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](#)

***De institutis reipublicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis aetatem commutatis I.* By Johs Sundwall. (Acta Societatis scientiarum fennicae, tom, xxxiv, No. 4.) Helsingfors : Ex officina typographica Societatis litterariae fennicae. 1906. 11½" × 9". Pp.26.**

M. N. Tod

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 07 / November 1907, pp 213 - 214
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00165151, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00165151

How to cite this article:

M. N. Tod (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 213-214 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00165151

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

lines quoted by Galen as coming from the Prometheus Vincutus, to a place in the play, may well be urged again. They need not follow ἡλιοστιβεῖς in 791; they may come after μῆνη ποτέ in 797; Galen quotes two fragments, heading the first Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἐν Προμηθεῖ Δεσμώτῃ, Εὐθείαν κ.τ.λ.; the second, ὁ αὐτός φησιν ἐν Προμηθεῖ, Ἐξευλαβοῦ κ.τ.λ. Now clearly what has happened is, that, in the second extract, Ανομένῳ has fallen out after Προμηθεῖ; not, as Hermann says, Aesch. vol. ii. 161, that both fragments are from the same Prometheus. The alternative is, that Δεσμώτῃ is a mistake for Ανομένῳ; if so, ὁ αὐτός φησιν ἐν Προμηθεῖ must mean the Vincutus, which is absurd, because two plays are being distinguished, and ἐξευλαβοῦ κ.τ.λ. cannot belong to the Vincutus, and there is no other of the plays called Prometheus to which they are appropriate.

I may appear to have dwelt too much on

defects in this edition, but it seemed worth while pointing them out, for its weakness is not so much in the matter, as in the method. Another point suggests itself: amid excellent criticism and illustration adapted for a pupil, one comes across learned bits of specialism, in statistical syntax, let us say; thus: 'ἀνά: poet. = κατὰ (or παρά here), only once in Thuc., twice in the Orators; never as the first element in diprothetics.' The same method was noticeable in the editor's notes to Euripides' Hippolytus. Now, just as some of our best grammarians print the important but elementary sections of their grammars in large type, but the more advanced in smaller, might not the same expedient be adopted in those editions which, like this, are valuable both to learners and teachers?

J. U. POWELL.

Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

De institutis reipublicae Atheniensium post Aristotelis aetatem commutatis I. By JOHS. SUNDWALL. (Acta Societatis scientiarum fennicae, tom. xxxiv, No. 4.) Helsingfors: Ex officina typographica Societatis litterariae fennicae. 1906. 11½" x 9". Pp. 26.

THE object of the essay before us is to examine the political changes which took place in Athens during the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. in the light both of all the available literary evidence and also of the inscriptions of the period. After a brief introduction and a useful bibliography, the author discusses the timocratic constitution set up in 321/0 under the influence of Antipater. This constitution was short-lived, for at the beginning of 318 the popular party overthrew Phocion and his colleagues and elected new magistrates: with this revolution the second chapter deals. The restored democracy, however, was soon overthrown. Early in 317 Demetrius of Phalerum became governor and introduced those changes which

form the subject of Sundwall's third and longest chapter. He argues that the secretaries of the council (γραμματεῖς κατὰ πρωτανείαν) and the archons were chosen by election, and discusses also the disputed question of the institution of νομοφύλακες and γυναικονόμοι. A full account follows of the ἀγωνοθεσία, the longest-lived of the creations of Demetrius, and the work closes with an examination of the *ephebia* at this period, which goes to show that only those who possessed the hoplite census were enrolled among the *ephebi*.

The author seems to have done his work well and carefully, and even when the conclusions reached are not new it is interesting to find fresh arguments brought forward and fresh evidence adduced: the present monograph, indeed, is intended to supplement rather than to replace Spangenberg's valuable dissertation *de Atheniensium publicis institutis aetate Macedonum commutatis*, but students of this obscure period of Athenian history cannot afford to ignore this latest contribution to the

subject. Unfortunately it must be added that misprints abound, and though these do not affect the sense they seriously detract from the pleasure of reading the work.

M. N. TOD.

Epigraphische Beiträge zur sozial-politischen Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des Demosthenes. By JOHS. SUNDWALL. Leipzig: Dieterich [also published as Beiheft IV. of *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*]. 1906. 11" x 7½". Pp. 6+92. M. 5.

THE utilization of Greek inscriptions for historical purposes may be divided into three stages which are logically, though not chronologically, distinct. The first of these consists in the discussion of individual inscriptions and the attempt to gain from them all the light they throw upon any aspect of Greek history. In the second the whole mass of published texts is examined with the view of illustrating a single, definite field of study, as, for example, in Ziebarth's admirable monograph, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Finally we have the work of the historian proper, who unites these scattered studies, giving to the results of each their due place and proportion in a comprehensive picture of Greek life and action.

It is to the second of these stages that the present work belongs. The author has set out to discover what the Attic inscriptions of the fourth century B.C., supplemented by the literary sources, teach us about the social condition of those who took the leading part in the public life of Athens during the period of Demosthenes' political activity. His main conclusion may be briefly stated in his own words (p. 74): 'The political influence of the propertied classes at Athens in no way diminished during the age of Demosthenes. In the most important branches of the administration, in the Council, as *strategi*, or as finance officers the propertied class had the upper hand: even the orators and politicians belonged as a rule to the higher strata of the citizen body. The political parties had not originated in the opposition of propertied and non-propertied classes, but in divergent views on foreign policy and the closely related conflict of economic

and personal interests.' In successive chapters lists are drawn up of the *bouleutae*, *strategi*, *diaetetae*, naval officials, financial officials, temple-presidents and cult officials, deme officials, ambassadors, and orators, whose names are known, and these are then carefully examined with a view of determining how many of them can be proved to have been wealthy or at least well-to-do. The most interesting study is that of the generals, including a continuation down to 322 B.C. of the useful list for the years 441 to 356 given in Beloch's *Attische Politik* (pp. 289 ff.). Two supplementary chapters, one on the priests of Asclepius, the other on the demes and their partition among the tribes, close the book, which, though marred by numerous minor errors of spelling and accentuation, may be warmly commended as a piece of careful and painstaking work.

M. N. TOD.

Studies in Virgil. By T. R. GLOVER. (Arnold.) 8vo. Pp. x+312.

I MUST apologize for my delay in noticing this most readable volume. I have indeed—if I may introduce a personal feeling—found myself rather of two minds about it. With part of its contents, and in particular with that part which is historical, I must confess to being in serious disagreement. For instance, Mr. Glover devotes a chapter to Augustus (chap. vii) and I dissent from the whole main thesis of the chapter. He begins by expressing astonishment that Horace and Virgil deified Augustus. To us (he says) the emperor seems a shrewd and successful adventurer, who had no ideas of his own and lived by assimilating those of his uncle and adoptive father. He is the middleman who comes in to utilize those gains which genius can indicate but not gather: he owes his success to his practical adroitness and his intellectual inferiority. In the words of M. Goumy he is 'ce trop habile homme, qui par peur des poignards n'organisa que le viager, and ne consacra que les mensonges.' Thus Mr. Glover. I think perhaps that for literary effect and dramatic contrast he has rather heightened his description. But even allowing for that, his estimate seems unfair. It is quite possible and permissible for scholars to differ about the character of Augustus—as, for that matter, of anyone else—and it is often a harmless and Platonic proceeding. But the differences in this case reach a point where facts begin to tell. For after all the Principate diverged so sharply in its constitution and its administrative system from the Autocracy of Julius that Augustus cannot be called an assimilator of the ideas of his uncle. It was indeed his consistent policy, so soon as he had shaken himself free from the opening events of the Triumvirate, to avoid following the ideas of his uncle in a whole series of details, which could easily be enumerated.