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](#)

Kaibel's *Athenaeus Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum Libri xv. recensuit Kaibel Georgius. Vols. i. and ii. 1887; Vol. iii. 1890. Leipzig: Teubner. 7 Mk. 50.*

J. B. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 29 - 30
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993119, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993119

How to cite this article:

J. B. Bury (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 29-30 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993119

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Boissevain's *ἐν σκέπη τοῦ φόβου* is accepted on the strength of Herod. 1. 143 where the same words occur, although Madvig's *φοβεροῦ* is preferable as accounting for the MS. reading while preserving the imitation of Herodotus (to which Madvig, *Adv. Crit.* 3 p. 79, makes no allusion). In the same section the remains of the word in the MS. which follows *νομίσαντες γοῦν ἢ* have been settled by Boissevain thus *δ.α. λειν* (of which *λ* is doubtful), but we are not satisfied with his suggestions *διασιλλοῦν* or *διαφεύγειν*. The Tarentines hoped for one of two alternatives of which the first (expressed by the missing word) is evidently something short of the result expressed by the second (*ἢ πάντως γε λαθάνειν*), in other words it is being detected by the Romans and 'squaring' them in some way or other (cf. what follows, *ὅτι μὲν ἔγκλημα ἐλάμβανον*). Possibly the word is *διαλείν*. The lacunae created and supplied by Boissevain in Fr. 40, 17 = 40, 21 (between *ἐπιτιμήσας* and *ἐδεύσει*), and Fr. 46 = 48 (between *κατασκοπῇ* and *Γαίον*) are quite gratuitous. In bk. 37, 16, 3, Madvig's *πτοίησιν* is accepted for the certainly corrupt *ἐμποίησιν* of Ma, but though it seems to be confirmed by 17, 4, *ὅπως τε περὶ αὐτὸν ἐπτόνηται*, the word in its ordinary sense of a display of violent emotion is not particularly adapted to express the customary reverence of the Jews for the Sabbath, and one would like to see a confirmation of the meaning attributed to it by Madvig here, 'furor et instinctus superstitiosus.' In 37, 53, 2,

Schenk's *χηλῇ* is a decided improvement on Madvig's *πέτρα* (for *γῇ* of Ma) though perhaps not perfectly satisfactory, for an artificial jetty or breakwater which is the sense in which Dio uses the word (*e.g.* in the description of Byzantium 74, 10, 5) is scarcely appropriate to the scene of the event. Among other corrections of Cobet's which are accepted, the two cases of a lost numeral (38, 50, 4, *μεθ' ἱππέων <πεντήκοντα> i.e. ἱππέων ν'* and 39, 25, 1, *καὶ <δέκα> ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς ἀνδρας i.e. καὶ ἵ*) may be mentioned.

We have detected very few misprints or omissions, and those not important ones. In the comparative table of the Fragments in the previous and the present edition (preface p. xx.) in the first column after 3, 4, 1a should be inserted corresponding to 3, 1 of the present edition; 4, 1, should be 4, 1b, 2; 4, 2-15 should be 4, 3-15. In the fourth column 11, 1-12; it ought to have been stated that 11, 4 is a new passage not in Dindorf. On p. xxi. first column near the bottom 29, 1-5, = 27, 1-5 should be 1-6 in each case. On p. xxii. third and fourth columns after 57, 47=56, 50 the new passage 56, 51 († in Dind.) is to be inserted. P. 78, third line from bottom, the reference to the book of Tzetzes (3) is omitted. P. 108 at the end of 35 and 36 the reference to Mai's 2nd. vol. has been omitted: it should be p. 166 in each case, as also in 33, 32 on p. 107 (not 167). P. 394 *adm. Crit.* 2, 3, the reading of Ma *φιλάρχοντα* should have been added.

G. MCN. RUSHFORTH.

KAIBEL'S ATHENAEUS.

Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum Libri xv. recensuit GEORGIUS KAIBEL. Vols. i. and ii. 1887; Vol. iii. 1890. Leipzig: Teubner. 7 Mk. 50.

A SHORT notice of the second vol. of Kaibel's text appeared in the *Classical Review* for February 1888; but now that the work is complete by the publication of vol. iii., it will be suitable to call attention to the editor's views as to the date of the work and the transmission of the text. He shows ingeniously that a passage in the fifteenth book was probably written in 228 A.D., the year of the historical Ulpian's death. For there (686 f.), when the fictitious Ulpian makes an end of speaking, Athenaeus adds, for the benefit of the reader, *καὶ μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας . . . ἀπέθανεν εὐτυχῶς*. This argument depends on three suppositions: (1) that, in inventing

Ulpianus Tyrius the grammarian, Athenaeus was thinking of the lawyer, his own contemporary; (2) that, granting he did mean the famous Ulpian, he would have used the words 'died happily' of a praetorian prefect who was slain by the praetorian soldiers; and (3) that he would not have feigned the death of a *dramatis persona* unless the original had really died. It is certainly rather curious that the only contemporary introduced in the Banquet should be introduced without any disguise save that of turning a lawyer and imperial minister into a grammarian and sophist. Ptolemy Philadelphus is disguised as Philadelphus of Ptolemais, Scipio Africanus Aemilianus becomes Aemilianus Maurus, Nicomedes of Bithynia becomes Pontianus of Nicomedia, and, if Rudolph is right in his identification, Herodes Atticus appears as Larensius. Ulpian, on the other hand,

although alive when the work was being written, is treated like Galen and Democritus.

Kaibel spends a good deal of work in proving that the *Deipnosophists*, which has come down to us incompletely in the Codex Marcianus A, is not the original work of Athenaeus but only an epitome, written in the sixth or early part of the seventh century by some one of whom we can tell nothing more than that he was acquainted with the life and works of a certain lawyer (σχολαστικός) named Eustathius (see *lemma* to Bk. xii. p. 533). But one epitome was not enough. Another epitomator arose in later years and abridged the abridgment. This short work was used by another Eustathius, but one of whom we do know something—the famous Archbishop of Salonica; and it has been preserved to us in several MSS. As to the author, Kaibel guesses from the nature of his excerpts that he was either an epicure or (more probably) some hungry wretch who wished to season his own thin fare by feeding in imagination on the delicacies of the rich. We may note with interest an attempt at humour in a preface to a Teubner text. Whether we accept all Kaibel's ingenious arguments or not, we may admit that he has shown that we have not the text of Athenaeus as it left the author's hands.

The third volume contains four excellent indexes: I. of the speakers in the dialogue, II. of the writers quoted, III. of proper names occurring in the text, and IV. of strange words (*glossarium*). In this volume, as in the two former, there are many successful emendations both of the editor himself and of Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. On p. 11 in a quotation from Aristotle's *περὶ Μέθης* we have this list: *σμύρνης, σχοίνου, ἄνθους, κρόκον, βαλσάμον, κ.τ.λ.* Wilamowitz restores *ἀνήθου*. On the same page, the words *ὁ Χρυσίππος ἐν τῇ εἰσαγωγῇ τῇ περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν Πραγματεία* are corrected with absolute certainty by Kaibel, who reads *ἐν τῇ Εἰσαγωγικῇ κ.τ.λ.*

On p. 20 (xi. 782 d), in the line of Kratinos

πιεῖν δὲ θάνατος οἶνον ἂν ὕδωρ ἐπῇ

ἐπῇ will not do; Kaibel's suggestion *ρέπῃ* is excellent, and far superior, both palaeographically and in point of meaning, to

Kock's *ἐνῇ* (*C.A.F.* i. 93). In the fragment of the famous skolion, which Pindar wrote for Xenophon of Corinth, and which is preserved in Athenaeus xiii. 573 f. (p. 265) these verses occur—

πολλάκι ματέρ' Ἐρώτων οὐρανιανῖπτάμεναι
νόημα ποττὰν Ἀφροδίταν.

Editors of Pindar generally read *οὐρανίαν πτάμεναι*, but Kaibel's *οὐράνιαι πτάμεναι* probably hits the truth. On p. 297 (xiii. 588 e) will be found a very plausible emendation, which occurred to Kaibel and Wilamowitz independently. In a story about Aristippos they propose to read *ὑπὸ Ἰκέτου* for *ὑπὸ οἰκέτου*, getting Hiketas of Syracuse from Diogenes Laertius, viii. 7, 3.

In conclusion I may mention two guesses which occurred to me in reading the late books of Athenaeus in Kaibel's third volume. (1) In xi. 464 a (p. 10) the following passage occurs: *παραιτητέον δ' ἡμῖν τὰ κεράμια ποτῖρια. καὶ γὰρ Κτησίας 'παρὰ Πέρσαις, φησὶν, ὃν ἂν βασιλεὺς ἀτιμάσῃ, κεραμίοις χρῆται.' Χοιρίλος δ' ὁ ἐποποιὸς φησι*

χερσὶν ἴδλβον ἔχω κύλικος τρύφος ἀμφὶς
ἐαγός,
ἀνδρῶν δαιτυμόνων νανάγιον, οἷά τε πολλὰ
πνεῦμα Διωνύσοιο πρὸς Ὑβριος ἐκβαλεν
ἀκτάς.

Kaibel regards *ἴδλβον* in the first line of this fragment as corrupt. I believe the corruptness lies in *χερσὶν* and propose

Περσικὸν ἴλβον ἔχω,

which is supported by the preceding fragment of Ktesias; in fact the context suggests, if it does not demand, a Persian cup in the quotations from Choerilos. (2) On p. 230 a fragment of the *Neottis* of Anaxilas begins thus—

ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἑταίραν ἡγάπησε πώποτε,
οὐ γένος τις ἂν δύναιτο παρανομώτατον φράσαι.
Perhaps we should read
οὐ γένος, ὃ τις ἂν δύναιτο παρανομώτερον
φράσαι.

At least this would involve less change than any of the other proposed corrections.

J. B. BURY.