

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](#)



***Euripides, Alcestis.* Edited by E. H. Blakeney, M. A.
London: G. Bell and Sons. 1900. Pp. viii, 180. xxxvii. 2s.**

H. Ellershaw

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 04 / May 1901, pp 229 - 229
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030213, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030213

How to cite this article:

H. Ellershaw (1901). The Classical Review, 15, pp 229-229 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030213

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Odyssey, Book xi. By J. A. NAIRN. Pitt Press Series. 2s.

MR. NAIRN may be congratulated on the production of an excellent school-book, admirably adapted to its purpose. The Introduction contains an instructive essay on the Homeric Underworld, and a brief, but adequate, account of Epic forms; and there are five Appendices dealing with syntax and other matters. The notes are full and accurate, and nothing of importance seems to have been neglected. I notice a few passages where I should take a different view from that adopted here by Mr. Nairn.—17. Monro's change of ὁπότεν to ὁπότε is based on his view that κε and ἄν have no place in general statements; but, as I have endeavoured to show in a school edition of the *Iliad*, this view is not borne out by the evidence. And if ἄν is to be effaced here, why not in the next line also? The instinct which has prevented it is a sound one; it is felt that the doctrine, if consistently applied, would carry us too far. It is difficult to make Monro's view of κε square with numerous passages where he does not propose to reject the particle, so that we can hardly be justified in altering the text in passages like the present.—24. ἔσχον, 'took hold of.'—45. ὃν, 'now.' The word is very rarely anything but a temporal adverb in Homer.—53. κατελείπομεν. The impf. is natural because the action of leaving is a continuous one: so 68, 86, 174.—76. καὶ ἐσσομένοις πυθέσθαι. Surely there is no 'attraction' of the dat. The barrow is to be made 'for those who shall come after, so that they may learn about me.' Cf. 156.—375. The note is right, but a wrong view of the passage is taken in the Appendix, p. 80.—443. κερνυμένον εἶναι is not an instance of a passive inf. for imperative; the participle is to be separated from εἶναι.—584. στείρω δὲ θυψάν, πίειν δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι. There is no probability in the meaning, 'reached out,' given to στείρω. Here, as always, the verb means to 'declare.' Transl. 'And though he deemed (declared to himself; cf. the common use of φημί, act. and mid.), thirsting, that he would [drink], yet was he not able,' etc.—608. There is no notion of 'timidity' inherent in πατταίνω, as the exx. show; the word seems to denote a sharp, quick glance.—634f. These two lines must be spurious, since there are no traces of the Gorgon in Greek art before the

seventh century. Leaf rejects the *Iliad* passages where reference is made to the Gorgon. In several places in the notes Mr. Nairn repeats the doctrine that κε 'particularises,' even in subordinate sentences, though in Appendix C he has gratified me by adopting the essential points of my own exposition of its uses. The two views are, I fear, irreconcilable.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

Euripides, Alcestis. Edited by E. H. BLAKENEY, M. A. London: G. Bell and Sons. 1900. Pp. viii, 180. xxxvii. 2s.

To edit the *Alcestis* again seems almost like slaying the slain, yet we think that Mr. Blakeney has produced a school edition which will make its way in spite of its elders in the field. To begin with, the book is well illustrated. Besides smaller cuts, there is a reproduction from a photograph of the Theatre of Dionysus, and of the bust of Euripides. The frontispiece is Leighton's Hercules wrestling with death for the body of Alcestis, but it is on too small a scale to represent the picture satisfactorily. In a general introduction Mr. Marchant gives a slight sketch of the origin of the drama and of the way in which a play was produced. The introduction to the play is sufficient and full use seems to have been made of all recent literature. The Notes are ample and give the kind of information required in a book of this sort—abundant grammatical exegesis. There are no changes of importance in the text. In 501, the editor convinced by Earle's paper in the *Classical Review*, vol. xii, returns to the MSS. reading. There is no doubt that Wakefield's *πᾶν* gives great point to the passage, but it is hardly necessary as *παισιν* gives a very fair sense. Indeed of *πᾶν* we may say what was said of Bentley's *nitedula*—that it is what the poet ought to have written. No new light is thrown on the well-known crux *μηνὸς* of 321. The knot is cut by reading with Kvicala *μὴν ἐσέρχεται*. With most late editors, Mr. Blakeney reads *καταρῶν* in 1118. The volume closes with full indices and a vocabulary which seems satisfactory. This little edition may be heartily commended.

H. ELLERSHAW.