The Scribal Habits of Demetrius Moschus

Graham Speake

IN A PREVIOUS article Francis Vian and I established the existence and importance of a group of late XV- and early XVI-century MSS of Apollonius Rhodius. This group (known collectively as the d group) suffered much contamination from the rest of the transmission but can be considered to be principally the work of one man, namely Demetrius Moschus, who copied four of the five MSS of the group. His editorial technique has already been discussed. This article is concerned with the alterations Moschus made in the text of the Argonautica.

"The unconscious habits of scribes are as important for an editor to understand as their deliberate actions," Dawe rightly tells us. For this reason I find his use of the general term 'emendation' to cover "anything in which the mind has a part" unsatisfactory, since the mindless is surely as important an indication of the scribe's worth qua scribe as the mindful. I have therefore chosen to employ the term 'degenerative change', coined by Mrs Easterling, in assessing the effect of Moschus' pen on the transmission of Apollonius.

Mrs Easterling begins her discussion of the text of Sophocles' Ajax offered by the 'Roman' family as follows:

Most of the characteristic 'Roman' readings are just the sort one would expect to find in a text that went on being copied so far into the Middle Ages, symptoms, in fact, of the natural process of degeneration. These 'degenerative changes' can be divided into two categories: mechanical errors (which abound in \( \rho \)) and deliberate alterations (in a charitable mood one might call them emendations). These deliberate emendations, though no doubt usually intended as improvements, are essentially corruptions; they are part of the process of simplification and 'normalization' that affects every text in its successive re-copyings.

2 Ibid. pp.315–17.
3 R. D. Dawe, The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus (Cambridge 1964) 47.
4 CQ N.S. 17 (1967) 58.
This seems to me the most realistic approach to adopt. Selected instances of degeneration in the Moschan manuscripts will be discussed under the following heads: (a) alteration on metrical grounds; (b) Homericism; (c) echo other than Homericism; (d) trivial substitution or substitution of a common or late word for a rare or early one; (e) easier syntax preferred; (f) change due to misunderstanding; (g) intrusion of a gloss; (h) other embellishments (which may or may not be mechanical). There will inevitably be some degree of overlap between categories. Whether or not the reader agrees with my classification of the alterations, it will become obvious that we are dealing with a scribe who was well versed in early epic and not inhibited by over-cautiousness. If on occasion he is described as foolish or rash this may be taken as either indirect criticism of his predecessor(s) or a reflection of the fact that even the best of scribes is liable to carelessness.

The manuscripts 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 MRQCD

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), Gillies (Book 3, Cambridge 1928), and Vian (Book 3, Paris 1961).

(a) ALTERATION ON METRICAL GROUNDS

1.19 καμείν] γε καμείν R. γε, “the universal panacea,” comes to R’s rescue, but it is a distinct improvement on καμείν.

334 τοίο] τοίο γ’ D. To avoid the hiatus. We may note another hiatus earlier in the same line, ‘correction’ of which is not attempted. This illustrates the sporadic and unsystematic nature of these alterations.

665 ὑμεῖον δ’ εἴ τις ἄρειου ἐποκ] ὑμεῖον δ’ εἴ κεν τις ἐποκ D. All our mss

Dawe, op.cit. (supra n.3) 44.
read ὑμεῖων with LAPE. D restores the metre and retains the syntax, but at the expense of a vital adjective. Presumably the idea came from the end of 663, εἶ κε δαεῖεν.

976 κλείτη] κλείτη τ' RQ. To avoid the hiatus.

1313 ἐπορέξατο] μεγ' ὀρέξατο MC. An attempt to remove the superfluous syllable in the text of κ (μεγ' ἐπορέξατο). See Fränkel’s apparatus.

2.1 ἐνθὰ δ' ἐσαύ RQC. ἐνθ' ἐσαύ is the reading of BPMD which, as the copyist realizes, does not scan.

143 ἐτάμωντο] ἐλάσσκον MRQ. A correction of Ἐλαύνοντο which D reads here,7 no doubt influenced by δηλασσκον above in 142.

160 ἀγχιάλου φύλλων τῇ περ[] ἀγχιάλω τῇ γάρ καὶ τῇ MRQC. Faced with ἀγχιάλω τῇ καὶ τῇ (κ) the scribe employs γάρ as a stopgap.

256 νόῳ ὕπι] ὕπι φρεὶ MRCD, μετὰ φρεὶ Q. This is the only reading which Fränkel mentions anywhere as proof of D’s descent from B.8 But in fact κ read ταῦτα ἐνιβάλλει (sic EKB); P and ὅ independently: ταῦτ' ἐνιβάλλει θυμῶ P, ταῦτα ἐνὶ φρεὶ βάλλει ὅ. All one can say then is that here ὅ rests on the text of κ.9 To avoid the hiatus Q emended ὕπι to μετὰ.

271 πόντοιο] πόντον R. Faced with πόντοιο φορέ(ρ)οντο (MQCD), the scribe makes the obvious correction.

329 ἐφείμαι] ἐφείμεν MRQ. An attempt to correct ἐμεῖν in D.

397 ἔχονται] ἔσαυ MRQC. An intelligent suggestion to replace ἔχονται, which is omitted by BH.10

513 θέσανν ηρανοὶ] θέσανν ἐπήρανον M. The scribe may have miscounted the number of syllables, or found θέσαν in his model and corrected the wrong word. Alternatively it could simply be faulty introduction of a compound form.

725 πνοίη δὲ] πνοίησι RQ. k could not tolerate the postponement of δὲ and, followed by CD, wrote ὑπὸ δὲ. RQ were driven to correct πνοίη to πνοίησι to give the line a metrical ending.

887 τὸ πάροιθε] προπάροιθε MRQ. CDB omit τὸ; MRQ use the prefix προ- as a stopgap.

---

6 For αἰ κε with the future indicative see Iliad 15.213.

7 See below, p.128, and H. Fränkel, Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Argonautika des Apollonios (Göttingen 1964) 90.

8 Fränkel, op.cit. (supra n.7) 91 n. But see now Speake and Vian, op.cit. (supra n.1) 307–09.

9 I owe this note to Francis Vian.

10 See Speake and Vian, op.cit. (supra n.1) 307.
1103 οὐρανοῦν] ύψόθεν D. MRQC retain k's unmetrical οὐρανόθεν: D's suggestion is not without merit.

1114 κύματα] κύμα τε MRC, κύμα δὲ D. k reads κύμα, which D and MRC attempt to correct.

1165 και ὀμ. M. RQCDB read εἰκαύτε. M sees it is wrong but cannot find the right correction.

1200 δἰον] βα R. C omits δἰον; R seizes upon a suitable replacement.

1240 ἡλθ' ἵνα δ'] ἐνθα δ' ἵνα M. C omits δ'; M attempts to restore the correct number of syllables. Fränkel suggests, quite plausibly, that ἐνθα results from a gloss on ἵνα.

3.223 ἀναβλέσκε] ἀναβλύζεσκε RQ. The uncompounded βλύζω is much commoner than βλύω so, pace Vian, normalization is more likely than assurance of a long ν.

254 δμωαὶ δὲ ποδῶν προπάροιθε] δμωαὶ δὲ πάροιθε C. All MSS omit ποδῶν. C is one degree more corrupt but offers a scannable line of five feet.

305 ξείνων ἡμετέρους ενὶ μεγάρους] ξείνων ενὶ μεγάρους εν ἡμετέρους Q. Q inherits the reading ξείνων from k and successfully restores the metre, though the duplicated preposition is rather clumsy. The transposition of μεγάρους and ἡμετέρους is harder to explain unless one or other had been omitted in the exemplar and inserted above the line.

437 αὐτῷ κεν] τῶ καὶ μοι D. Restoration of the metre but not of the sense. D still has a μοι after μέλοιτο.

445 θηέτο ὀμ. C, βίπτασκε R, κρύπταςκε Q. RQ seem to be following C here and make intelligent, if mutually contradictory, guesses to fill the gap.

529 περιάλλα] περὶ ἄλλων γε C (περὶ ἄλλων cett.). Unsuccessful reappearance of the 'universal panacea', employed no doubt to improve the scansion of the second half of the line, if not of the first.

571 ἄτε πτήσοντας] εἶπτούσοντας RQ. πτήσοντας in CD is the result of iotacism, which also afflicts RQ, but the addition of the prefix ἔπι- is a great improvement metrically. ἄτε of course has no MS authority and is merely Fränkel's suggestion.

673 δάκρυοι] δακρύοις R. The omission of δακρύοις is inherited from k. R attempts correction but is apparently unaware that the second syllable of δάκρυον is short, in spite of its appearance in the next line. But perhaps the scribe is ascribing to Apollonius an arbitrary lengthening of the ν metri causa.
771 εγὼ νῦν ἔνθα κακῶν ἦ ἔνθα] ἐγὼ γ' κακῶν (η) ἔνθ' ἦ ἔνθα RQ. The root of the trouble is omission of νῦν (ἐγὼν for ἐγὼ νῦν by haplography in D) for which RQ are attempting to cover up.

990 κόλ 8' ἂν ἐγὼ τέκσαιμι χάριν μετόπικεθεν ἄρωγης] κόλ 8' ἂν ἐγὼ μετόπικεθε τέκσαιμι χάριν ἐπαρωγής D. The scribe is mistaken about the quantity of the first syllable of τέκσαιμι.

1136 λιποῦε' ᾿ἀπο] λιποῦεά γε RQC. Also the reading of S and Paris.gr. 2844, but the obvious change may well have occurred independently to an intelligent scribe.

1200 ἣνεικε] ἐπένεικε C. k, followed by RQD, has removed the augment: reasonably enough, C makes up the lost syllable with a prepositional prefix.

1210 ὑπένειθεν] ὑψεπεθεν RQ, k, followed by CD, has ὑπερθεν by haplography. The scribe’s remedy is the same as at 1200, but the result is less successful with regard to sense. The corruption was no doubt influenced by καθυπερθε at 1209.

4.277 νῦν μένει] μέμνει RD. Omission of νῦν is inherited from k. RD make up for the lost syllable at the expense of the caesura.

435 ἦ 8' δτε] ἦ 8' δτε δὴ C. Perhaps an inherited conjecture to deal with the omission of a syllable. The form κήρεσσιν survives in H, and B retains a reminiscence of it with κηρύγχιν.

673 οὐδ' ἀνδρεσσι] ἀνδρες R. Another pentameter. QB also omit οὐδ'.

770 θοροῦε] ἄρτο θέουε RQC, ἄρτο θόουε D. All four mss read οὐλύμπουν for οὐλύμπου and insert ἄρτο in an attempt to make the second half of the line scan. Presumably Moschus allowed synecphonesis of -ον ἄρ.

1083 ὑπερψιάλοιο] ὑπερψιάλου RQ. k’s reading of δεινόν for βαρὺν precludes the genitive in -οιο.

1147 ὅφθαλμοις γλυκερῶν πόθον] ὅφθαλμοις γλυκὰς πόθοις Q. γλυκε is commoner than the form γλυκερὸς (though not in Apollonius), so we are surprised not to see it in RC, which, with Q, read ὅφθαλμοις.

1470 ὅπῃ λίπε] ὅθι λέεστο RQ. The scribe finds λέεστο in his model (sic CD); his alteration restores neither sense nor metre (except that the second half of the line now scans).

In assessing these metrical alterations, it is important to remember that Demetrius Moschus was himself the author of a poem in some 460 Homeric hexameters on the Rape of Helen, otherwise known as the
Circa Helenam et Alexandrum.\textsuperscript{11} This poem is highly derivative. Echoes of Homer and Apollonius are particularly abundant, and clearly the poet was familiar with all the relevant source material. Errors in prosody occur—occasional false quantity, absence of caesura, hiatus, others obviously resulting from the contemporary pronunciation of Greek. But they are not numerous nor (on the whole) of a serious nature. We must credit Moschus with a clear understanding of the basic principles of the Homeric metre. By and large this conclusion is supported by the metrical alterations discussed above; there are occasional lapses, but more than once we have noticed the scribe giving closer attention to metre than to sense.

(b) Homericism

1.39 \textit{λόντες} \textit{ίέντες} MRQCD. Perhaps influenced by the passive \textit{συμφορέονται}, but \textit{ήμι} is the usual Homeric word for the movement of rivers, and there is similar confusion in the mss at Iliad 12.33.

753 \textit{τινάκκω} D. \textit{ήμια τείνα} is the Homeric phrase, cf. Iliad 5.262, which the scribe seems to be adapting here.

811 \textit{χήραι τ' επι} \textit{τη} \textit{χήραι} \textit{τε γνωάκες} MR. Thoughtless intrusion of a Homeric reminiscence: cf. Iliad 2.289.

971 \textit{μέλεθαι} MRD. Apollonius does not use this word but cf. Iliad 2.384 \textit{πολέμων μεδέθω}. On the other hand it could be a misreading of \textit{μέλεθαι}.

1062 \textit{διψανόμενων \διέσθαι} MRQCD. Only once in Homer, Odyssey 19.385, which reads \textit{διψανόμενων επιφανείς}. Perhaps we see here a variant from the exemplar.

1226 \textit{εκοπιάς ὀρέων λάχον} MRQCD. Only once in Homer, Odyssey 19.385, which reads \textit{επιφραδέως ὀγορέως}. Perhaps we see here a variant from the exemplar.

2.116 \textit{τάχ' τ' ἀφ D.} This shows some grasp of the use of particles, cf. Odyssey 24.28 \textit{η' τ' ἀφα καὶ} \textit{πρω ψαραστήκεθαι εμελελε μοιρ’ ολόν}. But it could be just another Homericism.

\textsuperscript{11} The only editions known to me are Reggio (Em.) 1499; Alcalá 1519; Rome 1823, ed. I. Bekker; Vienna 1833, ed. A. G. Leukias. It is my intention in time to publish a new critical edition together with a study of the poet.
786 πατρὶς] δουρὶ Q (ita Lv). A reminiscence of Iliad 5.653, in view of which the agreement with Lv may be fortuitous.
833 ψυχορραγέοντα] βαρέα στενάχοντα Q. Cf. 1.388 where MRQCD read βαρν στενάχοντο. In both cases this is substitution of the regular Homeric phrase.
842 See above on 1.1062.
1062 ἀπείσιν ἀρετε] ἀπείς φράξετε D. Cf. Iliad 13.130 and 15.566: the result of an unfamiliar form and reminiscence of the Homeric passages.
1176 κομέονται] γανόωκαι Q. Thoughtless imitation of Odyssey 7.128. 3.20 δόλων] νόον C. For νοεω νόον cf. Iliad 9.104; but this may be mechanical assimilation.
119 ὑπὸ μαξῷ] ἐπὶ μαξῳ D. The more regular expression, cf. Odyssey 11.448, but ἐπὶ for ὑπὸ is a common change.
664 κινύρετο τὴν δὲ τις ἄφνω] τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυν εἶβεν R. Another Homeric formula, cf. Iliad 16.11 τῇ ἰκελος, Πάτροκλε, τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυν εἶβεις. Presumably τῇ ἰκέλη reminded the scribe of the passage in the Iliad which he felt compelled to introduce here. In the next sentence, finding himself in difficulties without τὴν δὲ τις ἄφνω, he resorts to omission of a whole line (666). This is a good example of the lengths to which Moschus was prepared to go for the sake of Homericism, although it may be that he was simply tired and inattentive.
866 ἀλύων] ἀχέων D. It is unlikely that the copyist would have been bothered by the lengthening of the ἀ (for which there is a Homeric precedent at Od. 9.398); he simply prefers the traditional Homericism, cf. Iliad 5.869 and 18.461.
919 ἐπὶ προτέρων] ἐπιχθονίων C. Apollonius is imitating Iliad 5.637, the scribe 9.558.
1262 γυῖων] χειρῶν D. Another Homericism which also occurs at 2.334 and 3.507.\(^\text{18}\)


1373 θεοὶ] θαρσαλέωι D. No doubt influenced mainly by θαρσαλέως in 1370, but also perhaps by Odyssey 19.91 θαρσαλή, κύν ἄδεες.


38 δούλωσι ἔργα] θέκελα ἔργα RQ. A Homeric phrase also occurring at 3.229.


262 γένος] μένος C. For the corruption cf. 1.548 and Fränkel, op.cit. (supra n.7) 134–37; for the phrase cf. Odyssey 8.2.


446 στοναχαί τε γόου τε] πόλεμοι τε μάχαι τε C. A reminiscence of Iliad 1.177 and 5.891.


467 τυτέντος] πεσόντος RQD. Imitation of Iliad 11.250.

497 ἐπαθρήκαντας] ἐσαβρήκαντας R, ἐσαβρήκαντες QD. ἐσαβρέω is Homeric, ἐπαθρέω is not.

591 ἡλιόοι] ὑπεριόνοις D. It does not scan here, but this word is common in Homer as an epithet of the sun; only once without the addition of ἡλιος, at Odyssey 1.24.

654 αἰθαλίνῳ] αἰχαλίνῳ D. Aethalia (the modern Elba) does not appear in Homer, but Oechalia does.

701 μέγα μὲν κοτέει] μέγα μὲν κρατέει D. μέγα κρατεει, but not μέγα κοτεει, is a Homeric phrase.

777 αἰθαλέουι] αἰσταλέουι D. This is a Homeric word fitting the metre and giving some sort of sense, so Moschus employs it.

860 αἱ τε πλαγκταί καλέονται] ἀς τε πλαγκτὰς καλέουσι D. No doubt influenced by Odyssey 12.61 Πλαγκτὰς δὴ τοι τὰς γε θεοὶ μάκαρες καλέουσι.

1067 εἰλεῖτο] ἡλοιεί RQ. Thoughtless imitation of Iliad 1.246.

\(^{18}\) Cf. similar confusion in the mss at Aesch. Pers. 913.
1198 ἄειδων ἐλεισόμεναι] ἄειδων ἀμειβόμεναι D. Imported from Iliad 1.604.

1244 παύρον ἐλειπτο] παῦρ’ ἐλειπτο RQCD. As Brunck pointed out, ἐλειπτο is the Homeric form (II. 2.700); the scribe had no Homeric lexicon, but he knew that ἐλειπτο did not occur in early epic.

1397 ρύετο μηλα] μηλ’ ἕφυλας Q, μηλα ἕφυλας Q, μηλα φύλας C. Reminiscence of Odyssey 12.136 or a gloss.

1674 μοῦνον] λυρός RQCD. Even if the copyist does understand the sense of μοῦνον he prefers to substitute a traditional Homeric epithet.

Simple cases of alteration to suit standard Homeric diction are commonplace in MSS of Apollonius and would cause us no surprise in d. Furthermore, the scholiast often quotes passages from Homer to explain and illuminate the text of the Argonautica; so a scribe’s eye could easily be caught by an attractive phrase in the marginal commentary of his exemplar. But of the readings discussed above, very few can be ignored as normalization to early epic, or for that matter as subtle allusion: most are instances of direct quotation from the Iliad and the Odyssey, often regardless of metre and syntax, and in no single case is the quotation to be found in the scholia.

Here is something truly remarkable in a Renaissance scribe: thorough familiarity with the Homeric poems and a persistent desire to introduce Homeric formulas and phraseology into the text of Apollonius. We know that Moschus made at least two copies of the Odyssey. The evidence accumulated above shows that his knowledge

13 Perhaps a rash assumption. We must examine the possibility of Moschus having access to a Homeric lexicon. That by Apollonius Sophistes exists in only one MS (Coislin. 345, X century) and the chances of its being in the right place at the right time are remote. There are other possibilities: the scholia minora to Homer would provide a kind of lexicographical aid, though of course it is not alphabetical; and R. Reitzenstein (Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika [Leipzig 1897] 335f) tells us “Ein drittes Werk des Oros, welches schon Fabricius nach einer Pariser Hs. erwähnt, trug den Titel περὶ πολυσημάτων λέξεων. Ritschl suchte es vergeblich; die Späteren haben es offenbar vergessen. Das Werk, welches in byzantinischer Zeit viel benutzt wurde, ist uns in Wahrheit nicht fremd.” This work is found in at least three Parisini—2720 (end of the XV century), 2830 (XVI century) and 2558 (end of the XIV century)—and contains many quotations from the Psalms and Homer. It is possible that Moschus had some such work of reference, but even so it is unlikely to have provided him with the comprehensive knowledge of Homeric poetry which he obviously possessed and which can only be obtained from thorough familiarity with the original texts.

of Homer was at least as great as of Apollonius, his fondness for the earlier poet perhaps greater,\textsuperscript{16} and lends support to the theory that he may have employed the same technique in copying Homer as we have suggested for Apollonius.\textsuperscript{16}

(c) **ECHO OTHER THAN HOMERICISM**

1.125 λυρκηφόν] πολυλήφον \textbf{MRQ}. No doubt lifted from 51, but it is a forgivable attempt to correct a still not understood epithet.\textsuperscript{17}

129 ἀπεειλεῖτο] ἀποκάτθετο \textbf{MRQ}. Not without merit: the double compound adds extra flavour and the word occurs again at 3.817 and 1287.

202. πᾶς] νόθος \textbf{MRQ}. An intelligent if unsubtle suggestion which could be the result of a gloss. It is tempting to consider this a metrical emendation, but dangerous to presume upon the metrical skills of Renaissance scribes, even those who were themselves poets. Most likely it is a reminiscence of Orph. Argonaut. 211: ἐν δὲ Παλαιμόνιος Δέρνου νόθος ἠλθθεν νίς.

331 μετέειπεν] προσέειπεν \textbf{C}. Lifted from 294.

457 ἀλλήλοις] ἀλλοθεν ἄλλος \textbf{M}. Cf. Theoc. 1.34 ἀμοιβαίδες ἀλλοθεν ἄλλος νεικείους ἐπέεις (and Ap. Rhod. 1.843). \textbf{M} contains Theocritus as well as Apollonius, so this is very likely an echo rather than a preference for a dactylic ending.

576 μυρία] ἄσπετα \textbf{RQ}. Lifted from 2.143 and 839.

770 ἐγγυαλύξε] ὀπάσεν εἶναι \textbf{C}. Imported from 2.31f.

1115 ποταμοῦ] ἱερὸν \textbf{C}. ἱερὸς is a regular epithet for rivers in Homer and Apollonius. The scribe finds it more attractive than a defining substantive.

1325 ἔλειφθεν] ἔβηκαν \textbf{MRQ}. Lifted from 1285.

2.32 δίπτυχα] δύσετο \textbf{C} (not ἐδύσετο as Fränkel states, \textit{op.cit.} [\textit{supra} n.7]

\textsuperscript{15} It may be relevant that both mss of the Odyssey copied by Moschus are prefixed by the following epigram:

\begin{quote}

υἱὲ μελητὸς ὄμηρεν· εὐ γὰρ κλέος ἀλλάδι πάσῃ
καὶ κολοφῶν πάτρη θῆκας ἐς ἀίδιον.
καὶ τάῦτ' ἀντιθέω ψυχῇ γεννήσακα κοῦρας,
διετάτη ἡμιβάνοι γραφάμενος σελίδας.
ὑμνεί δ'' ἤ μὲν νόστον ἢδυσεῖός πολυπλάγκτον,
ἡ δὲ τὸν ἵσικών δαρβανίδων πάλεμον.
\end{quote}

Authorship has not been established, but it is a reasonable conjecture that the poem may be attributed to the scribe himself.

\textsuperscript{16} Speake and Vian, \textit{op.cit.} (\textit{supra} n.1) 315-17.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. D. N. Levin, \textit{GK} 6 (1963) 9.
90). The result of failure to look ahead to 34, perhaps influenced by 1.1326, where RQCDBP read ἐδικαῖο.

107 τοῦ δ' ἄξον' ἄντος [τοῦ δ' ἄξον' ἄντος D]. A clever anagram possibly affected by ἄξον' ἄντος in 92.

115 ἐλάκας] ἀές MRQ. Also affected by 92, but the scribe has either forgotten that the α is long or permitted internal correction.ayıσσος] ἀντίσσος 1.1195 (and Iliad 10.23).

301 γέροντος] λέοντος. A reminiscence of 1.1195 (and Iliad 10.23).

339 μόρον] οἴτον MR. Imported from 172.

519 ἐφεπτή] ἐνίπτή C. Presumably the scribe meant to write ἐνίπτη, a reminiscence of 3.677 ἐδάγης ἐκ πατρὸς ἐνίπτην, and 4.615 ἄπω ἐκ πατρὸς ἐνίπτης.

749 ἀέλλη] ἀνάγκη MRQC. As a result of 3.430, κακή and ἀνάγκη are inseparable in the mind of the scribe.

811 πανήμεροι ἐψίωντο] πανημέροι πονέωντο MRQ. Lifted from 667.

903 εὐθὺσωντες] εἰρέσιης M. Drawn from 1031.

973 ἄνδιχα] εἰς ἄλα M. Taken from 744.

1134 ἐφέειν] προεκειμέν R. Copied from 1.1336.

3.306 ἄτη] ἄκα C. Imported from 328, though it could be a gloss.

415 ἀθηθή, δαξίων] αἴβα δαξίας D. Both adverb and tense are drawn from 412 αἴβα ταμών.

782 οἶνος] ἄκος Q. Vian is right to keep ἦδος (cf. 908), but we might have expected Q to make the change to ἦδος once he had introduced ἄκος, cf. 2.107 and Homer, passim; but maybe he has 3.253 in mind.

1092 οἴνομα' ἄκοισαί] οἴνομα κόλχων C. Imported from 680.

1351 ὄδοντας] ἄν ὄλην R. The scribe is reminded of the simile at 4.1338.

1358 ἄετράπτουσα] ἄείςουσα RQ. Taken from 1265 or 1379.

4.402 ἄλγος] ἄλλο RQCD. The result of confusion with 3.429f (the only other occurrence of ῥύγιον in the poem).

462 τεχνήκατο] τεκμήριατο C. Imported from 217.

477 τά μὲν θανόντος] θῆκε θυηλῆς C. Lifted from 1.1140.

570 ὄλη] αἴγλη RQD. Taken from 1710.

826 φέρρειν] βάλλειν RQC, θύελλα D. RQC inherit an error arrived at by confusion with the first word of the line; D attempts correction by importing θύελλα from 787 or 834.

912 ἔταφρων] ἄτ' ἄλλων RQ. Drawn from 1.60.

18 On correction in Apollonius see M. Campbell, RevPhil 47 (1973) 83-90.
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1008 πολέμου] ἀνέμου R, κελεύθου Q. Q's error is by confusion with κελεύθῳ in 1007; R's comes from 1.953.
1209 ἐνπᾶς] ἐφετμᾶς R. Cf. 1.279, 2.615.
1333 ἐρημονόμοι] ἐλεονόμοι RQCD. An unfortunate choice for the desert, but these marsh nymphs have already made their appearance twice in the poem and so are more acceptable to the scribe.
1393 κελεύω] ἐπεν CD. It may be just a slip, but probably the scribe is thinking of the simile at 3.1351.
1540 φορέωντο] πονέωντο R. Borrowed from 2.667.

The fact that so many of the changes discussed in this section took place at the end of the line suggests a basic flaw in Moschus' method of transcription. The most likely explanation is that the scribe attempted to take in a whole line at a time when looking at his exemplar and to write it in full without looking back. Inevitably his memory was less efficient towards the end of the line and the penultimate word may well have reminded him of another line perhaps recently copied with the same penultimate word at the same sedes or of a favourite passage elsewhere containing some verbal similarity. In this way many of the above superficially erudite importations may be dismissed as errors of psychological association. This at least provides an explanation for those changes that make nonsense of the line.

(d) TRIVIAL SUBSTITUTION OR SUBSTITUTION OF A COMMON OR LATE WORD FOR A RARE OR EARLY ONE

1.187 ἧμβροτής] ἧμβροτής D.
357 ἐρώτας] ἐλάσωμεν C.
376 πρώτης] προτέρης C.
576 μῆλι] ἐφέπονται μῆλα ἐπονταὶ D.
617 ἐρραίων] ἀλεξ(ε)αν MRQD.
629 ὅπετερον] ὅπειδον MR.
834 φόνον] φίλον C.
885 ὀπάσα] ἀλέσθαι C.
967 ἐμλῆσαν] ἐμμυσῶντο C.
972 ὑποσταχύσκον] ἐπιχυτόσκον D.
1212 ἀπούρας] ἀείρας MRQ.
1289 χόλος] ἄχος MRQ.
1339 μὴν] θυμὸν MRQ.
2.2 ἀγνώρω] ἀμύμω CD.
24 ἀντιάσθαι] δηριάσθαι MR.
96 ἱάχησαν] ὀμάδησαν C (not D as stated in Fränkel's apparatus).
159 μετάπα] κάρηνα MRQ.
286 ἄλτο] ἄρτο MR.
298 ἐδυσα] ἐθησα M.
467 ἐρέτησι] ἔταροισι D.
576 κατένευκε] κατέρνεκε MRQD.
577 αἰνότατον δέος] αἰνότατος χλόος MRQ.
610 ἱρχετο μύθων] ἐκφατο μύθον MD.
812 ἐγκονέοντες] εὐμενέοντες MRQ.
949 ἐέλδετο] ἱμεῖρετο Q.
1032 ἐλιπέτεν] ἡλυθεν R.
1123 ἐποῖσαν] ἱκεσίων M.
1215 ἕδακ] ἐνδόθι MRQ.
1248 στυφετοίς] στιβαροίς C.
1274 ἄρωγος] ἔταρος Q.
3.66 μέγα] πολύ R, πάνω Q.
232 στιβαροῖ] στυγεροῖ CD.
339 κακα] γαίαν D.
383 ἐέλδετο] ἱανέτο Q.
553 ἀμίνεν] ἀρίγεων D.
572 προαιτ] προέρχε C.
712 ἄρας τε στυγερά] ἄρην τε στυγερὴν R.
762 διὰ] κατὰ RQ.
797 αἰχοσ] ἀγος RQCD.
884 σαινουσι] θέουσι D.
886 κούρης] νύμφης C.
900 δὲ κε] δ' ἀν RQ, δὲ γε C.
916 σφεσι] τοῖς D.
1025 κοῦρη] νύμφη C.
1098 κεῖνη] νύμφη C.19
1113 πάντων θέρου] ποντου φορέασ C.
1147 ἕτοι] αὐτὰρ D.
1168 πάντεις μετένεπε] πάντεις εἰσέρρη RQ.
1170 ἕτε' απάνευθε] ἰκτατ' ἄνευθε D.
1372 σόλων] λίθου RQD.
4.19 βρυχήσατ' ἀνὴ] βρυχήσατο φωνῇ C.
57 ἀλέκω] ἱκάνω C.
148 ἐφορμὰν] ἐφικτομ D.
302. ῥόον] πόρον RQ.
392 κεάσαι] κεδάσσαι RQ.

19 As usual, it is the last word of this line that has gone astray, not the first as stated in M. L. West, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique (Stuttgart 1973) 19.
437 κνέφας] νέφος C.
559 κύρης] κουρής C.
567 κουρήν] νύμφην D.
578 ἀδάμας] αὐτάς R, ἀήτας Q.
743 ἐπιλευ] ἔτιν Q C.
871 χρίσεκε] δεύσεκε R.
1071 λεχέεκει] λεχτροις RQCD.
1103 νεῦκος] νόςτον D.
1315 ἢνεικεν] ἢρείς QCD.
1436 ἅβρα] ἅλλων R Q C.
1527 ἄμφαγέρωντο] ἄμφετένοντο R Q C.
1580 χέρσον] νήσον Q.

(e) EASIER SYNTAX PREFERRED

1.711 ἢξερέντας] ἢξερέουσα D. An attractive emendation to the myopic; but where is the interrogative in Iphinoé's speech?
969 ἰγ] καὶ D. The scribe took fright at ἰγ as the first word.
2.60 ἐρίδηνεν] ἔρειεν D. οὗ τί bears every resemblance to a direct object. In ἔρειεν the scribe finds a transitive verb fitting the metre, giving some sort of sense, and palaeographically close to the puzzling ἐρίδηνεν.
218 βόσακε] λύσατε MR Q D. SC read λύσακε, which was no doubt a gloss, but regardless of metre MR Q D prefer the active form.
695 ἢξερέοντες] εἰςορόωντες MR Q C. Common in this sedes and an easy change which still makes sense; no doubt influenced by ἐκίδοιεν in 696.
884 ἀπορρίψαντες] ἀπορρίψακεθ D MR Q. No logical reason for this change, but presumably the scribe prefers two imperatives.
3.68 πειρωμένη] πειρώμενος D. We may assume that the exemplar lacked the iota subscript: attraction to the case and gender of the subject of ἀντεβόλησεν is no surprise.
225 προεέσκε] προεέκε Q D, προθέσκε C. “Librarios turbavit minus obvius usus verbi ἰέω active significitis” (Brunck). R Q C have ὁνω for ὃδωρ from 224. Meanwhile Q D have changed to a more regular transitive verb. R keeps κ’s προέςκες; C, taking advantage of the chaos, offers yet another variant of little merit.
276 ὁλῶν] ὁλο D. An intelligent suggestion, probably the result of failure to recognize ὁλον as an adverb.
404 ἱν κ'] αἱ κ’ R Q D. Another intelligent alteration by a scribe
who was not endowed with Vian’s facility for adducing parallels for “une curiosité attestée chez Homère.”

510 ἐντύναιον. Gillies has correctly explained ἐντύναιον for us, but D, in search of a verb to govern ὑποσχείην, finds ἀνών and would have done better to add the prefix ἐξ-.

801 τελέσσαι | τελείθαι D. Unable to find a subject for τελέσσαι in the πρῶς clause, the scribe resorts to the passive.

1139 ἀφ οἰκόνδε νεέθαί | εἰς οἰκον ναίεθαί D. All our mss inherit εἰς from k, which makes the suffix of οἰκόνδε otiose. D realizes this and allows himself (perhaps unconsciously) phonetic corruption from νεέθαί to ναίεθαί, thereby retaining the metre.

1240 ἔθημον | ἔθημος D. An interesting transference of epithet, presumably the result of proximity to οἶκος and Ποσειδάων.

4.1399 ἐφίμυρον | ἐφύμυνον RQC. The scribe prefers a noun to an adjective and finds it from 2.713.

(f) Change due to misunderstanding

1.816 ἄεικέα παίδες ἀμύνον] ἄει παίδες προσάμυνον RQ, ἄεικέα πρόθεν ἀμύνον D. D’s πρόθεν is most likely a mechanical change influenced by πάροιθεν. RQ’s προσάμυνον may be affected by D’s πρόθεν, but more probably ἄεικέα was not understood and so shortened to the more familiar adverb and the prepositional prefix added to the verb metri causa.

2.738 περιτέτροφε πάχην] περιτέτροφεν ἄχην D. The scribe is not familiar with the word πάχην; his treatment is similar at 4.1531.

2.934[ τινάκεει ριπήν] φυλάκεει ριπτήν D. The scribe does not understand the text he is copying and is not averse to writing nonsense.

3.267 ἰκοιζθε ] ἐβητη RQC. ἰκοιζθε, as Vian remarks, is “‘potentiel du passé: ‘comment avez-vous pu aller ... ?’.” The uncomprehending scribe has imported ἐβητη (from 3167).

662 χήρον] φίλον RC. If the scribe did not understand χήρον he might at least have found a substitute that scanned. But it could be a corruption via ψιλόν.

755 ἐθνεν] ἀλεν RQ. The copist does not understand ἐθν(ι)εν and looks for a word to mean ‘bounded with joy’: he finds it at 866.

1111 ὀσσα] αἰσσα RC. Either the scribe did not understand ὀσσα and.

---

21 See below, p.133.
as at 306, resorted to a more familiar phrase; or it is another attempt to enforce Homeric-type formulas in Apollonius.

(g) Intrusion of a Gloss

1.40 ἵκανεν] ἤβαινεν MRQ.
350 γηθόδυνος] γηθόμενος D.
512 αὐθὴ] ὀμφῇ MQ.
601 ἀνέτειλε] ἀνέδραμε MRQ.
625 θάνατο] γέροντι MRQ. The truth?
803 ἐμβαλεν ἄτην] ἐμβαλε νεῖκος C.
837 χατέουσιν ὑπάξεις] χατέουσι παρίσχεις D.
1031 λέκτρον] δόμον D.
1219 ἀλέγοντες] ἁίοντες D.
1228 καλλινάοιο] καλλιρόου D.
1305 πέφυν] κτείνε D.

2.12 θέσμοι] θέμις MRQ.
143 ἐτάμοντο] ἐλαύνοντο D.
183 ἵαλλεν] ἐθηκαν MR.
205 κέκλιτ'] κεῖτο D.
363 κύρει] κεῖται MRQ.
419 γεραῖος] γέρων D.
465 ὅτις ἔξοχος] ὅτις ἄριστος M.
616 ὑπάκε] ἔδωκε M.
670 λεπτὸν] μικρὸν MRQ.
681 ἔλε] ὕλαβε D.
1152 ἀλέγοντες] ἁίοντες M.

3.366 γεγάασι] ἐβλάστησαν D.
862 ἐνέροισιν] νερτέροισιν R.
1000 εὐνασε μίνως] εὐνασεν ἢρως RQD.

4.156 θαλαξ] θαλών C (voluit θάμνων).
422 πόρον] πέμπον D.
1019 μαργυροῦσης] μαχλούσης RQCD.
1665 θέλυε] τέρπε Q.

(h) Other embellishments (which may or may not be mechanical)

1.221 νῶτοις] γαῖς RQ. I can see no motive for this absurdity, and yet I am reluctant to discount it as merely a copyist’s error. γαῖς occurs at 243 and 255, and might have caught the scribe’s eye.22

253 αἰώνι αὖ μέγα δὴ τι δυσάμμορος. ἡ τέ οἳ ἦν] αἰώνα δ’ αὖ μέγα

22 Dr Dawe suggests that it is a relic of a note explaining that νῶτα can sometimes refer to land as well as to people.
MOIRA DUSAMBROPOE EKXETO (ΗΧΘΕΟ M) PANTON MRQ. CDB1P OMIT ΔΗ ΤΙ: MRQ CONJECTURE MOIRA TO FILL THE GAP AND FIND THAT CONSIDERABLE ALTERATIONS TO THE WHOLE LINE ARE NEEDED. THERE SEEMS NO REASON TO SUPPOSE, WITH WELLAUER, THAT THIS REPRESENTS THE READING OF THE PROECDOSIS OR FIRST EDITION.23

361 E1 KE] ΔΦΡΑ MRQ. AN UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT TO CORRECT A FAULTY EXEMPLAR (CF. AI KE D). M7P PRESERVES THE TRUTH.

523 ΔΡΤΟΝΑΣΘΑΙ ΔΡΤΟΝΕΙΒΑΙ CD. A CURIOUS EMENDATION OF TENSE, WHICH BRUNCK UNWISELY ACCEPTS. THE SCRIBE MAY HAVE DOUBTED THE LENGTH OF THE Ν AND HAVE BEEN INFLUENCED BY THE HOMERIC FUTURE ΔΡΤΟΝΕΩ.

538 ΔΡΑΡΤΗΥ] ΕΝΥΣΤΗ MRQ. "MIRA SANE DISCREPANTIA," COMMENTS WELLAUER, AND I CAN SEE NO MOTIVE FOR IT. AGAIN M7P PRESERVES THE TRUTH.

822 ΤΙΝ' Ζ ΦΡΟΝΕΟΙΕΝ] ΔΦΡΥ Ζ ΝΟΕΙΕΝ D. IT IS TO BE ASSUMED THAT AN ANCESTOR OF D OMITTED ΤΙΝ'. THE SOLUTION IS CLEVER: BY REARRANGEMENT OF THE LETTERS THE SCRIBE NEEDS ONLY TO ADD ONE OMICRON TO RESTORE BOTH METRE AND SENSE.

1176 ΗΡΗΣΑΤΟ] ΕΝΑΡΗΣΑΤΟ D. THE SCHOLIAST ADMITS THAT THIS IS AN UNUSUAL SENSE FOR THE UNCOMPONDED VERB, SO WE SHOULD NOT BE TOO HARSH ON THIS READING IF IT IS A CONJECTURE. IT MAY ON THE OTHER Hand RESULT FROM MISCOPYING OF AN AWKWARD PAIR OF WORDS.

1213 ΕΠΕΦΝΕΝ] ΕΕΙΠΕΝ C. A FINE EXAMPLE OF EXCEPTIONAL STUPIDITY BUT CLEARLY NOT AN UNCONSCIOUS ONE, AS IT MAKES A NEAT DOUBLET WITH ΑΚΟΙΣΑΣ, THE ABSURDITY OF THE PREVIOUS LINE.

2.66 ΕΠ' ΑΙΣΗ] ΑΝΑΥΓΚΗ C. A BAD GUESS BY A MEDDLING SCRIBE.

139 OIΛΑI] OIVNAI MRQCD. PERHAPS A MECHANICAL SLIP, BUT OINH IS AN OLD NAME FOR THE VINE, CF. HES. OP. 572.

267 ΑΘΕΟΚΕΕΣ] ΑΚΗΘΕΕΣ D. THE SCHOLIA ARE DIVIDED ON THE MEANING OF ΑΘΕΟΚΕΕΣ HERE, SO WE MIGHT EXPECT A CONJECTURE FROM THE SCRIBE: HIS CHOICE DISAPPOINTS US AND IS SO CLOSE TO ANAGRAMMATISM THAT IT ALMOST CERTAINLY HAS A MECHANICAL ORIGIN.

323 ΑΚΤΗΥ] ΑΛΜΗ D. PERHAPS A SLIP: IT DOES NOT MAKE MUCH SENSE AS A CONJECTURE.

396 ΤΩΝ ΥΠΕΡ ΗΔΗ] OICIN ΥΠΕΡΘΕ D. EITHER ΗΔΗ WAS MISSING AT SOME STAGE, OR THE SCRIBE FOUND IT SUPERFLUOUS. IN ORDER TO FILL OUT THE LINE HE USES THE LENGTHENED FORM ΥΠΕΡΘΕ, INSPIRED BY ΕΦΥΠΕΡΘΕΝ IN 393, AND THE UNPARALLELED DATIVE, PERHAPS INFLUENCED BY ΕΠΙ ΤΟΙΣΙΝ.

23 ON THE PROECDOSIS SEE FRANKEL, OP.CIT. (SUPRA N.7) 7–11.
590 δ' ὅποιείκαθε δὲ παρείκαθε D. The copyist seems to have understood the objections to ἀνυμ24 and produced a fairly successful solution.

631 νύκτα] νῆα C. At first glance ἐπ' ἡματι νύκτα is an apparent paradox, and the scribe considers Jason more likely a φίλαξ of the ship than of the night. It is curious to observe that at 1.934 the same MS has νυκτὸς for νῆα, but there the change is probably unconscious, as νυκτὶ occurs in the same line.

843 φάλαγξ] φοινίξ RQ, πτόρθος M. The reading of RQ is presumably the result of a miscopied φάλαγξ; that of M is an attempt to restore the sense (but not the metre).

962 μετέπειτα θοὶ πεφορημένοι αὐρη] μετέειπε θοὶ πεφορημένον ἄλμη D. Although there is no direct speech within 50 lines, the scribe cannot resist τοῖς δ' ὀμοὶ μετέειπε.25 He is then involved in difficulties with the plural πεφορημένοι, which is made to agree with ποσαμὼν; but a river can hardly be borne along by the breeze, and so ἄλμη is conjectured, which strictly means 'sea-water'.

991 φιλοπολέμου] φιλοπολάκου M. This word is known to us only from the fragments of Euphorion. At first glance it is perhaps a more suitable epithet for κούρας than φιλοπολέμου, but no doubt the origin of the corruption is mechanical.

1260 δημοσύνης] ἐφημοσύνης MRQ. An attempt to improve on the absurd ἄλημοσύνης of all MSS except E21m.

3.22 ἀματ'] ὁσαν' R. Is this meant to be some sort of a joke? Reductio ad absurdum of Apollonius' Homeric variatio.

86 θέλει] φλέξει R; 143 θέλει] φλέξει R. Perhaps mechanical in origin, but clearly no accident when the same alteration is made twice within 60 lines; nor is it an improvement.

254-56 προπάροιθε βαλοῦσαι ... τραμον] προπάροιθεν ιόαζι ... ἔκβαλον D. This sort of rewriting allows us a glimpse of the scribe aiming to display his own poetic talents but succeeding in no more than an exhibition of his own ignorance.

300 ἐφαιδρύναντο] ἐπιτρύναντο D. I cannot see any motive for this alteration, which may well be accidental in origin.

418 τάδε τοῖα] τάδε πάντα C. "τάδε τοῖα τί fallor Graecum non est," writes Fränkel. If this is the scribe’s motive for alteration, his solution is quite successful, cf. 2.876, 1020; 3.697; 4.234. Indeed it may be the truth, but if so I am at a loss to explain the corruption. More likely

25 Though the usual Homeric phrase is τοῖς δὲ καὶ μετέειπε.
τάδε is a gloss on τοῖα and has displaced something like μοι (Fränkel's suggestion).

604 φράσσωνται] πράσσωνται RQ. Not as clever as it looks at first glance: the epic form is πρήσσω, and the phrase is rather prosy. Probably it is no more than a phonetic slip.

990 ἀφαιρήσει] ἀμοιβή Q. τίνειν ἀμοιβήν is common enough, cf. 1.619 and Odyssey 12.382, but τίνειν χάριν ἀμοιβής is absurd.

1025 δὲ δὴ] δὲ μὲν RQ. Whether the exemplar contained δὴ or not (it is omitted in Π), this is an intelligent suggestion.

1263 ἵχνος] ἵγχος D. The scribe is suspicious of ἵχνος and finds ἵγχος a more suitable subject for ἐπαλλεῖν. Spears are in the air both literally (τινάκκων) and metaphorically (μελίν in 1264 and ἵγχος in 1231 and 1286).

1266 μεταπαιφάσσεθαι] μεταπαιφάσσουσαν R. “Var. lect. apud Schol. utrumque, quae in quibusdam libris ex errore scribarum nata videtur, quorum oculi ad versus praecedentis exitum aberrabant” (Wellauer). This might suggest that R’s exemplar carried scholia, but alternatively it could be a mechanical change, as Wellauer suggests.

1272 ἐπιήβολος ἀματι] ἐπιροθος αἰματι D. Nonsense again, and probably mechanical in origin.

4.24 κόλπω] κόλποι RQ. This may be the truth (cf. Platt’s κόλπω), but perhaps more likely it is the result of confusion of compendia.

186 χερείν] φρεείν RQ. Another absurdity, probably a real word made out of nonsense.

293 ἡμετέρης γαίης] γαίης ἡμετέρης RQD. The order of the words is inherited from κ. As for the change of person, “loquitur Argus in Colchide natus. . . . Mendose quidem D, sed tolerabili menda, in utroque versu primam personam praefert.” Brunck is too tolerant of ignorance.

399 πατρί] πατήρ D. This destroys not only the metre but also the worth of the reading ἄγοιτο (400) in D. Perhaps it is simply the result of a nomen sacrum compendium.

405τ ἀντίωκει. . . . φέροιε] εἰκαίωτει D . . . φέροντει RQCD. “Das Letztere [ἀντίωκει. . . . φέροιε] ist in D durch eine weitere Konjektur in εἰκαίωτει verwandelt worden (worauf dann φέροιε hätte folgen sollen), wenn sie gewahr werden—dass Apsyrtos nicht mehr am Leben ist

26 op.cit. (supra n.20) 37.
27 For examples of the reverse corruption see R. D. Dawe, Studies in the Text of Sophocles I (Leiden 1973) 126.
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(vgl. 497 und 507), etwa in Anlehnung an den Vers II.1085 (der mit ἐνναέται beginnt), oder an die 7 anderen Verschlüsse mit εἰκαί-
ο(ντες)."^{28}

604 ᾠδέμεναι ἐλιγμέναι D. Giangrande may be right to support ᾠδέμεναι here (Zu Sprachgebrauch, Technik und Text des Apollonios Rhodios [Amsterdam 1973] 35), and R predictably 'normalizes' to the Homeric ἀημέναι. But D's ἐλιγμέναι (which surely means 'whirling,' cf. Hes. Th. 791) looks to me more like the preservation of an ancient variant (or uncial corruption AEIÆAIÆÆI) than a XV-century 'Verbesserungsversuch.'

606 βλεφάρων] λεχέων D. "In cod. D qui optimum ἐλιγμέναι modo suppeditavit absurda hie observatur lectio," comments Brunck with good reason. Mechanical in origin?

827 στυγερόν] ἔρον RQC, ὀλοῦν D. Mechanical?

938 ἰθυνε] ἵνες Q. A poor suggestion which does not even scan. It could perhaps be mechanical: ἰθυνε>νυθε>νυθε ... 998 κεχάρωντο] ἔρρωντο RQ, ἐγάννυτο CD. Alternative suggestions to 'correct' a faulty exemplar.

1055 εὐήκεας] χαλκήρεας RQ. Perhaps a variant in the exemplar.

1111 δρτο] ἐκτη RQ, ἔγνω CD. The reading of CD is imported from 698; that of RQ was perhaps intended to 'correct' it.

1144 ποικίλα] πυθμένα RQCD. I am unable to account for this word, which elsewhere in the poem occurs only as a variant at 946.

1162 μεγάρως] μεγάρω RQCD. Obviously intended to correct μεγάρου, which is read by k.

1195 πέδον] νέον R. Another mystery.

1197 αὐτε] ἀλλαί R, ἀλλα Q. Both are tasteless suggestions when followed by οἷόθεν οἷα (οἷον RQCD). The scribe allows himself to be carried away by the double jingle.

1320 ἐφ' ὑγρήν] ἐπὶ γῆν RQCD. Silly and irresponsible, but no doubt mechanical in origin.

1348 στέρφες] στέρνοις RQCD. Anatomical extravaganza induced by the proximity of αὐχένας, νῆτας, ἰξυας, κεφαλής.

1355 ἑυτροχος] ἑυτρόφος R. Correction of ἑυτροχος read by QCD: it is at least a more respectful epithet for Amphitrite than 'well-wheeled'. Moschus has a remarkable facility for Homeric reminiscence, but he is unable to think back 30 lines to find the truth.

^{28} H. Fränkel, Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios (Munich 1968) 485f.
1358 ἵδε θύγατρες] ἵδ’ ἐπώνυμοι D. On the face of it, a more likely doublet perhaps, but cf. 1323.
1361 ἄλλα τις] ἄλλα πη RQCD. Cf. 1.822 ἰε πη ἄλη but probably a mechanical error.29
1500 γαὶς] αὐτόθ R. Perhaps the exemplar omitted γαὶς. QC read νέκων from 1499; R’s suggestion is very feeble.
1523 χλοες om. R, ξλοκς tell. R recognized the corruption but rather than attempt correction resorts to omission.
1531 ἐρρεε λάχνη] ἐρρεεν ἣχνη RQCD. Fränkel’s parallel30 from Nicander, Ther. 328–31, is sufficient to secure λάχνη in the text. ἥχνη may be no more than a mechanical slip.
1595 ἐκρίνατο] ἀπεκρίνατο RQ, ἀπεκρίνατο CD. 1594, 1596 and 1597 all have ἐπὶ or ἐπ- at this point in the line. CD fall into the trap without realizing that the reading is excluded on metrical grounds. RQ alter to a compound which occurs (though only once, Iliad 5.12) in Homer.
1620 εἵματα] δῶματα RQCD. In spite of 554, the slight zeugma does not escape the attention of a literal-minded scribe.
1682 πεὐκη] πέτρη D. A particularly stupid alteration: Moschus, if not his predecessors, must have been familiar with the sources of this simile at Iliad 4.482 and 16.482.
1767 ἄμεμφεα] ἀτειρεά RQ, ἀτειρέα C. Since C was probably copied before RQ, ἀτειρέα was most likely a conjecture in the exemplar which was miscopied by C. It is perhaps an echo of a passage I have been unable to identify.31
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29 A plausible motive for the corruption is suggested by Campbell, op.cit. (supra n.18) 89.
30 op.cit. (supra n.28) 607.
31 I am grateful to Dr R. D. Dawe and the late Professor Douglas Young for criticism of this paper in typescript.