

geber des Rachias nicht in Frage. Man wird aber nicht weit in die Irre gehen, in der unmittelbaren Nachfolge Bhätikābhayas – man ist versucht, an die Zeit um Kaṇirajānu Tissa zu denken<sup>36</sup>) – den rājā zu suchen, der Rachias nach Rom entsandte.

Es zeichnen sich demnach folgende Vorgänge ab: 1. Zur Zeit des Augustus strandete der libertus des Plocamus auf Ceylon. 2. In diesem Zeitraum oder etwas später sandte König Bhätikābhaya Handelsschiffe in das imperium Romanum, um rote Korallen zu laden. 3. Eine offizielle Gesandtschaft aus Anurādhapura trifft unter der Führung eines Kronprinzen am Hofe des Claudius ein. Damit scheinen noch am ehesten jene Probleme gelöst zu sein, die der inhaltsreiche Abschnitt bei Plinius aufwirft. Darüber hinaus aber gestattet eine Reflexion über den lateinischen Text unter Zuhilfenahme der indischen Quellen einen tieferen Einblick in die Wechselbeziehungen zwischen unserer Antike und Indien<sup>37</sup>).

Graz

Franz F. Schwarz

---

A NEW SOURCE FOR TRICLINIUS'  
COMMENTARY ON AESCHYLUS,  
PROMETHEUS VINCTUS

The ms. Napoli II. F. 31 containing the autograph recension of Aeschylus by Demetrius Triclinius<sup>1</sup>) has been very damaged in the portion containing the Prometheus and this has af-

36) Nach Geiger von 88–91, nach Mendis von 29–32, nach Nicholas Paranavitana von 31–34.

37) Vgl. F.F. Schwarz, Neue Perspektiven in den griechisch-indischen Beziehungen, OLZ 67, 1972, 5–26.

Korrekturnote: In einen umgreifenderen Rahmen gestellt und eingehender interpretiert wird der Plinius-Abschnitt bei F. F. Schwarz, Pliny the Elder on Ceylon, Journ. As. Hist. 8, 1974 (im Druck). Der Artikel von Ch. G. Starr (The Roman Emperor and the King of Ceylon, ClPh 51, 1956, 27–30), auf den mich hinzuweisen Herr Prof. Dr. H. Herter die große Freundlichkeit hatte, behandelt primär die politisch-philosophische Tendenz im Ceylon-Bericht des Plinius.

1) I have accepted, with the majority of scholars, that the scribe is Demetrius Triclinius. For the discussion of his authorship cp. Ed. Fraen-

fected the scholia to a very large degree. In his edition<sup>2)</sup>, Herbert Weir Smyth did what he could to restore the illegible parts, but he still had to leave very extensive lacunae. Since the publication of his edition the matter seems to have rested at that.

In his study of the manuscripts of Aeschylus<sup>3)</sup> Turyn drew attention to the existence of an apograph of Napoli II. F. 31 in the ms. Vienna philos.-philol. 334 (Ta)<sup>4)</sup>. Smyth knew this ms, but he had a wrong view of the nature of its contents<sup>5)</sup>; accordingly he did not use it in the constitution of his text. I have recently inspected this ms in microfilm and have found that it preserves a certain amount of scholia from the parts which are now illegible in the exemplar T. As will appear from the following excerpts from these parts the Napoli ms probably had already been seriously damaged when it was copied by the scribe of Ta.

As to the date of the ms. Ta we have to rely on paleographical criteria. In the catalogue Herbert Hunger<sup>6)</sup> gives the date first half of the 16th century. I think that the ms was written in Rome, probably around the middle of the 16th century by a scribe connected with Fulvio Orsini and his circle. There is evidence that T caught the interest of these scholars as fol. 101<sup>r-v</sup> were restored by a scribe connected with Orsini, viz. Johannes Honorius<sup>7)</sup>; the writing and appearance of Ta strongly suggest this date as the most probable.

---

kel, Agamemnon I, Oxford 1950, p. 3 note 3 and W. J. W. Koster, *Autour d'un manuscrit d'Aristophane écrit par Démétrius Triclinius*, Groningen 1957, p. 3 ff. I have nothing to add to this discussion, though I should like to point out that any doubt that may still remain could be removed by an analysis of the evolution of Triclinius style, a matter that still needs detailed examination in view of the dangerous criteria assumed by Koster in the above-mentioned work.

2) The Commentary on Aeschylus' Prometheus in the Codex Neapolitanus, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology XXXII, 1921, 1 ff.

3) The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus, New York 1943.

4) Turyn, op. cit. p. 108. Cp. also L. Massa Positano, *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 5, 1952, 198.

5) Smyth op. cit. p. 93.

6) Herbert Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, Teil I, Codices Historici, Codices Philosophici et Philologici, Wien 1961, p. 430.

7) In order to verify this ascription I investigated the manuscript Paris., Ancien fonds grec 2379 written by this scribe. In Par. 2379 we have examples of the features which seemed to me to be against the ascription, viz. the uncial alpha, the open beta and theta, which forms are found along

The contents of Ta are as follows<sup>8)</sup>:

- Fol. 1<sup>r</sup>-46<sup>v</sup> Demetrii Triclinii scholia in Prometheus (1<sup>r</sup>-5<sup>v</sup>), Septem (6<sup>r</sup>-24<sup>v</sup>), Persas (25<sup>r</sup>-36<sup>r</sup>), Agamemnonem (36<sup>v</sup>-44<sup>r</sup>), Eumenides (44<sup>v</sup>-46<sup>v</sup>)
- Fol. 47<sup>r</sup>-115<sup>v</sup> Thomae Magistri scholia in Prometheus (fol. 47<sup>r</sup>-72<sup>v</sup>) Septem (73<sup>r</sup>-96<sup>v</sup>), Persas (97<sup>r</sup>-115<sup>v</sup>)
- Fol. 116<sup>r</sup>-152<sup>r</sup> Scholia vetera in Agamemnonem (fol. 116<sup>r</sup>-150<sup>v</sup>), Eumenides (151<sup>r</sup>-152<sup>r</sup>).

It appears from this analysis that the scribe started copying scholia distinguished by a cross and the note *ἡμέτερον*; then he copied the interlinear glosses and the marginal scholia distinguished by an initial capital letter. Unfortunately the first two quires in Ta are lost; the ms now begins at quire C (Prom. 561 ff.). This means that the Triclinius-scholia proper, that is the scholia marked as Triclinius' own, have been lost for the critical part of the play. But fortunately the scribe of Ta was indifferent enough to forget or overlook a certain amount of Triclinian scholia which he subsequently incorporated in the Thoman section on fol. 47<sup>r</sup>-72<sup>v</sup>.

I shall now give the scholia and glosses not in Smyth's edition, together with major supplements to Smyth's text. On the whole Ta confirms the emendations and supplements of Smyth, but the use of it is difficult because in copying minor glosses and supralinear explanations our scribe often runs different scholia together by means of *καί, ἦτοι* etc. and he often changes the word order without any obvious reason. The marginal scholia, however, have been copied very diligently and this part of the ms. is of course the most interesting to us. I have not had in mind to give an exhaustive collation but only a selection of the most important new material. The references are to Smyth's edition and I have distinguished between scholia to the same line by means of the letters a, b, c etc.

- 11b. *φιλανθρώπου] ἄρμολίως ἐνταῦθα κεῖται ἡ λέξις.*  
 20c. *παγετός] ἀπὸ τοῦ πάσσω.*  
 22b. *καὶ τοῦ αἰθῶ] καὶ τοῦ αἰθῶ τοῦ καίω.*  
 27. = Dindorf p. 172 1.13-18.

with the regular forms used by Honorius on fol. 101 in Neap. II. F. 31. Unfortunately, the published specimens of Honorius' style furnish no examples, so the reader will have to take my arguments on trust.

8) For a detailed analysis, see Hunger, loc. cit.

- 38c. γέρας ἦτοι τὸ πῦρ. τοῦτο γὰρ ἀνατίθεται τῶι Ἡφαιστίῳ. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πάλιν ἐπεγεῖρει τὸν Ἡφαιστον εἰς θυμόν.
71. βάλε] πῆξον<sup>9)</sup>.
- 74a. ἐπειδήπερ ἄνω περὶ ταῖς πλευραῖς μασχαλιστήρας περιέβαλεν, ἔδει δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς αὐτὸν φησὶ ὡς ἐπειδήπερ τε ἄνω καλῶς προσηλώθησεν, χῶρει κάτω ταυτὸ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ τοὺς πόδας ποιήσω.
- 86a. σημείωσαι τὴν σύνταξιν κτλ.
- 88a. ἢ μονοστροφικὴ αὕτη περίοδος στίχων \* μα' ὧν οἱ πρῶτοι ε' ἱαμβικοί τρίμετροι ἀκατάληκτοι \* τροχαικὸν δίμετρον ἀκατάληκτον \* ἀναπαιστικὸν τὸ δ' μο \* λοιπὰ δίμετρα ἀκατάληκτα \* ζ' μόνον καταληκτικὸν ἐφθημιμερές (πενθημιμερές Τα) ὃ καλεῖται παροιμιακόν. οἱ ἐξῆς γ' στίχοι ἱαμβικοί αὐθις τρίμετροι. τὸ ἐξῆς πρῶτον κῶλον ἱαμβικὸν δίμετρον βραχυκατάληκτον, τὰ ἐξῆς δύο ἀντισπαστικά ἡμιόλια καθαρὰ, ὃ ἐξῆς στίχος ἱαμβικὸς τρίμετρος, τὸ ἐξῆς κῶλον ἀναπαιστικὸν δίμετρον τὸν τρίτον ἔχον πόδα τρίβραχυν, ἔστι δὲ ἀκατάληκτον εἰς δισύλλαβον. οἱ ἐξῆς β' ἱαμβοὶ τρίμετροι, τὰ ἐξῆς ἠ' ἀναπαιστικά, τὰ μὲν ζ' δίμετρα ἀκατάληκτα τὸ δὲ η' καταληκτικὸν ἦτοι ἐφθημιμερές. ἐπὶ τῶι τέλει κορωνίς. δημητρίου τοῦ τρικλινίου<sup>10)</sup>.
- 102a. σκεθρῶς σκεθρὸν τὸ ἀκριβὲς καὶ γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ σκέπτομαι καὶ τοῦ ὀρῶ. ὃ γὰρ ἐσκεμμένως καὶ προσεχόντως τὰ πράγματα βλέπων τοιοῦτος ἐστὶν τουτέστιν ἀκριβής<sup>11)</sup>.
110. θηρώμαι ἢ μετὰ μηχανῆς λαμβάνω ἦτοι ἔλαβον κατ' ἀναχρονισμόν<sup>12)</sup>.
- 110a. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι πᾶσα οὐσία μείωσιν δέχεται, τὸ δὲ πῦρ κἄν μικρὸν εὐρηθῆ ἦτοι σμικρότατος σπινθήρ ἔτι πάλιν αὐξεται ἐκ μικροῦ<sup>13)</sup>.
- 111b. πόρος] πορισμὸς τοῦ ζῆν.
122. εἰσιγνεῦσι] εἰσπορεύονται, διάγουσιν.
- 128b. ἐπειδὴ θεοῖς μὲν πᾶσιν Προμηθεὺς ἐμισεῖτο κτλ.
- 145c. εἰσιδούση ἢ εὐρηται καὶ εἰσιδούση τὸ σῆ ἦ καὶ εἰσιδούσι τὸ σὶ ἰῶτα καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ πρὸς τὸ ὀφθαλμοῖς, τὸ δὲ ἦ πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον. τὸ γὰρ προσῆλθε τοῖς ἑμοῖς ὅσοις οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτερον ἢ ἑμοί.

9) This scholion is not in Smyth.

10) Though the scribe was unable to read some parts of his exemplar which he marked with the asterisk, he still has preserved a much larger part than can be read in T to-day. Note the remark on the authorship at the end of the scholion.

11) This scholion is not in Smyth.

12) This scholion is not in Smyth.

13) The scribe seems to have shortened the scholion found in T.

149. οἰακονόμοι ἄ τροπικόν ἐστιν. οἰακονόμοι γὰρ κυρίως οἱ κυβερνήται τῶν νεῶν ὥσπερ οὗτοι κινουῦσιν τὴν ναῦν διὰ τῶν οἰάκων ἔνθα βούλονται οὕτως καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς πράττουσιν ἀτ' ἂν βούλοιντο<sup>14</sup>).
- 153b. πεπέραμαι] πεπέραται περατὸν τὸ δυνάμενον περαθῆναι καὶ ἀπέρατον ὃ οὐδεὶς δύναται περάσαι, ὡς ἔχει καὶ τὸ τῆς παροιμίας. τὰ γὰρ πέρα γαδείρων οὐ περατά. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὸ χρῆμα τῶν νυκτῶν ἀπέρατον οὐ μοι δοκοῦσι καλῶς λέγειν. *δημητρίου τρικλινίου.*
162. δίχα] χωρὶς<sup>15</sup>).
- 185b. ἀπαράμυθον] οὐ παρὰ μύθον χορὴ γράφειν ἐνταῦθα διὰ τὸ μέτρον, οὐ μὴν ἀπαράμυθον. οὐ γὰρ ἔχει τὸ μέτρον οὕτως ὀρθῶς. *δημητρίου τοῦ τρικλινίου<sup>16</sup>).*
- 212a. σύναγκες] σύνεγγυς.  
εἶπε δὲ] εἶπε δὲ τὰ διὰ μέσου ἀναγκαίως· πρὸς μὲν γὰρ τὸ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη κτλ.  
ἢ ὀρμῇ] ἢ ὀρμῇ τοῦ λόγου. μετὰ δὲ εἶπε τὰ λῶιστα βουλεύων κτλ.
- 247a. κατὰ τί.
- 275a. οὕτω γὰρ κρεῖττον τὸ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ συμπονήσασθαι ἢ πρὸς τὸ μογοῦντι ἀποδίδοσθαι.
- 454c. τοῖς τρισὶ] τοῖς τρισὶ σννοεῖσθαι. τοιοῦτος παρὰ πᾶσι σχηματισμός. *δημητρίου τοῦ τρικλινίου.*

I need not say that future editors will have to collate Ta in more detail than I have done in this article; it also remains to be seen whether the scribe of Ta had other mss at his disposal. In this connection I should like to mention an instance which may be an indication of contamination. The metrical scholion on 436 exhibits the line 525 with the reading *βίας ἐκφυγγάνω* instead of *δύας ἐκφυγγάνω* which is found both in text and scholia of T. The reading *βίας* is, according to Dawe<sup>17</sup>), found in a number of manuscripts and may have intruded in Ta from another ms; of course, the possibility of a mere blunder on the part of the scribe cannot be wholly disregarded.

University of Aarhus  
Institute of Greek and Latin

Ole L. Smith

<sup>14</sup>) This scholion may be "old" and is perhaps the scholion out of which developed the short note in M: *κυβερνήται τροπικῶς*.

<sup>15</sup>) This gloss is not in Smyth. <sup>16</sup>) This scholion is not in Smyth.

<sup>17</sup>) R.D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1964, p. 220.