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](#)

Plutarchi Moralia *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia recognovit*. Gregorius N. Bernardakis. Vol. I. Lipsiae, Teubner, 1888. 3 Mk.

H. A. Holden

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 1-2 / February 1889, pp 35 - 37

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193977, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193977

How to cite this article:

H. A. Holden (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 35-37 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193977

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

quired. There are also some cases of questionable interpretation of the MS. reading, to which attention might suitably be directed in a similar way: for example, in Gen. iii. 10, the *περιπατος* of the governing MS. is interpreted by *περιπατούντος*: the Hebrew does not help us to choose, and *περὶ παντός* will just construe. So also in Gen. xiii. 12 *ενοσκηνώσεν* is interpreted by *ἐσκήνωσεν*: but *ἐνεσκήνωσεν* is not less possible, for many words, which, like it, appear to be peculiar to patristic Greek really come from the LXX.¹

2. The case of orthography and of grammatical inflexions is more difficult. It is often impossible, as in the case of the New Testament, to determine for certain whether a given form belongs to the age of the translator or to that of the transcriber. The difficulty is complicated in the case of the LXX. by the uncertainty which exists as to the times at which the several portions of the translation were made. In the present state of our knowledge of Hellenistic Greek, by far the safest rules are that an editor should follow his MS., even though this may lead to the introduction of forms which are not found elsewhere, and that he should avoid uniformity. In the great majority of cases which admit of doubt Dr. Swete deserves our thanks for his adherence to these rules. But I venture to hope that he will adhere to them even more closely in future. The edition would be an even more important contribution than it is at present to Hellenistic philology if the MS. had been followed, instead of being altered, in such cases as the following: (a) the contracted dative of nouns; e.g. *δόσι* Gen. xlvii. 22, *δυνάμι* Ex. vi. 26, Num. i. 3, *κρίσι* Ex. vi. 6, *κλήσι* Gen. xlix. 30, *πόλι* Lev. xxv. 29, which are all altered by Dr. Swete into the corresponding forms in *-αι*: (b) the vocative of *θυγάτηρ* which, with the same MS. reading in each case, is written *θύγατερ* in Ruth iii. 1, but *θυγάτηρ* in Ruth ii. 2, 22: (c) the forms of *γίγνομαι*, among which certain of those in *γεν-* are as legitimate as those in *γιν-*; hence e.g. *παραγένη* might have been retained in

¹ I am indebted for several of the references in this paragraph to the Rev. H. A. Redpath.

2 Reg. i. 3: (d) the forms *ἐμμέσφ*, *ἐγγαστρί*, might properly be left unaltered; they are too constant in the MSS. to be treated as the peculiarities of a single scribe; (e) such forms as the genitive *ἡμῖους* for the more usual *ἡμῖους* in Ex. xxvii. 5, and the dative *ἡμῖον* for *ἡμῖν* in Num. xxxii. 33, might also have been retained: the contractions are found in more than one MS. and in more than one passage: they are analogous to those of the Latin *-u* nouns; and the unfixedness of the inflexion of *ἡμῖους* is shown by the existence of the variant *ἡμῖος* in Phocian inscriptions (*τὸ ἡμῖον, ἐπὶ τῷ (ι) ἡμῖσι* *Sammlung der griech. Dialecten-Inschriften* Nos. 1523, 16, 1555 b 12) and by the use of *ἡμῖον* as indeclinable in Byzantine Greek.

I will add, in conclusion, the further hope that the remaining volumes may be based on collations not of the autotype and facsimile editions, but of the actual MSS. themselves of Codd. A and B. The labour would no doubt be considerable: but the value of the results to be attained would amply justify it. I can only speak from experience of Codex A, and I will give but a single instance of the unsatisfactoriness of the results which come from using only the autotype. In Gen. xxvii. 23 the original reading can clearly be made out underneath the later corrections to be *ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ὡς αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ*: this has been corrected by a much later hand to *ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ὡς αἱ χεῖρες Ἡσαῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δασεῖαι*: it is unsatisfactory that an edition like the present should print the text in its later form with merely the marginal note "*Ἡσαν* sup. ras. pl. litt. A": the 'rasura' being clearly that of the original *χεῖρες* of which only *χ* was left, at the end of a line, the remaining letters being written by the corrector in the margin. But I should like, at the same time, to bear testimony to the singular accuracy of Dr. Swete's work in the uncorrected and unobliterated passages: in the very few instances of discrepancy between my own collation and his, I have found on re-examination that Dr. Swete was right and I was wrong.

EDWIN HATCH.

PLUTARCHI MORALIA.

Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia recognovit
GREGORIUS N. BERNARDAKIS. Vol. I.
Lipsiae, Teubner, 1888. 3 Mk.

THIS is the first instalment of a complete edition of the miscellaneous treatises on a

variety of subjects — religious, political, literary and physical — which go by the name of Plutarch's 'Morals.' The volume contains, besides the two spurious dissertations 'on the training of children' and 'consolation to Apollonius,' the twelve treatises

'how a young man ought to hear poems,' 'on hearing,' 'on friendship and flattery,' 'on test of proficiency in virtue,' 'how to profit by our enemies,' 'on large acquaintance,' 'on fortune,' 'on virtue and vice,' 'care of health,' 'conjugal precepts,' 'the banquet of the seven wise men,' and the theosophical essay 'on superstition and atheism.'

No complete edition of the Greek text has been published since Wytttenbach's (Oxford, 1795-1830), which the editor did not live to finish, except that by F. Dübner in the Didot series (Paris, 1841). The former is not based upon the best MSS., and those which the editor used were only imperfectly collated; the latter professes to be based on a new collation by Contus of the Paris MSS., but there is nothing to distinguish the changes introduced on the authority of these from conjectures of the editor and his predecessors, there being no *apparatus criticus*. The edition of R. Hercher (Teubner, 1872) is vastly superior in a critical point of view to either of these, but owing to the premature death of the editor it did not extend beyond the first volume. The editor of the volume before us has undertaken a most difficult task and one from which most scholars would shrink in dismay—a thorough revision of the text with the help of the best MSS. M. Bernardakis is already favourably known to scholars by his *Symbolae criticae et palaeographicae in Plutarchi vitas et moralia* (Teubner, 1879), in which he has made many happy suggestions for the correction of the text, and by his spirited defence of his compatriot A. Koræ's (Coray) against the sneers of Cobet. M. Bernardakis in his preface, which extends to ninety-three pages, speaks modestly of his own labours, which must have been considerable in the examination and careful study of MSS.—all the more so because of the great want of uniformity in even the best, such as Paris *E*, those which are most trustworthy in some of the treatises being valueless in others. In the case of some of the treatises there are no good MSS. extant, but he speaks hopefully of a possible discovery by others, having been fortunate enough himself to light upon three—in the libraries at Milan, at Venice, and at the convent of Mount Athos, some of the readings in which confirm in a remarkable manner the conjectures of Xylander, Wytttenbach and Reiske. Not only a full list of all the known MSS., but a selection of readings from some of the best is given, as a test of their worth. In this respect

the editor has been able to supplement the researches of Treu.¹

The Preface concludes with some terse remarks on the general style of Plutarch (he takes no notice of his extraordinary fondness for the use of the participle—Prof. Gildersleeve's title 'polymetochic' would become him more perhaps than any other Greek author), and his use of certain words and forms of words. In Mr. Strachan-Davidson's notice of Hultsch's *Polybius*, Vol. I., ed. 2, in this Review,² attention is drawn to that writer's dislike and avoidance of the hiatus between two vowels. Plutarch had evidently the same dislike, and he frequently sacrifices the natural order of words in the sentence and uses different forms of the same word, merely in order to avoid the disagreeable effect of a concurrence of vowels. But it was perhaps beyond the editor's scope to enter into further details.

We now come to the text itself, which is based upon an independent study of the principal MSS., and must, so far as it goes, be accepted as the standard one. The editor has exercised a sound discretion in admitting only such conjectural emendations as carry conviction with them, and explain the origin of the reading which they replace. Being a Greek by birth, he has an instinctive feeling for the language, which is a very safe guide, and prevents him from accepting suggestions for the alteration of the text, even in deference to great scholars like Madvig. Attic forms he has not obtruded on his author, except where they can be found in other passages of Plutarch.

In the foot-notes, which are scanty, not only are the rejected MS. readings given, together with the name of the proposer of the reading by which they have been replaced, but reference also is made to the original source of quotations from classic authors— which Plutarch is so fond of making—whether from Plato, Homer, Aristotle, Thucydides, the Dramatists with their fragments, or the Lyric poets. This strikes us as a much more convenient and satisfactory method than that by which Kaibel has disfigured his edition of Athenaeus—viz. inserting them in the Greek text between brackets.

¹ *De codd. nonn. Paris. Plut. Mor. narratio*, Lauravivae 1867, *Ueber die handschriftliche Grundlage der Moralia*, Breslau Progr. 1877 and 1884, *Geschichte d. Ueberlieferung von Plutarch's Mor.* Ohlau, 1881. According to Treu the best MSS. are Vienna 148 (not, as he writes, 184), Venice 250 (V²), Milan 82, Paris 1672 and 1956. The latter is pronounced by Bernardakis to be *facile princeps*.

² Vol. II. December, 1888, p. 319a.

We heartily wish that M. Bernardakis's life may be spared to complete not only the present work, the preparation for which has occupied so many years, and in the execution of which he has exercised, so far, such sound judgment, and combined sober criticism with extensive and accurate knowledge of his

author, but also the larger edition with a complete *apparatus criticus* which he promises. The present handy volume is a credit to modern Hellenic scholarship, and will be welcomed by all students and lovers of the Boeotian sage.

H. A. HOLDEN.

ZOSIMI HISTORIA NOVA.

Zosimi Historia Nova. Ed. L. MENDELSSOHN. Teubner. Leipzig. 1887. 10 Mk.

STUDENTS of the later Roman Empire have some reason to look forward to possessing within the next twenty years satisfactory texts of the later Greek historians. For a long time one has been obliged to make the best of the Bonn *Scriptores Byzantini*, a series of volumes on which the editors can in few cases be said to have deserved congratulation; in fact if one possessed the Paris edition of the seventeenth century, there would be no occasion to consult the Bonn edition of the nineteenth. But during the last few years C. de Boor, A. Reifferscheid, and now L. Mendelssohn have come to the rescue; and we have at last really sound texts of Theophanes, Theophylactus, Nicephorus Patriarcha, Anna Comnena and Zosimus. Using these new editions the historical student feels that he is standing on the firmest available ground.

The palaeographical starting-point for a new edition of Zosimus was determined by A. Kiessling in 1863, when he showed that Vatican cod. Gr. 156 was the only really important MS., as all the others are derived from it. Mendelssohn's text mainly depends on a collation of this codex made by Dr. A. Mau of Rome, whose skill in palaeography is well known. The Preface contains, besides an account of this MS., a discussion of the vexed question as to the date of the historian, an account of the laws of hiatus which he adopted with modifications from Polybius, and a valuable treatise on his sources. It is to be regretted that the editor has not added an *index verborum* as well as an *index nominum*. The value of M. de Boor's texts of Theophanes etc. is greatly enhanced by the excellent glossaries of Greek words with which he has provided them.

That Zosimus wrote between 425 A.D. and 502 A.D. is certain; the further limit is determined by the circumstance that Olympiodorus' work, which went down to 425 A.D. was used by Zosimus in the later portion of his history; the nearer limit by the fact

that Zosimus was one of the sources of Eustathius of Epiphania, who wrote in 502. But an observation of Tillemont, accepted by Mendelssohn, renders it possible for us to advance from 425 to 450: the French scholar pointed out that the words *ἐπὶ χρόνον συχρόν* in ii. 38, 4 imply the abolition of the *folles* and the limitation of the burdens of the *praetura*, alleviatory measures which were passed by Marcian in 450. On the other hand it is not permissible to conclude from this passage that it was written after the abolition of the Chrysargyron by Anastasius in 501 (Preface, p. ix.) In future we may speak of Zosimus as a historian who flourished in the second half of the fifth century.

It is an interesting fact that Zosimus constructed his sentences according to regular laws of hiatus, imitating his model Polybius of Megalopolis, whose name (Πολυβίω) is the first word of his history. His laws however are not so strict as those adopted by Polybius. Mendelssohn gives a full account of the exceptions which Zosimus allowed himself and the means which he employed to avoid the collision of vowels (such as the use of *ὅσπερ* for *ὅς*, plural for singular, compound for simple verb, *ἀπρίως* for *ἀπρι*, &c.). On this subject I have a few criticisms and suggestions to make.

The 8th exception (I. i. p. xxix.) admitted by the editor is the case of proper names, *tam ubi praecedit nomen proprium quam ubi sequitur*. Nine apparent instances are mentioned; but Mendelssohn at the same time remarks that 'the author manifestly avoids hiatus when he can, even in proper names,' and on this principle would emend one of the passages where emendation is easy. I would observe that of these nine instances four at once disappear, namely (1) *ἄχρι παντός τοῦ βίου 'Ιουλιανῶ*, iii. 2, 4; (2) *οὕτω 'Ιουλιανός*, iii. 7, 2; (3) *προσῆκει 'Ιουλιανόν*, iii. 9, 4; (4) *ἐτετάχατο δὲ ἐν τόντῳ 'Ιοβιανοί*, iii. 30, 2. It seems clear that in the Graecized forms of Julianus and Joviani the consonantal pronunciation of the initial spirant was retained, and consequently there was no hiatus (just as in the case of *Οὐάλης*, *Οὐαλεντινιανός*).