

# 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](#)



---

## *Aristotelis quae feruntur Oeconomica*. Recensuit Franciscus Susemihl. (Teubner.) 1 Mk. 50.

H. R.

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 04 / April 1888, pp 115 - 115

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192431, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00192431](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192431)

### **How to cite this article:**

H. R. (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 115-115 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192431

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

the word, I would suggest *πικνύς*. Such a word comes naturally after *πολλὰς* and it is applied to trees in Xenophon's *Anab.* iv 8 § 2, and elsewhere.

*Or.* 16, *pro Mantitheo*, § 7. ἐμὲ τοίνυν οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀποδείξειεν οὐτ' ἀπενεχθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν φυλάρχων οὕτε παραδοθέντα τοῖς συνδικοῖς οὕτε κατὰστασιν παραλαβόντα. Weidner prints the last word *καταβαλόντα*, ascribing the alteration to Bake; but it might have been stated that that critic himself withdrew his suggestion in favour of *λαβόντα* (*scholicia hypomnemata*, v 163). In § 15, we have the well-known description of Thrasybulus, τοῦ σεμνοῦ Στειρίως τοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις δειλίαν ὠνειδικότος. The MS has τοῖς πασιν, whereupon Weidner prints τοῦ τὸ τ ε...ὠνειδικότος, but surely, after τότε, we should in this passage naturally expect, not the perfect, but the aorist. The text is therefore better left as it stands.

*Or.* 19, *de Aristophanis bonis*. In § 23 we have a good emendation: μηδενὸς ἀπορήσειν ἐκεῖ, προσρηγμένον for μηδενὸς ἀπορήσειν ἐκ Κύπρου, ῥηγμένον. In § 62, the MS has: οὐ μόνον ἵππους ἐκτίσαστο λαμπροὺς ἀλλὰ <καὶ Cobot> ἀθλητὰς ἐνίκησεν Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ Νεμέας. Reiske (followed by Scheibe) inserts οἷς after ἀθλητὰς, while Taylor and Bake (followed by Westermann, Rauchenstein and Frobergger) simply alter ἀθλητὰς into ἀθληταῖς. Weidner needlessly changes this into ἀθλοφόροις, which occurs in the *Iliad* (ix 124) as an epithet of a racehorse, but is apparently never found in prose. On the other hand, ἵππος...ἀθλητῆς is supported by Plato, *Parmenides* 137 A, which is sufficient to defend the text as hitherto printed, and to prove (in addition to general considerations) that the word must not be rendered 'athlete,' but 'race-horse.'

In *Or.* 23, *contra Panceleonem*, § 3, the MS has τοὺς Ἑρμασινᾶ οἱ Δεκελεῖς προσφοιτῶσιν. Weidner accordingly prefers τοὺς Ἑρμῆας οἱ to the usual text, ἵνα οἱ. My examination of the critical notes to four other speeches (*Or.* 22, 24, 30, 32) does not suggest any special remarks.

The book closes with an extract from Xenophon's *Hellenica*, ii chaps. 2-4, giving his account of the tyranny of the Thirty and the restoration of the Democracy, which may be conveniently read together with the speech of Lysias against Eratosthenes. Here again we have several interesting emendations. Thus in II 4 § 36, where the MSS have ἀμφοτέροις τῆς [μετὰ] Πεισάνδρου γνώμης ὄντες μάλλον ἢ [τῆς] μετὰ Αυσάνδρου, Weidner improves the text by discarding the words placed in brackets.

J. E. SANDYS.

**Index Thucydideus.** *Ex Bekkeri Editione stereotypa confectus* a M. H. N. von ESSEN Dr<sup>c</sup> Hamburgensi Berolini apud Weidmannos, 1887. (12 Mk.)

THIS index will be of essential service to the student of Thucydides. It is not a lexicon, giving explanations or context, but an index pure and simple, and as an index it seems perfect. I have tested it carefully in several places, and not found the slightest error or omission.

As an example of its completeness, the several cases of δ take up thirty-one large octavo pages with double columns; τ takes seven columns.

Changes of accent or breathing are not passed over; thus ἀπό, ἀπὸ, ἀπ', ἀφ', are arranged under separate headings, and the same principle is followed throughout. The whole number of pages is 457. The gratitude of all classical men is due to Dr. von Essen for his work of labour and love.

C. E. G.

**Aristotelis quae feruntur Oeconomica.** Recensuit FRANCISCUS SUSEMIHL. (Teubner.) 1 Mk. 50.

THIS volume is a companion to Susemihl's *Nicomachean Ethics*, his *Politics*, and various other Teubner texts of Aristotle, the character of which is well enough known to need no description here. In his introduction Susemihl gives his assent to the view that no part of the *Oeconomica* is the genuine work of Aristotle himself. He holds the first book on the one hand to be mainly made up out of the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon and the *Politics* of Aristotle, and on the other to take up some position inconsistent with those of Aristotle himself in the *Politics*. With some hesitation and apparent leaning towards Eudemus as the author, he is yet not prepared to reject the statement (which is at least as old as the time of Philodemus) that this first book should be ascribed to Theophrastus. As to the list of notable devices for raising money, which constituted the second book, there is of course no question now as to its non-Aristotelian origin. Susemihl has collected in a long note what he thinks the reason for regarding it as 'labentis graecitatis memorabile documentum'. A third book existed for us only in two Latin translations, which are here placed face to face. The Greek text of the two first books is printed with Susemihl's usual care and judgment and supplemented as usual with a full statement of various readings and conjectures. Good separate indices for the two books are added. In an appendix the editor has collected for the benefit of Aristotelian scholars a supplementary list of conjectures on all the Aristotelian treatises as yet published in the Teubner series. They are especially copious on the *De Anima*, the *Metaphysics* and the *Rhetoric*.

H. R.

**St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians:** *with a critical and grammatical Commentary*, by CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Longmans. 1887. Pp. xxiv. 344. 16s.

MOST English students of the Greek Testament have worked with one or more of Bishop Ellicott's earlier *Commentaries* on Epistles of S. Paul. The present *Commentary*, which follows the latest of its predecessors after an interval of a good many years, is very similar to the others in form, the only change of much moment being the omission of a continuous translation. 'The reason why it has been omitted is the very simple one that a far better translation than any one that I could produce is now in the hands of the Christian reader . . . the revised version of the N. T. . . . Of the version itself, to which I thus gladly give place, I do not, from the nature of my connexion with it, feel it either necessary or desirable to say more than this:—First, that I have gone over it in this Epistle in the closest manner, as a fair and unbiassed critic, and as one who has allowed no predilections or reminiscences of the past in any degree to influence his present judgment. Secondly, that the sum and substance of this review of it has led me conscientiously to regard it as the most accurate version of this Epistle that has ever yet appeared in any language.'

The Greek text is the result of independent consideration of the material supplied by Tischendorf and Tregelles, and approximates closely to that of Westcott and Hort, from whose decisions Dr. Ellicott only occasionally dissents (*e.g.* i. 1, 14; ii. 1; v. 2, 5; vii. 9, 15, 17), and in some of these cases with much hesitation. The labours of Westcott and Hort 'must be admitted by every fair-judging scholar to have at length placed N. T. criticism on a rational