



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

Professor MAX SCHNEIDEWIN has presented the world with a bulky volume of 558 pp. entitled *Die antike Humanität* (Weidmann), in which he has brought together, without any attempt at literary finish, many facts and reflexions in regard to a theme of permanent and universal interest. The author does not profess to have ransacked every nook and corner of antiquity for documents, and the draughts he has drawn on Cicero, whom he sets up as the accepted type of antique 'humanity,' are so considerable that this book may be regarded as a companion-piece to the slighter performance of the same writer published in 1890, 'Die Horazische Lebensweisheit.' No wonder, then, that the work revives for the reader the charm of Cicero and Cicero's circle, which is not less real because it is exotic, which, like the charm of the winter palaces of Russia, is only heightened by the rigor of the atmosphere without. When we are with Cicero we are in good society, society that is redolent of Scipionic traditions, and it would be rude to scratch the skin of this and that Roman grandee and compare the fine Greek sentiments with the merciless downright-ness of Italian action. Doubtless Cicero, the *novus homo*, and Horace, *libertino patre natus*, were saturated with Greek 'humanity,' but the Greek must have the credit of it all, directly or indirectly, and there is evidence enough that the Hellene or Hellenist, Greek or Greekling, whichever you choose, was fully alive to the essential hardness of the Roman character and was fully aware of his own success and his own failure in the emollient process.

---

But there are other sides to Cicero than the Greek side, the ethical, the philosophical, the humane side. He was much more than a translator of Panaetius, though the *de Officiis* has proved itself a potent book; much more than a clever lawyer, though the French Revolution is said to have been the work of lawyers; and in an essay which takes the form of a discourse in celebration of the second millennium of Cicero's birth, Professor ZIELINSKI has produced a sketch of Cicero's influence on the ages which forms a striking contrast to the work just mentioned, both in bulk and, if it must be said, in brilliancy. With such a champion as Professor ZIELINSKI is, the friends of Cicero may well take heart, for, as one reads this masterly summary of Cicero's after-life, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Teubner), Drumann's savagery and Mommsen's sarcasm, the bludgeon of the one and the rapier of the other, lose weight and point. The salient features are tipped with light, and the test-question, 'What thinkest thou of Cicero?,' is most effectively put to the leaders of human thought and action. Cicero's immense influence on style is generally recognized after a vague fashion, though perhaps few are aware that every penny-a-liner on the daily press is swayed by his

example and his precepts; but his influence on the course of history at its critical points is a matter that only such a cross-section as ZIELINSKI has given us can bring to the consciousness. What Cicero did for Christianity, what for the Renaissance, for the Reformation, for the French Revolution,—how he affected the leaders of those great transitional periods, this is the theme of an essay which combines the rhetorical swing of the panegyrist with the sober merits of historical story research. That Augustin was converted by reading Cicero is a familiar story, and no one that has once read is likely to forget the passage in Luther's Table-talk in which he extols the man who has wrought and suffered above that 'ass of leisure, Aristotle'—'weit überlegen,' he says, 'dem müssigen Esel Aristoteli'; but the influence of Cicero the humanitarian on Voltaire, of Cicero the orator on Mirabeau, of Cicero the republican statesman on the leaders of the French Revolution is not always present to the average mind. Vergniaud was the Cicero of the Gironde and denounced Robespierre in phrases borrowed from the Catilinarie, and Robespierre defended his cause and prolonged his power by a telling use of passages taken from the *Oratio pro P. Sulla*. With the close of the French Revolution ZIELINSKI bids the procession stop and contents himself with citing Taine to show the estimate in which Cicero is held by that penetrating student of history and literature, and with reinforcing in a brief summary the important lesson that with every advancing stage of culture the vision for the antique becomes wider and deeper and that the value of the antique is enhanced from stage to stage.

---

All who admire the scholarship, the precision, the balance of M. HENRI WEIL will be glad to have in a convenient volume the collection of his papers entitled *Études sur le drame antique* (Hachette). Nearly all these studies belong to a recent period. One, it is true, goes back to the remote date 1847, one to 1864, but of the remaining eight there is none older than 1886, and the eighth deals with the important work of M. MASQUERAY, *Les formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque*, which was published as late as 1895 and is still awaiting the notice it deserves in this Journal. It is a book which M. WEIL justly praises for the exhaustive command of the literature, its wide scope, its fine appreciation of the *ἦθος* of the lyric measures of tragedy. M. WEIL's admiration of *Wilamowitz's Herakles*, the subject of another chapter, is frankly expressed, while he preserves the independence of his judgment in details, a hard thing to do, if one yields at all to the rush of that fervid genius. Zieliński's *ἀγών* with all its minute subdivisions M. WEIL cannot bring himself to accept, but he recognizes, as some have refused to do (A. J. P. X 383), the popular element that lies at the basis of the comic debate, and compares the quarrel between tanner and sausage-seller in the Knights with the altercation of the modern carnival. "On pense," he says, "à notre carnaval: deux masques se provoquent, se criblent de lazzi; on fait cercle autour d'eux, on les encourage, on les excite, comme fait le chœur de l'antique comédie. De pareilles scènes n'étaient sans doute pas rares dans les joyeux ébats des Dionysiaques." In another article M. WEIL takes up M. Decharme's book, *Euripide et l'esprit de son théâtre*. M. Decharme is especially emphatic on the

atheism and rationalism of Euripides, and here, as elsewhere, M. WEIL has a wise word of caution. True, every scholar knows that atheism does not mean the same thing in Greek as it does in English (A. J. P. XVII 362), but it was well worth the while to say (p. 105): "Si l'on dit que le théâtre d'Euripide agit comme un dissolvant sur les vieilles fables et les croyances populaires, on dit vrai, mais on ne dit pas tout. Euripide n'a pas seulement ébranlé les opinions reçues, il a puissamment contribué à répandre une conception plus haute du divin, qui devait être celle de l'avenir." In the same paper Dörpfeld's theory of the stage comes up. M. WEIL minimizes the difference between the old view and the new, but holds after all to the raised wooden stage, and the words ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς are to him a stone of stumbling, as they have been to many philologists (A. J. P. XVIII 119). "Il faut vraiment," he says, "beaucoup de bonne volonté pour traduire [ces mots] par *près de la scène* plutôt que par *sur la scène*," and after the appearance of Dörpfeld and Reich's book he adds: "Tout le monde ne se persuadera pas non plus que les acteurs sont appelés οἱ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς parcequ'ils sortaient de la σκηνή."

---

Mr. MARCHANT has added *Book VI* to the three books of *Thukydides* he has already edited, II, III, VII (Macmillan). The text is based on Hude's, but the editor shows his wonted independence in minor matters. There is a chapter of new explanations headed 'Some *Cruces*' which will be read with interest by Thukydidean scholars. An adjutant and admirer of Dr. Rutherford's, Mr. MARCHANT has learned from his master the importance of a sharp formulation of Attic usage, and his work shows advancing appreciation of syntactical phenomena. As he has referred to this Journal (XIII 259), à propos of the negative in c. 81, 5, it may be as well to say that I cannot see any call for 'mobility' in order to understand so simple a case as τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔχθραν μὴ ἂν βραχεῖαν γενόμενῃν. The article with the participle gives, as it often does, the impulse to the negative μὴ, and the resolution is not what Mr. MARCHANT has, ἡ οὐκ ἂν βραχεῖα γένοιτο, but ἡ μὴ ἂν βραχεῖα γένοιτο, the so-called characteristic relative (ἡ = ἡτις) taking μὴ. See A. J. P. I 54, 56, and for rel., μὴ ἂν, opt. comp. Dem. 19, 313; 20, 161; 21, 203; Plato, Phileb. 20 A; Legg. 839 A, 872 D. For a parallel use of μὴ ἂν c. partic. see Dem. 54, 40 ὁ μὴδὲν ἂν ὁμόσας, with Sandys' note. This is one of the many points that show the importance of an historical survey for the appreciation of syntactical phenomena. It was only when the participle was consciously employed as the shorthand of a hypotactic sentence that the neg. μὴ could be used with it. Pindar's ὁ μὴ συννείεις (N. 4, 31) is a distinct advance not only on Homer, but also on Hesiod, whose βῶδς . . . μὴ τετοκίως (O. et D. 591) is under the domination of the imperative opt. εἴη.

---

Dr. RUTHERFORD's Introduction to his *Scholía Aristophanica* (Macmillan) is a prolonged growl over the uncongenial work that has cost the leisure of no less than seven years. Αἰάζω Διότιμον. The subject-matter of the scholia of the Codex Ravennas, he says, would not have tempted him to edit them. In

fact, "the direct value of any corpus of scholia as a commentary upon the text to which it belongs is in no degree commensurate with its indirect value as evidence, on the one hand, of the manner in which classical texts have been manipulated at different periods in the history of learning, and, on the other hand, of the kind of corruption and interpolation to which they have been exposed." We know the note from the Introduction to his Fourth Book of Thukydides. Still, a man might be worse employed than in laboring over the Greek scholia. It is higher work than the preparation of an index, and the preparation of an index is better than making canons of Greek usage on the basis of imperfect induction. It is something to have to one's credit two such stately volumes as these. The third volume is still due, the volume that is to contain Dr. Rutherford's conclusions, drawn from his seven years' study of the scholia; and while we are grateful for all that these two volumes hold, it is the third volume in which we shall behold the flower of the Scottish thistle.

---

The most striking characteristic of Professor TYRRELL's edition of the *Troades* (Macmillan) is the sympathetic discernment with which he has brought out the poetic vein of Euripides. In so doing he has made free use of translation—now an apt rendering of his own, now an extract from Mr. Way's brilliant version. The book is meant for boys, and, as Professor TYRRELL justly remarks, 'a boy should not be encouraged to think that the Greek poets were bald and frigid.' How soon the attention of the student should be called to the dissonances of Euripidean style, designed or not, is another matter. Dr. Verrall's 'Euripides the Rationalist' would not be a good book to put in the hands of a beginner in Euripides, and the young student would be rather puzzled than edified by a demonstration of the contrarieties of the diction and the syntax of Euripides, the matching of cloth of gold with cloth of frize. The metres are not neglected, as in so many English editions, but it is to be regretted that Professor Jebb's example has not been followed and that Schmidt's schemes have not been reproduced. It seems rather late in the day to cite Dr. Kennedy's views in the matter of Greek metres.

---

Dr. SANDYS' edition of the *First Philippic and the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes* (Macmillan) is marked by his unflinching adequacy. Every side of his author is treated with sound judgment, excellent taste and rare command of the literature. The proof-reading is good. An odd mistake occurs p. 36, §25 (critical note), where read '*suus* locus est infinitivo supra §12, Bl.' By the way, if Blass means to differentiate between participle and inf. in the two passages, he sees too much. §12 reads: *τί τὸ κωλύον ἐτ' αὐτὸν ἔσται βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται*; §25: *τίς αὐτὸν κωλύσει δεῦρο βαδίζοντα*; As *βαδίζοντα* is conditional, = *ἐάν βαδίζῃ*, the difference is naught. In conditional relations inf. and part. often meet. *αἰσχυνοίμην ἂν ἀντιλέγων* (X. Mem. 2, 6, 37) = *εἰ ἀντιλέγοιμι* = *ἀντιλέγειν*. See Hertlein (1853) on X. Cyr. 3, 2, 16.

An esteemed correspondent sends to the Journal the following note on FÜGNER's *Lexicon Livianum, Fasciculus III, s. v. ad, cum gerundio vel gerundivo*, which seems to belong to the black list of *Brief Mention*:

"The following incorrect references have been noticed: 28, 9, 1 for 28, 29, 1, p. 432, 8; 44, 19, 4 for 41, 19, 4, p. 441, 1; 10, 55, 4 for 10, 35, 4, p. 447, 16; 25, 35, 4 for 25, 36, 4, p. 448, 24; 31, 47, 2 for 31, 46, 2, p. 448, 38; 23, 34, 9 for 29, 34, 9, p. 457, 23. In a few instances the Lex. fails as a guide for the Weissenborn ed.: 4, 11, 5 triumviri ad coloniam Ardeam deducendam is not given p. 428, 2 (creo), nor p. 457, 40 (triumviri). 40, 24, 5 ad quod celebrandum is not given p. 434, 39. 42, 10, 8 ad quam pestem frugum tollendam . . . missus, ingenti agmine hominum ad colligendas eas coacto. The first gerundive is not given s. v. *mitto*; the second is not given p. 426, 19, where is given 9, 21, 3 magno exercitu coacto ad eximendos obsidione socios."

---

*Brief Mention* has received the following note from Dr. J. KEELHOFF, of Antwerp: "Sur l'expression *εἰ μὴ διὰ* cf. Rost, Griech. Gram., 7te Aufl., p. 641, note: 'Zu ergänzen (Plat. Gorg. 516 E) *οὐκ ἐνέπεσεν*, also der reine Gegensatz des im Hauptsatz enthaltenen Praedikates, wie *immer bei dieser Wendung*.' Votre explication [A. J. P. X 124, XVI 396, XVII 128] se rencontre donc avec celle de Rost, ce qui augmente encore les chances de probabilité. On trouve de bien bonnes choses dans cette syntaxe qu'on ne consulte plus guère." To my mind the explanation is so evident that it only needs to be stated, and I am not surprised that so sensible a grammarian as Rost was had reached the same formula, which, however, does not occur in the earlier editions, to which alone I had access.