

# Introduction

## 1. THE MANUSCRIPTS

Apart from the MSS treated below, there are several apographs of the Parisinus gr. 2003; these are not discussed here nor used for the present edition.<sup>1</sup>

### 1.1 THE PARIS MANUSCRIPT (P: PARISINUS GR. 2003)

Collated from microfilm.<sup>2</sup> The MS was inspected *in situ* in May 2007.

Bibliography: Hult 2002, Agapitos & al. 1996, Omont 1888, 177. See also Bydén 2003, Lamberz 2000, Prato 1991, and Ševčenko 1962.

Parchment codex, I+287(6) folia, 265–270x195–200 mm., first half of 14th c. (see further below).

#### *Parchment*

The parchment is white-yellowish, of good to excellent quality and with little difference between the two sides; there are but few knuckle marks. The first leaves are somewhat darkened, and there are some signs of worm.

#### *Lines to the page, ruling, quires, foliation, etc.*

There are generally 33 lines to the page. There is a simple system of ruling: two vertical lines through the whole page within which the text is contained; further, one horizontal line for each line of text.

After one paper leaf, the MS consists of 36 quaternions of which the first is mutilated: there is a leaf missing between ff. 2 and 3. The last leaf of the last

<sup>1</sup> See Hult 2002, xxxiif., and Arco Magri 1982. I am much indebted to earlier work (especially Hult 2002 and the standard catalogues) for my descriptions of the MSS. All the three main MSS have been inspected *in situ* for the present volume, and there are several points on which it has been possible to make additions to previous knowledge.

<sup>2</sup> The MS can now be accessed at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8514389m/f1.image.r=Grec%202003>.

quire is glued to the back of the book. At the bottom of f. 7<sup>v</sup> there is a quire signature. Thereafter there are regular quire signatures at the bottom of the recto of the first leaf of each quire (quire signature nr. 20 appears one folio too early).

There are two sets of foliation, both with Roman numbers, above right on the recto. The first of these (1-278) is in a blackish-brown ink (P<sup>2</sup>?) and starts with the first essay, on the first leaf of the second quire; the last independent leaf bears no number of this kind. The second set of numbers (1-286), in blue ink, is more recent and starts from the first parchment leaf.

### *Contents*

On the first paper leaf there is some bibliographical information.

The first two parchment leaves, originally empty, are flyleaves. On f. 1<sup>v</sup> Andreas Darmarios has written: θεοδώρου μεγάλου λογοθέτου τοῦ μετοχίτου ὑπομνηματισμοὶ καὶ σημειώσεις γνωμικαὶ διὰ κεφαλαίων ρκ' διηρημένα.

Ff. 3-7 contain a pinax; for an edition of this see Hult 2002, 5-19.

The text of the first essay commences on f. 8<sup>r</sup>. The text of the last essay ends on f. 278<sup>r</sup>. At the bottom of f. 278<sup>r</sup> there is the monogram of the author, resolved as follows in the hand of Andreas Darmarios: τοῦ μεγάλου λογοθέτου θεοδώρου τοῦ μετοχίτου.

For the essays edited here see ff. 111<sup>r</sup>-143<sup>v</sup> and 150<sup>r</sup>-171<sup>r</sup>.

### *Hands, ink, marginalia, etc.*

P was written in its entirety by Michael Klostomalles (Lamberz 2000, 157-59), a well-known writer of MSS of Metochites' works. Writing in the so-called Metochites style, he will be referred to here as P<sup>1</sup>. P<sup>1</sup> has made several corrections of his own text and has also introduced some corrections in the margin. The ink used by him in the main text has faded to brown. Red has been used for rubrics, the numbering of each essay, and the initial letter of the text of each essay.

Apart from P<sup>1</sup>, at least one contemporary hand has been working on the MS.<sup>3</sup> The question of the identity of this scribe—if indeed we are dealing with just one additional hand—is a vexed one. The relevant facts are the following.

First, on f. 3<sup>r</sup>, above the pinax, we read: τοῦ σοφωτάτου μεγάλου λογοθέτου θεοδώρου τοῦ μετοχίτου. Further, there are three notes in the margin which have been believed to be Metochites' comments or second thoughts, pertaining to his own work: these are the so-called 'Metochites notes' (see the following).

There are also manifold corrections in the text, mostly in blackish ink, as well as additional punctuation in the same, or very similar, ink, suggesting that someone has read the MS through, pen in hand.<sup>4</sup>

The question to consider is whether one and the same hand has made all these interventions. If so, it must be that of Nikephoros Gregoras, since the authorship note on f. 3 is undoubtedly his.

It was Ševčenko 1962 who contended that the three notes in the margin, commenting upon the text, called the 'Metochites notes' ever since, must be a specimen of our author's hand. However, Agapitos & al. 1996 contested this view and suggested that the 'Metochites notes' were examples of an informal variety of Gregoras' hand.<sup>5</sup>

To the discussion on these notes there has been some more recent development. It has been suggested that the MS Par. gr. 1776, the MS containing Theodore Metochites' poems, exhibits, besides Gregoras' hand, a similar but shakier variety which could be identified as that of Metochites himself, and that this hand might be the one attested in the 'Metochites notes' of our MS P.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The hand, using red ink, named P<sup>3</sup> by Hult 2002, xviii, seems to me to be identical with P<sup>1</sup> (Hult 2016 does not mention P<sup>3</sup>). There are also interventions by one hand (or, possibly, more than one hand) as late as the 16th c., a hand (hands) which mix(es) Latin and Greek; for evidence of different hands in the margin see e.g. ff. 30<sup>r</sup> and 31<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> There are also interventions which are clearly by P<sup>1</sup> and can be disregarded here.

<sup>5</sup> The examination was carried out by Ole L. Smith†.

<sup>6</sup> This was suggested by Chr. Förstel and J. M. Featherstone, and I am indebted to them for sharing this information with me. The same view (i.e. that the interventions in Paris. gr. 1776 are by Metochites himself) was adopted by Polemis 2015 in his edition of Metochites' poems.

As mentioned already, there are also interventions in the main text of P. It seems certain that at least some of these have been made by the same hand as that of the ‘Metochites notes.’ This is notably the case when a word, or part of a word, has been written as a correction above the line.

So far, the facts and the paleographic interpretation by others. To this should be added a *caveat* on two points: I do not feel at all certain that, first, it is always possible to distinguish between P<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>2</sup>, and secondly, that the corrections which are not by P<sup>1</sup> are all made by one hand.<sup>7</sup>

It would seem that some of the interventions have been made because the condition of the MS, and the faded state of the ink of P<sup>1</sup>, warranted this.<sup>8</sup> At the same time it seems quite strange that any intervention should have been necessary for this reason so soon after the completion of the MS as must be the case if Theodore Metochites, or, indeed, even Nikephoros Gregoras, made them.

Naturally, the question of hands is of importance for the exact dating of P, which remains unknown.<sup>9</sup> If interventions have been made by Metochites himself it is necessary to date P no later than 1332. If Metochites has not been involved, the duration of the careers of Gregoras and, in particular, of that of Klostomalles are the relevant factors for establishing a *terminus ante quem*. The question of the hands is also, and in particular, of importance for determining the authority to be accorded to P (for this see below, 3, p. li–lii).

## 1.2 THE VENICE MANUSCRIPT (M: MARCIANUS GR. 532

[COLL. 887])

Collated from microfilm. The MS was inspected *in situ* in January 2004, in November 2004, and in November 2007 (always by myself, in Novem-

<sup>7</sup> The general difficulty to distinguish between P<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>2</sup> has been stressed by Hult 2002, who uses the sign P? for either P<sup>1</sup> or P<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> For examples of this see below, 2.4 and 2.5.

<sup>9</sup> We do not know precisely for how long Michael Klostomalles was active as a scribe. The dating suggested by Hult for this particular MS is 1328–1334.

ber 2004 in conjunction with Karin Hult; on the legibility of this MS and its precarious state of conservation see further below).<sup>10</sup>

Bibliography: Hult 2002, Agapitos & al. 1996, Mioni 1985, p. 421, Zanetti/Bongiovanni 1740, p. 287.

It is almost certain that M belonged to Cardinal Bessarion's collection of MSS.<sup>11</sup>

Paper codex, III+396+III folia, 230x155 mm., first half of 14th c. (see further below).

### *Paper*

The paper is of a yellowish-brown-grey colour, without watermarks. It has been severely damaged by humidity. The paper has been restored in recent times; this has been done mostly, but not exclusively, at the edges. Occasionally the paper has been torn, and some folia have been cut so as to be reduced in size.

There seems to be no reason whatsoever to suspect anything but a uniform history of the MS, i.e. that the paper was taken from one source at one time, and the MS written and originally bound (or bound and then written, cf. the following) at one time.

There are signs which seem to suggest that the paper was in a bad state already at the time of the production of the MS, and consequently of poor quality originally. Of interest is the arrangement of the text on f. 203<sup>v</sup>, where almost the whole of the lower part of the page is without text, although no text is lost. Similarly, with the exception of some words on top of f. 291<sup>r</sup>, the pages 290<sup>v</sup>–291<sup>r</sup> are devoid of text: here one might ask if the

<sup>10</sup> For earlier inspections of the MS see Hult 2002 and Agapitos & al. 1996. During the January 2004 expedition the MS was examined with a UV-lamp (lampada di Wood). It became obvious that UV-light could indeed make more of the MS legible than is obvious from the microfilm or from an inspection of the actual MS with the naked eye. It was further suggested that the MS should be subjected to a broader spectrum of light, such as infrared, and at the same time be digitally photographed. However, so far it has not been possible to proceed with this line of investigation.

<sup>11</sup> See Mioni 1985, 421: 'Subscriptio Bessarionis una cum primo folio effluxit, sed in munere codex numero 309 designatus est'; cf. Hult 2002, xxi.

book can have been bound before it was written. Note also f. 95<sup>r</sup>, where the text has been filled in by the scribe (in red; see also below, p. xviii–xix, on the ink).

There are signs of mould in different colours: black, and also, quite often and throughout the MS, purple-red (the colour of red wine).

*Lines to the page, ruling, quires, foliation, etc.*

In the earlier part of M the number of lines to the full page varies from 22–26. From f. 45<sup>r</sup> there is a constant number of 26 lines to the full page.

There is no consistent system of ruling of the MS. Ruling occurs more often and with greater variation in the early part of the MS; in the later parts of the MS it is often totally abandoned, or at least invisible. In many pages there is a simple frame round the text (see e.g. ff. 21<sup>v</sup>, 22<sup>rv</sup>, 23<sup>rv</sup>, 24<sup>rv</sup>, 26<sup>rv</sup>, 27<sup>rv</sup>, 28<sup>r</sup>), whereas the system is more elaborate in other cases (see e.g. ff. 34<sup>v</sup>, 35<sup>rv</sup>, 36<sup>rv</sup>, 202<sup>v</sup>).

According to Mioni 1985, the MS (the 3 new leaves at the beginning and the end excepted) consists of 1 initial binion and 50 quaternions. This is an unsatisfactory description, since there can be no doubt that the MS once contained additional folia at the beginning. The proof of this is the fact that part of the table of contents, referring to Semeioseis 1–30(31), is missing: about two pages, i.e. one folio, are needed to accommodate the titles now lost. As far as can be made out, the most probable solution is that the original MS contained 51 quaternions, and that the first four folia are no binion in the technical sense, but leaves left over from an original quaternion, i.e. that four leaves are missing at the beginning (note in connection with this the empty folia at the end of the MS). There is no reason to believe that Mioni saw the MS unbound and therefore was able to pronounce himself with greater certainty than we can on how the folia belong together.<sup>12</sup> There are no quire signatures (*pace* Mioni, cf. footnote 14).

It is a matter of some interest that apart from one, or ca. one, folio belonging to the table of contents an additional three folia can be presumed

<sup>12</sup> No parts of the original binding are preserved. According to a note in the MS it was rebound in the year 1900, i.e. long before Mioni.

to have been lost at the beginning of the MS. Here there was obviously room for more information than that contained in the pinax. It is not impossible that information pertaining to the author as well as to owners of the MS has been lost to us here.

The folia are numbered 1–396 in pencil (Arabic numbering), mostly in the right-hand margin of the recto; there are also sometimes additional numbers by the same hand, also in pencil, in the top and bottom margins. This foliation has occasionally been done erroneously but has usually been corrected by the same hand (see e.g. f. 331<sup>r</sup>). There are also some examples, in another hand, of pencilled Arabic numbers (so f. 331<sup>r</sup>, the *manus secunda* giving the number as 289, and f. 392, the *manus secunda* giving the number, before correction, as 333).

The pencilled numbers are obviously very recent, and they were carried out after the restoration of the MS, when new paper was added (this is proved by the fact that it sometimes trespasses onto the new paper). Apart from this numbering, there are, in the early part of the MS, some traces of at least two different older systems of numbers: see, in the middle of the lower margin, in brownish red ink, ff. 13<sup>r</sup> (θ) and 14<sup>r</sup> (ι), and similarly, further to the right in the lower margin, ff. 25<sup>r</sup> (κα') and 26<sup>r</sup> (κβ').<sup>13</sup> See also, in the lower margin, ff. 7<sup>r</sup> (β') and 11<sup>r</sup> (γ'), the logic of which escapes me.<sup>14</sup>

### Contents

The main text begins on f. 5<sup>r</sup>; the folia 1<sup>r</sup>–4<sup>v</sup> are occupied by a pinax, which is incomplete, starting with -ληψις, in the title of essay 31 (cf. above, p. xii, on the pinax in P). Ff. 392<sup>v</sup>–396 are empty.<sup>15</sup>

For the essays edited here see ff. 154<sup>v</sup>–200<sup>v</sup> and 210<sup>r</sup>–238<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> θ, ι, κα', and κβ' are found on the 9th, 10th, 21st and 22nd folia respectively of the actual text (the pinax not counted), so obviously they are the numbers of the folia.

<sup>14</sup> Mioni 1985, 421, states the following: 'Fasciculi 50, omnes quaterniones praeter primum binionem, in imo margine primae singulorum paginae olim subputati erant, sed tantum vestigia numerorum hodie manent.' Despite this statement, there are no visible traces of numbers corresponding to the quires.

<sup>15</sup> Also empty are the flyleaves at the beginning and the end of the MS.

*Hands, ink, marginalia, etc.*

The text is written in a ‘somewhat nondescript’ hand (so Hult 2002, xx) belonging to the earlier half of the 14th c.<sup>16</sup>

The ink is generally of a light brown, faded colour. However, on some folia it is extremely black. The difference in colour between e.g. ff. 32<sup>r</sup> and 32<sup>v</sup> is remarkable indeed (going from black to brown, and from distinct to blurred). F. 326<sup>r</sup> is a striking example of different colours coexisting in the same page, the ink being brown and often washed out in the lower part of the page, and very black and distinct above.

The reason for the difference in colour may lie in the state of preservation of the folia, although it may be that the extreme differences are due to the use of different kinds of ink.

The ductus is the same when the ink is black as when brown, and it is clear that one hand, and one hand only, has been responsible for the main text.

Further, there are initial letters etc. in red ink, often faded to brown, but often extremely red, very probably written by the same hand.

There are only few marginalia, of which the following occur in the essays here edited: f. 164<sup>v</sup> in mg. sup. (ad αἱ τῶτθαι) *f* αἱ τροφοί; f. 166<sup>v</sup> (ad τὰ μάχιμα) γρ’ τὰ πολέμια.<sup>17</sup>

Apart from the activity of the main scribe, discussed so far, there are signs of intervention of a *manus secunda*, a fact which, to my knowledge, has not been recognised before. In the essays here edited the following instances are, in my opinion, certain cases of this: f. 166<sup>v</sup> ο, η; f. 196<sup>v</sup> τὸ χρησίμων s.l. 21; f. 197<sup>r</sup> τῆς s.l. 8. Here the ink is blackish-brown and bears a superficial resemblance to the main text at its blackest.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Mioni 1985, 421: ‘Scriptura elegans, perpaucis cum compendiis, litteris fere omnibus disiunctis.’

<sup>17</sup> See also the following minor corrections of the kind that sometimes occur *supra lineam*: f. 166<sup>v</sup> in mg. sup. ἐμοῦς (to be put between τοῦς and λογιμοῦς and having been forgotten in the text), and f. 221<sup>v</sup> (ad ξυμπιπτόντων) ξῦ. Also some numbers for the essays are found in the margin: ff. 161<sup>r</sup> ξγ; 172<sup>v</sup> ξς; 176<sup>r</sup> ξζ; 215<sup>r</sup> οδ.

<sup>18</sup> The correction of ξε into ξδ on f. 166<sup>v</sup>, l. 8, is possibly also done by the *manus secunda*: an argument in favour of this is the fact that this same hand also operates elsewhere on the same page.



I would also like to draw attention to f. 159<sup>v</sup>, l. 8 (α for ε), and 225<sup>v</sup>, l. 14 (-iv) and l. 16 (a stroke has been added): here the ink is quite dark (but brown rather than black), and obviously added afterwards. However, I do not feel certain that we are dealing with another hand than that of the main scribe. The strokes are less fine than, especially, in the interventions by the *manus secunda* on ff. 196<sup>v</sup> and 197<sup>r</sup>, and, as stressed, the ink is less black.

The *manus secunda* may tentatively be dated to the 16th c., and I would like to suggest that this might be that of the scribe of E, a manuscript which may very well be copied directly from M (for E see the following section, 1.3).

### *Legibility*

M is, as has been mentioned above, damaged by humidity. There is a distinct difference between, on the one hand, folia where the writing has been blurred but is still perfectly legible with a UV-lamp, though partly impossible to read with the naked eye on inspection *in situ*, or on the microfilm; and, on the other hand, folia where the result achieved with the UV-lamp is not much better than that which can be achieved by the naked eye, or by studying the microfilm. Regarding the degree of legibility when using a UV-lamp, the following can be said about the folia transmitting the essays of the present volume:

100–99%: 154<sup>v</sup>–168<sup>r</sup>; 175<sup>v</sup>–178<sup>r</sup>; 199<sup>v</sup>–200<sup>r</sup>; 201<sup>v</sup>–202<sup>r</sup>; 219<sup>r</sup>–238<sup>r</sup>

98%: 168<sup>v</sup>; 200<sup>v</sup>–201<sup>r</sup>

97–95%: 178<sup>v</sup>–179<sup>r</sup>; 196<sup>r</sup>; 197<sup>v</sup>–199<sup>r</sup>; 203<sup>r</sup>; 204<sup>v</sup>–205<sup>r</sup>; 206<sup>r</sup>

94–90%: 179<sup>v</sup>, 180<sup>r</sup>, 182<sup>r</sup>; 195<sup>r</sup>; 197<sup>r</sup>; 202<sup>v</sup>; 203<sup>v</sup>–204<sup>r</sup>; 205<sup>v</sup>; 206<sup>v</sup>–207<sup>r</sup>

89–85%: 180<sup>v</sup>, 181<sup>r</sup>; 186<sup>r</sup>–194<sup>v</sup>

84–80%: 169<sup>v</sup>; 175<sup>r</sup>; 185<sup>v</sup>; 207<sup>v</sup>–209<sup>v</sup>; 212<sup>r</sup>–214<sup>r</sup>

79–70%: 169<sup>r</sup>; 170<sup>r</sup>–174<sup>v</sup>; 182<sup>v</sup>–185<sup>r</sup>; 210<sup>r</sup>–211<sup>v</sup>; 214<sup>v</sup>–218<sup>v</sup>

This is an approximation. The important difference, which is not necessarily distinguishable on the microfilm or with the naked eye, can be observed between the quite numerous folia with a legibility (I repeat, with a UV-lamp) of 100% or almost 100% and the also quite numerous folia with a legibility below 85%, often as low as ca. 70%; here, quite a lot of the text seems to have been washed away, and it seems doubtful whether any method at all could restore perfect legibility. It should be stressed that no folia, at least not in the part of M under consideration here, are legible to a lesser degree than ca. 70%.

### 1.3 THE ESCORIAL MANUSCRIPT (E: ESCORIALENSIS GR. 248

[Y.I.9])<sup>19</sup>

Collated from microfilm. The MS was inspected *in situ* in April 2007.

Bibliography: Hult 2002, xxif., Agapitos & al. 1996, Arco Magrì 1982, de Andrés 1965, 89–92, Graux 1880, 184.

The MS once belonged to Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Spanish ambassador to Venice 1539–47, and his name is mentioned at the bottom of f. 1<sup>r</sup>.

Paper codex, ff. I+424 (- 345, 386)+II, 344x252 mm., mid-16th c.<sup>20</sup>

#### *Paper*

The paper is white, sometimes a little yellowish-brown, bright, shining, and typical of the age. It is of very good quality and generally in very good condition, although with some slight signs of mould and of wear and tear.

The flyleaves are brownish.

<sup>19</sup> Old signs: I.Z.3/I.I.11.

<sup>20</sup> A more precise dating is probably not possible (*pace* Agapitos & al. 1996, 21, and Hult 2002, xxii). However, the fact that Don Diego was ambassador to Venice 1539–47 may be relevant, supposing that this was when he ordered copies of Greek manuscripts available there. See also below on watermarks.

The paper looks very much the same throughout the MS. However, it seems to me that the folia of the scribe of the Metochites part (see below) are more shiny than the rest, possibly because of some process of preparation.

There are watermarks similar to Briquet 63; 3471; 6301, but no exact matches (cf. de Andrés 1965, 89).

*Lines to the page, ruling, quires, foliation, etc.*

There are normally 30 lines to the page, or sometimes fewer when an essay ends conveniently. There is a simple system of ruling, consisting of two vertical lines justifying the text, and one horizontal line for each line of text; the ruling seems to be the same throughout the MS. This general consistency as to number of lines and ruling may be a sign that the MS was written and put together on one occasion. It also seems that the paper was furnished from one source, since it has the same appearance throughout the MS (although, as mentioned above, it shines more brightly in the part written by the scribe of the Metochites text).

The MS consists of 54 quires, mostly quaternions, in some cases (quires 4, 17, 20, and 25) ternions; at the end there are 7 additional folia (i.e. folia not belonging to a quire). On ff. 133–184, at the bottom of the verso of the last folio of each quire, there are quire signatures.

Roman folio numbers are added above right on the recto (all done by one hand).

*Contents*

E is a *Sammelhandschrift* of mostly philosophical texts (for detailed contents, see de Andrés 1965, 89ff.); the *Semeioseis* are copied on ff. 204<sup>v</sup>–424<sup>r</sup> (ff. 201<sup>r</sup>–204<sup>v</sup> contain the pinax).

For the essays edited here see ff. 293<sup>v</sup>–319<sup>v</sup> and 324<sup>v</sup>–341<sup>r</sup>.

*Hands, ink, marginalia, etc.*

The texts contained in E have been written by a total of three hands. One of these is known also from Escorialensis gr. Y.I.2. A second one belongs to Petros Karnabakas. Finally, there is the scribe (of unknown identity) of the Metochites text (and of other works: this scribe has written ff. 1–76 and 201–424). The latter is a typical hand of the (mid-?)sixteenth c.<sup>21</sup> The ink is blackish-brown, with occasional red for initial letters and other adornments.

At least in the text of the essays studied here, there are no signs whatsoever of any intervention by another hand. There are corrections in the margin and also some interventions in the form of corrections in the main text. Still, although the ductus is somewhat different, and the ink mostly blacker, there is no reason to doubt that these corrections have been carried out by the main scribe, and without recourse to another MS. This opinion is confirmed by the very extensive marginalia on Damascius written by the same scribe (Damascius' Παρεκβολαὶ εἰς τὸ πρῶτον περὶ οὐρανοῦ are copied on ff. 31<sup>r</sup>–46<sup>v</sup>): they prove that the main scribe had the habit of adding marginalia. There are, however, marginalia in another hand in other parts of the work of this main scribe (see e.g. f. 62<sup>r</sup>, where Greek is combined with Latin).

## 2. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE MANUSCRIPTS TO EACH OTHER

### 2.1 E

Earlier research, notably Hult 2002, has concluded that E is dependent on M, either through an intermediary or, quite likely, directly.<sup>22</sup> Hult, p.

<sup>21</sup> 'Letra fina y recta' (de Andrés 1965). Cf. above, 1.2, p. xix, where I have tentatively suggested that this hand may be the correcting hand of M, i.e. that the scribe of E took the opportunity to make some interventions in M when copying from it.

<sup>22</sup> For reasons of chronology M (14th c.) cannot be dependent on E (16th c.), although the

xxiif., presents the following arguments in favour of this: E was written in Venice, and M was probably the only MS containing the *Semeioseis* available there at the time (i.e., in Bessarion's collection); further, there are many conjunctive errors of M and E; and, finally, there are readings in E which reflect M's poor state of conservation.

Of these arguments those concerning the availability of MSS and M's state of conservation are probably the most cogent.<sup>23</sup> With regard to the remaining argument, the existence of conjunctive errors of M and E, some caution may be called for. The following questions must be answered before a definitive opinion can be formed. Are the relevant readings common to M and E necessarily errors? If so, are they of such a kind that they could not be corrected by an intelligent scribe? Is there any reason that they should be less likely to appear in an author's MS than in a copy?<sup>24</sup>

With this in mind it should, nevertheless, be mentioned that there are many readings that at least do not contradict the opinion that E is dependent on M. However, indisputable conjunctive errors would be a highly desirable proof of this. For readings in M, not shared by P but mostly present in E, see below, 2.2.

There are also many singular readings in E, which can be interpreted as cases where E represents a deterioration from the text in M, or at least a possible development from the text of M (or, since M and P usually agree with each other, from P or an unknown MS). Here follows a complete list of these readings.<sup>25</sup>

independence of M from E could also be argued from the list of singular readings (errors) in E presented on p. xxiv. For an overall analysis of the tradition and a discussion of what the evidence can tell us about Metochites' intentions and involvement in the production of the MSS, see also Wahlgren 2016.

<sup>23</sup> See also Hult's (Hult 2002, xxiii) convincing remarks on lacunae in E.

<sup>24</sup> As far as I know, there are no signs of contamination in E.

<sup>25</sup> See also: 67.9.1 ἀσωτίας (non leg. M): ἀσωτείας E; 67.15.3 ταῦτά: ταυτὰ M, ταῦτα E; 67.21.1 ἐναλλάξ (non leg. M): ἐναλλάξ E; 70.2.5 μαγκανεύματα (non certe leg. M, sed fort. μαγκ-): μαγγανεύματα E; 81.3.8 κρίνουσι: κοῖνουσι ut vid. M, κοῖνουσί E.

*Readings in E not shared by M or P*

61.5.3 προσέχει: προσέχει E; 61.5.4 τάναντί': τάναντία E; 62.3.3 ξυντυχίαις: συντυχίαις E; 63.1.2 ὄρων: ὄρων E; 64.2.2 τηνικαῦτ': τηνικαῦτα E; 64.3.4 ἀλλάξαιτ': ἀλλάξαιτ' E; 64.4.1 κοινωνοῖς: κοινωνοῖ E; 65.2.2 τίν': τίς E; 66.1.2 εἶσι: εἶναι E; 66.1.7 οἶον om. E; 67.4.2 κοινοπολιτικῆς (fort. -ῆς M, sed non certe leg.): -οῖς E; 67.4.4 ἀνθρωπίνοις (fort. sic per comp. M, sed non certe leg.): ἀνθρώποις E; 67.2.1 προφέρειν καὶ καταριθμεῖσθαι: προφέρειν καταριθμεῖσθαι E; 67.7.5 Μαρίου: μαρτυρίου E; 67.11.5 κεκραμμένη (-μμ- fort. M, sed non certe leg.): κεκραμένη ut vid. E; 67.11.5 ἀλλὰ καὶ: ἀλλὰ E; 67.14.6 τοῖς (fort. τοῖς, sed non certe leg. M): ταῖς E; 67.20.1 κατεγελῶντο (sic ut vid. M): καταγελῶντο E; 68.2.6 οἷ δ': οἱ δ' E; 68.2.8 χωρεῖ: χωρεῖν E; 68.3.10 μόνως: μόνον E; 69.1.2 ἀνθαιρουμένους E (p.c., -ούμ- cum accentu a.c.): non leg. M; 69.1.3 συνηθείας: συνηθείαις E; 69.2.2 ἔχουσι (sic ut vid. M, sed non certe leg.): ἔχοντες E; 70.3.2 ἔργον (non certe leg. M, sed fort. ἔργον): ἐνεργὸν E; 70.3.5 ἄττα (sic E): ut vid. ἄττα P et M; 70.5.3 πολιτεία: πολιτία E; 72.2.6 οἷ δ': οἱ δ' E; 73.1.3 ἐστὶ (sic ut vid. M): -ίν E; 73.1.7 περιγιγόμενον: περιγιγόμενον E; 73.3.5 πράττειν: πράττον E; 74.1.2 ἐλόμνοι: ἐλόκμοι E; 74.2.3 κωμικόν: κοσμικόν E; 75.1.5 κοινοῖς: κενοῖς E; 75.1.7 αἰροῖτο: αἰρέτο E; 76.3.4 ἀνερέργητα: ἀνερέργητα E; 78.2.7 κακῶς: καλῶς E; 79.1.3 ἐπί: ἐπέι E; 79.2.4 πνεύματ': πνεύματα E; 81.1.2 τὸν add. E; vide etiam 63.5.6 σεμνὴν (sic M): fort. -ῆ p.c. ex -ει P<sup>1</sup>, σεμνύνει E

In some of these cases the reading of E does not in itself seem to be inferior to the alternative of the other MSS. Examples of this are at least those of οἱ δ' instead of οἷ δ' (68.2.6 and 72.2.6), where E simply seems to be more modern. In the case of ἄττα: ἄττα (70.3.5) E has, at least from our point of view, the correct reading against M and P. But these are minor points of orthography or phonology. There are also other cases where the reading of E seems to be as good and plausible as that of M P.

As already said, the readings discussed so far, or most of them, do not prove that E is closer to M than to P. And since, as will be seen below (2.2), it is extremely difficult to say with any certainty what the relationship might be between M and P, and when the one is more correct than the other, it is difficult to prove the dependence of E on either M or P.

However, an indication of the very probable connection between E and M is furnished by those readings in E which may be interpreted as misreadings of M; see e.g. 64.4.1 κοινωνοῖς P M: κοινωνοῖ E, where the final -ς in M is not distinct and might easily be overlooked; see also 67.14.6 ταῖς τρυφαῖς καὶ τοῖς (τοῖς: ταῖς E, fort. τοῖς, sed non certe leg. M) βλακῶδεσι,

where M is not easily readable either and may thus have given rise to the error made in E. Particularly interesting is the following case:

81.3.8 κρίνουσι: κοίνουσι ut vid. M, κοίνουσι E

Here M really seems to have an ο after the initial κ, not a ρ—and E, too, has that same absurd ο. This is important evidence for E's dependence on M.

There are further some cases where M and E exhibit corrections in the same place; this could also hint at a close relationship:<sup>26</sup>

63.4.1 ἀνούσιόν: fort. ἀνούσιόν p.c. ex ἀνόσιόν M (fort. etiam add. ν s.l. M, i.e. ἀνν-),  
fort. ἀνόσιόν p.c. ex ἀνούσιόν E

63.4.5 αἱ τίτθαι: αἱ τίτθαι in textu et αἱ τροφοὶ in mg. superiore M, τροφοὶ in textu et γρ.  
τίτθαι in mg. E

64.1.1 μάχημα in textu et γρ. τὰ πολέμια in mg. M, πολέμια in textu et γρ. μάχημα  
in mg. E

To these arguments in favour of a close relationship between M and E should be added the possibility that the *manus secunda*, which may be discernible in M, could be identical with the *manus prima* of E (cf. 1.2, p. xix).

There are also three readings common to P and E, against M:<sup>27</sup>

61.2.5 ἐστιν: ἐστι M

61.5.6 εὐρίπποις: εὐρίπποις M

65.3.1 ἄττα P et ut vid. E, ἄττα M

As can be seen, these are cases of very minor variation, and they could not by themselves be taken to disprove the pattern described above.

To sum up, there is no reason to doubt that E is dependent on M.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. with these the similar cases given by Hult 2002, xxiii f.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. the similar case mentioned in Hult 2002, xxii, n. 40.

## 2.2 P AND M

Hult 2002 (see especially p. xxvi) arrives at the cautious conclusion that P and M independently of each other probably go back to a common ancestor. Because of the similar case of MSS Vat. gr. 182 and Vat. gr. 1365, investigated in Bydén 2003, she is also open to an alternative possibility, i.e. that M might be the exemplar of P.<sup>28</sup>

In my part of the *Semeioseis*, as elsewhere, the differences between MSS P and M are fairly minor, and it seems doubtful that anything conclusive could be said about the nature of their relationship to each other. As an attempt at shedding some light, I have compiled a systematic list of the differences between the MSS (see below). Limiting myself to the essays investigated here, I have divided the material into categories. First, I have made a distinction between, on the one hand, semantic, or potentially semantic, (and syntactic) differences between the MSS (2.2.1), and, on the other hand, differences with no such import (2.2.2). It is obvious, though, that my categories are anything but clear-cut. What looks like a semantic difference may be a trivial case of orthographical variation (so the variation ἄττα: ἄττα, or τίς: τις). By a similar token, a case such as 67.13.1 (γεγονότων P, γενομένων M) is probably an example of morphological rather than semantic variation, since I presume that the perfect has merged with the aorist and that the two forms mean exactly the same to a late Byzantine writer. Conversely, where word order is concerned, there might exist subtle differences of function or meaning that escape us today (for instance, topicalization and emphasis may be at stake).

Further, in section 2.2.1 I have made a distinction between omissions/additions and word forms/vocabulary, and in 2.2.2 between word order and phonology/orthography/morphology. It goes without saying that the last category in particular is anything but straightforward: this is where I put everything which does not neatly fit in anywhere else.

<sup>28</sup> Vat. gr. 1365 is a sister manuscript of P, belonging to the same deluxe edition of Metochites' works, and it is probably dependent on Vat. gr. 182 which, in its turn, was probably written by the same scribe as M; on this see Bydén 2003, 383ff., and Agapitos & al. 1996, 22.



## 2.2.1 DIFFERENCES WITH SEMANTIC/SYNTACTIC IMPLICATIONS

*Omissions/additions*

	P (P <sup>1</sup> if not otherwise stated)	M (if not otherwise stated)
6 I tit.	καὶ ὅτι	καὶ ὅτι καὶ
64.1.5	πρῶτον τὸν Εὐρώταν	πρῶτον Εὐρώταν
65.4.4	τε καὶ	καὶ E, non leg. M
66.4.1	δὴ	δὴ om.
67.1.4	καὶ καθάπερ	καθάπερ
67.13.1	ῥωμαίων	τῶν ῥωμαίων
67.14.2	τῶν μαιφονιῶν	μαιφονιῶν
67.17.2	τε καὶ	καὶ
67.17.2	τῶν πολλῶν	πολλῶν
67.21.1	δὴ	om.
68.4.5	οὐδ' ἐντεῦθεν οὐ	οὐδ' ἐντεῦθεν
69.1.6	ἀποφεύγοι: ἀπ- ut vid. P <sup>2</sup> , sed sic etiam ut vid. P <sup>1</sup>	ἄν φεύγοι
70.1.3	om.	τῆς s.l. add. ut vid. M <sup>2</sup>
70.2.2	om.	καὶ
70.5.6	τῆς	om.
72.1.4	om.	καὶ
72.1.7	τοῖς τοιούτοις	τοιούτοις (τοῖς om. E et ut vid. M)
72.2.3	om.	καὶ
73.1.7	om.	γε
73.2.5	τοῦ Χριστοῦ	Χριστοῦ
74.1.6	συμφωνία	ἡ συμφωνία
74.4.1	κατ'	κατὰ τὴν
74.4.2	κατὰ τὰ (τὰ τὰ ut vid. per dittographiam)	κατὰ E et ut vid. M
76.3.1	τε καὶ	καὶ
79.3.4	μὴ	om.
80.2.2	om.	τὰ
80.2.2	om.	ἴσως

As can be seen, the differences between P and M are small.<sup>29</sup> The one retains an article missing in the other; particles and modifiers (γε, δὴ, ἴσως) and connectives may be present or not.

<sup>29</sup> To these cases should be added: 77.2.7 καὶ bis exhib. P (in fine lineae et in initio lineae sequentis).

Of some interest is 69.1.6 (ἀποφεύγοι: ἀπ- ut vid. P<sup>2</sup>, sed sic etiam ut vid. P<sup>1</sup>, ἄν φεύγοι M), where an intervention by the *manus secunda* is found in P (although there is reason to believe that the reading before and after the intervention was identical, i.e. that P<sup>2</sup> filled in what P<sup>1</sup> had already written). The reading of M, ἄν φεύγοι, leaves us with a somewhat peculiar case of ὅταν with ἄν (the reading of M being ὅταν ἄλλους τίς εὐθύνων περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἄν φεύγοι κτλ.). It is not impossible for a writer to put this down, but it is equally plausible that it would be corrected on a second inspection, either by the original writer himself or by someone else (note, however, that the correction leaves us with ὅταν with the optative).

There are two cases of differences where negations are concerned:<sup>30</sup>

- 68.4.5 Καὶ τοίνυν οὐδ' ἐντεῦθεν οὐ (οὐ om. M) μικρὸν ἔργον ὁμόμοιαν ἐγγίνεσθαι κτλ.  
 79.3.4 οὐ γὰρ ἄν ἄλλως σῶφρον εἴη, ὅτι μὴ (μὴ om. M) μετὰ τῆς θείας ἐλπίδος ἐπιχειρεῖν

In both cases the crucial word, i.e. οὐ or μὴ, is related to an earlier negation, and in both cases P is the manuscript with the double negation. In 79.3.4 the negation seems to me more of a necessity than in 68.4.5; i.e. I am prone to consider P to be right in one of the cases, and M in the other. I do not think it safe, however, to draw any conclusions from these cases as to the relationship between the MSS, and as to what is more likely to be the choice of a scribe as opposed to that of the author.<sup>31</sup>

#### Word forms/vocabulary

	P (P <sup>1</sup> if not otherwise stated)	M (if not otherwise stated)
61.1.2	ἔξοστρακιστέον	ὄστρακιστέον
61.5.5	ἄττα	ἄττα
62.3.8	ἀνθρωπεῖοις (-ει- add. P <sup>1</sup> vel P <sup>2</sup> s.l.)	ἀνθρωπίνοις
63.4.1	μάλισθ' οὕτως	μάλιστά πως
63.4.2	μόνην vel fort. μόνον	μόνον

<sup>30</sup> Cf. with this also the further case of negation discussed below, 2.5, p. xxxix–xl.

<sup>31</sup> In a similar case, Hult 2002, xxviii, speaks of an added negation as 'psychologically understandable' (8.2.3).

63.4.5	μήποτε	μήτε p1.
65.1.2	ἅττα	ἅττα ut vid. M (sic etiam E)
65.2.1	αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ
66.3.1	ἐμπομπεύοι	ἐμπομπεύει E, non leg. M
66.5.3	ἔχειν	ἔχει
66.5.7	οἱ δ'	οἱ δ'
67.1.1	τίς	τίς
67.1.5	μήδ'	οὐδ'
67.2.8	πόλεων	πόλων
67.4.4	καὶ (' P <sup>2</sup> , non leg. acc. in P <sup>1</sup> ) τίνων	καὶ τίνων
67.10.2	αἰρόμενον: spir. len. fort. P <sup>2</sup> , de P <sup>1</sup> non constat	αἰρόμενον E, non leg. M
67.13.1	γεγονότων	γενομένων
67.14.1	ἔνοχος	ἐνεχος E, non leg. M
67.15.5	τὸ	τῷ
67.15.8	αἰρουμένους	αἰρουμένους E (sic fort. etiam M, sed non certe leg.)
67.17.4	ἄρ' ἄλυσιτελὲς	ἄρα λυσιτελὲς
68.1.3	ὀμονοοῦντες	ὀμονοοῦντας E, non leg. M
68.3.2	τίς	τίς
68.4.5	ἅττα ut vid. P, sed non certe leg. (fort. ἄ- P <sup>1</sup> et ἄ P <sup>2</sup> p.c.)	ἅττα ut vid. E, non leg. M
69.1.6	τίς	τίς
69.1.6	ἀποφεύγοι: ἀπ- ut vid. P <sup>2</sup> , sed sic etiam ut vid. P <sup>1</sup>	ἄν φεύγοι
70.2.2	μήν (sic vel -ε- P <sup>1</sup> ): -η- P <sup>2</sup>	ut vid. μὲν per comp. M, μὲν E
70.4.2	τοῦ ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦ	τοῦ ῥωμαίου στρατηγοῦ
72.2.4	αἰρόμενον	αἰρόμενον E, non leg. M
73.1.5	πολλοῖς	πολὸν
73.3.8	ἑαυτῷ	ἑαυτοῦ E, non leg. M
74.1.6	κοινή	κοινή
74.1.6	μέλλοι	μέλλει
74.3.1	δεσπότας	δεσποτάτας
74.3.3	δὲ τὰ P <sup>2</sup> , de P <sup>1</sup> non constat	τά γε
74.4.2	ἀπέχεσθαι	ἐπέχεσθαι
74.4.3	βιοτὸν	βιωτὸν
75.1.2	ἅττα: " add. P <sup>2</sup> , de accentu sec. P <sup>1</sup> non constat	ἅττα M
75.1.5	δέει	δέοι
75.2.6	αὐτοῖς	ἑαυτοῖς

75.3.5	ἀντιτεινομένους	ἐντεινομένους
76.3.3	ἀνόητος	ἀνόνητος
76.3.4	γραφή	γραφική
76.4.6	τις	τίς
76.4.7	ἐν σπουδῇ	εὐ σπουδῇ
77.3.7	ἦττω	ἦττον
78.2.1	τις	τίς
78.3.6	σπουδάξι	σπουδάξοι
80.1.7	τίς	τίς
80.2.12	ἄττα	non certe leg. M, sed fort. ἄττα (ἄττα E p.c. ex ἄ-)
81.1.2	ὄπη	ὄποι
81.3.1	δύναιτ'	δύναιντ'

In 63.4.2 (πλαττομένην μόνον ζῶην) P probably had the erroneous reading μόνην before erasure. However, this is a very common kind of lapse by scribes: an ending is made to conform with that of neighbouring words. A similar case is 70.4.2 (τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦ), where M has the reading Ῥωμαίου. I see 76.3.4 (φανταστική γραφή (γραφική M)) as a further parallel to this, the reading γραφική presumably being influenced by the preceding word.

In 66.5.3 (ἔχειν P, ἔχοι M) the infinitive ἔχειν may depend on a following δέοι, but ἔχοι is a quite possible reading too.

In 68.1.3 (ὁμοιοῦντες P, ὁμοιοῦντας E, non leg. M) the reading of P is the correct one, in the sense of being the one which ensures grammatical congruency, although the accusative of E, close as it is to an infinitive, is quite understandable and could probably quite as easily be attributed to an author as to a scribe.

In 74.4.2 (ἀπέχεσθαι P, ἐπέχεσθαι M) the required meaning is something like 'keeping away from/refraining from/losing', and both readings are probably possible.

In 76.3.3 (ἀνόητος P, ἀνόνητος M) the reading of P seems, if not impossible, at least less probable (ἀνόνητος is fairly common; ἀνόητος occurs in the title of essay 34, see Hult 2002, 8). But the difference is small and an error might easily occur and just as easily be corrected. Indeed, in 81.1.7 such a correction has been carried out before our eyes (ἀνόνητα: ἀνόητα P<sup>1</sup>, -ν- inter ὅ εη add. P<sup>2</sup>).

In 77.3.7 ἦττω (P) as well as ἦττον (M) seem like possible readings; the reading of P may be considered the *lectio difficilior*.

In 81.3.1 the alternatives δύναιτ' and δύναιντ' are both possible, and it is perfectly understandable that anyone might hesitate between the singular and the plural.

In the following cases I most certainly incline to the reading in P: 74.3.1 (δεσπότης P, δεσποτάτας M), 76.4.7 (ἐν σπουδῇ P, εὖ σπουδῇ M). 67.2.8 (πόλεων P, πόλων M) the reading of M looks like a *lapsus calami*.

τίς (or τις) for the indefinite pronoun is the normal orthography in the MSS concerned (see 67.1.1, 67.4.4, 68.3.2, 69.1.6, 78.2.1, 80.1.7, 81.1.2). ἄττα and ἄττα (see 61.5.5, 65.1.2, 68.4.5, 75.1.2, 80.2.12) are easily confused. Also in cases such as αὐτοῦ: αὐτοῦ (65.2.1), αἰρόμενον: αἰρόμενον (67.10.2), we are most probably dealing with simple orthographical uncertainty because of the identical pronunciation.

## 2.2.2 DIFFERENCES WITHOUT SEMANTIC/SYNTACTIC IMPLICATIONS

### *Word order*

	P (P <sup>1</sup> )	M
61.1.1	γνώμη γνώμη τε	γνώμη τε γνώμη
61.3.4	καὶ μέχρι	μέχρι καὶ
62.2.2	Τὸν δ' αὐτὸν	Τὸν αὐτὸν δ'
62.2.6	χαίρουσιν εὖ μάλα	εὖ μάλα χαίρουσι
63.4.2	ἄρα φαίη τις ἄν	ἄν ἄρα φαίη τις
63.6.8	γνώμης ῥώμη a.c. P	ῥώμη γνώμης (sic etiam p.c. P)
64.5.1	ἐπιδοξότατα φέρονται ἀνθρώποις a.c. P	ἐπιδοξότατ' ἀνθρώποις φέρονται (sic etiam p.c. P)
65.1.4	ἑαυτῷ ἴσως a.c. P	ἴσως ἑαυτῷ (sic etiam p.c. P)
65.3.1	ἐβούλεθ' ὁ λόγος	ὁ λόγος ἐβούλεθ'
65.3.5	αὐτὸς πρῶτος	πρῶτος αὐτὸς
65.3.7	βουλόμενον τῷ νόμῳ	τῷ νόμῳ βουλόμενον
67.7.5	παιζόμενος ἐφορεῖτο a.c. P	ἐφορεῖτο παιζόμενος (sic etiam p.c. P)

67.12.5	νεκρὸν καὶ (Αἰγύπτου)	νεκρὸν Αἰγύπτου καὶ Μ
67.12.5	ψάμαθος αἰγιαλίτης Αἰγύπτου a.c. P	Αἰγύπτου ψάμαθος αἰγιαλίτης (sic etiam p.c. P)
67.15.1	πλείω κατακαιρὸν	κατὰ καιρὸν πλείω
67.19.10	φιλονεικίας καὶ φιλοτιμίας a.c. P	φιλοτιμίας καὶ φιλονεικίας (sic etiam p.c. P)
68.3.6	σχεδὸν πάντων	πάντων σχεδὸν
72.2.3	πάση σπουδῇ	σπουδῇ πάση
73.3.1	ἡμῖν τοῖς ἔχθροῖς	τοῖς ἔχθροῖς ἡμῖν
73.3.1	τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις a.c. P	τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις (sic etiam p.c. P)
74.2.1	δεσποτῶν ξυνέτυχε P	ξυνέτυχε δεσποτῶν (sic etiam p.c. P)
74.2.3	μετέχειν πάντως	πάντως μετέχειν
74.5.7	ἔξω πάσης	πάσης ἔξω
75.1.4	εἰ γὰρ μὴ	εἰ μὴ γὰρ
75.3.7	εὐγενῆς ἐν τούτοις εἶη (sic etiam p.c. M)	ἐν τούτοις εὐγενῆς εἶη a.c. M
75.4.4	ἐκείνων ἀνδρῶν	ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων
76.4.4	ζημιοῦντα πολλακίς μέγιστα	μέγιστα ζημιοῦντα πολλακίς
77.3.7	πολέμου νεῦρα	νεῦρα πολέμου
78.3.3	ἦν νῦν	νῦν ἦν
79.2.3	τοῦ σκοποῦ ἀμέλει a.c. P	ἀμέλει τοῦ σκοποῦ (sic etiam p.c. P)
79.3.4	εὐκταίας ἐκείθεν	ἐκείθεν εὐκταίας
80.3.1	ἐξαιρέτων ἐκείνων	ἐκείνων ἐξαιρέτων

There is a considerable number of cases where the MSS differ as to word order. I have not been able to detect a reason for this or a clear tendency in one or the other to favour, or avoid, a certain phonological sequence, or a tendency to favour a certain order of syntactic or semantic units. Possibly the position of τε (61.1.1), δὲ (62.2.2), ἄρα (63.4.2), γὰρ (75.1.4), and ἀμέλει (79.2.3) hints at a more classicizing language in P.

A characteristic feature of P are the many corrections explicitly made, i.e. the many cases where the scribe has added letters above the line to indicate that the word order should be changed. In almost all of these cases the corrected reading is identical with that of M. This phenomenon is discussed further in 3, p. li–lii.

The same kind of explicit correction of the word order is met with once in M (75.3.7).

*Phonology/orthography/morphology*

	P (P <sup>1</sup> if not otherwise stated)	M (if not otherwise stated)
61.4.2	εύρημένων	ἠύρημένων
62.1.6	γιγνόμενον	γινόμενον
62.3.6	ξυμπίπτοντες	συμπίπτοντες
62.3.8	εἶδαρ	εἶδαρ
64.5.1	ἐπιδοξότατα (φ-...)	ἐπιδοξότατ' (ἀ-...)
65.2.1	Ἄκραγαγαντίνων	Ἄκραγαγαντίνων
65.2.4	καταπιμπρωμένους	καταπιμπραμένους
65.2.6	ἐνδικωτάτην	ἐνδικωτάτην E, non leg. M
65.3.1	ἔβουλεθ'	ἠβουλεθ'
65.3.8	Ἀθήνησιν	Ἀθήνησι E, non leg. M
66.2.5	σφόδρα	σφόδρ' E, non leg. M
66.3.7	ἀναβιώσ<ε>ως per comp., vel fort. ἀναβιώσως (cf. 68.3.6)	ἀναβιώσεως
66.4.7	ἐνσπόδων	ἐνσπόνδων
67.3.2	ἐνεκμάζον	ἐνακμάζον
67.9.4	Κύννα	Κίννα
67.10.5	στρατεύματα ἀντιταξάμενος	στρατεύματ' ἀντιξάμενος E, non leg. M
67.11.1	Σύλας	Σύλλας
67.11.3	γίνεσθαι	γίγνεσθαι
67.15.3	συμπτώματα	ξυμπτώματα
67.18.3	δυοῖν	δυεῖν
67.18.6	παρέδωκαν	παρέδοσαν
67.19.4	δρυμύτατον	δρυμύτατον
68.3.6	χρήσ<ε>ως per comp., vel fort. χρήσως (cf. 66.3.7)	χρήσεως
69.1.2	ὄναιτ' (vel -αιτ')	ὄναιτ'
69.2.5	κατολιγώρουν	κατολιγώρουν
70.3.7	ἔβουλόμην	ἠβουλόμην (sic E) ut vid. M
70.4.2	συρακουσῶν	συρρακουσῶν (sic E) ut vid. M
70.4.5	πάντα ἀήττητος	πάντ' ἀήττητος
70.5.1	παραπλήσια	παραπλησία

72.1.3	τηνάλλως	τηνάλλως
72.1.7	fort. ῥλειπται P <sup>1</sup> (ῥληπται p.c. P <sup>2</sup> )	εἰληπται
73.1.3	ξυγχωρούμενον	συγχωρούμενον
74.3.4	συμπεπτωκότες	ξυμπεπτωκότες
74.4.3	βιοτόν	βιωτόν
75.1.5	δέει	δέοι
75.2.6	δεύτερα	δεύτερ'
75.2.7	μεταβάλλοντα	μεταβάλλοντ'
78.2.1	βιοτεύων	βιωτεύων
79.2.1	περιγίγνεσθαι	περιγίνεσθαι
80.3.3	πομπηλίου	πομπιλίου
80.3.5	συλλογίζεσθαι	ξυλλογίζεσθαι
80.4.2	κατεγλωτισμένον	κατεγλωτισμένον
81.2.2	συνιδεῖν	ξυνιδεῖν

In most or all of these cases it is difficult to say which alternative is likely to be the more and which the less authentic.<sup>32</sup> It should be noted that in the case of several recurring phenomena, such as συν- opposed to ξυν-, or γιγν- opposed to γιν-, there is no clear tendency for any of the MSS to favour the one alternative at the expense of the other.

### 2.2.3 SUMMARY

The categorization presented above has not yielded a clear result.

In an overwhelming number of cases there is no telling which is the more, which the less authentic reading.

I incline to the opinion that in some cases P, and in some cases M, contains an erroneous, or secondary, reading, and the natural explanation would be that the MSS, independently of each other, go back to a common ancestor.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> See also: 63.4.2 τοῦς: τοῦς P; 66.1.3 ἐξουρίου P, ἐξ οὔριου E, non leg. M; 67.2.4 γραΐδια P, i.e. non exhib. trema; 67.13.1 ἐκποδῶν: ἐκποδῶν M; 67.14.4 ἴσα: ἴσα M; 67.15.3 ταῦτά: ταῦτά M, ταῦτα E; 70.4.3 ῥωμαϊκῆς P, i.e. non exhib. trema; 70.5.3 ἐπαίειν P, i.e. non exhib. trema; 75.4.1 μετατῶν P; 76.4.6 ἐπαιόντα P, i.e. non exhib. trema; 77.2.6 ἀγιστείας: ἀγιστείας M; 81.3.8 κρῖνουσί: κοῖνουσί ut vid. M (κοῖνουσί E). I have, from this list, also excluded several words where no accent is visible in P.

<sup>33</sup> This is also the opinion of Hult 2002, building on the essays 1–26 & 71, and of Hult 2016, building on the essays 27–60; cf. above, 2.2, p. xxvi.



However, this conclusion is permissible only if the nature and cause of the errors can be established with sufficient probability. Is it an error a scribe is more likely to commit than the author? Why does the other branch seem to be right: does it preserve an authentic reading, or has correction taken place? In sum, I am not confident that the evidence can be used to prove the actual relationship between the MSS.<sup>34</sup>

In spite of this almost total agnosticism some circumstantial evidence may be adduced.

Some very few readings may indicate that P uses a higher style: see e.g. 62.2.2 and the position of δέ. It is probably less likely that anyone would change from a higher to a lower style than the opposite.

In the already mentioned (above, p. xxviii) case of 69.1.6 (ἀποφεύγοι: ἄπ- ut vid. P<sup>2</sup>, sed sic etiam ut vid. P<sup>1</sup>, ἄν φεύγοι M), the reading of M, ἄν φεύγοι, leaves us with a somewhat peculiar case of ὅταν with ἄν, and the reading of P could well be a correction of this (leaving us with ὅταν ... ἀποφεύγοι, which is noteworthy but, probably, unobjectionable Byzantine Greek).

I would also like to draw attention to a passage published in Hult 2016: in 57.7.3 the MS M (fol. 138r, l. 16) leaves a blank. This does not, to me, seem like a case where the paper would not allow the absorption of ink. A possible explanation of this could be that the scribe of M did not know what to put in the slot in question, and that the reading of P (ἀνεπιστρόφως ἔχοντες) is a second thought and the result of later activity (another explanation would be that the scribe of M copies from an exemplar with exactly this lacuna and leaves a corresponding blank).

The circumstantial evidence thus adduced would at least not contradict the picture of P being secondary as compared to M, either being a copy of M, or the copy of a MS similar to M. This would allow the view that M is, in fact, the original MS, or, to put it vaguely, at least very close to the process of creation of the work. This idea is attractive since it allows us to believe in as few MSS as possible. Indeed, if M is the original, there may never have existed any 14th c. MSS but those known to us. Further

<sup>34</sup> This is also my opinion about the evidence presented in Hult 2002 and 2016.

evidence compatible with this is that of the possibly somewhat preliminary character of M which is hinted at by the presence of folia not, or only partly, filled with text. Another piece of evidence, also pointing to a close relationship of the MSS to each other and, possibly, the existence of few MSS in circulation, is discussed in 2.7, p. xli, namely the presence of exactly the same corrections in P and M (and also in E).

As to the opposite, i.e. that M is secondary to P, no positive evidence has emerged.

### 2.3 CORRECTIONS BY THE MAIN SCRIBES

In 2.2 some examples were mentioned of how the main scribes correct themselves. Here the remaining cases of corrections by the main scribes will be displayed.

As already mentioned (2.2.2, p. xxxii), the tendency of P<sup>1</sup> to correct the word order is fairly common. Further corrections by P<sup>1</sup> are the following:

- 73.2.7 ὀλίγος ἐνταῦθα πόνος p.c. P et ut vid. M, ut vid. ὀλίγοις ἐνταῦθα πόνοις a.c. P  
 74.1.4 νόμοι E et ut vid. M (et p.c. P), νόμοι τοι a.c. P  
 75.3.3 ὡς M et p.c. P, fort. ὡσπερ a.c. P (lacunam fere 3 litt. exhib.)

See also 66.3.7 (λείποιτο (sic E, non leg. M), λοίποιτο a.c. P, corr. fort. P<sup>1</sup>), which is trivial. 75.3.5 (ἀνύττοντας a.c. P, corr. ut vid. P<sup>1</sup>) may be considered equally trivial, but ἀνύττ- seems to be the spelling of this word elsewhere in Metochites (see *Logos* 10).

Above, 2.2.2, p. xxxii, I mentioned a case of corrected word order in M (75.3.7: the correction has been carried out by the main scribe). There are also the following cases of correction by M's main scribe:

- 63.4.2 τοῦ: τὸ (ou s.l.) M, τοῦ E  
 64.5.6 καὶ p.c. fort. e καὶν M  
 66 title ζ fort. p.c. e ζ M (etiam rubro add. in mg. ξζ M)  
 67 title ζ fort. p.c. ex η M (etiam rubro add. in mg. ξζ M)

There may occasionally be some doubt whether it is actually the main scribe or a *manus secunda* who has made these corrections. Problematic is further 62.2.3 ἀπαλλάξετε: fort. α (i.e. ἀπαλλάξατε) p.c. M, in which case M seems to have introduced a new reading on second thought. However, this new reading does not look like an improvement, if at all possible.

Corrections common to P and M (and E) are discussed below, see 2.7, p. xli.

#### 2.4 CORRECTIONS BY P<sup>2</sup>: P<sup>2</sup> = M

In the following cases an original reading in P has been corrected by a *manus secunda* (for this hand see also 1.1, p. xiii, and 3, p. li), and this has been done in such a way that P has been made to conform with M (E):

- 61.2.4 ἀσφαλὲς M et p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, ut vid. ἀσφαλῆς P<sup>1</sup>  
 64.4.2 ἀνθαιρούμεθα M, -εθ- vel fort. -εν- (i.e. -μενα) P<sup>1</sup>, -εθ- p.c. P<sup>2</sup>  
 64.5.2 ἄττα E et p.c. fort. P<sup>2</sup> (non vid. M), ἄ- ut vid. P<sup>1</sup>  
 65.1.4 κακοπραγίας M et p.c. fort. P<sup>2</sup>, κακροπραγίας P<sup>1</sup>  
 67.5.4 ἐκτήσαντο M, ἐκτήσαν P<sup>1</sup>, το s.l. P<sup>2</sup>  
 67.6.6 καὶ M, om. P, add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 67.6.9 δρών M, δρώη ut vid. P<sup>1</sup>, -ν add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 67.18.9 καὶ bis, in fine lineae et in initio lineae sequentis, exhib. P<sup>1</sup>, καὶ<sup>1</sup> del. ut vid. P<sup>2</sup>  
 67.20.4 αὐτὸς M et s.l. P<sup>2</sup>, αὐτὰς P<sup>1</sup>  
 68.2.4 βελτίστων M, -ν add. P<sup>2</sup>, de P<sup>1</sup> non constat  
 68.3.10 βίῃ M, -α P<sup>2</sup>, fort. -ο P<sup>1</sup>  
 70.1.3 ἐπιστήμη M, -πι- s.l. add. ut vid. P<sup>2</sup> (i.e. ἐστήμη exhib. P<sup>1</sup>)  
 70.3.1 μαθηματικῆς M, -μα- sub linea add. P<sup>2</sup> (i.e. μαθητικῆς exhib. P<sup>1</sup>)  
 74.1.7 οὖν M, om. P<sup>1</sup>, s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 75.1.2 τῆς E et p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, fort. τοῖς P<sup>1</sup>, non leg. M  
 76.3.2 τοῦ M et p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, fort. τῆς a.c. P<sup>1</sup>  
 78.3.6 αὐτῆς M et p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, αὐτοῖς P<sup>1</sup>  
 80.2.4 καὶ αὐτὸς (sic M) bis, in fine lineae et in initio lineae sequentis, exhib. P<sup>1</sup>, primum expunxit fort. P<sup>2</sup>  
 81.1.7 ἀνόνητα M, ἀνόητα P<sup>1</sup>, -ν- inter ó et η add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 81.4.2 ἄττα P<sup>2</sup>M, fort. ἄττα P<sup>1</sup>

See also the following doubtful cases:

- 62.1.4 διαεθλεύειν: διαθλεύειν a.c. P, -ε- (i.e. διαεθλεύειν) add. P<sup>1</sup> vel P<sup>2</sup>  
 69.1.2 ὄναιντ': ὠναιντ' P<sup>2</sup>, ὠναιντ' vel fort. ὠναιτ' P<sup>1</sup>  
 70.1.2 καθότι: accentum posuit P<sup>2</sup>, de accentu in P<sup>1</sup> non constat  
 70.3.5 κατασυλλογιζομένους: -τ- P<sup>2</sup>, sic vel fort. -I- vel -Γ- exhib. P<sup>1</sup>  
 74.2.1 κέαρ: κέ (super)scrispsit P<sup>2</sup>, aliquid illegibile et post hoc -ε- exhib. P<sup>1</sup>  
 78.1.2 αἰροῦνται: αἰ- P<sup>2</sup>, sed fort. sic etiam P<sup>1</sup>  
 80.3.4 πολυετέι: -λι- ut vid. a.c. P<sup>1</sup>, corr. fort. P<sup>2</sup>

Most of these corrections are quite trivial and could be performed without recourse to a MS with the correct reading. A possible exception is 74.1.7 (οῦν om. P, s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>) in which case, perhaps, it is not self-evident that, even should one feel the need for a particle, one should choose οῦν and no other. Though hardly sufficient to convince anyone on its own, such a case might be evidence to the effect that P<sup>2</sup> had recourse to a MS with the properties of M.

## 2.5 OTHER CORRECTIONS BY P<sup>2</sup>

The following are readings in P<sup>2</sup> with no correspondence elsewhere in the tradition (with the possible exception of copies of P, which have not been taken into account):

- 61.5.1 καί: καὶ τὰ M et fort. a.c. P<sup>1</sup>, τὰ fort. erasit P<sup>2</sup>  
 62.1.3 κλήρον P<sup>1</sup>M, -ων s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 63.6.7 ἀναδιδάσκειν: ἀναμανθάνειν P<sup>1</sup>M, γρ(άφετ)αι ἀναδιδάσκειν in mg. P<sup>2</sup>  
 64.1.5 διαπεράσαι p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, διαπερᾶσαι M et a.c. P<sup>1</sup>  
 65.1.6 οἱ ut vid. p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, οἱ M et fort. P<sup>1</sup>  
 68.1.1 ἢ ἕκαστος πρότερον: ut vid. ἕκαστος ad ἢ s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>, (ἕκαστος) om. P<sup>1</sup>M (i.e. exhib. ἢ πρότερον etc.)  
 70.1.1 τοι om. P<sup>1</sup>M, s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 74.1.2 μὴ om. P<sup>1</sup>M, s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 74.1.2 πλείστων: πλείστον P<sup>1</sup>M, -ων s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 74.2.1 φύσιως: φύσεως fort. P<sup>1</sup> et -ε- corr. in -I- P<sup>2</sup>, fort. scrib. φύσιος, quod fort. exhib. M  
 76.3.2 ἐκίνησεν: ἐκίνησε καὶ M, -ν add. P<sup>2</sup>, fort. etiam exhib. καὶ P<sup>1</sup>, quod ut vid. erasit P<sup>2</sup>

- 77.2.2 ἀπειθεια P<sup>2</sup>, ἀπειθεία P<sup>1</sup>M  
 79.1.5 περιγίνοιτο: περιγένοιτο P<sup>1</sup>, περιγίνοιτο M, corr. P<sup>2</sup>  
 80 title ἐργασίαις: θεωρίαις P<sup>1</sup>M, exruxit θεωρίαις et add. ἐργασίαις in mg. P<sup>2</sup>  
 80.1.3 μὲν fort. P<sup>2</sup>, τε M et fort. P<sup>1</sup>  
 80.1.6 ἄττα p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, ἄττα P<sup>1</sup>M  
 80.2.10 ἔχουσι M et ut vid. P<sup>1</sup>, ut vid. -ω- P<sup>2</sup>, i.e. corr. in ἔχωσι  
 81.4.3 τὸ: τῷ P<sup>1</sup>M, ο s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>  
 81.4.4 ἄττα P<sup>2</sup>, ἄττα P<sup>1</sup>M

These corrections are of varying kind and consequence. Some are trivial (e.g. ἄττα: ἄττα). In some cases, both alternatives are plausible (e.g. 63.6.7, or 80.1.3). 64.1.5 (διαπεράσαι p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, διαπερᾶσαι M et a.c. P<sup>1</sup>) is a case similar to 79.2.2 (συμπεράναι PME pro συμπερᾶναι): it is not clear whether a 14th c. writer (or copyist) would have known when what kind of accent is due. In some further cases, P<sup>2</sup> is most certainly correct (e.g. 77.2.2).

In 62.1.3 (συνέχειαν ἐκ προγόνων καὶ κλήρων (κλήρων: κλήρον P<sup>1</sup>M, -ων s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>)) the correction of P<sup>2</sup> is surprising: a change from κλήρων to κλήρον would seem more natural. Also in the similar case of 74.1.2 (πλείστων: πλείστον P<sup>1</sup>M, -ων s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>) the reading of P<sup>2</sup> looks like a deterioration. In fact, in both instances the genitive plural of P<sup>2</sup> looks like an example of case attraction, making the words κλήρων and πλείστων conform with a neighbouring word also in the genitive plural.

Further, in 68.1.1 (ἡ ἕκαστος πρότερον: ut vid. ἕκαστος ad ἡ s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>, (ἕκαστος) om. P<sup>1</sup>M (i.e. exhib. ἡ πρότερον etc.)) the addition of P<sup>2</sup> should presumably yield the reading ἡ ἕκαστος; this gives a text which, while certainly possible, is hardly an improvement on a simple ἡ.

Also problematic is 81.4.3 (τὸ: τῷ P<sup>1</sup>M, ο s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>), in which case we have an articular infinitive which would seem to be instrumental.

See also:

- 74.1.2 καὶ μὴ πολλοῖς παραβάλλεσθαι καὶ συμφέρεσθαι, μὴ (μὴ om. P<sup>1</sup>M, s.l. add. P<sup>2</sup>)  
 δίχα καμάτων κτλ.

This instance is similar to the other cases of added negations discussed above, 2.2.1, p. xxviii. The μὴ added here follows upon an earlier negation

and may, also, perhaps, through the closeness to δίχα, be ‘psychologically understandable’ (cf. above, 2.2.1).

There are also some cases where P<sup>2</sup> has intervened although it is more than doubtful that P<sup>1</sup> had another reading:

- 65.2.3 περινοία (sic M) partim (-επινοί-) e manu altera quam P<sup>1</sup> (P<sup>2</sup>?) legi  
 67.16.1 Ἑλλήνων (sic M) partim e P<sup>2</sup> legi (i.e. non leg. P<sup>1</sup>)  
 69.2.5 ἄλλως E, -ω- P<sup>2</sup>, ut vid. -ου vel -ω- P<sup>1</sup>, non leg. M  
 75.1.2 ἀποτρεπτέον P<sup>2</sup>M, non leg. P<sup>1</sup>

See also:

- 73.3.5 μάταιον: -ν p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, de fine vocis sec. P<sup>1</sup> non constat (-ν vel -ς vel -ι),  
 μάταιος M

Considering P’s general state of preservation, which is very good, it is somewhat surprising that there should have been any need for all these interventions by P<sup>2</sup>. See also:

- 62.3.8 ἀνθρωπείους: -ει- s.l. add. P<sup>1</sup> vel P<sup>2</sup>, ἀνθρωπίνοις M

In the case of 74.2.1 (φύσιως: φύσεως fort. P<sup>1</sup> et -ε- corr. in -ι- P<sup>2</sup>, fort. scrib. φύσιος, quod fort. exhib. M), P<sup>2</sup> has corrected the -ε- in φύσεως into an -ι-; perhaps φύσιος (cf. M) is what P<sup>2</sup> had in mind.

## 2.6 CORRECTIONS BY M<sup>2</sup>

In the following cases I suspect the intervention of a *manus secunda* in M:<sup>35</sup>

- 64 title δ fort. p.c. ex ε M (corr. fort. M<sup>2</sup>)  
 64.1.2 ὡς P, ἢ E et fort. M<sup>2</sup>, de M a.c. non constat  
 70.1.1 πράγμασιν ... τις: πράγμασιν τὸ χρήσιμον (τὸ χρήσιμον s.l. add. ut vid. M<sup>2</sup>)  
 ὄψαιτ’ ἄν τις M, πράγμασι τὸ χρήσιμον E

<sup>35</sup> See also 77.2.2 πᾶσιν: iv fort. M<sup>2</sup> (also, there is a stroke in the following line, between the words ἀλογία and τάξεως, which may have been added by the same M<sup>2</sup>). As suggested above (see 1.2 and 1.3) the correcting hand, M<sup>2</sup>, may be that of the scribe of E.

Of these 64.1.2 may be an example of a problem in the archetype: before correction M may, like P, have had  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  instead of  $\eta$  (which, considering the fact that the sentence must be understood as a comparison, is troublesome).

## 2.7 MULTIPLE CORRECTION

The following cases have in common that one primary reading has been replaced by an identical secondary reading in more than one MS (for such cases in M and E only, see above, 2.1):

- 67.6.3  $\delta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  E,  $\delta\sigma\omega\nu$  in textu et  $-\sigma\iota\varsigma$  s.l. PM  
 67.19.4  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\nu\omega\nu$  p.c. P<sup>1</sup>ME,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\nu\omega\nu$  a.c. PME (i.e. in textu  $\kappa\alpha-$  et s.l.  $\mu\epsilon-$  P<sup>1</sup>ME)  
 68.2.11  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ :  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\zeta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$  in textu et  $\epsilon\nu$  s.l. P<sup>1</sup>M  
 79.2.2  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ :  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$  a.c. P, s.l. corr. in  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  P<sup>1</sup>,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$  et  $\bar{\ } et o$  s.l. M,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  E (add.  $\bar{\ }$  s.l. E<sup>2</sup>)

See also:

- 76.1.3  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ :  $\alpha\upsilon\tau$  in textu et  $\tau\alpha\mu$   $\sigma\iota\varsigma$   $quam$   $\acute{\omega}\nu$  per comp. s.l. exhib. P,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  in textu et  $\acute{\omega}\nu$  s.l. exhib. M

Since the same correction is carried out in the same place in more than one MS, it is not unreasonable to suppose that there is a close relationship between the MSS, and perhaps that there has been a direct contact between the MSS known to us—if the corrections are not of such a kind that they were bound to be made several times independently.

## 2.8 EARLIER EDITIONS: MÜLLER AND KIESSLING

On the editions of essay 61 by Bydén and of essay 80 by Marzi, see below, 3.3., p. lv.

Below follows a list of the divergences between the present edition and Müller & Kiessling's 1821 edition (M-K); the information here is not generally included in my *apparatus criticus*.

The list includes differences of orthography including that of the use of *ny ephelkystikon*. Unimportant differences in accentuation, especially that of enclitics, are not reported: one reason for such differences is that M-K's edition depends chiefly on a MS of the 16th c. (the Cizensis 64). I have, of course, reported differences of accent which seem worthy of note or which might be of interest for the interpretation. Potentially interesting cases of a differing use of the *iota subscriptum* are likewise mentioned.

An important difference between this edition (like that of Hult 2002 and Hult 2016) and that of M-K lies in the punctuation. With one notable exception (76.2.4), these differences are not reflected in the list below.

Remaining differences, however trivial (and often, no doubt, nothing but errors due to the printer), are reported.

Wherever I have considered it of interest, I have included information on the readings and comments to be found in M-K's apparatus.

	The present edition		Müller & Kiessling
61.1.2	λέσχη	371.4	λέγχη (λέσχη exhib. in app.)
61.2.1	γε	371.19	τε
61.2.5–6	καὶ μηδὲν – φανήσεται	372.22	om. (καὶ μηδὲν – φανήσεται exhib. in app.)
61.2.6	κόμπος – ἀμαθία	372.23	om. (fere eadem quae κόμπος – ἀμαθία exhib. in app.)
61.2.6	σὺν θράσει	372.23	συνθράσει
61.2.8	ἀναμφήριστον	373.10	ἀναφόριστον (ἀναμφήριστον exhib. in app.)
61.2.10	ἀνῦσαι	374.4	ἀνύσαι (ἀνῦσαι exhib. in app.)
61.3.1	προάγωνες	374.7	προαγῶνες (προάγωνες exhib. in app.)
61.4.1	τοῦ	375.8	om.
61.5.4	τάναντί'	377.7	τάναντία
61.5.5	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	377.16	ἄττα
62.1.3	κλήρων (κλήρον exhib. in app.)	378.20	κλήρον
62.1.4	ὄπηροῦν	378.23	ὄποιοῦν
62.1.4	διαεθλεύειν (διαθλ- exhib. in app.)	378.24	διεθλεύειν (διαθλ-//διαεθλ- exhib. in app.)
62.1.6	ὄσ'	379.14	ὄσα
62.1.7	παρέχωνται	379.19	παρέχονται



62.1.8	γέλωθ'	379.23	γέλωτ'
62.2.1	οὐ χαίρησεις	380.5	οὐχ αἰρήσεις (οὐχαίρησεις exhib. in app.)
62.2.1	καταπιμπρῶμενος	380.5–6	καταπιμπράμενος
62.2.7	φιλοδικούσι	381.16	φιλονικοῦσι (φιλοδικούσι exhib. in app.)
62.3.2	ὄν	382.6	ὄν
62.3.8	ἀνθρωπείους	383.11	ἀνθρώποις
63.1.3	συνηγορία	384.14	συνηγορίαν (συνηγορία exhib. in app.)
63.1.5	γνώμης	384.24	γνώμη (γνώμης/γνώμην exhib. in app.)
63.1.6	μέλλοντι	385.8	μένοντι (μέλλοντι exhib. in app.)
63.2.4	ἀπόμοτον	386.1	ἀπότομον
63.2.8	αὐταῖς	386.28	αὐτοῖς
63.3.2	ἐν	387.18	om.
63.4.2	μόνον (μόνην exhib. in app.)	389.3	μόνην (μόνον exhib. in app.)
63.5.2	διαθλεύοντα	390.20	διαθλεύοντα
63.5.2	περιγινόμενον	390.20–21	περιγινόμενον
63.5.6	φαίη	391.15	φαίη (an φαίη? exhib. in app.)
63.5.6	τῆ	391.15	om.
63.6.1	πραγμάτων alt.	392.15	πλασμάτων
63.6.7	ἀναδιδάσκειν (ἀναμανθάνειν exhib. in app.)	393.21	ἀναμανθάνειν (ἀναδιδάσκειν exhib. in app.)
64.1.1	βιώσαντα	394.14	βιώσαντας
64.1.3	εἶναι – Λακεδαμονίους	394.20	om. (εἶναι – Λακεδαμονίους exhib. in app.)
64.1.5	διαπεράσαι	395.12	διαπερᾶσαι
64.2.1	οὐπω ποτὲ	395.24–25	οὐ πρόποτε
64.2.2	Θηβαίους	395.28	Θηβαίους
64.4.1	ἀήθεσι	397.23	ἀηθέσι
64.4.2	ἐπιτυγχάνοιμἐν	398.1	ἐπιτυγχάνοι μἐν
64.4.3	κατὰ	398.3	μετὰ
64.5.1	ἐπιδοξότατ'	398.18–19	ἐπιδοξότατα
64.5.5	ἦτις	399.7	ἦ τις
65 tit.	δίκη	399.18	δίκης (δίκη exhib. in app.)
65.1.2	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	400.4	ἄττα
65.1.2	προκατασκευασάμενοι	400.5	προκατασκευασμένοι
65.1.5	προσποιούμενος	400.22	προποιοῦμενος

65.1.6	ῥᾶστ'	400.25	ῥᾶστα
65.1.6	οἷ	401.1	ὄς
65.2.1	Ἄκραγαντίνων	401.13	Ἄκραγαντίνων
65.2.4	καταπιμπρωμένους	402.4	πιμπρωμένους
65.2.4	μηκνομένους	402.5	μηκνουμένους
65.2.4	γλυκυθυμίαν	402.10	γλυκυθυμίας
65.2.5	βδελυξάμενον	402.11	βδελυξάμενον
65.2.6	καὶ pr.	402.17	om.
65.3.1	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	403.6	ἄττα
65.3.3	λοιπῶ	403.14	λοιπῶ
65.3.3	ἀποβαλόμενος	403.14-15	ἀποβαλλόμενος
65.3.7	μονοφθάλμω	404.15-16	μονοφθάλμω
65.4.3	τὴν	405.11	om.
66.1.1	ἀνοδεύτως	406.6	ἀνοδεύτων
66.1.2	ἄμα - ἔχοντες	406.7	om. (fere eadem quae ἄμα - ἔχοντες exhib. in app.)
66.1.2	καὶ πείθεσθαι	406.10	καὶ μὴ πείθεσθαι ...
66.1.3	ἀπαντώσας	406.12	ἀπαντώσας
66.1.5	περιγινομένην	407.1-2	περιγινομένην
66.1.6	σφαλοῦσαν	407.4	σφαλοῦσαν
66.3.3	πλείστη μὲν ἀηδία καὶ δυσχερεία	409.5-6	πλείστη μὲν ἀηδία καὶ δυσχέρεια
66.3.5	βδελυροὶ	409.16	βδελυροὶ
66.4.3	ναυαγοῦσιν	410.16	ναυαγοῦσι
66.4.7	ἐνσπόνδων	411.12	ἐν σπόδων (ἐνσπόνδων exhib. in app.)
66.5.2	ῥίπτειν	411.23	ῥίπτειν
66.5.3	κάειν	412.4	κάειν (κάειν exhib. in app.)
66.5.6	μέντ'	412.18	μέν τ'
67.2.6	ἦ	415.16	ἦ
67.4.3	ἐπιθεμένων	418.20-21	ἐπιτιθεμένων
67.4.4	τίνων (τινων exhib. in app.)	418.23-24	τινῶν
67.5.6	ἐθαυμάζοντο	420.19	ἐθαύμαζον
67.5.7	σύνδεσμον	420.21	σύνδεσμων
67.5.7	τῆς pr.	420.23	om.
67.5.7	ἐξέστησαν	420.24-25	ἐξανέστησαν
67.5.8	Καὶ (pr.)	421.1	om.
67.6.3	ὄσοις (ὄσων exhib. in app.)	421.21	ὄσων (ὄσοις exhib. in app.)
67.6.3	παραμένειν	421.23	παραμένειν
67.6.6	καὶ δυσνοίαις καὶ	422.10	καὶ δυσνοίαις
67.6.9	τὰ παρ' ἄλλοις	423.5	παρ' ἄλλοις

67.7.5	Μαρίου	424.2	μακαρίου
67.9.1	πολέμους	425.9	πολεμίους (πολέμους exhib. in app.)
67.9.4	Κίννα (Κίννα in app.)	425.25	Κίννα
67.10.4	τῆς ζωῆς	427.4	ζωῆς
67.11.5	καὶ πάσης	428.3	πάσης
67.11.5	κεκραμμένη (κεκραμένη in app.)	428.4–5	κεκραμένη
67.12.3	τὸν ἄνδρα	429.6	ἄνδρα
67.12.3	ἀνονήτως	429.9	ἀνονήτων
67.13.1	Καίσαρ	430.3	Καίσαρ
67.13.1	ῥετο	430.6	ῥετο τὸ (ῥετο exhib. in app.)
67.14.5	τὰ τιμώτατα	432.8	τιμώτατα
67.14.6	τοῖς (ταῖς exhib. in app.)	432.11	ταῖς
67.14.7	γυναικωνίτιν	432.14	γυναικωνίτιν
67.15.8	αἰρουμένους (αἰρουμένους in app.)	434.5–6	αἰρουμένους
67.15.9	ἐντεῦθεν – ἀποτελευτήσεις	434.18	om. (fere eadem quae ἐντεῦθεν – ἀποτελευτήσεις exhib. in app.)
67.18.5	ὥς	437.9	om.
67.18.8	Λακεδαμονίοις	438.5	Λακεδαμονίος
67.19.4	μετεκίρνων (κατεκίρνων in app.)	438.26	κατεκίρνων (μετεκίρνων exhib. in app.)
67.19.10	Λακεδαμονίων	440.6–7	Λακεδαμονίος
67.20.3	καταστασιάζων καὶ	440.23–24	καταστασιάζων (καταστασιάζων καὶ exhib. in app.)
68.1.1	ἢ ἕκαστος πρότερον	442.13–14	ἕκαστος ἢ πρότερον
68.1.3	τάναντίʹ	442.23	τάναντία
68.2.11	ἀτεξίαν (ἀταξίαν exhib. in app.)	445.16	ἀταξίαν
68.3.4	ἀνῦσαι	446.7–8	ἀνύσαι
68.3.8	ὥς	447.2	εἰς
68.3.9	χαίρησει	447.7	χαίρησουσιν
68.4.2	σμήχειν	447.21	σμήχειν
68.4.6	καὶ φύσει	448.17	φύσει (καὶ φύσει exhib. in app.)
69.2.2	φίλωσ	451.6	φίλος (φίλωσ exhib. in app.)
69.2.3	κακηγοροῦντες	451.14–15	κατηγοροῦντες
69.3.5	ἦν	452.26	ἦ
69.3.5	βραχέαττα	452.27	βραχέα ἄττα (βραχέαττα

			exhib. in app.)
69.3.5	ἦ	453.1	ἦ
69.4.1	ἀξιούσι	453.7	ἀξιού (ἀξιούσι exhib. in app.)
69.4.2	οὐχ'	453.11	οἶχ
69.4.4	αἰδούμενοι	454.1–2	ξυνορῶντας φειδόμενοι (αἰδούμενοι exhib. in app.)
69.4.5	τάναντί'	454.4	τάναντία
70.1.1	τοι	454.18	τὸ
70.1.4	ἢ τῆδ' ἐπιστήμη	455.14	τῆδ' ἐπιστήμη
70.1.4	ἐναργείαις	455.15	ἐνεργείαις
70.1.5	τὰ τοιαῦθ'	455.21	τοιαῦθ' (τὸ αὐθ' exhib. in app.)
70.2.2	καὶ παντὶ	456.23	παντὶ
70.2.2	ἄρ'	457.2	ἄρα
70.2.4	Ὡς	457.8	καὶ ὡς
70.2.5	μαγχανεύματα (μαγκ- exhib. in app.)	457.14–15	μαγχανεύματα (μαγκ- in app.)
70.3.5	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	459.7	ἄττα
70.3.8	κατασκαφὰς	459.23–24	κατασφὰς (κατασκαφὰς exhib. in app.)
70.4.1	λόγους	460.10	λόγους
70.5.2	κατασυλλογίζεσθαι	461.19	κατελλογίζεσθαι (κατασυλλο- γίζεσθαι exhib. in app.)
70.5.3	τοῦ νοῦ	461.26	τοῦ (νοῦ exhib. in app.)
70.5.7	ἐκποδῶν	462.24–25	ἐκ ποδῶν
72.1.7	ἦληπται (ἦλειπται et εἴληπται exhib. in app.)	483.1	ἦλειπται (an εἴληπται? exhib. in app.)
72.2.1	πλεῖστον	483.4	πλεῖστοι
73.1.7	περιγινόμενον	486.10	περιγινόμενον
73.2.4	καὶ alt.	487.6–7	καὶ τῆς
73.2.5	συνοικίας	487.17	συνοικίσης (συνοικίας exhib. in app.)
73.2.7	θεοῦ	487.25	Χριστοῦ
73.3.1	τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις (τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις exhib. in app.)	488.9	τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις
73.3.4	τὰ	488.26	om.
73.3.5	παντάπασι	489.9	παντάπασι
73.3.6	ἀντιπαλαῦσθαι	489.13	ἀντιπαλαῦσθαι (ἀντιπαλαῦσθαι exhib. in app.)
73.4.1	εὐέλεκτον	490.8	εὐέλεκτον (εὐέλεκτον exhib. in app.)

73.4.1	ἔστῳς	490.8	ἔστῳς
73.4.1	ἐν ταῦτῳ – τυπούμενον	490.9	ἐνταῦθα – τυπούμενον (fere eadem quae ἐν ταῦτῳ – τυπούμενον exhib. in app.)
73.4.2	ἀρτιουργόν	490.10	ἀντιουργόν (ἀρτιουργόν exhib. in app.)
74.1.3	ἑαυτοῖς	492.2	ἑαυτοῖς τοῖς
74.1.7	ἄλλους	492.23	ἄλλοις
74.2.1	φύσις (φύσις exhib. in app.)	493.14	φύσεως
74.2.4	ὀρώντας	493.25	ὀρώντα
74.3.2	φιλοπρωτίαι	494.28	φιλοπρωτεῖαι
74.4.3	βιωτὸν	496.3	βιωτὸν
74.5.4	βέλτισθ'	496.26	βέλτιστ'
74.5.5	οὐκ – ἐπιβούλοις	497.1	om. (fere eadem quae οὐκ – ἐπιβούλοις exhib. in app.)
74.5.7	διαδράς	497.9–10	καὶ διαδράς
74.5.7	ἐπὶ λιμένος	497.13	ἐπιμελιμένος
75.1.1	ὄροις	497.21	ἔργοις
75.1.2	ξυμπίπτουσιν	498.3	ξυμπίπτουσι
75.3.3	νόμους	501.20	νόμοις
75.3.5	παρρησί'	502.6–7	παρρησία
75.3.8	διὰ λείας	502.23	δι' ἀλείας
75.3.9	τὸν	503.5	τὸ
75.4.4	τῇ ἀρετῇ	504.1	τῇ ἀρετῇ τῇ
76.1.3	κουφότερον	505.9	κοφότερον (κουφότερον exhib. in app.)
76.1.3	αὐτῶν (αὐτοῖς exhib. in app.)	505.11	αὐτοῖς (αὐτῶν exhib. in app.)
76.2.2	ἐρημία	506.17	ἐρημία
76.2.2	ἄχθη	506.21	ἤχθη (ἄχθη exhib. in app.)
76.2.4	εὐφορία, λαμπρά	507.2	εὐφορία λαμπρά,
76.2.4	κατάχοντα	507.4	κατάχοντα (κατάχοντα exhib. in app.)
76.2.6	ἐντεῦθεν	507.12	ἐντεῦθην
76.3.5	λύειν καὶ	509.3	λύειν
76.3.5	τάκίνητα	509.6	τὰ κίνητα (τ' ἀκίνητα exhib. in app.)
76.4.1	εἰ	509.18	εἰς
76.4.1	εἶχε	509.18	ἔχει
77.2.3	ἰδί' – τρόποι πρὸς	513.3	om. (fere eadem quae ἰδί' – τρόποι πρὸς exhib. in app.)

77.3.2	ἄν	514.11	κἄν
77.3.3	οὐτοσί	514.16	οὐτωσί
77.3.5	θησαυρίζον – χρείας	515.5	om. (fere eadem quae θησαυρίζον – χρείας exhib. in app.)
78.2.1	περὶ τὸ	517.5	περὶ
78.2.1	ἀσφαλοῦς – πολεμεῖν	517.5–7	bis exhib. sed alt. uncis inclusum
78.2.2	ὠπλισμένους	517.11	ὠπλισμένοις (ὠπλισμένους exhib. in app.)
78.3.3	περὶ ὧν ἦν	519.18	περιῆν
78.3.4	πολεμησεῖοντι	520.4–5	πολεμησεῖον τι
79.1.5	περιγίνοιτο	521.24	περιγίνοιτο (περιγίνοιτο exhib. in app.)
79.2.3	ἀμέλει τοῦ σκοποῦ (τοῦ σκο- ποῦ ἀμέλει exhib. in app.)	522.15–16	τοῦ σκοποῦ ἀμέλει
79.2.4	κάπι	522.23	ἐπι
79.2.4	χειμῶνας	522.28	χειμῶνα
79.3.2	δὲ	523.15	δὲ τῶνδε
79.3.5	καὶ κατὰ	524.1	καὶ τὰ
80.1.4	τε	525.16	om.
80.1.5	τοῦ	525.18	τοῦτο
80.1.6	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	525.26	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)
80.1.7	ὡς	526.2	om.
80.2.1	καλῶς	526.16	κακῶς
80.2.5	ἅπαντᾶ	527.8	ἐπαντᾶ (ἅπαντᾶ exhib. in app.)
80.2.5	ἄττα	527.10	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)
80.2.6	καίρια	527.18–19	καίρια, καὶ
80.2.9	τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν	528.5	ὑπόσχεσιν
80.2.11	ἐπιλυγάζεται	528.18–19	ἐπιλυγάζεται
80.2.12	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	528.26	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)
80.3.1	Ἄτάρ	529.2	τὰ γὰρ (ἄτάρ exhib. in app.)
80.3.1	τὸ	529.4	om.
80.3.4–5	ἔχοντας – ὡς	529.23	om. (ἔχοντας – ὡς exhib. in app.)
80.3.6	γ'	530.5	om.
80.3.6	Ἄωνος	530.10	Ἄωννος (Ἄωννος exhib. in app.)
80.4.2	τελεωτέρας	531.3	τελευτέρας
81.1.2	οἷ	532.14	οὐ

81.1.6	μηθ'	533.14	μηδ'
81.2.3	παντοϊ'	534.8	παντοῖα
81.2.5	ῥάδιον – σύμφωνον	534.18	om. (ῥάδιον – σύμφωνον exhib. in app.)
81.3.1	τὸ alt.	534.21	om.
81.3.1	καὶ γραφικὴ	535.2	γραφικὴ
81.3.8	ἦ	536.4	ἦ̃
81.4.2	ἄττα (ἄττα exhib. in app.)	536.16	ἄττα
81.4.6	τὸν – ζημιοῦντες	537.10	om. (τὸν – ζημιοῦντες exhib. in app.)

## 2.9 REMAINING ERRORS IN THE TRADITION

In this section I have collected possible remaining errors—errors in the archetype and perhaps also in the author's original (which may be the same).<sup>36</sup> Some of these are quite trivial examples of orthographical variation, and there is no reason to suppose that the author should be a better speller than any 14th c. scribe. There can further be some doubt as to what the author would consider the better spelling. Such are the following cases:

67.1.4	τεχνίται: sic PME pro τεχνίται
67.14.7	γυναικωνίτιν: sic PME pro γυναικωνίτιν
67.18.4	fort. scrib. Πελοποννήσου: Πελοποννήσου PME
68.3.8	τίς ut vid. pro τις PME
68.4.2	fort. scrib. σμήχειν sec. M-K: σμύχειν PE, non leg. M
70.5.7	ἐκποδῶν PME, fort. scrib. ἐκποδῶν (cf. 67.13.1 ἐκποδῶν P, ἐκποδῶν M)
73.1.7	ἄρα ut vid. pro ἄρα PME
73.4.1	ἔστῶς: fort. scrib. ἐστὸς
76.2.2	ἐρημία: ἐρημία PM, iota subscriptum addidi (i.e. I take ἐρημία as dative)
79.2.2	συμπεράναι PME pro συμπερᾶναι (cf. 64.1.5 διαπεράσαι p.c. P <sup>2</sup> , διαπερᾶσαι M et a.c. P <sup>1</sup> ; see above, 2.5, p. xxxix)
80.2.9	τί pro τι PME

<sup>36</sup> The reader should keep in mind that, since this is just a list of errors common to P and M (and E), and since, as explained in section 3, I adhere very closely to P in my edition (i.e. even in those cases where P is likely to have errors on its own), the following should not be understood as a complete list of errors manifest in the edition (for this see further below, 3).

Of greater interest are:

- 61.1.4 ἡρεμία: ἐρημία scripsit Bydén  
 63.4.4 τὸ: fort. scrib. τῶ  
 63.4.5 κατὰ: fort. scrib. καὶ τὰ  
 63.5.5 an add. τε?  
 65.3.3 τοῖς αὐτοῖς: an scrib. αὐτὸς τοῖς vel αὐτοῖς τοῖς?  
 66.4.2 ἦ: fort. scrib. ὃ ἦ  
 70.2.1 παντὶ: an scrib. πάντα?  
 70.5.1 συγγραφῶν: an scrib. συγγραφέων?

61.1.4 (ἡρεμία : ἐρημία) is discussed in detail in a footnote to my translation (in short, I am not totally convinced that there is anything wrong with ἡρεμία). In 63.4.4 τὸ follows upon παραπλησίως, and perhaps τῶ is the expected reading; τὸ, however, is not inconceivable (a parallel of sorts is provided by 81.4.3: οἷοι τε βοηθεῖν τὸ καὶ ὄτιοῦν εἰσφέρειν τῶ βίω κτλ.). In 65.3.3 (ἠναγκάζετο περιπίπτειν τοῖς αὐτοῖς αὐτοῦ νόμοις καὶ γνώμῃ) αὐτοῖς is, if correct, at least strangely placed.

### 3. THE PRESENT EDITION

In the present edition I almost always put the reading of P in the text with the corrections introduced by P<sup>2</sup>, whenever they occur. Accentuation and orthography are almost identical with that of P<sup>1</sup>+P<sup>2</sup>. The punctuation is my own. Below follows a more extensive description and discussion of the editorial principles thus summarised.

P is used throughout, M wherever legible. E is almost certainly dependent on M and is only used when the reading of M cannot be established (in no places where M can be checked does E contain any singular readings which seem to be of importance).

It has not been possible to establish the relationship between P and M conclusively.

As discussed above (see especially 2.2.3), P and M may go back to a common ancestor independently of each other. If they do not, then M is most probably the exemplar of P.



If M is the exemplar of P, M is either the original MS of the author or a more or less modified archetype.

Further, P has been corrected. There are many corrections by the *manus prima*, and there is a possibility that M, or another authoritative MS, has been used as the source of these corrections. Also, a *manus secunda* (or, possibly, several secondary, but more or less contemporary, hands) has introduced corrections into P, and there is some reason to believe that these corrections, or, at least, some of them, have been made on good authority, and that Nikephoros Gregoras, or perhaps, at least partly, even Theodore Metochites himself, may have been holding the correcting pen.

Thus it seems reasonable to consider  $P^1+P^2$  as a kind of second, authorised, edition of the *Semeioseis*.

If produced by anyone but the author himself there is, of course, no guarantee that a second edition would be in perfect agreement with the author's intentions and wishes. It depends upon the circumstances surrounding its production. Even if a second edition was produced by someone close to Metochites, such as Nikephoros Gregoras, we should not necessarily regard every single intervention by the latter as approved of by the former (it would be of vital importance to know whether Gregoras was checking the MS against an authoritative text or not). If the corrections are the work of several people, the question of authority is even more complex.

Thus, a measure of uncertainty must remain regarding the authority to be accorded to P in its corrected form, and regarding the degree of consent given by the author. The following should also be kept in mind.

The corrected P still contains problematic readings. There are cases in which the reading of  $P^2$  does not seem to be an improvement on  $P^1$ , indeed, cannot be considered anything but erroneous. I do not, however, consider these cases as evidence against the involvement of Metochites himself in the process of changing the MS, since even an author can produce new errors.

Further, there is an uncertainty as to how far the processes of correction that we can observe were meant to go.

This is illustrated by P<sup>1</sup>'s tendency to correct the original word order of P so as to conform to that of M. Does this mean that the intention of P<sup>1</sup> when going over the MS a second time was to correct exactly those, and only those, instances of this phenomenon where he in fact does so? Or should we rather follow M's word order also in other cases, as well as perhaps other features of M? This could be the correct procedure if we believe that P<sup>1</sup> is checking his text against M or a similar MS and that, whenever he does not correct a divergence, he is guilty of an oversight.

This concern of P<sup>1</sup>'s with word order is a special case of the more general problem concerning what we should think about all cases where the text of P has been left as it is: to what degree must we consider these readings as actively approved of by P<sup>1</sup> (or, for that matter, by any other subsequent reader of the MS, such as P<sup>2</sup>, wherever such a reader has not intervened)?

With all this in mind, I have chosen to almost always print the reading of P, i.e. P<sup>1</sup>+P<sup>2</sup>, as my text even when difficult and possibly wrong or at least, in my judgement, inferior to an available alternative (i.e. that of M (or E), or of an earlier edition, or of a modern critic such as myself), and perhaps left as it is by oversight. Alternative readings have been suggested in the *apparatus criticus*. In other words, as far as actual readings are concerned (less so, however, with regard to accents and orthography, and even less so with regard to punctuation (cf. on these matters below)), my edition is almost completely diplomatic (for some exceptions, see below). In following these principles I am very close to Hult 2002 and 2016 (although somewhat more diplomatic).<sup>37</sup> Finally, as pointed out by Hult (see, e.g., Hult 2002, xx), it should be stressed that the differences between the alternatives available are generally small and insignificant. All potentially interesting readings are to be found in either the text or the apparatus.

In sum, a complete list of problematic readings left in the text is to be had by combining the information of several of the sections above, especially 2.3 (corrections by P<sup>1</sup>—corrections which are not always improvements), 2.4–2.5 (corrections by P<sup>2</sup>—corrections which, likewise, are not always improvements), and the list of *Remaining errors in the tradition*

<sup>37</sup> For a summary of Hult's principles see Hult 2002, xxxi, and Hult 2016, xxiv.

(2.9, i.e. cases where P and M (and, in most cases, E as well) share an error). In addition, I would like to draw attention to the following cases:

- 65.2.1 Ἀκραγαντίνων P, Ἀκραγαντίνων M  
 66.4.7 ἐνσπόδων P, ἐνσπόνδων M  
 67.3.2 ἐνεκμάζον P, ἐνακμάζον M  
 67.11.1 Σύλας P, Σύλλας M  
 69.1.2 ὠναιτ' P<sup>2</sup>, ὠναιτ' vel fort. ὠναιτ' P<sup>1</sup> (i.e. -v- alt. add. fort. P<sup>2</sup>), ὄναιτ' M  
 72.1.7 ἤληπται (pro εἰληπται): fort. ἤλειπται P<sup>1</sup> et ἤληπται p.c. P<sup>2</sup>, εἰληπται M  
 74.4.2 κατὰ E et ut vid. M, κατὰ in fine lineae et τὰ in initio lineae sequentis P, ut vid. per dittographiam  
 74.4.3 ὡς οὐκ ὄν ὄλωσ βιοτὸν (βιοτὸν P, βιωτὸν M)  
 75.1.5 δέει P, δέοι M

Most of these cases are a question of orthography, and pronunciation, and I have accepted most of P's forms in acknowledgement of the fact that we cannot really know what Metochites himself would have preferred. However, in 74.4.2 I have ignored P's κατὰ τὰ, which is a case of dittography (τὰ and, on the following page, τὰ) and a genuine slip. On the other hand, I have, in 67.3.2, put P's reading ἐνεκμάζον in the text (although this may be a slip of similar kind). Further, in 67.11.1 I have not adopted P's spelling of the name Sulla (Σύλας P, Σύλλας M), since the name occurs another five times, always with -λλ- even in P.

### 3.1 ACCENTUATION AND ORTHOGRAPHY

With regard to accentuation (including the use of spirits) E can be ignored, being a late MS and likely to reflect the conventions of a later age.<sup>38</sup> P and M, on the other hand, were both produced very close in time to Metochites himself, or even during his lifetime. As far as can be seen (M is not

<sup>38</sup> It can generally be observed that E's usage is closer to that of our time than to that of the 14th c. This is, of course, as expected. Here, too, what we observe in E is consistent with the view that it is dependent on an exemplar similar to the older MSS. The use of apostrophe in the case of οὐχ' is a telling example. E has this apostrophe but has sometimes (see 67.18.9 and 70.4.2) corrected it into οὐχ. This is likely to mean that the exemplar of E had the apostrophe as well, but that the 16th-c. scribe of E was aware of the fact that the sign has no justification.

always legible, and it has not always been possible to establish the accentuation of this MS), these two MSS do not differ from each other on many points, and they are both carefully produced.

In my edition, I almost always follow the accentuation of P, including the corrections by P<sup>2</sup>. The accentuation of M is occasionally reported in the apparatus.

With regard to orthography the edition almost always follows P, taking into account the corrections by P<sup>2</sup>; any divergences in M (these are very rare) are, if visible, reported in the apparatus. Iota subscript is added according to the principles adopted for editions of ancient texts.

### 3.2 PUNCTUATION

The punctuation is my own and should facilitate the modern reader's understanding of this difficult text. Like many other scholars, I sympathise with recent efforts to adhere to Byzantine practices as closely as possible.<sup>39</sup> However, there are several problems involved in doing so and it would certainly make the text more difficult to read and understand. Concerning the actual MSS, the following may be said.

For our purposes, the punctuation of E can be disregarded, because this is a 16th-c. MS. The two MSS of the 14th c. do not always agree with each other, although the differences between them do not appear great (it must be stressed that, because of its state of preservation, the punctuation of M is often very difficult to discern).

With P, as originally written by P<sup>1</sup>, as a basis, I have, like Hult 2002 and 2016, often subtracted marks of punctuation while adding as few as possible. What I am mostly inclined to add are parenthetical commas, in order to make the structure of the text clearer. Also, I have felt free to disregard what the punctuation marks of the MS look like, and to choose what kind

<sup>39</sup> This is a particularly natural procedure to adopt if there is an autograph and an autograph only. However, in our case we do not believe that this is what we have. If, indeed, we are in possession of Metochites' own original MS, this must be M. It should, perhaps, be mentioned that after the completion of most work on this edition there has been a significant increase in the number of editions actually adhering to Byzantine practices of punctuation. For a discussion of some of the issues involved see Reinsch 2009 and Bydén 2012.

of mark seems called for. In a couple of cases one may wonder whether a question is intended or not, and whether a question mark should be added or disregarded; in some cases this is commented upon in the apparatus.

A later hand, possibly identical with the corrector P<sup>2</sup>, has apparently read the text through and added punctuation marks. If we suspect a kind of definitive edition in P<sup>2</sup>, it would not be unreasonable to respect this new punctuation. However, there are reasons why I have refrained from doing so. First, we cannot be sufficiently certain as to the origin of this new punctuation. Secondly, the new punctuation is not complete. Thirdly, we cannot know to what extent we ought to take notice of it at all, and consider it as more authoritative than the earlier punctuation. After all, some people still read books with a pen in their hand (the act of adding something to the page, or so I would suggest, being more or less automatic and not intended for the benefit of others).

### 3.3 EARLIER EDITIONS

The edition by Müller and Kiessling is cited whenever this seems useful. Bydén's edition of essay 61 has been of great help and I give a complete account of the (small) differences between our editions. Marzi's edition of essay 80 is never cited.<sup>40</sup>

### 3.4 APPARATUS FONTIUM ET PARALLELORUM

The *apparatus fontium et parallelorum* is very limited. It has been my intention to include the earliest known source of quotations. Because of his obvious significance for Metochites, I have paid some special attention to Plutarch, and looked for parallels in his writings. Similarly, I have endeavoured to include at least some parallels to be found in authors to whom

<sup>40</sup> Only very recently I was made aware of the existence of this edition, and I would like to thank Börje Bydén for drawing my attention to it. As far as I can see, Marzi's edition is of no great help for my purposes. To mention two points, it does not give any independent analysis of the manuscript tradition, and no effort has been made to further our knowledge of the manuscripts. However, the editor's Italian translation and some of her interpretations may deserve attention.

Metochites was personally acquainted, as well as parallels in other works by Metochites himself. Quotations and parallels have mostly been collected by searching the TLG corpus.