

Carney (T. F.): *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon—Book III*, published by The Classical Association of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, viii + 204 pp. Neither date nor price stated.

Professor Carney in his introduction to this chaste paperback says that his edition of Tatius Book III was prepared at two levels. It is intended to cater for two groups of possible readers, first, to provide 'students just able to read Greek with a prose work as easily readable as, say, Xenophon'; but, secondly, to offer more advanced students 'a means of gaining acquaintance with the Greek novel, whose writers normally go unread for want of editing'. For a reader of the first kind the Greek of Tatius, 'the Classical Attic of the Literary Renaissance', is, he says, 'lucidly simple and has the attraction of being in a contemporary novelistic medium'. 'Excellent!' must be the response of anyone who has dished up *crambe repetita* for a beginners' class in Greek, 'here are simple inflections for us, infrequent optatives, few duals and a story full of incidents as fantastic as anything in 'Goldfinger'—contemporary, too, if that means that both Tatius and Ian Fleming whisk the reader into the same timeless world of the escapist.'

There are, however, disadvantages. It is a pity that the order of words in Tatius is often far different from that which newcomers to the language will meet when they go on to more normal Greek prose. Moreover, although much of the narrative is simple, some parts of it (not, *pace* Professor Carney, only purple passages) are hard (not only for beginners) for reasons to be regretted; i.e. they are hard not because Tatius, like Plato or Thucydides, is struggling to say something difficult yet worth saying but partly because he does not handle particles with the skill of (say) Demosthenes and partly because neither the words he employs nor the uses to which he puts them are always classical. Nor is the text so well established that the reader can be sure that what he is asked to construe will make sense. Χαλεπὰ τὰ καλὰ indeed, but the inference καλὰ τὰ χαλεπὰ, however seductive to the Puritan in many of us, is not valid. There is the further difficulty, which Professor Carney mentions more than once, that some passages are so extravagant as to suggest either that Tatius has no taste (or very bad taste); that he occasionally guys himself; or that the whole romance is parody. And if it is all parody, surely intelligent reading (if that does not sound naive) demands both a knowledge of the writers, e.g. Heliodorus, whose work is being burlesqued, and a feeling for style which *ex hypothesi* a beginner cannot yet have—nor is likely to acquire from such reading.

For such a beginner Professor Carney gives much. His procedure is strictly correct. On pp. vii and viii he prints a list of books to which he makes careful reference throughout, and, like the good teacher he is, from time to time drops hints about other books (e.g. *The Golden Bough* and *Prolegomena*

to *Greek Religion*) in which an adventurous prospector can fossick with profit. And he plainly recognises that the first (and often the final) comment on an author may be an apt parallel from somewhere else in his works. Sometimes (let it be confessed) I should have welcomed more examples of normal Greek usage drawn from classical writers. Yet I soon became aware that a scrupulous search for the finest shades of meaning was being carried through by an alert mind, eager to illustrate the nuances of a versatile language exploited by a self-conscious manipulator of words. Professor Carney adroitly registers the force of the prefixes in compound verbs and shows how the sentences of Tatius are contorted by his finical avoidance of hiatus. His own occasional translations make the most subtle points (at times one wonders if Tatius intended them) and are usually accurate but not always as racy as the text requires.

In the commentary, careful as it is, Professor Carney, perhaps overanxious to leave nothing unexplained, tends to fall into jargon, e.g. 'zeugmatic' (p. 49), 'concept' (p. 51 and elsewhere), 'antithetized' (p. 137), 'positioned' (p. 152). Nor does he avoid (e.g. on p. 92 and p. 186) a use of the word 'after' which, in spite of lapses by men as reputable as Goodwin, is not recognised in N.E.D. (Vol. 1.1888) or the Supplement (1933). It may seem convenient and is (alas) not uncommon but it encourages the confusion of *post hoc* with *propter hoc* and obscures a radical difference between languages like Greek and Latin on the one hand and English on the other. In the vocabulary and *Index Graecitatis* there are surprising gaps; and it is not clear why reference by chapter and verse is given for some of the words in it and not for others. Misprints are few. To the *Corrigenda* on p. vi should be added;—p. 13 ὁμολογήσαμεν to read ὁμολογήσαμεν, p. 34 εἰπὼν to read εἰπών, p. 112 *responsibile* to read *responsible*, p. 167 κερείας to read κεραίας, p. 174 'Thomson' to read 'Thompson'. On p. 24 βαλαντίου has one λ; in the vocabulary it is given two.

No more than a short paragraph is needed for some other perplexities. In the text at 6.3 ἐγγέγραπτο is either a misprint for ἐνεγγέγραπτο or should be mentioned on p. 119 as one of three examples of a pluperfect without augment. On pp. 38 and 59 ἠώρητο should be fathered upon αἰωρέω. At 17.3 does not μάλλον δὲ mean 'or rather' (LSJ.II.3—a common meaning)? On pp. 35 and 36 would not the yard be slewed rather than the mast? In 5.3 if Professor Carney had respected the prefix of παρατρέχει with his usual fidelity he might have preferred to translate a troublesome sentence differently. At 10.1 does not τῷ νῶ mean 'in my mind' (cf. ἀλγῶ τὴν κεφαλὴν meaning 'I have a pain in my head')? On p. 43 the scansion of κύματος needs to be corrected; and on p. 42 the quantity of the first syllable of ἵλην is wrongly marked, in words which Professor Carney also quotes in his article in *J.H.S.* 1960, p. 29.

On the second level Professor Carney's work can best be turned to account

by constant reference to his article in *P.A.C.A.* 3, pp. 8 ff. He is able to show that Jackson was mistaken, at 6.4 in assuming that ἀμοφῶν is dative; and at 7.5 rightly rejects his πιννῖνον. He also shows up Gaselee's occasional embarrassments. He does not mention R. M. Rattenbury's review of Wifstrand: *Eikota* (*C.R.* vol. LX, pp. 110 and 111) perhaps because Rattenbury deals with the same matters in *R.E.G.* 72 (1959) which he does refer to and which I have not seen. Professor Carney's own emendations are offered where emendation is needed and all deserve more expert scrutiny than can be given by someone neither familiar with the history of the text nor at home in the Greek of Tattius. All are reasonable, some are ingenious, e.g. at 25.1 κολλᾶται for κομᾶ και; at 7.7 πλῆκτρον for πλησίον; at 21.6 χρηστότητος for χρηστῆς, and some may never be improved upon, e.g. at 7.1 ὤσει for ὄς. To say that none of them clicks quite convincingly into its place may simply betray a defect in the mechanism of one's own receiver.

On a few general questions Professor Carney's views would have been welcome; e.g. Why does he assign Tattius to the second century A.D.? What was Homer's influence on Tattius? Was it as strong as it might have been expected to be on so literary a *genre*? How were the style and syntax of Tattius affected by the Latin of the Imperial bureaucracy (Professor Carney himself in a good note at 24.1 on φίλος as *comes* suggests further studies) or by the very different Latin of Cicero and the rhetorical schools? But there is one final question which concerns all teachers of the Classics, especially those of us who are far from the libraries, museums, etc., which are for us what the cyclotron and such instruments of research are for the physical scientists. Professor Carney is very properly not overawed by John Jackson's rollicking impersonation of Housman, nor deluded by the deceptive (not to say 'deceitful') elegance of Stephen Gaselee. Yet scholars of their generation, steeped in the Classics in their schooldays, were able to range widely with a sure sense of style and with minds well-furnished by years of leisured study. In our modern world, which needs more than ever the values, the quality of classical literature, there is less time to turn out such 'gentlemen-scholars'. (How the very label dates them!) We have a hard choice to make. Are we (to be crude) specialists or evangelists, scientists or salesmen? For the true scholar no author is too remote, no detail is too small for his attention. Any text, no matter how trivial or obscure, can be made the occasion for the teaching of method or, in plainer words, for a practical exercise in thinking straight. (How Professor Carney's pupils are to be envied!) But with five-day weeks (and overcrowded time-tables) ought we not to use in our class-rooms the very best from the start? In the long week-end let Ian Fleming and Tattius wholesomely (or not?) release the sadism of our times; but in the short working week ought we not to 'sell' (how the word dates us!) something even better than scholarship and a clear head?

Enough of doubts and grumbles; one must end not with regret for what

Professor Carney does not provide but with gratitude for what he does give, in plenty, and with praise for the team (its members are named in the Introduction) which accomplished a hard task with great accuracy. It is sad that its captain's tireless energy, the keen edge of his mind and the enthusiasm that enables him to inspire and see through exciting ventures like this have been lost to our continent. If the present reviewer has dared, not without a fearful enjoyment, to hazard opinions on matters about which he has no business to speak he takes comfort from a characteristic cracker-motto of Tattius himself—*ἄπερ φίλου καλὸς ὁ κίνδυνος* (22.1).

The University of Natal

S. WHITELEY

* * * *

P. J. Conradie: *The Treatment of Greek Myths in modern French Drama. A Study of the 'Classical' Plays of Anouilh, Cocteau, Giraudoux and Sartre* (Annale. Universiteit van Stellenbosch, volume 29, Serie B, n^o 2, 1963, pp. [21]—100).

Dans une brève introduction, M. Conradie définit le critère sur lequel il s'est fondé pour juger différentes pièces du théâtre français contemporain: *Eurydice*, *Antigone* et *Médée* d'Anouilh, *Orphée* et *La machine infernale* de Cocteau, *Amphitryon* 38, *La guerre de Troie n'aura pas lieu* et *Electre* de Giraudoux, et enfin *Les Mouches* de Sartre. La meilleure méthode est, selon M. Conradie, de dégager la signification que le mythe repris par l'écrivain moderne avait dans les oeuvres littéraires antiques. 'Then we must examine the modern drama to ascertain what interpretation the dramatist has given to the myth, decide to what extent he has succeeded in re-interpreting the essential meaning of the myth in modern terms, and whether he has enriched it by adding something of his own', écrit M. Conradie. Et de noter encore: 'As in the case of the adaptation of an ancient tragedy, the main criterion, in my opinion, is in how far the modern dramatist has succeeded in fusing the classical and modern elements into a new unity.'

S'appuyant sur Euripide, Platon, Virgile, Ovide, le *Culex* pseudo-*virgilien* et Sénèque, M. Conradie pense que dans l'antiquité, le mythe d'Orphée n'illustre pas tant le pouvoir extraordinaire de la musique que l'union étroite de la mort et de l'amour. E. O. Marsh (*Jean Anouilh*, Londres, 1953) portait sur l'*Eurydice* d'Anouilh un jugement sévère: 'The parallel with the Greek myth is too strained to carry the weight required of it—the two characters are dwarfed by their ghostly namesakes; their symbols reduce them rather than increase their stature. "If only his name were not Orpheus", you find yourself thinking'. M. Conradie repousse cette affirma-

ACTA CLASSICA



Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

For further information go to:
http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta_classica.htm