

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](#)



The New Greek Historian *L'Attide di Androzio e un papiro di Oxyrhynchos*. Nota di Gaetano De Sanctis. Torino, 1908.

E. M. Walker

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 03 / May 1908, pp 87 - 88
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00001232, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00001232

How to cite this article:

E. M. Walker (1908). The Classical Review, 22, pp 87-88 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00001232

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the Empire. Riegl and Wickhoff find in Roman art the main factor, and for both consequently Roman art is of great importance, both in itself and as a stage to the later art. The presence in the Roman monuments of certain qualities which Wickhoff discovers there is somewhat doubtful, and Mrs. Strong has not adopted his arguments without discrimination.

But however superior to Roman sculpture

we may consider Greek sculpture to be, and however little we may be willing to accept *au pied de la lettre* Wickhoff's conclusions and high commendation, it is well to weigh dispassionately his views. The student can study and appraise in Mrs. Strong's volume, more conveniently than elsewhere, both the monuments themselves, and the conflicting views to which they have given rise.

A. M. DANIEL.

THE NEW GREEK HISTORIAN.

L'Attide di Androzio e un papiro di Oxyrhynchus. Nota di GAETANO DE SANCTIS. Torino, 1908.

IN this essay Professor de Sanctis deals with the question of the authorship of the famous fragment of a Greek historian of the fourth century B.C., discovered by Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt, and published by them in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. v. He is dissatisfied alike with Theopompus, the candidate favoured by E. Meyer and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and with Cratippus, the suggestion of Blass. The new claimant for the honours of authorship is the Atthidograph, Androtion.

The argument resolves itself into a proof negative and a proof positive; and the negative part, again, may be subdivided into the disproof of the case for Theopompus, and the disproof of the case for Cratippus. With the result of the writer's criticisms, so far as they concern Theopompus, I find myself in entire agreement. I cannot but regard the hypothesis of Theopompean authorship as untenable. A much stronger case, however, can be made out against Theopompus, than is made out here. To the case as stated by the editors themselves only two additions of any moment are made. In the first place, attention is called to the well-known story of Theopompus' victory over Isocrates in 352, in the ἀγών instituted by Artemisia, which is rightly regarded as destructive of the plea for a distinction of style between the *Hellenica* and the *Philippica*. Secondly (and this is, perhaps, the

most valuable part of the essay), it is argued from internal evidence (e.g. the detailed account of the trivial incident of Demaenetus) that the author was an Athenian. It must be admitted, I think, that Professor de Sanctis has rendered this conclusion fairly certain. If he was an Athenian it follows, of course, that he cannot have been the Chian Theopompus. By far the most disappointing part of the essay is the section which deals with Cratippus. It is hardly too much to say, that the case for Cratippus is not seriously argued. Of the four passages in the writers of antiquity in which a reference to Cratippus is found, the one on which most stress is laid is the enigmatical mention of him by Marcellinus in the *Life of Thucydides*. This is regarded as proving Susemihl's hypothesis, that he was an obscure writer of the Alexandrine period. It is really almost amazing that the passage in Plutarch's *de Gloria Atheniensium*, which furnishes at once the most unequivocal and the most decisive testimony, is not so much as referred to. The passage in the *de Gloria Atheniensium* proves three things, and proves them conclusively. It proves that Cratippus was an Athenian historian; that he came, in point of date, between Thucydides and Xenophon, and that he was read by Plutarch, and was at least known to his audience. In view of this, the case for Cratippus needs to be argued.

The positive part of the argument must strike every reader of the essay as excessively weak. There is one argument, and only one argument, for the identification of P (i.e. the author of the papyrus-fragment)

with Androtion. Androtion described the revolt of Rhodes and the fate of Dorieus (fr. 49), and it is a certain inference that P did the same. It is true that there are coincidences between Pausanias and P, and that Pausanias quotes Androtion for this period of the history. But this is an argument which, by itself, would not carry us far. On the other hand, the arguments against the identification may fairly be called overwhelming. There is the argument from scope, the argument from scale, and the argument from date. As to scope. It may be admitted that the *Atthis* of Androtion was not confined to purely Athenian subjects. The fragments indicate that he dealt with matters which affected Athens only indirectly, if at all. But to touch upon a subject, and to deal with it exhaustively, are two very different things. Is it conceivable that the writer of an *Atthis* should have narrated the campaigns of Agesilaus, or the end of Tissaphernes, in such detail? Even if we reckon as Athenian subject-matter the whole account of the naval war, we still find that half the fragment is concerned with matters which are neither directly, nor indirectly, Athenian. That Androtion should have written a work of this character, is intelligible enough. What is unintelligible, is that he should have called it an *Atthis*. Secondly, as to scale. The objections on this score are not less fatal to Androtion than to Ephorus. Androtion apparently ended book iii. with the fall of the Thirty (fr. 10 and 11). In book v. he had reached 360 (conviction of Cephisodotus, fr. 17), and in book vi. the Sacred War (fr. 23). Thus he covered the first forty years of the fourth century in two or, at most, two and a half books. P gives to a single year (395) as much

as would equal nearly a whole book of Xenophon's *Hellenica*. A book of Androtion may have been, as the writer argues, much longer than a book of Xenophon. It may even have been three times as long. In that case, if the scale of Androtion were the scale of P, two books would have sufficed for eight years. In reality, they sufficed for forty. Even Ephorus is nearer than Androtion to the scale of P. He, at any rate, spared four books for the first twenty years of the century (cf. frag. 126, 130, 135, 138). Thirdly, as to date. Here I find some difficulty in following the writer's reasoning. He accepts the inference drawn from the description of the border disputes of the Phocians and Locrians, and uses the *terminus ad quem* (the year 346), thus gained as an argument against the identification of P with Theopompus. When, however, he comes to discuss the identification of P with Androtion, he appears to find no difficulty in this *terminus*. Yet if the *terminus* 346 is an argument against Theopompus, it is an even stronger argument against Androtion. External testimony asserts that his *Atthis* was composed during his exile at Megara, i.e. after 344, and internal evidence suggests that it extended at least to the end of the Sacred War, i.e. that it was composed after 346. In a word, the case for Androtion breaks down at every point.

Negatively, the essay is of considerable value for the determination of the authorship of the fragment. It shows the difficulties we get into, the moment we attempt to escape from the necessity of making our choice between Theopompus and Cratippus. If only some one would try his hand upon Clitodemus or Herodicus! And really, there is no one else left.

E. M. WALKER.

VOLLMER'S HORACE.

Q. Horati Flacci Carmina, recensuit Fridericus Vollmer. Editio maior. B. G. Teubner, Leipsic. 1907. 1 vol. Pp. viii, 390. 2 marks.

TEN years ago the criticism of Latin poetry touched its nadir in the publication of two

books, one of which was Mr Vollmer's *Silvae* of Statius. But the character of that work, it is now apparent, was less due to native deficiency than to rawness and a bad education: Mr Vollmer had neither digested his reading nor matured his judgment, and he had been trained in a school which