

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](#)



Gwatkin's *Ctesiphontea* of Aeschines *Aeschines in Ctesiphontea*. Edited with Notes and Indices by T. Gwatkin, M.A. and Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, M.A. (Macmillan's Classical Series). London, 1889. Pp. lii., 282. 5s.

J. H. Weight

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 04 / April 1891, pp 149 - 153
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00178849, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00178849

How to cite this article:

J. H. Weight (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 149-153 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00178849

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

phanes (*Fr.* 96) should be classed rather as *assimilated opt.*; that the three examples at the end are *normal deliberatives*, which it is superfluous to quote; and, last but not least, that the very same construction which is causing us such trouble occurs again in the play (695) with its *relative* character fully developed (ω for $\delta\tau\omega$), again after a negative clause, and yet is quite unnoticed by the editor.

I had hoped to discuss one or two more points of grammar; but space does not permit, and I must be content with a mere handful of references and suggestions. Line 797: is not $\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ in its common Attic sense 'come back'? 935: $\mu\eta$ cannot be due to the meaning 'if': $\omega\varsigma$ (= 'as if') is not conditional. Surely $\mu\eta$ is due to 'strong assurance' see

1329. 985: the doctrine of 'divided attribute' should be stated. 1006: a slight confusion here about 'generic' $\mu\eta$: it is the *man* who is 'of the kind to think nothing sound: it would still be $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\upsilon\iota$ if $\delta\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ were away. 303: $\xi\epsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$: it should be said that Attic *prefers* this fut. pass. in *pure* verbs. 350 $\alpha\iota\phi\acute{\omicron}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\iota$: why not say simply, '*orat. obliq.*'? But enough. These are mostly minor points: and even if such criticisms were all admitted, where much is no doubt disputable, they would in no wise affect the feelings of gratitude and admiration for Professor Jebb's work on Sophocles, which every succeeding volume only serves to deepen.

A. S.

GWATKIN'S *CTESIPHONTEA* OF AESCHINES.

Aeschines in Ctesiphontea. Edited with Notes and Indices by T. GWATKIN, M.A. and EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH, M.A. (Macmillan's Classical Series). London, 1889. Pp. lii., 282. 5s.

IN the preparation of this serviceable edition of the *Ctesiphontea* of Aeschines Mr. Gwatkin is responsible for the text and for the notes on §§ 1-160; Mr. Shuckburgh for the notes on §§ 161-260 and for the revision of the earlier notes, for the Introduction, Appendices and Indices, as also for 'a certain number of changes in the text' introduced 'in view of more recent criticism.' The stereotyped plates, made for the edition of this speech published with Drake's excellent *De Corona* of Demosthenes as long ago as 1860, are used for this book, with a few changes; the fact, however, that in these plates in their original form the text of the Zurich edition of 1841 was 'adhered to without any variation' is nowhere made known and the alterations of Mr. Gwatkin and Mr. Shuckburgh at no point interfere with integrity of the lines of the stereotyped plates. These changes are exceedingly few in number. In §§ 1-78, barring corrections of orthography and the like—as $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ etc. for $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ etc. for $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}$, $\kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\rho}\omicron\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\upsilon\iota$ for $\pi\acute{\rho}\omicron\alpha\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$ (§ 67); but $\sigma\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (§ 6), $\delta\iota\alpha\upsilon\rho\eta$ (§ 56—at § 166, however, $\pi\acute{\rho}\omicron\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$), $\tau\iota$ for $\tau\acute{\iota}$ (§ 37) $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ (§ 12—at § 17, however, we have $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\nu\alpha$) are allowed to stand—and the occasional insertion of brackets (at §§ 41,

57, 61, 74)—there are only the following: § 2 $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\eta$, § 3 $\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota$, § 8 $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\phi\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, § 16 $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\iota$ and $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\eta$, § 36 $\tau\eta\delta\epsilon$ $\tau\eta$ $\eta\acute{\mu}\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha$, § 39 ' $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\iota$ ', § 41 $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu$. The text, then, is that of BS., with corrected orthography and such other emendations, very few in number, as could be introduced into the stereotyped plates without injury to them. It is unfortunate that an ingenious and independent editor should be thus hampered by book-making considerations. In Appendix C. (Notes on the Text) Mr. Shuckburgh endeavours to make amends for these artificial restrictions. But this part of the book is far from satisfactory. It begins with a misleading misprint: the three codices embraced in group A are not Bekker's g k l, but e k l. This appendix consists mainly of indications of Weidner's readings (1872, 1878), and of information as to the readings of groups A (e k l) and B (a g m n), where these are divergent. Almost none of Weidner's suggestions, however, are adopted and they are regarded as 'often violent and unnecessary.' Still Mr. Shuckburgh thinks that Weidner's emendations are of 'considerable value, and deserve to be considered in each case.' At the same time he does not give us anywhere an account of Weidner's main theses, which alone render his (or even Mr. Shuckburgh's) procedure intelligible. Attention should at least have been called to the assumption that all codices not in group A or B are copies of MSS. in or cognate to those of these groups, and are not traceable to independent archetypes.

The promise to record deviations from BS. is not faithfully kept (*e.g.* at §§ 3, 8, 16, 48 out of §§ 1-78, not including all the bracketed passages). There are also numerous critical notes scattered throughout the exegetical commentary. Two original emendations have caught my eye, not introduced however into the text: at § 7, for the *εἰς τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν* of 'some MSS.' (cehkn p-Schultz, other MSS. omit *εἰς*), *εἶναι* is suggested. But for *εἰς*, κ.τ.λ. cf. Dem. *Cor.* 151, and the frequent expression *εἰς αὐτὸν*, which however neither Demosthenes nor Aeschines seems to have used. But it is probably better to follow the other MSS. in the omission, or rather in the non-insertion of *εἰς*, as the *lectio difficilior*. The other emendation at § 166, *στέρνα* for *σενά*, is interesting (Mr. S. compares Cicero *Phil.* II. 86 'Num expectas dum te stimulis fodiamus?'), but it can hardly win its way into our texts.

The introduction gives a clear and readable account of the life and ancestry of Aeschines, and of so much of Greek history as is needed to make the life intelligible, and the two other speeches of Aeschines are briefly adverted to. The outline of the *Ctesiphontea* here given is substantially an abridgment of Blass's. The long Chronological Table on pp. xviii.-lii. is unsatisfactory. Indeed Mr. Shuckburgh's grasp of chronological matters is uncertain and betrays him into grave inconsistencies. Some of the misinformation, however, of this Table is corrected (though, so far as one can see, the editor is unconscious of the fact) in the notes. Thus on p. 119 in the note on § 63, the date for Aesch. *in Tim.* is given 346 B.C.; in the Table, however, we have 345 B.C.: in the same note Aesch. *F.L.* is put into 343 B.C., in the Table, at 342 B.C. On p. 154, note on § 140, the seizure of Elateia is put 'into the winter of 335 B.C.'; in the Table, at June, 338 B.C. On p. 140, note on § 114, the date of Demosthenes's election as *pylagoras* is given as 343 B.C. (following Schäfer), and the Delian suit before the Amphictyonic Council was urged the same year; but in the Table the Delian affair is dated 345 B.C. Finally on p. 174, note on § 165, the defeat of Agis is given 330 B.C.; in the Table 331 B.C. This Table requires revision at many points, the most noteworthy being the following: 'B.C. 382. Birth of Demosthenes.' The uncertainty as to this date is in large measure removed by the recovery of fragments of Hypereides *in Dem.* (at col. xix. Blass), where Demosthenes is spoken of as over sixty years of age; as this speech was

delivered in 324 B.C. (Harpalus affair), the date of Demosthenes's birth would fall B.C. 385/4. This inference is confirmed (1) by Ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. Dec. Oratt.* 845 D. (from Caecilius?), where the archon in the year of Demosthenes's birth is given as Dexitheus (385/4 B.C.), the fact receiving independent corroboration from the statement that Demosthenes was thirty-seven in the Archonship of Callimachus (349/8 B.C.); (2) by the language of Dem. *adv. Onet.* i. 15 (867), on which compare Blass, *Chronol. Demosth.* pp. 2, 15, 16. To be sure Dion. Halic. *Ep. ad Anm.* i. 4, p. 724 gives Demosthenes's birth year as 381/0 B.C. But, as Blass has shown, this date probably, as the dates of several of the speeches demonstrably, is reached only by conjecture and subjective combination on his part. 'B.C. 355. Demosthenes begins speaking.' But at least *adv. Aphob.* and *adv. Onet.* were spoken before this time. — 'B.C. 346. Peace arranged (March).' Can 18, 19—24 Elaphebolion (Dem. *F. L.* 57: Aesch. *in. Ctes.* 68, 69, 73) have fallen within March of this year? Ol. 108. 1 (B.C. 348/7) is agreed to have begun July 17. If this year were a leap year of 384 days (Unger) B.C. 347/6 would have begun Aug. 5, and 24 Elaph. must have fallen in mid April B.C. 346. If, on the other hand, (Boeckh, Schäfer) not Ol. 108. 1, but Ol. 108. 2 were the leap year, B.C. 347/6 must have begun July 6; since however the intercalated month was inserted between Poseideon and Gamelion, *i.e.* before Elaphebolion, it would throw 24 Elaph. practically just where it would have been had the year begun Aug. 5—into mid April. The equivalent for the subsequent dates (Dem. *F. L.* 57—60) should be corrected accordingly.

No mention is made whatever of the lodgment on the part of Demosthenes (and Timarchus) of their charges against Aeschines in reference to his conduct in the Second Embassy: this must have taken place within the short time after the offence was committed, the statutory limitation being thirty days, *i.e.* in summer 346 B.C. Under B.C. 345, 342, and 341 wrong dates are given and an incorrect sequence of events. The proper sequence is: Aeschines's prosecution of Timarchus; [the affair of Antiphon]; the rejection, by the Areopagus, of Aeschines as delegate in the Delian matter, because of his connexion with Antiphon; the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Embassy. Now Antiphon was an Athenian who had been deprived of his rights as a citizen (Dem. *Cor.* 132), in all probability one of the considerable number thus treated, on the motion

of Demophilus, in the archonship of Archias (Androtion and Philochorus *ap.* Harpoc. *s.v.* διαφήσις), *i.e.* B.C. 346/5; hence this treasonable conduct cannot have preceded the Peace of Philocrates, and it is extremely improbable that either orator would ascribe to Philip—in the person of Antiphon—a willingness τὰ νεώρι' ἐμπρήσειν within a year, or even within two years, after the striking of the peace. It seems probable, therefore, that the arrest and execution of Antiphon followed the prosecution of Timarchus by a considerable interval of time. (Indeed Aesch. *in Tim.* 77 refers to the διαφήσις as something very recent—*νυλί*.) It was doubtless meant by Demosthenes as a counter-stroke against the Macedonizers who had won the day in the matter of Timarchus. However all this may have been, it is at least certain that the speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes on the Embassy were delivered—whether in the form we now have them or not is a question not to be raised here—in the summer of B.C. 343 (Schäfer, *ii.*² p. 373): now in Dem. *F.L.* 209 the rejection of Aeschines is spoken of as recently effected (πρώην), in spite of Aeschines's bitter and noisy protestations; on the other hand, in Aesch. *in Tim.* the Areopagus is represented as a venerable institution, not likely to make a mistake, in language which it is inconceivable that Aeschines could have used had he been smarting from the sting of a very recent adverse judgment.—The affair of the spy Anaxinus of Oreos can hardly have occurred as early as 341 B.C.; it must have taken place, if not after the declaration of war against Philip (summer 340 B.C.), at least only a short time before it; unquestionably after Oreos had been freed from the yoke of the Macedonizing Philistides.—'B.C. 338 June. Philip being chosen General of the Amphictyons marches south and seizes and fortifies Elateia. August. Battle of Chaeroneia...337. Proposal of Ctesiphon.' The main support of those who hold that Philip took Elateia in the spring or summer of 338 B.C., and not in the preceding autumn, is found in the documents in Dem. *Cor.* 154, 181, now however—*i.e.* by almost everybody since 1839—admitted to be spurious. The proper sequence of events in B.C. 339—336, inferred almost wholly from the explicit language of Demosthenes and Aeschines, is substantially this: B.C. 339. Spring; Aeschines stirs up Amphictyonic war against the Amphissians. Midsummer; special meeting of the Council with election of Cottyphus (so at least Aesch. *in Ctes.* 124,

128), unsuccessful campaign. Late summer or autumn; regular meeting of the Amphictyonic Council, when Philip was chosen general (Dem. *Cor.* 151 τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ Κόττυφος. ἤγαγε στρατιάν...ὡς δ'...οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν, εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν πυλαίαν ἐπὶ τὸν Φίλιππον εὐθὺς ἡγεμόν' ἦγον): later, seizure of Elateia and punishment of Amphissians; formation of Theban alliance. B.C. 338. Late winter and spring, various military operations. Summer, (7 Metageitnion), battle of Chaeroneia. B.C. 337, toward close of Chaerondas's archonship, Demosthenes elected *τειχοποῖός* for subsequent civic year (summer to summer, 337/6). B.C. 336, winter or early spring: Ctesiphon's *προβούλευμα*, introduced certainly only after Demosthenes has completed a considerable portion of his year of service, and probably shortly before the Greater Dionysia. Aeschines's notice of the *γραφὴ παρανόμων* which immediately followed was served upon Ctesiphon while Philip was still living (Aesch. *in Ctes.* 219), and Philip was assassinated in the summer of B.C. 336.—'B.C. 331 Arbela (October). About the same time Agis is defeated. B.C. 330. The trial of Ctesiphon on Aeschines's impeachment [is not this an unhappy word?] comes on shortly before the Pythian games (*in Ctes.* 254); that is in January or February.' The fall of Agis preceded by only a short time the trial of Ctesiphon (when Alexander was in Parthia—*i.e.* midsummer B.C. 330—he received news of it), which took place in the late summer B.C. 330, not six months earlier. The more important reasons for adopting this time of the year are: (1) The archon in the year of the trial was Aristophon, *i.e.* B.C. 330/29 (summer to summer): cf. Plut. *Dem.* 4; [Theophr.] *Char.* 7; Dion. Halic. *Ep. ad Amm.* i. 12, p. 746, 5. (2) The Pythian games fell in the third year of each Olympiad (Pans. x. 7. 3; Diod. xvi. 60, *i.e.* the Pythian games fell in the archonship of Archias, col. 108. 3). As the Olympiads began in summer the Pythian games could have fallen within the year only after midsummer B.C. 346/3, 330/29, 326/5 etc. (Ol. 108. 3, 112. 3, 113. 3). Further these games fell in the Delphian month Bucatius (Boeckh, *CIG.* 1688, line 45; Köhler, *CIA.* ii. p. 319); and Bucatius was equivalent—not, as Boeckh (*o. c.*) maintained, to Attic Munychion, but—to Attic Metageitnion (Kirchhoff, *Monatsber. Berl. Akad.* 1864, pp. 129 ff.), *i.e.* to late summer or early autumn. (Of course no one dreams now-a-days that the Pythian festival fell in the winter-spring month of Bysius.)—'B.C. 320. Death of Alexander' is of course a misprint for 323.—The date 'B.C. 314.

Aeschines dies at Samos' is extremely doubtful.

The notes are mainly exegetical; a sparing use is made of the testimony of the Scholia, but the parallel references are, perhaps, sufficiently full. The information upon political and legal antiquities might have been given with greater proportion and precision, as also that on historical matters. We miss a thorough treatment of Aeschines's language, and fuller citations of the rejoinders made by Demosthenes to the various assertions of Aeschines (for, of course, this speech will always be read in connexion with that of Demosthenes); the rhetorical aspects of the speech might also have been more fully treated. In all these respects Professor Richardson's recent edition, much more than an English version of Weidner, is distinctly in advance of this book. A cursory examination of a part of the notes suggests the following remarks. At § 2 the correct doctrine as to the πρόεδροι is given, but sharper attention should have been drawn to the fact that one proedrus was chosen from each of the non-ptyanising tribes, and that the old office of ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων continued, with diminished functions, even after that of ἐπιστάτης ὁ ἐκ τῶν προέδρων had been established. To the literature might be added Professor W. W. Goodwin, *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* 1885, pp. 165 ff.—§ 27. The dates of Chaerondas should have been given.—§ 34. The late Professor J. M. Crow's able study of the Pnyx, including a survey and notes by Mr. J. T. Clarke, might well be added to the list of articles cited (*Papers of the Am. School at Athens*, vol. iv. (1888) pp. 205–277).—§ 55. ὑπάρχουσιν does not necessarily carry with it the idea of advantage.—§ 56. A note is needed on μήτε...τε.—§ 65. In the list of references insert §§ 61, 65.—§ 76. προσκεφάλαια cannot here mean 'cushions to rest the head against.'—§ 108. Ἄθηνᾶ προναία. The statement that 'the MSS. have προνοία, as in Pausanias, but the error has been corrected by inscriptions' is inadequate. The form προναία (Ion. προνηή) is older than Aeschines, as the editors' references show (Aeschylus, *Eum.* 21, Herod. i. 92, viii. 27): it was also used by Callimachus, *Fragm.* 320, and Diod. Sic. xi. 14, and, as we are reminded, in Delphian inscriptions (e.g. Dittenberger, *Syll.* i. 169). But the form πρόνοια is also old, as in [Dem.] *in Aristog.* i. 33 (780), where the play on ἀπόνοια makes an emendation impossible. It would appear, then, that the popular etymology had early transformed the form προναία to πρόνοια. Still, it hardly seems probable—unless,

against the judgment of most ancient and modern critics,¹ we accept *in Aristog.* i. as genuine—that this transformation had taken place in Aeschines's time; so that the emendation (first made by B. S.?) must be adopted, especially as Harpocration (*s. v.* προναία) seems to have had this reading before him.—§ 118. The knot or braid forming the κρωβύλος with its τέττιξ pin, whether we adopt Conze's, Helbig's, Birt's, or Schreiber's view on the subject, was at all events not fastened on the crown of the head, but was rather of the nature of a queue. Cf. Baumeister, *Denkm.* i. p. 616, and Purser in Smith's *Dict. Ant.*¹ i. pp. 496 f.—§ 120. ἐνῆρκται τὰ κανᾶ, 'the baskets emptied for the commencement of the sacrifice.' Rather should be said, with Weidner, 'the baskets filled for the sacrifices,' with sacred barley (οἰλοχύται). Cf. Schol. Vat. Laur. F.: ἐπιτίθεται τὰ οἴλα κ.τ.λ.—§ 123, and Appendix C., on ἐπι δίεςτες ἡβῶσι. The important *fons*, Bekker, *Anecd. (Lex. Seguer.)*, p. 255. 15 (τὸ ἐπὶ δίεςτες ἡβῶσι τὸ γενέσθαι ἐτῶν ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἕνα ἡβῆ ἢ τὸ ἐκκαίδεκα ἐτῶν γενέσθαι) should have been cited. Mr. Shuckburgh's ingenious suggestions can hardly be regarded as settling this difficult question.—§ 132. More should have been made of the Congress at Corinth (b.c. 338 autumn, not 337), in which Droysen and his school sees the fullest justification of the policy of Philip and justification of that of Demosthenes and other members of the Anti-Macedonian party.—§ 150. Pheidias's Athena Lemnia was certainly not 'the chryselephantine statue in the Parthenon.'—§ 154. Not a special 'seat,' called ἐφηβικός, was assigned in the Dionysiac theatre to the ephebi, but rather a minor subdivision, a τόπος (Pollux, *l.c.*)—§ 187. The cult-statue, not the Metroum itself, was the work of Pheidias (μητρὸς θεῶν ἱερὸν ἦν Φειδίας εἰργάσατο, Paus. i. 3. 5; Arrian *Peripl.* 9) and even this cannot have been by Pheidias, if Pliny (*H.N.* xxxvi. 17) be correct in ascribing it to Agoracritus.—§ 187. It is not probable that Arrian (*Anab.* iii. 16, 7) and Pliny (*H.N.* xxxiv. 70) are right in ascribing to Alexander the restoration to Athens of Antenor's group-statues of the Tyrannicides: Paus. (i. 8. 5) and Val. Max. (ii. 10. ext. 1) ascribe it to Seleucus (Antiochus), which—as being the *lectio difficilior*—leaving wholly out of the question the sources

¹ Blass in his text edition (1888) does not bracket Δημοσθένους in the title of *in Aristog.* i.—of course an oversight—though he does so in that of *in Aristog.* ii.: in *Att. Bered.* iii. pp. 360 ff., however, he rejects both.

of Pausanias, is more likely to be the correct statement. Compare also Paus. i. 16, 3, where Seleucus—*πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εἰσεβής*—is credited with restoring to Branchidae from Ecbatana the bronze statue of Apollo by Canachus. § 225. Where does Aeschines say or insinuate that Demosthenes had at Athens ‘entertained Anaxinus’ and was ‘believed to have been intriguing with the Macedonian Court by his agency’? This inference can hardly be safely drawn from the *εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι μέλλων* of Aeschines; and the *ξέρον αὐτοῦ γεγονότα* of Ps.-Plut. *Vit. Dec. Oratt.* 848 A (which, however, has apparently no other source than this passage) refers rather to hospitality from Anaxinus at Oreus—probably as Athenian proxenus—at an earlier date, when the first Embassy (Dem. *F.L.* 163), or when the second Embassy (Dem. *F.L.* 155; Aesch. *F.L.* 89) went through Oreus. An *εἰσαγγελία* of this sort would have been an anti-Macedonian stroke of policy not to be expected of Aeschines at

this time. § 245. The speech *in Polycl.* is hardly Demosthenic. P. 266, note on § 212. Had Toup anything to do with the insertion of *πρόσωπον*?

The following confusing misprints, not already mentioned, are noted: p. vi. C. Weidner for A. Weidner. Notes: § 32, accusative; § 143, Lysides for Lysicles; § 159, Boehneck; § 171, *καταγνώσκω*; § 233, Blake for Bake; § 240, read *Dinarch. i.* §§ 18—20; § 242, read [Dem.] Halon. § 32. P. 271, *dele* *καλκιδεύς*.

Mr. Shuckburgh's books being so deservedly popular in Great Britain and the United States, I felt that the reviewer's duty would be better discharged by pointing out for correction whatever seemed to be wrong or misleading, than by a mere catalogue of excellences which are generally acknowledged.

J. H. WRIGHT.
Harvard University.

BYWATER'S EDITION OF THE *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS*.

Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. BYWATER. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCLXXC.

THE Delegates of the Clarendon Press may be congratulated, as every one will agree, on their publication of a text of the *Nicomachean Ethics* carefully revised by Mr. Bywater. He is not only a scholar among philosophers but a scholar among scholars, and probably no one in England could have done this particular piece of work so well: certainly no one could have done it better. He has brought to the task not only a long familiarity with the *Ethics*, but a wide and accurate knowledge of Aristotle's ideas and language, great care, great acuteness, great sobriety of judgment, all the equipment of perfect scholarship, and an unusually microscopic eye. Many therefore are the small changes, though not many the considerable ones, that those familiar with the older and much less critical texts will find in the new; and, though the editor fully recognises his obligation to the much improved text and the critical notes of Susemihl, he has been able in many places to make an advance even on him. The advance however is mainly in those things which in no disparaging sense may be called

minutiae, and the real importance of such changes may easily be overlooked by the careless reader. A slight change of stopping, the alteration of one letter in a particle, the insertion or omission of some small word, often makes an important difference to the sense and gives a passage quite a new aspect. There is nothing brilliant or startling about such improvements and they often fail to meet with the recognition they deserve, for only scholars who are something more than scholars in the narrowest sense are likely to make them. They need a reasoning mind, which great acquaintance with Greek and Latin does not always carry with it. Many scholars can discuss the grammar of a sentence for one who can understand its real relation to what went before and what is to come after.

It will be understood therefore that Mr. Bywater treats the text in a very cautious and circumspect manner. He has introduced, I think, very few emendations of his own or of anybody else, except in the minute matters indicated above. A careful examining and weighing of MS. evidence and of the early commentators has been his critical method, and in this matter, as far as our present materials go, he has probably left little for the industry or acuteness of