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](#)

***Die Rhetorik des Anaximenes unter den Werken des Aristoteles.* Dr A. Ipfelkofer. Würzburg. 1889.**

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 422 - 422

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019136X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019136X

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 422-422 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019136X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is only the veil which covers a deliberate refusal to truckle to the passions of the multitude. The theory seriously held by Callicles that laws are established by the weak in their own interest might well be compared with the passage in the *Republic* (358E), where a similar position is maintained by Glaucon for the sake of argument; while the contemptuous declaration of the same interlocutor (484E), that philosophy is all very well for boys, derives light from the contention of Adeimantus in the *Republic* 487 with regard to the practical failure of philosophers, which is met by Socrates with the parable of the true pilot. Then the reply of Socrates to Callicles in 490E, that he not only said the same things, but on the same subjects, requires a reference to Xenophon *Memorabilia*, iv. 4 § 6, where the same thing is related with more point as a retort made to Hippias; also the disgust of the same speaker at the vulgar illustrations which Socrates was in the habit of using may be paralleled from the *Memorabilia* (i. 2 § 37 and iv. 4 § 5) and from the passage in the *Symposium* (221E), where Alcibiades is made to declare that these are only the grotesque outside of the casket which contains the precious jewel of truth within. But the passage which above all cries aloud for comment is that which maintains in a vein of punning allegorization the mysterious doctrine that this life is death and that the body is the soul's sepulchre.

Such are a few of the points which suggest themselves most obviously as needing explanation or illustration in an edition which is intended to be helpful to learners. But on none of them does Herr Christ offer any aid, because they do not happen to fit in with the subject-matter of the introduction or to be suggested by any proper name in the index.

The text of this edition is drawn in the main from Schanz, but there is a pretty full list of deviations. It is not necessary to discuss these in connexion with a school book. There should be a clear line of demarcation drawn between the *critical* edition of a Latin or Greek author, which seeks by a careful recension of MSS. and by gleanings from the ancient grammarians to present the text in a more perfect form than before, and the *expository* edition, which, assuming the text, makes use of it as a basis for inferences as to the life, thought and language of antiquity. In 462D Herr Christ has done well in adopting the felicitous alteration in the ascription of parts, which brings out the fact that Socrates is prompting his opponent as to the way in which he ought to put his questions. But it is a disappointment not to find one's old friend, τὸν Αἰγυπτίων θεόν, after μὰ τὸν κύνα in 482B. The hypothesis of glosses might easily be pushed to such an extreme as to deprive the classical writers of the right to employ apposition. These words must have been in the text as early as the age of Constantine: for how else are we to explain the words of Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iii. 19)—Quis jam superstitiones Aegyptiorum audeat reprehendere, quas Socrates Athenis auctoritate confirmavit sua? Lactantius, following Zeno, appears to have taken seriously what Plato only meant in jest. We need not look for any deeper origin of the oaths by the dog and the goose than the resemblance in sound of κύνα and χῆνα to Ζῆνα. In the same spirit we have in 489E of this dialogue the surprise of Μὰ τὸν Ζῆθον. Very few misprints disfigure the text. On page 10, line 5, there is an unnecessary colon between between ὦν and ἐπῆρσεν; on the last line of page 39 ὄντδ is printed for ὄν-τδ; and on page 95, line 22, Γοργίαν appears for Γοργίαν. The spelling ἀποκτείνωμι and θνήσκω is intentional and habitual.

Herr Christ is no doubt right in conceiving that

the scene of the dialogue is not the house of Callicles, but the place in which Gorgias has already given his ἐπίδειξις. He may be right also in regarding Callicles as no historical character, even under a disguised name, but as a mere impersonation of the spirit of the times. But one of Callicles' three partners in philosophical study, namely Nausiklydes, appears to have been historical (Xen. *Mem.* II. 7 § 6; Aristoph. *Eccles.* 426), and another, Andron, the son of Androktion, figures again in *Protagoras* 315C.

ST. GEORGE STOCK.

Die Rhetorik des Anaximenes unter den Werken des Aristoteles. DR. A. IPFELKOFER. Würzburg. 1889.

VERY little agreement is possible at present with regard to the so-called *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Scholars are indeed tolerably unanimous in denying it a place among the Aristotelian writings, but beyond this all is confusion and controversy. Whether it dates from before or after Aristotle; whether it is in fundamentals a very early work or a very late one; whether it possesses an essential unity and has only suffered some interpolations, or is an amalgamation of two or more works, or is a mere collection of fragments—all these questions have been keenly disputed, and none of them can at present be said to be settled. The writer of the 'Programm' before us concurs in the opinion of Spengel that the *Rhetoric* belongs to the time immediately preceding the genuine *Rhetoric* of Aristotle and may be assigned with great probability, though not confidently, to Anaximenes. His more special thesis is that the treatise was subsequently altered with the direct object of procuring admission for it into the list of Aristotelian writings. First, the letter to Alexander was composed. This is admittedly false, but scholars like Rose and Zeller have thought that it and the book went together. Ipfelkofer however points to a great difference of style between the two, the latter being ornate and affected while the book is quite simple and straightforward, and also to certain differences of substance, e.g. in the views taken as to the scope and function of rhetorical training and as to the Platonic division of the soul. He falls in with the theory that the letter was forged simply to raise at some time or other the money-value of the book. Proceeding to the book itself he discusses certain parts which he regards as later interpolations and seems to indicate that in his opinion there are others which might be condemned on the same ground. His remarks deserve the attention of those interested in the subject.

H. RICHARDS.

De Isocratis Demonicea. Scripsit RICARDUS BRUNO PONICKAU MUELSENENSIS. Stendaliæ. Typis Franzénii et Grossii. MDCCCLXXXIX.

STUDENTS of Isocrates will be interested in this dissertation which discusses once more the vexata questio of the authenticity of the *paraenesis ad Demonicum*. Although Isocrates was credited with the authorship of the treatise by such authorities as Harpocration s.v. παράκλησις (the addition of Ἀπολλωνιάτης in Harpoc. s.v. ἐπακτός ὄρκος seems to be an error), Dionysius and Hermogenes, yet, as is well known, various modern writers have urged objections to its genuineness. Of these may be named Muretus, Stephens and Coray and more recently Benseler and Blass. Benseler in his treatise *De Hiati* and in his review of Schneider's edition of the *Ad Demonicum* and *Euagoras* (in *Jahn J.* lxxxii. 1860 p. 121 sqq.) urges as fatal objections (1) the violation of the law of