

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](#)



Pantazides' *Anabasis* and Gemoll's *Lexicon* to *Xenophon Ξενοφντος συγγρμματα* Edited by I. Pantazides. Vol. I. —Anabasis. Athens, Sakellarios, 1900. Pp. 646. Price 10 francs. *Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis Hellenica und Memorabilien*. By W. Gemoll. Leipzig, Freytag, 1901. Pp. 340. Price 4 M.

G. M. Edwards

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 02 / March 1902, pp 126 - 127

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020557X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020557X

How to cite this article:

G. M. Edwards (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 126-127 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020557X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

acquainted with the literature of the subject, Mr. Marchant has produced a very serviceable and at this time of writing no doubt the best text. In accordance with the principles of the series in which it appears it is strictly conservative in the actual text adopted, but in the brief critical notes he has mentioned many certain or probable conjectures. I should have been glad to see rather more of these, for they add considerably to the usefulness of the book. In *Mem.* 3. 5. 6 for instance, it is quite certain that *ἔσθ' ἄν...δείσωσιν* cannot be right in the sense of *when* or *as long as they fear*, and Coraes' suggestion that *ἔσθ' ἄν* should change places with *ὄραν* in the line before ought to be given. In 2. 1. 24 *ἀεὶ ἔσῃ* surely should be mentioned among the emendations of *διέσῃ*, and in 4. 4. 16 it should be noted that many critics propose to insert a substantive, which seems sadly wanted, after *τοῖς αὐτοῖς*. In *Oecon.* 8. 4 one would expect to find Zeune's *ἀγλευκίστατον* for *ἀκλειέστατον* mentioned along with, or in preference to, Wytttenbach's *ἀγδέστατον*, just as Orelli's *ἀγλευκός* is duly given a few lines before. There are some places too, where perhaps no plausible change has been proposed, but which cannot be right as they stand (e.g. *Symp.* 8. 4.), in which the editor gives no indication that the text is not perfectly satisfactory. He has however put a like restraint on his own conjectural powers, for the suggestions he makes are extremely few and trifling. It may be noted here that in

Mem. 1. 4. 1, though *ὥς* is supported by the papyrus fragment, *οἷς* is a quite certain restoration, as various scholars have seen. This bears upon the value of papyri.

It is no doubt outside the plan of the series to enter upon discussions as to genuineness, interpolations, and so on. At the same time it would have been useful and interesting even to the ordinary reader to have some indications of the extensive proposals for purging the *Memorabilia* and also the *Oeconomicus* of alleged accretions. Such an account need not have been as minute as that of Gilbert in his preface to the *Memorabilia*, but the bare statement in Mr. Marchant's preface that there have been such proposals is hardly enough. When too a good scholar has given as much time to a book as the preparation of such a text implies, one would be glad to have his opinion on the general question, if not on details. I am pleased to see that Mr. Marchant seems to accept the *Apology* as genuine.

Besides one or two other misprints (e.g. *Symp.* 4. 49 *Νῆ Δί', ἔφη, ὁ Σωκράτης* for *Νῆ Δί', ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης*, a misprint which is taken over straight from Dindorf) there is one in the mention of an emendation of my own. In the corrupt words *τῷ Νικίου τοῦ ἐπηλύτου ἱππῷ* (*Oecon.* 11. 4.) I had conjectured *τῷ ἐπηλύτῳ*. By some error this appears in Mr. Marchant's note as *τῷ ἱππηλύτῳ*, which readers will find puzzling.

H. RICHARDS.

PANTAZIDES' *ANABASIS* AND GEMOLL'S *LEXICON TO XENOPHON*.

Ξενοφώντος συγγράμματα. Edited by I. PANTAZIDES. Vol. I.—*Anabasis*. Athens, Sakellarios, 1900. Pp. 646. Price 10 francs.

THIS finely printed book, published under the auspices of the Greek Philological Society of Constantinople, is quite an *édition de luxe*. The chief aim of the series to which it belongs is to satisfy the wants of ordinary Greek readers of the Classics who have not capacity or leisure *πρὸς τελείαν κατάληψιν τῶν θαυμασίων ἔργων τοῦ δαιμονίου πνέματος τῶν προγόνων*. Sixty-six pages of *prolegomena* dealing with the life of Xenophon and other matters give a useful summary of the literature of the subject. The text is furnished with a brief, but adequate

apparatus criticus and an eminently business-like commentary, which, though designed for the 'general reader,' contains many notes superior to any I have come across in other editions of the *Anabasis*. In textual matters Dr. Pantazides is a conservative. It is refreshing to find an editor of Xenophon nowadays who has not fallen under the influence of Cobet and his admirers; for surely no author has fared as badly as Xenophon at the hands of some of his critics, who have ruthlessly corrected many of his deviations from the strict Attic standard of accident and syntax, or, like Hartman, have found *insulsa emblemata* everywhere. Writing as long ago as 1858, Dr. Pantazides pointed out the need of caution in this respect, *μήποτε τὰ ζιζάνια*

συλλέγοντες ἐκρίζωσωμεν ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον, and now he says:—ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἔτι πολὺ μᾶλλον φρονοῦμεν καὶ διακηρύττομεν, βλέποντες μετὰ πόσης τόλμης οἱ νεώτεροι τῶν κριτικῶν φέρονται πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις χωρίων ἀσφαλῶς καθ' ἡμᾶς γνησίων προϊόντων τοῦ Ξενοφοντείου καλάμου. For scholars the most valuable part of this edition is the appendix of 200 pages dealing at some length with a large number of important passages, which are handled with the good sense for which the whole book is remarkable.

Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis Hellenica und Memorabilien. By W. GEMOLL. Leipzig, Freytag, 1901. Pp. 340. Price 4 M.

DR. GEMOLL is well known as an editor of Xenophon. His clearly arranged and admirably illustrated lexicon is noteworthy as an indication that the German schoolboys of the twentieth century are to be pampered like our own. The pictures, over ninety in number, are very well selected, and there are two good maps. It is worth noticing that neither Dr. Gemoll nor Dr. Pantazides have availed themselves of Prof. W. M. Ramsay's researches in Asia Minor (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vols. iv. and viii.) for their maps of the Route of the Ten Thousand; the situation of Keramon Agora should certainly be altered.

G. M. EDWARDS.

PRAECHTER'S *HIEROCLES THE STOIC*.

Hierokles der Stoiker. Von KARL PRAECHTER. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1901.

THIS book is intended to prove that the quotations given by Stobaeus from Hierocles do not belong to the Neo-Platonic writer of that name but to a philosopher of the Stoic school. Whether this was the same as the author of the phrase ἡδονὴ τέλος πόρνης δόγμα, cited as 'verba Hieroclis Stoiciviri sancti et gravis,' by Gellius (9. 5. 8) is regarded by Herr Praechter as doubtful; but he considers that there is much more to be said for the identification of the philosopher quoted by Stobaeus with another philosopher named Hierocles of Hyllarima in Caria who began life as an athlete, and who must as being entitled 'of Hyllarima' have lived before the days of Hadrian, who refounded that city under the name of Hadrianopolis. The passage from Stephanus Byzantinus in which this Carian Hierocles is mentioned has been thought to be derived from the treatise of Philo περὶ πόλεων καὶ

οὓς ἐκάστη ἐνδόξους ἤνεγκε. The argument of Herr Praechter takes the form of a careful investigation of the views on various leading subjects attributed to the Hierocles of Stobaeus, and the conclusion arrived at is that they differ on the whole from those of the Neo-Platonic Hierocles: though it is admitted that on certain points, specially in what is said of duty to parents (p. 53) and of luxury in the furnishing of houses (p. 90), there is a close parallel. On p. 89, l. 3 there appears to be a misprint of HS. (Hierokles der Stoiker) for HN. (Hierokles der Neo-platoniker). The supposition of Bock quoted on p. 123 who 'beide' (viz. Jerome and Hugh of St. Victor) 'auf eine gemeinsame Quelle, Tertullian de nupt. angust. zurückführt,' is improbable. Is there any reason to believe that Hugh did not depend wholly, as is scarcely doubtful in the case of John of Salisbury in the next generation, upon Jerome for the Theophrastean discussion of matrimony?

C. C. J. WEBB.

GOW'S *HORACE, SATIRES I.*

Horace, Satires I. Edited by JAMES GOW, Litt. D., Head Master of Westminster: Cambridge University Press, 1901.

DR. GOW here gives us not only an excellent schoolbook but a very considerable contri-

bution to our knowledge of the Satires. The merits of the late Arthur Palmer's edition are not quite such as fit it for teaching purposes, but Dr. Gow's notes are models of perspicuity and provide neither too much nor too little. Where they run to