The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Prohibitions in Greek

Henry Jackson

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 05 / June 2004, pp 262 - 263

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990206, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990206

How to cite this article:

Henry Jackson (1904). Prohibitions in Greek. The Classical Review, 18, pp 262-263
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990206

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

p. 804 (=19)	δ ἀνάγνωσιν P ἀν γνῶσιν GCD	ἀν γνῶσιν [which throws light on the correctness of P in 796 (=24)]
p. 805 (=152, 15)	ον ποτέ P ἄμα τειχιστῶν P ἄμα ἀτειχίστων GCD	ἀν ὁπότε GCD ἄμ' ἀτειχίστων
(=16)	ἀνομοίως ὡς P ἀν ὁμοίως ὡς G	ἀν ὁμοίως CD
(=21)	οὔτε κατὰ θάλατταν om. PCD	ins. G
	τε PCD	δε G and our MSS of Thucydides
p. 806 (=154, 10)	ὥστῶν PG	ῶσων CD
p. 807 (=154, 19)	δρωμένους φησὶν PG	δρωμένου σφίσιν
(=156, 5)	ἐπικρίναι PGD ἐπικρίναι C	εἶη, κρίναι
p. 808 (=11)	τούτου τῷ P	τούτῳ GCD

Without here considering the relations of C and D—page 798 (=15, 16) seems to show that C is copied from D—it is evident that they follow one line of textual tradition, while P and G also are closely related. Since P is of the tenth or eleventh century, it is generally supposed that G—copied in the sixteenth—is a copy from it. But a consideration of p. 798 (=15, 16), p. 800 (=6), p. 804 (=19), p. 805 (=21), and especially of the readings in p. 794 suggests the propriety of provisionally arranging the pedigree of these MSS thus:

where A, A₁, A₂, A₃ are MSS now lost but imaginable as ancestors. If this hypothesis be sound, we may next ask whether G or P is more generally correct. Disregarding those readings in which PG agree, an examination shows that even if we give P the benefit of the doubt in p. 796 (=140, 3), yet (reckoning $\frac{1}{2}$ for a reading which preserves the vestiges of the true reading where other MSS fail) we can only credit P with 3 successes, as against $11\frac{1}{2}$ for G. It is therefore fair to claim for this MS greater attention than it has hitherto re-

ceived. Had G preserved παράλογος, I should have been inclined to reject the addition of ἐπιθειασμός; as it is, it is more reasonable to suppose its παραλογισμός a valuable testimony that the united witness of the other MSS to ἐπιλογισμός is not the last word, but that either ἐπιθειασμός was also in the text or that the common παραλογισμός was felt to be insufficiently uncommon and was corrected into ἐπιλογισμός. It should be pointed out as having some bearing on the probability of ἐπιθειασμός that practically all Dionysius' examples are drawn from the first book of Thucydides, only one or two from Book IV.

In conclusion two oversights in Roberts' edition may here be pointed out. In p. 762 (=102, 1) παραδείγματα δὲ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς καὶ τῆς ὑψηλῆς λέξεως ἐξ ἐνὸς βιβλίου τῶν πάντων περιβοήτων παραθήσομαι, the reading ποιήσομαι for which the editor gives παραθήσομαι is supported by ποιῶμαι in *de adm. vi dic. in Demosth.*

In p. 784 (=122, 23) οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ὠφέλειαν παρέχει, we cannot give as in p. 784 (=122, 28) τούτοις τοίνυν πᾶσαν ἀφθονίαν δέδωκεν the sense of 'complete' or 'greatest' to πᾶσαν when qualified by ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν. Hence the reading of the MSS πᾶσιν should be retained against Herwerden's emendation, and the sense is 'Theopompos' work is of use to *practically everybody*.' In p. 64 (=102, 6) correct ἐκπύπτον in Roberts' edition.

T. NICKLIN.

PROHIBITIONS IN GREEK.

In the *Classical Review* for July 1903, xvii 295, Mr. W. G. Headlam writes 'μὴ τοῦτο ποίει is 'do not do as you are doing,' 'do not continue doing so,' 'cease to do so':

and in a note he adds 'This I had from Dr. Henry Jackson years ago, who had it as he told me from Shilleto, who derived it probably from Hermann; see the quotation

from him in Greg. Cor. p. 864.' Mr. Headlam is mistaken in thinking that I learnt this truth from Richard Shilleto. I owe much to that excellent scholar: but it was the late Thomas Davidson, and not Shilleto, who explained to me this usage. Davidson told me that, when he was learning modern Greek, he had been puzzled about the distinction, until he heard a Greek friend use the present imperative to a dog which was barking. This gave him the clue. He turned to Plato's *apology*, and immediately

stumbled upon the excellent instances 20 ε μὴ θορυβήσητε, before clamour begins, and 21 Α' μὴ θορυβεῖτε, when it has begun. Ever since Davidson explained the distinction to me, I have kept a watch upon instances of particular prohibitions, and I am convinced that the rule holds. I did not know of Hermann's admirable statement until Mr. Headlam called attention to it in the *Classical Review*.

HENRY JACKSON.

15 April, 1904.

REVIEWS.

NAIRN'S *HERODAS*

The Mimes of Herodas. Edited with Introduction, Critical notes, Commentary, and Excursus by J. A. NAIRN, M.A., Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School. Pp. lxxxviii, 116. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1904. 12s. 6d.

THE actual gain accruing from this edition to the text and interpretation of Herodas is as follows: in I. 82 Mr. Nairn has restored οὐ π[αρα]λλάττ[ει]ν¹ πείσουσά σ' ἦλθον 'it was not to induce you to go astray that I came.' Successive scrutinies of the papyrus had approximated to this reading, which I do not doubt myself is right. But I doubt whether he has solved the very uncertain traces at the end of VII. 69 by reading εἰ τοῦτ' ὀκνεῖς γὰρ οὐ σε ῥῆδ' ὥς κῆναι 'if you object to this, it is not easy to conclude a bargain so'; for what is 'so'? Does it mean 'not easy for you at that rate (οὕτω, τοῦτο ποιοῦσαν) to give your ratification'? Or 'not easy for you to determine to that effect'? The last gives no sense, so it must be the first; but Mr. Nairn should have explained, and endeavoured to remove our scruples about this use of ὥς. His other conjecture τελῶ δραχμὴν in II. 8 I shall speak of presently. This edition also incorporates for the first time on pp. 99-100 the fragments received by Mr. Kenyon in

1900: the new scraps fitted into VII 22-4 will be discussed hereafter; that inserted into VII 8-10 I will mention here:

μᾶλλον δὲ τὴν ἄκανθαν ὥς ἔχει κάλη
ἐκ τοῦ τραχήλου δῆσο[ν.—εἰ]α δῆ, [Κέρκω]ψ,
κίνει ταχέως τὰ γούνα, [μ]έζον' [ἦ δαί] σε
τρίβειν ψοφεῖντα νοῦθ τῶνδε.

Crusius in his last edition (1900, p. 74) does not venture to adopt his conjecture that this scrap belongs to this place, and Mr. Nairn does not say whether it is certain. But ΑΔΗ makes it seem so, because εἰα δῆ is just the right phrase here and had been already conjectured by Diels, which was worth mentioning. The other lines, however, can hardly be right yet; no one could write μέζον' ἦ unless he meant 'greater than': there are many possibilities; τῶνδε might depend on μέζοντας (πέδας) or agree with νοῦθημάτων, or μέζον ψοφεῖντα might mean 'louder.' The first line I had been supposing meant 'tie the teal to his neck,' to keep his head from nodding; but Mr. Nairn suggests that the meaning is 'fasten his back-bone by the hump to his neck, just as he is.' In III. 80 Mr. Nairn takes φέρειν to mean 'you must endure,' which may be right; certainly the scribe would seem to have understood it so.

For the rest, Mr. Nairn's object has been to 'embody the results of the constant attention paid to this author during the past twelve years,' and with this object he has 'searched' the various periodicals 'as carefully as possible for everything bearing on the text or its interpretation.' This is a useful service; and what perhaps

¹ Mr. Nairn thinks that the Attic form in this and other words is from Herodas' hand. The matter is of small importance, but I think it highly improbable Herodas should have written so. Judgment in textual criticism depends on knowing what were the habits of scribes generally, and such forms as πράττειν, γλῶττα were occasional inadvertences in Tragedy.