

# 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](#)



**Recent Editions of Plays of Aristophanes** 1. *The Knights of Aristophanes*. Edited by R. A. Neil. Cambridge, 1901. Pp. xiv. 229. 10s. 2. *Aristophanis Equites*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. Van Leeuwen, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCC. Pp. xviii. 246. 6 M. 3. *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. Van Leruwen, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCCXI. Pp. xviii. 198. 5 M. 4. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*. Edited, translated, and explained by B. B. Rogers. ix. The Frogs, x. The Ecclesiazusae. London : Bell & Sons. 1902. Pp. xlviii. 274 and xxxv. 238. Price 15s.

Herbert Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 07 / October 1902, pp 354 - 357

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206550, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00206550](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206550)

## How to cite this article:

Herbert Richards (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 354-357 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206550

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

have used the word *τηλωπόν*, and that *κτείνει* in 440 may have arisen from *θείνει* glossing *κτίσαι* show that the dialect of scholia is still as much to learn as when he held that *μαινόλιν* and *ἀχέων* were glosses in the *Supplices*.

Elsewhere he appears too little sensitive to the difference between verse and prose; in 954 reading *ἐν χρόνους θέϊσα* to mean *χρόνους ἐμπούησασα*, and in 687 suggesting *κατ' ἄκρας ἐνστάσεως πορθούμεθα*, a prose word in a novel sense, 'our last place of resistance'; printing however *εἴπας ὡς πορθούμεθα* which would mean 'you have stated that we are destroyed,' but in the sense 'your tale imports our ruin' is a usage I had pointed out has no support in Greek.<sup>1</sup> In 914 *διχῶς ἐπράβην ὦν ἐλευθέρου πατρός* he does not indeed, like Dr. Verrall, translate it as though it were *διπλῶς*, but *διχῶς* is a purely prose word of the prosiest, most common in the language of grammar-

<sup>1</sup> The true reading, strange as it may look, I now believe to be M. Schmidt's *μηλεῶς*.

ians, *διχῶς*, *ἐξαχῶς*, *πολλαχῶς*, *λέγεται*, 'the word is used in 2, 6, many different senses;' and so far from Bothe's *αἰκῶς* being 'feeble' (V.), it seems to me to mark the point:—to be sold would be *οὐδὲν ἀεικὲς* for the slave-born; for the son of a free father it was *αἰκία*, a foul outrage.

While thinking, then, that in these 400 pages the professional scholar will not fail to find some gain, I also think that for a pupil there is a far larger balance of Aeschylus in the editions of Paley and Mr. Sidgwick, because for any step that Mr. Tucker has made forward he perversely makes so many backward. I do not think this work is worthy of him: perhaps too much Aristotle has allowed his natural instinct for the language to grow blunter; otherwise I cannot help feeling he must often do it violence. If he would foster it and give it freer play, I think he would do greater justice to his capabilities.

W. HEADLAM.

#### RECENT EDITIONS OF PLAYS OF ARISTOPHANES

1. *The Knights of Aristophanes*. Edited by R. A. NEIL. Cambridge, 1901. Pp. xiv. 229. 10s.
2. *Aristophanis Equites*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCC. Pp. xviii. 246. 6 M.
3. *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCCXI. Pp. xviii. 198. 5 M.
4. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*. Edited, translated, and explained by B. B. ROGERS. ix. The Frogs, x. The Ecclesiazusae. London: Bell & Sons. 1902. Pp. xlviii. 274 and xxxv. 238. Price 15s.

IN R. A. Neil Cambridge lost a true scholar. His premature death is also a real loss to the study of Aristophanes, for the book before us shows that he was in many ways admirably qualified for the work of a commentator on that fascinating but far from easy author. I should judge that Neil was not greatly interested in textual questions, for he dwells little on them and makes (I think), no valuable suggestion. Nor does his strength show itself in solving the riddle of very difficult passages and find-

ing a key to anything that has long been a mystery. It is to be found rather in two things. One is the care and the width of reading which he brings to bear on every ordinary point as it arises, calling the reader's attention to very many things that would probably escape him, and furnishing a neat and often convincing commentary on many little Aristophanic touches and matters of Attic life. The other is the nicety with which he often points out to us the proper sense, the special literary uses of individual words, helping us very greatly to take in their exact power and associations, a matter of extreme importance in the art of Aristophanes. A scholar of much ability and taste, with unusually wide interests and reading, who had for many years delighted in Attic comedy, sparing no pains in its study, and especially in the study of the *Knights*—this is the impression we carry away; and we regret that the knowledge and tact patiently acquired will not now be available for other plays.

Mr. Neil's death left his interesting Introduction apparently but half written, for about the *Knights* itself there is in it practically nothing. The notes however were virtually complete, and his two friends

(W. S. H. and L. W., Pembroke College, Cambridge), have had no occasion to add to them. If I miss anything in them, it is fuller statement and discussion of alternative readings and explanations. Mr. Neil is rather apt to limit himself too much to one view. An interesting feature of them is the occasional quotation of Shilleto's *adversaria*, hitherto as far as I know unpublished. It suggests the question whether, considering the great eminence of Shilleto as a scholar, some selection of notes from his own or his pupils' memoranda might not be made with gain and credit to English learning. It was implied above that the book offers few distinct novelties in text or interpretation, its characteristics being rather sobriety and thoroughness. I cannot say that the adoption of W. G. Clark's *βρετέρας* for *βρέας* in 32, ascribed to 'nervousness and chattering of teeth' commends itself to me very much, nor in 21 Dr. Verrall's explanation of ὡδὶ ξυλλαβῶν, 'taking it' (the word *μόλωμεν*), 'as I do,' i.e. pronouncing not *μόλωμεν* but *μολῶμεν*, in anticipation of *αὐτομολῶμεν* which is coming. For one thing this seems to disregard *ξυνεχές*, of which the note offers no explanation at all. It is surely too much to suppose that in 203 ὁ Παφλαγὼν οἴκοσι means the real Cleon 'visible inside the house from the stage.' Again<sup>1</sup> is Neil right in accepting the statement of lines 230-232 that Paphlagon (I am glad he calls him Paphlagon throughout), will not appear in a portrait-mask? This is the simple faith of most editors, but we are not always to take the comic poet at his word. I have always thought the exact opposite quite possible, as Mr. Van Leeuwen now points out that it is, namely that Paphlagon was one of the most speaking likenesses ever seen in the theatre of Dionysus. It is odd that, in mentioning here the old story that Aristophanes himself acted the part, Mr. Neil does not point out how the story is thought very plausibly to have arisen from the true statement that he brought out the play *καθ' ἑαυτόν*, in his own name. His explanation by the bye of this phrase where it occurs in 506, *πειραθέντες καθ' ἑαυτούς* is not more satisfactory than previous attempts to deal with it.<sup>1</sup>

In his note on *κωμωδοδιδάσκαλος* and *ποιη-*

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Verrall's junction of *καθ' ἑαυτούς* with *τοῖς ἀναπαίστοις*, anapaests appearing in their own, i.e. the poet's own, name (this *Review* 16. 8) seems not only very forced but, as requiring <τοῖς> *καθ' ἑαυτούς*, impossible. *Προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν τοῖς ἀναπαίστοις καθ' ἑαυτούς* could surely mean nothing but 'attend to the parabasis in itself' i.e. think of nothing but the actual parabasis.

*τῆς* (507. 509) Neil misapprehends the words of Aristotle, *οἱ λεγόμενοι αὐτῆς* (i.e. *τῆς κωμωδίας*) *ποιηταί*, which imply no question whether comedy-writers are *ποιηταί*, but mean only *its list of poets*. In 536 he not only prefers *παρὰ τῷ Διονύσῳ* to *παρὰ τῷ Διονύσῳ*, but fails to give the explanation of the latter, which is the reading of all MSS., as meaning Dionysus' image placed in the theatre for the occasion. Is there not something in Blaydes' doubt whether the former reading would not at least require *τῷ <τοῦ> Διονύσῳ*? Are the editors, including Mr. Neil, justified in regarding the narrative (624-682) in which Agoracritus recounts the proceedings in the senate as burlesquing a tragic rhesis? If it were so, tragic rhythm would predominate throughout, and there would also be much mock-heroic language. In reality there is very little of either, and the speech does not to me suggest the narratives of tragedy at all, any more than (say) *Wasps* 85-135. It is only a lively story with a burlesque touch here and there. In 1130 *ἄρας ἐπάταξα* the general sense points clearly to making *ἄρας* mean 'raising my hand,' not 'hoisting him for a whipping. Why should Demos whip a *προστάτης* when gorged? He fells and despoils him. The note on 1112 brings *δεδιάσι κ.τ.λ.* into relation with what Pericles and Cleon in Thucydides say (I would rather put it 'are made by Thucydides to say') about Athens being a *τυραννίς*. This ignores the distinction that in Thucydides the speakers are referring to the Athenian empire, while here it is mainly, if not exclusively, domestic dealings that are meant, as *τὸν λέγοντα* and other things show. *πάντες ἀνθρώποι* is hardly more than all Athenians.

It should be added that there are three excellent *excursus* at the end of the book; one a minute and instructive dissertation on the uses of *γε*: one on 'the political use of moral terms' (*καλὸς κάγαθός, ἀσφάλεια, σωφροσύνη, εὐνομία, πονηρός* and one or two more): and a third on tragic rhythm in comedy, which will make most readers of Aristophanes much more observant, if they bear it in mind.

Professor Van Leeuwen's two plays belong to the series in which he has already published *Clouds Wasps* and *Frogs*, and in which it is to be hoped that he will see his way to editing a complete Aristophanes. The *Acharnians* is an enlarged and Latinised revival of a small but useful edition with Dutch notes published in 1885. Both

volumes contain careful and very capable work. The critical part is better done than Mr. Neil's; the commentary contains less, though in its way excellent. The editor's mind is more open to novelties, and occasionally perhaps he is tempted into conjectures which are far from convincing. A few of the new suggestions may be set down here:

*Ach.* 46 οὐκ ἄρ' ἀστὸς for οὐκ ἄνθρωπος: 446 εὖ σοὶ μὲν εἴη for εὐδαιμονοίης: 504 καὶ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ ἐστὶ νῦν for οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἀγών: 717 σφαλῇ for φύγῃ: 1064 ποιητέ' ἐστὶ for ποιεῖτε τοῦτο: 1082 Γηρυνόη τετραπύλιε for Γηρυνόη τετραπύλῳ: *Eq.* 220 χρόνοι τε συμβαίνουσι κατὰ τὸ Πυθικόν for χρησμοὶ τε συμβαίνουσι καὶ τὸ Πυθικόν: 325 τῆς Πυκνός for τῶν ῥητόρων *metri causa*: 555 ποντοπόροι for μισθοφόροι: 707 ἐπὶ τῷ μάλισθ' ἦδουτ' ἄν for ἐπὶ τῷ φάγοις ἦδιστ' ἄν. One or two of these, e.g. the last in *Ach.*, are attractive, but most of them have no probability. In *Ach.* 541 I rather wonder that Mr. Van Leeuwen has abandoned the very plausible εἰσπλεύσαν (for ἐκπλεύσας) which appeared in his Dutch edition and has been conjectured independently by Dr. Blaydes. Keeping τις ἐκπλεύσας σκάφει, which he regards as a quotation from Euripides, he now reads χῆν' ἥ for φήνας and suggests ὑφέλετο for ἀπέδοτο. It may be worth noting that he and Mr. Neil are agreed in thinking, as against the usual view, that at the end of the *Knights* there is nothing lost.

Mr. Van Leeuwen, like Mr. Neil, pays marked attention to Aristophanes' diction, and often calls our attention to a tragic or elevated expression which indicates parody, burlesque, or some other special purpose in the writer's mind. A novelty in notes is the division of them into three series or tiers, critical notes below the text, commentary below the critical notes, and below the commentary notes (mainly references) on the commentary itself. I am not sure that this refinement is to be commended. The volumes are admirably printed and most handsome in appearance, but so badly sewn that they split into fragments long before the reader has done with them.

All lovers of Aristophanes will welcome the appearance after a long interval of another volume from Mr. Rogers, containing this time two plays with commentary, copious critical notes, and, best of all, some more of his excellent verse translation: and our pleasure is increased when we learn that there is now every likelihood of his doing in this way the whole of the eleven plays. In

the present volume, as it happens, we have together what some will think the best and the weakest of the eleven. Certainly nothing of Aristophanes gives more pleasure than the *Frogs*. Whether the *Ecclesiazusae* falls below the *Peace* and the *Plutus* in comic force may be disputed, but the later part of it is at any rate somewhat repulsive reading. In dealing with this and other things in the plays Mr. Rogers has steered a judicious course, intermediate between offensive frankness and excessive delicacy. No one would wish that Aristophanes should be put into English verse just as he stands.

Mr. Rogers, like his original, is always at his best in the long lines, especially the long rolling anapaestic tetrameters; and this makes us regret, what he himself half apologises for, that he has not rendered into this sort of metre the corresponding parts of the *Ecclesiazusae*. Praxagora's communistic scheme would have gained a good deal in vigour and conviction by the change. On the other hand the famous passage of the *Frogs* in which Aeschylus sets forth his theory of tragic art is very well rendered, though I confess to thinking that certain passages of the *Wasps* are at present the high-water mark of Mr. Rogers' work.

Those who care less about the regular scholastic editions will find a good deal that is interesting, instructive, and judicious in the commentary. Mr. Rogers' judgment is always shrewd, and he has not read the poet all his life for nothing. In the *Frogs* for instance what he has to say about μακάρων εὐωχίαν (85) and the καινὸν χρυσίον (720), and at *Eccl.* 38 and elsewhere about the distribution of the women between stage and orchestra, &c., is very well worth attention. His argument that ἐκεῖνος in *Frogs* 790 (κάκεῖνος ὑπεχώρησε κ.τ.λ.) is Sophocles and his interpretation of περὶ τῶν κρεῶν (191) seem to me more disputable. In *Eccl.* 1090 again does not the point of the passage disappear, if διαλελημμένον only means 'in someone's grasp'? One person can διαλαμβάνειν another (*Knights* 262); whereas here the very point is that there are two. But both passages are difficult. He is certainly wrong in saying that ἀγαθὸς ποιητής (*Frogs* 84) cannot mean 'a good poet.'

Mr. Rogers, though as a rule very conservative, suggests a few alterations of the text. In the *Frogs* besides περιπατεῖν in 953 and μελοφορεῖ in 1301 (both of which I may perhaps say have occurred to me too) he suggests in 647 ἔπτακον (improbable, as

being poetical) and in 1028 τὸν θρήνον ἀκούσας : in *Eccl.* 603 καὶ...ψευδορκήση; 643 τὸν ἐκείνου : 802 ἦν δὲ κωλύσῃσι.

In the introduction to the *Eccl.* will be found an interesting argument to show that women were not present at comedies in

Aristophanes' time, and in that to the *Frogs* an able examination of the points which each of the two contending poets makes against the metres of his rival. The examination of 1261 to 1295 is particularly good.  
HERBERT RICHARDS.

### LODGE'S LEXICON PLAUTINUM I.

*Lexicon Plautinum*, conscripsit GONZALEZ LODGE. Vol. I, fasc. 1, A—ALIVS (Leipzig, Teubner, 1900). M. 7. 20.

THE appearance during the last two years of the first fascicles of two Plautine Lexica<sup>1</sup> indicates the progress of Plautine studies. Hitherto we have had to content ourselves with the *Lexica Plautina* of Pareus, published in 1634, and of Weise (Second Edition, 1886), both of which works, however useful in their own ways, are quite out of touch with modern criticism of the text. Nor was it possible before the publication of the *editio minor* of the text by Goetz and Schoell, which was commenced in 1893, to approach the task of writing an up to date lexicon of Plautus with any hope of success. The late Mr. J. H. Onions of Christ Church laid his hand to a Plautine lexicon in the early eighties, if I remember rightly; but he found the ground on which he had to work too insecure to proceed. Now the situation is changed, and we may hope to possess in the course of a few years not one but two lexica based on the results of modern Plautine scholarship. Not that the task is by any means an easy one even now. The text of Goetz and Schoell leaves countless passages unemended, and the writer of a lexicon has necessarily to rely largely upon the work of other editors, such as Leo. But it is, I believe, generally felt by Plautine scholars that the publication of a lexicon on the basis of the results hitherto attained will prove to be itself the best means of securing further progress in the future.

The work of Professor Lodge will therefore be welcomed by all editors and students of the text of Plautus. It is executed on scientific principles, and it must

have involved an amount of patient labour from which most scholars would shrink and for which they will be proportionately grateful to the author.

The method of basing such a work on the text of Goetz and Schoell alone was a weakness of the first fascicle of Professor Waltzing's lexicon, as he himself recognized in his Preface—a weakness which he apparently intends to remove. Professor Lodge has wisely decided to take account of all the chief editions of the present day. In another point, too, he has improved upon the work of his immediate predecessor; by means of a judicious economy of space he has kept down the size of his book as compared with Waltzing's, though it might have been still further reduced. Thus whereas Waltzing took up 151 pp. to cover the ground from *a* to *adeo*, Lodge gets this into about 46 pp.; on the other hand it must be remembered that Lodge's pages are larger and have somewhat smaller print (not too small however).

The strong and the weak points of such a work as this can be fully appreciated only after using it for a considerable time. But I will indicate a few points in the first fascicle which have struck me as open to improvement, though nothing would be more unfair than to expect in a book of this kind absolute immunity from error, and most of the defects which I have to point out will not seriously diminish its utility to students who understand how to use it aright. In the first place I am doubtful whether some of the matter might not have been abbreviated with advantage. For instance the heading III on p. 41 might have been greatly reduced by omissions: was it necessary to enumerate all the passages in which we find together with *ad* and the accusative another preposition with its case, etc? If this were to be done with every preposition (e.g. *ab*) it would swell

<sup>1</sup> The work under consideration and the *Lexique de Plaute* edited under the direction of Professor Waltzing of Liège (1900).