

## LAURENTIANUS 31.10 AND THE TEXT OF SOPHOCLES\*

The dust jacket of the current Oxford Classical Text of Sophocles<sup>1</sup> entices prospective readers by claiming that, in the edition which it encloses, ‘the results of one important discovery have been exploited for the first time’. The discovery in question is the redating of Laurentianus 31.10, a manuscript to which Turyn gave the siglum K.<sup>2</sup> Previously regarded as a late manuscript,<sup>3</sup> it was redated by N.G. Wilson to the last third or quarter of the twelfth century,<sup>4</sup> and thus was revealed to be the third oldest mediaeval witness to the text.<sup>5</sup> The new date has been generally accepted by scholars.<sup>6</sup>

\* I am grateful to Professor Martin West for helpful comments and to Mr Nigel Wilson for his long-term loan of a microfilm of K.

<sup>1</sup> H. Lloyd-Jones and N.G. Wilson (edd.), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford, 1990; reprinted with corrections 1992). All my references are to the 1992 impression. Henceforth I refer to the Oxford editors as LJ-J/W; to their accompanying volume *Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford, 1990) as ‘*Sophoclea*’; and to R.D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, 3 vols (Leiden, 1973–8) as ‘*Studies*’.

<sup>2</sup> A. Turyn, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* (Illinois Studies in Languages and Literature 36.1–2, Urbana, 1952), 166–8. See also id., ‘The manuscripts of Sophocles’, *Traditio* 2 (1944), 1–41, at 15. Previously the manuscript was abbreviated as Laur. B, Lb, L<sup>2</sup>, or l.

<sup>3</sup> So e.g. Turyn (n. 2) dates it to the fourteenth century. In his later book *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 43, Urbana, 1957), 333 he is more specific (‘ca. 1320’).

<sup>4</sup> The scribe of K, Ioannikios, was dated to the thirteenth century by D. Harlfinger ap. P. Moraux, D. Harlfinger, D. Reinsch and J. Wiesner, *Aristoteles Graecus. Die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles, Erster Band. Alexandrien – London* (Peripatoi 8, Berlin and New York, 1976), 292. In his review of this book, Wilson says ‘I am inclined to date the scribe Ioannikios earlier than the thirteenth century’ (*CR* n.s. 28 (1978), 335–6, at 336). Two years later he specifies the second half of the twelfth century (review of Dawe, *Studies* iii (Leiden, 1978), *JHS* 100 (1980), 218–19, at 219). He presents his evidence in his subsequent article ‘A mysterious Byzantine scriptorium: Ioannikios and his colleagues’, *Scrittura e Civiltà* 7 (1983), 161–76, at 167–8, arguing on the basis of Ioannikios’ handwriting that the traditional date is untenable. He is cautious in putting forward the new dating (‘I personally believe ...’, p. 168), on the grounds that the earlier the hand, the harder it is to date. Nevertheless, assuming that Wilson’s conclusions are reliable (and no one has challenged them), the manuscript is unlikely to be much later than the date he suggests.

In the same year that Wilson published his first thoughts on Ioannikios, P. Canart speculated on the date of Ioannikios as follows: ‘Calabre ou Sicile dans la deuxième moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Terre d’Otrante au début du XIII<sup>e</sup>? Je pencherais plutôt vers cette dernière solution’ (‘Le livre grec en Italie méridionale sous les règnes Normand et Souabe: aspects matériels et sociaux’, *Scrittura e Civiltà* 2 (1978), 103–62, at 152). But the author makes it clear (pp. 151–2, n. 121) that it was Wilson who directed him to the manuscripts of Ioannikios, so the question of priority is not affected.

<sup>5</sup> The two older manuscripts are L (Laurentianus 32.9) and A (Lugdunensis Batavorum Bibl. Publ. Graec. 60A, a palimpsest of which only portions can be read), which are both dated c. 950. For the date of the former see A. Dain (ed.), *Sophocles. Tome I. Les Trachiniennes – Antigone* (Paris, 1955), xxvi (who puts it in 960–80) and A. Diller, ‘The age of some early Greek classical manuscripts’, in J.L. Heller (ed.), *Serta Turyniana. Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in Honor of Alexander Turyn* (London, Urbana, Chicago, 1974), 514–24, at 522 (middle of the tenth century). See however M. Hecquet-Devienne, ‘Lecture nouvelle de l’*Oedipe Roi* de Sophocle dans les manuscrits L et A’, *RHT* 24 (1994) 1–59, at 14–15, who is sceptical of Diller’s

According to Ll-J/W, the manuscript 'has two great merits: it incorporates good readings from a branch of the tradition otherwise entirely lost and not always fully appreciated by previous editors, and where it follows L it can perform a useful service by showing what the original reading of L was before correctors intervened'.<sup>7</sup> But they do not substantiate either of these claims.<sup>8</sup> Nor do they include K among the twenty or so manuscripts which regularly appear in the apparatus, but instead cite it at will.<sup>9</sup> These citations chiefly rely on a previously published collation,<sup>10</sup> although they have 'verified some difficulties by means of a microfilm'.<sup>11</sup> These editorial decisions were criticized by some reviewers, who believed that K deserved greater attention given its age.<sup>12</sup>

Other modern editors have adopted very different attitudes to the manuscript. In his editions of the plays which make up the Byzantine triad,<sup>13</sup> Dawe's 'Conspetus Siglorum' conspicuously omits any reference to K. This is the case even in his third edition, published in 1996 well after Wilson's redating. Nor does he mention it in his 'Praefatio' (dated 1993). He almost never cites it in his apparatus, even when K offers a good reading not found in L.<sup>14</sup> In a subsequent article, Dawe says that he did not cite K in the triad 'because there, where the manuscript tradition is at its most copious, it had nothing of unique value to offer'.<sup>15</sup> As a result, in his opinion, the redating of the manuscript 'hardly opens up a rich vein of information'.<sup>16</sup> My own edition of *Electra*,

reasoning. The question is badly in need of an up-to-date assessment from an expert palaeographer.

<sup>6</sup> G. Cavallo, 'La trasmissione scritta della cultura greca antica in Calabria e in Sicilia tra i secoli X–XV. Consistenza, tipologia, fruizione', *Scrittura e Civiltà* 4 (1980), 157–245, at 215, says that Ioannikios was 'molto attivo, a giudicare dalla sua scrittura, tra la fine dell'XII e l'inizio del XIII secolo ed operante, con ogni verisimiglianza, in Sicilia'. J. Irigoin, 'La tradition manuscrite des tragiques grecs dans l'Italie méridionale au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et dans les premières années du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle', in [C.M. Mazzocchi (ed.)] *Bisanzio e l'Italia. Raccolta di studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi* (Scienze Filologiche e Letteratura 22, Milan, 1982), 132–43, at 136, adopts a thirteenth-century date for Ioannikios. But Wilson's dating is accepted by D.J. Mastronarde and J.M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides* (Phoinissai (University of California publications: Classical Studies 27, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1982), 3 and J. Diggle, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides* Orestes (Oxford, 1991), 6.

<sup>7</sup> Ll-J/W (n. 1), viii.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the review by M.L. West, *CR* n.s. 41 (1991), 299–301, at 299: 'One would like to know the evidence for this assertion'.

<sup>9</sup> I count 39 citations of K in *Ajax*, 40 in *Electra* and 66 in *Oedipus Rex*: 145 in all, fewer than one per page.

<sup>10</sup> A. Metlikovitz, 'De Sophoclis codice Laurentiano Plut. XXXI.10', *Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses* 2 (1890), 213–302. Metlikovitz's readings are taken from autopsy on a visit to Florence in summer 1886 (p. 218), whereas mine are from a microfilm. I sometimes refer to Metlikovitz's collation in addition to my own, since with the original manuscript in front of him he may have seen more than I can.

<sup>11</sup> Ll-J/W (n. 1), p. viii, n. 7. West (n. 8), at 299 cites this remark and adds a question mark afterwards in brackets, because of the odd English.

<sup>12</sup> In addition to West's review see B. Zimmermann, *Gnomon* 65 (1993), 100–9, at 101; L. Battezzato in F. Ferrari et al., 'In margine al testo di Sofocle', *RFIC* 120 (1992), 388–410, at 390–2.

<sup>13</sup> R.D. Dawe, Teubner editions of the triad, Leipzig 1975<sup>1</sup>, 1984<sup>2</sup>, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1996<sup>3</sup>. Dawe does cite K in his edition of the four other plays.

<sup>14</sup> Nor does he cite it in his commentary on the *Oedipus Rex* (Cambridge, 1982<sup>1</sup>, 2006<sup>2</sup>): see my review (*CB* 83 (2007), 287–8). The exception is at *OR* 464, where in his 1996 Teubner (but not in either edition of his Cambridge commentary) he cites K's εἶπε as recorded by Ll-J/W. This is a false reading: the microfilm clearly shows that K reads εἶπε, with the majority of manuscripts.

<sup>15</sup> 'On editing Sophocles, Oxford style', *JCS* 27–8 (2002–3), 1–19, at 1–2.

<sup>16</sup> This negative view is not new. An anonymous work of 1823 declares 'To Laur. B., very

on the other hand, cites the manuscript regularly throughout the apparatus. But I provided no justification for this policy, other than a reference to the new date.<sup>17</sup>

I propose to examine afresh the value of this manuscript for establishing the text of Sophocles. I concentrate on the triad (*Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Rex*), as these plays survive in so many manuscripts. The other four plays have far fewer extant witnesses, and so it is much more likely that any individual manuscript will have something to offer.<sup>18</sup> My intention is to suggest and justify a policy for future editors of the triad with regard to K.

### READINGS NOT FOUND IN OTHER MEDIAEVAL MANUSCRIPTS

Contrary to Dawe's view expressed above, K contains several readings not (as far as we know) found in the other extant mediaeval manuscripts of Sophocles. Some of these are certainly, others possibly, true. At the very least, all deserve to be mentioned in an apparatus, yet Ll-J/W cite only one of them. They are as follows:

(i) K<sup>ac</sup> is the only manuscript to attribute *Aj.* 371 (correctly) to Tecmessa rather than the chorus.<sup>19</sup> Pearson<sup>20</sup> and Dawe award the attribution to 'rec.' (i.e. *codex recentior*, an unspecified late manuscript), but do not elaborate. I suspect that this 'rec.' is K: when Pearson was writing it was indeed regarded as a late manuscript, and Dawe appears to have repeated the designation.<sup>21</sup> Even if Pearson's 'rec.' is not K, the fact that the reading is in K greatly strengthens its chance of being genuinely ancient and not a mediaeval emendation. Ll-J/W tell us simply 'Tecmessae tribuit K.O. Müller, choro codd.'<sup>22</sup>

(ii) At *Aj.* 679 K has ἡμῖν where other manuscripts have ἡμην. Only the former makes sense; the latter 'as [a] Hellenistic κοινῇ form often intrudes into poetic texts under cover of similar-looking words'.<sup>23</sup> Here K is not alone in offering this reading, which is also found in one manuscript of the *Suda*.<sup>24</sup> As often, however, the two currently standard critical editions ignore the evidence which this tenth-century

modern, full of faults and impudently interpolated, not the least regard need be paid' (review of P. Elmsley, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* [Oxford, 1823], *The Classical Journal* vol. 28 no. 56 (December 1823), 356–63, at 358–9, n. 3). C. Stray *ap.* P.J. Finglass, 'A newly-discovered edition of Sophocles by Peter Elmsley', *GRBS* 47 (2007), 101–16, at 105, n. 8 suggests on stylistic grounds that the author may be Dobree.

<sup>17</sup> P.J. Finglass (ed.), *Sophocles. Electra* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 44, Cambridge, 2007), 15. My forthcoming edition of *Ajax* also cites K throughout.

<sup>18</sup> Even so, neither Ll-J/W nor Dawe cite K regularly in these four plays. I hope to investigate the importance of K for the tetrad elsewhere.

<sup>19</sup> According to Metlikovitz (n. 10), 222, the scribe wrote χρ' then added Τεκμ; the latter was then deleted by the scholiast. It rather appears to me that Τεκμ was written first, as it is the same distance from the beginning of the verse as the other character designations. The scribe later struck through Τεκμ and added χρ' between Τεκμ and the start of the verse: the gap was large enough for this to fit comfortably. If Metlikovitz were right, why would the scribe have placed χρ' unusually, and then added Τεκμ without crossing it out?

<sup>20</sup> A.C. Pearson (ed.), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford, 1924).

<sup>21</sup> There is no shame in his doing so, given that Pearson was so unhelpful in identifying the manuscript. But it is ironic that this ends up constituting Dawe's only citation of K in his edition of *Ajax*!

<sup>22</sup> This attribution to Müller is itself mistaken: see my forthcoming edition ad loc.

<sup>23</sup> M. Davies (ed.), *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991), on 24, referring to R. Kannicht (ed.), *Euripides. Helena*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1969), on 931.

<sup>24</sup> Manuscript A (Parisinus gr. 2625, 2626) at ε 4016 = A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. (Lexicographi Graeci I, Leipzig, 1928–38), ii. 494.29.

lexicon provides. LI-J/W simply attribute the reading to K; Dawe is worse, awarding it to 'rec.' Contrast Jebb's apparatus, which gives the full facts.<sup>25</sup>

(iii) At *Aj.* 1000 K<sup>pc</sup> reads καγώ, while all other known witnesses have άγώ. It is not in the hand of the scribe; Metlikovitz (n. 10), 224 attributes the change to the scholiast. In their apparatus LI-J/W propose καγώ as their own emendation, unaware that the reading in found in K. It is very attractive: Teucer has just referred to the όξεία βάξίς which swept the army at Ajax' death, and it is awkward for this to be given a neuter plural relative pronoun.

(iv) At *El.* 1099 θ' is found in K together with t, the two Triclinian manuscripts cited by LI-J/W.<sup>26</sup> L<sup>ac</sup> omits it, while δ' is the reading of L<sup>pc</sup> and the other manuscripts. θ' is correct (see my edition ad loc.), and, if the reading in t is an emendation by Triclinius, K thus has another unique, albeit small, preservation of the truth.

(v) K omits *OR* 56–7 from its main text; they are added by the scribe in the margin.<sup>27</sup> The difference in ink quality indicates that this was done at a different time from the writing of the main text. These lines were deleted by Schmidt, a deletion which has found favour with several scholars.<sup>28</sup> K's omission could be the result of scribal error: both 54 and 56 begin with ώς, which might have encouraged the scribe's eye to jump from 55 to 58. On the other hand, it is also possible that K's main exemplar was missing the lines, and that the scribe of K added them after comparison with another manuscript. The omission strengthens the case against the lines, without confirming it.

(vi) K also omits *OR* 121, again adding it in the margin: according to Battezzato (who has seen the original manuscript), the marginal addition may belong to the scribe.<sup>29</sup> The line is also most probably omitted by *P.Oxy.* 2180 (second century A.D.).<sup>30</sup> The omission of the line from two of the oldest three witnesses to the text means that the possibility of an interpolation must be taken seriously.

<sup>25</sup> R.C. Jebb (ed.), *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part VII. The Ajax* (Cambridge, 1896). The apparatus in L. Campbell's edition (vol. ii, Oxford, 1881) claims that the Sophoclean manuscript A (Parisinus graecus 2712) reads ήμιν: according to Dawe, *Studies* ii. 25, this is incorrect. I have checked a microfilm, and can confirm that Dawe is right. The compendium used here for the final *HN* is not common in this manuscript, and must have confused Campbell: but it occurs in line 477 at the end of *πράμην*. Both Jebb and Campbell correctly record that L contains ήμιν above the line in a later hand.

<sup>26</sup> Parisinus graecus 2711 (T) and Marcianus graecus 470 (Ta). In my commentary (but not my apparatus) I mistakenly ascribe this reading simply to Triclinius, forgetting K.

<sup>27</sup> This is also observed by Metlikovitz (n. 10), 230 and L. Battezzato, 'I viaggi dei testi', in id. (ed.), *Tradizione testuale e ricezione letteraria antica della tragedia greca. Atti del convegno Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa 14–15 Giugno 2002* (Amsterdam, 2003), 7–31, at 28. The latter compares *El.* 1485–6, suspect lines which K omits in its text and adds in the margin, although there the omission is also in L<sup>ac</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> M. Schmidt (ed.), *Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus* (Jena, 1871), a deletion later made independently by M.D. Reeve, 'Some interpolations in Sophocles', *GRBS* 11 (1970), 283–93, at 289–90. L.G. van Deventer, *Specimen Litterarium Inaugurale de Interpolationibus quibusdam in Sophoclis Tragoediis* (diss. Leiden, 1851), 5 had already deleted 54–7.

<sup>29</sup> Battezzato (n. 27), 28: 'da una mano più corsiva, forse la stessa mano dello scriba del testo'. Metlikovitz (n. 10), 230 attributes it to the scribe without signalling doubt.

<sup>30</sup> I have checked an image of the papyrus available online via the Oxyrhynchus Papyri website (<http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/>). Its only trace of the line following 120 is a mu under the mu of μαθεῖν, preceded by a speck consistent with the top of the left arm of an epsilon. This fits the end of 122, οὐ μὲν LI-J/W, *Sophoclea*, 83, rather propose that the papyrus has a different text of 121, suggesting εἰ λάβοις προθυμίας. But in the context προθυμία is less attractive than ἐλπς; and it is simpler to assume that a line is missing (for whatever reason) than to suggest a variant text. See further Battezzato (n. 27), 26–31. LI-J/W do not mention the possibility that the papyrus is missing the line.

(vii) At *OR* 772 manuscripts read *καὶ μείζονι*.<sup>31</sup> LI-J/W print Blaydes's conjecture *καὶ κρείσσονι*, whereas Dawe prefers Richards's *καμείνονι*.<sup>32</sup> K reads *κρείττονι* in the margin.<sup>33</sup> This may be a gloss: but 'often the true reading gets dispossessed and lives on under the guise of a gloss'.<sup>34</sup> The untragic double tau does not mean that the reading is not original, as this error often invades the mediaeval tradition.<sup>35</sup>

(viii) At *OR* 1481 manuscripts read *ὥς*, but LI-J/W record Elmsley's conjecture *εἰς* in their apparatus. This is a *supra lineam* variant in K, but apparently not found elsewhere.<sup>36</sup>

The number of unique readings is surprisingly large given the extent of the manuscript tradition for these plays.<sup>37</sup> It justifies LI-J/W's claim cited above that K 'incorporates good readings from a branch of the tradition otherwise entirely lost'. It also shows that K sometimes preserves readings elsewhere found only in the secondary tradition or a papyrus. The redating of K to the twelfth century makes it more likely that any given unique reading reflects ancient tradition rather than Byzantine conjecture, as deliberate emendation is less common in manuscripts of this date compared with those from later periods.

#### TRUE READINGS SHARED WITH A FEW LATER MANUSCRIPTS (AND NOT L)

In more places, K contains the truth in common with a small number of later MSS against L (and, where available, *A*). In the list below, I exclude cases where K preserves correct accentuation (*Aj.* 332, *OR* 1098/9) or word division (*Aj.* 224/5, 620/1, 1284, *OR* 184/5), as mediaeval manuscripts do not enjoy authority in such matters. But I include instances where K shares the truth with an ancient manuscript (i.e. a papyrus) as well as with later, mediaeval, manuscripts (*OR* 181/2, 525). It is reassuring that such cases exist, as they provide the clearest indication that K has access to ancient tradition not found in L.

For reasons of space, I do not argue why I believe that each of these readings is true (although for passages from *Electra* my commentary provides more details, as will my

<sup>31</sup> In L the final iota is written *in rasura*, and Dawe in his edition suggests that the original word may have read *-vaî*. The question is not significant for our purposes.

<sup>32</sup> See LI-J/W, *Sophoclea*, 97–8 and Dawe, *Studies* i. 243. The conjectures are owed to F.H.M. Blaydes (*locum non inveni*) and H. Richards, 'Varia', *CR* 16 (1902), 393–7, at 394 = *Aristophanes and Others* (London, 1909), 292.

<sup>33</sup> This is noted by M. Papathomopoulos, 'De quelques manuscrits de Sophocle revisités', in A. Machin and L. Pernée (edd.), *Sophocle: le texte, les personnages. Actes du colloque international d'Aix-en-Provence 10, 11 et 12 janvier 1992* (Aix-en-Provence, 1993), 75–94, at 89. He is not sure whether the manuscript has double sigma or double tau: it is certainly the latter. LI-J/W take care to specify '*καὶ μείζονι* codd. (etiam K)' in their apparatus, but apparently missed the marginal note, which supports the very reading that they adopt.

<sup>34</sup> R.D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1964), 57, with examples. Cf. e.g. *OR* 18, where Bentley's *ἱερεὺς* (for manuscript *ἱερεῖς*) is supported by the gloss in O *ἱερεὺς ὑπάρχων*.

<sup>35</sup> For example, *Aj.* 1396 *ξύμπρασσε* Brunck: *ξύμπραττε* codd. and *El.* 998 *ἐλασσον* *P.Oxy.* 693, conl. Brunck: *ἐλάττων* codd. The corruption has taken place in *κρείσσόνων* in *LA* at *Ant.* 63.

<sup>36</sup> So also Papathomopoulos (n. 33), 90.

<sup>37</sup> Compare the figures for other manuscripts collected by M.L. West, 'Tragica II', *BICS* 25 (1978), 106–22, at 106 for uniquely-preserved good readings unlikely to be emendations. He counts 9 across the whole **a** group (ADXR<sup>+</sup>XsZr), 5 from **r** (GRQ), 4 each from OH, 3 from C, 2 from P, and possibly one from V.

forthcoming commentary on *Ajax*). Although disagreement is possible in some cases, the overall picture would not be significantly affected by the loss of some instances. Some scholars would no doubt include additional cases.<sup>38</sup>

*Aj.* **727:** K preserves the τ' also found in FZc, but omitted by other manuscripts and the Suda (ω 239 = iii. 626.14 Adler).

**743:** K<sup>ac</sup> appears to have κέρδιον, together with F<sup>ac</sup>P: other manuscripts have the superlative κέρδιστον.

*El.* **192:** K is the earliest witness for ἀμφίσταμαι, also found in Eustathius 1692.57 and NOPVZg<sup>ac</sup>. Other manuscripts have ἀφ– (L<sup>ac</sup>Δ), ὕφ– (C), or ἐφ– (the rest).

**723:** K has δέφροις together with C<sup>pc</sup>HPV; other manuscripts read –οι.

**783:** K preserves the aorist ἀπηλλάγην along with rN and the Suda (π 2810 = iv. 233.20 Adler); most other manuscripts have –αγμαί (or, in Δ, ἀνήλλαγμαί).

**898:** KJZf are the only manuscripts to include the mu in ἐγχρίμπτει (which they write ἐγχρίμπτη; Nauck restores the correct ending).

**1332:** Only KD<sup>ac</sup>?HO have ἡμῖν (for which I write the enclitic ἦμιν); other manuscripts have ὑμῖν or ὑμῖν.

*OR* **181/2** θαναταφόρα is only in PSI 1192 and KFNP, with other manuscripts getting at least one of the vowels wrong.

**185/6:** KrCH<sup>1pc</sup> preserve ἐπιστενάχουσι where other manuscripts show the incorrect o-vocalism ἐπιστο–.

**525:** τοῦπος is in P.Oxy. 2180 and K, while r have τοῖπος: this is corrupted in other manuscripts (no doubt thanks to the crasis) to τοῦ πρὸς or πρὸς τοῦ.

**1084:** K has δ' along with AXrVZc, where t has γ' and F κ'. Other manuscripts have nothing.

**1086/7:** Only KFO have the correct Doric alpha in γνώμαν.

**1262:** The vocalism κλῆθρα (as opposed to κλεῖθρα) is only in KrV.

**1313/14:** KDZrNOZc read ἐπιπλόμενον: other manuscripts have –ώμενον.

**1330/1:** κακά is repeated only in KrADXrN.

**1445:** Kr have νὺν γ' ἄν; other manuscripts have νὺν τᾶν, except for O which has γ' ἄν νὺν.

**1487:** KCH<sup>pc</sup>NOPa have πικρὰ ... λοιποῦ where other manuscripts have λοιπὰ ... πικροῦ.

In the above instances K does not provide readings unknown from other sources. But it does tell us that these readings existed in the manuscript tradition at least as early as the twelfth century. As conjectures by Byzantine scholars were still rare at this time, the readings are likely to reflect ancient tradition, not emendation.<sup>39</sup> LI-J/W make this point in their discussion of *OR* 1487 when they say 'The presence of the reading πικρὰ ... λοιποῦ in K indicates that it is not likely to be a conjecture' (*Sophoclea*, 113). That applies not just to that passage, but to all those cited above.

<sup>38</sup> Manuscript sigla are those established by Turyn. I rely on Dawe's manuscript collations except for L (collated from facsimile), O (collated from microfilm; checked with original), K, A, Zf and Zg (collated from microfilm). I have checked an image of *P.Oxy* 2180 (see n. 30).

<sup>39</sup> Dawe, *Studies* i. 95–6 points out that emendation is already happening in the r group at the end of the thirteenth century.



TRUE READINGS SHARED WITH SEVERAL LATER MANUSCRIPTS  
(AND NOT L)

As would be expected, this is much the most numerous category: I count 39 instances across my apparatuses for the three plays.<sup>40</sup> As in the previous section, K's testimony indicates that these readings existed as early as the twelfth century, and so are unlikely to be Byzantine emendations. It may be objected, however, that several are found in so many different branches of the tradition that even without K, we could be confident that they were not the results of Byzantine conjecture. Why should we cite K on, say, *Aj.* 45 when **rapt** (17 manuscripts from right across the tradition) all have the same reading? What does K's testimony add in such a case?

Such a question gets things exactly the wrong way round. Rather than asking what K can add to the information provided by **rapt**, we should rather inquire what **rapt** can add to the information provided by K. After all, K is the third oldest mediaeval manuscript of Sophocles. Usually it is the second-oldest witness to the text, since *A* is fragmentary; and sometimes it is the oldest, when L is illegible and *A* unavailable. It is more than a century older than the next oldest manuscript. It contains more unique readings than most, if not all, subsequent manuscripts (excepting those likely to be Triclinius' emendations in t), and many true readings which are only weakly-attested in the subsequent tradition. If editors were constructing a Sophoclean *apparatus criticus* for the first time, and had to choose which manuscripts should be consistently cited in it, there can be no doubt that K would fall into that category.

There are two reasons why this has not happened. First, scholars were too ready to rely on a published collation of the manuscript which did not include all the unique readings. Second, the redating of K (so crucial for those of its readings which are *not* unique) took place after the first two volumes of Roger Dawe's *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* appeared in 1973. In this book, Dawe published collations of 19 manuscripts, most of which had not been systematically examined before, and assessed the results. These collations included almost all those manuscripts which Turyn had classed as *veteres* or older manuscripts. However, in the early 1970s nobody doubted that K was a late manuscript, and so Dawe quite reasonably did not collate it.

Dawe's own Teubner edition of the triad (published in 1975) was based throughout on the manuscripts from his *Studies*. This decision attracted justified criticism: for, as West pointed out, 'he did not ... show that these are the best manuscripts to put in the critical apparatus or that they all deserve a place in it. In his edition, however, he has put them all in, without attempting either to eliminate any or to investigate any others.'<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, Dawe did not change his practice in his second and third editions, and LI-J/W basically followed his lead, citing all the manuscripts from his *Studies* with only occasional additions, despite Wilson's redating of K.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> They are: *Aj.* 45, 199, 235, 245/6, 543, 546, 641/2, 812, 1024, 1075, 1113, 1330, 1360; *El.* 55, 63, 167, 482, 797, 947, 948, 1124, 1242, 1343, 1348, 1375, 1396; *OR* 185/6, 229, 322, 657, 659, 773, 836, 1011, 1046, 1138, 1171, 1337, 1446.

<sup>41</sup> M.L. West, review of Dawe's first edition (1975), *Gnomon* 50 (1978), 236–43, at 236. The same criticism is made in reviews of *Studies* i–ii by West, *CP* 72 (1977), 264–7, at 266–7; by Wilson, *JHS* 96 (1976), 171–6, at 171–2; and by J. Irigoin, *Gnomon* 50 (1978), 721–5, at 725 ('Ce qui est probablement plus important, c'est que rien ne nous garantit que les dix-neuf manuscrits collationnés sont les seuls qui méritaient de l'être; on trouverait assurément à glaner aussi dans d'autres manuscrits que D. n'a pas regardés').

<sup>42</sup> An attempt by West (n. 37), 106–8 to eliminate some of Dawe's manuscripts from regular citation in the Sophoclean apparatus has not been taken up by subsequent editors to date (Dawe, LI-J/W, myself).

This flawed approach assumes that Dawe's manuscripts are somehow fundamental, and that proposed additions should be cited only in those places where they provide information not found in his selection. Such an unscientific attitude to textual criticism is reminiscent of that found in the earliest stages of classical scholarship, when manuscripts were valued if they contained information not in the vulgate, but no attempt was made to examine whether the vulgate provided a suitable starting point.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, it frequently originated from a manuscript selected at random for the *editio princeps*: compare how some of Dawe's manuscripts were (quite properly, given the purpose of his work) selected 'to introduce a random element', as he himself points out (*Studies* i. 3).

We should rather decide which manuscripts to cite based on an assessment of their merits which is not prejudiced by whether a previous editor chose to cite them. When we do that, K's merits as set out above should easily win it the status of a permanently cited manuscript. The question of which other manuscripts deserve to be regularly cited alongside L(Δ)K is one which I hope to discuss elsewhere. But now at least we have a firm starting point from which we can consider that problem.

### K'S RELATIONSHIP WITH L

The second part of Ll-J/W's description of K with which we began stressed the importance of its closeness to L. It is time to examine this claim in more detail.

A cursory glance at my apparatus for *Electra* would indicate that K indeed shares many readings with L (and Δ, where available). The same holds for the other two plays of the triad.<sup>44</sup> This similarity was first noticed by Peter Elmsley, the first scholar to use these manuscripts for the constitution of the text. In a letter written at Florence on 23 February 1819,<sup>45</sup> Elmsley tells his correspondent that 'the Laurentian library contains a comparatively modern manuscript, in which many of the original readings of the former ms. are preserved. For instance, Elect. 33. I find *πατρός* in the first ms. and *πατρὶ* in the second. I then go back to the first ms. and find that the ink of *πατρ* is rather paler than that of *ός*, and that an *ι* lurks under the *ο*. But the alteration has been made so artfully, that an experienced collator would not observe it, if his attention was not directed to it by the knowledge of the existence of such a various reading.'

Later editors take a similar view of K,<sup>46</sup> including Ll-J/W, who (as cited above)

<sup>43</sup> 'The humanist style of collation ... was unscientific because selective: the MSS were looked upon as a source of improvement for the *lectio recepta*, and their readings were recorded when they seemed to coincide with the critic's idea of what constituted an improvement, passed over in silence otherwise' (E.J. Kenney, *The Classical Text. Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Sather Classical Lectures 44, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1974), 59–60).

<sup>44</sup> According to Turyn (n. 2), 167–8 (accepted by Irigoin [n. 41], 138–9), K follows r (i.e. GR) in *OR* (as also in *Antigone* 523–end and *Trachiniae* 1–372). It does share a few readings with this group against L, but its closest relationship is still with L, just as L stands closer to K than it does to r.

<sup>45</sup> The letter is taken from Elmsley's correspondence with Charles Watkin Williams Wynn (1775–1850). This correspondence is held at the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth, Coed y Maen bundle no. 10 (92 letters, dating 1796–1824, numbered 776–869; this is letter 826).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. R. Schneider, 'Der stammbaum der Sophokleischen handschriften', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 115 = *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 23 (1877), 441–9, at 447: K 'noch einen gewissen wert behält, da er an manchen stellen allein über die ursprüngliche lesart von L auskunft erteilt'; C. Meifert, *De Sophoclis codicibus* (diss. Halle, 1891), 64: K 'parvi pretii est ad Sophoclem emendandum et hic illic tantum respiciendus, ubi L scriptura dubia vel obliterata est'; S.P. Peppink, 'Ad Sophoclem eiusque scholiastam', *Mnemosyne* 3rd ser. 1 (1934), 67–78, at 74–5 = *Opera Minora Simonis Petri Peppink* (Leiden, 1938), 35–46, at 42–4.



claim that 'where it follows L it can perform a useful service by showing what the original reading of L was before correctors intervened'. Yet as we have seen, K often has different readings from L. So when L is unclear, we cannot assume that K provides evidence for its reading.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, even when L and K agree, that does not mean that their shared reading must come from a proximate common source. K might be reflecting a different branch of the tradition from L, which just happens in this place to coincide with that of the earlier manuscript.

Elmsley was aware that K contained readings different from those in L, but attributed these to the conjectures of a scribe.<sup>48</sup> Despite these differences, some scholars claimed that K was an apograph of L.<sup>49</sup> Others correctly realized that the many divergences between L and K meant that the latter must have been influenced by a different branch of the tradition, although they differed on the precise stemmatic relationship between these two manuscripts.<sup>50</sup> Among modern scholars, Ll-J/W see K as an indirect descendant of L,<sup>51</sup> while Battezzato more cautiously asserts that they are close relations.<sup>52</sup>

K's value is already established on the basis of those of its contents which do not

<sup>47</sup> This point is well made by Papatomopoulos (n. 33), 83: 'comment K qui a "many good readings" et qui souvent s'accorde avec d'autres mss. contre L, peut-il être garant de ce que portait L avant correction?' Ll-J/W's claim in particular is unfortunately expressed. They say that 'where it follows L', K can reveal the 'original reading' of that manuscript: but how can we tell whether K follows L in a given instance, when we do not know L's original reading? For Elmsley, by contrast, K is a prompt to scrutiny of the obscure, not divination of the illegible.

<sup>48</sup> P. Elmsley (ed.), *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* (Oxford, 1823), iii says of K 'Recens est et mendosissimus, necnon a librario profectus, qui conjecturas suas in textum admittere non dubitaret.'

<sup>49</sup> Thus W. Dindorf (ed.), *Sophoclis Tragoediae superstites et perditarum fragmenta* (Oxford, 1860), i p. vii ('ego huius apographi pluribus in locis mentionem feci, quia ex ipso codice Laurentiano descriptum videtur ea aetate, qua multae libri vetusti litterae facilius et certius quam hodie legi poterant') and iii p. iii (the manuscript is a fourteenth-century copy of L 'etsi scriptura passim mutata'). Cf. J. Kvičala, review of A. Seyffert, *Quaestiones Criticae de Codicibus Sophoclis recte aestimandis* (Halle, 1864), *ZOEG* 17 (1866), 21–33, at 29 ('Sehen wir doch dass auch Lb, der doch sicher eine Copie des L ist [vgl. z. B. Ant. 1098], und zwar eine unmittelbare Copie, gar manche Differenzen dem Original gegenüber aufweist'); and C.G. Cobet, *Oratio de arte interpretandi grammaticae et critices fundamentis innixa primario philologi officio* (Leiden, 1847), 103, according to whom L was the source of *all* other surviving manuscripts ('Satis mihi constat Aeschly et Sophoclis fabulas, quas habemus, in uno codice, qui nunc in Laurentiana Bibliotheca servatur, ad nos pervenisse: ex quo vetustissimo libro, decimo fere post Christum saeculo pulcherrime in membranis scripto, profluxit quidquid codicum MSS. ubique invenitur, unde magno labore et diligentia acervos variarum lectionum cumularunt utriusque Poëtae editores'). According to Cobet, readings in other manuscripts but not found in L arose 'ex describentium socordia vel correctorum interpolatione' (ibid.). This downgrading of all manuscripts but one to the status of worthless apographa was part of a general strategy to attack manuscript evidence in favour of conjectural emendation. Cobet's view was repeated and popularized by Dindorf, loc. cit.; cf. also his 'Ueber die mediceische handschrift des Aeschylus und deren verhältniss zu den übrigen handschriften', *Philologus* 18 (1862), 55–93, at 78.

<sup>50</sup> Thus I.H. Lipsius, *De Sophoclis emendandi praesidiis* (Leipzig, 1860), 14–15 (who believed that L and K shared a common ancestor) and H. Hinck ap. O. Jahn (ed.), *Sophoclis Electra* (rev. A. Michaelis; Bonn 1872<sup>2</sup>, 1882<sup>3</sup>), p. vii = v 'Hugonis Hinckii de libris L et I disputatiuncula', followed by Schneider (n. 46), at 447 (according to whom K descended from an apograph of L called λ).

<sup>51</sup> Ll-J/W (n. 1), viii. Cf. Wilson (n. 4, 1983), 163: 'Although it is thought to be a descendant of the famous tenth-century Laurentian manuscript, the text has undergone some contamination, and as a result our volume is the unique source of a few good readings.'

<sup>52</sup> L. Battezzato (n. 27), 28: 'Il manoscritto K è molto vicino a L, ma ne è indipendente, e conserva molte lezioni singolari giuste.'

have anything in common with L. Nevertheless, it is worth asking whether, for those readings which it does share with L against other manuscripts, it has simply copied them from L (perhaps via an intermediary), or whether L and K both testify to a common ancestor. If the former, K is considerably less interesting when it agrees with L. If the latter, K becomes even more important, as an independent witness to this crucial part of the tradition.

Either hypothesis will account for readings shared between L and K, when neither manuscript has been corrected, or when L has been corrected with a hand demonstrably later than K.<sup>53</sup> Cases where L has been corrected by the scribe or scholiast of L are more relevant, as they certainly predate K. If K's reading in such cases is the same as L<sup>ac</sup>, then K probably did not take the reading from L<sup>ac</sup>. And if the reading in L<sup>ac</sup>K is absent from or rare in other manuscripts, suggesting that the reading belongs specifically to this 'Laurentian' branch of the tradition, then we may tentatively suggest that L<sup>ac</sup> and K took the reading from a shared 'Laurentian' source, and thus that they are both independent witnesses to it.

Many possible cases must be ruled out, either because (as often) it is difficult to date the correction of L, or because the reading of L<sup>ac</sup>K is shared with a few other manuscripts and so it may not be distinctively Laurentian. There are three places which do appear important, however:

(i) At *Aj.* 706 the true reading  $\epsilon\lambda\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu$  is found in L<sup>ac</sup>K<sup>ac</sup> and a late manuscript.<sup>54</sup> In L the scholiast has corrected this to  $\epsilon\lambda\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , and K shows the same correction:  $\Lambda$  and A also contain this reading with no corrections. Other manuscripts have  $\epsilon\lambda\nu\sigma\epsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ . It is conceivable that the scribe of K took care to distinguish between the hands of the scribe and scholiast of L, and chose to report only the former's reading. But we do not usually expect to find this degree of diligence in a copyist. It is easier to suppose that K's exemplar at this point read  $\epsilon\lambda\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu$ , that this exemplar was related to the source of L, and that K was subsequently corrected by the addition of  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  from another manuscript.

The second and third cases both involve omissions of entire lines:

(ii) Line 1007 of *Electra* is omitted by LKR and added in the margin, in each case by the scholiast. ( $\Lambda$  contains the lines in the text, as do the other manuscripts.)

(iii) Lines 1485–6 of *Electra* are omitted in the text of LKWb, and added in the margin.<sup>55</sup> In L the addition was made by the scholiast,<sup>56</sup> in K by the scribe.

If the scribe of K was copying from L, it is strange that, on two occasions, he failed

<sup>53</sup> For example, the scribe of A made many corrections in L in the early fourteenth century, as identified by A. Turyn, 'The Sophocles recension of Manuel Moschopoulos', *TAPA* 80 (1949), 94–173, at 140, 146 with n. 92.

<sup>54</sup> Monacensis graecus 507, fourteenth or fifteenth century.

<sup>55</sup> The information on Wb (= Vatican graecus 1332, thirteenth century) is owed to Turyn (n. 2), 161, who records that it 'Wb<sup>ac</sup>' omits the lines: this implies that they were added later, but he does not say by whom. Peppink does not mention *El.* 1485–6 in his study of the manuscript ('De Sophoclis codice Vaticano 1332', *Mnemosyne* 3rd ser. 1 (1934), 155–9 = *Opuscula* (n. 46), 59–63). A collation of Wb would help determine whether the omission is a coincidence, or whether this manuscript has a special link to the Laurentian branch of the tradition.

<sup>56</sup> See Jebb in E.M. Thompson and R.C. Jebb, *Facsimile of the Laurentian Manuscript of Sophocles* (London, 1885), 16, n. 1; also his n. ad loc. in the apparatus criticus of his edition (Cambridge, 1894). The shape of the phi indicates that they are correct. My edition of *Electra* carelessly omits a reference to the addition; while Dindorf wrongly attributes it to a later hand.

to notice lines added in the margin of L until after he had written the main text. In each case the added lines in L are perfectly clear, and it would have been apparent that they were meant as additions to the text, not as scholia or parallel passages. Nor can we say that the scribe of K was copying everything in L unthinkingly, in the same place as it occurred in his source, as that would not account for the fact that 1007 was added not by him, but by the scholiast.

It is easier to suppose that K was copying from the same source as L, or another manuscript related to it. That source omitted *El.* 1007 and 1485–6 (correctly, in each case: see my commentary *ad loc.*). These lines were later added in the margins of L and K after one or more different manuscripts have been examined.

I thus believe that L and K are independent witnesses to the Laurentian branch of the tradition. This opens up the possibility that some of its unique readings identified above are in fact Laurentian, but were missed by the scribe of L.

### CONCLUSION

K provides us with several good unique readings, provides our earliest evidence for many more, and acts as an independent witness to the Laurentian tradition alongside L. Its place in the apparatus for the triad should be assured. K's misfortune, however, was that its redating by Wilson came a decade too late, after Dawe's collations, which have fundamentally and undeservedly shaped the construction of the modern Sophoclean apparatus. For some thirty years now there has been no attempt to follow through on Wilson's work and to work out what practical consequences it has for an editor. I hope that this article has gone some way to address that deficiency. Redating a manuscript is all very well: but it will tell us little if unaccompanied by recollation and reassessment.

*University of Nottingham*

P. J. FINGLASS  
patrick.finglass@nottingham.ac.uk