

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](#)



Euripides, Medea: N. Wecklein. Third edition. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.80.

E. B. England

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 08 / October 1892, pp 364 - 365

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186548, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186548

How to cite this article:

E. B. England (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 364-365 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186548

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

for which he has done so much, are not those usually regarded as the periods of Greek political greatness. He has indeed a great deal to say on the politics of the decadence, and upon 'the profoundly interesting and thoroughly modern problems, which agitated the minds of men in post-Alexandrian Greece' (p. 185). Here too is one of his heresies in the eyes of matter-of-fact scholars. Extremes meet. Dr. Mahaffy takes his stand with Thucydides (the clever rhetorician) and Polybius (dull but worthy man) in favour of the 'didactic' uses of history. We are to solve modern problems in the light of ancient examples. Cicero tried it. *Should Rome have been abandoned by Pompey? Themistokles said Yes: Perikles said No.* That is the worst of precedents! As to Polybius, he might have described the institutions of Rome all the better, if he had not been corrupted by Greek analogies. Writing ancient history with modern problems dangling before one, is pamphleteering. There is however a difference in methods: and Dr. Mahaffy does not corrupt his ancient history by importing modern politics into it; he believes however that modern problems can be solved, more or less, by the light of the antique. If you would understand the true bearings of Home Rule study the history of the Achaian League. Is not this an illusion? It is difference, not resemblance, which makes history. Professor Mahaffy points out that all sceptics have their credulous side: what is his own little superstition? It is hard to take him at a

disadvantage; but perhaps the notion that history should be made 'useful' is rather a creature of the twilight, though it goes down very well at summer meetings. As a theorem or philosophema can it be quite right? It seems perilously near the notion which underlies and justifies Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*. Professor Mahaffy knows that the great men of different epochs are never very similar (p. 163) and that the practice of comparing them is not much more than an amusement. As with the men so with the epochs. But amusements are perfectly legitimate, and the practice of drawing historic parallels and proposing historic analogies is an excellent pastime, even though not a single vote will be affected at the General Election by the fate of 'Nationalists' in Achaia. Surely, far better than such devices for making 'the acts and lives of older men speak across the chasm of centuries' (p. 197) is the attempt to bridge and fill in the chasm, and restore the actual causality and continuity between Hellenism and modern Europe, between one phase of Hellenism and another. Dr. Mahaffy has done more than most people towards that very object, and must not rest content until he has completed or supplemented the goodly series of volumes in which he has traced the literary and spiritual moments of Hellenism from the cradle to the grave by the promised volume, which shall exhibit fairly the debt of early Christendom to Hellas.

R. W. MACAN.

Euripides, Medea: N. WECKLEIN. Third edition. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.80.

THE most interesting feature in this new edition of a valuable work is the Critical Appendix. Though small change has been made in the introduction or the commentary, the critical notes have been largely re-written. Not only have recent contributions to the constitution of the text been noticed, but on the basis, as the author says, of Prinz's edition more specific information as to the readings of the MSS. and the earlier criticism has been added, together with a few fresh suggestions made by Dr. Wecklein himself. Of alterations in the text the following may be noted here. v. 157 *κουνὸν* for *κένωφ* Verrall (though Verrall's punctuation of the line is not adopted). v. 184 the author suggests *μέγ' ἄλαστον* for *μεγάλως τὸδ'*. v. 503 *ἄμ' ἐσπόμην* for *ἀφικόμην* Naber. v. 717 *σ' ἄτεκνον ὄντα* for *δέ σ' ὄντ' ἄπαιδα* Kuiper. vv. 798—810 and vv. 1056—1080 the author regards as belonging to Euripides' earlier tragedy bearing the same name: noticing that whereas the children are dismissed at v. 1053 they are still present at 1069. v. 829 *φορβὰν* for *σοφίαν*—reading at the

corresponding place in the antistrophe *χώραν κατάρδειν καὶ καταπνέειν ἀνέμων ἡδυπνόους αἶρας*—the author. (In v. 829 I would suggest the possibility of reading *κλεινότατοι σοφίαν*, taking *φερβόμενοι* absolutely.) v. 910 the author conjectures *παρεμπολῶντι συλλέκτρῃ πόσει* or *τῷ συναόρῳ*. v. 976 he suggests *κούρας* for *παίδων*. (At v. 1120, where Wecklein with Prinz suspects *κακόν* and suggests *ἔπος* for it, I would suggest *ἀγγελῶν* for *ἀγγελεῖ*, taking 'he' as the subject of *δείκνυσσι* instead of *πνέυμα*.) v. 1123 Wecklein suggests *παρεῖδ'* for the hopeless *λιποῦσ'*. It is true that Jortin's *αἰτοῦσ'* comes nearer to the MSS. reading, but there is something strange about this *λιποῦσ'*. At three places in this tragedy, vv. 781, 1123 and 1263, the word is, I think, inexplicable, and would seem to have been used as a familiar copyists' stop-gap. I would suggest *μένουσ'* here. v. 1136 f. W. suggests *ἐπεὶ τέκνον παρήλαθε δίπτυχος γοῆν | σύν πατρὶ καὶ δάροισι νομφικοῦς δόμους*. v. 1146 W. suggests *ποθεινὸν* for *πρόθυμον*. (At v. 1283 where W. notices Verrall's *γυναικῶν φίλοις*, some support may be gained for the *ἐν* of the MSS. by a consideration of the *τέκνοισι σοῖσιν ἐμβαλεῖν ἕξιφος* of v. 1325.) It seems a pity that the author has not adopted

Verrall's athetesis of v. 1359 and at v. 1367 the *καὶ ἰσώρας* of P & L. It is to be noted that the second person sing. of presents and futures middle and passive is given as *ῆ* throughout. At the end of the book is a drawing of a 'Medea Sarcophagus.' There is no index.

E. B. ENGLAND.

Die aristotelische Auffassung vom Verhältnisse Gottes zur Welt und zum Menschen, von Dr. EUGEN ROLFES. Berlin. Mayer & Müller. 1892. pp. iv. 202. 3 Mk.

THE author has devoted a volume of some two hundred pages to setting forth and establishing a series of theses concerning Aristotle's view of God's relation to the world and to man. He professes to have been aided largely by the commentaries of Thomas Aquinas, and somewhat naively appeals to his own success in interpreting Aristotle as an advertisement of the angelic doctor, p. 202. It would have been a more useful service if Dr. Rolfes had gone direct to his mark, and had given a study of Thomas's commentaries *de anima* to a world which is again taking interest in scholasticism. For, to tell the truth, his book is not noteworthy as a contribution to our knowledge of Aristotle. It is difficult, for instance, to understand how the notion of creation should be attributed to a system of which two cardinal points are the eternity of the heavens, and the production of all existence from some previous actuality. Dr. Rolfes proceeds too much on the high *a priori* road, and supports himself too little by textual references. With a writer so voluminous and at the same time so compact of statement as Aristotle such treatment is inexcusable.

F. GRANGER.

Short Notes on St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians and Philippians, by T. K. ABBOTT, Fellow of Trinity College. Dublin. 1892.

THIS little book of less than one hundred pages contains some useful and interesting notes, but it is difficult to find any principle of selection or to think of any class of readers for whom it is specially adapted. We are told indeed in the Preface that 'it is intended for the use of students commencing the study of St. Paul's epistles,' but surely beginners need much more help than can be given in the space, for instance, of nineteen notes on the first ch. of the Romans; and they would be more likely to profit, if their attention had been confined to one of the easier epistles. Nor is even the small space available made the most of. Many notes are merely quotations from the Revised Version, perhaps with the addition 'R.V. is good,' 'A.V. is bad.' We should suggest that, if a second edition is called for, the book should be entirely recast, and changed into a running comment on the R.V., showing the reasons in each case for the alteration from the A.V.

1. **Das Leben des Agricola von Tacitus.** Schulausgabe von Dr. A. DRAEGER. Fünfte Auflage. Leipzig. Teubner, 1891.
2. **Cornelius Tacitus Dialogus de Oratoribus.** Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt, von GEORG ANDRESEN. Dritte verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig, Teubner, 1891.

ALL readers of Tacitus will welcome new editions of any of his works from two scholars who have done so much in so many ways to assist in the study of that author; and the works here noticed, though pronounced. LIII. VOL. VI.

fessedly school editions, contain much that more advanced students may read with profit.

Dr. Draeger's commentary on the *Agricola* proceeds on much the same lines as his well-known edition of the *Annals*, and, like that, dwells by preference on the new usages and expressions found in Tacitus, and the relation of his diction, and that of the Silver Age generally, to the older classical standard. It may indeed be doubted whether, considering the brevity of the commentary as a whole, it might not have been better to have given less space to these subjects, and more to the explanation of the many difficulties of reading and interpretation which make the *Agricola* so hard a book to young students. The addition of a map of Britain would have been also useful; but that the work as a whole fully meets the needs of those for whom it is written is shown by its having reached a fifth edition.

Dr. Andresen's work is mainly an abridgment of his excellent edition of the *Dialogus*, which forms part of the last issue of Orelli's Tacitus, but is enriched by many gleanings from the results of later scholarship during the fifteen years which have passed since that edition was published. It has also the advantage of an Introduction, which the larger work has not. It is in every respect excellently suited for its purpose, and by its reappearance now for the third time shows the *Dialogus* to be a more popular schoolbook in Germany than it has any tendency at present to become in England.

H. FURNEAUX.

Reprints from the 'Neue Jahrbücher.'

Laudationum Funebrium Romanorum Historia et Reliquiarum Editio. Scripsit et recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Leipzig, Teubner, 1891.

THE author first discusses the origin and character of funeral orations among the Romans, then gives a list of those known to have been delivered, and finally edits such as have survived with commentaries. The whole essay is useful, as putting together in a comprehensive form information not easily to be obtained elsewhere; but the commentaries have especial value, and deserve the attention of all scholars.

Hominum Litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma commoratorum Historia Critica. Scripsit ALFREDUS HILLSCHER. Leipzig, Teubner, 1891.

LIKE Dr. Vollmer's essay, this dissertation deals in a thorough and scholarly manner with a somewhat obscure, but none the less important, chapter in the history of classical literature. The reader will obtain from it a vivid idea of the influence exercised continuously during more than 300 years by Greeks upon Latin culture. A good emendation in an epigram of Antipater of Thessalonica (p. 406 note) deserves notice: *τοιαῦτα Σιδονίων ἔλοχοι* for *Σιδονίων*. In the corrupt passage Suetonius *De Grammaticis* 13 (discussed pp. 365—6), *Staberius Eros + nametra emptus de catasta...docuit inter ceteros Brutum et Cassium*, may not *nametra* stand for *natione Syrus*, if, as Dr. Hillscher thinks, Staberius came from Antioch?

DR. OSCAR FROEHDE has reprinted an elaborate paper on C. Julius Romanus (*De C. Julio Romano Charisii Auctore*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1892). It falls into three parts: (1) The passages of Charisius in which Romanus is expressly or tacitly quoted; (2) the authorities consulted by Romanus; (3) the character and scope of his work *περί ἀφορμῶν*. The conclusions of the writer are that the book *περί ἀφορμῶν*

C C