

# 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](#)



---

## On Dionysius of Halicarnassus

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 05 / June 2005, pp 252 - 254

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992734, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00992734](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992734)

### How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1905). On Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Classical Review, 19, pp 252-254  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992734

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## ON DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS.

IN the following notes, which deal mainly with the *De Compositione Verborum*, I have followed primarily the new Teubner text of Usener and Radermacher (referred to as U. R.), of which vol. 1 appeared in 1899, vol. 2 in 1904.

1. 5 εἰ μέλλουσι μὴ πᾶν . . . λέγειν μηδ' ἐκῇ συνθήσειν.

Considering (1) the rarity of such a mixture of tenses, (2) the frequency in MSS of this particular error, the writing of present for future when they are very similar, we should probably read λέξεν.

*ibid.* εἰς δὴ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ὃ δεῖ πρῶτον νέους ἀσκήσθαι.

Write νέους. The dative with the passive present, though of course possible, is unlikely in Dionysius. ἀσκῶ can take two accusatives.

*ib.* 6 εἰ δ' ἐγγίγνται μοι σχολή.

Probably εἰ δὲ γέννται. Is there any parallel for such a use of ἐγγίγνεσθαι?

*ib.* 7 ποῖαν κρατίστην αὐτῶν εἶναι πείθομαι.

21. 146 τὰς μέντοι γενικὰς αὐτῆς διαφορὰς ταύτας εἶναι πείθομαι μόνας.

I suspect πείθομαι in both these places—in spite of θήσεται following almost immediately in the latter—should be τίθεμαι, as in 21. 145 εἰδικὰς μὲν διαφορὰς πολλὰς σφόδρα εἶναι τίθεμαι. Schäfer in this third passage would substitute πείθομαι for τίθεμαι (see his note), but it seems more natural to say 'I make three classes,' 'I lay it down that there are many distinctions,' than to say warmly 'I am convinced' that there are. Such uses of τίθεναι, τίθεσθαι are very common in Plato and Aristotle. So again in 26. 215 γέλωτος ἄξιον τίθεμαι.

4. 29 τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἀρχαίοις ὀλίγον δεῖν πᾶσι πολλὰ ἐπιτηδεύειν ἦν αὐτοῦ . . . χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον παντάπασιν ἡμεληθήη καὶ οὐδεὶς ᾤετο δεῖν ἀναγκαῖον αὐτὸ εἶναι.

For δεῖν, which can hardly be right, U. R. rather strangely suggest λοιπόν *now*. The error seems very unlikely. It is more probable that δεῖν represents an infinitive governed by ἀ. εἶναι, and itself governing αὐτό, e.g. οὐδεὶς ᾤετο ἐπιτηδεύειν ἀ. αὐτὸ εἶναι. ἐπιτηδεύειν suggests itself from ἐπιτηδεύσεις preceding, and the partial similarity of ᾤετο might occasion the mistake; but no doubt various verbs would do as well.

6. 39 ἰδεῖν τί μετὰ τίνος ἀρμοζόμενον πέφυκε καλὴν καὶ ἡδεῖαν λήψεσθαι συζυγίαν.

It is very improbable that anyone would put a future infinitive after πέφυκε. Scores of infinitives must be found after it in Greek literature: is there another case of the tense being future? Perhaps we should read τί μετὰ τίνος ἀ. <ὥς> πέφυκε κ. κ. ἢ λήψεται σ. Two or three times over in this chapter we have both λήψεται (πότερον λήψεται and κατὰ ποίᾳς ἐγκλίσεις . . . λήψεται), and πέφυκε with present infinitive.

*ib.* 40 I think πῶς must be repeated before ἀποκροῦσαι, or some equivalent in its place. With καὶ τρίτον εἰ κ.τ.λ., we cannot carry on the force of the πῶς above.

A few lines below (41) I cannot see why U. R. should alter πῶς οὐκ ἄμεινον to πῶς εὖ ἢ ἄμεινον. οὐκ ἄμεινον is a familiar expression, practically = *undesirable, to be avoided, better not*, and gives just the sense here required in contrast with ἐπιτηδεύειν.

9. 50 τελεία γὰρ ἂν ἡ λέξις ἦν . . . τὸ δὲ μέτρον ἡδίκητο καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἔσχεν ἦν νῦν ἔχει χάριν.

After ον in μέτρον has not ἂν fallen out?

11. 55 τὴν πείραν αὐτὴν παρέξομαι μάρτυρα ἦν οὐχ οἷόν τε διαβάλλειν τοῖς κοινοῖς πάθεσιν ὁμολογουμένην.

Schäfer expresses διαβάλλειν by *reicere*, agreeing with the old translation *quam arguere potest nemo*. This may be right, but ἦν may also be the subject and δ. mean, as it sometimes does, *deceive*.

13. 71 ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡδεῖα τις γίνεται λέξις, οὕτω γενναία τις ἄρα.

For ἄρα U. R. suggest ἐτέρα. Perhaps ἄλλη, as ἀλλά and ἄρα are certainly sometimes confused.

15. 87 μείζων . . . ἔσται . . . καὶ ἔτι βραχεῖα μένει.

Obviously μενέει. So too probably five lines above.

*ib.* 89 οὐ τὴν αὐτήν.

MSS vary between οὐ and οὔτε. Perhaps οὐ τι.

18. 112 τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα κείται τοῖς πράγμασιν ὡς ἔτυχεν.

The MSS have ἔκκειται and ἔγκειται. Perhaps ἐπί- or even σύγ-κειται, as there was probably some reason for the ἐκ and ἐγ.

ib. 118 ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐτέρωθί μοι δηλοῦται σαφέστερον.

δεδηλωται may be conjectured.

ib. 126 In the quotation from Hegesias a man is stripped naked and dragged about rough ground: πιλούμενος δὲ κακοῖς περὶ πολλὰς τραχύτητας ἔκραζεν. πιλούμενος κακοῖς seems possible in itself, but strange in combination with περὶ πολλὰς τραχύτητας. Is it too bold to suggest that it stands for an earlier εἰλούμενος κακῶς?

20. 136 ὥσπερ ὅταν ἐνθυμώμεθα μηδὲν ὅλως ἡμᾶς ταραττεῖν μηδὲ παραλυτεῖν.

So the MS which U. R. call F; others have ταραττή and παραλυτή. I am inclined to suggest ταραττον and παραλυποῖν.

22. 167 γενομένη should be γινομένη, I think, as twice above τὴν γινομένην and αἱ γινόμεναι.

25. 198 By another trifling change μέλλοι should be written μέλλει.

ib. 199 and 203 Is ἐξ ἀναπαίστων ῥυθμῶν really right, or should it be ἀναπαιστικῶν?

ib. 204 Did D. mean to call the *De Corona* the finest of speeches or the finest of Demosthenes' speeches? In the second case read ὃν ἐγὼ κράτιστον ἀποφαίνομαι πάντων <τῶν> λόγων.

26. 213 ἔγγιστα φαίνεται λόγοις τὸ . . . πεπλανημένον.

τὰ πεπλανημένα?

ib. 214 ὥς δὲ ἀξιώ διαιεῖν κ.τ.λ.

As there is a ὥς just before, it would be neater to write φ here.

ib. 224 In the last words of the book ἄν seems entirely out of place, and U. R. ought not to have introduced it. It is easy to see how σπουδαίαν grew out of σπουδαία.

I add a note or two on the other writings.

*De Imit.* 428 οἰκονομίας <ἐνεκεν> or <χάριν>? Cf. 430 lines 3 and 7. Otherwise the various genitives seem without construction.

*Ad Pomp.* 1. 750. Probably ἐπ' (for ἐν) αὐταῖς going with διατιθέμενος.

ib. 3. 766. γράψαι μέ <τι> περὶ αὐτῶν?

ib. 3. 776 The λείπει inserted by the edd. should surely be λείπεται, if they mean *is left, remains*.

ib. 6. 783 Slightly alter the order and read δημαγωγούς τε καὶ στρατηγούς.

ib. 6. 785 καί μοι δοκεῖ πως . . . ὁ μυθεύόμενος ἐν Ἄιδου . . . ἐξετασμός ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ δικαστῶν οὕτως ἀκριβῆς εἶναι ὥς ὁ διὰ τῆς Θεοπόμπου γραφῆς γιγνόμενος.

A pointed sentence has lost its point here by an unlucky accident which does not seem to have been detected. We have to read <οὐχ> οὕτως ἀκριβῆς.

*Ars. Rhet.* 1. 1. 225 οἰκτειράντων τῶν θεῶν τὸ ἀνθρώπειον ἐπίπονον <ὄν> γένος? Otherwise the words are more like poetry than prose.

2. 1. 233 Read γε for τε after ψυχαῖς.

7. 6. 277 ἵνα μὴ καὶ ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι ἀλλὰ τύχῃ μᾶλλον δοκῶσιν τῇ ἡττῇ κεχρησθαι. Sauppe may have been right in omitting καί before ψυχῇ. In any case should not μᾶλλον be μόνον? The same correction seems very probable (Pflugk) in Dio. Chrys. 45. 10.

9. 1. 322 ἀπέχει <τοῦ> ὁρθῶς λέγειν?

ib. 5. 331 λέγουσιν μὲν τὰ ἐναντία, πράττουσιν δὲ τὰ ἐναντία.

ἐναντία so repeated is hardly Greek. The first seems an accidental anticipation of the second, representing some such word as προσήκοντα.

ib. 8. 348 τοῖς δὲ δήμοις πικρότερον.

It is hard to believe this should not be δημόταις or τῷ δήμῳ (made plural by the influence of τοῖς βασιλεύσι). D. could scarcely follow the use of *Il.* 12. 213.

*de Or. Ant.* 1. 446 I incline to think οὐσίας should be οἰκίας, to which ἀρχεῖν is more suited. So διοικεῖν πόλεις in the corresponding part of the next sentence. The same confusion occurs in MSS of Lysias and Isocrates.

*Lysias* 3. 459 περὶ τῶν ἐπιστολικῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐταρικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων.

Surely ἐρωτικῶν, as Sylburg suggested long ago. Well known from the *Phaedrus*.

4. 462 ὃς γε (ὃς τε. ὥστε) οὐδὲν τοῖς διὰ χειρὸς ἔχουσι τὸν ἄνδρα οὔτε ἀκαιρολογίας οὔτε ἀσαφείας δόξαν λαβεῖν.

U. R. conjecture and read δόξειεν ἄν for

δόξαν. δόξαν λαμβάνειν is a good Greek expression (e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* 1. 6. 22 εἰ δὴ πείσαις ἐπαινεῖν σε πολλοὺς ὅπως δόξαν λάβοις), but λαμβάνειν τι (μηδὲν) ἀκαιρολογίας is perhaps more questionable. In any case I would suggest retaining δόξαν and inserting something, e.g. δόξαν λαβεῖν <δίκαιος ἂν δοκοίη>.

*Isaeus* 4. 592 παντὸς μάλιστα ought, one would think, to be either πάντων μάλιστα or παντὸς μᾶλλον.

*Demosth.* 2. 956 ἡ δ' ἐτέρα λέξις ἡ λιτὴ καὶ ἀφελὴς καὶ δοκοῦσα κατασκευὴν τε καὶ ἰσχὺν τὴν πρὸς ἰδιώτην ἔχειν λόγον καὶ ὁμοιότητα πολλοὺς μὲν ἔσχε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας προστάτας.

As this stands, πρὸς is unintelligible nor can κατασκευή, ἰσχύς, and ὁμοιότης really be coordinated. A little reflection however suggests that after λόγον another word parallel to ὁμοιότητα, probably οἰκειότητα, has fallen out. What D. says of this style is that its affinity and similarity to ordinary speech is its κατασκευὴ and ἰσχύς. For οἰκειότης πρὸς cf. e.g. *Ar. Pol.* 1262 b 19 τὴν οἰκειότητα τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

*ib.* 23. 1026 τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐκλέγειν . . . εἴ τι κάκιστον εἴρηται . . . οὐκ ἐδοκίμαζον· τὸ δ' ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων μάλιστα εὐδοκιμοῦντων, ταῦτα παρ' ἄλληλα θεῖς ἐξετάζειν τὰ κρείττω τοῦτο ἔδοξα εἶναι δίκαιον.

There seem to be two mistakes here. First κάκιστον should be κάκιον (like μᾶλλον perhaps for μάλιστα above). The superlative is too strong, and the confusion of the two forms is by no means uncommon. Secondly τὸ δὲ κ.τ.λ. yields no proper sense or construction. U. R. cite the conjectures παρ' ἀμφοτέροις and παρ' ἀμφοτέρω, but these do not really mend matters. I would read τὰ δ' ἐκ τῶν ἀμφοτέρων μάλιστα εὐδοκιμοῦντα, ταῦτα κ.τ.λ. The participle was probably miswritten under the influence of the genitive preceding it. The nominative θεῖς is not strictly grammatical with τοῦτο εἶναι δίκαιον, but this irregularity occurs elsewhere.

*Thuc.* 2. 813 καὶ οὐδ' οὗτος ἡμᾶς ὁ λογισμὸς <οὐκ> εἰσῆλθεν?

*ib.* 9. 826 τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ . . . ἡ κατὰ τόπους μεριζόντων τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἡ κατὰ χρόνους εὐπαρακολουθήτους.

Perhaps the adverb εὐπαρακολουθήτως. So in 37. 908 ἡρμηνευμένον οὐκ εὐπαρακολουθήτως.

*ib.* 51. 940. For the οὕτω and τοῦτο of the MSS I suggest αὐτό. οὕτω leaves ποιοῦντες without any proper object.

*ib.* 52. 942 παράξομεν καὶ παρεξόμεθα? Future tenses seem called for.

H. RICHARDS.

## LONGINUS ON THE RHYTHM OF DEMOSTHENES.

(*De Sublimitate*, CHAP. XXXIX § 4, *De Corona* 188.)

ὑψηλὸν γέ που δοκεῖ νόημα καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι θαυμάσιον, ὃ τῷ ψηφίσματι ὁ Δημοσθένης ἐπιφέρει· 'τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν τότε τῇ πόλει περιστάντα κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν, ὥσπερ νέφος·' ἀλλ' αὐτῆς τῆς διανοίας οὐκ ἔλαττον τῇ ἁρμονίᾳ πεφώνηται· ὅλον τε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν δακτυλικῶν εἴρηται ῥυθμῶν· εὐγενέστατοι δ' οὗτοι καὶ μεγεθοποιοί, διὸ καὶ τὸ ἥρῳον, ὃν ἴσμεν κάλλιστον, μέτρον συνιστάσι· τότε \*ἐπειτίτογε ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτὸ χώρας μετὰθε, ὅποι δὴ ἐθέλεις, 'τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα, ὥσπερ νέφος, ἐποίησε τὸν τότε κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν,' ἡ νῆ Δία μίαν ἀποκοψὸν συλλαβὴν μόνον· 'ἐποίησε παρελθεῖν ὥς νέφος,' καὶ εἴση πόσον ἡ ἁρμονία τῷ ὕψει συνηχεῖ. αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ 'ὥσπερ νέφος' ἐπὶ μακροῦ τοῦ πρώτου ῥυθμοῦ βέβηκε, τέτρασι καταμετροῦμένον χρόνους· ἐξαιρεθείσης δὲ τῆς μῆδος συλλαβῆς· ὥς νέφος' εὐθὺς ἀκρωτηριάζει

τῇ συγκοπῇ τὸ μέγεθος. ὡς ἔμπαλιν, ἐὰν ἐπεκτείνης 'παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὥσπερ νέφος,' τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνει, οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ἐπὶ προσπίπτει, ὅτι τῷ μήκει τῶν ἄκρων χρόνων συνεκλύεται καὶ διαχαλᾶται τὸ ὕψος τὸ ἀπότομον.

If any satisfactory explanation of this passage has been suggested, it has escaped (which does not seem likely) the diligence of Professor Rhys Roberts. In his translation the words ὅλον ἐπὶ τῶν δακτυλικῶν εἴρηται ῥυθμῶν are represented by 'the thought is expressed throughout in dactylic rhythms'; and in the critical appendix he cites, but apparently without faith, a proposed interpretation of this statement. Plainly, if this or anything like it is what the Greek critic means, there is, between his notion of rhythm