

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](#)



Schmidt's Studies on the Greek Dramatists *Kritische Studien zu den Griechischen Dramatikern*. Dr. F. W. Schmidt. Berlin. Weidmann, 1886. Vol. I. 8 Mk. Vol. II. 14 Mk.

R. C. Jebb

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 04 / May 1887, pp 93 - 96

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183933, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183933

How to cite this article:

R. C. Jebb (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 93-96 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183933

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the property of an Ionian school. By the same means the Epic poetry was elaborated and expanded in Ionian hands. The work of translation, and the consequent Ionicising of the Homeric poetry, must have been gradual. The 69th Olympiad marks nearly the close of the process. The commencement can only be inferred by *à priori* evidence. But the elaboration and expansion in question appear to coincide very nearly with the growth of alphabetic writing in Ionia, according to the dates assigned by Kirchhoff. The solitary allusion to writing (as it may almost certainly be regarded) occurs in a passage of *Iliad* vi., which Fick treats as an episode, probably composed in honour of some princely family of Ionia, who traced their ancestry to the Lycian Glaucus. The fact that Simonides, in quoting from this passage, ascribes the words to the 'man of Chios,' implies of course that the episode had long been a part of the 'Homeric' poetry. But there is nothing in the passage to indicate such antiquity as would oblige

us to refer the 'baleful signs,' with Dr. Isaac Taylor (*The Alphabet*, vol. ii. p. 119) to an early 'Asiatic' syllabary. On the contrary, there is a tone very unlike the real 'Homer' in the mournful apophthegm, which struck Simonides as the 'fairest of sayings.' He himself might have composed these lines, which I translate in the metre of the original:

The races of men are born and die as the
leaves of the forest.
As the dead leaves fall betimes in the wind,
but anon with the springtide
The greenwood is quickened again, and the
leafage appeareth in season,
So hath the seed of man its time to increase
and to perish.

The description of the long message of deadly import, which Proetus 'graved in a folded tablet,' seems to point to a time when alphabetic writing was known, but was still a novelty.

GEORGE C. WARR.

SCHMIDT'S STUDIES ON THE GREEK DRAMATISTS.

Kritische Studien zu den Griechischen Dramatikern. DR. F. W. SCHMIDT. Berlin. Weidmann, 1886. Vol. I. 8 Mk. Vol. II. 14 Mk.

In these volumes Dr. F. W. Schmidt collects the fruits of his studies in Attic Tragedy during the last ten years. The first volume (pp. xiv. + 282) contains emendations of Aeschylus and Sophocles; the second (iv. + 511), of Euripides. The prefatory note to the second volume (dated Dec. 7, 1886), promises a third.

It is just a quarter of a century since, in his work *De ubertate orationis Sophocleae* (ii. 25), Dr. Schmidt wrote of himself, 'mihi ipsi multo potius est conservare quam destruere.' In the Preface to his new work, he describes himself as being, indeed, 'a nature of thoroughly conservative bent'; but years have changed his point of view. He began with an earnest desire to defend the manuscript tradition against rash innovation. He has come to feel that there is a still higher duty—namely, to vindicate the genius of the ancient masters from the blunders of transcribers. He holds, with his friend Nauck, that 'we must ascribe to Sophocles, under all circumstances, the most beautiful work, the most complete, that we can conceive';

and further, that the extant plays suffice to give us a standard by which we can separate the spurious from the genuine 'with tolerable certainty.' The result to which, in practice, this doctrine leads is exaggerated distrust of the tradition. The subjective test is as arbitrary as it is rigorous. Spuriousness is at once assumed if anything, in language or in matter, does not square with the critic's notions. The niceties of Greek idiom are not observed with sufficient care, or with that sympathetic allowance for possible modifications of them which is to language what the scientific imagination is to science; the poetical context is seldom studied with sufficient closeness; the spirit of prose—and sometimes of tame prose—is apt to be dominant. I have elsewhere noticed a palmary instance, — Nauck's rejection of *O. C.* 610f.

The present volumes abound with examples. The reasons assigned for pronouncing a passage corrupt repeatedly surprise us by their manifest inadequacy. All the diligence is reserved for the task of emendation. It can hardly be doubted that this school of criticism must at last engender a defensive reaction, of which, indeed, there are already signs among the best German scholars of the new generation.

Meanwhile, it is only just to recognise the learning, the industry, the frequent acuteness, the uniform candour and modesty of Dr. Schmidt's work. Even those who believe that few of his emendations ought to find their way into the texts can read his studies with interest and profit. For emendations are not necessarily useless when they are not right. They may have a suggestive value; they can try, and strengthen, our comprehension of the original text.

In the first place we may notice some passages where Dr. Schmidt's conjectures, if not convincing, are at least attractive. In Eur. *Phoen.* 1651 ff., Antigone protests against Creon's refusal of sepulture to Polyneices:—

1651. AN. οὐκ ἔννομον γὰρ τὴν δίκην πρᾶσσεσθὲνιν.

KP. εἶπερ γε πόλεως ἐχθρὸς ἦν, οὐκ ἐχθρὸς ὦν.

1653. AN. οὐκ οὖν ἔδωκε τῇ τύχῃ τὸν δαίμονα;

KP. καὶ τῷ τάφῳ νῦν τὴν δίκην παρασχέτω.

The scholiast took v. 1653 to mean, 'Did he not, then, pay the doom (death) to his fortune?'—an impossible version. Nor will ἔδωκεν ἡ τύχη serve. Schmidt (vol. ii. p. 429) proposes οὐκ οὖν ὁδ' εἶκε τῇ τύχῃ τῶν δαιμόνων; 'Was he not constrained, then, by the heaven-sent fate?' Cp. Aesch. *Ag.* 1071, εἰκοσ' ἀνάγκῃ. I incline to believe that this is a true correction. Schmidt quotes Eur. *I. T.* 867, δαίμονος τύχα τινός (where Herwerden needlessly proposes τέχνα): but he might more aptly have quoted Eur. fr. 37, τὰς δὲ δαιμόνων τύχας. In v. 1651 he would change ἐχθρὸς ὦν to ἐχθρὰ δρῶν, and takes the sense to be: 'Yes, (my decision is *unjust*), if he was a foe of the city without doing a foeman's deeds,—i.e. a harmless foe. But ἐχθρὸς ὦν is clearly sound. Creon means: 'Yes, (my decision is just.) seeing that he was the city's foe, though no foe (by birth),—but a natural φίλος.—In Eur. *Andr.* 468, sons born to the same man by different women (ἀμφιμάτορες κόροι) are said to be ἔριδας οἶκον δυσμενείς τε λύπας. Instead of ἔριδας we want --, as the antistrophe shows. Schmidt (ii. 38) proposes οἶκον ἐρινύς. This is ingenious, but the word is too strong; the notion required is merely, 'cause of dissension.' ἐρίσματ' (or ἐρισμά τ') οἶκον lies nearer (the sing. ἐρισμα occurs in *Il.* 4. 37), and ἔριδας may well have been a gloss on it. This correction was suggested by Hermann, and had occurred to me independently.—In *Andr.* 746 ἀδύνατος οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν λέγειν μόνον, Schmidt's ἔρδων (ii. 44) is taking, at first sight; but, just as we have

ἀδύνατα (= οὐ δύνατα) μὴ οὐ βλέπτειν, so it is conceivable that οὐδὲν might stand here; and in any case οὐ δυνατός (Rappold) is a gentler remedy.

In Aesch. *P. V.* 1031, ἀλλὰ καὶ λίαν εἰρημένος is opposed to πεπλασμένος (said of the threat, κόμπο:, brought from Zeus by Hermes), and ought to mean, 'but denounced in all earnest.' Schmidt (i. 2) cleverly proposes ἀλλ' ἐκ καρδίας εἰρημένος. The participle has certainly never been corrected with success (for εἰμαρμένος will not serve). The true question, however, is not whether καὶ λίαν alone, could mean, 'in good earnest,' but whether, in combination with εἰρημένος, it could have that sense. εἰρημαί is often used of solemn decision or command (cp. ῥήτρα), and a doom, which is καὶ λίαν εἰρημένος, might (I think) be contrasted with one uttered merely in jest, or so as to scare without hurting. In *O. T.* 579, ἄρχεις δ' ἐκένη ταῦτα γῆς ἴσον νέμων ('and thou rulest the land as she doth, with equal sway'), Schmidt is again ingenious in proposing (i. 164) ἀρχῆς δ' ἐκένη ταῦτ' ἔχεις ἴσον νέμων, 'and thou hast all this' (power in Thebes), 'having an equal share of sway with her.' But ταῦτ' ἔχεις (to say nothing of palaeographical probability) is odd; while the only plausible objection to the vulgate, viz. the absolute use of νέμων as = 'ruling,' is very easily met: cp. Pind. *P.* 3, 70, ὅς Συρακόσσοισι νέμει βασιλεύς, 'who rules at Syracuse,'—where, as here, the special sense of νέμω is suggested by the context. In *O. T.* 1031 τί δ' ἄλγος ἴσχοντ' ἐν κακοῖς με λαμβάνεις, Schmidt would read (i. 173) τί δ'; ἐσχάτους ὄντ' ἐν κακοῖς με λαμβάνεις;—supposing that from the last five letters of ἐσχάτους came ἄλγος, and from the first three the ἴσχ of ἴσχοντ': but, though ἐσχ' ἄλγος might have thus arisen, it is not likely that the first corrupted syllable should have jumped over the two next. In *O. C.* 1076 Schmidt seems not insensible to the merit of Bücheler's ἀντάσειν for the hopeless ἀν δώσειν, but proposes ἀν λείσσειν (i. 196). Now, if we had to do with the infin. verb only, ἀν λείσσειν would be slightly nearer to the letters than ἀντάσειν: but in the next verse L has τὰν δεινὰ τλᾶσαν δεινὰ δ' εὐρούσαν, which ἀντάσειν suffers us to keep, with only the change of accent (from acc. sing. to gen. plur.); whereas Schmidt is forced by his λείσσειν to write τῷ δεινὰ τλάσα δεινὰ δ' εὐρούσα. This case is a good illustration of a general rule. Palaeographical probability, in regard to a single word, is relative to the context; i.e. the best restoration is not necessarily that which is closest to the letters of the single word, if (as compared with an alternative slightly

inferior in that respect) it involves a greater disturbance of neighbouring words.

In *O. C.* 1336 Schmidt's οἰκνοῦμεν for οἰκοῦμεν (i. 200) is neat, but not right. First, οἰκνοῦμεν is not ἀλώμεθα, 'wander in exile.' Secondly, οἰκοῦμεν is perfectly suitable. Oedipus has found a new home with his protector Theseus; Polyneices, with his father-in-law, Adrastus.—*Ant.* 390 σχολῇ ποθ' ἤξεν δεῦρ' ἂν ἐξήρουν ἐγώ. Schmidt proposes δεῦρ', ἀναξ, ἤρουν (i. 183). This, if somewhat obvious, is elegant; but the text is faultless. Few verses have been more tortured, on the assumption that ἂν could not go with ἐξήρουν. But cp. *Eur. Helen.* 1619, οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἤρουν οὔτε σ' οὔθ' ἡμᾶς λαβεῖν | Μενέλαον, ἄναξ, ὡς ἐλάνθανεν παρών: 'I should never have said,'—where, just as here, the suppressed protasis is, 'if I had been asked.' *Lys. or.* 12 § 22, ἐγὼ δ' ἐβουλόμην ἂν αὐτοὺς ἀληθῆ λέγειν, 'I could wish': sc. εἰ δυνατόν ἦν. The difficulties made about the ἂν in this verse (*Ant.* 390) seem to spring from a confused notion that, because the φύλαξ had actually said (in an 'aside,' 329) that he did not mean to come back, he was therefore debarred from using such a turn of phrase as, 'I could have vowed that I should not soon be here again.'

An immense number of the emendations in these volumes concern passages which do not afford a shadow of real ground for surmising any fault in the text. A few samples of this very large class may be given. *Aesch. Theb.* 244, τοῦτω γὰρ Ἄρης βόσκεται, φόνω βορῶν. Eteocles has just said, 'If ye hear of men dying or wounded, be not swift to cry aloud; for this is Ares' food, even the b'ood of men.' It might have been thought that, in such a context, τοῦτω was secure against suspicion. Yet Weil would change it to κοινῶ, while others have proposed χλωρῶ or βνῶ. Schmidt (i. 5) prefers, 'as surer,' θούρος.—*Ag.* 418, ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχρνίας: Schmidt (i. 34), δωμάτων δ' ἐν ἐρημίας.—*Cho.* 845f. ἡ πρὸς γυναικῶν δειματούμενοι λόγοι | πεδάροισι θρώσκουσι, θνήσκοντες μάτην. Schmidt (i. 82) alters θνήσκοντες to φάσκοντες. *O. T.* 719, ἔρρυψεν ἄλλων χερσίν: Schmidt (i. 170) ἔρρυψ' ὁπαδῶν χερσίν.—*Id.* 792 δηλώσοιμ': Schmidt (i. 171) γενήσοιμ'.—*O. C.* 907, νῦν δ' οὔσπερ αὐτὸς τοὺς νόμους εἰσῆλθ' ἔχων. Admitting that the article is confirmed by *Ant.* 404, θάπτουσιν δν σὺ τὸν νεκρὸν | ἀπείπας, Schmidt objects to εἰσῆλθε in reference to entering the land (but why?); and proposes (i. 195) νῦν δ' οὔσπερ αὐτὸς θεεὶς νόμους εἰσῆλθε γῆν.—*Ant.* 517, οὐ γάρ τι δοῦλος ἀλλ' ἀδελφὸς ὤλετο. Schmidt, for τι δοῦλος, would read τριδούλος (i. 184).—*Eur. Andr.* 462f., εἰ δ' ἐγὼ

πράσσω κακῶς, | μῆδ' ἐν τῷδ' αἵχει καὶ σὺ γὰρ πράξειας ἂν. For πράξειας, πταισείας (ii. 37).—*Her.* 1226f., ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ σαφέστατοι | φίλοι. Nothing could seem less provocative of change. But Schmidt would read ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς γὰρ ἂν μάθοις σαφέστατα | φίλους (ii. 99).—*Eur. fr.* 94, αἰεὶ δ' ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κρατοῦσι ταῦτα γὰρ | δούλοις ἀριστα. Both αἰεὶ, and the infin. as a 'sententious' imperat., suit the γνώμη: yet Schmidt would alter αἰεὶ into μέλου (ii. 440). All this is not amending, but wanton re-writing. Yet there is hardly a page of either volume which does not furnish such instances.

In his Preface the author expresses a laudable distaste for conjectures which ignore palaeographical probability (p. ix). And he is frequently careful to indicate the process by which he conceives the corruption to have arisen. But, on the other hand, there are numerous instances in which this principle is either strained or disregarded. Thus in *O. T.* 420ff., βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος οὐκ ἔσται λιμὴν, Schmidt is tempted to read βοῆς δὲ σῆς τίς οὐκ ἀκούσεται μέλη, but rejects this elegant verse in favour of βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῦ ποτ' οὐκ ἔσται μέλη: and then proceeds to change σύμφωνος τάχα (421) into σύμφωνος γόοις, and δόμοις (422) into πάλαι,—assuming (a) that πάλαι (uncial) generated τάχα, and γόοις, δόμοις: and (b) that the corrupted words then changed places (i. 161).—In *O. T.* 1512, εἵχεσθέ μοι becomes εἵχος φανῶ (i. 181).—In *O. C.* 1083, where θεωρήσασα τοῦμὸν ὄμμα is corrupt, θεωρήσας φίλον θέαμα is proposed (i. 196). Now, it is true that OMMA and ΘΕΑΜΑ might without much difficulty be confused; but it is a harder saying that 'in ΤΟΥΜΟΝ' (sic) 'tritt ΦΙΑΟΝ nicht minder deutlich zu Tage' (i. 196).—In *O. C.* 1116, ταῖς τηλικαῖσδε συμκρὸς ἐξαρκεῖ λόγος, the first two words are changed to ταῖσδ' ἐν τύχαις γε, because it is unworthy of Sophocles to glance—as he seems to do here—at other poets who had given long speeches to young maidens (i. 198); but Schmidt has forgotten that in *Soph. El.* 1289 there is another instance of such covert criticism.—In *Eur. Bacch.* 209, δι' ἀριθμῶν οὐδὲν is changed to ἀπωθῶν δ' οὐδέν', which suits the sense, but is not palaeographically justified by the suggestion that ΔΙ may have been a dittographia of ΑΠ (ii. 55). Brady's διαίρων (received by Tyrrell) is still the best correction.—*Eur. Her.* 169, ἐρεῖς τὸ λῶστον ἐλπιδ' εἰρήσειν μόνον. The Argive Copreus is dissuading Demophon from sheltering the children of Heracles. The sense is, 'At best, you will gain only a hope,' viz., of the strength which the young Heracleidae will

bring to Athens when they come to manhood. I incline to think that we should read:—*ἔρῳ τὸ λῶστον ἐλπίδ' εὐρήσει μόνον*. Schmidt's treatment of this verse is remarkable. In ΕΛΠΙΑ he finds XAPIN: in ΕΥΡΗΣΕΙΝ, ΕΚΤΙΞΕΙΝ: in ΜΟΝΟΝ, ΣΤΟΛΟΝ: in ΤΟΛΩΙ, ΠΟΛΕΙ: in ΣΤΟΝ, ΠΟΤΕ: and so evolves a verse which has not a word, except the first, in common with the text; viz. *ἔρεῖς πόλει ποτὲ χάριν ἐκτίσειν στόλον*. (ii. 170). He anticipates the criticism that, in a textual sense, he has 'not left one stone standing on another'; but expects an admission that 'in detail the changes are not improbable, and the restored sense leaves nothing to be desired.'

We know on good authority—that of Dionysius himself—that the equanimity of Sophocles in the shades was what it had been on earth; but verily there are some things here that might try it a little, if there is any consciousness of emendations in the house of Hades. Consider, for example, *O.T.* 1084: *τοιούσδε δ' ἐκφῶς οὐκ ἂν ἐξέλθοιμι* ἔτι | *ποτ' ἄλλος, ὥστε μὴ 'κμαθεῖν τοῦμόν γένος*. Under Dr. Schmidt's treatment, this comes out as follows:—*τοιούσδε δ' ἐκφῶς οὐκ ἂν ἐξέλθοιμι τις* | *ἄνθρωπος, οὗ 'στι μὴ ἐκμαθεῖν λῶν γένος*: 'a person whose birth it is better not to find out' (i. 176). In *O.T.* 374, *μᾶς τρέφει πρὸς νυκτός*, becomes *διαστρέφῃ πρὸς νυκτός*, 'you are led astray by Night' (i. 158). In *O.T.* 284f., *ἀνακτ' ἀνακτι ταῦθ' ὁρῶντ' ἐπίσταμαι* | *μάλιστα Φοῖβω Τειρεσίαν* emerges as *ἀνακτι Φοῖβω ταῦθ' ὁρῶντ' ἐπίσταμαι* | *μάλιστα φῶρᾶν Τειρεσίαν* ('is most likely to detect the culprit,' i. 155). We have no room for more examples; but the few which have been cited are only average specimens of a large class.

Lastly, we notice in these volumes an occasional tendency to re-open textual questions long ago settled (in the general opinion) by corrections so simple and so convincing

as to appear final. Among the corrections of this rare order we cannot hesitate to number Valckenār's in Eur. *Hipp.* 441f., *οὐ τᾶρα γ' οὐ δέϊ τοῖς ἐρώσει τῶν πέλας* | *ὅσοι τε μέλλουσ', εἰ θανείν αὐτοὺς χρεών*. The Nurse is saying to Phaedra, 'Thou lovest; what wonder? So do many. And then art thou to die for love? Truly 'tis hard for those who love,—and yet shall love,—if they must die.' The corruption is in *οὐ δέϊ*. The scholiast gives, *οὐ λυσιτελεῖ*. On this hint Valckenār restored *οὐ τᾶρα λύει*. (Cp. *Alc.* 627, *φημὶ τοιούτους γάμους* | *λύειν βροτοῖς*.) The phrase perfectly suits the Nurse's tone. Schmidt objects to this most certain correction that the words *ὅσοι τε μέλλουσ'* remain obscure; as if the common ellipse of the infin. (*ἐρᾶν*) was a difficulty: cp. Thuc. 3, 55, *οὔτε ἐπάθετε οὔτε ἐμελλήσατε*: Soph. *Tr.* 75, *ἐπιστρατεύειν . . . ἣ μέλλειν ἔτι*. He then re-writes thus: *οὐ τᾶρα πότμον τοῖς ἐρώσιν ἐντυχῇ* | *θεοὶ νέμονται, εἰ θανείν αὐτοὺς χρεών* (ii. 234). In Eur. *Suppl.* 745, *οἱ τόξον ἐκτείνοντες τοῦ καιροῦ πέρα*, the simple correction of *τοῦ* to *ὡς* (exclamatory) seems nearly certain. *ὡς* had dropped out: a scribe ignorant of metre supplied *τοῦ*. Schmidt writes *καὶ τόξον ἐκτείνοντες οὐ καιρῶ, τὸ πᾶν*, and places the verse between 740 and 741 (with *ἔπειρ'* for *κάπειρ'* in the latter).

Tested by the number of real corruptions which find probable corrections, these studies yield but a small result. Viewed, on the other hand, as exercises of ingenuity on given texts, they are often interesting; most often so, perhaps, when they challenge us to show that the impugned text can be vindicated by a just interpretation. 'Sarcinas colligam antequam proficiscar e vita,' is Dr. Schmidt's motto; but all scholars will hope that the melancholy ring of Varro's words is fraught with no omen.

R. C. JEBB.

BLAYDES' ARISTOPHANES.

Aristophanis Comici quae supersunt opera; recensuit F. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Sax-onum, 1886. 2 vols. 16 Mk.

MR. BLAYDES has chosen a very attractive form for his recension of the text of Aristophanes. No other edition—not even Meineke's *Prachttausgabe*—can compare with it in external beauty. And though we may hesitate to admit that none of the

other editions is 'ab omnibus partibus absoluta et litteratorum usui accommodata,' we may gladly allow that Mr. Blaydes' is better fitted than any other to be the Library and indeed the Standard edition of the Comedian.

How much Mr. Blaydes had done for Aristophanes more than forty years ago can be seen by any one who studies the critical notes of Meineke or A. Müller on the Acharnians; and his later editions have all