

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](#)



Recent Editions of Hyperides *Hyperides, the Orations against Athenogenes and Philippides*, edited with a Translation by F. G. Kenyon. London, George Bell and Sons, 1893. 5s. net. *Hyperidis Orationes Sex cum ceterarum fragmentis edidit F. Blass; ed. tertia, insigniter aucta. Leipzig, Teubner, 1894. 2m. IOpf.*

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 71 - 74
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201169, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201169

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 71-74 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201169

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

If Pan, therefore, as seems certain, had no connexion with the sun, there is little or no evidence to support the theory that the 'Pelagic' religion was confined to a simple worship of the heavenly bodies. M. Bérard's

reconstruction of Pelagic beliefs is as dubious as his theory of a 'Phoenician period,' influencing the whole of Arcadian ritual and mythology.

E. E. SIKES.

RECENT EDITIONS OF HYPERIDES.

Hyperides, the Orations against Athenogenes and Philippides, edited with a Translation by F. G. KENYON. London, George Bell and Sons, 1893. 5s. net.

Hyperidis Orationes Sex cum ceterarum fragmentis edidit F. BLASS; ed. tertia, insigniter aucta. Leipzig, Teubner, 1894. 2m. 10pf.

MR. KENYON has earned the gratitude of many scholars at home and abroad by the skill with which he has deciphered, and the promptitude with which he has published, the important Greek *papyri* which have recently been secured by the British Museum. The object of his present volume is to 'make available for readers, in an accessible form, the two most recently recovered orations of Hyperides.' Of these, the oration *against Athenogenes* has been published by M. Revillout and others, while the fragment of that *against Philippides* was first edited by Mr. Kenyon in a volume,¹ which he modestly describes as 'containing a large quantity of other matter, which a reader may or may not desire to possess.' Mr. Kenyon now supplies us with an interesting Introduction, a fairly satisfactory Text, and an eminently readable Translation, while the general attractiveness of the book is further enhanced by a Facsimile of nineteen lines of the Speech against Athenogenes from the *papyrus* in the Louvre. This MS is not later than the end of the second century B.C.; it is thus the oldest extant MS of any classical Greek work yet discovered, with the exception of the fragments of the *Antiope* and the *Phaedo*.

The recovery of the Speech against Athenogenes is particularly welcome as the author of the treatise *On the Sublime* couples it with the defence of Phryne as an example of a style in which Hyperides was superior even to Demosthenes. Athenogenes is an Egyptian resident in Athens, who has a slave named Midas (probably a Phrygian).

Midas, who has two sons, is manager of a perfumery belonging to his master. Hyperides' client wishes to acquire possession of the younger son, and is informed by the slave-boy's master that, if he wants to buy the boy, he must buy his brother and father as well. The original proposal to pay for their freedom only is cunningly changed by their master into one for buying them right out. When the transaction is completed, the purchaser finds himself saddled with heavy liabilities incurred by Midas, the full extent of which he now learns for the first time. He accordingly brings against Athenogenes an action which has, with great probability, been identified as a *δίκη βλάβης*. The intermediary in negotiating the bargain, in its original form, is a person of questionable character named Antigona, whose success in deluding the plaintiff is complete. The plaintiff's own character is obviously not high; and, having formally consented to the purchase and actually paid the money, he has in point of law a weak case. There was all the more reason why, in a matter requiring skilful and delicate handling, he should seek the aid of an expert like Hyperides.

The Speech *against Philippides* is concerned with a *γραφὴ παρανόμων*. Philippides had moved a vote of thanks to a certain body of *πρόεδροι* for the manner in which they had discharged their duties as the presiding committee of the *ἐκκλησία*. The *πρόεδροι* had put to the vote a proposal in honour of Philip. The proposal was irregular, but it had been put and carried under pressure. To screen the *πρόεδροι* from the consequences of this irregularity, Philippides, a member of the Macedonian party, proposed to vote a crown to the *πρόεδροι* 'for their upright and legal action.' Hyperides attacks this proposal as illegal. A point of interest may be found in the fact that among the friends of Philippides is one Democrates of Aphidna, who belongs to the same *deme* as Harmodius, and is a descendant either of Harmodius or (less probably) of Aristogeiton. In a

¹ *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum*, 1891.

note on p. 51, Mr. Kenyon, by the way, describes Democritus as 'a descendant of either Harmodius or Aristogeiton, probably the latter, who appears to have belonged to the same tribe of Aphidna.' But it was Harmodius, and not Aristogeiton, who belonged to Aphidna. The note is easily corrected by altering *latter* into *former*; and *tribe* into *deme*. The speech against Philipides adds to our knowledge of the privileges enjoyed by the descendants of the 'tyrannicides' by informing us of a law 'forbidding any one either to speak evil of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, or to sing insulting songs about them' (ἄσαι ἐπὶ τὰ κακίωνα).

In the text of the *Athenogenes*, col. i 14, the wily Antigonā is described as φενακίζουσα [.....] α ταῦτα. As the proposed insertion of ἅπαντα involves a *hiatus*, and neither this nor πάντα is sufficient to fill the gap, Mr. Kenyon supplies [τὰ μάταια]α ταῦτα. If an adjective is needed at all, I may suggest, as an alternative, [τάπαγωγ]α ταῦτα, which contains exactly the same number of letters as Mr. Kenyon's conjecture. ἐπαγωγός is particularly appropriate to the seductive blandishments of a person of Antigonā's class. Twice in Lucian's *Dialogi Meretricii* (1, 2; 6, 3) a similar character ἐπαγωγὸν μειδιᾷ (cf. Hdt. 3, 53, τὰ ἐπαγωγότατα λέγειν, Thuc. 6, 8, ἐπαγωγὰ καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῆ, Dem. *Neaer.* 70, ἐπαγωγὸς λόγους).¹ In col. viii 24 we have next to nothing in the text answering to the rendering: 'plucking me like a bird taken in a snare'; it is not until we turn to the critical note that we find the corresponding Greek:—ὡσπερ ὑπο[χείριον ἐν ποδοστράβῃ]κατ[ε]λημμένον, which might well have been printed in the text. In col. ix 14 [οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς εὐ]ρεῖν is clearly less good than [οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς ἐ]ρεῖν. οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς λέγειν, and the like, occur nine times in Demosthenes (18 § 23; 27 § 26; 29 § 5; 40 §§ 21, 53; 48 § 51; 58 §§ 12, 36; 59 § 125); οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς εὐρίσκειν never. In col. x 17 the editor accepts:—[ἐάν τι ἀγ]αθὸν πράξῃ ἢ ἐργ[ασί]αν εὐρ[ο]σ[ο]ύσαν ἔχῃ, τοῦ κεκτημένου αὐτὸν γ[ίγ]νεται, with the translation: 'if a slave effect a good stroke of business or establish a flourishing industry, it is his master who reaps the profit of it.'

¹ But for considerations of space, I should have preferred to propose φενακίζουσα [κάπαπατώ]α or [κάπατώ]α ταῦτα. φενακίζειν and ἐξαπατᾶν are coupled in Dem. 19 § 29; 21 § 204; 23 § 195. ἀπάτη occurs in § 27 of the same speech of Hyperides, and ἀπατᾶν in fragm. 21; but here, as elsewhere, ἐξαπατᾶν is more common (i 6, 12; iii 36; iv 5). Both verbs are found with cogn. acc.

εὐροοῦσαν is supported by Revillout, Diels and Weil; but the authority for such a word in the Attic Orators is *nil*. Plato has εὔροια of 'successful progress,' and it is also to be found in Alcidas, *περὶ Σοφιστῶν*, 17, where it means the same as εὐπορία, and has possibly been substituted for it, εὐπορία and the like being in constant use in this declamation (cf. § 3 εὐπορία, §§ 19, 24, 34 εὐπορος, §§ 6, 13 εὐπόρουσ, § 26 εὐπορημα, § 17 ἄπορος and §§ 8, 15, 21 *bis* ἀπορία). Polybius has εὔροια τῶν πραγμάτων, and τῶν πραγμάτων εὐροοῦντων (quoted in L. and S.); but the Orators have nothing of the kind. We should therefore prefer the proposal of Blass:—εὐρ[γ] ὁ οἰκίτης]. In col. xvii 6 Mr. Kenyon prints his excellent proposal [τοῦτον ὑποχείριον] εὐληφότες, which may be supported by Lysias 4 § 5, and Dem. 23 § 175; but, if (as we learn from Blass) there is only space for 'about thirteen letters,' we are reluctantly compelled to acquiesce in the less interesting suggestion of the German editor:—[τοῦτον ἑμῆς νῦν] εὐληφότες.

In the Speech *against Philipides*, col. i 19, [ἐν]θ', which can only mean 'there' or 'then' (or 'where' or 'when'), is unsatisfactorily proposed in the sense of 'here,' as though it were synonymous with ἐνταῦθα or ἐνθάδε. The passage is intricate, and a perfectly satisfactory restoration far from easy; but this, at any rate, cannot be right. In the next sentence, however, Mr. Kenyon has since shown his skill by suggesting the reading now adopted by Blass:—εἰς ἐσπέρα[ν δε]λ[ε]π[η]σων (instead of [συν]πλη[ρό]σων) ὡς ἕμ[α]ς ἔρχεται. (The subject is Democritus, who, as a descendant of Harmodius, is entitled to dine in the Prytaneum.) In col. v 112, ἐν μὲν σῶμα ἀθάνατον ὑπ[ε]ίληφας ἔσεσθαι is translated, 'you were foolish enough to suppose that a single individual's life would last for ever.' The 'life' is the life of Philip, and Mr. Kenyon (in his Introduction) rightly holds that Philip is still alive, while Köhler supposes the speech was delivered after his death. Consistently with the former view, it would perhaps have been safer to translate the verb not as an aorist, but as a perfect, best represented in English by a present:—'putas (minime putasti vel putabas),' as observed by Blass on p. liii of his edition. In col. viii 188 Mr. Kenyon has been prompted by Blass to print τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν (of the second declension), instead of ψευδομαρτυριῶν (of the first). Blass refers to Pl. *Theaet.* 148 B, ἐνοχος τοῖς ψευδομαρτυρίοις. To this one may add Aristotle, *Ἄθ. πολ.* 59 § 6, τὰ ψευδομαρτυρία <τὰ> ἐκ

'Αρείου πάγου, and Cratinus quoted by Pollux, viii 31 :—*ψευδομαρτυρία*. Κρατίνος δὲ καὶ ψευδομαρτύριον εἴρηκεν. Pollux clearly regards the form in *-ia* as the normal form, though it is never actually found in the singular except in the earlier texts of Isaeus 12 § 6 and Dem. 41 § 16, where the acc. sing. *-ian* is now altered into the gen. pl. *-iōn*. The latter form is printed by Scheibe in at least ten passages of Isaeus, and by Blass in no less than thirty passages of Demosthenes, while in Dem. 57 § 53 we have, as clear evidence for the first-declension form, *ἐν ψευδομαρτυρίαῖς*. The form in *-iōn* is also recognized in Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 194, 27. Thus we have only three certain instances of the neuter form, against forty instances of the feminine, unless, indeed, we are prepared to alter all of these into the neuter. The fact is that the forms are alternative; but the feminine form is much more common than the other. Just so, *μαρτύριον* exists by the side of *μαρτυρία*, though with a slight difference in usage.

With the exception of the *Speech against Athenogenes*, now in the Louvre, all the MSS of Hyperides have found their way to the British Museum; and the texts of all have now been united for the first time in a single volume by Professor Blass. In the language of the ancient epigram, we may now say that all the *papyri* of the most brilliant of the Attic Orators, *σποράδες ποκα, νῦν ἅμα πᾶσαι | ἐντὶ μιᾷς μάνδρας, ἐντὶ μιᾷς ἀγέλας*. Professor Blass is to be congratulated on the publication of the third edition of his work. The first appeared in 1869; the second was an improvement on the first, and the third shows a further advance in many points of detail, besides containing both the newly-discovered speeches. The new material includes the 'Tancock fragments' of the speeches against Demosthenes and for Lycophron, published by Mr. Kenyon in the *Classical Review*, vi 288, and the 'Raphael fragments' of the former. One of these last (pp. 11—12 of Blass) supplies us with a parallel to Aeschines and Plutarch. Aeschines, 3, 209, says of Demosthenes, *ἐκλιπὼν μὲν τὸ ἄστυ, οὐκ οἰκεῖς ὡς δοκεῖς ἐν Πειραιεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐξορμεῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως*. Hyperides (as restored by Mr. Kenyon) borrows this phrase, and says :—*οὐκ οἰκεῖς [ἐν Πειραιεῖ, ἀλλ(λ)] ἐξορμεῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως*. Again, Plutarch, *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 3, describes Demosthenes as having sums invested in loans on bottomry, *δανείζοντος ἐπὶ ναυτικοῖς*. Hyperides, addressing Demosthenes, says *[νῦν δὲ ναυ]τικοῖς ἐργάζη*. In col. xxiv of the same

speech (p. 16) Blass now reads, *οἱ δὲ νόμοι τοῖς μὲν ἀδικοῦ[σιν ἀπλᾶ], τοῖς δὲ δω[ροδοκού-σι]ν δεκαπλᾶ [τὰ ὀφλ]ήματα π[ρ]οστάτ[του-σιν] ἀποδιδόναι*. It is interesting to note that the substitution of *ἀπλᾶ* for *διπλᾶ* (the reading of ed. 2) is due to the new light derived from Aristotle, *Ἄθ. πολ.* 54 § 2, *ἂν δὲ ἀδικεῖν καταγνώσιν, ἀδικίου τυμῶσιν, ἀποτί-νεται δὲ τοῦτο ἀπλοῦν*. Again, in col. viii 3—4, *πλῆν [ἢ γῆρως] ἐνε[κεν] ἢ νόσου ἢ μανιῶν* gives us one more reason in favour of inserting *ἐνεκεν*, or *ἐνεκα*, after *ἐὰν μὴ μανιῶν ἢ γῆρως* in *Ἄθ. πολ.* 35 § 2, instead of retaining *μανιῶν ἢ γῆρῶν* and regarding them as rare and exceptional examples of participles.

In *pro Euxeniippo*, § 19, as well as in the *Funeral Oration*, § 27, and in fragment 219a, we find the word *ἐφόδιον*. This enables us to correct the statement in Liddell and Scott, that this word is rarely found in the singular. It may be added that, in Demosthenes, while the plural is used seven times, the singular is also used in as many as five passages (19 § 158, 25 § 56, 34 § 35, 53 §§ 7, 8).

In the *Philippides*, p. 53b, the lacuna in *ἐγὼ δὲ....ν* may perhaps be filled up by reading *ἐγὼ δὲ [τοῦνα]ν[τίον]*. On p. 56 the proposal *κα[ὶ] χορὸν ἰστάς γελωτοπ[οιῶν]* is confirmed by p. 58, *κορδακίζων καὶ γελωτο-ποῖων*.

In the *Funeral Oration*, p. 78, Bücheler's suggestion *μάρτ[υ]ς ἀκριβῆς ὁ χρόνος* may be supported by *Lycophr.* § 14, *ὁ παρεληλυθὸς χρόνος μάρτυς ἐστίν—ἀκριβέστατος*. Otherwise, one might be inclined to propose *μάρτ[υ]ς ἰκανὸς ὁ χρόνος*. *ἰκανὸς* is an epithet of *μαρτυρία* in Plat. *Symp.* 179 B, and of *τεκμήριον* in *Gorg.* 457 D and *Phaedo* 70 D, and is joined with *τεκμηριῶσαι* in Thuc. i 9 § 3. But Hyperides himself has *οὔτε ὁ χρόνος ἰκανός*, only twenty lines below this passage, and this may weigh against my suggestion. In col. iv *ult.* I still adhere to a proposal made in the course of a review of the first ed. (*Academy*, 1870, p. 221), *τεταπεινωμένην καὶ [δέει κατ]επτη[χ]ν[ίαν]*. No other word meets the case as well as *δέει*, which is found in the dat. in Dem. 4, 45 and 21, 124. In col. x 7—10 one is glad to see the manuscript reading *ἴσαιω...ωνταξιν* now represented by Sauppe and Kayser's *εἰς αἰώ[ν]ιον τάξιν* instead of Cobet's *εἰς ἀμείνω τάξιν*. The fact, which I had occasion to point out in the above review, that the *ω* after the lacuna is really altered into *ο*, is accepted by Blass as decisive.

The volume closes with an excellent index prepared by one of Professor Blass' pupils, H. Reinhold. Among the items in this

index which ought to be noticed in future editions of Liddell and Scott are, ἐνσείειν τινὰ εἰς ὄνην (v 26), 'to entrap into a sale'; κατατέμνειν τινὰ (v 12), 'to cry a person down'; παιδαγωγεῖν (v 2), 'to delude'; and προσπερικόπτειν (v 2), 'to appropriate in addition,' or (if an accusative of the person follows) 'to plunder afresh.' This last is a new compound.

Englishmen have done much for the

recovery and restoration of the text of Hyperides; and scholars in France, Germany, Holland, Italy and Sweden have contributed a good deal towards the study of the subject. Both of the works here noticed will doubtless serve to extend the interest which it has already inspired in England and elsewhere.

J. E. SANDYS.

BELLING ON TIBULLUS.

Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull. H. BELLING. Berlin, Weidmann: 1893. 8vo. pp. 97. 3 Mk.

Quaestiones Tibullianae, scripsit HENRICUS BELLING. Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Askenischen Gymnasiums. Berlin: 1894. Progr. no. 51. 4to. pp. 26.

THESE two pamphlets are a remarkable performance. They contribute new ideas towards the solution of the most vexed questions of Tibulline criticism. The most important of these may be thus distinguished and arranged. 'Except the lost Cujacian fragment (F) all the known codices of Tibullus descend from a single copy of an injured exemplar (t); the injuries of this exemplar were chiefly in the first and last lines of a page; the copyist of t supplied the missing portions where and as he could; not only did he interpolate here, but also where the exemplar contained repetitions or redundancies that offended him.' The following statement from pp. 42 sq. of the first pamphlet will show how the author applies the first three theses to the explanation of the existing text:—

"After i. 2, 25 a pentameter was lost in t. *The scribe went on with the next hexameter 25a.* In i. 4, 44 only the end was left 'imbrifer arcus aquam.' *The scribe supplied 'uenturam admittat [or annuntiat].'* In i. 5, 33, only the end was left 'hunc sedula curet.' *The scribe supplied 'et tantum uenerata virum.'* In i. 5, 47 only the beginning was left 'haec nocuere mihi.' *The scribe supplied 'quod adest huic diues amator.'* In i. 6, 42 only the end was left 'stet procul ante uia.' *The scribe supplied 'stet procul aut alia.'* In i. 6, 72 only the end was left 'proripiarque uias.' *The scribe supplied 'immerito propriis.'* In i. 7, 56 only the beginning was left 'augeat.' *The scribe*

supplied 'et circa stet ueneranda senem.' After i. 10, 25 a whole couplet was lost. *The scribe went on with the pentameter 26.* In ii. 1, 58 only the beginning was left 'dux pecoris.' *The scribe supplied 'hircus auxerat hircus oues.'* In ii. 2, 21 only the end was left 'prolemque ministret.' *The scribe supplied 'hic ueniat natalis auis.'* After ii. 3, 14a apparently a whole pentameter was lost. *The scribe went on with the hexameter ii. 3, 14b.* In ii. 3, 14c apparently only the end was left 'obriguisse liquor.' *The scribe supplied 'lacteus et mixtus.'* In ii. 3, 34 only the beginning was left 'imperat.' *The scribe supplied 'ut nostra sint tua castra domo.'* After ii. 3, 74 a hexameter was lost. *The scribe went on with ii. 3, 76.* In ii. 4, 22 apparently only the end was left 'et Coa puellis.' *The scribe supplied 'hic dat auaritiaie causas.'* In distich ii. 4, 37 sq. only the beginning of the hexameter was left 'hinc fletus rixaeque sonant.' *The scribe supplied 'haec denique causa fecit ut infamis hic deus esset amor.'* After iii. 4, 64 apparently a hexameter was lost. *The scribe went on with the pentameter 66."*

That in the majority of these passages (to which others are afterwards added) the tradition is corrupt will be admitted by everybody.¹ The author would further maintain that it has been corrupted in a particular way. In five out of the above passages i. 4, 4; 5, 33; ii. 1, 58; 3, 14c; 4, 38 are metrical faults of the same kind; and in other respects they evince the same handiwork, e.g. in the use of the pronoun *hic* i. 5, 47; ii. 2, 21; 4, 22, 37, 38 and cf. iii. 6, 23 'deus hic.' It is necessary in fairness to the writer's case to cite together the examples of apparently uniform interpolation;

¹ Except K. P. Schulze whose ignorance of prosody is a ground of just astonishment to the author, p. 11 n. 2, p. 14 n. 3.