

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](#)



Wright on the Date of Cylon *The Date of Cylon*, by John Henry Wright. Reprinted from the 'Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.' Boston : U.S.A. Ginn and Co. 1892. (80 pp.)

J. W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 10 / December 1892, pp 457 - 458
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186974, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186974

How to cite this article:

J. W. Headlam (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 457-458 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186974

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tenth century—the Venetian *Iliad*, the Ravenna Aristophanes, the Anthology, manuscripts of Demosthenes, of Aristotle, of the Tragedians, are these Constantinopolitan or provincial?

There is one characteristic of the Italo-Greek scribes that M. Batiffol does not notice, namely the abbreviations that they so frequently use. This, if not a perpetual property, is a very frequent accident, and when it occurs is almost as decisive a mark of the school as the writing or the illumination. Thus of M. Batiffol's typical MSS. the Cryptenses B. a, iv., B. a, iii. and others of Grotta Ferrata, the Vaticani 1633, 1658, 1673, 2067, and several others, are highly tachygraphic. And the recognised sources of tachygraphy, Vat. 1809, the British Museum MS. Add. 18234, the MS. Angelica B. 3. 11., have all been at Grotta Ferrata and were written in the South of Italy: the MS. Vat. 1982 came from the monastery of St. Elias de Carbone, of which M. Batiffol gives us the history, the Tropologium Vat. 2008 from St. John Theristes at Stilo. To these I can add upon the strength of M. Batiffol's canon a MS. of which Signor Vitelli has published the tachygraphy (*Museo Italiano* I. p. 9 sq.), but the Lombardic origin of which had not been suspected, Laur. Conv. Soppr. 177 (from the Badia di Fiesole). In the same way the unusual abbreviations of Vat. 1611 (s. xii.) incline me to regard it as Western, unless the mention of the *σχολή τοῦ ἁγίου πέτρον*, for which it was written, is decisive for a Byzantine origin (p. 83).

At the end of his book (pp. 103, 104) M. Batiffol makes a little group of four MSS. which offer somewhat different charac-

teristics—Vaticani, 1456, 2000 (but in this MS. only four pages, ff. 30–33, come into question), 2061, and 2066 (uncial). By an oversight Vat. 2067 is omitted, the first 200 pages of which are certainly in this hand, (s. x.–xi.), while the remainder of the book and all the marginalia are in a later and different hand. Parts of Vat. 1974 (ff. 71–102, 121–125) also belong to this hand. The characteristic of this school is that of a very linked and cursive minuscule, with peculiarities in the letters iota and kappa, and a marked uncial nu. M. Batiffol, finding an Arabic palimpsest in some of the leaves of Vat. 1456, is inclined to localise the hand in Calabria. The question, as he admits, requires more evidence; the hand certainly occurs more often than in these examples.¹ I should prefer to say nothing about locality, but the strongly cursive character of the hand suggests to me a connection with the very remarkable cursive-minuscule MS. Vat 2200 (s. viii.–ix.), a page of which has lately been facsimiled by the Palaeographical Society.

P. 151. The word in the subscription of Vat. 1611 which is printed *μοῦλτ* is *μοῦλτον*. I do not offer any suggestion as to its meaning. P. 156. In the subscription to Reginensis 75 M. Batiffol makes a lacuna after the word *μαλβιτο*; Sig. Stevenson in the catalogue prints what stands in the MS., namely the ordinary symbol for *εἰς τὸ*, which should be read. Is it correct to say (p. 104), that palimpsests were unheard of at Constantinople?

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ *E.g.* in the MSS. Messina 116, Vaticani 2084, 2089, 2115.

WRIGHT ON THE DATE OF CYLON.

The Date of Cylon, by JOHN HENRY WRIGHT. Reprinted from the 'Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.' Boston: U.S.A. Ginn and Co. 1892. (80 pp.)

'THIS paper was originally prepared in 1888 and was read before the American Philological Association at the meeting of that year; in the summer of 1890 it was re-written for publication in the *Harvard Studies*. Since that time the publication of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* has completely confirmed the correctness of the writer's chief

contention—a pre-Draconian date for Cylon. The paper has accordingly been revised and in part rewritten.' This extract from the introductory note gives the history of the pamphlet: it is doubtful whether, since the ostensible object of the author is to prove that the attempt of Cylon belonged to the period before Draco, and since this may now be considered certain, it was wise to republish the work in its present form. The author however deserves credit for having followed Busolt in a view which has now been confirmed; and he incorporates in

his work a full discussion of many of the difficulties of early Athenian history as well as a valuable review of the authorities and their relations to each other. He thinks that Plutarch did not have the unabridged *Respub. Ath.* before him: 'the resemblances, the dissimilarities, and the discrepancies alike are intelligible only on the supposition that Plutarch was transcribing from some work in which an abridgment of these parts of the *Respub. Ath.* was embodied.' The most important part historically is a short account of the history of the Alcmaeonidae before Peisistratus, which contains useful chronological work. A suggestion in a note (p. 43) that the word *εἰπατριδαί*, at least before the time of Aristotle, was not used in the technical sense to which we are accustomed, deserves special attention. The rarity of it in prose writing is certainly remarkable. *Xen. Oec.* 1. 17 (to which he does not refer) is doubtful. The best instance of its earlier use is Euripides *Ion* 1069 etc.

οὐ γὰρ δόμων γ' ἐτέρους
 ἄρχοντας ἀλλοδαπῶν
 ζῶσά ποτ' ὀμμάτων ἐν φαειναῖς ἀνέχουτ' ἀν
 ἀγαῖς
 ἅ τ' ὧν ἐῦ πατριδᾶν γεγῶσ' οἴκων

which also seems to have escaped his notice. This with the Scolion which he quotes from *Ar. πολ. Ἀθ.* 19 seems decisive for the old-fashioned view. Also if the statement in the *Ἀθ. πολ.* ch. 13 is correct, that five archons were to be selected from the *εἰπατριδαί*, the word must have had its technical meaning from the earliest times.

The work throughout shows learning and diligence; the author is thoroughly versed in the ancient and modern literature; there is a want of sense of proportion in the devotion of 80 pages to an argument which could have been clearly stated in a quarter of the space; the argument would however have been almost conclusive even had no further support been forthcoming. The attempt to fill up the bare outlines of the history and to show that the episode of Cylon is not a detached incident in Attic history, but 'reveals itself as one of the most interesting and significant steps in the social and political development of pre-Solonian Athens,' while it is closely connected with the establishment of the date, is a good piece of historical writing and is a very satisfactory *résumé* of what can be made out from the very scanty evidence.

J. W. HEADLAM.

FALKENER'S *ANCIENT GAMES.*

Games Ancient and Oriental, and How to Play them. By EDWARD FALKENER. Longmans: 1892. 21s.

THE contents of this volume are further described in the title-page as 'the games of the ancient Egyptians, the Hiera Gramme of the Greeks, the Ludus Latrunculorum of the Romans, and the Oriental games of chess, draughts, backgammon and magic squares.' Only a few of these games, it will be seen, come within the scope of this *Review*; those, namely, which have been identified, or sought to be identified, as practised by the Greeks and Romans. Egyptian tombs have yielded a large number of pictorial representations of different games, and some smaller remains of the actual boards and men with which they were played. The classical writers, on the other hand, have left a variety of descriptions and incidental allusions more or less intelligible, but never quite sufficient to give a clear

notion of the games to which they referred. It was a happy thought to combine these two sources of information, and further to bring into the comparison games actually played in the East in modern times. This plan has been carried out with great ingenuity, and the author's travels in Egypt, Asia Minor, and as far as China and Japan, extending it would seem over a long series of years, have been brought to bear on the various questions of identification. He claims to have solved, by this comparative method, difficulties which had baffled all previous inquirers.

'As the Egyptian game of *Tau*, or Robbers, and the Roman game of the *Latrones* or *Latrunculi*, or Thieves, were incapable of solution when considered separately, and resisted all attempts of the learned to explain them; though each has explained the other when the references to the Roman game were applied to the board of the Egyptian game: so the Greek and Roman games we are now about to consider have remained up to the present time mere abstract ideas, known only by name; while the