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](#)

The Language of Aristophanic Parody *The Language of Parody: a Study in the Diction of Aristophanes*. By E. W. Hope. Baltimore: J. H. Furst Company, 1906. Pp. 62.

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 06 / September 1908, pp 192 - 192

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0000192X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0000192X

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1908). The Classical Review, 22, pp 192-192 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0000192X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

printing ('acocunt' *Oed.* 709, 'breats' *Oed.* 1053, 'lossened' *Phaed.* 1085, 'whate're' *Herc. Oet.* 1354, 'all my, myself' *Med.* 176, 'Crysippus' in the argument to the *Thyestes*, incorrect punctuation in *Phaed.* 215 and

Med. 727). The paper and binding are hardly in keeping with the worth of the book.

HAROLD L. CLEASBY.

Syracuse University.

THE LANGUAGE OF ARISTOPHANIC PARODY.

The Language of Parody: a Study in the Diction of Aristophanes. By E. W. HOPE. Baltimore: J. H. Furst Company, 1906. Pp. 62.

THE aim of this interesting study is to collect, and to present in alphabetical order, those poetical or non-Attic words which Aristophanes uses in humorous contrast with the current language of his own day. The task is arduous, since it is not easy to determine what the ordinary Attic prose of, or near, Aristophanes' time really was. Greek prose is a very different thing, according as it is written by Thucydides or Xenophon, Antiphon or Andocides, Plato or Aristotle. Good guidance, however, is to be had from Lysias, and also from Aristophanes himself if he be read with constant care and discrimination.

In the present dissertation the words collected are marked with numbers denoting that they fall under one or more of the following divisions: *epic, lyric, tragic, poetic, Ionic, old-Attic, Doric, doubtful, obsolete, un-Attic*. The following words, chosen almost at random from the large number here brought together, may serve to suggest the nature of the work undertaken by Mr. Hope, who in each case gives an interesting note: *ἀγανός, ἀγνιά, αἰδέομαι, ἄλκιμος, ἄλοχος, ἄσσον, βαίός, βέλος, βλέφαρον, γαῦρος, δόμος, δρασείω, δύστηνος, δυσχείμερος, δῶμα, ἔδραι, ἔμολον, ἐξώπιος, ἐσθλός, ἔφεξις, ἥπύω, θέλω, θήγω, ἰνδάλλομαι, καταδοκέω, κάρτα, κέλευθος, κλύω, κραδαίνω, λῆμα, λίσσομαι, μέριμνα, μυθίζω, ναίω, νείκος, νέφος, ξυρέω, δῖς, ὀργή (= τρόπος), πάπαι, πάρος (= πρὸ τοῦ), πάτρα (= πατρίς), παῦρος, πῆληξ, πλάτη, ποθεινός, πόσις, σκάφος, στυγερός, τέκνον, τηλοῦ (= πόρρω), τλήμων,*

τύμβος, φάος, φρήν, φροῦδος, φώς, χθόνιος, χρήζω.

Such a list as this will help to show the industry of the writer, and the variety of the matter which he presents with much intelligence and skill and with but few errors of detail. He rightly lays stress (pp. 3, 42) on the fact that, after some Aristophanic character has used a poetical word, another within the next few lines will use the prose equivalent for it, or the Attic equivalent, if an Ionic or otherwise non-Attic word has preceded: e.g. *οἷς . . . πρόβατον* (*Pax* 929-937). In the list of helpful books, one misses any mention of Dunbar's *Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes* and of Beatson's *Indices in Tragicos Graecos*. On p. 11 *ἄλγος* should hardly be given as distinctively a prose word. More might perhaps have been said about certain tragic usages of the particles. Good use has, however, been made of some interesting points offered by the Fragments. The line *οὕτως αὐτοῖς ἀταλαιπώρως ἢ ποίησις διέκειτο* in the *Danaides* does not fall within the scope of Mr. Hope's dissertation, but its close resemblance to Thucydides' well-known phrase is very curious.

Any scholar who has worked systematically through all the Plays and Fragments of Aristophanes and has noted down all the literary references contained in them will know how copious is the material. Mr. Hope's dissertation does not take so wide a range as this. But modest as its compass is, it serves to bring into strong relief the fact that Aristophanes was not only a caricaturist but a critic,—a literary critic possessed of literary genius.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.