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](#)

Hirzel's History of the Prose Dialogue *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*. Rudolf Von Hirzel. Erster Theil, 565 pp.; Zweiter Theil, 473 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel, 1895. 18 Mk.

R. D. Hicks

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / February 1897, pp 61 - 62
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026123, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026123

How to cite this article:

R. D. Hicks (1897). The Classical Review, 11, pp 61-62 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026123

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

out, and that *κύρησε* is (as it ought to be) an auxiliary verb. The scholium is *ἔτυχεν ἀνευρὼν εὐωχούμενον Τελαμῶνα*. It seems nearly certain that the scholiast found a participle in the text. Such a participle, acceptable to Pindar for its Homeric complexion, and likely from its rarity to suffer corruption, would be *τετμῶν*, and the verse probably ran,

ἐς πλόον τετμῶν κύρησεν δαινύμενον.

As Mr. Bury accepted this conjecture and put it in his text, the editor might have at least told us why he thought that on this passage the evidence of the scholiast was to be rejected.

He accepts Bergk's hypothesis that Pindar used an accusative plural of the *a* and *o* declensions in *-ais* and *-ous*, actually reading in his text in J. i. 25,

*οἶά τε χερσὶν ἀκοντίζοντες αἰχμαῖς,
καὶ λιθίνοις ὅποτε δίσκοις ἔεν.*

On the whole, one can hardly help feeling that the edition might have appeared five and twenty years ago, and not been much the poorer; and that it is hard to discover any consistent or clearly apprehended principle on which the text is based.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

HIRZEL'S HISTORY OF THE PROSE DIALOGUE.

Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch.
Von RUDOLF HIRZEL. Erster Theil, 565 pp.; Zweiter Theil, 473 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel, 1895. 18 Mk.

THIS work is an important contribution to the history of literature. In some respect it reminds us of Rohde's *Griechische Roman*. The author discusses temperately the origin of the prose dialogue in Greece and traces it from its first rude germs through the splendid development of the Attic period. He is the historian of its long decline and subsequent revival in classical antiquity down to the last expiring efforts of an Augustine or Boethius. A glance at the dialogues of mediaeval and modern times is followed in the last chapter by a retrospect, in which are collected a few critical results of general application. A task so gigantic demands an encyclopaedic and almost cosmopolitan erudition to a degree which only few can attain, if the claims of Critias and Machiavelli, or Lucian, Heine and Voltaire are to be weighed in the balance, while, for purposes of illustration, reference is from time to time permitted to the '*Cortegiano*,' the '*Aristippe*,' the works of Albrecht Haller and the author of '*Der Ackermann aus Böhmen*.' Even the materials before us could not be compressed into the thousand pages here presented to the reader without the greatest economy of space. It is inevitable that some periods and writers suffer in comparison with others. Our author informs us that it is not his object to repeat once more facts generally known. Perhaps in consequence of this self-restraint the hundred pages devoted to Plato are among the

very best which the book contains. It is possible that other portions of the work might with advantage have been reduced within narrower limits. The details are sometimes strewn so thickly that we fail to carry away definite outlines of the writers or their works, while the transition from period to period is insufficiently explained.

The origin of that form of composition, which the genius of Plato employed for almost every literary purpose with unequalled effect, is referred to the Socratic school. Our author is willing to allow that the tendency to dialogue is clearly manifested in many quarters during the fifth century B.C. Before Aristophanes planned the '*Clouds*,' philosophical discussions were burlesqued in the comedies of Epicharmus and in Sophron's Mimes. Even in Herodotus and Thucydides we have the story of Croesus and Solon, the seven Persian conspirators, and the Median controversy. It is curious to find the great natural philosopher Democritus personifying the senses and making them hold a sort of dialogue with reason. But, despite the rival claims of the Eleatic Zeno and Protagoras, our author concludes that only in the Socratic circle and in consequence of their revered master's death was the transition actually made to the genuine dialogue of literature from rhetorical harangue or anecdote with dramatic setting. He goes even further than this and maintains that the patriotic efforts of the Socratics largely contributed to establish Attic as a literary dialect and to perfect it as a new instrument of language. He defends the historical character of the *Memorabilia*, at least in its author's inten-

tion, as something intermediate to *χρεῖαι* and *ὑπομνήματα*, but he holds with other critics that it is not the historical indictment of Meletus, but the literary onslaught of Polycrates against which Xenophon seeks to defend his master. The very complete and thorough account of the lost Socratic writers makes us especially regret Antisthenes and Aeschines. Had we the writings of the former, they would doubtless clear up many an obscure allusion in Plato. Could the seven dialogues of Aeschines be recovered, we have reason to think that if their natural and graphic touches did not furnish a new portrait of Socrates, they would at least enable us to decide between the two we have. Although the extant dialogues form a very respectable part of the total sum of ancient prose literature, they are, alas! a mere fraction compared to those of which we know little more than the authors and the titles. It is precisely in dealing with this huge mass of fragments that most ingenuity is required, and doubtless it is his achievements in this direction of which our author is most proud. Decidedly he deserves to be congratulated for his skilful conjectures and for his courage in treating such a subject at all. Yet, when all is done, the result is inevitably disappointing: we are taken, as it were, into a vast library, our guide points to the titles on the backs of books which neither he nor we must ever hope to touch, and, after retailing with indefatigable zeal any scraps of information bearing, however remotely, upon them, he is obliged, in default of anything better, too often to fall back upon a shrewd guess as to their subject matter and contents. Thus the lost *Ὀμιλῖαι* of Critias bears a suspicious title: on the strength of this it is conjectured to have contained conversations of Critias with friends on political subjects, possibly during his stay in Thessaly.

Limits of space forbid us to follow in detail the course of a work in which Cicero is treated as fully as Plato, and Plutarch at even greater length. We merely note in Vol. I., p. 218 a valuable appreciation of the epilogue to the *Euthydemus* in which we are surprised to find that Hirzel rejects Spengel's identification of the stranger with Isocrates. On p. 224 a novel view of the *Phaedrus* is presented, with an elaborate parallel between rhetoric and philosophy, and with illustrations from the *Oedipus Rex*, which to us are more ingenious than convincing. Compare p. 93, n. On p. 228 the development of the *Phaedo* is compared to Aristotle's procedure from an exoteric introduction to a philosophical discussion; while in a note on p. 231

occurs the sensible observation that it would not be difficult to separate the *Phaedo* into successive parts and to postulate a later date for the composition of the more advanced portions, precisely what Krohn has done for the *Republic*. The advocates of the statistical method will find a hard nut to crack in the remarks on p. 148. Roquette, following Dittenberger's application of the use of *τί μὴν*; as a chronological test in Plato, dates the *Oeconomicus*, in which *γέ μὴν* does not occur, after 387 B.C. and the *Memorabilia*, in which *γέ μὴν* does occur, between the years 384 B.C. and 380 B.C.; as if the Sicilian idiom had been naturalised at Athens in precisely those half dozen years! On the next page is an equally entertaining note on the question whether the particle *δέ* can introduce an independent work as distinct from the continuation of a previous one. The account of Cicero is worthy of the author of that elaborate and important work, the *Untersuchungen zu Cicero's philosophischen Schriften*, and he finds place for a mention of Curio the elder as well as the Menippean Satires of Varro. The second volume is chiefly devoted to Plutarch and Lucian, between whom an interesting parallel is drawn. The one is a mild and gentle philosopher, who has learnt in the Academy to give all sects a hearing, though for the Cynics he has something of contempt. The other, though not entirely destitute of philosophy, any more than Isocrates, was *κύων ῥητορικός*, the sworn foe of all other schools, against whose solemn dogmatism he is the champion of sound common sense, as of Atticism in style against Asian bombast. In the writings of Plutarch Greeks and Romans join in friendly conversation; we have interlocutors taken from actual life, the circle of Plutarch's own friends; we are on historical ground. Lucian transports us to fairyland, to the realm of marvel and fancy: his persons are not individuals but types, and yet they give a wonderfully faithful picture of the times. In place of Plutarch's historical sketches we find polemical pamphlets, the weapons with which their author defends himself in contemporary controversy. Like a journalist of to-day he is not always anxious to preserve consistency; it is the situation at the present moment, the conjuncture for which he writes, that he has solely in view.

With this graphic sketch we bring to a close our account of a most interesting and instructive work, a vast repository of materials which will fully repay careful study.

R. D. HICKS,