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](#)

Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*. Edidit Kock Theodorus. Vol. III. 1888. Leipzig: Teubner. Mk. 16.

A. Palmer

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 1-2 / February 1889, pp 22 - 26

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00193928, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00193928

How to cite this article:

A. Palmer (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 22-26 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00193928

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Nicolaus Varelis, 33.
 Nicolaus Vlastus, 115.
 Theodorus, 17.

OWNERS, ETC.

[Apostolius], Arsenius, 177.
 Barbaro, Alvise, 127.
 Barbaro, Francesco, 127.
 Βονακίλλος, Nicolaus δ, 233.
 Cabaces, Demetrius Rhaoul, 144.
 Calosynas, Antonius, 62.
 Chrysogonus, Georgius, 166.
 Cyriac of Ancona, 144.
 Euphemia, 28.
 Franciscus of Bologna, 224, 225.
 Franciscus grecus, 163.
 Gabriel monachus, 144.
 Georgius Scholarius, 144.
 Jacobus of Ferrara (?), 88.
 Jacobus Ferdinandi f., 97.
 Loredano, Lorenzo, 250.
 Manolesso, Andronico, 127.
 Margounius, Manuel, 178.
 μεγαγιάνης, Zacharias δ, 60.

Musurus, Marcus 101, 127, 143, 185.
 Nicolaus cathegum, 230.
 Onctariis (de), Benedictus of Vicenza, 82.
 Panidiotes Demetrius, 28.
 Panormita Antonio, 70.
 Pico, Giovanfrancesco, della Mirandola, 247.
 Pio, Alberto, (10), 21, (26), 28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 51, 54, 55, (56), 57, 59, 61, 70, 75, 76, (77), 85, 87, 88, 89, (91), 93, 100, 102, 103, (104), 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, (129), 130, 131, (132), 135, 140, 141, 145, 146, 149, 152, 164, (165), 166, 173, 174, 177, 191, 197, 198, 205, 215, (230).
 Pottillius (?), 38.
 Reggio, library of S. Spirito, 247.
 Theocletus, 2.
 Theodorus, 74.
 Theodorus δ ἀντιγονίτης, 242.
 Theophanes, 55.
 Valla, Giorgio 10, 24, 26, 28, (38), 39, 40, 49, 51, 54, 57, 59, 61, 70, 77, 85, 87, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, (102), (104), 110, 112, 114, 115, 123, 129, 130, 131, (132), 135, 140, 141, 145, 149, 152, 165, 166, 173, 177, 215, 230.
 Virgizio (Vergecius), Giorgio, 49.
 Xylalas, Theodosius,, 203.

T. W. ALLEN.

COMICORUM ATTICORUM FRAGMENTA.

Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta. Edidit
 THEODORUS KOCK. Vol. III. 1888.
 Leipzig: Teubner. Mk. 16.

DR. KOCK is to be congratulated on arriving at the completion of this important edition, on which he has spent so many years: *a maturiore aetate paene ad extremam usque senectutem*, he himself says. The work is throughout thorough and scholarly: the notes are terse, and the dryness of criticism is often relieved by happy illustrations; nor is the editor above adding a word of explanation when necessary. As far as can be judged he has neglected no source of information discovered since the appearance of Meineke's work; and the criticisms of Cobet, Herwerden, Blaydes, Naber, Ellis, and others, which have been published since that date, are by themselves sufficient to justify a new edition, even if the labours of Kock himself and the new fragments which he has brought to light did not found a claim for the publication of a fresh collection.

This, the third volume, is probably the most interesting of the series: for it contains the fragments of Menander. These fragments, having been to a large extent cited by Stobaeus for their merit, are more agreeable reading than the uninteresting fishy and culinary quotations of Athenaeus, which fill up so large a portion of the second

volume. Menander is not, perhaps, very profitable reading. A poet to whom marriage was a failure, sons and especially daughters a nuisance, and the duties of life more or less bores, is a poet after whom Euripides seems manly. Still his fragments are very pleasant reading, and not without utility, in so far as they inculcate prudence and moderation, though they seldom preach any higher virtue. Often too, his reflections irresistibly recall some well-worn English saying, so much of nature's kinship have they. Thus 'Man is born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward' is like Ἄνθρωπος ἱκανὴ πρόφασις εἰς τὸ δυστυχεῖν. 'Hope deferred maketh the heart sick' is like πρᾶγμα ἔστ' ἐπίπονον τὸ προσδοκᾶν. 'To be wroth with one we love Doth work like madness in the brain' resembles ὁ μέγιστον ἀγαπῶν δι' ἐλάχιστον ὀργίζεται. And sometimes he rises very far indeed 'supra soccum,' as in that solemn verse ἅπαντα σιγῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐξεργάζεται, and in the famous sentiment, ὃν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος. All this however, is very tragical mirth, and much nearer Euripides than Aristophanes. There was not much fun in Menander: and of the little there was less than its fair proportion has been preserved in these fragments. It was as a sentimentalist rather than a comic poet that Menander was the most popular dramatist of the world for many centuries.

Alciphron tells us that in his time all the world was still running to see Menander's *Misers*, and *Lovers*, and *Superstitious Men*, five hundred years after the author's death.

The Comic Fragments are a field in which the greatest English scholars have done some of their best work: scarcely a page is there without some fine critical correction of Bentley's or Porson's or Dobree's. It is satisfactory to find from Kock's pages that the torch of Greek criticism is still being handed on in England. On p. 89, fr. 312, Kock adopts a certain emendation of the late Bishop Wordsworth, *ἄλμα* for *ἄλλα*: several of Mr. Ellis's might have been adopted, not only mentioned: when Dr. Blaydes shall have published his *Adversaria* on these fragments, which have already gone through the press, no doubt the contributions of our countrymen will be considerably augmented. Among foreigners in recent years who have exercised their genius on the text the first place is occupied by Cobet. Perhaps Dr. Kock is a little too ready to place Cobet's conjectures in the text. Thus on p. 115, fr. 402, he reads with Cobet *ἐπ' ἀμφότερον οὓς ἡπίκλῆρος ἢ καλὴ | μέλλει καθευδῆσαι* where the MSS. of Gellius give *ΑΜΦΟΤΕΡΑΝΙΝ* which is certainly the old reading *ἀμφότερα νιν*, and the better reading, for *νιν* is wanted. The Greeks said both *ἐπ' ἀμφότερα* and *ἐπ' ἀμφότερα τὰ ὅτα*: the Romans rather said *in utramque aurem*. Next to Cobet, Herwerden's emendations are most conspicuous and are often obviously right. We should have been glad to see more of them introduced into the text. Dr. Kock's own emendations are generally sensible and good, occasionally brilliant, and he is evidently a thorough metrical scholar. The caesura of the anapaest seems to be the rock on which emendators are most frequently wrecked. Even Cobet himself does not always escape: for instance, p. 175, he proposes *ἐν ταῖς παραχαῖς μάλιστα τὸν εὖ φρονούντα δέει*, where the MSS. give only *φρονούντα*: 'qua conjectura caesura corrumpitur.'

Some of the more striking of Kock's conjectures are the following: p. 91, *ἡγορασμένον δραχμῶν ἄγω προβάτιον ἀνάπῃρον δέκα*, where the MSS. of Athenaeus give *ἀγαπητόν*, which is however defensible and scarcely succumbs before Kock's illustration; p. 109, *πολλοὺς λυγισμοὺς ἢ πονηρία κυκλοῖ* where Stobaeus had *λογισμοὺς*—this, if we remember *λυγισμῶν καὶ στροφῶν* of Arist. *Ran.* 775, quite puts Cobet's *ἐλυγμοὺς* out of court; p. 186, *τὰ πῖ- θανον ἰσχὺν τῆς ἀληθείας ἔχει | ἐνίοτε μείζω καὶ πῖθανωτέραν ὄχλῳ*: the MSS. of Stobaeus give

τὸ πῖθανόν, the sense evidently requires something like *τὰ πῖθανον*, 'what is incredible'; p. 190, for *ὅταν τύχῃ τις εὐνοοῦντος οἰκέτου | οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κτῆμα κάλλιον βίῳ* Kock prefers *ὅταν ἀτυχῇ τις*, which gives a stronger sense. Kock introduces this into the text, but this is scarcely justifiable. He is however more than justified in substituting, p. 214, *ὑπεδεξάμην* 'I conceived,' for *ἐδεξάμην* which never bears this sense: *ὑπεδεξάμην, ἔτικτον, ἐκτρέφω, φιλῶ*. His parallel from Plat. *Menex.* 237 is by itself sufficient to establish his conjecture: *τῆς τεκούσης καὶ θρεψαμένης καὶ ὑποδεξαμένης*. P. 236: on the word *ἐκκορηθείης* Aristoph. *Pax* 59, a scholiast says *ὥς που καὶ ὁ Μένανδρος φησι πολλάκις*: Kock suggests *Παλλακῇ*, probably rightly. Dr. Blaydes had already suggested this to me. There are many other good conjectures in the volume; there are also many inferior ones: and there are places where Kock seems puzzled by a simple sentiment: thus on p. 210, *ἔστι δὲ | γυνὴ λέγουσα χρῆσθ' ὑπερβάλλον φόβος*, Kock remarks 'quid sibi velit φόβος non exputo.' Surely φόβος is a fearful prodigy, a 'monstrum': as Juvenal says, if a friend gives up a deposit, it is 'prodigiosa fides,' so Menander says that a woman talking rightly is a prodigy, which, though not a chivalrous, is quite an intelligible, nor absolutely groundless observation. On p. 69 the words *καυθάρων μελάντερος* are quoted from Photius and Suidas. Kock adds the remark 'verbis κ. μ. bestiola significari videtur': surely the words refer to a person: perhaps some girl 'nigrior formica pice graculo cicada,' as Martial has it, was described as κ. μελάντερα. On p. 424, in an anonymous fragment where a sterile field is described, 'which, like ladies, attends only to appearances,' *τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν, σχῆμα διατηρεῖ μόνον*, Kock is at a loss, although sense and construction are both fairly obvious, and reads *ρήμα*, connecting it with the next line, but giving no sense. On p. 242 Arsenius's remark is given that Menander called envy *πρόνοιαν τῆς ψυχῆς*: Kock rightly points out that *πρόνοιαν* is wrong, and suggests *παράνοιαν*: but it is very extraordinary, when he himself reminds us that Socrates called envy 'the saw of the soul,' that he should not see that *πρίονα* is to be here read for *πρόνοιαν*.

Kock and Meineke seem both to have missed a probable emendation in a fragment, p. 212: *φιλόνομος δ' ἐστὶ καὶ μία γυνή | εἰς μῆνιν*. Here Herwerden suggests *καὶ λίαν* omitting *εἰς μῆνιν*, which occurred to me also, but I now see that the true reading is *μιαρά*. This word *μιαρός* was often applied to a woman,

as a pestilent creature, cf. Arist. *Lysist.* 253, ἄμαχοι γυναῖκες καὶ μυαράι: here ἄμαχοι corresponds to φιλόνομος in the text; cf. also Frag. 535 (K) γυναῖκας ἐπλασεν ὦ πολυτίμητοι θεοί | ἔθνος μυαρόν.

In a fragment on love from Stobaeus, p. 67, Menander says that those who are not taken captive in youth pay the penalty by loving more violently in old age.

οἱ δ' εἰς τὸ γῆρας ἀναβολὰς ποιούμενοι
οὔτοι προσαποτίνουσι τοῦ χρόνου τόκους.

Propertius probably had this passage in his mind when he wrote 'Saepe venit magno fenore tardus Amor.' The MSS. of Stobaeus vary between τοῦ χρόνου and ὥραιους. This discrepancy indicates a word which the copyists could not make out; it is strange that τάρχαίω has not been suggested: these men pay interest as well as principal. I now find Hirschig has anticipated τάρχαίω.

P. 152, fr. 530, l. 17 seqq. : εἰ μὲν τι κακὸν ἀληθὲς εἶχες, Φειδία, | ζητεῖν ἀληθὲς φάρμακον τούτου σ' ἔδει· | νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔχεις· κενὸν εὔρηκα τὸ φάρμακον | πρὸς τὸ κενόν· οἰθήτηι δ' ὠφελεῖν τί σε. | περιμαξάτωσαν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κύκλῳ | καὶ περιθεωσάτωσαν.

In the third verse read κενὸν αἶρε καὶ τὸ φάρμακον | πρὸς τὸ κενόν· οἰθήντα δ' ὠφελεῖν τί σε | περιμαξάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες κ.τ.λ. The sense is: 'you have a trivial ailment: you need apply only a trivial remedy: but if you think it does you any good, let women rub you and lustrate you.'

P. 167, fr. 550, 551: Clemens Alexandrinus quotes these fragments, in the first of which Menander says every man has a good genius, but no bad genius: in the second that every god is good, or good in every respect. Clement carefully tells us the words may bear either meaning:

ἅπαντα δ' ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν θεόν.

The emendations mentioned by Kock (ἀγαθὸν οἰομ' εἶναι, Dobree: ἡγοῦμ' ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, Kock) are not likely; I think εἶναι τὸν is a corruption of ἐννοητέον, 'we must conceive of every god as good,' or 'conceive God to be good in every respect.' τὸν θεόν cannot be sound: for if it were, the ambiguity noticed by Clement would not be in the words. It is also to be noticed that in Clement's comments on the passage εἶναι does not occur; and that the verbal νομιστέον precedes.

On leaving Menander we come back to Athenaeus and his cooks: and there is plenty of fun to be derived from these bragging artists. Anaxippus gives us a cook

who varies his dishes according to the profession or age of the guests, p. 296, vs. 41:

ὅταν ἐγγὺς ᾖ τῷ δ' ἡ σορός ἀρτύω φακῇν
καὶ τὸ περιδείκνυν τοῦ βίου λαμπρὸν ποιῶ.

Here ᾖ τῷ δ' ἡ σορός is a good conjecture of Kock's own for ᾖν δὲ ὅδ' ἵστερος of the MS. Dobree had proposed ᾖ δ' ὁ σταυρός, but Athenians were not crucified. Hegesippus tells us of a cook (p. 312) the odour of whose dishes was like the voice of the Sirens: no one could pass by until he was dragged away by a man with nostrils gagged. Sosipater's cook (p. 314) claims a knowledge of architecture, astronomy, and military science. Among other things he must τοῦπτανιον ὁρθῶς καταβάλεισθαι, (vs. 39) a passage which strangely puzzles Dr. Kock; ὁπτανιον is παρὰ προσδοκίαν for θεμέλιον. Euphron exhibits an artist who found everything else anticipated by previous masters; so he made stealing his speciality. In this passage, p. 318, several emendations have been overlooked: in v. 19 πολλοὶ γέροντες should be πολλοὶ γέροντες. At l. 24, the thief-cook addressing his favourite pupil, who is rivalling his master at thieving, describes how that pupil forced sacrificers to sacrifice several victims, instead of one, stealing parts of the victim as it was sacrificed:

τὸ γὰρ ἦπαρ αὐτῶν πολλάκις σκοπουμένων
καθεῖς κάτω τὴν χεῖρα τὴν μίαν λαθὼν
ἔρριψας εἰς τὸν λάκκον ἱταμῶς τὸν νεφρόν.

Here τὴν μίαν should be τὴν λαϊάν. The left hand was the hand of thieving, (furtifica laeva). MIAN and ΛΑΙΑΝ are practically the same word.

Euphron claims even the poetic art as part of a cook's education; Damoxenus tells us that Epicurus was a cook. The line is corrupt:

A. μάγειρος ἦν κάκείνος, οὐκ ἦδει θεοί.
B. ποῖος μάγειρος;

For οὐκ ἦδει θεοί I suggest οὐκ (or ἡ οὐκ) ᾗδουσι ὅτι; cf. Arist. *Nub.* 229, ταῦτας μέντοι σὺ θεὰς οὐσας οὐκ ᾗδουσι οὐδ' ἐνόμιζες; cf. also Plaut. *Bacch.* i. 2, 13. Hirschig gives ὦ γῇ καὶ θεοί which is adopted by Kock. But in the first place this could scarcely have been mistaken: secondly, there is an obvious objection to place it in the mouth of either speaker.

Diphilus having been included in the second volume, fragments like these form the major part of the longer citations after

Menander. But there is an interesting fragment of Apollodorus of Carystus quite Aristophanic in tone where the pleasures of peace are commended. Fortune is blamed for preferring to see the Greeks at war (p. 281):

ἔξῃν ἱλαροὺς παίζοντας ὑποπεπωκότας
αἰλουμένους ἰδεῖν.

The MS. gives ὠδαι for ἰδεῖν, which is my own conjecture. There must be some mysterious objection to it, which I do not see. I do not understand Kock's σποδεῖν.

Of the new fragments which have for the first time been included in a collection the most interesting is the anonymous one, p. 420, found by Weil among the Egyptian papyri: in which a young man describes with all the ardour of a convert how he has found salvation in a philosophic school. It has some hard critical nuts to crack, which will repay the critic to attempt. I have not much more to add at present, but I may remark that on p. 302 the word lost after γελάσας¹ is probably ἡρέμα: that on p. 354 in the line αὐτοὺς παρασίτους τοῦ θεοῦ τοὺς Δηλίους the first word should be αὐτοῦ, 'parasites of the god himself'; that on p. 451 after the line γαμῶ γέρων εἰ οἶδα καὶ τοῖς γέιτοσιν the words γέλῳ² ὀφλήσω probably occurred.

The main external defects are the want of a good index, a work in itself, and of a separate list of the new fragments included for the first time: these are now scarcely to be detected after a tedious comparison of the lists headed K and M: and a separate list is especially desirable in this volume, which contains an enormous number of new Adespota. In Meineke's edition these occupy seventy-three pages, and number 498; in Kock's they fill 286 pages, and amount to 1582. Dr. Kock must have been at immense pains to collect these fragments. They are gathered from scholiasts, grammarians, lexicographers, rhetoricians, fathers, historians, philosophers, anecdotes: many of them quoted as verses, and consequently already, for the most part, known, and already published with the Comic Fragments: but many have up to this lain hid, poetic gems of various brilliancy embedded in a matrix of prose quotation, now for the first time detected by a careful miner, now first polished and set by a skilful lapidary. But Dr. Kock has been too comprehensive, too anxious to include everything that could possibly be regarded as a comic verse, or part of a comic verse: he has, there is no doubt, often set before us as verse what is

not verse at all. I could give several probable instances of this, but one which is quite certain will suffice. It is a most astonishing blunder, and one which Dr. Kock was about the most unlikely man in the world to commit. On p. 543, fr. 768 is thus given:

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι, χῶ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμ.....

Dr. Kock's note is:

'Cramer, *Anecd. Ox.* II. 408, 22, σφενδόνη· παρὰ τὸ σπένδω τὸ ἀναιρῶ κ.τ.λ., quae quamquam ipsa nocte sunt obscuriora, cum manifesto sint *tetrametri iambici reliquiae ex comoedia excerpti*, hic deesse nolui. Vocem καιρὸς sequebatur vocalis.'

So Kock writes. But this is no comic tetrameter Iambic. These are the sublime words of St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 6,¹ translated in our version: 'I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.' There have been great blunders on the part of great scholars, but this 'takes the cake,' to use a metaphor which is both Aristophanic and modern. And the reader would like to know what criterion Kock obeys in making up his verses, when he detects them in their bed of prose. On p. 480, he gives us this quotation from Theophylact Simocatta: ἡ δὲ πάχνη λυμαίνεται τοὺς καρποὺς ὡς ἀπαραίτητος τύραννος καὶ τοὺς ἰδρώτας ὁ τάλας τοῖς ἀνέμοις χαρίζομαι. From this Dr. Kock gives us fr. 381 thus:

τοῖσιν δὲ καρποῖς ἡ πάχνη λυμαίνεται
καὶ τοὺς ἰδρώτας τοῖς ἀνέμοις χαρίζομαι.

Why does he leave out the highly poetical ἀπαραίτητος τύραννος? Why does he leave out ὁ τάλας? These have as poetical a look as any part of the passage. The following may be nearer to the original verses supposing that there were verses at all:

τοῖσιν δὲ καρποῖς ἡ πάχνη λυμαίνεται,
τύραννος ἀπαραίτητος ὡς, καὶ τοὺς [ἐμούς]
ἰδρώτας ὁ τάλας τοῖς ἀνέμοις χαρίζομαι.

Many instances like this will present themselves to a careful reader. But this collection of Adespota will probably prove the most interesting part of the book to scholars of a critical turn. It will give them employment and amusement for years to come, and in spite of occasional short-comings is one of the most valuable additions to classic literature which have appeared during many years.

But a second article would be necessary to do this work anything like justice. It is not

¹ The concluding words in the Epistle are καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐφύεσθη.

so great a work as Meineke's, and in all probability would not have been completed without that edition, but is lighter, handier, and more instructive; it brings the critique up to the level of recent scholarship, and ordinary readers who possess Dr. Kock's edition, can dispense with both of Meineke's, between which this occupies a middle position

in respect of bulk. The tone of comment is pleasant, and not generally discourteous except towards Herwerden, to whom Dr. Kock seems to owe a grudge. On the whole the world of scholarship will heartily congratulate Dr. Kock 'de provincia tam diu administrata decedenti.'

A. PALMER.

EURIPIDES AS A PHILOSOPHER.

De Euripide Philosopho. J. BERLAGE.
Leyden. E. J. Brill, 1888.

THIS treatise—a thesis for the Doctor's degree at Leyden—leaves the impression, which under the circumstances may be considered highly favourable, that the author, when he had finished it, was ready to write a much better one.

The book (208 pages) is divided and subdivided into numerous heads, such as 'Quid Euripides de rerum natura senserit', with sections 'De ortu et interitu rerum' etc. Under each head the passages bearing on the subject are collected and compared, with a view to obtaining for result the opinion of Euripides. Such a classified collection is useful in itself; but the results, though not for that reason useless, are in great part negative. We cannot trace in Euripides with any certainty the doctrines characteristic of Anaxagoras or of Socrates; he cannot be shown to have favoured Alcibiades, or to have differed in his views of contemporary politics from the average man of the later Periclean age. Such is the upshot. The discussion, though sensible in the main, shows traces of immaturity and imperfect consideration, as for example in the pages on the origin of religion (p. 79), which do not rise above the level of a prize essay. Meanwhile however we remain without any answer to the main question of all. Since the *dicta* of Euripides on almost all subjects are as inconsistent as we might expect from a dramatist, how is it that his works leave upon us, and produced on such contemporaries as Aristophanes, so strong an impression of 'tendency', and what is their tendency?

But on p. 166 we find some remarks which, if true, are of such wide bearing and great importance, that they seem rather late in their appearance:—

ἀρετή autem apud Græcos fuit perfectio illarum facultatum quæ virum faciunt agendo strenuum et

iustum, cogitando subtilem; neque ea in homine otioso esse potest sed in cive tantum qui cum civium societate coniunctus vivit. Quamquam autem in illis sentiis nihil inest, cur non talem virtutem etiam Euripides sibi proposuerit, puto tamen aliter se rem habere. Omnia quæ nuperrime enumeravi exempla virtutis excelsæ; castitas singularis, mors petita non solum pro patria sed etiam pro singulorum hominum salute, iniuriæ condonatae, praecepta quæ non solum facta sed et cogitata sancta esse iubent cet., mihi videntur esse indicia rationum severiorum et religiosiorum, quas poetam, cum morum priscorum auctoritas dissoluta esset, in ancipiti illo bivio sibi elegisse supra disputavimus. Si præterea reputamus vitam otiosam potius laudasse quam publicam, non inepta mihi videtur suspicio etiam virtutem ei obversatam esse diversam ab antiqua illa ἀρετή, augustiorem scilicet eandemque angustiorum, morum sanctitatem magis spectantem quam virtutem civilem, omnino propius accedentem ad recentiorum sæculorum humanitatem.

These remarks, much more clear and comprehensive (notwithstanding the reference back) than anything which precedes them, seem to me on the whole as true as they are striking. They imply a view of the poet more complete and more just than is current in any book of authority, and it would have been well if Dr. Berlage had laid them down more distinctly as the foundation of his treatise. The offence of Euripides, as some judges then thought it, his profound merit and interest, as it may well appear to us, does not lie in this or that erroneous or pervertible maxim. It lies in this, that he was one of the first to desire, and to conceive as possible, the general improvement of man. He tends to place the worth and interest of human life primarily in the daily thought and daily action of the average individual, and next in those influences of common family life which bear most directly on the inner and outer life of the individual, after these, and as an instrument to these, in larger organizations and more ostentatious activities. In doing so, he necessarily becomes a critic, and a not very friendly critic, of the specially Hellenic morality made by and for the Hellenic πόλις. The improvement of education, the true 'sophistic', so far as that