The Scribal Habits of Demetrius Moschus

Graham Speake

In a previous article¹ 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. 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 ρ) 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.

^a R.D. Dawe, The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus (Cambridge 1964) 47.

⁴ CQ N.S. 17 (1967) 58.

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

The manuscripts discussed are:

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

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

Q Vatican, gr. 37, ca. 1491-1514, Demetrius Moschus

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

D Paris, gr. 2729, 1490–1510, Demetrius Moschus d Collective siglum for the group **MRQCD**

The lemmata are taken from Fränkel's Oxford Classical Text (Oxford 1961). Other editions cited are those of Brunck (Strasburg 1780), Wellauer (Leipzig 1828), Mooney (Dublin 1912; repr. Amsterdam 1964), Gillies (Book 3, Cambridge 1928), and Vian (Book 3, Paris 1961).

(a) ALTERATION ON METRICAL GROUNDS

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

334 $\tau \circ i \circ j$ $\tau \circ i \circ j$ $\tau \circ i \circ j$. To avoid the hiatus. We may note another hiatus earlier in the same line, 'correction' of which is not attempted. This illustrates the sporadic and unsystematic nature of these alterations.

665 \dot{v} μέων δ' εἴ τις ἄρειον ἔπος] \dot{v} μείων δ' εἴ κεν τις ἔπος \mathbf{D} . All our $\dot{\mathbf{m}}$ ss

⁵ Dawe, op.cit. (supra n.3) 44.

read $\dot{v}\mu\epsilon l\omega\nu$ with **LAPE**. **D** restores the metre and retains the syntax, but at the expense of a vital adjective. Presumably the idea came from the end of 663, ϵl $\kappa \epsilon \delta \alpha \epsilon l \epsilon \nu$.

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

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

2.1 $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha$ $\delta'\tilde{\epsilon}c\alpha\nu$] $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\theta'$ $\tilde{\alpha}\rho'$ $\tilde{\epsilon}c\alpha\nu$ **RQC**. $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\theta'$ $\tilde{\epsilon}c\alpha\nu$ is the reading of **BPMD** which, as the copyist realizes, does not scan.

143 ἐτάμοντο] ἐλάαςκον MRQ. A correction of ἐλαύνοντο which D reads here,⁷ no doubt influenced by δημάαςκον above in 142.

160 ἀγχιάλου φύλλοις τῆ περ] ἀγχιάλω τῆ γὰρ καὶ τῆ **MRQC**. Faced with ἀγχιάλω τῆ καὶ τῆ (k) the scribe employs γάρ as a stopgap.

256 νόψ ἔνι] ἐνὶ φρεςὶ **MRCD**, μετὰ φρεςὶ **Q**. This is the only reading which Fränkel mentions anywhere as proof of **D**'s descent from **B**.8 But in fact k read $\tau\alpha\hat{v}\tau\alpha$ ἐνιβάλλεο (sic **EKB**); **P** and d corrected independently: $\tau\alpha\hat{v}\tau$ ἐνιβάλλεο θυμῶ **P**, $\tau\alpha\hat{v}\tau\alpha$ ἐνὶ φρεςὶ βάλλεο d. All one can say then is that here d rests on the text of k.9 To avoid the hiatus **Q** emended ἐνὶ το μετὰ.

271 πόντοιο] πόντου **R**. Faced with πόντοιο φορ $\epsilon(\rho)$ οντο (**MQCD**), the scribe makes the obvious correction.

329 ἐφίεμαι] ἀφιέμεν MRQ. An attempt to correct ίέμεν in D.

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

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

725 πνοι $\hat{\eta}$ δ $\hat{\epsilon}$] πνοι $\hat{\eta}$ c $\hat{\epsilon}$ **RQ**. k could not tolerate the postponement of δ $\hat{\epsilon}$ and, followed by **CD**, wrote $\hat{\upsilon}$ π $\hat{\upsilon}$ δ $\hat{\epsilon}$. **RQ** were driven to correct πνοι $\hat{\eta}$ to πνοι $\hat{\eta}$ c $\hat{\iota}$ to give the line a metrical ending.

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

⁶ For αl $\kappa \epsilon$ with the future indicative see Iliad 15.213.

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

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

⁹ I owe this note to Francis Vian.

¹⁰ See Speake and Vian, op.cit. (supra n.1) 307.

1103 οὐρανὸν] ὑψόθεν **D**. **MRQC** retain k's unmetrical οὐρανόθεν: **D**'s suggestion is not without merit.

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

1165 καὶ om. M. RQCDB read εἰcαῦτιc. M sees it is wrong but cannot find the right correction.

1200 ὄcoν] ρα R. C omits ὅcoν; R seizes upon a suitable replacement.

1240 $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta$ ' $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\delta\hat{\eta}$] $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha$ δ ' $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ **M**. **C** omits $\delta\hat{\eta}$; **M** attempts to restore the correct number of syllables. Fränkel suggests, quite plausibly, that $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\theta$ ' results from a gloss on $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$.

3.223 ἀναβλύεςκε] ἀναβλύζεςκε **RQ**. The uncompounded βλύζω is much commoner than β λύω so, pace Vian, normalization is more likely than assurance of a long v.

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

305 ξείνων ἡμετέροις $\dot{\epsilon}$ νὶ μεγάροις $\dot{\epsilon}$ νὶ μεγάροις $\dot{\epsilon}$ νὶ μεγάροις $\dot{\epsilon}$ νὶ μεγάροις $\dot{\epsilon}$ νὶ ήμετέροις $\dot{\epsilon}$ νος \dot

437 αὐτῷ κεν] τῶ και μοι **D**. Restoration of the metre but not of the sense. **D** still has a μοι after μέλοιτό.

445 θηεῖτο om. C, ρίπταςκε R, κρύπτεςκε Q. RQ seem to be following C here and make intelligent, if mutually contradictory, guesses to fill the gap.

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

571 ἄτε πτής coντας] ἐπιπτύς coντας **RQ**. πτύς coντας in **CD** is the result of iotacism, which also afflicts **RQ**, but the addition of the prefix ἐπι- is a great improvement metrically. ἄτε of course has no ms authority and is merely Fränkel's suggestion.

673 δάκρυς ν ὅςς ε] δακρύοις \mathbf{R} . The omission of ὅςς ε is inherited from \mathbf{k} . \mathbf{R} attempts correction but is apparently unaware that the second syllable of δάκρυον is short, in spite of its appearance in the next line. But perhaps the scribe is ascribing to Apollonius an arbitrary lengthening of the \mathbf{v} metri causa.

771 ἐγὼ νῦν ἔνθα κακῶν ἢ ἔνθα] ἔγως κακῶν (ἢ) ἔνθ ἢ ἔνθα **RQ**. The root of the trouble is omission of νῦν (ἐγὼν for ἐγὼ νῦν by haplography in **D**) for which **RQ** are attempting to cover up.

990 coì δ' αν έγω τείςαιμι χάριν μετόπιςθεν ἀρωγῆς] coì δ' αν έγω μετόπιςθε τίςαιμι χάριν ἐπαρωγῆς **D**. The scribe is mistaken about the quantity of the first syllable of τίςαιμι.

1136 λιποῦς ἄπο] λιποῦς φ **RQC**^{pc}. Also the reading of **S** and *Paris.gr*. 2844, but the obvious change may well have occurred independently to an intelligent scribe.

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

1210 ὑπένερθεν] ἐφύπερθεν **RQ**. k, followed by **CD**, has ὕπερθεν 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 $\kappa\alpha\theta$ ύπερθε at 1209.

4.277 $v\hat{v}v \mu \acute{e}v \epsilon \iota$] $\mu \acute{l}\mu v \epsilon \iota$ **RD**. Omission of $v\hat{v}v$ is inherited from k. **RD** make up for the lost syllable at the expense of the caesura.

435 ή δ' ὅτε] ή δ' ὅτε δὴ **C**. Perhaps an inherited conjecture to deal with the omission of a syllable. The form $\kappa \eta \rho \epsilon c \epsilon \iota \nu$ survives in **H**, and **B** retains a reminiscence of it with $\kappa \eta \rho \iota \iota^{\kappa} \epsilon c \epsilon \iota \nu$.

673 οὐδ' ἄνδρεςςιν] ἄνδρες **R**. Another pentameter. **QB** also omit οὐδ'.

770 θοροῦςα] ὧρτο θέουςα **RQC**, ὧρτο θόρουςα **D**. All four MSS read οὐλύμπου for οὐλύμποιο and insert ὧρτο in an attempt to make the second half of the line scan. Presumably Moschus allowed synecphonesis of -ου ὧρ-.

1083 ὑπερφιάλοιο] ὑπερφιάλου RQ. k's reading of δεινὸν for β αρὺν precludes the genitive in -οιο.

1147 ὀφθαλμοῖς γλυκερὸν πόθον] ὀφθαλμοῖςι γλυκὺς πόθος **Q**. γλυκὺς is commoner than the form γλυκερὸς (though not in Apollonius), so we are surprised not to see it in **RC**, which, with **Q**, read ὀφθαλμοῖςι.

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

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

(b) Homericism

1.39 ἰόντες] ἰέντες **MRQCD**. Perhaps influenced by the passive cυμφορέονται, but iημι is the usual Homeric word for the movement of rivers, and there is similar confusion in the MSS at Iliad 12.33.

753 τινάςςων] τιταίνων **D**. ἡνία τείνας is the Homeric phrase, cf. Iliad 5.262, which the scribe seems to be adapting here.

811 $\chi \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha i \tau$ ἐπὶ τ $\hat{\eta} \epsilon i$] $\chi \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha i$ τε γυνα $\hat{\iota} \kappa \epsilon \epsilon$ MR. Thoughtless intrusion of a Homeric reminiscence: cf. Iliad 2.289.

971 μ έλες θ αι] μ έδες θ αι **MRD**. Apollonius does not use this word but cf. Iliad 2.384 πολέμοιο μ εδές θ ω. On the other hand it could be a misreading of μ έλες θ αι.

1062 οψιγόνοιτιν ἰδέτθαι] οψιγόνοιτι πυθέτθαι **D**. Mooney draws our attention to *Iliad* 22.305 καὶ ἐτορμένοιτι πυθέτθαι, which clearly the scribe also has in mind. **MRQD** make the same change at 2.842.

1226 cκοπιὰc ὀρέων λάχον] cκοπιὰc ἔχον**D**. Cf. Odyssey 8.302 <math>cκοπιὰν ἔχεν. In his zeal to imitate the Homeric passage, the scribe omits ὀρέων. But perhaps λάχον had ἔχον as a superscript gloss, and that distracted the eye from the intervening ὀρέων.

1336 ἐπιφραδέως] ἐπιφρονέων **D**. Only once in Homer, Odyssey 19.385, which reads ἐπιφρονέους' ἀγορεύεις. Perhaps we see here a variant from the exemplar.

2.116 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi$ '] τ ' $\ddot{\alpha} \rho$ **D**. This shows some grasp of the use of particles, cf. Odyssey 24.28 $\dot{\eta}$ τ' $\ddot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota}$ co $\dot{\iota}$ πρω $\ddot{\iota}$ παρακτής εκθαι $\ddot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \mu o \hat{\iota} \rho$ ' $\ddot{\delta} \lambda o \dot{\eta}$. But 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.

470 ἐὸν μόρον] ἐμὸν νόον **D**. Cf. Odyssey 4.493 οὐδὲ δαῆναι ἐμὸν νόον. 673 βαῖνον ἔραζε] πίπτον [sic] ἔραζε **D**. Substitution of the regular

Homeric expression, cf. Iliad 12.156.

678 βιὸν ἀμφὶ δὲ νώτοις] βιὸν ἠδὲ φαρέτρην **D**. Slavish following of the Homeric formula, cf. Iliad 10.260.

786 $\pi\alpha\tau\rho i$] $\delta ou\rho i$ **Q** (ita L^{vl}). A reminiscence of Iliad 5.653, in view of which the agreement with L^{vl} may be fortuitous.

833 ψυχορραγέοντα] βαρέα cτενάχοντα **Q**. Cf. 1.388 where **MRQCD** read βαρυ cτενάχοντο. In both cases this is substitution of the regular Homeric phrase.

842 See above on 1.1062.

1062 ἀcπίcιν ἄρcετε] ἀcπίcι φράξατε **D**. Cf. Iliad 13.130 and 15.566: the result of an unfamiliar form and reminiscence of the Homeric passages.

1176 κομέουςαι] γανόωςαι **Q**. Thoughtless imitation of *Odyssey* 7.128. 3.20 δόλον] νόον **C**. For νοέω νόον cf. Iliad 9.104; but this may be mechanical assimilation.

119 $\hat{v}\pi\hat{o}$ $\mu\alpha\zeta\hat{\varphi}$] $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\hat{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\zeta\hat{\varphi}$ **D**. The more regular expression, cf. Odyssey 11.448, but $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\hat{\iota}$ for $\hat{v}\pi\hat{o}$ is a common change.

301 θυμὸν ἄρετςαν] θυμὸν ἔτερπον **D**. The Homeric formula, cf. Odyssey 1.107.

615 ἀμφαδὰ ἔργα πέλοιτο] ἀμφαδὰ ἔργα γένοιτο **RQ**. Cf. Odyssey 19.391. But it could be a gloss.

664 κινύρετο τὴν δέ τις ἄφνω] τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβεν **R**. Another Homeric formula, cf. Iliad 16.11 τῆ ἴκελος, Πάτροκλε, τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβεις. Presumably τῆ ἰκέλη reminded the scribe of the passage in the Iliad which he felt compelled to introduce here. In the next sentence, finding himself in difficulties without τὴν δέ τις ἄφνω, he resorts to omission of a whole line (666). This is a good example of the lengths to which Moschus was prepared to go for the sake of Homericism, although it may be that he was simply tired and inattentive.

692 κῆδος ἔλοιο] κῆδος ἄροιο **RQC**. Cf. Iliad 4.95 and 9.303, κῦδος ἄροιο, suggesting iotacist pronunciation by Moschus.

866 ἀλύων] ἀχεύων **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.

919 $\epsilon \pi l \pi \rho \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \omega v$] $\epsilon \pi \iota \chi \theta \sigma \nu l \omega v$ **C**. Apollonius is imitating *Iliad 5.637*, the scribe 9.558.

1262 γυίων] χειρῶν **D**. Another Homericism which also occurs at 2.334 and $3.507.^{12}$

1357 ἴκετο] ἴετο **D**. Just a mechanical error? Cf. on 1.39 above.

1373 θοοί] θαρςαλέοι **D**. No doubt influenced mainly by θαρςαλέως in 1370, but also perhaps by *Odyssey* 19.91 θαρςαλέη, κύον ἀδεές.

4.12 $\beta\alpha\theta\epsilon$ ίης] $\kappa\alpha\theta$ ' ὕλην **RQ**. Cf. Iliad 10.184, and Ap. Rhod. 3.1351 where **R** has αν ὕλην for ὀδόντας (see below, p.123).

38 δούλια ἔργα] θέςκελα ἔργα **RQ**. A Homeric phrase also occurring at 3.229.

260 θήβης] θήβης έδος **R**. Cf. Iliad 4.406.

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

425 ἀμφιάλω] ἀμφιρρύτω **Q**. Cf. Odyssey 11.325 Δίη ἐν ἀμφιρύτη and Ap. Rhod. 1.1305 Τήνω ἐν ἀμφιρύτη. Brunck prints it without comment, "ex ingenio, ut videtur" (Wellauer), but I am sure Moschus is the source of the conjecture.

446 ετοναχαί τε γόοι τε] πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε \mathbb{C} . A reminiscence of Iliad 1.177 and 5.891.

458 νήcov] δίφρου **D**. Thoughtless substitution to fit a Homeric phrase, cf. Iliad 13.26.

462 τεχνήςαιτο] τεκτήναιτο **D**. Imitation of Iliad 10.19.

467 τυπέντος] πετόντος RQD. Imitation of Iliad 11.250.

497 $\epsilon \pi \alpha \theta \rho \eta c \alpha \nu \tau \alpha c$] $\epsilon c \alpha \theta \rho \eta c \alpha \nu \tau \alpha c$ **R**, $\epsilon c \alpha \theta \rho \eta c \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon c$ **QD**. $\epsilon c \alpha \theta \rho \epsilon \omega$ is Homeric, $\epsilon \pi \alpha \theta \rho \epsilon \omega$ is not.

591 $\mathring{\eta}$ ελίοιο] \mathring{v} περίονος **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 $\mathring{\eta}$ έλιος, at Odyssey 1.24.

654 α $l\theta$ αλίην] $ol\chi$ αλίην **D**. Aethalia (the modern Elba) does not appear in Homer, but Oechalia does.

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

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

860 αἴ τε πλαγκταὶ καλέονται] ἄς τε πλαγκτὰς καλέους **D**. No doubt influenced by Odyssey 12.61 Πλαγκτὰς δή τοι τάς γε θεοὶ μάκαρες καλέους.

1067 εἰλεῖτο] ἥλοιcι **RQ**. Thoughtless imitation of *Iliad* 1.246.

¹² Cf. similar confusion in the MSS at Aesch. Pers. 913.

1198 ἄειδον έλιςςόμεναι] ἄειδον ἀμειβόμεναι **D**. Imported from *Iliad* 1.604.

1244 παῦρον ἔλειπτο] παῦρ' ἐλέλειπτο **RQCD**. As Brunck pointed out, ἐλέλειπτο is the Homeric form (*Il.* 2.700); the scribe had no Homeric lexicon,¹³ but he knew that ἔλειπτο did not occur in early epic.

1397 ρύετο $\mu \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$] $\mu \hat{\eta} \lambda'$ εφύλαςς \mathbf{R} , $\mu \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ φύλαςς \mathbf{Q} , $\mu \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ φύλαςς \mathbf{C} . Reminiscence of Odyssey 12.136 or a gloss.

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

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

Here is something truly remarkable in a Renaissance scribe: thorough familiarity with the Homeric poems and a persistent desire to introduce Homeric formulas and phraseology into the text of Apollonius. We know that Moschus made at least two copies of the Odyssey.¹⁴ The evidence accumulated above shows that his knowledge

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

¹⁴ Oxford, Canon.gr. 79, and Paris, gr. 2688: see Speake and Vian, op.cit. (supra n.1) 316-17.

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 λυρκηίον] πολυλήιον **MRQ**. No doubt lifted from 51, but it is a forgivable attempt to correct a still not understood epithet.¹⁷

129 ἀπεςείςατο] ἀποκάτθετο **MRQ**. Not without merit: the double compound adds extra flavour and the word occurs again at 3.817 and 1287.

202 πάις] νόθος **MRQ**. An intelligent if unsubtle suggestion which could be the result of a gloss. It is tempting to consider this a metrical emendation, but dangerous to presume upon the metrical skills of Renaissance scribes, even those who were themselves poets. Most likely it is a reminiscence of Orph. Argonaut. 211: ἐν δὲ Παλαιμόνιος Λέρνου νόθος ἤλυθεν υἷός.

331 μετέειπεν] προςέειπεν **C**. Lifted from 294.

457 ἀλλήλοιςιν] ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος **M**. Cf. Theoc. 1.34 ἀμοιβαδὶς ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος νεικείους' ἐπέεςςι (and Ap. Rhod. 1.843). **M** contains Theocritus as well as Apollonius, so this is very likely an echo rather than a preference for a dactylic ending.

576 μυρία] ἄςπετα **RQ**. Lifted from 2.143 and 839.

770 ἐγγυάλιξε] ὤπαςεν εἶναι **C**. Imported from 2.31f.

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

1325 ἔλειφθεν] ἔβηςαν **MRQ**. Lifted from 1285.

2.32 δίπτυχα] δύς ετο **C** (not εδύς ετο as Fränkel states, op.cit. [supra n.7]

¹⁵ It may be relevant that both Mss of the *Odyssey* copied by Moschus are prefixed by the following epigram:

υίε μέλητος δμηρε· εὺ γὰρ κλέος έλλάδι πάςη καὶ κολοφῶνι πάτρη θῆκας ἐς ἀίδιον. καὶ τάςδ' ἀντιθέω ψυχὴ γεννήςαο κούρας, διεςὰς ἡμιθέων γραψάμενος ςελίδας. ὑμνεῖ δ' ἡ μὲν νόςτον ὀδυςςῆος πολυπλάγκτου, ἡ δὲ τὸν ἰλιακὸν δαρδανιδῶν πόλεμον.

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.

- 90). The result of failure to look ahead to 34, perhaps influenced by 1.1326, where **RQCDBP** read $\delta\delta\nu$ c $\alpha\tau$ o.
- 107 τοῦ δ' ἀςςον ἰόντος] τοῦδ' ἀίςςοντος **D**. A clever anagram possibly affected by ἀίξαντος in 92.
- 115 $\epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} c \epsilon \alpha c$ αc αc αc αc Also affected by 92, but the scribe has either forgotten that the α is long or permitted internal correption. ¹⁸
 - 301 γέροντος] λέοντος. A reminiscence of 1.1195 (and *Iliad* 10.23).
 - 339 μόρον] οἶτον MR. Imported from 172.
- 519 ἐφετμ $\hat{\eta}$] ἐνιτπ $\hat{\eta}$ **C**. Presumably the scribe meant to write ἐνιπ $\hat{\eta}$, a reminiscence of 3.677 ἐδάης ἐκ πατρὸς ἐνιπήν, and 4.615 λιπων ἐκ πατρὸς ἐνιπῆς.
- 749 ἀέλλη] ἀνάγκη **MRQC**. As a result of 3.430, κακή and ἀνάγκη are inseparable in the mind of the scribe.
- 811 πανήμεροι έψιόωντο] πανημέριοι πονέοντο **MRQ**. Lifted from 667.
 - 903 εὐδιόωντες] εἰρεςίηςι **M**. Drawn from 1031.
 - 973 ανδιχα] εἰς ακλα \mathbf{M} . Taken from 744.
 - 1134 ἐρέεινε] προςέειπεν **R**. Copied from 1.1336.
- 3.306 $\alpha \tau \eta$] $\alpha l c \alpha$ C. Imported from 328, though it could be a gloss.
- 415 αδθι δαΐζων] αἷψα δαίξας **D**. Both adverb and tense are drawn from 412 αἷψα τ αμών.
- 782 olov] accov accov
 - 1092 οὔνομ' ἀκοῦςαι] οὔνομα κόλχων **C**. Imported from 680.
- 1351 ὀδόντας] αν ὕλην **R**. The scribe is reminded of the simile at 4.1338.
 - 1358 ἀ*cτράπτου*cα] ἀί*ccου*cα **RQ**. Taken from 1265 or 1379.
- 4.402 ἄλγος] ἄλλο **RQCD**. The result of confusion with 3.429f (the only other occurrence of $\dot{\rho}$ ίγιον in the poem).
 - 462 τ εχνήςαιτο] τ εκμήραιτο **C**. Imported from 217.
 - 477 τάμνε θανόντος] $\theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \lambda \hat{\eta} c$ C. Lifted from 1.1140.
 - 570 ὕλη] αἴγλη **RQD**. Taken from 1710.
- 826 φέρητιν] βάλητιν **RQC**, θύελλα **D**. **RQC** inherit an error arrived at by confusion with the first word of the line; **D** attempts correction by importing θύελλα from 787 or 834.
 - 912 $\epsilon \tau \alpha i \rho \omega \nu$] $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ **RQ**. Drawn from 1.60.

¹⁸ On correption in Apollonius see M. Campbell, RevPhil 47 (1973) 83-90.

1008 πολέμοιο] ἀνέμοιο **R**, κελεύθοιο **Q**. **Q**'s error is by confusion with κελεύθ ω in 1007; **R**'s comes from 1.953.

1124 ἐγρής $\dot{\epsilon}$ τον $\dot{\epsilon}$ τον $\dot{\epsilon}$ τον $\dot{\epsilon}$ οι $\dot{\epsilon}$ οι

1209 ἐνιπάς] ἐφετμάς **R**. Cf. 1.279, 2.615.

1333 ἐρημονόμοι] ἐλειονόμοι **RQCD**. An unfortunate choice for the desert, but these marsh nymphs have already made their appearance twice in the poem and so are more acceptable to the scribe.

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

1540 φορέοντο] πονέοντο **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 ἰμβρακίης] ἀμβροκίης D.
357 ἐρύκαιμεν] ἐλάκωμεν C.
376 πρώτηςι] προτέρηςι C.
576 μῆλ' ἐφέπονται] μῆλα ἔπονται D.
617 ἔρραικαν] ὤλεκ(κ)αν MRQD.
629 ρηίτερον] ρηίδιον MR.
834 φόνου] φίλου C.
885 ὀπάκκαι] ἐλέκθαι C.
967 ἐμέλοντο] ἐμνώοντο C.
972 ὑποκταχύεκκον] ἐπιχνοάεκκον D.
1212 ἀπούρακ] ἀείρακ MRQ.
1289 χόλοκ] ἄχοκ MRQ.
1339 μῆνιν] θυμὸν MRQ.
2.2 ἀγήνοροκ] ἀμύμονοκ CD.
24 ἀντιάακθαι] δηριάακθαι MR.
```

```
96 ἰάχηταν] ὁμάδηταν C (not D as stated in Fränkel's apparatus).
  159 μέτωπα] κάρηνα MRQ.
  286 ἀλτο] ὧρτο MR.
  298 ἔδυςαν] ἔβηςαν Μ.
  467 ἐρέτηςιν] ἐτάροιςιν D.
  576 κατένεικεν κατέρυκε MRQD.
  577 αἰνότατον δέος] αἰνότατος χλόος MRQ.
  610 ἤρχετο μύθων] ἔκφατο μῦθον MD.
  812 εγκονέοντες] εὐμενέοντες MRQ.
  949 εέλδετο] ίμείρετο Q.
  1032 ἔλλι\piεν] ἤλυθεν R.
  1123 \epsilon \pi \circ \psi \circ \omega] i \kappa \epsilon \circ \omega M.
  1215 ὕδαςι] ἔνδοθι ΜRQ.
  1248 ετυφελοῖει] ετιβαροῖει C.
  1274 ἀρωγούς] έταίρους Q.
3.66 μέγα] πολύ R, πάνυ Q.
  232 ετιβαροῦ] ετυγεροῦ CD.
  339 κῶας] γαῖαν D.
  383 ε έλδετο] ιαίνετο Q.
  553 ἀμύνειν] ἀρήγειν D.
  572 προΐαλλε] προέηκε \mathbf{C}.
  712 ἀράς τε ςτυγερὰς] ἀρήν τε ςτυγερὴν R.
  762 διὰ] κατὰ RQ.
  797 αἶτχος] ἄλγος RQCD.
  884 c\alphaiνουςi\nu] \thetaέουςi\nu D.
  886 κούρης] νύμφης C.
  900 \delta \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \delta \delta \approx RQ, \delta \epsilon \gamma \epsilon C.
  916 cφιςιν] τοῖς D.
  1025 κούρη] νύμφη C.
  1098 κείνην] νύμφην C.<sup>19</sup>
  1113 πόντοιο φέροιεν] ποντου φορέοιεν C.
  1147 ήτοι αὐτὰρ D.
  1168 πάντεςςι μετέννεπε] πάντεςςιν έφώνεε RQ.
  1170 \hat{\eta}c\tau' \hat{\alpha}\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon] [c\tau\alpha\tau' \tilde{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon D.
  1372 cόλοιο] λίθοιο RQD.
4.19 βρυχής ατ' ἀνίη] βρυχής ατο φωνη C.
  57 ἀλύςκω] ἱκάνω C.
  148 έφορμήν] έφετμήν D.
  302 ρόον] πόρον RQ.
  392 κεάςςαι] κεδάςςαι RQ.
```

¹⁹ As usual, it is the last word of this line that has gone astray, not the first as stated in M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973) 19.

```
437 κνέφας] νέφος C.
559 κίρκης] κούρης C.
567 κούρην] νύμφην D.
578 ἀέλλας] ἀυτάς R, ἀήτας Q.
743 ἔπλευ] ἔςτιν QC.
871 χρίεςκε] δεύεςκε R.
1071 λεχέεςςι] λέκτροιςι RQCD.
1103 νεῖκος] νόςτον D.
1315 ἔνεικεν] ἔρειςε RQCD.
1436 ὕβριν] ἄλλων RQC.
1527 ἀμφαγέροντο] ἀμφεπένοντο RQC.
1580 χέρςον] νῆςον Q.
```

(e) Easier syntax preferred

1.711 ἐξερέοντας] ἐξερέονςα **D**. An attractive emendation to the myopic; but where is the interrogative in Iphinoë's speech?

969 $\delta \dot{\eta}$] $\kappa \alpha \dot{\imath}$ **D**. The scribe took fright at $\delta \dot{\eta}$ as the first word.

2.60 $\epsilon \rho i \delta \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$] $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \epsilon$ **D**. ov $\tau \iota$ bears every resemblance to a direct object. In $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \epsilon$ the scribe finds a transitive verb fitting the metre, giving some sort of sense, and palaeographically close to the puzzling $\epsilon \rho i \delta \eta \nu \epsilon \nu$.

218 ρύ $c\alpha c\theta \epsilon$] λύ $c\alpha \tau \epsilon$ **MRQD**. **SC** read λύ $c\alpha c\theta \epsilon$, which was no doubt a gloss, but regardless of metre **MRQD** prefer the active form.

695 ἐξερέοντες] εἰcορόωντες **MRQC**. Common in this sedes and an easy change which still makes sense; no doubt influenced by ἐcίδοιεν in 696.

884 ἀπορρίψαντες] ἀπορρίψας θε δ' **MRQ**. No logical reason for this change, but presumably the scribe prefers two imperatives.

3.68 πειρωμένη] πειρώμενος **D**. We may assume that the exemplar lacked the *iota* subscript: attraction to the case and gender of the subject of ἀντεβόλητεν is no surprise.

225 προρέεςκε] προέηκε **QD**, προθέεςκε **C**. "Librarios turbavit minus obvius usus verbi ρέω active significantis" (Brunck). **RQC** have οἴνω for ὖδωρ from 224. Meanwhile **QD** have changed to a more regular transitive verb. **R** keeps k's προέεςκε; **C**, taking advantage of the chaos, offers yet another variant of little merit.

276 olóv] oloc $\dot{\mathbf{D}}$. An intelligent suggestion, probably the result of failure to recognize olov as an adverb.

404 ην κ'] αι κ' **RQD**. Another intelligent alteration by a scribe

who was not endowed with Vian's facility for adducing parallels for "une curiosité attestée chez Homère." ²⁰

510 ἐντύναιο] ἀνύcαιο **D**. Gillies has correctly explained ἐντύναιο for us, but **D**, in search of a verb to govern ὑποcχεςίην, finds ἀνύω and would have done better to add the prefix ἐξ-.

801 τ ελές $c\alpha$ ι] τ ελεῖ $c\theta$ αι **D**. Unable to find a subject for τ ελές $c\alpha$ ι in the $\pi \rho i \nu$ clause, the scribe resorts to the passive.

1139 ἃψ οἶκόνδε νέεςθαι] εἰς οἶκον ναίεςθαι **D**. All our MSS inherit εἰς from k, which makes the suffix of οἶκόνδε otiose. **D** realizes this and allows himself (perhaps unconsciously) phonetic corruption from νέεςθαι to ναίεςθαι, thereby retaining the metre.

1240 ἴ $c\theta\mu\iota$ ον] ἴ $c\theta\mu\iota$ ος **D**. An interesting transference of epithet, presumably the result of proximity to οἶος and Πος $\epsilon\iota$ δάων.

4.1399 ἐφίμερον] ἐφύμνιον **RQC**. The scribe prefers a noun to an adjective and finds it from 2.713.

(f) Change due to misunderstanding

1.816 ἀεικέα παῖδες ἄμυνον] ἀεὶ παῖδες προςάμυνον \mathbf{RQ} , ἀεικέα πρόςθεν ἄμυνον \mathbf{D} . \mathbf{D} 's πρόςθεν is most likely a mechanical change influenced by πάροιθεν. \mathbf{RQ} 's προςάμυνον may be affected by \mathbf{D} 's πρόςθεν, but more probably ἀεικέα was not understood and so shortened to the more familiar adverb and the prepositional prefix added to the verb metri causa.

2.738 περιτέτροφε πάχνην] περιτέτροφεν ἄχνην **D**. The scribe is not familiar with the word πάχνη; his treatment is similar at $4.1531.^{21}$

934f τινάςς ρίπήν] φυλάςς ρίπτην **D**. The scribe does not understand the text he is copying and is not averse to writing nonsense. 3.267 $\tilde{ι}$ κοις $\theta \epsilon$] $\tilde{ε}$ βητε **RQC**. $\tilde{ι}$ κοις $\theta \epsilon$, as Vian remarks, is "potential du passé: 'comment avez-vous pu aller . . . ?'." The uncomprehending

passe: comment avez-vous pu after . . . ? . The uncomparison scribe has imported $\xi \beta \eta \tau \epsilon$ (from 316?).

662 $\chi \hat{\eta} \rho \rho \nu$] φίλον **RC**. If the scribe did not understand $\chi \hat{\eta} \rho \rho \nu$ he might at least have found a substitute that scanned. But it could be a corruption $via \psi \iota \lambda \acute{\nu}$.

755 ἔθυιεν] ἄλυεν **RQ**. The copyist does not understand ἔθυ(ι)εν and looks for a word to mean 'bounded with joy': he finds it at 866.

1111 ὄςςα] αἶςα **RC**. Either the scribe did not understand ὄςςα 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 ἴκανεν] ἔβαινεν ΜRQ.
  350 γηθόςυνος] γηθόμενος D.
  512 αὐδη̂] ὀμφη̂ <math>\mathbf{MQ}.
  601 ἀνέτειλε] ἀνέδραμε MRQ.
  625 θόαντι] γέροντι MRQ. The truth?
  803 ἔμβαλεν ἄτην] ἔμβαλε νεῖκος C.
  837 χατέουςιν οπάζεις] χατέουςι παρίςχεις D.
   1031 λέκτρον] δόμον D.
   1219 ἀλέγοντες] ἀίοντες \mathbf{D}.
   1228 καλλινάοιο] καλλιρόοιο D.
   1305 πέφνεν] κτεῖνε \mathbf{D}.
2.12 θέςμιόν] θέμις MRQ.
   143 ἐτάμοντο] ἐλαύνοντο D.
   183 ἴαλλεν] ἔθηκαν ΜR.
   205 κέκλιτ'] κεῖτο D.
   363 κύρει] κεῖται MRQ.
   419 γεραιδε] γέρων D.
   465 ὅτις ἔξοχος] ὅςτις ἄριςτος \mathbf{M}.
   616 ὅπαςςε] ἔδωκε \mathbf{M}.
   670 λεπτον] μικρον MRQ.
   681 \tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon] \tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon D.
   1152 ἀλέγοντες] ἀίοντες Μ.
3.366 γεγάαςιν] έβλάςτηςαν D.
   862 ενέροιςιν] νερτέροιςιν R.
   1000 εὔναςε μίνως] εὔναςεν ήρως RQD.
4.156 \, \theta \alpha \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \, \theta \alpha \mu \dot{\omega} \, \mathbf{C} \, (voluit \, \theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \omega).
   422 πόρον] πέμπον D.
   1019 μαργοςύνης] μαχλοςύνης RQCD.
   1665 \thetaέλ\gammaε] τέρ\piεQ.
```

(h) Other embellishments (which may or may not be mechanical) 1.221 $\nu\omega\tau$ oic] $\gamma\alpha\iota\eta$ c **RQ**. I can see no motive for this absurdity, and yet I am reluctant to discount it as merely a copyist's error. $\gamma\alpha\iota\eta$ c occurs at 243 and 255, and might have caught the scribe's eye.²²

253 αἴτων αὖ μέγα δή τι δυτάμμορος ἡ τέ οἱ ἦεν] αἴτονα δ' αὖ μέγα

²² Dr Dawe suggests that it is a relic of a note explaining that $\nu \hat{\omega} \tau a$ can sometimes refer to land as well as to people.

μοῖρα δυcάμμορος ἔςχετο (ἤχθεο M) πάντων MRQ. CDB¹P omit δή τι: MRQ conjecture μοῖρα to fill the gap and find that considerable alterations to the whole line are needed. There seems no reason to suppose, with Wellauer, that this represents the reading of the proecdosis or first edition. 23

361 $\epsilon \ddot{\imath} \kappa \epsilon] \ddot{o} \phi \rho \alpha$ **MRQ.** An unsuccessful attempt to correct a faulty exemplar (cf. $\alpha \ddot{\imath} \kappa \epsilon$ **D**). $\mathbf{M}^{\gamma \rho}$ preserves the truth.

523 ἀρτύνας θαι] ἀρτυν έες θαι **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 ἀρτῦν έω.

538 $\delta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\hat{\eta}$] $\epsilon\nu\iota\epsilon\pi\hat{\eta}$ **MRQ**. "Mira sane discrepantia," comments Wellauer, and I can see no motive for it. Again **M**^{γρ} preserves the truth.

822 \vec{v} $\vec{\eta}$ $\phi \rho o \nu \acute{e} o \iota \epsilon \nu$] $\vec{o} \phi \rho$ $\vec{\eta}$ $\nu \acute{o} \acute{e} o \iota \epsilon \nu$ **D**. It is to be assumed that an ancestor of **D** omitted \vec{v} . The solution is clever: by rearrangement of the letters the scribe needs only to add one *omicron* to restore both metre and sense.

1176 ἢρήcατο] ἐναρήcατο **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.

1213 ἔπεφνεν] ἔειπεν **C**. A fine example of exceptional stupidity but clearly not an unconscious one, as it makes a neat doublet with ἀκούςας, the absurdity of the previous line.

2.66 ἐπ' αἴcη] ἀνάγκη **C**. A bad guess by a meddlesome scribe.

139 olai] olai **MRQCD**. Perhaps a mechanical slip, but olai is an old name for the vine, *cf.* Hes. *Op.* 572.

267 ἀδευκέες] ἀκηδέες **D**. The scholia are divided on the meaning of ἀδευκέες 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 ἀκτή] ἄλμη **D**. Perhaps a slip: it does not make much sense as a conjecture.

396 ὧν ὕπερ ἤδη] οἶτιν ὕπερθε **D**. Either ἤδη was missing at some stage, or the scribe found it superfluous. In order to fill out the line he uses the lengthened form ὕπερθε, inspired by ἐφύπερθεν in 393, and the unparalleled dative, perhaps influenced by ἐπὶ τοῖτιν.

²³ On the proecdosis see Fränkel, op.cit. (supra n.7) 7-11.

590 δ' ὑποείκαθε] δὲ παρείκαθε **D**. The copyist seems to have understood the objections to αν²⁴ and produced a fairly successful solution.

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

843 $\phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \gamma \xi$] $\phi o \hat{\imath} \nu \iota \xi$ **RQ**, $\pi \tau \dot{o} \rho \theta o c$ **M**. The reading of **RQ** is presumably the result of a miscopied $\phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \gamma \xi$; that of **M** is an attempt to restore the sense (but not the metre).

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

991 φιλοπτολέμους] φιλοπλοκάμους **R**. This word is known to us only from the fragments of Euphorian. At first glance it is perhaps a more suitable epithet for κούρας than φιλοπτολέμους, but no doubt the origin of the corruption is mechanical.

3.22 $\delta\mu\mu\alpha\tau$ o $\alpha\tau$ R. Is this meant to be some sort of a joke? Reductio ad absurdum of Apollonius' Homeric variatio.

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

254–56 προπάροιθε βαλοῦςαι ... ἔδραμον] προπάροιθεν ἰοῦςαι ... ἔκβαλον **D**. This sort of rewriting allows us a glimpse of the scribe aiming to display his own poetic talents but succeeding in no more than an exhibition of his own ignorance.

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

418 τάδε τοῖα] τάδε πάντα \mathbf{C} . "τάδε τοῖα 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

²⁴ Cf. Platt, op.cit. (supra n.20) 20.

²⁵ Though the usual Homeric phrase is τοῖcι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε.

 τ άδε is a gloss on τ ο $\hat{\iota}$ α and has displaced something like μ ο ι (Fränkel's suggestion).

604 φράccωνται] πράccωνται **RQ**. Not as clever as it looks at first glance: the epic form is $\pi \rho \eta$ ccω, and the phrase is rather prosy. Probably it is no more than a phonetic slip.

990 ἀρωγῆς] ἀμοιβῆς \mathbf{Q} . τίνειν ἀμοιβήν is common enough, cf. 1.619 and Odyssey 12.382, but τίνειν χάριν ἀμοιβῆς is absurd.

1025 $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \delta \hat{\gamma}$] $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \mu \nu \mathbf{RQ}$. Whether the exemplar contained $\delta \hat{\gamma}$ or not (it is omitted in **P**), this is an intelligent suggestion.

1263 ἴχνος] ἔγχος **D**. The scribe is suspicious of ἴχνος and finds ἔγχος a more suitable subject for ἔπαλλεν. Spears are in the air both literally ($\tau\iota\nu$ άςςων) and metaphorically ($\mu\epsilon$ λίην in 1264 and ἔγχος in 1231 and 1286).

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

1272 ἐπήβολος ἄρματι] ἐπήροθος αἵματι **D**. Nonsense again, and probably mechanical in origin.

4.24 κόλπω] κόλποις **RQ**. This may be the truth (cf. Platt's κόλπω),²⁶ but perhaps more likely it is the result of confusion of compendia.

186 χερείν] φρετείν **RQ**. Another absurdity, probably a real word made out of nonsense.²⁷

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

399 $\pi \alpha \tau \rho i] \pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho$ **D**. This destroys not only the metre but also the worth of the reading ἄγοιτο (400) in **D**. Perhaps it is simply the result of a nomen sacrum compendium.

405f ἀντιόωςι ... φέροιεν] εἰςαίοντες **D**... φέροντες **RQCD**. "Das Letztere [ἀντιόωντες] ist in **D** durch eine weitere Konjektur in εἰςαίοντες verwandelt worden (worauf dann φέροιεν hätte folgen sollen), 'wenn sie gewahr werden—dass Apsyrtos nicht mehr am Leben ist

²⁶ op.cit. (supra n.20) 37.

²⁷ For examples of the reverse corruption see R. D. Dawe, Studies in the Text of Sophocles I (Leiden 1973) 126.

(vgl. 497 und 507)', etwa in Anlehnung an den Vers II.1085 (der mit $\epsilon \nu \nu \alpha \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ beginnt), oder an die 7 anderen Versschlüsse mit $\epsilon \iota c \alpha \iota$ - $o(\nu \tau \epsilon c)$.''²⁸

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

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

827 *cτυγερ*ον] ίερόν **RQC**, όλοόν **D**. Mechanical?

938 ἴθυνε] ἤνυςε **Q**. A poor suggestion which does not even scan. It could perhaps be mechanical: $\iota\theta\nu\nu\epsilon\rangle\iota\nu\nu\theta\epsilon\rangle\eta\nu\nu\theta\epsilon$...

998 κεχάροντο] ἐρρώοντο **RQ**, ἐγάνυντο **CD**. Alternative suggestions to 'correct' a faulty exemplar.

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

1111 $\tilde{\omega}\rho\tau o$] $\tilde{\epsilon}c\tau\eta$ **RQ**, $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\omega$ **CD**. The reading of **CD** is imported from 698; that of **RQ** was perhaps intended to 'correct' it.

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

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

1195 πέδον] νέον **R**. Another mystery.

1197 αὖτε] ἄλλαι **R**, ἄλλα **Q**. Both are tasteless suggestions when followed by οἰοθεν οἶαι (οἶον **RQCD**). The scribe allows himself to be carried away by the double jingle.

1320 $\epsilon \phi$ $\dot{v}\gamma \rho \dot{\eta} \nu$] $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ **RQCD**. Silly and irresponsible, but no doubt mechanical in origin.

1348 $c\tau$ έρφες[v] $c\tau$ έρνοις[v] **RQCD**. Anatomical extravaganza induced by the proximity of $α \dot{v} \chi$ ένος, $v \dot{\omega} \tau \alpha$, $i \xi \dot{v} \alpha c$, $\kappa \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda \hat{\eta} c$.

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

²⁸ H. Fränkel, Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios (Munich 1968) 485f.

1358 ἢδὲ θύγατρες] ἢδ' ἐπίουροι **D**. On the face of it, a more likely doublet perhaps, but cf. 1323.

1361 ἀλλά τις] ἀλλά πη **RQCD**. Cf. 1.822 ἢ ϵ πη ἄλλη but probably a mechanical error.²⁹

1500 γαίη] αὐτοῦ **R**. Perhaps the exemplar omitted γαίη. **QC** read νέκυν from 1499; **R**'s suggestion is very feeble.

1523 ἄλγος om. **R**, ἔλκος rell. **R** recognized the corruption but rather than attempt correction resorts to omission.

1531 ἔρρεε λάχνη] ἔρρεεν ἄχνη **RQCD**. Fränkel's parallel³⁰ from Nicander, *Ther*. 328–31, is sufficient to secure λάχνη in the text. ἄχνη may be no more than a mechanical slip.

1595 ἐκρίνατο] ἀπεκρίνατο **RQ**, ἐπεκρίνατο **CD**. 1594, 1596 and 1597 all have ἐπί or ἐπ- at this point in the line. **CD** fall into the trap without realizing that the reading is excluded on metrical grounds. **RQ** alter to a compound which occurs (though only once, *Iliad 5*.12) in Homer.

1620 $c\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$] δώ $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ **RQCD**. In spite of 554, the slight zeugma does not escape the attention of a literal-minded scribe.

1682 πεύκη] πέτρη **D**. A particularly stupid alteration: Moschus, if not his predecessors, must have been familiar with the sources of this simile at *Iliad* 4.482 and 16.482.

1767 ἀμεμφέα] ἀτειρέα **RQ**, ἀπειρέα **C**. Since **C** was probably copied before **RQ**, ἀτειρέα was most likely a conjecture in the exemplar which was miscopied by **C**. It is perhaps an echo of a passage I have been unable to identify.³¹

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD November, 1973

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.