ON THE COMPOSITION OF SOME GREEK MANUSCRIPTS.

III. THE VENETIAN HOMER.

This celebrated book has for the last two hundred years received the attention it deserved. The earlier enquirers, Vettori, Küster, Bongiovanni, Villoison, are enumerated in the preface to Dindorf's edition of the scholia (Oxford 1875 i. p. xxiv sq.). Of modern collations and descriptions it would be difficult to give a complete list. The works of which it is still needful to take account are La Roche Text, Zeichen und Scholien des berühmten Codex Venetus zur Ilias, Wiesbaden 1862, Wachsmuth Ueber die Zeichen und einige andere Eigenthümlichkeiten des Codex Venetus zur Ilias, Rheinisches Museum N. F. xviii. (1863) p. 178 sq., O. Jahn Griechische Bilderchroniken 1873, p. 94 sqq. (the collation and description of the Venetus A was contributed by Studemund and de Boor), Dindorf's preface already mentioned, and in especial Ludwich Aristarchs Homerkritik i. p. 89 sq., and Georg Wissowa Ueber die Proklos-Excerpte im Codex Venetus A der Ilias, Hermes 1884 p. 198 sq. Some of these studies are more concerned with the text, others with the scholia. There is perhaps yet room for a technical view of the book as a whole.

No complete facsimile has been undertaken; separate leaves may be found in Dindorf l.c. i. pp. 156, 356 (ff. 48 r. and 132 v.), and in Wattenbach and von Velsen Exempla codicum graecorum litteris minusculis scriptorum, plates xxxii, xxxiii (ff. 15 v., 34 r.).

The ms. numbered 454 in Zanetti's catalogue of the Library of St Mark (p. 244) is a vellum book of which the pages
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measure 393 × 280 mm. It possesses 327 pages, not counting modern flyleaves. The sheets are arranged in gathers of 4, and according to the usual Eastern fashion ruled upon the hair-side, while the flesh-side of each pair of sheets is turned outward. Each leaf is ruled for 25 lines of text, and spaces on the lateral and lower margin are ruled for the reception of scholia. Between these and the text, and also between them and the edge of the page, blank unruled spaces are left.

The quires were originally signed on the first sheet in the outer bottom corner, but the first certain signature that is left occurs on f. 156 r. i6. Working back from this we establish the state of the book as follows:

Quire

(a) ff. a + 1—11. Signature gone. ff. 1, 4, 6, 8, 9 are originals, the rest xvith century.

(2) ff. 20—27 no traces of signature. A 402—B 186.
(3) ff. 28—35. id. B 187—592.
(4) ff. 36—43. id. B 593—Γ 101.
(5) ff. 44—51. id. Γ 102—Δ 33.
(6) ff. 52—59. id. Δ 34—434.
(7) ff. 60—67. id. Δ 435—E 285.
(8) ff. 68—75. id. E 286—685. The three middle sheets (E 336—636) have fallen out and are restored a. xvi.

(9) ff. 76—83. id. E 686—Z 179.
(10) ff. 84—91. id. Z 180—H 50.

(13) ff. 108—115. Θ 374—I 209. id.
(14) ff. 116—123. I 210—613. id.
(15) ff. 124—131. id. I 614—K 301.
(16) ff. 132—139. id. K 302—Λ 125.
(17) ff. 140—147. id. Λ 126—525.
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(23) ff. 188—195. Κ Ξ 379—Ο 250.
(24) ff. 196—203. Κ Ο 251—651.
(25) ff. 204—211. No trace of signature. O 652—Π 300.
(26) ff. 212—219. id. Π 301—705.
(27) ff. 220—227. id. Π 706—Π 226.
(28) ff. 228—235. id. Π 227—628. The three inner sheets (P 277—577) have fallen out and are restored s. xvi.
(29) ff. 236—243. id. P 629—Σ 252. The former leaf of the third sheet (P 729—761) is restored s. xvi, the flap of the new leaf projects round the inner edge of f. 241. The whole quire has been recomposed, for the string-holes in the hinge of the middle sheet, ff. 239, 240, are empty.
(30) ff. 244—251 (Σ 253—Τ 25). No trace of signature.
(31) ff. 252—259 (Τ 26—424). Slight traces of Λα. The two inner sheets, ff. 254—7 (Τ 126—326) have fallen out and are restored s. xvi.
(32) ff. 260—267. Λα. Τ 1—405.
(33) ff. 268—275. No trace of signature. Τ 406—Φ 300.
(34) ff. 276—283. Λα partly cut away. Φ 301—X 82.
(37) ff. 300—307. id. Ψ 360—758.
(38) ff. 308—315. Λα. Ψ 759—Ο 279.
(39) ff. 316—323. Λ Ψ 759—Ω 279. (3 is cut away). Ω 279—654. The middle sheet, ff. 319, 320 (Ω 405—504), has fallen out and been supplied s. xvi.
(40) ff. 324—327. Ω 655—804. No trace of signature. Two sheets. The text ends on f. 326 v. 327 r. is utilised for Hadrian’s epigram (Anth. Pal. IX. 387), the verso is blank.

A signature runs through all the quires from 1 to 40, including the inserted leaves, of the late type a 1, a 2, a 3 etc. Ff. 1—11 are numbered continuously in Arabic figures by a late hand, probably the same. There is nothing abnormal in these quires from 1 down to 40. The missing sheets and leaves are

11—2
supplied by sheets and leaves of white levigated vellum, the
writing on which is clearly in a xvith century hand (so Stude-
mund thought ap. Wissowa l.c. p. 201). These restorations were
apparently made after the book came to Venice, and coincide
with the re-signing, the insertion of blank leaves into the
prolegomena, the numbering of the prolegomena, and appar-
etly the trimming and gilding of the edges.

The element of uncertainty in this part of the discussion of
the ms. is presented by the leaves that precede quire a.
Their contents (Proclus’ prose summaries of the poems of the
Cycle) have given them an interest in the eyes of scholars, and
their arrangement and relation has been the subject of much
discussion. The exhaustive article of Georg Wissowa, Hermes
1884, p. 198 sq., summarizes earlier literature, and takes into
account all the conditions that can determine a restoration.
Some of these are derived from the subject-matter, and the
evidence of other mss., and therefore exceed my province. I
will confine myself to restating the purely palaeographical
data. The leaves are

1. ancient, flesh-recto, hair-verso.
2 and 3. late, blank.
4. ancient, hair-recto, flesh-verso.
5. late, blank.
6. ancient, flesh-recto.
7. late, blank.
8. ancient, hair-recto, flesh-verso.
9. ancient, hair-recto, flesh-verso.
10, 11. late, blank.

Of these 1 and 8 form a sheet: the hinge is unbroken.
As the outer-side is flesh, the sheet must have been either the
1st or the 3rd of a quire of 4; and, seeing that the subject
commences on f. 1 recto, and ends on f. 8 recto, f. 8 verso being
blank, and considering also the fact (to which some weight is
due) that the restorer used this sheet as an outside sheet in
which to wrap ff. 2—7, we may reasonably conclude that the
sheet was the first of the quire. The other ancient leaves,
4 and 6, are mounted on late vellum; they have each broken away from the other half of their respective sheets. No inference can therefore be drawn from their present position. From the fact however that the recto of f. 4 is the hair-side it follows that f. 4 may have been the 2nd, 4th, or 6th leaf of the gather; the position therefore given by the restorer to f. 4 is possible. F. 6 on the other hand, having a flesh recto and a hair verso, must have been the 3rd, 5th, or 7th leaf of the gather, and its present position is impossible. Considering now 4 and 6 together, it is evident that they may have stood to each other in a variety of relations. On the ground of context, Wissowa holds that f. 6 immediately preceded f. 4. This is probable, but the palaeographical evidence alone does not admit of such a stringent conclusion.

The odd f. 9 remains: this also is mounted. Its position and indeed significance are of the obscurest. The technical data are that its recto is the hair-side, so that it cannot have begun a new quire. But, as Wissowa acutely notices, it is ruled on a different plan to ff. 1, 4, 6, 8; the page is divided into one broad column and two narrow, as if to receive a text and scholia (the ruling of the Homer text is however different). Wissowa sees in this leaf the survivor of an entire new gather—a considerable supposition. The recto is entirely blank, on the verso one, the outer, narrow column is filled with a list of Homeric commentators; the other two are empty. Graphically we cannot guess at the possible connection of this leaf with the preceding quire; and it is to be noticed that the evidence of signatures, which might have given a clue to the extent of this prefatory matter, is wanting, since the signing of the body of the book began with the text of the Iliad.

The blank spaces on these leaves are partly covered by primitive paintings of scenes from the Iliad. Their age, as Wissowa notes, is fixed on one side by the circumstance that one picture (on f. 4 v.) covers a hand of the XIIIth century that had written some lines from Heliodorus on the blank vellum. From the want of sequence between the subjects of the paintings it would seem that there must at one time have been more of them, and that therefore they were inserted before the
original gather or gathers had burst. There must have been something singular about this preface, which left so many blanks for first a scribe and then an illustrator to fill. The circumstances defy our reconstruction, but the damaged and smirched condition of the surface of f. 12 shews that the preceding leaves must have been for some long time only loosely connected with the text. Fancy, if given rein to, might suggest—starting from the waste of room that seems to have taken place—either that the original gather was of three sheets only; or that, if it was a full quire of 4 sheets, the quantity of blank vellum tempted the knife of the depredator, and that in this way the disintegration of the quire began. This however is the purest hypothesis.

I have next to discuss the hands that are to be seen in this book—their character, function and individuality.

Each page of the ms. displays three sorts of writing differing widely in size, position and character. The Text is written in a large minuscule hand (T). This hand is strong, vigorous and supple. When it is entirely free, the letters are long rather than square; the direction varies, but is uniformly to the right. The character is fairly pure minuscule; the minuscule form of β is almost universal, that of η very frequent, those for κ and λ are usual. Ligatures and couplings of letters form a characteristic, e.g. δ, αγ, σφ; elaborate and boldly drawn combinations of σσ, εσ, ευσ, ει are frequent. The letters are always finely formed, with great dash and slancio. For size the hand is a salmon among minnows, and has no parallel in writing of this period. The scholia are as large as the text of some other mss. (e.g. of the Paris Aristotle, grec 1741). The hand is as typical of this period (s. x—xi) as the Plato Clarke 39 of early minuscule or the Demosthenes Paris grec 2534 of the style of the middle of the 16th century.

The Marginal scholia are smaller than the text by more than half. They develope the qualities of suppleness and freedom, while they lose firmness of stroke. They are closely and, as it would seem, rapidly written, and are
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extremely clear, and contain a low proportion of abbreviations.

The Intermarginal scholia do not differ materially from other semi-uncial scholia of this period: the semi-uncial script indeed admits of small variation. These scholia, like those of the Sophocles and the Aristophanes, are uncalligraphic (and in this respect differ from the semi-uncial scholia of a hundred years before, e.g. of the Arethas MSS.): they are plain, very small, the strokes one thickness, the letters most often disjointed.

These are the obvious and palpable differences between the three portions of writing on any page of the MS. The question follows, how many scribes are concerned in producing these apparently different pieces of script?

T and A are both minuscule, and the comparison between them is therefore direct. Allowance being made for the difference of size and rapidity already mentioned, they are plainly in the same hand, and this is generally recognised. A is T on a much smaller scale; the formation of the several letters and ligatures, accents, breathings and compendia can be followed in detail and seen to be in every particular the same. We have therefore a case of the very common practice at this period, especially frequent in Catenas, where text and comment are written by the same scribe in the same character, with a difference, more or less great, of size. Here, the scholia being very abundant, the difference is great.

More uncertainty might fairly be felt whether the Intermarginal scholia (B) were by the same hand as the Text and Marginal scholia. The point of comparison is naturally between them and the lemmata of the Marginal scholia, which are in semi-uncial. Now the A hand is, as I have said, markedly rapid and sloping, and the lemmata share this general character; consequently on any particular page it might be open to anyone to find a clearly marked difference between A and B, which is

1 None of the rarer signs occur; even comparatively common combinations like ῶ and τώρ are seldom found (κέλλος 111 v., θεδαμώτερον 126 r, προ- τώρ 140 v.). I have however noted ῶ, in ἀξιλλευς 139 v. The s is not rendered.
consistently stiff, upright, and even inclined to the left. Nevertheless, I have no doubt in stating (with most if not all of my predecessors) that these two hands are the same. At the beginning of the book, as generally happens, the scribe, either careful of his material or somewhat cramped in his stroke, writes an uniformly smaller and more careful hand—alike in text, marginal scholia, and intermarginal scholia. Here, if we compare the lemmata of A with B, we find that the size is nearly the same, and the strokes and formation of the letters are absolutely identical. I may give the word κριγων, which occurs f. 14 v. in both sets of scholia, as an instance. In these early pages the identity of the lemmata of A and the whole of B is evident: the divergence that takes place afterwards is sufficiently accounted for by the increased rapidity and freedom that the scribe as he warmed to his work gave to both text and marginal scholia, while the intermarginal semi-uncial, both from the narrowness of its space and the characteristics of its script, maintained to the end its original rigidity.

Accordingly, the Text, the Marginal Scholia and the Intermarginal Scholia were written by the same scribe; an achievement, if we consider the length of the book, and the unbroken excellence of writing, without a parallel in books of this period that survive. This conclusion greatly lightens the task of distinguishing between the innumerable corrections, clerical and otherwise, which beset the text. They differ in character, thickness and tint, and while some are clear, to divide all of them with certainty among three different scribes would have been almost impossible. If we view them as the work of one writer at different times using a different pen, their similarity is at once explained and the necessity of distinguishing them diminished.

I proceed to describe the portions of the book which the scribe wrote at these three reprises. When he wrote the text, he added thereto accents, breathings, and apostrophes to denote

1 This character may still be seen on f. 15 v. in Wattenbach and von Velsen's facsimile.
elision; quantitative marks\(^1\), elided syllables superscribed above the line, the critical signs in the left-hand margin. He also wrote the title of the books, \(\lambda\iota\alpha\delta\omicron\varsigma\) \(\ddot{a}\) etc., made the florets with which the books conclude, and apparently illuminated the initial letter. It is possible that the periochae (in red, semin-uncial) may have been written at the same time, but the character suggests the marginal scholia. Further, there are many corrections of the text, above the line, evidently made by the scribe as he wrote the text; the corrections are much smaller than the minuscule of the text—in fact almost minute: but (1) the ink is of the same colour as that of the text, (2) the stroke is the same thickness. We may conclude that the same pen wrote them. Lastly, lines omitted in the text are added from time to time by the writer, usually in the space left below the text, in a character little if at all smaller than that of the text.

I give instances of the operations of the Text-hand:

(1) Corrections: f. 30 r. B 300 \(\ddot{v}\), 30 v. B 324 \(\nu\), 31 v. B 387 \(\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\iota\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\), 33 r. B 461 \(\kappa\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\) (here the correction itself is marked out by dots in a paler ink), 114 r. I 112 \(\dot{\alpha}\rho\varepsilon\sigma\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\iota\), 123 v. I 596 \(\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\omicron\), 124 r. I 619 \(\ddot{v}\) \(\dot{\eta}\) \(\dot{\iota}\) \(\dot{\xi}\) \(\dot{\eta}\) \(\dot{\eta}\) \(\dot{\mu}\) \(\dot{\nu}\), 130 v. K 230 \(\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\dot{\nu}\), 132 v. K 342 \(\ddot{v}\), 134 r. K 452 \(\dot{t}\) \(\dot{\eta}\) \(\dot{m}\) \(\dot{\nu}\), 137 r. K 572 \(\dot{\iota}\) \(\pi\varepsilon\nu\iota\xi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\), 138 r. L 45 \(\epsilon\gamma\delta\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tau\theta\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\), 138 v. L 73 \(\delta^*\) \(\dot{\alpha}\rho\) \(\ddot{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\rho\iota\epsilon\), 140 v. L 171 \(\dot{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\).

(2) Omitted lines added: f. 106 v. \(\Theta\) 315 added beneath, with the usual sign (a sort of crescent) and the numeral \(\ddot{\alpha}\) prefixed, \(\alpha\) prefixed to 314 in the text. 108 v. \(\Theta\) 410 omitted and added in the same way on the lower margin, except that the numeral \(\ddot{\alpha}\) before v. 409 in the text comes from the inter-marginal hand. 226 r. P 141 added similarly; 305 r. \(\Psi\) 609 added similarly. 183 r. \(\Xi\) 147; this verse was written twice in the text. T cancels the second line by dots and prefixing the

\(^1\) A selection of these is given by La Roche l.c. p. 15.
crescent; the same sign at the end of the line is paler and seems to come from the intern marginal hand.

(3) Completion of elisions: 50 r. Γ 425 ἀντί, 125 r. I 673

The marginal-scholia hand—or, to speak more accurately, the scribe at the moment when he wrote the marginal scholia—does not seem to have carried the field of his operations beyond them. There is no writing in or about the text which may not with more likelihood be assigned to the pen which wrote the text or the intern marginal scholia. (I have noted these exceptions: 141 v. Λ 219 ἄντιος, 158 r. M 176 ἀγορεύσαι, in both cases the correction resembles exactly the marginal scholia; 158 v. M 219, this verse is omitted and added in the margin by this hand.) Possibly, as I have suggested, the Periochae belong to this moment; their moderate-sized semi-uncial recalls the lemmata. Here too one may note that the minuscule in which ff. 1—11 are written stands in size about half-way between the marginal scholia and the text, and the semi-uncials that occur resemble those of the Periochae.

The pen of the intern marginal scholia was more active. The scribe, who apparently did not begin to insert these scholia until the text and the marginal scholia were in their place, took the opportunity to give a clerical revision to the text. He added and altered countless accents, breathings, and apostrophes; some he corrected, with or without erasures, others he merely re-made (e.g. square out of round). He adds or

---

1 This statement rests (1) on the improbability that the scribe should have changed pen and style twice on every page; (2) on the fact that many intern marginal scholia are arranged in such a way as to avoid critical signs—which therefore were already written. E.g. 126 v. I 694, 150 r. Λ 632, 161 v. M 371, and especially 182 v. Ζ 117, 8. Some cases that might seem to prove the contrary (e.g. 119 v. I 405, 121 v. I 505, 6, 124 v. I 637, 125 v. I 686) are not decisive, for the apparently misplaced position of the critical sign may be original if we compare 207 v. II 81, where there is no scholion, but the diple is considerably above the line.
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alters critical signs. Further he added many variants between the lines or in the margin close to the text. These corrections and variants are recognisable by their semi-uncial character, their light tint, and their thin and sometimes barely visible stroke. They are to be absolutely distinguished from the intermarginal scholia, to which they stand in no relation. The scribe evidently kept his two tasks—the insertion of intermarginal scholia and the revision of the text—entirely apart. That the intermarginal scholia were like the marginal, copied en bloc from one archetype, is held by the authorities on this subject (Ludwich l.c. i. p. 140 sq.), and the evidence of writing confirms this conclusion. The scribe therefore, in correcting the text, paid no sort of attention to the scholia. I give instances of these corrections:

(1) Variants: 122 v. I 569 περσεφόνειαν, 124 r. I 632

φονήσα, ib. I 633 τεθειώδτος, 126 v. K 41 ἐσταί, 128 r. K 105

ἐξπεταῖ, π in ras., 128 v. K 141 οὖσα, c add., 131 r. K 273


πη, ib. K 387 κατατεθηνότων, 134 r. K 424 δή, 135 r. K 432

tapeis, 136 r. K 515 ἀλας σκοπήν, c add., 137 v. Λ 27 ἵρας,

139 v. Λ 146 ἱ, etc. In many cases it is doubtful whether a correction comes from the intermarginal or the extramarginal hand, especially where the intermarginal hand leaves its usual uncial; e.g. 145 v. Λ 394 ἵ, 140 v. Λ 151 ἢπειρο, 149 v. Λ 620

εὐρυμέδων, 157 v. M 161 βαλλόμεναι (ὑν looks like the pen of the marginal scholia), 160 r. M 281 καλψη, ὑ may be from either the marginal or the intermarginal pen.

(2) The restoration or alteration of accents, breathings etc. is too universal and too simple to need illustration.

(3) Elisions supplied: 130 r. K 204 πεπίθουθ', 133 r.
K 370 μέν, 137 r. Κ 557 δωρήσατ·, 137 v. Λ 11 δρθ', ib. Λ 13 γένετ' etc. Iotas adscripunt are added 151 r. Λ 698 τῶ, 158 v. M 207 πνοήσα, a sonant iota to ἀνασχόμενοι 157 r. M 134.

(4) The critical signs, as appertaining closely to the text, are as a rule written by the hand of the text. Many however shew erasures, and a certain number are in a lighter ink. E.g. f. 36 r. the four dotted diploe on B 612—616, contrasted with the four plain diploe on 596—599 and 605 and the obelus to 603, are paler, and seem to have been added by the intermarginal pen: so 35 v. the signs, especially the dotted diploe on B 571, are paler than the text. F. 42 r., here the signs are evidently in different hands; the diploe on Γ 4 is in the text-hand, the others are paler and seem in the intermarginal. Erasures are of necessity harder to attribute to any particular hand; a certain number also, as of corrections in this book generally, are due not to the knife but to the rough surface of the vellum. I give some specimens: 13 r. A 68 diploe, both dots erased; 14 r. A 117 an erasure in front of the line; 27 v. B 184, 186 diploe followed by an erasure before each, in both cases the material may have caused the roughness; similarly 30 v. B 320, 328; 34 r. B 511 the diploe stands on an erasure; 35 v. B 571 the dotted diploe seems added by man. intermarg.; 36 r. B 596 the diploe is followed by an erasure, and so 36 v. B 625, 629, 37 r. B 668, 670, 40 v. B 819; ib. 671, 672 erasures in front of both lines, diploe had been added in mistake. Cf. Wachsmuth, l.c. pp. 178, 179.

Up to this point the text and scholia are the work of one scribe. His labours however were not to go unchecked. In fact we shall find them subject to double revision. This supervision is contained in a number of phrases, words, and parts of words, sometimes reduced by the trimming of the page to single letters, which catch the eye of the careful reader on the outer margin of the pages, beyond the marginal scholia. These obscure and often truncated notes were long in receiving attention. Few of them have found their way into La Roche's
apparatus. Wachsmuth in an article, l.c. pp. 183, 184, collected some of them, and Ludwich l.c. pp. 160 sq. has a full if not quite exhaustive list of them. Their value, and in particular the relation between the frequent double corrections, has hardly yet been elucidated. They form the only problem connected with the scribes of the ms., as the first eleven leaves are the only point in doubt with regard to its arrangement.

This revising hand (which we may call C) first appears f. 24 r. A 608 ἐπὶ ποίησεν ἵδινησι, in small stiff minuscule: the text has ποίησεν ἵδινησι with the accent added: a dimere is possibly stood upon the iota. F. 25 v. B 65 θεορισάτις κέκλεισε: text se, κέκλευς. F. 27 r. B 137 εἰσακέν ἑνὶ μεγαροῖς ποτιδέγμεναι, in the same clear stiff ornamental minuscule; text εἰ and ποτιδέγμεναι. Ib. B 147 κίν..., two dots are faintly visible. The note must have conveyed some correction (probably κινήσει as B C etc.) to κινήσῃ in the text. This is the first case of a correction marked with dots. Others will follow. F. 28 r. here the marginal scholia are extensively corrected by this hand: in the scholion on B 212 (Dindorf, i. p. 92) the words l. 4, ὡς καὶ ἔπι—l. 11 βασιλῆς are tacked on to the marginal scholia by a sign; the ink is a brighter red, the hand small, upright, and more curled and calligraphic than the marginal scholia. The same hand adds the short scholia on 205 ἐπὶ ἐλώκε: εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἡ—γέρας (Dind. p. 90 l. 17) and 207 δίπεστρατον: διὰ τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐνήργει. In the long scholion on 212 θερείησε δὲ ἑττὶ μοῦνος it adds in the margin the words οὗ κακοὶ λέγει with the mark to which a similar sign answers in the text.

On the margin it has δεῖλωθ...a correction of δηλώ which stands in the text of the marginal scholia (Dind. i. p. 91 l. 22). Some inter-marginal scholia also on this page may be thought to be in this hand, e.g. ἀκούσαμεν—ἀγαμέμνον (Dind. p. 89), καλῶς—βασιλεῖ ib., οὐκ ἐσταὶ—κωσταπόκες (ib.). ἡχή—ἀπήχησον (Dind. p. 91), συμφωνοὺς—κυματω (ib.). In all the ink is brighter, and the semiuncial more calligraphic than that of the intermarginal hand. The difference amounts to certainty in the case of the notes βασιλκα διαπραττόμενος.
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ἔργα (p. 90) and θεροίτης—αἰολικόν (p. 91). F. 28 v., here also some of the intermarginal scholia seem to be added in this hand, e.g. 215 ἐσάιστο—ἀρης (Dind. p. 92 l. 25) and 219 φοξὰ—δυτα (Dind. p. 93 l. 9); and the following—ἐχθιστος ἀσιλή— αἰσχύρος (ib. p. 93 l. 16), πλεῖα τοι—οικώμενος (Dind. p. 94 l. 7), οἶκαδε περ—ἰάσατο (Dind. ib. l. 28), are certainly not in the hand of either marginal or intermarginal scholia. The next cases that occur are of ordinary correction: f. 30 r. B 294

εἰλέωσιν, text Πέλαξιν; ib. B 300 εὶ ἔτεων, text ἥ ἔτεων, the superscribed εἰ being either m. intermarg. or m. text. F. 30 v.

B 324 μὲν, text μὴν, e m. text. F. 31 r. B 351 ἐποκυττάρωσιν, text ἐν ὠκυττάροις. F. 31 v. B 387 διακρινεῖει, text διακρίνειει, e m. text or intermarg. F. 32 v. B 435 the interlinear gloss νόοςινοι όμεν (Dind. II. p. 312) seems to be by C. F. 33 r. the intermarginal scholia ἵνα μὴ—κατορθοῦν, ἀντὶ πολλοὶ—πιθορίσται, ϕῶ το φαίνω—παισάθη seem by C; the letters are ornamented, the ink is bright. While the other intermarg. scholia are exactly of the colour of the text. B 462 μενα, text ὁγαλλόμενα; 33 v. B 468 γενεται ὁρη, text γενεται ὁρη; ib. B 481 ἀγρομένης, text ἀγρομένης; 34 r. B 511 ἀσπληνόν ἔναιον, text ἀσπληνῶν ναίον; 34 v. B 537 πολυστάφυλον θ' ἵστιαν, text τ' ἵστιαν. 37 r. B 646 γόργυνα τε, text γόργυνατε, ib. B 656 ἕλα... text ἰῆλυσοντε, ib. B 663 δξης, text δξην. F. 38 r. B 716 μηθῶνην, text μηθῶμην. 38 v. B 723 μοιχήζοντα, but text μοιχήζουσα without erasure. 39 r. B 761 τις γαρ, text τις ταρ; ib. B 766 μερίν, text μερηί. These examples may suffice for the ordinary procedure of C; evidently he plays the part of the usual and normal reviser. His hand is distinguished from that of the text, the marginal and the intermarginal scholia by the characteristics of smallness, stiffness, and greater ornamentation, besides the accidental circumstance that the ink of these corrections is usually brighter than that of the rest of the page. C is on the evidence of its character at least coeval with the scribe of the text and scholia; the designation therefore of 'manus rec.' is erroneous. Older than the text-hand it can hardly be said that his hand proves
him to have been, but his function as corrector would make it natural, and the singular stiffness and formality (though elegant) of the strokes corroborates the possibility.

I next call attention to other points concerning this hand and its operation. F. 42 r., here for the first time we find a mark (/) on the margin to call attention to an error in the marginal scholia, ἀριστοφάνει for ἀριστοφάνη: the error is corrected apparently by the marg. hand. F. 47 v. Γ 295 the intermarginal note αρισταρρ ἀφυσιόμενος διὰ τοῦ δ is completed by the words ἄλλοι δέ δια του ἂ in C. On the other hand the very minute intermarginalia that sometimes occur, e.g. 50 r., do not shew distinctive signs of C, and seem additions by the intermarginal hand. F. 58 v. Δ 369, the first instance of an omitted line added by C;

οι καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἐπει ὑπερέτητα προσημόδα, the numerals ₯ and ₦ are prefixed to vv. 368 and 370 in the text. The minuscule here is naturally larger, and may be well compared with that of the text. The characteristics are the same—greater uprightness, with a certain curl and decoration about the single letters. 59 r. an example of an exegetical note by C; περιφράστικώς του ἐπεκλεισσ (Δ 386), cf. 59 v. Δ 413

τημεσώ, Δ. Next come cases of a curious phenomenon, which so far I believe has escaped notice—a series of double corrections. I will collect instances of this and of the dotted corrections, and suggest an explanation.

F. 46 r. Γ 219 text ἀδδρεῖ, marg. ἀδδρεῖ ἀ..., δ is on the extreme margin, ἀδδρεῖ is farther inwards. The first correction may have been ἀδδρεῖ; 46 v. Γ 231 ...κ' ἐστηκ', text ἐστηκ'; was the first correction ἐστηκ'? 61 v. Δ 516 ...ἐντασ μεθέντας, text μεθέντας; it is difficult to see what the original correction can have been. 66 r. Ε 198 text ὑν ποιητοῖς, marg. ἐνι ποιη

αν..... 64 r. Ε 96 text ἀντεδριν, marg. ἀμε α.....; the first correction was perhaps ἀν. 86 r. Ζ 285 text ἀτέρτου, marg. ἀτερ, του, ἀτέρτ..., the second accent is original, the first is added. 106 v. Θ 322 text ἀνώγει, marg. ἀνώγει ἀνώγειν. 111 r.

Θ 530 text ὑπ' ἱοῖ, marg. ἤπνοιοὶ ἥ... 202 r. O 567 text ἕγχεϊ, marg. ἐρχεὶ χαλ ἐρχεὶ χαλκεὶ. 224 r. P 44 χαλκὸς, text χαλκὸς, 259 r. T 401 ἡμιοξιάσ, text ἡμίοξη. The correction is in two hands, ασ is dark, ἡμίοξη light red.

These are the double corrections that occur in the outer margin. They are distinguished (1) by their respective position; one set are on the extreme margin and accordingly have often been cut down to one letter: (2) the colour of the ink. The outside note is uniformly a bright red, the inner paler: (3) character. The outside note is invariably in small minuscule, the inner note in small, but larger, semiuncial.

We will next take examples of marginal notes dotted. Besides f. 272 B 147 already quoted, we have 66 v. E 213 ἤγερθε, text ἤγερθεσ. 67 r. E 252 ὅιο, text ὅιο. 80 r. E 894 ὅιο, text ὅιο in ras. (ὁ and half of ὸ seem later, s. XII or after, and are a rare example of a late correction in the text).

85 r. Z 237 φι......, text πύργου. 87 r. Z 353 ἑυ......, text καλ.

89 v. Z 456 ἐν ἄργει ὕσσα, text ἐν ἄργει ὕσσα, 90 r. Z 483 λεία, text δέξατο; 93 v. H 133 ἢβοτ, text ἢβοιμ; 94 r. H 220 ἵψιο..., text τυχίασ. These instances may suffice; others will be found in Ludwig l. c. One very decisive case however must be quoted; 273 v. Φ 155 ἀνδραον ἄγων δολιχεγχέας, text ἀνδραον ἄγων δολιχεγχέας; i.e. C 2 at first deleted the entire correction, but afterwards erased the deletion so far as it regarded ἄγων which he preferred to ἄγων, but maintained it as to the accentuation of δολιχεγχέας.

What is the explanation of these curious facts, to which I do not know a parallel? That the dotted notes are intended to be cancelled, is almost obvious; this is the constant meaning of dots above a word in mss., and this explanation is given already by Ludwig l. c. p. 168 n. 201. Why however are sometimes the notes cancelled, and at other times left to stand but with another note by their side? After some reflection I
have hit on the following theory, which meets all the conditions. The corrections entered on the margin by the first reviser were examined and compared with the text by a second reviser. Where the second reviser judged the text right and the correction wrong, he cancelled in this manner the correction; where the correction seemed to him wrong, but the text also to be incorrect, he substituted a new correction for the old on the outer margin. As the second correction was held to supersede the first, it was not necessary to cancel it. If any one takes the trouble to consider the instances I have given, and others that he will find in Ludwich, he will see that no case disagrees with this hypothesis, and all are explicable by it. The book therefore underwent a double revision—a very remarkable sign of the care given to its editing. A doubt might exist as to whether the double correction and the cancelled variants were the work of one or two hands—whether a single corrector revised his own work, or a second revised the work of the first. The latter is in the nature of things the more probable assumption, and the hands are distinguished by colour and character. Now that the dots are assigned to the second corrector (C 2), we may identify the author of the cancelling at

33 r. B 461 καυστρίον; ον is in the text-hand, but the reviser disapproved of the correction; cf. 83 v. Z 170 in the marg. a

sign (/), in the text ἡνωγείν; and 14 r. A 124 πω.

The nature and source of these corrections, sufficiently evident from their nature, is made clear by several explicit statements; 246 r. Σ 377 a sign /, and, also in the outer margin + δασειάν (Dind. II. p. 164, l. 15), sc. τα βιβλια ἔχον εἴσοδον ἢ

δασειάν εἴχον εἰς τὸ ν.; text ἡ δ', originally ἡδ'. The reviser is in conflict with a previous corrector (intermarginal?). 248 v. Σ 490 a sign /, and πολικ φε, text πόλεισ, ei corrected out of i.
Here again the reviser confirms the original writing, and again appeals to the 'archetype'; τολις δια του εισε το αντισσολον.

A similar reference is made 322 r. Ω 558 ου o στι oυχ ευρε ez τω παλασ, and the line is marked out by a crescent prefixed. The reviser therefore compares the text with the archetype, and his function is mainly limited to securing a faithful copy of it. The readings quoted in the scholia do not affect him; the scholia in fact are themselves part of the archetype to be copied. This clerical function is the real characteristic of corrections of mss. at all ages.

The function and relation of these correctors being fixed, it remains to collect instances of their activity:

1. Lines added or removed. These are all by C 1; e.g. 158 r. M 197, the verse is written in the lower margin, with the usual arrangement of numerals α, β, γ, to indicate its place; 172 r. N 422, unless this is in the text-hand, to which C 1 as it expands partly approximates. 178 r. N 731, certainly by C 1, with beneath εν ἀλλω καὶ οὐ, with a mark to which a sign corresponds in the text. 246 v. Σ 381 in marg. εν ἀλλω καὶ ἀπεκτατηστο

ετο περε, one line is erased. Before and after the line are crescents and signs of reference, to which a sign in the text corresponds. 268 v. T 447, a crescent before the text and in marg. εν ἀλλω printf. 95 v. H 234 is added in the usual way with ά β γ. 98 r. H 368, 9 εν ἀλλω και ένταγθα ουτοι ι

οι στι κεινται: with a sign before the lines and to the text.

98 v. H 380 εν ἀλλω και ου ετο στι, with ά β γ. ib. H 385 om. add. in marg. with ά β γ, and the scholion (intemarg. really) εν ἀλλω ε'μινιμας αχαιοι. 79 r. E 841 sq. the passage is re-arranged by the numerals ά β γ ή έ θ prefixed to successive lines; in the margin abreast of 841 εν ἀλλω ουτ ο στι | μετα τεσσαρεις | στιχοις κενται. 80 r. E 901 εν ἀλλω printf.
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ρωταί. These examples sufficiently illustrate this branch of C 1's revision, which he seems to have kept to himself without interference from C 2. Cf. Wachsmuth l.c. p. 184, 5.

2. Scholia corrected, and quasi-exegetical notes added.

78 r. E 808 the internarg. scholion τὸῦ τῶν στίχων—
φυλάσσω (Dind. i. p. 223 l. 4) is by C 1, in bright red ornamental semiuncial. 78 v. E 813 ἔγγονος ὠ γιος, this note is
ἔγγονος ὠ γιός
by C 2, in semiuncial, larger and paler. 68 v. E 314 ἔπι
δ' ἐκάτω, 76 r. E 697 ἔπι ἄμυνωνθη; in both cases ἔπι is paler and
added after the variant was written; perhaps therefore by C 2.

Strokes as signs in the margin are frequent, and fill the place of ζτ or other signs which are used in Laur. 32. 9 and
other mss. So besides 42 r. which we have quoted, cf. 83 v.
Z 170 marg. /, text ἡμόγει, breathing and accent remade;
89 r. Z 444 text οὐδ' ἐμε, marg. οὐδέμε /....; 117 r. I 276 / in

| the margin, text ἡδε, τ is in the same ink as the stroke and
| is perhaps added by C 1. 128 r. K 106 marg. μοχθίσεων /
| text μοχθήσεων. These instances may be enough. The stroke
evidently serves the same end as ζτ or the sign, namely to call
| attention to a clerical error or an incomprehensible word; ζτ
| itself is occasionally found, as 76 r. E 698 referring to καφος
| in the marginal scholia (Dindorf, i. p. 219 l. 9); 150 v. Λ 674
| referring to the marginal scholia. 191 v. O 46 of uncertain
| reference. It is possible that in all these three places the sign
| may apply to something in the marginal scholia and be in
| that hand and a peculiarity of it.

90 v. c ο και εἰς ο κεκαί, refers perhaps to the accent on
στατώ, the same sign 179 v. N 793, 275 v. Φ 314. It is merely
the sigma of the usual sign for σμείωσασ without the usual
t θ or υ; the full symbol occurs 93 r., 222 r.

94 v., here the two correctors are well distinguished; the
notes ἄκηρήσατο (H 185), and ἀλλ' ἐπε δὴ τὸν ἵκανεν (186)
are by C 1, in bright ink, and characteristic ornamental miniscule; ἔπι οὐδετε, ἰδειν by C 2 (198), is in slightly paler ink,
more upright and regular. Other notes by C 2 of a gram-

12—2
matical nature are 192 B. O 71 τὸ ἰλιόν ὦ γι, sc. οὐδὲτερον, 213 v.
Π 387 π ἀ δικίας κριτῶν, 261 γ. Τ 58 π σειμ C 2 clearly distin-
guished from the three corrections ποσείδ which occur (by C 1)
on the same page; the same contrast is seen 263 r. between
κίνθως (N 165) C 2 and δὴ δὲν Τ 164 (C 1). 264 v. the symbol
for γινώμη Τ 250 is by C 2. C 2 also adds the scholion ἀπεινω
—μαραίνω 266 v. (Τ 332 Dind. II. p. 205 l. 22), ib. Τ 335
cancels C 1’s note ἔμβα, 276 r. Φ 313 ἰς τήν ἰς τό μετὰ τοῦ, ib. Φ 314 c (sc. σημείων) ἐμα να παγικομεν ἀρπ, the scholion Φ 319
τὸ κέρας—καθαρσίας (Dind. II. p. 222 l. 8), 276 v. Φ 329
κυπριών ἡ λείπει, 310 v. Ψ 885 ἀπευρον—τετερευμένον (Dind. II.
p. 273 l. 26), ib. Ψ 891 ἀκοντίσματιν, 311 v. Ω 30 a variant
γρ ἡ οἱ κεκαρισμένα δῶρ ὀνόμακον, ib. Ω 44 π ἄλογος.

The numbering of the similes (which is carried through the
book) seems to be by C, cf. e.g. f. 60 κθ and on the next page λ;
the letters are in bright ink and do not resemble the text hand.
On these numberings and the asterisk which accompanies them
see Wachsmuth l.c. p. 181. The signatures also where pre-
served resemble C; they are carelessly written. ΑΙΙ p. 308 r.
is a good instance.

There are few traces of hands later than the composition of
the book. On f. 4 v. a χιλιτ century scribe has written a
portion of Heliadorus, and the same hand apparently has
written an interlinear paraphrase as far as B 288. One late
correction I have noticed in the text: οἰων Ε 894, which may be
by a χιλιτ century hand. The pictures on the blank spaces
of the prolegomena come next: their age is fixed by the
Heliadorus over which one of them is painted. There is no
later writing in the book. When the gathers and parts of
gathers fell out cannot be exactly calculated: the want of
sequence of the existing pictures suggests that originally they
were more numerous, and that therefore the dislocation of
the first gather was later than their period. On f. 237 v., at the
bottom of the page, a χιλιτ century hand writes λεπτος φυλ ἔν.
ON THE COMPOSITION OF SOME GREEK MSS. 181

The supplements of pages on white vellum are written in a large xvith century hand. At the same time apparently new signatures were added throughout the book, and the pages were trimmed and gilded.

To recapitulate the history of the ms. which we have now reconstructed; the sheets, numbered and ruled, were given out to be written. The scribe who received them wrote the text and the principal scholia in the places ruled to contain them; during the act of writing he made corrections from time to time both in the text and the scholia. This done, he apparently began the book again and wrote in the irregular space left between the scholia and the text, and between the lines of the text, other shorter scholia in a different type of hand. He took advantage of this opportunity to correct in an exhaustive manner the text he had written; he added and altered breathings, accents and apostrophes, added and corrected critical signs, and wrote above or in the inner margin corrections of words. The book, thus complete in substance, was given to the original scribe who had numbered the quires and ruled the lines; he compared it throughout with the archetype and noted on the edge of the page differences; sometimes he accompanied these with a mark to call attention; he added lines left out, and omitted scholia either in the ruled margin or the intermediate space. In a few places he explicitly refers to his authority to defend himself from corrections already made in the text by, as it would seem, the first hand on his second round. Lastly, a third person reviewed in detail the suggestions of the reviser; deleted a great number of them in favour of the reading in the text, and in other cases substituted a correction of his own. He added likewise omitted scholia and remarks of a general nature upon the context. This excessive carefulness in the preparation of the book is further seen in the numbering of the similes, the quantitative marks, and the supplements of the elisions.

The book was now complete. Its further history consists of the decay of its structure and the loss of its leaves.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.