

Citation style

Wilson, Nigel Guy: review of: Michele Bandini / Louis-André Dorion (eds.), Xénophon, Hiéron, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2021, in: *Exemplaria Classica*, 26 (2022), p. 262-264, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v26.7422>, downloaded from Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

deserved at least a brief treatment is the relationship between the *Clouds* and tragedy. As often observed, the plot of the play, and especially its conclusion, seems to reproduce the very common tragic model of ‘learning through suffering’ (M.S. Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, Oxford 2000, 353, speaks of the “well-known world of late archaic and early classical ideology, whose watchwords are *suffering, responsibility, god, justice, punishment, delusion, recognition... too late*”; cf. also Lentini, *A Neglected Omen*, cit.). This element contributes significantly to making the *Clouds* (together with its hero) rather untypical of Aristophanes, as O. himself, as we have seen, observes. Contextualizing adequately the play within its cultural *milieu* would have been, of course, beyond the scope of the book. Still, a theme like the one about the conventional nature of law, for example, developed at ll. 1420-2, would have perhaps required at least a brief reference, in the note at p. 233, to the importance of this idea in the contemporary cultural debate.

The book is closed by three useful appendices and two indices. The first appendix is on the fragments of the first version of the *Clouds*; the second one on other passages relating to Socrates in Ancient Comedy; the third one on the metrical structures of the songs. An index of People, Places, and Objects and one of Greek words make consultation easier.

In conclusion, the author is to be congratulated on this excellent and stimulating edition which, hopefully, will make a fundamental text like Aristophanes’ *Clouds* more approachable also by younger students.

GIUSEPPE LENTINI
Sapienza Università di Roma
giuseppe.lentini@uniroma1.it

M. BANDINI, L.-A. DORION, *Xénophon, Hiéron*, Collection des Universités de France, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2021, ccxxxi + 1-156 (1-40 double) pp., 59 €, ISBN 978-2-251-00647-5.

This edition of the *Hieron* is the product of the same collaboration that gave us the *Memorabilia* in 2000-2011, and the structure is identical. There is a long introduction, and the supplementary notes are numerous and in many cases lengthy; the total number of notes for 39 small pages of Greek text is 345. Those that cannot be accommodated as footnotes occupy pages 41-114. A welcome feature is the series of six appendices which list in tabular form concepts occurring in this work that have parallels in other works by Xenophon, and in the case of no. 5, in works by Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle; on p. 188 Dorion justifiably claims to have traced quite a number that had not been noticed hitherto.

The history of the text, which is not particularly remarkable, is outlined on pp. 181-206. There are 31 MSS., of which six are primary witnesses, depending on a minuscule archetype. The secondary tradition is provided by citations in Stobaeus,

which avoid some errors but do not represent another strand of tradition. In the early 15th century Leonardo Bruni's translation offers a few corrections, which he perhaps found in his source, and a few decades later the talented Byzantine refugee Andronicus Callistus corrected some more errors. Consultation of various dissertations has enabled Bandini to revise the attribution of a number of more recent conjectures.

I offer a few thoughts on the preliminary matter. p. xi If Xenophon is proposing a set of reforms to the current ruler of Syracuse, we cannot suppose that a dedication copy was sent to him: the suggestion to Hieron that he might as well commit suicide does not exactly strike a tactful note. So was it merely hoped that the text would circulate among members of an opposition group? p. xxviii Though Dailokhos is not mentioned elsewhere, the patchy nature of our evidence leaves open the possibility that he did exist. The name is rare (x4 in *LGPN* IIIA); why should Xenophon have chosen it if the youth was a fiction? pp. xxxiv ff. This part of the discussion might have benefited from greater insistence on the possible translation of τύραννος as “ruler” rather than “tyrant”. p. 51 The fragments of Simonides are now best consulted in the edition of O. Poltera (2008).

Here are my observations on various passages. 1.1.4-5 Richards put forward “doubtfully” a suggestion that B. does not mention. Some editors have chosen to add an appendix of “coniecturae minus probabiles”, and there is a case for adopting this practice in preference to listing on pp. ccvii f. some minor orthographical variants. At 1.4.6 B. merely notes Richards' suggestion that something is missing, but the reader would like to know what Richards had in mind, i.e. a participle such as αἰθόμενοι. 1.11.2 I wonder if it is wise to use punctuation by commas as a solution to a minor puzzle. How were ancient readers to be sure of understanding the text correctly, given the lack of clear and widely accepted conventions? 1.13.2 and 1.16.2 B. has two attractive suggestions. (Others are at 2.17.3 and 4.) 1.23.3 Here one finds the first of the excellent suggestions of Andronicus Callistus; the others are at 1.30.5, 4.5.7, 10.5.6 and 7.1. 2.3.3 Readers would have appreciated a mention of Richards' supplement μάλα γὰρ <εὐηθῶς>. 2.5.4 Here too his μᾶλλον for κάλλιον is plausible. 2.10.2 I think B. should have had the courage to print his own conjecture in the text. 2.15.4 The figure 4 may be a misprint for 5. Richards was quite clear that the second occurrence of τοὺς πολεμίους should be deleted. 3.8.7 Cobet's deletion seems preferable to me. 4.3.2 I think Marchant was right to adopt C.H. Frotscher's supplement of the definite article, independently suggested by Richards. 4.8.4 Is it possible that one should read χρείας instead of χρήεις? 4.11.2 It would have been wise to cite Richards' <τὰ>; he offered as parallels *Oec.* 4.13 and 16.7. 6.4.5 ἀργάλεον of the MSS seems to me better than χαλεπόν in Stobaeus; *utrum in alterum*? 6.9.2 B. has no suggestion for improving ἔνια, and nor have I, but at 6.10.3 his <κύν>νομοί is ingenious. I would have mentioned Richards' ὥστε <καί>. 6.16.5 Richards' <χρωμένου> deserved mention, as did his οἱ{αυ}τοιοῦτοι at 7.9.9. At 9.9.2 and 11.1 I suspect that Reiske and Cobet respectively were right. 10.4.8 Muretus tried οὔτοι here,

but I do not think this is clear enough; we need something like οἱ ἄγαθοί (the translation has “les citoyens”). 10.5.4 B.’s proposal of a lacuna is a good idea. 11.7.3 One could consider a comparative rather than a superlative here. 11.12.7-8 Schneider’s deletion of the first occurrence of ἰδίῳν should be mentioned (and in my opinion adopted).

It should be obvious that these observations are intended to take discussion a stage further and not to diminish the value of this edition.

NIGEL WILSON
Lincoln College, Oxford
nigel.wilson@lincoln.ox.ac.uk

D.H. KELLY, J. McDONALD, eds., *Xenophon’s ‘Hellenika’. A commentary, vol. I: Hell. i.1.1-ii.2.24*, Classical and Byzantine Monographs 97, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2019, 408 p, 80,00 € (pb), ISBN 978-90-256-1344-0.

Remarquable: tel est l’adjectif qui vient naturellement à l’esprit pour qualifier le travail (posthume) dû à D.H. Kelly et publié grâce à la diligence de James McDonald. Il s’agit du fruit de décennies d’études (menées de 1969 à 2015) et de réflexion sur la constitution et sur la teneur de l’ouvrage fondamental pour l’histoire de la Grèce classique que sont les *Helléniques* de Xénophon.

Le volume I – dont il s’agit ici – comprend un sommaire (IX) qui en précise l’articulation ; il comprend une très riche introduction (1-63) puis une analyse détaillée de l’œuvre jusqu’au moment où elle traite de la défaite d’Athènes en 404 (65-302) ; viennent ensuite cinq appendices (303-36) puis une bibliographie choisie (337-60), un index général (361-7), un index des passages d’auteurs anciens dont les références sont au moins données au cours du travail (369-83), 23 cartes (385-407) dont la liste (XI) est fournie sans indication de pages. Deux autres volumes sont annoncés (VII).

Le propos liminaire affiche d’emblée l’ambition du travail qui consiste, en négligeant les modes intellectuelles temporaires, à comprendre ce que Xénophon écrivit et pourquoi il l’écrivit: “it aims at understanding *what* he wrote and *why* he wrote it”, 2). Dans la présentation des problèmes concernant les *Helléniques* sont, notamment, abordées la question du titre de l’œuvre, celle de la continuité avec l’*Histoire de la guerre du Péloponnèse* de Thucydide, celle des lacunes du début de l’ouvrage (il est ici admis que le tout début des *Helléniques* ne nous est pas parvenu, 10). La mise au point sur la chronologie (10-19) est l’occasion d’un exposé aussi clair que possible sur une matière complexe. D.H. Kelly explicite (14 et 10) que son commentaire se rattache à la chronologie posée par Dodwell en 1701, soit la chronologie dite basse (celle qui place le retour d’Alcibiade à Athènes en 407 et non en