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](#)

An Appeal in Behalf of the Archiv Für Lateinische Lexicographie

John E. B. Mayor

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 08 / October 1887, pp 227 - 228

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183180, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183180

How to cite this article:

John E. B. Mayor (1887). An Appeal in Behalf of the Archiv Für Lateinische Lexicographie. The Classical Review, 1, pp 227-228 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183180

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ant readings which he has taken from that group as against his favourites *MNTV*. The number of these readings in which *CGL* have preserved the true text might, I am sure, be largely increased.

The question which affects the largest section of the text is that as to the genuineness of eighteen lines in the last chapter describing two miracles of healing wrought by the body of the saint on its entrance into Naples—neither of them of such a kind that they might not have been believed by a contemporary. The relation of these two miracles is contained in *CGL* and is wanting in *MNTV*. There are also corresponding variants in the *Capitula*: the verses in honour of Severinus imply the narrative: at the same time, as the MS. in which these are found is of the eleventh century, their evidence does not in strictness go back beyond that date, though it is probable that they were written much earlier. They clearly belong to a time when the fame of the saint was at its height.

Knoell argues elaborately against the genuineness of this section (*Sitzungsberichte*, p. 486 ff.); but here again I confess that his arguments seem to me anything but happy. He quotes a number of expressions from them which he thinks are imitations from the surrounding context: to me they seem to be not imitations, but coincidences of style which point to identity of authorship. Of the two hypotheses, in the case of naïve workmanship of this kind, I cannot but regard the latter as the more probable. And the other arguments which Knoell has advanced are of little weight.

I have found myself expressing so much dissent both from Knoell and from Hartel, whose conjectures are frequently mentioned and in several cases received, that I think it only right in conclusion to quote two examples in which they seem to me to have deserved the thanks of all scholars. There is a difficult passage, p. 28, 10, where the

MSS. have *tunc ergo qui eos* (sc. *cereos*) *posuerant diuino declarati examine, protinus exclamantes secreta pectoris satisfactionibus prodiderunt et suorum testimonio cereorum manifesta confessione conuicti propria sacreligia testabantur*. For *satisfactionibus* Hartel proposes *satactionibus* in the sense of 'agitation.' In the *Corrigenda* Knoell would substitute for this *satisfactionibus* which would certainly involve a minimum of change, as the *f* might easily come in through the doubling of long *s* in a half-uncial hand. Is it just possible that *satisfactionibus* might = 'making amends for their faults'?¹ The other passage is one in which it seems to me that Knoell has both skilfully and successfully defended the reading of the MSS. In p. 41, 17, the MSS. read *quas* (sc. *reliquias*) . . . *suscipiens basilicam sancti Iohannis . . . ultronea benedictione collata sacrauit officio sacerdotum*. Knoell explains this quite satisfactorily by observing that *officio* is dative not ablative, and that *benedictio* = 'relics': 'he consecrated the basilica of St. John for priestly ministration (i.e. the celebration of the mass) by placing there the relics which offered themselves to his hand.' By a sudden inspiration Severinus had called for a boat, and crossing the Danube found on the bank a man who was bringing to him some relics of St. John the Baptist—the very thing that he wanted.

W. SANDAY.

I learn through the kindness of M. Delisle that the missing portions of the interesting Desnoyers MS. of the *Excerpts* of Eugippius (Cod. D, saec. viii., see *Classical Review*, no. 5, p. 141) are in the possession of the Earl of Ashburnham. M. Delisle ascertained this too late for the knowledge to be of use to the editor of the *Excerpts*.—W. S.

¹ I owe to a friend the following parallels from Cyprian: 'Deum mouere satisfactionibus' (*De lapsis*, c. 36; ed. Hartel, p. 263, 27), 'Satisfactionibus immorantes et Domini misericordiam deprecantes' (*Ep.* lxxv. 4; p. 725, 13).

AN APPEAL IN BEHALF OF THE ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXICOGRAPHIE.

THE following facts need only, I am sure, to be put before the English-speaking public, in order to set this undertaking on a sound financial basis.

Professor Wölflin of Munich, the director, has not only received no remunera-

tion, but is two thousand marks out of pocket. The Munich Academy allows £25 a year towards the expenses, but that is handed over to Mr. Teubner, the publisher. Two hundred and fifty free copies are sent to the contributors, and only 280 copies are

sold. Surely England alone ought to take at least that number.

Three volumes are now complete, and cost 12s. each. Of volume iv two parts have appeared, and a double volume will this year complete the volume.

It rests with the republic of scholars to determine whether, now that the staff of workers has been collected and drilled, specimen articles published and criticised, a zealous and capable editor and public-spirited publisher found, the projected Thesaurus of Latin shall be abandoned, or whether substantial aid shall be given at once, in order to ensure its success.

To every reader I venture to say :

Buy the book yourself, and see that any library which you can influence, does the same.

Let philological societies make a substantial grant in aid. When editor and publisher have been encouraged by a steady increase of subscriptions, let them issue a prospectus and specimen of the Thesaurus itself. There can be no doubt that England will call for as many copies as any other country.

I cannot think that scholars who have not yet seen the *Archiv* know what they lose by their neglect. Many hundreds of words are there for the first time registered, and the whole method of lexicography is criticised from many points of view, so that an eye, trained by travel through these 3½ volumes, will ever afterwards search the field of Latinity with a clearer vision and a more definite aim.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Les Cavaliers Athéniens. Par M. ALBERT MARTIN.
Paris. E. Thorin. 1886. 18 fr.

It may sound rather surprising at first to hear that it is possible to write a large octavo volume of 563 pages on the *ἰππείς* at Athens. But M. Martin, as he explains in the preface, takes a wide view of his subject: 'L'Histoire des Cavaliers athéniens c'est l'histoire religieuse, militaire, politique, économique et littéraire de l'ancienne Athènes . . . envisagée d'un point de vue particulier qui permet d'en saisir mieux les grandes lignes; . . . en étudiant cette histoire particulière, on voit l'histoire générale sous un jour un peu nouveau; il est donc possible d'apercevoir parfois des détails qui n'avaient pas encore été remarqués et d'apporter sur quelques points des explications nouvelles.' M. Martin has executed this difficult programme with great ability and freshness. Undoubtedly the book has defects; there are mis-translations that engender distrust in the accuracy of the author's scholarship, there are rash conjectures, there are elaborate theories built on nothing better than an ambiguous allusion. On the other hand, M. Martin has studied carefully the material provided by inscriptions, he has worked with wonderful diligence through a mass of literature and finally collected the fruits of his labour in a very readable book. For M. Martin has a respect for literary form which is not always felt by learned men: he writes clearly and with spirit, and sometimes, as when inspired by enthusiasm for 'l'aimable figure du fils d'Exékéstide' or 'ces beaux athlètes nus,' with unusual eloquence.

M. Martin treats his subject in four books. He begins with the aristocracies which are already in the Homeric poems encroaching on the king and maintains, against Grote and Schoemann, that 'in the majority of Greek countries' the military strength of these aristocracies probably consisted of a force of chariots. The course of military development was interrupted in European Greece by the Dorian invasion which proved the superiority of heavy infantry. Only a few states were in a position to develop a cavalry numerous enough to contend against the new

tactics—hence the admitted insignificance of cavalry in many Greek states when history begins to dawn.

Passing to Attica in particular, he touches on the controversy as to the character of the four old Attic tribes without venturing an opinion except so far as to observe very justly that it seems improbable that the *Ὀπλητῆς* were a governing equestrian aristocracy. An organised force of Athenian cavalry cannot be traced before the time of the Solonian constitution, some aspects of which M. Martin proceeds to discuss, devoting to the legislator, for whom he has an ardent admiration, nine chapters and nearly a hundred pages. Of course the mutilated fragment of Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* (Landwehr, *Papyr. Berol.* No. 163. *Frg.* I. b.) comes under consideration: M. Martin inclines to subscribe to the opinion of Blass that the archon Damasias mentioned in it is to be referred to 683 B.C.: he is the *last decennial archon*, and is succeeded by *nine annual archons*, four chosen from the *εὐπατρίδαι*, three from the *ἑπιοικοί*, two from the *δημιουργοί*, but some time before Solon the *εὐπατρίδαι* managed to reconquer sole power. I think this the most cumbrous of the rival hypotheses. In the review of the work of Solon what M. Martin is particularly eager to bring to light is that one great object of the division into classes was the organisation of military defence. 'Deux services importants, celui de la flotte et celui de la cavalerie, sont organisés par le moyen de deux prestations, la triérarchie et l'hippotrophie, qui sont réparties entre les citoyens, d'après une division du territoire, les naucraries, et une division des personnes, les classes censitaires' p. 295. To put it in another way, he contends, following Gilbert, that Solon was also the author of the division of each of the four tribes into three *τριτῦτες* and twelve *ναυκραπία*, and since Pollux (viii. 108) says that each *ναυκραπία* provided two horsemen and one ship, there is given a fleet of forty-eight ships, considerable for that time, and ninety-six horsemen, which is a respectable force. The trierarchy would fall on the *πεντακοσιομέδωνοι*, the class of *ἰππείς* would be liable for service in the cavalry. Here M. Martin has greatly exaggerated the value of his evidence. He confidently pronounces that Aristotle