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](#)

Anthologia Lyrica, sive lyricorum Graecorum veterum praeter Pindarum reliquiae potiores. Post Theodorum Bergkium, quartum edidit Eduardus Hiller. Leipzig: 1890.

J. W. M.

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 07 / July 1890, pp 313 - 314

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190584, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190584

How to cite this article:

J. W. M. (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 313-314 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190584

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SOME EDITIONS OF THE *ILIAD*.

Homeri Ilias. Scholarum in usum edidit PAULUS CAUER. Pars I. Carm. I.—XII. Editio Maior. Vienna, Tempsky; Leipzig, Freytag. 3m.
Ditto. Ditto. Editio Minor. 1m. 75.

The First Three Books of Homer's Iliad, with Introduction, Commentary, and Vocabulary for the use of schools. By THOMAS D. SEYMOUR, Hillhouse Professor of Greek in Yale College. Boston, Ginn.

Homer's Ilias in Verkürzter Ausgabe. Für den Schulgebrauch von A. TH. CHRIST. Mit 9 Abbildungen und 2 Karten. Vienna, Tempsky. 1 fl. 30 kr.

CAUER'S *Odyssey* was noticed in the first volume of the *C. R.* p. 198; it is now followed in due course by the *Iliad*, of which the first volume is before us. It is with Rzach's edition that comparison is challenged, for the two are issued by the same publisher, and appear to form part of the same series, though not quite uniform in size and type.

While Rzach gives a continuous *apparatus criticus*, chiefly from the scholia and grammarians, but with occasional reference to the variants of C and D as well as A, Cauer confines himself to only so much as is required to explain his deviations from the vulgate. In this he is wise; it is useless in our present ignorance as to the MSS. to attempt to offer an apparatus which is more than a mere skeleton. And Cauer's attitude is on the whole a conservative one; he does not vary from the MS. reading without cause. He has nothing to say to the digamma, believing it to have been entirely lost when the corpus of the Homeric poems took its present Ionic form, about 750 B.C.; though he yields so far to Fick as to admit that some fragments of the older Aeolic epic have been incorporated in it. It would be interesting to know what he makes of the evidence for a lost F^2 for F_1 (ε) in Ω 154. If he admits this, and it is difficult to deny it, then it follows that F was a living sound even for the latest poets of the *Iliad*; for it is hardly conceivable that ε alone could have made position in deference to tradition while vanishing entirely from the text.

The Preface and Introduction (pp. 64) deal chiefly with questions of orthography, and contain many good remarks. The least satisfactory perhaps is the section in which the editor defends his consistent introduction of the non-assimilated forms of the verbs with vowel stems, ἀντιδούσαν for ἀντιδῶσαν and the like, which form the most important part of his deviations from the accepted text. Wackernagel's theory is hardly so unassailable as to justify the change in a school text.

In individual passages it may be noticed that he adopts Nauck's καλέοντος for καὶ δαιτὸς in Δ 343, and Heyne's suggestion ἐκείθον ἂν for ἐκεῖθ' αὖτον, Γ 453. It is strange that he should still keep the unmetrical γυναικα γαμέσσεσθαι in his text in Γ 394, and mention Aristarchos' γυναικά γε μάσσεσθαι only in the note. On Λ 447 I am glad to see a correction of one of La Roche's careless blunders which has misled Rzach; it is quite true that κλειτήν is the reading of the MSS., not ἱερήν, as La Roche distinctly implies. μαρμαμένους in Σ 256 for μαρμαμένοι, and περὶ κάλλιμα Σ 321 for περικαλλέα, are quite needless changes. On every few pages Cauer writes οὐ δέ for οὐδέ when it is used in an adversative sense, with a note 'οὐδέ libri.' How does he distinguish the two in a MS.?

The text is in short a conservative one, with curious and rather irregular tendencies to advanced reform. It is, however, a very useful one, and well printed. The only misprint I have noticed is ἐνῆπατον

or ἐνῆπατον in the note on Γ 228. The *Editio Minor* consists of the text only, without introduction or critical notes.

The name of Prof. T. D. Seymour is in itself sufficient guarantee for the excellence of the edition of the first three books of the *Iliad* which he has based on the well-known German edition of Ameis and Hentze. The one before us is a school edition condensed from the fuller adaptation in the 'College Series.' The notes in the main follow Hentze, expanding his very condensed style; but a great deal of illustrative literary matter has been added, especially in the shape of parallel passages from Milton and the Bible. The grammatical introduction has been adapted from Prof. Seymour's own *Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer*. The most characteristic feature of the book is the vocabulary at the end. This is not merely a list of words with English equivalents, but contains a number of illustrations taken from Helbig. Considerable care has been bestowed on the explanations, particularly of the prepositions and particles, and on the mythological articles. As to the practical value of such a vocabulary in a book which is too advanced for mere beginners, schoolmasters must decide; but if that be granted, there can be no doubt that the edition is excellently suited to its purpose.

Schoolmasters too, not critics, must say if they require a condensed *Iliad* for teaching purposes, such as has been published by A. Th. Christ—who of course is not to be confounded with the Munich *Altmeister*. For Austria, where a virtuous government requires the use of Bowdlerized editions even of Homer, such a condensation has a justification; for the excisions are on so liberal a scale that the numbering of the lines affords no help to the naughty boy on the look-out for improprieties. A third of the whole *Iliad* is omitted. The lines rejected sometimes form whole episodes; for instance Thetis does not appear at all in Ω , and the deceiving of Zeus vanishes from Σ . In other cases single lines only are left out, either as being superfluous, or as causing needless difficulties. There is no doubt that such a method of treatment has advantages, as giving boys more story and less digression, but it removes the book from the range of serious criticism. It is enough to say that the excisions seem to be ingeniously done, and that the text reads smoothly. There are two fair maps, and little illustrated excursions of no special merit on the armour and chariots, and on the scene of the war, indices of proper names, and an introduction which gives some hints at the problem of the composition of the poems.

W. LEAF.

Anthologia Lyrica, sive lyricorum Graecorum veterum praeter Pindarum reliquiae potiores. Post THEODORUM BERGKIUM, quartum edidit Eduardus Hiller. Leipzig: 1890.

WHEN Bergk died in 1881, he had almost completed a fourth and definitive edition of the *Lyrici Graeci*, but only the first volume, containing Pindar, had appeared. His literary executor Schäfer put the task of bringing out the second and third volumes into the hands of E. Hiller, who performed it so as to give general satisfaction. Hiller has now brought out in the Teubner series of Greek texts a new edition of Bergk's small text of the *Anthologia Lyrica*, containing the fragments of the iambic, elegiac, and melic poets, or substantially the same material as vols. 2 and 3 of the *Lyrici Graeci*. He proposes to edit in a separate volume the fragments of the later poets which were included in the first edition of the *Anthologia Lyrica*.

In this edition Hiller has further revised the text in a good many places, of which a list is given in the preface, and has considerably altered the arrangement. The iambic and elegiac poets are placed by him in a single series, in order, he says, to avoid the awkwardness of a cross division in the case of poets who, like Archilochus, Crates and Solon, wrote both elegiacs and iambics. Perhaps the matter is of little consequence, but it seems hardly worth while to disturb an arrangement with which every one is familiar; and if carried out logically, the principle would involve still greater changes, for there are many elegiac pieces among the fragments of the melic poets. An index gives the variations made in this edition from Bergk's numbering. Following the authority of Choeroboscus, Hiller makes Simonides of Amorgos appear under the name of Semonides.

J. W. M.

Xenophon's Hellenica. Book II. With Analysis and Notes, by the Rev. LAUNCELOT D. DOWDALL. Cambridge, Deighton, Bell and Co., 1889. 1s. 6d. (Cambridge Texts with Notes.)

THIS tragic chapter of Athenian history is a well-chosen addition to the present series. For the introduction of the junior student to the subjects of Athenian history, political antiquities, and topography, no better choice could be made. The present edition is based upon the text of Breitenbach (1884), with two or three deviations. A useful analysis is prefixed. The notes contain much excellent illustrative material, but insufficiently digested and ill-arranged. Critical and controversial matter has no place in an edition for the use of students who need the information that *Byzantium* is the 'modern Constantinople, founded A.D. 330, taken by Turks 1453.' If critical notes must be given in such a book, they should be relegated to an appendix. The note from which a quotation is made above is an example of the editor's tendency to bring in irrelevant information. The mere mention of Byzantium in the text leads to the statement that the Turkish crescent is said to date from 339 B.C., when a light in the sky saved it from capture by the Macedonians.

Much of the historical and political matter contained in the notes might have been given more clearly and comprehensively in a general introduction, which should state also the situation at the opening of the work. Proper names are not treated uniformly here: e.g. we find Cleisthenes and Clisthenes; Piræus, Piræeus, and Peiræeus. The type is clear, but too small for a text-book. Misprints are not common. Oddly enough, the section-heading 1—4 is allowed to stand unchanged at the top of every page of the notes!

H. M. REYNOLDS.
Yale University.

Pauli Oropii Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII. ex recogn. CAROLI ZANGEMEISTER. Lipsiae. B. G. Teubner 1889. 3 Mk.

Little more than a reprint of Zangemeister's edition (1882) for the Vienna *Corpus*. There are a few additions (p. xvi.) to the critical materials, and a list is given of passages in which a change has been made. Upon the whole however the differences are trifling.

Studia Ambrosiana scripsit MAX IHM. Commentatio ex supplementis Annalium Philologicorum seorsum expressa. Lipsiae. B. G. Teubner. 1889. 2 M. 80.

A USEFUL book of reference for the student of Ambrose. It consists of four parts, treating of i. the

chronology of his life (*Fasti Ambr.*); ii. that of his works; iii. his imitation of Virgil; iv. a Trier MS. of his *Exp. psalmi cxviii*.

The second section is the most important. The decision of the Benedictines on the genuineness and date of the various works ascribed to A. are carefully reviewed, and found to be not unfrequently more definite than the evidence will warrant. Thus eleven of his letters to which they had assigned a date are thrown back into uncertainty. The genuineness of the *de Bello Judaico* is defended against Vogel; and the *Collatio legum Mosaiticarum et Romanarum* is assigned to Ambrose, in accordance with the statement of Ebedjesu followed by Rudorff. There is, however, one conspicuous omission.

We should have liked some notice of the *Explanatio Symboli ad initiandos*, so decidedly vindicated for A. by Caspari.

A History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Macedonian Conquest: By C. W. C. OMAN, M.A., F.S.A. Rivingtons: 1890. 4s. 6d.

THE object of this short history of Greece is 'the requirements of the upper forms in schools, and of the final pass examination at the universities.' It is not very clear what examinations are included under the last rather comprehensive expression, but there can be little doubt that, so far as the public schools are concerned, the author has fulfilled the greater part of his task with ability and precision. He writes in a clear and attractive style, and has contrived to pack his book with facts, without making it a mere epitome of events. The history, especially in the earlier parts, is brought up to the level of recent discoveries, and there are some useful maps and plans, but no chronological table.

At the same time, there are several points which invite a less favourable criticism. It a little offends one's sense of proportion to find a map of the Athenian Empire with its divisions as shown in the tribute lists, but to have to search in vain for the names of Aeschylus, Aristophanes, and, except for casual mention, Socrates. Plato is only mentioned as having visited Syracuse, Euripides as having been entertained at the court of Archelaus, Sophocles as commanding at Samos in 440, while a slip in the index makes him command in Sicily too. It looks as if the author had deliberately abstained, and even 'little Smith' does not, from touching on the literary side of Athenian history. A schoolboy can hardly obtain a just idea of what Athens really was from a book which omits all mention of her most characteristic feature.

The author has been much more successful with the earlier than with the later history. After 405 B.C. his account is in many places somewhat meagre: 103 pages are devoted to the Peloponnesian war, but only 113 to the remaining years 405—338 B.C. Athenian relations towards Sparta and Thebes are not very clearly indicated; Callistratus and Eubulus are never so much as mentioned. The result is that when the time of Demosthenes is reached, no attempt is made to describe his true political position, either before or after the peace of Philocrates. The general impression produced is that the latter part of the work has been rather hurried.

One or two minor points perhaps deserve notice. The 'Thirty did not 'soon earn for themselves the name of the Thirty Tyrants' (p. 412); the name occurs first in Diodorus. It is hardly correct to say that Pericles gave the dicast three obols a day; the evidence is overwhelming that the *τριάβολον* dates from Cleon. The closing incidents in the rule of the Thirty are not quite correctly described, and the true