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](#)

**Herwerden's *Pax APISTOΦANOYΣ EIPHNH* cum
scholiorum antiquorum excerptis recognovit et
adnotavit H. van Herwerden. 2 vols. Lugduni
Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1897. 8 fl. 15.**

F. W. Hall

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 03 / April 1898, pp 165 - 167
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025786, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025786

How to cite this article:

F. W. Hall (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 165-167 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025786

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

i.e. at least six times, less than six times, or only once. The uncertainty of such an arrangement is obvious; but it is better to have a 'rough and ready' list than to have no list at all. And it is extremely interesting to get a bird's-eye view of these dialectal names *Magius*, *Jubellius*, *Blossius* and the like. They seem to transfer one to quite a new world of vocabulary; and a careful study of them could not fail to produce valuable results for the Ethnography of ancient Italy. I trust that some reader of Prof. Conway's book will be impelled to undertake for the Names of Italy what Prof. Fick has done for the Greek Names, and will add to the names supplied by the Indices to the *Corpus* those that are scattered through the writings of ancient authors.

Here are some small matters which have occurred to me in reading Prof. Conway's pages: (p. 31) *proiecitad* of the Luceria inscription (*C.I.L.* ix. 782) will, if we admit Osc. *tt* for *ss*, be equivalent to **proiecissat* (cf. *incipissat*), as *fundatid*, *parentatid* of the same inscr. to *fundassit*, *parentassit*; (p. 42)

why *Anīmula* in Plaut. *Mil.* 648 rather than *Anīmula*?; (p. 50) Prof. Conway's identification of Osc. *Evklūi* with Hesychius' *Εὔκολος* *Ἐρμῆς παρὰ Μεταποντίους* seems certainly right; (p. 223) the *s* of Lat. *rosa* has been admirably explained by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Comm. Metr.* ii. 21; (p. 321) for 'Magulini' read *Magulnii*; (p. 512) how can Lat. *pār* Neut. correspond to **pāros* as *vir* to **vīros*?; (p. 597) *baetere* not 'betere' seems to be the true form of the Verb, the *ae* becoming *i* in compounds, *ad-būtere*, etc.; (p. 603) the connection of Lat. *dignus* and *decet* should, I think, be abandoned; (p. 615) the explanation of *eēhiā*- as **eevehiiā*—connected with Lat. *veho* is supported by Skutsch's discovery that *akkāto*- was the Oscan form of Lat. *advocatus*; (p. 616) Osc. *eituns* would surely be Lat. **itōnes* not **ēlōnes*; (p. 625) is Osc. *Herukinaī* (epithet of the Oscan Venus) not to be explained as *Erycinae*?; (p. 637) why does the *a* of *Numasioi* show it to be a distinct formation from *Numerius*? Would not *Nūmāsio*- become *Numerio*-?

W. M. LINDSAY.

HERWERDEN'S *PAX*.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ cum scholiorum antiquorum excerptis recognovit et annotavit H. VAN HERWERDEN. 2 vols. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1897. 8 fl. 15.

THIS is an elaborate but yet not quite a satisfactory edition of the *Pax*. The most valuable part of the book should be the text, in constituting which Herwerden has used a collation of the Ravennas made by himself in 1856, and a collation of Venetus 474 made by Cobet in 1842. Such a text ought to be distinctly in advance of those current, which still depend on Bekker's collations of R. and V.

When recently in Venice I was allowed through the kindness of the authorities of the Marciana to take about forty photographs of the text of the *Pax* as given by V. I have compared Cobet's collation very carefully with these. In many passages he restores to us the correct reading which Bekker missed:—e.g. 469 ἀλλ' ἄγε τὸν ξυνάλεκτον (which perhaps supports Dobree's ἀλλ' ἄγετε ξυνανέλεκε). 1040 θυλήματα. 1195 ἐπεισφόρει. 227 παρασκευάζετε. But I have

noted the following passages in which the collation fails:—56 V. has γὰρ not μὲν. 113 V. has λάθραι. 133 V. has αἰετοῦ. 137 V. has μέλ' ἐάν not μέλε δν. 246 It should be noted that V. has ὦ Μέγαρο, Μέγαρο(α), (α) being erased. The hiatus perhaps explains the corruption in ἐπιτρέψεσθ'. 282 V. anticipates Porson by reading Λακεδαιμονίοισιν. 355

τέ V. reads καττρίμμεθα (sic) in rasura. 374 V. μοι νῦν not νῦν μοι. 386 V. R. read ἐμοῦ not ἐμοῦ γε (? γε comes from Ald.). 402 κλέπτει τε V. The old report that αἱ τε are in ras. is correct. 446 The old report of V. πάσχοιτο τοιαῦταθ' is right. 473 Τρυγ. praef R.] so too V. 528 V. assigns to Τρυγ. 584 V. reads ἐδάμην not ἐδάμην. 628, 630 V. marks the speaker by a line only. 703 V. reads ἰδὼν not ὁρῶν. 704 V. reads γεγενῆσθ' ἐν τῇ πόλει. 711 V. has καταγέλασας written in ras. 717 V. has κατέδει not κατέδη. 939 V. omits μὲν with S. (Ven. 475). 746 V. also reads ἐπαθ' (? corr.). 759 V. has ἡμῶν. 864 V. has φανεί. 932 V. has λέγη not λέγει. 953 V. has τοῦθ' εὔ. 986 V. S. read ἡμῖν. 1144 V. reads ἄφαυε not ἄφευε. 1226 V. ποήση not ποήσει. 1240 τί δ' ἀρα V. as

S. 1344 V. ^οπρεταγμένους [προστ. R.]. It is worth noting that *πρ* in V. = *προσ*. Cobet was aware of this as is shown by his reading *προσερεῖ* in V. in *Vespae* 21.

Cobet's collation of V. has been known hitherto only from the excerpts which he gave to his friend Hirschig for an edition of the *Vespae* published in 1847. These give the reading accurately in nearly every case. I can only suppose that he was not satisfied with the accuracy of the other parts of his collation as he never published them during his lifetime.

I have tested parts of Herwerden's own collation of R. by a collation of that MS. in my possession. In some readings not noticed by Bekker, they agree e.g. 379 σὺ 458 καλοῖς 808 εἶχεν 1122 κωιδίων. I have marked the following discrepancies. 7 περικυκλήσας (H. περικυλίσας). 52 ὑπὲρ τοῦτοισιν (H. ὑπὲρ τούτων). 101 ἐπικλείειν (H. ἐπικλείην). 163 θ' (H. δ'). 165 Πειραεῖ. 185 ἐστιν (H. ἐστ'). 187 om. R. 314 καὶ om. R. 386 ἐμοῦ (H. ἐμοῦ γε). 553 R. also has καὶ ἀκοντίον. 568 R. om. αὐτῶν. 943 R. V. τοῦθ' εἰ (H. τοῦδ' εἰ). 1054 φρασεῖ' (H. φράσεθ').

It must be confessed that neither Cobet's collation of V. nor Herwerden's of R. gives a completely trustworthy account of what is contained in those manuscripts. It is to be hoped that Zacher will not be long in finishing the critical edition of Aristophanes begun by Von Velsen.

Herwerden gives no account of the manuscripts of the play beyond the bare enumeration on p. ii. Hence it is difficult to know whether he has any valid reasons (beyond deference to the authority of Blaydes to whom he dedicates his book), for treating S.¹ throughout as a manuscript of independent value. Certainly Cobet is in no two minds about the matter. 'Die codex [S.] is eene copie van den eersten [V.], gemaakt (zonder twijfel op last van Bessarion) door een Graeculus, die heerlijk mooi schreef, en vrij sterk was in het onteijferen van compendia, quibus horrent maxime Scholia, maar die bitter weinig Grieksch kende of liever gedachtenloos en als een ware ezel overschreef, zoodat die varianten bespottelijk zijn. (Brieven

¹ i.e. Venetus Marc. 475 usually known as G. Blaydes quotes it as S. Herwerden confuses his readers by quoting it sometimes as G. (e.g. in crit. notes on ὑποθέσεις) sometimes as S., sometimes as Ven. 475. He adds to the confusion by calling the Florentine Γ sometimes G. (notes on 682, 752, 948), and sometimes Q. (n. 700).

p. 328). Zacher, while admitting that it contains corrections from the interpolated Parisian group, holds as strongly to the opinion that it is a copy of V. After examining the MS. for a considerable time, I see no reason for rejecting this view. Where S. has a good reading, V. often has the reading, but has been wrongly reported by Bekker. [e.g. *Vesp.* 1107, V. also reads ἐυλλεγόντες: *ibid.* 678 V. has σὺ δὲ not σὺ δὲ γ': in *Pax* 932 λέγει is in V. I feel inclined to doubt Blaydes' report of S. in *Pax* 584 where he credits it with the good reading ἐδάμην for the corrupt ἐδάμην]. Nearly all the variants which H. quotes in his excerpts from the Scholia as due to S. will be found to resolve themselves either into readings which are actually in V. but have been wrongly reported or else into misreadings of what V. gives. Instances of the former may be found in H.'s notes *passim*. I will merely quote l. 870 where V. has the note ἐς τὸ ὀχεῖν etc. as well as S., and l. 890 where V. also contains the words μονομαχοῦντι τὴν ἀρχήν. A striking instance of the ignorant blundering of the scribe of S. in copying V. is to be seen in note on l. 735. Here H. prints, παράβασιν ἐκάλουν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραβαίνειν τὸν χορὸν ἀπὸ τῆς νενομισμένης <κομματικῆς addit Ven. 475> στάσεως κτλ. On turning to V. it is quite clear what has happened. The scribe of V. has written in the left hand margin against 729, where the chorus begins, κομμα(τιον) χο(ροῦ) [see also in R.]. This projects into the marginal scholia and comes between the line of the note which ends with νενομισμένης and the line beginning with στάσεως. The scribe of S. has read the word as κομματικῆς and as part of the scholion.

I think that what I have said will show that there are errors in the critical treatment of the text and scholia. The introduction to the book contains a useful summary of what is known or conjectured about the play. Perhaps undue prominence is given to a refutation of Paley's views about the scenic arrangements. The commentary is certainly too long and contains many notes on the usage of compound words in Aristophanes that anybody could construct for himself with the aid of Caravella's vocabulary.

I should like to take the opportunity of suggesting two alterations in the text of the play which have occurred to me.

ἐξεφύσθησεν τοσοῦτον πόλεμον ὥστε τῷ
καπνῷ
πάντας Ἕλληνας δακρῦσαι, τοὺς τ' ἐκεί
τούς τ' ἐνθάδε.

612. ὡς δ' ἄπαξ τὸ πρῶτον ἄκουσ'† ἐψόφησεν
ἀμπελος...
οὐκέτ' ἦν οὐδεὶς ὁ παύσων, ἦδε δ' ἠφανί-
ζετο.

612. ἄκουσ'] codd. except *Parisinus* B which
has ἤκουσ'.
ἤχοῦσ' Fl. Christianus. *τμηθεῖω*' Reiske.
ἠβῶσ' S. Widman.
ἀφθεῖς Blaydes, (adopted by Her-
werden.)

All these proposals depart too far from the reading in the manuscripts to explain the corruption satisfactorily. All assume that ἄκουσ' is the only corrupt word in the line. The only scholar who has suspected that the corruption has gone further is Richter who proposed ὡς δὲ πὺξ τὰ πρῶτα πληγείω' or ὡς δὲ π. τὸ πρῶτον ἀλγοῦσ' 'inepte' according to Blaydes who adds 'sine causa in ὡς ἄπαξ τὸ πρῶτον offendit.' R.'s conjectures were hardly felicitous, but I think he was rightly 'offended' with the phrase ὡς ἀπ. τὸ πρῶτον, which seems as intolerable in Greek as 'when once for the first time' would be in English. I can find no closer parallel to it than the fragment of Sophocles quoted in Plutarch *Q.C.* p. 732 D, ἅπαντα τὰ γένητα <τὰ γένη τοῦ codd.> πρῶτον ἦλθ' <ἦλθεν codd.> ἄπαξ. Believing τὸ πρῶτον to be corrupt I should like to suggest that the line be read

ὡς δ' ἄπαξ τὸ πῦρ ἀκούουσ' (or ἀκούσας')
ἐψόφησεν ἀμπ.

In V. τὸ πρῶτον is usually written τὸ πρ τ and more often than not the τ is written above the line. A careless or ignorant scribe could easily mistake τὸ πῦρ for this compendium of τὸ πρῶτον, especially as in such handwriting as that of the scribe of the Venetus the letter υ is so closely looped into the letter following that πρ and πῦρ are often hardly distinguishable.

The corruption of ἀκούουσ' or ἀκούσας' to ἄκουσ' will on this view be the result of an ignorant attempt to mend the metre. With this alteration the line becomes as natural as *Acharn.* 923 κείπερ λάβοιτο τῶν νεῶν τὸ πῦρ ἄπαξ.

In 871 *sq.* I should like to suggest an alteration in the *personae* so that the passage should read,

TPYT. ἴθι νῦν ἀποδῶμεν τήνδε τὴν Θεωρίαν
ἀνύσαντε τῇ βούλῃ—OIK. τίς αὐτῆί;
(Dobree)

<TPYT.> τί φῆς;
αὕτη Θεωρία 'στιν. <OIK.> ἦν ἡμέεις
ποτε

ἐπαίωμεν Βραυρωνάδ' ὑποπεπυκότες;

F. W. HALL.

SCHOEMANN—LIPSIIUS' GREEK ANTIQUITIES.

Griechische Alterthümer von G. F. SCHOEMANN,
vierte Auflage neu bearbeitet von J. H.
Lipsius. Erster Band; Das Staatswesen.
Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
1897. 12 M.

THIS book is a worthy product of an age of re-editing, of a generation which seeks to save great scientific works from becoming partially obsolete. This process is, for obvious reasons, more necessary in Greek Constitutional History than in most kindred subjects; and all who value Schömann will be thankful that this service has been performed, and should be grateful that it has been entrusted to the hands which produced the second edition of the *Attische Process.* But the problem of re-editing was not quite the same in the two cases. The *Griechische Alterthümer* was a work of a more literary and in the best sense 'popular' character, and it required larger additions

to be made to it—additions which could not well be specified by the sometimes convenient square brackets; hence the alterations in the present work have been incorporated in the text, and the notes have been fused with those of the original author. Only those who have attempted to bring a book 'up to date' know how difficult it is to secure uniformity of style in such a case. This task the editor has most successfully accomplished; the new matter has been skilfully interwoven with the old, and the occasional inequalities observable in the work are due to the fact that re-writing has been indulged in only where it was absolutely necessary. Some of the earlier portions of the book which deal with the general political development of Greece give the impression of not always containing the newest information. An editor may afford to neglect the passing vagaries of the archaeologist, interpreter and emender; but