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](#)

Rogers' Emendations in the Greek Tragic Poets *Emendations in Aeschylus, with a few others in Sophocles and Euripides, &c.*, by A. M. Rogers. Baltimore: 1894.

Lewis Campbell

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 07 / October 1895, pp 362 - 363

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202394, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202394

How to cite this article:

Lewis Campbell (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 362-363 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202394

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

words *προβαλλομένοις, παραιτήσεως, μαρτυρίου* are all drawn from the language of the courts, thus keeping up the manner of the whole exordium. We should therefore read our sentence τὰ δὲ Μηδικά, καὶ ὅσα αὐτοὶ ξύνιστε, εἰ καὶ δι' ὄχλου μᾶλλον ἔσται, αἰὲ *προβαλλομένοις ἀνάγκη λέγειν.*

The excellent 'notes on the grammar' and the 'glossary' demand special recognition, but call for no other remark than that there are too few of them. In particular, it is high time that some effort were made carefully to classify the real 'confusions' of thought and grammar that occur in Thucydides. Such a classification would help much towards settling the vexed question *what sort of passages are rightly con-*

sidered corrupt. For myself, the oftener I read writers like Herbst, and the oftener I think over passages in which the *thought* is supposed to be confused, the more convinced do I become that Thucydides is a much more careful writer and more exact thinker than is usually supposed. To examine carefully the *context* of a disputed sentence is, I believe, a golden rule very properly insisted on by Herbst. But such an exercise does not tend to increase one's respect for the MSS. where the meaning really is in confusion, as distinct from cases in which the supposed confusion of thought is due to our own blindness.

E. C. MARCHANT.

ROGERS' EMENDATIONS IN THE GREEK TRAGIC POETS..

Emendations in Aeschylus, with a few others in Sophocles and Euripides, &c., by A. M. ROGERS. Baltimore: 1894.

To the saying of Cobet, 'Commenta delet dies,' one is sometimes inclined to retort 'Conjectanea delet ultima ratio.' Of the emendations heaped together, for example, in Wecklein's Appendix to Aeschylus, how many are destined to rise again out of that 'Orcus' and find their place in any standard edition? Poor Theodor Heyse, who is sometimes referred to in this little *brochure*, used to say, when rewriting the Trilogy, 'If my readings are not the very hand of Aeschylus, at least they are worthy of him.' Though living at Florence, and frequently employed for others in the Laurentian library, he had long since relinquished all reliance on the Medicean MS. His *σπαργὴν θαλάσσης* (Aesch. *Ag.* 556), of which he was so proud, has not survived him.

Suppose all the emendations of any one critic to have found their way into the text of Aeschylus, and that by some accident all other copies had been destroyed, while all marks of distinction between MS. and conjectural readings had been obliterated:—would not the text which so became traditional be soon afterwards the subject of fresh emendations? Would not the places most liable to the cavils of a new generation be the inventions of the forgotten critic? And however little these may have diverged from the *ductus literarum*, it is unlikely that the former readings, even

where they were really sound, would ever be restored.

The pages now before us give evidence of close and loving study of the Greek Tragic poets by the late Alexander Mason Rogers of Baltimore. And although his busy life in the legal profession did not leave him time to supply the defects of earlier training, the acuteness and ingenuity of his mind rendered the bulk of the conjectures which he regarded as 'singular and valuable discoveries' at least as plausible as most of those by more accomplished scholars. It so happens that in more than fifty places he has hit upon the same expedient which others either before or after him have independently adopted. Such coincidence affords strong *prima facie* evidence in favour of a conjecture. See, for example, *Eum.* 483 where Mr. Rogers anticipated Wecklein in reading *φανῶ, δικαστὰς ὀρκίους αἰρουμένη.* And yet I cannot allow that such evidence is necessarily conclusive. In reasoning from the same data, persons whose education has been similar may sometimes think alike without thinking rightly. Take for example *Suppl.* 629 where for *τέρμον' ἀμέμπτως πρὸς ἅπαντα* Rogers and Hartung would read *τέρμονα πέμπτων πρὸς ἅπαντα.* Here the participle avoids the inconvenience of a pregnant construction, but is otherwise otiose, and supplants an expressive word. Or in the more familiar passage, *Agam.* 1391-2, where Rogers agrees (independently) with Casaubon in reading *χαίρουσαν οὐδὲν ἥσσαν ἢ Διὸς νότῳ | γαῖα σπορητός, —if σπορητός by itself*

means 'sown land' (which no one doubts), why drag in γαῖα, when by the change of a single letter (α for ε) we can have the expressive phrase Διὸς νότῳ γανᾶ σπορητός, preferred by Franz, and formerly suggested by Hermann? So in *Eum.* 576 where Rogers and Heyse independently change δόμων to δυοῖν, if any correction is needed Hermann's νόμῳ seems more probable. And the coincidence with Reiske does not convince me that in *Trach.* 145 Sophocles wrote χώροις ἀνατοῖν.

Of Mr. Rogers' new readings—the greater number—the following deserve special mention.

The attempt to make sense of *Suppl.* 826-832, if bold, is certainly ingenious:—

ὁδε με μάρπτει νάϊός γ', αἰεῖς;
τί σάν, προμᾶτορ, πτάκ' ἀμνημονεῖς;
αὐθι κάκις αὐ
δαῖον βοὰν ἀμφαίνω.
ὅρα τάδε φροῖμια, πρόξενε, πόνων
βυαίων ἐμῶν. ἡέ, ἡέ.
βαῖνε φυγάδος πρὸς ἀλκάν.

In *Pers.* 975 an idiomatic turn is given by what is little more than a transposition of two words τὰς ἀγγυίους | στρυγνὰς κατιδόντες Ἀθάνας.

In *Prom.* 354 πάρος ὅς ἀντέστη θεοῖς is plausible.

In *Ag.* 50, where Mr. Rogers reads ἐκπάττω λάεσι παίδων, it deserves notice that he coincides with Mr. Verrall in the interpretation of παίδων.

Ib. 469. He is happy in defending βάλ-
λεται γὰρ ὁ σοσοῖς Διόθεν κεραυνός.

On *ib.* 777, τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἐσθλά, he shrewdly remarks that ἔδεθλα (*Auratus'* emendation) 'denotes the very bottom foundation, which is never plated with gold.'

In *Eum.* 69 there is something to be said for γαῖας παλαιαὶ παῖδες.

The emendation of *Soph. Phil.* 1093 is rather plausible:

εἴθ' αἰθέρος ἄνω
πτωκάδας ὀξύτονον διὰ πνεύματος
ἀλωσίμους ἔτ' εἶχον.

I am bound to add that neither Mr. Rogers nor his editor appears to have quite a firm grasp either of the idiomatic use of words or of metrical rules.

In *Ag.* 562 τιθέντες ἔνθηρον τρίχα could not mean 'laying flat the hair of the sheepskins and other furs.'

In *Choeph.* 199 ἦγε (conjectured for εἶχε) could not mean 'he brought (ἦνεγκε) the lock of hair.'

In *Ag.* 975-7 it is true that ἐμπέδως ποτᾶται would be absurd if it meant 'firmly flies.' But how if it means 'flutters unremoved'?

And in *ib.* 413 ἀδὺς ἐς ἐφεμένους ἰδεῖν, 'courteous to those allowed *entrées*' comes in rather oddly.

Then, as to metres—not to dwell on some awkward slips, which may have arisen from inadvertence (*Ag.* 1589), or on some laws of euphony in lyric verse which have been neglected (*ib.* 1006), neither Mr. Rogers nor Mr. Forman seems to have realized the rule of the cretic (*Choeph.* 239 εἰς ἀνάγκας ἀς ἔχεις), still less that in the synapheia which is peculiar to Sophocles a short syllable is inadmissible, and the line is always broken with a pause in the sense (*S.c.T.* 576

καὶ τὸν σὸν αὐθις προσμολὼν ἀδελφὸν ὃ δ'
ἐξυπτιάζων ὄνομα, κ.τ.λ.).

Nor do they seem to understand that in a senarius ἄρσενά θρήνον (*Ag.* 1322) is hardly possible. Lastly, to make an end of fault-finding, this undoubtedly ingenious critic seems to have been unaware how much it detracts from the probability of a 'discovery,' when it involves a change at once in strophe and antistrophe.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

HOLDEN'S EDITION OF PLUTARCH'S *LIFE OF PERICLES*.

Plutarch's Life of Pericles. With an Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and Indices. By the Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, M.A. etc. Macmillan & Co. (Classical Series): 1895. Pp. lxii. + 303. Price 4s. 6d.

It is always a pleasure to take up one of Dr. Holden's school editions, for one knows

that here at least one will find work scholarly, conscientious, and thorough. He is always master of his subject, and invariably studies all that has been written on it in standard works, magazines, and the humblest gymnasium programs. Every point—grammatical, historical, archaeological, philosophical—receives its attention, and his books are storehouses of inform-