

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](#)



Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. xvi. 1905. Pp. 166. 6s. Qd.

H Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 2006, pp 129 - 130

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993946, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993946

How to cite this article:

H Richards (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 129-130 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993946

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Athens. In 1889 he received the degree of doctor of philosophy from Columbia, and from that time on was engaged in teaching at Barnard College, Bryn Mawr College, and since 1899 as professor of classical philology at Columbia. Had he lived he would undoubtedly have been elected to the presidency of the American Philological Association for 1906. Apart from his contributions to the *Review* he wrote numerous articles for the *American Journal of Philology*, *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Revue de Philologie*, *Harvard Studies*, and *Mnemosyne*. His chief work was in Greek tragedy, and he published editions of the *Alcestis* (1894), *Oedipus Tyrannus* (1901), and *Medea* (1904).

He was intellectually honest to the core. He was possessed by the scholarly instinct to a very high degree; he took little on authority, and a great name inspired in him no undue awe. Critical in his attitude of thought and refined in his taste, he permitted nothing to pass that seemed to him shallow, pretentious, or frigid. He was a hater of shams, above all of the sham of

half-knowledge. His own knowledge was varied and exact, but he made no display. He was an excellent executive officer, a delightful companion, full of humour and wit that was often caustic. He was a keen observer of nature: he loved the woods and birds.

Love of Greece was almost a passion with him. He wrote and spoke both the literary and popular language of Modern Greece with ease, his facility extending even to verse, which received the commendation of such an authority as Bikelas. He took a sympathetic interest in many of the Greek residents of New York and his keenest delight was to visit the land whose history and people were endeared to him by study and intimate association. His sojourn in Greek lands during the summer of 1905 was destined to be his last. On his return he contracted typhoid fever and died shortly after reaching home, September 26. His short life, filled with devotion to high ideals, will remain an inspiration to the many friends who mourn his loss.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Xenophontis Respublica Lacedaemoniorum.
Recensuit GINUS PIERLEONI. Berlin: MCMV.
Pp. v + 63. M. 1. 80.

THIS is another of the careful and useful texts of the *opera minora* edited by Italian scholars, the main features being (1) thorough collation of MSS., (2) complete statement of their evidence, (3) a complete verbal index. In statement of modern suggestions as to the text this, like other parts of the series, is not so satisfactory. Thus in 5. 8 Hug's emendation of *ὡς μῆποτε αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ.* should have been mentioned, for it or something like it—which had occurred to me independently—is certainly right. In 11. 10 the editor seems not to know Jebb's excellent emendation given in a note to Dakyns' translation. Again, the proposed exchange of the last words of Ch. 2 with the last of Ch. 3 should receive mention, even if it is not thought necessary. The proposal to make a slight change in Diogenes' list of X.'s writings, so that Demetrius would have doubted the genuineness of *R.A.* not of *R.L.*, is put down to Diels. I made it in this *Review* xi. 232 (1897), but perhaps

Diels had anticipated me. It is only surprising it was not made long ago.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.
Vol. xvi. 1905. Pp. 166. 6s. 6d.

BESIDES a short article on certain MSS. of Suetonius by Mr. C. L. Smith and one of considerable length on 'Theories regarding the nature and origin of Indo-European inflection' by Mr. H. Oertel and Mr. É. P. Morris, this volume contains an essay on the 'Dramatic Art' of Aeschylus by Mr. C. R. Post and a discussion by Mr. K. K. Smith of the use of the buskin on the Greek tragic stage. Mr. Post writes well and with good illustrations both on the general structure of plays and on various subordinate points, especially on Clytemnestra. Here and there perhaps he makes too much of things. *Persae* 134-139 for instance is not a serious reflection on the character of Persian women. Mr. K. K. Smith argues from literature and art that the high buskin was not in use on the stage before the time of Lucian and

Pollux. Good evidence for it is certainly hard to find, and some of his difficulties are real. But we may point out (1) that a good deal of the rapid movement of actors was not seen but imagined, being indeed often off the stage: (2) that actors and chorus must be kept distinct, as no one supposes high buskins to have been worn by the latter: (3) that after all the difficulties (e.g. of kneeling, or lying down, and then rising) were actually surmounted in Lucian's time. Mr. Smith does not question the use at that date of the high-soled buskin, and old, especially Euripidean, tragedies were certainly often played. It is possible however that, just as the stage probably got higher in later days, so did the buskin. Dr. Dörpfeld partly relies upon it to have raised actors above chorus in the absence of a stage. It would be curious if this argumentative resource were taken from him.

H. RICHARDS.

Greek Reader. Vol. I. Selected and adapted with English Notes from Professor von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Griechische Lesebuch*. By E. C. MARCHANT, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. Pp. iv+85. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1905. 2s.

THIS adaptation of the Berlin Professor's well known book is an interesting experiment in readers. It includes the following extracts: in Part I some four pages of maxims and anecdotes, 'The Hunter' from Dion Chrysostom, seventeen pages, Alexander's fight with Porus from Arrian, sixteen pages, Strabo's description of Great Britain, four pages: and in Part II 'Hiero's Galleon' by Moschion ap. Athenaeum, six pages and 'Pausanias and Themistocles,' Thuc. i. 128-138. The pieces are not hackneyed and 'The Hunter' is especially attractive; but it is not clear for whom the book is intended. As a 'first reader' it is too hard, and the detailed account of Hiero's monster ship will hardly interest a school boy. The notes are pithy and to the point; but sometimes pass over difficulties, e.g. in the last sentence of § 3 of 'The Hunter.' Nor do they

explain 'all words that are not to be found in the small Liddell and Scott,' Pref. p. iv. e.g. ἀντιπαραγωγή, ὑδροθήκη and κατιστεγνόμενων. At 28. 22 χεϊμόνος ἔμπαλιν ἰσχυοῖσι does not mean the same as the English 'the opposite happens'; but ἰσχυοῖσι, 'restrict' or 'check' sc. τὸ ἔδωρ, is opposed to αὐξοῖσι in the previous sentence. σταμῖνας (47. 8) and ἰχθυοστροφεῖον n. on 49. 24 are misprints, and πάλγκαλοι (12.19) is an odd division of a word.

Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus.

By H. A. J. MUNRO. Second edition, 1905. [By J. D. DUFF.] London: George Bell and Sons. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. Pp. xii+250. 7s. 6d. net.

EXCEPT for the incorporation of three notes on 63. 18, 64. 276 and 107. 7 which Munro published subsequently to 1878, the addition of a few further illustrations taken from a copy in which they were entered by Munro himself, the correction of a few misprints and the inclusion in one or two places of a reference to later discussions dealt with by Munro, this second edition shows no change from the first. The emendations and interpretations have long been known and appraised. It is to their setting that they owe the continued vitality of which this new edition is a proof, to the verve and gusto of their expression and the keen and masculine intelligence which they show in their treatment of letters men and affairs. The editor's strict construction of his task allows the sole remark that perhaps it would have been better to treat the first edition as a document and mark all additions and deviations beyond the corrections of mere errata in the places where they occur: as it is, the difference between the editions can only be ascertained by collating. I should indeed have preferred him to do more. A sketch of Munro's literary career by one so much in sympathy with him and a portrait as frontispiece would have enhanced the value of this posthumous tribute. The printing of the book is excellent.

J. P. P.