overall effect. The secrecy surrounding the activities of imperial ministers, which Tacitus attributes first to Maecenas, and is intended to cast suspicion on the entire nature of the principate.

21) The focus of this paper does not allow for a discussion on how exactly Maecenas came to serve as a model for ambitious knights who opted for real but secret power over meaningless public senatorial offices. Suffice it to say that I disagree with the idea that Maecenas was aware of the fact that in the new government knights acquired “real power, interesting power, inside power” by remaining knights and therefore appearing politically safe to the princeps, as defined by R. Lyne, Horace (New Haven 1995) 134–35. The elevation to the equestrian order of Agrippa and Salvidienus Rufus, which allowed them to embark on the senatorial cursus honorum, occurred in the 40s. Maecenas’ decision to remain a knight, whatever its cause, apparently occurred very early in Octavian’s career, long before the processes of the principate could have been envisioned.

22) As Sinclair 8–10 observes, the eventual loss of friendship between princeps and minister applies not only to Augustus and Maecenas, Tiberius and Sallustius, but also to Tiberius and Seianus, Gaius and Macro.

TWO DARMARIOS MANUSCRIPTS
OF SCHOLIA ON OPPIAN’S HALIEUTICA

A manuscript tradition of scholia on Oppian’s Halieutica, independent of the poetic text, appears to have developed toward the end of the first half of the sixteenth century. It was in currency by 1552, when the earliest surviving witness (Matritensis 4715 or M, see below) was written. In 1577 the prolific scribe and manuscript dealer Andreas Darmarios discovered a copy of these scholia in the library of Cardinal Mendoza in Madrid. This exemplar, which has not been identified, was a productive find for Darmarios, for he copied at least four manuscripts from it: Salamanca
2730 (S)¹, Escorial gr. 569 (E)², Brussels 85 (Br)³, and Beinecke 269 (B)⁴. These four manuscripts were written in Madrid from 1577 to 1579; Br and B were subsequently taken by Darmarios to Salamanca in 1580, where they were supplemented with scholia from a second source. This second source also generated two other copies of Halieutica scholia: part of Monacensis 134 (Mon) and Londinensis Royal Ms. 16 D XII (R). The scholia in all of the abovementioned manuscripts are ultimately derived from the scholia found in Laurentianus 31.3, or Z, one of the seven hyparchetypes of the Halieutica text tradition⁵. The six Darmarios copies of unattached scholia all belong to one of two branches, what I refer to as the Madrid and Salamanca lines. The oldest surviving representatives of these lines are Matritensis 4715⁶, its complement Mon1 (see below), and Salamanca M 31, or z1⁷, respectively. Unlike the other manuscripts under discussion here, the scholia in z1 accompanies the text of the Halieutica; z1 is, in fact, the closest surviving descendant of Z. Written by Johannes Calliandros in 1326, only thirty-five years after Z itself was written, z1 reproduces in full the copious corpus of Z scholia. Manuscripts of the unattached scholia tradition that are more closely allied to z1, that is, those belonging to the Salamanca branch, possess a virtually complete rendering of Z scholia as well⁸. Those more closely allied to M, that is, manu-


³) For a description of Beinecke 269 see B. Shailor, Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University (Binghampton, New York 1984).

⁴) For a description of Brussels 85 see H. Omont, Catalogue des manuscrits Grecs de la bibliothèque royale de Bruxelles (Gand 1885) 27.


⁶) For a description of Matritensis 4715 see G. de Andres, Catálogo de los Codices Griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid 1987) 283–286.

⁷) For a description of Salamanca M 31 see A. Tovar, Catalogus codicum Graecorum Universitatis Salamanitae, I (Salamanca 1963).

⁸) The most complete exposition of scholia on Oppian’s Halieutica available is U. C. Bussemaker, Scholia et paraphrases in Nicandrum et Oppianum (Paris 1849).
scripts of the Madrid branch, all have identically abridged assem­blinges of scholia.

In a recent paper I discussed the Madrid line of manuscripts. This branch comprises six manuscripts, four written by Darmarios – S, E, Br, and B – and two not. One of the latter two is Mon1, to be discussed below; the other is the aforementioned M, which was written by Camillus Gianetos in 1552, a quarter-century before Darmarios produced his first copy of the scholia in 1577. Like Darmarios’ four Madrid manuscripts, M presents a truncated version of Z scholia, but it is a very different abridgement from the one found uniformly in Darmarios’ renditions. The disparity in content between M and the Darmarios group is one source of evidence demonstrating that M was not Darmarios’ exemplar in Madrid. The other definitive evidence resides in the readings. I have previously demonstrated through a hierarchical series of separative readings from z1 and M that the Darmarios group of Madrid manuscripts was not derived from either of them, but is more closely related to M than to z1. Moreover, conjunctive readings in all four of Darmarios’ manuscripts – the Madrid group – evince a common source for all of them, the unidentified manuscript that Darmarios found in the Mendoza library in 1577. I have proposed the following stemma codicum for the Madrid branch of the tradition.

\[ Z \]
\[ \alpha \]
\[ \gamma \]
\[ z_1 \]
\[ \delta \]
\[ M \]
\[ S \]
\[ E \]
\[ Br \]
\[ B \]


10) Identified by both de Andres and Sosower as Camillus Venetus. See de Andres (n. 6, above) 285 n.; M. Sosower, A Forger Revisited: Andreas Darmarios and Beinecke 269, JOByz 43 (1993) 290.

11) While the content of these manuscripts consists entirely of Z scholia, none of the seven surviving descendants of Z possesses a body of scholia that corresponds to the peculiar assemblage that appears in the Darmarios group.
What I designate here as the Salamanca branch of the independent scholia tradition comprises four manuscripts, in three of which the Salamanca material constitutes only a (albeit substantial) portion of the composite corpus of scholia. Br and B initially consisted of the truncated ensemble of Madrid scholia. Darmarios wrote them both in 1579; he then appended B to another, unidentified codex, and paginated it accordingly with the numerals 205–263, while leaving Br unattached to any other codex. In 1580 Darmarios took B and Br with him to Salamanca, where he discovered a manuscript containing the full corpus of Z scholia. He supplemented both B and Br with the balance of scholia not included in the Madrid collection, that is, scholia on Books 1.74–405, 432–783, and 4.204–692. Darmarios simply appended the newly found material to the end of the first layer in Br, with the result that the order of presentation is skewed. However, he went to some lengths to emend many of the original Madrid readings with variants from his Salamancan source, which he clearly considered the more authoritative. While Darmarios did not emend the Madrid text so rigorously in B, he did take greater pains in arranging the material, integrating the two sets of scholia to accord with their natural sequence as found in the Z manuscripts. He detached B from its adopted codex and repaginated it in its newly construed order; there are thus alternating sections of B showing double then single pagination. In my earlier analysis of the Madrid group I demonstrated the tandem provenance of Band Br with alternating M and Z1 conjunctive readings. Band Br readings will be employed below in evincing a Salamancan derivation for two other Darmarios copies of independent Halieutica scholia, Londin. Royal Ms. 16 D XII (R), and part of Monacensis 134 (Mon2).

Royal Ms. 16 D XII comprises three manuscripts, the third of which was written by Darmarios (ff. 37–272). All three manuscripts date to the sixteenth century, but were not bound together until the eighteenth century. The Darmarios portion of the codex commences with scholia on the Halieutica (ff. 37–156), which is prefaced by the Life of Oppian that is a standard feature of Z family manuscripts in the Halieutica tradition, and a definitive feature of the Salamanca branch of manuscripts in the independent

scholia tradition. R, Mon, Br, and B all contain the Life (as does z₁), while neither M nor any of the Darmarian Madrid manuscripts that are not contaminated with Salamanca material (S or E) do. Following the Halieutica scholia are a paraphrase of Oppian’s Cynegetica, scholia on the Images of Philostratus, and a commentary on Hermogenes.

Monacensis 134⁴ is a manuscript of 57 folios comprising only scholia on the Halieutica, preceded by the abovementioned Life of Oppian. Mon consists of two strata, only the latter of which was written by Darmarios. The earlier stratum, which Darmarios found sometime in 1580, comprises the large tracts of scholia missing from M. Darmarios supplemented these scholia with the balance of Z scholia from another source, creating the second layer of the codex, or Mon₂. The circumstances of the division and subsequent transmission of the scholia to M and the antecedent layer of Mon remain a mystery. However, M’s exemplar had evidently been dissected by the time Gianetos wrote M in 1552, for in a couple of instances he unwittingly began to copy what were incomplete scholia in his exemplar, only to proceed confusedly to the middle of a different scholion following a lacuna of hundreds of entries⁵. The scholia that are missing in M are precisely the scholia, down to the word, that constitute the older sections of Mon not written by Darmarios. (The antecedent sections of Mon will be referred to as Mon₁, those portions that were written by Darmarios as Mon₂.) Mon₁ may, in fact, have been the other half of M’s missing exemplar. The alternation between the tandem parts of Mon and M runs as follows: M and Mon₂ contain scholia on Books 1.1–797, and 2.6–167, ending with the first word of 2.173, at which point Mon₁ commences on f. 29r with that initial word of 2.173, ἀγκοίνησιν. This section of Mon₁ continues through 2.333, where it ends mid-entry with the word βλέπειν on f. 30v. M and Mon₂ pick up here with the last six words of 2.333 following

---


⁵) On f. 153v Gianetos initially wrote ἀγκοίνησιν in the bottom right hand margin as an indication of the first word to appear on the next page. This was the first word in the scholion on 2.167 (and as it happened, the only word from that scholion in his exemplar). When Gianetos realized that there was a gap between ἀγκοίνησιν and the next words in his exemplar, which were the last six words of 2.334 beginning with καὶ οἶνος, he inserted ἀγκοίνησιν at the end of the last line of the text, and wrote καὶ οἶνος next to ἀγκοίνησιν in the bottom margin of f. 153v. Both postscripts are discernible from the discrepancies in alignment and writing angle. καὶ οἶνος are then the opening words on f. 154r.
and continue through 2.416, where a second lacuna intervenes in M. Mon begins anew on f. 32r with the next scholion, 2.419, and proceeds through 2.615 on f. 33v. Here again M and Mon$_2$ pick up the thread with the next scholion on 2.634, and follow through to the end of Book 2. A third and lengthy lacuna ensues in M, consisting of Book 3 in its entirety and Book 4.1 through all but the last eight words of 4.58, which is precisely the material that comprises the third segment of Mon$_1$. This section begins on f. 35r at the start of Book 3 and ends on f. 43v with ἔνδον καὶ in 4.58. M and Mon$_2$ resume here one final time with the last eight words of 4.58, and continue to the end of the book at 4.692. Scholia on Book 5 are missing altogether from M, and make up the last portion of Mon$_1$ on ff. 53r–57v.

Thus, the segments of Mon that Darmarios wrote to complement Mon$_1$ duplicate the scholia that constitute M, with a few differences in the arrangement of scholia in Book 1, and the inclusion of scattered entries that are omitted in M. But Darmarios used neither M nor the Madrid exemplar that he had employed for his Madrid group to augment the scholia in Mon. Whereas he had resorted to the same truncated exemplar in Madrid four times in the years 1577 to 1579 to produce the Madrid quartet, when Darmarios found the attenuated Mon$_1$ he took it to a Salamancaan exemplar he discovered sometime in 1580, one that he also employed to supplement the Madrid manuscripts B and Br. Darmarios was clearly using a more replete exemplar in Salamanca than the one he had utilized for his Madrid manuscripts, for in a couple of instances he started to copy scholia in Mon$_2$ that were already written in Mon$_1$, until he realized what he was doing and crossed the redundant words out$^{16}$. Moreover, the scholia Darmarios needed to complement the anterior core of B and Br were a very different set from the one he needed for Mon$_1$. Therefore if, as we shall demonstrate below, Darmarios used the same Salamanca exemplar to supplement the Madrid manuscripts B and Br as he used for Mon, he would have needed a virtually complete as-

$^{16}$ This happens twice. On f. 28v Darmarios ended the page prematurely, leaving off with the first word of 2.167, ἄγγελονειν, and the first letter of the second word, ἀ. Evidently Darmarios then realized that this was where Mon$_1$ began, and therefore left the bottom portion of f. 28v empty. On f. 34r Darmarios began with the last few clauses (twenty-three words) of the scholion on 2.615, but then recognized that these words comprised the final lines of this segment of Mon$_1$. He thus crossed out the redundant words and moved on to the next scholion on 2.634.
semblage of Z scholia to complement all three manuscripts. The chart below elucidates the relationship of the two layers of Monacensis 134 to the Madrid and Salamanca branches of the tradition, the former represented by M and the anterior layers of B and Br, the latter by the posterior layers of B and Br.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book/Line</th>
<th>Beinecke 269/Brussels 85</th>
<th>Monacensis 134</th>
<th>Matritensis 4715</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1–73</td>
<td>1st Layer (Madrid Source)</td>
<td>2nd Layer (Darmarios' hand, Salamancan source)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74–405</td>
<td>2nd Layer (Salam. Source)*</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan*</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406–431</td>
<td>1st/Madrid</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432–783</td>
<td>2nd/Salam.*</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan*</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784–end</td>
<td>1st/Madrid</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6–167</td>
<td>1st/Madrid</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173–333</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>1st Layer (Not Darmarios' hand, Madrid Source)**</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 (con-</td>
<td>1st/Madrid 2nd/Salamancan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tinued)–416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419–615</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634–688</td>
<td>1st/Madrid</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1–647</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1–58</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 (con-</td>
<td>1st/Madrid 2nd/Salamancan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tinued)–203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204–692</td>
<td>2nd/Salam.*</td>
<td>2nd/Salamancan*</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1–621</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>1st/Madrid**</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have previously demonstrated an uncular relationship of M to S, E, Br, and B, Darmarios’ Madrid quartet. Since the antecedent layer of Mon is unmistakably the complement of M, it too should show an M-like affinity to Darmarios’ group. Accordingly, one would expect, in the sections of scholia wherein Mon and B/Br share a Madrid provenance (doubly asterisked on the chart above), that those three manuscripts would frequently concur in their readings, together with the other two members of the Madrid tetrad. (Obviously, there are no M readings to compare here.) And this is indeed the case; the preponderance of Mon variants stands in agreement with B, Br, S, and E throughout Books 3 and 5 and two sections of Book 2. The brief catalogue that follows is but a representative fraction of these conjunctive readings.
Like its other half M, Mon₁ shares the errors of the Madrid quartet so consistently as to suggest a close alliance. But the same types of evidence that have previously been elicited to discount M as a parent or sibling to the Darmarios group apply to Mon₁ as well. First, there is the obvious disparity in constituent parts. Secondly, there are disjunctive readings that demonstrate separate sources for Mon₁ and the Darmarios group.
Two Darmarios Manuscripts of Scholia on Oppian’s *Halieutica*

3.291 post παρακειμένου om. ἔοικα z₁, R
ante ἔοικὼν, ἔοικός ... ἦ z₁, R
3.33 post μὲν add. γὰρ z₁, R
3.362 post νοὺν add. ἔχοντες z₁, R
5.1 post ἀνεπιξείρητον om. εἰς z₁, R
5.20 post Ὁμηροῦ add. πάνον ἐλκυσθῆ ἦ z₁, R
5.74 post θῆο add. ὃ z₁, R

We have previously demonstrated an intermediary between z₁ and the *Halieutica* hyparchetype Z. The separative readings that follow indicate that R was ultimately descended from this intermediary, for it cannot be derived from z₁.

3.13 post γὰρ om. πάντας z₁ hab. R rell.
3.31 χαλών] λαχών z₁ hab. R rell.
3.211 post εἰ διὸς om. ἀποβολὴ ... ἵδις z₁ hab. R rell.
3.246 post ἐσθίω om. ἐδή z₁ hab. R rell.
3.522 post τίς om. πνοή z₁ hab. R rell.
4.49 post ἵκθυς om. ὃ ... ταχύς z₁ hab. R rell.
5.215 post Ἰονίου om. δὲ z₁ hab. R rell.
5.296 post νόμον om. ἀδειν z₁ hab. R rell.
5.417 post φίλος om. θεοίς z₁ hab. R rell.

Vestiges of the intermediary between Z and z₁ are found in readings common to z₁, M, Mon, R, Br, and B, which do not appear in Z. (S and E, which were not augmented with second-source Salamancan material, do not possess these scholia.) These readings are relatively infrequent.

1.74 post ὅτι add. ὃ z₁, M, Mon, R, Br, B
1.76 ἀπὸ λίθου] ἀπολιθοῦντι z₁, M, Mon, R, Br, B
1.78 ὅτε] ὅταν z₁, M, Mon, R, Br, B
1.256 ante ἵκθυς add. οἱ z₁, M, Mon, R, Br, B
4.232 post ἵστεον add. δὲ z₁, M, Mon, R, Br, B

Singular readings in M are pervasive in the singly asterisked sections of scholia, wherein M is the sole witness to the Madrid tradition. Never does Mon₂, R, Br, or B agree with M against the other three in these sections of scholia. These readings provide evidence for the disjunction of Mon₂, R, and the second layers of Br and B from the Madrid branch of the tradition.

1.74 ante εὐντικοῦ add. τοῦ M
1.76 post ὅν om. τὸ M
1.95 post εἶπαι om. τῆς ἄλος M
1.100 post ὁδηνεῖ om. καὶ M
1.121 post γὰρ add. πρὸς M
1.129 λέπτορα] πέτορα M
1.150 πρώτην] τύχην M
1.155 post πεφροντικῶς om. τοῦ ... ἔχον M
Conversely, there is a large number of conjunctive errors among $z_1$, Mon$_2$, R, Br, and B. M does not share any of the following readings.

1.96 ἡγουν] ἡώς $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
1.107 ὦν] ἐν $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
4.232 post ἐστὶν] om. ὁ γὰρ ... ἐστὶν $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
4.257 post τάφους] add. τὰ $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
post κυκλίδας] om. χρυσᾶς $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
4.272 ante οἱ ὀκτάποδες] add. ἤν $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
4.329 ante δῖλος] om. ὅτι $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B
4.343 post δάκρυα] om. φαίη $z_1$, Mon, R, Br, B

However, the separative errors that follow demonstrate that $z_1$ was not the source of Mon$_2$, R, or the second layers of Br or B.

1.361 post ἀπὸ] om. τοῦ $z_1$
1.504 ante τοῦ] ἔν $z_1$
4.239 post μὴ] om. ἀκούοντι $z_1$
4.302 βάθος] βάρος $z_1$
4.343 ἐστὶ] ἐπὶ $z_1$
4.353 καταγομέναις] καταγομένη $z_1$

By far the most common constellation in these sections of the corpus comprises variant readings shared only by the descendent manuscripts Mon$_2$, R, Br, and B. I have in the past demonstrated a Salamancan origin for the latter strata of Br and B. From the many conjunctive readings among these four manuscripts we may infer a common source for them that is separate from the immediate sources of $z_1$ or M.

1.78 post γράφεται] add. δὲ Mon, R, Br, B
1.103 τόπος] τόπος Mon, R, Br, B
1.126–27 post Ἄγησιλάου] add. αὐ Mon, R, Br, B
4.204 ὅν] ὀν Mon, R, Br, B
4.204 πολλάκις] πολλάκι Mon, R, Br, B
4.239 post ἄνοιγτι] om. μὴ ἀκούοντι Mon, R, Br, B
4.293 μολεῖν] μαλεῖν Mon, R, Br, B
4.311 ἀλλήλους] ἀλλήλοις Mon, R, Br, B
4.325 καὶ] ἐν Mon, R, Br, B
4.329 χρόνος] χρόνος Mon, R, Br, B
4.343 ἀνομοίως] ἀνομίας Mon, R, Br, B

In the unmarked sections of the chart wherein Mon is assigned a Salamancan and Br/B a Madrid provenance, one would expect predominantly disjunctive readings between Mon and Br/B, the former inclining toward $z_1$, the latter two toward M var-
iants. Br and B agree almost unanimously with one another and with their sibling Madrid manuscripts, and frequently with M. They concur infrequently with $z_1$ variants, and never against each other or M. Mon and B are more ambivalent, with variants allied to both sides of the tradition. A number of readings shared by both $z_1$ and M reveal once again that Darmarios' source had an ancestor in common with both of them - the intermediary between Z and $z_1$.

2.51 φιλέβιδον| φιλέβιδιν $z_1$, M, Mon, R, Br, B
2.67 ἄρην| ἄρην $z_1$, M, Mon, R, Br, B
2.153 ἦς| ἦγουν $z_1$, M, Mon, R, Br, B
2.412 παραλλήλον| παραλλήλου $z_1$, M, Mon, R, Br, B
4.122 post ἄκολουθωσι om. σοι $z_1$, M, Mon, R, Br, B

Mon and R together share readings alternately with $z_1$ or with M to the exclusion of the other, a circumstance that proves Darmarios' source was separate from the exemplars of either of those two manuscripts. Neither Mon nor R share readings against the other with $z_1$ or M. In some instances joint Mon and R readings coalesce with those of $z_1$:

2.62 ὅμως| ὅμωμα $z_1$, Mon, R
2.111 ante ἴππαξει om. ἴππα $z_1$, Mon, R
2.370 post τροχοῦ om. ἤ ὀλέθμος $z_1$, Mon, R
2.398 post εἰπεῖν add. ὁτι $z_1$, Mon, R
4.103 post δομοῦ om. τὸ τέλος $z_1$, Mon, R
4.122 ὤμοιον συνεργὸν| συνεργῶν ὤμοιον $z_1$, Mon, R
post ἔγουν add. τῇς $z_1$, Mon, R
4.175 ante λέγεται om. ἡμαρίνη $z_1$, Mon, R
4.194 post κυκλῶν om. ἦ $z_1$, Mon, R

In other cases Mon and R together concur with M, Br, and B:

2.25 ante τεὸς add. ἦ Mon, R, M, Br, B
ἐμφανεῖν| εμφανεῖν Mon, R, M, Br, B
2.67 post ὠστερ om. παρὰ Mon, R, M, Br, B
ante ἄκην add. τοῦ Mon, R, M, Br, B
2.82 post ὀνείρου add. οὐ Mon, R, M, Br, B
2.111 ἀγγελινῆσι| ἀγγελίνωι Mon, R, M, Br, B
2.156 ante χάσων add. ὁ Mon, R, M, Br, B
4.62 ὀκτὼ| ὁ κάτω Mon, R, M, Br, B
4.132 ἡγγα λέγουσι| λέγουσιν ἡγγα Mon, R, M, Br, B
4.196 τοῖς γονοῖς] τῆς γονῆς Mon, R, M, Br, B

When either Mon or R agrees with only one other manuscript in these sections of scholia, it is almost invariably the other. A common source for Mon and R is implied by conjunctive readings like the following that are exclusive to them.
Mon and R each possesses a myriad of readings which make it apparent that neither was the other’s exemplar. A representative sample follows.

We can deduce that Darmarios had completed all four Salamanca line manuscripts – Mon, R, Br, and B – by 17 November 1580, the date entered in his colophon on f. 176r at the end of the Cynegica in B. We also know that he sold Br to Andreas Schott one week earlier in Salamanca on 10 November 1580. Darmarios must have come upon Mon after he had discovered the Salamanca source with which he augmented the original Madrid scholia in Br and B, for he did not return to his erstwhile Madrid source to complement the incomplete corpus in Mon. Instead, he went back to the replete volume of scholia he had discovered in Salamanca, from which he obtained the balance of Z scholia for Mon, and from which he made another full copy in R. One may also conclude that as he was completing these manuscripts Darmarios had on hand representatives from both sides of the tradition, for he provides marginal and interlinear emendations and alternate readings in all four, copiously in R and Br, and far more sporadically in Mon and B. The alternate readings are a promiscuous lot, but for the most part they are derived from the branch of the tradition opposite to the one from which the original read-
ing issues. Thus the alternate readings in $R$ are usually derived from the Madrid branch, and agree with $\text{Mon}_1$ or with $\text{Br}$ and $B$. Conversely, the numerous emendations that are found in the core layer of $\text{Br}$ are of Salamanca line provenance; they normally agree with either $z_1$, $R$, and/or $\text{Mon}_2$. Likewise, most of the very few emendations in $B$ occur in the Madrid stratum; they are all Salamanca readings, usually concurring with $z_1$ and often $R$. Emendations in $\text{Mon}$ are very few as well, and their affiliation depends on which section of the codex one is looking at. Collectively they reveal that Darmarios must have employed at least two exemplars, one representing each branch of the tradition, in the final stages of preparing the manuscript. Corrections in $\text{Mon}$ occur most frequently in the $\text{Mon}_1$ portions of the codex; the original readings are all singulares lectiones, which are emended to $z_1$ readings. Conversely, a couple of Salamanca branch readings in $\text{Mon}_2$ are provided with Madrid branch alternatives.

On the basis of the readings presented here in their shifting alliances I propose the following stemma codicum for all of Darmarios’ manuscripts of unattached Halieutica scholia. Since three of the four Salamanca codices share space with Madrid scholia, the Madrid line is included in the stemma for clarification. I am presenting the most economical model possible, while noting the possibility of an additional intermediary between $\alpha$ and $\beta$, or between $\beta$ and any one of its offspring. Although additional manuscripts are not required to account for the readings, we cannot discount the possibility of their existence at one time, since none of the immediate sources of Darmarios’ manuscripts has
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been identified. Moreover, since we can assign neither a scribe
nor a date more specific than the sixteenth century to Mon₁, it is
possible that Mon₁ itself was the complement of M’s lost exem­
plar, rather than the offspring of a lost complement. Regardless
of the number of intermediaries that once existed, one additional
conclusion emerges as certain from this analysis – that we have
underestimated the interest in this material and the profusion of
manuscripts which that interest yielded in the sixteenth century.
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GÖTTLICHE HENADEN
UND PLATONISCHER PARMENIDES
Lösung eines Mißverständnisses?*

I. Einführung in die Problemstellung

Zur schon oft diskutierten und äußerst problematischen
Frage von göttlichen Henaden im späteren Platonismus seien ein­
leitend die beiden Hauptthesen von H. D. Saffrey und L. G. We­
sterink¹ zitiert. Der Ausarbeitung dieser Thesen ist die Einleitung

*) A. Graeser und D. J. O’Meara gilt mein Dank für wertvollen Rat und
Hilfe.

1) Es gibt seit J. Dillon, Iamblichus and the Origin of the Doctrine of
Henads, Phronesis 17, 1972, 102–106 (= Appendix B von id., Iamblichī Chalciden­
sis In Platonis Dialogos Commentariorium Fragmenta, Leiden 1973, 412–16) eine
Diskussion, ob der erste Philosoph, der nachweislich Henaden ansetzte, Jamblich
oder Syrus was. Dillon tendiert zu ersterer Möglichkeit und Saffrey/Westerink,
in ihrer Antwort auf Dillon (Théologie Platonicienne [im folgenden als TP zitiert] III,
Paris 1978, IX–LII), zu letzterer. Dillon greift im Anschluß an D. J. O’Meara,
Pythagoras Revived. Mathematics and Philosophy in Late Antiquity, Oxford 1989,
138 die Frage wieder neu auf (Iamblichus und Henads Again, in: The Divine
Position, mit Berufung auf Jamblichs Über den Pythagoreismus VII, aufs neue zu
verteidigen.