The So-called D-Manuscripts of Apollonius

Graham Speake and Francis Vian

In his dissertation on the manuscript transmission of Apollonius Rhodius, Hermann Fränkel posited the existence of a group of MSS. headed by Paris.gr. 2729 (=D) and descended from Brussels 83 (=B). He admits, however, that his conclusions were based on a minimum of collation and that his views about the origin of the k family (of which B is a member) were, to say the least, hazy. This article presents the conclusions of an inquiry which we have conducted in collaboration on the eight MSS. (FNMRQCDDB) which Fränkel assigned to the D group. If these MSS. truly constitute an integral branch of the k family we should expect them to share a good number of significant errors against the rest of the transmission. Collation of the whole text, however, reveals that these suggested descendants of B in fact constitute two quite distinct groups which have only slight affinities with each other. It therefore seems necessary to revise Fränkel’s conclusions in certain respects.

Before proceeding with the inquiry we list below the MSS. to be treated, together with (where available) details of date, copyist and provenance. This list is followed by a reproduction of the stemma of the k family (otherwise known as the Cretan recension) as established by Vian.

The m family:

L Florence, Laur. 32.9, ca. 960–80


2 Speake has collated these MSS. in full and studied them in a dissertation entitled ”The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Apollonius Rhodius,” submitted in 1972 for the degree of D.Phil. in the University of Oxford. Vian has provided collations of the principal MSS. of Apollonius, thus enabling us to determine the place of the so-called D group in the k family.

3 Cf. Vian, ”La Recension ‘crétoise’ des Argonautiques d’Apollonius,” Revue d’Histoire des Textes 2 (1972) 191. This article contains full details of the MSS. of the k family. For a description of the so-called D-MSS. the reader is referred to pp. 1–9 of Speake’s thesis.
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A Milan, Ambros. 120 (B26sup.), ca. 1420, George Chrysococcas, Constantinople

The w family:
S Florence, Laur. 32.16, 1280, for Maximus Planudes
G Wolfenbüttel, 10.2 Aug. 4°, XIV century, by one Peter

The k family:
E Escorial, Σ.iii.3, ca. 1480–85, Antonius Damilas, Crete
B Brussels, 83 (18170–73), March 1489, Aristobulus Apostolides, Crete
H Paris, gr. 2728, ca. 1487, George Gregoropoulos, Crete
J Modena, Estensis a.P.5.2, ca. 1485–87, Alexander Chomatas, Crete
T Toledo, 102–34, late XV century
P Paris, gr. 2727, ca. 1487–89, Crete
K Sinai, gr. 1194, December 1491, Aristobulus Apostolides, Crete

The so-called D-manuscripts:
F Florence, Laur. 91.8 (to 3.117), ca. 1485–90
N Milan, Ambros. 477 (L.37 sup.), early XVI century, Michael Souliardos
D Paris, gr. 2729, 1490–1510, Demetrius Moschus
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

\[ H^1 = 1.1 - 2.1020 = \text{quaternions 1–5} \]
\[ H^2 = 2.1021 - 3.198 (?) = \text{quaternion 6 (partly)} \]
\[ H^3 = 3.199 - \text{end} \]
I. Characteristic Readings of Groups (M)RQCD and FN
(a) (M)RQCD (henceforth this group will be designated d)

We offer below a selection of readings common to these five MSS. (not forgetting that M carries only Books 1 and 2; we have identified the other four MSS. (RQCD) with the hand of Demetrius Moschus whom, for the sake of convenience, we shall consider as the scribe of the d group). The readings of the other MSS. are enclosed within parentheses.

1.39 ιόντες (ιόντες), 159 οτί περ (οτίτι κεν), 283 πάντα om., 388 βαρυ (ετυ-βαρυ), 703 άριο (άριο); 2.271 φορέ(ρ)ντο (φέροντο), 398 άς (ώς), 498 ετήσιαι (ετήσιαι), 640 προσεπείπ (μετέπειπ), 3.34 ούτε (ούδε), 86 αίήται (αίήται), 203 δή (νῦν), 332 άκ (ούς ε'), 458 αγόρευε (αγόρευεν), 580 ρ' om., 797 άλγος (άλχος), 1035 μελίσσαι (-ςςωι), 1086 έιρπητος (έιρ(ρ)ητος, έιρρη-τός), 1131 τή (τῆ), 1201 έκτοθι (έκτοθεν); 4.127 τείνατο (-ντο), 256 αγόρευε (αγόρευεν), 327 άλαδε προμολόντες (άλαδ', έκπρομολόντες), 402 άλλο (άλγος), 417 επερχόμενος (έπ-), 770 ουλύμπου άρτο θέουσα (θόρουςα D) (ουλύμπου θορούσα), 823 σήμα (δείμα), 873 άνεπάλμενος (άναπ-, άνεπ- G), 965 λιμένα (λεμώνα), 975 παρ' άδαι ποταμοί (ποταμίο παρ' άδαι), 1019 μεχλούνη (μαργυρόνη), 1022 έπειθεν (έπειθεν), 1198 οίνον (οίνα), 1201 ένι (άνα), 1217 τέτυκται (τέχονται), 1296 έπι om., 1320 έπίγην (έφ' έργην), 1330 άνέσταθεν (ιν' έσταθεν), 1361 πη (τις), 1368 πόδας om., 1531 έρρεεν άχυνη (έρρεε λάχυνη), 1585 κομίςα (κομίςα), 1613 ύπεκ (ύπαι), 1620 δύματα (σήματα), 1674 λυγρός (μούνον), 1698 βαράβρων (βεράβρων), 1759 δή om.

(b) FN

Now follows the evidence for the second group, FN. F stops at 3.117, so evidence for the existence of the group also ends there.

1.66 λατοίδης (λατοίδης), 257 άδην (αυδην), 466 ίστων αυ (ίστω νυν), 522 άρι-θυνεν (δρόθυνεν), 941 άρκτων (άρκτον), 1069 ούνα (ονομα), 1116 άδραστείης (αδραστείης), 1313 γ' επορεύετο (επορ-, επορ-, μεγ' επορ-); 2.751 άνέμοις (άνέμοι), 778 κομιζον (-ζων), 886 ποι (πη, ποι), 1189 έδαصεν (έκέδαصεν).

2. Relations between the Groups d and FN

There are instances of readings common to both groups or, more precisely, to certain MSS. of these two groups. The most important are those readings attested in MSS. of the first and second families. The most remarkable cases are listed below.

1.105 ευφαέα N, MRCd, G: ευφναζέα S\(^a\), \(^4\) ευφαέα cett.

\(^4\) Reading attested by Madrid gr. 4691, apograph of S. The reviser of S, erasing the faulty text, made a hole in the paper on the site of the ε; he then changed the ζ to an e.
Clearly these agreements, which are not otherwise numerous, do not signify the existence of affinities between FN and d; they prove only that all these mss. were subject to contamination, as we shall demonstrate later.

At the same time there exist a small number of readings which remain confined to the two groups under examination:

2.77 ἡ τε κράτος N, MRQC, BH: ἡ κάρτος cett.
81 εἶπ' ἄλλα δὲ τ' ἄλλος FN, CD, Bao H: ἐπ' ἄλλῳ δ' ἄλλος LASG, ἐπ' ἄλλα δὲ ἄλλος k, εἶπ' ἄλλῳ δὲ τ' ἄλλος Bfr
721 λ(ε)ἵπνον νῆσον Fao, D: νῆσον λῆπνον cett.
1155 κτύσωρος FN, D: κυτύσωρος LAS (G) et Eατ, κύτσωρος Eρ, BHJPTK, MRQC
4.436 παρὰ N, C: ποτὶ K, περὶ cett., μετὰ pap.
1147 γλυκερὸς πόθος N, RCD, P: γλυκερὸν πόθον LASG, γλυκεροῖς γλυκερὸς πόθος k

These six agreements are not analogous and may be explained in different ways. Two of them (2.77, 81) indicate that FN and (M)RQC knew B or were copied from it. The agreements noted at 2.721 and 4.1147 are probably fortuitous, particularly in the second instance where the elimination of k's unmetrical and absurd γλυκεροῖς makes the first reading inevitable. Only the shared conjectures listed at 2.1155 and 4.436 are worth considering, but they alone do not allow us to posit a group FN MRQCD. They indicate only that there was—or that there could have been—contamination between FN and D in one case,6 and between N and C in the other.

It is therefore practical to treat the two groups FN and d separately.

3. The Group FN

These two mss. are notable above all for the introduction into the

---

6 The scribe of L first wrote the two variants εἰδοὶ τοι in the text; then the reviser struck out τοι and wrote it in above the line as a variant between two points (τοι').

6 The form κτύσωρος is found in one ms. of Hdt. 7.197.
The only two agreements that we have noted with SG bear only on orthography and are therefore of no value: 2.705 παρηγοροῦ ΦΝ, SG and 733 πεφύσακεν ΦΝ, G.

It would be interesting to establish the point at which the group should be attached to the stemma of the third family. We have already remarked that at two points (2.77 and 81) the scribes seem to have known B. But three other readings suggest that ΦΝ may belong to the group JPT(K):

7 It is certain that ΦΝ used L itself: V, apograph of L, is unaware of a good number of the variae lectiones mentioned below, e.g. 2.358, 804, 1219, 4.657, 709, 810, 1065, 1115. ΦΝ were presumably therefore copied in Florence, since L was there from 1424.
It seems impossible to decide. It is more important to note that some other contemporary mss., of which only two have been partially collated, are related to FN to a greater or lesser degree. The most significant cases are those of Paris.gr. 2846 and Estensis gr. 140 (α.Τ.8.13, formerly II E 7).

Paris.gr. 2846 agrees with FN at 1.66, 257, 522, 941,1 1116, 1313; 2.81, 705, 733, 886, 908, 997, 1155, 1189; 4.1147, but it does not report readings of the group at 1.105 (N), 466, 1069; 2.77 (N), 751, 778; 4.436 (N). Furthermore along with FN it carries the following readings that issue from L(A): 1.384 (F), 494, 548, 575, 688 (Fyp), 692, 871, 893, 1117, 1144; 2.77 (Fs1), 358 (Fs2), 374, 379, 392, 404, 632, 730, 763, 766, 804, 1030, 1032, 1039, 1156 (Fyp), 1170 (F), 1219 (Fyp); 4.657 (Ns1), 689 (N), 709 (Nyp), 810 (Ns1), 1065 (Nyp), 1115 (Nyp), 1365 (N).9 It does not, on the other hand, carry those readings reported for 2.934 and 1032.

Estensis gr. 140, for which we have had to content ourselves with some soundings, appears to be very close to Paris.gr. 2846: it agrees with FN for 1.66, 466 (contrary to Paris.gr. 2846), 941 (άριστος, like Paris.gr. 2846), 1116; 2.81, 886;10 like them it gives the readings of L at 1.548, 871, 1144; 2.1030, 1032 (λάμπη only by Paris.gr. 2846), 1156. At 2.77 it offers two variants which are attested the one by F (and Paris.gr. 2846), η κάρπος αύτος η, and the other by N (written between the lines and prefixed by γρ), η τε κράτος αύτος.

These two mss. certainly belong to the same group as FN and no doubt more systematic collations would allow us to be more precise concerning their reciprocal relations.

The case of Marcianus gr. 1161 (= Class. IX 22) is different. This ms. is the work of an intelligent scribe who collated a great deal: he certainly used K (post correctionem) for his work, and probably also mss. of the first family and of the group d (MRQCD). We have twice

8 The conjecture of FN appears between the lines (άριστος) and seems to be in the first hand.
9 Like F and/or N, the ms. reproduces both variants at 1.688; 2.77, 358, 392, 730, 804, 1030, 1156, 1219; 4.657, 709, 810, 1065, 1115. The interlinear and marginal notes are always in the first hand.
10 Ποῦ appears to have been inserted in a blank space by a second hand, but there is no erasure.
noted agreement with an error in **FN** (1.66 and 466); but it disagrees
with them at 1.522, 548, 871, 941, 1116, 1144; 2.77, 81; at 2.1030 and
1032 it does not report the readings *παρανικτόμενοι* and *λιωρίζ*'. So we
may assume that the copyist knew a ms. of the group **FN**, but that he
only rarely borrowed from it.

4. THE GROUP **MRQCD = d**

(a) The Relevance of **B**

Now the time has come to examine the evidence for a possible con­
nection between *d* and **B**. We list below the most significant coinci­
dent readings:

1.447 -*βάντι* om. **BaeC** (**ἐπὶ ἀντίοις βάντι B, ἐνὶ λ. C, ἐνὶ τοῖο λ. MRQ**
(recte **M**<sup>90</sup>), **ἐπίθαντι λ. cett.**). This provides us with conclusive evidence
for a link between **B** and *d*. When **C** was copied, either the scribe
failed to read correctly **B**'s carets or the addition had not yet been
made in the exemplar.

594 This verse is omitted in **BaeKaeR** and is a glaring case of
homoeoteleuton. But "when two or more manuscripts agree in an
omission which can be thus [palaeographically] explained, it does not
necessarily follow that the omission is derived from any common
source of these manuscripts; the palaeographical cause is universally
operative, and manuscripts not akin to one another may be inde­
pendently affected by it."<sup>12</sup>

871 διώκειε **BC, διώκει επί **MRQ, διώκει cett.** This agreement seems to be
in no other ms. and provides further, but much less convincing, evi­
dence for some connection between **B** and **C**.

2.77 ἕ τε κράτος **BHMRCQCN, ἕ κάρτος cett.**

397 ἔχονται om. **BH, ἔσει MRQC**. A most significant agreement.
**ἔσει** is in 393 but not in the same *sedes*. Almost certainly **MRQC** are
attempting to make up for the deficiency they have found in **B** or **H**.

723 καὶ ἀνδρῶν **BHR, ἀνδρῶν cett.** This time the presence of καὶ ἀν­
immediately below in line 723 forbids any conclusion beyond the
simple palaeographical one.

739 μεσημβρινότος **BRQC, ivóντος D, ἰωντός cett.** This agreement,
although not especially significant in itself, adds some support
to the possibility of a connection between **B** and *d*. But it is not de­

<sup>11</sup> The Marcianus has ἕ κάρτος ἀλάρτος (sic).

cisive, for the same reading is attested in Vrat.Rehdig. 35 and Laur.gr. 32.45.

908 ὁμιλοῦσα BHMRCQ, ὁμιλεῖ EFN, ὁμιλάς LASG. This could indicate a link, though attraction to the ending of ὁμιλεῖ θήτουν is simple enough.

1222 οὐὸμεθ' BMRC, οὐομ' k, FNLQ, οὖομαι D, οὖο LASG.
4.633 δ' αὖ καὶ BRQ, δ' αὖ ἐπὶ EH, δ' ἐπὶ cett.

673 οὐδὲ om. BRQ. Independent haplography (the line starts with οὐδὲ) is a possibility, but the same mss. are involved as at 633 above, and the suggested conclusion is likelier than not.

Evidence of a connection between B and d is thin on the ground, but the quality rather than the quantity of the three or four really significant agreements cited above (especially 1.447 and 2.397) is sufficient to suggest that B was one of the mss. of the third family (but not necessarily the only one) available to the scribes of d.

(b) The Relevance of Other mss. of the Third Family

We must now examine the possibility of another ms. of the third family being available to the scribes of d. We list below a number of readings which d shares with mss. of the third group (and not with m or w) against B:

1.1356 ὅσα om. D, EK
2.142 δημιάκουν D, K: δημιακοὶ cett.
195 ἐπήκεν MRQC, Eαυγ.PK (T deest), ἐπήκεν E (Bαυ?) HD,
ἐποίηκεν N, ἐπήκεν LASG, Bηρ
996 ὡμηγυρέεις CD, JTFN: ὡμηγυρέεις cett.
1198 τ' RQD, K: δ' cett.
1255 πέλευν MRQCD, PK: πέλευν EBHJTFN, πέλευ cett.
3.179 παραίτητον RD, EHJK παροίτητον cett.
223 ἀναβλίζεσκε(ν) RQ, K: -έσκε cett.
356 ἐνεκ' RQCD, HK: οὖνεκ' cett.
556 ἑνορεύν RCD, K: ἐν- cett.
799 ἐν (νυκτί) om. D, JPTK
4.787 δειναί om. QD, K: in v. fine A
1147 γλυκερός RCD, PN: γλυκός Q, γλυκεροὶ γλυκερός EBHJTK,
γλυκερόν LASG
1427 ἐσπερή RQCD, K: ἐσπερή cett.

Of these shared readings it is hard to ignore 1.1356, 3.223, 356, 556, 799, 4.787, 1427. One ms. is conspicuous by its appearance at every one of these significant agreements, namely K. It therefore seems likely that
K as well as B was available to Demetrius Moschus, the scribe of the d group.

It is no doubt a fact of some relevance that B and K are in the same hand, namely that of Aristobulus Apostolides, and were both copied and signed by him in Crete in March 1489 and December 1491 respectively. It is not difficult to imagine a correspondence between Aristobulus and Demetrius Moschus, the latter asking for a good copy of Apollonius to use as his own model, the former sending both the copies that he had recently made since a collation of the two would provide a better text than one. Alternatively the two Cretan mss. may have been sold together or been copied for the same man and found their way to the same Italian library to be utilized by Demetrius Moschus.

(c) Contamination with Other Families

We may now turn to d's contaminations and its relationship with the other two ms. families. We first list the agreements of d with L, A, and LA.

L

1.281 ταρχύςας L\textsuperscript{ac} MRD: ταρχυκος L\textsuperscript{pc} AS (G), ταρχύςας vel -ες cett.
384 βρίσκετε LMRQD, F: βρίσκετε cett.
406 επιφραγμένος L, -κεν D, -κεν E, -καν ASG
2.77 ἀατον L\textsuperscript{al} DF\textsuperscript{al}: ἀατος LF, ἀατον A, ἀατος cett.
786 δια:τη L\textsuperscript{v} Q: διατη cett.
962 μετέπειτα L\textsuperscript{ac}, μετέπειτα D: μετέπειτα cett.
1198 μεμαότες L\textsuperscript{al} R: -τας cett.
3.1198 πάσιν LCN: πάσι cett.
1310 ἐριπόντα L\textsuperscript{ac} D: ἐριπόντα L\textsuperscript{pc} cett.\textsuperscript{15}
4.576 διαξοντο L\textsuperscript{ac}, διξ- D: διαξ- cett.
650 -ἐβηκεν GD: -ἐβ[... ]κεν L\textsuperscript{ir}, -ἐβαν cett.
1235 ὃν L, ὃθ RDN: ὃν L\textsuperscript{v} ASG, ὃθ k

\textsuperscript{13} On Aristobulus see D. J. Geanakoplos, Greek Scholars in Venice (Cambridge [Mass.] 1962) ch.6 and bibli. thereto. Unfortunately there is no evidence other than textual for a connection between Aristobulus and Moschus.

\textsuperscript{14} For notes on the Moschus family see E. Lobel, The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics (Oxford 1933) 51-53, L. G. Gyraldi, Dialogi duo de poetis (Florence 1551) 60, E. Legrand, Bibliographie Hellénique 1 (Paris 1885) Ixxxviii-xciiii. The only ms. which Demetrius signed was a New Testament (Vat.gr. 2139) for Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola in 1499. He was himself the author of a short epic poem, De Raptu Helenae, which owes much to Homer and Apollonius. He worked mostly in Ferrara.

\textsuperscript{15} Actual examination of L leaves no doubt as to the original reading. The reviser removed the stroke of the ρ and changed the remaining ρ to a π; he also erased the π before δ, but vestiges of the cancelled letter are still visible.
Here we must distinguish two types of agreement: (a) agreements which suggest contamination: 1.384, 2.77, 786, etc. (b) agreements between Lac and D: 1.281, 2.962, 3.1310, 4.576, 650, 1711. These latter agreements cannot be explained by L's influence on D since the reading of L has been corrected and is sometimes no longer legible except to a reader attentive to the erasures. They prove that D had access to a MS. which preserved readings (either errors or variae lectiones) of great antiquity which have completely disappeared from the MS. tradition. The case of 3.1310 is particularly significant in this respect. 18

Finally we shall examine the evidence for contamination of d by the w family. We list below agreements with S, G, and SG.

18 At 3.379, where D is the only MS. to attest what is perhaps the correct reading ἀποπροβήγκα, L presents a significant erasure before ἐπιμήκος; but the expunged reading seems to have begun with ε: L probably wrote ἐπιμήκος twice. At 4.1350 LII offers ἄν; D writes ἓκ, but the original reading of L cannot be deciphered.
1.19 καμείν SMvp: γε καμείν R, καμείν cett.
43 βαρύδεκεν SMRQCD: -κέ cett.
435 ἀκρῖτος SRQ: ἐκκρῖτος D, ἀκρῖτος cett.
515 αὐδην SM: -δής cett.
749 ἀμυνόμενος SMRQCD: ἀμειβ- cett.
829 οὐδὲ σ’ ὄλω SMRD: οὐδὲ τι (οὐδ’ ἔτι) σ’ ὄλω cett.
1097 πεπότητο SD: -ταί cett.
1224 κεῖν’ S1D: κεῖς’ S81 cett.

2.139 οὖναi S, οὖναi MRQCD: οὖαi cett.
218 λύσαςε SC, λύσαςε MRQD: βύσαςε cett.
243 χερί SMRQCD: χερί cett.
391 εὖποντα SMRQCD: εὖεν- cett.
504 χθονίας SMRQCD: -ις vel -ίς cett.
886 ποί SRQCD: ποί FN, πη cett.
οὔγε SMRD, K: οὔθε cett.
1015 ἰερὸν SMD: ἰερὸν δ’ cett.
1135 ὄιςάμενος SMQ: ὄιςά- cett.
1180 οἶ τε SM: οὐδὲ cett.

3.81 χαρεῖς SRQCD: χεῖρες cett.
104 δὴ om. SaeRQ
156 χρυσένη S(?)?D17: -γη cett.
445 παραί SRQD: παρά cett.
500 τούςε SRQCD: τούςε cett.
724 ἐνδοθεν SaeQD, ἐνδοθεν G, ἐνδον R: ἐντοθεν cett.
752 αἰκονιδον SaeRQCN: αἰκονιδω cett.
1111 αίσα SaeRc: ὀσσα cett.
1136 λιπούσα γιο SRQCae1: λιπούσα cett.
1163 εὖαντις εὖά(ι)ροις(ιν) SaeQD: εὐάροις ἐξαντις cett.
1219 ποταμίδες SRQCD: -γίδες cett.
1227 εφωκέραις SRQD: -ρη(ι)ς cett.
1320 αὖθις SRQCD: αὖθις cett.

4.44 ἰν’ SD: ἐν’ cett.
244 ἐνὶ SRQCD: ἐν cett.
245 ἀκτής SD: ἀκτῆς C, ἀκτῆς cett.
320 οὔτε SRQC (deest in D): οὐδὲ cett.
474 ἀργυφέν SC, pap.: -υφήν cett.
691 κέλευεν SaeRQD: -κεν cett.
723 ἱδρύθησαν SRQ: ἱδρύθησαν cett.
1642 ἱδρύθησε SRQCD: ἱδρύθησε cett.
1777 αὖθις SRQCD: αὖθις cett.

17 The last letter is hard to decipher in S: it is more like an elongated v than an i (S does not normally use the i adscript).
1.105 εὐφαέα GMRCDN: εἰφαέα cett. (εἰφαξέα S\textsuperscript{ac})
882 ἀμέλγουσιν(ν) GMRCQD: ἀμέλγυ- cett.
1153 ἐνθ' GMRCQD: ἐνθὲν LAS (sic) k
1188 διὸς νῦς SD: νῦς διὸς cett.
2.38 ἂ om. GD\textsuperscript{18}
148 πυγμαχήν GD: -η cett.
177 βιθυνίδι GMRCQD\textsuperscript{po}, K: θυνίδι D,\textsuperscript{19} βιθυνιάδι cett.
1019 ἀμφαδίνη GMRCQD: -η cett.
3.499 χαλκείος GRQCD: -οίς cett.
637 μέγα om. D: cf. τι πῆμα G
687 ἐπικλονέσκον GD: ἐπεκλ- cett.
4.18 λευκανής GD, E\textsuperscript{ao} H: λαυκ- cett.
262 γένος ἵππον GD: ἱππὸν om. S sed add. i. m., ἱππὸν γένος cett.
331–36 vss. om. D: 337–38 ante 335–36 G\textsuperscript{ao}
865 ἔβηκατο GD: ἐβδό- cett.
1618 νεκομένην GRQCD: νικο- S, νικο- cett.

SG

1.103 κοινὴ SG\textsuperscript{st} RCFDN: κενὴν vel κεινὴν cett.
204 πόδα SG\textsuperscript{po} M\textsuperscript{mp}: ποδί MRD, ποκί Q, πόδει C, πόδε k, πόδας LAG\textsuperscript{ao}
350 ἀγόρευεν SGRC: ἀευ(ν) cett.
371 περιβάλλετο SGMRQCD, pap.: -βάλλεται cett.
917 ἀρρήτους SGMRQC, T\textsuperscript{po}: ἀρρήκτους cett.
2.17 αδ SGC: ὅν cett.
393 ἐφύπερβεν SGMRQCD: ἐξώ- cett.
488 ἀθερίζε GRQCD, -ίζε SM: -εσσε cett.
606 περάσας SGQRQD: -ῆς C, -πάση cett.
710 ἤν SGMRQCD: ἦν cett.
807 vs. habent SGM (et B\textsuperscript{2lm})
3.26 ὀτρύνομεν SGRQCD, B\textsuperscript{po}: -νομεν cett.
163 ἐφεύγεται SGRQCD: ἐφεύγεται cett.
206 κατειλύσαντες SGD: -τε cett.
241 ἄλλον SGRCD: ἄλλῳ cett.
288 ἐν' SGRC: ἐν' cett.
477 ἐπέκλυε SGQC, K\textsuperscript{po}: ὄπτε- cett.
481 τόδε SGRQCP\textsuperscript{po}: τόγε cett.
732 αὐτὴ SGRQC: αὐτὴν cett.

\textsuperscript{18} The first hand of S makes the same omission, then corrects and inserts ἂ in the text.
\textsuperscript{19} The first hand of D wrote θυνίδι, which might suggest that the scribe possessed a ms. with a reading not far from the truth (θυνίδι).
Here we find a wealth of undeniable evidence for contamination. Of particular significance are the agreements at the following points: for $S$ at 1.19, 515, 829, 2.139, 218, 391, 1015, 1180, 3.104, 752, 1111, 1136, 1163, 1219, 4.474, 1642; for $G$ at 1.105, 882, 1188, 2.38, 4.262, 865; for $SG$ at 1.371, 917, 2.393, 807, 3.163, 973, 4.423, 590, 627, 979, 1065, 1224, 1653. So convincing is the connection with both mss. that we may confidently assume that Demetrius Moschus had access to a ms. high in the $w$ family—perhaps $w$ itself.

It should be stressed at this stage that our conclusions as to the

---

* Sic in spite of Fränkel's apparatus: the original $\nu$ has clearly been corrected to a $\rho$ with a paler ink.
stemmatic position of \(d\) must without the evidence of further collation remain provisional. Not but what we may safely sum up our findings as follows: \(\text{FN}\) and \(d\) are two distinct subgroups belonging to the third family. \(\text{FN}\) is essentially characterized by certain contaminations with \(L\). \(d\) is descended from \(B\); but the scribe may also have utilized the other Aristobulean ms. \(K\); the scribe of the \(d\) group certainly knew a ms. of the second family, perhaps \(w\) itself; he also borrowed some readings from the first family. The most original witness of \(d\), Paris.gr. 2729 (\(D\)), further utilized a ms. related to \(A\) and, what is most important, preserves some ancient readings which were eliminated in \(L\) by the revisers and are unknown in mss. later than \(L\).

5. **The Internal Relationship of \(\text{MRQCD}\)**

It remains to consider the internal relationships of the mss. of the \(d\) group. All five mss. offer sufficient evidence of their mutual independence to convince us that no one ms. can be the sole source of any other; on the other hand, instances of unique error are markedly more numerous in \(D\), and to a lesser extent in \(C\), than in \(\text{MRQ}\). Significant readings occur in almost every conceivable combination of mss.

Amid the confusion we may discern the existence of yet another subgroup, \(\text{MRQ}\). We list below some significant agreements. As before, the readings of other mss. follow in parentheses.\(^{21}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
1.125 & \, \text{πολυλήμων (λυγκήμων), 129 ἀποκάθετο (ἀπεθήκατο), 202 νόθος (παίς),} \\
361 & \, \text{枹ρα (ἐὰν Ἐς), 447 ἔν τοῖο (ἐπιθάντι), 559 περικαλλέα (περιγγέα), 601 ἀνέθραμε (ἀνέθρεσσε), 625 γέροντι (θανατί), 1325 ἔβησαν (ἐλεύθερα); 2.12 θέμιον} \\
& \, \text{θέμιον), 115 ἄγκας (ὁλόκληρος), 143 ἐλάσκουν (ἐπάμενο), 159 κάρην (μέτωπα),} \\
& \, \text{363 κεῖται (κύρει), 577 ἀνότατος χλός (ἀνότατον δέος), 587 πεπότητο} \\
& \, \text{(πεφόρητο), 811 πανημέριον πονέωντο (-μεροι ἐπιστo), 812 εὐμενέωντες} \\
& \, \text{(ἐγκονέωντες), 1260 ἐφημοσύνης (ἀληθοσύνης).}
\end{align*}
\]

To illustrate the promiscuity, yet at the same time the over-all coherence, of \(\text{MRQCD}\) we list below instances of \(\text{MRQ}\) agreeing with one or the other of the remaining mss. of the \(d\) group against the rest of the transmission. First the agreements of \(\text{MRQC}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
1.883 & \, \text{ἀμφὶ ὁμ., 1098 ἐκ δὲ (ἐκ γὰρ), 1169 ἀμφῶν (ἀμφω), 1337 θυμῶ (μῦθω);} \\
2.84 & \, \text{ἀκεπτὸν (ἡς), 90 μὲν ὁμ., 397 ἐαὶ (ἐχονταί), 695 εἰσορόωντες (ἐξερεύνον} \\
& \, \text{τες), 749 ἀνάγκη (ἀέλη), 1016 ναιετάακον (ναιετάον).}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{21}\) \(M\), it will be remembered, contains only Books 1 and 2. The evidence of \(RQ\) as a subgroup in Books 3 and 4 is equally convincing, but for the purposes of the present inquiry we shall limit ourselves to the first two books.
And now the agreements of MRQD:

1.228 and 320 ἓρέθοντο (ἥγερέθοντο), 582 ἀκτή (ἀκρη), 617 ἡλικοῦσα(τες) (ἐκλύσας); 2.198 ἰκε (ἰκε), 475 τίεκεν (τίεκεν), 569 ἐβρόμενον (ἐβρόμενον), 576 κατέρυκε (κατένευκεν), 627 ἅτρύτους (ἄτρυτους), 755 τοῖο γ’ (τοῖο), 842 -ει πιθέθαι (-ειν ἴδέθαι).

We are faced with a group of five mss., all apparently having a common parent, all sharing readings with each other in every possible combination, and yet all (to a greater or lesser extent) displaying signs of independence of one another. If these five really are a group, descended from one common ancestor, how can they be both so similar and so different?

In an article entitled “Commerce et copie de manuscrits grecs,”22 A. Dain published a small collection of letters which gave no indication of date or of the names of either author or addressee. On external evidence he identified the year as 1564, the author as Angelos Vergikios, and the addressee as Henri de Mesmes, “maître des requêtes du roi.” “Dans un même centre,” writes Dain, “chaque copiste a ses auteurs attirés, sur lesquels il a un droit d’option quand une copie en est demandée.” Vergikios made seven copies of Aelian, but Nicephorus Blemmides was his nephew’s territory. The contents of Vergikios’ library are unknown to us, but Dain discovered two working copies (or ‘brouillons d’atelier’ as he called them), one of Aeneas and the other of Aelian.

Dain continues his observations on the methods of Vergikios in a chapter in Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat II (Paris 1949) 329–49, entitled “Une Minute d’atelier.” Vergikios copied the Scorialensis Φ.III.2 from Paris.gr. 2526 and made it his working copy; he never returned to the Parisinus. It was the practice of the time for scribes to make Greek mss. conform to their printed Latin translations. So the first revision of the text of Paris.gr. 2526 was made by Vergikios on the current Latin translation and resulted in corrected readings, spellings and punctuation, and especially the filling of lacunae. The second revision consisted in a comparison with a more ancient Greek text, namely Paris.gr. 1774. After that yet a third revision was executed. Dain summarizes the scribe’s method as follows:

22 Humanisme et Renaissance 4 (1937) 395–410. Our attention was first drawn to this article by Mrs P. E. Easterling.
Si d'aventure Vergèce reprend à nouveau son brouillon ou sa minute, pour en tirer une nouvelle copie, il se retrouve devant les mêmes problèmes critiques. Le plus souvent, il a oublié la solution adoptée précédemment et il se décide pour un arrangement différent, car notre homme est un peu léger et versatile. C'est ce qui fait que les copies exécutées par Vergèce sur un même modèle sont parfois si dissemblables. (p. 339)

Vergèce revenait périodiquement à son exemplaire personnel et l'améliorait en ajoutant ça et là quelques corrections. (p.346) ... Le projet primitif: mettre à la disposition des lecteurs un texte grec retouché et adapté exactement à la traduction latine de 1535, trouve son parfait aboutissement dans l'exemplaire aujourd'hui placé dans la réserve de la Bibliothèque nationale en raison du luxe de sa calligraphie, le Parisinus gr. 2443. (p.347) ... Il est des copistes qui reproduisent leur modèle pour en donner comme une photographie et s'accuseraient volontiers d'omettre certaines fautes. Il en est d'autres, au contraire, qui font des éditions critiques ou prétendues telles. (p.349)

With his study of Vergikios, Dain has provided the most probable solution to our problems concerning Demetrius Moschus.23 Is it not likely that our scribe determined to establish himself as supplier of texts of Apollonius? For this purpose we may imagine him constructing a working copy based on B (and perhaps K), revising it against w and a ms. of the first family, and sprinkling it from time to time (perhaps as he made more copies from it) with his own conjectures. Having made this assumption, we may account for the numerous combinations and permutations of ms. sharing readings according to whether he remembered or bothered to consider the marginal variants in his mastercopy. Now there are no obstacles to our theory that Moschus was the maker of a group of ms. of the Argonautica which display at the same time both remarkable differences from and remarkable similarities to each other.

By a curious stroke of chance, this hypothesis may be put to the test. There is in the Bodleian Library in Oxford a ms. of the Odyssey, Canon.gr. 79, which was identified by Lobel as being in the hand of Demetrius Moschus.24 T. W. Allen, in his article on the ms. transmis-

---

23 Cf. F. Vian, Histoire de la tradition manuscrite de Quintus de Smyrne (Paris 1959) 26–41, where similar conclusions are reached in relation to Constantine Lascaris’ editions of the Posthomerica.

sion of the *Odyssey*,\(^{25}\) says of the group \(r\) that it "consists of the children of Pal. [\(=\) Heidelberg, *Pal. 45\)] where they depart from their parent, whether in obedience to the alterations made in Pal. in the xvth century . . . , or following some other unknown source. The latter may have been \(d\), with which *OP\(^3\) [\(=\) *Oxoniensis* and *Paris.gr. 2688\)] often coincide. . . . The survivals in single mss. of the xvth century, such as *O* and *P\(^3\)*, are remarkable." Are we not immediately reminded of the remarkable survivals in \(d\) of Apollonius? Does it not occur to us at once that here is a reason for Moschus' wide knowledge of Homer?\(^{26}\)

Is it possible that Moschus employed the method suggested above also for the copying of Homer? In other words, was he the scribe of *P\(^3\)*?

Speake communicated this suggestion to Vian, considering it at the time a wild conjecture, but asking him to compare the hand with that of *D* of Apollonius. Vian's reply was as follows: "J'ai confronté le *Paris.gr. 2688* avec *D* : les deux écritures sont identiques; les présentations (interventions du rubricateur) analogues. Ainsi l'A initial placé par le rubricateur (sans doute le copiste lui-même) au début d'Od. \(\kappa\), \(\xi\), \(\tau\) est identique à celui qui ouvre le ch.IV des *Argonautiques* et possède une décoration de même type, sinon tout à fait identique; il existe aussi de nettes ressemblances entre l'E initial d'Od. \(\omega\) et d'Apoll. Rh. II et III." We consider this identification sufficient justification for our theory that Moschus' method of copying Apollonius was at least similar to Vergikios' as described by Dain. The only essential difference is that Moschus did not concern himself with contemporary Latin translations, but rather with making his texts of Apollonius conform to standard Homeric diction.

It remains to try to place the mss. of the \(d\) group in their correct order of copying. External evidence shows that *C* and *D* have the same watermark (Briquet 465), giving them a *terminus post quem* of 1490. The watermarks of *M* cannot be identified with anything in Briquet, but those of *Q* place the ms. to within 1491-1514, and that of *R* is as late as 1505. In view of their close textual affinities, *MRQ* are likely to have been roughly contemporary, so on this evidence, and making allowance for the date of *K*, we may tentatively suggest that

\(^{25}\) BSR 5 (1910) 57-58.

\(^{26}\) A large proportion of the conjectures introduced into the text of the \(d\) group by the scribe are clear cases of deliberate Homericism. *Cf.* G. Speake, "The Manuscript *D* of Apollonius Rhodius," *ProcCamPhilSoc* n.s. 15 (1969) 86-94.
CD were copied in the years following 1491 and MRQ during the first decade of the XVI century.

Assuming the truth of our hypothesis concerning the copying of the $d$ group, it would be rash to base any conclusion as to the relative dating of the mss. upon internal textual evidence: we shall pursue the question no further. What matters most is that we have established the independence of each ms. of the $d$ group and given due consideration to the possibility that any single ms. may be the unique witness to an otherwise lost reading of either of the first two families.
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