

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](#)



Jebb's *Oedipus Tyrannus* Sophocles. *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Professor JEBB. 2nd Edition. 12s. 6d.

R. Whitelaw

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 03 / March 1888, pp 74 - 76

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192157, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192157

How to cite this article:

R. Whitelaw (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 74-76 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192157

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

phyrion, Acon and COMM. CRUQ., who can exactly estimate the evidential value of ABMOSTDY, and who is aware that Dr. Bentley thinks that *capacis Orci* would, possibly on theological ground, be an improvement on *rapacis Orci*, while Peerlkamp, if he had written the Odes, would have written *Sudare magnos jam video duces*. It may be so; but, if it is so, then the study of the classics, long and justly considered a necessary part of liberal education, will not long withstand the vigorous attacks with which it is continually assailed. The great classical writers have served for the delight

and discipline of many generations, because it has been their singular good fortune to express imperishable thoughts in language the perfection of which has never been surpassed, and rarely rivalled. They will cease to be studied if, instead of endeavouring to understand the secret of their living force, we make it our chief object to attain to a laborious knowledge of dry and unprofitable details connected with their survival. We shall find that we have let slip the kernel, while engaged in learned disquisitions about the exact constitution of the husk.

T. E. PAGE.

JEBB'S OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

Sophocles. Oedipus Tyrannus. Professor JEBB. 2nd Edition. 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR JEBB has subjected his commentary on the *Oed. Tyr.*, which appeared in 1883, to a careful and laborious revision throughout. He most truly says, 'The commentary, as it is now sent forth, will furnish sufficient evidence of the desire which I have felt to profit by any criticism which has convinced my own judgment, and to express gratitude for such criticism in the most practical form.' Nothing need be said here of the consummate excellence of the book, as it was, and is: the object of the present notice is to call attention to some of the alterations in detail which have been made in the new edition, rendering the book more than ever a 'vivid exposition' of Prof. Jebb's mind in relation to Sophocles.

The critical notes on the text have been rewritten in English. Latin critical notes were a survival and a luxury, hardly consistent with an English commentary; and common sense approves the change. But it entails some sacrifices. The 'traditional Latin of scholars' had its merits. Prof. Jebb was not one to avail himself of its controversial amenities. He never described a rejected emendation by the favourite 'traditional' epithet *putidissima*, so sweetly suggestive to the modern reader. But we miss in the sober English of the new critical notes such felicities as 'vulneris antiqui cicatrix,' 'praeposteram lectionem εξέθραψε κατέφρασε,' 'huius versus causam orare nullo coram iudice reformidem,' 'quod vereor ut Sophocleae Χάριτες facile patiantur.' Professor Jebb is more impressed than formerly

with the truth of the view that 'the positive worth of the corrections supplied by the other MSS. is no greater than it easily might have been if the Laurentian were their common parent.' He therefore adopts (when 'more specific statement is unnecessary') a summary and general denotation of the later MSS., by which 'the paramount significance of the Laurentian is brought into clear and bold relief.'

Notes either entirely rewritten or materially altered will be found at lines 34, 43, 98, 161, 178, 325, 397, 523, 775, 997, 1296, 1415. At 171 is a new note; at 1002, 1520, new notes, with change in translation; at 71, a defence of *ῥυσταίμην* added; at 493, note rewritten, but view maintained; at 1090, suggested emendation withdrawn, with new note, and further discussion in Appendix; a corresponding change at 1101; at 1219, defence at greater length of Prof. Jebb's ingenious correction *ὥσπερ ἰάλεμον χέων*. At 478, J. F. Martin is credited with anticipation of Prof. Lushington's conjecture, *πέτρας ἰσόταυρος*.

I am encouraged by Prof. Jebb's more than courteous reception of past criticisms to venture a few remarks suggested by some of the additions or alterations in this edition. 44. In note, the rendering 'issues of counsels' is now explained as concise for 'occurrences connected with (resulting from) counsels.' But *τύχην ἐσθλὴν τῇδε τῆς ὁδοῦ*, O.C. 1506, is 'the good fortune of this coming' (Prof. Jebb's translation), gen. of definition. In Thuc. i. 140, *τὰς ἐνυμφωρὰς τῶν πραγμάτων*, the gen. is, I think, objective ('the way in which things are brought together,' 'the comings-about of things'), cp.

Thuc. i. 23, παθήματα ξυμνήχθη γενέσθαι. Prof. Jebb says, 'Objectors fail to distinguish between English and Greek gen. They think that because we could not say "occurrences of counsels," therefore συμφοραὶ βουλευμάτων in this sense is impossible. It would be just as reasonable to object to λυγρῶν πόνων ἰκτῆρες (185) because we could not say "suppliants of weary woes."' But πόνων ἰκτῆρες (if indeed the gen. does not go with the verb of emotion ἐπιστενάχουσι) is like ἐνθάκης ἡλίου or ἀπόβας γῆς or ἐρωτησις πηλοῦ. It is (indirectly) objective; corresponding to ἰκετεύειν περὶ πόνων as they to ἐθακεῖν (ἐν) ἡλίῳ, ἀποβῆναι ἐς γῆν, ἐρωτᾶν περὶ πηλοῦ. Prof. Jebb, insisting on the strangeness of ξυμφοραὶ βουλευμάτων in the sense 'collationes consiliorum,' seems hardly to give due weight to the consideration that Sophocles had presumably in his mind the Aeschylean συμφέρειν βουλευματα. 'If Sophocles had intended to suggest συμφέρειν βουλευματα,' Prof. Jebb says, βουλευμάτων would have come at once. But ζώσας comes at once, to warn the hearer that there is something unusual about ξυμφοράς. And in giving up 'issues,' as he practically does, Prof. Jebb loosens his hold upon ζώσας. 'Conferences of counsels' (i.e. 'counsels when men confer') may be said to 'live,' and so may 'issues of counsels,' but hardly 'occurrences.' Again, 'the new interpretation' does not say, 'Men of experience are most ready to consult other people'; but 'Men of experience may prove their superior wisdom, not only unaided, but also in conference with others.' This does not lower Oedipus 'to the ordinary level,' but saves εἴτ' ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς οἰσθᾶ πού from the appearance of doing so. Most readers will agree that Prof. Kennedy's 'collatio exemplorum' in support of his 'law of ὥς, since,' does not 'live' (or 'breathes but badly') after Prof. Jebb's examination: and the same may be said of the collection of passages, by means of which Dr. Verrall, as Prof. Jebb humorously says, has gone near to prove that ξυμφορὰ never means 'occurrence.' 155. No longer explained 'Are we to suffer a new plague or an old one?' but 'Must the mode of expiation be new or old?' Qu. however if the normal meaning of ἐξάνύω ('what thing thou wilt work for me') suffices for this? In *Ant.* 1178 the normal meaning of ἀνύω is hardly suitable to the prophet, and in *O.C.* 454 it makes ποτὲ = 'at length.' 220. (1) Prof. Jebb now says (following in this Prof. Butcher), 'The suppressed protasis is εἰ μὴ ἐξείπον, supplied from ἐξερῶ. "For, if I had not thus spoken,—appealing

to you for help in tracking the crime,—I should not have tracked it far by myself.'" But is it possible to say 'I will appeal: for, if I had not appealed, I should have failed. But now I do appeal.'? Prof. Butcher says, 'Oedipus has thrown himself in imagination into the future, and looks back upon the event.' Could a man say, 'I will jump; for, if I had not jumped, I should have been a coward. But now—I jump'? Surely, if the sentence οὐ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. referred to the appeal which Oedipus is about to make, we should have ἔχουσι. (2) Prof. Jebb avoids the 'logical contradiction' of his former version ('if I had not had some clue; but, as it is, having no clue.') But he does not, like Prof. Butcher, avail himself of the suppressed protasis εἰ μὴ ἐξείπον ['if I had not appealed to you, I should have failed. But now I do appeal to you.'] He regards μὴ οὐκ ἔχων τι σύμβολον as a second protasis limiting the first: 'If I had not appealed to you, I should have failed—unless indeed I had possessed a clue. But (νῦν δὲ) I possess none, and therefore I appeal to you.' Now there are two points here. (A) μὴ οὐκ ἔχων is made to stand for μὴ ἔχων, the οὐ being explained as due to the negatived main verb. (B) μὴ ἔχων is made to mean 'unless I had possessed (which I did not).' To begin with (B). μὴ ἔχων cannot be explained, I submit, as the equivalent of ὅτε μὴ εἶχον, 'in a case where I had no clue.' A generic clause, ὅτε μὴ εἶχον, with causal force, would indeed make admirable sense; but (1) it could not be followed by νῦν δέ, which requires a preceding unfulfilled supposition; (2) its participial equivalent would be οὐκ ἔχων. μὴ ἔχων, without article, and adverbial, must be hypothetical, standing therefore for εἰ μὴ εἶχον, 'if I had not possessed (which I did).' The Greek for 'I should have failed, unless I had possessed a clue,' so as to avoid the inference 'which I did,' is surely οὐκ ἂν μακρὰν ἔχουσιν, εἰ μὴ σύμβολον ἔχων; or (if the inference 'which I did not' be intended) εἰ μὴ εἰ εἶχον. (A) The translation 'Unless I had some clue, I could not have tracked it far' implies that a Greek writer would or could have written (as Prof. Jebb says he could) οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανε μὴ οὐ μαχόμενος, meaning 'He would not have been slain, unless he had fought.' I venture to think that the nine recorded examples of μὴ οὐ with participle (if Dem. *F.L.* p. 379 may be spoken of as one) afford no support to this view; and that, if this sentence occurred, it would mean 'He would not have been slain, unless he had refused to fight,' on the principle of εἰ μὴ Πρόξενον οὐχ ὑπέδεξαντο, Dem. *F.L.* p. 364.

314. ἀφ' ὧν ἔχει. The optative and subjunctive are equally used in 'universal statements': the difference seems to be, that the optative (in a primary sentence) generalises hypothetically, suggesting a doubt; much as 'It is a man's noblest task to help others, however he *might*,' differs from 'however he *may*.' Cp. *Apol.* 19E, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτό γέ μοι δοκεῖ καλὸν εἶναι, εἴ τις οἶός τ' εἴη παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους. 316. ἔνθα μὴ λύει, 'in all cases where': ἔνθα μὴ λύνει, 'in a case where.' The former in Latin being *indic.* (with *ubi-cumque* or the like); the latter, *subjunct.* (without the *cumque*). 380. Prof. Jebb now takes τέχνη to be 'the art of ruling.' He still understands τῷ πολυζήλῳ βίῳ, not as 'the much-envied life (of princes),' but as 'the life (of men) with its many rivalries': but the 'locative' dative in this interpretation seems questionable. 420. Prof. Jebb retains the dislocation of ποῖος λιμὴν, ποῖος Κιθαίων ('what place will not be harbour, what of all Cithaeron will not ring?'), and the (to me) impossible 'ποῖος Κιθαίων = ποῖον μέρος Κιθαίωνος'; but, in accordance with Prof. Butcher's correction, he now translates τὸν ὑμέναιον ὃν εἰσέπλευσας 'the marriage into which thou didst sail.' Surely the rest follows. 'From the storms of that harbourless harbour, even Cithaeron will be a haven.' 'What haven, what Cithaeron (what haven, though it should be Cithaeron itself) will not ring with thine outcries?' (Cp. εἰ με ναίειν ὄρσιν κ.τ.λ. 1451). Can it be said that this 'weakens the figurative force of λιμὴν'? 690. Prof. Jebb omits 'The εἰ νοσφίζομαι of the MSS. would necessarily imply that the Chorus do reject Oedipus.'

He still, however, argues against νοσφίζομαι. But there is nothing 'playful or ironical' about the indic. in *Apol.* 25B. ('If it is as you say, the young men have good reason to congratulate themselves,' 'might indeed be thought fortunate.') 1455. The note has been rewritten. But 'οἶδα οὐκ ἂν πέρσαι would be more usual' is not consistent with 'The ordinary usage is...μὴ with infin. after verbs of feeling confident...as πέποιθα, etc.' The possible constructions (in order of usualness) are: (1) οἶδα as verb of sense (a) with οὐ and partic., (b) with μὴ and partic. [of which *Oed. C.* 656 has always seemed to me a most difficult example; so much so, that I think Schaefer is right in his conj. οἶδ' ἐγὼ σ' οὐ μὴ τινα...ἀπάξοντ': indirect for οὐ μὴ ἀπάξει, like οὐ μὴ πέρσοιεν, *Phil.* 611, οὐ μὴ πράξειν, *Phoen.* 1590]. (2) οἶδα = πέποιθα, followed, like πέποιθα, by infin. with μὴ. On the question whether πέρσαι ἂν = πέρσοιεν ἂν or ἔπερσεν ἂν, Prof. Jebb, who holds for the future sense, remarks, 'The poet of Colonus gives Oedipus a presentiment that his end is not to be as that of other men.' But is κακῶ quite consistent with this? If πέρσαι ἂν is prospective, Oedipus is looking forward to a climax of evil. But surely that climax is past. 1529. Is ἀλβύζειν consecutive (no full stop at ἐλήλυθεν), or imperative? Prof. Jebb says imper.; and (in second edition) justifies the subject in the *accus.* by saying that the infin. represents an imper. of the third person (quoting for this *Il.* 5, 284). But *can* it stand for an imper. of the third person, no subject being expressed, otherwise than by θνητὸν ὄντα, ἐπισκοποῦντα?

R. WHITELAW.

LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM.

Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der Griechischen Kirche (pp. 317). Von Dr. LOOFS. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1887. 10 Mk.

THE present volume, forming Band iii. Heft 1, 2 of Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, is the first volume of a series of investigations into the writings which are grouped in the Greek and Latin Patrologies under the name of Leontius. It is devoted to the personal history of Leontius of Byzantium, and to a critical study of his theological writings; the second volume, which may be

expected in about twelve months from the issue of the first, being reserved for a study of Leontius of Neapolis, Leontius presbyter and monk, and author of the life of S. Gregory, and the extremely valuable collections of early Patristic extracts which pass under the name of *Parallels*, and are usually attributed to John of Damascus. The latter part of this volume will find its place among the Leontian writings owing to the fact that some copies of *Parallels* bear the ascription of joint-authorship of Leontius and John—a fact which at once suggests, what a cursory examination of those copies of the *Parallels* which are extant confirms, that there is an