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](#)

(a) *Quamnam curam Athenienses post expeditionem illam a. 415 in Sicilian! factam rerum Siciliensium habuerint quaeritur.* Von Max Eosenthal. Gross-Strehlitz. 1890. (b) *Quomodo Plutarchus Thucydide usus sit in componenda Niciae vita.* Scripsit Dr Max Heidingsfeld. Liegnitz. 1890.

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 10 / December 1890, pp 478 - 478

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191693, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191693

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 478-478 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191693

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

limits of its subject, e.g. the consistency of Lucretius in apostrophising Venus.

A few of M. Bénard's statements seem not altogether accurate. The definition of art as *ἔστι μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς ποιητική* cannot be rightly rendered by 'l'habitude ou faculté de produire le vrai avec réflexion.' Truth in Aristotle's definition belongs to the *λόγος*, not to the *ἔργον*. Again, if we are to adhere closely to what Aristotle says and never go beyond it (which is M. Bénard's very sound general principle), we must not say that according to him 'all the arts' are forms of imitation, for Aristotle only says it of some, *πάνται* only meaning all those just enumerated.

The reader may perhaps be led by some of M. Bénard's translations and comments to feel a little doubt as to the accuracy of his Greek scholarship. If he is, he will certainly not be reassured by the way in which Greek is given in this book. Almost every Greek sentence here quoted, and for the matter of that almost every Latin sentence too, contains some error. The spelling and the accentuation of Greek words are most distressing. From three or four pages I collect the following monstrosities: ἀκριβομένα, ποιούμενα, εἶδος... ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, τυγκάνουσι, ἑκαστὸν. In Latin I find besides innumerable smaller blunders such things as 'operis quod onctis subjecitur' ('oculis subjecitur'), 'coetatis injusque notandae sunt tibi mores', ('aetatis cujusque notandi'), and a Lucretian hexameter 'arma, vias, vestes, et cetera genera horum' ('de genere'). No doubt the blame for most of this lies with the printer. But where were M. Bénard's eyes in looking over his proofs? It should in fairness be added that even the French is not always correctly printed.

H. RICHARDS.

A full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604 (with two facsimiles) [Egerton 2610 in the British Museum]. Together with Ten Appendices. By HERMAN C. HOSKIER. London, Nutt: 1890. pp. cxvi. 43, &c. £1 1s.

THE above is about a tenth of the contents of the title-page: for the headings of all the Appendices are given as well as the title of the main work. If the title-page were given here in full, it would exhaust nearly all the space available for this notice. The main portion of the volume consists of less than 50 pages, which are preceded by over 20 pages of Preface and nearly 100 of Introduction, and are followed by about 60 pages of very miscellaneous Appendices. The main portion is an account and careful collation of a MS. which was bought for the British Museum at Puttick and Simpson's in April 1882, and which has been previously noticed by Dean Burgon in the *Guardian* of July 1882, by Scrivener in the third edition of his *Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T.*, p. 243, and by Simcox in the *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. iv., Dec. 1884, pp. 454—465.

This volume has evidently been a labour of love and bears marks of having been produced with very great care. An accurate collation of an interesting MS. is a valuable contribution to textual criticism, and as such workers in that field will give it a hearty welcome. But they will probably accept Mr. Hoskier's facts and draw their own conclusions from them. Mr. Hoskier dedicates his handsome volume 'to the memory of the late John William Burgon, B.D..... in memory of his untiring zeal and unflinching efforts to prepare reliable foundations upon which might

securely rest the true science of the textual criticism of the New Testament'; and he believes that the facts which he has collected in it are a contribution towards fulfilling a prophecy made by Dean Burgon, that the heresies of Westcott and Hort *et hoc genus omne* will one day be discarded, and the views which he expressed with such confidence and vigour will be accepted. 'I may not live to see it. Most likely I shall not. But it will come.' The wish of Mr. Hoskier is that the truth should prevail. If it is found in the opposite direction from that in which he is looking for it, he will not lament that the material, which he has so conscientiously collected and so clearly presented for the use of scholars, has been instrumental in the discovery or confirmation of it.

A. PLUMMER.

- (a) **Quamnam curam Athenienses post expeditionem illam a. 415 in Siciliam factam rerum Siciliensium habuerint quaeritur.** Von MAX ROSENTHAL. Gross-Strehlitz. 1890.
(b) **Quomodo Plutarchus Thucydide usus sit in componenda Nicias vita.** Scriptis Dr. MAX HEIDINGSFELD. Liegnitz. 1890.

SICILY forms the common link which suggests the coupling of these two essays in a single notice.

(a) The chief feature in Rosenthal's dissertation is an attempt to illustrate, by means of inscriptions and otherwise, the friendly relations which the Athenians (who had towards the end of the Peloponnesian War been so much harassed by the Syracusans acting in concert with the Lacedaemonians) endeavoured to cultivate with Dionysius the Elder, with a view to detaching him from the Spartan alliance. Three Athenian psephisms, together with some passages in the orators of the time, are used to eke out the meagre information given by Diodorus and Xenophon when they speak of Dionysius in connexion with Greece proper. One of these psephisms—one found at Athens in 1862 and referred to the year 393 B.C.—seems to provide that Dionysius should receive a public compliment, possibly on the excellence of his poetry. Another, assigned to the year 363, proposes that the rights of Athenian citizenship should be conferred upon him. The third, assigned to the same year or the next, concludes an alliance with him. The date and text of these psephisms are so conjectural that no certain conclusions can be based on them, but Rosenthal discusses them with ingenuity and brings a number of side-lights to bear upon them.

(b) The general conclusion reached in this essay is that in Nicias cc. 1-5 (introduction, and characterisation of Nicias) Thucydides is scarcely seen at all, except in the expression *θειασμῷ προσκείμενος*, which is quoted from him; that in cc. 6-11 (Nicias' doings before the Sicilian expedition) he is reproduced in many closely imitated passages, which are however interwoven with others from other sources, and cannot be regarded as forming the direct basis of the narrative; and that in cc. 12-30 (the Sicilian expedition) he is used to supplement Philistus, who is the real *fons primarius* throughout, but particularly so as we approach the end of the expedition, which he described in greater detail.

The main position here assumed remains, one may venture to think, a paradox though no longer a novelty. The parallel passages quoted, and the argument founded on them, can hardly be held sufficient to overthrow the more obvious conclusion, adopted by Holm (*Geschichte Siciliens*, ii. pp. 343-357) and Holuen (*Plutarch, Nicias*, p. xliii), that the substratum of cc. 6-30 is the history of Thucydides.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.