

# 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](#)



---

**Blaydes's *Ranae Aristophanis Ranae. Annotations critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis Graecis instruxit* Febdericus H. M. Blaydes, LL.D., &c. Halis Saxonum, in Orphanotrophei Libraria, MDCCCLXXXIX. 10 mks.**

A. W. Verrall

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 06 / June 1889, pp 257 - 261  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195149, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00195149](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195149)

**How to cite this article:**

A. W. Verrall (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 257-261 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195149

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

BLAYDES'S *RANAE*.

*Aristophanis Ranae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis Graecis instruxit* FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES, LL.D., &c. Halis Saxonum, in Orphanotrophei Libraria. MDCCCLXXXIX. 10 mks.

ALL scholars, English and foreign, will gladly give a respectful welcome to this eighth instalment from the veteran editor of *Aristophanes*. The character of Dr. Blaydes's work is by this time so well known to those concerned as to make any general estimate superfluous. Whatever may be the difference of opinion upon this or that point, those who will candidly accept from the editor the help he offers, and not require of him that which is not in his plan, cannot but be benefited by his fulness of material, his fertility in suggestion, his vivacious and unflagging interest in the subject. In the present volume there is no falling off: always rich, if sometimes too much *amator ingenii sui*, he here maintains his abundance and tightens his control. If I fill this article, as it is my business to do, with matters of dispute, it will not be for want of gratitude to Dr. Blaydes for the pleasure and instruction which he has given. Commendation or introduction he does not need, and I will rather take the opportunity of his publication to investigate some of the points in the *Ranae* upon which he leaves or makes room for improvement.

There is one defect, or at least one danger, which a commentator upon Aristophanes can hardly escape, for it lies in the very nature of his subject. He will certainly contract and even cultivate a habit of indecision. Aristophanes is full of expressions only to be explained, at best, provisionally. Instead of the minute knowledge of place, time, and circumstance, upon which the satirist presumed, we have little or nothing but rival guesses, ancient and modern, differing in ingenuity but carrying for the most part no authority at all. Among the ancient suggestions it is often impossible to decide which, if any, is something more than a guess; among the modern, in a case of difficulty, it rarely happens that one only is specious. A complete commentary must therefore often cite on the same point several opinions, none certainly right but none quite out of court. In short, a careful edition of Aristophanes will always have a large ingredient of 'variorum'; and the mind of an editor long occupied with Aristo-

phanes, 'like the dyer's hand, subdued to what it works in', is likely to be coloured, perhaps over-coloured, with the 'variorum' complexion.

To this tendency Dr. Blaydes, by his very care and scrupulousness, is not unfavourable: and accustomed to the task of recording alternatives he sometimes leaves us without an opinion where in him it would have been no presumption to pronounce one.

Take, for example, the familiar passage in the hymn of the mystae to Iacchus (v. 402):

Ἰακχε, φιλοχόρευτα, συμπρόπεμπέ με.  
σὺ γὰρ κατασχίσας ἐπὶ τε γέλωτι  
κάπ' εὐτελεία τόν τε σανδάλισκον  
καὶ τὸ ῥακίον ἐξέυρες ὥστ'  
ἄζημίους παῖζειν τε καὶ χορεύειν.<sup>1</sup>

To the Athenian audience this was no doubt perfectly clear, and it seems at first sight plain enough, in its general meaning, to us. The myst thanks the god for having given religious sanction to a practice so convenient as that of wearing torn clothes in the procession to Eleusis. So far the recent editors (Mitchell, Kock, Merry) all agree. But the scholium strangely takes a different course, and tells us that the poet's object was to satirize the parsimony of the choregus, who had provided the performers with shabby costume. Thus explained, the words would have nothing to do with religion at all, and their interest would be of a quite different kind. It is therefore the first question, whether the scholium, in consideration of its antiquity, is entitled to any attention: and it is here that we look for the editor's decision, but do not get it. The passage is elaborately annotated, and in the first five notes the scholium, though cited, seems to be overruled. But at the end we read: 'ἀζημίους, i.e. ἀδαπάνους...nisi passivo potius sensu vox accipienda est, *impune, sine damno, sine detrimento*. Ita choregorum parsimonia perstringi videbitur, qui etc.' By this indirect way of reserving judgment the reader is apt to be altogether confused; and it is the less desirable, because here, as often in similar cases, the editor's criticism upon the current view well deserves to be put more decisively. In rejecting the scholium altogether, the recent commentaries are justified. It is a foolish guess, which ignores the conditions of the problem. But the recent commentaries also omit something, and what they omit is

<sup>1</sup> I give Mr. Blaydes's readings. The variants do not affect the sense.

indicated by Dr. Blaydes, when he hesitates over the rendering of ἀζήμιος. Indirectly this may mean *with cheapness* (Merry), but the primary meaning is that given by Dr. Blaydes, *impune, sine damno, without damage*: which may help us to answer the most interesting question of all—Why was it (as Aristophanes implies) a matter of religious precept to dress in torn clothes for the Eleusinia? Aristophanes, I think, knew and shows us why. It was one of the innumerable devices of superstition against *invidia* or the evil eye. The greater the happiness the more the danger: therefore in the supreme felicity of the initiated most danger of all. Therefore, by the benevolent direction of the god himself, they disguised their happiness in the garb of beggars, 'so as to take no damage in the joyous feast.' The motive of the mystae in wearing torn shoes was the same as Agamemnon's, when in the play, before walking over the purple, he takes off his shoes altogether. The supposed tenderness of Iacchus towards poor men's purses is merely the comedian's jest, for which he avails himself of the conveniently ambiguous ἀζήμιος.

A much better way of dealing with a difficulty is the editor's at v. 190. Says Charon:

δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω,  
εἰ μὴ νευαυμάχηκε τὴν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν.

'I convey no slave, unless he fought (and so became entitled to his liberty) at'—the battle of Arginusae. Why was this battle called ἡ περὶ τῶν κρεῶν? All agree that the phrase was suggested, as to the mere form of it, by the proverb, ὁ λαγὼς τρέχει τὸν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν (δρόμον) *a race for its meat* or, more elegantly, *for its life*. But this does not take us very far. Why should the proverb, or, to be more exact, a phrase somewhat like the proverb, have been tacked to this particular battle? Many answers are given. Dr. Blaydes decides definitely for one of the miscellaneous views in the scholium, that the battle was περὶ τῶν κρεῶν because upon it was staked the whole existence of Athens; and, having decided for this, he rightly resists any attempt to combine it with other incompatible suggestions, such as that the κρέα or 'meat' means the Athenian corpses, which after the battle were not picked up, a conception which certainly would seem little likely to gain popularity in Athens. Why the view preferred by Dr. Blaydes does not unite all votes, it is easy to see. Even if we grant the likelihood that either before or after the victory the Athenian populace would confess so frankly, not to say so grossly, their

desperate peril, and compare their country to a hare nearly run down, even then there is no particular point in applying the phrase to the special case of the slaves. Something of this kind, something proper to the slaves, is what the context requires. This is recognized by a note in the scholium: ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ δοῦλοι τότε ναυμαχῆσοντες περὶ οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἢ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων κρεῶν, τοῦτεστι σωματῶν. φησὶν οὖν οἶον οὐ περὶ χρημάτων ἢ πατρίδος—an explanation however which has little else to recommend it. In fact, none of the suggestions made seem adequate, and as a little more guessing can do no harm, I will venture one of my own. The reward promised and given to the slaves who fought at Arginusae was their freedom and the citizenship of Athens, that is, the limited form of it known as the Plataean franchise. It is to this (so much is plain) that Charon here refers; in the lower world, as upon earth, these slave combatants have the privilege of the free. Therefore the words περὶ τῶν κρεῶν, if they are to square with the purpose, ought to describe the object for which the slaves fought, that is, the freedom and the citizenship. Now the formal registration and enrolment of new citizens took place at the *Apaturia* (early in October). The battle of Arginusae was fought in July. Even before the battle it would be natural enough that the slaves should be described as fighting for the chance of participation in the approaching feast of citizenship. After the battle such an association of ideas could hardly be missed; for, as every one will remember, the tragic events which followed the battle were determined by the proceedings at this feast, and by the appearance there in mourning of those whose relatives by (or without) the fault of the generals were lost. At that same feast those slaves who survived must have appeared to partake for the first time of the Athenian communion, of which the sign was the eating of the sacrificial *meat* (τὰ κρέα ἐξ Ἀπαυρῶν, *Thesm.* 558). The new citizen, in Aristophanes' own words (*Ach.* 146),

ἦρα φαγεῖν ἀλλήντας ἐξ Ἀπαυρῶν.

It would seem therefore a very natural piece of slang to say that the battle of Arginusae illustrated in a novel sense the proverb of 'racing for your meat', and to describe the slave combatants as 'having fought' on this occasion 'for their meat'.

To the extent of raising the disputable questions and presenting the materials for a judgment, Dr. Blaydes's commentary is very seldom defective. One place, in which

a known difficulty has escaped remark, may be noted here for the interest of the question itself. It is where Euripides bids Aeschylus recite 'the prologue from the *Oresteia*', and Aeschylus replies by commencing that of the *Choephoroi* (v. 1124):

EYP. πρῶτον δέ μοι τὸν ἐξ Ὀρεστέας λέγε.

ΔΙ. ἄγε δὴ σιώπα πᾶς ἀνὴρ. λέγ', Αἰσχύλε.

ΑΙ. Ἐρᾷ ἡ χθόνη πατρὸς ἐποπτεύων κράτη...

Dr. Blaydes takes the *Ὀρεστέα* here to mean the trilogy or tetralogy, and does not explain how in that case Aeschylus can possibly understand the request to recite 'the prologue from the *Oresteia*', or how he infers, without more said, that it is the prologue to the second play which is asked for, and not that to the first or that to the third. Kock and Merry are also silent. The question has been put more than once, but I have seen no answer to it. The truth I take to be that there is no possible answer, and that the name *Oresteia* here cannot mean the trilogy but must mean what we call the *Choephoroi*. Nor is this at all strange. The *Oresteia*, or *Act of Orestes*, is a very good name for the play, a better name decidedly than that by which it goes now. It is that part of the story, the only part, in which Orestes is the leading figure; and the title *Oresteia* has the same application to it as the Homeric titles *Diomedea*, &c., to the books so called. Many indications conspire to show (what is likely enough in itself) that the titles of plays in the extinct *didascaliae*, by whomsoever and whensoever settled, were certainly not fixed and current from the first production of the plays. I have given, for example, elsewhere my reasons for thinking it impossible to attribute to Aeschylus the title of the *Seven against Thebes*. But the piece of evidence before us is singularly simple, complete, and interesting. It is to my mind plain as words can make it that Aristophanes and his contemporaries knew our *Choephoroi* as the *Oresteia*; and it is a natural, if not a necessary, inference from his language that he did not know that name as the title of the whole 'trilogy'. The fact is highly suggestive, but this is not the proper occasion for pursuing the subject.

In explaining the obscure citation itself, the editor has apparently not had before him the suggestion of Mr. Macnaghten, that in reality πατρὸς represents not πατρῷα at all, as Aristophanes advisedly or negligently assumes, but πατρῷε.

For the settlement of the text there remains, after the present edition, very much to be done in the way of distinguishing and

valuing the various documents. But the conclusions of Mr. Blaydes seem to be in general sober and acceptable in themselves. In v. 20 for instance—

ὦ τρισκακοδαίμων ἄρ' ὁ τράχηνος οὔτοσι,  
ὅτι θλίβεται μὲν, τὰ δὲ γέλοιον οὐκ ἐρεῖ—

he is probably right in accepting ὅτε from Palmer, and also in declining ἐρῶ from Cobet. In v. 54, πόθος | τὴν καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἶε σφόδρα. (*sic*), his punctuation seems to represent the linguistic fact better than the rival πῶς οἶε; σφόδρα. or, πῶς οἶε σφόδρα; On the unlucky v. 607 (ΞΑ. οὐκ ἐς κόρακας; μὴ πρόσσιτον. ΑΙ. εἶεν, καὶ μάχει); which has been altered and repunctuated in more ways than there are words, I do not altogether like either the editor's first thought (ἐς κόρακας. οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον;—εἶεν, καὶ μάχει); or his second (οὐκ ἐς κόρακας; οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον;—ἦ καὶ μάχει). Elmsley had reason for wishing to take οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον together: but this need not involve any change of the words or order. We should write οὐκ ἐς κόρακας μὴ πρόσσιτον;—εἶεν, καὶ μάχει; and regard the oath ἐς κόρακας as a parenthesis (like the Latin ejaculatory *malum*) in the grammatical construction of οὐ μὴ πρόσσιτον.

In v. 796 the editor betrays suspicion of a phrase which has before struck me as dubious. The slave Aeacus has just informed the slave Xanthias of the circumstances which have led to the proposed contest between the tragic poets, how the 'rascally mob' supported the pretensions of Euripides and insisted upon a trial, how Sophocles made no claim against Aeschylus, but reserved himself to contest, if necessary, the victory of Euripides. Then says Xanthias, τὸ χρημ' ἄρ' ἔσται; to which Aeacus replies, νῆ Δί', ὀλίγον γ' ὕστερον. κἀνταῦθα δὴ τὰ δεινὰ κινήσεται. Dr. Blaydes suggests δειν' ἄττα, citing v. 925, ῥήματα ὀφρὺς ἔχοντα καὶ λόφους, δειν' ἄττα μορμυροπά, scarcely, I think, a parallel case. But certainly τὰ δεινὰ κινήσεται, 'the terrors' or 'the marvels will be set to work', is an odd expression in itself, and there is nothing in the preceding context to prepare the way for it or explain it to the ear. I have long thought that the accentuation is wrong and should be corrected to τὰ δεινὰ. 'And so,' says Xanthias, in the slovenly jargon of gossip, 'the thingummy is to come off?' 'Yes,' replies Aeacus in the same style, 'directly'; and this is where the thingumbobs are to work.' Xanthias means the contest, Aeacus the performances of the rival artists (which he compares to an exhibition of puppets or machines), and both

express their meaning with the like indifference to classic precision.

It would take of course ten times the space now available to discuss half the little questions of this kind suggested by the play and by the editor's critical notes. We must return to the commentary, and conclude with a few more notes on points which still need clearing up. V. 158—

ΔΙ. οὔτοι δὲ δὴ τίνες εἰσίν; HP. οἱ μεμνημένοι,  
ΞΑ. νῆ, τὸν Δι', ἐγὼ γοῦν ὄνος ἄγων μυστήρια.

Xanthias, impatient of his burden, interrupts the conversation. The proverb points ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς οὐδὲν δέον ἀχθοφορούντων (Eustathius), or, as it is put more precisely by Fritzsche and Holden, to those who *themselves* get no good out of their trouble. The editor follows them here rightly, but not in incorporating the guess of the scholium that the 'ass performing a mystery' referred specially to the conveyance of luggage by asses to Eleusis. There is nothing in the phrase which points to the Eleusinia, nor any proof of connexion between asses and that feast. The 'ass' here meant is the same which plays so remarkable a part in the story of Lucian, the ass which regularly accompanied those strolling quacks who preached the lower kinds of 'ritual.' He carried of course their necessities, but he also had, or was supposed to have, a connexion with their 'rites', as is shown by the tenacity of the association in the public mind between the animal and Oriental superstition, of which the most notorious example is the strange Roman blunder about the religions of the Jew and the Christian. The allusion of Aristophanes carries the tradition back much earlier. But Greece and Athens were already full of strange and only too popular religions from the East, the Sabazian rite, the Adonian, and what not.

V. 168—

μισθωσαί τινα  
τῶν ἐκφερομένων, ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται.

'ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται: sc. ad bajulandum, ἐπὶ τὸ σκευοφορεῖν' (Blaydes). This is surely not right, and the scholium ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκφορὰν still less. Nor is there any reason to suspect error. The editor has overlooked the end of Mr. Merry's note, 'or ἐπὶ τοῦτο may be the intention of a journey to Hades.' Certainly it is. It was evidently a common saying that the best person to employ on an errand is ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται, 'one who is on his way for the matter,' i.e. one who can do it without going out of his way. Here, 'the matter' being the carrying of luggage to

Hades, the ὅστις would be a νεκρὸς ἐκφερόμενος. The difficulty has arisen from seeking for ἐπὶ τοῦτο a special explanation in the words of the immediate context, whereas τοῦτο is simply τὸ παρόν, 'the matter in hand' (τοῦτο as opposed to any ἑκείνο), and is, like ὅστις, strictly general, though in reference to this case it has the meaning determined by the circumstances.

V. 320—

οἱ μεμνημένοι  
ἐνταῦθά που παίζουσιν, ὡς ἔφραζε νῶν.  
ᾄδουσι γοῦν τὸν Ἰακχὸν ὄντερ Διαγόρας.

Dr. Blaydes leaves this allusion in the obscurity where it is only too likely to remain. There had been, in the generation before Aristophanes, a lyric poet Diagoras; there was also a notorious 'atheist' of that name, who is said to have satirized the mysteries; and it is possible, though it would seem not likely, that they were the same person. But why, taking either to be meant here, an Athenian should identify the familiar song of the Eleusinian mystae as 'that which Diagoras sings' (for the only word which can be applied is ᾄδει), remains itself a mystery. Aristarchus is cited by the scholium for the reading and the explanation (if such it can be called); but it may well be doubted whether he knew anything more about the passage than we do. There is probably some objection, which escapes me, to the neglected view of Apollodorus of Tarsus (see the scholium) that the true reading is δι' ἀγορᾶς, and the meaning simply that the mystae in Elysium are singing the same song which they sing 'through the agora', as they go out of the city by the Ceramicus on their way to Eleusis. This certainly fits admirably the beginning of the song itself, 'O Iacchus, who hast *here* thine honoured dwelling-place', which all refer to the temple in the Ceramicus sacred to Iacchus with Demeter and Coré. Evidently the song has begun, (off the stage) before Xanthias speaks, and we might well suppose that it is actually by this characteristic ἐνθάδε ναίων that he identifies the song as that of the Athenian worship.

V. 367—

τοὺς μισθοὺς ῥήτωρ ὦν εἴτ' ἀποπρώγει.

"Anglice in the capacity of a public speaker (bringing forward some motion to promote national economy), ut explicat Merry.' Mr. Blaydes does injustice to the Rector, who adds as an alternative 'though he was a public speaker and might have

been expected to support rather than starve the poets', and adds further that 'the latter explanation is favoured by εἶτα.' It is proved by εἶτα, which does not admit the other at all. It is the specialty of the offence, that the rewards of literature should be attacked by one who was himself winning money, some of it public money, by his literary talents.

V. 467—

ὃς τὸν κύν' ἡμῶν ἐξέλασας τὸν Κέρβερον  
ἀπηΐξας ἄγχων κάποδρὰς ὄχου λαβών.

Upon ἐξέλασας there is nothing in the commentary, but that the word does not quite satisfy the editor he shows by citing in the apparatus the conjecture of Reiske ἐξελών. The natural doubt arising from the unsuitable sense of the word may be fortified

by observing that this nineteen-line speech of Aeacus, tragic in tone and for the most part actual parody, is written throughout in tragic metre, except in the word ἐξέλασας, which gives an anapaest in the fourth foot. The oversight, for such it must be, is not probable; and, if ἐξελών is not near enough, I would suggest ἐσελάσας, *having invaded us*.

Here must be closed a discussion which with the copious assistance of Dr. Blaydes I would gladly pursue much further, but that I fear to weary even his own minute patience. It remains only to wish him all success in the completion of his long and serviceable task. 'Nubes mox prodibit. Equites sub prelo. Vespaë':

σφήκωμα τοῦτίκρανον ὡς τάχιστ' ἔχου.

A. W. VERRALL.

## SCHOLIA TO SOPHOCLES.

*Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera e codice Laurentiano denuo collato edidit commentario critico instruxit indices adjecit*  
PETRUS N. PAPAGEORGIUS. Lipsiae, 1888.  
4 Mk. 80.

It is not easy to discover a reason for the existence of this book. The compiler has little good to say of previous editors of the scholia of Sophocles, but the list of their mistakes by which he supports his criticism hardly justifies the way in which he speaks of scholars such as Elmsley and Brunck and editors such as Dübner. His own fitness to undertake so difficult a task is by no means apparent. If his intention was to supply an accurate and trustworthy text of the scholia for other men to use, he might most successfully have effected his purpose by taking the best existing or most accessible text and telling us exactly the points in which it is in error. Even this a scholar with any right to use scholia might now do for himself, seeing that an excellent facsimile of the Laurentian Codex has lately been produced under the competent editorship of Mr. Maunde Thompson and Professor Jebb. As it is, Mr. Papageorgius's book provides none of those precise palaeographical notices which are so necessary for all work on scholia; and without such aids it is immeasurably inferior to the facsimile. Then, on the other hand, if the end in view was to edit the scholia in the higher sense of getting at

their meaning, the editor has no less signally failed. Yet, that this was his intention is, I think, plain not only from his preface but also from the nature of the editing to which he has subjected the text. He has a system of brackets by which he distinguishes the omissions and insertions made by himself, and at the end he gives two lists, the one called *Index emendationum editoris*, and the other *Index conjecturarum incertarum*. Now it is no exaggeration to say that many of his changes, insertions and omissions are most misleading. Some of them are altogether uncalled for, as for example the insertion of the word κλυτὰς in the lemma ἔκγονα χθονός to a scholium on O.R. 172. The scholium ἢ τὰ δένδρα ἢ τοὺς παῖδας φησι is a note on ἔκγονα χθονός and not on ἔκγονα κλυτὰς χθονός: yet the editor imagines that he has made an improvement by inserting the adjective. If all his changes were as harmless as this, it would not matter much; but sometimes by his omissions and insertions he would deprive the scholia of the marks by which their origin and significance can be best understood. Scholia, as we now have them, often consist of several ancient notes all run together into a meaningless sentence by means of particles such as καὶ and δὲ and γάρ. Sometimes however the particle has not been inserted and sometimes even the ancient initial ὅτι has been left in the middle of such a sentence to show the way in which it has been