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](#)

Menander *Menander* (Loeb edition). The principal fragments, with an English translation, by F. G. Allinson. Pp. xxxii + 540; illustrations, 2. London and New York: Heinemann. 10s.

T. W. Lumb

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 5-6 / August 1922, pp 123 - 123

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016656, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016656

How to cite this article:

T. W. Lumb (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 123-123 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016656

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MENANDER.

Menander (Loeb edition). The principal fragments, with an English translation, by F. G. ALLINSON. Pp. xxxii + 540; illustrations, 2. London and New York: Heinemann. 10s. PROBABLY no other classical author has been hitherto so inaccessible in an English edition as Menander. The appearance of this Loeb edition will be welcomed by all. It contains everything of value that has been written to elucidate the most important fragments.

The General Introduction comprises discussions on Menander's life, on the New Comedy and its vocabulary and style, a history of the text, and an admirable bibliography. The editor's own judgment on his author is guardedly expressed as follows: 'The verdict passed upon Menander by the Greeks and Romans who possessed the great corpus of his un mutilated works, if due allowance for the personal equation is made, is probably not out of accord with some portions, at least, of what we have at our disposal.' Language of this kind is safer than that which would place Menander among the 'penny-a-line' brotherhood in the face of the splendid compliments he received from competent judges of antiquity. In a similar spirit of restraint the editor has rarely made any emendations of the text, being content to adopt what seems to him to be the best work of other critics. When he does attempt a restoration he is nearly always convincing. An admirable example of his work is to be found in the *Arbitrants*, l. 392:

(A.) οὐδεὶς Σικελικὸς ἕτερος ὑμῖν (Σμκ.) ποικίλον
ἀριστον ἀριστοῦσιν.

This most happy conjecture Σικελικός is backed up by a quotation of an exactly parallel passage in the *Republic*: Σικελικὴν ποικιλίαν ὄψων.

The newly discovered fragments rightly occupy the first place. Each of them is preceded by a short outline of the plot as far as it can be reconstructed, and a description of the textual difficulties where necessary. The first play is the *Arbitrants*, such being the generally accepted rendering of the word Ἐπιτρέποντες. What should be the real order of the fragments is a problem of well-known intricacy, on which there can be as yet no consensus of opinion. Professor Allinson prefixes to the play the 'St. Petersburg' fragments, which were assigned to

another play by the editor of the Teubner edition. In these fragments there is an indication of a chorus after l. 35; accordingly, we have part of Act i. and the opening lines of Act ii. The Cairo fragments then follow, containing the most lively portion of the play. In them the mainspring of the plot is indicated. The *dénouement* cannot be determined until the order of several most important minor fragments has been settled. The discovery of *Oxyrh.* 1236 made the Teubner arrangement untenable: a similar find may upset the Loeb order; but the editor has given excellent reasons for the order he adopts after much hesitation, and with an admission that his scheme can be only probable.

The other plays do not present so acutely the problem of arrangement. The excellent introductions offer all the information that is necessary for the understanding of the plot. The few well-chosen remarks on the metrical Argument of the Hero are worth attention, while the perplexing question as to the *dramatis personae* in the Γεωργός is stated with admirable brevity. The remainder of the book includes what, in the editor's judgment, are the most noteworthy of the fragments previously known.

But the metrical version is certain to provoke criticism. The editor has attempted a translation in the original metres. Yet he is not quite consistent: the Γεωργός and the Κθαριστής, though new, are in prose, while some of the older fragments are in verse. A prose translation would have been safer. The English six-foot iambic is doomed: even the skill shown in this translation has not saved the metre from the fatal break at the end of the third foot: weak words are bound to appear in strong positions, and even the colloquial license of comedy cannot excuse the presence of these words in English verse. In one or two places the vocabulary sinks almost to the level of slang. One instance will suffice:

'Right you are. Yes, that's my lay.'

It would be unfair to allow this defect to prejudice the reader. The volume is the work of one of the best living authorities on Menander. It is conservative, even when some slight change should have been made: it has an English translation, and is a worthy addition to the admirable Loeb series. T. W. LUMB.

'A HOTCHPOTCH OF ALL SORTS OF FISHES.'

Fishing from the Earliest Times. By WILLIAM RADCLIFFE. One vol. Pp. xvii + 478. John Murray, 1921. 28s. We hope that Mr. Radcliffe will not take the quotation, which heads this notice, otherwise than as a compliment to his delightful volume. 'Indeed, a rich and savoury stew 'tis.' Strike in your reviewer's flesh-hook (or Leister) where you will, and you impale some

appetising morsel. Unhappily, considerations of space forbid our exhibiting more than a very scanty selection from the good things provided.

The chapters relating to Greek and Roman fishing, to which our purview is confined, cover a period in relation to which the earliest 'document' cited by our author is the Fishermen's Vase of Phylakopi (say 1500 B.C.), and the