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](#)

***Die griechische Skulptur von Reinhard Kekule von Stradonitz* [Handbücher der königlichen Museen zu Berlin]. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906. 8" × 5¼". Pp. 383. 155 Text Illustrations. M. 4.50 unbound, M. 5 bound.**

F. H. M

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 01 / February 1908, pp 23 - 24
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000792, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000792

How to cite this article:

F. H. M (1908). Review of M. E. Shils, J. A. Olsen, M. Shike, and A. C. Ross 'Modern Nutrition in Health and Disease' The Classical Review, 22, pp 23-24 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000792

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Both are interesting, but neither is important. The first is a collection of all that is known about the production of plays in Rome. The author has a few opinions which are either novel or at least not frequently cited in England. He believes that the Roman stage was derived, through the Oscans, from the stage used in Magna Graecia, which is represented in the well-known burlesque scenes depicted on vases of that district. The Roman stage certainly had a stair in front [Polyb. 30, 13 (14), Suet. *Caes.* 39], and might have been about 5 feet high. It was built of wood even in Pompey's permanent theatre of B.C. 55 (cf. Tac. *Ann.* iii. 72, vi. 45). In regard to the use of masks by actors, there is some conflict of authority, for Diomedes (p. 489, 10 K) says that masks were introduced by Roscius, while Donatus (*de com.* vi. 3) ascribes them to Minucius Prothymus and another. Mr. van Wageningen adduces evidence to show that Minucius was acting B.C. 130-110 and was therefore earlier than Roscius, and then reconciles Diomedes and Donatus by supposing that Minucius was a Greek and followed the Greek fashion, whereas Roscius was the first *Roman* actor to adopt the mask. The other subjects discussed are the scenery, the *grex*, the lives of certain famous actors, stage-dresses and stage-gestures. This last topic furnishes the chief connexion between the two books, for the author, after collecting from Donatus and Quintilian all the allusions to gestures, endeavours to find illustrations of them in the pictures given in the *Album*. The discussion, however, is not very instructive even to us cold Northerners. To put the forefinger to the forehead in cogitation, to hold it up in instruction or admonition, to

join the thumb and forefinger in putting a pointed argument, are not remarkable symptoms of vivacity.

The *Album Terentianum* is a reproduction by lithography of the pictures which are drawn in two Terentian manuscripts. There are in all twelve illustrated manuscripts of Terence which are derived, through three distinct copies, from an archetype of the second century. This date is determined chiefly by the fact that many of the actors are depicted in masks, whereas by the time of Donatus (4th cent.) masks were no longer worn. Mr. van Wageningen's drawings are copied chiefly from *Ambrosianus* H 75 (F), but, where this is defective, from *Parisinus* 7899 (P). The former has black outlines filled in with red and blue colours (not here reproduced): the latter has outlines and shading only. There is not much to choose between them in execution, but the artist of *Parisinus* occasionally shows boldness of style both with the pen and the brush. In these drawings, all the actors have masks except those who represent women or young men: the men (except the soldiers in *Eunuchus*) wear a sleeved tunic reaching nearly to the ankles and a pallium: the women wear a longer tunic and a pallium: the only person who wears a hat is Thraso: the parasite in *Eunuchus* carries a huge *strigil*, but no *ampulla*. The doorways in *Adelphi* bear some resemblance to real doorways, but in the other plays they are represented by two props and a cross-piece with a curtain thrown over it. The law-book in *Phormio* is not a roll but a large *codex*. The gestures depicted are such as I have mentioned above.

J. Gow.

SHORT NOTICES

Die griechische Skulptur von Reinhard Kekule von Stradonitz [Handbücher der königlichen Museen zu Berlin]. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906. 8" x 5½". Pp. 383. 155 Text Illustrations. M. 4.50 unbound, M. 5 bound.

It is open to question whether it is altogether to the reader's advantage that guide-books to antiquities in particular Museums should be enlarged into hand-books dealing with a branch of archaeology in a general way. The visitor to the Museum is apt to find it

difficult to make practical use of such books, and to obtain the particular information he requires. The general reader on the other hand is rather wearied by the iteration of (to him) meaningless numbers. The plan of this little book is to describe a particular epoch in the history of Greek Sculpture in one or two preliminary chapters, and then to deal with the sculptures in the Berlin galleries, which belong to the epoch in question. The plan has the undeniable advantage of placing the sculptures of the Museum in their proper historical setting. Thus the description of the archaic sculptures in Berlin is preceded by an illustrated sketch of archaic Greek art in Attica, the East, the Peloponnese, and the West; that of the sculptures of the fifth century B.C. by chapters on the temple of Zeus at Olympia, the Parthenon, and the frieze of the temple at Phigaleia, and so on. The illustrations vary greatly in merit. Some, such as the stèle of Aristion (p. 14) are excellent; others, e.g. the Nikè from Delos (p. 26), are very poor. In one instance (No. 739, p. 180) one of the figures described as existing on the relief has to be regarded with the eye of faith, being presumably concealed in the inky blackness. Despite drawbacks such as those mentioned the book may be recommended as clear and trustworthy to those who wish to know how far the Greek sculptures in Berlin form a representative series. The want of an index is severely felt.

F. H. M.

The Meditations of M. Aurelius Antoninus. Translated by J. JACKSON. With an Introduction by CHARLES BIGG. Oxford, 1906. Pp. 240. 3s. 6d. net.

M. AURELIUS has appeared more than once, I think, recently in the form of a cheap English classic. Now we have another new translation, commendably accurate and very readable as far as the nature of the original allows. This reservation must be made, because the austerity, elevation, and frequent obscurity of the book remove it from anything like really popular reading. Mr. Jackson's version, like that of Dr. Rendall, is the work of a scholar, and it is a striking testimony to the high place which the original still holds that he should have been thus re-translated into English twice within ten years, and

that by very competent hands. In some respects the new version is only too readable, for much of the awkwardness and uncouthness of the Greek has been dropped. Possibly it would have been pedantic carefully to reproduce it all, and no doubt the English is pleasanter without it. But it must be said that Mr. Jackson's facile and agreeable turns of phrase often give no idea of the real style in which the emperor wrote. In Book I more particularly, where the long list of obligations to various persons is set forth in the most monotonous matter of fact way, like a ledger account in which all the items take the same sort of form, and where the vocabulary is at the same time peculiarly cumbersome and stiff, the English is as simple and as various as though it were a version, say, of Plato. In the later books, written in a less ponderous and more telling way, Mr. Jackson's easy English is not so far from the original. But does not the use of 'thou' and 'thy' throughout give a wrong character to the language? Dr. Bigg prefixes to the book fifty pages of introduction on the life and character of M. Aurelius, the nature of the book, and the character of Stoicism. He finds Aurelius 'the most tragic figure in history,' yet takes him on the whole less seriously than he took himself, and, with considerable admiration, points out very clearly certain defects belonging to the book, the system, and the man.

H. R.

Andocides Orationes. By F. BLASS. Editio tertia. Teubner, 1906. Pp. xiv + 124. M. 1.40.

WHEN we compare this new edition with its predecessor, we see that on the first and second speeches the critical notes are noticeably reduced in amount, but that those on the third and fourth are considerably augmented. The reason for this as regards the former is that the editor had come to regard the minor MSS. as simply taken from the Laurentian, and the Laurentian itself as taken from the *Crippsianus*, so that no independent value attached to their readings. The notes on these speeches therefore consist now mainly of references to the work of modern scholars. But for the last two Blass has profited by Lipsius' collation of the Ambrosian *codex*, and full information is given as to its readings, making altogether more in amount than the matter omitted. Blass regards the *Ambrosianus* as inferior, but not much inferior, to the *Crippsianus*. It has more mistakes, but at the same time it often corrects the other.

Full use seems to have been made throughout of such books and articles as have appeared since the last edition. It was not to be expected that either this or the editor's own reflection would make much difference now to the text of Andocides, but every care seems to have been taken. Blass worked so thoroughly and assiduously, with such wide knowledge of Greek and such soundness of judgment, that his premature death—for he was hardly to be called old—is a very serious loss to our studies. He was most generous too in the help he gave to English scholars, and we may well join Germany in regretting a man so capable and so distinguished.

H. R.