

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](#)



Lysias *The Epitaphios*, with Introduction and Notes, by F. J. Snell, B.A., late Scholar of Balliol. Part i. Introduction and Text. Part ii. Notes. (Clarendon Press Series), 1887. 2s.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 04 / April 1888, pp 113 - 115
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192418, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192418

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 113-115 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192418

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the way, of approximate or provisional certitude. But our author gives to these early thinkers their full meed of praise. They were philosophers and not mere sophists, and they assisted the advance of true inquiry by arresting judgment when in danger of going by default, and by contesting the pretensions of a crude and narrow dogmatism. There is one sphere of thought, however, which he holds to have remained untouched by their assaults, that of ideal morality. His eloquent words on this subject, though passing beyond the scope of his main inquiry, may fitly conclude the present notice.

‘Quant à la morale, elle présente, au point de vue de la certitude, un caractère tout particulier. Lorsqu’il s’agit de l’idée du devoir, suivant une profonde remarque de Kant, la question n’est plus de savoir si elle a

un objet au sens ordinaire du mot : on ne demande pas si le devoir est toujours accompli sur la terre. L’idée du devoir est un idéal, une règle que l’esprit trouve en lui-même et qu’il s’agit de faire passer dans ses actes. Le fait, ici, ne précède plus l’idée ; il doit se modeler sur elle. Si l’idée du devoir s’offre nécessairement à la raison, elle ne contraint pas la volonté : ici encore, il faut à l’origine de la connaissance un acte de libre initiative. Mais, une fois que l’autorité du devoir a été reconnue (et il importait peu que ce soit par obéissance ou par persuasion), la doute a disparu. L’agent moral n’a plus besoin de jeter les yeux sur le monde pour raffermir ses croyances ; c’est en lui-même qu’il découvre la vérité ; sa volonté se suffit pleinement à elle-même. Nul ne peut faire que l’idée du devoir ne soit absolument certaine pour quiconque s’est décidé à lui obéir. Ni les démentis de l’expérience, ni les cruautés de la vie ne sauraient affaiblir la fermeté du Stoïcien ; le monde peut s’écrouler sans ébranler sa foi. C’est assurément le type le plus parfait de certitude que nous puissions connaître.’

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

LYSIAS.

- (1) **The Epitaphios**, with Introduction and Notes, by F. J. SNELL, B.A., late Scholar of Balliol. Part i. Introduction and Text. Part ii. Notes. (Clarendon Press Series), 1887. 2s.

THIS is a school edition of the Funeral Oration which has come down to us under the name of Lysias, and, although few would now be prepared to maintain that it was really the work of that orator, there is no reason why it should not prove as useful for educational purposes as those kindred productions, the *Menæxenus* of Plato, and the *Panegyric* of Isocrates. It is written in good and (for the most part) easy Greek, and is suitable for boys who have read the last few books of Herodotus and have not yet begun Thucydides. Mr. Snell’s handy little edition makes it easy for English schoolmasters to make the experiment of adding the *Epitaphios* to the list of subjects which may occasionally be read with advantage by boys in the fourth or fifth form. He supplies them with a very readable Introduction, a satisfactory text (that of Cobet), and some brief but (on the whole) sufficient notes. It cannot, however, be ignored that, in point of accuracy, his work would have gained by a still more thorough revision, and it is with a view to its improvement in any future edition that the following points are suggested.

The first sentence of the Preface shews that the editor is not aware that the *Epitaphios* has already been published with English notes in a very meritorious and generally accurate volume of *Select Orations of Lysias*, by Prof. W. A. Stevens (Griggs and Co.), Chicago, second ed., 1878. The Introduction is partly founded on Villemain’s *Essai sur l’Oraison funèbre*; but no mention is made of the more recent dissertation by Caffiaux, *de l’Oraison funèbre dans la Grèce païenne*, Valenciennes, 1861; or of the discussion respecting the authorship of the *Epitaphios* in Dobree’s *Adversaria*. On p. 8 of the Introduction, the first two index figures, referring to the notes at the foot of the page, have been misplaced. Throughout the book Demosthenes is persistently described as the author of the *Epitaphios* bearing his name. Again,

on p. 11 we read, ‘Gorgias is said to have written an *Epitaphios*,’ when the fact is put beyond all dispute by the testimony of Philostratus and by the long quotation from it preserved by Dionysius (Baiter and Sauppe’s *Oratores Attici*, ii 129). On p. 13, we are told that ‘the voice of antiquity is unanimous in ascribing the *Epitaphios* to Lysias,’ but we ought to have been informed precisely that (apart from some anonymous scholiasts) there are only four persons who quote it as his, without any suspicion : Harpocration (once, s.v. *Ἐπίταφια*); Theon (once, *Rhetores Graeci*, i p. 155, Walz); Philemon; and Tzetzes. On the other hand, an authority of greater weight than any of these, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, passes over the speech in complete silence, although he has repeated opportunities for referring to it. Thus, he would almost inevitably have mentioned it in connexion with the *Menæxenus*, and elsewhere, had he supposed it was actually the work of Lysias. Again, ‘the earliest assailant’ of the speech was not Reiske, for he was anticipated by Valckenær (in his notes to Herodotus vii 139, ix 27 and vii 160, published by Wesseling in 1763, whereas Reiske’s attack was nine years later). On this point, Mr. Snell has doubtless been misled by Le Beau, the author of a German dissertation in defence of the genuineness of the speech. To the same dissertation may be traced his quotation of a criticism by Schlegel pointing out ‘the great value of Lysias’ oration from the view which it presents of old Attic morals.’ This criticism is so little known that he ought surely to have given us the reference to Wieland’s *Attisches Museum* i 2 p. 260f, and stated the source from which he derived it. On p. 8 it is asserted that ‘we are nowhere explicitly told when the custom of public funerals in the Ceramicus began.’ But we are expressly informed by Diodorus (xi 33) that it was after the battle of Plataea that the Athenians first instituted the *ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος* and the funeral oration. On p. 18 what is sometimes called the great battle of Corinth (394 B.C.) is described as a ‘battle at Nemea’: this involves a confusion between the scene of the Nemean games and the actual site of the battle in question, which was the Nemean brook in the lower part of its course, between Corinth and Sicyon. At the close of the Introduction it is suggested that

'Lysias' reflexions on the less noble traits in his countrymen's nature might serve to justify the choice of our great dramatist when he makes Athens the birthplace and the abode of a Timon.' To write thus is to ignore the fact that Timon is not a mere invention of the dramatist, but an actual person familiar to us from the allusions in Aristophanes, from Plutarch's *Antonius*, and from the *Timon* of Lucian. It is simply because Timon was actually an Athenian that Shakespeare calls him so, and not because Athens was the most likely place in the world to make a man a misanthrope.

In the Text and Notes, the following details are possibly worth suggesting. The use of ποιεῖν for 'writing poetry' (§ 2) might have been paralleled by our old use of *make* for 'compose,' and *maker* for 'poet,' instances of which are quoted by Taylor, and also in my note on Isocr. *Pan.* § 186. The distinction between θέλειν and βούλεσθαι (*ibid.*), so far as concerns the Attic Orators, is better given in Shilleto's note on Dem. *F. L.* § 26 than in Buttmann's *Lexilogus*. The parallelism of sound between φῆμυ and μῆμυ in the next § might have been illustrated from Isocr. *Pan.* § 186, and the *Helen* of Gorgias § 2. In § 5 a school-boy would probably find it easier to understand the text than the explanation, with its allusion to the proverbial phrase Μυσῶν λεία, with which he would doubtless be unfamiliar, and the exact meaning of which has been a matter of some dispute. There seems to be no more reason for using this phrase instead of 'a ready prey,' than for writing *régime* and *bétiise* in the Introduction, where 'rule' and 'blunder' would perhaps do equally well. In § 16, (the Athenians) διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐκείνους (the Heracleidae) τοῖς αὐτῶν κινδύνοις ἐσπεφάνωσαν, it is difficult to acquiesce in the explanation of Auger (after Reiske) that ἐσπεφάνωσαν means *victories effecerunt*. The word that we really require appears to me to be *ἔωσαν*, and this conjecture is confirmed by σωτηρία which is applied to the Heracleidae at the close of the next §. In § 23, λογισμῷ εἰδότες τοὺς ἐν τῇ πολέμῳ κινδύνους, the reading of the two best MSS has suggested the emendation *δεδίότες* which is well worth mentioning (G. Missowa in *Hermes* xix 650). In § 29, for φέρει πεφυκότα, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 896. In §§ 31, 41, words conjecturally introduced into the text are awkwardly denoted by marks of parenthesis, instead of angular brackets < >; and the words thus restored are oddly called 'interpolations,' whereas custom is clearly in favour of reserving that term for words rejected as spurious, instead of applying it to words inserted by critics to complete the sense. For the rhetorical question in § 34, τίς ἰδὼν οὐκ ἂν ἐφοβήθη; cf. §§ 40, 42, 54, 71, 73, 76, 77. In § 37, to the reference to Curtius' *Atlas von Athen* for the parting scenes on Attic tombs, add Mahaffy's *Rambles in Greece*. In § 50, *ῥεπάνεια* is not a 'mountain' but a mountain-range. In § 60 it should be stated that the passage is quoted *memoriter* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* iii 10, without, however, any mention of the name of Lysias. In § 75 the construction of ἂν μοι δοκοῦμεν... ἀποδοῦναι, might have been briefly explained, or a reference given to Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* § 42, 2, note. In § 77, (ὁ θάνατος) τὸν αὐτὸν παρέχει πᾶσιν might have been illustrated by the *aequo pede* ascribed to Death in Horace. πρὸς is misprinted in § 20, and περὶεῖσαι in 29; and περὶδεικνον, the last Greek word in the notes, happens to be wrongly accented.

(2) *Lysiae orationes selectae*; ANDREAS WEIDNER. Leipzig (Freytag) 1888, pp. 168. 1s. 3d. stitched; 1s. 6d. bound.

THIS is a plain text of fourteen speeches of Lysias, printed in the order which the editor has found to be

the most convenient for educational purposes (*Or.* 24, 7, 10, 16, 12, 25, 13, 19, 32, 31, 30, 22, 23, 1.) By way of introduction, we have a very brief account of the Attic Orators. Aeschines is dismissed in four lines, in which room is found for a reference to his lost love-poems, but none for any mention of his connexion with the stage; Isocrates is called 'the father of rhythmical style in prose,' although he was preceded by Gorgias and Thrasymachus (Cicero, *Orator* § 175); and, for the birth of Lysias, the date of Dionysius, B.C. 459, is regarded as probable, although this would make him no less than 56 years of age before beginning the profession of a λογογράφος. We have also short but sufficient arguments to all the selected speeches, and an explanatory index to the more difficult words and the proper names. Most of the latter have their meanings illustrated by modern equivalents, such as Richard for Ἀριστοκράτης, Robert for Κλεοφῶν, Roland for Περικλῆς, and Walter for Ἀρχέστρατος and Πολέμαρχος. But it may be questioned whether such illustrations are of any real value to the student; and there is more to be said in favour of such a treatment of names of places. Thus Παμνοῦς is rendered *Dornburg* and Μυρρινόυς *Myrtenhain*. Ἀχαρναί is less satisfactorily translated by *Heringsdorf*. There is surely no reason why a deme in the heart of Attica should have a name which would be appropriate to a fishing-village on the coast.

But the editor's main concern is with the author's text. The Heidelberg MS, which is practically our only authority for nearly the whole of the speeches now extant, is notoriously corrupt, and the editor's object has been to remove all textual difficulties by accepting all the best emendations of previous critics and by introducing many of his own which are often well worthy of the attention of future editors. His critical appendix covers ten closely printed pages, and I have examined all the details which it contains, in the case of eight out of the fourteen speeches.

In *Or.* 7, *de olea sacra*, § 29, the MS has (δεῖν δέ μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι... τοῦτον...) ἀπογράφαι μ' ἐγγύς μορῶν ἀφανίζεῖν. The editors omit ἐγγύς, on the supposition that it has been wrongly repeated from the previous line. Weidner, perhaps rightly, proposes ἐκ γῆς. The same emendation had occurred to myself, and I should feel some confidence in its correctness but for the fact that, where the phrase first occurs in § 2, the article is used: ἐλάαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀφανίζεῖν. In § 34, the emendation ἔτοιμος εἶην (for ἡμην) is anticipated by Dobree, and is actually printed in the Zurich edition. In the same § (τῶν τούτου λόγων καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐμῶν), ἔργων is needlessly changed into ἐχθρῶν. In § 39, ἐγὼ μὲν ὁμᾶς is satisfactorily altered into ἐγνωκέναι μὲν ὁμᾶς, but it should have been stated that ἐγνωκέναι had already been proposed, though not in the same position in the sentence. In § 22 (where the MS has εἰ φῆς μὴ δεῖν) Weidner proposes εἰ φῆς μὲν μ' ἰδεῖν τὴν μορῶν ἀφανίζοντα τοὺς <δ> [for ἐννέα] ἄρχοντας ἐπήγαγες. Here I should prefer suggesting εἰ εὐθὺς μ' ἰδὼν τὴν μορῶν ἀφανίζοντα τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας ἐπήγαγες. In § 24 the MS has: ἐπίστασθε γὰρ ἐν τῇ πεδίῳ πολλὰς μορῶν οὖσας καὶ πυρκαῖδ' ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μῦθις χαρίσας. Here *πυρκαῖδ'α* is open to grave suspicion. It is almost incredible that Harpocration, while he explains such words as σηκός and ἐπιγνώμων in the present speech, should offer no remark on so exceptional a use of the word *πυρκαῖδ'α*. It is now generally understood to mean (as in Liddell and Scott): 'an olive tree which has been burnt down to the stump and grown up again a wild olive,' but this instance of its use, if it be an instance, is absolutely unique. Rather than accept this departure from the regular meaning of

the word, I would suggest *πικνός*. 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 Ἰσθμιοὶ καὶ Νεμέα. Reiske (followed by Scheibe) inserts οἷς after ἀθλητὰς, while Taylor and Bake (followed by Westermann, Rauchenstein and Froberger) 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...ἀθλητής 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^c 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