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After having lain relatively unused for a century, Parisinus gr. 1813 ( = Q, s. xiii) has recently been the subject of several studies that argue its independent status. D. J. Murphy has sought to show that Q is a primary witness to the Charmides1) and to the Phaedrus, Hipparchus and Alcibiades II2), while Elizabeth Duke at the same time argued for Q's independence in Phaedo3). The present article

*) The authors decided to collaborate when they discovered that they had come independently to substantially the same conclusions about the place of Par. gr. 1813 (Bekker's ''G'', the siglum hitherto used by Murphy [cf. notes 1 and 2 below], herein = Q; s. xiii) in the tradition of the Cratylus. Both authors take responsibility for the positions laid out in this paper, save those about the nature of Q's exemplar and those in the Appendix, which solely represent D.J. Murphy's work. Reports of readings of primary witnesses have been jointly verified in all but a couple of cases (or, for Par. suppl. gr. 668, by D.B. Robinson), either from microfilm or from inspection by autopsy. The latter supports statements made herein about corrections in these MSS.
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3) Cf. E.A. Duke, The Place of Parisinus Graecus 1813 in the Tradition of the Phaedo, RHT 21 (1991), 243-256. Q is closely related to Par. suppl. gr. 668 (= S, s. xi) and Vat. Pal. gr. 173 (= P, s. x-xi), as over against W et al. in the third family.

A few statements made by Duke about Q need correction. It is written on Oriental paper, not parchment (cf. Murphy [note 2 above], 313-314). The blank spaces at Phdo. 99e5 and 100e5 were left by the scribe because of a faulty, creased spot on the corresponding recto and verso sides of f. 22. This removes the basis for Duke's supposition (p. 244) that pages of Q and its exemplar contained the same amount of text. Several correctors besides the first scribe worked on Phdo., as can be determined from different letter forms and ink (v. infra, n. 23).
aims to present more complete evidence than was offered in the preface for the position taken in the new Oxford Classical Text edition of the *Cratylus*, that *Q* is an independent witness to an alternative branch of the third family of MSS., standing as it does in *Phdo.* with the fragmentary *Par. suppl. gr.* 668 (= *S*, s. xi) over against *Vind. suppl. gr.* 7 (= *W*, s. xi). In 436b, however, *Q* begins to display first family readings, such that a switch appears to have been made to a source related to but independent of *Bodl. Clarke 39* (= *B*, A.D. 895) and *Ven. gr.* 185, coll. 576 (= *D*, s. xii).

M. Schanz derived *Q* in *Cra.* from *D*, but all of his proofs involved agreements of *Q* with corrections in *D*. Unfortunately, Schanz was not yet well acquainted with *W*, and it is to *W* not *D* that *Q* bears affinity. Nor did Schanz know that *W* was the source of the corrections that he observed in *D*, so that *Q*’s agreements with those corrections are purely casual. Although Wohlrab realized that *Q* cannot descend from *D-d*, and Král and Immisch asserted that *Q* is close to *W* but independent of it, it still remains to demonstrate *Q*’s claims conclusively.

**Primary Witnesses**

The starting point for an examination of *Q* must be the MSS. that we already know to be primary witnesses. The ones that have hitherto been identified in *Cra.* are: 1) first family, *B* and *D*; 2)