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](#)

Brief Notices *The Histories of Thucydides*. Book VI. Translated by E. C. Marchant, M.A. Bell's Classical Translations, 1s. *How to Learn Philology: a simple and introductory book for Teachers and Learners*. By Eustace H. Miles, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein. 5s. net.

W. H. D. R

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 03 / April 1900, pp 183 - 184
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082366, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082366

How to cite this article:

W. H. D. R (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 183-184 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082366

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

regret that I am unable to give a more favourable account of a book which evinces on every page the highest qualities of a

teacher, knowledge and cleverness and patience.

J. Gow.

BRIEF NOTICES.

The Histories of Thucydides. Book VI.
Translated by E. C. MARCHANT, M.A.
Bell's Classical Translations, 1s.

How to Learn Philology: a simple and introductory book for Teachers and Learners.
By EUSTACE H. MILES, M.A. Swan
Sonnenschein. 5s. net.

THERE is certainly room for a new translation of Thucydides. So far, Dale's holds the field; for Jowett's can hardly be called a serious competitor, if only for its cost. Dale's translation, with all its faults has deserved its success, for, though there are many mistranslations in it, and it has no more style than a financial circular, the student can generally get at the meaning of Thucydides with its help. Jowett, again, had a marvellous art in smoothing over rough places, so that it is often impossible to say whether or no he understood the Greek, and the style is distinctly too modern. In matters of criticism and interpretation Mr. Marchant is ahead of them both, and so far any one who has used his valuable school edition of the sixth book will be ready to trust his judgment. It is not often we find such a questionable rendering as 'they survived the battle' for *περιγενόμενοι τῇ μάχῃ* (vi., 16); and he sometimes distinctly improves upon the received interpretation, as in Chap. 77, where the last phrase is neatly turned 'a master not less shrewd, but less scrupulous' (*οὐκ ἀξυγνωστότερον, κακοξυγνωστότερον δέ*). We may mention that in this place he has been anticipated by Hobbes. As to style, the new version is undoubtedly better than Dale, and we prefer it to Jowett. This is not saying that Mr. Marchant has produced the ideal translation of Thucydides; we speak comparatively. The style is not strong enough, and we doubt if this age of commonplace correctness can produce anything strong enough for Thucydides. Mr. Marchant in his preface speaks in a slighting vein of the old version by 'Leviathan' Hobbes; but Hobbes gives the air of Thucydides better than any other translation we know. He can manage the period as Mr. Marchant

cannot do. See, for example, the end of Chap. 69, and note Hobbes's neat turn for *ἐν παρέργῳ*. Mr. Marchant has '... while the enthusiasm of the subject allies was chiefly concerned with the prospect of immediate and irretrievable ruin in the event of a defeat, though not unprompted by the hope that in return for helping the Athenians to subdue others, they might find their own yoke lightened.' But Hobbes:—'and their subject-confederates came also on with great courage, principally for their better safety, as desperate if they overcame not, and withal upon the by, that by helping the Athenians to subdue the country of another, their own subjection might be easier.' If Hobbes had had Mr. Marchant's knowledge, we need have looked no further for a Thucydides. One word to the publishers, and we have done. Why must they publish their translations so cheap? They are throwing needless temptations in the way of schoolboys. We wish they would give the whole work at six shillings, and there an end.

If we may judge from internal evidence, this book consists of a number of miscellaneous papers set and solved by Mr. Miles in his capacity as "Honours Coach in Classics and Philology." There is a rich variety in the subjects. Beginning with the Advantages of Studying Philology and the relation of the parent language to its offspring, Mr. Miles touches upon Greek Dialects, Latin Inscriptions, Grimm's Law, some General Principles in Philology, the Analysis of Words, some Sound Changes and Technical Terms, Accents and Pronunciation, and then (but not before) he explains How Sounds are Made, the history of the classical Alphabets. The last chapters are on Sémantique, Greek Particles, Textual Criticism, and Eminent Philologists, with bibliography in an Appendix. As will be seen, Mr. Miles is not methodical; we should expect the organs of speech and the alphabet to come first, technical terms and principles next, things general before details. We do not think Mr. Miles's is the

right way to learn Philology, but there is no doubt that both teachers and learners will find the book useful. There is, as Mr. Miles says, no practical introduction for those who know nothing; and if the learner will rearrange his knowledge when he has studied this book, he will certainly be able to tackle Giles's *Manual* or Lindsay's *Latin Grammar* with greater benefit. For answer-

ing critical papers this book contains a mine of information. It remains to add that Mr. Miles is on the whole conservative, and a safe guide. The book, as we have said, is not methodical, and it does not cover the ground in any one of its numerous sections; but apart from the faulty form, the matter is good.

W. H. D. R.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

SAUER ON THE THESEION.

Das sogenannte Theseion und sein plastischer Schmuck, von DR. BRUNO SAUER. Leipzig (Giesecke and Devrient). 1899. 4to. Pp. x + 274. 32 M.

THE appearance of a monograph on the Theseion at once suggests a comparison, as the author observes in his opening sentence, with the famous work of Michaelis on the Parthenon. The present work, however, is strangely different in character from that sober and careful survey of all the materials available to illustrate the subject in hand.

After a few pages devoted to a sketch of the mediaeval and modern history of the building, the author turns to his main purpose, which is to determine the subjects of the pedimental groups, and so to find a name which shall finally supersede that of Temple of Theseus. As everyone knows, there is not the smallest fragment of sculpture in either pediment, and it was only by degrees that archaeologists became aware that there was once a group at each end. At the east end there are a few holes for supports in the tympanum blocks, and bedding-marks on the floor of the pediment. At the west end there are bedding-marks only. In 1890 Dr. Bruno Sauer, whose useful studies of the floors of the Parthenon pediments are well-known, undertook an examination of the Theseion. He carefully mapped all the marks, but as he frankly tells us, for two and a half years the results seemed almost *nil*. At the end of that time he could only say of the west pediment 'The only certain fact is that no figure stood exactly in the middle' (p. 15). But then, as he goes on to tell, 'Things took a surprising and delightful turn.' As the result of prolonged study, first the east and then the west pediment

groups began to take shape and an 'abstract reconstruction' of both was proved to be feasible. By a happy chance it appeared that in each pediment, but especially in the eastern, there was a figure of a peculiar kind from which it was possible to interpret the subjects, and thereby to name the temple. 'Thus only, the temple and its sculptures had become a single whole, and conclusions were justified, which could never have been drawn merely from the extant sculptures of the nameless building' (p. 15).

After these preliminaries, the reader approaches the investigation with a feeling of profound distrust. The author begins with a minute examination of the bedding-marks of the various plinths, and considers the probable attitudes of the figures that they supported, formulating, with rather more solemnity than the case seems to require, the law that the outlines of the plinths, and therefore of the bedding-marks, conform to the *Grundumrisse* of the statues—a law, however, which he does not always observe (cf. p. 50). The crucial fact in his examination of the East pediment is that between two of the bedding marks, numbered J and K, there is a considerable space, while a cutting away of the tympanum block in the interval to receive a projecting piece of sculpture, indicates that there must have been some piece of sculpture projecting over the interval, and counterpoised by its base. Starting from this foundation, and taking into consideration two holes for metal stays high up on the tympanum blocks, the author decides that the sculpture in question must have been a *Mischwesen*, since he cannot imagine either man or beast that would satisfy the conditions. On the other hand a *Mischwesen* (say Cecrops) might uplift human hands to the level of the upper stay holes, and if it projected over its base, the human