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](#)

Preisendanz's *Carmina Anacreontea Carmina Anacreontea e Bybl. Nat. Par. Cod. Gr. Suppl.* 384 post Val. Rosium tertium edidit Carolus Preisendanz, Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana, Lipsiae, 1912. Pp. xx + 66.

J. M. Edmonds

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 04 / June 2014, pp 132 - 133
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00007228, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00007228

How to cite this article:

J. M. Edmonds (1914). The Classical Review, 28, pp 132-133 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00007228

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Nidri need not be Odysseus' palace because it had a water supply and a 'Blackwater' in the vicinity. Neither will the opposition be persuaded though the skeleton of a faithful hound be unearthed.

I have noticed a few errata. On p. III n, read 1902 for 1912; on p. 120, Phea for Thea; on p. 198 n¹, lives for live; on p. 266, n¹, C.P. for *Am. Journ. of Phil.*; on p. 274 n¹, *Quart.* for *Quat.*; and on p. 335 n¹, Thomopoulos for Thermopoulos.

The contents of these four books are generally worlds away from the ideas of the Homeric criticism which was dominant in Germany only a few years ago, and which obstinately refused to admit an alternative view. One of the last points that Rothe notices is the old argument 'that so many great critics could not have been wrong,' and he makes it the text of an interesting dissertation, to which might be added an illustration from the world of science.

Workers in that high sphere once saw, we are told, and for long had great joy of certain rays, the N rays, which are now known not to have existed. The savants saw them because they wished to see them. Some think the influence of the fixed idea was as strong in regard to Homer, and that it was this prepossession that led to those excesses of which Bethe, reviewing Rothe's *Ilias*, said the world was sick; and Bethe expressed the fear that the reaction might be marked by a similar intemperance. There is no sign of that in Rothe's *Odyssee*. He has fought a good fight through a generation not only with great courage but also with a 'sweet reasonableness' that has seldom been disturbed, and he has lived to see his belief surmount all ridicule and rise, for the moment at least, to a place of respect, if not something more, beside the one which he contested.

A. SHEWAN.

PREISENDANZ'S *CARMINA ANACREONTEA*.

Carmina Anacreontea e Bybl. Nat. Par. Cod. Gr. Suppl. 384 post Val. Rosium tertium edidit CAROLUS PREISENDANZ, Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana, Lipsiae, 1912. Pp. xx+66.

THIS little volume supersedes Rose's editions of 1868, 1875, and 1890.

The only MS. of the *Anacreontea* forms part of the famous codex of the Palatine Anthology. This codex the editor has dealt with fully elsewhere.¹ His Preface now repeats his observations and conclusions so far as they concern his present book, and the reader is thus furnished with an account of the history of the MS. and a discussion of the value of the corrections it contains. The volume includes a facsimile of a page of the MS. and an *index verborum*.

¹ Progr. Gymn. Heidelberg. 1910, *Zur griechischen Anthologie*, Teubner; and *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti duce Scatone de Vries tom. XV Anthologia Palatina, praefatus est Carolus Preisendanz*, Sijthoff, 1911.

In the text and critical notes the editor's first object has evidently been to give a complete account of the readings of the MS. This he appears to have done with admirable precision. Where his text differs from that of the MS., the changes are generally obvious and inevitable, the corrections of his predecessors. In more doubtful passages his preference among the various suggestions lies on the side of the smallest letter-change rather than on that of the literary requirements of the passage. This is a pity. Poor as some of these pieces are, they are nevertheless literature. The same idiosyncrasy makes him omit even to record a large number of excellent suggestions; e.g., Barnes' βρύοντας for βρέμοντας 43. 5, and γέγηθα for τέρπομαι 50. 24; Bergk's γελῶν for λέγων 1. 3, ζαφελῶς for ἀφελῶς 46. 7, and πολλὸν δὲ γῆρας ἐκδύς (cf. Dosiad. Ar. 14 ἐκδυγῆρας Salm.) 53. 7; Jacobs' ἔλησεν for ἔλυσεν 13. 17; Rose's ἐνώροις (= ὠραίους) for ἐν ὠραις 55. 6; Salmasius' ὠραις for αὔραις 50. 11; Scaliger's ἐκποῆσαι for ἐκβοῆσαι 25. 19; Steph-

anus' *ρόδα δός* for *παράδος* (correction of haplographic *ρόδος*) 53. 6, and *πολιοῖς πτεροῖσι* of the singing swan (MS. *ποικίλον πτ. contr. metr.*; cf. *Ερ. Bion.* 16 Wilam.) 60. 9.

On the contrary there are several places where he has adopted very questionable readings. In 33. 11 *μη φόβησαι* for the MS. *μη φοβήσαι* is hardly Greek. There is no question of the poet's *fearing* Cupid (cf. l. 14). Read *μη σοβήσης* or *μη σόβει με*, 'don't drive me away.' In 58. 6 where Preisendanz reads *μισούν*, the MS. *μισών* is right: 'for who hunts after that which he dislikes?' In 24. 8 *οὐκ ἔτ'* for *οὐκέτ'* is a strange correction. He should at least record Davies' *οὐκ ἐπέιχεν*; 'did she pay no attention to the women?' (For *τί οὖν*; in the next line, read *τί οὐ*; = 'Yes').

In 21. 1 he keeps *ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει* | *πίνει δένδρεα δ' αὐτήν*. The position of the adjective is surely impossible, and the sense of the whole piece calls aloud for an object to the first *πίνει*. Read *πηγήν μὲν αἶα πίνει* | *πίνει δὲ δένδρε' αἶαν*. The word *δέ* was lost by haplography, and the last two words were read *δένδρεα ἰαν*, which involved a *vox nihili* and tempted emendation, after *αἶα* had disappeared from the first line.

Of the four conjectures of his own

which the editor has ventured to incorporate, one (15. 6) appears to me needless. Adopting Trapp's *τίς ἔσσι*; he reads *σοὶ μέλει τι*; for *σοὶ μέλει δέ*. The only change required is *τί* for *τίς*. Read *τί ἔστι σοι μέλει δέ*; 'what is the matter and what your trouble?' comparing for the hiatus 24. 9, Ar. *Thesm.* 193, and *τί οὖν* in Tragedy. Another (53. 1) involves an unlikely—and in this book unparalleled—final elision. A third (14. 18), *τί φῆς ἀεὶ ληρώδης* (for *κηρωθείς*) seems to me to show lack of imagination. Bergk's *τί φῆς*; *ἐκηριώδης*; 'What? does your head swim? [there's more to come],' is admirable, and should have been recorded (*ἀεὶ* was an interpolation, following corruption, to mend the metre). On the other hand, the editor's placing of l. 16 in 55—a line doubtless rejected because corrupt, then added in the margin from another MS., and finally re-incorporated in the wrong place—must commend itself to future editors.

It will be seen that the book has its defects. But, take it all in all, it is a good piece of work, and deserves to rank high in the often excellent and never negligible Teubner series.

J. M. EDMONDS.

24, Halifax Road, Cambridge.

A COMPANION TO CLASSICAL TEXTS.

A Companion to Classical Texts. F. W. HALL. Pp. 363. Clarendon Press. 9s. 6d.

MR. HALL has here traced in a clear, skilful, and interesting manner the ways in which books took their origin and final form in Greece and at Rome; the ways in which they were preserved; the changes of form through which they passed; the dangers that beset them, so that while some survived many were lost; how some were much more exposed to chances of alteration, corruption, mutilation than others; how the Greek scribes and the Western monks, the mediaeval scholars, the Greek scholars of the Byzantine renaissance, the Italian scholars of the early and

later Italian renaissance did with them their best or their worst. Greek literature is kept carefully distinct from Latin, Attic from prae-Attic, prae-Alexandrian vulgates (Homer) from Alexandrian texts, prose from poetry, early Latin from Latin of the first century B.C. and later, scientific scholars like Probus and Donatus from amateurs and dilettantes such as Mavortius.

He shows how the methods of 'recension' (*i.e.* the whole study and treatment of a text short of emendation) have been gradually developed, and how even in the most recent years they have been improved and informed (like other branches of knowledge) with a more historical spirit, greater attention being now given to the special history,