THE TEXT OF THE HOMERIC HYMNS: I.

THIS article is a sequel to the text of the Homeric Hymns published by the Clarendon Press in the year 1893. For that edition it was my duty to write a preface, which under the circumstances did no more than enumerate the manuscripts and summarize the views as to their relations held by the principal writers. Since that time I have studied the subject of the tradition of these Hymns at greater leisure, and I now present such conclusions as I have been able to attain.

The reviewers of Mr. Goodwin's edition, while indulgent to the book as a whole, took exception to our neglect of modern criticism, the few conjectures that had been inserted in the text, and the scanty record of others, usually accepted, in the notes. As this circumstance, so far as it depended on myself, was the fruit of conviction, and since I have followed out the principle upon which I then acted more at length in this article, I may be allowed to spend a few words in explanation of the position which in these matters I take.

The Greek classics have been read, studied, and edited for above four hundred years; the simple and easy corrections that the early editors, Greeks and Italians, made in their texts have been followed by the more learned but of necessity less and less certain attempts of Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Germans, English, who have provided every ancient writer with an accumulation of alternative readings which exceeds in bulk his own words. The past and present ages of scholarship have been generous in accepting these conjectures, partly from a natural desire to present a currently legible text to the reader, partly from an *a priori* theory as to the depravation of the ancient books that have come down to us. The growing familiarity of the new generation with the circumstances of mediaeval scribes, and the methods by which MSS. were produced, and, in especial, the discoveries of a considerable number of early fragments of papyrus in which ancient texts appear in materially the same form as that in which the first printers received them, have made it an open question whether the hospitality that has been extended to these conjectures of four centuries be not too wide.

It may be said at least that the scholar who proposes to produce a new text of any of these much-edited authors must justify his undertaking (after he has collected and arranged the existing documentary evidence) by passing through the narrowest of sieves the conjectures that have held the field and sold themselves as genuine ware for so many generations. I will state my

own opinion that, whoever be the author that is taken, the percentage of tolerable conjectures on him will be found to be very small indeed. Ignorance of language, ignorance of the usage of writing and of MSS. on the one hand, and the sheep-like acquiescence of editors on the other, have produced and perpetuated a crowd of *monstra* which overlie the words of all the ancients, and of the minor and less-read writers among them in particular.

To lay down the canons that determine a good emendation is not an easy task. I will content myself with stating one principle, not the only one, but that which is in most danger of being overlooked, namely, that no emendation is certain the passing of which into the actual documentary reading cannot be explained according to recognized graphical laws. If this condition be unfulfilled, not the most brilliant or witty substitute for the text can be accepted. The datum, the evidence given by the MSS., is that from which we start, and to which we come back ; to depart therefrom is to compose, to rewrite the author, to write better than the author. We are tied by the document, and within the radius of graphical change about it lies the field for our invention.

How few conjectures are satisfactory, if this rule be strictly applied, is manifest, and it will be said that to admit the rule is to reduce the classics in many cases to a meaningless series of syllables. We may allow that much corruption has taken place which does not come under any definite case of permutation of letters. Such corruptions however, though their detection may be morally certain, do not admit of positive proof; they are suggestions not substitutes, and their proper place is in the commentary, not, unless we are to draw our facts of Greek from tainted wells, in the text.

In editing the portion of the Homeric Hymns for which I was responsible, I followed this principle, and thought myself deserving well of the author if I stripped him of his false skin of Batavian, Teutonic and British accretion and presented him, his wounds and sores clearly indicated, to the critical public. It has been said that even so a larger selection of conjectures should have been offered beneath the text. I admit that the amount of previous labour that should be retained and exhibited in an edition is a point upon which opinions may vary; but personally I am disposed to maintain that a bad conjecture is best soonest buried, both out of consideration for the author of it, and also that the reader's interest and critical sense may not be dulled and blunted. To take an instance—can anything be more disheartening and stupefying, and at the same time more intrinsically worthless, than the vast congeries of conjectures in the appendix to Wecklein's Aeschylus ? If the classics are to continue to be studied with effect, the student's path must not be blocked with this dead matter of the past. A rigorous selection must present to the reader such suggestions as are probable, interesting, and helpful. The rest an editor will seek where they lie buried. In Mr. Goodwin's edition therefore the absence of a record of conjectures is to be taken to imply disapproval of them. My grounds for such an opinion are put out in the following pages.

This dissertation is so arranged that in the first part the manuscripts are

described, arranged in families and traced to archetypes. In the second the relations of these archetypes are investigated, the history of the text taken back to its furthest point, and incidentally many passages wherein tradition varies discussed. In the third part such conjectures as are at hand to the writer are offered on lines where the MS. testimony is unanimous. That these conjectures fulfil the canons I have indicated not even a critic will expect ; they have at least this defence, that they are suggestions in a commentary, and do not in a printed text pose as the transmitted document.

I.

The Homeric Hymns are contained in twenty-six MSS. now extant. For a detailed description of them I may refer to Mr. Goodwin's edition. I here give a list of them according to the letters by which they are quoted. All except M (s. xiv.), Γ (s. xvi.) and G (s. xvi.) are of the fifteenth century.

A	Paris grec 2763.
At	Athous. Vatopedi 587.
B	Paris grec 2765.
C	id. 2833.
Γ	Brussels. Bibliothèque Royale 11377—11380.
D	Milan. Ambrosiana B 98 sup.
E	Modena. Estense iii. E 11.
G	Vatican. Regina 91.
H	British Museum. Harley 1752.
J	Modena. Estense ii. B 14.
K	Florence. Laurenziana 31, 32.
L	id. 32, 45.
L₂	id. 70, 35.
L₃	id. 32, 4.
M	Leiden. (Mosquensis) 33 H.
Mon.	Munich. Royal Library 333.
N	Leiden. 74 C.
O	Milan. Ambrosiana C 10 inf.
P	Vatican. Palatino greco 179.
Π	Paris grec suppl. 1095.
Q	Milan. Ambrosiana S 31 sup.
R₁	Florence. Riccardiana 53 K ii. 13.
R₂	id. 52 K ii. 14.
S	Vatican. Vaticani greci 1880.
T	Madrid. Public Library 24.
V	Venice. Marciana 456.

Γ was written by Aristobulus Apostolides, E by Giorgio Valla, L₂ and R₂ by Giovanni Scutariota, L₃ by Giovanni Rhoso, T by Constantine Lascaris in the year 1464. G is a copy of the editio princeps of 1488. L₃ and V present the Hymns in company with the Iliad and Odyssey, M (in its present

state) with the Iliad only ; the remainder include them in a sort of corpus of hymnographers and cognate literature, such as Callimachus, Proclus, Orpheus, Musaeus, the Batrachomachia, and parts of Hesiod, Phocylides, Theocritus, Pindar.

Collations of all these MSS., with the exception of At, Mon. and T, were made by or for Mr. Goodwin. Since the appearance of the edition the readings of the Madrid MS. have been published by E. Bethe, *Hermes*, 1893, p. 522 *sq.* The collation is, by Bethe's own account, incomplete ; but the information is very welcome and throws a great deal of light on the *x* family. The acute guess of Hollander (*Hermes*, 1891, p. 170 *sq.*) that the Matritensis would turn out a close connexion of E is fully confirmed. The position of the MS. is discussed further on in this article. The remainder of Bethe's paper is a repetition of the notions of his predecessors.

The readings of the Athos MS. have been published by Professor Ingram Bywater in the *Classical Review*, October 1894, from a collation by Professor M. Constantinides. See *infra*, p. 149.

I have had an opportunity to re-examine the two Modena MSS., E and J, and below (pp. 160—1) I give a list of wrongly-reported readings. The blame for these errata falls upon myself, for my collations of these MSS. were used for the edition.

The critical question of the Hymns has been discussed in the following works :

A. Gemoll, *Homerische Blätter*, Striegau, 1885, p. 12 *sq.*, reprinted with additions in his edition, Leipzig, 1886.

H. Hollander, *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der homerischen Hymnen*, Leipzig, 1886 ; ' *Zur Ueberlieferung der homerischen Hymnen,*' *Hermes*, 1891, pp. 170, 636 ; ' *Ueber den Codex Estensis der hom. Hymnen,*' *Neue Jahrb. f. Philologie*, 1892, f. 544.

E. Abel, preface to his edition, Lipsiae-Pragae, 1886.

More recent work upon these poems has not touched the subject of the manuscripts. In general, the views of Hollander may be said to be established ; Mr. Goodwin agreed with them, and Professor Ludwich has given his assent (*Index Lect. Regimont.* 1890, p. 4). In points of detail I differ often from Dr. Hollander, but my obligations are none the less great to his admirable and illuminating treatise.

M

This manuscript, known as M because it was found at Moscow (I will not repeat the familiar story[1]), and now marked 33 H in the public library at Leiden, is a book of fifty pages, written according to general agreement in the fourteenth century. The pages measure 293 by 210 millimetres, there are two columns on each page, and about twenty-five lines to a column. The hand, as the facsimile in Mr. Goodwin's edition shows, is clear and

---

[1] Which will be found in Matthaei's words in Geel's *Catalogue of the Leiden Library*, p. 9.

regular, the material is paper, which has now come to have a brownish colour, and is soft and fragile. Size and writing taken together, the book is above the average of fourteenth century MSS. The sheets are fastened in quinions, an arrangement not unusual at all periods of minuscule, but most frequent in MSS. written after the fall of Constantinople. The book has a well-marked character, and I do not remember to have seen another that exactly resembled it ; at the same time its peculiarities are not sufficient to support a conjecture as to its place of origin.

The quinions are signed back and front in minuscule letters exactly in the middle of the bottom of the page. The present state of the book is as follows :

Quires.
   (1) f. 1 r. The numeral has gone. Inc. Iliad Θ 435.
      f. 10 v. There are the remains of some sign, but not an iota proper.

   (2) f. 11 r. *ια.*
      f. 20 v. *ια'.*

   (3) f. 21 r. *ιβ'.*
      f. 30 v. *ιβ'.* Expl. N 134.

   (4) f. 31 r. No sign. Inc. καί οἱ ἀναστήσουσιν ἀγάλματα πόλλ' ἐνὶ νηοῖς (h. Dion. i. 1), and on the same page h. Dem.
      f. 39 v. *ιδ'.* This gather consists of only nine leaves; the last leaf, 39 v., is only half a sheet and is glued to the back of the quire. The first leaf therefore of the outside sheet has perished.

   (5) f. 40 r. ·ς· *ιε.*[2]
      f. 49 v. Sign wanting.

   (6) f. 50 r. and v. Sign wanting. This single leaf is glued at the back. On the recto expl. h. Herm. xviii. 4; the verso is blank.

From this table it appears that the nine first quires of the MS. are missing. It is natural to suppose that they would have contained the Iliad down to Θ 434, and as we have a statement, resting on information given by Matthaei to Heyne (ed. Iliad I. xiii., xiv., III. xc.), that an MS. containing exactly this amount of the Iliad exists or existed in the Imperial College at

---

[2] The former of these two signs is planted exactly in the centre of the lower margin of f. 40r, so that the number *ιε* which was written afterwards had to be put somewhat to the right. The sign *s* is an equivalent of the somewhat more frequent *ϛ*, and when applied to a quire denotes 6. There can be no doubt that it was marked on f. 40r with the purpose of signing the gather before it was filled. It might therefore be supposed that it was part of another system of signatures, and this of course would be of great importance in determining the original state of the MS. As however there is no trace of any other such figure, before or after, and the figures *ια*, *ιβ*, etc., in the gathers that precede occupy exactly the middle of the margin, I cannot think that ·*s*· has anything to do with the composition of our MS. Possibly the gather had been numbered to form part of some other book, but from some accident was left over, and used up for the MS. of Homer. Such an explanation at least is suggested to me by the juxtaposition of the two numerals.

Moscow, it is an obvious conclusion that this MS. and M are parts of the same book. Next, the fifty pages that are at Leiden have lost the first page of quire ιδ′, and the whole of ιγ′; this appears clearly from the signatures. Accordingly in M, as it was originally, there stood between N 134 and the first line of the fragment to Dionysus eleven leaves; eleven leaves, that is twenty-two pages of two columns of twenty-five lines each, give a total of 1,100 lines, less some few to be deducted for headings, ornaments, etc. What are we to suppose that these 1,100 verses consisted of? I am afraid that, beyond the general presumption that they were Homeric, we cannot say. An attempt has been made by R. Thiele (*Philologus*, 34, p. 193 *sq.*) to compute the extent of the original Hymn to Dionysus, by supposing that the scribe stopped writing the Iliad at one or another definite point, and giving the 1,100[3] lines, less this continuation, to the hymn. Thus, if the scribe ended with the last line of N, there will be 397 lines over for the hymn ; if, on the other hand, he included Ξ also, there is a minus quantity! Really, I am afraid, it is impossible to set bounds in this gap of eleven leaves, and therefore to reconstruct the Dionysus-Hymn. Such an attempt rests on the supposition that the scribe deliberately composed an anthology of part of the Iliad and the Hymns, leaving off the Iliad somewhere between N and Ξ, in order that he might take in a perfect hymn to Dionysus. This is too artificial an hypothesis to be entertained. Surely the idea of any scribe designedly presenting his readers with an abridgment of the Iliad is absurd. Fragmentary copies of the Iliad and of the Odyssey do exist, and in plenty; Laur. 32, 31 ends at Ξ 5, Ven. 458 begins at Ξ 419, Ven. 459 ends at M, Laur. 32, 25 at H, Laur. 32, 38 at Λ 523, Ven. 431 at Ξ, Laur. 91 sup. 2 at ξ 422—but these are all real fragments. The MSS. contained more, but they have been mutilated, or the scribe has lighted on a mutilated archetype and copied what there was to copy. Designed excerpts from the Iliad we do not meet with until the Renaissance, when, and chiefly in the sixteenth century, A, or A and B as far as the catalogue, or ΑΒΓ are often found separately. No parallel exists between these Italian schoolbooks and the case of M.

A somewhat similar omission of pages occurs in the Florence MS. of Aeschylus (Laur. 32, 9). Here a more extensive loss has taken place; f. 134 v. ends with Agamemnon 310, the next gather has gone completely and the whole of the following one except the first sheet, of which the first leaf contains part of the Agamemnon, the last part of the Choephori. There is of course independent evidence by which to control these data, but supposing there had been none, the amount of the Agamemnon lost in the first gather might have been roughly estimated, but no guess could have been made as to where, in the second, the Agamemnon ended and the Choephori began.[4]

I may notice in passing that the quire-signatures in M are all in the first hand. I find a suggestion in Mr. Goodwin's papers that this might not

---

[3] Thiele by some error makes the number 2080. I am glad to find that my view agrees more nearly with that of Professor Bücheler (ed. 1869, praef. p. 2).

[4] *Journal of Philology* xxii. p. 157 *sq.*

be the case, and it is an idea that might occur to any one reading Thiele's argument. Were they in a later hand, the whole argument would of course fall, but I think there is no doubt that they are in the hand that wrote the text. In the Iliad-part of the MS., the arguments, periochae and glosses are in the text-hand, though smaller than the text, and the signatures are in the same writing.

We cannot therefore reconstruct the contents of the lacuna in M, but we can on the other hand draw a conclusion as to the condition of its archetype. If the circumstance that eleven pages were allotted by the scribe of M to complete the Iliad from N 134 and commence the Hymns cannot be due to deliberate choice on his part, it must follow that the archetype, at the time when the scribe of M copied it, was defective at that point. The archetype obviously contained the Iliad and the Hymns, and there is no reason to suppose that originally they were anything but complete ; but by the fourteenth century a great gap had been made near the beginning of the second half of the Iliad, and the scribe of M found a truncated Iliad running on without a pause to the Hymns. He copied his materials as they stood, without seeking to complete them from other sources ; it is conceivable that he even made no division between the Iliad and the Dionysus-Hymn. In the archetype when perfect, the Odyssey may have stood between the Iliad and the Hymns, possibly Quintus also. It is obvious how far we are from fixing the length of the Hymn to Dionysus.

The archetype was not only defective in the middle, but mutilated at the end. The Mosquensis ends at xviii. 4, but the last two lines are written below the usual level upon the recto of f. 50 ; the verso is blank. That is to say, M is not itself mutilated here, but the archetype also stopped at xviii. 4, and the scribe seeing this economized his last page by finishing on the recto. Prof. Ludwich has already drawn this conclusion (*Index Lect. Regimont.* 1891, p. 18).

The next question is that of the age of the archetype, or at least of its style of writing; was it uncial or minuscule ? This sort of inquiry is often too confidently decided ; it must be based upon the consideration of such blunders in a MS. as appear to be purely graphical, and may therefore arise from confusion between letters, ligatures and the like. It is necessary to exclude all emendations, ancient and modern, and phonetic variations in spelling. The small remainder, especially if cases can be found where the scribe has faithfully copied obvious corruptions, may allow a conclusion to be drawn. It must be remembered in addition that with a minuscule MS. there is always a presumption that its archetype was minuscule, and when the minuscule MS. is late, the presumption is almost a certainty. Moreover, while a single instance of minuscule corruption is sufficient to prove a minuscule archetype, any number of uncial corruptions may prove merely an uncial stage in the manuscript's history, a circumstance which naturally does not require demonstration. Also, even clear uncial corruptions are not necessarily evidence for an uncial original, for, it is well known, several uncial forms, H, N, Π, T, Γ are frequent in minuscule also.

With these cautions we may consider the mistakes in M which appear to be graphical. The following seem due to an uncial confusion :—

Dem.	421	ὠκύρθη	: ὠκυρόη Hes. *Theog.* 354.
	424	ταλαξαύρη	: γαλαξαύρη *ib.* 353.
	482	χρησμοσύνην	: δρησμοσύνην Pausanias ii. 14. 3.
Ap.	156	θ'οὐ	: ὅου cett.
	306	τυφλόν τε	: τυφάονα *p* (τυφλὸν *x*).
Aphr.	158	δίνησι	: χλαίνησι cett.

On the other hand, we have these certain examples of minuscule corruptions :—

Ap.	88	κωμός	: βωμός cett.
	119	πρὸς	: πρὸ cett. (π̔ρ).
	367	δυσκλεέ'	: δυσηλεγέ' cett.
	457	ἐκ μὴ τοῦ δὲ	: ἐκβῆτ' οὐδὲ cett.
Dion. vii.	17	δεσμὰ ἐθέλοντες	: δεσμεύεθ' ἑλόντες cett.
Diosc. xvii.	5	ἐπ' ἀμήτων	: ἐπιβήτορες cett.

The minuscule character of the archetype of M therefore admits of no question. That M and no doubt also its predecessors were carelessly copied, and that errors once in existence were generally allowed to remain, will appear from these other mistakes, which I arrange under heads :—

(1) Mis-division.

Ap.	272	προσάγοι ἐνηεῖ παιήονι	: προσάγοιεν ἰηπαιήονι, cett.
	439	λιμένος δ'ἀμάθοισιν	: λιμέν'· ἡ δ' ἀμάθοισιν cett.
Herm.	38	ζώουσι δὲ	: ζώουσ' ἦν δὲ cett.
	82	νεοθηλέαν ἀγκαλωρήν	: νεοθηλέος ἄγκαλον ὕλης cett.
	238	ὀλοσποδός	: ὕλης σποδός cett.
	308	ἐνέχων δὲ	: ἔνεχ' ὧδε cett.
	406	νεογοίων	: νεογνὸς ἐών cett.
	556	διδασκαλίαν	: διδάσκαλοι ἦν cett.

This class of error is perhaps more natural in uncial MSS. In any case the nature of the corruption presupposes a long period of time. Νεοθηλέαν ἀγκαλωρήν probably contains an independent reading, as Hermann observed, praef. p. xxx. 'Ενέχων δὲ turns on the sign ‾ for ν, more frequent in uncial than in minuscule. (Ludwich's excellent emendation θεὰν σύ περ for θέας ὔπερ *Dem.* 64 rests on the same supposition.) Νεογνοίων probably is the result of ΝΕΟΓΝΕ͠ΩΝ ; cf. Κ 336 ἀριστεύωσι vulg., ἄριστοι ἔωσι Aristarchus and a minority of the MSS.

(2) Omission of syllables or letters.

Dem.	228	ἐπηλσίησι	: (ἐπηλυσίη Ruhnken).[5]
	420	ῥόεια	: ῥοδεία Hes. *Theog.* 351.
	422	contra, ἀκατάστη	: ἀκάστη Hes. *Theog.* 356.
Ap.	540	ἠέτ' ἐτήσιον	: ἠύτε τηύσιον cett.[6]
	220	τῶ τ' ουχάδε	: τό τοι οὐχ ἄδε cett.
Herm.	28	σκύλα	: σαῦλα cett.[7]
	522	μήτ'	: μηπότ' cett.
Aphr.	42	τέκε	: τέκετο cett.
	49	γελάσασα	: γελοιήσασα cett.
	66	κῆπον	: κύπρον cett.[8]

(3) Certain permutations of letters.

Ap.	125	ἐπώρξατο	: ἐπήρξατο cett.
	213	ἐλέλιψεν[9]	: ἐνέλιπεν cett.
	216	πετρίην	: πιερίην cett.[10]
	217	ἠδ' ἀγνιήνας	: ἢ μαγνιήνας cett.[10]
	234	κεῖνον[11]	: κεῖν' cett.
Herm.	55	ἥντε[12]	: ἠύτε cett.
	79	σάλδαλα	: σάνδαλα cett.
	137	οὐλοκάρηβα	: οὐλοκάρηνα cett.
	138	ηὔλησε	: ἤνυσε cett.
	373	ἀνάγκης[13]	: ἀναγκαίης cett.
	543	μὴ[14]	: μὲν cett.
Aphr.	159	ἐκ τῶν	: ἄρκτων cett.[10]
Ares viii.	10	πρὶν[15]	: πρηύ cett.

(4) Mistakes that do not fall under any particular head.

Dem.	13	κῶδις τ' ὀδμῆ (unmetrical).
	28	πολυκλίστω : idem Ap. 347, ubi πολυλλίστω cett.[16]
	51	φαινόλη (a vox nihili).

---

[5] This is made comparatively certain by the metre and the context.

[6] Cf. Apoll. Rhod. iii. 651 τήσιοι ' L ' for τηύσιοι.

[7] Σκύλα arrives apparently through σ[α]ῦλα σύλα.

[8] Similarly κῆπον seems a correction of κύπ[ρ]ον.

[9] Intended for ἐνέλειψεν?

[10] These three examples seem uncial: πετρίην it has been suggested to me = ΠΕΙΡΙΗΝ *i.e.* ΠΙΕΡΙΗΝ. Hollander plausibly explains ἠδ' ἀγνιήνας as = ΑΙΝΙΗΝΑ⊂, ΕΝΙΗΝΑ⊂, Matthiae's conjecture, and ἐκ τῶν as = ΑΙΚΤωΝ, ΑΡΚ-ΤωΝ.

[11] *I.e.* out of κεῖν', the accent being mistaken for the abbreviation of ον.

[12] The minuscule ligature ην resembles the minuscule letters ην.

[13] Possibly from the omission of the insignificant symbol for αι, ἀναγκ_ςησ.

[14] The ligature εν mistaken for the minuscule η.

[15] Cf. χ 411, 481 γρῆν ' P ' for γρηῦ. The ligature for ην was copied as ην, then itacistically πρην became πριν.

[16] Cf. ε 445 πολύλλιστον, where ' W ' has πολύκλυστος. It is probably a semi-conscious correction to make metre after one λ had fallen out.

Dem. 122 δῶς (unmetrical).
       267 συναυξήσουσ᾽ (unmetrical).
       362 θυσθύμαινε (vox nihili).
       421 μηλοβόστη : μηλόβοσις Hes. *Theog.* 354.
       430 δρεπομένη (unmetrical).

Ap.	76 ἀίδης	: ἀδῆ οἱ cett.
	475 κεῖνοι	: ξεῖνοι cett.
	543 ὄμματα	: ἤματα cett.
Herm.	108 τύνη	: τέχνη cett.
	151 δύσαχ᾽	: ἢ τάχ᾽ cett.
	338 τέρτομον	: κέρτομον cett.
	400 ὄχου	: ἤχ᾽ οὖ cett.
	404 γαίη κατ᾽	: πέτρη ἐπ᾽ cett.
	417 ἔθετ᾽	: ἔθελ᾽ cett.
	493 θ᾽ ἕξουσι	: τέξουσι cett.
	504 δραπέτην	: ἐτραπέτην cett.
	565 ἄνδρ᾽ ἀδαῆ	: ἄνδρα δαείης cett.
	576 νομίζων	: -ν ὁμιλεῖ cett.
Aphr.	135 δοιώ τε κασιγνήτω	: σοῖς τε κασιγνήτοις cett.
	157 αὐτή	: ἄνακτι cett.

Suggestions as to the origin of several of these variants will be found at the places where they occur. I call attention to them here, since their number and the remarkably unmetrical and ungrammatical character of many of them will have an important bearing on the question how far M is an intentionally corrected manuscript. The purely phonetic variants I omit; they are common to all MSS. and their rarity or abundance does not warrant any conclusion as to the nature of the original. They are collected by Dittmar, *Prolegomenon ad hymnum in Cererem homericum specimen*, Halis Sax. 1882.

There are two omissions of some length in M, *Apoll.* 22—74 and *Aphr.* 68—122. These are relied upon by Thiele (*l.c.*) to prove that M's archetype was uncial. After the evidence adduced above, it will probably seem more likely that the archetype of M was a book of much the same form as M itself, namely with about twenty-five lines on a page. As some of the minuscule corruptions (*Ap.* 119, 234, *Dion.* vii. 17, *Herm.* 373, 565 ?) appear to be due to abbreviations or ligatures, we may imagine *m* to have been a small book written in the common fluent hand of the tenth to twelfth centuries, the period to which we owe our most valuable copies of Greek writers. Did it resemble the MS. Laur. 32, 15 (D) of the Iliad, or Laur. 32, 24 of the Odyssey, or any of the various tenth to eleventh century MSS. of Hesiod, or perhaps Barocci 50, a book which contains the Batrachomachia, Musaeus and Phocylides? It was of course written in the East, and it was supposed by Matthaei that M itself was brought to Moscow from Athos (Geel *l.c.*).

In the course of time, like so many other books, *m* lost a number of

quires, which were not replaced, and when in the fourteenth century the
scribe of M took it to copy, nearly half the Iliad, and an unknown amount of
the Hymns, had disappeared. As far therefore as our positive evidence goes
the canon of the Homeric Hymns is unclosed, and a papyrus from an Egyptian
tomb may any day give us a hymn to Zeus or Athena.

x

After M we come to a group of MSS. DELΠT, which have been held to
belong to one family. The following list of absolute agreements justifies this
statement :—

Ap.

17	κύνθειον DELΠT	κύνθιον *p* κύνιον M.
35	αὐτοκανὴς DELΠT	αὐτοκάνης *p* (*deest* M).
46	σοι DELΠT	om. *p* (*deest* M).
ib.	γαιέων DELΠT	γαιάων *p* (*deest* M).
59	full line DELΠT	half line *p* (*deest* M).
65	γ᾽ ἐροίμην DELΠT	γενοίμην *p* (*deest* M).
71	ἴδης DELΠT	ἴδη *p* (*deest* M).
72	ἀτιμήσω DELΠT	ἀτιμήσας *p* (*deest* M).
73	ὥσει DELΠT	ὥση *p* (*deest* M).
74	κράτος DELΠ(? T)	κρατὸς *p* M.
174	ἡμέτερον DELΠ(? T)	ὑμέτερον *p* M.
216	πιερίης DELΠT	πιερίη *p* πετρίην M.
224	τευμησσὸν DELΠ(? T)	τελμησσὸν *p* τέμμισον M.
272	προάγοιεν DLΠ(*desunt* ET)	προσάγοιεν *p* M.
284	ὑποκρέμαται DLΠ (*desunt* ET)	ἐπικρέμαται *p* M.
322	μήσεαι DELΠT	ἔτι μήσεαι *p* μητίσεαι M.
326	καὶ νῦν μὲν τοὶ γὰρ DELΠT	καὶ νῦν τοὶ γὰρ *p* καὶ νῦν μέντοι M.
339	ἢ πόσσον DELΠT	ἢ παρόσον *p* ἐστιν. ὅσον M.
346	φραζάσκετο DELΠT	φραζέσκετο *p* M.
538	hab. DELΠT	om. *p* M.

Herm.

36	τὸ om. DELΠ(? T)	hab. *p* M.
45	αἲ ὅτε DELΠ(? T)	ἃς ὅτε *p* ἢ ὅτε M.
59	ὄνομα κλυτὸν DELΠ(? T)	ὀνομακλυτὴν *p* ὀνομακλυτὸν M.
72	ἀκειρασίους DELΠ(? T)	ἀκηρασίους *p* M.
286	δραύλους DELΠ	δ᾽ ἀγραύλους *p* M.
	δ᾽ ἀγραύλους⎱ T	
	δραύλους ⎰	
303	οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ DELΠ(? T)	οἰωνοῖσι σὺ *p* M.
361	ἀλεγύνων DELΠ(? T)	ἀλεείνων *p* ἀλεγίζων M.
397	σπεύδοντο DELΠ(? T)	σπεύδοντε *p* M.
398	δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ DELΠ(? T)	᾽ἐπ᾽ *p* M.
560	θυίσωσι DEL(*deest* Π, ? T)	θύσωσι *p* θυίωσιν M.

Aphr.

16 χρυσήλατον DELT(*deest* Π)   χρυσηλάκατον *p* M.
20 πόλις DELT(*deest* Π)   πόνος *p* πόλεις M.
267 ἕστασ' DELΠT   ἑστᾶσ' *p* M.
vi. 12 κοσμίσθην DELΠT   κοσμείσθην *p* κοσμήσθην M.

The list need not be continued beyond *Dion.* vii. 34, where L breaks off. DELΠT are thus descendants of an archetype (*x*) which is not that of M or *p*.[16a] We shall see later that ELΠT are the most exact representatives of this archetype; before proceeding to establish their position and value, we may examine D and several other MSS. which appear to belong to the *x* family.

D.

It will be shown afterwarde that *x* parts into two branches, ET (*a*) and LΠ (*b*). The following passages prove that D belongs to *b* rather than to *a*:—

Ap. 4 φαίδιμος ET   φαίδιμα LΠD.
20 τοι ET   τε LΠD.
38 νῆσος ET   νήσων LΠD.
ib. λιπαροτάτη ET   λιπαρωτάτη LΠD.
44 πετρήεσσα ETD   πετρήδεσ(σ)α LΠ.
51 κε θέλεις ET κ' ἐθέλεις D   κε θέλης Π κέλης L.
60 πεῖασ ET   πεῖαρ LΠ πεῖαρ D.
75 ἀδή οἱ E ἀδὴ οἶ T   ἀδῆ οἱ DL ἄδη οἱ Π.
76 ἀκηδέα ἄχη τεϊ λάων ET   ἀκηδέα χήτει λαῶν LΠD.
86 τε om. ETD   hab. LΠ.
88 σ' ἔξοχα ET   σέ γ' ἔξοχα LΠD.
96 om. ET   hab. LΠD.
128 ἀσπαίροντεσ ET   ἀσπαίροντα LΠD.
                                            βαμ
162 βαμβαλιαστὺν ET   κρεμβαλιαστὺν LΠ κρεμβαλιαστὺν D.
171 ἀφ' ὑμέων ET   ἀφ' ἡμέων LΠD.
176 ἐπειδὴ ET   ἐπιδὴ LΠ ἐπὶ δὴ D.
180 μήλιτον ET   μίλητον LΠD.
197 οὔτε λαχεῖα E(? T)   οὔτε λάχεια LΠD.
217 ἢ μαγνιήνας ET   ἢ μαγνηΐδας LΠD.
260 τελειέσσας ET   τεληέσσας LΠD.
261-89 om. ET   hab. LΠD.

Out of 21 variants in 300 lines, D agrees 3 times with ET, 18 times with LΠ. A continuation of the comparison would establish the same proportions. Plainly D was constructed on a basis of LΠ. It differs from them in the following points; I omit places in which D coincides with *p*.

[16a] I use *p* to denote the Paris family and its archetype (Hollander's π).

Ap. 41 this verse in D stands after v. 36. The eye of the scribe passed from ὄρος αἰπύ in 35 to ὄρος αἰπύ in 40.

60 πεῖαρ D πεῖασ ET πείαρ LΠ πῖαρ *p*.

72 ἀτιμήσω̇ D ἀτιμήσω *x*. The process of correcting D seems here displayed.[17]

74 κατα κράτος D κατὰ *x*. Cf. 71 where D (with NP) has το πρῶτον for τὸ πρῶτον of *x*.

83 ὅμωσεν D ὅμοσεν *x*. Evidently a correction to make metre.

114 ἴδμαθ' D ἴσμαθ' *x* (ἴσμαθ' *p*).

130 ἀθανάτοισι D ἀθανάτῃσι *x*.

223 ἴξας D ἴξες *x*.

402 ἐπεφράσσατο D ἐπιφράσσατο *x*.

514 ἀγατὸν D ...ατὸν *x*. This is the clearest case of conjecture in D.

540 τηΰσιόν γ' ἔπος D τηΰσιον ἔπος *x*.

Herm. 38 θάνοις D θάνῃς *x*. M also has θάνοις, but it was not available in Italy in the fifteenth century.

47 λαβὼν D and *x*. D in marg. γρ. ταμών. Cf. *Ap.* 72, another instance of the process of correction in D.

70 θέων D θεῶν *x*. Not an accidental difference, cf. Υ 53 θεῶν ἐπὶ καλλικολώνῃ, where θεῶν is Aristarchus' reading, θέων Herodian's and our MSS. are about equally divided. Cf. also Λ 503, νέων and νεῶν. *Dem.* 490 θέων of M is necessarily wrong.

99 σκοπιὴ D σκοπιὴν *x*.

100 μεγαμηδείαο D ; μεγαμηδείδ(ο)ιο LΠ, μεγαμηδείοιο ET. Here D seems closer to the ET branch.

103 ἤλαννον D ; ἵκανον cet. The effect of ἤλασεν before and ληνοὺς after ?

124 κατὰ στυφέλω D, κατα *x*. Cf. *Ap.* 71, 74.

151 εἰλυμένος D εἰλυμένος *x*.

186 ὀγχηστόνδ' D ὀγχηστόνδ' *x*.

238 ἀμφικαλύπτοι D ἀμφικαλύπτει *x*.

261 ἔειπες D ἔειπας *x*.

284 καθίσαι D καθίσσαι *x*.

289 πύματον καὶ ὕστατον D, πύματόν τε καὶ *x*.

425 δὲ λιγέως D δὲ λλιγέως *x*.

540 βούλεται D μήδεται *x*. Would seem an obvious conjecture, but cf. ξ 300 βούλετ' 'XD' for μήδετ', τ 326 βουλήν 'PU' for μῆτιν.

---

[17] The same correction seems to be found in T. Bethe *l.c.* p. 524 says 'ἀτιμήσω verbessert zu ἀτιμήσῃς [?].'

Aphr. 3 κατὰ θνητῶν D κατα *x*.

  13 σκύτινα D σάτινα *x*. Conjecture.

  22 ἐστίη D ἰστίη *x*. Cf. the contrary, *Hest.* xxix. 6, 11. ξ 159,

        τ 304 we have the same variant.

  118 χρυσηλακάτου D χρυσηλάτου *x*. Conjecture.

  174 ἦρε D $\begin{cases} βυρε\ a. \\ ηυρε\ b. \end{cases}$ A conjecture and not a happy one.

  203 ἐὸν D ἐνὸν *x*.

  205 τετιμένος D τετιμενόνος *x*.

  214 ἀγήραος D ἀγήρως *x*.

Ge xxx. 3 ὑπέρχεται D ἐπέρχεται *x*.

Hel. xxxi. 4 ἀγακλειτὴν D ἀγακλυτὴν *x*. A conjecture to help the metre, cf. *e.g.* I 165 κλητούς, κλειτούς, κλυτούς, E 491 al.

Diosc. xxxiii. 1 ἔσπετε D ἔσπετε *x*.

At.

In 1889, Prof. J. P. Mahaffy published in the *Athenaeum*, p. 631, an account of a MS. in the monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos, which contained the Homeric Hymns. The MS. did not include the Demeter-hymn, but still considerable hopes were excited by the discovery. These have been dissipated by the publication, in the *Classical Review*, October 1894, by Prof. Ingram Bywater of a collation of the MS. made by Prof. M. Constantinides. The facsimiles made by Mr. Constantinides, which Prof. Bywater had the kindness to show me, prove clearly, both from the writing and the style of illumination, that the Athos MS. is a specimen of an ordinary fifteenth-century book; and this coincides with Mr. Constantinides' description of the material, ἐπὶ χάρτου ἀρχαίου παρεμφεροῦς μεμβράνῃ. It is only in the fifteenth century that we find white glazed paper that looks like vellum.

This fifteenth century MS. closely resembles D, and (accordingly) its effect upon the text of the Hymns is limited to the immediate position of this MS. Its closeness to D may be judged from the following readings which the two have in common: *Ap.* 19 ὑπ' ἰνόποιο, 41 the line takes the place of 36, οἰσεῖς (with E), 372—4 om., 403 ἀνασείσασκε (with NV), *Herm.* 54 κονάβισε, 93 μηκέτι, 100 μεγαμηδείαο, 103 ἤλαυνον, 156 δέσε, 224 ἔστιν ὁμοῖα (with *p*), 420 γέλασε, 539 χρυσάραπι, 540 βούλεται, 572 δ' om., *Aphr.* 13 σκύτινα, 22 ἐστίη, 46 μιγημέναι, 174 ἦρε, 214 ἀγήραος, *Asclep.* xvi. 3 φλεγύος (with KN). The points in which it differs from D are unimportant; they are according to the collation as follows: *Ap.* 136—8, not added in marg., 147 ἰάγονες, 152 ἰάονες, 211 om. (accidental, cf. *p*), 217 μαγνηίας, 339 πόσοσον, 347 πολυάλιστοισι, 359 χώραν, 402 νοήσας, 468 ἐκγεάγασιν, 501 om. and in 500 νηόν for ἀείδειν, 509 δ' for τ', 522 τετιμημένος (with ΜΓ), 544 δὲ om., *Herm.* 5 ἠλαύνετ', 45 δυνηθῶσι (with *p*), 446 φηλητά (with *p*), *Aphr.* 203 ἥρπασε ὃν, 244 τάχα om., *Mus. Ap.* xxv. 1 Ζηνὸς for διὸς, *Hest.* xxix. 9, 10, after v. 11.

D and At therefore are copies of one archetype, and as commerce in Greek MSS. set Westwards and not Eastwards, we must suppose that this archetype was an Eastern Greek MS. and that D was copied from it in the Eastern world and exported to Italy. This archetype differed from the general x family, or more nearly from the branch b, in these points: (1) it omits the variants which we shall see belong to the family; (2) it exhibits certain readings which are not found in any other extant MS., and as it seems unlikely that the scribe had access to any different and now perished stock, are to be called conjectures. That is to say, the original of At D was a type of MS. intended to present a readable text of the author at the expense of tradition. In this respect it occupies an entirely different position from M, ELΠT and nearly all the p family. It resembles S, and approximates to the ed. pr. The critical faculty of the scribe was not great, far less than that of S, Γ, or of Demetrius Chalcondyles; he lets pass the palpable x corruption τυφλόν Ap. 306, and but few of his corrections are acceptable.

HJK

D or some MS. very like it has itself descendants, and these may next be disposed of. They are H (Harley 1752), J (Estense ii. B 14), K (Laur. 31, 32). That these belong to the general family x is proved by these passages where (H)JK agree with x against m p:

Art. ix. 3 μελήτης HJK x (and L$_3$)	μιλήτης p μέλητος m.
Mat. de. xiv. 3 τρόμος HJK x	βρόμος m p.
Apoll. 35 αὐτοκανὴς HJK x	αὐτοκάνης p (*deest* M).
ib. 59 full line HJK x	half line p (*deest* M).

and by these where (H)JK agree with x and m (with the latter of which they can have had no direct connexion) against p:

Ares viii. 9 εὐθαρσέος HJK x m	εὐθαλέος p y.[17a]
Mat. de. xiv. 3 τυμπάνων HJK x m	τυπάνων p.
Ap. 78 ἀκηδέα χήτει λαῶν JK (*deest* H) m x	ἕκαστά τε φῦλα ϝεπούδων p.
152 οἳ τότ' ἐπ' JK (*deest* H) m x	οἳ δή ποτ' ἐπ- p.
162 κρεμβαλιαστὴν JK (*deest* H) m ⎫ κρεμβαλιαστὺν x ⎬	κρεμβαλιασὺν p.

The difference between x and JK is only of itacism.

Ap. 172 ἡμέων JK (*deest* H) m x (ὑμέων E)	ὑμῶν p.
176 ἐπιδὴ JK (*deest* H) x ἐπειδὴ m	ἐπιδὴν p.

That HJK are more nearly descended from D appears from the following passages:

[17a] By y I designate the marginalia of x.

Asclep. xvi. 3 φλεγύος DK ⎱
　　　　　φλεγέος HJ ⎰ 　　　　φλεγύου x p (φλεγύος N).

Ap. 41, after v. 35 DHJK 　　　　after v. 40, cet.

　49 ἐβήσατο DK ⎱
　　βήσατο HJ ⎰ 　　　　ἐβήσετο cet. (ἐβήσσατο L).

　60 πεῖαρ DJK 　　　　πεῖαρ x, πῖαρ p.

　　　　　η
　72 ἀτιμήσω D 　　　　ἀτιμήσω x ἀτιμήσας p.
　　ἀτιμήσῃ JK (K in ras.)

Here J seems to have followed the correction of D, K to have followed the text of D and then to have been altered to the correction.

Ap. 83 ὄμωσεν DK ⎱
　　γρ. ὄμωσεν 　　⎬ 　　ὄμοσ(σ)εν x p.
　　ὄμοσσεν J 　　⎰

Here contrariwise K follows D, J follows the vulgate reading but is corrected into the reading of D.

　　　　　　　　　　　　δ　　　　δ
Ap. 114 ἴδμαθ' DJK 　　ἴσμαθ' x (ἴσμαθ' Π) ἴσθμαθ' p.

The close connexion between H, J and K is shown by their fragmentariness, and by the curious order of the Hymns (viii.—xviii. *Ap.* 1—186) that they contain; their archetype, which intervened between them and D, must have consisted of a few gathers, survivors of some more complete MS., bound up in a wrong order. The half-verse *Ap.* 186 ἔνθεν δὲ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον may have been the catch-word or guard of the quire with which the archetype ended. The copyists incorporated this morsel in their texts. How v. 185 came to be omitted, and v. 184 written after this catchword, does not appear.

The various members of the family differ amongst themselves, and if the variants in the original D are due to conjecture, much more so are these in its descendants. They are, in H,

Ares viii. 4 θέμιστα H 　　　　θέμιστος cet.
　Ap. 46 οἱ H (. . οι T) 　　σοι cet.

in J

Ap. 57 ἀγινήσουσ' J 　　　　ἀγίνουσιν S ed. pr. ἀγινήσουσιν cet.
　59 δὴ ῥὰ θεοὶ κε σ' ἔχωσι J 　δὴ ῥὰ om. cet.
　65 γενοίμην J cum p S 　　γ' ἐροίμην x cum K.
　70 αἰνῶς γε J 　　　　γε om. cet.
　74 ἄλλυδις J 　　　　ἄλις cet.
　82 ἔσται, γρ. J (cum m) 　　ἐστίν cet.
　86 πέλεται, om. τε J 　　πέλει cet. (om. τε DET ed. pr.).
Ap. 139 γ' ἀνθέει οὔρεος ἄνθεσιν
　　　　ὕλη J 　　　　τε ῥίον οὔρεος ἄνθεσιν ὕλης cet.
　151 ἄνδρας J 　　　　ἀνὴρ K x αἰεὶ m y p.

Of these ἀγινήσουσ' and ἔσται are excellent original conjectures, γενοίμην is an easy correction of the ρ of x.

Two of the family possess common variants in

Dem. xiii. 1 δημήτρ' HJ   δημήτηρ KET (δημήτηρ Π) δημήτερ' D p.
    Ap. 31 κυδνὴ add. HJ   om. K cet.

This variant I cannot explain, unless it is a relic ot ναυσικλειτή.
                                                          κλυτή

    39 κουρίκου H ⎫
       κουρύκου J ⎭   κορύκου K x κωρύκου, p.

    51 κ'ἐθέλοις H ⎫
       κεθέλοις J ⎬   κ' ἐθέλεις KD κεθέλεις ET p κεθέλης ⅬΠ.

    55 οἴσεις HJ   οἰσεῖς E p οἰστεῖς ⅬΠΤ (def. M).

    158 ἂν HJ   ἂρ cet.

Traces of the conjectures ot J appear in K.

Ap. 65 γενοίμην J γενοι K m. 2.
Ap. 151 ἄνδρας J, K m. 2, and cf. 72.

Lastly all three MSS. differ from D in reading

    ἐπὶ for ἐνὶ D Ap. 52.
    ὑπ' οἰνώποιο for ὑπ' ἰνόποιο D Ap. 18.

S.

S (Vat. 1880) is a fragment of eight pages, the first gather of a fifteenth century MS. That it belongs in stock to x appears from the following passages :

Ap.	22 ἆδον S x	ἄδον M p ἄδον Γ.
	35 ἀντοκανὴς S x	αὐτοκάνης p (def. M).
	46 σοι S x	om. p (def. M).
	59 full line S x	half-line p (def. M).
	73 ὤσει S x	ὤση p.
	75 ἀδήοί S ἀδῆυί x	ἀδοίη p.
	78 ἀκηδέα χήτει λαῶν S x	ἔκαστά τε φῦλα νεπούδων p.
	129 δέσματ' S K δεσμάτ' x M	δεσμάσ' p.
136, 7, 8 hab. S Π; in marg. x		om. M p.
	152 οἱ τότ' S x M	οἱ δή ποτ' p.
	162 κρεμβαλιαστὺν S x ⎫ κρεμβαλιασὴν MJK ⎭	κρεμβαλιασὺν p.
	176 ἐπειδὴ SME ἐπιδὴ x	ἐπιδὴν p.
	197 οὔτε λάχεια S x οὔτε λαχεῖα ME	οὔτ' ἐλάχεια p.
	211 ἐρευθεῖ S x ἐρεχθεῖ M	vers. om. p.
	272 προάγοιεν S x	προσάγοιεν M p.
	274 δέξαι S M x	δέξαιο p.

Next there are several places in which S agrees with p against x; although it seems more likely that they also are pure conjectures on the part of S, still it might be maintained that they were taken from a member of the p class. I therefore give them apart:—

$Ap.$	3	ἐπισχεδὸν S p	ἐπὶ σχεδὸν x.
	65	περὶ τιμήεσσα S p	περιτιμήεσσα x.
	ib.	γενοίμην S p	γ᾽ ἐροίμην x.
	83	ὄμοσσεν S p	ὄμοσεν x.
	114	ἴσθμαθ᾽ S p	ἴσμαθ᾽ x.
	151	αἰεὶ S p	ἀνὴρ x.
	306	τυφάονα S p	τυφλόν x.

In some other places S coincides with HJK or a member of p, e.g.

$Ap.$ 30 ὅσσους S A ὅ̇σους E ὅσους cet.

51 κ᾽ ἐθέλοις S H κε θέλοις J κεθέλεις and κεθέλης cet.

53 ἄλλως S J ἄλλος cet.

59 δηρὸν ἄνακτ᾽ εἰ βόσκοις θεοὶ κε σ᾽ ἔχωσι S. The nearest is J's δηρὸν ἄνακτ᾽ εἰ βόσκεις· δὴ ῥά θεοὶ κε σ᾽ ἔχωσι, and this is the only other MS. that has the accusative ἄνακτ᾽.

72 ἀτιμήσῃ S J ἀτιμήσω̇ D ἀτιμήσω corr. in η K $\begin{cases} ἀτιμήσω \ x. \\ ἀτιμήσας \ p. \end{cases}$

88 σε ἔξοχα S J σ᾽ ἔξοχα E T σε γ᾽ ἔξοχα S correctus, cet.

129 δέσματ᾽ S K (δεσματ᾽ J) δεσμάτ᾽ M x δεσμάσ᾽ p.

139 ὅτε ῥίον S ὅτε ῥρίον D ὅτε τε ῥιον or ῥρίον cet.

The list however is more important of readings that are found in S only:—

$Ap.$ 18 ὑπ᾽ ἰνώποιο S ; the nearest is M's ὑπὶ νώποιο.

44 ῥήναιά S ; the rest accent ῥηναία.

53 λήσει̇ S ; λίσσει cet.

54 εὔβωλο σε ἔσεσθαι S εὔβων or εὔβουν σε ἔσεσθαι cet.

57 ἀγίνουσιν S ἀγινήσουσ᾽ J ἀγινήσουσιν cet.

128 ἔσχον S ἴσχον cet.

165 ἀλλ᾽ ἄγεθ᾽ ἰλήκοι S (cum Thuc.) ἀλλὰ γε λητὼ M ἀλλάγε δὴ λητὼ cet.

209 ὁππότ᾽ ἀνωόμενος S ὁππόταν ἱέμενος M ὄππότ᾽ ἀνωόμενος cet.

216 πιερίην S (πετρίην M) πιερίης x πιερίη p.

234 κείν᾽ S κεῖν᾽ cet.

297. υἱέες ἐργίνου S υἱέε σεργίνου cet.

There being, as in the case of D, no other source existing from which different readings might be drawn, one must call these variants conjecture

of the scribe of S; and it must be admitted that he was a scholar of unusual attainments and penetration. Of all the *anonymi* that have dealt with the Hymns the second hand of Γ alone is comparable to him. The mutilated form of the variants vv. 54 εὔβωλο and 325 ἤ might suggest that they were not original to S but were copied from its archetype. At 165 we see the Thucydidean original reappear; naturally there can be no question of a survival of the genuine tradition; the scribe either took the reading from the text of Thucydides or conjectured it independently. I do not know which is the more probable hypothesis. It is to be noticed that in the other case of corruption in the passage quoted by Thucydides, 171, S does not revert to the Thucydidean ἀφήμως, but reads with Ep ἀφ' ὑμέων.

S then belongs to the *x* stock, but omits the *y* variants and presents a corrected text. Like D it was a copy intended for current reading, and the rough places in the text were intentionally smoothed over. This character, of D and S, is the result of our comparison and inference; the two MSS. find an analogy in a contemporary recension where the aim of polishing the text is avowed, and the name of the reviser known—the first printed edition.

ED. PR.

This was published in Florence in the year 1488, in two volumes, the first of which contains the Iliad, the second the Odyssey and Hymns. For a description of the book see Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique* i. p. 9 *sq.* The subscription, at the end of the Hymns, names Bernardo and Nerio Nerli to whose munificence, and Demetrius of Milan the Cretan to whose labour and skill, the edition was due; the latter according to Legrand, p. 10, was the printer. The name of the editor, to whom the scientific merit of the edition is owing, is given by Bernardo Nerli in the Latin dedication to Piero dei Medici [18] prefixed to the first volume: *Nam ut omittam Nerii fratris liberalitatem: et Ioannis Accaioli auxilium: Demetriique Cretensis dexteritatem: id inprimis mihi oportunum fuit: maximeque optatum: quod ad hanc rem Demetrium Chalcondylem Atheniensem nactus eram: Virum profecto tempestate nostra doctissimum: preceptoremque meum: a quo huiusmodi opus accuratissime recognosci posset. Perdifficile enim mihi videbatur sine eruditissimo viro id operis castigatissimum emendatissimumque fieri posse. Itaque ex illius consilio Homerum ut vetustate primum: ita etiam divino quodam ingenio summum poetam: ac litterarum fontem elegi: qui quidem ob incuriam atque negligentiam librariorum ita sui dissimilis videbatur: ut in nullo fere codice quamvis perveteri integer agnosceretur. Quamobrem eruditissimi sane viri opera; qualem Demetrium nactus est: summopere indigebat: qui et amore quo me non mediocri prosequitur: et communis utilitatis gratia maxime adductus ipsa Homeri opera singulari diligentia summoque studio cum Eustathii commentariis conferens examinavit: atque emendavit:......*The life of Demetrius Chalcondyles may be read in Legrand i. p. xciv. *sq.* He had been at this time some sixteen

---

[18] The unfortunate son of Lorenzo, killed in 1503 near the mouth of the Garigliano, and whose   tomb is at Monte Cassino. The Anthology also was dedicated to him (1494).

years public teacher of Greek at Florence, having succeeded Argyropoulos in 1471. Other books in which he appears as editor are the Isocrates of 1493, printed at Milan (Legrand i. p. 16) and the Suidas of 1499 also printed at Milan (*ib*. p. 63). For a specimen of his work as a scribe, see Omont, *Fac-similés des Manuscrits Grecs des XVe. et XVIe. siècles*, plate 16. To Homer Demetrius prefixes an address to the reader, following the dedication of Nerli, in which the essential passages are the following :......καλόν τε καὶ τέλειον πάντη τὸ ἔργον ἀπετέλεσαν· τῆς δυνατῆς καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν διορθώσεως τετυχηκὸς· σφόδρα γὰρ ἡμῖν πλειόνων ἕνεκα διὰ σπουδῆς ἐγένετο, ἐφ' ὅσον οἷόν τε ἦν διορθώσασθαι τά τε ὁμήρου ποιήματα προσχρησαμένοις καὶ τοῖς εὐσταθίου ὑπομνήμασι, καὶ τὰ τῶν συγγραφέων περὶ αὐτοῦ πεποιημένα· εἰ δέ τι καὶ διέφυγεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τοσαύτῃ πραγματείᾳ, συγγνώμης ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν εὐγνωμόνως κρίνειν ἐθελόντων δικαίως ἀξιοῖτο· καὶ μάλιστα ἐφ' οἷς ἡ οὐδαμοῦ ἢ ἐν κομιδῇ ὀλίγοις, οὔτε ἡ τῶν λεγομένων ἔννοια οὔτε μὴν ἡ ἀκολουθία ἐλλέλειπται. ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἄρα, ἔν γε ὀρθογραφία ἔστιν οὗ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ μέτρου ἀπαρτίσῃ εἴη ἄν τι τυχὸν ἐλλιπὲς· τὸ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν τὰ γράμματα συντιθέντων, τὸ δέ τι καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν παροφθέν· δεῖ μέντοι μὴ ἀγνοεῖν ὡς ἔν τε τῇ βατραχομυομαχίᾳ καὶ τοῖς ὕμνοις ἐνιαχοῦ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφθορὰν, οὔτε ὁ τῶν ἐπῶν εἱρμὸς οὔτε μὴν τὸ τῆς διανοίας ὑγιὲς ἀπαρτίζεται· παραπλησίως δὲ κἂν τῷ δίωνος συγγράμματι. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τά τε τῆς βατραχομυομαχίας καὶ τῶν ὕμνων ὁλόκληρά γε τυγχάνοντα, οὐ φαύλως ἴσως ἂν εἶχε· διεφθαρμένα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ τοσούτου χρόνου καὶ τῆς περὶ ταῦτα τῶν λογίων ἀμελείας, οὐκ ἂν πολλὴν τὴν ζημίαν ἐπιφέροιεν τοῖς φιλομαθέσι· τὰ δὲ ὑφ' ἡμῶν παροφθέντα κἂν ὁ βραχέα πεπαιδευμένος ἐν τούτοις οὐ χαλεπῶς συνίδοι. That is to say, Demetrius explains that he has made a recension, διόρθωσις, of the poem, assisted (for the Iliad and Odyssey) by the commentaries of Eustathius and the works of other (Byzantine) writers. He apologizes for errors and oversights, where tradition has lost both the meaning of words and the construction of sentences, and for mistakes in spelling and metre, due partly to the printers, partly to himself; in particular, in the Hymns and the Batrachomyomachia the badness of the MSS. has caused here and there the loss of the connexion of the lines and the soundness of the sense. We expect therefore to find an eclectic text, with the tradition improved in many places, left as it stands in others for want of a remedy.

The class of MSS. that Chalcondyles took as the foundation for his text is clear from the following passages (M, being still in the East, naturally does not enter into the question) :—

Ap. 39	κορύκου ed. pr. *x*	κωρύκου, *p*.
46	σοι hab. ed. pr. *x*	om. *p*.
59	full line ed. pr. *x*	half line, *p*.
65	γ' ἐροίμην ed pr. *x*	γενοίμην, *p*.
71	ἴδης ed. pr. *x*	ἴδη, *p*.
73	ὥσει ed. pr. *x*	ὥση, *p*.
74	κράτος ed. pr. *x*	κρατὸς, *p*.

Ap. 75 ἀδῆοί ed. pr. ἀδήοί etc. *x*   ἀδοίη, *p.*

   78 ἀκηδέα χήτει λαῶν ed. pr. *x*   ἕκαστά τε φῦλα νεπούδων, *p.*

  114 ἴσμαθ' ed. pr. *x*   ἴσθμαθ, *p.*

  129 δεσμάτ' ed. pr. *x*   δεσμά σ', *p.*

  136, 7, 8 hab. ed. pr. hab. in marg. *x*   om. *p.*

  151 ἀνὴρ ed. pr. *x*   αἰεὶ, *p.*

  152 οἳ τότ' ἐπαντία ed. pr. *x*   οἳ δή ποτ' ἐπαντία, *p.*

  174 ἡμέτερον ed. pr. *x*   ὑμέτερον, *p.*

  176 ἐπιδὴ ed. pr. *x*   ἐπιδὴν, *p.*

  197 οὔτε λάχεια ed. pr. *x*   οὔτ' ἐλάχεια, *p.*

  211 ἐρευθεῖ ed. pr. *x*   om. *p.*

  216 πιερίης ed. pr. *x*   πιερίη, *p.*

  224 τευμησσὸν ed. pr. *x*   τελμησσὸν, *p.*

  227 πώποτε ed. pr. *x·*   πωτότε, *p.*

  237 πρώτιστ' ed. pr. *x*   πρώτισθ', *p.*

  272 προάγοιεν ed. pr. *x*   προσάγοιεν, *p.*

  274 δέξαι ed. pr. *x*   δέξαιο, *p.*

  284 ὑποκρέμαται ed. pr. *x*   ἐπικρέμαται, *p.*

  291 οἵδ' ed. pr. *x*   ἠδ', *p.*

  292 τῆσιν ed. pr. *x*   τοῖσιν, *p.*

  304 ταναύποδ' ed. pr. *x*   τανύποδ', *p.*

  328 αἰσχύνας ed. pr. *x*   αἰσχύνασ', *p.*

  525 τῶν ed. pr. *x*   τὸν, *p.*

  538 τε ed. pr. *x*   δὲ, *p.*

Herm. 1 ὕμνεῖ ed. pr. *x*   ὕμνει, *p.*

   45 αἳ ὅτε ed. pr. *x*   ἃς ὅτε, *p.*

   59 ὄνομα κλυτὸν ed. pr. *x*   ὀνομακλυτὴν, *p.*

   72 ἀκειρασίους ed. pr. *x*   ἀκηρασίους, *p.*

   86 αὐτοπρεπὴς ὣς ed. pr. *x*   αὐτοτροπήσας, *p.*

  119 αἰῶνας ed. pr. *x*   αἰῶνος, *p.*

  152 περ' ἰγνύσι ed. pr. *x*   παρ' ἰγνύσι, *p.*

  159 φιλητεύσειν ed. pr. *x*   φηλητεύσειν, *p.*

                              λι
  168 ἄπαστοι ed. pr. *x*   ἄπαστοι, *p.*

  224 ἔστιν ὁμοῖα ed. pr. *x*   ἔλπομαι οἶναι, *p.*

  232 ταναύποδα ed. pr. *x*   τανύποδα, *p.*

  303 οἰωνοῖς· εὖ ed. pr. οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ *x*   οἰωνοῖσι· σὺ, *p.*

  313 ἐρέεινεν ed. pr. *x*   ἐρέεινον, *p.*

  342 δοιὰ ed. pr. *x*   δια, *p.*

  356 κατέρεξε ed. pr. *x*   κατέερξε, *p.*

  397 σπεύδοντο ed. pr. *x*   σπεύδοντε, *p.*

  398 δ' ἐπ' ed. pr. *x*   ἐπ', *p.*

  519 ὄμβριμον ed. pr. *x*   ὄβριμον, *p.*

  560 θυίσωσι ed. pr. *x*   θύσωσι, *p.*

Aphr. vi. 7 εὔτικτον ed. pr. *x*   εὔτυκτον, *p.*

   12 κοσμίσθην ed. pr. *x*   κοσμείσθην, *p.*

Dion. vii. 39 κατεκριμνῶντο ed. pr. *x*	κατεκρημνῶντο, *p*.
Ares viii. 9 εὐθαρσέος ed. pr. *x*	εὐθαλέος, *p*.
Art. ix. 3 μελήτης ed. pr. *x*	μιλήτης, *p*.
Mat. de. xiv. 3 τρόμος ed. pr. *x*	βρόμος, *p*.
Pan xix. 7 κάρηνα ed. pr. *x*	κέλευθα, *p*.
26 θαλέων ed. pr. *x*	θαλέθων, *p*.

Chalcondyles thus showed his judgment by selecting the *x* family, the excellence of which has only of late years been definitely recognized, for his basis; he did not however follow any of the nearest representatives of the original (ELΠT). He required an authority that did not offer alternative readings, or flagrant impossibilities in the text; he therefore had recourse to a corrected member of the family, namely D, or a MS. very like it. This appears from the following places in which D and ed. pr. coincide :—

Ap. 51 κ' ἐθέλεις (κε θέλεις ET, κε θέλης LΠ).
    60 πεῖαρ (πείαρ LΠ, πεῖας ET).
    72 ἀτιμήσῃ, ἀτιμήσω̇ D (ἀτιμήσω ELΠT).
    74 κατα (κατὰ *x*).
   130 ἀθανάτοισι (ἀθανάτῃσι *x*).
   402 ἐπεφράσσατο (ἐπιφράσσατο *x*).
   515 ἀγατὸν (...ατὸν *x*).
   540 γ' ἔπος (ἔπος *x*).
Herm. 11 μεῖς (μεὶς *x*).
    38 θάνῃς (θάνοις *x*).
    70 θέων (θεῶν *x*).
  100 μεγαμηδείαο (μεγαμηδείοιο ET; μεγαμηδείδ(ο)ιο LΠ).
  124 κατὰ (κατα *x*).
  224 ἔστιν ὁμοῖα (ἤστιν Π, ἤστην E).
  238 ἀμφικαλύπτει (ἀμφικαλύπτοι *x*).
  261 ἔειπες (ἔειπας *x*).
  289 om. τε (hab. *x*).
Aphr. 118 χρυσηλακάτου (χρυσηλάτου *x*).
  174 ἦρε (ηυρε *x*).
  203 ἥρπασ' ἑὸν (ἐνὸν *x*).
Terra xxx. 3 ὑπέρχεται (ἐπέρχεται *x*).
Sol xxxi. 4 ἀγακλειτὴν (ἀγακλυτὴν *x*).

Or perhaps it would be more correct to say that D is one among several manuscripts that Chalcondyles consulted, and whose readings he sometimes prefers to those of ELΠT. At all events, the ed. pr. not unfrequently coincides with other extant MSS., as in the following passages. M, as already noticed, is put out of consideration.

Ap. Title : ομηρου υμνοι εις απολλωνα. So exactly only Π.
  18 ὑπ' ἰνώποιο. So exactly only S.
  25 ἢ ὥς (ἤ ὡς A, rough breathing apparently erased).

Ap.   57 ἀγίνουσιν with S.

         59 δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκεις· θεοὶ κέ σ᾽ ἔχωσιν; so exactly DΠ.

         82 ἐπειὴ with J.

         136, 7, 8 hab. in text.   SΠ, though only by accident in Π.

         210 ἐλατιονίδη with EB.

         223 ἴξας cum DS.

         230 ἴξες cum S.

         233 οἱ δὲ cum p (οὐ δὲ x).

         244 ἄδε cum S p (ᾶδε x).

         259 ἀνθρώποις cum p (ἀνθρώποισι x).

         297 υἱέες ἐργίνου cum S.

         306 τυφάονα cum S p.

         322 ἔτι μήσεαι cum p (ἔτι om. x).

         326 καὶ νῦν τοι γὰρ cum p.

Herm. 138 ἐπεί τοι cum A (ἐπεὶ x).

         254 λίκνῳ cum p y (κλίνῃ x).

         322 ἵκοντο κάρηνα cum p y (τέρθρον ἵκοντο x).

Aphr. 16 χρυσηλάκατον cum p.

Dion. vii. 8 ἦγε cum p.

It is possible that some of these apparent agreements with MSS. may be mere conjectures on the part of Chalcondyles, but according to strict method it would be improper to call them so.   The following readings however, for which no other authority can be quoted (except M in the East, and the second hand of Γ, the latter very possibly drawn from the printed book), may be fairly called Chalcondyles' own editorial contribution.

Ap. 63 μὲν	κεν cet.	
93 ῥείη	ῥέη cet.	
96 μεγάροισι	μεγάροις cet.	
220 ἄδε	ἁδε cet.	
223 ἀπ᾽	ἐπ᾽ cet.	
317 in marg. λείπει		
318 ἔμβαλον	ἔμβαλεν.	
325 ἦν ἀρ	ἤρὲν or ἤρὲν cet. ἦ ''ἀρ S seems to point to the same conjecture.	
339 ἦ ὄσσον	ἦ πόσσον x, ἦ παρόσον p.	
361 καὶ ἔνθα om.	this is perhaps one of the printer's mistakes to which he alludes.	
392 νῆα θοὴν	ἠμαθόην cet.	
407 οἳ τὰ πρῶτα	τὰ πρῶτα cet.	
411 ἴξον	ἴξον cet.	
414 ἠδ᾽	ἠδ᾽ cet.	
419 παρὲκ	παρεκ cet.	
450 χαίτη	χαίτης cet.	
452 τίνες	πόθεν cet.	
502 ἔφαθ᾽	ἔφατ᾽ cet.	

Herm. 65	ἆλτο	ὦρτο cet.
94	φὰς συνέσευε	φασὶν ἔσευε cet.
175	φιλητεύων	δὲ φιλητεύων cet.
214	φηλητὴν	φιλητὴν *x*, φηλωτὴν *p*.
236	χωόμενος	χωόμενον cet.

Perhaps another printer's error.

292	φηλητέων	φιλητέων *x*, φηλιτέων *p*.
303	οἰωνοῖς· εὖ	οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ *x*, οἰωνοῖσι σὺ *p*
400	ἀτάλλετο	ἀτιτάλλετο cet.
474	αὐτάγρετόν	αὐτ' ἄγρετόν cet.
482	ἄρ'	ἂν cet.
491	αὖ	αὐτ' cet.
533	ἐρεείνης	ἐρεείνεις cet.
Aphr. 20	πτόλις	πόλις *x*, πόνος *p*.
39	καταθνητῆσι	κατὰ cet. Cf. 50, 51, 52.
229	καὶ εὐγενέος	εὐγενέος cet.
Dion. vii. 13	λύγοι	λυδοὶ cet.
Pan xix. 31	κυλληνίον	κυλληνίου cet. Another printer's error.
Poseid. xxii. 3	αἰγὰς	αἶγας cet.
Ge xxx. 15	παίζουσαι	παίζουσι cet.

Of these conjectures of Demetrius several were found in M on its discovery in 1780, viz. *Ap.* 223 ἀπ', 318 ἔμβαλον, 392 νῆα θοὴν (though only in a late hand), 502 ἔφαθ', *Herm.* 65 ἆλτο, and these all are correct, though ἆλτο on *Herm.* 65 has probably no stronger position than that of an independent variant.

These also are correct, though no MS. evidence has since been found to support them : *Ap.* 93 ῥείη, 96 μεγάροισι, 220 ἄδε, 317 the marginal remark λείπει coincides with the judgment of most modern editors, 325 ἦν ἀρ, 411 ἷξον, 419 παρὲκ, 452 τίνες, *Herm.* 94 φὰς συνέσευε, 214 φηλητὴν, 292 φηλητέων, 400 ἀτάλλετο, 474 αὐτάγρετόν, *Aphr.* 20 πτόλις, 39 καταθνητῆσι and other forms of καταθνητός, *Dionys.* vii. 13 λύγοι, *Posid.* xxii. 3 αἰγάς, *Ge* xxx. 15 παίζουσαι.

The following appear to be incorrect: *Ap.* 63 μέν for κεν which is demanded by grammar ; 339 ἦ ὅσσον, where the real reading is quite uncertain ; Demetrius seems right in deserting the πόσσον and παρόσον which his MSS. offered him.   407 οἳ τὰ πρῶτα ; here M shows πρώτιστα to be the original ; Dem. sought to emend the unmetrical πρῶτα of his MSS. by inserting οἵ.   414 ἤδ', perhaps a printer's mistake.   450 χαίτη, probably because he did not recognize a dative in the MS. χαίτης.   *Herm.* 175 φιλητεύων, perhaps intended for φηλητέων as he corrects 214, 292 ; at least he is right in omitting the δὲ of the MSS. ; 303 οἰωνοῖς· εὖ, which at least is an improvement on the unmetrical οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ.   482 ἄρ' for ἂν, 491 αὖ for αὐτ', 533 ἐρεείνης.   *Aphr.* 229 καὶ εὐγενέος ; an attempt to correct the unmetrical MS. εὐγενέος ; M shows the real reading to be εὐηγενέος ; the case is parallel to *Ap.* 407.

With a total of some **33** conjectures, of which **23** are certain, the first editor of the Hymns brought a very solid contribution towards the restitution of his author's text; and when we consider that Stephanus' corrections were clerical, and that most of Joshua Barnes' suggestions that deserve consideration are taken up with introducing parallel phrases from the Iliad and Odyssey, it may be said without hesitation that Demetrius has, to find his equal as an editor, to wait for Ruhnken.

To recapitulate the results up to this point, we see that these MSS. which appeared generally to belong to the x family, viz. AtDHJKS and the MS. basis of the ed. pr., do not exhibit the influence of any other stock of tradition, unless in the ed. pr. we may recognize traces of the other family p. The variants between these MSS. and ELIIT, the principal representatives of x, are seen to be due to conjecture. When therefore we proceed to investigate the relations of ELIIT [19] and to reconstitute their archetype, we may leave out of account AtDHJKS.

---

[19] Errata in the readings of E and J given in Mr. Goodwin's edition.

Apoll. Title εἰς ἀπόλλωνα ιβ J ^{os}
3 ἐπισχεδὸν J.
36 ἐϋκτισμένη E.
51 κεθέλοις J.
53 ἄλλως J.
58 ἐνθάδε γ' ἀρόμενοι J.
59 in marg. οἴ ex οἱ E.
61 φᾶτο E.
65 γενοίμην J.
68 δε E.
71 τὸ J.
ib. after ἴδης for E *read* D.
72 ἀτιμήσῃ J.
ib. ἐπείη E.
73 ὥσει J.
75 ἀδή οἱ E.
77 φῶκαι τὲ E.
79 for ὀμόσσας *read* ὀμόσσαι.
ib. εἰ E.
82 ἐπειὴ J.
83 instead of ὄμωσον margo J *read* ὄμοσσεν J. γρ. ὄμωσεν
86 τε om. J.
ib. πέλεται J.
94 ἄλλαί τε, ἦτε for ἰχναίη τε J.
101 τέξασθαι J.
102 προὔπεμψαν E.
ib. ἐϋκτισμένης E.
105 ἤνωγεν E.
112 ἔχοντες E.
114 ἴσμαθ' not ἴσθμαθ' E.
119 ἄπασσαι E.
128 σε E.
ib. ἀσπέροντα J.

134 αἴδ' E.
135 ἄπασσα E.
136 sq. σῇ ἐν ἑτέρῳ κεῖνται καὶ οὗτοι οἱ στίχοι; the mark *ss* is prefixed to the three vv. E.
141 βήσαο J.
156 ὅου E.
166 χ' pro δ' J.
172 ἐν E.
176 οἴδ' J.
188 κίθαρεις E.
208 μνηστῆρσῖν E.
210 ἐλατιονίδη E.
211 ἐρευθεῖ not ἐρωθεῖ E. Valla's εν is very straggling and like a large ω; but the matter is settled by the word ἐρευθεὺς in the marg., where both syllables are represented by the sign in question.
213 ὅδ' E.
226 πω, and ἐν E.
235 ἄγῃσιν not ἀγῇσιν E.
238 δε E.
240 ἂρ E.
248 οἴ τέ E.
256 εἶπε τε E.
291 οἴδ' E, and τὲ E.
292 τῆσιν E.
304 ταναύποδ' E.
307 ἂρ E.
309 ἤδ' E.
311 πᾶσαι E.
312 ὡς ἐμ' E.
313 κεδν' E.
320 κόμισεν E.
325 ἤρ' E.
325a γρ. καὶ E.
326 καὶ νῦν μὲν τοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ E.

ELΠT.

An inspection of the variants of these four MSS. shows at once that they fall into two groups, ET and LΠ; *e.g.*

Ap. 4	φαίδιμος ET	φαίδιμα LΠ.
38	νῆσος ET	νήσων LΠ.
ib.	λιπαροτάτη ET	λιπαρωτάτη LΠ.
44	πετρήεσσα ET	πετρήδε(σ)σα LΠ.
51	κε θέλεις ET	κε(θέ)λης LΠ.
	θ	
59	περίτας ET	om. LΠ.
60	πεῖας ET	πείαρ LΠ.
75	οἱ ET	οἱ LΠ.
78	ἄχη τεϊλάων ET	-α χήτει λάων LΠ.

329 ἀπο E.
331 ἀπὸ E.
335 τιτῆνεσ E.
347 ἤγ' E.
348 ἱεροῖσ E.
351 ἤδ' E.
355 πολλ' E.
356 φέρεσκε E.
357 πρὶν γε E.
358 ἤδ' E.
362 βοτιανείρη E.
367 τι E.
375 ἐπὶ in the text is a misprint.
376 καλλίροος E.
386 εὐχετόωντϊ E.
       ἤν
392 ἠμαθό' (*i.e.* ο) E.
393 κνώσσου E.
403 ἀνασσείσασ κε E.
410 παρ E.
412 τὲ E.
428 ὑπ'ἐκ E.
439 ἤδ' E.
ib. ἐσ ex ἐλ [λιμέν'] E.
441 ἄπο E.
445 αἵδ' E.
447 ῥριπῆς E.
454 οἷα E.
463 ηὕδα E.
476 οὐ ' E.
495 ὃ E.
499 ἔρον E.
513 ἔντο E.
516 οἱ E.
       ζάθεον
523 δεῖξε δ' ἄγων ἄδυτον ζάθεον E. ζάθεον above the line is in Valla's hand, much smaller than he rest.

525 ἀν' E.
526 ηὕδα E.
533 τὲ E.
Herm. 13 τότε γείνατο E.
  42 αἰῶν E.
      η
111 πυρία E.
119 correct this to διαιῶνας M δι'αἰῶνάς DELΠ
       α
    δι'αἰῶνος Γ δι'αἰῶνος Parisienses.
143 ὄρθρια E.
158 διεκ E.
163 τιτύσκεαι E.
171 πολυληΐϊλον E.
232 ταναύποδα E.
233 λάϊον E.
241 marg. ἡδύ E.
259 ἐρήεις E (as L).
      ρ
269 πόθου E.
303 ταύτοις E.
394 ὄπτη E.
426 ἔπετο E.
Aphr. 61 χρίσαν E.
  74 συνδύο E.
113 *read* ἡμετέρην pro ὑμετέρην E.
134 κεδν' E.
167 θεὰ E.
168 αὐλΐφν as printed is really αὐλίον with ο crossed out.
        κ
Aphr. x. 1 ἐυπρογενῆ E, with ἐ crossed out.
Mat. de. xiv. 3 τυμπάνων J.
  ib. τυπάνα in E marg. is by Valla, not 'a man. rec.'
Pan xix. 46 δ' ὀμβάκχειος E.
  48 ἱλάσομαι with one σ E.

86 τε om. ET | hab. LII.
88 σ' ἔξοχα ET | σέ γ' ἔξοχα LII.
96 om. ET | hab. LII.
102 ἐϋκτισμένης ET | ἐυκτιμένης LII.
128 ἀσπαίροντες ET | ἀσπαίροντα LII.
136 in marg. ση. ET | ση. om. LII.

162 βαμβαλιαστὺν ET | $\overset{\beta\alpha\mu}{\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu}$βαλιαστὺν LII.
171 ὑμέων ET | ἡμέων LII.
176 ἐπειδὴ ET | ἐπιδὴ LII.
180 μήλιτον ET | μίλητον LII.
217 μαγνιήνας ET | μαγηίδας, marg. μαγνιήνας LII.
260 τελείεσσας ET | τελήέσσας LII.
261—89 om. ET [20] | hab. LII.
325 ἦρ' ET | ἦρ' LII.
348 ἱεροῖς ET | ἱεροῖσι LII.
423 ἐϋκτισμένον ET (cf. Ap. 102) | ἐϋκτιμένον LII.
414 ἤθελον ET | ἔθελον LII.
466 γάρ ET | δέ LII.
479 καλλοῖσι ET | λλοῖσι L ⎱ πολλοῖσι Π ⎰
506, 7, 8 om. ET | hab. LII.
523 $\overset{\zeta\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon o\nu}{\acute{\alpha}\delta\upsilon\tau o\nu}$ ζάθεον E ⎱ ἄδυτον ζάθεον T ⎰ | αὐτοῦ δάπεδον, marg. ἄδυτον ζάθεον LII.
Herm. 45 ἀμάλδυναι ET | ἀμαρυγαί, marg. ἀμάλδυναι LII.
81 συμμϊότων ET | συμμίσγ(τL)ων LII.
86 αὐτοτροπήσας ὡς ET | αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς, marg. αὐτοτροπήσας LII.
100 μεγαμειδείοιο, priore ει ex η correcto ET | μεγαμηδειδ(ο)ιο LII.
168 ἄλιστοι ET | $\overset{\lambda\iota}{\alpha}$παστοι LII.
288 ἀντήσεις ET | ἀντήσῃς LII.
296 μετὰ post τλήμονα add. ET | om. LII.
400 ἀντιβάλλετο E ⎱ ἀντιτάλλετο T ⎰ | ἀτιτάλλετο LII.
Aphr. 10, 11 in one ET | in two LII.
68 θεῶν, marg. γρ. θηρῶν ET | θηρῶν LII.
97 om. ET | hab. LII.
113 ἡμετέρην ET (cf. Ap. 171) | ὑμετέρην LII.

---

[20] Accidentally, owing to ἐνθάδ' 260 and 289 ; cf. 506, 7; 8 where θαλάσσης in 505 and 508 has caused the omission.

123 ἄκτιστον ET	ἄκτιτον LΠ.
156 μεταστραφθεῖσα ET	μεταστρεφθεῖσα LΠ.
174 βυρε ET	ηυρε LΠ.
186 ἔειπας ET	ἔειπες LΠ.
207 τρῶς E ⎱ τρῶς T ⎰	τρῶα LΠ.
214 ἴσα θεοῖσι ET	ἤματα πάντα, marg. γρ. ἴσα θεοῖσι LΠ.
256 ἤδη ET	ἴδη LΠ.
262 σελῃνοὶ ET	σιλῃνοὶ LΠ.
265 ἔφυγαν ET	ἔφυσαν LΠ.
Dion. vii. 3 νεανίη ET	νεηνίη LΠ.
29 ἑκατέρω ET	ἑκαστέρω LΠ.

I need not continue the list beyond *Dion.* vii. 34 where L breaks off. The number of literal variants that are common to E and T makes it abundantly clear that they are direct copies of the same archetype (*a*).

It is remarkable that these two MSS. E and T, so closely related, are among the few MSS. of the Hymns of which we know the scribes' names. E was written by the personage who signs himself γεώργιος οὐάλλα or βάλλας πλακεντῖνος, Giorgio Valla or Valle of Piacenza. This scribe, collector, author and teacher, after passing a life in Lombardy, Liguria and Venetia, died as public teacher of Greek at Venice in 1499. His name has been obscured by the better known Lorenzo, perhaps his relative, and his biography remains to be written.[21] His library, including many MSS. in his own hand, passed at his death to Alberto Pio, Count of Carpi near Modena, and now forms the nucleus of the Greek collection in the Estense.[22] Constantine Lascaris, the scribe of T, is a better known man; see Legrand *l.c.* I. p. lxxi. *sq.* When he wrote our MS. he had been some four years at Milan, teaching Greek under the patronage of Francesco Sforza. In view of the usual belief that late MSS. were generally corrected by their writers, it is noticeable how few novelties are the result of the editing of these two considerable scholars. To Valla belong the corrections οἰσεῖς *Ap.* 54, ὅον *Ap.* 156, μνηστῆρσιν *Ap.* 208, ἀντιβάλλετο *Herm.* 400; to Lascaris ἀνασσείασκε *Ap.* 403, κρισσαίων *Ap.* 446, ὦρτο *Herm.* 65, δ' ἀγραύλους *Herm.* 286. The value of Lascaris' emendations it is evident exceeds that of Valla's. The archetype *a*, about whose date we can only say it was earlier than 1464, contained a number of gross graphical errors, which I need not

---

[21] See however Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, 1823, p. 1564 *sq.*, and Gabotto, 'Giorgio Valla e il suo processo in Venezia nel 1496,' *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* 1891, p. 201 *sq.* Valla unfortunately rarely dated his MSS., and therefore we do not know to what period of his

life they are to be assigned. The only exception appears to be Estense ii. F 9, written in Venice in 1488.

[22] For the authorities see *Notes on Greek MSS. in Italian Libraries*, 1890, p. 3.

repeat, and two or three noticeable variants, namely *Ap.* 479 the obvious conjecture καλλοῖσι for ·· λλοῖσι of *x*, *Herm.* 296 μετὰ between τλήμονα and γαστρός, *Aphr.* 174 βυρε which is *a*'s reading of the original ἱυρε.

L and Π are not connected in the same degree of closeness. It is true that they have a certain number of graphical errors in common, e.g. *Ap.* 20 τε for τοι, 44 πετρήδεσ(σ)α, 51 κε[θέ]λης, 60 πείαρ, 84 ἴστω, 95 ἤρης, 155 ἤδ', 171 ἡμέων, 175 ἐπιδὴ, *Herm.* 362 ἀπολεγέως, 364 μηνύσσαιμ', 412 πάσσησιν, *Aphr.* 174 ηυρε, but each of them, and especially L, has a much greater number which are not common to the other. Π's errors are not worth collecting; those of L testify to a certain cautiousness on the part of the scribe (*e.g.* in the lacunas *Ap.* 7 λ ρεσσιν, 8 ἀνεκρ μασε, 12 π τνια, *Herm.* 5 μ ἀρ, *Aphr.* 6 ἔρ μέμηλεν, 133 ἀπ ρήτην) and also apparently to a misunderstanding of some abbreviations in the archetype (e.g. *Ap.* 17 πρὸ for

·Λ· ·Λ·
πρός, 42 μεερόπων for μερόπων, 64 δεξαίμ = δεξαίμην, 178 λυκι = λυκίην,

·Λ·
μηονι = μηονίην, *Herm.* 565 φρέντα a misunderstanding of φρέν). It is possible therefore that L and Π are not direct copies of the same manuscript; whether they are or not, however, is of little practical importance; their ultimate archetype (*b*) is represented very closely by them, and had well-marked characteristics which distinguished it from *a*—viz. fidelity and absence of conjecture and, in particular, the retention of the marginalia of *x* (=*y*) as marginalia and not as readings in the text. This will more clearly appear as we proceed to tabulate the readings of *a* and *b* and to reconstruct from them the general archetype of the family, *x*.

$$Ap. 55 \quad \begin{matrix} οἰσεῖς & E \\ οἰστεῖς & T \end{matrix} \Big\} \quad ? \quad a \Big\} \quad \begin{matrix} οἰστεῖς & L \\ οἰστεῖς & Π \end{matrix} \Big\} \quad οἰστεῖς \ b \Big\} \quad οἰσ(τ)εῖς \ x.$$

The source of this error is evidently a confusion between σ and the ligature for στ. It might be questioned whether σ is a correction of E (as would certainly appear at first sight) or στ in T was accidental. On the whole following the majority it is safer to say that *x* had οἰστεῖς, the more so as it is in the older sort of minuscule that there is a close resemblance between σ and στ.

ib. οἰσεῖς πολλὸν E ⎫   πολλὴν   ⎫
             πολλὴν   ⎬   οἰστεῖς   *a*   ⎪   οἰστεῖς,
   οἰστεῖς οὐτ' T ⎭   ⎪   marg.
          πολλῆν   ⎫ οἰστεῖς,   ⎬   πολλήν *x*.
   οἰστεῖς   L   ⎬ πολλὴν above or in marg. *b*. ⎪
   οἰστεῖς, marg. πολλῆν Π ⎭   ⎭

All four MSS. here record the variant of *x*; Π alone keeps it in the place which it apparently occupied in *x*, the margin; E puts it, corrupted, into the text.

Ap. 59 δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις περίτας   σ' ἔχωσιν E in text.
       γρ. εἰ βοσκοισθε οἵ (ex οἱ) κε σ' ἔχωσιν E in marg.
δηρὸν αναξ εἰ βόσκοις περίτας   σ' ἔχωσιν T
       δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις περίτας   σ' ἔχωσιν a
δηρον ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις   σ' ἔχωσιν L
δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις θεοί κέ σ' ἔχωσιν Π
      δηρον ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις [θεοί κε] σ' ἔχωσιν b.

This deep corruption has left a certain divergence between the members of either family; thus E in a and L in b alone preserve the important variant μ above δηρὸν, which T and Π omit. On the other hand E and T agree literally in the curious περίτας—a considerable test of relationship; and we may thence conclude that E's marginal variant γρ. εἰ βοσκοισθε οἵ κε σ' ἔχωσιν was not in a, but was either conjectured by Valla or, more probably, taken from a MS. such as Π or the archetype of Π and L, b. In a the theta over περι is evidently a relic of the word which followed βόσκοις or βόσκεις. The letters περίτας are most ingeniously explained by Hollander, p. 13, who supposes them to mean περὶ τὰ ς̄, 'about six,' and to be a marginal note of a scribe defining the extent of the lacuna; this interpretation is very attractive, though I am not aware of any instance of a copyist giving such precise particulars about his original, and the expression as it stands is necessarily imperfect. Nothing less than λείπει (λ) γράμματα (γρ.) περὶ τὰ ς̄ would be intelligible Greek. With this provision it is possible that the note stood in the margin of x, and that a incorporated it (thinking it represented the actual reading) in his text, while b omitted it altogether. This process may suggest that a stage or stages intervened between a and x.

The relation between L and Π seems simpler; L leaves a lacuna which Π fills up: b therefore had either a lacuna or a few unintelligible letters between βόσκοις and σ' ἔχωσιν. Π either filled the lacuna with a conjecture or read these letters as θεοί κε. The survival of the letter θ in the other family a suggests the latter view.

We may therefore reconstruct the reading of x as—

       δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις θ   σ' ἔχωσιν,
          marg. λ γρ.   περὶ τὰ ς̄.

In the lacuna may have stood traces of εοικε. The corruption does not begin with x, but goes back to the common archetype of x and p, i.e. to the full uncial period.

ib. 114 ἴσμαθ' ET, ἴσμαθ' *a* ⎫
    ἴσμαθ' L ⎫   ⎬ ἴσμαθ' *x.*
      δ   ⎬ ἴσμαθ' *b* ⎭
    ἴσμαθ' Π ⎭

The same corruptions occur E 778 where ἴσθμαθ' is common, ἴσμαθ' and ἴδιαθ' rarer. Π's δ is evidently a correction of the scribe's; it occurs in DJK.

ib. 136, 7, 8 in text. om. ET
in marg. praefixis σῆ ἐν ἑτέρῳ κεῖνται καὶ οὗτοι οἱ στίχοι ET
ita *a.*
in text. om. L
in text. hab. Π
in marg. praefixis ἐν ἑτέρῳ καὶ οὗτοι οἱ στίχοι κεῖνται LΠ
ita *b.*

Π evidently included these verses in the text by error; *x* omitted them in the text, but had them in the margin with the formula in the words of either *a* or *b*.[23]

ib. 151 ἀνήρ ET   ⎫ ἀνήρ, marg. αἰεὶ *a* ⎫
    αἰεὶ marg. ET ⎬   ⎬
    ἀνὴρ αἰεὶ L   ⎫   ⎬ ita *x.*
    ἀνὴρ Π   ⎬ ἀνήρ, marg. αἰεὶ *b* ⎭
    αἰεὶ marg. Π ⎭

L here has put the marginal reading into the text.

ib. 162 βαμβαλιαστὺν ET βαμβαλιαστὺν *a* ⎫ κρεμβαλιαστὺν,
    βαμ   βαμ   ⎬
    κρεμβαλιαστὺν LΠ κρεμβαλιαστὺν *b* ⎭ mg. βαμβαλιαστὺν *x.*

In *a* the marginal reading was put into the text; *b* records both.

ib. 171 ὑμέων ET ὑμέων *a* ⎫
    ἡμέων LΠ ἡμέων *b* ⎬ ? *x.*

Since υ and η are equivalent phonetically to each other, it is a question what stood in *x*; ἡμέων is given by M, ὑμῶν by *p*.

ib. 202 ἀμφὶ φαείνει E ⎫ ἀμφιφαείνει *a* ⎫
                       ηι   ⎬
    ἀμφιφαείνει T ⎭   ⎬ id. *x.*
    ἀμφι φαείνειη L ⎫   ⎬
    ἀμφί φαείνει Π ⎭ id. *b*   ⎭

---

[23] The 'hooks' which are written before these lines in Π are not necessarily signs of omission, since E and T exhibit them in their margins, but imply that the vv. to which they are prefixed are to change their place from text to margin or *vice versa,* e.g. in the Iliad Ven. 454, ff. 106v. and 108v., omitted lines are added in the margin with , prefixed.

The four MSS. here differ only minutely in their representation of the original; E has with painful accuracy preserved the iota adscript which was natural to an early minuscule MS., L has run the correction into the text and then marked it out again.

ib. 211 ἢ ἄμ᾿ ἐρευθεῖ E ⎱ id. a.
η ἄμ᾿ ἐρευθεῖ T ⎰

η ἄμ᾿ ἐρευθεῖ L
η ἄμ᾿ ἐρευθεῖ Π   ⎱ id. b.
marg. γρ. ἢ ἄμα φόρβαντι τριοπόω ἢ ἀμαρύνθω LΠ ⎰
ἢ ἄμ᾿ ἐρευθεῖ, marg. γρ. ἢ ἄμα φόρβαντι τριοπόω ἢ ἀμαρύνθω x.

In a the marginal variant is ignored; in b it is recorded.

ib. 217 ἢ μαγιήνας ET,   id. a ⎱   ἢ μαγνηίδας, marg. γρ.
η μαγνηίδας LΠ   ⎱ id. b ⎰   μαγνιήνας x.
marg. γρ. μαγνιήνας ⎰

In a the variant has been taken into the text, to the exclusion of the original reading: b records both variant and text.

ib. 276 def. ET   def. a
τ
δελφούση L ⎱   ⎱ δελφούση x.
δελφού ση Π ⎰ δελφούση b ⎰

L has been corrected.

ib. 325a om. in text ET ⎱
marg. γρ΄. ET ⎰   id. a
om. in text LΠ   ⎱ om. in text; marg.
marg. γρ. καὶ οὕτως L ⎰ γρ. [καὶ οὕτως] b ⎰   γρ΄. x.
γρ. Π

Here all four MSS. have recorded the variant as a variant.

ib. 344 om. E ⎱ hab. a ⎱
hab. T ⎰   ⎱ hab. x.
hab. L ⎱ hab. b ⎰
hab. Π ⎰

The omission in E is plainly accidental, and is due to the line beginning with the same word as 345. For the same reason the p family omit it, independently.

ib. 377 κεχολωμένον E ⎱   ο
? T ⎰ ? κεχολωμέν a ⎱ id. x.
κεχολωμένοι L ⎱   ο
κεχολωμένος Π ⎰ ? κεχολωμέν b ⎰

The mistakes in E and L suggest a misapprehension of something in the respective archetypes. Possibly in *a b* the last syllable was represented by an omicron, and this, as sometimes happens, was mistaken for *ov* by E, while L copied it on the line and added an iota *de suo.* Cf. part II. *Herm.* 451 (χορὸς for χοροί).

> *ib.* 394 ῥρέζουσι E ⎫ ? *a*
>   ?   T ⎭ ⎫ ? *x.*
> ῥρέξουσι L ⎫ ῥρεξουσι *b* ⎭
> ῥρέξουσι Π ⎭

The evidence is undecisive, for ζ and ξ are perpetually and arbitrarily exchanged in minuscule; cf. the same words and ἀλαπάζειν -ξειν, ἐναρίζειν -ξειν, πτολεμίζω -ξω, ἐγγυαλίζει -ξει, etc. in the Iliad and Od. MSS. The present ἀγγέλλουσι somewhat supports E's ῥρέζουσι.

> *ib.* 479 καλλοῖσι ET   καλλοῖσι *a* ⎫
>   λλοῖσι L ⎫ .. λλοῖσι *b* ⎭ .. λλοῖσι *x.*
>   πολλοῖσι Π ⎭

The three variants presented by the four MSS. establish that in *x* there was either a lacuna or some illegible letters. *a* either read these as κα or conjectured κα to fill the space, and ET reproduce this stopgap: *b* appears to have rendered the gap faithfully (or, to have omitted the illegible letters), and in doing so was followed by L; Π conjectured (or read) πολλοῖσι, which has the independent confirmation of M Par. This is one of the cases which suggest that Π is a stage farther than L off *b*, or that the scribe of Π found *b* in a better state than L did. Cf. 59, *Herm.* 42.

> *ib.* 515 ἔχων ατὸν E ⎫ ἔχων   (a)τὸν *a* ⎫
> ἔχων   τὸν T ⎭ ⎫ ἔχων   ατὸν *x.*
> ἔχω   ατὸν LΠ   ita *b* ⎭

This passage may induce us to regard the scribes of ELΠT as faithful copiers rather than emenders. An original lacuna has been transmitted with remarkable fidelity through at least two generations.

>   ζάθεον
> *ib.* 523 ἄδυτον ζάθεον E ⎫ ἄδυτον ζάθεον *a* ⎫
> ἄδυτον ζάθεον T ⎭ ⎫ αὐτοῦ δάπεδον, marg.
> αὐτοῦ δάπεδον,   ⎫ id. *b* ⎭ ἄδυτον ζάθεον *x.*
> marg. γρ'. ἄδυτον ζάθεον LΠ ⎭

a has taken the original variant in place of the original text; *b* records both. Why Valla wrote ζάθεον over the line is inexplicable, fortunately T shows that it does not go farther back.

> *Herm.* 42 ὀρεσκώ   λώνης E ⎫ ὀρεσκώ .... λώνης *a* ⎫
>   ?   T ⎭ ⎫ ὀρεσκω ...
>   ὀρεσκώ   λώνης L ⎫ ὀρεσκω[οιο κο]λώνης *b* ⎭ λώνης *x.*
>   ὀρεσκώιο κολώνης Π ⎭

Here unfortunately Bethe has not given T's reading.   The case is, however, parallel to *Ap.* 515 ; a lacuna in *x* has been transmitted through two stages ; E in one family and L in the other give exactly the same-sized gap.   Π, as in *Ap.* 479, seems to have found *b* in a more perfect state, or to have filled the gap by conjecture.   For his ὀρεσκώιο cf. his μέγα μηδείδιο *Herm.* 100.

ib. 45 ἀμαλδῦναι ET   id. *a* ⎫
     ἀμαρυγαὶ LΠ   ⎬ id. *b* ⎨ ἀμαρυγαί, marg. γρ. ἀμαλδῦναι *x*.
     marg. γρ. ἀμαλδῦναι LΠ⎭   ⎩

a, as before, has substituted the variant for the text; *b* preserves both.

ib. 46 ἐμήσατο E⎫
     ?   T⎬ ? *a* ⎫ ἐμήδετο *x*.
     ἐμήδετο LΠ id. *b*⎭

Whether ἐμήσατο is a correction of Valla's, or the real reading of *a*, depends on T, the reading of which we do not know.   We may however safely conclude that ἐμήδετο stood in *x*, perhaps with a marginal σα.

ib. 65 ὦτο E⎫
     ὦρτο T⎬ ὦτο *a*⎫ ὦτο *x*.
     ὦτο LΠ ὦτο *b*⎭   Lascaris reinserted ρ.

ib. 79 σάνδαλα   ἔριψεν E ⎫
       ?   T ⎬ ? *a*
     σάνδαλα   κ' ἔριψεν L ⎫
     σάνδαλα αὐτίκ' ἔριψεν Π ⎬ σάνδαλα [αὐτί] κ' ἔριψεν *b* ⎫
       σάνδαλα [δ' αὐτίκ'] ἔριψεν *x*.

Here unfortunately we have no reading from T.   Again an original lacuna has propagated itself, and again Π seems to have seen *b* in a better state than L did; again also, as at 42, there is one letter wanting in Π's supplement.

ib. 86 αὐτοτροπήσας ὡς ET   id. *a*   ⎞
     αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς LΠ   ⎟
      marg. γρ. αὐτεοπήσας L ⎫ αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς   ⎬
       γρ. αὐτοτροπήσας Π ⎭ marg. γρ. αὐτοτροπήσας *b* ⎠
     αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς, marg. γρ. αὐτοτροπήσας *x*.

a here displays the same tactics as before; only that in inserting the marginal reading into the text, it has neglected to take out the whole of the original text reading, and thus produces the unmetrical result αὐτοτροπήσας ὡς.

ib. 100 μεγαμειδείοιο priore ει ex η correcto E ⎫ μεγαμηδείοιο   ⎫
     μεγαμηδείοιο T   ⎬   ⎬ ? *x*.
     μεγαμηδείδοιο L ⎫   ⎭
     μέγα μηδείδιο Π ⎭   μεγαμηδείδοιο *b* ⎭

It must remain a question whether x inserted a δ between ει and οιο or not; the μηδείδαο of M p is in favour of the δ. The omission is no doubt due to the scribe's feeling for ἐπαλληλία, Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 4.

ib. 168 ἄλιστοι ET id. *a* ⎱
      ^{λι}   ^{λι}
    ἄπαστοι LΠ id. *b* ⎰ ἄπαστοι *x*.

a has accepted the variant instead of the text; *b* records both.

ib. 212 φοῖβος ἀπόλλων,   id. *a* ⎫
     marg. γρ. μῦθον ἀκούσας ET   ⎬ id. *x*.
    id. LΠ   id. *b* ⎭

Here *a*, contrary to its usual custom, has with *b* recorded both text and variant.

ib. 224 ἔλπομαι εἶναι E   ⎱
           ? T   ⎰ id. *a* ⎫   ἔστιν ὁμοῖα,
   ἤστην ὁμοῖα L   ⎬ mg. γρ. ἔλπομαι
   ἤστιν ὁμοῖα Π   ⎱ id. *b* ⎭   εἶναι *x*.
     marg. γρ. ἔλπομαι εἶναι LΠ ⎰

The reading of T is not given us, but in all probability it is the same as E: *a*, as usual, preferred the variant to the text; *b* recorded both.

ib. 241 δή ῥα νεόλλουτος προκαλεύμενος ἥδυμον ὕπνον E
       mg. ἐν ἄλλῳ οὕτως· θῆ ῥα νέον λοχάων προκαλεύμενος
        ἡδύ E
    ? T
    id. LΠ (λοχεύων in marg.)
    id. *a* ⎱
    id. *b* ⎰ id. *x*.

T's reading fails, but apparently here, as at 212, *a* as well as *b* record both text and variant. (The variant in *x* must either have been cut off at the margin, or abbreviated as ἥδυ; that is to say ἡδύ or ἡδὺ merely represents ἥδυ[μον ὕπνον]. Cf. 42 where M has in the margin γρ. ὡς δοκεῖ μοι ἀγών' ἐξετό [for ἐξετόρησεν].)

ib. 254 λίκνῳ E ⎱
      ? T ⎰ id. *a*   ⎱
   κλίνη LΠ   ⎬ κλίνη, marg. γρ. ἐν λίκνῳ *x*.
    mg. γρ. ἐν λίκνῳ LΠ ⎰ id. *b* ⎰

T's reading fails. As before, *a* adopted the variant, *b* recorded both text and variant.

ib. 280 τὸν E ⎱
     ? T ⎰ id. *a*   ⎫
   τὸν   ? τὸν
   ὡς L   ⎱ ? τὸν   ⎬ ὡς *x*.
   τὸν ὡς Π ⎰   ὡς *b*   ⎭

This case is more complicated, especially as we miss T's reading; however following the usual procedure of the three MSS. we may suppose that E preferred the variant τὸν, and that accordingly ὡς was the text, in the original, and τὸν the variant, both of which are recorded by L and Π, more accurately by the former.

ib. 288 ἀντήσεις ἀγέλησι βοῶν καὶ πώεσι μήλων ET   ⎫
　　　marg. γρ'. ἄντην βουκολίοισι καὶ εἰροπόκοις ὁίεσσιν ET ⎬ id. *a.*
　　　id. LΠ (sed ἀντήσῃς)   id. *b.*
　　　id. (ἀντήσηισ or -εισ) *x.*

Here, as 212, 241, both *a* and *b* record text and variant.

ib. 322 δ' ἵκοντο κάρηνα E ⎫
　　　　　? 　 T ⎬ id. *a*　　　　　　　　⎫ δὲ τέρθρον ἵκοντο,
　　δὲ τέρθρον ἵκοντο LΠ　　　　　　　　⎬ mg. γρ'. δ' ἵκοντο
　　marg. γρ'. δ' ἵκοντο κάρηνα LΠ ⎬ id. *b* ⎭ κάρηνα *x.*

T's reading is wanting; *a* prefers the variant, *b* records text as well as variant.

ib. 326 μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἠῶ E ⎫
　　　　　　? 　 T ⎬ id. *a*　　　　　　ποτὶ πτύχας
　ποτὶ πτύχας οὐλύμποιο LΠ　　　　⎫　　οὐλύμποιο, mg.
　marg. γρ'. μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἠῶ LΠ ⎬ id. *b* ⎬ γρ'. μετὰ χρυσό-
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　⎭ θρονον ἠῶ *x.*

The same.

ib. 366 ἑρμῆς δ' ἄλλον μῦθον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔειπεν E ⎫
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　? 　 T ⎬ id. *a*
　ἑρμῆς δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα LΠ ⎫
　　marg. ἑρμῆς δ' ἄλλον (ἀύλλον L) μῦθον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ⎬ id. *b.*
　　ἔειπεν. LΠ ⎭
　ἑρμῆς δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν κ.τ.λ.,　　⎫
　　marg. ἑρμῆς δ' ἄλλον μῦθον κ.τ.λ. ⎬ *x.*

The same.

ib. 400 ἀντιβάλλετο E ⎫
　　　ἀντιτάλλετο T ⎬ ? ᵃ ⎫ ἀτιτάλλετο *x.*
　　　ἀτιτάλλετο LΠ　id. *b* ⎭

This case is complicated, but it seems likely that *a* had ἀντιτάλλετο, intended as a correction of the unusual ἀτιτάλλετο of *x*; and that Valla further emended ἀντιτάλλετο into the comparatively familiar ἀντιβάλλετο. Or, of course, there may have been a ν superscribed in *x* and *a* have incorporated this in the text, while *b* preserved the original *x*, which is supported by M *p.*

ib. 451 οἶμός E

mg. γρ. καὶ ὕμνος E } id. *a* } id. *x.*

? T

id. LΠ   id. *b*

Here *a* as well as *b* has recorded text and variant; so 241, 288, 563.

ib. 473 τῶν E } id. *a*

? T

καὶ LΠ   } id. *b* } καὶ   mg. γρ. τῶν *x.*

marg. γρ. τῶν LΠ

Here *a* has accepted the variant, *b* has recorded text and variant.

ib. 563 πειρῶνται δ᾽ ἔπειτα παρὲξ ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύειν E

marg. γρ. ψεύδονται δ᾽ ἔπειτα δι᾽ ἀλλήλων δενέουσαι E } id. *a*

? T

id. L } id. *b*

def. Π

id. *x*

Both *a* and *b* here have recorded text and variant of *x*.

Aphr. 99 βήσεα ΕΤ   id. *a* } βη

βη   } πείσεα *x.*

πείσεα L } id. *b*

def. Π

Even in the absence of Π it is plain that *a* has preferred the original variant, while *b* has recorded variant as well as text.

ib. 174 βυρε ΕΤ   βυρε *a* } ꝉυρε *x.*

ἡυρε L }

ηυρε Π } ηυρε *b*

These are typical misreadings of the minuscule kappa (ꝺ); *a* read this as beta, *b* as eta; since we find ἡυρε also in *Par.* it would seem that *p* had the same form.

                                                   ον

ib. 205 τετιμένονος ΕΤ   id. *a* } τετιμένος

id.   LΠ   id. *b* }   or   *x.*

                                                   ος

                                              τετιμένον

the alternative τετιμένον is not a mere error, for we find it in M (see *infra*, Part II.).

ib. 214 ἴσα θεοῖσι ΕΤ   id. *a* } ἤματα παντα,

ἤματα πάντα LΠ   } id. *b* } marg. γρ. ἴσα θεοῖσι *x.*

marg. γρ. ἴσα θεοῖσι LΠ

a prefers the variant, *b* reads text and variant.

ib. 244 τάχα ET   id. *a* ⎫
  τάχα ⎱ LΠ id. *b* ⎬ κατά, marg. τάχα *x.*
  κατα ⎰   ⎭

The same has happened.

Dion. vii. 37 φόβος ET   ita *a* ⎫ τάφος,
    τάφος Π   ⎬ marg. φόβος *x.*
      marg. φόβος Π ⎱ ita *b* ⎰
    def. L

Here L fails us, but Π as we have seen is amply representative of *b*, and we may conclude as before that *a* has accepted the original variant while *b* recorded the original text with the variant.

Arcs viii. 9 εὐθαλέος ET   id. *a* ⎫   λε
    εὐθαρλέσεος Π ⎱   λε   ⎬ εὐθαρσέος, *x.*
      def.   L ⎰ εὐθαρσέος *b* ⎰

It is plain that Π has 'conflated' text and variant into one; in the absence of L however it might be doubted how to separate the two constituents of εὐθαρλέσεος. If we suppose *a* to have followed its usual habit and written the variant instead of the text, it is evident that εὐθαρσέος was the text-reading of *x*; we see also that D, which in general inclines to *b*,   s εὐθαρσέος.

Pan xix. 7 κέλευθα ET   id. *a* ⎫ κάρηνα,
    κάρηνα Π   ⎬ marg. γρ. κέλευθα *x.*
      marg. γρ. κέλευθα ⎱ id. *b* ⎰
    def. L

ib. 48 ἱλάσομαι ET   id. *a* ⎫
  ίλα   ⎱ ίλα
  λίσομαι   Π ⎱   ⎬ λίσομαι, marg. ίλαμαι *x.*
      marg. ίλαμαι   ⎬ id. *b* ⎰
    def. L.

This case is more complicated; ἱλάσομαι of *a* seems to have grown out
ίλα   αὐτοτροπήσας
of λίσομαι in the same way as αὐτοτροπήσας ὡς out of αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς *Herm.* 86. Then in *x* followed by *b* the variant seems to have been added, through mischance, twice over, once above the line and once in the margin; this double variant is literally preserved by Π. D again confirms the text-reading of *x.*

To count up, it appears that out of forty-four passages examined in twenty-nine *b* has preserved the reading of *y* which was part of the common archetype *x*, while *a* has done so only nine times. The question therefore which has been raised[24] as to the relative value of *a* and *b* answers itself. The four

---

[24] The superiority of E over L was maintained by Gemoll in his *Hom. Blätter*, and reasserted in his edition (1886).

MSS. ELΠT are descended from an archetype with marginal or interlinear variants: these variants the scribe of *a* seems to have considered to be actual corrections, not alternatives, and to have put them into his text to the exclusion of the original; that *a* really was copied from *x* when *x* had these variants we see from the minority of cases where *a* has preserved the variant as well as the text, or has mixed it with the text. If we had *a*, that is ET alone, we should necessarily form an entirely false idea of the readings of *x*. As it is, these readings are preserved and with singular fidelity by *b*. There can be no doubt therefore of the greater value of this family, that is of LΠ. Between L and Π the question is less important. It turns upon the passages (*Ap.* 59, 479, *Herm.* 42, 79) in which the reading of Π is fuller than that of L. Are the additional details of Π the work of conjecture, or are they due to some advantages that Π enjoyed in copying *b'*? In the absence of a third direct descendant of *b* the question cannot be answered positively. There is perhaps a *prima facie* probability in favour of L.

Next, with regard to *x*, the archetype of the whole family, can we arrive at any conclusion as to its character and age? The graphical corruptions common to ELΠT are few: *Ap.* 65 γ' ἐροίμην for γενοίμην is due to the exchange of ν and ρ, only possible in minuscule; instances may be gathered from the Hymns themselves (*Selene* xxxii. 6 ἀκτῆρες *x* for ἀκτῖνες *p* is perhaps an example) and I may refer to a collection from the scholia of the Ven. A of the Iliad in Ludwich's *Aristarchs hom. Textkritik* i., p. 267, n. 1, a characteristic dictum of Cobet's *Var. Lect.* p. 121, and the following instances from Laur. 32, 9, the excellent tenth to eleventh century MS. of the *Argonautica*; ii. 449 and 556 ἀνωγῆι for ἀρωγῆι, 320 ἐνήρεινται for ἐρήρειν-
ται, iv. 308 παρέσχατον, 617 ἀμύνοιο. *Herm.* 216 δραύλους for δ' ἀγραύλους can only be explained by the minuscule ligature αγ which was somewhat similar to the following ρ; *ib.* 303 οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ for οἰωνοῖσι σὺ seems on the other hand an uncial corruption. *Aphr.* 174 βυρε of *a* and ηυρε of *b* necessarily go back to a minuscule *ιυρε*. The archetype *x* was therefore minuscule, and fairly early minuscule, if we remember that some of the mistakes in L (p. 164) are such as might have been made in copying a MS. (*b*) of about the twelfth century. Of this archetype *x* it would be true to assert what Hollander says of the supposed general archetype of the Hymns, that it was in a damaged state; the lacunas *Ap.* 59, 479, 515, *Herm.* 42, 79 are good evidence for that.

The manuscripts that remain, namely ABCΓL₂L₃NOQR₁R₂V Monac., agree in the following readings:—

Ap.	11	δὲ om. *p* cum H	hab. M *x*.
	19	πάντων *p*	πάντως *x* πάντοσσ' M.
	21	παντοτρόφον *p*	πορτιτρόφον *x* M.
	24	λίμναι *p*	λιμένες *x*.
	28	λιγυπνόοις *p*	λιγυπνοίοις *x*.
	29	θνητοῖς *p*	θνητοῖσιν cet.

Ap. 32 ἀγχίαλυς *p*   ἀγχιάλη cet.

    42 πόλεις *p*   πόλις cet.

    46 σοι om. *p*   οἱ H σοι cet.

    ib. γαιάων *p*   γαιέων cet.

    54 εὔβουν *p*   εὔβων *x.*

    59 δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσ-   δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις· θεοί κέ σ'.
        κοις (-εις B) *p*   ἔχωσιν, or some similar reading *x.*

    65 πέρι τιμήεσσα *p* cum S   περιτιμήεσσα cet.

    ib. γενοίμην *p* cum S   γ' ἐροίμην cet.

    72 ἀτιμήσας *p*   ἀτιμήσω *x* ἀτιμήσῃ S K corr.
                          D corr.

    ib. ἐπείη *p*   ἐπειὴ *x.*

    75 ἀδοίη *p*   ἀδή οἱ, ἀδῆ οἱ cet.

    78 ἕκαστά τε φῦλα νε-   ἀκήδεα χήτει λαῶν cet.
        πούδων *p*

  129 δεσμάσ' *p*   δέσματ' or δεσμάτ' cet.

  143 τε *p* cum J   τοι cet.

  152 οἳ δὴ πότ' *p*   οἳ τότ' cet.

  159 αὖθις *p*   αὖτις cet.

  162 κρεμβαλιασὺν (prae-   κρεμβαλιαστὺν or -ὴν cet.
        ter L₃) *p*

  176 ἐπιδὴν *p*   ἐπιδὴ and ἐπειδὴ cet.

  178 ὑμνῶν *p*   ὑμνέων cet.

  184 ἔχον *p*   ἔχων cet.

  189 v. om. *p*   hab. cet.

  197 οὔτ' ἐλάχεια *p*   οὔτε λάχεια *x* οὔτε λαχεῖα ME.

  211 vers. om. *p*   hab. cet.

  215 ἀπόλλωνος *p*   ἄπολλον cet.

  216 πιερίη *p*   πιερίης *x* πιερίην S (πετρίην M).

  224 τελμησσὸν *p*   τευμησσὸν *x* τέμμισον M.

  233 οἱ δὲ *p*   οὐδὲ M *x.*

  274 δέξαιο *p*   δέξαι cet.

  293 βωμῷ *p*   νηῷ M *x.*

  306 τυφάονα *p*   τυφλὸν *x* τυφλόν τε M.

  322 ἔτι μήσεαι *p*   μήσεαι *x* μητίσεαι M.

  326 καὶ νῦν τοιγὰρ *p*   καὶ νῦν μὲν τοὶ γὰρ *x* καὶ νῦν
                         μέντοι M.

  328 αἰσχύνασ' *p*   αἰσχύνας M *x.*

  339 ἦ παρόσον *p*   ἦ πόσσον *x* ἐστιν. ὅσον M.

  344 vers. om. *p* (cum E)   hab. cet.

  351 ἐναλίγγιον *p*   ἐναλίγκιον cet.

  356 αἴσιον *p*   αἴσιμον cet.

  366 ἀδινήσουσι *p*   ἀγινήσουσι cet.

  394 ἀγγελέουσι *p*   ἀγέλλουσι *x* ἀγγέλλουσι M.

  402 ἐπιφράσσαιτο *p*   ἐπιφράσσατο, ἐπεφράσσατο cet.

  403 παντόσ' *p*   παντόθ' cet.

Ap.	416 vers. om. *p*	hab. cet.
	460 σφας *p*	σφεας cet.
	517 χρυσῆν *p*	χαρίεν Athenaeus ἀγατὸν D ...ατὸν *x* ἐρατὸν M.
	518 τε alt. om. *p*	hab. cet.
	538 om. *p* cum M	hab. cet.
Herm.	10 δὴ om. *p*	hab. cet.
	20 γύων or om. *p*	γυίων cet.
	45 ἂς ὅτε *p*	αἱ ὅτε *x* ἢ ὅτε M.
	ib. δυνηθῶσι *p*	δινηθῶσι cet.
	59 ὀνομακλυτὴν *p*	ὀνομακλυτὸν M ὄνομα κλυτὸν *x*.
	127 χάρμα φέρων *p*	χαρμοφέρων cet.
	152 παρ' ἰγνύσι *p*	περ' ἰγνύσι *x* περιγνύσι M.
	157 πλευροῖσι *p*	πλευρῆσι cet.
	159 φηλητεύσειν *p*	φιλητεύσειν cet.
	193 ἐβόσκετο om. *p*	hab. cet.
	209 εὐκραίροισιν *p*	εὐκραιρῆσιν, or -αίρησιν cet.
	214 φηλωτὴν *p*	φιλητὴν M *x* φιλοτὴν E.
	241 νήδυμον *p*	ἥδυμον cet.
	312 δέξαι *p*	δέξο cet.
	ib. παρὰ *p*	πὰρ cet.
	313 ἐρέεινον *p*	ἐρέεινεν cet.
	342 δῖα *p*	δοιὰ cet.
	356 κατέερξε *p*	κατέρεξε cet.
	361 ἀλεείνων *p*	ἀλεγύνων *x* ἀλεγίζων M.
	386 κραταιῶ *p*	κρατερῷ cet.
	402 ἥλαυνε *p*	ἐξήλαυνε cet.
	412 ἀγραύλοισι *p*	ἀγραύλησι cet.
	420 κονάβισσε *p*	κονάβησε cet.
	440 σὺ *p*	σοί cet.
	446 φηλητὰ *p*	φιλητὰ cet.
	449 νήδυμον *p*	ἥδυμον cet.
	478 ἑταῖρον *p*	ἑταίρην cet.
	481 φιλομειδέα *p*	φιλοκυδέα cet.
	ib. χῶρον *p*	κῶμον cet.
	484 νόα *p*	νόῳ cet.
	495 πέρι ζαμενῶς *p*	περιζαμενῶς cet.
	502 κοναβισσε *p*	κονάβησε cet.
	530 ἀκήραον *p*	ἀκήριον cet. (ἀκήαον L).
	532-4 om. *p*	hab. cet.
	540 πιφάσκειν *p*	πιφαύσκειν cet.
	543 ἔλθοι *p*	ἔλθη cet.
	557 ἀλέγεινεν *p*	ἀλέγυνεν cet.
	560 θύσωσι *p*	θυΐσωσι *x* θυίωσιν 'M.
	ib. ἐδωδυῖαι *p*	ἐδηδυῖαι cet.

Aphr. 20	πόνος p	πόλις *x* πόλεις M πτόλις ed. pr., marg. Γ.
	39 and 50 θνητοῖσι p	θνητοῖς cet.
	71 πορδάλιες all but all p	παρδάλιες cet.
	82 τε καὶ all but all p	καὶ cet.
	84 θάμβαινεν p	θαύμαινεν cet.
	136, 136a οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκὶ p	οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη νυὸς ἔσσομαι ⎫ ἀλλ᾽ εἰκυῖα ⎪ εἴ τοι ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ⎬ cet. ἠὲ καὶ οὐκὶ ⎭
	146 ἀγοράζεις p (ἀγορεύεις N)	ἀγορεύεις cet.
	152 προίοι, προοίοι p	προίη cet.
	194 τοι om. p	hab. cet.
Art. (ix.) 3	μιλήτης p (praeter L₃)	μελήτης *x* μέλητος M.
Ath. (xi.) 3	πόλεμοι p	πτόλεμοι cet.
Mat. dcor. (xiv.) 3	κροτάλη p	κροτάλων cet.
Asclep. 3	δωτίνω p	δωτίω cet.
Pan xix. 24	λυγγός p	λυγκός cet.
	25 θαλέθων p	θαλέων cet.
Ath. xxviii. 10	ὀβρίμης p	ὀμβρίμης cet.
Hest. xxix. 3	ἔλαχες p	ἔλαχε cet.
Ge xxx. 14	παρ᾽ εὐανθέσιν p	περεσανθέσιν cet.
Selene xxxii. 6	χρυσοῦ p	χρυσέου cet.
ib.	ἀκτῖνες p	ἀκτῆρες cet.
	11 πλήθη p	πλήθει cet.
Diosc. xxxiii. 14	ἀέλλαι p	ἀέλλας cet.

From this list it will be seen that the 'Parisienses' are a very well defined family, rendering their archetype *p* with unusual fidelity. The way in which omissions (*Ap.* 11, 189, 211, 344, 416, *Herm.* 10, 193, 532-4, *Aphr.* 194) and impossible forms (λιγυπνόοις *Ap.* 28, ἀδοίη *ib.* 75, κρεμβαλιασὺν *ib.* 162, ἀπόλλωνος *ib.* 215, ἐναλίγγιον *ib.* 351, αἴσιον *ib.* 356, ἀδινήσουσι *ib.* 366, δυνηθῶσι *Herm.* 45, δῖα *ib.* 342, ἑταῖρον *ib.* 478, νόα *ib.* 484, ἐδωδυῖαι *ib.* 560) are reproduced without correction in the text of thirteen manuscripts is very remarkable.

The variations within this family are neither many nor important. I give a list of those that appear in the collations at my disposal:—

Ap. 18	ὑπὶ νόποιο	: ὑπ᾽ ἰνόποιο A (" corr.) ὑπ᾽ ἰνοποῖο Γ.
22	ἄδον	: ἄδον Γ.
25	ἠώς	: ἤως A.
51	ἐμεῖο	: ἐμοῖο AR₁.
59	βόσκοις	: βόσκεις B.
71	τὸ	: το NP.

Ap. 83 ὅμοσσεν : ὅμοσσεν L₂,₃OR₁ ομοσσεν V ὅμοσεν^σ B.

156 ὅ οὐ (ὅ οὐ) : ὅον B (so E).

162 κρεμβαλιασὺν : κρεμβαλιαστὺν L₃, Q corr.

166 ἐμοῖο : ἐμεῖο L₂R₂ ἐμεῖο^{οι} NV.

169 ὔμμιν : ὔμμιν NOP.

202 βιβὰς : ^{βϊ}βας B βὰς Γ.

ib. ἀμφιφαείνει : ἀμφι φαείνει L₂P, ἀμφι φαείνει^ηἡ Ο ἀμφι
φαείνη L₃NQR₂V·

210 ἐλατινιονίδη : ἐλατιονίδη B.

213 ἐνέλιπεν : ἐνέλειπεν AQ.

214 τὸ : το NP (cf. 71).

219 κηναίου : κυναίου BO κυναί Γ.

232 om. BO.

253 θεμιστεύοιμι : θεμιστεύσοιμι BΓ.

260 τελείεσσας : τελήεσσας PR₁.

293 βωμῶ : βωμῶ^{νηῶ} PV βωμῶ^{νιῶ} Ο.

311 θεοὶ : θεαὶ AΓL₂OP.

366 ἀγινήσουσι N : ἀδινήσουσι AL₂V ἀδινήσουσι^γ L₃PR₁.

491 ἐπί : γ' ἐπί ΓΟ.

496 δέλφειος : δέλφιος AOPQ.

536 μῆλα : μᾶλα L₂,₃, NR₁,₂V μάλα BΓ.

Herm. 20 γύων : om. OL₂PR₂.

50 δὲ : om. BΓN.

80 θαυματά : θαυμαστὰ BNV.

138 τοι om. : hab. A.

168 ἄπαστοι^{λι} L₂NPR₁ : ἄπαστοι ΓV.
ἄπλαστοι R₂   ἄπ στοι B.
ἄπλιστοι ACL₃Q

p evidently had ἄπαστοι^{λι}; of the copies L₂NPR₁ repeated both text and
variant, ACL₃QR₂ combined the variant with the text, in different ways, ΓV
ignored the variant, B held an attitude of suspense. The original *p* copied
its archetype faithfully, without seeking a correction.

217 εὐρέας : οὐρέας BΓ.

242 ἄγρης : ἄγρην BΓ.

254 λίκνω AL₃NV : λίμνω R₁.
λύκνω L₂R₂ : λήμνω B.
λήκνω Γ

280 τὸν : τὸ AQ.

292 φιλητέων BR₂ φηλιτέων AΓL₂,₃, NQR₁V φηλι··τέων corr.
ex φιλητέων P.

Herm.	330	μενοεικέα	: μενέοιοκέα Β μενοοικέα Γ.
	397	σπεύδοντε	: σπεύδοντϊ Β.
	410	ἀγνοῦται	: ἀγ ται Β.
	460	κρανάιον	: κρανίον Β κρανάϊνον ΑΓ.
	472	μαντείασ ἑκάεργε	: θ' ins. AQ δ' ins. V.
Aphr.	71	παρδάλιες	: πορδάλιες ΒΓL₂, ₃NR₁, ₂.
	82	μέγεθος καὶ	: τε καὶ ABCΓL₂QR₁.
	139	οἱ δέ τέ	: οὐδέ τε AQ.
	146	ἀγοράζεις	: ἀγορεύεις, marg. ἀγοράζεις N.
	152	προίη	: προίοι ΓL₃NQR₁V προοίοι L₂R₂.
	189	βιοθάλμιος	: βιοφθάλμιος NP.
	190	ἀθανάτησι	: ἀθανάτοισι Γ, N.
	237	δή τοι	: δ' οὗτοι AL₂NPV δ' οὗτϊ Β.
Aphr. vi.			no title ΒΓ.
Ares viii.	12	ἐμεῖο	: ἐμοῖο Β.
Art. ix.	3	μιλήτης	: μελήτης L₃.
Aphr. x.	1	κυπρογενῆ	: οὐπρογενῆ Β υπρογενῆ V.²⁵

Mat. De. xiv.	3	τυπάνων	: τυμπάνων ΓR₂ τυ͡πάνων L₂.
Pan xix.	32	ψαφαρότριχα	: ψαφορότριχα AQ.
Heph. xx.	4	ναιετάασκον	: ναιετάεσκον ΒΓ.
Hest. xxix.	6	ἱστίη	: ἑστίη Q.
Ge xxx.	8	πάρεστι	: πέρ ἐστι L₂NP πέρεστι Β.
Hel. xxxi.	5	ἥ οἱ	: οἵη ΒΓ.
Sel. xxxii.	1	μήνην	: σελήνην Γ.
	11	πλήθη	: πλήθει Β.

Hollander (p. 11), with a more detailed collation at his command, has concluded for a relationship between PL₂R₁, ₂. A reading of the variants above might incline one to group ΒΓΟ together. At least it is plain that the Par. family are not immediate descendants from their common ancestor, but that several stages intervene. Certain corrections in B (*Ap.* 156, 210) and words left uncomplete (*Herm.* 168, 410) are to the credit of its scribe. The striking feature however in this family is the second hand of Γ and its corrections.

Γ, a Brussels manuscript (Bibliothèque Royale 11377-11380, see Omont, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles*, 1885, no. 74), was written by Aristobulus Apostolides, son of Michael, a Cretan who at the beginning of the sixteenth century wrote many Greek books and ended his life as bishop of Monembasia. See Legrand, *Bibl. Hellénique* I. clxv. *sq.* and Omont, *Facsimilés des manuscrits grecs des quinzième et seizième siècles*, no. 5. The book is corrected by a second hand, of which I have no nearer information than M. Ouverleaux' statement that it is later ('posterior') than the

---

²⁵ Cf. the readings of D υπρογενῆ and of EK εὐπρογενῆ. In all the cause is the same ; the first letter of the Hymn was left by the scribe to be added in colour. DV have reproduced their archetype. B and EK have given the headless word the first beginning that occurred to them.

original. Still we may safely assume that both the first and the second hand were not earlier than 1500, and therefore that the printed edition (1488) may have been consulted.

The text of the MS. is not very remarkable; the most noticeable variants are ἄδον *Ap.* 22, νεπόδων *ib.* 78, ῥήσσοντες *ib.* 516, ἠρίζεσκον *Herm.* 58, and these may be put to Aristobulus' credit. The corrections of the second hand are far more striking and deserve enumeration.

Ap. 32 ἀγχιαλος [ἀγχιάλη *x*]. [η above ο]

59 βόσκοις [βόσκεις B, JK]. [ει above οι]

181 περικλύστης [περικλύστου M]: the writer must have intended to omit μέγ'. [οιο above υ]

184 θυώδεα. [τε above]

192 ἀφραδέες [ita M].

215 ἄπολλον [ita *m x*].

217 μαγνηΐδας [= μαγνιήνας of *y*]. [ν above]

243 ἀλίαρτον corr. ex ἄμαρτον.

244 δελφούσης. [τ above]

309 κορυφῆς, ς add. m. 2.

318 ρίψ'ανα.
. . .

ib. ἔμβαλεν [ἔμβαλον M ed. pr.]. [ον above]

325 ἦν [ἦν ἀρ ed. pr., ἤ' ἀρ S].

392 νῆα θοὴν [ed. pr., m. 2 M].

402 οὖτις [id. M].

423 ἐύκτιτον [id. M].

450 χαίτηϛ (*sic*) [χαίτη ed. pr.].

452 ποθεν [τίνες ed. pr.]. [τίνες above]

Herm. 45 ἢ ὅτε [ita M].

58 ὡς corr. ex ὅν.

119 αἰωνος [ita M *x*]. [α above]

303 εὖ [ita *x* ed. pr.].

397 σπεύδοντε [σπεύδοντο *x*]. [ο above]

Aphr. 13 σάκεα.

20 πτόλις [ita ed. pr.].

Mat. de. xiv. 3 κροτάλη [κροτάλων *m x*]. [ων above]

Pan xix. 45 ἔτερφθον. [ε above]

Terra xxx. 15 παίζουσι [παίζουσαι ed. pr.]. [αι above]

Some of these, *Ap.* 32, 59, 215, 217, *Herm.* 119, 303, 397, *Mat. de.* xiv. 3, are the readings of other extant MSS., and therefore although one or all of them may possibly be conjectures of the second scribe, we are not warranted in describing them as such.   Next come coincidences with the editio princeps, e.g. *Ap.* 318, 325 (partly), 392, 450, 452, *Aphr.* 20, *Ge* xxx. 15.   Here again these emendations may be the independent work of the second scribe; but, as I have said, the MS. was written at a time later than the ed. pr., and the probability is that the scribe availed himself of the labours of Demetrius Chalcondyles.   There remain the variants to which no other source can be given; these are *Ap.* 181, 184, 192, 243, 244, 309, 318, 402, 423, *Herm.* 45, *Aphr.* 13, *Pan* xix. 45.   Of these *Ap.* 192, 402, 423, *Herm.* 45 were confirmed upon the discovery of M in 1780.   The list as a whole shows very great qualities of insight on the part of the corrector, and not one · modern scholar only is anticipated in his emendation.   It would be interesting if a further examination of the MS. threw any light upon the personality of the corrector.

I return to the Paris family as a whole.   Upon the nature and age of the common ancestor (*p*), the following corruptions throw light—

Ap. 162 κρεμβαλιασὺν for κρεμβαλιαστὺν.   Obviously the minuscule ligature στ is the cause of this error.

176 ἐπιδὴν for ἐπιδή.   Perhaps δη written in minuscule was taken for δὴν also in minuscule ; the presence of the ν would add only a single extra curve.

215 ἀπόλλωνος (unmetrical) for ἄπολλον; perhaps from ἀπόλλων, the *o* which was meant for the vocative being mistaken for the abbreviation of ος.

Herm. 481 φιλομειδέα for φιλοκυδέα.   I think that this word, though an existing form, is a graphical corruption from φιλοκυδέα, μ taking the place of the minuscule κ (*k*), and ει that of υ by ordinary itacism.

I notice a similar interchange in Quintus i. 815, κείροντο and μύροντο.

ib.   484 νόα for νόω.   This corruption seems possible only in minuscule.

ib.   560 ἐδωδυῖαι for ἐδηδυῖαι.   This if a graphical corruption must have its origin in minuscule.   An open omega and the minuscule η written together with δ might be mistaken one for the other.   Cf. ἐπώρξατο ἐπήρξατο in M *Ap.* 125, φηλωτὴν φηλητήν *Herm.* 214 in *p*.

Aphr. 174 ἠυρε for κῦρε.   The minuscule *k* has given eta.

These instances suffice to show that the archetype of the Parisienses was a minuscule manuscript, and as it is impossible that thirteen scribes should have made identical errors in copying one correct original, it follows, as in the case of ELΠT, that p itself was copied from a minuscule MS.

We have now seen that the existing copies of the Homeric Hymns may be regarded as descendants of three independent minuscule manuscripts m x and p. The relation between these archetypes will be considered in the next part of this treatise. One theory with regard to two of them has first to be discussed. Otto Schneider (*Callimachus* i. p. vii.), Wilamowitz-Möllendorf (*Callimachus* p. 6), and Hollander *l.c.* p. 9 maintain that the archetype of all our MSS. whatever except M is a book which arrived in Italy in the year 1423, and has since disappeared.

In the letter which describes the celebrated cargo of 238 books of profane literature which Giovanni Aurispa brought from Constantinople to Venice in 1423 there occurs this passage (*Ambrosii Traversarii Epistolae*, ed. Laur. Mehus, Florentiae 1759, ii. col. 1027) 'Nam Gentilium Auctorum volumina Venetiis habeo ducenta triginta octo, ex quibus aliqua tibi, quae rarissimo inveniri solent, nominatim dicam......Argonautica Orphei, et eiusdem Auctoris tria opuscula, et Hymnos; Callimachum; quam plurimas Pindari Odas. *Laudes Deorum Homeri non parvum opus:* Oppianum de Venatu, item de naturis Piscium, sed id rarum non est......' Certainly the Homeric Hymns are intended by this description, and Schneider is entitled to every credit for his happy discovery, which seems to impart concreteness to a hypothetical genealogy.

That however this 'codex Aurispae' is the source of our existing copies with the exception of M cannot, if the preceding exposition is correct, be maintained. We have seen that some twenty-five MSS. extant fall into two principal families, x and p; among the x family three fifteenth century MSS. H J and K appear to be descendants of D, another fifteenth century MS. D and At, yet another fifteenth century book at present in Athos, seem to be sprung from a common archetype c, which in its turn belongs to a group of MSS. now represented by LΠ; these two books themselves are descended more or less directly from an archetype b, which together with a similar hypothetical archetype a actually represented by two fifteenth-century MSS. ET, spring from the original ancestor of the whole family, x. The other family p does not seem to have developed so many ramifications, but nevertheless the existing MSS. show signs of more than one generation between them and their parent p, and p itself appears to be the descendant of at least one earlier p'. Finally the two families x and p unite in a common ancestor z. And this common ancestor we are asked to believe is a book brought to Italy in 1423, and which before 1500 gave birth to this complicated

progeny! To pass over the fact that many of the steps in the genealogy of *x* and *p* point clearly to early minuscule writing, and that the original *z* was certainly an uncial MS., has it never occurred to the originator and the continuers of this theory to ask if such εὐπαιδία were even materially possible in the space of seventy years? The hunger of Greeks and the jealousy of Renaissance collectors may explain the production of copies as such; but the growth of error, the development of variant lections and the formation of families is a natural process, the work of centuries.

I shall only weaken this position if I add that, supposing Aurispa's MS. to be the parent of AAtBCΓDEGHJKLL₂L₃NOPΠQR₁R₂STVMon., all these MSS. must necessarily be of Italian origin. Now I am not aware of any test to distinguish a Renaissance Greek MS. written in Italy from one written in Crete or on the Greek mainland; and we have now a case, At, of one MS. at least actually written in the East. Moreover, Schneider and Hollander assume that, this act of production accomplished, Aurispa's book disappeared from the world of manuscripts; it, 'als sie nach Italien kam, schon einige Jahrhunderte alt sein mochte, und durch ihr hohes Alter gelitten hatte' (p. 9). But the rest of Aurispa's cargo, the Venetian Homer, the Ravenna Aristophanes, the Laurentian Sophocles, survive, and are not even in tatters; why are we to assume the Hymns MS. was less robust? And where is the book? even a ragged MS. need not vanish entirely; does it lurk in an unrifled private collection, or have decamping Jesuits buried it?

As far as our evidence goes there is no reason why Aurispa's book may not be D itself or another of the fifteenth century MSS. which we actually possess.

T. W. ALLEN.