

## Zitierhinweis

Jackson, Donald F.: review of: José Francisco González Castro (ed.), Jenofonte, Helénicas, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2015, in: Exemplaria Classica, 20 (2016), p. 273-274, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v20i0.2928, downloaded from Website

**exemplaria**  
C L A S S I C A  
Journal of Classical Philology

## copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

JOSÉ FRANCISCO GONZÁLEZ CASTRO, *Jenofonte, Helénicas*, (ed., trad., not.), Madrid: CSIC, Alma Mater, 2015, ISBN 978-84-00-09998-5

For many years a lack of understanding about relationships between manuscripts of Xenophon resulted in printed texts often based upon derivative witnesses, critical apparatuses cluttered with variant readings of little value and editorial interpolations intended to improve an apparently error-ridden tradition. The text histories of most Xenophonic works are now known quite well and the best representatives of each work have been carefully collated. It is therefore possible to provide present day scholars with higher quality texts than has previously been the case.

This new edition of Xenophon's *Greek History* accompanied by a facing-page Spanish translation with helpful geographical, biographical and technical notes takes positive steps in improving the quality of what is presently available of a major work of Xenophon.

The Greek text offered here is carefully edited and is presented in a very attractive and readable form. It has been strongly influenced by that of Carolus Hude (Teubner 1930), by no means a bad choice upon which to base a text. Hude's *apparatus criticus*, however, suffers from failings mentioned above as characteristic of older editions. While it has here been cleared of Hude's distracting variant readings from lesser manuscripts, it is still burdened with numerous interpolations offered by earlier editors which are neither adopted into the text nor affect the translation in any way.

This practice of providing more information than is necessary carries over into the Introduction, as well. In a section dealing with manuscripts of *Hellenica* several witnesses not employed by the editor, proven elsewhere to be derivatives of other extant codices, are nonetheless described in some detail alongside six of greater importance. Whether such detailed description is appropriate for a volume of text and translation is debatable, but some of the details included in the discussion should be clarified or corrected. Parisinus gr. 1738 (B), one of the two most important witnesses to the text of *Hellenica*, here incorrectly said to be a parchment codex, has not lost folios at its end. The scribe apparently copied a mutilated source and left blank pages at the end, probably hoping to supplement the text later. Matritensis 4561 (T) is rightly hailed as a formerly virtually ignored witness, important for materials lacking in B and Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 140 (P). But it should also be noted that this is a composite codex of three parts put together by Constantine Lascaris late in the fifteenth century. Only the third part (*Hellenica*) dates to the year 1427. The second part (Thucydides,

*Peloponnesian War*) is not dated. The first part, a life of Thucydides, is an autograph of Lascaris and therefore dates to a later time. Although Britannicus 5110 (H) is not important for the establishment of the *Hellenica* text, one statement about it should be corrected. It is a copy of Parisinus Coislinianus gr. 317 (L), a close relative of T. Codex L suffers from many small *lacunae*, perhaps better called *fenestras*. The scribe of H filled in these blanks, but not from a manuscript of the second family. He tried to guess the word or words which belonged in at least fifty-four *fenestras* without succeeding even once.

The foregoing comments should not distract us from the quality of the rest of the Introduction. In it the reader will find very useful information about other works of Xenophon, his style and language, the structure of the history and an up-to-date list of papyrus witnesses. All in all, this and the following carefully crafted text is a solid piece of scholarship which will serve very well readers in various stages of their study and research.

DONALD F. JACKSON  
The University of Iowa  
djackson379@gmail.com