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](#)

Demosthenes De Corona, By F. Blass *Demosthenes Rede vom Krauze filr den Schulgebrauch erklärt*, von Friedrich Blass. Leip.: Teubner. 1890. Mk. 2. 10.

S. H. Butcher

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 07 / July 1891, pp 309 - 315

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179090, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179090

How to cite this article:

S. H. Butcher (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 309-315 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179090

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MERRY'S EDITION OF *THE BIRDS*.

Aristophanes. The Birds. W. W. MERRY, D.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1889. 3s.

DR. MERRY may be heartily congratulated on the progress he is making towards a complete edition of the plays of Aristophanes. His editions, unpretending in appearance and modest in tone, show most of the highest qualities which an editor of Aristophanes ought to possess—a faculty of concise and clear exposition, a keen appreciation of the niceties of Aristophanic idiom, a sense of humour, and a taste for turning phrases. In some of these editions we have even had ingenious and probable corrections of the text, but Dr. Merry does not as a rule meddle with criticism. Indeed in this play more than in some of the others which he has edited he resists (except when the MS. reading is quite impossible) the seductions of emendations, however attractive, which would supersede the traditional text. In verse 484

ἦρχε δὲ Περσῶν πρῶτος πάντων Δαρείου καὶ Μεγαβάζου,

it must have cost so tasteful a scholar a pang to refrain from introducing into his text the ingenious emendation of Haupt which he quotes in the note,

ἦρχε δὲ Περσῶν πρότερος πάντων Δαρείων καὶ Μεγαβάζων.

When, however, he has MS. authority on his side he does not hesitate to leave the vulgate, giving, for instance, *ἔσωκράτων* with *Codex Ravennas* in 1281, a form paralleled by *μελλονικιῶν* in 639 and more in accordance with analogy than *ἔσωκράτωνν*. In other places too he has introduced conjectures of the truth of which there can be no reasonable doubt. In 1340 he 'gratefully accepts' Bentley's *ψευδαγγελήσειν* for *ψευδαγγελὴς εἶν'*, and in 385 the same critic's *ἐνην-*

τιώμεθα for *ἡναντιώμεθα* of the MSS., which is unmetrical. The best renderings of Frere and others find place in the notes, and the editor's own translations are admirably neat and pointed. As examples of good grammar notes we would point to those on *ἦλθετον* 112 and on *εἰσάγοιτο* in 1524. In 1658 Dr. Merry reads with the MSS.

ἀνθέξεται σου τῶν πατρῶν χρημάτων,

but says in his note 'This is commonly rendered *he will secure instead of you*, equivalent to *ἀντί σου ἔξεται*; but there is no parallel to this construction, and it seems better to substitute *σοι* for *σου*, meaning, *as you will find or to your disadvantage*.' But is not *ἀνθέξεται σου* = *ἀντί σου ἔξεται* very nearly, if not exactly, paralleled by *ὁ τι μοι παρορᾶς* = *ὁ τι ὀρᾶς παρ' ἐμοί* 454, which he there accepts as a possible reading and interpretation, though preferring a different one, and which is at all events defended by *δειλὴν μοι παριδὼν* 'seeing cowardice in me' Hdt. i. 37; cf. also *παριδὼν τοι* *ib.* 38, *παρίδες ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ἄχαρι οὐδὲν* *ib.* 108, and *ἐμοὶ δὲ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐνορᾶ* Plat. *Theag.* 127. In 759 *αἶρε πλῆκτρον εἰ μαχῇ* we would much prefer *μάχει* of the MSS. as far more vigorous and more in accordance with the manner of Aristophanes. On 1148 Dr. Merry, like all other editors, has laboured in vain to give a meaning to *ὥσπερ παιδία*. We are glad to remind our readers how successfully Dr. Rutherford has applied his theory of corruption arising from adscripts to this passage in the pages of this *Review*, Vol. v. No. 3, p. 89. He has shown satisfactorily that the words *ὥσπερ παιδία*, *τὸν πηλὸν* (an error for *πίλον*), and *ἐν τοῖς στόμασιν* are separate attempts at explanation and that the passage should run:—

ἄνω δὲ τὸν ὑπαγωγέα
ἐπέτONT' ἔχουσαι κατόπιν αἱ χελιδόνες.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

DEMOSTHENES *DE CORONA*, BY F. BLASS.

Demosthenes Rede vom Kranze für den Schulgebrauch erklärt, von FRIEDRICH BLASS. Leip.: Teubner. 1890. Mk. 2. 10.

THIS edition of *The Crown*, which is a continuation of the very useful series of speeches NO. XLIV. VOL. V.

annotated by Rehdantz, is entitled a school edition, but it will be eagerly read by scholars generally, not so much perhaps for its careful commentary as for the critical interest of the questions raised by the text. In order to understand the principles on which the

text is based, it is necessary to have some acquaintance with the previous labours of Dr. Blass on Demosthenes. The text, as it stands, even with the help of the full commentary, hardly explains itself. Rarely are any reasons given even for striking deviations from the accepted reading. The whole critical apparatus is condensed into the seven pages of *Anhang* ii., which is itself only intelligible if studied with constant reference to the *Commentarius Criticus* prefixed to vol. I. of Dr. Blass' complete text of Demosthenes (Editio Maior 1885), and to the *Addenda* to be found in vols. II. (1888) and III. (1889). Viewed in this connexion the edition before us has a singular interest. It presents the latest, but assuredly not the last stage, in the development of an erudite and gifted mind in relation to fundamental questions of textual criticism. The development has gone on rapidly. Since 1885 the editor has repeatedly changed his mind. The *Addenda* to vol. II. give up many opinions confidently held in 1885; the *Addenda* to vol. III. modify the results of 1888. The present work often departs from the conclusions of vols. I. II. and III. alike. 'Dies diem docet' is Dr. Blass' motto. Though we could wish he had allowed himself time to form his judgments more maturely, we must admire the openness of mind with which he reviews his own work and his candour in admitting where he has been over-hasty or in error. On a careful comparison of the several revisions of the text few will be inclined to doubt that the more conservative text of 1890 is far superior to that of 1885.

The edition of 1885 was marked by the wealth and variety of the critical material it contained. Probably no one ever made a more exhaustive study of the scholiasts, the sophists, the rhetors, the grammarians, the imitators, who expound quote adapt or travesty Demosthenes. Dr. Blass convinced himself of what can hardly now be questioned, that the most deep-seated corruptions of the text are of very ancient date. They did not originate with the Byzantine scribes. The worst barbarisms, indeed, may be put down to the age between Augustus and Justinian, when Demosthenes was everywhere read and explained in the Schools of Rhetoric. But at a much earlier period, within a century after his death, he was already a classic, and doubtless suffered from glosses and adscripts which gradually became incorporated with the text. The great prose writers, not being safeguarded by metre, were far more exposed than the poets to this particular corruption.

The more popular the works, the greater was the risk. Speeches, which were accepted as models of style and were in wide use, were specially liable to interpolation; which is probably the reason why the private speeches of Demosthenes have come down to us, as it seems, in a purer form than the more famous speeches of the assembly or of the law courts. Dr. Blass in his text of 1885 had carried to its furthest limit the principle that the interpolation of words is more frequent than their omission. Wherever, therefore, words are wanting in S or any of the best MSS. and are not essential to the context, he held the case against them to be made out. Words, again, which are found only in S and are wanting in all other MSS. he deleted, if they could by any means be dispensed with. To a similar use he applied ancient quotations. If two independent authors in citing a passage agree in an omission he followed them, whatever the evidence of the MSS. Or if one author omits certain words and these words occur in varying order in different MSS. he at once struck them out as a wandering interpolation, which had been unable to secure for itself a fixed place.

Rules such as these have all their value if regarded as general principles; but the great defect of the edition of 1885 was that Dr. Blass applied them as if they were universal laws. He admits the error in the Preface to his edition of *The Crown*, and lays down the common-sense rule that each case as it arises must be judged by itself, and account taken of all the facts; that it is unsafe to decide the individual case by general probabilities. It may seem strange that so simple a truth should need to be rediscovered as a canon of criticism. However, it is the recognition of this truth that constitutes the first essential difference between the former and the present text of *The Crown*. Many words which were hastily deleted have in the edition of 1890 been restored, and the speech on *The Crown* is no longer defaced by many bald and broken sentences. The number of bracketed words is also reduced. A bracket was meant to denote something short of entire rejection. It was a compromise adopted in cases where there was still room for doubt. In the edition of 1885 those words were bracketed which, though supported by MSS. authority, were omitted in quotation by some ancient writer. The bracket is now more sparingly employed.

The whole subject of ancient quotation would deserve a discussion to itself. A few words must here suffice. Unwarranted inferences have often been drawn from inconsist-

encies between quoted passages and our existing texts. The Homeric question, for instance, has been grievously obscured by such criticism. Demosthenes has also suffered. Dr. Blass, in spite of his vast erudition in this field of scholarship, has overrated the evidence so afforded for the correction of the text. No one knows better than he the distinctive manner in which Dionysius, Aristides, Libanius, Isodorus and the rest quote or imitate Demosthenes. His indefatigable industry has led him to enquire closely into the original text of these authors. Yet in applying his learning his judgment appears to be often at fault. We could wish that his sceptical attitude of mind towards the MSS. reading of Demosthenes had been extended to the quotations from the orator. There are many reasons why these are to be distrusted. First, the texts of most of the authors by whom the citations are made themselves need to be carefully scrutinized. The copyists had in their minds or before their eyes the more familiar originals, and would easily substitute the readings they knew for the words of their manuscript. Some confusion or amalgamation of readings would be almost inevitable. Next, even if we could be sure that the quotation as it has been transmitted to us is word for word that which the rhetor found in his text of Demosthenes, it would be a most unsafe inference that it was what Demosthenes wrote. In the course of the first four centuries A.D. the text had (as Dr. Blass himself points out) been seriously corrupted. Different recensions of the text were already in existence. Libanius, for example, quotes *Phil.* iv. 46 ἐξέστητε, ὁ ἄνθρωπος Ἀθηναῖος, τῆς ὑποθέσεως κ.τ.λ. once with the reading ὑποθέσεως (iv. 299, 1), once with τάξεως (iv. 254, 24). So too Aristides. Again, Aristides cites the famous oath in *The Crown* (§ 208) now with the words τῶν προγόνων, now without them. Other writers exhibit the same variation, and many similar instances might be added. The fact that a single ancient writer furnishes us with different versions of the same passage, that one quoted version may be set against another in a different author, and that ancient quotations sometimes reproduce the same variations as are found in our MSS., ought to caution us against accepting any quotation as in itself decisive of a disputed reading. Much will depend in a given case not only on the value of the text of the author who makes the quotation, but also on his critical sagacity and on the probability that he himself followed the best manuscripts. Besides—and stress must be laid on this—

ancient writers, speaking generally, did not trouble themselves about exact quotations from prose. They trusted largely to memory. Even Aristotle is very loose in his quotations. Literary critics and rhetoricians, whose minds were stored with commonplaces from the great classics, and whose success depended on the ready use of these in lecture-room, quote more inaccurately than do reviewers and journalists in our own day. Proper allowance must be made for reminiscences and adaptations. Dr. Blass undoubtedly assigns too much weight to these authorities. Even quotations which profess to be verbal and are introduced by Δημοσθένους ἔφη, or the like, must be dealt with as cautiously as the actual text of the orator. The same critical rules must be applied to these as to the original, nay, applied more rigorously, as there are here possible sources of error which do not affect our manuscripts. On the whole result it will probably appear that the best MSS. of Demosthenes are more trustworthy guides on disputed points of reading than ancient quotation. In a few passages Dr. Blass has gleaned something of real value from the quotations or reminiscences of the rhetors, and has established readings (*e.g. Phil.* i. 25) which the MSS. would never have suggested. But his labours in this line have been poorly rewarded. It may be questioned if there is a single instance in *The Crown* of a successful correction thus obtained. Probably he himself now believes in the method less than he did. He still employs it, but the changes so effected in the text of 1890 are markedly fewer than in that of 1885.

If however he attaches less importance to ancient quotation, he insists more than ever on the value of the rhythm for purposes of textual criticism. In vol. I. p. xx. he defined what he conceived to be the essential quality of the Demosthenic rhythm. It consists in a correspondence, a symmetry between the members of a phrase, whether between two clauses or between different parts of the same clause. In the instances where he discovers it the correspondence varies from a general similarity of rhythmical structure to an exact metrical equivalence. What the limits are within which divergence is consistent with correspondence he nowhere explains very clearly. From his later application of the doctrine in *The Crown* we should infer that he looks on a close agreement between the metrical value of the syllables in the corresponding clauses as the surest test of Demosthenic workmanship. Clause must answer clause, almost like the

strophe and antistrophe of a chorus. Indeed he says (Preface p. xiii.) that an exact correspondence, which can hardly be the result of chance, is required to establish a valid conclusion. But even an imperfect correspondence often enables him to choose decisively between two conflicting readings. Here we get upon doubtful ground. Whose ear is to vouch for the true Demosthenic rhythm? In the Preface to *The Crown* Dr. Blass tells us almost pathetically that there are as yet few, if any, believers in his rhythmical test; but he falls back on the thought that 'all men have not an eye for these things, for the Muses do not distribute their gifts alike to all.' He writes almost in the manner of a mystic who stands alone among the unilluminated. The principle of *εὐρυθμία* now becomes with him the final test to which doubtful readings are submitted. It is a principle whose application is the more difficult to criticize because Dr. Blass seldom gives the reasons which determine him, for want, as he says, of space and because of the little interest which the subject is likely to excite in most of his readers. We trust he will some time discuss it more fully. No scholar who has studied Demosthenes can be insensible to the rhythmical structure of his periods. But the correspondence is a delicate one; it can hardly be made into a rigorous test, by which words and whole phrases are to be excised. Dr. Blass appears to do violence to a principle which nevertheless contains an important truth. In following out his method there is a risk of breaking up sentences into arbitrary divisions, and by ingenious omissions of words, backed perhaps by some ancient quotation, of substituting for the rich and complex harmonies of Demosthenes the trivial monotony of syllables that are metrically equivalent. If we may express a hope it would be that the dispassionate power of self-criticism that Dr. Blass has already shown in his frank admission that he was wrong in the arrangement of the Kola of *The Crown* as proposed in his *Attische Beredsamkeit* (1877), and that the rhythmical correspondences of his 1885 edition were sometimes fanciful, may induce him to reconsider the principle of *εὐρυθμία* in all its bearings.

The latest application of it in *The Crown* has not led to many alterations in the text. It has rather acted as a corrective of the facile scepticism produced in Dr. Blass' mind by too much deference to ancient quotation. As he tells us (Pref. to *The Crown* p. xiii.), it has convinced him that many conjectures

are wrong, and has generally shown that a disputed word ought not to be omitted.

Thus in *The Crown* § 3 he formerly read (ed. 1885) οὐ βούλομαι δυσχερὲς εἰπεῖν, and found here a rhythmical correspondence with ἀρχόμενος τοῦ λόγου. In 1890 he returns to the reading of S, οὐ βούλομαι δυσχερὲς εἰπεῖν οὐδέν and discovers an entirely new correspondence. Now the οὐδέν is of course necessary. It is not Greek to say δυσχερὲς λέγω for δυσχερὲς τι λέγω, and equally impossible is οὐ δυσχερὲς λέγω for δυσχερὲς οὐδέν λέγω. But this is a matter of Greek idiom not of rhythm, and although the right result is gained, it is by a roundabout if not a wrong process. On rhythmical grounds, again, the brackets are removed which in the edition of 1885 enclosed the words—§ 14 καὶ τιμωρίαι (found in all MSS. though transposed in A); § 21 ἐν τῷ παρόντι (omitted by Hermogenes and now restored on the ground that ἐὼ...ἐν τῷ παρόντι answers rhythmically to Εὐβουλος καὶ Κηφισοφών); § 35 ἐχθρόν (omitted by Priscian); § 67 παρελθῆναι, τοῦτο (previously bracketed on the strength of a vague reminiscence of the phrase in Choricus); § 140 πεπραγμένα στανῶ (omitted by Libanius). This list might be largely increased. But in several instances the law of *εὐρυθμία* leads to wrong or doubtful results. Hitherto no one had suspected § 10 μηδ' εἰ πάντα τὰ κοινὰ ὑπέρην πεπολίτευμαι. Dr. Blass now brackets the last word for the sake of the rhythm, adding that εἰ or ὑπέρην πολιτεύεσθαι is an impossible phrase. That is a hard saying. In the 1885 edition the reading in § 26 was that of all the MSS.; ὅσα τῆς πόλεως προλάβοι. In 1890 it is changed to ὅς' ἂν . . . προλάβῃ. The original intention of the change was to produce symmetry of rhythm between νομίζων ὅπερ ἦν ἀληθές, ὅς' ἂν . . . προλάβῃ and πρὸ τοῦ τοὺς ὄρκους ἀποδοῦναι, and to avoid the concurrence of short vowels in ἀληθές ὅσα τῆς (vol. III. p. lxxxiv.). In *Anhang* ii. of *The Crown* this capricious alteration is further recommended by a distinction which will not hold between the subjunctive and optative, here and elsewhere, in *Oratio Obliqua*. Again, in 1885 the editor read in § 32 πάλιν ὠνείται παρ' αὐτῶν ὅπως μὴ ἀπιμεν, in 1890 he reads ἀπιώμεν. The MSS. waver between ἀπιώμεν and ἀπίωσιν. The arguments of Cobet (*N.L.* p. 515) are decisive in favour of ἀπιμεν (cf. Bekk. *Anec.* 129); but considerations of rhythm have prevailed with Dr. Blass to restore ἀπιώμεν. Goodwin (*Syntax of Greek Moods and Tenses* 1889) also retains ἀπιώμεν: but in those examples in which the reading is beyond dispute ὅπως μὴ with the subjunct.

has some final force ; it does not, as here, serve merely to introduce the object clause. The correction ἀπμειν is almost as certain as ἀποσπῆσονται in Thucyd. i. 57, 4, where the MSS. have φυλακὴν ἔχειν ὅπως μὴ ἀποσπῆσονται, but the error is betrayed by the implied ἀποσπῆσάμην for ἀπέστην. In § 61 the 1890 text is in the main an improvement on that of 1885. In 1885 φορὰ was written for φορὰν of the MSS. and συνέβη for συνέβη γενέσθαι τσαύτην of the MSS., the words being so quoted in Dionysius (*Dem.* ch. 14). In 1890 the MSS. reading is restored, being confirmed by an adaptation in Plutarch (*Mor.* 999 E) and, as Dr. Blass thinks, by the rhythm. But, in truth, there was never any real cause to suspect it. In the next clause, however, τοὺς Ἕλληνας, which is in all the MSS. and is almost essential to the clearness of the passage, is now bracketed purely on rhythmical grounds. It had passed unchallenged in 1885. (In the Preface to *The Crown*, p. xiii. the editor has misgivings whether the words should not after all stand.) In § 71 he keeps the ἄς μὲν...ἄς δὲ of most MSS. believing that this form was chosen instead of τὰς μὲν...τὰς δὲ for the sake of the rhythm καὶ πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας ἄς μὲν = καὶ Βυζάντιον πολιορκῶν in the previous clause. The usage ὅς μὲν...ὅς δὲ for ὁ μὲν...ὁ δὲ, common in later Greek and twice found in spurious documents of *The Crown* (§§ 164 and 182), only occurs once elsewhere in the text of Demosthenes, and is open to serious doubt.

Paragraph 111 τῶν μὲν οὖν λόγων, οὗς οὗτος ἄνω καὶ κάτω διακυκλῶν ἔλεγε περὶ τῶν παραγεγραμμένων νόμων,.....συνεῖναι τὰ πολλὰ has fared badly through the combined influence of a quotation in a very late rhetor who reads νόμων for λόγων, and of the rhythmical theory. In 1885 περὶ τῶν περιγ. νόμων was bracketed ; so also were ὁμᾶς and αὐτός. In the *Addenda* vol. II. p. cxlv. the latter brackets were removed, νόμων was still substituted for λόγων in the first line and περὶ τῶν παραγεγραμμένων was kept for the rhythm, while the νόμων of the MSS. was bracketed—all to the confusion of the sense ; and so the passage stands in the edition of 1890. In § 156 the appropriate word παρὰσχων (S and L), which was kept in 1885, is now replaced by παραδούς (vulg.) for the rhythm's sake, but it is not easy to see where the improvement even in rhythm lies. Still bolder is the bracketing of words καὶ δι' ὃν ἡρέθη (§ 143), merely in order to produce a rhythmical correspondence in three successive clauses—an effect which it would perhaps be better to avoid. In

§ 206 the nearer equivalence gained by τίς οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως ἐπιτίμησέ μοι ; (the reading of Dionysius and perhaps of the Schol.) with εἰ μὲν τοίνυν τοῦτ' ἐπεχειρῶν λέγειν is insufficient reason for rejecting οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως ἐπιτίμησέ μοι, the reading of S, where the opt. makes perfect sense and is not likely to have been wrongly substituted for the indic. in a conditional sentence of this form.

Under the head of Demosthenic rhythm comes the rule against the accumulation of short syllables (see also Blass *Att. Bereds.* *Dem.* p. 100—104). As now formulated by Dr. Blass it would in general exclude three consecutive short syllables except when they are within a single word or precede a pause. The prevailing practice of Demosthenes is fairly summed up in this law. But Dr. Blass in making it a fast and binding rule imposes mechanical fetters upon oratorical prose. Not the combined authority of all the MSS. appears to him sufficient to admit either a faulty hiatus or the infringement of the rule about short syllables (Preface to vol. I. ed. 1885 p. xix.). Wherever these irregularities confront him, he mends the passage if he can ; if not, he notes it as corrupt or wanting in revision. Sometimes a change in the order of the words effects his purpose. This remedy he applies e.g. to the MSS. reading of § 20 εἶτε καὶ ἀμφότερα ταῦτα, § 108 πολλὰ δὲ τὰ ἀδύνατα συνέβαινεν, § 136 Φίλιππον ἐξήλεγε φανερῶς, § 201 τίσι δ' ὀφθαλμοῖς πρὸς Διὸς ἐωρῶμεν, § 307 ἂν δέ τις ἰδῇ τι. Sometimes he adds a bracket as in § 177 δύναμις [ἐν Ἑλατείᾳ], § 291 ᾤετο μὲν [ἐμοῦ], § 288 αἰρεθέντες [ἐπὶ τὰς ταφάς]. Sometimes he emends the text as in § 102 ἡ μέτρι' ἢ μικρὰ for μέτ. ἢ μικ., § 162 προτέρων for πρότερον (so too § 201 and § 316), § 177 εἴτ' αὖ μεταθέσθαι for εἴτα μετ., § 303 οὐδὲ πραθένθ' with Dobree for οὐδὲ προθέντα S, A, προδοθέντα vulg. (Here the diversity of MSS. reading affords independent ground for doubt), § 317 τοὺς πρότερον γεγενημένους δ' ἐπὶνουν for τοὺς δὲ προτ. γεγ. ἐπ. S. Sometimes the words which infringe the rule are left undisturbed : e.g. § 23 οὗτος ὁγμῆς, § 111 βίον ὑπεύθυνος, § 119 ἂ μὲν ἐπέδωκα, § 132 ἐξεπέπεμπτ' ἂν ὑπὸ (in 1885 ἂν was bracketed), § 134 σύνδικον ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, § 179 τὸ τότε γινόμενον, § 197 ὅσον ἐγὼ μὲν, § 219 Καλλίστρατος ἐκείνος, § 230 ἐπτακόσια στάδι' ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως (how else could Dem. have said what he meant?), § 258 τίνι κέχρησαι, § 312 εἶχες ἔρανον. There is something a little arbitrary in Dr. Blass' whole method of dealing with short syllables. His rule is based on examples—there is no other

authority for it—but the examples resist the rule so often and in such a way as to preclude the simple hypothesis of error or inadequate revision.

Where questions of rhythm or of ancient quotation are not concerned we are generally safe in accepting Dr. Blass' judgment on conflicting readings. But does not the reading he takes from S¹ in § 316 violate all idiom? The passage runs thus in the ed. of 1890, διὰ τὰς...ἐπεργεσίας οὐσας ὑπερμεγέθεις οὐδὲ μὲν οὖν εἶποι τις ἂν ἡλίκας. The note he gives illustrates μὲν οὖν but not οὐδὲ μὲν οὖν. In the ed. of 1885 he read οὐ μὲν οὖν which alone is possible. Again in § 322 he follows S, οὐκ εἰς 'Ἀμφικτύονας δίκας ἐπαγόντων. The other MSS. have οὐκ 'Ἀμφικτυονικὰς δίκας. With the latter reading ἐπαγόντων 'setting in motion' will bear the same sense as in § 150 and 249. But if we accept εἰς 'Ἀμφικτύονας' idiom will require εἰσαγόντων, for εἰσάγειν not ἐπάγειν εἰς is used of bringing a case before a court. A much more doubtful question is raised by § 227. The reading of S¹ is ἂν καθαιρῶσιν αἱ ψήφοι καὶ μηδὲν περιῆ, συγχορεῖτε. Other MSS. have καθαπαὶ ὦσιν. Dr. Blass follows S¹ with the slight change of ἂν for ἂν, and compares Aesch. *Ctes.* § 59 ὁ τι ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ λογισμὸς αἰρή. He admits that there is no evidence that καθαιρεῖν like αἰρεῖν can mean 'to prove,' but he says it can here bear no other sense. The passage quoted in vol. I. p. cviii. from Dionys. *Ant. Rom.* iii. 44 ὁ τι δ' ἂν αἱ πλείους ψήφοι καθαιρῶσιν is not exactly to the point. In late Greek καθαιρεῖν from its lawcourt sense 'to condemn,' came to mean 'to pass judgment,' 'to decide.' This, however, is not the same thing as 'prove,' and in any case it is not an Attic usage. But supposing we could get over these difficulties and take καθαιρῶσιν as 'prove,' the reading adopted by Dr. Blass makes the combination of the clauses ἂν καθαιρῶσιν and ἂν μηδὲν περιῆ exceedingly harsh: 'whatever the figures prove and if there is no surplus, you accept it.' On the whole ἂν καθαπαὶ ὦσιν ('if the figures come out clear,' explained by καὶν μηδὲν περιῆ) is preferable, in spite of the want of a precise parallel to this use of καθαπαὶ and in spite of the hiatus. The required sense of καθαπαὶ would only be an extension of its natural meaning, while καθαιρῶσι as interpreted by Dr. Blass would be off the lines of normal usage.

The number of emendations admitted into the text, apart from minor rearrangements of order, is small. One of them, made by Dr. Blass himself, is simple and in a high degree probable. In § 30, S, L¹, and A read ἐξὸν ἡμερῶν δέκα, ὁμοίως δὲ τριῶν ἢ τεττάρων, where

the vulg. is μᾶλλον. Dr. Blass reads ἴσως, and compares § 17 ἀναγκαῖον καὶ προσήκον ἴσως where the scholion is ὁμοίως. In § 30 ὁμοίως is indefensible if supposed to come from the pen of Demosthenes, but natural enough as a gloss. In § 104 the correction of Christ (*Philolog.* xlv. p. 383) is accepted, ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν προτέρων νόμων σὺν ἐξ καὶ δέκα λειτουργεῖν for the MSS. συνεκκαίδεκα λειτ. The motive of the change is to bring the statement of Demosthenes into nearer agreement with our other information on the subject. Hyperides (*Harpocration* art. *συμμορία*), referring to the custom that existed before the reform of Demosthenes, says σύμπεντε καὶ συνὲς τριηραρχοῦντες, and inscriptions give instances of five, six, or seven citizens being associated for the trierarchy. The correction is intended to signify 'in groups of six or even ten' (cf. a few lines later ὁ...ἕκτος καὶ ἑκατος, which will then mean 'the sixth or even the tenth,' not 'the sixteenth'). If it had been σὺν ἐξ καὶ ἐπτά, 'in groups of six or seven,' we should have understood it, but why 'six or ten'? The καὶ for ἢ καὶ is surely an odd way of marking the upward limit. Another very questionable change introduced into the text since 1885 is in § 242. Having rightly restored ἀεί, previously omitted after *συκοφάντης*, Dr. Blass in the next clause reads οὐδὲ ἐν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑγιὲς πεποιηκὸς οὐδ' ἐλεύθερον αὐτὸν, τραγικὸς πύθηκος, in place of the MSS. οὐδ' ἐλεύθερον, αὐτοτραγικὸς πύθηκος. He objects to οὐδὲν ἐλεύθερον ποιεῖν as not being Greek—in what respect is it wrong? On the other hand we would ask what is the point of αὐτό attached to ἐλεύθερον. (The force of πύθηκος as applied to an actor ought, by the way, to be illustrated by a reference to Arist. *Poet.* ch. 27, 2.) Again, in § 247 the conjecture adopted is not felicitous. The reading of S and L¹ is καὶ μὴν τῷ διαφθαρῆναι χρήμασιν ἢ μὴ κεκράτηκα Φιλίππου. All MSS. have τῷ or τῷ γε. Some omit ἢ μὴ, some insert μὴ before διαφθαρῆναι. The dat. τῷ can hardly be right; Dr. Blass reads τοῦ γε διαφθαρῆναι χρήμασιν κεκρ. Φιλίππου, 'as concerning bribery, &c.' Such a use of the genit. might possibly be found in Polybius, but not in Demosthenes. The accusat. τὸ (Dobree and Weil) is the simplest solution of the difficulty.

Of all the emendations, however, which are put forward or accepted in this volume the most interesting is the correction of the well known words, in § 169, τὰ γέρρα ἀνεπίμ-
πρασιν. In his commentary Dr. Blass gives the ordinary interpretation which makes τὰ γέρρα the wicker-booths in the market-

place, which were set on fire as a signal to the country people. But in *Anhang*, i. he accepts the correction of Girard—unpromising at first sight but in truth irresistible—*ἀνεπεράνυσαν τὰ γέρρα*, ‘spread out the hurdles,’ which were used to fence off the market-place and prevent the people from loitering there when an assembly was about to be held. The Scholion on Aristoph. *Acharn.* 22 is the key to our passage: *ἀνεπεράνυσαν γὰρ τὰ γέρρα καὶ ἀπέκλειον τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς μὴ φερούσας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὰ ὄνια ἀνήρουν ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ὅπως μὴ περὶ ταῦτα διατρίβοιεν.* The MS. reading *ἐνεπίμπρασαν* was current at least as early as the time of Harpocration, who also explains *γέρρα* as *τὰ τῶν σκηνῶν σκεπάσματα καὶ παρακαλύμματα.* Several other ancient writers followed the same tradition in an age when the old custom connected with the *γέρρα* had been forgotten. The singular interest of the emendation, therefore, lies in this—that it is a certain restoration of a reading which at an early date became unintelligible and was therefore lost, and which but for a chance scholion would probably never have been recovered.

In connection with the notes to *The Crown* ought to be read the editor’s ‘Demosthenische Studien’ in the *Rheinisches Museum* (1888), vol. 43 p. 268 &c., and (1889) vol.

44, p. 1, &c., 406, &c., where there is much that is both new and sound. The first of these relates chiefly to Demosthenic rhythm, the two next to the use of *οὔτος, ὅδε, οὗτος*, to the insertion of the article with proper names and with the infin., to the distinction between *ψευδῇ μαρτυρεῖν* and *τὰ ψευδῇ μαρτυρεῖν, ἀληθῇ λέγειν* and *τὰ ἀληθῇ λέγειν* &c., and to certain uses of the aorist and imperfect. Here and there the distinctions may appear to be over subtle and the conclusions not quite convincing, but the materials collected and the hints thrown out remain of permanent value. I have chiefly limited myself in this article to the somewhat ungracious task of expressing dissent or doubt about the text. It has not been possible to convey an impression of the range and quality of Dr. Blass’ linguistic knowledge and observation; they are visible on every page of the commentary. A single unpretentious looking note is not unfrequently the result of an exhaustive investigation. Students of Demosthenes who venture to differ from Dr. Blass on particular questions will do so with a deep sense of indebtedness to him for all he has taught them.

S. H. BUTCHER.

PLUTARCH'S *LIVES OF GALBA AND OTHO*, BY E. G. HARDY.

PLUTARCH'S *Lives of Galba and Otho* with Introduction and explanatory notes by E. G. HARDY M.A. London: Macmillan and Co. (*Classical Series*). Price 5s.

THE volume before us consists of an Introduction extending to cxxiv pages, followed by the Greek Text—with *Apparatus Criticus* and Summaries prefixed to each Chapter—covering 84 pages, and Notes covering 189 pages, and concludes with an Appendix on facts attested or inferred from Coins and Inscriptions, and a short Index to the Notes.

The object of the Introduction, as is stated in the Preface, is to show the relation which existed between Tacitus and Plutarch, that Plutarch has drawn independently from the same authority—probably Pliny the Elder—which Tacitus used, occasionally supplementing and improving upon the account of the latter. This proof is carefully worked out by a comparison of parallel passages in the two writers, from

which it appears that Plutarch’s employment of this authority often amounted to what is practically a literal and almost word for word translation. Both external and internal evidence seems conclusive that Plutarch did not make use of the *Histories* of Tacitus; in fact that they were published after Plutarch wrote his *Lives of Galba and Otho*. These are not Biographies in the same sense as the *Parallel Lives*, in which a moral rather than an historical end is professedly kept in view, and chronological order sacrificed to artistic symmetry. They are moreover without Greek Parallels. Mr. Hardy concludes that they belong to an earlier, not a later stage of Plutarch’s literary history, but his conclusion is open to question. The Introduction contains also a long account of the reigns of Galba and Otho, and concludes with an (incomplete) account of Manuscripts and Previous Editions and a list of the Places—13 in number—in which the Text of Sintenis (Teubner 1884) is departed