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](#)

England's *Iphigeneia at Aulis*

Lewis Campbell

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 15 - 16

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184513, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184513

How to cite this article:

Lewis Campbell (1892). England's *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. The Classical Review, 6, pp 15-16
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184513

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ENGLAND'S *IPHIGENEIA AT AULIS*.

THERE is a sobriety of tone in Mr. England's criticism that is extremely prepossessing; and if, in a subject-matter which has baffled scholars from Porson and Monk to H. Weil and Vitelli, one is sometimes inclined to differ from him, dissent is always mingled with respect and doubt. There is also something that pleases and inspires confidence in his appreciation of Euripides. His admiration of his author's 'dramaturgy' and characterization may not always work entire conviction, but the reader's perceptions are quickened to observe many excellencies which would otherwise be hid, and the regret that a work of so much beauty should have been marred returns with redoubled force.

Considerable labour, as well as much serious thought, has been expended on the edition. Mr. England has himself collated the Palatine MS. (P.) and compared its readings with G. Vitelli's exhaustive report of the Laurentian (L.). He has made extensive and minute use of the voluminous literature, and in weighing the evidence for and against different views he has spared no pains. His well known familiarity with other portions of the text of Euripides has naturally served him in good stead.

The editor makes out a strong case for his treatment of the Prologos, which certainly reads better as he has re-constituted it, although the method of combined transposition and excision could only be justified in such an extreme case, and no one knows better than Mr. England that certainty cannot be claimed for the result.

It is a little strange, by the way, that in noting the beauty of the expression *συχαι άνέμων* (l. 10) the poet's innovation of substituting a windless calm for the *πνοαί από Στρώμονος* should be left unnoticed. Nor is the change of persons in ll. 6—11 really justified by the quotation from Theon of Smyrna, who in altering the words may possibly have mistaken their connexion. It is true that Sirius is separated from the Pleiades by the constellation of Orion; but in this there is no star of the first magnitude, and while the Pleiades are sinking westwards, Sirius is still *αἴσων . . μεσσηρης*.

With the perplexing *ξόδος* of this play Mr. England deals still more convincingly. The Byzantine workmanship of part of it is shown by the occasional substitution of accent for quantity, e.g. 1599 (*χώρει τε πρὸς*

ναῦν, ὡς ἡμέρα τῇδε δεῖ), while the better portions of the Messenger's speech, in which there are manifest echoes from other parts of Euripides, are with great probability referred to the posthumous production under the management of the poet's grandson. There is considerable force in Mr. England's reasoning that Clytemnestra, whose threat in l. 1456 has left its due impression on the spectators, must have been intended by the poet to depart before the arrival of the Messenger reporting the metamorphosis of the maiden. The writer of the existing *ξόδος* was misled by the analogy of Hecuba and Polyxena. On many detailed points of textual criticism I reserve my judgment, merely observing that the defective or mutilated condition of the opening and concluding scenes appears to have unduly stimulated the suspicion of interpolation elsewhere, and that the editor has often bracketed verses of which he himself does not despair.

But there are two points affecting the characterization on which I should like to speak.

1. All readers will respond to Mr. England's praise of the scene in which Agamemnon and Iphigeneia meet (ll. 640—690). 'The distraction and despair which his answers to his daughter half reveal to us heighten the exquisite sense of the girlish innocence which cannot interpret the signs of distress and thinks of nothing but the joy of the meeting.' But does it therefore follow that Aristotle's criticism on the maiden's other two appearances (1211 ff., 1368 ff.) is unsound—*οὐδὲν γὰρ εἴκειν ἡ ἱκετεύουσα τῇ ὑστερά*? Is it not rather the fact that the first of the three passages is alone inspired with the pure expression of character, and each of the others is *motivé* (to use a convenient word) much rather by the reason of the situation? May I be permitted a modern illustration of this remark? Feeling as I do the exceeding beauty of Browning's *Pompilia*, I cannot but observe that in the 1845 lines which he has put into the girlish mouth there are some things which are rather the poet's comment than her natural speech, and these in so far detract from the dramatic presentation of her character. So here, only the fault is greater in an acted play.

2. The change of mind in Menelaus (ll. 473—503) is regarded by Mr. England as a piece of deeply calculated hypocrisy.

'He sees his brother is but half-hearted in his protest, and that all that is needed to decide him to sacrifice his daughter is that he should be brought face to face with the alternative. Such a character is consistent with the picture of Menelaus which Euripides gives [of him] in the *Andromache* and in the *Orestes*. It is natural too that such should be the character in Euripides of the king of that people of whom he wrote at *Andromache* vv. 446 ff. that they were

δόλια βουλευτήρια,
ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,
ἐλικτὰ κούδεν ὕγιες, ἀλλὰ πᾶν περίε
φρονοῦντες.'

In all this it seems to me that Mr. England is for once but following too closely in the footsteps of his precursor in this series, Dr. Verrall of Cambridge. He states his view with moderation, but it is really not tenable. Not craft and villainy, but weakness, is the chief note in the character of Menelaus. And with Euripides the situation of the moment weighs more than character. Dissimulation is not infrequent in Greek Tragedy; but those who have been deceived by it are always undeceived. Else, for dramatic purposes, the point is lost. In

this case not Agamemnon only but the Chorus also are impressed with the honest compunction of Menelaus. I venture to think that the audience were so too. And there is nothing in the ensuing action to show them that they were wrong.

Here I may dwell on a single point of detail. The critical note on 484—surely by an afterthought, for the line is not bracketed—runs as follows:—'This line seems to me very like an interpolation; there was no question of the *death* of any one belonging to Menelaus.' But is not the rhetorical antithesis sufficiently supported by Soph. *El.* 539—541, which may have been present to the poet's mind:

πότερον ἐκείνω παῖδες οὐκ ἦσαν διπλοῖ
οὓς τῇσδε μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν θνήσκειν, πατρὸς
καὶ μητρὸς ὄντες, ἧς ὁ πλοῦς ὄδ' ἦν χάριν;¹

On the whole the edition deserves to be highly commended, and will repay careful study.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

APELT'S PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN TREATISES.

Aristotelis quæ feruntur De Plantis, De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus, Ventorum Situs et Nomina, De Melisso Xenophane Gorgia. Edidit OTTO APELT. Lipsiæ, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MDCCCLXXXVIII. 3 Mk.

(FIRST NOTICE.)

THIS group of short pseudo-Aristotelian treatises comprises some which are very difficult, both from the abstruse nature of the subjects, mathematical or metaphysical, with which they deal, and from the mutilated and corrupt state of the Greek text. There can be no doubt that the new Teubner edition of them has been put into competent hands, and that it is a considerable advance on anything previous to it. The editor has not only a minute knowledge of these treatises, but is versed in Aristotelian thought and modes of expression. He is often acute as well as judicious in his treatment of the text; he appears to have been very diligent and conscientious in the use of manuscripts and collations, and his acquaintance with the literature of the subject is beyond the criticism of a reviewer who has had to learn so much from him.

The present notice will be confined to the book of which the common title *περὶ Ξενο-*

φάνους *περὶ Ζήνωνος* *περὶ Γοργίου* has been altered by modern critics to *περὶ Μελίσσου* *περὶ Ξενοφάνους* *περὶ Γοργίου*. Apelt was already known in connexion with this by his excellent articles in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* (1866) and in the *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* (neue Folge, xliii. 1888).¹

The Prolegomena contain a short account of the manuscripts, together with a discussion of a few of the editor's numerous emendations. A special merit of this edition is that the editor has collated the best manuscript, Codex Lipsiensis, himself. This manuscript, he says, was unknown to Syllburg. Fabricius (see Mullach's preface to his edition of this treatise) appears to have been the first to discover its value and published a collation which was made for him by Olearius. This was faulty, and a much better one was made by Beck (Mullach *ibid.*, Apelt Proleg.) Even Bekker omitted to examine the Leipzig MS., and relied on the inferior collation published by Fabricius when he might have used that of Beck (Mullach, Apelt, *l.c.*). The latter col-

¹ He has also published recently a translation of the book *περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν*, in a volume entitled *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1891.