

Thucydides MSS Used by Poppo, Arnold, other old Editors

Karl Maurer, (office) 215 Carpenter, (972) 252-5289, (email) filokalos@aol.com

This table, and the notes that follow, I made several years ago for my own use, so that I could see at a glance (a) what MS is meant by an old editor or commentator of Thucydides (for often the *sigla* have changed) and (b) what is the rough derivation and rough worth of each MS. These derivations, arrived at by Alberti and others, are often so complex that they make the head spin. I cannot guarantee that these pages are free of errors; but they seem worth posting in case they may be of use to anyone.

I list the MSS in alphabetical order of the *sigla* used by Poppo. For each MS I list: (1) the modern *siglum*; (2) Poppo's; (3) Arnold's (underlined if it is also Bekker's) (4) (if a *recentior*) the derivation, or (if a capital MS) the full name & when it was first collated (see Marchant Bk. 2, p. xxi-xxii, Stahl p. xxv).

' => ' means "is the exemplar of". ' :::: ' a namless lost intermediary MS. ' + ' collation; '<=' means "which itself was copied from". So e.g. 'A => :::: (+ [B]) => C (& D)' means "A is exemplar of a lost MS which, collated with a B-type MS, is exemplar of C (& of D)". Or e.g. 'α => ψ (+ γ) => ψ¹ (+ ζ <= Ω?)' means: "α was exemplar of ψ (which had been collated with γ), which was exemplar of ψ¹ (which had been collated with ζ, which itself had been copied perhaps from Ω)."

"?" means I could find no clear information (normally, such MSS are minimally interesting). A Roman numeral like "(lxix)" = a page in Alberti, *Thucydidis Historiae*, I. "Kl." = Kleinlogel. The date of a *recentior* is given-- e.g. "J (xiv, xv)"--only if it is other than saec. xv.

Re Arnold. For our CAPITAL MSS except M and G, Arnold used our *sigla*. But note well that, though by "G" he often appears to mean our G (for his apparatus lists MSS alphabetically, "C G " etc.), his "G" really means our J, & his "M" means only the Barrocius.

<i>modern</i>	<i>Poppo</i>	<i>Arnold, Bekker</i>	<i>DERIVATION ("coll." = "collatus ab ")</i>
Ar	Ar.	L	(1.1-1.55) G => :::: => Pk => :::: (+ ψ) => Vk => ::::=>:::R => Ar; (inde)...Vk=>O => Ar (cxliv)
F	Aug.	F	"Augustanus" = Monacensis 430. (saec. XI) coll. Bekker, Gottleber
--	Bar.	<u>M</u>	? ("librum non inspexi" Albert xxxi. Nil nisi contiones praebet)
J (xiv,xv)	Bas.	<u>G</u>	α => ψ (+ γ) => ψ ¹ (+ ζ <= Ω?) => :::: (+ [B]) => J (lxxxii, lxxxv)
S (1277)	Cass.	H	F => :::: (& :::: => D) => S corr. (a Planude) ex Pl (q.v.), Pl ² , Pl ³ (clix)
--	Cam.	?	hic nil nisi excerpta ex J, a Camerario publicata (vide Poppo pp. 16, 26)
O	Chr.	O	G => :::: => Pk (& L) => :::: (+ ψ, ?ξ) => Vk => O (cxliv, cxlix)
Cn	Cl.	<u>N</u>	F => :::: => D => :::: (+ A B) => :::: (+ B Pi Mb) => Cn (cxliv)
Ha	Dn.	P	G => :::: => Pk (& L) => :::: (+ ψ, ?ξ) => Vk => :::: => Ha (cxliv)
K	Gr(aev).	K	α => ψ (+ g) => ψ ¹ (+ ζ <= Ω?) => :::: (+ [B]) => :::: (& Nf) => K (& Bb) (lxxxii, lxxxv)
A	It.	A	Italus = Cisalpinus = Paris. suppl gr.255. (saec. XI ex. vel XII in.) coll. Bekker
C	Laur.	C	Laurentianus Pl. 69, 22. (X init.) coll. Bekker (1.15-2.103, 8.1-31) Schoene Hude alii
X (xiv)	Lugd.	"R"	M => μ => μ ¹ => Al (+ ψ ²) => :::: => X (lxix) (<i>de siglo vide Powell CQ 1936 91</i>)
D (xiii)	Marc.	X = <u>D</u>	F => :::: => D (cxliv)
G	Mon,m	S	Monacensis 228 (saec. xiii) coll. Bekker, Goeller (qui eum magni aestimabat)
R	Mon., b	"R"	G=> :::: => Pk => :::: (+ ψ) => Vk => :::: => Wb =>R (<i>coll. ad 1.77 De siglo Powell loc. cit</i>)
Q	Mosq.	Q	F => :::: => D => :::: => Sc => σ => :::: Uc => Ba => τ => Q! (clvii, cxliv)
E	Pal.	E	Palatinus (Heidelberg). (saec. X ex. aut XI ineunte) coll. Bekker, Poppo
Pg	Reg., G	g	(vide s.v. Paris MSS) "Reg" = ed. Duker; "G" = ed. Gail "(G)" = consensus
Valla	Valla		(3.28 - <i>fin.</i>) G iam integer (xcvi) => L (& Pk) => Nf (+ ξ) (lxxxii) => q (+ ξ) => Valla & Pi => Pd (cxxvii). (1.1. - 3.27) α => ψ (+ γ) => ψ ¹ (+ ζ) => :::: (+ ψ ²) => Nf (lxxxii)(+ ξ) (lxxxii) => q (+ ξ) => Valla (<i>passim</i>) ξ (=ξ+B) => Valla (& H). Ita 3.28 - <i>fin.</i> adfines L (ita et Bb K), Pk Nf Pi Pd ξ-mss (e.g. H)
B	Vat.	B	Vaticanus gr. 126. (saec. XI) coll. Bekker, Hude & alii. B^u incipit 6.92.5

O	Chr.	O	G => ::: => Pk (& L) => ::: (+ ψ, ?ξ) => Vk => O (cxliv, cxlix)
V	Ven.	V, Ven	F => ::: => D => ::: => ::: => Cn (q.v.) => V (cxliv)
Wa	Vind.	I.	C => ::: (+ Vk <= Pk [q.v.]) => Vi => Wa (cxliv)
L	Laur. lxix. 30		G (<i>nondum lacunosus neque emendatus</i> , xcvi) => L (et Pk) (lxxxii, cxliv)
M	?	?	Britannicus. Add. 11 727. (saec. X ex. vel XI in., mm. recc. XIV) 1867, coll. Eggeling
Nf (xiv)	?	?	(3.28 fin.) G (<i>nondum lac. neq. emend.</i> , xcvi) => L (& Pk) => Nf (cf. Bb, K) (lxxxii) (+ ξ, cxxvii)

PARIS MSS (all 15th c., save Pb = 16th, & H & Pl = 14th init. As Poppo sensed, often very valuable):

<i>Mod.</i>	<i>Poppo</i>	<i>Arnold, Bekker</i>	<i>Derivation</i>	<i>coll</i>	<i>details of deriv. & coll. (nearly all have j readings coll. by late hands)</i>
Pa	A	A	F (S)	H	(1.140) F => ::: => S => ::: (+ H) => Pa. (1.40 fin.) ? (clx, clxii)
Pb	B	b	?	?	?
Pc	C	C	α	ψ, ξ	α => ψ => ψ ¹ => ψ ² (+ π, & + B!) => ::: => Pc (lxxxv)
Pd	D	D	G, ψ	ψ, ξ	descriptus ex Pi (de quo vide infra) et Pi ² et Pi ³ (cxxvii)
Pe	E	E	C (Vi)	ψ ² ξ	C => Vi (+ Vk: ex G) => p (+ ψ ² , qui ipse + B!) => Pe (lxxv)
Pf	F	F	α	ψ ² ξ	α => ψ => ψ ¹ => ψ ² (+ π, & + B!) => ψ ³ => ψ ⁵ => Pf (lxxxv)
Pg	G=Reg.	G	F (D)	-- (? ξ)	(1.1 - 3.63) F => ::: => D => ::: => Pg (cxliv, cli); postea Vh => Pg (clxiii)
H	H	h	B, ξ	ψ, ξ	(1.1 7.5) B => η => H (+ ξ); (7.5 7.50) ξ (+η) => H (+ η)
Pi	I	I	α, G, ψ	ψ, ξ	Vallae exemplar q (q.v. supra, s.v. Valla) => Pi (+ ξ a manibus recc.)
Pk	K	K	G	? ψ	G (<i>nondum lacunosus neq emend.</i> , xcvi) => Pk (& L) (lxxxii, cxliv, cxlvii)
Pl	?	?	M, ψ ¹	ψ, ξ?	(libr. 1-6) M => μ ² => Pl; (libr. 7-8 [<i>velut Ud</i>]) ψ ¹ => Pl (+ ξ) (lxix, Kl. 62)

Alter "Vind" = Wb: (3.82 - fin.) G => ::: => Pk => ::: (+ ψ) => Vk => ::: => ::: => Wb
(1.1 - 3.82) F => ::: => D => ::: => Sc => s => Wb (cxliv)

OTHER OLD SIGLA: *marg. Steph.* = scriptura in margine a Stephano notatam. *Tus.* = adn. a Tusano adscripta. *Vict.* = adn. a Victorio adscripta

re **PARIS MSS** (*Hemmerdinger p. 9*). First collated and named with capital letters by Gail for his 1807 edtn. Bekker 1821 renamed with small letters but used Gail's collation. Bekker 2nd edtn. 1832 abandoned these MSS and used only A B C D E F G=J. (N.b. Hemmerdinger implies that Bekker's "G" means our G, but it means our J acc. to Powell CQ 1936 86 n.)

re **H** (*Hemmerdinger p. 55 ff.*) Named "H" and collated by Gail, 1807; coll. in bk. 6 by Bekker. Poppo saw its value (pars II vol. 1 p 39); but Bekker did not (Oxford 1821 vol. I p. v): "Parisienses cum valde recentes esse omnes viderem, inspexi, non pertractavi." Marchant (Book VI 1897) used from 6.92.5; so Hude in 1901, using Gail's collation. Wil. & Marchant considered it a copy of B.

re **BEKKER**. Preface to the 1824 smaller edition, p. iv: "Quorum qui optimi sunt et antiquissimi, Cisalpinus (A), Vaticanus (B), Laurentianus (C), Palatinus (E), Augustanus (F) [*n.b. his brilliance in discerning capital MSS!*], longe absunt ab ea praestantia qua excellunt inter Isocrateos Urbinas, inter Platonicos et Demosthenicos Parisienses A et S, et si qui alii singuli singulorum scriptorum ad salutem fati esse destinati videntur: ut neque ejusmodi libros impune neglexeris, et Thucydideorum barbarismi nimis patienter ferantur."

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE TABLE. Most recc. are now ignored as almost purely derivative (e.g.--if we can trust Alberti--most in which I put no " + " followed by a Greek-letter *siglum*). A modern apparatus tends to cite

only those which (a) by collation got ψ or ξ readings (so e.g. J, K, the Paris MSS) or (b) reflect *G nondum lacunosum neque emendatum* (e.g. L, Nf), and even these a modern apparatus cites but rarely.

This "minimalism" is fine but has a price. Most often only old editions list *any* rec. readings. Now and then you can find the truth hiding in Poppo's or Arnold's apparatus. But since they list these readings "unscientifically"--e.g. they cite a family's worst representative--you need to know the full derivation and kinship of even the worst MS. Thus you can see or sense the "constellations" there.

NOTA BENE:

==> My table ignores Φ , Λ and Ω .

==> It shows *direct* descent but not all contamination. E.g. the ξ readings written by late hands in ψ mss (e.g. in Pi--otherwise dull--by Pi², Pi³ etc.)--these I did not always spell out.

==> One can often see or sense the provenance of a Φ , Λ , Ω or even ξ reading (the latter e.g. by elimination: for if H alone or Valla alone or Pi³ alone has an apparently true reading, we assume--for better or worse--that its source was ξ); but a ψ reading is much harder. For (a) the actual exemplar of ψ is *alpha* which itself, after all, is not well known to us (C is careless and G is late and contaminated), and (b) there is a massive contamination, partly in ψ itself (see below), and partly caused by the late dates and sheer size of the family. So a putative ψ reading might have come from anywhere (from conjecture, from Ψ , from α , from ϕ etc.) This symbol has only two real functions: (a) to "explain" certain families that the basic stemma does not; (b) to ensure some respect for the recc. For if it occurs in a known ψ -MS, an interesting reading might not be some late Byzantine conjecture. But always remember:

==> ψ was *itself* collated not only with Ψ but also with γ = EZ (p. xcii), and ψ 1 was collated with ζ (p. lxx). Also (maddeningly) at the same time γ was collated with ψ .

==> J, K, Valla, Nf (till 3.27), Pf and some other ψ "deteriores" are in a *direct* line not from any capital MS but from *alpha*: surely this ought to raise their status somewhat.

==> Conceivably, this or that *recentior* is now too wholly despised. Most of this work was done by Alberti. Usually he collated only one book, or two, just enough to satisfy himself about the main derivation. His intuition, like Kleinlogel's, is probably sound and subtle, but one seems to see room for error. And even if a MS *is*, in fact, basically dismally derivative, it might contain surprises.

POPPO'S SCHEME FOR MSS (E. F. Poppo, ed., *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo*, Leipzig 1825: Pars II, vol. 1, p. 62). I use the modern sigla for the MSS, and information from Alberti. Here I have copied signs from the above table; so again " + " means contamination. " :: " lost intermediary MS. " = ? " means I can't identify the MS. " : ? " = derivation unknown to me. "Fam." = familia".

GENUS I "*praeclarum*" [F-derived MSS] [often J and even Wa kin to these]

Fam. A -- "*omnium optima*":

S : F => :: (& *alterum* :: => D) => S, corr. (a Planude) ex Pi, Pi², Pi³

F (closer to fam. B [p. 30])

Fam. B -- "*bona*" [cf. fam. II.c below]:

Cn : F => :: => D => :: (+ A B) => :: (+ B Pi Mb) => Cn

V : F => :: => D => :: => :: => Cn (q.v.) => V (cxliv)

Fam. C -- "*aliquanto deterior*":

Pc : α => ψ => ψ^1 => ψ^2 (+ π , & + B!) => :: => Pc

Pa : F => :: => S => :: (+ H) => Pa. (?? This applies to 1.1 - 1.40, at least: see Alberti clxi-clxii)

Pf ("*reliquis peior*"): α => ψ => ψ^1 => ψ^2 (+ π , & + B!) => ψ^3 => ψ^5 => Pf

GENUS II "*et ipsum praestans*" [pure beta || beta + Omega, Xi || again F!]

Fam. A -- "*bona, transitum a praecedente genere parans*":

E

A

Fam. B -- "*bona, et magis propria indole utens sed correctorem experta*":

B (+ Ω praesertim in libr. 7 - 8)

H (1.1 - 7.5) $B \Rightarrow \eta \Rightarrow H (+ \xi)$; (7.5 - 7.50) $\xi (+\eta) \Rightarrow H (+ \eta)$

Fam. C -- "*satis bona praeter l. VIII*" [In 1st bks this seems "I.D" (p. 38). Cf. I.B, but here no B- and Pi-readings]:

Pg (1.1 - 3.63) $F \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow D \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Pg$. (Inde) ...Vh $\Rightarrow Pg$

D : $F \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow D$

GENUS III "*mediocre*" [i.e. **alpha** MSS, valuably contaminated || C MSS]

-- "*transitum a praecedente parat, sequentibus melior*"

J : $\alpha \Rightarrow \psi (+ \gamma) \Rightarrow \psi^1 (+ \zeta \leq \Omega?) \Rightarrow \dots (+ [B]) \Rightarrow J$

Fam. A -- "*modo bona, modo corrupta*":

K : $\alpha \Rightarrow \psi (+ g) \Rightarrow \psi^1 (+ \zeta \leq \Omega?) \Rightarrow \dots (+ [B]) \Rightarrow \dots (& Nf) \Rightarrow K$

Pi (3.28 - *fin.*) $G iam integer (xcvi) \Rightarrow L (& Pk) \Rightarrow Nf (+ \xi) (lxxxii) \Rightarrow Q (+ \xi) \Rightarrow Valla \& Pi \Rightarrow Pd (cxxvii)$

(1.1. - 3.27) $\alpha \Rightarrow \psi (+ \gamma) \Rightarrow \psi^1 (+ \zeta) \Rightarrow \dots (+ \psi^2) \Rightarrow Nf (lxxxii)(+ \xi) (lxxxii) \Rightarrow Q (+ \xi) \Rightarrow Pi$

Pd ("postremus reliquis posthabendus") **Pi** $\Rightarrow Pd$

Fam. B -- "*longe saepius mendosa quam sincera*":

C

Pe : $C \Rightarrow Vi (+ Vk: ex G) \Rightarrow p (+ \psi^2, qui ipse + B!) \Rightarrow Pe + \xi$

Wa : $C \Rightarrow \dots (+ Vk \leq Pk [q.v.]) \Rightarrow Vi \Rightarrow Wa$

GENUS IV "*depravatum*" [i.e. G-DERIVED MSS !]

-- "*transitum parans a praeced. gen.*":

Pk : **G** ("*nondum lacunosus nec manibus rec. emendatus*") $\Rightarrow Pk$ (et L)

-- "*Familia maxime corrupta*":

Ar. (1.1-1.55) $G \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Pk (& L) \Rightarrow \dots (+ \psi, ?\xi) \Rightarrow Vk \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow R \Rightarrow Ar$; (1.55 - *fin.*)... $Vk \Rightarrow O \Rightarrow Ar$

O : $G \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Pk (& L) \Rightarrow \dots (+ \psi, ?\xi) \Rightarrow Vk \Rightarrow O$

Ha : $G \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Pk (& L) \Rightarrow \dots (+ \psi, ?\xi) \Rightarrow Vk \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Ha$ (cxliv)

R : $G \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Pk \Rightarrow \dots (+ \psi) \Rightarrow Vk \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Wb \Rightarrow R$

-- "*aliquanto melior sequentibus*":

Q : $F \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow D \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow Sc \Rightarrow \sigma \Rightarrow \dots Uc \Rightarrow Ba \Rightarrow \tau \Rightarrow Q!$

-- "*vilis pretii*": **G** nullius plane acutoritatis: **Bar.** : ? (Has only speeches; Alberti has not even examined)

GENUS V "*libros varios incertae fidei complectens*" [i.e. he can't see what they are worth]

-- "*satis bonus, ut videtur*":

X : $M \Rightarrow \mu \Rightarrow \mu^1 \Rightarrow Al (+ \psi^1) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow X$

-- "*mediocris, ut videtur*" [these I haven't researched]

Pb : ?

Marg. Steph. [variae lect. ultimately from J: Powell CQ 1936 88 n.]

Marg. Vict. = ?

Marg. Flor. = ?

Vin. = ?

Tus. = ?

Poppo summarizes thus (op. cit. p. 62-63. For brevity and clarity, I translate his Latin freely, using the signs of the above table. Anything in square brackets is added by me):

From this scheme arise certain critical rules. First, it is clear that wherever MSS of genera I and II agree, their reading, if at all possible in sense and usage (*si ob sententiam verborum et usum loquendi ullo modo fieri possit*), should be preferred to that of the other MSS. But there is no need for all six families of Genera I & II to agree. Provided that most agree, i.e. four or five, you can easily bear the dissent of the rest. But also it matters which families disagree. For since I.C is somewhat worse [than I.A & I.B], and since II.C past Book 7 represents only one MS, which could have been badly copied or read, and

in Book 8 is kin to the two corruptest genera, one should pay less attention to I.C and II.C than to the other families.

So of these families even three are enough to establish the text, provided that among them be I.A and the most idiosyncratic of genus II; thus e.g. S F [= I.A] and Cn V [= I.B] & B H [= II.B] ; or S F [= I.A] & E A [= II.A] & B H [= II.B]. *

You might go farther and choose just S F and B H [i.e. only I.A & II B], as leaders of either side, or S F& Cn V [i.e. I.A & B], as the best MSS of the best class. But you may not--as we know Bekker has so often done--prefer B H alone to all the rest, nor may you, unless you have also "internal" arguments, prefer S F alone.

You will the more side with S F where one or two of the other better MSS also do. But not if that one is Pa (e.g. at 1.15 [...etc.]), for that MS is too often corrupt; nor if it is Pc [...etc.]. Rather, I mean e.g. Cn at 1.69.4 ἡσυχάζατε μὲν γὰρ [F] pro solo ἡσυχάζετε γὰρ [cett., Hude, Jones and the others],--since there δέ does not appear but is only supplied in thought, and one cannot see how this reading crept into these three MSS [i.e. into S, F, Cn; this "agreement" is really a mirage since S Cn derive from F; but his rule of course is right]. For wherever that is clear [i.e. when we have a plain banalization], then ... [etc.]... In such places we trust the majority of witnesses; and it is only where the best MSS of genera I and II conflict, or those genera themselves are in complete conflict, that we should call in the other witnesses, especially those of genus III.

***"and the most idiosyncratic of genus II"** = "*atque secundi (sc generis) ea (sc. familia) quae plurima sibi propria habet.*" On pp. 38-42 he explains more exactly. He was aware of the exact character and worth of B H (or as we say now, Ω and Ξ) in Bk. 8. Like Hude later, and unlike Bekker (who according to Poppo too blindly follows B H), he discerned that B H reflect some very assiduous "Corrector" who imported (a) many old authentic readings but also (b) many conjectures of his own--some plausible, though they tend to "clarify" and banalize the text, many plainly impossible.

FURTHER REMARKS ON POPPO. Poppo has an extraordinary attentiveness, acumen and tenacity. He discerns so much of the truth that he is often curiously sound even though his 'stemmatic' method is nonsense.

His main defect is that he cannot discern what derived *historically* from what. He lacks Bekker's penetrating insight into what the 'capital MSS' must be. He can discern (a) kinships, often even the very subtlest, and often (b) what MSS are basically closer to the truth, but not (c) a manuscript's provenance. So on the one hand his 'familiae' are oddly accurate; on the other, he does not suspect that some members of a 'family' were actually copied from others, and his hierarchy of 'genera' is impressionistic.

He is overimpressed with good readings in recc. which are really the results of collation and conversely, too put off by the coarseness of capital MSS like C and G. I suppose this comes in part from a want of purely historical method, concerning dates of MSS, handwriting, etc.; i.e. ignorance of things that Bekker knew well from his vast experience.

But he well illustrates the truth of a remark in my book, that even when confronted with a terrible mass of contaminated MSS, it is still better to devise a scheme and search hard for 'authority' than to rely in despair on mere intuition (i.e. the pompous 'iudicium' of Wilamowitz); for even if the scheme is wrong, the very attempt to make it checks subjectivity and hones perception.

In brief: on the one hand basically derivative MSS, improved by collation and conjecture, are so far preferred that the the seemingly slapdash old C and G are despised; on the other, precisely because of his attentiveness to his absurd 'families', his view of Bk 8 is often more accurate than Bekker's. And unlike Bekker, not hampered by contempt of 'recentiores', he was able to prize the Paris MSS and Valla. To put three Paris MSS in "Genus I" is absurd stemmatically—but not not in other ways.

In brief: If only the virtues of Bekker and Poppo could have combined! Then the right stemma would have emerged a full 150 years earlier than it did.