

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](#)



***The Antigone of Sophocles*, with a Commentary,
abridged from the large edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb.
By E. S. Shuckburgh. Cambridge, University Press.
1902. Pp. xl+252. 4s.**

R. C. Seaton

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 01 / February 1903, pp 78 - 78
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207415, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207415

How to cite this article:

R. C. Seaton (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 78-78 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207415

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

periods, the hypothesis of a continuous tradition must clearly be restricted to a very narrow range.

If we now turn to the five hymns that belong to the Rigveda proper, we notice that two (iv. 26, 27) which really contain a myth are interpreted by Sieg without any reference to the tradition. 'It is a reasonable matter for surprise' he says 'that so simple a story has so completely disappeared from the later tradition.' In iv. 24 the traditional version serves a useful purpose in preserving the meaning of a Vedic phrase, though the story as a whole is worthless. Finally in v. 2 and v. 61 we have hymns which are quite of the ordinary Vedic type except that they consist of somewhat disconnected fragments, and for which the traditional interpretation is only mentioned by Sieg in order to be abandoned in its most essential features.

On the whole it appears that nothing has

yet emerged from the mass of traditional comment to give it a direct value in Vedic exegesis: indeed a bias in favour of the tradition is one of the standing dangers to which Vedic scholarship is exposed. A correct tradition as to any sacred text is indeed almost inconceivable in itself, since the commentators naturally desire to make it support the views which they themselves favour. But indirectly a study of the later Vedic literature promises much, for in no other way can a thorough familiarity with an idiom approximating to that of the Rigveda be obtained. Dr. Sieg has possibly been hunting for a non-existent treasure, but a rich crop may certainly be looked for from the soil he has turned up so diligently. He possesses a singular fairness of statement and breadth of view, and has established a claim to a position in the front rank of Vedic scholars.

E. V. ARNOLD.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

The Antigone of Sophocles, with a Commentary, abridged from the large edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb. By E. S. SHUCKBURGH. Cambridge, University Press. 1902. Pp. xl. + 252. 4s.

THIS edition by Dr. Shuckburgh comes very quickly on the heels of Mr. Bayfield's edition. But both are welcome. Mr. Shuckburgh has made a most judicious abridgment of Prof. Jebb's edition by omitting, as he says, 'the notes containing discussions of the views which the commentator rejects,' which, however valuable they may be, are more suited for advanced students. The introduction also has been considerably shortened by the omission of certain paragraphs, but everywhere Prof. Jebb's language has been adhered to, while all that is essential in it to the comprehension of the play has been retained. Prof. Jebb's reasons for considering ll. 905-920 to be spurious are very shortly given. Some German scholars, e.g. Bellermann and Steinberg still consider them genuine. Dr. Shuckburgh's work has been almost wholly confined to selection. Only very rarely has he added a few words or a quotation. It is in fact difficult to see how the abridgment could have been better made. Perhaps a subject-index might with advantage have been

interwoven with the grammatical index, as Prof. Jebb has done.

R. C. SEATON.

De Aristophanis in Nubium fabula consilio atque arte. By J. HELDER. Haarlem, Kleyenberg, 1901.

It is difficult to find anything new and original in these 196 pages. The language runs in and out of Dutch and Latin, and the content consists largely of quotations. The subject is perhaps to blame. To interpret the mind of an ancient author is the privilege of the mature and of the exercised. The young should be turned to the collection of details, from papyri or inscriptions, which may establish some matter of fact, and dissuaded from topics which invite to unsubstantial rhetoric. *Fecimus et nos haec iuvenes*, but in this country we do not continue it beyond our College literary society.

The two instructive things which have been of late said about Aristophanes' '*Ars et Consilium*,' are to my knowledge, Kaibel's remark that the Old Comedy was a critic *ex professo*, and the Athenian government from Pericles onwards progressive; and