

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF CICERO'S *DE ORATORE*: E IS A DESCENDANT OF A

The manuscripts of Cicero's *De oratore* divide into two families: *mutili* and *integri*.¹ The oldest representatives of the mutilated family are Avranches 238 (A; c. 830–50), Erlangen 380 (*olim* 848; E; c. 985), and London, Harley 2736 (H; written by Lupus of Ferrières, c. 830–40). A and H are independent of each other, and the best witnesses to the text of the lost archetype (M). E too is considered to be an independent witness. Since the work of E. Ströbel, dating from the early eighties of the last century, the view has been generally held that E, though closely related to A, is not a descendant of it but a copy of a 'gemellus' of A. The stemma devised by Ströbel² has remained essentially the same to the present day.³

In the course of my work on the manuscripts of *De oratore* I began to doubt whether Ströbel's view on the relationship between A and E could be correct. I therefore decided to subject both manuscripts to a systematic inquiry. This has convinced me that E is in fact a descendant of A itself.

Apart from A, E has two further close relatives: Leiden, Voss. lat. O. 26 (F; s. XII¹) and a florilegium, Vatican, Reg. lat. 1762 (K; c. 845–60). F, which has long been neglected, and to which attention is first drawn in *Texts and Transmission* (p. 106), is there said to be a descendant of E.⁴ K's excerpts are thought to have been copied, like E, from Ströbel's *Abrincensis gemellus* (cf. above, n. 3). Throughout the article, I add the readings of F and K (where present) to those given of A and E. I will not deal, however, with the question of exactly how FK relate to AE, reserving this for some other occasion. For the sake of a proper appreciation of many details

¹ Cf. L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: a Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 102–9; for the *mutili*, esp. pp. 102–4. Some additions and corrections to this account, and the stemma underlying it, were later given by M. D. Reeve, 'The Circulation of Classical Works on Rhetoric from the 12th to the 14th Century', in Cl. Leonardi/E. Menestò (eds.), *Rhetorica e poetica tra i secoli XII e XIV* (Atti del secondo Convegno internazionale di studi dell'Associazione per il Medioevo e l'Umanesimo Latini (AMUL); Trento e Rovereto, 1985), [Florence, 1988], pp. 109–24 (for *De oratore*, see pp. 118–24).

I will cite the following work by the author's name only: E. Ströbel, *De Ciceronis de oratore librorum codicibus mutilis antiquioribus* (diss. inaug., Erlangen 1883; also in *Acta seminarii philologici Erlangensis*, 3 [1884], 1–74, which I have used).

The edition of *De oratore* I have used is K. F. Kumaniecki's (Leipzig, 1969). Occasionally the previous Teubner edition by W. Friedrich (1891 etc.) is referred to.

On derivation in general, and the means of establishing it, see M. D. Reeve, 'Eliminatio codicum descriptorum: a methodological problem', in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York, 1989), pp. 1–35.

² P. 48. The reader will find it reproduced in A. S. Wilkins' OCT edition (1902 etc.), p. iv; also in the Introduction to his Commentary (Oxford, 1892; repr. Hildesheim, 1965, 1990), p. 66.

³ See Kumaniecki, p. vii; the only change he has made is the addition of K (see below), which was still unknown to Ströbel. In *Texts and Transmission* Ströbel's/Kumaniecki's stemma is accepted (see e.g. p. 105: 'E and K descend from a sister of A'): the only point on which they voice some doubt (see p. 103, n. 2) concerns the intermediary unnecessarily introduced between M and H by Ströbel. Cf. Reeve, 'The Circulation...' (above, n. 1), pp. 119–21.

⁴ Later, Reeve (op. cit., p. 122) saw that it is in fact independent of E.

in the discussion below, suffice it to say that I think that E and F both descend from an early copy of A (*a*), now lost, but are otherwise independent of each other. K's excerpts are in my view partly (§§429–41) taken from *a*, partly (§§401–28) from some related manuscript, possibly A itself.

In the present article I will concentrate on the relationship between A and E. I will use the following arguments:

- A. There are some places where an omission in E corresponds to one or more whole lines in A. Apparently, the mistakes concerned were made in copying from A.
- B. On the strength of Ströbel's stemma the number of A's copying-errors is too low to be plausible, and among them there is a strikingly high percentage of errors that are easily corrected by conjecture.
- C. As long as the scribe of A writes the verbal ending *-mus* in full, E also has *-mus*. However, once he starts using *-m*; (a rather uncommon abbreviation), things often go wrong in E.
- D. Readings in A that look like typical *lapsus calami* of the scribe of A itself (and of which it is hence improbable that they also stood in a 'gemellus' of A) leave their traces in E.

In the second half of this paper I will go into Ströbel's counter-arguments and say something on the possibility of E's text being contaminated. I will begin, however, by working out the above points (A–D) in more detail.

A. LINES OF A OMITTED BY E

The following cases (presented in order of decreasing cogency) are concerned:⁵

(1) 3.203,1–2 *latio atque—percontatio expo* om. EF. Here the words omitted exactly fill in A line 18 of f. 47^r. Line 17 ends with *supra* (3.203,1), line 19 begins with *sitioque* (3.203,2). When I collated A at this point, my eye too went from *supra* to *sitioque* (thus skipping line 18), because A's lines here slope down slightly towards the right, and in addition to that, *sitioque* is written somewhat high on its line. In E *suprasitioque* has already been 'emended' to *suprascriptioque*; F reads *suprascitioque*.

(2) 2.205–6,3–6 *goedias agamus—animis aut* om. E¹F (suppl. E³ in mg. inf.).⁶ In this case the text omitted by EF exactly fills lines 11–12 of f. 19^v of A. The meaningless *tra* (of *tragoedias*) was 'emended' in E to *contra*,⁷ in F to *ira*.

(3) 2.214,10–11 *intuleris—confirmat* om. E¹F (suppl. E³ in mg.).⁸ The words omitted exactly fill in A the eleventh line of f. 20^v. At the end of line 10 *atque*

⁵ As Book 1 is lacking in A, all passages adduced in this article are from Books 2 and 3. In citing them I add line numbers (Kumaniecki's edition) to the book and section numbers. All manuscript readings given have been checked with the aid of photographs (the many discrepancies with Kumaniecki's app. crit.—which is highly inaccurate—are only seldom made explicit); F I have collated *in situ*; in a later stage I have also seen A *in situ* and re-checked many of its readings. Manuscript abbreviations are mostly resolved without notice; sometimes, when it seemed to serve some purpose, line end has been indicated (/). I use the abbreviation p.c. (or ^{pc}) for corrections evidently made by the original scribe in the course of copying; m.p. (or ^{mp}) denotes a later corrector on whose identity I cannot be more specific.

⁶ It is noteworthy that the words concerned were evidently not missing in K's exemplar, as K's §428 starts with *Haec fere maxime* etc. (2.206,5).

⁷ A rather thoughtless emendation of a type that occurs more often in E: out of an impossible form it makes an existing Latin word, without bothering too much about the sense. As a result of all this E reads: *si aut contra quicumque illi erunt* etc.

⁸ On top of that, in F the words *quae* (codd.: *idque* Kuman.) *simul atque* (2.214,11) are also omitted. This is probably a case of deliberate 'emendation'. F reads: *Item misericordia aut inuidiam simulatque emissa est adherescit* (cf. Kuman. *ad* 9.10; 12). Note that in isolation F's text could be the result of one single jump (from the first *simul atque* to the second).

(2.214,10) is abbreviated (to *atq.*); directly underneath, at the end of line 11, stands *confirmat.* (with a *distinctio media*, i.e. a punctuation mark that looks the same as the single dot of *-q.* that A uses). This may have caused the 'jump'.⁹

In (4) the words omitted do not correspond exactly to lines in A, yet they do come close to it:

(4) 3.111,8–11 *omnis—disceptatur* om. EF. In A the tenth line of f. 36^v begins with: *t(ur). Omnis* (3.111,8); two lines further down, the twelfth begins with: *t(ur), sive* (3.111,11). This may have caused the omission in EF.

I must admit that (4) is of doubtful cogency. In this case *saut du même au même* is involved, and this might just as well have happened in some other manuscript than A, e.g. in Ströbel's *Abrincensis gemellus*. To some extent the same goes for (3). (1) and (2), on the other hand, are so remarkable that they alone, I feel, should be sufficient to prove my point. However, because the independence of E from A has been so generally, and for so long, considered to be an established fact, I think a more comprehensive case is called for. Hence I will proceed to develop the remaining parts (B–D) of my programme as well.

B. THE COPYING-ERRORS OF A

On the strength of Ströbel's stemma we may define 'copying-errors of A' as follows: obvious errors in A where both E and H have preserved the obviously correct reading.

I have drawn up a list of all A's errors (according to the given definition) that I have been able to find (see Table 1). With it go the following remarks:

(a) Ströbel too provides a list (pp. 31–2). However, as the data on which he had to rely were not seldom either incorrect or incomplete, the following passages have to be removed from it:

2.34,13 *quod* AEF: *quid* HK; 2.38,10 *minus* AK: *munus* H: om. E¹F inter alia (suppl. E³ in mg. inf.);¹⁰ 2.40,13 *iam* AE¹F: *tam* HE^{mp}; 2.41,18 *crassus* AEFH, edd.; 2.61,17 *quos* AE¹F: *quo s(unt)* H¹E³: *qui s(unt)* H^{mp}; 2.159,3 *ac* AEFH, edd.; 2.182,1 *persequere* AH, edd.: *persequere* EF;¹¹ 2.197,11 *fuca* AE¹FH¹ (cryphias in AH): *fuga(m)* E^{mp}H^{mp}; 2.232,22 *ducamus* AE¹F: *ducamur* H: *deducamur* E³; 2.235,13 (this is in a part of the text supplemented by A², but omitted

⁹ There is yet another case of words omitted by E corresponding exactly to one line in A: 2.102,6–7 *habeat—plus* om. E¹ (= A, f. 8^r, the last line (30) of the page). But here I do not consider the mistake to have arisen in copying from A, because the words concerned are not missing from F, while in E they are supplied, not by E³, but by an older corrector (E²), who emended many errors of E throughout the three books of *De oratore*, and who must have used a descendant of A closely related to EF for his exemplar (perhaps *a*, or else the copy of *a* from which F descends). Besides, the bottom line of a page will not, I think, easily be skipped by a copyist. So the mistake is better explained as one of E's own copying-errors, caused by the two occurrences of *plus*. For the source of E³, see below, n. 10.

¹⁰ The omission in E¹F concerns 2.38,10–11 *suum munus—non potest*. Note that the words are not missing in K (they form part of K's §422, which runs from 2.35,2 to 2.38,14); we have seen a similar case at 2.205–6,3–6: above, with n. 6. E³ has his supplements (and corrections) either from a manuscript very close to H (cf. Ströbel, p. 46), or—more probably—from H itself. Like E² (above, n. 9), he made numerous corrections in E. Moreover, he must be responsible for E's cryphias (which correspond continually to either a cryphia or a vacant space in H). He seems to have given up after he had finished 2.233. Note that Ströbel and Kumaniecki fail to distinguish E² and E³: to them all the corrections made by these hands are by one and the same corrector ('E²').

¹¹ In A, *per-* is not very legible, but autopsy (above, n. 5) has convinced me that this is in fact the correct reading (not *con-*, as not only Ströbel but also Friedrich and Kumaniecki have it).

by A¹EF);¹² 3.136,6 *pontificum* AH¹: *pontificium* EFH^{mp}; 3.145,15 (A reads simply *co(m)pulisti*); 3.147,10 *ut* AEFH; 3.176,16–17 *solut* A: *solut* EF: *solut* H (cf. ‘*solut* m’, Friedrich’s app. crit.).¹³

(b) There are a limited number of cases in which A stands alone among the three mutili antiquiores in reducing double *i* to single *i*. Examples: 2.80,14 and 3.119,12 *ali* A: *alii* EFH; 3.124,15 *ingenis* A: *ingeniis* EFH; 3.131,7 *studis* A: *studiis* EFH; 3.139,20–4 *alisne ... alis ... alis* AF: *aliisne ... aliis ... aliis* EH.¹⁴ In each instance it is clear from the context what is meant. Often a later hand added an *i* above the line. Is A in these passages a faithful copy of its exemplar, whereas the spelling in EH has already been normalised? Whatever the case, it is not a matter of ‘mistakes’ here, so I have decided to bar these cases from my list.

(c) The same goes for a similarly limited number of cases in which A first abbreviates a word (or syllable), but then changes his mind and decides to write it out after all, without however taking the trouble to delete the abbreviation symbol. Examples: 2.303,2 *quōm* A (*cū* EF: *quō* H);¹⁵ 3.147,11 *cōmmunium* / A (to fill out the line? *cōmuniū* EFH); 3.186,14 *ambit’us* A (*ambit’* EH: *ambitus* F).¹⁶ I know of two cases in which A does not bother to delete an abbreviation stroke when he has made a mistake but immediately corrects it: 2.130,11 *ēius* A (i.e. *ē* = *est* corrected to *eius*; *ei’* EH: *eius* F) and 3.126,9 *quān/tā copiā* A (i.e. *quā* = *quam* corrected to *quantam*; *quantā copiā* EFH).

(d) Orthographic ‘errors’ of A (like *celum* for *caelum*, *naratio* for *narratio*, *phitagoras* for *pythagoras* etc.) I have omitted, except for those that could cause confusion.

(e) For the sake of clarity I have suppressed all those small blemishes, orthographic deviations and other peculiarities of EH that are irrelevant to the point concerned.¹⁷

(f) Use of the siglum A¹ implies that a later hand in A has correctly repaired the error concerned.

If we now turn to the list itself (Table 1), the first thing to be noted is that it comprises only 45 cases. Moreover, a large majority of them concern rather insignificant mistakes. Anyone who took the trouble to have a look at all forty-five in their proper context would find that most of them are easily emendable by conjecture. Setting aside the major omission of 2.24,9–10 (which I will discuss when examining Ströbel’s counter-arguments) and 3.13,11 *publicam* (to which I will return presently) nowhere have words been omitted. Changes in word order do not occur at all. Among the errors that do occur there is a high percentage of mere trifles.

¹² A² correctly reads *p(er)tineret*, anyway.

¹³ Here, of AEH, only H has the ‘obviously correct reading’. The readings of EF and m look like attempts to emend the senseless *solut*. Thus, on the strength of Ströbel’s stemma, it is uncertain—to say the least—whether *solut* is indeed one of A’s peculiar errors. Cf. 2.128,18 *peta* A: *petam* Em: *peto* FHL, edd.; 2.197,12 *causu* A: *causa* E¹F: *casu* HE³L, edd.

¹⁴ In line 20 F’s *alisne* is p.c. (*aliisne* F^{ac}).

¹⁵ Unlike H, A nearly always writes *quom* in full, probably to forestall confusion with *quō* = *quoniam*: see W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915; repr. Hildesheim, 1963), s.v. *quoniam*, esp. §§328, 330.

¹⁶ Unlike EH, A does not generally abbreviate *-us*, probably to forestall confusion with *-ur*: in some pre-Caroline scripts, and also in early Caroline minuscule, the apostrophe was not seldom used for both *-us* and *-ur*. See *Notae Latinae* (above, n. 15), s.vv., esp. §§468, 470–1, 474–5.

¹⁷ E.g. at 2.72,20 in E *sci-* is p.c. (*si-* E^{ac}), but *hau/haud* is the relevant point; at 2.111,14 EFH^{mp} read *hi* instead of *ii* (H¹), but in the Middle Ages this is a question of spelling; 2.196,23 *lacrumis* E; 2.327,1 *uir-* H¹ (*uers-* H^{mp}); at 3.190,2 H has *st* instead of *est* (with aphaeresis, as in A), but here the final *-m* is the point concerned; likewise, 3.219,1 *est* EF: *st* H^{pe} (om. H^{ac}).

Table 1. *Errors of A not found in EH*

Book 2

24,9–10 *dixi non*—*Scaevola* om. A¹: *habent EFH*

25,4 *inlitterarum* A¹: *-ratum* EFH

[50,26–60,15: lacuna in A]

65,18 *apellant* A: *appellant* EFH

72,20 *hausciam* A: *haud sciam* EFH

75,9 *aliquod* A: *aliquot* EFH

76,20 *uidisse* A: *uidisset* EFH

76,24 *erant* A: *errant* EFH

85,7 *pos* A: *possit* EFH

95,6 *dicend* A: *dicendi* EFH

96,20 *quaestio* A¹ (*cryphia* s.l.): *quae stilo* EFH

101,22 *uituperatio* A¹: *-tionem* EFH

104,16 *causa causa* A: *causa* EFH

111,13 *Ambigorum* A: *Ambiguorum* EFH

111,14 *in* A: *ii* EFH

117,13 *aptu est* A: *aptu(m) est* EFH

122,3 *Nam qu(a)e* A: *Namq(ue)* EFH

135,2 *ad / multis* A: *a multis* EFH

136,5 *forsitam* A: *forsitan* EFH

146,25 *animi* A¹: *animus* EFH

148,12 *praecipu(a)e* A: *praecipue* EFH

168,11 *si uos* A: *suos* EFKH

194,2 *imflammatione* A: *infl-* EFH

196,23 *lacrumi* A: *lacrimis* EFH

199,13–14 *illae seditio* / A: *illae seditiones* EH (*illa sedicio* F)

199,3 *odum* A: *odium* EFH

214,13 *requit* A: *requirit* EFH

[234,15–287,13: omitted by A¹EF]

304,10 *praemuntione* AF: *praemunitione* EH

308,2 *ide(m)* AFK: *idest* E: *id e(st)* H

327,10 *lamentio* A: *lamentatio* EFH

327,10 *peruari(a)e* A: *peruarie* EFH

327,1 *decemuir siculis* A¹: *decem uersiculis* EH (*uersiculis* F)

357,5 *caecasset* A: *caecas et* EFH

363,24 *uoluitis* A: *uoluisti* EFH

Book 3

13,11 *rem* AF: *rem p(ublicam)* EH

[17,11–110,18: lacuna in M]

119,11 *quaesti/tionum* A: *quaestionum* EFH

119,13 *longust* A¹ (*longu(m)st* A²): *longu(m) est* EFH

136,23–4 *honore* / A¹: *honores* EFH

[149,26–171,11: omitted by A¹EF]

177,12–13 *temus* A: *tenemus* EFH

183,7 *maxim(a)e* A: *maxime* EFH

186,8 *anni* A: *amni* EFH

190,2 *utendu st* A: *utendu(m) est* EFH

205,15 *discriptio* AF: *descr-* EH

219,1 *miscendust* A: *miscendu(m)st* EFH

226,16 *tecla* A: *tela* EFH

226,2 *intellegu* A: *intellego* EFH

Once again, a consequence of taking Ströbel's stemma for granted is that the scribe of A in copying Books 2 and 3 of *De oratore*¹⁸ made fewer than 50 mistakes, most of them rather trivial. The man must have been of well-nigh superhuman accuracy,¹⁹ and must have had a curious preference for making mistakes that are emendable by conjecture.²⁰

This is unacceptable; the stemma is in need of rectification. We should look at Table 1 in a different way. It is not a list of A's errors *tout court*, but only of those of A's errors (whether committed by the scribe of A or by his predecessor) that we find already emended in E. In most cases this emendation will have been achieved *per conjecturam*,²¹ in some by collation.²²

¹⁸ To be more precise: the parts of Books 2 and 3 present in A, minus those written by A²; all in all about 400 sections.

¹⁹ One cannot argue that he systematically corrected himself: there are relatively few places in A (much fewer, for example, than in H) where the original scribe corrects errors of his own.

²⁰ By way of comparison: I estimate that in the same parts of the text H—by no means a careless copy—has about 150 to 170 peculiar errors, about 30 to 35 of which concern word-omission (e.g. 2.84,18 *sentio*; 2.119,11 *dumtaxat*; 2.128,20 *modo*; 2.219,15 *persaepe*; 2.305,15 *dicas*; 2.312,7 *animos*; 2.327,10–11 *narrantur*; 3.139,23 *doctissimum*; 3.202,11 *quam dixeris*; 3.227,10 *quiddam*).

²¹ In many places the text of E shows signs of this striving for emendation. Success in at least some of these places need not surprise us. Ströbel (p. 44) gives a few (of the many) examples of failure; cf. also my notes 7, 13 and 53.

²² E.g. 2.24,9–10. Note that here (and elsewhere) E probably owes its emendation to the activity of a corrector in A; I will return to this later.

To round off this section, I would like to make the following observation. One could have doubts about whether a number of items in the list of Table 1 really belong to it. I have decided to let them stand, in order to avoid giving the impression of forcing the data into my own mould. For example, the correction in A at 2.25,4 is perhaps not by a later hand, but by the original scribe. At 2.76,20 E reads *uidiss&*, but the *t*-part of the ligature seems to be expunged, possibly by E¹ himself (who in that case must have rectified a copying-error of his own). At 2.117,13 and 3.190,2 the *m*-strokes of *aptu(m) est* and *utendu(m)st* in H look as if they were added by a later hand, so possibly H¹ read the same as A. At 2.214,13 H has *requirit*, but *ri* has subsequently been expunged, and above the word was placed a cryphia,²³ which seems to me in Lupus's hand. So possibly Lupus emended *requit* while copying to *requirit*, but on second thoughts deemed it wiser to maintain the original form, with a cryphia above it. At 2.363,24 H reads correctly *-isti*, but preserves the corrupt ending in the margin, as a 'marginal variant'.²⁴ So almost certainly H's exemplar (or, if one wishes, the exemplar of this exemplar) still read *-istis*, like A. At 3.13,11 E reads *ea quae nosmet ipsi ob amorem in rem p. pertulimus incredibilem et singularem pertulimus. Ac sensim cogitanti etc.*, with *p. pertulimus*, as indicated, deleted by underlining. One gets the impression that the scribe of E, while dictating to himself what he had memorized for copying, subconsciously replaced *ob amorem in rem incredibilem et singularem* by *ob amorem in rem publicam*, noticed his error almost immediately, and corrected it. If so, in his exemplar *p.* must have been missing, as in A (F too omits it).

C. THE VERBAL ENDING *-MUS* IN A AND E

Up to almost the end of the second book the scribe of A does not generally abbreviate the verbal ending *-mus* (to *-m'*), probably to preclude confusion with *-mur* (cf. above, n. 16). Instead, he nearly always writes it in full. At 2.359, however, he suddenly changes his habit and starts using the abbreviation *-m*; (i.e. *-m* with a 'semicolon'), which then remains in regular use up to the end of the third book.²⁵ This abbreviation was not uncommon in the early Middle Ages, but seems to have passed into disuse with the rise of Caroline minuscule (except in *-b*; = *-bus*).²⁶

Why this observation? Because of the curious phenomenon that as long as A writes *-mus* in full, E correctly transmits *-mus* (mostly shortened to *-m'*), while as soon as A

²³ A mark used to indicate a corruption (cf. Isid. *Etym.* 1.21.10). For the cryphias in H, see Ch. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic: a Study of his Autograph Copy of Cicero's De oratore* (Cambridge, MA, 1930), p. 27.

²⁴ Erased by a later hand. Cf. Beeson (above, n. 23), pp. 34–6. By some slip, he lists the present case under H's marginal corrections (see p. 37, s.v. '82^v. 2.15'), rather than under the marginal variants. [*uoluit* E¹: *-s* add. E², s.l. (prave Kuman).]

²⁵ At the same time he begins to abbreviate superlative forms in *-mus* in this way: e.g. *prim*; (3.7,7 and 3.137,17), *optim*; (3.135,20), *grauissim*; (3.177,12—*graves sumus* edd.—and 3.209,14). The same goes for *eius*: from 2.366,13 onwards this is mostly written *ei*; *Hui*; occurs at 3.121,7 and 3.227,13, *cui*; at 3.132,13 (*Cous* edd.). All these forms are correctly transmitted in E, except for 3.7,8 *ei*; A: *ei* EF. To be sure, I found an isolated case of *ei*; as early as 2.46,16 (*ei'* EF) and one of *cui*; at 2.233,12 (*cui'* EF), both well before the turning-point near the end of Book 2. A similar change of habit occurs in H, though a book earlier. Lupus starts abbreviating *-mus* to *-m'*, but changes to *-m*; at 1.98,15 (*quaerim*;). From then on forms like *grauissim*;, *ei*; etc. are also frequent in H (*hui*; already at 1.96,4). The 'semicolon' normally looks in H more like a 'colon', but that makes no real difference.

²⁶ For the various means of abbreviating *-us*, see *Notae Latinae* (above, n. 15), s.v., esp. §§475–6; for the one with 'semicolon', esp. §§476 I, 477.

changes to *-m*; E often transmits *-m* (1st p. sg.; mostly shortened to *-(m)*). The facts are as follows:

2.359,11 *comprehendam*; A: *comprehenda(m)* EF. This is the first case²⁷ of *-m*; = *-mus* in A, and also the first time E transmits this ending wrongly. In the remaining paragraphs of Book 2 nine verbal forms in *-mus* occur. Of these, three are written out by A (362,6 *diligimus*; 362,7; 367,1) and correctly transmitted by EF. In the remaining six instances EF make four mistakes: 363,21 *ignoscerem* E (*-re(m)* F); 363,21 *cognosce* E¹ (*-se(m)* E^{mp}F); 364,14 *audia(m)* EF; 367,3 *manere(m)* EF.²⁸

In 3.1–17 fourteen verb forms in *-mus* occur. Four of these in A are either abbreviated by means of the apostrophe or not abbreviated at all (6,15; 6,18; 14,22; 17,11). They are all correctly transmitted by EF. Ten times, however, A shortens to *-m*; and in five out of these ten cases E has a corruption in its text: 13,12 *sensim* EF; 14,18 *perga(m)* EF; 14,24 *refera(m)* E (*-ram* F); 16,10–11 *cognouera(m)* E (*-ramus* F: by emendation?); 16,11 *id ipsu(m)* EF (haplography of *id ipsum sum?*).²⁹

3.110–48³⁰ contain sixteen verb forms in *-mus*, one of them not abbreviated in A (123,10; correct in EF). Of the fifteen that are, five are transmitted incorrectly by E: 123,7 *possu(m)* EF; 123,9 *transfera(m)* E (*-ram* F); 137,11 *possu(m)* EF; 143,10 *quaerim* E: *querimus* F;³¹ 144,8 *dicere(m)* EF.³²

Finally 3.171–230.³³ In this section I noted 30 verb forms in *-mus*. Two are written out by A (215,5 and 230,17; both correct in EF). The remaining 28 are shortened to *-m*; in A. Evidently, by this point the scribe concerned³⁴ has become much more sensitive to these abbreviations, for in this section only one mistake occurs (226,19 *cupia(m)* EF).³⁵

D. *LAPSUS CALAMI* IN A

There are a number of places where the text of A has mistakes or peculiarities which, for varying reasons, should be assigned to the scribe of A himself. They quite often have consequences for the text of E. I will discuss only the more conspicuous cases here.³⁶

²⁷ Apart from an isolated case as early as 2.80,8 *faciam*; A: *faciam* E (*faciamus* F). The preceding word is *nobis*, which may have prevented a copying-error, or else may have inspired emendation.

²⁸ The two instances where they commit no error are 362,6 (*ignoscim*; A) and 362,8 (*adnoscim*; A). Note that reading *ignoscim* and *adnoscim* would produce impossible Latin, and that the context offers ample support for finding the right interpretation.

²⁹ The remaining five are: 9,23; 9,3; 13,12 (*pertulim*); 15,4; 16,8. EF have all five correctly (9,23 *suscipimus* F). Note that reading *suscepim*, *tenem*, *pertulim*, *postulam*, would produce impossible Latin. As to *interfuissem*; (16,8), here the immediate context would probably force even the dimmest of scribes to read a plural.

³⁰ 3.17–110 are lacking in AEF, as indeed in all *mutili*.

³¹ Perhaps it was by a mere slip that the scribe of E forgot to add the apostrophe here. [*si quaerim*; A (prave Kuman.)]

³² Among the remaining ten, three instances of *sum*; (122,14; 123,8; 147,16) are preceded by nominative plural forms; *viderim*; (123,11) was perhaps saved by *teramus*, one line earlier. In the other cases (123,13–14; 126,13; 133,1; 137,18; 138,1; 138,10) neglecting the 'semicolon' would have produced impossible Latin.

³³ 3.149–71 are omitted by A¹EF.

³⁴ I.e. the scribe of the lost intermediary between A and EF (a; see above, the introduction).

³⁵ Among the remaining 27, there are cases in which the immediate context offers little or no support for the correct interpretation of these forms (e.g. 181,13; 182,4; 185,19–20; 186,8; 186,9; 201,1; 210,18). As Professor Reeve (below, n. 64) points out to me, one could, if necessary, suppose that this section of a was written by a different scribe.

³⁶ Among the others are: 2.193,7 *pater/num* A: *pater num* E (*paternum* FH); 2.346,7 *dici or/natissime* A (with only a slight space between *dici* and *or*); *ditior natissime* E¹ (*dici ornatissime*

(1) 2.189,8 ~~adhiber&uol&~~ iudici A: *adhiber& uole* [*sp. vac. parv.*] *iudici* E¹ (-*t* ins. m.p.; *adhibere uolet iudici* FH). In my opinion the reading of A should be explained as follows. Instead of *adhibere uol&*, the scribe inadvertently wrote *adhiber& uol&*. He then noticed his mistake, and intended to correct it by erasing the *t*-part of the &-ligature and adding a horizontal stroke. However, he made another mistake, by altering the wrong &. As a result A has *adhiberet vole iudici*, and this is also the reading of E¹.³⁷

(2) 2.296,2 ~~semperis~~ fui A: *sem pris fui* E (*semper is fui* FH). The -*r* of *semper* may have dropped because, when writing the vertical stroke of it, the scribe of A thought he was already writing the *i*- of *is* (a 'jump' of one letter). This would at the same time explain why *is* is connected to the preceding letters, as if to make one word. The slight space after *sem* is probably unintentional, as a peculiarity of A is that it often leaves such spaces within words. Next, the scribe noticed his mistake and corrected it by adding the -*r*, in a not unusual manner, viz. with a dot on the line, and one before the letter to be inserted. However, the result of all this looks rather strange. Turning now to E, it is striking to note that it too has a rather strange reading, which moreover can be explained by starting from A's, if we assume that someone made the mistakes (a) of taking the space after *sem* seriously, and (b) of thinking that the *e* of '*peis*' had been expunged and was to be replaced by the *r*.

(3) 2.299,3 ~~prope~~ A: *proprie* EFm (*prope* H). Here the scribe of A inadvertently wrote³⁸ *probe*, instead of *prope*. He then noticed his error and made the *b* into a *p*, without however finding it necessary to erase the *b*'s ascender, obviously trusting that what was meant was sufficiently clear.³⁹ Yet, later copyists took the result as a *p* with an *i* above it (= *pri*): hence the reading of EF and the manuscripts belonging to Friedrich's m-class, of which it is certain that they derive ultimately from A. That their interpretation was wrong, is proved by the fact that A—as rightly observed by Ströbel (p. 36)—does not use this compendium.

(4-5) 3.131,1 ~~natus~~ A: *natis* E (*natus* FH); 3.217,11 ~~atreis~~ A: *atreis* EF (*atreus* H). In these two cases A unintentionally⁴⁰ wrote -*us* in ligature. Or, perhaps more likely, he wrote -*is* but noticed his error and corrected it by making *is* into an (improvised) *us* in ligature.⁴¹ Whatever exactly happened, the resulting forms look like *natis* and *atreis*. One cannot argue, however, that they *are* in fact *natis* and *atreis*: A's serifs are short, much shorter than we would have to postulate here.⁴² I find it remarkable that precisely in these two instances correctly transmitted forms in -*us* (as witnessed by AH) are corrupted in E to -*is*, which hardly, if ever, occurs elsewhere.

E^{mp}FH); 3.14,22 *ii* A (looking like *n*): *n*. E: om. F (*ii* H¹: *hi* H^{mp}: *ei* edd.); 3.127,1 *manc*- A^{ac}: *manu* A^{pc} (the *c* made into a *u*, while copying): *manci* E¹ (*manu* FH). I have noted a few more.

³⁷ The -*t* of E's *uolet* is in my opinion added by a later hand, since (a) it looks different from the way E¹ writes -*t*, (b) E¹ always writes the verbal ending -*et* in ligature (-&), and (c) as it is now, there is no space between *uolet* and the following *iudici*, which is contrary to E's normal practice.

³⁸ Or perhaps I should say: *nearly* wrote, as one could quarrel about whether the *b* was ever finished. After seeing A itself I think it was, but I am not quite sure.

³⁹ Kumaniecki is wrong in attributing the correction to A²: considering the shape of the *p* involved and the hue of its ink, I am convinced that it was made by the original scribe.

⁴⁰ I infer this from the fact that elsewhere A always writes -*us* without ligature (hundreds of cases).

⁴¹ If the latter explanation is right, the corrections must indeed have been made by the original scribe, as there is no difference in ink.

⁴² See the reproduction of one of A's pages (f. 37^r) in É. Chatelain, *Paléographie des classiques latins*, 1 (Paris, 1894), Pl. XIX.1.

STRÖBEL'S COUNTER-ARGUMENTS

On p. 47 of his dissertation Ströbel tackles the problem of how to fit E into the stemma. In this connection he explicitly opposes the opinion defended in this paper. I will cite the passage in its entirety. For the sake of convenience I will number his arguments:

Atque E cum A, non cum H coniungendum esse satis, ut mihi videtur, demonstratum est; nam ita illi inter se consentiunt, ut facile quis E ex A descriptum esse suspicari possit. Sed hanc opinionem prorsus reiiciendam esse compluribus causis convincitur. (1) Primum enim E aliquot locis recta servavit, ubi in A (et H) errores irrepserunt; (2) deinde E illum quidem ab A¹ omissum, ab A² additum locum II 24 exhibet, alii autem loci, qui item in A ab altera manu correcti sunt, in E corrupti leguntur; (3) denique maxime mirum esset, quomodo in E, si ex A difficultatem legenti nullam praebente descriptus esset, tot nova invasissent menda.

As to (3), this may be dismissed briefly. Nothing prevents us from assuming one or more (now lost) intermediaries between A and E, just as the *Abrincensis gemellus* in Ströbel's stemma is obviously such an intermediary, introduced to account for all those 'nova menda'.⁴³ Between A and E lay some 140 years. That E need not necessarily be a *direct* copy of A seems to have been overlooked by Ströbel.

Next (2). This concerns the addition by a later hand of the words *dixi non*—*Scaevola* (2.24,9–10), which had been omitted by A¹.⁴⁴ Ströbel certainly is right in claiming that the corrections of A² are as a rule ignored by E.⁴⁵ There is some logic in this, since it is clear that, if E descends from A, the copy of A to which E goes back must have been made before A got its major supplements from A²,⁴⁶ and it is not improbable that A² took his corrections from the same exemplar as these major supplements, and at roughly the same period of time. Ströbel is wrong, however, in attributing the addition at 2.24 to A².⁴⁷ A²'s hand is of a rounded, almost lax appearance,⁴⁸ and the ink he uses is mostly rather pale. By contrast, the addition at 2.24 is in a vigorous, angular hand, and written in a fairly dark brown ink. It must have been made by someone other than A², and as its script is an early Caroline minuscule closely related to the script used by A¹, I can see no reason why it *might* not be older than A²'s corrections. This possibility deprives Ströbel's argument of its force.

Finally (1). This requires a more elaborate discussion. I should start by saying that it is not entirely clear to me exactly which are the 'aliquot loci' meant by Ströbel. Probably he has in mind at least some of the items on his list (pp. 31–2) of A's peculiar errors. Furthermore, he must be thinking of some (not all) of those instances where

⁴³ Ströbel speaks of it as a manuscript 'qui iam non tanta fide quanta A archetypi scripturas servaverat' (p. 47).

⁴⁴ Cf. above, section B (Table 1). [2.24,9 *scaeuola* M (prave Kuman.)]

⁴⁵ As may be illustrated by the following examples. 2.164,8 (*est*²;) *et* A: *est* A²; 2.209,15 *non gessit* A: '(ue)l longe sit' ss. A²; 2.231,11 *si* A: *sit* A²; 2.233,15 *se* A: *esse* A²; 3.113,5–6 *mente* in A (cryph. adh.): *mentiri* A² in mg.; 3.116,7 *uerberibus* A: *-ue rebus* A² in mg.; 3.121,10 *pecus* A (cryph. adh.): *pectus* A² in mg.; 3.132,13 *cuius* A: '(ue)l chous' adscr. A² in mg.; 3.134,11 *repereretur* A: *referretur* A² in mg. In all these instances EF still have the corruption of A¹ in their text ('emended' at 3.121,10 *penus* F; 3.134,11 *repperetur* E: *repeteretur* F). For some exceptions, see below (with n. 60).

⁴⁶ 1.157–93, 2.13–18 (?), 2.234–87 and 3.149–71; now partly lost again, because of the mutilation of A. In EF, as in A, these passages were originally missing (they were c. 1470 supplemented in E, but F is still in its original state). Cf. *Texts and Transmission*, p. 103.

⁴⁷ Note that Ströbel did not see A itself: he had to rely on a collation made by Heerdegen in 1881 (see his statement to that effect on p. 2).

⁴⁸ See Chatelain (above, n. 42), Pl. XIX.2.

Table 2. *Errors of AH not found in E*

Book 2	
39,17 <i>nihilque</i> AFH ¹ : <i>mihique</i> E	215,2 <i>sumentur</i> AFKH: <i>sumuntur</i> E ¹
[50,26–60,15: lacuna in A]	[234,15–287,13: omitted by A ¹ EF]
89,17–18 <i>ut tamen te</i> A ¹ H ¹ : <i>ut tota mente</i> EF	357,5 <i>aspectu</i> AFH: <i>aspectus</i> E ¹
90,1 <i>meo</i> A ¹ H: <i>in eo</i> EF	
99,20 <i>ad sas</i> A ¹ H ¹ : <i>ad causas</i> EF	
99,1 <i>aliqui</i> AH: <i>aliquis</i> EF	
101,24 <i>quam</i> om. A ¹ H: <i>habent</i> EF	
140,16 <i>quod</i> AH ¹ (<i>quot</i> corr. Lupus in mg.): <i>quot</i> EF	
140,20 <i>extimatis</i> AH ¹ : <i>existimatis</i> EF	
158,17 <i>uniusque</i> AFH: <i>uniuscuiusque</i> E (<i>unius-cuiusque</i> edd.)	
159,7 <i>ruina</i> A ¹ FH ¹ : <i>trutina</i> E	
163,4 <i>bocabulum</i> A ¹ H ¹ : <i>uocabulum</i> EF	
173,6 <i>sublebantur</i> AH ¹ : <i>subleuantur</i> EF	
179,16 <i>num</i> AFH: <i>nunc</i> E ¹	
181,10 <i>posita</i> AFH: <i>proposita</i> E	
188,19 <i>dicito</i> AH ¹ (<i>dicto</i> H ^{mp}): <i>digito</i> E (<i>cito</i> F)	
189,6 <i>adfectet</i> AH: <i>ad fletus</i> E (<i>ad fletum</i> F, edd.)	
Book 3	
11,19–20 <i>crassos edicarant</i> AH: <i>crasso se dicarant</i> EF	
[17,11–110,18: lacuna in M]	
116,6 <i>simplicum</i> AH: <i>simplicium</i> EF	
116,7 <i>honoris</i> AH ¹ : <i>honores</i> EF	
120,15 <i>aeaeque</i> AFH: <i>aeae quae</i> E	
136,6 <i>pontificum</i> AH ¹ : <i>pontificium</i> EF	
[149,26–171,11: omitted by A ¹ EF]	
190,17 <i>uobis</i> AFH: <i>nobis</i> E ¹	
197,20 <i>exercitatur</i> AH: <i>excitatur</i> EF	
202,7–8 <i>amplificandum</i> AH: <i>amplificandum</i> EF	
204,14 <i>commonendos</i> AFH: <i>commouendos</i> E ¹	
211,5 <i>dissupatio</i> AH (' <i>ue</i> l <i>disputatio</i> ' con. Lupus in mg.): <i>disputatio</i> EF	
211,6 (<i>an</i> ² :) <i>at</i> AH (' <i>ue</i> l <i>an</i> ' con. Lupus in mg.): <i>an</i> E (' <i>ue</i> l <i>aut</i> ' ss. E ² ; <i>aut</i> F)	
212,10 <i>oratoris</i> AFH: <i>orationis</i> E ¹	

both A and H are corrupt, while E has the obviously correct reading. Of these, he gives a list on p. 41. The former list I have discussed above (section B). Here I shall discuss the latter, which is shown in Table 2.⁴⁹

Looking through this list, one cannot maintain that in all these cases E has inherited the old, correct reading of M, whereas in A and H errors have crept in. For it is improbable that, independently of each other, A (or his predecessor) and H would have committed the same mistakes in so many places. Moreover, most of the mistakes concerned are emendable, i.e. of such a nature that a medieval reader could conceivably emend them by conjecture. It seems to me, therefore, that what we have is just a list of those places where an old error of the M-tradition is still present in AH, but eliminated in E. This means that we find already corrected in E not only some of the more recent mistakes, viz. those of the A-branch of the M-family (see above, section B), but also some of the older ones. And it would have been strange indeed if correctors in their attempts to eliminate errors had discriminated between age groups. Many of the mistakes in both lists also seem to have been emended in the manuscripts of Friedrich's m-class, which certainly descend from A. Thus, in this respect E already behaves like a *mutulus recentior*.

Ströbel in fact admits (pp. 41–2) that it is probable that most of the readings of E on the list are due to emendation by conjecture. But he would perhaps object that E could have inherited at least some of them, e.g. *uniuscuiusque* (2.158,17) or the *ad fletus* of 2.189,6, which receives in his list the designation 'maxime notatu dignum'.

⁴⁹ I have supplemented Ströbel's data with a number of cases I have found myself. For the sake of clarity cryptic, vacant spaces, and some irrelevant peculiarities are passed over in silence. Unless otherwise stated, the sigla 'A¹' and 'H¹' imply that a later hand has correctly repaired the error concerned. 'E¹' implies that a later hand (probably E², in most cases) 'corrected' the correct reading of E to the corrupt one of AH. Not listed are a few doubtful cases, notably 3.174,18 *sum* AH: *suum* F (E's reading uncertain, but perhaps *sunt* E¹: *sum* E²) and 3.219,5 *colicandas* AH: *colligandas* EF: *coligandas* edd. rec. (*collocandas* L, edd. vett., fort. recte).

This latter reading is indeed highly remarkable,⁵⁰ but I do not think it can be used as an argument in the present discussion. To assume that E inherited this reading down the lines of the traditional stemma would mean that the curious corruption of *ad fletum* to *adfectet* occurred in both A and H, independently of each other. This is unacceptable.⁵¹

The same objection does not apply in the case of *uniuscuiusque* (2.158,17),⁵² as the corruption from this form to *uniusque* is obvious, and might very well have occurred independently in both A and H. On the other hand, I think E's reading *can* be explained as a conjecture. Perhaps someone sensed that behind *uniusque* an indefinite pronoun lay hidden, and if you then try to make a possible Latin form out of it, there is a good chance that you will arrive at *uniuscuiusque*.⁵³ However that may be, F has the same error as AH, which confirms the impression that E's reading is due to emendation.

There are more instances in the list where F agrees with AH. K does the same at 2.215,2. Here E's reading may even be accidental.⁵⁴ Some emendations E probably owes to corrections made by later hands in A (I will return to that presently). Some he may have made himself, while copying.⁵⁵ In my opinion there is not a single case in the list that yields a cogent argument in favour of Ströbel's view.

I know of two—rather innocuous—cases in which A and H have *different* errors, whereas E offers something better: 2.335,13 *metimus* A: *metiamur* H ('*.A. mus*' adscr. Lupus in mg.): *metimur* EF, edd.;⁵⁶ 3.4,20–21 *ni ipso loco* A: *ipso loco* H: *in ipso loco* EF, Friedr., Pid.-Harn., Born. (*ipso in loco* L, edd. pler.).

IS E'S TEXT CONTAMINATED?

If it is accepted, then, that E derives from A, there still remains a word to be said about the possibility of E's text being contaminated.⁵⁷ Indeed, it cannot be ruled out *a priori* that E, though derived from A, is not derived *exclusively* from it. For example, it is not impossible that a reader of the lost intermediary (*a*) with the help of some other manuscript was able to make corrections in *a* that were later incorporated into E's text. Theoretically at least, there is also the possibility of the scribes of *a* and/or E having a second exemplar at their disposal, which they could use whenever they felt their primary source let them down.⁵⁸ If anything of the sort happened, and if a manuscript independent of A or even of AH was used in the process, the resulting contamination should be detectable in either or both of the two Tables shown above, as these together offer a *conspectus* of all those instances where E is free from mistakes found in either A (Table 1) or AH combined (Table 2).

⁵⁰ That E reads *fletus* instead of *fletum* seems immaterial. Considering the testimony of F, the plural in E might be due to some mistake in copying.

⁵¹ How E's reading *should* be explained is another matter. Perhaps simply as a lucky guess. I will return to this when discussing the possibility of E's text being contaminated.

⁵² E actually reads *uniuscu(us)q(ue)*, but the omission of the *i* seems only a slip of the pen.

⁵³ Cf. 2.193,1 *quic* AH¹: *quicquid* E¹: *quid* edd. (*qui* F), to illustrate that this method of emending may fail as well. Cf. above, n. 21.

⁵⁴ The same may hold true for, e.g., 2.357,5 (there are three words ending in *s* in the immediate context) and 3.190,17 (*uobis* and *nobis* are easily confused in the manuscripts).

⁵⁵ E.g. 2.39,17 (where he started writing *n-*, but immediately corrected to *m-*).

⁵⁶ *-mus* for *-mur* is an old error in the M-tradition, emended in H but at the same time cautiously preserved in the margin as a 'variant'; we have seen a similar case at 2.363,24 (above, with n. 24). *-amur* for *-mur* may be a copying-error of Lupus's.

⁵⁷ On contamination in *descripti*, see Reeve, 'Eliminatio...' (above, n. 1), pp. 23–5.

⁵⁸ Reeve, loc. cit. (p. 24, with n. 73).

When looking through these lists again, there are two things we must realize. Firstly, as we have seen above, most of E's readings in both lists can easily be explained as being due to conjecture, and this in turn makes it likely that they *are* in fact due to conjecture (at least to a large extent), since it is improbable that contamination would result in such a high proportion of easy and inconspicuous emendation. Cases of this nature at any rate cannot be used as arguments in the present discussion. Secondly, there are a number of items⁵⁹ in both lists where E's reading coincides with a correction made by a later hand in A. Once it is established that E derives (basically) from A, I cannot see any reason why E should not owe most of these readings precisely to the fact that they have been entered as corrections in A. The corrections involved may well be early enough for *a* to have profited from them. They were all made by hands other than A², with only four possible exceptions.⁶⁰

If we subtract from Tables 1 and 2 all items falling into these two categories, we are left with the following cases upon which to base our verdict:⁶¹

- 2.76,24 *erant* A: *errant* EFH, edd.
- 2.158,17 *uniusque* AFH: *uniuscuiusque* E (*uniuscuiusque* edd.)
- 2.168,11 *si uos* A: *suos* EFKH, edd.
- 2.181,10 *posita* AFH: *proposita* E, edd.
- 2.189,6 *adfectet* AH: *ad fletus* E (*ad fletum* F, edd.)
- 2.214,13 *requit* AH^{pc}: *requirit* EFH^{ac}, edd. (cryphias HE³)
- 3.11,19–20 *crassos edicarant* AH: *crasso se dicarant* EF, edd. (cryphias AH)
- 3.13,11 *rem* AE^{pf}: *rem p(ublicam)* E^{ac}H, edd.
- 3.177,12–13 *temus* A: *tenemus* EFH, edd.
- 3.197,20 *exercitatur* AH: *excitatur* EF, edd.

I doubt very much whether this is sufficient proof of contamination. 2.158,17 I have discussed above (with nn. 52–3). For 3.13,11, see the concluding remarks to section B. Some of E's readings in the list may be accidental, as the scribes of both *a* and E must have been rather careless copyists. If careless copyists copy a long and corrupt text, there is a good chance that, at least occasionally, correct readings will be restored by accident. This may have happened at 2.181,10 and 3.197,20.⁶² The emendations at

⁵⁹ All those in which the siglum 'A¹' occurs.

⁶⁰ 2.163,4, 2.327,1, 3.119,13 and 3.136,23–4. Note that in these four instances the errors involved are easily emendable, and may well have been emended more than once independently. In total, I have found only some eighty corrections made by later hands in A. More than three quarters of these can be assigned to A², either certainly or probably. As we have seen above (with n. 45), they are as a rule ignored by E. The majority of those that are not by A² are adopted by E, and are listed in Tables 1 and 2. I have already discussed one of these (the addition at 2.24,9–10: above, with n. 44), the others are mentioned in what follows. The corrections at 2.99,20, 2.101,22 and 2.101,24 (possibly also 2.96,20) are by one and the same corrector, to be distinguished not only from A² but also from the hand active at 2.24,9–10. He writes a tiny but clear and precise Caroline minuscule in a fairly dark brown ink. It is likely that E owes its emendations to this hand, as seems to be borne out, paradoxically, by the one case in which it does not follow its lead: 2.101,24 *tradi ciatis* A¹ (*tarditatis* ss. A^{mp}): *traditiatis* E¹: *tarditatis* F (*traditis* E^{mp}: *tradidatis* H¹: *tradi datis* H^{mp}). In this case the corruption of A¹ is not deleted by our corrector, which may account for the divergence of E from F, as it may have induced *a* to copy both the corruption and the 'variant'. Something similar may have happened at 2.159,7: here too the corruption of A¹ (*ruina*) is not deleted by the corrector (*trutina* simply being written above it), which may be the reason why we still find it in F, whereas E saw that the 'variant' *trutina* should be correct. I do not know to which hand I should attribute this correction, or the ones at 2.25,4 (perhaps A¹), 2.89,17–18 and 2.90,1 (perhaps the hand active in 2.99–101, discussed just now), and 2.146,25; but as far as I can tell, none of these is by A².

⁶¹ I give them here in more detail than I did above. The selection is of course somewhat subjective, but not, I hope, unreasonable.

⁶² Though not necessarily, of course. The corrections concerned may also be explained as deliberate conjectures.

2.76,24, 2.168,11, 2.214,13, 3.11,19–20 and 3.177,12–13 are perhaps less easy than would appear in retrospect (which is why I included them in this more select list), but I do not believe anyone could reasonably claim that they are impossible as conjectures. In my opinion the only truly remarkable reading in the list is 2.189,6 *ad fletus/-tum*. One such reading alone, however, makes very slender evidence indeed. All in all, I prefer to assume that the text of E is uncontaminated and to regard the reading at 2.189,6 as a lucky guess.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of positive indications that E is a descendant of A. For example, a case like D3 alone (2.299,3 *prope/proprie*) should almost be sufficient to settle the matter. The same goes for A1, A2, D1, D2, and section B of my argument. The other items belonging to sections A and D, as well as C, may serve as corroborative evidence.

Compared to all this material, Ströbel's arguments look rather thin. As I have tried to demonstrate, he does not in fact produce anything cogent. Not even 2.24,9–10, which he perhaps considered his strongest asset, actually proves anything. In my opinion the Erlangensis descends from A, and can safely be barred⁶³ from the critical apparatus wherever A is present. It could still be useful, however, as a substitute for A in those parts of the text where A has been lost to us.⁶⁴

Klassiek Seminarium, Universiteit van Amsterdam

D. S. A. RENTING

⁶³ Apart from one or two remarkable readings.

⁶⁴ I am grateful to my colleagues in Amsterdam (to single out only a few: Sé Lenssen, Rodie Risselada, Jaap Wisse) for discussing the contents of this article with me; also to Professor M. D. Reeve (Cambridge), who very kindly read an earlier typescript and returned it to me with numerous valuable annotations and corrections.