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](#)

Wedd's Edition of the *Orestes* *The Orestes of Euripides* edited with Introduction, Notes, and Metrical Appendix by N. Wedd, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. The University Press. 1895. 4s. 6d.

E. B. England

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 07 / October 1896, pp 344 - 346

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204617, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204617

How to cite this article:

E. B. England (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 344-346 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204617

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

can sue him *ad exhibendum* and thus regain his property. Paul in *D. vi. 1, l. 23, § 5* uses *dominus* of a handle in such a condition, and *vere fuit* means no more. He is owner but cannot for the time vindicate. If the handle were ferruminated, the case were different: the handle is for ever part of the cup, and even if separated does not revert to its former owner (*ib.*, cf. also *xli. 1, l. 27, § 2*).

l. 31. This law appears to have puzzled Mr. M. and yet I suppose he has referred to *D. iii. 4* though his reference is wrong. I have no doubt that *de ceteris rebus publicis* means other communities than that of a municipium; and that *societates* refers to the large public companies (cf. *D. xvii. 2, l. 59*). I see Savigny takes this view (*System* § 87, note *e*; § 88, note *h*).

l. 52, § 11. Mr. M. is not unnaturally puzzled by the decision in the case of the wheat-dealer. But I think '*nomine ejus*' does not mean 'using his name' but 'on his account'; and the wheat-dealer did not take sufficient care to ascertain this fact. This is practically the gist of the words '*non enim mihi negotium sed sibi siliginarius gessit.*' 'He was not, as it happened, acting for me but for himself,' like a banker who pays a forged cheque.

ib. § 12. Mr. M. in his comments seems not to have considered the possibility of the man who got the slave out of custody being perfectly honest in believing the slave to be his own. The fact of his giving sureties shows him probably not to be a mere thief.

l. 54, § 3. This is another of the sections in which Mr. M. shows an imperfect conception of the principle on which the *actio furti*

is granted. It is limited to cases in which the plaintiff holds the thing as owner or by consent of the owner (l. 86). A voluntary *negotiorum gestor* is of course liable to him with whose business he has chosen to intermeddle; and by the cession of the owner's action he may obtain compensation for what he has to pay: but it is entirely for the owner to say whether he will use the action himself or not. A mere volunteer cannot occupy property where he chooses, and have an action for theft if the property be stolen. That is the owner's right, or the right of those to whom he gives a legal and responsible position in reference to it.

There are other sections on which I have noted some disagreement with Mr. Monro's views, but I have said enough, and perhaps more than enough, for the readers of this *Journal*. May I plead that the *Digest* is one of the most important literary monuments of the world and lies at the foundation of most civilized legislation? For us now in England it is chiefly matter for antiquarian study: its students are not as numerous as are found for Homer or pre-historic monuments, but perhaps all the more on that account respect is due to those who, like Mr. Monro, honestly and capably try to make rough places smooth, and to shed light on the somewhat hurried but most precious and fruitful labours of Tribonian. He has preserved to us a building which would otherwise have perished, and, if he adapted it to the practical wants of the time, he has in so doing freed it from much that otherwise would have hindered its continued life.

H. J. ROBY.

WEDD'S EDITION OF THE ORESTES.

The Orestes of Euripides edited with Introduction, Notes, and Metrical Appendix by N. Wedd, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. The University Press. 1895. 4s. 6d.

It is to be hoped that this excellent book will be largely used. The chief of its many merits seems to me to lie in the introduction, which treats in a masterly way of the poet's attitude towards his subject, showing how in the matter of bloodguiltiness the public for which he wrote had 'become more moral than its gods,' and how the large space which the difficulties of the moral problem occupied in the poet's mind led him

to 'sacrifice art to ethics.' It concludes with some useful remarks on the 'bearing of the play on contemporary events.'

Of the explanatory notes, too, there is little but good to be said. They are a thorough and scholarly guide to the text. Perhaps too many *alternative* interpretations are given. One could almost imagine that an inexperienced learner would thereby be encouraged to think that in Greek ambiguity was a virtue.

Critical questions are only slightly touched. The metrical appendix gives Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt's schemes of the choric passages; the necessary alterations having been made where the reading adopted is not that

adopted by Dr. Schmidt. The best argument in favour of such an addition to a school-book is that *if* a learner takes the trouble to master the notation and terminology, he will have learnt a good deal about Greek choric metres. On the other hand when a sceptic finds that the elaborate scheme will only suit one text and one arrangement, and that other books give other texts and other arrangements of lines, he will perhaps proceed to ask his teacher some awkward questions: *e.g.* how it is that in v. 179 the last syllable of *δόμον* which ends the v. (the next v. begins with a vowel) is represented in the scheme by □ (a *μακρὰ τετράχρονος*) followed by Λ (a pause equivalent to)? The only answer is: 'the other feet in which we have arranged the line have five short syllables, so we must call this *one* short *five* short, or the equivalent.'

For the rest, I will gladly take the opportunity of discussing with the author a few points in the notes on which I cannot unhesitatingly accept his views. L. 54 *λιμένα* ... *ἐκπληρῶν* (*πλάτῃ*) W. 'filling (with his fleet)' as an alternative to Porson's 'traversing (with oars)': better still Heath's explanation: 'explere portum = explore navigationem: so = 'reach.' 182-6 the two alternatives which in translating *στόματος*... *ἄπο* or *ἀπὸ λέχους* (*χάριν*) render the latter phrase by '(the boon) which the couch gives' or 'issuing from the couch,' seem much inferior to Porson's *ἀπὸ λέχους* 'away from the couch.' The two former give two genitives awkwardly to *χάριν*. 188 *τί δ' εἶποις ἄλλο* is Schmidt's reading: it squares with the metrical scheme, but not with any MS. reading, nor with the reading which the metrical note on p. 174 leads us to expect, which is *τί δ' ἄλλο γ' εἶποις* the reading of F. 194 HA. should come before *καλῶς δ' οὖν*, I conclude from note (1) on p. xxviii. (Introd.) that the editor did not mean here to desert the MSS. 228 for *intransitively* read *absolutely*. 362f. 'See Hom. *Od.* 4, 514 for an account of the interview.' In Homer the *μάντις* was Proteus, not Glaucus. 432 *τὸ Τροία μῖσος*, *Τροία* is a doubtful correction of Musgrave's for the MSS. *Τροίας* ('bringing up against my father the hate which dates from Troy') W. transl. 'the hateful thing done at Troy.' 547 *ἕτερον ὄνομα* W. 4 'a different title'—better, 'on the other count.' The Schol. has *καθ' ἕτερον ὄνομα*. ABFc have not *δέ γ'* but *δ'*. I suspect the true reading to be *δ' ἐταῖρον ὄνομα* 'on a kindred count.' 624 *ἀμύνειν* 'used imperatively': better to take

it as dep. on *λέγω* in 622 and with Kirchh. to reject 625 which is identical with 536. The mode of death has already been mentioned by T. at 614. 860 Is it correct to talk of '*lamenting* the future'? 882 'there is a v. l. *φίλον*': not worth mentioning: a mere copyist's error, as the scholiast shows. The Schol. on 1023 (*λείπει τὸ δεῖ φέρειν*) shows that 1024 is a late insertion. It is a very instructive case, showing how interpolators dealt with apparently unfinished sentences. 1036 I have long thought that the right reading here was *ξίφει θήγειν χέρα*: for the expression cf. v. 1222 *ὀπλιζόμεσθα φασγάνῳ χέρας*, and H. F. 195 *ῥοοὶ δὲ τόξοις χεῖρ' ἔχουσιν εὐστοχόν*. 1038 It should have been mentioned that not only Klotz but a scholiast takes *τὸν Ἀγ. γόνον* to refer to Orestes: also that a schol. says that Aristophanes read *δόμον* for *γόνον*. 1051 Much better to reject the v. with Kirchh. than to torture *ἀμφὶ τοῖς ταλαιπώροις* into 'concerning us the wretched pair.' 1126 *πρόσθεν δ' ὀπαδῶν* W. 'before (killing) her attendants': better 'in the presence of her attendants.' 1129 All MSS. have *οἱ ἦ* which W. prints first occurs in Ald. 1172-4 'In this case *ἐνὸς γὰρ εἰ...σωτηρία* forms the apodosis to *εἰ ποθεν...θανοῦσιν*.' Possibly *σωτηρία* is put by inadvertence for the last word of the preceding line: otherwise I cannot understand it. W. gets out of the difficulties of the passage by giving *εὐτυχοῦμεν ἂν* an *ironical* sense: 'I should be lucky if' *i.e.* 'it is impossible that.' I think the best way to take the whole passage (vv. 1172-4) is to put a full stop at the end of 1172, taking *ἐνός* (as in 1151 *ἐνός γὰρ οὐ σφαλόντες ἔξομεν κλέος*) to mean 'one of the two objects' (just mentioned),—the dying nobly, and the taking vengeance on Menelaus. The two foll. vv. will then be a wish (or perhaps an aposiopesis). 1188 'For *δὴ τί* see on 62.' There is no note on *δὴ τιν'* in 62. 1196 Has not this verse got out of place? It comes much better after 1198. Nauck suspects it of being spurious. 1208 'With *λέχος* supply *αὐτῆς*': better *λέχος* as a usual synonym for 'wife.' 1219 Best with v. Herwerden to reject this v. It is very awkward not to take *σύμμαχος* as well as *καὶ* with *πατρός*, and this the context forbids. The line probably comes from another play. 1221 *λόγους πέμψας* 'ἔσω' by sending a message in to us': surely it is 'calling out so as to be heard within,' 'sending your voice into the house.' 1387 *σκύμνον*, and not *σκύμνον* is the reading of all the MSS. This should have been mentioned. 1478 *πρόκωπον* 'with the handle in

front,' i.e. 'towards the hand, hence, ready for action': perhaps better 'with hilt advanced' i.e. drawn (forward) out of the sheath: hence *drawn* simply, which Suidas gives as its meaning. 1510 I doubt whether 'the natural way to take this line is to regard *Μενέλεω* as governed by *κραυγὴν ἔθηκας*.' It seems to me more natural, even if we neglect the foll. v., to take *Μενέλεω* with *βοηδρομεῖν*. 1520 For *ὥστε* for *ὥς* cf. also above v. 882. 1607 'μ' is omitted in some MSS.' should be 'in all the good MSS.' 1614

I don't believe in 'death' as a transl. of *σφάγιον* here: *σοὶ σφάγιον ἐκόμισ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν* 'To thee death was all I brought from Troy.' Nor can I see any reason for deserting the M. *σοὶ* for *σέ* as W. does, following Canter. The only misprints I have noticed are on l. 6 782-6 for 982-6, on 974 *ἐν πόλει* for *ἐν πολίταις*, 1123 text? *ταῦθ'* (translated 'the same as') for *ταῦθ'*, 1628 should have a full stop at the end.

E. B. ENGLAND.

WELLMANN'S PNEUMATISCHE SCHULE.

[*Philologische Untersuchungen* herausgegeben v. KIESSLING und WILAMOWITZ-MOLLENDORFF. Vierzehntes Heft.] *Die Pneumatische Schule bis auf Archigenes; in ihrer entwicklung dargestellt* von MAX WELLMANN. 8vo. Pp. 239. Berlin: Weidmann. 1895. Preis 7 Mk.

At the time when Galen wrote his voluminous works the great impulse which medicine had received from the Hippocratic school was waning. I trust that it is not to detract in any degree from the merits of that great man to say that in his works themselves some signs of decadence are to be seen by him who reflects upon them. Next to Hippocrates himself Galen stands forth in the history of medicine as the greatest of our predecessors. But Galen's genius was too splendid! A great observer, a great experimenter, and a great and wise physician, he was also a man of enormous learning and too ingenious a philosopher. Ardent in spirit, rich in imagination, fertile in hypotheses, profuse in eloquence, Galen rounded off the undeveloped figure of truth with a splendid mantle woven of his own genius and learning; so that modest truth was hidden in embroidery. Not only so, but the embroidery was more akin to the taste of the age than to the nature of truth herself; and truth and embroidery together bulked so largely that no one dreamed of reading Galen; unless to steal from him, and the thieves stole the wrong things, the apparel and not the vital substance. So it came about that as medicine, like other knowledge, fell to pieces in the lower empire, and indeed ceased to have any productive existence, the system of Galen, based upon the Hippocratic writings, upon Aristotle,

upon his own genuine work, but artificially reared into a great and largely artificial synthesis, was well calculated, even if it had not found the shelter of the mediaeval church, to dominate medical thought, as indeed it did dominate it until the time of Vesalius and Harvey.

Now what were the beliefs of medical writers at and soon after the time of Galen?

First there were the Dogmatists who stood in the following of the school of Hippocrates, and who held the doctrine of the four elements or humours—the cold, the hot, the moist, and the dry; a classification older of course than Hippocrates. 'For Hot, Cold, Moist, and Dry, four champions fierce, Strive here for mastery, and to battle bring Their embryon atoms:' This school was a rational and even scientific school which professed both to observe phenomena and also to inquire into their laws, whether by dissection or other means. A second school was Methodism, which was satisfied to refer all symptoms and all disease to the variations of the 'strictum' and the 'laxum'; that is, to the restriction or laxity of the secretions and other fluids of the body. A third school was that of the Empiricists, who professed to be guided by obvious phenomena or symptoms only, and to repudiate all generalizing or inferential methods. This was of course no 'method' at all, but a denial of method. It is extremely difficult in modern language to put these tenets briefly in such a way as not to be misleading; however, so things approximately were with the Greek physicians of the empire. Now out of the Methodists arose the Pneumatists, who attributed to the *pneuma*, or a *pneuma* (for the word was used in more than one sense),