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](#)

**Butcher's and Bywater' s Editions of the *Poetics*
Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, by Prof S. H.
Butcher. Second edition. Macmillan. 1898. 12s. 6d.
Aristotelis de Arte Poetica liber. Recognovit brevique
adnotatione critica instruxit Bywater. Oxonii.
MDCCCXCVII. 1s. 6d.**

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 47 - 49

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042360, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042360

How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 47-49 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042360

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

μασιν ῥαδίως ἔσται, and translates, 'it will easily hold a position off the country itself and close to the entrances of the sea ports,' 'it' being ἡ δύναμις, which has to be supplied from τῇ δυνάμει in the preceding sentence. But can ἔσται have this meaning? No parallel is quoted. Dr. Sandys has it is true the support of Sauppe, Blass, and Westermann, but it is difficult to believe that Demosthenes can have ended a sentence so tamely.

In *ib.* § 35 Dr. S. reads ἄν τε δεινοὶ λάχωσιν ἄν τ' ἰδῶνται [οἱ] τούτων ἐκατέρων ἐπιμελησόμενοι, but in his explanatory note he seems inclined to keep the article. If the article is retained, is there any valid reason for rejecting ἐπιμελούμενοι, the reading of S? In *ib.* § 43 he has altered the relative positions of περί and ὑπέρ to avoid hiatus—following Blass; but who was likely to have been at the pains of disturbing the original order? ἀλλὰ μὴν—κωλύσει in the same section are printed, after Blass, in small letters 'quia sententia nexum aperte turbat.' The words take up τὴν τελευτήν just before. 'That end will come, for P will not stop, unless some one checks him,' is the connection. In *ib.* § 44 Dr. S. follows S¹ in reading μὴ where Bekker has οὐ μὴ, accepting the rule that οὐ is not inserted between οὐδεὶς μὴ, οὐδὲν μὴ. In *Olynth.* 1 § 5 we find in the text κινδυνεύουσιν taken from Max. Planudes instead of the πολεμοῦσιν of the MSS.—a far stronger word, and doubtless correct, in spite of the small inaccuracy involved. An excellent specimen of Dr. S.'s criticism will be found in *Ol.* iii. § 6 where he prints παντὶ σθένει κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν as a quotation,

on the ground that σθένος is an archaic word never found in the Greek of Demosthenes, and that κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν not only involves five short syllables, but is a phrase never used by Demosthenes.

The notes on grammar, antiquities, and history are all excellent. Dr. Sandys assumes that the διωβελία is identical with the θεωρικόν (p. 197), and this view is at any rate more probable than that put forward by Wilamowitz—that it was a state pension. Beloch claims to have proved that the διωβελία introduced by Cleophon was the juror's fee, or mainly so, which, as he thinks, when reintroduced after the Four Hundred, was two obols only (*Griech. Gesch.* ii. 77 A.), an explanation which is hardly consistent with the account given by Aristotle (?) in *Ath. Pol.* c. 28. On Eubulus there is an interesting note (p. 144) contributed in part by Mr. Whibley. It is the fashion now to whitewash Eubulus, and Holm has done so *con amore* in his *History of Greece* (iii. 222). Yet there is no doubt that Demosthenes, who had the means of forming an opinion, thought that the revenues were misapplied, when under his care. The war with Philip was not carried on with vigour; expeditions were commonly too late; the soldiers were not paid; the generals picked up money where and how they could; and meanwhile streets were paved and houses whitewashed, and the festivals went on with the regularity of clockwork. If there is any truth in these statements, it is clear that Eubulus put the lower interests of the city above the higher.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

BUTCHER'S AND BYWATER'S EDITIONS OF THE *POETICS*.

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, by Prof. S. H. BUTCHER. Second edition. Macmillan. 1898. 12s. 6d.

Aristotelis de Arte Poetica liber. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit I. BYWATER. Oxonii. MDCCCXCVII. 1s. 6d.

PROF. BUTCHER'S book was noticed in these columns in May 1895, and has since appeared in a second edition, as has also that separate part of it which consists of the text of the *Poetics* with translation and critical notes (*The Poetics of Aristotle*, Macmillan, 1898). In the essays which form the bulk of the book there seems to be little

change, but a few notes have been added or enlarged. I ventured to dissent before from Mr. Butcher's suggestion of οὐ (for the MS. οὕτω) τὰ τυχεύοντα ὀνόματα in 9, 5, though it is supported by the Arabic version. He has now adopted it in his text and defended it in a note, mainly by a statement that the names in 'Middle Comedy' were representative and significant of the character of the person much more than those of Old Comedy. To the best of my belief the facts are the other way. In Aristophanes the names of important characters, when not real names (*Socrates*, *Euripides*) are very frequently significant

(*Dicaeopolis*, *Paphlagon*, *Pheidippides*), as Mr. Butcher himself admits. But, as far as we can judge from Greek fragments and Roman imitations, this habit dwindled (I should have said) instead of growing and the names of persons in Middle and New Comedy do not usually indicate anything as to the character. The historical argument seems to tell against Mr. Butcher rather than for him. So, I must hold, does the run of the whole passage.

The translation has been materially improved in many places. It is, however, possible to point out a few, where justice seems hardly yet done to the meaning. *ὅψις* throughout means a good deal more than *scenery* or even *scenic equipment*, and *declamation* is not a good equivalent for *ὑπόκρισις* (*ὑποκριτική* 19, 4), which is rather *delivery*. In 4, 5 *οὗτος ἐκεῖνος* means rather 'This is so and so' than 'This is he.' In 5, 2 I should not have said there was anything about 'comic poets, *distinctively* so called,' only 'poets whose names are known.' In 7, 7 *κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος* is not limitative, 'so far as beauty depends on size,' but 'by reason of its size.' In 13, 6 it is certain that *ἀν κατορθωθῶσιν* means 'if they are well *represented*' and that *εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὴ εὖ οἰκονομεῖ* should be understood as 'Euripides faulty as he is, &c.'? For anything I see *κατορθωθῶσιν* may refer to the author, and I cannot help doubting whether *εἰ καὶ* here admits the fact, when I read such passages as *De Caelo* 3, 1, 5: cf. *Pol.* 6 (4), 1, 5, where it is *καὶ εἰ*. See Krüger's *Grammar* 65, 5, 15, and Jebb on *Soph. O.T.* 305 (Appendix). In 16, 5 it seems impossible that *αἰσθῆσθαι* should be used of the sort of 'feeling' usually expressed by *πάσχειν*, e.g. *Dem.* 19, 195 *ὥστε τὸν Φίλιππον παθεῖν τι καὶ δοῦναι*. Finally in 18, 2 and 24, 1, although Prof. Jebb in his *Homer* takes the same view, I cannot think that *παθητική* (*τραγωδία, ἐποποιία*) refers to *passion*.

I venture to add that the readings adopted in 4, 1449 a 8 and 24, 1460 a 27 are highly questionable and that the former could hardly be translated as Mr. Butcher translates it. As to 21, 1457 b 1, it is very difficult to follow Diels in adopting *τῶν Μασσαλιωτῶν* from the suggestion of the Arabic, until the improbability has been surmounted that most (*τὰ πολλὰ*) Massilian words were compounds of at least three other words. Mr. Butcher *ἡδύνει τὸ ἄτοπον* by rendering *τὰ πολλὰ* *many*, but even then it would be considerable.

In spite, however, of these minute criticisms it should be repeated that Mr.

Butcher's book is a most excellent one and that the essays are probably the best contribution that has been made to the literature of the *Poetics* since the *Beiträge* and the critical editions of Vahlen.

The Oxford Regius Professor, *ὃς ἀπὸ σμικρᾶς δαπάνης ἡμᾶς ἀριστίζων ἀποπέμπει*, contents himself for the present with a text and very sparing critical notes, but holds out hopes of the commentary to come. It is, of course, a work of sound and cautious scholarship, yet not so conservative as we might judge at first sight or as might seem suggested by the warning given in the brief preface, *ne librariis imputemus quae non est incredibile deliquisse ipsum*.

Mr. Bywater has embodied in his text some of the suggestions he has previously published: others he seems tacitly to renounce. Besides *Δειλιάδα* (1448 a 13) and *Ἀρθεῖ* (1451 b 23), which of course do not emanate from him, we note among the changes *αὐτόν* for *τὸν αὐτόν* in 1448 a 22), *κωμωδῶ* (1449 b 1), *<διὰ> μέτρον μεγάλου* (*ib.* 10), *τῶν ἐν λόγῳ* (1450 b 12), *συστημάτων* for *σωμάτων* (1451 a 3), *θεῖναι* (1459 a 22), *<πρὸς> ἅπαντα* (1461 b 29). On one or two of these, especially *θεῖναι*, one would be glad to see what he has to say. At present I prefer *ἅπαντα* to *πρὸς ἅπαντα*, remembering *πάντα μιμῆσται* in *Republic* 397 A, nor do I think *χορὸν κωμωδῶν... ἔδοκεν* impossible, especially in view of *Peaces* 806 (cf. *Birds*, 787) *ἡνίκα τῶν τραγῳδῶν τὸν χορὸν εἶχον ἀδελφός τε καὶ αὐτός*, where *τῶν τ.* can hardly be a partitive genitive with *ἀ, τ, κ, ἀ*. It is a little surprising that neither editor notices the suggestion, revived by Prof. Margoliouth, of *πράττοντες* and *δρῶντες* for the accusatives in 3, 2. Although it is, of course, true that the nominative partly confuses author and actor, for the author cannot strictly be said *πράττειν*, still 1449 b 32 *πράττοντες ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν* supplies confirmation, if any is really needed, of its correctness. All imitators *μιμοῦνται πράττοντας* (1448 a 1): dramatists *μιμοῦνται πράττοντες* (*δρῶντες* 1449 b 27), or as he says elsewhere *ἐν τῷ πράττειν* (1459 a 17). But on these and other far more important points, such as the value of the Arabic version, which Mr. Bywater rates much lower than Mr. Butcher does, and the general trustworthiness of the traditional text, we await the full commentary which he is understood to have long had in hand. It is a pity for the sake of practical convenience that he could not adopt the same division of chapters into sections as Mr. Butcher and save both pupils and teachers a good deal of trouble.

In conclusion I will seize the opportunity to suggest a few small changes that have from time to time occurred to me. Most of them explain themselves. 1449 b 20 ἀ δ' ἐν αὐτῇ: 1450 a 5 αὐτὴν τὴν σύνθεσιν (Mr. Bywater makes the reverse change in 1449 b 36, reading τοῦτον for αὐτὴν): 1452 a 4 exchange μάλιστα and μᾶλλον: 1452 b 36 before ἐπιεικὲς insert some word like λίαν or

σφόδρα, ἐπιεικὲς not being strong enough in itself: cf. τὸν σφόδρα πονηρόν in 1453 a 2 where σφόδρα is really less needed: 1454 b 25 ἀστέρες: 1455 b 23 οὕτω δὲ: 1458 b 21 Εὐριπίδου καὶ Αἰσχύλου, καὶ going closely with τὸ αὐτό. In 1459 b 5 the ludicrous πλέον δκτώ perhaps took its rise from a confusion of πλέον ἤ—with πλέον ἡ'.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

DYROFF'S *ETHIK DER ALTEN STOA*.

Die Ethik der alten Stoa. Untersucht von Dr. A. DYROFF. Berlin. 1897.

UNDER an ambitious title this book includes a medley of topics: ethics, politics, paedagogy, and a long string of minor details discussed in appendices. Amongst them all the first place should be accorded to the laboured attempt, p. 238 sqq., to prove that the spurious treatise *De educandis pueris*, with which Plutarch's *Moralia* opens, is based upon a work of Chrysippus, and that possibly Quintilian, i. 1. 4-10. follows the same authority. The treatment of the main thesis is less happy. To another exposition of Stoic ethics no one could object if it threw fresh light upon the subject. But this is hardly the case. The author, following a hint of Zeller's, believes he has rediscovered the principles on which Chrysippus (according to Diog. Laert. vii. 84) subdivided the subject, and boldly applies his discovery. The result is that, while his exposition contains few new facts—which is perhaps not surprising—its arrangement is fantastic in the extreme. The passage just mentioned appears to indicate three main divisions and six subdivisions (ὁ ποιοδιαφοῦσι). In place of this the author gives us 'eine Darstellung der allgemeinen Ethik' on the lines of Chrysippus, but omitting one of his subdivisions (viz. περὶ προτροπῶν καὶ ἀποτροπῶν), followed by 'Untersuchungen zur parainetischen Ethik,' which seems mainly to consist of the προτροπαὶ καὶ ἀποτροπαὶ, the 'Ermahnungen und Abmahnungen,' previously omitted. This may be thought to misrepresent the author's meaning: but as he has replied to critics of his book in an article in the *Archiv f. Philosophie* xi. 491 sqq. and explained his position more precisely, we are content to refer to his own words *l.c.*

NO. CXI. VOL. XIII.

502 sqq. He expressly eschews a twofold division of Stoic ethics, whether expressed by the terms 'general' and 'special' (or applied)—or by the terms 'theoretical' and 'practical' ethics. He has guarded himself (he says) from ascribing to the early Stoics the distinction between 'general' (allgemeine) and 'paraenetic' ethics, though he is careful to add that such a distinction is not wholly unjustified. He appears to regard paraenetic ethics as consisting of 'an inquiry which determines what concrete actions correspond to the notions of Virtue and Vice'—thus introducing a picture of the Stoic sage—together with 'exhortations and dissuaves adapted to particular important spheres of life' (p. 185).

Both the execution and method of this work are open to criticism. Even the author does not defend the logic of his classification. There is no examination of the sources. Occasionally there is padding. We have the inevitable chapter on the historical position of Stoicism. We have in Excursus iv. five pages vindicating the authority of Cleanthes and Chrysippus with the later Stoics by references as recondite as the following: 'Gerade in der Zeit des Plutarchos wurde Chrysippos wieder fleissig gelesen. Die Ausfälle des Horatius gegen Chrysippos können nur so erklärt werden, dass Chrysippos wieder zu Ehren kam... Auch aus Persius (satir. 2, 5. 13, 184)'—this should be Juvenal—'sieht man dass Chrysippos als der erste glänzte. Von Cornutus wurde er verehrt,' etc., etc. The problem of reconstructing the ethics of the early Stoics may indeed prove practically insoluble from insufficient materials, though no doubt when these are collected and properly sifted as by Mr. A. C. Pearson in his *Fragments of Zeus and Cleanthes*—a work to which the one under review is con-

E