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](#)

The Histories of Tacitus, Books III. IV. and V., with Introduction and Notes by A. D. Godley, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

H. F. Burton

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 423 - 424

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191383, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191383

How to cite this article:

H. F. Burton (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 423-424 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191383

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

hiatus, (2) the use of expressions foreign to the usage of Isocrates, and (3) the bad arrangement of the precepts. Blass (*Att. Bered.* ii. p. 126 *sqq.*, 256 *sqq.*) would remove cases of hiatus, as in other orations, by emendation, but on the ground of Benseler's other objections assigns the treatise to one of the pupils of Isocrates. It must be admitted, as Ponickau remarks (p. 10), that such high authority as that of Benseler and Blass may well shake our faith in the authenticity of the *paraenesis*. Yet defenders of its Isocratean origin have not been wanting. 'Quisquis harum rerum peritus est,' says Sauppe (*Apospasm. or. Att.* p. 245), 'facile intelligit multa in illa oratione inesse, quae Isocrati Atheniensi tribuendam esse demonstrent nihil esse, quod de alio auctore cogitare nos cogat.' Strange regards it as genuine, as also does O. Schneider (Isocrates, *Ausgewählte Reden*), though, as Blass and Ponickau have shown, he can scarcely be right in regarding it as an early work of Isocrates. In England Dr. Sandys in his well-known edition of the *Ad Demonicum and Panegyricus* (1868) has defended its genuineness in a way which has carried conviction to the mind of Professor Jebb (*Attic Orators*, ii. p. 86). Since then Benseler's objections have been even more fully examined and refuted by Henkel in a programm written in Greek (Θεοδώρου Ἀγκυλίου τῶν περὶ Ἰσοκράτη ζητήσεων βιβλίον δ. Rudolst. 1877), and Wrobel and Hartlich have taken the same side, while on the other hand Lehman de Lehnfeld (*De oratione ad Demonicum Isocrati abiudicanda*, Lugd. Batav. 1879), Jahr (*Quaestiones Isocrateae* Hal. 1881), Allbrecht *Philol.* xliii. 1884, p. 244 *sqq.*) and Keil (*Herm.* xxiii. 1888, p. 374 *sqq.*) argue for the non-Isocratean origin of the treatise. In the view of such a conflict of opinion Ponickau has thought it expedient to consider afresh the objections urged. Regarding Benseler as still the most formidable antagonist of the more conservative view, he proceeds (after giving a full account of the literature of the subject) to discuss his objections in detail.

First as to the *hiatus*. Benseler, with strange inconsistency, allowed many cases of hiatus to remain in this oration while he removed by emendation quite similar ones in others. Ponickau, who insists on a more rigorous application of the law than seemed necessary to Dr. Sandys (*l.c.* pp. xxxvi. and 128), shows that, of the twenty-one cases of violation presented by the *Codex Urbinas*, many may be removed by elision, contraction, transposition or other emendation. A few examples may here suffice: for *καταριθμησάμεθα*. ἀλλὰ § 11 he would read *καταριθμήσασμεν*. ἀλλὰ since Isocrates elsewhere uses the active, not the middle of *ἐξαριθμεῖν*, *ἀπαριθμεῖν* and *ἀριθμεῖν* and the α may easily be a dittograph of the α in ἀλλὰ; in § 20 he would remove the 'foetidissimus hiatus' τῷ δὲ λόγῳ εὐπροσέγγυρος by reading with Henkel τοῖς μὲν τρόποις.....τοῖς δὲ λόγοις (cf. τοῖς λόγοις in the same section, and τὰ τῶν τρόπων ἦθη in § 4); παντὶ ἐλαττομένους in § 49 he considers corrupt and is unable to suggest a certain correction. He concludes then that, in respect to *hiatus*, there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the treatise.

He next shows that the occurrence of many words not occurring in the other orations of Isocrates (some of them poetical, e.g. § 19 *πλάγος*, *διαπερᾶν*, § 6 *μαραινέω*) need not surprise us, since the same thing is true of other orations, e.g. the words *στοδ*, *ἀγορά*, *αἰδώς*, *νεώσοικος*, *δένδρον* occur once only and all in *Or. vii.* Nor does he shrink from the more difficult task of justifying the use of many expressions foreign to the usage of Isocrates, e.g. §§ 9, 22 λέγειν with dative (cf. xvii. 23, 24); § 33 οὐς ἂν βούλῃ ποιήσασθαι φίλους, ἀγαθὸν τι λέγε περὶ αὐτῶν, which, though without a parallel in Isocrates, is frequent in other writers; § 24 θέλε justified by

considerations of euphony; § 28 ἀπολαύειν without an object. Some of these peculiarities he would explain as due to the Gorgian influence so evident in this oration, e.g. § 31 τὰς χάριτας ἀχαρίστως χαρίζομενος (*παρονομασία*); § 30 τοὺς πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον ἀπεχθανομένους antithetical to the preceding πρὸς τὸ φαυλότατον χαρίζομένους: others as due to the desire to preserve the original form of current maxims and of quotations from poets and philosophers, on which ground he would excuse σύν (for μετὰ) in § 16 (cf. Blass, *Att. Bered.* ii. p. 127), γονεῖς in §§ 14, 16 (unless it is due to MS. error, v. Sandys on § 11), συνεῖδῃσεις in § 16 and εἰδήσεις in § 44, these last being examples of *δμοιοτέλεuton*. Thus § 16 τέρψις (γὰρ) σύν τῷ καλῷ ἄριστον is to be compared with Pittacus (Mull. i. p. 225, 7, Stob. ix. 33, ἥδονῃ σύν τῷ καλῷ δίκαιον, and § 32 ἐξανίστασο πρὸς μέθης with Theognis v. 485 (Bergk) ἀλλ' ἢ πρὶν μεθεῖν ὑπανίστασο. Ponickau concludes this part of his argument by showing how much there is in the treatise thoroughly Isocratean. Lastly he regards the confused arrangement of the precepts as not unsuited to a treatise of this kind, and he justifies sentiments which have been regarded as unworthy of Isocrates by similar ones from the other orations. The whole dissertation, whether we accept Ponickau's conclusion or not, is valuable as a careful study of Isocratean diction and will be welcomed by those teachers who find the orations of Isocrates useful as a preparation for the study of more difficult authors.

H. CLARKE.

The Histories of Tacitus, Books III. IV. and V., with Introduction and Notes by A. D. GODLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

THIS little volume is a continuation of the previous work of the same editor upon the first and second books of the *Histories*, and like its predecessor is a useful school edition. Halm's text is uniformly followed, yet other readings are occasionally quoted in the notes without discussion. In the commentary the editor, as he intimates in his preface, has followed Heraeus rather closely. His treatment of verbal and syntactical difficulties is excellent—the notes, though brief, being always clear and helpful. In the use of parallel and illustrative passages good judgment is shown. Nothing is more instructive than well selected quotations: Mr. Godley's illustrations really illustrate, and are not too numerous nor too long. Historical and archaeological allusions are well explained. The historical introduction is a model of condensation, yet the virtue of brevity has here perhaps been carried too far. In addition to the statement of the necessary facts, a few suggestions as to the deeper significance of the events of the time, with a little vivid portraiture of the chief actors in them, would have been of service to the average school-boy. The editor's judgment in matters of archaeology is well shown in his discussion of the topographical questions involved in Bk. III. Ch. 71. His identification of the *Capitolii fores* with the still visible doorway leading to the Tabularium from the Forum is extremely plausible, and apparently has the endorsement of Prof. Middleton. In locating the Tarpeian Rock on the southwestern side of the Capitoline hill Godley is supported by the best recent authorities, and has the advantage of Heraeus, who follows Becker in favouring the traditional site on the northwest. A plan of ancient Rome, or at least of the region about the Forum, and one or two small maps exhibiting the seat of war in Italy and Germany, would have been a useful addition to the book. The editor evidently assumes that his edition of Bks. I. and II. will be in the

hands of students who use this volume, for he frequently contents himself with explaining a passage in the latter by referring to a note in the former. Either the note should be repeated, or the two volumes should be bound in one.

H. F. BURTON,
University of Rochester, N. Y.

A Study of Juvencus, by JAMES TAFT HATFIELD, Professor in Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Bonn: 1890.

THIS monograph of fifty-two pages treats of (1) the noun- and verb-forms, (2) the syntax, (3) the prosody, (4) the classes of alliteration, (5) the imitations of other poets, (6) the occasional words which are peculiar to Juvencus. It is based entirely on Marold's edition (Teubner, 1886).

So inconsiderable a poet as the author of the four versified books of the Gospels perhaps hardly deserves so careful a study as Mr. Hatfield has given him. Especially the elaboration of the section on Juvencus's syntax, extending to thirty-three of the fifty-two pages, seems excessive. Almost any other Christian poet will better repay study than this one, unless perhaps metrically. The monograph therefore must be pronounced uninteresting; yet as a companion in reading Juvencus it will certainly be found not without use.

R. ELLIS.

Beiträge zur Griechischen Geschichte. Von LUDWIG HOLTZAPFEL. Berlin, 1888.

THESE excellent *Beiträge* are composed of three papers: in the first, the date of the Solonian laws is discussed; in the second, the relations of Athens and Persia in 465-412 B.C.; in the third, the chronology of the events which occurred between the battle of Leucimne and the first invasion of Attica by the Peloponnesians. The work is one which cannot be criticised in much detail without tedious and minute learning; but it is one which ought to be carefully read by every student of Greek history.

In the first essay the author brings down the date of Solon's legislation to the year 584 B.C., after the archonships of Damasias II. In doing so, he relies mainly on the evidence afforded by the 'Berlin Fragments,' of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens. Readers of the CLASSICAL REVIEW will remember that Professor Case has argued, on different grounds, in favour of a later date for Solon than 594 B.C.

In the second essay Holtzapfel refuses to accept the historical reality of the Peace of Callias or Cimon. He says, very truly, that neither after the battles of Eurymedon (465 B.C.) nor after those of Cyprus (449 B.C.) was there a lasting peace between Athens and Persia (p. 21 ff.). But he thinks that there was a *truce* after Eurymedon (p. 30 f., 33). In this view

I do not agree, and I do not see why the decree quoted by Craterus should be rejected as evidence of a peace (p. 29) and accepted as evidence of a truce (p. 35). In either case there would be a date attached to the decree, if genuine, and the confusion about the time at which the peace was made could not have arisen. It is of course possible to say that the document was concerned with a truce for a short period; and for a short period after Eurymedon there was no war between Athens and Persia, Artaxerxes being engaged in crushing revolts, and Athens in subduing Thasos, etc. When the *truce* was turned by orators or historians into a *peace* the true date could not be kept as every one knew that the battles of Cyprus were fought in 449 B.C.—a conclusive proof that peace was not concluded in 465 B.C. But to this we may answer that, if the document was correctly copied by Craterus, it would be clear that it was concerned with a *truce*, not with a *peace*; and if it was not correctly copied, what is the value of the evidence?

Holtzapfel also argues in favour of a peace between Athens and Persia in 424 B.C. (p. 41). He thinks this is the peace mentioned by Andocides (*De Pace* § 28), in negotiating which Epilycus, the uncle of the orator, took a leading part.

The third essay is the most elaborate. It deals of course with old well-worn difficulties, τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος, etc. Holtzapfel considers that this expression refers to the ripeness of the corn (regarding the words καρποῦ συγκομιδῇ, Thuc. iii. 15, which denote something done after the Olympia, as the ingathering of the *fruit*, not of the corn¹). Consequently the invasion of Attica by the Peloponnesians in 431 B.C. cannot be put later than the end of May—the date of the harvest in Attica. Holtzapfel thinks that this date can be reconciled with the expression τοῦ θεροῦ ἀκμάζοντος which Thucydides couples with τοῦ σίτου ἀ. (p. 53), but he does not remember that Herodotus fixes μέσον θερος τῆς ἔργης to the time of the Olympia or after (Herod. viii. 12). Holtzapfel also maintains that the Greek spring began earlier than ours—about the late rising of Arcturus (p. 59 ff.). Hence he would put the attack on Plataea in the night of March 5/6, adopting of course Krüger's proposal to read *four* instead of *two* months for the remainder of the archonship of Pythodorus (Thuc. ii. 2).—These indications of the line taken by Holtzapfel will be enough to show that his work is one which must be read, though even he has not succeeded in producing a scheme of chronology which will enable us to keep the text of Thucydides.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

[¹ Holtzapfel assumes that the Olympia were celebrated in the middle of August, which has still to be proved, *pace* Unger.]

NOTES.

Κανθήλη, CANDELA, Κανθλία.—A new portion of the 'Edict of Diocletian,' from Megalopolis, which is to be published in the forthcoming number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, contains a considerable number of new and curious words. Of these the word *κανθήλη* seems to me to deserve a separate notice. The entry preceding that in which *κανθήλη* occurs contains the word *λυχνεῖδος*, which is perhaps a

mistake for *λυχνεῖδος*, and in any case denotes the lychnitis-plant (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxv. 10, 74), the leaves of which were used for lamp-wicks. Then comes the entry in question, 'κανθήλης ἦτοι καλαμανθήλης.' The word *κανθήλης* following immediately upon *λυχνεῖδος* naturally suggests the notion of a candle, while *καλαμανθήλης* suggests some sort of reed. What we require is a plant which might be