

Book Reviews

Herodoti Historiae, Vol. I libri I–IV, ed. Haiim B. Rosén, Teubner Leipzig 1987

H. B. Rosén's new critical edition of Herodotus, published in the 'Bibliotheca Teubneriana', may be considered a landmark in Herodotean scholarship. The fact that it is based on the results of the author's penetrating investigation into the Herodotean dialect entitled *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform* (Heidelberg 1962; hereafter *Grammatik* or *Gr.*) marks it off from all previous critical editions and constitutes its unique value.

Most previous critical editions of the *Historiae* were based on their editors' implicit or explicit assumption that the work has been composed in "pure" Ionic (whatever this may mean). Consequently, the various manuscripts were evaluated according to their conformity or lack of conformity to an imaginary standard of linguistic purity. It followed that only those manuscripts or groups of manuscripts which were considered to preserve the "correct" dialectal forms were given a high rating, while others were stigmatized as "deteriores" (praef. VIII; *Grammatik* 207).

In his Herodotean Grammar Rosén exposed the *petitio principii* underlying this procedure. If our evaluation of manuscripts depends on their preservation of the "true" dialectal forms, while the "true" dialectal forms can be known only through their preservation by the manuscripts, we face the difficulty of moving in a vicious circle. Hence the contention of Wilamowitz that the "horrible devastation" ("grauenhafte Verwüstung") brought about by later scribes would thwart any attempt to restore the historian's original dialect (quoted in *Grammatik* 243; *cp.* also praef. VII).

The prevailing opinion among previous editors was that dialects were well defined abstract entities and that their distribution corresponded to geographically fixed areas. However, this conception has been modified as the result of research carried out by Risch (*MH* 1949) and Porzig (*IF* 61, 1952). Today dialects are rather looked upon as junctures of isoglosses merging gradually one into another (*Gr.* 241). Accordingly, Rosén has carefully tried to reconstruct the Herodotean language by applying a strictly inductive method, whereby only those forms were tentatively accepted, which meet the requirements of a dialect (*Gr.* 246).

At this stage contemporary inscriptions were consulted for comparison. Orthographic and morphological variants attested by inscriptions, which can be dated back to the

historian's lifetime and are found to be located in the vicinity of his homeland, are considered authentic on the assumption that the existence of such variants is a characteristic feature of any spoken dialect (*Gr.* 247). Furthermore, Rosén assumes that before the reform of the archon Eucleides (403 BC), writers were not bound by any strict rules of *orthographia* ("correct spelling"). The same writer could spell the same word in two or more different ways without being considered "uneducated": "Herodoti ... aequales liberam scribendi variationem a cultu atque humanitate abhorreere non censebant" (praef. V; cp. *Gr.* 26).

It follows that Rosén's critical edition rests on different theoretical assumptions than those of editors like Hude, who tried to account for the existence of such variants by positing a kind of 'Kunstsprache', which Herodotus was supposed to have used: "sed restat quaestio ...num Herodotus in scribendo certam aliquam dialectum expresserit. Ab tribus Iadis generibus, quae testimoniis titulorum tradita extant ... scribendi genus Herodoti in rebus et multis et gravibus ita differt, ut *nullo singulari eorum usus esse videatur*; contra aliqua ex parte cum testimoniis ceterorum scriptorum, poetarum maxime, ita consentit, ut et hos et illum *normam quandam non ex sermone cotidiano* expressam, sed potius *ad usum artemque* scribendi institutam secutos esse veri simile fiat" (praef. XI sqq.). There is another assumption, which Rosén does not share with Hude. According to Hude cod. A (Laur. LXX, 3), which dates as far back as the Xth or even the end of the IXth century and belongs to the stirps Florentina, possesses a higher authority than all other manuscripts on account of its highest antiquity, which brings him nearer to an alleged archetypus, the source of all later 'corruptelae': "horum (scil. ceterorum codicum) codex A, ut vetustissimus est, ita memoriam verborum sinceriores quam ceteri exhibet, ut *ad archetypum*, unde omnes fluxisse communio vitiorum ostendit, proxime accedat" (praef. VIII).

Rosén, on the contrary, had already reached in his '*Grammar*' the conclusion that both the stirps Florentina and the stirps Romana, which constitute the two main groups into which the majority of our MSS are divided, cannot be traced back even to two different 'subarchetypi'. As a matter of fact, there did not exist neither in Herodotus' time nor later any 'Vulgate', from which our later manuscript tradition may have been derived either directly or indirectly (*Gr.* 205 sqq.; cp. also praef. LVII). It stands to reason that already during the historian's lifetime his *History* was published in different places in the form of separate roles, each role being coloured by the locality of its place of publication and probably also by the language of its first publisher (*Gr.* 202). Even Herodotus himself may have been under the influence of the Attic dialect, while composing his account of contemporary Attic history (*Gr.* 204; praef. LVIII). This assumption may account for the fact that Attic case forms of $\nu\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ like $\nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma$ (nom. pl., 8.107.2) may be found in that part of his work, which deals with Athenian history (Book VIII) and may have been composed by the author during his stay in Athens (praef. LVIII; *Gr.* 205 n. 5). Later editors of the respective roles tried to reach uniformity by eliminating one form in favour of another according to their "ideology" with regard to Herodotus' dialect (*Gr.* 207).

The assumption that different roles underwent different editing in a time which antedates the earliest sources of our manuscript tradition, accounts for the fact that within certain passages our manuscript tradition differs from the tradition preserved in subsequent passages with regard to a number of variants. Such alternations may take place within a single book, which proves the well-known fact that the traditional division of the *Historiae* into books is of much later origin than the division into units of contents, the length of which may have corresponded to the size of the original roles into which the *Historiae* were probably divided.

This fact may be illustrated by the following example: In Book VII the form of the acc. plur. of πόλις before vowels and “in pausa” transmitted by the MSS of the stirps Florentina is πόλις e.g.: ...τάσδε πόλις, ἐκ τῶν κτλ. (7.122). In 8.32.2 the reading of the stirps Florentina is πόλις (before vowels), while the reading of the stirps Romana is πόλιας e.g. ἐς τὰς πόλις ἐνέντες (stirps Florentina) -πόλιας (stirps Romana). In 8.108.3 both stirpes read πόλιας before consonants (κατὰ πόλιας τε καὶ κτλ.).

The idea that the division of the *Historiae* into different roles, each of which constituted a self-contained unit of contents, antedated the traditional division of the work into “books”, was first suggested by Jacoby (*RE* Suppl. II, s.v. “Herodotus” 283ff.) and taken up by Legrand, whose division differed in many points from those of his predecessor. Both in his *Grammar* and in his *apparatus criticus* Rosén has supplied ample evidence in support of his contention that the transition from one unit of contents to another is paralleled by a corresponding shift of our manuscript tradition from one unit to another with respect to orthographic and morphological variants. Thus Jacoby’s theory has been corroborated by application of completely independent linguistic criteria.

We have mentioned before that Rosén’s critical edition rests on assumptions that differ from those of his predecessors in many respects. These may be summed up as follows: The existence of orthographic and morphological variants in our MSS may be accounted for in more than one way. It may reflect : a) orthographical inconsistencies either of the author himself or of the earliest publishers of his work; b) the existence of variants in Herodotus’ dialect, a trait common to dialects in general; c) the result of early editing of the historian’s work by different editors, each one trying to make the text conform to his own ideas about the author’s language.

It follows that no variant contained in any of our MSS has been considered *a priori* unworthy of being included either in the text or in the apparatus criticus. A comparison with Hude’s edition shows that in many cases the editor has been more conservative, preferring to retain a form supported by consensus codicum rather than emend it, in order to reconstruct an imaginary “pure” Ionic form. The following example may illustrate this point: In spite of the fact that the aspirated, elided prepositions within the prepositional combinations ἐφ’ οὔ, ἀφ’ οὔ, ἀνθ’ ὧν have been transmitted by all our MSS, Hude has replaced them by the corresponding non-aspirated forms ἐπ’ οὔ, ἀπ’ οὔ κτλ., assuming apparently that these forms are more authentic.

As a matter of fact, our MSS have also preserved the non-aspirated variants, but Rosén had already shown in his *Grammar* that the opposition between aspirated, elided prepositions and non-aspirated elided prepositions reflected an underlying grammatical opposition (*Gr.* 37ff. 163ff.; praef. XVII). ἀπ' οὐ, ἐπ' οὐ introduce relative clauses, in which οὐ, ὧν prove to be relative pronouns on account of the fact that they refer to an antecedent contained in the governing clause. On the other hand, ἀφ' οὐ etc. introduce adverbial clauses, in which the respective combinations function as conjunctions, that have developed out of prepositions governing former relative pronouns, which have ceased to refer to an antecedent. The aspiration of the final stop of the former prepositions can be looked upon as a marker of such "univerbation" (XVII ff.).

The following examples cited by Rosén may serve to illustrate his contention: a) κρητῆρα οἴνου, ἀφ' οὐ πίνουσι ("out of which they drink"; 4.66.1); b) εἶναι δὲ ἔτεα ἀφ' οὐ Τύρου οἰκέουσι, τριηκόσια καὶ δισχιλία ("It is two thousand and three hundred years that have passed since they settled in Tyre": 2.44.3: praef. XVII; *Gr.* 38. Hude corrects ἀπ' οὐ).

Regarding Herodotean morphology, Rosén has been more careful than his predecessors to preserve apparent morphological variants, which are backed by consensus codicum, whenever it can be proved that such "variants" are not variants at all, but reflect an underlying grammatical opposition. In the language of Herodotus there exists an opposition between τοι (οἷ)σδε (dat. instr.) and τοι (οι)σίδε (loc.) e.g.: νόμοισι χρέωνται τοιοῖσδε (1.216.1; instr.; τοιοῖσδε codd. τοιοισίδε corr. Hude) ἐν τοισίδε χωρίοισι III 111,1; loc.; praef. XVIII, GR. 114). In his *Grammar* (ibid.) Rosén refers to Schwyzer I 612, where it is stated that originally the second element (-δε) of these pronouns possessed inflectional endings. The Homeric forms τοῖσδεσσι (K 462, v 258; see Gehring, *Index Homericus s.v.*) may reflect an intermediate stage of development. Having lost the inflection of the second element, the respective pronouns developed an internal inflection. Consequently, they withstood much longer the process of case syncretism than nouns and adjectives. Former editors, like Hude, who were not aware of this distinction, tried to substitute τοῖσδε by τοισίδε, assuming that only the latter represents the true Herodotean form.

We have dwelled upon these examples in order to show that, by discarding any preconceived ideas with regard to the Herodotean language and by following a strictly inductive method of research, Rosén has reached important conclusions, which constitute a major contribution to the study of historical Greek Grammar.

A special feature of Rosén's apparatus is the provision of ample room for ancient "testimonia". These are divided into two sections. Section A contains citations from ancient authors, whose aim was either to illustrate some points of style or to supply historical and geographical information. Section B, on the other hand, contains testimonia of ancient grammarians and lexicographers. In his introduction Rosén accounts for this procedure (praef. ILIX sqq.). It stands to reason that grammarians and lexicographers made a greater effort to preserve the original language of Herodotus than historians, geographers and antiquarians. The latter were naturally more interested in supplying evidence for

factual information and often tended to make the language of the author conform to their own speech habits. It follows that on matters of language their evidence bears considerably less weight than that of the first group. Accordingly the atticized form ἀπόδειξις (I Prooem.) contained in Aristotle's quotation (*Rhet.* III 9, 1409 a) may not be considered a *varia lectio*, while following remark by a grammarian may lend support to the reading ἀπόδειξις preserved by the stirps Romana (TRbSV): 'δείξω' διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου 'Ἡρόδοτος αὐτὸ χωρὶς τοῦ ἰ προηγάγετο' εἶπεν γάρ' ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις ἦδε (Choerob. *Orthogr.* 195; cp. also the citation from Greg. cor. *De dial. Ion.*).

Although both Hude and Rosén accept the reading ἀπόδειξις, while relegating the lection ἀπόδειξις to the apparatus, the inclusion of the grammarian's testimonia in the apparatus of Rosén's edition adds more weight to this decision. In I 9,1 the following remark found in the *Etym. Magn.* supports the reading ἀρρωδέων preserved by most MSS (excluding CD^a, which read ὀρρωδέων); μετὰ τοῦ στερητικοῦ α ἄρρωδῶ' Ἡρόδοτος' καὶ ἀπεμάχετο τὴν ψυχὴν ἀρρωδέων (*ibid.* 633,43). Hude, too, accepts this reading, but his apparatus does not contain the relevant testimonium preserved by the *Etym. Magn.*

The story of Cleobis and Bito in 1.31.2 is introduced by the words: καὶ δὴ καὶ λέγεται ὧδε λόγος. The MSS of the stirps Romana (DRSV) and QM contain the reading ὅδε λόγος; cett. ὅδε ὁ λόγος, while bT and Ald. contain the lectio ᾗδε λόγος ("the story [is told] in the following way"). Rosén prefers the reading ὧδε λόγος, according to which Solo is made to refer to a well known story. His decision is based on Cicero's paraphrase "nota est fabula" in Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 1.113, which he includes in his apparatus, adding the following remark: 'nota est fabula' melius congruere videtur cum λέγεται ὧδε quam cum aliis lectionibus." One may ask, whether this story, which Cicero assumes his readers to be familiar with, was already well known in Herodotus' times. Still the inclusion of Cicero's paraphrase in the apparatus offers the attentive reader a much broader base for reaching a decision on this point than Hude's edition, which does not include any testimonia.

Rosén's ingenuity is not confined to recension. His edition, contains many interesting emendations, which display both depth of knowledge and soundness of judgement. The slightest emendations are those which concern the MSS tradition regarding marks of accent and breathing, which were not systematically employed till after 900/1000 AD (Schwyzer I 374). Some scholars go so far as to suggest that it should be disregarded completely by the editor (cp. Gardthausen's opinion quoted in praef. p. VI). If this is true, the substitution of a spiritus asper by a spiritus lenis, involving also a change of accent, might be considered to be the slightest kind of emendation; nevertheless, an emendation of this kind may lead to important results as, for instance, the substitution of spiritus asper and acute by a spiritus lenis and circumflex in 1.205; ταύτην (*scil.* τὴν Τόμυριν) πέμπων ὁ Κύρος ἐμνάτο (τῷ λόγῳ θέλων γυναῖκα ἦν (codd. ἦν) ἔχειν. If we retain the transmitted spiritus asper, we are faced with the difficulty of positing the existence of the possessive adjective ὄς, ἦ, ὄ in the language of Herodotus. But Rosén has pointed out that there is no evidence for its use by any Greek prose writer later than the sixth century BC, including our author (praef. XXIV

and *Gr.* 115). By ignoring the consensus codicum and reading ἦν instead of ἦν, we get the imperfect ind. of εἶναι, which combines with the part. praes. act. θέλων to form a periphrastic construction. Rosén devoted an important paper to the syntactic function of such constructions (“Die zweiten Tempora” im Griechischen. Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim Griechischen Verbum,” *MH* 14,133 sqq.; cp. also *Gr.* 189 footnote 105, where Herodotus 1.205 is discussed). Such constructions enable the rhematization of certain parts of the sentence. The use of the periphrastic construction fits very well into the context of the passage under discussion. Cyros only *pretended* that he wanted to keep Tomyris as *his wife* (τῷ λόλῳ . . . ἔχειν). “Tomyris, however, aware that it was her *kingdom* and not *herself*, that he courted, forbade the men to approach” (Rawlinson. ἡ δὲ Τόμυρις συνιεῖσα οὐκ ἀτήν μιν μνόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὴν Μασσαγατέων βασιληίην, ἀπέειπατο τὴν πρόσοδον). It is clear that the periphrastic construction θέλων ἦν serves to rhematize the word γυναῖκα. Accordingly, Rawlinson translates the respective explanatory clause by using a cleft sentence.

Rosén’s emendations are not confined to matters of language, but include also some cases, in which a reading backed by consensus codicum, does not make sense within its context. The following sentence, which concludes an aetiological myth about the origin of the Scythians, may serve as an example. The sentence reads: τὸ δὴ μούνον (codd.) μηχανήσασθαι (μηχανᾶσθαι ABCTM) τὴν μητέρα Σκύθην (stirps Romana: Σκύθη-stirps Florentina and P). “this was the only thing that the mother (*i.e.* of Scythes) did for him” (10.3: Rawlinson).

According to the story preceding this sentence a woman bore three sons to Heracles and following his injunction asked them, after they had reached maturity, to bend their father’s bow. “Two of them . . ., proving unequal to the task enjoined, their mother sent them out of the land. Scythes, the youngest, succeeded, and so he was allowed to remain. From Scythes, the son of Heracles, were descended the . . . kings of Scythia” (*ibid.* tr. Rawlinson). The reading of our MSS does not yield any satisfactory meaning within this context. Rosén suggests the reading τὸν δῆμον ὦν on the assumption that τὸ δὴ μούνον is a corruptela, which may have crept into our MSS as a result of an insertion from the margin, which resulted in a conflated reading, τ’ δῆμον^{ου} being turned into τὸ δὴ μούνον.

Furthermore, he adopts the reading Σκύθην (acc.) and takes it to be an ethnic adjective. as a result, we get a sentence which does not only make sense, but which may also serve as an appropriate conclusion of an aetiological myth: “So the the mother (*i.e.* of Scythes) has produced (established) the Scythian people.”

One may still argue that the meaning attributed to the verb μηχανᾶσαι in this context (“herstellen, fertigestellen”-app. crit. *ad loc.*) lacks attestation, since in 1.94.6 cited by Rosén (*ibid.*) its object is a concrete noun (πλοῖα). The attribution of a more abstract meaning to the verb μηχανᾶσθαι may seem a little bold; but such a relatively slight extension of meaning may be postulated in order to make the sentence as a whole sound more intelligible.

This example may illustrate another feature of Rosén's critical edition. Its apparatus criticus is not only more comprehensive than that of Hude, but it also contains more detailed information about the origin of many textual corruptions and a deeper insight into the reasons which lay behind the editors with regard to matters of recension and emendation than one could get from any previous edition.

Limit of space prevents us from giving a full account of Rosén's contribution to the "Textgeschichte" of Herodotus. But our review would be incomplete without a reference to Rosén's 'collatio' of the codex Hierosolymitanus (J), an achievement of which he is rightfully proud: "Herodotea Hierosolymitana ipse contuli et benignitate curatoris usus in Bibliotheca post annum 1967 potui exscribere (praef. XXXVI). Codex Hierosolymitanus dates from the middle of the XVth century. According to the testimony of A. Papadopoulos Kerameus ('Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη I, 160 s.) it is a compilation based on fragmentary pieces of MSS dating from the end of the XIVth and the beginning of the XVth century. The binding of the pages was carried out in the library of Patmos. There the closing and opening pages, written in 1769, were added. Finally, the manuscript was brought to Jerusalem (not later than 1860). The value of this manuscript consists in the fact that it constitutes an important member of the stirps Romana. Rosén tried to determine its exact location within the scheme of the stemma Romana propounded by Weber (*Analecta Herodotea*, Philologus supp. 12). For further details we refer the reader to praef. XXXVIff.

Summing up, we welcome the publication of the first part of Rosén's critical edition of Herodotus, hoping that it will soon be followed up by the publication of the second part.

By selecting only a few examples, we tried to draw the attention of scholars to the wealth of new information and new insights contained in this monumental work.

R. Freundlich

Tel Aviv University

K. J. Boudouris (ed.), *Ionian Philosophy* (Athens: International Association for Greek Philosophy, 1989), 454 p.

'The articles in this volume are, in the main, the texts of papers read either in full or in part at the First International Conference on Greek Philosophy (Samos 1988)' (from the editor's Preface). Appropriately to such a first conference, it was devoted to the beginnings of philosophy in Greece and, more specifically, in Ionia itself. The volume includes forty-seven papers dealing with all the major figures of Ionian philosophy, from the Milesians to Anaxagoras. Pythagoras, the most illustrious native of Samos, and the Pythagoreans (technically considered an 'Italian' sect, but included by courtesy in the theme of the conference), attract the attention of seven scholars. The other notable Samian, Melissus, is the subject of only one contribution, by D. Furley, possibly because Melissus is usually