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](#)

Ajax of Sophocles. A Revised Text with Brief English Notes for School Use. By F. A. Paley, M.A., LL.D. Cambridge: Deighton Bell & Co. 1888.

R. T.

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 07 / July 1888, pp 205 - 205
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019290X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019290X

How to cite this article:

R. T. (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 205-205 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019290X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Pelignian, *pros* (= * *paros*, *paucos*) 14, where the Latin form of the suffix appears.

Voc. -same as Nom. (Celt. same as Acc.)

In Latin, e.g. *divi*, *pueri*, *fili*; in Umbrian

e.g. *Ikuvinus*, *Ikuvinu*, *Iiovinur* (never with the *o* vowel) Tab. Ig.

WALLACE M. LINDSAY.

(To be continued.)

Die Wolken des Aristophanes ERKLÄRT VON W. S. TEUFFEL. Zweite Auflage, bearbeitet von OTTO KAEHLER. Leipzig. B. G. Teubner. 1887. 2 Mk. 70.

JUST twenty years have elapsed between the publication of the first and second edition of this book. Twenty years is a long while in an era prolific in criticism; and the task of bringing this edition up to date has extended it from pp. 184 to 221. But Kaehler never forgets that his duty has been to prepare a new edition, not to write a new book; though he has subjected it to a careful and conscientious revision. He neatly describes his editorial work as similar to the change between the earlier and later editions of the original play, described in the sixth *hypóthesis* in these words: *τοῦτο ταῦτόν ἐστι τῷ προτέρῳ διεσκευάσθαι δὲ . . . καθόλου . . . σχεδὸν παρὰ πᾶν μέρος γεγεννημένη ἡ διόρθωσις. τὰ μὲν γὰρ περιήρηται, τὰ δὲ παραπέλεκται καὶ μετεσχημάτισται.* In the various sections of the Introduction may be noticed the full and satisfactory additions to the bibliography of Aristophanes; and a largely increased list of books and articles of critical research on the text, scholia, grammar, and especially on the stage-arrangements of the plays and particular disposition of the parts. Herr Kaehler avails himself largely of the studies of A. Müller (*Lehrbuch der griech. Bühnenaltertümer*. Freib. 1886) and Zieliński (*die Gliederung der allatt. Kom.* Leipzig. 1885).

The changes in the commentary are not serious, although the editor claims to have considered it sentence by sentence. It is still Teuffel's commentary of twenty years ago, and the slight amount of change found requisite by such a careful reviser is a high testimony to the value of the first edition. Among the principal alterations we may note that Kaehler (l. 35) changes Teuffel's *ἐνεχυράσασθαι* (Rav.) to *ἐνεχυράσασθαι*, supporting his views in a note in the *Krit. Anhang*. In l. 44 he quotes Holzinger as establishing a pun between *ἀκόρητος* and *κόρις*, which is hardly likely to secure acceptance. In 195 the difficulty of *εἰσιτε* as addressed to the *μαθηταί* is further cleared; and good notes, either new or recast, are given on *ταῦτα=ideo*, l. 319; *μᾶ*, l. 330; the *στρατηγία* of Cleon, l. 582; the allusion in *κατὰ μικρόν* to the Socratic philosophy, l. 741; *Δισχύλον πρῶτον ἐν ποιηταῖς*, l. 1366.

Kaehler admits very few changes into the text, except a few slight ones like *πλὴν εἰ* for *πλὴν ἢ*, or *μή μοι γε* for *μή μοι γε*. But he accepts G. Hermann's emendation (l. 662), *τῇ τε θηλείᾳ καλεῖς | ἀλεκτρυόνα καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκ τῶν ἄρρενα*, and (l. 880) he approves Naber's conjecture of *σκύνιας* for *σκυνίας*. In line 334, where *οὐδὲν δρῶντας* seems to be tautological by the side of *ἀργούς*, he would break up the lines, as suggested by Piccolomini, making the words of Socrates end with *οὐδὲν δρῶντας*, and assigning the next words thus: ΣΤΡ. *Βόσκουσ' ἀργούς; ΣΩ. ὅτι γ' αὐτὰς μουςποιούσιν.* In the *Kritischer Anhang*, Kaehler is disposed to acknowledge the difficulty in

l. 6—*ἀπόλοιο δῆτ', ὃ πόλεμε, πολλῶν εἵνεκα | ὅτ' οὐδὲ κ.τ.λ.*, because the *many reasons* are reduced to *one*: and he would read *πολλῶν θ' εἵνεκα, χῶτ' οὐδέ*. But is a change necessary? A parenthesis is much more likely to settle the form of a sentence in Aristophanes than considerations of logic. Kaehler has also a good note on l. 523, *πρώτην ἀναγεῖναι*, where he proposes to read *πρῶτός*, as an echo of the Homeric *πρῶτος γεύσασθαι*, *Od.* 17. 413. The edition does not profess to be a critical one; but Kaehler's appendices on the readings of the Codd. Par. A, and Florent. Δ, and a selection from RV (A) show him to be a master in the minute study of the text.

In welcoming this excellent edition, we must be permitted to offer a friendly remonstrance to Herr Teubner for leaving the list of his Schulausgaben so long with only one play of Aristophanes announced. And we will ask him to make atonement and earn our gratitude by setting Professor Kaehler to work on a further instalment. W. W. M.

Ajax of Sophocles. A Revised Text with Brief English Notes for School Use. By F. A. PALEY, M.A., LL.D. Cambridge: Deighton Bell & Co. 1888.

THE brief notes in this edition will be found of course to be sound and useful. The renderings do not aim at artistic finish; and one does not like to read that Ajax was 'sulky with Odysseus' and 'crusty to Tecmessa.' But can the text be said to be revised? One turns at once to v. 1281, and one finds the old and demonstrably wrong reading—

ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φῆς οὐδὲ συμβῆναι ποδί.

It is true that the note recognises the absurdity of such a statement about Ajax as that he 'never faced in fight'—some one or something, presumably a foe. It even suggests a very improbable recasting of the whole verse. But there is no allusion to one of the best conjectures ever made, the certain emendation of Madvig in *Adv. Crit.* vol. iii.

ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φῆς οὐδ' σὺ μὴ βῆναι ποδί.

When one compares this with v. 1237

ποῖ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος οὐπερ οὐκ ἐγώ

and reflects how certainly the mistake of *οὐδ'* for *οὐ* (which nine out of ten scribes would certainly have made) would have led to the corrupt reading which stands in Dr. Paley's text, one wonders did the editor overlook the emendation, or could he possibly have rejected it? R. T.

Quid sibi in dialogo cui Cratylus inscribitur proposuerit Plato. By C. CUCUEL. Lutetiae Parisiorum. Ernest Leroux edidit viâ dictâ Bonaparte, 28. 1886. 3 fr. 50.

IN the first part of this dissertation for doctor's degree the writer, by way of elucidating the design of