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.
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In my previous work on the textual interrelations of the extant medieval manuscripts in the transmission of the Platonic *First Alcibiades*,¹ I was not able to collate the related Florentine manuscripts². 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 manuscripts³. 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 Γ according to Bekker’s sigla, and Laurentiani, Plut. 59.1, Plut. 85.6, Plut 85.9 and Plut 85.12 (only foll. 91r-92v (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, Ψ; the T family: T Pa₀⁸ Pa₀⁹ Y M Sc Pa₁₁ s Pa₁₂ Ld P W o R⁴.

¹ Post 1987
² Taki 2001a
³ Taki 2001b
⁴ Stallbaum 1995
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.

Among the T family, there are three groups: (i) T Pa08 Pa09 Y M Sc Pa11 s Pa12 Ld; (ii) P; (iii) W o R.

Among the first group of the T family, Pa08 is a direct copy of T and the others are derived from Pa08.

Among Pa08’s descendants, Pa09, M and Y form a group whereas Sc, Pa11, s, Pa12, 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 Γ.

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 Pa08 and its descendants.
H4. Among the group of Pa08 and its descendants, b belongs to the Sc group, not to the Pa09 group.
H5. Among the Sc group, b along with Pa11 is derived from Sc while s, Pa12, and Ld are derived from Pa11.
H6. Among Pa08 and its descendants, a and c belong to the Pa09 group, not to the Sc group.
H7. Among the Pa09 group, a and c are derived from Y, while Pa09, Y and M are independently derived from a hypothetical ancestor.
H8. Among Y’s descendants, c is derived from a.
H9. d and Γ belong to the T family
H10. d and Γ form a group with T and Pa08, not P or W
H11. d and Γ are derived from T or Pa08.
H12. d and Γ are derived from T, not Pa08.
H13. d and Γ 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 τ.
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 $a b c \Gamma d$

104e7 διῆλθον β: διήλθομεν τ $a b c \Gamma d$

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

ώσπερ γάρ οὐ ἐλπίδας ἔχεις ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνδείξασθαι ὅτι ..., ἐνδειξάμενος δὲ ... δυνήσεσθαι, οὕτω κάγω παρὰ σοὶ ἐλπίζω μέγιστον δυνήσεσθαι ἐνδειξάμενος ὅτι ... Τ Γ $Pa^{08} Pa^{09} Y M Sc Pa^{11} s Pa^{12} Ld P a b c \Gamma d$

ώσπερ γάρ οὐ ἐλπίδασ ἔχεις ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνδείξασθαι ὅτι ..., ἐνδειξάμενος δὲ ... δυνήσεσθαι, ἐνδειξάμενος ὅτι ... $W o R$

105e5 ἡγεῖσθαι 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 $Pa^{08} Pa^{09} Y M Sc Pa^{11} s Pa^{12} Ld a b c \Gamma d$

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 Τ $Pa^{08} Pa^{09} Y M Sc Pa^{11} s Pa^{12} Ld a b c \Gamma d$

3. H3: Among T and its descendants, $a$, $b$ and $c$ belong to the group of $Pa^{08}$ and its descendants.

From the handwritings and ink one can reasonably conjecture that the scribes of $Pa^{08}$, $Pa^{09}$, $Y$, $M$, $a$ 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 Τ $W$: προσηγόρευσα eadem manu scripserunt scribae in $Pa^{08}$ $Pa^{09} M Y a c$; om. B Sc

At the scholion to 104a2-3, The scribes of $Pa^{08}$, $Pa^{09}$, $Y$, $Sc$, $a$ 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 Pa08 Pa09 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 Pa08 and its descendants against T at 105e45.

105e4 ἰκανός] ἰκανῶς T

From these three pieces of evidence I would propose that a, b and c belong to the group of Pa08 and its descendants among the T family.

4. Among the group of Pa08 and its descendants b belongs to the Sc group, not to the Pa09 group.

 b agrees in hardly suppliable omission with Sc, Pa11, s and Ld against the others at 105b5.

105b5 ἐλλησι om. Sc Pa11sc s Ld b et s.l. supplev. altera manu Pa11pc

b also agrees in transposition with Sc, Pa11, s, Pa12 and Ld against the others at 105c2 and 105c6.

105c2 μοι δοκεῖς/δοκῆς ] δοκεῖς μοι Sc Pa11 s Pa12 Ld b

105c6 ἔχεις ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα] ταύτην τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχεις Sc Pa11 s Pa12 Ld b

Therefore b probably belongs to the group of Sc, Pa11, s, Pa12, and Ld. Pa12 is conjectured to repair the omission at 105b5 by reading the correction in Pa11.

5. H5: Among the Sc group, b along with Pa11 is derived from Sc while s, Pa12, and Ld are derived from Pa11.

 b, along with s and Pa12 has peculiar omissions which a later scribe could hardly supply without looking at some other sources.

104b6 ὅτι om. Pa12 ἀ Pa12mg(γQ. ἀ)

105a4 νῦν om. Pa12

105b6 τοῖς om. Pa12 o R

105c7 οὖν om. Pa12

105e6 οὖν om. Pa12

106a1 νῦν δ’ ἐφήκεν om. s

104a1 ὡτι B T Pa08 W ϕ Y Sc Ld o a bpc(s.l. altera manu) c ω V C DΨ Γ Pa09 M Pa11s s Pa12 P R d om. b

104b6 ἐν om. b

104c7 γε om. b

104e7 νυνδῇ B T W: νῦν δῇ V C DΨ Γ Pa08 Pa09 Y Sc Pa11 s Pa12 Ld a c: νῦν M b P o R d
b also, along with s, Pa12 and Ld, has peculiar incorrect readings.

104b5 ἐπίτροπον κατέλιπεν ἐπίτροπον s

103b3 ὥς] εἰ Pa12
104b5 σοι] σὸν Pa12
104c5 ποτε] τοτε Pa12
104d4 σὸν] σου Pa12
104e8 πάλαι] πάλιν Pa12ac (πάλαι Pa12pc i.m.)
105c3 ὁνόματος | ὁνόματι Pa12
105d4 ἐγὼ δύναμιν οἴμαι / ἐγὼ οἴμαι δύναμιν] οίδα ἐγὼ δύναμιν Pa12
105e1 παντός] πάντα Pa12

105a3 ὁμοίως] ὁμοίως Ld

103b5 ὑπὸ] ἀπὸ b
104c4 ταυτὸ scripsit b et ταυτ’ οὖν rescripsit b2
104d1 με] μ’ b
105b7 εἴποι | εἴπη Pa09 Y a b c M P R
105b8 δυναστεύει scripsit b et v s.l. add. b2
105e4 οὔτε] οὔτε b

Therefore b along with s, Pa12, Ld, are independently derived from either Sc or Pa11.

b agrees in incorrect reading with Sc against Pa11, s, Pa12 or Ld.

104a1 ὑπερσφόρηκας B C DΨ T Γ Pa06 Scr(Sc (s.l. πε) Pa11 s Pa12 Ld P W o R d: ὑπερσφόρηκας V Pa09 Y M Scr a b c
104c5 ήντιν’ ἕχων ἐλπίδα T Γ P08 Pa09 Y M asc(alteran manu ν in textu) bpc(alteran manu ν in textu) Pa11 spc(s.l. ν eadem manu)Pa12 Ld P W o R d: ήντινα ἕχων ἐλπίδα
105a3 εἴποι β T Γ Pa11 s Ld P W d: εἴπην Pa09 o εἴπην Pa09 Y M a b c Sc Pa12 R
105a7 φράσω β Pa11 s Ld P W o R dpc(eadem manu s.l. σω): φράζω T Γ Pa08 Pa09 Y M a b c Sc Pa12 dpc

In these cases Pa11 shows correct readings even against its hypothetical ascendants, Pa08 at 105a3 and T at 105a7. Pa11 therefore would sometimes have emended the Sc-type exemplar or looked at some other sources. On this hypothesis, Pa12 would often carelessly have copied Pa11 as its frequent incorrect readings suggest, while s and Ld would have copied Pa11.
6. H6: Among Pa⁰⁸ and its descendants, a and c belong to the Pa⁰⁹ group, not to the Sc group.

   a and c agree in incorrect reading with Pa⁰⁹, M and Y against Pa⁰⁸ at the following places.

   scholion ad 103a5 τι δαμόνιον: τοῦτο γ ὑ Τ Pa⁰⁸: τοῦτο δὲ B Pa⁰⁹ M Y Sc(ut videtur) a c nulla scholia scripserunt scribae in Pa¹¹ s Pa¹² b

   104a1 ὑπερφρόνηκας Β C ΔΨ Τ Γ Pa⁰⁸ Scφ(s.l. πε) Pa¹¹ s Pa¹² Ld P W o R d: ὑπερφρόνηκας V Pa⁰⁹ Y M Sc a b c

   105a4 η] η V Pa⁰⁸ Sc

   105b7 εἰποι] εἰπη Pa⁰⁹ 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 Pa⁰⁹, Y and M.

7. H7: Among the Pa⁰⁹ group, a and c are derived from Y, while Pa⁰⁹, Y and M are independently derived from a hypothetical ancestor.

   a and c agree in such hardly coincidental or suppliable omission with Y against Pa⁰⁹ 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 Pa⁰⁸ Pa⁰⁹ M as well as against Sc Pa¹¹ s Pa¹² and Ld at 105b5, c2, and d1.

   105b5 δ’] δὲ Y a c

   105c2 δοκείς ] δοκής C Y a c W o R

   105d1 διό β T Γ Pa⁰⁶ Pa⁰⁹ M Sc b Pa¹¹ s Pa¹² P W o R d: δτ’όν Pa⁰⁸ endeavour γρ δτ’όν) Pa⁰⁶ endeavour γρ δτ’όν) Y a c M endeavour γρ δτ’όν) b²(s.l. ν) Ld

   a and c agree in incorrect reading with Sc against Pa⁰⁹, 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 Pa⁰⁹ and Y.

   titulus ἀλκιβιάδης Μ P W o R: ἀλκιβιάδης α BV ΔΨ Τ Γ Pa⁰⁸ Pa⁰⁹ Y Sc a b ἀλκιβιάδης πρὸ τος Pa¹¹ s Pa¹² Ld d ἀλκιβιάδης α’ C c


   104e7 νυνδή Β T W: νῦν δὴ V C ΔΨ Γ Pa⁰⁸ Pa⁰⁹ Y Sc Pa¹¹ s Pa¹² Ld a c: νῦν M b P o R d

   Pa⁰⁹ disagrees in incorrect reading with a and c as well as with M and Y.

   103a2 γενόμενος ἡ γενόμενος Pa⁰⁶ endeavour γρ γενόμενος Pa⁰⁹ endeavour
Therefore Pa⁰⁹, M and Y are probably derived from a common ancestor independently but as argued above, the ancestor would not have been Pa⁰⁸. 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 suppplicable or coincidental omission with a at 105a2

Therefore c is probably derived from a⁰⁷.

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.

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 Pa⁰⁸, not P or W

Among the T family, there is such an omission in P, W and the group of T and Pa⁰⁸. At those places d and Γ agree with the group of T and Pa⁰⁸ 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 Pa⁰⁸.

11. H11: d and Γ are derived from T or Pa⁰⁸.

Nowhere do T and Pa⁰⁸ agree in an omission of the kind mentioned above against d and Γ; nor do T, Pa⁰⁸ and d against Γ; nor do T, Pa⁰⁸ and Γ against d. However, d and Γ agree in such an omission against T and Pa⁰⁸.

Therefore d and Γ are probably derived from T or Pa⁰⁸.
12. H12: d and Γ are derived from T, not Pa08.

Pa08 nowhere disagrees in a hardly suppliable omission mentioned above with T, d and Γ but it disagrees in incorrect readings with T, Γ and d at 105a3 and 107a3.

105a3 εἶποι T Γ d: εἶπηι Pa08
107a3 συμβουλεύσων β T Γ d: συμβουλεύον Pa08

This separation is corroborated by the following variants.

105a4; 106a3; 106c9; 106d4; 107b6(ή post.) ή] ή Pa08
107b4 ή BCρκ(supra εὶ puncto notavit)D T Γ d P W: εἰ C=ή Pa08
105d6 εάν ] εάν Pa08
106c3 ἔφεις] ἔφης Pa08
106b11; 106d4 οὐκοῦν] οὐκ οὖν Pa08
106e2 τυγχάνειν scripto eadem manu τυγχαν delevit et εἰδέναι fecit Pa08

Therefore d and Γ are more likely than otherwise derived from T, not from Pa08.

13. H13: d and Γ are each independently derived from a hypothetical manuscript, a close descendant of T.

d and Γ each disagree with the others in a hardly suppliable omission mentioned above.

104e7 νυνδή T: νῦν δή Γ Pa08: νῦν d
106a6 μοι om. d
106b8 οὐ χαλέπιον om. d
106c2 καὶ (pr.) T Pa08 Γ: om. d
107b6 γε om. d

106c5 συμβουλεύσων ... μέλλοντός scripsurunt T Pa08 d: post συμβουλευ, sequentibus litterae -σων ... μέλλον- omissis συμβουλεύντος fecit Γ (haec absunt apud Schanz.)

Therefore d and Γ, 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 Γ is derived from T through a hypothetical intermediate copy but modify another that d is derived from Γ8.

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.
Likewise, the following variants are also suggesting that the scribe or a corrector of \( \Gamma \) was in a position to choose between the \( d\)-type and the \( Pa^{08}\)-type readings as well as to emend the readings of its exemplar.

And the inclination to avoid hiatus, common to \( d \) and \( \Gamma \), may well be attributed to the scribe of the hypothetical manuscript, a common ancestor of \( d \) and \( \Gamma \).
105b3 οὔτ’ ἄλλος BC Γ d: οὔτε ἄλλος D τ
105c2 οὐδ’ β Γ d: οὐδὲ τ
105e8 τούτ’ β Γ d: τούτο τ
106a1 δ’ β Γ d: δὲ τ
106d8 μήτ’ β Γ d: μήτε τ Pa08 PW

104d2 τίνα] τίν’ (falsa elisione) Γ d
105c1 οὐδὲ] οὐδ’ Γ d
105e3 οὔτε] οὔτ’ Γ d
106b3 ταύτα Pa08: ταυθ’ Γ d
107b4 ταύτα] ταυτ’ Γ d
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5 a, b and c agree in incorrect reading with Pa08, Pa09, Sc, and Y against T at 105a3: εἴποι β T Γ Pa11 s Ld P W d: εἴπηι Pa08 o εἴπη Pa09 Y M a b c Sc Pa12 R.
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104d1 πρότερος] πρότερον DΨ Pa12 b; 105a6 δοκεῖς] δοκῆς Sc Pa11 Pa12. I have not taken into consideration the three variants: 104a4 δὴ om. Yac et supplev. altera manu Ype; 105e2 πρᾶγμασιν ] πρᾶγμασι Y; 104d1 σοι] fortasse σού 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
フイレンツェ諸写本並びにパリ、コイスリアヌス写本の
テク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、フイレンツェ、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。