

A COLLATION OF THE MANUSCRIPTS OF MOSCHUS' *EUROPA*

WINFRIED BÜHLER's edition of Moschus' *Europa* (*Hermes*, *Einzelschrift* xii [1960]) has had the rare accolade of unstinted praise from reviewers in all languages. And deservedly so. Its text is eminently sound,¹ its commentary relevantly erudite and richly instructive particularly about Moschus' stylistic debts and paternities. Bühler's review of the Europa saga in ancient literature supersedes all that was written previously. And finally, his detailed collation of the nine independent manuscripts of the text establishes for the first time the full evidence for a completely effective stemma which few will challenge and none substantially alter.²

What is the point then of attempting here a new collation? One reason is that the mischievous elf who corrupts the first, accurate drafts of a collation into the distorted or deceitful *apparatus criticus* below the printed text has operated a little too often at the foot of Bühler's text. Although *his* apparatus does not merit inclusion among those succinctly characterized in an already famous note by R. D. Dawe,³ it contains a moderate residuum of positive error that cries for correction. The second reason for a new and fuller collation is this. Bühler's apparatus is what is called a 'negative' apparatus: failure to cite the reading of a particular manuscript at any point is to be interpreted as a tacit acknowledgement that that manuscript there contains the text that Bühler has printed. At the same time several of the manuscripts of Moschus' *Europa*, and especially those in the *v*-group (etlv), are absurdly prone to trivial but often palaeographically interesting variants. Bühler does not always record these variants (as he affirms, p. 16 of his edition); and although his editorial judgement about what deserves to be mentioned and what suppressed is rarely at serious fault, yet the very practice of such judgement militates against the principles of the negative apparatus, and leads at times to a misleading inconsistency. For example, at 146 Bühler rightly reports that Fl^v have τοι in place of the correct τι; but he does not mention that the same error is repeated by lv at 105 and v at 141. Furthermore, if these 'trivial variants' of (e.g.) l and v had been recorded more fully, their sibling relationship would have been more immediately obvious. On p. 11 of his edition (but not in his apparatus, ad loc.) Bühler reports the *Sonderfehler* of l and v at 8 (δνὰσ) and 61 (περιέσκεπε) only. There are at least 16 further cases (12 2nd ὡς om.; 21 τιᾶδε, προήλεν; 29 οἶετε [*sic*]; 62 περικαλλέησ; 63 εἰσῆλυθον; 68 θούεισαν; 76 δαμᾶσαι; 80 ἐνιφέρβετε; 90 ἐγγύθ'; 95 χείρεσσιν; 97 ἀτὰρ; 98 λῦγύν; 105 οὐδέ τοι; 154 δειθι l^{ac}, δειθι v; 164 δέ om.).

This paper was born out of the discovery that G. Hermann's emendation ὀφρύσιν in 48 was already anticipated in S by a corrector (Planudes?), and

¹ Occasionally the editor rejects the manuscript tradition, without overriding justification, however, as I hope to show in an accompanying paper.

² Bühler may be wrong only in his assessment of the position of S in the stemma. J. Irigoin (*REG* lxxvi [1943], 421 ff.) argues

persuasively that where S has a good reading against FBA, its superiority may reflect not a better tradition but rather Planudes' emendatorial flair.

³ *The Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, 1964, 6 n. †.

that in 166 the correct reading τέκε τέκνα was perhaps to be found in M^{pc}, long before its apograph n claimed this reading as its own. In the paper I seek to correct Bühler's omissions and errors. No doubt even this limited aim will prove on rigorous investigation to be imperfectly achieved: *humanus sum*. To make the paper's brevity commensurate with its limited scope, the principles of Bühler's own negative apparatus are stringently followed. Readings are cited only where Bühler's own apparatus is faulty or defective. Instances of such nugatory errors as incorrect breathings and accents, wrongful omission or addition of paragogic nus and subscript iotas are ignored where Bühler's apparatus is otherwise correct, but tacitly registered when there are other reasons to cite a reading: e.g. 84 ἔσκειν Setlv, where the addition of the nu is a revealing factor in these manuscripts' omission of 85-6 by a *saut du même au même* (86 ends with ἀστράπτεισκειν).

The sigla used are generally those in Bühler; except that Dawe's useful shorthand (op. cit. 197) is adopted where appropriate.¹ A manuscript's use of abbreviation or tachygraphy is reported only where the information may possibly be of some use: e.g. 20 παρθένος (os per comp.) F, where Bühler untypically was misled by this manuscript's habitual use of the supralineal omicron compendium for -os.²

In preparing this collation, I have been compelled mainly to rely on photographs of the nine manuscripts, promptly and courteously supplied by all the libraries concerned; autopsy was possible only for l and t. The photographs were clear, but they could not heal the sores of illegibility that now affect parts of A and V (cf. Bühler, 2 f., 5).³ And even the best black-and-white photographs do not always distinguish the colours of the inks, or provide a completely reliable record of what appears on the original manuscript.

I should like to acknowledge the generous help of Mr. N. G. Wilson, who frequently guided the faltering steps of an inexperienced palaeographer; and of Professor D. Del Corno, who kindly checked F's vital marginal reading at 104 by autopsy. By their help some of the faults that marred the earlier stages of this paper's composition were removed. Any that remain are entirely the author's responsibility.

II

THE CORRECTED COLLATION

1 ἡμεν e	2 ὅτι e, inter ὅτε et τρίτον trium uel quattuor litterarum spatium A	3 γλυκύων t ^{ac} lv	8 δυάσ l δυάσ v ^{ac} (uide Bühler, p. 11); ἀο v
9 ἄσιαδ' l ^{pc}	11 εὐδαπην M	12 alt. ὡς om. lv; ἀντίτηλέ t ^{pc} (-ηλλ a.c.)	
14 ἦρ●●έν uel ἦρ●έν l ^{ac}	15 αἰγινόχου e ^c	18 ἐπιδηρόν Ml; ἀμφοτέροις A	
19 εισέτ ^{ov} M, spiritu euanido	20 ἀνεήκατο e; παρθένος (os p. comp. script.) F	21 τιάδε lv; προτήλλε S, προήλιν lv	22 ὕπαρ δέ (uel δεον, si on p. comp. scriptum esset) εν A
	25 αὐτῆς etl ^{ac} v (-s t)	28 εἰποισ' sine accentu A, ut uid.; εἰταίρους εν (-ας v ^{po})	29 οἶετε l ^{ac} οἱ τε v
30 συνεθειρεν l i.m.	31 χόα εν	32 ἦ ὅτε e ^{ac} ; εὔπλι e (trium litt.	

¹ Particularly s.l. = *supra lineam*; i.m. = *in margine*; ● = an illegible letter; * = a *rasura* covering the space of one letter. Underlining defines the extent of a correction.

² Cf. also on 90, 144.

³ Ahrens (ed. maior, i [Leipzig, 1855], xlv) already refers to A's '*litteris ita euanidis . . . ut pauca legi possint*'.

spatio sequente); ἀ*μέρσοι F^{ac} (δ uel ε deleto?) 33 αἶ S ut uid. ταῖ F^{pc}
 σῆ t^{ac} τῇ t^{pc} 36 κύματος S (ος p. comp. script.) 40 περικαλλέη M
 41 ἔσ••• t^{ac} 42 τελεφάσσσα S τελεφάσσσα v (α add. sub linea v², fortasse

ante rasur. τελεφάσσ scripserat v¹); περικλυτὸν S 43 τετεύχαιο v (τ sscr.
 v²) 44 ἦν incipiebat e^{ac} 45 εἰσέτις e^{ac}; γυναιιν ut uid. A (ιν p. comp.

script.), γυνανὸς uel γυνανιδὸς e^{ac} 48 ὕψου om. A; ὄφρυνι ut uid. S (utrum
 S¹ an S² σί sscr. incertum) 49 ποντοπόρου A 50 Ζεὺς ἐπαφώμενος
 ἡρέμα χειρὶ θεεῖη ASetlv 51 ἔ••••ι ληιστήν l^{ac} ut uid. (fortasse εἶναι λ.);

δι ut uid. t 52 εὐκάροιο e, η•ὸν κεράοιο t^{ac} 53 εἴ A, ἔκην S; *ῆ δ' ἄρα
 S (fortasse ε eraso) 54 χαλκείους sine accentu A (ους p. comp. script.);

ἔην αὐτὸς e 56 ἡσκητο sine accentu spirituque l i.m. 61 περιέσκεπε
 lv (uide Bühler, p. 11) 62 περικαλλέησ l^{acv} 63 λειμώνας ἐπ' ἀνθε-
 μοέντος (sic) B, εἰσήλυθον lv 64 ἄλλοσι A^{ac}; ἔτεπον l^{ac} 66 ἐρπύλον lt

67 ἑαρτοροφῶν A 68 κρόκρον e; θείεσσαν lv 73 παρθενὴν v^{pc} (η
 ex κ correcto); ἔρισθαι l 74 ὦσ (pr.) FS (p. comp. script. S), ὦσ (pr.) e

75 θυμόν l^{pc} (fortasse -ός a.c.) 76 δαμάσαι l et (ut uid.) v 80 ἐνι-
 φέρβετε lv (cf. 140) 81 διαδμήσσει σύρον l² i.m., διατμησσει sine accentu

v² i.m. 82 ποίμνησ M (ης p. comp. script.) l² i.m., ποιμνης sine accentu
 v; ἐπι βόσκειται l i.m. 83 ἐρύη e^{ac} 84 ἔσκει Setlv 85 μετόπω M

88 αὐτησ uel ἀντησ l^{ac} ante κεραίησ; κύκλους e et t^{ac} (α sscr. t^{pc}) 90 πάσαις
 B (αις p. comp. script.); ἐγγύθ' lv 92 αὐμὴν e 93 ἀμύμονος M

95 χείρεσσιν lv (sed accentu ambiguo, v) 96 κύσε Flv 98 λῆγύν l &
 (ut uid.) v^{ac} (fortasse υγ ex ὕ, corrector) 99 ποδοῖν F¹; ἐδέρκετο l^{pc} (ρ ex

v correcto, ut uid.) 100 ἐπιστρέψας S^{pc} et (ε pr. ex α correcto) e^{pc}; δει-

κνυε v^{pc} (κ ex μ correcto), δείκνυε e 104 ὑποστορέσθ (sic) M; τ νῆυσ F, γρ(ά-
 φεται) καὶ οἶα [τ'] ἐνηγ[ς F^v i.m. (litteras suppletas in libro male consuto iam

non dispicias) 105 οὐδέ τοι lv 108 ὦ (ὥς uice) e; μειδιάωσα e^{ac}
 109 μέλλεσκειν S 110 θέλαι fortasse t^{ac} 112 ἡδύναντο κιχάνειν t^{pc}

(χικ- a.c.) 113 θέεν v 118 νηρείδεσ e^{pc} (primo scr. νηρέσ) 119 ἀντι-
 χόωντο e, οχέωμαι sine accentu spirituque l i.m. 120 βαρύδουπόν S (όν p.

comp. script.); ἐνοσίγαιος M (supra σί scr. aliquid obscurum) 121 ἡγείτο
 e^{pc} (γ ex ε correcto?) 124 κόχλοισιν e 127 εἴρωεσ e^{pc} (σ ex ι cor-

recto?), εἴρω l¹ ut uid.; πορφυρέαις l^x; κε del. aliquis in t 131 ἀνευθεν
 BMSetlv (εν p. comp. script. BS) 132 ἀλίροθοσ M^{pc}, ἀλίρροος (uel -οος)

etlv 135 θεόταιρε e^{ac} 136 θάλασσα e 140 θεοῖς δ' uel θ. γ' F,
 θεοῖς ἀπεικίότα e^{pc} tv (ἀπεικίότα e^{ac}), θεοῖς ἀπεικίότα l 141 τοι (τι uice)

v 142 πόντω S^{pc} (primo fortasse ἄβ scr.) 144 ὕψος sine accentu F
 (ος p. comp. script.), ὕψος' M 145 οἶωνῆσι M^{ac} (cf. 157) 147 πατρὸς

ἀπο π. e, ἀποπρολειπούσα v 148 ναυτηλίην e 151 ἔμοιλο v 154 δειθι
 l^{ac} δειθι v 156 γε M et (γ ex τ correcto) e^{pc} 157 ἄλλα l 159 ὅπη S

160 κλειτοὺς Sv (ους p. comp. script. S) 162 τετέλεστο S et (στ ex σθ
 correcto?) M^{pc}; φαίνετο e^{pc} (φ ex λ correcto?) 163 δέ om. v 164 δέ

om. l^{acv}; μῖ (μίτραν uice) e, spatio duarum litt. sequente 166 τέκ τέκνε^a
 M, α suprascripto fortasse correctionis causa; γένετο M^{ac}, γίνετο M^{pc}.

III

NOTES ON SELECTED READINGS

19. With its pure gold M mixes a dross of lunatic *Sonderfehler* (e.g. ἡλθεν 1, ἄσσαδ' 9, ἀκμήν 18, πόντον προπάροιθεν ἐμείο 151). εἰσέτ^{ov} here presumably results from the scribe's misreading an ill-formed iota as the compendium for *ov*. Cf. on 104.

20. The suprascript omicron compendium for *os* is normal in F.

21. Set gloss the final word in the verse with ἔπεμψε, which indicates that the glossator's manuscript correctly had the aorist προήλε.

22. If A intends δέ rather than δεον, there seems to be no logical connection between the wrongful addition of that particle here and its omission by haplography in 20 or the clumsily written suprascript δε (δέ, δέ?) at the end of 18.

32. e began to copy 31 again in error.

33. The outlines of the letters in S fit both σῆ and αῖ, but αῖ was clearly intended here: (1) αῖ is written in exactly the same way at the beginning of 63; (2) the suprascript squiggle is closer to a rough breathing than to a circumflex accent; (3) αῖ is correct, and Planudes (the scribe) was no fool.

40. t writes πόρε rather than πόρεν because he was mistakenly copying 39 again (he added δῶρον ὅτ' ἐς λέχος before realizing his error).

40. M's error is a further instance of this scribe's proneness to homoeoteleuton errors (e.g. παρθένον αὐδὴν 20, ἐγγύθεν εἶδομεν 155).

45. It is perhaps more likely that A's scribe confused the very similar compendia for -*uv* and -*ην* than that here he intended γυναι<ξ>*uv*.

96. The accent in Flv's κῶσε may be due, like Call.'s and Non.'s κύε, to an inappropriate anticipation of the story's climax (164-6).

99. F habitually thickens the middle of the stroke in his iotas, and this has misled Bühler into error here.

100. e's odd error was due presumably to confusion between *v* and *ü*.

104. M's ὑποστορέσθ clearly came from the scribe's misreading *σ* and the *as* abbreviation as a ligatured *σθ*.—On the marginal reading in F here, Professor Del Corno writes: 'Del sigma che sicuramente seguiva (sc. ἐνηγ[ι]), si distingue solo la barretta di congiunzione con l'eta . . . Il legamento corrispondeva nella forma a quello che si osserva alla fine del v. 107 in αὐδῆς. La notizia di Bühler, stranamente imprecisa, si può forse spiegare con il fatto che il volume fu restaurato nell'aprile del 1955.'

120. S has βαρύδουπὸν or -ον, the ὄν/ον being written \/, which is normally the compendium for ὄν, but occasionally appears to be used for unaccented *ον*, as N. G. Wilson reminds me (cf. G. F. Cereteli, *Sokraščeniia v grečeskich rukopis-jach'*, 99).

136. e's error arises presumably from confusion with the ending of 137.

140. Although l's odd ἀπειοκότα could be derived from an exemplar with ἀπειοκότα (*v*, l's twin, has ἀπειοκότα) in which the initial alpha had its tail prolonged vertically, it is also possible that ἀπε- mis-spells ἐπε-, which in Byzantine times was pronounced identically. The latter explanation would tie in better with the 'conuenientia' gloss.—F's scribe writes an uncial gamma with a flourish that makes the letter indistinguishable from those of his deltas which replace the pedal circlet with a blob of ink. Not surprisingly Ambr. O. 123, an apograph of F (Gallavotti, *Theocritus*², 325; Bühler, 8), confuses the two

letters when copying ἡγερέθοντο (122) as ἡδερέθοντο. In 140 there is no objective criterion for deciding whether F intended γ' or δ'. Cf. on 156.

142. N. G. Wilson ingeniously suggests that the scribe of S had erroneously begun to copy the beginning of the next verse before making his correction to πόντω.

156. M (like F: see on 140) has very similar gammas and deltas, but it is usually possible to distinguish between them. Here γε, not δέ: there is no accent, and the gamma is absolutely identical in shape with the neighbouring gammas.

166. Does τέκν^ε in M represent τέκνεα (so, for example, Gallavotti and Bühler), or τέκνε corrected to τέκνα? In defence of the former interpretation it may be argued that (1) this scribe frequently writes his word-endings suprascript and in full, and (2) he prefers to make his occasional corrections by writing through the erroneous letters (e.g. 132 ἀλίροθοσ, 166 γίνετο). But because correction of error in M is relatively rare, we cannot exclude the possibility that here the suprascript alpha was intended as a correction.

University of Leeds

GEOFFREY ARNOTT