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](#)

Kock's Edition of the *Clouds* of Aristophanes *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, erklärt Theodor von Kock. Erstes Bändchen: Die Wolken. Vierte Auflage. Berlin, Weidmann: 1894. Pp. 226. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

F. Arthur Hirtzel

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 03 / April 1895, pp 172 - 174
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201595, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201595

How to cite this article:

F. Arthur Hirtzel (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 172-174 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201595

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Rather 'constrain him to adopt ways he does not like : ' at v. 888 ὥς with the present reading must be taken as = οὕτως (see above on v. 441) : rather than adopt this I should prefer (as an irresponsible reviewer) to read (here and at *I.T.* 603, and *Tro.* 726) either ἄλλως or ἴσθ' ὡς γενέσθω for ἄλλ' ὡς γενέσθω : at 1025 ff. Mr. Hadley on ἀμέρσας βίον practically says 'ἀμέρδω never means to lose but always to take away, therefore we must here translate it to take away from himself.' This reminds one of the κατ' ἀντίπτωσιν of the scholiasts. If Euripides had meant to say 'having lost your life' (which in the sequel we find Pol. did not) he could have said ἀμερθεὶς βίον : at v. 1032 Mr. Hadley says 'Pol.'s attack and Hec.'s defence each take up fifty lines.' So they would if with Prinz the editor rejected v. 1174 and with

Nauck v. 1191, but as Mr. Hadley prints them they each take up fifty-one lines : at v. 1155 διπ. στολισματος, i.e. 'both of spear and cloak' ; but even supposing the cloak could be called a στολισμα why should the women want to take it away, and so make Pol. better able to fight? : at v. 1270 on the supposition that some meaning must be found for everything in a Greek text Mr. Hadley translates the line, forcing ἐνθάδε to mean 'in my present position' i.e. a slave. Weil's comment on the line is refreshing after Mr. Hadley's translation, it is 'ces mots n'ont pas de sens.'

There is a sympathetic introduction to the play, and an analysis, but the edition contains no scheme of choric metres.

E. B. ENGLAND.

KOCK'S EDITION OF THE *CLOUDS* OF ARISTOPHANES.

Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes, erklärt von THEODOR KOCK. Erstes Bändchen : Die Wolken. Vierte Auflage. Berlin, Weidmann : 1894. Pp. 226. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

THIS admirable edition of the *Clouds* now passes, after an interval of eighteen years, from its third into its fourth edition with an increase in bulk of eleven pages. It has been thoroughly revised from beginning to end, though the alterations are less remarkable for their importance and quantity than for the conscientious carefulness to which they bear witness—carefulness so conspicuous by its absence from the ordinary English school editions of the classics with which the minds of our youth are misguided. No point is too small to escape Kock's vigilance, as the insertion of the *v.l.* ψιλόν in the passage quoted from Strabo on v. 597, or the substitution of 'wohl' for 'sicherlich' in the note on 666 show.

Since the appearance of the third edition the most important contributions to the literature of the *Clouds* have been Blaydes' edition and Piccolomini's 'Studi critici ed esegetici' in *Annali delle Università Toscana* vol. xvi. (Pisa 1879 fol.), and Zielinski's general work *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*. The latter is discussed by Kock in a preface of four pages added to this edition. Though he has not perhaps put the case against Zielinski's view of the

epirrhetic nature of comedy in its strongest form, yet the objections which he enumerates on pp. 6-7 are quite sufficient to justify him in refusing to bind down Aristophanes with these new-fangled fetters of form or to bombard his readers with the contents of 'a perfect arsenal of names (borrowed partly from the form, partly from the subject matter) for things which have long been quite well known without the want of a special terminology for them ever being felt.' For a system like Zielinski's must be one of two things. Either it represents the actual mould, so to speak, in which comedy is cast—which is incredible : for, to use Kock's metaphor, 'das dichterische Schaffen sprengt eben alle Fesseln, welche die Theorie ihm anlegen möchte.' Or it is merely a method of dividing a play into parts : in which case it must establish claims to a greater convenience than any existing systems, if it is to drive them out of the field : and this Z.'s system most emphatically cannot do.

Piccolomini's *Studies* are frequently quoted, and contain many valuable suggestions. Thus v. 144 Picc. would read Χαίρεφών τὸν Σωκράτην, on the ground that Sokrates is the subject of ἐμέτησε (v. 148), and must therefore be the person to whom the question was addressed. vv. 218-9 his re-arrangement of the lines : ΣΤΡ. φέρε, τίς γὰρ οὗτος ; ΜΑΘ. οὐπὶ τῆς κρεμάθρας ἀνὴρ ; | αὐτός. ΣΤΡ. τίς αὐτός ; is certainly an im-

provement. On the other hand in *v.* 334 it hardly seems possible to agree with him in assigning the words βόσκον' ἀργούς as an interruption to Strepsades: it seems far better to regard ἀνδρας...ἀργούς as an interpolation and read αὐτάς for ταύτας with Kock (who does not quote Picc.'s view). In *v.* 439 Kock follows Picc. (whom he does not mention) in regarding ἀτεχνῶς ὁ τι βούλονται as an interpolation from *v.* 453, a special form of corruption which Picc. also finds in *v.* 266 where μετέωροι has got in from μετέωρον in *v.* 264, and in *v.* 1010 where πρὸς τούτοις is due to πρὸς τούτοις of *v.* 1022.

Blaydes is less often referred to—less often perhaps than his work deserves. His suggestion τηλεφανούς σκοπιᾶς *v.* 281 is quoted, and in *v.* 284 Kock inclines to his πόντον στενάχοντα for κελάδοντα. A note on *v.* 582 remarks on his statement that ἡνίκα is rare in comedy, that it occurs fifty-two times (forty-one times in Aristoph. only) as against eighty times in Aesch. Soph. and Eur.

The introduction is reprinted almost without alteration, though there are a few additional references to recent literature. Thus a note on § 12 refers to Diels' view (to which attention is also called in the commentary, *e.g.* on *v.* 627) that Ar. frequently parodies the scientific theories of Diogenes of Apollonia. A long note on § 27 quotes Naber's theory of the διασκευῇ of the *Clouds*, and dismisses it somewhat more summarily than its merits deserve: for example, it is hardly a disparagement of the relative value of the statements of the fourth Hypothesis to say that the bulk of it is 'nichts als Vermutung'; nor is it a weakness in Naber's theory that it is not identical with the statements of the Hypothesis by which it was suggested. Kock's own theory, which in the main agrees with Teuffel's, remains unaltered.

A few new readings are printed in the text. *v.* 47 we now have ἄσπεως, attested by inscriptions, for the MSS. ἄσπεος. 230 the better form καταμείξας should be read: *vide errata.* 489 προβάλω with Hirschig. 530 ἦν for ἦ, which must surely be a misprint: the metre does not require the later form, and Kock himself in a new note calls attention to the 'remarkable' fact that the only certain instances of ἦν 1st pers. sing. in Ar. occur in the *Plutus*: it must, however, be remembered that the *Plutus* is Ar.'s latest play and that Attic had by that time lost much of its purity. 814 elsewhere he now prefers the form ἐνταυθοῖ

which is attested alike by inscriptions and by the best MSS. 985 Κηδείδου, for Κηκείδου, apparently because Κηδείδης ἐδίδασκε occurs in an inscription of the end of the fifth cent., of whom the poet referred to in the text may have been son or grandson (Köhler). 1130 τυχεῖν ὦν with the MSS. for Suidas' ἄν. 1309 ἴσως (Reisig) is omitted and a lacuna marked. 1355 Κρίον for Κρίων on the authority of Aristarchos (Lehrs). Besides these readings Kock suggests a few new emendations. *v.* 62 he would read δὴ 'νθένδ' ἐλοιδορούμεθα to avoid the break after the first syllable of αἰ anapaest in the fourth foot. 337 διὰ τ' αἰθρίας διερᾶς (or ιερᾶς) γαμψούς &c. to escape the difficulty of εἶτα and the want of connexion between αἰρίας διερᾶς of the MSS. 376 κἀναρπασθῶσι φέρεσθαι for κἀναγκασθῶσι to avoid the tautology with κατ' ἀνάγκην. 1130 τυφῆναι for τυχεῖν ὦν, which is certainly very attractive; and 1418 τὸν γέροντα τοῦ νέου 'στι κλάειν for τοὺς γέροντας ἢ νέους τι κλάειν. The critical appendix still appears to be too brief even for a Weidmann school edition.

The commentary has been thoroughly revised, and much new and interesting matter has been added, of which space only allows me to refer to a little. The first new note (on *v.* 1) is pessimistic: 'die Frage, wie sich die Handlung bald in bald vor den Häusern des Streps. und des Sokrates im einzelnen abgespielt hat, scheint unlösbar': but one is quite willing to believe that Kock has something much better to do than attempt to solve it. *v.* 332 σφραγιδονυχαραγοκομήτας is now rightly explained as being rather = 'wearing onyx rings' &c. 377 there is an interesting note on verbs in -νάειν in comedy. 508 on καταβαίνων he observes that there must have been steps down into the φροντιστήριον—a fact which does not simplify the problem of the stage arrangements. 523 he emphasizes his view of πρώτων (Welcker's reading for MSS. πρώτους) 'zuerst, d.h. vor allen andern Komödien,' and quotes a number of other compounds with ἀνα- denoting 'again' to support ἀναγεῖσαι = 'wieder kosten lassen.' 541 ὁ λέγων τᾶπη is now explained as meaning the protagonist. On *vv.* 653–4 he adds a remark which, if borne in mind as a principle of general application, would save much perversion of ingenuity in the explanation and emendation of Ar.: 'die Worte sind nicht sehr verständlich, erhielten aber wohl ihre Erklärung durch die Gebärdensprache' (the italics are mine). In 870 he now takes τριβῶν as referring to the 'well-known article of clothing of poor men

and philosophers.' 880 Naber's *συνίνας* for *σκύνίνας* is quoted and rejected on the ground that Herod. i. 194 mentions real *πλοῖα σκύνινα* and therefore no change seems necessary—a quite insufficient ground for rejecting what appears to me to be a certain correction. 1036 he notes that the *Ἄδικος* uses a pseudo-Sokratic dialectic, while the *Δίκαιος* explains his principles in a connected speech—which, if it is anything more than a coincidence, would tend to show that in this part of the play at all events Ar. distinguishes between Sokrates and the Sophists. On 1096 there is an interesting note calling attention to the climax in 1089–1100: *συνήγοροι* (the lowest grade of official), *τραγωδοί* (who rank next in public estimation), *δημηγόροι* (the representatives of the sovereign *δῆμος*), and finally even the sovereign *δῆμος* itself (= *θεαταί*)—all alike are *εὐρύπρωκτοι*. 1194 an unnecessary attempt is made to defend *ἀπαλλάττοντο* in the sense of *διαλλάττοντο*, which, if the meaning required is 'reconcile,' must certainly be restored with Hirschig: but there seems to be no reason for abandoning the old and natural explanation of Ernesti: *per compositionem aut alio modo se expedire e controversia*. 1236 his suggestion that *ἔτι* is used in its threatening sense 'a time will come when' &c. seems undoubtedly right. 1304 Reisig's *ἐξαρθείς* = *ἐπαρθείς* (for MSS. *ἐρασθείς*) is defended by *Thesm.* 981 *ἔξαιρε διπλὴν χάριν χορείας*. 1315 *ἐγγιγνῆται* is taken = 'feindlich zusammentreffen,' for which, as he admits, there is no parallel: but surely it need mean no more than 'beat every one he has anything to do with.' The commentary is enriched throughout by many new parallels from the New Comedy, and by frequent references to Guhl and Koner's sixth ed.

There are one or two things that one would like to see altered in this new

edition. v. 824 Dawes' *διδάξεις* is still read: but as the canon Davesianus (to which Kock adheres strictly in the constr. of *οὐ μή* also) is not borne out by inscriptions, and as Goodwin has given a very good explanation of the origin of the aor. subj. after *ὅπως μή*, the change, slight as it is, seems unnecessary. 1149 it is surely impossible that *ὄν* refers to *νῖόν* and not *λόγον*. 1271 *κακῶς ἄρ' ὄντως εἶχες* the imperf. appears to be of the kind nicknamed 'panoramic' so common in Plato (cf. *quanta laborabas Charybdi*), and to have no reference to the time when Amynias borrowed the money. 1277 there does not seem sufficient reason for abandoning the MSS. *προσκεκλησθαι*: the use of the perf. was probably suggested by *σεσεῖσθαι* in the line before. 1342 a note is wanted on the rare use of *ὥστε* c. indic. in oratio obliqua. 1384 *φράσας*, the reading of EFG, which is mentioned with approval in the note, should certainly be printed in the text. 1431 Kock still approves of G. Hermann's *ἐπ' ἱκρίου*, but in the face of Pollux's remark (x. 156) *πέτευρον δέ, οὐ τὰς ἐνοικιδίας ὄρνιθας ἐγκαθεύδειν συμβέβηκεν*, *Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει ὥσπερ καὶ κρεμάθραν, ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις*, which can scarcely refer to any passage but this, and of Rav.'s *καπὶ πλείον*, it is more probable that the word *πέτευρον* in some form or another is concealed in the line: at all events the facts are worth mentioning in a note.

It is impossible to read such a model edition as this without wishing very strongly that Kock would not confine his editorial labours to the four plays which have already been before the public so long in the Weidmann series, but would go on and produce a complete edition of Aristophanes, which no one is so well qualified as he to undertake.

F. ARTHUR HIRTZEL.

SIHLER'S EDITION OF THE *PROTAGORAS*.

The Protagoras of Plato, with an Introduction and Notes, by E. G. SIHLER, PH.D. New and revised edition. Harper & Brothers. 1892.

THIS new edition offers a clear attractive page, and has the excellences of the former one; among others, a body of notes containing a large amount of valuable illustrative material. The changes are inconsider-

able. Some errors in accent and breathing, however, have been brought over from the first edition. Also in the Greek index, p. 135, both editions derive *συνεστρέον* from *συνίστασθαι*, where the notes now give the matter correctly. The English words 'would' and 'should' are interchanged too often perhaps even for a Greek text-book, e.g. p. 95, ll. 25 and 37; p. 115, l. 7; p. 126, l. 15.