# The Scribal Habits of Demetrius Moschus 

Graham Speake

In a previous article ${ }^{1}$ 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. ${ }^{2}$ 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. ${ }^{3}$ 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.
1 "The So-called D-Manuscripts of Apollonius," GRBS 14 (1973) 301-18.
${ }^{2}$ 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 mbtrical grounds

$1.19 \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu] \gamma \epsilon \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu \mathbf{R} . \gamma \epsilon$, "the universal panacea,"'s comes to R's rescue, but it is a distinct improvement on $\kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon i v$.
334 roîo] roîó $\gamma^{\prime}$ 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.

${ }^{5}$ Dawe, op.cit. (supra n.3) 44.
read $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon i \omega \nu$ with LAPE. D restores the metre and retains the syntax, ${ }^{6}$ but at the expense of a vital adjective. Presumably the idea came from the end of $663, \epsilon \ddot{i} \kappa \epsilon \delta \alpha \epsilon \hat{i} \epsilon \nu$.
$976 \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \tau \eta] \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \tau \eta \tau^{\prime} \mathbf{R Q}$. To avoid the hiatus.
 superfluous syllable in the text of $k$ ( $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \in \pi o \rho \epsilon ́ \xi \alpha \tau o$ ). See Fränkel's apparatus.
 which, as the copyist realizes, does not scan.
 reads here, ${ }^{7}$ no doubt influenced by $\delta \eta \iota \alpha \alpha<\kappa о \nu$ above in 142.
$160 \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda o v$ фú $\lambda \lambda$ дoıc $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho] \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha \dot{ } \tau \hat{\eta}$ MRQC. Faced with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha i \tau \hat{\eta}(k)$ the scribe employs $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ as a stopgap.
 which Fränkel mentions anywhere as proof of D's descent from B. ${ }^{8}$ But in fact $k$ read $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \iota \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon o$ (sic EKB); $\mathbf{P}$ and $d$ corrected
 one can say then is that here $d$ rests on the text of $k .{ }^{9}$ To avoid the hiatus $\mathbf{Q}$ emended $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \dot{\text { i to }} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$.
 the scribe makes the obvious correction.
$329 \dot{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota] \dot{\alpha} \phi \iota^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ MRQ. An attempt to correct $i \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ in D.
$\left.397{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi o \nu \tau \alpha \iota\right]$ є้ $\alpha c \iota \nu M R Q C$. An intelligent suggestion to replace ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \circ \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, which is omitted by BH. ${ }^{10}$
$\left.513 \theta \epsilon \in \subset \alpha \nu \eta^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu o \nu\right] \theta \epsilon \in c c \alpha \nu \notin \pi \eta^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu o \nu$ M. The scribe may have miscounted the number of syllables, or found $\theta$ éccav in his model and corrected the wrong word. Alternatively it could simply be faulty introduction of a compound form.
$725 \pi \nu o \iota \hat{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon}] \pi \nu o \iota \hat{\eta} \subset \iota$ RQ. $k$ could not tolerate the postponement of $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ and, followed by $\mathbf{C D}$, wrote $\dot{v} \pi \grave{o} \delta \dot{\epsilon} . \mathbf{R Q}$ were driven to correct $\pi \nu o \iota \hat{\eta}$ to $\pi \nu o \iota \hat{\eta}<\iota$ to give the line a metrical ending.
$887 \tau o ̀ \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho o \iota \theta \epsilon] \pi \rho o \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho o \iota \theta \epsilon$ MRQ. CDB omit $\tau \dot{o}$; MRQ use the prefix $\pi \rho o$ - as a stopgap.

[^0]1103 ov่ $\rho \alpha \nu o ̀ \nu]$ v́ $\psi o ́ \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ D. MRQC retain $k$ 's unmetrical où $\rho \alpha \nu o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$ : D's suggestion is not without merit.
$1114 \kappa \hat{v} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha] \kappa \hat{v} \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon$ MRC, $\kappa \hat{v} \mu \alpha \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mathbf{D}$. $k$ reads $\kappa \hat{v} \mu \alpha$, which $\mathbf{D}$ and MRC attempt to correct.

1165 ккi от. M. RQCDB read єicav̂тıc. M sees it is wrong but cannot find the right correction.
$1200{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{o}$ cov ] $\rho \boldsymbol{\rho} \mathbf{R}$. C omits öcov; $\mathbf{R}$ seizes upon a suitable replacement.
$\left.1240 \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta^{\prime}{ }_{i \nu}^{i} \alpha \delta \dot{\eta}^{\prime}\right] \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \nu \theta \alpha \delta^{\prime}{ }_{i \nu \alpha} \mathbf{M}$. $\mathbf{C}$ omits $\delta \grave{\eta} ; \mathbf{M}$ attempts to restore the correct number of syllables. Fränkel suggests, quite plausibly, that $\epsilon \nu \nu \theta^{\prime}$ results from a gloss on $i v \alpha$.
$\left.3.223 \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta \lambda v^{\prime} \epsilon \subset \kappa \epsilon\right] \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta \lambda v^{\prime} \zeta \epsilon \subset \kappa \epsilon \mathbf{R Q}$. The uncompounded $\beta \lambda \dot{v} \zeta \omega$ is much commoner than $\beta \lambda \hat{v}^{\prime} \omega$ so, pace Vian, normalization is more likely than assurance of a long $v$.
$254 \delta \mu \omega \alpha i \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \pi \alpha ́ \rho o \iota \theta \epsilon] \delta \mu \omega \alpha i \delta_{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \circ \iota \theta \epsilon$ C. All mss omit $\pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu$. C is one degree more corrupt but offers a scannable line of five feet.
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \rho o \iota c \iota \nu \mathbf{Q} . \mathbf{Q}$ inherits the reading $\xi \in \hat{\imath} \nu o \nu$ from $k$ and successfully restores the metre, though the duplicated preposition is rather clumsy. The transposition of $\mu \epsilon \gamma^{\alpha} \rho o \iota c \iota \nu$ and $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho o \iota c \iota \nu$ is harder to explain unless one or other had been omitted in the exemplar and inserted above the line.
$437 \alpha v \dot{\tau} \hat{\omega} \kappa \epsilon \nu] \tau \hat{\omega} \kappa \alpha \iota \mu \circ \iota$ D. Restoration of the metre but not of the sense. D still has a $\mu \circ \iota$ after $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda o \iota \tau o ́$.
 ing $\mathbf{C}$ here and make intelligent, if mutually contradictory, guesses to fill the gap.
$\left.529 \pi \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha\right] \pi \epsilon \rho i \not \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \gamma \epsilon \mathbf{C}(\pi \epsilon \rho i \nsim \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \nu c t t$.$) . Unsuccessful re-$ appearance of the 'universal panacea', employed no doubt to improve the scansion of the second half of the line, if not of the first.
$571 \ddot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \pi \tau \dot{\eta}<c o \nu \tau \alpha c]$ є́ $\pi \iota \pi \tau v \dot{\prime} c c o \nu \tau \alpha c$ RQ. $\pi \tau \dot{v} c c o \nu \tau \alpha c$ in $\mathbf{C D}$ is the result of iotacism, which also afflicts $\mathbf{R Q}$, but the addition of the prefix $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ is a great improvement metrically. $\dot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon$ of course has no ms authority and is merely Fränkel's suggestion.
 from $k . \mathbf{R}$ attempts correction but is apparently unaware that the second syllable of $\delta \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho v o \nu$ is short, in spite of its appearance in the next line. But perhaps the scribe is ascribing to Apollonius an arbitrary lengthening of the $v$ metri causa.
 root of the trouble is omission of $\nu \hat{v} \nu(\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ by haplography in $\mathbf{D}$ ) for which $\mathbf{R Q}$ are attempting to cover up.
 $\mu \epsilon \tau o ́ \pi \iota c \theta \epsilon \tau i c \alpha \iota \mu \iota \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \rho \omega \gamma \hat{\eta} c \mathbf{D}$. The scribe is mistaken about the quantity of the first syllable of $\tau i c \alpha \iota \mu \iota$.
 Paris.gr. 2844, but the obvious change may well have occurred independently to an intelligent scribe.
$\left.1200 \eta_{\eta}^{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \kappa \epsilon\right]$ є́ $\pi \epsilon \in \nu \epsilon \iota \kappa \epsilon$ C. $k$, followed by RQD, has removed the augment: reasonably enough, $\mathbf{C}$ makes up the lost syllable with a prepositional prefix.
$1210 \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \in \nu \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon \nu]$ є่ $\phi \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \mathbf{R Q}$. $k$, followed by $\mathbf{C D}$, has $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon \nu$ 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 $\kappa \alpha \theta v i \pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon$ at 1209.
$4.277 \nu \hat{v} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota] \mu i \mu \nu \epsilon \iota$ RD. Omission of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is inherited from $k$. RD make up for the lost syllable at the expense of the caesura.
$\left.435 \dot{\eta} \delta^{\prime}{ }_{o}^{\circ} \tau \epsilon\right] \dot{\eta} \delta^{\prime}{ }_{o}^{\circ} \tau \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$ C. Perhaps an inherited conjecture to deal with the omission of a syllable. The form $\kappa \dot{\eta} \rho \in c c \iota \nu$ survives in $\mathbf{H}$, and B retains a reminiscence of it with $\kappa \eta \rho v_{\wedge}^{\kappa \epsilon} c c \iota \nu$.

673 oư $\left.\delta^{\prime}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \epsilon c \iota \nu\right] \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon c$ R. Another pentameter. $\mathbf{Q B}$ also omit oủ $\delta^{\prime}$.
 ov̀ $\lambda \dot{v} \mu \pi o v$ for ovं $\lambda \dot{v} \mu \pi o \iota o$ and insert $\hat{\omega} \rho \tau o$ in an attempt to make the second half of the line scan. Presumably Moschus allowed synecphonesis of ov $\hat{\omega}^{\hat{\omega}} \rho-$.
$1083 \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \iota \alpha ́ \lambda o \iota o] \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \phi \iota \alpha ́ \lambda o v$ RQ. k's reading of $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ for $\beta \alpha \rho \dot{v} \nu$ precludes the genitive in -oıo.
 $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v v_{c}$ is commoner than the form $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \epsilon \rho o c_{\text {( (though not in Apollo- }}$ nius), so we are surprised not to see it in $\mathbf{R C}$, which, with $\mathbf{Q}$, read ò $\phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu o i ̂ c \iota$.
 (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. ${ }^{11}$ 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

 of rivers, and there is similar confusion in the mss at Iliad 12.33.
$\left.753 \tau \iota \nu^{\prime} c c \omega \nu\right] \tau \iota \tau \alpha i v \omega \nu$ D. $\dot{\eta}^{\prime} i^{\prime} \alpha \tau \epsilon i \nu \alpha c$ is the Homeric phrase, cf. Iliad 5.262, which the scribe seems to be adapting here.
$\left.811 \chi \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha i \tau^{\prime} \in \pi i ̀ \tau \hat{\eta} \subset \iota\right] \chi \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha i \tau \epsilon \gamma v \nu \alpha \hat{\imath} \kappa \epsilon c$ MR. Thoughtless intrusion of a Homeric reminiscence: cf. Iliad 2.289.
$971 \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota] \mu \epsilon ́ \delta \epsilon \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota$ MRD. Apollonius does not use this word but cf. Iliad $2.384 \pi$ по $\lambda \epsilon \mu о$ о $\mu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \theta \omega$. On the other hand it could be a misreading of $\mu \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota$.
 attention to Iliad 22.305 ккì éccopévoıィ九 $\pi v \theta \in \in \in \theta \alpha \iota$, which clearly the scribe also has in mind. MRQD make the same change at 2.842 .
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \in \nu$. In his zeal to imitate the Homeric passage, the scribe omits
 distracted the eye from the intervening $\boldsymbol{o} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$.
$1336 \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \rho \alpha \delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega c] \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ D. Only once in Homer, Odyssey
 variant from the exemplar.
$\left.2.116 \tau \tau^{\prime} \chi^{\prime}\right] \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \rho \mathbf{D}$. This shows some grasp of the use of particles, cf.
 it could be just another Homericism.
${ }^{11}$ 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.
 $673 \beta \alpha i ̂ \nu o \nu$ є̆ $\rho \alpha \zeta \epsilon] \pi i \pi \tau o \nu[s i c] \epsilon ้ \rho \alpha \zeta \epsilon$ D. Substitution of the regular Homeric expression, cf. Iliad 12.156.
$\left.678 \beta \iota o ̀ \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi i \delta_{\epsilon} \nu \omega ́ \tau o \imath c\right] \beta \iota o ̀ \nu \eta$ グ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \phi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \eta \nu$ D. Slavish following of the Homeric formula, cf. Iliad 10.260.
$786 \pi \alpha \tau \rho i]$ Sovpi $\mathbf{Q}\left(\right.$ ita $\left.\mathbf{L}^{\mathbf{v l}}\right)$. A reminiscence of Iliad 5.653, in view of which the agreement with $\mathbf{L}^{\mathbf{1 l}}$ may be fortuitous.
$833 \psi v \chi \circ \rho \rho \alpha \gamma \epsilon ́ \sigma \nu \tau \alpha] \beta \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \alpha<\tau \epsilon \nu \alpha \chi \chi \circ \nu \tau \alpha$ Q. Cf. 1.388 where MRQCD $\operatorname{read} \beta \alpha \rho v$ cтє $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime} \chi o \nu \tau o$. In both cases this is substitution of the regular Homeric phrase.

842 See above on 1.1062.
 result of an unfamiliar form and reminiscence of the Homeric passages.

1176 конє́ovс $\alpha \iota] \gamma \alpha \nu o ́ \omega \subset \alpha \iota$ Q. Thoughtless imitation of Odyssey 7.128. 3.20 סólov] vóov C. For vó́w vóov cf. Iliad 9.104; but this may be mechanical assimilation.
$119 \dot{v} \pi \dot{o} \quad \mu \alpha \zeta \hat{\varphi}] \quad \epsilon \quad \pi i \quad \mu \alpha \zeta \hat{\varphi} \mathbf{D}$. The more regular expression, cf. Odyssey 11.448 , but $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ for $\dot{v} \pi o^{\prime}$ is a common change.
$301 \theta \nu \mu \dot{\partial} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \subset \alpha \nu] \theta v \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ ढ̈ $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \sigma \nu$ D. The Homeric formula, $c f$. Odyssey 1.107.
 19.391. But it could be a gloss.
$664 \kappa \iota \nu v \cup \rho \epsilon \tau o \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon ́ \tau \iota c \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \phi \nu \omega] \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho v o \nu \epsilon i \beta \epsilon \nu \mathbf{R}$. Another
 $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho v o \nu є \ddot{\imath} \beta \epsilon \iota$. Presumably $\tau \hat{\eta}$ iкє́ $\lambda \eta$ 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 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \in \tau \iota c \not{\alpha} \phi \nu \omega$, 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.
$692 \kappa \hat{\eta} \delta$ ос $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda о \iota \circ$ ] $\kappa \hat{\eta} \delta$ ос ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \circ \iota \circ$ RQC. Cf. Iliad 4.95 and 9.303, $\kappa \hat{v} \delta o c$ $\alpha^{\alpha} \rho o \iota o$, suggesting iotacist pronunciation by Moschus.
$866 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \omega \nu]{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \chi \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu \mathbf{D}$. It is unlikely that the copyist would have been bothered by the lengthening of the $v$ (for which there is a Homeric precedent at Od.9.398); he simply prefers the traditional Homericism, cf. Iliad 5.869 and 18.461.
$\left.919 \epsilon \pi{ }^{\prime} \grave{i} \pi \rho \circ \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu\right] \epsilon \pi \iota \chi \theta o \nu i \omega \nu$ C. Apollonius is imitating Iliad 5.637, the scribe 9.558 .
$\left.1262 \gamma \operatorname{vic}^{i} \omega \nu\right] \chi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ D. Another Homericism which also occurs at 2.334 and 3.507. ${ }^{12}$

1357 iкєто $^{\boldsymbol{i} \epsilon \epsilon \tau о} \mathbf{D}$. Just a mechanical error? Cf. on 1.39 above.
 1370, but also perhaps by Odyssey $19.91 \quad \theta \alpha \rho \subset \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \eta$, кvoov $\alpha \delta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon ́ c$. $4.12 \beta \alpha \theta \epsilon i \eta c] \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \lambda \eta \nu$ RQ. Cf. Iliad 10.184, and Ap. Rhod. 3.1351 where $\mathbf{R}$ has $\grave{\alpha} \nu \nu ँ \nu \eta \nu$ for $\dot{o} \delta o ́ v \tau \alpha c$ (see below, p.123).
 at 3.229 .

 (supra n .7 ) 134-37; for the phrase cf. Odyssey 8.2.
 Ap. Rhod. $1.1305 T \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu \omega \underset{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \rho v ́ \tau \eta$. Brunck prints it without comment, "ex ingenio, ut videtur" (Wellauer), but I am sure Moschus is the source of the conjecture.
 Iliad 1.177 and 5.891 .
$458 \nu \eta \dot{c}_{c o v}$ ] $\delta i \phi \rho o v$ D. Thoughtless substitution to fit a Homeric phrase, cf. Iliad 13.26.
$462 \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \dot{\prime} \subset \alpha \iota \tau \circ$ ] $\tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \not{ }^{\prime} \nu \alpha \iota \tau o$ D. Imitation of Iliad 10.19.

 Homeric, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \theta \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ is not.
$591 \dot{\eta} \in \lambda i o o o] \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho i o v o c ~ D$. It does not scan here, but this word is common in Homer as an epithet of the sun; only once without the addition of $\eta^{\prime} \in ́ \lambda \iota o c$, at Odyssey 1.24.
$654 \alpha i \theta \alpha \lambda i \eta \nu]$ oi $\alpha \alpha \lambda i \eta \nu$ D. Aethalia (the modern Elba) does not appear in Homer, but Oechalia does.
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \propto \kappa о \tau \epsilon \in \epsilon$, is a Homeric phrase.
 and giving some sort of sense, so Moschus employs it.

 $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ o u c ı$.

${ }^{12}$ Cf. similar confusion in the mss at Aesch. Pers. 913.
$1198 \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \epsilon \iota \delta o \nu$ є́ $\lambda \iota c \subset o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota]$ 关 $\iota \delta o \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \iota \beta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ D. Imported from Iliad 1.604.
 out, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \tau o$ is the Homeric form (Il. 2.700); the scribe had no Homeric lexicon, ${ }^{13}$ but he knew that ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \tau o$ did not occur in early epic.
 Reminiscence of Odyssey 12.136 or a gloss.
$1674 \mu o \hat{\nu} \nu o \nu$ ] $\lambda v \gamma \rho o ̀ c$ RQCD. Even if the copyist does understand the sense of $\mu$ ôvov 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. ${ }^{14}$ The evidence accumulated above shows that his knowledge

[^1]of Homer was at least as great as of Apollonius, his fondness for the earlier poet perhaps greater, ${ }^{15}$ and lends support to the theory that he may have employed the same technique in copying Homer as we have suggested for Apollonius. ${ }^{16}$

## (c) Echo other than Homericism

$1.125 \lambda_{\nu \rho \kappa \eta i o v]} \pi о \lambda \nu \lambda \dot{\eta}_{i} \circ \nu$ MRQ. No doubt lifted from 51, but it is a forgivable attempt to correct a still not understood epithet. ${ }^{17}$
$129 \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\epsilon}(\alpha \tau \circ] \dot{\alpha} \pi о к \dot{\alpha} \tau \theta \epsilon \tau о$ MRQ. Not without merit: the double compound adds extra flavour and the word occurs again at 3.817 and 1287.

202 тóıc] vótoc 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: $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \grave{\epsilon} ~ \Pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota \mu o ́ v o o c ~$ $\Lambda \epsilon ́ \rho \nu o v \nu o ́ \theta o c ~ \eta ้ \lambda \nu \theta \in \nu \nu$ vióc.
$331 \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu] \pi \rho o c \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ C. Lifted from 294.

 as well as Apollonius, so this is very likely an echo rather than a preference for a dactylic ending.
$576 \mu v \rho i \alpha] \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \subset \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha$ RQ. Lifted from 2.143 and 839.

$1115 \pi o \tau \alpha \mu o \hat{v}]$ i $\epsilon \rho 0 \hat{v} \mathbf{C}$. $i \in \rho o o_{c}$ is a regular epithet for rivers in Homer and Apollonius. The scribe finds it more attractive than a defining substantive.
$\left.1325{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\nu} \lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \nu\right] \stackrel{ }{\epsilon} \beta \eta<\alpha \nu$ MRQ. Lifted from 1285.


[^2][^3]90). The result of failure to look ahead to 34 , perhaps influenced by 1.1326, where RQCDBP read $\epsilon \in \delta \dot{\prime} с \alpha \tau o$.
 affected by $\dot{\alpha} i \xi \alpha \nu \tau o c$ in 92.
$115 \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \subset c \alpha c] \underset{\alpha}{\alpha} \iota \xi \alpha c$ MRQ. Also affected by 92, but the scribe has either forgotten that the $\alpha$ is long or permitted internal correption. ${ }^{18}$
$301 \gamma \epsilon$ є́родтос] $\lambda \epsilon$ 'огтос. A reminiscence of 1.1195 (and Iliad 10.23).
339 но́рор] oíтov MR. Imported from 172.
$519 \epsilon ่ \epsilon \epsilon \tau \mu \hat{\eta}] \epsilon \in \nu \iota \pi \hat{\eta} \mathbf{C}$. Presumably the scribe meant to write $\epsilon ่ \nu \iota \pi \hat{\eta}$, a
 $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ c ~ \epsilon ่ \nu ı \pi \eta ̂ c$.
$749 \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \eta] \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ MRQC. As a result of 3.430, $\kappa \alpha \kappa \eta$ and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ are inseparable in the mind of the scribe.
$811 \pi \alpha \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \iota$ є́ $\left.\psi \iota o ́ \omega \nu \tau o\right] \pi \alpha \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \iota o \iota \pi о \nu \epsilon ́ o \nu \tau o ~ M R Q . ~ L i f t e d ~ f r o m ~$ 667.
$903 \epsilon \dot{v} \delta \iota o ́ \omega \nu \tau \epsilon c]$ єipєciŋcı M. Drawn from 1031.
$973 \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \delta \iota \chi \alpha] \epsilon i c \stackrel{\circ}{\alpha} \lambda \alpha$ M. Taken from 744.
$1134 \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon] \pi \rho \circ \subset \epsilon ́ \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ R. Copied from 1.1336.
$3.306 \ddot{\alpha} \tau \eta] \alpha i c \alpha \mathbf{C}$. Imported from 328, though it could be a gloss.
$\left.415 \alpha \hat{v} \theta_{\iota} \delta \alpha i \zeta \omega \nu\right] \alpha \hat{i} \psi \alpha \delta \alpha i \xi \alpha c$ D. Both adverb and tense are drawn from $412 \alpha i \psi \alpha \tau \alpha \mu \omega \dot{\nu}$.

782 oiov] $\hat{\alpha} c c o \nu \mathbf{Q}$. Vian is right to keep ioov̂co (cf. 908), but we might have expected $\mathbf{Q}$ to make the change to iov̂c $\alpha$ once he had introduced $\dot{\alpha} c c o \nu, c f .2 .107$ and Homer, passim; but maybe he has 3.253 in mind.

1092 оv้ $\nu о \mu$ ' $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \hat{\iota} \subset \alpha \iota$ ] ov̋vo $\mu \alpha$ кó $\lambda \chi \omega \nu$ C. Imported from 680.
1351 ó óóv $\tau \alpha c] \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} v \ddot{v} \lambda \eta \nu \mathbf{R}$. The scribe is reminded of the simile at 4.1338.
$1358 \dot{\alpha} \subset \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau o v<\alpha]$ 人ंiccovco RQ. Taken from 1265 or 1379.
$4.402 \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \lambda \gamma o c] \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o$ RQCD. The result of confusion with $3.429 f$ (the only other occurrence of $\rho i \gamma \iota o \nu$ in the poem).
$462 \tau \epsilon \chi \nu \eta{ }^{\prime}<\alpha \iota \tau o$ ] $\tau \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \tau о \mathbf{C}$. Imported from 217.
$477 \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \epsilon \theta \alpha \nu o ́ v \tau o c] \theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \theta v \eta \lambda \hat{\eta} \subset$ C. Lifted from 1.1140.
$\left.570 \tau^{\prime \prime} \lambda \eta\right] \alpha i \gamma \lambda \eta$ RQD. Taken from 1710.
$826 \phi^{\prime} \epsilon_{\eta \eta<\iota \nu]} \beta^{\prime} \lambda \lambda_{\eta \iota \iota \nu} \mathbf{R Q C}, \theta v^{\prime} \epsilon \lambda \lambda \alpha$ D. RQC inherit an error arrived at by confusion with the first word of the line; $\mathbf{D}$ attempts correction by importing $\theta v^{\prime} \epsilon \lambda \lambda \alpha$ from 787 or 834.
$912 \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \dot{\prime} \rho \omega \nu] \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \mathbf{R Q}$. Drawn from 1.60.
${ }^{18}$ On correption in Apollonius see M. Campbell, RevPhil 47 (1973) 83-90.
 with $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \theta \omega$ in 1007; R's comes from 1.953.


 desert, but these marsh nymphs have already made their appearance twice in the poem and so are more acceptable to the scribe.

1393 кuciv] cúcıv CD. It may be just a slip, but probably the scribe is thinking of the simile at 3.1351 .

1540 форє́धото] порє́ovто 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 i\mu\beta\rho\alphaci\etac] \alpha}\mu\beta\mathrm{ росi`с D.
```





```
    617 \epsilon}\rho\rho\rho\alpha\iotac\alpha\nu] \omegä\lambda\epsilon\epsilon(c)\alpha\nu MRQD.
```



```
    834 \phióvov] \phii'\lambdaov C.
```





```
    1212\dot{\alpha}\piov́\rho\alphac] \alphȧ\epsiloní\rho\alphac MRQ.
    1289 \chió\oc] \alphä\chioc MRQ.
    1339 \mu\hat{\nu}\nu\nu] 0v\muò\nu MRQ.
```



```
    24 \dot{\alpha}v\tau\alpha\alpha}\alpha<0\alpha\iota] \delta\eta\rho\iota\alphá\alphac0\alpha\iota MR
```


$159 \mu \epsilon \in \tau \omega \pi \alpha] \kappa \alpha ́ \rho \eta \nu \alpha$ MRQ.
$286 \hat{\alpha} \lambda \tau o]$ ஸ̂ $\rho \tau о$ MR.
$\left.298{ }^{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \delta v<\alpha \nu\right] \epsilon \not \epsilon \beta \eta<\alpha \nu \mathbf{M}$.

576 к $\alpha \tau \in ́ v \epsilon \iota \kappa \epsilon \nu]$ катє́ $\rho v \kappa \epsilon$ MRQD.
577 кіvóт $\alpha \tau о \nu$ ס́́oc] $\alpha i \nu o ́ \tau \alpha \tau о с ~ \chi \lambda$ о́oc MRQ.

812 є่ $\gamma \kappa о \nu \epsilon ́ о \nu \tau \epsilon \subset]$ є $\dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon ์ о \nu \tau \epsilon \subset$ MRQ.


1123 є̇ $\pi \circ \psi i o v]$ iкєciov M.
1215 v゙ $\delta \alpha c \iota]$ є้ $\nu \delta o \theta_{\iota}$ MRQ.


$3.66 \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \alpha] \pi \circ \lambda \dot{v} \mathbf{R}, \pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu v \mathbf{Q}$.
232 cт兀ß $\alpha \rho \circ \hat{v}] ~ c \tau v \gamma \in \rho \circ \hat{v} \mathbf{C D}$.
$339 \kappa \hat{\alpha} \alpha c] \gamma \alpha \hat{\alpha} \alpha \nu \mathbf{D}$.
383 є́є́ $\lambda \delta \epsilon \tau о$ ] iaivєто $\mathbf{Q}$.
$553 \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu] \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ D.
$572 \pi \rho \circ \stackrel{\imath}{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \epsilon] \pi \rho о$ є́ $\eta \kappa \epsilon$ C.

$762 \delta \iota \dot{\alpha}] \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \mathbf{R Q}$.
797 кíсүос] $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ уос RQCD.
884 caívoucıv] $\theta$ є́oucı $\mathbf{D}$.

$900 \delta \epsilon \in \kappa \epsilon] \delta^{\prime} \ddot{\alpha} \nu \mathbf{R Q}, \delta \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \mathbf{C}$.
916 сфıcıv] тоîc $\mathbf{D}$.
1025 кои́p $\eta$ ] $\nu \cup ́ \mu \phi \eta$ C.
$1098 \kappa \epsilon i \nu \eta \nu] \nu v ́ \mu \phi \eta \nu \mathbf{C} .{ }^{19}$

$\left.1147{ }^{\eta} \tau \circ \iota\right] \alpha u ̀ \tau \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ..... D.
$\left.1168 \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon c \iota \iota \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon\right] \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \epsilon c \iota \nu$ є́ $\phi \dot{\omega} \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ RQ.
$\left.1170 \hat{\eta} \subset \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon v \theta \epsilon\right]$ íc $\tau \alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \mathrm{D}$.
1372 со́ $\lambda$ oьo] $\lambda i ́$ Ooıo RQD.
$\left.4.19 \beta \rho v \chi \eta^{\prime}<\alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu i \eta\right] \beta \rho v \chi \eta^{\prime}<\alpha \tau o ~ \phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \mathbf{C}$.
$\left.57{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \subset \kappa \omega\right]$ ік $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \mathbf{C}$.
$\left.148 \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \phi \circ \rho \mu \eta \eta^{\prime}\right] \epsilon{ }_{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \mathrm{D}$.
302 ро́ov] по́рог RQ.
$392 \kappa \epsilon \alpha ́ c c \alpha \iota] \kappa \epsilon \delta \alpha ́ c c \alpha \iota$ 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.


```
559 кіркпс] кои́ рпс \(\mathbf{C}\).
567 коv́ \(\eta \nu\) ] \(\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \phi \eta \nu \mathbf{D}\).
\(578 \dot{\alpha} \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \alpha c] \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mathbf{R}, \dot{\alpha} \eta{ }^{\prime} \tau \alpha c \mathbf{Q}\).
```



```
871 रрі́єскє] \(\delta є \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \subset \kappa \epsilon \mathbf{R}\).
\(1071 \lambda \epsilon \chi \epsilon ́ \epsilon \subset с \iota] \lambda \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \rho о \iota \subset \iota\) RQCD.
\(1103 \nu \in i ̂ \kappa о с]\) vócтov D .
```



```
\(1436 \dot{\nu} \beta \rho \iota \nu]\) 爻 \(\lambda \lambda \omega \nu\) RQC.
\(1527 \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \alpha \gamma \epsilon ́ \rho о \nu \tau о] \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \epsilon \pi \epsilon ́ v \circ \nu \tau o\) RQC.
```


(e) Easier syntax preferred
$1.711 \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \rho \in \dot{\epsilon} \circ \nu \tau \alpha c] \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \rho \in \epsilon_{0} v<\alpha$ D. An attractive emendation to the myopic; but where is the interrogative in Iphinoë's speech?
$969 \delta \dot{\eta}] \kappa \alpha i \mathbf{D}$. The scribe took fright at $\delta \grave{\eta}$ as the first word.
 object. In $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \in \in \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon$ the scribe finds a transitive verb fitting the metre, giving some sort of sense, and palaeographically close to the puzzling є́ $\rho i ́ \delta \eta \nu \in \nu$.
$218 \rho ீ v \not c \alpha c \theta \epsilon] \lambda v^{\prime} \subset \alpha \tau \epsilon$ MRQD. SC read $\lambda v^{\prime} \subset \alpha c \theta \epsilon$, which was no doubt a gloss, but regardless of metre MRQD prefer the active form.
$695 \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \rho \in \neq \nu \tau \epsilon c]$ єico $o ́ \omega \nu \tau \epsilon c$ MRQC. Common in this sedes and an easy change which still makes sense; no doubt influenced by écíסoıє in 696.
$884 \dot{\alpha} \pi о \rho \rho i \not \psi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \epsilon] \dot{\alpha} \pi о \rho \rho i \not \psi \alpha c \theta \epsilon \delta^{\prime}$ MRQ. No logical reason for this change, but presumably the scribe prefers two imperatives. $\left.3.68 \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \epsilon_{\eta} \eta\right] \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o c \mathbf{D}$. We may assume that the exemplar lacked the iota subscript: attraction to the case and gender of the subject of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \beta o^{\prime} \lambda \eta c \epsilon \nu$ is no surprise.
$225 \pi \rho о \rho \epsilon ́ \epsilon \subset \kappa \epsilon]$ ] $\pi \rho о є ́ \eta \kappa \epsilon$ QD, $\pi \rho о \theta$ є́ $\epsilon \subset \kappa \epsilon$ C. "Librarios turbavit minus obvius usus verbi $\rho \in \epsilon \epsilon$ active significantis" (Brunck). RQC have oilv $\omega$ for $\boldsymbol{v} \delta \omega \rho$ from 224. Meanwhile QD have changed to a more regular transitive verb. $\mathbf{R}$ keeps $k$ 's $\pi \rho о є ́ \epsilon с к є ; \mathbf{C}$, taking advantage of the chaos, offers yet another variant of little merit.

276 oióv] oioc D. An intelligent suggestion, probably the result of failure to recognize oiov as an adverb.
$\left.404 \eta_{\nu} \nu \kappa^{\prime}\right] \alpha{ }^{\prime} \kappa^{\prime} \mathbf{R Q D}$. Another intelligent alteration by a scribe
who was not endowed with Vian's facility for adducing parallels for "une curiosité attestée chez Homère." 20
 us, but $\mathbf{D}$, in search of a verb to govern $\dot{v} \pi o c \chi \epsilon c i \eta \nu$, finds $\dot{\alpha} \nu v v^{\prime} \omega$ and would have done better to add the prefix $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$-.
$801 \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ c c \alpha \iota] \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \iota \theta \alpha \iota$ D. Unable to find a subject for $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon c \alpha \iota$ in the $\pi \rho i \nu$ clause, the scribe resorts to the passive.
 from $k$, which makes the suffix of oiккóv $\delta \epsilon$ otiose. $\mathbf{D}$ realizes this and allows himself (perhaps unconsciously) phonetic corruption from $\nu \epsilon_{\epsilon} \epsilon \subset \theta \iota$ to $\nu \alpha i_{\epsilon} \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota$, thereby retaining the metre.
$\left.1240{ }^{\imath} c \theta \mu \iota \nu\right]$ ${ }^{\prime} c \theta \mu \iota o \mathrm{D}$. An interesting transference of epithet, presumably the result of proximity to oîoc and Посєi $\delta \alpha \dot{\omega} \omega$.
$\left.4.1399 \epsilon^{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu\right]$ є́ $\phi \dot{\prime} \mu \nu \iota \nu \mathbf{R Q C}$. The scribe prefers a noun to an adjective and finds it from 2.713.

## (f) Change due to misunderstanding

 $\ddot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu o \nu \mathbf{D}$. D's $\pi \rho o o^{\prime} \theta \theta \epsilon$ is most likely a mechanical change influenced by $\pi \alpha ́ \rho o \iota \theta \epsilon \nu$. RQ's $\pi \rho o c \alpha ́ \mu \nu \nu o \nu$ may be affected by D's $\pi \rho o ́ c \theta \epsilon \nu$, but more probably $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \iota \kappa \epsilon ́ \alpha$ was not understood and so shortened to the more familiar adverb and the prepositional prefix added to the verb metri causa.
$\left.2.738 \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \epsilon \pi \alpha^{\prime} \chi \nu \eta \nu\right] \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \epsilon \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \chi \nu \eta \nu$ D. The scribe is not familiar with the word $\pi \alpha^{\alpha} \chi \nu \eta$; his treatment is similar at 4.1531. ${ }^{21}$
$\left.934 \mathrm{f} \tau \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} c c \epsilon \iota \dot{\rho} \iota \pi \eta^{\prime} \nu\right] \phi v \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} c c \epsilon \iota \rho \iota \pi \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ D. The scribe does not understand the text he is copying and is not averse to writing nonsense. 3.267 ікоьс $\theta \epsilon]$ € $\epsilon \eta \tau \epsilon \mathbf{R Q C}$. їоьс $\theta \epsilon$, as Vian remarks, is "potentiel du passé: 'comment avez-vous pu aller . . . ?'.' The uncomprehending scribe has imported $\epsilon \beta \eta \tau \epsilon$ (from 316?).
$662 \chi \hat{\eta} \rho o \nu]$ фídov RC. If the scribe did not understand $\chi \hat{\eta} \rho o \nu$ he might at least have found a substitute that scanned. But it could be a corruption via $\psi \iota \lambda o ́ v$.
 looks for a word to mean 'bounded with joy': he finds it at 866.

1111 öcc $\alpha] \alpha i c \alpha$ RC. Either the scribe did not understand öcco and.
${ }^{20}$ Cf. Gillies, appendix p.139, and A. Platt, JP 33 (1914) 31.
${ }^{21}$ 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 iк\alpha\nu\nu\nu] \epsilon}\beta\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\nu MRQ.
    350 \gamma\eta0ócv\nuoc] \gamma\eta0ó\mu\epsilonvoc D.
    512\alphav`\delta\hat{\eta}] oे\mu\phi\hat{\eta}MQ.
    601 \alpha
    625 0ó\alpha\nu\tau\iota] \gamma\epsiloń\rhoо\nuт\iota MRQ. The truth?
```



```
    837 \chi\alpha\tau\epsilońоvс\iota\nu ò\pi\alphá\zeta\epsilon\iotac] \chi\alpha\tau\epsilońоvс\iota \pi\alpha\rhoíс\chi\epsilon\iotaс D.
    1031 \lambdaéкт\rhoо\nu] \deltaó\muо\nu D.
    1219 \dot{\alpha}\epsiloń\gammaо\nu\tau\epsilonс] \alphaं'о\nu\tau\epsilonс D.
    1228 к\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\nu\alpháo\iotao] к\alpha\lambda\\iota\rhoóoьo D.
    1305\pi\epsiloń\phi\nu\epsilonv] к\tau\epsilonìv\epsilon D.
2.12 0\epsilońс\muно́v] 0\epsiloń\muис MRQ.
    143 \epsiloṅ\tau\alphá\muо\nu\tauо] \epsiloṅं\alpha\alphav́vovтo D.
    183 <ै\alpha\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu] \epsilonैध\etaк\alpha\nu MR.
    205 кє́к\lambda\iota\tau'] кєє̂то D.
    363 кv́\rho\epsilon\iota] к\epsilonі̂\tau\alpha\iota MRQ.
    419 \gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\iotaòc] \gamma\epsiloń\rho\omega\nu D.
    465 öт\iotaс \epsilonै\xi%о\chiос] öст\iotaс \alpha้рıстос M.
    616 ӧт\alphacc\epsilon] \epsilonॅ\delta\omegaкє М.
    670 \lambda\epsilon\pi\tauò\nu] \mu\iotaкро\grave{\nu MRQ.}
    681 \epsilon゙\lambda\epsilon] \epsilonॅ\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon D.
    1152 \alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsiloń\gammaо\nu\tau\epsilonc] \alpha'iov\tau\epsilonc M. 
3.366 \gamma\epsilon\gamma\alphá\alphac\iota\nu] \epsilon}\beta\lambda\alphác\tau\eta<\alpha\nu\nu D.
    862 \epsiloṅ\nu\epsiloń\rhoо\iotaс\iota\nu] \nu\epsilon\rho\tau\epsiloń\rhoо\iotaс\iota\nu R.
    1000 \epsilonvैv\alphac\epsilon \muiv\omegac] \epsilonṽv\alphac\epsilon\nu \etaँ\rho\omegac RQD.
4.156 0\alpha\lambda\lambda\hat{\omega}] 0\alpha\muóv C (voluit 0\alphá\mu\nu\omega).
    422\piо́\rhoо\nu] \pi\epsiloń\mu\piо\nu D.
    1019 \mu\alpha\rho\gammaосv́v\etac] \mu\alpha\chi\lambdaосúv\etaс RQCD.
```


(h) Other embellishments (which may or may not be mechanical)
 I am reluctant to discount it as merely a copyist's error. $\gamma \alpha$ inc occurs at 243 and 255 , and might have caught the scribe's eye. ${ }^{22}$

${ }^{22} \mathrm{Dr}$ Dawe suggests that it is a relic of a note explaining that $\nu \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha$ can sometimes refer to land as well as to people.
 MRQ conjecture $\mu o i \rho \alpha$ 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. ${ }^{23}$
$\left.361 \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \kappa \epsilon\right]$ ó $\phi \rho \alpha$ MRQ. An unsuccessful attempt to correct a faulty exemplar (cf. $\alpha i \kappa \in \mathbf{D}$ ). $\mathbf{M}^{\gamma \rho}$ preserves the truth.
$\left.523 \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau v v_{\nu \alpha c} \theta \alpha \iota\right] \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau v \nu \epsilon \in \epsilon \subset \theta \propto$ CD. A curious emendation of tense, which Brunck unwisely accepts. The scribe may have doubted the length of the $v$ and have been influenced by the Homeric future $\dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \tau \check{\nu} \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$.
$538 \dot{\delta} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \hat{\eta}] \quad \epsilon ่ \nu \iota c \pi \hat{\eta}$ MRQ. "Mira sane discrepantia," comments Wellauer, and I can see no motive for it. Again $\mathbf{M}^{\gamma \rho}$ preserves the truth.
 ancestor of $\mathbf{D}$ omitted $i \nu$ '. The solution is clever: by rearrangement of the letters the scribe needs only to add one omicron to restore both metre and sense.
$1176 \eta_{\eta} \rho \eta^{\prime}<\alpha \tau \sigma$ ] $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \rho \eta^{\prime}<\alpha \tau o$ D. The scholiast admits that this is an unusual sense for the uncompounded 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.
$\left.1213{ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \phi \nu \epsilon \nu\right] \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ C. A fine example of exceptional stupidity but clearly not an unconscious one, as it makes a neat doublet with $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о$ и́с $с$ с, the absurdity of the previous line.
$\left.2.66 \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime \prime} c \eta\right] \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ C. A bad guess by a meddlesome scribe.
 old name for the vine, cf. Hes. Op. 572.
$267 \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon v \kappa \epsilon \in \epsilon c] \dot{\alpha} \kappa \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \subset$ D. The scholia are divided on the meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \subset$ 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.
$323 \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \dot{\eta}] \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \lambda \mu \eta$ D. Perhaps a slip: it does not make much sense as a conjecture.
$396 \hat{\omega} \nu \ddot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \ddot{\eta} \delta \eta$ ] oicıv vँ $\pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon \mathbf{D}$. Either $\eta \neq \eta \eta$ was missing at some stage, or the scribe found it superfluous. In order to fill out the line he uses the lengthened form $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon$, inspired by $\epsilon \phi \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon \nu$ in 393, and the unparalleled dative, perhaps influenced by $\epsilon \pi i \grave{\imath} \tau o \hat{\imath} c \iota \nu$.
${ }^{23}$ On the proecdosis see Fränkel, op.cit. (supra n.7) 7-11.
$\left.590 \delta^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi о \epsilon і к \kappa \theta \epsilon\right] \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon i \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \mathbf{D}$. The copyist seems to have understood the objections to $\tilde{\alpha}^{24} \nu^{24}$ and produced a fairly successful solution.
$631 \nu v ́ \kappa \tau \alpha] \nu \hat{\eta} \alpha$ C. At first glance $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \eta^{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \iota \nu v v^{\prime} \kappa \tau \alpha$ is an apparent paradox, and the scribe considers Jason more likely a $\phi \dot{v} \lambda \alpha \xi$ of the ship than of the night. It is curious to observe that at 1.934 the same ms has $\nu v \kappa \tau$ ò for $\nu$ خóc, but there the change is probably unconscious, as $\nu v \kappa \tau i ́$ occurs in the same line.
$\left.843 \phi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \xi \xi\right] \phi$ oìvı $\mathbf{R Q}$, $\pi \tau o ́ \rho \theta$ oc $\mathbf{M}$. The reading of $\mathbf{R Q}$ is presumably the result of a miscopied $\phi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha \gamma \xi$; that of $\mathbf{M}$ is an attempt to restore the sense (but not the metre).
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \mu \eta \mathbf{D}$. Although there is no direct speech within 50 lines, the scribe cannot resist $\tau 0 i \bar{c} \iota \delta^{\prime} \delta^{\circ} \mu \circ \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon .{ }^{25} \mathrm{He}$ is then involved in difficulties with the plural $\pi \epsilon \phi \circ \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu o \iota$, which is made to agree with $\pi o \tau \alpha \mu o ́ \nu$; but a river can hardly be borne along by the breeze, and so ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \mu \eta$ is conjectured, which strictly means 'sea-water'.
$991 \phi \iota \lambda о \pi \tau о \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu о v с$ ] $\phi \iota \lambda о \pi \lambda о к \alpha ́ \mu о v с \mathbf{R}$. This word is known to us only from the fragments of Euphorion. At first glance it is perhaps a more suitable epithet for коv́pac than $\phi і \lambda о \pi \tau о \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu о v c$, but no doubt the origin of the corruption is mechanical.
$1260 \delta \alpha \eta \mu \circ c v ́ v \eta c \iota \nu]$ є́ $\phi \eta \mu \circ c v ́ v \eta c \iota \nu$ MRQ. An attempt to improve on the absurd $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \mu o c u ́ v \eta \subset \iota \nu$ of all mss except $\mathbf{E}^{2 i m}$.
3.22 oै $\left.\mu \mu \alpha \tau^{\prime}\right]$ oṽ $\alpha \tau^{\prime} \mathbf{R}$. Is this meant to be some sort of a joke? Reductio ad absurdum of Apollonius' Homeric variatio.
 origin, but clearly no accident when the same alteration is made twice within 60 lines; nor is it an improvement.
 ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \beta \alpha \lambda o \nu \mathbf{D}$. 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.
 alteration, which may well be accidental in origin.
$418 \tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon \tau 0 i ̂ \alpha] \tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ C. " $\tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon \tau o i ̂ \alpha$ ni 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

[^4]$\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta$ is a gloss on $\tau o i ̂ \alpha$ and has displaced something like $\mu \circ \iota$ (Fränkel's suggestion).
$604 \phi \rho \alpha ́ с с \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota] \pi \rho \alpha ́ с с \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ RQ. Not as clever as it looks at first glance: the epic form is $\pi \rho \eta^{\prime} c c \omega$, and the phrase is rather prosy. Probably it is no more than a phonetic slip.
$990 \dot{\alpha} \rho \omega \gamma \hat{\eta} \subset{ }^{\alpha} \mu o \iota \beta \hat{\eta} \subset$ Q. $\tau i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu o \iota \beta \hat{\eta} \nu$ is common enough, cf. 1.619 and Odyssey 12.382, but $\tau_{i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu o \iota \beta \hat{\eta} c$ is absurd.
$1025 \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\eta}] \delta \epsilon \in \mu \iota \nu \mathbf{R Q}$. Whether the exemplar contained $\delta \dot{\eta}$ or not (it is omitted in $\mathbf{P}$ ), this is an intelligent suggestion.
$\left.1263{ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \nu \circ c\right] \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \circ \subset \mathbf{D}$. The scribe is suspicious of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \nu \circ$ and finds ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \chi \circ c$ a more suitable subject for ${ }_{\epsilon \prime} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$. Spears are in the air both literally ( $\tau \iota \nu \alpha \alpha_{c c} \omega \nu$ ) and metaphorically ( $\mu \epsilon \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \eta \nu$ in 1264 and ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \circ c$ in 1231 and 1286).
$1266 \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \iota \phi \dot{\alpha} с с \epsilon \subset \theta \alpha \iota] \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \iota \phi \alpha{ }^{\prime}<c o v \subset \alpha \nu \mathbf{R}$. "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.
 probably mechanical in origin.
4.24 кó $\pi \omega \omega$ ] кó $\lambda \pi$ оис $\mathbf{R Q}$. This may be the truth (cf. Platt's кó $\lambda \pi \omega)$ ), ${ }^{26}$ but perhaps more likely it is the result of confusion of compendia.
$186 \chi \epsilon \rho c i \nu] \phi \rho \epsilon c c i \nu$ RQ. Another absurdity, probably a real word made out of nonsense. ${ }^{27}$
$293 \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta \subset \gamma \alpha i \eta c] \gamma \alpha i \eta c \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta c$ RQD. The order of the words is inherited from $k$. As for the change of person, "loquitur Argus in Colchide natus. ... Mendose quidem $\mathbf{D}$, sed tolerabili menda, in utroque versu primam personam praefert." Brunck is too tolerant of ignorance.
$399 \pi \alpha \tau \rho i] \pi \alpha \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$. This destroys not only the metre but also the worth of the reading ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\gamma}$ oıro (400) in $\mathbf{D}$. Perhaps it is simply the result of a nomen sacrum compendium.
$405 \mathrm{f} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota o ́ \omega \subset \iota . . \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota \epsilon \nu]$ єic $\alpha i ́ o \nu \tau \epsilon c$ D . . . фє́ $\rho о \nu \tau \epsilon \subset$ RQCD. "Das Letztere [ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota o ́ \omega \nu \tau \epsilon c$ ] ist in $\mathbf{D}$ durch eine weitere Konjektur in $\epsilon i c \alpha i o \nu-$ $\tau \epsilon c$ verwandelt worden (worauf dann $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota \epsilon \nu$ hätte folgen sollen), 'wenn sie gewahr werden-dass Apsyrtos nicht mehr am Leben ist

[^5](vgl. 497 und 507)', etwa in Anlehnung an den Vers II. 1085 (der mit
 $\mathrm{o}(\nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{c}) .{ }^{\prime}{ }^{28}$
$604 \dot{\alpha} \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota] \quad \in \lambda \iota \gamma \mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \nu \alpha \iota$ D. Giangrande may be right to support $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\mu} \in \nu \alpha \iota$ here (Zu Sprachgebrauch, Technik und Text des Apollonios Rhodios [Amsterdam 1973] 35), and $\mathbf{R}$ predictably ' normaliz es' to the Homeric $\dot{\alpha} \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v \alpha l$. But D's é $\lambda \iota \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu \alpha \iota$ (which surely means ' whirling,' cf. Hes. Th. 791) looks to me more like the preservation of an ancient variant (or uncial corruption AEI EEAI $>E \wedge I$ ) than a XV-century ' Verbesserungsversuch.'
$606 \beta \lambda \epsilon \phi \dot{\alpha} \rho \omega \nu] \lambda \epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ D. 'In cod. D qui optimum ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \iota \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu \alpha \iota$ modo suppeditavit absurda hic observatur lectio," comments Brunck with good reason. Mechanical in origin?

$938 \approx \theta v \nu \epsilon] \eta \geqslant \nu v c \epsilon \mathbb{Q}$. A poor suggestion which does not even scan. It could perhaps be mechanical: $\iota \theta v \nu \epsilon\rangle \iota \nu v \theta \epsilon\rangle \eta \nu v \theta \epsilon \ldots$
 to 'correct' a faulty exemplar.
$1055 \epsilon \dot{\nu} \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \alpha c] \chi^{\alpha \lambda \kappa \kappa \eta} \rho \epsilon \alpha \subset$ RQ. Perhaps a variant in the exemplar.
 698; that of $\mathbf{R Q}$ was perhaps intended to 'correct' it.
$\left.1144 \pi о \iota \kappa_{i}^{\prime} \lambda \alpha\right] \pi v \theta \mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \alpha$ RQCD. I am unable to account for this word, which elsewhere in the poem occurs only as a variant at 946.
$1162 \mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho o 九 c] \quad \mu \in \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \omega$ RQCD. Obviously intended to correct $\mu \in \gamma \alpha \rho o v$, which is read by $k$.

$1197 \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \epsilon] \not \tilde{\alpha}^{2} \lambda \alpha \iota \mathbf{R}, \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ Q. Both are tasteless suggestions when followed by oió $\theta \in \nu$ oicı (oiov RQCD). The scribe allows himself to be carried away by the double jingle.
$\left.1320 \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \dot{v} \gamma \rho \eta^{\prime} \nu\right] \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \eta^{\prime} \nu$ RQCD. Silly and irresponsible, but no doubt mechanical in origin.
1348 cтé $\rho \phi \epsilon \subset \iota \nu$ ] стє́ $\rho \nu o \iota c \iota \nu$ RQCD. Anatomical extravaganza induced by the proximity of $\alpha \dot{v} \chi \in \dot{\prime} \nu o c, \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha, i \xi v ́ \alpha c, \kappa \in \phi \alpha \lambda \hat{\eta} c$.
 is at least a more respectful epithet for Amphitrite than 'wellwheeled'. Moschus has a remarkable facility for Homeric reminiscence, but he is unable to think back 30 lines to find the truth.

[^6]$\left.1358 \eta^{\prime} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \theta v^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \tau \rho \epsilon c\right] \eta^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\prime} \dot{o} v \rho o \iota$ D. On the face of it, a more likely doublet perhaps, but $c f .1323$.
$1361 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota c] \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \pi \eta$ RQCD. Cf. $1.822{ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \pi \eta \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta$ but probably a mechanical error. ${ }^{29}$
$1500 \gamma \alpha i \eta] \alpha \dot{v} \tau o \hat{v} \mathbf{R}$. Perhaps the exemplar omitted $\gamma \alpha i \nmid \eta$. QC read $\nu \epsilon \in \kappa v \nu$ from 1499; R's suggestion is very feeble.
 rather than attempt correction resorts to omission.
 Nicander, Ther. 328-31, is sufficient to secure $\lambda \alpha_{\alpha} \chi \nu \eta$ in the text. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha}_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \eta$ may be no more than a mechanical slip.
 all have $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\iota}$ or $\epsilon \pi$ - at this point in the line. CD fall into the trap without realizing that the reading is excluded on metrical grounds. $\mathbf{R Q}$ alter to a compound which occurs (though only once, Iliad 5.12) in Homer.
$\left.1620 \subset \eta^{\prime} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha\right] \delta \omega^{\prime} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ RQCD. In spite of 554 , the slight zeugma does not escape the attention of a literal-minded scribe.
$1682 \pi \epsilon v^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ ] $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \rho \eta$ 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.
$\left.1767 \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu \phi \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha\right] \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha \mathbf{R Q}, \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \rho^{\prime} \alpha \mathbf{C}$. Since $\mathbf{C}$ was probably copied before $\mathbf{R Q}, \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \iota \rho \rho^{\prime} \alpha$ was most likely a conjecture in the exemplar which was miscopied by $\mathbf{C}$. It is perhaps an echo of a passage I have been unable to identify. ${ }^{31}$

Christ Church, Oxford
November, 1973

[^7]
[^0]:    ${ }^{6}$ For $\alpha \boldsymbol{i}{ }_{\kappa} \epsilon$ with the future indicative see Iliad 15.213.
    " 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.

[^1]:    ${ }^{13}$ 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 $\pi \epsilon \rho i \not \pi o \lambda \nu \subset \eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \xi \epsilon \omega \nu$. 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.
    ${ }^{14}$ Oxford, Canon.gr. 79, and Paris, gr. 2688: see Speake and Vian, op.cit. (supra n.1) 316-17.

[^2]:    ${ }^{15}$ It may be relevant that both mss of the Odyssey copied by Moschus are prefixed by the following epigram:

[^3]:    Authorship has not been established, but it is a reasonable conjecture that the poem may be attributed to the scribe himself.
    ${ }^{16}$ Speake and Vian, op.cit. (supra n.1) 315-17.
    ${ }^{17}$ Cf. D. N. Levin, GRBS 4 (1963) 9.

[^4]:    ${ }^{24}$ Cf. Platt, op.cit. (supra n.20) 20.
    ${ }^{25}$ Though the usual Homeric phrase is $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ îcı $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ кaì $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon$.

[^5]:    ${ }^{26}$ 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.

[^6]:    ${ }^{28}$ H. Fränkel, Noten $z^{u}$ den Argonautika des Apollonios (Munich 1968) 485 f.

[^7]:    ${ }^{29}$ 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.

