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](#)

Roberts' *Demetrius de Elocutione* Roberts' *Demetrius de Elocutione*

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 02 / March 1903, pp 128 - 134

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207646, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207646

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 128-134 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207646

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Tweedledee.' I do not rightly understand 'embolstered,' and can only imagine that he labours under some *a priori* error as to the word *ὑπλίζω*. *ὑπλίζετο* is, of course, due to a far greater scholar than myself, namely Victorius. If the protection afforded to the Greek baby by the process implied is not pleasing to Mr. Headlam I am afraid it is too late for him to rectify matters. In default he might look at the illustration in Dict. Ant. vol. I. 1005 b.

(7) On *φιλίαις* **οἷμασι* *δνοφερᾶς* *καλύπτρας* (805), with which cf. *Ag.* 525, we have more humour. 'The image apparently being such a smile as parts the face of Sir John Tenniel's Cheshire Cat.' To analyse delicate humour is to destroy its fine bloom. I may therefore quietly ask any unprejudiced reader whether an opening in a veil (or door) which brings, or is accompanied by, joy can or cannot be normally expressed in Greek poetry by *φαιδρὸν οἶγμα καλύπτρας* (or *πυλῶν*). Mr. Headlam will find endless work for his Procrustean bed if he is disposed to handle the Greek language as he has done here or at v. 469. He there declares that *οὐ δώμασιν ἔμμοτον τῶνδ'* *ἐκάς* cannot mean 'except this way the house can find no staunching of its wound.' 'That,' he announces with characteristic absoluteness 'would be *οὐ τῶνδ' ἄτερ ἔμμοτον δώμασιν*.' Even if this astounding assertion contained a germ of truth it might be pointed out to Mr. Headlam that his order should mean 'not apart from *this* way has the house a cure.'

(8) On v. 882 he invites me to 'try to strike anyone's head off with a razor.' I do not find anything in the text about cutting off a head. I really cannot agree to alter the text of M to a conjecture of Abresch because Mr. Headlam misconstrues.

(9) On v. 1038 'let every Argive in time to come e'en bear me witness that I wrought it not ruthlessly,' he asks, 'Is not that rather in the style of Mr. Gilbert?' I think not, when English words are properly understood. 'Ruthless' means 'without pity.' A man who slays his mother at the bidding

of an oracle may still feel pity in the act, and Orestes desires to make that point. My conjecture *μὴ νηλεῶς* (for *μενέλεως*) may, of course, be wrong, but it is certainly not disproved by a forensic observation of Cicero. Aeschylus had not studied the moral or dramatic law under Cicero. In any case *μὴ νηλεῶς* may claim some resemblance to *μενέλεως*. Contrast this with *ἐνπᾶς ὥς* (687) 'corrected' by M. Schmidt, with the approval of Mr. Headlam, into *νηλεῶς*. If this is emendation, then any substitution is emendation.

It would require too much space in the *Classical Review* to deal with all the cases in which Mr. Headlam misrepresents or dogmatizes. More than once he remarks, explicitly or in effect, that 'we have only his (*i.e.* my) word for it.' Yet no one can read his review without finding statement after statement made which amounts simply to flat contradiction. I repeat that this is not reviewing. As a contribution to scholarship it is unconvincing.

I deeply regret being compelled to write in this way of a scholar from whom I had expected to welcome some *magnum opus* at an early date. But I believe it will be conceded that I have no alternative but to speak plainly when so vigorous an attempt is made to discredit those contributions of mine to the study of Aeschylus, concerning which I entertain no very exalted opinion, but concerning which my conscience as a 'well-intending' worker is entirely at ease.

T. G. TUCKER.

P.S.—On re-perusing the above I find a slight error in the statement that Mr. Headlam nowhere actually proves an assertion. He does prove that the verses numbered 956, 957 do not metrically correspond respectively to vv. 967 *sq.* Yet any one else would have perceived that *ιδεῖν* at the beginning of 968 is simply misprinted there instead of at the end of 967.

ROBERTS' *DEMETRIUS DE ELOCUTIONE*.

Reply to Dr. Rutherford.

In a review—not too severe if sound, but, as I contend, radically unsound—criticizing in the current number of this Journal my recent edition of *Demetrius de Elocutione*, Dr. Rutherford suggests haste and hurry as

an excuse for some of my alleged shortcomings. Instead of troubling my readers with an autobiographical account of my literary life, which would prove that I am unable to avail myself of this plea, I

propose to show that the scholar who needs it is not I but my critic.

I shall begin by expressing some surprise that, in the review, no description is given of the general plan, scope, and contents of my edition. No mention is made of the fact that the Introduction includes a historical sketch (however slight) of the study of Prose Style among the Greeks; a summary and appreciation of the *De Elocutione*; and a discussion of the evidence (internal and external) with regard to the Date and Authorship of the treatise.¹ Not one word is said about the Bibliography, though the endeavour to reach and read the various writings included in it has been not slight; nor is any reference made to the many modern illustrations incorporated in the work. Nor yet is any notice taken of the fact that this is the first English critical text, and the first English translation, of Demetrius; and that, for this edition as for Dionysius' *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, the Paris MS. 1741 has been carefully collated. For the print, indeed, and the facsimiles there is a word of commendation; and it is commendation well won. But that is all. Are these omissions, on the part of the reviewer, the outcome of haste, or what is their origin?

Dr. Rutherford has chosen, then, to devote himself almost entirely to criticism of the Translation and the Glossary: ground on which I am quite ready to meet him. But it is necessary to premise that, for sheer lack of time and space, I must confine myself (with little more than one exception) to the first page of his review, and in that to specimen blunders only. I therefore pass lightly over the reviewer's confusion (*in a passage where accurate language is of consequence*) of Dionysius and Demetrius on the second page of his review; nor do I dwell on the *bustling haste, quickening often into a scamper*, which causes him to give some wonderful Greek of his own in the second column of the last-page-but-one.² I have no wish to waste time on comparative trifles, but desire rather to meet him on the ground where he evidently feels strongest.

¹ In the matter of Date and Authorship (as indeed in many other matters) the most recent German editor Radermacher and I have independently reached very similar conclusions: based, for the most part, on a study of the language and the grammar of the treatise. It may be well to add that, when I undertook the publication of the *De Elocutione*, I had not heard that a critical edition, on modern lines, was elsewhere in preparation.

² From this point onward it will be understood that the words in italics are those used by Dr. Rutherford himself when reviewing *Demetrius on Style*.

There is, then, one point (not on the first page) that I shall dwell on because Dr. Rutherford thinks it a conclusive one against me: the true meaning of the word *γλαφυρός*. Let it be admitted at once that he is right in attaching the utmost importance to a correct rendering of this term. It is one of the most vital words in the whole treatise; and if I have misrepresented its meaning, I deserve all the censure which can be conveyed by his most ample vocabulary of depreciation, on which, being now confessedly *in a hurry*, I shall continue to draw occasionally. His own equivalent for *ὁ γλαφυρὸς λόγος* is 'the light style,' and he says:—

'Perhaps no part of the translation is quite so bewildering as that relating to the 'light style' (*ὁ γλαφυρὸς λόγος*)..... Following tradition, he renders the cardinal term *γλαφυρός* by 'smooth,' and then all the subordinate terminology goes wrong. There is one passage from which he might have learned for certain that 'smooth' does not render *γλαφυρός*, at least in Demetrius, namely, § 183; but this contains technical terms unfamiliar to him, and is so rendered that it does not represent in any sense what Demetrius says.'

Now will it be credited that not once in the entire translation (not even in § 183, to which the reviewer refers specifically), nor once in the Summary (pp. 28–34 of my edition), is *γλαφυρός* translated 'smooth'? The rendering 'elegant' is given consistently throughout, the words 'smooth' and 'smoothness' being as consistently reserved for *λεῖος* and *λεῖωτης*: cp. § 178, where *τῶν δὲ εἰρημένων ὀνομάτων τὰ λεῖα μόνον ληπτέον ὡς γλαφυρόν τι ἔχοντα* is rendered, 'Of all the words indicated, the smooth alone must be employed as possessing any elegance.' As far as I remember, the word 'smooth' is only once used in connexion with *γλαφυρός*, namely in the Glossary (p. 272), where the entry runs: '*γλαφυρός*, §§ 36, 127, 128, 138, 178, 179, 183, 184, 186. *Smooth, polished, elegant*: *χαρακτήρ γλαφυρός* being one of the four types of style. Lat. *politus, floridus, ornatus, elegans*. French, *élégant, orné*.' The Glossary is intended to supplement the Translation; and anyone who had read the Translation might be expected to remember (refreshing, if necessary, his memory by consulting the references) that 'elegant' had been deliberately preferred in it, and that the adjective 'smooth' is mainly (though not entirely) introduced in order to show how the sense 'polished' or 'elegant' arose from the early Homeric meaning. For the meaning 'light' I can find no support in etymology, nor yet in the actual usage of the *De Elocutione*. Take § 138 for

example: 'The conveyance of two ideas in one sentence often gives a graceful effect (τὸ χάριεν). A writer once said of a sleeping Amazon: "Her bow lay strung, her quiver full, her buckler by her head; their girdles they never loose." At one and the same time the custom concerning the girdle is indicated and its observance in the present case,—the two facts by means of one expression. And from this conciseness a certain elegance (γλαφυρόν τι) results.' Dr. Rutherford, would, I suppose, substitute 'a certain lightness' for 'a certain elegance.' But where is the 'lightness'? I see none, though I see considerable neatness.¹ My censor may reply that, though he favours the adjective, he would not necessarily favour the noun. But no one knows better than Dr. Rutherford that one of the first duties and most difficult problems for the translator is to find, if he can, an adjective which has a corresponding noun, adverb, and (if possible) verb as well. Let us, however, carry our inquiries a little further.

When in a witty passage (too long to quote fully) Longinus (*de Subl.* x. 6) says: πλὴν μικρόν αὐτὸ καὶ γλαφυρόν ἐποίησεν ἀντὶ φοβεροῦ, he means 'Aratus has replaced the awe-inspiring poetry of Homer by a petty elegance,' not 'a petty lightness.' If these words of Longinus are compared with those which precede them, it will be seen that ἄνθος corresponds closely to τὸ γλαφυρόν. That γλαφυρός and ἀνθηρός are practically synonymous appears also from Dionys. Hal. *de Comp. Verb.* c. 21 (τὴν μὲν αὐστηράν, τὴν δὲ γλαφυράν ἢ ἀνθηράν, τὴν δὲ τρίτην κοινήν), and c. 23 (ἢ δὲ γλαφυρά καὶ ἀνθηρά σύνθεσις: the two adjectives in this last passage are translated respectively by 'smooth' and 'florid' in Jebb's *Attic Orators* ii. 56, while in vol. i. p. 161 of the same work 'polished type' is given as an equivalent of Demetrius' χαρὰκτὴρ γλαφυρός). Looking back on this brief investigation we are, I fear, forced to the conclusion that the reviewer is likely to prove an untrustworthy guide to rhetorical doctrine expressed in terms of art, if he deliberately mistranslates a term which he himself justly describes as cardinal. I fear we must confess that he misrepresents the doctrine of Demetrius to a serious degree. If next we desire to moralise, it will be in some such words as these: *it takes time and patience to ponder and brood over technical*

terms, and to find, if one can, simple English equivalents for them. If, in our charity, we try to find an excuse for the offender, we shall speak of a *misapprehension, due itself also to haste, of the technical terms, which in a τέχνη cannot well be avoided, and in any version of a τέχνη should be rendered with the most minute and deliberate exactness.* No one who has followed this demonstration of the reviewer's incompetence (or haste) in a cardinal instance chosen by himself will need my assurance, with reference to subordinate terminology, that it would make a long list were I to register by the page and line the cases in which he seems to me to have perverted the signification of technical terms.²

The observant reader will have remarked how careful I have been, in the course of the above argument, to quote no Roman author but only late, and probably not far from contemporaneous, Greek critics. And why so? Because Dr. Rutherford has somehow got it into his head that I am a 'Romanist,' a 'convinced Romanist'; and I want to prove to him that I am as good a Protestant as he is any day. Only, I am not blind to one great danger to which extreme forms of the Protestant religion are exposed: the danger that each man should constitute himself his own Pope. I have, indeed, heard of men, happy men, in modern times, who can think in Greek, and to whom a mere translation must seem a mockery. And if any such man there really be, I should think him well entitled to be his own Greek Pope and to command the homage of the faithful. But till I find him, I shall prefer to put my faith in Cicero. Not that I shall think Cicero infallible: my Protestant instincts will save me from that. But I shall not forget that he was a man of genius and an orator, that he learnt Greek rhetoric from the lips of Greek teachers, that he took extraordinary pains to find the best Latin equivalents for the technical terms used by the Greek rhetoricians; and I shall prefer the 'hit-or-miss' renderings of Tully to the veritable meaning of the technical terms employed by the Greeks, if the 'verit-

² There is in the reviewer's language as above quoted a small inaccuracy, unnoticed so far, to which I shall only refer as a mote moving on the surface and showing how the current goes. He speaks (perhaps because in his haste he has confined his turn for search to § 123) as though λόγος were Demetrius' regular term for 'style.' The truth is that here Demetrius is using not technical but popular language, his technical term for 'style,' in the sense here meant, being χαρακτήρ. A small point, I repeat; but such small points create, in the long run, an odd sense of mystification and of insecurity.

¹ As soon should I imagine that when Plutarch, in his *Life of Marius* c. 3, mentions ἀστεῖον καὶ γλαφυρόν βίον, he has in mind the 'light' life of the town. But really, what 'lightness' is in style I scarcely know.

able meaning' be that pontifically expounded by Dr. Rutherford.

But it is time to return to the selected first page. Take the following criticism :—

'It were possible, no doubt, to find Greek terms which ought to be translated, "like as a horse untethered bounds proudly prancing over the plain"; but the line (sic) from Xenophon (§ 89) does not furnish them, but common words that should be Englished; "like a horse unbridled bounding freshly across the field and kicking up his heels."'

Let us give the Greek of § 89 as a whole (since the reviewer quotes none of it, being—for a Hellenist—rather sparing of the Greek in all his criticisms): ἐπὶ μὲντοι εἰκασίαν ποιῶμεν τὴν μεταφοράν, ὡς προλέλεκται, στοχαστέον τοῦ συντόμου, καὶ τοῦ μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ ὥσπερ προτιθέναι, ἐπεὶ τοι ἀντ' εἰκασίας παραβολὴ ἔσται ποιητικὴ, οἷον τὸ τοῦ Ξενοφώντος, ὥσπερ δὲ κύων γενναῖος ἀπρονοήτως ἐπὶ κάπρον φέρεται, καὶ ὥσπερ ἵππος λυθείς διὰ πεδίον γαυριῶν καὶ ἀπολακτίζων. ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ εἰκασίαις ἔτι ἔοικεν, ἀλλὰ παραβολαῖς ποιητικαῖς. The gist of this passage is that, in prose, poetical imagery must be avoided; plain metaphor and plain simile may be employed, but nothing more. Now in the example dealt with by Dr. Rutherford there is 'color poeticus' not merely in the image but in the actual language, and the words in my English version were carefully chosen so as to suggest that most undesirable thing, poetical prose. In the reviewer's own better mind there may lurk some dim consciousness of this when he speaks of Xenophon's 'line'. But the passage does not, seemingly, come from any of Xenophon's extant works. Here the reviewer, in his haste, has been led astray by the misplacement of one numeral, and the loss of another, in my edition. As he would have seen, had he been at the trouble to turn the reference up, the words are not taken from the *Cyropaedia*, but should have been marked (after my usual practice) by *Scr. Inc.*¹ Nevertheless it is in a work attributed to Xenophon that the best parallel to the passage may be sought: ἦν δέ τις οὕτως ἀνεξωπυρημένῳ αὐτῷ δῶ τὸν χαλινόν,

¹ It would have been a real service to scholarship had Dr. Rutherford helped in tracing to their source the too numerous illustrations unassigned in my edition. Some of these are probably invented examples, but there are no doubt others which could be found somewhere in extant Greek literature if only we were to carry our search far enough. Again, it would have been a useful thing had he made some remarks on the connexion of Demetrius *de Elocutione* with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Theophrastus' treatise *On Style*. I have said something on this subject in my edition, but by no means all.

ἐνταῦθα ὑφ' ἡδονῆς τῷ διὰ τὴν χαλαρότητα τοῦ στομίον λελύσθαι νομίζειν, κυδρῷ μὲν τῷ σχήματι, ὑγροῖν δὲ τοῖν σκελοῖν γαυριώμενος φέρεται, παντάπασιν ἐκμιμούμενος τὸν πρὸς ἵππους καλλωπισμόν (*R. Eq.* 10, 16). It is to me incomprehensible how the editor of *Babrius* and *Herondas* (of which latter the 'complete edition', promised long ago, still lingers), and above all the author of the *New Phrynichus*, can have so utterly failed to seize the point of Demetrius' criticism in § 89. 'Common words', yes; but common only in the 'Common Dialect' and in poetry, not in the best Attic prose. If anyone doubts this, let him consult Dr. Rutherford's *New Phrynichus* and other books; let him think of *pedion*, with its suggestion of a score of Homeric similes; let him even take *ἀπολακτίζων*, which on the surface looks the essence of colloquialism, and note that it is never used by Aristophanes (who, in my opinion, would never have used it except in parody of Aeschylus) and that *ἐκλακτίζων* would be the appropriate word in Attic prose. Shall I *speak my mind in perfect frankness* to the reviewer and tell him one chief cause of his *shortcomings*—*grave shortcomings as they appear to me*? It is his want of true literary sense: a want conspicuously illustrated, in the general judgment of scholars, by his magisterial method of criticism as exhibited in the castigation of Thucydides.

It has puzzled me why, on the same first page of the review, exception should be taken to the conception of the Notes as notes—as a means of stating doubts, suggesting alternatives, removing difficulties, and generally supplementing the Translation. Metaphrase can hardly be made to do duty for paraphrase. This point has been well made, in a recent number of the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique* by Monsieur Ch. Michel, Professor of Greek in the University of Liège: 'celle-ci (la traduction) forme ce premier commentaire qui ne devrait jamais manquer dans les éditions de traités techniques et dont se dispensent si facilement les philologues.'² This conception of the translation as the first line of commentary is surely the right one. It is the first line: that and no more. But the first line should never be wanting. How far there is, in my edition, due co-operation

² If my memory serves me (I have not the volume within reach where I write) a similar view was not long ago expressed, in a notice (in the *Revue de Philologie*) of my *Longinus* and *Dionysius* by the distinguished scholar M. Albert Martin, author of 'Les scolies du manuscrit d'Aristophane à Ravenne: Étude et collation,' published in 1882.

(so to say) between Translation, Notes, and Glossary, it is for others to judge; but I could wish nothing better than that each reader of Dr. Rutherford's review should read the book for himself, in order to test personally the validity not 'only of the criticism now under discussion but of every other. Take, for instance, p. 68, l. 21 of my edition (we are still keeping to the first page of the review): κατακεκορμένη γὰρ ἔοικεν ἡ σύνθεσις καὶ κεκερματισμένη, καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος διὰ τὸ μικρὰ σύμπαντα ἔχειν. That is the reading of the Paris manuscript, on which my text is avowedly based, and whose readings I am therefore anxious to retain if possible. And so in the Notes I write: 'Schneider proposed κατακεκορμένη and κεκερματισμένη, which palaeographically would be hardly a change at all, apart from the corresponding alteration of εὐκαταφρόνητος which it seems to entail.' I might have added that ἐοίκαι ἡδόμενοι occurs in Xen. *Hellen.* vi. 3, 8, and is rightly retained in Mr. E. C. Marchant's recent text; though, as might be expected, Cobet (and no doubt his faithful British henchman) would 'correct' ἡδόμενοι to ἡδομένοισι. And so one might go on and on. But to repeat one's edition is weary work, and I prefer (after again asking each reader to see and judge for himself) to take another line. In order that this controversy may, if possible, be not entirely barren, I shall pick (not from the first page only but from the entire review) the three cases in which the reviewer seems to have some show of reason on his side.

The first case, though it looks at first sight substantial, is really only verbal. The reviewer complains that in § 122, through an ignorant belief that στρατηγός can mean nothing but 'military commander,' I proceed to insert a conjectural ἡ. He exaggerates my ignorance: I have not read Polybius and Plutarch (and much earlier writers than these) to so little purpose. Nor have I failed to read § 78 of the *De Elocutione*, where I translate 'There is a resemblance, for instance, between a general, a pilot, and a charioteer; they are all in command. Accordingly it can correctly be said that a general pilots the State, and conversely that a pilot commands the ship.' Here in using 'general,' rather than 'magistrate,' to translate στρατηγός, it is obvious that I was not thinking solely of military command. Nor in § 122 do I give 'military commander,' but 'general' (a word which in earlier English was much less restricted than now) in my translation; and I may add that the real difficulties of the passage which lead

Radermacher to mark a lacuna, and me to insert a word, are not met in the rendering which the reviewer substitutes for my own.¹ —The second instance seems more serious. In § 258 the Greek runs: ποιήσῃ δ' ἂν ποτε καὶ δεινότητα, εἴ τις ὧδε εἴποι 'ἀνέρευσεν δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀφροσύνης τε ὑπὸ τῆς ἀσεβείας τε τὰ ἱερὰ τε τὰ δῶιά τε,' which I have rendered, 'Force of style will also mark a sentence of this kind: "He turned upside down, in his folly and his impiety too, things sacred and things holy too."' Here Dr. Rutherford kindly suggests that, in 'working against time,' I have overlooked the established meaning of ἱερὰ καὶ δῶια. Again I would assure him that I have not read Thucydides and Demosthenes (not to mention Plato's *Republic*) without coming upon that well-known phrase and apprehending (I hope) its meaning. But the question a translator has to ask himself is: what is its meaning here? Is it here used in its Attic sense, or is it not? My own feeling was, and is, that it is not.² The part of the *De Elocutione* in which it occurs is, as I have more than once remarked in my edition, markedly inferior to the earlier part and probably contains many interpolations; this may be one of them. At all events, I find it hard to believe that any good Attic writer is the serious author of the illustration given by Demetrius; the τε four times used (as a sort of Homeric echo in prose) in the Greek original is even more awkward than the 'too' twice used in the English rendering. Here, where we are in a real difficulty and would like to be informed from what author the words are taken, Dr. Rutherford does not help us at all, and till he informs me to the contrary I shall take them to be late Greek and to be correctly translated as above. The sentence is a remarkably poor example

¹ For verbal points of this kind, cp. *C.R.* xvi. 386b, xvii. 79a. Professor Seymour's article illustrates the difficulty of translating not only ναύκληρος (which can be applied even to a 'doss-man'), but also κυβερνήτης (π. ἐρμ. § 78, where Demetrius clearly has Demosth. *de Cor.* § 194 in mind: a fact that throws light on the meaning of στρατηγός here and elsewhere in the π. ἐρμ.) The Elizabethan translators have much to teach us in these matters: cp. Sir Thomas North's 'that he had continued treasurer under his captain the space of three years,' as a rendering of a passage in Plutarch's *Life of C. Gracchus* c. 2 ταμείων ('acting as quaestor') δὲ τῷ στρατηγῷ ('praetor', or more strictly 'proconsul' here) παραμενηκέναι τριετίαν.

² It is noteworthy that so diligent a student of the Attic writers as Dionysius never (so far as I know) uses the phrase ἱερὰ καὶ δῶια in the special Attic meaning. Instead, he uses such expressions as ἐκ παντὸς ἱεροῦ καὶ βεβήλου τόπου (*Antiq. Rom.* vii. 8).

of 'force,' but it is on a par with similar suggestions in §§ 256, 257, and I have myself little doubt that the writer (or interpolator) intended a kind of parallelism or proportion, ἡ ἀφροσύνη: ἡ ἀσέβεια :: τὰ ἱερά: τὰ ὅσια. It is noteworthy that Victorius (a scholar not inferior to Dr. Rutherford) explains τὰ ἱερά τε τὰ ὅσια τε as meaning 'fana et sacras alias res.'—The third instance, again, is a question of late Greek. Personally I am not much concerned to defend the reading in question, for the suggestion is not my own. But as an illustration of the reviewer's methods, let this graphic sentence be transcribed. 'But as Demetrius says:—ταῦτα μὲν δὴ παρατεχνολογίσθω (παρατεχνολογήσθω ??) ἄλλως.' The natural inferences of a reader here would be: (1) the editor has conjectured and adopted παρατεχνολογήσθω, (2) he has committed a great enormity in so doing. But, as a matter of fact, the conjecture is not adopted in my text, and the only mention of it is in the Notes (p. 242) as follows: 'if any change were to be suggested, it might be (with Goeller) that of παρατεχνολογίσθω to παρατεχνολογήσθω (cp. λελέχθω § 41).' Let it be observed that recognition of late grammatical forms and usage is denied to the reviewed, though permissible to the reviewer. Says the reviewer, in one of those remarkable suggestions he makes when he turns from the task of demolition to that of reconstruction: '§ 260 τοῦ ὀπλίτου δραμόντος: the active aorist will not translate unless in this race there were but one runner; but can Demetrius have written a form like δραμέντος?—δραμέντος?!!'

Thus on reviewing my reviewer, I have been astonished at the weakness of his onslaught, and have been tempted to think that I could do better myself. Of one thing I am certain. Did I desire to find fault at all costs with any classical edition, it is on the Translation that I should undoubtedly fasten, especially if my general acquaintance with the subject was limited and I did not wish to take any great trouble. The reasons why translations (however carefully executed) must always be vulnerable are obvious; in a translation are involved such difficult points as those of taste, of ambiguities in the original, and of the inadequacy of all attempts to render those terms which were meant to be significant and informing to Greeks alone.

There is one other passage in the review to which I must briefly refer before concluding. It begins just two lines from the end of the first page (which, after all,

is only three-quarters of a page), but even if it were not on the first page at all, I am sure Dr. Rutherford would never forgive me were I to pass it over and thus deprive this dull encounter of the comic relief it so sorely needs. The paragraph of Demetrius must have tickled his own sense of humour irresistibly, though (rather selfishly, as I consider) he has kept all the fun to himself. But as the sage Ibsen somewhere says (I am, I regret, too much in a hurry to give the quotation with that precision which the reviewer demands), 'sorrow and suffering we can bear alone; it takes two to be glad.' And I feel confident that, once he realises the truth of this, Dr. Rutherford will not refuse to share his joys with others more liberally than he has done on this occasion. I quote, without further preface, from the bottom of the first page:—

'In § 160 Demetrius says: "And there is mirth too in likening one thing to another thing, the cock to a Mede because he wears his turban cocked, or to a king because a king dresses in rich colours": καὶ εἰκασταὶ δ' εἰσὶν εὐχάριτες, ἂν τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα Μήδω εἰκάσῃς, ὅτι τὴν κυρβάσιαν ὀρθὴν φέρει· βασιλεῖ δέ, ὅτι πορφύρεός ἐστιν: the editor renders, nor gives any proof that κυρβάσι is ever used for a cock's-comb, "Comparisons also are full of charm—if (for instance) you compare a cock to a Persian because of its stiff-upstanding crest, or to the Persian king because of its brilliant plumage." [It will probably be convenient to the reader that the text and translation of the remainder of this section should be added at this point (before we proceed to comment on the reviewer's criticism): ἢ ὅτι βοήσαντος ἀλεκτρυόνος ἀναπνέωμεν, ὥσπερ καὶ βασιλέως βοήσαντος, καὶ φοβούμεθα,—or because when the cock crows we start with fear as though we heard the loud call of the monarch.]

'The editor renders, nor gives any proof that κυρβάσι is ever used for a cock's-comb.' This is a true charge: the editor is guilty of the alleged omission. He has, at all events, given no reference at the foot of the page.¹ And why? Because in his simplicity he thought that any reader—Dr. Rutherford, for example—would have made use of a *solid and informing*, but by no means *dull and unattractive book*, by one who is anything but a *Romanist*, Rutherford's Scholia Aristophanica, which would have saved a critical notice from some *disfigurements*. References are given in 'Rutherford,' which if followed up would have kept a reviewer straight, even if he had not read largely in Aristophanes. The passages (R 1, 458 ff. = Aristoph. Av.

¹ It is, perhaps, to be regretted that Dr. Rutherford was not Romanist enough to visit just for once the *locus paenitentiae*, p. 239. He would there have found the needed reference.

275 ff.) are a capital example of archaic Greek, expressing straightforward reasoning in straightforward and accurate language, and I give a translation of them below.¹

Dr. Rutherford may not be satisfied with one passage of Aristophanes (*Av.* 487), but may object that it is equivocal (as all puns have the misfortune to be: let him compare *λόφος*, *ib.* 279). Very well, I present another to his notice: Aristoph. *Fragm.* 465, καὶ τὴν κυνὴν ἔχειν με κυρβάσιαν ἐρεῖς. I can well imagine that, in translating this passage, Dr. Rutherford will be loyal to his

¹ The cock fu' stately strides wi' genty tread,
An' wears his bonnet strait upon his head:
[The cock's a vera Shah!
His philabeg an' tartan plaid sae gay
Shame e'en the rainbow hues on simmer's day:
[The cock's a vera Shah!
His pibroch loud, when heard in mirkest night,
Gars lazy louns start frae their beds wi' fright:
[The cock's a vera Shah!

I wish I knew my Burns better, but I have done the best I could—in a hurry. It is well known among Hellenists (as distinguished from mere 'Romanists') that the genuine works of Aristophanes, like those of Menander, have long since perished from the world. In the reconstructed Greek which underlies my verse translation, I have ventured to assume that expressions such as διαβάσκει, ἀσποβάτης and ὄρβριος νόμος, gleaned or inferred from Rutherford's invaluable (the praise awarded above is altogether too grudging) *Scholiaz Aristophanica*, are part of the original passage. May I take this opportunity of announcing that I have long had in preparation a work entitled *Aristophanes e Scholiis Aristophanicis Rutherfordianis Restitutus*: a work which, when it appears, will be no hurried production but the ripe fruit of my leisure and not unworthy (I trust) of the source from which it draws its inspiration?

It will be noticed that (in order to humour the reviewer, who has a pronounced aversion to the 'cock's-comb') I have translated τὴν κυρβάσιαν (which should be 'bonnet-crest') by 'bonnet' merely. I am afraid I cannot help him any further, though, in the rather awkward dilemma in which he finds himself placed. Either (1) he has forgotten his Aristophanes, or (2) he has missed his jests; and one really does not know which is the less formidable alternative. The methods of cure are, however, fortunately obvious. In case (1), the natural remedy is not to pin one's faith to Liddell and Scott; (who are here most misleading), and not to allow the brisk and humorous lecturer Demetrius (who here enjoys his joke so much that he is more than usually elliptical and never pauses to explain that he means the Persian king throughout—not an ordinary Persian, nor an ordinary king) to prove altogether too brisk and altogether too humorous for his casual reader and so be changed into a clumsy and somewhat prosy writer treating of things which he does not wholly comprehend. In case (2), I have no title to prescribe. But I cannot help thinking that, when Dr. Rutherford has found a remedy, he will then modify in some way the following translation in his *Scholiaz Aristophanica* I. p. 459, 'κοκκύσει γὰρ κυρίως θραν παρ' εαυτῷ μετὰ νύκτι τῆς μάχης ἔσται: "κοκκύσειν being properly applied to the noise made by the bird for his own satisfaction after a victory in the cock-pit."

turban and (with Blaydes) will say 'and the cap that I am wearing you will take for a turban.' But where's the point in that? And if I suggest that there is a punning reference to the dog and the cock and that a better English rendering would be 'and you'll call my beaver my cockade,' or something of that kind, he will tell me that I am ignorant of my Homer, let alone my Demetrius. (By the way, Burns's 'Cock up your beaver, and cock it fu' sprush,' or his own 'cocked turban' might have kept him straight, though I do not suggest that there is any actual pun in these expressions). Even in Homer's time, he will remind me, κυνὴ had become a mere conventional term for 'cap,' so that the aged Laertes is wearing αἰγείνῃ κυνέην when his gallant son finds him in the vineyard. This is true. But may not the inveterate punster, a true lover of the past though less reverent than his brother-poets of epic and of tragedy, laugh into life again the dead meanings of words? Is not this, this also, part of the Greek nimbleness of mind?

But though Dr. Rutherford will have none of Aristophanes, he may yet hearken to a later Greek, Hesychius (who writes 'κυρβάσι· ὀρθὴ τιάρα. ταύτῃ δὲ οἱ Περσῶν βασιλεῖς μόνοι ἐχρῶντο. καὶ κορυφὴ ἀλέκτορος'); or (passing by other evidence of a similar kind) to the Greek dictionary instituted by a still later Hellenist Stephanus ('κυρβάσι· ἡ, Hesychio κορυφὴ ἀλέκτορος, crista gallinaei; item ὀρθὴ τιάρα, Tiara erecta, qua Persarum reges soli utebantur'). And if he will have none of these, then we must just leave him to himself with his turban cocked.

But no. Never shall he in this merry war be compared to vainglorious chanticleer, not even in that happy hour when the royal bird 'makes a noise for his own satisfaction after a victory in the cock-pit.' Rather, remembering alike his present plight and the undoubted services which in the past he has done to Greek scholarship, we shall employ a nobler and yet a sadder image and shall liken him to the 'struck eagle':—

"Twas thine own genius gave the final blow,
And help'd to plant the wound that laid thee low:

So the struck eagle, stretch'd upon the plain,
No more through rolling clouds to soar again,
Viewed his own feather on the fatal dart,
And wing'd the shaft that quiver'd in his heart.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES,
BANGOR.

February 17th, 1903.