The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on Procopivs of Caesarea

A. W. De Groot

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / April 1915, pp 97 - 98

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800006315, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800006315

How to cite this article:

A. W. De Groot (1915). Notes on Procopivs of Caesarea. The Classical Quarterly, 9, pp 97-98
doi:10.1017/S0009838800006315

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON PROCOPIVS OF CAESAREA.

IN the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* xxi. 52 Paul Maas states: 'Es ist das Verdienst von H. B. Dewing, zuerst erkannt zu haben, dass Prokop seine Satzschlüsse rhythmisch reguliert.' That this is only partly true appears from the remark of Heisenberg in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1901, Sp. 1481, who comments on it, and that in a case of text-criticism, and likewise from a remark of Crönert in the *Rheinisches Museum*, 54, 1899, 593. Dewing was the first to point out the connection between the rhythm of Procopius and Meyer's law and to collect specific statistical material, although his numbers are to a great extent of no practical value. Compare in this connection Maas *B.Z.* xix. 593 (Maas himself came to the conclusion later that he exaggerated in this article: *τά, μή, σύν, περί* should, according to Maas, here not be considered as accentuated). It appears to me that the correct statement of the end-rhythm of Procopius is that given by Maas for Constantinus Manasses, *B.Z.* xi. 505: 'Im Ausgang der Satzglieder musz die Zahl der zwischen den letzten beiden Hochtönen stehenden Silben eine gerade sein,' on condition that 0 is considered as an even number. Whether 6 and higher numbers are allowed may be contested. Sufficient stress has been laid upon the 0-form in Procopius, and that it was 'erstrebt' was first pointed out by Heisenberg and repeated by Dewing and Maas. When the origin of Meyer's law is sought in the avoidance of the iambic-trochaic rhythm, the 0-form is sufficiently explained, except in so far as it appears in a few (one?) writers only. In this way the law assumes a different character from that given to it by Dewing (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, xiv. 1910, 415-466), who keeps too strictly to Meyer's law and counts the 0-forms under the exceptions, thus arriving at 36.7 per cent. of these.

My intention is to point out that the clausula may occasionally indicate a *wrong reading in the archetype*, two examples of which I wish to mention. I quite agree with Maas that no emendation should be made to fit the clausula (*B.Z.* xxi. 53, A. 1), and restrict myself to cases supported by analogy, and only such where a clausula of the form $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim . . .$ is found in the MSS. I select one example from the *Bella Persica* and one from the *Bella Gothica*.

Bella Gothica I. 2, 11:

ξύλλεγέντες τε, ὅσοι δὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγμοι ἦσαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν Ἀμαλασοῦνθαν ἐλθόντες, ἡτιῶντο οὐκ ὀρθῶς σφίσι, οὐδὲ ᾗ ξυμφέρει τὸν βασιλέα παιδεύεσθαι. γράμματα τε γὰρ παρὰ πολὺν κενωρίσθαι ἀνδρίας, καὶ . . . ἀποκρίνεσθαι . . . δεῖν τοῖνυν . . . τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις μελέτας ποιεῖσθαι.

Thus rightly Haury, according to V., which represents one of the two groups of MSS. which are taken into consideration by Haury in his edition. L. has *κεχώρισται*, which is not only contrary to the clausula, but also departs from the row of infinitives.

That in I. 20, 8 the unanimous reading is wrong, is indicated by the clausula :

Πάλαι, ὡς στρατηγέ, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εὖ τε καὶ καλῶς διώρισται τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ὀνόματα, ἐν οἷς ἐν τόδε ἐστίν, θράσος κεχώρισται ἀνδρείας.

That this passage should be emended also appears from *B.P.* II. 7, 28 :

πάλαι δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εὖ τε καὶ καλῶς διώρισται τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ὀνόματα· ἐν οἷς καὶ τόδε ἐστίν, ἀγνωμοσύνης κεχωρίσθαι ἀσθένειαν.

So Haury in agreement with P. Haury mentions a parallel reading from the *Excerpta Constantiniana* in H. This different reading of this MS. of less importance is not even mentioned by De Boor, being only one of the many textual variations in the readings of the two scholars. The rest of the MSS. of the *Excerpta* have *κεχωρίσθαι*. Here the expression ἐν οἷς τόδε ἐστίν governs the accusative and infinitive. It would be interesting to know the reading of the group y_1 for *Bella G.* I. 20, 8. Compare Crönert, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1906, 393.

We have another case in *B.P.* II. 29, 29 :

ἐτύγχανε δὲ (ὁ Γουβάζης) πολλῷ πρότερον—
 Ἀλανούς τε καὶ Σαβείρους ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐπαγόμενος—
 οὔπερ ὡμολόγησαν κεντηναρίων τριῶν—
 οὐχ' ὅσον ἀδήςτων Λαζοῖς ξυμφυλάξειν τὴν γῆν—
 ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰβηρίαν οὕτω καταστήσεσθαι ἀνδρῶν ἔρημον—
 ὥς μηδὲ Πέρσαις ἐνθένδε τὸ λοιπὸν ἵεναι δυνατὰ ἔσεσθαι.—

I distinguish six 'Satzglieder,' only one of which shows a wrong clausula, and that of the form ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ . . ., of which only 2 per cent. have been found. Apart from unimportant textual variations this is the unanimous reading, from which the *Excerpta* differ, where we read :

. . . ὅτι Γουβάζης ὁ Λαξῶν βασιλεὺς Ἀλανούς καὶ Σαβίνους ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐπηγάγετο, οὔπερ ὡμολόγησαν κ.τ.λ.

The supposition arises that the form ἐπηγάγετο is substituted for ἐπ<αγ>αγόμενος, a form which is repeatedly confused with ἐπαγόμενος. This supposition is considerably strengthened when we compare *B.G.* I. 1, 3 :

ἐτύγχανον δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι χρόνῳ τινὶ πρότερον Σκίρους τε καὶ Ἀλανούς καὶ ἄλλα ἄττα Γοτθικὰ ἔθνη ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐπαγαγόμενοι κ.τ.λ.

This method of investigation should certainly prove of value to future investigators.

A. W. DE GROOT.