

## P. Phil. Nec. 23 and Euripides as a Resource for Teaching and Practicing Rhetoric

Donald J. Mastrorade, University of California, Berkeley

In this discussion I explore two somewhat disparate but related points. First, I indicate how the evidence of a medieval gnomology of Euripides and the markings of passages with γνωμικόν and/or ὠραῖον in medieval copies of his plays may provide parallels for the selections made from *Ino* if they are indeed separate extracts and not one continuous text. Second, I suggest that, given that such excerption is usually a reflection of rhetorical and educational purposes, we can gain a further perspective on that context by exploring the interest in rhetorical analysis revealed in the scholia and glosses of medieval manuscripts of Euripides. While labeling with technical rhetorical terminology is most obvious in our copies from the 13<sup>th</sup> century and later, the discursive older scholia that are in general likely to go back to antiquity also exhibit an interest in rhetorical analysis, both for praise and for blame of the characters or author.

In Eustathius' *Commentary on the Odyssey*, one comes upon passages where the scholar remarks on the circumstances in which one might quote a Homeric phrase.

α 76–79 ὅτι συμβουλευομένῳ οἰκεῖον τὸ ‘ἀλλ’ ἄγεθ’ ὑμεῖς οἶδε περιφραζώμεθα πάντες’, ὅπως τόδε τι γένηται. τὸ δὲ ‘οὐ γάρ τι δυνήσεται ἀντία πάντων ἐριδαίνειν οἷος’ χρήσιμον ῥηθῆναι πρὸς τὸν μονοτονοῦντα καὶ πᾶσιν ἀντικαθίστασθαι θέλοντα.

It is appropriate for one giving advice to say ‘Come now you others, let all of us here consider’ how such and such may come about. — The phrase ‘For he alone

will not be at all able to struggle against all' is useful to be said to a person being stubborn and wanting to stand in opposition to everyone.

α 88–89 ὅτι ὁ προθυμοποιῶν τινα εἴποι ἄν τὸ ὄφρα μᾶλλον ἐποτρύνω, καί οἱ μένος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω’.

The person who is inspiring eagerness in someone might say ‘so that I may stir him the more and put strength in his heart’.<sup>1</sup>

While such suggestions may reflect the practices of a highly literate and cultured segment of metropolitan Byzantine society in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, it is consonant with a very long tradition of using Homer and other poets as sources of traditional wisdom and of elegantly-expressed phrases worth quoting or adapting in one’s own discourse. The symposium and similar gatherings may have been the earliest venues for hearing and deploying such excerpts of poetry, but the schoolroom would not have been far behind, and eventually the anthology, the written collection of excerpts, can be attested through the papyri.<sup>2</sup>

Euripides had an important place in this tradition. The *editores principes* have referred to the *Livre d’écolier* papyrus (3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE),<sup>3</sup> where we find a gnomic passage written out in separate syllables, and to a lost inscription from Armenia containing at least 3 Euripidean lines from at least 2 plays (TrGF adesp. fr. 279g, ca. 200 BCE?). That inscription, like the gnomic lines

---

<sup>1</sup> Eust. in *Odyseam* α 76–79 (1393,2–4); α 88–89 (1393,41–42), text from Cullhed and Olsen 2022: 108, 112. All translations in this paper are my own unless otherwise noted.

<sup>2</sup> Anthologies on papyrus are known from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE onward. See, e.g., Pordomingo 2013. For discussion of Euripides in anthologies on papyrus, see the *editio princeps*, Gehad, Gibert, and Trnka-Amrhein 2024. On Euripides in anthologies in general, see Piccione 2020: 52–58.

<sup>3</sup> Guéraud and Jouguet 1938 = Cairo, Egyptian Museum JdE 65445 = TM 59942, LDAB 1054.

on a Delphic stone,<sup>4</sup> perhaps come from an educational context. For more advanced students and readers, we have the recommendations of Quintilian (*Institutiones oratoriae* 10.1.66–68) and Dio Chrysostom (*Oratio* 18.6) that those pursuing rhetorical excellence should read Euripides. Scholars have studied how Euripidean plots and themes were used as inspiration for rhetorical exercises.<sup>5</sup> The prefatory material in our manuscripts sometimes seems to reflect the rhetorical interests of those who compiled such material in the Roman period and late antiquity. Apart from the comment that *Phoenissae* is “full of many fine maxims,” the prefatory matter to *Andromache* includes, tacked on to a small remnant of the Aristophanic hypothesis, an appreciation of the rhetoric: “The prologue is expressed clearly and elegantly. ... In the second act there are an extended speech of Hermione projecting regal character and the speech against Andromache not badly done. Also well done the Peleus who removed Andromache (from the clutches of Menelaus).”<sup>6</sup>

In this context, it is natural to regard the excerpting of passages from *Polyidos* in the new papyrus as the product of a milieu of cultural ambition, whether the user was a rhetor or a teacher gathering material for use in his own composition or in an educational context, or simply a layman deeply engaged in literature and presumably hoping to have opportunities to use the excerpts either orally in some social setting or in written communication. The themes of wealth, power, coercion, freedom, justice and injustice, *philia*, respect for the gods and the

---

<sup>4</sup> de la Coste-Messelière 1925: 88 no.13.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Fernández Delgado 2020 and 2021. Another possible connection between Euripides and rhetors is offered by P.Oxy. 76.5093: D. Colomo, the *editor princeps*, has argued, cogently to my mind, that this fascinating composition alleging a Euripidean rewriting of *Medea* is a clever display-piece by a rhetor.

<sup>6</sup> *Phoenissae*, *Argumentum* 2 Mastronarde = *Argumentum* (b) Diggle: περιπαθεῖς ἄγαν αἰ Φοίνισσαι τῆ τραγωδία. ... ἔστι δὲ τὸ δράμα καὶ πολυπρόσωπον καὶ γνωμῶν μεστὸν πολλῶν τε καὶ καλῶν. *Andromache*, *Argumentum* (20–26 Diggle): ... (ὁ) πρόλογος σαφῶς καὶ εὐλόγως εἰρημένος ... ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ μέρει ῥῆσις Ἑρμιόνης τὸ βασιλικὸν ὑποφαίνουσα καὶ ὁ πρὸς Ἀνδρομάχην λόγος οὐ κακῶς ἔχων· εὖ δὲ καὶ ὁ Πηλεὺς ὁ τὴν Ἀνδρομάχην ἀφελόμενος.

way they have arranged the world—these are all easy to parallel in the quotations of tragedy in other literature and in Stobaeus. At first glance, the *Ino* portion of the new papyrus seems rather anomalous when we posit a rhetor or rhetorically-motivated layman as the compiler. But I want to suggest here that there is a considerable amount of anthology-worthy material in the *Ino* lines. As a thought experiment, let us posit that these lines of the papyrus are many separate excerpts and not a continuous text or just a few passages of moderate length.<sup>7</sup>

Lines 1–2 could be spoken by Ino (boasting to the chorus?) after giving Themisto the impression that she will carry out the plan to murder her own children. The lost previous lines could have been about deception or winning Themisto’s favor, and τ’ adds another point, that she even egged Themisto on. The rest of this couplet may have had the rhetorically neat θύουσα θύμαθ’ as Ino ironically calls on her enemy to delight in the “sacrifice” that she will be making. That is, these lines come from a scene before the children have been killed. The couplet is worth quoting because of the neat rhetoric.

Lines 3–4 sound to me like the words of a chorus, drawing conclusions from what they observe before them. The use of eisthesis in this and the next two lyric passages gives the visual impression of an amoibaion, but to my mind it is difficult to extract a convincing continuity from the trimeters to the following lyrics. As Battezzato points out in his paper, the metrical sequence is without parallel and the use of eisthesis can be explaining as the result of copying the format of a source text in which particular lines were marked for excerption. Thus the couplet 3–4 may have been part of a longer lyric, and likewise lines 7–9 and 16–18. The lines are certainly worth excerpting because of the appeal to “ancient *nomoi*” and the

---

<sup>7</sup> In an article separate from the *editio princeps*, J. Gibert and Y. Trnka-Amrhein explore an interpretation of the *Ino* portion of the new papyrus as a continuous text. Several speakers at the conference expressed the view that the lines from both plays consist of separate extracts.

disapproval of competition between two women for one marriage bed, similar to what is said in the second stasimon of *Andromache* (464ff.). As I will show later, there are occasionally lines from choral odes marked as worthy of quotation in medieval manuscripts, although the vast majority of such markings occur in iambic trimeters.

Lines 5–6 would be, as the editors suggest, spoken by Ino after the death of Themisto’s boys has been reported to the house. The mourning in the house need not imply that Themisto is the only one mourning (she could even perhaps be on stage). Compare *Phoenissae* 1317 βῶν δέ δῶμα πᾶν, meaning the household slaves are mourning for Menoeceus while Creon himself is seeking Jocasta to perform the ritual washing and setting out of the body in preparation for the burial procession. The couplet 5–6 is worth quoting for the striking phrasing and content of the second line, however one reconstructs line 6.<sup>8</sup>

Lines 7–9, with their gnomic observation about the variability of fortune and the unseen and unpredictable action of the divine, again seem to me typical of lyric commentary by an observer, such as the chorus, not so directly affected by the disaster as Themisto is.

Line 10, although it may not have been gnomic in its original context, could certainly be adaptable as a generalization. It need not have been connected to 5–9 or to 11ff.

Lines 11–12 are another quoteworthy moralizing generalization.

Lines 13–15 are too damaged to be confident about, but 13–14 again seem attractive as a potential excerpt because of ὄστις, whether it was indefinite in its original context or not. Line 15 by itself may be the single line excerpt found as line 10 of the Armenian inscription (line 9 of TrGF adesp. 279g).

Lines 16–18 are not easy to relate to what comes before or after, but could have been chosen as a separate excerpt because of their generalizing and moralizing content.

---

<sup>8</sup> Various proposals have been offered by Battezzato, Diggle, and Finglass as well as the *editores principes*.

In lines 19–21 and 22–25 we have two passages already surviving as book fragments. It would not be necessary to seek continuity between them if they are simply separate quotations.<sup>9</sup>

Lines 26–37 are very damaged, but 35–37 could easily stand on their own as an attractive excerpt, and 33 has a neat rhetorical structure. Line 31, with θεοῖς στυγούμενος, was perhaps attractive because it could be reused in insults or invective. Line 32 contains ἄκραντα, a word used of the futility of human speech or action, so the line could have been deemed useful for quotation in argumentative contexts. Among other possible restorations, I suggest, e.g., [φω]νεῖς ἄκραντα, παῦε, [μὴ λέξης πέρα] (borrowing the ending from Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 1275).<sup>10</sup> Line 33 has the neat contrast of ὀνήσας and ἀλγύνας and it is likely that the original text also had (σ)μικρὰ and μεγάλα.<sup>11</sup> Viewing these lines as independent couplets or single lines would obviate the difficulties that arise when one tries to find a reasonable continuity among them.

Since the left margin of the column is lost, it is impossible to know whether there were paragraphoi or not at particular points. The only paragraphoi visible to us in col. i are the three that fall beneath the last line of each short lyric. This position for marking the end of a passage of ἀμοιβαῖον in eisthesis is the same as is seen more clearly in the *Hysipyle* papyrus

---

<sup>9</sup> While the *editores principes*, in treating 19–20 as part of a continuous passage, translate “How fine a prize it is to prevail in a just cause, and how everywhere evil to do so in an unjust one,” I prefer the translation given by Collard and Cropp 2008: 583, with τᾶνδιχ’ and τὰ μὴ δίκαια as subjects of νικᾶν: “How fine a reward it is that justice prevails, and how everywhere evil that injustice does so.”

<sup>10</sup> Or λέξης πλέον for λέξης πέρα. There are, of course, other possibilities for restoring this line: for the initial verb, see Battezzato and Diggle, and for the end of the line Finglass.

<sup>11</sup> At the conference, both Battezzato and Diggle suggested how the traces before ικρα, considered problematic by the *editores principes*, could indeed be as part of (σ)μεικρα or (σ)μικρα.

(P.Oxy. 6.852), where the paragraphos that precedes the first line in eisthesis is at the normal left margin, and only the marks at the end of a lyric in eisthesis are farther to the right.

I suggest, then, that the lines of *Ino* could have appealed to the same sort of interest that inspired the selection of the more clearly gnomic lines from *Polyidos*. This seems to me plausible whether or not we agree on the question of continuity vs. separation of the lines. Another way to approach this question is to look at the range of passages that were considered worthy of excerpting according to the evidence in our medieval manuscripts of Euripides.<sup>12</sup> In manuscripts of tragedy, one finds marginal abbreviations for γνωμικόν and ὠραῖον, and in a few cases that for σημείωσαι.<sup>13</sup> I have recently surveyed several manuscripts of the triad that I have been using for my edition of the scholia on the triad plays of Euripides.<sup>14</sup> It is impossible to get a complete inventory of the marginal signs because margins have sometimes been trimmed, or are now washed out, or invisible because of tight binding. In addition, some scribes place the sign within the line itself if the relevant passage does not include the first words of the line, so these instances are easy to miss if one is quickly scanning an image for the marginal signs. In the case of Euripides, however, we also have another useful comparandum, the manuscripts containing gnomological collections arranged by play, with the excerpts in the order in which they occur in the play. For the purpose of this paper I have reviewed the selection in the oldest of these gnomologica, Vatopedianus 36, siglum gV, possibly of the mid

---

<sup>12</sup> On such signs see Mastronarde 2017: 137–138. Although marginal ὠραῖον and χρηστόν are firmly attested in legal texts, in literary papyri so far the examples are very few (and far from certain): see McNamee 2007: 248 (no. 362), 252 (no. 376.1), 287 (no. 1949.3), and for the juristic texts, 503–504 (nos. 2277, 2280).

<sup>13</sup> In very late manuscripts (15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> cent.) one also finds a marginal drawing of a hand with pointing finger used for a similar purpose.

<sup>14</sup> EuripidesScholia.org; as of 2023 the scholia on *Orestes* 1–1100 are complete, and those on the remainder of *Orestes* are expected to appear in 2025.

11<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>15</sup> This gives us a view of the choices made by a single compiler as he read through the select plays. While many of the lines in gV's compilation can be found marked with a sign in manuscripts of complete plays, gV has excerpted far more lines than are marked in any single manuscript and contains some lines that are not marked in any manuscript I have checked. Furthermore, gV differs from the manuscripts in that its excerpts include passages of several lines: e.g., 5 lines in *Hecuba* 253–257; 18 lines in *Hecuba* 585–602, the longest piece, almost the first half of Hecuba's rhesis reacting to the narrative of Polyxena's death, from which the final 7 gnomic lines are separately excerpted. The manuscripts usually place abbreviated marking only against a single line without indicating whether or how far the noteworthy passage extends.<sup>16</sup>

Some features of the gV selection are relevant to our characterization of the *Ino* lines in the new papyrus, and these features can be usually paralleled in other manuscripts.<sup>17</sup> I noted earlier that lyric lines occasionally attract the γνωμικόν and/or ὠραῖον designation. Here are six instances I have found so far, two of them shared by gV (γν = γνωμικόν, ὠρ = ὠραῖον, ση = σημείωσαι):

*Hecuba* 638–639: γν O, ὠρ Zm

πόννοι γὰρ καὶ πόνων

---

<sup>15</sup> See Fries 2014: 53 n. 36 for N. Wilson's support of a possible 11th century date (as proposed by Lamberz in the catalog), a dating also accepted in Maksimczuk 2018: 104 n. 22. In his important study Longman 1959 dated it instead to the 12<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>16</sup> Among the few exceptions are the manuscript R, which may place a vertical line beside the sequence of lines intended, and some Thomano-Triclinian copies that put ὅλον vertically below the sign to indicate an entire range of lines (although this may not unambiguously identify the end point).

<sup>17</sup> See the Appendix of this article for list comparing gV with Stobaeus and with the lines marked in the manuscripts of complete plays.



ἀνάγκαι κρείσσονες κυκλοῦνται.

*Orestes* 340: gV, γν OVRMnXbXoZmT

ὁ μέγας ὄλβος οὐ μόνιμος ἐν βροτοῖς.

*Orestes* 823–824: gV, γν ZmT

τὸ δ' αὖ κακουργεῖν ἀσέβεια ποικίλα  
κακοφρόνων τ' ἀνθρώπων παράνοια.

*Orestes* 1545: γν Zm

τέλος ἔχει δαίμων βροτοῖς.

*Phoenissae* 689: γν ZZmT

πάντα δ' εὐπετῆ θεοῖς.

*Phoenissae* 814: γν RZZmT, ὦρ by a late hand in V

οὐ γὰρ ὁ μὴ καλὸν οὔποτ' ἔφου καλόν.

Five other features of gV's selections are relevant for comparison of the new papyrus. First, some quotations include more than just the gnomic kernel. In *Hecuba* 227–228, the truly gnomic statement occupies the last five-sixths of the second line, but the lead-in to this statement is included in gV, despite its specificity to a particular situation. We can observe similar behavior in the some other examples:

*Hecuba* 227–228: gV, γν R, γν in margin at 228 ZZmT, in line at σοφόν Xo

γίγνωσκε δ' ἄλκῃ καὶ παρουσίαν κακῶν  
τῶν σῶν· σοφόν τοι κὰν κακοῖς ἄ δεῖ φρονεῖν.

*Hecuba* 293–295: gV, γν at 294 ZZmT

τὸ δ' ἀξίωμα , κὰν κακῶς λέγῃς, τὸ σὸν  
πείσει· λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰῶν  
κὰκ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς οὐ ταῦτὸν σθένει.

*Hecuba* 1187–1194: gV, γν ὄλον Zm, γν at 1187 VZ

Ἀγάμεμνον, ἀνθρώποισιν οὐκ ἐχρῆν ποτε  
τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν γλῶσσαν ἰσχύειν πλέον  
through  
κακῶς δ' ἀπώλοντ'· οὔτις ἐξήλυξέ πω.

*Orestes* 1161–1162: gV

κούκ ἐκποδῶν εἶ· παύσομαί σ' αἰνῶν, ἐπεὶ  
βάρος τι κὰν τῷδ' ἐστίν, αἰνεῖσθαι λίαν.

*Phoenissae* 1762–1763: gV, γν for the couplet Z, at 1763 VRXo, ὦρ at 1763 Zm

ἀλλὰ γὰρ τί ταῦτα θρηνῶ καὶ μάτην ὀδύρομαι;  
τὰς γὰρ ἐκ θεῶν ἀνάγκας θνητὸν ὄντα δεῖ φέρειν.

In other cases the quotation continues beyond the gnomic part: *Phoenissae* 507–510 includes a final half-line that is incomplete without the remainder of its sentence in 511; *Phoenissae* 528–532a continues for a line and a half after the gnomic kernel.

*Phoenissae* 507–510: gV, γν at 509 ZmT

τοῦτ' οὖν τὸ χρηστόν, μήτηρ, οὐχὶ βούλομαι  
ἄλλω παρεῖναι μᾶλλον ἢ σώζειν ἐμοί·  
ἄνανδρία γάρ, τὸ πλεόν ὅστις ἀπολέσας  
τοῦλασσον ἔλαβε. πρὸς δέ τοῖσδ' αἰσχύνομαι

*Phoenissae* 528–532a: gV (528–530 = Stobaeus 4.50a.1), γν at 528 VRMnZT)

ὦ τέκνον, οὐχ ἅπαντα τῷ γήρα κακά,  
Ἐτεόκλεες, πρόσεστιν ἄλλ' ἡμπειρία  
ἔχει τι λέξαι τῶν νέων σοφώτερον.  
τί τῆς κακίστης δαιμόνων ἐφίεσαι  
Φιλοτιμίας, παῖ;

Second, we find a selection in gV with the same sort of indignant/admonitory second person plural address as found in our *Ino* lines. Hecuba addresses politicians/orators currying favor with the many, while *Ino* addresses “bad men” and human beings in general.

*Hecuba* 253–257: gV, γν R, ὦρ at 254 XbXoZ

δρᾶς δ' οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς εὔ, κακῶς δ' ὅσον δύνῃ;<sup>18</sup>  
ἀχάριστον ὑμῶν σπέρμ', ὅσοι δημηγόρους  
ζηλοῦτε τιμᾶς μηδὲ γινώσκεσθέ μοι,  
οἱ τοὺς φίλους βλάπτοντες οὐ φροντίζετε,  
ἦν τοῖσι πολλοῖς πρὸς χάριν λέγητέ τι.

---

<sup>18</sup> Note the inclusion of 253 in the extract, whereas most identify 254 as the beginning of the quoteworthy passage.

*Ino* i.22–25

βία νυν ἔλκετ' ... τιμὰς ... / ... καὶ κτᾶσθε πλοῦτον ... / ... ἔπειτ' ἀμᾶσθε ... θέρος

*Ino* i.35

τί μοχθεῖτ' οὐδέν εἰδότες πέρα

Third, some excerpts appear to be chosen without being gnomic because they are the kind of phrase Eustathius chooses to recommend, something to be cleverly quoted in an appropriate context. Here are three examples from gV, and a similar case not in gV:

*Orestes* 100: gV

ὀρθῶς ἔλεξας, οὐ φίλως δέ μοι λέγεις.

*Orestes* 670: gV

κούκ ὑποτρέχων σε τοῦτο θωπεῖα λέγω.

*Phoenissae* 1680: gV

γενναιότης σοι, μωρία δ' ἔνεστί τις.

*Orestes* 211–212: ὦρ at 211 V; perhaps a very damaged γν at 211 R (211–214 =

Stobaeus 4.36.1)

ᾧ φίλον ὕπνου θέλγητρον, ἐπίκουρον νόσου,

ὡς ἡδύ μοι προσῆλθες ἐν δέοντί γε/τε.

Fourth, there are lines that are probably chosen for their neat rhetorical structure or a form of expression that is otherwise striking, even if not a gnomic generalization. *Hecuba* 370–371 is probably an example, as well as being useful to quote to express one’s despair in an appropriate context. Additional examples are given here:

*Hecuba* 370–371: gV

οὐτ’ ἐλπίδος γὰρ οὔτε του δόξης ὄρω  
θάρσος παρ’ ἡμῖν ὡς ποτ’ εὖ πράξαί με δεῖ.

*Orestes* 390: gV

τὸ σῶμα φροῦδον, τὸ δ’ ὄνομ’ οὐ λέλοιπέ με.

*Orestes* 424: gV

οὐ σοφός, ἀληθής δ’ εἰς φίλους ἔφυς κακός.

*Orestes* 1082–1083: gV

ἀλλ’, ὦ ποθρινὸν ὄνομ’ ὀμιλίας ἐμῆς,  
χαῖρ’ οὐ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐστι τοῦτο, σοί γε μιν.

*Phoenissae* 494–496: gV

ταῦτ’ αὐθ’ ἔκαστα, μήτηρ, οὐχὶ περιπλοκάς  
λόγων ἀθροίσας εἶπον ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφοῖς  
καὶ τοῖσι φαύλοις ἔνδιχ’, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.

*Phoenissae* 917: gV, ὦρ Xb

ὦ πολλὰ λέξας ἐν βραχεῖ λόγῳ κακά

*Phoenissae* 1446: gV

φίλος γὰρ ἐχθρὸς ἐγένετ', ἀλλ' ὅμως φίλος.

Fifth, there are a few excerpts containing speaker-turns:

*Phoenissae* 386 & 388–389:<sup>19</sup> gV (388–391 = Stobaeus 3.39.17), ὦρ at 386 ZZm, ὦρ at

388 R, ση Xb

—ἄ γὰρ σύ βούλῃ, ταῦτ' ἐμοί, μήτηρ, φίλα.

—τί τὸ στέρεσθαι πατρίδος; ἦ κακὸν μέγα;

—μέγιστον· ἔργῳ δ' ἐστὶ μείζον ἢ λόγῳ.

*Phoenissae* 392–397: gV (392 = Stobaeus 3.19.11, 391–392 = Stobaeus 3.40.9), γν at 393

T, γν at 395 BZmT, ση(μείωσαι) at 395 Xb<sup>20</sup>

—δούλου τόδ' εἶπας, μὴ λέγειν ἅ τις φρονεῖ.

—τὰς τῶν κρατούντων ἀμαθίας φέρειν χρεῶν.

—καὶ τοῦτο λυπρὸν, συνασοφεῖν τοῖς μὴ σοφοῖς.

—ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ κέρδος παρὰ φύσιν δουλευτέον.

—αἱ δ' ἐλπίδες βόσκουσιν φυγάδας, ὡς λόγος.

—καλοῖς δὲ βλέπουσιν ὄμμασι, μέλλουσι δέ.

---

<sup>19</sup> It should be noted that in a few places gV fails to use the usual four-dot punctuation and enlarged initial to show where one extract ends and the next begins. Thus it is not certain whether the scribe intended this to be a single extract or two separate ones. Thus the omission of 387 in gV may or may not be related to the fact that line 387 is omitted in Π<sup>13</sup> and was declared spurious by Haslam.

<sup>20</sup> There is also an unusual cross in the margin of O that may be intended to mark 393–394 as noteworthy.

*Phoenissae* 1214–1216: gV

—κακόν τι κεύθεισ καὶ στέγεις ὑπὸ σκότῳ.

—οὐκ ἄν γε λέξαιμ' ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖσί σοῖς κακά.

These habits of the users and scribes of medieval manuscripts demonstrate that the contents of the *Ino* section of the new papyrus fit the practices of excerption, so that we can conceive of the same person selecting these lines of *Ino* as well as the more obviously gnostic selections from *Polyidos*.

For the remainder of this paper, I want to expand on the possible evidence for the context of reading and studying Euripides in relation to rhetorical education or rhetorical re-use. As I have worked on collating and editing the scholia on the Euripidean triad, I have been asking myself what traces rhetorical education may have left in the scholia, whose scope and content were significantly influenced by the interests of readers and teachers in the Roman Imperial and early Byzantine eras. This issue has received several treatments in relation to commentary on Homer, but the evidence of tragic scholia has been less exploited, for the obvious reason that it is less abundant there. One of the main indicators to be studied is the technical terminology used to describe aspects of narrative and argument and composition. In the Homeric case, it has been established that medieval commentators, esp. of the 12<sup>th</sup> through 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, employed a rich and varied technical terminology that owes much to the tradition of Hermogenes and his commentators. These scholiastic sources also use terms from Aristotle and the Peripatetic tradition and other terms new to the inventory. In a study mainly of Homeric scholia, Valiavitcharska<sup>21</sup> has noted a few parallels in the scholia on Sophocles and

---

<sup>21</sup> Valiavitcharska 2013.

Aristophanes, but did not cite those on Euripides. This mostly Hermogenean terminology is in fact prevalent in the marginal labels of schemata and divisions of narrative or argument in some manuscripts of Euripides. In the scholia on *Orestes* 1–1100, there are around 90 such marginal labels (the total depends on whether slight variations are counted as essentially the same or distinct), each attested in from one to thirteen witnesses. Almost three quarters of these labels use terms attested in Hermogenes or his commentators. My collations, which are now complete for the whole triad in the 40 witnesses chosen in my project, reveal that such labels are found similarly scattered through the rest of *Orestes* as well as *Hecuba* and *Phoenissae*.<sup>22</sup> Unlike the γνωμικόν and ὠραῖον labels, the rhetorical labels are not found in the oldest manuscripts HMBO and are rare in the original hands of V. This absence may be partly due to the fact that M and B seem to be reference copies for the use of more learned users, while the *recentiores* and the manuscripts containing notes by Moschopulus and Thomas are more personal copies, sometimes apparently those of students. But it could also be due to an intensification of rhetorical education based on the Hermogenean corpus from the 11<sup>th</sup> century onward.

What we do find in the discursive commentary of the older manuscripts of the triad and the other select plays is a limited number of notes that offer a close rhetorical analysis of a passage. In these notes the technical terms that occur are mostly very old and basic ones: ἀντίθεσις, εἰρωνεία, ἐμφαντικόν, ἐπιχείρημα, ἐσχηματισμένον, καθ' ὑπόθεσιν, κατασκευή, προοίμιον, πρωθύστερον, τροπικὴ λέξις, but one finds a few more recondite items (ἀνθυποφορά, ἀντίστασις, στοχαστικόν). Other rhetorical terms found in the older scholia but not among the labels deployed in later copies are βεβαίωσις, ἐπεξήγησις, περίφρασις, προκατασκευάζω, ἐπεξεργασία. One close parallel for the later labels can be seen in a scholion

---

<sup>22</sup> See the listing in the Appendix of this article.



in B on *Alcestis* 693,<sup>23</sup> where Pheres says that his remaining time of life may be short, but it is nevertheless sweet. The comment is simply “antithesis (counterargument) to what was said by Admetus,” followed by a quotation of 649–650 “In any case the remaining time of your life was brief.”<sup>24</sup>

To illustrate the range of notes with a rhetorical cast in the older scholia, let us begin with a few from the scholia on *Hippolytus*. The scholion on 151, the opening of antistrophe beta of the parodos, paraphrases the first four lines of the stanza and offers two possible views. In both the M tradition and the slightly different one of B, the explanation is preceded by the phrase στοχαστικὸν τὸ ἦθος, “The character (delineated rhetorically in the passage) is that of conjecture,” which probably started as a distinct comment. At 208 we find a stylistic comment and a typical use of ἐσχηματισμένως and αἰνίττεται, but also appreciation of the suitability of the passage to “the character of those who are sick.”

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 151 ἢ πόσιν τὸν Ἐρεχθιδᾶν: στοχαστικὸν τὸ ἦθος. ἢ, φησὶν, εἰς οὐδένα τῶν θεῶν ἤμαρτες, ἀλλὰ τάχα τὸ δεινὸν ἔρωσ ἐστὶ καὶ μοιχεία ἑτέρου, φόβῳ δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἔρωτι τοῦ μοιχοῦ κατεχομένη ἀγωνιᾶς; δύναται καὶ ὡς τοῦ Θησέως ἔχοντος ἑτέραν γυναῖκα ὁ λόγος τάττεσθαι· ἢ τις γυνὴ ἀπατᾷ σοῦ τὸν ἄνδρα τῇ ἑαυτῆς λαθραία συνουσίᾳ, ... —MBVN

The character (delineated rhetorically in the passage) is that of conjecture. Or, (the chorus) says, have you committed no offense against any of the gods, but perhaps the terrible woe is love and adultery with another man, and afflicted by

---

<sup>23</sup> Scholia are cited based on my own collations and preliminary editing. Sigla are those used at EuripidesScholia.org.

<sup>24</sup> πρὸς τὸ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ Ἀδμήτου ἀντίθεσις [649–650] ‘βραχὺς δέ σοι / πάντως ὁ λοιπὸς ἦν βιώσιμος χρόνος’.

fear of your husband and love for the paramour you feel tortured? The statement can also be construed as if Theseus has another woman: or is some woman deceiving your husband with her own secret liaison, ...

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 208 **πῶς ἄνδρο()**: ἐπαναβέβηκε λοιπὸν ὁ λόγος ὡσπερὶ συναυξόμενος τῷ πάθει καὶ λοιπὸν ἐσχηματισμένως<sup>25</sup> τὰ τοῦ ἔρωτος αἰνίττεται. λέγει οὖν ... ταῦτα δὲ ἔξωθεν ἐσχημάτισται πρὸς τὸ ἦθος τῶν νοσοῦντων. —B

The discourse rises up (to a higher/more intense style) from this point, as if growing greater together with the pathos, and from here on, with language having double meanings, she (Phaedra) hints at the matter of love. Thus she says ... . These details have been expressed ambiguously in their surface meaning to match the character of those who are sick.

The comment on 601, the beginning of the scene in which Hippolytus and the nurse burst out of the palace, shares the view of some other scholia on the play that Hippolytus is φιλόσοφος, on the lines of an ascetic philosopher.

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 601 **ὦ γαῖα μητερ**: ὡς φιλόσοφος τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐπικαλεῖται προσμαρτυροῦντας χάριν τῶν εἰρημένων. ἤδη δὲ προτραγωδήσας ἱκανῶς, ἐπὶ [ἐπὶ del. Wilam.] τὴν ὀργὴν Ἰππολύτου καὶ τὴν ἱκεσίαν τῆς γραδὸς ἐπεξέρχεται, πρότερον ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ τραγικοῦ, δηλαδὴ τῆς ὀργῆς Ἰππολύτου, τὴν δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀδολεσχίαν τῆς γραδὸς καὶ τὸν ὄρκον ἀποκρυψάμενος. —BV<sup>1</sup>N

---

<sup>25</sup> B perhaps wrote ἐσχηματισμ(έν)η, which Cavarzeran 2016 prints. But the suspended ending is ambiguous and could be a careless ὡς-sign. In any case, parallels indicate that the adverb must be read here by emendation if it is not actually in B.

As a philosophical character, Hippolytus invokes the earth and the sun as witnesses for what has been said. And after having played up the strong emotion sufficiently in advance, he (the poet) elaborates on the wrath of Hippolytus and the entreaty of the old woman, beginning first with the tragic aspect, that is, the wrath of Hippolytus, but concealing (at first) the original talkativeness of the old woman (scil. in revealing Phaedra's love to Hippolytus) and the oath

This note carefully describes the calibration of revelations in the stichomythia. The language, however, is generally non-technical, but perhaps a bit precious, a stylistic trait evident in some other examples to be shown. ἀδολεσχία is used in its non-technical sense, and ἐπεξέρχεται is a typical, but less technical, way to refer to ἐπεξεργασία. This note is more about the rhetorical strategy of the poet than of the characters. In contrast, the notes on 609 and 610 directly address the rhetorical skill of the two speakers, under the assumption that the characters in serious classical literature are masters of rhetorical technique and that they engage in a contest of expert manipulation and counterattack.<sup>26</sup>

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 609 ὁ μῦθος ᾧ παῖ: παραλογίζεται τὸν νέον τῆ μεταθέσει τῶν ὀνομάτων κλέπτουσα τὴν ἀκρόασιν. δέον γὰρ εἰπεῖν ‘οὐ κακὸς’, φησὶν ‘οὐ κοινὸς’, οὐ πᾶσιν ὀφείλων ἀνακοινωθῆναι. εἶναι γὰρ μέχρι τινὸς καὶ καλὰ σιωπώμενα. —BV<sup>1</sup>N

She tries to trick the youth, deceiving her audience by the shifting of terms. For whereas she should have said ‘(the account is) not bad’, she says ‘(it is) not

---

<sup>26</sup> For this attitude toward the rhetorical skill of heroes in Homer, see Hunter 2018, Hunter 2020. I discuss the similar phenomenon in tragic scholia in Mastronarde 2025.

common', one that ought not to be shared with everyone. For (her reasoning is that) there are to a certain extent also fine things that are not spoken of.

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 610 **τά τοι κάλ' ἐν πολλοῖσι**: δεινότερον αὐτῆς ἀνεῖλε τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀπάτην. εἰ γὰρ οὐ κοινά, δῆλον ὡς οὐδὲ καλά. τῷ γὰρ δημοτελεῖ<sup>27</sup> τῆς ἐπιδείξεως πλέον δοξάζεται τὸ χρηστόν. —BV<sup>1</sup>N

In a rather shrewd/forceful way he refuted her deception based on the terms. If things are not for sharing, obviously neither are they fine. For what is good is more approved by the public nature of its display.

The terms used here are partly technical and partly technical adaptations of ordinary words: παραλογίζομαι, μετάθεσις, κλέπτω, ἀπάτη, δεινότερον, ἀναιρέω.

A little later, when Hippolytus begins his invective rhesis at 616, the analysis again features some technical language and some precious expressions (τὴν τοῦ κρείσσονος νόσον, ἀφροδισιασμῶν χωρὶς):

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 616 **ὦ Ζεῦ τί δὴ κίβδηλον**: λοιπὸν καταστατικώτερον τὴν γυναικεῖαν διαβάλλει φύσιν, ἀναφέρων τὸ προοίμιον ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ κρείσσονος νόσον. φιλοσοφώτερον δὲ τὴν ἀντίθεσιν λύει, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀξιῶν μὴ ὑπὸ ἀφροδισιασμῶν παῖδας γίνεσθαι. ὁ δὲ νοῦς διὰ τί, φησὶν, εἰς τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου

---

<sup>27</sup> τῷ δημοτελεῖ is striking. The word usually applies to festivals, sacrifices, and the like, made at public expense and thus open to all, but in few places in later Greek the adjective seems to be 'public, open to all' without reference to rituals or public expense. E.g., Psellus, *Chronographia* 1.9,1 αὕτη τελεωτέρα κρίσις καὶ δημοτελεστέρα ἀμφοῖν ἔδοξε, 'this decision [in a physical confrontation won by one of the two] seemed to both men more complete and more widely known to all'.

τὰς γυναῖκας ἀδόκιμον κακὸν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κατώκισας; κίβδηλον τὸ μηδὲ  
δοκιμασίας δεόμενον, ἀλλὰ προφανῶς δεινόν.<sup>28</sup> —BVN

From this point on he maligns the nature of women in a more settled fashion, directing the proem toward the fault of the greater power. And he refutes the counterargument in a more philosophical style, recommending that in the first place children not be born from sexual couplings. The general sense is: Why, he says, did you settle under the light of the sun women, an infamous/counterfeit evil for men? ‘Counterfeit’ means that which does not even require scrutiny, but is manifestly terrible.

After a scholion on 623 follows up with a further positive evaluation,<sup>29</sup> the second part of the note on 625 continues the same analysis, praising the construction of the argument:<sup>30</sup>

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 625 **νῦν δ’ ἐς δόμους:** ... προκατασκευάσας δὲ λογισμὸν οἰκειότατον τῷ προσώπῳ, λοιπὸν κατατρέχει καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν διαβολὴν [ἐπὶ τ. διαβ. del. Schwartz] τῆς γυναικείας φύσεως. ἔδει γὰρ πρῶτον λογισμῷ τινι ἀναιρήσαι

---

<sup>28</sup> Schwartz suggested in his apparatus that δεινόν is corrupt, and Cavarzeran 2016 puts an obelus before it. In using this term, however, I suggest the paraphrast is thinking of the women, not the coinage they are compared to.

<sup>29</sup> Schol. Hipp. 624 οἰκειοτάτη τῷ προσώπῳ ἢ γυμνασία· πῶς γὰρ [γὰρ del. Wilam.] ἂν ἀφροδισιασμῶν χωρὶς ἢ φύσις συνίσταται; (in BV, also in N, but obscured by trimming and garbled at end); “The (argumentative) exercise is very suitable to the character: for (his view raises the question) how could the natural world (of living creatures) be established without sexual couplings?”

<sup>30</sup> See also *Scholia in Hippolytum* 634: “He expands (διεξέρχεται) on these points, demonstrating that in every way what relates to the woman/wife is evil etc.”; *Scholia in Hippolytum* 645 “Having previously gone through (ἤδη διεξεληθὼν) the account of how women are the purveyors of evils, hereafter he transitions (μεταβαίνει) to their management and employment, ... He has spoken this point with regard to their madness (πρὸς τὸ παράφορον, their tendency to go astray uncontrollably?).”

τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰς, εἴθ' οὕτως ἄρξασθαι τῶν διαβολῶν. τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς ἄριστα ὡς ἐκ συγκρίσεως ἐπιφέρεται. —BVN

After setting out in advance a reasoning very well suited to the character, he (Hippolytus, or the poet?) thereafter rushes onward also to the vituperation of women's nature [or with deletion: thereafter attacks women's nature]. For it was necessary first by the use of reasoning to refute the notion that they (women) (should) exist, and then and only then to begin the points of vituperation. What follows is added very well as (an argument) based on comparison.

After Hippolytus storms off and Phaedra condemns the nurse, the nurse tries to justify her actions and win back Phaedra's approval. The scholion on *Hippolytus* 695 takes pains to explain the nurse's strategy for regaining good will and for shifting the blame from herself.

*Scholia in Hippolytum* 695 **δέσποιν'**, **ἔχεις μὲν**: καταδέχεται τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς μέμψιν, ἵνα οὕτως καὶ αὕτη τὴν τοῦ σφάλματος ἀπολογίαν καταδέξῃται. ἐξῆς δὲ πάλιν εἰς εὐνοίαν [Dindorf, ἔννοϊαν BV] αὐτὴν προάγειν βούλεται, τὸν σκοπὸν τῆς μὲνύσεως καθ' ὃν γεγένηται λέγουσα. ... ἡ μὲν κατασκευὴ τοῦ λογισμοῦ τῆς εὐνοίας [Dindorf, V<sup>3</sup>, ἔννοϊας BV] ἀπόδειξις, ἡ δὲ τῆς ἀποτυχίας δυσχέρεια τῆς τύχης κατηγορημα. —BV

She (the nurse) accepts the reproach from her in order that she too (Phaedra) may accept the explanation of the error. Thereafter she wants to lead her back into a state of good will, speaking of the goal of the revelation in pursuit of which it occurred. ... The explication of the reasoning is a demonstration of her

(the nurse's) good will, while the vexation resulting from the failure is an indictment of fortune.

There are traces of similar analyses in the scholia on *Alcestis*. The stichomythia between Apollo and Thanatos gives rise to two examples, as the commentator sees both speakers as shifting the terms of the argument to their advantage:

*Scholia in Alcestin* 55–56 **νέων φθινόντων**: ... ὁ δὲ Ἀπόλλων, καίτοι νοήσας τὸ λεχθὲν, παραλογίζεται τὸν Θάνατον φάσκων ὅτι κἂν γραῦς ὄληται ἢ Ἄλκηστις, ἀξίως ταφήσεται, τὸ μείζον γέρας λέγων ἐπὶ πολυτελοῦς ταφῆς· ὅθεν ὁ Θάνατός φησι· νόμον σὺ προβάλλῃ τὸ πλουσίως θάπτεσθαι τοὺς ἔχοντας καὶ τοῦτο νομίζεις γέρας ἐμόν, ἐγὼ δὲ γέρας φημὶ τὸ ἐπὶ νέοις νεανιεύεσθαι. —BV

Apollo, even though he has understood what was said (by Thanatos), tries to mislead Thanatos by faulty reasoning by saying that even if Alcestis perishes as an old woman, she will be buried in a worthy manner, speaking of the ‘greater gift of honor’ as applying to a rich burial. Wherefore Thanatos says: you propose the practice of the haves being buried in a rich style, and deem this to be my gift of honor, but I say the honor (for me) is to act just as willfully as I please<sup>31</sup> with the young.

*Scholia in Alcestin* 57–58 **πρὸς τῶν ἐχόντων, Φοῖβε**: ὁ μὲν Ἀπόλλων λέγει ἐπὶ τῆς Ἄλκηστιδος ὅτι ἐὰν γενομένη γραῦς ἀποθάνῃ, πλουσίως θάπτεται· ὁ δὲ καθόλου

---

<sup>31</sup> This translation uses an attested meaning of νεανιεύεσθαι, which is the transmitted word. The point is that exercising one's powers without restriction is a privilege of divinity that marks their high status, hence, a γέρας. Wilamowitz (in Schwartz's edition) improbably conjectured πρεσβεύεσθαι, and Cavarzeran 2024 prints νεανιεύεσθαι but in his apparatus, after recording Wilamowitz's emendation, adds *possis et ἀλαζονεύεσθαι*.

ἔλαβε καὶ φησί· τὸν νόμον τίθης, ὃ Ἄπολλον, ὑπὲρ τῶν πλουσίων {λέγει [λέγων B]}· ἀγοράσουσι γὰρ οἱ πλούσιοι ἑγέροντας εἰς θάνατον· διὸ Ἀπόλλων φησὶν αὐτὸν πανούργως εἰρηκέναι. —BV

Apollo, speaking about Alcestis, says that if she reaches old age and then dies, she is buried in a rich style. But he (Thanatos) took it in a universal sense and says: You are establishing the law, Apollo, on behalf of the rich. For the rich will purchase the right to die in old age(?). Therefore Apollo says that he has spoken with unscrupulous cunning.

Whereas Apollo's feint is classified as a παραλογισμός, the lower-status character Thanatos, who generalizes Apollo's suggestion to enable a socio-economic critique, is said to be accused by Apollo of πανουργία (malicious cleverness in argument).

In contrast to these examples where the commentator seems to approve the rhetorical technique of the speaker or of Euripides, there are other cases where the commentator finds fault. At *Medea* 538, Jason boasts to Medea that she has benefitted from leaving her barbarian land and from living in Greece, claiming that she now “knows justice and how to live by the rule of law in a way that does not give free rein to force.” The scholia here recognize the weakness of this claim.

*Scholia in Medeam* 538 **νόμοις τε χρῆσθαι**: ἐπιλαμβάνονται τοῦ ἐπιχειρήματος· ἔδει γὰρ αὐτὸν ταῦτα λέγοντα ποιεῖν μηδὲν ἄδικον. πρὸς γὰρ τὸν λέγοντα ὅτι νόμοις ἐπίστασαι χρῆσθαι, εἴποι ἄν τις εἰκότως· ἀλλὰ σὺ οὐκ ἐπίστασαι νόμοις χρῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὅρκους παραβέβηκας καὶ τὰς δεξιάς καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα προδέδωκας, ὅπως τὴν τοῦ τυράννου θυγατέρα λάβης, τοῦτο δὲ ἔνεκα φιλοδοξίας. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε ἔλεγεν· ἦκω, ὅπως σοι ἐπαρκέσω, καταμωκώμενος



ἔλεγεν. ἥκιστα οὖν ἔδει νῦν τὰ τῶν νόμων παραλαμβάνειν μέλλοντα πρόσωπον  
τοιούτον εἰσάγειν παραβεβηκὸς τοὺς νόμους. —B

Critics find fault with the epicheireme (attempted proof). For if he (Jason) says this, he ought to have been doing nothing wrong. For in reply to a person arguing ‘you understand how to observe the rule of law’, one could reasonably say: ‘But you yourself do not observe the rule of law, but you have violated the oaths and betrayed the sworn right hands, your children, and your wife, in order to marry the daughter of the king, and you do this because of your desire for reputation’. For when he (Jason) said ‘I have come to help you’, he was speaking in mockery. So he (the poet) ought least of all to employ now the topic of the laws when he is intending to bring on stage such a character who has transgressed the laws.

*Scholia in Medeam* 538 περιπετής ὁ λόγος κατὰ ῥήτορας περιπίπτει γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ λέγων. —B<sup>marg</sup>

The speech is ‘peripetēs’ in the terms of the rhetoricians. For the speaker trips himself up.

In the criticism of the longer note, the commentator seems to be ignoring the dramatic characterization of Jason, in which such a chauvinistic claim and such blindness to the contradiction are quite suitable, but to be thinking instead how someone arguing with Medea should construct the best possible speech, a lesson a teacher of rhetoric would want to impress on his pupils. The separate marginal note in B is more neutral, more like a label.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> περιπετής λόγος is by no means a well-attested expression (once in an oration of Eustratius, 11th–12th cent.). The term is based on the better-attested use of περιπετής absolutely of persons who trip themselves up in speech;

There are instances of ambiguous criticism, where one cannot be quite certain whether the critic is speaking of a mistake committed by the character or one made by Euripides, and perhaps for a teacher of rhetoric the distinction between character and author was not essential, just as it was often ignored in other forms of literary or moral criticism. For example, at *Troades* 906 Hecuba encourages Menelaus to let Helen speak to defend herself, setting up the *agōn logōn*. The short scholion sees a rhetorical fault here.

*Scholia in Troadas* 906 ἄκουσον αὐτῆς: καταφέρεται εἰς τὸ νόσημα τῶν ἀντιθέσεων· ἢ γὰρ πρότερον λέγουσα· ὄρα [890] ‘μή σε ἔλη’ νῦν φησιν ‘ἄκουσον αὐτῆς’. —V

She (or: he, the poet?) is carried along into the fault of contradictory propositions, for the woman who previously was saying [890] ‘be careful that she not take you captive’ now says ‘listen to her’.

The verb *καταφέρεται* implies a lack of control: the skilled rhetorician should be careful enough to avoid self-contradiction.

Some scholia and some glossators evince a fault to which all commentators may be prone, an atomistic approach to the text in which the larger context may be ignored. This sometimes reflects, I believe, the bias of rhetorical teaching, in which each and every word and its position can be probed as an example. A series of scholia on the first third of *Orestes* show an unusual concentration of close readings of words or lines, some detecting a great deal of cunning and malice in the word-choice and arguments of Electra, Helen, and Menelaus, a few

---

as an extension of this, *περιπετής αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ* and *περιπετής τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ λόγοις* occur a dozen times, once in Hermogenes and then in authors from the 11<sup>th</sup> century and later.

faulting the speakers (or Euripides) for the strategy they adopt.<sup>33</sup> Here I will confine myself to two short examples from nearly adjacent lines.

*Scholia in Orestem* 374.07 **φόνον**: δέον εἰπεῖν εὐσεβῆ φόνον, κακοήθως ἀνόσιον καὶ ἀσεβῆ φόνον καλεῖ τὴν τιμωρίαν Κλυταιμνήστρας. —BCRw

Although he should have said ‘pious murder’, maliciously he calls the punishment of Clytemnestra ‘unholy and impious murder’.

*Scholia in Orestem* 376.05 **ὄς τὰ δεῖν’ ἔτλη κακά**: καὶ ἐκ τούτου δῆλός ἐστιν ὁ Μενέλαος πονηρῶς ταῦτα λέγων. δέον γὰρ εἰπεῖν ‘ὄς ἤμυνε τῷ πατρί’, φησὶν ‘ὄς τὰ δεινὰ εἰργάσατο κακά’. —MBCRw

From this detail too it is clear that Menelaus says these things maliciously. For when he should have said ‘who avenged his father’, he says ‘who accomplished the dreadful evils’.

What is the viewpoint of the critic’s use of “he should have” (δέον) in these notes? At this point in the play Electra and Orestes have both referred to the horrific and morally ambiguous nature of the matricide. Why would Menelaus be expected to adopt a one-sidedly approving stance toward this deed? Would a critic insist that Euripides as tragic playwright ought to have put the more favorable phrases in his character’s mouth in these lines? Or is the critic instead approaching Menelaus’ words from the point of view of an advocate’s rhetorical task, assuming the assignment of formulating a speech for Menelaus as advocate for his nephew, a role that Euripides represents him as unwilling to perform, and perhaps morally incapable of

---

<sup>33</sup> I discuss these in detail in another paper in progress. One example is the exceptionally lengthy analysis in Sch. Or. 414.05, which I have discussed in Mastronarde 2017: 200–203.

performing? Judged as rhetoric in such terms, abstracted from the dynamic context of the drama, the δέον applies perfectly well to the task of the rhetorician, namely, to minimize the objectionable elements in an act that cannot be denied and to play up the mitigating factors. These commentators find that Menelaus is instead adopting the techniques suited to a prosecutor and enemy.

As a final example, I have chosen the scholion on *Phoenissae* 584, at the end of Jocasta's speech in the agon-debate.

*Scholia in Phoenissas* 584 **ἄλλως**: ἐν τούτοις Ἰοκάστη οὐδὲν συμβεβούλευκε τοῖς παισὶ κοινωφελές, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν λέγει· εἰς τί φιλοτιμῆ τυραννεῖν, τῷ δέ· εἰς τί πολεμεῖς τὴν πατρίδα. ἐχρῆν δὲ τοῦτο συμβουλεῦσαι, διελομένους τὰ πατρῶα καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν παύσασθαι τῆς διχοστασίας, ὥσπερ ὑπέστησαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνὰ μέρος ἄρχειν. καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ ποιητῇ ἦν ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς μὴ πειθομένους, ὅπως τὰ τῆς ἱστορίας μένη βέβαια· εἴμαρτο γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀλληλοκτόνους γενομένους κατὰ τὰς ἀρὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποθανεῖν. νῦν δὲ οὐδὲν τούτων πεποίηκεν. —MBVC

In these words Jocasta has given no mutually beneficial counsel to her sons. Rather, to one she says ‘why are you ambitious for tyranny?’ and to the other ‘why are you waging war on your fatherland?’ She ought to have given this advice: that they divide up their father’s property and the kingship and bring an end to the strife, just as they undertook in the first place to rule in turn. For it was in the poet’s power to represent them as not yielding to her persuasion, in order that the details of the mythic story remain secure (for it was fated that they die by each other’s hands in accordance with the curses of their father). But as it is, the poet did none of this.

At first glance, this looks like a criticism of the poet's approach to composing this play and would find a parallel in some other scholia critical of Euripides' choices in composing *Phoenissae* as well as in the *argumentum* that lists among faults that "Polyneices comes onto the scene under truce for no purpose." The critic of this note, however, accepts the presence of the scene, but would rather that Jocasta had used a different argument, almost as if she had been assigned a rhetorical exercise with the theme "reconcile the quarreling sons of Oedipus." Taken in abstraction from the dramatic context, what the critic recommends would be a suitable approach for an adviser or arbitrator. But in the actual context, Polyneices has already offered to return to the previous agreement, and Eteocles has vehemently rejected such a possibility, so it will do no good for Jocasta to repropose it, and the best alternative approach is to get one or the other brother to relent, which is exactly what Euripides portrays Jocasta doing. Perhaps our note is just bad literary criticism, but one should also consider whether the critic came to this assessment because his interest lay elsewhere, in how to learn from and to emulate or surpass the rhetorical technique in the text being studied.

Comments such as these in the older scholia, I suggest, may give us a sense of the cultural and educational context in which a selection such as that in the new Euripides papyrus came into being.

## **Bibliography**

- J. Cavarzeran, *Scholia in Euripidis Hippolytum. Edizione critica, introduzione, indici* [Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, 19], Berlin and Boston 2016.
- C. Collard and M. Cropp, *Euripides. Fragments*, 2 vols. [Euripides VII–VII, Loeb Classical Library 504, 506], Cambridge, Massachusetts and London 2008.
- E. Cullhed and S. D. Olson, *Eustathius of Thessalonica, Commentary on the Odyssey*, Vol. I, Leiden and Boston 2022.

- P. de la Coste-Messelière, “Inscriptions de Delphes”, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hélienique* 49 (1925) 61–103
- J. A. Fernández Delgado, “Euripides in the Rhetoric Classroom,” in María del Carmen Encinas Reguero, Milagros Quijada Sagredo (eds.), *Tragic rhetoric: the rhetorical dimensions of Greek tragedy* [Le rane, 69], Rome 2021
- J. A. Fernández Delgado, “Mythology and Rhetorical Exercises at the Greek School,” in J. Muñoz Morcillo, C. Y. Robertson-Von Trotha (eds.), *Genealogy of Popular Science. From Ancient Ecphrasis to Virtual Reality*, Bielefeld 2020, 95–103.
- H. Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus* [Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, 114], Berlin and Boston 2014.
- B. Gehad, J. Gibert, and Y. Trnka-Amrhein, “P. Phil Nec. 23 ↑: New Excerpts from Euripides’ *Ino* and *Polyidos*,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 000 (2024) 000–000.
- O. Guéraud and P. Jouguet, *Un livre d’écolier du IIIe siècle avant J.-C.*, Cairo 1938.
- R. Hunter, “The Rhetorical Criticism of Homer,” in F. Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, II, Leiden 2015, 673–705.
- R. Hunter, *The Measure of Homer: the Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Cambridge 2018.
- G. A. Longman, “Gnomologium Vatopedianum: The Euripidean Section,” *Classical Quarterly* new series 9 (1959) 129–141.
- J. Maksimczuk, “The Anthology of Parisinus gr. 852 and Vatopediou 36 and Its Relation to the Florilegium Coislinianum”, *Revue des études byzantines*, 76 (2018) 99–136.
- D. J. Mastronarde, *Preliminary Studies on the Scholia to Euripides* (California Classical Studies, 6], Berkeley 2017.

- D. J. Mastronarde, “Authority and the Tragedians: The Evidence of the Scholia on Tragedy,” forthcoming in *Aevum Antiquum* 2025.
- K. McNamee, *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt* [American Studies in Papyrology, 45], New Haven 2007.
- R. M. Piccione, “Von der Bühne in die Bücher: Zur Dynamik der Euripides-Überlieferung,” in M. Schramm (ed.), *Euripides-Rezeption in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin and Boston 2020, 43–62.
- F. Pordomingo, *Antologías griegas de época helenística en papiro* [Papyrologica Florentina, 43], Firenze 2013.
- V. Valiavitcharska, “Rhetoric in the Hands of the Byzantine Grammarian Author(s),” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 31:3 (2013) 237–260.

## Appendix

I. Technical rhetorical terms used in labels in Scholia on *Orestes* 1–1100

Sigla are those used at EuripidesScholia.org. (H) = found in corpus of Hermogenes and commentators on it. \* = found in a discursive note of older scholia (citation in parentheses)

ἀδολεσχία	ZlZmGu
ἀνασκευή (H)	T
ἀνατροπή (H) τῆς εἰσβολῆς τοῦ ἐλέους	Zu
ἀναφορά (as reference to an authority) (H)	T
ἀνθυποφορά* (H)	Y <sup>2</sup> (Sch. vet. Or. 423.01)
ἀντέγκλημα (H)	MnPrB <sup>3</sup>
ἀντίθεσις ἀντεγκληματική (H)	V <sup>3</sup> FGMnSY <sup>2</sup> Zu
ἀντίληψις (H)	SGGuZu

ἀντινομία (H)	SSaY <sup>2</sup>
ἀντιπαράστασις (H)	Y <sup>2</sup> Gu
ἀντίστασις, κατ' ἀντίστασιν* (H)	V <sup>3</sup> GMnPrRwSY <sup>2</sup> TGuZuB <sup>3</sup> (Sch. vet. Hec. 26)
ἀντίφρασις (used in irony)	V <sup>3</sup>
ἀξίωσις (H)	CrOx
ἀποστροφή (H)	AaGTGu
ἀρχὴ τῶν ἀναλύσεων	Zu
(τὸ/τὰ) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄχρι/μέχρι τέλους (H)	V <sup>3</sup> FGPrY <sup>2</sup>
βουλή	B <sup>3</sup>
γλυκύτης (H)	B <sup>3</sup>
γνώμη συμβουλευτική, γνώμη	T
διάλληλος δεῖξις, διάλληλος λέξις (διάλληλος H)	V <sup>3</sup> PrGu
διάνοια (H) λυτική (H) τῆς προβολῆς καὶ τῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄχρι τέλους (H), διάνοια διαλυτική	V <sup>3</sup> FY <sup>2</sup>
διήγησις (H), διήγησις περιληπτική	ZT (Sch. Hipp. 625a)
διπλασιασμός (H), διπλασιάζει (H)	Y <sup>2</sup>
εἰσβολή/ἐκβολή ἐλέους (H)	MnPrRfY <sup>2</sup> ZmGuZuB <sup>3</sup>
εἰσβολὴ νόμου	T
ἐμπερίβολος (H)	Rf
ἐμφαντικὸν* (H)	Gu (various sch. vet.)
ἐναρκτικόν	Zu
ἐνθύμημα, ἐνθύμημα ἐνστατικόν (cf. ἐνστατικὸν ἐπιχείρημα H)	T
ἐνστασις	TY <sup>2</sup> Gu (cf. Sch. V Or. 414.05)



ἐξ ὑπολήψεως (H)	Υ <sup>rubr</sup>
ἐπενθύμηα (H)	T
ἐπιδιόρθωσις (H), ἐπίκρισις (H) ... ἢ καὶ ἐπιδιόρθωσις καλουμένη, ἐπιδιορθοῖ τι	AaFRfTZuGuB <sup>3</sup>
ἐπίλογος (H)	T (cf. Sch. V Or. 1545, as emended by Münzel)
ἐπιστροφή, ὑποστροφή (H) καὶ ἐπιστροφή	PrS
ἐπιχείρημα* (H)	Zb (Sch. B Med. 538)
ἐργασία (H)	MnPrZbTG <u>u</u>
ἐφερμηνευτικόν	Pr
θέσις/ἄρισ (the two parts of ἀντίθετον) (H) check	SaZZmTG <u>u</u>
κακόζηλον (H)	Mn
καραδρομή (H) καὶ καταφορά (H)	B <sup>3</sup>
κατασκευή* (H), κατασκευαστικόν (H)	MnPr (Sch. Hipp. 695a1, cf. Sch. V Or. 1.02)
λύσις τοῦ ἀντιπίπτοντος (H)	ZuB <sup>3</sup>
λυτικόν (H)	Mn
μεσεμβόλημα	PrZm
μετάληψις (as στάσις in an argument) (H)	V <sup>3</sup> GGuY <sup>2</sup>
μετάστασις (H)	V <sup>3</sup> AaGMnPrRRfY <sup>2</sup> ZbTG <u>u</u> ZuB <sup>3</sup>
παράδειγμα (H) check	ZbTG <u>u</u> B <sup>4</sup>
παράλειψις (H) [or παράληψις by itacism]	VV <sup>1</sup> V <sup>2</sup> MnSaGuB <sup>3</sup> , Thomas
παράλληλος δεῖξις	F
παρασιώπησις	MnSaZmZuGu

παρένθεσις (H)	B <sup>3</sup>
παρήχησις (H)	V <sup>3</sup> AaMnPrSZmTG <u>u</u>
πηλικότης ἀπὸ μείζονος, πηλικότης ἐξ ἑναντίου	V <sup>3</sup> GMnPrY <sup>2</sup> Zu
προβολή (H)	V <sup>3</sup> FPrY <sup>2</sup>
προδιόρθωσις (H), προδιόρθωσις καὶ προκατάστασις, προδιόρθωσις καὶ προκατασκευή (H)	MnTZmGuB <sup>3</sup>
προκατάστασις (H)	V <sup>3</sup> ZZmTG <u>u</u>
προοίμιον* (H)	Y <sup>rubr</sup> T (Sch. Hipp. 616a)
πρότασις (H), πρότασις προσφωνη(μα)τική	SaV <sup>3</sup> T (cf. Sch. V Or. 1.02)
πρωθύστερον*	Pr (Sch. vet. Hec. 762, cf. Sch. V Or. 702.05)
συγγνώμη, συγγνωμονικὸν σχῆμα	MnPrB <sup>3</sup>
σύγκρισις (H), κατὰ σύγκρισιν (H)	V <sup>3</sup> GY <sup>2</sup> Gu
σύντομος ἀπάντησις (H)	Gr
σύντομος εἰκὼν, σύντομος παραβολή	MnPr
συντρέχον(?)	B <sup>3</sup>
στοχαστικόν* (H)	G (Sch. Hipp. 151a1)
σχῆμα ἀντιθετικὸν (H), ἀντίθετον (H), ἀντιθετικόν, ἀντίθεσις*	V <sup>3</sup> GMnSY <sup>2</sup> GrB <sup>3</sup> (Sch. B Alc. 693; Sch. V Tro. 906; cf. Sch. V Hipp. 616a)
σχῆμα ἀποθετικόν, ἀπόθεσις	STZuB <sup>4</sup>
σχῆμα βαρύτητος (H)	MnS
σχῆμα βίαιον, βίαιον, ὄρος βίαιος (H), βιαία λύσις	V <sup>3</sup> FGMnPrRfTY <sup>2</sup> GuZuB <sup>3</sup>
σχῆμα ἐκ περιουσίας (H)	ZbTZu

σχῆμα ἔμφαντικὸν (allusive, indirect expression) (H)	V
σχῆμα ἐναντιοφανές	FPrY <sup>2</sup> (cf. Sch. VRw Or. 424.02)
σχῆμα ἐναργείας	Rf
σχῆμα ἐσχηματισμένον, ἐσχηματισμένον, ἐσχηματισμένως* (hidden meaning) (H)	Pr (Sch. B Hipp. 208a1)
σχῆμα ἐπιτρέχον (H)	B <sup>3</sup>
σχῆμα ῥητορικὸν	PrS
σχῆμα σεμνότητος (H)	Pr
τετράκωλος περίοδος (H), τετράκωλος, περίοδος τελεία ἀπλή διμερής	SaTZc
τροπικὴ λέξις* (H)	Pr (Sch. vet. Med. 910)
τρόπος ἐτυμολογικός	V <sup>2</sup> GKZmGu
ὑποβολή (H)	R
ὑποθετικὸν (H), καθ' ὑπόθεσιν* (H)	VV <sup>1</sup> V <sup>3</sup> F <sup>2</sup> PrMnSY <sup>2</sup> (Sch. Or. 646.03)

II. List of lines in the triad plays excerpted in *gnomologicum Vatopedianum* (gV) or Stobaeus, or marked with marginal signs for γνωμικόν (γν), ὠραῖον (ὠρ), or σημείωσαι (ση). The signs have been recorded from the witnesses of the older scholia (HMBOVC), from two representatives of the *recentiores* (RMn), two Mochopulean copies (XbXo), two Thoman (ZZm), and Triclinius' autograph copy (T).

<i>Hecuba</i>	377–378 Stobaeus
227–228 gV, γν R	378 γν ZMT
228 γν XoZZmT	379–381 gV, Stobaeus, γν R
234–235 (or 235–237) ωρ Zm	379 γν ZT
253–257 gV, γν R	497–498 gV
254 ωρ ZbXoZ	551–552 ση B
279 ωρ Zm	570 ση B
282–285 Stobaeus	585–602 gV
282–283 gV, γν R	592–602 ωρ R
282 γν VXbXoZmT	592 γν VZmT, ωρ M, ση B
283 γν VZ	596 γν VZT
285 ωρ V	600–602 Stobaeus
291–292 gV	600 γν Zm, ωρ R ση B
291 γνV, ωρ XbZ	606 γν ZZm, ωρ M
293–295 gV, Stobaeus	622–628 gV
294 γν ZZmT	623 ση B
296 ωρ M	626 γν OV, ωρ Zm
306–308 gV, Stobaeus	638 (lyric) γν O, ωρ Zm
306 γν VRZZmT	760 ωρ? R
307 γν M	799 γν BO
311–312 gV	805 Stobaeus
311 γν VT, ωρ MRZ	807 γν O
317–320 gV	808 ωρ Zm
317 ωρ M	814–819 gV, γν R
328–331 gV	814 ωρ MOZZm, ση B
332–333 gV, Stobaeus	820 γν R
332 γν ZZmT	831–832 γν R
370–371 gV	831 γν ZZmT
375–378 gV, Stobaeus	836 γν Zm
375 gV, γν VRXbZZmT, ωρ M	844–845 Stobaeus, γν R

844 γν MOXbZZmT	
846 γν MT	<i>Orestes</i>
864 gV, γν MBZmT	1–3 gV, Stobaeus
865–867 gV	1 ὥρ V, γν ZZmT
884 γν M	66 ὥρ ZmT
898 gV	70 gV, γν BOZZmT
902–904 gV	100 gV
902 γν OZm, ωρ T, ση B	108 gV, Stobaeus, γν H
956–960 γν. R	126–127 gV, γν HT, ωρ ZmT(or a.c. T)
956–957 gV, Stobaeus (includes preceding φεῦ)	211–214 Stobaeus
956 γν MORZbZZm	211 ωρ V, γν? R
975 ση B	213–214 gV
984 BO	213 γν VXo
1107 γν ZZm	214 gV
1178–1182 Stobaeus, γν ὄλον Zm	229–233 Stobaeus
1178 γν Z, ωρ OV	229 γν ZmT
1181 γν BOVXb, ωρ MO	232 gV, ωρ Mn, γν XbXoZZmT
1183–1186 Stobaeus	234 γν Mn
1185 ση B	235–236 Stobaeus
1187–1194 gV	236 gV, γν BOMnT
1187–1191 γν ὄλον Zm	251–251 Stobaeus
1187–1188 γν Z	251 ωρ M, γν Xo
1187 γν V	258 Stobaeus
1226–1227 gV	299–300 γν Z
1226 γν BOVXbZZmT, ωρ R, ση B	300 gV, γν OVRMnXbXoZmT
1237 γν O	314 γν Zm
1238–1239 gV, Stobaeus	315 γν? M, γν Mn
1238 γν Zm	340–344 (lyric) γν ὄλον Z
1248 ση B	340 (lyric) gV, γν OVRMnXbXoZmT
1250 ωρ ZmT, ση B	386 gV
1254 ση B	388 gV
	390 g

395–396 Stobaeus  
 397 γν? V, γν ZmTB<sup>3</sup>  
 398–399 Stobaeus  
 413 gV, γν OMnZm  
 423 γν O  
 424 gV  
 449 γν MBOV  
 450–451 gV  
 454–455 gV  
     454 γν ORZZmT, ωρ VR  
 478 γν VMnXbZT  
 485 ωρ Zm  
 486 γν Zm, ωρ T  
 488 γν ZmT  
 540 γν MB  
 542–543 gV, Stobaeus  
     542 γν OVXbZmT  
 602–606 gV, Stobaeus  
     602 γν OXbZZmT  
     605 γν OXbZZm  
 627–628 (or 628?) γν O  
 638–641 gV  
     638–639 γν ORZZmT  
     640–641 γν RZmT  
 665–668 ωρ R  
     666–668 gV  
     666 γν OZmT  
 670 gV  
 694ff. γν ὅλον Zm  
     694 ωρ R, γν? Mn, γν T  
 696–701 Stobaeus, γν ὅλον T  
     696 γν MnXbXo  
 703 γν OT  
 706–709 γν R  
     706 γν XbT  
     708 γν OVZZmT  
 715–716 γν BORT, ωρ Mn  
 727 γν OMnZbZmT  
 732 ωρ C  
 735 γν OV  
 737 gV, γν VZm  
 754 γν OV  
 772 gV, γν ZZm  
 773 γν Zm  
 792 gV  
 794 gV, γν O, ωρ C  
 802 γν BO  
 804 ωρ Zm  
 805 γν OVMn  
 823–824 (lyric) gV  
     823 ZmT  
 895 γν MBOVXoZZmT  
 907–913 γν ὅλον Zm  
     907–910 Stobaeus  
     907 γν ORMnXbZT  
     909 γν MnXb  
 1024 γν BOV, ωρ T  
 1034 gV  
 1082–1083 gV  
 1084 γν RXbZZm, ωρ BMn  
 1086 γν Mn  
 1103 γν OV, ωρ BO  
 1115 γν ZZmT, ωρ V  
 1140 ωρ T

1155–1157 gV	355 γν BMnZm
1155 γν HRXoZZmT, ωρ M	357–360 Stobaeus
1161–1162 gV	358–360 gV
1162 Stobaeus	360 ση Xb
1175–1176 gV	374–375 gV
1175 ωρ ZZmT	374 γν BMnZmT
1182 gV, γν T	386 gV, ωρ ZZm
1204–1205 Stobaeus	388–391 Stobaeus
1224 γν C	388–389 gV
1225 ωρ? M	388 ωρ R, ση Xb
1348 ωρ Mn	391–392 Stobaeus (quoting Musonius)
1361 γν V	392–397 gV
1509 Stobaeus, γν VMn	392 Stobaeus
1514 γν V	393–394 cross in margin O
1523 gV, Stobaeus, ZZmT	393 γν T
1545 (lyric) γν Zm	395 γν BZmT, ση Xb
1552 γν ZmT	403 gV (run on from 397), γν BOVT, ωρ R, ση Xb
<i>Phoenissae</i>	405 γν BT, ωρ OV
3 Stobaeus	406–407 gV
18–20 Stobaeus	406 γν Zm
34 ωρ R	438–440 gV, Stobaeus
86–87 γν R	439 γν BZZmT, ωρ R, ση XbZZm
86 γν MnZm, ωρ OZ	442 γν BMnZZm
198–201 gV, Stobaeus	452–454 gV
198 γν MnXoZZmT, ωρ V, possibly also δόκ(ιμο)ν Mn	452 γν ORZmT (Zm crossed out)
270–271 gV	453 γν BVZZm, ωρ Mn
270 γν OV(Mn?)ZZmT, ση Xb, pointing hand B <sup>rec</sup>	454 ωρ Zm
354 γν R	461–464 gV, γν ὄλον Zm
355–356 gV	461 γν OVMnXbZT, ωρ VRXb
	462 γρ R
	467 ωρ Zm

469–472 gV, Stobaeus  
     469 γν RZZmT, ωρ O  
     470 ση Xb  
 494–496 gV  
 499–502 gV  
     499 γν ZZmT  
     501 ωρ Mn  
 503–506 Stobaeus  
 507–510 gV  
     509 γν ZmT  
 516–517 ση Xb  
 520 ωρ ZZm  
 524–525 Stobaeus, γν R  
     524 γν BMnZT, ωρ OZm, ση Zb  
 526–527 gV (run on from 507–510)  
     526 γν MnT  
 528–532a gV  
     528–530 Stobaeus  
     528 γν VRMnZT  
 538–540 gV  
     538 γν BZZmT  
 552 ωρ Zm  
 554–558 γν ὄλον Zm  
     554 Stobaeus, γν RZ  
 555–558 gV  
     555 γν MnT, ση RXb  
     556–557 Stobaeus  
     556 ωρ R  
     558 γν RMnT  
 584 ωρ 584  
 597 gV, Stobaeus, γν MnXbZmT, ση Xb  
 599 Stobaeus, γν ZZmT, ση Xb  
 689 (lyric) γν ZZmT  
 721 gV  
 726 γν OV  
 731 gV, ωρ T  
 772 gV  
 814 (lyric) γν RZZmT, ωρ V<sup>rec</sup>  
 878 ση ZZm  
 889 ωρ Xb  
 917 gV, ωρ Xb  
 920 γν V, ωρ Xb  
 922 ωρ Xb  
 954 ωρ ση Xo  
 965 gV, γν RXbXoZZmT  
 1015–1018 Stobaeus  
     1015 γν RXoZZmT (possibly a tiny  
     trace at trimmed left margin M)  
 1200 γν BV  
 1214–1216 gV  
 1320–1321 Stobarus  
     1320 γν V<sup>rec</sup>XoZZmT, ωρ Mn  
 1446 gV  
 1447–1452 Stobaeus (quoting Teles)  
 1595–1596 gV  
 1622–1624 gV  
     1623 γν VR  
 1680 gV  
 1762–1763 gV, γν Z  
     1763 γν VRXo, ωρ Zm



