

# Hypotheses on the Textual Interrelations of Some Medieval Manuscripts in the Transmission of the Pseudo-Platonic *De iusto* and *De virtute*.

Akitsugu Taki

## Abstract

On the basis of my collation of the digital reproductions I hypothesize on the textual interrelations of the medieval manuscripts of the two concomitantly transmitted pseudo-Platonic works *De iusto* and *De virtute* that Parisinus graecus 1807 has a relative ascendancy over the others bifurcated into the two sub-groups, the one descendant from Vaticanus graecus 1 and the other descendant from, and in part contaminated with, Parisinus graecus 1808.

**Key Words:** textual criticism; *Spuria*; *De iusto*; *De virtute*; Parisinus graecus 1807; Parisinus graecus 1808

The Pseudo-Platonic works *De iusto* and *De virtute*, both known to Stobaeus under Plato's authorship (3.1.204; 3.12.25), are always transmitted concomitantly among all the extant medieval manuscripts of Plato's works and in their common medieval manuscripts, twenty-six all told, both are always arranged in this ordering at the beginning of Plato's spurious works (νοθευόμενοι)<sup>1</sup>.

Among those twenty-six manuscripts, I collated thirteen and reported the results of each work in different articles<sup>2</sup>.

From the analyses below on the basis of these results I will propose the following hypotheses on the textual interrelations of those thirteen manuscripts<sup>3</sup>.

H1: The extant medieval transmission sometimes has a common error.

H2: A common ancestor of the extant medieval manuscripts is not derived from the exemplar Stobaeus used.

H3: B, V, C, M Y, and a are separated as a group from A, O, R, J, L and Ψ.

H4: A is the ancestor of the others.

H5: Among the B group, V has no ascendancy over the others.

H6: Among the B group, C, M and Y, none of which is an ancestor of the others, form a sub-group against the others.

H7: Among that sub-group, neither M nor Y is derived from C

H8. Among that sub-group, neither C nor M is derived from Y.

H9: Among the B group, a and c are directly derived from B.

H10: c is directly derived from a.

H11: Among the B group, B has a relative ascendancy over the others.

H12: Among the B group, V is directly derived from B.

H13: Among the O group, R, J, L and Ψ are independently derived from O.

1. H1: The extant medieval transmission sometimes has a common error.

The medieval manuscripts I collated have in common at *De iusto* 375a7 an omission which a later scribe could hardly supply without looking at some other sources.

*D. iu.* 375a7 καὶ τῶ καιρῶι Boeckh: καιρῶι/καιρῶ/καιρῶ AORJLΨ B VCMY a c  
Stob.

Therefore this variant indicates that the extant medieval transmission sometimes has a common error.

This conclusion is corroborated by the following variants.

*D. iu.* 373d7 τὰ Boeckh: haplographiae causa om. AOJL B V CMY a c ὄν τὰ RΨ

*D. iu.* 374d5 γε Stob. Boeckh: τε AORJLΨ B V CMY a c

*D. iu.* 374e3 καὶ μυκτῆρα Stob. : μυκτῆρα AORJLΨ B V CMY a c Boeckh

*D. iu.* 374e5 ταῦτὰ Stob. : τὰ αὐτὰ AORJLΨ B V CMY a c Boeckh

*D. iu.* 374e9 ταῦτὰ Stob. : τὰ αὐτὰ AORJLΨ B V CMY a c Boeckh

*D. iu.* 375d4 τὸ ἄδικοι εἶναι Boeckh: τὸ ἄδικον εἶναι AORJLΨ B V CMY a c

*D. v.* 376b3 ἦν Fischer(nota) Boeckh: ἦι AO B ἦ a c ἦ RJLΨ V CMY

*D. v.* 376d2 τί δέ Venetus gr. 184 Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus  
Fischer Boeckh: τί δῆ<sup>4</sup> AO RJL Ψ B V CMY a c

*D. v.* 377b3 ἐπέμενε Horreus(nota) ex Meno 93d3: ἐπέβαινε AO RJLΨ B V CMY a c

*D. v.* 378d4 (interpunctio) ἐστί; τί Boeckh : ἐστίν τι/ἐστί τι AO RJLΨ B V CMY a c  
ἔστι τί Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer ἔστι τὶ Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2

*D. v.* 379b4 ἀπέκειντο A<sup>Pc</sup>(altera manu s.l. α) V<sup>Pc</sup>(α fecit) Venetus gr. 184 Aldina Bas.  
1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: ἐπέκειντο A<sup>ac</sup>ORJL Ψ B CMY  
a c Salvinius

*D. v.* 379b5 γε Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: δέ  
AO R(compendio)JLΨ B(compendio) V CMY a c

*D. v.* 379c3 τοπάζω μέντοι Stob Boeckh: τοπάζω μὲν δῆ AO JL B V<sup>Pc</sup>(accentu  
reficto s.l. δῆ add.) CMY a c Ψ Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus  
Fischer τοπάζομεν δῆ R τοπάζωμεν V<sup>ac</sup>

2. H2: A common ancestor of the extant medieval manuscripts is not derived from the exemplar Stobaeus used.

Stobaeus' excerpt has against the medieval manuscripts some hardly suppliable omissions of the kind mentioned above.

*D. ii. 374e4* πάνυ γε AORJLΨ B V CMY **a c** Boeckh: om. Stob.

*D. ii. 374e8* ναί AORJLΨ B V CMY **a c** Boeckh: om. Stob.

*D. ii. 375a2* καὶ τῶ om. Stob.

*D. ii. 375b5* ἐν τῶι δέοντι καὶ ἐν τῶι καιρῶι AORJLΨ B V CMY **a c** Boeckh: ἐν τῶ δέοντι καιρῶ Stob.

*D. ii. 375b8* ἐν τῶι δέοντι καὶ τῶι καιρῶι AOJL B V CMY **a c**: ἐν τῶι δέοντι καὶ ἐν τῶι καιρῶι R Ψ ἐν τῶ δέοντι καιρῶ Stob.

*D. v. 379d1* τίν' ἄλλον τρόπον γίγνιντ' ἂν om. Stob

*D. v. 379c2* οὐκ ἂν] οὐ Stob.

Stobaeus' excerpt also has an error with similar irreparability.

*D. v. 379c3* μάλιστα ante θεῖόν scrips. Stob

*D. v. 379c6* ἐπιπνοῖαι A B ἐπιπνοῖα R **a c** ἐπιπνοῖα OJL V CMY Ψ ἔπιπνοι Stob

Therefore a common ancestor of the extant medieval manuscripts is not derived from the exemplar Stobaeus used.

3. H3: B, V, C, M, Y, and **a** are separated as a group from A, O, R, J, L and Ψ.

B, V, C, M, Y, and **a** agree against A, O, R, J, L and Ψ in a hardly suppliable omission of the kind mentioned above.

*D. ii. 372a5* δὲ AORJLΨ M<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. δὲ) a<sup>pc</sup>(eadem manu s.l. δὲ) **c** Boeckh: om. B V CM<sup>ac</sup> Y **a**<sup>ac</sup>

*D. ii. 373d8* καὶ μετρητικός AORJLΨ M<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. καὶ μετρητικός) Boeckh: om. B V CM<sup>ac</sup>Y **a c**

*D. ii. 374d7* καὶ ἐξαπατᾶν AORJLΨ a<sup>pc</sup>(eodem atramento s.l. καὶ ἐξαπατᾶν) Stob. καὶ ἐξαπατᾶν **c**(ι dextra supposito) Boeckh: om. B V CMY **a**<sup>ac</sup>

*D. v. 378e6* ἔσεσθαι AO RJL M<sup>pc</sup>s.l. **a** <sup>pc</sup>s.l. **c** Ψ Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: om. BV CM<sup>ac</sup>Y **a**<sup>ac</sup>

The B group also agree against the O group in a similarly irreparable transposition.

*D. v 378e7* ἐλπὶς ἐστὶ AO RJL Ψ Bas. 2: ἐστὶν ἐλπὶς B V CMY **a c** Aldina Bas. 1 Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh

Therefore the two groups are distinctly separated, which is corroborated by the following variant.

373c5 μέτρον AORJLΨ Υ<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. ov et i.m μέτρον γὰρ ἦν ᾧ) Boeckh: μέτροι B μέτρο  
V CMY μέτρο **a c**(ι dextra supposito)

4. H4: A is the ancestor of the others.

A, B, V, C, M, Y, and **a** agree in error against O, R, J, L and Ψ.

*D. iu.* 374e7 τοῦ ORJL Ψ<sup>ac</sup>Stob. Boeckh: τοῦδε AΨ<sup>pc</sup>(infr.l. δε compendio)B V CMY **a c**

Also O, R, J, L and Ψ agree in error against A, B, V, C, M, Y, and **a**.

*D. v.* 379a8 ἀπέφαινον A B V CMY **a** Aldina Bas. 1 Stephanus Clericus Horreus

Fischer Boeckh: ἀπεφάνοντο ORJL **c** Bas. 2 ἀποφάνοντο Ψ

These two variants point to A's ascendancy over the others, which is corroborated by the following peculiar errors in A before the scribe's or some later corrector's correction.

*D. v.* 376d2 ἄλλων scrips. A<sup>ac</sup> et circo sinistro de ω eraso ἄλλον fecit A<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v.* 376d3 ἐλευθέρων scrips. A<sup>ac</sup> et circo sinistro de ω eraso ἐλεύθερον fecit A<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v.* 376d3 δούλων scrips. A<sup>ac</sup> et circo sinistro de ω eraso δούλον fecit A<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v.* 378a8 οὔτως scrips. A<sup>ac</sup> et circo sinistro de ω eraso οὔτος fecit A<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v.* 379b7 παραγίνεσθαι A<sup>pc</sup>(altera manu Γ in textu)ORJLΨ B V CMY **a c**

Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: παραγίνεσθαι A<sup>ac</sup>

5. H5: Among the B group, V has no ascendancy over the others.

V has against the others of the B group some hardly suppliable omissions of the kind mentioned above.

*D. iu.* 374e2 ἐγὼ AORJLΨ B CMY **a c** Stob. Boeckh: om. V

*D. v.* 377b5 καὶ θαυμασία εἰργάζετο καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ om. V

*D. v.* 379b7 ἄν om. V

Therefore V has no ascendancy over the others. This hypothesis is corroborated by the following peculiar errors in V.

*D. iu.* 373e7 τὸ ἄδικον AORJLΨ B CMY **a c** Boeckh: ἄδικον V

*D. iu.* 373e10 οὐδέπεω AORJLΨ B CMY **a c** Boeckh: οὐδέ ποτεV

*D. iu.* 374a7 ἀλλά τοι AORJLΨ B V<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. ο) CYM **a c** Boeckh: ἀλλά τι V<sup>ac</sup>

*D. v.* 376d3 ἔχει] ἔχειν V

*D. v.* 377e5 ἐγένοντο] ἐγένετο V

*D. v.* 378a4 γήρω scrips. V<sup>ac</sup> et altera manu s.l. σ add. V<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v.* 378b1 οἱ AO RJLΨ B CMY **a c** Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: ὅπου  
A<sup>i.m.</sup> B<sup>i.m.</sup> V C<sup>i.m.</sup>(nota eadem qua in B) **a**<sup>i.m.</sup> **c**<sup>i.m.</sup>

*D. v.* 378b2 του scrips. V<sup>ac</sup> et altera manu s.l. σ add. V<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v. 378d5* τι scrips. V<sup>ac</sup> et altera manu s.l. σ add. V<sup>pc</sup>

*D. v. 378e9* ἵπποι καὶ AO RJLΨ B CMY **a c** Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: ἵπποι  
V (causa paginae vertendae )

*D. v. 379a4* ἦτις AO RJLΨ B CMY **a c** Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: εἵ  
τις V

6. H6: Among the B group, C, M and Y, none of which is an ancestor of the others, form a sub-group against the others.

At *De virtute* 376c3 C, M and Y agree in omission against the other manuscripts. Therefore they possibly form a group.

*D. v. 376c3* οἱ ἀγαθοί] ἀγαθοί CMY

7. H7: Among that sub-group, neither M nor Y is derived from C

C has a peculiar error. Therefore neither M nor Y is derived from C.

*D. iu. 375d1* ἀδικία AORJLΨ B V MY **a c** Boeckh: ἀδικίαν C

8. H8. Among that sub-group, neither C nor M is derived from Y.

Y has against the others some hardly suppliable omissions of the kind mentioned above.

*D. iu. 372a13* μετροητικῆι AO B μετροητικῆ R **a c**: μετροητικῆ JLΨ V CM : om. Y

*D. iu. 373b9* ναί AORJ<sup>2</sup>LΨ B V CM **a c**: om. Y

9. H9: Among the B group, **a** and **c** are directly derived from B.

**a** and **c** agree against the other manuscripts in a hardly reparable error of the kind mentioned above.

*D. iu. 374a7* ἔχει AORJL Ψ BV CMY: ἔφη **a c**

Therefore neither has ascendancy over the others.

At *De iusto* 374b1 **a** and **c** agree with B against the other manuscripts in scholion. Therefore **a** and **c** are directly derived from B.

scholion ad *De iu. 374b1* scholion: σημείωσαι παροιμία πολλά ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί  
A(script. maj.)

σημείωσαι παροιμία ὅτι πολλά ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί O(script. min.) ὅτι add.

παροιμία ὅτι πολλά ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί J(script. min.)

σημείωσαι παροιμία πολλά ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί: ἐπὶ τῶν κέρδους ἕνεκα καὶ  
ψυχαγωγίας ψευδῆ λεγόντων. φασὶ γὰρ τοὺς ποιήτας πάλαι λεγόντας τάληθῆ,  
ἄθλων ὕστερον αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι τιθεμένων ψευδῆ καὶ πεπλασμένα λέγειν

αίρεισθαι, ἵνα διὰ τούτων ψυχαγωγούντες τοὺς ἀκροωμένους τῶν ἄθλων  
 τυγχάνωσιν. ἐμνήσθη ταύτης καὶ Φιλόχωρος ἐν Ἀτθίδος ἀ' καὶ Σόλων  
 Ἐλεγεῖαις καὶ Πλάτωνος ἐνταῦθα. B a(eadem manu) c(eadem manu)  
 πολλὰ ... ἐνταῦθα. M  
 om. RLΨ V CY

10. H10: c is directly derived from a.

c has against the other manuscripts some hardly suppliable omissions of the kind mentioned above.

*D. iu.* 373c7 ἦν γὰρ ... ἐκρίνετο om. c (homoeoteleuti ἐκρίνετο causa)

*D. iu.* 373e5 εἴπομεν ... κοῦφον om. c (homoeoteleuti κοῦφον causa)

*D. iu.* 375d10 οὐκ om. c

Hence c is probably directly derived from a. This hypothesis is corroborated by the agreement of c with a<sup>pc</sup> at the variants *De virtute* 372a5, 374d7 and 378e6 (see above at section 3) and by c's following peculiar error.

*De iu.* 373e7 δὲ AORJLΨ B CMY a<sup>pc</sup>(δὲ s.l. eadem manu) Boeckh: καὶ V a<sup>ac</sup> δὲ καὶ c

11. H11: Among the B group, B has a relative ascendancy over the others.

Since, as the variants in sections 5 to 10 show, no other manuscript among the B group has ascendancy, B is more likely than the others to be an ancestor of the group. This ascendancy is corroborated by the variants at *De virtute* 376b3 and 379c2.

*D. v.* 376b3 γένοιτο PHaw 26 A<sup>pc</sup>(v eraso) LΨ B(spatio unae litterae inter γενοι et το)V CMY a c Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh γενοι\*το J<sup>pc</sup>(v eraso ut videtur): γένοιτο A<sup>ac</sup>OR fortasse J<sup>ac</sup>

*D. v.* 379c2 γίγνουντ' A<sup>pc</sup>(altera manu N in textu)<sup>6</sup> RJ(ex emend.)L B(litteris γίγνουντο exarafis τ finalem ut N fecit et τ altrum addidit)V CMY a c Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: γίγνουντ' A<sup>ac</sup>O Ψ

However, as the variants in *scholion ad De iusto* 374b1 (see section 9) and at *De virtute* 378e4 (see the next section) and 379d4 suggest, B is not directly derived from A<sup>5</sup>.

*D. v.* 379d4 μεγαλοπρεπῶς A<sup>pc</sup>(una littera erasa ω fecit)<sup>7</sup>R(ex emend.) BV CMY a c Stob Aldina Bas. 1 Bas. 2 Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: μεγαλοπρεπὲς A<sup>ac</sup>OJL μεγαλοπρεπῆ Ψ

12. H12: Among the B group V is directly derived from B.

V agrees in error with B and a against the others at *De virtute* 378e4.

*D. v.* 378e4 τε AO RJL CMY c Ψ Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: τε καὶ

## B V a

From this variant and Hypotheses Five to Nine, it follows that V derives from B, not C or a. This conclusion is corroborated by the following variant.

*D. v. 378b1* οἱ AO RJL B CMY a c Ψ Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh:  
ὄπου A<sup>i.m.</sup> B<sup>i.m.</sup> V C<sup>i.m.</sup>(nota eadem qua in B) a<sup>i.m.</sup> c<sup>i.m.</sup>

13. H13: Among the O group R, J, L and Ψ are independently derived from O.

Each of R, J, L and Ψ has against the other manuscripts some hardly suppleable omissions of the kind mentioned above, whereas O's peculiar omissions and errors could have been mended by the scribe or some later correctors before the composition of the other manuscripts. Therefore O has a relative ascendancy over R, J, L and Ψ and the latter four are independently derived from O<sup>8</sup>.

J:

*D. iu. 375b5* ὁ δὲ μὴ AOR LΨ B V CYM a c Boeckh: ὁ δὲ J

*D. v. 376b1* ὦ σώκρατες om. J

R:

*D. v. 378a3* δὴ om. R

*D. v. 378d3* τὴν ψυχὴν AO JL B V CMY a c Ψ Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh:  
ψυχὴν R

Ψ:

*D. iu. 372a3* γε om. Ψ

*D. iu. 372a9* τι om. Ψ

*D. iu. 372a11* αὐτὸ om. Ψ

*D. iu. 373c1* δὴ om. Ψ

*D. iu. 374a2* ἐκόντας om. Ψ

*D. iu. 374b3* λέγει ... ἀληθῆ om. Ψ(homoeoteleuton ἀληθῆ (374b4))

*D. iu. 375b4* οἴος τε om. Ψ

*D. iu. 375b6* οὕτως ... ἐπιστάμενος οὐ (375b7) om. Ψ(homoeoteleuton ἐπιστάμενος οὐ)

*D. iu. 375d6* οὐ γὰρ οὖν ... γίγνεται om. Ψ(homoeoteleuton γίγνεται)

*D. v. 376c3* τε καὶ] καὶ Ψ

*D. v. 376d13* ἀλλ' ἐν κακοῖς om. Ψ

*D. v. 377b7* οὐκ om. Ψ

*D. v. 377c2* σὺ AO J<sup>pc</sup>(s.l. συ ut videtur)LR B V CMY a c Fischer: om. J<sup>ac</sup> Ψ

*D. v. 377e4* ἄρα RJL B V CMY a Stephanus Fischer Boeckh: ἄρα AO c Clericus  
Horreus om. Ψ

*D. v. 378c4* ἦ om. Ψ

D. v. 378d5 καὶ om. Ψ

D. v. 378e3 τὰς om. Ψ<sup>ac</sup> et altera manu s.l. scrips. Ψ<sup>Pc</sup>

D. v. 379b1 ἄν om. Ψ

L:

De v. 378c5 φύσει om. L

De v. 379d1 καὶ om. L

O:

D. iu. 375d5 ναί om. O et supplev. O<sup>3i.m.</sup>

D. v. 377e1 ὡς om. O<sup>ac</sup> et altera manu s.l. supplev. O<sup>Pc</sup>

## Bibliography

Bekker, I. (ed.) 1826. *Platonis ... scripta Graece omnia* .... Vol. 9 (London)

Boeckh, A. 1810. 'Simonis Socratici' ut videtur *Dialogi quatuor* ... (Heidelberg)

Brumbaugh, R.S. and R. Wells (1968), *The Plato Manuscripts: A New Index*, New Haven and London.

Burnet, J. (ed.) 1914. *Platonis opera*. t. 5 (Oxford)

Clericus, J. 1711. *Aeschinis Socratici Dialogi tres* (Amsterdam)

Fischer, J.F. 1752<sup>1</sup>, 1766<sup>2</sup>, 1786<sup>3</sup>. *Aeschinis Socratici Dialogi tres* (Lipsiae)

Grynaeus, Simon 1534. ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΜΕΘ' ΥΠΙΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΑ ΠΡΟΚΛΟΥ ... *Platonis Omnia Opera cum commentariis Procli* ... (Basileae)

Hense, O., and C. Wachsmuth 1884-1912. *Ioannis Stobaei anthologium*. 5 vols (Berlin) (voll. 1-2:1884; vol. 3:1894; vol. 4:1909; vol. 5:1912)

Hopperus, Marcus 1556. ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ... *Platonis Omnia Opera* (Basileae)

Horreus, P. 1718. *Aeschinis Socratici Dialogi tres*. (Leovardiae)

Manutius, Aldus et Marcus Musurus 1513. ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ *Omnia Platonis Opera* (Venetiae)

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

Salvinius, A. M. 1711. *Collatio variorum lectionum, et antiquo Codice MS. Bibliothecae Laurentianae Mediceae*, in: Clericus 1711, 38-40.

Serranus, I. et Stephanus, H. 1578. ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ: *Platonis opera quae extant omnia*, 3 t. (Genavae)

Souilhé, J. (ed.) 1962. *Platon Oeuvres complètes*. t. xiii, 3e pt. (Paris)

Taki, A. 2012. *Variant Readings in the Main Medieval Manuscripts of the Pseudo-Platonic De Iusto*, Bulletin (Department of Social and Environmental Studies, Josai International University) [=BDSSES] 21-8, 29-48

---- 2013. *Variant Readings in the Main Medieval Manuscripts of the Pseudo-Platonic De Virtute*, BDSSES, 22-7, 39-63.



## 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 Brumburgh and Wells (1968).

2 Taki (2012); id. (2013).

3 The sigla of the manuscripts I examined are: A: Parisinus graecus 1807, saec. IX; B: Parisinus graecus 1808, saec. XI-XII ?; C: Parisinus graecus 1809, saec. XV; J: Vaticanus graecus 1031, saec. XIII-XIV; L: Florentinus, Laurentianus plut. 80.17, saec. XV; M: Caesenae, Malatestianus D XXVIII, 4, saec. XIV ?; O: Vaticanus graecus 1, saec. IX-X; R: Vaticanus graecus 1029, saec. XIV; V: Vaticanus graecus 226, saec. XIII; Y: Vindobonensis phil. gr. 21, saec. XIII; a: Florentinus, Laurentianus Plut. 59, 1, saec. XIV; c: Florentinus, Laurentianus Plut. 85, 9, saec. XV; Ψ: Escorialensis Ψ I 1, saec. XVI. I add 'PHaw 26' the variants in Papyrus Hawara 26, 2nd century CE, the pseudo-Platonic *De virtute* 376b-c, under 'Stob.' the variants in the text of Stobaeus' *Anthology*, for which I have used the edition of Hense and Wachsmuth, and by the name of the editor the variants in the Aeschinean and Boeckh's editions and in Stephanus' edition. For the origin of the readings in Stephanus' edition I sometimes add the variants in the other earlier edition of Plato's works by the following abbreviations: Aldina: Manutius and Musurus 1513; Bas. 1: Grynaeus 1534; Bas. 2: Hopperus 1556. 'De iusto' and 'De virtute' in the citation of variants are each abbreviated as 'D. *iu.*' And 'D. *v.*'.

4 Bekker did not report A.

5 The variant at *D. iu.* 374e5 (δεξιὰ AORJL Ψ B<sup>pc</sup>(i.m. δεξιὰ eadem manu) V CMY a c Boeckh: om. B<sup>ac</sup>), where the scribe of B corrects his own mistake, does not weaken the hypothesis.

6 Souilhé wrongly reported A.

7 Neither Bekker nor Burnet reported A<sup>pc</sup>.

8 This hypothesis is corroborated by the variant at *D. v.* 377d6: εἶδομεν A B V CMY a c Stephanus Clericus Horreus Fischer Boeckh: ἴδομεν O RJL(indistincte a ligatura εἰ) Ψ.

# 偽プラトン著作『正義について』並びに『徳について』の 伝承における諸中世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、一対の作品として常に伝承されている偽プラトン著作『正義について』並びに『徳について』の本文伝承に関して、パリ、ギリシア語写本1807番が他の写本文に対して総体的に祖本文をなし、そこから、ヴァチカン、ギリシア語写本1番を祖とする本文群とパリ、ギリシア語写本、1808番を祖とする本文群に分かれるが、後者パリ写本には、祖本文にない伝承が混入している事、以上を仮説として立てる。