

# Some XV-Century Truths in Apollonius

*Graham Speake*

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

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

<sup>1</sup> GRBS 14 (1973) 301–18.

<sup>2</sup> GRBS 15 (1974) 113–33.

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

As before the mss. discussed are:

**M** Milan, *Ambros.* 426 (H.22 sup.) (Books 1 and 2), early XVI century

**R** Vatican, *gr.* 1358, ca 1505, Demetrius Moschus

**Q** Vatican, *gr.* 37, ca 1491–1514, Demetrius Moschus

**C** Rome, *Casan.* 408 (G.III.5), 1490–1510, Demetrius Moschus

**D** Paris, *gr.* 2729, 1490–1510, Demetrius Moschus

*d* Collective siglum for the group **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), Vian (Book 3, Paris 1961), and Livrea (Book 4, Florence 1973).

#### BOOK 1

148 *τοὺς ἦγε MRQ*, *τοὺς δ' ἦγε cett.* The relative *τοὺς* is supported by Fränkel's references (23, 35, 119, 180, 212). It is surely a conjecture in our mss., one that was first made in modern times by Herwerden. Vian argues for the parataxis.<sup>3</sup>

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

335 *ἐπιπνεύουσιν] ἐπιπνεύωσιν RQCD*. The subjunctive is supported by *PSI* 1478. There is a close parallel (but with *κε*) at *Odyssey* 9.138f:

*εἰς ὃ κε ναυτέων  
θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃ καὶ ἐπιπνεύωσιν ἀῆται.*

We have seen so many instances of change for the sake of Homerism<sup>4</sup> that this is most probably a conjecture.

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

<sup>3</sup> *REA* 75 (1973) 93 (*ad* 2.376).

<sup>4</sup> *GRBS* 15 (1974) 118–22.

565 *χεῦαν* **RQ**, *coni.* Brunck, *χεῦον cett.* The aorist is clearly required here. This verb regularly causes confusion, *cf.* Fränkel's references.

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

643 *ὁ οἱ* **D**, *ὄς οἱ cett.* We may assume that Apollonius had some rudimentary knowledge of the *digamma*<sup>5</sup> which precludes the reading of *ὄς* here; the corruption is common in mss. of Homer (*cf.* Wellauer *ad loc.* and Leaf on *Iliad* 6.90). We may with equal certainty assume that Moschus knew nothing of it except what he had observed from reading Homer and that any mss. of Homer he may have seen are likely to have contained the corruption. It follows, then, that this would be a conjecture beyond his powers and must be a case of genuine preservation.<sup>6</sup>

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

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

811 *κοῦραι*] *τε κοῦραι* **C**, *τε κόροι* **LA**, *τε κόραι* **RQDSE**. With the

<sup>5</sup> See Mooney, Appendix II, p.416.

<sup>6</sup> Vian retains *ὄς*, *cf.* his *Recherches sur les Posthomericas de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris 1959) 154.

<sup>7</sup> P. Kingston, ed., *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 34 (1968) 70–71.

<sup>8</sup> M. Campbell, *CQ* n.s. 19 (1969) 271.

exception of *H.Cer.* 439 Homer and Apollonius use the form *κούρη* exclusively. **C**'s retention of *τε* suggests that, if not an accident, this reading is a conjecture, perhaps influenced by the occurrence of the word at 801 and 818.<sup>9</sup>

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

955 *εἰρύσαντες*] *ἐρύσαντες* **C**, *ἐκλύσαντες* **MRQD**, *ἐκλύσαντες* *cett.* **C**'s *ἐρύσαντες* may be closer to the truth than the quotation from Heliodorus' scholia to Dionysius Thrax accepted by Fränkel: *ἐξερύσαντες* would explain the compound in *ἐκλύσαντες*, the reading of most mss. Alternatively it could be a corruption of *εἰρύ(σ)αντες*. But particularly in view of **D**'s behaviour at 987 (*ἐξέρυσαν* for *ἐξήλασαν*) and 1276 (*ἐκ δ' ἄρα νηός* by tmesis with *ἐρύσαντες*), the reading of **C** here seems most likely to be a conjecture. Vian argues persuasively<sup>10</sup> for the retention of the vulgate *ἐκλύσαντες*.

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

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

1323 *ἀναπλήσειν*] *ἀναπλήσαι* **M**. Platt was probably right<sup>12</sup> to prefer the aorist after *ἐκπλήσαι* in 1318 and *ἐκτελέσαι* in the *scholia Parisina*. But the proximity of *ἐκπλήσαι* also prevents our considering any possible source other than conjecture by the scribe of **M**.

## BOOK 2

34 *ὀριτρεφέος*] *ὀρειτρεφέος* **RQD**. Purely a matter of orthography.

108 *δεξιτερῆ καιῆς* **MRC D**, *δεξιτερῆ καιῆ* **QLAGk**. This may

<sup>9</sup> Vian retains *τε κόραι* on the grounds that its correction introduces too many consecutive spondees.

<sup>10</sup> *REA* 72 (1970) 94–95.

<sup>11</sup> Vian believes that here Apollonius uses *μόγις* exceptionally because he is quoting *Il.* 21.417.

<sup>12</sup> *JP* 35 (1919) 84.

be the reading of  $S^{pc}$ , with which ms. *d* not infrequently shares an interesting reading.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, the truth would be obvious to any scribe who gave a moment's thought to what he was copying. Either this is further evidence of a link between *d* and *w* or Moschus is thinking for himself.

119 †μέλαν τεταγών] μάλα τεταγών **D**, μέγαν (μέλαν) τεταγών *cett.* *P.Oxy.* 2697 preserves ἀντεταγ(ων) in the margin but not, unfortunately, the reading of the text. "The conjecture of Sanctamandus seems to be confirmed," writes Kingston. "But what did the text read? To write ἀντεταγών in the margin is not a wholly effectual way of correcting μέλαν τεταγών to μάλ' ἀντεταγών, if this is what the corrector had in mind."<sup>14</sup> I suggest that the text read not μέλαν τεταγών but the unmetrical μάλα τεταγών. The rarity of the word ἀντεταγών is not, as Kingston thinks it is, the reason for its presence in the margin, but it is the reason for its corruption, which involves no more than the removal of one letter. Now αἶψα μάλα is a common Homeric combination (*cf. e.g. Iliad* 4.70), substitution of which would be by no means beyond the powers of Moschus. How are we to decide whether the reading is the result of genuine preservation of an ancient error or another Homericism no older than the pen of Demetrius Moschus which brought him within a *v* of the truth?

243 χερὶ *d*, χερὶ **LAGk**. Vian confirms that this is the reading of **S** and perhaps of  $B^{pc}$ , but the possibility of independent metrical conjecture cannot be excluded.<sup>15</sup>

342 καὶ **Q**, κε *cett.* A phonetic 'error' on which one would hesitate to base any argument.<sup>16</sup>

389 καὶ **CD**, κε(*v*) *cett.* Brunck adopted this reading from **D** and not, as Fränkel's apparatus suggests, by conjecture. Moschus, however, could well have conjectured it or even hit on it by phonetic 'error'.

399 κυταίδος **MQD**, κυταίδος *cett.* Purely a matter of orthography facilitated by a glance at 1267 and 4.511. The alternatives are weighed by Campbell, who "would read *Κυταίδος* and label **D**'s *Κυταίδος* as 'fort. recte'."<sup>17</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Cf. GRBS* 14 (1973) 311.

<sup>14</sup> *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 34 (1968) 66–67.

<sup>15</sup> *Cf. GRBS* 15 (1974) 114–18.

<sup>16</sup> It is also the reading of **K** and **W** (= *Vrat. Rehdig.* 35) and the **L** scholia.

<sup>17</sup> *RevPhil* 47 (1973) 73–74.

460 ἀνάψεσθαι **RQ**, ἀνάψασθαι *cett.* An obvious conjecture—and I am not convinced that it represents the truth, *cf.* 172 and 1.1343.

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

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

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

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

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

κεῖνο καὶ εἰέτι νῦν ἱερὸν κληίζεται ἄντρον  
Μηδείης.

<sup>18</sup> Professor Vian tells me: "Selon la collation ordinairement très sûre qui m'a été communiquée par J.-M. Jacques, le *Genuinum* en 2.705 écrit: πετραίη ὑπὸ δειράδι. Il semble donc que Fränkel se soit trompé." He also tells me, however, that δειράκι is clearly the reading of **E<sup>ss</sup>** here.

<sup>19</sup> Professor Lloyd-Jones draws my attention to *Soph. Aj.* 697 πετραίας ἀπὸ δειράδος, but an isolated parallel from tragedy can hardly affect our decision here.

It is perhaps a conjecture, but more probably an ancient variant (in *w*? cf. 1.1224).

795 ἐφ' **D**, ὑφ' *cett.* ὑπό is defended by Campbell.<sup>20</sup> If ἐπί is right, it can be no more than a scribal conjecture or chance confusion of prepositions. See Campbell (*loc.cit.*) for further examples of confusion involving prepositions in Apollonius.

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

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

874 ἄλλοι **MD**, ὄλλοι *cett.* This word is regularly confused in our mss. Cf. 1.1101 and Fränkel *ad loc.*

940 δ' **MC**, τ' *cett.* Clearly the preferable connective and a simple enough conjecture.

987 ἐπήτιες **D**, ἐπήτυες **M**, ἐπητέες *cett.* "Die vielleicht richtige Form," says Fränkel of **D**'s ἐπήτιες,<sup>22</sup> but we can make no assertions about the source of a reading the truth of which depends merely on orthography.

### BOOK 3

81 αἶδε **D**, αἶγε *cett.* This was conjectured by Platt, accepted by Fränkel, and correctly ascribed to **D** by Vian. Did Moschus know that ὄγε in Homer is substantival?

201 ἐμπεφύασι **RCD**, ἐκπεφύ(κ)ασι *cett.* Another reading coincident with *Etym.Gen.*, cf. above on 2.705. ἐμφύω is so much commoner than ἐκφύω from Homer onwards that this could be the conjecture of an intelligent scribe.

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

278 προδόμω ἐνι] προδόμου ἐνι **QCD**, προδόμω ἐνι *cett.* This reading, also found in *Etym.Gen.*,<sup>23</sup> gives more support to Kingston's theory

<sup>20</sup> CQ 21 (1971) 414.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 112 and Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1111.

<sup>22</sup> *Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Argonautika des Apollonios* (Göttingen 1964) 91.

<sup>23</sup> The actual reading of *Etym.Gen.* is ἐνι φληῖ προδόμου.

(cf. above on 2.705) than either of the other two. Wilful alteration to the genitive here is improbable and, although it could just be a slip, genuine preservation seems highly likely.

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

316 ὄππη τε **R**, ὄπη τε **QCDk**, ὀππότε *cett.* Vian now denies that ὄππη τε was the reading of **S<sup>ac</sup>**,<sup>24</sup> but it is in **H** and **N**. Palaeographically this is the most likely solution, and it is so easy a conjecture that there is no difficulty about its appearance in unrelated mss.

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

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

548 ἀθερίζειν **RQD**, ἀθερίζειν *cett.* The *praesens propheticum* of most mss. is the *lectio difficilior* (cf. Kühner-Gerth 1.195ff), but the reading of **RQD** is attractive, especially in view of ἔσσεσθαι in 550. Another conjecture.

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

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

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

1034 ἐνὶ **QCD**, ἐπὶ *cett.* If this is the truth, the scribe probably hit on it by conjecture or by simple confusion of prepositions. The passage is elucidated by Campbell, who supports ἐπὶ.<sup>26</sup>

1086 εὐρρειτός *d*, εὐρρυτος *k*, εὐρρηνος **LASG**. The reading of *d* seems to have been a variant in the archetype, cf. Fränkel *ad loc.* The

<sup>24</sup> He believes that ὀππότε has been corrected to ὀππητε.

<sup>25</sup> *CR* 13 (1963) 157.

<sup>26</sup> *CQ* 19 (1969) 280.



scribe may have found the correct spelling either by genuine preservation or by phonetic 'error'.

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

1172 ἐμέλοντο **CD**, μέλοντο *kQ<sup>ac</sup>*, ἐμέλλοντο **R**, μέλλοντο **LAGQ<sup>pc</sup>**, μίμνοντο **S**. The reading of **CD** is also the lemma of the *scholia Parisina*; but Fränkel is right to suspect the passage.<sup>27</sup>

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

#### BOOK 4

94 φώνησέν τε **RQD**, θάρσυνέν τε *cett.* Fränkel's reasons for accepting φώνησέν are rejected by Vian<sup>30</sup> and Livrea. προσπτύξατο φώνησέν τε occurs at 1.1331, and the last two feet are so common in Homer for the introduction of a speech that we cannot but suspect Moschus yet again of Homericism.

142 ἰλίγγοισιν **Q**, εἰλίγγοισιν *cett.* Purely a matter of orthography.

182 ἦέ **RQD**, ἦδέ *cett.* Sense demands ἦέ, and Moschus could easily have found it by conjecture.

233 ἐνιπλήσει **R**, ἐνίπλήσει (*sic*) **D**,<sup>31</sup> ἐπιπλήσει *cett.* This is obviously the truth, cf. 3.1350 and *Odyssey* 19.117. Wellauer attributed it to "praepositionum confusio frequentissima," but it could be a conjecture.

247 θυηλῆν *d*, θυηλῆ *cett.* The accusative is clearly required and easily conjectured.

345 †τό] τόδε **RQ**, τόγε **S**, τὸ *cett.* The reading of **RQ** is not necessarily ancient, but it is at least a possibility, which is more than can be

<sup>27</sup> *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich 1968) 433.

<sup>28</sup> *Hellenistische Dichtung II* (Berlin 1924) 251.

<sup>29</sup> *GRBS* 14 (1973) 309–10.

<sup>30</sup> *REA* 75 (1973) 88 n.5.

<sup>31</sup> Livrea's report is inaccurate.

said for τὸ which Fränkel prints (with an *obelus*). His attitude to this crux is uncharacteristically defeatist, though he does propose τόγε δὴ, which is accepted into the text by Livrea. At best **RQ** present the truth by conjecture; but there would be a case for considering the reading as a degenerative change for metrical reasons.

400 ἄγοιτο **RCD**, ἄγοιντο *cett.* The singular is preferable as referring just to Apsyrus, and corruption to the plural is much more likely than the reverse. But the scribe is meddlesome enough for conjecture to be as likely as genuine preservation.<sup>32</sup>

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

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

1429 πάλιν ἔμπαλιν **D**, πάλιν ἔμπεδον *cett.* Fränkel questions the propriety of ἔμπεδον with an aorist verb<sup>34</sup> and suggests τοῖαι πέδον ἔμπαλιν as a possibility. **D**'s πάλιν ἔμπαλιν is clearly a palaeographical slip, but once again we have to decide at which end of the transmission corruption occurred. If it represents a corruption of πάλιν ἔμπεδον, it is mediaeval (or rather Moschan), but if it is a corruption of <πέδου> ἔμπαλιν, then it must be ancient and a genuine preservation. I am inclined to favour the former but do not entirely discount the possibility of the latter.

1570 ἐξανάγει **d**, ἐξενάγει **k**, ἐξανέχει *cett.* A lucky slip, as proved by the fact that it is also in **N**, which we now know to be an unrelated **MS**.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> **D** spoils his good work by writing πατήρ for πατρί in 399, *cf.* GRBS 15 (1974) 131.

<sup>33</sup> *Cf.* GRBS 14 (1973) 311–14.

<sup>34</sup> *Noten* 601. But see Vian, REA 75 (1973) 97 n.1.

<sup>35</sup> *Cf.* GRBS 14 (1973) 303–04.

1615 ἐπὶ νειόθι **RQC**, ἐπινειόθι *cett.* Chance again. ἐπινειόθι would be a ἄπαξ here, but the corruption hardly surprises us.

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

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

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

July, 1974

<sup>36</sup> I am grateful to Professor F. Vian for criticism of this paper in typescript.