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](#)

Some School Editions of Greek Plays

A. W. Verrall

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 5-6 / June 1887, pp 132 - 135
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183453, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183453

How to cite this article:

A. W. Verrall (1887). Some School Editions of Greek Plays. The Classical Review, 1, pp 132-135 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183453

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It is not likely that an iambic trimeter, even though a parody of an Euripidean senarius, would be introduced into a passage written in tetrameters catalectic. I do not think any of the words suggested to fill the *lacuna* (e.g. *προσῆκεν* or *οὐ χρῆναι*) are such words as

would have probably fallen out. I would suggest *δοκῶ γῶ*, 'I think he should.' Its resemblance to the last words of the foregoing verse would account for its loss.

ROBERT Y. TYRRELL.

SOME SCHOOL EDITIONS OF GREEK PLAYS.

Sophocles for the use of Schools. Edited with Introductions and English Notes, by LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrew's, and EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., Balliol College, Oxford. New and Revised Edition. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Text. Vol. II. Explanatory Notes. 10s. 6d.

Editions of the Medea.

With Notes, by M. G. GLAZEBROOK, M.A., Assistant-Master at Harrow School. Rivingtons. 1886. 2s. 6d.

With Introduction and Notes, by C. B. HEBERDEN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. Part I. Introduction and Text. Part II. Notes. 1886. 2s.

Scholarum in usum edidit TH. BARTHOLD. (Metra recensuit W. Christ). Prague, F. Tempsky. Leipzig, G. Freytag.

In the new edition of Campbell and Abbott's 'Sophocles', the first volume includes with the text a full general introduction, comprising a life &c., and short articles on the grammar of Sophocles, the metres, and the MSS.; in the second volume with the notes are special introductions to each play, an index of Greek words, and a general index. The form of the book is neat, the execution careful, and the whole deserves a strong recommendation.

In the general introduction, under the head 'Improvements introduced by Sophocles into the Art of Tragedy', p. xi., is a statement which anticipates and corrects an error in the special introduction to the *Antigone*: 'While there are two actors only in the *Supplices* and *Persae*, and two alone speak, even if three are on the stage, in the *Septem contra Thebas*, three speakers are admitted in the *Oresteia*. In his later work, therefore, Aeschylus availed himself of the practice of Sophocles.' Here appears to be adopted the correct view, that in the closing

scene of the *Septem* Ismene remains on the stage and leaves it only at the end, though from the entrance of the herald she is silent; whereas in vol. ii. p. 94, 'the fact that Aeschylus in the *Septem* employs two actors only makes it necessary that Ismene should withdraw to make room for the herald, and thus we are left in uncertainty with regard to her action.' This inference, resting only on misconstruction of the phrase 'employment of two actors', cannot be true; it is unnatural and dramatically impossible that Ismene should quit the stage at the entrance of the herald, or at any time before the end of the piece, and there is no reason to doubt that she follows the bier of Eteocles, thus forecasting the contrast of character between the sisters, which is developed by Sophocles in the *Antigone*.

The section on grammar is interesting and good. Here and there a remark might perhaps be modified. 'The middle future for the passive is not uncommon.' This way of putting the matter is apt to dismay a learner, and confuse his notions of language. The truth is that in archaic Greek for many verb-forms the futures 'middle' and 'passive' are the same, like the presents. It is the later distinct forms for the future passive which are in tragedy to be regarded as 'peculiar': *φυλάξομαι*, *I shall be watched*, is as regular as *φυλάσσομαι*, *I am watched*. —The indicative with *ἄν* in *O.T.* 523, *ἦλθε τάχ' ἄν*, 'it may have come,' 'it probably did come', should not be marked as peculiar. It is as regular as the more common use to indicate that which would have happened but for interfering circumstances. The addition of *ἄν* merely shows that the past action was conditioned; whether the conditions were favourable or adverse is to be gathered only from the context. For examples see Krueger, *Greek Grammar*, § 392a, 4 and 5. —'In the use of the relative observe that *ὅστις* is used for *ὅς*, *O.T.* 1054, 1335, *Ai.* 1300.' This seems to be a mistake, and it is certainly not proved

by the references. In the first Oedipus is asking Jocasta whether the peasant already sent for is likely to be the person from whom the Corinthian messenger received the exposed child:—

γύναι, νοεῖς ἐκείνον, ὅτιν' ἀρτίως
μολεῖν ἐφιέμεσθα; τόνδ' οὗτος λέγει;

The difference here between ὄντινα and ὅν is sensible enough, though perhaps not expressible; it is in full 'the man, however he is to be called, whom &c.', and imports both a certain impatience in the speaker and the fact that the person addressed is better informed. In the second—

τί γὰρ ἔδει μ' ὄραν,
ὅτῳ γ' ὁρώντι μηδὲν ἦν ἰδεῖν γλυκύ;—

if ᾧ had been used, we should more properly have said that it had the force of ὅτῳ, which is regular in a causal relative sentence, 'since seeing I could behold nothing of delight.' The third case is somewhat different—

ὃς ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν εἰμι Τελαμῶνος γεγώς,
ὅστις στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας ἐμήν
ἔχει ξύνευνον μητέρα—

but neither here is ὅστις used indifferently. It is not simply 'who' but 'one that'. The point which Teucer makes is that the circumstances of the case prove the high distinction of his father, his mother having been given to the greatest soldier *as such*, ἐκείνῳ ὅστις ἠρίστευσεν τὰ πρῶτα.

The introductions to the several plays are pleasant and useful reading. In that to the *Antigone* (vol. ii. p. 172) there are some very true remarks, which should be weighed before the Chorus of Greek drama is again spoken of as representing an ideal spectator. The Chorus of the *Antigone* might with more truth be described as a foil to the wit of a moderately appreciative audience. In the preface to the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (vol. ii. p. 1) there is one section which, I must confess, puzzles me. The editors apparently think that the horror of Oedipus at the discovery of his position is less easily intelligible to us than to the Greeks, and would help us to 'a simple and profound impression' by explanations which strike me as rather confusing. No doubt the action of Oedipus seems to us extravagant. So it did to the Oedipus of the *Coloneus*, and still more to the Eteocles of the *Phoenissae*. But even this curious and rather interesting person does not find it unnatural. Nor, I suppose, do we.

It is plainly impossible to attempt here any extended discussion of the difficulties of Sophocles. The editors' notes appear to be

very complete; positive errors, it is perhaps needless to say, are very seldom to be found. In *O.T.* 22 'ἄγαν σαλεύει *is fiercely tempest-tossed*' misses the point; ἄγαν has the full sense *too much* and is closely connected with ἤδη, omitted in the lemma of the note; the storm-beaten vessel can *now* sustain no more. On *O.T.* 281, 'οὐδ' ἂν εἰς *no man whatever*' would mislead a student; it should have been οὐδὲ . . . εἰς; ἂν is of course constructed with the verb. Every book has a few slips of this kind, and here they are very few.

In revising the *Oedipus* plays the edition of Jebb has been used, but not in my judgment as fully by any means as it might have been. At *O.T.* 1091 the editors still give the MS. reading Οἰδίπουν and 'supply ἡμᾶς': Jebb's Οἰδίπουν is not, I think, even mentioned. It might have been adopted, at all events in a school-edition, where simplicity is desirable for its own sake. Later work, *e.g.* Whitelaw's papers in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, offer further material to be considered. But the book, as it is, is good, and well worth a place in a school-boy's library.

In spite of controversy there is at least one 'classical' masterpiece which does not seem to be losing its hold upon teachers and learners. This Review is hardly started, when already three small editions of the *Medea* are sent in, and the field is not unoccupied either in England or in Germany. But the *Medea* will support them all, and doubtless more, if more should offer.

Of the three, that of Mr. Glazebrook is certainly the most interesting, being in its form a more or less original experiment. In my own judgment it is also decidedly the best; but I am perhaps not an unimpeachable arbiter. The most marked differences between the two English editions proceed from a difference of view as to what a school-text should be. It is quite maintainable that an author like Euripides, depending on fair MSS., should for ordinary reading be printed without any change at all, plausible corrections (there is perhaps no such thing as a certain correction) being given, where desirable, in notes. And it is certain, that if conjectures are admitted at all, they must be admitted for various grounds in places not only construable but perfectly easy, as, for instance, where none of the MS. readings can be supposed the parent of the rest, and the original must therefore have differed from all. For school purposes, however, it is plainly needful that there should be both more change and less change. It is useless

to offer to a mind labouring at the elements sentences which one versed in the bye-ways of the language can just believe to have escaped the writer in a fit of subtlety or of negligence: and the discussion provoked by such passages conveys to the learner, if he reads it, nothing but vexation that he should be asked to learn what nobody seems to know. On the other hand, critical doubts are nothing to the beginner if they are not based on grammatical difficulty. The first and last requirement is a text beyond all question construable and explicable on common principles. A competent teacher will of course supply himself with critical materials, and use them as circumstances admit; but they are out of place in a class-book. All this may be commonplace, but it is only now obtaining an imperfect recognition. To take an instance: in *Med.* 1051, τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης, | τὸ καὶ προέσθαι μαλθακοὺς λόγους φρενί, the MSS. vary between φρενί and φρενός. Both give doubtful grammar and doubtful sense. Something of a case could be made for either, and the argument might be highly instructive to a professional scholar, whatever the value of the result. No one else has any interest in the MS. reading. Badham's προσέσθαι . . . φρενί removes all difficulty, and is, if any is, the received text. Mr. Glazebrook prints it and occupies the whole of his note with the explanation which, for most people, it requires. Surely this is the right way. Mr. Heberden, whose notes are of the old form, critical notes in miniature, prints προέσθαι, and being thus involved in a discussion for which he has not room, is led into the statement, misleading if made without reserve, that 'προέσθαι = to utter'. The sole practical effect of this discussion is to divert attention from προσέσθαι, which finally appears as a conjecture of 'much probability'. Teachers will judge how much consideration the ordinary student will give to a conjecture of 'much probability'. The net result is that, while the two editors are much of the same opinion, the one note will and the other will not convey that opinion to the intended reader; and these notes are a fair sample of the respective methods. Both as to readings and interpretations, Mr. Glazebrook makes it a first principle to avoid debate; and for the purpose in hand he is perfectly right. There should however have been an appendix—a page would be enough—stating the reading of the MSS. whenever it varies importantly from the printed text. Instead of this we have what is of little use, a list of emendations admitted in the text which

are not found in the edition of Prinz; and even this is incomplete; in 890, for instance, the text has χρῆ' ἑομοιοῦσθαι, which, as I have the best reason for knowing, is not in the edition of Prinz.

Another unconventional and useful plan of Mr. Glazebrook's is the division of the play into acts and scenes, with head-notes, stage-directions, &c., like Mr. A. Sidgwick's, only on a more extended scale. It has even a certain scientific value, since it forces the editor and the student to imagine clearly the representation of the play, and thus brings out problems which are apt to be overlooked, but are not beyond the capacity of beginners. Thus Mr. Glazebrook is obliged to have a theory on a question commonly ignored, yet most important to the play,—at what time Medea prepares the poisoned gifts?¹ He places the preparation between v. 823 and v. 844—a solution not without difficulties, but perhaps as good as any. By the way, an 'entr'acte' cannot surely come in the middle of an 'act' (v. 1081); it is but a matter of form, but it ought to be put right. What is Mr. Glazebrook's authority for his 'curtain' (see final note)?

Mr. Glazebrook mentions Wecklein's edition and mine as those which he has chiefly used. Of my conclusions he accepts so many that I have little to say. When we disagree, it is generally on a matter not proveable any way. If I pressed for reconsideration, it would be on vv. 137–8, 194, 487, 581, 888, 942, 963, 1346 (common numeration). The note on Peirene (v. 69) is not accurate; and the statement (v. 314) that 'in Greek tragedy when women speak of themselves in the plural they use the masculine gender' is carelessly worded; it should be of course (as in Mr. Heberden's note) 'when a woman speaks of herself &c.' On vv. 738–9 Mr. Glazebrook improves a suggestion of mine by one (ἀντίθωο for ἀντίθωο) which I should be glad to accept.

How far Mr. Heberden might agree with me I cannot say, for there is no reference in his book to any edition later than Wecklein's of 1880.

To the notes Mr. Heberden adds two Appendices: (1. *List of chief variations from the readings of the MSS.* 2. *On the Choral Metres*) and two Indices, Greek and English. The want of something answering to the first Appendix has been already noticed as a defect of Mr. Glazebrook's book. In the second Mr. Heberden has put very neatly and briefly as much about the general nature

¹ See the introduction to my smaller edition.

of the choral metres as his readers are likely to learn. Indeed his discretion in not attempting determinations for which there are no sufficient data might well be imitated in more ambitious works.

The German book is a text only, without explanatory notes. Below the text is a pretty full *apparatus criticus* of MS. readings and conjectures. With a class sufficiently advanced for critical work it might be used at the lesson; for preparation something else would of course be necessary. It is injured, I think, for its purpose by some strange licences. Surely it is not desirable to put into the text readings possible perhaps, but such as neither are established, nor are likely to be; as for instance at v. 11:—

ἀνδάνουσα μιν
[ᾧπερ μεγίστων ἐκ πόνων σῴτειρ' ἔφνυ]
φυγῇ πολιτῶν τῶνδ' ἀφίκετο χθόνα.

The verse in brackets is invented to stop a gap, which most people do not suppose to exist, and τῶνδ' for ὧν is an alteration, to say the least, very uncertain. For a critical lesson a doubtful passage like this should be printed as in the MSS.—At v. 155 we have

εἰ δὲ σὸς πόσις
καινὰ λέχη σεβίζει,
σοὶ τόδε μὴ χαράσσου.

The MS. κείνῳ τόδε is probably wrong, but to call κείνῳ 'a gloss' is purely arbitrary, and, if the learner believes it, will prevent him from understanding what a gloss really is; nor do I see how the amended text can properly be translated.—The suggestion of ὡς φίλ' ἐγὼ προσανδῶ for ξέῳ φίλα καὶ τὰδ' αὔδα (182) should have been made, if anywhere, certainly in the notes.—The interpretation of γινώσκειν καλῶς (228) as an infinitive absolute, before it is to be considered, must have better illustration than ὡς εἰπεῖν.—The best suggestion which I have noticed is κόρην for πατρός in 942 (943 spurious). But could σὴν κόρην mean 'thy bride'?—It would be a good service to print the *Medea*, or any part of Euripides, with a strictly conservative text and a complete *apparatus criticus*, in fact as Wecklein has printed Aeschylus. If the editor would bring his book nearer to this, it would, I think, be more useful than in its present shape.

A. W. VERRALL.

TEXTS OF CICERO.

- M. Tulli Ciceronis libri qui ad rem publicam et ad philosophiam spectant*; vol. ix. *Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*; 50 Pf. vol. x. *De Officiis*; 80 Pf. ed. Th. Schiche, Leipzig, Freytag.
M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes Selectae; vol. i. *Oratio pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*; 30 Pf. vol. ii. *In Q. Caecilium Divinatio, in C. Verrem Accusationis, Lib. iv. v.*; ed. H. Nohl; 80 Pf. Leipzig, Freytag.

THESE volumes are part of a *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum* now appearing under the general editorship of C. Schenkl, with whom at first J. Kvičala was associated. The series is especially intended for use in schools, and, for that purpose, will prove a formidable rival to the Teubner series of texts; for other purposes the two series do not come into competition. The volumes are printed in excellent type, and on paper pleasant to look at and to handle, though too thin, and the prices are extremely moderate. There is in each case a brief

introduction and a small *apparatus criticus* at the foot of the page, an advantage not possessed by the Teubner volumes, where the very full critical notes are placed apart from the text in the front of each volume. The editing is careful and competent. I have made a general examination of all the four books mentioned above, and have read carefully the editions of the *Cato Maior* and the *Laelius*. The names of the editors are well known to all who busy themselves with Ciceronian scholarship. It is a matter of course that opinions should differ as to the judgment exercised by an editor who is restricted to the selection of a very few topics for comment, whether the comment be critical or explanatory. The few criticisms therefore that I am about to offer must not be taken as detracting from the opinion I have already expressed as to the general value of the editions. Schiche has everywhere exercised sound and independent judgment. He is judiciously conservative and takes no notice of such extravagant *atheteses* as those put