

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](#)



Forman's Index to Andocides, Lycurgus and Dinarchus *Index Andocideus, Lycurgeus, Dinarcheus*, confectus a L. L. Forman, Ph.D. Oxford (Clarendon Press). 1897. Pp. 91. 7s. 6d.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 01 / February 1900, pp 65 - 66
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080331, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080331

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 65-66 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080331

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

i.e. the gods (or the mention of them) are the foundation-stones on which the ode is to be built. The present writer has independently reached the same conclusion, or perhaps been led to it by some one else. Dr. Fennell has also strengthened his interpretation of *Nem.* v. 44 by regarding ὁμόσπορον ἔρνος as an accusative, and has been wise, we think, in adopting the βλάβεν of the Vatican in *Nem.* vii. 17, where he makes a new point by giving to σοφοὶ the special meaning of 'poets.'

In other cases he cannot command so ready an assent, for example, when he reads

γόνον (preferring it to υἱὸν on unsatisfactory palaeographical grounds) for ὕμνον in *Nem.* iv. 16 and when he emends διδάσκειο for δέσεται in line 90: nor is his emendation of *Nem.* vi. 52, 53 βαρὺ δέ σφι νεῖκος Ἀχιλεὺς ἔμπαϊε χαμαὶ καταβὰς ἀφ' ἁρμάτων convincing.

The new edition is decidedly better printed than the old; but the title-page still omits to mention the *Fragments*, which occupy forty-eight pages.

GILBERT DAVIES.

FORMAN'S INDEX TO ANDOCIDES, LYCURGUS AND DINARCHUS.

Index Andocideus, Lycurgeus, Dinarcheus, confectus a L. L. FORMAN, Ph.D. Oxford (Clarendon Press). 1897. Pp. 91. 7s. 6d.

THE Index to Demosthenes (1892) and Aeschines (1896) by Preuss, to Lysias (1895) by D. H. Holmes, and to Antiphon (1895) by Van Cleef, is now followed by Forman's Index to three more of the Attic Orators—Andocides, Lycurgus, and Dinarchus. Even a cursory inspection of the Index to Lycurgus and Dinarchus is enough to prove that (as might have been expected) their vocabulary is practically identical with that of their great contemporary Demosthenes; but a careful comparison of the Index to Andocides shows that it includes as many as 112 words not found in Demosthenes. In the following list I distinguish words found in the fragments alone by f., and those occurring only in the fourth speech, *Against Alcibiades*, by (4), this speech being generally regarded as spurious.

ἀγωνοθέταις (4)	ἀρασάμενοι
ἀμιλλᾶσθαι (4)	ἀργυροκοπέω, f.
ἀνεβίω	ἀριστίνδην
ἀνακρύπτονται	ἀρπαγῆς (4)
ἀνανδρίας	ἀρχιδέωρος
ἀναυμαχίου	ἀρχάνης
ἀνηράσθη	βιαιότητος (4)
ἀνηλεῶς (4)	βόρειον
ἀνθρακευτάς, f.	διαβουλεύσασθαι
ἀνωρθίαζον	διαπεπλασμένος
ἀντειθυμοῦσι (4)	διασχυρίζεσθαι
ἀντωνέιτο	ἐδίπλασε (4)
ἀπαγχομένη	δυσδαιμονιάς
ἀπεκερδαίνωμεν	———έστερος
ἀπωλοφυράμην	δυσπραγία
ἔπονον	δυστυχήματι
ἀποπειρώμενοι	ἔδραν
ἀποτελεσθῇ	ἐκπορίζουσι
ἀποφοράν	ἐξεστρατευμένοι

ἐμπολεμῆν	ὁμόνηφοι
ἐξοπλιζόμενος, f.	ὀρχήστραν
ἐξάρμει	ὠστρακισμένον
ἐξωστρακίσσατε (4)	ὠστρακισθῆναι (4)
ἐπαναφορᾶς	παρακινδυνεύω
ἐπεισάγων (4)	περικαίονται
ἐπεγήμει	πιστότητος
ἐπιδόξειε (4)	προκρυκευσόμενον
ἐπεστράτευσε	πρόρριζον
ἐπίτριπτον	προσπηδῶ
ἐστίαν	προσπεράξατο (4)
εὐαδίκητος (4)	πρόσταξις
εὐθαρσείν	προτάξartes
εὐωχεῖν, f.	πρῶ
θηρεύειν	πῶλιον
καταπεπτακυνίας	σάλπιγγι
κατελεῆσαι	σελήνην
κίονος	σιταγωγοί
κλαυμάτων (4)	σκάνδικας, f.
κληδῶν	στασιωτείας (4)
κοινότητα (4)	στεφανηφόρος
κρατιστεύειν	έστεγμένος, f.
κυάμφ	συγκατέλυσας
κάνειον	συγκατέσκαψας
κωπίας	συμφιλονικάντων (4)
λαθραῖον (4)	συνεκτραφέις
ἐλῆσω	συννικῶντας
λογιστηρίοις	συνωμότας (4)
λυροποῖός	τειχῆρεις
λυχνοποιεῖν, f.	τοσαυτάκις (4)
μήνυσις	ὑπεραυξανόμενος (4)
μηνύτρων	ὑπουργημάτων
μισοδήμους (4)	φάγομεν, f.
μισοδημία (4)	φιλότητα
μοιχείας (4)	φιλοχρήματος (4)
ναυκρατίαν, f.	χαλκείω
νότιον	χροнисθέντες
οἰκτος	

It will be observed that among the words characteristic of the author of the speech *Against Alcibiades*, are the abstract terms βιαιότης, κοινότης and στασιωτεία, the poetic κλαύματα and λαθραῖος and the very rare adjective εὐαδίκητος. Thus the evidence derived from the vocabulary of this speech

may be added to the other reasons for regarding it as not written by Andocides.

In Forman's *Index to Lycurgus* it might have been well if the words found in the Oath in § 81 had been distinguished from the orator's own language. Among these words are δεκατεύσω, εὐηκοήσω, θαλλώ, στοιχίσω, the second and fourth of which it may be safe to say would never have been used by Lycurgus himself. Similarly δαιμόνων, ἐσθλόν, νοῦν, τρέπει, φρενῶν might have been marked as coming from a poetic quotation, especially as the second and the last of these words are hardly ever found in prose, although φρενῶν is found once in Andocides and φρένας only in the peroration of the Speech *On the Crown*. δοκιμασίαν may be added to δοκιμασίαι from frag. 24, Ἐκατόμπεδον from frag. 58, θαλλόν and θαλλοῦ from frag. 88 and 58, χλιωθέντα comes from frag. 11 and κεχλιώσθαι from frag. 55, and ᾠδεῖον from frag. 58. ἰσχνῶς (§ 80) will probably have to give way in future editions to Haupt's emendation ἴχνος, also λειποταξίου (§ 147) to λιποταξίου, and ὁρίους (§ 109) to ἡρίους, and συγγενεῖς (§ 122) to εὐγενεῖς. All these corrections are adopted in the recent edition by Blass (1899). To these I may add γονέων as a correction of the poetic word τοκέων in § 147. I have made the same suggestion in [Dem.] 35 § 48; in both passages it may be supported by κάκωσις γονέων in Aristotle's *Const. of Athens*, 56 § 6 and οἱ περὶ τῶν γονέων νόμοι in Dem. 39 § 33.

In Forman's *Indices* the articles on ἀλλά, ἄν, ἅπας and πᾶς, γάρ, εἰ, ἐπειδή and ὥς are not a mere string of references, but include a proper classification of the various uses of the words. Thus a distinction is drawn between the passages in which ἅπας or πᾶς precedes the noun and article, and those in

which it succeeds them. The articles on νόμος and ψήφισμα in the Index to Lycurgus would have been more instructive if, instead of a bald list of references, they had similarly been classified under *leges Dracontiae*, *leges militares*, *leges frumentariae*, *populiscitum de Phrynicho*, *de Hipparcho*, etc., as in the short Index to the text of Blass.

The Index to Lycurgus by Sergius Kondratiew (Moscow, 1897) is a very painstaking piece of work, but is less accurate than that of Forman. The order is not always strictly alphabetical, and the following items, included by Forman, are omitted. Ἀγλαυρος, ἄδειαν, ἀράμενον, ἀνάγειον, ἄνοικος, ἀντεῖπον, εἰρεσιώγη, εἰσβάλλειν, ἐντεῦθεν, καταβληθέντων, κατέλευσαν (71 bis), Κοιρωνίδαι, ποιητέον, and σεμιδαλις. The misprints are as follows: ἄψιον for ἄξιον, διήλλαξαν for -εν, ἐλέησεν for ἦλ-, ἐμπεπορτεμένους for ἐμπεπορπημένους, ἐναγγελιζόμενος for εὖ-, ἐπιτελώματα for ἐπιτελεώματα, ἐπετρεψάμεν for ἐπετρεπεύσαμεν, εὐμολπον for Εὖ-, κατέλυσαν for -έλευσαν, λογοποιεῖν for λωποδυτεῖν, μετακοντίζεσθαι for μετακομιζεσθαι, ᾠχετε for ᾠχετο, παρῆναι for παρείσθαι (s.v. παρήμι), προκτησασθαι for προσ-, προσέδωκα for προσεδόκα, σκέψεως for σκήψεως, σύμβουλον for σύμβολον, Τιμοχάρης for Τιμοχάρης, Φιλόμελος for Φιλόμηλος, and Χαιρωνείας for Χαιρωνεῖα. Lastly under ὑπέρ (gen.) we have a reference to § 39, where ὑπέρ is really found with the accusative. Both in accuracy and in beauty of typography the printers at Moscow are far excelled by those of the Clarendon Press. The light grey binding of Forman's *Index* adds much to the attractiveness of an excellent piece of work.

J. E. SANDYS.

TWO RECENT TEXTS OF ARISTOTLE'S *RESPUBLICA*.

- (1) *Aristotelis ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ* tertium ediderunt G. KAIBEL et U. DE WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORF. Berlin, Weidmann, 1898. pp. xvii. and 98. 1 M. 80 Pf.
- (2) *Aristotelis ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ* tertium edidit F. BLASS. Leipzig, Teubner, 1898. pp. xxxi. and 126. 1 M. 80 Pf.

IN these two books we have the result of the matured experience gained by more than seven years' close study of the Consti-

tution of Athens, first published just nine years since. Comparing the works together we find that they approach one another more nearly than the second editions by the respective editors; *ut laeti agnoscere possimus*, says Blass, *legendi restituendique progressus magnos non opinione sed re ipsa factos* (p. xxi.). In no small degree this gain is due to the careful examination of the original in the British Museum by Prof. Wilcken, whose merit in particular is recognised in the improved form in which