

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](#)



Marshall's *Aristotle's Theory of Conduct* Aristotle's *Theory of Conduct*. By Thomas Marshall. London: Fisher Unwin. 1906. 8vo. Pp. 600. 21s. net.

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 07 / October 1906, pp 353 - 354

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994915, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994915

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 353-354 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994915

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is his treatment of 503 foll. Lines 365, 417, 744, 831 he thinks should be omitted altogether.

Without discussing at any length the difficult question of the staging of the *Peace*, he takes the house of Zeus to be shown on a higher level than that of Trygaeus. The image of Peace is tall enough to allow of her whispering into Hermes' ear at 661, and it is from the higher level that Trygaeus and Hermes direct the operation of raising her from the pit, the chorus being on earth while they (Trygaeus and Hermes) are in heaven. In a lively Latin preface to the *Ecclesiazusae* he dwells on the small part played by women in the first six plays of Aristophanes and in early tragedy (Aeschylus' women are men and those of Sophocles are at least virile), and on the place of women at Athens generally, going on to speak of the subsequent change of spirit in the poet and the change of subject in the later plays. He accepts 392 as the date of the *E.* and thinks that Aristophanes had Plato little, if at all, in mind. As to the *Peace* he holds that there was no second edition.

In the *Vindiciae* van Herwerden has put together a very miscellaneous collection of notes bearing on the text of Aristophanes and on recent criticism. Naturally they refer most of all to the edition of van Leeuwen, which is highly praised and the excessive boldness of its conjectures (I have

given examples above) not sufficiently pointed out. But other commentators and critics are also taken into account, Mazon, Willems, Blaydes' *magnum opus*, Starkie's *Wasps*, my own articles in this *Review*, and from time to time all sorts of Aristophanic work. Sometimes the writer only gives a critic's proposal with just a word of acceptance; sometimes he challenges and controverts it. Many of the notes consist merely of a reference to the volume of *Mnemosyne* in which he previously discussed a passage, the object of the book being to bring together either explicitly or by these references all that he has or has had to say. There is a good deal that is new, perhaps not much of first-rate importance, for he has done so much before that we could not expect much still to come. The notices of other men's work are always courteous and kindly, but it is not always apparent why one thing is noticed, whether with praise or dissent, and another not. It is indeed a rather casual series of notes, but, like his *Collectanea* of 1903 on the *Comic Fragments* and in a greater degree, it has a good deal of interest for any one who is fond of Greek comedy.

Mr. Graves' *Acharnians* is a fair school-book, not aiming at anything more and not, I think, with any marked features. It has a few critical notes below the text and some eighty pages of commentary.

H. RICHARDS.

MARSHALL'S ARISTOTLE'S THEORY OF CONDUCT.

Aristotle's Theory of Conduct. By THOMAS MARSHALL. London: Fisher Unwin. 1906. 8vo. Pp. 600. 21s. net.

THIS book, in which 'an attempt is made to present Aristotle's *Ethics* in a readable shape' has considerable merits, and, if only its price were more moderate, it might be recommended to many students and that not only the weakest among them. After a general introduction of some thirty pages the author goes through the *Ethics* analysing, paraphrasing, commenting, and illustrating. He is clear and intelligible, sensible and often decidedly shrewd in his remarks, and he writes in an interesting way. The book gives a very fair account of the contents of the *Ethics*, sometimes a truer one than more ambitious writers, and

takes often a just view of its merits and defects. Apart from many unpardonable errors in the Greek quotations, for which he apologises in a note (and with which 'apothegm' in his preface may be ranked), I find things which I cannot quite agree with, a few such as the statement (p. 196) that 'the words *ἀμα τῇ φρονήσει πᾶσαι ἀνάγκησιν* here mean that all the virtues will be found to stand to prudence in the relation of species to genus'; the explanation (p. 311) of *τὸ πρῶτον (δικαίον)*; the account of the exact nature of distributive and 'regulative' (the author's word) justice; his difficulty (pp. 274, 296) in bringing justice under the theory of the mean; and his application of the illustration in 3.3.18 from the Homeric 'constitutions,' where Grant too went wrong. He seems not to know of the light thrown

on 7. 4. 2 by an Oxyrhynchus papyrus. Much more serious than any of these small details is his choice of certain words to express Aristotelian terms. No one can ever really understand the *Ethics* who is taught to think of εὐδαιμονία as 'happiness,' or even who has 'habit' given him as an equivalent of ἔξις. 'Intuition' is very questionable for νοῦς; 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' do not fairly represent ἐκούσιον and ἀκούσιον, unless we considerably alter their ordinary English

meaning. Whether in 10. 9 οἱ σοφισταί is well rendered by 'Professors,' I will not venture to say. The use of inverted commas is sometimes misleading and may give the idea of a much closer translation than the author really attempts. There is a useful index. I hope to see a second edition, revised in places and much cheaper.

H. RICHARDS.

HOSIUS' *LUCAN*.

M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili Libri decem. G. Steinhartii aliorumque copiosis iterum edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1905. 8vo. Pp. lx + 374. Price M. 4.50.

IN the year 1892 appeared Dr. Hosius' first edition of *Lucan*, and all scholars interested in the poet rejoiced that a really scientific text was at last available. The great merits of Hosius' work were duly recognized in this *Review* (viii, pp. 34 ff.) as marking 'an important epoch in the critical study of *Lucan*.' After the lapse of thirteen years we have now the opportunity of welcoming a second edition. In the interval much study has been devoted to the *De Bello civili*, and if it is true that the new light shed on one of the most complicated of textual problems has often served merely to make the complication more evident, it is no less true that the elucidation of many obscure points by various scholars has materially advanced our prospects of a final solution of the great enigma.

In 1894 Lejay published at Paris a scholarly edition of Book I, with a long introduction containing, among other things, an account of the MSS and a discussion of their relationships. The chief importance of this book lies in the fact that it drew attention to several Paris codices of which Hosius had taken practically no account.¹ But Lejay's edition has been strangely overlooked by most scholars. Beck, in a work which will shortly be mentioned, says that it is hardly to be found in a single

state or university library in Germany. The year 1894 saw also the publication of Genthe's dissertation on the codex *Erlangensis* (E).

Even before Hosius' first edition was published, C. M. Francken had shown his interest in *Lucan* by several articles in *Mnemosyne*, and in 1896 and 1897 appeared the two volumes of his edition. Francken's opinions about the MSS do not, on the whole, differ very much from those which had been expressed by Hosius, but he uses a few codices which had, for the most part, been neglected by former editors. Of these, the ninth-century *Ashburnhamensis* (A), which Lejay had used for Book I, is in some respects the most notable. Full use was made of this MS by Mr. Heitland in editing *Lucan* for the new *Corpus Poetarum* (1900). The same scholar has also made in this journal several valuable contributions to the study of *Lucan*'s text.

In the same year in which Mr. Heitland's text appeared there was published at Munich a doctoral dissertation entitled *Untersuchungen zu den Handschriften Lucans*, by Friedrich Beck. This is probably the most important treatise that has ever been published on the subject. Beck availed himself of previous labours in the same field, and he had also examined some MSS previously ignored. He aimed at comprehensiveness, and therein lies his chief fault. The problem of *Lucan*'s text is a tangle of broken threads which are not likely to be unravelled and sorted out for many a long day to come. Beck's 'scharfe Scheidung und Ableitung'² was rash in itself; it was doubly rash, because he had a very defective

¹ Lejay's discussion of the relationships of the MSS shows much industry and acumen, but it is vitiated by some very serious oversights, which will be mentioned later.

² The words are those of Hosius in his review of Beck's work, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* Feb. 23, 1901.