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Now that several recent publications have shown the independence of Paris. gr. 1813 (=Q, s. xiii) in a number of Platonic dialogues 1), it is natural to inquire into Q's status in the Laches, the only dialogue in the first seven tetralogies in which Q has not recently been studied 2). M. Schanz had sought to show that Q was a copy of Bodl. Clarke 39 (=B, A.D. 895) in Chrm. and La. 3), but he cited a bare handful of readings, and in the only one that is significant (La. 195d8, v. infra, III), Q also agrees with Vind. suppl. gr. 7 (=W, s. xi), a primary witness not well known to Schanz. J. Král, on the other hand, pronounced Q independent, arguing that all primary witnesses show a number of separative errors against Q in the Laches, despite Q's affinities with W against B 4). Král did not discuss the possibility of contamination, however,
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2) Q also contains the Deff., but the text of the Spuria rests on a different basis than does that of the first seven tetralogies.

3) M. Schanz, Untersuchungen über die platonischen Handschriften, Philologus 35 (1876), 648.

and his reports of W's readings, based on E. Svoboda's collations, are often incomplete or inaccurate—to say nothing of the fact that he relied on Bekker's notoriously flawed apparatus for readings of Q. Therefore, the evidence for the independence of Q in this dialogue needs to be reexamined, as does Král's belief that Ven. Marc. gr. 184 (Bekker's Ξ, s. xv) is a twin of Q.

In what follows, I will argue that, although conclusive proof of Q's independence in the Laches is elusive, no convincing case can be made that it is derived from any extant primary witness. In fact, the pattern of its readings can only be explained plausibly if one takes Q to be independent. Ξ, on the other hand, will turn out to be a copy of Q, as will two other codices.

First, separative errors show that Q is not an uncontaminated copy of B, T or W alone.

5) I.e., Ven. Marc. gr. 186, coll. 601 (= Vs, so designated by G. Jonkers [cf. note 15 below], while I had previously used the siglum H [1990, note 1 above]; s. xv) and Neap. III E 17, coll. 339 (= Np, s. xiv; I had used the siglum L [1990, note 1 above], but I here drop it to avoid confusion with other MSS. which editors have designated L).

I have collated these MSS. from microfilm in the Yale Plato Microfilm Archive: QΞVsNp; Ven. Marc. Append. cl. IV. 1, coll. 542 (= T, s. x); Vat. gr. 2196 (= Vat, s. xiv-xv); Vat. Pal. gr. 173 (= P, s. x-xxi; cf. note 6 below). I collated W from microfilm provided by the Nationalbibliothek, and B from T.W. Allen, Plato Codex Oxoniensis Clarkianus 39 phototypic edictus (Leiden 1898). I was able to check many readings in Q and B, as well as some corrections in T, by autopsy, and statements made herein about corrections in these MSS. are based on it.

6) P (cf. note 5 above), which is a primary witness to the text of several dialogues in the first seven tetralogies, offers of La. only three tiny excerpts (187b3-4 ἀτευγάζεται ... γιγαντεύεται, and 192b1 and 198b8-9, paraphrased definitions of ταχυρία and δέος) and three scholia on fol. 150r. There is not enough text to shed light on any possible relationship in La. between Q and the exemplar of P. Q and P are related in Phd.; cf. Duke (note 1 above), 246-249. On P, see now M. Menchelli, Il Vaticano Palatino Gr. 173 (P) di Platone e il Parisino Gr. 1665 di Diodoro, BPEC ser. 2, 12 (1991), 93-117; C. Brockmann, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung von Platons Symposium, in: Serta Graeca 2 (Wiesbaden 1992), 153-155, 248-255.

I am not aware of any other MS. that can both be a primary witness and is old enough to be the source of Q. Most of the MSS. in the lists of N.G. Wilson (A List of Plato Manuscripts, Scriptorium 16 [1962], 386-395) and R.S. Brumbaugh and R. Wells (The Plato Manuscripts. A New Index [New Haven 1968], 93-94) are already known apographs that maintain the same parentage in many dialogues. Vat. gr. 2196, s. xiv-xv, has been found to be derived from T in Clit. (cf. S.R. Slings, A Commentary on the Platonic Crito [Amsterdam 1981], 272-273) and part of the Republic (cf. G.J. Boter, The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic, Mnemosyne supp. 107 [Leiden 1989], 150-153), and it displays the same pedigree in La., where