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](#)

Sihler's Edition of the *Protagoras* *The Protagoras of Plato, with an Introduction and Notes*, by E. G. Sihler, Ph.D. New and revised edition. Harper & Brothers. 1892.

J. A. Towle

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 03 / April 1895, pp 174 - 175

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201601, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201601

How to cite this article:

J. A. Towle (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 174-175 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201601

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

and philosophers.' 880 Naber's *συνίνας* for *σκύνίνας* is quoted and rejected on the ground that Herod. i. 194 mentions real *πλοῖα σκύνινα* and therefore no change seems necessary—a quite insufficient ground for rejecting what appears to me to be a certain correction. 1036 he notes that the *Ἄδικος* uses a pseudo-Sokratic dialectic, while the *Δίκαιος* explains his principles in a connected speech—which, if it is anything more than a coincidence, would tend to show that in this part of the play at all events Ar. distinguishes between Sokrates and the Sophists. On 1096 there is an interesting note calling attention to the climax in 1089–1100: *συνήγοροι* (the lowest grade of official), *τραγωδοί* (who rank next in public estimation), *δημηγόροι* (the representatives of the sovereign *ἄσμος*), and finally even the sovereign *ἄσμος* itself (= *θεαταί*)—all alike are *εὐρύπρωκτοι*. 1194 an unnecessary attempt is made to defend *ἀπαλλάττοντο* in the sense of *διαλλάττοντο*, which, if the meaning required is 'reconcile,' must certainly be restored with Hirschig: but there seems to be no reason for abandoning the old and natural explanation of Ernesti: per compositionem aut alio modo se expedire e controversia. 1236 his suggestion that *ἔτι* is used in its threatening sense 'a time will come when' &c. seems undoubtedly right. 1304 Reisig's *ἐξαρθείς* = *ἐπαρθείς* (for MSS. *ἐρασθείς*) is defended by *Thesm.* 981 *ἔξαιρε διπλὴν χάριν χορείας*. 1315 *ἐγγιγνῆται* is taken = 'feindlich zusammentreffen,' for which, as he admits, there is no parallel: but surely it need mean no more than 'beat every one he has anything to do with.' The commentary is enriched throughout by many new parallels from the New Comedy, and by frequent references to Guhl and Koner's sixth ed.

There are one or two things that one would like to see altered in this new

edition. v. 824 Dawes' *διδάξεις* is still read: but as the canon Davesianus (to which Kock adheres strictly in the constr. of *οὐ μή* also) is not borne out by inscriptions, and as Goodwin has given a very good explanation of the origin of the aor. subj. after *ὅπως μή*, the change, slight as it is, seems unnecessary. 1149 it is surely impossible that *ὄν* refers to *νίόν* and not *λόγον*. 1271 *κακῶς ἄρ' ὄντως εἶχες* the imperf. appears to be of the kind nicknamed 'panoramic' so common in Plato (cf. *quanta laborabas Charybdi*), and to have no reference to the time when Amynias borrowed the money. 1277 there does not seem sufficient reason for abandoning the MSS. *προσκεκλησθαι*: the use of the perf. was probably suggested by *σεσεῖσθαι* in the line before. 1342 a note is wanted on the rare use of *ὥστε* c. indic. in oratio obliqua. 1384 *φράσας*, the reading of EFG, which is mentioned with approval in the note, should certainly be printed in the text. 1431 Kock still approves of G. Hermann's *ἐπ' ἱκρίου*, but in the face of Pollux's remark (x. 156) *πέτευρον δέ, οὐ τὰς ἐνοικιδίας ὄρνιθας ἐγκαθεύδειν συμβέβηκεν*, *Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει ὥσπερ καὶ κρεμάθραν, ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις*, which can scarcely refer to any passage but this, and of Rav.'s *καπὶ πλείον*, it is more probable that the word *πέτευρον* in some form or another is concealed in the line: at all events the facts are worth mentioning in a note.

It is impossible to read such a model edition as this without wishing very strongly that Kock would not confine his editorial labours to the four plays which have already been before the public so long in the Weidmann series, but would go on and produce a complete edition of Aristophanes, which no one is so well qualified as he to undertake.

F. ARTHUR HIRTZEL.

SIHLER'S EDITION OF THE *PROTAGORAS*.

The Protagoras of Plato, with an Introduction and Notes, by E. G. SIHLER, PH.D. New and revised edition. Harper & Brothers. 1892.

THIS new edition offers a clear attractive page, and has the excellences of the former one; among others, a body of notes containing a large amount of valuable illustrative material. The changes are inconsider-

able. Some errors in accent and breathing, however, have been brought over from the first edition. Also in the Greek index, p. 135, both editions derive *συνεστρέον* from *συνίστασθαι*, where the notes now give the matter correctly. The English words 'would' and 'should' are interchanged too often perhaps even for a Greek text-book, e.g. p. 95, ll. 25 and 37; p. 115, l. 7; p. 126, l. 15.

The book in the introduction and notes sets forth with some fulness the line of the argument, yet fails to make sufficiently clear to the student its real character and aim—a matter of much importance, where the dialogue has so much keenness and subtlety. Several points may be mentioned which the editor has failed to make clear. (1) The contrast between Socrates' and Protagoras' ideas of *ἀπέρη*, the one being simple—although definition is disclaimed—the other elastic and indefinite, aiming to be *practical*, whatever that may mean (cf. 318E). (2) The fallacies in the arguments of Protagoras. For instance, as his definition of *ἀπέρη*, he reaches, instead of a definition, that which ordinary people *think* to be *ἀπέρη*. (3) The *unity*, from Socrates' point of view of the whole dialogue, in spite of the repeated dramatic breaks. Socrates does not expect an immediate definition of *ἀπέρη*, and at the close dis-

avows having attained to a definition. Yet again and again, by different lines, he directs the thought unceasingly *towards* this goal, every time forcing the conclusion that *ἀπέρη* is knowledge. (4) Socrates uses a twofold method of argument; serious, and ironical or playful,—we may call it by different names. In this latter, Socrates does not hesitate—and this with entire propriety—to imitate Protagoras, and to foil him with his own weapons. His use of Simonides' poem illustrates this, and to the reader of to-day is delightfully sophistical. If the weapon is a good one, Protagoras is fairly beaten; if the weapon is poor, Protagoras' weapon is a failure. At all events, when Socrates has worsted his opponent, he himself says the weapon is worthless, throws it away (cf. 347), and takes one more to his mind.

J. A. TOWLE.

DE MIRMONT'S *APOLLONIOS ET VIRGILE*.

Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile, by H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT. (Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux, 1894, I. pp. 1-83).

ABOUT two years ago a translation of Apollonius Rhodius with commentary by M. de Mirmont was noticed in this review, and, pursuing the same subject, this dissertation is intended as an introduction to various studies on Apollonius and Vergil. The first of these has lately appeared, and is a formidable thesis of 778 pages, presented to the *Faculté des Lettres de Paris*, upon the Mythology and the Gods in the *Argonautics* and the *Aeneid*.

The object of the present little work is to define with more precision than has been done hitherto the influence of the Greek poem upon the *Aeneid*. The parallel passages in the two poems have often been collected both in ancient and modern times. M. de Mirmont gives some account of these, beginning with Servius and Macrobius. In modern times Orsini (Fulvius Ursinus) in 1568 collected all the passages of Vergil which he thought imitated from Greek poets and some prose writers, and judiciously did this without making any criticisms. He has been followed by Tissot and Eichhoff in France, whose works both appeared in 1825.

Before this however the elder Scaliger in the fifth book of his *Poetice*, published posthumously in 1561, had compared the best-known passages with the object of exalting Vergil and depreciating Apollonius. This was answered in 1641 by Hoelzelinus, who edited Apollonius and undertook his defence against Scaliger. As neither of them thought it necessary to give reasons for their preference of either poet, their differences need not detain us, but upon the whole Apollonius suffers less from the indiscriminate abuse of Scaliger than from the clumsy eulogy of the Dutchman. No collection of parallel passages however is of any critical value without some estimate of the different times and circumstances in which the two poems were composed. Heyne has the merit of having pointed this out in 1753, but we have no History of Alexandrian Literature to refer to until we come to that of M. Coket in 1882. Meanwhile several French writers in a vague and rhetorical way had made the usual comparisons, and even Sainte-Beuve by detaching the episode of Medea in Bk. iii. had injured the reputation of the rest of the *Argonautica*. It was considered enough to say generally that Apollonius had inspired Vergil in the fourth book of the *Aeneid*. In 1838 however Patin, in the introduction to a course of