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](#)

Notes on Demosthenes. III

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 04 / May 1905, pp 200 - 202
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000421, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000421

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1905). Notes on Demosthenes. III. The Classical Review, 19, pp 200-202
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000421

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It has not been noticed that this very early variant in the Aristophanic text is probably graphical. ΚΑΒΛΑΕΠCΕΝΔΠΥ easily gave ΚΑΒΛΑΕΠΕCΙΝΔΠΥ. The fashion of writing ΠC for ψ, ΧC for ξ is common in inscriptions and has left some

traces in MSS. A well-known instance shews this: *Poetics* c. 21.

μία γίνεται ἀμφοτέρων ὄψ,
for ψ the MSS. give us ησ, that is ΠC.

T. W. ALLEN.

NOTES ON DEMOSTHENES. III.

31. 14 ὃν μόνον ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ τῆς ἐπωβελίας ἄξιον ἦν κινδυνεύειν.

As a genitive seems not to be found elsewhere with κινδυνεύω, the conjecture may be hazarded that a substantive on which it depended has been lost. We find elsewhere κίνδυνον κινδυνεύειν and κινδύνεσμα κινδυνεύειν, and such a word would easily drop out near the verb, *e.g.* immediately after it. Or περί may be missing. The genitive with φεύγειν etc. is not parallel, because there was of course no ἐπωβελίας δίκη.

34 arg. (*ad finem*). ἐκεῖ μὲν <ῆ> ἐκατέρου διαστολή φανερὰ.

The similarity of ν and η (N and H) often leads to error.

37. 4 ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις <τοῖς> ἐν Μαρωνείᾳ?

53 τινάς . . . οἳ τὸ πρᾶγμα τέχνην πεποιημένοι μήτε συγγνώμης μήτ' ἄλλου τινός εἰσιν ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ πλείονος.

Here again the genitives seem unaccountable, and something may be missing, *e.g.* μήτ' ἄλλου τινός <ῆττους> εἰσίν, if συγγνώμης ῆττων could stand.

41. 11 φιάλην μὲν γὰρ λαβόντες . . καὶ θέντες ἐνέχυρα μετὰ χρυσίων, οὐκ ἀνεηνόχασι κεκομισμένοι ταύτην . . , σκηνὴν δ' ἦν ἔχουσιν, οὐδὲ γὰρ ταύτην λαβόντες ἀναφέρουσιν.

It would be hard to interpret σκηνήν here; but, when we come to 27 παρὰ τοῦ Λεωκράτους ἔχουσιν τὰ χρυσία καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια τὴν γυναῖκα ἔλαβεν and compare 59. 35 ὅσα ἦν αὐτῇ . . περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἱμάτια καὶ χρυσία, we see it to be unnecessary, as σκηνήν is an easy error for σκευήν, to which ἱμάτια directly points.

44. 17 σκέψασθε ὡς πολλοστὸς εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἀρχιάδου συγγένειαν προσήκων.

The nominative πολλοστός seems questionable. Perhaps πολλοστῶς, as in *Ar. Eth.* 10. 5. 1176 a 29 δευτέρως καὶ πολλοστῶς.

45. 59 See *Journal of Philology* 13, 98, where I suggested ἔνεκα τῶν for κακῶν.

In 42 Reiske's μίσθωσιν for μίσθωσις and in 53 Cobet's τὰ τῆς φύσεως δίκαια (for οἰκεία)-should surely be adopted. With the latter cf. *Gorgias* 484 A ἐξέλαμψε τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον.

68 ὀκνησιέν τις ἂν προσελθεῖν πρῶτον.
Should not πρῶτον be πρότερος?

47. 4 ἀναγκάζει for ἀναγκάζοι?

48. 7 περὶ ὧν οὗτος ἡξίου ἐαντῷ εἶναι.
ἐαντοῦ?

53. 1 οὐδ' αὖ οὗτος ἄπορος ἦν οὐδ' ἄφιλος ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν ἐξευρεῖν τὸν ἀπογράφοντα.

This is well known as one of two passages in Demosthenes, where οὐ is joined with an infinitive after ὥστε not in *oratio obliqua*. The other passage I have dealt with before (see in vol. xvii. 148 my note on 9. 48). Here I should suggest οὐκ ἂν ἐξηῦρον or οὐκ ἂν <εἶχον> ἐξευρεῖν.

54. 6 ἵν' εἰδῇθ' ὅτι, ᾧ προσῆκε τοῖς τὸ πρῶτον ἀμαρτηθεῖσιν ἐπιτιμᾶν, οὗτος αὐτὸς πρότερος πολλῷ δεινότερ' εἰργασται.

For πρότερος (said by Paley and Sandys to mean *as a ringleader*, which cannot be the case) Dionysius gives πρὸς τούτοις, but that does not harmonise really well with πολλῷ δεινότερα: we should rather expect ἄλλα καὶ δεινότερα. Can πρότερος be a mistake for ὑστερον? ὑστερος could not, I think, stand. Possibly ὑστερον <οὐ> πολλῷ. That χρόνῳ δ' ὑστερον οὐ πολλῷ follows within a line or two is hardly an objection, as the reading of the evidence comes in between.

20 ἰθύφαλλοι τινές ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς συνειλεγμένοι, καὶ ἐρῶντες οὓς ἂν ἡμῖν δόξη παίομεν καὶ ἀγχομεν.

The connexion of ἐρῶντες with the verbs

seems 'grotesque. Perhaps *ἰθύφαλλοι* . . . *συνειλεγμένοι καὶ ἐρώντες*, <καὶ> οὕς ἀν κ.τ.λ.

56. 10 *πυθόμενος τὰς τιμὰς τὰς ἐνθάδε τοῦ σίτου καθεστηκυίας*.

The words *τοῦ σίτου* seem out of their proper place. Are they not an adscript from 9 above, *αἱ τιμαὶ τοῦ σίτου ἐπ' ἔλαττον ἐβάδιζον*? Or should we read *τῷ σίτῳ*?

16 *ταῦτα δ' ἡμῶν λεγόντων . . . καὶ ἀξιούντων Δ. τουτονὶ τὴν μὲν συγγραφὴν μὴ κινεῖν . . . , τῶν δὲ χρημάτων ὅσα μὲν αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ ἀποδοῦναι ἡμῖν, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων ὡς ἐτοίμων ὄντων κριθῆναι . . . , οὐκ ἔφη προσέχειν Δ. τούτων οὐδενί*.

Kennedy follows Schäfer in taking *ἐτοίμων* as neuter and translating it *certain*, as against Reiske who says it is *positum in bivio* and = *ἀξιούντων ἡμῶν Δ. κριθῆναι* (*id est ἔάν κριθῆναι*), ὡς ἐτοίμων ἡμῶν ὄντων κριθῆναι. No doubt Reiske is right in making the word masculine. Omit ὡς as having arisen from the *ων* preceding, and all difficulty disappears, *ἐ. ὄντων* being parallel to *ἀξιούντων*.

προσέχειν should be *προσέξειν*. [In Blass' text *κάν* just below is apparently a misprint for *κάν*.]

57. 7 *τὸ γὰρ εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα πάντα λέγειν τοῦτ' ἐγὼ ὑπολαμβάνω, ὅσα τις . . . πέπονθ' ἀδίκως ἐπιδείξει*.

I do not see how these two things can be identical. Read *τοῦ γάρ*.

44 Blass is certainly wrong in adopting *ψηφίσαιθε* from Lambinus without any MS. authority and leaving the nominative *μηδεὶς κ.τ.λ.* without construction. What Schäfer says is perfectly true, I think, that *μηδεὶς* really stands for *τις*. *τις* has become a negative under the influence of the *μηδενί* following it and of the tendency to double and emphasise a negation. *εἴ τις, μηδενὶ τούτων ἀμφισβητῶν . . . , ψηφίσαιτο* is what the orator had in his mind.

59. 105 *ἔπειτα τοὺς δοκιμασθέντας ἀναγραφῆναι ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τῇ θεῷ*.

στήναι?

61. 43 *καίτοι τινὲς ἤδη καὶ δι' εὐτυχίαν πραγμάτων γυμνασθέντες ἐθανμάσθησαν*.

As in 31. 14 and 37. 53 above, so here the genitive seems to have lost the word which governs it, though here possibly the error may be different. A few lines before we have *τὴν μὲν ἐκ τῶν πράξεων ἐμπειρίαν*

γυγνομένην, which suggests *πραγμάτων <ἐμπειρία> γυμνασθέντες* or something similar.

54 *δὲ ἃ δεῖ σε τῶν ἐπαίνων ἄξιον εἶναι δόξαντα καὶ μὲ τῆς σῆς φιλίας ἀνεπιτίμητον ποιεῖν*.

Again a dubious genitive. Any real parallel can only be found in poetry, e.g. *ἄθικτος ἡγητήρος. τῆς σῆς φιλίας <ἐνεκ'> ἀνεπιτίμητον*?

Prooem. 2. 3 *τὸ δὲ μὴδ' ὅτι οὐκ μεταλαμβάνειν τὸν δῆμον ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀντιπράττοντας περιεῖναι κ.τ.λ.*

The drift of the whole passage seems to require some such word as *αἰεὶ* or *πάντως* with *περιεῖναι*.

26. 3 *ἀθῶους τοὺς κινδύνους ποιήσουσιν αὐτοῖς*.

Such a use of *ἀθῶος* is unparalleled. Should we read *ἀθῶους τοῦ κινδύνου ποιήσουσιν αὐτούς*?

29. 3 *τοῦτο δὲ, τοῦτο*.

Reiske was practically right in *τοῦτο δὲ ταυτό*, but the regular order is *ταὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο*.

33. 2 *οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῷ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς μὴ δυνήσεσθαι θαρρεῖν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ κἂν δύνωνται κρατήσιν*, and 3 *ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ ἀποτρέψομαι λέγειν ἃ δοκεῖ μοι, καίπερ ὁρῶν ἡγμένους ἡμᾶς*.

The absolute use of *δύνασθαι* and still more that of *ἡγμένους* are strange. I conjecture something like <*φαύλως*> *ἡγμένους* (as in *Or.* 13. 15 *ὅταν ὑμεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, φαύλως ἡγμένοι κ.τ.λ.*) and *τοὺς ἐχθροὺς <ἐπιέναι> μὴ δυνήσεσθαι*.

33. 2 *καὶ γὰρ ὡς δικαιοτάτοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐστὲ πολλ' εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐώρων καὶ ὁρῶ, καὶ ὡς ἀρίστων προγόνων, καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα*.

Something like *πόλλ' <ἀν ἔχων> εἰπεῖν*, or *πόλλ' <ἐνόντ'> εἰπεῖν* would seem more likely.

34. 1 *πάλιν ταῦτ' εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν οὔτοι λαβόντες τούτων κατηγορήσουσιν*.

λαβόντες, which Kennedy translates (with *ταῦτα*) *take the same course*, can hardly be right. I would suggest *ἀναβαλόντες* *having deferred*. To avoid hiatus this should be put before *οὔτοι*, and then we see that the *ανα* may have been lost after the *αν* of *ἐκκλησίαν*.

39. 3 *βουλευθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ παροξυνθέντων τῷ γεγεννημένῳ*.

There is nothing in the context to be

supplied with *βουληθέντων*. Has not an infinitive been lost?

53. 4 καὶ <τοῦ μὲν> γελάσαι . . μετέδωκαν ὑμῖν?

55. 1 ἐν οὐδέποτε' εὐτυχῆσαι τοῦτο νομίζω.

Should we not write οὐδεπώποτε? In prose οὐδέποτε is usually, if not always, future or present.

Letters. 1. 3 ἔστιν μὲν οὖν ἔργον ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς ἐμμεῖναι συμβουλῇ· πολλοῖς γὰρ εἰώθατ' ἀπαντᾶν ὑμεῖς πρὸ τοῦ περιμεῖναι μαθεῖν.

ἐμμεῖναι συμβουλῇ can hardly be right,

the sense needed here being only *giving advice*. It has arisen, I think, from the *περιμεῖναι* which follows in the next sentence, and which would have prevented the writer from using *ἐμμεῖναι* here, even if it were suitable. The true word need not have resembled *ἐμμεῖναι*, and some other case of *συμβουλή* may have followed.

2. 7 δι' ὁμιλίας πείσαι προσέχειν αὐτῷ τὸν νοῦν ὡς βούλοιο.

προσέχειν has no distinct subject, and on the other hand ὡς βούλοιο is otiose and weak. Read therefore οὗς for ὡς.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ON LITERARY ASSOCIATION, AND THE DISREGARD OF IT IN 'LONGINUS.'

THE author of the treatise 'On the Sublime,' whatever was his name and date, is justly reputed one of the best representatives of ancient criticism. All the better does he illustrate a strange and characteristic defect of it, by repeatedly ignoring the possibility, or even the certainty, that a striking word, phrase, or sentence, which is not in keeping with the style of the context, was chosen by the writer for the sake of its literary associations, and owed its effect, the effect of a quotation, to the very fact of its peculiarity.

Let us illustrate this familiar principle by the first example that comes to hand.

'America, gentlemen say, is a noble object. It is an object well worth fighting for. Certainly it is, if fighting a people be the best way of gaining them. Gentlemen in this respect will be led to their choice of means by their complexions and their habits. Those who understand the military art will of course have some predilection for it. Those who *wield the thunder of the state* may have more confidence in the efficacy of arms. But I confess, possibly for want of this knowledge, my opinion is much more in favour of prudent management than of force,' etc.

The pompous phrase here italicized instantly catches the ear, as incongruous with the studied and ironical simplicity of the passage. And therefore in Burke we should suspect, even if we did not know, that it is a quotation, and that the source of it will be worth examining. It comes of course from the famous couplet of Pope,

Argyle, the state's whole thunder born to wield

And shake alike the senate and the field ;

and it depends upon this origin for its meaning. Not military men merely, but military orators, soldiers speaking in Parliament, the opponents of conciliation with America, are 'those who wield the thunder of the state'; Burke is sneering at the violence of their declamations. But it is by Pope, by the context in Pope, and not by the context in Burke, that the innuendo is explained; and in the incongruity of style, as directing the memory to Pope, lies the principal merit of the passage. What would be said of a critic who, ignoring all this, were to tax the incongruity as a fault in the orator?

Yet this is what 'Longinus' does again and again. He ignores the possibility of quotation, not only where there is a presumption in favour of it, but where his own citations, if the idea had occurred to him, are sufficient to prove it. And in some cases, perhaps in all, he is following precedent, an established error of criticism and common to the stock.

'A hazardous business . . . is periphrasis, unless it be handled with discrimination; otherwise it speedily falls flat, with its odour of empty talk and its swelling amplitude. This is the reason why Plato (who is always strong in figurative language, and at times unseasonably so) is taunted, because in his *Laws* he says "that neither gold nor silver treasure should be allowed to establish itself and abide in the city." The critic says that if he had been for-