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THE MANUSCRIPT AFFILIATIONS OF BTW IN THE TRADITION OF PLATO’S *EUTHYDEMUS*

I. Introduction

A fundamental problem in the study of the transmission of Plato concerns the precise relationship of the three manuscript families which together transmit the first six tetralogies of his dialogues, and their most important representatives, manuscripts B, T and W. There is no doubt that these manuscripts ultimately derive from a common source, but how precisely we should envisage the lines of the tradition following on from this common ancestor has been the subject of intense debate, with some arguing for a tripartite stemma, others opting for bipartition. The issue is complicated by the fact

* I would like to thank Dr. G. J. Boter and Dr. R.J. Allan for their constructive remarks on a draft version of this paper. I would also like to thank Nina King for correcting my English. All remaining errors are, of course, my own.


(2) For details on BTW, see infra, section II. In several dialogues BTW are joined by other primary witnesses; in the *Euthydemus* this is not the case (though cf. n. 6).

that throughout the Platonic corpus the reciprocal relations of BTW vary extensively. Therefore we cannot expect manuscript affiliations established for one dialogue to hold true for others as well: instead, each dialogue should be studied individually.4

In what follows I propose to do just that and look at the evidence for the interrelations of BTW presented by the text of the Euthydemus. After a brief introduction of our manuscripts and a discussion of the arguments for their primary status and their shared descent from a common source, I will turn to a detailed investigation, based on fresh collations and in situ examination, of their reciprocal relations and examine whether there are grounds for postulating a common hyparchetype for TW, BW or BT. Subsequently, I will address the issue as to whether our primary witnesses are the descendants of one, two or three separate transliterations – an issue which, theoretically at least, could contribute in important ways to a solution of the matter at hand. And finally, I will examine the indirect tradition of the Euthydemus and what little can be gleaned from an extant papyrus fragment, which may shed further light on our manuscripts and their affiliations.

II. The primary manuscripts of the Euthydemus

There are three primary witnesses to the text of the Euthydemus, all well known and often described in detail. For present purposes, therefore, a brief summary will suffice.

[ii.

...the priest Mary Manuscript of the Euthydemus...]

There are three primary witnesses to the text of the Euthydemus, all well known and often described in detail. For present purposes, therefore, a brief summary will suffice.

[iii.

...the priest Mary Manuscript of the Euthydemus...]

...the priest Mary Manuscript of the Euthydemus...
Ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, E. D. Clarke 39: B; membranaceus; date: 895 AD (subscr. f. 418v); scribe: Joannes Kalligraphos (subscr. f. 418v); cont.: tetr. I-VI; Euthd.: f. 317v-336r. The manuscript was commissioned by Arethas, deacon of Patras at the time; for many centuries it was in the library of the monastery of St. John on the island of Patmos, until it was discovered by Clarke in 1801 and taken to England. Apart from corrections by the main scribe (B1c), there are corrections in the Euthydemus by a hand that is contemporary with or very close in time to the first scribe (B2) and further corrections by several later hands, which, for present purposes, I will group under the collective siglum B7.


Because P is a primary manuscript for the dialogues which it contains in full as well as for the excerpta longiora from tetr. I-VII (for literature, cf. Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 19 n. 39; in R. and Ti. on the other hand, P is a descendant of ms. Parisinus gr. 1807 [A]: Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3, p. 150; id., The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 119-120; Jonkers, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 203-205), Martinelli Tempesta argues that, unless there are indications to the contrary, P should ex hypothesi be considered a primary witness for the smaller excerpts as well (Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 18-19). Although the hypothesis is interesting, the excerpta brevia are usually too few in number and too short to admit of any certainty about their stemmatic position (as is the case with Ly., studied by Martinelli Tempesta, op. cit.). P has some excerpts and scholia from the Euthydemus, but they amount to no more than four sentences with only slight alterations to the text, most of which are probably intentional, made in order to adapt the text to its new context (e. g. γάρ om. bis); for such «editorial» procedure in P and other excerpt manuscripts, cf. e. g. Boter, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 147, 200; Brockmann, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 153-154; D. Cufalo, Scholia Graeca in Platonem I: scholia ad dialogos tetralogiarum I-VII continens, Roma, 2007, p. lxxiv-1xxv). Therefore, as far as the Euthydemus is concerned, P offers too little material to assess its stemmatic position and shall thus be left out of further consideration here.

(7) Scholarly literature on B is vast: cf. e. g. T. W. Allen, Plato Codex Oxoniensis Carkianus 39 phototypice editus, 2 vol., Lugduni Batavorum, 1898-1899, vol. 1, p. i-xi; Dodds, cit. n. 1, p. 35-37; Carlini, Studi sulla tradizione, cit. n. 4, p. 151-158; Brockmann, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 37-48; Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 71f.; Cufalo, Scholia Graeca, cit. n. 6, p. cxxviii-cxxv; B. Vancamp, Untersuchungen zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung von Platons Menon, Stuttgart, 2010, p. 12-13; Manerin, Studi sulla tradizione tes-
Ms. Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Gr. IV, 1 (coll. 542): T; membranaceus; date: ca. 950 AD (old part); scribe: Ἐφραίμ Μονάχος (old part) and several more recent hands; cont.: tetr. I-VIII up to R. 389d7 (old part) + R. (389d7-end), Ti. and other works in more recent hands; Euthd.: f. 145v-152v. In T, as in B, corrections and variants written by the main scribe (Tₚ) are accompanied by corrections of a near-contemporary hand (T²) and several later hands, which I collectively designate t₈.

Ms. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 7: W; membranaceus; date: ca. 1050-1100 AD (old part); scribe: Ἄνωνυμος Κ (old part) and two more recent hands; cont.: tetr. I-VII except Alc.2 (old part) + other works in more recent hands; Euthd.: f. 451v-471r. The first scribe has written all marginal and interlinear variants and made many corrections (Wₚ); apart from one or two negligible instances (e.g. 291a4 κρειττόνων κρ*τόνων W, corr. man. alt.), no other hands are at work in the Euthydemos.

Dating from 895 AD, ca. 950 AD and ca. 1050-1100 AD respectively, BTW are the oldest manuscripts containing the complete text of the tuale, cit. n. 3, p. 13-14. For the possible identification of B² with Arethas himself, see the literature cited in Brockmann, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 38-41; Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 9 n. 14; id., Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 15 n. 9; Manfrin, Studi sulla tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 13.


Euthydemus. Furthermore, it has been convincingly shown that, even
though T and W themselves are younger, the traditions of which they
are the most important representatives were in existence already in
the IXth century.

The arguments for their primary status are the following. As the
oldest manuscript of the Euthydemus, B is a primary witness by
definition. Furthermore, it is the sole bearer (excluding apographa)

(10) Except, perhaps, the secondary manuscript Parisinus gr. 1808, a copy of T
cf. e. g. Brockmann, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 162-167; Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 32-39; id., Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 46-53; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 47-48, for which a date in the XIth or early XIIth century is now usually accepted: e. g. Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 46; Vancamp, cit. n. 7, p. 20; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 47.

(11) Concerning T: from the subscription at the end of tetr. VII (f. 197v τξλοζ τοῦ x' δηκβνω) we learn that T is a copy of an edition of Plato in two volumes containing tetr. I-VII and tetr. VIII-IX + spuria respectively (the fact that Clit. is numbered x01 likewise points to a complete edition; cf. Boter, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 112). Now, in the old part of tetr. VIII (Cit. and R. up to 389d7; cf. S. R. Slings, A Commentary on the Platonic Clitophon, Amsterdam, 1981, p. 273; Boter, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 111ff.) T is a copy of Parisinus gr. 1807 (A), which contains tetr. VIII-IX + spuria, and which appears to be the second part of an edition in two volumes. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that T's exemplar for tetr. I-VII (now lost) represents the first volume of this Platonis opera omnia edition, and that A is the second volume. – That A and (the exemplar of) T are closely linked is also shown by their close resemblance in codicological and palaeographical details (mise en page, numbering of dialogues, etc.): cf. Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 43; Boter, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 112.

– Now, as A is dated to around 875 AD (thereby making it the oldest medieval
manuscript of Plato), the exemplar of T for tetr. I-VII should be dated to the
same period, which shows that the tradition of T was already in existence in the
IXth century. For details, cf. e. g. H. Alline, Histoire du texte de Platon, Paris, 1915, p. 214-217; Dodds, cit. n. 1, p. 37-38; Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 43, 147-148, 160-161; Diller, cit. n. 8, p. 324; Boter, The Venetus T, cit. n. 8; id., The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 112ff.; E. A. Duke, Evidenza for the Text of Plato in the later 9th Century, in Revue d'Histoire des Textes, 19, 1990, p. 19-29; Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 213-214, 272; L. Ferroni, Per una nuova edizione dello Ione platonico: I manoscritti primari e l'indipendenza del Marc. gr. 189 (S), in Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes, 81.2, 2007, p. 271-289, at p. 272 n. 9 (with more

(12) Excluding, of course, the papyrus fragments mentioned in n. 6.
of the authentic reading in e.g.: 272c1 αὐτὸς TW; 273a2 αὐτὸς om. TW; 279a7 εὐφρείνιν εὕφρείν TW; 286b4 ἄλλοιν ἄρα T: ἄρα W; 287d3 ἀποκρίνασθαι ἀποκρίνασθαι καὶ δέτε μὴ (του ante ἀποκρίνασθαι s.l. T) TW; 291b4 τα... πολλά] τὰς... πολλὰς TW; 300d5 ἢττησαι] ήττησαι TW; 304c1 δὲ] om. TW. Since T and W are the second and third oldest manuscripts respectively, it will suffice to show that T is independent from B and that W is independent from both B and T. That this is indeed the case, can be easily demonstrated. In the first place, B has many separative errors not found in either T or W, e.g.: 271b6-7 ὁ δὲ παρ᾽ ἐμὲ ὃς δὲ παρέμενε; 276b4 ἐφη οἷς οὕτω οὗτοι BW: 285c1 γενναῖε om. 277a8-b1 ἐφη BW: εἰδὼς T: ἦδ᾽ ὅς Routh; 285d5 γενναῖε om. 297a1-2 πάνυ πολλὰ BW: 297a1-2 πάνυ πολλὰς BW; 299a5-6 τὸ s.l. T) BT. Furthermore, T and W, like B, each contain authentic readings not found in the other two manuscripts. Some examples from T: 280c1 ἡγοῦτο τοῦτο ἢγοῦτο W: ἡγοῦτο τοῦτο καλλίω B: ἡγοῦτο τοῦτο W; 289c3 δὴ ὁμολογεῖ δὲ BW; 290c3 ἐκαστοῖς ἐκαστά BW; 302a2 ἶγγοι T: ἶγγοι ὁταν B: ἶγγοι τ' ἐν W. Some examples found in W: 278c5 ἀποδόσων άποδοσῶν BT; 285d4 τὸ τοι (sic) B: τοῖς T; 286a6 λέγοντες γνώντες BT; 286e9 παχέως παχέως BT; 299a5 τῶν] τῶν BT. Moreover, direct indications of T’s dependence on B or of W’s dependence on B or T are entirely lacking. For these and other possible TW-errors, see infra, section IV.

For these and other possible errors of BW and BT, see infra, section IV.

For example, of those omissions in W which could be long enough to correspond exactly to one or more lines in an exemplar (apart from 277a3-4, 277b9-c1, 279e9-d2, 284a5-6, 293e7-8 mentioned above, these are: 289d5-6 ἐκεῖνοι – λόγους; 297a1-2 πάνω – λαγθόλι) none corresponds exactly to a line or lines in either B or T, nor is the text in B or T in any of these passages written in such a way as to facilitate parablepsis (e.g. with the words «surrounding» the omission directly above one another). This fact provides some confirmation of W’s
Additionally, all other manuscripts containing the complete text of the \textit{Euthydemus} and some of the manuscripts with selected \textit{excerpta} – the others simply having too little material to reach firm conclusions – can be shown to ultimately derive from B, T, or W\textsuperscript{16}. Thus, considering the arguments thus far presented\textsuperscript{17}, we must conclude that BTW are primary witnesses to the text of the \textit{Euthydemus}, and that no other primary witnesses are currently known to exist.

III. BTW derive from a common archetype

After having established BTW as primary witnesses for the \textit{Euthydemus}, I turn to the arguments for their shared descent from the archetype\textsuperscript{18}. The most important ones are the following\textsuperscript{19}. In the first place, it has often been observed that BTW closely adhere to the tetralogical order of the Platonic dialogues, B and T following it without any divergences, and W presenting it in a slightly modified form (besides omitting \textit{Alc.2} altogether)\textsuperscript{20}. Now, since the tetralogical arrangement contains material which is doubtlessly spurious independence from the others, but the argument should not be pressed: six out of seven of these omissions are due to \textit{homooeoteleuton} (289d5-6 is the exception) and thus do not prove much; furthermore, the (theoretical) possibility of W being dependent on B or T via an intermediary would still remain.

(16) I intend to discuss the \textit{eliminatio codicum descriptorum} in more detail elsewhere.
(17) For possible majuscule errors and links with the indirect tradition, see \textit{infra}, sections V and VI.
(18) Although this is not the place for a detailed discussion of terminology, the term ‘archetype’ has been defined in so many different ways that using it calls for clarification (cf. P. Trovato, \textit{Everything you Always Wanted to Know about Lachmann’s Method: A Non-Standard Handbook of Genealogical Textual Criticism in the Age of Post-Structuralism, Cladistics, and Copy-Text}, Padova, 2014 [repr. Padova, 2017], p. 63): here I use the term simply to designate the (in our case, lost) manuscript which is not the original and from which all relevant extant manuscripts can be shown to derive: cf. e.g. P. Maas, \textit{Textkritik}, Leipzig, 1927 [repr. Leipzig, 1957], p. 6, 9; Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 134 (although he refrains from using the term ‘archetype’); Trovato, cit., p. 63-67.
(e.g. Amat., Hipparch.), this ordering cannot be ascribed to Plato himself and must therefore post-date him. Hence, the presence of this arrangement in our manuscripts may be seen as a Bindefehler of sorts. However, this argument, perhaps, does not take us very far: as the tetralogical ordering seems to have been quite popular in the medieval tradition of Plato, the fact that BTW all reproduce it does not necessarily mean that they are bound together (i.e., in stemmatic terms, it could be «polygenetic»).

In the second place, and more decisively, BTW are linked by many shared errors which must have been already present in their common ancestor. From the Euthydemus we may note the following examples (but there are more to be found): 272d1-2 σὺ τί οὐ συμφοιτᾷς; ὃς Winckelmann: σὺ τί (σὺ τί B) ποὺ συμφοιτᾷς ἵσως BTW; 273e1 ἤν δ᾽ ἐγὼ Coislinianus 155 (p.c., rasura ante ἤν) Malatestianus D.28.4: ἐφηγὰν ἤν δ᾽ ἐγὼ BTW (ἦν [sic] B: ἤν ut vid. W); 276c7 ἐφὶ σὺ Burnet (ἐφὶ Schanz): ἐφὶ δὲς BTW; 277a6 ἤν add. s.l. Coislinianus 155: om. BTW; 294d8 τὸν ἐφὶ δὲς ηγῆμον secl. Hermann: habent BTW; 295a3 (ἦν δ᾽) ἐγὼ Cornarius: ἐγὼ BTW: alii alia; 297d1 Πατροκλῆς secl. Heindorf: habent BTW; 299d4 χρῆναι Badham: χρῆμα BTW; 300c4 τὰ λεγόμενα secl. Schanz: habent BTW: alii alia.

In all of the above instances, whichever editorial solution one chooses, the transmitted reading is evidently incorrect – though not always, strictly speaking, impossible. More examples could be added, but, even though they are not all equally significant, these suffice to point to the existence of a common source from which BTW descend and in which these errors were (most probably) already to be found. Naturally, this does not imply that these errors were all made in one particular time and place, for example when the archetype

(21) Cf. Pasquali, cit. n. 19, p. 251-2; Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3, p. 152 n. 8; Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 20. The ordering is ascribed to Thrasyllus (1st century AD) by Diogenes Laërtius (D.L. III.56-61; IX.45) but is almost certainly older: cf. Pasquali, cit. n. 19, p. 251-2, 261; Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 24ff.; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 1.
(22) Cf. Maas, cit. n. 18, p. 27.
(23) Ms. F (Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 39; XIIIth century), for example, contains Grg., Men., Hp.Ma., Hp.Mi., Ms., Ion, tetr. VIII, Mi. (incomplete), i.e. (parts of) tetr. VI-IX with Ion and Ms. inverted, and thus likewise maintains the ‘Thrasyllan’ order, even though F represents a branch of the tradition which is completely distinct from that of BTW (cf. Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3, p. 152 n. 11). On F, see e.g. Dodds, cit. n. 1, p. 41-47; Boter, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 62-64, 99-110; Ferroni, cit. n. 11, p. 275ff.
(24) Some more errors common to BTW are mentioned in sections V and VI.
The Tradition of Plato’s *Euthydemus*

was produced. On the contrary, the tradition as found in BTW is the result of a long and complex process of transmission, contamination and revision, at every stage of which errors were committed (and corrected) and variants were introduced: a highly stratified amalgam of readings which in some way or other found their way into the archetype from a plurality of sources.

IV. The Manuscript Affiliations of BTW: Bipartition vs. Tripartition

Do the primary manuscripts BTW in the *Euthydemus* form a bipartite or a tripartite stemma? If we want to argue that two out of three manuscripts together form a sub-branch of a bipartite tradition, we shall, first and foremost, need to find agreements in readings that are not only manifest errors, but also significant, i.e. they cannot plausibly be explained in terms other than those of «regular» vertical transmission. This truism is worth restating, since on it depends the number of instances that can be used as evidence. Therefore, it may be useful to keep in mind the other phenomena (other than vertical transmission) that may cause two manuscripts to agree in error against the third. They are the following: (i) polygenesis, or coincidence, where two scribes commit the same error independently of one another; (ii) correction of a corrupt archetype: one of the three descendants corrects the mistake, leaving the others in error; (iii) horizontal transmission, or contamination; (iv) the archetype was equipped with variant readings, in response to which two manuscripts copied variant A, while variant B was copied by the third.

(25) Cf. e.g. Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 128; Martinelli Tempesta, *Platone. Liside*, cit. n. 3, p. 20; Ferroni, cit. n. 11, p. 287 n. 62. Much has been written on the possible time and place in which the archetype was produced, too large a subject to deal with here; for a concise *status quaestionis*: Martinelli Tempesta, *La tradizione testuale*, cit. n. 3, p. 258-266; cf. Ferroni, cit. n. 11, p. 287 n. 62.

(26) Of Leitfehler, as Maas, cit. n. 18, p. 27ff. calls them. Cf. e.g. Boter, *The Textual Tradition*, cit. n. 4, p. 72; Martinelli Tempesta, *Platone. Liside*, cit. n. 3, p. 25; Trovato, cit. n. 18, p. 54-56.

(27) Alternatively, the archetype itself may, after one or more copies have already been made, have been corrected, subsequently producing further offspring without the error in question: Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 155-156.

(28) To some extent, (ii), (iii) and (iv) overlap, since correcting errors *ope codicium* always and bearing variant readings usually implies that some form of horizontal transmission has taken place (cf. F. Ronconi, *La traslitterazione dei testi greci: una ricerca tra paleografia e filologia*, Spoleto, 2003, p. 125-126). However, when, in what follows, I speak of horizontal transmission, I mean horizontal transmission...
If one could prove that one of these phenomena has occurred in a particular instance, that particular agreement can no longer be used to argue for a (vertical) stemmatic relationship between the two manuscripts in question.

To what extent, then, can we expect to find these phenomena in the tradition of the *Euthydemus*? Unfortunately, it is not possible to answer this question with any certainty, but it seems *a priori* likely that all have played some part in shaping the testimony of BTW. Polygenesis and some form of correction of the archetype, of course, form the standard ingredients of any tradition (especially with insignificant errors). The same goes for horizontal transmission. That the transmission of Plato’s dialogues is already characterised by large-scale contamination from Antiquity onwards is a well-known fact, which can be observed in almost every stage of the tradition. In the *Euthydemus* it is most clearly seen in W (as is often the case in other dialogues as well), primarily in its many pairs of variant readings: in fifteen out of a total of twenty-six variant pairs (all of which are written by the first hand) one reading agrees with B while the other agrees with T (though in two cases only partly). In these cases W neatly divides its allegiance between the other two manuscripts, which strongly suggests horizontal transmission in an ancestor of W. B and T show less clear traces of contamination than W, but it may well have acted on their respective traditions as well.

between the three separate branches of our tradition (i.e. *intra*-stemmatical and *post*-archetypal).

(29) Cf. e.g. Alline, cit. n. 11, p. 306-307; Pasquali, cit. n. 19, p. 260-261; Dodds, cit. n. 1, p. 38-39; Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 72, 137-138; Boter, *The Venetus T*, cit. n. 8, p. 110; id., *The Vindobonensis W*, cit. n. 3, p. 145, 147-148, 151, 154; Martinelli Tempesta, *La tradizione testuale*, cit. n. 3, p. 269-270; id., *Platone. Liside*, cit. n. 3, p. 27, 29, 33-34; F. VendraScolo, *Storia del testo di Platone: a proposito di uno studio recente*, in *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*, 128, 2000, p. 110-121, at p. 120; Murphy, cit. n. 3, p. 144; Jonkers, cit. n. 4, p. 6-10; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 27, 34, 36. For traces of contamination in ancient papyri, cf. e.g. Pasquali, cit. n. 19, p. 255ff.; Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 72; Martinelli Tempesta, *Platone. Liside*, cit. n. 3, p. 33-34.

(30) Since in such cases we cannot know which reading was transmitted vertically and which was transmitted horizontally, the agreement of two manuscripts in error cannot prove stemmatic affiliation: Boter, *The Vindobonensis W*, cit. n. 3, p. 154 n. 40.

(31) Cf. Nicoll’s sensible admonition not to regard «the B-T traditions as in some way more ‘fixed’ than that of W» (W. S. M. Nicoll, *A problem in the textual tradition of Plato’s Politicus*, in *The Classical Quarterly*, n.s. 25.1, 1975, p. 41-47, at p. 47). For signs of horizontal transmission in B in the *Euthydemus* (excluding readings imported from other branches by later hands) one may point to 298a8-9 (quoted below). Regarding T: T has 22 pairs of variants by the first hand, in
For even when no indications are present at all, horizontal transmission must be kept in mind as a possible explanation for agreement in error, although it will usually be impossible to prove it.\textsuperscript{32}

Similarly hard to prove is the hypothesis of an archetype with variant readings\textsuperscript{33}. In and of itself it is not unlikely that the archetype had at least a few variants written above the line or in the margin, and there are some possible indications from the Euthydemus that this was indeed the case. The fact that many variae lectiones in \textit{T} and all those in \textit{W} (22 and 26 instances respectively) are written by the first hand suggests that they were already present in their respective exemplars – although some may have been added by the scribes themselves in scribendo. However, there are no cases where \textit{BTW} all share exactly the same pair of variants: \textit{B} has just one marginal variant by the first hand (292d5 ᾦ prius] ἦ et ἦι i.m.), which is not found in TW, and only twice do TW share a pair of (nearly) identi-
cal variants\textsuperscript{34}. These could have been carried over from a common ancestor (the archetype or an hyparchetype, if there was one), but B does not have them and the agreement between TW could be the result of contamination.

Further indications are provided by cases such as the following: in 277a8-b1 \(\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\ T\), Routh’s conjecture \(\varepsilon\vartheta\ 2\varepsilon\)\textsuperscript{35} perfectly explains the impossible reading of T (\(\varepsilon\vartheta\ 2\varepsilon\ > \varepsilon\vartheta\)) and if he is right, we are possibly dealing with an instance of variant speech formulas in the archetype\textsuperscript{36}. In 295d5 (διενενοήμην BW: διενενοούμην [sic] revera T)\textsuperscript{37}, the reading of T might be a blend of a pluperfect and an imperfect indicative, but probably is simply an error singularis of T (ditto graphy of -en). In 298a8-9 we find \(\omicron\upsilon\chi\\upsilon\nu\) (sic) πατηρ ἐστιν B: \(\omicron\upsilon\nu\) (sic) πατηρ εἴη T: \(\omicron\upsilon\nu\) πατηρ ἐστίν W: B’s text looks like a conflation of the potential optative and indicative moods, possibly stemming from variants in an ancestor. Admittedly, such conflations do not necessarily point to variants in the archetype, but may have arisen afterwards. Thus, although it seems plausible that the archetype was furnished with at least some variant readings, it is difficult to prove, and we probably should not overestimate the extent to which the archetype had such variants\textsuperscript{38}.

\textsuperscript{(34)} 284b6 \(\acute{\omega}\gamma'\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\nu\iota\nu\iota\zeta\) (iota subscr. ut vid.) et i.m. \(\gamma\rho\) \(\delta\sigma\tau\) (sic) \(\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\a T:\ \acute{\omega}\gamma\ \kappa\lambda\nu\iota\nu\iota\alpha\) et i.m. \(\delta\sigma\tau\) \(\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\a\) W; 286c5 \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\a\) T: \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\a\) ei supra W.

\textsuperscript{(35)} M. J. ROUTH, Platonis Euthydemus et Gorgias, Oxonii, 1784, p. 318.

\textsuperscript{(36)} Routh’s conjecture, brilliant though it may be, need not necessarily be the authentic reading, of which it is difficult to be certain; e. g. Ammendola (G. AMMENDOLA, Platon. Eutidemo. Testo critico, Introduzione e Commento, Milano, 1936) and Méridier (L. Méridier, Platon, Œuvres complètes. Tome V, 1re partie: Ion, Ménekhène, Euthydème, Paris, 1931 [repr. Paris, 1956]) print \(\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\). Similar, in a sense, is 273e1 (quoted in full above) where BTW read \(\varepsilon\varphi\nu\eta\nu\ \acute{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\iota\omega\) (sic) B: \(\acute{\eta}\nu\ ut\ vid\ W), which looks very much like a conflation of, again, two speech formulas. Note, however, that this does not constitute an indication of variants in the archetype: both variants must already have been written in textu in the archetype, since BTW all have them in the text and in the same order. Cf. E. H. GIFFORD, The Euthydemos of Plato. With Revised Text, Introduction, Notes and Indices, Oxford, 1905 ad loc. for a different explanation.

\textsuperscript{(37)} Burnet’s (BURNET, cit. n. 1) report of the reading of T (διενενοούμην) is incorrect; the error was carried over from M. SCHANZ, Platonis opera quae jam earum omnia ad codices denuo collatos, vol. 7: Platonis Euthydemos, Protagoras, Lipsiae, 1880 (cf. BURNET, cit. n. 1, vol. 3, Praefatio). Méridier’s (MÉRIDIER, cit. n. 36) report (διενενοήμην BW: ενοούμην T) is misleading, as it could easily be taken to mean the same as Burnet’s apparatus entry.

\textsuperscript{(38)} No conclusions can be drawn from the agreement of a variant in T – written by the first hand; the editors of ADORNO, cit. n. 6 (CPF I.1***, p. 63) mistakenly attribute it to the second hand – with the reading in the papyrus fragment
As I hope to have shown, these potentially distorting factors will make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to establish with certainty the existence of a common hyparchetype. Horizontal transmission, for example, usually cannot be proved (or disproved) and it is theoretically possible to make it responsible for all the agreements in error of any two manuscripts. Naturally, everyone will agree that in practice there is a limit to the extent to which one can explain away agreements in this manner, but it is not self-evidently clear how far one is allowed to go in such matters. Furthermore, there is always a possibility that pre-existing (shared) errors were later corrected, thereby making original stemmatic affiliations unclear, and there is evidence that the text in our manuscripts, W in particular, is the result of considerable diorthosis. In view of all this, the only possible course of action is to examine each case individually, constantly keeping in mind that plausibility, and not certainty, is all we can achieve.

I now turn to a closer examination of the agreements in error of BTW and start with the manuscript pair which shares the high-

\[ P.Oxy 6 881 \text{ in } 302a1 : \pi \rho \delta \beta \alpha \tau \nu \text{ ov } \varepsilon t o v \text{ } \varepsilon t \text{ } o v \text{ } T : \pi \rho \delta \beta \alpha \tau \nu \text{ } T \text{ } \text{ } P.Oxy 6 881. \] Alline argued (Alline, cit. n. 11, p. 183-185, although he does not mention this example; cf. n. 33) that, when a variant in a Byzantine manuscript is also found in a papyrus but nowhere else, that proves that the variant is older than the archetype and could only have made it into the medieval tradition (i.e. in T) if it was present as a variant in the archetype. However, it is always theoretically possible that a now lost source carrying this reading was still available in early Byzantine times (cf. Carlini, Platone: Alcibiade, cit. n. 33, p. 23-24). Furthermore, this particular case proves nothing, as the reading of T and the papyrus might actually be the authentic reading (cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Platon. Beilagen und Textkritik, Berlin, 1919 [repr. Berlin, 1962], p. 372; R. S. W. Hawtrey, Commentary on Plato's Euthydemus, Philadelphia, 1981, ad loc.) and even if it is an error, it is hardly significant.

(39) Cf. Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3, p. 149-150; Murphy, cit. n. 3, p. 140.

(40) Cf. e.g. Carlini, cit. n. 4, p. 170; Murphy, cit. n. 3, p. 137; Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 27, 30-32, 34; and the literature cited in n. 29.

(41) Part of our uncertainty is caused by the very nature of primary manuscripts, whose Vorlage is by definition no longer extant and thus cannot be compared. Therefore, «in dealing with the relationships of MSS of which the primary status has been proved convincingly, stemmatological evidence should be used much more cautiously than in dealing with secondary MSS» (Boter, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 4, p. 71-72; cf. Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 268).

(42) I exclude from this survey all errors consisting of orthographical minutiae (such as movable ν and second person middle endings \( \gamma/-\varepsilon \)), diacritical signs and
est number of errors: TW. A number of them are rather insignificant, such as: 274d2 κυτώ] κυτῶι (corr. t); 301ε1 ἐπιτιθείζ] ἐπιτιθείς B: ἐπιτιθείς (sic) T: ἐπιτιθής W; 303δ8 μήτε] μήτε 13. Others are perhaps a little more interesting, but still do not, in my opinion, carry enough stemmatic weight, e.g.: 275c1 ἀποκρίνεσθαι] ἀποκρίνασθαι 44; 280c1 ὀφέλοι] ὀφελεὶς B: ὀφελεὶς T: ὀφελης (sic) W; 303d8 μηδὲ] μήτε 43.

Others are perhaps a little more interesting, but still do not, in my opinion, carry enough stemmatic weight, e.g.: 275c1 ἀποκρίνεσθαι] ἀποκρίνασθαι 44; 280c1 ὀφέλοι] ὀφελεὶς B: ὀφελεὶς T: ὀφελης (sic) W; 303d8 μηδὲ] μήτε 43.

If word division, as well as errors in the division of speakers (although these may now and then provide useful information). In addition to cases where one of the shared readings is a varia lectio (cf. n. 30), I have also disregarded all instances of varying word order for the following reasons: first, although the study of Ancient Greek word order has made remarkable progress over the past decades (for summaries and literature cf. e.g. G. K. Giannakis (ed.), Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics, Leiden, 2013, s.v. Word Order; E. Van Emde Boas, A. Rijksebaron, L. Huitink, M. De Bakker, The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek, Cambridge, 2019, 60.1-60.38, p. 702-721), the authentic order of words is, in many cases, still very hard to ascertain. Second, of the 13 cases in the Euthydemus where BTW differ in the ordo verborum, T stands alone against BW in 10 of them (in the others it is W which stands alone), in line with T’s often noticed penchant for committing word order mistakes (cf. e.g. D. J. Murphy, Critical notes on Plato’s Charmides, in Mnemosyne, 60.2, 2007, p. 213-234, at p. 218; Manfren, cit. n. 3, p. 23). That T relatively often makes this kind of mistake is corroborated by the fact that Ephraim himself often corrects his transpositions currente calamo (Alline, cit. n. 11, p. 215-216; Dodds, cit. n. 1, p. 38): there are two additional cases of this type in the Euthydemus [286ad δὴ προ] 299b8 κυτώ B: κυτῶι 304a1 τοῦτο] τούτου (anticipation of τοῦ πράγματος); 305c5 μανθά] μανθάνω 47. Of

43 A widespread mistake, facilitated by the abundance of compound negatives in 303d7-8.

44 Aspектual variation is fairly common: e. g. 275c4 ἀποκρίνεσθι] ἀποκρίνασθι BW; 282e1 ἀπέλιπον] ἀπέλειπον T; 291b3-4 ἱπτόμαι] ήπτόμαι a.c. sed corr.; 298b4-5 zοὺ πεταόγ] πεταόν ζου a.c. sed corr.; the transposition signs used are // and \). This scribal idiosyncrasy makes one a priori doubt the reading of T in such cases, although it does not automatically follow that we should always adopt BW’s reading (cf. Carlini, Platone: Allocibade, cit. n. 33, p. 20-21; Morescchini, cit. n. 1, p. 6-7). Third, in most word order variants in the Euthydemus, the majority reading (shared by two manuscripts) appears to be the better reading, anyway. Therefore, nothing is lost, I think, if we exclude this type of error from our survey.


46 Evidently the succession of four syllables with identical pronunciation (α/ ει/ ει/ η) caused some confusion here.

47 Confusion of -ωι/-ουωι is not uncommon: e. g. 272b7 έχωι] έχοι T; 306a4 γεισωι] γείσωι B; Hp.Mei. 372c3 μανθάνοι] μανθάνωι F (teste Cufalo, Scholia Graeca, cit. n. 6, p. lxxiii n. 263); Smp. 218c9 έχοι] έχων TW; 221d4 λέγοι] λέγοι B.
several other concurrences of TW it is hard to establish with certainty whether they are incorrect, and even if they were, most of them would still be rather insignificant, e.g.:

271a7 δ᾽ B: δύο TW; 274b5 τοῦς Κλεινίου B: τοῦ κλεινίου TW; 275b4 διαφθείρη: διαφθαρῆι TW 48; 279d3 ἐλέγομεν B: ἐλέγομεν sed ἐ- punct. not. T: λέγομεν W 49; 293d6 ἐπεὶ B: εἰ TW.

In 285d7 TW’s ὁ διονυσόδωρος is more likely to be authentic than the simple διονυσόδωρος of B (followed by Burnet), since in reported dialogues Plato almost invariably uses the article with proper names in so-called «turn-taking scenes», i.e. «scenes where two, or more, speakers engaged in a discussion each in turn have the floor, and are contrasted with each other» 50. Identical variation is found in 286e5: διονυσόδωρος B P.Oxy 76 5085: ὁ διονυσόδωρος TW. The text of 286e5-8, including the distribution of speakers, is in serious doubt: Hermann’s conjecture ἐκέλευεν ἔφην was accepted by Burnet and others, and ἐκελευεν seems to have been the reading of P.Oxy 76 5085 51. Nevertheless, I am inclined to follow the manu-

---

(48) For TW’s διαφθαρῆι cf. e. g. the closely parallel Prt. 320a5-6; the change of subject (to either Cleinias himself or his διάνοια), though somewhat abrupt, is easily understandable: cf. G. J. de Vries, Notes on Some Passages in the Euthydemus, in Memosyne, 25.1, 1972, p. 42-55, at p. 44.

(49) If the present is preferred over the imperfect, we should write νῦν δή instead of νυνδή, although in reality νῦν δή may actually be the only correct form, to be printed everywhere in Plato: cf. A. Rijksbaron, Plato. Ion, or: On the Iiad, edited with introduction and commentary, Leiden-Boston, 2007, p. 64-68 (who calls νυνδή a «ghost form»); Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 169. For Burnet’s editorial criteria in this respect: J. Burnet, Plato: Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates and Crito. Edited with notes, Oxford, 1924, ad Euthphr. 3d10.


(51) ἐκελευεν itself is not preserved on the papyrus, but it is a plausible assumption that was the original reading, since in between ἐκελευεν/-ον and ἐφην/-η stands ἐμε, which can be read reasonably well – for details, cf. Colomo, Chapa, cit. n. 6, p. 63, where the relevant lines are presented as: ἐκελευεν/-εν ἐμε ἐφην/-ω – and which, as a direct object to ἐκελευεν, would require the third person singular in order to make sense. The presence of ἐμε, almost certainly an interpolation, shows that the precise form and meaning of this sentence were already disputed in Antiquity. Therefore, the testimony of P.Oxy 76 5085 does not necessarily sway the balance towards ἐκελευεν ἐφην, as the text may very well have been tampered with.
scripts in reading ἐκέλευον ἐφη (ἐκελευον ἐφη [sic] T), in which case Dionysodorus would be the speaker and we would expect (on the basis of the above «rule» for turn-taking scenes) the article with his name. But it would be unwise to think that absolute certainty can be attained in such matters and, in any case, an article is quite easily added or omitted.

TW-variants such as the following I consider to be incorrect and to some degree significant, but I hesitate to give them too much weight: 272c1 αὖ] αὐτὸς (variation of this sort is not uncommon; cf. e.g. Ap. 19d1; Grg. 483c9, 500a8); 278a7 τῷ πρίος [σικ] ἐπὶ (ἐπι W) τῷ (perseveration and anticipation, creating parallelism). Next, in 287d3 we find ἄποκρίνασθαι ἄποκρίνασθαι καὶ ὅτε μή (ante ἄποκρίνασθαι add. του s.i. T), where the added words καὶ ὅτε μή are obviously interpolated from two lines above (d1). There the phrase is apposite; in d3 it is certainly wrong. I do not consider it very likely that the interpolation occurred independently more than once, even though, in a sense, it is a mechanical error resulting from parablepsis. Nevertheless, due to the fact that the error in TW's nonsensical reading is rather easily spotted, it seems quite possible that the corrupt reading was already to be found in the archetype but was corrected by B or an ancestor, in which case the agreement of TW has no value for our purposes. The same could be true of 300d5 ἰττήσαι ἰττῆσαι, which has actually been corrected in several of T’s descendants, probably, at least in some, ope ingenii.

The significant errors of TW appear to be the following:

272b10 πέρυσιν] πέρυσιν δὲ; 273a2 αὖ om.; 274d7 ἔργον ἐπιδεῖξαι] ἔργον ἐπιδεῖξαι εἴη ἂν (sic; ἂν in ras. ut vid.) T: εἴη ἂν ἐπιδεῖξαι ἔργον (ras. inter -ξαι et -ρ-, et -γον in ras.) sed b’ supra εἴη et κ’ supra ἔργον W 56; 279a7 εὑρεῖν] εὑρεῖν; 291b4 τὰ... πολλὰ... πολλάς; 304e1 δὲ om. revera TW. In 272b10 B’s asyndeton appears superior and the desire to remove it might be the reason for TW’s...


(53) Cf. Brockmann, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 48. For B’s agreement with P.Oxy 76 5085 in omitting the article, cf. infra, section VI.

(54) It was also deleted, for instance, by a later hand in the Florentine manuscript Plateus 85.6, a descendant of T.

(55) Admittedly, not all are «manifest» errors in the sense that they are impossible, but I am fairly confident that B’s reading in these cases is authentic.

(56) The signa transpositionis in W are by the first hand, so W (probably) corrected against its exemplar.
addition of the particle. TW’s omission in 273a2 still yields unobjectionable sense, but an intrusion into B is harder to account for than the other way round; on the other hand, the presence of ἄν, directly preceding ζ, may have facilitated the omission somewhat. In 274d7, again, the reading of TW is possible, but it is much more likely that someone troubled by the absence of a predicate verb introduced ζ ἄν into the text, than that these (harmless) words would have been removed. At 279a7 B’s far superior εὐπορεῖν and TW’s εὑρεῖν are quite similar in appearance and perhaps, therefore, the weight of the lipography of the middle syllable should not be overestimated, but the corruption does not strike me as commonplace. In 291b4 TW’s feminine form could have come about under the influence of τῶν ἐπιστημῶν and ζι δ’ in 291b3, but the agreement is probably no coincidence. Neither is the omission of δε in 304e1.

Finally, I would include 286b4 ἄλλον ἄρα T: ἀρά W, though with less confidence. Postponed ἀρά is a well-documented Platonic usage, but the polyptoton of ἄλλον… ἄλλον is likewise idiomatic and appositely emphasises the difference between the two accounts of which Dionysodorus speaks.

On the basis of these agreements, clearly some form of contact between TW must be assumed. TW are bound together by six or seven truly significant errors, and if one is willing to add to that number those errors of slightly less significance, the count might be raised to about eleven. This would amount to 1 error every 3,4 Stephanus pages (counting 11 significant errors) or 1 every 5,3 Stephanus pages (counting 7 significant errors). To my mind, the tally is rather low on either count and even if we take into account the possibility that some pre-existing errors were corrected in W, the evidence so far reviewed does not, I believe, compel us to conclude that TW are the descendants of a common hyparchetype. The links between TW may also be the result of horizontal transmission, traces of which, as we have seen, are clearly to be found in W.

(57) Cf. LSJ, s.v. ἔργον IV.1.c for examples of ἔργον + inf. with and without a predicate verb.
(59) Joyal, The Platonic Theages, cit. n. 3, p. 123 and his n. ad Thg. 124c2.
(60) In the majority of cases where W has one variant agreeing with B and another agreeing with T, it has the B-reading in textu (11 out of 15 instances), which makes one wonder whether the T-readings might not be the imported, «secondary» readings, thus suggesting horizontal transmission coming from T (cf. Murphy, The basis of the text, cit. n. 3, p. 147), but, strictly speaking, we cannot tell: cf. n. 30.
Turning to BW, we find fewer shared errors than in the case of TW, but some of them are rather significant. Nevertheless, several may be dismissed right away: e.g. 273b5 ἀποβλέποντες ἀποβλέποντες⁶¹; 286a6 οὗτοι οὕτωι; 287c2 χρήσουμαι χρήσουμαι; 290c3 ἔκαστοι ἔκαστα (perseveration: τὰ διαγράμματα precedes)⁶². 275c4 ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἀποκρίνασθαι (cf. n. 44) and 300b2 ὃ· ὃ (om. ὅς) revera are perhaps not entirely without significance, but they do not carry much weight either. In other cases, it is difficult to determine whether BW’s reading is in fact incorrect. At 273b7 ἐν ἀριστερᾷ BW: ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς T, we are dealing with two perfectly acceptable variants, equivalent in meaning⁶³. BW’s περὶ αὐτῶι … περὶ νέῳ (W often omits iota mutum; cf. Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 16) 303b3 παρετάθησαν παρετέθησαν; 304d8 ἦν BW: εἶ et i.m. ἦι T.

(61) Corruption of duals into plurals is very common due to «[t]he unfamiliarity of the dual from Hellenistic times onwards» (Dodd, cit. n. 1, ad GrG. 454d8; cf. op. cit. ad GrG. 481d2; Alline, cit. n. 11, p. 60-61), and even more so in the case of the graphically similar endings of the participle (especially when written in majuscules: E → C; cf. Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 88, 99).

(62) Other insignificant errors are: 290d7 ἤ; 291c9 μόνις ἐπισταμένη ἐπισταμένη (W often omits iota mutum; cf. Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 16); 303b3 παρετάθησαν παρετέθησαν; 304d8 ἤ BW: εἶ et i.m. ἦι T.

(63) 271a8 (ἐξ διέξας) and 271b7 (ἐξ ἀριστερὰς) a little earlier seem to support T’s reading at 273b7, but a glance at e. g. Phd. 89a9-b1 suffices to show that Plato could just as well have chosen to vary the phrasing at 273b7 (and an attentive reader might have wanted to «restore» complete parallelism on the basis of 271a8 and 271b7).

(64) Dative and genitive after φοβέομαι περὶ are both possible: cf. e. g. (for gen.) Smp. 189b5; Ep. 360d3-4; (for dat.) Th. 4.123.2. With a different verbum timendi, cf. Prt. 320a5 (gen.; a very close parallel) and 322c1 (dat.).

(65) Although (with T) the position of ἤ BW: εἶ ἤ εἶ would be a bit surprising – it being usually found nearer to the beginning of the turn, either within or directly after the first sentence (not counting short «sentences» such as τί δέ) – but there are parallels for a position later in the turn (e. g. Euthd. 296d8, R. 368d1) and it is not infrequently found at the end of a somewhat longer discourse move, rounding off a speaker’s contribution (e. g. Euthd. 304b4-5, R. 394b1, 561a2).
tain opinion of someone/something) is uncommon, but is paralleled in R. 508d3. Both readings yield acceptable sense, and, while BW’s νοοῦσιν is lectio difficultior, the ironic praise implicit in T’s reading suits the general atmosphere of false admiration in this passage quite well.

In two instances we find significant agreement in manifest error, but circumstances suggest that horizontal transmission need not be the only way of explaining the agreement. First, in 278c6 BW read δεῖν ὑποθήτην προτέρον δεῖν παίσας, incorrectly doubling the infinitive, while T has only the first δεῖν. Though it cannot be proved, it is quite likely that the corruption was already found in the archetype but corrected by (a forerunner of) T: a correction which even the most mediocre of scribes could have managed to make. Second, BW’s error at 280e1 (ἡδη τούτο ἱκανὸν T Stobaeus: ἡ δὴ τούτῳ καλλίω B: ἡδη τούτῳ καλλίω W) seems highly significant prima facie, since polygenesis is out of the question. However, the fact that T shares the authentic reading with Stobaeus (IV 39, 29 Hense) suggests the possibility that, here again, the archetype was corrupt and that the authentic reading passed into T from the florilegist from Stobi. If my reconstruction of these examples is correct, they cannot be made to support the hypothesis of an hyparchetype of BW.

Further, we find three significant agreements of BW in certain error which cannot easily be explained away by other means. First, at 289c3 διῄρηται δὲ διήιρηται, the reading of BW, though grammatically possible, gives decidedly inferior sense, as it turns διῄρηται (66) οὕτω το ίνυν καὶ τῇ ψυχῆς ὧδε νόει. HAWTREY, cit. n. 38, ad Euthd. 303d3 also cites Phdr. 246c6 as a parallel, but in the phrase πλάττομεν οὔτε ιδόντες οὔτε ικανῶς νοήσαντες θείν κτλ. the words οὔτε ικανῶς νοήσαντες do not seem to mean «not having a correct opinion [about the god]» but rather «not having sufficiently grasped [what the god is]» (cf. G. J. de Vries, A commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato, Amsterdam, 1969, ad loc.; H. YUNIS, Plato. Phaedrus, Cambridge, 2011, ad loc.: «we fashion god, without having seen or sufficiently apprehended it, as…»), with a contrast between ιδόντες (actual seeing) and νοήσαντες (mental perception), as in e. g. R. 507b8-9.


(68) Admittedly, T agrees with Stobaeus in the authentic reading and not in error, but given the fact that connections between T and the indirect tradition are clearly discernible elsewhere – e. g. e. g. ALLINE, cit. n. 11, p. 155 n. 3, 157 n. 2; CARLINI, Platone: Alcibiade, cit. n. 33, p. 20-21; ID., Studi sulla tradizione, cit. n. 4, p. 98-99; in Chem. 156d4 T has a marginal variant which «may have been inserted there from the indirect tradition [Stobaeus]» (MURPHY, Critical notes, cit. n. 42, p. 217) – it is not a priori improbable that in 280e1 T’s authentic text was culled from an indirect source. See infra, section VI for possible further links between T and the indirect tradition.
δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πέρι into a separate clause with no new information. Second, an intriguing instance at 291d5-7, which is best quoted more fully (with regularized orthography and punctuation added):

σὺ κρινεῖς, ὦ Κρίτων, ἐὰν βούλῃ ἀκούειν (ὁ supra εἰ) καὶ τὰ μετὰ τάῦτα συμβάντα ἡμῖν. αὖθις γὰρ δῆ πάλιν ἑσκοποῦμεν ὡδὲ πως T (et Burnet)

σὺ κρινεῖς, ὦ Κρίτων, ἐὰν βούλῃ ἀκούειν (ὁ supra εἰ b)· μετὰ γάρ τὰ ἐμπροσθεν συμβάντα ἡμῖν αὖθις (ἀὖ τις B: αὖθις et τ supra θ W) μετὰ τάῦτα ἑσκοποῦμεν ὡδὲ πως BW (et Méridier).

BW’s text is grammatically possible, but the tautology in μετὰ γάρ τὰ ἐμπροσθεν συμβάντα... μετὰ τάῦτα seems intolerably harsh, especially since both elements stand so close to each other. Third, in 302a2 ἡγοῖ (-ο s.l.) T: ἡγοῖ B: ἡγοῖο τ᾽ ἂν W, the text of BW is impossible and no simple explanation for the agreement suggests itself.

Finally, I would be inclined to add 273d5 που T: πι BW to the list of significant BW errors, for που gives a very apt «hint of irony» to the potential optative and the corruption που > πι is more easily explained than the other way round: misreading of π as πι (cf. section V), after which the deletion of που was a simple alteration, as there is evidently no need for a negation here. But there is nothing at all wrong with reading, with BW, καλὸν ἂν τι τὸ ἔργον ὑμῶν εἴη 73.

Again, as with TW, we see that the number of truly significant errors of BW is rather small (only 3 or 4), too small, in my opinion, to sustain the hypothesis of a shared hyparchetype. Naturally, the actual amount might be higher, if one adds some of those cases where I hesitate to pronounce judgement and allows room for occasion.

(69) The addition may have been prompted by the seemingly tautologous χωρὶς διῄρηται, but cf. e. g. R. 595bl χωρὶς ἔκκαστα διῄρηται τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς εἴδη.

(70) For some reason Méridier, cit. n. 36, does not print ἡμῖν in his text (not even in square brackets), even though he correctly cites it in his apparatus as found in all three manuscripts. The oversight was perhaps carried over from Schanz, cit. n. 37, who in his apparatus cited B without ἡμῖν and then adopted B (without ἡμῖν) in his text. But the error was already corrected by Burnet, Platonis opera, cit. n. 1, vol. 3, in apparatu: «ἡμῖν re vera BTW».

(71) It is telling that Méridier, cit. n. 36, adopts BW’s text, while in his translation he avoids the difficulty in μετὰ τάῦτα by transferring the tautology to αὖθις: «Après les résultats précédents, nous recommencâmes de nouveau notre examen à peu près comme ceci» (my emphasis).

(72) Hawtree, cit. n. 38, ad loc.

(73) No parallels are needed, perhaps, but Phdr. 266d1 καλὸν ποῦ τι ἄν εἶη κτλ. nicely supports both variants.
sional correction of originally shared errors. Admittedly, the few certain errors of BW are quite significant and they clearly indicate some contact between the two traditions. But it seems wisest not to postulate any further (vertical) stemmatic links between the two, other than their common descent (with T) from the archetype.

Of the common errors of BT, many are easily explained and do not carry any weight: 272c4 μοι] μου (anticipation); 272c2 ἔδειξ] ἔδεξ (̣- fort. p.c. T); 281a7 ὑγείας] ὑγείας; 298b1 ἔφη] ἔφην\(^{71}\); 300c3 ἔδειξ] ἔδες (sic) B: ἔδες (vel ἔδεξ) T, ἔδειξ T\(^2\) ut vid. (the correction looks like the work of a second hand, but it might also have been done by the first)\(^{75}\). Some are a little more interesting, but still do not count for much, in my opinion: 278c5 ἀποδῶσιν] ἀποδώσειν; 286c9 παχέως] παχέως (cf. section V); 285d4 τῶι] τῶι T; 291b3-4 ὑπεξέφυγον] ὑπεξέφυγον (the aorist might not even be incorrect); 295d5 τοῦτον] τοῦτον; 298c9 ἢ] ἢ (sic) B: καὶ τῶι (perseveration); 298d1 ἢ prius om.; 299a5 τῶι] ὅ τῶι (perseveration).

This leaves only two truly significant common errors of BT. The first is 286a6 λέγοντες] γνώντες, where it is difficult to find a convincing ratio corruptelae. The second significant error is 296a5 ἢ] καὶ T: ἢ τ. Although ἢ is found twice a little further on (296a6, 296a7), which may have influenced the error, polygenesis does not strike me as obvious here. However, restitution of the relative pronoun for the unintelligible ἢ is not so difficult after the almost identical phrasing in 295e4-5 ἐπίστασαί τῷ ἢ ἐπίστασαί (cf. also 296b5-6, 296b8 and 296c7 ἢ (γ’) ἐπίσταμαι), so perhaps W’s authentic reading is the result of correction. Either way, a total of only two significant errors is insufficient evidence for firm stemmatic conclusions.

To summarize the discussion so far: all three manuscript pairs share significant errors, but we cannot postulate a separate hyparcetype for each manuscript pair (TW, BW and BT), since this is stemmatically impossible – unless BTW each changed exemplars during copying (for which there is no evidence) or each was copied from two exemplars simultaneously (which is highly unlikely). A common ancestor for BT against W can be quite positively ruled out, as they share at most two significant errors. TW appear to be the

\(^{74}\) A very common error: cf. e. g. Prt. 332a4 ἔφη B: ἔφην TW; Chrm. 165c8 ἔφη W: ἔφη BT; Prt. 330d7 ἔφην recentiores: ἔφη BTW.

\(^{75}\) Some other examples: 291d1 μόνη W: μόνη BT (cf. n. 62); 300b4 ἢ] ἢ B: ἢ (sic) T; 300b5 χαλκείοις] χαλκίοις (sic) B: χαλκίοις T.
best candidates for a common ancestor, with BW, which have fewer but rather significant shared errors, as the runners-up. However, for neither of these, I believe, is there sufficient reason for assuming a shared ancestor. Other scholars may disagree with my judgement on some of the particular instances discussed above, but that probably would not alter the general conclusion: the relative paucity of significant agreements and the fact that several disturbing factors (could) have blurred our view of the lines of the tradition, leave no firm basis for postulating a bipartite stemma based on significant shared errors.

V. Multiple transliterations?

An inquiry into possible transliteration errors found in all or some of our manuscripts may provide additional evidence for either bipartition or tripartition. However, the rather one-sided focus on majuscule errors (i.e. errors caused by misreading of majuscule script) and errors of word division which has dominated most earlier research dealing with transliterations in the tradition of Plato\(^\text{76}\), meets with serious objections: i) an error induced by misreading of majuscule script is not necessarily a transliteration error, i.e. committed during the metacharakterismos itself, but could have arisen at any given moment in the majuscule phase of the tradition\(^\text{77}\); ii) the presence of individual Majuskelfehler in different branches is not sufficient proof for the existence of different transliterations: there are other ways in which such a distribution of errors can come about\(^\text{78}\); iii) confusion of majuscule letter forms is strictly speaking a «mechanical error», a fact which lessens the conjunctive force of shared majuscule errors\(^\text{79}\); iv) due to the gradual reintroduction of individual majusc-

\(^{(76)}\) Cf. Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 69-72. Manfrin, cit. n. 3, ch. 2.1, passim is an exception within Platonic studies.

\(^{(77)}\) Cf. e. g. Alline, cit. n. 11, p. 181; Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 216; Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 63.

\(^{(78)}\) E. g. horizontal transmission; cf. Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 79, 125-126.

\(^{(79)}\) Martinelli Tempesta holds that, although qua mechanical errors their conjunctive force is slighter, the separative force of majuscule errors is very strong, so that «errori da maiuscola nei singoli rami [of the tradition] presuppongono sempre diverse traslitterazioni» (Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 265 n. 50, his emphasis; cf. id., Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 23 n. 60). However, Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 80 is certainly correct in stating that the presence of majuscule errors in separate manuscript families is only the «condizione necessaria, ma non sufficiente» (his emphasis) for establishing different transliterations (cf. op. cit., p. 125-126 et passim).
cule letters into minuscule script from the late 1xth century onwards, errors seemingly caused by confusion of majuscule letter forms need not necessarily be ascribed to the majuscule phase of the tradition, as they may also have been committed while copying a text written (primarily) in minuscules80; v) scriptio continua was not «abolished» simultaneously with the metacharakterismos, nor were accents and breathing marks consistently added during transliteration; therefore, errors in word division and accentuation are also made when copying a minuscule manuscript81.

These objections seriously complicate our attempts at establishing separate or shared transliterations in general, and numbers iv) and v) pose great problems to such attempts for BTW in particular. B and T, dating to the 1xth and xth century respectively, are extremely inconsistent in adding accents and breathing marks, often lacking either or both, and even word division is far from systematically indicated; the same goes, to some extent, even for W (xth century). Any argument based on errors in Worttrennung or diacritics should therefore be handled with great caution. In the case of W, the difficulties become almost insurmountable, as the reintroduction of majuscule letter forms was already in full swing when W was written and majuscule letters abound in W’s writing82. Accordingly, it is extremely difficult – if not impossible – to find convincing majuscule errors for W and the same goes for T, though to a lesser extent, because T dates to ca. 950 AD83. Furthermore, previously committed transliteration errors may have been corrected later on, thereby erasing all memory of them.

In an excellent study on the phenomenon of traslitterazione84, Filippo Ronconi tries to overcome the methodological objections raised above and stresses that one should search for errors that can unequivocally be linked to the majuscule phase of the tradition or to the actual act of transliteration itself. He argues that cases of majus-

(80) This only holds true for those majuscule letters that actually re-appear in minuscule manuscripts (MANFRIN, cit. n. 3, p. 20), but many do, though with varying frequency. For literature on the «reintroduction»: RONCONI, cit. n. 28, p. 126 n. 3; MANFRIN, cit. n. 3, p. 20 n. 87.

(81) Cf. e. g. RONCONI, cit. n. 28, passim; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 216 n. 19, 265 n. 53; MANFRIN, cit. n. 3, p. 30.

(82) Cf. e. g. PERRIA, cit. n. 9, p. 97-98; CUVALO, Scholia Graeca, cit. n. 6, p. cxxx: «litteris... haud raro maiusculis».

(83) Cf. e. g. MURPHY, The basis of the text, cit. n. 3, p. 146; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 23-24 n. 60-61, p. 29-30; MANFRIN, cit. n. 3, p. 34 n. 141.

(84) RONCONI, cit. n. 28.
cule errors where only a single letter is involved do not necessarily prove anything, since due to the reintroduction of majuscule letters a minuscule context of origin usually cannot be ruled out. Instead, only instances which feature a combination of errors that may be traced to a majuscule origin should be taken into consideration: the higher the number of mistakes ascribable to misreading majuscule script found in the same context (a word or group of words), the bigger the chances are that that particular error was made in the majuscule phase of the text or during transliteration\(^85\). Therefore, we should base our arguments primarily on complex errors consisting of multiple misread majuscule letters\(^86\). Nevertheless, when a majuscule error is «complex», that still does not prove that it was made during the metacharakterismos (it could also have happened before) and therefore one should always look for further indications to strengthen the hypothesis, such as shared minuscule errors or links with the indirect tradition\(^87\). As for errors of word division, which in themselves prove nothing, they should only be taken into consideration when found in conjunction with (complex) majuscule errors\(^88\).

Returning to the Euthydemus with Ronconi’s criteria in mind, we should first investigate possible transliteration errors shared by all three manuscripts, which would suggest a single transliteration for the entire tradition\(^89\). Such simple errors as 285c3 γ’ Coisliniа-

\(^{(85)}\) Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 108-109, 121ff.; cf. Vendruscolo, cit. n. 29, p. 118. Because in minuscule contexts majuscule letter forms usually appear in isolation or at least in small numbers, finding errors caused by misunderstanding of several majuscule letters close together increases the likelihood that the scribe was copying a text written in majuscules.

\(^{(86)}\) By «complex majuscule errors» I simply mean instances where multiple majuscule letters have been misread in the same context. In Ronconi’s more elaborate terminology, a scambio complesso signifies something else: Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 100-103.

\(^{(87)}\) Ronconi, cit. n. 28, passim, esp. p. 125-142.

\(^{(88)}\) Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 107-112. Naturally, errors that can also be explained in other ways (e. g. itacism, perseveration, etc.) should be left out of consideration; cf. op. cit., p. 103-106.

\(^{(89)}\) In what follows, I disregard all cases of variation between dual and plural endings of the participle (e. g. 273a3 εἰσελθόντες εἰσελθόντες B; cf. n. 61) and cases of Η vs. ΗΝ in the ending (e. g. ἔφη vs. ἔφην; cf. n. 74), for they are just as common in minuscule manuscripts. In line with Ronconi’s precepts, simple errors of word division (e. g. οὐδὲ μιᾶς, ἄλλ᾽ ὅτι/ἄλλο τι) are likewise excluded. If, for instance, cases like 289a1-2 καὶ ἔφησθα] ζεγοφύσθαι BTW, 303a2 ἄλλο τι] ἄλλο τι ΒΤ, 284b4 ἄλλο τι] ἄλλο τι ΒΒ, 288d1 ἰπέλιπτον τό] ἰπέλιπτον ΤΩ, 285d2 καί τοι με] καὶ τί οἷς Β, 302a3 ἰπεκύπτωτο] ἰπεκύπτωτο Τ Β, 292d4 λέγωμεν] λέγω μὲν W, were all used as evidence for separate transliterations, the result would be a stemmatical ἦδονατον.
nus 155: τ᾽ BTW (Γ → T) or 290a7 ἔτι Stephanus: ὅστε BTW (Ε → O) involve only a single letter. The same objection holds for 284b6 ὅς γε κλεινίζει B: ὅς γ᾽ ἕκλεινία (iota subscr. ut vid.), i.m. ὅστε (sic) ἕκεινα T: ὅς γε κλεινία, i.m. ὅστε (sic) W. If TW’s marginal variant is the authentic reading, as some editors believe, the (obviously incorrect) reading in textu could be the result of a majuscule error (Τ → Γ) + an incorrect division of words. Two further instances might seem more interesting: 272d1-2 τί οὔ συμφοίτας ὡς Winckelmann: τί (τί B) ποιο συμφοίτας (ΤΙ → Π + incorrect Worttrennung) and 302e5 δὴ Schanz: ἄν (ΔΗ → AN). However, the former is equally common in minuscules and, although the latter is a classic Majuskelfehler, it need not necessarily be linked to the transliteration itself. Furthermore, I have not found any convincing shared minuscule errors, which, though not a necessary condition, would strengthen the case for a single transliteration. Finally, what decides against seeing these three mistakes as proof of a single transliteration is the presence, or so it seems, of separate transliteration errors in T and (possibly) B.

The following could, in theory, be conjunctive transliteration errors, shared by two manuscripts: 273d5 ποιο T: τι B W (Π → ΤΙ, with ου deleted); 277d5 ἄηθεις ἄληθεις B: ἄληθεις et i.m. γρ. καὶ ἄηθεις (sic) W (Α → ΑΛ); 286e9 παχέως ταχέως BT (Π → Τ). None of these errors is adopted by e. g. BURNET, Platonis opera, cit. n. 1, and MÉRIDIER, cit. n. 36. GIFFORD, cit. n. 36, HAWTREY, cit. n. 38 (with some hesitation) and ERLER, cit. n. 52, however, accept Hermann’s conjecture ὅστε καὶ ἐνι, which, if correct, would increase the number of possible majuscule phenomena in the corruption into BTW’s reading in textu: τὸ Γ + Λ + Ν → ΝΙ + incorrect division of words. Hermann’s conjecture certainly is appealing, but it is not strictly necessary to emend here (cf. DE VRIES, Notes on Some Passages, cit. n. 48, ad loc., where, however, ἔνιων must be considered a typo for ἔνιων); either way, it still wouldn’t prove a single transliteration for BTW.

Mirroring AN for ΔΗ, facilitated by the fact that it concerns two adjacent letters, is easily done in any majuscule context (cf. e. g. BROCKMANN, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 250; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 268). The same goes for TI → II, although the (near-)identical division of words and accentuation of BTW in 271d1-2 is somewhat striking (perhaps the archetype was already furnished with incidental accentuation?).

Almost all scholars hold that BTW are the descendants of at least two separate transliterations; the only exception appears to be JOYAL, who argues (JOYAL, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 3, p. 40-45; id., The Platonic Theages, cit. n. 3, p. 161-164) that the evidence of the Thg. points towards an archetype in minuscule script, but his arguments are entirely unconvincing; cf. MURPHY, The basis of the text, cit. n. 3, p. 142 n. 26; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 22 n. 54.

(90) ὅστε (sic) ἕκεινα is adopted by e. g. BURNET, Platonis opera, cit. n. 1, and MÉRIDIER, cit. n. 36. GIFFORD, cit. n. 36, HAWTREY, cit. n. 38 (with some hesitation) and ERLER, cit. n. 52, however, accept Hermann’s conjecture ὅστε καὶ ἐνι, which, if correct, would increase the number of possible majuscule phenomena in the corruption into BTW’s reading in textu: τὸ Γ + Λ + Ν → ΝΙ + incorrect division of words. Hermann’s conjecture certainly is appealing, but it is not strictly necessary to emend here (cf. DE VRIES, Notes on Some Passages, cit. n. 48, ad loc., where, however, ἔνιων must be considered a typo for ἔνιων); either way, it still wouldn’t prove a single transliteration for BTW.

(91) Misreading AN for ΔΗ, facilitated by the fact that it concerns two adjacent letters, is easily done in any majuscule context (cf. e. g. BROCKMANN, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 250; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 268). The same goes for TI → II, although the (near-)identical division of words and accentuation of BTW in 271d1-2 is somewhat striking (perhaps the archetype was already furnished with incidental accentuation?).

(92) Cf. RONCONI, cit. n. 28, p. 126ff.

(93) Almost all scholars hold that BTW are the descendants of at least two separate transliterations; the only exception appears to be JOYAL, who argues (JOYAL, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 3, p. 40-45; id., The Platonic Theages, cit. n. 3, p. 161-164) that the evidence of the Thg. points towards an archetype in minuscule script, but his arguments are entirely unconvincing; cf. MURPHY, The basis of the text, cit. n. 3, p. 142 n. 26; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 22 n. 54.
of them is decisive, however. Slightly more interesting is 280e1 τοῦτο ἵκανόν τούτῳ καλλίων B: τοῦτῳ καλλίῳ W (N → Α1 + word division), as it appears to be at least partly founded on a confusion of majuscule letters. But as I have argued above, it is not unlikely that the error was already in the archetype, so this need not count as an error shared by BW against T. I have found no majuscule errors shared by TW. Furthermore, none of the three manuscript pairs has common minuscule errors either. Thus, there is nothing to suggest that BT, BW or TW descend from a shared transliterated manuscript.

B has possible unique majuscule errors in: 271b6-7 ὃ δὲ παρ᾽ ἐμὲ ὃς δὲ παρέμενε B (Ο → ΟϹ + ΜϹ → ΜϹΕϹ + incorrect word division); 281d2 συνεχωροῦμεν ἐν B (Μ → N + word division); 300d6 ὡστε ὡσπερ B (Τ → Η); 305c7 γς B (Τ → Γ). All of these, however, are equally possible in minuscules and except 271b6-7 they involve only a single letter. On the other hand, when B was written, minuscule script was still rather «pure», i.e. with few majuscule intrusions, which perhaps makes these instances not entirely negligible. Furthermore, if these errors are ascribed to a misreading of minuscule script, there must have been an intermediary (in minuscules) between B and the transliterated manuscript, which, given B’s age and the fact that B generally has very few minuscule errors, would be somewhat unexpected – though by no means impossible. Because of this, it is sometimes suggested that B itself is the transliterated manuscript, which, if true, automatically means that there are at least two transliterations at the basis of our tradition, since T and W are independent of B. Thus, on the whole it seems possible to interpret the evidence of the Euthydemus in such a way as to support a separate transliteration for B, although none of the above examples is convincing by itself.

(94) Cf. Alline, cit. n. 11, p. 223.
(95) Confusion of M and N is not listed as a possible majuscule error by Ronconi (only as a possible minuscule error: Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 127 n. 6), but it is not inconceivable in majuscules: cf. e. g. Joyal, The Textual Tradition, cit. n. 3, p. 41-42.
(96) Ronconi would apparently add 303d4 ὡτε’ B as a possibility (cf. Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 83, 90, 96), but to me that does not seem very likely.
(97) Cf. e. g. Martinelli Tempesta, Platone, Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 23 n. 58; Murphy, The basis of the text, cit. n. 3, p. 143 n. 29; and in general Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 127-130. Murphy (loc. cit.) mentions two possible minuscule errors of B in the Euthydemus: 280d3 συνομολογεῖσθαι συνομολογεῖσθαι and 288d3 ὧκτεῖροντε ὧκτεῖροντε, to which we might add 278d1 πεπαυσθω (sic). But none of these is certain (as Murphy also acknowledges).
(98) For the possibility of a separate transliteration underlying B in other dialogues: cf. e. g. Carlini, Studi sulla tradizione, cit. n. 4, p. 137; Brockmann, Die
In T we find – apart from the inconclusive οἴσεσθαι οἴσθαι (ΤΕ → Ε) in 305d4 – the following possible majuscule errors: 271c6 ἀτεχνῶς τώ γε] ἀτεχνῶς ὡς ἔγωγε (sic); 303d7 ὅποτεν] ὅτι δὲ τ’ ἄν. 271c6 is a rather interesting case: apart from the ditto-graphy of ΩϹ (which could just as well have occurred in minuscule script), there is the confusion of similarly shaped majuscule letters ΩϹ → ΩϹЄ, misreading of majuscule Τ as Γ and incorrect division of words. 303d7 is due to corruption of Π into ΤΙ and an error in Worttrennung. Neither of these is beyond doubt, but the more complex 271c6 might with some degree of probability point to a separate transliteration. T could not itself be the transliteration copy, for T’s exemplar is the lost companion volume to Parisinus gr. 1807 (A; ca. 875 AD; cf. n. 11) and must already have been written in minuscules, since A is a minuscule manuscript. The fact that T’s exemplar is closely tied to A but appears to have had no such links with the almost coeval manuscript B (895 AD), perhaps lends some further credibility to the existence of a distinct transliteration for T. Thus, all in all, there is evidence to suggest a separate transliteration underlying the tradition of T, distinct from B and W.

In W we find little worth considering: instances like 298e1 μάλ᾽ μάλα (Λ → ΛΑ), 301e2 ποτε τότε (Π → Τ), 306b3 δ’ om. (Δ followed by Α) could in theory be linked to majuscule misreading, but such an explanation is far from necessary and, especially in the case of W, unprovable. Therefore, in the light of this meagre evidence and the methodological difficulties discussed earlier, the question as to whether a separately transliterated manuscript is at the basis of the W-tradition in the Euthydemus must remain unresolved.

It has become clear, I think, that on the issue of transliterations it is very difficult to attain firm conclusions. Other reconstructions of the available material are perhaps possible, but to my mind, the best way to make sense of the evidence at our disposal is to suppose that the archetype of BTW in the Euthydemus was a majuscule manuscript that was transliterated at least twice. Generally speaking it is not improbable that a text was transliterated multiple times –

handschriftliche Überlieferung, cit. n. 3, p. 43-45; Murphy, The basis of the text, cit. n. 3, p. 143; Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 22-23; Vancamp, cit. n. 7, p. 12; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 33-34.

(99) Evidence from other dialogues is rather scarce: cf. e. g. Garlini, cit. n. 4, p. 137; Murphy, cit. n. 3, p. 146; Vancamp, cit. n. 7, p. 17; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 34.

(100) Cf. Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 29-30, 34 who likewise concludes that a separate transliteration for the third family in Euthphr. is possible but cannot be demonstrated.
even though for a long time this was considered unlikely due to the alleged difficulty of the transcription process. That the T-tradition is the heir to an individual transliteration in the *Euthydemus* seems plausible. The indications for a separate transliteration underlying the B-family likewise seem to point in that direction. About W nothing can be said with certainty.

VI. THE TEXT IN ANTIQUITY: THE INDIRECT TRADITION AND *P.OXY* 76 5085

Although the indirect tradition of the *Euthydemus* is not nearly as extensive as that of some of the more widely read dialogues such as the *Republic* or the *Timaeus*, there is an interesting string of allusions, paraphrases and literal citations of the *Euthydemus* through which we can trace its reception in Antiquity and beyond. As is

---

(101) For a refutation of this "opinione vulgata": Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 7ff.
(102) Of course, if B and T derive from two separate transliterations, it does not automatically follow that W must form a third separately transliterated branch, as the transliteration errors of B or T may have been removed from the W-branch by correction.
(105) For a selection of authors alluding to the *Euthydemus*, see H. Keulen, *Untersuchungen zu Platons Euthydemus*, Wiesbaden, 1971, p. 4 n. 16; Erler, cit. n. 52, p. 59-60, 106; and cf. infra. The earliest verbatim quotation of the *Euthydemus* – I leave Aristotle's *Sophistici Elenchi* out of account here, for, notwithstanding the fact that certain sophisms from the *Euthydemus* are also found in *SE*, precise verbal links are hard to establish and it is far from certain that Aristotle drew from Plato and not from a common source (Erler, cit. n. 52, p. 101-103); I also disregard the theory, entertained by some, that those passages in Iamblichus' *Protrepticus* which are inspired by the *Euthydemus* are actually taken from Aristotle's (lost) *Protrepticus*: for details and refutation, cf. W. G. Rabinowitz, *Aristotle's Protrepticus and the sources of its reconstruction I*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1957, p. 53ff. – appears to be the anti-platonic polemical treatise *Against Plato's Euthydemus*, partially preserved on a Herculanean papyrus (*PHerc.* 1032, first edited by...
to be expected, many references to the dialogue are no more than generic allusions with little importance for the constitutio textus. Nevertheless, in addition to verbatim quotations of a handful of smaller phrases and sentences and of two somewhat longer paragraphs in Aelius Aristides and Stobaeus, we are in the fortunate possession of Iamblichus’ Protrepticus, which contains an elaborate reworking of the first protreptic scene of the Euthydemus (278e3-282d3) and bits of the second (288d5-293a9), and which is highly important for Platonic textual scholars due to its many literal quotations and verbal reminiscences of the Greek text 106.

Apart from strengthening the textual basis of some authentic readings found in (part of) the medieval tradition 107, the ancient testimonia at times carry readings which differ from the combined testimony of our manuscripts, some of which should actually be adopted into the text or at least be considered with care 108. For present purposes, 


(106) Cf. Dodds, cit. n. 1, p. 64; Carlini, Studi sulla tradizione, cit. n. 4, p. 98: «un mosaico di citazioni platoniche e aristoteliche». The testimony of the Protrepticus should, however, be examined with some caution, for Iamblichus did not slavishly transcribe the passages he selected but «generalizes, omits, and alters whole phrases, sentences, and paragraphs… fills lacunae… [and is] skilful at subordinating the form and thought of his source to his own protreptic purpose» (Rabinowitz, cit. n. 105, p. 59; cf. Des Places, cit. n. 45, p. 5). Therefore, what Iamblichus wrote does not necessarily reflect what he read. Cf. Rabinowitz, cit. n. 105, p. 55-59 on Iamblichus’ creative reworking of Platonic material and J. Whittaker, The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation, in J. N. Grant (ed.), Editing Greek and Latin texts: papers given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6-7 November 1987, New York, 1989, p. 63-95 on the general difficulties inherent in using the indirect tradition for establishing the text of Greek philosophical authors.


(108) E. g. 279d7 δεί BTW: τοι Colotes (T. III, p. 7a 1-7 Cronert; cf. Concolino Mancini, cit. n. 105, p. 65); 279d8 τε καὶ BTW: καὶ Colotes (Concolino Mancini, cit. n. 105, p. 65, with n. 46); 307a4 φαῦλοι πολλοί BTW: πολλοί
however, what is important is whether there are significant agreements in error between an indirect witness and just one or two of our manuscripts. If such agreements are found in sufficient numbers, that would entail that the branch of which the manuscript(s) in question form(s) part had already originated in Antiquity, and, thus, before transliteration into minuscules. This would provide further indication of the independence of that branch from the others (or other, if two manuscripts are found to agree with indirect testimonia). Therefore, here I will only discuss this particular type of agreement.

For B and W matters are quite straightforward. I have not found significant agreements in error between B and the indirect tradition. B does share a reading with Demetrius (Eloc. 226, p. 64 Chiron) against TW: 271a2 ἦ B ras. Demetrius: ἦ TW. But it is not an agreement in error and the variation is very slight either way. For W there is only a single instance to consider (apart from the variant reading in 285a3 discussed below): in 300d6–7 it shares an error with Aristides (Or. XLVII 38 = p. 385, 10 Keil): διπλάσιος pro δεκαπλάσιος. But Fehlerkoinzidenz is quite likely, as (morphemes connected to) numerals are exceptionally liable to corruption and διπλάσιος is by far the more common word. 109

The case of T is more interesting: apart from the rather meaningless agreement of a T-variant with the reading of P.Oxy 6 881 (cf. n. 38) and T’s agreement with Stobaeus in the authentic reading at 280e1, which has already been mentioned above, there is an agreement between T and Iamblichus in 281d5: πέφυκεν BW: πέφυκεν… εἶναι T 110 Iamb. (57, 20–21 Des Places). Though not strictly speaking an error, T’s and Iamblichus’ variant is probably not authentic and the agreement might therefore be significant. On the other hand, an infinitive is easily added after πέφυκεν and elsewhere Iamblichus similarly supplies forms of εἶναι to complete elliptical expres-

109 In the corpus Platonicum there are 72 instances of διπλάσιος against 5 of δεκαπλάσιος.

110 After an autopsy of the manuscript I am convinced that Schanz’ suspicion that εἶναι was added later (expressed in apparatu: Schanz, cit. n. 37) is unfounded.
Furthermore, there is a short quotation in Ps.-Didymus (61, p. 282 Valente), which agrees with T and a variant in W: 285a3 τὸν κτήσιππον B: τῶι κτησίπῳ (sic), ὰι supra τὸν et ὰι supra -ον W. But since προσπαίζειν may be construed with either the dative or the accusative, the agreement of TW with the lexicographer is probably fortuitous.

One instance in particular merits our attention. In 271c8 T agrees with Pollux (3.150 = p. 201, 16-17 Bethe) in omitting ἐγενέσθη, which should probably be retained – although what exactly Plato wrote here is not entirely certain. Pollux’ omission might well be deliberate, as 271c7-8 (τούτω – ἀδελφώ) appears to have been purposely rewritten as a single sentence: τούτω γάρ ἐστον κομιδῇ παμμάχω κατὰ τοὺς Ἀκαρνάνας τοὺς παγκρατιαστάς (i.e. om. οὐ et ἐγενέσθη; τοὺς Ἀκαρνάνας τοὺς παγκρατιαστάς pro τῶ Ἀκαρνάνε τῶ παγκρατιαστά ἀδελφώ). As the quotation is introduced primarily in order to illustrate the word πάμμαχος, the nucleus of the quotation (τούτω… παμμάχω) has been preserved without variation, while the «periphery», i.e. contextual material of secondary importance (which is generally more susceptible to alterations), has been simplified, intentionally, I suspect, for the sake of

(111) In his reworking of the Euthydemus passages, Iamblichus adds, or so it seems, a form of εἶναι in 281e4-5 [ἡ μὲν σοφία ἀγαθόν] ἡ μὲν σοφία ἀγαθόν ἐστιν Iamb. (57, 25-6 Des Places); 282a4-5 ἐπιστήμη ἡ παρέχουσα BTW: ἐπιστήμη ἐστίν ἡ παρέχουσα Iambl. (58, 2-3 Des Places); ἐπιστήμη ἡ παρέχουσα Badham; and perhaps 288d8 ἡ δὲ φιλοσοφία κτῆσις ἐπιστήμης Iamb. (58, 6-7 Des Places), where he is consciously adding to the definition in order to create a more comprehensive characterization of philosophy in the Platonic sense (Rabinowitz, cit. n. 105, p. 56).

(112) Cf. LAJ, s.v.; for the dative: e.g. Euthd. 278b3 (where τοι may be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both φημι and προσπαίζειν); 278b5-6; for the accusative: e.g. Mx. 235c6. In his apparatus ad Ps.-Didymus 61 Valente, cit. n. 103, p. 282 cites several Greek lexicographers who disagree on whether to use the dative or the accusative after προσπαίζειν.

(113) For details, cf. Gifford, cit. n. 36, Ammendola, cit. n. 36, Hawtrey, cit. n. 38, Erler, cit. n. 52, ad loc.; W. L. Lorimer, More of the Budé Plato, in The Classical Review, 48.1, 1934, p. 19-21. Gifford’s (loc. cit.) statement that in B «there has been an erasure after the first α in κα τα (sic)», implicitly suggesting that the reading ante correctionem might have concurred with his own conjecture χΘ θ, is not supported by in situ examination of the manuscript: there is no trace of an erasure here – as was already noticed by Lorimer, cit., p. 20: «the erasure in B seems imaginary».

(114) For the terminology of «nucleus» and «periphery» in citations and the varying degrees of corruption they can be exposed to during transmission, cf. R. Tosi, Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci, Bologna, 1988, p. 63-67,
clarity. In T, however, no obvious reason for omitting ἐγενέσθην presents itself and the agreement therefore seems significant, even though T does not share all Pollux’ alterations. Thus, all in all, there is some evidence to link T to the indirect tradition.

Finally, a brief look at one of the two papyrus fragments of the Euthydemus presently known, P.Oxy 76 5085, dating to the 11th century AD. Although it contains only a small portion of the text (parts of 286d-e) – which I offer as justification for discussing it last – it offers several variant readings, two of which are of interest to our present inquiry: 286c5 διονυσόδωρος B P.Oxy 76 5085: ὁ διονυσόδωρος TW; 286c7–8 οὐδὲ κελεύεις ὅτι ἤν δ’ ἐγώ ὡς ἔνθεμε B: οὐδὲ (sic) κελεύεις ὅτι (et i.m. γρ. καὶ σὺ δὲ κελεύεις) ἤν δ’ ἐγώ ὡς ἔνθεμε W: ὡς ἔνθεμε ἤν δ’ (δ’ [sic] T) ἐγώ T P.Oxy 76 5085. The agreement of the papyrus with B in 286c5 in what I would consider an error is interesting, but too much stress should not be laid upon it, for this type of concurrence is not very significant and, as mentioned earlier, the text in this passage is doubtful. The agreement in the inauthentic reading (for that, I think, is what it is) with T in 286c7–8, on the other hand, is highly significant: although T’s and the papyrus’ text may very well be the result of conscious alteration of this difficult passage, a polygenic...
origin of this conjecture (if it is a conjecture) or corruption does not seem very likely. By which way this ancient reading found its way into the tradition of T, we cannot know, but the agreement strengthens the hypothesis that the T-tradition has roots which predate the metacharakterisimos.

VII. Conclusion

Ideally, we should extend our research in order to include the results obtained by scholars working on the transmission of other dialogues and the corpus as a whole, as well as a more detailed treatment of the physical aspects and paratextual material of our manuscripts, and the cultural-historical background of the time and place in which they were produced. Although fully aware of these shortcomings, I will nonetheless try to come to a conclusion.

I submit that the textual material of BTW in the Euthydemus does not present unequivocal evidence for a bipartite stemma: each manuscript shares some significant errors with both of the others, but the number of errors for TW, BW or BT seems too low to postulate a hyparchetype for any of these combinations with any certainty. Furthermore, none of the three possible manuscript pairings can be shown to derive from a shared transliterated ancestor, but separate transliterations for B and T, in any case, seem plausible. A survey of the indirect tradition likewise did not provide any reason for stematically grouping together two of the three manuscripts, although it did seem to single out T as bearing some readings which can possibly be shown to be ancient, and this was confirmed by a highly significant agreement of T with one of the two extant papyri of the Euthydemus.

On the other hand, we must concede that there is no unequivocal evidence for tripartition either, as each manuscript shares significant errors with both of the others and since it is impossible to establish three separate transliterations for BTW. Nonetheless, due to the relatively small number of shared errors and the possible ways of accounting for them other than vertical transmission, it seems to me most likely – even though it cannot be proved – that we are dealing with a stemma that is essentially tripartite. For the editor of the

(119) Cf. e. g. Carlini, Studi sulla tradizione, cit. n. 4, passim; Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3; Martinelli Tempesta, La tradizione testuale, cit. n. 3, p. 271-278; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 1-37, passim; and in general Ronconi, cit. n. 28, p. 132-134.
Euthydemus, however, the issue is primarily a theoretical one with little bearing on editorial practice. For, as has often been noted\textsuperscript{120}, even if it were possible to establish beyond doubt a bipartite stemma, strict application of stemmatics during the constitutio would not be possible in a highly contaminated tradition such as this. The future editor will be well advised to judge each individual reading on its own merits\textsuperscript{121}.
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\textsuperscript{120} E. g. Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3, p. 151; Manfrin, cit. n. 3, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{121} Though, for possible exceptions cf. Boter, The Vindobonensis W, cit. n. 3, p. 151; Martinelli Tempesta, Platone. Liside, cit. n. 3, p. 34.