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](#)

***The Evagoras of Isocrates*, with an introduction and notes by Henry Clarke, M. A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 2s. 6d.**

E. S. Thompson

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 09 / November 1891, pp 429 - 430

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167812, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167812

How to cite this article:

E. S. Thompson (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 429-430 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167812

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

plex and inconsistent corrections by the three later scribes, and the other interpolations of uncertain date and authorship. The reviser of the text, however cautious he may be, can scarcely expect to escape the animadversion of his successors. It is thus that Kempf retaliates upon Halm with an attack that is of the true *tu quoque* sort. Halm had spent much time in Bern in careful study of the codex; his friend Wilmanns had personally made for him a list of readings from the Vatican MS.; yet notwithstanding all this care, Kempf, who has been allowed to borrow the Swiss codex, finds it an easy matter to show instances of oversight on the part of Halm no less obvious, though much less numerous, than those which exposed his own recension to criticism. Some of the corrections in the present edition are worth mentioning, e.g. in the passage i. 6. 2, where Kempf's old reading from the Bern codex (*concionante seivunxit*) was overlooked by Halm, who noted **clu*il*, conjecturing *cluxit*, which Kempf himself has now accepted; in iv. 7. ext. 1, where Halm had, apparently in despair, adopted the conjecture of Foertsch, *et hora a Dionysio constituta veniam qui acceperat supervenit*, but where Kempf now establishes Madvig's reading *et eam qui acceperat supervenit*, i.e. *et hora supervenit et eam qui acceperat*, though for convenience of reading this is hardly as good as that of C.B. Hase, *qui eam acceperat*; and in vi. 7. 3, in which Halm incorrectly read *prosequeretur*, noting *sequeretur* from B, but ignoring the *persequeretur* of Kempf, which is from the *persequeretur* of the Bern codex (the first hand).

On the whole, however, it cannot be truly said that the corrections and additions to the work of Halm are sufficient to impair the authority of the text that scholars have now been using for two decades; and it is perhaps not too much to say that some of Kempf's alterations in his own former readings are distinctly no improvement, substituting as they occasionally do an unintelligible for a quite intelligible lection. A good instance of this is afforded by the much disputed passage (v. 3. ext. 3) which Kempf in his recension of 1854 gave in the body of the text as doubtful, but cleverly suggested the reading *vix vitalis vita hominum* from Cic. *Lael.* 6. 22 *cui potest esse vita vitalis* etc., without, however, clearing up the difficulty involved in the following *exeret*, for which, it may be remarked, the Torrenian edition reads *exstat*. Halm's admirable remarks on this passage (Praef. xvi.) amounted, it may be remembered, to a demonstration, proving beyond question that the *hominum extar extollit* cited by Kempf from the Vienna codex was a pure misreading of *hominum extar et tollit* i.e. *hominum exstaret* (= *esset*). In the present edition, Kempf alters his own text, if anything, for the worse, and clearly sins against logic in permitting such an impossible reading to stand as *beneficii commercium sine quo vix vita hominum exeret tollit*, which he himself marks with an asterisk. At times he has allowed the most unsatisfactory of his former readings to stand such as *itaque qui amara suggillatione* of vi. 9. 12; while the best of the corrections noticeable in the new text are really those of Halm, e.g. *catenatae cervicis totius tunc fori ora clausurunt* vi. 2. 3), or of Madvig, who furnishes what is perhaps the best of all the emendations, in the well-known passage over which so many editors have given way to despair (vii. 2. ext. 10), but which is now made beautifully simple by the reading *a caritate istud pater, ab usu Philippus*, etc., in place of Halm's *avus o Philippus*, as given by the Vienna codex.

H. T. PECK.

Columbia College.

D. Junii Juvenalis Satira Septima. Texte Latin, publié avec un Commentaire critique, explicatif, et historique, par J. A. HILD, Professeur à la faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. Paris, Klincksieck, 1890. 3 fros.

A gracefully written exposition, which, although offering and professing to offer little that is new, will be found useful to students and attractive to literary readers. The editor has grappled conscientiously with the difficulties of the text, and intersperses very sensible remarks on the weakness of the composition, which he justly regards as inferior to that of several other of Juvenal's pieces. One error should be mentioned. On pages 30 and 32 the *Lectioes Ausonianae* are attributed to Julius Caesar (J. C. and C.) Scaliger insted of to Joseph Justus.

H. N.

De Apulei Quae fertur Physiognomia recensenda et emendenda. Scripsit RICHARDUS FOERSTER. Leipzig, 1887. 1 Mk. 20.

THIS essay (thirty pages in length) is reprinted separately from the supplement to Jahn's *Jahrbücher*. Foerster begins by denying, quite rightly, that the *Physiognomia* edited by Valentine Rose can be the work of Apuleius of Madaura. The Latin style alone is sufficient to put this hypothesis out of court. He proceeds to discuss afresh the relations of the existing manuscripts to their lost archetype, and then gives a series of emendations, based partly on the Greek of Adamantius, partly on independent conjecture. A considerable number of these will probably be accepted. The following are suggested as possible improvements. Apuleius p. 117 l *pupillae oculorum iaciantes et porrectae vanitatem delegunt*. *Iactantes* cannot be right, as some word is wanted corresponding to *εὐπρύς* in the Greek, and Foerster therefore proposes *late patentes*. Perhaps *lâtescentes*. P. 122 8 *niger* (so Foerster rightly for *sinister*) *circulus si fuerit rubrus in univdis oculis.....magnanimum hominem et sapientem.....declarat, iuxta pueros*. Foerster proposes in *pueros dementem*. But *iuxta* in this Latin may mean 'with regard to.' Ti. Donatus on *Aen.* 4. 371 *tanta mala iuxta me commissa sunt*: ib. *Aen.* 5. 6 *aliquid mali.....iuxta salutem Didonis esse commissum*: Faustus Reiensis *Epist.* p. 6 *iuxta substantiam Dei.....scriptum*. The true correction may perhaps be *iuxta pueros* [*furiosum*]: or, if *iuxta* be an adverb, *iuxta puerosum*, *puerosum* being formed on the analogy of *virosus* and *multi-erosus*.

H. N.

The Evagoras of Isocrates, with an introduction and notes by HENRY CLARKE, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 2s. 6d.

THE notes in this edition are sufficiently full, and instructive and profitable both with regard to the language and subject-matter. It may be regretted that no notes are given to the *ῥηθεις*, an interesting piece of ancient literary criticism, possessing some interest and demanding some explanation. I note but few and unimportant omissions in the notes on the text. To the note on *κινδύνων* in § 2 might be added a reference to § 65. On § 7 (*ὑπερβάλλῃ*) add reference for the active to § 13, for the middle to § 41. On the same section it might be noted that the agent with *δουλευτόν* is expressed in the accus. rather than the dative because the dative might be mistaken for the indirect object after *δουλευτόν*. (Similarly in the passage xvii. 56 cited in the note on § 75 we have the accusative *μενημένους* rather than the genitive, to avoid collision with the genitive *τούτων* that follows it.) On § 8 a reference should be given to Dr.

H H

Thompson's Excursus to the *Phaedrus* "On the Philosophy of Isocrates." In the note on comparative adverbs (§ 34) the form *φιλοτιμοτέρως* at § 5 might be cited, and the statement that the forms in *-ως* are commoner than the forms in *-ον* should be limited to Isocrates. On § 47 (*ἀπολελείφθαι*) add reference to § 79. The editor follows the good practice of illustrating his author chiefly from his own writings; but it would be useful to have a list of the titles of the speeches corresponding to the Roman numerals by which they are cited; a student would hardly gather that the 'ix. 61' in this note was a reference to the work before him.

The following notes appear to contain questionable points: § 18 '*ποίησας*, not *ποιῶν*, since the choice of the name preceded the foundation of the city': § 38 '*καὶ τοῦτου* on this account also,' dependent on *ἐπανέσειαν*'; but does not *τοῦτου* depend on *μᾶλλον*, 'more than even Cyrus'? § 64 the note on *οἷός τε* is not clear; moreover *καὶ ὅς* in Homer is not equivalent to *ὅς τε*, and the transition from the demonstrative to the relative meaning of *ὅς* was probably independent of the influence of particles like *τε* or *καὶ*.

The number of misprints is undesirably great. I note in the text: p. 13, 11th line from bottom, *τῷ* for *τῷ*: p. 14, 8th line from top, *Εγκομιον* for *ἐγκόμιον*: p. 17, 9th line from bottom, *νομίζοντες*: 5 lines lower dele comma after *ἐκείνῳ*: p. 22, 8th line from bottom, *ἀντοσχεδίδειν*: next line, *ζητεῖν*: p. 23, 7th line, *ἡκουνεν*: p. 25, line 20, *νόμῳ* for *νόμῳ*: p. 29, line 5, *μῆμην*: line 19, *ὕστερίζω*. The most important misprint in the notes is on p. 57, where § 66 is numbered § 65, and in consequence the summary of §§ 65 — 72 is put one section too late.

Mr. Clarke complains that Isocrates is too much neglected in English schools and colleges. For this no doubt we must partly blame the bluntness of our English ears, almost insensible to time and rhythm in speech, and thereby incapable of appreciating the chief beauty of Isocrates. But perhaps other causes militating against his popularity may be found in the author himself. Such are his absolute want of sense of humour and his indifference to historical truth. The resulting impression of insincerity and artificiality in his author the student can hardly escape. Was not Plato after all right in seeing something conventional and even vulgar in the man who could write (see § 40) *γὺν δ' ἅπαντες ἂν ὁμολογήσειαν τυραννίδα καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μέγιστον καὶ σεμνότερον καὶ περιμαχητότερον εἶναι*?

E. S. THOMPSON.

Sabrinæ Corolla. Editio Quarta. (G. Bell and Sons.) 10s. 6d.

THE three original editors of *Sabrinæ Corolla* have all passed away, but the last survivor Dr. Kennedy has not only enriched the fourth edition with numerous specimens of his own work, but, as we learn from the preface, was employed almost up to the day of his death in revising and correcting it.

Dr. Holden, who succeeded Mr. James Riddell as joint editor of the third edition, has brought out the present edition in conjunction with Mr. Archer-Hind. It is practically a new book; many of the old pieces have disappeared, those which reappear have been often emended, and the amount of fresh matter is such that, though much has been withdrawn, the new volume is at least double the size of its predecessor.

Between the second and fourth edition we have lost four scholars of the highest class all educated at Shrewsbury, Mr. Shilleto, Mr. Munro, Canon Evans and Dr. Kennedy, not to speak of Mr. Paley and Mr. W. G. Clark: and their work has been largely incorporated in the present edition.

There are 14 new pieces by Canon Evans, 15 by Mr. Shilleto, 31 by Mr. Munro and no less than 108 by Dr. Kennedy, who has however withdrawn 56 which appeared in earlier editions.

The engravings have been omitted; the opening poem 'Sabrina fair,' originally ascribed to the three Editors, is with slight alterations assigned to Dr. Kennedy.

His most ambitious contribution to the book is a translation of Gray's 'Elegy' in Hexameters, but he is far more successful in shorter pieces, especially happy in epigrams. Whether the nymph of a grotto or big fleas or a proposal to lay down gas-pipes is the subject, he is equally at home. A version of 'Ye mariners of England' in Alcaics is rather spoilt by pauses at the end of the first line of the stanza, and perhaps the British oak can hardly be the ilex. If Horace is to be our authority for Lyrics, 'senseris aeyo' should not end a Sapphic stanza (the same objection by the way may be made to 'qua nius arces veneris igneas' of Mr. Holmes, page 245). One regrets to see so great a composer lend his authority to poclum' (it is true it occurs in a sacred poem) and to the use of 'quando' for 'cum' (page 21), though doubtless he would have chapter and verse for each. In this use of 'quando' he has Mr. Munro's authority at any rate, but Mr. Munro's vast reading and consummate knowledge of Latin led him into eccentricities, from which the limited study of the writers of the Augustan age would have saved a man of less erudition.

What is to be said of 'Qua, Nymphae, fueratis?' or of the use of 'hic in three several elegiac poems, or of 'suprema sequi vestigia fortis' for 'the brave man's latest steps to trace'? Is 'omnia nequiquam!' good Latin? In the translation of the well-known passage of Milton entitled here 'War in Heaven' the following passage occurs:—

'Visum excussit atrox retrorsum horrore, sed urisit
terga tamen longè pejus: de margine caeli
dant se præcipites: ast ira aeterna flagravat
ad cassum fundo post illos usque barathrum.'

The lines that follow have a rugged grandeur of their own, but those quoted though astonishingly close to the original are surely portentous, and produce the same effect on the reader as the sight of 'that spacious gap in the wasteful deep' produces on the rebel angels. When Mr. Munro avowedly imitates Lucretius he is in his element. When he aims at Virgil he is haunted by reminiscences of Lucretian rhythm and usage, and the result is a hybrid. His work is always deeply interesting and passages of rare beauty and felicity occur, but they are always marred by some jarring notes which confound the harmony. May one protest against *Δογλῆς* for Douglas?

Mr. Shilleto's new pieces are chiefly Greek and experiments in metre, but the best is the passage from the 'Merry Wives,' in which Justice Shallow enlarges on the antiquity of his coat of arms. The following epigram preserves happily the play on words:—

'Thy praise or dispraise is to me alike,
One doth not stroke me, nor the other strike.'

'Culpane dignum an laude me putas? neutram
Moramur: haec non mulcet, illa non mulcat.'

But of past masters in the art there is no one perhaps whose new contributions are so uniformly good as those of Canon Evans, and he is equally successful in all metres. It may be doubted however whether 'plagam opimam' can mean 'a noble stroke.'