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](#)

**Philologische Streifzüge, von Dr Michael Gitlbauer,
Professor an der Universität in Wien. Freiburg
Herdee'sche Verlagshandluug. 1886. 9Mk. 60.**

A. W. Verrall

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 1-2 / February 1888, pp 30 - 31
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191966, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191966

How to cite this article:

A. W. Verrall (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 30-31 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191966

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

graphic *Corpus* which O. Crusius has long had in hand. The proverbs given are those contained in Cod. Paris. Gr. 1409. They are accompanied by German renderings and notes. 21 out of the 70 proverbs have close counterparts in the collection of Planudes, as edited by Piccolomini. Slight variations in language, however, tend to show that Planudes presented his materials in a learned dress rather than in their popular form. But linguistic considerations at the same time render it probable that the proverbs as a whole originated at a period considerably earlier than that at which Planudes himself flourished, viz. the beginning of the fourteenth century. This point is well worked out by Krumbacher, who also discusses such metrical questions as arise, and quotes parallel proverbs from Ancient and Modern Greek. Much illustration of this latter kind had previously been supplied by E. Kurtz and others; indeed, some half-dozen or more German scholars have written on various aspects of the Byzantine proverbs during this year and last. The knowledge of MSS. in particular has greatly advanced since the appearance of Piccolomini's work in 1879.

The following will serve as specimens of the proverbs contained in this collection. 'Ο θεός κατά τὸ ρόυχα μερίζει καὶ τὴν κρύαντα. ['God tempers the wind,' etc. *Plan.* ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐσθῆτας μερίζει καὶ τὸ ψῦχος]. Κάμνει ὁ πῖθος καὶ ὁ ρόγος, καὶ ἀκούει ἡ κυρὰ κωματερή. ['Labour for larder and barn, for housewife the name of laborious.' Of persons who, while others do the drudgery, themselves reap all the credit. The language of the proverb betokens at once early origin and absence of learned revision.] 'Ἐκατὸν Παῦλοι ἀπέθανον, καὶ ὁ καθέ τις τὸν ἴδιον Παῦλον ἐκλαίει. [*Plan.* ἕκατὸν Παῦλοι ἀπέθανον, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἴδιον Παῦλον ἐθρήνει. It is only private, not universal sorrow that comes home to man. Such at least is Krumbacher's interpretation]. 'Ὅπου φιλεῖς μὴ δανεῖς, καὶ ὅπου ἀγαπᾷς μὴ συχνάς. [A proverb, like the apophthegm of Bias in the eyes of Cicero, 'amicitia inimicissimum.'] Πρὶν πνιγῆς, δὸς τὸν ναῦλον. [One of the gems of the collection. Without known analogue in other tongues. 'Pay your fare ere you drown' would be a good motto for the Byzantine tax-gatherer when about to levy a ruinous impost. *Krumbacher.*] 'Ἀπὸ κλέπτου κλέψον καὶ κρίμα οὐκ ἔχεις. [Cp. Welsh proverb, 'Nid twyll twyllo twyllwr, 'Tis no deceit to deceive a deceiver.'] 'Ἐάν σοι ἔλθῃ ἕν καλόν, ἐκδέχου καὶ ἄλλο. [Cp. the pessimistic converse, 'Misfortunes never come singly.'] Σιγηροῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ βάθη γύρευε. ['Still waters run deep.' *Plan.* ἡρεμίουτος ποταμοῦ (ἦτοι τὸ βάθος.) Γέροντα Σαρακηνὸν γράμματα μὴ μάθαινε. ['Einen alten Sarazenen lehre keine Wissenschaft! d. h. einem alten, dummen Menschen ist nichts beizubringen. 'Was Hänschen nicht lernt, lernt Hans nicht mehr.']

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Io. NICOLAI MADVIGII, *Professoris Hauniensis, Opuscula Academica. Ab ipso iterum collecta, emendata, aucta.* Hauniae. Sumptibus Librariae Gyldendallianae (Hegeliurum patris et filii) typis excudit Fr. Bagge. 1887. 8vo. pp. xi. 779, with 'Opusculorum ordo' 2 pp. and 'Addenda et corrigenda' 2 pp. 20 Mk.

THE preface is dated Nov. 1886. The concluding words are of special interest: 'Vos igitur valet libelli ultimum ab auctore cum non ingrata memoria iuventutis severe ac fideliter in studiis philologicis actae recogniti.'

The separate prefaces (1834, 1842) to the original volumes are reprinted. Nearly 60 pp. (699-757) were not included in the old edition. They contain emen-

dations from the *Philologus* vols. i. ii. 'epistola ad. C. Halmium' from the *Jahrbücher für Philologie* lxxiii.; and extracts from the prefaces to select orations of Cicero (Hauniae 1858, 4th ed.). The volume is enriched throughout by corrections and additions, including a large number of citations from ancient authors; so that even possessors of the original editions, which have been long out of print, may find it worth while to purchase the new one, especially as it contains a likeness of the veteran author, with the motto *πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*, and a facsimile of his neat handwriting.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Philologische Streifzüge, von DR. MICHAEL GITLBAUER, *Professor an der Universität in Wien.* Freiburg Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1886. 9 Mk. 60.

THIS is a volume of critical essays on various subjects, viz. (1) on *νήδυμος ὕπνος* in Homer, (2) on the elements of the *strophe* in the Greek chorus, (3) on the text of Caesar, *Bell. Gall.*, (4) on Porphyrio's text of Horace, (5) on the description of the Cyclops and their country in the *Odyssey*, (6) on the text of Plato, *Laches*, (7) metrical studies in Soph. *Aias* and Aristoph. *Lysistrata*, 781 foll., (8) on Eurip. *Heracleidae*, 1-380, (9) on a signature in short-hand to a Greek 14th century MS. in the Laurentian library, Plut. ix. 15, (10) *Miscellanea*; in the whole 481 pages. In spite of a style highly technical and sometimes diffuse, the volume is interesting and leaves a favourable impression of the author's knowledge and acuteness, though not always of his judgment. The resulting conclusions appear very unequal in cogency and value; but in every essay there is something which deserves attention.

The essays on the *Bellum Gallicum* and the *Laches*, both of which the author has edited, must certainly not be neglected by those who may have to deal with the texts. Both are chiefly occupied with that kind of small explanatory interpolation to which all MSS. of prose are exposed, and Greek and Latin MSS. especially, from the elliptical forms of expression which the languages permitted and, in their classical periods, even preferred.

The chief instrument which the author uses for detecting such interpolation is variation in the MSS., and especially in the order of the words. So far as it is available it is legitimate and effective. When certain words, which facilitate the meaning yet are not necessary to it, are wanting to some copies, and still more when they are found now in one part of the clause and now in another, it is more than likely that they have been adopted from the margin. The author shows beyond doubt that this kind of evidence has not yet been used as it may be. It must also be said that he frequently goes beyond the evidence, and sometimes seems to act on the principle that what is not necessary is therefore interpolated. To take one instance at hazard out of hundreds:—Caesar *B. G.* iii. 28, *arbitratus id bellum (celeriter) confici (celeriter) posse, eo exercitum adduxit.* It is at once evident here that 'celeriter' may be a gloss, explaining the idiomatic use of *conficere*, which makes the adverb unnecessary. This would not in itself be any reason whatever for expelling it; but the fact that the MSS. are not agreed whether it should stand before *confici* or after it makes all the difference, and at once carries what would be a needless suspicion into something very near proof. And the number of such cases is surprising. But when the author proposes *without any justifying variation* to omit the preposition in *adduxit*, he passes into the field of mere conjecture, and only disturbs the effect of a strong case. One of the most striking examples, though by no means the most convincing, is that

cited in the preface—*B.G.* vii. 15, *tamen hoc sibi solacii proponebant, quod se prope explorata victoria celeriter amissa recuperaturos confidebant*. The author reduces this to *tamen hoc sibi proponebant, explorata victoria celeriter amissa recuperaturos*; and bold as this may appear, he certainly offers for it evidence 'which must go to the jury'.

For the problematic *νήδυμος* the author proposes the rendering *invincible, irresistible (unwiderstehlich)*, from *δαμ-* in *δάμνημι*, etc. The meaning is perfectly suitable, nor do I see any conclusive objection to the derivation. The general remarks on the Homeric conception of sleep are in any case interesting. The most suspicious example is *Hom. Hymn* xix. 14—16, *τότε δ' ἑσπερος ἐκλαγεν ὅλος, ἔγρης ἔξανιών, δονάκων ὑπὸ μοῖσαν ἀθύρων νήδυμον*, where *entrancing* (*bezaubernd*) is a considerable stretch of the assumed meaning, and not very suitable to the context. The writer of the hymn to Pan probably supposed the word to have meant *sweet*, and so also the writer of the *Doloneia* in *ἐπεὶ οὐ μοι ἐπ' ὄμμασι νήδυμος ὕπνος ἰδάνει* (K. 91); but we are in no way bound to follow them. Without exception in 'Homer' the epithet is fixed to *ὕπνος*, and it is possible that the poets themselves used it conventionally, and with but a vague notion of its meaning. The author attempts to *disprove* the current derivations. This he does not completely do; but his own remains possible and perhaps preferable.

Essay V. ("on the geography of the land of the Cyclops, *Od.* x. 106 foll.") is on the main point from which it starts convincing. It cannot be denied, when once pointed out, that the description of the 'isle of goats' lying 'next' after nothing, and of a 'harbour,' which has not been mentioned but drops into the story from the sky (*νήσος ἔπειρ' ἐλαχίστη παρὲκ λιμένος τετάνυσται*, *ib.* 116), is irregular and scarcely intelligible as it stands. Upon further examination this obvious flaw is found, as often, to be the sign of others less obvious. I think the author proves the fault, and makes highly probable his conjecture as to the cause of it. Only I should not affirm that the confusion *must* be the work of a copyist or corrector; it may well be the work of the poet. On any hypothesis the *Odyssey* is a story retold, and already existing in literary poems before it was shaped as we find it. Not the genius of a Homer would save such a story from occasional confusion in the re-telling. The rest of the discussion is less productive.

In Essay IV may be noticed one observation incontestable and very curious:—*Hor. Od.* iv. 11, *Est mihi nonum* is one of the *Odes* which betray traces of that laborious 'fashioning' which the poet himself describes. It seems, like i. 7 and others, to have been welded together out of separate parts. *Vv.* 1—20 make a very complete poem; and here is seen on careful inspection a break so marked, that, as Dr. Gitlbauer points out, Porphyry took the rest, *Telephum quem tu petis* etc., for a separate poem. And it is certainly most remarkable that, tried by the well-known metrical test, the first part (1—20) proves to be written in the *Sapphic* of the *Three Books*, the second part (21—36) in the *Sapphic* of *Book IV*. This cannot reasonably be supposed an accident; and it justifies the suspicion that the first part was not only written separately from the rest, but much earlier. It does not justify us in following Porphyry, and dividing what Horace has put together; nor is the author so happy in his further remarks, particularly when he essays once more the mistaken task of constructing a Horatian love-story. However, the whole essay is worth reading. Some more *Horatiana* will be found at p. 428; there also the author starts from

a true and proved observation, the likelihood that words like *et, aut, ac, in, ab, est*, have been improperly inserted in our texts. Copyists, capable of incorporating the gloss even in *Od.* ii. 3. 36, *versatur urna serius aut ocius*, have probably been at work where elision prevents such easy detection. The author has made a list of more than 100 passages in the *Odes* and *Epodes*, embracing all those in which such words could be spared—and some from which they could not. In particular, we must object to one large class, of which *insultet armentum, (et) catulos feræ* is a specimen. If this caesura was, as the author would make it, not at all uncommon in the *Alcæic* of Horace, how is it that we find not one clear and in-correctible case, such as would be, for example, *et terga concidunt fugientium*? With much more reason it might be argued that the one doubtful case, *mentemque lymphatam Mareotico*, ought itself to be reduced to rule by reading a *Mareotico*, and taking *Mareotico* (*Baccho*) as a personal title of the god.

Essay IX is beyond my scope; but it is certainly curious and interesting, and I should suppose it to be of some importance. The elaborate metrical studies in Greek tragedy (*II. VII.* and *VIII.*), occupy more than 200 pages. It is impossible here even to state the conclusions, much less to discuss them; but if it is proper without doing this to express an opinion, I do not think they will prove by any means so convincing as the author expects. With what boldness—to use no harder word—he can pursue a theory, is shown by the extraordinary essay on the *Heraclidae*; from the first 380 lines of which he would cut away nearly one half, and by methods, where necessary, such as this. *Vs.* 90—92 run in the MSS. thus—

οἷδ' εἰσακούσας καὶ πρὶν. ἀλλὰ τοῦ
ποτ' ἐν χειρὶ σὲ κομίζει κόρους
νεοτρεφεῖς; φράσσον.

The author's argument requires a single *senarius* in this place; and he writes accordingly—

νεοτρεφεῖς δὲ τοῦ ποτ' ἐν χειρὶ; φράσσον.

In one part of these metrical essays, the author, whether right or wrong in his conclusions, takes his start from a firm bit of significant fact. He observes (p. 275) that in *Aristoph. Lysistrata* 781—796, and *ib.* 805—820, the strong evidence of the MSS. against the commonly prevalent theory of strophic responsion is disguised in current texts by several violent and unreasonable changes. This is true—here and elsewhere; and it is certain that before we can have a doctrine of this subject resting on solid foundations, not a little hasty building of this kind—after all, what are three centuries in the progress of a science?—will have to be taken down.

A. W. VERRALL.

ARNOLD SCHAEFER ON THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DEMOSTHENES.

Demosthenes und seine Zeit, revised edition, vol. i. 1885; vol. ii. 1886; vol. iii. 1887. Leipzig (Teubner). 30 Mk.

NEARLY fifty years ago, when Arnold Schaefer was a boy at Bremen and was on the point of leaving for the University of Leipzig, he selected, as the subject of his farewell exercise, the *de Corona* of Demosthenes. Six years afterwards, he published a dissertation on the Lives of the Ten Orators; and, when appointed in 1851 to a mastership, with the title of Professor, in the little Saxon town of Grimma, he devoted his leisure to the composition of what proved to be the most widely known of all his writings, his classical work on the Life and Times of Demosthenes. After