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](#)

The Clouds of Aristophanes *The Clouds of Aristophanes*. With Introduction, etc., by W. J. M. Starkie. Pp. lxxxviii + 369. London: Macmillan, 1911. 12s.

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 25 / Issue 07 / November 1911, pp 211 - 212

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00047247, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00047247

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1911). The Classical Review, 25, pp 211-212 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00047247

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἀήθεσον non ἀήθεσσον posuerit.' Here Merkel has taken Ziegler's emendation ἀήθεον suggested by Hesych. ἀηθεῖν· μὴ εἰθίσθαι and this seems much better than the text. With great perversity Mr. Boesch says (p. 28 n.), 'iv. 1704 πολλὰ δὲ Πυθοῖ ὑπίσχεται πολλὰ δ' Ἀμύκλαις, πολλὰ δ' ἐς Ὀρτυγίην ἀπε-

ρείσια δῶρα κομίσσειν, dativi e verbo ὑπίσχεται pendent,' but a comparison with i. 418 shows conclusively that they depend on κομίσσειν. Finally, p. 24, δασόμεσθα is connected with δαήσομαι instead of with δαίομαι.

R. C. SEATON.

Woodburn, Reigate.

THE CLOUDS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Clouds of Aristophanes. With Introduction, etc., by W. J. M. STARKIE. Pp. lxxxviii + 369. London: Macmillan, 1911. 12s.

How much of the matter properly belonging to lexicons, dictionaries of antiquities, and other works of reference should be put into editions of ordinary books is a question on which editors differ very considerably. Some would have their readers go for it to the proper quarter, and not expect to have it quarried for them in every commentary. Others seem to think that the commentary should be complete in itself and dispense the reader from the task of consulting works of reference at all, and they sometimes pile up masses of information which even those works themselves hardly contain. In this there is some convenience, and it occasionally enables a writer to bring together a good deal that is not known as universally as it might be. But the copious commentary thus produced is apt to be rather overwhelming and the reader to have some difficulty in picking his way through the apparent wilderness. Not a few would prefer something more select and concise, with the power always in reserve of repairing, if they wish, to ampler sources, and they think that the same full information need not be given over and over again in every edition. Indeed, it would sometimes be better if a scholar, instead of producing an elaborate and expensive edition of a book, contented himself with publishing anything new or valuable that he had to say about a few passages in it.

Dr. Starkie has put together a very full commentary on the *Clouds*, including a fresh transcript of the *Venetus* scholia,

and accompanied by a prose translation. The translation is not, like that of the *Acharnians*, in Shakespearean language throughout, but it is so in great measure, and not, I think, with a very happy result. As I ventured to say before, the language of Aristophanes certainly made no such impression on the Athenians who first heard it or for a long time afterwards read it as that of the Elizabethan dramatists makes on us. Dr. Starkie finds quaint archaic out-of-the-way expressions for quite ordinary Attic words and phrases. Why should λουδορεῖσθαι be represented by 'falling at brain-buffets'? This is surely a sort of pedantic humour and ecstasy of Elizabethan learning which would have taken Aristophanes himself very much aback. In 87 πιθοῦ is 'be toward,' 88 ἐκστρεψον . . . τοὺς σαντοῦ τρόπους 'set a new nap upon your ways,' 498 γυμνοῦς in *querro*, 499 φωράσων 'going on an office of discovery,' and these oddities are all supported in the notes by Shakespearean quotations. Loving Shakespeare on this side idolatry as much as anyone, I must yet protest against such a misuse of him. It is characteristic of the editor that in commenting on the jocose appropriateness of the oaths in 627, μὰ τὴν ἀναπνοήν, μὰ τὸ χάος, μὰ τὸν αἶρα, he remembers Bobadil, but apparently forgets Bob Acres, with the theory of swearing which he borrowed when 'damns had had their day.' But after all is any prose translation at all wanted in such an edition as the present? It seems now to be one of the *idola* of English scholarship that a translation is always to be added.

Dr. Starkie refers in various places to the unsatisfactory and puzzling shape in which the play has come down to us,

changed from its first form, yet not definitively and consistently. He does not encourage speculation about this, and he defends the play as it stands from some of the criticisms to which it has been subjected, but he shows himself in detail quite alive to the many difficulties which its structure presents. He refers to my observations (C.R. xvii. 86 = *Aristoph. and Others*, p. 27) on line 1130, *κὰν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κ.τ.λ.*, and says that I do not 'appreciate the double sense,' but my very complaint was that Aristophanes mixes up two senses in an awkward illogical way; nor do I see that he makes much of a defence for the like want of logic in the *Electra* passage (534-6), or for the quite needless and involved modern transposition of lines at 1366, *ἐγὼ γὰρ Αἰσχύλον κ.τ.λ.* In 995 he affirms that R really has, like V, *ἀναπλήσειν*, and he maintains this

against *ἀναπλάττειν*; but he renders it 'slubber the image of Purity in your heart,' where 'in your heart' is wholly an insertion of his own; and, though an image can be stained or defaced (*τᾶγαλμα μαίνειν, κακῶσειν, κακουργεῖν*), he does not show that it can catch an infection. (I do not know the exact sense of 'slubber,' nor of 'meal' and 'colly,' which are offered as equivalents.) In 1307 he reads from his own conjecture *ὅπως οὐκ ὄψεται τήμερόν τις πρᾶγμ'*, the *λήφεται* of the MSS. being very dubious, and in 998 he suggests the genitive *Ἰαπετοῦ* without reading it. These are the only new textual suggestions which I remember to have noticed.

The edition is a very sound and solid one, showing great Aristophanic reading, knowledge, and spirit.

H. RICHARDS.

LES STATUES FUNÉRAIRES DANS L'ART GREC.

Les Statues Funéraires dans l'Art Grec.
Par MAXIME COLLIGNON. Pp. vii + 404, with 1 plate and 241 cuts.
Paris: E. Leroux, 1911.

M. COLLIGNON'S book is not merely a good book of its kind, but also a book of a good kind. He has put together, in a monumental volume, the works of sculpture adorning Greek tombs, that is the works in the round, for he has not usually included reliefs; he has arranged them in classes by species and periods, and given us an excellent conspectus of their origin and decay, as well as of their purpose and meaning. A conspicuous feature of the work is the wide field from which the writer has drawn his examples, many of which are figured for the first time. Not only the great museums, but such lesser ones as those of Rheneia, Smyrna, Chalcis, Alexandria, and Corneto, as well as private collections, have been searched. Another feature is the caution and sobriety of M. Collignon's judgment. When he thinks the facts warrant a definite conclusion, he says so; when it is hard to decide between a variety of theories, he throws these

into perspective, and estimates their respective probability; where a question is involved in doubt, he is content to be agnostic. Naturally such procedure is less attractive than that of the bold theorist, who starts with a theory, and fits the facts into its framework. But it produces work of a more lasting kind—work which may stand even that severest of all tests, the publication of the great modern *Corpus* or *Corpora* of works of ancient art, which make short work of theories based on a few examples.

The one great drawback inseparable from a work of this kind is that the limits of its material cannot be clearly defined. It is often quite impossible to say whether a statue was meant to adorn a tomb, or whether it was merely athletic or votive. And even if we could set apart the strictly sepulchral statues, they would not be in style and character a distinct class. M. Collignon evidently often hesitated whether he should include particular statues: nor indeed can we always separate human figures from those of the gods.

The richness of the material in M. Collignon's book helps forward