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](#)

Spicilegium Tragicum: Observationes criticas in Tragicos poetas Graecos continens. Scripsit F. H. M. Blaydes, M.A. Oxon. Halis Saxonum. 1902. Pp. 263. 6 mk.

E. H. Blakeney

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 08 / November 1903, pp 400 - 400

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208767, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208767

How to cite this article:

E. H. Blakeney (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 400-400 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208767

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The genuine scholar will set a high value on them.

H. RICHARDS.

Spicilegium Tragicum: Observationes criticae in Tragicos poetas Graecos continens. Scripsit F. H. M. BLAYDES, M.A. Oxon. Halis Saxonum. 1902. Pp. 263. 6 mk.

This 'farrago' of 'observationes' will not add to Dr. Blaydes' reputation. The notes are, for the most part, ill-digested, and jejune to a degree. Moreover, many of them are repeated from his 'Adversaria Critica'; and there are numerous minor errors and contradictions as well. A great number of the emendations proposed have either been anticipated by other scholars, or by Dr. Blaydes himself. Occasionally a fresh interpretation is forthcoming, e.g. on *Agam.* 365, 1045; *Oed. Col.* 35 where, discarding the τῶν ἀδελφῶν φράσαι of the MSS (δὲν Elmsley) Dr. Blaydes proposes, in place of his former conjecture ταῦθ' ἃ μὴ ἔισμεν φράσαι, the following: ἄστ' (ἄ' στ') ἀδελ' ἡμῖν φράσαι.

An examination of his emendations upon a single play, the *Hercules Furens*, shows that Dr. Blaydes has already, in his 'Adversaria in Euripidem,' printed about three-quarters of the notes that now appear in the 'Spicilegium.' Is this quite fair to his readers? The book appears to have been put together without much regard for order or selection. No doubt there are useful notes scattered up and down the book that would be quite sufficient to demonstrate the immensity of Dr. Blaydes' erudition, had such demonstration been necessary. What we regret is that this book should have been allowed to appear at all in its present haphazard condition.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art.

With a Critical Text and Translation of the *Poetics*. By S. H. BUTCHER. Third Edition. Macmillan & Co. 1902. Pp. xxxvii, 418. 12s. net.

THIS is the third edition of Prof. Butcher's *Poetics* noticed in the *Classical Review* in the last eight years, a signal proof of the correctness of Mr. H. Richard's forecast when reviewing the first edition that it would 'be indispensable to all who wish thoroughly to

master Aristotle's theory of the drama and the epic in relation to art and life' (*C.R.*, 1895 p. 214) and a welcome indication of the interest taken in Greek literary criticism and aesthetics. This edition differs but little from the previous one: but Prof. Butcher could hardly revise a piece of work, even of his own, without improvements here and there, and both text and essays show traces of such revision. The chief differences between the text of the second and third editions are noted in the preface. They are these: vii. 6, the MS reading ὥσπερ ποτε καὶ ἄλλοι φασὶ is restored; ix. 7, Welcker's Ἀνθεί is accepted; xvii., 5, the MS ἀναγνωρίσας τινάς with Vahlen; xix. 3, for ἡδέα MSS ἡ διάνοια is read with Spengel; xxii. 6, for μέτρον MSS μέτριον with Spengel.

In ix. 5 the editor still reads his conjecture οὐ τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα based on the Arabic version, but he has considerably modified his statement in defence of it against the vulgate οὕτω τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα. The choice is doubtless a difficult one; but I think Aristotle is not specially concerned with the question (interesting though it may be) whether the names of characters in comedies were significant or not. His point is that the comedian, unlike the lampooner, did not lash real individuals. He then goes on to explain the apparently discrepant practice of tragedy by showing how its 'real nomenclature' falls under the general principle of pursuit of τὸ πιθανόν. In xiv. 8 he approves but does not adopt Neidhardt's interchange of δεύτερον and κράτιστον. I cannot think this the remedy. It is more likely that εἰδόρα has fallen out of the sentence τὸ δὲ πρᾶξαι δεύτερον (as I suspect must have been already suggested) δεύτερον meaning second in the ascending order here adopted. Brandscheid and Vahlen assign the same sense to the passage: but the latter's explanation that γινώσκοντα is to be understood from 1453 b 38 seems hardly possible. Acknowledgments are made to Tucker's and Bywater's recent texts. The latter has enabled the editor to substitute MS authority for conjecture in some sixteen places. But when the name of the MS (Parisinus 2038) was inserted, the name of the emender should not have been expunged. It is important that these corroborations of the value of the critical method should not be buried out of sight; and to an edition on the scale of the present one the space saved by the omission of a few scholars' names is of little moment.