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](#)

Botsford's *Ancient History An Ancient History for Beginners*. By George Willis Botsford, Ph.D. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. 494. 7s. 6d.

M. Alford

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 02 / March 1903, pp 121 - 123

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207610, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207610

How to cite this article:

M. Alford (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 121-123 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207610

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

standing to what the poet refers. This verse is a very *crux* of criticism. Brandt has done a most real service in calling marked attention to it: but the problem cannot be considered solved. It is sad that the early Bodleian Welsh MS. of the *Ars* (Bradshaw thought it of cent. ix) contains only the first book, and does not help us here.

In an even more doubtful passage, I. 731, (unfortunately omitted in the Welsh MS.) which Brandt prints thus *Pallidus in Side siluis errabat Orion*, MSS. give no warrant

for *Side*. R (Paris 7311) has *linces silli* ^a
ius e. arion (not *orion*, which however seems to be the reading of the mass of MSS.) Of those which I have looked at, D'Orv. 170 (of cent. xii) has *linca* (a over an erasure, in darker ink, *c* might be *o*); Can. Lat. 1 (saec. xiii) has *linca*, but in a marginal note *lineam*; Auct. Rawl. G. 108 has *lincem*; Auct. F. i. 18 dated 1483 *lyricem*. No nymph or female with a name like this has yet been discovered; the daughter of Oenopion, of whom Orion was enamoured, is called sometimes Merope, sometimes (as by Parthenius) Haero (*Aero* Knaack), sometimes Aerope; Side was his first wife, but he is not said to have been specially fond of her. It is I think clear that neither of these is intended by Ovid. Meanwhile the coincidence of the name in the best MSS. with the *lynxes* which Horace says were (with lions) the main objects of Orion's hunting, is very perplexing; for the pentameter which immediately follows *Pallidus in lenta Naide Daphnis erat* (732) points unmistakably to a similar ablative in 731. There is a general consensus in all the variants mentioned by Heinsius on the passage as to the name beginning with *l*; but it seems not beyond possibility that a *c* or *g* may have fallen out before *l* in a very early period of the transmission of the *Ars*, possibly (C)lytic. The nearest actual

approach to the word which I have discovered is *Lyca*, the name of a nymph who loved the shepherd Daphnis (Philargyrius on Ecl. v. 20); but the *y* of *Lyca* would be short, nor can the *n* of *Lynce* or *Lynca* be easily put aside.

I confess to a little disappointment in not finding what I think a very probable emendation of my own in II. 305-8 not mentioned by Brandt. I published it in the American Journal of Philology for 1892 p. 343 with some other suggestions on Ovid.

Bracchia saltantis, uocem mirare canentis,

Et quod desierit uerba querentis habe.

Ipsos concubitus, ipsum uenerere licebit

Quod iuuat et † quaedam gaudia noctis
habe.

I regard *quaedam* as one of the many cases where *d* has been written for *cl*, *quaedam* for *quae clam*. Then *habe* will become either *habet*, or *habet* (sc. puella). *Clam habere* = *occulere*: *licebit uenerere ipsam uoluptatem coitus et gaudia ueneris quae taces* (tacet).

III. 287, 8

Est quae peruerso distorqueat ora cachinno,
Cum risu † usa est altera, flere putes.

The conjecture of Rappold *quassa est* is good in itself, yet not very likely to have been corrupted into *usa est*. I suggest either *cum risu uisa est altera*, 'another has been seen laughing', or *cum* (when) *risu fusa est altera*, f. p.

It will be seen from the above remarks how much has still to be done for the *A.A.*, as well as for the other directly amatory works of Ovid. Brandt's new edition cannot fail to make this more sensibly felt: I am even in hopes that we may soon possess something like an adequate conspectus of the primary sources of the text of these very interesting poems.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

BOTSFORD'S ANCIENT HISTORY.

An Ancient History for Beginners. By GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD, Ph.D. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. 494. 7s. 6d.

DR. BOTSFORD in his preface tells us that this book 'is intended for pupils who have

never studied history before,' and is meant to furnish material for a year's work to 'beginning classes in the high school.' The statement helps us to understand one or two omissions strange at first sight, and to appreciate the success with which the

writer has adapted his book to its special purpose, a task not often accomplished so skilfully. Among the omissions, one notices the entire absence of Theramenes. Sulpicius is not named in the sketch of the events of 88 B.C., and no doubt Dr. Botsford was right in simplifying as far as possible the intricacies of that difficult time. There seems to be less necessity for leaving out the 'Knights' and the jury-courts in speaking of Gaius Gracchus and the changes he introduced (p. 353), and this omission is perhaps regrettable, especially as attention has been drawn to the previous community of interest between culprit and judges in trials *repetundarum* (p. 339).

But the most noteworthy omission of all is the absence of that dulness which is so hard to exclude from compressed text-books, and the history is excellent, a book for which one may well be grateful to its author. The matters of real importance are selected and made prominent with a sureness of touch that shows both historical insight and much careful work guided by a teacher's experience. The balance is well maintained between the personal and dramatic elements in history on the one hand, and on the other the influences of geographical position, tendencies of an age, general character of a race or state. Such short notices as those of Dionysios (§ 160), Agesilaos (§ 167), Flaminius (§ 277), the Gracchi (§ 281)—to name a few among many—make the men real and interesting persons. Again, the nature of a City State (§ 65) of an Amphiktyony (§ 66), the bond between a Greek colony and its metropolis (§ 63), the relations of Thebes, Argos, Athens, Sparta, to their surrounding districts (§ 68), the effects of geographical conditions on Italian history (§ 215), are some of the more general topics that are treated briefly but clearly. The girls and boys who use this book should have at the close of their year's work upon it a good outline in their minds of the main features in the histories of Greece and Rome; and they must be dull indeed if they are not kindled to an interest in the subject that will make them want to learn more about those two states.

Greece and Rome in their best days occupy the bulk of the book. Forty pages at the beginning are given to a sketch of Oriental history from the fifth millennium B.C., forty-three near the end carry us from Diocletian to Charlemagne. These outlines may be made very useful by a good teacher; but the central part of the book tells its story well even by itself. Teachers are,

however, encouraged to supplement, 'Topics for Reading' being suggested at the end of each chapter.

Turning to political questions, we find that Dr. Botsford believes strongly in the necessity and advantages of imperial rule at Rome. He has little sympathy with Greek oligarchies, and holds that the history of both Athens and Rome has been somewhat distorted by passing through an aristocratic or oligarchic medium. He takes the view that Kleon 'had a remarkable talent for finance and was an orator of great force' (p. 164). The decemvir Appius Claudius was 'a man of rare intelligence and ability' (p. 303), and the fall of the body to which he belonged was due to its liberal policy (p. 304). In dealing with the early emperors, a very large discount from tradition is given. Not only is Claudius allowed to have been generous, wise, firm in punishing offenders and in protecting the frontiers (p. 393); even Domitian, whose traditional portrait is the most repulsive in the whole collection, is presented as a firm and able ruler of the provinces, his treatment of the Roman nobility being but slightly suggested (p. 398 f.). Tiberius one no longer expects to find set forth in that monstrous form for which Tacitus himself supplies corrections; and Dr. Botsford's estimate of him (p. 390) is particularly just and sensible.

Due attention is paid to the interesting topic of federal government in connexion with Greece and Rome; but in the desire to bring home to American readers the nature of the Italian union under Rome, Dr. Botsford goes too far when he speaks of it as a 'federal system' (p. 296). Freeman, in his *History of Federal Government*, calls attention to the 'quasi-Federal position of the allies,' but clearly points out how it differed from a real federation. This difference may indeed be gathered from the context in Dr. Botsford's book; but the relation between Rome and her allies is so hard for beginners to apprehend that there is danger in a phrase which seems to sum up the situation in familiar terms.

The treatment of the *Comitia Tributa* is not very satisfactory. Our author starts with the view—to my mind highly improbable—that the *Comitia Tributa* and 'the plebeian assembly of tribes' were identical (pp. 302, 304, 311); he tells us nothing of any other assembly by tribes, and then suddenly (p. 360) we find under Sulla the tribal assembly electing the new members

of the Senate. Surely it was not a purely plebeian assembly that did this? yet the beginner in history would be justified in supposing that it was.

As to the spelling of Greek names and other Greek words, I cannot but repeat the protest I made in reviewing Dr. Botsford's History of Greece. And we are again instructed to pronounce 'Sikyon' as 'Sishion' (p. 103, and Index), a pronunciation recommended neither by correctness nor by beauty.

A few more dates would be helpful. Plato and Sophokles are left undated, though dates are given for Aischylos. Again, that battle at the Colline Gate in which the Samnite ox seemed so near trampling down the Roman wolf, should be marked by an exact date; perhaps also the battle of Thapsus or that of Munda. It might be well to give more often the quantities of Greek and Latin words, especially such words as 'Cle-om'-e-nes,' in which the accent, which is marked, tends

to produce a false 'quantity'. Unfortunately, in one of the few cases in which a quantity is given, the mark has been shifted by a printer's error to a wrong syllable, 'hegemōny' being printed (p. 76). Of such small mistakes I have detected very few: on p. 194, '287' has taken the place of '387' at the beginning of § 159, and on the maps in the Roman part the references given to other maps have not been altered to suit the present volume.

Throughout the history, quotations from original authorities are introduced with excellent effect. Pictures and maps are liberally scattered, and increase the usefulness as well as the attractiveness of this very attractive book. The pictures are remarkably good, some of the representations of statuary and vase-paintings giving a better idea of the beauty of the originals than one would have supposed it possible to convey by illustrations on so small a scale.

M. ALFORD.

THUMB'S *HANDBUCH DER Koinḗ*.

Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus; Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurtheilung der koinḗ. Von ALBERT THUMB. Strassburg, 1901. Pp. iv + 275. 8vo. 7 M.

THIS learned publication is a very acceptable and valuable contribution to our meagre knowledge of post-classical and subsequent Greek speech, a form of language recently dubbed by the misnomer *koinḗ*. It is to be regretted that this term *koinḗ* has been adopted also by Prof. P. Kretschmer in a paper on 'Die Entstehung der Koine,' published contemporaneously and independently in the *Wiener Sitzungsberichte* (vol. 143 X. pp. 1-40): a very meritorious and painstaking essay which has been issued also separately and which I recommend to all students of Greek, alike classical and modern.

Prof. Thumb's *Handbuch* of the so-called *koinḗ* consists of six separate papers or *Beiträge* purporting to discuss and illustrate the character and historical evolution of the said *koinḗ*.—In paper I (pp. 1-27) Prof. Thumb reviews the multifarious modern views and applications of the term *koinḗ*, and concludes by proposing to use it synonymously with 'Hellenistic Greek'

(p. 9), applying either term to that form of Greek speech which was commonly current from 300 B.C. to about 500 A.D. (p. 6), or to the language generally spoken in ordinary intercourse from the time of Alexander the Great to the end of Greek antiquity (p. 7). Within the *koinḗ* so defined, Prof. Thumb further distinguishes two periods of about 300 years each, then within each period again speaks of a literary and a colloquial *koinḗ*, and later on (p. 160 ff.) discriminates no less than five dialects within the *koinḗ*. Continuing his general remarks, the writer in the same paper points out the close connection of modern with classical Greek and the great value of present speech both for the study of the *koinḗ* and the critical edition of classical Greek texts. The value and importance of modern Greek is, moreover, emphasised throughout the book.—In paper II (pp. 28-52) the author cites a few ancient testimonies to the survival of the old dialects in post-classical antiquity, then discusses the gradual spread of the *koinḗ* in the inscriptions, especially in Rhodes, and attributes the phenomenon to the natural evolution of living speech.—Paper III (53-101) speaks of the influence of the *koinḗ* on the Attic dialect (*Koinisierung des*