

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](#)



Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora recensuit Otto Kelleb. Vol. I. Schol. in Carmina et Epodos; Vol. II. Schol. in Seimones, Epistulas, Artemque Poeticam. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Leipzig, 1902–1904. Pp. xiii. + 480 and xvi.+512. 21s.

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 01 / February 1905, pp 69 - 70

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991376, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991376

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 69-70 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991376

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

like the clauses introduced by *quod, si*, etc.; they are principal clauses (or principal sentences, as they would be called in this book) on just the same level as the 'principal statements' spoken of in § 534. 1 (ex-

pressed by the Accus. with Infin.). This serious defect of terminology is probably only an oversight.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN

The University, Birmingham.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Plato gegen Sokrates. Interpretationen von DR. ERNST HORNEFFER. Teubner: Leipzig, 1904. Pp. 82.

THE German programm-writer is nothing if not paradoxical. To fly the flag of heresy is a sure way of attracting attention. And what could be more heretical than to accuse Plato of anti-Socraticism? This, accordingly, is what Dr. Horneffer has set himself to do. His treatise consists of an elaborate analysis of those Platonic dialogues—*Hippias Minor*, *Laches*, and *Charmides*—carried out so as to demonstrate to the author's complete satisfaction that the aim of all these dialogues is to overthrow the Socratic doctrine 'Virtue is Knowledge.' Thus, in the *Hippias Minor*, both the argument of the first section (363A–369B), concluding with the words ἀναπέφανται ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν ψευδὴς τε καὶ ἀληθὴς κ.τ.λ., and the arguments of the second section, resulting in the proposition ἀμείνων οἱ ἐκόντες ἢ οἱ ἄκοντες ἀμαρτάνοντες, appear to be of the kind known as *reductio ad absurdum*; and the absurdity thus rejected is, according to Dr. Horneffer, none other than the Socratic dictum 'Tugend ist Wissen.' Support for this interpretation is also found in the 'Einkleidung' of the dialogue—in the antitheses between Achilles (ὁ ἀπλοῦς) and Odysseus (ὁ πολύτροπος) and between Hippias, the 'polymath,' and Socrates. That the *Hippias Minor* contains controversial allusions to Antisthenes, as suggested by Dümmler, H. refuses to admit; rather, he supposes, it was Antisthenes who in opposition to Plato wrote a vindication of the character of Odysseus.

The *Laches* and *Charmides* are treated on similar lines: the Socratic elements in both are emphasized, and the point of each is made out to be the same, viz. the denial of the ethical premiss of Socrates.

The obvious objection to this whole line of interpretation is that in later dialogues Plato appears to adopt the Socratic position; so that Dr. Horneffer is forced to

admit that the *Hippias Minor*, etc., as he interprets them, are 'freilich mit den späteren Hauptwerken Platons nicht in Einklang zu bringen.' But H., like Grote, insists on construing each dialogue by itself; and rather than credit Plato with a 'system,' he prefers apparently to credit him with any amount of inconsistency. For my part, I prefer to believe to the uttermost in 'the Unity of Plato's thought,' as a talented Platonist has recently described it in a work that may be commended to Dr. Horneffer's attention. That Socrates should be made the agent of his own dialectical destruction is another σκάνδαλον in the interpretation here proposed; but it is lightly set aside with the remark that the dialogues are 'völlig freie Dramen.' That 'Aristoteles gegen Platon' gained the reputation of a kicking foal we have long known: now it appears that it was, after all, but a just Nemesis which befell the 'Platon gegen Sokrates.'

R. G. BURY.

Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora recensuit OTTO KELLER. Vol. I. Schol. in Carmina et Epodos; Vol. II. Schol. in Sermones, Epistulas, Artemque Poeticam. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Leipzig, 1902–4. Pp. xiii. + 480 and xvi. + 512. 2ls.

THE current edition of these *Scholia* by Hauthal (Berlin, 1864) was known to be unsatisfactory. The painstaking and thorough labour of Prof. Keller has now provided us once for all with the best available text and the fullest available information regarding them. Though not of equal importance with the *Porphyrion Scholia* (edited by Holder, 1894), they are not without interest; and an accurate edition of them was necessary in order that no part of the traditional interpretation of Horace's poems might remain out of the reach of students. How much of this commentary comes from ancient sources, and

how much originated in mediaeval times is not always easy to determine. Such clues as are to be found are mentioned by Keller in his Introduction and in a recently published article 'Zu Pseudacron,' in which he defends some of his emendations of the text.

To attempt to criticize a work of this

description would be impertinence. We can only express our thanks to the Prague professor for the great service which he has rendered to students of Horace. The *Pseudacron Scholia* will have to find a place beside the *Porphyrion Scholia* on our bookshelves.

W. M. LINDSAY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE OPENING SENTENCE OF THE VERRINES.

IN the *Classical Review* for December, 1904 (p. 440 f.), Principal Peterson proposes to change the *mirantur* of the MSS into *mirabitur*. The very excellence of the MS tradition and the fact that the error, if error it be, could—shall we say? must—have been corrected long before the date of our existing MSS, ought to make us suspicious of any emendation, and to look for corruption (or misunderstanding) in another part of the sentence. I take liberty to doubt the explanation that *mirantur* is a copyist's error for *mirabitur*, through the stages *mirauitur*, *miramtur*. It is true that *b* is often written *v*, but in verbs this would surely hardly occur except where the other form is a real word, for example, where *habitauit* appears instead of *habitabit*. Also, the confusion between *n* and *w* is not common before the 13th century.

The proper solution is, I think, to regard *quis* as the nominative plural, and not as the nominative singular. This form is the same as that *ques*, which is attested by Charisius, Festus, and Priscian, and found in Cato, the S. C. De Bacanalibus, and Pacuvius, etc. (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 444). The form *quis* is quoted by Mr. C. H. Turner, in his *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (Oxonii 1899–1904), Fasc. I. (Pars ii.), p. 150, seventeen times from Latin MSS of the Canons of Early Church Councils, which are amongst the most careful productions

of the scribe's art. The originals of these MSS are in no case older than the fourth century A.D.; so that we are face to face with the fact that a nom. pl. *quis(ques)* existed continuously throughout the long period of Latin literature. Confusion with the singular, or alteration to *qui*, was most natural.

I cannot see that there was anything to hinder Cicero from using this form. If it be a colloquial form, then he may have avoided it in his later speeches, as it is well known that there are stylistic features in the Quinctius and the Roscius, and even in the Verrines, which he seems to have given up afterwards. But this is a point, for the full discussion of which it would be necessary to have collations of all the oldest MSS of Cicero's works, and it must be left to experts like Dr. Peterson.

As to the last part of the sentence, I think it may stand as it is. The sentence is long, and the plural *si quis* may quite easily have been varied to the singular subject of *probabit* and *putabit*. But there is a ready way out of the difficulty; namely to regard *probabit* and *putabit* as corrections of *probab̄t* (= *probabunt*) and *putab̄t* (= *putabunt*). The contraction assumed is found in ninth century MSS, perhaps also earlier.

A. SOUTER.

Mansfield College, Oxford.

A TRANSLATION OF MÜLLER AND DEECKE'S *ETRUSKER*.

MAY I be allowed space to state that I am engaged on A Translation into English of Müller and Deecke's *Etrusker*? Some of

the latest discovered Etruscan inscriptions will be reproduced in the volume.

HERBERT A. STRONG.

LIVERPOOL, January, 1905.