

# 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](#)



---

## Notes on Julian

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 03 / April 1905, pp 156 - 159  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000172, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00000172](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000172)

### How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1905). Notes on Julian. The Classical Review, 19, pp 156-159 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000172

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## NOTES ON JULIAN.

P. 61 B. ὅστις δὲ θέλει μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κάλλους ἐξαπατάσθαι τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἐπιφερομένων πλασμάτων, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ περὶ ἀρωμάτων τινῶν καὶ χρωμάτων, Ἀρεοπαγίτης ἔστω κριτὴς καὶ οὐκ εὐλαβησόμεθα τὴν κρίσιν.

Of the passage marked by daggers Hertlein observes: 'Locum corruptum ita olim tentavi, ut scriberem ὥσπερ ἐν γραφῇ ὑπ' ἀργυρωμάτων τινῶν καὶ χρυσομάτων. Accepting from this ἐν γραφῇ I would continue with περιλειμμάτων τινῶν καὶ χρωμάτων. Though περιλείμμα may seem a strange word to go with γραφῇ, yet compare Plato *Rep.* 420 c: ἀνδριάντας γραφόντας... ὁστρεῖω ἐναηλιμμένοι. And ἐπιφέρειν χρώματα occurs at *Soph.* 251 A.

70 D. Qu. τῇ κρατίστῃ?

76 c. Transpose βασιλεῖ to follow ἐποιεῖτο.

79 A. Read εὐδαιμονίζοντα for εὐδαιμονούντα.

80 C. ὅλος γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἐκείνου κρείττον, ὃ βιασάμενον καθέξει καὶ καταφαιρήσεται τὸν ἔχοντα ἅπαξ.

ἀφαιρήσεται Hertlein, but much more alteration is required. The precious possession referred to is ἀρετή, and this is presently compared to the light of the sun, τὸ φῶς δὲ οὐδεὶς αὐτὸν ἀφαιρείται. It is then as plain as the sunlight itself that Julian wrote something like ὃ βιασάμενος οὐδεὶς καθέξει. When οὐδεὶς had dropped out, by whatever accident, the termination of βιασάμενος was assimilated to agree with ὃ.

100 D. οὐ παραπέμπειν εἰς τοὺς παῖδας οὐδὲ εἰς ἐγγόνους προφάσει τῆς ἀκριβοῦς δίκης καὶ τοῦ βούλεσθαι περ ἐπιεικῶς μάλα πίτυος δίκην τῶν πονηρῶν ἀφανίζει τὰ σπέρματα.

'Not to continue the quarrel to the second and third generation on a pretext of rigid justice, or on the still more specious pretext of wishing to abolish the seed of the wicked root and branch.'

περ is of course impossible. Reiske proposed ὅπερ ἐπιεικῶς μάλα προφασίζονται, πίτυος. Hertlein would delete περ as a remnant of ὥσπερ, 'quod aliquis ad δίκην explicandum addidisse videtur, ut 406 c.' I should prefer to read καίπερ (or possibly εἴπερ); either would be easily corrupted after βούλεσθαι, and would give a good sense.

As to Hertlein's observations on ὥσπερ, I

do not believe that any one would think of adding it or anything else on the ground that a word so common as δίκην in late Greek was unintelligible without it. But it might be added superfluously, and that by Julian himself just as much as by any other person. Look at all these passages, beginning with that quoted by Hertlein himself:

406 c. ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡλίου καθαροῦ δίκην.

393 c. οἰονεὶ καλύκων δίκην.

440 D. οἰονεὶ σφαίρας δίκην.

447 B. οἰονεὶ πτηνοῦ δίκην.

Are we to suppose that some one went through Julian with pencil in hand looking out for every δίκην he could see and explaining them for the benefit of a posterity which might just as well be ignorant of the meaning of οἰονεὶ and ὥσπερ? Julian added them all himself, why not? Such expressions are apt to be doubled.

104 B. καὶ γάρ, οἶμαι, σῶφρονα καὶ συνετὴν καὶ νέμειν ἐκάστῳ τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ θαρραλίαν ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς καὶ μεγαλόφρονα καὶ ἐλευθέριον καὶ πάντα ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ὑπάρχειν ἐκείνῃν οἴομενοι χρῆναι τὰ τοιαῦτα, τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐγκωμίον ἀφαιρησόμεθα;

'Believing Eusebia to have all the virtues under heaven, am I not to praise her?' The first four virtues are naturally the cardinal, and the words καὶ νέμειν—ἀξίαν have to represent δικαίαν. As they can't do it, Hertlein proposes to read καὶ <οἶαν> νέμειν. Don't you feel an awkwardness about this? I should prefer καὶ νέμουνσαν. But a more important point is χρῆναι. Surely the most careless reader must see that χρῆναι is wrong. Fancy a panegyrist saying that a Queen ought to have all the virtues! Of course she not only ought to have them, but has: 'Tis the prerogative of royalty,' as somebody says in one of Fletcher's plays, Nor can we get out of the difficulty by making the words mean 'she ought to be called by all such epithets,' not even if we should read ἐκείνῃ, for πάντα must represent a feminine accusative parallel to σῶφρονα, etc. For this curious neuter in place of the feminine compare 212 B, πρὸς διδασκάλους, πρὸς πατέρας, πρὸς κηδεμόνας, πρὸς πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα, and 234 D τοῦ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ Διὸς ἀνθρώπου.

I conclude then that χρῆναι must be ejected from the text or is corrupt.

105 c. καὶ ὡς κρίνειν εὖ ἡπίστατο, οἷσιν τ' εὖ φρονέσῃ, καὶ διαλύειν τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐγκλήματα τοῖς πολίταις ἀναφύμενα ξὺν δίκῃ.

'οἷσιν τ' εὖ φρονέσῃ Cob. ex Odyss. η 74.' But V gives ἦσιν δὲ εὐφροσύνη, M ἦδη δὲ εὐφροσύνη, and the rest ἦδη δὲ φρονήσει. And the reading of η 74 has been disputed from early times. αἱ χαριέστεραι read ἦσιν τ' εὖ φρονέσῃ, and Eustathius testifies to a third reading, ἦσιν εὐφροσύνησι. The original was probably ἦσί τ' ἐπιφροσύνησι, but this was of course unknown to Julian. The question then is which reading he had. The line ends with καὶ ἀνδράσι νείκεα λύει, and this is what Julian paraphrases by καὶ διαλύειν κ.τ.λ. In Homer, and therefore also in Julian, καὶ means *even* or *also*, and therefore the comma before it must be deleted. Then τοῖς πολίταις shews that Julian does not take ἀνδράσι to be *men* opposed to *women*, and so he cannot have read ἦσιν τ' εὖ φρονέσῃ. But the reading of V plainly points to ἦσιν, and the other MSS. are at least nearer to that than to οἷσιν. Moreover τοῖς πολίταις does not appear to me to come in a natural position after οἷσιν κ.τ.λ. On the whole the reading preserved by Eustathius (and in a corrupted form by two of La Roche's MSS.) seems much the most probable here, ἦσιν τ' (perhaps changed by Julian to δ' if we are to trust *his* MSS.) εὐφροσύνησι καὶ διαλύειν.

108 A. νῦν δὲ ἦδη τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπιλειπούσης, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς μοναρχίαν τὰ τῆς πολιτείας μεθέστηκε, τιμὴ καθ' αὐτὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων στερομένη πρὸς πᾶσαν ἰσχὺν ἀντίρροπος εἶναι δοκεῖ.

The subject of the sentence is the Consulship. We must read μεθέστηκεν, ἡ τιμὴ καθ' αὐτὴν. For to say 'though its power is lost, it seems to be an honour in itself,' is ridiculous. 'The honour *per se* is reckoned equivalent to any power whatever.'

Also we must read ἐπιλειπούσης with the inferior MSS. Nobody in the fourth century could use the present tense in talking of the decline of the consul's power. At 137 D we shall find the same correction to be necessary, at 448 B Hercher has had to correct the strange form λειποτάκτην, and at 449 B a nonsensical ἀπολείπων (ἀπολιπόν Vat.) has yielded to Horkel's ἀπολιπών.

110 c. τῇ δὲ ἀνὴρ μὲν οὐδεὶς καλὸς καὶ μέγας ἢ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ πλούσιος ὅς ὑπὲρ τούτων εἰς λόγους ἐλθεῖν ὑπέμεινε ποτε.

Nobody has ever had the face to ask the Empress's mother to marry him. For this

more reasons than one might be assigned, but the beauty or the inches of the suitor could not well be a lawful impediment. Hence it is no use to eject δς with Horkel, for the result is a sentence signifying that no man of any looks, and so on, has ventured to propose himself, and you expect the author to continue by saying that hideous dwarfs have besieged the lady like a princess in a fairy tale. What has happened really is that οὗτω has dropped out after οὐδεὶς. Cf. 179 c: τίς οὖν οὗτω παχὺς τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅς οὐ συνήσιν;

119 D. ἡμεῖς δὲ τί ποτε ἄρα πεπόνθαμεν; καὶ τίνα νῦν διαπεραίνειν οἰόμεθα λόγον;

'Post διαπεραίνειν,' says Hertlein, 'fortasse δεῖν excidit. Malim vero scribere περαίνειν διανοούμεθα.' It seems however that οἶμαι δεῖν was such a common expression that it became abbreviated, as common expressions will, into οἶμαι without δεῖν. Lysias *Eratosthenes* 26: οὐκ οἶε μοι καὶ τουτοισὶ δοῦναι δίκην; where Madvig wished to omit οἶε, making δοῦναι depend on ἀξιοῖς a little way back. *Ibid.* 93: εἰνους ὦντο εἶναι, where the context shews the meaning to be 'expected you to be their partisans.' Plato *Laches* 200 B: οὐ σὺ πον οἶε καταγέλαν, 'whom you see fit to laugh at.'

128 A. Omit the words τὸν πρὸς τοῖς νεωρίοις πόλεμον, which are a manifest gloss on τείχους μὲν αἶρεσιν (the storm of the Greek wall in the *Iliad*), καὶ πολιορκίαν καὶ τρόπον τινα ναυμαχίαν εἶναι δοκοῦσαν.

130 c. ἐντέτῃ μοι δεινὸς ἐκ παίδων τῶν αὐγῶν τοῦ θεοῦ πόθος.

Read ἐκ παιδός, which was corrupted by the τῶν following. Unless indeed the Emperor wrote ἐκ παιδόθεν as at the opening of the 74th epistle.

133 A. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ξύμπας, ἄτε δὴ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μεγίστου [τῆς ἰδέας τάγαθου] γεγονὼς ἕκγονος.

Another most gross and palpable gloss. Hertlein seems to suspect something, for he suggests ἀγαθοῦ for τάγαθου, but what he means by it I cannot conjecture.

137 D. ἐκ δὲ τῆς οὐσίας εἰ πάντως ἐγένετό τι συνεχῶς, ἀνελύτο δὲ εἰς αὐτὴν μηδὲν, ἐπέλειπεν ἂν τῶν γιγνομένων ἡ οὐσία.

ἐπέλειπεν VEFg, ἐξέλειπεν Mb, ἐπέλιπε vulgo. Surely the old vulgate is right, and the good MSS. are wrong again. The sense requires 'would have run dry,' not 'would now be' nor 'would have been running

dry.' Why should the οὐσία τῶν γιγνομένων have been failing just when Julian wrote this Oration? His argument is a bad one of course, because things may be getting used up without our knowing anything about it, but such as it is it needs an aorist. And such as it is, it is an echo of Plato *Phaedo* 72 D: εἰ γὰρ ἐκ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων τὰ ζῶντα γίγνοιτο, τὰ δὲ ζῶντα θνήσκουσι, τίς μηχανὴν μὴ οὐ πάντα καταναλωθῆναι εἰς τὸ τεθνάναι; Not καταναλίσκεσθαι.

152 B. ὑμνεῖσθω τε ἄλλοις ἀξίως καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν πιστευέσθω μᾶλλον ἢ δεκνύσθω.

The dative of the agent after ὑμνεῖσθω is not impossible in Julian, but yet we ought to read ὑμνήσθω, as is shewn by the whole tenor of the sentence. πιστευέσθω μᾶλλον ἢ δεκνύσθω makes it clear that the subject *has been* already illustrated by others, and so needs no further witness from us.

159 A. ἀρά γε χρὴ φάναι καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων; καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρρήτων γράφομεν καὶ τὰ ἀνέξοιστα καὶ τὰ ἀνεκλάλητα ἐκκαλῆσομεν; the balance of the sentence makes it clear that we should insert ἐξοίσωμεν after ἀνέξοιστα.

168 A. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὅλως ῥέπειν πέπεικε νένειν εἰς τὴν ὕλην δοκεῖ. ῥέπειν καὶ νένειν B. Friederich. Better ῥέπειν τε καὶ ἐπινένειν, which accounts for the letters of the text.

160 C. ἡμῖν [τε] οἱ θεοὶ κελεύουσιν ἐκτέμνειν καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἀπειρίαν καὶ μιμῆσθαι τοὺς ἡμῶν.

τε seclutit Hertlein. Compare 219 A ὑφ' ἡγεμόσι τοῖς θεοῖς, and write here μιμῆσθαι τοὺς ἡγεμόνας, or possibly τοὺς ἡγεμόνας ἡμῶν.

179 C. δι' Ἑρμοῦ μὲν καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ἀνακαλεῖται πάντα πανταχοῦ τὰ τῆς γενέσεως ἔχοντα τὸ ἕνεκα τοῦ πάντη καὶ πάντως, ὃ τοῦ λόγου μάλιστα ἰδίον ἔστιν.

Read τὸ ἕνεκά του, and translate: 'By Hermes and Aphrodite are typified all those parts of the material world which shew evidence of design (have in them that which is for the sake of some end), for that is the peculiarity of Reason.' Hermes was called λόγιος, and τὸ ἕνεκά του is what shews λόγος in γένεσις; therefore Hermes may be taken as a type of design in the world. As for Aphrodite, even the ingenuity of a disciple of Iamblichus cannot make out much of a case for her; she and λόγος are 'many miles asunder,' but Hermes is called ἐπαφροδίτος ὑπὸ τῶν μυστικῶν, and if you aren't content with that, you will be called παχὺς τὴν ψυχὴν by the master of many legions.

Directly after, Attis is described as ἄφρων

μὲν ὅτι τὴν ὕλην εἴλετο καὶ τὴν γένεσιν ἐπιτροπέει. Read ἐπιτροπέειν. To say that Attis chose τὴν ὕλην is absurd; he chose to look after τὴν ὕλην.

183 A. εἶτε ὁμοίωσιν θεῶν κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν.

Read θεῶ. Plato *Theaet.* 176 B.

195 C. Ἐπικούρος . . . οὐδὲ τῶν θεῶν φησιν εἰς εὐδαιμονίας λόγον ἐλαττοῦσθαι, πρὸς μὲν τοὺς θεοὺς οὐκ ἐρίζων, τοῦ δοκοῦντος δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εὐδαιμονεστάτου ζῶν καὶ ἔλεγε ζῆν εὐδαιμονέστερον.

Reiske made a truly monstrous sentence out of this by inserting εὐδαιμονέστερον after εὐδαιμονεστάτου. The real corruption is in καὶ ἔλεγε, for which read κατ' ἐμέ γε, and either omit ζῆν as a makeshift inserted after κατ' ἐμέ γε had been corrupted, or else read ζῶν εὐδαιμονεστέρων. The former alternative commends itself most to me, as one would expect βίον rather than ζῶν (ζῶεις δ' ἀγαθὸν βίον, *Odyssey* xv. 491), but the lexicon quotes ζῶν ἔζων from Herodotus.

For κατ' ἐμέ γε cf. 192 D, κατὰ σὲ φάναι.

195 D. ὃν ἂν πριώμεθα δραχμῶν ἀργυρίου τόσων ἢ μναῖν δυοῖν ἢ χρυσίου στατήρων δέκα.

ἂν addidit Hertlein. Add further καὶ τόσων after τόσων, according to the rule for prose, though it is true that Plato does use τόσος for τοσοῦτος once or twice. But even Plato does not use it in this sense. Cf. 275 C, τὰ καὶ τὰ.

203 C. γυναικῶν ἀθλίων τεθαύμακας φιλῶν νεκρὸν βίον.

The last words are plainly corrupt, nor does Hertlein's suggestion of φιλονεικῶν help much. In φιλωνεκρον the ν is a dittography, ε is for α, and κ is the usual corruption of β. The whole six words are evidently the ends of two tragic senarii.

At 203 B accent σοὶ for σοι.

206 C. οἷον εἶδωλα ἅττα καὶ σκιαί· πράττουσι γοῦν πρὸ τῆς τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐπιστήμης τὰ ψεῦδη.

πράττειν τὰ ψεῦδη is no sort of Greek, nor is it read here by any MS. of Julian. There is a string of lacunae hereabouts in his MSS. which is partly supplied by Suidas s.v. ὑπηνέμια. As just above Suidas gives ἀντί for ταυτί, his testimony is not infallible. Here V has 'καὶ σκιαὶ . . . ἄττονσι (ut videtur) . . .' and the other MSS. fail altogether, for the only word of any difficulty. Whether V really had πράττουσι or not, I can have no doubt that what Julian wrote was προτιμῶσι, a favourite word of his; see e.g. 259 B, 261 D, 263 C, 268 B, 327 A, 329 C, 375 A,

376 c, 400 B. And *προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν* was almost a proverb. Certainly *προτίονσι* would be much more 'scientific' as people call it, but who ever saw *προτίω* in prose?

219 A. It is time *ἰδοῦ* was corrected to *ἰδοῦ*.

227 B. *ὃν ἐποίησεν ὁ Παιανιεύς πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ἥνικα ὁ Μακεδὼν ἐξήτει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ῥήτορας.*

It is strange that the second *Ἀθηναίους* has not long ago been cleared away.

233 B. *αἰδοῦ δὲ καὶ ἡμᾶς μόνον, ἀνδρῶν δὲ ὅσους ἡμῖν προσομοίος ἐστιν, ἄλλον δὲ μηδένα.*

For *καί* read *μή* (the usual confusion of *κ* and *μ*). For *δέ* after *μή μόνον* see Hertlein's note on 116 c: *καὶ οὐ τοὺς ξυγγενεῖς μόνον τοσαῦτα ἔδρασεν ἀγαθά, ξενίαν δὲ . . .* Hertlein there gives a number of other references to Julian for this consecution.

252 A. *καὶ τοῦτο μὲν οὐχ ὥς εὐχόμενος· ἐπὶ τό γε ἵνα πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν αὐτὴν ταχέως ἄμεινον· ἀλλ' ὥς, εἰ γένοιτο, καὶ πρὸς τοῦθ' ἔξων οὐκ ἀπαρμυθήτως οὐδὲ ἀψυχαγωγῆτως ἐννοῶ.*

Read *ἐπεὶ* for *ἐπί*. The meaning is: 'I don't say this (that you may go further than Illyria) as a wish, for it were better for you to come back to me the way you went.' One would certainly expect *ἀνείναι*, but at 252 D we have *τὴν οἴκαδε παρ' ἡμᾶς πορείαν*, not *νόστον*.

256 B. *πρὸς ἣν ῥητέον ὥς οὐ ταυτὸν ἐστιν ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ μακαρίζεσθαι, καὶ εἰ φύσει τὸ ζῶον εὐδαιμονίας ὀρέγεται, κρείττον εἶναι τὸ κατ' ἐκείνην μακαριστὸν τέλος τοῦ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐπαινετοῦ [μαντευόμενον].*

The last word is bracketed by Hertlein; 'videtur expungendum esse, corruptum certe est.' If however we expunge it, the change from the construction of *ῥητέον ὥς ἐστιν* to *κρείττον εἶναι* is very unlike Julian, nor is it easy to see where *μαντευόμενον* should have come from. As he is manifestly thinking throughout this passage of the first book of the Nicomachean ethics, so here it looks as if he were consciously or unconsciously echoing the sentence in the fifth chapter: *τὰ γὰρ θὸν δὲ οἰκείον τι καὶ δυσαφαίρετον εἶναι μαντεύομεθα*. It would be nearer to his MSS. if we supposed that he used the active form *μαντεύομεν*.

272 A. *οὐ πρότερον ἐπαύσατο πρὶν καθελεῖν αὐτόν, οὐδὲ τῷ περιελεῖν τὸ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον ἀρκεσθεῖς.*

Julian's use of *πρὶν* is not above suspicion (*οὐ θέμις προσελθεῖν ἐστὶ πρὶν ἀπολούσασθαι Ep. 76*), yet seeing how ugly *καθελεῖν* and *περιελεῖν* are so close together, being indeed only defensible as a silly pun, and how easy the corruption involved, I can hardly doubt that he wrote *καθεῖλεν*. Similarly in the well known lines of Solon *οὐτ' ἐπαύσατο πρὶν ἀνταράξας . . . ἐξεῖλεν* was corrupted, not indeed to *ἐξελεῖν* but to *ἀν . . . ἐξέλη*, and it looks as if that passage may have been in Julian's mind.

272 D. *οὐ καὶ αὐτὸς πρότερον ἢν ἀγαγόμενος τὴν ἀδελφήν.*

He inveighs against the iniquity of Constantius in murdering Gallus, 'his cousin, the Caesar, the husband of his sister, the father of his niece, whose sister he had himself previously married.' If he had meant to say *ἡγάγετο* he would have said so; where else does he use such a periphrasis as *ἦν ἀγαγόμενος*? Is it not more likely that *γαμβρός* has dropt out after *ἦν*? then *ἀγαγόμενος τὴν ἀδελφήν* is added to insist further on the force of *γαμβρός* by repeating the idea in other words in a manner suitable to the impassioned tone of the whole sentence.

273 A. *καὶ τοι μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς οὐδ' ὄναρ μοι φανείς ἀδελφὸς ἐπεπράχει.*

*ἀδελφός* Hertlein, *ἀδελφός* MSS. I suspect that Julian wrote *οὐδὲν οὐδ' ὄναρ*.

285 A. *δυοῖν θάτερον προσδοκῶντες, ἢ διαστήσειν ἀλλήλους ἢ καὶ παντάσῃ ἐπιθέσθαι μοι φανερώς.*

Obviously *ἐπιθήσεσθαι*.

287 C. *τῶν αὐτοῦ στρατοπέδων.*

Read *αὐτοῦ*.

299 D. *οὐδ' ὅσα νερτερίων ὑπεδέξατο φύλα καμόντων Τάρταρος ἀχλυόεσσαν ὑπὸ ζόφον αἶδος εἰσω.*

'*ἀχλυόεντος*?' Hertlein. No, *ἀχλυόεσσα*, which would to a certainty become *ἀχλυόεσσαν* because of the hiatus.

301 C. *μήτε Ἐπικούρειος εἰσίτω λόγος μήτε Πυρρώνειος· ἥδη μὲν γὰρ καλῶς ποιοῦντες οἱ θεοὶ καὶ ἀνθρώκαςιν, ὥστε ἐπιλείπειν καὶ τὰ πλείεστα τῶν βιβλίων. ὅμως οὐδὲν κωλύει τύπου χάριν ἐπιμνησθῆναι μὲν καὶ τούτων.*

This punctuation spoils the whole passage. Read *βιβλίων, ὅμως δ' οὐδέν*.

ARTHUR PLATT.