

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](#)



Blass on Demosthenes *Die Attische Beredsamkeit, III i, Demosthenes*, dargestellt Friedrich von Blass. Pp. 644. Leipzig: Teubner. 1893. 16 M.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 10 / December 1894, pp 465 - 465

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189218, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189218

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 465-465 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189218

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

7, 451 ὄσσην seems to be a misprint for ὄσον. In 9, 133 the reading *Fῆς* is hardly to be reconciled with the reflexive sense of *Fός*. In 9, 230 *σωθέμεν'* is a form hard to account for. Is it a passive aorist? In 10, 246 the usual reading *γ' ἔσπομένοιο* might be given in a note. In 11, 156 *πάντη* must be a misprint, as Mr. Platt elsewhere writes *πάντη*. In 11, 348 *στέομεν* for *στέωμεν* is doubtful: how do we arrive at the Attic *στώμεν*? In 11, 417 the MS. reading is not *ἀμφὶ δέ τ'*, as given in the note, but *ἀμφὶ τε* or *ἀμφὶ τ'*. In 11, 831 to whom should *δεδαέσθαι* be attributed? In 16, 150 *ἄρπυια* is altered to

ἀρέπυια: but the alteration is not noticed in the preface. Similarly in 23, 327 *δργυια* is turned into *δρόγυια*. In 19, 208 *τισαίμεθα* is surely required by the governing optative.

Mr. Platt has done a considerable service to scholars by ascertaining as far as possible to whom the various alterations are due. We now know for the first time how much was done by Bentley: and it is interesting to see how little advance was made upon his work except by making use of the light afforded by the comparative method.

D. B. MONRO.

BLASS ON DEMOSTHENES.

Die Attische Beredsamkeit, III i, *Demosthenes*, dargestellt von FRIEDRICH BLASS. Pp. 644. Leipzig: Teubner. 1893. 16 M.

WHEN the publication of the volume on Demosthenes in the *Attische Beredsamkeit* of Professor Blass was first announced in 1877, those who were familiar with the masterly work of Arnold Schaefer on the same subject may well have wondered what more was left to be said on a theme which had apparently been already exhausted. When the volume was actually published, they were interested to find that it was dedicated to Arnold Schaefer himself, and they soon discovered that there was ample room for the literary treatment of the great orator's speeches side by side with the historical treatment which they had already received from the author of *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*. English readers were further gratified to observe that Professor Blass, in the absence of any personal experience of public life, had supplemented his own criticisms by giving special prominence to those of Lord Brougham.

The value of the work as a whole has been widely recognized, and now, after an interval of sixteen years, we have to congratulate the author on the publication of a new and enlarged edition. The enlargement extends to no less than eighty additional pages, and the thorough revision which the work has received proves that the author is still true to the motto quoted

in the preface to his edition of the Speech on *The Crown*:—'dies diem docet.' Besides many minor additions we now have a fuller treatment of the orator's public life, and a revised and expanded exposition of the author's views on the rhythm of Demosthenes. He dwells more fully on the law of composition discovered by himself, in obedience to which the orator avoids the 'ignoble tribrach'; he also discusses at greater length the rhythmical correspondences between the several clauses of the orator's sentences. The views of Professor Blass on these points are familiar to scholars and there is less need to dwell upon them here as they have been discussed in the *Classical Review* in the course of an admirable article by Professor Butcher (v. 309–315). The general result is that we have now fresh reason for regarding the prose of Demosthenes as something intermediate between *oratio soluta* and the strictly metrical compositions of poets.

The only misprints which I have observed are on p. 126 ὦ θεία κεφαλῆ for κεφαλῆ, and on p. 210 (in an English quotation) *seam* for *seem*.

Whatever differences of opinion may prevail as to the value of the author's criticisms on the *minutiae* of rhythmical composition, there can be no doubt of the great value of the work as a whole. It is a work that is absolutely indispensable to every serious student of Demosthenes.

J. E. SANDYS.