

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](#)



Mélanges Weil *Mélanges Henri Weil*. Paris, Fontemoing. 1899. Pp. 471. 15 fr.

J. P. Mahaffy

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 09 / December 1899, pp 447 - 448

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00079245, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00079245

How to cite this article:

J. P. Mahaffy (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 447-448 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00079245

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

733, 5, 6

ὀδῶν κονταίετς ἐπιλείπομεν ἐς τόδ' ἰκέσθαι
τῆς μοίρης· ἐτέων δ' οὐ φθόνος ἴσσοσιν.

Read αἷς ὁσίῃ 'there is no grudging of years
to the religious.'

734, 1 The letters of P suggest Μῆ ξένε
πλάτι τυ τεῖδε, if we might suppose a form
πλάτι = πλάθε 'approach,' or a perfectly
separate formation from a lost aorist corre-
sponding to τλήθι from ἔλθην.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

MÉLANGES WEIL.

Mélanges Henri Weil. Paris, Fontemoing.
1899. Pp. 471. 15 fr.

THIS collection of short papers dedicated to Henri Weil on the occasion of his 'eightieth anniversary' show in the first place how great is his influence and authority in the world of letters. Forty scholars, all of high repute, hailing from France, England, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Greece, have combined to do him honour by publishing snatches of their work in the volume. The result is such a kaleidoscope of philology that no sane critic would attempt to judge either the absolute or the relative value of these essays. All that can here be done is to say a word in description of the subjects which seem to the critic most interesting. Nor is the omission of notice to imply that the rest are not equally good in their way, and perhaps, to another critic, of even greater importance. The scrappy character of such a book seems to be unavoidable, and we have no right to complain of it. Taking the essays in the random order, in which we find them, the notes of Blass on the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus seem to be peculiarly appropriate, as a dedication to the best of living editors of Aeschylus.

Not less so is Campbell's most interesting paper on the real crisis of a Greek tragedy. The general scheme being similar to that of a Greek pediment which swells to the middle, and then declines to the end, it is this latter part, in which modern tragedy is supposed to culminate which affords most difficulties to the critic of dramatic art. What is the intention of the poet in this part of his play, as for example in the *Ajax* of Sophocles, in which Jebb places the climax here, whereas Campbell seeks it in the death of Ajax, regarding the rest as but the swell which succeeds the great storm of the piece?

Comparetti argues that the short poems of hitherto unknown form in the collection

of Bacchylides are really *dithyrambs*, and gives good reason for his opinion. If so, we have in these pieces recovered a long-lost species of Greek Literature. Couat argues elaborately that a division of the chorus into two parts was normal in all the comedies of Aristophanes. Alf. Croiset shows that cases of emancipation of slaves in war was antecedent to their service in the land army of their country, and only granted after the victory in cases of naval battles.

O. Crusius's interpretation of a papyrus fragment (Brit. Mus. CCXCV. A) with a reference to the *Melanippe* of Euripides as not from a tragedy, but some lost comedy, such as the *Gerytades* of Aristophanes, seems very plausible, and will convince most readers. Paul Girard's analysis and recension of the well known fragment of Pratinas (from a satyric drama) is very interesting. So is Gomperz' discussion on the relation of Sophocles and Herodotus. We must hurry on to the paper of Homolle, based on his yet unpublished researches at Delphi, regarding the votive offerings of Gelo, Hiero and their brothers. This glimpse into the future publication of the French school is very tantalizing, and for that reason will attract attention. F. G. Kenyon shows that Brit. Mus. Pap. CCLVI is not a fragment from one of the orators, but a rhetorical exercise. Jules Nicole gives an account of another papyrus fragment on the adventures of Leda. H. Omont's Inventory of the treasures of the Monastery of Stronmnitza in Macedonia would be most instructive if he had given us the least hint how many, if any, of the books and ornaments are now extant. M. Jules Oppert applies his matchless oriental knowledge to vindicate and explain the account of the Persians in Herodotus, which he regards as perfectly honest and genuine, though the historian was misled by his informants on some points. A vindication of Herodotus by such an authority is very welcome in these latter days of scepticism. Perrot

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