thomanis codd. est cum dubites num glossa supra lineam an varia lectio exstet.)

There are times when such a doubt might cross the mind, but neither *Ant.* 386 nor OT 1178 is such an occasion. *Ant.* 386 is a variant reading found *supra lineam* in Zc and in the text of most MSS (and editions). It could not by the nature of the Greek language be a gloss. *εἰς* in OT 1178 is shown to be a gloss by the mere presentation of the evidence. The *lectio difficior* *ὥς* goes with the verb in the next line. Someone who did not know that *ὥς* as a preposition can only govern a personal object mistakenly glossed it with *εἰς*. For an even more foolish example, see *Ant.* 1179:

1179. *ὥς*] *εἰς* Ya

Let us examine briefly the "Second edition," letting Zc and TTa and for practical purposes Zf and Zh wander where they will.

27. *φησὶν* L<sup>ac</sup>PZc<sup>r</sup>R: *φασὶν* rel.

*φησὶν* is probably the true L-family reading. It is wrong.

134. *γαῦ*] *γᾶν* ZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa

One of the only four or five places where the "second edition" has a unique reading against the rest of the tradition. It is mistaken.

152. *παννύχοις* LPKSRAUYZhTTa: *παννυχίοις* ZcZZbZfZgZhZoZp

If this is a conjecture of Thomas Magister he could scan Greek lyrics better than Demetrius Triclinius. It is tradition.

225. *ἔσχον*] *ἐῦρον* KSZc<sup>m</sup>ZZbZfZgZhZoZpTTa

*ἐῦρον* is a genuine variant which there is no reason to ascribe to Thomas. It gives a good meaning, preferred by G. Müller. *ἔσχον* also gives a good meaning and one slightly more difficult to arrive at: "for many a time my thoughts brought me to a stop" (Bayfield).<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> G. Müller, *Sophocles, Antigone* (Heidelberg 1967) 69; M. A. Bayfield, *The Antigone of Sophocles* (London 1902) 70.

379. δύστηνος] δύστηνε ZZbZfZgZoZp

The “correct” vocative destroys the meter. Elsewhere Turyn attributes metrical corrections to “Thomas.” Dawe comments that “Defenders of the belief in a textual edition by Thomas are strangely fluid in their notions about his metrical competence” and asserts that “we must still reject the argument that Thomas’ knowledge of metre came and went like the quartan fever.”<sup>23</sup> I personally do not believe that Thomas Magister is the source of all the “innovations” attributed to him by Turyn and Dietz, but it does not seem unlikely to me that a man might be so overjoyed by his restoration of a vocative that he would miss the fact that he had ruined the meter. Triclinius’ edition, on which we will comment later, is equally an example of the “problem of reconciling in one person metrical crudity and metrical understanding.”<sup>24</sup> To move into the twentieth century, “knowledge of metre coming and going like the quartan fever” strikes me as the perfect description of the editors of the Budé and Paravia editions of Seneca Tragicus.

557. μέντοι L<sup>p</sup> and lem. K<sup>s</sup>: μέν τ’ οὐ (L<sup>ac</sup>?)R: μέν τ’ οἴου (L<sup>ac</sup>?) ZcSVZh (cf. schol. Thom., ἤγουν ἄριστα τούτοις προσετέθης ἐν μόνῳ λόγῳ καὶ οὐκ ἐφρόνεις ὥσπερ ἐγώ, schol. ZcZZb): μὲν τοῦ KZZbZf ZgZoZpTTa: μὲν τοῖς AUΥ

A typical, letter-juggling medieval conjecture.

660. τοὺς] τοὺς γ’ KSZZgZhZoZpTTa: τοὺς τ’ Zb

Why would any one make such a conjecture? If not a conjecture, the γ’ slipped down from the line above. But the γ’ in 659 is τ’ in all MSS. Does this mean that the Z reading goes back to a stage of the transmission preceding the error in 659? There are enough gammas in 659 and gamma and tau are easily enough confused at all periods to make this only speculation.

673. τ’ RL<sup>2</sup>Zf, θ’ L<sup>1</sup>: om. ZcZZbZgZhZoZpTTa

The textual situation is more complicated than Turyn’s annotation would suggest, but I have reprinted it because most editors from

<sup>23</sup> Dawe 67.

<sup>24</sup> Dawe 73.

Dindorf to Dain have agreed that the Z reading is correct. It could easily be an accident, however.

759. ψόγοισι] ψόφοισι ZZbZgZhZoZpTTa (glossa Thomana *ματαιολογίαις*)

There is no reason to think this a conjecture of Thomas. If not genuine, it may be a memory of *Ajax* 1116, but personally I find it more effective and more Creontic than the old reading.<sup>25</sup>

855. προσέπεσες] προσέπεσ Zf: προσέπαισας ZZbZgZoZpTTa: προσέπεσας VZh<sup>70</sup>

There are metrical and lexical problems in this line. One of the two readings is a trivialization of the other, since  $\epsilon = \alpha$ . To decide which means expounding an entire theory of the *Antigone*.<sup>26</sup>

806. πατρίας] πατρώιας SZZbZfZgZhZoZp

An unmetrical trivialization with many parallels.<sup>27</sup> See Page on *Med.* 431.

863. πατρώιαι LRZc: ματρώιαι rell. fere

A mistake in the old tradition due to a polar error. If there had been no alternative variant, Byzantine scholarship would have explained the old reading, not changed it.

926. ξυγγνωῖμεν] ξυγγνώμεν Zc<sup>i fere</sup> ZZbZg<sup>corr</sup>ZoZpTTa

Erroneous forms of verbs are one of many common textual errors. Why should Thomas have conjectured the subjunctive?

1027. ἀίνητος L ἄνητος P: ἀνήτος RZh: αἰκίνητος Zc: ἀκίνητος ZZbZfZgZoZpTTa

Most editors print the reading of the Paris and Z families. A better presentation might be the following:

1027. ἀκίνητος ZZbZfZgZoZpTTaAUY: αἰκίνητος Zc: ἄνητος LPKS: ἀνήτος VRZh

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *Inachus* (P. Tebt. 3.692 [1933] col. ii.7) fr. 1.22 (= Richard Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* [Berlin 1974] 72–73 and note on 85): *εἰκάσαι παρέστιν Ἑρμῆν πρὸς τὰ σὰ ψοφήματα*.

<sup>26</sup> Cf., e.g., Müller (note 22, above) 190–91 with A. Lesky, *Hermes* 80 (1952) 91–95 = *Gesammelte Schriften* (Bern 1966) 176–80.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. A., *Pers.* 932, *πατρώιαι* Tric.: *πατρίαι* rell.; OR 1394, *πάτρια* codd.; *πατρώα* glossa. See F. Ellendt-H. Genthe, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Berlin 1872) s. vv. *πάτριος*, *πατρώος*.

If ἀνίατος (Blaydes) were poetic language, we might want to reverse my arrangement. In any case, the L reading is not the original.

1032. λέγοι LPRZcVZf<sup>ac</sup>Zh: λέγει Zc<sup>yp</sup>SZ<sup>yp</sup>Zg<sup>i</sup>Zh<sup>ac</sup>AUY: φέρει Zh<sup>pc</sup>Zg<sup>s</sup>KZoTTa: φέρεις Zp φέροι Zb φόροι Z

A glance at *Ant.* 462–64 will show why both (all) readings are genuine variants. The authority of the ancient tradition must be accepted.

1119. παγκοίνους LK<sup>ac</sup>Zc<sup>s</sup>Zf: παγκοίνουR Σ<sup>L</sup>ZhVAUY<sup>pc</sup>: παγκοίνους Σ<sup>L</sup>Zc<sup>i</sup>K<sup>pc</sup>SZZbZgZoZpTTa

The Z MSS are right. As mentioned earlier, a change from dative to genitive or accusative is a common error.

1266. ξυνμόρωι LZcZfAUy: ξυνμόρωι R (scholia vetera unam vocem intellegere videntur): ξυν μόρωι SZZbZgZoZpTTa

S and R should be grouped with the “second edition,” whose reading is correct. The hapless R had enough trouble reading what was before his eyes. (See A. Colonna, *Athenaeum* 18 (1940) 271.)

If there were any reason to assign all or most of these readings to Thomas Magister, we would have to change our tune about him. So far from being the author of “mostly poor interpolations made just for the sake of changing the text,”<sup>28</sup> he would turn out to be a collator and scholar of taste, even if subject to slips. There is, in fact, no reason to assign any of these readings to him or to any single figure, although the fact that he wrote his commentary on the basis of a good and relatively rare text (Zc is the only extant witness of the L family from the fourteenth century) is evidence for some intelligence, if not just dumb luck.

Most of the rest of the four pages devoted to Thoman readings in the *Antigone* is a hodge-podge of little interest to the scholar. Some of Turyn’s citations are a mass of confused variants, e.g.:

58. ἐλελειμμένα L<sup>ac</sup>, λελειμμένα L<sup>pc</sup>ZcZZdZoZp, λελειμένα Zb: ἐλελείμμεθα R, λελείμμεθα Zf<sup>i</sup>Zh: λελείμμεθον Zf<sup>s</sup>ZgTTa  
249. γενήιδος L, γενήϊδος R, γενῆδος ZoZp: γένιδος ZcZZbZg<sup>ac</sup>TTa, γένυδος Zg<sup>pc</sup>, γένειδος Zh, γέν[.]ιδος Zf

<sup>28</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 31.

Some of the passages are intrusive Thoman glosses, of no critical interest, e.g.:

835. βροτοὶ LRZcZfZg<sup>i</sup>TTa: θνητοὶ ZZbZg<sup>s</sup>ZhZoZp (haec primitus erat glossa Thomana, velut Zc<sup>81</sup>)

943. σεβίσασα LRZcZfZgTTa: σεβήσασα Zh: τιμήσασα ZZbZoZp (haec erat glossa vetus L<sup>81</sup> et Thomana Zc<sup>81</sup>)

Are we expected to believe that Thomas inserted into the text of his second edition, not inventions, but glosses from his first edition? Many of the passages are minor slips found only in a part of the tradition, e.g.:

518. δὲ LRZcZZb: γε ZfZgZhZoZpTTa

680. γυναικῶν LRZcZbZfZhZoZpTTa: γυναικὸς ZZg

955. ὁ LRZcZfZhTTa: om. ZZbZgZoZp

1103. γ' LZcZZbZgTTa: τ' R: om. ZfZhZoZp

1249. στένειν LRZ<sup>pc</sup>ZfZgZoZpTTa; στέγειν ZcZ<sup>ac</sup>

These trivial and unimportant slips are supposed to be significant and the result of conscious editorial choice.

We should also realize that sometimes Thoman mss.—especially other mss. than Zc—occasionally adopted different readings in the process of the so-called horizontal transmission. For example, *El.* 868 του om. GRZZg: it means that ZZg were impressed by the reading of the class ρ to the point of following it.<sup>29</sup>

Since there is no reason to believe and positive documentary evidence to refute the idea that the presence of identifiable scholia proves that the text accompanied by the scholia was edited by the author of the scholia even when the text differs from the readings found in or implied by the scholia, there is absolutely no basis for Turyn's hypotheses on the "recension" of Thomas Magister. "Thoman readings" are and can only be a more or less useful shorthand for "readings found in the scholia and glosses attributed by Triclinius to Thomas Magister." There is no reason to attribute to Thomas what conjectures there are in the Z MSS and even less reason to attribute to him old variants and ordinary scribal errors. All readings found in the Z MSS are to be judged on the basis of reason, context, grammar, and meter,

<sup>29</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 50.

not condemned beforehand as inventions of a Byzantine scribe. The double Sophocles recension of Thomas Magister is resolved into the various MSS from which it arose.

## II

This section is devoted to a brief evaluation of the Z MSS, especially Zc, the Palaeologan Vulgate (Z, Zo, Zg), and the Triclinian recension (TTa). All of these MSS but Ta are fourteenth century. It would be well to preface the discussion with a glance at the tenth-century tradition, represented most significantly by L. (With a few rare exceptions P is either illegible or a copy of the exemplar of L.)

### L: Flor., Laur. 32.9

L contains many good readings in the *Antigone*, but none is unique, mainly because of the existence of Zc. The family to which L belongs also includes the fifteenth-century MS R and there is erratic agreement with one or more of the *recentiores*. L is most valuable for its set of scholia and the many variants recorded in the scholia and between the lines of the text. Some of these variants are true. That even the false ones sometimes "must derive ultimately from an uncial manuscript of another family" has been demonstrated by J. Jackson.<sup>30</sup>

We have discussed in section I above passages where later MSS have preserved truth not found in L. There are some places where no one doubts this, e.g.:

507. δρᾶν omit. L

757. λέγειν LPK: κλύειν rel.

831. τάκει LVK<sup>ac</sup>S: τέγγει vel τέγκει rel.

920. θανάτων LZc: θανόντων rel.; κατασφαγὰς L: κατασκαφὰς rel.

1068. βάλλειν L<sup>i</sup>: βάλλων L<sup>p</sup>Zc (fere ZsRK<sup>p</sup>): βαλὼν rel.

Several are less significant:

180. σόφου L<sup>ac</sup>; φόβου rel.

565. καὶ σοι L<sup>ac</sup>: σοὶ rel. fere

583. δόμοσι L: δόμος rel.

640. ὀπιθεν LL<sup>lemm</sup>: ὀπισθεν rel.

697. ὠμιστῶν L: ὠμηστῶν rel. fere

965. τ' omit. LZc

<sup>30</sup> CQ 35 (1941) 36; *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford 1955) 121.



We will close this section with reflections on two quotations from Turyn. One is on *Ajax* 1419, where "the copyist of L corrected the metrical flaw by himself." Without questioning this interpretation of the correction, let us think back to Turyn's assertion that "of course, the respectable age of LP vouches for the pure character of their text."<sup>31</sup> If this means that there are no Palaeologan interpolations in tenth-century MSS, it is quite true, although somewhat banal. If it means that the text represented by L and P is not the result of collation, choice between variant readings, and even the correction of faults where recognized, it is almost certainly a mistake. (The important interpolation of *Ant.* 1337 will be discussed with Zc.)

L and P present us with a good text, made from a variety of sources in both text and scholia. Their readings are often, but not invariably, better than those of later MSS. If the text of the *Antigone* had to be reconstructed from our fourteenth-century MSS and R, it would not be noticeably inferior to the present vulgate.

#### Zc: Vat. gr. 1333

The MS Vaticanus graecus 1333 contains the Sophoclean tetrad and the Olympian epinicians of Pindar. A likely date for it is the middle or third quarter of the fourteenth century.<sup>32</sup> Its textual importance is two-fold. It alone of Palaeologan MSS presents us substantially with the text on which Thomas Magister based his scholia. It alone of the extant MSS of the Palaeologan era represents an L-like text.

We have already discussed the fact that the scholia identified with Thomas seem to be based on an L-like text, which Zc possesses. The hand of Zc for Sophocles has been recognized as the second hand (scribe of arguments) in the Aeschylean portion of Cambridge Univ. Lib. Nn. 3.17A (Turyn's Z for Euripides). In his *Eur.* 46 Turyn gives evidence for the existence of a scriptorium which specialized in Thomas and may well have been located in Thessalonica.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 106, is doubted by Mervyn-Jones 372: "δ was in an ambiguous position in the archetype;" Turyn, *Soph.* 103.

<sup>32</sup> Watermarks include Br. 3196, which appears in documents dated to 1369 and 1378; 4347, which is on paper dated 1354.

<sup>33</sup> Turyn, *Eur.* 45 with note 77, cites Eur. Cambridge Nn. 3. 14, fol. 121<sup>v</sup> + Nn. 3.17A, fol. 1<sup>r</sup> and Aristophanes, Nn. 3.15.1, the subscription of which makes it the only MS to mention Thomas except for those of Triclinius and Milan I 47 sup.

Dawe has pointed out in Zc scholia that are apparently Triclinian and post-Triclinian.<sup>34</sup> Zc is an edition of the tetrad based on Thomas' work by a mid-fourteenth century scholar. It is not a photographic copy of Thomas' autograph, and Thomas' scholia must be reconstructed out of several MSS. There is no reason to be surprised that a version of Thomas' commentary copied some two generations after its inception by a diligent scholar should include post-Thoman scholia. I do not think that Thomas "edited" the text in our sense of the word. He and later editors probably made conscious and unconscious changes (especially the latter). What we do know is the scholia and the scholia were written for a text substantially like Zc.

Although a fourteenth-century MS, Zc represents a level of the family of L as old as and even older than L. Turyn knew that Zc on occasion gives us L<sup>ac</sup>.<sup>35</sup>

13. δύο] δύω L<sup>ac</sup>PZc

27. φασίν] φησίν L<sup>ac</sup>PZc<sup>i</sup>R

140. δεξιόσειρος] δεξιόχειρος L<sup>ac</sup> and lem ZcR<sup>ac</sup>

706. τοῦτ'] ταῦτ' L<sup>ac</sup>ZcK: ταῦθ' V

767. βαρύς] βραχύς L<sup>ac</sup>Zc

786. τ' ἄγρονόμοις] πατρονόμοις L<sup>ac</sup>Zc

There are other random signs of antiquity. Twice (100 and 809) Zc reads ἀθλίου for ἀελίου. In 1027 discussed above the Zc reading seems to be the source of the LPKS reading.

1232. ξίφους omit. Zc: ὅλως L<sup>i</sup>P<sup>i</sup>VR

ξίφους of most of the tradition explains the difficult διπλοῦς κνώδοντας of the next line. Although the hiatus in Zc may be an accident, it does give the situation that would explain the conjecture in LPR. The use of ὅλως with a negative may be found in Greek from the fourth century B.C. on (see LSJ, s.v. ὅλος III.3). It corresponds perfectly to the patterns of modern Greek: Δὲν ἀπήντησε καθόλου.

In a number of places, Zc alone (or virtually alone) preserves the truth.

1224. εὐνῆς ἀποιμύζοντα τῆς κάτω φθορὰν  
τῆς] τοῖς ZcZoZpTmCa

The movement is usually from dative to genitive. A parallel may

<sup>34</sup> Dawe 62-65.

<sup>35</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 47.

be Eur. *Med.* 31: αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτὴν πατέρ' ἀποιμώξῃ φίλον. Cf. *S. El.* 59, 141. The play has been concerned from the beginning with the family in Hades, e.g., 65: αἰτοῦσα τοὺς ὑπὸ χθονὸς ξύγγνοιαν ἴσχειν, and 74-75: ἐπεὶ πλείων χπόνος/ὄν δεῖ μ' ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κάτω τῶν ἐνθάδε.

1337. μή νυν προσεύχου μηδέν.

προσεύχου] κατεύχου ZcZbMa (periit Z), coniecit Benedict

In the fifth century, *προσεύχομαι* meant to pray to or worship; *κατεύχομαι* meant to pray for something or to curse. Campbell thought the chorus was telling Creon not to pray to the gods or worship any more. I agree with Jebb that "such an interpretation ill accords with the tone of the Chorus, which presently insists on the duty of piety towards the gods (1348)." The meaning we want is not "pray thou no more" (Jebb), but "do not pray for death." The verb for that meaning is *κατεύχου*. A parallel is Eur. *IT* 536, *μηδὲν κατεύχου*, "do not curse him," i.e., Ulysses. *προσεύχομαι* alone survives in Modern Greek.

There are signs that may indicate that the scribe of Zc was working from an isolated MS that was also hard to read, especially the places where the original scribe has left out a word or a few letters.

18. ἤδη] om. Zc<sup>ac</sup>

89. μάλιστ δεῖν Zc<sup>ac</sup>

327. εἰάν om. Zc<sup>ac</sup>

328. τύχη om. Zc<sup>ac</sup>

This may be the explanation for the omission at 1232. The text also shows signs of the influence of the scholia vetera.<sup>36</sup>

118. κύκλωι] κυκλώσας Zc

The MS eventually found its way to Crete where it was copied a number of times around the year 1496. Later it came into the hands of Fulvius Orsinus, who filled in the lacunae and made other corrections in a thick, brown ink on the basis of a manuscript of the "second edition" type.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Scholia vet. ad 117 (Papageorgius 222): ὡς αἰετὸς ὁ Πολυνείκης κυκλώσας τὰς Θήβας ταῖς τῶν φόνων ἐρώσαις λόγοις ἀμφιχανὼν ἔβα· ἐνέμεινε δὲ τῇ μεταφορᾷ.

<sup>37</sup> See the fuller description in Kopff 120-21.

Zf: Paris, ancien fonds grec 2884

Zf (E in other scholars from Brunck on) was subscribed by Athanasius Spondiles on 24 February 1301 and contains the tetrad for Sophocles, the triad for Aeschylus, and Theocritus I, III–XIII. The *Antigone* has rare Thoman scholia. Since scholia and text are an indissoluble unity in Turyn's Byzantine Empire, he sees Zf as a representative of the edition of Thomas, which is now dated as earlier than the year 1301. Dain tells us that "le manuscrit type de la recension de Thomas Magister est le *Parisinus gr.* 1884 (*sic*), E, datable de 1299."<sup>38</sup>

Here is Turyn's brief analysis of Zf:

Only the portion comprising *Oed. Tyr.* 1302–end and *Antigone* is Thoman and has sparse scholia on *Ant.* 101–161; this portion is symbolized Zf. The rest of the Sophoclean text is Moschopulean.<sup>39</sup>

We note again that it is the indefatigable researches of Turyn himself which have refuted "the assumption that these mss. followed basically the same source throughout the whole given ms." Dain's comment is his version of Aubreton's remark, "A. Turyn, dans son étude sur la tradition manuscrite d'Eschyle, estime que le *Parisinus gr.* 2884 est, en ce que regarde ce poète, le type même du manuscrit de Thomas."<sup>40</sup>

Because he did not possess a knowledge of the entire tradition, Aubreton's analysis of the readings of Zf is not persuasive.<sup>41</sup> His description of the MS itself (pp. 96–104) is exemplary and its conclusion bears repeating.

Athanase Spondile a fait, vers 1301, une copie d'un manuscrit qui semble nettement de tradition courante.<sup>42</sup> En effet, les arguments ressemblent à ceux que nous avons relevés dans les manuscrits possédant le commentaire de Moschopoulos. Pourtant un des arguments d'*Antigone* lu ici ne se trouve que dans la tradition du manuscrit ancien L. Ensuite, notre scribe s'est mis à recopier les scholies anciennes, et ceci peut sembler curieux car nous trouvons rarement cette tradition byzantine accompagnée

<sup>38</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 31; Dain XLVII.

<sup>39</sup> Turyn, *Soph.* 41.

<sup>40</sup> Aubreton 96. Dain's discussion of the date is also botched (XLVII, note 1). He is agreeing, not with Aubreton, but with Gallavotti, *RFIC* n.s. 12 (1934) 558. H. W. Smyth, *HSCP* 44 (1933) 8, cites Omont for 1298 and Wilamowitz for 1299. Both Aubreton 97–98 and Turyn, *Soph* 41, note 31, agree on 1301.

<sup>41</sup> Aubreton 142–46; 151–53.

<sup>42</sup> I.e., not a text peculiar to Thomas.

des scholies anciennes; s'il s'est interrompu c'est que son modèle ne comportait pas davantage de scholies, ou qu'il a laissée la place à un commentaire plus moderne, contemporain même. Or, ce même Athanase a continué son oeuvre par la copie d'Eschyle, et cette fois il a pris un texte nettement thomanien aussi bien pour les leçons que pour les scholies . . . tout en rapprochant parfois de la tradition du *Laurentianus* L<sup>2</sup>, ce manuscrit constitue un cas assez particulier se rapprochant tantôt de la tradition du manuscrit A, et tantôt s'opposant à toutes les autres traditions.<sup>43</sup>

The readers of this article have ceased to marvel at ancient scholia found with the Palaeologan Vulgate or texts that sometimes do and sometimes do not agree with the MSS L and A.

For the *Antigone*, we have very full scholia on fol. 113<sup>v</sup>–114<sup>r</sup>, the beginning of the *parodos*. There are intermittent glosses throughout and several scholia on fol. 119<sup>v</sup>, where the first *stasimon* begins. The hand of the very faded, often illegible scholia on fol. 113<sup>v</sup>–114<sup>r</sup> appears frequently writing scholia on the other Sophoclean plays. It is not the hand of Athanasius Spondiles, as Aubreton had already noted.<sup>44</sup> He is certain that the Aeschylean scholia are by Spondiles.<sup>45</sup> Much of the Theocritean scholia is Triclinian and no one supposes that to be in the first hand of Zf.<sup>46</sup>

Thomas' Aeschylus commentary appears to have preceded his Sophocles scholia. If there is a logical reason for Spondiles' failure to copy Thoman scholia into the Sophoclean tetrad, it may be that the scholia did not yet exist. That would make 1301 the *terminus ante quem* of the Aeschylus commentary but the *terminus post quem* of the Sophocles commentary. It would thereby prove that the text of the Palaeologan Vulgate preceded the scholiastic activity of Thomas Magister. As Touchstone said, "much virtue in If."

In the *Antigone* Zf has few interesting readings:

567. μένσοι rel.: μέντοι S, μέντοι σοι Zf

Zf's text suggests an exemplar reading μέντοι with σοι *supra lineam*, whence the error in the rest of the tradition, except for S. (For the

<sup>43</sup> Aubreton 102–103.

<sup>44</sup> Aubreton 98.

<sup>45</sup> P. 101.

<sup>46</sup> See Turyn, *Aes.* 76–77 with note 70.

gloss, compare *Ant.* 243: τοι] σοι Zc.) S and Zf at 567 represent a tradition which goes back to an independent source and may also be the origin of the following, if it is not a conjecture:

343. κουφονόων P<sup>ac</sup>SZf<sup>s</sup>: κουφονέων rell. fere

1237. παρθένωι] παρθένον Zf

Campbell Bonner defends Brunck's reading of the accusative, arguing that *προσπτύσσομαι* with the accusative means "embrace" (cf. *Od.* 11.451; *Eur. Ba.* 1319), while with the dative it means "cling to" (*Tr.* 767; cf. *Achilles Tatius* 4.1.2 vs. 4.9.4).<sup>47</sup> Zf has the accusative but a change from the obsolete dative to the current accusative could be a slip. Zf was not carefully corrected and so is a mine of errors of all sorts, including intrusive glosses. Some of the unique variants may be conjectures, and Spondiles might repay study.

### The Palaeologan Vulgate

Most of the manuscripts and their apographs described and collated in Turyn's chapters on the Thoman recension do agree frequently enough in readings and colometry to encourage one to think that at some points they may issue from a common hyparchetype. This I believe to be a fair conclusion, although there seems to be too few *Trenn-und-Bindefehler* that are both significant and unique to settle the issue definitively. The MSS in question fall into four groups: Z<sup>+</sup>(ZZbMa);<sup>48</sup> Zo<sup>+</sup>(ZoZpZr); Le<sup>+</sup>(ZgZs); T<sup>+</sup>(TTaTeTm).<sup>49</sup> Of the other "Thoman" MSS, Zf and Zh, although agreeing often with the other Z MSS, also agree frequently and significantly with other groups.

We have discussed Turyn's explanation for the similarities and disparities in this group, i.e., the second edition with many interlinear and marginal variants. Here is mine. The Palaeologan Vulgate represents a non-L tradition. Whether its truth comes to it from the transliteration of a late ancient MS or from the desultory collation of

<sup>47</sup> Campbell Bonner, "The Death of Haemon (*Ant.* 1336-7)," *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps* (Princeton 1936) 24-28.

<sup>48</sup> Ma (my siglum), Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, C.24. *sup.*, described in Kopff 111-12.

<sup>49</sup> Tm (my siglum), Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS gr. 39 = T. 9.2., described in Kopff 113.

lost sources, we cannot say. There is no positive proof for the first hypothesis and the second suffices to explain the evidence. Palaeologan scholars rarely or never merely copied the text in front of them. They collated other MSS; they read scholia; they corrected errors when they recognized them.<sup>50</sup> It is thus almost never possible to identify with security the unique exemplar of a fourteenth-century MS. Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century MSS are to a large extent written for the new Italian market. They tend to be mere apographs of older MSS, written in hands that are larger and easier to read than fourteenth-century MSS and with notes and glosses that are more elementary. This is the explanation of the pseudo-"discipline" of Triclinian MSS, one of which is fourteenth century, three of which are fifteenth century and later.

We have already discussed in section I above places where the reading of the Z MSS seems worthy of consideration. Let us discuss briefly the one group that we know involves a complete re-working of text and scholia, the edition of Demetrius Triclinius.

As is well known, Triclinius' most important contribution lay in his study of the lyric meters and the changes in colometry and readings, sometimes drastic changes, in which his new-found learning led him to indulge. Dawe has rightly insisted that there is no reason to call all his changes "conjectures."<sup>51</sup> At any rate, the daring changes of Triclinius in the choruses were not imitated or accepted by his contemporaries.

We have no autograph MS of Triclinius' Sophocles as we do of his Aeschylus and his Euripides. On the basis of cross-references in the scholia, Turyn has reconstructed the order of the editions: Euripides-Sophocles-Aeschylus.<sup>52</sup> He also discovered the master-copy of

<sup>50</sup> For convenient summaries of the habits of medieval scribes and scholars, see, e.g., G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Firenze 1952<sup>2</sup>) 43-183; A. Dain, *Les manuscrits* (Paris 1964<sup>2</sup>) 151-54; R. Browning, "Recentiores non deteriores," *BICS* 7 (1960) 11-21, esp. 14 and notes 19-22. The works of Turyn, Aubreton, Dawe, and Zuntz are also important.

<sup>51</sup> Dawe, *Aes.* 60-62; Dawe 80-81.

<sup>52</sup> The order Eur.-Aes.-Soph. found in Turyn, *Aes.* 104 and Aubreton 20-23, was established by C. M. Franken, *Disputatio critica de antiquarum Aeschlyli interpretationum ad genuinam lectionem restituendam usu et auctoritate* (Trajecti ad Rhenum 1845), on the basis of scholia that were mixed Thomano-Triclinian. It is the correct order for the commentaries of Thomas. Turyn's suggestions for Triclinius are found in Turyn, *Eur.* 35-36.

Triclinius' edition of Euripides' triad.<sup>53</sup> The evidence of the hand suggests that the edition was prepared over a number of years, c. 1315–1320. What evidence I have seen for the Naples autograph of Triclinius' Aeschylus indicates watermarks of the late twenties and thirties of the fourteenth century.<sup>54</sup>

Triclinius used for the basis of his work on Sophocles the families I have analysed as  $Z^+Zo^+Le^+$ . The watermarks of the fourteenth-century representatives of these groups, or of this family, suggest dates c. 1310–1315.<sup>55</sup> Triclinius' original textual work is concentrated in the choral lyrics and anapaestic passages. Most of the significant variants in the iambic sections of Triclinius' text are also found in one or more of these groups. So the  $\gamma'$  inserted in 648 is attributed to Triclinius by Dain, although it is also found in  $Zo^+Le^+$ . Among these variants are striking errors.

*Ant.* 330. γνώμης τ'] γνώμης γ'  $Zo$ : —γνώμης τ' (καὶ sl) $Z^{pc}$  καὶ γνώμης  $Z^{ac}ZfLe^+T^+$

997. φρίσσω] φρίττω  $SZo^+T^{+fere}$

This is prime proof that Triclinius did not revise the iambic portion with the care he expended on the choral lyrics. (Note here that the omission of 628 (in anapaests) by  $Z^+Zo^+T^+$  is of interest as a *Leitfehler*, not as a conjecture by Triclinius.)<sup>56</sup> I have found only three variants in Triclinius' dialogue sections.

484. ἐγὼ post μὲν  $Z^+$ : με  $Zo$ : γ' ἐγὼ  $T^+$

Elmsley proposed  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho'$  for  $\nu\nu$ . We could suppose Triclinius bothered by the same problem and intending  $\nu\nu$  γ'. It is probably just a mistake.

533. τρέφων] τρέφον  $T^+$

888. τυμβεύειν] τυμβεύει  $Zc^{ac}AUy$ : τυμβεύσει  $T^+$

533 is probably only a slip. In 888 we see Triclinius basing a conjecture on a slip which happens to be common to  $Zc$  and the Paris family.

<sup>53</sup> Turyn's discovery of Angelicus 14 is discussed below.

<sup>54</sup> Aubreton 21 cites the following watermarks for Naples, II.F.31: Br. 7482, 7484, 14101, 14109, which appear in documents dated to 1322, 1330, 1336.

<sup>55</sup> Zg: Br. 16014 (1311, 1313); 16019 (1314–21); Moslin-Traljac: 4595 (1300?); 1718–1719 (1316; 1310–12). Z: Br. 9394 (1315); 9386 (1312–15); 5973 (1306); 7415 (1316); 9011 (1316).

<sup>56</sup> Here I agree with Turyn, *Soph.* 62 note 55, against Dain 96.



We can more easily picture how Triclinius worked on the *Antigone* now that Turyn has identified Triclinius' working copy of his Euripides triad text, Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, gr.14 (=olim C.5.1).<sup>57</sup> Triclinius took a copy of the vulgate and made many notes. When he wanted to make a more serious revision, he even ripped out pages and added new ones. These latter generally correspond to the lyric and anapaestic parts of the triad. "Angelicus 14 is a final copy of Triclinius composed of parts that came into being at different times." What we call Triclinius' different editions of Aristophanes, etc., may be only different stages of his work on the authors. The state of Angelicus 14 "should rather warn us against attempting to establish rigidly a definite succession of Triclinian editions. His editions conceivably were in the making over a period of years in a fluid state of formulation until they attained their final nature."<sup>58</sup> Although Turyn does not say so, this could also be true of all the other editions he discusses.

The manuscripts containing the Triclinian edition proper are not the only ones to be associated with the name and hand of Demetrius Triclinius. Zg and Zo contain the alphabetic plays of Euripides. Turyn has shown that the correcting hand (l) of Zg (L for Euripides) is that of Triclinius himself and that of the second scribe is Nicholas Triclines, possibly a relative.<sup>59</sup> Sophocles was transcribed by the first hand. Zs in the Euripidean triad (Sophocles' Zo=P for Euripides) was copied from Zg apparently before some of l's corrections and after others.<sup>60</sup> Both manuscripts should be associated with the "scriptorium" of Triclinius. It is thus possible that corrections found in Zo+T+Le+ might be due to an early and preliminary effort of Triclinius, when they are not simply common errors.

58. λελείμμένα codd. plerique fere: λελείμ(μ)εθα KZfZhSa: λελείμμε-  
εθον T+Le+(K<sup>s</sup>Zf<sup>s</sup>)

390. ποθ'] γὰρ Zf: γ' ἄν T+Le+<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Turyn, *Eur.* 23-42.

<sup>58</sup> Turyn, *Eur.* 34; 37. See note 52 above and Ole Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus*, vol. 1 *The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (Leiden 1975).

<sup>59</sup> Turyn, *Eur.* 224-33; cf. p. 243. For Triclinius' and others' additions to the Sophoclean part of Zg, see Zuntz 127-28 and notes.

<sup>60</sup> Turyn, *Eur.* 264-88; Zuntz 16-125; W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964) 429.

<sup>61</sup> "Exquisitius vulgato," says Herrmann, comparing OT 434.

T<sup>+</sup> does not, however, agree uniquely with Le<sup>+</sup> more than it agrees with Z<sup>+</sup> or Zo<sup>+</sup> and the presence in Le<sup>+</sup> of 628, for example, indicates that Zg is not *the* exemplar of T.<sup>62</sup>

This is not the place to discuss Triclinius' conjectural initiative in depth. Let it be noted that it ranges from minor and widely accepted (122: τε add.) to daring and specious (364: σοφόν] δεινόν T<sup>+</sup>)<sup>63</sup> and beyond that to really clumsy and imperceptive:

366. καὶ γὰρ ποτὲ μὲν καλόν, ἄλλοτ' ἀθις γ' ἐπ' ἐσθλὸν ἔρπει.

### Summary

The fourteenth-century MSS of the *Antigone* grouped by Turyn under the heading "Thoman" are indispensable witnesses for the text and their text rarely if ever was influenced by the conjectures of Thomas Magister.

<sup>62</sup> See Turyn, *Eur.* 256–57 and note 242.

<sup>63</sup> σοφά is a gloss on δεινά at 332 in several MSS.