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](#)

Wecklein's *Supplices* and *Heraclidae* of Euripides *Euripidis Fabulae*, Ed. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. II. Pars II. *Supplices*. 2 M. Vol. II. Pars IV. *Heraclidae*. 2 M.

E. B. England

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 2009, pp 54 - 58

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029498, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029498

How to cite this article:

E. B. England (2009). The Classical Review, 15, pp 54-58 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029498

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES.

ON ARISTOTLE, *Poet.* 1455a 34.—Prof. Butcher, who did me the honour of consulting me on certain readings of the Arabic Poetics for his interesting edition of the Greek, informed me that a continental scholar had asserted that the Arabic read *ἐκστατικοί* for *ἔκστατικοί* in this passage. I had been unable to satisfy myself about the Arabic word intended by the writer of the Paris MS., and therefore could not confirm this; but I must regret my want of perspicacity, for I have now no doubt that the word intended is *ʿajabiyyīna*, which is vulgar Arabic for ‘buffoons,’ literally ‘men of wonder.’ The Syriac translated by this word will almost certainly have been *mathh'rānē*, a literal translation of *ἐκστατικοί*, which the Syriac translator probably thought meant ‘men who produce ecstasis.’ The verb *ἐκστασθαι* is not unfrequently rendered by the Syriac verb whence this word is derived. I hope this may be not the only passage in which that continental scholar has solved difficulties which baffled the editor of the Arabic Poetics.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

* * *

STRABO XII. 3, 38, p. 360.—Nearly the same cure for this passage as Mr. Munro advocates was proposed by Von Sallet in his *Beiträge z. Gesch. u. Num. d. Könige*, &c., who, however, instead of simply excising *ἔνδ*, substitutes *ἐς* for it. The resulting sense is practically the same. In one of the scores of unpublished papers on Asia Minor, which burden my shelves and my conscience, I find that the difficulties of the vulgate text are stated, and the conclusion is thus reached: ‘All difficulties disappear by a slight change in the text: we must either omit *ἔνδ* before *τῶν παίδων* or (with Von Sallet) change it to *ἐς*. Then we have the clear and naturally expressed narrative: “in the fortress of Sagylon

[*ἐνραῦθα*] Arsakes, (one) of the sons of Pharnakes, who was playing the dynast and causing disturbance without authorisation from any of the Roman leaders (i.e. Triumvirs), was captured and slain.” On the other hand, the vulgate is defended by Hennig *Symbolae ad As. Min. Reges Sacerdotes*; but his defence is equivalent to a disproof.

That the same cure suggests itself independently to many scholars is a strong corroboration of its necessity.

W. M. RAMSAY.

* * *

ON HORACE, *Odes* IV. 2, 45–8.

Tum meae, si quid loquar audiendum,
Vocis accedet bona pars et, ‘O sol
Pulcher! O laudande!’ canam, recepto
Caesare felix.

Is it too late to advocate an interpretation of the last two of these lines, which has scarcely ever been noticed and in the new *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* is not accorded even a mention? I find it alluded to only by Maclean, who says that ‘whether “felix” refers to Horace himself or the sun is doubtful. The reader’s taste must determine,’ and by Orelli, who thinks that a much ‘*tenerior sensus*’ is obtained by the former (usual) choice. It seems to me that the objective sense of the word *felix* (‘fortunate,’ not ‘happy’) and the sense of *laudande* (‘to be cited with approval’ rather than ‘to be praised’) are both in favour of printing the last three words between inverted commas. It would also be too personal, if not grotesque, a touch for Horace to describe himself as singing with joy at the emperor’s return. For the shape of the sentence compare ‘*pulcher fugatis ille dies Latio tenebris.*’

F. W. THOMAS.

REVIEWS AND COMPTES RENDUS.

WECKLEIN’S *SUPPLICES* AND *HERACLIDAE* OF EURIPIDES.

Euripidis Fabulae, Ed. R. PRINZ et N. WECKLEIN. Vol. II. Pars II. *Supplices*. 2 M. Vol. II. Pars IV. *Heracidae*. 2 M.

THE publication of Dr. Wecklein’s excellent work on Euripides continues at a pace which leaves the panting reviewer far behind. The chief value of the work continues to lie in the thoroughness and accuracy of the new collations of the MSS. and of the history of the constitution of the text. It is needless to add that the editor’s learning and judgment are such as to compel and reward the attention of all students of Euripides to each separate

decision made by him, both as to the need for emendation, and as to the value of different emendations proposed by others or by himself. The study of this edition, however, will, I think, suggest to many the question whether, in the proposal or adoption of emendations of the text, the editor has not allowed himself too free a hand. Especially is this the case where he is replacing, not the bad by the good, but the good by what he holds to be the better. Another question which may also be asked, though with some hesitation, is, has not the editor been rather too partial, seeing that this is a standard critical edition, to his own suggestions? As

readers know, Dr. Wecklein arranges emendations in three classes. The first class he prints in the text, the second in the notes at the foot, the third in an appendix. In the *Supplices* the number of his own emendations in the first class is 34, or one for every 36 lines, in the second 93, or one for every 13 lines. In the *Heracidae* the numbers are: first class 26 or one for every 40 lines, second class 65 or one for every 16 lines. (In the *Orestes*, the last of the plays which has appeared, the numbers are: first class 25 or one in every 68 lines, and second class 116 or a little more than 1 in every 15 lines.)

I have endeavoured, in the detailed remarks which follow, while noticing important innovations, to furnish some material towards the answer of these two questions, and I propose then to revert shortly to the subject (which I have more than once discussed in this Review) of the relation of the two MSS. L and P to each other, and to see what light is thrown on the question by passages in these two plays. Dr. Wecklein follows Vitelli in regarding P as a copy of L. I still hold the older view that L and P were independent copies of the same MS.

SUPPLICES.

In the MSS. v. 38 ends with *χθονός* and v. 32 with *θεός* (which should have a comma before it). For these words W. substitutes *φρενῶν* and *χθονός* respectively. I think most readers, even if they thought the alteration an improvement, would pronounce it too violent and too 'subjective' to be introduced into a critical text.—60. *σὸν δὲ PL, τεόν W.* Cf. the note on *Heracidae* 911 where precisely the opposite alteration is made.—63. W. gives *θελέμωσ* as a probable substitute for *δοίωσ*. This is guess-work.—90 f. W. reads *μητέρ* for the MSS. *μήτηρ*, putting a comma after *ποδί* instead of after *δόμων*. So emended the sentence runs better, but at the expense of the sense: *ἀποῦσαν* should go closely with *μεταστείχω*. The long absence is mentioned as the reason for the search. As to the main construction *μήτηρ ἔχει τι νέον* is as good as *μητέρα ἔχει τι νέον*.—199 f. should surely remain.—221. W. prints the MSS. *ζώντων*, mentions Heath's *ὄντων* as an emendation of the second class, and puts Porson's *ἑόντων* (which I should unhesitatingly print) in the third, along with such an emendation as *ὡς σφύζων τὰ θεῶν*. (Heath is no doubt right in saying that the *μέν* in 220 corresponds to the *δέ* in

229, and that 222–228, which W. unnecessarily follows O. Lueders in rejecting, are parenthetical.—240 f. Here W. puts into class II two emendations which I at least should have been glad to see printed in the text: Wilamowitz's *οἱ δ' οὐδὲν ὄντες* (for the MSS. *οἱ δ' οὐκ ἔχοντες*), and Herwerden's *ἀεὶ* for *δευοί*, which mends the sense and is palaeographically likely.—249. The adoption of Nauck's *δ' ἔαν* for the MSS. *λίαν* is not enough to mend this line. If one emendation only is to be allowed, Marchant's *αἰσχροὺν* for *αὐτὸς* seems best.—250. W. puts Elmsley's *ἡμαρτον* (for MSS. *ἡμαρτεν*) in the third class. The arguments for it however are strong. The following words *ἐν νέοισι δ' ἀνθρώπων τόδε ἔνεστιν* show that it is no error on the part of Adrastus that the Chorus are speaking of. He is not νέος. In v. 232 Theseus has said that Adrastus had been νέος παραχθείς, and enlarges on the wicked folly of these νέοι. To these then the Chorus would naturally refer in *ἡμαρτον κ.τ.λ.* Also the following *τῷδε*, which does refer to Adrastus, is more natural as referring to some one fresh.—306. This v. runs in the MSS. *νῦν δὲ σοὶ τε τοῦτο τὴν τιμὴν φέρει*. W. proposes in the footnotes to re-write it: *νῦν δ' ἔστι σοὶ τε τοῦτ' ὄνειδος εὐκλεές*. This is surely wild work in a critical edition.—380. W., adopting Canter's *νέμονσ'* for *νέμεις* well substitutes *ἡσσον* for MSS. *ἀεὶ τὸν* (the intermediate stage having been *νέμονσα ἦττον*, *α η τ* becoming *ἀεὶ*).—413. It is perhaps a misprint that this v. ends with a full stop, and not with a comma. The comma is rendered necessary by the adoption of Wilamowitz's *τὸ δ'* for *δ δ'* at the beginning of the next v.—441. According to Barnes it was Dupont, not Scaliger, who first read *ἔστ'* here for *ἔστίν*.—442. It is surprising that W. does not accept Markland's *εὐθνήτης* for the MSS. *αὐθέντης*. Markland quotes a note of Theodorus Gaza (*Περὶ Μηνῶν*) to the effect that in late Greek *αὐθέντης* was used as equivalent to the Lat. *auctor* and that *αὐθεντία* was *auctoritas*. This use would be familiar to a Byzantine scribe, and would account for the error.—478. The words *ἐκ βραχίωνων* which some editors have thought corrupt, seem to me sound, and to mean "though on the weaker side." Cf. v. 518 f. *οὐκ οἶδ' ἐγὼ Κρέοντα δεσπόζοντ' ἐμοῦ, οὐδὲ σθένοντα μείζον*.—523. The 'vulgata lectio' seems to me far sounder than either Kirchhoff's or Wecklein's suggestions.—550. It is an interesting fact that both Reiske and Markland conjecturally restored *παλαίσμαθ'*, the original reading of the MSS., though all the editions had followed the late hand of

L and P in writing *πάλαισμα θ*.—573. W. leaves in the text *χάτερος ἄλλους πόνους* (χά. ἄθλους ἐγώ Nauck) though surely there is more need of alteration than in 599 where he replaces *ταράσσει* by *θοάζει*, and the source of the corruption, if there is one, was in both cases a marginal explanation.—608. W. well emends the MSS. *ἂν τις αἰρή* to *αὐτίς ἀρεῖ*.—660. The δ' after *ἱππότην* was not inserted, as W. says, by Scaliger, but by Reiske (and Markland).—688. W.'s *ἔσαντέλλουσιν* for MSS. *προσαντέλλουσιν* would perhaps be more in place in a footnote than in the text.—701. Here W. prints *κελευμόν*, but at *Cyclops* 653 *κελευσμοῖς*. Is this because P in the latter passage reads *κελευμοῖς*?—708. *ἐκέρδαινε* (MSS.) is better than Hermann's *ἐκύνδαινε* which W. prints, or Dindorf's *ἐκέρδενε* which he puts in the footnote: *οὐ γὰρ τὸ νικῶν τοῦτ' ἐκέρδαινε μόνον* is: 'he would not rest content with victory on this wing.'—W. well transposes vv. 745 and 746, and in 747 substitutes *λόγους* for the MSS. *φίλους*, referring to *Ion* 649 and *Soph. Aj.* 330 for the same mistake.—787 f. W. well reads *παλαιᾶς...ἀμέρας* for the MSS. *παλαιῶς...ἀμέρα* (though Porson's *ἀμερᾶν* involves less alteration). He would have done well to adopt Nauck's *τί μὲν* for *τὸ μὲν* in v. 790, and Markland's *στερεῖσα* for the MSS. *στερεῖσθαι* (of which in L the *σθαι* is a late addition). W. prints Blomfield's *στέρεσθαι*.—885. Musgrave's *ἐξήρη* seems a much better emendation of the MSS. *ἔχαιρε* than W.'s *ἔχομπτε*.—931. W. well emends the MSS. *αὐθαίρετος* to *αὐθαίρετφ*, and in 1020 and 1033 makes good suggestions in the footnote: to read *φίλω* for *φίλον* in the former, and to reject the latter v.—1112. Are W.'s two suggestions on this line: *ᾠφέλουν τινα* or *μηδέν' ᾠφέλουν βροτῶν* worthy of the place he gives them in the second class?—1183. 'τῆσδ' Markland.' It was Matthiae who proposed *τῆσδ'*. Markland at *I. T.* 1436 wants to change a similar *τῆσδ'* to *τοῦσδ'*.—1200. W. prints *πρυτανικὴν* for the MSS. *πυθικὴν*. This is unnecessary. Heracles told Theseus to take the tripod to Delphi, but we must suppose that Theseus had not yet done so. It is quite in accordance with this explanation that Athena says in v. 1203 *κάπειτα σῶζειν θεῶ' δὸς ᾧ Δελφῶν μέλει*.—It is a curious coincidence that at v. 1194 W. suggests that *πόλιν* was written as an explanation over the *χθόνα* at the end of the following v. whereas at v. 1184 he prints *πόλιν* (also over a *χθόνα* at the end of the following v.) as an emendation (Reiske's) of the MSS. *τάδε*.

The only misprints I have noticed in this

play are the following: The numbers are omitted in the footnotes before notes on vv. 206 and 761, p. 58 l. 5 *συννάψω* for *συνάψω*, v. 1180 footnote *δῆθ'* for *δῆτ'*.

HERACLIDAE.

5. For *αὐτῷ δ' ἄριστος* W. reads *αὐτῷ δ' ἀρωγός*. F. W. Schmidt's *ἀρεστός* seems better (cf. Hdt. v. 129 *καὶ κως ἐωντῷ μὲν ἀρεστῶς ὄρχετο*), if any alteration is necessary.—37. For *τέρμονας* W. well suggests in the footnote *τέρμιον*.—72. *ἰατιμίαν* for MSS. *ἀτιμία*.—132. I prefer Holzner's *μὴ ἀμελεῖν* (δ' ἐμόν) which W. puts in the third class to his own *μανθάνειν δ' ἐμόν* (which he puts in the second) for the MSS. *μὴ μέλλειν ἐμοί*.—1 dele v. 140.—165. *ῆ*, which W. reads for *ῆ*, was Barnes's emendation, though W. does not say so.—169. It was hardly worth while to record in the Appendix F. W. Schmidt's unmetrical line *ἐρεῖς πόλει ποτὲ χάριν ἐκτίσειν στόλον*. (At *Cyclops* 144 W. prints a line beginning *ἐν σέλμασι νεῶς*, which shows the same metrical irregularity).—180 f. Wilamowitz's *γὰρ* for *μὲν* in 180 renders the athetesis of *πάρεστί μοι* in 181 unnecessary.—193. W. adopts Cobet's *οὐδ' Ἀχαικὸν* τὰδε for the MSS. *ἔστιν οὐδ' ἀχαικὸν*—unnecessarily.—211. W. does well to adopt Reisig's *αὐτανεψίων* for the MSS. *αὐτανεψίω*.—223. I would suggest that the *χωρὶς* is a commentator's remark, and that we should read *σοὶ γὰρ τὸδ' αἰσχρὸν, ἐν δὲ τῇ πόλει κακόν*.—In 300 (the middle one of three reasonably suspected verses) W. reads *κακαῖς* for the MSS. *κακοῖς*. The masc. is certainly possible when speaking of women generally, and I think most scholars would call it more idiomatic in this passage. 'κακαῖς' would, I think, imply that the man in question had had more than one wife, and that all were bad ones.—315. Wecklein says the Aldine reads *ἄξιον γ'*, but the reading of the Aldine here is *ἄξιον γ'*.—324. W.'s *εὐκλεῖς* for *εὐγενής* is convincing, but not so his suggestion of *φθάσῃ* for *λάβῃ* (λάβῃ P) in 338.—416. The MSS. reading is *δίκαιον ῆ*. Of this W. adopts Schäfer's emendation *δίκαιον ῆν*, though Dobree's *δίκαιος ῆ* seems much better.—426. Why not adopt Musgrave's suggestion that this and the preceding verse are a question?—437 f. W. well rejects these two lines: the singular *σοί* is enough to condemn them.—451. W. reproduces, curiously enough, the misprint of Kirchhoff's critical notes in numbering the v. 452.—458. Elmsley's *ἀνῆρ* is adopted, but he is not mentioned as its author.—460. Tyrwhitt and not Elmsley (as W. gives) first changed *τύχη* (MSS.) to

τύχοι.—493. W.'s ἀστοῦ for the MSS. ἄλλον is mere re-writing of Euripides.—594. Kayser's κακούμενοι for the MSS. θανόμενοι seems at least as worthy of a place in the first class as Wecklein's φυλάσσει for the MSS. κελεύει at 558.—677. For the thoroughly sound ἐξηκούμεν Wecklein suggests ἐξικνούμεθα, which gives a far inferior sense.—706. Bothe's τήνδ' (for the MSS. τήν) which W. adopts, seems inferior to Porson's σήν.—735. If δοκοῦντα needs correction surely Nauck's ποιοῦντα is better than ἐγκοινοῦντα which W. suggests alongside of it.—745 f. W. seeks to mend the ill-fitting neuter τόδ', in apposition with the fem. δόκησις by putting a comma after ἄλβω. It seems better to reject the words from οὐκ ὀρθῶς to δόκησις as a spurious addition.—735. W.'s περὶ δαιμόνων for the MSS. καὶ περὶ δόμων (corrected by a late hand in L to περὶ τῶν δόμων) is good, as is his πόποι for πόλις in v. 763.—769. This is one of the few passages that W. leaves imperfect, though he prints two suggestions in the footnotes: one by Herwerden, and one by himself.—813 ὁ δ' οὔτε τοὺς κλύοντας αἰδεσθεῖς λόγῳ MSS. λόγῳ (or λόγῳ) gives no construction here, so the second Hervagian Ed. wrote λόγων (i.e. as the obj. of κλύοντας). This W. alters to λόγον. The gen. is possible, though less likely than the acc., and it comes nearer the MSS. reading. The position of the negatives in this passage is extraordinary.—845. W. unnecessarily alters ἐμβῆσαι to ἀμβῆσαι. For the impossible κρατοῦντα in v. 884 W. suggests ναύοντα, referring to Hesych. ναίνειν ἱκετεύειν.—In v. 886 W.'s ἔξευξα δεσμοῖς for ἔξευξ' ἀνάγκη is 'a wild surmise,' which he should hardly have put in the second class.—911. For the θεὸς of the MSS. the Paris copy of L suggests τεὸς, an admirable emendation. It does not satisfy W. He writes ὁ σὸς. It is curious that at *Suppl.* 60, where Kirchhoff would emend the MSS. σὸν δὲ to τὸ σὸν, W. is not content with τὸ σὸν, but writes τεὸν.—930. W.'s note is 'τύχην H. Stephanus τυχεῖν L P.' The only reading recorded by H. S. from his 'codices vetustissimi,' near this passage is τύχαν at the end of 935, where the Aldine reading is τύχας (I may note that at *Cyclops* 39 W. prints κόμους for κῶμοι L or κῶμοι P, giving Bothe as the author of the emendation, and mentions in the Appendix that H. S. proposed κόμους. What Stephanus says is that the v. c. have κώμους, but that he would prefer κόμους. Men who call the great Stephanus a liar should at all events refer to his book when they quote him.)—932. I cannot see wherein W.'s δοριπόνῳ σὺν

ἀσπίδι is an improvement on Hermann's admirable πολυπόνῳ σὺν ἀσπίδι for the MSS. πολυπόνῳ σὺν ἀσπίσιν.—959. W. here has the note 'κερδανεῖς γε ταῦτα vel potius κερδανεῖς γε πάντα.' If the former conjecture is 'minus probabilis' than the latter, why is it not banished to the appendix 'conjecturas minus probabiles continens'?—1005. W.'s ἀν λαχοῦσα for the MSS. ἀναλαβοῦσα is convincing.—1038. ἀλλ' οὐ χρησμὸν ἡρόμην θεοῦ; MSS. Cobet's ἡζόμην or even Musgraves ἡδοῦμην seems far preferable to W.'s ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτ' ἐπηρρόμην.—(I should like to be allowed to make one further comment here, which seems to me important, on Wecklein's *Cyclops*. At v. 145 he prints Hermann and Nauck's εἰσορᾶς for the MSS. ὡς ὄρᾶς. The MSS. reading is quite sound, ὄρᾶς being *subjunctive*. Cf. two lines above ὡς σαφέστερον μάθης: and also to suggest ἐμπολῶντες for ἐμβαλόντες at v. 239 of the same play).

L AND P.

SUPPLICES.

8. This v. was first written in L without τάδε, in P with it.—9. L had at first some word that was not λιπούσαι, but began with two other letters: P always had λιπούσαι.—16. ὀλολότας L ὀλωλότας P.—50. ῥυσσὰ L ῥυσὰ P. In P a later hand added the second σ.—228. συννοσοῦντα L συνοσοῦντα P. The emendation of Lambinus οὐ νοσοῦντα is undoubtedly the correct reading. This one case far outweighs, to my mind, all Wecklein's arguments on the other side drawn from cases which look as if a mistake in P was due to a misreading of a badly written letter in L. Is it more likely of the two that P's scribe had here συννοσοῦντα before him or οὐ νοσοῦντα? No doubt the first ο was so written in the MS. from which both L and P were copied that it was mistaken by both scribes for a σ, but P copied the rest of the letters as they stood, while L thought he could mend matters.—242. ἀφίᾳσι L ἀφίᾳσιν P.—344. τεκοῖσ (after the σ is an erasure of a single letter) L τεκοῖσα χ' P.—364. ἀν L ἀ'ν P (a late hand in L added the rough breathing)—754. No doubt the correct reading is (ὦν δ') εἶνεχ' ἄγων (ῆν), to which P with οὔνεκ' ἄγων comes nearer than L with οὔνεκεν ἄγων. Is it conceivable that P should have copied from L here?—858. ἔγω γε L, ἔγω τε P, ἐγώ τε Nauck. The wrong accent makes the case doubtful, but

anyhow P seems nearer the right than L.—872. W.'s note is 'ἄλλην P, ἄλλον L sed o in ras. scr. l.' If ἄλλον is due to a late corrector of L it is not fair to say 'ἄλλον L.' If not, this is another case where P has the better reading. (I expect I was a very late hand who altered L, as in many cases which I have noticed in *I.T.*, to agree with Ald.)—897. καὶ ὅπότ' L χ' ὅπότ' P.—1078. L has μετέλλαχες but P avoids the mistake.—1116. The readings here are perplexing: ἀ*μενοῦς L ἀσμένους P ἀμένους Ald. The only explanation I can give is that here again L was altered to agree with Ald. which omitted the σ by pure error. At the same time the accent in L looks as if it had been copied from a MS. which had the correct ἀμενοῦς. If so the passage makes rather against my contention.—1164. W.'s note is ; 'σε (sic scr. ut facile σῆς legas) μητρός L σῆς μητρός P' surely a far-fetched explanation of so simple a blunder. That P could make a pretty gross blunder we see in v. 1198, where he writes ἡλίου instead of ἱλίου.

HERACLIDAE.

27. συμπάσχω P, συμπράσσω L.—789. ἐλευθερώσαι changed by the first hand, apparently, to ἡλευθερώσθαι L ἐλευθερώσαι P. This does not look as if P copied from L. On the other hand, at 704, P's μῆ, W. suggests, is best explained as a misreading of L's μὲν, which is written by means of an abbreviation. So at 778 P's unaccountable λεύθει, W. explains as due to the fact that in L the α of λάθει looks like ευ.—858. ἦβη τὸν changed to ἦβητὴν L ἦβη τὴν P. Does not this case outweigh the above arguments on the other side? If P copied from L before the alteration it is inconceivable that he should have altered τὸν to τὴν: if after, it is equally inconceivable that he should have failed to accept ἦβητὴν. The only reasonable explanation of the variants is that both L and P copied independently from MSS. which had ἦβη τὴν, that P left the nonsensical words unaltered, and L altered τὴν to τὸν. In this case we have more cause to thank P than L.

E. B. ENGLAND.

BURNET'S *ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE*.

The Ethics of Aristotle, edited with an Introduction and Notes by J. BURNET, M.A. Pp. lii, 502. Methuen. 18s.

SOME years ago it was matter of complaint that Oxford in spite of the amount of time she bestowed on the *Ethics* had done but little in the way of published writings to promote their study. Such complaint can hardly be made now, when to the old and still very useful edition of Grant there have been added Prof. Bywater's text and contributions, Prof. Stewart's two copious volumes of notes, and now Prof. Burnet's text with notes of a conciser kind. Even if we are so hard to please that we venture to think the ideal edition yet to seek, we must recognise how much of value there is in the work of each of the three, and we need not ask which among them deserves best of Aristotle or ourselves.

I will say at once that, excellent as Mr. Burnet's book is, he seems to have partly fallen into the opposite error to Mr. Stewart. The latter from his stores of learning and reflexion heaped upon us too much; too much at least for students addressing themselves to the *Ethics* for the purpose of University examinations, who were really

the class of readers he had most in view. Mr. Burnet's command of the subject is equally indisputable, but he perhaps has given us too little. One volume of 550 pages (wonderfully light to hold in the hand, thanks to Messrs. Methuen) contains not only his notes and introductions, but Aristotle's text, which Mr. Stewart did not print at all, and also very considerable portions of the *Eudemian Ethics* as well, put on each page below the text and above the notes. He writes tersely enough, but in spite of this we often feel that the notes, though very good, leave a great deal unsaid, and that a thorough commentary on the *Ethics*, such as the ordinary reader requires, cannot be packed into this comparatively scanty space. I do not know whether Mr. Burnet will be satisfied by teachers of the *Ethics* finding his book valuable. Certainly they ought to do so. But students are likely to think that it does not give them as much assistance as they need. The editor seems often to be writing such notes as would be useful rather to himself and other advanced scholars than to the man to whom the *Ethics* are not yet familiar. If the book were wholly for the maturer scholar, the case would of course be different. But it con-