This is the culminating third of three monographs on the complex manuscript tradition of the ‘Byzantine Triad’, complementing the studies by K. Matthiessen (Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides, 1974) and D. J. Mastronarde–J. M. Bremer (The Textual Tradition of Euripides’ Phoinissai, 1982). D. modestly describes his residual task (‘all that remains’) as being ‘to add a few more details and repair a few more weaknesses in that corner which has remained untouched of the monument erected by Turyn’ (A. Turyn, The Byzantine Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides, 1957). His purpose is in fact twofold: on the one hand to complete the ‘Triad’ picture in respect of Orestes, with a sufficient overall view of the picture as a whole, and at the same time to explain and justify the procedures to be adopted in the apparatus of his forthcoming Euripidis fabulae iii (containing also Phoenissae). It is thus with two predecessors that he is concerned in particular: with Turyn as the pioneer, and with Mastronarde as author of the ‘exemplary’ study at once most recent and most immediately relevant (see also D.’s review of Mastronarde’s Phoenissae in CR 40 (1990), 6–11 [Euripidea 353–61]). It is no coincidence that D.’s study has a similar title and a similar sequence of chapters. ‘Preliminaries’ begins directly with Turyn, and ‘Conclusions’ (a single page) ends with: ‘In short, a more than adequate picture of the manuscript evidence which is available for the constitution of the text is provided by HMBOV(Va)ACFGKLPPrRSXZT gV. There will be few places where this evidence needs to be supplemented by the citation of other manuscripts’. This takes further, and more decisively, the kind of reductive simplification suggested by Mastronarde in his longer ‘Conclusions and miscellaneous notes’, but not put into practice in his subsequent Teubner edition with its 34 + 3 base MSS, and its confusing plethora of group- and subgroup-sigla.

HMBOV(Va) + gV are the veteres; FPrRS adequately represent the

---

group $\Theta$ (FSa; AbR; MnS; Pr) and its associates (RfRw; Aa; Cr), of particular interest as affording evidence, partly colometric, of a different uncial ancestor; A, C and GK (‘we might discard G’) are of good quality, variously linked with the *veteres* and with $\Theta$; X alone suffices for the group $\xi$ (Mastronarde’s $\chi$) with Moschopulean scholia (primarily XXaXb; also AdAnAtDrJMsThXcXdXeXfXgXh etc.); and Z for the group $\zeta$ (ZZbZcZdZmZuZv etc.) with Thoman scholia. With Z, LP (not closely linked in Or.) and T represent the eclectic Thoman-Triclinian branch of the tradition issuing from Thessalonika, T being at once another representative of $\zeta$ as originally written ($T^2$), but also containing Triclinius’ corrections and conjectures, all of which merit reporting; for these additionally ‘Ry is perhaps worth reporting; but Tp may be ignored’. Of the fifty-five MSS analysed D. has personally collated no less than twenty-eight from both microfilm and the original, or entirely from the original, plus a further five late MSS selectively; a very thorough coverage of the MSS located in Rome, Florence, Venice, Milan, Paris, Oxford and Cambridge. Another fifteen he has personally collated from microfilm, slides or facsimile. For only seven does he lean on the reports of others; and these seven include only one (gV) of his élite twenty. It is to be hoped that he will deposit somewhere the raw fruits of this Herculean labour, since his more compact study does not include them in the manner of Mastronarde–Bremer’s ‘Part II’.‡

The detailed analysis of affiliations and multifarious linkages does not make for easy reading, but it is handled with unimpeachable accuracy (so far as one can judge) and clarity of presentation. The conclusions reached are broadly in line with those of both Matthiessen and Mastronarde. Where Mastronarde sounded a note of caution against Matthiessen as to Moschopoulos, D.’s study confirms that Matthiessen was right. We can now decisively abandon Turyn’s hypothesis of Moschopoulanean and Thoman ‘recensions’. Moschopoulos may indeed have introduced some novelties of his own invention, but we have no way of identifying them if they exist. Rather, we must visualize an indefinite number of Byzantine scholars actively interested in the text in the Palaeologan period, and even somewhat earlier, with access to many more earlier MSS than have survived to the present day. Usefully appended in chs. xvii–xviii are résumé lists of what D. judges to be ‘Conjectures in the Medieval Tradition’ and ‘Truth Preserved in a Minority’.

Decisions as to transmitted truth are mostly in line with those of