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](#)

The 'Ancient Vulgate' of Plato and Vind. F

H. Stuart Jones

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 08 / November 1902, pp 388 - 391

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206677, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206677

How to cite this article:

H. Stuart Jones (1902). The 'Ancient Vulgate' of Plato and Vind. F. The Classical Review, 16, pp 388-391 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206677

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

γὰρ τοῦ ἱατροῦ οὔτε τοῦ κυβερνήτου ἔργον ἐστὶ τὸ ἢ πεῖσαι ἢ τὸ βιάσασθαι τοῦ μὲν τοὺς θεραπευομένους τοῦ δὲ τοὺς πλωτήρας. This seems strongly to support the contention that the Platonic *οἰομένους* refers to the true

pilot, while the Platonic passage would indicate that the subject of the Aristotelian *ἀρχή* was not the indefinite *τις* (so Newman) but ὁ πολιτικός.

THE 'ANCIENT VULGATE' OF PLATO AND VIND. F.

PROFESSOR BURNET's article on 'A Neglected MS. of Plato,' in *C.R.* xvi., 98 ff. and Mr. Adam's review of Prof. Burnet's text of the *Republic* in *C.R.* xvi., 215 ff. have initiated the discussion of a question whose solution is of the highest importance to the textual critic of Plato. Prof. Burnet, in his introduction, repeats with approval the statement of Schneider with regard to Vind. F, 'Veterem vulgatam repraesentat, et fere cum Stobaeo, Eusebio etc. consentit.' To this he adds, 'Mirum in modum consentire solet hic liber cum Iamblichi Galeni Stobaei Eusebii aliorum testimoniis, quae res vel ex mea adnotatione satis apparebit,' and thereupon hails with joy 'diu quaesitum antiquioris recensionis testem.' In *C.R.* xvi. 99 Prof. Burnet lays down the proposition that 'the original of Vind. F was not only older than our oldest MSS.; it was quite independent of the common archetype of ADM, and followed the recension used by Galen, Iamblichus, Stobaeus, Clement, Eusebius and other writers of the first five centuries after Christ.' He then adduces the agreement of W¹ with the Armenian version on the one hand and ancient quotations on the other as a proof of the theory that 'there was an "ancient vulgate" of Plato's text, while our MSS. represent a recension made possibly about the ninth century A.D.'

Mr. Adam, in his review of Prof. Burnet's text, concedes 'for the sake of argument' that F represents the 'ancient vulgate,' although he afterwards speaks hesitatingly as to the existence of such a 'vulgate,' and confines himself to arguing that its authority is at least no greater than that of the old MSS.

It appears to me that the previous question as to the existence of an 'antiquior recensio' of the Platonic text, used by the writers of the first five centuries A.D., deserves a closer examination than it has hitherto

received. It would no doubt be necessary, in order to a final solution of the problem, to undertake a thorough examination of the text, not merely of the *Republic*, but also of other dialogues; Prof. Burnet, however, claims that his own *apparatus criticus* furnishes a sufficient proof of his thesis, and it would certainly seem that the facts therein set forth do enable us to form a judgment on the question at issue, though not, as I believe, that upheld by Prof. Burnet.

First let me say that it seems necessary to set out with a strictly defined conception of what is meant by the term 'vulgate.' As applied to printed books the word denotes a 'commercial' text reproduced in successive editions with no pretence at critical revision. The distinguishing mark of such a text is naturally its uniformity. In the ancient world the same phenomenon may be observed in the transmission of classical texts; the Homeric 'vulgate' affords a conspicuous example of a 'commercial' text such as those to which I have referred: but owing to the want of a purely mechanical process of reproduction the limits of variation are much greater than in modern books. At the same time, as has been shown by Mr. Allen and others in the case of Homer, such a 'commercial' text became so far fixed that the collation of a few MSS. of no special excellence would be sufficient to produce a text satisfactory on the whole.

We have now to ask firstly, whether such a text of the Platonic dialogues obtained currency in ancient times, and secondly, whether (if so) it is represented in the case of the *Republic* by Vind. F.

The witnesses to whom Prof. Burnet appeals in giving an affirmative answer to the first question are certain writers of the Christian era. The earliest of those whom he names is Galen; of the others two are Neo-Platonists, two Ecclesiastical writers and the last the compiler Stobaeus. Quotations from the *Republic* are also found in writers other than those enumerated by Prof. Burnet, e.g., Plutarch, Justin, Athen-

¹ W does not, of course, contain the *Republic*. Prof. Burnet had drawn attention to the fact, and deduced from it the theory of the 'Vulgate,' in the preface to his first volume.

aeus, Theon and Proclus. It must be admitted that if proof could be adduced that these writers, belonging to different centuries and schools of literature, were in possession of a substantially uniform text of Plato, there would be considerable justification for speaking of an 'ancient vulgate' of Plato. But is this the case?

There is no passage in the *Republic* for which so much external evidence is available as the Vision of Er. The *testimonia* are drawn from Plutarch, Theon, the Fathers of the Church, the Neo-Platonists and Stobaeus, so that here if anywhere we shall find a test case by which to try Prof. Burnet's theory. Now his *apparatus criticus* reveals as plainly as could be desired the fact that these authors do *not* quote from a 'vulgate' text. The Ardiaeus of Proclus, for example, is Aridaeus in the text used by the Christian writers. A number of readings are quoted by Prof. Burnet as supported by one ancient authority only; and the extent of the variation between the texts current in later antiquity may be gauged by such instances as the following:—

614^b 8 οὐν Proclus Stobaeus; αἰ Eusebius Theodoretus.

615^a 3 χυλίετη Proclus: χυλίετιν Stobaeus.

615^d 1 οὐδ' ἂν ἤξει Justinus Stobaeus: ἂν om. Proclus.

615^e 6 διαλαβόντες Proclus: ἰδίᾳ λαβόντες Stobaeus; ἰδίᾳ παραλαβόντες Clemens Eusebius.

616^a 3 κνάμπτοντες Proclus Clemens Eusebius: γνάμπτοντες Justinus.

616^b 6 προσφερέῃ Proclus Stobaeus: ἐμφερές Theo.

No passage, as has been said already, furnishes so ready a means of testing the accuracy of the theory which postulates an 'ancient vulgate': but there are other important variations in the text of ancient quotations which point in the direction indicated above. Thus the reading ἀποδράς, adopted by Prof. Burnet in *Rep.* 329^e 4, is due to Theon, whereas ἀποφυγών is found in Clement and Stobaeus. Which is that of the 'vulgate'? There are no doubt passages in which various ancient writers appear to have had the same or similar recensions of the text before them. Thus in ii. 361 the Christian writers generally agree in readings which differ from those of our MSS.; yet even here Eusebius and Theodoret disagree in two places (361^b 5 and 361^c 5). In iv. 422 Eusebius and Stobaeus agree in three readings but disagree in three others. In vii. 531 Theon and Eusebius disagree in

every important case. Certainly there is nothing in such facts as these—and they are typical—to countenance the theory that the text used by the writers of the first five centuries A.D. partook of the nature of a 'vulgate.'

We now pass to the consideration of Vind. F and its readings. The question, indeed, which we proposed at the outset no longer demands an answer, since the existence of an 'ancient vulgate' appears more than doubtful. At the same time it is not to be denied that in a number of instances the reading of F coincides with that of one or more ancient writers and differs from that of ADM. When, however, we examine these instances we find that the statements quoted from Prof. Burnet at the beginning of this article cannot be maintained without modification. It will be convenient to treat the cases of different ancient writers separately.

I. Galen's testimony is available in the following sections of the *Republic*.

(a) II. 368. Here he has the following readings:—δοκῶ 368^d 1 (adopted by Prof. Burnet): ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς 368^e 2: πάλιν τῆς 368^e 3: μείζων 368^e 5 (so too Proclus): ἂν εἴη 368^e 7. *In no case does F agree with Galen.*

(b) III. 407. Galen has:—τί γε for γε τί 407^b 4 in which F agrees, and διατάσεις 407^e 2, to which reading F has been corrected.

(c) III. 410. Galen has:—γε μὴν (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 410^b 5: κάκεῖν ἐπεγείρων 410^b 6: μεταχειρίζονται 410^b 8. *In no case does F agree.*

(d) IV. 435/436. Galen has:—γ' omitted 435^e 9: αἷς δὲ 435^d 1: ἄλλη (an important variant, adopted by Prof. Burnet) 435^d 3: τε 436^b 9: διομολογησόμεθα 436^e 8: στρόμβοι 436^d 5: ἀποδεχοίμεθα (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 436^d 8: καὶ (om. MSS., adopted by Prof. Burnet) 436^e 4: ἔστιν omitted 436^e 6. *In no case does F agree.*

(e) IV. 439/441. Galen has:—θηρίον 439^b 4 (so too Stobaeus): τῷ γε αὐτῷ τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ 439^b 5: πᾶρτεν 439^b 6: εἴη ἂν (for ἂν εἴη) 439^e 4: τοῦτο 439^e 6 (so too Stobaeus): αὖ omitted 439^e 9 (so too Stobaeus); μὲν 439^e 10 (so too Stobaeus): <χαλεπαίνειν καὶ> πολεμεῖν 440^a 5: πολλάκις 440^a 8: ζεῖ (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 440^c 7: νικᾶν...λίγειν 440^d 1: ἐκεῖ omitted 441^b 4. *In only two readings (εἴη ἂν for ἂν εἴη, and μὲν [om. MSS.]) does F agree with Galen, while M agrees with Galen and Stobaeus in τοῦτο.*

and D with the same authorities in omitting αὐ. Moreover the readings of Galen and Stobaeus, though agreeing in the cases mentioned above, are widely divergent in several others, so that in this passage at least it would be hard to maintain either that an 'ancient vulgate' was in existence, or that it was 'represented' by any one of our MSS.

(f) V. 451—456 passim. Galen has:—*ταῖς μὲν* (om. MSS.) 451^a 1: *τε* omitted 452^a 2: *τε* (om. MSS.) 452^a 5: *λέγομεν* 453^b 2: *κατοικήσεως* 453^b 4: *δ'* omitted 453^b 9: *νυνὶ* 453^c 3: *τεῖνον τὰ* (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 454^d 1: *ἔχοντα* 454^d 2: *γε* (om. MSS., except F) 454^e 5: *ὀλίγω* 455^a 5: *τοῦ* 455^c 5: *πάμπλου* (so *toc* Eusebius) 455^d 1: *τί* 455^e 4: *δὲ ἄρ' ἢ* 456^a 1: *καὶ* (for *οὐδὲ*) 456^a 1: *ἢ μὲν* (om. MSS. and Eusebius) 456^a 11: *ὁ δ' ἰσχυρότερος* 456^a 11: *αἱ* om. 456^b 1: *φυλάττειν* 456^b 2. Here we have some minor agreements with F; twice the particle *γε* is found in both authorities, but not in the old MSS.: the two remaining cases are the common errors *λέγομεν* for *λέγωμεν* and *κατοικήσεως* for *κατοικίσεως*, which are in all probability the result of coincidence. *For none of the really important variants in the latter part of the passage is common to Galen and F: while the texts of Galen and Eusebius differ materially.*

(g) IX. 581. Galen has *ὅτι* 581^a 6: *τοῦ* omitted 581^a 6. *In neither case does F agree.*

II. Iamblichus furnishes a considerable amount of external testimony to the text of book VII. We extract the following readings from Prof. Burnet's *apparatus criticus*.

παρὰ πᾶν 514^a 4: *ἦν εἶναι* 514^b 4: *ὑποδομῆ- μένον* 514^b 4: *δεικνύουσιν* 514^b 6: *οὐ ταῦτα* 515^b 4: *ὄντα* 515^b 5 (and probably also Proclus): *ὀνομάζειν* 515^b 5 (where F and Proclus have *νομίζειν*): *ἢ* 515^c 5: *αὐτὸ* 515^d 2: *τε* (for *τότε*) 515^d 6: *πάντως δήπου* (for *πολύ γ' ἔφη*) 515^d 8: *νῦν* omitted 516^a 3: *σεληνῶν* 516^b 1: *τε* (om. MSS.) 516^b 6: *ἦσαν αὐτοῖς* 516^c 8: *περὶ* 516^c 8: *εἰωθε* 516^d 1: *καὶ* omitted 516^e 7: *ἀμβλυνοπεῖ* 516^e 9: *παρέχοι* 517^a 2: *ἀνίεναι* 517^a 4: *ὥς ἀληθῶς τοῖς* (for *τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν*) 517^b 1: *αὐτῇ* (for *αὐτῇ* or *αὐτῇ*) 517^c 4: *παρεχομένη* 517^c 4: *νοῆσαι* 518^b 6: *οἶον* 518^b 7: *σφέις* omitted 518^c 1: *ἐκάστω* 518^c 5: *τὸ* omitted 518^d 5: *δεῖ μη-χανήσασθαι* 518^d 7: *μὲν* transposed 519^a 2: *τὰ* (om. MSS.) 519^b 2: *φιλομάθειαν* 521^a 6: *ἀληθινὴν* 521^a 8: *ἐπ'* (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 523^d 1: *οὐδ' ἐγερτικὸν* omitted 523^e 1: *αὐτῶν τινα* 523^e 4: *ἡ μαλακότης* omitted

523^e 6: *δηλώσονσιν* 523^e 7: *αὐτῇ* 524^a 7: *μεταχειρίσασθαι* 526^a 7: *εἰσὶν* omitted 527^c 5: *ἔτι ἀδυναμία* (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 532^b 9: *τὸ* (for *τότε*) 532^c 6: *ἀοράτω* 532^d 1: *καὶ* omitted 536^b 5: *φιλομαθείας* 536^b 5: *παισιν* omitted (so too Stobaeus: but Theon has *πᾶσιν* and F reads *παισί*) 537^c 1: *τε* (found in F Theo Stobaeus, but omitted by ADM) 537^c 2. Out of all these readings only four are found in F: one is *αὐτῇ* for *αὐτῇ* (*αὐτῇ* D), two are omissions of *καὶ*, one—and the only one which we might perhaps call that of the 'ancient vulgate'—the addition of *τε*. Not one of the really important variants given by Iamblichus recurs in F.

Iamblichus' testimony is also available for IX. 589—591. The following readings are found in his text: *ἐαυτῷ* 589^a 4 (*ἐαυτοῦ* MSS., *αὐτοῦ* Stobaeus): *εἰς ἐλευθερίαν* (also Stobaeus: omitted by MSS.) 590^a 7: *βούλε-ται* (also Stobaeus and [possibly] F) 590^a 1: *τῶν* 591^a 1: *τοῦτω* 591^a 1: *τὰ* omitted 591^c 2: *ζήσει* (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 591^c 7: *φανέεται* (adopted by Prof. Burnet) 591^d 3: *εἰς* (om. MSS.) 591^d 8. Only in the doubtful case of *βούλεται* does F agree with Iamblichus: while in the important variant *ζήσει*—the true reading—Iamblichus is supported not by F but by M, just as *δεῖ μηχανήσασθαι* is read by A and Iamblichus in 518^d 7.

I have examined the cases of Galen and Iamblichus with special minuteness because the results are such as to demonstrate beyond the possibility of doubt that Prof. Burnet's statement as to F—*mirum in modum consentit cum Iamblichi Galeni...testimoniis*—cannot be upheld. It will not be necessary to deal minutely with the cases of the other ancient writers who cite passages of the *Republic*. The principal of these are Eusebius and Stobaeus: and it may be said at the outset that it would no doubt be possible to frame a not inconsiderable list of passages in which the reading of F agrees with that of one (or perhaps both) of those writers. At the same time the following propositions may also be laid down without fear of contradiction.

(a) That the cases of agreement between F Eus. and F Stob. are *much* less frequent and less important than those in which they differ: for example the consensus of F Stob. in the reading *τὸ* for *τὰ* 444^c 2 is followed by a series of the widest divergences down to the end of Book IV.

(b) That the text to which Eus. and Stob. bear witness is on the whole very inferior

to that of our MSS. I should not, it is true, describe it as an 'ancient vulgate,' but I should at any rate assert that it represents the 'commercial' texts which circulated amongst the reading public rather than the more scholarly editions in the hands of Galen and Iamblichus.

(c) That in a considerable proportion of the instances in which the reading of F Stob. (or F Eus.) is obviously to be preferred to that of ADM, the palaeographical difference involved is too small to afford any presumption of a distinct recension used by the scribe of F and by the ancient authorities. In other words—it may be conceded that F in several cases preserves the true reading where it has been corrupted in ADM, and further that in a certain proportion of these the right reading is confirmed by ancient quotations. For example, both F and Stobaeus have *φαμὲν* (rightly) in 490^c 2 against *φαίμεν* of ADM: yet no one would affirm that *φαμὲν* was the reading of the 'ancient vulgate' merely: *φαίμεν* is an example of an extremely common error. So too F and Eusebius have *ἐθῆ* (rightly) in 522^a 7, where ADM by a very frequent corruption have *ἐφῆ*—certainly not owing to any 'recension.' It is unnecessary to multiply such examples, which I merely adduce in proof of the fact that the agreements of 'F Stob.' 'F. Eus.' &c., which are to be found in Prof. Burnet's critical apparatus are not all of equal value in demonstrating the relationship of F to an assumed 'vulgate': many of them prove

only (what indeed all scholars will be grateful to Prof. Burnet for bringing into strong relief) that F must rank as a witness independent of ADM.

And this leads me to add a word in conclusion as to the value to be assigned to this MS., whether we regard it as the ancestor of Ang. B and Flor. R or, as Mr. Adam suggests, merely the senior representative of the group. I have already said that Prof. Burnet has rendered a great service to students of Plato by employing it to correct the errors of ADM and thus to a considerable extent rendering an appeal to the MSS. of the Renaissance (esp. *Ξq*) superfluous. An examination of its readings must, I think, convince the open-minded that it follows a tradition not derivable from ADM. At the same time I cannot think that it is safe to pronounce it unhesitatingly (as Prof. Burnet does in his preface) 'sincerum nec aliunde ut fit interpolatum.' The well-known reading <οὐ> κατὰ τὴν χρείαν 330^c 6 (which is *not* supported by Stobaeus) bears the stamp of an unintelligent conjecture, and is in fact found in the MSS. of which such unfortunate emendations are characteristic. Another instance in which the scribe of F or its ancestor has endeavoured to improve the traditional text is ἀδικεῖν ἀδικεῖ for ἀδικεῖν ἀδικεῖν 360^b 8. We must therefore, I fear, regard its unsupported readings with something (though, as I allow, with *relatively* little) of the scepticism with which those e.g. of *Ξq* are rightly treated.

H. STUART JONES.

ARETHAS AND THE CODEX CLARKIANUS.

UNDER this title Professor Burnet, the learned editor of the Oxford Plato, has commented in the June number of the *Classical Review* on a short article which I had contributed to the February number 'On some corrections in the Clarke MS. of Plato.'

From the fact that both this famous Codex and the oldest MS. of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius were written for Arethas, the one in A.D. 895, and the other in A.D. 914, I was naturally led to compare carefully the texts of the principal passage common to the two MSS., *Phaedo* 96 A—C=Eus. *P.E.* 26 b 8. I thus became convinced that certain corrections in *Clarkianus* (1) were

written by the hand which is generally admitted to be that of Arethas himself, and (2) were either taken from or 'made to correspond with the text of Eusebius as reproduced by the scribe Baanes from some older MS. now lost.'

On the former point Professor Burnet writes that he has 'no desire to dispute this belief which is held by many scholars of repute,' but then proceeds to give reasons for still hesitating to accept it. Those reasons had been considered and, I think, sufficiently answered in my article; but in order to remove all lingering doubt as to the probability of the rich owner of an important MS. writing corrections with his