

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](#)



Headlam's Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides *The Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides*. With Introduction and Notes, by Clinton E. S. Headlam, B.A. Cambridge University Press. 1889. 2s. 6d.

E. B. England

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 05 / May 1890, pp 210 - 211

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190274, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190274

How to cite this article:

E. B. England (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 210-211 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190274

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Herr von Sybel's thesis—the *Symposium* an Academic Programme—whether substantiated or not, is at least suggestive. For it reminds us how revolutionary was Plato's plan of education:—not less astonishing one would imagine to the upholders of the old Righteous Cause (Δίκαιος λόγος) than it would have seemed to the Busbys and the Keates of modern England. Plato dares once for all at the outset to discard exhortation (νοθηγητική) and to lay the foundation of the Higher Culture in sympathy. He is well aware that the new principle also has its weak side. But the one safeguard he requires is that sympathy should be informed with love of truth. Mere affection and mere knowledge taken apart (as witness Pausanias and Eryximachus) are corruptible and futile:—not so the passion, at once human and divine, which lifts companionship out of the trivial-

ities of human intercourse into energetic and practical communion with a noble ideal.

The *Symposium*, if read aright, is an inexhaustible well-spring of encouragement for the true teacher. It may remind him of his misfortunes—for did not Socrates fail with Alcibiades after all? But would 'Strict Age and sour Severity' have succeeded better? And how much worse a man would Alcibiades have been, had he never peeped under the Silenus-mask, or had he never known the 'oestrus' of Socratic enthusiasm, which all present at that bright gathering had in some way felt?

That all education, to be worth anything, must be creative in a sense, and that there can be no creation without sympathy nor without ideas—this is one at least of the many lessons of the *Symposium*.

L. CAMPBELL.

HEADLAM'S IPHIGENEIA AT AULIS OF EURIPIDES.

The Iphigeneia at Aulis of Euripides. With Introduction and Notes, by CLINTON E. S. HEADLAM, B.A. Cambridge University Press. 1889. 2s. 6d.

THIS is a book of the right sort. The matter of the notes and introduction, whether original or not, bears the stamp of thoughtful and enlightened consideration. The former contain many fresh and apt interpretations of single words and quotations of parallel passages, especially from Plato. As good instances I may mention the quotation from Theognis on v. 392 and the explanation (not to be found in Liddell and Scott) of the technical musical use of the word μεταβολή in illustration of v. 1101. Two passages in the text are emended by the editor. At v. 23 he reads λύπη for λυπεῖ—satisfactorily enough—making the same change in Machon's parody of the passage: and at v. 1310 Δαναΐδαις, σίνος κόρη for Δαναΐδαισιν, ὃ κόρη.

If the publication of selections from a play for school use can ever be justified it would be so in the case of the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Many scenes are very good, and large passages of the text are inconsistent with the good parts in almost every respect. Mr. Headlam has primarily had younger students in view and, as he has had to prepare for their use an edition of the whole of the text, his ingenuity has been here and there pressed into the service of an unwholesome conservatism. This remark applies in general to the unquestioning

retention of the second part (vv. 231—303) of the parodos, and the whole of the messenger's speech in the exodus: and in particular to the defence of such expressions as ὥστε τερφθείης (418—'opt. of wish'), and ἵνα πλῆξεν ἄν (1579—ἵνα 'local'): to the assumption that ἀναψύχουσι θηλύπων βάσιν (v. 421), which is translated 'they are easing their delicate feet,' is applied by Euripides to 'ladies and steeds alike': and to v. 678, where χώρει δὲ μελάρων ἐντὸς ὀφθῆναι κόραις is taken to mean 'go inside, out of sight of the men,' lit. 'so as to be seen by maidens alone.' (It appears to me that it is the punctuation alone which has been at fault here, and that the two lines should be read:

χώρει δὲ μελάρων ἐντὸς ὀφθῆναι κόραις
πικρόν· φίλημα δοῦσα δεξιάν τ' ἐμοί,

ὀφ. κ. π. being a parenthesis.)

There is very little in the book which can be criticised as careless work. The second; in v. 3 is a misprint, nor does the; in v. 725 harmonize with the explanation given in the notes. These, with the omission of an accent on p. 124, l. 20, are all the misprints I have noticed. 'Leave go' (on v. 310) is an objectionable expression, and the notes on vv. 358, 700, and 1017 may be thought to show a want of proper distinction between the different tenses: (on 1017 ἢ ἐπίθετ' is translated 'in case you persuaded,' and no explanation is given of the use of the plural verb).

The introduction is interesting, though exception may be taken to the prominence given on p. xiii. fin. and f. to the 'idea of an inexorable fate' as a leading 'motive' in the tragedy. The peculiarity of Euripides in providing adequate *human* 'motives' is, I

venture to think, nowhere more conspicuous than in the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*.

If for the 'Chronological Table' at the end of the introduction a table of the choric metres had been substituted it would have been a distinct gain to the book.
E. B. ENGLAND.

CORAY'S NOTES ON HESYCHIUS.

Adamantii Corais opera posthuma. Vol. vii. containing notes on the Lexicon of Hesychius. Edited by N. M. DAMALAS. Athens 1889 (Pp. 152). 4s.

THE valuable jottings which the eminent Coray inscribed in the margin of his copy of Alberti's Hesychius—lately discovered at Chios—have found a judicious editor in M. Damalas, a Professor of Theology at Athens. The standard edition of Hesychius now is that of Mor. Schmidt, and M. Damalas has added Schmidt's notes in brackets, so that, without the trouble of turning from one book to another, the reader can compare the acuteness of the German with the acuteness of the Greek.

That a scholar of Greek nationality is in a much better position in some respects than a scholar of any other to edit a Greek glossary is brought home to us by this posthumous work of Coray as much as by his other writings. The knowledge that vinegar is called euphemistically *γλυκάδι*, *γλυκάδιον* prevented him from suspecting any serious corruption in the gloss *ἀδύθεμον ὄξος*. He merely writes *ἀδυσμόν*, but he would have done better if he had not attempted to emend; *ἀδύθεμον* is just as likely as *ἀδυσμόν*, and, as it stands in the text, we are bound to accept it, if we have no conflicting evidence. Again, on *βρόγχος*: '*ρούφισμα, ρούφισμα est ex Neograecorum lingua*,' so that Schmidt's conjecture *ρόφημα* (in itself unlikely) is disposed of. *ἀφιλοκάλητον*, a gloss on *ἀκατασκεύαστον*, means 'unswept,' cf. modern Greek *ἀφλοκάλητον*, *ἀφροκάλητον*. Similarly *λόγγη τάφος* (I will not quarrel with Coray for reading *τάφος*) is illustrated thus, '*apud nos hodie Λόγγος (gen. masc.) est saltus*.' On *φύμα ψώρα* he notes that the modern compound *ψωροφύτης* *la teigne des enfants* comes from these words.

Like most students of Hesychius Coray is too fond of 'emending.' The only corrections proposed by him which I should feel inclined to accept are two. (1) In the diffi-

cult gloss *ῥαδάνη κρόκος. ὁμοίως ῥοδάνη*, his knowledge that '*les Grecs modernes donnent au rouet les noms de ῥοδάνη et τζικρίκι*' enabled him to suggest *κρίκος*. *τζικρίκι* would come from *κρίκος* as *τζικνίδα* from *κνίδη*. This emendation, though by no means certain, may lay claim to probability. (2) For *λία* (*κρίνα. ἄνθη. ἰα*) he neatly proposes *λίλια*, that is, Latin *lilia*, which suits the alphabetical order. If this is right it is a good instance of a well-known source of textual error.

As a specimen of Coray's ingenuity I may call attention to his conjecture on *βρόχος ἀγκύλη. Δημόκριτος*. Observing that *Δημόκριτος* occurred in the previous gloss he proposes *δημόκοινος, minister publicus*. The hangman might be called a rope, by the so-called figure of metonymy. This ingenuity is misplaced. For the hopeless *γύαι πάμποι* he would read *γύαι* (or *γύαι*) *κάμποι*, which is certainly better than Perger's *γυαί πάπποι*.

He is right in defending the gloss *γλοιάς ἢ κακοήθης ἵππος καὶ πολυδίκη. πολυδίκη* is from *δικεῖν*, to throw, and is not an explanation of *γλοιάς* (slippery-footed) but '*potius innuit γλοιάδα praeterea et πολυδίκην ab aliquibus dictam fuisse*.' On the other hand, there is no reason to call in question, as Coray does, *ἄπροπον ἄτροπον, ἀπρεπές* (he suggests *ἀότροπον* for *ἄπροπον* at the expense of the order). We should rather be grateful for an indication that *-προπος*, related to *πρέπω* as *τρόπος* to *τρέπω*, really existed. Again, the valuable gloss *αἰόν μάταιον* would get scant mercy from Coray, who proposes *αἰόλον* (rightly as far as sense is concerned). *αἰός* is the adjective of which *αἰόλος* is the diminutive (*ῥασίος = varius*). If Coray had been more familiar with Aeschylus he would have spared us the conjecture *τέλη* for *στέφη* in the following quotation: *αἰθρία ἐν τῷ στίχῳ τοῦ Κρατίου ὑπερβορείου αἰθρία τιμώντας στέφη*. Compare *Choeph.* 95, *τοῖσι πέμπουσιν τάδε στέφη (= χοάς)*, which shows in what a wide range of sense *στέφος* was used.

On the interesting gloss
ἐξήμαρ ἐπέρασεν