

heavily to the periods of Athenaeus and Porphyrius. Didymus necessarily had all Porphyrius' material before him. It is not certain that Porphyrius had all Didymus'. No one can say that Aristarchus' works were in existence in A.D. 200. Eustathius, of course, has no *locus standi* at all. But for a glossary or two the excellent man had less than we have.

These considerations seem to me fatal to this thesis. Quasi-clerical errors of ascription, due to successive abstracts, can be admitted; but the method of setting up a later source against an earlier seems to bear its own condemnation. It must be remembered also that Porphyrius himself is only known to us through scholia, and that the Townley scholia, though they contain a good deal that is not in the Venetian, seem to go back to the same sources. What should they go back to?

T. W. ALLEN.

*The Public Orations of Demosthenes.*

Translated by A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE. In 2 volumes. 3s. 6d. net each. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912.

THE speeches here translated are those in the first volume of Butcher's text, less the spurious or dubious pieces and the documents inserted in the *Crown*. Mr. Pickard-Cambridge's version is very good: faithful, clear, responsive, scholarly, and, in short, worthy of his name. His English is not quite the English of modern orators, but that is more their fault than his. He has a pretty turn of expletives. He knows the value of thrift both in syllables and

in words. The introduction is judicious and well put. The notes are brief and helpful. At the end there is a good bold map of Greece, the Aegean, and its coasts, and on one of the fly-leaves a map of Mid-Greece on a larger scale.

Here are a few notes and queries. There is a misprint, or worse, in the Preface, p. 4. In xv. 38 insert a verb. In xv. 15 omit a comma. In iv. 44 the first 'you' should be 'we.' In v. 4 τοῖς πολυμῶσι is missed, in viii. 26 αὐτόν. In xviii. 295 read 'Sicyonians,' in 302 for 'Tenedos' read 'Abydos.' In xix. 253 for 'the king' read 'the King of Persia.' In xv. 25 should not 'with' be 'against'? There are doubtful renderings at xix. 193, 'the well-known actor' for τουτονί; 199, 'in that magnificent voice of his' for λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ; 233, 'a somewhat fast life' for ἰταμώτερον. There is a misleading sentence in v. 2. Was it a 'canal' or a trench that Philip was to cut across the Chersonese (vi. 30)? In iv. 38 ζημία seems to mean 'detriment,' 'mischief,' as also perhaps in vi. 37. In xviii. 35 μάλα σεμνῶς ὀνομάζων perhaps scoffs at οἰκειότητος, *adfinitates*; cf. xix. 22, where again the word is put into the mouth of Aeschines. In ii. 12 I should suppose that Demosthenes ascribes to the Athenians readiness of speech, not the glib use of empty talk. In xix. 245 the translator's prose ignores the comic trimeter into which the Greek is here made to fall, in mockery of Aeschines' citation from tragedy. Has it been observed that D. plays a similar trick just above, in 244, where his gibes at A.'s quotation from Hesiod are wound up hexametrically with σὺ διώρισας αὐτός?

E. HARRISON.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### CICERO AND LUCRETIVUS.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Is it not possible that Cicero intended to use the word 'ars' simply as 'method' or as a 'treatise'? Thus we have 'ars imperatoria, rhetorica, musica'; 'ars amandi,' 'ars poetica,' etc. Thus I have always thought that Cicero intended to commend in Lucretius at once the flashes of his genius, and the consis-

tency with which, in spite of his poetical divergences from his theme, he carried out his plan and object of stating the principles of the Epicurean philosophy. In fact, Cicero eulogises at once the 'anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce' and the 'ars' itself.

HERBERT A. STRONG.

*Clyst, Farnham Common, Slough.*  
May 16.