

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](#)



A Neglected MS. of Plato

John Burnet

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 02 / March 1902, pp 98 - 101

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205453, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205453

How to cite this article:

John Burnet (1902). A Neglected MS. of Plato. The Classical Review, 16, pp 98-101
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205453

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

prose and two poets Billaras and Christopoulos who have still a vogue. Entirely new life and interest, says Dr. Quinn, was given to the dispute by the deep scholarship and patriotic labours of Adamantios Koraes whose views were first made public in 1804. His object was to keep as close as possible to the demotic which he would purify by weeding out of it foreign discordant elements such as Turkish and Albanian words. This purified demotic was known as the *Katharevousa*, now the recognised name of the official language of Greece. Passing to the present day he distinguishes three grades of the *Katharevousa*: that used by the 'austere purists,' like the poet Kleon Rangabes in his *Ἄλγη* (Leipzig 1893), the 'temperate' form in which is written the largest part of the better contemporary literature, and the least rigid form, used for example by Bikelas in his translation of Shakespeare. Amongst the supporters of demotic pure and simple may be mentioned Professors

Psycharis and Émile Legrand of Paris, the poets Polemas and Mashoras and the novelist Andreas Karkobitsas. Dr. Quinn writes moderately and temperately of these rival claimants; but his own sympathies appear to be with some form of the *Katharevousa*.

A welcome sign of the vivid interest of Modern Greece in Ancient is the appearance of Part I. of a Modern Greek counterpart of Liddell and Scott, a work which the editor, M. Anestes Constantinides, eulogises in terms that would have rejoiced the hearts of the two scholars to whom we owe so much. The first instalment takes us down to the very beginning of B; 462 pages are devoted to A as against 269 in the model; but difference of type accounts for the greater part of the excess. We hope to publish a more detailed account in a future issue.

A NEGLECTED MS. OF PLATO.

UNDER Cobet's influence the great Paris MS. (A) was long regarded as the sole authority for the last three tetralogies of Plato, just as the Clarke MS. at Oxford (B) was supposed to be the sole authority for the three first. 'Vile damnum,' he says of the rest, 'si omnes ad unum flammis comburentur.' Little by little, editors have retreated from this extreme position. Schanz has shown that D (Venetus 185, Bekker's II) is independent of A in the *Republic*. It represents for us, as Jordan suggests, the missing second volume of B, just as T (Venetus App. class. 4. cod. 1) represents for us the missing first volume of A. Still more recently, Professor Lewis Campbell has shown that the Cesena MS., which he calls M, is independent of A as well as of D. We thus possess three independent witnesses, and on these three Professor Campbell's text of the *Republic* is mainly based.

It can hardly be said, however, that these three MSS. represent three, or even two, *families* in the strict sense. They are all clearly derived from a single archetype, and give substantially the same recension of the text. In particular M is very closely related to A, and there is every reason to believe that the original of ADM was not

very much older than A itself. It is clear, therefore, that the text of the *Republic* will rest on a much surer foundation if it can be shown that there exists a tradition wholly independent of ADM.

The Hofbibliothek at Vienna has proved the Nemesis of nineteenth century Platonic criticism. Its MSS. are very imperfectly represented in Bekker's apparatus, and most scholars have formed their views independently of them. The bitterness caused by the appearance on the scene of the MS. now known as W would be amusing if it were not so unedifying. Even Schanz has been a good deal less than fair to Král's perfectly honest and well-meant examination of this MS. It is, therefore, with some fear that I venture to claim an even higher place in the Platonic apparatus for another Vienna MS., of which a full collation has been in the hands of scholars for three-quarters of a century. I can only explain its neglect by the fact that it is in Schneider's apparatus and not in Bekker's, beyond which few scholars care to travel. Mr. Adam (who knows the value of Schneider) would certainly have discovered the truth if he had for a moment abandoned his generally prudent and healthy scepticism as to theories of manuscript affiliation. In

the preface to his text of the *Republic*, he says (p. xii. n. 3) 'the general result—that where A is wrong, v is right oftener than any other single MS. except II, E and g—is, I believe, firmly established.' So far as Bekker's MSS. go, this is probably true; but v (Schneider's Ang.) is demonstrably derived from Vind. F, which is, at the very least, two centuries older, and should, therefore, get all the credit in these cases. I may add, in passing, that Stallbaum's x (Schneider's Flor. R), to which some editors have paid considerable attention, is also derived from Vind. F.

With regard to Vind. F itself, I believe I can show (1) that it is derived, mediately or immediately, from an archetype of greater

antiquity than any extant Platonic MS., (2) that its archetype was independent of that of ADM.

(1) The antiquity of its archetype is proved by the nature of the graphic errors in F. These are mostly of such a kind that they could hardly have arisen in the process of transcribing an original written in minuscule characters, while many of them must have arisen from the misreading of a manuscript written in majuscules. The following list is far from exhaustive, but it is sufficient to prove the point, and may also have some interest as a fairly representative table of the sort of errors to be expected in such cases. It will be seen that *ex* correct the most obvious mistakes.

ADM

St. 330e δειμαίνει
339b μεγάλη
349b εὐθήθησ
351b γε ἡ ἀρίστη
353a ἡρώτων

358c αὐτὸ οἱ
 „ ἀναγκαῖον
359a δὴ ἄρξασθαι
363a ὁσίοιο
367a ἴσωσ
371b μεταδώσουσιν ὧν
394e ἡ οὐ
398d αἰδομένου (AM)
399c νῦν δὴ (AM)
401a κακοηθείας (AM)
401c αὔρα (AM)
404b μάλιστα ἡ
405c λυγιζόμενος AM }
 λογιζόμενος D }
420a οὐδ' ἀναλίσκειν
449a ἦα
450a τισ ἑάσοι
451b γελάσας
460d ἐκπορίζοντες
467b οὕτω κίνδυνος
487e δέ γε
500d μόνον
504d σπάνιον
519e ἐγγενέσθαι
520a ἐπὶ
521d εἴη ὃ
543c τε δεῖν
576d ἀθλιότητος
588c φύειν
595c ῥητέον

F

ἀεὶ δειμαίνει (ἀεὶ δ. v: αἰεὶ δ. x)
 μέγα δὴ (corr. μεγάλη δὴ, and so vx)
 εὖ ποιῆς (ἐπεικῆς corr. v)
 γ' ἐπαρίστω (not vx)
 πρῶτων (corr. ἡρώτων int. vers.: ἡρώτων
 πρῶτων x)
 αὐτόθι (corr. αὐτὸ and so vx)
 ἂν δίκαιον (not vx)
 ἀπάρξασθαι (so vx)
 θείois (δικαίοis vx, a conjecture)
 τέωσ (so vx)
 μεγάλως οὐσιῶν (not vx)
 ποῦ (not vx)
 διδομένον (also D and so x)
 νῦν ἂν (also D, not vx)
 κακονοίας (also D, and vx)
 λύρα (also D, not vx)
 μάλιστ' ἂν (so vx)

AY

αὐ λογίζόμενος, *i e.* ΛΟΓΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΣ (so vx)
 οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν (corr. οὐδ' ἀναλίσκειν and so vx)
 ἦλα (corr. ἦτα (*sic*) and so vx)
 τισ θεάσοι (not vx)
 κλάσας (corr. γελάσας and so vx)
 σκορπίζοντες (not vx)
 οὕτως ἰνδυνος (not vx)
 λέγε (not vx)
 πόνον (not vx)
 ἐπανιόν (not vx)
 ἐπαινεῖσθαι (not vx)
 ἐν ἧ (not vx)
 εἶπω (not vx)
 τελεῖν (not vx)
 δολιότητος (δουλιότητος pr. v, a conjecture)
 φύσιν (not vx)
 ἰητέον (not vx)

(2) The original of Vind. F was not only older than our oldest MSS.; it was quite

independent of the common archetype of ADM, and followed the recension used by

Galen, Iamblichus, Stobaeus, Clement, Eusebius, and other writers of the first five centuries after Christ. As I said in the Preface to the first volume of my edition of Plato, the agreement of W in peculiar readings with the old Armenian version on the one hand, and with Eusebius and Stobaeus on the other, is only to be explained on the theory that there was an 'ancient vulgate' of Plato's text, while our ninth century MSS. represent a recension made possibly about the fifth century A.D. The agreement between F and the 'indirect tradition' is even more striking, and extends even to small details. Considerable significance must be attached to the fact that in Rep. 612d the reading of F (vx) and Stobaeus ἐπειδὴ τοῖνυν, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, κεκριμένοι εἰσι is given in the margin of Par. A by the first hand with the sign γρ, while in the text A has ἐπειδὴ ἣν τοῖνυν κεκριμένοι εἰσίν, ἐγώ with

DM. In many places, F and the indirect tradition have alone preserved the true reading, e.g. 388e ἐφίγ F Stobaeus: ἔφη AM: ἔφη D, 620a ὡσαύτως. εἰκόστην F Plutarch; ὡσαύτως εἰκόσ. τὴν ADM. In other places, again, F and the indirect tradition agree in manifest errors, 432a οὕτω AM: ὅτι D: οὕτω τὴν πόλιν F Stobaeus, 534c ἐξέγρεσθαι ADM: ἐξεγρεῦσθαι F, a reading only to be explained by contamination of the ἐξαγρεῦσαι found in the Farnesinus of Stobaeus with the true reading. It would be easy to multiply such instances, but it is better to take a single passage, Rep. ii 377c 'Εν τοῖς μείζουσιν κ.τ.ε., which is transcribed as far as the end of the book by Eusebius (P.E. xiii. pp. 376-379), and several detached pieces of which are quoted elsewhere by the same author. The following variants are the most significant.

ADM

- 377d καὶ πρῶτον
378b δοκῶ
οὐδὲ
378c μέλλομεν
λεκτέα μᾶλλον DM: μᾶλλον A
378e ταῦτα AM: αὐτὰ D
379a ὁ θεὸς ὦν
379d δῶ ἀμφοτέρων
380b λέγειν ταῦτα
380c τοὺς λέγοντας
381a ἀνδρειοτάτην
ἔστι δὲ
381b δῆλον ἔφη ὅτι
381c θεῶ
ἅπαντα
381d πρωτέως
381e ἡμῖν
382a φάντασμα
382b ἄγνοια ἢ τοῦ ἐψευσμένου.
382d ψευδὴς ἐν θεῶ
ψεύδοιτο
383c χρώμην

F EUSEBIUS

- πρῶτόν τε (so vx)
δοκεῖ (so vx)
οὔτε (not vx)
μέλλομεν (so vx)
μᾶλλον λεκτέα (so vx)
om. (so vx)
ὦν ὁ θεὸς (so vx)
ἀμφοτέρων δῶ (so x)
ταῦτα λέγειν (not vx?)
τοὺς τε λέγοντας (so vx)
ἀνδρειοτάτην τε (so vx)
ἔστι (add. δὲ corr., and so vx)
δηλονότι ἔφη (so vx)
θεὸν (so vx)
πᾶσα (so vx)
πρωτέως τε (so vx)
ἡμᾶς (so vx)
φαντάσματα (so vx)
τοῦ ἐψευσμένου ἄγνοια (so vx)
ἐν θεῶ ψευδὴς (so v)
ἀν ψεύδοιτο (so vx)
αὐτοῖς χρώμην (so vx)

It appears to me that these agreements and differences can only be explained on the theory I have advanced, and it would be easy to show in the same way the agreement of F with Iamblichus, Stobaeus and other writers, extending often even to minutiae like elision.¹ I claim, therefore,

¹ In his Index, Schneider had already pointed this out. He says of Vind. F 'Veterem vulgatam representat et fere cum Stobaeo, Eusebio, etc. consentit.' Being in the Index, this observation has been left unnoticed. I did not know of it myself till I had already worked out the problem. It shows

for Vind. F that it, along with the 'indirect tradition,' gives us a second foundation for the Platonic text, coordinate with the archetype of ADM. The manuscript is full of mistakes, no doubt; but they are not of the misleading kind, being due to ignorance and not to perverse ingenuity. Critically used, I believe its evidence to be of the highest value. If I am right, it follows, for instance, that the agreement of F with D will in

that the theory of an 'ancient vulgate' is not so modern as is sometimes supposed.

many cases outweigh the undoubted authority of A, even when supported by M, and that in many cases F is our oldest, and often our sole authority for the true reading. By assigning to it its due place in the *apparatus criticus*, we are able to dispense to a large extent with the Renaissance MSS. Ξ and q (which Mr. Adam ranks immediately after A and Π), and this in itself is an appreciable gain. At the time these MSS. were written, conjectures were made in the most light-hearted way, and both of them come from the very centre of Platonic study. Ven. Ξ was written by Joannes Rhosus for Cardinal Bessarion, and Mon. q reveals its *provenance* in a marginal reference by the first hand to δ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\Pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\omega\nu$. Readings so attested have no more authority

than those of Ficinus and Cornarius, though it seems sometimes to be thought that the mere fact of their being written rather than printed gives them a superior claim to consideration. In point of fact, we can still see quite clearly from what originals these two MSS. were copied, and it is antecedently improbable that, where they depart from the earlier MSS. of their own family, they rest on anything better than conjecture. Of course, a few—a very few—of their conjectures are right, and they should be quoted for these, just as we quote Stephanus for his; but we are on much surer ground with an entirely unsophisticated document like Vind. F.

JOHN BURNET.

ARISTOPHANES, *KNIGHTS*, 532, 3.

DR. VERRALL'S notes on this play in the last number of this *Review* are most original and refreshing. The hard ground of the text cracks and out flies an $\epsilon\mu\pi\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\nu$ $\iota\sigma\chi\alpha\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. Whether his novelties are true is another question, and in one case I think his crusade against ancient and modern nonsense has carried him too far.

The traditional interpretation of vv. 531 sq., νυνὶ δ' ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ὁρῶντες παραληροῦντ' οὐκ ἐλεεῖτε, | ἐκπιπτονσὼν τῶν ἡλεκτρῶν καὶ τοῦ τόνου οὐκ ἔτ' ἐνότος, | τῶν θ' ἀρμονιῶν διαχασκουσῶν· ἀλλὰ γέρον ὦν περιέρρει, | ὥσπερ Κοννᾶς στέφανον μὲν ἔχων αὖτον δίψῃ δ' ἀπολωλώς, is given by the scholiast; ἰδίως τὰ ταῖς κλίναις ἐπιβαλλόμενα ἐλεφάντινα οὕτως ἐκάλουν ἡλεκτρα. μεταφορᾷ οὖν κέχρηται ἀπὸ τῶν κλινῶν· αἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖαι κλῖναι τοὺς πόδας εἶχον ὠφθαλμισμένους ἀνθραξι καὶ ἡλεκτροῖς ὥσπερ νῦν ἀργύρῳ ἢ καττιτέρῳ . . . ἀκολουθῶς μετὰ τὴν κλίνην ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ τόνου· τόνος γὰρ τὰ τῶν κραββάτων σχοινία . . . ἀρμονίας λέγει τὰ συμπησσόμενα τῶν κραββάτων μέρη. ἐπέμεινε δὲ τῇ τροπῇ.

The word ἡλεκτρος is not known elsewhere in the feminine, nor as part of a piece of furniture. Therefore many commentators transfer the term to a lyre, while Dr. Verrall writes ἡλεκτρῶν and ἀρμονιῶν with capital initials and sees in them characters in Cratinus' plays.

I believe the scholiast to be right, as scholiasts usually are; and I produce the following evidence.

Athen. *Mittheilungen* viii. 357 sq. An

inventory of furniture in the temple of Hera at Samos, p. 371 $\epsilon\nu$ διφρακον συντετριμμενον του δευτερου διφρακον ενλειπει τα πλεκτρα υπο τουτωι διφρακον | τον τονον ουκ εχε[ι . . .] κλιντηριος ελεφαντι ποικιλος ουκ ην. Köhler, who publishes a revised copy of the inscription, remarks 'Weiterhin wird man τὰ πλέκτρα wenn richtig abgeschrieben als "das Flechtwerk" fassen müssen; man erwartet τὰ πλεκτά.' Read H for Π , sc. τα ηλεκτρα. The coincidence is striking: in both cases ἡλεκτρα(οι) is followed by τονος. About the latter there is no doubt; see Pollux x. 37 with quotations (adduced by Köhler), and another inscription, *C.I.A.* iv. Pt. ii. p. 178, No. 682 c. κλῖναι . . . τοὺς τόνους λίαν ἐντατοῖ four times repeated. I think these passages amply justify the scholiast, and the difference of gender must be accepted.¹

Dr. Verrall, however, hedges, and says 'the allusion to Electra and Harmonia does not exclude a reference by way of pun to the ἡλεκτρος (-τρον, -τρα) of a bed or a lyre.' I think Electra and Harmonia are excluded not merely because it is a desperate sup-

¹ As it appears that ἡλεκτρος wherever it occurs in literature before Aristophanes is ambiguous (*Soph. Ant.* 1038, which the *Lexx.* quote for the masculine points the other way), viz. equally masculine or feminine, we ought perhaps to let this place decide, and say that ἡλεκτρος f. and ἡλεκτρον n. are the two forms in use in early and classical Greek. The ἡλεκτροι were I suppose the metal, 'white gold,' as the *Dict. Ant.* calls it. The same authority s.v. *Iectus*, brings cases of inlaid bed-feet. See also 'Electrum' in Daremberg and Saglio.