The following notes are intended to supplement my discussion of the MSS. of the Clitophon*: when the book went to the publisher, I had not yet seen (photographs of) three of the twenty-six MSS.; of three others, photographs had arrived too late to be taken into account completely. Besides, new light is shed on some problems by the research of Dr G. J. Boter and myself on the text of the Politeia.

My basic conclusions have not changed. The text of the Clitophon must be constituted, as was done by Burnet and myself, on the basis of the MSS. A (Paris. 1807), D (Ven. 185) and F (Vind. Suppl. 39); some ancient readings are to be found besides in Pa (Paris. 1809) and Va (Vat. 2196). I offer below a better description of the various hands in A; later hands in D and F, which I have lumped together as d and f, might have been distinguished more precisely, but as these hands have no authority anyway I have refrained from doing so.

This is not the place to discuss Boter’s theory (94-104) that DF constitute one family as against A. The Clitophon is too small a text for this problem to be solved without having recourse to the Politeia, for which ADF prove likewise to be the primary MSS.

Collation of MS. readings is with Burnet’s text, not my own.

1. Corrections and additions in A

Following Schanz, whose collation he used for the Clitophon, Burnet distinguishes two later hands in A: A2, which he rightly

suspects to be identical to the scribe, and a, the hand of Constantine of Hierapolis (which will here be called A³). Later scholars distinguish besides A³, a hand that is especially prominent in the _Nomoi_; this hand is sometimes identified as that of Arethas. Boter has added A⁴, whose main concern is to correct some terminations. The later hands a² and a³ do not concern us here (cf. Boter, 106-112; the question whether he is right in denying that A² is sometimes a different hand from the first scribe in the _Nomoi_ is irrelevant for the _Clitophon_. I do not adopt Boter’s distinction between A² and A⁴c. Readings attributed below to A² are in minuscules unless otherwise stated.).

In the _Politeia_, readings introduced by A² and A³ recur in _Ven. app_. 4,1 (T), at any rate in its old part; the same will be seen to hold for the _Clitophon_.

406a8f. μὴ ἔχειν φροντίζειν] μὴ ἔχειν εἰλέναι i.m. A³ (gloss?) not in T.
a¹⁰ δυνεῖ A a.c. T: δυνεῖ (-ει erased and a majuscule e written through it) A⁴.
a¹¹ φαίνει A a.c. T: φαίνη (-ει erased and -ηι written in majuscules) A⁴. This is A⁴’s hobby-horse.

c² ἀφετῆς T: -της A² in an erasure.
d⁸ αἰρεί AT: καταλαμβάνει i.m. A²T. This is a scholion (written in typical scholia uncialis in A) and should be discarded from the apparatus.

408a¹ μὴ ἐπίσταται] μὴ ἐπιστέται i.m. A³: in the text, -ηι over -αι- A³: -η over -αι- T. The correction was prompted by A’s reading γὰρ ἀν δὴ (γὰρ δὴ F recte: γὰρ ἀν D).
d⁶ ἐτέρους T: -έ- A² in an erasure, -αι- presumably A a.c.

409b¹ ἔστιν] ἔστιν A a.c. T ἔστιν A⁴ (accent added).
d¹ φήσει A a.c. T: -υ- over ἦ A² or A⁵.
d⁶ οὗτος T: -ο- A² in an erasure (οὐτως A a.c.?)

410a¹ ἵκανοι ἔστων ἐπιπλήττειν] γρ. ἐπεχείρησαν ἐπιπλήττειν A²T (I wrongly stated in the Addendum to my text that this hand is not identical to A¹).
a⁶ ἔστιν A a.c.: ἔστιν A⁴ (accent added): ἔστι T (Schanz’ statement that A originally had ἔστιν seems wrong).
b² ὅψειλαι A a.c. T: ὅψειλαι A⁴ (-τ- changed to -τι-, another hobby-horse).