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](#)

Jebb's *Bacchylides Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*. Edited, with introduction, notes, and prose translation, by Sir Richard C. Jebb. Cambridge : The University Press, 1905. Pp. xviii + 524. 15s.

J. Arbuthnot Nairn

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 03 / April 2006, pp 168 - 170
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994186, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994186

How to cite this article:

J. Arbuthnot Nairn (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 168-170 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994186

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

explanation), and accepts Auratus' *πέραν*, making a very clear and fine verse. In the remainder, though the sense generally is not obscure, the verbal restoration is quite uncertain.

ll. 864-5. MSS. ἡ πῦρ καὶ φῶς ἐπ' ἔλευ-
θερίᾳ | δαίων ἀρχάς τε πολισσονόμους | ἔξει
πατέρων μέγαν ὄλβον. Here the difficulty is
the τε: ἀρχάς can hardly be taken by a
zeugma with δαίων (as Tucker): nor is ἀρχαῖς
after ἐπὶ (Porson and Verrall) likely. Weil's
πατέρων θ' ἔξει is better, but it breaks the
MS. order, and so is a larger change than it
looks. H. ingeniously proposes to read
before ἔξει a half-line καὶ δώματ' ἀνὴρ | which
settles the τε difficulty, gives a nom. to ἔξει,
and mentions the *house*, otherwise only in-
directly referred to in ὄλβον. Of course the
insertion of new words can never be more
than a guess: but all guesses are helpful
which draw attention to the real conditions
of the problem, as this does.

l. 915. διχῶς ἐπράθην, if it were sound (as
some maintain), must have been followed by
explanation of the 'two ways.' The choice
lies between αἰκῶς (Bothe) and αἰσχροῦς
(Heath). H. takes the former.

ll. 952-961. Full discussion is impossible.
I will only say (1) it must be Λοξίας who
ἐποίχεται, not 'the remedy proclaimed by
Loxias' (H.). (2) H. makes a strong case for
κραεῖ as against κρατεῖται, following Portus,
Grotius, H. L. Ahrens, Rossbach, and others.
(3) H. rightly rejects παρὰ before τὸ μῆ, which
is not classical Greek.

ll. 997-1004. The transposition of these
lines to follow 982, suggested by Scholefield,
and adopted by Meineke, Hermann, and
Hartung, has not been approved by recent
edd. and is not referred to by H. It still
seems to me a great improvement, and par-
ticularly in view of τοιάδ' ἐμοὶ ξύνουκος (line
1005).

In regard to the translation, I am not
quite able to agree with Mr. Headlam. I

feel (with him) that the 'true *spirit* and
effect' of the Greek drama 'are only in the
power of verse to convey': but that a good
prose translation may come much nearer to
conveying the spirit of poetry than he
appears to admit, is sufficiently shown by
Jebb's Sophocles, not to speak of the
Authorised Version of the Hebrew poets,
familiar to all English-speaking nations.
Mr. Headlam's translations, which contain a
great deal of matter most helpful and in-
structive to students, and which fully carry
out his explicit and clearly defined purpose,
nevertheless to my mind would have been
still more useful, without losing any of their
manifold merits, if his theory of translation
had been slightly modified. A few illustra-
tions will suffice. 'I beat my breast for
dismal happenings' (p. 2), 'this petitionary
mission' (p. 5), 'in tune with this forfend-
ing to avert things evil' (p. 8), 'I could be
well certified to spurn the tress away from
me' (p. 12), 'pitifully mummified by a
death of utter wasting, . . . 'the lack of my
estate that pinches' (p. 16), 'a true and
rightful lamentation for a father, for a
parent, goes a-hunting, when stirred up
thoroughly with both hands' (p. 18), 'all
may come off pat exactly' (p. 29), 'proceeds
without fail against the mischief become
chronic' (p. 49), 'a foot-donned coffin-curtain
for a corpse' (p. 51) . . . all these are in no
way typical of Mr. Headlam's forcible
lucidity and literary sense, but are the
results of a mistaken theory.

And I cannot part from Mr. Headlam
without an emphatic recognition of the
value of his work on Aeschylus,—the close
and learned scrutiny he has directed upon
the immensely numerous difficulties of the
text, the new evidence he has brought to
bear on them, and the combination of wide
learning, independent thought, and original
illustration, which have done so much to
stimulate, enrich, and illuminate the study
of one of the greatest of poets.

A. SIDGWICK.

JEBB'S *BACCHYLIDES*.

Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments.
Edited, with introduction, notes, and
prose translation, by SIR RICHARD C.
JEBB. Cambridge: The University Press,
1905. Pp. xviii + 524. 15s.

THE plan of the present edition of *Bacchyl-*

ides had taken shape in the mind of the
late Sir Richard Jebb even before the ap-
pearance of the *editio princeps* in 1897. He
saw the proofs of Dr. Kenyon's edition
'from the earliest appearance of the text in
type and contributed suggestions and advice
in all subsequent stages'; and Dr. Kenyon,

in making acknowledgment of the value of Jebb's assistance, added: 'it is satisfactory to know that there is a good prospect of his undertaking an independent edition, in which his admirable scholarship will be free from the trammels of an *editio princeps*, and in which he may do for Bacchylides what he has done for Sophocles.'¹

In due course the edition thus foreshadowed has appeared; and has been almost immediately followed by the death of Sir Richard Jebb. The loss of one of the foremost Greek scholars of our time has been deeply mourned by all who have at heart the welfare of Classical studies, both here and abroad.

Of Jebb's work in general this is scarcely the occasion to speak at length; but reference may be not unfittingly made to the eloquent tribute paid to him by Mr. S. H. Butcher at the annual meeting of the 'Classical Association' in January last. Mr. Butcher referred to Jebb's distinguishing characteristics: his instinct of divination, his luminous power of literary exposition, his fairness in stating the arguments on both sides of a question, and also to his brilliant gifts in the sphere of Classical composition: 'his writings' (he said) 'would remain an abiding monument of a great scholar and a great humanist.'²

If we now turn to the edition of Bacchylides, in which Jebb's latest work is contained, we find that sanity of judgment and clearness of exposition are no less conspicuous here than in his Sophocles. The problems, indeed, which have to be faced by editors are different in the case of these two authors. In some respects Bacchylides presents greater difficulties than Sophocles, owing to the condition of the text. But the present edition successfully surmounts those difficulties; and is likely to hold its ground unless and until fresh manuscript evidence is forthcoming.

Jebb was equipped for the task of editing Bacchylides both by previous study of Pindar and also by his Bacchylidean researches, continued through eight years, and testified to by the Bibliography given in his edition. This work consists of an Introduction (pp. 1-240), which deals with the life of Bacchylides, his position in the history of the Greek Lyric, his relations to Pindar, his character as a poet, dialect and grammar, metres, the papyrus (it may be noted that Jebb gives three autotype plates of different portions of the MS.; and also prints the text of the papyrus

as it stands when the smaller fragments have been fitted into their places; and thus in the condition in which it was left by the ancient correctors, before any modern hand had touched it). Then come introductions to the several odes, forming one of the most valuable sections of the whole work.

The text is accompanied, as in the case of Sophocles, by critical and explanatory notes, and by an English prose translation. It is followed by the fragments of Bacch., with commentary thereon: these in turn by an Appendix, in which the more difficult passages in the text of the poems are discussed. Finally there is an *index Graecitatis*, and a subject index.

In the introduction, the points which will probably be thought to possess most interest are the relations between Bacch. and Pindar, the history of the Greek lyric before and after Bacch., the relation of Bacch. to Greek art. In discussing the first of these questions Jebb inclines to the view that the well-known lines in Pindar's second Olympian (*Ol.* ii. 86-88: σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φῦλ' κ.τ.λ.) allude to Simonides and Bacchylides, though he would 'welcome a proof that this impression is erroneous' (p. 21). He also thinks that Bacch. *fr.* 4 (*ἕτερος ἐξ ἑτέρου σοφὸς τό τε παλαι καὶ τὸ νῦν*, 'poet is heir to poet now as of old') is a quiet reply to Pindar's proud assertion of his own originality. In tracing the earlier history of the Greek lyric Jebb is on well-worn ground; but the rapid decline of taste after Bacch. is a theme which gives him more scope; and here, for example, he utilizes the fragment of Timotheus' *Persae* (discovered in 1902, and edited by Wilamowitz) to illustrate this period of decadence. He also breaks new ground in tracing the influence of earlier poets (Homer, Hesiod, Theognis, and others) upon Bacch.; and the influence exerted in turn by Bacch. upon Roman poets of the Augustan age, notably Horace (p. 77). Dealing with the relation of Bacch. to Greek art (pp. 72-3) Jebb concludes thus: 'Bacchylides did not innovate like Stesichorus, or boldly recast his material like Pindar. He adhered to the forms of the myths generally current in his own day. When he and the vase-painters concur, it certainly is not because they have followed him.' In at least one case Bacch. probably followed the vase-painters (p. 73, notes).

The sections on the dialect, grammar, and metres of the poems and on the papyrus,³

¹ *Ed. princeps* (1897), p. lii.

² See *C.R.* xx. (1906), pp. 71-2.

³ Jebb distinguishes three hands to which corrections of the papyrus are due: he designates

are admirable. In the introductions to the odes in honour of Hiero, Jebb has been able to use for their chronology the Oxyrhynchus fragment of the Olympic register, which enables us to fix the date of Bacch. v. as 476. He has also made use of the agonistic inscription from Iulis in Ceos, which throws light on the subject of Bacch. i. (on Argeius).

The text, though not conservative, is based on close study of the special characteristics of the papyrus. The scribe, as Jebb notes, 'habitually worked in a mechanical manner, merely transcribing the letters which he seemed to see before him, without regard for the sense' (p. 127). And though the latest of the three correctors (called by Jebb A³) certainly improved the text, nevertheless he left the MS. still containing 'many errors destructive of the sense, and many flagrant breaches of metre' (p. 135). Hence the emendations of scholars have been received into the text of Bacch. much more freely than is the case with Sophocles. In this labour of correction Jebb himself has played a conspicuous part. He has also had the advantage of the work done by Prof. Blass in completing the text by assigning places to small detached fragments of the papyrus.

As the MS. is mutilated, gaps of various sizes are frequent in the text. Jebb has clearly stated his practice in filling up such *lacunae*. Wherever a supplement is suggested under conditions which justify this course, 'it is offered only as an *illustration* of the sense to which the evidence points, and not

as a restoration of the text' (p. vii): it is, furthermore, printed in a Greek type smaller than that of the text. The best example of Jebb's skill and taste in this difficult part of his task is probably to be found in Ode viii. Of the commentary, it may be said that it is on a level with his best work: see *e.g.* the note on v. 160.

Some detailed criticisms may now be offered. In the printing of the text (pp. 241 foll.) the square brackets indicating missing letters are not to be trusted. See, for instance, ii. 2, where Jebb prints ἐς Κέον ἱερὸν without brackets: in the MS., however, there is now no trace of any letter in these words save the first three (cp. p. 150). Other examples of similar inaccuracy in this matter are at iv. 3, v. *init.*, xx. 5.

The critical notes are usually accurate in their attribution of corrections to their authors; but at v. 107, and ix. 47, Jurenka is more exact.

The translation is, it need hardly be said, faithful; and renders excellently the spirit of the original. At x. 30 πορριρόφον is translated 'horse-feeding': but see note *ad loc.*

The *index Graecitatis* under Μοῖσα gives two instances of this Aeolic form: viz. v. 4 and *fr.* 27 A 2. See however p. 81, and note on v. 4: in both places it is stated that Μοῖσα occurs only once in Bacch. The attribution to him of *fr.* 27 A 2 is uncertain; but a slight discrepancy of statement remains.

A few misprints, but only a few, occur: *e.g.* Λατριῶδα xiv. 6. Finally, it is noticeable that the references on philological matters are mainly to Curtius. These might with advantage be replaced by references to Brugmann.

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

BOAS ON SIMONIDES.

De epigrammatis Simonideis, pars prior: commentatio critica de epigrammatum traditione. Dissertatio inauguralis quam . . . in universitate Amstelodamensi . . . submittet MARCUS BOAS. Groningae apud J. B. Wolters, MCMV. Pp. xvi + 256. Fl. 3. 90.

IF the Simonidean riddle was not solved in the nineteenth century, it was not for lack of solvers. Mr. Boas gives us a long list of recent works on Simonides, and the list is adorned by the names of Kaibel,

Reitzenstein, and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. But Reitzenstein resigned most of the task of disentanglement to a more 'geduldige Feder' than his own, and Wilamowitz overcame difficulties with rather a high hand. It was left for the industry of Mr. Boas to reach a solution as acceptable and as adequate as the nature of the evidence allows. His work belongs to the field of Quellenforschung, and it has the faults of that questionable science, or art. He is largely concerned with lost authors; and if his arguments are not often open to formal refu-