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](#)

Notes on Greek Orators

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 04 / June 2015, pp 100 - 104

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00048356, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00048356

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1915). Notes on Greek Orators. The Classical Review, 29, pp 100-104
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00048356

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

mentary, a great number of grammatical explanations, and a very detailed analysis of grammatical forms. They often send the reader back to the *Institutiones* and render an account of certain special features which that book presents. Comparisons between the Greek and Latin are not rare. By the side of practical advice addressed to masters and pupils we find in the work remarks of a general kind, such as the considerations on the manner of interpreting authors. We meet, also, in places with reasonable criticism of Budé and some corrections of Basil's text.' Clenard thus, as it were, attempts to stand by the side of the student reading Basil's epistle, and the book, supplies the place of the oral teacher. To the student of the history of education to-day, such a volume reveals much of the pedagogical aims and processes in Clenard's thought, in some ways more effectively than a formal treatise on linguistic method.

Briefly, his merits as a Greek grammarian may well be described in the words of M. Roersch.¹ 'He is far removed from the scholastic subtleties of the Middle Ages. He is the declared enemy of all pedantry. To take away for ever from grammars their repellant aspect, to make easier the beginnings, always arduous, of the study of Greek, and thus to open out to everyone the treasures of ancient erudition—such is his aim. The pupil, instead of being frightened, must have obstacles cleared away. Instead of being wearied, the pupil must be interested from the first hour of study, and must have his interest retained by the earliest reading of *authors*.' There are many indications that it was the success of Clenard as an oral teacher which suggested to him the idea of his textbooks.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

NOTES ON GREEK ORATORS.

DEMOSTHENES.

Ol. 2. 15. ταῦθ' ἃ μηδεὶς πώποτε κ.τ.λ. Rather perhaps τοιαῦθ' ἃ. Cf. *olia* in *De Pace* 5.

In 14 I would now read τὸ συνάμφοτερον for τοῦτο συναμφοτερον, not τοῦτο τό as I formerly suggested. In 2, if I was right in thinking an infinitive lost, and if the word was ἀμελεῖν or ὀλιγωρεῖν, it should, to avoid hiatus, follow προειμένους.

Ib. 30. Surely the pronoun before ἐπιτάττειν should be a dative governed by it, as Lambinus and others have thought. Cf. on Andocides 1. 25 below.

Phil. 1. 32. It is to my mind very unlikely that Demosthenes, so careful an artist in words, allowed ὑπάρχει both to begin and to end the sentence. If in one of the two places we read ὑπάρξει, like ῥαδίως ἔσται following, the effect would be less unpleasant; but a quite different word would be better. The present repetition is like that of an unskilful impromptu speaker.

Ib. 48. I think Reiske was right in wishing to add something to οἱ δὲ λόγους πλάττοντες ἕκαστος περιερχόμεθα. οἱ δὲ are *others*, distinct from those already mentioned, whereas in λόγους πλάττοντες there is nothing new to distinguish them. All the men mentioned λόγους πλάττονσι; the distinction is in the contents of the λόγοι. I suggest <ἐτέρους> ἕκαστος.

Ib. 51. νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἀδήλοις οὖσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τούτων ἐμαυτῷ γενησομένοις ὅμως ἐπὶ τῷ συνοίσειν ὑμῖν ἂν πράξητε ταῦτα πεπεισθαι λέγειν αἰρούμαι.

The first ἐπὶ is perfectly idiomatic in its use; the second (instead of διὰ τὸ πεπεισθαι) seems questionable, and in any case the double ἐπὶ is unskilful. Perhaps then it is the erroneous repetition of a copyist and Demosthenes really used διὰ τό. In the last words of the speech we might have expected ῥηρῆμαι rather than αἰρούμαι, like πεπαρησίασμαι above, but no doubt the present tense is admissible.

De Pace 11. ταῦτα τοῖνυν ἅπανθ' ὅσα φαίνομαι βέλτιον τῶν ἄλλων προορών

οὐδ' εἰς μίαν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὔτε δεινότητ' οὔτ' ἀλαζονείαν ἐπανοίσω.

Do not these words gravely accept and adopt the idea that there may be on the speaker's part some degree of pretence (ἀλαζονεία)? 'I will not refer them either to cleverness or to pretence (on my part).' Demosthenes' real words were, I think, not οὔτε . . . οὔτε, but εἴτε . . . εἴτε. Two passages in the *De Corona* are very apposite: 270 συγχωρῶ τὴν ἐμὴν εἴτε τύχην εἴτε δυστυχίαν ὀνομάζειν βούλει πάντων αἰτίαν γεγενῆσθαι, and 277 εὐ οἶδ' ὅτι τὴν ἐμὴν δεινότητα . . . ἔστω γὰρ· καίτοι κ.τ.λ. εἰ δ' ἄρ' ἔστι καὶ παρ' ἐμοί τις ἐμπειρία τοιαύτη, κ.τ.λ., where he modestly throws doubt on his own δεινότης and substitutes another word, though of course between ἀλαζονεία and ἐμπειρία in themselves there is no affinity. In the *De Pace* then, reading εἴτε . . . εἴτε, the sense will be 'put them down to any cleverness real or pretended.'

Phil. 2. 25. ἀλλοτριωτάτας ταύτη· ταύτης? In *Isocr.* 14. 51 οὐδ' ἀλλότριον τυγχάνομεν ὑμῖν ὄντες the dative certainly need not depend on ἀλλότριον. Cf. on *Phil.* 4. 39 below.

Ib. 37. μετὰ τοῦ πάντων κινδύνου καὶ τῆς ζημίας δίκην ὑποσχεῖν. *Malim* τῆς πάντων ζημίας *Reiske*. I suggest καὶ ζημίας τὴν δίκην.

[*De Halon.*] 13. τὰ σύμβολα ταῦτα γίνεταί εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ μηδ' ἀμφισβητῆσαι εὐλόγως ἔτι Ποτειδαίας.

Read <ἂν> ἀμφισβητῆσαι.

De Cherson. 14. Probably ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνοίας τῆς αὐτῆς ἥσπερ (not ὥσπερ) νῦν, as was long ago suggested. Cf. *De F. Leg.* 342 ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἥσπερ νῦν ἐξουσίας, and on *Isoc.* 15. 141 below. *Phil.* 1. 39 τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὥσπερ is not a good parallel, because ὥσπερ, the adverb of manner, is very suitable to τρόπον.

Ib. 75. τὰ μὲν ἔργα παρ' ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ζητεῖτε, τὰ δὲ βέλτιστα ἐπιστήμη λέγειν παρὰ τοῦ παριόντος.

ἐπιστήμη has been doubted. Blass actually adopted on his own conjecture τὰ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἢ μὴ [λέγειν], in which the ἢ μὴ is really ludicrous, and Sandys suggests ἃ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἐνεστι λέγειν.

Plato *Ion* 532C may however be quoted in its defence, τέχνη καὶ ἐπιστήμη περὶ Ὀμήρου λέγειν ἀδύνατος εἶ, and also *Rep.* 422C, though the latter is not quite parallel. If ἐπιστήμη here is wrong, ἐπιστάμενον would seem preferable to the above suggestions.

Phil. 3. 30. ὅσα μὲν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἢ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔπασχον οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀλλ' οὖν ὑπὸ γνησίων γε ὄντων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡδικοῦντο.

No other instance of γνήσιος with a genitive is cited, nor does it seem quite natural. If there is none, perhaps we may think of γνησίως. Cf. [59.] 28 γνησίως μετέχοντας τῆς πολιτείας, 122 τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως, and *Isocr.* 4. 24 καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόναμεν.

Ib. 4. 19. μηδ' αὐτοὶ χειροτονήσαντες πόλεμον βούλεσθε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὑμῖν ἐρίζειν εἰ δέον ἢ μὴ δέον ὑμᾶς τοῦτο πεποιθέναι.

The last words cannot be right. It is, or was, or will be, δέον or οὐ δέον to do a thing, never to have done it. From the very meaning of the word it must be prospective at the time to which it applies, expressing a need or obligation that something be then done. The author might have said εἰ δέον ἢ μὴ δέον τοῦτο πεποιθήκατε; with ὑμᾶς and the infinitive I conjecture something to be lost, e.g. λεκτέον or νομιστέον.

Ib. 39. εἰ τῇ παρὰ τῆς τύχης βοηθείᾳ γεγονυῖα τοῖς ἀπóροις φθονοῦμεν.

τῆς . . . βοηθείας γεγονυίας, the usual construction with φθονῶ? Cf. on *Phil.* 2. 25 above.

Ib. 52. ὁ βασιλεὺς ἅπασιν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν οἰκείως ἔχει καὶ πάντων ἥκιστα δὴ ἡμῖν.

The latter clause has been gravely suspected and altered so as to produce an antithesis (πάντων ἥκιστα δὲ and the like). I agree rather with *Reiske* that a negative has been lost in the earlier words, <οὐκ> οἰκείως (= ἐχθρῶς or ὑπόπτως). The general sense of the context requires this. The author is saying that things are now more disturbed than ever before. Formerly there were two great parties, and the Persian king took up the cause of one or the other as suited him. Now there is much more confusion. The king is hostile to all Greeks alike, while each

State is fighting for its own hand and standing aloof from others. Friendship on the King's part to everyone could hardly be a cause of confusion (*παραχή*). But the words *ἔπειτ' οὐχ ἦττον κ.τ.λ.* must be admitted to come in rather strangely.

ἀνοικείως may be preferable to *οὐκ οἰκείως*, but for the meaning *unfriendly* there seems no Attic authority, though it is probable enough.

De Megalop. 11. To avoid hiatus, *᾽Ωρωπὸν κομίσασθαι* is at least as likely as Benseler's *κομίσασθαι τὸν ᾽Ωρωπὸν*. In 13, etc., the name occurs without an article, in other places with one.

De Foedere 16. *ἔτι δ' ἕτερον δείξω τὸ λευκὸς τὰς συνθήκας*.

The article is oddly used after *ἕτερον*, an other thing. Indeed, the Greek words would rather mean 'I will show that what broke the agreement was something else.' Should we read *τι* for *τό*?

De Corona 50. *ὥσπερ ἐωλοκρασίαν τινά μου τῆς πονηρίας τῆς ἐαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων κατασκεδάσας, ἣν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν πρὸς τοὺς νεωτέρους τῶν πεπραγμένων ἀπολύσασθαι*.

ἀπολύσασθαι is used regularly in relation to such words as *τὰς αἰτίας*, *τὰ κατηγορούμενα*, *τὴν διαβολήν*, etc., but in application to *ἐωλοκρασίαν* its use is very loose and improper; we may doubt whether the exact and critical judgment of Demosthenes can really have approved it in a carefully written oration. On the other hand, he is, as a matter of fact, answering accusations brought against him (see 9-19), and this is actually conveyed in figurative fashion by *ὥσπερ . . . κατασκεδάσας*, which means that Aeschines was imputing to his rival what he himself had done. It is therefore with a good deal of hesitation that I suggest what has occurred to me, that Demosthenes' own word was *ἀπολούσασθαι*.

De Falsa Leg. 16. It seems very probable that the infinitives *θήσειν καὶ γράφειν* are wrong, like *χαιρήσειν* and *χαίρειν* in 320, and that *θήσει καὶ γράψει* should be read.

Ib. 76. *δὴλόν ἐστι σαφῶς ὅτι πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη συνεσκευάσθη τοῦ περὶ Φωκίας ὀλέθρου*.

The editors do not explain what sort of genitive they take *τοῦ ὀλέθρου* to be. It cannot be possessive. It cannot mean *in the matter of*, *concerning*, nor *with a view to*, *for*, as the simple genitive is not used in either of these senses. It is not parallel to 134 *ὁ τῆς εἰρήνης χρήματ' ἀνάλωσας*, *Ol.* 3. 22 *προπέπεται τῆς αὐτίκα χάριτος τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα*, and various other passages where the genitive gives that on which money, etc., has been expended, a sort of converse to the genitive of price. *ἀναλώσας, προπέπεται*, and so on, express parting with something, *συνεσκευάσθη* the opposite idea of accumulation.

In default of any good explanation I suggest *πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη συνεσκευάσθη <τὸ> τοῦ περὶ Φωκίας ὀλέθρου*. *τό* or *τά* with the genitive is well known in Demosthenes (Rehdantz, *Index s.v. Artikel*). I understand *πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη* like *Soph. El.* 301 *ὁ πάντ' ἀναλκίς οὗτος, ἢ πᾶσα βλάβη*, *Phil.* 927 *ὦ πῦρ σὺ καὶ πᾶν δέημα*, *Ar. Thesm.* 787 *ὡς πᾶν ἐσμέν κακὸν ἀνθρώποις*, *Herod.* 1. 32 *πᾶσα ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπος συμφορὴ*. *συνεσκευάσθη* is an elaborated *ἐστὶ*. *Ar. Ach.* 121 *εὐνοῦχος ἐσκευασμένος*, *dressed as a eunuch*, and 729 *χοίρους ὑμὲ σκευάσας* are partly parallel, as the predicates *εὐνοῦχος*, *χοίρους*, *ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη* express in each case an effect and result. So, too, in *Frogs* 523 *ὅτι ἡ σε παίζων Ἡρακλέα ἔνεσκεύασα. κατασκευάζω, make, render, so and so*, is common.

Ib. 89. *καὶ κατασκευαῖς ὅπλων καὶ χώρας καὶ προσόδων*.

Should not the first *καὶ* precede *ὅπλων* (perhaps *καὶ ὅπλων κατασκευαῖς*)?

Ib. 200. *ἀλλὰ δὴ τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας*.

This is taken to be an exclamation, but for an exclamation the form is very unusual. We should get the common genitive if we read *ἀλλὰ δὴ τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας*. *ἀλλὰ δὴ τὰ* is certainly used in asking questions, and I do not know why it should not be used here in exclaiming.

Ib. 209. *ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶ μακρῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἀγώνων καὶ λόγων ἀρχή*.

Here too it would accord with usage if we read *πολλῶν καὶ μακρῶν* for *μακρῶν καὶ πολλῶν*. πολλοὶ regularly comes first in such a couple.

45. 86. In *ταῦθ' ἅπερ ἡμεῖς* write rather *ταῦθ'* (like *τὸ πρᾶγμα ταυτό* just below), and so perhaps too in 54. 22 and 30 (the third *ταῦτα*). We ought to remember that the accentuation in such cases is entirely at our discretion, as it cannot possibly come from the author.

47. 73. *διομόσασθαι αὐτὸς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα οὐκ ἂν ἐτόλμησα*.

The accusatives have no construction whatever. Should we insert (say) *κελεύειν* after *γυναῖκα*, i.e. *κελεύειν ὁμοσαι* or *διομόσασθαι*?

58. 59. *οὕτως ἔλαττον παρά τισι τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχύει <τῶν ἀποβησομένων ἀπὸ> τῆς παρρησίας?*

LYSIAS.

2. 35. *οὔσης καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας ἀπίστου καὶ τοῦ προσιόντος κινδύνου*.

Is not some adjectival word lost, that went with *κινδύνου* as *ἀπίστου* go with *σωτηρίας*? We might think of *δεινοῦ* (*μεγάλου, τοσοῦτου*) *τοῦ προσιόντος κινδύνου*. Thalheim suggests *τοσοῦτου* in place of *καὶ τοῦ*, but this would not account for the *καί*.

Ib. 61. *εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ κατήλθον . . . <ἐν> καινοῖς κινδύνοις τὴν παλαιὰν ἀρετὴν τῶν προγόνων μιμησάμενοι?*

The dative can hardly stand alone. 'By dangers' is not the same as 'by incurring dangers.' *κινδύνοις* quite possibly = *μάχαις*, but we should expect *ἐν μάχαις* here, not *μάχαις* simply.

6. 21. *εἰσαχθεὶς εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἐδέησεν ἑαυτὸν τιμησάμενος δεσμοῦ*.

For *ἐδέησεν* the *ἔδησεν* conjectured by Stephanus is usually substituted, but *ἔδησεν ἑαυτόν* is a very questionable phrase. I have thought of something like *<ὀλίγου ἀπολλύναι> ἐδέησεν ἑαυτόν*.

7. 6. For *ἄλλως τε* read *ἀλλ' ὥς*. When *ἀλλ' ὥς καί* became *ἄλλως καί*, it was natural for *τε* to be inserted.

Ib. 33. *πάντες ἂν ὁμολογήσαιτε δικαιοτέρον εἶναι τοῖς μεγάλοις χρῆσθαι τεκμηρίοις περὶ τῶν μεγάλων*.

Dobree suggested *μικρῶν* for *μεγάλων*. That was certainly wrong, but I think *μικροῖς* should be written for *μεγάλοις*. The speaker has behaved properly on previous occasions *ἐν μικροῖς*, that is, as he explains in 32, in matters where he ran no danger or next to none. The present matter is great because the danger is very serious; but the court may infer the great from the small. *μεγάλοις* is the unintentional anticipation of a coming word.

12. 60. *μισθωσάμενοι δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς πόλεως καὶ <ἄλλας τε> πόλεις ἐπάγοντες καὶ τελευτώντες Λακεδαιμονίους?*

20. 12. *εἰ δ' ἦν δημότης, οὐ δίκαιος διὰ τοῦτο βλάπτεσθαι ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ, εἰ μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε, ὅτι ὑμῶν ἐστὶ πολίτης*.

The last words cannot be right, because the man in question was dead. I think now that we should read *ὑμῶν ἐστὶ <τις> πολίτης*, because so and so is a fellow-citizen of yours, an imaginary case. *τις* would easily disappear after *τι*.

Fragm. 1. 5. *καὶ μοι ἀνάβητε τούτων μάρτυρες*. Should not this be *<οἱ> τούτων μάρτυρες?*

Fragm. 271 (90). *ἦν τις . . . <τὴν> τάξιν λίπη τῆς αἰδοῦς?*

ANDOCIDES.

1. 25. *πρὸς τούτοις ἐγὼ πιστότητος ὑμῶν ἔνεκα τάδε ποιήσω*.

ὑμῶν is surely wrong. The *πιστότης* is that of Andocides himself, and the genitive *ὑμῶν* cannot mean *to you*. *ὑμῖν* seems required (cf. on Dem. Ol. 2. 30 above), and there is no difficulty about attaching the dative to a substantive. Cf. for instance Thuc. 5. 5. 1 *περὶ φιλίας τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις*.

ISOCRATES.

7. 14. *ἔστι γὰρ ψυχὴ πόλεως οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ πολιτεία*.

It is odd to assume that there is a

'soul of the state' and only declare that soul to be the constitution. What we seem to want and what would be natural to say is ἔστι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ ψυχὴ πόλεως πολιτεία or ἡ πολιτεία. Cf. Aristot. *Poet.* 6. 1450a 40 ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἶον ψυχὴ ὁ μῦθος τῆς τραγωδίας.

12. 40. (πόλεις) τὰς παραπλησίαν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἔχουσας καὶ περὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πράξεις γεγενημένας.

Is not παραπλησίαν out of its place? It might stand after καὶ or δύναμιν or ἐχούσας, but not where it does.

15. 28. Read <ἐξ> ὧν οὐδέν μοι πλέον γέγονε. Otherwise the genitive lacks construction.

1b. 141. ἐσκόπουν περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων ὥσπερ ἂν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος.

ὥνπερ will at once be more idiomatic and give αὐτῶν a point which it hardly has at present. Cf. on Dem. *de Cherson.* 14 above.

19. 43. οὐ μέντ' ἂν μοι δοκῶ φυγεῖν οὐδὲ τὴν Θρασύλλου γνώμην.

He does not mean that he would not escape, but that he would not avoid or try to escape, Thrasyllus' judgment. Write therefore φεύγειν.

AESCHINES.

2 (end). τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦμὸν ἤδη παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ νόμος.

Is it really possible for παραδίδωσιν to stand thus before ἐγὼ? If we should not write παραδίδωμεν, at any rate we might alter the order to something like τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦμὸν ἤδη καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ νόμος παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν. In Isaeus 11. 10 παρεσκευάζοντο is now corrected to παρεσκευαζόμεθα.

3. 156. ὧν ἱερὰ καὶ τέκνα καὶ τάφους ἀπώλεσεν ἡ Δημοσθένους δωροδοκία.

τέκνα comes strangely between ἱερὰ and τάφους. Should it change places with τάφους or ἱερὰ?

H. RICHARDS.

THE NATIONALITY OF VERGIL.

I. IN Conington's *Vergil* (Ed. 5, I, xviii) we read: 'The name *Andes* is Celtic, and so apparently is *Vergilius*'; and in a note on the name *Vergilius*: '*Vergilius* and *Magius* were common names in Cisalpine Gaul.' The object of the following pages is to investigate these statements as fully as possible, and to attempt to estimate from Vergil's own names and those of his nearest relations the probability of his being of Celtic or some other determinable race. The method followed will be that of comparison with other proper names containing the same or similar stems from all parts of the Roman empire, collected from the indices, as far as they exist, to the volumes of the *C.I.L.* If, for example, we find that the name *Vergilius* occurs fairly frequently in other parts of Italy proper (*C.I.L.* IV, IX, X, and XIV),¹ we shall

be forced to conclude that though it may in one or two particular cases be a genuine Celtic name in Gallia Cisalpina (*C.I.L.* V²), yet the probabilities are against this, and we shall not be able to base any arguments merely on its occurrence in countries where the Kelts were settled. On the other hand, if *Vergilius* and cognate names occur but rarely in Italy and are common in the Celtic parts of the Roman

names found in *C.I.L.* VI (Rome) be used for purposes of comparison. In Rome, apart from the Latin population, we must expect to find foreigners from all parts of the Roman world. Livy (39, 3, 4) tells us that as early as 187 B.C. the Latin allies sent envoys to Rome, complaining that thousands of their citizens had migrated thither in order to avoid taxation in their native towns. An investigation was made, and Livy adds: *Hac conquisitione duodecim milia Latinorum domos redierunt, iam tum multitudine alienigenarum urbem onerante*. This intermingling of nationalities at Rome must have become still more complete under the empire, and it would be most unsafe to build any theories on the names of such a heterogeneous population.

² *C.I.L.* V also contains Venetia and Liguria.

¹ I have not consulted *C.I.L.* I, which contains the older Latin inscriptions arranged according to their dates; they are all found again in the other volumes of the *C.I.L.*, which are arranged geographically. Nor can the