

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](#)



Two Anthologies *Myths from Pindar*. Chosen and Edited by H. R. King, M.A. Geo. Bell & Sons, 1904. Pp. xii + 96. 2s. 6d. net. *Florilegium Tironis Grascum*. Simple Passages for Greek Unseen Translation chosen with a view to their Literary Interest. by R. M. Burrows and W. C. Flamstead Walters. Pp. ix + 271. Macmillan & Co., 1904. 4s. 6d.

J. H. Vince

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 05 / June 2005, pp 269 - 270

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992825, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992825

How to cite this article:

J. H. Vince (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 269-270 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992825

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

slightest and least satisfactory. He seems sometimes to get out of touch with his author. His interpretation strikes one here and there as frigid and recondite, where the chronicle is popular and superficial. He attributes to the compiler too much antiquarian and mythological interest, whereas his list of facts or subjects may have been taken from any handbook of useful information or guide to culture, and he is concerned with the remote past less for its own sake than as giving some account of the origin of existing institutions and the like. The speculations on the sources are not convincing, the classification is too artificial, and the conclusions are hard to reconcile with the editor's own restoration of the first line of the Marble. The net result amounts to little more than the suggestion, worth consideration but capable of quite simple statement, that the Chronicler may have drawn upon Ephorus and Aristoxenus. It is a temptation of *Quellenkritik* to be too confident that we know all the possible sources, but every fresh discovery shows more clearly that the common stock of classical tradition was less dependent on particular works, and individual diversity more frequent, than was supposed. There is enough in the Marble itself that is unique to warn us how little we really know.

One cannot but wish that Dr. Jacoby had given us some general discussion of the chronology. To those who are inclined to believe that the received system is a comparatively late reconstruction begun in the 4th century B.C., still in progress when the Chronicler wrote, and not finally accepted till long after him (cf. Diels, *Die Olympionikenliste*

aus *Oxyrhynchos*, in *Hermes* xxxvi), the variations of the Marble from chronological orthodoxy are profoundly interesting. Are they mere mistakes, or do they preserve traces of rival versions, and indicate joints and sutures in the fabric? Are the problems as to the Pythiads for example, or the Sicilian dates, or Melanippides, or Simonides, ultimately chronological? Is the Athenian archon-list of even the fifth century above suspicion? I regret that Dr. Jacoby has seen fit to retain the theory of the double *computus*, which seems to me scientifically improbable and an easy evasion of a real difficulty. I am surprised that he is naively ready to admit an otherwise unrecorded seizure of Delphi by the Phocians in 366/5 on the strength of Ep. 75, especially as the variation in date is closely related to a well known problem in the chronology of the Spartan kings (cf. Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen* ii. pp. 502-11).

Perhaps, however, these large questions lay outside the scope of the edition, and certainly Dr. Jacoby within his limits has produced a thoroughly serviceable book. Without detracting from its solid merits a foreigner may be allowed to enter a mild protest against a style so overloaded with parenthesis, so careless of the art of composition, and so indifferent to capitals, stops, and paragraphs, as to double his labour in reading it. Misprints, moreover, are too abundant, although not many of them are serious. But it is a pity that so scholarly a work should not have been turned out in better form.

J. A. R. MUNRO.

TWO ANTHOLOGIES.

Myths from Pindar. Chosen and Edited by H. R. KING, M.A. Geo. Bell & Sons, 1904. Pp. xii + 96. 2s. 6d. net.

Florilegium Tironis Graecum. Simple Passages for Greek Unseen Translation chosen with a view to their Literary Interest. By R. M. BURROWS and W. C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS. Pp. ix + 271. Macmillan & Co., 1904. 4s. 6d.

COMPULSORY Greek has been supposed to narrow the intellect by concentrating it on the minutiae of grammar and verbal accuracy. To parody Newton's words, the schoolboy

or the passman is like a child picking up unfulfilled conditions on the seashore, while the great ocean of Greek literature lies all undiscovered before him. It is to supplement this deficiency that these two books have been compiled.

Mr. King has produced an elegant book, in which good paper and print, a rubric margin, and full page illustrations combine to please the eye. He has made a judicious selection from an author who lends himself readily to the process. If Pindar's words are often *φωναεῖρα συνεροῖσιν*, he grows comparatively easy when he comes to his myth. It would be difficult to improve on

the selection made. The greater part of the 4th Pythian is here and the whole of that fine poem, the 9th Pythian. The beautiful Castor and Pollux myth of the 10th Nemean is included, and the famous eagle and volcano passage from the 1st Pythian. If a boy can be taught to appreciate, even partially, the merits of such passages, he will have learned much. Mr. King has provided substantial help in the notes by means of frequent and careful translations, while he keeps his aesthetic object before the reader by quotations from English poetry—not indeed always accurate, as when Milton is made to write ‘Adam, the *wisest* man of men since born.’

With the difficulties of the text the editor does not much concern himself, and in some cases cannot be acquitted of shirking his responsibilities. For example, on xii. 16 (=Nem. iii. 96) ἀγλαόκαρπον Νηρέος θύγατρα he remarks, ‘Both reading and interpretation are disputed in the second part of the compound, so I leave the word.’ It would have been bolder to read ἀγλαόκρανον, which is accepted by both Bury and Fennell, and can be supported from Bacchylides. In another note we are sorry to see the old heresy of ἀλλὰ γάρ surviving: ‘but (in vain) for’ etc. Truly of this ellipse it may be said that age cannot wither it nor custom stale its infinite variety. The editor disclaims any attempt to elucidate the metrical schemes; in which case it seems superfluous to add, as he occasionally does, to the heading of his selection, ‘The rhythm is Dorian,’ or what not.

One last criticism we have to make. The illustrations, beautiful in themselves and satisfactorily reproduced, might have been, as indeed the editor seems to admit, more suitably chosen. Nor has sufficient care been exercised in describing them.

The object which Profs. Burrows and Walters have in view is clearly stated in their preface. ‘Can it be made possible for him [*i.e.* the average schoolboy or pass-man], while reading as a set book a single play of Euripides or a single book of Homer, to form a conception of Euripides as a poet,

or of the general outline of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*?’ To secure this end, some sacrifices have been made: ‘We have, wherever necessary, omitted lines and phrases; we have occasionally adopted the *facillima lectio* without regard to the weight of evidence; in a few cases . . . we have, preferred making some slight simplification or modification in an important piece to omitting it altogether.’ The plan is excellent, and the sacrifice needs no apology. Eighty-four passages from Homer, containing about 1,500 lines, are sufficient to indicate the course of the story and to illustrate the character of the poetry. Each reader will of course miss some favourite passage, but on the whole the selections have been made with very great skill. It has been more difficult to give the substance of a Greek play in three or four short passages, but here again it is surprising how much can be done in a little space. To take for example the *Philoctetes*: we have a few lines of the hero’s greeting to his visitors, a few lines of his description of his solitary life, the short invocation to sleep by the Chorus, the burst of indignation at ὦ πῦρ σὺ καὶ πᾶν δαίμα, and lastly the dialogue in which Neoptolemus restores the bow and is interrupted by Odysseus: and there is the tragedy in eighty-seven lines!

With Herodotus, Plato, and the Orators the editors have been equally successful, but the selections from Thucydides seem to suffer from divided aims. In their anxiety to supply the salient points of the narrative, they have failed to bring out the literary characteristics of their author. What shall we say of a selection which contains no specimens from the Funeral Speech of Pericles or the description of the battle in the Great Harbour? The editors can hardly plead that these are too hackneyed to give, seeing that they print the θάλαττα passage from the *Anabasis* and the ἐσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν from the *De Corona*.

With this slight reservation, we have nothing but praise to bestow on a book which seems likely to be of the very greatest value to teachers.

J. H. VINCE.