

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](#)



Two Editions of Andocides *Andocidis Orationes* edidit Iustus Hermann Lipsius; pp. xxxii, 67. B. Tauchnitz, Leipzig, 1888. M. 1. 20. *Andocidis de Mysteriis et de Reditu*; edited by E. C. Marchant, B.A., late scholar of Peter house, Cambridge; Assistant Master at St. Paul's School. Rivingtons, London, 1889. 5s.

Morris H. Morgan

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 03 / March 1890, pp 114 - 116
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189784, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189784

How to cite this article:

Morris H. Morgan (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 114-116 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189784

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

we commend it to M. Zola: 'le public a plus de plaisir aux fictions qui l'élèvent, qu'aux réalités qui le dégradent. L'Art, sans

cesser d'avoir le plaisir pour but, le cherchera plutôt dans la transfiguration que dans la copie de la réalité.'

R. Y. TYRRELL.

TWO EDITIONS OF ANDOCIDES.

Andocidis Orationes edidit IUSTUS HERMANN LIPSIUS; pp. xxxii, 67. B. Tauchnitz, Leipzig, 1888. M. 1. 20.

THE interest felt in the announcement that an edition of Andocides was in preparation by the reviser of *Der Attische Process* was somewhat tempered by the knowledge that the work would be purely critical. The fact that no satisfactory explanatory edition of this author had ever been written made it all the more desirable that the entire field should first be covered by a scholar who had given proofs of his competence to deal with the general subject.

The editor however gives a very valuable introduction on the life and writings of Andocides, where in copious notes the reader is referred to the sources, ancient and modern, upon which he bases his judgments. His argument against the genuineness of the so-called Fourth Oration is a most powerful one, and further proof will scarcely be needed that it is the work of a late rhetorician. His belief that the pseudo-Lysian oration against Andocides was a similar exercise, and not a contemporary argument in court, will hardly yet find such general acceptance. He promises an article on the subject, but I am not aware that it has appeared. Upon the critical apparatus of this edition it is not necessary to enlarge here, although it is distinctly the most valuable part of the book. The spelling is based throughout upon the combined results gleaned from Attic contemporary inscriptions which are certainly better authority for spelling than the most careful copyist of the Middle Ages, and we must accordingly expect to find the latter give place in our newer texts of the authors. Such emendations as are due to the editor, except mere verbal corrections based upon the new collations of MSS., have in the main already appeared in his contributions to German periodical literature, and are therefore known to readers. But we are given also a collation of the suggestions and corrections of other scholars, most conscientiously gathered and destined to be of great helpfulness. On the whole, this edition, in

spite of a number of emendations which have elsewhere met with criticism, may be safely recommended as the most useful to the critical student which has ever appeared.

Andocidis de Mysteriis et de Reditu; edited by E. C. MARCHANT, B.A., late scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge; Assistant Master at St. Paul's School. Rivingtons, London, 1889. 5s.

MR. MARCHANT's text, also, is preceded by an essay on the life of Andocides and by a full analysis of the two orations. The historical circumstances are ably treated with fair references to authorities. At the end of the book there is an appendix on the connexion of Andocides with the Hermes affair. In this, Mr. Marchant concludes that Andocides had fully intended to take part in the business. So far he is probably right, but what about the reasons he assigns for the inaction of Andocides? 'His absence was due to scruples at the last minute, or to the fear of detection.' To believe this, it is necessary to discredit the whole of Andocides' description of the affair as given in *Myst.* § 61 sq. Mr. Marchant thinks that he is justified in disbelieving all the statements in the later oration by the admissions made in the earlier (*de Reditu*, § 7), which he interprets as a declaration of guilt; he avoids stating, however, whether he believes that Andocides was really an actor in the crime or not. I think that the statements in the two orations may be partly, although not wholly, reconciled. We are not obliged to believe from *de Red.* § 7 that the speaker is confessing participation in the actual mutilation of the Hermae. Perhaps he means only to say that he was in the plot and had intended to take part in its execution. He was thus in a position to inform against the actual criminals and at the same time to clear himself from the act of crime, although he does not try to avoid the charge of being to some extent implicated in it. He doubtless expected complete indemnity, and indeed

got it for a time, but the decree of Isotimides was sweeping enough to cover his case, and he went into exile. The story about the fall from his horse is too natural and too easily refutable to be a lie; not so his statement that he refused altogether to share the plot. This may fairly be discredited, and one may think that Euphiletos was ignorant of this accident and expected Andocides to do his part. I should therefore reject only the latter's statement that he refused to join the plot and that Euphiletos knew it. His absence, then, on the eventful night would be due to his accident, and not to scruples, least of all, in such a man, to fear. This explanation may reconcile perhaps the statement of Thucydides (vi. 60) that Andocides gave evidence against himself. However, I do not feel as anxious as some commentators over any apparent contradiction of Andocides by Thucydides. The historian, it will be remembered, left Athens eight years before the Hermes affair and could not have returned till eleven years after it. In so complicated a matter it would be difficult for any one, not actually on the ground, to know the exact details. Thucydides himself admits that nobody had ever been able to be sure about them. It is rather surprising that Mr. Marchant, who seems to realize (pp. 127 and 136) the untrustworthiness of Thucydides in two particulars, should elsewhere (pp. 35 and 178) accept his evidence with little question. Mr. Marchant is perhaps nearer the truth in other places (pp. 11 and 22) and when he says (p. 6) 'Andocides gave evidence incriminating himself and others,' but even 'incriminating' appears to me scarcely the proper word in this connexion. But after all that has been written on this vexed subject, we are as far as ever from the last word.

Mr. Marchant is familiar with the work of Lipsius along the lines of legal antiquities, and treats fully of legal matters as far as they fall within his subject. Perhaps teachers would have been better satisfied with fuller references to the sources. It is rather unfortunate that all the references to Lipsius' *Attische Process* should be by sections, the fact being that Mr. Marchant has taken for sections the *page-numbers* of the old edition found on the margin of the new. This is frequently confusing, especially on p. 155, where the reference should read *Att. Proc.* p. 900, note 383. The page-numbers of Stephanus are omitted. They should always be given as long as Liddell and Scott continue to quote by them.

Not much grammatical comment is attempted, but what appears is as a rule founded upon acquaintance with the general subject and with the habits of this particular orator. In a very useful note on *Myst.* § 10 the reference to Kühner should read 423 C. On § 30 we are given some sound doctrine on *δηλον ὅτι*. Just above, in the same section, Mr. Marchant reads with Blass *ἡγήσεσθε*, where Lipsius has allowed the unnecessary *ἡγήσασθε*. In his note on § 21 the proper reference to Professor Goodwin's *M. and. T.* is § 49, 2, N 3, (ε), although § 44, 3 may also be compared. In the *de Red.* § 16 my feeling is that the notion of *possibility*, so prominent in *ἰδόν τε καὶ πόρον*, takes away any 'harshness' from the following infinitive. In his translations the editor is correct enough, but not always idiomatic. There is here and there the especial weakness of rendering a long Greek sentence, composed of many subordinate clauses, into a correspondingly long one in English (cf. p. 126).

The comments on two passages may be mistaken. In *Myst.* § 41 Leagoras was not represented as supposing that Diocides had come to 'join the plot,' but to listen to proposals of the conspirators that he should keep quiet about it. In § 132 we read 'of course *μῶν* does not mean A. himself performed the rites, but he paid the expenses.' The first part of this is right, for A. was nothing but *μυσταγωγός*, but what were the expenses? The *μυσταγωγός*, as I know him, merely presented the candidate, and, himself an initiate, took charge of the latter as a sort of 'Mentor' during his initiation. Do we know anything of initiation fees? Mr. Marchant wisely refrains from saying much about so dark a subject as the Mysteries; he might well have omitted his quotation on § 31 from C. R. Kennedy. 'Solemn revelations' looks too much like a reference to a fancied expounding of doctrines. Lobeck exploded the notion that any preaching was done at Eleusis.

In the matter of spelling the editor wisely follows Lipsius, and goes even further in the right path when he prints *τοῖν* for *ταῖν* (*Myst.* § 144). We have long been warned in grammars of the feminine dual of the article; it utterly disappeared from F. D. Allen's edition of Hadley, but it still survives in a few passages in the authors as printed.

In the critical notes the editor's system seems to have been to present only the collation of those passages wherein Blass and Lipsius differ, and to state which of them he

himself has followed. In *Myst.* § 4 the emendation attributed to Lipsius was made by Köpke in 1864 except for the spelling *δορεῖα*. Realizing the danger of emending according to stereotyped rules so easy-going a writer as Andocides, the editor is very conservative. His restoration of the MS. reading *de Red.* § 22 seems sound, and also his transposition of *χρήσασθαι* in *Myst.* § 86. The correction of *ταῖν χερσῶν* (*Myst.* § 144, by a misprint referred on p. iv. to § 141) has already been mentioned. In § 153 his change to the aorist seems unnecessary, although it might be accepted in the case of a more exact writer. In § 12, for *τὸ μεράκιον* ὃ Mr. Marchant reads *ὄν*, on the ground that an Attic ear would not bear the neuter. It is true that the natural gender prevails in such cases, yet we have a neuter with *μεράκιον* in Anti-

phon *Tetral.* B γ, § 10, and in Plat. *Prot.* 315 D, side by side with the masculine; cf. 315 E. Neither of these examples is an exact parallel, but after all who shall decide on the nicety of the ear of Andocides?

The remarks here made are by no means written with a wish to detract from the just dues of so meritorious a book as the one before us. Every one must be grateful to Mr. Marchant for giving English and American readers an excellent practical edition of an author who has been too long neglected; for his fairness in stating both side of disputed questions, his clearness in summing up results, and the modesty with which he differs from the more dogmatic utterances of some of his predecessors.

MORRIS H. MORGAN.
Harvard University.

COLERIDGE'S TRANSLATION OF APOLLONIUS RHODIUS.

The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius translated into English prose from the text of R. MERKEL by EDWARD P. COLERIDGE B.A. George Bell & Sons, 1889. 5s.

THERE are in English three poetical or rather verse translations of Apoll. Rhod. by Fawkes, Greene, and Preston respectively, more or less near the original, but it is certainly time that there should be a prose translation, and so the present one is welcome. The interest of the poem at the present day is mainly literary, not to say philological, and apart from the Greek the story of the Golden Fleece as told by Apollonius will not attract many readers.

The present translation though it cannot be compared to the best of Bohn's, such as Dale's Thucydides or Kennedy's Demosthenes, is yet above the average and may be considered adequate. At the same time it bears many marks of haste and some of the errors I shall presently point out seem to be due solely to that cause. The translation is from the Teubner text of 1852 based on the Laurentian MS. In the next year came out Merkel's larger edition which contains many improvements over the ed. min. Mr. Coleridge apparently adopts the theory that Apollonius should be translated in an archaic style. I have nothing to say against such a theory, indeed much may be said for it, but it is not carried out by writing in a modern style and interspersing archaic words and

phrases. The archaism should lie rather in the structure of the sentences than in single words. Thus we find such scattered gems as 'astonied,' 'God wot,' 'I wis,' 'swinked,' 'an' (=if), 'took up his parable' (=replied) 'or ever,' 'yestreen,' &c. 'Unbeknown to thy father' may be archaic, but its associations are rather with Mrs. Gamp, and 'for to behold' is a vulgarism now at any rate. Mr. Coleridge has a sufficient vocabulary at his command and can use it with effect, e.g. IV. 152 'like a dark wave dumb and noiseless rolling o'er a sluggish sea.' Alliteration is no stranger to him, as 'a flash as of flame from the flashing of the fleece.' The passage of the Symplegides II. 551 foll. is very well rendered on the whole. It is rarely we find such an awkward sentence as 'what time, alone and apart from the other chiefs, he routed them' &c., but why will he always write *Iolchos*?

The translation is prefaced by a short notice of the life of Apollonius in which the date of his birth is given as 'about B.C. 235.' I should have thought this to be a misprint, if it were not that Smith's *Dictionary of Biography* gives the same date. Though the precise year of Apollonius' birth is uncertain, the limits of deviation are narrow and Ritschl's date of Ol. 126 (276-273 B.C.) is probably correct. I will now notice more particularly some points in the translation and notes which require correction. I. 43 'Now on that day were his limbs