

IMPRIMERIE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ

CORRESPONDANTS  
DE  
J.F. BOISSONADE

III  
—  
N-Z

BIBL.  
UNIVERSITÉ  
MS.  
1553



BIBL.  
DE  
L'UNIVERSITÉ  
MS.  
1553



MS  
Fiches faltos







1254

Thetford, Oct. 8, 1820.



Dear Professor, With your copy of the *Arcadius & Aristarchus* went copies of both those works for D.<sup>r</sup> Coray, & a copy of the latter work for M. Gail, & if your books have not reached you, the other must, I suppose, have miscarried also. M.<sup>r</sup> Bohte assures me that they were forwarded to Paris the day after he received my order through Mess.<sup>rs</sup> Treuttel & Wurtz. If you think that they are irrecoverably lost, I will send duplicates immediately. There is some unaccountable obstruction in the conveyance of goods of this description from Paris. For A. Coray's Ode, which you forwarded to me from D.<sup>r</sup> Coray, & Professor —'s Proclus have not yet arrived.

I think that you asked me who was the author of the articles in the *Classical Journal*, signed Cecilius Metellus. His name is Walker — he is a promising young man, just elected a Fellow of Trinity-College, Cambridge, but has not published any work, by which he might be known to the public.

In my last Letter I solicited you to send something to me for insertion in the second part of my *Aristarchus* with the view of exciting attention to my book, & of giving to it the chance of permanency, & the probability of a sale. In one particular you might render me considerable service, which would be at the same time intimately connected with my book — forgive me, if I ask too great a favour, or one, which is incompatible with your pursuits & your leisure.

The settled conviction of my mind is that D.<sup>r</sup> Blom-

field is mistaken in charging Stanley with pirating the  
Notes of St. Casaubon on the Agamemnon of Aeschylus. There  
is every reason to believe that the book, referred to in your  
Library, (which, according to your testimony, contains the hand-  
writing of St. Cas. mixed with the handwriting of some other  
person,) was originally Casaubon's own book, in which he  
noted down conjectures for his own use - that this book  
after Cas.'s death passed into the hands of some person,  
who for his own purposes noted down numerous con-  
jectures made by Stanley in his Ed.<sup>n</sup> of Aeschylus, & that  
Stanley has been most unjustly accused of pillaging Cas.'s  
notes, when they are in reality his own property. Even  
Fäehse entertains, <sup>or seems to entertain</sup> this opinion, but I dare not put my  
faith on him. What I want is to have the question finally  
settled, & it is one of the highest moment, a work of  
Christian charity - to rescue the memory of the modest Stan-  
ley from so <sup>foolish</sup>, <sup>as I think</sup>, a charge. Pray give me your aid, & that you  
may not be thrown into any unpleasant situation with re-  
gard to Blomfield, I will make just what mention you  
please of your name.

1. Then, as I have not access to Vauwilliers' Notice of the  
Paris Book, please to favour me with an exact tran-  
script of the whole, accompanied with such remarks, as  
may occur to you in transcribing.
2. Blomf. produces 35 instances of coincidence between  
Casaubon & Stanley, & I want to know precisely what  
is cont.<sup>d</sup> in the Paris Book respecting those 35 in-  
stances. They are on the following verses of the Agam.  
viz. 106. 109. 224. 260. 290. 469. 569. 630. 655. 673.

678. 723. 748. 770. 826. 843. 912. 976. 985. 987. 991. 1110. 1131.  
1220. 1249. 1270. 1308. 1341. 1437. 1489. 1521. 1596. 1604. You  
will observe that Blomf. in professing to give 35 instances  
is as inaccurate as usual. For in point of fact they  
are only 34 in n.º Hell, please to transcribe all, which  
you find in the Paris-bk on these 34. passages. 1255

3. From your Letter to me, published by D.º Butler in the  
Preface to his Aesch. T. VIII. it appears that there are  
two hand-writings in the Paris-book. Bauvilliers considers  
the manum nitidiorem to be Casaubon's, & the other ~~graver~~  
~~graver~~ to be that of Puteanus. Please to give me the year of  
the death of Puteanus. Your own opinion is that, if either  
hand belongs to Casaubon, the more difficult one is.  
D.º Butler writes thus at the end of the Preface:—

« Postquam hanc prefationem typis mandaram, ipse Casau-  
boni Codicem Parisius inspexi. Ac primo quidem neutram ma-  
num Casauboni esse credidi. Sed cum alia ejus scripta  
indubie fidei ibidem evolvissem duplici ac plane diverso  
charactere eum in scribendo usum fuisse repperi.  
Atque in librum ejusd. Bibl. N.º. 8451. incidi, cum hoc, de  
quo agitur, plane gemellum. Continet vero Aristoph. I.  
et quaedam ex Anthol. a Casaubono descripta, cum  
versione interlineari ac Notulis manu quidem pulcherrima  
re, quam qua festinanter uti solebat vir magnus  
exaratus, sed huic tam simili, ut ovum non sit ovo  
similius. »

Now please to compare this Codex N.º 8451. ~~&~~ with  
the book in question, & tell me whether you now

coincide with D.<sup>r</sup> Butter in thinking that the book in question does contain the hand-writing of Cas., & that the manus. nitidior, as Vauvilliers states, is really Cas.?

4. In transcribing the 34 instances please to distinguish clearly which is written in the one hand, & which in the other.

5. It would be of great use, if you could ascertain to whom the unknown hand belongs. Have you in the Paris-Library any Mss. of Puteanus, with which you can compare it?

6. Faehse says that this Paris-bk. contains the emend.<sup>s</sup> of Stanley & Canter. What does he mean by Canter? Is there any mention of Canter's name? how did he know that Canter's emend.<sup>s</sup> are cont.<sup>d</sup> in the bk.? Did he, think you, ascertain it from looking at Canter's Ed.<sup>n</sup> of Aesch.? or are these readings of Canter copied from some Mss., which cont.<sup>d</sup> the hand-writing of Canter? <sup>& relates to emendations not found in Canter's ed.<sup>n</sup></sup> Or does this unknown hand-writing, which Vauvilliers attributes to Puteanus, belong to Canter? If your Library contains any Mss. of Canter, you may by examining them ascertain this point.

7. The Paris-book was transcribed by Peter Needham entire, & D.<sup>r</sup> Askew afterwards transcribed from P.N.'s copy. They have both prefixed to their transcripts the words Casaub. et Cas. Therefore they manifestly considered the Paris-bk. as cont.<sup>d</sup> both Casaubon's hand & some other person. This other person they designate by Cas., while Vauvilliers considers him to be Puteanus. What is your opinion about this Cas. I know

You will much oblige me by informing Mr. Barker that I owe much to Professor Boissonade for his edition of the Hymns of Proclus, & particularly for his additions to, & emendations of the Hymn to Minerva. But he is greatly mistaken in giving the title of  $\Upsilon\mu\upsilon\sigma\ \kappa\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma$  to the Hymn, which immediately follows the Hymn to the Muses. For it is obviously a second Hymn to these Divinities, & is so entitled in a Ms. copy of the Hymns of Proclus in the British Museum. This I was not aware of till after the publication of my Translation of these two Hymns in my Sallust; for in consequence of following Fabricius, I edited the two as one. I have said that this second Hymn should be obviously inscribed to the Muses; & I think that the following observations will prove that this is incontrovertibly true.

In the 2<sup>d</sup>. line of the 2<sup>d</sup>. Hymn we have,

$\text{Οἱ ψυχᾶς μερόπων ἀναγνώριον ἀψαμένον μῦσῶν}$   
 and in the 1<sup>st</sup>. line of the 1<sup>st</sup>. Hymn,

$\Upsilon\mu\upsilon\epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\ \Upsilon\mu\upsilon\epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \varphi\omega\varsigma$   
 For the fire or light proceeding from the Muses

is of an elevating nature. Again in the 4<sup>th</sup> line of the 1<sup>st</sup> Hymn we have,

Ἀχραντοὺς τετέησεν ἔγερσιν ἄπο βιβλῶν  
& in the 4<sup>th</sup> line also of the 2<sup>d</sup> Hymn

Ἕμνων ἀργητοῖσι καθηραμένοι τετέησι.  
In the 5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> lines likewise of the same Hymn we have,

ζαθεῶν δ' ἄπο βιβλῶν

νεύσασ' ἔμοι φάος ἄγνον κ.τ.λ.

& in the 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> lines of the 1<sup>st</sup> Hymn we find,

φάος ἄγνον

εἶδκετ' ἔμην ψυχὴν παναδημονα πρὸς

ἕμετέρων βριθουσαν ἀξίλων ἄπο βιβλῶν.  
And in the last place the concluding line of the 2<sup>d</sup> Hymn is

Ὀρῶν καὶ τετέτας ἔργων ἀναφαίνετε μυστῶν.

The following line too from the Orphic Hymn to the Muses, greatly corroborates what I have said:

Αἱ τετέτας θνητοῖσι ἀνεδέξατε μυστῶν ποδευτοῦς

For here the Muses are celebrated as unfolding the mysteries to mankind, & this is perfectly conformable to

what is said by Proclus, both in the first & second of these Hymns.

1257

I will likewise thank you to inform Mr. Barker that I was surprised to find the following remark of Boissonade respecting Proclus in this volume of his Sylloge:— 'Fuit quoque Proclus artium musicae non vulgariter peritus, adeo ut me quidem iudice melior sit poeta meliorque grammaticus quam philosophus.' This decision of Boissonade is not only adverse to the opinion of all the Platonic philosophers posterior to Proclus, but also to that of many celebrated moderns, such as Bepler, Dr. Barrow, Fabricius etc., & contradicts what he said in a Letter to Mr. Valpy on the receipt of a copy, which I presented to him, of my Translation of Proclus on the Theology of Plato. For he there

says:— 'Magna est Taylori adversus me humanitas et liberalitas. Virum doctissimum meo nomine salutes, <sup>rogo,</sup> ipsique significo memorem me semper fore benevolentiae tantae. Utinam sum aliquando illa dignior! Nam μοδῖς προτεδελῶν καὶ μελῶν μυστηρίων ἀψακένος, οὐπὼ πρὸς

την Προκτου ἑκκελευσιν μυσταγωγίαν ἀναβλέ-  
πειν τεθαρρηκα.

"I was much gratified to find that Boissonade has  
inscribed this volume in so handsome a manner  
to our worthy & erudite friend."

Mr. T. Taylor to Mr. J. J. Welsh,

Aug. 22, 1830.