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](#)

Schmid's Atticism of Dionysius *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halicarnassus bis auf den zweiten Philostratus dargestellt* von Dr. Wilhelm Schmid. vol. i, pp. 432, 1887; vol. ii, pp. 316, 1889 (Kohlhammer) Stuttgart. 6 m. and 5 m.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 31 - 32

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993120, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993120

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 31-32 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993120

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SCHMID'S ATTICISM OF DIONYSIUS.

Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halicarnassus bis auf den zweiten Philostratus dargestellt von Dr. WILHELM SCHMID. vol. i, pp. 432, 1887; vol. ii, pp. 316, 1889 (Kohlhammer) Stuttgart. 6 m. and 5 m.

THESE volumes are a valuable contribution to the history of Greek prose under the earlier Empire. They trace in fullest detail the story of the endeavours made by a series of writers, extending from the time of Augustus to that of Alexander Severus, to give an artistic form to prose composition by reviving the language and style of Attic authors of the classical age.

The first volume includes a minute examination of the chief representatives of Atticism in the persons of Polemo, Dio Chrysostom, Herodes Atticus, Lucian, Ælian and Philostratus. It rightly begins with an analysis of the linguistic and stylistic principles of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the leading Atticist of the times of Augustus. Among other points of interest it gives an excellent account of Dio Chrysostom, who, wearied with the frivolity of the rhetoricians of his day, spent part of his half-voluntary exile under Domitian in searching for the traces of a simpler, sounder and more genuinely Greek life amid the woodlands of Eubœa and on the banks of the Borysthenes (*Or.* vii and xxxvi). We learn from himself that, among the Greeks of the northern outpost of civilization at Olbia, he found men who, in spite of their Scythian surroundings, were passionate admirers of Homer and knew the *Iliad* by heart; and one of them, Callistratus, a manly youth with genuine Ionic features and conspicuous for his beauty, was a zealot for literature and philosophy, but above all things for Homer (*Grote, H.G.*, chap. xcviii). The Atticism of Dio, as our author shows, is by no means of a pedantic type; thus, among other minor peculiarities, he does not refrain from the poetic future *ἐλεύσομαι*, the use of which in prose is denounced by purer Atticists such as Phrynichus and Mæris. Like other non-classical writers, he confounds the uses of the perfect and the aorist tenses, and often writes *μὴ* where authors of the best age would have written *οὐ* (pp. 95, 99). For his vocabulary (which is here elaborately examined) he is mainly indebted to Plato and Xenophon (p. 147). Even his

similes have been patiently enumerated with the result that, in his 80 speeches, there are no less than 397, many of them borrowed from the art of healing (p. 169). Lastly, he is characterized as presenting a refreshing phenomenon among the representatives of the Attic renaissance, in so far as he is not merely concerned with the *minutiae* of artistic style, but really aims at saying something of genuine and practical value (p. 190). More than 200 pages of the rest of this volume are devoted to a much better known author, Lucian; and students of that interesting Atticist will here find a minute investigation of his diction, showing in detail that it is mainly derived from Plato, Xenophon and the poets of the Attic Comedy.

The whole of the second volume, which has been recently published, is assigned to Aristides, the imitator of Demosthenes. The author justifies this course by pointing out the historical importance of this rhetorician, as a standard by which we can examine the performances of those of his successors, whether in pagan or in Christian literature, who made any pretensions to style. By far the greater part of this volume consists of lexicographical matter, the general result of which is to show that the vocabulary of Aristides is mainly taken from Plato, Xenophon, Herodotus, Thucydides and Demosthenes. But there are not a few readable pages of literary criticism, in which (amongst other observations) the author points out that, notwithstanding all the rhetorician's verbal accomplishments as an imitator of a bye-gone style, he is intellectually nothing more than a dwarf struggling beneath the armour of a giant (p. 298). Whatever dignity there is in his writings is entirely confined to echoes of the past, while his references to his contemporaries are generally in a querulous tone suggestive of unsuccessful endeavours to win their applause. It is probably this Aristides and not a younger namesake, that is the subject of a cruel epigram on his seven pupils, namely, the four walls and three benches of his empty lecture room:—

χαίρετ' Ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐπὶ μαθηταί,
τέσσαρες οἱ τοῖχοι καὶ τρία σινδελία.

But, towards the close of his life, it must have been some consolation for him to remember that a passage in his description

of the desolation of Smyrna (after the earthquake of 178 A.D.) moved Marcus Aurelius to tears, and prompted that emperor to grant his aid in the rebuilding of the city (Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.*, ii 9, 2). In the times of the Byzantine renaissance the *Panathenaicus* of Aristides, together with the funeral oration of Psellus in memory of his mother and that of Gregory Nazianzen in

honour of Basil the Great, was mentioned by the side of the *De Corona* of Demosthenes, as one of the four masterpieces of eloquence; and at the close of the fourteenth century that memorable eulogy of Athens supplied the patriotic historian, Lionardo Bruno, with an appropriate model for his Greek encomium of Florence.

J. E. SANDYS.

FIERVILLE'S QUINTILIAN.

M. F. Quintiliani de Institutione Oratoria Liber Primus. Texte Latin, publié avec des notes biographiques sur Quintilien, l'histoire de l'institution oratoire et de ses abrégés, la classification et la description des manuscrits, le texte abrégé par Étienne de Rouen et par Jean Racine, des notes critiques, les variantes principales et deux facsimile de manuscrits par CH. FIERVILLE. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1890. f. 10.

In this volume M. Fierville has brought to bear on the first book of Quintilian's *Institutes* the wide knowledge of MSS. of which he gave proof in a former work (*De Quintilianeis Codicibus*, Paris, 1874). He believes that Halm's text (1868) rests on too narrow a basis, depending as it does mainly on the *Ambrosianus*, the *Bernensis*, and the *Bambergensis*; and he puts prominently forward certain MSS. of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as well as others of the fifteenth which are obviously copies of older codices now no longer extant. In fact the most valuable feature of the book is the account given of no fewer than sixty-seven MSS., twenty of which M. Fierville claims to have himself examined, either in whole or part. He proposes a classification of his own, differing from those of Zumpt and of Halm, according to which the various families of the *incomplete* MSS. (those with the great lacunae in Books v.-viii. and ix.-xii.) take first rank: examples are the *Bernensis*, the *Nostradamensis*, and the *Pratensis* (the last as representing the *Beccensis* now lost). In the second class he places the *Ambrosianus*, the *Bambergensis* G, the *Florentinus*, and the *Turicensis*—combating the view by which Halm inclined (rightly, as we shall see) to regard the last named two as copied, either directly or indirectly, from the second. Lastly come the various MSS. of the fifteenth century.

It is remarkable that M. Fierville nowhere notices Meister's edition (1886), which made a distinct advance on that of Halm, embodying as it does the main results of German criticism—which has lately been very busy over Quintilian—and setting forth in particular the readings of the *Nostradamensis*, as furnished by MM. Chatelain and le Coultre. It is not even mentioned in the list given on p. clxv. The only references to one of the highest authorities, who has made Quintilian a life-study, occur on p. xci. where Meister appears as 'le récent éditeur de Darès le Phrygien' (the Teubner text, 1873), and in a foot-note on p. xv., where mention is made of Meister's early paper 'Quaestiones Quintilianeae,' Anhalt, 1860. And it is still more to be regretted that a work which its author evidently intended to be final, so far as it goes, should have been completed without a careful examination of the various MSS. in this country, some of which have never been collated at all. Perhaps it was his unfortunate experiences of certain English libraries (pp. lxx. and cxxviii.) that led this laborious scholar to confine his attention practically to the MSS. of France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy and Spain; and yet if he had ever visited the British Museum a prize would have been within his grasp. To say nothing of seven more or less interesting fifteenth century MSS. (one of which I think can be proved to be a copy of Poggio's), there is in the Museum a MS. of the greatest value, which must be reckoned with, at least in part, before any final text of Quintilian can be arrived at. After careful examination I can venture to affirm that it must take rank above both the *Turicensis* and the *Florentinus*, on which Spalding depended so greatly for the constitution of his text. This MS. (Harl. 2664), which was first noticed by Mr. Purser in *Hermathena* (No. xii.—1886), I