

tional scholia by two hands of apparently the 14th century (*m'* Vitelli). The ms. is regularly quoted as M.

- (ii) Cod. Guelferbytanus, assigned to the 15th century. The *Supplices* and *Oresteia* are in another and later hand than the rest.
- (iii) Cod. Parisinus, assigned to the latter part of the 15th century.
- (iv) Cod. Escorialensis, a paper ms. of the 16th century. The *Supplices* is the only part of Aeschylus which it contains.

The remaining mss. of Aeschylus (Marcianus or Bessarionis of 13th century, Florentinus of 14th, Venetus of 15th, Augustanus of 16th, and Farnesianus 14th (?)) do not contain this play.

It is usual to regard M as the parent of all other existing mss. of Aeschylus, and where the latter differ from M the divergence is put down to conjecture of their copyists. But Keck and others rather assume a common source for the Medicean and the rest than a filiation of the rest to the Medicean. As examples of readings in the *Supplices* in which mss. disagree we may take

69.	$\eta\betaai$ M.	$\dot{\eta}$ καὶ Guelf.
70.	$\acute{e}touimw\sigma$ M.	$\acute{e}tumw\sigma$ (sic) Guelf.
73.	$\ddot{a}r\eta s$ M.	$\dot{a}r\eta s$ Guelf.
530.	$\ddot{o}r\hat{o}n$ M. $\ddot{o}r\hat{o}n$ (<i>m</i>).	$\ddot{o}r\hat{o}n$ Guelf. Esc.
549.	$\tau\grave{a}n \delta' a\hat{v}$ M.	$\tau\grave{a} \delta' a\hat{v}$ Guelf. (first hand).
595.	$Z\eta\tilde{n}\circ s \kappa\acute{t}o\acute{v}$ M.	$\Delta i\circ s \kappa\acute{t}o\acute{v}$ Guelf.
608.	$\acute{a}m\acute{e}m\pi\tau\omega n$ M.	$\acute{a}m\acute{e}m\pi\tau\omega s$ Guelf.
739.	$\kappa\rho e\acute{i}s\sigma\sigma\omega n$ M. ^{ous}	$\kappa\rho e\acute{i}s\sigma\sigma\omega s$ Guelf.
766.	$\acute{e}n \sigma a\rho\gamma\acute{a}n\omega s$ M.	$\acute{e}n \acute{a}r\tau\acute{a}n\omega s$ Par.
767..	$\tau\hat{o}\delta' \acute{e}x\rho i\mu\phi\theta\hat{\eta}n$ $\chi\rho o\acute{v}$ M.	$\tau\hat{o}\delta' \acute{e}x\rho i\mu\phi\theta\hat{\eta}n\omega s$ $\chi\rho o\acute{v}$ Guelf. $\tau\hat{o}\delta' \chi\rho i\mu\phi\theta\hat{\eta}n\omega s$ Par. $\chi\rho o\acute{v}$ Esc.
952.	$\phi\acute{i}l\omega n$ M. ^{ws}	$\phi\acute{i}l\omega s$ Guelf.
995.	$\theta e\acute{l}e\mu\acute{o}n$ M.	$\theta a\acute{l}e\mu\acute{o}n$ Par.
1000.	$\kappa u\acute{\theta}e\acute{r}e\acute{\i}as$ M.	$\kappa u\acute{\theta}e\acute{r}e\acute{\i}os$ Guelf.
1031.	$\gamma\acute{a}m\omega n$ M.	$\gamma\acute{a}m\omega s$ Par.

Considering the number of cases of agreement in errors and peculiarities these divergences are not striking, and it can reasonably be urged that $\acute{a}r\tau\acute{a}n\omega s$ (766), $\tau\hat{o}\delta' \chi\rho i\mu\phi\theta\hat{\eta}n\omega s$ (767), $\theta a\acute{l}e\mu\acute{o}n$ (995) of Par. are emendations, the first two being right and the last not improbable. This, however, is of course incapable of proof. In v. 1031 $\gamma\acute{a}m\omega s$ of Par. is, I believe, the true reading accidentally preserved, whereas M