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](#)

Il Riso e il Pianto in Omero: Studio di Vittorio Graziadei. Rome, 1890.

W. L.

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 04 / April 1892, pp 176 - 176
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185415, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185415

How to cite this article:

W. L. (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 176-176 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185415

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

quite clear. He is profoundly impressed, as every one must be, with the beauty of these scenes, and he has not the heart to say that they belong to a later part of the poem. He is in short still under the ban of the prejudice which regards 'late' as identical with 'inferior.' It is not too much to say that until he has cast aside this pernicious 'idol' he is not likely to do much for the advance of Homeric criticism, except in helping to shake the prevailing belief in the unity of the *Iliad*. There I gladly welcome him as a somewhat misguided but useful ally.

WALTER LEAF.

Il Riso e il Pianto in Omero: Studio di VITTORIO GRAZIADEI. Rome, 1890.

THIS tract makes no claim to be philological or critical: it is a study of the Homeric gods and men from the standpoint of modern psychology, as set forth by Darwin, Spencer, and Bain, whom Graziadei frequently quotes. With this is combined a good deal of aesthetic and literary criticism, as may be expected: but this is of course on rather well-worn tracks, and the freshness of presentation depends chiefly on the comparison of the emotional condition of the Homeric Greeks with that of children which the doctrine of evolution would lead us to expect. The work is not one which can be fairly illustrated by short quotations, for the style is somewhat rhetorical and diffuse: but the reader will find it, if I may judge from my own experience, fairly interesting, if not particularly instructive.

W. L.

Homeri Odyssea. Recensuit ARTHURUS LUDWICH. Editio Minor. Teubner, 1890. Mk. 1.50.

Homeri Odyssea. In usum scholarum editio et commentario instruxit J. LA ROCHE. Vindobonae (Tempsky), Lipsiae (Freitag): 1892. 2 Mk.

Commentar zu Homers Odyssee. Von J. LA ROCHE, Heft 1: Gesang I-VI. Tempsky, Freitag. 1891. 1 Mk.

THE publication of school texts of Homer goes on apace in Germany. Ludwig's hardly calls for notice, as it is merely a reprint from his larger critical edition, which is elsewhere discussed. La Roche's on the other hand is perhaps to be taken as an authoritative expression of his latest views: but as no critical information is given either in text or commentary it is not easy to deal with it in this way. He certainly however does not adhere to his own earlier critical text. For instance he now reads in ζ 286 (καὶ δ' ἄλλη νεμεσῶ ἦτις τοιαῦτά γε βέ(οι) νεμεσῶμ', on the ground that it is required by the following optative. On the other hand he will have none of the far more likely conjecture ἀποξύνουσιν for ἀποξύνουσιν in ζ 269. Can this be because the latter is adopted by Ludwig?

The commentary proper is quite elementary and only suited for the lower forms at schools. There is however an appendix of more general interest in which various points of Homeric language are discussed and illustrated at some length. The Homeric use of the participle, for instance, covers more than eight pages.

W. L.

The Discourses of Epictetus with the Encheiridion and fragments, reprinted from the translation of GEORGE LONG. Bell and Sons. 1891. 10s. 6d.

THE praise bestowed on the translation of Antoninus in a late number of this *Review* may be extended to

that of Epictetus, so far as the general appearance of the book is concerned, and the satisfaction one naturally feels in reading a translation which was evidently a labour of love to the translator. At the same time it is right to point out that the Epictetus at all events is not without grave defects, as regards (1) the text chosen, (2) the accuracy, (3) the intelligibility and ease of the version.

(1.) III. 20. 10 is thus translated: 'The exercise master does right when he says: Raise him up with both hands, and the heavier he is, so much the more is my advantage.' In a note it is said 'the meaning is not clear if we follow the original text. Schweighäuser cannot see the sense "with both hands" in the Greek, nor can I.' It is true that Schweighäuser gives in the text the reading ἄρον ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων, but in his note he suggests ἄρον ὑπερον ἀμφοτέρων, which is accepted by Dübner in the Didot edition, and gives the sense 'raise the club with both hands.' In the same chapter § 13 L. translates 'What will you do with death? Why, what else than that it shall do you honour, or that it shall show you, by act through it, what a man is who follows the will of nature?' The Greek which L. attempts to render by the last clause is ἡ ἴνα δείξῃ σε ἔργῳ δι' αὐτοῦ τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ., justly characterized by Schweighäuser as *scabra oratio*, and for which we read in Dübner ἴνα δ' εἰς ἔργῳ κ.τ.λ. In like manner Fragments 29 and 35, which have been put into intelligible shape by Dübner, are vainly attacked in their old shape by L.

(2.) I. 7. 30 'If then I shall make a mistake in these matters may I not have killed my father?' This is L.'s translation of ἂν οὖν ἐν τούτοις πλανηθῶ, μή τι τὸν πατέρα ἀπέκτεινα; altogether mistaking the force of μή τι. Mrs. Carter translates rightly 'But suppose after all I have made a mistake in these points, have I killed a father?' IV. 7. 17 'I have been made free; I know his commands, no man can now lead me as a slave. I have a proper person to assert my freedom; I have proper judges. (I say) are you not the master of my body? What then is that to me?' The Greek which L. is here translating is ἡλευθέρωμαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐργῶκα αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς, οὐκέτι οὐδέτι δουλαγωγῆσαι με δύναται καρπιστὴν ἔχω οἷον δεῖ, δικαστὰς οἷους δεῖ. Οὐχὶ τοῦ σώματός μου κύριος εἰ; τί οὖν πρὸς ἐμέ; Here the end of the first clause has been lost, making nonsense of the second: 'proper' is a poor translation of οἷους δεῖ, which means rather 'such as Providence ordains.' The penultimate sentence should be translated 'Is it not my body (in contrast with my soul) you are master of?' I. 2. 'To the rational animal only is the irrational intolerable' (τῷ λογικῷ ζῳῷ μόνον ἀφόρητόν ἐστι τὸ ἄλογον). I. 5. 6. 'Do you comprehend that you are awake? I do not, this man replies, for I do not even comprehend when in my sleep I imagine that I am awake.'—Here 'comprehend' is a wrong word for καταλαμβάνεις, which Mrs. C. more correctly translates 'are you certain,' and 'not even' is a wrong translation of οὐδέ, for which Mrs. C. gives the correct 'neither.' III. 24. 112 τούτου με ὁ Ζεὺς αὐτὸν παρ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαβεῖν ἀποδείξειν ἠθέλησε, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ γινῶναι, εἰ ἔχει στρατιώτην οἷον δεῖ, πολίτην οἷον δεῖ, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις προάγειν με μάρτυρα τῶν ἀπροαιρέτων ἴδετε, ὅτι εἰκὴ φοβείσθε, μάτην ἐπιθυμεῖτε ὦν ἐπιθυμεῖτε. L. translates 'Of this Zeus has willed that I shall receive from myself a demonstration, and shall myself know if he has a soldier such as he ought to have, a citizen such as he ought to have, and if he has chosen to produce me to the rest of mankind as a witness of the things which are independent of the will. See that you fear without reason, that you foolishly desire.' I have marked the blunders by italics; in the first a nominative is translated as an