

platitudes and falsehoods in which Athenian history is disguised'. On the other hand it is too like a rhetorical exercise to seem worthy of the most brilliant and imaginative of Greek writers. With the exception of the splendid and impassioned appeal in the closing chapters, there is little originality of thought or expression, and no characteristic breadth of view. Plato only shows that he can equal Lysias or Isocrates: he does not surpass them. There remains the view that the *Menexenus* is not Plato's work. To quote again from Jowett—'Internal evidence seems to leave the question of authorship in doubt. There are merits and there are defects which might or might not be ascribed to Plato. The form of the work makes the enquiry difficult; the introduction and the finale wear the look either of Plato or of a skilful imitator of Plato. In this uncertainty, the express testimony of Aristotle<sup>1</sup> may perhaps turn the balance in its favour. It must be remembered also that the work was famous in antiquity, and is included in the Alexandrian catalogues of the Platonic writings'. See also Grote; who believed the *Menexenus* to have been written especially in rivalry of Lysias, who had lately put forward a funeral oration, and to whom Plato was undoubtedly antagonistic. The *Panegyricus* of Isocrates, though not a funeral oration, follows the same order of events, and may be consulted with advantage. Sandys's edition has been in my hands throughout, and throws much light on the funeral speeches and on the Greek rhetoricians generally.

<sup>1</sup> See note on *Menex.* 3. 8.