

The Classical Review

MARCH 1902.

THE selection of London as the place of meeting for the National Academies in 1904, will have been a fortunate circumstance for classical studies in this country if it lead to the creation of an organisation which will have their interests as those of other at present unrecognised studies officially in its charge. Our readers are doubtless aware of the three petitions recently presented to the King, the first from a number of eminent philosophers, scholars, and historians praying for their incorporation as a British Academy, another from the Council of the Royal Society supporting this prayer, and a third one, in point of time prior to the second, which urged that the objects of the first petition would be best attained not by a separate institution but by one in connexion with the existing Royal Society. The latter proposal appears to have decided advantages. *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*; and as a branch of the Royal Society the new institution would succeed at once to the possession of the two things most vital to future usefulness—a recognised standard and an admitted prestige.

We have received from Dr. Daniel Quinn a copy of his article on the Language Question in Greece which forms Chapter XXIII. and pages 1297–1319 in the Report of the United States Bureau of Education for 1899–1900. It may be recommended to the notice of foreigners who wish to appreciate more exactly the issues in the question now distracting Greece. In a historical survey which starts with the popular dialect in old Attic, as revealed to us by the

researches of Paul Kretschmer from the inscriptions upon ancient vases, and comes down to the most recent times, Dr. Quinn shows that bilingualism or, as he calls it, 'diglossy' is no new thing in the history of Greece. Among the forms of Greek linguistic development which are passed under review are the Homeric 'Kunstdialekt,' the *κοινή*, the new Attic of the 'Atticists' and the mixture of the *κοινή* and the popular idiom of the day in which Ioannes Malalas of Antioch composed his Chronicle. The struggle for predominance between the literary language and the 'demotic,' the modern popular Greek, which first made its appearance in literature in the twelfth century, although of course much older, is not a new one. 'From the beginning of the sixteenth century down to the beginning of the nineteenth, there were three phases of language struggling for the future mastery in literature, the old Koene, the demotic in the form of local dialects chiefly, and a mixed variety which accepted very much from the demotic and discarded very much that was peculiar to the old language, as for instance the use of infinitives and optatives and datives, but which nevertheless retained in general the ancient grammatical types.' Towards the beginning of the present century the claims of ancient Greek or, at least, what we may call ancient ecclesiastical Greek were supported by men of high and wide repute at that time, such as Lampros Photiades, Stephanos Kommetas, and Neophytos Doukas. The claims of the demotic to be the sole national language were advocated by Katarztes, a forgotten writer in

prose and two poets Billaras and Christopoulos who have still a vogue. Entirely new life and interest, says Dr. Quinn, was given to the dispute by the deep scholarship and patriotic labours of Adamantios Koraes whose views were first made public in 1804. His object was to keep as close as possible to the demotic which he would purify by weeding out of it foreign discordant elements such as Turkish and Albanian words. This purified demotic was known as the *Katharevousa*, now the recognised name of the official language of Greece. Passing to the present day he distinguishes three grades of the *Katharevousa*: that used by the 'austere purists,' like the poet Kleon Rangabes in his *Ἄλγη* (Leipzig 1893), the 'temperate' form in which is written the largest part of the better contemporary literature, and the least rigid form, used for example by Bikelas in his translation of Shakespeare. Amongst the supporters of demotic pure and simple may be mentioned Professors

Psycharis and Émile Legrand of Paris, the poets Polemas and Mashoras and the novelist Andreas Karkobitsas. Dr. Quinn writes moderately and temperately of these rival claimants; but his own sympathies appear to be with some form of the *Katharevousa*.

A welcome sign of the vivid interest of Modern Greece in Ancient is the appearance of Part I. of a Modern Greek counterpart of Liddell and Scott, a work which the editor, M. Anestes Constantinides, eulogises in terms that would have rejoiced the hearts of the two scholars to whom we owe so much. The first instalment takes us down to the very beginning of B; 462 pages are devoted to A as against 269 in the model; but difference of type accounts for the greater part of the excess. We hope to publish a more detailed account in a future issue.

A NEGLECTED MS. OF PLATO.

UNDER Cobet's influence the great Paris MS. (A) was long regarded as the sole authority for the last three tetralogies of Plato, just as the Clarke MS. at Oxford (B) was supposed to be the sole authority for the three first. 'Vile damnum,' he says of the rest, 'si omnes ad unum flammis comburerentur.' Little by little, editors have retreated from this extreme position. Schanz has shown that D (Venetus 185, Bekker's II) is independent of A in the *Republic*. It represents for us, as Jordan suggests, the missing second volume of B, just as T (Venetus App. class. 4. cod. 1) represents for us the missing first volume of A. Still more recently, Professor Lewis Campbell has shown that the Cesena MS., which he calls M, is independent of A as well as of D. We thus possess three independent witnesses, and on these three Professor Campbell's text of the *Republic* is mainly based.

It can hardly be said, however, that these three MSS. represent three, or even two, families in the strict sense. They are all clearly derived from a single archetype, and give substantially the same recension of the text. In particular M is very closely related to A, and there is every reason to believe that the original of ADM was not

very much older than A itself. It is clear, therefore, that the text of the *Republic* will rest on a much surer foundation if it can be shown that there exists a tradition wholly independent of ADM.

The Hofbibliothek at Vienna has proved the Nemesis of nineteenth century Platonic criticism. Its MSS. are very imperfectly represented in Bekker's apparatus, and most scholars have formed their views independently of them. The bitterness caused by the appearance on the scene of the MS. now known as W would be amusing if it were not so unedifying. Even Schanz has been a good deal less than fair to Král's perfectly honest and well-meant examination of this MS. It is, therefore, with some fear that I venture to claim an even higher place in the Platonic apparatus for another Vienna MS., of which a full collation has been in the hands of scholars for three-quarters of a century. I can only explain its neglect by the fact that it is in Schneider's apparatus and not in Bekker's, beyond which few scholars care to travel. Mr. Adam (who knows the value of Schneider) would certainly have discovered the truth if he had for a moment abandoned his generally prudent and healthy scepticism as to theories of manuscript affiliation. In