



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Elementary Composition? Where is the mystic line beyond which lies Advanced Composition?

There is not sufficient time here to go deeply into the possible lines of division, but for mere illustration of the principle we may observe that it is obvious that for study previous to Cicero we could advantageously omit verbs governing the genitive case, complex passive constructions, idiomatic accusatives, expressions of value and price, independent subjunctives, commands and prohibitions (direct and quoted), all uses of the gerund and gerundive except those with *ad* and *causa*, conditional sentences (except the three normal types in direct discourse), and conditional clauses of comparison. There should be also a limit to the vast array of temporal, causal, and concessive conjunctions, and of substantive clauses. It is clear that great stress should be put upon purpose, result, indirect discourse (barring complex dependent clauses), questions direct and indirect, important case constructions, and particularly upon the principles of agreement. By laying stress upon just such selected points of syntax, and by drill in a selected vocabulary, tutors who make no effort to give a *course* in composition, but who attempt merely to cram the pupil for the immediate needs of the examination test succeed amazingly well in pushing boys into College. But no legitimate text-book on the market dares to suggest such a process. Certainly all who believe in the teaching of Latin as a language, and not as a piece of apparatus for gambling would welcome any move tending to make work in Latin composition a really progressive process, and one above all else thorough at every stage.

A word should be added regarding the requirements in grammar alone. The Secondary School teacher has fully enough on his hands in the work of the first two years if he teaches the regular inflections and syntax of frequent occurrence, without attempting to present satisfactorily much material which young pupils cannot comprehend, but which he *dares not omit*. Second year pupils do well if they absorb the fact that Latin is a highly inflected language, and that the word 'good', immutable in English, has in the Latin thirty forms, some spelled alike, to be sure. The mere assembling of the English meanings of a group of Latin words is all that some pupils can accomplish in translation for a long time after they begin the study of Latin; how much more true this must be of the reverse process, Latin composition!

Much is being said about the unit system. In this connection it is sufficient to observe that the requirements in text work may be quite in proportion to the credits awarded, but the requirements in composition are wholly out of proportion. As a general principle, for a college to *accept at all* Latin through Caesar and then to expect pupils of that stage to have a working knowledge of the general principles of Latin grammar, is foolishness at best. If the Secondary Schools can have a strict definition of what constitutes Second Year Latin, and a definite goal in the various stages of

composition work, they will have with a more definite purpose in view a corresponding reasonable hope of success.

LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL.

C. H. BREED.

REVIEWS

The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia: its Authorship and Authority. By E. M. Walker. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press (1913). Pp. 149. \$1.75.

The historian of Greece has at present no more puzzling problems to solve than those set by the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, and he cannot go out of their way if he views his work seriously. Without taking account of details, they are two in number: first, the problem of the authorship of this notable historical fragment, and, second, the question of its value.

The papyrus on which it is written is of course anonymous. The writing was done in a country-town in Egypt in the third century of our era. This fact establishes a presumption, which, on a little reflection, we may convert into a fair certainty, that the author was a standard authority; hence, beyond a doubt, an historian of eminence. Since he lived in the half century following 395 B. C. (see next sentence), it ought, therefore, to be possible for us to ascertain his name. The work to which the fragment belongs contained a detailed narrative, interrupted by many excursions, of events in Greece and Asia Minor in the years 396 and 395 B. C. It is commonly believed that it was a continuation of Thucydides and covered the period from 411 to 394 B. C. This, however, as Mr. Walker points out, is mainly an assumption. We cannot say with any assurance when the work began. All we know about its ending is that it cannot have occurred after 346 B. C.

For reasons which were, to say the least, far from conclusive, the claims of Ephorus to be considered its author were ruled out by the first editors; whereupon the controversy settled down into a struggle between the advocates and the opponents of Theopompus. The advocates of Theopompus, conspicuous among whom stand Wilamowitz, Eduard Meyer, Schwartz, Wilcken, and Busolt, have had to contend with the difficulties, (1) that in style and attitude the author of the fragment reveals a very different Theopompus from the one whom we have hitherto known on the joint authority of ancient report and extant fragments; (2) that it becomes necessary to assume that Theopompus was the main, if not the only, source from which Ephorus drew for his knowledge of this period; (3) that, far from plagiarizing Xenophon, as a passage from Porphyry gave us warrant for believing (*πολλὰ τοῦ Ξενοφώντος αὐτὸν μετατιθέντα κατελήφα*), Theopompus was quite independent of Xenophon, so independent, in fact, that Busolt makes him an historical charlatan bent primarily, not on telling the truth but on 'going one better' than Xenophon, whose history he was striving to discredit and oust from popular favor.

These difficulties Wilamowitz, Meyer, and the others do not blink, but they do not find them serious. They say that we really know nothing of the youthful Theopompus, the author of the *Hellenica*; that the Theophrastus of the acrimonious temper and the impetuous style is the author of the *Philippica*, which was written when his style, like that of Carlyle in his maturity, had become personal, and his political and moral convictions had become fixed. They argue that you may assume that Theopompus (377–376—ca. 300 B. C.) wrote his *Hellenica* as early as 356 or at least before 346 and that Ephorus wrote about the events of 395 B. C. not much, if any earlier than 350 B. C., and possibly as late as the last quarter of the fourth century. The accusation of plagiarism is met by affirming that only in the one passage cited—that narrating the encounter between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus in the winter of 395–394 B. C.—did Theopompus use Xenophon, the reason for this exceptional practice being that of this encounter Xenophon was the only literary witness.

The difficulties of the opponents of Theopompus resolve themselves simply into the task of finding anyone else who suits the conditions of being approximately contemporary and at the same time a standard authority. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, on editing the papyrus, considered the claims of Cratippus, whom Blass had proposed to them; and for this mysterious person the author of the book under review made a vigorous plea in a well-known article in *Klio* (1908), 356 ff., and Beloch, it seems, is about to make another. The main trouble with Cratippus, however, is that we cannot be sure that he wrote before 346 B. C., or was a contemporary in the necessary sense of that term; and that we cannot be sure that the kind of work he wrote was a history such as we have before us in the fragment from Oxyrhynchus. The fragment might as well be anonymous as belong to Cratippus.

At present the most formidable competitor of Theopompus is beyond all doubt Ephorus himself, whom Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt and those whom they consulted before editing the papyrus disposed of too summarily. The idea that he must be more seriously reckoned with was first stated by W. A. Bauer; his case was first pleaded by Judeich. The present book is a critical examination of Judeich's brief which resulted in strengthening and elaborating its arguments. It is a splendid example of English workmanship at its best and may be commended to all and sundry as a model of sound reasoning, scholarly competency, and masterly presentation. I hasten to add that I have been convinced of the correctness of its main thesis.

Mr. Walker deals first with the assumptions which have hitherto prejudiced the case against Ephorus: (1) that the scale of the fragment is too great for an universal history, and (2) that Ephorus, according to Diodorus, wrote topically (*τῶν γὰρ βιβλίων ἐκάστην πεποίηκε περιέχειν κατὰ γένος τὰς πράξεις* . . .). By an elaborate calculation Walker shows that Ephorus, in the part of his work which concerned the first

quarter of the fourth century B. C., included the events of four or five years in an average book: Book 18, for example, began with the despatch of Thimbron to Asia in 400–399 and ended with the recall of Agesilaus in the spring of 394 B. C.; that one of his books may have had as many as 4000 lines of Teubner text, and that the papyrus fragment, if completed on scale, would have covered the period from 399 to 394 B. C. in an equal number of lines. Mr. Walker refuses to agree with Judeich that Ephorus did not write topically; his eighteenth book, for instance, had as its topic the Spartan crusade against the Persians. What he does assert, and, as it seems to me, establish conclusively, is that a topical arrangement of the subject by books permits a synchronistic arrangement of the material within a book. Moreover, by an analysis of Diodorus, he shows that Ephorus did, as a matter of fact, arrange his material synchronistically in Book 18. Further, he gives weighty reasons for the conclusion that this synchronistic arrangement of the material was precisely the one followed by the papyrus. With this argument he passes from the position that Ephorus is a possible author for the fragment to the positive one, that he is, in fact, *the* author. His strongest point in favor of this position is that the papyrus is embedded, often without verbal change, in Diodorus in so obvious a way that we are bound to conclude one of two things: either the papyrus is Diodorus's source, Ephorus, or Ephorus was an equally slavish and mechanical transcriber of his source, the papyrus, as was Diodorus himself. Hence, if the author represented by the papyrus is Theopompus, we have to recast completely our conception not only of Theophrastus but also of Ephorus. This, however, is intolerable. The force of this reasoning Mr. Walker increases by showing that the style of the fragment is exactly what we have long since discovered that of Ephorus to be; that the papyrus has the same interest in Central Greece and Asia Minor that is evident in Ephorus, and that its author took the same Mugwump view of politics that Ephorus did.

With the second great problem raised by the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*—that of the value of its materials—Mr. Walker deals less exhaustively; and now as before the one great work on this theme is Meyer's *Theopomps Hellenica*. The conclusion as to authorship reached by Walker has, however, important bearings upon the time of composition of Ephorus's history (it was left unfinished at the year 357–356 B. C. on account of the author's death at ca. 350 B. C. After Ephorus's death his son completed the account of the last generation, the 25th from the Return of the Heraclidae [1091 B. C.], which, beginning as it did with the battle of Leuctra in 371, had to end rather abruptly in 341 B. C.); it has important bearings, too, upon its relationship, rather, lack of relationship, to Xenophon's *Hellenica* (the two histories were being written at the same time and neither author knew the other's work), and upon its character.

Into the details of the two final chapters of Mr. Walker's book, on the Credibility of the Narrative, lack of space forbids me to enter. His place is in general with Eduard Meyer, for he is convinced that Ephorus, if we may now give the author of the papyrus his name, has to be seriously reckoned with even when he comes into conflict with Xenophon. He says rather pessimistically:

It is not the least important result of the literary finds of the last quarter of a century that we are beginning to realize that our certitude in regard to the details of Ancient History is largely an illusion. The great historians have gone uncontradicted, because there was commonly no other authority, of at all the same rank, with which to confront them. But where comparison was possible divergencies and contradictions were at once apparent.

Thucydides contradicts Herodotus; Aristotle contradicts both of them and Xenophon as well; now Ephorus contradicts, and contradicts very flatly, Xenophon. What are we to do about it? This question historians of Greece may answer differently: they cannot afford to shirk it.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Ancient Eugenics (the Arnold Prize Essay for 1913).
By A. G. Roper. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell (1913).
76 pp.

In one form or another, eugenics is perhaps as old as babies, but as a science it can hardly be traced back of Sir Francis Galton, who laid the foundations a half century ago and first applied the term in 1884. The researches of a eugenicist among our classical authors might, therefore, be expected to result in some novel finds and in an especially illuminating treatment of the material. Unfortunately this book is by no means exhaustive, nor even sufficient to satisfy the ordinary investigator into the life of the ancients. Reference to such accessible works as Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, I, 3, 82-83, and Daremberg et Saglio, s. v. *expositio*, not to speak of others, would have acquainted its author with passages too important to overlook. On the other hand, the writer's point of view is responsible for an interesting and suggestive book.

Following an excellent Introduction, in which he theorizes about the usages among prehistoric savages and traces the general development of eugenic ideas, Mr. Roper conducts the reader to his selection of Latin passages. These concern almost exclusively times long after Aristotle, with whom he is later to bring his account of Greek eugenics practically to completion. Christianity's abolition of infanticide is the chief differential factor between the old eugenics and the new. While the pagan would unhesitatingly end the existence of the child he deemed unfit to live, we prolong the life of even the obviously useless. Infanticide, indeed, spared the Greeks many of the problems of heredity with which we are wrestling as yet almost hopelessly, because, as the essayist frankly states, our actual knowledge is for practical, constructive purposes hardly

greater than that of Plato. The crucial trouble, the fact that the possession of a *corpus sanum*, the ultimate aim of the eugenicist, does not insure the possession of a *mens sana* is still to be faced and will perhaps exist forever. Productivity and mental and moral superiority are scarcely commensurate.

While the reviewer approached his task with a strong desire to pass a favorable judgment, he has been shocked to find among the rather limited references that the author gives such a formidable number of errors as to suggest inevitably not only carelessness but also a dependence upon secondary sources for the material used. Thus, we should read on page 12, note 4, ii. 15, and, in note 5, i. 15.2; on p. 13, note 3, x. 33; on p. 17, note 2, 555 c; on p. 21, note 1, 276 d. On p. 19 in note 1 the 37 might be omitted. The 553 c is incorrect on p. 22, note 3. On p. 30 in note 1 the 20 should be replaced by vii. 2. 3. Note 9 of p. 33 also has a wrong reference and there are others.

It is not safe to say (p. 13) that "Quintilian declared that the exposed rarely survived" on the strength of "Dec." cccvi. 6, since this *Declamatio* may never have even met his eye. Even if one could accept the conclusions drawn from Pliny's boast (p. 14: "for 600 years Rome had known no doctors"), the figures given need rectification in the light of what he really says in his H. N. 29. (6) 12, and chronology forbids us to believe that "Aratus voices again the lament of Horace" (15). Xenophon does not speak of Sparta as having the smallest population in Greece (23). It was Epigenes and not Epigones (39) that vexed Socrates. *Kratisickleia* (19) might sick-en both those who represent kappa by a *k* and those who prefer the *c*, but in this matter the book is repeatedly at fault. Greek words, too, are spelled or accented wrongly. The reviewer would like a reference for the statements that "the Indians . . . offer up children to Moloch (the Semitic God!) . . . the Carthaginians sacrifice them to Kronos", on page 8 (Diodorus Siculus 20. 14. 6 states that the Carthaginians sacrificed children to Kronos; but his identification of Moloch with Kronos is absurd). The allegation (9) that "among the Prussians the aged and infirm, the sick and deformed, were unhesitatingly put to death", was important enough even before the war to deserve a reference to the evidence, but this is only one of a number of statements for which the source is not given. The last sentences on page 25 represent a conflation of Xenophon *De Rep. Lac.* 1.10 and 5.9, but Mr. Roper has not rendered the former passage correctly. The first note on page 55 is not an adequate reference to a work that is divided into three books.

If some of these errors might lead one to suppose that the graduate of Oxford who received at the hands of the Regius Professor of Modern History, the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and the Camden Professor of Ancient History the high honor and financial reward of the Arnold Prize was somewhat deficient in Greek and Latin, he needs to read but a few pages to dispel his doubts. Only a classicist could use so