

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](#)



Usener and Radermacher's *Dionysii Halicarnasei opuscula Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula*. Ediderunt Hermannus Usener et Ludovicus Radermacher. Volumen prius. Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri. MDCCCXCIX. pp. xliv, 438. M. 6.

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 09 / December 1900, pp 452 - 455

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082056, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082056

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 452-455 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082056

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

appears to be no sufficient reason to doubt that, in each case, both of the alternative versions are due to Demosthenes himself.' If this is right does it not follow that in some of our classical authors there may not have been such a thing as an original text, without a *varietas lectionum*? In his text Dr. Sandys takes up a very cautious attitude toward the alterations which Blass admits in order to avoid three short syllables in succession. Thus in *De Pace* l. 41 he will not alter *πώποτε* into *πω*, and in *Phil.* 2 l. 97 he retains *ὁ τι συνοίσει κοινῇ*, yet in *De Chers.* l. 18 he cannot resist *ἐπισχοῦσιν* for *ἐπισχοῦσι* (before *περί*). In *De Pace* § 7 οὐδὲ εἰς γὰρ ἦν he observes that οὐδὲ εἰς 'must surely mean *ne unus quidem*, rather than *non unus*, which is οὐχ εἰς.' Yet 'not even one' implies, as Dr. Sandys says, that no one supported the speaker, and we get the result that no one supported Neoptolemus because he was so favourably received, and no one (apparently) supported his opponent (Demosthenes) because he was so ill received—which is strange. In *Phil.* 2 § 12 οὐδ' ἐν μὲν τῇ μεσογείᾳ τιν' ἀρχὴν εὗρηκεν τῆς δ' ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ τῶν ἐμπορίων ἀφέσθηκεν, Dr. Sandys supplies γῆς or χώρας with ἀφέσθηκεν as preferable to ἀρχῆς. But is not ἀρχῆς almost unavoidable? The word need not be translated 'empire': 'his

sphere of rule on the sea coast, and his ports' is what is meant. In *Phil.* 2, § 15 συλλαμβάνειν is read after Weil for the συμβάλλειν of the MSS. 'The Act. συμβάλλειν in the sense of making a contract is naturally (?) confined to ten passages in the *Private* speeches, in only three of which is it followed by the dative and in none by ἐπὶ.' If the word is supported by ten passages, and the construction with the dative by three, is not that enough? Why should the word be confined to the *Private* Speeches? In *ib.* § 17 Dr. Sandys reads ἡγέται after Cobet for ἡγέιρο. I take the connection to be: Philip is secure in the rest of his acquisitions, because he has retained towns belonging to Athens, and he retained them because he thought that he would not be safe in Macedonia, if he gave up Amphipolis and Potidaea. Philip's action falls in the past, and was due to what he thought in the past.....These are very slight matters and opinions may differ about them. About the excellence of this edition there can be no difference of opinion. Is it possible that Dr. Sandys may be induced to edit the three 'Hellenic' speeches, of which an English edition is certainly a desideratum?—On p. 208 there is a misprint, *Clabrias* for *Chabrias*.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

USENER AND RADERMACHER'S *DIONYSII HALICARNASEI OPUSCULA*.

Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula. Ediderunt HERMANNUS USENER et LUDOVICUS RADERMACHER. Volumen prius. Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri. MDCCCXCIX. pp. xlv, 438. M. 6.

THIS important book forms the fifth volume of the Teubner edition of the remains of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The four volumes which precede it contain the *Antiquitates Romanae*. As Dionysius himself clearly held the *History of Early Rome* to be his *opus magnum*, it seems natural enough to apply the term *Opuscula* to his essays in literary criticism. They are certainly shorter in length, and their author no doubt regarded them as inferior in value. But authors are not always the best judges of the comparative merits of their own works; and like many historians since his day, Dionysius is seen to less advantage in the great effort of his life than in his minor

writings. Historical criticism is not his strong point, and in this respect he suffers sorely by comparison with his Greek predecessors Thucydides and Polybius, whose true greatness he seems hardly to have realised. In literary criticism, on the other hand, he excels. Writing chiefly as a teacher of composition, and paying special attention to the practical needs of students of oratory, he has left behind him a valuable collection of *Scripta Rhetorica et Critica*. Such is the older and traditional title; and we may hope that it will not fall entirely into disuse. It has distinct advantages of its own. It invites no comparison between works of a different order. It is also sufficiently descriptive, since the writings in question are either rhetorical or critical, if they do not (as is often the case) partake of both characters at once.

The contents of the present volume are arranged as follows by its editors, whose

guiding principle is rather the connection of the subject-matter than any conjectural order of publication: *De Antiquis Oratoribus Lib. I,—de Lysia, de Isocrate, de Isaeo. De Antiquis Oratoribus Lib. II,—de Demosthene, Reliquiae. Ep. ad Ammaeum I. Tabulae Criticae Orationum Atticarum, Reliquiae Librorum Perditorum, Libellus de Dinarcho. De Thucydide. Ep. ad Ammaeum II.* Roughly it may be said that all the writings thus enumerated have reference either to the Attic orators or to Thucydides. For a second volume there remain the *de Compositione Verborum*, the *Epistula ad Pompeium*, the fragments of the *de Imitatione*, and the *Ars Rhetorica*. This last work, the attribution of any part of which to Dionysius is doubtful, was edited separately by Usener in 1895 under the title *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae fertur Ars Rhetorica*. Previously (in 1889) Usener had brought out *Dionysii Halicarnassensis Librorum de Imitatione Reliquiae Epistulaeque Criticae Duae*, one of the two epistles thus denoted being the *ad Pompeium*. Consequently he has already edited, in a separate form, the entire contents of the second volume with the exception of the *de Compositione Verborum*. And although he has not actually edited the *de Compositione*, yet he has given, in an *Index Scholarum* published as far back as 1878, an admirable classification of the manuscripts of this treatise and an equally admirable specimen of a reconstructed text. These facts warrant the expectation that the second volume will follow the first at no long interval.

As editors of the critical works of Dionysius, Usener and Radermacher stand in a distinguished line of succession. Among their predecessors may be mentioned R. Stephanus, H. Stephanus, F. Sylburg, William Holwell, and J. J. Reiske. The editions of Sylburg (1586) and of Reiske (1774–1777) are especially notable as containing the whole extant work, historical and critical, of Dionysius. Reiske's six volumes have, indeed, continued to be the standard edition till our own time, when they have been superseded in the historical portions by the texts of Kiessling and of Jacoby, and in the critical portions by that of Usener and Radermacher. Even now the supersession is only partial, for the student will often turn gladly to the *Variorum* notes which Reiske embodied, with valuable supplements of his own, in his great work.

Modern scholars can but rejoice in the happy association, to which we owe the

present edition, of Hermann Usener with his pupil at Bonn, Ludwig Radermacher, a writer already favourably known by those studies in the history of Ancient Rhetoric which he has contributed to recent volumes of the *Rhenish Museum*. In the severity of a critical edition like this it is not often that personal details emerge; but we cannot hear without sympathy of an 'affection of the eyes' from which the older scholar has suffered, or read without interest of his younger colleague's failure (in one slight particular) to keep fully abreast of the current literature of his subject while working at his task in the 'lonely Eifel country.' Their co-operation must have been an advantage to both workers; and it is a pleasure to think that the tradition of profound classical learning is still unbroken in the great university beside the Rhine. In 1858 Usener was presenting at Bonn his *Analecta Theophrastea* as a graduate's dissertation; and five years later Friedrich Blass of the same university wrote on a similar occasion his *De Dionysii Halicarnassensis Scriptis Rhetoricis*. The work done by Radermacher may be regarded as an indication that these two eminent Hellenists are influencing the younger generation of students as effectively as Otto Jahn once influenced them.

In the volume before us Usener is more immediately responsible for the two *Letters to Ammaeus* and for the treatise *On Thucydides*; the text of the remaining portions has been edited by Radermacher. Usener himself writes the *Praefatio*, which deals with the history of the text. The general conclusion reached, after a discussion which is as masterly as it is minute, may be briefly stated. For the *Second Letter to Ammaeus* the Paris manuscript 1741 (tenth or eleventh century) is the sole independent authority.¹ The *de Dinarcho* depends entirely on the Florence manuscript lix. 15 (twelfth century). The remaining works included in this volume fall, from the textual point of view, into two sets. For the *First Letter to Ammaeus*, the *Letter to Pompeius*, and the essays on *Thucydides* and *Demosthenes*, there are available a number of manuscripts (none of them older than the fifteenth century) which Usener regards as derived from a rhetorical *Sylloge* (S) now lost. For the

¹ This manuscript contains not only the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, but also the *Ars Rhetorica*, the *de Compositione*, and the fragments of the *de Imitatione*. The text of the *de Compositione* has been recently discussed, with special reference to Oxford MSS., by Mr. A. B. Poynton in the *Journal of Philology*, Vol. xxvii. No. 53.

de *Lysia*, de *Isocrate*, de *Isaeo*, and for the *Proem*, there is a double tradition, that of S and that of the Florence manuscript above-mentioned. Thus does Usener, on the basis of collations made by himself or supplied by his friends, sift and determine the claims of the numerous manuscripts of Dionysius. To none except those above indicated will he allow any independent value.

It need hardly be said that their prolonged study of the Greek rhetoricians often leads the present editors to retain a manuscript reading with which others might be tempted to tamper. Though not the men to shrink from conjectural emendation when they are face to face with a manifest corruption, they show that wise conservatism which is the offspring of knowledge. They know the later rhetorical language too well to fall into those traps which await the unwary. The nature of these pitfalls may be illustrated by an example. Not long ago it was stated, with a confidence which would have been admirable had it been justified, that Δημοσθένης ἐπέστραπται (in the sense 'Demosthenes is condensed, displays concentrated force') is impossible Greek. But when, in editing Dionysius, Usener and Radermacher find συνέστραπται similarly used of Lysias, they never dream of altering it. To do so would be no less gratuitous than to quarrel with Quintilian because he speaks of the Attic writers as 'pressi et integri,' or with Cicero because he describes Thucydides as 'verbis aptus et pressus.' Almost as soon might Jane Austen be taxed (on the ground that Ben Jonson applies the word 'concise' not to persons but to style) with bad English when, in *Mansfield Park*, she says 'if he wrote to his father, no wonder he was concise.' Points so obvious as this Usener and Radermacher, naturally, do not feel called upon to establish. But in cases of more serious difficulty they have a convenient habit of giving a reference, or a morsel of exegesis, by way of defending the manuscript reading. Instances may be found on pages 179, 189, 245, 329, 342, 373 of this edition. May we anticipate that, when Usener comes to re-edit the fragments of the *de Imitatione*, he will find himself able now to retain at least one reading, which he challenged eleven years ago? In the second book of the *de Imitatione*, P 1741 gives: ἐξήλωσεν δὲ πρῶτον μὲν τὸ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἀτελῆ καταλιπεῖν τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείνῳ τρόπῳ. The reference is to Philistus as an imitator of Thucydides; and although Usener prints ἀπλήν, ἀτελῆ is abundantly confirmed by *de Thucydide*, c. 16 and by *ad Pomp.* c. 3.

Admirers of Thucydides were supposed by the later Greek critics to have been so carried away by fanaticism that they left their histories unfinished in imitation of him!

As among the best of the conjectural emendations in this volume may be mentioned πελαγίσῃ for πολλάκις in *de Isaeo* c. 14, ἐφ' οἷς εἰσιν ἀνθρώπιναι σπονδαὶ for ἐφοῖς ἐὰν ἀνθρωπίν[α]ις τοῦ δέ in *de Isocrate* c. 6, τοτὲ δὲ τὸ μελιχρόν for τό τε λεγόμενον ἐχθρόν in *de adm. vi dic. in Dem.* c. 48. Less happy conjectures are: δᾶν in *de adm. vi dic. in Dem.* c. 11, Πλάτων as a vocative c. 24 *ibid.* (if so here, why not also in c. 31 fin.?), θηρώσης *de Thucyd.* c. 1 (cp. *de adm. vi dic. in Dem.* c. 40). In *de adm. vi dic. in Dem.* c. 13 Radermacher seems right in preferring ἀναγκαῖον to Usener's Ἀυσιακόν. In c. 5 of the same essay it might have been well to write μείγμα rather than μίγμα, since the manuscript reading δείγμα in *ad Pomp.* c. 2 (where this passage is reproduced) seems to point to the original presence of the diphthong.

The manuscripts of Dionysius not infrequently themselves indicate lacunae in the text. To the number of these gaps the editors, beginning with Sylburg, have steadily added; and Usener and Radermacher have certainly furnished their full quota. The words 'hiatum indicavi' or 'lacunam indicavi' are a constantly recurring feature of their critical notes. Occasionally supplements are attempted. Some of these are successful, as in *de Thucyd.* c. 25 τὸ γὰρ 'συγγενές' καὶ τὸ 'ἐταιρικόν' <ἀντὶ τῆς συγγενείας καὶ τῆς ἐταιρίας> κείμενον μετεῖληπται, where a scholium gives the hint for the insertion made; others unnecessary, as in *de Dinarcho* c. 1 ὥστε τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους αὐτοῦ λόγους σχεδὸν πᾶσι ἐπὶ ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ὄντας <πάντας> ἀγνοεῖν συμβέβηκε, where πάντας is inserted by Radermacher *de suo*.

In typography and general appearance the volume is worthy of the house of Teubner. The misprints are rare. I have noticed few beyond the wrong letter on the top of p. 7, the wrong numeral on the fifth line of p. xxxii., and the doubtful punctuation on p. 362 l. 20 and on p. 235 l. 1. For certain small inconsistencies in the method of dividing Greek words at the end of lines, and in the writing of modern proper names, the dual editorship is probably responsible rather than the printers.

Of the work as a whole it may be said that it needed doing and that it has been done well. More than a century has passed

since the appearance of Reiske's edition, and the non-existence of a modern critical edition of the rhetorical writings has been often lamented in Germany and elsewhere. The want has now been excellently supplied; and not only the reader of Dionysius, but also the editors of Thucydides and of other writers whom Dionysius quotes can feel full confidence that they have before them a trustworthy and discriminating report of the best manuscript evidence available. The task accomplished has entailed great

labour and demanded the most varied erudition. The second volume will, it is to be hoped, reach the same high standard; and the two volumes together will then form an invaluable aid to the study of Dionysius as a literary critic, and should do much to make him better known in this his true sphere. It is as an interpreter of Greek literature, rather than as an authority on Roman history, that he shines and illuminates.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

TWO BOOKS ON LUCIAN.

- (1) *Lucian, The Syrian Satirist.* By Lieut.-Col. H. W. L. HIME. Pp. 95. (Longmans, 1900). 7s. 6d.
- (2) *Lucianus.* Recognovit JULIUS SOMMERBRODT. Pp. 306. Vol. III. (Berlin, Weidmann, 1899). 6 Marks.

COLONEL HIME's short study of Lucian's life, works, and character is marked by a certain freshness of interest and by a genuine effort to come close to his subject and see clearly the man and the author. But the result is marred by narrowness of previous study and by a readiness to be contented with insufficient evidence. Apart from children's books and stories, probably no author can be quite understood and appreciated without a full study of his age and surroundings; and Lucian's relations to religion and philosophy can neither be grasped nor explained to a reader without a much fuller survey of the position of sects and of the vitality of pagan religion than that which Col. Hime has undertaken. He gives no clear general view of the schools of philosophy among which Lucian found himself, and his account of the religious circumstances of the day is contained in little more than two pages. It is hard that a man whose mind has ripened upon other subjects cannot turn to a classic author and make a study of him *per se* without more ado, but so it is.

All the learning in the world, too, would be of little use if it were not supported by judgment and by an eye for the value of evidence. We should have an interesting, and even a valuable acquisition, if it could be proved that Lucian showed some familiarity with Latin literature. But, though not impossible, this is *a priori* not to be expected of a Greek writer; and Col. Hime's

attempt to prove it is the thinnest of argumentation. Lucian no doubt knew some Latin (*De Electro* 2, *Pro Lapsu* 13); it would be odd if he did not, after living and travelling in Rome and Gaul: but Col. Hime adduces no real proof that any phrase in his writings is to be traced back to a Latin author. The argument is that, as Lucian used the *Odyssey* at least six times without acknowledgment, so he may have used Latin writers. So he *may*: but this carries us forward but little, unless we find undoubted cases of borrowing: and, if we had them, we could do without the parallel use of the *Odyssey*. But Col. Hime gives us no undoubted cases: the phrases cited are either too vague and general (as the resemblance between Lucretius 4,365-75 and Lucian's *Nekyom.* 11) or may well go back to a common original (as likenesses between the *Nekyom.* and *Aeneid VI*). Lucian describes how Europa on the bull τῇ ἐτέρᾳ [χερὶ] ἡνεωμένον τὸν πέπλον ξυνείχεν *Dial. Mar.* 15). But if it is argued that this detail must be drawn from Ovid's *laeva retinebat amictus* (*P. V.* 305), why not push on further and recognise an earlier source for both in Greek sculpture?

A more promising field for study about Lucian is the suggestion that his was an "Asiatic mind" (p. 39).

"The wild luxuriance and lavish prodigality of imagery displayed in the 'Veræ Historiæ' [sic], and elsewhere, are not astonishing when we reflect that Lucian was a Western Asiatic. He possessed the imagination of his race, the imagination of Firdousi's 'Shahnama,' and the 'Arabian Nights,' of Job, Isaiah and the Apocalypse" (p. 89).

The line of thought thus suggested is, however, pushed no further.