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](#)

Platt's Edition of the *Iliad* *The Iliad of Homer*, edited by Arthur Platt, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Professor of Greek in University College, London. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1894. 4s. 6d.

D. B. Monro

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 10 / December 1894, pp 464 - 465

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189206, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189206

How to cite this article:

D. B. Monro (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 464-465 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189206

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

κατὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον ἐστὶν ἡ γνῶσις (cf. *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 188, n. 18).

On the whole, however, a just view of these things is taken, and on p. 117 we find this very true remark—

‘Immaterialism is Plato’s distinctive new creation. Wherever in earlier systems—Anaxagoras not excluded—there is anything said of the spiritual as a principle by itself, it yet appears always as a particular kind of corporeal reality. It is Plato that first discovers the purely spiritual world.’

It would be easy to accumulate criticism of details, but it is more important to emphasize the merit of the book. It is far the best introduction I know to Greek philosophy; those who wish for more than the outlines will still have to go to Zeller and Diels—δεῖ γὰρ ἵσως ὑποτυπῶσαι πρῶτον, εἴθ’ ὕστερον ἀναγράψαι.

JOHN BURNET.

United College, St. Andrews.

PLATT’S EDITION OF THE *ILIAD*.

The Iliad of Homer, edited by ARTHUR PLATT, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Professor of Greek in University College, London. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1894. 4s. 6d.

MR. PLATT has followed up his edition of the *Odyssey* (noticed in this *Review* in October 1892) by an edition of the *Iliad*, in which the recension of the text is carried out on the same lines. The chief differences are (1) the substitution of η for ϵ in such verb forms as $\thetaείω$, etc., and (2) the expulsion of $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\tilde{\eta}\nu$, though the particle $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ is (rightly) retained. As the plan of the work does not admit of any discussion, or even of an introductory statement, of the principles on which the new text is constructed, there is no occasion now to do more than refer briefly to the opinions expressed in this journal two years ago.

The restoration of the original text of Homer is really the restoration of an earlier stage of the Greek language, and is to be accomplished, if at all, partly by inference from the language and metre of the poems, partly by the light which has been thrown upon the history of Greek by comparative grammar. It is in the latter branch of the inquiry that Mr. Platt appears to be less entirely at home than he is in Homeric scholarship proper. Several instances pointing in this direction were quoted in the former article. One of these may be repeated now as an illustration of the difference between the older or philological and the later linguistic point of view. In the declension of nouns in $-is$, such as $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\delta\psi\iota\varsigma$, Mr. Platt rejects the contracted dative forms $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota$, $\delta\psi\epsilon\iota$, and substitutes, where possible, the ‘resolved’ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$, $\delta\psi\mu\iota$. What

is the evidence for these forms? Grammarians find Ionic and Aeolic datives $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}$, $\delta\psi\iota$, etc., and infer that they are contracted from the seemingly regular $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$, $\delta\psi\mu\iota$. But in the opinion of Brugmann (*Grundriss* ii. § 266, p. 620, and § 278, p. 631) the $-i$ of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}$, $\delta\psi\iota$ is not formed by contraction from $-u$, and in any case is older than any period of Greek. It is Indo-Germanic, and belongs to the original instrumental case. On the other hand, the ‘resolved’ forms $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota$, etc., represent an Indo-Germanic locative form. Thus we have evidence for $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota$ etc. and for $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}$ etc., but $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ is a mere hypothetical construction, which we have no sufficient reason for introducing into Greek of any period.

Again, a form may be undoubtedly Homeric, but may belong to the archaic element in Homer, i.e. to that part of his vocabulary which was due to poetical tradition. A good instance of such a form is the genitive in $-oo$. But if an archaic form, which is preserved in certain phrases or combinations only, is introduced whenever the metre admits it, we run a great risk of falsifying the language—of making it older than Homer.

Turning to individual passages, we find few alterations to which any serious objection can be taken. In 1, 291 Bekker’s $\pi\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ introduces a form of this subjunctive (with ϵ for η) which is not Homeric: for *Od.* 24, 485 $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ is hardly to be counted. In 2, 291, where $\alpha\nu\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha$ ‘ἀνέχεσθαι’ is read instead of $\alpha\nu\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha$ ‘νέεσθαι’, Mr. Platt adds: ‘dispicet tamen aoristum.’ The objection is surely fatal, especially when it would have been so easy to say $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ ‘ἀνέχεσθαι’. In 6, 149 Mr. Platt gives $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\theta$ in the preface, but leaves $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$ in the text. A similar discrepancy occurs in 10, 362. In

7, 451 ὄσσην seems to be a misprint for ὄσον. In 9, 133 the reading *Fῆς* is hardly to be reconciled with the reflexive sense of *Ῥός*. In 9, 230 *σωθέμεν'* is a form hard to account for. Is it a passive aorist? In 10, 246 the usual reading γ' ἑσπομένοιο might be given in a note. In 11, 156 πάντη must be a misprint, as Mr. Platt elsewhere writes πάντη. In 11, 348 στέομεν for στέωμεν is doubtful: how do we arrive at the Attic στῶμεν? In 11, 417 the MS. reading is not ἀμφὶ δέ τ', as given in the note, but ἀμφί τε or ἀμφί τ'. In 11, 831 to whom should δεδαέσθαι be attributed? In 16, 150 ἄρπνια is altered to

ἀρέπνια: but the alteration is not noticed in the preface. Similarly in 23, 327 ὄργνια is turned into ὀρόγνια. In 19, 208 τισαίμεθα is surely required by the governing optative.

Mr. Platt has done a considerable service to scholars by ascertaining as far as possible to whom the various alterations are due. We now know for the first time how much was done by Bentley: and it is interesting to see how little advance was made upon his work except by making use of the light afforded by the comparative method.

D. B. MONRO.

BLASS ON DEMOSTHENES.

Die Attische Beredsamkeit, III i, *Demosthenes*, dargestellt von FRIEDRICH BLASS. Pp. 644. Leipzig: Teubner. 1893. 16 M.

WHEN the publication of the volume on Demosthenes in the *Attische Beredsamkeit* of Professor Blass was first announced in 1877, those who were familiar with the masterly work of Arnold Schaefer on the same subject may well have wondered what more was left to be said on a theme which had apparently been already exhausted. When the volume was actually published, they were interested to find that it was dedicated to Arnold Schaefer himself, and they soon discovered that there was ample room for the literary treatment of the great orator's speeches side by side with the historical treatment which they had already received from the author of *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*. English readers were further gratified to observe that Professor Blass, in the absence of any personal experience of public life, had supplemented his own criticisms by giving special prominence to those of Lord Brougham.

The value of the work as a whole has been widely recognized, and now, after an interval of sixteen years, we have to congratulate the author on the publication of a new and enlarged edition. The enlargement extends to no less than eighty additional pages, and the thorough revision which the work has received proves that the author is still true to the motto quoted

in the preface to his edition of the Speech on *The Crown*:—'dies diem docet.' Besides many minor additions we now have a fuller treatment of the orator's public life, and a revised and expanded exposition of the author's views on the rhythm of Demosthenes. He dwells more fully on the law of composition discovered by himself, in obedience to which the orator avoids the 'ignoble tribrach'; he also discusses at greater length the rhythmical correspondences between the several clauses of the orator's sentences. The views of Professor Blass on these points are familiar to scholars and there is less need to dwell upon them here as they have been discussed in the *Classical Review* in the course of an admirable article by Professor Butcher (v. 309–315). The general result is that we have now fresh reason for regarding the prose of Demosthenes as something intermediate between *oratio soluta* and the strictly metrical compositions of poets.

The only misprints which I have observed are on p. 126 ὦ θεία κεφαλῇ for κεφαλῇ, and on p. 210 (in an English quotation) *seam* for *seem*.

Whatever differences of opinion may prevail as to the value of the author's criticisms on the *minutiae* of rhythmical composition, there can be no doubt of the great value of the work as a whole. It is a work that is absolutely indispensable to every serious student of Demosthenes.

J. E. SANDYS.