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](#)

Morris's First Book of Thucydides *Thucydides* Book I. Edited on the basis of Classen's Edition by Charles D. Morris, [late] Professor in the Johns Hopkins University. Ginn and Co. 1888. \ \$ 1.65.

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 405 - 406

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191279, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191279

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 405-406 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191279

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MORRIS'S FIRST BOOK OF THUCYDIDES.

Thucydides Book I. Edited on the basis of Classen's Edition by CHARLES D. MORRIS, [late] Professor in the Johns Hopkins University. Ginn and Co. 1888. \$ 1.65.

It is almost superfluous to say that a thoroughly good school edition of Thucydides may be made out of Classen's great work. Every one who has had occasion to examine the brilliant scholar's edition knows that his positive errors are but few, and that the only demerit which extends throughout his notes is a tendency to excessive subtlety. From an adapter all that is required is that he should correct mistakes and add the results of recent research. These requirements were on the whole well met by Professor Morris, who, himself possessing those linguistic gifts which are the common birthright of German and American scholars, made many valuable additions to the commentary. The critical notes are, according to the American system, placed in an appendix: but there is little chance that they will be read there by young students; and we hold that the right arrangement for an author whose text is full of corruption would be to place the text with critical footnotes in one volume and the explanatory notes in another. This ideal will scarcely be attained in this country by the time that Greek disappears from the curriculum of schools; but in future centuries, when the second Revival of Learning takes place, and the truth of the Dutch views is recognized, we trust that it may be realized.

The references to other books of Thucydides are given here according to the lines of Classen's edition and not according to sections. This is irritating to the reader and is likely to render the references valueless to a schoolboy. And we are confident that the editors of this series will take in good part a suggestion that some parts of the commentary should receive reconsideration in a future edition of the work. For instance, in c. 5 § 2 *ὡς οὐτε ὃν πυνθάνονται ἀπαξιούντων τὸ ἔργον, οἷς τ' ἐπιμελὲς εἶη εἰδέναι οὐκ ὀνειδιζόντων*, Prof. Morris was probably misled by Classen's subtlety. 'The indic. *πυνθάνονται* implies that the question was as a matter of form always asked; the opt. *εἶη* that there might or might not be persons who would care to know.' Several passages are quoted to support this statement, but in all the indic. verb is in the imperf., not in the pres.

Here *ὃν πυνθάνονται* might have been *ὃν πυνθάνοντο* and *εἶη* is simply iterative, the meaning being 'any who cared to know' (see Kieser, *Thucydidea*, p. 13). An inferential force is in many cases ascribed to *τέ* where the existence of such a meaning is open to question. In c. 11 *ῥαδίως ἂν μάχη κρατοῦντες εἶλον, οἳ γε οὐκ ἀθρόοι...ἀντείχον, πολιορκία δ' ἂν προσκαθεζόμενοι...εἶλον*, Classen's explanation is rightly rejected. The note runs, 'The two clauses state the two natural stages of the expedition.' Most certainly they do. 'To answer *πολιορκία* δέ we might have expected *ῥαδίως μὲν*.' We should not have expected that at all; but we suspect that Thucydides wrote *μάχη μὲν*. The first *εἶλον*, the editor continues, 'may be explained with Herbst with ellipse of *τοὺς Τρῶας*.' But (1) *κρατοῦντες* already gives the sense thus obtained from *εἶλον* and (2) whether Thucydides wrote *μάχη* or *μάχη μὲν*, it is clear that both *μάχη* and *πολιορκία* belong to the second *εἶλον*, and that only one verb can go with *κρατοῦντες* and *προσκαθεζόμενοι*. On this passage, see F. Stein, *De figurarum apud Thuc. usu*, p. 19. At c. 12 we read, over a distinguished name, that *ἔσχον* is the only second aor. which appears to be used ingressively. But we submit with deference that *ἔγνων*, *ᾔσθόμην* and *ἔφάνην* have a similar use; and in c. 69 *γόνοντες* is rendered by Prof. Morris 'when they have come to the conclusion.' In c. 21 *ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων τεκμηρίων τοιαῦτα ἂν τις νομίζων...οὐχ ἁμαρτάνοι, καὶ οὐτε...πιστεύων, οὐτε...ἡγησάμενος*, where Classen's explanation required *μήτε* for *οὐτε*, we are told to take *νομίζων* as conditional, *πιστεύων* and *ἡγησάμενος* as causal. But this requires that *καὶ* should be cut out of the text, since *καὶ* joins *πιστεύων* to *νομίζων*. If *καὶ* is genuine, all three participles must be part of the apodosis, and the protasis is implied in *ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων τεκμηρίων*. In c. 29 *ἐπλήρουν*, which represents continued action, is rendered 'began to man.' We can mention but one passage more. In c. 69 *μηδεὶς ὑμῶν ἐπ' ἔχθρα τὸ πλέον ἢ αἰτία νομίσῃ τάδε λέγεσθαι. αἰτία μὲν γὰρ φίλων ἀνδρῶν ἐστὶν ἁμαρτανόντων, κατηγορία δὲ ἐχθρῶν ἀδικησάντων*, Classen's note overlooks the fact that *κατηγορία* is not in place of an elucidation of *ἔχθρα*, but is quite properly an elucidation of the idea contained in *τὸ ἐπ' ἔχθρα λέγεσθαι*.

The notes on the text are full of interest, but contain none of the recent results with regard to Thucydides' employment of Ionic

words and constructions. We set down at random a few words which call for a note in this connection : τὰ πολέμια (for τὰ πολεμικά) c. 18, ἐξαπίνης (for ἐξαίφνης) c. 21, λογάδες (for ἐπιλεκτοί) c. 62, κατεβίων with gen. c. 67, ἐκάς (for πόρρω) c. 69, δικαιοῦν c. 140 (here Classen is wrong). There are several others.

In the list of critics who reject the Ullrichian hypothesis M. Jules Girard is omitted. We conclude our notice of this good school book by stating our conviction that in ii. 2 μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτειδαίᾳ μάχην μὴν ἔκτω must be

bracketed with Steup. It is rightly remarked that we cannot discover the date of the battle at Potidaea from i. 24—62 : to get at the date we have to work back from ii. 2, and, as often, we find that the number, ἔκτω, is wrong. But these words in ii. 2 assume that the date of the battle is known. Also Thucydides would not have referred to the battle, which is outside the period within which he wishes to make his chronology exact, but to the resolution at Sparta to go to war.

E. C. MARCHANT.

ZACHER'S SCHOLIA OF ARISTOPHANES.

Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien—Mitteilungen und Untersuchungen von KONRAD ZACHER. Besonderer Abdruck aus dem sechszehnten Supplementbande der Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie (pp. 503—746). Leipzig. Teubner, 1888. 6 Mk.

THIS is a book of a very different type from the new edition of the Scholia of Sophocles which I lately reviewed in this *Review*. It is by a man whose work in different directions is known and appreciated as both painstaking and fruitful, and is itself a model of what such discussions ought to be.

The investigation is vitiated, as I believe I shall be able to show, by several serious omissions and misconceptions, but these do not prevent the book from serving the two chief purposes of all books—the conveying of knowledge accurately and lucidly and the stimulating of the minds of those who read them. In the first half of the book the various manuscripts of Aristophanes containing 'scholia' are described in the most thorough-going way. Great sagacity and common-sense are shown in grasping and explaining the indications which the several manuscript books supply of the relations between them and their originals. It is delightful and entertaining as well as instructive reading. We are carried back in imagination to the cloister in which the scribes performed their task; we learn in the clearest way their manner of working; we are made to see how in this case or in that they had only one manuscript to copy from, how such and such a scribe preferred to write 'scholia' and text simultaneously as he went along, and another liked better to write in the 'scholia' after the text was copied. Zacher can tell us also a great deal

about the manuscripts used to copy from, how the Venetus, for example, reproduces the codex from which it was copied not only in the number of the gatherings and the number of the lines of text contained in each gathering, but also in the number of lines to a page and in general appearance. He can prove that both the Venetus and the Ravennas were copied in the most mechanical way. Indeed every page is full of admirable inferences of this description. He has even been able to trace one more surprising history of a manuscript. If this is not so intensely interesting as the story of the Ravennas (it is given by Martin pp. 5 ff.), yet the identification of a Leiden codex of the *Lysistrata* with the missing portion of a Laurentian codex has still the same sort of fascination for every scholar.

Nor is this exact scrutiny of authorities confined to the best-known codices or to such as contain only pre-Tzetzesian notes. It is pursued also for manuscripts of a much later date and of less value and even for the editio princeps itself. The pages upon the editions of Tzetzes, Triclinius, and Thomas Magister are in a high degree instructive. Indeed of all this first part of the investigation a critic can have little to say but unqualified praise.

But Zacher at once enters upon more debatable ground when he comes to discuss the mutual relations of 'scholia'-carrying manuscripts and the bearing of such relations upon the question of manuscript 'scholia' tradition. I must own here to considerable disappointment. The sentence with which the book opens, perhaps I should say the first sentence of the preface, seems clearly to promise that the subsequent discussion will supply some clue to guide us through the labyrinth of 'scholia,' some