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](#)

Coleridge's *Res Graecae Res Graecae*. By Edward P. Coleridge, B.A. George Bell & Sons. 1898. 5s.

M. Alford

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 09 / December 1899, pp 448 - 449

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00079257, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00079257

How to cite this article:

M. Alford (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 448-449 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00079257

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

gives us a general discussion of the place of sculpture in Greek architecture, especially that of temples. The volume concludes with an acute analysis by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff of the real nature of the *versus Phalaeceus*.

These selections will give the reader some notion of the volume, in which, as has already been said, other articles may attract him more than these. The collection is perhaps of general interest as showing what the current studies of the best scholars now

are: and what courses classical philology is now adopting. The predominance of archaeology over pure philology is manifest; nor can this be surprising, seeing that the search for new material, and the sifting of it when found, absorbs the keenest intellects. Palaeography, epigraphy, the criticism of artistic fragments, for which we have not yet a proper designation—these are the branches of classical study which the rising generation should pursue keenly at our Universities.

J. P. MAHAFFY.

COLERIDGE'S *RES GRAECAE*.

Res Graecae. By EDWARD P. COLERIDGE, B.A. George Bell & Sons. 1898. 5s.

A book of this type suggests the question, 'What is its purpose?' The contents are rather miscellaneous. There are chronological tables and historical summaries (carried down, we are glad to see, as far as 146 B.C.) and these should prove a help towards an orderly knowledge of Greek history. But the 'Geographical Index' and 'Biographical Index' seem of little value unless for purposes of cramming. In most cases a more satisfactory idea of the person or place would be obtained by using the indexes of history and atlas, and any substitute that tempts the student to dispense with atlas or history is a hindrance rather than a help. *Res Graecae* further provides a good deal of various information, some of which will be found interesting and useful by those who have few books of reference. The plans of Athens in particular are considerably better than those in Gow's *Companion to School Classics*, a work which is in the main superior to *Res Graecae*, where the subjects of the two overlap. The list of authors is another useful feature. But the historical tables and summaries are the best part of the letter-press; we may mention especially those that deal with the Constitution of Athens (p. 97 ff.), Colonization (p. 72 f.) and the relations between Persia and Greece (p. 78 ff.).

There are unfortunately many inaccuracies, a particularly serious matter in a book intended for those who have little opportunity for testing the information given. τὸ ναυτικόν meant at Athens and elsewhere 'the fleet' and not 'money borrowed or lent on bottomry' (p. 121). δὲς κράμβη θάνατος

appears (p. 216) with the two last words in reversed order, so that the Greeks would seem to have declared that 'cabbage is death twice over.' The surplus at Athens after Perikles had expended vast sums on beautifying the city was not 'nearly 10,000 talents,' as stated on p. 105, but, as given on p. 125, 6,000 talents; the other sum was the total before the expenditure (Thuc. 2. 13. 3). The number of 18,000 Athenian hoplites at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (p. 113) is probably a misprint for 13,000 which is given on p. 95, in accordance with the statement in Thucydides. Discrepancies between one part of the book and another are numerous, and even in cases where different statements may have equal probability, the inconsistency tends to bewilderment. Thus the Tholos and Prytaneion are identified on p. 179, but marked separately on the plan (p. 168). Kallirrhoe is close to the Olympieion on p. 175; yet Enneakrounos (which is identified with Kallirrhoe, p. 167) appears in the plan to the N. W. of the Akropolis and no hint is given of more than one Kallirrhoe. The date of the law curtailing the power of the Areopagite Council is 462 B.C. on p. 100, in accordance with 'Aθ. πολ. ch. 25; on p. 88 it is 460 B.C. Some statements made are unintelligible or misleading as they stand. The somewhat vague account given on p. 90 conveys the impression that if a charge was declared frivolous (by whom?) and at the same time the plaintiff obtained less than a fifth of the jurors' votes, he would be liable to both the ἐπωβελία and the fine of 1,000 drachmai. This was assuredly not the general rule even if, as some scholars hold, the plaintiff did in certain cases incur the double risk. On p. 224 we find the usual distinction, which

must be approximately correct, assigning the *ἐπωβελία* to civil suits, the *χίλια* to public cases. The *πρόεδροι* are brought in on p. 86 without any explanation; and if we turn to p. 232 we find that they are the same people as the *πρυτάνεις*, which is impossible. In the map of Syracuse intended to elucidate the Athenian operations, the wall of Dionysios which would have rendered those operations impossible is marked as 'Ancient Wall,' and nothing said of its later date. Among the Greek Proverbs appears *λύκον ἰδεῖν* (p. 216) with the explanation that 'to see a wolf' meant

'to be struck dumb' because that affliction befell a man who did not see the wolf before he was seen. If it is too bold to alter one letter in the text of Theokritos, the proverb would be better away; the belief that a Greek or Roman said 'You saw a wolf,' when he meant 'You did not see a wolf,' flourishes sufficiently without encouragement. The gap might be filled by adding the Socratic *σὺν τε δὴ ἐρχομένῳ ἢ λῆξ ἤλυκα τέρπει*. And *γνώθι σεαυτὸν* ought to be in the list as well as *μηδὲν ἄγαν*.

M. ALFORD.

BOUTROUX' *ÉTUDES*, DÖRING'S *SOCRATIC SYSTEM*, AND ZELLER'S *ARISTOTLE* (TRANSLATED).

Études d'Histoire de la Philosophie, par ÉMILE BOUTROUX. Paris. Alcan. 1897. Pp. 443. 7 Fr. 50.

Die Lehre des Sokrates als sociales Reformsystem, von Prof. Dr. AUGUST DÖRING. Munich. Beck. 1895. Pp. x, 614. 11 M. 50.

Zeller's Aristotle and the earlier Peripatetics, translated by B. F. C. COSTELLOE, M.A., and J. H. MUIRHEAD, M.A. Longmans. 1897. 2 vols. Pp. xii, 520 and viii, 512. 24s.

HOWEVER dissimilar at first sight, these works have much in common to justify a reviewer in noticing them together. Of the essays on the history of philosophy which M. Boutroux has republished, one half, including a striking estimate of Kant, deal with modern philosophy and do not concern us here. There remains a study of Socrates, which invites comparison with the longer and more ambitious treatise of Prof. Döring, and an encyclopaedia article on Aristotle which may serve as a contrast to the English translation of Zeller.

It is but natural that the personality of Socrates should exercise a perennial attraction, and that from different sides attempts should be made to determine the true character of his teaching. This fascinating problem, never at any time easy, has in our time become almost hopeless owing to the divergent views held respecting the authorities. It has been the fashion to question the integrity of Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, and most of the chapters have, at one time or another, been denounced as interpolations. Krohn admitted as genuine only 26½ pages

out of 145 (counting by the Teubner text) and of these 17 would be condemned by Hartman, who however takes as his standard of the genuine Xenophontic style two chapters, II. 7 and III. 11, which Krohn has pronounced spurious. Mr. Herbert Richards has lately shown in this review how little the language of Xenophon countenances such violent excisions. Both M. Boutroux and Prof. Döring have our hearty sympathy in their reaction from this mistaken tendency of the higher criticism. Both admit that the *Memorabilia* as an apology for Socrates answers the pamphlet of the sophist Polycrates and not the indictment of Anytus. Prof. Döring thinks he can distinguish in B. II. additions by Xenophon himself of later date, but his careful and elaborate analysis of the whole treatise triumphantly establishes the unity of authorship. M. Boutroux urges that Xenophon brought to his task the fidelity and impartiality which, though often questioned, are nevertheless the characteristics of his other writings.

In their conception of the Socratic teaching our authors greatly diverge. To Prof. Döring Socrates was an ardent social reformer. He had been led from teleology to monotheism: whether consciously or not, he had ceased to be an orthodox adherent of the national religion. The public which Xenophon wished to influence would hardly have understood, much less sympathized with, the martyr in the cause of progress, the regenerator of society. Yet we may gather what Socrates' ultimate aims were from his plain, unassuming talk about