

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](#)



Greek and Roman Sacrifice *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer*. By S. Von Eitrem. Pp. 493. Kristiania: Utgit fär H. A. Bennechts Fond, bei Jacob Dybwad.

J. T. Sheppard

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 07 / November 1915, pp 214 - 216

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00049040, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00049040

How to cite this article:

J. T. Sheppard (1915). Review of Jonathan Boston, and Judith A. Davey 'Implications of Population Ageing: Opportunities and Risks' The Classical Review, 29, pp 214-216
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00049040

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

at *Ach.* 459), but apart from such express citation the only plausible reading due to him alone seems to be *θερμόν* at *Vesp.* 330,¹ and the list of his agreements in good readings with one or other group of MSS. presents no very imposing testimony to his integrity. It is noticeable that the emendations which Mr. Elliott tries and condemns by the evidence of what he calls the 'undesigned coincidence' of Athenaeus and the MSS. are almost without exception unacceptable on other grounds. Still, if I wished to read with Bentley *ἵππος* at *Plut.* 815, I should not be much deterred by Athenaeus's disapproval. Mr. Elliott himself is a little inconsistent, for at 745 he prints an emendation which ignores Suidas's express testimony to the word *φιλάτιον*, though elsewhere he attaches great importance even to such late evidence, and is sufficiently patient of eccentric forms to defend *ἐντετευτλανωμένης* at 894.

The third appendix, which contains an investigation of the dialect scenes in Aristophanes, is in some ways the most valuable part of the book, though the results show that editors may well despair. Aristophanes is inconsistent (*Ach.* 746 is the most striking example) and, judged by inscriptional evidence, inaccurate, and of course his scribes Atticise. So when, to take a simple instance, Megarian inscriptions have

¹ *Nais* at *Plut.* 179 is an emendation.

both *εἰ* and *αι*, Aristophanes consistently *αι*, but at 742 *εἴπερ*, the choice between *εἴπερ* and Elmsley's *αιπερ* can hardly be decided by reason.² But, at any rate, this appendix contains a full and impartial digest of all the materials, and will be indispensable to all students of the dialect plays.

As I have in this notice criticised mainly certain judgments of Mr. Elliott, it is only fair to say that the importance of the book lies not in his judgments, but in the store of facts he has collected. Scholars will not, I think, always agree with Mr. Elliott, but they will not be the less grateful on that account for the years of patient and laborious work which have obviously gone to the making of his edition. The immediate results seem to me, and I think must have seemed to Mr. Elliott, disappointing, but the information here gathered together will in various ways be of value to students of this and other plays, and when the problem of the Aristophanic MSS. is finally solved Mr. Elliott will not be without his share in the credit.

A. S. F. GOW.

² The question is in certain cases complicated by a doubt as to how Aristophanes represented the sounds; but speculation on this head does not seem very profitable in the present state of our knowledge. On p. 163 Mr. Elliott says Aristophanes' autograph 'would probably have been in the Ionic alphabet'; on the next page he seems to imply that it was in the Attic.

GREEK AND ROMAN SACRIFICE.

Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer. By VON S. EITREM. Pp. 493. Kristiania: Utgit för H. A. Bennechts Fond, bei Jacob Dybwad.

THE main argument of this book suggests that the normal preliminaries of Greek and Roman sacrifice are the 'fossilised' survival of a ritual older than the gods, and older than the sacrifice of animals to the gods; that this ritual is itself, in origin, a sacrifice, not, as Stengel thought, to Gaia, but to the dead. The author examines each detail of the preliminary rite, and shows how each has its place in the ancient

cult of the dead. That cult passed into the cult of heroes, and of chthonic powers, and finally of Olympian gods: traces of it survive in the Olympian ritual as in magic and mystery.

To this general argument, I suppose, few scholars will object. But I imagine that the methodical and rather pedestrian treatment, though to the present reviewer it gives confidence, will seem, to learned and imaginative followers of Dieterich and other hierophants of protobarbaranthropology, to omit all that really matters. In defence of Eitrem's method it may be said that we know,

without question, that the worship of the dead played an important part in the primitive religion of Greece, whereas the evidence for the 'Eniautos-Daimon,' for Kouros-worship, and even for Dieterich's universal Gaia-cult, at any rate in Greece, is, at least, inadequate. Eitrem explains too much by reference to the cult of the dead. He seems to imply that there was a time when that particular department of superstition alone mattered. Is it not more probable that, from the earliest times, life was made complicated, not only by the dead, but also by all manner of magical powers and dangers? Still, the worship of the dead played so important a part in the development of religion that I prefer the exclusiveness of Eitrem to the vague, if stimulating, lavishness of *Themis*. The advantages of Eitrem's method may be illustrated by his insistence that the pouring of water must be explained on the same lines as similar ritual use of milk, blood, honey, etc. (p. 100), so that we must not talk, with Jevons, of the 'water-spirit'; by his rejection of Usener's suggestion that honey is given to the 'blessed' dead because honey is the food of the gods (p. 107), and by his admission that water is used by the dead for washing as well as for drinking (p. 118), however much the The-saurus may incline to Loewe's gratuitous conjecture *aqua quae mortuis libatur* for *qua mortuus lavatur*. Turn to his treatment of the *καταχύσματα* (e.g. p. 266) and the kindred throwing of stones (p. 284), and I think you will feel more comfortable than you generally feel when you read of such strange matters. And, in general, the use of literary evidence—though the distinction between early and late, Greek and barbarian, might be more clearly indicated—is more sober, and therefore more suggestive, than, for example, that of a recent writer on the origin of Comedy. It is unlikely, I think, that Xenophon, when he laid aside his garland on the receipt of bad news, did so because death 'breaks the protective power of garland as of ring,' and not rather because he felt that garlands were unsuitable for a moment of sorrow (p. 69). It is perverse to

suggest that ἀνηφαίστω πυρί in Eur. *Or.* 614, has anything to do with the superstition that it is a bad omen if sacrifices refuse to burn (p. 137). The fact that Demos is boiled to youth by the sausage-seller is *not*, though the myth of Medea *is*, evidence for the superstition that hot-water has magical powers (p. 191). Still, slips like these are exceptional, and there is nothing here which approaches the fantastic imagination of those who will not allow Medea to outwit Jason or recoil from her crime without the excuse of an original ritual *Agon*,¹ and who forbid Demos to be cooked, Philocleon to faint, victors to be crowned, or Aristophanic characters to throw stones or behave obscenely, unless they have the excuse that the poet had to follow the outlines of an 'original sacred drama,' with human sacrifice, and a ritual contest, and *ἱερὸς γάμος* as well.² From this kind of fancy Eitrem's sober method is a welcome relief. In the difficult matter of the interpretation of vase-paintings (e.g. p. 10 and p. 168) he is not always cautious.

A book of this kind, made up of a great mass of evidence, naturally contains many suggestions which interest a student of literature. I will mention a few:—ἀμφίπολον Pind. *Ol.* I. 93 is applied to the tomb of Pelops because the worshipper *went round it ceremonially*, not, as the scholiast says, to admire (p. 10); Eur. *El.* 803, the queen prepares the barley, as the wife probably did in the ancient family worship (p. 294); *Eum.* 371, the dances of the Furies are ἐπίφθονοι because they move from right to left to bind the victim (p. 45); Suet. *Vitell.* 2, *capite velato circumvertensque se, deinde procumbens*, a combination of the old Roman act of worship with the oriental προσκύνησις (p. 48); Soph. *O. C.* 489, whispering, so that only the ghosts can hear (p. 124); *Od.* iv. 759, not a truncated sacrifice, but a complete, old-fashioned rite, prayer with offering of grain (p. 277); Ar. *Pax* 1,074, an excellent jest, as van Leuwen shows,

¹ See Professor Murray in *Themis*, p. 354. The argument is characteristic.

² See Mr. Cornford's *Origin of Attic Comedy*.

because salt is used medicinally for madness (p. 325).

It would have made the task of reading and of reviewing easier if the author had always provided as clear a summary of his conclusions as that with

which he has ended his illuminating account of magic circles and garlands and rings.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

THE ALCESTIS OF EURIPIDES.

The Alcestis of Euripides, translated into English Rhyming Verse, with Explanatory Notes, by Professor GILBERT MURRAY. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1s. net; cloth, 2s. net.

IN this new rendering of the *Alcestis* Professor Gilbert Murray has given us a fresh example of his admirable method of translation. When he sits down to translate Greek tragedy he does not ask himself, 'Is this in the tragic style?' but, 'Will this convey to an English audience what Euripides meant to convey to the Athenians?' In the *Bacchae*, by using modern religious phraseology, he tries to make us realise something of the religious feeling of the Greeks; so here, wishing to make us see how Euripides presented the grief of a child at the loss of its mother, he gives us—

Mummy has gone away
And left me and will not come back any more.

* * * * *

Such a little time we had her. She might
have stayed
On till we all were old. . . .
Everything is spoiled when Mother is dead.

Some critics will object that this is not the language of poetry. But then that is what they said about Wordsworth.

The choruses hardly afford the translator the same opportunity for lyric verse as the choruses of the *Bacchae*; but some of the charm of

'Will they ever come to me, ever again?'

of the *Bacchae* is to be found in the following stanzas:

Chorus.

Oh, a House that loves the stranger,
And a House for ever free!
And Apollo, the Song-changer,
Was a herdsman in thy fee;

Yea, a-piping he was found
Where the upward valleys wound,
To the kine from out the manger
And the sheep from off the lea,
And love was upon Othrys at the sound.

And from deep glens unbeholden
Of the forest to his song
There came lynxes streaky-golden,
There came lions in a throng,
Tawny-coated, ruddy-eyed,
To that piper in his pride;
And shy fawns he would embolden
Dappled dancers, out along
The shadow by the pine-tree's side.

In the longer speeches there is much fine writing, and all the dignity with which Admetus can be invested is expressed in the stately lines beginning:

I called not thee to burial of my dead.

In the Preface is much fresh suggestion, even in regard to this much-commented-on Play. But then, as Professor Murray says of Dr. Verrall, his 'work, as always, stands apart. Even if wrong, it has its own excellence.' He devotes some space to maintaining that Alcestis is 'not by any means a mere blameless ideal heroine. . . . Where he (Admetus) is passionate and romantic, she is simple and homely. . . . When Admetus has made a thrilling answer about eternal sorrow, and the silencing of lyre and lute, and the statue who shall be his only bride, Alcestis earnestly calls the attention of witnesses to the fact that he has sworn not to marry again.' Is not Professor Murray from the Greek point of view a little 'wrong' here? Surely her simplicity and homeliness are just what the average Greek husband held to be 'ideal' in a wife? This inability on our part to realise the shifting nature of some ideals, though not of all, very much exaggerates the difficulty critics have raised over Admetus' treatment of Heracles. Hos-