

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](#)



Paralipomena Sophoclea *Paralipomena Sophoclea*. Supplementary Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Sophocles. By Lewis Campbell. London: Rivingtons, 1907. Cr. 8vo, pp. xv + 287. 6s.

A. S. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 08 / December 1907, pp 248 - 248

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018045X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018045X

How to cite this article:

A. S. Owen (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 248-248 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018045X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

prepared for independent study. It is very properly insisted by the author that the evidence of the Fathers from 150-400 A.D. must play a great part in the final solution of the problems he has outlined. Meanwhile an eclectic text, drawn from the consent, not of editors in the last fifty years, but of good and early representatives of the 'Alexandrian' and the 'western' traditions, would be useful to the rank and file of New Testament students. It was only the other day that a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus supplied new confirmation of the value which the 'western' text has. The Greek original of a passage in Irenaeus was recovered, and was found to agree with Codex Bezae. Although Prof. Knopf does not refer to this, he is aware of the change in the position of the question, and his little book can be warmly recommended and commended.

T. NICKLIN.

PARALIPOMENA SOPHOCLEA.

Paralipomena Sophoclea. Supplementary Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Sophocles. By LEWIS CAMPBELL. London: Rivingtons, 1907. Cr. 8vo, pp. xv + 287. 6s.

THIS book represents the matured opinion of a Sophoclean editor on disputed points in the text and interpretation of Sophocles, especially those where he has expressed opinions in his earlier commentaries from which Sir Richard Jebb differed. Professor Campbell now takes the opportunity of stating whether or not he has been converted to Jebb's views. Often he confesses to conversion, but his attitude is somewhat that of Alcmena to Zeus:—

Ζεὺς ἐξ ἐμοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἀκούσεται κακῶς,
εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ὁσιος αὐτὸς οἶδεν εἰς ἐμέ.

With his great admiration for Sir R. Jebb as an interpreter of Sophocles, he seems to feel that views of his own have been dismissed too summarily as 'harsh,' 'untenable,' or 'impossible.' In several instances he has vindicated his position by giving satisfactory reasons, as, *e.g.*, on *O.T.* 902, where he proves the intransitive use of

ἀρμόττω in the parallel passage quoted from *Plat. Soph.*, and on *Phil.* 1207, where he quotes from the *Ajax* a similar instance of 'prothysteron.' But there are instances in which he has dismissed Jebb's views with equal curtness: *e.g.* on *Ant.* 637, where he makes no reply to Jebb's objections to the reading ἀξίως ἔσται, but merely says: 'there is no sufficient reason for reading ἀξιόσεται (fut. pass.),' or again on 1102 when, dismissing Jebb's δοκεῖ as tautological, he restates the view of δοκεῖς which Jebb had condemned. He has further taken the opportunity of adding fresh illustrations for certain passages, many of which are helpful, though at times the parallelism is not very close: it is difficult to see why *Herac.* 863 is quoted as a parallel for *Ant.* 325: on *Ant.* 1238 the quotation from *Agam.* 1389 is at least as good evidence for ῥοήν as for πνοήν: in *Ajax* 917 καί (=even) can hardly be paralleled by the use of καὶ μὴν, and the use of ἐξ ἐμοῦ in *O.T.* 997 is not very close to the frequent use of ἐκ with verbs of destruction. Among further criticisms it might be questioned whether there is a difference between the use of ἄν ἦκοι in *Ajax* 186 and ἄν ἐξήκοι in *O.T.* 1182, or whether χρόνον is the necessary word to supply in *El.* 1075, if we retain the reading, instead of supplying, with Wilamowitz, στόνον, the noun which is most easily supplied from the verb. But though there are many suggestions open to criticism, the book is worth attention as showing the independent judgment of a scholar with a strong love of Sophocles and a strong feeling for Sophoclean style: where he has let us into his confidence as to the reasons for adopting certain views, as on *Ajax* 405 and *O.T.* 1526, he is interesting. A few misprints may be noted: p. 11 ἄρ' for ἄρ': p. 16 πατράς for πατρός: p. 17 χῳρίς: p. 27 οὐ for σύ: p. 27 ἄνθρω: p. 27: *It is* for *Is it*: p. 31 Θνητῶν for θνητῶν: p. 33 ἦν for ἦν: p. 39 παρῶν: p. 42 πλευράς: p. 58 ἡμαρ': p. 196, 45 is a wrong reference: p. 266 κακως (unaccented): p. 267 τῶν: p. 268 πλέονας. On p. 157 it would be better to supply Ἡρακλέα than Ἡρακλῆ (see Jebb, *ad Trach.* 233), and there is rather loose English on p. 284: 'εἰ is easily changed to ἐν, as Jebb does.'

A. S. OWEN.