

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](#)



Griechische Geschichte, von Ernst Curtius. *Erster Band; Bis zum Beginne der Perserlcriege. Sechste verbesserte Auflage.* Berlin, 1887. 8 Mk.

A. H. Cooke

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 1-2 / February 1888, pp 34 - 35

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191991, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191991

How to cite this article:

A. H. Cooke (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 34-35 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191991

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of property was not effected by this means. From the earliest times there were rich and poor Spartans, and (as Aristodamus said, *χρήματ' ἄννηρ*) honour went with riches; for from these richer Spartans the members of the *γερουσία* were elected (§ 89). Susemihl (Arist. *Pol.* n. 322^b, cf. n. 1264), it is true, combats the opinion that there was a kind of superior nobility at Sparta, and points out that the office of *γέρων* was looked upon as *ἄθλον τῆς ἀρετῆς* (cf. Demosth. xx. 107), and that, therefore, *καλοὶ κάγαθοί* must mean 'the best fitted'; yet, if this were the meaning of the phrase, how could Aristotle compare the Spartan *γερουσία* with the Cretan *βουλή*, the latter consisting of ex-cosmi, and the cosmi being elected *ἐκ γενῶν τινῶν*? As regards the class of people qualified to be archons by Solon's reforms, Busolt occupies a kind of middle position. He neither follows the generally-accepted view, that any member of the first property-class was eligible, nor does he accept Landwehr's suggestion that Eupatrids alone, irrespective of property qualification, could aspire to the office (a view which is clearly at variance with Pollux, viii. 85). Busolt (as did Niebuhr) holds that only Eupatrids of the first property-class were eligible (§ 125); then by the compromise after Damasias (whom he places after Solon) four archons were to be elected from amongst the Eupatrids, and three and two from the *ἔπικοι* and *δημιουργοί* respectively, an arrangement which lasted but one year. The archons had not to undergo a *docimasia* before becoming members of the Areiopagitic senate (§ 187), for they were members of that body already as archons (Lipsius, *Leipziger Studien*, iv. p. 151 foll.). Busolt says (§ 157) that in 445/4 a *diaphephisis* was held, and that a large number of persons were struck off the registers and sold into slavery; and in note 9, that the law which is ascribed to Pericles had always been in force, *μόνον Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δυνεῖ Ἀθηναίων γεγονότας*. But facts are surely against this view; Cleisthenes (his mother was betrothed by her father to Megacles *νόμοισι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίων*, Herod. vi. 130), Cimon, Themistocles, &c., all *μητρογένεοι*, enjoyed full civic rights; hence Busolt supposes that in each case civic rights were specially granted by a popular decree. This is in itself improbable, and it is made still more so by the law quoted by Harpocration, s.v. *ναντοδίκαι*, from Craterus' *Pseph.* book iv. In my opinion Duncker has convincingly proved that no such law as quoted above was in force before 403 B.C., and then it was passed with the amendment *τοὺς δὲ πρὸ Εὐκλείδου ἀνεξέταστους ἀφείσθαι*. Besides, it was only in case of a person not acquiescing in the verdict of the *demotae*, and appealing to a court of justice, that, if judgment there also went against him, he was sold as a slave.—H. HAGER.

In Professor Butcher's notice of Weil's *Demosthenes* no mention is made of Lipsius's paper in *Leipziger Studien*, vi. p. 317 foll. This paper contains the very evidence which Prof. B. would accept as conclusive against the speech *contra Aristog.* i. being by Demosthenes, viz. proof of 'archaeological inaccuracies' (in point of law).

Griechische Geschichte, von ERNST CURTIUS. *Erster Band; Bis zum Beginne der Perserkriege. Sechste verbesserte Auflage.* Berlin, 1887. 8 Mk.

As compared with the edition from which the English translation of Prof. Ward was made, this new edition of Prof. Curtius's great work shows large and important additions, corrections, and modifications of his

previous views. The author maintains his theory of the Ionic migration, a theory which Busolt considers so untenable that he refutes it by a single reference in a footnote (*Griech. Gesch.*, Teil. I., p. 35, n. 1). He carefully rewrites (p. 29) the paragraphs dealing with this important point, adding the islands besides the coast-land of Asia Minor to the original home of the Ionian race, and maintaining that the eastern character seen in early Greek culture is inexplicable except on his theory. The history of the relations between the Greeks of Asia Minor and the Phoenicians (p. 40) is rewritten, and the strong opposition between the two races more clearly brought out. The early connection of the Greeks with Egypt is entirely rewritten; the theory that, in the 16th and 15th centuries before our era great bodies of maritime Greeks were settled under Egyptian sovereignty in the land of the Nile appears to be given up. The paragraphs dealing with the Carians (p. 45) are recast: they are regarded as the 'link between Phoenicia and Greece.' The progress of modern investigation into comparative religion has led to many additions. While juster weight has been given to the indigenous origin of much of the Greek religion, we find much fresh matter on the introduction of eastern divinities in Greece, and the changes they underwent in the process of becoming Graecised (pp. 48-59). The paragraphs about the Lycians (pp. 72-75) are rewritten and largely added to. 'Seven-gated' Thebes is regarded (following the theory of Brandis put forward in 'Hermes') as closely connected with Babylonian worship of the sun, moon, and planets, which took root under Phoenician influence in Boeotia (p. 81).

Passing on to the history of the Peloponnese we find that the entrance of the Dorian migration *vid* Naupactus is now only regarded as 'extremely probable.' On p. 116, last par., a misprint of 'ein' for 'kein' makes nonsense of an important passage. No change is made in the history of the Dorian immigration and the first settlement in Laconia. With regard to the Spartan kings, two significant omissions are the sentences which used to run: "neither of them is Dorian," and "we are left to suppose the other to have been connected with the ancient Aeolic princely house of Laconia." Additional matter is introduced touching the Spartan *γερουσία* (p. 175), and the fact that the two kingly lines are Agidae and Eurypontidae, not Eurysthenidae and Proclidae (p. 167). The passage dealing with the land of the Spartiatae is entirely rewritten; the author now seems (p. 177) to regard the Lyncrgean division of land as the result of a centralising of military power in one camp at Sparta, and the despatch therefrom of 'military colonies' on a new basis. He now takes 4,500 instead of 9,000 as the number of the *κλῆροι*. The disturbances under Polydorus and Theopompus receive a different explanation. Instead of being largely referred to the question about the Parthenii, they are regarded (p. 195, f.) as due to a tension between kings and commons, the result of the greater power each had acquired during the First Messenian War; kings and pure Dorians being opposed by the Achaean element in the state.

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are definitely referred (p. 224) to the 10th century B.C.; developed in Ionic schools of song in Asia Minor after the confusion of settlement was over and the cities had secured their independence of the barbarous tribes of the interior. Important additions are made (p. 230) to the question of early coinage, and it is shown how Asia Minor first introduced money into Greece from the East, while the connection between the Greek and Babylonian standard of value is clearly brought out.

The history of Pheidon of Argos is entirely rewritten with additions, the later date (669 B.C.) of his conquests is maintained, Grote placing him about 748 B.C.

Coming to the history of Attica we find (p. 289) an omission supplied with regard to Eleusis, "which always, even in later times, maintained an independence of a certain kind and ranked as a town." The question of the four Ionic tribes (p. 293) is not quite so dogmatically treated as heretofore; their origin is allowed to admit of doubt, while the view now favoured is that they were connected with the ancient Ionic tetrapolis in N. Attica. The successors of Codrus are regarded (p. 296), not as regular monarchs, but as being the leading members of the family to which they belonged, which, like the Bacchiadae at Corinth, was collectively at the head of affairs of state. The title of Prytanis is now mentioned as belonging to these "life-long presidents of an oligarchical republic." On p. 300 we have for the first time the mention of the term *ἄποικοι*, and of the fact of the houses of the Eupatridae being round the *ἀγορά*. It is well pointed out (p. 302) how the Draconian legislation affects the question of the state taking over from the individual the duty of the avenger of blood; the duties of the Ephetae and their different courts are better defined.

The religious aspect of the early reforms of Solon is dwelt upon; common Apollo-worship was opened out to the whole state, with a consequent widening of full Athenian citizenship: the parallel case of the *plebs* at Rome is compared (p. 312). The coinage question under Solon is more fully treated (p. 317); it was the adoption of the Asiatic or 'Euboic' standard of gold coinage, and the reduction of the silver coinage to the same standard. Thus it was not a mere debasement of the coinage but a readjustment of the standard for both metals. The Senate of the Four Hundred, which was curiously neglected in previous editions, is now (p. 326) more fully dealt with; it is regarded as a fusion of the old State Council with the Naucrariae, who are mentioned by Herod. in connection with the history of Cylon. Important additions are due to the new Berlin papyrus fragment. Curtius thinks that the landed proprietors and artisans living away from Athens found the Solonian reforms a mere empty show. Efforts were made to prolong the annual archonate, in order to gain time to carry through a new political programme; these efforts succeeded nine years after Solon in the archonship of Damasias, who was elected for two years in succession (584-3 B.C.). The claims of the citizens, as opposed to the nobles, to take part in the archonate were not to be withstood, and the famous subdivision of office took place (p. 337-8).

A good many new points are brought out in the history of the Alcmaeonidae (p. 324, f.), and of Pisistratus. The final conquest of Salamis and the founding of the first Athenian *κληρουχίαι*, the history of Lesbian politics and the date of the conquest of Sigeum appear not to have been dealt with before. The author now adopts the view that the Homeric poems were not committed to writing before the time of Pisistratus (p. 362).

There is not much change in the chapter on Greek colonisation. The early history of Coreya is expanded, and the colonisation of Sicily is in part re-written. In the famous chapter on the unity of Greece there are important additions on the Greek romantic art as derived from Eastern sources (p. 464), the plan of the pentathlon (p. 486), the derivation of and changes in the Greek alphabet (p. 501), and the characteristics of the different schools of art (p. 530, f.).—A. H. COOKE.

The Odyssey of Homer. Done into English verse. Vol. II. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Reeves and Turner. 12s. 6d.

It could not be expected that Mr. Morris's second volume should be substantially different from his first. He has made up his mind as to how Homer should be translated, and the censures of the critics are not likely to change it. It would not be profitable to argue the matter any more. He has not himself condescended to justify his style, but his admirers contend that as Homer wrote in a dialect which cannot be assigned to any one place or tribe or time, so his translator must use a kind of English that has never been written or spoken. This contention may be safely left without discussion to the judgment of reasonable people. We shall address our very brief criticism to two points. 1. Is Mr. Morris's use of his own peculiar phraseology correct? One instance will suffice. Supposing we allow such strange phrases as 'heart-up,' 'toil-stout,' 'flatling,' 'Cloud-pack's Herder,' can we accept 'bow well shaven' for *τόξος ἔξθος*? 'Well shaven' has a definite meaning in English, and that meaning is not 'polished,' which is of course the signification of *ἔξθος*. Mr. Morris's hatred of Latin words leads him here into a ridiculous misuse of language. 2. Does he translate rightly? In xxi. 4, we find *ἀέθλια καὶ φόνον ἀρχὴν* used predicatively of *τόξον πολὺν τε σίδηρον*, Mr. Morris translates 'For the birth of strife and murder,' clearly misconceiving the meaning of *ἀέθλια*. In ll. 113-6 of the same book we have:—

καὶ δὲ κεν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ τόξου περὶρσαίμην
εἰ δὲ κεν ἐντανύσω, διοίστευσω τε σιδήρου,
οὐ κέ μοι ἀχρυνμένω ταδε δάματα πότνια μήτηρ
λείποι ἄμ' ἄλλω ἰούσῃ.

This Mr. Morris translates:—

Yea, I myself will try it, this deed of the bow to do,
If haply I may bind it and shoot the iron through.
Then my mother beworshipped shall leave me, and I
with no sorrow of mind,
When she goes from this house with another...

He does not recognise that *εἰ δὲ κεν ἐντανύσω* is the protasis to the apodosis *οὐ κέ μοι ἀχρυνμένω*, but makes it a dependent sentence on *περὶρσαίμην*. In 302 again we hear of Eurytion that, mutilated by the heroes.

ἦεν ἦν ἄτην δόλων ἀσιφρονι θυμῷ.

This is translated:—

'he wandered from part unto part,
Bearing the sin and the sorrow of the folly of his heart.'

ἄτην is the burden, the Nemesis of his sin, and *ἀσιφρονι θυμῷ* refers not to the folly which prompted his crime, but to the dotage into which he fell. As Messrs. Butcher and Lang put it, 'he bare about the burden of his sin in foolishness of heart.' We have not thought it worth while to pursue the inquiry any further.

The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles. Translated by SIR GEORGE YOUNG. (Deighton, Bell & Co.)

THERE are many signs that this translation has suffered by being detached (as the preface informs us) from the complete translation of Sophocles of which it will form a part, and cast rapidly into print to meet the occasion, *i.e.* the performance of the original at Cambridge. It has vigour and force enough to make it readable, but it lacks everywhere the final touches: in Cicero's phrase, *manus extrema non accessit*. . . . *praeclare incohata multa, perfecte non plane*. When the translator thoroughly revises his whole work, he will no doubt eliminate such casual rhyming couplets