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](#)

Sandys' *First Philippic and Olynthiacs* Demosthenes. *The First Philippic and the Olynthiacs*, with Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by J. E. Sandys, Litt. D. Macmillan & Co. 1897. 5s.

Evelyn Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 46 - 47
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042359, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042359

How to cite this article:

Evelyn Abbott (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 46-47 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042359

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἐπέδησε. Again ἐκ λάρνακος ἐγκλάσασα 'from the chest in which she had shut it' is supported by ἐκ δίφρου καθήμενος *Od.* xxi. 419, 'from the chair in which he sat.' In l. 186 Festa translates εἰδαιμονίας πέταλον 'il fiore della felicità,' a hardly possible meaning for πέταλον, (what would one think of *folium felicitatis* in Latin?); Poste's 'bringing to Hiero a sure token of heaven's favour' goes nearer to the Pindaric meaning of 'a vote' or 'ballot leaf,' which is probably the true one. In ix. 10 Poste translates Housman's [φοι]νικάσπιδες, while Festa reads λευκάσπιδες in spite of the papyrus. 'Felon snake' for δράκων ὑπέροπλος (l. 13) is good, and felicities like this abound in the translation; but the version of l. 28 assumes that διακρίνειν can mean 'to be conspicuous among,' and so does Festa's 'vince i chiarori delle stelle.' The English version of ll. 42-46 though mainly following the lines of Housman's admirable explanation (fully accepted by the Italian) spoils the diction by divorcing ποταμῶν from ἀναξ, 'rued, Oh famous river, the prowess of a child of thy flood.' The appanages of a ποταμός are ρεύματα, ῥοαί, νάματα, but not ποταμοί. Besides 'rued' is too strong for γεύσαντο, 'felt the prowess of thy seed.'

'Closed Cercyon's wrestling school' is, perhaps, a too modern-seeming rendering of τάν τε Κερκύονος παλαίστραν | ἔσχεν, xviii. 26. Festa as a rule follows the text of Blass, whose strange theory, making — τω ὁ equivalent to one long syllable, he seems to commend in his note on iii. 22. In his text he gives the original reading in which γάρ is quite displaced. The reading θέλοντες ἀγλαΐζεθ' and the change of γάρ to παρ' (which should there be read, not πάρ') are defended in the November Number, p. 412. In ii. 10 he understands ἐβδομήκοντα σὺν στεφάνοις to mean 'a chorus of seventy garlanded youths,' which seems hardly possible; Blass rightly explains 'tot victorias Cei ex Isthmo reportaverant.' In xii. 76 he accepts Blass's παμμαχίαν ἀνα φαίνων for παμμαχιᾶν ἀναφαίνων, but has inadvertently printed ἀνὰ φαίνων. Neither English nor Italian translator could have heard of Mr. Walker's admirable Ἀϊόνα in xvii. 112, a correction which was not published until after their works had appeared. We hope future editors will give Ἀϊόνα a place in their texts.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

SANDYS' FIRST PHILIPPIC AND OLYNTHIACS.

Demosthenes. The First Philippic and the Olynthiacs, with Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by J. E. SANDYS, LITT. D. Macmillan & Co. 1897. 5s.

THE qualities of Dr. Sandys' work on Demosthenes are well known, and in this edition of *The First Philippic* and *The Olynthiacs* there will be found the carefulness, the accuracy, the moderation and judgment, the completeness, which appear in his edition of the oration against Leptines. Indeed if any fault can be found with the book, it is that it is too elaborate; more than once we come upon mere strings of names in the notes which might well be omitted, e.g. p. 102, where an excellent note on the unity of the *First Philippic* ends with an enumeration of nine writers who are against the unity to twenty-four who are in favour of it!

The text we are told 'though founded mainly on that of the Teubner edition, not unfrequently departs from it, not only in cases where Blass himself has changed his mind, but also in others where the evidence

of the MSS. seems too strong to be overruled.' In this Dr. Sandys is much to be commended. Corrections made in obedience to Blass's 'law,' that Demosthenes avoided three short syllables in succession, except under certain conditions, are liable to the objection brought against corrections made to preserve the law of the 'cretic' in an Iambic line: no reason can be given why a scribe should blunder at these points in the line or sentence more frequently than elsewhere. Why then should the MSS. be wrong in these instances more frequently than in others?

Dr. Sandys arranges the orations in their chronological order, and indeed they cannot otherwise be read intelligently. The order of the *Olynthiacs* is discussed in § vi. of the Introduction. 'Whatever uncertainty there may be as to the relative position of *Or.* 1 and *Or.* 2, *Or.* 3 is clearly the last'—is the conclusion with which the editor is content.

A few points may be noticed. In *Phil.* 1, 32 Dr. Sandys keeps the MS. reading: πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ πρὸς τοῖς τῶν ἐμπορίων στό-

μασιν ῥαδίως ἔσται, and translates, 'it will easily hold a position off the country itself and close to the entrances of the sea ports,' 'it' being ἡ δύναμις, which has to be supplied from τῇ δυνάμει in the preceding sentence. But can ἔσται have this meaning? No parallel is quoted. Dr. Sandys has it is true the support of Sauppe, Blass, and Westermann, but it is difficult to believe that Demosthenes can have ended a sentence so tamely.

In *ib.* § 35 Dr. S. reads ἄν τε δεινοὶ λάχουσιν ἄν τ' ἰδῶνται [οἱ] τούτων ἐκατέρων ἐπιμελησόμενοι, but in his explanatory note he seems inclined to keep the article. If the article is retained, is there any valid reason for rejecting ἐπιμελούμενοι, the reading of S? In *ib.* § 43 he has altered the relative positions of περὶ and ὑπέρ to avoid hiatus—following Blass; but who was likely to have been at the pains of disturbing the original order? ἀλλὰ μὴν—κωλύσει in the same section are printed, after Blass, in small letters 'quia sententia nexum aperte turbat.' The words take up τὴν τελευτήν just before. 'That end will come, for P will not stop, unless some one checks him,' is the connection. In *ib.* § 44 Dr. S. follows S¹ in reading μὴ where Bekker has οὐ μὴ, accepting the rule that οὐ is not inserted between οὐδεὶς μὴ, οὐδὲν μὴ. In *Olynth.* 1 § 5 we find in the text κινδυνεύουσιν taken from Max. Planudes instead of the πολέμουσιν of the MSS.—a far stronger word, and doubtless correct, in spite of the small inaccuracy involved. An excellent specimen of Dr. S.'s criticism will be found in *Ol.* iii. § 6 where he prints παντὶ σθένει κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν as a quotation,

on the ground that σθένος is an archaic word never found in the Greek of Demosthenes, and that κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν not only involves five short syllables, but is a phrase never used by Demosthenes.

The notes on grammar, antiquities, and history are all excellent. Dr. Sandys assumes that the διωβελία is identical with the θεωρικόν (p. 197), and this view is at any rate more probable than that put forward by Wilamowitz—that it was a state pension. Beloch claims to have proved that the διωβελία introduced by Cleophon was the juror's fee, or mainly so, which, as he thinks, when reintroduced after the Four Hundred, was two obols only (*Griech. Gesch.* ii. 77 A.), an explanation which is hardly consistent with the account given by Aristotle (?) in *Ath. Pol.* c. 28. On Eubulus there is an interesting note (p. 144) contributed in part by Mr. Whibley. It is the fashion now to whitewash Eubulus, and Holm has done so *con amore* in his *History of Greece* (iii. 222). Yet there is no doubt that Demosthenes, who had the means of forming an opinion, thought that the revenues were misapplied, when under his care. The war with Philip was not carried on with vigour; expeditions were commonly too late; the soldiers were not paid; the generals picked up money where and how they could; and meanwhile streets were paved and houses whitewashed, and the festivals went on with the regularity of clockwork. If there is any truth in these statements, it is clear that Eubulus put the lower interests of the city above the higher.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

BUTCHER'S AND BYWATER'S EDITIONS OF THE *POETICS*.

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, by Prof. S. H. BUTCHER. Second edition. Macmillan. 1898. 12s. 6d.

Aristotelis de Arte Poetica liber. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. BYWATER. Oxonii. MDCCCXCVII. 1s. 6d.

PROF. BUTCHER'S book was noticed in these columns in May 1895, and has since appeared in a second edition, as has also that separate part of it which consists of the text of the *Poetics* with translation and critical notes (*The Poetics of Aristotle*, Macmillan, 1898). In the essays which form the bulk of the book there seems to be little

change, but a few notes have been added or enlarged. I ventured to dissent before from Mr. Butcher's suggestion of οὐ (for the MS. οὕτω) τὰ τυγχόντα ὀνόματα in 9, 5, though it is supported by the Arabic version. He has now adopted it in his text and defended it in a note, mainly by a statement that the names in 'Middle Comedy' were representative and significant of the character of the person much more than those of Old Comedy. To the best of my belief the facts are the other way. In Aristophanes the names of important characters, when not real names (*Socrates*, *Euripides*) are very frequently significant