

BENEDICT EINARSON

67

having been transferred from its original gathering (now numbered 9) to the following one (now numbered 10). The correct order of the folios is: (gathering 9) 65–67, 72, 79, 68–70; (gathering 10) 71, 73–78, 80. Of the original quire numbers the following have survived the binder: λβ (71^r); λθ (129^r); μς (185^r); μη (201^r). Twenty-two gatherings, presumably quaternions, must once have preceded the present contents, that is, some 176 folios in addition to the 269 that now contain *HP* and *CP*.

Two contemporary hands alternate, the one more angular, the other more round. The round hand has written 71^{rv}, 73^r–78^v, 80^r–208^v, 213^v–218^r line 17 (through εἶναι near the end of *CP* 4. 11. 4), 248^r–251^v, 256^r–269^v.⁴

- U^d The *diorthotes* of U, who supplies some omissions in *HP*. I have not noticed the hand in *CP*.
 u The fifteenth-century corrector (or correctors) of U. Some of these corrections were taken from a lost collateral or ancestor of f:

HP 5. 6. 1 ψοφέιν U: ψόφοις f u.

HP 7. 4. 5 πλατεῖων Athenaeus: πλατεων U f¹⁸⁵; πλαγίων f^t u.

- U* An ancient editor (Andronicus?) appended to *HP* an earlier version of 9. 8. 1–9. 19. 4: Wimmer calls it U*.⁵ U* bears the title περὶ δυνάμεως ριζῶν κ.⁶ Except for H PB all the manuscripts indicate a new book at the join between the two versions. H and P combine them. The scholar responsible for the common source of H and P imported readings from U (including U⁰ and U*) into a manuscript derived from N. He probably entered these readings into the margin: both H and P, sometimes separately, sometimes in concert, have variants in the margin, sometimes from U⁰ or U*, sometimes from N⁰ or N*. One may guess that this original had only the fragment of the text of N* that still remains, and that the reading of U* (or U⁰) was entered into the margin of the text of N⁰ when N* was missing. The distinction into two separate versions became inconvenient, and was dropped. Our editor has a strong sense for sequence and more than once alters the order of words by conjecture. The rest call a root “thick and sweet”; for him it is “sweet and thick” (9. 12. 1); “cattle, sheep, and mules” become “cattle, mules, and sheep” (9. 18. 2); the two readings “differences” and “differences and potencies” become “potencies and

4. This differs from the accounts of C. Stornajolo (*Codices Urbinae Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* [Rome, 1895]) and A. Colonna (“Per una edizione critica del *De causis plantarum* di Teofrasto,” *BPEC*, n.s. 14 [1966]: 5). The first says: “Hunc [sc. codicem] duae manus exscripserunt, prima fol. 1–72, secunda 73–78, rediva prima manus fol. 79, inde ab 80 secunda iterum ad finem usque . . .”; A. Colonna says: “il primo [sc. copista] . . . ha scritto i fogli 1–72 e il foglio 79r; il secondo . . . ha scritto i fogli dal 73 alla fine (eccetto il 79r). . . .”

5. F. Wimmer, *Theophrasti Eresii Historia plantarum* (Breslau, 1841), p. 310. I call the corresponding portions of N v (and the rest) N* v* (and so forth) and distinguish the text of the parallel version as U⁰ N⁰ v⁰, etc.

6. The books of *HP* and *CP*, together with the *Topics*, *Physics*, *History of Animals*, *Metaphysics*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Eudemian Ethics*, and *Politics* are indicated by letters, not by letter-numerals: so Book 6 is ζ (not s), 9 is ι (not θ), 10 is κ (not ια). This older practice (it is found for the books of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) may well go back to the library at Scepsis and to Theophrastus himself.

differences" (9. 11. 4), and the readings "punish" and "chasten and punish" become "punish and chasten" (9. 18. 4). It is perhaps this sense of priority and order that leads him to unite the two versions and crown the work with a conclusion pieced together from the introductory remarks to the two separate versions. He has only to say "these points have been dealt with" instead of "we shall deal with these points."

The Aldine was printed from H and follows it closely. But v was then (as now) at Venice and could be borrowed. In v⁰ we find a cross in the margin at the beginning of 9. 8. 2⁰ (where the opening passage of v⁰ ceases to differ appreciably from the corresponding passage of v* and H) and eighteen pages later a mark of separation (like a Γ with a prolonged horizontal bar) at the passage of v* (9. 8. 2*) where the three versions, v⁰, v*, and H (the last now lost, but inferable from aP) again become sensibly the same. From v* the Aldine took the title *περὶ δυνάμεως ῥιζῶν, κάππα* (altering the kappa to K to suit his own style), some modifications of the text of H, and the final six lines, which end with *ῥιζοτόμοι*, the word indicated by the cross in v⁰ and the Γ in v*.

The Aldine editor was led to take these measures because he consulted Gaza's translation, where the stump of Book 10 is also found.

It was not in Aldus' interest to publish a text noticeably shorter than the one Gaza had rendered, and the insertion of alterations and supplement from v* yielded a tenth book and the same conclusion as the celebrated translation. The *editio princeps* of Gaza (1483) and the Aldine (1497) each conclude with a note:

Theophrasti Liber decimus cuius paucula quaedam habentur. & quod apud graecos habetur: id Theodorus [*sic*] traduxit.

Ταῦτα μόνᾳ τοῦ δεκάτου ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις [that is, in H and v] εὐρήκαμεν· εἰ μὴ ἄρα τῷ ἐννάτῳ συγκέχυνται τὰ λοιπά.

The Aldine editor saw that H had combined the two versions seen in v. Gaza no doubt stops here because the major discrepancy between the two versions has come to an end: from here on the two versions practically coincide (v⁰ being at times slightly fuller than v*) until the point is reached where v* breaks off (9. 10. 3*).

This tenth book of the Aldine survives in the Basel edition of 1541 and in D. Heinsius' of 1693. In Bodaeus' posthumous edition (Amsterdam, 1644) it is silently omitted, though promised in the title ("De HISTORIA PLANTARVM LIBRI DECIM"). J. Stackhouse, who generally follows Bodaeus, prints it at the end of his notes on Book 9 (vol. 2 [Oxford, 1814], p. 435), citing it from the Aldine. The admirable J. G. Schneider cites it (evidently from Heinsius) in his notes (vol. 3 [Leipzig, 1818], p. 841); in his text he returns to the reading of H (which he found in the conclusion of P, jotted down by Ezechiel Spanheim in the copy of Heinsius' edition in the royal library at Berlin), printing it in square brackets (which with him indicate an

addition) as part of 9. 20. 6. F. Wimmer (Breslau, 1842; Leipzig, 1854–62; Paris, 1866) follows Schneider, but lets 9. 20. 6 coincide with the text taken from P and omits the brackets. Hence the difficulty of referring briefly to the readings of U*: the references by book, chapter, and section are the same for both U⁰ and U* because the printed texts depend ultimately on H, where the versions are united.

- N Florence, Laurentian Library, desk 85, 22; fifteenth century; *CP*, *Pl*, *HP*. For a guess about the scribe see Harlfinger, *Textgeschichte*, page 224, note 1, and page 417.

N* breaks off at *HP* 9. 10. 3 with οἷς [*sic*]. The word is the last of a full line on a full page (269^v): the last leaf of a quinion (and anything that followed) has been lost.⁷ The missing part of the appended version would have filled about eight leaves in N; the surviving part of N* fills about five. MC v p all end like N with οἷς (οἷς p), but in them the last page is never filled. They therefore all derive from N. *HP* was bound last in N to facilitate the insertion of further leaves in the event of the discovery of the missing conclusion; even in U* the concluding passage (9. 19. 4 through γίνεσθαι in Wimmer's text) is evidently incomplete.

N descends from U through a lost intermediary:

HP 1. 1. 5 ἀναλογον (-νά- u) U (which is perfectly legible): a blank in N MC v V p PB a (of 9, 15, 7, 5, 10, 10, 3–4, 8 letters respectively; H is wanting).

HP 3. 4. 1 ἐνιαυτοφορεῖν U (with a line break after ἐνιαυ) MC v V p Ha P (-αυ- B): ἐνιαυτο-φορεῖν N (no line break).

HP 4. 2. 7 ἀπλοῦν u M² P (ἀπνοῦν B) Ha: ἀπλοῦν U (perfectly legible) V; ἀ a blank οὖν N v M¹ C p (of 3, 3–4, 4, 7, 2 letters respectively).

HP 4. 4. 13 εἰ προσράνιεν ego: εἰ προσραίνιεν U (-ν now erased): a blank (of 8, 10, 11, 10–11, 12, 10, 7–8 letters respectively) followed by ε (·ε p) Nv MC V p P; no blank and ε B; a blank of 6–7 and 5 letters respectively Ha.

HP 6. 4. 3 (after οὗτος) οὐ U PB a (H is wanting): δ N MC v p (V is wanting).

In U the long tail of the ξ of δνόπυξος in the preceding line appears to cross out the v.

The scribe of N or of his lost original was a Latin (perhaps both were):

HP 1. 10. 4 πλατύφυλλα U (-ττ- f) PB Ha N² v MC: πλαθύφυλλα N¹ p V.

HP 4. 2. 2 ταριχεύουσιν U (-σι u MC PB Ha): ταρικέουσιν N v p V.

HP 4. 14. 13 ἐκπήξεις Schneider: ἐκπλήξεις U PB a (H is wanting); ἐκπλήσεις N MC v p V.

HP 6. 8. 1 βολβοῦ U MC p PB a: βουλβοῦ N (first v expunged) v.

- v Venice, Library of St. Mark 274; copied by Demetrios Sgouropoulos for Cardinal Bessarion at Florence and dated January 3, 1443; *HP* and *CP*. The scribe skips exactly two pages of N (163^v and 164^r), passing directly from ὁσκαλσιν (*HP* 2. 7. 5), the last word on 163^r in N, to ὁμοιόδητος (*HP* 2. 8. 4), the first word on 164^v. There is no such omission in MC p V PB Ha.

v (like p V) comes from an earlier state of the text of N than does M. The scribe is hasty and not at home in Latin. Thus he neglects certain

7. p adds a note: λυ' φύλον ἐν εἰς τὴν τελίωσιν τοῦ βιβλίου.

longer deletions by N², a Latin who encloses them between two brackets, superscribing *va* over the first and *cat* over the second. In the first of them *v* omits the *va* and misreads the *cat* as *γαρ*:

HP 2. 3. 3 after *συμβαίνειν* (-νει α) N² deletes *δὲ οὐκ ὄντων δὲ οἷον ἐλαία ποτ' ἀποκαυθεῖσα τελέως ἀνε;* *v* alone retains the deleted words (with *τελείως* for *τελέως* and *ἀνε*^{γάρ} for *ἀνε*^{cat}).

N¹ omitted the titles and initial letters of each book, leaving them for the rubricator: the guide letters for the initials are still visible in the margin. But no rubricator was forthcoming, and N² inserted the present titles and initials in black.

The scribe of *v* copied N before N² had added the titles and initials. The original scribe, however, left two blank lines for the heading of each book and omitted the initial letters of each, including Books 9 and 10. Bessarion and his scribes extemporized. Guide letters have been inserted by *v*² (those for 1 and 8 are no longer visible; none were inserted for 9 and 10). This hand has also placed nine Greek ordinals (α β γ δ ε ζ η ι), each surmounted by -ος' (*λόγος* being understood) in the margin of the first line of the book, skipping θ (= 9) and leaving Book 9 with an erased Roman IX in the margin. The η for Book 8 has been expunged. Another η, placed in the margin at 7. 11. 1 (where *v* leaves a blank of 29 letters and a line, punctuating the preceding word with : + as if it ended a book), has been erased.

A third scribe (*v*³) has added the titles in all except one of the blanks (that which heads Book 9) left for them by *v*¹, and has also supplied the ornate initials. The titles are of the form *θεοφράστου τῶν περὶ τὰ φυτὰ ἱστοριῶν* (modeled on Aristotle's *τῶν περὶ τὰ ζῷα ἱστοριῶν*); each is followed by the name of a letter: ἄλφα (1), βῆτα (2), γάμμα (3), δέλτα (4), εἶ (5), ζῆτα (6), ἥτα (7), ἰῶτα (9), κάππα (10; that is, where *v*^{*} begins).⁸ There is no difficulty about Books 1–5. For the rest, a diagram (Table 1) may be convenient.

Hesitation about the marginal numbers begins with η^{ος}, which is twice set down and twice deleted (erased at 7. 11. 1, expunged at 8). The number is important because it marks not only the beginning of an eighth book but the end of a seventh, and Galen says that 8. 9. 2 comes from Theophrastus "in the seventh book on plants" (*ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ περὶ φυτῶν: De alimentorum facultatibus* 1. 11 [CMG, 5. 4. 2, pp. 237. 20–238. 7 Helmreich; 6: 516 Kühn]). Neither placement of the marginal η puts the citation in the seventh book; both put it in the eighth. The placing of the Roman IX (now erased) at 9. 1. 1 looks like a noncom-

8. So in *CP* the titles are omitted by N¹ (although room is left for them); in *v* the third hand (*v*³) adds titles of the form *περὶ φυτῶν γενέσεως τὸ ἄλφα* (and so through εἶ), modeled on Aristotle's *περὶ ζῴων γενέσεως*. (Book 5, with which fol. 172^v begins in *v*, lacks title and number, no blank having been left for them by *v*¹, who failed to notice the blank left by N¹ [later filled by N² with the title *θεοφράστου περὶ φυτῶν αἰτιῶν*, τὸ εἶ because it there was the last line of the page.) Gaza gently sets the title right and corrects the number near the close of his *Praefatio*: "cum in his omnibus Theophrasti libri, tum maxime in his sex quos de generatione sive de causis plantarum addidit . . ." [italics mine].

TABLE 1

Book	Ordinal by v^{2m}	Letter Name in Title by v^3
6	$\xi^{os'}$ (= 6th)	$\zeta\eta\tau\alpha$ (= 6)
7	$\zeta^{os'}$ (= 7th)	$\eta\tau\alpha$ (= 7)
7. 11. 1 ^a	$\tilde{\eta}^{os'}$ (= 8th; now erased)	[no title or letter name]
8	$\tilde{\eta}^{os'}$ (= 8th; now expunged)	$\iota\omega\tau\alpha$ [<i>sic</i>] (= 9)
8. 9. 2 ^b	[no ordinal]	[no title or letter name]
9	IX (Roman numeral; now erased)	[no title or letter name in the two lines left blank by v^1]
10 ^c	$\iota^{os'}$ (= 10th)	$\kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha$ (= 10)

^a The punctuation lets the lacuna appear as an interval between books.

^b Cited by Galen as "in the seventh book."

^c Before v^* .

mittal expedient: the "nine" would be $\tilde{\theta}^{os'}$ in the style of v^{2m} , $\iota\omega\tau\alpha$ in the Aristotelian style of the titles by v^3 . We may conjecture that Bessarion knew (perhaps from Diogenes Laertius 5. 46, perhaps from rumor among the learned, who had the news from U or the lost original of N) that *HP* contained ten books, and decided to attempt to identify the eighth book by figuring backward from the last. He found the beginning of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha$ $v^3 = \iota^{os'} = 10$ easily enough, but his attempt was frustrated by an error of the rubricator (v^3), who misread the $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$ of his instructions as $\iota\omega\tau\alpha$ (hence the omission of the breathing) and may well have misplaced it, since a $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$ (= 8) placed somewhere after 8. 9. 2 would have left the citation in Book 7, where according to Galen it belonged. The correct solution would doubtless have been to lump Books 7 and 8 together into a single book of about twice the usual length, calling it $\eta\tau\alpha$ (= 7) and then call Book 9 $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$ (= 8) and Book 10 (= v^*) $\iota\omega\tau\alpha$ (= 9). This was precluded by working backward and designating Book 10 as $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha$; Galen was apparently citing from an edition in nine books, not ten. The confusion however had its uses; it indicated that the division of books in the tradition was wrong.

But we hasten to Bessarion's notes. On the first five pages of v (2^r – 4^v) Bessarion cites many of Gaza's versions, sometimes turning Gaza's conjectures into Greek. On the flyleaf (1^v) Bessarion has written two long notes, the first dated 1445, the second 1446.⁹ In the first he calls the book *ἀδέσποτον καὶ ἀνεπίγραφον* (lacking author's name and title), but infers that it is by Theophrastus (as some suppose) because of the Aristotelian character of the style (to be expected in Theophrastus) and because the Latins have all the books of Aristotle that the Greeks have, but lack this one (although they and the Greeks have the *De plantis*, which bears Aristotle's name). In the second note Bessarion announces further proof of the authorship. He has found in Galen's *De alimentorum facultatibus* a passage (*HP* 8. 9. 2) cited expressly as what Theophrastus

9. Both are cited and translated by L. Labowsky, "Aristoteles *De Plantis* and Bessarion . . .," *MRS* 5 (1961): 145–47.

says in the seventh book on plants. Bessarion is concerned about the discrepancy in the number of the book (the seventh in Galen), and thinks that the scribes have erred in dividing the books. In his marginal note on *HP* 8. 9. 2 he concludes: τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ζ' (= ἔβδομον) ἀλλ' οὐκ ὀγδοὺν ἀριθμεῖσθαι ὀφείλει. A few lines later Bessarion corrects the text of v (and the rest) from Galen, adding ἡ τε ζεία καὶ ἡ τίφη. Gaza adopts the correction.

- G** Theodorus Gaza (or Gazae, as Bessarion has it in the *ex libris* cited below) translated *HP* and *CP* into polished Latin in 1450–51. His chief source was v,¹⁰ but he also had readings from the edition now represented by H and P. The *editio princeps* was printed at Treviso and bears the date February 20, 1483. It swarms with errors and must often be corrected from the manuscripts, of which eight are known:¹¹

Budapest, University Library 1 (*HP*, *CP*).

Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana S XXIV 3 (*HP*, *CP*). The colophon runs:

"Scriptus per me Iohannem antonii de Spinalo pro Magnifico & potenti domino dñō Malateste nouello de Malatestis &c." Domenico Malatesta Novello died in 1465.

London, British Museum, Harley 3414 (*HP*).

New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 118; about 1470 (*HP*).

Valencia, University Library 729 (*HP*, *CP* through *ad aeris* [2. 4. 9] with the catchword *habitu* at the end of a quinion; the rest is lost).

Vatican City, Chigi F VIII 193 (*HP*, *CP*).

Vatican City, Urbinas 250 (*HP*, *CP*); dated 1520 (*finis Deo grās. φ.κ.* before the subscription of *CP*).

Venice, Library of St. Mark 265 (*HP*, *CP*); from Bessarion's library. Bessarion became *Card. Sabiniensis antea Tusculani* in October 1468.¹² On an *ex libris* we find in Bessarion's own hand the following statement in Greek and in Latin (I quote the Latin): "Locus. 31. | Theophrasti de plantis. Translatum per theodorum Gazae; liber meus. | b. Car(dinalis) Tusculani."

- M** Florence, Laurentian Library, desk 85, 3; fifteenth century; *HP*, *CP*, *Pl*; written by Harlfinger's Librarius Florentinus (cf. Harlfinger, *Textgeschichte*, pp. 223, 417). Near the end of *HP* 3. 9. 4 N writes πῶλλ' for πολλήν, the tachygraphic sign for ην appearing as a circumflex and being placed too early; it is a besetting fault in N to place accents too early or too late. M¹ did not understand the word and writes πο and a blank of five letters; C follows M, leaving a blank of nine letters; V writes πόλλον (misreading the grave as the sign for ον), and M² (a late hand) corrects to πολλεῖν.
- C** Oxford, Corpus Christi College 113; it contains (inter alia) *HP*, *CP*, *Pl*. It was written by Petros Hypsilas, according to Harlfinger, *Textgeschichte*, page 412. In *HP* and *CP* it is a copy of M.

10. Cf. *HP* 7. 7. 2 κόρχορος U N MC p a PB: κίχυρος u⁸; κόρχος v (corchus G [corcus Budapest MS; corcorus (from Pliny) *editio princeps*]).

11. Cf. C. B. Schmitt, "Theophrastus" (in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, vol. 2 [Washington, 1971], p. 268).

12. Cf. A. Diller, "Three Greek Scribes Working for Bessarion: Trivizias, Callistus, Hermonymus," *IMU* 10 (1967): 408.

- V** Vienna, National Library, Suppl. 32; fifteenth century; *HP* through γὰρ οὐτε (6. 3. 2), breaking off after 50^v (a full page) through loss of the following leaves. A descendant of N.
- P** Vatican City, Palatinus 162; among its contents are *HP* and *Pl*. Written by Johannes Scutariota in 1442–47.
- H** Harvard College Library 17; fifteenth century. Among the manuscripts bound together in this volume is one that when intact contained the entire *HP* and *CP*. The Aldine was printed from it. Two mutilated fragments survive, bound in the reverse order:

HP 9. 16. 8–*CP* 3. 3. 7 (|ἐκ σούσων—ριγόν|); the last three folios of quire ιθ are lost (*CP* 2. 6. 1–2. 9. 6 |διὰ—τῶν|).

HP 1. 8. 3–*HP* 4. 6. 5 (|μείζον—καὶ ἐ|); the third folio of quire ε is lost (*HP* 3. 11. 1–*HP* 3. 12. 1 |προσαγορεύουσι—κρᾶνείας|).

Harlfinger, *Textgeschichte*, page 413, suggests that the scribe was Paulos (Paolo Bombasio?).

- a** The fourth volume of the Aldine Aristotle, dated *Calendis Iunii M IIID*.
- P** Paris, National Library 2069; fifteenth century; *HP*, *CP*, *Pl*; copied, according to Harlfinger, *Textgeschichte*, page 413, by Andronicus Callistus.
- B** Vatican City, Vaticanus 1305; fifteenth century. The second part, originally a separate manuscript, contains *HP*, *CP*, *Pl*. In *HP* and *CP* it is a direct copy of P. The scribe (easily the worst of the lot) is Harlfinger's tenth Anonymus (*Textgeschichte*, p. 418).

H and P derive from an ancestor copied from N and containing readings introduced from U.

The Excerpts

- f** Phillips 3085; fifteenth century.¹³ The extracts (all from *HP*) were collated by me from the manuscript; I have no photographs. They occupy the last 52 pages and break off (after ἀλφίτου 9. 9. 1) with the loss of the folio (or folios) that once followed. The loss antedates b.

In the Theophrastus there is no second hand. There are numerous corrections by the first hand, so made that it is evident that both text and correction stood in the original (thus the accents are so placed that they do not interfere with the superscriptions). The numerous blanks appear to be mainly due to the scribe's inability to read a difficult hand.

The longest nearly continuous extract is of some seven pages (*HP* 9. 4. 2–9. 8. 1). The excerptor freely omits and paraphrases, especially in the shorter selections. He has no concern for avoiding hiatus or bad quantitative rhythm, and often returns to a more natural phrasing and arrangement of words.

13. Cf. *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, pt. 1: *Codices ex Bibliotheca Meermaniana Phillipici graeci nunc Berolinenses*, p. ix, n. 2; also A. Wartelle, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote* . . . (Paris, 1963), p. 60.

The following readings of f do not all appear to be mere accidents or conjectures:

1. 3. 2 γιγνομένου f: γιν- U (dot over ν).
1. 5. 3 ῥάμνον Wimmer: βάκνον f; βαλανον U.
1. 6. 1 ἐπειτα καὶ f: ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ U.
1. 8. 4 ἡ ἀποκοπὴ f: καὶ ἡ ἀποκοπὴ U.
1. 12. 2 ἐλάτης f: ἐλεῖ|ατῆς U (ἐλαίας τῆς υ).
3. 1. 6 ὅλης πληθός U: πληθός ὅλης f (avoiding hiatus).
4. 7. 7 ἐξείρειν Wimmer: ἐξεί(αι ss.)ρειν f; ἐξαιρεῖν U (-αίρειν υ).
5. 9. 8 ἀφεδρον Lobeck: ἐφεδρον f; ἐφυδρον U.
- 9 heading: ἱ U^m; θεοφράστου περὶ φυτῶν ὁπῶν (in red) f. The title was evidently intended to contrast with the title of U* (περὶ δυνάμεως ριζῶν) and shows the presence of the U* text in the MS excerpted.

- b** Paris, National Library 1823; sixteenth century (?). It contains (inter alia) the excerpts from *HP*. These were once a separate MS, written in a different hand and with its own quire numbers. It is a copy of f.
- b₁** Paris, National Library 1953; sixteenth century; a copy of b (so at *HP* 1. 6. 12 it drops an exact line of b: οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν λίνων· μίαν γὰρ ρίζαν ἔχει τὴν κατὰ τὸ βάθος—).

An excerpt from *HP* 1. 3. 1 by a grammarian is independent of U and is found in four manuscripts:

- h₁** Paris, National Library 2408; thirteenth century; 225^r.
- h₂** Zavorda 95; 76^v col. 2 by the second hand (cf. L. Politis, "Kloster Zavorda und die Photios-Handschrift," *Philologus*, 105 [1961]: 141). I owe a transcription of the passage to the kindness of Dr. Christos Theodoridis of Thessaloniki and the courteous permission of Professor K. Tsantsanoglou.
- h₃** Paris, National Library 1630; fourteenth century; 115^v. The passage is printed in J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca* (Paris, 1829), 1: 410–11.
- h₄** Vienna, National Library phil. gr. 178; 1429–30; 44^v.

Plethon's excerpts are represented by four manuscripts:

- g** Venice, Library of St. Mark 406; 74–76; in Plethon's own hand.¹⁴ The excerpts are very free, and of little or no value for the text. The source was N or a related manuscript, not U: *HP* 3. 11. 3 φυλλοροεῖν U: φυλλοφορεῖν g Nv MC Vp a(-υλο- PB).
- g₁** Munich, Bavarian National Library 48; 440–441^v; from the preceding manuscript. It was written by Petros Karneades (Harlfinger, *Textgeschichte*, p. 413).
- g₂** Vatican City, Vaticanus 1759; fifteenth century; 246–248^v. It is quoted in full by J. G. Schneider, *Theophrasti Eresii Quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 5 (Leipzig, 1821), pp. 185–88.
- g₃** Paris, National Library 2080; 282^r–286^r.
- m** Heidelberg, Palatinus 129; 70^v–71; end of the fifteenth century. The excerpts are from *HP* 1. 1. 9, 1. 2. 6, 1. 3. 1, 1. 3. 2, 1. 5. 3, 1. 8. 2,

14. A. Diller, "The Autographs of Georgius Gemistus Pletho," *Scriptorium* 10 (1956): 41.

1. 9. 2, 1. 9. 3, 1. 9. 4, 1. 9. 6, 1. 9. 7. They are followed by explanations of some terms. The source is presumably U; it is not N or one of its descendants (including the edition represented by H and P).

The editor of *HP* can ignore the other MSS and excerpts and rely exclusively for the tradition on U, f, and h. He must take care not to confuse U with u, since the readings of u are conjectures, except for the few that were taken from a lost connection of f. He must also take care in using f: an excerptor is not likely to include unintelligible passages, and is apt to abbreviate and paraphrase without warning.

Three common sources of corruption in U are these:

- (1) Breathings and accents are very frequently absent. It is therefore very easy to confuse a superscribed L (= εν) with a square rough breathing and vice versa, and again ε and ú.
- (2) In an ancestor omitted words and phrases were sometimes not only written in the margin but entered into the text; they thus appear twice.
- (3) A word or phrase is corrected from a parallel passage. Compare *HP* 2. 8. 1 ἐπὶ Ἀλύκῳ ego: ἐπὶ φαλύκῳ U. The φ came from *HP* 8. 2. 11 ἐφ' Ἀλύκῳ ego: ἐφαλύκῳ U.
HP 8. 4. 5 τοῖς Πισσόγγοις ego (here and in the two passages to be cited; cf. τοὺς Πισσόγγους W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graeci inscriptiones selectae*, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1903], no. 315 A 6): τοῖς πισσάτοις U; τοῖς πισσύτοις f.
CP 4. 9. 5 τοῖς πεισάγγαις U. *CP* 4. 11. 6 ταῖς ἐπισυνάγγαις U. One may suppose that εσ is a corruption of σσ, and that the ε, superscribed over πισ, yielded ἐπισ-; again, that τ is a corruption of γγ (perhaps through τγ, a common way of writing ττ); υγγ, superscribed over αγγ, yielded υναγγ.

University of Chicago