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](#)

Blaydes' *Fragments of the Greek Tragedians Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* scripsit et collegit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes, LL.D., Aedis Christi in Universitate Oxoniensi quondam alumnus.

Lewis Campbell

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 49 - 50
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201078, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201078

How to cite this article:

Lewis Campbell (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 49-50 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201078

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

prefer that the notes should be at the end of the volume rather than at the foot of the page.

One or two misprints may be noted, as in the note on c. 28, 8, 'avaros producit' for

'producit avaros' (in a verse quotation), and in the text of c. 30, line 8, the omission of 'prius' (see the note *ad locum*).

H. FURNEAUX.

BLAYDES' FRAGMENTS OF THE GREEK TRAGEDIANS.

Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta scripsit et collegit FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES, LL.D., Aedis Christi in Universitate Oxoniensi quondam alumnus.

AFTER a lifetime's devotion to the critical study of Greek dramatic poetry Dr. Blaydes is anxious to 'bind up his sheaves.' All scholars will sympathize with him in this desire, and will readily allow the excuse he gives for not having fulfilled the good resolution which he had formed of revising his work before allowing it to appear:—

'Has lucubrationes meas propositum mihi erat retractare, ut quae nimium festinanter ac parum considerate scripta essent castigarem, nonnulla levioris momenti materiaeque criticae copiam aliquando uberiorem reciderem; sed quominus hoc facere possem obstant senectus iners ac valetudo non satis firma.' (Preface.)

Yet it is matter for regret that so much darnel should be left amongst the grain. For it is this admixture which has hindered so materially the acceptance of Dr. Blaydes' labours, at least by his own countrymen. Only German perseverance can unweave the tangle of things good, bad, indifferent,—probable, possible and impossible, which are brought together by this author's ingenuity and industry. He seems to be incapable of cancelling what he has once set down. Else a scholar whose judgment often shows itself to be at bottom clear and sound, could never commit to print so many things which savour not of 'iners senectus' but rather of 'calida juvenas.' Why, for example (p. 108), when he has invented the quite possible dochmiac line κλύεθ', ὀράτε, δεῦρ' ἀλάστωρ περὶ φοβερός αἵματος, should he have allowed to stand the tuneless and unmetrical first attempt, κλύεις, ὄρας νῦν κλύεις νῦν ἔργον φοβερόν αἵματος? (P. 108). Why admit so many lines without caesura and so many objectionable trisyllabic feet? Or why should he at once quote Soph. *O.C.* 481 and deny that Soph. could have used μέλισσα for μέλι? (P. 37).

NO. LXXV. VOL. IX.

Some latent feeling both of the extent of corruption and of the uncertainty of all conjecture seems to betray the critic into the illusion that by heaping together many conjectures he can come nearer to the truth. The 'ductus literarum' is certainly not always an infallible guide, but where that clue fails, the word selected, to be at all probable, should at least be 'inevitable' in point of sense. Can this be said, *e.g.*, of the following?

'Aesch. *Fr.* 372 (D) (ὑψηλὸν †ἡβάσασα τεκτόνων πόνον) ἡβάσασα] ἡβήσασα Heath. ἀμφιβάσα Paleius. Fort. ἐξήστωσα, ἡίστωσα, ἐκκέασα, ἡ φθείρασα, αὐτ' ἐς τείχισμα?' The notion required by the context is that of *bringing low*. Has ἡμύσασα (transitive) never been tried?

A volume of *Adversaria* is at best somewhat dreary reading. It is seldom that such brilliant sparks shine out amidst the endless hammering as Conington's (Aesch. *Fr.* 98 D)

ἀλλ' ἄρης φιλεῖ
αἰεὶ τὰ λῶστα πάντ' *ἀπαριθμεῖν στρατοῦ

(πάντα τὰνθρώπων MSS.), or Scaliger's αἰμόρρντον κούρειον in Soph. *Fr.* 132 (D), or R. Ellis' ἐς φρ[άτορας] in the new fragment of Eur. *Antiope*.

The mention of Conington reminds me that forty years since he set me as an exercise to correct Aesch. *Fr.* 238 (D)—

ἄδων ταῖς ἀγναῖς παρθένοις γαμηλίων
λέκτρων αστεί μὴ βλεμμάτων ῥέποι βολή.

My attempt was:—

*ᾤδ' *ἄν *τις ἀγναῖς παρθένοις γαμηλίων
λέκτρων *ἐτοίμη βλεμμάτων *ῥέποι βολή;

'Would the eye-glance of maidens unattainted of marriage-rites incline so towardly?'

I do not 'stake my reputation' on it, but I still think that it bears comparison with the suggestions (partly his own) which

Mr. Blaydes has thrown together in his note.

In the *Fragments*, as in the text of the plays, some readings have been unduly obelized. For example, in the beautiful passage from the *Danaïdes* (Aesch. *Fr.* 41 D), why should the naïve naturalism of *τρῶσαι* and *ἐκῦσε* have been questioned? Or why should the pathetic oxymoron *ἐφίμερον κακὸν* in Soph. *Fr.* 162 (D) be spoilt with Nauck's all too tame *ἀνήμερον*?

May I observe that at the eleventh hour or even later Dr. Blaydes seems to have become aware of my edition of Sophocles, whether directly or through foreign quotations does not appear. In his notice of Nauck's edition of 1889 he refers to me once or twice, and in the *Addenda* he mentions three suggestions of mine with distinct approval. That is some return for the pains I spent on the *Fragments* fifteen years ago. But I should have been glad if this critic's attention had been drawn to some others of my notes. For instance, I cannot but still think that *πρὸς τὰ †βαρά*, in Soph. *Fr.* 86, 7, D, is not only unmetrical but flat in meaning, and that 'untrodden and inaccessible' or 'unapproachable' is the sense required. My conjecture *καὶ τὰπρόσυκτα* was 'capped' by Prof. E. L. Lushington with *κάπροσπέλαστα*. I am glad to find that in *Fr.* 377 D, the emendation *ἡμέρα φθάνει*, which I thought of independently in September 1876, was also made by Meineke.

The criticism of the *Fragments* of Euripides is a large subject on which there is hardly space to enter here. The work of deciphering and emending the recently discovered fragments of the *Antiope* has been one of the happiest results of contemporary criticism. Dr. Blaydes' edition nearly corresponds with the revised version published by Prof. Mahaffy in the Cunningham Memoirs after communicating with various eminent scholars. It shames me to find some of my avowedly rash guesses, hazarded before the publication of the facsimile, quoted in the notes side by side with the deliberate and well-advised suggestions of such persons as Ellis, Blass and Weil. It is something, however, to find that I have contributed a morsel here and there. On a few points I have still a word to say.

P. 105, *Fragm.* A, l. 4. Dr. Blaydes' objection to *ἵκται* seems hardly justified. He says 'passive poni nequit.' But 'it has

gone so far' (*sc.* τὸ πρᾶγμα) is not passive. The 'ductus literarum' must surely count for more in a papyrus than in mediaeval MSS. And *ἵκται*, 'The matter has been brought,' is hardly possible.

ll. 8, 9. I cannot doubt that Blass and others are substantially right in reading *ὥστ' ἡ...ἡ νῦν...στήσαι*, or something of the kind.

l. 10. The certain correction *καὶ σοὶ μὲν* was anticipated by E. L. Lushington.

l. 15. I cannot think that this line is yet restored, nor that my former conjecture is hopeless: *qu.*

πάρισθι· πρὸς ἄγραν τ' εὐτυχὴς εἴη λιμὴν?

l. 21. *Qu.*

τίνες δὲ ναίονσ' ἐντός; ἐκ ποίως (πάτρας); σῆμάναθ'· (ὥς) δίπα(ἰδα σύντροφον) πέτρας.

P. 106. *Fragm.* B, l. 1. *Qu.* (*μίασμα πᾶτ*)*ρας?*

P. 107, *Fragm.* B, l. 15. I am glad to find *παῖδα Νυκτέως* approved.

P. 109, *Fragm.* C, l. 38. *χύσιν*, Mr. Starkie's conjecture, should not be disturbed.

P. 110, *Fragm.* C, l. 50. Nor should *ἐρρνυαί*, Mr. Bury's reading, be rejected.

P. 110, *Fragm.* C, l. 51. In spite of M. Weil's fine tact, this line seems hardly yet restored: *ἐκλιπούσα* appears to be clearly indicated in the facsimile (unless indeed the scribe took *δένδρη* for fem. sing.).

P. 112, *Fragm.* C, l. 70. I cannot see the merit of *θεγοῦσα*.

The discovery of the *Phaëthon*, first copied by Bekker from the palimpsest leaves of the Claromontane codex of St. Paul's Epistles, created once as vivid an interest as is now felt in the papyrus of the *Antiope*.

P. 165. In *Fragm.* 781 (N) l. 50 (775 D.)—

ἄπαντα ταῦτ' ἤθρησ' ἀκαπνώτως ἔχει.

comes nearer to Bekker's transcription than what is here adopted: and is preferable, I think, to Munro's reading mentioned on p. 344. In *Fragm.* 324, 5 (N) I seem once to have thought of *ἐργάτης* (for *ἡβητής*).

On the lesser tragedians I have at present nothing to offer.

I hope Dr. Blaydes will accept of these few notes as a tribute of sincere respect for his laborious work, of which the value cannot be fully appraised in a hasty review. Such things are—

οὐ λόγοις

τιμώμεν', ἀλλὰ τῇ ξυνουσίᾳ πλέον.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.