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](#)

Sandys' *Bacchae* *The Bacchae of Euripides*. By J. E. Sandys, Litt.D. Cambridge: at the University Press. Fourth edition. (Date on the title-page 1900; published in 1904.) Pp. clv + 275. 12s. 6d.

A. H. Cruickshank

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 02 / March 1905, pp 118 - 119
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991662, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991662

How to cite this article:

A. H. Cruickshank (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 118-119 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991662

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the vulgate gives a weak sense, *ἄθυρμα* is unsuitable to the metaphor of *ἔσσο*, and as a vocative would be weak likewise. The proposed substitution of *κατὰ* for *διὰ* (*vōta*) in iv. 48 is good; one could wish it to be true, and the parallels go far to justify acceptance. No solution is found of the muddle in iii. 213, which can hardly be right. This is not the only problem still left for the future critic; but it may be doubted whether we shall ever get more light on these, unless by spoiling the Egyptians. Could *πάντας* for *παντός* be the right reading in iii. 403, 'he shook them all off'?

A few errors or questionable points may be indicated. The notes on i. 18, ii. 431 confuse a short vowel with a short syllable: nothing can ever make a short vowel long. The first line of *Dionysus* surely cannot mean 'Dracanon or elsewhere in Icaros'; the parallel cited from *Anth. Pal.* vii. 651. 3 mentions the general term first, which makes all the difference. The use of the word 'sacramentally' on p. 11 begs an important question; there is doubt whether the Greeks in the time known to us regarded the sacrificial meal as a sacrament. There is no difficulty in holding *πῖαρ* to be both adjective and substantive; one has only to alter the words, to see that the translation of *πῖαρ ἐξέλεγ γάλα* in the *n.* to iii. 60 as 'take the rich part out of the milk' can not be right. A euhemeristic explanation of the lameness of Hephaistos, because 'the trade of the smith was particularly suited to the lame' (p. 106), is not borne out by my limited knowledge of black-smiths; I should have thought them likely as a class to be particularly hale and robust. On iii. 495 the editors reject all historical basis for the alleged Cretan origin of the cult of Apollo Delphinios, it is difficult to see why; only opinions are set against the statement of the text, which is after all, evidence. The word *thesis* is improperly used in the note on vii. 24; the Greeks used it of the syllable bearing the ictus, and it is strange that modern writers

nearly always give the wrong meaning to arsis and thesis both.

Finally some places may be indicated where further additions would have been useful. The assimilation of the accusative of Demeter to the first declension (ii. title) is post-classical, which should have been explained in the note (see Jannaris, *Hist. Gr. Gr.* 384b, 386). The effect of abusive language in bringing good luck (ii. 195) may be illustrated from modern Greece; a local feast at one of the villages in Samos, just above Vathy, practised *αἰσχρολογία* until quite recently, when it was stopped, I believe, by the late Prince Mousourous because of the scandal. The roll of Titanic female deities in iii. 93 is indeed remarkable, and an excursus on this topic would have been welcome. It would be worth while to mention on iii. 439 that the name Crisa seems to survive in the village *Χρυσό* by Delphi, with a natural perversion to the more familiar word; *τετράδι* (iv. 19), not *τετάρτη*, the regular word for the fourth of each section of a Greek month, also seems to be perpetuated in the popular name for Wednesday, *τετράδη*, as I have already pointed out in this journal. More might have been said also of the Delian excavations (*App. I.*). The sacred pool has always had water in it when I have seen it, and that is in the height of summer; and whilst the ancient sanctuary on Cynthus has certainly been improved by art, it was I think built over or against a natural cavity. Besides these details—which are not the only ones I have noted—the treatment of the mythological problems might have been fuller with advantage.

But withal there is no doubt that this is a sound and laborious work, and that it contains a great deal which no other edition of the *Hymns* does contain. It sums up our knowledge of the *Hymns* with accuracy and fullness, and in many places adds to it.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

SANDYS' *BACCHAE*.

The Bacchae of Euripides. By J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Cambridge: at the University Press. Fourth edition. (Date on the title-page 1900; published in 1904.) Pp. clv + 275. 12s. 6d.

DR. SANDYS' commentary on the *Bacchae* is too well known to require more than a short notice to greet the appearance of the long-delayed fourth edition. The twenty-four years which have elapsed since the publica-

cation of the first edition have been marked by a widening of our conceptions of Hellenic culture, and the completeness of Dr. Sandys' *Bacchae* has helped the onward movement. It would be hard to name a book which would be more stimulating to an intelligent sixth form boy, or to an undergraduate reading for classical honours, not only as an introduction to him whom some of us still think to be the greatest of the Greek tragedians, but as an encouragement to wide and liberal reading of Greek literature in general. Its strength consists not so much in textual emendations (Dr. Sandys' name we believe occurs only four times in the critical notes at the foot of the page in Prinz and Wecklein's edition of 1898) as in the exhaustive orderly and accurate tabulation of the facts of all kinds connected with the play, a characteristic which also marks Dr. Sandys' notes on Demosthenes, and the new History of Classical Study, on which he has so auspiciously embarked, and which all scholars hope he may be able to bring to a satisfactory conclusion.

There is little that is new in the fourth edition: it embodies in the critical notes 'all the points of any importance in which Tyrrell's text of 1892, and Wecklein's of 1898 differ from those of an earlier date.' Only two changes have been made in the text: in l. 513 Dr. Sandys now reads κτύπον for κτύπος thereby getting rid of an awkward change of construction, while at l. 1084 he agrees with Wecklein in reading ἵλμος instead of εἵλειμος, on the ground that the combination ἵλμος νάπη is found not only in the *Christus Patiens* l. 2260, but in a fragment of Euripides' *Melanippe* discovered in Egypt in 1879. A short account of a painting found at Pompeii in 1894-5 has also been

added; and the conspectus of the literature of the play brought up to date.

The weak side of the book is in details of philology and art. To take one or two instances. The reader will feel that the last word in philology has not been spoken by Max Mueller (quoted p. 253) on Dionysus; that the account of πορνιάδες in the note on l. 664 might be supplemented by a reference to Photius *Bibl.* v. 533^b; that the discussion of Dithyrambus (Sandys p. 171) is not up to date; that the note (l. 370) on ὁσία does not give the real inner meaning of the word. It is a pity that stereotyped notes do not easily lend themselves to recasting or expansion. The fact is that, as Miss Harrison has lately shown us, the Dionysiac myth and worship are such far-reaching anthropological problems that any attempt to deal with them adequately nowadays requires more space than Dr. Sandys allots to them. And with regard to the works of art reproduced in this edition it is impossible not to feel that vases have more to teach us than gems, and that the illustrations in this book, interesting and illuminating as they are, do not deal exhaustively with the vast problem of Dionysus.

One more remark perhaps there may be space to make: the reference to the *Christus Patiens* and Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* on p. lxxxv does not quite do justice to the help which these 'dreary' documents may give to the editor of the *Bacchae*. The fact for example that Pentheus in Nonnus 44. 153 uses μόθος of the Bacchic rout points to the plausibility of Heath's ὄσσοις μόθον in l. 1060, in spite of Professor Tyrrell's fascinating emendation ὄσσοις νόθον.

A. H. CRUICKSHANK.

WILLIAMSON'S *PHAEDO OF PLATO*.

The Phaedo of Plato. Edited with Introduction and Notes by HAROLD WILLIAMSON, B.A. Pp. xxxix + 251. London, Macmillan and Co. 3s. 6d.

THIS edition of the *Phaedo* is intended especially for use in schools. Accordingly Mr. Williamson gives attention 'mainly to the interpretation and the language of the dialogue, discarding the discussion of philosophical ideas, except so far as [is] necessary to elucidate the meaning.' In his *preface*

he writes: 'My debt to Mr. Archer-Hind is one that I cannot adequately express . . . I have to thank him for his courtesy in allowing me to use *in toto* his summary of the argument, which appears at the head of the chapters in my notes . . . The text of this edition is based on that of Mr. Archer-Hind.' The book, however, is really something better than these phrases might lead one to expect. Mr. Williamson is not a mere disciple and hero-worshipper. His notes prove that he is a sound and careful scholar,