

## 9 Summary: The Pollux that could be

As far as it has been possible to ascertain for Books 2, 5, and 10, the fundamentals of Bethe's *stemma codicum* remain valid, but several improvements can be made to the text of the *Onomasticon* in the light of the observations on the textual tradition made so far. Bethe's division into four families is undoubtedly correct, although some revisions are necessary. In summary, these families are:

- family *a*, whose only witness is M;
- family *b*, whose sub-archetype can be reconstructed using F and S;
- family *c*, which includes A and the sub-archetype *x*, to which several 15th-century witnesses belong. The latter was not used by Bethe, but despite the contamination with *d*, it is essential to better understand *c* and to identify A's possible interpolations and corrections; obviously, this applies only to Books 1–7, since A and *x* in 8–10 depend entirely on the tradition of the *d* family;
- family *d*: of the numerous manuscripts belonging to this family, Bethe used only C and B, and occasionally L. From what I have been able to determine, C and L are very important for the reconstruction of *d*, but they are not sufficient. The sub-archetype *d*<sup>2</sup> is also essential, although it is certainly less complete – to say the least – than *d* and *d*<sup>1</sup>. To reconstruct *d*<sup>2</sup>, Bethe turned to B: this is probably a very correct and complete witness, but even B has errors in some cases that are not shared by the other *d* manuscripts from the Palaeologan Age. This has already been verified for Books 2, 5, and 10 and will also be verified for Book 1, but it also applies to the rest of Pollux's work, even in the limited sample of it that I have collated:

3.5 ήδὺ post ἀκοῦσαι add. B || τε : οῦν B || 3.5 αὐτῆς : αὐτοῦ B || 3.6 γένος : γένους B || 4.7 αὐτῶν : αὐτῆς B || ἐπιστημοσύνη om. BE || 4.9 ἀνοησίᾳ : ἀνοσίᾳ B || 6.10 κνέφαλα : κουέφαλα B || 7.9 κεκαπήλευται : καπηλεύεται B || 9.7 καὶ πρὸς ἔτερον om. B || 9.8 ἐνηβατήρια B || ἀποδημεῖν om. B

Therefore, in my opinion, in addition to B, D, E, G, H, and I must also be considered worthy of attention within this group. The other most recent witnesses of the *d* family could easily be disregarded, not because of their recentness but because they depend entirely on the textual tradition of the Palaeologan Age: in some cases their scribes were able to correct the text, but only by contamination, and in no case were they able to fill the gaps of *d*<sup>2</sup>. Some help may also come from looking at the *t* group, but even in this case it seems most likely to me that its correct readings are due to the ingenuity of the scribes or to comparison with other witnesses. Other manuscripts of the *d* family, such as Br, Lu, Or, and Pa, are late and contaminated

copies which re-use older material by grafting it onto more recent versions of the text: Br onto that of G, and Lu, Or, and Pa onto that of E.

As far as manuscript E is concerned, it preserves a contaminated redaction with some remarkable differences and additions with respect to the text edited by Bethe. This manuscript was not used by Bethe, but it should undoubtedly be included in a future new edition.

Precisely in the light of what has been said, one may wonder whether a new edition is really necessary: Bethe's text is generally good, but not always reliable, and suffers from the lack of some witnesses. Some improvements could be made:

- (1) The *recensio* should be expanded. In addition to the manuscripts used by Bethe, it would be beneficial to systematically use L, as well as D, G, E, H (where available), and I, in order to better and more completely describe the textual tradition of the *d* family and the development of the text during the Palaeological Renaissance. On the other hand, the manuscripts descending from *x* must be collated, so as to reconstruct *c* as far as possible.
- (2) Both redactions ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) should be taken into account, since in some passages they differ considerably. Although typical expressions of redaction  $\beta$  (such as, as we have seen,  $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ , and the like) are probably interpolations and therefore could not be included in the edited text, but only noted in the apparatus, it would be very useful to provide the reader with the text of  $\beta$  and not only that of  $\alpha$ . This is because  $\beta$  seems to have been the most common text of Pollux from the 10th century until the Renaissance. Bethe's solution is, as always, a sensible one, but it is very inconvenient for the reader, who has to wade through a forest of parentheses, and, most importantly, consult a text that never existed. Another possible solution would be to edit the two different redactions synoptically, if necessary.
- (3) The critical apparatus should be much less selective than Bethe's and include more variant readings. The apparatus of sources should also be expanded and updated in the light of more recent editions and studies.