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](#)

Selections from the Attic Orators *Selections from the Attic Orators, Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, edited with notes by R. C. Jebb, Litt. D., Camb., [late] Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Second Edition. London: Macmillan. 1888.*

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 09 / November 1889, pp 406 - 408

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195940, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195940

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 406-408 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195940

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

his conclusions, and it will repay any reader to study them for himself. The fifth chapter discusses the *Memorabilia*. Here Dr. Hartmann is a thorough-going follower of Schenkl and Krohn, who used the knife with such astonishing freedom. True he controverts in nine cases the excisions or objections of Schenkl, but he makes up for that by many more of his own. He believes in an *interpolator impudentissimus*, who, editing the treatise after Xenophon's death, foisted in the parts which he condemns as foolish or ill-written or false. This was rendered all the more easy as the treatise, even as Xenophon wrote it, was not consecutive, but had been continually added to during the author's life. The sixth chapter contains emendations on the text of the *Memorabilia* left after these excisions. The seventh chapter discusses the *Oeconomicus*. He rejects the suggestion that it ever formed, or was intended to form, part of the *Memorabilia*, and defends his position at great length and with full illustration. The eighth chapter (pp. 188–213) again contains emendations on particular passages of the *Oeconomicus*. The ninth chapter discusses the old question of the connexion between the *Convivium* of Xenophon and that of Plato. He confesses that the arguments which he here uses are not new; and it will be enough to say that his position is that Plato's *Convivium* was published after that of Xenophon and was intended to refute and ridicule the presentment of Socrates contained in the latter's work. The tenth chapter follows (pp. 235–246) with emendations on the text of the *Convivium*. In the eleventh chapter—which has the motto *τίς ἀλκή τὸν θανάτῳ ἀπικρατέειν*;—he restates the case against the genuineness of the *Agesilaus*. This he rests on (1) its rhe-

torical style, alien to that of Xenophon, (2) its affected and poetical diction, (3) its false statements, (4) direct borrowing from the *Hellenica* of passages which the writer has either tried to make more definite and particular, or has spoilt by failing to understand, or has deliberately changed in order to do greater honour to Agesilaus, (5) statements and observations not suited to the time at which Xenophon must have composed the piece, if he had done so. To this array of historical arguments are added certain critical difficulties, and the use of certain *verba locutionesque insolentiora aut suspecta*. The upshot of it all is to show that the *Agesilaus* is by a young declaimer of the School of Isocrates. Dr. Hartmann however feels that the very number of the arguments makes it the less certain that a reader will be convinced, for the detection of a weak point in any one shakes his confidence in all. He appeals therefore finally to the finer sense of readers... *qui enim non SENTIT Agesilaum a Xenophonte non esse scriptum, eum nullis convinces argumentis*. The twelfth and last chapter (pp. 276–405) is devoted to criticisms and emendations of the *Hellenica*. They are full both of the strength and weakness of the critic; and, while they will often carry conviction, they will also sometimes call forth opposition, and occasionally provoke a smile. It may be safely said, however, that the book as a whole contains a mass of criticism on Xenophon of first-rate value. It certainly is entertaining, and has scarcely a dull page from end to end. And whether a reader agrees or disagrees with the author, he will undoubtedly close the book with awakened interest in and a fuller knowledge of Xenophon.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

SELECTIONS FROM THE ATTIC ORATORS.

Selections from the Attic Orators, Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, edited with notes by R. C. JEBB, Litt. D., Camb., [late] Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Second Edition. London: Macmillan, 1888.

TEACHERS of Greek have good reason for rejoicing that a book, which has been before the public for the last nine years as a companion volume ranging in size with the editor's brilliant and attractive work on the

Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus, has now been reprinted in a handy form that will make it readily accessible to a still larger number of students. It is superfluous at the present date to praise the taste and judgment which have here been applied to the difficult task of selecting adequately representative specimens of the earlier Attic Orators, or to dwell on the scrupulous pains which have been bestowed on the explanatory as well as the critical notes. In the new edition the latter, instead of being placed

apart before the text, are far more conveniently printed at the foot of the page, while the explanatory notes remain as before at the end of the book.

The few suggestions here offered for the removal of some misprints and other trifling inaccuracies will be almost entirely confined to the speech of Lysias on behalf of Manti-theus (*Or.* 16), that of Isaeus on the estate of Dicaeogenes (*Or.* 5), and the *Aegineticus* of Isocrates (*Or.* 19).

In the explanatory note on Lysias 16§7, οὔτε κατὰστασιν παραλαβόντα, Prof. Jebb rightly states that 'Bake reads καταβαλόντα, which could hardly = *refunded*'; but it ought to be added that this proposal, though approved by Sauppe, was afterwards retracted by Bake himself in favour of λαβόντα, in his *Scholica Hypomnemata*, V 162-3, published in 1862:—'re iterum iterumque considerata, dubitare coepi an vere dixerim.' The work just quoted is little known in England, but English scholars may turn with interest to the preface of its second volume, published in 1839. They will there find an account of the pleasant impression produced at Leyden by the visit (in 1816) of Gaisford, Professor of Greek at Oxford, and (in 1815) of Dobree, one of Professor Jebb's predecessors in the Chair of Greek at Cambridge.

In the text of § 15 of the same speech, μάλιστα τῆς ἡμετέρας φυλῆς δυστυχισμένης καὶ πλείστον ἐν θανάτῳ, the last word is rightly altered into ἐναποθανόντων. In the critical note, the editor says: 'ἐναποθανόντων is my correction of ἐθανόντων,' adding that 'Markland conjectured ἐνθα or ἐνταῦθα θανόντων.' The authority for this statement, which unintentionally does a slight injustice to Markland, is apparently the preface to Scheibe's second edition (the true date of which, by the way, is 1862 and not 1876, which is only the date of a reprint with a fresh title-page). Scheibe there says: 'Markland vel ἐνθα θανόντων, quod vereor ut Lysianum sit, vel ἐνταῦθα θανόντων, quod malim. Certe ἐναποθανόντων usitatus erat.' Thus ἐναποθανόντων had already been vaguely suggested by Scheibe; but Scheibe himself has quoted Markland inaccurately, and in particular has omitted to mention that it was Markland who, among several alternatives, was the first to propose this very correction, ἐναποθανόντων. I quote from Markland's *coniecturae*, printed in 1738, as an appendix to Taylor's *Lysias*, p. 576: 'vox ἐθανόντων, quae praecedit, depravata est. Conieceram ἐνθα θανόντων. Sed Lysianum magis foret ἐνταῦθα ἀποθανόντων, vel ἐναπο-

θανόντων. Vide Thuc. ii. 52.' In Dobson's *Oratores Attici*, the same emendation is ascribed to the French editor, Anger; but, as I have shown, it was an English scholar who was the first to suggest it in a timid and tentative way, leaving Professor Jebb to propose it afresh and to print it with confidence as part of the text.—In the explanatory note on § 13, the Athenian expedition for the relief of Haliartus is by a misprint attributed to B.C. 325, instead of 395 which is correctly printed in the former edition. Again, in the note on § 19 the apt quotation ἐπίφθονός ἐστι καὶ τάχως βαδίζει καὶ μέγα φθέγγεται has accidentally been assigned to *Dem. adv. Callippum*, instead of *adv. Pantaenetus*.

On Isaeus, *Or.* 5 § 17, ψευδομαρτυριῶν is in both editions misprinted ψευδομαρτυρῶν, the modern compositor having thus made a similar slip to that of the ancient copyist in the well-known passage of Aristotle's *Politics* ii. 12, as emended in Bentley's *Phalaris*: Χαρώνδου ἴδιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἐστίν, πλὴν αἱ δίκαι τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν, κ.τ.λ. In the next note (on ἐξαίρεθυσίων τῶν ψήφων), Dobree's emendation is in both editions printed ἐξερασθεισίων, instead of ἐξεραθεισίων. In the note on § 23, the reference for ἀν προσχωρήσειν should be Thuc. ii. 80 (not ii. 8).

Turning to some pages of greater literary interest in another part of the volume, I notice in passing that, in the remarks on the influence of Isocrates on the Latin style of Cicero, Professor Jebb appeals, as before, to the passage of Cicero, *ad Att.* ii. 1, where he speaks of himself as 'using all the fragrant essences of Isocrates and all the little stores of his disciples'; but, to quote the courteous criticism of Professor Wilkins, 'it ought not to have been overlooked that in the words so admirably rendered Cicero is speaking of a work written in *Greek*' (Intro. to *De Oratore*, p. 36 of first ed., 1879). On Isocrates, *Aegineticus*, § 21, Troezen, by a perhaps needless but not unwelcome redundancy of information, is described as situated 'just opposite the little island of Calauria (where Demosthenes died—now *Poros*, πόρος, because the narrow strait can sometimes be forded).' This is just one of those descriptive touches which add vividness to an oral exposition in the lecture-room, but are perhaps best omitted in a printed commentary, though the student of these selections may not be sorry, while reading of Troezen in Isocrates, to be reminded how near it was to the scene of the death of Demosthenes.—In the note on § 26, the penultimate of ξμπυος is marked long, as being a derivative of a word which is here

printed πῶν with the circumflex accent on the first syllable. The penultimate is also marked long in Ellendt's *lexicon Sophocleum*, in Pape, and in the sixth edition of Liddell and Scott; in the seventh the quantity is not marked. In *Soph. Phil.* 1378 (as is well known) the position of ἔμπρος leaves the quantity undetermined. But, as I have endeavoured to show in an *excursus* on the *Select Private Orations* of Demosthenes, ii. p. 226, ed. 2, the quantity may be ascertained (i.) by the accent of πῶν, which, according to the grammarian Arcadius, should never be written πῶν, and (ii.) by the fact that Empedocles makes the first syllable of πῶν short. The derivative is actually found with the penultimate short in a poetic description of a powerful antidote, written by Andromachus the elder and quoted by Galen xiii p. 876:

καὶ μογερῶν στέρνων ἀπολύσεται ἔμπρον ἰλὺν
 πιομένη πολλοὺς μέχρις ἐπ' ἡελίους.

It may be interesting to look forward to the expression of Professor Jebb's deliberate opinion on this perhaps unimportant point, if he cares to discuss it in the edition of the *Philoctetes* which is now in the press. In the preface to his edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, he has explained that it was 'as a preparation, in one department, for the task of editing Sophocles that the special studies embodied in the *Attic Orators*' were 'originally undertaken.' Many, besides the present writer, are grateful for all that he has done for the Greek Orators by allowing that which was begun to a certain extent ἐν παρέργον μέρει to be extended beyond its immediate scope; for we may fitly apply to Professor Jebb what Plato says in praise of geometry: καὶ γὰρ τὰ πάρεργα αὐτοῦ οὐ σμικρά. A still larger number will welcome the speedy completion of his monumental edition of Sophocles.

J. E. SANDYS.

LYSIAS, SELECT ORATIONS.

Ausgewählte Reden des Lysias, erklärt von R. RAUCHENSTEIN, besorgt von KARL FUHR. Tenth ed. part 1 containing *Or.* 12, 13, 25, 16 and 31. Weidmann, Berlin. 1889. 1 m. 50 pf.

THE first edition of this excellent school-book was published in 1848 when the editor was fifty years of age. He lived thirty years longer, and during that time saw his work go through six editions, all of them carefully revised by himself. I have before me a copy of the fifth edition which he was good enough to send me in 1869, with a few lines of kindly greeting written in a clear though somewhat tremulous hand, when he was already over seventy. For fifty-five years in all, he was, in various capacities, on the staff of the school at Aarau in Switzerland; and since his death in 1879, three further editions of his work have been seen through the press by a thoroughly competent scholar, Karl Fuhr of Elberfeld.

In the preface to the eighth and tenth editions, Fuhr urges the necessity for a new critical edition of the whole of Lysias, including a complete record of all the conjectural emendations, and ascribing each to its first proposer. Many emendations, as he justly observes, are now-a-days put forward as new

which have already been suggested by Markland and Reiske. In the preface to the ninth he complains that Cobet, in his second edition of 1882, had entirely neglected all that had been done for the textual criticism of the author during the thirty years that had elapsed since the first edition of Scheibe. Some allowance may perhaps be made for a veteran scholar who re-edits a text of Lysias when on the verge of seventy, and who shortly after that time, as I well remember observing during a visit to Leyden in 1885, found himself compelled to place on the university screens the following notice in lieu of the ordinary announcement of a course of lectures: *Professor Cobet, propter aetatem immunitis, commilitonum studia quantum poterit adiuvabit.* A similar excuse can hardly be pleaded on behalf of the editor of the English edition of select speeches of Lysias, founded on Rauchenstein's first edition, *deren Herausgeber...* (as Fuhr complains) *mit der neueren Litteratur ebenfalls ganz unbekannt ist.*

As to the much disputed date of the birth of Lysias, the ten successive editions of Rauchenstein's book reflect the changes of opinion that have prevailed during the last forty years. Thus the first and second accept 459, the third and fourth 432, the