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](#)

Starkie's *Wasps* of Aristophanes *The Wasps* of Aristophanes: with Introduction, Metrical Analysis, Critical Notes, and Commentary, by W. J. M. Starkie, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, Late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Macmillan & Co.'s Classical Series. 1897.) 6s.

R. J. G. Mayor

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 09 / December 1898, pp 449 - 451

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033709, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033709

How to cite this article:

R. J. G. Mayor (1898). Review of Prakash Shah 'Law and Ethnic Plurality: Socio-legal Perspectives' The Classical Review, 12, pp 449-451 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033709

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

made under the direction of Gaspare, finished on the 19th of October, 1375, and sent to Coluccio; and that from this copy a scribe wrote the MS. which has now been found in Rome, leaving out entirely, as unessential, the address to the reader at the end, while another copyist, at this time or later, wrote the MS. G, copying most of the address to the reader, but dismissing all that came after the *laborabat in extremis* with the phrase *etc.*? If these surmises are probable, they certainly open up considerations which are not without consequence for the critical foundations of the study of the text of Catullus. In a word, Professor Schulze ought, in my opinion, to have seen, on many grounds, that the MS. deserved a good deal more than the passing glance which his work shows that he has given it.

As for myself, my belief is that the collation of R, while it, of course, will not transform the text of Catullus (Professor Schulze himself has pointed out, in urging the value of M in an earlier article in the *Hermes*, xxiii. p. 591, that not even the discovery of O was able to do this, since all our MSS. go back to a common source), will, taken in connection with other collations that need to be made, enable us to determine once and for all on what the critical foundations of the restitution of the text shall be based. I believe that I see, with great probability, what these foundations will be. But complete certainty can be attained only by one who has before him complete collations, not only of the three great MSS. (for I still, in spite of Professor Schulze's disappointment, regard R as a MS. of the same rank with O and G),

but of a sufficient number of the seventy or more secondary MSS. to represent fairly well the whole mass of tradition for which they stand. Messrs. Burton, Denison, Tamblyn and Holmes, members of the School in Rome during my Directorship, collated four MSS. in the Vatican, to which I shall attach the sigla W, X, Y, and Z. Messrs. Shipley and Dixon, likewise members of the School, collated A and B respectively, soon afterward. Mr. Dixon has since that time returned to Europe to make collations of P (Parisinus 7989), C, A (Ellis's La¹) La², Ricc. 606, Vaticanus 1630, D, H, L, and M. He was recalled to this country before the last four collations were made, but I have since provided for them. With the help of Mr. Dixon and Mr. Washburn, Fellows of the University of Chicago, I plan to put out a complete collation of A B C D G H L A La² M O P R T Vat. 1630 W X Y Z and Ricc. 606, together with the conclusions to which we come with regard to the main lines of descent, and the very complicated inter-relationships, of the secondary MSS. This done, I propose to publish a continuous restored text of the lost Verona MS. (uncertain restorations being indicated by underlining), with a critical apparatus comprising the readings of those MSS. which have survived the tests. I hope that by that time Professor Schulze will have been able to give a little more thought to the matter, so that he will not say of these things, as he has done of R, that he does not see 'wie die Kritik des Catull durch sie weiter gefördert werden kann.'

WM. GARDNER HALE.

The University of Chicago.

STARKIE'S WASPS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Wasps of Aristophanes: with Introduction, Metrical Analysis, Critical Notes, and Commentary, by W. J. M. STARKIE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, Late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Macmillan & Co.'s Classical Series. 1897.) 6s.

THE preface states that this edition 'is intended to supply a general introduction to the study of Aristophanes.' It may be doubted whether the *Wasps* is the best play with which to introduce a beginner to Aristophanes: the details of the Athenian law-court system are not of much interest

to modern readers, and there is nothing in the play, except the Marathon chorus, which is up to the poet's highest level. Apart from this there can be little fault to find with the way in which the editor has done his work. The book is not, like so many publications intended for school use, a mere epitome of matter to be found in previous editions. Mr. Starkie shows a thorough acquaintance with the literature bearing on Aristophanes and his times, and he has produced an edition of first-rate importance which should satisfy the requirements, not of beginners only, but of advanced students. A specially valuable feature of the book is

the introduction, which contains a full account of the structure of an Aristophanic drama and of the metres employed, giving much information not hitherto brought together in a form accessible to English readers. The bibliography of Aristophanic literature will also be found very useful. In an edition meant for beginners it might have been well to add a short sketch of the development of Athenian comedy and of Aristophanes' career: nearly all that would be needed is to be found scattered through the notes, but it would have been more conveniently available if brought together in the introduction.

The text has been carefully treated. The more important variant readings and suggestions are given at the foot of the page, and points of special difficulty are thoroughly discussed in a critical appendix. The new emendations proposed are not numerous, but are in every case worth consideration. Mr. Starkie has followed Zielinski in transposing lines 1265-91 and lines 1450-73. The alteration is a plausible one and would certainly have been worth mention in the notes; but it is doubtful whether rearrangements of this kind deserve to appear in the text. The gain in logical connexion is slight, and the departure from the old numbering of the lines produces a good deal of confusion.

The notes are full and accurate on both grammatical and historical points: the translations given are usually vigorous, and succeed very satisfactorily in preserving the order of the words, a point of much importance for the appreciation of Aristophanic humour. Mr. Starkie has perhaps now and then gone rather too far in his attempts to give his commentary an up-to-date flavour: for instance his explanation of the *μανρεία* of Eurycles by a reference to Trilby (note on line 1022) is unnecessary and will, we may hope, before long be unintelligible. On the other hand all students of Athenian history will be grateful to him for the note (line 895) in which he illuminates the description of Cleon as *κύων τοῦ δήμου* by quoting Heine's picture of Cobbett.

The passage in the *Wasps* which presents most points for discussion is no doubt Bdelycleon's speech (lines 650-718). It seems clear that Bdelycleon is here the mouthpiece of the political views held by Aristophanes and the party of young aristocrats with whom he was in sympathy; and the speech is consequently of first-rate importance for the comprehension of the poet's general standpoint, as well as for the light

which it throws on questions of Athenian economy. Mr. Starkie's notes are here as usual careful and instructive, but it seems to me that he has not quite grasped the true force of the argument. He adopts Rogers's view that the *ἀρχαία νόρος* attacked by Bdelycleon is not the jury system in general, but the alliances between the demagogues and the dicasts; and, if I understand him rightly, he thinks that Aristophanes wishes to break up this alliance by showing that the dicasts are unjustly deprived by the demagogues of their due share of the state revenues. Surely the more obvious view is the right one, and what Aristophanes means to attack is the jury system as a whole; though no doubt the attack is to some extent masked. But when he complains with mock sympathy that the jurymen's fees do not amount to so much as a tenth of the entire revenue of the state, the irony is unmistakable: the audience are meant to feel, not that the dicasts are underpaid, but that they are scandalously overpaid. If this is the intention of the passage, we must make allowance for it in drawing conclusions from the figures quoted. It is to Aristophanes' interest to make as high an estimate as possible of the expenditure in dicasts' fees: consequently we may expect to find that the figures on which this estimate is based are considerably exaggerated: and this fact has been generally recognized, though on Mr. Starkie's view of the passage the exaggeration would be inexplicable. It is also to Aristophanes' interest to give a low estimate of the total revenue, so as to make the disproportion between the two senses appear more glaring; and this is a strong ground for believing that the 2000 talents is an understatement, rather than, as usually supposed, an overstatement; though in the absence of corroborative evidence the point must remain doubtful.

The note on line 56 makes I think an unnecessary difficulty of the relations between Eupolis and Aristophanes. We know that the two dramatists were political allies and collaborated in the Knights: and we also find that they seem to take every occasion of attacking one another in their plays. Mr. Starkie and others have invented a breach of friendship to account for this: but it seems more natural to suppose that these attacks were merely an ingenious arrangement for mutual advertisement. Most of the criticisms which Aristophanes brings against the dramatic methods of Eupolis would apply equally well to his own. In lines 407-8, where the best MSS. give *ἀλλὰ θαιμάτια*

λαβόντες ὡς τάχιστα, παῖδια, θέϊτε καὶ βοᾶτε, Mr. Starkie has adopted the reading βαλόντες. It is no doubt true, as he says, that the ἱμάτια must belong to the chorus, but I do not see that this is inconsistent with the retention of the reading λαβόντες. The old men would certainly wear their cloaks while waiting in the streets in the early morning: then when they prepare to use force against Bdelycleon, they give them to the boys to hold: this is not incompatible with the fact that the boys, or some of them, are to run for help. In line 536 the reading of the MSS., εἶπερ, δὲ μὴ γένοιθ', οὗτός σ' ἐθέλοι κρατῆσαι, is corrected by the ingenious emendation σ' ἔθ' ἔλοι κρατῆσας, which is almost certainly right. In the difficult passage 1017 *seqq.* Mr. Starkie provides a satisfactory construction by altering εἰς to ὥστε

(line 1020): but his further suggestion of κομῆσαι (line 1024) is hardly convincing, though ἐκτελέσαι is no doubt wrong. In line 1290 ἐπιθήκισα is taken as referring to the *Clouds*, but this hardly seems likely in view of the fact that Aristophanes elsewhere prides himself on the καινόταται διάνοιαι of that play.

I have noticed the following misprints. In the text line 659 καὶ should be omitted: in the notes, on line 849 for Bdelycleon read Philocleon, on line 1312 for Philocleon read Sthenelus: on p. 395 for 'εἰσφορά line 60' read 'εἰσφορά line 41.' By a curious slip Mr. Starkie speaks throughout the book of H. (instead of U.) von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff.

R. J. G. MAYOR.

HILL'S SOURCES FOR GREEK HISTORY.

Sources for Greek History, B.C. 478-431.

Collected and arranged by G. F. HILL, M.A., of the British Museum. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1897. 10/6.

MR. HILL is a specialist in coins, a subject in which the student, if he is to work at it at all, must ever be face to face with his original sources. It is this, perhaps, that has inspired him to come over and help the unhappy Greek historian, who is ordinarily removed from his evidences by a cloud of commentary, and can only get at them by undergoing the maximum amount of unnecessary labour. Mr. Hill has earned the gratitude of all students of the πεντήκοντα ἔτη. It is possible now to read one's Busolt with profit, without an armoury of books by one's side. I do not say that for a final decision on every disputed point it would be wise to take this list of sources as exhaustive. Space has compelled a certain amount of selection, and here and there, as I shall show later, perfection will only be reached in a second edition. But it would not be going too far to say that in nine cases out of ten the researcher or lecturer who wishes to shake himself free for a moment from other men's theories, and review the evidence for himself without prejudice, will find this book clear and adequate. He would, too, be indeed a well-equipped historian if he did not here and there find an inscription or a reference that had previously escaped him.

The interesting record of the construction of a guard-house on the Akropolis ὁ[πος] ἂν δραπέτες μὲ ἐ[σί]ει μεδὲ λοποδύ[ες] (Ch. iv. p. 196 = *C.I.A.* iv. p. 140, 26a) will be new to some, while many will not yet have read their last edition of Busolt thoroughly enough (iii. 1, pp. 426, 7) to realise what a gap has been filled in our knowledge of the events of 446/445. Even in that dry light the story reads vividly enough, of how the three tribes honoured Pythion the Megarian, who saved them at that great débâcle, ἐκ Παγῶν ἀγαγὼν διὰ Βουωτῶν ἐς Ἀθήνας (Ch. iii. p. 131 = *C.I.A.* ii. 1675). Though Köhler published the article which interpreted the epitaph aright in *Hermes* for 1889 (p. 92 *seq.*), this most exciting of inscriptions has not found its way into Beloch (1893), Holm (Eng. Trans. 1895), Forbes, Thuc. i. (1895), nor even into Frazer's note on Pausanias x. 15, 1 (1898). Classen-Steup. Thuc. i. (1897) mentions it, but dismisses it summarily in the most uncritical fashion. It will be worth while then for everyone—except perhaps Professor Busolt—to read through this book on the chance of adding to knowledge.

Mr. Hill himself, however, disclaims writing this book for the advanced scholar except in a secondary degree. Its main object is to be a reference book for lecturers and their pupils. There is certainly no book in existence on ancient history which could be used so well for developing the historical