

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](#)



***Euripides Hippolytus*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. E. Harry. Pp. xlv, 175. Boston: Ginn and Co. 1899. 6s.**

H. Ellershaw

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 05 / June 1901, pp 280 - 281

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030468, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030468

How to cite this article:

H. Ellershaw (1901). The Classical Review, 15, pp 280-281 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030468

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

happy form the fruit of the voluminous research of recent years; for example the note on page 260 gives all the main points of Wheeler's acute and convincing essay on the development of grammatical Gender (in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, 1899 (ii.) p. 528). And even this is not the most recent research which Mr. Giles has made accessible; light is thrown on many points from work only published last year, for example, on p. 520, the reader has the benefit of the results of Mr. Arthur Evans' most recent discoveries in Crete, bearing on the history of the Greek alphabets. The treatment of the changes of I.-Eu. η^* in Greek on p. 125 may be quoted as an example of the author's readiness to

accept the best view available though it involves the abandonment of his previous doctrine. One may regret in passing that Osthoff's wild speculations as to the 'double' treatment of sonant η and η are still given with so much prominence (p. 148), though there is some reserve in their statement. In § 45 a rather fundamental question ('Is Philology an exact science?') is still left without a very explicit answer, and on p. 226 there seems some obscurity in the description of 'the new accent' (in Greek nouns). But these are trivial blemishes in an admirable book.

R. S. CONWAY.

CARDIFF, May 1901.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Euripides Hippolytus. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. E. HARRY. Pp. xlv, 175. Boston: Ginn and Co. 1899. 6s.

It is strange that so seldom appears a new edition of the *Hippolytus*. The press positively reeks with notes on the *Alcestis* or the *Hecuba* or the *Medea*, while not more than about once in ten years does anybody find anything to say in English on the *Hippolytus*—almost the greatest, if not the greatest, monument of Euripides' genius. However, one is content to wait for a good book, and Prof. Harry has given us one.

The introduction is full. The life and opinions of the poet are dealt with at length and then follows a good section on Euripides' 'dramaturgy,' in which the editor defends the Euripidean prologue. From the Euripidean point of view Prof. Harry makes out a good case, though from the artistic standpoint there is little can be said for it. Then follows a criticism of the poet's shortcomings as exemplified in the use of the *deus ex machina*; in the break in interest which occurs in some of the plays; and in the ineffectiveness of the choruses dramatically considered. A brief account of Euripides' style and language succeeds and the remainder of the introduction is taken up with an analysis of the characters of the play, an account of the myth, and a description of the illustrations, eight in number, which occur in the volume. The whole of the introduction is interesting and useful.

The text and notes show Prof. Harry to be a conservative critic. He does not bracket or transpose lines simply because a better sense (as it appears) may be obtained by doing so, nor does he admit emendations needlessly. An emendation is too often made to cut the knot which sympathy with the poet and close study of his thought might have untied. Sometimes however the editor is almost too conservative, as for instance when he retains 32-3. He defends them on p. 148 though in the note below the text he remarks that the text is corrupt. One or two other points may be noticed; in 111, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ calls for something more luminous than 'more circumstantial and cautious than simple $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ or $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$.' It might seem from the note that $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ might take $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ in the construction, which the editor certainly would not intend. 167. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. To the references given might be added *P.V.* 645. There is a good note on $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma \chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ (200) in which the femininity of Phaedra's character is well brought out. 246. $\delta\mu\mu\alpha$ surely means 'face' here; cf. 'shame hath covered my face.' 270. Is it not rather too strong to say that the use of $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is an innovation of Euripides? There are three instances at least in Aeschylus—*P.V.* 867, 929. *Pers.* 215. 328. $\sigma\omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \tau\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ is taken in the sense of 'fail to keep thee' = to lose thee, instead of 'fail to gain my request from thee.' The following lines, too, taking Prof. Harry's interpretation of the thought, make good sense without transposition or omission (Nauck). There seems no sufficient reason

for omitting them. 513-15 are in brackets. The editor here has followed Nauck and most editors. But we may be sure that the poet knew what he was doing when he made the nurse indulge in a bit of folk-lore. 1167. Another example of sigmatism might have been quoted from the play 295, as well as the line from the *Medea*. 1186. Some explanation of λέγοι without ἄν should have been given. The references quoted for the construction do not seem strictly parallel. But there is little room for fault finding. The notes throughout are clear and to the point. A feature which cannot pass without remark is the great number of apposite quotations which Prof. Harry has collected from modern authors in illustration of the thought of the play. They certainly add much to the interest of an excellent edition.

H. ELLERSHAW.

Xenophon de Vectigalibus V. 9 und die Ueberlieferung vom Anfang des phokischen Krieges bei Diodor. Von Oberlehrer AEMILIUS PINTSCHOVIVS. Hadersleben, 1900. Printed by W. L. Schütze.

THE starting point of this dissertation is the passage in the *Πόποι* of Xenophon; it is, however, chiefly concerned with the account in Diodorus of the origin of the Sacred War. The author's conclusions may be summarised as follows. The seizure of the temple at Delphi is to be put in the archonship of Agathocles, 357/6, and took place about June 356; so that the war, which was regarded as ending with the *φθορά τῶν διανεμημένων τὰ ἱερὰ χρήματα* (Diod. xvi. 14), i.e. with the devastation of Phocis in August 346, lasted in reality a few months over the

ten years. He argues at length in favour of Volquardsen's view that the inconsistencies and repetitions in Diodorus xvi. 28 ff. as compared with Ch. 23-27 indicate a difference of source. He regards Ephorus as the authority followed by Diodorus in the earlier part of book xvi., down to the end of ch. 27, except in the chapters relating to Philip, which he assigns to Theopompus, from whose *Philippica* he supposes the latter part of the book to have been, in the main, derived. The Sicilian chapters in this part of the book come from Timaeus, although he maintains that Ephorus is the authority followed for Sicilian affairs down to ch. 27. He asserts the Xenophontic authorship of the *Πόποι*, and suggests the summer of 355 as the date of its composition, the passage in V. 9 being inspired by the Phocian embassy which he supposes to have been sent to Athens by Philomelus about this time.

The dissertation is a conscientious piece of work, marked, unfortunately, by an absence of method and style which one has come to associate with compositions of this sort. The most important contribution which the writer makes to the solution of the difficult problems of which he treats is his hypothesis that the whole of the thirtieth book of Ephorus' work was written by his son Demophilus. It has hitherto been inferred from the references in Diodorus that Ephorus carried down his history to the siege of Perinthus, and that Demophilus was responsible only for the account of the Sacred War. A strong case is made out in favour of this hypothesis; and, if it is accepted, it would furnish a plausible explanation for Diodorus' parting company, at the end of ch. 27, with Ephorus, to whom he has been so faithful up to that point.

E. M. WALKER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CLASSICS IN EDUCATION.

[We print below underneath a covering letter of Dr. GRANGER of University College, Nottingham, the first of two communications whose contents seem likely to excite both interest and dissent among readers of the *Classical Review*:—ED. C.R.]

These two letters upon Classical Education were not written, in the first instance, in order to be published. Their writer chose this way of expressing his objections to the discipline to which, as will appear, he was subjected in the usual course at Oxford. The letters summarise from one side a rather lengthy correspondence in which two