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](#)

Plays of Aristophanes *The Frogs of Aristophanes*. Edited by T. G. Tucker. Macmillan, 1906. Pp. lix + 276. 3s. 6d. *The Birds of Aristophanes*. Edited by B. B. Rogers. Bell, 1906. Pp. xcii + 305. 10s. 6d.

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 06 / September 1907, pp 174 - 176
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00180114, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00180114

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 174-176 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00180114

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of Rameses II. are the Lycians, so that we obtain some evidence of weight that Hellenic settlement had taken place in Crete by the fifteenth century B.C., a result of great importance for the early ethnology of the Aegean.

Of the great festivals connected with the cults dealt with in these volumes, the most interesting are the Thesmophoria (iii, 75-112), the Eleusinia (iii, 126-198), and the Thargelia (iv, 268-284). Dr. Farnell proves conclusively that the Thesmophoria had nothing to do with laws or marriage, but was a rite intended to further human and animal fertility, as the women's ceremonial march with torches and the ritual *αἰσχρολογία* would be sufficient to show. His interpretation of *θεσμοφόρος* as 'the bringer of treasure or riches' (iii, 106) is attractive and probable. In the case of the Eleusinia he rejects Dr. Jevons' theory of the sacramental meal of corn, and M. Foucart's attempt to resolve it into an analogue of the Book of the Dead. The former theory seems, indeed, impossible in view of the silence of Iamblichos in his attack in the *De Mysteriis* on the gift theory of sacrifice, and the latter theory confuses the private Orphic mysteries with the Eleusinian cult. The religious power of the Eleusinia appears, indeed, from the old notices, to have rested in the main on the spectacle with its striking allegory of life and death. The Thargelia, on the other hand, takes us back to a very primitive stage of ideas. The human victims there offered combined in themselves the functions of scapegoats and the decaying deity of vegetation. But in view of Dr. Frazer's theory of the slain god, it is

worth noting that in the Attic festival no trace appears of any consciousness on the part of the worshippers that the victims were in any degree divine. So also, even if we admit, what is not very probable, that in the Karneia the priest once died in the ritual, yet we must agree with Dr. Farnell (iv, 284), that the idea of the ceremony was not pressed to the strained logical conclusion that in his death the god died also.

It must suffice merely to refer to Dr. Farnell's conclusive proof that Apollo is not a sun-god (iv, 136-143), to his development of Ahrens' theory of the original meaning of *ὑπερβόρειοι* as *ὑπέρφεροι*, the sacred ministrants who carried the cereal offerings from one community to another (iv, 100-104), to the proof from cult-titles of the very early date of the Aeolic migration (iv, 169), to the interesting chapter on the cults of Hades (iii, 280-288), and to the note on the existence of the conception of a virgin mother (iii, 305, 306). Most important for the history of Greek morality is the section on the influence of Delphi (iv, 202, *seq.*), and, for the history of art, the chapters on the cult monuments and the ideal types of Demeter, Apollo, and Poseidon.

It is intended to complete the work next year by the issue of a volume dealing with the worship of Dionysos, Hermes, and minor deities, while the same or another volume will deal with hero-worship; and we venture to congratulate Dr. Farnell on the approaching completion of a treatise which is indispensable to every student of religion, history, and art.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

PLAYS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Frogs of Aristophanes. Edited by T. G. TUCKER. Macmillan, 1906. Pp. lix + 276. 3s. 6d.

The Birds of Aristophanes. Edited by B. B. ROGERS. Bell, 1906. Pp. xcii + 305. 10s. 6d.

Mr. TUCKER's *Frogs* is an excellent school edition, and more than that, full of knowledge and judiciously done. He is equally careful to dwell on the meanings of words, to bring out points of Greek syntax, to set forth the rules of the metres, what is known as to the

antiquities, what is guessed as to the jokes. The Introduction takes first 'the date and motives' of the play, then proceeds to maintain that the 'mysteries' more or less embodied in it are the lesser Mysteries of Athens, not the Greater Mysteries of Eleusis. Here may be recognised an article contributed by him to Vol. xviii of this *Review*. There follow two sections on the language and metres of comedy and on 'some features of the comic style,' which young Aristophanists will find extremely serviceable, and a concluding section on the text. The commentary is copious and to the point, even if it does not always recommend itself to the reader's judgment. It contains a considerable amount of new matter in the way of suggestions for explaining, occasionally even for emending, the text, though in textual matters the editor is as a rule conservative. I am sorry that in 83 he puts forward anything so fanciful as ἀπολιπὼν μ' ὁ-οίχεται, on the model of W. G. Clark's unhappy βρετερέτας in *Knights* 32. In 957 his conjecture ἔριν (for ἔραν) τεχνάζειν may be right, though in 1028 ἐχάρην γοῦν ἥνικα γ' ἦν εἰκοῦς πέρι is assuredly not so, and his small changes in 1130 (οὐδὲ πάντα γ' ἐστὶ ταῦτ') and 1305 (τοῦτου for τοῦτον) seem improvements. 320 he adopts the variant δι' ἀγορᾶς for the common Διαγόρας, 168 he understands ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται to mean 'is on that errand,' i.e. to visit Hades. There is however no mention of Hades anywhere in the immediate context and τοῦτο should refer to τὰ στρώματα λαμβάνειν. 685 he will hardly upset the usual translation of κὰν ἴσαι γένωνται in favour of 'even if fair terms are got.' 790 he fails to do justice to the difficulty of making ἐκεῖνος refer to Sophocles (κάκεινος ὑπεχώρησεν). 607 (οὐκ ἐς κόρακας μὴ πρόσσιτον) the idea that ἐς κόρακας is a curse by the way needs better parallels. 891 ἰδιῶται θεοί and 459 ἰδιώτας still remain strange. 1114 I concur in thinking a book of the words improbable, but a 'book of military exercises and tactics' seems improbable too as an explanation. 1055 it is surely wrong to condemn the ordinary translation of ἔστι διδάσκαλος ὅστις φράζει, ὅστις being due to ἔστι (ἔστιν ὅστις).

The *Birds* is another part of B. B. Rogers'

many-volumed and much appreciated *Aristophanes* with text and commentary and critical notes and verse translation complete. It is indeed remarkable that two old Oxford men, not divided by more than ten or twelve years of University standing, should have independently taken in hand, and now one may say achieved, so big a piece of work as the respective editions of Blaydes and Rogers. In the preface of the new part not less than sixty pages are devoted to identifying the various birds mentioned in the play and to the classical lore belonging to them, evidently a labour of love. The editor argues from certain details that the play was taken in hand soon after the composition of the *Peace*, or at least while Aristophanes had the *Peace* and its contents very fresh in memory, although seven years elapsed between their respective first performances. The preface also contains a long note by that high authority, Mr. Christopher Welch, on the music of the αἶλός as representing the song of the nightingale. In text and notes Mr. Rogers is, as usual, tenacious of tradition. He will not even allow us to alter *Peisthetaerus* to a more plausible form. In various passages usually regarded now as corrupt he is satisfied with the reading of the MSS. In 16 for instance he explains ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων as a jocose reference to plumage obtained from the bird-market, as though the metamorphosis of Tereus were a mere pretence. But of this there is no sort of hint elsewhere in the play, and it is likely enough that ἐκ τῶν ὃ is an accidental repetition from 13, where the words occur in the same part of the line. In 167 foll. Mr. Rogers clings again to the traditional words (τοὺς πετομένους κ.τ.λ.), though one knows that he would never have written anything so awkward himself. In a note of considerable length he defends 753-4 against what I had to say about it in *C.R.* xv. 388, but I venture to think the defence insufficient, especially as it takes no account of the fact that on his view the ἡμᾶς of 754 are not the ἡμῖν of 756 and 758: 'if anyone would like to live with birds (in general), let him come to us (in particular), for with birds (in general)' etc. On the other hand his citation of *Theogony* 116 and 127 satisfies me that 701 is right

and *γένετο* practically a quotation from Hesiod. 725 he suggests *ἦρος ἐν ὥραις* for *αἰῶραις ὥραις*: 777 puts a comma after *ποικίλα*, understanding *φῶλα* with it (is this good Greek?): and 718 makes (in his translation) *γάμον ἀνδρός* mean a friend's marriage, which the general drift will hardly allow. 1681 he retains *βαδίζειν* 'let us migrate hence, like the swallows'; but is migration at all apposite to the topic of Basileia?

Mr. Rogers' translation of the parabasis will as a whole hold its own with others, though it has nothing quite so good as the first few lines of Frere's. But no translation that I know of is very satisfactory. Even Mr. Swinburne's hand, if one may say so, here loses something of its cunning. I quote the beginning of Mr. Rogers' rendering:

Ye men who are dimly existing below, who
perish and fade as the leaf,
Pale, woebegone, shadowlike, spiritless folk,
life feeble and wingless and brief,

Frail castings in clay, who are gone in a day,
like a dream full of sorrow and sighing,
Come listen with care to the Birds of the
air, the ageless, the deathless, who flying
In the joy and the freshness of Ether are
wont to muse upon wisdom undying.

We will tell you of things transcendental; of
Springs and of Rivers the mighty upheaval;

The nature of Birds; and the birth of the
Gods; and of Chaos and Darkness
primeval.

When this ye shall know, let old Prodicus
go and be hanged without hope of
reprieval.

The anapaestic exposition 462 foll. is well rendered, as are the trochaics of the parodos scene, the choral lyrics that rather mechanically separate the later episodes, and the songs of the hoopoe.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ROME AND GREECE.

Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 avant Jésus-Christ. Par G. COLIN. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. 8vo. Pp. 684. Paris: Fontemoing, 1905. Fr. 16.

THIS book is practically a history of Philhellenism among the Romans. It is curious that there should have been such a divergence of opinion on this subject. Mommsen attributes all the Roman dealings with Greece to a love of ideal justice, not to say to a naïve sentimentality; Duruy supposes the Romans to have followed from the beginning a Machiavellian policy of hypocrisy and greed; Hertzberg thinks that they started with good intentions, which gradually changed to a programme of selfish conquest. M. Colin sets himself the task of finding out the truth about Philhellenism. In this he has succeeded. Moreover, his results are presented in so attractive a form and style, that the book may be recom-

mended for the pleasure of the reading as much as for its historic worth. The only criticism I would make is that it is a little too long.

The conclusion to which the author comes is that Philhellenism was a force that grew, developed, decayed, revived. This fact, apparently so simple, he has been the first to grasp properly. It is impossible to reduce the whole of Roman policy towards Greece to one single formula. Attempts to do so end in confusion and contradiction, simply because the conduct of the Romans varied at different times. M. Colin distinguishes three periods—those of Flamininus, of Cato, and of Scipio Aemilianus. During the first, the Romans, intoxicated by the charm of Hellenic civilization, which they were just beginning to know, showed a most marked favouritism to the Greeks in their political dealings: this is the great period of flourishing Philhellenism. Unfortunately a closer acquaintance with the lamentable state