

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](#)



Latin Passages for Translation *Latin Passages for Translation*. Selected by M. Alford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1902. Pp. xiii. 250. Price 3s.

E. H. Blakeney

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 06 / July 1902, pp 329 - 329
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206471, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206471

How to cite this article:

E. H. Blakeney (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 329-329 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206471

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BRIEFER NOTICES.

The Iliad of Homer: Books IX and X.
 Edited with Introduction and Notes, by
 J. C. LAWSON, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke
 College, Cambridge. Pp. xxx, 97. Cam-
 bridge, Pitt Press. 2s. 6d.

THIS edition of Books IX. and X. of the *Iliad* amply sustains the traditions of the Pitt Press Series. The Introduction contains a chapter on the Composition of the *Iliad* which shows that the Homeric question has been carefully studied. The language of the *Iliad*, grammatical forms, metre and quantity, and Homeric armour, are all ably treated. The text is based on that of the Teubner edition. The notes are commendably brief and to the point; Mr. Lawson's training in Archaeology and his knowledge of the language and customs of Modern Greece have given additional interest to his remarks, as for example on x. 7. There is a novel and possibly correct interpretation on ix. 122 (*ἀκρυπος* = 'hand-beaten,' as opposed to 'cast'). Other suggestions worthy of note will be found on x. 13 and x. 256.

It would not be gathered from the note on ix. 394 that there was any objection from a metrical point of view to *γαμέσσεται*: see *Monro H.G.* 2, 367 (2).

The printing is as usual excellent, and I have not noticed any errors.

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

Latin Passages for Translation. Selected by
 M. ALFORD. London: Macmillan & Co.
 1902. Pp. xiii. 250. Price 3s.

THE price of this little book is perhaps somewhat against it, otherwise we should think that it will receive an ungrudging welcome both in schools and by 'students working for pass degrees.' Miss Alford has chosen the 250 pieces contained in her book with care and judgment. Whether or not a few 'notes' would not have been a welcome addition is a matter on which there may be two opinions. The present reviewer is in favour of books of 'Unseens' being presented in two forms—the one a student's edition (plain text), the other a teacher's edition, duly equipped with hints and helps. Miss Alford contemplates a companion volume of 'versions,' for the use of 'teachers and private students.' Perhaps the subsidiary matter we suggest will be included there.

Good, on the whole, as the selection is, we should like to see a larger number of extracts from the less known writers—Lucan, Suetonius, Claudian, Ammianus Marcellinus, and the like. The present school and college 'Curriculum' is a highly restricted one, in any case; to widen that curriculum, and so enlarge the range of literary vision, is surely desirable.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

REPORTS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—SUMMER TERM, 1902.

ON May 16th. a paper was read by Professor BURNET, of St. Andrews University, on 'The criticism of the Platonic text in the light of the Petrie and Oxyrhynchus Papyri.'

The object of the paper was to show that the controversy as to the Platonic text raised by the discovery of the Petrie papyrus had been so bitter and fruitless mainly because the controversialists had not the facts before them. They all used the critical apparatus of Schanz, which does not at all represent the views held on the subject of the Platonic MSS. at the present day by Schanz himself or anyone else. The result is that the papyrus text has been compared only with that of the *Clarkianus* (B) and the 'learned MS.' written by Joannes Rhosus of Bessarion (E=Bekker's E). Schanz's apparatus contains no collation of Ven. T, which is now admitted to be of almost equal authority with B, and still less of Vind. W, which is independent of both these sources. To judge the text of the

papyrus fairly, it is necessary to compare it with the *paradosis* as a whole, that is, with the text of the common archetype of BTW. For instance, it was claimed that the papyrus alone gave us the true form *ἀιδής*, 'invisible' for the *ἀειδής* of our texts; but, as a matter of fact, *ἀιδής* is the constant reading of T, as well as of the papyrus. A second defect of Schanz's apparatus is his habit of marking all the hands of B other than the first by the common *siglum* b. As these hands range from the 9th to the 16th century, this is most misleading. The readings of the original diorthotes (sometimes supposed to be Arethas himself) are of equal or superior authority to those of John the Calligrapher in the text. It is to be noticed, too, that in *Phaedo* 68 b, 4 the marginal reading of B, *γρ. ἄλλοθι δυνατὸν εἶναι καθαρῶς* (which agrees with the papyrus) is written by the same hand that wrote the text. A third deficiency in Schanz's apparatus is the inadequate account given of the indirect tradi-