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](#)

Blaydes' *Sophoclis Antigone Sophoclis Antigone*: denuo recensnit et brevi annotatione critica instruxit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes, M.A., Oxon. Halis Saxonum: 1905. Pp. 104. Price M. 2.

E. H. Blakeney

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 06 / July 1906, pp 308 - 309
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994691, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994691

How to cite this article:

E. H. Blakeney (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 308-309 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994691

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS.

BLAYDES' *SOPHOCLIS ANTIGONE*.

Sophoclis Antigone: denuo recensuit et brevi annotatione critica instruxit FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES, M.A., OXON. Halis Saxonum: 1905. Pp. 104. Price M. 2.

It is nearly half a century ago since Dr. Blaydes issued the first instalment of his edition of Sophocles; this instalment contained the Trilogy. During the interval that has elapsed since 1859, he has completed the Sophocles, issued an edition of Aristophanes in some dozen or more volumes; has published *Adversaria* upon most of the Greek classical authors, as well as an edition of the Aeschylean Trilogy; and now, in extreme old age, has girded himself to the task of re-editing the Sophoclean Trilogy. Of that edition—which is almost wholly 'critical'—two parts are already out; the third, containing the 'Antigone', is before us. The Nestor of English philologists has not laid his pen aside even yet; on the cover of the book now under notice we observe the announcement:

SUB PRELO: ANALECTA COMICA
GRAECA.

It is, indeed, a wonderful record of work achieved; and we must all heartily congratulate Dr. Blaydes on the services he has rendered to the cause of Classical philology. If this scholar's work is less known in England than it ought to be, he cannot complain of any lack of attention in Holland and Germany.

The present work exhibits all Dr. Blaydes's virtues, and vices, as a commentator. There is the same wealth of conjecture, the same maddening iteration, the same tantalizing incompleteness in the survey of the critical field. Despite all that Jebb has done for Sophocles, in our generation, Dr. Blaydes takes singularly little account of his work (except, possibly, in the 'Addenda').

Let me take one or two examples of what is implied in the above animadversion.

In the *Antigone* there are two instances where the older scholia give a sure clue to a reading otherwise lost. The first is l. 40, the second l. 235. As regards the former passage (where the MSS give *θάπτονσα*), Blaydes reads as follows:

κλαίονσ' ἂν ἡ θάπτονσα προσθείην πλέον. . . .

that is, he disregards the apparently certain reading (suggested by the Schol.) *θάπτονσα*, adopts (in his text) Haakma's κλαίονσ' ἂν (for λύνουσ' ἂν: Heath κλύουσ' ἂν), and changes *προσθείμην* into *προσθείην*.

In 126 Blaydes keeps the genitives *ἀντιπάλου* . . . *δράκοντος* (abandoning his old conjecture *δυσχείρωτα*), but makes no mention of the conjecture proposed, and adopted, by Jebb.

Coming to line 130—a well-known crux—Blaydes, adhering to his old suggestion *Καπανῆ* (for *καναχῆς*), suggests, without the slightest warrant, *μεστόν* for *χρυσού*. Thus:—

μεστόν Καπανῆ ὑπερόπτας :

giving, as his reason, that the participle *ὀρμῶντα* is sufficient indication that a proper name is required. But this is to re-write one's author, not to edit—much less explain—him. In l. 149 *ἀντιχαρείσα* (though excellently supported by Jebb) is branded as 'vitiosum,' and *ἄρτι χαρείσα* adopted in the text, though in the *crit. n.* *ἄλκαρ ἔχουσα* is put forward as a suggestion.

No passage is likely to test the literary sense of a commentator more exactly than the highly impassioned lines 593–602. Roughly speaking, Jebb, in his text, departs some three times from the MSS; Blaydes seven or eight times. Yet a glance at his critical notes shows that he is by no means satisfied with the text he adopts. This is how his text runs:

ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν δόμων ὀρῶμαι
πήματ' ἄλλ' ἄλλοις ἐπὶ πῆμασι πίπτοντ',
οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεὰν γένος, ἄλλ' ἐρείπει
θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν.
νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ἀπὸ
ρίζας ὁ τέτατο θάλος ἐν Οἰδίπῳ δόμοις
κατ' αὖ νῦν φονία θεῶν τῶν
νερτέρων ἀμᾶ κοπὶς
λόγον τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενὼν Ἐρινύς.

The following are the changes that are proposed (in the *crit. nn.*):—for *δόμων* he conjectures *σκοπῶν*; *ὀρῶμαι* is stigmatized as 'suspectum'; instead of Dindorf's *ἄλλ' ἄλλοις* he proposes *ἀφθόνως*; for *γένος*, *ἄγος*; for *ἔχει λύσιν*, *ἔστιν λύσις*; for *ὁ τέτατο*, *ἐτέτατο* (this

conj. was orig. made by Hermann); for *φάος*, *θάλος* (though it is admitted that *τέτατο φάος* finds good support in *Philoct.* 831); for *φρενῶν*, *Θεῶν*.

But this is not all. On referring to the *addenda* (Dr. Blaydes seems unable to dispense with the inevitable 'addenda'), we find the following note:

'Quamvis longe aptius de *φάει* quam de *θάλει* diceretur *τέτατο*, vix dubitari potest quin vera lectio hic sit *θάλει* (et *κοπῆς*).'

One turns, with some interest, to lines 23-25, by way of seeing how this passage fares in Dr. Blaydes's hands. This is how the passage appears:

'Ετεοκλέα μὲν, ὡς λέγουσ', ὑπὸ χθονὸς
ἔκρυψε, τοῖς ἐνερθεὶν ἔντιμον νεκροῖς.

In other words, the editor has conflated three lines into two, and has arbitrarily changed *κατά* into *ὑπὸ*, remarking (in the

addenda) 'melius aberit versus futilis interpolatus.'

In the opening lines of the play, what is the editor's attitude towards the *locus vexatus* *ἄτης ἄτερ*? Admitting that the words offend, he reads (from his own conjecture, made in 1859)

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐτ' ἀτηρὸν οὐτ'
ἄτιμον κ.τ.λ.

but makes no mention of his alternative conjecture (also published in 1859) *ἀτηφόρον*, one of the best yet proposed (see Jebb's note).

That this edition contains much valuable matter, will not be denied; but, of the many dozens of conjectures Dr. Blaydes put forward, a very scant percentage is likely to find favour with future editors. The book is rich in its collection of parallel passages; and herein, perhaps, lies its chief claim upon the attention of scholars.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

King's School, Ely.

GOODWIN'S *MIDIAS* AND *DE CORONA* OF DEMOSTHENES.

Demosthenes against Midias. With Critical and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix by WILLIAM WATSON GOODWIN. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1906. Demy 8vo. Pp. viii+188. 9s.

It is matter for mutual congratulation amongst lovers of Greek literature that Prof. Goodwin is devoting his energies to editing Demosthenes. Except the speeches undertaken by Dr. Sandys separately or in conjunction with the late Prof. Paley, an English student is reduced to read his Demosthenes in the main with the assistance of antiquated commentaries or such knowledge as he himself possesses. It is true that such independent study breeds a sturdy judgment and individual appreciation of the orator; but there is much to-day, ascertained and demonstrated past question, which a young student cannot easily fall in the way of, and in consequence, either wastes time in impossible conjectures of his author's meanings or sees darkly what he might have seen clearly.

To begin with, Prof. Goodwin gives us a text deduced from the manuscript tradition by the rigidly scientific methods now understood to be alone legitimate or fruitful.

Then he gives a sufficient commentary on difficulties,—obscurities, negligences, allusions—bringing in the evidence of new discoveries like Aristotle's *Ἀθ. πολ.* and inscriptions to elucidate his text; and lastly, deliberately excluding from his notes such comments as too many other editors supply—as he says, 'using the oration to teach Greek syntax,'—he throws what little he allows himself of such writing into an Appendix.

I have already said that Prof. Goodwin can be relied upon to give a generally sound text. In a few places only are his conclusions debatable. In § 55⁴ the reading of E (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν*) seems at least arguable, if *αὐτῶν* = *τῶν μαντιῶν*. In § 85⁷ *ἀποφέρειν* of Σ might be supported by § 86⁶ *ἀνώματος ἀπηνέχθη*. In § 99⁴ (quoted below) I see no reason for rejecting *προσῆκεν* on the single authority of A. In § 129⁶ *φοβοῦμαι . . . μὴ . . . τοιοῦτός τις ὑμῖν λογισμὸς ἐμπέσῃ 'τί οὖν; σὺ δεινότερ' ἢ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς ἕκαστος πεπονθὼς ἀγανακτεῖς*;' the argument seems to me to require *σὺ <οὐδὲν> δεινότερ' ἢ κ.τ.λ.* The previous section says 'had Midias injured me only, I should have been afraid that he would escape punishment by pointing to his general good behaviour.' Then in § 129 we