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](#)

***Ciceros Rede für Cn. Plancius*, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Dr Ernst Köpke: in dritten Auflage neu bearbeitet von Dr G. Landgraf. 1 Mk. 20.**

W. Y. Fausset

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 08 / October 1888, pp 252 - 253

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193369, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193369

How to cite this article:

W. Y. Fausset (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 252-253 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193369

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

μαλᾶκός, &c.), corresponding in form and meaning to Latin *proculeo* = *pro-calco*, to trample on, insult. Popular etymology would connect *προπαλακίζω* with *πηλός*, 'mud,' and hence the first *α* was altered to *η*.

The index of Greek words is a useful addition, but does not seem to be complete; e.g. the word *αἰρεῖσθαι*, discussed on p. 230, is not included.

J. B. BURY.

The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A. (Camb. Univ. Press. 1887. pp. 66. 4to.)

THIS is an interesting contribution to the genealogical study of later cursive mss. of the New Testament. Codex 69, now the property of the Corporation of Leicester, is described by Scrivener (Introd.³ p. 190) and has been frequently collated: most recently by T. K. Abbott ('A Collation of Four Important Manuscripts of the Gospels,' Dublin 1877.)

Prof. Harris shews that the codex is by the same hand as the Caius psalter which belonged to Friar Brinkley of Cambridge, Provincial of the English Minorites at the time of the dissolution. Both the psalter and the Leicester codex passed from Brinkley's possession into that of William Chark, a Puritan divine at Cambridge, whose library also contained the notorious codex Montfortianus, the production of which in answer to Erasmus' challenge led to the insertion, in Erasmus' third edition of his N. T., of the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses. Prof. Harris shews grounds for the supposition that this latter codex was written by Franciscan friars (or "monks" as he strangely calls them pp. 26, 47, &c.) for the purpose of supporting the interpolation; possibly the actual writer was Friar Roy (this, and not Froy, appears to have been his name) the first known possessor of the ms. Prof. Harris examines the writing, catch-words, arrangement, material, &c. of the Leicester codex, with great learning and ingenuity. Specially interesting, if not absolutely conclusive, is the examination of the water-marks. Taken together, the indications converge upon an Italian origin for the ms., and upon a date not fifty years before the invention of printing. This agrees in substance, though there remain questions of detail upon which difference is still possible, with the conclusion of M. Martin, that this and the allied mss. are traceable to a Calabrian origin.

Enough has been said to shew the interest of Prof. Harris' investigation both for the N.T. critic and for the paleographer. His pages are by no means without human interest as well; his personal and academic prepossessions (pp. 27, 31, 34, 38 note, &c. &c.) relieve the dryness of scientific enquiry. And there are curious antiquarian pickings to be gleaned, of which this is not the place to speak. Prof. Harris' book is very favourably reviewed by Dr. Gregory in Schürer's Theol. Literaturzeitung 1887, no. 25.

A. ROBERTSON.

Hermæ Pastor Graecæ Integrum Ambitu. Primum Edidit ADOLFUS HILGENFELD. Leipzig: Weigel. 1887. (London: Trübner.) 4 Mk.

PROFESSOR HILGENFELD gives us in the *Prolegomena* an account of the Greek editions of Hermas which have appeared since 1856. In that year R. Anger and G. Diindorf published the complete Greek text as far as Sim. IX. 30, 3. They availed themselves for their edition of three MS. leaves containing Mand. XII. 4, 8, to Sim. VIII. 4, 3, and Sim. IX. 15, 1, to IX. 30, 5, which C. Simonides had brought from Mount Athos, as well as of a copy (apograph II.) which he had made of the earlier and the intervening

portions of the book. On the same MS. leaves, but on a different copy (apograph I.), C. Tischendorf based his edition of Hermas 1856. This however, as well as the later editions by A. Hilgenfeld, 1866 and 1881, O. v. Gebhardt and A. Harnack, 1887, F. Funk, 1878—altogether five since Hefele—stopped short at Sim. IX. 30, 3, *εἰ δὲ*.... In these editions the remaining portion, IX. 30, 3—X. 4, 5, was added from Latin translations. Simonides had already (1859) published the last Sim. in Greek. But having been convicted of a series of systematic forgeries, his last edition to the text of Hermas was at the time universally rejected as spurious: 'Timendus igitur est hic Danaus et dona ferens, sed etiam dona tulit non respuenda,' says Hilgenfeld. He considers that the man to whom we owe so large a part of the Greek text has a right to be heard when he offers to restore the last remaining chapter, and that his proposal should not be so peremptorily dismissed, as was done by Harnack (*Theol. Lit. Zeit.* 1887, No. 7: comp. No. 21). Hilgenfeld admits the last Sim., not however without a certain amount of hesitation, into his edition, and thus furnishes the first '*H. P. Graecæ integer ambitu*.' The editor gives in the remaining four chapters of the *Prolegg.* an account of the Cod. Lipsiensis vel Clementinus, the two apographs taken by Simonides, the remaining MSS. of Hermas, the Cod. Sinaiticus and the Cod. Amphilochii, the extracts found in ecclesiastical writers, as well as the old Latin and Aethiopic versions of the last Simm. There follows 'a life of Hermas': the work, it is stated on the authority of Simonides, of a Libyan bishop of the sixth century. The text is accompanied by copious notes. The readings found in the different Codd. and apographs are fully quoted, as well as those which have been adopted in the various editions mentioned above. Antiochus Homm. XCIV. and CXXII. are very appropriately quoted in illustration of Sim. IX. 31 *sq.* The lost portion, Sim. IX. 30, 3—X. 4, 5, is given first as restored by Simonides, next as rendered in the *Versio Vulgata Palatina*, and finally in a Greek translation by the editor. Whatever the value may be of the additions which Simonides offered to make to the Greek text of Hermas, there can be no doubt as to the completeness of this its latest edition.

CHARLES MERK.

Ciceros Rede für Cn. Plancius, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von DR. ERNST KÖPKE: in dritter Auflage neu bearbeitet von DR. G. LANDGRAF. 1 Mk. 20.

THOSE who know Dr. Landgraf's edition of the speech *pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* will not need to be told that any contributions from his own stores to that which Köpke's Planciana had provided have an independent value: and Dr. Holden will do well to consider them in the next edition of his excellent commentary, which is largely based on Köpke's second edition, as far as we can judge without having the latter actually before us.

We will just notice a few of these points, though it is not always easy to tell what is of Köpke and what is of his *διασκευαστής*.

Reserving purely textual matters for the present, we find in § 16 an entirely fresh treatment of the difficult passage which runs thus in Holden—'vel nescio vel non dico vel denique, quod mihi gravissimum esset, si dicerem, sed impune tamen deberem dicere: non recte. nam quid adsequerere, si illa extrema defensione uter, populum quod voluisset fecisse, non quod debuisset?' no explanation, however, being given of the construction of 'vel denique . . . recte,' where the sentence is broken-backed.

Landgraf removes this difficulty by pointing with a comma at recte, and reading *nam* for *nam* (nunc TE); thus *adsequerere* is apodosis to *si dicerem*, which is further defined in 'si . . . uterer.' (Cp. for the order of the clauses *pro Cluent.* § 124 'sin autem, quod subscriptum est, quia verum est, idcirco grave debet esse, hoc quaeramus': and for the double condition, with the apodosis in the middle, Ter. *Hec.* 255 'sin east retinendi causa . . . te mi iniuriam facere arbitror si metuis.') The sense given is excellent: 'You ask, Laterensis, why the electors preferred Plancius to you? I am not concerned to answer your question: if I took an extreme line and said what I might say without compromising my client's case, viz. that the people made the wrong choice, acted in mere caprice, you would gain nothing by the admission.'

Another point is in § 23: where 'hoc municipii genere,' translated by Holden after Nägelsbach 'in respect of his municipium,' is more satisfactorily explained, 'in the different character, type, of the municipium to which he belonged.' *Genus* means properly 'kind or class of objects' in such a phrase as 'in omni genere, in eo genere': so that we should expect in 'hoc municipiorum genere,' if so it meant here.

In § 83, 'te in ludos . . . sine tensis autem quid potero dicere?' Holden quotes Long, 'the passage is obscure and Wunder admits that he cannot explain it.' Previous commentators seem to have inferred from this and from § 40, and *Q. fr.* ii. 16; *ad fam.* i. 9, v. 9 (which refer to the preceding trial of Vatinius), that Plancius was tried at the end of August, before the ludi Romani (Sept. 4-20); and indeed have assumed that a trial could not take place during the ludi Romani. But Zumpt has disproved the assumption. Landgraf fixes the date at Sept. 5, approximately. Cicero is meeting irony with irony. 'Laterensis says that he was most reluctant to have the case taken during the Ludi, because he knew that I should as usual make oratorical capital out of the religious solemnities, as I had done before in defending aediles. I can assure him he has effectually clipped my wings: sine tensis quid potero dicere?' In § 90 impiorum is rightly referred to Clodius and his gang, not (as by Holden) to Catiline.

The book is judiciously arranged for school use. Critical notes go to a Critical Appendix: there is a useful list of divergences from C. F. W. Müller's text of 1886. There is a wise economy of citations: and references to Zumpt, Seyffert, etc., which most students have no mind and most teachers no time to verify, are relegated to what is called a Sachlich-sprachlicher Anhang. This contains some things which should have gone into the main commentary, which is sometimes defective. In § 20 habemus hoc nos, 'this is a peculiarity of ours,' might have been explained; habere = habere in se. In § 55 neque tu haec habes neque eis confidis, the same verb is explained as neither = 'know' (as Holden) nor 'believe,' but = in causa habere; 'you have not got any such facts in your favour.' In § 30 it is unnecessary to say that 'we know nothing of a vetus ius' allowing of personal violence against actors: *ius* is not technical, but means 'privilege.' In § 31 'communis sensus, the general way of thinking: sensus communis, feeling of propriety, tact': surely this cannot be maintained: Hor. *Sat.* i. 3, 65 communis sensu = 'ordinary tact' (Prof. Palmer): Sen. *Ep. M.* i. 5, 4 sensum communem, humanitatem et congregationem, 'the social sense, the feeling in which all partake' (cp. *Planc.* § 34).

Space forbids us to dwell at length on the text: in thirty instances Dr. Landgraf dissents from C. F. W. Müller. He has made ample use of the critical labours of Madvig, Lehmann, Karsten and

others: but his leanings are conservative. He is slow to bracket or expunge; but is content at the same time, in such cases as those of §§ 40, 78, to offer a reading as provisional only. In § 35 'ego quia . . . conferuntur' is retained: in § 40 'tum (codd. edd. cet. tu) me ignaro . . . iniquos' is well defended against Wunder, Cobet, Müller and others, though there is evident corruption at 'inscio notes.' In § 54 'rogatus' is plainly wrong: Karsten conj. 'provocatus.' In § 77 'praeferam' (TE) is retained, others reading 'prae me feram': for this use (generally post-classical) with substant. object. Landgraf compares *Rosc. Am.* § 87, *de rep.* i. § 52. In § 29 O. Müller's emendation 'futilis' is preferred to 'fallax' (Campe), on palaeographic grounds: in § 95 'arcum (codd. arcem) facere ex cloaca' is palmary. Cp. Prof. Nettleship, *Journ. of Phil.* xxix. 21.

W. Y. FAUSSET.

A Companion to School Classics. By JAMES GOW. Macmillan and Co. 1888.

THIS is a remarkable little book which, unless we are much mistaken, will be warmly received by classical teachers, and will be of no small use even to many advanced students and scholars. Dr. Gow describes it as being an attempt 'to give the information which a commentator is, from the nature of his task, compelled to assume even in a young student.' On questions like Textual Criticism, the Theatres, the Public Economy of Greece and Rome, the commentaries and dictionaries (Dr. Gow remarks) present a vast mass of details, 'but not the history or theory by which such details can be correlated'; and this defect he attempts 'partly to supply', and 'to give from the latest and best authorities a summary of essential facts and rules.'

The first difficulty in carrying out this programme is obviously the selection of the points on which such summaries will be most useful. Probably if teachers were asked to write down a list of subjects which they would like to see so treated, no two would quite coincide in their lists: though we think it likely they would all agree in declaring that many of the points they most desired to include were to be found here. The best test of this is to give the headings of the chapters.

A. Classical Texts.—The Greek and Latin Alphabets, Books and their Publication, History of Classical MSS., Modern Libraries of Classical MSS., Apparatus Criticus, Textual Criticism, Famous Scholars, Dialects and Pronunciation.

B. Greece.—Greek Chronology, Greek Metrology, History of Athenian Government, Population of Attica, Athenian Officials, Athenian Deliberative Assemblies, Athenian Army and Fleet, Legal Procedure, Finance, Sparta, Colonies and Cleruchies.

C. Rome.—Roman Chronology, Metrology, History of Roman Government, Rome under the Kings, the Republic of Rome, (Magistrates, Characteristics of Magistracy, Religious Functionaries, Deliberative Assemblies, Classes of Free People, Government of Italy and Provinces), Imperial Government, Roman Army and Navy, Law, Finance.

D. The Drama, and E. Philosophy.

Perhaps some will demur to the advantage of summarising the tenets of the various schools of philosophy for beginners, though such summaries are frequently wanted and often given in a detached and bald way. But there can be little doubt of the advantage of *B. C. D.* being presented in a convenient and continuous manual form; while the first book on Classical Texts is just what many students have long sighed for. It presents as fully as is possible in the space an account of just those points on which