

# 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](#)



---

## Bodleian MS. of Epictetus

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 37 - 39

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201017, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00201017](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201017)

### How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1895). Bodleian MS. of Epictetus. The Classical Review, 9, pp 37-39  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201017

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

planation. But does not the fact of such alterations being necessary prove that Upton's filling up of the lacuna is not the conjectural emendation of an ingenious scholar, but a tradition of the original reading, which was lost through homoioteleuton (προσδέχεσθαι)?

25, 4. τὰ σὰ τήρει ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων μὴ ἐφίεσο. τὸ πιστὸν σόν... τίς οὖν ἀφελέσθαι δύναται σου ταῦτα.

*lacunam notavit Upt. e. cod. sed quod supplevit τὸ αἰδῆμον σόν viz sufficit: possis de εἰγνώμων, δῖον, κόσμον al. cogitare.*

I do not see why it should be necessary to mention more than two specially human characteristics. In c. 28, 21 τὸ αἰδῆμον, τὸ πιστόν, τὸ συνετόν are the three selected. In c. 4, 20, ii. 2, 4, 9, 11, iii. 17, 3, iv. 1, 161, *Enchir.* 24, 3, 4, we have simply these two.

10, 10. τίς ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ κόσμου διοίκησις καὶ ποίαν τινα χώραν ἐν αὐτῇ ἔχει τὸ λογικὸν ζῶν;

*αὐτοὶ S, αὐτῇ Upt. e. cod., αὐτῇ s.*

19, 11. γέγονε γὰρ οὕτως τὸ ζῶν· αὐτοῦ ἔνεκα πάντα ποιεῖ. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος αὐτοῦ ἔνεκα πάντα ποιεῖ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτὸς ὁ Ζεὺς.

*λοιπὸν Upt. e. cod., λυπηρὸν S.*

It should have been mentioned that Upton on the authority of his codex also inserted ὥστε after ζῶν and changed the first ποιεῖ into ποιεῖν, in both which changes he is followed by Schw. It certainly reads better to have the law laid down first in the infinitive, and then that the examples should follow in the indicative.

28, 19. οὐδενὶ οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος πελαργόῳ; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τοῦτοις οὐ διαφέρει. τίνι οὖν διαφέρει; ζῆτει καὶ εὐρήσεις ὅτι ἄλλω διαφέρει.

Here there is no note, but Upton writes *noster codex* ὅτι ὄλῳ διαφέρει, which is certainly far more vigorous: ἄλλω adds nothing to what has been said before, and does not prepare the way for the list of qualities which follow.

It may perhaps be worth while to mention that the readings in the 'Codex' are sometimes introduced by an ἵσως or an ἄλλως, which might seem to indicate that they were taken from a MS. which had been annotated by a Greek scribe.

It only remains for me now to speak of the Index, which is a work of immense, but not altogether intelligent industry. It has the advantage over Schweighäuser's in containing, so far as I have been able to test it, every word which occurs in Epictetus and almost every instance of the use of each word, but the words are given without explanation and without context, except occasionally to show the construction; and important or peculiar uses are often smothered among the unimportant. Thus, under the heading ἐν, no notice is taken of the use of ἐν for εἰς in i. 11, 32 ἐν 'Ρώμῃ ἀνέρχῃ and ii. 20, 33 ἀπελθεῖν ἐν βαλανείῳ, indeed the references themselves are altogether wanting, though special attention had been called to it in Schw.'s lex. So the unusual form ἀνίστακα does not appear under ἀνίστημι, though in Schw.'s lex. we read '*In praet. perf. notione activa, rariori usu βωμοὺς πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἀνεστάσιν* i. 4, 30.' The peculiar use of ἔρχομαι in i. 1, 4 ἡ λογικὴ δύναμις πόσον ἀξία οὕσα ἐλήλυθε and in i. 7, 12 ἐλήλυθεν ἡμῖν περὶ τῶν συναγόντων λόγων πραγματεία is in no way distinguished from the common use. Under ὅς c. conj. (p. 635, col. 1) i. 9, 11 οὐ... θέλῃσι is omitted. Under ὅταν no instance of the omission of the verb is noted, though stress was laid on this in pp. xci. and xxxix. If the reader is puzzled with the construction i. 2, 17 σὲ ἔδει φροντίζειν πῶς ἂν ὁμοίος ᾖ τοῖς ἄλλοις and looks for πῶς ἂν in the Index, he will find πῶς c. conj. and then πῶς ἂν c. opt., but no πῶς ἂν c. conj.; only at the end of the article, half a page below, comes '*de πῶς ἂν vide ἂν*.' No reference is made to the position of the indefinite τις at the beginning of a sentence, as in iii. 1, 14 τινά ποτ' ἀκούω Πολέμωνα, 5, 6 τί ποτε μὲν γὰρ ποιούντά σε δεῖ καταληφθῆναι. The use of ὥφελον, as a particle, with the indicative is unnoticed in such passages as ii. 18, 15 ὥφελόν τις ἐκοιμήθη, ii. 22, 12 ὥφελον ἐγὼ ἐπύρεσσον, ii. 21, 1 ὥφελον τύχην εἶχον, which are not even referred to at all. Under αὐτός we find the startling statement that in i. 25, 24 εὐθὺς γὰρ αὐτὸς κατ' ἐμαντοῦ δηλῶ, τίνι ἄλωτός εἰμι, the reading of S (ἐμαντός) is *fortasse recte*.

J. B. MAYOR.

#### BODLEIAN MS. OF EPICTETUS.

IN appending to Mr. Mayor's review an account of Prof. Schenkl's collation of the Bodleian MS. of the *Dissertations* I have had to depart from my original intention. I had meant to give a full list of the instances in which Prof. Schenkl's account of the readings

of the MS. required correction, but I soon found that to do this would take up too much space. I must content myself therefore with cautioning the reader of this edition against attributing infallibility to its statements about the Oxford codex, and with giving some instances (all taken from Book i.) which will justify this caution.

## (1) Words wrongly omitted :—

Schenkl.

MS.

<i>Epist.</i> § 1.—τοιαῦτα.	τὰ τοιαῦτα.
<i>Cap.</i> xi. § 3.—τούτου.	τούτου γ'.
<i>Cap.</i> xiv. § 7.—ἀνθρωπίνων.	τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων.
<i>Cap.</i> xix. <i>Tit.</i> —τυράννου.	τοὺς τυράννους.
<i>Cap.</i> xxv. § 4.—ὅταν τὰ.	ὅταν περὶ τὰ.

## (2) Words wrongly inserted :—

<i>Cap.</i> iv. § 3.—ἡ πρὸς.	πρὸς.
§ 9.—τί δ'.	τί.
<i>Cap.</i> xvii. § 16.—οὗτος ὁ.	οὗτος.
<i>Cap.</i> xxix. § 28.—ὁ λόγος.	λόγος.

## (3) Confusion of Words :—

<i>Epist. Tit.</i> —εὖ πράττειν.	χαίρειν.
<i>Cap.</i> i. § 31.—παρεσκενακέαι.	παρεσκενάκέ μοι.
<i>Cap.</i> ii. § 4.—ὑπὸ.	ἀπὸ.
<i>Cap.</i> iv. § 1.—κακά.	καλὰ (λ <i>rec.</i> in <i>ras.</i> )
<i>Cap.</i> v. § 2.—ἀπολυθωθῇ.	ἀπολυθωθῇ.
§ 9.—ἀποτέμνηται.	ἀποτέμνηκ[εν ?] (The last two letters have been concealed by the binding.)
<i>Cap.</i> vi. § 41.—οὐδ'.	μηδ'.
<i>Cap.</i> ix. § 30.—ἐπι. <i>S.</i>	ἔτι. <i>S.</i>
<i>Cap.</i> x. § 2.—ἐπαγγελλόμενος.	ἐπαγγελλόμενος.
<i>Cap.</i> xii. § 6.—ἐπιμελουμένων.	ἐπιμελομένων.
<i>Cap.</i> xiv. § 16.—μέμψασθαι.	μέμψασθαι.
<i>Cap.</i> xxii. § 6.—γενέσθαι.	γίνεσθαι.
§ 10.—εἰσιν.	ἐσιν.
<i>Cap.</i> xxvi. § 6.—θέλω.	θέλω.

## (4) Confusion of Contractions :—

<i>Cap.</i> ii. § 36.—ἔστιν.	ἔσται.
<i>Cap.</i> vi. § 24.—ἔστιν ἥδη καὶ πάρεστιν.	ἔσται ἥδη καὶ πάρεσται.
<i>Cap.</i> i. § 3.—ἐτέρω <i>S.</i>	ἐταίρω <i>S.</i>
<i>Cap.</i> ix. § 30.—*τ' ἀλλότρια ἀποδιδόνς ( <i>mg.</i> )	τὰ ἀλλότρια ἀποδιδόντος ( <i>mg.</i> )

Traces of at least three correctors (*Sb*, *Sc*, *Sd*) are clearly present in the MS.; and there were probably more than three. *Sb* and *Sc* seem to me not later than the beginning of the fourteenth century. But the MS. must be examined by a specialist in Greek palaeography before it can be decided how many correctors there were, what were their dates, and which corrections should be referred to each. Since Prof. Schenkl himself admits his doubts about referring this or that reading to *Sb*, *Sc* or *Sd*, I need not mention cases where he seems to me to be in error, but will pass on to a matter of much greater moment—

(5) Passages where the original reading is ignored or wrongly given :—

Schenkl.	MS.
Cap. i. § 3.— <i>ότε</i> .	<i>οτι</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>οτε</i> ).
§ 30.— <i>ελθε</i> .	<i>ελθ(ων?)</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>ελθε</i> ).
Cap. vii. § 25.— <i>συγκαθήσει S.</i>	<i>συγκαθήσεις S.</i>
Cap. xii. § 26.— <i>οισθα</i> .	<i>οισθας</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>-θα</i> ).
Cap. xii. § 30.— <i>ἔχων...ἀγνοῇ*</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>-εἰς</i> ).	<i>ἔχεις...ἀγνοῶν</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>ἔχων...ἀγνοεῖς</i> ).
Cap. xvii. § 11.— <i>μὼν ὥς</i> .	<i>μόνως</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>μὼν ὥς</i> ).
Cap. xxv. § 14.— <i>οὐ</i> .	<i>οὐ</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>οὐ</i> ).
Cap. xxviii. § 18.— <i>ἡ δ'</i> .	<i>ὁ δ'</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>ἡ δ'</i> ).
Cap. xxix. § 21.— <i>τοσοῦτον</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>τοσοῦτων</i> ).	<i>τοσοῦτων</i> ( <i>corr.</i> <i>τοσοῦτον</i> ).
	W. M. LINDSAY.

### LAFAYE ON CATULLUS.

*Catulle et ses modèles*, par GEORGES LAFAYE, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des lettres de Paris. Hachette. 1894.

THIS essay is an *ouvrage couronné* by the Academy of Inscriptions, and is an attempt to answer the question, How much is Catullus indebted to the Alexandrian poets, how much to the older Greek lyrists? Such a subject is on the face full of difficulties. The Greek lyric poets, except Pindar, exist only in fragments; an ode as nearly complete as Sappho's *Ode to Aphrodite*, is rare and exceptional. Thus the very basis of a really adequate judgment is wanting: for no one can appraise a poet fairly unless he has at least some one complete work before him. From this point of view then the comparison is unequal: for the Alexandrian poets are well preserved, and have come down to us not in fragments, but entire. The *Idylls* of Theocritus, the *Argonautics* of Apollonius of Rhodes, the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, the *Hymns* of Callimachus, the astronomical poem of Aratus, have come to us in a form more or less complete: we can see perfectly the aim of each poet and the amount of success with which he worked it out. We can understand why it was that the Alexandrian poets so greatly influenced the Romans. Whereas from the short fragments of the lyric poets we can only arrive at the most imperfect apprehension of their distinct form; and when the question—how much they affected any given Roman poet—is raised, can give little more than an approximate answer.

There is another difficulty which besets the question: the *absolute* loss of so much literature which may have contributed to

mould a writer, Catullus or whoever it may be. Any one who reads M. Lafaye's account of the hendecasyllable before Catullus will feel how difficult his task has been simply from want of materials. The hendecasyllable is Catullus' most successful experiment: we are curious to learn who had used it before him, what poems of any considerable length had been composed in this metre, and what kind of subject had been treated in it. But the actual specimens of pre-Catullian hendecasyllables are few, isolated, and insignificant; if there was nothing more than we have, Catullus may almost claim to be the inventor of this metre, so perfectly new is the development he has given it, and so various the tones which it assumes in his hands. But it is more than probable that specimens of Greek hendecasyllables were familiar to him which have perished entirely: and that these were known also to Catullus' older contemporary, Furius Bibaculus.

Mr. Lafaye's book is open then to a criticism which is, at starting, inevitable: it is obliged to be tentative, conjectural, and in not a few cases unconvincing. Of this the author is himself perfectly conscious: in discussing the two poems on the Sparrow, which have many forerunners in Greek literature, but are essentially an original inspiration of Catullus, he cites Meleager's well-known elegiacs to a locust, and even Archias' epigram on a cicada killed by ants, and then after justly contrasting the effect produced by Catullus' *Passer* with these light and somewhat frivolous effusions, concludes that it is impossible to say to what extent Catullus was consciously imitating either these or any other Greek model: 'il