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](#)

Greek Version Of Ovid's *Heroides* By Planudes *De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo*. Scripsit Alfredus Gudeman, Americanus. Berolini, 1888. 3 Mk.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 06 / June 1889, pp 269 - 270
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195198, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195198

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 269-270 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195198

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

it can only be done by a comparison with all the other crude beginnings of mediaeval romance. The value of Mr. Tunison's work—and that, notwithstanding my disagreement with many of his views, I think very considerable—is that it supplies materials

for such a study; and it has the further value that it is the only book in the English language which gives in any detail the legends themselves associated with the name of Virgil.

W. Y. SELLAR.

GREEK VERSION OF OVID'S *HEROIDES* BY PLANUDES.

De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo.
Scripsit ALFREDUS GUDEMAN, Americanus.
Berolini, 1888. 3 Mk.

THOUGH his translation of the *Metamorphoses* has been long known, by a curious fate the Greek version by Planudes of the *Heroides* has been hitherto unpublished. It is true this work had not escaped Naugierius, who quotes it on *H.* vi. 103, which Gudeman does not notice; but beyond Dilthey's disparaging account of one epistle (*De Callimachi Cydippe*, p. 139), we have as yet had no trustworthy information; and to Gudeman belongs the credit of first clearly demonstrating the value of this version, which has been transcribed for him from two MSS. by Dr. Treu. Planudes is here shown to have been a scrupulous translator, adhering usually even to the order of the words in his original; hence, if only he used a good MS., his work must be of great critical use. Though his Latin is not always as good as his Greek,—thus *degener* he connects apparently with *deus* and renders by *διογενής*,—still mistakes are rare; and the fidelity as a whole of his version is remarkable, even in such small points as the turning of the pronouns, *ille* being consistently rendered by *ἐκεῖνος*, *iste* by *οὗτος*, and *ipse* by *αὐτός*. By an exhaustive comparison of readings Gudeman shows that the Latin MS. used by Planudes, which he names D, came from the same archetype as all our MSS., that it is most nearly related to our best MS. P, though it represents a different stage of descent in the same family, that these two alone concur frequently in the genuine reading, though we are not surprised to find that D is often right where P is wrong, and the converse not seldom the case, that it belongs to a group totally different from our next best MS. G, to which it is superior, and that the same is the case to a greater extent with regard to all the other MSS. It is to be regretted that in the comparative tables Gudeman frequently gives the readings of D

in Latin as restored by him, omitting the Greek; we should like to see the Greek of the whole MS., as there are evidently some mistakes in his tables. Thus *H.* iii. 154 the Greek *δεσπότου τρόπον* shows that D read *more* not *iure*, about which Gudeman hesitates. iv. 124 *tollendi* is mistranslated *αἰξήθηται* by Planudes, thinking no doubt of such phrases as Horace's *tergeminis tollere honoribus*; there is no need with Gudeman to suppose that D read *augendi*, which will not scan. vi. 147 for *sospesque* *ἴσως* is given, whence Gudeman restores *fortasse*: rather, as is shown on p. 14, Planudes used a glossed

fortasse

MS., which read *tutus sospesque fuisses*: the *fortasse*, which was added, as is so common in Ovid MSS., to explain the subj., was mistaken by Planudes for a correction. vii. 160 *perque fugae comites, Dardana sacra, deos*: Gr. *πρὸς τὸν τῆς φυγῆς μετασχόντων σοι Δαρδανίων θεῶν*. Gudeman supposes that D had *Dardaniusque deos*; but where has the *-que* vanished to in the Greek? I suppose rather that the exegetic *Dardana sacra* is here merely paraphrased. ix. 145 *τίς ἐξέκασε* points to *quis ussit* not *urit*. Gudeman prints the Greek of the whole of the fifth epistle with the Latin, as reconstructed, side by side; here again I think he is not always right, and his Greek MS. requires some correction: l. 1 *perlege! non est, ἀλλ' ἀναγίνωσκε*. οὐδὲ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. perhaps D read *sed lege*. l. 10 *edita de magno flumine nymphe fui, μεγάλου ποταμοῦ φύσα νύμφη*. Read *μεγάλου <ἀπὸ> ποταμοῦ*, the error being due to the avoidance of dittography, for Planudes is very careful with prepositions. l. 18 *tegeret, κρύπτει*. Read *κρύπτοι*. l. 30 *recurret, δρόμοι*. D read *recurrat*, a wish. l. 38 *gelidusque cucurrit, ut mihi narrasti, dure, per ossa tremor, καὶ τρόμος ψυχρός, ὅτε μοι διηγῆσω, διέδραμε τὰ ὅσα*. Gudeman supposes that D omitted *dure*. Rather read *διηγῆσω, <ὦμέ>, διέδραμε*. l. 45 *nostros flentis ocellos, τοὺς ἡμετέρους δακρυόσας ὀφθαλμούς*. Read *δακρυόσσης*. l. 67 *terrasque cita ratis attigit*

aura, καὶ τῆς γῆς ὑπὸ ταχυνοῖς πνεύμασιν ἄπτεται ἡ ναὺς. D read clearly *terrasque citis ratis attigit auris*, perhaps rightly, as the sigmatism is quite Ovidian, cp. *M.* xiii. 397, xv. 169. *T.* ii. 538. l. 86 εἰσὶ μοι χεῖρες αἷς ἂν δύνατο πρέπον τὸ σκῆπτρον. Read πρέπειν. l. 100 ἦ τις οὕτω ταχύς ἐστράφη. Read ταχύ. In xiii. 60 for *quota quemque* P is read *quotacumque* by D = P², which I suspect is right; *quota quemque* arose from the spelling *quotacumque*, cp Bersu, *Die Gutturalen* p. 87. n. Gudeman shows in an interesting

section on the life of Planudes that his death is usually put too late, that he was born 1250-1260 A.D., translated the *Heroides* about 1295, and died not before 1302, and not long after 1310. The dissertation is scholarly, and we shall look forward with interest for fresh work from this young American: if he would publish the whole version of Planudes, he would do a great service to Philology.

S. G. OWEN.

LA RHÉTORIQUE ET SON HISTOIRE.

La Rhétorique et son Histoire. Par A. ED. CHAIGNET. Paris, 1888. 10 frs.

M. CHAIGNET'S protest (with which the book begins) against the abandonment, in the French Lycées and Colleges, of Rhetoric, i.e. of the study of the principles of eloquence, poetry, and other literature, for the mere historical *résumé* of practical results or products of an art, is entirely out of accord with the dominant note of our present practical age and especially of our modern educational systems and text-books, the main object of which, at least in literature, seems to be to discourage independent thought and observation as a training of the mind, and to substitute instead facilities for storing up ready-made the thoughts of others and those useful facts and rote-lessons which appear most likely to secure the main object of early life, success in examinations.

Still books like the above may after all be welcome to the few who believe that there are phenomena in literature quite as interesting as in natural science, and deserving just the same sort of scientific observation and analysis as that study: and even those who think that Rhetoric is dead may perhaps be inclined to read an obituary account of a system which was developed by the greatest of philosophers and helped to produce some of the grandest literature of ancient times and some of the best orators not only of Greece and Rome but of France and England.

The preface is good and interesting and one may add characteristic; certainly the note on p. xiii. (in which M. Sainte-Beuve's 'naturalist' method of studying literary phenomena by tracing them back to inherited maternal influences is touched on,

and his omission of all reference to the father explained *par les difficultés de la recherche de la paternité*) is more French than English. The next part is a history of Rhetoric in 66 pages, very readable, if not original, tracing the early development of the terms and divisions familiar to the student of Cicero and Quintilian. Then follows the main work, which is an attempt, suggested by Fénelon, to weave into one work the best rules and observations of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian and others.

Part I is devoted to a general survey of the subject and to the usual definitions of Rhetoric and its distinctive divisions. Part II. (*Inventio*) reproduces in nearly all its details and mostly in the same order the main subjects of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Books I. and II., illustrated of course from other works of Aristotle and from Cicero and Quintilian, as well as a large extract from the *Politics* on the theory of governments—in all about 250 pp. Part III. discusses the structure and the five (or six) divisions of the speech at much less length, in 65 pp., of which, strangely, three pages only are given to the peroration. Part IV. finishes the work, with about 130 pp. on style, tropes, and figures. These two last parts naturally reproduce Cicero and Quintilian more than Aristotle.

The work as a whole is somewhat diffuse and popular, yet not free from a good many of those technical importations from later rhetoricians which eventually ruined Rhetoric as an art. At the same time it is very much more readable than Volkmann's useful summary (*Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer*). The last part is the best. The illustrations from Bossuet brighten the subject, and it is a pity that more in this way has not been done