

in Dr. Cureton's solitary fragment. But we must go behind the MSS. and determine what version was employed by the earliest extant Syriac writers. Little thorough work has been done in this direction. A specimen was afforded in an appendix kindly added by Mr. Woods to my paper (No. viii.) in the *Studia Biblica*, 1885. Perhaps Mr. Norton has the leisure to devote himself to the examination of quotations in all available extant works, or fragments of works, of early Syriac writers. We commend this to his careful consideration. He could not make a more important addition to the literature of his favourite study.

G. H. GWILLIAM.

**De Coincidentiæ apud Ciceronem vi atque usu.**  
H. LUTTMANN. Göttingæ, 1888.

IN these days of laborious specializing when scholars can be found who think a life well spent on elucidating the uses of *cum*, one need not be surprised at a book of 116 pp. on 'Coincidence' in Cicero; and a short summary of its contents may be found interesting.

As some scholars may not know even the meaning of the word, a short history of the discovery of this new grammatical species is first given, then a definition follows. When two or more clauses come together [e.g. *cum dico me, te, Brute, dico; quidquid vult valde vult; deficior ego si quis meorum deficitur*] either identical in meaning or one contained in the other (like a minor in a major premiss), they are as it seems called 'coincident.' If 'coincident,' each clause must be coincident in time and so must have the same tense, or what is practically the same tense; but this 'congruence' of tenses which occurs also in 'non-coincident' clauses must be carefully distinguished from 'coincidence' of meaning.

Further as we make no practical progress by repeating identical propositions such as 'when eggs are eaten, eggs are eaten,' practically, coincident clauses must differ somewhere in form of expression, e.g. in subject or in predicate (e.g. by help of adverbs) or in object, sometimes in all three. Forthwith all conceivable forms of these variations are classified under four great genera and 12 species with still

more subdivisions, all duly tabulated in the Index at the end. Even the number of times (in Cicero) that *si, quod, cum, &c.* are used to connect these clauses are laboriously registered.

Then, in chapter III, the variations of the related tenses in coincident clauses are similarly classified at still greater length. Congruence of tense being necessary for coincidence (though not peculiar to it or partaking of its essence), the apparent exceptions to the law are explained: e.g. the congruence of perfects with historic presents, of present-perfects with presents: of imperatives and futures, of futures simple and future-perfects, and here it is pointed out that the future-perfect was often used merely to distinguish a *non-continuous* future action from the continuous action of the simple future (cf. p. 69). So too the congruence of indicatives with subjunctives, of present participles and the gerundive (treated suggestively here as a present participle) with finite (imperfect) tenses, of the past participle with perfect and pluperfect tense or *futurum exactum*, of *posse* &c., and pres. infin. with present perfect and future tenses, are illustrated and explained. Lastly dependent infinitives present past and future, and their congruence in coincident clauses with finite indicative and subjunctive tenses, are examined and classified. The whole subject is worked out elaborately and in a scholar-like way, and occasionally some fairly interesting points of grammar crop up: e.g. on pp. 101-2 it is shown that the perfect infinitive in certain cases owing to its collocation with some main future tense has the force of a future-perfect indicative or of a subjunctive, e.g. *omnia a te data mihi putabo si te videro; arma qui non habuerint eos inermes fuisse vinces*, where also he notices by the way the indiscriminate use of fut. perf. and perf. conjunct. Generally in establishing these practical congruences and coincidences not enough account is taken of the freedom with which a passing change of thought changes the intended regularity and symmetry of a sentence before it is completed. On the whole, though the results are not great or adequate to the labour spent, the book is worth the attention of scholars and teachers as it suggests a somewhat new and sound view of the phenomena of compound sentences.

J. E. NIXON.

ON THE STUDY OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES.

To the EDITORS of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

YOUR February number contained a survey of the general conditions under which classical studies are pursued in the United States. Among the aids to these studies and more especially to classical archaeology, the growing interest in which is regarded by American scholars as a most hopeful indication for the future of classical philology, collections of casts deserve, it would seem, a prominent place; and it may not be amiss to consider a very praiseworthy effort recently made to enlarge our present opportunities in this respect. There exists a curious lack of accord among our professors of the classics as to the supreme educational value of plaster-casts; the difficulty and expense of procuring a large number of representative casts has led some of them to substitute stereopticon views of the best examples of statuary, and to claim for these views as decided merits for purposes of instruction as the casts possess. But these slides, however excellent in themselves, fail to

reveal to the student the actual size of the object and the details of texture and treatment, in which the eye must be aided by the sense of touch; furthermore, a prolonged comparison between two art-types in which the eye should be able to wander constantly between the two objects is not feasible by means of the stereopticon.

A visit to the Slater Museum, which has been recently given to the Free Academy of the little town of Norwich, Connecticut, would I think, suffice to convert every admirer of stereopticon views. Noteworthy as an example of well directed private munificence, this museum is equally suggestive by reason of the selection and arrangement of the casts, and may therefore serve as a stimulus to similar educational enterprises.

The most evident advantage of this collection lies in its perfect adjustment to the allotted space. There is no overcrowding; for each period a smaller number of representative works is preferred to a congeries of material which baffles study. Many an

inquirer will recall the sense of disappointment experienced in so comprehensive a collection as that of Berlin, where the attention is distracted by the surrounding objects, and an all-round view of a work of art is often rendered impossible by the proximity of other statuary. By a very simple contrivance almost every statue and bust in the Slater Museum can be made to revolve, with what advantage to the student need not be stated. The obvious benefit of examining a statue from every point may be illustrated in the case of a work hitherto only known to us from photographs and wood-cuts; in the sitting bronze figure of a boxer, discovered at Rome in 1885, a cast of which was furnished to the museum by Lanciani, the modelling of the back reveals itself as a marvel of art, quite as remarkable as the battered ears, the scarred neck, and the general air of exhaustion in the countenance.

The governing principle in a collection of limited extent should be the fullest illustration of Greek art in the splendid vigour of its maturity and in the succeeding period of a superb technical ability that grapples with the most intricate problems of emotional expression. Hence the works of Graeco-Roman art are but meagrely represented at Norwich, specimens having been selected with a view to define the dependence on the earlier types as well as the points of conscious departure from those standards; e.g. the Youth of Stephanos, and the Ludovisi-group of Mother and Son ('Orestes and Electra') by Menelaos. And so, on the other hand, the aim to focus the attention on the highest achievements of Greek art has led to a restricted exposition of archaic Greek work. We look in vain for the reliefs from the Harpy-monument, the terra-cotta reliefs from Melos, and the early Spartan grave-reliefs; but we find the Akropolis-figure that is in the act of mounting a chariot, the Leukothea relief, the so-called Hera of Samos (now in the Louvre), the Apollo of Tenea, and several archaic busts; of the Aegina marbles the central group of four figures sufficiently characterizes the epoch, whilst the rest of the pedimental group can be studied from the standard publications. Whenever questions of a peculiar technique are suggested by the marbles, there is no dearth of illustrative material: thus the Doryphoros is known to present, in the entire treatment of the surface and especially of the head, peculiarities pointing to an original other than marble, and attention is invited to this fact by the juxtaposition of a cast from the Naples bronze which affords a much closer reproduction of the original of Polykleitos. So, too, immediately beside the Diskobolos in which the artistic incongruity of the tree-stump is plainly manifest, is placed a cast of the small Munich bronze which reveals the daring character of the original pose.

It is not difficult to recognize in the above-mentioned and similar arrangements of the statuary the hand of a judicious organizer, stimulating to teacher and scholar alike. In just proportions the various chapters of 'Kunstmythologie' are accentuated; no salient type of any of the great divinities is unrepresented. Quite as adequately the several classes of reliefs, the sepulchral, votive, and purely decorative, are represented by instructive examples. A single form of art-work seems however to have received insufficient attention, viz. the sarcophagi.

It may be conceded that the great majority of the themes treated on them is neither highly artistic nor original, yet apart from the fact that the sarcophagus-sculpture is of pronounced value in its bearings upon classical literature, there are a few striking exceptions to the mediocrity of most of these monuments, which ought to be found in our museums.

In the central hall of this delightful Slater collection are gathered the gems of Greek art, the great figures from the Parthenon pediments as well as the frieze, the Apollo-group with Centaur and Lapith-woman from the temple of Olympian Zeus, two sections of the Zeus altar at Pergamon, the Praxitelian Hermes, Venus of Milo, Niobe and daughter, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, the Nike of Samothrace, etc., etc. In the centre is poised the Nike of Paionios on a triangular base, reared to the actual height of the original, about nineteen feet from the ground. To one who has hitherto seen this figure on the ordinary low pedestal, and who has confessedly been disappointed in the impression received, the effect produced by the correct elevation is overpowering; the attitude of the goddess rushing through mid-air is absolutely truthful.

One might continue to speak of the arrangements by which without any meretricious resources a delightfully mellow light pervades the galleries, but it is foreign to the purpose of this notice to herald the praises of this special collection; its aim is rather to indicate that within a moderate compass may be comprehended the material to illustrate satisfactorily the canons of Greek taste.

Together with this collection, and by way of comparison with its arrangement, I had intended to discuss the casts at the Metropolitan Museum of New York. But years may elapse before it will be in proper shape for study. Meanwhile it is to be hoped that some of its more glaring characteristics, such as the immediate fellowship of Assyrian bas-reliefs, Phigalian friezes, and pedimental groups of the Parthenon, or the equally alarming treatment of some of the casts to an oil-saturation, will be definitely abandoned.

JULIUS SACHS, PH.D.,  
New York.

## NOTES.

ARISTOPHANES, *Acharnians* 347 (Dindorf).

ἐμέλλετ' ἄρ' ἅπαντες ἀνασείειν βοήν is perhaps the

most commonly received reading. R. gives *βους*. The difficulties of interpretation that beset the various conjectures are well known. They are perhaps less with the reading

ἐμέλλετ' ἄρ' ἅπαντας ἀνασείειν βοῶς: βοῶς being

accusative plural of βοῆς, a sail-rope (cf. *Od.* 2, 426: *Hymn. in Ap. Pyth.* 229).

The sense will then be "So you were going to shake out every rag of canvas (to try every means), were you!" and Dicaeopolis twits the Chorus with the sudden collapse of their attack. With ἀνασείειν βοῶς in this sense maybe compared the Μουσεῶν πάντας εἰσεῖσε κἀλωσ of Crinagoras in the *Anthology* ix. 545 (Jacobs).

ALFRED GOODWIN.