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](#)

The Knights of Aristophanes *The Knights of Aristophanes*. By B. B. Rogers. Pp. L + 247. Bell and Sons. 1910. Price 10s. 6d. *Aristophanis Pax*. Edited K. Zacher. Pp. xxxii + 127. Teubner. 1909. Price M. 5. *Aristophanische Studien*. Von Hugo Weber. Pp. 180. Dieterich. 1908. Price M. 5. *Die metrische und rhythmische Komposition der Komödien des Aristophanes*. 1 Teil. Von Carl Conrad. Pp. 58. Fock. 1910.

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 24 / Issue 07 / November 1910, pp 218 - 219

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0004556X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0004556X

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1910). The Classical Review, 24, pp 218-219 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0004556X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

junctive; and p. 5, where I speak of the full-blooded meanings (as Mr. Roby calls them) of command, wish, etc., as mere accidents of the context.

(6) My answer to Dr. Eleanor Purdie's question (*C.R.*, p. 194) is that I trace the use of the Subjunctive in expressions of wish to the idea of 'obligation' as defined by me. The ideas of natural necessity and determined futurity are too narrow to serve as a basis for the development of the idea of wish; and on p. 17 f. I have expressly excluded them. But an expression denoting that something *is to be* or *ought to be* seems to me (as to Professor Arnold and Professor Conway) a possible and natural form of speech for expressing a wish, e.g., a wish for fine weather; and this possibility is made a certainty by the use of *ὀφείλειν* in Greek and *sollen* in German to express wish; see examples, p. 32.

(7) One word in conclusion on the suggestion that the Subjunctive should be defined as the *subjective mood* or *mood of thought*—terms which have attractions for several of my critics, as indeed they have had for most of the writers of grammars, whether of ancient or of modern languages, from the early years of the nineteenth century down to the present time. But are these terms really adequate to the mood? They lead straight on to that disastrous definition, the 'mood of doubt,' against which the average pupil has so

often to be warned. I do not know whether my critics have read Professor Hale's attack on them in his paper entitled 'The Heritage of Unreason,' in the *Proceedings of the Classical Association* for 1907. Most recent syntacticians substitute for 'thought' and 'subjectivity' in this definition terms with a more positive content, such as 'will' or 'expectation.' 'Thought *as opposed to fact*' (to use Mr. Roby's expression) is a negative idea, which fails to do justice to the meaning of the Subjunctive in expressions of command, wish, purpose. Even in instances like *Socrates accusatus est quod juventutem corrumpere* it would be more accurate to say that the Subjunctive expresses the thought *of another*, as opposed to the thought of the speaker (here expressed as corresponding to fact). I have only to add that I do not admit that I have lent unconscious support to this theory in saying (p. 50) that the Subjunctive with *cum* expresses something like the idea 'bearing in mind that,' 'always remembering that'; for these expressions are meant to be postulative, like 'be it remembered that,' which is only a modification of 'supposing that,' 'granted that.' Would it be really helpful to say that the difference between *cum Athenis eram* and *cum Athenis essem* is a difference between fact and thought as opposed to fact?

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

THE KNIGHTS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Knights of Aristophanes. By B. B. ROGERS. Pp. L+247. Bell and Sons. 1910. Price 10s. 6d.

Aristophanis Pax. Edidit K. ZACHER. Pp. xxxii + 127. Teubner. 1909. Price M. 5.

Aristophanische Studien. Von HUGO WEBER. Pp. 180. Dieterich. 1908. Price M. 5.

Die metrische und rhythmische Komposition der Komödien des Aristophanes. 1 Teil. Von CARL CONRADT. Pp. 58. Fock. 1910.

I HAVE dwelt so often in this *Review* on the great merits of Mr. Rogers' volumes

of Aristophanes that a short notice of the latest will now serve. In his *Knights* we find the same skilful combination of fidelity and spirit in the verse translation; in the introduction and notes, miscellaneous and critical, the same robust common sense (joined with some mistrust of the conclusions of more professed scholars), the same sympathy with his author, and in consequence the same happy faculty of shrewd, terse, and enjoyable interpretation. He defends not a few things which in my own judgment are not right, and explains others in a way which to me is not convincing, but his notes are never

conventional, mechanical, compiled: they are original—that is, the work of his own mind—and worth weighing.

I give a short specimen of the translation (537 foll.), though both here in the parabasis and earlier at the first inrush of the chorus I rather think (but this may be the result of old association) that Frere has for once the better of Mr. Rogers.

And then he remembered the stormy rebuffs which
Crates endured in his day,
Who a little repast at a little expense would provide
you, then send you away;
Who the daintiest little devices would cook from
the driest of mouths for you all;
Yet he, and he only, held out to the end, now
standing, now getting a fall.
So in fear of these dangers he lingered; besides, a
sailor, he thought, should abide
And tug at the oar for a season, before he attempted
the vessel to guide;
And next should be stationed awhile at the prow,
the winds and the weather to scan;
And then be the pilot, himself for himself. So
seeing our Poet began
In a mood so discreet, nor with vulgar conceit
rushed headlong before you at first.
Loud surges of praise to his honour upraise; salute
him, all hands, with a burst
Of hearty triumphant Lenaeon applause,
That the bard may depart, all radiant and bright
To the top of his forehead with joy and delight,
Having gained by your favour his cause.

Zacher's *Peace* was not quite completed at the time of his death in November 1908. It has been finished, revised, and furnished with a valuable preface on the MSS. by O. Bachmann. In general character it is like the *Knights* of 1897, i.e. a text accompanied by critical notes (1) on the readings of scholars, (2) on those of the MSS.; but unhappily it will not be supplemented, like the *Knights*, by even a partial issue of *Anmerkungen* in the way of commentary. The textual novelties are thus stated by Bachmann—quae ipse coniecit: scribendum esse ἀρ' ἐτυμός γ' ἄρα 114. εἰ γὰρ

ἐκγένουτ' ἰδεῖν μοι τήνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν ποτέ 346. περικείμεναι 542. οἴμ' ὥς 891. personas aliter distribuendas esse 1045 sq., ante v. 1329 aliqua excidisse—satis habuit in adnotatione critica proponere (ibidem v. meam coniecturam λινεποπτώμενος 1178).

Weber's *Studien*, also posthumous, comprise 116 pages on the *Acharnians* and 70 on *Knights*, *Wasps*, *Clouds*. His occasional suggestions of new readings seem to me usually infelicitous, e.g. *Ach.* 136 χρόνον μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἦνον, 197 καὶ μὴ ἐπὶ τηρεῖν in the impossible sense *und nicht ist mit ihr verbunden der Befehl* etc., 610 ξένῃ a strange local dative for the difficult ἐνῇ or ἐνῆ, *Wasps* 1020 νέωσας for χέασθαι, *Clouds* 528 οἷς ἡ δίκη λέγειν for οἷς ἡδὺ καὶ λέγειν. More plausible are *Ach.* 833 πολυπραγμοσύνη ἡ νῦν, *Knights* 526 ὁρούσας (I have thought of this myself, but it is too poetical and indeed mainly epic) for the impossible ρεύσας. A large part, however, of the miscellaneous remarks making up these studies is not textual, and this has more value. Such for instance is a long argument of more than thirty pages to show that *Ach.* 634-641 (παύσας ὑμᾶς ξενικοῖσι λόγοις κ.τ.λ.) refers to the *Banqueters* (Δαιταλῆς), not the *Babylonians*. Examination of the topics and incidents of the early part of the *Acharnians* is the most substantial contribution made by the book.

Conradt examines the verse structure of four plays (*Ach.*, *Birds*, *Lysistr.*, *Thesm.*), and shows in them that what Lachmann erroneously held about the choral songs of tragedy is really true about comedy, namely that the parts of which it is composed make multiples of the number 7. Thus his final analysis of the *Acharnians* is 'A 1-236 16 × 14, B 237-479 16 × 14, C 480-627 10 × 14, D 628-718 6 × 14, E 719-958 35 × 7, F 959-1234 35 × 7.'

H. RICHARDS.

PHILOSTRATUS ÜBER GYMNASTIK.

Philostratus über Gymnastik. JULIUS JÜTHNER. 9½" + 6½". Pp. 336. Teubner, 1909. M. 10.

ALL who are interested in the history of Greek athletics are deeply indebted to

Dr. Jüthner. His *Antike Turngeräthe*, published in 1896, was, despite the prodigious output of German scholars, the most important, almost the only important, contribution to our knowledge of the