

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' *Demosthenes Demosthenes: On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonese and Third Philippic*. With Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes by J. E. Sandys, Litt.D. Macmillan & Co. 1900. 5s.

Evelyn Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 09 / December 1900, pp 451 - 452

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082044, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082044

How to cite this article:

Evelyn Abbott (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 451-452 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082044

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Coleridge is just dead, having lived just long enough to close the eyes of Wordsworth.'

Tacitus, *Ab Excessu Divi Augusti*, i. 81.—Plerumque eos tantum apud se professos disseruit, quorum nomina consulibus edidisset; posse et alios profiteri, si gratiae aut meritis confiderent: speciosa uerbis, &c.

Tiberius' practice of producing a list of candidates for the consulship whose number, apparently, coincided with the number of the vacancies to be filled, finds a curious parallel in the life of Richard Bentley. 'At the election of scholars in 1717, he allowed none to be candidates but those previously selected by himself, and their number was exactly the same as

that of the vacancies. Some young men, not included in his list, having entered their names, he immediately ordered them to be erased. This continued afterwards his ordinary practice; and that there might be no doubt of the Master being the sole fountain of honour and reward, he gave the candidates this subject for a theme, *Nemo ex hoc numero mihi non dotatus abit*' (*Monk's Life of R. B.*, 2nd ed., ii. 28).

Nominally, at any rate, the Roman Princeps would appear to have been less autocratic in this matter than the Master of Trinity.

EDWARD BENSLEY.

*The University,
Adelaide, S. Australia.*

REPORTS.

OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

A meeting was held in Oriel College on Friday, November 2.

Mr. H. RICHARDS read a note 'On two Greek adverbs of place, *αὐτοῦ* and *ἐδῶ*.'

Mr. GREENIDGE read a paper on 'A limitation of the Tribune in the reign of Nero' (*Tac. Ann.* xiii. 28, 2). He interpreted the tribune's interference with the consuls and praetors, which was checked in 56 A.D., as a perfectly legitimate and regular employment of the veto of civil jurisdiction against the praetor's right of deciding on the competence of the courts of the municipal towns, and perhaps against the consul's right of *Komam revocatio*. He pointed out modes in which the veto, when pronounced against the magistrate in Rome, might have the effect of forcing cases to be tried at Rome when the municipal courts were

really competent ('vocare ex Italia cum quibus lege agi posset,' and he attempted to show that, if even the veto operated outside the walls, this was a necessary result of the fiction which, after the Social War, made all municipal jurisdiction a part of urban jurisdiction. He thought that the *vocare* of this passage had no reference whatever to the tribunician right of *vocatio*, but was merely a positive result of the negative effect of the intercession.

The meeting announced for Nov. 9 was unavoidably postponed.

A meeting was held in Oriel College on Friday, November 16.

PROFESSOR ROBINSON ELLIS read 'Suggestions on disputed passages of Apuleius *de Magia* and *Florida*

CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

At the meeting of October 18, part of a paper by Dr. C. TAYLOR, Master of St. John's College, on the sources of *Hermæ Pastor* was read. The thesis of the paper was that one of the main sources is *Cebetis Tabula*.

Dr. WALDSTEIN read a paper on Bacchylides xi. 43 sqq.

At the meeting of November 1, Mr. J. A. NAIRN read a paper of notes on various passages of Pindar.

REVIEWS.

SANDYS' DEMOSTHENES.

Demosthenes: On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonese and Third Philippic. With Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes by J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Macmillan & Co. 1900. 5s.

WITH this volume Dr. Sandys brings to an end his admirable edition of the Philippic orations of Demosthenes. The book has all the merits which we expect to find in the

work of Dr. Sandys: it is accurate, careful and complete; no difficulty has been passed over and no source of information has been neglected. To all students of Demosthenes the edition will be indispensable.—In Part VI. of the Introduction Dr. Sandys discusses the textual criticism of the Third Philippic. He accepts the theory of a double redaction. 'In four passages we have clear indications of a double redaction and there

appears to be no sufficient reason to doubt that, in each case, both of the alternative versions are due to Demosthenes himself.' If this is right does it not follow that in some of our classical authors there may not have been such a thing as an original text, without a *varietas lectionum*? In his text Dr. Sandys takes up a very cautious attitude toward the alterations which Blass admits in order to avoid three short syllables in succession. Thus in *De Pace* l. 41 he will not alter *πώποτε* into *πω*, and in *Phil.* 2 l. 97 he retains *ὁ τι συνοίσει κοινῇ*, yet in *De Chers.* l. 18 he cannot resist *ἐπισχοῦσιν* for *ἐπισχοῦσι* (before *περί*). In *De Pace* § 7 οὐδὲ εἰς γὰρ ἦν he observes that οὐδὲ εἰς 'must surely mean *ne unus quidem*, rather than *non unus*, which is οὐχ εἰς.' Yet 'not even one' implies, as Dr. Sandys says, that no one supported the speaker, and we get the result that no one supported Neoptolemus because he was so favourably received, and no one (apparently) supported his opponent (Demosthenes) because he was so ill received—which is strange. In *Phil.* 2 § 12 οὐδ' ἐν μὲν τῇ μεσογείᾳ τιν' ἀρχὴν εὗρηκεν τῆς δ' ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ τῶν ἐμπορίων ἀφέσθηκεν, Dr. Sandys supplies γῆς or χώρας with ἀφέσθηκεν as preferable to ἀρχῆς. But is not ἀρχῆς almost unavoidable? The word need not be translated 'empire': 'his

sphere of rule on the sea coast, and his ports' is what is meant. In *Phil.* 2, § 15 συλλαμβάνειν is read after Weil for the συμβάλλειν of the MSS. 'The Act. συμβάλλειν in the sense of making a contract is naturally (?) confined to ten passages in the *Private* speeches, in only three of which is it followed by the dative and in none by ἐπὶ.' If the word is supported by ten passages, and the construction with the dative by three, is not that enough? Why should the word be confined to the *Private* Speeches? In *ib.* § 17 Dr. Sandys reads ἡγέται after Cobet for ἡγέιρο. I take the connection to be: Philip is secure in the rest of his acquisitions, because he has retained towns belonging to Athens, and he retained them because he thought that he would not be safe in Macedonia, if he gave up Amphipolis and Potidaea. Philip's action falls in the past, and was due to what he thought in the past.....These are very slight matters and opinions may differ about them. About the excellence of this edition there can be no difference of opinion. Is it possible that Dr. Sandys may be induced to edit the three 'Hellenic' speeches, of which an English edition is certainly a desideratum?—On p. 208 there is a misprint, *Clabrias* for *Chabrias*.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

USENER AND RADERMACHER'S *DIONYSII HALICARNASEI OPUSCULA*.

Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula. Ediderunt HERMANNUS USENER et LUDOVICUS RADERMACHER. Volumen prius. Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri. MDCCCXCIX. pp. xlv, 438. M. 6.

THIS important book forms the fifth volume of the Teubner edition of the remains of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The four volumes which precede it contain the *Antiquitates Romanae*. As Dionysius himself clearly held the *History of Early Rome* to be his *opus magnum*, it seems natural enough to apply the term *Opuscula* to his essays in literary criticism. They are certainly shorter in length, and their author no doubt regarded them as inferior in value. But authors are not always the best judges of the comparative merits of their own works; and like many historians since his day, Dionysius is seen to less advantage in the great effort of his life than in his minor

writings. Historical criticism is not his strong point, and in this respect he suffers sorely by comparison with his Greek predecessors Thucydides and Polybius, whose true greatness he seems hardly to have realised. In literary criticism, on the other hand, he excels. Writing chiefly as a teacher of composition, and paying special attention to the practical needs of students of oratory, he has left behind him a valuable collection of *Scripta Rhetorica et Critica*. Such is the older and traditional title; and we may hope that it will not fall entirely into disuse. It has distinct advantages of its own. It invites no comparison between works of a different order. It is also sufficiently descriptive, since the writings in question are either rhetorical or critical, if they do not (as is often the case) partake of both characters at once.

The contents of the present volume are arranged as follows by its editors, whose