

⟨Research Article⟩

# Hypotheses on the Textual Interrelations of Florentine and Coislian Manuscripts in the Transmission of the Platonic *First Alcibiades*

Akitsugu Taki

## Abstract

On the basis of my collation of the digital reproductions I hypothesize on the textual interrelations of the secondary medieval manuscripts of the Platonic *First Alcibiades*, Laurentiani Plut. 59.1, Plut. 85.6, Plut. 85.9 and Plut. 85.12 and Coislianus 155 that all of them are derived from Venetus App. Cl. IV, 1, the first three through Parisinus graecus 1808 but the last two, as gemelli, through a hypothetical manuscript directly descendant of the Venetian.

**Key Words:** textual criticism; the *First Alcibiades*; Laurentianus Plut. 59.1; Laurentianus Plut. 85.6; Laurentianus Plut. 85.9; Laurentianus Plut. 85.12; Coislianus 155

In my previous work on the textual interrelations of the extant medieval manuscripts in the transmission of the Platonic *First Alcibiades*,<sup>1</sup> I was not able to collate the related Florentine manuscripts<sup>2</sup>. At that time, in order to propose a hypothesis on the transmission of the whole of the extant medieval manuscripts, I deduced Post's implications from his general observations on those manuscripts<sup>3</sup>. However I have been able to collate Coislianus 155 in the PDF monochrome version and four of the related Florentine manuscripts in the fine PDF color version which Biblioteca Laurenziana Medicea offers in its service on the Internet.

For this work I will analyse mainly on the basis of a sample collation covering as in my previous work mentioned above the text 103a1-106a1 the interrelations of Coislianus 155, abbreviated below as  $\Gamma$  according to Bekker's sigla, and Laurentiani, Plut. 59.1, Plut. 85.6, Plut 85.9 and Plut 85.12 (only foll. 91<sup>r</sup>-92<sup>v</sup> (103a1-111a3) online exhibited but not insufficient for my hypothesizing below), each abbreviated below as **a**, **b**, **c** and **d** according to Stallbaum's sigla.

In what follows, my discussion is based on the hypotheses I reached in the previous work mentioned above:

(A) The text of the Platonic *First Alcibiades* was transmitted in the two manuscript groups: the B family: B, C, D, V,  $\Psi$ ; the T family: T Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld P W **o** R<sup>4</sup>.

(B) The primary manuscripts, that is, the manuscripts which include readings underived from the other manuscripts, are B, C, D, T, P and W, whereas the other manuscripts are derived in text from the primary ones.

(C) Among the T family, there are three groups: (i) T Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld; (ii) P; (iii) W **o** R.

(D) Among the first group of the T family, Pa<sup>08</sup> is a direct copy of T and the others are derived from Pa<sup>08</sup>.

(E) Among Pa<sup>08</sup>'s descendants, Pa<sup>09</sup>, M and Y form a group whereas Sc, Pa<sup>11</sup>, **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup>, and Ld form another.

From the analyses below I will propose the following hypotheses, the first eight of which are on **a**, **b** and **c** whereas the other five are on **d** and  $\Gamma$ .

H1. **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the T family.

H2. Among the T family, **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the group of T and its descendants.

H3. Among T and its descendants, **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the group of Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants.

H4. Among the group of Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants, **b** belongs to the Sc group, not to the Pa<sup>09</sup> group.

H5. Among the Sc group, **b** along with Pa<sup>11</sup> is derived from Sc while **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup>, and Ld are derived from Pa<sup>11</sup>.

H6. Among Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants, **a** and **c** belong to the Pa<sup>09</sup> group, not to the Sc group.

H7. Among the Pa<sup>09</sup> group, **a** and **c** are derived from Y, while Pa<sup>09</sup>, Y and M are independently derived from a hypothetical ancestor.

H8. Among Y's descendants, **c** is derived from **a**.

H9. **d** and  $\Gamma$  belong to the T family

H10. **d** and  $\Gamma$  form a group with T and Pa<sup>08</sup>, not P or W

H11. **d** and  $\Gamma$  are derived from T or Pa<sup>08</sup>.

H12. **d** and  $\Gamma$  are derived from T, not Pa<sup>08</sup>.

H13. **d** and  $\Gamma$  are each independently derived from a hypothetical manuscript, a close descendant of T.

1. H1: **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the T family.

Each of the primary manuscripts of the B family has some peculiar omissions which a later scribe could hardly supply without using some other sources. In those cases **a**, **b** and **c** agree in correct reading with  $\tau$ .

121d2 τι/τί/τοι τ **a b c** Γ: om. B (τοι Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld)

104b3 τὸς πρὸς μητρὸς ... συμπάντων om. C

110b8 με om. D

Therefore **a**, **b** and **c** probably belong to the T family (see also Section 9).

This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that **a**, **b** and **c** always agree with the T family against the B family where these two families disagree. For examples,

104c1 μέγα φρονεῖν β: μεγαλοφρονεῖν τ **a b c** Γ **d**

104e7 διήλθον β : διήλομεν τ **a b c** Γ **d**

2. H2: Among the T family, **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the group of T and its descendants.

Among the T family, the primary manuscripts P and W each have some such peculiar omissions. In those cases **a**, **b** and **c** agree in correct reading with T and its descendants.

105d7-e3

ὥσπερ γὰρ σὺ ἐλπίδας ἔχεις ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνδείξασθαι ὅτι ..., ἐνδειξάμενος δὲ ...  
δυνήσεσθαι, οὕτω καγὼ παρὰ σοὶ ἐλπίζω μέγιστον δυνήσεσθαι ἐνδειξάμενος  
ὅτι ... T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld P **a b c** Γ **d**

ὥσπερ γὰρ σὺ ἐλπίδας ἔχεις ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνδείξασθαι ὅτι ..., ἐνδειξάμενος δὲ ...  
δυνήσεσθαι, ἐνδειξάμενος ὅτι ... W **o** R

105c5 ἠγεῖσθαι om. P

T and its descendants also have such a peculiar omission at 107d8. In that case **a**, **b** and **c** also agree with them against P and W.

107d8 οὐχ BCD PW: om. T Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld **a b c** Γ **d**

Therefore **a**, **b** and **c** probably belong to T and its descendants among the T family. This hypothesis is corroborated by the reading at 105e5.

105e5 μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ β PW: μετὰ θεοῦ T Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld **a b c** Γ **d**

3. H3: Among T and its descendants, **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the group of Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants.

From the handwritings and ink one can reasonably conjecture that the scribes of Pa<sup>08</sup>, Pa<sup>09</sup>, Y, M, **a** and **c** copied the text and scholia in their exemplars. At the scholion to 103a4 οὐδὲ προσεῖπον, those manuscripts agree in omission against T.

οὐ προσηγόρευσα D T W: προσήγορευσα eadem manu scripserunt scribae in Pa<sup>08</sup>  
Pa<sup>09</sup> M Y **a c**; om. B Sc

At the scholion to 104a2-3, The scribes of Pa<sup>08</sup>, Pa<sup>09</sup>, Y, Sc, **a** and **c**, who are likewise conjectured to copy the scholion in their exemplars, commonly left a transposition of T's wording as one could not repair it without some other sources.

μεγάλα εἶναι post Ἀλκιβιάδῃ scrips. B D T W: post ἀρχόμενα eadem manu scripserunt scribae in Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y Sc **a c**; scholion om. M

Although the scribe of **b** did not leave any scholia of his own handwriting, **b**, along with **a** and **c**, agrees with Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants against T at 105e4<sup>5</sup>.

105e4 ἱκανὸς] ἱκανῶς T

From these three pieces of evidence I would propose that **a**, **b** and **c** belong to the group of Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants among the T family.

4. Among the group of Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants **b** belongs to the Sc group, not to the Pa<sup>09</sup> group.

**b** agrees in hardly suppliable omission with Sc, Pa<sup>11</sup>, **s** and Ld against the others at 105b5.

105b5 ἔλλησι om. Sc Pa<sup>11ac</sup> **s** Ld b et s.l. supplev. altera manu Pa<sup>11pc</sup>

**b** also agrees in transposition with Sc, Pa<sup>11</sup>, **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup> and Ld against the others at 105c2 and 105c6<sup>6</sup>.

105c2 μοι δοκεῖς/δοκῆς ] δοκεῖς μοι Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld **b**

105c6 ἔχεις ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα] ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχεις Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld **b**

Therefore **b** probably belongs to the group of Sc, Pa<sup>11</sup>, **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup>, and Ld. Pa<sup>12</sup> is conjectured to repair the omission at 105b5 by reading the correction in Pa<sup>11</sup>.

5. H5: Among the Sc group, **b** along with Pa<sup>11</sup> is derived from Sc while **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup>, and Ld are derived from Pa<sup>11</sup>.

**b**, along with **s** and Pa<sup>12</sup> has peculiar omissions which a later scribe could hardly supply without looking at some other sources.

104b6 ὅτι om. Pa<sup>12</sup> ᾶ Pa<sup>12mg</sup>(γρ. ᾶ)

105a4 νῦν om. Pa<sup>12</sup>

105b6 τοῖς om. Pa<sup>12</sup> **o R**

105c7 οὖν om. Pa<sup>12</sup>

105e6 οὖν om. Pa<sup>12</sup>

106a1 νῦν δ' ἐφῆκεν om. **s**

104a1 ᾧ B T Pa<sup>08</sup> W ᾧ Y Sc Ld **o a b**<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. altera manu) **c ᾧ** V C DΨ Γ Pa<sup>09</sup> M Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> P R d om. **b**

104b6 ἐν om. **b**

104c7 γε om. **b**

104e7 νυνδὴ B T W: νῦν δὴ V C DΨ Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld **a c**: νῦν M **b P o R d**

**b** also, along with **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup> and Ld, has peculiar incorrect readings.

104b5 ἐπίτροπον κατέλιπε] κατέλιπεν ἐπίτροπον **s**

103b3 ὡς] εἰ Pa<sup>12</sup>

104b5 σοί] σόν Pa<sup>12</sup>

104c5 ποτε] τοτε Pa<sup>12</sup>

104d4 σόν] σου Pa<sup>12</sup>

104e8 πάλαι] πάλιν Pa<sup>12ac</sup> (πάλαι Pa<sup>12pc i.m.</sup>)

105c3 ὀνόματος ] ὀνόματι Pa<sup>12</sup>

105d4 ἐγὼ δύναμιν οἶμαι / ἐγὼ οἶμαι δύναμιν] οἶδα ἐγὼ δύναμιν Pa<sup>12</sup>

105e1 παντὸς] πάντα Pa<sup>12</sup>

105a3 δοκεῖς] δοκεῖ Ld

103b5 ὑπὸ] ἀπὸ **b**

104c4 ταυτοῦ scripsit **b** et ταῦτ'οὐ rescripsit **b**<sup>2</sup>

104d1 με] μ' **b**

105b7 εἴποι ] εἶπη Pa<sup>09</sup> Y **a b c M P R**

105b8 δυναστεύει scripsit **b** et v s.l. add. **b**<sup>2</sup>

105e4 οὔτ' ] οὔτε **b**

Therefore **b** along with **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup>, Ld, are independently derived from either Sc or Pa<sup>11</sup>.

**b** agrees in incorrect reading with Sc against Pa<sup>11</sup>, **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup> or Ld.

104a1 ὑπερφρόνηκας B C DΨ T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Sc<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. πε) Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld P W **o R d**:  
ὑπερφρόνηκας V Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc<sup>ac</sup> **a b c**

104c5 ἦντιν' ἔχων ἐλπίδα T Γ P<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M a<sup>pc</sup>(altera manu v in textu) **b**<sup>pc</sup>(altera  
manu v in textu) Pa<sup>11</sup> s<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. v eadem manu) Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld P W **o R d**: ἦντινα ἔχων ἐλπίδα  
β: ἦντιν' ἔχω ἐλπίδα a<sup>ac</sup> **b**<sup>ac</sup> c Sc s<sup>ac</sup>

105a3 εἴποι β T Γ Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Ld P W **d**: εἶπη Pa<sup>08</sup> **o** εἶπη Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M **a b c** Sc Pa<sup>12</sup> R

105a7 φράσω β Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Ld P W **o R d**<sup>pc</sup>(eadem manu s.l. σω): φράζω T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M  
**a b c** Sc Pa<sup>12</sup> **d**<sup>ac</sup>

In these cases Pa<sup>11</sup> shows correct readings even against its hypothetical ascendants, Pa<sup>08</sup> at 105a3 and T at 105a7. Pa<sup>11</sup> therefore would sometimes have emended the Sc-type exemplar or looked at some other sources. On this hypothesis, Pa<sup>12</sup> would often carelessly have copied Pa<sup>11</sup> as its frequent incorrect readings suggest, while **s** and Ld would have copied Pa<sup>11</sup>.

6. H6: Among Pa<sup>08</sup> and its descendants, **a** and **c** belong to the Pa<sup>09</sup> group, not to the Sc group.

**a** and **c** agree in incorrect reading with Pa<sup>09</sup>, **M** and **Y** against Pa<sup>08</sup> at the following places.

scholion ad 103a5 τι δαυμόνιον: τουτό γε T Pa<sup>08</sup>: τουτο δε B Pa<sup>09</sup> M Y Sc(ut

videtur) **a c** nulla scholia scripserunt scribae in Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> **b**

104a1 υπερωπεφρόνηκας B C DΨ T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Sc<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. πε) Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld P W **o R**

**d**: υπερωφρόνηκας V Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M Sc<sup>ac</sup> **a b c**

105a4 η] η V Pa<sup>08</sup> Sc

105b7 εἴποιοι ] εἴπη Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M **a b c P R**

Although the agreement has not been found in the case of an omission which a later scribe could hardly coincidentally make as in the case of *homoeoteleuton* or hardly supply without looking at some other sources, **a** and **c** more likely than otherwise belong to the group of Pa<sup>09</sup>, **Y** and **M**.

7. H7: Among the Pa<sup>09</sup> group, **a** and **c** are derived from **Y**, while Pa<sup>09</sup>, **Y** and **M** are independently derived from a hypothetical ancestor.

**a** and **c** agree in such hardly coincidental or suppliable omission with **Y** against Pa<sup>09</sup> and **M** at 105b6.

105b6 εν pr. om. Y **a c o R**

**a** and **c** also agree in incorrect reading with **Y** against T Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> **M** as well as against Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> and Ld at 105b5, c2, and d1.

105b5 δ' ] δε Y **a c**

105c2 δοκεῖς ] δοκῆς C Y **a c W o R**

105d1 διὸ β T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> M Sc **b** Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> P W **o R d**: δι'ὸν Pa<sup>08mg</sup>(γQ δι'ὸν)

Pa<sup>09mg</sup>(γQ δι'ὸν) Y **a c M**<sup>mg</sup>(γQ.) b<sup>2</sup>(s.l. v) Ld

**a** and **c** agree in incorrect reading with Sc against Pa<sup>09</sup>, **M** and **Y** at 104c5 (see above at p. 5).

Therefore, in so far as the incorrect reading could coincidentally have occurred both in either **a** or **c** and in Sc, **a** and **c** are probably derived from **Y**.

**M** disagrees in omission with **a** and **c** as well as with Pa<sup>09</sup> and **Y**.

titulus ἀλκιβιάδης M P W **o R**: ἀλκιβιάδης α BV DΨ T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y Sc **a b**

ἀλκιβιάδης πρῶτος Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld d ἀλκιβιάδης α<sup>ησ</sup> C **c**

scholion ad 104a2-3: μεγάλη εἶναι post Ἀλκιβιάδῃ scrips. B D T W: post ἀρχόμενα scrips. Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y **a c** Sc scholion om. M nulla scholia habent Γ **b d**

104e7 νυνδῆ B T W: νῦν δῆ V C DΨ Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> Y Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld **a c**: νῦν M **b P o R d**

Pa<sup>09</sup> disagrees in incorrect reading with **a** and **c** as well as with **M** and **Y**.

103a2 γενόμενος] γιγνόμενος Pa<sup>09pc</sup>(s.l. γ) γνόμενος Pa<sup>09ac</sup>

105b8 τῆι εὐρώπῃι / τῆ εὐρώπῃ / τῆ εὐρώπῃ: τῆ ἐρώπῃ Pa<sup>09</sup>

105e7 ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ] ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν C Pa<sup>09</sup> post θεὸς transpos. o R

Therefore Pa<sup>09</sup>, M and Y are probably derived from a common ancestor independently but as argued above, the ancestor would not have been Pa<sup>08</sup>. Therefore I hypothesise some ancestor common to these three.

8. H8: Among Y's descendants, **c** is derived from **a**.

c disagrees in such hardly suppliable or coincidental omission with **a** at 105a2

105a2 σὰ om. **c**

Therefore c is probably derived from **a**<sup>7</sup>.

9. H9: **d** and Γ belong to the T family

The B family and the T family each have in common an omission which a later scribe could hardly supply without looking at some other sources. In these omissions, **d** and Γ agree with the T family against the B family.

105e3 σοὶ β: om. TPa<sup>08</sup> PW **a b c** Γ **d**

106c2 καὶ (post.) TPa<sup>08</sup> PW **a b c** Γ **d**: om. β

Therefore d and Γ probably belong to the T family (see also Section 1).

10. H10: **d** and Γ form a group with T and Pa<sup>08</sup>, not P or W

Among the T family, there is such an omission in P, W and the group of T and Pa<sup>08</sup>. At those places d and Γ agree with the group of T and Pa<sup>08</sup> against P or W (for the evidence see the variants at 105c5, 105d7-e3, 107d8 and 105e5 in Section 2). Therefore among the T family **d** and Γ probably belong to the group of T and Pa<sup>08</sup>.

11. H11: d and Γ are derived from T or Pa<sup>08</sup>.

Nowhere do T and Pa<sup>08</sup> agree in an omission of the kind mentioned above against **d** and Γ; nor do T, Pa<sup>08</sup> and **d** against Γ; nor do T, Pa<sup>08</sup> and Γ against d. However, **d** and Γ agree in such an omission against T and Pa<sup>08</sup>.

104b2 καὶ om. Γ **d**

105c7 καὶ om. Γ **d**

d and Γ also agree in hardly emendable transposition or another incorrect reading against T and Pa<sup>08</sup>.

106b1 εἰπεῖν λόγον μακρόν TPa<sup>08</sup>: λόγον μακρόν εἰπεῖν Γ **d**

106b11 ἄ φημί σε TPa<sup>08</sup>: ἀφίημι σοι Γ **d**

Therefore d and Γ are probably derived from T or Pa<sup>08</sup>.

12. H12: **d** and  $\Gamma$  are derived from T, not Pa<sup>08</sup>.

Pa<sup>08</sup> nowhere disagrees in a hardly suppliable omission mentioned above with T, **d** and  $\Gamma$  but it disagrees in incorrect readings with T,  $\Gamma$  and **d** at 105a3 and 107a3 .

105a3 εἴποι T  $\Gamma$  **d**: εἴπηι Pa<sup>08</sup>

107a3 συμβουλευσων  $\beta$  T  $\Gamma$  **d**: συμβουλεύων Pa<sup>08</sup>

This separation is corroborated by the following variants.

105a4; 106a3; 106c9; 106d4; 107b6(ῆ post.) ῆ] ῆ Pa<sup>08</sup>

107b4 ῆ BC<sup>pc</sup>(supra εἰ puncto notavit)D T  $\Gamma$  **d** P W: εἰ C<sup>ac</sup> ῆ Pa<sup>08</sup>

105d6 ἔαν ] ἔαιν Pa<sup>08</sup>

106c3 ἐρεῖς] ἐρής Pa<sup>08</sup>

106b11; 106d4 οὐκοῦν] οὐκ οὔν Pa<sup>08</sup>

106e2 τυγχάνειν scripto eadem manu τυγχαν δεlevit et εἰδέναι fecit Pa<sup>08</sup>

Therefore **d** and  $\Gamma$  are more likely than otherwise derived from T, not from Pa<sup>08</sup>.

13. H13: **d** and  $\Gamma$  are each independently derived from a hypothetical manuscript, a close descendant of T.

**d** and  $\Gamma$  each disagree with the others in a hardly suppliable omission mentioned above.

104e7 νυνδῆ T: νῦν δῆ  $\Gamma$  Pa<sup>08</sup>: νῦν **d**

106a6 μοι om. **d**

106b8 οὐ χαλεπόν om. **d**

106c2 καὶ (pr.) T Pa<sup>08</sup>  $\Gamma$ : om. **d**

107b6 γε om. **d**

106c5 συμβουλεύσων ... μέλλοντός scripserunt T Pa<sup>08</sup> **d**: post συμβουλευ, sequentibus litterae -σων ... μέλλον- omissis συμβουλευτότος fecit  $\Gamma$  (haec absunt apud Schanz.)

Therefore **d** and  $\Gamma$ , since as argued above they have in common a hardly suppliable omission, are probably independently derived from a hypothetical manuscript, a close descendant of T.

14. The Coherence of Hypotheses Nine to Thirteen with Some Other Variants

Hypotheses Nine to Thirteen here agree with one of Schantz' hypotheses that  $\Gamma$  is derived from T through a hypothetical intermediate copy but modify another that **d** is derived from  $\Gamma$ <sup>8</sup>.

If this conclusion is acceptable, however, the following variants are suggesting that the scribe of **d**, or **d**'s exemplar, or even the scribe of the hypothetical manuscript proposed above was in a position to choose between the B-type and T-type readings as well as to emend the readings of its exemplar.



105d2 δεινομάχης] δεινομένης B C(δεινομάχης C<sup>m8</sup>) Γ **d** P T<sup>sl</sup> Pa<sup>08sl</sup> W<sup>sl</sup>

107c1 ζητήσουσιν T Pa<sup>08</sup>PW C<sup>pc</sup>(τ ut σ reficto τη supra η addidit) D<sup>pc</sup>(τ ut σ reficto τη supra η addidit): ζητοῡσιν BC<sup>ac</sup>D<sup>ac</sup> Γ **d**

105b2 οὖν β **d**: δὲ τ Γ

106a2 αὖ β W **d**<sup>ac</sup>(αὖ in rasura): om. T Pa<sup>08</sup>P Γ eadem manu αὖ eraso ος rescripsit **d**<sup>pc</sup>

106b4 ἐθελήσης T Pa<sup>08</sup>W: ἐθελήσης Γ **d** P(ης compendio): ἐθέλης B ἐθέλης CD d<sup>s.l.</sup>(altero atramento sed eadem manu λης scripto)

106e1 ἄ ἄρα β **d**: ἄρ' ἄ T Pa<sup>08</sup> Γ ἄρ' ἄ PW

105b2 ἐνδείξεσθαι β **d**: ἐνδείξασθαι τ Γ

104d7 εἰδέναι] εἰδέναι καὶ ἀκοῦσαι β **d**: εἰδέναι ἀκοῦσαι T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup>

106e8 δέ γε οὔτε β **d**: δὲ οὔτε γε T Pa<sup>08</sup> PW: δὲ οὔτε Γ

105a7 φράσω β P W d<sup>pc</sup>(eadem manu s.l. σω): φράζω T Γ Pa<sup>08</sup> **d**<sup>ac</sup>

Likewise, the following variants are also suggesting that the scribe or a corrector of Γ was in a position to choose between the d-type and the Pa<sup>08</sup>-type readings as well as to emend the readings of its exemplar.

104a4 δεῖ scripsit Γ<sup>ac</sup> et altera manu H inposito et spiritu reficto δῆ scripsit Γ<sup>pc</sup> 104b3 οὐδὲν β W **d** Γ<sup>pc</sup>(altera manu εν inposito): οὐδὲ T Γ<sup>ac</sup>(δε compendio) Pa<sup>08</sup> P

104d7 τί] ἄ **d** τε rescripto ἄ s.l. add. Γ<sup>pc</sup>

105e4 ἱκανὸς Pa<sup>08</sup> **d** Γ<sup>pc</sup>(altera manu iuxta compendium ως ο s.l. scripto ος fecit): ἱκανῶς T Γ<sup>ac</sup>(ως compendio)

107c7 τῶν Pa<sup>08</sup> **d** Γ<sup>pc</sup>(altera manu nigriori atramento ῶ in o inposito): τὸν T Γ<sup>ac</sup>

105d1 δὲ β Γ<sup>ac</sup>(ut videtur) **d**: δῆ τ Γ<sup>pc</sup>

And the inclination to avoid hiatus, common to **d** and Γ, may well be attributed to the scribe of the hypothetical manuscript, a common ancestor of **d** and Γ.

103b1 δ' β **d**: δὲ τ Γ

105b1 δ' ἔσεσθαι β Γ **d**: δε ἔσεσθαι τ

105b3 οὐτ' ἄλλος BC Γ d: οὔτε ἄλλος D τ

105c2 οὐδ' β Γ d: οὐδὲ τ

105c8 τοῦτ' β Γ d: τοῦτο τ

106a1 δ' β Γ d: δὲ τ

106d8 μήτ' β Γ d: μήτε T Pa<sup>08</sup> PW

104d2 τίνα] τίν' (falsa elisione) Γ d

105c1 οὐδὲ] οὐδ' Γ d

105e3 οὔτε] οὔτ' Γ d

106b3 ταῦτα Pa<sup>08</sup>: ταῦθ' Γ d

107b4 ταῦτα] ταῦτ' Γ d

## Bibliography

Burnet, J. 1901. *Platonis opera*, t. 2 (Oxford)

Schanz, M., 1877a. *Über den Platocodex der Markusbibliothek in Venedig Append. Class 4 Nr. 1* (Leipzig)

---, 1877b. *Über den platonischen Codex Coislianus 155 (Bekker Γ)*, RhM 32, 483-484

Taki, A., 2012. *Hypotheses of the Textual Interrelations among Some Medieval Manuscripts of the Platonic Alcibiades I*. The Bulletin of the Graduate School of Josai International University, 16, 1-24

## Notes:

This work is supported by JSPS Kakenhi Grant Number 22520323 and 26370363. Thanks are due to Prof. Peter J. Rhodes for reading my English.

1 Taki 2012.

2 Florentinus Laurentianus 59.1 (Stallbaum Laur. a), saec. XIV; Florentinus Laurentianus 85.6 (Stallbaum Laur. b), saec. XIII; Florentinus Laurentianus 85.9 (Stallbaum Laur. c), saec. XV; Florentinus Laurentianus 85.12 (Stallbaum Laur. d), saec. XIV; Florentinus Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 54 (Stallbaum Laur. i), saec. XIV (W41); Florentinus Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 180 (Stallbaum Laur. o), saec. XV.

3 Post, L. A. 1934. *The Vatican Plato and Its Relations* (Middletown, CN).

4 Sigla: T: Venetus App. Cl. IV, 1, saec. X; P: Palatinus gr. 173, saec. X; W: Vindobonensis suppl. phil. gr. 7, saec. XI; o: Vaticanus gr. 228, saec. XIV; R: Vaticanus gr. 1029, saec. XIV; s: Vaticanus gr. 1030, n.d.; Sc: Scorialensis Y. I. 13, saec. XIII; Ψ: Scorialensis Ψ I. 1, saec. XVI; Pa<sup>08</sup>: Parisinus gr. 1808, saec. X-XI; Pa<sup>09</sup>: Parisinus gr. 1809, saec. XV; Pa<sup>11</sup>: Parisinus gr. 1811, saec. XIV; Pa<sup>12</sup>: Parisinus gr. 1812, saec. XIV; M: Caesenas Malatestianus 28.4, saec. XIII-XV; Ld: Etwall's text (Etwall 1771) for Bodleianus Laud. 16, saec.

XV; Y: Vindobonensis phil. gr. 21, saec. XIII-XV (103a1-119e1 καταφρο- : scriba primus; 119e1-νηθέντας -135e8: scriba secundus)); B: Bodleianus E.D. Clarke 39, 895 CE (B); C: Tubingensis gr. Mb 14, saec. XI; D: Venet. gr. 185, saec. XII; V: Vaticanus gr. 225, saec. XIII; β: the B family: BV C DΨ; τ: the T family: T Pa<sup>08</sup> Pa<sup>09</sup> YM Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld P W **o** R.

5 **a**, **b** and **c** agree in incorrect reading with Pa<sup>08</sup>, Pa<sup>09</sup>, Sc, and Y against T at 105a3: εἴποιο β T Γ Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Ld P W d: εἴπηι Pa<sup>08</sup> **o** εἴπη Pa<sup>09</sup> Y M **a b c** Sc Pa<sup>12</sup> R.

6 b agrees in elision with Sc, Pa<sup>11</sup>, **s**, Pa<sup>12</sup> and Ld against the others at 105e3 (οὔτε] οὔτ' Sc **b** Pa<sup>11</sup> **s** Pa<sup>12</sup> Ld Γ **d**).

7 I hypothesise that the following incorrect readings coincidentally occurred among some of the manuscripts: 104d1 πρῶτερος] πρῶτερον DΨ Pa<sup>12</sup> **b**; 105a6 δοκεῖς] δοκῆς Sc Pa<sup>11</sup> Pa<sup>12</sup>. I have not taken into consideration the three variants: 104a4 δῆ om. Y<sup>ac</sup> et supplev. altera manu Y<sup>pc</sup>; 105c2 προῶγμασιν ] προῶγμασι Y; 104d1 σοι] fortasse σὺ **a**.

8 Schanz 1877a, 40-46; 1877b.

# 擬プラトン著作『アルキビアデス1』の伝承における フィレンツェ諸写本並びにパリ、コイスリアヌス写本の テキスト上の相互関係に関する仮説

## 瀧 章 次

### 【要旨】

デジタル複製写本資料の校合に基づいて、擬プラトン著作『アルキビアデス1』の本文伝承に関して、フィレンツェ、棚番 59.1、85.6、85.9、85.12、4 写本、並びに、パリ、コイスリアヌス 155 番、以上 5 写本の後代写本について、本文は全て写本 T を祖本文とするが、最初の三写本の本文が、パリ、ギリシア語写本、1808 番の本文を祖とするのに対して、残り 2 写本本文は、双対として、写本 T 本文を写した、現在失われた写本本文に由来する事、以上を仮説として立てる。