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](#)

Demosthenes, Philippic i., Olynthiacs i. ii. iii. With Introduction and Notes by Evelyn Abbott, M. A., LL. D., and P. E. Matheson, M. A. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1887. 3s.

S. H. Butcher

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 07 / July 1888, pp 207 - 208

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192947, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192947

How to cite this article:

S. H. Butcher (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 207-208 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192947

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

guistic usages contrived to bring into relief the distinctive features of Antiphon's style. Taking the various heads under which the facts are grouped, we should hardly gather that there was anything in the structure of Antiphon's sentences and periods to distinguish his manner from the developed idiom of Attic prose. Differences of vocabulary are indeed pointed out, but not without serious inaccuracies. A list is given (p. 19, &c.) of words which, so far as our literary records show, are stated to be used by Antiphon in a sense peculiar to himself. This list, however, includes *πρόνοια*, 'malice prepense,' which in the phrase *ἐκ προνοίας* is regular in the orators; *ἀναγινώσκειν*, 'to persuade,'—frequent in Herodotus; *ἀποβάλλειν*, of *involuntary* loss, which is common in writers of all periods; *διατίθεσθαι*, 'to dispose of,' 'sell,' found in Herodotus and Xenophon; *ἀναδέχεσθαι*, 'to be surety,' found in Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, &c. The word *αὐθέντης*, we are told, primarily means 'absolute master,' but takes in Antiphon the special sense of 'murderer.' But the meaning 'absolute master' belongs to late Greek, while the meaning 'murderer' already occurs in Herodotus.

Passing to syntax we find the phrase *σωφρονίᾳ τὸ θυμούμενον τῆς γνώμης* (Tetral. i. γ 3) twice discussed, but without any reference to *ἀποπληῖσαι τῆς γνώμης τὸ θυμούμενον* in Thucyd. vii. 68, or to other similar Thucydidean usages. On p. 48 we read that this genitive is to be considered as 'possessive not partitive,' but on p. 120 that it is 'partitive not possessive,' and in each passage it is translated in a corresponding manner. On p. 52 the clause *καὶ ἡ ὑπέσχετο τάχιστα* is quoted to illustrate the use of the *article* as a demonstrative. On p. 59 *ὅς* is made out to be a *direct interrogative*, the sentence *ἄξιον δ' ἐνθυμηθῆναι...ὅπως τρώω ἐρχονται ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα* (vi. 20) being cited as an example of the *direct* instead of the *indirect* interrogative form. Though acute remarks are scattered through the book, M. Cucuel has no firm hold of grammatical principles, nor does he seem to know along what lines fruitful inquiry has already been carried. From the meagre notice *e.g.* of the use of the *article* with the *inf.*, we should infer that he is unacquainted with the investigations started by Prof. Gildersleeve, and carried further by Dr. R. Wagner. In short, the tabulated results would throughout have been more instructive and significant if the author had been conversant with the labours of other workers in a similar field and with the development of Attic syntax as a whole.

S. H. BUTCHER.

Demosthenes, Philippic i., Olynthiacs i. ii. iii. With Introduction and Notes by EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., and P. E. MATHESON, M.A. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1887. 3s.

THIS edition is one which, though on a small scale and designed it would seem primarily for school use, implies a thorough study of Demosthenes, of his age, and of his critics. It is not often that so much mature scholarship and learning are exhibited in a form so unpretending. The notes are written with studied brevity and self-restraint, and indeed err rather on the side of defect. It would be so much clear gain if there were more of those touches and illustrations which stimulate a scholarly curiosity and add life to the minute reading of an author.

In *Phil.* i. 7, *ἢν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἐβέλγησθε γενέσθαι*, the whole energy of the phrase (as in *Olynth.* ii. 30) is lost if its strict meaning is overlooked. It is not, as often translated, 'if you resolve to depend upon yourselves,' but 'if you resolve to be your own

masters.' The metaphor of *ἐαυτοῦ γενέσθαι* is that of emancipation from slavery—*sui iuris esse, in libertatem se vindicare*. No hint of this is given in the notes. In the same passage the expression *πάσαν ἀφελὲς τὴν εἰρωνείαν* deserves more careful comment; the presence of the *article* needs justification, and the difference ought to be indicated between the Demosthenic use of *εἰρωνεία* (cf. *Phil.* i. 50) and the more familiar use in Aristotle. On *Phil.* i. 38, *ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ὅσα ἂν τις ὑπερβῇ τῷ λόγῳ, . . . καὶ τὰ πράγματα ὑπερβήσεται*, the note stands thus: 'ὑπερβήσεται (1) *sc. tis* (2) *sc. τὰ πράγματα*, "the course of events." The second is preferable.' But this still leaves unexplained the sense of *ὑπερβήσεται*, which, not without some degree of pressure being put upon the word, keeps up the correspondence with the previous clause. In *Phil.* i. 44 the reading adopted is *οὐδέποτε οὐδὲν ἡμῖν οὐ μὴ γένηται τῶν δεόντων*. No observation is made upon this reading. Yet it is obvious that Greek usage imperatively requires the omission (with S. first hand) of *οὐ* here, which, if it could stand at all, would cancel and not reinforce the preceding negatives. The text, it is to be observed, which the editors throughout follow (except in details of punctuation) is that of Bekker's stereotyped edition (Leipzig). Though this edition bears favourable comparison with several later texts in which the authority of S. is made paramount over sense and grammar, yet it in no way merits unreserved acceptance. A clearly wrong reading is defended in *Olynth.* i. 21, *οὕτε γὰρ, . . . εὐτρεπὲς οὐδ' ὥς ἂν κάλλιστ' αὐτῶ τὰ πάροντ' ἔχοι, οὐτ' ἂν ἐξήνεγκε τὸν πόλεμον κ.τ.λ.* Here *ἔχοι* is a copyist's error for *ἔχει*, and arises from a misapprehension of the common idiom, *ὥς ἂν κάλλιστα* (*sc. ἔχοι*). The suppression of *ἔχει* would leave the sentence incomplete and meaningless. In the note, however, we merely find, 'Here the optative is expressed; it is often omitted,' with quotations illustrating the omission of the optative.

Another instance of a reading hardly defensible being upheld is *Olynth.* iii. 30, *τί δὴ ποτε ἅπαντ' εἶχε καλῶς τότε καὶ νῦν οὐκ ὀρθῶς; ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ στρατεύεσθαι τολμῶν αὐτὸς ὁ δῆμος δεσπότης τῶν πολιτευομένων ἦν, . . . νῦν δὲ τούναντίον κ.τ.λ.* Surely *τὸ μὲν πρῶτον* cannot be forced to mean 'in the old days' (as the notes say without misgiving), in opposition to *νῦν δέ*;—apart from the further difficulty in the *καὶ* before *στρατεύεσθαι*. The most probable correction is that of Rehdantz, *τότε μὲν πράττειν καὶ στρατεύεσθαι* (cf. § 33).

On *Olynth.* ii. 23, *μή τί γε δὴ*, the note is "'much less," cf. *μή τί γε, de Chers.* 27.' But *μή τί γε* in *Chers.* 27 means 'much more.' The sense 'much less' belongs to this combination of particles only after a negative clause. The statement (on *Phil.* i. 35) that *οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ* = 'haud scio an' is incorrect, as *οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ* inclines to the side of doubt, not of belief, and is therefore more nearly = 'haud scio an.. non.'

The effort after compression is sometimes carried so far as to render the notes inadequate or obscure. If four alternative constructions (of which two may at once be put aside) are offered for the genitive *πόλεων καὶ τόπων* (*Olynth.* ii. 2), we may well complain of the meagre explanation of *ῥάδιως ἔσται* (*Phil.* i. 32); 'Supply *πολεμείν*,' (but from what?); and of the vagueness of the remark (on *Olynth.* ii. 20), 'Whatever the difference between the two words (*θέλειν* and *βούλεσθαι*) *θέλειν* is commonly used with *θεός*;' and of the absence of any comment on *μὴ καλῶν* (*Phil.* i. 15), where the negative is noteworthy, or on *ἐκαστοί* (*Olynth.* ii. 28), where the normal difference between *ἐκαστοί* and *ἐκαστος* is not easy to trace.

A more serious oversight is the discrepancy of view in two passages of the notes on the subject of the

Theoricon. On *Olynth.* i. 19 we read 'After Apollodorus' condemnation Eubulus got a law passed enacting capital punishment for any one proposing this in future (*i.e.* proposing to apply the surplus to war).' The scholiast on *Olynth.* i. 1 is quoted as the authority for this fact, but the editors embody the scholiast's statement in their own summary of the case. On the other hand on *Olynth.* iii. 12 we read, 'ἀπολέσθαι of civil death, not physical. Any one who proposed the use of the theoric fund before the law was altered would be indicted by a γραφή παρανόμων, and if condemned would lose his civil rights till he had paid the fine imposed.' The latter interpretation is probably the correct one, but it is directly at variance with the former. A flaw, however, of this kind is altogether exceptional, for in all that concerns the subject-matter of the speeches—in the historical introduction, in the analysis prefixed to each speech, in archaeological details—singular exactness is apparent. Those who know the quality of Mr. Abbott's previous work will be fully prepared for such an exercise of independent judgment after a patient sifting of materials. S. H. BUTCHER.

Vetus Testamenti Graeci Codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum Textu Recepto collati ab Eberardo Nestle. Supplementum editionum quae Sixtinam sequuntur omnium, in primis Tischendorfianarum. Editio altera recognita et aucta. Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus. 1887. 5 Mk.

SINCE Dr. E. Nestle published his valuable *Supplementum* to Tischendorf's Septuagint in 1879, two important works have appeared; the sixth and concluding volume of the Roman edition of the Vatican MS. containing the Prolegomena and Commentary; and the autotype reproduction of the Alexandrian MS. Of these Dr. Nestle has made full use in his new edition. When the former edition was published, it was only possible to give the corrections in the Vatican MS. generally, without distinguishing the different hands to which they appear to be due: now he has entirely revised his collation by the help of the Prolegomena and Commentary, following the judgment of the Roman editor H. Fabiani in distinguishing the different hands, or rather classes, of corrections, found in the MS. It was impossible to do otherwise: but the imperfections of the Roman edition, valuable as it is, are well known, and the editor's account of the various hands is generally acknowledged to be more than doubtful. Dr. Nestle warns the student that Fabiani's confident identification of the scribe who retraced the text with the monk Clement in the fourteenth or fifteenth century is in opposition to the general opinion which has hitherto assigned that corrector to the tenth or eleventh century. Would he not have done well to point out further that the account of the corrections given by the Vatican editors must be accepted as provisional only, until better information can be obtained?

In the collation of the Alexandrian MS. Dr. Nestle has given some variations intentionally omitted by Tischendorf, and corrected a number of errors due to oversight on Tischendorf's part, or mistakes in Baber's edition, which he followed.

Dr. Nestle's name is a guarantee for the accuracy of the work, and the new edition of his *Supplementum* is indispensable to every scholar who uses Tischendorf's edition of the LXX.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

Plutarch's Life of Nikias, edited by Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, D.C.L. Cambridge University Press.

THE *Nikias* of Plutarch is the Greek subject for the Previous Examination of the present year 1888, and

again Dr. Holden has undertaken the work of editor, giving us a companion volume to the *Lives of the Gracchi* and of *Sulla*. All students of Plutarch, an increasing number as they bid fair to be under the stimulus of the Cambridge Board of Classical Studies, will find all, more than all perhaps, that they require; besides the notes which are of course very full and elaborate, we have an introduction which gives us a complete account of Plutarch himself and a discussion of the chief sources of information for his *Life of Nikias*—next, we have a Chronological Table from B.C. 460 to B.C. 413 of events in the life of Nikias. To the text is appended a marginal summary after the fashion now so commonly adopted by editors and so very helpful to the student. The book is well furnished with indices, one for the subject-matter, a second for the author quoted, and a third for points of grammar. Last comes 'a complete Lexical Index'; here are noted, by means of numerals affixed, words peculiar to Plutarch or to late Greek authors, words which he uses in a sense other than classical, and poetical words, (such as ἄλκιμος, ἀύλατος) to which he seems to have been rather partial. The word φοροδῆς ('highly nervous') is by an error here set down as peculiar to later Greek, whereas it occurs in Plato's *Phaedrus* (257 D), as indeed the editor himself observes on page 59. The notes are very copious and touch alike on grammar, criticism and history, and every now and then we find the errors of translators (which are pretty numerous in the version of the Greek *Lives* in Bohn's Series; let students be warned in time) exposed and corrected. In ch. i. 3, the not very clear expression ὑποπτεύειν εἰς τὸν Ξένάρχον, rendered by Liddell and Scott 'seeking shelter behind (the authority of) Xenarchos,' is very differently explained by Dr. Holden as 'dribbling into conceits worthy of X,' though he is rather doubtful. The context seems to favour his rendering; something disparaging would seem to be implied. Tolerably proficient scholars in the Greek of the classical period will often stumble at passages in Plutarch, and we should suppose that the Previous Examination as to its Greek subjects will be a trial to a good many men.

As in his edition of the *Lives of the Gracchi* and of *Sulla*, so here Dr. Holden has overloaded his notes with long extracts in illustration of the history of the time. Was it necessary to quote so largely from such an accessible book as Grote's history of Greece? This objection does not apply to extracts from Boeckh's *Economy of Athens*, a work with which an ordinary student is hardly likely to be familiar. Dr. Holden, we suppose, was determined to make his edition complete at all points, as it is to be hoped he will follow up his work with the result of Plutarch's *Lives* taking their place at the side of Thucydides and Xenophon in our schools and universities.

W. J. BRODRIBB.

Zur Kritik des Johannes von Antiochia, by GEORGIOS SOTIRIADIS. Leipzig, 1887. 3 Mk. 20.

THIS thorough-going examination of the fragments attributed to Johannes of Antioch, which were collected by Carl Müller in the fourth and fifth volumes of his *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, throws a flood of light not only on the fragments themselves but on other very important questions relating to Byzantine historiography, for example on the date of Johannes Malalas. These historians, who were both natives of Antioch, have often been confounded, and many papers on them have appeared from time to time in *Hermes* from the pens of Mommsen, Haupt, Neumann and de Boor.

Herr Sotiriadis proves elegantly and convincingly that of all the so-called Salmasian excerpts (fragments