

INTRODUCTION

Considering that Plato is a central figure to world literature and philosophy, and that his philosophical doctrine has had and continues to exert a considerable impact on readers' consciousness, there is still a significant need within the scholarly community to scrutinize Platonic texts with all their details, including both textual criticism and researching the history of the texts. This is particularly true since we have neither autographs nor early complete copies (i.e. papyri) of Plato's works. Our textual witnesses are an unknown number of generations of copies removed from the originals. Research into the textual history of Plato's works is far not yet complete, and the Laws are among the works not covered to date. The surviving Platonic dialogues are transmitted in more than 260 extant manuscripts (= mss), 34 of which are entirely or partially dedicated to the Laws. Furthermore, no collation (systematic comparison of textual transmission) has ever been carried out for some of the later mss, and there is a reason to suspect that previous published collations are not always reliable or complete.

The aim of the present thesis is to deliver a detailed evaluation of the existing manuscript evidence at our disposal pertaining to the text of the Laws, as well as to elucidate this work's textual transmission. The mutual relationships of the known codices are investigated fully, assessing their value to the reconstitution of the text. The main outputs are therefore extensive scholarly descriptions of the mss according to current standards as well as a stemma codicum (a tree representation of textual transmission) for this work. The research foresees examination of two books of the work, namely I and V, checking the hypothesis supported by contemporary scholars, according to which, from two most ancient text witnesses Vaticanus gr. 1 is independent of Parisinus gr. 1807 from the very beginning of the work up to a certain place in book V (746b8) and in all further books the former codex is a copy of the latter one.

The established method of collation is used to determine the exact textual history, resulting in the creation of a stemma codicum, the approach generally accepted among Classical scholars. For this work, the full collation (charting of all deviations among manuscripts over select representative passages to determine their filiation) of the following sample passages at approximately equal intervals is executed: beginning section of book I (624a – 627e), discussion of legislation in Crete and Sparta (633a – 635e), ending section of book I (647a – 650b), beginning section of book V (726a – 728c), description of social-political and state purification theory (734e – 736c), ending section of book V (746a – 747e). Additionally, marginalia, corrections, omissions and erasures on the entire text are examined in all the mss. Besides contributing to establishing the stemma, this also provides further insight into the cultural history of the mss. Further collation is required if the results from these passages have not led to an unambiguous statement considering role of a ms in the transmission (its stemmatic position). For instance, it appears to be necessary in case of Vaticanus gr. 230 due to occasional illegibility of its text, including sample passages. With respect to certain mss as well as Latin translations at times I go beyond sample passages noting (and checking) readings of first five books from John Burnet's and Edouard Des Places' apparatuses.

Beyond the collation of sample passages, both independent textual witnesses Parisinus gr. 1807 and Vaticanus gr. 1 as well as some other interesting or problematic manuscripts (e. g. Bessarion's Marciani gr. 184, 187 and 188) have required a comparison of their texts in full. With regard to the excerpt mss, because of mostly insufficient evidence in books I and V I have collated further fragments from books II–IV.

Here and there do I compare results of my study to those of Boter and Jonkers who discussed Parisinus gr. 1807 in their chapters on the primary mss of the Republic and Timaeus&Critias respectively as well as Brun Schön who investigated Parisinus gr. 1807 and Vaticanus gr. 1 on the basis of Minos&Epinomis. Unavoidably, I shall make references to some points already mentioned by these scholars.

The edition of John Burnet (Vol. 5, Oxford, 1907) is used as the base reference for all collations to be created. Square bracket ([]) marks adopted readings from this edition.

Examining marginal notes, text passage, which a note refers to, is on the left whereas the note itself is on the right.

In recording the readings of the mss I follow Boter and Jonkers using such abbreviations as:

X^{ac} = *lectio ante correctionem*

X^{im} = *lectio in margine scripta*

X^{ir} = *lectio in rasura scripta*

X^{it} = *lectio in textu scripta*

X^{pc} = *lectio post correctionem*: this abbreviation may indicate readings added by the scribe himself after the text has been copied as well as *a manu recentiore scripta*

X^{pl} = *lectio per litteras scripta*

X^{pn} = *lectio punctis deleta (punctis notatum)*

X^{sl} = *lectio supra lineam scripta*

Every now and then I use such abbreviations as, e. g., X^{pcsl} for *lectio post correctionem supra lineam scripta*. Latin abbreviated terms such as *om.* for *omisit* or *corr.* for *correxit* are normally used in the studies of the Classical scholars.

The order in *index siglorum* is: Roman upper case, Roman lower case, Greek upper case, Greek lower case, composite sigla.

1. DESCRIPTION OF MANUSCRIPTS

In this chapter, I shall give a concise description of all extant mss pertaining to the text of the first five books of the Laws,¹ in alphabetical order and with regard to the city and library in which they are now preserved.² The data fall into the following sections:

- a. Date, appearance, number of folios, and format.
- b. Sigla given to a ms by different scholars. In cases where more than one siglum is suggested, the one I follow is shown in bold.
- c. The name of the scribe³ and the place a ms was copied (if possible). Furthermore, any activity by later, correcting hands (on the basis of the Laws) is noted as is the presence of *scholia vetera*.
- d. History of the ms, including remarkable codicological and paleographical observations, information on former owners, paracontent, etc.
- e. Contents.⁴
- f. Folios in the text of the Laws.⁵
- g. Collations by other scholars of the Laws (not necessarily complete).
- h. Opinions of other scholars about stemmatic position of a ms, namely, of Post with regard to the Laws (or the whole tetralogy IX) and other scholars with respect to other Platonic works (selectively).
- i. My own conclusion regarding stemmatic position in the Laws I and V, based on the analysis made in respective discussion of a ms.
- j. References to catalogues.
- k. References to the lists of Wohlrab, Post, Wilson and Brumbaugh-Wells (if available).
- l. References to important works in which a ms is mentioned (in chronological order).

1 With the exception of Barberinianus 4 (fragment from book VII) and Rosanbo 283 (books IX–XII), my research does not include mss containing the Laws VI–XII. Ambrosianus 329 (F 19 sup.) (Ficino’s autograph, excerpts from different books) is not discussed either, since, as I was informed by Biblioteca Ambrosiana, nowadays it is not available for consultation.

2 When mentioning the signatures of mss, I avoid the abbreviation gr. for graecus.

3 Angle brackets <...> are noted if there is no direct reference to the name in a ms.

4 Non-Platonic and non-Pseudo-Platonic works can be omitted, especially in mss containing *diversorum scriptorum opera varia*. When denoting Platonic dialogues, I adopt those abbreviations generally accepted by Classical scholars.

5 On this point, paying tribute to classical tradition, I use the Latin title “Leges”, whereas in all subsequent chapters I refer to the English title “the Laws”.

El Escorial Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de el Escorial

1) Scorialensis Ψ I. 01

- a. a. 1462⁶ chartaceus ff. 169 mm 381 x 278.
- b. Ψ (Boter); Matrit. (Post), Esc. (*ego*).
- c. Copied by Demetrios Triboles⁷ in Corfu;⁸ rare scholia.
- d. Surprisingly, the codex in the Laws only has book V. It is noteworthy that this book is preceded by several blank folios with the title “νόμων πλάτωνος βιβλίον πρῶτον” atop the very first one. Triboles must therefore have deliberately left blank with the intention of copying the first book of the Laws most probably from another exemplar.⁹ Nevertheless, it is not clear why Triboles has decided exactly upon book I. It is possibly due to the fact that this book contains fundamental preliminaries of the work or particular topics of special interest to the scribe. In any case, as the allotted space remained blank, we can assume that he failed to acquire the appropriate exemplar or find time for copying.
 Additionally, as Triboles’ subscription occurs directly at the end of the Definitions, it enhances the probability that this work was primarily intended to be the very last one in the codex. In an attempt to understand what incited the scribe to subsequently copy a few other Platonic works (Republic, Laws, Epinomis, Menexenus and Epistles), Müller 249 hypothesizes that Triboles could have initially been fed up with the philosophy of the state and ideas of reforms after the fall of the empire in 1453 and the loss of his motherland in 1460.
- e. Tetr. I, Cra., Phdr., Grg., Men., Tht., Sph., Plt., Prm., Ti., Phlb., Smp., Alc. 1, Alc. 2, Hipparch., Am., Clit., Ax., Iust., Virt., Dem., Sis., Eryx., Def., R., Lg. (V), Epin., Mx., Epist.
- f. Leges ff. 290–295.
- g. Collated by Post.
- h. Post 22 assumes Esc. is “probably from K”. Müller 243 suggests that it descends from K through two lost intermediary mss in “On Virtue” as well as the Laws. The indirect dependence on K is supported by Brunschön 140ff. in the Epinomis. In Cleitophon (Slings 1981, 262) and Symposium (Brockmann 1992, 100ff.), Esc. derives from Marcianus 185. In the Republic it descends from Marcianus 185, too, but indirectly (Boter 1989, 30f.).
- i. Esc. depends on K indirectly.
- j. Miller 409f.; De Andrés III 1f.
- k. Post 82; Wilson nr. 15; Brumbaugh-Wells 69.
- l. Carlini 1964, 27f.; Müller 241ff.; Slings 1981, 262; Boter 1989, 30f.; 174ff.; Jonkers 271f.; Brockmann 1992, 19; 100ff.; Vancamp 1995, 82f.; Brunschön 140ff.

⁶ See footnote 8 below (footnote 8).

⁷ See Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten I, n. 103.

⁸ According to the inscription (f. 207v): ἡ βιβλος ἥδε ἐγράφη δι’ οἰκείας χειρὸς ἐμοῦ Δημητρίου Τριβόλη Πελοποννησίου ἐκ Σπάρτης τὰς διατριβὰς ποιῶντος ἐν Κερκυραίων νήσῳ. μετὰ τὴν τῆς ἡμετέρας πατρίδος ἄλωσιν. ἔτει ς’ἧο.

⁹ Müller 241ff. reasonably concluded that Esc.’s exemplar did not contain book I.

Firenze Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana

2) Laurentianus Conv. Sopp. 180 (abbat. flor. 2552, olim 13)

- a. ante 1425¹⁰ membranaceus ff. 299 mm 390 x 270.
- b. o (Stallbaum, Post, Jonkers).
- c. Copied by <Stephanus Metropolitan of Medeia¹¹> in Greece;¹² corrected by <Marsilio Ficino¹³>; no scholia.
- d. The codex was owned by Antonio Corbinelli¹⁴ who died in 1425. It subsequently came into the possession of Jacopo di Niccolò Corbizzi¹⁵ and, no later than 1437, it appeared in the library of Convento di S. Maria dei Benedettini.¹⁶ Marsilio Ficino applied o for his Latin version (1484). In 1808, the ms was confiscated during the French occupation of Tuscany, and, in August 1809, it finally found its place on the shelves of Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana.¹⁷
- e. Pyth. (Carmen aureum), Tim. Locr. (De anima mundi et natura), Plut. (Epitome de animae procreatione in Ti.), Ti., IV–VI, Criti., Tetr. IX, Epist., Def.
- f. Leges ff. 160–272.
- g. Collated by de Furia (for Stallbaum) and Post.
- h. Post 38 following Schanz says that o derives from a throughout. Scholars mostly point at the direct dependence on a, e.g. Murphy 1990, 329f. in Charmides, Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 119 ff. in Lysis, Joyal 166 in Theages, Marg 11 in Timaeus Locrus. On the other hand, in Gorgias (Díaz-Serrano 364f.), Timaeus and Critias (Jonkers 50) o derives indirectly from a.
- i. In the Laws o depends on a, probably directly.
- j. Bandini 26; Rostagno-Festa 168.
- k. Wohlrab 672; Post 38; Wilson nr. 45; Brumbaugh-Wells 36.
- l. Des Places 1936, 247; Moore-Blunt XII; Murphy 329f.; Jonkers 308f.; 344f.; Blank 13; Joyal 16; 18ff., 52; Vancamp 1995, 27ff.; Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 119ff.; Carlini 1999, 20f.; 24f.; Brunschön 86ff.; 150.

10 See d.

11 Brunschön 86. On him, see *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten I*, n. 366. Earlier Blank 13 said o had been copied by George Chrysokokkes, teacher of Filelfo and Bessarion, who worked in Constantinople in 1420–1428.

12 See Gentile 1987, 58.

13 Gentile 1987, 71 and Berti 1996, 139ff. On him, see *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten II*, 363; III, 438; Cosenza 704ff.; Kristeller, *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance*, Stanford University Press (Stanford, CA, 1964) Chapter 3, “Ficino,” 37–53.

14 See Gentile 1987, 58; Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 119. Antonio Corbinelli had five Platonic mss in his library: apart from o, they are Conv. Sopp. 42, 54, 78, and 103. For his biography, see Cosenza 547.

15 On him, see Cosenza 548.

16 See inscription on the second unnumbered folio recto and verso: *ipse liber est abbatiae florentiae ordinis sancti benedicti*, etc. There is a similar inscription on the last folio of the codex.

17 For more details, see Blank 11ff.; Brunschön 86.

3) Laurentianus Plut. 59. 1

- a. s. XIII–XIV¹⁸ bombycinus ff. 539 mm 327/330 x 225/230.
- b. z (Bekker); a (Stallbaum, Post, Boter); Flor. A (Schneider).
- c. Copied by two anonymous scribes in Greece:¹⁹ *mani A e B* (Menchelli). In the Laws, the scribe (*mano B*) himself provided corrections and added scholia.
- d. Marcel 254f. and Sicherl 1962, 50ff. suggested that a is the full Plato edition “in carta bona”²⁰ granted by Cosimo de’ Medici to Marsilio Ficino.²¹ Yet, this hypothesis was later discarded with a reference to the absence of Ficino’s hand upon the ms, as well as the fact that c (a’s copy) rather matched the description of a parchment codex. The latter idea was ultimately corroborated by Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 106 and n. 323, who in the footsteps of Gentile and Carlini, recapitulated that a had only been brought to Italy in 1492, by Janus Lascaris, for Lorenzo De’ Medici, and the codex obtained by Ficino in 1462 was actually c.²² Accordingly, another assumption²³ that a was in Italy during the Council in Ferrara-Florence²⁴ (1438–1439) must be erroneous. The hypothesis that George Gemistos Plethon²⁵ owned a²⁶ is equally unfounded, given that there are no vestiges of his hand in the codex.
- e. Diog. Laert. (Vita Platonis), Alb. (Intr.), Theo Smyrn., Alb./Alc. (Epitome philosophiae Platonicae), Plut. (De musica), Tetr. I–III, Pyth. (Carmen aureum), Tim. Locr., Plut. (Epitome de animae procreatione in Ti.), Ti., tetr. IV–VII, Iust., Virt., Demod., Sis., Halc., Eryx., Ax., Clit., R., Criti., Min., Lg., Epin., Epist., Def.
- f. Leges ff. 769–1000.
- g. Collated by Bekker, de Furia (for Stallbaum) and Post.
- h. Post 36 defines O as an exemplar of a in the Laws. As does Brunschön 131 and 149 in Minos and Epinomis. In the Republic, a belongs to the A-family (Boter 1989, 33). In the Timaeus, it is “possibly a direct copy of Y (Vindobonensis Phil. 21)” (Jonkers 51). In the Clitophon and Critias, it derives from Vindobonensis Suppl. 39 (Slings 1981, 264 and Jonkers 51). In Symposium, a depends on Parisinus 1808 (Brockmann 1992, 168).
- i. In the Laws, a depends on O, in all probability directly.
- j. Bandini II 485–488.
- k. Wohlrab 666f.; Post 66; Wilson nr. 22; Brumbaugh-Wells 37f.

18 See primarily Menchelli 2000, 185ff.; 193ff. and Pérez Martin 2005, 120f.; also Brockmann 1992, 17; Vancamp 1995, 23; Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 106; Bianconi 2008, 256; 278. Luzzatto says a was written in Constantinople in the circle of Maximus Planudes (see discussion of O⁴). Brunschön assumes: „eine Entstehung von a schon Ende des 13. Jhs. scheint mir nicht unbedingt ausgeschlossen“.

19 See above. Boter’s suggestion (1989, 32) that a could have been copied in Italy in the XV century was ultimately discarded.

20 Made of parchment.

21 See also discussion of c.

22 Cf. Piccolomini, Due documenti relativi ad acquisti di codici greci, fatti da Giovanni Lascaris per conto di Lorenzo de’ Medici, RFIC 2, 1874, 401ff.; Sicherl 1962, 53 nr. 28; Diller 1954b, 126f.; Carlini 1999, 6.

23 See Diller 1954b, 126f. and 1983, 257.

24 On the Council, see Woodhouse 119ff.

25 On him, see Masai, Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra (Paris, 1956); Michalopoulos, George Gemistos Plethon and his Legacy in Intelctualii Politicii si Politica Intelctualilor, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2016, p. 448ff.

26 See Marcel 254f. and Sicherl 1980, 554f.

- l. Des Places 1936, 245f.; Carlini 1964, 17; Moreschini 181; Berti 1969, 427ff.; Marg 8f; Slings 1981, 262ff.; Boter 1989, 32f.; 125f.; 127f.; Jonkers 52; 259f.; 286f.; Murphy 329; Brockmann 1992, 19; 168ff.; Vancamp 1995, 21; Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 106f.; 113f; Joyal 16; Reis 182ff., Brunschön 83f.; 131; 149.

4) Laurentianus Plut. 59.30

- a. ante a. 1305 chartaceus (partim charta orientalis) ff. (4 +) 346 (+ 3) mm 145 x 225.
 b. L (Bühler, Ferroni), **Laur.** (ego).
 c. Copied by at least two anonymous scribes.²⁷
 d. –
 e. Collectanea Planudea: excerpts from Lg., compendia of Tetr. I–VII (except for Amat.) and Spp.
 f. Leges f. 48r.
 g. Uncollated.
 h. Fryde 190f. suggests Parisinus 1808 and Vindobonensis Phil. 21 underlie Laur. in the compendia of tetralogies I–VII.
 i. Laur. belongs to the O-family. Further clarification is impossible due to very scanty evidence.
 j. Bandini II 550–553.
 k. –
 l. Diller 1937, 297; Bühler 127ff.; Fryde 190f.; Ferroni 327ff.

5) Laurentianus Plut. 80. 17

- a. ante a. 1340²⁸ membranaceus ff. 353 mm 273 x 180.
 b. δ (Stallbaum); L (Post).
 c. The text and scholia are written by *copista F* and are identical to that of Parisinus 1811 and Laurentianus Plut. 31.08, who must have belonged to the circle of Byzantine scholar Demetrius Triclinius, who died in 1340 (Bianconi, Menchelli). Quite a few marginal annotations and occasional corrections are made by a later hand.
 d. Surprisingly, in one of the first unnumbered folios there is a fragment²⁹ from Manuel Moschopoulos’ “Περὶ σχεδῶν” added by a different hand than that of the scribe.
 e. Lg., Epin., Ax., Iust., Virt. Dem., Sis., Halc., Eryx., Def., Epist.
 f. Leges ff. 3–254.
 g. Collated by Post.

27 Bandini II 550–553.

28 For a long time, it was believed that L had been produced in the early XV century (e.g. Post 22, Brunschön 136), until recent studies confirmed that L was actually from the first half of the XIV century: see Bianconi 2005, 253; Menchelli 2013, 847.

29 κήρυκες ἢ εὐθεῖα τῶν ἐνικῶν ὁ κήρυξ πόθεν γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ κηρύττω τὸ δὲ κηρύττω ἀπὸ τοῦ γαρύω^a τὸ φωνῶ κατὰ παραγωγήν καὶ τροπήν τοῦ^b α εἰς η καὶ τοῦ γ εἰς κ προβαλλόμεθ (sic)^c κανόνισον βάλλω τὸ πέμπω καὶ ρίπτω^d ἀφ’ τοῦ βέλος ὃ δηλοῖ τρία τὸ πεμπόμενον.

^a τῶν γαρύω (Kurzböck); ^b τῶν (Kurzböck); ^c προβαλλόμεθα (Kurzböck); ^d ρίπτω καὶ πέμπω (Kurzböck).

- h. Immisch 54ff. argues that L is an independent text witness in the Laws. However, this hypothesis was ultimately discarded by Post 23ff., who demonstrated that it depends on J and, consequently, belongs to the O-family. Post's statement was confirmed by Moore-Blunt IX in the Epistles and Brunschön 138f. in the Epinomis.
- i. L depends directly on J.
- j. Bandini III 208.
- k. Wohlrab 674; Post 22ff.; Wilson nr. 29; Brumbaugh-Wells 38f.
- l. Des Places 1936, 244f.; Moore-Blunt IXf.; Carlini 1999, 21f; Brunschön 138f.

6) Laurentianus Plut. 85. 9

- a. s. XIV (in.)³⁰ membranaceus ff. 434 mm 335 x 245.
- b. Gothic c (Bekker); c (Stallbaum, Post, Boter); Flor. C (Schneider).
- c. Copied by three anonymus scribes, namely, *copiste A, B, C* (Menchelli), being of Byzantine provenance.³¹ Scholia are copied by the scribe of the Laws himself. There are very few corrections by a later hand.
- d. Until 1438, c might have been preserved in the royal library owned by the Emperor John VIII Palaeologos,³² as suggested in Ambrogio Traversari's³³ letter³⁴ to Ser Ugolino Pieruzzi, in which he mentions that in Ferrara he had seen a certain Platonic codex from the emperor's collection closely resembling c. This theory cannot be verified by any codicological evidence, however.³⁵
- . Another hypothetical owner of the codex was George Gemistos Plethon,³⁶ who allegedly bestowed it on Cosimo de' Medici during his stay in Italy, in 1439, at the Ecumenical Council in Ferrara-Florence. Notwithstanding the fact that there are no traces of Plethon's hand in the codex, there are some marginalia³⁷ by his disciple

30 Menchelli 2000, 147ff. proves this dating as *terminus ante quem* by pointing to c's apographs Vindobonensis Phil. 109 and Marcianus 189, copied circa in the mid-XIV century. Today, this idea is also supported by Canart, Irigoien and Cavallo. Independently of Menchelli, Eleuteri attributes c to the third quarter of the XIV century, proposing George Galesiotes as the scribe (on him, see also discussion of J). However, Brunschön 92 casts some doubts on this, in view of diverging characteristic letters, such as κ, ξ, φ, ζ, ω, π and β. Previously, the codex was believed to have been transcribed either earlier or later than the XIV century: Bandini III 257–266 suggested it had appeared in the XIII century, whereas Boter 1989, 36 attributed it to the XV century. Following the latter idea, Wilson tentatively assumed that c had been copied by the XV-century scribe Christophorus Persona (on him, see Gamillscheg, Übersetzer und Kopist - Betrachtungen zum Werk des Christophoros Persona, Grottaferrata 1997, 233ff.).

31 Sicherl 1980, 554, n. 139 suggested c had been copied from a at the instigation of Ficino. However, this hypothesis was later discarded, as was Boter's suggestion that c had been copied in Italy.

32 This hypothesis seems to be plausible in view of the fact that, initially in the second half of the XIV century, the parchment was only used for secular texts for clients holding high positions in the empire: see Prato 1994, 141ff.; cf. Brunschön 93.

33 For his biography, see Cosenza 1781f.

34 The letter dating back to the period between 11.3 and 7.4.1438 is transmitted in Vaticanus lat. 3908.

35 Cf. Reis 189.

36 See Hankins 1991, 157f., n. 49.

37 In Meno (ff. 187, 189), Hippias Major (f. 195) and Ion (f. 202).

Cardinal Basil Bessarion.³⁸ This reinforces the supposition that Plethon was at least familiar with the codex.³⁹

- In any case, Marsilio Ficino undoubtedly owned the codex. We know from his letters to Cosimo de' Medici (4 September 1462⁴⁰) and Amerigo Benci ("paulo post Septembrem 1462"⁴¹), as well as from his testament,⁴² that Ficino received "librum Platonis in greco in carta bona cum omnibus dyalogis" from Cosimo de' Medici as an exemplar for the upcoming Latin translation commissioned by the Florentian *pater patriae*. Another piece of evidence is the fact, recognized by many scholars,⁴³ that the humanist made numerous annotations in the codex himself.
- e. Pyth. (Carmen aureum), Alb./Alc. (Epitome philosophiae Platonicae), Theo Smyrn., Diog. Laert. (Vita Platonis), Alb. (Intr.), Tetr. I–VII, Spp., VIII Iust., Virt., Demod., Sis., Halc., Eryx., Ax., Clit., R., Tim. Locr., Plut. (Epitome de animae procreatione in Tim.), Ti., Criti., Min., Lg., Epin., Epist., Def., Aristid. (Ad Capitonem, Pro quattuor viris, Pro Rhetorica, Ad Achillem), Lib. Decl. 5, Xen. (Oeconomicus, Symposium).
- f. Leges ff. 289–350.
- g. Collated by de Furia (for Stallbaum) and Post.
- h. According to Schanz 1876a, 173f., Post 39 and Carlini 1999, 20, n. 62 c derives from a throughout. c is a direct copy of a in the Republic (Boter 1989, 37), Lysis (Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 114), Minos-Epinomis (Brunschön 90–93 and 149) and Timaeus Locrus (Marg 12). In Symposium (Brockmann 1992, 230f.) and Gorgias (Díaz-Serrano 364f.) it depends on a indirectly.
- i. In the Laws, c depends on a, in all probability, directly.
- j. Bandini II 257–266.
- k. Wohlrab 669; Post 66; Wilson nr. 35; Brumbaugh-Wells 40f.
- l. Des Places 1936, 246f.; Moerschini 181; Berti 429; Marg 12; Slings 266f.; Boter 1989, 36f.; 137ff.; Jonkers 260f.; 287ff.; Murphy 329f.; Hankins 1991, 158; Brockmann 1992, 20; 230f.; Vancamp 1995, 21; Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 114f.; Joyal 16f.; Reis 187f.; Carlini 1999, 5ff.; Brunschön 90ff.; 149.

38 See Blank 7. On him, see Mohler; Hankins 1991, 217ff.; Manoussakas 19ff.; Wilson 1992, 57ff.; Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten II, n. 61; III, n. 77.

39 Cf. Menchelli 2000, 164: "Non è rigore possibile stabilire quando il cardinale abbia avuto il codice ma visto il fragile legame del manoscritto con Pletone, direi che la annotazione bessarionee difficilmente risaliranno agli anni dei suoi studi presso la scuola del filosofo a Mistra. Più plausibile è lo studio del manoscritto in occasione del Concilio di Ferrara – Firenze e dopo."

40 See Kristeller II, 88; Hankins 1991, 159f.

41 See Kristeller I, CXLVII.

42 Ficino devised the codex to Lorenzo di Pier Francesco de' Medici: See Kristeller II, 195.

43 Blank 16 with n. 65 in the Republic; Vancamp 1995, 24f. in Hippias Maior; Martinelli-Tempesta 1997, 115 in Lysis; Berti 1996, 148f.; 2002, 356 in Philebus and Phaedo. In addition, Blank 16f. and Gentile 1987, 77f. give a list of variants added by Ficino throughout the codex.

Firenze Biblioteca Riccardiana

7) Riccardianus 67

- a. a. 1477–1491⁴⁴ membranaceus ff. 185 mm 240 x 170.
- b. Gothic h (Bekker); H (Post).
- c. Text and scholia are copied by <Demetrius Damilas⁴⁵>, likely in Florence, in the circle of Demetrius Chalcondyles.⁴⁶ There are two correcting hands, one of which belongs to <Demetrius Chalcondyles> (Speranzi) himself.
- d. –
- e. Lg. I–XI, 919a.
- f. Leges I–XI, 919a.
- g. Collated by Post.
- h. According to Post, 29 H derives from L via Hyp.
- i. I can confirm Post's statement.
- j. Vitelli 518.
- k. Post 69; Wilson nr. 51; Brumbaugh-Wells 42f.
- l. Des Places 1936, 248.

Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek

8) Vossianus Q 51

- a. s. XV (second half) chartaceus ff. 160 mm 210 x 145.
- b. Voss. 51 (*ego*).
- c. Copied by the hand responsible for Vossianus Q 38.⁴⁷
- d. –
- e. Epist., an excerpt from Lg.
- f. Leges f. 158.
- g. Uncollated.
- h. –
- i. Stemmatic position of Voss. 51 cannot be established due to the absence of any specific readings.
- j. De Meyier 159ff.
- k. Post 87, Wilson nr. 59.
- l. –

⁴⁴ The scribe Demetrius Damilas cooperated with Demetrius Chalcondyles in Florence exactly within this period.

⁴⁵ See Speranzi, Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Riccardiano, Ricc.67, https://manus.iccu.sbn.it//opac_Scheda-Scheda.php?ID=207302. On him, see Harlfinger ap. Moraux, Aristoteles Graecus, 351; Canart, D  m  trius Damilas, 328–337; Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten I, n. 93.

⁴⁶ See Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten I, n. 105.

⁴⁷ De Meyier 159.