

The Plato Manuscripts **W** and *Lobcovicianus*

David J. Murphy

IN A RECENT NOTE, LIDIA PERRIA¹ has identified the scribe of *Lobcovicianus* VI Fa 1 (=L)² with the principal scribe of *Vind. suppl. gr. 7* (=W),³ a primary witness to the text of Plato.⁴ It had long been maintained that L is a copy of W.⁵ On the strength of her identification of the scribes as the same man, however, Perria suggests that W and L may have been copied independently from the same exemplar in the eleventh century.⁶ If she is right, Perria's conclusions would be important for students of Plato as well as for palaeographers, for she raises the possibility that L may be a new primary witness. Unfortunately, neither Perria's hypothesis of the independence of L nor her identification of its scribe can be correct.

¹ L. PERRIA, "Note paleografiche," *RStBiz* n.s. 22–23 (1985–86: hereafter 'Perria') 82–89; her contribution to a recent collection of studies of L in *Studi su codici e papiri filosofici* (=StAccTosc 129 [Florence 1992]) 103–36 reached me too late for use here but does not affect the present argument.

² On L cf. E. GOLLOB, "Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften in Österreich außerhalb Wiens," *SBWien* 146 (1903: hereafter 'Gollob') 108; J.-M. Olivier and M.-A. Monégier du Sorbier, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de Tschécoslovaquie* (Paris 1983) 97–103. L is the *siglum* used by Perria *et al.*; the Ms. has been designated Lobc by Slings, Boter, Jonkers (n.11 *infra*) and myself elsewhere (n.12 *infra*).

³ On W cf. H. Diels, "Über den Wiener Platocodex W (Suppl. phil. gr. 7)," *SBBerl* (1906) 749; H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Supplementum graecum* (=Biblos-Schriften 15 [Vienna 1957]) 13; O. Mazal, *Byzanz und das Abendland. Katalog einer Ausstellung der Handschriften- und Inkunabelsammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Graz 1981) 313ff.

⁴ The independence of W was first proved by J. Král, "Über den Platocodex der Wiener Hofbibliothek Suppl. phil. gr. 7," *WS* 14 (1892) 161–208.

⁵ First argued by M. Schanz, *Über den Platocodex der Markusbibliothek in Venedig Append. Class. 4 Nr. 1* (Leipzig 1877) 62, and J. Král, "De Platonis codice Lobkoviciensi," *ListFil* 13 (1886) 359f.

⁶ Perria 84. She is probably right in assigning W to late s. xi (cf. her "Il codice W di Platone e il Vat. gr. 407," *RStBiz* n.s. 20–21 [1983–84] 99ff), although it could be younger.

First, there can be no doubt that L is a copy of W. Král (*supra* n.5) had already offered decisive proof based on blank spaces or false conjectures in L that correspond to words that are truncated on torn leaves of W. Perria discounted Král's evidence on the strength of her thesis that the scribes were the same man: in her view, not enough time could have elapsed for damage to W to have occurred when L was copied.⁷ But this does not follow, and these errors of L cannot plausibly have arisen from W's *exemplar*; the nature of damage to W makes it clear that W once contained more letters than the scribe of L read. To Král's evidence from *Euthyd.*, add: 295E2 κάλλιον ἐπίστασαι] κάλλι | *ν ἐπ*στασαι W: κάλλιστ' ἂν ἐπίστασαι L; 296C1 δύναιο] δύ | ναιο W: δύ *sic spat. relict.* L.⁸ Further, *Cra.* 439E7 ὑπ' ... 440A2 γνωσθεῖη was omitted but added *i.m.* by the first scribe of W. The edge of the folio was later cropped, cutting off some of the marginal words. Here again, L tried to restore by guesswork: *i.e.*, 440A1 ἂν ἐπιόντος] *absciss. in* W^{im}: ἐστι L; *ibid.* ἄλλο καὶ] ἄλ- *sic absciss. W^{im}*: ἄλλο L. Cf. also *La.* 194 A5 ἀνδρεία] *evanid. in* W: *om.* L.

Second, W as we now have it was copied by three different scribes.⁹ L reproduces each scribe's work almost exactly, including W3's inserted *Symp.* and *La.* leaves, where L follows W3,¹⁰

⁷ Perria 85, although she grants that other evidence may show L to be a copy of W. Olivier and Monégier du Sorbier (*supra* n.2: 98) also express doubt that L is a copy of W.

⁸ | indicates line break; *, damage. Král (*supra* n.5: 360) reports that a sheet of paper had once been glued onto the torn edge of fol. 464v in W. This sheet obscured some of the letters at the beginning of lines.

I have used films in the Yale Plato Microfilm Archive to collate L, *Par. gr.* 1808 (=Par), and *Escorialensis* Y I 13 (=Esc) in various dialogues, including *Cra.* and *La.*, and film provided by the Nationalbibliothek to collate W. For *Bodl. Clarke* 39 (=B) and *Ven. gr. Append. Cl. IV.1* (=T) in *Symp.* I have used Burnet's apparatus; in *La.* I have collated T from microfilm and B from T. W. Allen, *Plato Codex Oxoniensis Clarkianus 39 phototypice editus* (Leiden 1898). Esc is a copy of T through Par in these dialogues.

⁹ W1 (the scribe studied by Perria) copies the bulk of the codex. W2 copies *Clit.*, *Resp.*, and *Ti.* W3 copies *Timaeus* *Locrus* and supplies fol. 139 *Thet.*, fol. 256 in *Symp.* and fol. 486–88 in *La.* Cf. Diels, Hunger, and Mazal (*supra* n.3) and L. Post, *The Vatican Plato and its Relations* (Middletown 1934) 31f.

¹⁰ Two errors of L (*La.* 190E5 ἐθέλοι] ἐθέλει L, and 190E6 φεύγοι] φεύγει L) arise from W3's attempt to abbreviate by leaving off the ending of each verb. Cf. also *Symp.* 173C7 οἴεσθε BTEscL¹⁷: οἴεσθαι W3L^{ac}; 174A5 ὅποι BTEsc: ὅπη W3L; *La.* 186E1 ἐπαίειν BTEsc: ἐπακούειν W3L; 187E8 πρότερον BTEsc: *om.*

even against **W3**'s source, **Esc**.¹¹ **L** cannot have copied those leaves from **W1**'s exemplar, for this either had *lacunae* or a text different from **Esc**, which is in another Ms. family. **W3** did not copy **L**; cf. e.g. *La.* 189A7 μανθάνων **BTEscW3**: θαυμάζων **L**; 189B5 συνδιεκινδύνευσας **BTEscW3**: συνεκινδύνευσας **L**; 190E6 εὖ ἴσθι **BTEscW3**: οἶσθ' **L**.

Finally, in *Cra.* and *La.* as well as in other dialogues, **L** repeats all the errors of **W** and adds errors of its own.¹² **L** is correct against **W** only in cases of errors easy to emend, many of them involving orthography or quotations from poetry. This is the classic pattern presented by an apograph. **L**, then, is of no value for the text save as a source of *lectiones singulares*.

Now, to the two scribes. Perria (*supra* n.6: 96–99) is right, as far as I can judge from the plates, in her identification of **W1** and the scribe of *Vat. gr.* 407. It appears, however, that she has been misled by the small portions of **L** shown in plates printed by Gollob and Olivier/Monégier du Sorbier (*supra* n.2). Although the hands of **W1** and **L** are very much alike, down to many details of letter forms and ductus, fundamental differences show that the two scribes are not the same man.

I. Overall Look of the Script (cf. PLATES 2 and 3)

(a) **W1**'s letter forms are more oblong and less uniformly rounded than **L**'s. (b) **W1**'s acute accents are at an angle of 45°

W3L; 188B4 αὐτῷ **BTEsc**: αὐτὸ **W3L**; 190A2 οἷς **BTEsc**: οἷσπερ **W3L**; 190A4 ἦς **BTEscL^p**: οἷς **W3L^{ac}** (and six other separate errors).

¹¹ **Esc** is the source of **W3**'s added leaves. Cf. *Symp.* 173 D1 ἐμὲ ἠγεῖσθε **Par**: ἐμὲ ἠγεῖσθαι **BT**: ἠγεῖσθε ἐμὲ **EscW3**; 174E2 οἶ **Photius b**: οἶ **BTPar**: τὸν **Esc^pW3**; 175A8 κάμου **Esc^pW3**: καὶ οὐ **BT**: καὶ σοῦ **ParEsc^{ac}**; *La.* 186E6 μαθόντε **BTPar**: μαθόντες **EscW3**; 187A6 γενόμενοι **BTPar**: γιγόμενοι **EscW3**; 187B4 συμβαίη **Esc^pW3¹** (confirms Bekker): συμβαίνει **BTPar Esc^{ac}**; 190C9 ἴσως **BTParEsc**: ἴσθι **W3** (**Esc**'s compendium for *ως* looks like *θι*). **W3** is a copy of **Esc** in *TL* as well; cf. W. Marg, *Timaeus Locrus. De Natura Mundi et Animae*² (Leiden 1972) 20f.

W2 also descends from **Esc** in *Resp.* and *Clit.* Cf. G. Boter, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic* (= *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 107 [Leiden 1989]) 160ff; S. R. Slings, "Notes on Some Manuscripts of the *Clitophon*," *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 40 (1987) 37ff. In *Ti.*, it is a copy of *Par. gr.* 2998; cf. G. Jonkers, *The Manuscript Tradition of Plato's Timaeus and Critias* (diss. Amsterdam 1989) 203ff.

¹² To discuss them would create unnecessary tedium. For other dialogues cf. Marg, Boter, Slings, and Jonkers (*supra* n.11); A. Carlini, *Platone. Alcibiade, Alcibiade secondo, Ipparco, Rivali* (Torino 1964) 28f; D. Murphy, "The Manuscripts of Plato's *Charmides*," *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 43 (1990) 332.

or less; those of L at an angle of 60° or more. (c) W1 forms smooth breathing marks with a two-part stroke: down, then across, with varying degrees of roundness. There is also an occasional square breathing mark. L always makes smooth breathing marks with one rounded stroke: across, then down. I would consider (b) and (c) decisive by themselves.¹³ (d) Unlike W1, L displays elements of *Fettaugen-Mode*, esp. on fol. 1–28 and after fol. 500: enlarged *epsilon* (both types), *omicron*, *sigma*, sometimes *alpha* or *phi*.¹⁴

II. Formation of Letters, Ligatures

(a) W1 frequently forms εγ, εσ, εν, and εχ ligatures with an ascending crest and a stroke descending from its middle to begin the next letter (*cf.* PLATE 2 *passim*). With εζ, εξ, and επ, W1's ascending crest creates occasional "ace of spades" ligatures (*cf.* PL. 2, line 26), although W1's overall style is not so-called *en as de pique*.¹⁵ *Epsilon* ligatures whose next stroke descends from the middle are rare in L. When they do appear, crests are normally descending (*cf.* PL. 3, ii lines 10, 15). If ascending crests appear at all, they are added as separate strokes. (b) W1's majuscule *nu* often continues the diagonal stroke down to the right beyond its junction with the vertical ascender to form a pronounced point (PL. 2, line 3, last line). (c) The bottom of L's minuscule *nu* often approximates a point (*cf.* PL. 3). (d) Many of W1's majuscule *eta*'s are twice as tall or more as their width and have wavy verticals (PL. 2, line 9). Those of L are rarely taller

¹³ Angle of accents and the method of writing round *spiritus lenis* are likely to remain stable features over the career of a scribe, even if other elements of his script may develop. These two features remain stable in e.g. the script of Joasaph (*cf.* L. Politis, "Eine Schreiberschule im Kloster τῶν Ὁδηγῶν," *BZ* 51 [1958] Abb. 1–9) or Ephrem (*cf.* L. Perria, "Un nuovo codice di Efrem: L' *Urb. gr.* 130," *RStBiz* N.S. 14–16 [1977–79] Tav. 1–7; B. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* [New York 1981] Pl. 32; G. Prato, "Il monaco Efrem e la sua scrittura. A proposito di un nuovo codice sottoscritto (*Athen.* 1)," *ScritCiv* 6 [1982] Tav. 1–8).

¹⁴ Cf. H. Hunger, "Die sogenannte Fettaugen-Mode in griechischen Handschriften des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts," *ByzF* 4 (1972) 105–13 with Abb. 1–7.

¹⁵ I have not seen "ace of spades" ep ligatures in W. On the style *cf.* M. L. Agati, "L'As de pique' fuori d'Italia: qualche osservazione," *Byzantion* 53 (1983) 347–53; M. Formentin, "Altri esempi di grafia 'Ad asso di picche' (*Marc. gr.* 579 e II, 196)," in P. L. Leone, ed., *Studi bizantini e neogreci. Atti del IV Congresso Nazionale di Studi Bizantini* (Galatina 1983) 127–35, who with Agati cites the principal earlier works.

than one-and-a half times their width and lack the wavy look. These factors disallow identification of the scribes as the same man.

III. Frequency of Certain Features

This material does not generate 'proof', strictly speaking, for scribes do change features of writing style within a codex or develop them over the years. Indeed, statistical analysis of many of L's usages is problematic, for the scribe modifies features of his script several times as he goes along.¹⁶ The following differences, however, are stark enough that they become difficult to harmonize with the "identity" thesis.

(a) Forms of καί (in percentages).¹⁷

Agati Type:	W1				Type:	L		
	A	C	G	I		A	C	G
fol. 10r-13v	56	42	1	-	fol. 8r-11v	15	77	8
fol. 78r-81v	70	29	1	-	fol. 67r-70v	11	87	2
fol. 283v-287r	67	27	2	3	fol. 238r-240v (incl. unnumb. fol.)	6	94	-
fol. 482r-485v	55	35	3	7	fol. 421r-424v	2	83	15

I have seen a Type L on fol. 83v of L; none in W. (b) L encloses *omicron* inside lunar *sigma* occasionally at line end, a feature lacking in W1. (c) W1 often reduces ει ligature, less often εγ, to

¹⁶ L's script usually inclines to the right at 100°-105°, but in fol. 29 to ca 91 it inclines at 105°-110° and in sections with extensive scholia (e.g. *Phaedrus*) it is almost vertical. Proportionate size of rounded letters diminishes at fol. 29, although the first scribe is clearly still at work (so too conclude Olivier and Monégier du Sorbier), but it gradually increases again, beginning about fol. 91. Percentage of minuscule to majuscule *eta* is 91%-99% on 28r-v, 85v, 421r and 433r; on 29r-v it is 26%-74%. Elsewhere, letter size is reduced when scholia are extensive, but beginning on fol. 451, which contains only two words *i.m.*, letter size drops temporarily from ca 21.7 letters per line on 450v (consistent with most of L) to 26.1 letters on lines of the same width.

¹⁷ M. L. Agati, "La congiunzione καί nella minuscola libreria greca," *ScritCiv* 8 (1984) 69-81, esp. 71f, distinguishes these types, among others:

- Type A: three minuscule letters written out
- Type C: three letters written out, majuscule *kappa*
- Type G: cursive ligature with majuscule *kappa*
- Type I: tachygraphic abbreviation resembling an S
- Type L: tachygraphic abbreviation Ċ.

its minimum shape (*cf.* Pl. 2, line 20), a form avoided by L. (d) L employs hyphens *passim* in the left margin to join words divided by line end (*cf.* Gollob Pl. 5 n.1) but uses no *paragraphos*. The reverse is true for W1. (e) W1's mute *iota* is adscript. L follows suit, but I have detected subscript *iota* on fol. 29–30 and 451r.

Scholars have disputed L's date.¹⁸ Although its heavy use of minuscule forms and overall similarity to W1 make L look close to it in age, some features would suggest L is at least a century or two later (*cf. supra* Ib–d; IIa, c; IIIa, d–e).¹⁹ Certainty, however, is provided only by its derivation from W3, the terminus post quem of which Marg (*supra* n.11: 20) has established as 1314. Thus, although L offers little help to the editor of Plato, it is interesting as an apparent product of a versatile, archaizing scribe. The codex was a *de luxe* piece (*cf.* Perria 87f), and it is tempting to speculate that this factor, as well perhaps as the influence of W, helped induce L's scribe to be sensitive to earlier canons.²⁰

ST HILDA'S & ST HUGH'S SCHOOL, NEW YORK

September, 1992

¹⁸ To various proposed dates of L listed by Perria 84, add Diels (*supra* n.3) s. xv; Post (*supra* n.9: 32f) and Jonkers (*supra* n.11: 66): s. xiv. N. G. Wilson, reviewing Olivier and Monégier du Sorbier (*cf. supra* n.2), *CR* n.s. 35 (1985) 176, correctly suspected that L is an archaizing Ms. of at least s. xiv. He notes that the illumination appears to be Western, although that could have been added at a later time (so Perria 88). On the date of W *cf. supra* n.6.

¹⁹ On implications of forms of *epsilon* ligatures for dating, *cf.* E. Follieri, "La minuscola libraria dei secoli ix e x," in *La Paléographie grecque et byzantine* (= *Colloques Internationaux du CNRS* 559 [Paris 1977]) 140ff. On those of *καί* *cf.* Agati (*supra* n.17) 74, 80f; of *iota* subscript *cf.* N. G. Wilson, "Miscellanea Palaeographica," *GRBS* 22 (1981) 397–400. Although there are earlier examples, a hyphen in the left margin to show separation of syllables does not appear with any frequency before the thirteenth century. Alexander Alexakis and I are preparing a study of this mark.

²⁰ L's script, however, does not archaize by replicating eleventh-century *Perlschrift*, as do many Mss. of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. *Cf.* H. Hunger, "Archaisierende Minuskel und Gebrauchsschrift zur Blütezeit der Fettaugenmode," in *Paléographie grecque et byzantine* (*supra* n.19) 283–90; G. Prato, "Scritture librerie arcaizzanti della prima età dei Paleologi e loro modelli," *ScritCiv* 3 (1979) 151–93, esp. 191f on the rôle of the wealthy; H. Hunger and O. Kresten, "Archaisierenden Minuskel und Hodegonstil im 14. Jahrhundert," *JÖBG* 29 (1980) 187–236; J. Irigoin, "Une écriture d'imitation: le *Palatinus Vaticanus graecus* 186," *IIClSt* 6 (1981) 416–30.

φ5 Λοφορον

ὡ φίλτατε· ἔθος δὲ λέγειν, οἷ εἰ τί διαφέρειν λέγειν σωτή
 κησ· ἢ ἄλλο πλῆεις τὸ ἔθος· ἢ ὅτι φεῖ ὅταν τοῦτο φθῶ
 γωμα· διαμοῦμαι ἔκείνο· σὺ δὲ γινώσκεις, ὅτι ἔκείνο
 διανοῦμαι· οὐ τοῦτο λέγεις· ναί· οὐ κοῦν εἰ γινώσκεις ἔμου
 φθῶγομενον· διλωμαῖ σοι γίγεται παρ' ἑμοῦ· ναί· ἀπὸ
 τοῦ ἀμομοίου γὰρ ἢ ὁ διαμοοῦμενος φθῶγομαι· εἰ πρὸ τῶ
 ἀμομοίου ἐστὶ τῆ· ἢ φησὶ σὺ σκληρότητι· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο οὕτως
 ἔχει, τί ἄλλο ἢ αὐτὸ αὐτὸ σμείθον· καὶ σοι γίγεται ἢ ὀρθότης
 τοῦ ὀνόματος, σωθήκη· ἔπει πρὸ γὰρ διλωί και ταῦ ὀμοια
 και ταῦ ἀμομοια γραμματα· ἔθουσ τὸ και σωθήκησ τυχόν
 ται· εἰ δὲ ὅτι μαλίστα μὴ ἐστὶ τὸ ἔθος σωθήκη· οὐ και
 και λῶσ ἔχει ἄτι λέγειν τῆσ ὀμοιότητα διλωμα εἰνασθ
 λαι τὸ ἔθος· ἔκείνο γὰρ ὠσθοί κε και ὀμοιο και ἀμομοιο
 διλωί· ἔπει δι δὲ ταῦτα συγχροῦμεν ὡ κρατύλο τῆσ γὰρ
 σι γλώσσου συγχροήσιν θῆσ· ἀμ και ὀν που ἐστὶ και σω
 θήκησ τι και ἔθος, σμμεῖα λῆσθαι προσ διλω σιμ ὦν δια
 μοοῦμενοι λέγομεν· ἔπει ὡ κβλ τιατ εἰ ἔθελήσεις ἔπει
 ἀριθμὸν ἔλθειν, πὸ θῆσ οἷ εἰ ἔξει ἰμομοιατα ὀμοια· ἔπει
 ἔκαστω πῶν ἀριθμῶν ἔσθιν φκειν· ἔσθιν μελ ἔσθιν τι τῆσ
 ὀμοιογίαν και σωθήκησ· κίρσο ἔχην τῶ ὀνομοιατα ὀρ
 θότητος πρὸ· ἔμοιομοῦ και αὐτοῖ· ἀμ ἔκειμεν και ταῖ
 τὸ διωατῆν ὀμοια εἶναι ταῦ ὀνοματα τοῖσ πρῶτα γρασθ ἄλλ
 μελ ὡσ ἀληθεσ τὸ τοῦ βρ μογομοῦσ γλίχραι ἢ ἢ ὀλκῆ
 αὐτῆ τῆσ ὀμοιότητος· ἀμ και ὀν δὲ ἢ και τοῖ φορτικῶ
 τούτοι προσχρησθαι τῆσ σωθήκησ· εἰσ ὀμομοιατῶ ὀρθ
 τητῶ· ἔπει ἰσοσ γὰρ και ἔπει ἄλλοι ἄλλοι ἄλλοι ἄλλοι
 ὅταν ἢ πασι μὴ ὡσ πλεῖστοσ ὀμοιομοῖσ ἀφῆσθαι και ταῖ
 δὲ ἀπὸ προσθῆ και σιμ· ἔπει ἄλλοι ἄλλοι ἄλλοι ἄλλοι
 ἔπει εἰ πὸ· μελαταῦ τα· τί ναι κίμην διωαμ ἔχει τῶ ὀνοματα
 και τί φῶρην αὐτα και λογ ἀπὸ γὰρ 3 εσθαι· διλωσκειν ἔμοιο
 δὲ κεί ὡσ ὡ κρατύλο και τοῦτο παρ' ἑμοῦ αὐτῶσ εἶνασθ· ὡ σῶ

Ms. Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 7, fol. 100v: Plato, Cra. 434E4-435D5.
(Courtesy Nationalbibliothek, Wien)

