

gives γάμον, by a corrupt adaptation to the erroneous ἀποστεροίη; though it may be argued on the contrary that γάμον of Par. really owes its origin to nothing better than attraction to the following accusative adjectives δυσάνορα δάϊον, which stand in need of a noun. Turning to Guelf., it might appear that κρείσσονας (739), ὄρων (530), φίλους (952) are conjectures, though the last is curious enough as a conjecture in the unemended context. κυθέριος (1000) might be put down as an attraction to γάμος, and ἀρής (73) as a sagacious correction; but it is not so easy to see how the correct τὰ δ' αὖ (549) came to be written, nor how ἄμεμπτος (608) could be any attempt to emend ἀμέμπτων. If it be held that ἐτύμως (70) was a mistake in writing from dictation (οι and υ), then ἄμεμπτος is a similar error for ἀμέμπτως (ω and ο), which implies a different reading to that of M. A very striking discrepancy occurs in v. 112, which is not to be disposed of so readily. If Guelf. be rightly reported, it gives ἐνγαγρονγίς for the εὐγακόννις of M. The right reading is, I believe, σὺν, γὰ, γνοίης, and, if this be true, Guelf. cannot but point to an independent source. So v. 88 while M gives φρόνημά πως Guelf. gives φρονηματόως 'sed το in π mutato' (Hermann). The true reading seems to be φρονήματ' οὐκ. v. 396 M has προδῶς Guelf. προδῶς, where προδοὺς is desired. v. 535 M has εἰσικνουμένον but Guelf. -η, the true reading being (see note) ἐγκυκλουμένα. v. 723 M gives ἐπὶ τάχει and Guelf. ἐπὶ τύχει, where ἐπιτυχεῖς is to be read.

These differences can hardly be put down to copyists' conjectures, nor can the difference in v. 112 and v. 723 be put down to miscopying. I am therefore at present disposed to think that Guelf. at least is not derived from M, and am doubtful whether Par. is so.

*m* appears to have been the διορθωτής, who had before him the archetype of M or some other older copy. This is proved by his insertion of the lines 497—499, which had been omitted in the copying. The tendency of his corrections is generally right, though his remarks (if they be his own) shew that he had no conception of metre. For instance v. 280 οἴστρον καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Νείλου πέλας (πέδας M) he notes οἶμαι παῖδες, in v. 405 οἶμαι μήτι τλαίης where the scansion μήτι τλῆς is required, and in v. 907 he suggests ἴσως γ' αὐτὸς χ' οἱ ξυνέμποροι for the senarius. His metre being thus bad, it is clear that the correction v. 488 βέβηλον ἄλσος ἄν for β. ἄν ἄλσος comes from inspection of an older copy. His accentuation is also faulty e.g. ὀμαῖμον (428), ὄρων (530).

The note on v. 405 μήτι τλαίης for μήτι τ' αίας of M might seem to indicate that his copy was in uncials (Λ for Α), but it is not impossible that he was making (or perhaps only recording) a conjectural emendation of value.