Some XV-Century Truths in Apollonius

Graham Speake

This article concludes my discussion of the D-manuscripts of Apollonius Rhodius. In an article entitled “The So-called D-Manuscripts of Apollonius”¹ Francis Vian and I considered the integrity of the D-group, its relation to the rest of the transmission, and the editorial techniques employed by its scribe, Demetrius Moschus. We established the independence of each ms. and concluded with the possibility that any single ms. may be the unique witness to an otherwise lost reading of either of the first two families. I followed this with a paper on “The Scribal Habits of Demetrius Moschus”² in which I classified and discussed the degenerative changes that occurred in these mss. as a result of Moschus’ tampering with the text: he emerged a reckless fellow but by no means a stupid one. In this final episode I shall attempt to penetrate beyond the tangled web of corruption and contamination that has grown over these mss. in order to lay bare what is most valuable to us in our reconstitution of the text, namely the unique preservations of the truth, readings which may be described as ancient or Apollonian and which are not preserved or conjectured in any other established line of the transmission.

In the pages that follow I list the readings from mss. of the D-group that I would print in a text of the Argonautica. We have already seen that Moschus, fortified by his good knowledge of Homer and his own attempts at hexameter poetry, felt no hesitation in changing and correcting—or even improving, to his mind—the copy before him. He was thus a more significant force in the transmission of the text than the traditionally selfless ‘Byz. anon.’ Nevertheless he was the scribe of four mss. of the D-group and I shall continue to refer to him as ‘the scribe’, having thus warned the reader not to be misled by my use of the term. In assessing the good readings carried by mss. of the D-group I shall be concerned primarily with whether or not they provide us with a text that Apollonius wrote (or at least might have

¹ GRBS 14 (1973) 301-18.
written); but mindful of the warning issued above about Moschus as ‘scribe’, I shall not hesitate to speculate on how these readings come to be found in our mss., even if it may appear to the reader that the inevitable and sometimes insoluble contest between textual authority and scribal interference is of purely academic interest.

As before the mss. discussed are:

M  Milan, Ambros. 426 (H.22 sup.) (Books 1 and 2), early XVI century
R  Vatican, gr. 1358, ca 1505, Demetrius Moschus
Q  Vatican, gr. 37, ca 1491–1514, Demetrius Moschus
C  Rome, Casan. 408 (G.III.5), 1490–1510, Demetrius Moschus
D  Paris, gr. 2729, 1490–1510, Demetrius Moschus
d  Collective siglum for the group M R Q C D

The lemmata are taken from Fränkel’s Oxford Classical Text (Oxford 1961). Other editions cited are those of Brunck (Strasburg 1780), Wellauer (Leipzig 1828), Mooney (Dublin 1912; repr. Amsterdam 1964), Vian (Book 3, Paris 1961), and Livrea (Book 4, Florence 1973).

Book 1

148 τοῦτον ἦγε M R Q, τοῦτο δ’ ἦγε cett. The relative τοῦτο is supported by Fränkel’s references (23, 35, 119, 180, 212). It is surely a conjecture in our mss., one that was first made in modern times by Herwerden. Vian argues for the parataxis.3

285 κενοίκι d, κεν εἶχε cett. This is the reading of schol. P and has stood in the text since Brunck’s edition. Perhaps it is a happy accident in d, though the scribe’s eye could easily have strayed to the scholia. None of the d-mss. in fact contains scholia, and this is perhaps an argument for suggesting that Moschus’ working copy did.

335 ἔπιπένευσεν] ἔπιπενεύσεως R Q C D. The subjunctive is supported by PSI 1478. There is a close parallel (but with κε) at Odyssey 9.138f:

εἰς δ’ κε ναυτεῖν
θυμὸν ἐποτρύνῃ καὶ ἔπιπενεύσεως ἀπήταυ.

We have seen so many instances of change for the sake of Homericism4 that this is most probably a conjecture.

403 ἐπάκτιον M, ἐπακτίον cett. The genitive is absurd here when followed by ἀκτίον in 404. Brunck’s parallels (359, 2.689) would suggest that this is a conjecture; but it could be a mere accident.

3 REA 75 (1973) 93 (ad 2.376).
565 χεδον R Q, coni. Brunck, χεδον cett. The aorist is clearly required here. This verb regularly causes confusion, cf. Fränkel's references.

625 ἰδαντί] ἱέροντι MRQ. It is easier to consider this a preservation of the truth which in other mss. has been displaced by the intrusive gloss ἰδαντι than to account for corruption in the opposite direction.

643 Ὑ οἱ D, Ἕ cο cett. We may assume that Apollonius had some rudimentary knowledge of the digamma which precludes the reading of Ἕ here; the corruption is common in mss. of Homer (cf. Wellauer ad loc. and Leaf on Iliad 6.90). We may with equal certainty assume that Moschus knew nothing of it except what he had observed from reading Homer and that any mss. of Homer he may have seen are likely to have contained the corruption. It follows, then, that this would be a conjecture beyond his powers and must be a case of genuine preservation.6

802 μηνις C, μητίς L, μητίς P. Oxy. 2698, μητίς cett. Commenting on the superscript letter in the papyrus, Kingston writes: "If this letter is ν, μηνις, as conjectured by Fränkel, was at least a variant in antiquity. It is also interesting to note that, although the coincidence is no doubt fortuitous, L, a tenth-century ms., not only reflects an ancient pair of variants, but also reproduces, almost letter for letter, the word + variant arrangement of Π."7 The superscript letter in L has been satisfactorily explained by Campbell,8 who at the same time commends Fränkel's conjecture. It is not so easy to account for the appearance of the truth in C. The scribe might be thinking of the first line of the Iliad, where Achilles' μηνις is ἀδελφόμενη. It is tempting to class this reading as a genuine preservation, but our knowledge of the scribe's tendency to Homericize at every possible opportunity prevents our considering any origin for it other than degenerative change.

805 ἀπεεεμένοντο D, ἀπεεεμένοντο cett. Even Wellauer, who has little respect for D, accepts this reading. In Homer the word is used in the passive to mean 'to flee'; the active occurs at Nic. Ther. 77 and AP 9.642. The unfamiliarity of the word suggests a genuine preservation, but it could be accidental confusion of the prepositional prefix.

811 κοῦραι] τε κοῦραι C, τε κόροι LA, τε κόραι R Q DSE. With the

6 See Mooney, Appendix II, p.416.


8 M. Campbell, CQ n.s. 19 (1969) 271.
exception of H.Cer. 439 Homer and Apollonius use the form κοῦρη exclusively. C's retention of τε suggests that, if not an accident, this reading is a conjecture, perhaps influenced by the occurrence of the word at 801 and 818.9

944 ἣρέδθοντο MRQC, ἣρέδθονται cett. Past tenses are needed both here and in 942. Emendation here is easier than two lines above.

955 εἰρύσαντες C, εἰρύσαντες MRQD, εἰρύσαντες cett. C's εἰρύσαντες may be closer to the truth than the quotation from Heliodorus' scholia to Dionysius Thrax accepted by Fränkel: ἔξερυσαντες would explain the compound in εἰρύσαντες, the reading of most mss. Alternatively it could be a corruption of εἰρύσαντες. But particularly in view of D's behaviour at 987 (ἔξερυσαν for ἐξήλασαν) and 1276 (ἐξ δ' ἅρσι νησί by tnesis with εἰρύσαντες), the reading of C here seems most likely to be a conjecture. Vian argues persuasively10 for the retention of the vulgate εἰρύσαντες.

1019 φατίζεται ἡδ' ἔτι] φατίζεται εἰς ἔτι D. Was this taken from the scholia Parisina to 1.1109, or an independent conjecture, or a genuine preservation? Perhaps most likely it is an ancient variant which has found its way into the text.

1233 μόλις M, μόνις cett. μόνις is the Homeric form (which we are not surprised to see retained by the Moschan mss.), but our texts of Apollonius generally show a preference for the later form. Through M it reached Vat.Pal. 150 and the Aldine edition, but its appearance in M is less easy to account for. Perhaps the scribe is reminded of 3.634, but since he does not even copy Book 3 we should not discount the possibility of a genuine preservation.11

1323 ἀναπλήκειν] ἀναπλήκει M. Platt was probably right12 to prefer the aorist after ἐκπλήκει in 1318 and ἐκτελέσαι in the scholia Parisina. But the proximity of ἐκπλήκει also prevents our considering any possible source other than conjecture by the scribe of M.

Book 2

34 ὀριτρεφέως] ὀριτρεφέως RQD. Purely a matter of orthography.

108 δεξιτερῆς κκαίης MRCD, δεξιτερῆς κκαίη QLAG k. This may

9 Vian retains τε κόραι on the grounds that its correction introduces too many consecutive spondees.
11 Vian believes that here Apollonius uses μόνις exceptionally because he is quoting II. 21.417.
12 JP 35 (1919) 84.
be the reading of $S_{pc}$, with which ms. $d$ not infrequently shares an interesting reading. On the other hand, the truth would be obvious to any scribe who gave a moment's thought to what he was copying. Either this is further evidence of a link between $d$ and $w$ or Moschus is thinking for himself.

119 $\mu\ell\alpha\nu$ $v$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha$ $\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ $D$, $\mu\varepsilon\gamma\alpha\nu$ ($\mu\ell\alpha\nu$) $v$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ $\text{cett.}$ $P.Oxy.$ 2697 preserves $\alpha$$\nu$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ in the margin but not, unfortunately, the reading of the text. “The conjecture of Sanctamandus seems to be confirmed,” writes Kingston. “But what did the text read? To write $\alpha$$\nu$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ in the margin is not a wholly effectual way of correcting $\mu\ell\alpha\nu$ $v$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ to $\mu\alpha\lambda\nu$ $\alpha$$\nu$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$, if this is what the corrector had in mind.” I suggest that the text read not $\mu\ell\alpha\nu$ $v$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ but the unmetrical $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha$ $v$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$. The rarity of the word $\alpha$$\nu$$\text{teta}\gamma\omega\nu$ is not, as Kingston thinks it is, the reason for its presence in the margin, but it is the reason for its corruption, which involves no more than the removal of one letter. Now $\alpha\lambda\varphi\alpha$ $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha$ is a common Homeric combination (cf. e.g. Iliad 4.70), substitution of which would be by no means beyond the powers of Moschus. How are we to decide whether the reading is the result of genuine preservation of an ancient error or another Homericism no older than the pen of Demetrius Moschus which brought him within a $\nu$ of the truth?

243 $\chi\varepsilon\rho\iota$ $d$, $\chi\varepsilon\rho\iota$ $L A G k$. Vian confirms that this is the reading of $S$ and perhaps of $B_{pc}$, but the possibility of independent metrical conjecture cannot be excluded.

342 $k\alpha\iota$ $Q$, $k\varepsilon$ $\text{cett.}$ A phonetic “error” on which one would hesitate to base any argument.

389 $k\alpha\iota$ $C D$, $k\varepsilon(\nu)$ $\text{cett.}$ Brunck adopted this reading from $D$ and not, as Fränkel’s apparatus suggests, by conjecture. Moschus, however, could well have conjectured it or even hit on it by phonetic “error”.

399 $K\nu\tau\alpha\iota\deltaoc$ $M Q D$, $K\nu\tau\alpha\iota\deltaoc$ $\text{cett.}$ Purely a matter of orthography facilitated by a glance at 1267 and 4.511. The alternatives are weighed by Campbell, who “would read $K\nu\tau\alpha\iota\deltaoc$ and label $D$’s $K\nu\tau\alpha\iota\deltaoc$ as ‘fort. recte’.”

---

16 It is also the reading of $K$ and $W$ (= Vrat. Rehdig. 35) and the $L$ scholia.
17 RevPhil 47 (1973) 73–74.
460 ἀναφέθεθαι RQ, ἀναφασθεὶς cett. An obvious conjecture—and I am not convinced that it represents the truth, cf. 172 and 1.1343.

474 τὶς MRQD, τὶ cett. The truth is so obvious that one cannot consider any source other than conjecture by the scribe.

498 ἐτήσιαι αὔραι d, ἐτήσιων αὔραι cett. Cf. 525, where LAGMRQ read ἐτήσιαι and SkCD ἐτήσιοι. Fränkel’s explanation of the corruption is attractive: “commixtis oï ἐτήσιαι—accentum nota—et αἱ ἐτήσιων αὔραι.” But if ἐτήσιαι ἄνεμοι is admitted (Hdt. 2.20), why not ἐτήσιαι αὔραι? At all events the likelihood of attraction to the ending of αὔραι restricts our verdict to one of conjecture by the scribe.

499 ἀνωγη MRQ, ἀρωγη cett. This is the rarer word and is surely more suitable when it comes to Zeus’ rôle in connection with the winds. Pace Mooney, there seems to me no reason why 524ff should have any bearing on this word and, pace Fränkel, 556 cannot be the source, as there MRQ read ἀρωγη. Conjecture is possible, but in view of the rarity of the word it seems most likely to be a genuine preservation. For similar confusions cf. 1.1134 ἀνωγη m, ἀρωγη w, 2.556 ἀνωγη Lst ASG, ἀρωγη k.

705 πετραῖη ὑπὸ δειράδη] πετραῖη ὑπὸ δειράς D. Also read by Etym.Gen., according to Fränkel.18 In his introduction to the fragments published in part 34 of Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Kingston writes that “coincidence in superior readings between D and the Etymologicum Genuinum suggests that D had access to a line of the transmission which bypassed the archetype.” My collation of d has yielded no addition to the three examples listed by Fränkel in his Praefatio Critica (the others being 3.201 and 278, q.v.). Here there seems no logical reason for alteration from singular to plural (or vice versa),19 but we can never be sure that we are dealing with a logical scribe. Kingston may yet be proved right, but it is with some hesitation that I would classify this reading as a preservation of the truth.

718 κεῖν MR, κεῖν cett. κεῖν is often dubious in our texts of Apollonius, cf. 1.955, 1224, 4.1217, 1239. For κεῖν cf. 4.1153

κεῖνο καὶ εἰκέτι νῦν ἱερὸν κληίζεται ἄντρον
Μηδείης.

18 Professor Vian tells me: “Selon la collation ordinairement très sûre qui m’a été communiquée par J.-M. Jacques, le Genuinum en 2.705 écrit: πετραῖη ὑπὸ δειράδη. Il semble donc que Fränkel se soit trompé.” He also tells me, however, that δειράς is clearly the reading of Εα here.

19 Professor Lloyd-Jones draws my attention to Soph. Αἴ. 697 πετραῖας ὑπὸ δειράδος, but an isolated parallel from tragedy can hardly affect our decision here.
It is perhaps a conjecture, but more probably an ancient variant (in w? cf. 1.1224).

795 ἐφ' D, ἐφ' cett. ὑπὸ is defended by Campbell.20 If ἐπὶ is right, it can be no more than a scribal conjecture or chance confusion of prepositions. See Campbell (loc.cit.) for further examples of confusion involving prepositions in Apollonius.

829 αἰγανέη C, αἰγανένν cett. When ὑπέγιοι is followed by a genitive of the thing aimed at, the instrument must be in the dative, cf. 1.1313 and Iliad 13.190, though, as Fränkel points out, 2.1212 is an exception.21 The scribe might know that, or it could be a lucky slip.

843 νηίον M, νηίου cett. νηίου produces a not impossible hypallage, but the proximity of ἐκ κοτίνου makes the corruption from νηίος to νηίου more likely than the reverse.

874 ἄλλοι M D, ἄλλοι cett. This word is regularly confused in our mss. Cf. 1.1101 and Fränkel ad loc.

940 ἐ' MC, ἐ' cett. Clearly the preferable connective and a simple enough conjecture.

987 ἔπητες D, ἔπητες M, ἔπητες cett. “Die vielleicht richtige Form,” says Fränkel of D’s ἔπητες,22 but we can make no assertions about the source of a reading the truth of which depends merely on orthography.

Book 3

81 αἰδε D, αἰγε cett. This was conjectured by Platt, accepted by Fränkel, and correctly ascribed to D by Vian. Did Moschus know that διγε in Homer is substantival?

201 ἐμπεφύας R CD, ἐκπεφύ(κ)ας cett. Another reading coincident with Etym.Gen., cf. above on 2.705. ἐμφώ is so much commoner than ἐκφώ from Homer onwards that this could be the conjecture of an intelligent scribe.

264 ἐπετελλετ' R Q, ἐπετείλατ' cett. Also read by P.Oxy. 874. An imperfect suits the tense of θηγκων much better than an aorist. But what scribe would think of that? After all, no editor did before the publication of the papyrus.

278 προδόμῳ ἐν] προδόμου ἐν Q CD, προδόμῳ ἐν cett. This reading, also found in Etym.Gen.,23 gives more support to Kingston’s theory.

---

20 CQ 21 (1971) 414.
21 Cf. also Bühler on Mosch. Eur. 112 and Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 1111.
22 Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Argonautika des Apollonios (Göttingen 1964) 91.
23 The actual reading of Etym.Gen. is ἐνι φιλῇ προδόμου.
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(cf. above on 2.705) than either of the other two. Wilful alteration to the genitive here is improbable and, although it could just be a slip, genuine preservation seems highly likely.

291 χεύετο QC, δεύετο S, χεύετο cett. A common confusion, cf. 1.565 and Fränkel ad loc.

316 ὀππη τε R, ὀπη τε QCDk, ὀπποτε cett. Vian now denies that ὀππη τε was the reading of S^24 but it is in H and N. Palaeographically this is the most likely solution, and it is so easy a conjecture that there is no difficulty about its appearance in unrelated MSS.

379 ἀποπροέκα D, ἐπιπροέκα cett. Both words are Homeric, and ἀπο- appears to give the better sense. A conjecture.

401 ἄγορευεις Q, ἄγορευεις cett. The optative is read by H and N. See above on 316.

548 θερίζει R QD, θερίζει cett. The praesens propheticum of most MSS. is the lectio difficilior (cf. Kühner-Gerth 1.195ff), but the reading of RQD is attractive, especially in view of ἐκκεκα in 550. Another conjecture.

606 δημογέρουει D, δημοτέρουει cett. Pace Lloyd-Jones,25 we do not need a word here to mean ‘chiefs, nobles’ but rather one for the common people. Such a word is provided by most MSS., and Fränkel and Vian are right to print it in the text. δημογέρων is Homeric (Iliad 3.149), as δημοτέρος is not; once again Moschus is tampering with the text, and this alteration should have been printed in my previous article on his scribal habits under the heading ‘Homericism’.

879 διεξελάγει RQC, διεξελάγει cett. This conjecture, which appears also in Vat.Pal. 150, is no doubt influenced by ἐλαεν in 872.

909 μετὰ εφίεω R QD, κατὰ εφίεω cett. P.Oxy. 691 has μετ, which was conjectured by Stephanus and, in view of Iliad 1.368, is obviously correct. Here again Moschus is either turning his knowledge of Homer to excellent use or offering another genuine preservation.

1034 ἐν QCD, ἐπὶ cett. If this is the truth, the scribe probably hit on it by conjecture or by simple confusion of prepositions. The passage is elucidated by Campbell, who supports ἐπί.26

1086 ἐὑρρειτός d, ἐὑρρυτος k, ἐὑρρηνος LASG. The reading of d seems to have been a variant in the archetype, cf. Fränkel ad loc. The

---

24 He believes that ὀπποτε has been corrected to ὀππητε.
scribe may have found the correct spelling either by genuine preservation or by phonetic 'error'.

1155 ἀνιῶσεὰν R Q D, ἀρ’ ἰῶσεὰν cett. "Est ea correctio librarii, qualibus plenus est deterrimus ille codex, eaque minime necessaria." So comments Wellauer, who, had he but cast his eye two lines above to τῆ δ’ ἀρ’, would have seen an excellent reason why this should not be a 'minime necessaria correctio', and had he but collated D for himself, would have been less hasty in his condemnation of it.

1172 ἐμέλλοντο C D, μέλλοντο k Q, ἐμέλλοντο R, μέλλοντο L A G Q P, μύμνοντο S. The reading of C D is also the lemma of the scholia Parisina; but Fränkel is right to suspect the passage.27

1310 ἐπιώντα D L Q, ἐπιώντα cett. "Eine schöne Verbesserung eines hoffnungsvollen liebenswürdigen Schülers Breidenbach," wrote Wilamowitz.28 This is the stock epic phrase for falling on one's knees, but it seems too bold a change for Moschus to have made himself. We have already discussed the significance of the agreement with L Q.29

Book 4

94 φῶνησέν τε R Q D, θάρσωνέν τε cett. Fränkel's reasons for accepting φῶνησέν are rejected by Vian30 and Livrea. προσπτύζετο φῶνησέν τε occurs at 1.1331, and the last two feet are so common in Homer for the introduction of a speech that we cannot but suspect Moschus yet again of Homericism.

142 ἱλγγοοις Q, εἰλγγοοις cett. Purely a matter of orthography.

182 ἦ ῃ R Q D, ἦ δὲ cett. Sense demands ἦ δὲ, and Moschus could easily have found it by conjecture.

233 ἐνιπλῆσει R, ἐνιπλῆσει (sic) D, ἐπιπλῆσει cett. This is obviously the truth, cf. 3.1350 and Odyssey 19.117. Wellauer attributed it to "praepositionum confusio frequentissima," but it could be a conjecture.

247 θυηλὴν d, θυηλὴ cett. The accusative is clearly required and easily conjectured.

345 [τῶ] τῶδε R Q, τόγε S, τό cett. The reading of R Q is not necessarily ancient, but it is at least a possibility, which is more than can be

27 Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios (Munich 1968) 433.
28 Hellenistische Dichtung II (Berlin 1924) 251.
30 REA 75 (1973) 88 n.5.
31 Livrea's report is inaccurate.
said for τὸ which Fränkel prints (with an obelus). His attitude to this crux is uncharacteristically defeatist, though he does propose τόγε δῆ, which is accepted into the text by Livrea. At best RQ present the truth by conjecture; but there would be a case for considering the reading as a degenerative change for metrical reasons.

400 ἀγοιντο RCD, ἀγοιντο cett. The singular is preferable as referring just to Apsyrtus, and corruption to the plural is much more likely than the reverse. But the scribe is meddlesome enough for conjecture to be as likely as genuine preservation.²²

636 ἀθέσφατοι RQ, ἀθέσφατον LASG C, ἀθέσφαται KD. Apollonius is concerned not with the size of continents but with the dangers his heroes faced on the waterways of Europe. So it is the lakes that need an awe-inspiring epithet (cf. βαθὺν 627, κυκώμενον 629, ἀπειρονα 633); but corruption to ἀθέσφατον after ἡπειρον would be hard to resist. KD retain vestiges of the truth with ἀθέσφαται assimilated to αἰτε in 635 (or even to πέπτανται ?). I do not believe this is a correction that would occur to a scribe.

873 ἀνεπάλμενος d, ἀνεπάλμενος G, ἀναπάλμενος cett. This reading is correctly ascribed to D by both Brunck and Wellauer and is not a conjecture by the latter as stated in Fränkel's apparatus. The verb is ἀνεφάλλομαι, and, pace Livrea, the reading of d is supported by 2.825 and Quintus Smyrnaeus 1.140. G reads ἀνεπάλμενος, and in view of the close link established between d and w,³³ this is most likely a genuine preservation.

1429 πάλιν ἐμπαλιν D, πάλιν ἐμπεδον cett. Fränkel questions the propriety of ἐμπεδον with an aorist verb³⁴ and suggests τοῖς πέδου ἐμπαλιν as a possibility. D's πάλιν ἐμπαλιν is clearly a palaeographical slip, but once again we have to decide at which end of the transmission corruption occurred. If it represents a corruption of πάλιν ἐμπεδον, it is mediaeval (or rather Moschan), but if it is a corruption of <πέδου> ἐμπαλιν, then it must be ancient and a genuine preservation. I am inclined to favour the former but do not entirely discount the possibility of the latter.

1570 ἔξανάγει d, ἔξανάγει k, ἔξανάγει cett. A lucky slip, as proved by the fact that it is also in N, which we now know to be an unrelated MS.³⁵

²² D spoils his good work by writing παρῇ for παρὶ in 399, cf. GRBS 15 (1974) 131.
³³ Noten 601. But see Vian, REA 75 (1973) 97 n.1.
1615 ἐπὶ νειότη RQC, ἐπινειότη cett. Chance again. ἐπινειότη would be a ἀπαξ here, but the corruption hardly surprises us.

The contribution made by $d$ to the text of the Argonautica is small but not insignificant. The ancient readings which it offers us are overshadowed by a greater abundance of corruption and degenerative change. They are there none the less, and now that we know more about $d$'s position as an independent witness in the transmission, we may adopt them without hesitation. As a further result of this newly established independence, $d$, while perhaps not adding a great deal to the text, should become a more frequent visitor to the apparatus criticus, taking its place alongside $m$, $w$ and $k$; and the fact of independence is an eloquent demonstration of how many gaps remain in our knowledge of the transmission of ancient texts.

This discussion of the $d$ group has sidelonged the working habits and editorial technique of a previously little-known Renaissance scribe and added a new name to the history of classical scholarship. But the discovery both of his erudition and of his audacity in tampering with the text has a direct relevance to the readings discussed in this article, and our decision as to how they come to appear in $d$ must be considered and cautious.36

Christ Church, Oxford
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36 I am grateful to Professor F. Vian for criticism of this paper in typescript.