

Analecta Isocratea. Composuit BRUNO KEIL. Praga, F. Tempsky;  
Lipsiae, G. Freytag. MDCCCLXXXV.

In the *Analecta Isocratea* of Keil we have the complete work, of which the doctor-dissertation of the author had only presented a specimen. The introductory part gives a brief account of the life and works of Isokrates, in which especial stress is laid on the attitude of the orator to the tragic poets of his day. A sworn foe to the later dramatists, he tried to be for his generation what the older tragic poets had been for theirs, and while appropriating some of their devices, he developed a rhythm that rivalled verse without coinciding with it, and treated themes that were on as high a level as those of the tragic Muse.

The bulk of the book is made up of references to the authors by whom passages of Isokrates have been quoted, with critical notes on the more important divergences from our MSS of Isokrates, and occasional remarks on subject matter and diction, showing close study of the orator. So we are told (p. 57)

that Isokrates always says *χάριν ἔχειν*, never *χάριν εἰδέναι*, except IV 175, where *ἔχειν* is avoided on account of a preceding *ἐπισχεῖν* and a following *μετασχοῦσιν*. To *χάριν ἀποδιδόναι*, *ἀπολαμβάνειν*, *ὀφείλειν*, *κομίζεσθαι*, I. has no objection. In the second chapter, entitled 'Quaestiones criticae Isocrateae,' Keil glorifies the Urbinas for having preserved the true order of the speeches, first the *demonstrativae*, then the *suasoriae*, followed by the *deliberativae* and the *iudiciariae*, IX (Euagoras) occupying the place between the *demonstrativae* and the *suasoriae*. This shows, according to Keil, the hand of an accomplished scholar, by whom the sixty orations current under the name of Isokrates in the first century were reduced to twenty-one in the second, and those twenty-one arranged according to the familiar categories given. The dropping of XVIII from the Urbinas is a mere accident.

The discussion of [I] 14 leads to an excursus on Isokrates' use of the third form of the reflexive for the first and second, and of the forms *αὐτοῦ* or *ἐαυτοῦ*. *αὐτοῦ*=*ἐμαντοῦ* occurs V 129, and is restored to XIX 23 on the authority of Priscian. Hence we must have the third per. [I] 21 (*bis*), II 14. 24. 38, V 149, XI 47[ ep. 2, 3]. Also *αὐτοῦ* [I] 14 instead of Stobaios's *ἐαυτοῦ*. Of the tragic poets Aischylos has *ἐμαντόν* P. V. 444, *ἐμαντήν*, v. 746; Choeph. 213: *αὐτοῦ*=*ἐμαντοῦ*, Suppl. 770, *αὐτᾶς*=*ἐμαντῆς*. Soph. has the third per. for the first, Ai. 1132, O. R. 138, O. C. 966, El. 275; no example in Euripides. 3d per.=2d per. in Aisch. Ag. 1095. 1251, Choeph. 104, Soph. O. C. 853, 930, Trach. 451. Eurip. in the chorus of the Alkestis 462, *αὐτῆς*=*ἐαντῆς* (ex conl. Erfurdtii). In the plural *αὐτῶν*=*ἡμῶν αὐτῶν*, Isok. XI 20; XIV 48 (ex conl. Corais), Aischylos, Sept. 177, fr. 135, 4, Sophokles nowhere, Eurip. Bacch. 723, Heracl. 143. Nowhere *αὐτῶν*=*ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*. In Aristophanes *αὐτῶν*=*ἡμῶν αὐτῶν* (Av. 808) is a quotation from the Myrmidons of Aischylos (fr. 135, 4). That Isokrates regularly uses *αὐτοῦ*, and not *ἐαυτοῦ*, is an old story. In the tragic poets *αὐτοῦ* is the rule, *ἐαυτοῦ* the rare exception, and so *σεαυτοῦ* is largely outnumbered by *σαντοῦ*. In Aristophanes, on the other hand, *ἐαυτοῦ* is not so much overcrowded by *αὐτοῦ*, nor *σεαυτοῦ* by *σαντοῦ*. In the comic fragments there are 84 instances of *αὐτοῦ*, 35 of *ἐαυτοῦ*, 39 of *σαντοῦ*, 16 of *σεαυτοῦ*. It is sufficiently characteristic of the stateliness of Isokrates that he should have followed the tragic standard, rather than that of comedy, rather than of the inscriptions in which the trisyllabic forms prevail over the dissyllabic (30; 14).

Another illustration of Isokrates' leaning to tragic pomp is his use of *ν ἐφελκυστικόν* before consonants. Leaving to Maassen (Leipziger Studien IV) the statistic of epigraphic usage, Keil has collected the examples in which *ν* is needed to make position, with the following result:

|              | <i>Trimeters.</i> | <i>ν ἐφ.</i> | <i>Per ct.</i> |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aischylos    | 4308              | 112          | 2.6            |
| Sophokles    | 7568              | 113          | 1.5            |
| Euripides    | 17825             | 407          | 2.3            |
| Aristophanes | 8918              | 118          | 1.3            |

The comparison does not yield any tangible result, though Aischylos and Euripides approach each other here as they do elsewhere on the principle of the affinity of extremes. Maassen's observation that in inscriptions the gutturals admit the concurrence of paragogic *ν* more freely than labials, and

much more freely than dentals, is not in accordance with the results that Keil has got from the drama, in which the proportion is, dentals 44, labials 31, gutturals 25; and, in fact, we must rest satisfied with the general result that the Athenians were guided by their feeling in the matter, and now put the  $\nu$ , now omitted it, until it became the fashion to put it almost everywhere. Here too Keil sees the pre-eminence of the Urbinas and upholds  $\eta\nu$  rather than  $\eta$ ; V 8; XII 233, 231 (*ter*); XV 159; XVII 24, 42; XVIII 37; XIX 36, 37; XX 22.  $\pi\rho\sigma\phi\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$  (1 per.) is wanted, XII 127; hence we are to put  $\eta\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$  for  $\eta\delta\eta$ , XII 85. This enthusiastic appreciation of the Urbinas was printed prior to the appearance of Schöne's publication of the Marseilles papyrus in the *Mélanges Graux* (Paris, 1884), of which Blass has given an account in *Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher*, 1884, p. 417 ff., by which it appears that this ancient papyrus has much more in common with the Vulgate MSS than with the best, *e. g.* the Urbinas and the Ambrosianus. To be sure, despite the closer agreement of the Papyrus Massiliensis with the Vulgate, Blass considers it impossible to return bodily to the *Vulgata ante Bekkerum*. The readings of the Urbinas must rest on good old tradition; there was no purist equal to the task of making Isokrates more concise, difficult, artistic, and yet the Urbinas is many centuries younger than the papyrus; and if in the time of the papyrus the current texts were so seriously interpolated, how must it have been in the time of the Urbinas? It is only a question of degree, and the facts in the ad Nicoclem of the Papyrus Massiliensis show that the Urbinas has the same corruptions as the others or analogous errors. Here is the principle that Blass would formulate, if he had to edit Isokrates again: "Words that are found in  $\Gamma$  (Urbinas), and not in the others, are not much less suspicious by their absence in the latter than they would be if found in the Vulgate and omitted in  $\Gamma$ . If they are to be dispensed with, and their introduction is explicable, then they are not to be admitted into the text." The conclusion of the whole matter is that the Urbinas and the Ambrosianus have no such exclusive authority that other MSS are to be laid aside as worthless.

In an elaborate article (*Hermes*, XIX 596-648) Keil has come back to the subject and edited the fragments of the Papyrus Massiliensis. His conclusion is (p. 631): *Misella messis: unum expiscabamur granum felix, quinque quattuorve dubiosa granane an palea, cuncta cetera stramenta vilia debilia inutilia*. True, there is no older witness of the text of Isokrates than this—he puts it in the second century after Christ—but even this oldest witness is so full of faults and glosses that it does not come up to his cherished Urbinas, so far from surpassing it (p. 638). Still it has its uses, lights up the way to the correction of errors, and—which is distinctly precious—proves that Keil's theory of a common original of all the Isokratean MSS is correct.

B. L. G.