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](#)

Note on Eur. A/c. 501.

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 08 / November 1898, pp 393 - 394

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0003331X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0003331X

How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1898). Note on Eur. A/c. 501.. The Classical Review, 12, pp 393-394 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0003331X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

difficulty of converting into Attic Zonaras' phrase (7. 19. 8, τῶν μὴ ἀπογραφασμένων τὰς οὐσίας ἐν ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς καὶ ἑαυτοὺς) if the addition of the pronoun were absolutely proscribed. Similarly, if an index maker desired to attach to a name in the genitive a clause to this effect 'having styled himself son of Nicodiceus,' I do not think he would have feared to write ἐπιγραφασμένου αὐτὸν Νικοδίκου υἱόν. The phrase is unambiguous and terse, and is justified by its convenience.

The first words of the speech are perhaps beyond discovery. The plural ἀποψηφισαμένων is an appropriate opening for an advocate whose office is to defend the votes of the majority in the deme. Compare *Aesch.* 1. 78: ἐπειδὴν γὰρ εἶπη ὁ κατήγορος 'ἄνδρες δικασταί, τουτοὶ καταψηφίσαντο (ἀπε-

ψηφίσαντο: Hamaker) οἱ δημόται, ὁμόσαντες, οὐδένος ἀνθρώπων οὔτε κατηγορήσαντος οὔτε καταμαρτυρήσαντος, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ συνειδότες, εὐθύς θορυβεῖτε ὑμεῖς ὡς οὐ μετὸν τῷ κρινομένῳ τῆς πόλεως. But if the change be accepted, as it was by Sauppe, it is hard to imagine what place is left in the sentence for συμβαλόν. What is wanted is a genitive plural to go with the participle. No 'demoticum' furnishes an entirely convincing restoration. The two forms nearest to συμβαλόν are Σφενδαλέων and Συπαληγτίων, it being remembered that in the first century B.C. the latter was sometimes written Συβαληγτίων (*C.I.A.* ii. 470). But proper names, especially if they happen to be rare, are outside all rules of palaeographical probability.

W. W.

NOTE ON EUR. *ALC.* 501.¹

HERACLES, newly arrived at Pherae, converses with the Coryphaeus and is more nearly informed of the nature of his quest in Thrace. When told at length that the master of the man-eating horses is a son of Ares he says:

καὶ τόνδε τοῦμοῦ δαίμονος πόνον λέγεις·
σκληρὸς (f. στερρὸς: cf. *Androm.* 98 et schol.
ad loc.) γὰρ αἰεὶ καὶ πρὸς αἶπος ἔρχεται· 500
εἰ χρὴ με πασιὼν οὓς Ἄρης ἐγένετο
μάχην ἐνάνθαι πρῶτα μὲν Λυκάωνι,
αὐτὸς δὲ Κύνῳ, τόνδε δ' ἔρχομαι τρίτον
ἀγῶνα πῶλοις δεσποτῇ τε συμβαλὼν·
ἀλλ' οὕτως ἔστιν ὃς τὸν Ἀλκμήνης γόνον 505
τρέσαντα χεῖρα πολεμίαν ποτ' ὄψεται.

I have been at some pains to punctuate this passage accurately. It is a single sentence. V. 499 is parenthetic and might, therefore, be set off by dashes as well as by the point above the line. The gist of the sentence may be given briefly thus: 'Just my luck—always hard—to fight with another son of Ares after fighting with two! But I'll never turn my back on a foe.' I emphasise the fact that Heracles's speech is a single sentence, because I conceive that it is the vicious modern tendency to curtail the comprehensive ancient sentence and to fail to grasp it as a whole that has led here, as too often in the Classics, to a serious

misconception of the author's meaning. To this misconception we owe it that the word πασιὼν in v. 501 has been called in question. Gilbert Wakefield in his *Tragoediarum Delectus* (London 1794) was, so far as I know, the first of the would-be correctors of this word. He printed in his text πασι, annotating thus: 'Erectiorem feci sententiam et loquentis menti accomodatiorem, restituendo ex divinatione proprâ (sic) πασι pro inerti atque inutili dictione πασιων: et quisnam adversabitur?' G. A. Wagner in his edition of the *Alcestis* (Leipzig 1800) objected to Wakefield's 'restitution,' but without giving an adequate reason for his objection and—apparently—without fully understanding the passage. Monk merely notes 'πασι pro πασιων edidit Wakefield.' In our time, in which peace has not been given to this passage, at least two editors of the *Alcestis* have hit upon the same conjecture as Wakefield. In Dr. Wecklein's edition of Wolff. Bauer's *Alkestis* (Munich 1888) πασι is printed and credited apparently to himself by Dr. Wecklein. Again Mr. W. S. Hadley in his edition of the *Alcestis* (Cambridge 1896) prints πασι with the explanatory note: 'πασι, a natural exaggeration,' and the critical note: 'For the MSS. πασιων I have read πασι; cf. n. in commentary; the enumeration of first, second and third makes the exaggeration natural: πασιων seems pointless.' (Cf. also *Class. Rev.* xii. pp. 118–119.) By the rough rendering

¹ Read before the American Philological Association at Hartford, Conn., 6 July, 1898.

I have given above of this passage, as well as by my preliminary remarks upon it, I have already sought to indicate the arguments against this persistent conjecture. Heracles complains not of fighting with all Ares's sons, but of fighting with another, a third son of Ares. In a clearer and more prosaic form the sense of vv. 501-504 might be reproduced thus: *εἰ χρή με τῷδε τρίτῳ παιδὶ Ἀρεὸς μάχην ξυνάψαι δις ἤδη παισὶν Ἀρεὸς μάχην ξυνάψαντα πρῶτα—Κύνῳ.* The reading *παισὶν* brings *δεσπότης* in v. 504 among the 'sons that Ares begat'; the conjecture *πᾶσιν* puts Lycaon and Cynus among them 'that Ares begat,' but places the 'master of the foals' in another category. If we try to reduce the proposed text to a more prosaic form we shall get something like this: *εἰ χρή με πᾶσιν οὓς (δσους) Ἀρης ἐγείνατο μάχην ξυνάψαντα, πρῶτα—Κύνῳ, τόνδ' ἔρχεσθαι κτέ.* This reduction to prose is certainly a *reductio ad absurdum*. I do not, however, venture to hope that I shall have been able to banish this pestilent critical heresy for ever.

I may add that this passage gives me another occasion to note what I have noted by implication elsewhere (*Class. Rev.* ix. 202), that a translator may succeed when the commentators fail. Mr. Way does tolerable justice to the passage just discussed thus:

'Thou say'st: such toil my fate imposeth still,
Harsh evermore, uphillward straining aye,
If I must still in battle close with sons
Gotten of Arès; with Lycaon first,
And Kyknus then: and lo, I come to
grapple—
The third strife this—with yon steeds and
their lord.
But never man shall see Alkmênê's child
Quailing before the hand of any foe.'

It may be added to what has been already said about this passage—and perhaps the addition will put the case in even clearer light—that if Euripides had chosen to write *παίδων*, instead of *παισὶν*, there would have been no possible ground for emendation. The regimen of *ξυνάψαι* before his mind and the consciousness that he was expressing himself somewhat indirectly caused him, I conceive, to prefer the dative. If we translate as though *παίδων* were written—and in v. 504 *πᾶλων δεσπότης*—, we shall gain a clear understanding from another point of view of the difficulties of this passage and the reasons why editors have blundered.

It may be noted in conclusion that M. Henri Weil in his edition of the *Alceste* says nothing of the conjecture *πᾶσιν*.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

LUCIAN: *HERMOTIM.* 81.

WITH reference to Mr. Headlam's note on p. 350, I should like to point out that Lucian is referring not to the *Δόγμια* Ἰησοῦ, but to certain pantheistic utterances of the Stoics. The whole context in the *Hermotimus* is redolent of Stoicism, and the matter is put beyond dispute by a comparison with Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 5, § 66 οὐδὲ μὴν τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Στωῦς παρελεύσομαι διὰ πάσης ὕλης καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀτιμοτάτης τὸ θεῖον δέικειν λέγοντας

and Themist. *de Anim.* 72b τάχα δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ζήνωνος σύμφωνος ἡ δόξα διὰ πάσης οὐσίας πεφοιτηκέναι τὸν θεὸν τιθεμένους. The coincidence of thought with the passage in the *Δόγμια* is no doubt striking, but not more so than, e.g. the similarity of Arr. *Epict.* ii. 8, 12, 13 with 1 Cor. vi. 18-20.

A. C. PEARSON.

NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

ix. 22 sqq. Mr. Kenyon punctuates κλεινοῖ[ι βρ]οτῶν, | οἱ τρίτετι κτέ. Either the comma should be omitted (cf. the punctuation of v. 50) or it should be placed between κλεινοῖ and βροτῶν. The meaning is not 'glorious among mortals are they that,' etc.,

but 'glorious are those among mortals that,' etc. It may be added here that the comma after Χάει in v. 27 should be removed. It is immaterial whether or not a comma be placed after ἔθειραν in v. 29.

xi. 8 sq. [βαθυ]πλοκάμουν seems certainly