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](#)

Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte, 1888–1898, verzeichnet und besprochen Adolf von Bauer. (München, Beck, 1899). Pp. 574.

Leonard Whibley

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 07 / October 1900, pp 368 - 369

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083219, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083219

How to cite this article:

Leonard Whibley (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 368-369 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083219

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the worst of guides; but the mixture of negligence and confidence with which he controverts Lachmann is, to use the mildest term, inappropriate. Mr Bailey seems to have detected this sometimes (e.g. iii 198, iv 858-876), but at other times it escapes him (e.g. i 454, v 110-234). At iv 632, where the MSS have *umidum*, he prefers *umectum* to *umidulum*, which he does not mention. Does he believe Mr Brieger's assertion that 'Lucretius adiectiuis deminutiuis

non uti solet nisi quantitatem significantibus'? It is not true.

Mr Bailey says in his preface that he has been sparing of original conjectures because he does not wish to inflict new wounds upon the text. This estimate of his own talent in that department is certainly modest and seemingly correct. He prints only one emendation, and it is *intust*. Better one than two.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Euripides Iphigenia auf Tauris, herausgegeben von DR. SIEGFRIED REITER. Leipzig. G. Freytag. 1900. (Pp. xx., 126, 6 engravings; price 1 M. 20 Pf., bound 1 M. 60 Pf.)

AN excellent school book, thoroughly equipped. The constitution of the text shows scholarship and judgment. It is in fact as good a text of the play as is to be found anywhere. The explanatory notes, which are not copious, consist largely of idiomatic translations which throw clear light on the character and force of the Greek words and phrases. The critical appendix is the least satisfactory part of the book. It professes to give the more important deviations from the MSS., but many which are left out are more important than some which are given. Of the four emendations proposed by the editor himself 414 *βροτῶν* omitted, 452 *συμβαίη*, 'ν for *συμβαίην*, 454 *ἀπολαύσειν* for *ἀπόλανσιν*, 1260 *ἀπενάσσαθ'* ὁ for *ἀπενάσατο* (Barnes *ἀπενάσσατο*)—the two first have been made long ago, though probably no other editor would be content with the metre of 414 thus shortened as the equivalent of that of v. 399 in the strophe. As an instance of the independence and at the same time the soundness of the editor's judgment, may be mentioned the adoption of Mekler's beautiful ὅπ' *ἀφθελκτον* (which Reiter translates *mundtot*) for *ἀπόφθελκτον*, at v. 951, an emendation which, however, Wecklein regards as third-class. Noticeable also is his punctuation of vv. 6 f.; where he puts a comma after *Εὐρύπος* and another after *ἄλα*.

E. B. ENGLAND.

Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte, 1888-1898, verzeichnet und besprochen von ADOLF BAUER. (München, Beck, 1899). Pp. 574.

DR. ADOLF BAUER has undertaken to render account of the contributions to Greek History which have been made between the years 1888 and 1898. The extension of research in the spheres of Archaeology and Epigraphy, the multiplication of histories and monographs, the dissipation of results in learned periodicals will explain the magnitude of the task; and the record of ten years' work, which has hitherto been a section in a *Jahresbericht*, now appears as a volume of nearly 600 pages. That anyone should carry through a study so minute and so laborious constitutes in itself a claim on our gratitude; and Dr. Bauer's book must serve a useful purpose for those who desire to know what work has been done in different branches of Greek History. At the same time one cannot but regret defects which seriously diminish the value and usefulness of the book. With a thousand or more separate works and articles cited in the footnotes, nothing is done to facilitate reference; there is only one brief index of authors' names and there is not even a detailed list of contents prefixed to the chapters. On the other hand Dr. Bauer undertakes the impossible in attempting to give a digest and appreciation of so many diverse books and studies. Controversial criticism seems out of place in what should have the neutral character of a bibliography. Full lists of works and articles classified according to subject, brief abstracts of contents in the case of the more important

books, summaries of new theories or results, would have been easier to compile and would have proved more useful to the student. It is only natural that many of the works (especially those not by German scholars) should be cited at second hand. In the

main justice is done to the contributions of English scholars, especially in the sphere of Archaeology, but it is surprising that Mr. Frazer's edition of Pausanias should be dismissed with the briefest mention.

LEONARD WHIBLEY.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING ATTIC TOPOGRAPHY AND RELIGION WITH REFERENCE TO THUCYDIDES II. 15.

MANY vital questions concerning Attic topography and some questions of interest touching Attic religion depend on the interpretation of the 15th chapter of the second book of Thucydides, in which the prehistoric City of Athens is contrasted with the Athens of his day. I venture reluctantly and diffidently to approach the thorny topographical problem. I am constrained to do so because many of the inquiries in which I am more specially interested depend upon it; and also because a certain theory has been put forward in recent years by Dr. Dörpfeld concerning that chapter, which claims acceptance or refutation. Hitherto it has met with little acceptance; the criticism has been mainly hostile, but not sufficiently searching and conclusive. The question at issue is at first purely literary, a question of translation or of paraphrase. Beginning with the words § 4 τὸ δὲ πρὸ τούτου Dr. Dörpfeld would translate this and the following section somewhat in this manner. 'In the days before Theseus that which is now the Acropolis, together with the district at its foot that lies more or less towards the South, constituted the City. The proof that the Acropolis with this small outlying portion was the ancient city, is that the temples on the rock itself are dedicated to (...? Athena) as well as to other deities, and the temples that lie outside (the wall of the ancient Acropolis) are situated in the main near to this latter portion of the city (viz. near to the ancient Acropolis), and there are other ancient shrines situated near to the ancient Polis (ταύτη)...§ 7. And the fountain now called 'Ερνεάκρονος, but formerly Kallirrhoe when the springs were above ground, was used by our ancestors for all the

most important purposes as being conveniently near to the Burg-gate, and even now from ancient tradition its water is customarily employed for the religious preliminaries of the marriage ceremonies and for other ritualistic purposes, and the Acropolis is still called the Polis by the Athenians, owing to the original settlement here.'

Dr. Dörpfeld, in accord with the modern editors (e.g. Klausen), assumes in § 5 a lacuna after the words καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἐστὶ; and the logic of the passage may seem to justify this assumption.¹ But his version is at variance with the received interpretation in all the essential points. As regards the mere translation, the controversy turns mainly on the meaning of the sentence τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἰδρύνται: as regards interpretation, it turns mainly on the intention of the words τεκμήριον δέ. What is it that Thucydides wishes to prove and ought to prove? According to Dr. Dörpfeld, he only succeeds in proving, or making probable that the old Polis was confined to the rock of the Acropolis, and this was all that he desired to prove; the additional statement made in § 4 that the old city extended below the rock in a southerly direction, becomes a matter of indifference to Thucydides the moment after he had uttered it: it was merely added to show that he was aware that the ancient Polis was of rather larger compass than the rock itself; the extension towards the south is not established by any kind of proof; the temples that are

¹ This article was written before I had the opportunity of reading Dr. Verrall's paper in the May number of the *Classical Review*. Dr. Verrall is right, I think, in rejecting the theory of the lacuna. His criticism is confined to the textual interpretation. But no criticism is satisfactory that does not take account of the archaeological difficulties as well. Another paper on the same subject has just appeared in the *American Journal of Philology*, which I have not yet been able to consult.