

# 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 Euripides's Alcestis

Mortimer Lamson Earle

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 08 / November 1896, pp 374 - 376

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204769, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00204769](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204769)

### How to cite this article:

Mortimer Lamson Earle (1896). Note on Euripides's Alcestis. The Classical Review, 10, pp 374-376 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204769

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

observation is liable, as proved by the hard facts of actual measurement, has made me somewhat prejudiced in favour of the use of instruments. But in any case it has been very instructive to me to read Mr.

Burrows' valuable paper, and I cannot but welcome it as a real contribution to what is to me a subject of great interest.

G. B. GRUNDY.

#### NOTE ON EURIPIDES'S *ALCESTIS*.

Vv. 282-289.

ἐγὼ σὲ πρεσβεύουσα κἀντὶ τῆς ἐμῆς  
ψυχῆς καταστήσασα φῶς τόδ' εἰσορᾶν  
θνήσκω, παρὸν μοι μὴ θανεῖν ὑπὲρ σέθεν  
ἀλλ' ἄνδρα τε σchein Θεσσαλῶν ὃν ἤθελον  
καὶ δῶμα ναίειν ὀλβιον τυραννίδι  
οὐκ ἠθέλησα ζῆν ἀποσπασθείσα σου  
ἐν παισὶν ὀρφανοῖσιν οὐδ' ἐφεισάμην,  
ἥβης ἔχουσα δῶρ', ἐν οἷς ἐτερπόμην.

The difficulty in this passage begins with v. 285. It will not do to supply, with Monk, παρὸν μοι from v. 284, or, with Hermann, to make ἀλλ' connect only the infinitives. Lenting's οὐκ for οὐκ in v. 287 and Kirchhoff's οὐδ' in the same place do not satisfy; nor has M. Weil helped the passage by writing in v. 284 θνήσκω παρὸν δὲ κτέ. In order satisfactorily to treat this difficult passage we must begin with v. 284. (Perhaps I should have said that the difficulty, though not the obvious one, begins here.) It is certainly far more natural to take ὑπὲρ σέθεν with θνήσκω than with θανεῖν: that every reader of the verse must feel. But if we read in that way, we shall begin a new construction with ἀλλ'. The one word that interferes with ἀλλ' ἄνδρα κτέ. as a new sentence is the infinitive ζῆν in v. 287; and here, I believe, we have found the ἔλκος. Substitute for ζῆν the participle ζῶσ' (cf. v. 695 ζῆς παρελθὼν and Xen. *Anab.* 2. 6, 29 ζῶν αἰκισθεῖς) and all is right.

θνήσκω, παρὸν μοι μὴ θανεῖν, ὑπὲρ σέθεν.  
ἀλλ' ἄνδρα τε σchein Θεσσαλῶν ὃν ἤθελον  
καὶ δῶμα ναίειν ὀλβιον τυραννίδι  
οὐκ ἠθέλησα ζῶσ' ἀποσπασθείσα σου  
ἐν παισὶν ὀρφανοῖσιν κτέ.

Vv. 291 sq.

καλῶς μὲν αὐτοῖς καταναεῖν ἦκον βίου,  
καλῶς δὲ σῶσαι παῖδα κεῖκλεῶς θανεῖν

V. 292 is objectionable in its traditional form by reason of the repetitious θανεῖν. This is best got rid of by accepting Wake-

field's φθίνειν (cf. Wecklein's emendation in v. 25). But there is another word that seems quite as clearly wrong, and that is κεῖκλεῶς. Read the adjective for the adverb — κεῖκλεεῖς.

Vv. 320-322.

δεῖ γὰρ θανεῖν με· καὶ τόδ' οὐκ ἐς αὔριον  
οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴνός ἔρχεται κακόν,  
ἀλλ' αὐτίκ' ἐν τοῖς μηκέτ' οὔσι λέξομαι.

Though I cannot feel with Mr. Hayley (*Amer. Journal of Philology*, xvi. i. p. 103) that v. 321 is right as it stands, I am becoming less and less disposed to regard it as a probable or possible interpolation. The simplest treatment of this *crux criticorum* seems to be the changing of a single letter so as to read

οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴν ἐσέρχεται κακόν,

This had been suggested also by Johann Kvíčala (*Studien zu Euripides*, ii. p. 11), although (with a perverseness sadly characteristic of this scholar) he proposes as "das wahrscheinlichste"

οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μέλλον ἔρχεται κακόν

For the μὴν in this position in the verse may be compared M. Weil's excellent restoration of v. 487 (ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀπειπεῖν μὴν πόνους οἷόν τ' ἐμοί) and his note thereon.

[Since this note was written, I have received, through the courtesy of the author, Mr. Hayley's *Varia Critica* (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. vii.), at the close of which he resumes the discussion of this passage. From this it appears that he is now disposed to regard μὴνός as unsound. For it he suggests *νηλὲς*.]

Vv. 360-362.

κατῆλθον ἄν, καὶ μ' οὐθ' ὁ Πλούτωνος κύων  
οὐθ' οὐπὶ κώπῃ ψυχοπομπὸς ἄν γέρων  
ἔσχευ, πρὶν ἐς φῶς σὸν καταστήσαι βίον.

The word γέρων in v. 361 is due to the acuteness of Cobet (*Var. Lectt.*<sup>2</sup> p. 581). It is accepted, as I am glad to see, by M. Weil (whose excellent edition of the *Alcestis*, I may add, did not come into my hands until the printing of my own text was so far advanced that I was unable to adopt several admirable corrections of his). Cobet in the same place suggested that βίον in v. 362 was a gloss on φῶς that had ousted the original final word of the verse. This word, he suggested, was δέμας. The same conjecture was made by Nauck. Not satisfied with this I have kept the vulgate. M. Weil had done the same. I am inclined, however, to believe that Cobet's account of the origin of βίον is right. The key to the emendation of v. 362 appears to be given by *I. T.* 981 sq. καὶ σὲ πολυκώπῳ σκάφει | στείλας Μυκήναις ἐγκαταστήσω πάλιν. Read in the *Alcestis*

πρὶν ἐς φῶς σ' ἐγκαταστήσαι <πάλιν>.

Vv. 1118-1120.

ΑΔ. καὶ δὴ προτείνω. HP. Γοργόν' ὡς καρατομών.

ἔχεις; ΑΔ. ἔχω. HP. ναί, σῶζε νῦν καὶ τὸν Διὸς  
φήσεις πότ' εἶναι παῖδα γένναϊον ξένον.

To M. Weil is due the admirable division of v. 1118 that I have here followed; but the same scholar is not equally successful in his treatment of v. 1119, where he would read ΑΔ. ἔχω νυν. HP. σῶζέ νυν, καὶ κτέ. It seems unnecessary to change the traditional ναί. Why should νυν have given way to it? Monk seems to have been right in giving ναί to Admetus. Hermann pithily says: "Recte ναί Monkius Herculi dedit: male autem scripsit νυν" [for νῦν]. A careful study of the passage seems furthermore to demand that we read the words after σῶζε as they are printed in Hermann's Monk's *Alcestis* (Leipsc 1824) and are reproduced above. The νῦν and πότ' are contrasted: 'keep now and you will say some time' etc.

V. 1131.

ΑΔ. θίγω, προσείπω ζῶσαν ὡς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν;

The ὡς is certainly awkward. Paley construed it with ζῶσαν, "i.e. not as a mere φάσμα νεπτέρων." But the following words are awkwardly definite. I have suggested an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction with both ζῶσαν and δάμαρτ' ἐμήν. But this is awkward. M. Weil in his critical note to v. 1129 quotes

Mekler's εἰσορῶ ξυνόρον for εἰσορῶ δάμαρτ' ἐμήν and in his explanatory note on the same verse asks: "Le poète aurait-il répété ces mots au vers 1131?" The doubt is a fair one; but the difficulty in v. 1131 should prompt us to emend there rather than in v. 1122, the close of which seems quite natural as a repetition of that of v. 1126 (ὄρῳ δάμαρτα σήν). *Med.* 1350 (ἔξω προσειπεῖν ζῶντας) points to a separation of ὡς from ζῶσαν (so too does the position of ὡς), and *Alc.* 1124 may perhaps supply what we need. We may compare too *Soph. El.* 1452 ἦ καὶ θανόντ' ἡγγεῖλαν ὡς ἐτητύμως; Certainly the reading θίγω, προσείπω ζῶσαν ὡς <ἐτητύμως>; might easily have been corrupted to the traditional form by the gloss δάμαρτ' ἐμήν added to ἐτητύμως.

V. 1134.

ἔχω σ' ἀέλπτως, οὔποτ' ὄψεσθαι δοκῶν;

(best read as a question in view of Heracles's answer) should perhaps be corrected by writing οὐκέτ' for οὔποτ'. The same correction was suggested—not improbably—by Musgrave in v. 876.

V. 1143 seems to need a slight correction. Thus:

τί γάρ ποθ' ὦδ' ἀναυδος ἔστηκεν γυνή;

The importance of the readings of Codex Parisinus 2713 (a) in several passages of the *Alcestis* needs to be emphasized. Kirchhoff's judgment of this MS. was certainly unfair.

Vv. 433-4.

ἀξιά δέ μοι  
τιμᾶν, ἐπεὶ τέθνηκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ, λίαν.

The reading of a punctuated thus gives excellent sense and emphasis. (I may add that a spells τέθνηκεν.) Kvíčala (*Studien zu Eur.* ii. p. 12) saw the value of a's λίαν but thought it in the wrong place. His suggested emendation (ἀξιά δέ μοι | τιμῶν (oder nach S τιμῆς) λίαν, ἐπεὶ τέθνηκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ) is, of course, valueless. Nauck's ἐπεὶ τέτληκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θανεῖν, which I, rather rashly, adopted, is better than Usener's ἐπεὶ γ' ἐθνησκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ μόνη, which M. Weil accepts.

In v. 546 it is perhaps unnecessary to call attention to a's τῷδε, which (in the form τῷδε) has won general acceptance, except in proof of the independent value of a.

In v. 811. a's reading

ἡ κάρτα μέντοι καὶ λίαν θυραῖος ᾗν

(for the verification of which I am indebted to the courtesy of M. Henri Omont of the Bibliothèque Nationale) has been undervalued or disregarded since Kirchhoff's great edition. It is supported by *ᾄθειος* in v. 810 and, more clearly, by *θυραίων* in 814. (I still maintain the integrity of the traditional arrangement of vv. 809–815.) A misunderstanding of the irony of v. 811 with a's reading might well have led to *οἰκείος*. *θυραῖος* (which appears only in a of the MSS. recognized by Prinz but is found also in inferior MSS.) was printed by Lascaris and accepted by Matthiae and Hermann, though persistently rejected by Monk. Paley accepted it in his first edition but changed to *οἰκείος* in his second. Mr. Way in his translation accepts *θυραῖος* ("O yea, an alien she—o'ermuch an alien!"). Mr. Verrall (*Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 52 note) says: "The reading *λίαν θυραῖος* is clearly right: *λίαν οἰκείος*, the facile but pointless variant, is merely an unintelligent gloss."

A higher estimate of the value of a's

readings may well lead us to accept v. 1055 in the form

ἡ τῆς θανούσης θάλαμον εἰσβήσας τρέφω;

In v. 1140 *δαιμόνων τῶι κυρίῳ* should probably be accepted with Matthiae, Hermann, Kvicala (*Studien zu Eur.* ii. p. 38), Weil and Verrall (*Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 68 note). The variant is a guess like *οἰκείος* in v. 811. Kvicala interprets rightly "der entscheidende *δαίμων*"—"jener, mit dem es eben Herakles aufnehmen musste."

Other readings in the *Alcestis* that appear to be rightly supported by a (not to mention the obvious *αὐτῇ* in v. 37 and *πάσῃ* of v. 1154) are the following:

V. 45.

χθονὸς κάτω.

V. 1049.

γυνὴ νέα (on account of the *νέα* γάρ of v. 1050).

V. 1117.

τόλμα· πρότεινε χεῖρα καὶ θέγε ξένης.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

## NOTES ON REICHEL'S HOMERISCHE WAFFEN.

THE work of Dr. Reichel, *Ueber Homerische Waffen*, appears to me quite the most striking and important contribution to Homeric science that has appeared for a long time. It was reviewed by Dr. Leaf in the *Classical Review* in just terms of praise, and it is no intention of mine to diminish in aught the credit due to the author. But there are a few points on which I should like to have a more definite pronouncement of opinion.

First and foremost what is the relation of Homeric armour to the Mycenaean discoveries? That the latter have thrown a flood of light upon the former is indisputable, but are we to take it that this is evidence for a European as opposed to an Asiatic origin for the poems? Dr. Reichel indeed seems determined to observe strict silence upon this point, but Dr. Leaf's review might certainly lead one to suppose that he at any rate considers that the armour *does* afford evidence of this kind. Perhaps I am too much prejudiced in favour of Ionia; anyhow I do not see the force

of the evidence. A certain armour is found at Mycenae, the same is Homeric; it by no means follows that any part of Homer is Mycenaean. The emigrants to Ionia presumably took the old fashion of armour with them; in fact Reichel refers several times to the description of the old shield in Herodotus, i. 171, and Herodotus knew nothing of Mycenae. More than this, the very best description of the shield in question is to be found in Tyrtaeus, not Homer.

μηρούς τε κνήμας τε κάτω καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὤμους  
ἀσπίδος εὐρείης γαστρὶ καλυψάμενος.  
δεξιτέρῃ δ' ἐν χειρὶ τινασσέτω ὄβριμον ἔγχος,  
κινείτω δὲ λόφον δεινὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς.

See Tyrtaeus, xi. 23, and compare the whole passage, especially 35, for the *γυμνήτες* sheltering behind the shields. It is a perfect confirmation of Reichel and might have been written to illustrate him. The *θώρηξ* however appears in xii. 26. If the *θώρηξ* came in about 700 B.C. (Reichel,