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](#)

Hude's Thucydides *Thucydidis Historiarum*, libri vi.-viii. ad optimos codices denuo collatos recensuit Hude Carolus, Dr. Phil. Hauniae Mdcccxc. Impensis Librariae Glydendaliae [F. Hegelii et Fil.] pp. xv. 219. 5Mk.

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 22 - 24

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993077, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993077

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 22-24 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993077

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

and purpose of the writer are not to be confounded even with the purpose of Providence through him, as the latter may have been disclosed by the educative uses his writings have subserved in the history of the Kingdom of God on earth. It is not easy, may not always be possible, to draw hard and fast lines in this matter. The history of opinion is a convenient if not a legitimate part of a commentary's contents, as has been indirectly acknowledged above. Moreover, the jejuneness and at times timidity that have characterized certain attempts at a more scientific treatment of the sacred text have not tended to command admiration for it, hardly even respect. But after all it holds true that the province of the exegete is distinct from that of the homilete and from that of the speculative theologian; and the distinction cannot be disregarded without detriment. The book before us is avowedly constructed on a different theory. Its opening sentence strikes its key-note: 'Every student of the Epistle to the Hebrews must feel that it deals in a peculiar degree with the thoughts and trials of our own time.' Its author frankly declares that 'he has endeavoured to suggest in the notes lines of thought which he has found to open light upon problems which we are required to face.' Now the objection to this is not that the

remarks are not rich, instructive, judicious; but that they tend to burden and distract a reader intent simply on understanding what the sacred author has said—tend to make that author look through our eyes, rather than to enable us to see through his.

In conclusion a few trivial matters may be noted, worthy of correction in subsequent editions. Page xlv. line 1, for '168' read '169' (Dr. Westcott is not responsible for the error); p. lviii. second paragraph, line 3, for 'xiii. 18' read (probably) 'xiii. 9'; p. xl. paragraph 2, line 7, for '22' read '22, 23'; p. 6, col. 2, line 2, for 'Wünsche' read 'Weber'; p. 8, col. 1, fifth par., last line, for 'vi. 10' read 'vi. 12'; p. 136, col. 1, par. 2, last line, for 'ψυχῆς' read 'καρδίας'; p. 168, lines 3 and 4, for 'Ps. xiv. (xv)' read 'Ps. xxiv. (xxv.)'; p. 353, col. 2, par. 2, line 4, for 'note' read 'Additional Note'; p. 400, line 1, for 'παίδων' read 'παιδέων'; p. 413, line 2, the comma should come *after* πανηγύρει (not before it); frequently we find Œhler, sometimes (p. 225) correctly Oehler; in the case of re-edited works the editor's name is sometimes prefixed to the author's (e.g. Moulton-Winer, pp. 223, 224, 245, 342, 350, &c.), sometimes (*correctly*) appended (e.g. Winer-Moulton, p. 78).

J. H. THAYER.

HUDE'S THUCYDIDES.

Thucydidis Historiarum, libri vi.-viii. ad optimos codices denuo collatos recensuit CAROLUS HUDE, Dr. Phil. Hauniae MDCCCXC. Impensis Librariae Glyden-dalianae [F. Hegelii et Fil.]. pp. xv. 219. 5 Mk.

THIS is the first instalment of the critical edition of Thucydides on which Dr. Hude is engaged. That the last books appear first will cause no surprise to those who know the author's *Commentarii Critici*, which formed his exercise for the degree of Doctor at Copenhagen in 1888. None the less, the 'odd plan, which threatens to become a recognized system, of beginning anywhere in an author but at the beginning, is to be deplored. In the present case an additional reason is that A. Schöne's revision of Bekker has already forestalled Dr. Hude to some extent in books i. and ii. But the edition under notice differs from Schöne's in that

it includes all the readings of AEF G, while it omits the *testimonia veterum* and the *scholia*. The collation of ABCEFG is careful and elaborate, and it is improbable that anything remains to be discovered from the best MSS. in regard to these latter books. With regard to M, our own MS. of the first rank, Hude has been content to use the collation which was made for Stahl. That collation was very incomplete, and I have often lighted on mistakes in it, apart from the many omissions. Where the reading of M is unrecorded, Hude signifies the fact by the sign m. This is inconvenient, because the symbol m is already in use to denote the *manus recentior* which supplied the lost leaves of M. What is Dr. Hude to do if he edits, as every one will hope that he may do, the first and second books, to which the leaves are supplied? Scholars have not lost much by neglecting M. I know of no constant reader of it but the indefatigable

and ingenious Herr Müller-Strübing. Herwerden, who read through the eighth book when in London many years ago, rightly judged that the MS. is old enough to be better.

Below will be found all the hitherto unpublished readings of M for the first nine chapters of book vi. I deeply regret that the great demands on my time prevent me from carrying my collation of this part of the MS. further at present. It may be of interest to add that there is strong ground for believing that the MS. in the Cambridge Library marked T, which was collated by Shilleto, is very closely related to M. The latter has many foolish blunders, such as *οἱ ἀθηναῖοι* for *οἰαθῆναι*, and many omissions and transpositions. In all these respects T almost exactly corresponds to M. With regard to the *iota subscript* in M, Hude says 'testimonia inter se valde dissentiunt. Stahlus quidem plerumque id omitti, rarius adscribi adfirmat.' This is wrong: the *ι* is regularly added, rarely omitted. In vi. 1, it is present in four cases out of five: in c. 2, in twelve cases out of sixteen. It is always wanting with the aor. pass. of *οἰκίζω*.

The new readings are: C. 1. Heading *θουκυδίδου συγγραφῆς* *ς'* with many embellishments. || C. 2. *ὅποθεν* | *πη γινώσκει* | *μεταντούς*—this is regular with *μετὰ* and of course common with other preps. | *αὐτοὶ φασὶ*—as regularly; so *τὲ* oftener than *τε* | *ὀπικοὺς* | *ἄλλως πῶς* | *νῦν ἐν τῇ*—omission of *ἐτι* | *χωρὰ* | *ἰταλοῦ* | *τούνομα* | *εἰς*—this blunder is common | *οὕτω ἰταλία*—not *οὕτως* | *ἄκρας ἐπὶ*—omission of *τε* | *ἐπεισέπλεον* | *συνοικίσαντες* || C. 3. *χαλκιδεῖς*—generally, but not always, *-εἰς* appears for *-ης* | *ἐστὶν ἰδρύσατο*—*ἐστὶν* is regularly accented | *ὄτ' ἂν* | *συρακουσῶν*—there are continual blunders and inconsistencies in proper names. Yet, in some cases, the true form is preserved, as in ii. 22, where Stahl wrongly says that only Lugd. has *κρανώνιοι* | *ἐρχομένου* *ἔτους* | *σικελους* | *χαλκιδεῖς* || C. 4. *ὥκισαν τοὺς ὕβλαιους κληθέντας* inserted by later hand | *συρακουσίων ἀπέστησαν* | *πάμιλλον* | *συγκατωίκισε* | *συρακουσῶν* | *τούνομα* | *περίηρης* | *ὑστερον οὐ πολλοὶ*—order wrong || C. 5. *χαλκιδεῖς* | *συρακουσῶν* | *συρακουσίων*—below *συρακουσίων* | *συρακουσῶν* | *συρακουσίων* | *δ' ἐγγὺς* | *συρακουσίων* | *διὰ πόσασιν* | *συρακο + σίων* || C. 6. *συρακουσίους* | *συρακούσιοι* | *δωριεῖς* | *δυναμιν* | *συρακουσίους* || C. 7. *ἄποθεν*—in other places *ἀποθεν* || C. 8. *ἔτοιμα*—as usual | *τὰλλα* | *καθότι*—twice | *ορθῶς* ||

In order to exhibit Hude's method clearly, I add a collation of the same nine chapters, as they appear in his text, with the same

chapters in the editions of Herwerden (Hw.), Stahl (St.) and Classen (Cl.). Spelling only counts in so far as it illustrates a principle. C. 1. *Σικελίας*. *Σικελία* Hw. | *ἐν εἰκοσι σταδίῳ* | [*ἐν*] *εἰκοσισταδίῳ* Hw. | *ἡπειρος εἶναι* | *ἡπειροῦσθαι* Hw. So Shilleto and Badham || C. 2. *τὸ ἀρχαῖον* | *τάρχαῖον* Hw. | *παλαιῆται* | *παλαιότατοι* St., Cl. | *ἐσπέραν τὴν Σικελίαν* | [*τὴν* *Σ.*] Hw. | *πρὸς τὴν Σικελίαν* Hw. brackets | *Ὀπικοὺς* | *Ὀπικας* Hw., St., Cl. But St. has since corrected this. Hude deserts the Vatican group in favour of the Laurentian and G, and this reading is supported by Dion. H. Strabo and Steph. Byz. | *οὕτω Ἰταλία* | *οὕτως* Hw., St., Cl. The only authority for the *-ς* is G and a correction in the Laurentian. [*Ἰταλία*] Hw. | *καὶ . . ὥκησαν ἔχοντες* | [*καὶ*] . . [*ὥκησαν*] Hw. | *βορρᾶν* | *βορέαν* Hw. | *ἐμπορίας ἔνεκα* | *ἔνεκεν* St., Cl., and all MSS. Hude follows stone records | *Σολόεντα* | *Σολοῦντα* Hw. | *ξυνοικίσαντες*, with the Laurentian | *ξυνοικήσαντες* St., Cl., with the Vatican | *ὅστις* | *ὅς* Hw. | *θύουσι* | *Συρακούσας* | *θύουσιν* Hw. Hude does not attempt a rule with regard to this || C. 4. *παραδότος* | So Hw., St., on Cl.'s conjecture. Cl. printed *προδότος* | *οἰκίσαι* with the Laurentian | *οἰκήσαι* Cl., with the Vatican group | *Πάμιλλον* with Herodian | *Πάμιλον* Hw., *Πάμιλλον* St., Cl., | *ἐπελθὼν* | *πλήθος ἔλθων* Hw. | *ἡ πόλις* | *ἡ πόλις†* Hw. | *καλεῖται* | *καλοῦνται* Hw., St. || C. 5. *ἐστὶ* (*τὸ δὲ δρέπανον οἱ Σικελοὶ ζάγκλον καλοῦσιν*), *ὑστερον* | *ἐστὶ*, *τὸ δὲ . . καλοῦσιν* *ὑστερον* Hw., Cl. | *τὴν πόλιν* | [*τὴν*] Hw. | *ξυμμείκτων* | *ξυμμίκτων* St., Cl.—St. has since adopted the correct form | *ἀντωνόμασε* | *†αὐτὸ† ὠνόμασε* Hw., *αὐτὸ ὦ* St., *ἀντωνόμασεν* Cl. Again a question between the Laurentian and the Vatican. Probably both readings are wrong | *χρόνῳ* | *Ἰ. ὑστερον* | χρ. ἰ. Ἰ. Hw. || C. 6. *ἐφίεμνοι . . ἄρξαι* | *ἄρξειν* Cl., [*ἄρξειν*] Hw. Cf. ii. 29, 5. Hude follows St. | *προσγεγεννημένους* | *προγ.* Hw., St., Cl. [*Ἐγεσταίων* | *τε*] . . *ἐπικαλούμενοι ὁμοροὶ γὰρ* | γε for *τε* St., *Ἐ. τε . . ἐπικαλούμενοι ὁμοροὶ γὰρ* Cl., assuming an anacoluthon, which seems improbable here | *ἐπαγαγόμενοι* | *ἐπαγόμενοι* St. | *κατείργον* | *καθείργον* Hw. | *πόλεμον* | [*Λεοντίνων*] after Cl. | π. *Λεοντίνων* St. | *διαφθείραντες* | *διαφθείροντες* St., Cl. | *μή ποτε* | *μήποτε* Hw. | *ἐκπέμψαι* | [*Πελοποννησίοις*] after Cobet | *ἐκ.* Π. Hw., St., Cl. | *ὑπολοῖπῳ* *ἐτι* | *ἔ. [ἐτι]* Hw. | *εἰσόμενοι* | Hw. brackets | C. 7. *οἶτον ἀπεκομίσαντο* | σ. *ἀνεκομ.* Hw., St., Cl. Hude's change improves the sense | *τοὺς μὲν ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς* | *μὲν* om. Hw., St., Cl. with the Vatican group | *ἄποθεν* | *ἀποθεν* St. Cl. | *δέκατον ἔτος τῷ π. ἐτελεύτα* | *τῷδε* | *ἐτελεύτα τῷ π. τῷδε* St., Cl. [*ἐτελεύτα*] Hw. This is one of the

burning questions in Thucydidean criticism || C. 8. ἦν <τέ> τι περιγίγνηται αὐτοῖς τοῦ πολέμου — an ingenious and probable correction] †τοῦ πολέμου† Hw.—καὶ <τοῦ> τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ψηφισθῆναι—the addition is quite unnecessary || C. 9. ἐς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεῖν] Hw. brackets ἐς Σ. | εἰ καὶ ἄμεινον—a combination of the Vatican and Laurentian] εἰ ἄμεινον Hw., St., Cl. | οὕτως βραχεία] οὕτω Hw., St., Cl. | πειθομένους] πιθομένους Hw. | αἰρεσθαι with the Laurentian] ἀρασθαι Hw., St., Cl. with the Vatican | νομίζων] νομίζω δ' Hw. | ἀλλ' ἢ ἂν γινώσκω] ἀλλ' ἢ ἂν γ. Hw., Cl., ἀλλὰ ἢ ἂν γ. St. | τά γε ὑπάρχοντα] τά τε ὑ. Hw., St., Cl. | τῶν ἀφανῶν καὶ μελλόντων] τῶν ἀ. [καὶ μ.] Hw. ||

Now in the first place it will be seen that the new text represents a timely protest against the tyranny of the Vatican. Hence it differs considerably from Classen's text. Another merit is that the spelling is reformed in accordance with the teaching of Herodian, Stahl and Meisterhans. In introducing corrections Hude is temperate, and his views on the subject are thus stated: 'duae maximae sunt res quibus difficultas hujus scriptoris recensendi continetur, . . unum quod memoria librorum per se ipsa haud ita magna fide digna est . . , alterum quod ea Thucydidei sermonis proprietates est, quae multa ab vulgari consuetudine dicendi abhorrentia exhibeat.'¹ But on the serious

¹ He gives in the *Not. Crit.* the more important conjectures which are not admitted into the text. A good proof of his general candour and consideration for the labours of others is found at vi. 46,

question of interpolation—a question which confronts us at the very outset—Hude has no clear views. In one sentence of his preface he admits as much as Cobet ever contended for, but just afterwards he utterly condemns the 'rationem expungendi quam Batavi invenerunt.' So would every one, were that *ratio* such a preposterous fad as Hude imagines it to be: 'pleraque quae nullo aut fere nullo sententiae damno abesse posse videntur, hi glossematum nomine expungunt.' Any one, Dane or Dutchman, who went to work on such a plan would justly incur the ridicule of the whole republic of letters. The problem is one which cannot be solved in a few lines. Was the text of Thucydides extensively annotated or edited for the use of schools before the Christian era? Was the text interpolated before Cicero's time? If to all this we answer 'no,' then Thucydides knew very little of his own language. Granted that the language was 'in the stage of infancy,' yet Thucydides could not understand the infant whose ways his contemporaries Gorgias, Antiphon, Andocides, had thoroughly mastered. Is this possible?

The printing of this book is admirable, and the Greek type is most beautiful. Would that the English printers could acquire a fount of type from Copenhagen.

E. C. MARCHANT.

where he duly recalls Roscher's proposal and defence of *ὑπάργυρα* for *ἀργυρά*, though Hude himself successfully replied to that proposal in the *N. Jahrb.* for 1889 (p. 829).

WESTERMANN'S DEMOSTHENES.

Ausgewählte Reden des Demosthenes, erklärt von ANTON WESTERMANN. Drittes Bändchen: Aristokrates, Konon, Eubulides. Dritte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von DR. EMIL ROSENBERG. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1890. 1 Mk. 80.

THIS is the third instalment of Dr. Rosenberg's reissue of Westermann's Demosthenes, in the Haupt-Sauppe series. In the revision of the text the editor has enjoyed special advantages: the new recension by Blass has been available throughout, and in the *Aristocrates*, the most important of the three speeches, the valuable labours of Weil and

his collation of MS. Σ. The variations of these two editions are given in the critical appendix, a new feature not to be found in Westermann, with whom textual criticism was a subordinate point. Rosenberg's text, however, is much more conservative than Blass's, sometimes even than Westermann's. Quoting Blass's dictum in the preface to his third volume (1889) '*dies diem docet, et alia multa fortasse olim rectius cognoscam quam adhuc cognovi*,' he remarks that in an edition like the present, *i.e.* intended for school use, the beaten path must not be quitted too often. We have failed to discover any guiding principle save that of departing as little as possible from the MSS.