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](#)

Rutherford's a Chapter in the History of Annotation A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica, Vol. III. By William G. Rutherford, Formerly Head-Master of Westminster. London: Macmillan & Co., 1905. 8vo. Pp. xii+494. 25s. net.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 1906, pp 115 - 117
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993843, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993843

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1906). Review of J. F. Handler, and Y. Hasenfeld 'Blame Welfare, Ignore Poverty and Inequality' The Classical Review, 20, pp 115-117 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993843

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

p. 177). Consult, for examples from the customs of savage nations, J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*², vol. i. pp. 10 *sqq.* Some further examples are cited in Macculloch's *The Childhood of Fiction* (1905), pp. 197, 8.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

* * *

BACCHYLIDEUM.—A minute error which took its rise in the editio princeps has run through all the subsequent recensions of Bacchylides. I tacitly amended in 1898 the one example which I had occasion to quote (C.R. xii p. 71 b), but the correction seems to have escaped notice. In the following passages, ix 39 Ἀσώπῳ παρὰ πορφυροδίαν, xi 26 Ἀλφειῷ παρὰ καλλιρδαν, 96 Λοῦσον ποτὶ καλλιρδαν, xvii 119 νᾶα παρὰ λεπτόπρυμον, the prepositions are falsely accentuated: they must suffer anastrophe and be *πάρα* and *πότι*. The contrary error στέρνοις τ' ἄμφι at xviii 53, which also I corrected in 1898 to ἄμφι (C.R. xii p. 74 b), is now set right in Mr Blass's

third edition by Mr W. G. Headlam, who has similarly amended the βάλωσιν ἄμφι of xix 7.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

* * *

ON HORACE, *Epodes* V. 29-31.

Abacta nulla Veia conscientia
lignonibus duris humum
exhauriebat.

In all editions and translations that I have seen, the first line is taken to mean 'deterred by no scruples of conscience.' I have never read the line in that way, but as I seem to be in a minority of one I propound my view with diffidence. Does it not mean 'excluded from no complicity,' i.e. admitted to full knowledge of their nefarious secrets? Certainly there is nothing in the usage of 'abigo'—as displayed in the new *Thesaurus*—or in that of 'conscientia,' to make this interpretation inadmissible. Is it not rather *more* likely that 'conscientia' has this simple meaning here?

W. R. HARDIE.

REVIEWS.

RUTHERFORD'S *A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF ANNOTATION.*

(*Scholia Aristophanica*, Vol. III.)

A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica, Vol. III.

By WILLIAM G. RUTHERFORD, Formerly Head-Master of Westminster. London: Macmillan & Co., 1905. 8vo. Pp. xii + 494. 25s. net.

It is common enough to meet with works of research that are mines of facts uninformed by originality or the generalizing reason. It is common enough too to meet with brilliant disquisitions, ingenious, stimulating, provocative, but unsustained with the solid work of the sapper and the miner. Such work as Dr. Rutherford's is too often a mere matter of desire. Anyone who should pass it by, suspicious of its title and its bulk, as if it were but provender for the grammarian, would miss what will repay study in many other ways. This is no lumber for the shelves of the professional Grecian: it abounds in hints, parallels deftly insinuated, allusions half concealed and half revealed to educational problems of the present day, and to sum up in one sentence the impression it leaves upon the mind, it is a book which every one interested in classical learning, every one anxious for the improvement of education, every one studious of our country's

future welfare, should read himself, should reflect on, and should discuss with all his friends. For it is indeed a notable ingredient that should do somewhat to leaven the mass of thought fermenting to-day in England ready to result in what strange amalgam of old and new, of practical and intellectual, who can prophesy?

Yet the partisan of any view who turns to Dr. Rutherford as to a sure ally will find his hopes surely blighted. Perhaps he goes to canvass this new comer for his vote on the side of Greek and scholarship. It is a wholesome drubbing—if that be not too rude a word for the mellow gentleness of persuasive exhortation which is habitual with the author—that he gets for his presumption. He is told that the Atticists ruined the Greek language, that Greek was made a dead language by the perverse folly which denied cosmopolitan or Hellenistic Greek to be fit for the educated to use, that men live in a gimcrack world who persist in an obsolete orthography instead of spelling as they speak, that it did a vast deal of harm when it was taught that for learning Greek it was indispensable to imitate the ancients, assiduously studying what they had been good enough to write out for others' advantage.

Or perhaps our partisan fondly imagines that one who can deliver such judgments must be zealous of natural science or the modern languages. Bitterly will he be undeceived, when he finds his hero still supposing it to be worth his while to settle minute points of Greek scholarship, absorbed heart and soul in admiration for the Greek point of view, and, if anything, resenting the necessity of teaching barbarians and attributing the degeneration of Greek, of learning, and of thought to the consequent blurring of the Greek view.

The reader will by this time have gathered some idea of the extraordinary interest and fascination the book will exercise over many minds. Yet he must not suppose that it is an illogical or rambling hotchpotch of random notions. It is nothing of the kind, but a methodically developed treatise by a mind not dwarfed and stunted by the drudgery of learning but elastic vigorous and above all original.

It is impossible to do justice within the necessary limits of this review to a tithe of the subjects which it would be a pleasure to discuss with Dr. Rutherford. Perforce, I must almost haphazard select one or two for consideration here.

Dr. Rutherford lays great emphasis on the divergence between the true and original Greek view of style, literature, the written word and the later view. To the Greek, he rightly bids us to impress upon ourselves, ἡ λέξις was the manner of speech into which ὁ καλῶς λέγων refined the fashion of speech in vogue amongst his neighbour Greeks. To the Greek τὰ γράμματα were dead symbols, from which must be recovered the living sounds. There is no doubt that an enormity of misconception has vitiated scholars' judgments solely in consequence of their not adequately grasping with lively imagination what Dr. Rutherford thus insists on. Whole cartloads of foolish diatribe might be shovelled away as rubbish from the studies of theologians, especially those who deal with the Old Testament, if every one of them were compelled to read this Introduction before beginning his proper subject. Yet when Dr. Rutherford goes on to urge that this original Greek view is superior to the later, misgivings arise in the reader's mind. He begins indeed to think that the separation which the author abhors between educated and uneducated may be perhaps theoretically vain in his eyes, yet has never been practically removed by him. Otherwise he would have discovered that the peasant or artisan who knows English alone, is the slave of

ambiguities just as the Greek was. Only the contact with barbarians, the illumination shed by comparison with another not too similar tongue, has ever removed and, it would seem, ever will remove these fallacies and sophisms which bewilder and betray the monoglot. It is this that makes Plato's slighter dialogues legitimately contemned by the modern schoolboy. I myself from boyhood for some years liked no Greek prose style as I did Plato's. But in these more rapid days, it seems as if a Sixth Form boy felt it waste of time to demolish elaborately a verbal quibble—he is rarely amused by it. Historically interesting it may be to assist at the first struggles of the Greek logician to put an edge on his instruments—but a modern boy's verdict on them is uncompromising, that they are puerile. Only such a dialogue as the *Phaedo*, where these consequences of knowing one language only are not apparent, can—and it does so preeminently—overpower and transport his imagination and feelings, to the contentment of the most jealous champion of Plato's honour.

I make no doubt that contact with Rome, with Egypt and the East developed, improved, clarified the Greek's intellect. The subsequent decadence is attributable—at least such a view is arguable—not to that contact which Dr. Rutherford seems to think its almost sufficient explanation, but to the lamentable persistence of dead tradition, which the author also holds to be in part responsible, the barbarian troubles and general insecurity of life, and the blighting doctrine that, all knowledge once scheduled into an encyclopaedic form, no substantial progress in discovery and invention remained for man.

To turn to a very different subject for discussion, the author devotes one of his longer notes to the examination of the evidence for an ordered commentary embracing more plays than one of Aristophanes. Others have concluded that there was evidence for such an order in the annotation of the plays as *Plutus*, *Clouds*, *Frogs*, *Knights*, *Acharnians*, *Wasps*, *Peace*, *Birds*, *Thesmophoriazusai*, *Ecclesiaz.*, *Lysistrata*. Dr. Rutherford has no difficulty in shewing that the evidence is very scanty, and himself concludes that what little there is indicates no order at all. That this is a hasty conclusion, the evidence he quotes will serve to shew. On *Clouds* 239 the *ven.* says ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ἔπους φθάναντι αὐτῷ εἰρηται ἐν Εἰρήνῃ. Again on *Wasps* 61 the *ven.* has κατ' αὐτοῦ (i. e. Euripides) καθῆκε τὰς Θεσμοφοριαζούσας.

φησὶν οὖν οὐ δεύτερον ταυτολογῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ. If we take these statements at their face-value and suppose them to refer to the order of the plays in a collected edition, we have two facts, viz. that the *Peace* preceded the *Clouds*, and the *Thesmoph.* preceded the *Wasps*. On *Peace* 92 we read *ἔφη δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις*, and this Dr. Rutherford supposes to contradict the previously quoted comment. But this form of expression, with no definite word for 'previously' added, seems always to be used when the commentator intends to say that another example will be found in a play later in the edition. If this observation be sound, we have *Birds* 1058 *ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν Ἰππεύσι πεποίηκε* *Peace* 199 *ὡς καὶ ἐν ταῖς Σφηξίν εἴρηκεν* 432 *προεῖρηται* (but *εἴρηται καὶ ven.*) *ἐν ταῖς Σφηξίν*. 756 *εἶπεν ἐν τοῖς Ἰππεύσιν* *Plut.* 797 *καὶ ἐν ταῖς Σφηξίν* *Frogs* 567 *Κλέωνα εἰς ὃν γέγραφεν τοὺς Ἰππείας* *Thesm.* on the other hand 162 *καὶ ἐν τῷ πρὸ τούτου δράματι ταῖς Ὀρνισι, καὶ ἐν Σφηξίν* (with which a note so near as 168 *καὶ ἐν ταῖς Ὀρνισιν* cannot fairly be pretended to disagree) *Wasps* 62 *ὃν ἐκωμώδησεν ἐν τοῖς Ἰππεύσι*. It will be observed that the comment on *Thesm.* 162 agrees with that on *Wasps* 61 if our interpretation of the usage be correct. We should thus get something like the following order for the plays in the collected edition: (*Lysistrata*)¹ *Birds*, *Thesmophoriazusai*, *Plutus*, *Peace*, *Frogs*, *Wasps* (or *Wasps*, *Peace*, *Frogs*, if we do not follow *ven.* at *Peace* 432), *Knights*, *Clouds*. But we have not quite exhausted Dr. Rutherford's list of comments. *Birds* 822 *προεῖρηται ὅτι πένης οὗτος* he rightly passes by—*Theogenes* was mentioned in *Peace* 928, *Wasps* 1183, the *Hours* as well as *Lysist.* 63. So *Birds* 1296 *ὁ Χαιρεφῶν προεῖρηται* might refer to any of several non-extant plays as much as *Clouds* 104, etc. or *Wasps* 1408. *Frogs* 932 *προεῖρηται* he refers to *Birds* 800 or *Peace* 1177—it will be seen how this agrees with our scheme. *Birds* 988 he decides to be in the main a hopeless 'hash,' but *εἴρηται ἐτέρωθι* of *Knights* 1084 is clear enough. *Clouds* 371 *αἰθρίαν ἐν ἐκτάσει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν παρηγοῦμεν* well suits our order for that play, whether the reference is to *Plut.* 1129 or not. *Wasps* 418 *ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτου εἴρηται* may refer to 42 or to *Birds* 1701 and *Wasps* 1270 *προεῖρηται* he decides cannot safely be supposed to refer to *Clouds* 109.

There remain one or two undebateable instances, Dr. Rutherford holds. Confining ourselves to those dealing with extant plays,

we have *Lysist.* 801 *δύο Μυρωνίδαι ἦσαν ὡς ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησιαζούσαις δεδῆλωται*, which, he determines, describes a note on the *Eccl.* as antecedent to this on the *Lysist.* Similarly *Peace* 797 *καὶ ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις δὲ εἶπον*, he interprets in a sense opposite to what our theory would require. His view does not seem incontestable and the rule above suggested would still be entirely reconcileable with all these statements. So on *Birds* 750 *περὶ ὧν ἐν Βατράχοις ἰκανῶς εἰρήκασι*, even if we read *εἰρήκαμεν*, it may be questioned whether the meaning is not satisfied by supposing in accordance with our suggestion that a note on a subsequent play is referred to. And *Wasps* 496 *ἐν Ἰππεύσι εἴρηται περὶ αὐτοῦ* and 1206 *εἴρηται περὶ Φαύλλου ἐν τοῖς Ἀχαρνεύσιν* may support our theory and fix the *Acharnians* to follow the *Wasps*.

Here I must end. How Galen is pressed into the author's service to illuminate Greek life and thought; how the meaning of catechetical instruction is elucidated; how ancient practice warrants the importance of the master, like Dr. Kennedy, giving a fluent and vigorously dramatic interpretation at the end of a classical lesson, rather than one meticulously faithful but slow and frigid; how scholium after scholium can be traced to a scheme of suitable comment naturally adopted by the professional γραμματικός; how some are due to the desire for dramatic recital, others to the artificial criticism that tabulated the Tropes—still faintly surviving in some grammars—others to the change, decay, or renewed youth of the Greek tongue, yet others to the effort for the instillation into the half-educated of some vigilance for poetical propriety—all this the reader will find with a multitude of illustrations in Dr. Rutherford.

Once the author observes that the fact is certainly odd that the scholia to Aristophanes should seldom refer to the errors of transcribers. But the solution of the problem is not far to seek. The γραμματικός dictated to his pupils what he fancied the text to be—often correctly enough, for he would know the work in the main by heart, and used the script merely to assist or prompt his memory. To this extent I feel less sceptical than the author of the substantial permanence in the century or two after Alexander of the classical texts.

Of misprints I have noted scarcely any: p. 10 note 2, line 13 *παροῦσιν* must be wrong and presumably p. 68, line 12 *ἀνεν τό*; p. 64, line 21 read perhaps *ἐριζομένων*; p. 415 notes, col. 2 should *ἀρρώστου* be read and *ἀνέστη*?

T. NICKLIN.

¹ See immediately below.