

by one character its prosaic equivalent will often in the next line or two be used to designate the same thing by another character, this close connection of picturesque and prosaic words frequently amounting to clear proof that Aristophanes employed the unusual word designedly. Sometimes, too, the use of the prosaic synonym at a greater remove, but where the situation or thought is similar, is significant, and not infrequently this internal criticism is the only means of judging.

A word occurring several times and always in parody may be assumed to be not of every-day speech, but serving as a vehicle for the poet's humor; but classification is not always so sure, for most of the words of the collection occur both in and out of parody. The evidence to be used in classifying words depends on questions like the following: "In what kind of meter is the word prevailingly found? What prose writers use it? What poets? How often? In what way? Does it prevail in poetry or in prose? What characters in our plays use it? or in addressing whom? or in speaking of whom? *Was there any other word that could have been used?* Is it a favorite with any particular author?"

Often a word apparently belonging to the higher style of Aristophanes occurs in classic prose, and in such cases the following must be borne in mind: use by the orators, especially the later ones, is generally good evidence against a word being poetic. Plato is full of poetry and poetic words; and Thucydides and Xenophon in their usage often depart far from the later standards of Attic prose; Herodotus has much in common with tragedy, especially Sophoclean tragedy.

Synonyms are a great help in classifying words, as is also the proximity of other picturesque words and their number. "Parodic words occur in patches or bundles."

"The plays differ greatly in the amount of parody they contain. In *The Frogs* where Euripides and Aeschylus wrangle, while Dionysus and the chorus stand by to judge and mock, we have the greatest amount of parody. Next comes the *Thesmophoriazusae*, with Euripides and his relative quoting tags of tragic verses to each other in antiphonal chant, while Agathon and his servant help to swell the total. *The Acharnians* and *The Birds* both have considerable parody, while the *Lysistrata* has very little, etc."

The work seems to be very carefully done.

C. F. S.

The Frogs of Aristophanes. Edited by T. G. TUCKER. New York: Macmillan, 1906. Pp. lx + 276. 2s. 6d.

Whoever henceforth shall teach the *Frogs* in English, ignorant of this edition (*ἄπειρος τοιῶνδε λόγων* v. 355), him, in the words of the Coryphaeus (v. 370), I charge once, twice, and three times, *ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς*.

Merry's edition served its school-purpose excellently, we all admit; but Tucker proves that notes may be brief yet also packed with advanced instruction—may be witty yet learned—may translate *ad verbum* yet press hard on even Rogers' versions for liveliness and rhythm. More important still, scholarship, for nearly a quarter-century since Merry's edition appeared, has been lighting up many a dark joke, allusion, or custom; and contrariwise has proved that we often laughed in the wrong place, and really deserve βάρβωρος and σκῶρ along with Morsimos.

Tucker's Introduction of 51 pp. is a compact statement of the minimum the student should foreknow. After dealing with the date and motives of the play, he presents the discovery he made in 1904 (*Class. Rev.* XVIII, p. 416), by which at one stroke he dispelled the obscurities of a whole scene (316–459), viz., that not the Greater Mysteries of Eleusis (celebrated in the autumn) are here burlesqued, but the Lesser Mysteries celebrated in the spring at Agrae. Following this is a brief and admirable section distinguishing the language and non-lyric meters of comedy from those of tragedy on the one hand and prose speech on the other. (Because the exposition is so clear, one the more regrets that lyric meters are nowhere treated in the book.) The editor next itemizes the elements of comic style, with illustration of the Aristophanic pun, parody, *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, quotation, allusion, colloquial metaphor, diminutive, expletive, etc. (a capital section); and finally adds an account of his text and a list of his innovations in readings, punctuation, assignment of lines, interpretation, etc. Among these I like best the following:

15. σκευηφοροῦσ' (V), construing therewith μηδὲν ὥνπερ as internal accus.; cf. 833, *Ach.* 677. 83. RV read οἴχεται. Qu. δ-ο-οἴχεται with broken voice? Cf. *Eq.* 32 βρετ-ετ-έτας, *Av.* 310 ποποποποῦ, Pl. *Mostel.* 316 ο-ο-ocellus es meus. 197. ἐπιπλεῖ with the MSS, 'if any one is (to be) a passenger.' See L. & S. s. v. 279. τὰ δελν' ἔφασκ' ἐκείνος by the MSS, but with a dash after ἐκείνος—, marking the sentence as unfinished and obviating emendation. 377. ἥρστηται. After 371 the chorus perform a dance, which by comic fiction stands for the παννυχίς. In 377—presto—it is morning, and breakfast done. 507. κολλάβους—The dash intercepts any verb for κολλάβους. 574. δέ γ' as in MSS. 607. οὐκ ἐς κόρακας μὴ πρόσσιον, 'you shan't come near me, confound you.' Cf. *Soph. Aj.* 560 and *Ant.* 1042 for οὐ—μὴ separated; *Aesch. Sept.* 232 for interjected expletive. 790. ἐκείνος, i. e. Sophocles, strongly contrasting his conduct with that of the contentious Euripides. 957. ἔριν (not ἐράν) τεχνάζειν; cf. ἐριστικοί, and v. 1105. 1028. Qu. ἦνίκα γ' ἦν εἰκοὺς περὶ 'when it was a matter of a phantom of Darius.' 1235. ἀπόδος (to *Aesch.*) 'give it back.' 1265. ἰὴ κόπον οὐ πελάθεις κτλ., interspersed five times over, does not parody the refrains of Aeschylus, but the monotony of his dactylic tunes. No matter in what play, no matter what the rhythm of their initial "basis" (Φθιῶτ' Ἀχιλ-, or Ἑρμᾶν or what not), they were sure to swing into ἰὴ κόπον οὐ κτλ. = te | túm te-te | túm te-te | túm. 1268. δύο σοὶ κόπω κτλ. Here and in 1272 the impressionable Dionysus catches the te-te | túm rhythm as readily as he did βρεκεκεκέξ. 1301. μέλι for μέν (*A.*

Palmer). 1403. *κάν* for *καί*. 1437-53. A distribution of the verses between the two productions of the play, as already proposed in *Class. Rev.* XI (1897), p. 302. 1438. Qu. *ἀέριον ἄραι*?

Further, the notes are clear and full on the probable "staging" (or should we say "orchestration"?) of the play; e.g. 194: "In the theater we are to imagine Dionysus working his passage across the orchestra in the roller-boat, while Xanthias runs round and sits down." Often, too, the notes are as merry as Merry can be; e.g. 245 πολυκολυμβήτοισι μέλεσιν 'many and *divers* strains.' Of the metrical versions of the songs the following is a specimen (211-20):

Come, children of the fount, folk of the lake, | Let us awake | And in its fullest sweetness loud upraise | Our hymn of praise | —Coáksh! Coáksh!—
| The hymn of Nysa's story, | Of Dionysus' glory, | The same we carolled in the marsh that day, | When on the Feast of Pots | The noble throng of sots | Through my demesne with headaches wends its way.

On the other hand, I cannot but object to the following: 194. Note on *παρά* c. accus. is long out of date; see Rau in Curtius' *Studien*, Vol. III. 202. One may wish but cannot at all believe that the explanation of οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις is as easy as Tucker makes it, viz. οὐ (δέος ἐστὶ) μὴ—. 369. That Blaydes' emendation (*πρωιδῶ* thrice repeated) should be preferred to that of H. Richards in *Class. Rev.* XV (1901), p. 389 (viz. *αἰδῶ*, then twice *ἐπ-αυδῶ*) is to me unaccountable. 455. If we translate 'For we alone have sun and gracious light,' Tucker's initial accent on *ἔστιν* is needless. 570 and 574 assigned to Dionysus can surely not be so happy as if given to Xanthias, as van Leeuwen. 610-11*a*. Tucker takes from Dionysus and gives to Aeacus, to save Dionysus from a "very unnatural position." This seems to me naïve. 645. *οἶν* for *οὐκ* is purposeless, if not worse. See Koch on *Nub.* 1066, or Kühner-Gerth II, p. 204. 665. <περὶ> *πρῶνας* is labor lost. 896. Again it is lost labor to defend a text proved corrupt by the antistrophe. 936. Why suggest *ποῖ' ἄρ'*, when the text *ποῖ' ἄττ'* is so amply protected by 173, *Pax* 704, *Av.* 1514? 1203. "Qu. κατὰ κωδάριον?" No, it would spoil the intentional singsong of the thrice-heard rhythm — — — — —. 1210. *ἴνα καί*: note on *καί* "says nothing." See my note in *Selections from Plato on Sympos.* 175*c*, and cf. *ᾧσφ καί, ὅτι καί* 'just because.' 1298. Qu. *ἀλλ' οἶν ἐγὼ μὲν γ'?* The argument for here adding *γε* is curious: 1st, the formula *ἀλλ' οἶν . . . γε* is well known; 2d, "the combination *μὲν γε* is also very common." Ergo: "probably we should read *ἀλλ' οἶν ἐγὼ μὲν γ'.*" 1307. *ταδί γ'* for Hermann's *τάδε γ'* results in an unpleasant and unmitigated anapaest in the 4th foot, which I leave to Mr. Starkie's tender mercy (*Vesp.*, p. xxxvii), as also the query on 286: *ᾄπισθεν οἶν ἴθι?* 1323. That the misshapen "*πόδα*" exemplified in *περίβαλλ'* should receive no explanation is perhaps to be expected in a book so mute as this on lyric meters. Yet I hold it a

serious delinquency when Aristophanes is taught with his rhythms omitted. Granted that we have little certitude on the details, yet we do know that the songs of the Greek drama were rhythmical. Better therefore give if-it-be-but-a-hint of their ancient effect through our modern rhythms than leave them in utter sprawling prose.

Misprints sometimes occur (e. g. Dioneia in note on 650), and wrong references are thick (e. g. p. 85, l. 5, read 17, not 14; p. 86, l. 3, read 677, not 647; p. 99, l. 4 of note on 97, read 573, not 57; p. 117, l. 11 from bottom, read 380, not 310; and these are but the beginning!). Nevertheless, in returning to the upper world, as Dionysus did by Aeschylus, I shall choose Tucker and leave the rest.

L. L. FORMAN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

A Short History of Greek Literature from Homer to Julian.

By WILMER CAVE WRIGHT, PH.D. New York: American Book Co., 1907. Pp. 543. \$1.50.

This book, which appears in the "Greek Series for Colleges and Schools," edited under the supervision of Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, does credit to its authoress, who is evidently well acquainted with the opinions of modern scholars as well as with the works of the Greek writers. The views expressed are sane and reasonable, and the style is, on the whole, agreeable in spite of a few lapses into figurative expressions of doubtful taste. So (p. 31) it is said of critics of the style of the Homeric poems that they "range over the same ground, but they never put up the same game," and (p. 45) the cyclic poets are said to owe their "second-hand immortality" to the "antiseptic quality" of the Homeric poems.

In a small book which contains the history of the rich literature of more than a thousand years much must necessarily be omitted, and it is therefore only to be expected that those writers whose works are lost or preserved only in fragments are for the most part passed over in silence or with very brief mention. It would, however, have been well to impress upon the reader in some way the fact that in the Alexandrian period and the succeeding centuries the quantity of Greek literature produced was vastly greater than is indicated by the comparatively small number of writers whose works are discussed. Many of those whose works are lost exercised no little influence upon Roman writers, and through them upon the literature of later times. While it is probable that the lost works (like some of the extant works) of many post-classical writers had no great literary excellence, the immense literary activity of the post-classical period is of great importance in the history of literature.

The analysis of the style of each author is clear, and as accurate as the brief space allotted to it allows, but it is doubtful if such analysis