

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](#)



Supplementa ad procli Commentaries in Platoniam de republica libros nuper vulgatos, edidit Ricardus Reitzenstbin. Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen. Vierter Band. Drittes Heft. Breslau, 1889. pp. 1—31. 1 Mk.

J. Adam

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 1-2 / February 1890, pp 45 - 45

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018953X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018953X

How to cite this article:

J. Adam (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 45-45 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018953X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

fitly characterize this speech-writer as long-winded and strong-winded. It may safely be doubted whether in all the compass of classic Greek prose there can be found a more ponderous or more awkward period than that beginning §18 *contra Dem.* οὐκ ἀποκτενεῖτε and ending μὴ βοηθήσαι τοῖς Θηβαίοις at the conclusion of § 21 (cf. *Transactions of the American Philol. Association* for 1885).

Some of the points to be noted after a comparison of the first and second editions of Blass' *Dinarchus* are the following. Blass now proceeds radically in making elision to avoid hiatus, not hesitating even where the resulting form might be ambiguous, as μηδέν' for μηδένα. Many changes have been made in the matter of pointing, generally in the direction of more articulation. In questions of form and spelling he desires conformity with epigraphic evidence of the times and refers to Meisterhans' *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*. He writes the perf. of τρέπω τέτροφα. With one exception (§54 c. *Dem.*) he writes γίγνεται, not γίνεταί, and spells Μουνιχία and ἐκτείνα for ἐκτινά, ἐκτείσις for ἐκτίσις, probably from epigraphic considerations. Of passages where the reading is still in grave doubt we may note § 2 c. *Dem.* οὐ γὰρ ἔν' ἐνοχλῶμεν κ.τ.λ. Following Meisterhans he reads ἐπιτεθηκότες in § 23 c. *Dem.* for ἐπιτεθεικότες of the MSS.

A few critical suggestions may be here appended. It was suggested (*Proceedings Am. Philol. Assoc.* for 1885, and *Am. Journal of Philol.* vol ix.) to insert οὐδὲν after πῶποτε c. *Aristog.* 15, in which remark we coincide with Bekker. τοιοῦτον for τοῖς τοῦτον in the same section would seem to be more in harmony with grammar and context. E. G. SIHLER.

New York.

In the *praefatio* xi. line 4, *Hermes* xxii. 78 is a mistake for 378.

Supplementa ad Procli Commentarios in Platonis de republica libros nuper vulgatos, edidit RICARDUS REITZENSTEIN. Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen. Vierter Band. Drittes Heft. Breslau, 1889. pp. 1—31. 1 Mk.

THIS short pamphlet has been issued in view of Cardinal Pitra's recent publication (from the MS. Gk. Vat. 2197) of Proclus's commentary on the story of Er, the son of Armenius, in Tom. v. part ii. of the *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata* (Parisii 1888). Cardinal Pitra seems to have been unaware that a second copy of this work of Proclus, made by Angelus Maius, is preserved in the Vatican library: and Reitzenstein has published a revised text of part of the commentary (= pp. 25—32 and pp. 1—12 of Vat. MS. 2197) from a comparison of the original MS. with Maius's copy. Pitra's text contained many errors, and probably was not finally revised by him when he died. Reitzenstein has corrected most if not all of his mistakes, and made many certain emendations where the manuscript is unintelligible, e.g. δ αὐτός for εἶς on page 7, line 2: μὲν ὅν for μένον on 7, 23: ἵκαν for διπλῶν on 9, 15: ἀνάγειν εἰς τὸν αἰθέρα for ἀνάγει τὸν αἰθέρα on 10, 24: ποιεῖν εἴκειν for ποιηκεν of MSS. in 12, 14: χάσμα for χίσμα on 17, 30: ἀπ' ἄλλων for ἀπ' ἀλλήλων on 29, 14: and ὄχημα for σῆμα on 31, 7. It may however be doubted if the editor is justified in inserting ἐπὶ before τὸν αἰθέρα on page 10, 26, ὥς ἐπὶ δικαστικὸν τόπον ἀνιέναι τὸν αἰθέρα: in such cases, as is well known (Cobet, *Var. Lectiones*, p. 165 foll.), the preposition is idiomatically inserted only once, viz. after the ὥς (ὥσπερ, καθάπερ), provided the ὥς clause comes first. We have no reason for denying this elegance even to Proclus. Reitzenstein will confer a boon on readers of Plato and Proclus if he will publish the remaining parts of the commentary. J. ADAM.

Bellum Alexandrinum, erklärt von R. SCHNEIDER. Berlin: Weidmann. 1888. pp. viii. 65. 90 pfg.

THE writings of Caesar's continuers were, until lately, among the most neglected portions of Latin literature. The text had been edited but textual criticism had not been applied in detail and, since 1830, no commentary appears to have been written on any part of them except the last book of the 'Gallic War.' But the energy recently developed in the study of Caesar has extended to his continuers also. Merguet and Menge-Preuss have indexed them, and Dr. Schneider offers a brief commentary on the pamphlet describing the Alexandrine war, that is the events from the battle of Pharsalus to Caesar's entry into Rome. The book comprises a short introduction, critical and explanatory notes, and an index. The critical notes give the readings of the four chief MSS. and select conjectures. In constituting the text, Dr. Schneider has been reasonably conservative (as conservatism is now understood); he appears, however, to rate the literary capacities of his author higher than previous scholars have done. Some of his conjectures are certainly attractive, e.g. ch. 8 *consolatione et hortatione* for c. *et ratione*; ch. 17 *Pharitas* for *pariter*; ch. 42 *in Illyricum sinum* for *in illum s.*, and the geographical restorations (for instance in ch. 52, *liipa* and *Naeva*) are well worth considering. If I may venture myself a suggestion, I would suggest *appetuntur* for *aptantur* in ch. i., comparing Caesar's *appetere umerum gladio* (*Bell. Civ.* 2, 35). On the whole, Dr. Schneider's text is a distinct improvement on previous editions. The same cannot be said of the notes—for there is practically no previous edition on which they could constitute an advance. But they are (as would be expected from the writer) well chosen and scholarly, and, though never lengthy, they seldom leave the reader in the lurch. The whole book deserves to be very warmly recommended.

F. HAVERFIELD.

Der Codex Mediceus, Pl. xxxix. n. 1 *des Vergilius*, von DR. MAX HOFFMANN. Berlin, Weidmann, 1889. 3 Mk.

THIS is a new collation of parts of the Medicean manuscript of Vergil, comprising part of the sixth Eclogue, and the remaining Eclogues, the Georgics, and the first and sixth Aeneids. In minute details it supplements Ribbeck, who mainly depended on Foggini's transcript. The account of the different classes of corrections is especially interesting. As the corrected or double readings are all printed in facsimile, the collation will be of great service to students of Latin palaeography; but whether it throws much new light on the text of Vergil is very doubtful. H. N.

Lettres Inédites de Michel Apostolis, publiées par HIPPOLYTE NOIRET. Paris, Thorin, 1889.

A very interesting and valuable contribution to the history of Greek erudition in the fifteenth century. Michel Apostolis was a professor in Crete from 1455 to 1474 (or later) and lived during this troubled time by teaching, and copying Greek manuscripts. Forty-eight of his letters (the forty-seventh being incomplete) had been published by Legrand in the appendix to the second volume of his *Bibliographie Hellénique*. The present volume contains seventy-four more letters of Apostolis, hitherto unpublished, and now edited by M. Hippolyte Noiret, whose early death at the age of twenty-four is a great loss to letters. They were found in two Vatican MSS., *Palatinus Graecus* 375 (once at Heidelberg) and *Vaticanus*