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](#)

Westermann's Demosthenes *Ausgewählte Reden des Demosthenes*, erklärt Westermann von Anton. Drittes Bändchen: Aristokrates, Konon, Eubulides. Dritte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Dr. Emil Rosenberg. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1890. 1 Mk. 80.

W. Wayte

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 24 - 25

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993089, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993089

How to cite this article:

W. Wayte (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 24-25 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993089

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

burning questions in Thucydidean criticism || C. 8. ἦν <τέ> τι περιγίγνηται αὐτοῖς τοῦ πολέμου — an ingenious and probable correction] †τοῦ πολέμου† Hw.—καὶ <τοῦ> τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ψηφισθῆναι—the addition is quite unnecessary || C. 9. ἐς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεῖν] Hw. brackets ἐς Σ. | εἰ καὶ ἄμεινον—a combination of the Vatican and Laurentian] εἰ ἄμεινον Hw., St., Cl. | οὕτως βραχεία] οὕτω Hw., St., Cl. | πειθομένους] πιθομένους Hw. | αἰρεσθαι with the Laurentian] ἀρασθαι Hw., St., Cl. with the Vatican | νομίζων] νομίζω δ' Hw. | ἀλλ' ἢ ἂν γινώσκω] ἀλλ' ἢ ἂν γ. Hw., Cl., ἀλλὰ ἢ ἂν γ. St. | τά γε ὑπάρχοντα] τά τε ὑ. Hw., St., Cl. | τῶν ἀφανῶν καὶ μελλόντων] τῶν ἀ. [καὶ μ.] Hw. ||

Now in the first place it will be seen that the new text represents a timely protest against the tyranny of the Vatican. Hence it differs considerably from Classen's text. Another merit is that the spelling is reformed in accordance with the teaching of Herodian, Stahl and Meisterhans. In introducing corrections Hude is temperate, and his views on the subject are thus stated: 'duae maximae sunt res quibus difficultas hujus scriptoris recensendi continetur, . . unum quod memoria librorum per se ipsa haud ita magna fide digna est . . , alterum quod ea Thucydidei sermonis proprietates est, quae multa ab vulgari consuetudine dicendi abhorrentia exhibeat.'¹ But on the serious

¹ He gives in the *Not. Crit.* the more important conjectures which are not admitted into the text. A good proof of his general candour and consideration for the labours of others is found at vi. 46,

question of interpolation—a question which confronts us at the very outset—Hude has no clear views. In one sentence of his preface he admits as much as Cobet ever contended for, but just afterwards he utterly condemns the 'rationem expungendi quam Batavi invenerunt.' So would every one, were that *ratio* such a preposterous fad as Hude imagines it to be: 'pleraque quae nullo aut fere nullo sententiae damno abesse posse videntur, hi glossematum nomine expungunt.' Any one, Dane or Dutchman, who went to work on such a plan would justly incur the ridicule of the whole republic of letters. The problem is one which cannot be solved in a few lines. Was the text of Thucydides extensively annotated or edited for the use of schools before the Christian era? Was the text interpolated before Cicero's time? If to all this we answer 'no,' then Thucydides knew very little of his own language. Granted that the language was 'in the stage of infancy,' yet Thucydides could not understand the infant whose ways his contemporaries Gorgias, Antiphon, Andocides, had thoroughly mastered. Is this possible?

The printing of this book is admirable, and the Greek type is most beautiful. Would that the English printers could acquire a fount of type from Copenhagen.

E. C. MARCHANT.

where he duly recalls Roscher's proposal and defence of *ὑπάργυρα* for *ἀργυρά*, though Hude himself successfully replied to that proposal in the *N. Jahrb.* for 1889 (p. 829).

WESTERMANN'S DEMOSTHENES.

Ausgewählte Reden des Demosthenes, erklärt von ANTON WESTERMANN. Drittes Bändchen: Aristokrates, Konon, Eubulides. Dritte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von DR. EMIL ROSENBERG. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1890. 1 Mk. 80.

THIS is the third instalment of Dr. Rosenberg's reissue of Westermann's Demosthenes, in the Haupt-Sauppe series. In the revision of the text the editor has enjoyed special advantages: the new recension by Blass has been available throughout, and in the *Aristocrates*, the most important of the three speeches, the valuable labours of Weil and

his collation of MS. Σ. The variations of these two editions are given in the critical appendix, a new feature not to be found in Westermann, with whom textual criticism was a subordinate point. Rosenberg's text, however, is much more conservative than Blass's, sometimes even than Westermann's. Quoting Blass's dictum in the preface to his third volume (1889) '*dies diem docet, et alia multa fortasse olim rectius cognoscam quam adhuc cognovi*,' he remarks that in an edition like the present, *i.e.* intended for school use, the beaten path must not be quitted too often. We have failed to discover any guiding principle save that of departing as little as possible from the MSS.

Yet the editor is not wanting in initiative ; he often strikes out or brackets words which have hitherto passed muster, and in one passage at least proposes a considerable excision. In the concluding words of *Aristocr.* § 178, πάντ' ἄνω καὶ κάτω πεποίηκε, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ δικαίως ἔπραξεν, Cobet had struck out πεποίηκε, Rosenberg thinks the whole sentence spurious.

In *Aristocr.* § 72 a discrepancy between the notes and the text is, we suppose, merely a misprint. Westermann had retained διέρηκε, while noting that Dindorf was probably right in giving διήρηκε after Dobree's correction. Rosenberg condemns the alteration in his note, but prints it in the text. Conclusive evidence in favour of διέρηκε, both here and in § 140, will be found in Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, p. 331. In § 78, where Blass wishes to introduce τῆς αἰτίας from Aristides after ἀθῶς ἀφίεται, the editor simply brackets φυγῆν: 'doch wird δίκην leicht ergänzt und φυγῆν besser entfernt'; a good correction, but made by Cobet after Dobree. In § 108 Westermann had introduced Cobet's τοσοῦτον ἀπέχει and § 191. Εὐβοᾶς: Rosenberg goes back upon the old readings τοσοῦτ' ἀπέχει and Εὐβοίας. In § 117 there is a well-known difficulty in μὴ βουλῆσθε εἰδέναι: Westermann had already taken it imperatively, Rosenberg further refers to 'Whitelaw in *Classical Review*, ii. 18' (p. 322). In the same section he approves, but does not adopt, Blass's πάσης ἄρξας Θράκης for εἰ πάσης ἄρξεις Θρ.: in bracketing ὥς ἂν οὖν δύνονται, πίστιν οὐκ εἶναι he follows Dobree and Cobet without acknowledgment: he throws out a good suggestion to drop φασὶν after ἐκείνων. In § 125 Cobet is again ignored: he had bracketed the words δεύτερον δὲ and τοῦτω δοτέον: the former is taken and the latter left equally without explanation. In § 186 κὰν φύλακας κατέστησαν is read upon Cobet's certain conjecture, which accounts for the reading of the inferior MSS. καὶ φύλακας ἂν κατέστησαν: Weil alone among recent editors adopts κεί, a suggestion of his own. In the same section, where Dobree and, after him, Cobet had bracketed τὸ τοῦ ἐφροῦρει Χαρίδημον, Rosenberg takes no notice of these omissions, but would like to read φρουρῶν Χαρίδημον. In § 192 omitting ἡγοῦμαι is rather a good suggestion. In § 201, while bracketing, with Cobet and Weil, τῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα γραφόντων ἐτόιμος, he further suspects καὶ τὰς παρ' ὑμῶν δωρεάς. In § 211 αὐτὸν before ἡξιώκεναι and again § 219 λέγειν after ἐπιτρέπετε are denounced as glosses, but not marked in the

text: ὑπερβὰς § 220 on the other hand is bracketed.

Conon § 2 there is an ingenious suggestion ἀδικεῖσθαι for ἡδικῆσθαι, following traces in Σ, which has ἀδικῆσθαι. § 3 the question between εἰώθαμεν, the common reading, and Blass's εἰώθειμεν he would settle by omitting the word altogether. § 15 the proposed omission of φῆ ἡ seems hardly intelligible. § 30 the proposal to write ἄπερ νῦν instead of ἄπερ παρ' ὑμῖν is certainly no improvement.

The *Eubulides* is the least important of the three speeches, but throws much interesting light on two points; the demotic sacra, and the abuses connected with the registration of citizens. § 3 τοῖς ἡδικημένοις is not unreasonably regarded as suspicious, συναδικηθείμεν following. § 5 the editor's conjecture ἀνυπευθύνως for -ω is contrary to idiom and to the usage of the Orators, who never employ the adverbial form of this word. § 34 the text and notes do not agree; the former gives τί οὐ from conjecture, the latter retains Westermann's explanation of οὐδέν τι, the reading of ΣΦQ. The reading of οὐδέν τι has nothing but diplomatic authority to recommend it; and Blass has the courage to retain the common reading οὐδέν ὃ τι οὐ. The editor, in the critical note, appears drawn two ways, common sense pointing one way and his favourite MSS. the other. § 36 the proposal to write ταύτας [τὰς] διαβολάς without the article is rather startling. § 42 he thinks ποιούσα perhaps a gloss, and we are disposed to agree: the change of tense from ποιήσασα to ποιούσα is difficult to account for, and Westermann's explanation certainly not satisfactory: 'ersteres vom Uebernehmen, letzteres vom Vollziehen des Auftrages zu verstehen.' § 49 his final conjecture οὐδ' ἦδει for οὐδεὶς ἦδει is a decided improvement.

Westermann's strongest point, his knowledge of Attic law, comes out with especial force in these three speeches: his explanatory notes required little alteration, but have been sparingly and judiciously revised. Some notes of Weil (on the *Aristocrates*) and Sandys (on the *Conon*) are cited in the original languages. The English quotations however are not altogether happy: § 4 he writes *abut* for *but*, evidently thinking of *aber*; § 7 'the inner Cerameicus, the N.W. district of Athens, lying [within the walls, as opposed] to the outer Cerameicus,' the sense is not improved by omitting the words in brackets; in the concluding section he prints 'Greec writers on Rhetorik.'

W. WAYTE.