

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](#)



Hude's *Lysias Lysiae Orationes recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit* Carolus Hude, Ph.D. Pp. x + 272 (the latter not numbered, except with the pages of Stephanus). Date of Preface, December 1, 1911; date of publication, December 19, 1912. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper covers, 3s.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 01 / February 1914, pp 12 - 15
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00006429, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00006429

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1914). The Classical Review, 28, pp 12-15 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00006429

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

This seems palaeographically easier than Heinsius'

custodum grege seu circa se stipat euntem,

or Burmann's

custodum gregibus seu quum se stipat euntem.

III ix 23-26.

cum tibi Romano dominas in honore securis
et liceat medio ponere iura foro,
uel tibi Medorum pugnaces ire per hostis
atque onerare tuam fixa per arma domum. . .

One simple hypothesis will explain all the complication of oddities in this passage: *Romano honore, dominas secures, Medorum hostis*.

It is to suppose that a vertical dislocation has taken place at the third letter in each of the three lines—*i.e.*, two words have been shifted up into the line above that where they ought to be.

24, 25 should then read:

et *tibi Romano* ponere iura foro
vel *liceat medio* pugnaces ire per hostes.

What about 23? We have to deal with

cum tibi dominas in honore securis

for I assume the *tibi* to be sound. What is to be supplied?—*i.e.*, What has *romano*, intruding from below, displaced here? The missing word must be (1) one that is liable to be confused with *romano*, and (2) a genitive to qualify *dominas*. *Terrarum* fulfils the conditions; so would *uel rerum*:

cum tibi terrarum dominas in honore securis,
or

cum tibi vel rerum dominas in honore securis.

Note that in II vii 15, for

quod si romanae comitarent castra puellae

(as I now agree with Scaliger and Passerat in reading), the MSS. offer

quod si uerameae.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University, Glasgow.

REVIEWS

HUDE'S *LYSIAS*.

Lysiae Orationes recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit CAROLUS HUDE, Ph.D. Pp. x+272 (the latter not numbered, except with the pages of Stephanus). Date of Preface, December 1, 1911; date of publication, December 19, 1912. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper covers, 3s.

THE *editio princeps* of Lysias is included in the first volume of the *Orationes Rhetorum Graecorum* published by Aldus Manutius, Venice, 1513. Among later editions may be mentioned those of Henricus Stephanus in the *Oratores Graeci*, Paris, 1575; John Taylor, Cambridge, 1739; Reiske, Leipzig, 1772; and Auger, Paris, 1783. In the nineteenth century Lysias was edited, in the *Oratores Attici*, by Bekker, Oxford, 1822 f., and Berlin, 1823 f., and by Baiter and Sauppe, Zürich, 1838; and, separately, by Scheibe in 1852 (ed. 2, 1862), Westermann, 1854, Cobet, 1863, and

Herwerden, 1899. Scheibe's Teubner text is now superseded by that of Thalmheim, 1901. Among editions of *Select Speeches* may be named those with German notes by Rauchenstein in 1848 and Frohberger in 1866, which have been repeatedly revised since the above dates, and those with English notes by W. A. Stevens, Chicago, 1876 and 1878, and M. H. Morgan, Boston, 1895, and by R. C. Jebb, in *Selections from the Attic Orators*, 1880 and 1888, and E. S. Shuckburgh, 1882 and 1885, etc.

The primary MS of Lysias, Palatinus X, No. 88 in the Heidelberg Library, was written in the twelfth century by one Theodorus, a name very frequent in the Byzantine age. It was formerly preserved in Nicaea, the celebrated Bithynian city which, under Theodorus Lascaris (1206-1222), became for a time the capital of Western Asia. When the Greeks recovered Constantinople in 1261, the MS may well have been taken to the city which

continued to be their capital until its capture by the Turks in 1453. Even before the fall of Constantinople the MS (like many others) may have been removed to the safe seclusion of the monasteries of Mount Athos. In the preface to the *editio princeps*, Aldus Manutius, after mentioning Lysias and Aeschines, says that many of the speeches of the orators included in the same edition *latebant in Atho*, until Janus Lascaris, who had been sent to the East by Lorenzo dei Medici, brought these and many other MSS to Florence.¹ Later in the fifteenth century the primary MS was repeatedly transcribed, and some at least of these transcripts were probably made in Florence, where they are still preserved. Either the primary MS, or a transcript of the same, was used in Venice for the *editio princeps* in 1513. From Venice or Florence this primary MS may have been taken to Heidelberg by one of the several scholars who formed the links between Italy and Germany during the Revival of Learning. When Heidelberg was captured by Tilly in 1622, the library of the capital of the Palatinate was assigned, as part of the spoils of war, to Maximilian of Bavaria, and was presented by him to Pope Gregory XV, who sent a renegade Greek, Leo Allatius, to superintend its transfer to the Vatican in the following year. Sauppe begins the sentence, in which he correctly states the vicissitudes of the MS, with the following words: 'Ex Italia Heidelbergam allatus est, Heidelbergam Leo Allatius anno 1622 Romam abstulit . . .' Dr. C. Hude, the editor of the text now under review, condenses the whole sentence thus: 'Ex Italia

Heidelbergam allatus est, anno 1622 Romam revertit, anno 1797 Lutetiam Parisiorum asportatus est, anno denique 1815 Heidelbergam rediit.' The words which I have printed in italics, *Romam revertit*, imply that the MS was formerly in Rome, and that it naturally returned thither, whereas it seems more probable that it was formerly in Venice or in Florence.

Dr. Hude, a member of the Royal Danish Academy and Rector of the Danish School of Frederiksborg, north of Copenhagen, is already favourably known to scholars as an editor of Herodotus in the same series, and of two editions of Thucydides, published by Teubner. For the present text of Lysias he has himself minutely collated the Heidelberg MS, which had already been collated, in whole or in part, or specially examined, by at least nine other scholars. He has also recorded nearly all the readings of the fifteenth-century Florence MS, C (Laur. lvii. 4), which Bekker made the basis of his text of 1822 f., but which Sauppe in his celebrated *Epistola ad Hermannum* (1841) proved to be only an intelligently copied and occasionally interpolated transcript of X. Thus the readings of this MS, where it diverges from X, are of no primary authority, but are to be regarded as the conjectures of a capable Greek scholar. Some good examples of the corrections tacitly introduced by this copyist may be gleaned from Dr. Hude's critical notes: *Or.* 14 § 14, οἱ δὲ φίλοι (for φίλοι) ἐστρατεύοντο; *Or.* 19 § 50, Ἀθηναίων πάντων (for ἀπόντων) ἀκηκοότων; and *Or.* 23 § 14, ἐπισκεψάμενος (for ἐπισκεψάμενος) . . . τῷ μάρτυρι οὐκ ἐπέξῃλθεν. Dr. Hude agrees with Sauppe in his general opinion of C, and states the result of his own record of its readings in the following terms: 'Quicumque hanc editionem cum superioribus comparaverit, facile apparebit [some scholars might prefer the personal *intellegit* to the impersonal *apparebit*] multas bonas scripturas quae vulgo Stephano, Contio, aliis imputantur re vera huic librario deberi.' 'Stephanus' is obviously Henricus Stephanus, the editor and printer of the Paris edition of 1575. For 'Contius' we have to turn to the pre-

¹ Beriah Botfield's Prefaces to the *Editiones Principes*, p. 298. The inventory of Janus Lascaris' MSS, published by K. K. Müller in the *Centralblatt f. Bibl.* i (1884) 333 f., includes on p. 374 *Διοχίνου λόγοι* and *Λυσίου ἀπολογία β*, which Müller proposes to identify with Laur. lvii. 4 (=C), a corrected and interpolated transcript of the primary MS (X), whereas the Aldine text is mainly founded on the primary MS (or an exact transcript of it). Thus in 19 § 22 it has *μὲν εἰπὼν κατεχρήσατο* with X, whereas C has *λαβὼν*; in 14 § 14, *φίλοι* with X (*ψίλοι* C); 19 § 50, *ἀπόντων* with X (*ἀπάντων* C). Possibly therefore X, with which the Aldine generally agrees, was brought by Janus Lascaris from Mount Athos.

face of Auger's Paris edition of 1783, where we find (on p. xiii) that 'Antonius Contius' was a native of Nyon (on the Lake of Geneva); that he distinguished himself as a lawyer in Orleans and Bourges, where he died in 1586; that he entered in the margin of his copy of the Aldine text of 1513 a number of emendations and typographical memoranda which appeared to imply that he was meditating a text of his own, and that the volume (now in the Paris Library) was placed in Auger's hands by De Cissé, Bishop of Auxerre. It is not, however, certain that the emendations were made by Conti himself; like the *marginalia* in other copies of the Aldine text, they may have been transcribed from some other source (cp. Erdmann's *Lysiaca*, p. 4, n. 3). All these emendations were regarded as original, and were recorded by Auger at the end of his second volume. This is stated in a shorter form on p. viii of the preface to Thalheim's edition of 1901: (editionis Aldinae) 'ex exemplo . . . nunc Parisino Augerus in editione (Par. 1783) Antonii Contii emendationes deprompsit, qui natus Novioduni, doctissimus IC, Bituricae mortuus est 1586.' As there are many other persons of the name of Conti, and two or three of the name of Antonio Conti in *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, where there is no notice of the critic of the text of Lysias, the bare mention of the name of Contius in Hude's preface is inadequate, and some further details are necessary. Again, in *Or.* 10 §§ 23, 28, Hude as well as Thalheim ascribes certain conjectures to 'Brulart,' but it is only from Thalheim's preface that we can readily learn that Brulart was a Bishop of Sillery, who died in 1714, and whose conjectures were entered in the margin of a copy of Stephanus' text now in the Paris Library.

An examination of the critical notes shows that more than ninety scholars have already contributed towards the correction of the text of Lysias. Six of these are justly mentioned with honour in the preface: Taylor, Markland, Reiske, Bekker, Dobree, Sauppe. Three of these belong to Cambridge: Jeremiah Markland of Peterhouse, John

Taylor of St. John's, and Peter Paul Dobree of Trinity. Markland's emendations were published in the editions of Taylor and Reiske, while Dobree's were posthumously printed in his *Adversaria*. One would gladly have seen the names of some editors of *Select Speeches*, such as Rauchenstein and Frohberger, and of the whole of Lysias, such as Cobet and Thalheim, duly recorded by the latest editor of the text. Cobet's interesting preface includes four pages of parallel columns setting forth the errors of the Palatine MS and the corrections of Cobet's predecessors, and thirteen comparing the readings of the MS with the great Dutch critic's own emendations. Thalheim, again, gives us four pages of bibliography, including the names and dates of previous editors, and an alphabetical list of fifty-three comparatively recent scholars, with references to the articles or dissertations in which they have dealt with the text. The page and a half remaining blank at the end of Hude's preface leaves room for some slight expansion in this direction in a future issue. Many English students will possess no other copy of the text than the present excellent edition, and, in their interest, as well as in justice to previous critics of the text, some such expansion is eminently desirable. Some notes and suggestions on the text may here be added:

Or. 2 (*Epitaphios*), §§ 24-28. In the critical notes Dr. Hude states that 'Aldus,' that is the *editio Aldina* of 1513, has ἐπηγγείλαν for ἀπηγγείλαν in § 26, and ἐξόν for ἐξόν γάρ in § 28. But neither of these variants can possibly be attributed to 'Aldus,' since the whole of the passage beginning with ἀποθανεῖν in § 24 and ending with Ἑλλησπόντου in § 28, in which these variants occur, is omitted in the printed text of the Aldine edition, which draws special attention to the *lacuna* by a blank containing the words λείπει πολὺ, the amount omitted being about equivalent to a small octavo page of text. But, in a copy of that edition in the Leyden Library, the missing passage is supplied in *manuscript*, possibly (as has been suggested) by Paulus Manutius, with a view to a new edition of his father, Aldus Manutius' text of 1513. The above variants are in the *manuscript* addition to the Leyden copy, and ought to have been assigned, not to 'Aldus,' but to the *margo exempli Leidensis editionis Aldinae*, Dr. Hude's abbreviation for which is 'marg. Ald.'

The evidence as to the *marginalia* in six

copies of the Aldine text has been partially collected with care in Erdmann's *Lysiaea* (Strassburg, 1891). But, on the two copies in Cambridge, he quotes Taylor, at second hand, as quoted by Reiske: *exemplar alterum collegio D. Joannis . . . legavit . . . Matthaeus Prior; alterum in bibliotheca J. Mori episcopi Eliensis asservatur*. He conjectures that the latter personage was 'Joannes Morus, Prediger in York †1592, . . . Socius in Collegio Christi.' But John More, Fellow of Christ's, was not a preacher in York; he was known as the 'Apostle of Norwich,' and was never Bishop of Ely. The person in question was obviously John Moore, Fellow of Clare and Bishop of Ely (†1714), whose celebrated library was bought by George I. and presented to the University of Cambridge. Taylor, who was University Librarian 1731-4, was perfectly familiar with this fact, and, indeed, at the end of the sentence correctly copied by Reiske, but incompletely quoted by Erdmann, actually adds: *Quam totam munificentia vere regia et liberalitate nunquam satis praedicanda Academiae Cantabrigiensis donavit Rex Optimus Georgius I.* (*Praefatio* dated 1738, p. xxvi).

Or. 7 (de olea sacra), § 1, οὕτως ἀπροσδοκήτως αἰτίας καὶ πονηροῖς συκοφάνταις περιπέττωκα. Thalheim and Hude agree in rejecting Taylor's alteration of ἀπροσδοκήτως into ἀπροσδοκίους, which, however, is accepted by Cobet. Taylor was in fact justified in expecting an adjective before αἰτίας as a necessary parallel to πονηροῖς before συκοφάνταις, but ἀπροσδοκίους is not a true parallel to πονηροῖς. Accordingly, I suggest that the missing adjective is αἰσχροῖς. Such a word might easily have dropped out, owing to its beginning and ending with the same syllables as the next word—αἰτίας. This suggestion is confirmed by § 41 of the same speech, where the same disgraceful charges are referred to in the phrase ἐπ' αἰσχίσταις αἰτίας, also by

Or. 6, § 44, ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς αἰτίας, *Or. 10*, § 26, οὕτως αἰσχροῖς αἰτίας (αἰσχρὰν αἰτίαν Reiske), *Or. 16*, § 12, δίκην αἰσχρὰν, *Or. 21*, § 18, αἰσχροῖς δίκας, and Deinarchus, *Or. 1*, § 93, περὶ αἰσχροῖς αἰτίας κουνῇ πάντες ἀγωνιζόμεθα. All these passages tend to support my proposal that the text should run: οὕτως ἀπροσδοκήτως αἰσχροῖς αἰτίας καὶ πονηροῖς συκοφάνταις περιπέττωκα.

Or. 30 (in Nicomachum), § 6, ὑμᾶς τοῖνυν χρῆ, . . . ἐπειδὴ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου δίκην οὐκ εἰλήφατε, νῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων γοῦν τὴν τιμωρίαν ποιήσασθαι. Here Hude regards γοῦν as *vix sanum*. Thalheim, on the other hand, endeavours to defend it by quoting *Or. 25*, § 4, ταῦτα γοῦν. But ταῦτα γοῦν presents no difficulty, because γοῦν ('at all events') there draws a contrast between a *part* and a preceding *whole*; as elsewhere, between *one* or a *few* and a preceding *all* or *many* (cp. 6, § 44, ἐν γοῦν, and 10, § 21, ἐγὼ γοῦν). The real difficulty lies in the contrast between πάντων and the preceding ἐνὸς ἐκάστου. It may, however, be suggested that, although, at first sight, πάντων γοῦν, 'all at any rate,' is apparently wrongly contrasted with the preceding ἐνὸς ἐκάστου, 'each single individual,' the real contrast is between condemning all *at once* and condemning several individuals *seriatim*. πάντων (= ἅμα πάντων) is stronger than πάντων, and is practically equivalent to ἀπαξπάντων. Thus the *single* notion of the condemnation of all at one fell swoop is contrasted with the *series* of condemnations of the several persons previously mentioned; so that we here have a contrast between a single thing and a preceding plural, which is in accordance with the regular usage of γοῦν. No such attempt to defend the text would have been necessary, if we had found in the MSS νῦν γοῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων τὴν τιμωρίαν ποιήσασθαι.

J. E. SANDYS.

St. John's House, Grange Road, Cambridge.

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS.

The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius.

Edited with Introduction and Commentary by GEORGE W. MOONEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. Pp. 454. Dublin University Press Series, 1912.

MR. MOONEY is justified in claiming the merit of freshness for his edition of the *Argonautica* with an English commentary, as the last edition by an Englishman was made nearly a century and a half ago. But Mr. Mooney has given us here an edition which, besides being fresh, is quite satisfactory and shows a thorough acquaintance with the principal work that has been done in this field up to the present time. The

literature is, as he remarks, very scattered and in many cases unprocurable, for Apollonius is a favourite subject for German dissertations. After all is said however, our ignorance of his life is so great that we know neither the date of his birth or death nor even whether he was, as tradition says, in the list of Librarians of the Alexandrian Library. The prevailing opinion among scholars now is that he was not. The tradition, as it appears in the anonymous *Lives* of Apollonius and in Suidas, is treated as of no account and rejected on chronological grounds. These grounds, if certain, must be conclusive, but they themselves rest on doubtful interpretations of passages in Callimachus and