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](#)

Adam's *Platonis Euthyphro Platonis Euthyphro*, with Introduction and Notes by J. Adam, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. 1890. (pp. xxviii. 107.) 2s. 6d.

Lewis Campbell

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 08 / October 1890, pp 362 - 363

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191000, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191000

How to cite this article:

Lewis Campbell (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 362-363 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191000

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

jealous uncle Cyaxares that he had taken unfair advantage of his kindness and eclipsed him in the estimation of his subjects, Cyrus, after saying that he had merely asked him to permit Median volunteers to join him in his projected campaign, continues thus:—*οὐκοῦν παρὰ σοῦ τούτου τυχών οὐδὲν ἦν, εἰ μὴ τούτους πείσαιμι* i.e. 'if I got this concession from you, I was nothing (no good), if I failed to get their consent.' Dr. Hartman condemns Hug for recalling what he calls the absurd reading *οὐδὲν ἦν*—which is that of the four best MSS—instead of adopting the correction *οὐδὲν ἦνυον*, which is due to a second hand in one of them and found its way into the Aldine and Juntine Editions. Hug quotes one passage from VI ii 8 to justify his choice, but Dr. Hartman is not satisfied; perhaps he might have been, had he remembered his Aristophanes, who has two instances of the phrase, *Vespae* 1504 *ἐν τῷ ῥυθμῷ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστι* and *Eccles.* 144 *ὃν μὲν βιάδιζε καὶ κάθητο· οὐδὲν γὰρ εἶ*. Hug is probably right in this as in most of the other readings which Hartman selects for adverse criticism.

Chapter IV, extending over more than 100 pages, contains critical comments on passages of the *Cyropaedeia*, 140 of which are taken from the five first Books, but in at least 100 of these the writer of this notice is unable to detect any difficulty that cannot be solved on the ordinary principles of Greek syntax. There are not more than 14 of the remainder in which Dr Hartman's observations serve to elucidate the meaning, while ten or more have been already satisfactorily explained in commentaries which he does not appear to have consulted. The same observation applies equally to the critical comments on the *Hieron* and other minor writings, a detailed examination of which would be impossible in a short notice like the present.

Dr. Hartman differs very decidedly in opinion from Cobet as to the authorship of the essay 'on the Spartan constitution'; he regards it as a scholastic compilation, the

clumsy work of some *ludimagister insulsus* 'arrogans, verborum et sententiuncularum aueps'. He agrees with most critics in considering the tract 'on the Athenian constitution'—which strangely resembles Machiavelli's 'Prince'—as an anonymous production, not however that of a contemporary politician—such as Critias Alcibiades or Phrynichus—but rather of some later compiler, who had no other sources of information but those which are open to us, especially Aristophanes and Xenophon. As to its being the earliest specimen of Attic prose—he considers that it does not bear the smallest resemblance in style to Antiphon or Thucydides. Of the three technical tracts ascribed to Xenophon two—the *Hipparchicus*, and that 'on the Horse'—carry with them unquestionable proofs of being genuine, the third—that 'on Hunting'—Dr. Hartman considers quite unworthy of Xenophon: it is, he thinks, the composition of some *Ἰσοκπαριδεὺς* *qui arroganter et rixantis in modum loqui a magistro suo didicit*, though he admits that he has no practical knowledge of the subject himself, nor does he know any brother philologist who has. Such is the degeneracy of the modern Dutch scholars, whose compatriots—the Ruhnken Lenneps and other celebrities—were in their day as distinguished in the hunting-field as they were in the field of Greek scholarship.

It is impossible to lay down this volume without a feeling of gratitude to the writer for his contribution to our knowledge of Xenophon and for the interest he has succeeded in imparting to his writings. There is not a dull page throughout, and though, as a whole, it does not rise to the level of its predecessor, it is full of instruction, even where the conclusions of the writer provoke difference of opinion. It is a pity that a book, so elegantly got up, should be disfigured by such misprints as *vellit* (for *velit*), *deviciendi*, *coelo*, *lasciniæ*, which are only a few specimens, taken at random.

H. A. HOLDEN.

ADAM'S PLATONIS EUTHYPHRO.

Platonis Euthyphro, with Introduction and Notes by J. ADAM, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. 1890. (pp. xxviii. 107.) 2s. 6d.

THIS edition would bear pruning, but is highly to be commended on the whole. Mr.

Adam proves himself thoroughly competent for the work he undertakes. He evades no difficulty, and he is generally most successful where the difficulty is greatest. His elaborate notes on IV. 4 A, 4 D, V. 5 A, IX. 8 A, XX. 15 D, for example, might perhaps be shortened with advantage, but they are

entirely sound. In more than one instance Mr. Adam's independent conclusion is to be preferred to that of Schanz or Cobet. The following may be quoted as giving a fair impression of the commentary :—

IV. 4, Β ἐννεν is not = 'although,' a meaning which it never bears, but 'that is to say, if.' Euthyphro implies that one is not bound to prosecute unless the guilty man lives under one's own roof: only then is one exposed to μίσος. XIII. 11, C. τοῖς is wrongly rejected by Stallbaum: it goes with ἐννεν, by the usual Platonic hyperbaton, on which see Riddell's *Apology of Plato*, p. 236 ff., and Prof. Cook Wilson 'On the Interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*,' p. 97 ff. Schanz remarks that its position is determined by the paronomasia with τοῖς, and quotes the parallel in *Phaed.* 239 A.

The editor's remarks on IX. 8 D, XI. 9 C, although equally ingenious, are less convincing.

The Introduction touches on the same topics as those dwelt on by Professor Jowett, and to much the same effect. Both seem to agree that the truth hinted at in the *Euthyphro* but not expressed is that 'piety consists in working under God for the production of some good result not specified' (p. xiv.). 'When we expect him to go on and show that the true service of the Gods is the service of the Spirit, and the co-operation

with them in all things true and good, he stops short; this was a lesson which the soothsayer could not have been made to understand, and which every one must learn for himself' (Jowett). The coincidence is the more striking in that our editor, who is most conscientious in acknowledging obligations, makes no reference to the earlier and abler writing.

As I hinted at first, some things in this edition might be dispensed with. Citations, especially of German books, are needlessly profuse. What need we Nägelsbach to tell us that 'it had been a common-place with Pindar, Aeschylus, and other writers of a lofty moral tone, to urge that goodness must needs be one of the divine attributes' (xix.)? Or why must the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* be dragged in to prove that sacrifice was 'originally the gods' food' (xxii.)? In the notes also there are some things that might well be spared. Too much is sometimes made of accidental coincidences (IV. 4 A. πετόμενόν τινα διώκεις). And here and there a note is quite away from the point (XI. 9 C ὥστε τούτου ἀφηνίμει σε). Altogether, the little book might be made better by being made still smaller. But, as it is, it is decidedly good.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

AELIUS DIONYSIUS AND PAUSANIAS, THE ATTICISTS.

ΑΙΛΙΟΥ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΟΥ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ ΑΤΤΙΚΑ. Aelii Dionysii et Pausaniae Atticistarum Fragmenta collegit ERNESTUS SCHWABE. Accedunt Fragmenta Lexicorum Rhetoricorum apud Eustathium laudata. Lipsiae. Sumptibus Dykianis. 1890. pp. vi. 282. Mk. 12.

THE fame of these two Atticists of the age of Hadrian is closely bound up with the fame of other distinguished Greek scholars, some their predecessors, some their followers, from Aristophanes and Aristarchus in the third century B.C. to Cobet and Naber in our own day. Between these two extremes are many more, who either contributed to or borrowed—in too many cases stole—from these 'cabinets of precious rarities.' The most honest among the borrowers was Eustathius, who never attempts to conceal the source from which he derives his knowledge; yet he often cites his authorities so vaguely as to make it very difficult to trace his glosses to their true author. Were it not for this carelessness, the collection of

the fragments of Aelius and Pausanias would be a far easier matter than it is.

To Cobet belongs the honour of having been the first to point out the immense value of the glosses in the twelfth century lexicographers. The year 1860, in which Cobet published his first paper on Photius, is an epoch in the study of the Attic Dialect. In a second paper, in 1861, he dealt with the relations of that lexicographer to the Atticists. Cobet's conclusions, it is true with some important reservations, still hold good. About the same time (1861 and 1863) appeared Meier's *Opuscula*, in which he dealt with the Atticists, and made the first systematic collection of their fragments from Eustathius. In 1866, W. Rindfleisch wrote an Academic dissertation on the same subject. He added from Eustathius twenty-five fragments of Pausanias and twenty-two of Aelius to those given by Meier. He also contested some of Cobet's views. Cobet says (*Mnem.* x. p. 54 fol.) that, as Photius considered Aelius and Pausanias to be of the highest value—*χρησιμώτατος τοῖς τε ἀττικίζουσιν*