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](#)

Marchant's Second Book of Thucydides *Thucydides*. Book II. edited by E. C. Marchant, M.A. Macmillan. 1891. 3s. 6d.

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 05 / May 1892, pp 215 - 216
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018566X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018566X

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 215-216 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018566X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MARCHANT'S SECOND BOOK OF THUCYDIDES.

Thucydides. Book II. edited by E. C. MARCHANT, M.A. Macmillan. 1891. 3s. 6d.

THERE may be room for difference of opinion as to the principles on which Mr. Marchant has treated the text of Thucydides, but there can be none as to the fact that he has produced an excellent and in its own way masterly little edition. Readers of the *Classical Review* know him for a sound scholar, capable of independent work, and, though in this schoolbook there is not very much that can be called exactly new, every page bears witness to the thoroughness and skill with which it has been edited. There are, I should say, few schoolbooks that could be put into boys' hands with more certainty that they would find there nothing inaccurate and nothing vague.

On points of grammar Mr. Marchant is always clear and precise. He belongs to the more rigid school of grammarians, and he thoroughly understands what he is writing about. He avails himself throughout of the evidence now at our disposal as to the real forms of Greek words and their proper spelling: I mean chiefly the evidence afforded by inscriptions and collected in Meisterhans' invaluable book. Of course it matters very little in itself whether we spell *σώζω* with an iota or not, and a man may be an excellent scholar without knowing or caring anything about it: but accuracy is always good, and it is better to spell as the Greeks spelt. In matters of interpretation he uses an independent judgment to good purpose and usually points out the true meaning in few words. Perhaps the notes on difficult passages are in some cases somewhat too brief. His practice is to give one interpretation only without discussing and usually without noticing others. For boys of a certain age this may be the best policy, but for sixth forms and for university students rather more is required. They may learn a good deal in weighing rival explanations and seeing why one is better than the other. But it is right to repeat that, though Mr. Marchant usually confines himself to giving one view, he always has good grounds for that view; little or nothing which is certainly untenable will be found in his commentary.

In the second chapter of his Introduction he indicates the principles on which he holds that the text of Thucydides is to be dealt with. They may be called the principles of

Cobet, as carried further by Van Herwerden and Dr. Rutherford, and indeed the book is dedicated to the scholar last named. How far these principles are to be received (for that they must be received and acted upon to some extent hardly any competent scholar who has studied the matter will deny) is too large a subject for a short review. Mr. Marchant adopts most of the suggestions made by Cobet and others for leaving out here and there a few words that have the appearance of being an addition made in Byzantine times or earlier for the benefit of schoolboys or other readers in need of assistance. I cannot doubt that such additions were made and that they may sometimes be detected with certainty; but there is great doubt as to details. On the one hand we cannot be sure that Thucydides (and other authors) never used a word too much and never gave any information that was not strictly necessary. Thucydides expected to be read in distant places and at distant times. On the other hand, if we begin cutting out things as unnecessary because a well-informed Greek of Thucydides' own time would not have wanted them, we might probably omit a good deal more than the critics have yet proposed to omit. For instance, in 93.1 of this book Mr. Marchant brackets the latter words of τοῦ Πειραιῶς [τοῦ λιμένος τῶν Ἀθηναίων], but he leaves untouched the words that occur a few lines further about Megara, ἐκ Νισαίας τοῦ νεωρίου αὐτῶν. An Athenian would hardly need this information about Nisaea. So in 55 he writes μέχρι Λαυρεῖον [οὗ τὰ ἀργύρεα μέταλλά ἐστιν Ἀθηναίους]: but, if so, why not write in 66 ἐστράτευσαν νασὶν ἑκατὸν ἐς Ζάκυνθον [τὴν νῆσον ἣ κείται ἀντιπέρας Ἡλίδος· εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀχαιῶν τῶν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου ἄποικοι καὶ Ἀθηναίους ξυνεμάχων.]? It is indeed pretty apparent from the last words that this ought not to be omitted: but τὴν νῆσον... Ἡλίδος is just like many of the passages removed as 'adscripts': Mr. Marchant's little list of exactly similar notes actually to be found in the scholia is instructive but not absolutely conclusive as to particular passages in the text. In more difficult and sometimes complicated passages, when Mr. Marchant adopts by himself or with others the remedy of excision, the policy of it seems to me very doubtful. Almost the only excision of the sort that really recommends itself to me is that of τῷ μὴ σκεδάνυσθαι in 102.4. As to that of μετεῖχον in

16, though it is recommended by the sober Classen, is it likely that some later hand put in a word which was quite unnecessary and which upset the grammar of the sentence? No doubt *μετείχον* is wrong, but it wants emending, not omitting. Then again in 4. 2, *ἐμπείρους δὲ ἔχοντες τοὺς διώκοντας* [τοῦ μὴ ἐκφεύγειν, ὥστε διεφθείροντο οἱ πολλοί], is the addition such as a scholiast would have made? and do the scholiasts use the construction of τοῦ with an infinitive? With regard to 11. 4 *πολλάκις τε τὸ ἔλαττον πλῆθος* [δέδωδ' ἄμεινον] *ἠμύνατο τοὺς πλείους*, which has been discussed in this *Review*, the omission of *ἀμεινον* at any rate seems to me to be rendered impossible by the fact that *ἀμύνεσθαι* τινα means only to resist and fight, not to repulse and vanquish, so that some additional word is absolutely required here. Mr. Marchant has however in this case the support of Dobree.

To show the character of his text in other respects, it may be mentioned that in the Funeral Oration he adopts among others the following emendations: 41. 4, *καλῶν τε κἀγαθῶν* for *κακῶν τε κἀγαθῶν* (Herwerden): 42. 2, *τῷ ἔργῳ* for *τῶν ἔργων* (Dobree): 42. 4, *κάλλιον* for *μᾶλλον* (Dobree): 43. 1, *ἦν τί ἂν τις* for *ἦν ἂν τις* (Krüger): 44. 1, *ἐνταλαιπωρῆσαι* for *ἐντελευτῆσαι* (Herwerden): 44. 2, *οἶδα μὴ ποθεῖν* for *οἶδα πείθειν* (his own conjecture). In 7. 2 he adopts Shilleto's ingenious but most unsatisfactory insertion of certain words in a place which they could surely never have occupied, though the whole plausibility of the emendation depends on their insertion in just that place and no other. On the other hand I am

rather surprised at his not adopting *τὴν ἐναντίαν γῆν* for *τὴν ἐαυτῶν γῆν* in 90. 1; nor does he seem aware that it was suggested independently some time ago by Dr. Henry Jackson.

Attention should be called to an excellent little chapter on the style of Thucydides, and to an admirable index, from the study of which alone no small amount of Greek might be learnt. For instance, under the letter Γ we find a large number of references for the use of γε, all the instances in which γίγνεσθαι is practically the passive of ποιεῖσθαι (ἡ ἔσδοδος γίγνεται etc.), a number of references for γνώμη with the words (ἔργον, τύχη, etc.) to which it is opposed, and a collection of the γνώμαι of the book. As to γε, however, it is very misleading to put down such readings as οὐπω...γε, οὐδέ...γε, as though there were some connexion between the οὐπω and the γε, when a reference to the passage shows that γε goes with some other word and has absolutely nothing to do with οὐπω. Nor ought a word to be omitted from the index because the editor deems it to be wrong. Thus the *μετείχον* with its dative of 16 might surely appear in the index with a query or otherwise, and so too the no doubt erroneous ἂν with the future which occurs twice in 80. An index is less useful, and may even be misleading, if such things are not recorded.

I may repeat in conclusion that even where I venture to differ or doubt the book seems to me extremely well done and that it may be cordially recommended.

H. RICHARDS.

CHURCH'S TRANSLATION OF SOME DIALOGUES OF PLATO.

The Trial and Death of Socrates, being the Euthyphron, Apology, Crito and Phaedo of Plato, translated into English by F. J. CHURCH, M.A. London, Macmillan and Co. and New York, 1891. pp. lxxxix. 213. Price 2s. 6d. net.

THIS book consists of five parts, the introduction and the four translated dialogues.

The introduction is written in a flowing and pleasant style, and puts the reader in a position fully to appreciate the dialogues which follow. It begins with a life of Socrates, in which Mr. Church is careful to distinguish between fact and fancy. There

is no word about Myrto, daughter of Aristides the Just, nor of the strange assertion that Socrates had two wives at once. Yet with all his caution Mr. Church has perhaps accepted too much rather than too little. For on what evidence does the oft-repeated statement rest, that the mother of Socrates was 'Phaenarete a midwife' (p. x.)? Simply on that of a bantering passage in the *Theaetetus* (149 A), where it is quite possible that Plato is giving the reins to his exuberant imagination, and that this 'buxom and burly' matron is as apocryphal as Mrs. Harris. The name indeed is confirmed by *Alcib.* 131 A, but the coincidence of the