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](#)

Adversaria Demosthenica

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 04 / May 1902, pp 201 - 201
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020591X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020591X

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1902). Adversaria Demosthenica. The Classical Review, 16, pp 201-201
doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020591X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Might I suggest *βύρσαν* *vice* *θύρον*? This gives excellent sense and presents no special palaeographical difficulty. Musgrave supposes a similar corruption of *θάλλει* to *βάλλει* in line 1186. Cf. also line 955. If *θύρσαν* were once written *vice* *βύρσαν* the next copyist would be sure to 'correct' it to *θύρον*. As Housman remarks on another

passage, 'the scribe's head would be full of thyrsi.'

It may further be noted that the phrase *βύρσης κύπος* occurs in line 513 of the play.

R. B. CROSS.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

ADVERSARIA DEMOSTHENICA.

(1) Dem. 36 (*pro Phormione*) § 38 τῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς νευθεΐσης οὐσίας. This is still, even in the last edition of Sandys and Paley, explained as the shield factory and a reference is given to § 11. The editor does not observe that, were this interpretation correct, we should have the rent from the factory *twice over*, here and in § 37, where it is for the first 8 years included in the rent of the whole business and then reckoned for 10 years singly. The true explanation is to be derived from § 9, where we read that the guardians divided with Apollodorus all the property except the business leased to Phormio: this was divided later when the lease fell in.

(2) [Dem.] 45 (*in Stephanum* 1) § 19 οἱδὶ δέ, τῇ προκλήσει χρησάμενοι παραπετάσματι, διαθήκας ἐμαρτύρησαν ὡς ἂν μάλισθ' οἱ<μὲν Blass> δικασταὶ ταύτην τὴν διαθήκην ἐπίστευσαν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι, ἐγὼ δ' ἀπεκλείσθην τοῦ λόγου τυχεῖν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀδικοῦμαι, οἱτοὶ δὲ φωράθειν τὰ ψευδῇ μεμαρτυρηκότες. Editors have made great coil over this sentence. But with Blass' insertion there seems no occasion for further hesitation. The ἂν goes with *φωράθειν* only; cf. [Dem.] 46 (*in Stephanum* 2) § 19 and Gebauer's comment quoted by Sandys; the indicatives are independent of it; and the whole sentence is 'deposed to a will in that way in which, *although* the jury believed ... and I was debarred ... yet they can most easily be convicted.' Had the speaker not interposed his *μὲν* clauses, there would be no difficulty.

(3) § 28 πρὸ τῆς προκλήσεως MSS., emended by Reiske to *μετά*, by Dobree to *διά*. The MS. reading seems endurable if we translate πρὸ 'instead of,' cf. § 19, the sense being 'instead of this challenge that they ostensibly make so much of, they have really been deposing to this will under cloak of the challenge.'

(4) § 59 καίτοι ὅστις ὁ ἄνθρωπος Ἀθηναῖοι κακῶν ἁλλοτρίων κλέπτῃς ὑπέμειν' ὀνομασθῆναι, τί ἂν ἡγείσθε ποιῆσαι τοῦτον ἄλλου του FSQ (ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γρ FQ). Sandys reads ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. Some years ago I proposed *κακ[ίων ἕνεκα τ]ῶν ἁλλοτρίων*. But I then failed to grasp the important fact that nowhere in the speech is there any suggestion that Stephanus has done any thing *for himself*: and if this fact may be disregarded and the sentence be looked on as empty rhetoric, another fact cannot be disregarded: the parallel passage in § 62 makes it certain that the antithesis I then suggested was on the wrong lines. There, to summarize the argument of §§ 57-61, we have: *ἀρ' οὖν ἂν ὑμῖν αἰσχυνθῆναι δοκεῖ τὴν τοῦ τὰ ψευδῇ μαρτυρεῖν δόξαν, ὃ τὴν τοῦ κλέπτῃς φανῆναι μὴ φυγῶν; ἢ δεηθέντος ὀκνῆσαι τὰ ψευδῇ μαρτυρεῖν, ὃς ἂ μηδεὶς ἐκέλευ' ἐθελοντὴς πονηρὸς ἦν*; It seems clear then, that, as Sauppe said, the sense would be satisfied if we had at the end of § 59 *δεομένου του* or the like. I suggest therefore (i) that *κακῶν* conceals *χάκων* (= *καὶ ἐκῶν*) and (ii) that *ἄλλου του* of the MSS. is sound and means 'for another's sake,' this rare use of the genitive being the cause of the variant mentioned in FQ, originating in an adscript comment, *ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ* i.e. 'FOR HIS (another's) SAKE.' This genitive seems to have been unnecessarily ousted by editors also in Aristotle *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 35 § 2. Cf. [Dem.] 46 (*in Stephanum* 2) § 10 *Νόμος* B. B. As for *ἁλλοτρίων κλέπτῃς* it is simply a rhetorical amplification of *κλέπτῃς*, and it is just because this amplification was common that Aristophanes' joke in *Ranæ* 611 is so pointed. The addition of *ἁλλοτρίων* is *not* to point any contrast with the second half of the sentence.

T. NICKLIN.