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PREFACE.

The object with which this little book has been prepared is twofold, — to provide a convenient text-book for the use of students who are just beginning the critical study of the Greek drama, and to contribute something toward the constitution of a sound text of the Alcestis.

The play in question is often said to be an "easy" one; yet it abounds in critical difficulties and presents many interesting problems. These are thrown into stronger relief by the very simplicity and clearness of many portions of the play, and so can more easily be noted and discussed by the beginner in the critical art, who would be completely baffled by the manifold and complex difficulties of such a drama as the Agamemnon or the Trachiniae. Hence the Alcestis seems peculiarly adapted for the use of our classical "seminaries" and "pro-seminaries," and is often selected as a subject for their labors. In writing the present work, and especially in preparing the introduction and apparatus criticus, I have had in view the needs of students in these seminaries.

This, however, is not the sole object of the book. Some five years since, when looking over a large collection of works relating to the Greek drama, I was impressed by the fact that since the edition of Professor Monk no edition of the Alcestis which had for its chief purpose the critical constitution of the text
had appeared in English. This seemed all the more strange because the play is one of the best known and most popular of all the Euripidean dramas. There appeared, therefore, to be need of a new edition which should gather up the scattered critical material which has appeared during this century—which should, in other words, "bring Monk up to date." To do this adequately would require a much larger and more elaborate work than the present one; but I have tried to make at least a beginning in this direction.

In the treatment and constitution of the text I have been, on the whole, conservative. I have no sympathy with what some one has called "the yelping chorus of those who carp at conjectural criticism"; but the need of caution in the exercise of the art can scarcely be too strongly emphasized. Nothing is easier than to make conjectures; nothing is harder than to make a certain one. Still, I have received not a few conjectures into the text, especially from those suggested by Wecklein, F. W. Schmidt, Herwerden, Wilamowitz, Earle, and the early editors and critics. Variations in the text from the reading of the MSS. have been indicated by using bold-face type in the words where the change occurs.

The apparatus criticus is necessarily based upon that of Prinz; but I have made many changes and additions, and have omitted those testimonia which show no variant from the reading of the Euripidean MSS. Through the kindness of Professor U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, a few readings from \( d \) (Cod. Laurent. 31, 15) have been added. Under the heading "Select Conjectures" have been collected a number of emendations which for one reason or another seemed worthy of mention, but which I did not ven-
ture to receive into the text. These have been very carefully sifted from the great mass of conjectures upon the *Alcestis*, which could not have been reprinted as a whole without preserving a great deal of rubbish. In the critical notes, which form the larger part of the book, I have tried to discuss, or at least to point out, most of the difficulties which confront the student of the play. Many of the problems are still unsolved; some, perhaps, are incapable of solution, but I have honestly striven to blink none of them. At the end a brief "Metrical Appendix" has been added to help the student in dealing with the lyric metres of the play.

Though I have been under constant obligation to the labors of my predecessors, this edition is not "based" on that of any previous commentator, German or otherwise, and I have tried in all cases to exercise an independent judgment. I have aimed to make due acknowledgment for whatever is not the common property of scholars, though in so small a book it is not always possible "suum cuique reddere." I wish to express my special obligation to the following: to former editions of the play (particularly that of Monk), especially for "parallel passages"; to Professor von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, of Göttingen, for valuable information and advice; to Professor M. L. Earle, of Bryn Mawr, who very kindly communicated to me a number of unpublished readings and conjectures, with permission to make use of them; to Professors C. L. Smith, M. H. Morgan and A. A. Howard, of Harvard, for advice and encouragement, and above all to the late Professor F. D. Allen, of the same university, without whose kindly counsel this book would probably never have been written. I am much indebted, also, to my...
colleague, Dr. J. M. Paton, of Wesleyan University, for the
valuable chapter (on the works of art in which scenes from
the Alcestis are represented) which he has contributed to the
introduction.

It may appear to some that I have been too cautious in
many of my statements, and that "probably," "perhaps," "it
would seem," etc., recur too often in these pages; but I have
thought it best to run the risk of erring in this direction rather
than in that of over-confidence and "cocksureness." It be-
hooves the classical scholar to be very cautious in his assertions
in these days, when the very next discovery in Egypt may
prove him to be in the wrong. I may perhaps be permitted to
add that this is (if I mistake not) the first mainly critical edi-
tion of a Greek play that has been published by an American
scholar.  *Sit venia tironi!*

H. W. Hayley.

Middletown, Conn., September 1, 1897.
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INTRODUCTION.

A. The Myth of Alcestis.

Its History and Literary Treatment.

Few Greek myths have become more celebrated or have furnished a greater stimulus to literary effort than that of Admetus and Alcestis. It would be both interesting and profitable to trace the evolution of the story from its origin down to the time of Euripides; but, unfortunately, so many links in the chain are wanting that much must be left to conjecture. With the various "solar-myth" theories that have been suggested to account for the legend I will not weary the reader; they have long since been "gathered to their fathers." They may be found stated at length in the dissertation by Karl Dissel, "Der Mythos von Admetos und Alkestis" (Brandenburg, 1882) pp. 6 ff. The Euhemeristic explanation of the myth which was proposed by Gottfried Hermann (see the dissertation prefixed to his Alcestis pp. xiii. ff.) may also be dismissed as quite untenable.

That keen-sighted scholar, K. O. Mueller, in his Prolegomena zu einer wiss. Mythologie pp. 300–306 (cf. his Dorier, Eng. trans. I. p. 340 f.), advanced a different and much more probable theory. Noting that Αδμητος, "the unconquered," is a common title of Pluto, and that Αδμητος κόρη (see Hesychius s. v.) was a name of Hecate, he made the suggestion that Admetus was originally not the hero of later legend, but the king of the under-world himself. After slaying the Python, Apollo was obliged to atone for the blood-guilt thus incurred by descending into Hades and serving Αδμητος (i.e. Pluto) for a time. That form of the legend which connects Apollo’s servitude with the killing of the Cyclopes is, as we shall see, of later origin (see also Pauly, Real-Encyclop.² s. v.
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Apollon III. 12 and IV. 2). This view of Mueller's is extremely plausible, and is probably correct,* though it cannot, with our present data, be absolutely proved. As he points out (Dorier l. s. c.), it is confirmed by the obscure traditions which represent Apollo as actually dying and descending into the lower world (Euhemerus in Minucius Felix c. 21, 2, etc.). If Mueller is right, it becomes probable that *Ἀλκηστίς (cf. ἄλκη, 'Αλκίμος, 'Αλκήτας, 'Αλκμήνη, etc.) was originally a name of Persephone, Pherrhephatta, or Core, the queen of Hades. In what manner the story became localized and Pluto was transformed to a Thessalian monarch we can only guess. Possibly the fact that the name Admetus was not uncommon among the chieftains of northern Greece may have had something to do with the change. The Molossian king with whom Themistocles took refuge was an Admetus, and there were several distinguished Macedonians of that name.

In the Homeric poems we find but little about Admetus or Alcestis, but enough to show that the myth had already obtained a "local habitation." Admetus, the son of Pheres (Φήρητιάδας II. II. 763, XXIII. 376) and grandson of Cretheus and Tyro (Od. XI. 257-8), rules over four Thessalian cities, Pherae, Boebe, Glaphyra and Iolcus (II. II. 711 f.). His wife Alcestis is mentioned (II. l. s. c.) as "the fairest of the daughters of Pelias," who (as we learn from Od. XI. 253 f.) was the son of Poseidon and Tyro and dwelt in Iolcus. Eumelus, son of Admetus and Alcestis (II. II. 713), commands twelve ships at Troy, and possesses mares famed for their speed, τὰς ἐν Πειρέῃ θρέψ ἄργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων (II. II. 766). Eumelus appears among the contestants in the chariot race (II. XXIII. 287 ff.); but he does not play a conspicuous part in the Iliad. His wife is Iphthime, daughter of Icarius (Od. IV. 797-8). It is clear, I think, that, though the Iliad and Odyssey contain no detailed statement of the myth, the story was known to the authors of the parts of the Homeric poems above cited, and had already passed through a long process of development. It will be noted, also, that Admetus, Alcestis, and Eumelus are mentioned only in portions

* See, however, Schreiber, Apollon Pythoktonos pp. 11, 12, who opposes Mueller's theory.
of the *Iliad* which are now generally believed to be of comparatively late origin (viz. the *Catalogue of Ships* and Book XXIII).

The poet who did most to give the myth form and coloring seems, however, to have been Hesiod, or, rather, the unknown author of that curious work, the *Eoeoe*. In one of the divisions of this poem the story of Admetus and Alcestis was told with considerable fullness; and, though the work itself is lost, Wilamowitz with extraordinary acuteness has succeeded in making out the plot of this particular *Eoeoe* (see his *Isylos* pp. 57 ff.). This he has accomplished by piecing together bits of information from various ancient writers (the fragments of the poem, Pindar *Pyth.* III. and the schol., Apollod. *Bibl.* III. 10, 3 and I. 9, 15, Hyginus *Fab.* 49 and 51, etc.). Not all the details of his combinations are certain; but, taken as a whole, his conclusions seem well assured. According to him (*l. s. c. p. 70 f.*), the tale as told by the Hesiodic poet ran about as follows (omitting the earlier portion, in which were narrated the loves of Apollo and Coronis and the fate of the latter): Asclepius, son of Apollo and Coronis, grew up to manhood under the care of the centaur Chiron, and learned to know the medicinal powers of the herbs and the spells that stay disease. He became a physician without peer, and healed many of their ills; but when he presumed so far as to bring back the dead to life Zeus smote him with the thunderbolt and slew him at Delphi, where was his father's sanctuary. Then Apollo, in anger at his son's death and not being able to take vengeance upon Zeus, slew the Cyclopes who had forged the bolt which caused the death of Asclepius. At Leto's intercession Apollo was spared expulsion into Tartarus, but was condemned by Zeus to spend a "great year" in servitude to a mortal. So he entered the service of Admetus, king of Phere, and pastured his master's flocks near Lake Boebeis. Being kindly treated by Admetus, he caused the latter's herds to thrive and multiply (cf. *Alc.* 588 f.). He also aided the king to yoke together to his chariot a lion and a boar, in order to win Aleestis, whose father, Pelias, would grant her hand only to the suitor who should accomplish this feat. Admetus won his bride and brought her home amid rejoicing, but he forgot
to sacrifice to Apollo's sister, the cruel Artemis Bριμώ of Pherae; and, as a token of her wrath, he found a coil of snakes in his bridal chamber. Apollo interpreted to the king the will of the goddess; she demanded the life of the bridegroom, and would spare it only on condition that the life of another be voluntarily offered as a substitute. Friends and kindred all refused to make the sacrifice; only the young wife would consent to give her life for that of her husband. But when the sacrifice had been consummated, Persephone (who is Artemis Bριμώ under another aspect) had mercy on her and sent her back to the upper world. Thus, or nearly thus, the author of the Eoeae (see esp. Apollodorus and Hyginus u. s. c.). Though both Apollodorus and Hyginus mention the interference of Heracles, the former speaks of it only as another form of the legend (ὡς δὲ ἐνιολ λέγοντιν, Ἡρακλῆς μαχοσάμενος "Αδη; cf. the third schol. on Aristoph. Vesp. 1239). The date of the Eoeae is not exactly known, but probably is not far from the latter part of the seventh century B.C.; hence we may assume that at the time when the legend takes on a definite literary form. As we have seen, the poet assigns as the cause of Apollo's θητεία not the slaying of the Python but the killing of the Cyclopes; but whether he was the first who introduced this change into the story we cannot say.

Another step in the development of the myth was taken by the tragic poet Phrynicus. Among his tragedies Suidas (s. v. Φρύνιχος) mentions an Ἀλκηστίς, and one line of this play (fr. 2 Ναυκ) has been preserved to us by Hesychius (s. v. ἄθαμβέσ): σῶμα δ' ἄθαμβέσ γνωδόνητον (so Hermann; γνωδόνηστον MS.) | τείρει. If, as seems highly probable, this refers to the struggle between Heracles and Thanatos,* it is clear that Phrynicus, or the source from which he drew, introduced Heracles into the story and ascribed the restoration of Alcestis to his intervention. Robert (Thanatos p. 30) holds that this form of the myth is the older one, on the ground that "die Lösung eines Konflikts durch physische Kraft ist in aller Sagenentwicklung älter und ursprünglicher als die Versöhnung durch das Eingreifen ethischer Motive." But, though this is undoubtedly true as a general principle, it is hardly a safe criterion in individual cases.
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We learn further from Servius (on Aen. IV. 694) that Phrynichus brought Thanatos ("Orcus"); some hold that Hades is meant) upon the stage, bearing a sword with which to cut off a lock of hair from the head of Alcestis; a feature which was borrowed by Euripides. Aeschylus (Eum. 713 ff.) says (the Erinyes are addressing Apollo)

toiauv ἐδρασας καὶ Φήρητος ἐν δόμοις: | Μοῖρας ἐπεισάς ἅφθιτος θειὰς βροτοῦ. . . . σὺ τοι παλαιὰς διανομάς καταφθίσας | οὐν παρηπάτησας ἀρχαίς θεάς: cf. Eum. 171 f. παρὰ νόμον θεῶν βρότεα μὲν τίων, ἔποιη γενέες ὅτι Μοῖρας φθίσας. As the schol. on Alc. 12 points out, this obviously refers to the same incident as Alc. 11 ff. παιδὸς Φήρητος, ὦ θανεῖν ἐρρυσάμην, | Μοῖρας δολώσας κ.τ.λ. That form of the legend according to which Apollo made the Moerae intoxicated and then obtained from them permission for Admetus to offer a substitute is therefore older than the Euripidean Alcestis, and probably goes back to the play of Phrynichus, if not farther (cf. Apollod. Bibl. I. 9, 15, 2).

In the Aristophanic hypothesis to the Alcestis is the statement: παρ’ οὐδετέρῳ (i.e. neither Aeschylus nor Sophocles) κείται ἡ μυθοποιία. This is not quite correct: for, though Aeschylus seems not to have written on this subject, Plutarch (De defect. orac. c. 15 p. 417 F) has preserved a line of Sophocles in which Admetus says, ὦμὸς δ’ ἀλέκτωρ αὐτὸν ἢγια πρὸς μύλην. As G. Hermann long ago pointed out, this looks like a passage from a satyric drama, and Aristophanes may have neglected to mention the play because it was of that character. What form of the legend Sophocles adopted we have no means of knowing.

Pherecydes (doubtless the Lerian, who flourished about B.C. 450) seems to have related the myth, or a part of it, in his Ιστορία. He asserted that not the Cyclopes themselves, but their sons, were slain by Apollo (schol. on Alc. 1 = Mueller F. H. G. fr. 76), doubtless because the Cyclopes were commonly believed to be immortal. What other innovations he may have tried to introduce into the legend we do not know, but he seems to have followed Hesiod pretty closely (cf. the schol. on Pindar Pyth. III. 59 = F. H. G. fr. 8; Wilamowitz l. s. c. p. 62).

The story of Admetus seems to have been very popular about this time: the famous skolion
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"Αδμήτων λόγον ὑ ταύρε μαθὼν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει,
τῶν δειλῶν ὑ' ἀπέχον, γνῶς ὅτι δειλός ὄλγη χάρις

was probably written by Praxilla of Sicyon, a contemporary of Pherecydes, though some attributed it to Alcaeus, others to Sappho (schol. on Aristoph. Vesp. 1240; Pausanias in Eustath. on II. II. 711, p. 326, 36). This song is mentioned by Cratinus (fr. 236 Kock) and twice by Aristophanes (Vesp. 1239, fr. 430 K.), and was so much in vogue that "Αδμήτων μέλος passed into a proverb (Hesych. and Suidas s. v.; see also Hesych. s. v. "Αδμήτων λόγον, Athenaeus XV. p. 695 C). Even in antiquity its precise application seems to have been disputed (see Eustath. l. s. c. and the schol. on the Vespae 1239). Aristophanes puts it into the mouth of the flatterer and parasite Theorus, and it probably reflects on the courage of Admetus; though some (schol. on the Vespae l. s. c.) took it as referring merely to the refuge which the Thessalian king, when driven into exile, was said to have taken with Theseus.

This brings us to the time of Euripides. He seems to have followed the Hesiodic form of the myth, with those modifications which were shown in the Phrynichean play. It is not clear that he introduced any important change, except, possibly, that he makes Admetus king of all Thessaly (Alc. 590 ff.). Euripides seems, also, to have laid greater stress upon the hospitality of Admetus, as shown to Heracles in the midst of the mourning for Alcestis, than did the earlier poets; though whether he invented that part of the story which represents Heracles as entertained at that time in the house of the Thessalian monarch, we cannot say. Probably, however, he borrowed this, too, from Phrynicheus.

Two poets of the Old (or early Middle) Comedy, Aristomenes and Theopompus, each wrote an "Αλκηστις (see the fourth hypoth. to Aristoph. Plutus, and Athenaeus XV. 690 Α), but of the contents of these plays we know little or nothing.

Better known is the "Ἀλκηστις of the comic poet Antiphanes, from which two (perhaps three) fragments have been preserved. The first of these (Athenaeus III. 122 D=fr. 29 K.),
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επὶ τὸ καινονργεῖν φέρον
οὕτως, ἐκείνως, τοῦτο γεγυλωσκων ὅτι
ἐν καινὸν ἐγχείρημα, κἂν τολμηρὸν ἦ,
pολλὰν παλαιῶν ἐστὶ χρησιμώτερον,

looks like a piece of advice given by Admetus to Heracles (or by some one to Admetus) as to the way to recover Alcestis.

Athenaeus says (XII. 553 C = fr. 30 K.): Ἀντιφάγης ἐν Ἀλκηστίδι ἐλαίῳ τινὰ ποιεῖ χριῶμενον τοὺς πόδας. Apparently Heracles had his feet anointed with oil to relieve them after the long journey down to Hades.* A third fragment (Ath. II. 47 B = fr. 276 Kock) may belong to the same play: ἐν νόσημα τούτ’ ἐχει. | ἀεὶ γὰρ ὑδότεινος ἐστὶ. B. Θεταλῶν λέγεις | κομβὴ τὸν ἀνδρα.

In accordance with the erotic taste of the time, the poet Rhianus (second half of the third century B.C.) ascribed (in his Θεσαλικά?) the servitude of Apollo to his love for Admetus, whose servant he voluntarily became (schol. on Alc. 1). This form of the story was, as might be expected, popular with later writers. The Delphian periegete Anaxandrides, on the other hand, retained the older, Delphian version which represented Apollo as undergoing the θητεία to atone for his slaying the Python (schol. on Alc. l. s. c.).

The Atthidographer Phanodemus (schol. on the Vespa l. s. c. = F. H. G. fr. 9) related that Admetus, being driven out of Pherae, came with his wife Alcestis and his youngest son Hippasus to Theseus at Athens, and settled there. This addition to the legend may have been suggested by Alc. 954 f., which clearly implies that some of Admetus’ subjects were disaffected toward him. (For other minor features and variations of the legend, see Wentzel’s admirable article “Admetos” in Pauly’s Real-Encyclopaedie 2.)

Fulgentius (Expos. Serm. Ant. s. r. friguttire) gives what purports to be a quotation from an Alcestis of the Roman poet Ennius; but as no such play of Ennius is mentioned elsewhere, and Fulgentius is known to have forged many quotations, his statement is now generally disbelieved.

* That a form of the legend existed in which Heracles brought Alcestis up from Hades is shown by the works of art. See p. lii ff.
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The tragic poet L. Accius, however, wrote an *Alcestis*, of which one line—*cum striderat retracta rursus inferis*—has been preserved to us by Priscian (IX. p. 867 P., X. p. 893 P.). What version of the myth he followed is quite unknown (see Ribbeck, *Römische Tragödie* p. 551; *Frug. Seuen. Rom. Po.* I. p. 143).

We have also a fragment (*Gellius* XIX. 7, 3; *Nonius s. v. obesum*; *Bachreus Po. Lat. Min.* VI. p. 288) from an *Alcestis* of the poet Laevius, which, however, was probably not a play,* but a part of his *Erotopaegnia* (see Weichert, *De Laevio poeta* pp. 55 ff. in his *Poet. Lat. Relig.*). The fragment runs (the text is somewhat uncertain): *corpore pectoreque undique obeso ae | mente exsensa tardige-nucho | senio obpressum.* It may be a description of Pheres.

It would appear from Lucian *De Saltu* 52 (cf. Juvenal *Sat.* VI. 652) that under the empire the myth of Alcestis was often made the subject of mimetic performances.

It is clear, both from this brief sketch and from the number and character of the allusions to the legend in classical writers, that it never occupied a commanding position in Greek mythology or literature, such a position, for instance, as was held by the story of the Atridae or of the house of Laius. The reason for this is twofold: the scene of the legend is in northern Greece, removed from the great centres of life and civilization, and the family involved is not one which played a very conspicuous part in the mythical history of the heroic age; and secondly, the conception of conjugal love and fidelity which the story reveals is so elevated that it could scarcely be appreciated by the great mass of the Greeks of classical times. But later, when the romantic element in the relation between the sexes began to appear more prominently, the myth came at once into vogue. The influence of Christianity was favorable rather than unfavorable to its popularity; it was often referred to by the fathers of the church, to whom the servitude of Apollo and the self-sacrifice of Alcestis offered convenient illustrations; and, in one way or another, it has exercised no slight influence upon modern literature.†

*Menozzi (Rivista di filol. class. 185 pp. 191 ff.) holds that it was a tragedy.
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B. The Euripidean Play.

The *Alcestis* is the earliest of the plays which are known* to have been written by Euripides that has come down to us. Its date was long uncertain, for that part of the Aristophanic hypothesis which contained information as to this point had been lost. It was known, however, from internal evidence, such as the severity of the metrical treatment, the friendly mention of Sparta (l. 448 f.), and the fact that vv. 367–8 are parodied in the *Acharnians* (which appeared b.c. 425), that the play was an early one. In 1834 W. Dindorf published in his edition of the *Alcestis* a new fragment of the hypothesis, which he had found in the Vatican MS. (B). This fragment contained (in addition to other matter previously known) the following words: τὸ δρᾶμα ἐποίηθη ἤ. ἔδιδαχθη ἐπὶ Γλαυκίνου ἄρχοντος τὸ Ἀ. πρῶτος (πρῶτον MS.) ὥν Σοφοκλῆς, δεύτερος (δεύτερον MS.) Εὐριπίδης Κρήσσας Ἀλκμέων (ἅλκμαίον MS.) τῷ διὰ Ψωφίδος (διαψωφίλῳ MS.) Τηλέφω Ἀλκήστιδι. τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα κομικωτέραν ἔχει τῆν καταστροφὴν. As we know from other sources (see Diodor. XII. 30, who gives the name as Glauicides; schol. on Aristoph. *Achar.* 67; Clinton, *Fasti Hellen.* II. p. 62–3), Glaucinus or Glaucines was archon in the second year of the 85th Olympiad; hence Dindorf substituted for the meaningless τὸ Ἀ of the MS. (which is certainly corrupt) ὀλυμπιάδος πέ ἐτεί δευτέρῳ (or β'). The fragment gives us the following facts: the play was the seventeenth in order of composition. As Earle has pointed out (p. 4 f. of his edition),† this probably means that it belonged to the seventeenth group of plays brought out by the poet. We know from the *Vita* that Euripides presented his first drama in 455; hence either ἤ is a mistake for ἦ, or (more probably) the poet let one year pass without exhibiting. The *Alcestis* was presented in the year of Glaucinus, i.e. 439–8, and hence must have been performed (if, as is probable, it appeared at the Greater Dionysia) in the

* The *Rhesus* is, of course, disputed.
† Cf., however, Teuffel in the *Rheinisches Museum* 1866, p. 471.
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spring of 438. It was the fourth member of a tetralogy (the other plays being the *Cretan Women*, the *Alcmeon in Psophis* and the *Telephus*), thus occupying the place usually held by a satyric drama. Euripides gained only the second prize, Sophocles being first.

The *Alcestis*, then, is the work of no prentice hand. It appeared when Euripides was in at least the forty-second year of his life (probably several years older; the statement of the Parian Marble that he was born in Ol. 72, 1 is much more likely to be right than the other version, which makes his birth occur in the year, and even on the day, of the battle of Salamis) and the eighteenth of his career as a dramatist. It belonged to the same tetralogy as two of his most famous plays,—the *Alcmeon in Psophis* and the *Telephus*. Whatever imperfections the play may contain cannot, therefore, be ascribed to the poet's youth or inexperience. The period at which the drama was presented was that when the greatness of Athens was at its height, seven years before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War and while the Parthenon was still in process of building.

The *Alcestis*, like the first play of Euripides (the *Peliades*) and the *Medea*, has to do with the fortunes of the royal family of Iolcus. As Wilamowitz has pointed out, during the earlier part of his dramatic career Euripides tried to please the Athenians by treating new subjects with which they were not already familiar. It may be suspected, also, that there was some strong tie which bound Euripides himself to northern Greece. We know that later in life he went to Macedonia to the court of Archeclus; and doubtless some other attraction beside the liberality and literary taste of the king drew him thither. It is possible that he had kinsfolk in Thessaly or Macedonia.

The question arises, in what relation did the *Alcestis* stand to the other three dramas of the tetralogy? Were the four plays connected in plot or by some other internal bond, or was the connection between them merely external? That they were not linked together in plot seems clear; their subjects are too different and the myths of which they treat cover too wide a range for this to be possible. It has been suggested, however, by Bernhardy (art.
“Euripides” in Ersch and Gruber’s Encycl.) and G. A. Schoell (Tetral. d. Att. Theatres pp. 52–9) that the poet’s object in selecting the subjects of these plays was to show different types of woman, the lascivious adulteress Aerope being opposed to the trustful and faithful Alphesiboea (or Arsinoe), and the masculine Clytaemestra to the womanly Alcestis. Schoell notes, also, that in all four dramas the sanctity of the household hearth and the duties of hospitality are important elements. But, ingenious as this theory is, at best the verdict must be “not proven.” We do not know enough of the three lost tragedies to enable us to establish such a connection.

The contents of the Euripidean play are, in brief, as follows: vv. 1–76. Prologue. Apollo makes the introductory speech, informing the spectators of the situation. The day appointed for the death of Alcestis has arrived, and hence he must leave the palace of Admetus to avoid pollution (1–27). Thanatos enters: seeing Apollo before the door, he reproaches him in a short ana-paestic system. A dialogue between the two follows: Apollo entreats Thanatos to spare the queen’s life, but in vain, and leaves in anger. Thanatos enters the palace (28–76). 77–135. Parodos. The chorus enters, full of anxiety to find out whether Alcestis is still alive or not. Their opinions differ; but they know that her end is near; no one can save her now that Asclepius is dead. 136–434. First Episode. An attendant comes out of the palace and is questioned by the coryphaeus. She relates the preparations made by Alcestis against her death, her prayers in behalf of her children, and her farewell to her marriage-bed and her domestics. The servant tells also of the grief of Admetus, and the dying queen’s desire to see once more the light of the sun (141–212). A lyric dialogue between the two semi-choruses follows. They doubt whether there is still hope, but pray Zeus and Apollo for aid; express their sympathy for Admetus, and praise Alcestis as she is brought out of the palace (213–243). Alcestis says farewell to the sun and to her home. She believes that she sees Charon, who is impatient for her departure, and that a spectre from the under-world is trying to drag her away. Admetus entreats her to stay with him (244–279). Alcestis
then makes a long and affecting speech, setting forth his obligations to her and begging him to love and care for her children and not to marry again. In a long speech he promises to comply with her wishes, and she solemnly commits the children to his care. She then says farewell and expires (280–392). The child Eumelus sings a monody lamenting his mother’s death (393–415). The chorus comforts Admetus, who gives orders as to the mourning for his wife (416–434). 435–475. First Stasimon. The chorus lauds Alcestis for her devotion and prophesies that her name will live in song, expresses the wish that it could bring her back to life, and contrasts her conduct with that of the king’s parents. 476–567. Second Episode. Heracles, on his way to Thrace to bring the horses of Diomedes, comes to Pherae. He explains the object of his journey and receives information from the coryphaeus as to the dangerous nature of the undertaking (476–506). Admetus, clad in the garb of mourning, comes out of the palace. Heracles questions him as to the reason for his attire, but he evades the question, presses the visitor to remain and gives orders for his entertainment. The chorus remonstrate, but Admetus persists (507–567). 568–605. Second Stasimon. The chorus recall the time when Apollo served the king, and the manner in which the god charmed the wild beasts with his music. They then extol the wealth and power of the king, and express their confidence that his hospitality will be rewarded. 606–961. Third Episode. Pheres enters and tries to condole with Admetus, but is indignantly rejected. An angry dialogue between father and son follows, and Pheres departs in wrath. Admetus renounces him. The king and chorus pass out to the burial (606–746). A servant comes out of the palace and complains of the greediness of Heracles and his lack of regard for the proprieties of the occasion. Heracles follows him and gives him a serio-comic lecture on the duties of a servant to his master’s guests and the true philosophy of life; but soon discovers the truth and goes off to the tomb to rescue Alcestis (747–860). Admetus and the chorus return (ἐπιπάροδος), and Admetus laments his loss while the chorus sympathize with him and try to comfort him (861–934). Admetus then paints the wretched-
ness of his situation in a short speech in trimeters (935–961), 962–1005. Third Stasimon. The chorus sing the power of Necessity, and predicts the honours which await Alcestis as heroine. 1006–end. Exodus. Heracles enters, leading a veiled woman, whom, he says, he has won as a prize in certain games in which he has contested. He asks Admetus to take charge of her until his return from Thrace. The king at first refuses; but at last yields, though very reluctantly and after a long dialogue. Heracles then unveils her, and Admetus recognizes his wife. He inquires how she was rescued, and Heracles tells him. Admetus thanks his benefactor, and presses him to remain; but Heracles is in haste and cannot stay. The king then orders a general thanksgiving. The chorus march out to the closing anapaest.

Such, in brief, is the action of the play. This brings us to that most perplexed and difficult question: is the Alcestis a tragedy, and if not, what is it? On this subject volumes (I had almost said libraries) have been written, and the question is still far from being settled. It seems to have been disputed even in ancient times. We read in the last paragraph of the hypothesis: τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα ἔστι σατυρικότερον ὅτι εἰς χαρὰν καὶ ἡδονὴν καταστρέφει ἐκβάλλεται ὡς ἀνοίκεια τῆς τραγικῆς ποιήσεως ὁ τε Ὄρεστης καὶ Ἡ Ἀλκηστὶς, ὡς ἐκ συμφορᾶς μὲν ἀρχόμενα, εἰς εἰδαμονίαν ἐκὶ καὶ χαρὰν λήξαντα, ἀν ἐστὶ μᾶλλον κομψὸν ἐχώμενα· and on the other hand in the treatise περὶ κομψών published by Duebner (see his ed. of the scholia to Aristophanes p. xix.) from the Codex Parisinus 2677 we read: σατυρικῆς δὲ οὖ τὸ ἀπὸ πένθους εἰς χαρὰς ἀπαντᾶν, ὡς ὁ Εὐριπίδου Ὄρεστης καὶ Ἡ Ἀλκηστὶς καὶ Ἡ Σοφοκλέους Ἡλέκτρα, ἐκ μέρους, ὢσπερ τινὲς φαινόν, ὅλλ' ἀμυγή καὶ χαρίεντα καὶ θυμελεκόν ἔχει γέλωτα κ.τ.λ. Aristophanes of Byzantium seems to have contented himself with the cautious remark: τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα κομικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν καταστροφήν (the last clause of the Vatican fragment), which was amplified by later grammarians (see Trendelenburg, Gramm. Graec. d. art. trag. jud. reliq. p. 36 f.). He makes a similar observation in the hypothesis to the Orestes.

The modern literature of the subject is, as I have said, very large. The best survey of it is to be found in the very sane and
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The theories which have been advanced respecting the nature of the *Alcestis* may be divided into seven classes:—

I. Many authorities regard the play as a *tragedy* in the strict sense. So Sponheim, Buhl, Wieland, Firnhaber, Preller, G. Hermann, Goethe, Kolankowski, Wilken, Sittl, Cucuel, etc. (For references see list at the end of this section.) Steinberger regards the drama as a "distorted tragedy" (verzerrtes Trauerspiel), the poet having at first intended to write a comic play, but having found the subject unsuitable for that purpose.

II. Few writers, if any, have openly expressed the view that the *Alcestis* is a *comedy*. The Frenchman Brumoy, however, seems to have held nearly this opinion, and (as Bissinger points out) Köchly's view (see below) involves nearly this conception of the play. Schöne believes that the *Alcestis* is a parody on the play of Phrynichus.

III. Others have held that the *Alcestis* is a satyr-drama. So Hedelin, d'Aubignac, Danina, Lessing, Glum, Hartung, Klein.

IV. Others, still, have seen in the play a tragi-comedy (or *hilarotragoedia*) with an intentional admixture of tragic and comic elements. So O. Mueller, Buchholz, Duentzer.

V. Others believe the *Alcestis* to be neither a tragedy nor a comedy nor a mere combination of the two, but rather what the Germans call a "Schauspiel," a "play" in the modern sense, with varying moods and situations, not falling wholly within the limits either of comedy or tragedy. So Eichstädt, Wagner, Ranckenstein, Ritter.

VI. Others still, while holding that Euripides was endeavoring, by producing the *Alcestis*, to strike out a new path in the drama, do not attempt to classify the play under any one of these heads. So Köchly, whose view is so peculiar that I quote him more at length: "An die Stelle der Satyrn und Silene setzte er aus dem eigenen Kreise des gewöhnlichen Alltagslebens die fadesten Personen, mit denen er einen tragischen Charakter umgab, in Berührung
und Wechselwirkung brachte. Das Wesentliche dieser neuen Gattung nun wurde der Conflict eines tragischen Charakters mit der Philisterwelt der Gegenwart, der Gegensatz einer idealen Weltanschauung zu der kahlen, nüchternen Prosa des wirklichen Lebens." The humor of the piece lies in the fact that in this conflict the idealist is saved by the materialist, the tragic heroine by the "Philistine." Bernhardy expresses a similar view, and so Jöhring.

VII. Lastly, Mr. Verrall holds that the play is what the Germans would call a "Tendenz-Schrift," a covert attack on the popular religion, bearing one meaning to the multitude and another to the "advanced thinkers" of the day.

The theory that the Alcestis is a comedy does not, I think, require any extended refutation. Neither the subject of the play, nor its arrangement, nor the position which it occupied in a tetralogy is consistent with the Greek conception of a comedy. Whatever we may pronounce the play to be, the tragic element in it clearly preponderates over the comic.

Nor is it easy to believe that the Alcestis was a satyric drama. True, it occupied the place of one; but the characteristic features of the satyric drama, the chorus of satyrs, the rude jests and unrestrained merriment, are conspicuously absent. The Alcestis differs less widely from the Agamemnon than from the Cyclops.

It is clear, however, that the drama is not an ordinary tragedy. The fact that it held the place usually occupied by a satyr-play is proof positive of this; and the comic tinge of certain portions of it, though slight, is unmistakable. In what, then, does the difference consist? Not in the fortunate ending; for this criterion, if strictly applied, would exclude many plays the tragic nature of which has never been questioned. True, Aristotle preferred that in a tragedy the change of fortune should be from prosperity to adversity (Poet. 1453 b 12); but he also knew and recognized as tragedies plays in which the change was in the opposite direction (1453 a 25, 1455 b 29). Nor yet does it lie in the nature of the characters who appear in the play. True, the Alcestis is a drama of domestic life, and the personages who take part in it are very much like ordinary men and women; but who could be more ordinary (I had
almost said vulgar) than the characters who rail and wrangle through so many lines of the *Andromache* or the *Orestes*? Nor does the difference consist wholly in the more subdued nature of the action. It is true that the characters move in a calmer atmosphere than in many of the Euripidean plays; but surely the spectacle of a young and lovely woman snatched away in her prime by a merciless and irresistible power is sufficient to excite both terror and pity.

It has seemed, and still seems, to the present writer that, after all, the main difference between the *Alcestis* and an ordinary tragedy is in the comic element which appears in the play; and even this difference is one of degree rather than of kind. It has often been noted that occasional comic touches are found even in Aeschylean and Sophoclean tragedies, (e.g. the nurse’s speech in *Choeph*. 715 ff., esp. l. 735 f.); and they are much more frequent in Euripides. What is more natural, then, than for the poet, having to provide a substitute for a satyric drama, to offer a tragedy in which these occasional comic features have been slightly intensified? I say slightly; for the comic element in the *Alcestis* is in reality much less prominent than some have claimed.

Wherein does this comic element appear? Some have thought that it may be traced in the scene between Apollo and Thanatos (vv. 28–76). That there may be a slight touch of humor here I will not deny; but, taken as a whole, the scene is merely an angry dialogue of the kind so common in Greek tragedies. Almost the same may be said of the scene between Pheres and Admetus, which is simply an ἄγων of the kind so dear to Athenian audiences. Neither contains anything which is inconsistent with the idea of a tragedy; and the Apollo-Thanatos scene cannot weigh very heavily in any case, as it lies under grave suspicion (see below). Nor is the comic element prominent in the closing scene (1006 ff.). Some have thought that the long hesitation and timid consent of Admetus to receive the woman were intended to amuse the audience. They have, I think, missed to a large extent the real purport of this scene. Why does Heracles tantalize Admetus with a feigned tale and press him to receive a (supposed) stranger woman into his
house, instead of restoring Alcestis to him at once? Partly, no doubt, to test his faithfulness to his wife's memory; partly, too, because Euripides wished by the suspense to heighten the interest of the spectators; but there is a stronger reason. The poet's attitude toward the conduct of Admetus (and this it is the great merit of Mr. Verrall to have pointed out) is by no means one of unmixed praise. The first words which Heracles speaks on his return are words of censure (1008 f.). Admetus has deceived him, though with kindly intent; has evaded his questions and dealt in language of double meaning. The king is now requited in full measure for this deception. Every evasion, every double-entendre is repaid to him with interest. Not until he has atoned for his deceit is Alcestis restored to him. In this scene, then, there is nothing inconsistent with the conception of a tragedy. There remains the scene between Heracles and the servant. This is undeniably tinged with comic humor. The poet lets us see for an instant the gluttonous, riotous Heracles of the popular conception; though even here, when we consider in what light the hero was represented in the comedy of the day, we see that Euripides has confined himself within relatively narrow bounds. In this scene, then, the difference between the Alcestis and an ordinary tragedy mainly lies.

Did this comic element belong to the original plan of the play? At the close of "Balaustion's Adventure" Robert Browning has sketched a plot which in his judgment (and surely he was no mean judge) would have been preferable to that of the Euripidean Alcestis. Curiously enough this plot follows very nearly the story as (according to Wilamowitz) it was told in the Hesiodic Eoeae. Why should Euripides, when he had this form of the myth ready to his hand, have preferred the Phrynichean version?

The late Prof. F. D. Allen long entertained doubts as to the authenticity of the Apollo-Thanatos scene in the prologue. He kindly permitted me to use the following brief abstract of his arguments:—

"1. If Thanatos goes into the house (at 76), how and when does he leave it? He is next heard of at the tomb (845, 1140 ff.). Does he depart by a postern gate, or does he become all at once invisible to the spectators?"
2. After the announcement of Thanatos at 74 ff. (cf. 47, 48), it is strange that Alcestis dies quietly on the stage, in the absence of Thanatos, then is carried into the house, and presently carried out again and actually buried. (In 253 ff. she does indeed see 'Aidēs and Charon, but this is, of course, only in her mind’s eye.)

3. Alcestis is in the death-throe (20) before the arrival of Thanatos.

4. Altogether there is confusion between two notions. (a) In the Thanatos scene the notion is that Thanatos comes to despatch Alcestis in person, goes into the house for the purpose, and is to carry her off bodily to Hades (47, 49, 73, etc.). (β) In the rest of the play, the notion is that Alcestis dies quietly in the ordinary way, is buried, and that then Thanatos comes to the tomb to fetch her, and is overcome by Heracles, who is awaiting him in ambush (1142).

5. If Apollo knows that Alcestis is to be released by Heracles (64–69), why his distress in the earlier part of the prologue, and his effort to dissuade Thanatos from his purpose?

6. A notion runs through the Thanatos scene (32, 34 [av], 43, 45) that Admetus’ death-day is already past, a separate death-day being set for Alcestis (the present day). But the conception of the play itself (12 ff., 523 f., especially 694–700) is that Alcestis dies on Admetus’ appointed day.”

These are certainly weighty reasons, and show, I think, conclusively that the Thanatos scene is an insertion. Whether it was put into the text long after the time of Euripides or not is hard to say. The cruces and ineptitudes which occur in it favor this view. Another possibility that has presented itself to me is: that Euripides may have originally intended to make of the Alcestis a pure tragedy of the ordinary type, perhaps taking as its groundwork that form of the myth found in the Eoeae. Then, finding that he had no satyric play on hand to complete a tetralogy, he may have taken the unfinished drama and worked it over, using the other form of the legend, which was better adapted to a comic treatment. If this view be correct, vv. 24–76, 476–605, 747–860, 1006–end will be later additions by the poet, which did not belong to the
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original plan of the play. Except in these portions there is no allusion whatever to Heracles. When we remember that Euripides is believed to have written over ninety plays and that he seems to have exhibited in at least seventeen of the first eighteen years of his dramatic career, we cannot wonder if he was forced to resort to such an expedient. The defects and incongruities which have so often been noted in the play could be easily explained on this hypothesis; and Professor Allen's arguments against the authenticity of the prologue would not lose their force, but simply point in a new direction. I make this merely as a suggestion; a demonstration of the theory from our present data would be difficult, perhaps impossible.

Be this as it may, I believe the Alcestis to be a tragedy, with only so much of the comic element as was absolutely necessary in a play which was to replace a satyric drama. The ancient writers, though they speak of it as σατυρικότερον or as having a κωμικωτέρων καταστροφήν, regularly call it a δράμα or a tragedy, not a comedy, a satyr-play or a hilario-tragoedia. By their judgment we must abide.

This subject must not be dismissed without a few words as to the theory lately propounded by Dr. Verrall. Ingenious and instructive as his essay is, the present writer, for one, must wholly dissent from his main position; and this for the following reasons.

(1) Euripides (especially during the earlier part of his career) was a poet first and foremost, and only secondarily a moral teacher. It is not probable that he would have sacrificed a fine play in order to covertly disseminate his opinions.

(2) No ancient writer, so far as I know, gives us even a hint of the secret meaning which Dr. Verrall has discovered in the Alcestis. Not even that most keen-eyed and merciless of critics, Aristophanes, betrays a suspicion of it. If Euripides really was concealing a rationalistic doctrine under the garb of a drama, he hid it "not wisely but too well," so that for more than two thousand years no one was able to penetrate the disguise.

(3) It appears to me that, from the Greek point of view, Dr. Verrall has unduly depreciated the characters both of Admetus and
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Heracles. That the former cuts a contemptible figure it would be vain to deny; but we must not forget that (in spite of some brilliant exceptions) the Greek sense of personal honor and personal responsibility was less keen than that of modern people. What person ever reads the story of the typical Greek hero, Odysseus, without partly despising the "man of many wiles"? Macaulay has pointed out that an Italian audience of Machiavelli's day would have felt more sympathy for Iago than for Othello. I will not say that an Athenian audience of the time of Euripides would have been in full sympathy with Admetus; but it would certainly have felt much less repugnance for him than modern readers of the play necessarily feel. There is force, also, in the hackneyed argument that in the eyes of the Greeks a king was of more importance than any woman, even though she were a queen. — Heracles, too, has suffered at Dr. Verrall's hands. The rescuer of Alcestis is no mere "athlete-adventurer"*: the true idea of him is as far from Dr. Verrall's materialized notion on the one hand as it is from Browning's idealized conception on the other. The complaints of the domestic (v. 747 f.), like the grumblings of discontented servants in every age of the world, should not be taken too literally. Heracles is slightly flushed with wine,† it is true; but the clearness and coherence of his speech show that he is not by any means intoxicated. The philosophy which it expresses is not a very lofty one; but such as it is, it is set forth consistently enough. The reason why Heracles pretends to bring a stranger woman and quarter her upon Admetus (a piece of seeming discourtesy of which Dr. Verrall makes a great deal) has been already stated. Deceit must be repaid with deceit; the punishment, though a kindly one, is none the less a punishment. In short, I believe that instead of lowering the popular conception of Admetus and Heracles, Euripides has distinctly raised it.

* Note the extreme brevity and modesty of his replies in ll. 1140 ff., without a particle of self-praise or braggadocio.

† "Non ebrius est, sed paulum incaluit vino," as Hermann rightly observes; but Dr. Verrall repeatedly (pp. 8, 26) says or implies that Heracles "*got very drunk."
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(4) The strongest point of Dr. Verrall's argument, and one to which he was the first to call attention, is "the haste and precipitancy, irregular and indecent in any case, and in this particular case nothing less than outrageous, with which the corpse of the noble heroine is conveyed to the grave" (p. 44). This is a real and serious difficulty. Dr. Verrall has, I think, somewhat overstated the amount of repugnance which a Greek would feel toward the hasty burial of a corpse.* Still, it must be admitted that such a proceeding was contrary both to Attic law and Attic custom. In our play something had, no doubt, to be conceded to dramatic convenience, in order to bring the action within a comparatively short space of time. But this is clearly not a sufficient reason for so marked a violation of Greek usage. As Dr. Verrall says (p. 45), "it would have been perfectly easy to present a story like that of Alcestis, a story of death and revival, without introducing any funeral at all,† and so that a day or a few hours should naturally cover events from first to last." Moreover, the poet has emphasized the haste of the burial in the most striking way. The chorus actually speak of the funeral before they know that Alcestis is dead (v. 96). "Scarce a minute (says Dr. Verrall, p. 48) has passed since her last 'Farewell!' was spoken, the wail of her frightened child has scarcely sunk into sobbing, and the friend who stands by has barely proffered his first word of condolence, when Admetus ... runs on, as it were in one sentence, to invite the immediate assistance of his visitors in conveying 'this corpse' to the cemetery."

But is there no reason for all this? The circumstances are most exceptional; the Moeræ have been cheated of their destined victim by a disgraceful trick, and there is every reason to believe that the payment of the debt will be enforced with the utmost rigour. The

* Cf. Eustathius on II. VIII. 410 (p. 688, 7): νεκραὶ μελλόμεναι μὲν ἡ ὀικεία ταφὴ ... μὴν μὲν ἄλλο δὲ τὸ μῆ παρὰ τὸ ὅρα αὐτὸν. The sooner the burial took place, the sooner the soul would pass through the "gates of Hades."

† But if, as I believe, the Alcestis was worked over by the author and the plot changed, the funeral certainly belonged to the original plan of the drama (according to which Alcestis probably died, was buried, went down to Hades and was sent back by Persephone, as in the Eoeae), and hence could not be cut out without destroying too much of the whole framework of the play.
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appointed day has come, and the substitute is ready; the offering must be promptly made, and the chthonian powers receive their ψέπας. If there is one moment's delay beyond the time which has been set, all will be lost. But the payment is not complete, and Admetus is not safe, until the funeral with its attendant offerings has taken place; hence Alcestis must be buried on the very day of her death. The preparations made by the queen before her decease (158 f.), the promptness with which the chorus appear at the palace on the appointed day, the arrangements which are made for the funeral immediately after Alcestis dies, all point in this direction; and surely the proclamation of Admetus to all the Thessalians (425 ff.) does not look as though the proceedings were "clandestine" (Dr. Verrall, p. 56)!

I append a partial list of the essays and articles dealing with the nature of the Alcestis. For the older literature, see the essays of Buchholz and Bissinger, mentioned below. I include only works that have appeared in this century. Much additional matter may be found in the different editions of the play, the histories of Greek literature (esp. Bernhardy,\(^3\) vol. III. pp. 458 ff.), and special works on Euripides (see esp. Hartung, Euripides restitutus I. pp. 229 ff.).

Glum, *De Euripidis Alcestide commentatio*. Berlin, 1836.
Rauchenstein, *Die Alcestis des Euripides als besondere Gattung des griechischen Dramas.* Aarau, 1847.
Bendixen, *De Alcestide Euripidis commentatio*. Altona, 1851.
Kolanowski, *De natura atque indole fabulac Eurip. quae Alcestis inscribitur*. Ostrowo, 1868.
Bissinger, *Ueber die Dichtungsgattung u. d. Grundgedanken d. Alcestis*. Erlangen. Th. I. 1869, Th. II. 1871. (This is by far the best treatise on this subject.)
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Wilken, De Alcestide Euripidea. Berlin, 1876.
Jöhring, Ist die Alkestis des Euripides eine Tragoedie? Feldkirch, 1894.
Verrall, Euripides the Rationalist. Cambridge, 1895. (The Alcestis is treated in pp. 1–128 of the book.)
The short article by Bremi (in the Allgemeine Schulzeitung, 1829 no. 48, pp. 393–7), and the dissertation of Bendixen and article of Koechly mentioned above I have been unable to consult at first hand.

C. The Critical Basis for the Text.

The Manuscripts, Scholia, Editions, etc.

As every scholar knows, the MSS. of Euripides are comparatively late and poor. Fortunately, however, the Alcestis was a favorite drama in post-classical times, and was included in the Byzantine edition of ten* selected plays (the Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae, Hippolytus, Medea, Alcestis, Andromache, Rhesus, Troudes and Bacchae; see Wilamowitz, Herakles pp. 195 ff.) as well as in the larger one of nineteen plays. Hence we have the advantage of two † recensions of the play, each of which acts as a check upon the other. I have followed Prinz in designating the MSS.; for his nomenclature, though not entirely satisfactory, is more widely

* On the question as to whether there were nine (so Kirchhoff) or ten see Wilamowitz, Analecta p. 51, Herakles I. p. 207 and note.
† I ought strictly to say three; for a c d probably represent a recension differing somewhat from B, though much less widely than from L P. But the exact relation of a to c d is not yet known.
used than any other. To introduce a new nomenclature would be almost a crime.

Unfortunately for us, the best of the Euripidean MSS., the Marcianus 471, does not contain the Alcestis. It formerly did include the play; but the part which contained it had been torn out of the codex even before the latter was brought to Italy (Wilamowitz, Herakles I. p. 206 note). The text of the Alcestis rests mainly upon four MSS. These are:—

(1) The codex Vaticanus 909 (B Prinz = B Kirchhoff = V Dindorf and Wilamowitz = A Schwartz = Rom. A Elmsley). This is a paper (bombycine) MS. of the twelfth (Kirchhoff) or thirteenth (Prinz) century, containing the Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae, Medea, Hippolytus, Alcestis, Andromache, Troades and Rhesus, with scholia and glosses. It has been corrected in many places by the first hand (marked B¹ by Prinz); and many corrections and variant readings were added by later hands (marked b by Prinz). Kirchhoff ranked this MS. next to the Marcianus. Later critics have, for the most part, held it in somewhat lower esteem (see esp. Wilamowitz, Herakles p. 206). The extreme carelessness with which it is written greatly diminishes its value, and it is sometimes hard to tell whether its readings are mere blunders of the copyist or really represent what stood in its source. Still, for the Alcestis I should be inclined to rank it higher than any other single MS., though when it stands alone it is inferior to L and P conjoined.

(2) The codex Parisinus 2713 (a Prinz = a Kirchhoff = (Par.) B Wilamowitz, Schwartz and the older edd.). This is a fine vellum MS. of the thirteenth century, written in an elegant hand and containing the Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae, Hippolytus, Medea, Alcestis and Andromache, with glosses and very copious scholia, mostly written by the first hand. Beside the first hand (a¹ Prinz), a second hand (a² Prinz) and several later ones (a³ Prinz) have corrected the MS. In the Alcestis this codex has suffered much from interpolation; but, on the whole, it is not to be despised, particularly when it confirms the testimony of B. When it stands alone, however, it is to be used with extreme caution, as the scribe (or the
maker of the recension which he followed) was a man of some learning and prone to arbitrary emendation. Good examples of his conjectures are 289 (where by leaving out δῶρ' and retaining the gloss or interpolation ἐγώ he has contrived to make a tolerable trimeter), 329 εἰμοὶ γυνὴ for ἐμὴ γυνὴ (to avoid the rhyme), 426 θέλω for λέγω, 434 λάνι, 531 γυνακός δ' (δ' inserted to remove asyndeton), 794 οἶμαι μὲν given to the servant), 811 θυραῖος for οἰκέως (the most successful of his emendations, though I do not believe that Euripides wrote θυραῖος), 837 ψυχή τ' (from Orestes 466) for καὶ χείρ, 1038 ἀδήλιος for ἀδήλιον (not a bad emendation), 1048 συμφοράς for συμφορᾶ, 1085 σ' νῦν (an impossible elision to avoid the extra syllable), 1111 σῶς for τῆν. On the other hand, in minuta, this codex is often in the right against the other MSS., as the greater care or scholarship of the scribe has preserved him from many errors. In particular, L a together are very often right in small points (such as accent, the use of ν movable, etc.). In general, however, α agrees so closely with B in our play that editors are fully justified in speaking of them as belonging to one "family." α shows occasional signs of contamination with a MS. of the other class, e.g. 259 ἄγει μ' ἄγει τῖς ἄγει μέ τις, 1045 μῆ με μυκήνης. It has preserved one excellent reading, 1140 κυρίφ, which, however, was also known to the scholiast.

(Codices Florent. 31, 10 [ε Prinz, ε Kirchhoff] and 31, 15 [d Prinz, d Kirchhoff] agree very closely with a. They deserve, however, a new examination, especially d, which (as Professor von Wilamowitz, who has kindly communicated to me a number of readings from it, assures me) is not without importance for the Alcestis. I much regret that I have been unable to collate it.)

(3) The codex Laurentianus (or Florentinus) 32, 2 (L Prinz = B Kirchhoff = C Dindorf, Wilamowitz = Fl., Flor. (2) or Laurentianus older edd.). This is a paper (chartaceus) MS. of the fourteenth century, written by several hands. It contains (beside six plays of Sophocles, three of Aeschylus and the Works and Days of Hesiod) eighteen of the Euripidean plays, the Troades and part of the Bacchae being wanting. The text has been corrected by the first hand, or rather hands (L' Prinz), and then many corrections
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and alterations have been made by a later hand (ℓ Prinz). For a more minute description, see Wilamowicz, Analecta Euripidea pp. 4 ff.

(4) By the side of L stands the codex Palatinus 287 (P Prinz = C Kirchhoff = P Dindorf, Wilamowitz = P, Pal., Palat. or Rom. C older edd.). This codex (now in the Vatican) is a vellum MS. of the fourteenth century. It contains the Antigone, Oedipus Col., Trachiniae and Philoctetes of Sophocles, the Andromache, Medea, Supplices, Rhesus, Ion, Iph. Taur., Iph. Aul., the spurious prologue to the Danae, the Hippolytus, Alcestis, Troades, Bacchae, Cyclops, Heraclidae as far as 1. 1002, and the Prometheus, Septem and Persae of Aeschylus. The rest of the Heraclidae, the Helena, Heracles, Electra, Heeuba, Orestes, Phoenissae, and the Ajax, Electra and Oedipus Rex of Sophocles (with the hypothesis and list of characters of the Antigone) once formed part of this codex, but were torn off not long after the year 1400, and are now preserved as a separate MS., the Laurentianus 172 (G Prinz = Γ Wilamowitz). That P and Γ belong together was first pointed out by Robert (Hermes XIII. pp. 133 ff.). P has been corrected by the first hand (P¹ Prinz) and by a later hand or hands (p Prinz).

The exact relation in which P stands to L and their comparative value have been, and still are, matters of high dispute. In his Analecta Euripidea (pp. 3 ff.) Wilamowicz expressed the belief that both MSS. were copied from a lost codex which was written in minuscule letters not earlier than the twelfth century. This lost MS. he designated by Φ. From this L was copied near the beginning of the fourteenth century, and P toward the end of the same century. Prinz held substantially the same view, and indicated the lost archetype of L and P by the letter S. Wilamowitz, however, has now changed his opinion, and holds (Herakles¹ I. pp. 208 ff.) that in P the nine dramas which are without scholia were copied from the same MS. as was L (though much more carelessly); while in the other plays the scribe of P has constituted a text of his own, partly from the MS. which he had used for the nine dramas, partly from an unimportant manuscript akin to Bα. He adds: "das mischungsverhältnis ist verschieden; in den drei ersten stücken
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und Andromache folgt er mehr dem vulgären, in Rhesos und Alkestis stimmt er mehr zu C (i.e. L): es leuchtet ein, dass P fur diese dramen ganz wertlos ist; es sei denn, er hilft einmal eine überschmierte lesart von C erkennen.” Prof. Vitelli, on the other hand (see the pref. to van Herwerden’s Helena p. vii.), has long maintained that Laurent. 172 (and consequently P) is a copy of a copy of L. Though I hesitate to express an opinion contrary to such high authority, as regards the Alcestis at least I cannot agree either with Vitelli or with the later view of Wilamowitz. Much more probable to me seems the view of Bruhn, that in the Alcestis L and P go back to a common source, but the scribe of L, being a man of considerable learning, has allowed himself changes and interpolations, while the more ignorant but more faithful copyist of P adhered more closely to his original (Lucubrationes Euri- pideae p. 255 f.).

I do not, however, believe that L and P were derived directly from the same MS. The number of different readings which they contain (about 160 in the Alcestis alone, if I may trust a very carefully made list of mine) is much too great for this to be possible. Many of these differences, to be sure, are slight (matters of accent, etc.), but still the sum total is considerable. Space will not allow me to give a complete list, but the following are the variants for the first 300 lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v.</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>κὶ χῆ</td>
<td>κὶ χῆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>σύμμετρως</td>
<td>σύμμετρως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ἥμαρ</td>
<td>ἥμαρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 ff.</td>
<td>θαν. pref.</td>
<td>θαν. pref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>is in L</td>
<td>is in L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>διακωλύσαι</td>
<td>διακωλύσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>αἰεὶ</td>
<td>αἰεὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>κατώ</td>
<td>κατὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>μέτα</td>
<td>μέτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>νερτέρων</td>
<td>νερτέρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>τίθης</td>
<td>τίθεις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>ἦ</td>
<td>ἦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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58 λέληθας L,  58 ἐληλυθας P.
59 ὁνοιτ L,  59 ὁνοιτ' P.
73 ᾧ δ' L,  73 ἦδ' P.
74 κατάρξωμαι L,  74 κατάρξωμαι P.
80 ἐπτοι L,  80 ἐπέτοι P.
82 λεύσει L,  82 λεύσει P.
88 γόνιν L,  88 γόνιν P.
91 ἡμιχ. pref. L,  91 ἡμιχ. omitted in P.
94 νέκυν ἢδη L,  94 ἢδη νέκυν P.
103 νεολαία L,  103 νεολαία P.
105 ἡμαρ L,  105 ἡμαρ P.
106 χορ. pref. L,  106 ἡμιχ. P.
107 χρή L,  107 χρή P.
108 ἡμιχ. not in L,  108 ἡμιχ. before the 2d ἐθικες P.
118 ἀπότ** μοσ L,  118 ἀποτμος P.
120 ἔχω πι L,  120 ἔχω ἐπι P.
129 πλάκτρων L,  129 πλάκτρων P.
136 ὀπαδός L,  136 ὀπαδόν P.
140 βουλομέθ' αν L,  140 βουλομέθα P.
141 βλέποι L,  141 βλέπ* P.
145 πάθοι L,  145 πάθη P.
148 οὐκοῦν L,  148 οὐκ οὖν P.
151 παράγραφοι pref. in L,  151 θερ. in P.
152 " " " "  152 " " " "
157 θανάσεις L,  157 θανάσει P.
173 ἀκλαντος L,  173 ἀκλαντος P.
181 ὀφθαλμοτέκτω L,  181 ὀφθαλμοτέκτω P.
188 αὐτὴν L,  188 αὐτὴν P.
190 δ' ἔχει L,  190 τ' ἔχει P.
198 αὔπετ' οὗ L,  198 αὔποτε P (sic).
198 λήσται L,  198 λελήσται P.
211 πα** στάναι L,  211 παριστάναι P.
213-17 to χορ.  213-17 to χορ. P.
218-25 to θερ.  218-25 to θερ. P.
226-43 to χορ.  226-43 to χορ. P.
213 ἀν πως ** L,  213 ἀν πως πατ* P.
From this partial list (and still more from the complete one which I have before me) we may draw, I think, the following inferences:

(1) The two MSS. were not copied directly from the same archetype. The differences are too numerous, and in the aggregate too considerable.

(2) On the other hand, these differences are just what we should expect in two MSS. descended from a common and not very remote ancestor. Most of them are slight, and very few are what we may call characteristic variants.

(3) L is, on the whole, distinctly superior to P. This superiority, however, shows itself mainly in small matters. The scribe of L was evidently a man of some learning, and avoided many errors into which the more ignorant copyist of P stumbled. Probably he also corrected many small mistakes in his original, while the scribe of P seems to have merely copied what lay before him.

(4) On the other hand, P occasionally shows superiority to L,
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e.g. ὀπαδὼν in 136 against ὀπαδός, λελήσεται in 198 against λήσεται, ὀφρόν in 289 against ὀφρόν, etc. Cases like these may be ascribed to contamination with a MS. of the other family; but what shall be said of instances like σύμμετρος in 26, the omission of 31 (rejected by Nauck), νερτέραν in 47, κατάρξωμαι in 74, πάθη in 145, where P alone, or virtually alone, offers readings worthy of careful consideration and even of acceptance? Though I consider L the better MS., I cannot for an instant agree with Wilamowitz that P is almost worthless in the Alcestis.

It may be noted, also, that L, like a, occasionally indulges in daring emendations. Examples are 401 σε γὰρ (σ’ ἔγρω P) to avoid asyndeton, 487 μ’ ἡν πόνους (πόνους P) to fill a lacuna, 825 μόνον for μόνη to avoid the rhyme, etc. If P is a copy of a copy of L, why do not these changes reappear in P? (See also the Classical Review X. [1896] pp. 258–9, where England has pointed out some of the difficulties which stand in the way of Vitelli’s view.)

In order not to do injustice to the opinion of Wilamowitz, I intentionally selected the first 300 lines, where the differences between L and P happen to be more marked than in the rest of the play. The number of cases, however, in which L P agree (or substantially agree) against the whole or a part of Prinz’s other MSS. is large (well over 220, rejecting doubtful cases), and of the readings offered by L P in common a very large proportion are characteristic, e.g. κλέος against γέρας in 55, the inversion of 106 and 107, the omission of έτι in 130, the interpolated interjections in 226, the omission of ἰδοὺ ἰδοὺ in 233, the order in 234, the omission of μὲθες μὲ in 262 and of μὴ—ὀρφανεῖς in 276, σοῦι ταρσυνεῖ τέκνον against τοῦι σοῦι ἑλαρσυνεῖ in 318, the omission of 376, μελαμπέπλω στολῇ in 427, πέρι against έτι in 520, the omission of δύσσο—γ’δε in 760–61, and scores of others. These show conclusively that L P are derived from a common source.

Nor do I find any proof that in the Alcestis P shows the influence of the other family more strongly than L. Any one who will take the trouble to make a list will find that L agrees with B or a or B a about as often as P does. L and a in particular frequently show agreement, which I attribute not to contamination but to the fact
that the scribes of these two MSS., being men of learning, often both went right in small matters where other copyists erred.

To sum up then, I believe that, in the *Alcestis* at least, \( L P \) spring from a common ancestor lying not very far (perhaps two or three removes) back; that, though \( L \) is on the whole the better MS., \( P \) sometimes better represents the common original, and is by no means to be despised; and that from the agreement of \( L P \) we can generally deduce the reading of that original, which with Prinz I have denoted by \( S \).

The *codex Harleianus 5743* (\( A \) Kirchhoff \( = \) H Earle \( = \) Harl. older edd.) is a late MS., containing (beside two plays of Sophocles) the *Alcestis* from v. 1029 to the end, the *Rhesus* and the *Troades*. It is said by Earle and others who have collated it to be of little value in the *Alcestis*, except in v. 1037, where it offers the reading \( \delta \tau i \zeta o\nu \) (see note ad loc.).

The *codex Harniensis 417* (\( C \) Prinz \( = \) C Kirchhoff \( = \) Havn. older edd.) is a paper (chartaceus) MS. of the fifteenth century, containing the *Medea*, *Heeuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae*, *Hippolytus*, *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Troades* and *Rhesus*. Kirchhoff ranked it comparatively high, placing it in his first class; but Prinz held it to be of less importance, and Wilamowitz believes it to be of little value. In the *Alcestis* it is certainly almost worthless. Of the readings from it given by Prinz \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \iota \sigma t a \) in 219 (so also \( a \) and \( d \)), \( \eta \lambda e k t r \rho \nu \nu o s \) in 839 (which may be wrong, as Wilamowitz's conjecture is very tempting; see note ad loc.), \( \mu \eta \ ' \lambda a \beta e s \) in 1102 and \( \kappa \nu o \sigma \alpha n \) in 1156 are easy changes; \( \kappa a i \ \kappa o \kappa \nu \tau o \nu \ \tau e \ \rho \epsilon \epsilon \theta r o n \) in 458 I do not believe to be right, though it has the much stronger authority of \( B \ a \) (\( \kappa a i \) at all events must be rejected), while \( \mu \eta \delta ' \ \epsilon \tau ' \) in 18 (see note) and \( \theta \epsilon \lambda o \alpha s \) in 1079 (see Apparat. Crit.) are almost certainly wrong.

We come now to the much-vexed question as to the comparative value of the two families \( B \ a \) and \( L P \). Kirchhoff, as is well known, attributed very much greater importance to the MSS. of his first class than to those of his other two classes; and hence in the *Alcestis* he has pretty consistently followed \( B \), rejecting for the most part the readings of \( L P \). Most recent editors of Euripides, on the other hand (including Nauck, Prinz, Wilamowitz, Barthold,
Weil, Wecklein, England, Earle and others), rate $L P$ higher than did Kirchhoff. Wilamowitz in particular, as some one has remarked, "has constituted himself the champion of $L$." The general trend of critical opinion seems to be toward the verdict of Prinz (pref. to his Medea p. ix.): "pretium duarum classium non prorsus par est, cum numeros vitiorum et interpolationum primae classis minor sit, sed secunda classis non multo deterior ac nequaquam herele contemnenda est." This is substantially my own view; though in the Alcestis I should be inclined to rate $L P$ a little higher than does even Prinz. While I believe $B$ to be on the whole superior to any other single MS. of the play, I hold the authority of $L P$ combined to be very nearly, if not quite, equal to that of $B a$. For the grounds of this opinion I must refer the reader to the notes passim, as space will not permit an adequate discussion of the subject here. Useful material (which, however, must be used with caution) may be found in the essay of Krauthausen, Der Werth der Handschrift "S" der Alcestis (Saarlouis, 1895). I would gladly have given here a complete list of the passages in the Alcestis where $L P$ agree against $B a$; but Kirchhoff and Prinz have not given the readings of $a$ with sufficient fullness to make this possible. A list of those where $L P$ agree against $B$ would be of comparatively little value; for $B$ is written so carelessly that it is often unsafe to trust it unless supported by $a$.

What I have said above applies only to the Alcestis. The general question of the value of the two families cannot be really decided until we have full and accurate collations of the principal Euripidean MSS. Scholars are eagerly awaiting from the competent hands of Wecklein the completion of the work begun by Prinz. Then, and not till then, shall we really know just what the testimony of $L P$ is worth, and whether any of the less known MSS. are of value.—See also the preface to Kirchhoff's larger edition; the prefaces to Prinz's Medea, Alcestis and Hercaea; Wilamowitz's Herakles I. pp. 205 ff. and Analceta passim; Wecklein in N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1878 pp. 226–7. The article by Prinz in the Rhein. Mus. n. v. XXX. (1875) pp. 129 ff. (on the cod. Harniensis) should also be consulted.
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The Alcestis, being one of the ten plays of the Byzantine delectus, possesses tolerably copious scholia, which are preserved chiefly in the MSS. B and a (A and B of Schwartz). These scholia are, of course, of a very composite character. They contain some valuable bits of Alexandrian learning, such as the Aristophanic portion of the hypothesis, the scholarly notes on vv. 1, 968, etc.; but taken as a whole they are not of great value. The best account of the origin and history of the Euripidean scholia is given by Wilamowitz, Herakles I. pp. 144 ff.* The scholia themselves may be found to best advantage in the editions of Dindorf (Oxford, 1863; schol. to the Alcestis vol. IV. pp. 85 ff.) and Schwartz (Berlin, 1887–91; schol. to Alcestis vol. II. pp. 214 ff.). In making quotations from them I have followed the text of Schwartz.

The editions of the Alcestis are very numerous. I give a partial list, including especially those valuable for the history and criticism of the text. To those which are of prime importance an asterisk is prefixed.

A. Editions of Euripides which are of critical value for the Alcestis, but include other plays as well.


2. Aldine edition, Venice, 1503. Contains all the plays but the Electra. Edited by Marcus Musurus, who followed P (except in the Helena, Hercules Fur., Cyclops, Heraclidae and Ion, where he used Parisinus 2817 (a copy of L), and in the Hecuba, Phoenissae and Orestes, where he used some late MS.). Musurus made numerous emendations, some of value, many worthless.

3. Hervagian editions, Basle, 1537, 1544, 1551.


6. Barnes' edition, Cambridge, 1694, with scholia and notes. Barnes' comments may still be consulted with profit in a few

* See also Barthold, De Scholiorum in Eur. vett. fontibus, Bonn, 1864.
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passages. This edition was reprinted, revised by Beck, Leipzig, 1778.

7. Musgrave's edition, Oxford, 1778. Musgrave laid a firmer foundation for the text, using a in addition to the MSS. employed by the earlier edd. His original edition, which is very rare, I have been unable to consult.

8. Matthiae's edition, Leipzig, 1813–29, with scholia and notes. (Notes on the Alcestis vol. VII. pp. 113 ff.) Matthiae used more MSS. than any of his predecessors, including L, c, d, C. He erred in the opposite direction from Kirchhoff, showing partiality toward the readings of the second family (P L).

9. The Glasgow edition of 1821, with scholia, notes and Beck's index. (This is the best edition to consult for the notes of Barnes, Musgrave, Markland and the older edd. and critics.* Alcestis vol. IV. pp. 409 ff.)

10. W. Dindorf's Poetarum Scenicorum fabulae, London and Leipzig, 1830, etc.; fifth ed. Leipzig, 1869. (Contains the Alcestis among other plays, with brief critical apparatus.)


*13. Kirchhoff's large edition, Berlin, 1855. (This laid the foundation for the critical study of the text. The editor was too partial to the MSS. of his first class, and the collations which he used were often incomplete and inaccurate. Nevertheless the edition was an epoch-making one, and is still indispensable.)

14. Kirchhoff's smaller edition (Berlin, 1867–9, with brief critical apparatus) shows less unfairness toward L P.

15. Paley's edition, London, 1857 (new ed. of vol. I. 1872, of vol. II. 1875), with notes. (Not of great critical value; but the exegetical notes are sometimes useful.)

* (Trollope's) Notae philol. et gramm. in Euripidis tragedias, London, 1828, is also a useful collection. (Notes on Alcestis vol. I. pp. 281 ff.)
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B. Special editions of the *Alcestis* (including those which form *separate volumes* of larger editions).

1. The *Alcestis* from Barnes' edition, revised by Kaltwasser, with preface by Geissler, Gotha, 1776. (Contains the scholia to the play, Barnes' notes and Buchanan's Latin version.)

2. Kuinoel's edition, Leipzig, 1779 (also 1811). (Of little value.)


4. Gaisford's edition, Oxford, 1806, with various readings. (School edition, for the use of Westminster students.)

*5. Monk's edition, Cambridge, 1816 (second ed. 1823), with notes and Buchanan's version. (The first really *critical* edition of the play. Monk, who was Fellow of Trinity and Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, was a fine scholar and a worthy contemporary of Porson, Elmsley and G. Hermann. His edition is still extremely valuable.)

6. Wuestemann's edition, Gotha, 1823. (This is a reprint of the second edition of Monk, with a preface and additional notes by Wuestemann. The additions are not of great value.)

*7. G. Hermann's edition, Leipzig, 1824. (This has selections from the notes of Monk and Wuestemann, and a valuable introductory dissertation and short additional notes by G. Hermann. The editor's notes, though curt and arbitrary in tone, are often of great value.)

8. Woolsey's edition, Cambridge (Massachusetts), 1834, etc. —Hartford, 1875. (This is a school edition; but Woolsey was a sound scholar, and his exegetical notes are occasionally of service.)


10. Dindorf's edition, Oxford, 1834. (In this the famous Vatican fragment of the hypothesis was first published.)
INTRODUCTION.


*12. Prinz's edition, Leipzig, 1879. (Text with critical apparatus. Full and careful collations of the leading MSS. enabled the editor to lay a firm basis for the constitution of the text. This work is indispensable for critical students of the play.)


*15. Earle's edition, London, 1894. (School edition, but with brief *apparatus criticus* and useful introduction and explanatory notes. Also short critical and metrical appendices.)


Of English translations I will mention the following: those of Potter (in his translation of Euripides, London, 1781; also in Morley's *Universal Library*, vol. 54); Buckley, London, 1850 (in
his translation of Euripides in Bohn’s series); Rice, Dublin, 1879; Coleridge (in his *Plays of Euripides*, London, 1891); Lawton (in his *Three Dramas of Euripides*, Boston, 1892) and Way, London, 1894. Browning’s *Balaustion’s Adventure* deserves special mention as a spirited version in a charming setting; but even in the part of it which is translated it is sometimes Browning, not Euripides, who speaks. It was published in 1871 (in London and New York).

— The elegant Latin version of Buchanan (written about 1540) also deserves mention; it may be found appended to the editions of Monk and Wuestemann.

The essays, articles, etc., of a critical nature dealing with the text of the *Alcestis* are so numerous that only a small part of them can be mentioned here. Of special importance are the following:—


* These are to be found also in the *Mélanges Gréco-Romains* III. pp. 31, 39 and IV. p. 214.
D. Questions concerning the Scenic Representation of the Play.

I. The Alcestis and the Stage-question.

In view of the battle-royal now going on between the "old-stagers" and the "no-stagers" (as Prof. Gildersleeve has wittily called them) it behooves us to speak with extreme caution as to this point. We do not absolutely know how plays were represented in the fifth century B.C., but it must be admitted that the probabilities now seem to be very strongly in favor of the view advo-
cated by Dr. Doerpfeld and his followers. Hoepken (*De theatro attico suec. a. Chr. quinti*, 1884), White (*Harv. Stud. in Class. Philol.* II. pp. 159 ff.), Capps (*Trans. of Am. Philol. Assoc.* 1891) and Pickard (*Am. Jour. Philol.* XIV. Nos. 1–3), but above all Doerpfeld and Reisch (*Das Griechische Theater*, 1896), have shown that the extant plays could never have been acted on the Vitruvian stage. The theory that there was a low, temporary stage is also liable to grave objections; and the architectural evidence against it seems conclusive.

The evidence supplied by the *Alcestis*, while not in itself decisive, strongly favors the no-stage theory. As Capps (*l.s.c.* p. 14) points out, the withdrawal of the chorus with Admetus at v. 740 f., and their return together at 860 f. would be decidedly easier if the actors and choreutae were on the same level. Moreover, the scene in 77 f. is much more effective if the chorus are on the same level as the palace than if they peer up at it from below. So, too, the words of Admetus to the chorus at 423 f. are more natural if he is standing at the same elevation as they are.—We may also infer that the front of the *σκηνή*, or the *προσκήνιον* (if one was used so early; see Doerpfeld and Reisch *l.s.c.* p. 372), had at least two doors in it, one the main door of the palace and the other the side-entrance through which Heracles retires at v. 552.

II. *The Withdrawal of the Chorus.*

As has been said above, there is a withdrawal (*μετάστασις*; see Pollux IV. 108) and re-entry (*ἐπιπάροδος*) of the chorus in this play. The reason is obvious. The chorus must withdraw at 740 f., or they will learn of Heracles' resolve to rescue Alcestis and the surprise of the last scene cannot be motived properly. If, as I believe, the play has been worked over and the plot changed, the *μετάστασις* may, or may not, have belonged to the original plan; but in the former case the reason for it must have been a different one. There are four other instances of *μετάστασις* in the extant tragedies,* viz., in the *Eumenides*, *Ajax*, *Helena* and *Rhesus* (though

* There is also a case in the *Ecclesiazusae* of Aristophanes.

III. Distribution of the Rôles.

As to the way in which the parts were distributed among the actors in the *Alcestis* there has been considerable dispute, and a decision is by no means easy. As Elmsley long ago pointed out, the silence of Alcestis in the last scene of the play is due in all probability to the poet's unwillingness to bring more than two speaking actors upon the scene at once. Why he was unwilling is not so clear; for three speaking actors appeared at once in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus (458 B.C.) and probably earlier. It is noticeable, also, that (as O. Mueller pointed out in his *History of Greek Literature*) the play can be performed with only two actors. Putting these two facts together, it seems probable that the play was intended to be performed by two speaking actors, perhaps to save the choregus the expense of providing a third. With two actors the parts may be divided as follows (Mueller, *Scenische Fragen* p. 5 f.): protagonist Admetus, Thanatos, man-servant; deuteragonist Alcestis, Apollo, Heracles, Pheres, maid-servant. The part of the boy Eumelus (393 f.) was probably sung ad manum by some one behind the scenes, the actor merely going through the appropriate motions; while his sister Perimele, Alcestis from 1007 on and the servants at 546, 1110 are mutae personae. Another possible division is: protagonist Apollo, Alcestis, Pheres, Heracles; deuteragonist Thanatos, Admetus, maid-servant, man-servant; mutae personae as before. This is inferior to the first, as it gives the rôle of Admetus, which is clearly the most exacting, to the second actor. The main objection to both is that the same actor takes the parts of both Alcestis and Heracles, which are so very different. But there are other instances of this kind; e.g. in the *Prometheus* one actor took the parts of Kratos and Io. With three actors the distribution would be easy, e.g. (with Wecklein) protagonist Apollo,
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Alcestis, Heracles; deuteragonist Admetus, Thanatos; tritagonist servant-maid, Eumelus, Pheres, man-servant; mutae personae: or, better I think (with K. F. Hermann, De distributione personarum in trag. Graec. [Marburg, 1840] p. 49), protagonist Admetus; deuteragonist Alcestis, Heracles, Pheres, Thanatos; tritagonist Apollo, man-servant, maid-servant; mutae personae.* Which of these arrangements was actually adopted in ancient times we have no means of determining. — See further A. Mueller, Lehrbuch d. Griech. Bühnenalterthümer p. 173, note 3; A. Mueller, Scenische Fragen zur Alkestis d. Euripides pp. 4–8.

E. The Myth of Alcestis in Ancient Art.

By James M. Paton, Ph.D.

The works of ancient art containing scenes which may be referred to the story of Alcestis have been collected and discussed by Petersen (Arch. Zeit. 21, 1863, pp. 105 ff.), Dissel (Der Mythos von Admetos und Alkestis), Engelmann (Roscher, Lexikon I. 235) and Escher (Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc. I. 1513), but none of these have aimed at completeness. In this chapter I have endeavored to bring together all known representations of this story, although, as I have been compelled to rely on published material, it is scarcely possible that none have escaped notice. The necessary limits of this introduction have prevented an exhaustive discussion of these works, but the following pages contain an outline which may serve as the basis for a more detailed study. The collection is confined to those works which are directly concerned with the story of Admetus and Alcestis, and therefore all representations of Alcestis among the daughters of Pelias, Admetus as a participant in the Calydonian Hunt, and similar scenes, have been omitted.

I., II. The statement of Pausanias (III. 18, 8), that Admetus was represented on the throne of Apollo at Amyclae yoking a lion and

* Hermann did not decide whether the part of Eumelus was taken by the tritagonist or was a παραχωρήγημα; but see above.
INTRODUCTION.

a boar, has led Petersen to find the wooing of Admetus on an Etruscan ring (Abeken, *Mittelitalien* Taf. VII., 6 a). A lion and boar are driven by a man in a chariot, while in front marches a winged male* figure. The winged figure belongs to a distinctly oriental type, and only the lion and the boar suggest the story of Admetus. A similar union of these animals occurs on the bl. fig. amphora from Rhegium in a representation of the marriage of Cadmus and Harmonia (Benn-dorf, *Vorlegebl.* Ser. C., Taf. VII. 3). It seems better to see in this ring one of those general types which the Greek artists adapted to the representation of particular scenes. An Apollo of the type of this winged figure can scarcely be accepted, unless some other representations of the god in this form are cited.

III. If the connection of this ring with our story is more than doubtful, the reference is clear in a stucco relief, which forms part of the interior decoration of a tomb on the Via Latina. It was briefly described by Brunn (*Bull. d. Inst.* 1858, p. 81), and published by Petersen (*Ann. d. Inst.* 33, 1861, p. 227; cf. *Mon. Ined.* VI. Tav. 52, 3). On the right a bearded man is seated on a throne, and beside him stands a woman. In front of this group, and with his left foot planted on the platform on which the throne stands, is a young man, who, while looking at the king, points with his outstretched right arm to a marvellous sight. Through the open gate of the court comes a chariot drawn by a lion and a boar, beside whom walks a man crowned with laurel and probably carrying a bow. In the chariot stands a female figure in a short chiton, and with a quiver on her back. Brunn referred this scene to an otherwise unknown form of the myth in which Apollo and Artemis went to the lower world to rescue Alcestis. Petersen, however, is certainly right in interpreting it as a representation of the wooing of Admetus, who appears before King Pelias and his daughter to show how easily with divine assistance the required task has been fulfilled. The presence of Artemis in the chariot may point to a form of the story in which she also helped Admetus, whose later neglect thus appears in a stronger light, but her connection with wild beasts renders it natural that she should act as charioteer, when artistic

*Surely not female, as Dissel says, l. c. p. 10.*
requirements made it necessary that Admetus should occupy another position.

This part of the legend, however, did not attract the ancient artists. As in literature, so in art, the story turned rather to the representation of Alcestis as the type of wifely devotion, and its popularity is of comparatively late development. Apparently no extant work of Greek art belonging to the fifth or fourth centuries contains any reference to this myth, with the single exception of the sculptured drum from Ephesus, of which the interpretation is by no means certain. It is found on Etruscan works of a somewhat later date, though were it not for inscriptions, which leave no doubt as to the intent of the artist, it is scarcely likely that his meaning would have been recognized.

IV. The first is an amphora from Vulci formerly in the collection of the Duc de Luynes (Arch. Zeit. 8, 213*). It is published by Dennis (Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria II. front., cf. I. ci., and 437; also Arch. Zeit. 21, 1863, Taf. 180, 3). The centre of the picture is occupied by the husband and wife. Alcestis (Alcestis) has thrown her arms about the neck of Admetus (Atmite), but the time of their separation is at hand, for on either side there hastens forward a demon of death, behind Alcestis the Etruscan Charon with wolf's ears, huge tusks, and a great hammer in his hand, behind Admetus a winged figure with hideous face, and holding a snake in each hand. It seems needless to try to read into this picture the story of the self-sacrifice of Alcestis, who throws herself between death and her husband. The positions of the two figures are practically the same, while the snakes of the demon on the right are no more threatening to Admetus than is the hammer of Charon to Alcestis. A parting scene* specialized by the addition of legendary names, that and nothing more, in my opinion, is shown on this vase.

* A similar scene, though much ruder in conception, is published in the Annali d. Inst. 1866 Tav. W. An unpublished red-figured Etruscan vase of late date, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, shows a man and woman parting, while a bearded and winged demon hovers over them. The addition of names could turn the scene into a representation of Admetus and Alcestis.
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V. The second occurrence of this legend in Etruria is on a mirror from Civita Castellana, published by Körte (Gerhard, *Etruskische Spiegel* V. p. 217 Nachträge No. 9), and now in the Metropolitan Museum of New York. In the centre stand Admetus (*Atmite*) and Alcestis (*Alcestis*). He is clad in an himation which covers the left shoulder and the lower part of the body, while Alcestis is fully draped. They embrace one another, and a large necklace encircles both, a symbol of union found also on a mirror representing Venus and Adonis (Gerhard, *l. c.* V. Taf. XXIII.). On the right a maid seems to be smoothing the hair of Alcestis with a small rod, which has doubtless been dipped in the alabastron in her left hand. On the left is a youth in the act of leaving; in his left hand he carries a pair of shoes, and in his right an object which Professor Körte thinks may be a περιπώβολον. As is pointed out by the editor, this scene, so far as the chief figures are concerned, is simply a transference of the type used for the Aphrodite-Adonis series. There is no reference to the death of Alcestis, and apart from the inscriptions, there is nothing to separate this group from the many similar love scenes on Etruscan mirrors.*

VI. The same lack of any sharply defined characterization renders the meaning of the artist somewhat uncertain in the class of monuments now to be discussed. Among the Etruscan urns there are a number which show a composition that has been thought to represent the death of Alcestis. This interpretation was first suggested by C. N. Grauer† in connection with an urn now in Berlin. A better example is the one published by Inghirami (*Mon. Etr. Ser. I. Tav. 74*) from Volterra. In the centre on a couch reclines a fully draped woman. She rests her left arm on the cushions and stretches her right toward a man who approaches from the left. He is closely wrapped in a large himation, which covers the back of the head and is drawn closely under the chin. His left foot rests on a footstool in front of the couch. On this stool sits a boy, who rests his chin on his right hand, while he looks

* Cf. Gerhard, *l. c.* V. p. 35 and the plates there cited, also plates CXLVII. 1 and CL.

up at the woman on the couch. From the right there hastens to the head of the couch a young girl, whose right hand seems to rest on the pillow, while in her left she holds a ring on which hang some indeterminate objects. Back of this girl hovers a winged female figure with a torch. The ends of the relief are occupied by symmetrically grouped women, who start back from the central scene and raise a hand to the forehead in a gesture of surprise. That this is a representation of the death of a mother is very probable, and the presence of the children makes it quite possible that the artist had in mind the parting of Alcestis and Admetus. At the same time this is the only urn where the children are present, unless the grown youth at the head of the couch, and the maiden who seems to receive tablets from the dying woman on the urn in Inghirami, *l. c. Tav. 75*, are intended to take the place of the boy and girl. In the great majority of cases, while the central group remains substantially the same, the figure at the head of the couch is a youth whose right hand seems to rest on the dying woman's shoulder, while in the left is the ring with the indistinct pendants.

These scenes were interpreted by Inghirami as Eriphyle and Amphiaraus, a view which now scarcely calls for discussion. Grauer's explanation was adopted by Dissel (Admetos und Alkestis p. 16) and at first by Dütschke (*l. c. I. 8*), though in a later volume (II. 381) he left the question of interpretation open. K. O. Müller (Ancient Art § 413, 2) saw in them a representation of the return of Protesilaus to Laodamia. In favor of this view of the meaning of some of the urns are the absence of the children, and the close veiling of the head of the figure, though the face is not covered. On the other hand, any such view seems impossible for the urn first described. Both interpretations, however, can fairly claim some consideration. The Protesilaus and Alcestis sarcophagi in spite of

* Cf. Inghirami, *l. c. Tavv. 19 and 77*. In Tav. 76 Admetus (?) is just entering the door. In Tav. 75 this figure has been crowded away from the couch by the interposition of the maiden. Cf. also Gori, Mus. Etr. I. 133; Dütschke, Antike Bildwerke Ober- und Mittelitaliens I. Nos. 8, 91, 99; II. 320, 381; IV. 602; V. 407; Mus. Gregor. II. Tav. 103, 6. This latter omits the figure at the head of the couch. Instead there seems to be a partition, behind which is a female figure, starting back from the scene on the other side.
many divergencies in detail have still a common source for the central group, and there is nothing antecedently improbable in the use by an Etruscan artist of the same general arrangement for both myths. In one relief (Inghirami, l. c. I. Tav. 20) a reclining figure much like "Alcestis" occupies the right half, while the left is filled by two standing figures clasping hands. Scenes of parting are too frequent on the urns to make it necessary to seek in all of them a mythological meaning. Whence the artist drew his inspiration is made clear by such a Greek relief as the stele of Plangon in the National Museum at Athens.* If a conclusion may be drawn from silence, Professor Körte may also be cited against a mythological interpretation for these urns, as they are not found in Rilievi delle Urne Etrusche vol. II.

To sum up,—it seems not impossible that the death of Alcestis was in the mind of the maker of the urn (Inghir. l.c. I. Tav. 74), but if the same thought governed the other workmen, they gave no certain clue to its expression. In any case the motif is not one invented for the expression of this thought, nor even sharply and precisely differentiated for it, a sure proof in my opinion that the myth did not occupy the attention of Greek artists, at least not before the Hellenistic period.

In the Roman period scenes from the myth of Alcestis become more frequent and at the same time more clearly defined. With the exception of some Pompeian paintings these representations are on funeral monuments, either in the form of mural paintings, or as decorations of sarcophagi and other sepulchral reliefs.

VII. In Herulaneum and Pompeii seven pictures† have been found, manifestly representations of the same scene, though differing in the grouping of the persons concerned. The two types are published by Petersen in Arch. Zeit. 21, 1863, Taf. 180, 1 (= Helbig 1157) and 2 (= Helbig 1158). I abridge the description of Helbig.

* Le Bas, Voy. Arch., Mon. Fig. Pl. 71; Kavvadias, Ἐλληνικά τῶν Ἐθν. Mon. 749; Conze, Att. Grabreliefs p. 70.
A. At the left sits Admetus, who is represented as youthful and vigorous. He is wrapped in a mantle and rests his bowed head on his left hand. On his left and a little behind him sits Alcestis, fully draped and with a veil over the back of her head. Her right arm is passed around the shoulders of Admetus, and her left hand rests on his arm. Both are listening to a young man, who, seated on a stool in front of them, is reading from a scroll. At the right an old woman leans forward in close attention to the reader and behind her stands a bearded old man. The centre of the background is occupied by Apollo, plainly distinguished by his quiver, and in front of him stands a fully draped female figure, with a veil over her head, who raises the right hand as if in astonishment.

B. The other type contains the same groups but differs in their arrangement. Admetus and Alcestis occupy an ornamental throne at the left with the youthful reader before them. The upper part of Admetus' body is nude and he leans forward with his right arm outstretched toward the reader. Alcestis, who here wears a diadem, rests her chin on her left hand and gazes into vacancy, evidently sunk in deep thought. The old man and woman stand behind the throne, and on the extreme right, leaning on a high balustrade is Apollo. On his right a little behind him, and apparently in conversation with him is the female figure with upraised right hand. The other paintings are merely variations on these types, though one (Helbig 1159) adds to type A two beardless figures behind Admetus, probably attendants.

These pictures were at first explained as the recognition of Orestes and Iphigenia, and though Petersen's reference to the story of Alcestis was adopted by Helbig, it has been doubted by Dissel (l. c. p. 13 and Anm.), mainly because of the unexplained female figure with Apollo and the absence of any reference to an oracle in the literary versions of the myth. The interpretation seems to have been settled by Mau (Bull. d. Inst. 1879, p. 69) in a paper which must have escaped Dissel's notice. In a discussion of Pompeian inscriptions referable to mural paintings Mau communicated an unpublished graffito from the house Reg. V., Ins. 1, No. 18, consisting of two words PELIAS | ALCESTIS. On the
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Wall to the right are found the chief groups of our first type arranged among fantastic architectural decorations, and we obviously have here the interpretation which some member of the household put upon the painting. The introduction of Pelias is well explained by Mau as due to the ignorance of the scribbler, who confused him with Pheres. We have here, therefore, the reading of the message which announces the impending death of Admetus unless he can provide a substitute, and it is easy to see that the artist has endeavored to show Alcestis as already contemplating her self-sacrifice. The old couple are of course the parents of Admetus, and the presence of Apollo requires no comment. The female figure near Apollo has hitherto baffled satisfactory explanation. Petersen calls her the Nymphentria in the first type, who has been elevated to a marriage-goddess in the second, but such a view must be supported by other examples before it can be accepted as certain.

The other paintings which contain references to this myth are concerned chiefly with the intervention of Heracles and the restoration of Alcestis.

VIII. A drawing in the Codex Pighianus of a ceiling, which was probably in a columbarium in Rome.* Two panels are connected with this story. In one, a young man, his chlamys floating over his left shoulder, hastens toward Heracles, who stands at the right with lion's skin over his left arm, and club in hand, and stretches his right hand toward his welcomer. The sarcophagi show that these two figures are taken from a scene which has usually been interpreted as the reception of Heracles, but is regarded by Robert, following Dissel, as representing Admetus entreating his rescuer to remain with him. As the interpretation must depend on the sarcophagi, it will be considered later. As to the other panel there can be no doubt.† Out of an arched door-
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way at the left, Heracles is leading a veiled woman, certainly Alcestis. His right hand is laid encouragingly on her shoulder, while her left hand rests on his arm. This rescue of Alcestis from the lower world is also found on the sarcophagi, and it seems clear that the painter of the ceiling had the same copy-book which furnished the stone-cutters with their designs.

IX. The same scene of the rescue of Alcestis forms the subject of a painting from Antium at Dresden.* In this example the doorway is omitted, and Heracles leads Alcestis, holding her right hand with his left, toward the left.

X. In the tomb of the Nasones † is a painting which has been referred to this myth, though its interpretation is far from certain. At the left is seated on a rock (?) a bearded man with his mantle covering the lower part of the body, and thrown over the right shoulder, leaving the upper part of the body bare. His right hand rests on the rock, and his left elbow on what looks like the unornamented arm of a throne, while the left hand supports his chin. At his left stands a female figure in Doric chiton with girdle, on her left arm an arm-ring and in her left hand a spear, though the copyist has made it a sceptre. On her right arm is a shield. Opposite this group stand Heracles and a woman. His club is in his right hand, and on his right side hang his bow and quiver. His left hand is laid on the shoulder of the woman, who wears the veil over her head in such a way as to leave the face exposed. The irregularities in the position of the shield and bow and quiver show that in the process of engraving the figures have been reversed, and Bartoli's accuracy as an artist is never above suspicion. If Athena is really present the scene can scarcely be the release of Alcestis by Hades, and to assume that the copyist has transformed Persephone into Athena seems rather violent. Petersen suggests that it represents Heracles with Alemena or Hebe before Zeus and Athena. No exactly similar representation of Hebe is

* Hettner, Bildw. d. königl. Antikensamml. 440d. ; W. G. Becker, Augusteum, Taf. 92. The circumstances under which the picture was discovered are unknown.

cited, and though we hear of Heracles leading his mother before Rhadamanthus (cf. Furtwängler in Roscher, *Lexikon* I. 2248), I do not know of any authority for Alcmena's reception into Olympus. Robert (*Sark.-Rel.* III. 1, p. 33) compares with this a Pompeian painting (Helbig 1149),* and considers it the restoration of Alcestis to Admetus. Athena has been created by Bartoli out of the doryphorus of Admetus. This may be correct, though as it rests on a mutilated painting and a conjectural emendation it cannot be regarded as conclusive.

XI. This painting can scarcely be called a scene from the story of Alcestis, but is interesting as showing the typical character which her self-sacrifice came to assume in later times. In the Catacomb of S. Praetextatus at Rome is the burial-vault of Vincentius, priest of Sabazius. It is decorated in part with paintings† representing the mystical reception of his wife Vibia into the future life. The only picture which need be mentioned here is in the first chamber. In the centre *Disputer* and *Aeracura* (*Abracura* Cumont) are enthroned on a high platform; on the left are the three *Fata Divina*; on the right *Mercurius* introduces Vibia attended by Alcestis. It is clear that the latter is present to vouch for the dead Vibia as a faithful and devoted wife.

XII. One more painting calls for mention, though it has commonly been referred to the sacrifice of Iphigenia. It is the Pompeian picture No. 1305 in Helbig, published by Zahn (*Die schönsten Ornamente u. s. w.* II. 61) and discussed by Jahn (*Arch. Beitr.* p. 378). In the centre, facing the right, is a female figure in a long chiton and wearing a wreath on her head, but with loosely flowing hair. Next to her stands a bearded man in a short chiton, girt up at the waist, and likewise wearing a wreath. With his left hand he draws forward a long lock of the woman's

* On the right a man in a chlamys and hunting boots sits on a rock; his left hand holds two spears and his right is raised to his head. Before him stands Heracles, behind whom advances a female figure in chiton and mantle. The upper part of all the figures is missing.
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hair, and in his right he holds the sword with which he is about to sever this lock and thus consecrate his victim to the gods of the nether world. Behind the woman, with his back to this scene, sits a man wrapped in his mantle, and evidently sunk in deep grief.

The application to the story of Iphigenia is clear, and seems rendered certain by the close resemblance to the so-called altar of Cleomenes at Florence. Robert,* however, prefers to see in it Thanatos in the act of cutting off the lock of Alcestis' hair, as mentioned in the prologue of this play. A full discussion of this question can hardly find space here, but it may be said that Robert himself cites no similar representation of Thanatos. On the Attic lecythi he is always winged, and the sword and costume alone can scarcely be considered sufficient to differentiate him from a priest.

It remains to consider the most important group of scenes from this myth,—the Sarcophagi.†

Four complete Roman sarcophagi contain this story on the front; in two instances it furnishes scenes for the ends, once it decorated a cover, while several fragments show that it occupied a prominent place on lost works.

XIII. The complete Sarcophagi.—I give these with the numbering of Robert, which is the same in the text and on the plates.

22. [Mich. A., B.; Dissel D.] Sarcophagus at the Villa Faustina near Cannes, belonging to M. de Courcel. It was formerly in Rome and is mentioned by Zoega (Bassiril. I. 205) and Gerhard (Hyperb.-röm. Stud. I. 154). Robert seems to have proved that it is the

† Cf. Robert, Die antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs III. 1, pp. 24-38, Taf. VI., VII.; Michaelis, Röm. Mitth. VIII. 174 ff. Robert's work was not accessible until this chapter was completed, though I have endeavored to incorporate all the new information which it brings. As there was no time for a careful review of his interpretations, I have thought it best to make few changes in the treatment of disputed points, and to be content in general with a simple statement of his views.
original of the drawing in the Cod. Coburg. 44, 208 and Cod. Pigh. f. 265, No. 205,* published by Beger (Alcestis pro marito moriens, p. 3). It belongs to the first half of the second century.


24. [Mich. D.; Dissel B.] Robert says it was found near Rome in the time of Ficoroni,† who sent a copy of the inscription to Gori in 1732. It was bought in 1734 by the Duc de St. Aignan, and is now at the Chateau St. Aignan in France. It is careful work of the early second century. It bears a Greek inscription in memory of Ulpia Cirilla. Published by Roulez (Gaz. Arch. 1875, p. 105, pl. 27).


The variations in the sarcophagi have been pointed out by Michaelis, and I have used his account freely in the description, checking it with the text of Robert and the various plates. Through the kindness of Professor C. L. Smith of Harvard University and Professor Petersen of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome I have been able to use photographs of 22 and 26, which seem to me much better than the published drawings. Twenty-two and 23 are very closely connected, and 24, though by no means identical, evidently belongs in the same group. Twenty-six also follows similar models, but treats the whole material with such freedom that it requires a separate discussion. For 22 and 23 I use the lettering of Michaelis, and have kept the same notation for 24, so far as possible.
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22, 23  \(a\ b\ c\ d\ e\ f\ g\ |\ h\ i\ l\ m\ |\ p\ q\ r\ s\).

24.  \(t\ u\ v\ w\ x\ i\ h\ l\ o\ |\ p\ q\ r\ y\ s\).

In 22 \(a\) and \(b\) are female figures, who raise the left hand to the face in a gesture of grief. While \(b\) leans forward toward the other figures, \(a\) stands with bowed head, as if in thought. In 23 the gestures are different; \(b\) faces the left, her right hand raised to her head, while \(a\) seems to be trying to dry her tears, though the gesture is uncertain, as at least the right forearm of \(a\) has been restored. \(c\) is a doryphorus, who stands in full front, but looks toward the right. \(d\) is a male figure in profile to the right. His chlamys is gathered over the left shoulder and arm, so as to leave the greater part of the body nude. In 22 he seems unarmed, but in 23 he has a sword at his side, and the point of a spear appears over the left shoulder. He is in animated converse with the next two figures, of which \(e\) occupies the background, and in 22 is a woman, apparently old, fully draped and with a veil over the back of the head. In 23, owing evidently to the thoughtlessness of the artist, this figure has become a youth in a long chlamys. \(f\) is a bent old man who faces the left, leaning on a staff. \(g\) is a youthful doryphorus, who also faces the left. The meaning of this group can scarcely be doubtful. Admetus (\(d\)) having heard the terms on which he can survive, entreats his parents (\(e\) and \(f\)) to come to his rescue. The doryphori are probably attendants on Admetus and Pheres. At such a scene it seems as if Alcestis should be present, as in the Pompeian paintings, and Petersen has already suggested that in 23 she must be the second figure (\(b\)), who is momentarily overwhelmed by the evil news; in 22, on the other hand, she must be the first (\(a\)), who with hand to face meditates on the deed.

In 24 the place of these figures is taken by a group which for the most part is connected with the central scene, though the first two figures may perhaps be regarded separately. At the left is a young man (\(t\)), facing the right, naked save for the chlamys on his left shoulder, bearing a spear in his left hand, and in his right a
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sheathed sword. In the background in very low relief a youth \((u)\) in girded chiton advances toward \(t\). The third figure \((v)\), which faces the right, is an older man, bearded, a lagobolon \((?)\) in his right hand, while his left is concealed in his chlamys, which is tightly wound about the arm. In the background is another youth \((w)\) in girded chiton, facing the right and plainly an attendant of \(x\). This is a young man, who stands with his back to the spectator, his right hand raised to his mouth and his head turned to the right in contemplation of the central scene. He wears a sword, and carries two spears in his left hand. It is possible that the scene represents the return of Admetus \((x)\) and his followers, who on their arrival at the house find that the fatal day has come. The artist does not seem to have had the skill to bring Admetus into closer connection with the central scene, and so has placed him on the edge, differing but little from a mere spectator. Robert's interpretation of this scene is entirely different. He calls attention to the unanimity of the literary sources in representing the fatal day as well known, so that a return of Admetus from the hunt is scarcely justified. At the left is Admetus, clearly marked as in the other scenes, accompanied by his servant, sorrowing at his fate. The other figures belong to the death scene. The chief difficulty is the bearded man \((v)\), who shows no sign of sorrow but seems almost a pendant to the figure of Heracles at the other end. The object in his hand is not properly carried for a lagobolon; otherwise he might be regarded as a representative of the chorus. He is in the proper place for Thanatos, but is a figure more suited to the Roman belief, and if the object he holds can be a key, he is probably Ianitor Orci.

The central scene on 22 and 23 shows no important variation, and on 24 the differences are not such as to affect the meaning. At the left is a somewhat bent old man \((h)\) in chiton and himation, who stands at the foot of a couch on which lies a woman \((l)\). She supports her body on her left elbow, her head sinks on her shoulder, and her whole attitude is that of extreme weakness. Her right hand is extended and clasps the hand of the old man. In the background is an old woman \((i)\), who bends forward to the right
over the dying woman. At the head of the couch is a woman (o) who in her dishevelled hair and bared breast exhibits the usual signs of mourning, and in 22 the head of another woman (m) turned toward the right appears just above the head of the figure on the couch. In the foreground are two children. A girl (k), whose garment has fallen about her waist, rests her right knee on a footstool in front of the couch and stretches both hands upward toward her dying mother. At the other end of the footstool stands a boy (n). He faces the left, his right foot on the stool, his right elbow on his knee, leaning his bowed head on his right hand in an attitude of deep sorrow. In 24 the same figures occur, with the exception of m, but the grouping is somewhat different. The old woman (i) is at the foot of the couch, and holds in her right hand the right hand of the reclining figure, who has fallen farther back and seems already dead. The old man (k) is farther forward, between the couch and the little girl, and kneels beside the dead woman whose left hand he holds in his right. The mourner (o) is also placed somewhat farther from the couch, and is tearing her hair with both hands.

The meaning of this scene is evident. It is the death of Alcestis, surrounded by her children and attendants. The only question concerns the identity of the aged man and woman who are placed in such prominent positions. Petersen is inclined to call them the father and mother of Admetus, while Dissel sees in them the paedagogus and nurse, urging that Pheres cannot be present at this scene, and that the costume, so far as it is visible, favors this view. It must be remembered that this entire scene is in its origin simply the death of a mother, and that in their first significance these figures have nothing to do with Alcestis. Furthermore, the consideration of the person for whom the sarcophagus is intended is seldom wholly disregarded by the maker, and therefore Robert's view (Sark.-Rel. III. 1, p. 25) seems very probable that in the thought of the artist these figures are the parents of the dying woman; not Pelias and Anaxibia, but simply the father and mother who belong at the bedside of their daughter. While it must be admitted that on 22 and 23 the old woman (i) wears the headdress
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of the nurse, the old man (h) does not wear the costume of the paedagogus, and his position seems too prominent for even a trusted servant. Robert emphasizes his view by the greater prominence of the woman on 24, which is shown by the inscription to have been ordered by a mother.

In the third scene 22 and 23 agree, while 24 again shows divergencies. From the left hastens a young man (p), the chlamys over his left shoulder, a sheathed sword in his left hand, his arms outstretched toward Heracles (r) who, easily recognized by club and lion's skin, stands with the body in full front, his head turned toward the left and his right arm extended toward this youth. Behind Heracles stands a doryphorus, his right hand raised to his mouth, looking with interest at the scene to his right. In general appearance he forms an excellent pendant to the figure (c), near the left end. Evidently we have here a meeting between Heracles and Admetus; but at what point in the story does it belong? The answer to this question depends upon the fourth figure (q), and unfortunately just at this point the evidence is most unsatisfactory. On 23 only the body of Admetus (p) and traces of this figure (q) have been preserved, though the restorer has endeavored to supply this lack. On 22 the space between the heads of the mourning servant (o) and of Heracles (r) has been broken out, destroying the upper part of the head of Admetus and the face of the all-important figure. The drawing in the Coburgensis shows this figure complete, but, as will be seen, its testimony is not wholly clear. The figure is that of a woman in a long chiton and mantle, the body in full front, who stands in the background between Admetus and Heracles. The right foot is firmly planted and pointed directly toward the front. The left leg is slightly bent and only the toe touches the ground. This is plain both in the drawing and in the photograph, where the position of the feet indicates a pose almost identical with that of Heracles.* In the drawing the upper part of this figure is slightly twisted, so that in

* Schenck's drawing in Robert does not give the position of Heracles quite as in my copy of the photograph.
spite of the position of the feet, the woman stands at the side of Admetus, with head turned toward Heracles. In the photograph of 22, this distortion of the upper part of the body does not appear, while both shoulders are concealed, owing to the narrow space between Admetus and Heracles. Michaelis describes this figure as "accanto ad Admeto," and interprets the scene as the reception of Heracles by Admetus, where this woman and the doryphorus must be servants. As this is the opinion of one who has seen the Courcel sarcophagus, it is with great hesitation that I express a doubt as to its correctness. After a somewhat protracted search I have failed to find any figure with the lower limbs in the position shown by the photograph, and the upper part of the body as represented in the drawing. So far as my examination goes, a figure standing thus always has a tendency toward the direction indicated by the advanced and firmly planted foot. She may have halted, may even be looking backward, but the arrested motion was in the direction of the foot on which she rests. If this theory is correct, the figure on 22 is coming from the same direction as Heracles, and the position of the missing head is of less account.*

The scene then represents the restoration of Alcestis to Admetus by Heracles. Against this view can be urged, apart from the drawing, the attitude of Admetus, strikingly unlike his dignified pose at this moment on 26, and very like the ceiling-painting already described; and especially the corresponding scene on 24. Here Admetus (μ) bends still more toward his visitor, whose hand he grasps and whose pose and general form suggest very strongly the reveller to whose presence the servant of Admetus takes such exception in the play. The position of the woman (γ) is here open to no dispute. She stands at the side of Admetus, and slightly in front of him, clad in a chiton and mantle, her right hand raised to her chin, her gaze directed toward Heracles, whose great size is made more prominent by the stooping posture of Admetus, and by

*I regard the figure as much in the position of the figure e but in the opposite direction. In the Coburgensis the drawing of the hair of q is so like that of e that it seems not unlikely that q also had the mantle over the back of the head.
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the decidedly short stature of the woman.* The figure behind Heracles no longer carries a spear, but rests his right hand on his breast, and in the left clasps what Roulez calls a scroll, but in the drawing of Eichler (Sark.-Rel. III. 1, Taf. vi. 24) is plainly a sheathed sword. In the background between Heracles and this youth is visible another figure (γ) in profile to the left, but in very low relief, who is possibly the servant of Admetus already seen on the sarcophagus at u and w. In that case the figure with the sword may be a representative of the people (so Robert). As has been said, this scene can scarcely be the return of Alcestis. The small stature, the absence of any veil, the whole costume, and the position by Admetus combine to make any such view as that of Roulez more than doubtful. But does not this settle the meaning of the scene of 22 and 23? Possibly; but in view of what seems to me the position of the figure (γ), I am inclined to see in 24 only another instance of the freedom which its sculptor has used in the other scenes, though the presence of a maid-servant at the reception of Heracles is certainly hard to explain.

Here again Robert offers a different explanation. He sees in this scene on all three sarcophagi an illustration of the closing lines of the play. Alcestis is restored to life and hence no longer wears the veil which enfolds her in the rescue scenes; hence, too, she stands beside her husband, and almost seems to join him in his earnest entreaty to Heracles to remain as their guest. This had also been suggested by Dissel, but in spite of its ingenuity I cannot feel convinced that it is beyond question. The chief difficulty in 24 is the small size, which is appropriate for a young girl or a servant, but scarcely seems to belong to Alcestis. Moreover, in the symmetry, which Robert shows is so marked in this work, this figure corresponds to the servant (w). The heavy figure of Heracles also, in spite of the poplar wreath† in which Robert sees the sign of his return from the lower world, is in marked contrast to his dignity

* Roulez's drawing gives the position and costume of the woman somewhat differently. It may be noted that the position is the reverse of that on the other sarcophagus, and is similar to that of the figure e.

† This wreath is not very clear even in Eichler's drawing.
in the other scenes. The attitude of Admetus in all cases suggests hasty movement, appropriate in welcoming his guest or his new-found wife, but not quite fitting in an endeavor to detain his friend. In 22 the position of Alcestis, as has been said, seems to connect her more closely with Heracles than Admetus.

The ends of the Courcel sarcophagus 22 and of a Florentine sarcophagus (Mich. E.) containing the rape of Persephone on its front, show further scenes from our story.* The left end of E shows Hermes conducting a veiled woman (Alcestis) to the lower world, the entrance to which is indicated by the arch at the left. The right end of 22 evidently represents a later moment in the story. At the right Hades from his throne stretches out his right hand toward the veiled Alcestis who has passed through the portal, which is shown behind her. In the background is another veiled head in low relief, probably that of Persephone. The left end of 22 presents a scene very similar to that on the ceiling already described (cf. supra, p. lviii). In addition the character of the gate is marked by the appearance behind Alcestis of the triple-headed Cerberus. The right end of E offers simply a variation of this scene. Cerberus is omitted, and Heracles seems to be drawing the veil of Alcestis across her face. Dissel regards the action as an unveiling, but surely any violence on the part of Heracles is excluded by all the terms of the myth.

It remains to consider the important sarcophagus from Ostia (26), whose maker has in most cases known how to express his meaning with great clearness, though he cannot be acquitted of a tendency to unite separate incidents into single scenes.

At the left is an arch in which stands a bearded man who seems distinctly larger and heavier than the other figures. He wears a chlamys over his left shoulder and carries a spear, point downward, in his left hand, while in his right he holds the leash of a dog, which is sitting just inside the arch with its head thrown back as if howling. Next to him is a bearded man, wrapped in his chlamys, who appears to turn away from the group to his left toward the figure at the door. His head is bowed, and his

* Drawings in Robert, Sark.-Rel. III. 1, pp. 28 and 35, under 31, 1.
right hand is raised to his face. In his left hand, which hangs at his side, he carries a sheathed sword, the hilt of which is visible, while the sheath is concealed behind the arm. Next to this man in the foreground is a tripod, around which coils a serpent, while in the background in profile to the right is another man, who holds in his right hand what Robert thinks may be a broken rod, though it is too indistinct in the photograph and drawings to warrant a positive opinion. As to the next figure there can be no doubt. Apollo, chlamys over left shoulder and bow in left hand, is hastening forward toward the left, though he looks back toward the central scene.

This is the death of Alcestis, in many particulars showing a close resemblance to the other sarcophagi. Alcestis on the couch, the children in the foreground, the attendant at the head, and the woman in the background are much the same, though the position of Alcestis is less indicative of immediate death, and the grief of the attendants is not so strongly marked. The place of the old man at the foot of the couch is taken by Admetus, who hastens forward, much in the attitude of the welcomer of Heracles* (p); his chlamys is thrown back over the left shoulder, his right hand is extended to meet the hand which Alcestis reaches toward him. In his left hand we see the hilt of the sheathed sword, though the rest of the weapon is invisible. The old man is visible in the background between Apollo and Admetus, leaning on a crooked staff.

The rest of this relief is occupied by a new combination of figures. At the extreme right sits Hades enthroned, much as on the right end of 22 (Mich. l. c. 177). Next to him in the background stands Persephone, the torch in her right hand, while her left rests on the shoulder of her husband, and her gaze is bent upon his face. Next comes Alcestis, a veil over her head, her face bowed, and her right hand raised to her mouth. She moves slowly toward the left, following Heracles, who with the club on his left shoulder, and the lion's skin hanging over his arm, extends his

* The chief difference is that the body above the hips is erect instead of bent forward. The position of the legs seems identical.
right hand to grasp the hand of Admetus, who stands facing the right, his chlamys covering his body, and again in the sunken left hand the hilt of the sword, which he carried in the central group. Beneath the clasped hands of Heracles and Admetus is the opening of a cavern in which sits the three-headed Cerberus. In the background, filling the vacant space between Admetus, Heracles, and Alcestis, are three female figures, evidently the Moirai. In this scene we have a combination of two distinct episodes,—the rescue of Alcestis from the lower world by Heracles, probably through the mediation of Persephone, and the restoration to Admetus. With the omission of Admetus, Cerberus is quite in place as marking the entrance to the region, whence Alcestis and her guide are to withdraw. In his present position he is meaningless, for it is scarcely possible to suppose with Roulez that Admetus has accompanied Heracles to the entrance to the world of shades. Besides, even on this theory, Admetus and Heracles are on opposite sides of the gate.

I have purposely left till the last the interpretation of the scene at the left. Three interpretations have been proposed, so far as I am aware. Roulez, followed by Dissel, sees in it Admetus returning from the hunt and met at his entrance into the palace by a sorrowing servant with the news of his wife’s impending death. To this there seem to me serious objections. In both the other scenes Admetus is clearly marked, and carries the sheathed sword with the hilt projecting from the left hand. This sword is carried by the sorrowing man, and in my opinion gives strong grounds for believing that the artist meant to designate him as Admetus. Moreover, the returning hunter shows no likeness to Admetus in the other scenes, and is also much larger. Petersen interprets the scene as Admetus turning in sorrow from an inquiry of the Delphic oracle, indicated by the tripod and the presence of Apollo. The figure in the archway is a retainer. Against this view it may be urged that Apollo is manifestly interested in the central scene, not in Admetus, with whom his figure has no association whatever, and that the tripod does not necessarily indicate Delphi, but simply adds distinctness to Apollo, although it must be admitted that the bow
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would have been a sufficient attribute.* Moreover, the other figure seems much too large and occupies too prominent a place (his spear is across Admetus' right leg) to be a mere attendant. The third explanation has been given by Robert.† In spite of the sword the sorrowing man is not Admetus, for he has not the portrait features, doubtless those of Euhodus, by which the sculptor has elsewhere marked the husband. The figure in the door is a representative of the lower world, a Roman substitute for the Thanatos of Euripides, and may be compared with Hades and the dog on the cover of the San Lorenzo sarcophagus.‡ This certainly makes a marked parallelism between the ends of this relief. At the left the hunter enters for his prey, and at the right the rulers of the dead release their victim. It seems to me that this view gains if the husband appears helpless and weeping before the impending blow, as well as receiving his lost wife from the grave. Nor does the absence of the portrait features seem a fatal objection, though it is certainly not without weight, for, so far as I can judge from the photograph, Alcestis has the features of Metilia only in the death scene.

XIV. The Fragments of Sarcophagi.

25. The right end of the front of a sarcophagus in the Louvre (Clarac, II. pl. 194, No. 758, 214; Reinach, p. 82) shows Heracles followed by a doryphorus, with traces of another figure in the background, much as at the end of 22. Clarac calls this fragment Heracles and Iolaus, but in the opinion of Robert it may be part of the missing end of 23.

27. [Matz-Duhn, Ant. Bildw. in Rom, 2889.] A fragment in the Villa Pamfili shows part of the central scene in a somewhat different type. There are more figures in the background, the old man sets his left foot on the stool, and the little girl no longer kneels but is hastening toward the couch.


* Cf. on this point Robert, Sark.-Rel. III. 1, p. 32.
† West-Deutsche Zeitschr. f. Gesch. u. Kunst, 1885, 231. Cf. Arch. März. 177; Sark.-Rel. III. 1, p. 32. The first article I know only from the later references.
‡ Matz-Duhn, 3090; Wien. Vorlegebl. 1888, Taf. ix. 4a.
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29. [Matz-Duhn, 2890.] This fragment shows the children from the death scene in the usual type, and traces of the couch and the figure of the old man.

30. [Matz-Duhn, 2892.] This is a fragment of a left corner, and shows three male figures, which do not agree with any of the other reliefs; though it has been proposed to see in it Admetus hastening to meet Heracles, to which view the position at the left seems fatal, or Admetus and Pheres, which seems possible. On the corner of the left end traces of a caduceus perhaps indicate a scene like that on the Uffizi sarcophagus, but the connection of this fragment with the story is more than doubtful.

30.¹ [Matz-Duhn, 2891.] A lost fragment which seems to have contained only the figure of Admetus (d) from the first scene of 22 or 23.

31. [Matz-Duhn, 3385.] This fragment is also lost, and its connection with the Alcestis monuments must remain very doubtful, as the description shows no marked likeness to the other reliefs. It is possible that it belonged to a variation of the scene between Admetus and his parents.

31.¹ This is a fragment in the Villa Albani, which once formed the left end of a sarcophagus. Heracles leads Alcestis into the upper world from an opening in the rock, while at the left is a figure emerging from the earth, and raising the right hand in astonishment. Robert calls him the Ianitor Orci, who appears in a similar position on the Persephone sarcophagi, and on one with scenes from the life of Heracles (Sark.-Rel. III. 120). He suggests to me the Hermes on the Rinuccini relief, though the mutilation is too great for any exact comparison.

XV. [Sark.-Rel. 32.] Another relief, which very probably formed part of the cover of a sarcophagus,* is now preserved in the Palazzo Rinuccini in Florence in a badly mutilated condition, and more completely in a drawing in the Cod. Pighianus. It was first published from the drawing by Petersen (Arch. Zeit. 21, 1863, Taf. 179, 1, 2), and later was discovered by Dütschke (Ant. Bildw. in

* Robert suggests it might have belonged to 23, could it be shown that this sarcophagus was known in the sixteenth century.
Oberital. II. 314), and published from the original by him (Arch. Zeit. 33, 1875, pp. 72 ff. Taf. 9, cf. also Baumeister, Denkmüler I. 46). The fragment is only 0.55 M. long and 0.21 M. high, according to Dütschke, and is broken at both ends.

At the left stands Heracles, the lion's skin over his left arm; the head and much of the right side have been restored, but even in the Pighianus the right leg and lower right arm are missing. It seems probable that the right hand rested on the club. He looks toward the right after a woman (Alcestis) in long chiton, and mantle which covers her head and is drawn around the face without covering it. She seems to be moving slowly and with bowed head toward the right. In the drawing the scene is completed by the addition on the left of Hermes,* who stands in the entrance to a cavern, and by his gesture seems to dismiss Heracles and Alcestis.

The next scene to the right is clearly separated by a column, which stands in front of the veiled Alcestis. Here we have a group of five figures. On the right a woman in long chiton and with the mantle over her head is gently urged toward the left by another woman. This group is evidently that of a bride supported by the nymphaeutria. The husband in this scene is a youthful figure, nude but for the chlamys over his back, who while moving toward the bride, turns away his face and grasps her right hand with his left. In the background, between the husband and wife, is a youthful figure clad in a long chlamys and holding an inverted torch, who is turning his back on the newly wedded pair, but looks over his shoulder toward the fifth figure. This is a young man, of much the same size and general appearance as the husband. He stands with his back to the spectator, his left elbow resting on the top of the pillar, and his right arm partly extended, while with the hand he seems to beckon to one of the figures at the right. His chlamys is gathered over the right arm at the elbow.

Petersen (Arch. Zeit. 21, 116) explained this scene as the marriage of Admetus and Alcestis, the unhappy issue of which is sug-

* Dütschke claims that all to the left of the figure of Heracles is due to the combination by the artist of Pighianus of two distinct reliefs. In opposition to this, cf. Robert, Arch. März. p. 174¹, who speaks with authority on this point.
gested by Hymenaeus, who turns away and reverses his torch. To this Dilthey (Annali d. Inst. 1869, p. 24) added the ill-omened use of the left hand by Admetus. The fifth figure according to Petersen is the nymphagogus, who brings to Admetus the tidings of the evil omen sent by Artemis. Dütschke accepts this view in most particulars, but calls the figure to the left Hermes, and sees in his gesture a sign to Hymenaeus to return, as with the left hand the god points to the rescue of Alcestis in token of the ultimate happiness of the newly wedded pair. Against this last interpretation may be urged the uncertainty as to the exact direction and intention of the gestures of this so-called Hermes, whose relation to his fellow god is by no means distinct in the reproductions; but the most serious objection is the total absence of an attribute, which seems to me to exclude at once this identification. Robert also accepts the view that this scene is the marriage, and his interpretation of the other figures has much to commend it. The evil fate is indicated by the ill-omened use of the left hand, from which Admetus, suddenly aware of his mistake, turns his face in terror, while his nymphagogus by his gesture expresses his horror. The same emotion is shown by the turning away of the torch-bearer, who is not necessarily Hymenaeus, and this act is accompanied by a further sign of the ill-will of the gods in the inverted torch. These signs have been substituted by the artist for the traditional coil of snakes. Dissel's interpretation of this scene is entirely different. He sees in it a free imitation of the last part of Euripides' play.* The youth is Hermes, who has brought Heracles and Alcestis from the lower world. Alcestis is conducted by some maid-servant to Admetus, who unwillingly extends to her his left hand, while in the background Thanatos turns away. Apart from the difficulty in finding a Hermes Psychopompos without the customary attribute, and the exceedingly doubtful type assumed for Thanatos, this view makes Heracles belong to both scenes, or else absent at the all-important moment of the return of Alcestis to Admetus. The first alternative requires us to admit Alcestis twice in a scene, where Heracles occurs only once, and the second is surely impossible.

* This idea is due to von Duhn. Cf. Dissel, l. c. 1819.
The extreme right of the relief was broken away in the time of Pighius, though his drawing shows part of a figure turned toward the right. The rest of this figure and an additional one have since been very badly restored, but we only know that there must have been still another scene, perhaps connected with the miraculous wooing, as the remains of the first figure suggest the possibility of Artemis, as on the stucco relief from the Via Latina, but behind the chariot.

The left end of the relief, in the drawing, is occupied by a scene which still waits for a satisfactory explanation. The whole style is totally unlike the rest of the sculpture; a fact which led Dütschke to his theory of contamination, though it is explained by Robert as due to the variety in the sources used by the artist. Back of the grotto in which Hermes appears, there sits on a rock a young man wearing a chlamys. He faces the left and rests his left hand on the rock and the end of a short shepherd's crook; beside the rock, looking up at the hand of his master, is a dog. Beside this man, in the background, is a young girl, her back to the spectator, and looking back at the man, while with her right hand she seems to make a gesture of dismissal. He pays no attention to her, but extends his right hand toward a boy wearing a chlamys over his back, who stands before him, holding in his left hand a bow. The boy does not look toward the man, but down over his right shoulder, toward an old woman, who stands at the extreme left and by her gestures seems to be encouraging the lad.

Petersen interpreted the scene as Admetus, who in grief at the loss of his wife has retired to his flocks, and his children, accompanied by the nurse. This does not seem very natural. The group as a whole shows no sign of sorrow, and a retirement of Admetus to the fields is a rather long step from his reluctance to enter the palace (Ale. 911 ff.). Dilthey (Ann. d. Inst. 1869, 252), while admitting that the man is Admetus, insists that the two children are Apollo and Artemis. This view has been adopted by Robert, who interprets the scene as the entrance of Apollo into the service of Admetus. The reluctant Apollo, who, according to the Delphic version, has been condemned to servitude for slaying the
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Python, and is therefore still a mere child, is urged forward by Leto, and kindly welcomed by Admetus, from whom his sister turns away in the first manifestation of that anger which was to have such a fatal termination. This explanation accounts for the representation of the divinities as children, but it must be admitted that the figure of Leto does not suggest the goddess, nor does the Delphic version seem to have enjoyed such prominence as to make its choice by an artist of a late date easily intelligible. It is probably the best interpretation yet suggested, but it certainly is by no means free from difficulties, nor can it be regarded as the final decision of a still perplexing question.

XVI. Another monument in Rome has been brought into connection with the story of Alcestis. It is an oblong basis,* which supported a column, from Porto d'Anzio, now in the Villa Albani, and published by Francke (Annali, 1879, pp. 53–58, Tav. E. 1). One side and the two ends contain a continuous scene. The front shows a woman on a bed, resting on her left elbow, in an attitude not unlike that of the dying Alcestis. In front of the couch, with her arms about the other, kneels an apparently aged woman. Behind the couch stand five mourning women, the upper part of the body nude, some tearing their hair, others with hands crossed on the breast. The two ends are said to show the ends of the couch, and at each a mourner of the same type as those on the front. Thus far there is nothing to show that the relief is more than a representation of the mourning of a mother (for so we might interpret the kneeling woman) for her daughter, or of a family for its mistress. Neither Admetus nor the children nor any other of the characters especially concerned in the death of Alcestis are even hinted at. The supposed connection with the myth is found on the fourth side. Here we see on the left Heracles en face, his right hand resting on his club, his left arm, over which hangs the lion's skin, stretched out toward a woman, on whom his gaze is directed. This woman wears a chiton and mantle, which perhaps covers the back of her head, though her entire face and neck are uncovered. With her left hand she grasps the left hand of the hero, and her

* Size 0.22 M. by 0.14 M. The height of the fragment is 0.39 M.
right seems to be touching his face. Francke thought that the original artist had here represented Admetus, but that the copyist had changed the scene for his own purpose, which was to show the love felt for the dead woman, under the types used for a well-known myth. Dissel objects to this, and sees in the last scene Alcestis resisting and rebuking Heracles for an attempt to unveil her. Considering the deference shown by Heracles toward his prize in the other representations, such an interpretation of this relief and of the end of the Florentine sarcophagus (E) seems scarcely warranted. The gestures of the woman are rather those of earnest entreaty, and the group looks as if it belonged in some other story of Heracles. While it is possible that the scenes owe their suggestion to the Alcestis monuments, I can see no reason for believing that the sculptor was endeavoring to portray that story on this occasion.

There are several representations of Heracles and a veiled woman, which seem to be taken from this legend, though the emphasis seems rather on Heracles than on Alcestis.

XVII. Near Salona in Dalmatia in a grotto is a rock-cut tomb in the form of a sarcophagus. The front is divided into three compartments in which are represented various labors of Heracles.* On the left is the capture of Cerberus, in the centre Heracles hurries to the right, the lion's skin around his shoulders, the club in his left hand, while with his right he grasps the left wrist of a veiled woman, who seems to walk slowly after him. The attitude of Heracles is very like that in the Cerberus relief. The third relief represents a combination of the shooting of the Stymphalian birds and the plucking of the apples of the Hesperides, which the artist has accomplished by putting the birds in the tree which bears the apples.

XVIII. Walled into a tower near Smederevo in Servia is a funeral relief, which seems to me very closely related to the Alcestis representations. It is published by Kanitz (Denkschr. d. Wien.

* Literature. Steinbücher, Wiener Jahrbücher der Litteratur, 1820, Anz. Taf. I. Fig. 3; Denkschr. d. Wiener Akad. II., Carrara, De' scavi di Salona nel 1848, p. 11, Tav. VI. 17; Ib. VII., Lanza, Monumenti Salonitani inediti, p. 7, Tav. II. 1.
Akad. XLI. Röm. Stud. in Serbien p. 11, Fig. 6), who describes it as “ein an einigen Stellen beschädigtes oblonges Relief mit zwischen zwei korinthischen Säulen trefflich angeordneter und gut ausgeführter Trauererscen.” The wood-cut shows on the left a veiled woman (though the face seems uncovered) who is led toward the right by Heracles, who grasps her wrist in his right hand. He is represented nearly en face; in his left hand he holds the club, which rests on his shoulder, while the lion’s skin, or possibly a chlamys, hangs over the left arm. The rest of the relief is somewhat badly damaged, but seems to represent a couch, at the head of which (the extreme right) is a stool, on which sits a figure with the head bowed on the right hand. The right elbow and the left hand rest on the head of the couch. On the couch seems to be another figure, and there was possibly a footstool before it.* This relief in my opinion is derived from the representations of the death and return of Alcestis, though the absence of Admetus and the children would indicate that it was not so much the myth which occupied the thought of the artist, as the idea of a death and rescue of the departed.

XIX. In the following monument the relation to Alcestis is somewhat clearer. It was discovered in Tripoli, at a place called El-Amrouni about halfway between Douirat and Nalout, near the border of Tunis. Here a mausoleum was unearthed by M. Lecoy de la Marche, and a short description published by M. Philippe Berger (Rev. Arch. 1895, 1, pp. 71-83). Two inscriptions, one Latin, the other Neo-punic, show that it was erected to Q. Apuleius Maximus Rideus (?) by his wife and three sons. It was decorated on the outside with two rows of reliefs, of which only one is of immediate interest. In the lower row, the west side represented Orpheus charming the wild beasts, the south side Orpheus and Eurydice, including a view of Sisyphus, Ixion, and Tantalus, while the north side furnished a new form of the rescue of Alcestis (Berger, l. c. p. 79, Fig. 3). This relief is broken longitudinally a little

* The relief is badly damaged near the centre, and the couch is very indistinct in the drawing. I consider it as like the relief from Servia, Arch.-Epigr. Mitth. aus Oester. X. 214, Fig. 6.
below the middle, but the general character of the representation is clear. On the left is Charon, pushing his boat to shore. On the end of the boat is seated a fully draped female figure (Alcestis). In front of her, on the shore, stands Heracles, the club in his left hand, and the lion's skin over his shoulder. His right hand is extended, apparently in the act of helping the woman to descend from the boat. On the right is the lower part of the gate of the lower world, and beyond this Heracles pushing Alcestis forward, up the steep incline to the world of life. The style of the reliefs is the only means of fixing the date,* and as this can scarcely be determined from the drawings published, it is not possible to give any exact statement, further than that the work evidently belongs to the late Roman time.

XX. Another relief, whose connection with this story is only known through the inscription, is now in Aquileia, where it was found in 1863. I have not seen any illustration of the relief, though a description was published by Dütschke from a sketch by Conze (Arch. Zeit. 33, p. 78).† On the left is a bearded man, perhaps with the chlamys over his left shoulder, and a staff in his left hand, who raises his right hand as if in conversation with a veiled woman at the right, who rests her bowed head on her right hand. The lower part of the relief is broken away. Apparently across the top of the stone is the inscription ADMETVS ET ALC (estis). It does not seem necessary to see in this, with Dütschke, Admetus communicating his fate to Alcestis, who is meditating her sacrifice. It rather belongs with such scenes as those on the Etruscan vases, and Admetus and Alcestis are simply typical figures to express the conjugal devotion of the pair in whose honor this funeral monument was erected.

XXI. Preller (Ber. d. Sächs Gesellsch. 1850, 241) mentions a terra-cotta relief in Weimar, brought from Rome, about the size of those of the Campanari collection, as representing the return of

---

*The inscription is not published in facsimile, nor does the editor assign any date.
† For the inscription, cf C. I. L. V. 2, 8265, where is cited Gregorutti, Le antiche lapidi di Aquileja, which I have not seen.
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Alcestis to Admetus. He gives no further description, and I do not know of any other mention of it.

XXII. It is barely possible that there may be some remote connection between this story and a sardonyx of the British Museum, representing a youthful Heracles seated in weariness on a rock, while from behind him hastens away a bearded and winged man, somewhat in the type of Thanatos. (Cf. Furtwängler in Roscher, *Lexikon*, s.v. Herakles, I. 2141–42.) I do not believe this can be Thanatos flying from his conqueror, but include it for the sake of completeness.

XXIII. It now remains to consider the most difficult of the monuments which have been referred to the story of Alcestis,—the *columna caelata* from the temple of Artemis at Ephesus.* Of the figures (probably about eight in number) which originally filled this relief only four have been preserved with any approach to completeness, though there are fragments of two more. On the right is the lower part of a seated figure, probably male. In front of him is a standing female, fully draped, and holding a somewhat indefinite object, which may possibly be a necklace or taenia; the head is missing, but seems to have been turned toward the left. The third figure is the best preserved of the group, and by the *kerykeion* is easily recognizable as Hermes, who, with head thrown back and glance directed upward, is moving toward the left. Before him, apparently just starting, is a woman, fully draped, who is in the act of fastening her mantle on the left shoulder; the head is lacking, but probably was turned to the right. The next figure is also well preserved, except for a break on the right side. It represents a youth with great wings, extending even above the head, and a great sword suspended by a band over the right shoulder. He stands with the body turned very slightly toward the left, his right hand at his side, while with the left he seems to beckon to the woman behind him, toward whom he turns a somewhat sad and thoughtful face. Beyond this figure there can be distinguished

traces of a naked shoulder and a left arm wrapped in a chlamys, so that it can fairly be inferred that here stood a man, who rested his left elbow on his side. It does not seem to me that the traces are sufficient to show whether he stood in the attitude of Heracles on the Rinuccini relief, as Robert thinks, or in a position more like that of Hermes on this column. If Smith is correct (see below), the position would be unlike either. Space will not permit a full account of all the attempts to interpret this scene, on which the last word, in my opinion, has not yet been spoken. Ernst Curtius (Arch. Zeit. 31, 1873, p. 72) in a notice of the newly discovered relief, suggested that it might be connected with a contest of the Muses before Apollo, under the leadership of Hermes, and that the youth with the sword was Agon—a view which seems to have found no adherents. Later Engelmann (Arch. Zeit. 37, p. 115) brought this scene into connection with the story of Phineus, interpreting the figure with the sword as a Boread. This view also labors under serious difficulties and has not met with any acceptance.

The view which has supplanted earlier theories, and has not as yet been driven from the field, was first published by C. Robert in "Thanatos. 39tes Programm zum Winckelmausfeste," Berlin, 1879. Here was maintained very skilfully the thesis that the relief represented the return of Alcestis. Heracles having conquered Thanatos has descended to the lower world and prevailed on the deities to reward his victory. On the right are Hades and Persephone, who have consented to the return, then Hermes ready to conduct Alcestis, who stands next to him, to the upper world, while Thanatos* by his gesture indicates the release of his victim. At the extreme left must have been Heracles quietly waiting for his prize. As to the missing figures Robert refused to make any conjecture. The view was at once denied by Kekulé (Deutsche Litteratur-Zeitung, 1880, 382), and later by Wolters (Gipsabgüsse ant. Bildw. 1242), but has been accepted by many scholars, notably Rayet, Overbeck, and Collignon. Benndorf (Ball. della Comm. Arch. 1886, p. 54) endeavored to establish the view that the Judgment of Paris was

* The interpretation of this figure as Thanatos had been suggested in Sat. Rev. 1873, 35, p. 51.
INTRODUCTION.

here represented. Zeus and Hera, Eros and Aphrodite, Hermes as conductor of the goddesses, and apparently Paris waiting at the left,—such was his interpretation, which was refuted by Robert (Arch. März. pp. 160-175), who also endeavored to overthrow the criticism of Wolters. The last explanation with which I am acquainted is that of A. H. Smith (Jour. Hell. Stud. XI. pp. 278 ff.), who sees here the sending of Pandora. From the right we have Zeus, Hera, who holds a necklace or diadem, Hermes with slightly opened mouth in the act of imparting the gift of speech to Pandora, who already fastens her mantle for departure, Eros, who here in his gloomy aspect presages the unhappy result of this gift of the gods, and finally Hephaestus, his left hand on his hip, while he leans on his stick thrust under the right shoulder. The discovery of a part of the original surface showing part of a staff is very important, but the traces are evidently too faint to be entirely conclusive. Without discussing this theory in detail, it may be said that Eros with a sword still awaits an analogy in Greek art, and that all other Greek representations of this scene show Pandora as a very stiff doll-like figure, in no way like the graceful woman of the column.

Robert's theory, however, requires a brief examination. Wolters brings against it three arguments: (1) Thanatos on representations of this time ought to be a bearded man, (2) Heracles cannot wear the simple chlamys, (3) the scene here represented does not correspond with any literary version; to which Benndorf adds (4) that the necklace in the hands of Persephone is unexplained, and Furtwängler (Roscher, Lexikon I. 2248) (5) that the presence of Heracles is due to a conjecture. Robert (Arch. März. I. c.) has answered the first four objections. (1) In the fourth century the idea of Thanatos was changing from the type of the fifth century toward that conception which later led to Erotes as symbols of death; moreover, Thanatos is certainly beardless on the cylix of Pamphaios and an altar from the Esquiline (Monum. d. Inst. XI. Tav. X. 3). It is certainly not improbable that the beginnings of a tendency, which developed during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, should be found in the later fourth century, although the fact that Thanatos is beardless on the vases more than a century earlier can scarcely weigh very
heavily, in view of the prominence of the bearded type on the Attic lecythi of the late fifth and earlier fourth centuries. That the dank and matted hair and sad expression are very appropriate to the later conception of Thanatos cannot be denied, but Robert's interpretation of this scene requires that this Thanatos be a rival of Heracles, and it seems to me very hard to imagine this youth in contest with a Heracles of the type belonging to this period. As Robert has urged in answering objection (3), the artist has combined two versions which the literature kept separate, and the sarcophagi have already made it clear that the art recognized a journey of the hero to the lower world in this connection; but the only justification for Thanatos in the Alcestis legend is that he may be conquered by Heracles, and for that purpose the type of the time of Euripides is in my opinion a necessity. As to the costume of Heracles, Robert has shown that he does appear in a chlamys on several works, but a comparison with the citations of Furtwängler (Roscher, Lexikon I. 2183) would indicate that this is confined to special occasions, where he is not engaged in any of his heroic labors. The object in the hand of "Persephone" is too indistinct to make argument (4) very weighty, though Robert's suggestion that it is a thank-offering of Alcestis seems to call for some analogy to justify it. The last objection (5) is of course enough to prevent certainty, and if the traces which Smith regards as proving the presence of a staff, cannot be reconciled with the theory that the hero leaned on his club, they alone would suffice to make the connection with Alcestis still more doubtful.

A modification of Robert's view has been suggested by Edward Robinson (Catalogue of Casts in Boston Mus. III. 526), who interprets the scene as the departure of Alcestis to the lower world with Thanatos and Hermes. Apart from the fact that this fails to explain the calm attitude of the figures at the right, whom Mr. Robinson calls the parents of Admetus, it seems difficult to account for the presence of both Thanatos and Hermes, one of whom would seem sufficient, and for the position of Hermes, who as ψυχοπομπός regularly precedes the soul on its descent to the lower world.*

* Cf. Robert, Thanatos, 40.
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For these reasons I am unable to believe that the connection of the Ephesus column with the story of Alcestis has been proved, though it must be granted that there are perhaps fewer difficulties in this interpretation than in any other. Nor is it easy to see how certainty can be reached, unless some work of art should come to light of obvious dependence on this column, and containing some clue to the missing figures.

F. Hypotheses of the Play.

The following are the hypotheses of the Alcestis which have come down to us. The text is that of Schwartz in his edition of the scholia, with one slight change.

ΤΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΔΟΣ

Απόλλων ήτόςατο παρά τῶν Μοιρῶν ὅπως ᾧ Ἀδμήτου, τελευτῶν μέλλων, παράσχει τὸν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ έκόντα τεθνηζόμενον, ἵνα ᾧν τῷ προτέρῳ χρόνῳ ζήσῃ. καὶ ὅ Ἀλκηστὶς ἥ γυνὴ τοῦ Ἀδμήτου ἔπεδωκεν ἑαυτήν, οὐδετέρου τῶν γονέων θελήσαντος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποθανεῖν. μετ’ οὗ πολὺ δὲ παύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς γενομένης Ἡρακλῆς παραγενώμενος καὶ μαθῶν παρὰ τινος θεράποντος τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀλκηστὶν ἐπορεύθη ἐπὶ τῶν τάφων καὶ τῶν Θάνατον ἀποστήμαι ποιήσας, ἔστήτη καλύπτει τὴν γυναίκα· τὸν δὲ Ἀδμήτου ἥξιον λαβόντα αὐτὴν τηρεῖν· εἰληφέναι γὰρ αὐτὴν πάλης ἄθλον ἔλεγε· μὴ βουλομένου δὲ ἐκείνου, εἶδον ἕν ἐπένθει.

Ἀλκηστὶς, ἡ Πελίου θυγάτηρ, ὑπομείνασα ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἓδον ἀνδρὸς τελεύτησι, Ἡρακλέους ἐπιθυμήσαντος ἐν τῇ Ἑθτυλίᾳ διωσάζεται, βιωσάμενον ἡ ἑνίον τοὺς χθονίους θεοὺς καὶ άφελομένου τὴν γυναίκα. παρ’ οὐδετέρῳ κείται ἡ μυθωποί.

τὸ δραμα ἐπούρθη ἢ. ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Γλαυκίνου ἠρχόντος ὀλυμπιάδος τε ἐτεὶ β. πρῶτος ἦν Σοφοκλῆς, δεύτερος Εὔριπίδης Κρήστος τὸν Ἀλκμέιοι τῷ διὰ Ψωφίδος Τιθέμενο Ἀλκηστίδα. εἰσε ἡχορήγει. τὸ δὲ στράμα κωμικώτεραν ἔχει τὴν καταστροφήν.

1 <αὐτοῦ> was inserted by the ed.
Η μεν σκηνή τοῦ δράματος ὑπόκειται εἰς Φεραῖς, μηδὲ πόλει τῆς Θεσσαλίας· ὁ δὲ χορός συνέστηκεν ἐκ τινῶν πρεσβυτῶν ἐντοπίων, οὐ [καὶ] παραγίνονται συμπαθήσοντες ταῖς Ἀλκήστιδος συμφοραῖς. προλογίζει δὲ Ἄπόλλων.

τὸ δὲ δράμα ἐστὶ σατυρικώτερον ὅτι εἰς χαρὰν καὶ ἱδονὴν καταστρέφει [παρὰ τοῖς τραγικοῖς] ἐκβάλλεται ως ἀνοίκεια τῆς τραγικῆς ποιήσεως ὁ τε Ὁρέστης καὶ Ἡ Ἀλκήστις, ὡς ἐκ συμφορᾶς μὲν ἀρχόμενα, εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν (δὲ) καὶ χαρὰν λήξαντα, (ἀ) ἐστὶ μᾶλλον κωμῳδίας ἐχόμενα. (πολλὰ δὲ τοιαύτα παρὰ τοῖς τραγικοῖς.)
CRITICAL SIGNS AND ABBREVIATIONS.

$B = \text{Codex Vaticanus 909.}$
   $B^1 = \text{the first hand, } b = \text{the second hand.}$
$L = \text{Codex Laurentianus 32, 2.}$
   $L^1 = \text{the first hand, } l = \text{the second and third hands.}$
$P = \text{Codex Palatinus 287.}$
   $P^1 = \text{the first hand, } p = \text{a later hand.}$
$a = \text{Codex Parisinus 2713.}$
   $a^1 = \text{the first hand, } a^2 = \text{the second hand, } a^3 = \text{several later hands.}$

$C = \text{Codex Havnicensis 417.}$
$c = \text{Codex Laurentianus 31, 10.}$
$d = \text{Codex Laurentianus 31, 15.}$

$S$ indicates a reading which is common to both $L$ and $P$, and hence was found in their common source.

$r$ stands for \textit{reliqui libri}.

$*$ denotes the erasure of a letter or an accent.
ΕΤΡΙΠΙΔΟΤ ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΣ.
ΤΑ ΤΟΤ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ
ΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ
ΧΟΡΟΣ
ΘΕΡΑΠΑΙΝΑ
ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΣ
ΑΔΜΗΤΩΣ
ΕΥΜΗΛΟΣ
ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ
ΦΕΡΗΣ
ΘΕΡΑΙΩΝ
ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΣ.

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ.

"Ω δόματ' Ἀδμήτει', ἐν οἷς ἔτην ἔγω
θῆσαν τράπεζαν αἰνέσαι θεὸς περ ὠν.
Ζεῦς γὰρ κατακτᾶσ παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν αἶτιος
Ἄσκληπιόν, στέρνουσιν ἐμβαλὼν φλόγα.
οὐ δὲ χολοθεῖς τέκτονας Δίου πυρὸς
κτείων Κύκλωπας· καὶ με θητεύειν πατήρ
θυντῷ παρ’ ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἄποιν’ ἤμακασεν.
ἐλθὼν δὲ γαῖαν τὴν ἐβουφόρβουν ξένω,
καὶ τῶν’ ἐσωφόν οἴκον ἐς τόδ’ ἡμέρας.
ὀσίον γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ὀσίος ὁ ἐτύγχανον
παιδὸς Φέρητος, ὃν θανεῖν ἐρρυσάμην
Μοῖρας δολώσας· ἦνεσαν δὲ μοι θεὰι
"Ἀδμητον ζῇν τὸν παραντικ’ ἐκφυγεῖν,
ἄλλον διαλλάξαντα τοῖς κάτω νεκρών.
πάντας δ’ ἐλέγξας καὶ διεξελθὼν φίλους,
[πατέρα γεραιᾶν θ’ ἡ σφ’ ἔτικτε μητέρα,]
οὐχ ἢπε, πλῆν γυναικὸς, ὁστὶς ἤθελε
θανὼν πρὸ κείνου μηκέτ’ εἰσοράν φάος·

3 κατ’ ἀκτᾶς B. 8 δὲ γαῖαν] δ’ ἐς ἀλαν Athenagoras Legat, pro Christ. c. 21 (p. 25 Steph.). 9 ἐς τὸδ’ ατ’ ἐστὶ δ’ B; (with ἐς τὸδ’ added by b) eis τόδ’ S. 11 ἐρρυσάμην S] ἐρρυσάμην τ. 12 δηλώσας B. 13 παρ’ αὐτικ’ B. 15 ἐλέγξας B (but with an acute accent and γ written above the θε by B'). 16 rejected as spurious by W. Dindorf. 17 ὁστὶς Reiske] ἠτὶς MSS. 18 θανὼν Reiske] θανεῖν MSS. | μηδ’ ἐτ C.
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ

η νῦν κατ' οίκους ἐν χεροῖν βαστάζεται
ψυχορραγοῦσα: τῇδε γάρ σφ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
θανείν πέπρωται καὶ μεταστήναι βίου.
ἐγὼ δὲ, μὴ μίασμά μ' ἐν δόμους κίχη,
λείπω μελάθρων τῶνδε φιλτάτην στέγην.
(ἡδη δὲ τόνδε Θάνατον εἰσορῶ πέλας,
ιερέα θυινόντων, ὃς νῦν εἰς "Αἰδοὺ δόμους
μέλλει κατάξειν: σύμμετρος δ' ἀφίκετο,
φρουρῶν τόδ' ἡμαρ ὃ θανεῖν αὐτὴν χρεῶν.

ΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ.

α ᾗ:
τί σὺ πρὸς μελάθρων; τί σὺ τῇδε πολεῖς,
Φοῖβ'; ἀδικεῖς αὖ τιμᾶς ἐνέρων
[ἀφοριζόμενος καὶ καταπαίων.]
οὐκ ἡρκεσέ σοι μόρον Ἀδμήτου
diakolūsai, Μοῖρας δολίῳ
σφήλαντε τέχνη; νῦν δ' ἐπὶ τῇδ' αὖ
χέρα τοξήρη φρουρεῖσ ὀπλύσας,
η τόδ' ὕπεστὶ πόσιν ἐκλύσασ' ἀὐτὴν προθανεῖν Πελίου παῖς.

ΛΠ. θάρσει: δίκην τοι καὶ λόγους κεδνοὺς ἔχω.
ΘΑ. τί δήτα τόξων ἔργον, εἰ δίκην ἔχεις;

22 κιχή BP. 23 λίπω B | τῶνδε φιλτάτην Schol. on Hippiol. 1437] τῶνδε
φιλτάτων B α τῇδε φιλτάτην S. 25 ιερ with epó written above the epή L
ιερή r. ἱερὰ Monk. 26 σύμμετρος P (and Nauck ex conj.)] συμμέτρος r. |
φιλτάτων Wecklein] θανάτων MSS. 27 ἡμαρ L] ἡμαρ r. 28 ΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ] Π
has ἡδή (= χάρων) here, and the same abbreviation prefixed to 43, 45, etc.;
but the same MS. has ἡδά (= θάνατος) prefixed to 39 and 72. 29 αὖ πρὸς] σοι πρὸς B.
31 is not in P, and was rejected by Nauck without knowledge of that fact.
33 diakolūsai Pl u] diakolūsai r. 37 αὐτή u]
αὐτὴν r. 38 τοι] τε S.
ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΣ.

ΑΠ. σύνηθες αἰεὶ ταῦτα βαστάζειν ἔμοι. 40
ΘΑ. καὶ τοὺς ἑ γ’ οὐκοις ἐκδύκως προσωπελεῖν.
ΑΠ. φίλον γὰρ ἀνδρὸς συμφοραῖς βαρύνομαι.
ΘΑ. καὶ νοσφείεις με τοῦδε δευτέρου νεκροῦ;
ΑΠ. ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ἐκεῖνον πρὸς βιὰν σ’ ἀφειλόμην.
ΘΑ. πῶς οὖν ὑπὲρ γῆς ἐστὶ καὶ κάτω χθονός;
ΑΠ. δάμαρτ’ ἀμείβας, ἢν σὺ νῦν ἥκεις μέτα.
ΘΑ. καπάξομαι γε νερτέραν ὑπὸ χθόνα.
ΑΠ. λαβῶν ἵθ’ οὐ γὰρ οἶδ’ ἄν εἰ πείσαι σε.
ΘΑ. κτείνειν γ’ ἄν ἄν χρῆ; τοῦτο γὰρ τετάγμεθα.
ΑΠ. οὐκ, ἄλλα τοὺς μέλλουσι θάνατον ἀμβαλεῖν.
ΘΑ. ἔχω λόγον δὴ καὶ προθυμίαν σέθεν.
ΑΠ. ἔστ’ οὖν ὅπως Ἀλκηστίς ἐς γῆρας μόλοι;
ΘΑ. οὐκ ἔστιν τιμαῖς κἀμὲ τέρπεσθαι δόκει.
ΑΠ. οὕτω πλέον γ’ ἄν ἣ μίαν ψυχὴν λάβοις.
ΘΑ. νέων φθινώντων μείζων ἀρνυμαι γέρας.
ΑΠ. καὶ γραῦς ὀληταί, πλουσίως ταφήσεται.
ΘΑ. πρὸς τῶν ἐχόντων, Φοῖβε, τὸν νόμον τιθεῖς.
ΑΠ. πῶς εἰπτα; ἀλλ’ ἢ καὶ σοφὸς λέληθας αὖ;
ΘΑ. ὁνομάτ’ ἄν οἶς πάρεστι γηραιοὶ θανεῖν.
ΑΠ. οὐκοι δοκεῖ σοι τὴνδε μοι δοῦναι χάριν;
ΘΑ. οὐ δὴ’ ἐπίστασαι δὲ τοὺς ἐμοὺς τρόπους.
ΑΠ. ἐχθροὺς γε θυντοῖς καὶ θεοῖς στυγμοῦνεον.

40 aiei L] aie r. 41 ekdiwos S] evikos r. 44 blav B a l] bia S. 45 εὔτηκ’
oe B (corrected by b). | κατὰ χθονὸς P. 46 μετὰ L,a] μετὰ r. 47 νερτέραν
P I] νερτέρων r. 48 πείσμαι B. 49 γ’ ἐν r | χρῆ Schaefer] χρῆ MSS.
53 δοκεῖ B. 54 οὕτω B (corrected by b). 55 γέρας] κλέος. 57 τιθεῖς
τιθεῖς P] τίθης r. 58 ἢ P I] ἢ r. | λεληθας L] λεληθας B (with πεφικας
written above by B3] ἐκλήθησας P πεφικας α (with λεληθας written above by a3).
59 ὁνομάτ’ L (with o rewritten, and o written over the τ and a over the αι by l)]
ὁνομάτ’ P a ὁνομάτ’ B ὁνομάτ’ l. | oes S] οὺς B a. | γηραιοὶ W. Dindorf] γηραιοὺς
MSS. 60 οὐκ οὖν α.
ΘΑ. οὐκ ἂν δύναιον πάντ' ἔχειν ἃ μὴ σε δεῖ.

ΑΠ. ἢ μὴν σὺ κλαύσῃ καῖπερ ὁμός ὦν ἀγαν. τοῖς Φέρητος εἰσὶ πρὸς δόμους ἀνήρ, Ἐυρυσθέως πέμφαντος ὕππειον μέτα ὄχημα Θρήκης ἐκ τόπων δυσχεμέρων, ὦς δὴ ἤξεωθεῖς τοίσδ' ἐν Ἀδμήτου δόμους βία γυναῖκα τήνδε σ' ἐξαιρήσεται.

[κοῦθ ἢ παρ' ἡμῶν σοι γενήσεται χάρις δράσεις θ' ὁμοίως ταῦτ', ἀπεχθῆσει τ' ἐμοί.]

ΘΑ. πόλλ' ἂν σὺ λέξας οὐδέν ἂν πλέον λάβοις. ἢ δ' οὐν γυνὴ κάπεισιν εἰς Ἀιδον δόμους. στείχῳ δ' ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὡς κατάρξουμαι ξίφει· ἰερὸς γὰρ οὕτως τῶν κατὰ χθονὸς θεῶν ὅτου τόδ' ἔγχος κρατὸς ἀγνώγη τρίχα.

ΧΟΡΟΣ.

τί πολ' ἡσυχίᾳ πρόσθεν μελάθρων;
τί σεσίγηται δόμος Ἀδμήτου;
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλων πέλασ ἢστ' οὐδεῖς,
ὄστις ἂν εἰποὶ πότερον φθιμενήν
χρῆ βασίλειαν πενθείν, ἡ ζωὸς'

64 κλαύσῃ Earle] παῦσῃ MSS. 70, 71 were rejected as spurious by W. Dindorf. 73 ἢ δ' L a] ἢ' r (with l). 74 κατάρξουμαι P (with Macrobius Sat. V. 19, 4) κατάρξουμαι τ. 75 τῶν δεῶν] τῷ θεῷ Macrobius l. l. 76 ὅτου τῶν'] ὅ τούτῳ ὅ' B ὅτῳ τῶρ Macrobius l. l. | ἀγάπει S. ΧΟΡΟΣ] χορ. was prefixed in S, ἡ μη. τ. | πρόσθεν Blomfield] πρόσθε MSS. 79 ἡμή. is prefixed in the MSS., but was rejected by Kirchhoff. [πέλασ ἢστ'] οὐδεὶς Monk] πέλασ οὐδεῖς MSS. (in L τισ has been inserted after φίλων by l). 80 εἰποὶ B a] εἰποὶ (with ἐνε' written above the ei by l) L ἐνετοὶ P. 81 χρῆ βασίλειαν πενθείν Blomfield] βασίλειαν πενθείν χρῆ MSS. (in L a has been written above χρῆ and β above πενθείν by l).
etî φῶς λεύσει Πελίου τόδε παῖς
"Αλκηστίς, ἐμοὶ πάσι τ' ἀρίστῃ
dόξασα γυνῇ
πόσιν εἰς αὐτῆς γεγενησθαι.
HMIX. κλύει τις ἡ στεναγμῶν ἡ
χειρῶν κτύπον κατὰ στέγας
ἡ γόνων ὡς πεπραγμένων;
HMIX. οὐ μᾶν οὐδὲ τις ἀμφιπόλων
στατίζεται ἀμφί πυλας.
eἵ γὰρ μετακύμιος ἄτας,
ὁ Παιάν, φανείης.
HMIX. οὐ τὰν φθιμένης γ' ἐσιώπων.
<HMIX.> νέκυς ἤδη.
HMIX. οὐ δὴ φροῦδός γ' εἶς οἶκων.
HMIX. πόθεν; οὐκ αὐχώ. τί σε θαρσύνει;
HMIX. πῶς ἄν ἔρημον . .
τάφον Ἀδμητος
κεδήν̣ς ἄν ἐπραξε γυναικός;
HMIX. πυλῶν πάροιθε δ' οὐχ ὁρῶ
πηγαίον ὡς νομίζεται
χέρνιβ' ἐπὶ φθιτῶν πυλαῖς.
<HMIX.> χαίτα τ' οὔτως ἐπὶ προθύρως
tομαῖος, ὡ δὴ νεκύων

82 λεύσει Πελίου τόδε Bothe] τόδε λεύσει (λεύσει B Π) πελίου MSS. 85 αὐτῆς Schaefer[ αὐτῆς MSS. 87 χειρῶν Nauck] χειρῶν MSS. 88 γόνων L] γόνων τ. 90 στατίζεται G. Hermann] στατίζετ' MSS. 91 ἰμιχ. is prefixed in B τ L, but not in P. | ει S] ει B ει a. 92 ναυ Mattheae] ναυ MSS. 93 οὖ τὰν Mattheae] οὖτ' ἐν MSS. | φθιμένης Monk] ἄτεμνα MSS. 94 In the MSS. the words νέκυς ἦδη (ἡδη νέκυς P, ἦδη deleted in L by l) come directly after οἶκων. Kirchhoff transposed them as in the text, and prefixed to them HMIX. | οὖ γὰρ δὴ MSS. γὰρ was rejected from the text by Kirchhoff. 96 Earle conjectured that the lacuna is after ἔρημον. 99 πηγαί' l. 100 φθιτῶν S] φθιμένου τ. 101 HMIX., which is not in the MSS., was added by Hartung. | χαίτα τ' S a] χαίτη B.
πένθει πίνυει· οὐ νεολαία
doustet χείρ γυναίκῶν.

105
HMIX. καὶ μὴν ῥόδε κύριον ἡμαρ,
HMIX. τί τόδ’ αἰνόσ;
HMIX. ὡ χρή σφε μολεῖν κατὰ γαίας.
HMIX. ἔθιγες ψυχᾶς, ἔθιγες δὲ φρενῶν.
HMIX. χρη τῶν ἁγαθῶν διακναυμένων
πενθεῖν ὅστις
χρηστῶς ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς νενόμισται.

ΧΟ. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ναυκληρίαν
ἔσθ’ ὅποι τίς αἰας
στείλας η’ Ὅυκιαν
εἰτ’ ἔφ’ ἐδρᾶσ ἀνύδρους
ἀμμωνιάδας
dυστάνου παραλύσαι
ψυχάν· μόρος γὰρ ἀπότομος
πλάθει· θεῶν δ’ ἐπ’ ἐσχάραν
ουκέτ’ ἔχω τίνα μηλοθύταν πορευθόω.
μόνος δ’ ἄν, εἰ φῶς τόδ’ ἦν
ὁμμασίν δεδορκῶς
Φοίβου παῖς, προλιπούοι’
ἡλθεν ἑδρας σκοτίων

103 πένθει S | πίνυει Elmsley] πιτνεί MSS. | οὐ Aldine] ουδὲ MSS. | before οὐδὲ Β and η have ἡμιχ., which is not found in Λ and Π. | νεολαία B Π l] νεολαία r.
105 ἡμαρ Λ] ἡμαρ r. 107 stands before 106 in Λ and Π. 106 HMIX.] χρό. Λ. 107 ἡμιχ. Β (and w2)] not in r. | χρῆν Π. 108 HMIX.] χρό Σ.
P has ἡμιχ. before the second ἐθιγες. 109 ἡμιχ. a (?)] χρό. Σ. B has no sign.
112 χρό. Β and a. S has no designation of the part. 114 Ὅυκιαν Monk] Ὅυκλας MSS. 115 εἰτ’ ἔφ’ ἐδρᾶσ ἀνύδρους ἀμμωνιάδας Nauck] εἰτ’ ἐπί τας ἀνύδρους ἀμμωνιάδας ἑδρᾶς MSS. 117 παραλύσαι Β (and w2)] παραλύσαι r. 118 ψυχάν S] ψυχῆς Β ψυχᾶς a (but w2 has changed the grave to the circumflex and written ἤν above). | ἀπότομος Blomfield] ἀποτόμος * * * B ἀπότομος B ἀπότομος r (with l). 119 ff. δ’ ἐπ’ ἐσχάραν οὐκέτ’ ἐχω tina] ἐπὶ ἐσχάρας οὐκ ἐχω ἐπὶ τίνα (ἐχω πι’ Λ) MSS. See Critical Notes. 123 ὤμμασιν Barnes] ὤμμασι MSS. 125 σκοτίας Β.
"Διδά τε πύλας.
δημαθέντας γὰρ ἀνίστη,
pρὶν αὐτὸν εἶλε Διόβολον
πλῆκτρον πυρὸς κεραυνίου.
νῦν δὲ βίου τίν ἐτ' ἐλπίδα προσδέχωμαι;
— πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τετελεσταὶ
βασιλεύσων,
pάντων δὲ θεῶν ἐτι ἐτὶ βωμοῖς
αἰμόρραντοι θυσιᾷ πληρεῖς,
οὐδὲ ἔστι κακῶν ἄκος οὐδέν.
ἀλλ' ἦδε ὁπάδων ἐκ δόμων τις έρχεται
dακρυρρουσῶσα· τίνα τύχην ἀκοῦσομαι;
πενθεῖν μέν, εἰ τι δεσπόταιοι τυγχάνει,
συγγυνωστόν· εἰ δ' ἐτ' ἐστὶν ἐμψυχος γυνὴ
eἲτ' οὖν ὅλωλεν εἰδέναι βουλοίμεθ' ἀν.

ΘΕΡΑΠΑΙΝΑ.

καὶ ζῶσαν εἴπειν καὶ θανοῦσαν ἐστὶ σοι.
ΧΟ. καὶ πῶς ἂν αὐτὸς κατθάνοι τε καὶ βλέποι;
ΘΕ. ἦδη προμωπῆς ἐστὶ καὶ ψυχορραγεῖ.
ΧΟ. ἐλπὶς μὲν οὐκέτ' ἐστὶ σύζεσθαι βίων;
ΘΕ. πεπρωμένη γὰρ ἡμέρα βιάζεται.
ΧΟ. οὐκούν ἐπ' αὐτὸν πράσσεται τα πρόσφορα;

126 ἀδίδα S ἀδίδα r. 129 πλάκτρον P (with l). 130 βλω τίν ἐτ' Hartung] τίν ἐτι βλω B τίν ἐτι βλω Α τίνα βλω S. 131 προσδέχωμαι Musgrave] προσ-δέχομαι MSS. 132 βασιλεύσιν L α] βασιλεύσι B P. 133 εἰσ' was inserted by Mekler. 135 οὐδ' S] ἀλλ' οὐδ' r. 136 χρ. is prefixed in B. | ὁπάδων P] ὁπάδως L ὁπάδων r. 140 βουλοίμηθ' ἂν L a] βουλοίμηθα r. 141 is omitted in B, but has been added by a later hand. 142 πῶς] πῶ B. | αὐτὸς Kirchhoff (?) αὐτὸς MSS. (αὐτὸς Gaisford, ὁμός Aldine,) | βλέποι L α p] βλέπει B βλέπ* P. 146 σῶσασθαι S. 148 οὐκούν Elmsley] οὐκούν B L οὐκ οὖν r. | αὐτοῖς S.
ΘΕ. κόσμος γ’ έτοιμος, ὁ σφε συνθάψει πόσις.

ΧΟ. ὁ τλῆμον, οίας οῖος ὁν ἀμαρτάνεις.

ΘΕ. οὐπω τὸδ’ οἶδε δεσπότης πρὶν ἂν πάθη.

ΧΟ. ἵστω νῦν εὐκλεῆς γε καθανουμένη
gυνῆ τ’ ἀρώστη τῶν ψ’ ἡλίῳ μακρῷ.

ΘΕ. πῶς δ’ οὐκ ἀρώστη; τίς δ’ ἐναντιώσεται
tὸ μή οὐ γενέσθαι τήν ὑπερβεβλημένην
gυναῖκα; πῶς δ’ ἄν μᾶλλον ἐνδείξατό τις
πόσιν προτιμῶσ’ ἡ Θέλουσ’ ὑπερθανέων;
καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ πᾶσ’ ἐπίσταται πόλεις·
ἀ δ’ ἐν δόμων ἔδρασε θαυμάσῃ κλύων.

ἔπει γὰρ ἧσθεθ’ ἡμέραν τὴν κυρίαν
ήκουσαν, ὑδαίνετο ποταμίου λευκὸν χρόα
ἔλουσατ’, ἐκ δ’ ἐλούσα κεδρίων δόμων
ἐσθήτα κόσμον τ’ ἐνπρεπῶς ἕσκησατο,
καὶ στάσα πρόσθεν ἐστίας κατηγξατο:
δέσποιν’, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐρχομαι κατὰ χθονός,
πανύστατον σε προσπίνωσ’ αἰτήσομαι,
tεκν’ ὀρφανεύσασα τάμα· καὶ τῷ μὲν φίλην
σύζευξον ἀλοχον, τῇ δὲ γενναῖον πόσιν.

μηδ’ ὡσπερ αὐτῶν ἡ τεκνοῦ’ ἀπόλλυμαι
θανεῖν ἀώρους παῖδας, ἀλλ’ εὐδαιμονας
ἐν γῇ πατρῷα τερπνόν ἐκπλησάι βίον.

πάντας δὲ βωμοὺς οἱ κατ’ Ἀδμήτου δόμους
προσήλθε καξέστεψε καὶ προσηγζατο,

144 ὅ] ω Β. 145 πάθη] πάθη Π πάθω ρ. The insertion of 144-5 after 149 was suggested by H. Mueller. 150 ιστῶ Β | νῦν ι[ νῦν ρ. In L the parαγραφος is prefixed to 151 and 152, so that 152 ff. are assigned to the chorus. In Π θερ. (= θεράπαινα) is prefixed to 151 and τροφ. (= τροφός) to 152. | 151 μακρῶν Β. 153 τὸ μῆ ϑο — τὴν’ Lenting] τὶ χρῆ — τὴν MSS. 157 θαυμάσῃ] θαυμάσῃ Β (with η written above η by b) θαυμάσεις L (with η written above the ης by l). 164 προσπίνωσ’ α] προσπίνωσ’ ρ (and α2). 167 ἀπόλλυται Λ.
πτόρθων ἀποσχίζουσα μυρσίνης φόβην, ἀκλαυστός ἀστένακτος, οὗ δὲ τούπιὸν κακὸν μεθίστη χρωτὸς εὐειδῆ φύσιν. κἀπετα θάλαμον ἐσπεσοῦσα καὶ λέχος, ἔνταῦθα δὴ 'δάκρυσε καὶ λέγει τάδε: ὁ λέκτρον, ἐνθα παρθένει ἐλυσ' ἔγω [κορεύματ' ἐκ τοῦδ' ἀνδρός, οὗ θυήσκοι πέρι,] χαίρ': οὔ γὰρ ἐχθαίρω σ': ἀπώλεσας δέ με μόνον: προδοῦναι γάρ σ' ὀκνοῦσα καὶ πόσιν θυήσκω. σὲ δ' ἄλλη τις γυνὴ κεκτήσεται, σώφρων μὲν οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον, εὕτυχὴς δ' ἴσως. κνυὲ δὲ προσπίνονσα, πᾶν δὲ δέμιον ὀφθαλμοτέγκτῳ διεύτει πλημμυρίδι· ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλῶν δακρύων ἐσχὲν κόρον, στείχει προνωπῆς ἐκπεσοῦσα δεμνών, καὶ πολλὰ θάλαμον ἐξίουσ' ἐπιεστράφη κάρρυπεν αὐτήν αὕτης ἐς κοῖτην πάλιν. παῖδες δὲ πέπλων μητρὸς ἐξηρτημένου ἐκλαιοῦν · ἥ δὲ λαμβάνουσ' ἐς ἀγκάλας ἡσπάζετ' ἀλλοι' ἀλλι' ἡδὸν, ὅς θανουμένη, πώντες δ' ἐκλαιοῦν οὐκέται κατὰ στέγας δέσποιναι οἰκτήροντες. ἥ δὲ δείξαν προὔτειν' ἐκάστῳ, κούτις ἤν οὗτω κακὸς δὲν οὐ προσεῖπε καὶ προσερρήθη πάλιν.

172 πάρθων B (with τ written above the π by b). | μυρσινὼν S. 173 ἄκλαυτος L. 176 'δάκρυσε Heath] δάκρυσε MSS. 178 rejected as spurious by Nauck. 180 μόνον Blomfield] μόνην MSS. 182 οὐχὶ Suidas s. v. κλέπτης. 183 κνυει S. [προσπίνονσα Elmsley] προσπίνονσα B S (in L πιτ was written at first, but has been altered to πιτ by L1) προσπίνονσα α. 184 ὀφθαλμοτέγκτῳ P (and αθ) ὀφθαλμοτέγκτῳ r. | δεῦτο S (with an erasure in P above the ο). 185 ἐσχέν Earle] εἰχὲν S εἰχὲ r. 186 πνονών ῃ B (with προ written above πνο by b). 188 αὕτην L] αὐτῆν r. 190 ἐν ἀγκάλαις S. 194 προὔτειν' B.
τοιαύτ' ἐν οἴκοις ἐστὶν 'Αδρήτου κακά. 
καὶ κατθανῶν γὰ ἀν ὀλετ'. ἐκφυγὼν δ' ἔχει 
tοσοῦτον ἄλγος οὕποθ' οὗ λελήστεται.

ΧΩ. ἡ ποιο στενάζει τουσίδ' Ἀδρητὸς κακοῖς, 
ἐσθλῆς γυναικὸς εἰ στερηθήναι σφε χρή;

ΘΕ. κλαίει γ' ἄκούων ἐν χερῶν φίλην ἐχων, 
καὶ μὴ προδοῦναι λύστεται, τἀμήχανα 
ζητῶν. φθίνει γὰρ καὶ μαραίνεται νόσῳ. 
pαρεμένῃ δὲ, χειρὸς ἀθλιον βάρος,
όμως δὲ, καίπερ σμικρῶν, ἐμπνέουσ' ἐτί, 
βλέψαι πρὸς αὐγάς βουλέται τὰς ἡλίουν. 
[ὡς οὕποτ' αὐθίς, ἀλλὰ νῦν πανύστατον 
ἀκτίνα κύκλον θ' ἡλίου προσώπεται.] 
ἀλλ' εἴμι καὶ σην ἀγγελῶ παρουσίαν·
οὐ γὰρ τὶ πάντες εὖ φρονοῦσι κοιράνοις,
ὡστ' ἐν κακοῖσιν εὑμενεῖς παρεστάναι.
σὺ δ' εἴ παλαιὸς δεσπότας ἔμοις φίλος.

HMIX. ἴδω Ζευ, τίς ἀν πῶς πᾶς πόρος κακῶν 
γένοιτο καὶ λύσις τύχας ὁ πάρεστι κοιράνοις;

HMIX. ἐξευσί τις; ἡ τέμω τρίχα, 
καὶ μέλανα στολμὸν πέπλων 
ἀμφιβαλομεθ' ἡδη;

HMIX. δῆλα μὲν, φίλοι, δῆλα γ', ἀλλ' ὀμως

197 κατθανῶν γ' second Hervagian edition] κατθανῶν τ' MSS. | τ' ἔχει P. 
198 οὕποθ' οὗ Nauck) οὕποτ' οὗ L, α οὗ ποτ' οὗ B, L. οὗ ποτ' οὗ α2 οὕποτε P. | λήσται L. 
199 τουσίδ'] τούσιδ' B a τούσιν S. 200 ei S] ζ B (and α2) ζ ζ | σφε S, a] γε B. 
205 The punctuation in the text was suggested by F. D. Allen. 
207, 208 That these lines are an interpolation from Ileucba 411, 412 was pointed 
out by Valckenaer. 211 παρεστάναι P παστάναι L παρεστάναι L. B a P 
assign 213–43 to the chorus; L assigns 213–17 to the chorus, 218–25 to the 
θεράπτανα, and 226–43 to the chorus. The assignment in the text follows Week- 
lein. 213 ἀν πῶς πᾶ B] ἀν πῶς πᾶ L ἀν πᾶ a. 215 τέμω 
G. Hermann] τευκω MSS. 218 γ'] δ B.
θεώσων εὐχόμεσθα. θεῶν γὰρ δύναμις μεγίστην.

ΧΟ. ὅναξ Παιάν,
ἐξευρέ μηχανάν τιν Ἀδμήτω κακῶν,
pόριζε δὴ πόριζε· καὶ πάρος γὰρ
tοῦτ’ ἐφηύρες, [καὶ νῦν]
λυτήριος ἐκ θανάτου γενοῦ,
φόνιον δ’ ἀπόπαυσον "Αἰδαν.

HMIX. παπαῖ . . . . . . . . ἀντιστρ.
ὁ παῖ Φέρητος, οἷα πράξεις δάμαρτος σᾶς στερεῖ.

HMIX. ἀρ’ ἀξία καὶ σφαγᾶς τάδε
καὶ πλέων ἡ βρόχῳ δέρην
† οὐρανίῳ πελάσσαι;

HMIX. τὰν γὰρ οὗ φίλαν ἄλλα φιλτάταν
γυναῖκα κατθανοῦσαν εἰν ἦματι τῶδ’ ἐπόψει.

ΧΟ. ἵδον ἰδοῦ,
ἡδ’ ἐκ δόμων δὴ καὶ πόσις πορεύεται.
βόασον ὧ στέναξον, ὧ Φεραία
χθῶν, [τὰ] ἀρισταν
γυναῖκα μαρανομέναν νόσῳ
χθόνιον κατὰ γὰς παρ’ "Αἰδαν.

219 εὐχόμεσθα αὶ δ (Flor. 31, 15) ἐν εὐχόμεσθα Π. εὐχόμεσθα B | δύνα-
μις B] ἀ δύναμις r | μεγίστη B L. P'] μεγίστα a μεγίστα C d. 220 ὅναξ B.
221 μηχανάν τιν’ S] μηχανὴν τιν’ οἱ μηχανὴν ἦν τοῦ B. 223 τοῦτ’ Μονκ] τοῦτ’
MSS. | [καὶ νῦν] was bracketed by Monk as an interpolation. 225 δ’] τ’ S. | "Αἰδαν Χεθα] ἄδαν MSS. 226 παπαὶ ὧ B α] παὶ παὶ φεῦδο φεῦδο ὥ ὥ S. The
lacuna after παπαὶ was first marked by W. Dindorf. 227 οἷα πράξεις Jacobs]
ὁ’ ἐπραξάς MSS. | σάσ] σῆς P τῆς σῆς S L | στερεῖς Μονκ] στερεῖς MSS. 228 ἀρ’
G. Hermann] αἱ αἱ P αἱ αἱ L αἱ αἱ αἱ ἦβ αἱ αἱ B ἦβ αἱ αἱ α. 229 καὶ is omitted in
α | πλέων S. 230 τ’ οὐρανῷ] see Critical Notes. | πελάσσαι Erfurdt] πελάσαι
MSS. 231 φιλτάτην S. 232 εἰν W. Dindorf] εὖ MSS. | ἦματι B L P]
ἀματὶ αὶ αὶ ἄματι α. | τῶδε γ’ δεῖ S. 233 ἰδοὺ ἰδοῦ was not in S. 234 στε-
ναξον ὧ βόασον (βόασον P) ὧ S. 235 [τὰ] rejected as an interpolation by
Erfurdt. 237 χθόνιον κατὰ γὰς Weil] κατὰ γὰν χθόνιον MSS. (but γὰς B).
"Αἰδαν] ἄδαν S ἄδαν r.
οὐποτε φήσω γάμον εὐφραίνειν
πλέον ἡ λυπείν, τοῖς τε πάροιθεν
tekμαιρόμενος καὶ τάσδε τύχας
λεύσσων βασιλέως, ὃστις ἀρίστης
ἀπλακῶν ἀλόχου τῆςδ' ἀβίωτον
tὸν ἐπείτα χρόνον βιοτεύσει.

ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΣ.

"Αλιε καὶ φάος ἀμέρας,
oὐράνιαι τε δίναι νεφέλας δρομαῖον."  στρ.

ΑΔΜΗΤΟΣ.

ὅρα σὲ καμέ, δύο κακῶς πεπραγότας,
oὐδὲν θεοὺς δράσαντας ἀνθ' ὀτον θανῆ.

ΑΛ.  γαϊά τε καὶ μελάθρων στέγαι
νυμφίδιοι τε κοίται πατρῴᾶς Ἰωλκοῦ.

ΑΔ.  ἔπαιρε σαυτῆν, ὦ τάλαινα, μη' προδῷς.
λίσσου δὲ τοὺς κρατοῦντας οἰκτίραι θεοὺς.

ΑΛ.  ὀρῶ δίκωπον ὀρῶ σκάφος [ἐν λίμνᾳ],

υεκύων δὲ πορθμεῦς
ἐχὼν χέρ' ἐπὶ κοντῷ Χάρων μηδὴ καλεῖ· τί μέλλεις;
ἐπείγον· σὺ κατείργεις. τάδε τοί με
σπερχόμενος ταχύνει.

239 πάροιθεν L ἔγραφεν τ. 241 λεύσσων] λεύσσων καὶ S (but in L καὶ has been deleted by l). | ὃστις] in L the τίς has been deleted. 242 ἀπλακῶν Wakefield] ἀμπλακῶν S ἀμπλακῶν r (in B λ is a correction by B1 from some other letter). 244 ἀμέρας S. 247 θανίων L. 249 νυμφίδια S | 252 ὀρῶ before σκάφος has been erased in L. | [ἐν λίμνᾳ] omitted in the Aldine ed., bracketed by Prinz. 254 χέρ' Aldine] χέρ' MSS. 256 τάδε τοι με B a] τάδ' ἑτοιμα S.
ΑΔ. οὐμοι, πικράν γε τήνδε μοι ναυκληρίαν ἐλεξας. ὃ δύσδαιμον, οία πάσχομεν.

ΑΔ. ἁγει μ' ἁγει μέ τις, οὐκ ὅρας; νεκύων ἐσ αὐλὰν ὑπ' ὄφρυσι κυνανγέσι βλέπων, πτερωτὸς Ἀιδας. τί ῥέξεις; ἄφες. οἰαν ὠδὸν ἀ δει-λαοτάτα προβαίνω.

ΑΔ. οἰκτράν φιλοσω, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μάλιστ' ἐμοί καὶ παισών, οἷς δὴ πένθος ἐν κοινῷ τόδε.

ΑΔ. μέθετε μέθετε μ' ἡδη, κλίνατ', οὐ σθενω ποσίν; πλησίον Ἀιδας. σκοτία δ' ἐπ' οἴσοις νὺξ ἐφέρπει. τέκνα, τέκν' οὐκέτι δὴ οὐκέτι μάτηρ σφῶν ἔστιν. χαίροντες, ὃ τέκνα, τόδε φαὸς ὀρϑῶν.

ΑΔ. οὐμοι· τὸδ' ἐπος λυπρῶν ἀκοῦω καὶ παντὸς ἐμοὶ θανάτου μεῖζον. μὴ πρὸς [σε] θεῶν τλῆς με προδοῦναι, μὴ πρὸς παιδῶν οὐς ὀρφανεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀνα τόλμα· σοῦ γὰρ φθιμένης οὐκέτ' ἄν εἰην· ἐν σοι δ' ἡμῖν καὶ ζῆν καὶ μη· σοῦ γὰρ φιλίαν σεβόμεσθα.

ΑΛ. Ἄδμηθ', ὅρας γὰρ τάμα πράγμαθ' ὡς ἔχει, λέξαι θέλω σοι πρὶν θανεῖν ἄ βουλομαι.
ἐγὼ σε πρεσβεύουσα κάντε τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς καταστήσασα φῶς τόδ' εἰσορανθήματος καὶ δώμα ναίειν ὀλβίον τυραννίδι.
ουκ ἡθέλησα ξῆν ἀπουσπασθεῖσα σου σὺν παιδὶ ὀρφανοῖς, οὐδ' ἐφεασάμην, ἣβης ἔχουσα δῶρ', ἐν οἷς ἐτερπόμην.
καίτου σ', ὁ φύσας χῇ τεκόουσα προῦδος, καλὼς μὲν αὐτοῖς ἵκαταθανεῖν ἥκον βίον, καλὼς δὲ σῶσαι παῖδα κεῦκλεώς θανεῖν, μόνος γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἤσθα, κοῦτις ἐλπὶς ἢν σοῦ καθανόντος ἀλλὰ φιτύσεων τέκνα.
καγώ τ' ἄν εξών καὶ σὺ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον, κοῦν ἄν μονοθείς σῆς δάμαρτος ἐστενες καὶ παίδας ὁρφανεῖς, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν θεῶν τις ἐξέπραξεν ὥσθ' οὕτως ἔχειν.
εἰεν· σὺ νῦν μοι τῶν ἀπόμυνασαι χάριν· αὐτήσουμαι γὰρ σ' ἀξίαν μὲν οὔποτε· ψυχῆς γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστι τιμιώτερον· δίκαια δ', ὡς φήσεις σὺ· τοῦστε γὰρ φιλεῖς οὐχ ἤσθον ἥ γὼ παῖδας, εἴπερ εὖ φρονεῖς· τούτους ἀνάσχοι δέσσω σαῦ τρέφων δόμων,

285 θεσαλῶν α θεσαλῶν ῥ. 288 in L above οὐδ' ἔλα ἕλε ὡς ἔχει. 289 ἔχουσα δῶρ' (so P, δῶρον τὸν) ἐν οἷς ἐτερπόμην S] ἔχουσα δῶρ ἐν οἷς ἐτερπόμην εγὼ B (but with ἔγῳ deleted, by what hand is uncertain) ἔχουσα' ἐν οἷς ἐτερπόμην ἔγῳ α. 291 see Critical Notes. 294 φιλεῖς τρέφων ῥ. 295 ζήσων B] ζῆσθαν τὸν (but in L the first hand has written ὡ above the η) with Etymol. Mag. p. 413, 9. 298 ἐξέπραξεν S] ἐπιβαίνεται B (but with ἔξ written over the ἔπ by B') εἰσεπραξεν α. 299 νῦν μοι ἐν B] μοι νῦν α ὅμοιον L δ' ἡμῶν P. 304 τρέφων Wecklein] ἔμιων MSS.
καὶ μὴ ἐπέγγυς τοῦσε μητρινὰν τέκνοις,
ήτις κακών οὐδ’ ἐμοῦ γυνὴ φθόνω
τοῖς σοῦι κάμοις παυσὶ χείρα προσβαλεῖ.
μὴ δὴνα δράσης ταῦτα γ’, αἰτοῦμαι σ’ ἐγώ.
ἐχθρὰ γὰρ ἡ ’πιοῦσα μητρινὰ τέκνοις
τοῖς πρόσθ’, ἔχιδνης οὐδὲν ἡπωτέρα.
καὶ παις μὲν ἀρσὴν πατέρ’ ἔχει πῦργον μέγαν,
[ὅν καὶ προσεᾶπε καὶ προσεπρῆθη πάλιν]
οὐ δ’, ὥ τέκνον μοι, πῶς κορενθήσει καλῶς,
τοῖς τυχοῦσα συζύγου τῷ σῷ πατρί;
μὴ σοι τῶν αἰσχρῶν προσβαλοῦσα κλήδόνα
ήβης ἐν ἀκμῇ σοῦς διαφθείρῃ γάμους.
οὐ γὰρ σε μῆτηρ οὔτε νυμφεύσει ποτὲ
οὔτ’ ἐν τόκουσι σοῦι θαρσνεῖ, τέκνον,
παροῦν’, ἵν οὐδὲν μητρὸς εὐμενέστερον.
δεὶ γὰρ θανεῖν με, καὶ τόδ’ οὐκ ἐσ ἄρισθον
οὐδ’ ἐσ τρίτην μοι νηλές ἐρχεῖαι κακόν,
ἀλλ’ αὐτικ’ ἐν τοῖς μηκέτ’ οὔσι λέγομαι.
χαῖροντες εὐφραίνονουσθε· καὶ σοὶ μὲν, πόσι,
γυναῖκ’ ἀρίστην ἐστὶ κομπάσαι λαβεῖν,
ὑμίν δὲ, παῖδες, μητρὸς ἐκπεφυκέναι.

ΧΩ. θάρσεί· πρὸ τοῦτο γὰρ λέγειν οὐχ ᾠζομαί·
δράσει τάδ’, εὔπερ μὴ φρενῶν ἀμαρτάνει.

ΛΔ. ἔσται τάδ’, ἔσται, μὴ τρέψης· ἐπεὶ σ’ ἐγὼ
καὶ ἐκομοῦν εἶχον καὶ θανοῦν’ ἐμὴ γυνὴ
μόνη κεκλησίει, κοῦτις ἀντὶ σοῦ ποτε

310 B¹ has written δ’ above the σ of ἔχιδνης. 312 rejected first by Pierson; cf. 195 and see Critical Notes. 314 τοῖς Reiske] ποῖς MSS. 318 σοιὶ ταρσνεῖ τέκνον S] τοῦι σοιὶ ταρσνεῖ r. 320 ἐς L] εἰς r. 321–22 are omitted in the text of L, but have been added by L¹ in the margin. 322 νηλές Hoefer] μηνὸς MSS. 326 οὐχ ᾠζομαί B, and a¹] οὐ χάζομαι S (and a² and a³). 327 ἠμπερ and ἀμαρτάνῃ S. 329 ἐμὴ] ἐμοῦ a.
τόνδ’ ἀνδρα νύμφη Θεσσαλίς προσφέρεγξεται.
οὐκ ἐστὶν οὐτῶς οὔτε πατρὸς εὐγενοῦς
οὐτ’ εἰδος ἄλλως εὐπρεπής οὔτω γυνή.
ἄλις δὲ παίδων· τῶν’ ὄνησιν εὐχομαι
θεοὺς γενέσθαι· σοῦ γὰρ οὐκ ἄνημεθα.
οὕσω δὲ πένθος οὐκ ἐτήσιον τὸ σὸν,
ἀλλ’ ἔστ’ ἂν αἰών οὐμὸς ἀντέχῃ, γιναί,
στυγῶν μὲν ἡ μ’ ἐτικτεν, ἐχθαίρων δ’ ἐμὸν
πατέρα· λόγῳ γὰρ ἦσαν οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι,
σὺ δ’ ἀντιδοῦσα τὴς ἐμῆς τὰ φίλτατα
ψυχῆς ἑσώσας. ἀρά μοι στένειν πάρα
τοιάσθ’ ἀμαρτάνοντι συξύγου σέθειν;
παῦσω δὲ κώμως συμποτῶν θ’ ὀμιλίας
στεφάνους τε μοῦσαν θ’, ἡ κατείχ’ ἐμοὺς δόμους.
οὐ γὰρ ποτ’ οὔτ’ ἂν βαρβίτου θίγωμ’ ἐτι
οὔτ’ ἂν φρέν’ ἐξαίρομι πρὸς Δίβουν λακεῶν
αὐλῶν· σὺ γὰρ μου τέρψιν ἐξείλου βίον.
[σοφὴ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων δέμας τὸ σὸν
ἐκασθὲν ἐν λέκτροισιν ἐκταθῆσεται,
ὁ προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας
ὁνομα καλῶν σὸν τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις
δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν,
ψυχρὰν μὲν, ὄμια, τέρψιν, ἀλλ’ ὄμως βάρος
ψυχῆς ἀπαντλοῖην ἂν. ἐν δ’ ὀνείρασι
φοιτῶσά μ’ εὐφραίνοις ἂν: ἤδυ γὰρ φίλοις
καὶ νυκτὶ λεύσσειν χῶντιν’ ἂν παρῆ τρόπον.]
ei δ’ Ὀρφέως μοι γλώσσα καὶ μέλος παρῆν,

333 εὐπρεπῆς οὔτω Wecklein] εὐπρεπεστάτη B a εὐπρεπεστάτη S (in P ἐκ is
written over an erasure). Perhaps ἐπερίπτεις οὔτω is to be preferred. See Critical
Notes. 337 οὐμὸς B. 344 κατείχεν ἐμοὺς B. 346 εξάρωμ S. 348–56 I have
 wart ἡ κόρην Δήμητρος ἡ κεῖνης πόσιν ὕμνουσι κηλήσαντά σ' εἴς Ἂδιον λαβέων, κατήλθον ἄν, καὶ μ' οὖθ' ὁ Πλοῦτωνος κύων οὖθ' οὔπλ κόπῃ ψυχοπομπός ἀν Χάρων ἐσχεν, πρὶν ἐς φῶς σὸν καταστήσαι βίων. ἀλλ' οὖν ἐκείσε προσδόκα μ', ὅταν θάνω, καὶ δῶμ' ἐτοίμαζ', ὃς συνοικήσουσά μοι. ἐν ταῖσιν αὐταῖς γάρ μ' ἐπισκήψω κέδροις σοι τούσδε θεῖναι πλευρά τ' ἐκτείναι πέλας πλευροῦσι τοῖς σοῖς· μηδὲ γάρ θανῶν ποτε σοῦ χωρίς εἰνα τῆς μόνης πιστῆς ἐμοί.

XO. καὶ μὴν ἑγὼ σοι πένθος ὡς χιλιαῖον χιλιω λυπρῶν συνοίσω τήσδε· καὶ γὰρ ἀξία.

ΑΛ. ὁ παῖδες, αὐτοὶ δὴ τάδ' ἐσθηκοῦσατε πατρὸς λέγοντος μὴ γαμεῖν ἀλλην τινὰ γνωάκερε' ἐφ' ὕμνω μηδ' ἀτιμάσεων ἐμε.

ΑΔ. καὶ νῦν γέ φημι, καὶ τελευτήσω τάδε.

ΑΛ. ἐπὶ τούσδε παῖδας χειρὸς εἴς ἐμῆς δέχον. 375

ΑΔ. δέχομαι, φίλον γε δῶρον ἐκ φίλης χερός.

ΑΛ. σὺ νῦν γενοῦ τοῦσδ' ἀντ' ἐμοῦ μήτηρ τέκνοις.

ΑΔ. πολλή μ' ἀνάγκη, σοῦ γ' ἀπεστερημένοις.

ΑΔ. ὁ τέκν', ὦτε ζην χρήν μ', ἀπέρχομαι κάτω.

ΑΔ. οὔμοι, τί δράσω δῆτα σοῦ μονούμενος;

ΑΔ. χρόνος μαλάξει σ'· οὐδὲν ἐσθ' ὁ καθανάνων.

ΑΔ. ἄγου με σὺν σοὶ πρὸς θεῶν ἄγου κάτω.

358 ὅστ' ἡ Reiske] ως τὴν MSS. 362 ἐσχεν Lenting] ἐσχον MSS. 372 τινα] ποτὲ S. 376 This verse is not in P, and in L is not in the text, but has been added in the margin by L. Hence in P 375 and 377 are given to Alcestis, and in L the lines which belong to Alcestis are assigned to Admetus and those of Admetus to her all the way down to 391. 378 μ' Monk] γ' MSS. 379 χρήν μ' c] χρήν μ' B a μ' ἐχρήν L (in P μ' ἐχρήν has been written by P over an erasure above ἀπέρχομαι).
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ

ΑΛ. ἀρκούμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ προθυμήσκοντες σέθεν.
ΑΔ. ὁ δαίμων, οίας συζύγου μ' ἀποστέρεις.
ΑΛ. καὶ μὴν σκοτεινὸν ὦμμα μου βαρύνεται.
ΑΔ. ἀπωλόμην ἄρ', εἰ μὲ δὴ λείψεις, γύναι.
ΑΛ. ὡς οὐκέτ' οὔσαν οὐδὲν ἂν λέγοις ἐμὲ.
ΑΔ. ὀρθοῦν πρόσωπον, μὴ λίπης παιδὰς σέθεν.
ΑΛ. οὐ δὴθ' ἐκοῦσά γ'. ἀλλὰ χαίρετ', ὁ τέκνα.
ΑΔ. βλέψων πρὸς αὐτοῦς βλέψων. ΛΛ. οὐδὲν εἰμ' ἐτι. 390
ΑΔ. τί δράς; προλείπεις; ΛΛ. χαῖρ'. ΛΔ. ἀπωλόμην τάλας.
ΧΟ. βέβηκεν, οὐκέτ' ἐστὶν Ἀδμήτου γυνῆ.

ΕΤΜΙΛΟΣ.

лат μου τύχασ. μαῖα δὴ κάτω
βέβακεν, οὐκέτ' ἐστιν, ὁ
πάτερ, υφ' ἀλῶ.

προλιποῦσα δ' ἀμὸν βίον

DEFINED通りσεν τλάμων.

ἔδε γαρ ἔδε βλέφαρόν
καὶ παρατόνους χέρας.

ὑπάκοισον ἄκουσον, ὁ μάτερ, ἀντιάξω σ'.

ἐγώ σ', ἐγώ, μᾶτερ,
...

καλοῦμαι ὁ

σὸς ποτὶ σοὶ σιν πίτνων στόμασιν νεοσοσῶς.


MSS. 399 χέρας α] χέρας B χέρας S. 400 ἀντιάξω σ' Monk]

ἀντιάζω MSS. 401 ἐγώ σ' ἐγώ μάτηρ P] ἐγώ σ' σ' σ' ἐγώ, μᾶτερ,

ἐγώ B α. 402 ὁ S] σ' ὁ τ. 403 πίτνων α] πίτνων τ] στόμασιν Barnes] στό-

μασι MSS.
ΔΔ. τὴν οὐ κλύονσαν οὐδ’ ὀρῶσαν, ὡστ’ ἐγὼ καὶ σφῶ βαρείᾳ συμφορᾷ πεπλήγμεθα.

ΕΤ. νέος ἐγὼ, πάτερ, λεῖπομαι φίλας ἀντιστρ. μονόστολος τε ματρός. ὁ σχέτλια δὴ παθὼν ἐγὼ ἔργα ... σὺ τε σύγκασί μοι κοῦρα ...

συνετλασί.

... ὁ πάτερ.

ἀνόνατ’ ἀνόνατ’ ἐνύμφευσας οὐδὲ γήρως ἐβας τέλος σὺν τᾶς· ἐφθιτο γὰρ πάρος, οἰχομένας δὲ σοῦ, μάτερ, ὄλωλεν οἶκος.

ΧΟ. "Ἄδρυτ’, ἀνάγκη πάσδε συμφορὰς φέρειν· οὐ γὰρ σὺ πρῶτος οὐδὲ λούσθιος βροτῶν γυναικὸς ἐσθλῆς ἕμπλακε· γίγνωσκε δὲ ὃς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν καταθεῖν ὁφείλεται.

ΔΔ. ἐπίσταμαι γε κοῦκ ἀψων κακὸν τόδε προσέπτατ’· εἰδὼς δ’ αὐτ’ ἐτειρόμην πάλαι.

ἀλλ’ ἐκφορὰν γὰρ τοῦτο θήσομαι νεκροῦ, πάρεστε καὶ μένοντες ἀντηχῆσατε πιανάν τῷ κάτωθι ἀσπόνδῳ θεῷ.

πᾶσιν δὲ Θεοσαλῶσων δὲν ἐγὼ κρατῶ πένθος γυναικὸς τῆςδε κοινοῦσθαι λέγω κουρᾶ ἐυρήκει καὶ μελαμμέπλω στολῆ.

406 πάτερ λεῖπομαι S] λεῖπομαι πάτερ τ. 407 τὸ S] not in τ. 409 ff. the lacunas were indicated as in the text by G. Hermann, who also transposed σύγκασι, which in the MSS. follows ὡστ. S has τ’ ἐμῷ σύγκασι, τε μοι σύγκασι. 412 ἀνόνατ’ ἀνόνατ’ Matthiae] ἀνόνατα ἀνόνατα B ἄν π τ’ ἀνόνητ’ ἀνόνητ’ S. 417 σὺ F. W. Schmidt] τι MSS. 420 γε] τε τ. 421 προσέπτατ B (with τ written over the πα by b). 425 πάσιν B a l] πάσι τ. 426 πένθοις B a] λέγω] θέλω a. 427 μελαμμέπλω στολῆ S μελαγχήμοις πέπλοις ε μελαγχείμοις πέπλοις B. In al and d κουρᾶ ἐυρ has been written by the first hand, but the rest of the line is wanting.
τέθριππα θ’ οἱ ζεύγνυσθε καὶ μονάμπυκας
πώλους, σιδήρῳ τέμνετ’ αὐχένων φόβην.
αὐλῶν δὲ μῆ κατ’ ἀστυ, μῆ λύρας κτύπος
ἐστώ σελήνας δώδεκ’ ἐκπληρουμένας·
οὐ γάρ των ἄλλων φίλτερον θάμων νεκρὸν
τοῦ δ’ οὐδ’ ἀμείνον’ εἰς ἐμ’· ἀξία δὲ μοι
τιμᾶν, ἐπεὶ τετληκέν ἀντ’ ἐμοῦ θανεῖν.

ΧΟ. ὦ Πελίου θύγατερ,
χαίρονσά μοι εἰν Ἄιδα δόμῳσιν
τὸν ἀνάλιον οἴκου οἰκετεύοις.
ἰστω δ’ Ἄιδας ὁ μελαγχαίτας θεὸς ὃς τ’ ἐπὶ κόπα
πηδαλίῳ τε γέρων
νεκροπομπὸς ἦζει,
πολὺ δὴ πολὺ δὴ γυναῖκ’ ἀρίσταν
λίμναν Ἀχεροντίαν πορεύσας ἐλάτα δικωπω.
πολλά σε μονοσόλοι
μέλψοις καθ’ ἐπτάτονον τ’ ὀρείαν
χέλων ἐν τ’ ἀλύροις κλέοντες ὑμνοῖς,
Σπάρτα κύκλος ἀνίκα Καρνείου περινύσσεται ὃρας
ὑμνὸς ἀειρομένας
παννύχου σελάνας,
λυπαραίσι τ’ ἐν ὀλβίαις Ἁθάναις.
τοῖν ἐλιπτες θανοῦσα μολπᾶν μελέων ἄοιδοῖς.

428 θ’ οὐ] τε S. 432 τιν’] τί B. 433 τιμῆς S | τετληκέν Nauck] τεθνῆ-
437 οἰκετεύοις P a] οἰκετεύεις L οἰκετεύοις B. 438 ἄιδας B a] ἄιδης L ἄιδης P.
439 κόπα S] κόπη r. 443 Ἀχεροντίαν S (but in L l has written ἐl’ above the el’).
446 ὀρέιαν ὁδρέιαν r. 447 κλέοντες Elmsley] κλέοντες MSS. 449 κυ-
klo* s a | περινύσσεται l L] περινύσσεται a περινύσσεται (sætæ written over an erasure)
P περινύσσεται P. | ὃρας Hesychius s. v. περινύσσεται ὃρας] ὃρα* L ὃρα P l’ a ὃρα B.
450 I have marked μηνος with a dagger as suspicious. 451 παννύχου a l] παννύχου τ] σελάνας S (but σελάνας l). 452 ἄθάναις S (but ἄθαναις l).
εἰδ’ ἐπ’ ἔμοι μὲν εἰη, στρ. 455
δυνάμαν δὲ σε πέμψαι
φάος ἐξ ’Αίδα τεράμμων
Κωκυτοὶ τε ἰεδρῶν
ποταμία νερέρα τε κώπα.
σὺ γὰρ, ὦ <σὺ> μόνα, φίλα γυναίκῶν, σὺ τὸν αὐτὰς
ἐτλας πόσων ἀντὶ σὰς ἀμεῦψαι
ψυχᾶς ἐξ ’Αίδα. κοῦφα σοι
χθών ἐπάνωθε πέσοι, γύναι. εἰ δὲ τι
καινὸν ἐλοιτὸ λέχος πόσις, ἥ μάλ’ ἄν ἐμοιγ’ ἄν εἰη
στυγηθεῖς τέκνοις τε τοῖς σοῖς.
ματέρος οὐ θελούσας
πρὸ παιδὸς χθούν κρύψαι
dέμας, οὐδὲ πατρὸς γεραιοῦ,

ἐν ἐτεκόν δ’ οὐκ ἔτλαν ρύσθαι,
σχετλίω, πολιᾶν ἐχοντε χαῖταν.
σὺ δ’ ἐν ἦβα
νέα προβανοῦσα φωτὸς οἰχῆ.
τοιαύτας εἰη μοι κύρσαι
συνυνάδος φίλιας ἀλόχου· τὸ γὰρ

ἐν βιότῳ σπάνιον μέρος· ἵ γὰρ ἀν ἐμοιγ' ἀλυπος
dι' αἰῶνος ἀν ἐννείῃ.

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ.

ξένου, Φεραιάς τῆς δε κωμηταί κρονός,
"Αδμητον ἐν δόμουσιν ἅρα κιγχάνω;
ΧΟ. ἔστ' ἐν δόμουσιν παῖς Φέρητος, Ἡράκλεις.
ἀλλ' εἰπὲ κρεία τίς σε Θεσσαλῶν κρονα
pέμπει, Φεραιῶν ἀστυ προσβήναι τόδε.

ΗΡ. Τιρυθώρ πράσσω τιν' Εὐρυσθεὶ πόνων.
ΧΟ. καὶ ποι πορεύθ; τῷ συνεξευξαί πλάνω;
ΗΡ. Ἐρηκός τέτρωρον ἄρμα Διομήδους μέτα.
ΧΟ. τῶς οὖν δυνήσῃ; μῶν ἀπειρος εἶ ξένου;
ΗΡ. ἀπειρος· οὐπω Βιστόνων ήλθον κρονα.

ΧΟ. οὐκ ἔστων ὑππον δεσπόσασι σ' ἀνευ μάχης.
ΗΡ. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀπειπεῖν τοὺς πόνους οἴον τ' ἐμοί.
ΧΟ. κτανών ἄρ' ἥξεις ἡ θανών αὐτοῦ μενείς.
ΗΡ. οὐ τόνδ' ἀγώνα πρώτον ἀν δράμουμ' ἐγώ.
ΧΟ. τί δ' ἀν κρατήσασ δεσπότην πλέον λάβοις;
ΗΡ. πώλους ἀπάξω κοιράνῳ Τιρυθώρ.
ΧΟ. οὐκ εὐμαρὲς χαλινών ἐμβαλεῖν γιάθοις.
ΗΡ. εἰ μὴ γε πῦρ πνέουσι μυκτήρων ἀπό.
ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ἄνδρας ἀρταμοῦσι λαψηραῖς γιάθοις.
ΗΡ. θηρῶν ὀρείων χόρτων, οὐχ ὑππον λέγεις.
ΧΟ. φάτνας ἱδοις ἂν αἴμασιν πεφυρμένας.

ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΣ.

HP. τίνος δ' ὁ θρέψας πάις πατρὸς κομπάζεται;
XO. 'Αρεως, ζαχρύσων Θρηκίας πέλτης ἀναξ.
HP. καὶ τόνδε τούμοι δαίμονος πόνον λέγεις·
      σκληρὸς γὰρ αἰεὶ καὶ πρὸς αἰτός ἐρχεται·
      εἰ χρῆ με πᾶσιν οὕς 'Αρης ἐγείνατο
      μάχην συνάφαι, πρώτα μὲν Λυκάοιν,
      αὖθις δὲ Κύκνω, τόνδε δ' ἐρχομαι τρίτων
      ἀγώνα πύλοις δεσπότη τε συμβαλῶν.
      ἀλλ' οὕτις ἔστιν ὃς τὸν 'Αλκμήνης γόνον
      τρέσαντα χεῖρα πολεμίαν ποτ' ὀψεται.
XO. καὶ μήν ὅδ' αὐτὸς τῆςδε κούρανος χθονὸς
      'Αδµήτως ἔξω δωµάτων πορεύεται.

ΑΔ. χαίρ', ὁ Δίας παὶ Περσεώς τ' ἀφ' αἴµατος.
HP. 'Αδµητε, καὶ σὺ χαίρε, Θεσσαλῶν ἄναξ.
ΑΔ. θέλωµ' ἄν· εὖνοις δ' ὅντα σ' ἔξεπισταµαι.
HP. τι χρῆµα κούρα τἳδε πενθίµω πρέπεις;
ΑΔ. θάπτευ τιν' ἐν τῇδ' ἠµέρα µέλλω νεκρῶν.
HP. ἄπ' οὖν τέκνων σῶν πηµοῦν ἐγροι θεὸς.
ΑΔ. ζῶσιν κατ' οἴκους παιδεις οὕς ἐφυσ' ἐγώ.
HP. πατὴρ γε µῆν ὁρᾶνος, εἰπέρ οἴχεται.
ΑΔ. κάκεινος ἔστι χή τεκοῦσα µ', 'Ἡράκλεις.
HP. οὐ µῆν γυνὴ γ' ὅλωλεν 'Αλκηστῖς σέθεν;
ΑΔ. διπλοὺς ἐπ' αὐτὴ µύθος ἔστι µοι λέγειν.
HP. πότερα θανοῦσις εἶπας ἢ ζώσις πέρι;
ΑΔ. ἔστιν τε κοὐκέτ' ἔστιν, ἀλγυνεὶ δὲ µε.

HP. οὐδὲν τι μᾶλλον οἴδ᾽· ἀσημα γὰρ λέγεις.
ΑΔ. οὐκ ὁσθὰ μοῖρας ής τυχεῖν αὐτήν χρεῶν;
HP. οἴδ᾽, ἀντὶ σοῦ γε καθαναίεν υφειμένην.
ΑΔ. πώς οὖν ἔτ᾽ ἑστιν, εἴπερ ἤνεσεν τάδε;
HP. ἃ, μὴ πρόκλαι αἴκουτι, ἐς τόδ᾽ ἀμβαλοῦ.
ΑΔ. τέθνηχ᾽ ὁ μέλλων, καὶ θανῶν οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἔτι.
HP. χωρὶς τὸ τ᾽ εἶναι καὶ τὸ μὴ νομίζεται.
ΑΔ. σὺ τῇδε κρύνεις, Ἡράκλεις, κεῖσθαι δ᾽ ἔγω.
HP. τί δὴτα κλαίεις; τὶς φίλων ὁ καθανῶν;
ΑΔ. γυνή· γυναικὸς ἀρτίως μεμνήμεθα.
HP. ὀθνεῖος ἦ σοὶ συγγενῆς γεγώσα τίς;
ΑΔ. ὀθνεῖος, ἀλλως δ᾽ ἤν αναγκαία δόμοις.
HP. πώς οὖν ἐν οἴκοις σοῖς ἰδέσεν βίον;
ΑΔ. πατρὸς θανόντος ἐνθάδ᾽ ὀρφανεύετο.
HP. φεῦ.
εἰδ᾽ ηὐρομέν σ᾽ ὢν Ἀδμητε, μὴ λυποῦμενον.
ΑΔ. ὡς δὴ τι δράσσων τόνδ᾽ ὑπορράπτεις λόγου;
HP. ξένων πρὸς ἄλλων ἑστιάν πορεύσομαι.
ΑΔ. οὐκ ἔστων, ὲναξ· μὴ τοσόνδ᾽ ἕλθοι κακῶν.
HP. λυπουμένοις ὁχληρός, εἰ μόλοι, ξένος.
ΑΔ. τεθνάσων οἱ θανόντες ἀλλ᾽ ἦθ᾽ ἐς δόμους.
HP. αἰσχρὸν παρὰ κλαίοντι θουκάσθαι φίλοις.
ΑΔ. χωρὶς ξενώνεσ εἰσιν οἱ σ᾽ ἐσάξομεν.

524 ἀν τι B. 525 ἤνεσε B. 526 ἀ L ἀ P ἀ ἁ r. μὴ] omitted in P. [ἀμβαλοῦ Nauck] ἀναβαλοῦ MSS. 527 τέθνηχ᾽ ὁ B ἀ] τέθνηκε L (but with χ᾽ ὁ written over the ke by L1) τέθνηκεν ὁ P | καὶ θανῶν οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἔτι Schwarz καὶ ὁ θανῶν οὐκέτ᾽ ἐστιν P χωθανῶν οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἐτι L. κοικέτ᾽ ἐσθ᾽ (ἐστιν B) ὁ καθανῶν B u. 530 φίλων] οὖν P ἤν L (but L has deleted ἤν and written φίλων in the margin). 531 γυναικὸς δ᾽ a. 533, 534 are wanting in the text of L, but have been added in the margin by L. 534 ἤλεσε u P ἤλεβε B. 536 φεῦ was omitted in L, but has been supplied by l. 537 δὴ τι u] δὴ τι r. 538 ξένων a L1] ξένων P l ξένων B | ἀλλην S | ἐστιαν B. 539 τόδονδ᾽ B. 541 ἅ S] εἰς r. 542 φίλοις ξένων S. 543 ἐσάξομεν P l] εἰσάξομεν r.
αλκήστις

μεθες με, καὶ σοι μυρίαν ἔξω χάριν.

οὐκ ἔστων ἄλλου σ’ ἀνδρὸς ἐστίαν μολεῖν.

ήγου οὗ τῶδε δωμάτων ἐξωπίους
ζενώνας οἴξας, τοῖς τ’ ἐφεστῶσιν φράσον
σίτων παρεῖναι πλήθος· εὖ δὲ κλήσατε
θύρας μεταύλους· οὗ πρέπει θοινωμένους
κλέειν στεναγμῶν οὐδὲ λυπεῖσθαι ξένους.

τί δρᾶς; τοιαύτης συμφορᾶς προσκειμένης,
’Αδμητε, τολμᾶς ξενοδοκεῖν; τί μῶρος εἶ;

ἀλλ’ εἰ δόμων σφε καὶ πόλεως ἀπῆλασα
ζένου μολόντα, μάλλον ἂν μ’ ἐπῆνεςα;

καὶ πρὸς κακοίς ἄλλο τούτ’ ἂν ἢν κακὸν,
δόμους καλεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐκθροξένους.

αὐτὸς δ’ ἀρίστου τοῦτο τυγχάνω ξένου

τῶς οὖν ἐκρυπτεῖς τὸν παρόντα δαιμόνα,
φίλου μολόντος ἀνδρός, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγεις;

οὐκ ἂν ποτ’ ἡθέλεσθαι εἰσελθεῖν δόμους,

καὶ τῷ μὲν, οἴμαι, δρῶν τάδ’ οὐ δόξω φρονεῖν,

οὐδ’ αἰνέσει με· τάμα δ’ οὐκ ἐπισταταί
μελαθρ’ ἀπωθεῖν ὦν’ ἀτιμάζειν ξένους.

546 τῶδε Ι] τῶδε η τῶν ὑ τ. 547 ἐφεστῶσιν Gaisford[ ἐφεστῶσι MSS. 548 εὗ England] εὗ MSS. (ἐνδεκλήσατε B). 549 μεταύλους Ussing[ μεταύλους MSS. 551 τοιαύτης S | προσκειμένης Wakefield] προσκειμένης MSS. 552 ξενοδοκεῖν Stephanus] ξενοδοχεῖν MSS. | μῶρος C] μωρός τ. 558 καλεῖσθαι L (but κα has been changed to kek by l) [ ἐκθροξένους S] κακοξένους τ. 560 ὅταν ποτ’] ὅταν περ S. 563 after ἤθλησεν the writer of B repeated by mistake the letters ὡς αὐτὸς λ from the preceding verse, but they have been cancelled with red-lead. 564 ἐγνώρισε B] ἐγνώρισεν τ. 565 οὐ δόξω φρονεῖν Herwerden] οὐ φρονεῖν δοκ’ MSS.
ΧΟ. οἱ πολύζεινοι καὶ ἔλευθερον ἀνδρὸς ἀεὶ ποτ' οἶκος, στρ.
σὲ τοι καὶ ὁ Πύθιος εὐλύρας Ἀπόλλων 570
ηξίωσε ναίειν,
ἐτλα δὲ σοῦσι μηλονόμας
ἐν νόμοις γενέσθαι,
δοχιμᾶν διὰ κλιτύων
βοσκήμασι σοῦσι συρίζων
ποιμνῖτας ὑμεναῖος.
σὺν δ' ἐπομαινοντο χαρᾶ μελέων βαλιαὶ τε
λύγκες,
ἀντίστρ.
ἐβα δὲ λιποῦσ' Ὕθρυνος νάπαν λεόντων
ἀ δαμοῦνος ἦλα.
χόρευσε δ' ἀμφὶ σὰν κιθάραν,
Φοῖβε, ποικιλόθριξ
νεβρός ὑμικόμων πέραν
βαινοῦσ' ἐλατᾶν σφυρῷ κούφῳ,
χαίρουσ' εὑφροι μολπᾶ.
τοίγαρ πολυμηλοτάταν
στρ.
ἐστίαν οἰκεὶ παρὰ καλλίανον
Βοιβίαν λίμναν· ἀρότοις δὲ γυνᾶν
καὶ πεδίων δαπέδους
ὁρον ἀμφὶ μὲν ἀελιὸν κανεφαίαν
ἵπποστασιν αἰθέρα τὰν Μολοσσῶν . . . τίθεται,
πόντιον δ' Λιγαίων' ἐπ' ἀκτὰν
ἀλίμενον Πηλίου κρατύνει.

569 ὁ ι'] ἦτο τ] πολύζεινοι καὶ ἔλευθερον Wecklein (πολύζεινοι καὶ ἔλευθερον Purgold)] πολύζεινοι καὶ ἔλευθερον MSS. 570 καὶ ὃ] χφ ι,. 572 ἔτλα Matthiae]
ἐτλη MSS. 574 νόμοις Pierson] νὸμοι MSS. (νῦμοι ιΙ). 577 ποιμνήτας S.
579 βαλιαὶ ι] βαλαί τ. 580 Ὅθρυνοι ι] Ὅθριοι τ. 582 χόρευσε Monk] ἐχό-
ρευσε MSS. 588 τογάρ τοι ι]. 589 οἰκεὶ Purgold] οἰκεῖς MSS. 590 γυνα
βι] γῆν α (with the circumflex over ν deleted by α’) γῆν L γῆν P. 594 ὑπὸ-
στασιν ι] (with ὑ (= τὴν) written over the ν by ι), 595 ὀ'] τ ι | Λιγαίων'
schol.] Λιγαίου MSS.
καὶ νῦν δόμον ἀμπετάσας
δέξατο ἕξινον νοτερῷ βλεφάρῳ,
tὰς φίλας κλαίον ἀλόχου νέκυν ἐν
dώμασιν ἀρτιθανή·
tὸ γάρ εὐγένεις ἐκφέρεται πρὸς αἴδω.
ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς δὲ πάντ' ἐνεστὶν σοφίας. ἀγαμαί·
πρὸς δ' ἐμὰ ψυχὰ θάρσος ἦσται
θεοσεβὴς φῶτα κεδνὰ πράξειν.

ΑΔ. ἀνδρῶν Φεραιῶν εὐμενὴς παρουσία,
νέκυν μὲν ἥδη πάντ' ἔχοντα πρόσπολοι
φέρουσιν ἄρδην ἐς τάφον τε καὶ πυράν·
ὑμεῖς δὲ τὴν θανόνθαν, ὡς νομίζεται,
προσεύπατ' ἐξιουσαν ὑστάτην ὁδὸν.

ΧΟ. καὶ μὴν ὅρῳ σὺν πατέρα γηραιῷ ποδὶ
στείχουν', ὡπαδοὺς τ' ἐν χεροῖν δάμαρτι σῇ
κόσμον φέροντας, νερτέρων ἀγάλματα.

ΦΕΡΗΣ.

ἡκὼ κακοϊσὶ σοὶ συγκάμμων, τέκνων·
ἐσθλῆς γάρ, οὐδεὶς ἀντερὶ, καὶ σώφρονος
γυναικὸς ἡμάρτηκας. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν
φέρεν ἀνάγκη καίπερ οἴντα δύσφορα.
δέχου δὲ κόσμον τόνδε, καὶ κατὰ χθόνος
ἀτω· τὸ ταύτης σῶμα τιμᾶσθαι χρεῶν,
ἡτὶς γε τῆς σῆς προύθανε ψυχῆς, τέκνων,
καί μ' οὐκ ἄπαιδ' ἐθηκὲν οὐδ' εἰάσε σοῦ
στερέντα γῆρα πενθίμῳ καταφθίνειν,

598 ἕξινον Aldine] ἕξινον MSS. 599 φιλας Aldine] φιλας MSS. 603 ἐνεστὶν
Barnes] ἐνεστὶ MSS. | in L ἀγαμαί has been deleted by l. 604 ἦσται S] ἦσται τ.
608 ἐς] πρὸς S. 617 δύσφορα S (and a[)] δύσμενη τ' d. 622 καταφθίνειν Matthiae] καταφθίνειν MSS.
πάσας δ' ἐθηκεν εὐκλεέστερον βίον 
γυναῖξιν, ἐργον τλᾶσα γενναῖον τόδε.  
ω τόνδε μὲν σώσασ', ἀναστήσασα δὲ 
ημᾶς πίνουντας, χαίρε, κἀν Ἄιδοι δόμοις 
ἐπὶ σοι γένοιτο. ἤμι θοιούτους γάμους 
λύειν βροτοῖσι, ἣ γαμεῖν οὐκ ἄξιον. 

Ἀδ. 
οὐτ' ἦλθες ἐς τόνδ' εξ ἐμοῦ κλήθεις τάφουν, 
οὐτ' ἐν φίλουσι σὴν παροινίαν λέγω.  
κόσμον δὲ τούτον οὐποθ' ἡδ' ἐνδύσεται, 
οὐ γάρ τι τῶν σῶν ἐνδέχετα ταφήσεται. 

tότε ἰσωαλγεῖν χρήν σ' ὀτ' ὀλλύμην ἐγώ. 
σὺ δ' ἐκποδῶν στὰς καὶ παρεῖς ἀλλὰθανεῖν 
νέω γέρων ὥν, τόνδ' ἀποιμώξη ἑκρόν; 
[οὐκ ἡθὸν ἅρ' ὡρθῶς τούδε σῶματος πατήρ, 
οὐδ' ἡ τεκεῖν φάσκονσα καὶ κεκλημένη 
μήτηρ μ' ἔτικτε. δουλίου δ' ἅφ' αἴματος 
μαστῷ γυναικὸς σῆς ὑπεβλήθην λάθρα.]

ἔδειξας εἰς ἐλεγχον ἐξελθών ὃς εἶ, 
καὶ μ' οὐ νομίζω παῖδα σὸν πεφυκέναι. 
ἡ τάρα πάντων διαπρέπεις ἁμυχώ, 
ἄς τηλικόσδ' ὅν κατί τέρμ' ἥκων βίου 
οὐκ ἡθέλησας οὐδ' ἐτόλμησας θανεῖν 
tοῦ σοῦ πρὸ παιδός, ἀλλὰ τῆνδ' εἰάστη 
γυναίκι ὀθυνεῖν, ἣν ἐγὼ καὶ μητέρα 
pατέρα τ' ἀν ἐνδίκως ἀν ἡγοίμην μόνην. 
καίτου καλοῦ γ' ἀν τόνδ' ἀγων' ἡγούνσων 

623 εὐκλεέστερον B] εὐκλεέστατον τ.  
625 τόνδ' ἐμὸν S [σώσασ'] σώσ'. B. 
626 πιτνοτας α] πιτνύτας B πιτνύτας S | κωρί S (written over an erasure in L) } 
κείν τ.  
631 τοῦτον Earle] τῶν σῶν MSS.  
635 ἀπομώξῃ ἀπομώξῃ α ἀπομώξῃ Matthiae.  
643 τηλικόςδ' α] τηλικὸς L τ' ἡλίκος P.  
647 τ' ἀν Elmsley] τ' B a τ' γ' S. | μόνην S α] ἐμὸν B.
τοῦ σοῦ πρὸ παιδὸς κατθανὼν, βραχὺς δὲ σοι πάντως ὃ λοιπὸς ἦν βιώσιμος χρόνος.
[kάγω τ' ἄν έξων χήδε τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον, κοῦκ ἄν μονωθεῖς ἐστενον κακοῖς ἐμοῖς.]
καὶ μὴν ὧσ' ἄνδρα χρὴ παθεῖν εὐδαίμονα πέπονθας· ήβησας μὲν ἐν τυραννίδι,
παῖς δ' ἦν ἐγὼ σοι τῶνδε διάδοχος δόμων, ὥστ' οὖν ἀτεκνὸς κατθανὼν ἄλλοις δόμοιν
λείψειν ἐμελλές ὀρφανὸν διαρπάσαι.
οὐ μὴν ἔρεις γε μ' ὡς ἀτιμάζοντα σὸν γῆρας θανεῖν προφόκας, ὅστις αἰδόφρων
πρὸς σ' ἣ μάλιστα, καὶ τῶνδε μοι χάριν τοιάνδε καὶ σὺ χὴ τεκοῦσ' ἡλλαξάτην.
τοῦγαρ φυτεύων παίδας οὐκέτ' ἄν φθάνοις,
οἱ γνησιοκαθόσουσι καὶ θανόντα σε
περιστελοῦσι καὶ προβήσονται νεκρόν.
οὐ γάρ σ' ἐγὼγε τῇ δε μῆθα diagnostics χερὶ.
τέθυκα γάρ δὴ τοῦτο σ'· εἰ δ' ἄλλου τυχὼν
σωτήρος αὐγὰς εἴσορῷ, κείνου λέγω
καὶ παῖδά μ' εἶναι καὶ φίλον γνησιοφόρον.
μάτην ἄρ' οἱ γέροντες εὐχόνται θανεῖν,
γῆρας ψέγουτες καὶ μακρὸν χρόνον βίου.
ἡν δ' ἐγγὺς ἐλθηθα θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βουλεῖται
θυμίσκειν, τὸ γῆρας δ' οὐκέτ' ἐστ' αὐτοῖς βαρύ.

ΧΩ. 'Αδμηθ', ἀλὸς γάρ ἦ παροῦσα συμφορά,
παῦσαι, πατρὸς δέ μῆ παροξύνῃς φρένας.

651-2 rejected by Lenting. ἐξην α. 657 διαρπάσαι S διαρπάσειν r l.
658 ἀτιμάζοντα S' ἀτιμάζων τὸ r. 659 προφόκας S' προφόκα σ' r. 665 τῇ δε
μὴ Weil] τῇ' ἐμῆ MSS. 671 ἐλθοὺ B. 672 ἐλθηθα] θανεῖν α. 673 'Αδ-
μηθ' Mekler] παῦσάςθ' MSS. 674 παῦσαι Mekler] ὁ παῖ MSS. (Elmsley
pointed out that ὁ παῖ in 674 was probably a mistake of the copyist due to ὁ παῖ
just below in 675). | φρένα S.
ΦΕ. ὁ παῖ, τίν' αὐχεῖς, πότερα Λυδὸν ἤ Φρύγα κακοῖς ἐλαύνειν ἀργυρῷηντον σέθεν; οὐκ οὐσθα Θεσσαλὸν με κάπο Θεσσαλοῦ πατρὸς γεγώτα γυνησίως ἐλεύθερον; ἀγαν ύβρίζεις, καὶ νεανίας λόγους ρίπτων ἐς ἧμᾶς οὐ βαλῶν οὔτως ἀπει. ἐγὼ δὲ σ' οὐκὼν δεσπότην ἐγενάμην κάθρεψ', ὁφεῖλω δ' οὐχ ὑπερθυήσκευν σέθεν. οὐ γὰρ πατρῷον τὸν' ἐδεξάμην νόμον, παίδων προθυήσκευν πατέρας, οὐδ' 'Ελληνικῶν. σαυτῷ γὰρ εἴτε δυστυχῆς εἶτ' εὐτυχῆς ἐφιυ; α δ' ἧμῶν χρῆν σε τυγχάνειν ἔχεις. πολλῶν μὲν ἄρχεις, πολυπλέθρους δὲ σοι γύας λείψω. πατρὸς γὰρ ταύτ' ἐδεξάμην πάρα. τί δήτα σ' ἡδίκηκα; τοῦ σ' ἀποστερῶ; μὴ θυησχ' ύπερ τοῦδ' ἁνδρός, οὐδ' ἐγὼ πρὸ σοῦ. 690 χαίρεις ὀρῶν φῶς; πατέρα δ' οὐ χαίρειν δοκεῖς; ἢ μὴν πολύν γε τὸν κάτω λογίζομαι χρόνον, τὸ δὲ ζῆν μικρόν, ἀλλ' ὄμως γλυκύ. σὺ γοῦν ἀναιδῶς διεμάχοι τὸ μὴ θανεῖν, καὶ ζῆς παρελθὼν τὴν πεπρωμένην τύχην, 695 ταύτην κατακτᾶς· εἰτ' ἐμην ἄψυχιάν λέγεις, γυναικός, ὁ κάκισθ', ἥσσημένος, ἢ τοῦ καλοῦ σοῦ προύθανεν νεανίο; σοφῶς δ' ἐφηύρες ὡστε μὴ θανεῖν ποτε, εἰ τὴν παρούσαν καθανεῖν πείςεις ἄει γυναῖχ' ὑπὲρ σοῦ· κατ' ὁνειδίζεις φίλοις

679 ἀγαν μ' Λ. 680 ἀπεῖ Β. 682 ὁφεῖλω δ' Β α] ὁφεῖλων Σ. 686 χρῆν Β. 687 γύας Λ] γύας Β γύας τ. 689 ἡδίκησα Σ. 690 θυησεχ' Σ] θυησκ' τ. 692 ή Σ (with ἦ τ.) ή τ. 693 σμικρὸν α Ρ. 694 σὺ γοῦν Β Λ] σὺ γ' οὖν τ. 698 ή Β. 699 δ' ἐφεύρες Β α δ' εὔρες Σ (but δὲ γ' εὔρες λ). 700 πεισεῖς ἄν Σ. 701 κατονειδίζεις Β.
τοῖς μὴ θέλουσι δράν τάδ’, αὐτὸς ὤν κακός; σύγα: νόμιζε δ’, εἰ σὺ τὴν σαυτοῦ φιλεῖς ψυχὴν, φιλεῖν ἀπαντας· εἰ δ’ ἡμᾶς κακῶς ἔρεις, ἀκούσῃ πολλὰ κοῦ ψευδὴ κακά.

ΧΟ. πλείω λέλεκται νῦν τε καὶ τὸ πρὶν κακά· παῦσαι δὲ, πρέσβυ, παῦδα σὸν κακορροθὼν.

ΑΔ. λέγ’, ὡς ἐμοῦ λέξαντος· εἰ δ’ ἄλγεὶς κλύων τάληθες, οὐ χρὴν σ’ εἰς ἐρ’ ἐξαμαρτάνειν.

ΦΕ. σοῦ δ’ ἄν προθνήσκων μᾶλλον ἐξημάρτανον.

ΑΔ. ταῦτον γὰρ ἡβοῦτ’ ἅνδρα καὶ πρέσβυν θανεῖν;

ΦΕ. ψυχὴ μᾶ ᾳ ς, οὐ δυνών, ὀφείλομεν.

ΑΔ. καὶ μὴν Δίος γε μείζον’ ἄν ζωῆς χρόνον.

ΦΕ. μνηστευε πολλάς, ὡς θάνωσι πλείονες.

ΑΔ. φεῦ.

εἰθ’ ἅνδρος ἐλθοὺς τοῦδε γ’ ἐς χρείαν ποτε.

ΦΕ. ἀρὰ γονεύσων οὐδὲν ἐκδικον παθὼν;

ΑΔ. μακροῦ βίου γὰρ ἡσθόμην ἐρωτά σε.

ΦΕ. ἀλλ’ οὐ σὺ νεκρὸν ἀντὶ σοῦ τὸν δ’ ἐκφέρεις;

ΑΔ. σημεία τῆς σῆς γ’, ὃ κάκιστ’, ἄψυχίας.

ΦΕ. οὐτοὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν γ’ ὀλετ’. οὐκ ἔρεις τὸδε.

ΑΔ. σοὶ τοῦτ’ ὁνείδος· οὐ γὰρ ἡθελες θανεῖν.

ΦΕ. φίλον τὸ φέγγος τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ, φίλον.

ΑΔ. κακόν τὸ λήμμα κούκ ἐν ἄνδρασιν τὸ σῶν.

ΦΕ. οὐκ ἐγγελαζάς γέροντα βαστάζων νεκρῶν.

ΑΔ. θανὴ γε μέντοι δυσκλεής, όταν θανής.

ΦΕ. κακῶς ἀκούειν οὐ μέλει θανόντι μοι.

ιΔ. φεῦ φεῦ· τὸ γῆρας ὡς ἀναδείας πλέων.

ΦΕ. ἑδ' οὐκ ἀναδής· τηνδ' ἐφηύρες ἄφρονα.

ιΔ. ἀπελθείς ἀκήμε τόνδ' ἐὰν θάψαι νεκρόν.

ΦΕ. ἀπεμέλεις θάψεις δ' αὐτὸς ἄν ἀυτῆς φονεύς, δίκαιος τε δόσεις σοὺς κηδεσταῖς ἐτί. ἡ τάρ' Ἀκαστος οὐκέτ' ἔστ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν, εἰ μὴ σ' ἀδελφῆς αἴμα τιμωρήσεις.

ιΔ. ἔρρων νυν αὐτὸς χή ἕννοικήσασά σοι ἀπαίδε παιδὸς ὡντος, ὠσπερ ἄξιοι, γηράσκετ'· οὐ γὰρ τῷ δ' ἔτ' ἐς ταύτων στέγον νεῦσθ'· εἰ δὲ ἀπεπείν χρῆν με κηρύκων ὕπο τὴν σήν πατρώαν ἐστίαν, ἀπεἶπον ἂν. ἡμεῖς δὲ—τοὺν ποσὶν γὰρ οἰστέον κακόν—στείχωμεν, ὡς ἄν ἐν πυρᾷ θῶμεν νεκρόν.

ΧΟ. ἵω ἵω. σχετλία τόλμης,

ὦ γενναία καὶ μέγ' ἀρίστη,

χαίρε· πρόφρων σε χθόνιος θ' 'Ερμῆς

"Αἰώνις τε δέχοιτ', εἰ δὲ τι κάκει

πλέον ἔστ' ἄγαθοίς, τούτων μετέχουσ' Α'

"Αἰώνιν νύμφην παρεδρεύοις.

ΘΕΡΑΠΩΝ.

πολλοὺς μὲν ἥδη κατὸ παντοίας χθονὸς ἔγεινος μολόντας οἴδ᾽ ἐσʼ Ἀδμήτου δόμους, οἷς δεῖπνα προύθηκ᾽ ἀλλὰ τοῦδ᾽ οὗπο ξένον κακίον ἐς τὴνδ᾽ ἐστίαν ἐδεξάμην.

ὁς πρῶτα μὲν πενθοῦντα δεσπότην ὀρῶν ἐσῆλθε κατόλμησι ἀμεύμασθαι πύλας. ἔπειτα δ᾽ οὕτω σωφρόνως ἐδέξατο τὰ προστυχοῦντα ἕνεα, συμφορὰν μαθὼν, ἀλλ᾽ εἶ τι μὴ φέροιμεν, ὦτρυνεν φέρειν.

ποτήρα δ᾽ ἐν χείρεσσι κύσσινον λαβὼν πίνει μελαίνης μητρὸς ἐνζωρον μέθυ, ἐως ἠθέρμην αὐτὸν ἀμφιβάσα φλὸξ οἴνου. στέφει δὲ κράτα μυρσίνης κλάδοις ἀμουσ' ὑλακτῶν, [δισσα δ᾽ ἤν μέλη κλύειν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἤδε,] τῶν ἐν Ἀδμήτου κακῶν οὐδὲν προτιμῶν, οἰκέται δ᾽ ἐκλαῖομεν δέσποιναν· ὁμμα δ᾽ οὐκ ἐδείκνυμεν ξένῳ τέγγοντες. ὧν Ἀδμήτος γὰρ ὅδ᾽ ἐφίετο.

καὶ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν ἐν δόμουσιν ἐστιῶν ξένου, πανοῦργον κλώπα καὶ λῃστήν τινα, ἢ δ᾽ ἐκ δόμων βέβηκεν, οὐδ᾽ ἐφεσπόμην οὐδ᾽ ἐξέτεινα χεῖρ᾽, ἀπομμῶζων ἐμὴν δέσποιναν, ἢ μοι πάσι τ᾽ οἰκέταισιν ἥν μήτηρ· κακῶν γὰρ μυρίων ἐρρύετο,

οργάς μαλάσσους' ἀνδρός. ἀρα τῶν ξένων στυγῷ δικαίως, ἐν κακοῖς ἀφιγμένοι;

HP. οὔτος, τί σεμνόν καί πεφροντικὸς βλέπεις;

οὐ χρῆ σκυθρωπὸν τοὺς ξένους τὸν πρόσπολον εἶναι, δέχεσθαι δ’ εὐπροσηγόρη φρενί.

συ δ’ ἀνδρ’ ἔταρον δεσπότου παρῶθ’ ὅρων, στυγνῷ προσώπῳ καί συνωφρυμένῳ
dέχει, θυραίου πήματος σπουδὴν ἔχων.

dεῦρ’ ἐλθ’, ὅπως ἂν καὶ σοφώτερος γένη.

τὰ θυντὰ πράγματ’ οἶδας ἢν ἔχει φύσιν;

οἶμαι μὲν οὖ· πόθεν γάρ; ἀλλ’ ἄκουν ἐμοῦ.

βροτοῖς ἀπασὶ καθανεῖν ὀφείλεται,

κοῦκ ἐστι θυντῶν ὅστις ἐξεπίσταται
tὴν αὐριον μέλλουσαν εἰ βιῶσεται·

τὸ τῆς τύχης γὰρ ἄφανες οἱ προβήσεται,

καστ’ οὐ διδακτῶν οὐδ’ ἀλίσκεται τέχνη.

ταῦτ’ οὖν ἀκούσας καὶ μαθῶν ἐμοῦ πάρα,

εὐθραυνε σαυτόν, πῶς, τὸν κἂν ἡμέραν

βίον λογίζου σὸν, τὰ δ’ ἀλλὰ τῆς τύχης.

τίμα δὲ καὶ τὴν πλεῖστον ἢδίστην θεόν

Κύπριν βροτοῖς· εὐμενῆς γὰρ ἡ θεός,

τὰ δ’ ἀλλ’ ἔσον ταῦτα καὶ πιθοῦ λόγοις

ἐμοίσων, εἰπερ ὁρθά σοι δοκῶ λέγειν·

οἶμαι μὲν. οὐκοιν τὴν ἄγαν λύπην ἀφεῖς

πῇ μεθ’ ἡμῶν [τάσθ’ ὑπερβαλὼν τύχας,

771 ἀρα B P (corrected by P1). 781 οἶμαι] δοκῷ Plutarch Consol. ad

Apollon. 11. p. 104. 782 ἀπασίν ἀποθαναίνειν Menander Monostich. 69. 783 ἐστὶν

αὐτῶν Plutarch l. s. c. 785 οἰ] oū S ἀ C. 787 τοῦτ’ Orion Anth. viii. 4

p. 53. 788 πῶς L r] πῶς r. 792 πιθοῦ Monk] πιθοῦ P πείθου r. 794 οἶμαι

μὲν] these words are assigned to the servant in a. 795 τύχας] γρ. πῖδας α1 in

the margin. The schol. mentions both readings. The words τάσθ’ — πυκασβεῖς

were rejected by Herwerden as interpolated from 829 and 832.
στεφάνοις πυκασθείς]; καὶ σάφ' οἶδ' ὅθονεκα
tου νῶν σκυθρωτοῦ καὶ ξυνεστώτος ἃ φρενῶν
μεθορμεῖ σε πέτυλος ἐμπεσῶν σκύφου.

大纲 δὲ θυητοῦ τὴν θυητὰ καὶ φρονεῖν χρεῶν·
ότι τότε γε σεμνοῖς καὶ συνωφρυωμένοις
ἀπασίν ἐστίν, ὡς γ' ἐμοὶ χρῆσθαι κριτῇ,
οὐ βίος ἀληθῶς ὁ βίος ἄλλα συμφορά.

ΘΕ. ἐπιστάμεσθα ταῦτα· νῦν δὲ πρᾶσσομεν
οὐχ οία κάμιου καὶ γέλωτος ἄξια.

ΗΡ. γυνὴ θυραῖος ἡ θανοῦσα· μὴ λίαν
πένθει· δόμων γὰρ ζώσι τῶνδε δεσπόται.

ΘΕ. τί ζώσιν; οὐ κάτοισθα τὰν δόμοις κακά;

ΗΡ. εἶ μὴ τι σὸς με δεσπότης ἐφεύσατο.

ΘΕ. ἀγαν ἐκεῖνος ἐστ' ἀγαν φιλόξενος.

ΗΡ. μῶν ἑμφοράν τιν' ὦσαν οὐκ ἐφραξὲ μοι;

ΘΕ. χαίρων ὁθ'. ἡμῖν δεσποτῶν μέλει κακά.

ΗΡ. ὁδ' οὐ θυραῖοι πημάτων ἁρχεῖ λόγος.

ΘΕ. οὐ γὰρ τι κωμάζων' ἄν ἡχῶμην σ' ὀρῶν.

ΗΡ. ἀλλ' ἣ πέπονθα δεῖν ὑπὸ ἕξενον ἐμῶν;

ΘΕ. οὐκ ἡλθες ἐν δέοντι δέξασθαι δόμοις.

ΗΡ. οὐ χρῆν μ' ὀθνείον γ' οὔνεκ' εὐ τάσχειν νεκροῦ;

ΘΕ. ἦ κάρτα μέντοι καὶ λίαν οἰκεῖος ἦν.

[πένθος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐστὶ· καὶ κουρᾶν βλέπεις
μελαμπεόπλους στολμοῦς τε. ΗΡ. τίς δ' ὁ κατ-
θανῶν;]
μῶν ἡ τέκνων τις φροῦδος ἡ γέρων πατήρ;

γυνὴ μὲν οὖν ὄλωλεν 'Αδμήτου, ξένη.

tί φῆς; ἔπειτα δῆτα μ' ἔξενιζετε;

ἡδεῖτο γάρ σε τῶν δ' ἀπώσασθαι δόμων.

ὁ σχέτλη, οίας ἦμπλακες ξυνάορου.

ἀπωλόμεσθα πάντες, οὐ κείνη μόνη.

ἀλλ' ἡσθόμην μὲν ὅμμ' ἵδον δακρυρροοὺν
κουράν τε καὶ τ' ἀπόσωπον· ἀλλ' ἔπειθε με
λέγων θυραίων κῆδος ἐς τάφον φέρειν.

βία δὲ θυμοῦ τάσδ' ὑπερβαλῶν πύλας
ἐπινοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐν φιλοξένου δόμῳ,

πράσοιτος οὖτω. κατὰ κωμάξω κάρα
στεφάνους πυκασθεῖς; ἀλλὰ σοῦ τὸ μὴ φράσαι,
κακοῦ τοσοῦτον δόμασιν προσκειμένου.

ποῦ καὶ σφε θάπτει; ποῦ νῦν εὑρήσω μολὸν;

ὁρήθην παρ' οἴμον ἡ 'πὶ Λάρισαν φέρει
τύμβων κατοψεί γεστον ἐκ προαστίου.

ὁ πολλὰ τλάσα καρδία καὶ χεὶρ ἐμῆ,
νῦν δείξου οἶνο παιδά σ' ἡ Τιρυνθία

'Ἡλεκτρύνονος ἐγέινατ' 'Αλκμήνη Δι.υ.

dεῖ γάρ με σῶσαι τὴν θανοῦσαν ἄρτιώς

γυναίκα κείς τόντ' αὖθις ἰδρύσαι δόμον

Ἀλκηστίν, 'Αδμήτῳ θ' ὑπουργήσαι χάριν.

820 τις φροῦδος ἡ Σ (τις ἡ φροῦδος ἡ Π) τι φροῦδον γένος ἡ Β (but Β has deleted γένος) τι φροῦδον ἡ Α. 825 μοῦν Λ. 827 πράσωπον is probably corrupt. [ἀλλ'] ἀλλ' ὅμοι Ἡ [but Β has deleted ὅμοι] 829 τύχαις πύλας α (but α3 has erased πύλας and altered τύχαις to πύλας). 831 κάτα (κάτα α3) κωμάξω α κατακωμάξω Β κατ' ἐκώμαξον Λ κατεκώμαξον Π. 833 δόμασιν α] δόμασι Σ δόματος Β | προσκειμένου Scaliger] προκειμένου MSS. 834 μολὼν Β. 835 οἴμον Β | Λάρισαν Nauck] Λάρισαν MSS. 836 προαστίον Λ. Ρ] προαστείον τ. 837 καὶ χεῖρ] ψυχ' τ' ο (cf. Orest. 466). 839 ἡλεκτρύνονος Ο ('Ἡλεκτρύνονος Blomfield)] ἡλεκτρύνονος τ' ἐγέινατ' Blomfield] γείνατ' MSS. 841 ἰδρύσαι Π'] ἰδρύσαι τ. 842 θ'] δ' Σ.
ἐλθὼν δ’ ἀνακτα τὸν μελάμπτερον νεκρῶν
Θάνατον φυλάξω, καὶ νῦν εὐρήσειν δοκῶ
πίνοντα τύμβου πλησίον προσφαγμάτων.
κἂν περ loξαίας αὐτὸν ἐξ ἔδρας συνθεὶς
μάρψω, κύκλον δὲ περιβάλω χεροῖν ἐμαῖν,
οὐκ ἔστω οὕτως αὐτὸν ἔξαιρήσεται
μογοῦντα πλευρὰ, πρὶν γυναῖκ’ ἐμοί μεθῇ.

ἡν δ’ οὖν ἀμάρτω τῆςδ’ ἄγρας, καὶ μὴ μόλῃ
πρὸς αἰματηρῶν πέλανον, εἰμι τῶν κάτω
Κόρης ἀνακτός τ’ εἰς ἀνηλίους δόμους
αἰτήσομαι τε. καὶ πέποιθ’ ἄξειν ἄνω
’Αλκηστὶν, ὦστε χερσῖν ἐνθείναι ἕξενον,
ὅς μ’ ἐς δόμους ἐδέξατ’ οὐδ’ ἀπήλασε,
καὶ περ βαρεία συμφορὰ πεπληγμένος,
ἐκρυπτε δ’ ὧν γενναίος, αἰδεσθεὶς ἐμέ.
τίς τοῦτο μᾶλλον Θεοσαλῶν φιλόξενος,
tίς ‘Ελλάδ’ ὦκὼν; τοιγὰρ οὐκ ἔρει κακὸν
ἐνεργητῆσαι φῶτα γενναῖος γεγώς.

ΑΔ. ἰόν,
οὗναί πρόσοδοι, στυγναὶ δ’ ὀψεῖς
χῆρων μελάθρων. ἰό μοί μοι. αἰαί.
ποί βῶ; πᾶι στῶ; τί λέγω; τί δὲ μῆ;
πῶς ἀν ὀλοίμαι;
ἡ βαρυδαίμονα μήτηρ μ’ ἔτεκεν.

ζηλῶ φθιμένους, κείνων ἔραμαι.

κεῖν ἐπιθυμῶ δῶματα ναίειν.
οὔτε γὰρ αὐγάς χαίρω προσορῶν
οὔτ' ἐπὶ γαίας πόδα πεζεύων·
tοῖον ὦμηρόν μ' ἀποσυλῆσας
"Αἰδη Θάνατος παρέδωκεν. 870

ΧΟ. πρόβα πρόβα· βάθι κεῦθος οἰκων.
ΛΔ. αἰαὶ.
ΧΟ. πέπονθας ἄξι' ἀιαγμάτων. ΛΔ. ἐ ἐ.
ΧΟ. δι' ὄδυνας ἐβας,
σάφ' οἶδα, ΛΔ. φεῦ φεῦ. ΧΟ. τὰν νέρθε δ' οὐδὲν ὕφελεῖς. 875

ΛΔ. ἵω μοὶ μοι. ΧΟ. τὸ μήτοτ' εἰσὶδεῖν φιλίας ἀλόχου
πρόσωπον <σ' ἐν>αντα λυπρόν.
ΛΔ. ἔμνησας ὁ μου φρένας ἔλκωσεν·
tί γὰρ ἄνδρὶ κακὸν μεῖζον ἀμαρτεῖν
πιστῆς ἀλόχου; μὴ ποτε γῆμας
ῄσχελον οἰκεῖν μετὰ τῆς δόμους.
ζηλῶ δ' ἀγάμους ἀτέκνους τε βροτῶν·
μία γὰρ ψυχή, τῆς ἦπερ ἄλγειν
μέτριον ἄχθος·
παιδῶν δε νόσσους καὶ νυμφιδίους
ἐυνὰς θανάτους κεραῖζομένας
οὗ τλητοῦ ὅραν, ἐξὸν ἀτέκνους 880

871 παρέδωκε B. 872-77 are given to the chorus in L, while in P 872-76
(through μοὶ μοι) are assigned to the chorus and the rest from τὸ in 876 through
διὰ παντὸς in 888 is given to Admetus. 873 αἰαὶ] αἱ αἱ B αἱ αἱ L (omitted
in P) [ἀξί' Σ] ἄξια τ. 875 νέρθε δ' Hermann] νέρθεν MSS. 877 σ' ἐναντα
Hartung] ἄντα MSS. For other conjectures see Critical Notes. 878 ἀδ.
omitted in L (but it has been added by I). | ὁ μοὺ φρέν' ἔλκωσε B. 880 πιστῆς
S a (with Stobaeus Flor. 69, 12)] φιλίας B. 883 μὰ γὰρ ψυχῇ B α] μὰ γὰρ
ψυχῇ L ψυχῇ γὰρ μὰ P ψυχῇ δὲ μὰ l. | τῆς Stobaeus Flor. 68, 13. ἦπερ ἄλγειν
Ed.] ὑπεραλγεῖν MSS. 887 sq. ἀτέκνους and ἀγάμους S] ἀτέκνους and ἀγάμους
B α.
ἀγάμως τ’ εἶναι διὰ παντὸς.

ΧΟ. τύχα τύχα δυσπάλαιστος ἥκει. ἀντιστρ.

ΑΔ. αἰαῖ.

ΧΟ. πέρας δέ γ’ οὐδὲν ἀλγέων τιθεῖς. ΑΔ. ἐ ἔ.

ΧΟ. βαρέα μὲν φέρειν, οὐμὸς δὲ ΑΔ. φεῦ φεῦ. ΧΟ. τλάθ’ · οὐ σὺ πρῶτος ὀλεσας

ΑΔ. ἵνα μοι μοι. ΧΟ. γυναῖκα· συμφορὰ δ’ ἐτέρους ἐτέρα

πιέζει φανείσα θνατῶν.

ΑΔ. ὦ μακρὰ πένθη λύπαι τε φίλων τῶν ὑπὸ γαῖναν.

τί μ’ ἐκώλυσας βῆσαι τύμβου τάφρον ἐς κοίλην καὶ μετ’ ἐκείνης τῆς μέγ’ ἀρίστης κεῖσθαι φθίμενον; δύο δ’ ἀντὶ μιᾶς “Λιδῆς ψυχᾶς τὰς πιστοτάτας σὺν ἄν ἐσχεν, ὄμοι χθονίαν λίμνην διαβάντε.

ΧΟ. ἐμοὶ τις ἥν ἐν γένει, ὦ κόρος ἀξιόθρηνος ὠλετ’ ἐν δόμουσιν, μονότατος· ἀλλ’ ἐμπάς ἑφερε κακὸν ἀλίς, ἀτεκνὺς ὦν,

889 ff. The verses are assigned in the text according to ἀ. B gives al al (sic) to the chorus, πέρας—τιθεῖς to Admetus, and the following words through οὐμὸς δὲ to the chorus. L and P give 889–94 to the chorus. 889 al al] al al MSS. (L has at at). 890 δὲ γ’ α] δ’ ἐγ’ B δ’ S. | ἀλγέων τιθεῖς B S ἀλγέων τιθῆς α. In L L has written α over τιθεῖς and β over ἀλγέων. 892 τλάθ’ B. 894 βατάνων L ὀνηστήν τ. 895 λύπαι L] λυπαὶ τ. 896 γαῖαν B. 897 βῆσαι Hermann] βῆσαι MSS. 898 καὶ μετ’] κατ’ P. In L three letters (doubtless κατ’) have been erased here, and l has supplied καὶ μετ’. 901 σὺν ἄν ἐσχεν Lenting] συνανέσχεν B P ****νασχὲν L γε συνάσχεν L συνέχεν α (with σ written above the ex by al). 902 λίμναν S. 904 κόρος] κόρος L τ. 905 ὠχεῖτ’ ἐν δόμοις S.
πολιῶς ἐπὶ χαίτας

ηδη προπετῆς ὥν
βιότον τε πόρω.

ΑΔ. ω σχῆμα δόμων, πῶς εἰσέλθω;
πῶς δ᾽ οἶκησω μεταπίπτοντος
δαίμονος; οὖμοι. πολὺ γὰρ τὸ μέσον·
tότε μὲν πεύκαις σὺν Πηλιάσιν
σὺν θ᾽ ύμεναίως ἐστειχον ἐσω,
φιλίας ἀλόχου χέρα βαστάζων,
pολυάχητος δ᾽ εἴπετο κώμος,
tήν τε θανοῦσαν καὶ ὁλβίζων,
ὡς εὐπατρίδαι καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων
ὁντες ἀριστέων σύζυγες εἶμεν·
νῦν δ᾽ ύμεναίων γόος ἀντίπαλος
λευκῶν τε πέπλων μέλανες στολμοὶ
πέμπουσι μ᾽ ἐσω
λέκτρων κοίτας ἐς ἐρήμους.

ΧΟ. παρ᾽ εὔτυχῆ
σοὶ πότμον ἤλθεν ἀπειροκάκῳ τόδ᾽
ἀλγος· ἀλλ᾽ ἐσωσας
βιότον καὶ ψυχάν.
ἔθανε δάμαρ, ἐλιπε φιλίαν·
tὶ νέον τόδε; πολλοὺς
ηδη παρέλυσεν
θάνατος δάμαρτος.

ΑΔ. φιλοι, γυναικὸς δαίμον᾽ εὔτυχέστερον

τούμον νομίζω, καίπερ οὐ δοκοῦνθ᾽ ὀμως· τῆς μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀλγος ἀβεταὶ ποτε, πολλῶν δὲ μόχθων εὐκλείης ἐπαύσατο.

ἐγὼ δ', ὅν οὐ χρῆν ζῆν, παρεῖς τὸ μόροιμον λυπρὸν διάξω βίοτον· ἀρτι μανθάνω.

τῶς γὰρ δόμων τῶνδ᾽ εἰσόδους ἀνέξομαι; τίν' ἄν προσεπών, τοῦ δὲ προσρηθεῖς ύπο, τερπνῆς τύχομι ἄν εἰσόδου; ποὶ τρέψομαι; ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἐνδόν ἐξελιξ μ᾽ ἐρημία, γυναικὸς εὑνάς εὑτ᾽ ἄν εἰσίδῳ κενὰς

θρόνους τ᾽ ἐν οἴσιν ὦτε, καὶ κατὰ στέγασ

αὐχμηρὸν οἴδας, τέκνα δ᾽ ἀμφὶ γούνασι

πιπτοῦτα κλαίῃ μητὲρ', οἱ δὲ δεσπότων

στένωσιν οὐαν ἐκ δόμων ἀπώλεσαν.

τὰ μὲν κατ᾽ οἶκον τοιάδ᾽· ἐξωθεν δὲ με

γάμοι τ᾽ ἐλωσὶ Θεσσαλῶν καὶ ξύλλογοι

γυναικοπληθεῖσι· οὐ γὰρ ἐξανέξομαι

λεύσσων δάμαρτος τῆς ἐμῆς ὀμηλικας.

ἐρεῖ δὲ μ᾽ ὀστίς ἐχθρός ὅν κυρεῖ τάδε·

ιδοῦ τὸν αὐτχρῶς ζῶνθ', ὅς οὐκ ἐτήθ ϑανεῖν,

ἀλλ᾽ ἦν ἐγγεμον ἀντιδοὺς ἁψυχία

πέφυνεν "Ἄιδην· κἀτ' ἀνήρ εἶναι δοκεῖ;

στυγεῖ δὲ τοὺς τεκόντας, αὐτὸς οὐ θέλων

ϑανεῖν. τοιάνδε πρὸς κακοῖς κληδόνα

ἐξω. τί μοι ζῆν δήτα κύδιον, φίλοι,

κακῶς κλύνοιτι καὶ κακῶς πεπραγότι;

ΧΩ. ἐγὼ καὶ διὰ μούσας

στρ.

936 τούμον  B) τόμον L a τοῦ μοῦ P. 939 χρῆν Elmsley] χρῆ MSS.


948 κλαίῃ S κλαίει r. | μητέρα B. 950 οἰκον S. 951 τ᾽ Wakefield] γ᾽ MSS.

953 λεύσσων B. 955 ἰδοῦ L ἰδοῦ r. 957 κἀτ S] κατ' r. 960 ἐξω L b a²] ἐξω r.
καὶ μετάρρυθαν γῆς, καὶ πλείστων ἀφάμενος λόγων
κρείσσον οὐδὲν Ἀνάγκας
ηὐρον, οὐδὲ τι φαρμάκον
Θρήσσας ἐν σανίσιν, τὰς Ὠρφεία κατέγραψεν
γῆρος, οὐδ' ὁσα Φοῖβος Ἀνκληπτιάδας ἔδωκε
φάρμακα πολυπόνως
ἀντιτεμὼν βροτοῖσιν.
μόνας δ' οὖτ' ἐπὶ βωμοὺς
ἐστιν οὕτε βρέτας θεᾶς
ἐλθεῖν, οὐ σφαγίων κλύει.
μή μοι, πότινα, μείζων
ἐλθοὶς ἕ το πρὶν ἐν βίω.
καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς ὃ τι νεύσῃ,
σὺν σοὶ τοῦτο τελευτᾷ.
καὶ τὸν ἐν Χαλύβοις δαμάζεις σὺ βία σίδαρον,
οὐδὲ τις ἀποτόμου
λήματός ἐστιν αἰδώς.
καὶ σ' ἐν αἱμάκοις χερῶν εἶλε θεὰ δεσμοῖς.
τὸλμα δ' οὖ γὰρ ἀνάξεις ποτ' ἐνερθεῖν
κλαίων τοὺς φθιμένους τ' ἀνω.
καὶ θεῶν σκότιον φθίνουσι
παῖδες ἐν θανάτῳ.

964 ἀρέσκενος Stobaeus EcL. 1. 4, 3. 967 θρήσοσαις L α | σανίσων Matthiae]
sανίσι MSS. 968 κατέγραψεν Monk | κατέγραψε MSS. 970 ἔδωκε Musgrave]
παρέδωκε MSS. 972 βροτοῖσιν P a | βροτοῖσι τ. 974 οὕτε — ἐστιν MSS.
W. A. Wagner made the transposition. 978 νεύσῃ S νεύσει τ. 980 χαλύ
βοις S. 981 οὐ βία P. In L l has written above γρ. οὐ βία. | σίδαρον L α]
σίδηρον τ. 984 ἀφύκτοις S. 985 τὸλμα δ' S (l has written τὸ or τα above
the a δ', but has deleted it afterwards)] τὸλμα ταδ' B τὸλμα τδ' a. 986 φθινο-
μένους B. | ἀνω is perhaps corrupt. See Critical Notes. 989 φθίνουσι S]
φθινύδουσι τ (with l).
φίλα μὲν ὦτ' ἢν μεθ' ἤμων,
φίλα δ' ἔκτι καὶ θανόυσα,
γενναστάται δὲ πασάν
ἐξευξώ κλωσίαις ἄκοιτων.
µηδὲ νεκρῶν ὡς φθιμένων χῶµα νοµιζέσθω ἀντιστρ. 995
tύµβοι σάς ἀλόχου, θεοῦι δ' ὀµοίως
tιµάσθω, σέβας ἐµπόρων.
καὶ τις δοξμίαν κέλευθον
ἐµβαίνων τόδ' ἐρεί. 1000
αὐτὰ ποτὲ προύθαν ἄνδρός,
νῦν δ' ἐστὶ µάκαιρα δαίµων·
χαῖρ', ὦ πότνι', εὖ δὲ δοῖης.
τοῖαὶ νῦν προσεροῦσι φᾶµαι.
καὶ µὴν ὦτ', ὡς ἐοικεν, Ἀλκμήνης γόνος,
'Αδµητε, πρὸς σὴν ἐστίαν πορεύεται.

992 δ' ἐτὶ καὶ θανόυσα Portus (the Aldine has δὲ τι, probably a misprint for
οὐ μὴν σε λυπεῖν ἐν κακοῖς βοῦλομαι. 1020
ἀν δ’ οὐνεχ’ ἦκῳ δεῦρ’ ὑποστρέψας πάλιν λέξω. γυναῖκα τῆς μοι σῶσον λαβὼν,
ἐώς ἀν Ἴππους δεῦρο Ἡρμιάς ἄγων ἐλθόω, τύραννων Βιστόνων κατακτανῦν.
πράξας δ’ ὡς τῦχοιμι — νοστήσαμι γάρ — δίδωμι τῆς δοὺς προσπολεῖν δόμους. 1025
πολλῷ δὲ μόχθῳ χείρας ἤλθεν εἰς ἐμάς· ἄγῶνα γὰρ πάνθημον εὐφύσκω τινὰς
τιθέντας, ἀληταῖσιν ἂξιον πόνον,
ὁθεν κομίζω τῆνι νικήτηρια λαβὼν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ κούφα τοῖς νικῶσιν ἦν
ἵππους ἀγεσθαι, τοῦσι δ’ αὖ τὰ μείζονα νικῶσι, πυγμήν καὶ πάλην, Βουσφόρβια.
γυνὴ δ’ ἔπ’ αὐτοῖς εἴπετ’· ἐνυγχόντι δὲ αἰσχρὸν παρεῖναι κέρδος ἦν τὸδ’ εὐκλεέσι.
ἀλλ’, ὡσπερ εἴπον, σοὶ μέλειν γυναῖκα χρῆ. 1030
οὐ γὰρ κλοπαῖαν, ἀλλὰ σὺν τῶν λαβὼν ἦκοι· Χρόνῳ δὲ καὶ οὐ μ’ αἰνέσεις ἵσως.

ἈΔ. 1035
οὕτω σ’ ἀπίζων οὐδ’ ἐν ἐχθροῖσιν τιθείς ἐκρυψ’ ἐμῆς γυναίκος ἀθλίου τύχας· ἀλλ’ ἄλγος ἄλγει τοῦτ’ ἀν ἦν προσκεῖμενον,
εἰ τοῦ πρὸς ἄλλου δώμαθ’ ὀρμήθης ἦν ἐκολοθείνων· ἀλλις δὲ κλαίειν τοῦμον ἦν ἐμοὶ κακὸν.
γυναίκα δ’, εἰ πως ἐστίν, αἰτουμαί σ’, ἄναξ, ἄλλον τιν’ ὀστίς μὴ πέμπονθεν οὐ’ ἔγω

1017 μὲν Β. Α] δὴ Λ. δὲ Π. 1021 θρήκιας S (l has written ὁς above the α).
1022 ἔθω] ἔνθα Β. | βιστόνων Β. 1024 σοί] οὐ Β. | πρόσπολον S. 1025 πολ-
λῶν δὲ μόχθων ήλθε χείρας εἰς ἐμᾶς S. 1027 πόλων Β] πόλων Α πόλων S. 1030 αὖ
τὰ S] αὐτὰ τ. 1034 μέλλειν Β. 1036 μ’] γ’ S. 1037 ἀπίζων cod. Har-
leianus 5713] ἀπιμάζων τ. | ἐχθροῖσιν Α] ἐχθροῖσι Β ἀισχροῦς Ι. ἀισχροῦς Π.
1038 ἀθλίους Α. 1039 προκεῖμενον Β Π. 1040 εἰ τοῦ Β εἴπερ Σ.
σώζειν ἄνωχθι Θεσσαλῶν, πολλοὶ δὲ σοι
ξένοι Φεραίων· μὴ μ’ ἀναμνήσῃς κακῶν.
οὐκ ἀν δυναίμην τήμερον ἐν δώμασιν ἀδακρυς εἶναι· μὴ νοσοῦντί μοι νόσον
προσθῆς· ἀλέω γὰρ συμφορᾶ βαρούμοιμαι.
ποῦ καὶ τρέφοιτ' ἀν δωμάτων νέα γυνή; νέα γὰρ ὡς, ἔσθητι καὶ κόσμῳ πρέπει.
πότερα μετ’ ἀνδρῶν δῆτ’ ἐνοικήσεις στέγην;
καὶ πῶς ἀκραυφῆς εἰν νέοισ στρωφομενῇ ἑσται; τὸν ἡβῶνθ’, Ἡράκλεις, οὐβάδιον
εἰργειν· ἐγὼ δὲ σοῦ προμηθίαν ἔχω.

η τῆς θανούσης θάλαμον εἰσβῆςας τρέφω;
καὶ πῶς ἐπεσφρῶ τήμεδε τῷ κείνης λέχει;
διπλὴν φοβοῦμαι μέμψιν, ἐκ τε δημοτῶν,
μὴ τὶς μ’ ἐλέγξῃ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐνεργέτην
προδότ’ ἐν ἄλλης δεμνίας πίνειν νέας,
καὶ τῆς θανούσης· ἄξια δὲ μοι σέβειν·
πολλὴν προνοίαν δεῖ μ’ ἑχειν. σὺ δ’, ὡ γύναι,
ήτις ποτ’ εἰ σὺ, ταύτ’ ἔχουσα· Ἀλκήστιδι
μορφῆς μέτρ’ ἵσθι, καὶ πρὸς ἥματα δέμας.
οἴμου. κόμιζε πρὸς θεῶν ἐξ ὀμμάτων
γυναικα τήμεδε, μὴ μ’ ἐλης ἠρημένον.

δοκῶ γὰρ αὐτὴν εἰσορῶν γυναῖχ’ ὀρᾶν

εμήν· θολοὶ δὲ καρδίαν, ἐκ δ’ ὁμμάτων πηγαὶ κατερρώγασιν· ὃ τλῆμαν εγώ,
ῶς ἄρτι πένθους τοῦδε γενομαι πικροῦ.

ΧΩ.  ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχομι ἀν εὖ λέγειν τύχην·
χρῆ δ’, ἦτει εἰη, καρπερεῖν θεοῦ δόσων.

ΗΡ.  εἰ γὰρ τοσαύτην δύναμιν εἶχον ὡςτε σὴν
ἐς φᾶς πορεῦσαι νερτέρων ἐκ δωμάτων
γυναῖκα καὶ σοι τὴν ἑποῦ πορεύναι χάριν.

ΑΔ.  σάφ’ οἴδα βουλεσθαί σ’ ἂν. ἀλλὰ ποῦ τὸδε;
οὐκ ἔστι τοὺς θανόντας ἐς φάος μολεῖν.

ΗΡ.  μὴ νῦν ὑπέρβαλλ’, ἀλλ’ ἐναυσίμως φέρε.

ΑΔ.  ῥάον παρανεῖν ἥ παθόντα καρπερεῖν.

ΗΡ.  τί δ’ ἂν προκόπτοις εἰ θέλεις ἀεὶ στένειν;

ΑΔ.  ἐγγυκα καυτός, ἀλλ’ ἔρως τις ἐξάγει.

ΗΡ.  τὸ γὰρ φιλησαί τὸν θανόντ᾽ ἅγει δακρυ.

ΑΔ.  ἀπώλεσέν με, κατὶ μᾶλλον ἥ λέγω.

ΗΡ.  γυναικὸς ἐσθλῆς ἡμπλακες· τίς ἀντερεῖ;

ΑΔ.  ὡστ’ ἄνδρα τόνδε μηκέθ’ ἡδεσθαὶ βίω.

ΗΡ.  χρόνονος μαλάξει, νῦν δ’ ἐδ’ ἡβάσκει, κακῶν.

ΑΔ.  χρόνονος λέγεις ἂν, εἰ χρόνος τὸ καθανείν.

ΗΡ.  γυνη’ σε παύσει καὶ νέοι γάμοι πόθου.

ἈΔ. σίγησον· οἶνον ἑίπας. οὐκ ἀν ὁμήν.
ΗΡ. τί δ'; οὐ γαμεῖς γάρ, ἀλλὰ χηρεύσει λέχος;
ἈΔ. οὐκ ἔστιν ἆτις τῶδε συγκληθήσεται.
ΗΡ. μῶν τὴν θανοῦσαν ὑφελεῖν τι προσδοκᾶς;
ἈΔ. κεῖνην ὀποιον ἔστι τιμᾶσθαι χρεῶν.
ΗΡ. αἰνῶ μὲν αἰνῶ· μωρίαν δ' ὀφλισκάνεις.
ἈΔ. ὅς μῆτορ' ἄνδρα τόνδε νυμφίον καλῶν.
ΗΡ. ἐπηνεσ' ἀλόχω πιστὸς οὖνεκ' εἰ φίλος.
ἈΔ. θάνομι' ἐκείνην καίπερ οὐκ οὖσαν προδούσ.
ΗΡ. δέχου νυν εἰςω τῆνδε γενναίων δόμων.
ἈΔ. μῆ, πρός σε τοῦ σπείραντος ἀντομαὶ Δίος.
ΗΡ. καὶ μὴν ἀμαρτήσει γε μὴ δράσας τάδε.
ἈΔ. καὶ δρῶν γε λύπη καρδίαν δηχθήσομαι.
ΗΡ. πιθοῦ· τάχ' ἄν γὰρ ἐς δέον πέσοι χάρις.
ἈΔ. φεῦ.

εἶθ' ἐξ ἀγώνος τῆνδε μή ἀλβές ποτε.
ΗΡ. νυκῶιτι μέντοι καὶ σὺ συννικᾶς ἐμοί.
ἈΔ. καλῶς ἔλεξας· ἥ γυνὴ δ' ἀπελθέτω.
ΗΡ. ἀπεισων, εἰ χρή· πρῶτα δ' εἰ χρεὼν άθρει.
ἈΔ. χρή, σοῦ γε μὴ μέλλοντος ὀργαίνειν ἐμοί.
ΗΡ. εἰδῶς τι κάγω τῆνδ' ἔχω προθυμίαν.
ἈΔ. νίκα νυν. οὐ μὴν ἀνδάνοντά μοι ποεῖς.
ΗΡ. ἀλλ' ἐσθ' οὖ' ἡμᾶς αἰνεῖσεις· πιθοῦ μόνον.

1089 χηρεύσῃ λέχος Β χηρεύεισι λέχος Α χηρεύεις μῶνος S. 1090 τῷδε] τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ Β. 1093 μυρίαν Β (b has written μω over the μv). 1094 In L έστι has been written above ὃς by Λ| καλὸν Β καλεῖν l (with νων written above by another hand). 1097 νυν νοὸν Λ ἐν Ρ. γενναίαν] γενναίαν Σ. 1098 ἀντομαὶ S] αἰτοῦμαι τ. 1101 πιθοῦν Σ] πείθουν Ρ. τάχ' γὰρ Β. 1102 μὴ λαβεῖς Τυρ- 1103 θίττ] μὴ λαβεῖς C μὴ λαβές Β μὴ λαβεῖς Α (μὴ λαβές ΑΒ) μὴ λαβεῖς Π μὴ λαβεῖς Λ (l has written in the margin γρ. μ' ἡ λαβεῖς.) 1105 ἀθρεῖ] ἄρα Σ. 1108 omitted in the text of B, but added in the margin by Β| νυν Λ] νυν Ρ. ποεῖς Wecklein] ποεῖς MSS. In Β from 1109 to 1113 the scribe has given the lines of Hercules to Admetus and vice versa. He prefixed to 1114 the sign indicating that the verse belonged to Admetus, but afterwards deleted it.
ΑΔ. κομιζετ', εἰ χρή τήνδε δέξασθαι δόμους. 1110
HP. οὐκ ἄν μεθέην τὴν γυναῖκα προσπόλοισ.
ΑΔ. σὺ δ' αὐτός αὐτήν εἰσαγ', εἰ δοκεῖ, δόμουσ.
HP. ἐσ σᾶς μὲν οὖν ἔγγυε θήσομαι κέρας.
ΑΔ. οὐκ ἂνθ' ὀγομιὶ. δῶμα δ' εἰσεθεὶν πάρα.
HP. τῇ σῇ πέποθα χειρὶ δεξιᾷ μόνη.
ΑΔ. ἀναξ, βιάξὶ μ' οὖ θέλοντα δράν τάδε.
HP. τόλμα προτείναι χειρά καὶ θυγείν ἔγνης
ΑΔ. καὶ δὴ προτείνω, Γοργόν' ὡς κατατομών.
HP. ἔχεις; ΑΔ. ἔχω. HP. ναι, σφιζε νων, καὶ τὸν Διὸς
φήσεις ποτ' εἶναι πάιδα γενναίον ἐγνον.
βλέψον πρὸς αὐτήν, εἰ τι σῇ δοκεῖ πρέπειν
γυναικί: λύψης δ' εὐτυχών μεθύστασο.
ΑΔ. ὡ θεοί, τί λέξω; θαυμ. ἁνελπιστον τόδε.
γυναῖκα λεύσω τήν ἐμὴν ἔτητύμως,
ἡ κέρτομός μ' ἐκ θεοῦ τις ἐκπλήσσει χαρά;
HP. οὐκ ἔστων ἄλλη: τήνδ' ὥρας δάμαρτα σήν.
ΑΔ. ὡρα γε μὴ τι φάσμα νερτέρων τόδε.
HP. οὐ πυσαγαγών τόνδ' ἐπούντ' εἴδου.
ΑΔ. ἀλλ' ἂν ἐθάπτον εἰσοφρω δάμαρτ' ἐμὴν;
HP. σάφ᾽ ἵσθ'. ἀπιστεῖν δ' οὐ σε θαυμάζω τύχην.
ΑΔ. θίγω, προσείπω ζώσαιν ὡς δάμαρτ' ἐμὴν;

1111 μεθέηνιν σοι γυναίκα α. 1112 εἰσάγαγ' B | δοκεὶ S] βούλει r. | δόμους
Cod. Marc. IX. 10] δόμους ι. r. 1114 δῶμα δ' Σ] δόματ' r. 1117 προτείνα
Π] προτείνειν S πρὸςειν χ. | θείει Elmsley] θείειν B S θείες α. 1118 δῆ] μὴν S |
κατατομῶν Lobeek] κατατόμων MSS. 1119 εὐχαὶ ναι is given to Admetus in the
MSS. Wakefield was the first who gave ναι to Heracles, but he altered it to
καὶ. Monk restored the true reading. | νν] νν MSS. 1120 παίδα was omitted
in B, but Βρ has written above λείπει τῶν παίδα. 1121 πρὸς B] δ' ἐς r. | σῇ
Musgrave] σοι MSS. 1122 δ' is omitted in B. | εὐτυχῶν B P. 1123 Μέξ
S] λέοσω B λέοσω α. 1124 λέοσω α] λέοσω B λέοσων P λέοσων L. | τήν]
tήν S. 1125 η] η ρ. | μ' ek Buchele] me MSS. | εμπλήσει P. 1126 ἄλλη
Radermacher] ἄλλῃ MSS. 1127 τόδε Herwerden] τόδ'] εἰσοφρω B (γρ. τόδ'] η
has been written above by B when writing the scholia) τόδ'] η r.
HR. πρόσειτ'. ἐχεις γὰρ πᾶν ὅσονπερ ἡθελες.
AD. ὁ φιλτάτης γυναικὸς ὀμμα καὶ δέμας,
ἐχω σ' ἀέλπτως, οὐποτ' οφεσθαι δοκῶν.
HR. ἐχεις· φθόνος δὲ μὴ γένοιτο τις θεών.
AD. ὁ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζηνός εὐγενεῖς τέκνον,
εὐδαίμονοις, καὶ σ' ὁ φιτύσας πατὴρ
 σῶζοι· σὺ γὰρ δὴ τὰμ' ἀνώρθωσας μόνος.
πῶς τήνδ' ἐπεμψας νέρθεν ἐς φάος τόδε;
HR. μάχην συνάψας δαιμόνων τῷ κυρίῳ.
AD. ποὺ τοίδε Θανάτῳ φῆς ἀγώνα συμβαλείν;
HR. τῦμβον παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκ λόχου μάρφιας χερών.
AD. τί γὰρ ποθ' ᾧν ἀναυδος ἔστηκεν γυνή;
HR. οὐπωθ' θέμις σοι τῆςδε προσφωνημάτων
κλύειν, πρὶν ἁν θεοῖς τοῦ τις νερτέροις
ἀφαγνίσηται καὶ τρίτον μόλη φάος.
ἀλλ' εἴσαγ' εἰσώ τήνδε· καὶ δίκαιος ὅν
το λοιπόν, 'Ἄδμητ', εὑσέβει περὶ ξένους.
καὶ χαὶρ'· ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν προκείμενον πόνον
Σθενέλου τυράννῳ παιδὶ πορσυνῷ μολὼν.

AD. 'μείνον παρ' ᾧν ἀν καὶ ξυνέστιος γενοῦ.
HR. αὖθις τὸδ' ἔσται, νῦν δ' ἐπείγεσθαι με δει.
AD. ἀλλ' εὐτυχοῖς, νόστιμον δ' ἐλθοὺς δρόμον.
ἀστοῖς δὲ πάσῃ τ' ἐνενέω τετραρχία
χεροὺς ἐπ' ἐσθαλάις συμφοραίσιν ἱστάναι
βωμοὺς τε κινσάν βουθύτουσι προστροπαῖς.

1132 πανθ' διαπερ S. 1134 οὐποθ' B. 1137 φιτύσας B] φυτύσας τ.
1138 σὺ γὰρ τὰμ' ὀρθώσας S (σὺ γὰρ δὴ τὰμα γ' ὀρθώσας I). 1140 κυρίῳ α d,
with the schol.] κοράνῳ B S. 1143 ἐστηκε B. 1150 τυράννῳ B P L] τυρά-
νον α L. | πορσυνῳ L] πορσυνω τ | μολὼν S] μολὼν τ. 1151 ξυνέστιον S] αὐνέ-
στιον τ. 1153 δόμον Wilamowitz] δόμον S τόδα α (ας has written in the
margin γρ. δόμον γρ. καὶ ὄμοι) ά ά B. 1154 πάσῃ τ' α πάσι τ' τ (πάσιν τ).
1155 συμφοραῖς συνιστάναι α. 1156 κινσάν C] κινσάν τ προστροπαῖς L α]
προστροπαῖς τ.
νῦν γὰρ μεθηρμόσμεσθα βελτίω βίον
tοῦ πρόσθεν· οὐ γὰρ εὐτυχῶν ἀρνήσομαι.

ΧΩ. πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῶν δαμονίων,
pολλὰ δὲ ἀέλπτως κραίνουσι θεοῖ·
kαὶ τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη,
tῶν δὲ ἀδοκητῶν πόρον ἦνε θεὸς.
tοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα.

1157 μεθηρμόσμεσθα τ] μεθηρμόσμεσθα ὦ τ. μεθηρμόσμεθα τ. 1163 τόδε] τόδε τὸ Ὡ.
At the end stands in Ὡ αὶ Π τέλος εὐριπίδου ἀλκηστίδος, in Ἠ εὐριπίδου ἀλκηστις.
SELECT CONJECTURES.

The conjectures which have been made as to readings in the text of the Alcestis number more than four thousand. From this great mass I have selected the following as worthy of mention, either from their plausibility and ingenuity or from the influence which they have exerted upon the history of the text. Among them will be found nearly all* of Nauck’s and Wecklein’s, and many of those made by F. W. Schmidt and Kviçala.

Verse 16 πατέρα τε γραμάν θ’ Monk, καὶ πατέρα γραμάν θ’ Nauck. 17 οὖχ εὖρεν μήν γυναικὸς οὔτε ἦθελε (rejecting v. 16) Kviçala. 19–20 ἐν νόν κ.ο.ε.χ. βασιλέως | ψυχορραγοΰσαν Usener. Kirchhoff thinks a line has been lost after v. 19. 23 Earle suggests μελάθρων τήνδε φιλτάτων στέγην. 30 τιμῶν ἐνέρους Maass. 31 νοσφιλό-μενος Wecklein. 34 Monk suggested σφήλαντα. 36 τὸδ’: τὸδ’ Elmsley. 44 βίαν σ’: βίαν γ’ Earle. 45 χθονίς κάτω Matthiae. 49 Von Holzinger would punctuate with a colon after χρύ. 51 καὶ προθυμία: Wecklein suggests τής προθυμίας. 63 ἀ: χα’ Herwerden. 64 πείσει Schmidt (παύσῃ the MSS). 66–7 Perhaps these two lines should be rejected as an interpolation. 70 καὶ τ’ ὁδ’ for κοῦθ’ γ’ Steup. 71 δράσει G. Hermann, δράσω Weil. Zacher would insert 70 and 71 after 62, giving 70 to Thanatos (with a period after χάρις) and reading δ’ for θ’ in 71. 79 φίλων τοιν πέλας Dobree, φίλων οὖν πέλας Nauck (formerly), φίλων οὖν πέλας Heiland. 81 βασίλεων χρή πενθείν ή ζῶσ’ Lascaris (with l), βασίλεων πενθείν χρή μ’ ή ζῶσ’ Kirchhoff. 83 πᾶσι τ’: πλείστον Naber. ἀεὶ πᾶσιν for ἐμοὶ πᾶσι τ’ Schmidt. 85 Ηλίων δυνάτηρ (omitting τὸδε) Dindorf.

* Except, of course, such as have been received into the text.

| πάντα γαρ γι' | χρήν | δή τετέλεσται
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύσι</td>
<td>τελη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| πάντων δέ θεών είσ’ | ετ’ βωμοίς, κ. τ. χ, supposing a tear in the archetype. Nauck brackets τετέλεσται βασιλεύσι. Kirchhoff marks lacunas after ηδόν, τετέλεσται, βασιλεύσι, θεών, βωμοίς, supposing that these words began five lines the ends of which have been lost. 134 Dindorf conjectures that six anapaesths have fallen out either before or after πλήρεις. 136 εκ δόμων: γαρ δόμων Usener. 148, 149 Tournier would insert these two lines after 143. 153 ου μή γενέσθαι τήν άν Reiske, τίς, μή γενέσθαι Matthiae. 160 δό-μον: δοκῶν Herwerden, δοχῶν Lenz. 180 δλην for (MSS.) μόνην Schmidt. 187 θαλάμων Nauck. Earle transposes 204 and 205. 208 Laechmann would reject this line only, retaining 207. 213 τίς άν πῶς Aldine, τίς άν πτ’ Lascaris, 'αλιι aliter.' Nauck reads bacchiacs, thus: ιώ Ζεύ, τίς άν πτ’ πόρος πτ’ γένοιτ’ άν τίχας α τάρεστιν τυμάννοις and 227 παπαί φεύ, ιώ πτ’ Φέρητος, παπαί, οτ’ επαρεξες δάμαρ-τος στερηθεις. 215 ετ’ εις τίς Herwerden. 223 τούθ’ εφεύρες (MSS.): τούθ’ εφεύρες (τούτο) Hermann, τούθ’ εφεύρες (τούθ’ Hadley, τούθ’ εφρούρες Schmidt. Dindorf regards τούθ’ εφεύρες as an interpolation; τούθ’ (sc. ησθα), καί νῦν Wecklein, τούθ’ ήσθα (sc. αυτήμοιος), καί νῦν Weil. 227 σάς: ας Weil. 230 ούραυρων: ούραυ-ρών Lenting, άρτανίων Herwerden, άγχονιω Weeklein, ούλομενω Hay-ley. 231 εποψει: ετ’ οψε Schmidt. 243 βίον: χρόνων Schmidt. 245 ούραμα: ούραμοι Earle. 247 άνθ’ οίου θανεύ Weeklein. 252 f. Allen restores the text of this and the antistrophic passage thus:
SELECT CONJECTURES.


* Cf. Monk's note on 262 of his edition (= 254 Prinz) where he suggested χέρας and κωμανύγες (though apparently he had given them up).
SELECT CONJECTURES.


* Prinz ascribes this conjecture to Monk, but it is not in Monk's edition. Tyrwhitt suggested ἐστι ἐστί.
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL NOTES.

[In citing from the dramatists Kirchhoff's edition of Aeschylus (Berlin, 1889), Mekler's Sophocles (Leipzig, 1889), Kirchhoff's smaller edition of Euripides (Berlin, 1887), and for the fragments Nauck's Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (second ed. Leipzig, 1889) have been used.]

Verse 1. Scene Phærae in Thessaly, in front of the palace of King Admetus. Apollo, armed with bow and quiver (vv. 35, 39–40), comes out of the palace-door and speaks the prologue. 'Ω δώματ' Ἀδμήτει': the address serves at once to fix the locality and to lend impressiveness to the opening of the play. The Andromache and Electra open with a similar apostrophe. — The use of the adjective derived from a proper noun instead of the possessive genitive is too common in the tragedians to need illustration.

2. θήσαν τράπεζαν: so El. 205 θήσαν ἐστίαν. αὐνέσαι: Schol. εὐαρεστήσει, καταδέξασθαι.

4. φλόγα: here unqualified by an adjective; although when the flame meant is the lightning (as here) the usual phrase is φλέξ κερανία or οὐρανία.

8. Wakefield and Earle read δ' ἐσ άλαν with Athenagoras. But (1) it is a well-known principle of criticism that variant readings found only in quotations made by one classical writer from another should be regarded with great suspicion, as the ancients so often quoted from memory: (2) as has been repeatedly pointed out (recently by Wecklein Berliner Woch. f. klasse. Phil. 1895, No. 40, p. 1255), the tragedians do not use the form ἀλα where γαία is metrically possible.


10. This line has given some difficulty. Wuestemann objects that Apollo would not call himself δοσίως, especially when he was still laden with blood-guilt from the slaughter of the Cyclopes. Wheeler (De Alcest. et Hippol. interp. p. 11) goes so far as to say of the verse: 'spurium esse certis argumentis docuit me vir illustissimus mihi hoc loco non nominandum. Menda non sanabilia duo sunt.' Nevertheless, I cannot help believing the line to be perfectly sound. If δοσίως means 'outwardly pure,' there is a real difficulty; for according to the prevailing Delphian form of the legend (symbolized by the festival called Stesphoria) Apollo was not purified until his servitude was over, though there was another form of the story according to which he was purified in Crete before
he went to Thessaly (see the 3d. hypoth. to Pindar Pyth., vol. II. p. 298 Boeckh). I do not believe, however, that the objection applied to Euripides at all. Cf. Aesch. Suppl. 204 ἀγνὸν τ' Ἀπόλλων φυγάδ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ θεὸν, where Apollo is called ἀγνός, though his punishment is mentioned in the same breath. Besides, δῶς usually denotes inward piety rather than ceremonial purity (Schmidt Synonymik s. v. ἱερός). Apollo merely means that being himself pious by nature he found a congenial spirit in his master. The fact that there are two resolved feet in the line does not militate against its genuineness; see note on v. 802. The verse cannot be detached from its context without injuring the connection; the play on words in ὡς οὖν ἀνδρὸς δῶς ὥν is characteristic *; indeed, it would be hard to find a more Euripidean line.

12. Μοίρας δολῶσας: cf. Aesch. Eun. 713 ff. τοι' ἐδρασίας καὶ θέρητος ἐν δόμως. | Μοίρας ἐπεισάς ἀφθίτοις θείαι βροτοῖς ... σοὶ τοι παλαιᾶς διανομᾶς κατα-φιλίας | οἴνῳ παραπάτησας ἀρχαῖας θέας. Wilamowitz (Isylos p. 66) with great plausibility conjectures that Aeschylus and Euripides are here following Phrynichus (see Introd. p. xv). ἰνεσαν: cf. aïνεαι in v. 2. In both uses there is the underlying idea of concession or acquiescence.

13. ἄρην: here a common noun, 'death,' as often; e.g. Hippol. 1047 ταχὺς γὰρ αἴθὶ ρόστος ἀνθρώπος ἄνεος, Aesch. Ag. 667 ἕρην πῶντιον περιευγής. It is very difficult to determine at what point the personal element in such words ceases to be felt.

16. This line was rejected by Dindorf, and is bracketed by Prinz and Nauck. Earle rejects it altogether. As it stands in the MSS. (πατέρα γεραιάν θ' ἦ σφ' ἐτικτε μητέρα), Nauck's objection (Euripideische Studien II. p. 49): "Die Worte πατέρα γεραιάν τε μητέρα können nach dem Zusammenhange nur als Apposition zu πάντας φίλους genommen werden; dass es aber vollkommen unmöglich ist πάντας φίλους durch πατέρα καὶ μητέρα zu erläutern, wird jeder zugeben müssen" is unanswerable. Hermann, with his usual positiveness, observes: "Non tria, amici, et pater, et mater commemorantur, sed omnes comprehenduntur amicorum nomine, quorum deinde exempla afferuntur"; but this is unsatisfactory. We should in that case at least have an intensive particle, "even his own father and mother." Dr. Verrall has recently argued (Euripides the Rationalist pp. 27 ff.) that the MSS. reading is sound because "according to the bargain none was admissible except the family of Admetus," so that the πάντας φίλου are necessarily the father, mother and wife of Admetus (the children being too young to be accepted as substitutes). This position seems quite untenable. (1) The writer in the Bibliotheca of Apollodorus, I. 9, 15, 2 Hercher (probably following the Hesiodic account; see Wilamowitz Isylos pp. 57 ff.) says: ἵππος τοπος παρὰ Μοίρων ἵνα, δὲν Ἀδμητος μέλλει τελευτάν, ἄπολυσῃ τοῦ θανάτου, ἂν ἑκουσίως τὶς ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ θήσκειν ἔλθαι. The words πατήρ ἢ μητήρ ἢ γυνη, which follow in the MSS., have ever since Heyne's time been justly regarded as 'interpretationem miselli grammatici':

* See Weber's article (in Comment. Wolfdlinnae, p. 99 f.) on "Nominalparataxon" in the tragedians.
Hercher omits them in his text. Hyginus (Fab. 51), who probably drew from the same source (Wilamowitz l. s. c. p. 68), says "et illud ab Apolline acceptit ut pro se alius voluntarie moreretur. The schol. on v. 12 observes: ολν γάρ ταύτας, φασί, τῶν λογισμῶν ἀπαγαγῶν έχετήσατο 'Αδμητον, οὕτω μέντοι ὡστε αὑτίδιοίναι ἕαντος ἔτερον τῷ 'Αδη. The schol. on v. 34 says: μεθύσας γάρ αὐτάς ἦτησε παρ' αὐτῶν ἀντὶ 'Αδμητον ἄλλον ἀποθανεῖν. So too the first hypothesis to the play: 'Απόλλων ήτήσατο παρὰ τῶν Μούρων δῶς ὁ 'Αδμητος τελευτάν μέλλων παράσχει τὸν ὑπέρ ἕαντος ἕκοντα τεθυηδημενον. In none of these cases is any restriction spoken of such as Dr. Verrall assumes to have existed (if we except the worthless gloss in Apollodoros mentioned above). And if Euripides meant to restrict the substitution to the family of Admetus, why did he use such phrases as ἄλλον νεκρόν and πάντας φιλοὺς, which, taken apart from v. 16, would certainly be understood otherwise? (2) Again, Dr. Verrall, understanding τοῖς κάτω (v. 14) as meaning the dead of Admetus's family, observes: "The death of a person of another family, who would be buried with his 'loved ones,' in a different burying-place, and worshipped with other and alien rites, would be no compensation at all." But surely it is more natural to take τοῖς κάτω (sc. θεοῖς) as meaning the deities of the underworld (cf. v. 75, v. 851 ff.). According to the Eoeae (Wilamowitz l. s. c.) the deity whose wrath made the sacrifice necessary was the Pheraean Artemis Brumw (cf. Apollod. Bibl. I. 9, 15, 2); and this very Brumw was identified with the chthonian Hecate (Lycoph. Alex. 1176, Apollon. Rhod. III. 860) or Persephone (Lycoph. Alex. 608 and schol.), the queen of the underworld. Euripides doubtless was familiar with this fact. Hence Dr. Verrall's argument loses much of its force. (3) Again, could there be a more glaring instance of bathos than after the fine line πάντας δ' ἐλέγξας καὶ διεξελθὼν φιλοὺς (with its emphatic πάντας) to suddenly inform the reader that these πάντες φιλοὺς were only three in number? The question then arises whether the line should be emended or rejected as an interpolation. Nauck's καὶ πατέρα γραίδων θ' ἤ σφ' ετικτε μητέρα is probably the best emendation that has yet been suggested; but he himself was inclined in his later years to reject the line. The omission of the verse restores a clear and simple connection, and leaves to πάντας φιλοὺς its proper and natural sense. I believe the line to be an interpolation, made by some one who wished, like Dr. Verrall, to restrict the substitution to the family of Admetus.

17, 18. ὅστις, Reiske's certain and necessary emendation for ἦτις, is accepted by almost all modern editors of the play. Kvičala's οὖχ πήρε: πλην γνωνικὸς ὅστις ἔθηκε is elegant, but not convincing. With regard to 17, however, there is a wide difference of opinion. One class of editors (Dindorf, Kirchhoff, Prinz, Weil, Nauck) reads ὥθειν and (with C) μηδ' ἔτ'. Another (Monk, Wecklein, Earle, with Wilamowitz Hermes XVII. p. 364) reads ὥθων (with Reiske) and μηκέτ' (with all the best MSS.). To read ὥθειν and retain μηκέτ' is out of the question, as the asyndeton is too harsh. In behalf of the reading ὥθειν . . . μηδ' ἔτ' may be urged the frequent parallelism in such expressions,
e.g. v. 21, *Heracl*. 969 χρήν τόσον μὴ ἔννυμι· ὧν ὑπὸν φάσον ἔτι, *El*. 349 ἀνήρ ἔστι καὶ λεύσας φάος; etc. But the arguments of Wilamowitz in favor of θανῶν . . . μηκέτ' seem conclusive (see *Hermes* l. s. c.). μηκέτι has the support of the best MSS. of both classes, while μηδ' ἔτι' is attested only by the comparatively worthless Codex Havniciensis. Moreover, if θανῶν . . . μηκέτ' was the original reading, when some 'intelligent reader' changed δόσις in 17 to ἕτις, thinking that γνωρίσκω should be its antecedent, θανῶν in 18 could not be changed to θανώσα for metrical reasons, and hence would naturally be altered to θανεῖν. This would leave exactly that form of the two lines which is found in the best MSS. Then some one, thinking to better matters, would change μηκέτ' to μηδ' ἔτι' to avoid the asyndeton, exactly as we find in C. But if θανεῖν . . . μηδ' ἔτι' was the original reading, the change of μηδ' ἔτι' to μηκέτ' was quite uncalled-for. Besides, the expression θανῶν . . . μηκέτ' εἰσορᾶν φάος can easily be paralleled, e.g. Ion 853 ἀπόθονι θανεῖν τε ζῶν τε φέγγοις εἰσορᾶν, *Pcl*. 550 φησὶ δ' ἐν φάει | πάσιν τὸν ἄμων ζῶντα φέγγοις εἰσορᾶν, etc. — κείνου: the use of the demonstrative instead of the indirect reflexive changes the point of view from that of Admetus to that of Apollo and the audience, as Earle well puts it. Besides, πρὸ δοὺν or αὐτοῦ would have given hiatus. For a still bolder use of the demonstrative instead of the reflexive, see Xen. *Hellen*. 1. 6, 14 ἐαυτοῦ γε ἀρχοντος — εἰς τούκεινον δυνατόν.

19. Usener (*Fleckeisen's Jahrb*. vol. 139 [1889] p. 364) says of this line: "quoniam quis tandem mulierem moribundam sustentet plane obscurn est, ferri nequit." He would therefore emend (see Select Conjectures). But ἐν χεροῖν is purposely left indeterminate, the poet not caring to specify whether Alcestis is being carried by Admetus himself, or the attendants, or both. Cf. v. 201 ἄκουσιν ἐν χεροῖν ἔχον (but 266 μεθετε, μέθετε . . . κλινατ'). The dual (χεροῖν) is, of course, no proof that Admetus alone is meant.


22. Cf. *Hippol*. 1137 ff., where Artemis withdraws to avoid pollution from the dying Hippolytus. The Greeks thought not only that a person was polluted by touching, seeing, or being under the same roof with a corpse, but also that the house in which there was a dead body was itself rendered impure: a belief which is attested not only by numerous passages in ancient writers, but also by inscriptions (e.g. Dittenberger *Syll. med.* nos. 379, 468, 469) and by the custom of placing the δόστρακον or ἀρδάκων at the door (see note on vv. 98 ff.).

23. The question arises whether Apollo is conceived as just quitting the service of Admetus, or whether his servitude has ceased some time before and he has merely been revisiting his former master. The language of the text is not in itself decisive (cf. vv. 8–9), but on the whole favors the former alter-
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native, which I am strongly inclined to accept. The tone of lingering affection in which Apollo speaks in v. 23 is certainly appropriate to one leaving a kind master after a long term of service. \(\tau\omega\nu\delta\varepsilon\ \varphi\iota\lambda\tau\alpha\tau\eta\nu\) : so the schol. on \textit{Hippol.} 1437. This is probably right: \(\tau\omega\nu\delta\varepsilon\ \varphi\iota\lambda\tau\alpha\tau\tau\omega\nu\), the reading of one class of MSS., and \(\tau\eta\prime\rho\delta\varepsilon\ \varphi\iota\lambda\tau\alpha\tau\eta\nu\), that of the other, are both due to that tendency to assimilate the constructions and forms of adjacent words which has been so pernicious to our classical texts.*

24. As to the genuineness of vv. 24–76, see Introd. p. xxxvii f. If the passage is an interpolation, it is at least an early one. — Enter Thanatos. He carries a sword (v. 76), and we may perhaps infer from v. 843 that he has black wings (or black garments if we read \(\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\mu\varepsilon\pi\lambda\omega\nu\)). On the conception of Thanatos in this play, see notes on 261 and 845.

25. \(\iota\epsilon\rho\varepsilon\alpha\) : the MSS. have \(\iota\epsilon\rho\hat{\eta}\) (though in L the first hand has written \(\epsilon\rho\varepsilon\alpha\) above the \(\epsilon\rho\hat{\eta}\)). The question whether the acc. sing. in \(\eta\) from nouns in \(\epsilon\omega\varsigma\) is allowable in the tragedians is disputed. The evidence seems to be as follows. In Homer the forms \(\vartheta\omega\hat{\nu}\hat{\eta}\) (\(\Delta\ 384\), cf. Herodian, vol. II. pp. 676–7 Lenz) and \(\mu\eta\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\hat{\eta}\) (\(O\ 339\)) are found in the most and best of the MSS.; though in both passages there are some variants, and in both emendation is easy. The form \(\'\Omega\delta\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}\) is said by the schol. to have been read by Aristarchus in \(\tau\ 136\), though the MSS. have \(\delta\nu\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}\alpha\) or \(\delta\nu\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}a\). Whether these forms in \(\eta\) should be retained or not is matter of high dispute, and editors are very evenly divided. The present writer is inclined, with Nauck (\textit{Bulletin de l'Académie imp. de St: Pétersboury} 17 pp. 190 ff.), Christ, Van Leeuwen and others, to reject them. See Menrad \textit{De contractionis usu Homeric.}, pp. 60 ff. Hesiod has no instance of the form in \(\eta\). In Pindar, too, it is surprisingly rare; I have noted but three cases, "\(\Lambda\lambda\nu\nu\iota\nu\theta\iota\nu\) \textit{Isth.} V. (VI.) 53 and \textit{Nem.} IV. 27, and "\(\Omega\delta\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}\) \textit{Nem.} VIII. 26. In the other lyric poets there seems to be no instance of the form in \(\eta\) ("\(\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\tau\rho\nu\) Crates fr. 5 is Bergk's emendation, the MSS. having "\(\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\tau\rho\nu\)). In Herod. VII. 220 in an oracle the form \(\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\sigma\hat{\eta}\) occurs (so most MSS., \(\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\sigma\hat{\eta}\ C\), \(\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\sigma\hat{\eta}\) dz). Aeschylus seems not to have the form in \(\eta\), and I have found no instance in Sophocles. In Euripides I have noted four cases, \(\textit{El.}\ 439 "\(\Lambda\chi\lambda\hat{\eta}\), \textit{Rh.}\ 708 "\(\Omega\delta\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}\), fr. 781, 24 Nauck \(\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\sigma\hat{\eta}\) (\(\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\sigma\hat{\eta}\ M. Schmidt), all lyric, and the one in our text. Aristophanes has "\(\xi\nu\gamma\gamma\rho\alpha\beta\hat{\eta}\) in a chorus, \textit{Achar.} 1150 (but there the soundness of the text is doubtful on other grounds, and many editors read \(\tau\omega\nu\) \(\mu\epsilon\lambda\varepsilon\omega\nu\) \(\tau\omega\nu\) \(\mu\epsilon\lambda\varepsilon\omega\nu\) with Elmsley). The Attic inscriptions do not have the form in \(\eta\) (Meisterhans p. 109, Wecklein \textit{Cur. Epigr.} p. 21), though it is not rare in the \(\kappa\omega\upsilon\eta\) and common in the later Doric (Kühner-Blass l. p. 451, 3). In view of these facts I doubt whether Euripides ever used the contracted form in \(\eta\) in trimeters, and am inclined to read \(\iota\epsilon\rho\varepsilon\alpha\) with Monk. For the synizesis cf. "\(\Gamma\nu\rho\nu\nu\omega\varepsilon\alpha\) Hesiod \textit{Th.}\ 982 (so Rzach with M), \(\Pi\nu\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\) \textit{Soph.}\ fr. 447, 1, "\(\Omega\delta\upsilon\sigma\sigma\hat{\epsilon}a\) \textit{Soph.}\ \textit{Aj.}\ 104, \textit{Mevoukēa}\ \textit{Eur. Phoen.}\ 913, "\(\Lambda\chi\lambda\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\) \textit{Rhes.}\ 977, I. A. 1341, *

* On the frequent interchange of pronominal forms in the MSS., see Wecklein \textit{Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides} p. 4794.
II.6 Aristoph. Rhet. 863, etc. ϕιλιόντων: so Wecklein for θανόντων of the MSS. Thanatos is the iepov of the dying (cf. 71 ff.), not of those already dead; hence the emendation seems necessary. The resemblance both in form and meaning between ϕιλιόντων and θανόντων would facilitate the change. Weil thinks that θανόντων is used by a kind of prolepsis: but Ierc. F. 454 ἀγώμεθα ἔγεργος οὐ καλὸν νεκρῶν, which he quotes, is scarcely a parallel to this passage.

26. σύμμετρος, which Nauck conjectured to be the true reading (the adjective, not the adverb, being regularly used in such cases), is actually found in Ἡ, the other MSS. having συμμετρὶς. Nauck compares Soph. Antig. 387 ποίᾳ ζύμημετρος προφύζην τύχη;

27. φρονεῖν τόδε ἡμαρ: the figure is that of one watching a prisoner who is liable to escape him. I know of no other instance of φρονεῖν ἡμαρ or ἡμέραν in Euripides, Aeschylus or Sophocles.

29. πολεῖς: cf. Or. 1269 τίς ὅδε ἁρμα μελαθρον πολεῖ σών ἄγροτας ἀνήρ;

30-31. This passage has given rise to much discussion. Nauck (Eur. Stud. II. p. 50) rejected v. 31 as a useless and inappropriate addition. He pointed out that v. 30 ἀδικεῖι ἀό τιμᾶς ἐνέρων makes complete sense by itself (cf. Φθοεν. 958 ἀδικεῖι τὰ τῶν θεῶν), and thought that 31 was added by some one who did not understand the construction ἀδικεῖι τιμᾶς. The line has a very Byzantine look, and is actually wanting in Ἡ. Nauck's objections to ἀφορίζομενοσ do not, however, appear conclusive. The verb ἀφορίζειν signifies "to mark off with bounds" (ὅροι), and hence "to circumscribe, limit, define," the usual meaning of the word; and in the middle it may mean "to mark off for oneself" as one's own property, and hence to "appropriate," as in the passage from our text and Isocr. Phil. 120 χώραν οὔτι πλεῖστην ἀφορίσασθαι. Another way of explaining the latter usage is to assume that ἀφορίζειν sometimes meant "to remove the bounds," and in the middle "to appropriate by removing the bounds"; cf. the Scriptural injunction not to move a neighbor's landmark. But I know of no passage where ἀφορίζειν is used with the meaning "to remove the bounds" from a piece of property. On ὅριζειν and its compounds, see Pollux IX. 8. But though ἀφορίζομενοσ may be defended, its juxtaposition with κατασκαύων ("appropriating and suppressing") is certainly harsh, and I am inclined to think that Nauck's critical insight guided him airtight in rejecting the line.

33-4. Μοίρας δολῶ | σφήλαντι τέχνη: see note on v. 12.

35. τοξῆρη: proleptic. Cf. Iun. 980 ξιφηφόρους σοὺς ὀπλίσασ ὀπάνασ for the construction, and for the word Rhes. 226 Ἀπολλον...μόλε τοξῆρης, Herc. F. 188 τοξῆρη σάγγη, ib. 1062 τοξῆρει ψαλμῷ τοξεύσας.

36. τόδε: i.e. πόσιν ἐκλύσασ αὐτῇ προθανεῖν. The τόδε is used because Thanatos wishes to make his statement just as explicit as possible, and remind Apollo of the exact terms of the agreement. Hence it is needless to read τόδε with Elmsley.
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38. θάρσει: the form in πό is commonly said to be early Attic, but this has not thus far been confirmed by the inscriptions. See Meisterhans² p. 76, 5. λόγοις κεδνοῖς: cf. Ἰέης. 272 φέρω κεδνοῖς λόγοις.

39. τί... τόξων ἐργον: cf. Ηιππολ. 911 σιωπής δ' οὖν μεν ἐργόν, and the Latin opus est.

40. Monk aptly compares Hor. Odes III. 4, 60 nonquam humero positurus arcum... Apollo. αἰεί: so L. Porson, relying upon insufficient evidence, denied that the tragedians used this form; but in the words of Mr. Rutherford (New Phrynichus p. 112), "no one would now venture to dispute that in the old Attic of Tragedy forms like κάω, κλαίω, αἰετός, αἰεί, ἔλαια, were retained when κάω, κλαίω, αἰεί ἔλαια had replaced them in ordinary speech." Cf. Wecklein Curt. Epigr. p. 64: "Nulla causa est cur formam αἰεί ab prius longa requiritur a diversio tragicorum abundicemus: comprobatur illa titulis, libris, testimonio Marcellini" (vii. Thucyd. 52). The Medicean MS. of Sophocles and Aeschylus generally has αἰεί where the metre requires a long penult. The Attic inscriptions show αἰεί and αἰεί side by side down to about 360 B.C., after which (except in the decrees of θιασώται) αἰεί is the form in regular use. Hence the statements of the grammarians (see Voemel Dem. Contr. pp. 28 ff., Wecklein l. s. c. pp. 63 ff.) that αἰεί was the Attic form are correct as to the later Attic usage, but should not be understood as excluding αἰεί from the tragedians. See also Ellendt's Lex. to Sophocles s. v. αἰεί, Meisterhans² pp. 24-5, Kühner-Blass I. p. 137. In the passage from our text the penult is long and has the ictus, and besides αἰεί, as being the older and rarer form, is more likely to be right than the later and more familiar αἰεί. A copyist might easily change αἰεί to αἰεί, but would scarcely have changed αἰεί to αἰεί. Hence I have followed the reading of L.

43. νοσφυείς: cf. Suppl. 153 ἦ ποῦ σφ' ἄδελφος χρημάτων νοσφυέται; ib. 539. Euripides seems not to have used the double-accusative construction with this verb.

44. πρὸς βιάν σ': Earle's conjecture, γ' for σ', is very plausible, and may well be right; but it does not seem necessary to alter the reading of the MSS.

45. κατω χθονός: so the best MSS. (except P, which has κατά χθονός). Matthiae read χθονός κάτω, and so Herrmann, Dindorf and Earle (see his pref. p. VI note). It is true, as Herrmann observes, that the chiasmic order (ὑπήρ γῆς... χθονός κάτω) is more effective; and the inferior MSS. c, d, (also a ?) are said to have that reading; but Euripides did not always put things in the most effective way, and it seems most prudent to follow the best MSS. Cf. Troad. 1243 εἰ δ' ἡμᾶς θεὸς | ἐστερψε τάνω περίβαλων κάτω χθονός. κατά χθονός in P is doubtless due to κατά χθονός in 75 (cf. 163). Cf. Heraclid. 592, where Stobaeus read κατω χθονός, but our MSS. have κατά χθονός.

47. νέρτεραν: this reading (that of P and l) is certainly right, and is accepted by all the edd. Cf. Her. F. 335 νέρτερα... χθονί, and from the Cresphontes (fr. 450 Nauck) εἰ μεν γάρ οἰκεί νέρτερας ὑπὸ χθόνος. Weil compares Aesch. Pers. 839 ἀπειμα γῆς ὑπὸ χθόνον κάτω.
48. Cf. Med. 941 ὁδὲ ὁδ'] ἄν εἰ πείσαμι, πειράσθαι δὲ χρῆ. It is curious that the Greek ὁδὲ ὁδ'] εἰ so often indicates a leaning toward the negative side of a question, while the Latin nescio an usually implies a leaning toward an affirmative view. On the position of ἄν see Goodwin M. and T. 220, 2.

50. This is a very troublesome line. Two principal questions arise: (1) what does τὸις μέλλουσι mean, and (2) whether we should read ἐμβαλεῖν with the MSS. or ἀμβαλεῖν with Bursian. Τὸις μέλλουσι (sc. θνήσκειν) might mean (α) "those who are destined to die." But all are destined to die, and Alcestis with the rest; hence this interpretation seems impossible here, particularly if we read ἐμβαλεῖν. Some editors (Jerram, and Earle if I rightly understand his note) explain the phrase as meaning (β) "those who in the natural course of things will die," i.e. the old, and retain ἐμβαλεῖν. But this is surely very forced, and would be liable to be misunderstood, as Alcestis herself μελλει θνήσκειν in another sense. The words may also mean (γ) "those who are delaying," or "hesitating to die," i.e. the aged, who are ripe for death but fain would linger, possibly with special reference to the father and mother of Admetus. Cf. the schol.: τοῖς γεγιγακόσι, τούτοις γὰρ λέγει (γὰρ) μέλλουσι. βραδινοῦσι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ. In this case we must obviously read ἐμβαλεῖν. Lastly (δ) the words may mean "those who are about to die," "are at the point of death," with special reference to Alcestis. Bursian's emendation will then be necessary. The choice clearly lies between (γ) and (δ). Both interpretations are supported by eminent authorities, but a question of this kind cannot be settled by "counting heads." Explanation (γ) has the support of the schol., and requires no change of text; but (δ), to which I strongly incline, gives to τοῖς μέλλουσι a simpler and more natural sense, while an unusual form like ἀμβαλεῖν would be extremely liable to be altered to a more familiar one. Cf. Her. 1263 ἀμβησε, where Δ L G have ἀμβαῖσι but A B E ἐμβαῖσι. Bauer thought that the line contained an intentional "double entendre," τοῖς μέλλουσι being capable of meaning either "the aged," or "those who are about to die," i.e. Alcestis (retaining ἐμβαλεῖν); but this would have given Thanatos a chance to make a very effective retort, taking the words in the latter sense, and Apollo would have no object in thus "laying himself open" to his adversary. Thanatos is here said βάνατον ἀμβαλεῖν, just as Lyssa Her. F. 806 (quoted by Monk) says πρὶν ἄν ἔλας λόσσας ἀφη, and as the chorus say of Ares Iph. Aul. 775 (quoted by Jerram) κυκλώσας Ἀρει φανίω. For other ancient and modern parallels see Monk and Jerram ad h. loc.

51. This line, too, has occasioned much discussion. The plain and simple meaning is, "I understand, of course, your meaning and your zeal," ἔχω being used in its colloquial meaning of "comprehend," "grasp," like the Lat. teneo, the Elizabethan "take" ("D'ye take me") and the "catch on" of modern slang. Cf. Orest. 1120 ἔχω τοπούτα, τάπιλουσα δ' ὄνκ ἔχω, Hippol. 1436 ἔχεις γὰρ μοίραν ἡ διεφθάρας, etc., and the ἔχεις τι; of comedy. Apollo has expressed his wish somewhat vaguely, and Thanatos, who has an uneasy con-
sciousness of his own mental inferiority, wishes to show that he is aware what the former is aiming at. The δῆ gives at the same time a sneering tone to the remark. Some think that the line has a double sense, (1) that given above, and (2) "I understand you and am ready" (σέθεν in the second case being taken with λόγον only) or "I cherish regard for you (ἐχω λόγον σέθεν) and good-will toward you," and that Thanatos means (1) while Apollo pretends to understand him as meaning (2). But the order shows that σέθεν is to be taken with both λόγον and προθυμία. If ἐχω προθυμίαν σέθεν could really mean "I am eager to serve your interests," "feel good-will toward you," this objection would be obviated; but what evidence is there of such a usage? Cf. Hes. 410 ἐχω... προθυμίαν | τοσήδο' ἐς ὑμᾶς. Προθυμίαν ἐχειν τινός, "to desire a thing," is, of course, a common construction. Weil boldly alters ἐχω to ἐχει, on the ground that if Thanatos perfectly understood Apollo's words he would immediately protest. But the sneer is protest enough.

52. ἐστὶν ὅτι... μάλιο: On the omission of ἄν after ἔστιν ὅτι... see Goodwin M. and A. T. 241. V. 51 is so worded that though Thanatos does not mean to spare Alcestis, Apollo can draw from it the opposite inference, or at least pretend to do so. The sneer he purposely overlooks.

55. ἀρνυμαι γέρας: cf. Hes. 40 αἰτεὶ δ' ἀδέλφην τὴν ἐμὴν Πολυκένην | τόμβῳ φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ γέρας λαβεῖν. The reading of Λ and Π, κλέος, is either a gloss on γέρας which has crept into the text, or possibly a slip of some early copyist who was thinking of the Homeric κλέος ἁρέσται. Mistakes of the latter sort are especially common at the end of a line; and, as Bruhn has ably shown in his "Lucubrationes Euripideae," this is due, at least in part, to the fact that the scribe in copying first fixed a number of words in his mind and then wrote them out, and as he did so the grasp of his memory became weaker as he neared the end; so that he often would get the last word wrong, or substitute for it some other of kindred meaning which happened to be in his mind. The scholiast read γέρας.


57. πρὸς τῶν ἐχόμονων: "in the interest of the rich." For this use of πρὸς cf. Soph. O. T. 1434 πρὸς σοῦ γάρ, οὖδ' ἐμοὶ, φράσσω, Herod. VIII. 90, 2 τὸ ἐν στεφῳ ναυμαχίᾳ πρὸς ἡμένοις ἔστι, Thuc. II. 86, 5 νομίζοντες πρὸς ἐκείνους εἶναι τὴν ἐν ὀλίγῳ ναυμαχίαν, etc. The use of πρὸς in expressions like πρὸς τίμως εἶναι, "to side with one," is analogous. Euripides often employs ὅ ἐχων, οἱ ἐχόντες ὧ πλοῦσιν, οἱ πλοῦσιν, e.g. Suppl. 214ff. οἱ δ' οὖν ἐχόντες καὶ σπανίζοντες βιον... εἰς τὸν ἐχόμον κέντρ' ἀφάσαν κακά, fr. 326, 8 κακός δ' ὁ μη ἐχων, οἱ δ' ἐχόντες δίβιος, fr. 402, 2 τῶν ἐχόμον πάντες ἀνθρώποι φίλοι, etc.; and many examples might be cited from other writers. τίθεις: P has τιθείς, and hence Prinz, Bauer-Wecklein and Weil read τιθείς. The question as to whether τιθείς is good Attic cannot be said to be settled as yet. Porson condemned the form,
and Brunck defended it. It has more recently found vigorous champions in Cobet (Misc. Crit. pp. 282 ff.) and Mr. Rutherford (New Phrynichus pp. 316–17), though Kühner-Blass (II. p. 193) seem inclined to decide against it. Wecklein-Bauer go so far as to say "τιθεὶς ist die attische Form der 2. Pers. Präsens" (see their note ad loc.). The Attic inscriptions unfortunately are silent on this point, but the evidence of the MSS, is very strong in favor of the Attitude of τιθεὶς (see for the evidence Von Bamberg in Ztsch. f. Gymn. W. XXVIII. pp. 27–8, Kühner-Blass l. s. c.). I have noted the following cases from Euripides: Ael. 57 (τιθεὶς Π, τιθης ι), 890 (τιθεὶς Β L Π, τιθης α), Androm. 210 (τιθης Λ, τιθεὶς Β, τιθης Ε, τιθεὶς with η written over the ι Π, τιθης α), Cycl. 545 (τιθεὶς Π, τιθεὶς with η written above ι L), Hel. 550 (προστιθεὶς), Heracl. 690 (προστιθεὶς Π, προστιθεὶς with η written above ι L), Herc. Fur. 710 (προστιθεὶς), Ion 741 (τιθεὶς Π, τιθεὶς Λ), 1525 (προστιθεὶς Π, προστιθεὶς Λ), Orest. 1187 (υποτιθεὶς Λ, υποτιθεὶς Β, υποτιθεὶς Ε, υποτιθεὶς Λ ε). When the inscriptions are silent, the testimony of the best MSS. becomes doubly important. The cod. Laurentianus of Sophocles, the Ravennas and Venetus of Aristophanes and the Clarkianus of Plato all have instances of the form in question. Hence, while I should not dare (like Cobet, and apparently Wecklein) to assert that τιθεὶς is the Attic form, it seems probable that it was in good use. A change from τιθεὶς to τιθης would be far more apt to be made by copyists than one in the other direction; hence I have followed Π (except as to accent) in this passage. Cf. 890.

59. An extremely troublesome line. L has ωνοιντ' (ω rewritten), Π and a ωνοιντ', Β ονοιντ', ι δναιντ'. L and Π have οις, the rest apparently οι. All have γηραιωδος. The passage clearly puzzled the scholiasts; one says: παρα των πολυχρωμων αγορασειαν αν οι πλονασι τον εκεινουν χρωνων ωστε αυτους βραδεως αποθανειν; another has (perversely) αγορασειαν αν γηραιων οις παρεστι το θανειν, εν τοιο συνγχωροσο. The reading δναιντει we may dismiss at once, as it gives no appropriate sense and δνομαι does not occur in the tragedians. The editors fall into two great classes, (I) those who read ωνοιντ' and (II) those who prefer δναιντ', and these again have their subdivisions.

1. Those who read ωνοιντ'.

(a) Lascaris, Monk, Hermann, Woolsey, Jerram and others read (with L, and Π except as to the accent of ωνοιντ') ωνοιντ' αν οις παρεστι γηραιων θανειν. The sense will then be, as Hermann puts it: "emereant, quibus opes suppressunt, granduavere mori quos viveere cupiunt, sive semet ipsos, sive quos amant alios." This reading, taken as a whole, has better MSS. authority than any of the others.

(b) Dindorf and Earle, feeling that the exemption of the rich themselves from death is what should be especially emphasized, read ωνοιντ' αν οις παρεστι γηραιων θανειν. This gives a clear sense, and one suited to the context, and I believe it to be the true reading. The nom. γηραιων might very easily be changed
to γηραιοῦς by some copyist or reader who did not understand the construction and thought that an accus. was needed with the infinitive, or wished to make the adjective the object of οὐνομεν' (as one of the scholiasts seems to have done).

II. Those who read δναιντ'.

(a) Kirchhoff, Nauck, Prinz, Bauer-Wecklein, Weil and others read δναιντ' ἀν οἷς πάρεστι γηραιοῦς θανείν. This is usually rendered: "those would be benefited who could afford to purchase long life" ("die wegen ihres Reichthums in der Lage wären etc." Bauer-Wecklein). But (1) the "wären" begs the question. The true rendering would be "those whose living to old age is (now) possible," not "those who (in that case) would be able to live to old age." Weil saw this; but even his version, "les riches auraient un avantage, puisqu'ils ont le moyen de mourir vieux (si des funérailles somptueuses peuvent procurer une longue vie)," does not meet the difficulty. If δναιντ' ἀν is a "less vivid future" apodosis, it does not harmonize with the pres. ind. πάρεστιν. If, however, δναιντ' ἀν be regarded as "potential optative," "those can obtain advantage who (under your new νόμος) have the power to reach old age" (cf. νόμον τίθεις in 57), the construction becomes at least a possible one. But (2) the reading δναιντ', as Earle points out, could easily arise through the influence of τρός τῶν ἐξόντων.

(β) It would also be grammatically possible to read δναιντ' ἀν οἷς πάρεστι γηραιοῦς θανείν (or γηραιοῦς θανείν with Heiland), with the same meaning as (a) but a somewhat easier construction. These readings are liable to the same objections as (a), and γηραιοῦς has no MSS. authority.

On the whole, the choice seems to lie between I (a) and I (b), and of these the second is the clearer and simpler. οἷς πάρεστι will then = oi πλούσιοι (not, as Matthiae understood it, ois παρεστι sc. τὸ ὡνείσθαι).

62. The signatism of the line expresses anger and contempt; cf. Ion 386 σὺ δ' οὖν ἐσώσας τὸν σὺν ὥν σώσαι σ' ἔχρην.

63. πάντι: Prinz's conjecture παῦτι is quite needless; Thanatos means, "You cannot have everything to which you have no right, though you have defrauded me in one case" (cf. v. 43).

64. κλαόση: so Earle, who suggests that παῦσῃ of the MSS. is due to contamination of κλαόση with a gloss πελάγη. παῦσῃ clearly will not do (stop doing what?); πελάσει (better πελάγη), F. W. Schmidt's emendation, makes good sense, but is rather weak, while κλαόση seems admirably suited to the tone of the dialogue. Apollo begins in a tone of studied though ironical courtesy; as the conversation goes on he begins to lose patience, and finally answers Thanatos in his own rough way (cf. 62). Wecklein calls κλαόση an "unpassender Ausdruck" (Woch. f. klass. Philol. 1895 p. 1255), but Enriptides uses the verb in this sense some fifteen times, chiefly in angry dialogues of just this character.
It is noticeable that here the MSS. all have the form in -η, which is now recognized to be preferable to that in -ε. The latter is probably a mere "graphic variant," due to the confusion between -η and -ε which began in the fourth century B.C., and the grammarians of the Roman period preferred it (see Voemel Dem. Cont. p. 84) because it enabled them to distinguish the subjunctive in -η from the indicative in -ε. See Meisterhans p. 131, Kühner-Blass II. p. 60, Blass Aussprache des Griech. p. 47, etc. Earle takes ἀγαν as modifying κλανσ, comparing Hel. 1398 ἀγαν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ παράθει δόμω στένεις: but there no one would think of taking ἀγαν with παράθει', while in the passage from the text it is surely more natural to take it with ὁμός, "you will certainly come to grief ('catch it'), very savage though you are."

66-7. I formerly suspected these lines to be an interpolation, as they are not essential to the construction, and the addition of the detail seems at first sight to weaken rather than strengthen the statement. But Euripides often err in this direction, and, as Earle points out, the lines have a certain ὅγκος which may help to lend impressiveness to the prediction. It is hard in studying a work of this kind to avoid contracting what some one has wittily called the delirium delens. Wheeler (De Alc. et Hüp. Interp. pp. 12 ff.) rejects in this one scene vv. 30-31, 58-9, 60-71, 73-6! ἰπειον ὅχημα: so ὅχημα ἰπειον Hüppl. 1355, νάιον ὅχημα Iph. T. 410, ὅχημα πολλών Rhees. 621, 797, ἰπεικών ὅχημάτων Soph. El. 740, etc. Cf. v. 148 ὦρκός τέτρωφον ᾅρμα Διομήδους μέτα. Ἄρμα is a less pretentious word. μέτα: a case of so-called tnesis (πέμφαντος ... μέτα = μεταπέμψαντος). So most edd. Weil and Wecklein read μετὰ "having sent (him) to fetch the team from," etc., the addition of ἐκ δυσχειμέρων τόπων being possible because of "the verbal idea contained in μετὰ." Weil compares 483 and Phoen. 1317 ᾅκω μετὰ | ... ἄδελθήν: but these are not parallel to such a construction as πέμπω (τινὰ) μετὰ τί ἐκ τόπου τινός. On the other hand, cf. for the "tnesis" Hec. 504 ἀγαμέμνονοι πέμψαντος, ὡ γύναι, μέτα, and for the construction Arist. ἐπισ. 679 παρ’ ἐνχαρίδον τρεῖς ἄγλαθα μετέπεμψα, Thuc. IV. 30 στραταν τε μεταπέμψων ἐκ τῶν ἐγγον ξυμμάχων. The active is, of course, less common than the middle, but is perfectly classical and Euripidean.

71-2. Kirchhoff, Nauck and Prinz follow Dindorf in rejecting these two lines, rightly as it seems to me. The MSS. show no variant, but the schol., who says καὶ όυτε ὑμεῖς ἔξομεν soi(ἔξομεν MSS.) χάριν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δ’ βουλόμεθα πρά-ξομεν, appears to have read δράσω (Weil suggests that he read πράξω θ’ ὁμοίως τάρ’), which seems improbable. As the lines stand ταῦτ’ is not clear, δράσεις is strange (as Thanatos is to take a passive rather than an active part in the transaction), and ὁμοίως is suspicious. Hermann’s δράσει (sc. Heracles) does not help matters; for, as Dindorf observes, "hoc si voluisse poetæ, dixisset saltem δράσει τ’ ἑκείνων ταῦτα, quo pronominie multo magis opus erat quam illo ὁμοίως: ne quid de verbis ἀπεχθήσει τ’ ἐμοὶ dicam, ubi potius σὺ τ’ ἀπεχθήσει ἐμοὶ dici debebat." This last objection remains if we read δράσω, which
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besides emphasizes Apollo's share in the transaction too much. Nowhere else in the play are we told that Heracles is merely his instrument. Zacher's suggestion (see Select Conjectures) is ingenious but not convincing; in short the lines have never been satisfactorily emended. I am inclined to hold, with Dindorf, that they were composed and added to the text by some grammarian who thought the close of Apollo's speech too abrupt.

72. The first ἐπ points out the participle as conditional (Goodwin M. and T. 224), and at the same time helps to emphasize πόλις (ib. 223).


74. στείχω δ’ ἐπ’ αὐτήν: it is not quite right, I think, to say that ἐπί here = μετά of 46. True, ἐπί with the accus. is often so used, as in Androm. 73, 81 (which Earle cites), Rhes. 28, etc. But why should Thanatos "go after her" (to fetch her) in order to cut off the lock of hair? To do that he need only enter the room where she is lying. Probably ἐπ’ here means merely "to" (cf. Orest. 88 ἦκεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἀδύνας πεπραγότας). In Ion 1043 ἔχθρον δ’ ἐπ’ ἀνδρα στείχε, ἐπ’ clearly means "against," and in our passage there may be a slight implication of hostility. ώς κατάρδψμαι ἐξεῖ: from Homer down κατάρδψσα is the technical word for performing the rites preliminary to a sacrifice, and particularly for the operation of cutting off hair from the victim's head and placing it on the fire. Hesychius says κατάρδψσα τοῦ ἰερεύόν τῶν τριχῶν ἀποστάσα (Photius has κατάρδψσαι τῶν τριχῶν ἀπάρδψσαι τοῦ ἰερεύον). For the literature on κατάρδψσα, see Mr. Blaydes's very elaborate note on Aristoph. Aves 959, and for Greek offerings of hair and their significance, see Wieseler Philologus IX. 711 ff., esp. 714–15.

75. ἰερὸς . . . θεῶν: Monk compares Aristoph. Plut. 937 μὴ δὴδ’, ἱερὸν γάρ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πλοῦτου πάλαι. So Plat. Leges V. 741 C γῆς ἱερᾶς οἰσης τῶν πάντων θεῶν, etc. The dative with ἱερὸς is less frequent.

76. ἐγγυς: = ἐξεῖ in v. 74. Euripides uses the word in the same way in Elect. 696 and Phoen. 1413 (cf. 1404); cf. Soph. Aj. 287, Antig. 1236, etc. Some of the ancient critics, misunderstanding Homer Il. VII. 255 τὸ δ’ ἐκατασκευαμένῳ δολίᾳ‘ ἐγγυς χεραν ἄμι’ ἄμφω | σύν ρ’ ἐπεσον, thought that ἐγγυς there meant swords, an opinion which was refuted by Aristarchus (see the Scholl. Aristonic. on Il. VII. 255, 273). Whether the loose tragic use of ἐγγυς is due to the same misunderstanding (so Blass in Mueller's Handbuch d. Altp.-Wiss. 1.2 p. 151) or is merely a poetic inexactness (cf. the use of "blade," "glaive," etc. in English poetry) I will not undertake to say. ἄγνισθη: the "relative general condition" without ἄν (or κε) in the protasis is more common in Homer than the regular form (Goodwin M. and T. 538), and is doubtless older. On the use of the form without ἄν in later poets see Goodwin 540. In this passage Euripides is following Phrynichus; Servius on Virg. Aen. IV. 694 says: "Alii dixerunt Euripidem Orcum in scenam ducere gladium ferentem, quo erim Alcesti abscondat, Euripidem hoe a Phrynicho (so O. Jahn; poenio F, phenico T) antiquo
tragico mutuatum." Erupides in his turn was imitated by Virgil *Aen.* IV. 698-9 "nullum illi flavum *Proserpina* vertice crinem | absulterat *Stygioque caput damnaverat Orco," as is pointed out at length by Macrobius V. 19, 1-5, *q. v.* There is a similar allusion in Hor. *Carm.* I. 28, 19, "nullum | *saeva caput* *Proserpina fugit," where see the edd. — With this line closes the prologue, in the ancient sense of that word. Apollo probably withdraws at v. 69, Thanatos enters the main door of the palace at 76.

77-140. The πάροδος. We are told in the hypothesis ὁ δὲ χορὸς συνάστηκεν ἐκ τιμων πρεσβετῶν ἐντοπίων, and the schol. on v. 77 says ἐκ γερβῶν Ψεφαλῶν ὁ χορὸς. It has been pointed out by Bendixen (*De Alcest. Eur. Comment.*), cited by Ritter *De Eur. Alcest.* p. 32) and Arnoldt (Chorische Technik des Eur. pp. 52 ff.) that several things in the play seem inconsistent with this view. The wish in vv. 473 ff. certainly would sound strangely in the mouth of gray-haired men; and the chorus make no allusion to, or complaint of, their own old age. But the statement in the hypothesis probably goes back to Aristophanes of Byzantium, who lived less than two centuries after Euripides, and who doubtless had seen the *Alcestis* performed; it scarcely seems probable, therefore, that he would have made a mistake in the matter. Moreover, the wish in 473 ff. must not be taken too strictly as applying to the chorus themselves; it may be the poet who is speaking (cf. 962 ff.). V. 212, too, though it does not necessarily imply that the *coryphaeus* is an old man, is certainly more natural if the person addressed is a man of age and position. On the whole, I strongly incline to the traditional view. There is great danger that, in analyzing the information which has come down to us from antiquity, we may prune away the true together with the false.

As to the division of this πάροδος and the distribution of the parts there has been great difference of opinion. All recent editors accept the statement of the schol. on v. 77 (which is confirmed by the MSS.) that the chorus is divided into two semi-choruses. They disagree, however, as to the amount sung by these semi-choruses, some (e. g. Kirchhoff, Nauck, Weil, Wecklein) assigning them only 93-7 and 105-111, while others (Arnoldt, Prinz, Earle, etc.) extend the division into semi-choruses through nearly the whole of the πάροδος. In a matter of this kind, where we have so little evidence, the MSS. are the safest guide, as the division which they offer us may well go back to early acting-copies of the play. Hence in the text I have followed them as closely as practicable. The introductory anapaestic system has χορ. prefixed to it in L and P, and I have assigned it (with most edd.) to the chorus. Whether it was sung by the whole chorus or by the *coryphaeus* I will not undertake to decide, as in the present state of our knowledge it is useless to dogmatise on such points. The other MSS. have ημαξ., but it does not seem probable that the division into semi-choruses took place at the very beginning of the πάροδος. At 86 and 89 I have prefixed ημαξ. with *all* the MSS. At 89 the sudden change from a question to a direct statement points clearly to a change of speakers. As to
93–7 there is now substantial agreement among editors, and I have followed the usual arrangement. The same is true of 105–111. At 98 I have prefixed Ḫμχ, with the MSS., and at 101 have added it, following Hartung. A comparison with 89 shows that symmetry requires the addition. At 112 I have prefixed χρ. with B and a (L and P have no sign, doubtless through a copyist’s error). At 132 I have added a παράγραφος, to show that (as I believe) the following lines were delivered by the coryphaeus. 132–5 may have been sung by the whole chorus, but 136–40 were clearly spoken by the coryphaeus, and it seems most natural to suppose that he also sang the preceding anapaests. See for other arrangements Arnoldt Chorische Technik des Eur. pp. 153 ff., and the edd. ad loc. Cf. also Schmidt Kunstformen d. griech. Poesie II. p. 11 and Westphal-Rossbach Griechische Metrik 3 pp. 165, 149, 494 for the metrical treatment.

77. πρόσθεν: πρόσθε the MSS., but the metre requires a spondee.

78. σεσίγηταί: Wecklein compares Iph. T. 367 αὐλείται μελαθρόν. The use of the perfect (“lies hushed in silence”) is very picturesque.

79. This dimeter as it stands in the MSS. has lost a long syllable either before or after πελάς. The τίς of I is a mere guess of the scribe. For some of the conjectures which have been made see Select Conj. The best suggestion that has yet been offered is probably that of Monk, πελάς ἕστ’ ὄνδας, as the copula so frequently falls out. This line has Ḫμχ, prefixed to it in the MSS. But it seems very improbable that the division into semi-choruses took place at or near the beginning of the πάροδος. The natural place for that division is at 86, at the close of the anapaestic system, where both the construction and metre change. Hence I have followed Kirchhoff in striking out the Ḫμχ. The only recent editor, so far as I know, who retains it is Mr. Jerram.

80. ὅστις ἄν εἰσοι: so B a L; ὅστις ἄν ἐνεποι (so L; ἐνεποι P) is incorrect because an anapaest cannot immediately follow a dactyl, as four shorts must not come together unless they belong to the same foot. See Christ, Metrik 2 p. 212 (§ 282). The variant probably arose thus: ἐνεποι was written by mistake for ἄν εἰσοι, and then changed to ἐνεποι to give sense. Then ἄν was inserted because the construction required it, thus giving the reading of l and (with a slight change in the spelling) P. The letters a and e are very often confused in the MSS.

81. βασιλεῖαν πενθεῖν χρῆ, ἦς ἠώς’, the reading of the MSS., is certainly wrong, as the hiatus is objectionable and there is not the customary caesura after the second foot. Kirchhoff would insert μ’ after χρῆ, which obviates the first difficulty but not the second (cf. Nauck Eur. Stud. II. p. 51). Probably a transposition is necessary. Two different arrangements of the line have been proposed: (1) βασιλεῖαν χρῆ πενθεῖν ἦς ἠώς (so l), (2) χρῆ βασιλεῖαν πενθεῖν ἦς ἠώς’ (so Blomfield and Nauck). (1) has the (slight) authority of l, and requires merely the transposition of χρῆ and πενθεῖν: but (2), though the change is slightly bolder, certainly sounds much better to the ear, and is probably
right. Nauck remarks: "Die überlieferte falsche Wortstellung ist dadurch veranlasst dass man βασιλείαν an φθείρην heranrückte, zu dem es dem Sinne nach gehört. Ganz ähnlich im folgenden Verse, wo ebenfalls die Caesur fehlt, weil man τόδε unrichtig zu φως zog." Weil retains the MSS. reading both here and in 79 and 82 by dividing the cola differently, thus: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλων πέλας οὐδεὶς, ὧν ἐστιν ἐν εἴποι | πῶτερον φθυμένην βασιλείαν | πενθεῖν χρῆ, | ή ἔφοιτο ἐτι φῶς τόδε λεύσει | Ἡλίου παῖς | Ἀλεξανδρικ, ἕμοι παῖς τ' ἄριστην | δύσασα γνώνη | πάσιν εἰς αὐτῆς γεγενηθᾶται. He thus obtains in 79-82 three catalectic dimeters, the first followed by an acatalectic monometer, the other two each by a catalectic monometer. But a system of eleven lines of which four are paroemias and four monometers is surely an almost unparalleled anomaly.

82. The MSS. have the order ἐτι φῶς τόδε λεύσει Ἡλίου παῖς, which lacks the customary caesura after the second foot. Here again a transposition is probably necessary. Blomfield's ἐτι παῖς Ἡλίου λεύσει τόδε φῶς is too violent; words are not to be shuffled in this way like cards. The reading ἐτι φῶς λεύσει τόδε παῖς Ἡλίου will not do on account of the hiatus. Bothe's ἐτι φῶς λεύσει Ἡλίου τόδε παῖς is the best that has hitherto been suggested, and is probably right; though the position of τόδε is certainly hard. Some editors (e.g. Wuestemann, Dindorf) follow the Aldine in omitting τόδε. This leaves a paroemiac, which seems out of place here. Earle, following a hint of Dindorf's, drops τόδε and reads Ἡλίου θυγατηρ (thinking that Ἡλίου παῖς owes its origin to v. 37). But he seems inclined to over-estimate the influence which similar passages have had upon the text of each other; and in the absence of all MSS. evidence for θυγατηρ Bothe's transposition is on the whole more likely to be right.

83. παῖς τ' has been suspected, without adequate reason. See Select Conj.

86. I believe that Arnoldt and Prinz are right in making the dialogue between the semi-choruses begin here. Probably it was carried on by the leaders only, not by the semi-choruses each as a whole. As to the arrangement of the semi-choruses and the evolutions which they went through speculation is worse than useless; for we have absolutely no evidence.

87. χειρών: so Nauck for χρηρών, as the corresponding verse of the antistrope (89) has a long first syllable (πη-).

88. ή γόον: so L, rightly, as the antistrope (v. 99) has a dactyl (χρηρῆς' ἔ-); γόον, the reading of the other MSS., is either due to the wish to have the usual genitive construction after κλέει, or (more probably, as two accusatives precede it) is a simple mistake of some early scribe. The letters ω and o are constantly confused in Greek MSS., as every scholar knows. It is not many years since such cases as the one in the text were explained on the theory that the tragedians wrote in the old Attic alphabet, in which 0 stood for both omicron and omega; but the researches of Köhler and others have made it probable that Euripides, at any rate, used the Ionic alphabet. See Meisterhans pp. 3 ff. In our passage the mistake must have been made quite early, as B in P all have γόον; and γόον of L is probably a correction of the scribe (who was
evidently a man of some learning, as is clear from his corrections and emendations in other places) rather than an independent variant. ὡς πεπραγμένων: on the omission of the noun see Goodwin *M. and T.* 848.

90. στατίζεται: so Hermann for στατίζετ’. The elision of ae in the 1st and 3d pers. sing. was probably not allowed by the tragedians, as the examples are few and suspicious (see Kühner-Blass I. p. 238); and comparison with the antistrophe (τοµαίος ἑ v. 102) shows that another syllable is needed. On the shortening of the final diphthong before an initial vowel see Seidler *De Dochm.* pp. 95 ff., Christ *Metrik* 2 p. 26 and Kühner-Blass I. p. 197, 5. For the word itself cf. *El.* 315 πρὸς δ’ ἑδραίων Αἰσίδες | δῷαί στατίζοντε, where the active is used intransitively in the same sense.

91. μετακύμιος ἄτας: a troublesome phrase. The four scholia on the passage show that it occasioned difficulty even in ancient times. Four explanations may be distinguished: (1) most editors and the third schol. take the word μετακύμιος to mean “among” or “between the waves” (cf. μεταδήμιος, μεταίχμιος, μετακόσιος, μεταμάζιος, μετατόντιος, μεταστήθιος, etc.). The sense will then be: “Would that thou wouldst appear amid the waves of ἄτη” to still them. This I believe to be the true meaning: the language would almost inevitably call up to the mind of a Greek the image of Poseidon amid the waves of the sea, quelling their fury. (2) Earle, taking μετακύμιος in the same sense as above, thinks that the figure is that of a beacon-light appearing amid the waves. This is ingenious, but would be much less likely to occur to a Greek hearer than to a modern one, as lighthouses, though not unknown in antiquity, were far from common. (3) Some hold, with one of the scholiasts, that the word means “after the waves,” bringing calm after the storm. Analogies for this meaning of μετά in the compound are hard to find. Μεταδήμιος apparently sometimes means “after supper” (see L. & S. s.v.), though this is disputed. Cf. also μεταχρόνιος. (4) The fourth scholiast says: ὁσπερ λέγομεν μεταίχμιον τὸ μεταξὶ δύο στρατευμάτων, οὔτως μετακύμιον τὸ μεταξὶ δύο κυμάτων (cf. Hesych. s.v. μετακύμιον). Hence, as Kviçala (*Studios zu Eur.* II. p. 6) points out, he probably read μετακύμιον ἄτας, i.e. (as Kviçala explains it), “the respite from misfortune.” But surely to call a person “die Ruhepause des Unglücks” is a strange mode of expression. On the whole it seems much wiser for the modern course to adopt explanation (1) and take ἄτας as dependent upon the substantive (κύματα) implied in μετακύμιος.

93–7. It is disputed whether these lines metrically correspond to 105–11. Westphal-Rossbach observe (*Gr. Metrik* 3 p. 165): “Dreimal beginnen die Ana- paeste nach Vollendung der Strophen mit zwei Paroemiaci und einer dazwischen stehenden katalektischen Dipodie, welche metrisch mit einem Ionicus a minore übereinkommt . . . Eine antistrophische Resonspiration aber, die bereits Seidler dochm. p. 81 versucht hat, findet nicht statt.” On the other hand Kirschhoff and most recent editors hold that the lines in question do respond, and (as it appears to the present writer) with good reason. True, the verses as they
stand in the MSS. do not accurately respond (see Apparatus Criticus); but Kirchhoff’s elegant restoration of v. 94 is necessary to the sense. Vv. 93–7 are a dialogue between two parties in opposite states of mind, the expressions of hope alternating with those of despondency. Hence v. 93, which has a hopeful tone, should be followed by an utterance of the opposite kind, not by one of the same character. The words νέκυς ἤδη (sc. ἐστίν) should therefore precede, not follow, οὗ δὴ φροῦδος γ᾽ ἐξ οἴκων. The transposition was due to some scribe or grammarian who wished to make νέκυς the subject of φροῦδος (ἐστίν); and the γὰρ which the MSS. have after οὗ was inserted to connect 93 with 94, the latter being thus made a reason for the statement in 93. But as soon as νέκυς ἤδη was restored to its proper place the γὰρ became not only needless but objectionable, and Kirchhoff struck it out. Again in 96 the very baldness of the language shows that something is gone, whether the lacuna is after Ἀδμητος (as Hartung conjectured) or after ἐφημον (as Earle thinks). Ἐφημον of what? But these very changes, which are necessary to the sense, restore the respension; and the chances are a hundred to one that this coincidence is not accidental. Seeing that a respension was intended, some early scholar (after the transposition in 94 had been made) tried to restore it by transposing 106 and 107 (as in L and P), thus making a bad matter worse. There can be little question that Kirchhoff has restored the true reading. Christ (Metrik p. 263) says: “Strophische Responsor scheint den anapaestischen Systemen von Hause aus fremd gewesen zu sein und kann namentlich in den Einzugsliedern schon deshalb nie vertragen werden, weil hier der Chor beim Vortrag der Anapaeste sich weder in Halbeböne sheitete noch in zurücklaufenden Linien bewegte.” But as in our passage (which he seems to have overlooked) there is a division into semi-choruses, this objection clearly will not apply.

93. οὗ τὰν: i.e. οὗ τοι ἅν. The scribes who wrote our MSS. (or their sources) did not understand the crisis, and divided wrongly, οὗτ’ ἅν. φθιμένης: so Monk for φθιμένας. The Doric forms should probably be excluded from the anapaests.

94. φροῦδος: feminine, as in Iph. T. 154, Soph. Elect. 807. The fem. in -η is more common.

95. πόθεν: se. τοῦτ’ οἶδα, or the like. Cf. 781, and Phoen. 1620. οὐκ αὐχώ: the verb αὐχέω from its regular meaning of “to boast,” readily passes into that of “feel confident,” as here and Aesch. Prom. 338 αὐχώ γὰρ αὐχώ τηρέει δωτρίν ἐμοί | δῶσειν Δή’. It then becomes still weaker, = “think,” or “expect,” as in 475, Her. 931 οὗ γὰρ ποι’ ηὲχει χεῖρας ἵπτασι σέθεν, Tro. 770 οὗ γὰρ ποι’ αὐχώ ἦνόμα γ’ ἐκφύσαε σ’ ἐγώ, etc.

96. ἐφημον: this word was probably followed by two words in the genitive (Wecklein suggests τῶν ὕπηνοιντων), which have fallen out. To be sure, it might be used absolutely, as in ἐφημω δίκη (so Earle); but this seems very bald, and it is probable that the two lost words made the meaning of ἐφημον more explicit.

98 ff. On the custom of placing the δστρακον or ἄρδανον full of water before
the door of the house in which there was a dead body, cf. the schol. : ὀστὲ τις ἀποθάνοι, πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν δότρακα πληροῦντες ὦδατος ἐτίθεσαν καὶ κλάοντος δάφνης, ἵνα οἱ ἐξαντες περιπαλώντω. The water had to be brought from another house (Pollux VIII. 65, Ilesycb. s.v. δότρακον). Cf. Aristoph. Eccles. 1033 (and Blaydes ad loc.), and see Bekker-Göll Charikles I. p. 252; Hermann-Blümner Griech. Privatalterthümer p. 365; Rohde Psyche p. 263 (with note 2).

100. φθιτῶν (so L and P) is clearly the true reading, as the responsion shows; φθιμένων, the reading of the other family of MSS., is a gloss on φθιτῶν which has crept into the text. It is singular that φθιτῶς is never used with the article. πῦλαις: Prinz reads φῦλαις, doubtless a misprint. Wecklein conjectured that we should read ἐπὶ φθιτῶν φορᾷ. But does Euripides ever use φορά in this way? I believe the text to be perfectly sound; the expression ὃς νομίζεται ἐπὶ φθιτῶν πῦλαις, "as is customary at the portals of the dead," is not quite logical here, as ὃς νομίζεται does not refer to ὄρῳ but to the placing of the water at the door, and Tournier's ἃ νομίζεται would be easier; but the sense is clear, and there does not seem to be sufficient ground for any change.

101-2. Apparently clipped hair was placed at the entrance of a house in which there had been a death, just as we tie up the door-handle with crape. But (like previous editors) I have not been able to find another allusion to this custom in any Greek classical writer (though references to offerings of hair at tombs are, of course, very frequent). Cyprus-twigs, however, were used for a similar purpose; cf. Servius on Aen. III. 681: apud Atticos funestae domus huius (i.e. cupressi) fronde velantur. To escape the difficulty Lascaris read χάιτας τ' οὕτις... τομαίως, "no one with shorn hair," and one scholiast seems to have found χαῖταν or χαίτας in his text, for he paraphrases by οὖν δὲ ἐν τοῖς προθνήμασι ἀνθρώπων τετμημένοι ἑνὶ τῆς τρίχας: but Ἀesch. Cho. 160 ὄρῳ τομαίῳ τόνδε βοστρυχὸν τάφῳ supports the reading of the MSS. Weil ingeniously reads χαίτα τ' οὕτις ἐπὶ προθρήμασι τομαίως, ἄ δὴ νεκροῖν πένθη (sc. ἑστίν), πίτευς, thus making χαίτα the subject of πίτευς. But is it probable that the cutting of the hair was done in front of the house rather than within it? Passers-by should certainly have been spared such a barbarous spectacle! As the strophe has a short syllable, ἄ must be neuter pleural, not a Doric feminine singular. If the text is sound, the plur. is generic. Weil compares Orest. 920 αὐτουργός, οὐτερ καὶ μάκροι σφξουσι γῆν: add Hel. 440, Suppl. 868. For this use, see Hadley-Allen 629 a, and for the neuter after a feminine antecedent Hadley-Allen 630, Goodwin 1022. But it must be confessed that the combination of the two irregularities is hard; and though I have not ventured to change the text, I am much inclined to read πένθη ("signs of mourning") with Weil, in which case ἄ would be "attached" into the gender of πένθη. πένθεσι and πένθει, the readings of the MSS., would then be conjectures by persons who wished to make ἄ fem. sing., and πένθεσι seems to point to an original plural. (πένθει might also be due to iotaism.) Still, the text may be sound, though I know of no exact parallel in Euripides. The nearest seems to be
ANDROM. 271-2  ἀ  ὅ  ἐστι  ἐξίδνησι καὶ  πυρὸς  περατέρο,  |  οὐδές  γυναικὸς  φάρμακα  ἐξήρησεν  πῶς,  but  the  poem  has  just  been  speaking  of  ἑρπτετὰ  ἀγρία  and  the  neuter  plural  is  still  in  his  mind.

103. πίνακα: "falls," i.e. "is cut off." So in English the phrase "his head fell" is used of persons executed by the axe or guillotine. Some (e.g. Musgrave and Jerram) take the word as meaning "it happens"; but though πίνακα, πίνακα may be used of a chance occurrence ("to turn out," "befall"), they are rarely if ever used of what customarily or regularly takes place. For the shortened ultima of πίνακα, see the note on στατίζεται  in v. 90. οὐ: so the Aldine. The MSS. have υόδε, which gives one short syllable too many if we retain νεολαία. The question therefore is, whether to keep νεολαία and read οὐ or to emend νεολαία and retain υόδε. All the MSS. have υόδε: Α  ἦν  Ἱακείων  καὶ  ὀ  ἐκ  τῶν  νέων  ὄχλος. Photinus has: νεολαίαν (νονολαίαν) Τὴν  νέοτητα  τετρασυλλάβως  ὦ  Ἀττικοί.  Βαρβουλωνίους  (Aristoph. fr. 67 Kock); 2Ω Ζέου τὸ  χρύμα  τῆς  νεολαίας  ὑδὼν.  Add Pollux II. 11, ὑᾶν δὲ  τοῦτον  (σε.  νεανίκων)  πλήθος  νεολαία,  and  Bekker's  Anecd.  52,  25,  νεολαία: ἑστὶ  νέος  λαὸς  ἡ  (εἰς.  ἃ)  νεότης,  παρ'  ὁ  γέγονεν  ἡ  νεολαία.  The  lexicographers, therefore, clearly knew the word only as a noun; and (with the possible exception of our passage) it is always so used by classic writers. See Aesch. Pers. 663, Suppl. 655; Theocrit. XVIII. 24; Lucian Anach. 38, Phal. 1, 3, in all of which passages the word clearly means "youth" or "young people." Hence in the place in our text various changes have been suggested to avoid taking νεολαία as an adjective, e.g. νεολαῖα, νεολαίας, ναλῆς (W. Dindorf). Of these the last is the best, as it gives an adjective to agree with χείρ, makes good sense and renders it unnecessary to alter υόδε: and ναλῆς may well be right. But νεολαία may be the fem. of an adj. νεολαίος (Doric?) from a noun νεόλαος (cf. ἀκρόπολις, etc.). Photinus has νεολός: ἐφηνός: and this νεόλος (mistake for νεολάος?) looks like the masculine of the said adjective. Like so many other adjectives, these words have become nouns through the omission of the nouns with which they once agreed. It is possible, not to say probable, that in the passage from our text there is a survival of the early adjectival use.* Moreover, οὐ would be extremely apt to be changed to υόδε by some one who wished to remove the asyndeton. Hence it seems, on the whole, wisest to read οὐ νεολαία with Matthiae. Νεολαία χείρ γυναικῶν = χείρ νέων γυναικῶν by Ἐνειλιψεν. Cf. Hippol. 397 θυραία ... φρονήματι ἀνδρῶν, Ηέρ. Φυσ. 450 γραίας ὄσον ἔτη πηγάς, ib. 468 πεῖδα τάμα γῆς, Phoen. 1351 λευκοπῆχες κτύπους χερών, and the like.

105. κύριον ἰμαρ: cf. Or. 1035 τὸδ' ἰμαρ ἰμὼν κύριον, also ib. 48, Ael. 158.
109. διακαιομένων: cf. Med. 161. The word is a very expressive one.
111. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: "from the first," as in Phoen. 1595. Wecklein is wrong, I think, in rendering it "überhaupt," which would be ἀρχήν.

* See also Zacher De nominibus in -αῖος p. 73 (in Dissert. philol. Halenses vol. III.).
112 ff. A very involved passage. The construction is: ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἔστιν ὅποι αἱας τις στειλῶν ναυκληρίαν ἦ Λυκίαν εἶτε ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνύδρους Ἀμμωνίδας ἔθρας δυστάνου ψυχὰν παραλύσαι.

112. ναυκληρίαν: this word seems to mean here "expedition"; cf. Med. 527 Κύπρων νουμέν τῆς ἐμῆς ναυκληρίας | σώτεραν ἔλναν. In Ili. 1510 τῖς δὲ νῦν ναυκληρία | ἐκ τῆς δ’ ἀπόρρε χρονός; it almost = ναύ. In Alc. 257 it means simply "voyage."

114. Λυκίαν: the MSS. have Λυκίας, which many edd. retain, some regarding it as a noun, others as an adjective. So far as the form goes, it might be either. By those who retain Λυκίας the following explanations of its construction have been suggested: (1) that it is an adjective agreeing with αἱας (so apparently Woolsey); but the order of the words is strongly against this, and it is much more forcible to take αἱας = "the world"; (2) that it is the genitive of the noun and is in a kind of "partitive apposition" with αἱας (so Jerram); but the sudden change of construction to ἐπὶ ἔθρας is then very harsh; (3) that it is an adjective agreeing with αἱας understood, which is in apposition with αἱας (so Bauer-Wecklein); an explanation which is liable to the same objection as the preceding; (4) that it is an adjective agreeing with ἔθρας understood, the preposition being expressed with the second member only; which is possible but hard; (5) that it is the genitive of the noun and depends on ἔθρας understood (so Wuestemann); which is still harsher, as one ἔθρας will then be modified by a genitive and the other by an adjective, thus destroying still further the parallelism of the construction. Another alternative is to read Λυκίαν with Monk (though this has no MSS. authority). Λυκίαν may then be "accus. of limit of motion," followed by a change of construction to the accus. with ἐπὶ: or we may regard the preposition as expressed with one member and understood with the other (so Monk, who compares Phoen. 284, Heracl. 755, Soph. O. T. 734, 761, etc.). Λυκίαν could very easily have been altered to Λυκίας through the influence of αἱας just above it, and certainly gives a clearer and simpler construction. On the whole, I incline to Monk’s view, though explanation (3) may be right after all. This instance shows how many possibilities the critic is obliged to weigh against each other even in fairly plain passages. And yet the Alcestis is called an "easy" play! For ἦ . . . εἶτε = ἦ . . . ἦ, cf. Soph. Aj. 177 ἦ ἡ κλυτῶν ἐνάραν ψυχοθεία δῶρος εἰτ’ ἐλαφαβολαίς;

115-16. The text follows Nauck, whose elegant restoration of these lines is one of his finest critical achievements. See his Eur. Stud. II. pp. 51 ff. The order of the words in the MSS. looks like the work of some schoolmaster who wished to make the construction plain to his pupils; and the same may be said of vv. 81-2. ἀνύδρους: the Libyan desert in which the temple and oasis of Jupiter Ammon were situated was without water, though in the oasis itself there is a fountain. Cf. El. 734 f. ἐξηρά ὁ Ἀμμωνίδας ἔθρας | φθινουσ’ ἀπερθ-δροσού, and see Herodot. IV. 81 with Rawlinson’s note. Arrian (Anab. III. 4) says: ὁ δὲ χῶρος ἐναπερ τοῦ Ἀμμωνος τὸ ἱερὸν ἐστὶ τὰ μὲν κύκλῳ πάντα ἔρημα καὶ
ψάμμον τὸ πᾶν ἔχει καὶ ἀνυδρον. The temple of Apollo at Patara in Lycia and that of Jupiter Ammon in Libya are mentioned both as famous oracular shrines and as widely distant from Greece and from each other (cf. ὅπως αἰάς in 113).

117. παραλύσαι: so B, the other MSS. having παραλύσαι. The optative is perfectly correct (see Goodwin M. and T. 241), and Wakefield's παραλύσαει, which many editors have adopted, is a quite unnecessary change. Cf. v. 52. The origin of this curious use of the optative without ἄνω is doubtful. I cannot, however, agree with Earle that the optative was originally one of desire (see his note on 52). It seems much more probable that it is a survival of the early potential use of the optative without ἄνω (Goodwin M. and T. 240; cf. 13). Suppose, for example, the paratactic construction ἔστιν οὖν; ὅπως Ἀλκησίς ἐστι γόρας μᾶλα; “Is it possible then? How (ὅπως in its old interrogative use) can Aleestis reach old age?” From a construction of this kind the hypotactical one might easily arise. But the origin of the usage is very uncertain, and Goodwin is wise in not attempting an explanation.

118. ἀπότομος: so Blomfield. The change is necessary, as the antistrophic has Δόξαλον (128): and ἀπότομος (the reading of the MSS. except L), though a good Euripidean word (Πηγγός 1144), is weaker and less appropriate than ἀπότομος. Moreover, it looks as though L once had ἀπότομος (see Critical Apparatus), and the double accent of ἀπότομος in B points in the same direction. Cf. 981, Soph. O. T. 877 ἀπότομον ὄρονεν εἰς ἀνάγκαν, and the Homeric ἀπότος ὀλέθρος. So in English the expression “a rugged fate,” i.e. a harsh, inexorable one, is sometimes heard.

119. πλάθει: this rare poetic word is used with the accus. (Rhes. 13–14 τίνες...τὰς ἄμετρας | κότας πλάθουσ';;) and with the dat. (Soph. Phil. 726 ὅ χαλκάσπις ἀνήρ θεός | πλάθει πᾶσαι). It is commonly said to be a by-form of πελάξαω, but is really a distinct formation in θο/ε from the root πλα-. Cf. πελάθω. θεόν. It is a difficult sentence. Vv. 120–21 read thus in the MSS.: οὐκ ἔχω ἐπὶ τίνα | μηλοθύταν πορευθώ, and the antistrophic lines 130–31 thus: νῦν δὲ τίν' ἐπὶ βίου | ἐπιθάδα προσδέχομαι. All editors agree that for προσδέχομαι we should read (with Musgrave) προσδέχομαι, as both sense and metre require. When this change is made, the metrical correspondence becomes pretty close. Vv. 130–31 give perfectly good sense as they stand; but with 119–21 the case is otherwise. As Monk long ago pointed out, ἐπὶ ἐσχάρας followed so closely by ἐπὶ τίνα μηλοθύταν is very harsh. Moreover μηλοθύτης in the sense of a “sacrificer,” “priest,” is attested only by this passage; and the analogy of Iph. T. 1116 βωμοῖς τε μηλοθύτας and of phrases like βωῦθος ἑστία or ἑσχαρα (see for the passages Nauck Eur. Stud. II. pp. 52–3) favors Reiske's emendation ἑσχάραν. Μηλοθύταν will then be an adjective agreeing with ἑσχάραν. Reiske, Nauck and Earle would also change μηλοθύταν to μηλόθυτον; but in the passage from Iph. T. quoted above all the MSS. have μηλοθύτας (though a noun in -ους precedes), and it is audacious (to say the least) to alter the word in both of the
two passages where it occurs in classical Greek. 

**Mēλθωτῆς** may perfectly well have been used as an adjective, like so many other nouns of agency in -τῆς. Suidas (s. v. βουτῦπος) and perhaps Athenaeus (XIV. 660 Α) have βουτῦτης (as a noun). What now is to be done with vν 120 and 130? Weil and Wecklein-Bauer change the ετι in 120 to ετι, which palaeographically is almost no change at all, and retain the order of words found in the MSS. *Ετι will then correspond in position with the ετι in 130. (A still closer correspondence might be obtained by striking out δέ in 130 and reading νυν βλου ετι τίνα, but the asyndeton is too harsh, to say nothing of other objections.) But if Weil's reading is correct, we have syllabum anceps, and in 130 hiatus, at the end of the colon (to say nothing of the shortening εχω ετι in 120, which, to be sure, is possible enough). These difficulties would not be insuperable if taken singly, but occurring as they do together they militate strongly against the soundness of the text. Moreover βλου in 130 is suspicious and could well be spared. It may be an interpolation or gloss which has crowded out some other word. If so, the true reading is probably lost past recovery. The best of the emendations that have been suggested is that of Hartung, which I have adopted in the text. It involves, however, the changing of both strophe and antistrophe, which is always a serious objection; and besides if in 120 the original reading was οὐκετι it is hard to see why ουκ and ετι should ever have been separated.* I doubt if any really satisfactory restoration of the text can be made with the evidence now at our command.

122. μάνος: this word is, I think, sound, though it has been suspected by Nauck and others. It is put first because strongly emphatic, and ἄν has, as so often, attached itself to the emphatic word. Hence μανος need not be taken as belonging to the apodosis, and there is no real anacoluthon. The thought is clear: "the son of Phoebus, if he were now alive, is the only person who could restore Alcestis"; but this is expressed a trifle loosely: "if the son of Phoebus, and he alone, were now alive, Alcestis would return to the upper world." The position of ἄν, as Weil observes, is no more strange than in the familiar idiom οὐκ οἶδ’ ἄν εἰ (cf. v. 48). That the poet started to write μανος δ’ ἄν ἀνήγαγεν (or έσωσεν) αὐτήν and then deliberately changed the construction, leaving μανος hanging, as it were, is to my mind incredible. The first syllable of μανος does not correspond with ἄλλ’ of 112; but in the anacrusis this inaccurate responson is allowed. Wakefield conjectured μανόσως, but there is no certain instance of μανόσως or μανόσως in Euripides, though Sophocles uses μανόσως. Ἰν...δεδορκόσ: as the perfect of δερκομαι has a present sense, the periphrastic form is nearly equivalent to a true imperfect, though giving still greater prominence to the state or condition.

123. δρμαστ: the v movable was added by Barnos to restore the correspondence with εσθο’ δπα (113).

125. Ἡλθεν: as in long sentences ἄν is so often repeated, Monk's Ἡλθο’ ἄν

* Cf. however the reading of B in 1. 732.
has much in its favor. In the absence of MSS. testimony for it, I have not ventured to introduce it into the text; but it may well be right, particularly as α and ε are so often confused in the MSS. The use of the *aorist* here is very singular (see Goodwin M. and T. 414). Cf. the condition *ε* ... *παρην* ... *κατηλθεν* *αν* in 357 ff. In both cases the protasis is clearly contrary to fact in present time; but what is the time of the apodosis? It is clearly not past, nor even, strictly speaking, present, for Alcestis is not yet dead. We may perhaps state the usage thus: a contrary-to-fact protasis in present time may have an apodosis referring to the *immediate future*, which apodosis then takes the aorist indicative with *αν*. (The optative with *αν* could not be used, or the contrary-to-fact implication would at once be lost.) For other examples of this usage of the aorist, see Goodwin l.s.c. (add to his list I. A. 1214). The only other alternative to this view that I can see is to suppose that in the apodoses of these conditions the speaker or writer by a kind of "mental prolepsis" projects himself into the future and looks back from that stand-point, so that the aorist really refers to the past; as one might say in English, "were the son of Phoebeus alive, he would have rescued her; but as it is, no one can save her." This, however, seems less probable. *σκοτίως*: *B* has *σκοτίας*, but Euripides has a well-known predilection for the two-ending declension, and uses with two endings many adjectives which in other writers commonly have three. The parallelism of *ἁνδόρος* in 115, to which Earle calls attention, is also in favor of the form in -ονς.

126. This line has been emended in various ways (see Select Conjectures) by those who read *Ἀμωνίδας* (or with Musgrave *Ἀμωνίδας* *ἐδρας* in 116; but Nanck’s arrangement of the strophe (see note on 115) renders change unnecessary here.


128. *πρὶν αὐτὸν εἶλε*: on the indicative after *πρὶν* in the Attic poets (seven cases only in Euripides) see Goodwin M. and T. 633. *Διόρθωτον* | *πλῆκτρον*: this seems to be the only passage where *πλῆκτρον* is used of the thunder-bolt. For the epithet *Monk* compares Soph. O. C. 1464 κτύπος ἄφατος δὲ δίόρθωτος.

130–31. See the note on 119 ff. If the text is sound, τίνα βίον ἐλπίδα must mean "what hope of her living"; but the expression seems vague and forced, and *βίον* may be an unskillful addition by some one who wished to define ἐλπίδα, or a mere gloss which has crept into the text.

132 ff. This is indeed a "locus desperatissimus," and has long been a battle-ground of critics. The MSS. show no variants, except that *L*α have *βασιλεύουν* for the form without *ν* in 132, and all the MSS. but *L* π have an (obviously interpolated) ἀνάν before *οὔ* in 135. The schol. has merely the following note on 132: *α ἔδει ποιεῖν τετελεσται τῷ Ἀδμήτῳ ἔδει τὸ διε; τὸ εὐθανάτικα καὶ τὸ δύσαι τοῖς θεοῖς.

The principal objections made by Nanck and others to the soundness of the
text as it stands in the MSS. are the following: (1) the first line violates the rules of anapaestic verse; (2) the words πάντα γὰρ ἡδη τετελεσται βασιλεύσι are too vague; (3) the paroemiac πάντων δὲ θεῶν ἐπὶ βωμοίς is out of place; (4) θυσίας has no verb; (5) πλήρεις seems an unsuitable epithet to apply to θυσίας, and its meaning, too, is not clear. Let us examine these one by one.

The first objection is easily obviated by making πάντα γὰρ ηδη τετελεσται the first line, and βασιλεύσιν (adopting the reading of L and α) the second. The system will then begin with a paroemiac followed by a monometer, like the two systems in 93 ff. and 105 ff. As to the vagueness of 132, it is not so great as has been represented, for τὰ τέλη is easily supplied with πάντα, being implied in τετελεσται. The paroemiac 133 is perhaps sufficiently defended by those in the two preceding systems (93 ff. and 105 ff.) already mentioned; but as a verb seems needed with θυσίας and the copula can so easily fall out, I have followed Mekler in inserting εἰς’ after θεῶν, thus forming an acatalectic dimer. The main difficulty is with πλήρεις, which, however, can fairly be rendered ‘‘full,’’ ‘‘abundant’’; cf. fr. 912, 5 (Nauck) σῶ δε μοι θυσίαν ἀπυρον παγκαρπεῖας δέξαμεν, πλήρη προχωθέσατο, and H. 1411 ὥσ ἀν τὴν χάριν πλήρην λάβω. It would also be possible to render it ‘‘in full tale,’’ so that no altar lacks its sacrifice; cf. the analogous use in passages like Hec. 521–2 παρὰν μὲν δῖκης πᾶς Ἄρακε-κοῦ στρατοῦ | πλήρης προτόμῳβ, Aristoph. Eccl. 95 εἰ πλήρης τύχοι | ὁ δήμος ὕν. I see no sufficient reason, therefore, for assuming a series of lacunas with Kirchhoff and others, or for making any violent alteration of the text. The scholiast’s explanation of 132 (see above) is no proof that his text contained anything which is not in our MSS.; his ᾧ έδει τοιεῖν is merely an attempt to supply the ellipsis after πάντα.

132. βασιλεύσιν: the so-called ‘‘pluralis maiestatis.’’ The scholiast’s note shows that he understood it as meaning Admetus alone.

134. αἰμόρραντοι: for the formation the edd. compare κυμοδέγμονος Hippol. 1173. So, too, αἰμοβαφή Soph. Aj. 219, etc. Cf. σπερματολόγος and σπερμολόγος, αἵματόρραντας and αἰμόρραντος. See for a list of similar formations Kübler-Blass II. p. 331 n. 4. In Bekker’s Anecdota III. p. 1308 the words αἰματόρραντοι (sic) θυσίας are said to be found in the Oxford Codex Baroccius of Choeroboscus; but I have been unable to find the passage in Hillard’s edition of Choeroboscus.

136–434, first ἐπεισόδιον.

136. Usener (Jahrb. f. Phil. vol. 139 p. 369) would read γὰρ for ἐκ. Probably, however, no change should be made. The Alcestis abounds in asyndeta, which are not to be emended away but are due to the desire to produce a rhetorical effect by the very abruptness thus secured. Weil compares for the omission of γὰρ Phoen. 99–100 ἀλλ’ οὕτως ἀστῶν τοῦτον χρώμπτεται δόμους, | κέδρου παλαίνων κλαμακ’ ἐκπέρα ποδί, which is still more daring.

138–9. The sense of these lines seems clear enough: ‘‘Your weeping is excusable, to be sure; but I wish you would (stop and) tell me whether Alcestis

* The order is against taking παγκαρπεῖας with πλήρης, as do some.
is alive or not," or as Bauer-Wecklein put it: "Das Weinen ist dir zwar nicht zu verarbeiten; ich möchte aber, dass du jetzt meine Frage beantwortetest." What there is obscure or difficult about this I confess myself unable to see. Weil, however, reads πένθει μεν, ὥς τι δεσπόταισι τυγχάνει, εὐγνωστόν κ.τ.λ., and observes: "J'ai corrigé la leçon πενθεὶν μὲν, εἰ (juste au-dessus de εἰ au vers suivant) τι . . . συγγνωστὸν, dont le sens ne s'accorde ni avec les sentiments du cheeur ni avec la suite des idées"! In this, as in some other cases, the brilliant French critic has been led astray by his own over-acuteness. The words are merely a courteous request to the domestic to stop weeping and give the desired information.

141. Even in her grief the servant cannot resist the temptation to quibble. What Johnson says of Shakespeare is peculiarly true of Euripides: "His persons, however distressed, have a conceit left them in their misery, a miserable conceit."

144-5. I have followed H. Mueller in placing these two lines after 149. As they stand in the MSS. the sudden apostrophe to Admetus is needlessly abrupt, but when 144 follows 149 the address is adequately motivated by the mention of him in ὧ σφε συνιδέψει πότος. Any one who has copied out a long στιχομονία will realize how easy it is to get the lines transposed by mistake. Tournier (followed by Weil) would place 148-9 after 143, less happily, as it seems to me. πάθη: here P has preserved the true reading at the end of the line, while at the end of 142 and 140 L a have the correct form of the text. These, like hundreds of other instances, show how extremely liable the last part of a line is to suffer change.

146. μὲν: Weil reads νῦ, which seems a needless alteration. For the use of μὲν, cf. Ηιρροῖ. 316 ἀγναῖς μὲν, ὥ παλ, χείρας αἴματος φέρεις: The particle serves both to lend emphasis to the preceding word and to indicate that the asker of the question expects an affirmative answer. It may be well rendered by our "I suppose." σῳζεσθαι: σῶσασθαι L P; but, as Earle points out, the present is preferable as denoting continuance, "be kept in safety," "preserved," βίον being subject, not object. All recent ed. read σῷζεσθαι.

148. ἐπ' αὐτῇ: ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, the reading of L P, was known to the schol., who observes: ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰμαρμένοις ὁ ἄνηρ τὰ προσήκοντα πουεῖ, ἢ ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ 'Αλκηστίδι. Ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, "in view of the circumstances," gives fairly good sense, and Hermann (who daringly read ἡλπισμὲν for ἠλπίς μὲν in 146) preferred it; but ἐπ' αὐτῇ is clearer and more probable. The variant αὐ. αὐτ. may have come from αὐτὴ = αὐτῇ being mistaken for αὐτὸς = αὐτοῖς, or possibly the last letters of the word had been lost in the archetype and were variously supplied from conjecture by early scholars or copyists. πρᾶσσωσται: not an "old-Attic" form, for the Attic inscriptions show ττ from the earliest times (Meisterhans p. 75). The use of σα in the tragedians and Thucydides is probably an Ionism (Cauer in Curtius' Studien VIII. pp. 283 ff.). Aristophanes and the Attic prose writers have regularly ττ.
153. The reading of the MSS., which Monk and Earle retain, would be satisfactory if it really admitted of the former’s rendering “what must the woman be that has surpassed her?”; but unfortunately, as Hermann pointed out, the true version would be “what must become of the woman who has surpassed her” (or, if the article is generic, “of the supremely excellent woman”). Cf. e.g. Aesch. Sept. 297 τι γένωμαι; Thuc. II. 52, 3 οὖν ἔχοντες θανάτου· Hence some emendation is necessary, and I have adopted that of Lenting. The reading in the MSS. looks like a clumsy attempt at emendation by some one who was puzzled by the construction τό μὴ ὅλ ἑνεδραί after the verb of denial (see Goodwin M. and T. 811). For other suggestions see Select Conjectures.

159. Earle’s notion that λευκὸς is proleptic appears to me, I must confess, horribly prosaic, though defended by the analogy of Hel. 676 ff. But perhaps I am biased by our modern prejudices. England, who is a high authority, seems inclined to agree with Earle.

160. δόμων, which had been suspected (see Select Conjectures), has recently been ably defended by Radermacher (N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1895 p. 235), who accepts the old explanation of Graevius, that δόμων here = cista, and compares El. 870 φῆρ, οἷα δὴ χεὶ καὶ δόμων κεύθοις μου | κόμης ἀγάλματ' ἐκενγκωμαί, Soph. Trach. 578 δόμων γὰρ ἤν (sc. ὁ χιτῶν) ... ἐγκεκλημένων καλῶς. Add Hesiod. Op. 96 ff. μονὴ δ' αὐτόλεξοι Ἑλπίς ἐν ἀρρήκτοισι δόμωσιν | ἐνδον ἐμμεν (cited by Earle). Δόμων (δόμως being properly “anything built,” from δέμω) can be applied as well to the compartments of a chest or wardrobe as to the apartments of a house. Lenz’s conjecture δοχὰ, which Bauer-Wecklein accept, seems to me distinctly bad, as Hesychius has δοχῶς, δοχεία, λουτήρας, implying that the word was commonly used of vessels to contain liquids.

162. κατηφέμενο: this, not κατέφεμεν, is the regular Attic form. The statement of Morcis p. 161: ἤρξαμεν διὰ τοῦ Ἡ Ἀττικός, διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἐλληνικός is confirmed by the Attic inscriptions. See Meisterhans p. 136, 14.

163. δέσπον: it is not certain what goddess is here meant. πρόσαρεν ἔστις is not decisive, as the statues of various deities (θεοὶ ἐστιοῖς) were placed near the hearth. The epithet δέσπον is often applied to Persephone and sometimes to Hecate; and the Pharaean Artemis also might be thus addressed by Alcestis. But it seems far more probable that the deity here meant was Hestia than that she was one of the chthonian deities. The grim Pharaean Artemis Βρεμω in particular was scarcely a goddess to whom such a prayer would be offered by an anxious mother.

165. ὄρφανεύς: this rare word is used at least five times by Euripides, here and vv. 297 in the active in the sense of “to rear” or “care for orphans,” and 538, Hippol. 847, Suppl. 1132 in the middle with the meaning of “to live in orphanhood.” It is a distinctively Euripidean word. τῷ μὲν: the boy was Eumelus who afterward led his father’s forces in the Trojan war (II. 11. 712). The schol. on Aristoph. Vesp. 1239 mentions another son, Hippasus.
166. τῇ δὲ: the daughter's name was Perimele. She married Argus and bore him Magnes, after whom Magnesia in Thessaly was named (Antonin. Liberal. 23).

167. ἀπόλλυμαι: this reading is more elegant and idiomatic than ἀπόλλυται, and is clearly right. Some one wished to have a verb in the third person, of which η τεκοῦσα could be directly the subject, and so altered ἀπόλλυμαι to ἀπόλλυται, the reading of L and P.

168. θανεῖν: preceptive infinitive (Goodwin M. and T. 785). This seems a more probable explanation than that of Jerram, who holds that the clause καὶ τῷ μὲν ... γενναῖον πόσιν forms a parenthesis, after which the infinitive construction dependent on αἰτήσομαι in 164 is resumed.

170. οἱ κατ᾽ Ἀδμήτου δόμους: a good example of something which is very rare indeed — the omission of the copula in a relative clause. Bauer-Wecklein compare Odyssey XX. 298, διὸ, οἱ κατά δώματ᾽ ὦνευς ὁδεῖον.

173. μυρσίνης: this is preferable to μυριπινῖν, the reading of L P, as the adjective μυριπῖνος or μυρσίνης is very rare (though Callimachus ad Diana. 202 has μυριπῖνος δόζος). Cf. 757 and note. A purifying power was attributed to the myrtle; hence it was used in lustrations and funeral solemnities, and was consecrated to the deities of the lower world.

173. ἀκλαυστός: ἀκλαυστός L. About the true orthography of this word there is much uncertainty. In Homer the form without σ seems best attested, and is adopted by nearly all recent editors, though in all the four passages where it occurs (II. XXII. 386; Odyss. IV. 494; XI. 54 and 72) there is considerable MS. authority for the signative form. In Aeschylus (Septem 683 and Eum. 561) the Laurentian has the form with σ (but κλαυτὸν Septem 320). In Sophocles the Laurentian has the signatic form once (El. 912; cf. κλαυστά O. C. 1360), the non-signatic four times (Ant. 29, 847, 876, O. C. 1708). In Euripides, besides the passage from our text, we have Androm. 1235, where all the MSS. have the form without σ, Phoen. 1634, where the MSS. except L b c have the signatic spelling, and Hec. 30, where all the MSS. but L have the non-signatic form. In view of these facts I see no reason why the statement of Eustathius (1673, 17), τὸ δὲ ἄκλαυτον οἱ μεθ᾽ "Ομηρον καὶ ἄκλαυστον, should not be true of Euripides. Probably both forms existed side by side, and the poet used now one, now the other, as he saw fit. Hence I have followed the majority of the MSS. in reading ἄκλαυστος. The fact that both B and P have this form is much in its favor. It is noticeable that ἄκλαυστος is here coupled with another adjective beginning with a privative. Cf. the Homeric ἄκλαυτος ἄταφος (II. XXII. 386; Odyss. XI. 54 and 72), and Hec. 30, Phoen. 1634, Soph. Ant. 29, 876, Aesch. Eum. 555. For the active sense, cf. Odyss. IV. 494 οὐδὲ σὲ φαμιλών ἄκλαυτον ἔστεθαι, Aesch. Sept. 683 ἄκλαυστοι δύσμασιν.

174. φύσιν: here = "complexion." Φύσις, being in itself a colorless word, requires "to be filled with meaning from the context to the requisite amount," as some one has well put it.
175 ff. Sophocles probably had this passage in mind when he wrote Truch. 912 ff.: ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν 'Ελησσον, ἐξαίφνης σφ' ὄρα | τὸν 'Ἡράκλειον θάλαμον εἰσορομωμένην | . . . καθέξωτ' ἐν μέσωιν εὐναπτηρίως, | καὶ δακρύων ῥήξασα θερμὰ νάματα | ἔλεγεν, ὥ λέξη τε καὶ νυμφεί' ἐμά, | τὸ λοιπὸν ἦδη χάρισθον, ὥς ἐμ' οὕτος | δέξσο' ἐτ' ἐν κοίταις ταῖσ' εὐνήτριαν. No Sophoclean play shows so strong an affinity in style with the Alcestis as the Trachiniae.

176. δακρυσε: the copyists, who doubtless did not find the aphaeresis indicated in their sources save by the omission of the augment, have written δάκρυσε: but the unaugmented form is not admissible in trimeters. In such cases as this it is now the fashion not to mark the aphaeresis at all, but to write δὴ εἴδακρυσε and the like. But convenience certainly requires that it be indicated; and though the ancients often did not mark it, I see no reason why we should not.*

177-8. There can be no doubt that Nanck is right in rejecting 178. The use of κορεῖματ', ἐκ and πέρι is alone enough to condemn it, and a more clumsy "Anhängsel" it would be hard to find. Two plausible reasons may be suggested, either of which would account for the interpolation: (1) the interpolator may have inserted a line in order to supply a substantive with which παρθένει could agree, or (2) κορεῖματα may be a gloss on παρθένει, which was subsequently filled out so as to make a complete trimeter. The instances in which glosses, παρεπιγραφαι and the like have led to wholesale interpolations are not rare; how great their influence upon the text has been is ably shown by Mr. Rutherford in his editions of Thucydides and the scholia to Aristophanes. The question next arises, whether παρθένει ἔλυσ' ἐγὼ in 177 is sound. The use of the active form ἔλυσ' as Nanck (Eur. Stud. II. 54) pointed out, is defended by Tr. 101 οίδ' ἔλυσα συμφοραῖς ἀγνευμα σὸν, and Pindar Isthm. VII. 94 (VIII. 45) λοικ ἵκεν χαλινὸν ἑφ' ἤρωι παρθέναια, both of the woman. For παρθένεια in the sense of "virginity" I know no parallel from classical writers, though the Septuagint has τὰ παρθένεια for the tokens of virginity. Still, the expression seems possible enough, and the text probably needs no further change; though it would be easy to read παρθένεια with Hannemuehler (cf. Ion 1472).

179-80. A much disputed passage. The question turns on the first word in 180. We may distinguish the following views:

Α. Those who retain the MSS. reading μῶνῃ.

(1) Some editors retain μῶνῃ and take ἀπώλεσας in the sense of "destroy." The rendering will then be: "Farewell; for I do not hate thee; but thou hast destroyed me only; for because I shrink from betraying thee and my spouse I am about to die." This makes fairly good sense, but the exact force of μῶνῃ is not clear. Woolsey says: "μῶνῃ, me only, i.e. no other woman has perished in a similar manner, destroyed by marriage in this way." But Alcestis is addressing her own particular λέξις, not speaking of marriage in general.

* For inscriptive cases of aphaeresis, see Lucius in Diss. phil. Argentor. IX. p. 396.
Jerram says: "'you have destroyed me, but you will destroy no other woman,' for no one will do for a husband what I have done for him." Well explains: "c'est moi seule que tu fais mourir (mon époux vivra)." These different explanations show how vague the sense is if we read μονη. And what is the force of δέ after ἄπωλεσας? To render it by nam, as Hermann does, is surely bold.

(2) Earle and others render ἄπωλεσας by "lost," a meaning which the word not infrequently has. The sense will then be: "thou hast lost me only (but not Admetus)." But in that case why δέ? We can scarcely suppose that the particle here = γάρ, though it sometimes has nearly the same force.

B. Reiske wished to put the stop after με and read μονη προδούναι γάρ σ' ὀκνοῦσα κ.τ.λ. This gives very good sense, and the position of γάρ can, of course, be easily paralleled. Still, though the change is slight, I prefer Blomfield's emendation.

C. Others read μόνον with Blomfield. The sense will then be clear: "Farewell; for I do not hate thee; but thou, and thou alone, hast destroyed me; for it is because I shrink from betraying thee and my spouse that I am about to die." To one who believes that in Greek, as in Latin, the emphatic position is usually at or near the beginning of the sentence or clause, the order of the words (especially the position of προδούναι σ') is, I think, decisive in favor of this view. The δέ, too, thus receives its proper force. If this view is the right one, we should read δέ με (with the MSS.) in 179; those who prefer μόνη should, of course, read δ' ἐμδ.

181-2. These lines are wittily parodied by Aristophanes in the well-known passage of the Equites: ὁ στέφανον, χαίρων ἀπίθα, καὶ σ' ἄκων ἐγὼ | λεπτονό σέ δ' ἄλλος τις λαβὼν κεκτήσεται, | κλέπτης μὲν οὔκ ἄν μᾶλλον, εὐτυχὸς δ' ἰσως. For the elliptic use of δ' (sc. οὔτα) see Goodwin M. and T. 227 and 483.

183. προσπιτνουε: the long controversy as to the correct accentuation of this by-form of πιτηνω may, I think, be said to have been pretty definitely decided in favor of Elmsley and against Hermann; and nearly all recent editors prefer πιτηνω to πιτνω. The MSS. waver between the two spellings; even the Medicean of Aeschylus and Sophocles is not consistent.

184. ὀθβαλμοτέγκτο: this word is apparently of Enripidean coinage; at all events it seems to occur nowhere else in classic Greek. πλημμυρίδι: the edd. from Monk down point out that Enriptides is here following Aeschylus, who says (Chor. 177-8): ἐξ ὀμάτων δὲ δίψαι πιτνωνί μοι | σταγόνες ἀφαρκτοι δυσχίμων πλημμυρίδιον. The grandiloquence of the description contrasted with the simple language of Alcestis herself is very effective. Αἰκία, which Porson restored ex conj., is confirmed by the MSS. of the first class; the early edd. had δέος (with L and P), and κόνει above in 182 (with the same MSS.).

185. δακρύων: I cannot agree with Professor Earle that this is genitive of source or cause. πολλῶν is not decisive against the ordinary view: "when she had had her fill of many tears" is certainly a possible and natural poetic
expression. Cf. *Phoen.* 1750 κόρον ἐφοφ’ ἐμὼν κακὼν, and expressions like μεστός πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν, etc., where the πολλῶν is seemingly pleonastic.

187. Two questions arise in regard to this line—what does ἐπιστράφη mean, and should we read θάλαμον with the MSS. or θαλάμων with Nauck?

(1) Many editors, including Monk, render ἐπιστράφη “returned.” There seems, however, to be no passage where it is certain that ἐπιστρέφομαι has this meaning, either in Euripides or elsewhere. The alleged instances of this use are all susceptible of a different interpretation.

(2) Others (with Liddell and Scott s.v.) render the verb “turned round” (to look back). This meaning of ἐπιστρέφομαι is well attested, e.g. Xen. *Sympos.* 9, 1 καὶ ὁ Λύκων ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῷ συνεξὼν ἐπιστρέφεις εἴπε, Herod. I. 88, etc. Cf. also the figurative use in *Rhes.* 400 οὐκ ἤκουες οὐδ’ ἤμμας οὐδ’ ἐπιστράφης and similar passages. But this translation seems weak; for the next line shows that Alcestis not only looked back but actually went and threw herself upon the bed again. We should expect a verb of going rather than one of mere turning about.

(3) Euripides himself has *Hel.* 83 πόθεν γῆς τῆςδ’ ἐπιστράφης πέδων; ib. 89 τι δῆτα Νελων τοῦδ’ ἐπιστρέφει γῆς; ib. 768 Κρήτης τε Λιθής θ’ ἀς ἐπιστράφην πόθεα. In these cases the meaning of the verb seems to be “wander to,” “visit.” Cf. *Andr.* 1031 θεοῦ μν κλεισσά ἐπιστράφη. The closest parallel to our passage, however, is *Ion* 352 καίτοι πάλιν ἐπιστράφη πέδων, where ἐπιστράφη (though it may be rendered “returned to,” “visited”) probably means “roamed over,” “wandered through” (in the search for traces of the child), as in the Hesiodic γαῖαν ἐπιστρέφεται. In all these instances the notion of roaming or wandering seems to lie in the word. Hence in our passage, as the participle εἴςωσα may have a future sense, I am inclined to render: “and oft she wandered through the chamber about (or intending to go out),” i.e. went about to take a last look before leaving. If this view is correct, θάλαμον requires no change. Those, however, who accept (1) or (2) must read θαλάμων with Nauck, as the word for “chamber” is naturally expected with the verb of leaving, which logically comes first, not with that of returning or looking round. The order of the words and the frequent use of the plural of θαλάμος by Euripides favors Nauck’s emendation (*Eur. Stud.* II. 54); but on the whole I think no change is necessary. The order may be due to metrical reasons.

188. αὐθίς . . . πάλιν: a common pleonasm. Sophocles even goes so far as to end a line (*Oed. Col.* 364) with αὐθίς πάλιν. Cf. also *Hel.* 932 πάλιν . . . αὐθίς αὐ.

190. ές ἀγκάλας: ἐν ἀγκάλαις L P, which is perfectly possible, and may be right*; cf. *Hippol.* 1431 λαβέ | σῶν πάδ’ ἐν ἀγκάλαις. With λαβεῖν sometimes the idea of motion predominate, sometimes that of rest.

193. οἰκτίροντες: the Attic inscriptions show that οἰκτίρω, not οἰκτέλω, is the correct spelling. See Meisterhans p. 142; Kühler-Blass II. p. 498.

* Wecklein prefers it; see his *Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides* p. 530.
195. This line is here in place; but in 312 (where see note) it appears in a distorted form and is inappropriate to the context. From ὅν, ὣφ' οὖ is to be understood with προσφημῆ.

197. γ': so the second Hervagian edition. The τ' of the MSS. is probably due to confusion between Τ and Γ. The intensive particle "seems demanded by the sense," as Earle justly observes. ἄλετ': ὄχετ', F. W. Schmidt's emendation, is quite needless, and was subsequently withdrawn by Schmidt himself. δ': τ', the reading of P, which Prinz and Weil accept, is probably due to some grammarian who, after γ' had become corrupted to τ', was offended by τ'. . . δ', and wished to have a second τ' coördinate with the first one. This constant effort to plane away all that seemed irregular and reduce everything to one "dead level" of monotony was one of the worst failings of the Byzantine scholars, as it is of some modern critics.

198. οὖπωθ' οὖ: Nanck's brilliant and certain emendation. The various readings of the MSS. (see Critical App.) show that the scribes were misled by the unusual position of the negative. This position is due to the desire to give it special emphasis, and perhaps also to metrical reasons.

199. τουσι': the emphatic form is clearly preferable to τοῦσιν of L P.

200. α: here, on the other hand, L and P are almost certainly right. ης of B perhaps came from a carelessly written ηι (C for a crooked iota) or it may have been a deliberate emendation; and ηι (so α) in its turn is doubtless a mistake for α, due to iotaism. It would be possible, but much less elegant, to read ηι and take γεναικός as gen. of cause. σφε: that this reading is correct is shown by the agreement of L P α; γε, the reading of B, is either a perverse emendation or a blunder of the scribe.

201. ἀκοίτου: a formal word, "consort," like ἀλοχος.

204. χειρῶς ἀδιλλον βάρος: (1) Some take βάρος as accus. of specification with παρεμειίνη, and understand by χειρῶς the hand of Alcestis. So the schol., who paraphrases by τήν ἵπχιν τής χειρῶς παραλειμείην.

(2) Others (better, I think) make βάρος refer to Alcestis herself, "a hapless burden of the hand," helpless and unable to move.

Elmsley, Kirchhoff, Prinz, Weil, Bauer-Weeklein, Earle and others hold that a line has been lost after 204. This is quite needless. There is no lacuna, and with the punctuation given in the text the sense is perfectly clear: — "and all relaxed, a piteous burden for the hand, but yet with life still left in her, albeit but little, she wishes," etc. The true punctuation and meaning were first pointed out by F. D. Allen.

207-8. These two lines (with προσφημαι instead of προσφηται) occur also in Hec. 411-12. In our passage they are unnecessary, and ἀκτίνα κόκλον 0' ἥλιου is displeasing after πρὸς αἰγάζ . . . τὰς ἥλιου. Valckenaer rejected them, and nearly all modern editors have followed his example. Probably some early reader wrote the parallel passage from the Hecuba in the margin of his MS. and it was then copied into the text of the Alcestis by mistake.
212. Exit maid-servant. The choral dialogue which follows is differently divided by different editors. The MSS. give very little guidance. The arrangement in the text is substantially that of Prinz, except that I have assigned 220-25 and 232-7 to the whole chorus, and have prefixed a παράγραφος to 238 to indicate that 238-43 were delivered by the coryphaeus. But the details of the distribution are, and probably always will be, uncertain.

213. The text of this line is extremely uncertain; πῶς πᾶ is suspected, and some editors omit πῶς, others πᾶ, while Musgrave would strike out both words. But B and P have both words, and L seems to have once had them, though the second has been erased. In the face of this evidence the fact that a omits πῶς is of little weight, as that MS. is full of arbitrary changes. Hence I have retained both.* The accumulated questions mark the extreme excitement of the chorus. Nauck’s restoration of bacchiacs (see Sel. Conj.) is elegant but daring, and the changes which it requires are too sweeping. Unfortunately the anistrophic line 226 is lacunose, and gives little help. In 214 the MSS. show no variant, and as the sense of the two lines 213-14 is clear, there does not seem to be good reason for change.

215. ἐξεστὶ τις: i.e. “will any one come out of the palace to give us directions, or shall we put on mourning at once on our own responsibility?” Herwerden’s εἶ ἐστὶ τις seems unnecessary. As the servant has gone in to inform her master of the presence of the chorus, they have good reason to expect that some one will come out and tell them what to do. The words are doubtless spoken after a short pause. τέμω: the deliberative subjunctive was restored by Hermann. The copyists, who perhaps did not know ἔτεμον, took the form to be future and accent it τεμῶ. *Ετεμον, not ἐταμον, is the Attic form of the aorist; see Meisterhans p. 146, and the authorities there cited.

216. στολμὸν πέπλων: so Audr. 148 στολμὸν τε χρωτὸς τόνδε ποικίλων πέπλων, Aesch. Choeph. 29 πρόστερνοι στολμοὶ πέπλων.

218. δῆλα μέν: i.e. that Alcestis is dead and the mourning should be put on; or we may understand ὅτι ὄν ἄν γένοιτο πόρος κακῶν (so Earle). It is hard to tell whether 218-19 is an answer to 215-17, or a continuation of 213-14 without regard to the intervening words of the other semi-chorus.

219. εὐχόμεθα: here the scribe of a, who was evidently a man of some learning, has the right form; L is next in point of accuracy, then P, while B, which has ἐχόμεθα, is farthest from the truth. The correspondence is not perfect, as the antistrophe has καταθάνοσαν (232), but μεσθα is required to = -νοῦσαν. γὰρ δύναμις: so B. The other MSS. have γὰρ ἀ δύναμις, and it is possible that not ἀ but γὰρ should be omitted, thus giving another of the asyndeta so common in this play. Hermann omitted both γὰρ and ἀ, scanning θεῶν without synizesis. μεγίστη: so the best MSS. C d a have μεγίστα, but these are comparatively untrustworthy. The agreement of B L P makes it probable that the archetype had μεγίστη. Many edd., however, prefer the Doric form.

* Possibly, however, we should read ἰὼ Ζεῦ τις ἄν πόρος πᾶ κακῶν, a dochmiac dimeter.
223. A very difficult place. The strophe has οΟοΟο, the antistrophe (235) οΟοΟο, and it is clear that some change is necessary to restore the responson. The principal MSS. show no variant in either the strophic or antistrophic line. Editors have treated this passage in the most various ways. They may be roughly divided into three groups:

A. Those who with W. Dindorf reject τοῦδ᾿ ἔφηβες. To fill the lacuna thus left various substitutes, τοῦσθε, παρήσας, etc. have been suggested; see Sel. Conj.

B. Those who with Erfurdt and Monk reject καὶ νῦν, and τάν in the antistrophic line. These I believe to be in the right.

C. Those who adopt other measures: e.g. Hermann, who read τῆδ᾿ for τοῦδ᾿ with Heath, inserted τοῦτο after ἔφηβες, and in 235 στέναξαν after χῦών; and so Earle. Weil proposed τοῦδ᾿ ἱσόθα (sc. λυτήρως), καὶ νῦν. See also Sel. Conj.

On examining 223 the first thing which appears suspicious is τοῦδ᾿. If it is genitive after πάρος the construction is clearly very unusual, as πάρος with the genitive is very rarely used of time (though there is an instance in Andr. 1208). If, on the other hand, it depends on ἀμφανάν understood, “(a means of escape) from this (evil),” the ellipsis seems harsh in the extreme. We feel that ἔφηβες needs an object that is expressed. Moreover τοῦδ᾿ is not found in all MSS., for (according to Hermann, Kirchhoff and Dindorf: Prinz does not mention the reading) C, the Copenhagen MS., has τοῦτ᾿, and the Florentinus of Voss had τῶν δ᾿. These are probably conjectures, not independent variants; but they show that τοῦδ᾿ was felt to be wrong quite early. We note also that ἔφηβες, if its ultima is long by position, corresponds in the number and quantity of its syllables with ἄρισταν. Ἐφευρέκα is a favourite word with Euripides, occurring at least ten times in the plays (and again v. 699 of the Alcestis). It seems to me, also (though here opinions differ), that καὶ νῦν, occurring as it does at the end of the line and being clearly implied in the context, looks very like an interpolation, and can well be dispensed with. If so, by striking out τάν in 235 (which may easily have been inserted by some later hand) the complete responson is restored, as Erfurdt long ago pointed out. Cf. Westphal-Rossbach Gr. Metrik p. 286 note. Hence I am strongly inclined to read τοῦτ᾿ (i.e. τὸ λυτήρως ἐκ θανάτου εἴναι) with C and Monk, and to reject καὶ νῦν and τάν with Erfurdt. Hermann, to be sure, says in his curt way “parum normat morem tragicorum, qui καὶ νῦν putant abesse posse”: but to say this is one thing, to prove it another.

224. ἐκ: λυτήρως is usually followed by the gen. of separation without a preposition, as in Aesch. Eum. 294, Soph. El. 635, etc. Euripides probably used the preposition here for metrical convenience. See note on 983.

226. The lacuna in this line was first marked by W. Dindorf. The reading of L and P is obviously a mere attempt to fill up the gap in the line with interjections. What the original reading was it is quite impossible to say.
227. ὣν παῖ: this does not accurately correspond to ἀνου- of 214; but in the anacrusis a short may answer to a long, and hence no change is necessary. See Metrical Appendix. οία πράξεις: I have accepted Jacob's emendation, as Alcestis is not yet dead, and in 232 (which was probably spoken by the same semi-chorus) we have the future ἐπόθει. It may be urged that in 218 the death of Alcestis is assumed; but it is not certain to what δῆλα refers (see note ad loc.). δάμαρτος: as the ultima is long by position, this does not correspond to πάρεστι of the strophe (214). Perfect responsion may be restored by reading πάρεστιν in the strophic line, or ἀς for σας (with Weil) in the antistrophe; but probably no change should be made. Responsion in logoeic strophes is usually pretty rare, but exceptions certainly sometimes occur. στερεῖς: so Monk for στερηθές, as the strophic line has —, not — —. The conjecture is supported by Bacch. 1363 (στερείσα Βαρνε, στερηθείσα Π.), Suppl. 793 (στερείσα Markland, στερείσα MSS.), Iph. T. 474 (στερείσα Scaliger, στερηθείσα MSS.).

228. ᾧρ': so Hermann. The letters a and ρ are often extremely alike in Greek MSS., both in literary and cursive writing; hence ᾧρ' was mistaken for αἰ. Then, as the interjection usually occurs twice or four times, it was doubled as in L P or quadrupled as in B a. — For the sentiment cf. Bacch. 246, Heracl. 216, Soph. O. T. 1373, Aristoph. Achar. 125, etc. (cited by Monk).

229. πλέον: this is the classical form of the neut. sing.; see Meisterhans pp. 119-20, Wecklein Cur. Epigr. p. 27.

230. οὐρανίφ: the epithet seems unduly extravagant, and the word has been suspected by Lenting, Prinz, Wecklein and others. The soundness of the text has been defended by Earle, who compares Hipp. 1207 κῷρ οὐρανόφ στερηθέν, Autr. 830 ἤρ' αἰδέρων πιλκάμων ἐμών ἂτο, | λεπτόμενον φάροι. Add El. 860 ὥς νεβρός οὐράνιον πήδημα κονφίζουσα, ib. 1158 οὐράνια τέιχα, Tro. 1087 τείχεα . . . οὐράνια, ib. 325 πάλλε πάδ' αἰδέρων, Inach. 1064 ἐλάτης οὐράνιον ἄκρον κλάδον, etc. Euripides even goes so far as to say of a horse Tro. 519 ἅπτον οὐράνια | βρέμοντα. But these uses, bold as they are, do not seem to me to justify the expression in the text, and I have marked the word as corrupt. For some of the emendations that have been proposed see Sel. Conj.; but the "inevitable word" has not yet been suggested. πλάσσατι: Erfurd's emendation is necessary, as the strophic line ends with ἶλη. The tragedians sometimes allow themselves the Epic license of doubling the σ of the first aorist after a short vowel; cf. Iph. A. 1051 ἀφοισε, Soph. Phil. 1163 πέλασσον, etc.

232. εἶν: so Dindorf, the MSS. having εἶν. A long syllable is required, as the strophe (219) has θέων. The Epic and Doric form εἶν is found also in 436 εἶν 'Αίδα δῆμουσιν, and in Soph. Antig. 1241 εἶν Ἀιδον δῆμοις (in an iambic trimeter; Heath and Jebb read εἴν γ'). Jerram objects that these are not parallel to our passage, as both are imitations of the Homeric εἶν 'Αίδα δῆμουσιν Il. XXIII. 19, 179; but εἶν ᾤματι τῷ' is probably also an Epic reminiscence. Cf. also Aesch. Suppl. 839 εἴπελας εἶν αὐταίσ, where, however, the soundness of the text is very doubtful. It is possible to retain εἶν by rejecting both γάρ and ἃ.
in 219 with Hermann; but γὰρ stands in all the MSS. ἡματι: that this form stood in the archetype is made probable by the agreement of B L P; the authority of d and a is slight in comparison. The limits of Dorism in the tragic choruses are not well defined, and in cases like the present the wisest course is to follow the best MSS. τῶδ' ἐπόψει: L and P have τῶδε γ' ὅψει, a reading obviously due to a H mistaken for Τ. The two are often extremely alike in the MSS., particularly when (as often) the H has its second leg shorter than the first.

233. The dying Alcestis is slowly borne upon the stage. Admetus and the two children accompany her. ἰδὼν ἰδὼν, which is not in L and P, had probably been omitted in their common source by a mere error of the抄ist. The imperatives are, at all events, appropriate, though it is to be noted that the correspondence with 220 is not exact (— — — — — — — —).

234. L and P have στέναξον ὁ βρασόν ο (P βρησον), but στέναξον as the more explicit word should probably come second.

235. [τὰν]: see note on 223.

236. μαρανομέναν: pregnant, "wasting away (and going)." Cf. 363 ἐκεῖσε προσδόκα μ'. Woolsey aptly compares the words of the Scotch song "I am wearing awa' to the land of the leal."

237. χθόνων: I have followed Well in transposing this word, as it is clear that χθόνων..."Αἰδαν was meant to answer φόνον..."Αἰδαν of 225. The Greek dramatists delighted in subtle correspondences of this sort; see for numerous instances Christ Melrūk2 pp. 642 ff. γὰς, which Monk restored ex conj., is found in B, the other MSS. having γάν. When κατά means "under," "down beneath" (either of motion or rest), the genitive is the regular construction. Cf. 107, El. 144, Ion 1411, Ἱππόλ. 836, 1366, Suppl. 1024, Rhes. 834, An. 563, Iph. T. 170, etc.; and on the other hand for the use of κατά γάν Or. 832, 1398, Bacch. 371, Ἱππόλ. 194, etc.

238 ff. This anaepastic system was in all probability sung by the euryphaeus.

241. λεύσων καὶ L P. The insertion of καὶ, which disturbs the metre, was evidently due to some one who read τάσει for τάσδε in 240.

242. ἀπλακών: the MSS. here and in Iph. A. 124 λέκτρων ἀπλακών have ἀμπλακών, but the metre requires a short first syllable. Cf. Aesch. Eum. 915 (ἀπλακήματα Pauw, ἀμπλακήματα MSS.). In these cases some would retain the spelling of the MSS. (e.g. Clemm Rhein. Mus. 32 pp. 466 ff.; Kühner-Blass l. p. 286, II. p. 307 note 3), supposing the μ to have been so faintly sounded as not to count toward "making position." But we have one clear case of αὐλ, Soph. O. R. 472, where the Laurentian by the first hand, Triclinius, the schol., Zonaras and Snudas all support the reading ἀναπλάκηστο. (Kühner-Blass l. s. c. are wrong in saying "ἀναμπλάκητος codd., ἀναπλ. die Neueren Soph. O. R. 472"); the μ in L, has been added above the word by a later hand.) Hence I have preferred, with most cdd., to spell with απλ where the metre requires a short syllable. The formation of ἀμβλακειν, ἀμπλακειν, ἀπλακειν is
very doubtful. Curtius and Jebb hold the π to be original, the verb being cognate with πλάζω; while Kühner-Blass hold the π to be an euphonic insertion, π being used instead of β because βν commonly makes position, so that ἄμβλακων could not = ὀ ὀ —. Cf. ἄμβροτος, ἄβροτος, (μ)βλίττω etc. —Note the alliteration in ἀριστης ἀπλακων ἀλόχων ... ἀβιωτον ... βιοτεύσει: a favorite oxymoron. Cf. Ἐρίπολ. 821, 868, Aristoph. Plutus 1169, Demost. XXI. 132 ἀβιωτον ἑτ' ἐσεθαι τὸν βίον ἐαυτῷ, etc. F. W. Schmidt's suggestion to read βίον for χρόνον is tempting, and may be right; but I suspect that Euripides thought that ἀβιωτον βίον βιοτεύσει would be "too much of a good thing."

245. Some, absurdly enough, have seen in this line an allusion to the theory of Anaxagoras respecting the revolution of the heavens. It has often been noted that Euripides is especially fond of references to the sky, clouds, upper air, etc., and his references to the sea and figures drawn from it are also very numerous (see E. Schwartz De metaphoris e mari et re navali petitis quaest. Eurip.). Probably no ancient poet had a keener eye for natural phenomena.

246 ff. The alternation of the iambic trimeters with the more impetuoussic metres is very effective.

247. θανὴ: here all the MSS. but L have the better form in ἡ.

249. νυμφίδιοι: this seems preferable to νυμφίδαι, the reading of L and P; see note on 125 σκοτίος. πατρόφας: I have retained the reading of the MSS., though most edd. follow the Aldine in reading πατρίας. Musgrave, Matthiae, Wuestemann, Kirchhoff and Jerram retain πατρίας. If we may trust the MSS., Euripides often shortens the second syllable of πατρόφος in lyric and anapaestic passages; so Bacch. 1368, El. 1315, Hec. 82 (most MSS.), Me. 431, tro. 162; cf. Soph. Phil. 724, Pind. Nem. IX. 14, etc. Many editors follow Porson in substituting πατρός in such cases; but the number of instances is against the change. The distinction in meaning between πάτρος and πατρόφος which Hermann and others have striven to establish certainly was very frequently neglected, if indeed it really existed. Porson's words "Attici πάτρος et πατρόφος promiscue usurpant" are abundantly borne out by the usage of Euripides; thus, for example, he constantly uses πατρία and πατρία γά without any perceptible difference of meaning. See Beck's index for abundant examples. —The mention of the νυμφίδιοι κόηται in Iolcus, as the schol. and Weil point out, does not agree with vv. 177 and 911 ff., which represent the marriage as having taken place in Pherae. This is probably a mere piece of carelessness on the part of the poet.

252 ff. With this passage the edd. compare Aristoph. Rho. 181 ff. (which is not, I think, an intentional parody of this scene), Lysist. 605 ff. (which is clearly a real parody of our passage), and Athenaeus VIII. 341 C, where Machon uses for comic purposes part of the Νιόδε, a dithyramb of Timotheus, which was apparently very similar in tone to this passage from the Alcestis.
252. δίκωπον σκάφος: Wuestemann compares Lucian Charon ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν δίκωπιαν ἱράττω μόνος: and the boat which Dionysus rows in the Ranae seems to have been two-oared. For antique representations of Charon and his boat, see Roscher Lex. d. Mythologie p. 886, Baumeister Denkmäler des klass. Alt. s. v. Charon. [ἐν λίμνῃ]: these words disturb the responsion, add little to the sense, and are almost certainly a gloss (perhaps suggested by the mention of the Λίμνη in Aristoph. Ran. 137 and 181). They were omitted in the Aldine, and are rejected by most editors.

254. This line, with the antistrophic line 261, forms one of the worst cruces of the play. The two cannot well be treated separately. Editors have disagreed widely as to the constitution of the text, the kind of metre, and the division into cola. We may roughly distinguish the following classes:

(1) Those who retain the reading of the MSS. except as to χέρ' in 254, which they change to χερ' (with the Aldine), as the antistrophic line has a short syllable. So Monk, Hermann, Dindorf, Pflugk, Nauck, Prinz, Woolsey, Jerram. With this reading H. Schmidt (Kunstformen vol. III.) gives the following scheme of the lines (logaoedio-trochaic):

∅ | -∅ | ∅ ∅ | - | - | - | - | - | L | -

But the apparent anapaest in the second foot of 254 is awkward, and it is very doubtful whether Euripides ever admits an anapaest in logaoedic verse (see Groeppel De Eurip. versibus logaoedis, p. 84). It is much better to scan as iambic, thus:

∅ | - | ∅ ∅ | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | L | -

The lines give good sense as they stand, and I believe no further change to be necessary. The strophe and antistrophe will then be "iambo-logaoedic"* (see Westphal-Rossbach Metrik* p. 720).

(2) Others, following a suggestion of Paley, omit μ' ἂοθ in 254, and read κυαναύγ′ς with Kirchhoff in 261. Of these some, e.g. Bauer-Weeklein, read χέρ' in 254; in which case the first syllable of δφρνσι will be short (ἐχαυν, ∅ = = ἅμ' δφρν-, ∅ ∅ ∅); others read χέρας (suggested by Paley), thus restoring exact responsion,

∅ | -∅ | ∅ ∅ | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | L | -

But μ' ἂοθ cannot well be spared, for we miss the personal object with καλεί: and surely the epithet κυαναύγ′ς suits the hair of the eyebrows better than it does the eyes or the look. I know of no other place in any classic writer where the phrase κυαναύγ′ς βλαστὲν occurs; while the Homeric κυανάγ′ς ἔηδ' δφρνσι and κυανοχαίτης are familiar to every reader, and were probably in the mind of Euripides.

* i.e. logaoedic with iambic elements.
(3) Others still resort to bolder expedients. For example, Weil reads in 261 (with χέρι in 254) ὑπ’ ὄφρωσιν κυναυγές βλέπων, πτερωτός. Ἅδας and bringing up μέθες με from the next line. This reading does not seem likely to meet with much acceptance. Earle has in the strophe ἔχων χέρας ἐπὶ κοντῷ | Ἱάρων καλεὶ μ’ ἐπείγων. | τί μέλλεις; σοῦ κατείργεις. τάδε τοι με | σπερχόμενος ταχύνει, and in the antistrophe ὑπ’ ὄφρωσιν κυναυγές | βλέπων πτερω- τός "Αδας. | τί βέβεις; μέθες. οἷον ὅδων α’ δειν. | λαυσάτα προβαίνω, thus establishing a very elegant parallelism. But the changes, are, I fear, too sweeping. Still nearer is F. D. Allen’s restoration (see “Select Conjectures”).

256. Τάδ’ ἑτοιμα, the reading of L P, makes good sense if τάδ’ is taken as the object of κατείργεις; but in that case the clause σπερχόμενος ταχύνει is left with nothing to connect it with what precedes, and ῥαχύνει (which must be transitive or it would be awkwardly tautological with σπερχόμενος) is deprived of an object. Hermann, who accepted τάδ’ ἑτοιμα, changed σπερχόμενος to σπερχομένους, putting a colon after the latter word, and altered ταχύνει to τάχυνε. But τάδε τοι με, the reading of the other class of MSS., calls for no alteration of the text, and is clearly preferable. Τάδ’ ἑτοιμα is probably an emendation of some early scholar who divided the words wrongly. Elmsley and Monk read τάδε· τοῖα ἐκ εὐφ. Τάδε and με are probably both objects of ταχύνει = λέγων ταχύνει: Klitz and Jerram compare Soph. Αj. 1107 τά σεμ’ ἐπὶ κόλαξ’ ἐκείνους. Cf. also Soph. Αj. 1404 ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν κοίλῃ κάπετον χερσὶ ταχύνατε for the transitive use. It is possible to take τάδε as “accus. of inner content” with σπερχόμενος: but it is more probable that σπερχόμενος is used absolutely, “in haste,” as it so often is in Homer.

259. ἄγει μ’ ἄγει μὲ τίς: the repetition has led to haplography, most MSS. omitting the first με, while B omits the second. The reading of π’ (ἄγει μ’ ἄγει τίς ἄγει μὲ τίς) looks like a conflation: see note on 1045. The μ’ is clearly necessary, as without it there would be hiatus or shortening, neither being possible here.

260. νεκύων = νεκύων of 258. Note the subtle parallelism that runs through strophe and antistrophe.

261. κυναυγές: see note on 254. κυναυγές, which Kirchhoff and others receive into the text, was first suggested by Monk (see his note on 262). πτερω-τός "Αδας: these words have given much trouble. The main difficulties are two: (1) it was not Hades but Hermes or Thanatos whose function it was to conduct the dead down to the lower world, and in this play (cf. v. 24 ff.) it is Thanatos who comes to fetch Alcestis; (2) Thanatos is represented as having wings, but neither on the monuments nor in the literature is Hades so represented, save in very few instances (one in Kaibel Epigr. Graec. 89; see Robert Thanatos pp. 34 ff., where our passage is discussed at length). Several ways of escaping these difficulties have been suggested:

A. Some scholars alter the text. Weil, as we have seen, omits "Αδας altogether: but the knife of the critic, like that of the surgeon, should be used
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only as a last resort. Wilamowicz would read αἰδαν, which Robert (l. s. c.) accepts; but, elegant as the emendation is, the position of πτερωτός is distinctly against it.

B. Some hold that here and elsewhere in the play Hades and Thanatos are treated as identical. So Rohde, who says (Psyche p. 540 note): "Eigentlich ist er (Thanatos) nur ein Diener des Hades; aber da doch ἄθνατος schon ganz gewöhnlich = θάνατος gebräucht wurde, so wird Thanatos auch selbst geradezu "Αἷόται genannt (271: so oben p. 191, 3); nur als identisch mit Hades kann er ἄναξ νεκρῶν heissen 855 (δαιμόνιν κοιραίος 1143)." But the whole conception of Thanatos in this play, his coming to fetch the souls of the dying, his lurking about the tomb and drinking of the sacrificial blood (843 ff.), appears so inconsistent with the Greek idea of the god Hades that this explanation seems impossible. The words ἄνακτα νεκρῶν (843) are too general to be decisive, especially as the ἄναξ νεκρῶν seems to be distinguished from τῶν κάτω | Κόρης ἄνακτος τ’ (851-2); and as if to make us sure of the distinction Euripides says in 870-71 τοῦν δημήριον μ’ ἀποσφυλήσας | "Αἷόται ὑάνατος παρῷδοκεν: while in 1140 κυρίφω, not κοιράνῳ, is probably the true reading (see note ad loc.).

C. Others still hold that the word "Αἷόται is here used loosely, so that πτερωτός "Αἷόται means merely "a winged shape from the under-world." Hermann observes: τὸς "Αἷόται est nescio quis Orceus, i.e. nescio quid simulacrum Orci." (He makes τος agree directly with "Αἷόται; but it is also possible to take τος as subject of ἄγει, and "Αἷόται as in apposition with τος, and the distance between the words favors the latter view; hence I have put a comma after βλήτων.) Though decision is hard, I strongly incline to this view. A dying woman in her agony does not speak by the card. Moreover, words like "Death," "the grave," etc. may be loosely used in almost all languages; and Euripides need not mean by "Αἷόται the god Hades any more than, for example, Mr. Kipling when he speaks of a cobra as "the hooded Death" means to identify the animal with the museen power.

262. In a and B the words μέθες με stand before τί μέξεις. These words are not found in L, disturb the responson, and are probably a gloss on ἄψεις which has crept into the text. Nauck omits μέθες με, but reads μέθες for ἄψεις. But ἄψεις, which is the rarer word in this sense and is found in all the MSS., is more likely to be the true reading. Πράξεις of B is a gloss on μέξεις: cf. Hesych. τί μέξεις: τί πράττεις, which may refer to this passage, though the difference of tense makes it doubtful.

264. τῶν: the article has here its old demonstrative force; see Hadley-Allen 653 a.

266. B and a have μέθετε με μέθετε μ’, L, P omit με. Either reading is possible, but the repetition of both μέθετε and με seems wooden, and probably L, P are right. A ditto graphy would be all the easier as μέθετε begins with με. Kirchhoff, as usual, follows the reading of the first class.

267. ποσίν: Hermann's certain emendation. L, which has ποσί, is here
nearer right than the other MSS., which read πόσι. The scribes evidently took the word to be vocative of πόσι.

271. οὐκέτι: this time L P have the ditto graphy, reading οὐκέτι δή. ἐστιν: cf. Hel. 279 οὗτος τέθνηκεν, οὗτος οὐκέτι ἔστι δή. It is quite possible, however, to read ἔστιν with Weil, taking σφῶν as "ative of possessor." He compares Soph. O. C. 1612 οὐκ ἔστι ἔθ᾽ ἤμιν τῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πατήρ. The MSS. favor Weil's reading, as all but L have ἔστι (L has ἔστιν); but in matters of accent they are very untrustworthy.

272. ὁρῶτον: so all the MSS. Elmslie wished to read ὁρῶτην, in accordance with the principle which he laid down (see his notes on Med. 1041 and Aristoph. Ach. 733) that in the 2d person dual of the historical tenses and the optative -την, not -τον, is the true ending, the form in -τον being an invention of the Alexandrian grammarians. But, though some scholars still hold Elmslie's view, the weight of evidence is distinctly against him; and few critics now uphold the sweeping changes which he made in order to carry out his theory. In the optative, in particular, there is not a single well-attested instance of the form in -τον (Kühner-Blass II. p. 69). See Frischke on Aristoph. Thesm. 1159, Von Bamberg in Zeitschr. f. Gymn.-W. 1874 p. 622 f., Kühner-Blass l. s. c., and on the other side Wecklein Cur. Epigr. p. 18.

273. ἀκόσω: as Monk points out, one would rather expect ἀκόσῳν; but probably no change should be made.

275. σε: this word was inserted by Porson, in accordance with the regular idiom; cf. 1098, Hippol. 607, Med. 324 πρὸς σε γονάτων, Soph. Phil. 468 πρὸς νῦν σε πατρὸς, etc., and in Latin Terence Andria 538 per te deos oro, Hor. Od. I. 8, 1 per te deos oro. The metre shows that the addition of a short syllable was necessary to complete the anapaest.

276. ἀλλὰ ἀνα: cf. II. XVIII. 178 ἄλλ᾽ ἀνα, μῦθ᾽ ἄτι κείσο, Od. XVIII. 13, and the like; and Soph. Aj. 194 ἄλλ᾽ ἀνα ἐξ ἔδρανων. All the MSS. but B have ἀνατόλμα, and so the edd. before Porson; but the verb ἀνατολμᾶ is found only in late writers. See Porson's note on Med. 325.

279. A very troublesome line. Either ἐσμέν (so the MSS.; the text follows Wecklein, who reads ἡμὰν) is corrupt, or there is a very daring admixture of two idioms, ἐν σοι ἐσμεν and ἐν σοί ἐστι καὶ ζήν ἡμᾶς καὶ µή ζήν. Such an admixture seems possible enough, but I have not been able to find a real parallel in Euripides or in other classic writers; though cases like Soph. O. T. 314 ἐν σοι γάρ ἐσμεν and Phil. 903 ἐν σοί καὶ τὸ πλεῖν ἡμᾶς, ἀναξ, ἢ ἡ δὴ στι καὶ τοῖν τοῦτο προσχωρεῖν λόγου (cited by Yalkeinew and Monk) are not very rare. Hence I am on the whole inclined to regard ἐσμέν as corrupt, and have accepted Wecklein's emendation. F. W. Schmidt's ἐστιν would be an easy change, but does not bring out so well the personal interest of Admetus in his wife's recovery.

282. σε προσβεέωνα: "putting you first," deeming your welfare of more importance than my own. Cf. Aesch. Eum. 1. From this signification the
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verb easily passed into the more common one of "to honor," "worship." This use bears striking indirect testimony to the respect which the Greeks paid to old age.


285. Θεσαλῶν, the reading of α, is clearly right; the partitive construction is the more elegant, and the jingle Θεσαλῶν δὲ ἥμελον would be intolerable. Tho reading Θεσαλῶν is due to the influence of the following δν.

287. οὖν ἡθέλησα: the attempts which have been made to remove the asyndeton are, in my opinion, one and all futile. The asyndeta which abound in this play are not to be emended away, but in the words of Professor von Wilamowitz "recovenda sunt a purum culta arte rhetorica."

288. οὖδ' ἐφεύσαμην: sc. τῶν δόρων ἡμῖν.

291. A "locus desperatissimus." The case is very similar to that of 1. 278. The idiom εὖ (καλῶς) ἤνω βἰῶν, "I am well situated, well off, in respect to life," is perfectly good; cf. Elect. 751 πῶς ἄγωνός ἥκομεν, Heracl. 213 γένοις μὲν ἥκεις ὥς τῶνδε, Herod. I. 30 τοῦ βιῶν εὖ ἥκοντι, ib. V. 62 χρημάτων εὖ ἥκοντες, etc. (I have not been able to find an instance of this idiom with καλῶς instead of εὖ, if we except the passage in the text; but one can scarcely doubt that the two adverbs might be used interchangeably.) The expression ἥκει μοι θανεῖν, "it beseems me to die," is also possible; cf. Soph. O. C. 738 οὐνεχ' ἥκει μοι γένει | τά τοῦδε πενθείν πήματ' εἰς πλέιστον πόλεως. (I do not find any instance of εὖ or καλῶς used with this in impersonal construction, though there seems to be no reason why they should not have been so employed; Herod. I. 30 πόλεως εὖ ἥκοσις and the like are, of course, different.) The question now arises, whether in our passage there is an admixture of the two constructions καλῶς αὐτῶν ἥκοντων βιῶν and ἥκον αὐτῶν κατάθειν, or the text is corrupt.

A. Many editors, including Monk, Hermann, Kirchhoff, Christ, Nauck, Weil, Earle, Woolsey, Jerram, retain the MSS. reading. The schol. says αὐτῷ τῷ ἥκοντος: ἐδέστην καιρὸν αὐτῶν ἥκοντος εἰς τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ἀπογεγρακόσιν. Woolsey renders the line "while it was highly proper for them in point of age to die"; Jerram "though they had reached a fit time of life for dying gloriously" or "with credit to themselves"; Earle "though they are come to a point of life at which it were a fitting thing for them to die," and Weil "quand ils sont arrivés dans la vie à un point où il serait opportun d'en sortir." These are all attempts to "attain the unattainable" by combining two conflicting forms of expression. "Ἡκὼν cannot mean at the same time "though they had arrived" ἥκοντων and "though it became them" καθήκον or προσήκον, and any rendering which gives it both senses, however skilfully disguised, simply begs the question. Even Woolsey, whose rendering is the most justifiable of the number, though he translates καλῶς ἥκον "while it was highly proper," goes on to speak
of the use of ἴκειν with an adverb and the genitive in a way which shows the same confusion of ideas.

B. Some critics, with whom I must agree, hold that κατθανεῖν is either corrupt or a gloss which has displaced some verb governing βλοῦν. The latter alternative seems extremely probable; but as we cannot restore the lost verb with certainty I have marked κατθανεῖν with a dagger. For some of the readings that have been suggested, see Select Conjectures. The sense doubtless was "though it was highly fitting (καλῶς ἤκον) for them to depart from life." The chief objection to this is the use of καλῶς with ἤκον; but as ἴκεῖν itself is very rare in this sense, it is not strange that no other example of the use of καλῶς with it happens to occur.

292. σῶσα: that in the present σφῶ is the correct orthography is now generally agreed; see Meisterhans p. 142 note and the authorities there cited, and Usener in Fleckeisen's Jahrh. f. Philol. 1865 pp. 238 ff. The question as to the first aorist is much more difficult; see Kühner-Blass II. p. 514, Usener l. s. c., Meisterhans p. 145 note (with the references there given). Doubtless ἐσωσα from σαῶ and ἐσφῶα from σφῶ existed side by side. The verb σαῶ being epic and poetic, we ought probably in prose of the classical period to write ἐσφῶα. The Attic inscriptions show the form with ι: so C. I. Α. 1675, 4 (4th cent.) εἰ(σο)φέων, 605, 6 (early part of 2d cent.) ξ(ε)φέον. Cf. also Dittenberger's Syll. 320, 15 (Cos, 3d cent.) δεσφε, ib. 316, 10 (Dyme, 3d cent.) συνδιαφόρατες, Tabl. Heraci. I. 51 κατεσφόραμες, ib. II. 31 κατεσφόραμες, and the Laconian form κατέσφων mentioned by Hesychius (cited by Blass l. c.). The MSS., as might be expected, favor ἐσωσα (though in Soph. Philoct. 919 the Laurentian has σῶσα: see Usener l. s. c.). The testimony of the inscriptions, however, is clearly much more reliable; and were our passage prose I should be strongly inclined to write σφῶα. But as it is verse, the form may come from σαῶ; hence I have not ventured to add an ι against the MSS. The question of the forms of the perfect middle and passive space will not permit me to discuss here.

294. φιτόσευν: this must be the true reading, as the metre requires that the antepenult be long and φυτεῶθ as ι.

295. εἰὼν: so B. The other MSS. have ἵπνυ (but in L ν has been written over the η by the first hand), and so the Etymol. Magnum 413, 9. But ἵπνυ (as if from ἵπνοι) was formed after the analogy of ἵπνοι, ἵπνη, and is probably a late word (though the MSS. have it in Demos. XXIV. 7). Cf. Thomas Magister s. v., εἰὼν: ἵπνω, ὅπε ἵπνη, ὅπα ὦσαι τινες... ἵπνη δὲ καὶ ἵπνη: and Herodian II. 315, 6 Lenz. Moeris says ἵπνυ Ἀττικᾶς. ἵπνω Ἐλληνικῶς: but ἵπνυ and ἵπνω should undoubtedly be transposed in his text.

301. This line passed into a proverb, and is found also among the Menandrian monostichia (552).

304. ἐμῶν: this word seems inappropriate here; Alcestis would not have been likely to emphasize her ownership so strongly, especially when making
such a request of her husband. Hence ἐμῶν has been suspected by Prinz and others. L and P have τῶν ἐμῶν, which might be a mistake for τῶν σῶν, especially as C and E are so easily confused in the MSS. But τῶν is far more probably a mere interpolation, the article having been inserted as in 227, 318, 731. 'Ἀνάσχον, too, gives trouble; the schol. explains it by ἀνάγαγε, ἀπὸδειξο, probably with the underlying idea of holding up a torch; cf. I. A. 722, Med. 482, etc. But one almost instinctively wishes to take the word in the usual sense of the middle, "suffer," "allow," with a participle; and it is highly probable that a participle, e.g. ὄντας (Tournier), has dropped out and ἐμῶν been inserted to fill the lacuna, or that ἐμῶν is itself a corruption of the participle. For the suggestions that have been made see Select Conj.; none of them is entirely satisfactory, but Wecklein's τρέφων, which I have received into the text, gives far the best sense.

305. ἰπγήμης: for the force of ἐπὶ, cf. ἐφ' ὑμῖν 373. Weil compares Herod. IV. 154 ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ ἰμήτορι . . . ἐγήμη ἄλλην γυναίκα. Orest. 589 οὗ γὰρ ἐπεγέμει πόσει πόσαιιν and Andoc. 1, 128 ἐπέγημε τῇ θυγατρὶ τῆν μητέρα are different, ἐπεγέμειν there meaning "to take a second spouse in addition to the first"; but Plutarch Compar. Aristid. et Cal. 6 and Cal. Maj. 24 has the verb in the same sense in which it is used in our passage.

310. ἐχένθης: with the Greeks, as with us, the viper was an emblem of malice and cruelty. Cf. Aesch. Choephe. 249, Soph. Ant. 531, etc.

311. πόργον μέγαν: so Od. XI. 556 of Ajax, τοῖς γὰρ σφιν πόργος ἀπόκλεω: Med. 390 ἦν μὲν τε ἡμῖν πόργος ἀσφαλὴ φανῇ, Soph. O. T. 1201 θανάτων δ' ἐμὰ | χώρα πόργος ἀνεστα. This line, which is clearly out of place here, = 195 with the change of καὶ for ὅ. The question as to the way in which it came to be inserted here is very interesting. Probably (cf. Earle's edition pp. 65 ff.) v. 195 began a page and 311 ended one in the archetype, so that the scribe, mistaking the page, copied 195 instead of 313. If so, we have 312 – 195 = 117 = three pages of 39 lines each. Now curiously enough Wilamowitz (Analecta p. 51) had noted that the end of Troad. 193, 194, 195 and the beginning of 232, 233, 234 were mutilated, and hence he inferred that the archetype had 38 or 39 lines on a page, a conclusion which our passage strikingly verifies. Hence Mekler's defense of 312 is quite needless (see his Euripides pp. 21 ff.).

313. τέκνον μοι: this, not τέκνον μου, is the regular idiom. κορευθήσει: παρθενησσὴ schol., "wie wird dein Tochterloos sein?" Kvigala. The word probably means, not "grow up to maidenhood" (Liddell and Scott), but (with καλῶς) "pass your maidenhood in good repute." Some would render it "be wedded" (cf. διακορεβομαι).

314. τοῖς: so Reiske and Herwerden. Many edd. retain πολας, the MSS. reading, regarding the second question as a kind of explanation of πῶς in 313. But the difference between τ and π is very slight, and the sentence gains immensely in force and clearness by the change. Τοῖς means of course "such
as I have described,” ἐχίδνης οὖδὲν ἤπωτέρα. Kvičala thinks 314-16 interpolated, as Alcestis has already urged Admetus in the most pressing way (305 ff.) not to marry again. But nothing can be more natural than for the mother, who knows the weak nature of Admetus, to hark back in her anxiety to the point about which she feels special uneasiness. Indeed, this passage alone would show that Euripides was a close student of the workings of the female mind.

315-16. μὴ ... διαφθείρη: a beautiful example of the independent subjunctive with μὴ expressing “apprehension coupled with a desire to avert the object of fear” (Goodwin M. and T. 261 ff., esp. 264).

317. νυμφεύσαι: the active is here used as in Ι. Α. 885 ἐν ἀγάλαοι χαλρνω’ Ἀχίλλει παῖδα νυμφεύσανσα σήν.

318. Here the two families of MSS. diverge widely, the first having τοῦι σωσί σωσί βαρσωσε, the second σωσί βαρσωσε τέκνον. Kirchhoff observes “οὔτ’ εν τόκουσι σωσί βαρσωσε, τέκνον [B] C manifesta interpolatione.” But why may not τοῦι be an interpolation just as well as τέκνον? Nothing is more common than the insertion of the article where it does not belong, as every scholar knows. Moreover the reading τόκουσι τοῦι σωσί is far from euphonious, and Nauck makes the matter even worse by reading σωσί σε for σωσί. On the other hand τέκνον is distinctly fine; one can easily imagine the tone of fond affection with which the mother lingers on the word.

320-22. A famous crux. The MSS. show no variant, except that Λ and Π have οὐκέτ’ instead of μηκέτ’. In L 321-2 are omitted from the text, but have been added by the first hand on the lower margin. The schol. says only: οὐκ εἰς τήν αὐριον τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦτον οὐδὲ εἰς τήν μεταύριον.

The difficulty centres around μηνὸς in 321. The older commentators tried in vain to explain it. “Musgrave says that he can find no reason why μηνὸς should be used. Monk supposes an allusion in these words to a custom at Athens, of making those who were to be capitally punished drink the hemlock within three days. But this had nothing to do with the third day of the month, nor does such a custom seem to have existed. The reviewer of Monk in the Quarterly thinks that the appointed day for the death of Alcestis was the first of the month. The scholiast’s paraphrase ... makes μηνὸς idle. Some find a reference to days of grace granted by the creditor to the debtor, and to the payment of monthly interest, the time for which may have been the day of the new moon. But for all this, there is, so far as I know, no evidence of facts” (Woolsey). If μηνὸς is retained, the only possible explanation seems to be that of the reviewer of Monk, that the κύριον ημαρ on which Alcestis was to die was the νομημανία, on which (as well as on the ἐνη καὶ νεά) debts were customarily paid. The τρίτη μηνὸς will then be mentioned simply to strengthen the statement (cf. χθές καὶ πρώην, χθές καὶ τρίτην ἡμεραν). But though εἰς τρίτην μηνὸς, “on (or rather “against”) the third of the month,” may be a possible poetic expression, I know no example of it; the usual phrase is, of course, εἰς τρίτην
ισταμένων. Hesychius s. v. φθινάς ἀμέρα (Heracl. 779) says τὴν ἱσταμένων τρίτην τριμήνων λέγει, which, if it refers to Euripides, might suggest the reading οὖδ’ ἐς τριμηνιαίον ἐρχεται κακῶν (but τριμηνιαίος seems not to occur, and τριμηνιαίος is late).

It seems more probable, therefore, that 321 is corrupt. For some of the emendations that have been proposed, see Select Conj. Herwerden would read ἐς τρίτον μὴν φέγγος; and it is noteworthy that in 450, where μηρὸς again gives trouble, Wecklein would read φέγγος. But paleographically the two words are not very much alike. Well conjectured ἔην for τρίτην; but, as I have pointed out (Harvard Studies in Class. Phil. VII. p. 221), "τρίτην might well be a gloss on ἔην: but if ἔην = τρίτην the difficulty with μηρὸς remains; while if it = ἔην καὶ τέαν, the Hesiodic ἐς τ’ αὖριον ἐς τ’ ἐννησί (Works and Days 410) and phrases like αὖριον καὶ τὴ ἔην (Antiphon 143, 44) and έὶς ἔην (Aristoph. Achar. 172) are distinctly against the conjecture." Νηλός (i.e. ΝΙΛΑϹ C for ΜΗΝΟϹ), which I had supposed to be my own conjecture (see Harvard Studies l. s. c.), I find to have been anticipated in a dissertation by Hoefer, which, however, I have been unable to consult at first hand. It seems as probable as any; but certainty is impossible.

Another alternative is to reject 321 with Mekler and Earle, or 321-2, which two lines, as we have seen, are omitted in the text of L, it is uncertain for what reason. But emendation seems preferable to excision. —μηκὲτ’: οὐκέτ’ of L and Π is probably due to the influence of the following οὐ in ὀδην. ἀξομαί: passive in sense, as in Her. 906, Her. F. 582, I. T. 1047, and Soph. O. C. 1186; see Goodwin. Gr. Gram. 1248 n., Hadley-Allen 496.

325. μητρὸς: sc. ἀριστής. The ellipsis seems harsh; παίδες may be a gloss on ὑμῖν which has displaced some adjective agreeing with μητρὸς.


327. ἐπερ...ἀμαρτάνει: this is preferable to the reading of the other class, ἔπερ...ἀμαρτάνη, though the apodosis is future. The indicative is more courteous to Admetus, implying that the condition is merely a pro forma one, "if he is in his right senses" (as of course he is).

331. τὸνδ’ ἀνδρα = ἐμι, as usual. Some take ἀνδρα as the second accus. with προσφιθέγγεται, "shall call me husband"; but Euripides never elsewhere uses προσφιθέγγομαι with two accusatives, and surely the words "no Thessalian bride shall ever greet me in your stead" are explicit enough. Or, with Hermann, we may take νεμψθ as in apposition with Θεσσαλις, "no Thessalian woman shall ever address me as bride in your stead." Earle takes ἀνδρα with both τονδε and προσφιθέγγεται; while Mekler quite needlessly alters ποτε to ποσιν.

332-3. These lines have given much trouble, and Nauck and Kirchhoff regard them as an interpolation.

333. The first class of MSS. have ἐμπρεστάτη (L and P ἐκπρεστάτη), which is certainly wrong. Such a use of the superlative cannot be justified by any amount of argument. Wecklein’s ἐκπρηπής οὕτω seems to me very brilliant and convincing. For other emendations, see Sel. Conj. It is hard to determine whether we should read ἐκπρηπής or ἐκπρηπής, as both give good sense and each is favored by the reading of one family of MSS. Ἐκπρηπής may be right, and in IIIc. 269 the Cod. Marcianus has ἐλθος ἐκπρεστάτη: but it is impossible to be certain, as the two words are perpetually confused in the MSS. For the position of οὕτω see L. and S. s. v. B, and cf. Heracl. 413 κακῶς οὕτω. The exact force of ἄλλως is well brought out by Bauer-Wecklein: “ἑλθος ἄλλως, sonst, in anderer Hinsicht, nämlich in Hinsicht auf Schönheit.” A good parallel is Herod. I. 60 γυν... μέγεθος ἀπὸ τεσσάρων πνεῦμων ἀπολείπονσα τρεῖς δισκόλους καὶ ἄλλως (i.e. in other respects, as well as in her height) ἐκείνης. The statement so often made that ἄλλως in such cases = “besides” is not quite accurate.

340. τὰ φίλτατα not merely = τὴν ψυχήν but includes the ties that bind husband and wife together. Cf. Med. 16 νοσεῖ τὰ φίλτατα. These ties will be in part severed by her death.

341. ἐσωσάς: Herwerden’s μ’ ἐσωσάς is very plausible, though the object can easily be supplied from the context. ἀρα = νονον, as in 228.


345. βαρβίτου: the βάρβιτος was an instrument resembling the lyre, but longer and narrower. See K. von Jan Die griech. Saiteninstrumente pp. 20 ff.

346. έξάρομι: ἔξαρομι L P. Wakefield conjectured ἐξάρωμι, which the schol. seems to have read, and which Wecklein (Beiträge zur Kritik des Eur. p. 528) prefers. I have followed B a with most edd., as the verb seems to denote a process rather than the mere occurrence of an act.

351. Δίβαν... αὐλόν: “We find Δίβας αὐλός in II. F. 681: Δίβας λαντὸς in Hel. 170 sq., Troad. 514, I. A. 1036” (Earle). The flute was called Libyan because flutes were made from the wood of the lotus, a tree which grew in Libya; cf. Theophrastus Περί φυτῶν IV. 3. 1. See on the αὐλός the very thorough and careful article by Howard Harvard Studies in Class. Phil. IV. 1 ff. Λακείων here = “sing.” The word is generally used of harsher sounds. Aristophanes makes Euripides himself say τὸ λέξακας (Achar. 410).

348-56. These lines could well be spared, and are probably an interpolation. They are offensive to modern taste; but this is of itself a very unsafe criterion; for, as Paley pertinently observes, “the Greeks had a deeper feeling for sculptured forms than we can pretend to realize.” But they are awkwardly expressed (especially 355-6), and, as was pointed out to me years ago by Prof.
F. D. Allen, they are both preceded and followed by a reference to music, so that the context gains very much in continuity by their excision.

353. ψυχράν: ψυχράς, like the Lat. frigidus, often means "empty," "insipid," "unsatisfactory." Hermann wickedly observes on 318 δέμας τὸ σῶν: "ψυχράς παραγκάλσμα (Soph. Ant. 650), nec minus frigidum poetae inventum." Some one has even gone so far as to suggest that the poet in using ψυχράν τήρην is hinting at the ψυχρότης of the lines! He might have adduced οἶμαι (taking it asironical) in support of his notion. οἶμαι: "no doubt," "to be sure," without ironical force. Oidia has been suggested for οἶμαι both here and in 565; but probably no change should be made, although the palaeographical difference between the two words is not so very great.

354. ἀπαντλοῖν, a very expressive word, "draw off," as one draws off the bilge-water from a ship's hold. Cf. Ion 927, Or. 1641, Aesch. Prom. 84. Euripides is exceedingly fond of such metaphors; see note on 245.

355-6. A very awkward passage; if we retain χρόνων, the sudden change from the dative with καὶ to the accusative (which seems quite out of place here) is very harsh, and the asyndeton is also troublesome. But though in the text I have adopted Wecklein's χώντινα and Prinz's τρόπων, I suspect the trouble is due to the unskilfulness of the interpolator rather than to textual corruption. Render: "for 'tis a pleasant thing to see one's friends, both at night and in whatever way one may come" (lit. "be present"). The change from the plural φίλοις to the sing. παρῃ is rather abrupt, and Musgrave's φίλος would be easier; but the constructio ad sensum is possible enough. I doubt, however, if the lines are worth the trouble that commentators have taken about them.

357 ff. Cf. I. A. 1211 ff. έι μὲν τὸν Ὄρφεος εἶχον, ὁ πάτερ, λόγον . . . ἐνταῦθ’ ἀν ἱλθον (cited by Monk), both for the sense and for the use of the aorist ἱλθον (as to which see note on ἱλθεν 125). κατήλθον has been emended in various ways (see Sel. Conj.), but no change is needed.

362. Χάρων: Cobet's emendation γέρων is very plausible, as Χάρων might so easily be a gloss on οὔτε κἀπη ψυχομαρδός γέρων, and the substitution would be facilitated by the resemblance between the words Χάρων and γέρων. Glosses which resemble in outward form the words which they explain (e.g. πράξεις for μέσες 262) are especially liable to oust the true reading. But as Χάρων may be right, I have not ventured to alter the text.

362. ἔσχεν: so Earle, in accordance with the regular usage. Porson defended the MSS. reading ἔσχων, and many editors have followed him; but, as Earle points out, Ihec. 88 f. ιοῦ ποτε θείαν Ἑλέουν ψυχάν | καὶ Κασάνδραν ἐσίδω, Τρύφαδε, ὡς μοι κρίσων ὄνειρους, which Porson urged in favor of ἔσχων, is not really parallel. Such a constructio ad sensum* is very different from a case like the present, in which two subjects in the singular separated by οὔτε . . . οὔτε are supposed to be used with a plural verb. Besides ε and ο are constantly confused in MSS. θείαν: δέμας Cobet and Nauck; but θείαν is supported by {itech. 1339 μακάρων τ' ἐς αἷαν σῶν καθάρωσει βιῶν (cited by Pluck).

* Porson read η instead of καὶ in Hec. 88, with some MSS.
363. ἐκεῖσε προσόδοκα μ': constructio praecognus; see note on μαρανομέναν παρ' Ἀθάν 236. Neither Prinz's ἐκέι σὸ nor Wecklein's ἐκεῖ γε seems necessary. The verb of motion is expressed with προσόδοκα in Aesch. Ag. 653 Μενδεων... προσόδοκα μολείν.

365. κέδρος: the wood of the cedar was much used for coffins because it preserved the bodies of the dead from decay. Cf. Orcst. 1053, Tro. 1141. On the coffins of the Greeks see Becker-Göll Charikles III. pp. 139 ff. That in the historical period the custom of burning the bodies of the dead and that of burying them existed side by side among the Greeks is now generally admitted: see Becker-Göll l.s.c. pp. 152-41; Rohde Psyche p. 208 and note. The Homeric poems speak only of burning the dead; but recent excavations at Mycenae and elsewhere have shown that (as one might expect on a priori grounds) the practice of burying the bodies of the deceased is older than that of burning them.—It has been repeatedly asserted that this passage is inconsistent with other places in the play which imply that the body of Alcestis was to be burned; but (1) Admetus is speaking under great excitement, and his words must not be taken too literally; and (2) there is no passage in the play which necessarily implies that the body itself was to be burned (see note on v. 608).

367-8. The ridiculous parody in Aristoph. Achar. 893-4, where Dicaeopolis says to the cel μηδὲ γὰρ θανὼν ποτε | σοῦ χαρίς εἶν ἐντευετλανωμένης, will occur to every reader.

372. γαμάειν: the regular Attic form; γαμήσειν is late. τινά: L and P have ποτὲ, which is doubtless due to ποτε in 367, the eye of the copyist having caught the wrong line. The mistake must have been already made in their common source.

373. ἐφ' ύμῖν: see note on ἐπαγχήμης, 305. Nauck would read ἐφ' ἡμῖν, comparing Med. 694 γυναίκ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν δεσπότειν δόμων ἔχει: but no change is necessary.

374 ff. Α στιχοφωνία follows, broken at the end by the short, gasping utterances of the dying woman and the cries and entreaties of her despairing husband. The sudden change in 390 from the even flow of the monostich is very effective.

381. This line is omitted in L and P (though in L it has been added by a later hand), and the omission has caused confusion in the assignment of the lines. Note that both 380 and 381 commence with an anapaest. In the case of proper names the tragedians admit the anapaest not only in the first foot of the trimeter, but sometimes, though less frequently, in the second, third, fourth and fifth. A word which is not a proper name can stand as an anapaest only in the first foot. In Aeschylus (with two exceptions) and the earlier plays of Sophocles an anapaest which begins a line must always be a word, or a part of a word, which is anapaestic according to its natural prosody, e.g. κορυφαῖς, ἀδαμαπτώτωρ; in the later tragedy we also find initial anapaests that consist of two words (usually a particle and substantive or preposition and its object
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(e.g. ἐστὶν τοῦτον ἰδοὺ, or of a word which is naturally a trisyllabic but has become an anapaest by position), as ἰκατόν | προσήγε. See C. Fr. Mueller De pedibus solutis in dialog. sewaritis Aesch. Soph. Eurip., and Christ Metrik2 p. 325 f., Westphal-Rossbach Metrik3 pp. 225-6. Mr. Jeram says in his note on 375 that the anapaest in the first foot of an iambic line is freely employed by Euripides but never by Sophocles or Aeschylus, except when the foot consists of a single word. But cf. Soph. Phil. 705 τὸν ἵσον | χρόνον τρέφοντε τὴν ἄδη τὴν νόσον.

383. πολλή μ' ἀνάγκη: se. μητέρα γενέσθαι: μ' is Monk's certain emendation for γ'. Some of the forms of γ and μ look much alike, and they are not infrequently confused in the MSS. Here the mistake may have been facilitated by the fact that there is a γ' just beyond in the same line.

384. χρήν μ': this, the reading of one MS. (c) is certainly right; * μ' ἐχρήν of L and P does not suit the metre, and χρή μ' of B and a, though more nearly right in form, has not the necessary contrary-to-fact implication. 'Αν is not used, as the chief stress falls on the infinitive (Goodwin M. and T. p. 407); and the antithesis between ζήν and ἀπέρχομαι is thus emphasized still more. The combination ζῆν χρήν, cacophonous as it seems, recurs in v. 939, and ζήν ἐχρῆν Orest. 1030. Euripides often offends in this way; he even has γυνῇ γέννη Hel. 1293.

385. σκοτεινόν: proleptic.


388. ὀρθοῦ προσωπον: cf. Heracl. 635 ἔπαρεν νυν σεατόν, ὀρθωσον κάρα.

393 ff. A monody ἀπὸ σχήμης, supposed to be sung by the child Eumelus. In reality the words were sung by some one behind the scenes, while the person taking the role of the child merely acted out the song. Cf. the Latin cantare ad manus. Young children appear and speak in several of the plays of Euripides: see Androm. 504 ff.; Suppl. 1122 ff. This was only in accordance with the practice criticised by Aristophanes Ran. 949-50 ἀλλ' ἐλεγεν ἣ γυνῇ τέ μοι χω διδάσκαλος οὔδεν ἤττον, χω διεσπάθησ χή πάρθενος χή γραίν ἰν. μαία: usually "nurse," here "mother," as in Aesch. Chor. 41 γαῖα μαία.

394. Cf. Suppl. 1139 βεβάσαν, οὐκ' εἰσι μοι, πάτερ, | βεβάσαν, Orest. 971 ἐρέω κροκός κροκός, σιχθεσ τέκνων | πρόσπασα γέννα. Wecklein reads οὐκ for οὐκ', and omits τε (which is found only in L P) in 407.

399. παρατόνον: "stretched at her side," "hanging at her side." The word seems not to occur elsewhere in writers of the classical period.

* See on the frequent interchange of χρή and χρῆν in the MSS. Wecklein Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides p. 531, and cf. Ins Studien zu Eur. p. 3661.
401. A very difficult place. The response shows that ἐγὼ σ'. ἐγὼ μάτερ of P is preferable to σ' ἐγὼ, μάτερ, ἐγὼ of B α; but the hiatus ἀντίάξω—ἐγὼ is awkward. It may, however, be easily removed by reading in 400 ἀντίάξω σ' with Monk. If ἀντίάξω σ'. | ἐγὼ σ' ἐγὼ, μάτερ is the true reading, we can account for the text of B α thus: in this source σ' was omitted before the second ἐγὼ by an easy haplography; then to obviate the hiatus thus left μάτερ was transposed, and the remaining σ' was removed from its place after ἀντίάξω and put in 401 before the first ἐγὼ to furnish καλοῦμαι with an object. Kirchhoff, to be sure, with his usual prejudice against L P, says of the reading of P "nescio an non correctori metrico debeantur"; but it is most unfair to point out all the mistakes of a class of MSS. and then whenever they offer a really plausible reading to attribute it to a Byzantine grammarian or a "corrector metricus." L has ἐγὼ σε γὰρ μάτερ, which is clearly an arbitrary attempt at emendation. Nauck would read σ' ἐγὼγ' ὡ μάτερ, ἐγὼ and in 413 ἐβας σὺν τὰς ἀκρός; but why alter both strophe and antistrophe when (with so slight a change in 400) the reading of P gives good sense and accurate response?

402. If καλοῦμαι ὦ is sound, a trochee has been lost before it corresponding to ἐφθα in 414; νῦν γε (so the Aldine), νῦν σε, οὐ σε, ὡδε, etc. have been suggested to fill the lacuna. Wilamowitz (accepting the reading of P in 401) would omit 402 altogether, and strike out ἐφθατο γὰρ πάρος in 414. This is very plausible, and may be right; the true reading is far from certain. In B and A a σ' stands before ὦ, but the antistrophic line shows that the ultima of καλοῦμαι must be shortened.

403. στόμασιν: the υ is required by the response. Herwerden's γόνασιν is worse than needless; Alcestis is dead and her corpse is lying, not sitting or standing up; and hence there is no reason for the child to clasp his mother's knees. He would naturally kneel at her head and clasp her about the neck and try to rouse her with his kisses, as young children will in such cases. Even were this otherwise, στόμασιν might still be defended; cf. Herc. F. 1208 ἀμφὶ σὰν γενεάδα . . . προσπίτνων, Herc. 274. νεοσσός: Euripides has this word in the sense of "child" some half a dozen times. Cf. Aesch. Choeph. 488, etc. The way in which this use arose may be seen from the similes in Herc. F. 71-2, Troud. 750-51.

406. λείπομαι . . . μονόστολος: with λείπεσθαι and similar verbs a seemingly pleonastic μόνος is often joined, e.g. Med. 51 πῶς σοῦ μονὴ Μήδεα λείπεσθαι θελει, etc.; and μονόστολος is here used in the same way. The word properly means "without convoy," of vessels; schol. ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν μόνων στελλομένων πλοίων: μονόστολος σὺν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔρημος. Cf. Phoen. 742 μονοστόλων δορός.

409 ff. The lacunas were first marked as in the text by Hermann, who also transposed μοι in 410, which in the MSS. stands just before σύγκασιν. In 409 a spondee (τλάμων?) has been lost after ἔργα corresponding to ἀμόν in 396.

412. In this line five short syllables are wanting to complete the responsum, and in 413 a long and three shorts are lacking. The lacuna is probably due to a tear in the archetype.

413. ἀνόνατ' ἀνόνατ': adverbial accusative. Cf. Iloc. 766 ἀνόνητα (sc. ἐτέκον) . . . τόδε ὦν εἰσορίες: Hier. F. 716 ἀνόνητα γ' ἱκτεύουσαν ἐκσώσαι βιον: Hippol. 1145 ἐτέκες ἀνόνητα. γῆρως τέλος: the "period" or "term of old age"; cf. βιον τέλος, θανάτου τέλος. "End" or "goal" would be a more literal rendering; cf. the Scriptural phrase "fullness of years."

417. λοίσθος: a poetical word.

419. Cf. 782, Orest. 1245 ἣ ἐξ ἄπασιν ἥ θανεὶν ὤφειλεται, Andr. 1272 and fr. 10 κατθανεὶν ὤφειλεται, etc. Euripides is very fond of certain cadences, and repeats them again and again almost ad nauseam.*

421. προσέπτατ': προσπέτασθαι is used of the swift and sudden coming of evils, as here and Aesch. Prom. 643, Soph. Aj. 282. "The metaphor was apparently originally derived from the swooping of birds, particularly carrion-birds, upon their prey." (Earle).


423. μένοντες: F. W. Schmidt's μέλποντες is very plausible, and may be right; but μένοντες, "while you are waiting" (before the procession starts), makes good sense, and probably no change should be made. ἀντηχίσατε: Jerram suggests that the ἀντι refers to the answering of strophe by antistrophe in the following choruses.

424. παιὰνα: the word παιὰν may be used of any solemn song or chant, even of one in honor of the gods of the lower world: cf. Troad. 578 τὸ παιὰν' ἐμὸν στενάξεις: ib. 126 αὐλῶν παιὰν στυγνῷ, Aesch. Choeph. 145 παιὰνα τοῦ θανόντος ἔκαιον, Ἄρ. 817 'Αδὴ τ' ἔχθρον παιὰν' ἐπιμέλειαν, Αγ. 623 πρέπει λέγειν παιὰνα τὸν' Ἐρυθῶν (Monk).

424. ἀσπόνδως: the schol. read ἀσπονδών (which is clearly inferior), for he says ἰδὴν ἐφ' ὑ' οὐ στενόνων ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς παιὰσιν. Monk and others compare the well-known fragment of the Niobe of Aeschylus (161 Nauck) μὸνος θεών γὰρ θάνατος οὐ δόρων ἐρυ', | οὐδ' ἄν τι θών οὐδ' ἐπισπένδων ἰσος, | οὐδ' ἐστί βερός οὐδὲ παιωνίζεται: | μόνον δὲ Πειθώ δαιμόνων ἀποστατεῖ, and H. IX. 158 'Αδης τοι ἀμέλειχος.

425 ff. Rohde (Psyche p. 511 note 1) observes: "Diese ausschweifenden Trauerkundgebungen wohld nach dem in thessalischen Dynastengeschlechtern Ueblichen."

426. πένθος κοινοῦσθαι: so L P; πένθον the other family of MSS. The accus. is preferable as the "difficilior lectio"; Matthiae pointed out that Euripides has two other cases of the accus. with κοινοῦσθαι, Iom 608 κοινοῷμεν τὰς συμφοράς σοι, ib. 857 συμφοράν . . . κοινοῳμεν τήνδε. Add Troad. 61 κοινώσῃ λόγους, Xen. Veq. 1, 32 κοινομένους τὴν τόχην, Thuc. 8, 8, 1 ό μὲν οὖν Καλλιγε-
τος καὶ Τιμάγορας . . . σῶκ ἐκοινώνυμο τὴν στόλον, ἦδ. 8, 82, 3 ἰνα δὴ δοκῇ πάντα μετ’ ἐκείνου κοινωνύμαι. In these cases κοινωνύμαι means "to make common to one’s self," and so "share," the transitive force predominating; while in κοινοθηκα τινος the genitive-construction of κοινός predominates. It is possible, of course, that πένθος is merely a copyist’s blunder for πέντεν: but the probabilities seem to me to lie in the other direction.

427. As to signs of mourning among the Greeks, see Becker-Göll Charikles III. pp. 156 ff., and cf. 215–17, Hel. 1087 f., I. A. 1347–8, Phoen. 322–6, etc. The text of the line is extremely doubtful, B and L P diverging widely. It is clear (see Critical Apparatus) that in the common source of a and d stood only κοινῷ ἔναρ, followed by a lacuna. If this lacuna goes back to the common ancestor of all our MSS., as seems probable, the readings of B and L P are merely different attempts to fill out the gap, and the disagreement between them is accounted for. Μελαμπέπιπερ στολή was then probably suggested by 216 (cf. the suspected line 819, and Orest. 457–8), and μελαγχίμως πέπλος by some Aeschylean passage (cf. Eustath. p. 1254 οὗτῳ Αἰσχύλος πέπλοις μελαγχίμων φήσιν), perhaps Cho. 11 φάβερεν μελαγχίμως. (It is quite possible, however, that the lacuna in the source of a d was due merely to inability or unwillingness to decide between two readings of nearly equal authority.) In the Phoenissae (l. 372) we have the interpolated line κάρα ἐφηκας καὶ πέπλοις μελαγχίμως, probably suggested by our passage and El. 335 κάρα τ’ ἐμόν ἐφηκας. This, so far as it goes, supports μελαγχίμως πέπλος: but though Phoen. 372 is at least as old as the time of the schol. ad loc., its source may perfectly well have been merely a MS. of the same family as B, and hence it is not at all decisive. Hesychius has μελάμππεπλος· πνεύμης, which may or may not refer to our passage. I incline, on the whole, to follow L P, simply as a matter of taste; that Euripides wrote either μελαμπέπιπερ στολή or μελαγχίμως πέπλος we have no certain means of proving.

428. μονάμπμπικας: the ἀμπικες was a band passing horizontally across the horse’s forehead; see Daremberg and Saglio Dict. des Antiquités s. v. Αμφίης. Μονάμππικας is properly “having a single head-band,” hence “single,” not hitched to a chariot. Schol. ἀζύγους. κέλητας.

429. Monk compares Plutarch Vit. Alex. 72 εὖθες μὲν ἵππους τε κεῖραι πάντας ἐπὶ πένθει καὶ ἡμῶνοι ἐκλέανες, and Pelop. 33. The Persians had the same custom; see Herod. IX. 24.

434. τιμᾶν: τιμῆς, the reading of L P, gives equally good sense and metre; but the infinitive construction is the less common-place one. τέληκεν ἀντ’ ἐμοῦ θανεῖν: Nauck’s very plausible conjecture. The MSS. have τέθνηκεν, and as the last word μοῦν, μόνην or λαίαν, variants which seem to point to a lacuna in the archetype at the end of the line. The true reading is far from certain.

435–75. First Stasimon.

435–6. A reminiscence of II. XXIII. 170 χαϊρε μοι, ὦ Πάτροκλε, καὶ εἰν Ἁδα σῶμος.
437. οἰκετεύωις: ἄπαξ εἰρμήνευον in classic Greek. Hesychius has οἰκετεύεται, συνوكεία. Though so rare, the word is regularly formed, and there seems to be no ground for questioning the soundness of the text.

442. πολύ δὲ πολὺ δὴ: “the present (or a similar) passage seems to be parodied in Aristoph. Λυ. 539 πολὺ δὲ πολὺ δὴ χαλεπωτάτους λόγους” (Earle).

444. Λόμανα . . . πορέψασα: a daring construction after the analogy of πόρον or ὄδον πορεύειν. Cf. Soph. Τριχ. 551 οἱ τὸν βαθύρον ποταμὸν Ἕπνοιν βροσοῦσι | μυσθὸν ἑρέαν χερσίν, on which Mr. Jebb observes: “Here the second acc. denotes the space traversed; it would more usually denote the place to which, as in Eur. Τρο. 1085 ἐμὲ . . . σκάψος | . . . πορέψει | . . . Ἀργος.” Πορέψασα properly applies only to Charon, the more remote subject 'Αἰδάς being lost sight of. ἐλάτη δικώπω: ἐλάτη, properly the fir, often means “oar,” but is here used in the sense of “boat”; cf. Φθον. 208 ὑπὸν κατὰ πόντον ἐλάτη πλεύσασα. So in Latin abies and pinus often = navis.

446. όρειαν χέλων, because the shell of the land-tortoise, which loves the high ground, was used for this purpose.

447. κλέωντε: the tragedians probably do not use the form κλείω, though the MSS. have it here. Cf. I. Λ. 1046 (κλέωσαι Monk, κλέωναι MSS.), fr. 389, 7 (Stob. Φλο. 55, 4; κλέωναι Gaisford, κλέωνται SM, κλεόνται Λ), Soph. Τριχ. 639 (κλέονται Musgrave; κλεόνται MSS.).

448-51. An extremely troublesome passage. The difficulty centres about ὄρας in 449 and μηνὸς in 450. The MSS. vary between ὄρα (P'ut) and ὄρα (I); I has ὄρ with an erasure after ρ. All have μηνὸς, and all but a l (πανόχου) have πανόχους. Hesychius has περιλάσσεται (leg. περιλάθησαται) ὄρας: περιείρχεται τάς ὄρας, which shows that the author of the gloss read ὄρας and took it as acc. plural. We may distinguish four principal ways of dealing with the passage:

A. Barnes, Musgrave and others accept Scaliger’s κυκλάς for κύκλος. Καρπεῖον will then agree with μηνὸς, and ἀειρομένας will be intransitive; so that the rendering will be: “at Sparta when the circling season (κυκλάς — ὄρα) of the Carnean month comes round, when the moon is on high all night long.” This gives good sense; but we have no proof that Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides ever used κυκλάς; nor do I find any instance in which they use ἀειρεσθαί in this way of heavenly bodies, though, to be sure, the scholiast takes it as intransitive. Sophocles has the active αἰρῇ of the sun, Phil. 1331.

B. Monk reads ὄρα, and puts a comma after Σπάρτα and one after σελάνας. He observes "editum defendit Iph. Λ. 717 "Οταν σελάνας εὐνυχῆς ἐλθοὶ κύκλος": whence it would appear that he made σελάνας depend on κύκλος, and Καρπεῖον . . . μηνὸς on ὄρα. But this makes the construction (κύκλος . . . ἀειρομένας πανόξου σελάνας) very clumsy, and σελάνας is too far from κύκλος.

C. Earle and others (with Hesychius) read ὄρας and take it as acc. with περιέρχεται. The rendering will then be: “at Sparta when the circle of the Carnean month comes the round of the seasons, when the moon hangs high in
the heavens all night long." This may well be right; cf. Ion 1486 δεκάτῳ μηνός εν κύκλῳ. But the intransitive use of ἀειρομένας is still an objection. I cannot find an instance of σελήνη ἀειρέται or the like in the tragedians.

D. Wecklein and others take ὁρᾶσ with a gen. sing., and Καρνέιον as agreeing with it. To this view I strongly incline, believing μηνός to be a gloss on Καρν-έιον ὁρᾶσ, which gloss has ousted from the text some noun which was the object of ἀειρομένας. This noun may have been φέτγοσ (Wecklein), or some other word of like meaning. That μηνός is itself a corruption of φέτγοσ I do not believe; though in 321 Herwerden suggests φέτγοσ for μηνός. But the two words are not very much alike, and φ preserves its characteristics pretty stubbornly.

452. λιπαραῖοι: the epithet which so pleased the Athenians when applied to their city (see Aristoph. Achar. 639 and Blaydes' learned note, where the examples of this use of the adjective are given at length). Pindar (Nem. IV. 29, Isthm. II. 30, fr. 76 Bergk) seems to have inaugurated the practice of calling Athens λιπαραῖοι, and even Aristophanes himself follows suit in no less than three passages (Nub. 299, Eq. 1529, fr. 110 Kock)!

Does Euripides hint in Trould. 801–3 at the reason why the term was especially appropriate to Athens?

457. φάος: poetic accus. of the limit of motion. τεράμων: a favorite word with Euripides, who always uses it in the plural. It is not found in Sophocles or Aeschylus. The spelling varies in the MSS. between τέραμα and τέρεμα; but on the whole the weight of authority is on the side of τέραμα. It is noteworthy that in two passages (Phoen. 333, Orest. 1371) the Marcianus has the form with α while most of the other MSS. have that with υ. Hesychius has τέρεμα· οἰκήματα.

458. Some (e.g. Bothe and Wecklein) regard this line as spurious, as there is no corresponding line in the antistrophe. But an examination of the antistrophe shows that something has been lost after 468, unless we assume a violent anacoluthon. The text of 458 is in doubt; I have given Κωκύτοι τε (with Earle) ρέθρων. Κωκύτων of L P points to κωκύτων (C for 0), and L actually has κωκύτων by a later hand and ρέθρων. Earle reads ρέθρων; but Sophocles, except perhaps in Ant. 1124 (ρέθρων L, ρέθρων Hermann), and Euripides always use the plural. Κωκύτων τε ρέθρων (so B and a) also is possible. All the MSS. have before κωκύτων (or κωκύτοις) an interpolated καὶ, which was struck out by Matthiae.

459. ποταμία νερέρα τε κότα: the adjectives take the place of adverbial phrases. For the expression, cf. Hel. 526 εἰναλίῳ κότα, Heracl. 82 ἀλίῳ πλάτη, I. T. 140 κλεινῷ συν κότα χιλιαντρά, Rhes. 53 νυκτέρα πλάτη, etc.

460. I have accepted Wilamowitz's excellent emendation of this line: ὃ φίλα γναυαίκων occurs Hippiol. 848, but ὃ μόνα γναυαίκων is not, I think, Euripidean.

462. αὐτᾶς: Erfurdt's emendation, which the antistrophic line (471) shows to be necessary. For the use of the reflexive of the third person, where we
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL NOTES.

should expect the second, see Goodwin *Gr. Gram.* 995 note, Hadley-Allen 686 a. For the sentiment, cf. Kaibel *Epigr. Græc.* 551, 4 κοῦρα σοι κόνις ἵπτει πῶς: Tibullus II. 4, 50 terraque securret sil super ossa levis: the Latin formula frequent on tomb-stones, S. T. T. L., i.e. *sit tibi terra levis*; and especially the last two lines of that most dainty and pathetic epigram, Martial V. 31, mollia non rigidus cespes tegat ossa, nec illi | *Terra, gravis fœrus:* non fuit illa tibi. Such prayers can be traced back to the primitive belief that the earth did actually discommode the dead by its pressure.

469. Some, e.g. Weeklein, believe that no verse has been lost here and assume an anacoluthon, regarding ὅν ἐτεκνὸν—χαῖταν as parenthetic, and σῶ δ᾿ ἐν ῥῆβῃ κ.τ.λ. as following just as though the parenthesis were an independent clause preceding. But this is difficult for several reasons. The transition from 468 to 469 is singularly abrupt; moreover if Weeklein is right we must reject 459, which is at least as old as the time of the scholiast of B, and for the insertion of which—(supposing it to be spurious) no adequate reason has been suggested.

472. νέα: so B a; L and P have νέα νέων, which the responsum will not allow. The way in which the reading νέα νέων arose is doubtful. It may be a conflation of two readings νέα and νέων (a subscript is often omitted in the MSS.), or perhaps νέων was written beside νέα (or *vīce versa*) as a variant lection and then was copied into the text by mistake, or possibly the common source of L and P may have had νέων, and νέα be a gloss on ἐν ῥῆβῃ. Νέα is probably right; it is the youthfulness of Alcestis, not that of Admetus, that the poet wishes to emphasize.

473. κύρσαι: κυρῆσαι MSS., but the strophic line shows Musgrave’s correction to be necessary. Euripides has both ἐκυρῆσαι (cf. Iou 1105) and ἐκύροντα (cf. *Hec.* 215). Κύρω and κυρῆω are said not to occur either in classic Attic prose or in comedy.

474. συνύναδος: ἀπαξ εἰρημένων. It is probably a noun, though many lex. give it as an adjective. Nauck (*Eur. Stud.* II. 62) regards the word as corrupt. He thinks that in its place should stand some word meaning "wife," to which ἀξιόων was added as a gloss. Hence he would strike out ἀλήθεια, and γόναι in 464. But συνύναδος has been ably defended by Zacher (*Philología* L. I. p. 542). He points out that συνύναξεσθαι presupposes συνύναξι, and that the word is a regular formation from σύνυναι after the analogy of περιναξὶς, δεκας, etc. It differs from ἀξιόων because the two members of the pair belong together as a whole. Render "such union with a loving consort."

476–567. Second Epeisodion. Heracles enters from the left, doubtless wearing the lion-skin and carrying his club. His costume enables the chorus and spectators to recognize him at once; hence no introductory words are necessary.

476. κωμῆται: the word κώμη was often used of a neighborhood or district; cf. Aristotle *Pol.** 3, 6 οὕτω μὲν (sc. οἱ Ἑλοπονήσιοι) κώμας τὰς περιουκίδας καλεῖν
φασὶν, Ἀθηναίων δὲ δήμως. Hence as Suidas says (s. v. κωμήται), κωμήται οἱ παλαιοὶ τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀμφότεροι καὶ τῶν ἐλεγον. The word is peculiarly appropriate here, as Thessaly contained few large towns, and these were mostly independent of each other, each being surrounded by its own group of dependent villages. χθόνος: Nauck would read πόλεως, as the repetition χθόνος — χθόνα (479) — χθόνα (485) is suspicious. He might have adduced in favor of his view Ἱππολ. 34, 36, in one of which lines χθόνα has probably displaced πόλιν. But Nauck’s conjecture seems far from certain.

479. χθόνα: here L P have πόλιν, but χθόνα seems preferable on account of ἀστυ in the following line. πόλιν may be a conjecture, or a slip of the kind described in the note on v. 55.

480. προσβήναι: see Goodwin M. and T. 772 a.

481. Eurystheus was king of Tiryns as well as of Argos and Mycenae.

482. Here L and P have συνέξεια: cf. loc. 243 εἰ θεῷ συνεξῆ, Ἑλ. 255 τίνι πόσμῳ συνεξῆ, Ἀνδρ. 98 στερνόν δαύμων ὁ συνεξή, and Ἱππολ. 1389 ἡ αὐτή συνέφαρας σύνεξῆς (where the Auline has προσεξῆς). B a have in our passage προσέξεια: but, as Nauck (Eur. Stud. II. p. 63) pointed out, the verb προσ-εξέγημα does not occur in the early literature; though in late Greek it is not uncommon.

487. τοῦς πόνους: so Monk; P has only πόνος, the article having fallen out in the source of L and P. L has μὲ ἄν πόνους, an obvious attempt to fill out the lacuna ex conj. B a have τοὺς πόνους, which many edd. adopt; ἀπειπεῖν will then mean “say no to,” and the πόνοι be personified (so Earle). Cf. Ἰερ. 942 ἀπειπον ἀλγεῖ. But it seems simpler and more natural to take ἀπειπεῖν in its usual sense, “renounce,” and read πόνους: cf. Ἰερ. F. 1354 ὁν (sc. πόνων) οὐτ’ ἀπειπον οἰδέν’ οὐτ’ ἀπ’ ὀμμάτων κ.τ.λ.

489. ἀγών has here, as often, the double sense of “athletic contest,” “race,” and “danger,” “peril.” Cf. Herod. VIII. 102 πολλοῖς πολλάκις ἀγώνας δραμέονται περὶ σφέων αὐτῶν ὁ Ἕλληνες: also I. 4. 145 ἄνειν ἀγώνας διὰ σὲ δὲ κεῖνον δραμεῖν, Ὀρ. 878 ἄγωνα θανάσιμον δραμοβεμνον, Ἐλ. 883 ἥκεις γὰρ ὅστις ἀχρείων ἐκπλέθρον δραμὼν | ἄγων’ ἐς οἶκους.

491. ἀπάξω: the fut. indic. (as compared with ἄν λάβως in 494) shows the confidence with which Heracles looks forward to the result.

492. εὔμαρτε: cf. fr. 176, 2 Ν. μαθεῖν δὲ πάσιν ἔστιν εὔμαρτε: also I. 4. 519, 969, Ἑλ. 1227, fr. 382, 19, fr. aedesp. 11. Sophocles has the word once (Ἑλ. 179), Aeschylus twice (Ἀγ. 1280, Συγγ. 325). Pindar thrice (Ἠ. XI. 33, Ῥυ. III. 105, Ἱ. III. 21). The schol. on II. XV. 137 says: μάρη γὰρ ἡ χείρ κατὰ Πινδαρον, δύνα τι καὶ εὔμαρτε. If he is correct, the word closely resembles εὔχερῆ both in origin and meaning. Hesychius says εὔμαρτε: εὔχερης, ἱερής, βέβαιον, ἀσφαλές, and Suidas εὐμαρτής εὐκόλος, εὔχερης.

494. ἀρταμος: a rare word. Cf. Ἐλ. 816 δοτις ταῦτον ἀρταμος καλός. It properly means “to cut in pieces like a butcher” (ἀρταμος). The schol. explains by μαγειρεύοντι, ἀρταμος γὰρ λέγεται ὁ μάγειρος.
496. ἁμασιν: "clots" or "goats of blood." Cf. for this use of the plural El. 1172, I. T. 73, Aesch. Ag. 1247 (ἀμάτων = "streams of blood"), Soph. Ant. 120, etc.


498. ξεκρύσσου: probably a reference to the celebrated gold-mines near Scapte Hyle, which were leased by the historian Thucydides. πέλτης: the πέλτη was a small, light shield of wood, often covered with goat-skin and shod with iron. The word is here used collectively = πελταστῶν: cf. Rhes. 410 ἔρρηξα πέλτην. "In Greek the weapon often stands for the person armed with it" (Wecklein). Others, with Monk, regard πέλτης ἄναξ as = πελταστής, and compare Aesch. Pers. 376 κώπης ἄναξ: a view which to me seems less probable. The Thracian targeteers enjoyed a reputation similar to that of the Rhodian and Balearic slingers and the Cretan bowmen.

499. δαμόνος: here, as often = "fortune," "destiny." But to the mind of the Greek hearer of the play was present the idea of a personal δαμον.

500. σκληρός: "a metaphor from a hard and stony road, as πρός αἰτος from a steep one. There is doubtless a reference here to the words of Hesiod (Op. 287-292) about the rugged path of virtue, — words that formed, as it were, the text of Prodicus' apologue of Heracles at the cross-ways (Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 21-34), which was doubtless familiar to Euripides" (Earle).

501. πᾶσιν (πασιν MSS.) is Wecklein's brilliant emendation, which certainly adds greatly to the force of the sentence.

502. Δυκάνων: this seems to be the only passage where a son of Ares named Lycaon is mentioned.

503. Κύκνω: according to Apollodorus (Bibl. 2, 5, 11, 3 and 2, 7, 74 Hercher) Heracles fought with two different Cyeni, one the son of Ares by Pelopeia and the other the son of the same god by Pyrene. The contest with the former, which took place near Iton in Thessaly, was the more celebrated, and is doubtless the one referred to here. Cf. Herc. F. 380 ff. and Hesiod Sent. Her. 345 ff. ἱχθομαί συμβαλών: see for the construction Goodwin M. and T. 895. This is better than to take ἱχθομαί literally, "am on my way," as do some editors. The phrase is nearly equivalent to a fut. indic., or μέλαμω with the infin.

506. πέρασμα: see for the tense M. and T. 148. πολεμίαν, which Dobree had conjectured for πολεμῶν, is actually found in B and a, and is almost certainly right. Nauck compares Med. 1322, Hec. 1153, Orest. 271, fr. 705, 2. Add Rhes. 286.

507. καὶ μῆν, as often, marks the entrance of a character.

508. πορευόμαι, like Lat. incedere, the appropriate word for the stately advance of the monarch.

509. Πέσεως τ' ἀφ' αἰματος: Alemene, mother of Heracles, was the daughter of Electryon, one of the sons of Perseus and Andromeda. See the schol., and Hesiod Sent. Her. 3, etc.

511. θελομ' ἄν: se. χαλμεν, a double-entendre. ἐξεπίσταμαι: "I am well assured," stronger than ἐπισταμαι.
512. τί χρῆμα: like the simple τι: see L. and S. s.v. χρῆμα II. 2 for parallels.

513. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: nouns denoting day, night, month and year generally are put in the dative of time without a preposition if an adjective word is joined with them; but exceptions sometimes occur, especially when the time within which an action takes place is to be indicated. See Hadley-Allen 782 a.

514 ff. Note the order in which Heracles mentions the members of his host’s family (children, father, wife); cf. Hippol. 794 ff. (father, children, wife).


520. πέρι: all the MSS. save L and P have ἐτί. For the simple genitive with the meaning of “concerning,” “in respect of which” see Hadley-Allen 733 a, Sonnenschein 413 and the examples there cited; but the present writer, for one, cannot believe that Euripides used that rare and difficult construction in a passage like the one in the text. Nauck is quite wrong, however, when he alleges that ἐτί is “überflüssig und störend.” On the contrary, the use of ἐτί with ἡμερὰ is almost stereotyped; cf. Bacch. 8, I. T. 771, Or. 1147, Suppl. 454, Hel. 56, 293, etc.

523. μολαρας: a striking instance of “attraction.” The verse would not allow the order ἄτρ μολαρας.

524. ύψειμένη, like ὁπέστη, v. 36. “Perhaps the figure is here that of a victim bowing to receive the death-stroke” (Earle).

526. εἰς τόδ’, i.e. until she dies, a euphemism. Wakefield’s τότε is tempting, but not, I think, necessary. ἀμβαλόν: so Nauck for ἀναβαλόν, to avoid the tribrach in the fifth foot. Euripides sometimes admits three shorts in the fifth, but very rarely in his earlier plays. There is no certain instance in the Alcestis. Hence it seems better to substitute the apocopated form in this place. See note on ἀμβαλόν, l. 50, and cf. Πεγ. 1281 (ἀμμένει ι, ***μένει Λ ἀμμένει Α ἀμμένει γ), Andr. 444 (ἀμμένει MSS., ἀμμένει Nauck), Soph. El. 1397 (ἀμμένει MSS.). See Nauck’s learned note in his Eur. Stud. II. p. 64 f.

527. A troublesome line, and one about which there probably will always be difference of opinion. I conceive the history of the text to have been this: in 521 Admetus has made about Alcestis the ambiguous statement ἐστιν τε κοφκετ' ἐστίν. This Heracles naturally does not understand. Admetus tries to explain (523, 525), but his visitor still fails to comprehend. Finally the king states his meaning in words which are seemingly most explicit, though chosen so as to conceal the fact of the queen’s death: τέθνηκ’ ό μέλλων, καὶ θανών οὐκ ἐστ’ ἐτί, i.e. “the person who is soon to die is (to all intents and purposes) already dead, and, being dead, no longer exists.” But this sentence, simple as it seems, had two peculiarities which led to corruption of the text, viz. the separation of οὐκ and ἐτί and the use of the two participles side by side in different constructions. Some scholar reconstructed the verse in the form τέθνηκ’ ό μέλλων κοφκετ’ ἐσθ’ ό καταβανών, thus removing both peculiarities and
producing a very tolerable trimeter. This version has come down to us in
B a. In L, on the other hand, τέθνηκε (and in Π τέθνηκεν) has been written for
τέθνηχε (probably their common source had τέθνηκε, the ν in Π having been
added to remove hiatus), and the article inserted before θανῶν. In Π a further
change has been made, the clumsy and unmetrical transposition οὐκέτ’ ἐστιν.
Thus in Π has been accomplished, though in a very awkward way, precisely
the same result which in B and a has been attained by a clever reconstruction.
Many edd. prefer to follow B a; but the most obvious course is not necessarily
the right one. For other readings, see Sel. Conj. The one in the text is due
to Schwartz, the editor of the scholia.

528. ι’ : γ’ Earle; but cf. Αesch. Prom. 926 δοσὺν τὸ ι’ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ δουλεῖσθαι
οἰκία, Soph. O. C. 808 χωρίς τὸ ι’ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ καὶ τὰ καίρα, Plato Προταγ. 336 B
χωρίς ψυχὴ εἶναι τὸ συνελεύσαι τε διαλεγόμενου καὶ τὸ δημηγορεῖν.

531. γυνὴ, γυναικός: intentionally ambiguous, “the woman” or “my
wife.”

532. ὀθεῖος: this word (from ἀθὸς, old by-form of ἔθος?) was the Athen-
ian term for ἄλλοτρος (Bekker’s Anecd. p. 1095). Hesychius has ὀθεία· μάταια.
says: ὀθεῖος οὖκ ἐκ τῆς ἄλλοδαπῆς ἄφιμιμοι ὡς ὀνεὶς ἀπόδοσαν, ἀλλοευθής, ἄλλ’
ὅ ἀπὸ πόλεως τῆς αὐθής ὁν καὶ ἄλλως ἐπιτείθεος, οὐ μὲντοι κατὰ γένος προσήκων,
which looks as though he were misled by the use of the word in our passage.
Ὀθεῖος does not occur in Aeschylus or Sophocles, and Euripides has it only
in the Alcestis (cf. 646, 810).

533. ἄλλως: in a double sense, “otherwise,” and “notwithstanding.” See
L. and S. s.v. 1 and 2, b. ἀναγκαία: cf. Latin necessaria. Admetus, while
his words are literally true, contrives to give a false impression through-
out.

536. εἴθ’ ἕφορομεν: a typical instance of an unfulfilled wish referring to a
past object. See M. and T. 732.

537. ύπορράπτεις: very rare in classic Greek, though it occurs not infre-
quently in late writers. It is properly a tailor’s term, “to stitch underneath,”
“patch up.” Here it is used figuratively, like ῥάπτειν, ὕφαίνειν and Lat. suere,
consuere. It is not found in Aeschylus or Sophocles, and occurs only here
in Euripides.

540. εἶ μόλις: see M. and T. 501 c. παρὰ κλαίουσι: if the text is sound
-ρα is here lengthened before κλ. Usually in trimeters a short final syllable
ending in a vowel is not lengthened before a mute and liquid, except in the
case of γυ, γν, δμ, δν, and sometimes βλ and γλ. But cf. El. 1058 ἀρα κλαίουσαν,
Aesch. Pers. 773 νέα φρονεῖ. Cases of this kind of lengthening in lyric passages
are much more frequent. The truth seems to be, that while the rule as laid
down by Porson (see his note on Orest. 64) generally holds good, exceptions
sometimes occur. Almost all such rules of usage, e.g. the “Canon Davesi-
umus” and “Porson’s rule of the fifth foot,” are subject to some exceptions,
which should not be emended or explained away. Elmsley and Earle insert \( \tau \) after \( \alpha i\sigma\chi e\beta\nu \), thus obtaining a tribrach instead of the suspicious iambus. See Christ *Metrik* 2 p. 14; Kühner-Blass I. p. 306; Goebel *De Correctione Attica*, pp. 19 ff. and Kopp *Rhein. Mus.* 1886 p. 256.

544. \( \mu \nu \\rho \lambda \nu \chi \acute{\alpha} \rho \nu \): as we might say “I will be infinitely obliged to you.”

546. \( \delta \omega \mu \acute{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \): for the gen. with \( \varepsilon \zeta \omega \pi \omega \) and other adj. of separation, see G. 1140, II. 753 g. ‘\( \varepsilon \zeta \omega \pi \omega \) (\( \varepsilon \xi \) and \( \dot{\omega} \psi \))’ is properly “out of sight of,” and hence “apart from,” “away from.” Cf. *Suppl.* 1038 \( \dot{\eta} \) \( \delta \mu \omega \nu \) \( \varepsilon \zeta \omega \pi \omega \) \( \beta \varepsilon \beta \gamma \varepsilon \kappa \), *Med.* 628 \( \chi \rho \omicron \iota \zeta \omega \nu \) \( \delta \omega \mu \acute{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \) \( \varepsilon \zeta \omega \pi \omega \), and the line parodied by Aristoph. *Thesm.* 881 \( \acute{\alpha} \rho \tau \dot{o} \) \( \delta \) \( \chi \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \) \( \acute{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\nu} \) \( \acute{\epsilon} \rho \upsilon \), \( \dot{\eta} \) \( \varepsilon \zeta \omega \pi \omega \); (cf. *Hel.* 468). The word is not used by Aeschylus and Sophocles.

547. \( \xi \nu \nu \omega \nu \alpha \nu \): guests were usually lodged under the same roof as their hosts, the upper story (\( \upsilon \pi \rho \rho \dot{o} \nu \dot{o} \nu \)) being often used for this purpose. But large and luxurious dwellings sometimes had separate apartments for guests, at a little distance from the main building and connected with it by a passage-way, in which was a door (\( \delta \rho \pi \alpha i \) \( \mu \tau \alpha \nu \lambda \alpha \ 549 \)). See Bekker-Goll *Charikles* II. p. 140; Hermann-Blümner *Privatatt.* d. *Griech.* p. 405 note 3. As Earle has pointed out (see the introd. to his ed. p. xl.), Heracles must have gone in at a side-door of the back-scene, for he and the servant can scarcely have retired through one of the \( \pi \alpha \rho \delta \rho \omega \). But the presence of two doors occasions no difficulty; for though the permanent stone \( \pi \rho \sigma \kappa \acute{\eta} \acute{\mu} \alpha \nu \) of Hellenistic times often show only one door (sometimes none at all), the theaters of the fifth and fourth centuries probably had \( \pi \rho \sigma \kappa \acute{\eta} \acute{\mu} \alpha \nu \) with three doors. See Doerpfeld *Gr., Theater*, pp. 67, 377–8, 552.

548. \( \acute{\epsilon} \nu \): so England for \( \epsilon \nu \) of the MSS. Those who retain \( \epsilon \nu \) either take it with \( \kappa \lambda \acute{\gamma} \acute{s} \alpha \tau \epsilon \) as a case of so-called “tmesis,” or as equivalent to \( \epsilon \nu \dot{\nu} \) (so Earle).

549. \( \theta \upsilon \rho \alpha s \) \( \mu \tau \alpha \nu \lambda \alpha \) \( \nu \): here not of the door between the \( \alpha \mu \delta \rho \alpha \rho \alpha \nu \) and \( g \nu \alpha \alpha \kappa \epsilon \zeta \eta \iota \iota \nu \iota \iota \), but of a door in the passage between the \( \xi \nu \nu \omega \nu \alpha \nu \) and the palace proper. \( \theta \omicron \ihnu \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \acute{\nu} \): a poetic word.

551. \( \pi \rho \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \nu \eta \): the MSS. have \( \pi \rho \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \iota \nu \eta \) \( \pi \rho \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \iota \nu \eta \) \( \eta \) \( \pi \sigma \kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \nu \eta \): but as the calamity has already come, Wakefield’s emendation is necessary.

552. \( \xi \nu \nu \dot{\nu} \) \( \delta \alpha \kappa \epsilon \iota \iota \): in the iambic trimeter “resolutions are by far most frequent in the third foot. This fact stands in connection with the fact that in that part of the line, after the caesura, begins a new trochaic series, with the first thesis strongly accentuated. For in trochaic verse it is the first long that is most frequently resolved” (Christ).

553. Admetus, stung by the censure of the chorins, retorts with an impassioned speech. \( \sigma \phi \): the tragedians sometimes use this form as singular; see Goodwin *Gr. Gram.* 394, Hadley-Allen 261 D, a.

558. The MSS. except \( L \) and \( P \) (\( \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \alpha \zeta \epsilon \nu \) \( \eta \) \( \kappa \kappa \alpha \zeta \epsilon \nu \) \( \nu \) \( \kappa \kappa \alpha \zeta \epsilon \nu \) \( \nu \)) have \( \kappa \kappa \alpha \zeta \epsilon \nu \) \( \nu \). The sense is much the same with either reading; but \( \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \alpha \zeta \epsilon \nu \) \( \nu \), as the rarer and stronger word, is more likely to be right than the more colorless \( \kappa \kappa \alpha \zeta \epsilon \nu \) \( \nu \), especially
as κακόν stands at the end of the preceding line. Aeschylus has ἔχορδέσειν repeatedly (Prom. 725, Sept. 589, 604).

560. διψάν: the commentators compare Ι. ΙV. 171 καὶ κεν ἐλέγχησατο πολυ-δύσιον Ἀργος ἰκόλουν. But the epithet is by no means a mere epic reminiscence; for the plain of Argos is very dry and dusty still. Jerram aptly quotes Wordsworth (Hist. of Greece), who says: "The higher parts of this plain suffer from want of water, whence the epithet applied to it by Homer (πολυδύσιον), indicative of the thinness of the soil."


565-6. I keep τῷ and αἰνίσει with the MSS.; Heracleis is clearly meant. Schmidt's καίτῳ would give the same sense. Some editors read καὶ τῷ (the indefinite) with Heath. This might be a more polite form of expression than the direct address, or it might be sarcastic, like φοβεῖται τις Αἰσχ. Cho. 52, and the like. But the emphatic position of τῷ is against this reading. Earle has the conjectures καὶ σοί and αἰνίσεις: but the fact that the chorus do at once proceed to praise Admetus is a fatal objection. The difficulty lies, I think, in φρονεῖν δοκῶ: I have given in the text Herwerden's δόξα φρονεῖν. If φρονεῖν δόξα were once written by mistake, δόξα might easily have been changed to δοκῶ for metrical reasons, as the last foot cannot be a spondee. Moreover when this idiom occurs at or near the end of a trimeter δοκῶ usually comes first: cf. fr. 188, 3 N. δόξεις φρονεῖν, Soph. Αj. 504 δοκεῖς φρονεῖν, O. C. 1666 and El. 550 δοκῶ φρονεῖν, Critias fr. 4 δοκῇ φρονεῖν, etc.; though this is not a very safe criterion (Aesch. Prom. 389 φρονεῖν δοκεῖ).

566. ἐπισταταί: the meaning "to know how" to do a thing readily passes into that of "to be able" to do it. Cf. ΙΙ. ΧΧΙ. 320 οὖδέ οί οὕτε ἐπιστήσονται Ἀχαῖοι | ἀλλέξαι, Soph. Trach. 543 ἐγὼ δὲ θυμόνθαι μὲν οὐκ ἐπισταταί | νοσώντι. So in French "il ne saurait faire ce que vous voulez."

567. Admetus now enters the palace, and the chorus sing the second Stasimon (568-605).

568. πολύζεινος καὶ ἐλευθέρου: Weeklein for πολυζεῖνοι καὶ ἐλευθέρος (see his Studien zu Euripides p. 364). Purgold had already proposed πολυζεῖνοι καὶ ἐλευθέρου; but the epithet πολυζεῖνος suits the house, while ἐλευθέρος (here = ἐλευθέρους, Lat. liberalis) is better adapted to the man.

570. "In thee did Pythian Apollo, lord of the tuneful lyre, deign to dwell." εὐλύρας: cf. Aristoph. Thesm. 969, where the epithet, as here, is applied to Apollo. The word is very rare.

573. μηλονόμας: Doric for μηλονόμης. The word is very rare, if not indeed ἀπαξ εἰρημένον.

574. νόμων: so Pierson for δόμων. Those edd. who retain δόμων either hold that in σκότῳ there is a sudden transition of the address from the house to Admetus (so Monk, Woolsey, Jerram, Earle), or that there is no such transition, but that δόμως refers to the different apartments of the palace. But νόμως agrees far better with the following lines. We need not suppose that
in σῶις Admetus is addressed, for the pastures and herds attached to the palace are meant. In the heroic age the home of a king (e.g. that of Odysseus) had its own pastures, stalls and cattle.

575. δοχμιάν: "slanting," "sloping." Schol. τῷν πλαγίων καὶ ἀνακεκλι-μένων ὀρῶν. κλιτῷν: κλίτος is from κλίνω: cf. Lat. cli-itus. συρόνων: i.e. "playing on the shepherd's pipe" (σὺρόνες). See as to the σὺρόνες Howard in Harvard Stud. in Class. Phil. IV. pp. 18 ff. — This passage shows very clearly the poet's power of sketching a charming picture in a few words. Earle aptly compares I. A. 573 ff.

576. ποιμνίται: Pollux 7, 185 has ποιμνίται κύνες. The word seems to be always used as an adjective, though a noun in its formation. So ἵπποτης, πρωμηθής, etc., are sometimes used as adj., e.g. Sapph. 600 ἵπποτην ὃχλον. Cf. victor exercitus and the like in Latin. ὑμενιόνωσ, properly "marriage-songs," is doubtless used here in a general sense, "strains"; though the schol. somewhat coarsely explains it by ποιμνικάς ψιδᾶς θ' ὥν ἦχεν τὰ βοσκήματα εἰς τὸ ἀλλήλως μίγνυσαι, and so Aelian H. A. 12, 44.

579. σῦν...ἐποιμαίνοντο, a case of so-called "tnesis." It is really, of course, a survival of the early adverbial use of the preposition. βαλαί: "dappled"; cf. Vergil's lynces variae, Georg. III. 264.

580. Ὄθρως: this important mountain-range of Thessaly forms the watershed between the Peneius and Spercheius. It rises at its highest point to a height of about 5500 feet, and is still covered with forests to a large extent. λεόντων: Herodotus (VII. 120) asserts, and Aristotle (I. A. VI. 31) confirms the statement, that in Europe lions were found only between the Nestus and the Acheleous; but Dio Chrysostom (Orat. XXI. p. 269 C, cited by Rawlinson in his note on Herod. l. s. c.) says that in his time they were extinct in Europe. The story of the attack made by lions upon the baggage-camels of Xerxes (Her. VII. 125) is well known. Cf. the graphic representation of a lion-hunt on one of the Mycenaean swords.

581. δαφωνός: "tawny," of the color of the hide. So also II. X. 23 δαφω-νόν...δέρμα λεβάτος: cf. II. XI. 474, where the epithet is applied to jackals; II. II. 308, where it is used of a snake; Aesch. Prom. 1022 of an eagle, and Hom. Pymn. 19, 23 of the skin of a lynx. In all these cases the animal to which the term is applied is a beast of prey. Was this because with the meaning of "red" or "tawny" was associated to some extent the other meaning of "blood-thirsty" or "cruel"? Both significations arose logically enough from the original one of "all bloody," "wholly blood-red." Sophocles does not use the word.

582. χόρευσε: so Monk for ἔχορευσε, to restore correspondence with ἔταλα δέ of the strophe (573). For the omission of the augment, see Goodwin 549, Hadley-Allen 354 D.

585. νεόρθος: for νεφρός, from the root νεφ; cf. Skt. navas, Lat. novus, Eng. "new." The word must originally have been applied to any young animal.
ψικόμων πέραν ἐλατάν: i.e. beyond the limits of the forest. For the use of πέραν = πέρα, cf. Hippiol. 1053, Pindar Nem. V. 21. Herwerden would read πέρα. ψικόμων: so Tertullian (Jud. Dom. 8) uses the epithet alticomae of cypresses.

586. σφυρψ: properly the ankle; here by "synecdoche" for the foot in general.

588. πολυμηλοτάταιν: a Homeric epithet, applied to Orchomenos (II. II. 605) and to persons (e.g. II. II. 705). Earle compares Pindar Ol. I. 16 ff., to which may be added I. Pyth. IX. 11 (cited by Monk). The neighborhood of Phereac still abounds in flocks.

589. οἰκεῖ: the necessary emendation of Purgold and Markland for οἰκεῖς. The third person is required both because Phoebeus, not Admetus, has just been addressed and because of τίθεται, κρατώνει, which follow. The subject of οἰκεῖ is, of course, a pronoun understood referring to Admetus. παρὰ... λίμαιν: so II. II. 711 οὔ δὲ θέραν ἐνμοντο παραί Βοιβήδη Λίμην κ.τ.λ. Cf. Strabo c. 436 Meineke. The lake was called Βούβης or Βούβια Λίμη from the town of Boebe which was situated upon it. The epithet καλλίταυρος is puzzling, especially as the lake is said to have no outlet, though several streams flow into it. When applied to a river or fountain (e.g. Med. 835 καλλιτάυρο... Κηφίσου) the term is appropriate enough; but why use it of a lake? Woolsey suggests that it refers to the water moved to and fro by the wind, but probably the poet is not speaking by the card.

590 ff. We may render: "And for his tith and the level stretches of his fields he sets as limit on the side toward the sun's evening resting-place the clime of the Molossian mountains"; ἀφότος γναῖν refers to the rich arable lands as distinguished from the πεδινὸς δαπέδουs, the upland pastures with their broad expanses. ἵπποστασον: properly the stodle where the Sun puts up his steeds at night. For the expression, cf. fr. 771, 5 N. ἐω φαενᾶς Ἡλίου θεῷ ἵπποστάσεις, and Pollux I. 184. After Μελόσσων two shorts and a long are needed to correspond to σοφίας of 602. Probably some anapaestic word has dropped out; Bauer and Earle suggest ὥρεων, which may well be right. The responson might also be restored by striking out ἀγαμαί in 602, and so l actually reads; but this would spoil the antithesis in 602-3.

595. Ἀλγαίων: the schol. takes this word as an adj. agreeing with ἀκτήν, for he paraphrases: κρατεὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀλγαίων ἄκτην τὴν πόντιον καὶ ἀλίμενον. He is probably right; though some edd. regard the word as a noun. There are at least three possibilities: (A) Ἀλγαίων may be an adj. =Ἀλγαῖον; (B) it may be the name of the sea-giant put for the sea itself by "metonymy" (so Jerram, Earle), or (C) it may be a substantive meaning "the Aegean sea"; cf. Hesych. s.v. Ἀλγαίων: ἐνάλιος θεός. καὶ τὸ περί τὰς Κυκλάδας πέλαγος. If it is a noun, it is the object of κρατώνα; but if, as seems more probable, it is an adjective, κρατώνα is used absolutely, "he rules as far as the harbourless Aegean sea-strand of Pelion." The MSS. have aἰγαῖον; but the schol. certainly read
Aigaiōν', and the antistrophē (504) has — — —. For the phrase Monk compares Troad. I ἡκω λιητῶν Αἰγαίων ἀλμυρῶν βάλος | πάινου.

596. Reiske would read ἀλιμένου for ἀλιμενον, which is an easy change and may be right. Πηλίον: the mention of Pelian would naturally recall to a Greek the fearful shipwreck of the Persians on the Magnesian coast in 480 B.C. The name "Πνοον or "Ovens" was given to a part of the Πηλιάδ ἀκτῆ, either because of the seething of the waters there (so Earle) or more probably because of the oven-like caves in the cliffs which may still be seen there. Cf. Herod. VII. 128 and Strabo IX. p. 443 M.

597. δόμων ἀμπετάσας: short-hand expression for πῦλας δόμων ἀμπετάσας.

598. νοτερφ' βλεφάρφ: i.e. "in spite of his grief." ξείνων: the correspondence requires this form; the MSS. have ξένων.

599. φίλας: so the Aldine. The MSS. have φίλας, but the strophic line (589) has — — —.

600. ἀρτιθανή: an extremely rare word.

601. Render: "for natural nobility of soul is impelled too far toward respect for others' rights": ἐκφέρεται strictly means "is carried out of the proper course," the figure being that of a race-horse or runner who swerves out of the bounds of the race-course. Hence it implies a mild censure of the excessive hospitality of Admetus. Cf. Soph. El. 628 ὀρφα; πρὸς ὤργην ἐκφέρει. Αἰδώς is a word almost as untranslatable as the τὸ τὶ ἦν εἶναι of Aristotle.

602. πάντα σοφίας = πᾶσα σοφία. ἔνεστίν: so Barnes for ἔνεστι, to restore the responson. ἄγαμαι: "I am filled with awe and wonder." The word is not in l, and many editors omit it (see note on 594). But without it the antithesis between 602 and 603 is lost, and δ' of 603 becomes merely connective.

604. Many edd. compare Aesch. Ag. 945 θάρσος εὐπειθὲς ἥξει φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον. The sense then is: "Confidence sits (enthroned) at my heart." This seems better than to render ἦστα: "lurks" with Liddell and Scott.

605. φώτα: here, as in 472, without contemptuous force. κεννά πράξειν = καλῶς πράξειν. As Monk acutely observes, "ea vox (κεννά) usum habet non minus late patemtem quam ἀγαθός vel ἔσθλος." He compares Troad. 683 πράξειν τι κεννόν, and for the idiomatic use of the neut. plu. of the adj. with πράσσειν Orest. 533 θυγάτηρ δ' ἐμὴ θαυμάσσετέ 'ἐπραξεν ἐνδικὰ, I. A. 346 πράζσσαντα μεγάλα, El. 1359 εὐδαίμονα πράσσει. To these may be added Heracl. 435 (τάδε πράσσειν = οὔτως πράσσειν, a nearly similar case), Aesch. Ag. 1397 ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπράξετην, etc.

606-962. Third Epeisidion. The king comes out of the palace, followed by his attendants carrying the bier on which lies the body of Alcestis. See note on l. 422.

606. ἀνδρῶν Φεραίων εὐμενῆς παρουσία = ἀνδρεῖς Φεράοι εὐμενῶς πάροντες, but the use of the abstract gives the address a certain dignity and formality.

607. πάντι: sc. τὰ πρόσφορα.
608. ἂρδην: for the testimonies of the ancient grammarians as to this word, see Ellendt Lex. Soph. s.v. It is used once by Aeschylus, three times by Sophocles, and at least half a dozen times by Euripides. ἰσ τάφον τε καὶ πυράν: cf. Suppl. 1058 τῶμαὶ καὶ πῦρα φαίνει πέλας. Monik and others long ago pointed out that this passage of our play and 740 seems to imply that the body of Alcestis was to be burned, and are therefore inconsistent with 365 f. and 897 f., which clearly imply that it was to be buried. Hence they have reproached the poet for carelessness. Dr. Verrall, on the other hand (see his Euripides the Rationalist pp. 122 ff.), holds that "the sort of pyre which he (i.e. Admetus) has in view is a grave-pyre, in which, as he says, not on which, the corpse would be placed. It is a mortuary kiln, a chamber in the royal tomb, opening from the floor of it. Here the body would be laid; here that of Alcestis was laid and left by the performers of the funeral. Afterwards—at night we should probably suppose, since one object of the whole arrangement was to achieve a sanitary purpose without insulting the majesty of the dead or affronting the eyes of the living—fire would be put to the fuel with which the chamber had been provided, and the chamber closed." He then compares the so-called "grave of Agamemnon" discovered by Schliemann at Mycenae, and the "fiery rock-chamber" of I. T. 626 (πῦρ ἱερὸν ἑνὸν χάσμα τ' εὑρωπὸν πέτρασ). But this solution, ingenious as it is, is not, I fear, wholly correct. Dr. Dörpfeld, probably the highest living authority, holds (cf. Schuchhardt Schliemann's Ausgrabungen² p. 194) that there is no trace of cremation in the "shaft-graves" at Mycenae; the ashes found in them (and in other tombs at Volo, etc.) have probably come from burnt-offerings. In the words of Rohde (Psyche p. 31), "Den Fürsten ist reicher Vorrath an kostbarem Geräth und Schmuck mitgegeben, unverbrannt, wie ihre eigenen Leichen nicht verbrannt worden sind; sie ruhen auf Kiesel, und sind mit einer Lehmsschicht und Kiesellage bedeckt; Spuren von Rauch, Reste von Asche und Kohlen weisen darauf hin, dass man die Körper gebettet hat auf die Brandstelle der Todtenopfer, die man in dem Grabraum vorher dargebracht hatte." If this "Brandstelle der Todtenopfer" is the πυρά of the Alcestis, the difficulty is in great part removed; the body is laid upon it (cf. 740), but not burned. I find no proof in the Alcestis that the queen's corpse was to be cremated. The case of Capanus in the Suppliques 980 ff. is quite different; there the body is burned on a pyre in the open air. As to the passage from the Iphigenia, that refers to a barbarian country; and the custom there spoken of was felt to be so un-Greek that Diodorus (XX. 14) actually suggests that Euripides had in mind the human burnt-offerings of the Carthaginians!—Instead of ἵσ L P have πρὸς, which Weeklein (Beiträge zur Kritik des Eur. p. 538) prefers. Either reading gives good sense; but ἵσ is peculiarly appropriate if the tomb and πυρά were of the character just described, as the body would be carried to and into the burial-chamber.

609. It was a religious duty to take a last, solemn farewell of the deceased
before the body was burned or buried. This was commonly done by exclaiming χαίρε (among the Romans vale), adding the name of the dead person. See Hermann-Blümmer Privatalt. d. Griech. p. 370 note 3. The chorus are prevented from at once complying with the king's command by the coming of Pheres; but they take their farewell in vv. 741 f. after the old man's departure.

610. Cf. the English "to take the last journey," to the grave.

611. Enter the aged Pheres, followed by attendants bearing rich ornaments for the dead. γηραίω ποδί: cf. Hec. 64 γηραίας χειρός, Soph. O. C. 200 γηραίων σώμα, and the like.

613. νερτέρων ἀγάλματα: ἄγαλμα may be used here as often in Homer, = πάν ἐφ᾽ ὑσ τις ἄγαλλεται, the idea being that the dead actually rejoiced in the offerings and honors bestowed upon them. This belief is a very wide-spread one among primitive peoples, and survives even at the present day to a much greater extent than most persons probably imagine. The word may, however, mean simply "ornaments."

617. δύσφορα: δυσμενή, the reading of all the MSS. but L P, has been defended as being the "difficilior lectio"; but I fear that it is "difficilior" in another sense of the Latin comparative. As Jerram and others observe, δυσμενή is very rarely used of things; and the σχῆμα ετυμολογικόν (φέρειν . . . δύσφορα) is too Euripidean to be lost. As Earle points out, δυσμενή may be due to the μέν just above at the end of 616; or it may be merely an unskilful attempt to fill out a lacuna by some one who found only δυσ . . . legible in his MSS. For some of the numerous eneudations that have been suggested, see Sel. Conj.

618. κατὰ χθονὸς ἐτῶ: i.e. be buried with her.

620. ἤτις γε: causal relative. "It is to be observed that either δασίς or δο γε generally represents this causal sense (expressed in Latin by the subjunctive), but that we sometimes find both combined, precisely in the same way" (Paley).

623. εὐκλέεστερον: so B. The other MSS. have the superlative, which would be too extravagant, especially as the tone of the speech is a trifle cold and perfunctory.

624. ἥργον τλάσα: cf. Med. 706 τλάσα ἥργον ἀνοσοῦτατον: ib. 1328, etc. It is hard in such cases to decide whether the verb is really transitive or whether there is an ellipsis of ἰβαν or ποιεῖν: but instances like Hec. 1251 τὰ μῆ καλὰ | πρᾶσσειν ἔτόλμας, etc. seem to point in the latter direction.


629. ἥλθες: "the aorist, expressing simply a past occurrence, is sometimes used where we should expect a perfect." (Goodwin M. and T. 58). ἐς ἐμοὺ: source passing into-agency. This use of ἐς is especially common with verbs of giving, and perhaps originated with them; though even in Homer occur such cases as II. II. 33 ἐφηπται ἐκ Δῶς, ib. 609 ἐφάπτεν ἐκ Δῶς, etc. In Attic prose the preposition is rarely used to denote agency.
630. φίλους: probably masculine (cf. 1037), though some take it as neuter.
   σὴν παρουσίαν — σὲ παράφνη. Cf. 606.

631. τοῦτον: so Earle. The MSS. have τὸν σὸν, which is highly suspicious, as we have σὴν in 630 and τὸν σὸν in 632. The change from τὸν σὸν to τοῦτον is really very slight.

632. Nauck would reject this line as an interpolation; he says (Eur. Stud. H. p. 65 f.): "Die im zweiten Verse gegebene Begründung für das Zurückweisen der Schmucksachen ist unpassend schon an sich und zumal in dieser Situation; kein Todter bedarf des Schmuckes, und nicht darum weil Alcestis schon hinlänglich versorgt ist, sondern weil Pheres sein Leben mehr geliebt als seinen Sohn und weil er somit den Tod der Alcestis verschuldet, werden seine Gaben verschmäht. Es scheint daher unzweifelhaft das v. 632 dem Dichter fremd ist; vermutlich haben wir in den Worten τὸν σὸν ἐνδικέσθαι einen Doppelgänger zu τὸν σὸν ἐνδικεῖται." But according to the Greek conception the dead did need the clothes, etc. that were buried with them; had Nauck forgotten the story of Periander and his wife Melissa (Herod. V. 92), the money that was put in the mouth of the corpse, etc.? It is clear from his words that he has lost the point of the taunt; Admetus means "When I bury her she will have enough ornaments from me, and will not be at all in need of gifts from such as you." One can easily imagine what a world of scorn a good actor would infuse into the words τὸν σὸν ἐνδικέσθαι. Ἐνδικέσθαι is saved from ambiguity by the context; otherwise the sense might be "she will have plenty of your possessions when she is buried." Cf. Truöl. 906 μὴ θανῇ τοῦτον ἐνδικέσθαι.

633. τότε: the asyndeton and emphatic position are very effective. ὀλλοῦ-μην: a fine example of the imperf. denoting likelihood or danger. Cf. Hirc. F. 537.

635. γέραν ᾄν is certainly awkward, and Earle’s conjecture γεραιῶς is very plausible. He compares Phoen. 103 γεραιῶν νέας κ.τ.λ. Still Euripides may have written γέραν ᾄν, harsh as it sounds. See note on ἧν χρήσ, 379.

636 ff. These lines have been suspected by many commentators, and with good reason. Admetus has far too strong a sense of “the divinity that doth hedge a king” to make such a damaging admission in regard to himself. The only question is how many lines are to be rejected. G. A. Wagner wished to reject 641, and Nauck 638 and 639. Badham and Prinz regard 636-41 as spurious. For other opinions see Sel. Conj. Earle retains 640-41, and suggests that 634-9 is a parallel passage (from an Oedipus?) which was written in the margin and has crept into the text. This seems, on the whole, the most probable view. Admetus would never have admitted that he was the son of a slave, but might very well in his anger go so far as to say that Pheres was not his father.

636. ἤνθ’ ἄρα: “the imperfect ἤν (generally with ἄρα) may express a fact which is just recognized as such by the speaker or writer, having previously been denied, overlooked, or not understood” (Goodwin M. and T. 39).
639. ὑπεβλήθην: this passage shows how ὑποβάλλειν came to be the technical
word for substituting a child, like Lat. supponere, subdilere. Cf. ὑποβολμαῖος.
640. εἰς ἑλεγχον ἐξελθόν: ἐξερχέσθαι, like κατέρχεσθαι, is used of one who
engages in a task, trial or conflict. Cf. Pec. 226 μὴ ἐσ ἕρων ἄμιλλαν ἐξέλθης ἐμοί.
Woolsey compares Soph. Phil. 98 εἰς ἑλεγχον ἐξελθόν, which, however, is
not quite parallel. ὅς εἶ: not "who you are" (which would be τίς or ὅτις εἶ),
but "what sort of man you are" (= olos εἶ). So in Latin in indirect questions
quis sis = quals sis.
642. τὰρα = τοῦ ἄρα. πάντων: διαπερέπειν here is followed by the gen.
after the analogy of verbs of superiority and comparison: some, however,
regard πάντων as partitive genitive. The genitive-construction with this verb
is very rare.
644. ἡθέλησας: in Attic prose ἔθελω, not θέλω, is the usual form, and in
Attic inscriptions θέλω does not appear until about 250 B.C. In the tragedians
both forms occur in lyric passages, while in trimeters the pres. ἔθελω is excluded
for metrical reasons. The aorists ἡθέλησα and ἡθέλαν, according to Veitch,
belong only to ἔθελω.
645. ἐλάσπει: because the mother is included, the plur. is used.
646. δῶνειαν: see note on 532.
647. The καί is probably intensive, not correlative with τε. Good writers
never, or almost never,* employ καί . . . τε like τε . . . καί: and in passages like
fr. 328, 3, Aesch. Suppl. 708, Septem 558-9, Eum. 75-7, etc. which some have
regarded as exceptions to this rule, a close examination shows that καί and
τε are not correlative. Hermann regards the καί . . . τε in our passage as a
kind of anacoluthon instead of καί μητέρα καὶ πατέρα, and renders quanm ego
et matrem, —patremque adeo duco solam, the use of τε for καί thus giving greater
emphasis to πατέρα.
647. The ἄν was inserted by Elmsley, B and a having only τε ἔνδικου. L
and P have τε γ', the γ' being clearly "metricorum supplementum." μόνην:
so L P a. B has ἐμόν, whence Nauck conjectured ἐμοί. Probably in the MS.
from which B was derived μόνην had lost the last two letters, and ἐμόν was an
attempt of the scribe to restore the text by filling out the word. 434 (see note)
is not a parallel case, as there B, L P and a disagree; while in our passage
the agreement of a with the other family makes it probable that μόνην stood
in the archetype.
648-9. Note the emphatic position of καλὸν and τοῦ σοῦ πρὸ παίδος. Earle
would read καθανείν, quite needlessly. The participle is conditional.
650. πάντων: to be taken with βραχύς.
651-2. These lines, which are obviously an imitation of 295-6, are rejected
by Lenting, Nauck, Paley, Prinz, Weil, Wecklein and Earle. They are very
weak and inept, and are certainly an interpolation. ἐξων: see note on 295.

* Cf. however, Andr. 50 εὐνοῦσ  ἃ καὶ σοι ἐξωτι τ' ἤν τῷ σῷ πόσει.
653. καὶ μὴν: “and what is more,” introducing a new point of special importance.

655. παῖς δ’ ἦν ἑγώ σοι: Nauck’s conjecture ἦ γεγώ σοι is ingenious but not convincing. The emphatic pronoun of the first person is quite in keeping with the self-esteem which belongs to the character of Admetus. διάδοχος: “perhaps a substantive, as in Aesch. Prom. 1027” (Earle). This view is probably correct, though Euripides generally uses διάδοχος as an adj. Cf. Andr. 743, 803, Hec. 588, Suppl. 72. δόμων is suspicious, as the next line ends with δόμων. F. W. Schmidt’s ἥρων for δόμων is very plausible, though I have not ventured to receive it into the text.

657. λείψειν ἐμελλεί: for the periphrasis see Goodwin M. and T. 428 (a). ἐμελλέσθαι: in the ind. with ὅσοι to express actual result (M. and T. 601). διαπάσατι may be inf. of purpose, but is better taken as inf. limiting the meaning of ἄφθασθαι (M. and T. 763). The order distinctly favors the latter view. All MSS. but L P have διαρπάσειν, which reading is clearly due to the influence of λείψειν just before.

658, 659. ἀτιμάζοντα, προὔδωκας (sic) L P. With this reading the sense will be: “You will not say, either, that you gave me up to death because I did not pay respect to your old age.” The rest of the MSS. have ἀτιμάζων τὸ σὸν and προὔδωκά σ’, which gives the meaning: “You won’t say, either, that it was from disrespect for your old age that I gave you up to death.” The former reading is clearly better suited to the connection. Admetus is arguing that his father has no reasonable excuse for being unwilling to die in his stead. Phereis has enjoyed sovereign power; he has a son to take his place, and that son has always shown him due respect, so that the old man cannot plead ill-conduct on the part of Admetus as a pretext for unwillingness to make the sacrifice. This is clear and consistent. On the other hand, the other reading makes an abrupt transition to the defense of Admetus himself against a possible accusation from his father. The schol. must have had προὔδωκας and ἀτιμάζων τὸ σὸν in his text; for he observes, oddly enough: οὐ μὴν ἑρείς γε ὦς θανεῖν μὲ προὔδωκας ἀτιμάζοντα τὸ σὸν γῆρας. τὸ γὰρ ἀτιμάζων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀτιμάζοντα. Or is the last clause of the scholium a later addition by one who had ἀτιμάζων in his text and was trying to reconcile it with the scholiast’s explanation? οὐ μὴν ἑρείς: cf. Aristoph. Nub. 53 οὐ μὴν ἑρείς γ’ ὦς ἀργὸς ἦν. For the proleptic μ’ Monk compares Soph. El. 552 ἑρείς μὲν οὐχὶ νῦν γέ μ’ ὦς ἄρχεια τι | λυπηρὸν εἰτα σοῦ τάδ’ εξῆκομε’ ὑπὸ. αἰδόφρων: only here in Euripides. Sophocles has it once (O. C. 237 ὦ ἄνειοι αἰδόφρωνε), Aeschylus not at all. It seems not to occur elsewhere.

660-61. χάριν ἥλλαξάτην: cf. El. 89 φόνον φονεὶσι πατρὸς ἄλλαξέων ἐρωθ. 662. οὐκέτ’ αὐν φθάνοις: for this use of φθάνω with a participle see M. and T. 894.


666-68. These three lines were rejected by Badham; Nauck, too, rejects 668 as absurd, and proposes to read τόδε instead of λέγω. But it is not necessary to reject or change anything. It is perfectly true that Admetus cannot logically call himself the γνωριμόφος of his dead wife. But who is strictly logical under such circumstances? Almost every impassioned speech of this kind, when closely analyzed, shows inconsistencies and absurdities. Admetus means: "I will not cherish you in your old age nor bury you; those duties I owe to the one who has preserved my life, and who is therefore my real parent." The fact that Alcestis is dead is for the moment left out of sight. τοῦτι σ': δον τὸ κατὰ σέ school. So Hec. 514. ἡμεῖς δ' ἀτέκνου τοῦτι σ', and Iheses. 397. αὐγάς: sc. ἥλιον. So 868 αὐγάς προσορᾶν, and Hec. 137:3 αὐγάς εἰσορᾶν.

669 ff. Euripides loves to close a long speech with a maxim or moral apopthegm. μάτην: note the emphatic position.

671. The edd. call attention to the fact that this line violates the so-called "rule of Porson." This celebrated rule, as stated by Porson himself (Suppl. ad Praef. ad Iecubam), is as follows: 'Nempe hanc regulam plerunque in senariis observabant Tragicci, ut, si voce quae Creticum pedem efficeret terminaretur versus, camque vocem hypermonosyllabon praecederet, quintus pes iambus vel tribrachys esse debet. . . . Res eadem est, si Creticus in trochaecum et syllabam dissolvit, vel si, Cretico in syllabam longam et iambum dissoluto, syllaba longa est articularus, aut praeposito, aut quaevis longa denique vox, quae ad sequentia potius quam praecedentia pertinet.' It is clear that in the first sentence quoted Porson has either made an error or is using 'Creticum pedem' in its wider sense, to include the Fourth Paen (ο —ο — —); otherwise, if the fifth foot were a tribrach, the line could not end in a true Cretic (—ο —). Just below he is evidently using 'Creticus' in the narrower sense. Porson's rule has been frequently misstated by grammarians. The principle is perhaps best expressed thus (cf. Hadley-Allen 1091, 5): "if the fifth foot of a tragic trimeter is divided by a caesura, the syllable immediately preceding that caesura must be short or a monosyllable." To this there are two principal exceptions. One is thus stated by Porson himself: 'Verum si secunda quinti pedis pars ejus sit generis, ut praecedenti verbo adhaereat (i.e. an enclitic or ἂν after an elision), et ambo quasi unam vocem simul efficiant, non jam amplius necesse erit, ut verbum praecedens brevi syllaba terminetur.' For a list of cases of this kind, see Wecklein Studien zu Aeschylus p. 130. The other exception is when the main caesura falls in the fourth foot (see Wecklein l. s. c., who gives a list of cases; cf. Hermann El. Doct. Met. p. 22), as in the line in the text.

673-4. 'Αδημήθ', παύσαι: so Mekler for παύσασθ' and ὁ παί. παύσασθ' is clearly wrong, as Pheres has thus far taken no part in the dispute, and the sing. παροξύνης immediately follows. ὁ παί was doubtless written by mistake
under the influence of the ῥ ἡπεί just below, and has probably displaced an imperative. Then some one, seeing the need of an imperative, inserted παῦσαρθ' in place of the first word of 673. "Ἄδησθ' is supported by the analogy of 416, 552, 1007, and παῦσαρ by the parallelism with 707. Mekler, however, (Euripidea pp. 14 ff.) gives a more artificial explanation of the origin of the corruption. He suggests that a strip containing the first four letters of 673 and 674 had been torn out, and that some one in filling up the lacuna from another copy made a mistake of a line and filled up the gap in 673 with the first six letters of 674 and that in 674 with the first two letters of 675, thus:

[ΠΑΤΣΑ]C]Θ.
[Θ Π]ΔΙ

(But if his restoration of the text is right, the sixth letter of 674 would have been I, not C, and we should have had in 673 not [ΠΑΤΣΑ]C]Θ but [ΠΑΤΣΑ]C]Θ.) ἡρένας: ἡρένα ἩΡ, "under the influence of ἡρένα" (Earle).

675. αὐχεῖς: here, as usual, in a bad sense. ἄνδον ἡ Φρύγα: cf. Aristoph. Aves 1244 φέρ' ἔδω, πότερα ἄνδον ἡ Φρύγα | ταυτὶ λέγουσα μορφολύττεσθαι δοκεῖς;

The proverb marks the contempt of the free Greeks for the servile Asiatics very forcibly.

676. κακοὶς ἐλαύνειν: cf. Androm. 31 κακοὶς πρὸς αὐτῆς σχετλιὼς ἐλαύνομαι, Ion 1619 ὅταν ὅ᾽ ἐλαύνεται | συμφοράς ὀίκος (which is slightly different). ἀργυρω-νητόν: a rare word; cf. Aesch. Ag. 913 ἀργυρωνήτους ψῆφας.

677-8. These two lines are an echo of a favorite formula of Attic law. γεγότα γνησίως: really a figura etymologica, as γνησίως is from the root γεν-, γνη-.

679. νεανίας: adj. as in Hel. 209, 1562, Hec. F. 1095 and often. It has here a bad sense, "insolent." Jerram well observes: "This use of the word would be familiar at Athens, where the fashionable young men of the day were in the habit of committing assaults upon respectable citizens."

680. A difficult place. Most editors since the time of Elmsley take ω with ὀῦτος, and render "not so easily" or "not with impunity," comparing Her. 374 ὀνχῷ ὀῦτος ἄ δοκεῖς κωρήσεις. They either take βαλων absolutely, "having fired your shot," or supply it λόγους, κακοίς or the like. Probably this is right; but it is at least possible to take ω with βαλων, "without hitting (your mark)"; cf. Iasch. 1179 τις ἄ ἐβαλόνα πρῶτα; This use of βάλλω is by no means rare from Homer down. ὀῦτος would then mean "as you came," i.e. without accomplishing your object. The order of the words seems to me to favor this interpretation; but it is undeniably less effective than the direct threat. Weil would read παῦ for καὶ in 679, and Weeklein would change ω in 680 to κω, thus bringing πῆτρων into agreement with the subject of ὑπῆρκες. The conjunction of the two participles is certainly awkward, and the emendations are tempting; but I have not ventured to receive them into the text. Render "and since you keep flinging at me words full of the insolence of youth, you shall not get away with impunity after firing your shot."
687-8. Nauck (Eur. Stud. II. 69 ff.) says of this passage: "Der begründende Satz πατρὸς — πάρα ist höchst nüchterner und nicht einmal passend für den Zweck des Pheres, der zeigen will dass er für seinen Sohn genug gethan habe. Das Futurum λέψω scheint sich mit πολλῶν ἄρχεις nicht zu vertragen; wenn Admetus König ist, so hat er nicht auf den Tod des Vaters zu warten, um in den Besitz der πολύπλεθρων γνώμ. zu gelangen. Die Stelle würde somit gewinnen, wenn V. 688 fehlte, d. h. wenn man vorher schrieb πολλῶν μὲν ἄρχεις, πολυπλέθρους δ' ἔρχεις γνώμ. " This reasoning is most sophistical. I quite agree with Kvicala (Stud. zu Eur. p. 80), who points out that the words πατρὸς — πάρα were intended to stand in strong contrast with 683 οὖ γάρ πατρῶν τόνδ' ἐδέξαμην νόμον, and that the future λέψω shows that Pheres, while giving up the sovereignty, had reserved for life the use of the royal estates. And what could be more "nüchterner" than Nauck's proposed reading?

691. This line is quoted by Aristoph. Thesm. 194, and amusingly parodied in Nub. 1415. Cf also Hec. 1256 (a similar cadence).

697. λέγεις: "talk about," "tell of," probably a colloquial use; ψέγεις is an old conjecture which was revived by Cobet, and which Earle adopts; but no change is necessary. Cf. Xen. Cyropæd. I. 3, 10 λέγων δὲ ἐκαστός ὑμῶν τὴν ἐαυτῷ φώνην, and the like; also the Latin use of narrare, e.g. vigiliantiam tuam tu mihi narras? Terence Adelphoe 398. This use of λέγω may have been developed from the poetic use in the sense of "sing of," "celebrate."

700 f. ἐν τὴν παρούσαν... γυναῖξ: a most biting taunt. τοῖς μηθέλουσι, "any who are unwilling"; the μή, of course, gives the participle a conditional force.

704-5. Monk aptly compares Terence Andria 920 si mihi pergt quae volo dicerc, ea quae non volo audiet.

706-7. Note the parallelism with 673-4. τὰ: Wakefield for τὰ of the MSS. πλεῖω will then mean "more (than is fitting)" as often. The reading τὰ probably arose because some early copyist was thinking of the construction πλεῖω ἡ τὰ πρὸν κακά. κακορροθών: so Hippol. 340 εὐγγένειαν κακορροθεῖσ.

708. λέξαντος: so the MSS. With this reading the sense will be: "Speak on, assuming that I have spoken (ill of you). But if you don't like to hear the truth (about yourself), you ought not (on that account) to wrong me." Admetus means to imply that he did not abuse Pheres but merely told the truth about him, though the latter chooses to assume that the case is otherwise. There is no need of changing λέξαντος to λέξουσι with Reiske or to λέγουσι with Hermann. The latter based his emendation on the schol., which says: λέγε ὃν καὶ ἐκόμ κακῶς λέξαντος, δ' ὧν ὡκ ήθελησαν ὑπὲρ ἐμὸν ἀποθανεῖν (where for λέξαντος a has ἐλέγξαντος and B ἐλέγξουσι). Hermann thought that the schol. wrote καλὸς ἐλέγξαντος, ἴογενη περὶ στειχίων venae scripdrinæ scripdrut; but it is more probable that the true reading in the scholiast is κακῶς λέξαντος (Schwartz) or κακῶς σε λέξαντος (Dindorf). In the line from our text Dindorf, Nauck and Earle retain λέξαντος: Prinz and Weil follow Hermann, and Weeklein accepts Reiske's emendation.
713 ff. A difficult passage. It is clear from 714 that some kind of an imprecation immediately preceded. In the MSS. 714 immediately follows 713; hence the question at once arises: "Is 713 an imprecation?" Many edd. follow Schaefer in omitting ἀν and reading καὶ μὴν Δώς γε μείζονα ζῷης χρόνον, rendering "May you live longer than Zeus at least," or the like. To this there is the twofold objection that the MSS. have ἀν and that such an imprecation would surely have seemed impious to an Athenian audience. Such language is not at all consistent with the character of the pious Admetus. Others (so Hermann, Paley) retain ἀν and render, "You had better live longer than Zeus," ἀν ζῷης being used like χαῖροις ἀν and the like. But this converts the line into an ironical recommendation, not a curse. On the other hand, 719 is an unmistakable wish of some kind may befall Phærus. Hence Nauck is probably right in placing 714 immediately after it. 713 will then be a mere "potential optative-clause," "And yet you fain would live longer than Zeus himself." The schol. oddly observes: καὶ ξησεῖα μείζονα παρὰ (τόν) τοῦ Δώς χρόνον. ὁ γὰρ μὴν καὶ ἀν παρέλκει, which looks as though he wanted to take the line as a wish, but found μὴν and ἀν in his way. Another schol. is: ξησεῖα τοσοῦτον χρόνον δοσὺ ξεῖον ὁ Ζεύς, which (if ξησεῖα be not corrupt) looks as though some read an indicating phrase in place of ἀν ζῷης. On the form ζῷης (so L P rightly; ζῶος the other MSS.) see Nauck Eur. Stud. II. p. 70. That critic would put 714 and 715 after 719 and not transpose any of the other lines; but the arrangement in the text, which is that of Wecklein, seems better, though it involves more changes.

717. Van Heerwerden wished to insert γ' after σῆς. The particle seems to be needed, "Yes, a proof of your cowardice!"; this use of γε in answers is too familiar to need illustration. L and P have the variant σημεία γ' ω κάκιστε ταῦτα ἄψυχια, which is weaker, as the emphatic τίς σῆς is lost. Wecklein brackets 717–18 as an interpolation, on the ground that 717 and 721 are too much alike; but this seems hardly necessary. Admetus reiterates his charge in spite of the old man's denial.

719. φεῦ is followed by a wish in the same way I. A. 666.

722 ff. Note the triple rhyme φιλον, τὸ σῶν, νεκρόν. Was this intentional, to give a mocking, sneering effect to the lines? ἐν ἀνδράσιν: so 732, I. A. 945 ἐγὼ τὸ μηδέν, Μενέλαω δ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν. Orest. 1528 οὔτε γὰρ γυνὴ πέφυκας οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν σῶ γ' εἰ is, of course, different. Androm. 591 σῶ ποῦ μέταστιν ως ἐν ἀνδράσιν λόγον; illustrates the origin of the idiom.

725. θανῇ: here all the best MSS. show the form in η. Cf. 247.

726. κακῶς ἀκούειν: so male audire in Latin. μέλει: so L P, rightly, the other MSS. having μέλλει. These two verbs are often confused in MSS.—The line is one of those immoral sentiments which drew down on Euripides the censure of Aristophanes and other men of the old school. Of course Euripides himself should not be taxed with upholding the opinion here expressed.

731. τε: L P have δὲ, doubtless a copyist's error. σωτῆ: so L P a. B
has τοῦι σῶσι (with σῶσι cancelled by the first hand). The variant is interesting as showing how easily the article may creep into the text where it does not belong; see note on 318.

732. "Ακαστος: B has ἀκλαυστος, a curious instance of text-corruption.

733. For the construction, cf. Cycl. 691 eι μῆ' ε' ἑταῖρων φῶνον ἐτιμῷρησάμην and fr. 559.

734. ἔρρων: B a have ἔρρωις, L ἔρροι, P ἔρρο (with an erasure of one letter after the o). The schol. observes: ἔρρωις νῦν αὐτὸς: φθείρον. ἔτα εξ ἑτέρας ἀρχῆς καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ ἐξουκούσα σοι γηράσκετε ἀπαίδες, ὥς ἔστε ἅξιοι, καὶ ταύτα ἐμοὶ ζώντως. τινές δὲ ἔρρων γράφονσι σὺν τῷ ν, ἵνα ἣ μετοχὴ ἄντι ἄντις ὑματος τοῦ ἔρρε. Ἐρρον we may dismiss at once, as ἔρρωμαι is never used by classic writers. There remain ἔρρωις and ἔρρων. Of these ἔρρων is clearly the more idiomatic and elegant; ἔρρωις is too weak, as an imperative is needed rather than the milder optative, and the asyndeton ἔρρωις — γηράσκετε is also an objection. See Nauck Eutr. Stud. II. p. 71. νυν: so Lascaris; the MSS. have νῦν. It is, of course, the intensive νῦν which is required. χὴ ξυνοικήσασά σοι: Admetus uses this formal phrase to avoid calling her μήτηρ.

735. ἀπαίδε παιδῶς ὄντος: a fine oxymoron.

736. τῷδ' ἔτ': so Elmsley; τῶδε γ' B a, τῶδ' ἔτ' L P. Cf. 719, where Kirchhoff would read τοῦδ'ἔτ' for τοῦδε γ'.

737. νεισθ': the pres. of νέωμαι, like that of εἴμι, is generally used with a future sense. The word is poetic.

739. τοῦν ποσίν κ.τ.λ.: a common proverbial expression. Cf. Andr. 397, I. T. 1312, 938, and esp. Soph. Antig. 1327 βράχιστα γάρ κράτιστα τάν ποσίν κακά. Jebb ad loc. compares Pindar Pyth. 8, 32 τὸ δ' ἐν ποσί μοι τράχον. a has τούμποσιν, Β τούμπασι, which may well be relics of the original spelling. See Meisterhans p. 85.

740. ὡς ἄν: on final clauses with ὡς ἄν in Euripides, see Schanz Belträige II. pp. 100, 104, where Weber has collected the statistics. See also M. and T. 325 ff. and Gildersleeve in Am. Jour. Phil. IV. p. 422. — Pheres passes out at, or soon after, 730, and at the command of Admetus (739) the procession starts again and moves off from the scene to the left. The chorus joins the procession, and takes a solemn farewell of Alcestis, as Admetus had directed (609-10). At 746 it probably vanishes through the left-hand parodos. The anaepastic system 741-6 is, of course, sung during the march.

741. σχέτλα τόλμης: καρτερήκη τῆς τόλμης χάριν the schol., who therefore felt the gen. to be causal. The original meaning of σχέτλως (from εἶχω) seems to have been "clinging to a thing," hence "persistent," "steadfast," "stubborn." The genitive may be really, as Earle suggests, a "gen. of part taken hold of," like the gen. with ἐχεσθαί.

743-4. χθόνιος θ' ἄδης ἐρμῆς τε δέχηθ' B. But Hermes χθόνιος (= ψυχα-γωγός or ψυχοπαμπός) is properly mentioned first, as Alcestis would meet him first and be guided by him down into the realm of Hades. Hence the other
reading is preferable. \(\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon\)is: the appropriate word, "be the chosen attendant"; \(\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon\)s, the reading of \(L\) \(P\), is obviously less apposite, though \(\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omega\) is an Euripidean word (Orest. 403).

747. The servant comes out of the door of the \(\xi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\) (i.e. probably the side-door to the right of the main entrance to the palace). The semi-comic nature of the following scene has often been remarked upon. Heracles is here the gluttonous hero of comedy; cf. Aristoph. Pax 741. \(\alpha\pi\delta\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\omega\lambda\alpha\varsigma\ \chi\theta\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma:\) a very unusual expression, to which I have found no parallel elsewhere in the tragedians, "from every possible country." Aeschylus does not use \(\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\omega\omicron\omicron\): Sophocles has three cases, Euripides at least four.

749. \(\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu:\) so Dobree for \(\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\). The genitive would be a not impossible construction; but the prevailing usage favors the emendation, and the change is really very slight.

752. \(\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\phi\sigma\sigma\omicron\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma:\) "The proper meaning of the middle probably is, 'to have the position of the door changed with respect to oneself,' i.e. to have it behind, whereas it was just now in front" (Paley). \(\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\phi\sigma\sigma\omicron\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota\) may mean "to pass beyond a thing" either inwards or outwards, and so either to enter or to leave it, according to the connection. Cf. the Homeric \(\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\phi\sigma\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\rho\kappa\sigma\ \delta\delta\omicron\tau\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma\), and Hesiod Theog. 749 f.

753. \(\sigma\omicron\tau\iota:\) one is tempted to read \(\omega\nu\delta\epsilon\), "he did not even receive the proffered cheer with proper moderation"; but the change is not absolutely necessary.

755. \(B\) has \(\phi\epsilon\rho\omicron\epsilon\nu\) which is clearly a blunder. The speaker is himself one of the slaves in question.

756. \(\epsilon\nu\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\sigma\sigma\iota:\) so \(\alpha\) (\(\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\sigma\sigma\iota\) the other MSS.). Cobet and others long ago asserted that this epic form is out of place here in a trimeter and in a comic portion of the play. See ScL Conj. for some of the emendations that have been suggested. But the epic form, as Jebb points out in his note on Antig. 1297, was probably used intentionally, to give a mock-heroic tone to the passage. Cf. \(\epsilon\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\) in 793, \(\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\sigma\) 947 (also in trimeters). \(\kappa\lambda\omicron\sigma\omicron\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\nu:\) ivy wood was a favorite material for drinking-cups. Monk compares fr. 135, Cycl. 390, Hom. Od. IX. 346. Add Theoc. I. 26 ff., where there is an elaborate description of such a cup (\(\kappa\nu\sigma\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\omicron\)). See also Athenaeus XI. p. 476 f., 477 a, b.

757. \(\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\iota\varsigma\ \mu\eta\rho\omicron\sigma:\) i.e. \(\tau\iota\varsigma\ \Gamma\varsigma\iota\). \(\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\iota\varsigma\) is a common epithet of the Earth, perhaps not so much from her color as from her position among the dark, mysterious chthonian divinities. \(\epsilon\omicron\zeta\omicron\omega\rho\omicron\nu:\) "pure," "unmixed," Lat. \(\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\). Hesychius wrongly defines the word by \(\epsilon\omicron\kappa\iota\rho\alpha\omicron\sigma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\); but Photius has rightly \(\epsilon\omicron\zeta\omicron\omega\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\), \(\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\). Suidas has both definitions. The derivation from \(\epsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \zeta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) and use of the word are both in favor of the signification "unmixed." It is a rare term. \(\mu\epsilon\theta\nu:\) originally \(\text{honey-wine, as the cognate words show}, but used of wine in general from Homer down. See Brugmann, Vergl. Gram. II. p. 295. (Has the word any connection with Hebrew \(\text{meseq}\)? The resemblance of \(\omicron\nu\omicron\sigma\) and \(\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\) has often been noted.)
759. μυρσίνης: so Canter for μυρσίνος. See note on 172. On the use of the myrtle at symposia, see Guhl and Koner Leben d. Griech. u. Röm. p. 310. Myrtle chaplets were so much in demand at Athens that the flower-market was called αἱ μυρσίναι (see Aristoph. Thesm. 448).

760. ἀμοῦντες: "cognate" accus., like σεμνῶν in 773. — The words δισσά ... ὧδε are not in L P (in L a later hand has aced them in the margin). They are not essential to the sense, and may well be an interpolation. I have bracketed them as suspicious.

761. ἐν Ἀδμήτου: sc. ἄδωφ, as often.

764. τέγγοντες: best taken with ἐδείκνυμεν, "we did not let the guest see that we were shedding tears. Others take ὄμφα as direct object of ἐδείκνυμεν and also to be understood with τέγγοντες, "we did not show our faces (eyes) to the guest while we were weeping."

768. οὐδ' ἔξετεινα χεῖρ': on gestures of mourning see Sittl Gebärden d. Griech. u. Röm. pp. 65 ff., where this passage should have been cited. The schol. compares Aesch. Choeph. 8 οὐδ' ἔξετεινα χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἐκφορᾶ νεκροῦ. Monk cites Eur. Suppl. 772 ἄλλ' ἐιμ' ἐπαρὼ χεῖρ ἀπαντήσας νεκροῖς.

769 ff. A pleasing and characteristic touch. Such a state of things must have existed in many Greek households.

771. ὀργάς. Euripides is fond of the plural of ὀργή, using it nearly twenty times. Compare in English "whenever he falls into one of his rages."

773. οὔτος: used here in unceremonious address, as often. So Hec. 1127, 1280, Hēl. 1627, Or. 1567, etc. πεφροντικός: this use of the perf. participle with verbs of looking is very rare in Attic, though not uncommon in late writers. See Jacobs' ed. of Philostratus p. 590 and Lobeck's Phrynichus p. 119 for examples. There seems to be no other case of the construction in Euripides.

775. εὐπροσηγόρω: a favorite Euripidean word; cf. Hippol. 95, Herc. F. 1284, Suppl. 869, fr. 1132, 45. It means properly "easy of address"; cf. Latin adfusibilis, our "affable."

776. άνδρ' ἐταϊρον: so ἐταῖρος ἀνήρ in Il. XVII. 466, Od. VIII. 584. The presence of an apparently pleonastic ἀνήρ in such cases is probably due to the fact that the other substantive was once an adjective. So ἐταῖρος (for ἐτάριος) probably originally meant "following"; see Bezzenberger's Beiträge IV. p. 327. Traces of the adj. use of ἐταῖρος may still be seen in classic Greek, e.g. Plat. Gorg. 487 D τοῖς σαντοῦ ἐταῖροτάτοις.

777. συνοφρυωμένω: Nauck would read συνοφρυωμένος, which would be more idiomatic; but the change is unnecessary. If authors always used the most idiomatic constructions, their works would be "like plum-puddings made only of plums," as some one has well put it.

778. θυραίου ... ἐξων: these words recur in 1012, which is probably an interpolation from this line, or is due to a mistake of the same kind as gave us 312 (1012 — 778 = 234 = 6 pages of 30 lines each — a singular coincidence if accidental. See note on 312).
779. καὶ σοφότερος: a sly hit. Heracles, though somewhat exhilarated, is not by any means drunk; and his speech is consistent enough from one point of view.

780. οἶδας: Nauck (Eur. Stud. II. p. 71) argues at great length that we should read οἴσθας: but in this passage, Athenaeus IV. 175 d. (a fragment of Philemon, 44 Koek), and Xen. Mem. IV. 6, 6 the MSS. all have οἶδας. See also Rutherford New Phryn. pp. 227-8, who cites the testimony of the grammarians. He observes: "Nauck is rash in the extreme to alter οἶδας to οἴσθας in Aic. 780. . . . There is, in fine, not one assured instance of the form οἴσθας in Attic of any period."

781. οἴμαι μέν οὖ: note the colloquial tone. Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 107 B and C) has ὅςκόω for οἴμαι, doubtless quoting from memory. — 'This scene where Heracles expounds his easy philosophy is delicious. Wecklein calls attention to the rhymes 782-5, which heighten the humorous effect.


783. A favorite Euripidean cadence; cf. 848. Plutarch has ἦστιν αὐτῶν, probably through confusion with some other line which was also in his mind.

784. τὴν (ἡμέραν) αὐφρον μέλλουσαν έναι: cf. Soph. Trach. 945 οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ γῆ αὐφρον, Alexis fr. 241 K. Through this ellipsis of ἡμέραν, αὐφρον was fairly on the way to become a true feminine substantive. In the line in our text it would be easy (though, I think, needless) to read τὴν ἡμέραν μέλλουσαν and take αὐφρον as a gloss which has displaced the true reading.

785. τὸ τῆς τύχης: an intentionally vague expression. Elmsley proposed τά for τό: the plural is more common, but that is not a decisive reason for the change. προβητήσται: cf. Med. 907 καὶ μή προβητήσῃ μετέχῃν ἡ τὸ νῦν κακῶν, Orest. 511 πέρας δὴ ποικιλῶν προβητήσται; and esp. Med. 1117 καραδοκῶ τάκτηκεν οἱ προβητήσται. Hippol. 342 ποί προβητήσται λάγος; ib. 936 φεῖ τὴς βροτείας: ποί προβητήσται; φρένος may also be compared. The sense must be: "for it is uncertain how far fortune will proceed," i.e. what will be its outcome. Wecklein would read 'προβητήσται: but the emendation, though undeniably elegant, is not, I think, necessary.


788. ταύτα: as Hermann pointed out, Markland's conjecture πάντα is quite needless; ταύτα = "these of yours."

789. πη: πεί MSS. πῦλασ: the MSS. have τῦχας, except that in α the first hand has written in the margin γρ. πῦλας. The schol. says: γράφεσαι πῦλας ἐν γῇ νερβᾶς τὰς πῦλας: εἰ δὲ τῦχας, καταφρονήσας. I should be inclined to read
τόχας were it not for the fact that the words τάσο'... πυκασθείς are almost certainly an interpolation from 829 and 832. The interpolator wrote πυλας, as in 829. Then some one, wishing to avoid a repetition and obtain a more appropriate meaning, emended πυλας to τόχας. The change then reacted in turn on 829, where α has τόχας πυλας by the first hand. The expression ἱππερ-βαλὼν τόχας can hardly be paralleled, and I believe that Wecklein is right in bracketing τάσο'... πυκασθείς.

796. ὀθούνεικα: == ὦς or ὅτι, as not infrequently in the tragedians.

797. φρενῶν: so L P; the other MSS. have κακοῦ. Of the two readings φρενῶν is clearly the better; but neither is satisfactory, though Jerram compares Hippol. 983 ξύστασις φρενῶν. The view of Kirchhoff, that there was a lacuna in the archetype at the end of 795, which was filled out in different ways by grammarians or copyists, is extremely probable. The true reading cannot be restored with certainty; Nauck's τρόπον is very plausible, though I have not ventured to receive it into the text.

798. A bold nautical metaphor; μεθορμίζειν, "to shift (a vessel) from one anchorage to another," is repeatedly used by Eur. in this figurative way (Bacch. 931 εί τὸς μεθώρμιον [τὸν πλάκαμον], cf. Med. 258, 443). Πίτυλος: the clash of wine poured into the cup; but when used in connection with μεθορμίζει the nautical meaning of the term would instantly occur to an Athenian hearer. Hence I must agree with Earle in regarding σκύφον as an ἄπροσδόκητον added at the last moment by way of joke, though Mr. England (Class. Rev. IX. p. 52) seems to hold a different opinion. Euripides uses πίτυλος of the plashing of oars (I. T. 1050, 1346, cf. Troudl. 1123), of the sound of falling tears (Hippol. 1464), of the noise of beating with the hands (Tro. 1236), of the crash of spears striking in the onset (Heract. 834), of the sudden and violent impulses of madness (I. T. 307, Her. F. 1180) or panic (Her. F. 816). Difficult is Troudl. 817, where ὅνων πιτυλῶν is generally taken as meaning "two encounters" or the like; cf. Heract. 834.

799. Some English poet has the line "For mortal thoughts beseeem a mortal mind"; but I have been unable to find the source of the quotation.

800. Earle calls attention to the signification of this line. Note also the repetition of συνώφρωνενοις (cf. 777). The effect is to give the words a highly contemptuous tone.

801. ὦς... κριτῇ: quoted by the schol. on Soph. Aj. 395 to explain the use of ὦς εὑρι in that passage.

802. This line has tēo substituted dactyls, showing how far Euripides deviated from the metrical usage of Sophocles and Aeschylus. "Quid quod Alcestis, quae inter fabulas est summa metri severitate compositas, versum continet, qualis 802... quo loco ne id quidem excusationi est quod vocabula, quae initiun efficient versus, arcte inter se cohaerent? Sed ne cui suspicione incidat, opus esse corrige illum versus, tenendum est, Herenici illa pronuntiare verba paullo liberiores utentem metro" (Mueller De ped. sol. p. 98). That the
line is not corrupt is sufficiently shown by the other cases of resolution cited by Mueller l. s. c. See also Rümptel Die Auflösungen im Trimmer d. Euripides Philol. XXIV. pp. 407–21.

803. ἐπιστάμεσθα: so L a, rightly, as the metre shows. The other MSS. have ἐπιστάμεθα.

807 ff. The στιχομωθία which follows has given a great deal of trouble. As far as 809 everything seems to be clear; but with 810 the difficulty begins. Prinz regards 810–11 as spurious, without assigning any adequate ground for doing so. They are probably genuine; but it cannot be denied that when they follow 809 (as in the MSS.) they occasion difficulty. As Nauck points out (Eur. Stud. II. p. 75), Euripides would never have been so careless as to let 811 immediately precede 812, leaving it to the reader to divine that ὀκείως ἦν refers to the dead person and οὐκ ἐφραξε to Admetus. By removing 810 and 811 a perfect connection is restored at 809–12. But what is to be done with 810–11? Nauck would insert them immediately after 813. But 813 and 814 give an excellent connection as they stand. It is the ominous phrase δεσποτῶν κακα that makes Heracles observe ἤδε οὐ θυραίων πιμάτων ἄρηκε λόγος (Cf. IIcr. F. 537–8.) On the other hand, where can the indignant question 810 come in so fittingly as after the broad hint in 817 that the guest's presence is undesirable? I am therefore strongly in favor of the arrangement in the text, which is due to Wecklein—all the more because I had come to the same conclusion quite independently after long and careful study of the passage.

812. ἐφραξε: for the use of the imperf. (almost = οὐκ ἐβολετο φράξει), see Goodwin M. and T. 38.

813. χαίρων ὠμ': a polite intimation that the conversation is to be dropped.

815. τι ... ο' ὀρόν: se ... ἄρων L P, a much inferior reading, as it loses the force of the expressive τι. — The implication is, "(Yes), for had they been θυραία, I should not have been displeased," etc.

816. ἀλλ' ἂν πέπονθα δείν': a stereotyped phrase expressing surprise and vexation at an unpleasant discovery. So I. A. 847 (cited by Earle); cf. Bacch. 612, Or. 1616. δείνα πᾶσχειν seems to have been almost a slang expression; cf. Aristoph. Ran. 252, Eccl. 650, etc. Euripides is excessively fond of the adj. δείνος.

817. ἐν δεόντι: cf. Hippol. 923, Med. 1277, Or. 212.

810. οὔνεκ': οὔνεκα is the only form found in Sophocles, and is the preponderating form in Aesch. and Eur. (see Kühner-Blass II. p. 251, 10). Moreover it (I am speaking of the preposition) is attested by at least one Attic inscription (C. I. A. IV. b, 491, 8) of the fifth century. (C. I. A. IV. b, 422 No. 4 is doubtful, as there Kirchhoff believes the word to be a conjunction and the lacuna makes it impossible to decide the question. See Meisterhans p. 177, 25 and note.) Hence those who would change it to εἶνεκα (as Prinz does in this instance) are probably in the wrong. εὖ πᾶσχειν: "be hospitably treated." Nauck would read εὖ πράσσειν: but his objection, that πᾶσχειν cannot refer
to “das innere Behagen,” amounts to nothing; for it is not “das innere Behagen” that Euripides means.

811. This line is a most conspicuous example of the power of the Greek particles, a power which so often may be felt but cannot be expressed in translation. οἰκεῖος: ὅπραῖος (so α) is in my opinion a mere guess, though Lascaris, Matthiae, Hermann, Woolsey, Verrall and others prefer it. The sarcasm would undeniably be more forcible with that reading; but the authority of α cannot stand for an instant against B L P. The schol. says οὐκ ᾐν ἐνη, ἀλλὰ πάνω οἰκεία, which may look either way. — The place which in the text is occupied by 810-11 is filled in the MSS. by the two bracketed lines which follow (818-19). These are open to two objections: they break the στιχομαθία, and the schol. has on 820 the note: ταῦτα δὲ τὰ τριλαξαμβεία ἐν τισιν ὅπρ ἐγκεκταί. Hence Kirchhoff rejects 818-20 as an interpolation; while Nauck would reject 816-19, reading τέσσαρα instead of τριά in the scholium. The whole trouble is, I think, due to 818-19. Wilamowitz and Klotz defend them; but surely it is not accident that almost at the very place where the στιχομαθία is interrupted the schol. remarks that three lines are not found in some copies. Either the lines are an interpolation, or they were arbitrarily rejected by some ancient scholars. I firmly believe them to be spurious. 820, on the other hand, makes a good connection with 811, and should probably be retained. I conceive the history of the passage to have been about as follows: 810-11 originally stood after 817. By a copyist’s blunder they were torn from their proper context and inserted after 809. Then, observing the lacuna thus left, some one composed 818-19 and inserted them in the gap; and, being either careless or ignorant, he interrupted the στιχομαθία. In composing the two lines he probably had in mind 215-17, 427 or 923, or all of them. The τρια of the schol. is then a mistake for δῶ. Hannemüller’s proposal to reject 817-20 and read πέντε ἡμέρα δεινά τις in 816 is ingenious but futile, as the corrective μὲν ὅν in 821 is fatal to it.

820. The text is that of L P; a has τι φροῦδον ἦ, B τι φροῦδον γένος ἦ (γένος deleted by the first hand). The reading of L P, with its constructio ad sensum, is bolder and more characteristic; and τι φροῦδον is probably due to some grammarian who wished to bring the gender of τις in accord with that of τέκνων. The γένος of B (whence Earle conjectures μῶν ἦ γένος τι φροῦδον) is, if I mistake not, the remnant of a grammatical gloss on the gender (γένος) of φροῦδος (or φροῦδον). The schol. says: ἂρα, φησίν, ἄφανής ἐγενετὸς τις τῶν παιδῶν ἦ ὃ γέρων πατὴρ ἀπέβαλεν. (Note that he says γέρων πατήρ, not πατήρ γέρων with Wecklein; though he may have transposed.)

826. ἂνθομὴν ἰδὼν: “I noticed that I saw.” So England; this is, I think, better than to take ἂνθομὴν and ἰδὼν separately, with Earle.

* Woolsey’s objection to οἰκεῖος, that “it supersedes all further inquiry,” is obviated by Wecklein’s arrangement of the lines, as Heracles at once infers (820) from the servant’s words that Admetus has lost a near relative.
827. πρόσωπον: probably corrupt (Prinz). Those who retain it explain it as referring to the expression of the face, like Latin vultus (so Earle, who compares Ion 925, and others). But surely the order—eyes, hair, expression—is very odd; though cf. Med. 1071 f. (χειρ, κάρα, σχήμα, πρόσωπον). In place of πρόσωπον we should expect either (1) an adjective qualifying κομμάζω, e.g. Herwerden’s δυσπρόσωπον, which Weeklein accepts, or (2) a noun denoting dress or general appearance, e.g. Stadtmüller and Melker’s περιλώματι. None of the conjectures that have been made seems really satisfactory (see Sel. Conj.), πρόσωφιν (cf. Or. 388) among the rest.

828. κήδος: euphemistic for νεκρόν.

829. βία δὲ θυμοῦ: “against my inclination,” like βία φρενῶν. τάσθ... πόλας: here these words appear in their proper connection. See note on 795.

831. κάτα κομμάζω: so α (except for the i subscript); B has κατακομμάζω, L κατ’ εκμαζον, Π καπεκομμαζον. “The preceding imperfects seem to have caused the alteration of κομμάζω—which is properly used as denoting an action not fully ended—into εκμαζον, and the other reading(s) then easily arose” (Woolsey). The source of L P probably had κατ’ εκμαζον: the reading of P is due to the common mistake of π for τ.

832. πυκασθείς: note the contemptuous force, “loaded with garlands.” See note on 796. σοῦ τὸ φράσαι: there is much doubt about the construction of these words. At least three possibilities arise: (1) ἄλλα may be corrupt for some verb of blaming or wondering; (2) σοῦ may be “exclamatory genitive” and τὸ μὴ φράσαι the articular inf. used in exclamations (M. and T. 805), as is held by Monk, Paley, Weil, Weeklein, Earle and others, probably with reason (cf. Med. 1051 f.); (3) ἤν may be understood, “it was your fault not to tell,” as the school, and Woolsey explain it. F. W. Schmidt’s τὸ δὲ ἤν for τὸ μὴ and Matthiae’s μωί for μῆ are ingenious but not convincing.

833. προσκειμένου: Scaliger’s certain emendation for προκειμένου. See 551 and note.

834. ποὺ νῖν: ποῖ νῖν Monk; but εὐρήσω, not μολῶν, predominates in the writer’s mind.* In Hippol. 1153 ποῖ (ποῖ Λ, πὸ Christus patiens 1863) γῆς ἄνακτα τῇ ὑσεὶ ὑμῖν | εὐρίαν· ἐν and Soph. Aj. 403 ποῖ μολῶν μενῶ the participle, on the other hand, stands nearer to the adverb than the verb does, and so predominates. The order is significant.

835. Δάρισαν: δάρισαν the MSS.; but the grammarians and inscriptions show conclusively that the form with one σ is the correct one. See Nauck Eur. Stud. II. pp. 77 ff.; Meisterhans p. 75, 12. ἕστον: i.e. made of polished stone. Cf. Hel. 986 τὸ δ’ ἐπὶ ἕστῳ τάφῳ. Such monuments must have been familiar to every spectator, common as they were in Athens. Nauck’s χωστὸν for ἕστον is quite unnecessary. As Earle well observes, “the objection that any proper monument could hardly be set up at such short notice is of little moment; for the poet intended his audience to think of the lovely sculptures

* See on the other side Weeklein Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides p. 540.
of the Ceramicus, situate ἐπὶ τοῦ καλλιστῆν προσάτειον τῆς πόλεως (Thuc. II. 34, 5)." Besides, when a monarch commands, work is done quickly. ἐκ προσάτειον: the metre requires the form without ε in this place, Pindar fr. 129, 2, Soph. El. 1431 (cf. Soph. fr. 647 γῆς προσάτειος) and Polemo Anth. Pal. XI. 38 (see Nauck Eur. Stud. II. p. 77). Nauck regards προσάτειον as the correct form of the word, and προσάτειον as an erroneous form which was perhaps introduced under the influence of ἄστειος. There seems to be no passage where the metre requires the form with ε; but Suidas (s. v.) and Choeroboscus (Cramer’s Anecd. II. p. 250) speak of προσάτειον as the regular form, and Suidas mentions the Sophoclean usage as exceptional. This may mean merely that the grammarians in introducing the form προσάτειον found that the passages from Sophocles would not fall into line, and so one of them wrote the note in question. The change from ε to ϵ is much less natural than that from ε to ϵ, but the analogy of ἄστειος may be sufficient to account for it.
The question must for the present remain sub judice. See Lobeck Paralip. p. 253, where the grammarians are cited. The metrical inscriptions give no help in this case. The force of the phrase ἐκ προσάτειον is also in doubt. What relation does ἐκ here express? (A) Some connect ἐκ προσάτειον with κατάψει, "You will see the tomb from the suburb." (B) Others still take ἐκ = ἐξω or ἐκτός (so the schol. and Jerram). Others (C) take it in the sense of "next to," "adjoining" (so Bauer-Wecklein). Others again (D) suppose an ellipsis of ἢν εἰς τὸν ἄγραν or the like (so Paley). The true explanation is, if I mistake not, that of England (E), who says: "Is it not better to take it as ἐν προσάτιῳ, as it were 'looking at you from the suburb'"? As so often, the Greek prefers the point of view of motion to that of rest. The speaker thinks of the image as coming (as it were) from the suburb to meet the eye of Heracles.
See for an excellent statement of this and allied uses of ἐκ Matthiae Greek Gr. (Eng. trans, 6) § 500. Euripides even uses the ἐκ construction with verbs of standing and sitting; see Jebb’s elaborate note on Antig. 411, and cf. Donkin in the Classical Rev. IX. p. 350. The tomb would naturally be in the suburb, like those in the Ceramicus, which the poet doubtless had in mind. As far as sense and metre go, Euripides might have written here ἐν προσάτιῳ, though it is not probable that he did so.

837. Exit Servant. καὶ χείρ: a has ψυχή τ’, an inferior reading probably due to the influence of Or. 460 ὡ τάλαινα καρδία ψυχῆ τ’ ἐμῆ.

839. Ἡλεκτρύνων ἐγείνατ: ἡλεκτρύνων C (which, however, is of slight authority), ἐγείνατ’ Blomfield. a has ἡλεκτρύνων, the other MSS. ἡλεκτρύνων: all have γείνατ’. The epic form γείνατ’ can scarcely be right, as in trimeters the omission of the augment occurs very rarely, and then only in the beginning of the verse. Hence it seems necessary to read ἐγείνατ’, and this in turn necessitates reading Ἡλεκτρύνων. The usual form of the gen. is that in ω (cf. Herc. F. 17 Ἡλεκτρύνωνα); but in Apollod. Bibl. 2, 4, 5, 6 the MSS. have the form with ω. See also Nauck Eur. Stud. II. p. 78, Kühner-Blass I. p. 476 (with
the "Nachträge" ad loc.). Wilamowitz has proposed the very ingenious and elegant conjecture "Πλεκτρώνη ἑλναί", which may be the true reading; but the probabilities seem to me to favor "Πλεκτρώνοις.

841. κας τον ἱδρύσαι δόμον: eis because of the motion implied in ἱδρύσαι, "(bring and) set down." Cf. Ion 1573, Hel. 46.


843. μελάμπτερον: the MSS. have μελάμπτερον, but, as Musgrave long ago pointed out, the schol. seems to have μελάμπτερον, for he says: εἰδωλοποιεῖται μελάναια πτέρυγας ἐξων ὁ Θάνατος. Μελάμπτερον is appropriate enough; but μελάμπτερον is the finer and more poetic term. Cf. Ic. 71, 705, Ior. Sat. 11. 1, 58. Besides, as μελάμπτερον occurs in this play (according to one reading) in 427 and in the interpolated line 819, it might easily have displaced the other word.

845. About this line much critical controversy has raged. The older edd. retained the MSS. reading πῖνοντα, and took προσφαγμάτων as "partitive genitive" with it. Then arose the question why Heracles expects to find Thanatos drinking of the blood-offerings. To this various answers have been given. Koechly (Litt.-hist. Taschenb. von Prutz 1847 p. 381) suggested that the poet merely intended to produce a comic effect, adding that the guess of Heracles is "eine köstliche Vermuthung für einen Trinker von Profession"! Much more plausible is the view of J. Lessing (De Mortis apud veteres figura p. 25 note 5) that the poet had in mind the passage of the Homeric Nέσαια (Od. XI. 23 ff.) where the shades taste the blood of the victum. The habit thus attributed to the shades might well be extended to the ἄναξ νεκρῶν, Thanatos (cf. Rolde Psyche p. 540 note 1). F. W. Schmidt (Sat. Crit. p. 29; cf. his Krit. Stud. II. p. 24) objects that πῖνοντα would assume that the burning of the body was already in progress. But Heracles has just learned that Alcestis is dead; he has not seen Aedectus for some time, and knows that the funeral-rites are going on (θάπτει 834). Why then should he not suppose that "der Akt der Leichenverbrennung schon im Gange war"? Besides, even if the objection were just, a poet does not always speak by the eard. Schmidt conjectures πείνώντα, "hungry for," the offerings, which is accepted by Prinz and Bauer-Wecklein. Nauck, Weil and Earle retain πῖνοντα: Dindorf conjectured ἵππωντα, Hartung πῖνοντα 1). The schol. read πῖνοντα, which I believe to be sound. προσφαγμάτων: for the part. gen. after πῖνω Weil compares Od. XXII. 11 δόρα πῖνον οἶνον. So also Od. XV. 375, XI. 96 (in the very passage which, according to Lessing, Euripides had in mind). The force of προ in προσφαγμα is much disputed. Some think it refers to the offering of the blood-sacrifice in front of the tomb, others that a προσφαγμα was so called because offered in behalf of some one, others still that the sacrifice was given this name because it preceded the offerings of milk, honey and wine which were made to the dead. I have little doubt that the term originally denoted a preliminary sacrifice of some kind and then was gradually made to include other kinds of blood-offerings.
846. λοχαίας: this reading was recovered from the schol. (γράφεται λο-
χαίας) and the cod. Flor. of the Etymol. Mag., where the line is cited thus
(with wrong division of words): κάντερ λοχαίας σαυρῶν ἐξιδράς. The MSS. have
λοχῆςας. Cf. fr. 727 b, where σῖτον λοχαίαν is used of grain in which one can
lie in wait (ἐν ἡ ἡ περί λοχῆςας, Etym. Mag. l. s. c.).

847. περιβάλω: so Monk; περιβαλὼν of L P is due to some one who took
both this verb and μάρψι to be fut. indic. The other MSS. have περιβαλὼν,
which is clearly wrong, as the preceding δέ shows. Nauck would read τε for
δέ: but in such cases δέ has a slight climactic rather than adversative force,
almost = “and what is more,” though weaker. ἡμαῖν: Nauck suspects this
word to be corrupt. a has ἧμα by the first hand, which the second has cor-
rected to ἡμάν and the third to ἡμαῖν. There is probably not sufficient ground
for emendation.


851. αἱματηρόν πέλαιον: here not of a sacrificial cake, but of the clotted
blood of the offering. Cf. I. T. 300, Rhes. 430, Or. 220, etc. τῶν κάτω:
explained by Κόρης and ἄρακτος, which are in “partitive apposition” with
it; τῆν κάτω (sc. ὀδόν), the reading of the Aldine, is a neat but needless
emendation.

852. B has ἄνηλον: but ἄνηλος, the reading of the other MSS., is shown
by the position and sense to be right. Cf. Herc. F. 607.

854. Wecklein compares ll. I. 441 πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐν χερσὶ τίθει.

856. πεπληγμένος: πεπλεγμένος has been conjectured, but lacks MS. author-
ity. Cf. 405 and Herc. F. 1393.

857. F. W. Schmidt thinks this line is spurious, and calls attention to the
repetition of γενναίος three lines below. But Greek writers were less sensitive
to blemishes of this sort than we are.

859. ἐλᾶδ B, obviously a mere “copyist’s blunder.” The Attic inscrip-
tions show that during the classical period the gemination of consonants was
pretty carefully observed.

860 f. Exit Heracles, to the left. Admetus and the choruses return by the
same way by which they left the scene at 740 ff. Admetus sings a short
anapaestic lament, followed by a responsive song between him and the chorus.
The whole scene from 861-934 is a κομμός: see Aristotle Poet. 12, 3.

862. χήρων μελαθρών: cf. in English “her widowed couch.” αἰαί: as to
the number and form of the interjections there is much difference in the MSS.
Thus in 860 l has added a second ἡς, and so Hermann and Earle read. In 862
B has μοι only once; at the end of the line, too, there is disagreement (see
Critical Apparatus). The reading in the text is that of Prinz and Nauck;
Wecklein omits αἰαί altogether, Hermann and Earle double it. The arrange-
ment of the anapaests, too, differs in different editions; the text follows Prinz.

863. ποῖ: restored by Porson (see his note on Hec. 1062). l has πῇ, the
other MSS. ποῆ. The adverb of rest, not that of motion, is required; and πῇ
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would be quite out of place in a lyrical passage and surrounded by Doric forms (cf. ὀλοίμαν just below).

864. The same question occurs in Med. 97, Suppl. 796, Rhes. 751. On the construction (originally a deliberative question, implying a wish, "how can I" = "would that I could") see M. and T. 728.

865. ἐτεκεν: this, the reading of L P, is confirmed by the metre.

866. κεῖνων ἔραμαι: to restore the symmetry of the clauses F. W. Schmidt would read νεκών ἄγαμαι. There seems, however, not to be sufficient reason for any change. The repetition κεῖνων...κεῖν expresses very forcibly the speaker's yearning, and κεῖνων (euphemistic) is no more vague or weak than κάκει in 744. Cf. Aristoph. Υεσπ. 751 κεῖνων ἔραμαι, κεῖν ἑνοῦμαι, which looks like a parody, or at least a reminiscence, of this passage.

868. αἰγάς: see note on 667.

869. πόδα πεζεύων: a striking example of the "cognate" accusative. I have not been able to find another instance of πόδα πεζεύων.

870-71. A difficult passage. The schol. gives two explanations: τοιοῦτον ἐνέχειρον ὑπὲρ ἔμοι, ἵνα κἀγὼ ἀποθάνω. λυποῦμενος γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτῆν ἀπόλλυμαι, and δύναν: ἐνέχειρον. τοῦ δὲ χίου φρισάν δύναν αὐτῷ γεγονέναι τὴν Ἀλκηστίν. ἀντὶ γὰρ αὐτῶ δεδοται τῷ "Αἰδή. The former is, I think, the correct one, as ἀποσυλήσας shows. Admetus regards Alcestis as his pledge or security for living. But Thanatos has robbed him of this security and has delivered it to Hades; so that Admetus has now no guarantee that his life will continue to be spared. This is, of course, illogical, as it is the death of Alcestis which is the real security. Admetus, like most weak characters, would fain "have his cake and eat it too." If the other explanation were correct, ἀποσυλήσας would be out of place, for Thanatos would only be doing his duty in taking away Alcestis and handing her over to Hades. ἀποσυλήσας implies violence or fraud, and hence could not be used of a mere legal transfer. The figure is that of stealing hostages from an enemy.

872. κεῦθος: except in fr. 781, 63 this word seems not to occur elsewhere in Euripides. Sophocles has it once (Antig. 818), Aeschylus twice (Eum. 1013, Suppl. 744).

873. Hermann read here πεποθῶσ, in agreement with the subject of ἐβάλι, while Musgrave read πέποθάσ γ’. These changes they found necessary because they read in 890 πέρας δ’ οὐδὲν with L P. But if we accept there πέρας δέ γ’ (so ά, and B; except for the division of δὲ γ’), there is no need of changing πεποθῶσ. (ἀλγέων in 890 is to be scanned with synizesis.)

874. δ’ ὀδύνας ἐβάσ: cf. El. 1210, Phoen. 1561, cited by Monk. So in English "to pass through suffering," with a similar underlying material conception.

877. This line is certainly corrupt, as we have only -νσον to correspond to -τινος of 894. The difficulty lies, in all probability, in ἄντα (so the MSS.). Hartung conjectured στ ἄντα, which is probably right. See Sel. Conj. for
other emendations. Cf. Or. 1478 ἔναντα δ’ ἥλθεν, Soph. Antig. 1299 τὸν δ’ ἓναντα προσβλέπω νεκρὸν.

878. ἥλκωσεν: a very strong word. Cf. Suppl. 223 (which, however, is not quite a parallel case). B has here ἴμοι φρέν’ ἥλκωσε, with wrong division of words and loss of a syllable and a ν. The value of that MS. is greatly diminished by the extreme carelessness with which it was written.

879-80. The construction of ἀμαρτεὶν and ἀλόχον has been much disputed. At least seven views have been advanced: (1) we may punctuate ἐμκησας ὁ μοι φρένας ἥλκωσεν (τὶ γάρ ἀνδρὶ κακὸν μεῖζον), ἀμαρτεὶν πιστῆς ἀλόχον (so Schaefer); (2) we may suppose an ellipsis of ᾧ; (3) we may take ἀμαρτεὶν as τὸν ἀμαρτεὶν (so Wuestemann and Earle); (4) we may suppose an ellipsis of τοῦτον, with which ἀμαρτεὶν is in "explanatory apposition" (so Wecklein); (5) we may assume an inversion of the clause for ἀμαρτεὶν πιστῆς ἀλόχον—τὶ μεῖζον κακὸν; (so Hermann and Paley); (6) we may render "quid enim tristius est ad amitendum quam fida uxor"? taking ἀλόχον as gen. after μεῖζον (so Hermann formerly); (7) we may take τὶ directly with ἀμαρτεὶν, "What loss is greater than (the loss of) a faithful wife"? (so Bauer). Explanation (1) is flat in the extreme; (2) and (3) are, I believe, impossible. I have not been able to find any instance of a simple infinitive after a comparative without ᾧ or τοῦ. Verse 11 ὅν θανεῖν ἐφροσάμην, is different, as there is no comparative and θανεῖν is not for τὸν θανεῖν (see M. and T. 807). (4) and (5) are harsh, and the same may be said of (7). I believe that (6), which Hermann proposed and then retracted, is substantially correct. Render: "What is worse (lit. 'a greater evil') for a man to lose (ἀμαρτεὶν epexegetical inf., 'as to losing it') than a trusty wife?" Cf. in English "A good wife is a bad thing to lose." The only alternative that I can see is to boldly emend τὶ γάρ to τίνος and render "What is there the less of which (lit. 'losing what') is a greater evil than (to lose) a faithful wife?" πιστῆς ἀλόχον being for τοῦ πιστῆς ἀλόχον ἀμαρτεὶν (comparatio compendiaria). But probably the change is needless. πιστῆς: so L P a, and Stobaeus Flor. 69, 12. This is clearly better than φιλίας of B, which comes from 876 φιλίας ἀλόχου. μὴ ποτὲ... ὠφελον: the view that in this construction "μὴ originally belonged to the inf. and afterward came to negative the whole expression" (M. and T. 736) seems improbable. The position of μὴ is against it, and besides does a case like ὠφελε μὴ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, "he ought not to be doing this," ever occur in classic Greek? Cf. II. XVIII. 367. Of course, cases like εἰδ’ ὠφελε μὴ γενέσθαι (where μὴ and γενέσθαι form one idea) do occur (e.g. Med. 1). The other alternative, that μὴ was prefixed after the original meaning of ὠφελον was obscured and it came to be looked upon as a real wish-construction, has the analogy of εἴδε and εἰ γάρ with ὠφελον in its favor, and is probably the correct view.

883. μᾶ γάρ ψυχῆ: this order of the words (so B a L) is certainly right; ψυχῆ γάρ μᾶ (sic), the reading of P, does not suit the metre, and ψυχῆ δὲ μᾶ (sic), that of l, is wrong, as the explanatory γάρ is needed, and besides has
too slight MSS. authority. τῆς ὑπὲρ ἄλγειν: "The use of the verb ὑπεραλγέω with a genitive, 'to grieve for or because of a thing,' is attested by the Greek lexicons from Stephanus down. Only four passages, however, are cited as examples of this usage until we come down to late writers. These are: Alcestis 883, Hippol. 260 τῆς ὑπεραλγοῦ, Antig. 630 ἀπάτης λεχέων ὑπεραλγόν, Aristoph. Aves 466 ὑψῶς ὑμῶν ὑπεραλγόν. It is clear at a glance that in all these cases the verb follows the genitive, so that it is perfectly possible to read ὑπὲρ with anastrophe. Hence they by no means prove that the compound verb ὑπεραλγεῖν was used by classical writers with a genitive in this sense. While I will not venture to assert that it was never so used by them, I have not been able to find a certain instance" (Ed. in Harvard Studies VII. p. 221). There is certainly none in Homer, Hesiod, Pindar or the tragedians and comedians. 885-6. Blomfield compared II. X. 63 καὶ θαλάμους κεραίζομένους. θανάτοις: Seidler long ago pointed out that Euripides often uses the plural of θάνατος when speaking of a violent or premature death. 887-8. ἄτεκνοις ἄγαμοις τ': it is hard to decide between the dative, which is the reading of L P, and the accus., which is that of the other family. The accus. is grammatically the difficilior lectio, and as it is supported by the schol., I should be inclined to accept it were it not for the fact that we have ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος τε in 882, which might so easily have affected the reading in 887-8. Most edd. accept the accusative. 889. δυσπάλαιστος: so Suppl. 1108 ὃ δυσπάλαιστον γῆρας, Aesch. Choeph. 673, Suppl. 451. 890. L P have δ' οὐδὲν: see note on 873. δέ γ' οὐδὲν is probably right; "setzest du doch deinen Thänen keine Grenze" (Wecklein). δ' ἐτ' οὐδὲν has occurred to me as a possible reading. τιθεῖς: see note on τιθεῖς in 57. With the whole line cf. Andr. 1217 οὐκ ἔχων πάρας κακῶν. 892-3. Cf. 416 f., where the chorus use the same hackneyed means of consolation. 894. πιέζει: cf. Suppl. 249 πιέζειν τὴν τέχνην ἡμᾶς Λαυ. θνατῶν: so L; the other MSS. have θνητῶν. Cf. τύχα in 889. 896. τῶν ὑπὸ γαῖαν: sc. οἰχομένων. Monk wished to read γαῖαν against the MSS., but the accus. is more idiomatic. The idea of motion was present in the poet's mind. Cf. Hec. 147 τῶς θ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν (so the MSS., γαῖαν Porson). 897. ῥέψει: for this intransitive use, cf. Cycl. 166 ῥέψει τ' ἐς ἀλμην λευκάδος πετρας ἄπο (cited by Monk); also Hel. 1325, Theognis 176, Xen. Cynege. 9, 20 αὐτάν: Jerram compares Milton's "out of doors he flung." 898. τύμβου... τάφρον ἐς κοιλήν: see note on 607 ἐς τάφον τε καὶ πυράν. The poet evidently has a deep grave in mind. 901. σὺν ἄν ἐσχέν: written as one word in B L P. l has γε συνεσχέν, a συνεσχέν, with σ written above by the first hand. Lenting first divided the words as they stand in the text. The difficulty came, of course, from the "theses."
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903. Jacobs has suggested, not without some degree of plausibility, that Anaxagoras is here referred to. This conjecture is based on Cicero’s Tusc. Disp. III. 14, 20–30, where he translates a passage from Euripides (ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦτα) parâ soφον τινος μαθών, etc. fr. 964 N.) and observes: “quid Theseus a doctis se audisse dicit, id de se ipso loguitar Euripides; fuerat enim auditor Anaxagoraem, quem ferunt nuntiata morte filii dixisse ‘scelum me genuisse mortalem.’” The view of Jacobs is, however, opposed by Hermann (see his note) and by Decharme (Revue des Études grecques 1889 p. 236, cited by Earle). If it is correct, the words ἐν γένει are probably a “blind,” as there is no evidence that Anaxagoras was akin to Euripides. We know, too, that the philosopher had more than one son (Diog. Laert. II. 3, 9). On the relations between Euripides and Anaxagoras, see for the ancient sources Schaubach Anaxagoriae Fragmenta pp. 20–21, and for the modern Zeller Gesch. d. Griech. Phil. I. 4 p. 975 n. 2. The dissertation of Köhler Die Philosophie des Eur., Th. I. Anaxagoras u. Euripides, I have been unable to consult.*

904. ἐν γένει: so Soph. O. T. 1016 ὑπώνυκεν ἁν σοι Ἡλιόσως οὖδὲν ἐν γένει, [Dem.] XLVII. 70 ὅ γάρ ἐστιν ἐν γένει σοι (cited by Jebb ad loc.). κόρος: so ἦν; κόρος the other MSS., but a dactyl is required by the responsion (ὁ κόρος = ἦλθεν ἃ- of 927). Liddell and Scott are incorrect in stating that the form κόρος is always used in the lyric passages of the tragedians.

905. ὅλετε: ψάχετ’, the reading of L P, would give the same sense, but is less appropriate with ἐν δύμωσιν.

906. μονόταις: most edd., following the schol., have taken this word as here = μινος or μονογενῆς, so that κόρος μονόταις will = κόρος μινος παῖς ὅν. So Or. 904 Περσέφασσα καλλίταις θεά, where καλλίταις probably means not καλῶς παῖδας ἔχοντα but καλὴς παιδίσκα. See as to this usage Lobeck Purælip. pp. 371–2, Kühner-Blass II. p. 314 ad fin. This may be the correct view; but I suspect that we should punctuate after δύμωσιν and take μονόταις as a possessive compound in agreement with ταῖς, the adj. being used resumptively, as so often in Pindar—“I had a kinsman whose son, a youth worthy to be lamented, died in his home—and yet but one son had he.” ἐμπα: cf. Cycl. 535 ἐμπα δ’ οὖντις ἐν πάντοις μοι, Aesch. Prom. 190 ἄλλ’ ἐμπα μαλακογνώμον ἐσταί. On the forms of the word, cf. the schol. on Soph. Aj. 122 ι@synthesize ἐμπας φασίν, Ἀττικοὶ δὲ ἐμπας καὶ ἐμπα. This statement is confirmed by the facts. Homer knows only ἐμπης: while Aeschylus has only ἐμπας (four cases); Sophocles has ἐμπας (three times) and ἐμπα (once, Aj. 563; cf. Pind. Nε. IV. 36); Euripides has only ἐμπας (two cases). The word here = δύμως. Its derivation has never been satisfactorily explained. If from ἐν πᾶσι, how account for ἐμπης and ἐμπα (to say nothing of the Pindaric ἐμπα?)

907. ἄλις: ἰδίως τοῦ ἄλις τέταχαν ἐπὶ τοῦ μετρίως: μετρίως ἑφερε τὸ κακὸν, καίπερ ἀτεκνός ὃν σχολ. Hesychius says s. v. ἄλις: ἰκανὸς, πληροτάτως, αὐταρκες. ἐστι

* See also Parmentier Euripide et Anaxagore, in Mémoires couronnées de l’Académie de Belgique, vol. XLVII. (1892).
909. ἐποπτῆς: cf. Hec. 152 ἐν δὲ δὲ τῇ ἐπιδέιν τῷ μὲν ἐποπτῆ... πάρθενον, and better Plato Legg. VII. p. 792 D αὐτῶν ἐποπτῆ πρὸς τᾶς ἡδονᾶς γιγνόμενον, though neither is an exact parallel. The sense here is clearly "vexing upon old age," just slipping down into it, as it were.

910. πόρσω: so Gaisford for πρόσω. The response (cf. 934) requires a long penult. The Doric form πόρσω occurs in Pindar and the tragedians, but not in Homer. Πόρσω is probably not "old Attic"; at least the inscriptions do not favor ρσ (see Meisterhaus p. 76). For πόρσω with the gen. of part. cf. Plato Apol. 38 εὐρατέ γὰρ δὴ τῆν ἡλικίαν δότι πόρρω ἡδη ἐστὶ τοῦ βίου, and the like.

911. σχήμα δόμων: "not a mere periphrasis for δόμω, but giving a picture of the old, familiar form of the house, as it strikes his eye" (so Jerram, who compares Ανδρ. 1 'Ασιάτιδος γῆς σχήμα, Hec. 619 ὁ σχήματ' οἶκων). Add Soph. Phil. 952 ὁ σχήμα πέτρας δίπλαν (cited by Monk).

912. μεταπίπτοντος: as in English "when the luck is changing"; but the underlying figure is that of the fall of dice.

914. τὸ μέσον: τὸ διάφορον τῆς νῦν τῶν κει τῆς πάλαι σχολ.; τὸ μέσον in this sense is Herodotean (I. 126 ὁ δὲ ἐφασαν πολλάν εἶναι τὸ μέσον, IX. 82 τῆς θοινίς παρεδεδομένη ἡν πολλάν τὸ μέσον), but rare in other writers.


917. φυλίας: so the MSS. The schol. says γραφθέαν πιαστῆς, a variant which is due to 850, where see note. A comparison of 876, 880 and 917, with their variants, is most instructive, as showing the way in which the readings of our text have been influenced.

918. πολυάχρονος: a very rare word, probably ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in classic writers.

920-21: an echo of a legal phrase like οἱ εἰς ἀμφοτέρων γεγονότες ἀστῶν, Aristotle Const. Ath. 42, 1 or μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ἡν ἤν μὴ εἰς ἀμφοίν ἀστῶν ἢ γεγονότως, ib. 26, 4; cf. Politics 1278 a 34. One is almost tempted to propose ἀστῶν διατε σύγγει εἰμέν. ἀριστεῖς: Dobree for ἀριστων. The emendation is supported by Soph. Aj. 1304 ἄρ' ἄδ' ἀριστεῖς εἰς ἀριστεῖον δυοῖν ὁ Βλαστών ἤν ἄσχο- νοιμ τοὺς πρὸς αἵματος, as well as by the analogy of εἰς ἀμφοτέρων ἀστῶν. A noun, not an adj., is required. καὶ ἄπτ.: καὶ ἄπτ., but the metre allows καὶ ἄπτ', which is supported by the other MSS. εἰμέν: so Heath (εἰμέν P a). The other MSS. have Ἰμέν, which is defended by Nauck (Eur. Stud. II. p. 79). The form εἰμέν is rare in tragedy, but seems well assured in Hippol. 319 (ἄν εἰμέν A L P a d, ἤν Ἰμέν B C E c, ἄρ' Ἰμέν Nauck), a trimeter. There the possible optative
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("probably I have experienced," etc.) well suits the connection, as Phaedra has just admitted that she is a novice in such matters. Homer has είρι Od. XXI. 195, and Soph. O. T. 1046 the analogous form είδειτη for είδειντη (Jebb on Antig. 215). See for other examples Kühner-Blass II. p. 221, 3. Nauck's objection to είμεν, then, will not hold. The question is simply which is the better reading; neither is impossible. The MSS. are pretty evenly divided P a against B L), though ημεν has, on the whole, slightly better authority. If ως is causal, either ημεν or είμεν may be used (cf. M. and T. 713-14); if, on the other hand, it merely introduces indirect discourse (διαίροντες implying a verb of saying), είμεν is certainly right, as in such cases the Greek retains the original tense, though after secondary tenses the mood may change. The scholiast's paraphrase καλ εμακάριζον ημάς ως έσμεν ειγενεσ favors είμεν, which I have adopted with most edd. Cf. Troutl. 1253 μέγα δ’ οίδασθεις ως εκ πατέρων | άγαθων έγέννου. ημεν of B L may be due to iotacism; but the passage is one where it is almost impossible to feel sure of the true reading.

923. μέλανες στολμοι: sc. άντίσπαλοι, a somewhat bold ellipsis.

924. παρ’: here the preposition has the force of "during" or "in the midst of"; see L and S. s. v. παρά II. Some (so Earle) render it more literally, "alongside of," implying contrast. Heracl. 611, cited by Paley, is different, as there παρά denotes alternation rather than succession. The use in our passage, whether local, or, as I am inclined to think, temporal, is a rare one, and I know of no exact parallel in Euripides.


929. βίοσον καλ ψυχάν: not a mere pleonasm. βίοσ denotes the physical side of life, ψυχή the emotional and intellectual. See Schmidt Synonymik § 75, 2.

930. φιλίαν: so the MSS. A writer in the Quarterly Rev. XV. p. 123 proposed the reading ἐλεκτρη, φιλία, "she has left you, the dear one," φιλία being a semi-substantive in apposition with διάμαρ (so Earle). But cf. 282 σὴν γὰρ φιλίαν σεβάμεθα, where φιλία refers to conjugal love, as here.

931 ff. A troublesome passage. The MSS. have πολλοῖς, and all but B (δάμαρτας) read δάμαρτος. The scho. paraphrases by τι ξένων; πολλοι τάς γνώσεις ἀπόδεικνυσιν, which looks (though of this we cannot be certain) as though he read δάμαρτας. (A) Hermann retains both πολλοῖς and δάμαρτος, and understands φιλίαν to be supplied from 930 as the object of παρέκλησεν: "multis iam solvit nutuam amorem mors uxoris." This is hard indeed, and can scarcely be right. (B) Others retain πολλοῖς and read δάμαρτα (so Prinz) or δάμαρτας (with B and Reiske). But παρέκλησεν will then be ambiguous = abstulit or vires resolvit. If it = abstulit, πολλοῖς will be 'dative of disadvantage' where we
should expect a 'genitive of separation.' Another possibility (C) would be to read πολλών and δάμαρτα or δάμαρτας: the sense would then be good, "from many men already has death taken away (unyoked) their spouse" or "wives." On the whole, however, I incline to the view of Canter and most recent editors (I), that we should read πολλῶν and δάμαρτας. The change from πολλῶν to πολλοῦς is very slight, and δάμαρτας has the authority of all the MSS. but B. The rendering will then be, "many a man already has death separated from his spouse." Ἡπαράλυει, with the accus. only, occurs in 117 in the sense of "set free," "release"; but δάμαρτας in our passage is best taken as gen. of separation with παρέλυσεν, not as depending on θάνατος. It must be admitted, however, that the reading in the text is ambiguous, and might perfectly well be translated, "many a man already has the death of a wife unnerved." But both (B) and (C) are liable to a similar ambiguity, owing to the double meaning of παράλυειν. παρέλυσεν: Matthiae for παρέλυσε, as the strophe (906) has a long syllable and syllaba anceps is not permissible here.

936. δομος: cf. in English "though it doesn't look so, I think so all the same," which at the same time shows how δομος came to mean "nevertheless."

939. χρήν: Elmsley for χρη. The harshness of the combination is palliated in some measure by the metrical lotus. See note on 379.

943. This line was rejected by Nauck (Eur. Stud. I. p. 80), who observes: "Im dritten Verse erscheint τερπνησ als unpassend; wenn Admet vorher gesagt hat, sein verödetes Haus sei ihm unerträglich, so kann er nicht füglich fortfahren dass keine Anrede die er an jemand richte oder die an ihn gerichtet werde, sein Eingehen in das Haus zu einem ergötzlichen machen werde." He conjectures that the line was interpolated in order to supply a finite verb to go with the participles προσεταπόχων and προσερθέλεις. Not conclusive: Admetus is thinking of the cheerful welcome which he used to receive from Alcestis, which might well be said to make his home-coming delightful. Nauck, great scholar though he was, was sometimes led by his love of verbal accuracy to sacrifice literary effect.

947. γούνας: the epic form of the plural occurs in trimeters also in Hec. 752, 839, Andr. 893, being required by the metre in all four places.

948. πίπτουτα: so the MSS. Wecklein (Jahrb. f. kl. Phil. Suppl. IX. p. 171) would read πιπτοντα. He lays it down as a principle that the "forma πιπτεων aut metri causa poetae tragici cadem qua πιπτεων usi sunt aut temperata cadendi significatione ut vel tarditatem vel decorum vel mollitiem depingat." This rule is in general borne out by the usage; but he does not make it entirely clear that πιπτεων is not sometimes employed "temperata cadendi significatone." To enforce the rule strictly he has to emend some ten passages. Hence I have not ventured to read πιπτοντα here against all the MSS. δεσπότην: this rare word (= δεσποτε) occurs also in Med. 17, 694, 970; fr. 1132, 53. Sophocles has it twice, Aeschylus and Pindar not at all.
951. γάμοι: "nuptials," "wedding-feasts." The rendering of some editors, "uxores," is absurd, as Woolsey points out. ξύλλογοι γυναικοπληθεῖς: the edd. from Monk down remark that this is a reminiscence of Aesch. Pers. 122 γυναικοπλήθες ὄμλος. γυναικοπλήθες seems to be δίς εἰρημένου.

952. ἐξανέξομαι: cf. Med. 74 ταῦτα παῖδας ἐξανέξομαι πάσχοντας; Heracl. 907, Andr. 201. The word is a very strong one.

954. κυρῆ: Monk would read κυρῆ, which would require δοτείς ἄν (Μ. and T. 529). Hippol. 427 ὡτῳ παρῇ, which Monk compares, is different, being a "general relative condition with omitted ἁν" (Μ. and T. 540); and the same is true of ὁτι νεόση in 978 of our play. In the passage in the text Admetus has particular enemies in mind, and so uses the indicative. — It is with profound knowledge of human nature that the poet represents Admetus as lamenting, not his own selfishness and cowardice, but the consequences to which it has led and will lead.

960. κόδιον: so the MSS. If the comparative is right, τοῦ τεθναία: must be understood. Cf. Andr. 639 f. κόδιον (so L P and Stobaeus; κώδιον Λ, κέρδιον Weeklein * ) βροτοῖ | πέντα χρηστῶν ἣ κακῶν καὶ πλούσιων | γαμβρόν πεπάσθαι, and Hesych. κόδιον: κρείττον, αἵρετώτερον. Purgold conjectured κέρδιον, which Weeklein approves; but there seems to be no certain example of κερδιῶν, κέρδιαν in the tragedians. Perhaps we should read κέρδος, ὦ φίλοι, or κέρδος ἄν with Blomfield (cf. Med. 798, Aesch. Prom. 745); but, on the whole, I am inclined to believe that the MSS. are in the right.

962 ff. From the time of the school, down these words have been taken as a personal statement of the poet's own experience. The school observes on μετάρσιον ἥξα: καὶ περὶ μετεώρων ἐφρόντισα, οὖν ἄστρολόγησα καὶ ὅρμην ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐσχοῦν. As was noted by the ancient grammarians, these addresses of the poet to the audience correspond in a manner to the parabasis of the comedy. Cf. Pollux IV. 111 τραγικῶν δὲ οὐκ ἐστίν (sc. ἡ παράβασις) ἀλλὰ Εὐριπίδης αὐτὸ πεποιηκέν ἐν πολλοῖς δράμασιν κ. τ. λ.

965-6. κρείττον ὠν καὶ ἄρον (— ὁ) do not correspond exactly with μή μοι and ἔλθοι (— —) of the antistrophic lines 976, 977. But no emendation is necessary, as Glyconics and Pherecrateans allow this imperfect responson in the first foot (see Christ Melrik2 p. 521 f.). It is noteworthy that 902, a Pherecratean, introduces a Glyconic system; which is unusual.

967. σανίσιν: here, like Lat. tabulae, of the wooden tablets which were covered with wax for writing. σανίς occurs in other senses in Or. 1221 and Hel. 1572. The ancient belief that the inhabitants of Thrace and Thessaly were skilled in magic enchantments shows itself over and over again in the literature.

968. κατέγραψεν: Monk added the ὦ because the ultima must be long to correspond with that of τελευτά in 979. The schol. quotes Heraclitus, who says: τὸ δὲ Διονύσου (sc. ἱερὸν) κατεκεκάστατι [ἐπὶ] τῆς θράκης ἐπὶ τοῦ καλλομένου Λίμου, διὸ τὴν τινα ἐν σανίσιν ἀναγραφᾶς εἶναι φασιν ἢ ὄφρωι. Among the

* See his Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides p. 541 f.
pseudo-Orphic works current in later times was a treatise περὶ φαρμάκων; see Lobeck Aglaophamus p. 748 f. Note that the chorus here mention the Thracian Orpheus, and the Asclepiads, who probably had their origin in Thessaly (see Walton Cult of Asklepios pp. 18 ff.) and would naturally be familiar to the Thessalians of Phierae. The poet is true to the local coloring.


972 ff. For the sentiment, cf. the famous lines of Aeschylus quoted in the note on 424. In the MSS. ἐλθεῖν of 975 and ἔστιν of 974 have exchanged places, thus disturbing the responson. The true reading was restored by G. A. Wagner.

975. κλέει: Wecklein reads μέλει, on the ground that κλέει cannot be used of sacrifices. But the sacrifices were accompanied by prayers, and κλέει, like the English "hearken to," may be loosely used. Cf. Aesch. Ag. 1064 κακῶν κλέει φρενῶν, which is nearly as bold an usage.

976. μετάων: Wuestemann compares Med. 630 εἰ δ' ἄλοι ἐλθοί Κόπρις, 627 ἔρωτες ἢπερ μὲν ἄγαν ἐλθόντες.

978. ὁ τι νεῦση: τούτο ἀναγκαιοποιητήτα πράττει. οἷν καὶ ὁ "Ομηρικὸς Ζεὺς ὑπόκειται τῷ τῆς Ἀνάγκης ζυγῷ, ὁφ' οὐ ἤ ἄν' ἐπινεύσῃ τιν.: "οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸν παλιννάργεστον οὐδ' ἀπατηλὸν οὐδ' ἀπελεύθητον ὅ τι κεν κεφαλῆ κατανεύσω schoel. For the omission of ἄν, see note on κιρεί, v. 954.

980. Χαλύβως: L P have Χαλύβως, but the responson requires the shorter form. Cf. fr. 472, 5 τρόπθεσα δόκος... Χαλύβω τελέει, Aesch. Prom. 712 λαίας δὲ χειρὸς οἱ σπηροπτέκτονες | οἰκοῦσι Χάλυβες, Sept. 711 f., etc. Hence the names χάλυβος and χάλυψ for iron. See Xen. Anidr. V. 5, 1 and Strabo XII. 19 (514 M.). σὺ βία: P has ὅ βία (Ὁ for C). στάρον: so L α.; the other MSS. have σύνηρον.

981. ἀποτόμου: this word seems to be ἀπαξ εἰρήμενον in this sense in classic Greek, but is not uncommon in late writers, esp. Diodorus. Earle compares Aesch. Prom. 18 τῆς ὁρθοβοῦλου θεᾶδος αἰτιμῆτα παί, and Jerram Tacitus Ann. XVI. 17 ἀνίμο πραερπυρίτις. μόρος ἀπότομοι in l. 118 is slightly different, being more like the Homeric αἴτιος δηθρος.

983. καὶ σ' ἐν: Nauck proposed καὶ σε γ': but the preposition is often used with verbs of binding and loosing where it might be omitted. So Bacch. 444 κάθεσαν ἐν δεσμοίσι πανθήνων στέγης (cf. Hercul. 861), Πήρρολ. 1214 ἐκ δεσμῶν λωτεῖς (cf. fr. 128, 2). There may also be here the notion of catching one in a noose or net.; cf. Herc. F. 153 ὅν εἰρήχοις ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ. Hence there is not sufficient ground for altering the text. The schol. probably read ἐν, for he says: καὶ σου ἐν δεσμῖν ἐφέξεσθαι ἡ Ἀνάγκη, οὔ 'Λήμυτε, ἐν ἄφθονος δεσμοῖς.

986. ἄνω: this word seems pleonastic with ἀνάξιος, and its position, too, is strange, as one would naturally take it with φθιμένους. Earle proposes to
read βροτῶν, taking ἀνω as part of a gloss on ἀνάξεις. But why make a gloss on such a simple word? Possibly we should read in 985 ὁ ἱπρ ὁ γ᾿ ἄξεις and retain ἀνω: cf. 853. The sense will then be: "for you, at least will not bring up the dead," whatever Orpheus may have done. ἀνάξεις may then be a note on ἄξεις ... ἀνω which has crept into the text. But, on the whole, I am inclined to believe ἀνω corrupt. Perhaps we should read ἄγαν (with κλαῖον), or ἄναξ, with a comma after φθυμένου (cf. Soph. Phil. 150 μέλον πάλαι μέλημα μοι λέγεις, ἄναξ, and the like).

989. σκότιοι: proleptic = εἰς σκότον. The schol. absurdly takes it = νόθος: cf. Hesych. s.v. σκότιος and II. VI. 24. Earle is probably right in holding that the figure is taken from the setting (or waning) of a heavenly body. The use of ἀξειν and φθίνειν in thisfigurative sense is very common. φθινοντες: so L P; φθινόθωνα, the reading of the other MSS., is forbidden by the respon- sion (κελευθον 1000).

982. The MSS. have θανόω εἶσαι, which in all but a is preceded by a καλ. The old conjecture of Portus, φίλα δ᾽ ετί καλ θανόσα seems to me preferable to the more modern emendations; εἶσαι would be so apt to be supplied to show the construction, and the τι of δ᾽ ετί could so easily fall out. Next, I think, in order of merit is Prinz’s φίλα δὲ θανόω ετί εἶσαι, which palaeographically is very easy; though it sacrifices the καλ, which word improves the sense and has excellent MSS. authority. Nauck proposed θανόω ἐς δέ, Wecklein θανόσα κεῖται (cf. Soph. El. 1134 θανόν εἴκειο). See also Sel. Conj.

994. The extraordinary frequency of the metaphor of yoking with reference to the marriage relation is extremely noticeable in the Greek writers, and the same is true of the Latin, though to a less extent. I have noted over one hundred instances of the metaphor, and the number might easily be increased. A good parallel to the cases in the text is Ion 901 ἔνα με λέχεσι ... ἐξεύξω: cf. Troad. 671. κλωσίαι: here in its original sense (from κλι-νω) = λέχεσι. "A rare usage, perhaps without nearer parallel than I. T. 857 sepy. Ἀχιλλεώς | εἰς κλωσίαν ἕλκτρων | ὀλλ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἁγίμαν" (Earle). In Pindar Pyth. IV. 133 ἀπὸ κλωσίαν perhaps means "from their banquet-couches," though some take κλωσίαν = "seats" and others (with the schol. ad loc.) think it means "tents." But I know of no exact parallel to the passage in our text.

997. θεοῦ δ᾽ ὅμοιως: a fine example of "brachylogy."

1000. δοξήμαν κέλευθον: the tomb of Alcestis was in a conspicuous place in the suburb (see note on 836), so that the traveller, as he climbed up the ascent, would see it from a distance and turn aside from the road into the path that led to it. On the situation of the ancient Pherae, see Bursian Geog. v. Griechenland I. p. 69; Wordsworth’s Greece ed. Tozer p. 302.

1001. ἁμβαίνων: L P (with the schol.) have έκβαίνων, which Usener (Jahrb. f. Phil. 139, p. 369) defends, on the ground that the words 1002-4 would be said after the person has seen the monument and as he is going back from the side-path into the main road, not when he first enters the path. This is not
at all conclusive; τις may refer to the towns-people and kin of Alcestis as well as to strangers; and those acquainted with the tomb would naturally pay their greeting as they came in sight of the monument. Cf. Hel. 1165 f. ω χαίρε, πατρός μην· επ' εξόδους γάρ | ἐπαγα, Πρωτεύ, σ' ε' ἔμης προσφήσεως: άεί δέ σ' ἐξιόν τε κείσιων δόμων | Θεοκλύμενος παῖς ὥθε προσεννέπω, πάτερ. Moreover, the passages which Usener cites to support the construction κέλευθον ἐκβάινεν (Eur. Bacch. 554, II. VI. 128, Od. XVIII. 206) are not one of them parallel, the preposition in all of them being not εκ but κατά. I have not been able to find one example of ὅδον or κέλευθον ἐκβάινεν in the sense which Usener would assign to it (the nearest approach being ταῦρφ νάτος ἐκβάινοντι; in a late epigram, Adaicus in Anth. Pal. IX. 300). I suspect that κέλευθον ἐκβάινεν would have meant to Euripides "to overstep," "to stray beyond the path"; cf. Her. F. 82 ώς οὕτε γαίας ὥρι ἐν ἐκβαίνειν λάθρα, Bacch. 1044 ἐξέπημεν Ἀσωποῦ ροάς.

1002. προθανά: προθαναν or προθανεν the MSS., but the respasion with 901 requires the shorter form.

1005. φάραι: so Monk; the MSS. have φήμαι. (Cf. αὐτα above.) The word not merely = "speeches," but has a distinct religious sense, "solemn addresses." Aeschylus uses the word of solemn song, Suppl. 663 ἀγρῶν τ' ἐκ στομάτων φερέσθω φήμα φιλοφρόνως.

1006 ff. Exodos. Heracles returns from the left, leading the veiled Alcestis.

1009. μομφάς: μορφᾶς all the MSS. but L α, a blunder due to the frequent confusion between a long-tailed μ and a ρ. ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοις ἔχειν: cf. Theoc. VII. 99 παῖδος ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοισιν ἔχει πόθον. Euripides uses σπλάγχνοι no less than eleven times. Cf. esp. Med. 220, Hippiol. 118.

1011. ἐγγύς παρεστῶς: so I. A. 465 παρὼν ἐγγύς, and in English "near at hand." φίλος: possibly we should read φίλον, "my friend" = σέ. If φίλος is retained εξετάζεσθαι will be passive, "to be proved to be": see L. and S. s. v. IV. I know no other instance of this use of the verb in Euripides. If we read φίλον, εξετάζεσθαι will, of course, be middle, "to question my friend."

1012. προκείμενον: referring to the πρόθεσις of the body.

1014. A line which does not belong here. See note on 778.

1017. μεν: so B and α; L P have the one δῆ, the other δέ. "Id (μεν) cum excidisset propter sequentis syllabae similitudinem, correctores addiderunt δῆ, quod hic multo deterius est" (Hermann).

1021. Ὀρηκίας: θρῆκας L P; on which [θρηκ]ιων of l is a gloss. The metre, of course, demands Ὀρηκίας (— ὕ —), not Ὀρηκας or Ὀρηκας. The variant arose from the correct spelling ὈΡΗΚΙΑΣ; see Meisterhans p. 50. For the genitive, see Goodwin Gr. Gram. 1119.

1023. Note the euphemism, and the prayer added to avert evil consequences from the mention of possible misfortune. Cf. Heracl. 511, 714 and the like.

1022 f. In B this passage was copied with excessive carelessness. See App. Crit.
1024. προσπολέιν: πρόσπολον L P, which gives equally good sense; but the infin. is more idiomatic. (Hermann observes, "in prima dipodiae arsi finalis syllaba longioris vocabuli, quae nullum accentum habet, non perite collocatur"); but to this rule there are very numerous exceptions. Cf. just below in 1027 ἄξιον πόνον, etc.)

1027. πόνον: so B. a has πόνων (ω for ο), L P πόνον. As B L P have ο in the ultima, and B a both have the final ν, πόνον seems, on the whole, well accredited; but πόνον gives equally good sense. Certainty in such a case is scarcely possible, as the MSS. are so evenly balanced. Πόνος is, of course, in apposition with ἄγώνα, and if we read πόνον, ἄξιον would agree with ἄγώνα. I have preferred πόνον, as being the difficilior lectio; but it may be a mere "copyist's error." To be dogmatic in such cases is the sheerest folly.

1029. τὰ ... κούφα τοῖς νικῶσιν: a very unusual order, doubtless adopted for metrical convenience, as well as to make κούφα emphatic. Cf. Soph. Antig. 710 ἀνόρα ... τὸ μανθάνειν, Trach. 65 σὲ ... τὸ μὴ πώθεθαι.

1031. βουσφόρμι: ἄγέλη βοῶν schol. The word occurs also in I. T. 301, fr. 485. It is here used of cattle taken separately, not of whole herds; as Monk pointed out, Euripides obviously had II. XXIII. 259 ff. in mind in arranging the scale of prizes.

1032. ἐντυχόντι: some take this as meaning 'to me that chanced upon (the games).' So the schol., who paraphrases by ἐπειδὴ ἐντυχὼν ἔκεια, τὸ μὲν κερδάνειν αὐτὴν εὐκλεῖς ἡγησάμην, τὸ δὲ έδασαι αἰσχρόν. Others take ἐντυχόντι = 'that happened upon (the prize)'; the sense being 'since I had won her, I thought it disgraceful not to keep her.' I incline to the former view, though some high authorities (among them England) prefer the other.

1035. κλαπαίαν ... λαβὼν: periphrasis for κλέφας.

1036. μ': L P have γ', the two letters being frequently confused in the MSS. A γ and a μ with one arm shorter than usual often look extremely alike in cursive writing.

1037. ἀτίζων: all the best MSS. have ἀτίμαζων, which the metre will not admit of. Fortunately, however, Cod. Harl. 5743 has the true reading. The MS. in question is of little value except in this passage, and I suspect that ἀτίζων is a lucky guess rather than an independent variant. Scaliger proposed ἀτίζων ex conj., not knowing that it stood in the Harleian. ἀτίμαζων is merely a gloss which has displaced the word which it was meant to explain. Cf. Suppl. 19 νόματι ἀτίζεστε θέων, ib. 865 τάρκοιντ' ἀτίζων, Ili. 251, 327, etc. ἑξεροίσιν: αἰσχροῖσιν L P; but ἐν αἰσχροῖσιν τιβίς is weak and tautological after ἀτίζων. Probably in an ancestor of L P only ῥοῖσιν was legible, and the gap was filled at a venture by some one. "Matthiae ἐν αἰσχροῖσιν referendum censet ad τὸχας, non quo uxoris sortem mihi turpem esse putem, ob ignaviam, quam pater Admeto exprobraverat. At de haec re ille, quum Herculi se expurgare vult, non cogitaret" (Hermann).

1038. ἀθλίου: so all the MSS. but a, which has ἀθλίον. A decision between
the two readings is very difficult. The order favors ἄθλων, but may be due to the exigencies of the metre. The weight of MSS. authority, on the other hand, favors ἄθλοι, which is clearly the difficilior lectio. It has been suggested that ἄθλοι is due to some one who was offended by what seemed to him to be the masculine ending of ἄθλων, not knowing that Euripides has a predilection for the two-ending declension of adjectives. But if so, why did he not at once read ἄθλαι? The slight rhyme ἄθλαις τόξας would hardly have deterred him. Hence, though not with great confidence, I have followed B L P. The tragedians use ἄθλαιos freely both of persons and things.

1039. προσκελέμενον Β Ρ. Cf. 551 and 833, in both of which the MSS. have προ- for προσ- in this compound. The sense, of course, requires προσκελέμενον.

1040. εὗ του: Λ Ρ have εὖπερ, but the restrictive περ is not needed here. Perhaps εἰπον == εὖπερ was read by mistake for εὐ του.

1045. μὴ ἀναμνήσῃς: so (except for the : subscript) Λ Ρ. α has με μμήνησης (with erasures above ε and between μ and ν), B με μμήνηκες. To read μη με μμήνηκες is, of course, impossible. Kirchhoff, Nauck, Weil, Bauer-Wecklein and Earle read μη με μμήνηκες κακῶν. This is ingenious but not convincing; as Leutsch has pointed out (Philologus XXIII. (1866) p. 27), the tragedians never elsewhere use the present μμήνηκες, and μμήνηκες κακῶν sounds abrupt and almost discourteous. Probably in an ancestor of Β the word ἀναμνήσῃς was so mutilated that only μη or μης was legible, and the gap was wrongly filled out. The reading of α looks like a conflation of μμήνηκες and ἄναμνήσῃς. Cf. μη... προσθής below. A long study of the question has convinced the writer that the testimony of Λ Ρ is not only not to be despised, but is in many cases to be preferred to that of the other family.

1048. συμφορά: συμφοράς α, but in speaking of a single misfortune the singular is more natural.

1050. The edd. pass very lightly over this passage, which, simple as it seems, is in reality one of the most difficult in the play. To show how complicated the question of its syntax and interpretation is, I append a list of some of the possibilities that have been, or may be, suggested. The question centres about the meaning and use of ως and of πρέπει.

A. The schol. paraphrases: καὶ γὰρ νεὰ φαίνεται ως εκ τῆς ἐσθητος, which looks as though he read νεὰ γὰρ, ως ἐσθητι καὶ κόσμω, πρέπει, taking πρέπει = "appears," and so Woolsey. But νεὰ πρέπει, "she appears young," is hardly classic Greek, and there is certainly nothing like it in the tragedians. The nearest approach to it that I can find is Aesch. Pers. 247 τοῦτο γὰρ δραμάμα φωτὸς Περσικὸν πρέπει μαθεῖν, and even here the meaning "is conspicuous" or "clear" has not quite passed into that of "seems," as the addition of the inf. shows. Even in this construction ως is usually added; cf. Eur. Suppl. 1056, Soph. El. 664 πρέπει γὰρ ως τὸπάνυς εἰσοράν.

B. Another possibility is to assume the ellipsis of οὕσα with πρέπει, "for she clearly is (πρέπει οὕσα) young, to judge by her dress and ornaments." Cf. Aesch.
Ag. 30 ὡς δ ὑπερτὸς ἀγγέλλων πρέπει ("clearly announces") and the like. But I know of no example of this usage in Euripides.

C. Again, we may take ὡς as post-positive with νέα, "for as a young woman (naturally would be), she is conspicuous by (or "in respect to") her clothing and ornaments." For the dative, cf. 512, Hel. 1204 Ἀπόλλων, ὡς ἐσθήτη δυσμόρφῳ πρέπει, etc. Young women, especially the unmarried (Aristoph. Aeschin. 670), wore much jewelry, and Admetus, seeing the queen's rich attire, would naturally suppose her to be young.

D. Or, still taking ὡς as post-positive, we may construct πρέπει ὡς νέα, ἐσθήτη καὶ κβσμφ, "she is clearly young (is conspicuous as young) by her dress and ornaments." The case would then be like Soph. El. 664 πρέπει ὡς τύραννος εἰσοραν if the εἰσοραν were omitted. But for this it will be hard to find a parallel, and I doubt whether it is possible.

E. Or ὡς may be causal, "for she is young, inasmuch as she is conspicuous by her dress and ornaments."

F. Or ὡς may be demonstrative, "for she is young; so conspicuous is she by her clothing and ornaments." Cf. Hippol. 1054 ὡς σὸν ἐχθαῖρω κάρα, El. 155, Aesch. Ag. 894, Soph. O. C. 1242, etc.

G. Or we may take πρέπει as impersonal in its ordinary sense, "for she is young, as is in keeping with (beseesms) her dress and ornaments."

H. Some would take πρέπει as impersonal in the sense of "is clear," "for she is young, as is evident from her dress and ornaments." This is not, I think, possible, as there seems to be no parallel for this use of πρέπει.

I. We might read νέα and render "for she seems like (resembles) a young woman, to judge by her dress and ornaments"; but this would, I fear, imply doubt as to the reality of her youth!

Explanations A, B, D, H and I we may, I think, dismiss, the first four as not borne out by Euripidean usage, and the last as inappropriate in sense and involving a change of the text. G, too, seems very dubious, as in classical Greek πρέπει is rarely, if ever, used impersonally with the dative of the thing (cases like Aesch. Ag. 462 γυναικὸς αἰχμᾶ πρέπει ... χάριν γυναικεία are, of course, not real exceptions, as there the inf. is really the subject of πρέπει); though instances like fr. 292, 3 ἐὰν ταῦτα τῇ νόσῳ πρέπει, Cyc. 137 φῶς γάρ ἐμπολήμασιν πρέπει, Plato Rep. V. 450 ημοι ... πρέποντες τοῖς γεγομένοις γάμοις, etc. are not uncommon (see Stephanus s. v. πρέπω). Nor do I believe that ὡς is causal, though I cannot give any very convincing reason for the disbelief.

F is, I think, possible, though the demonstrative ὡς is very rare in Attic; but, on the whole, I strongly incline to explanation C, supported as it is by the analogy of 512, Hel. 1204, Aesch. Choeph. 11, Sept. 117, etc. The post-positive ὡς is surely unobjectionable, as it is common in the tragedians. There are thirteen cases at least in Aeschylus alone. Cf. Phoen. 628 δόθην ὡς, Soph. Tr. 771 εὗρον ὡς ὡς, Aesch. Choeph. 493 φέλλοι δ' ὡς, Suppl. 863 εὗρον δ' ὡς, etc. But I must frankly admit that the true syntax and meaning of the passage are far from certain. Dogmatism in such cases is mere folly.

1055. εἰσβήγας: so εἰσέβην Iacch. 466, ἐξέβησε Hel. 1616, ἐμβήγας Heracel. 845, ἐμβήγας Cycl. 467. The first aorist is therefore well attested for Euripides. All the MSS. but a have εἶς θάλαμον βήγας, which is clearly erroneous, as the anapaest in the fifth foot is not admissible.

1056. ἐπεσφρόω: the most plausible explanation of this curious form is that of Brugmann (Fleckeisen's Jahrh. 1880 pp. 217 ff., Vergl. Gram. II. p. 962), that from the stem φρ-η- "to bring" (I. E. bher-) were made forms after the analogy of ἑμι (φρω, φρές, φρήνας, φρέως). See Veitch s. v. φρέω for the Euripidean instances. The old derivation from προῆμα is surely untenable. The simple verb probably never occurs (in fr. com. adesp. 489 Kock εἰσφραίς is to be read) except in grammarians.

1058. ἀλέγχη: so all the MSS. but B (ἐλέγχηδ). The reading of B is probably a mere blunder. The scribes constantly confuse and exchange the forms of the present, future and aorist tenses*; and here there is no reason for emphasizing the continuance of the action.

1059. ἄλλης: so L P, rightly. ἄλλος (so the other MSS.) is due to the influence of the following dative. For the phrase ἐν δεμιόιοις πίπτειν, cf. Hel. 1099 ὠ πότειν νεῖ δίοισιν ἐν ἱερωταῖοι πίπτειν, and (in a different sense, of the sick Orestes) Or. 35 πεπόν ἐν δεμιοίοι κεῖται, ib. 88 πόσον χρόνον δὲ δεμιοίοι πέπτωχ' δὲ: (where perhaps we should read δ' ἐν δεμιοίοι).

1063. πρὸς ἡμιαὶ: England; προσήμιαί L, προσήμιες P, προσήμιεσι the other MSS. Hesychius has προσήμικαί· προσέτακε, which gloss NauE refers to this passage (Eur. Stud. II. p. 85), though he does not venture to decide whether we should read the third person here or the second in Hesychius. He doubts, however, the genuineness of the lection, for the reasons that neither προσήμικαι nor any other form of προσείκω occurs elsewhere (though, as he points out, ἡκτο and ἐκτο are attested for Homer, and ἡκται for Nicander Theriaca 658), and that the juxtaposition of constructions so different as τοῦτο εἶχον and προσήμιεσι is harsh. The true solution of the difficulty is, I believe, that the words are wrongly divided in the MSS.; πρὸς is an adverb, as in Hel. 962 καὶ πρὸς σῶσον, ib. 110, Or. 622, Phoen. 611, Heracel. 641, Aesch. Choep. 293, etc. As to the change of construction, it is not harder than in Euripides, and besides is softened by the καὶ πρὸς.

1065. μὴ μ' ἐλης ἡρημενόν: see Otto Sprichwörter s. v. vincere.

* See Weeklein Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides p. 522 f. for a list of mistakes of this class.
1067. \( \theta \delta \lambda \delta \iota \): a very expressive figure. Cf. Pherecrates fr. 115 K. and the parallels cited by Kock \emph{ad loc.} Soph. \emph{Aj.} 206 has \( \theta \delta \lambda \epsilon \rho \varphi \kappa \varepsilon \tau \alpha i \chi e \mu \omega \nu \nu \nu \sigma \varsigma \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \) of the mad Ajax. See also Aesch. \emph{Prom.} 883 \( \theta \delta \lambda \epsilon \rho \varphi \iota \lambda \gamma \nu \iota \) (with Wecklein's note) and Hesychius \textit{s. v.} \( \theta \delta \lambda \omega \delta \alpha i \).

1068. \( \pi \gamma \alpha i : \) cf. \emph{Herc.} F. 99, 450, 1355; Aesch. \emph{Prom.} 404, \emph{Ag.} 852, Soph. \emph{Antig.} 803, and esp. \emph{Trojan.} 852 \( \epsilon \eta \varphi \omega \gamma \nu \pi \alpha \gamma \alpha \delta \kappa \rho \omega \nu \nu \) \( \alpha \iota \varepsilon \rho \mu \nu \). The figure is that of a spring suddenly bursting forth and sweeping down in a torrent. \( \tau \lambda \epsilon \mu \omega \nu \) \( \omicron \nu \tau \) \( \beta \) and \( \P \) have \( \tau \lambda \epsilon \mu \omega \nu \), but the metre requires the form with \( \omega \). So \emph{Andr.} 348 \( \omicron \nu \tau \) \( \tau \lambda \epsilon \mu \omega \nu \ \epsilon \gamma \omega \) (at the end of a trimeter); cf. Soph. \emph{O.} C. 185.

1071. \( \eta \tau \iota \sigma i \epsilon \iota \): \( \dot{o} \tau \iota \sigma i \epsilon \iota \ \sigma \nu \) the MSS. The edd. from Hermann down have seen that an address in the second person, "whoever you are," is out of place here. Hermanu proposed \( \dot{o} \tau \iota \sigma i \epsilon \iota \), "whatever one shall come," whether a hostile or a friendly deity. See Sel. \emph{Conj.} for other suggestions. I suspect that Euripides wrote \( \eta \tau \iota \sigma i \epsilon \iota \) (see \emph{M.} and \emph{T.} 555). The emendation is papyrographically easy, as a carelessly written \( \mathrm{H} \) often looks extremely like \( \mathrm{Y} \) in the MSS.; and \( \eta \tau \iota \sigma i \pi \tau \iota \) \( \epsilon \iota \ \sigma \nu \) in 1062 would help to facilitate the change. Then some "intelligent reader," noticing that \( \eta \tau \iota \sigma i \epsilon \iota \ \sigma \nu \) would include only \textit{women}, changed \( \eta \tau \iota \sigma i \) to \( \sigma \tau \iota \sigma i \).

1072. \( \omega \sigma \tau e \ \sigma \eta \nu \): lacking in \( \mathrm{L} \ P \). In \( \mathrm{P} \) some one has added \( \epsilon \kappa \ \theta \varepsilon \omega \ \varepsilon x \ \mathrm{conj.} \)

1073. \( \pi \rho \o \gamma \nu \delta \sigma \iota \alpha i \delta \iota : \) cf. \emph{pore\kappa\iota \sigma \alpha i} in 444.

1074. The words \( \kappa a i \ldots \chi \alpha \iota \mu \iota \nu \) seem tame, but probably no change should be made. \( \kappa a i \ \sigma o i \ \tau \nu \varphi \delta \iota \nu \) \( \epsilon \pi \omicron \rho \sigma \omicron \nu \) \( \alpha \nu \chi \alpha \iota \mu \iota \nu \) has been conjectured, but \( \epsilon i \ \gamma \varphi \iota \ldots \) \( \epsilon \iota \chi \nu \) is a wish, not a condition.

1077. \( \upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \) \( \omicron \): so \( \mathrm{Monk} \), \( \upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \ \alpha \). The aorist inv. with \( \mu \eta \) in prohibitions does sometimes occur in poetry (\emph{M.} and \emph{T.} 260), but as it is rare and one \( \lambda \) of \( \upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \) might so easily be lost, \( \mathrm{Monk}'s \) conjecture is probably right. \( \upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha \nu \nu \), the reading of the other MSS., would mean "transgress," "err," which is much less appropriate here than "go to excess." \( \mathrm{IN} \) might easily come from a carelessly written \( \mathrm{\Lambda} \); or, as \( \mathrm{Earle} \) observes, \( \upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \alpha \nu \nu \) may be due to the influence of \( \pi \rho \alpha \alpha i \nu e i \nu \) just below it.

1078. Cf. \emph{Terence} \emph{Andr.} 307 \textit{facile omnes, quom valemus, recta consilia aegrotis damus}.

1079. \( \pi \rho \kappa \o \iota \pi \o \iota \omega i \): "a metaphor taken from clearing ground" (Earle). — The text of 1080, 1081 and 1085 I have given according to Galen, \emph{De plac. Hipp. et Plat.} pp. 388, 394 \textit{Mueller} ; for the MSS. variants, see \textit{App. Crit.} The most noticeable difference is in 1085, where Galen reads \( \eta \beta \alpha \kappa \varepsilon \iota \) (our MSS. of Euripides having \( \eta \beta \alpha \ \sigma o i \)): cf. Photius \( \eta \beta \alpha \kappa \varepsilon i \). \( \alpha \kappa \mu \alpha \zeta \iota \), Macedonius in \emph{Anth. Pal.} VI. 30 \( \kappa a k o \dot{\omega} \ \delta \) \( \epsilon \pi \iota \ \gamma \iota \rho \alpha \omega \ \eta \mu \iota \mid \delta \lambda \alpha \u v \tau o \ \eta \beta \alpha \kappa \varepsilon \iota \ldots \) \( \pi e n \iota \). A harder question is whether in 1080 we should read \( \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \alpha \gamma \iota \varepsilon i \) with Galen or \( \mu \) \( \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \alpha \gamma \iota \varepsilon i \) with the Euripidean MSS. In \emph{Suppl.} 79 and \emph{Ion} 361 we have the pronoun but that fact does not prove that Euripides used it here, where it can so easily be supplied from the context. Moreover, "Porson's rule" (see note on 671) if strictly interpreted favors \( \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \alpha \gamma \iota \varepsilon i \); and as Galen's MS. of the \emph{Alcestis} seems
to have been better than ours (witness ἡβάσκει just below), I have adopted that reading.

1086. The χρόνον just below χρόνος of 1085 looks suspicious, and Nauck conjectured ὀρῶς λέγοις ἀν. But the threefold repetition (χρόνος — χρόνον — χρόνος) may be intentional, to increase the emphasis; and probably no change should be made.

1087. νέον γάμου πόθου the MSS., but Schmidt’s emendation νέοι γάμωι πόθου is almost certainly right. Some early scribe simply exchanged the endings of νέοι, γάμωι and πόθου, one of the commonest kinds of error in copying. Euripides often uses the plural γάμωι of a single marriage.

1088. οὐκ ἂν ψόμην: cf. the English “I wouldn’t have thought that of you.”

1089. A difficult place. The text follows α; B has χρησθῇ λέχος, while L P show the curious variant χρησθείς μῦνος. Monk read χρησθείς μῦνος, which gives good sense (cf. Soph. O. T. 479), though μῦνος is somewhat pleonastic. But, if I mistake not, μῦνος is part of a gloss on χρησθείς or χρησθῇ. A much stronger case may be made out for the reading χρησθείς λέχος: χρησθείς and χρησθείς will then be different mistakes for χρησθείς, and λέχος “accus. of specification” with the verb, “remain widowed as to your couch.” But in that case λέχος is otiose, and could well be spared. Kirchhoff and Earle read χρησθῇ: but the middle does not occur elsewhere in Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides, and I doubt if it is to be found in any good writer. On the whole, it seems best to read χρησθείς λέχος, making λέχος the subject, “will your couch remain empty”? Cf. Od. IX. 123 f. ἀλλ’ ἥ γ’ (sc. νήσος) ... ἀνδρῶν χρησθῆς, and the English “widowed couch.” So 862 χήραν μελάθρων. The reading χρησθῇ may be due to iotaism, or be the work of some one who took χρησθῇ to be second person and preferred the form in -γ. (It is just possible that χρησθῇ, λέχος and μῦνος are all glosses, and that the true reading was ἀλλ’ ἄνευ καίτης (or λέκτρων) μεμειθή, or something of the sort.)

1090. This line has been much tortured by the critics. The MSS. have the reading in the text (except that B has καλῶν and καλεῖν), which I believe to be correct without any change at all. There is, of course, an ellipsis of ἵπτε: μὴ ποτὲ needs no alteration (see M. and T. 688 for other cases of μὴ with a participle after ἄδια in Orat. Obliqua). The construction is exactly like that in Soph. Antig. 1066 ὦς μὴ μετολήσων ἵπτε τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα, except that ἵπτε is not expressed. In L the first hand has written ἵπτε above ὦς to show the ellipsis, and the schol. says ἵπτε μηδέποτε καλέσων με νυμφίον. For emendations that have been suggested, see Sel. Conj. The passage is a good example of the way in which a perfectly sound text has sometimes been tampered with.

1095. ἣπηνος’: for this use of the aorist, see M. and T. 60. So Med. 707, I. A. 440, Herc. P. 1235, Or. 1672, Phoen. 771, Soph. Aj. 536, Ei. 1322, etc. The usage in the case of this verb may fairly be called a settled idiom of the language.
1097. γενναίον: so B a, γενναίαν L P, γενναίως Lenting. I have retained γενναίον with Hermann; cf. Ἱππολ. 409 ἐκ γενναίων δόμων. The phrase τήν ἐκ γενναίαν could only mean "this high-born lady," an epithet which could not fail to arouse curiosity when applied to a slave; but Admetus shows no surprise.

1098. ἄντομαι: so L P, rightly. The other family have αἰτοῦμαι, obviously a gloss on the rarer and more distinctively poetic word. The substitution was aided by the resemblance in form between the two words. Cf. Suppl. 279 πρὸς σε γεννάδος . . . ἄντομαι, Heracl. 226.


1101. εἰς δέον π. Χ.: a curious phrase. The meaning seems to be, "perhaps the kindness (or "favor") may result advantageously" (or "opportune"). Bauer-Wecklein render εἰς δέον "wie es soll, zum guten." Earle and others take it = εἰς καρδία, which is supported by cases like Soph. Antig. 386, O. T. 1416, and by the analogy of εὖ δέονται. Herod. 1. 119 εἰς δέον ἐγέγονεν and 186 εἰς δέον εὖ δέοκες γεγονέναι are disputed, some rendering εἰς δέον "as it should be," others "opportune." The difference, however, is not great. Cf. also Demos. IV. 14 εἰς δέον λέγοντα, ib. XX. 41 εἰς δέον δὲ νῦν γέγονεν αὐτῷ τὸ . . . λαβεῖν . . . τὴν ἀτέλειαν.

1102. μὴ λάβεις: on this aphaeresis see Christ Metrik² pp. 34 ff. The MS. variants here are due in part to a misunderstanding of it. Tyrwhitt restored the true reading.

1105. ἄθρα: so the first class. ὅρα of L P is probably a gloss. Euripides uses ἄθρα in some fifteen times.

1107-8. Nauck rejects 1108 (which is not in the text of B, but has been added in the margin by the first hand), and 1107 as well. He deems the whole of 1107 corrupt except προβυμαν, which word he holds to be a variant of πίθου μόνον (Eur. Stud. II. p. 83 f.). This seems quite needless. The omission of 1108 in B does not prove very much, as that MS. is written "unsächlich flüchtig" (Wilamowitz) and abounds in slips. 1107 is intentionally vague, "I, too, have some secret knowledge that leads me to show this eagerness (for you to receive her)." Heracles in this scene is paying back Admetus for the double-entendres of 513 ff. Though the vengeance is comic and harmless, the king does not escape unpunished for his deceit. κᾶγω implies that it is now Heracles' turn. There is no ground for any change. ποεῖς: see Christ Metrik² p. 26 (§ 36) and Wecklein Cur. Epigr. pp. 53 ff.

1112. δοκεῖ: so L P; βολέα the other MSS. The use of the impersonal verb without a dative, seeming unusual, led to the emendation βολέα. So often in the MSS. δοκεῖ has been changed to δοκεῖς or δοκεῖ. See Jebb on Antig. 1102. δόμοις: so the Venetian copy of L; δόμοις of the other MSS. is clearly due to δόμοις in 1110.

1115. μόνη: μόνον Nauck, which is undeniably "neat"; but probably change is unnecessary.
1117. προτείναι: προτείνειν L P, πρότεινει α. θυγείν: θύγειν the MSS. as usual (θύγε α). προτείναι was proposed by Elmsley ex conj., and is confirmed by B. "Nam et aoristus accommodation est præsente (i.e. the act is momentary), et ex ea scriptura intelligitur unde προτείνειν et θύγε venerint" (Hermann). προτείνειν is due to the wish to have the other verb in the same tense as the (supposed) present θύγειν.

1118. καρατόμων: so Lobeck; καρατήμω the MSS. Mr. Brennan (Class. Rev. VII. pp. 17 ff.) has defended the reading of the MSS. on the ground that καρατόμων "is in reality ridiculous, for Perseus was a model of courage." But surely the most courageous man would be justified in using caution under such circumstances. As another has well said (Class. Rev. VII. p. 204), "the attitude of Admetus is the real point of the comparison. He is unwilling to look at the stranger for fear he should be attracted by her beauty and so even for a moment false to his wife's memory; and in thus standing with hand outstretched but averted face (ταύτα ηλεια ἀποστραμμένα schol.), he is like Perseus, who dares not with all his courage look at the features which turned beholders into stone." The elision of the dative i in tragedy has been almost universally given up by scholars, and all cases where it seems to occur are capable of easy emendation. See Jebb's critical note on Soph. O. C. 1456. — Cf. Rhes. 586 χρη καρατομείν, and Trusc. 564, Phoen. 606, where καρατήμω is used. For the Gorgon simile, cf. Orest. 1520, Herc. F. 990, Phoen. 455.

1121. πρὸς αὐτήν: B has πρὸς, the other MSS. δ' ἑσ. Euripides uses both πρὸς and εἰς (ἐς) with βλέπων: but as when the imperative βλέψον is used in this way the conjunction is almost always omitted (cf. 390, Hel. 1442, Heracl. 225, Herc. F. 1227, I. A. 1238; I. A. 320, etc.), I have followed B. *

1123. τι λέξω: so L P. The other class has λέσσω (λέσσω B), which Earle reads, changing λέσσω in the next line to λέξω. But cf. Hec. 488, Cycl. 375 ὄ ζεω, τι λέξω, Hel. 483, and the like; and for λέξω in 1124 there is no MS. authority. It seems more likely that the reading λέσσω in 1123 is due to the influence of the λέσσω just under it in 1124. Nauck would read φάσμα for θαῦμα, on the ground that "statt des unverhofften Wunders muss man eine unverhohnte Erscheinung erwarten." He compares Ion 1395 τι δήτα φάσμα τῶν ἀνελπίστων ὦρῳ; Or. 879 ὄρῳ δ' ἀλπτών φάσμα', ὦ μήποτε ὦφελον. Add I. A. 1585 ἀλπτών εἰσιδόντες ἐκ θεων τίνος | φάσμα'. But, as Nauck himself points out, the phrase θαῦμα ἀλπτίστων occurs in Soph. Trach. 673, a play which shows a strong Euripidean influence. Moreover, a general term like θαῦμα may include an "unverhoffte Erscheinung" as well as any other form of prodigy. In Or. 879, the very passage quoted by Nauck, B has θαῦμα, and in I. A. 1581 we have θαῦμα δ' ἵν αἰθήσης ὦρὼν just before the φάσμα is mentioned. Hence, though the emendations are plausible, I am inclined to believe that no change is necessary. φάσμα would hardly have been used here unnecessarily when it occurs just

* See on the other side Weeklein Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides p. 538.
below in 1127. — Dobree punctuates ὃθεοι, τὶ λέξῳ θαῦμ’ ἀνέλπιστον τοῦτο; γυναικα λείσσω κ.τ.λ., which may be right.

1125. "All the MSS. except a (which has Ἐ) read Ἐ, and all except P (which has ἐκπλήσσει) have ἐκπλήσσει. Nauck and Prinz suspect the words ἐκπλήσσει χαρά, the former on the ground that the ideas expressed by ἐκπλήσσει and χαρά are not congruous. But surely if one can say ἐκπλαγήναι χαρά cf. Aesch. Choeph. 231) or ἠδορὴ (cf. Soph. Trach. 626), the expression χαρά ἐκπλήσσει τινά ought to be both possible and natural. So in English we can say ‘joy crazes a man’ as well as ‘a man is crazed with joy.’ On the other hand, the simple genitive θεοῦ is certainly hard. If it is possessive, ‘some delusive joy of the divinity,’ it is ambiguous, and if it is a genitive of source we miss some verb indicating motion or origin. Should we not insert one letter and read μ’ ἐκ θεοῦ? This seems better than to escape the difficulty by altering χαρά to χάρις with Κβίκαλα (Studien zu Euripides II. p. 36)” (Ed. in Harvard Studies VII. p. 220). Since the above was written, I find that Buecheler proposed μ’ ἐκ θεοῦ many years ago (on quite different grounds); and the conjecture therefore belongs to him. His reason for making it was that θεοῦ, θεῶν, etc., when synizesis occurs, are almost always, if not always, preceded by a long syllable. The conjecture is thus confirmed by evidence of another kind.

1126. Radermacher’s ἄλλη for ἄλλα improves both sense and metre so much that I have ventured to receive it into the text. The caesura between the conjunction ἄλλα and the clause with which it belongs seems very clumsy.

1127. τόδε: so Herwerden; Ἐ is, of course, understood. For the ellipsis, cf. Iph. T. 67 ὅρα, φυλάσσον μὴ τὶς ἐν ἐπίθε βροτών. τὸδ’ εἰσορῶ of B and τὸδ’ of most MSS. will then be different attempts to supply the verb. For μὴ with the subjunctive after ὅρα and ὀδο, see M. und T. 396. Kirchhoff thinks ὅρα γε a gloss, and that μὴ τὶ has come by a "copyist’s error" from ἄλλη Ε τὶ (i.e. ΜΗΤΙ from ΑΛΛΗΤΙ). Hence he would read ἄλλη Ἐ τὶ φάσμα νερτέρων τὸδ’ εἰσορῶ; One might also think of μὴ νερτέρων τὶ φάσμα γὲ εἰσορῶ τὸδε (M. und T. 264; cf. v. 315) or μὴ νερτέρων τὶ φάσμα νῦν τὸδ’ εἰσορῶ, which would account better for the addition of ὅρα γε: but, on the whole, I prefer the reading in the text.

1128. "Mediums" seem to have been in ill repute in ancient times as well as in modern.

1130. τοῦχνη: so the MSS. The sense will then be "that you disbelieve your good fortune," which seems apposite enough, as Admetus has just asked doubtingly, "do I really behold my wife, whose funeral I was holding just now?" I cannot see why Reiske’s emendation τοῦχη is at all necessary. "Aliud est non fidere sorti, quod est instabilem futuram putantis: de qua re hic non est sermo; aliud non credere verum esse, quod accidit. De eo hic solo agitur" (Hermann).

1135. As to envy felt by the gods, Wecklein aptly compares Herod. III. 40, VII. 46, V. 21. Do the words of Heracles also convey a gentle hint that
it is time to thank him and his divine parent? At all events, the promptness with which Admetus turns to him is noticeable.

1137. φίλτασ: this, the reading of B, is certainly right, as the metre requires the antepenult to be long. The phrase ὁ φυτεύσας (φιλτασ) πατήρ is a favorite one with the tragedians; cf. I. A. 1177, Soph. O. T. 793, 1514, etc.

1138. τὰμ' ἀνώρθωσας: τὰμ' ἀνώρθωσα L P (av lost after μ). In L the second hand has tried to fill out the line by reading τάμα γ'. Cf. Suppl. 1227 σύ γὰρ μ' ἀνορθοῦσι.

1140. δαίμόνων τῷ κυρίῳ: so the schol., a and d. B L P have δαίμονων τῷ κοφάνῳ. Those who retain κοφάνῳ take δαίμονες in the sense of "departed spirits," manes, comparing 1003 and Hesiod Op. 121 τοῖ μὲν δαίμονες εἰσι... ἐσθολ. That δαίμον sometimes has this sense cannot be denied; but, as Weil points out, "tous les morts ne s'élevaient pas au rang de daïmônes, qui était reservé à une minorité privilégiée." To this privileged minority Alcestis would belong; but surely no unprejudiced person on hearing the phrase δαίμονων κοφάνος would ever think of Thanatos. He would naturally suppose that Zeus was meant, or if the connection showed that δαίμονων meant "departed spirits," that Pluto was in the speaker's mind. Those who believe that in this play Hades and Thanatos are identified, find support for their theory in this passage; but see note on l. 261. Moreover, as Jerram points out, an attributive genitive, like δαίμονων, usually has the article when the other noun has it, so that we should expect τῶν δαίμονων if we accept τῷ κοφάνῳ. On the other hand, if we read δαίμονων τῷ κυρίῳ, "with that one of the divinities who had her in his power," all is clear and simple. There is no need of interpreting with Matthiae δαίμον ἐκείνῳ ὁς κύριος ἐστι τοῦτον, τοῦ ἀνάγειν τοὺς τεθηκέντας, or with Hermann δαίμονων τῷ τοῦ ἐν ἡ μὴ ἡ ἐν κυρίῳ: with κυρίῳ, αὐτής or τῆς γυναικός is to be understood. The use of the article and the order of the words are just what we should look for if the adj. κυρίῳ is used; δαίμονων, too, has its ordinary sense, and, in short, all is plain and regular. I cannot doubt for an instant that κυρίῳ is the true reading. See on this whole passage Lessing De Mortis apud veeres figura p. 19; Robert Thanatos p. 35.

1132 ff. A clumsy device for explaining the silence of Alcestis. The poet obviously did not wish to have more than two speaking actors on the "stage" at once; a fact which would mark the play as early even if we did not know its date.

1145 6. πρὶν ἀν ἀφαγνιστῇ: i.e. "before the consecration to the powers of the lower world, which has been laid upon her, has been taken off." Cf. vv. 75-6. ἀφαγνιστῇ is very rare in classic writers, if not indeed ἀπαξ εἰρ. Suidas defines ἀφοσίῳ by ἀφαγνιστῇ.

1150. τυράννω: so B L P; τυράννον a l. Euripides often uses τύραννος as an adj., e.g. Πιππολ. 843, Med. 957, Aturn. 3, etc.

1153. δρόμον: Wilamowitz's brilliant emendation for δῆμον of L P (which reading is also mentioned by the schol.). ὁδὸν of B is probably a gloss on
δρόμον: while πόδα of α is doubtless an emendation made by some one who had in mind Ihec. 930 f. ἐπεὶ νῶτιμον | ναύς ἑκίνησεν πόδα and the construction πόδα βαίνειν (El. 94, 1173). The figure in ἐλθοσ δρόμον is that of a ship making her “run” (cf. Hel. 1080 νέως δρόμος, etc.), so that the meaning is, “may your return home be safe and speedy.”

1154. πάση τ’: so α (except that the i is omitted, as usual). The other MSS. have πάσι τ’, but πάση must be right, as the τ’ shows; for the adj. must belong with the following word. τετραρχία: Δημοσθένης Φιλιππικοῖς. τετάρων μερῶν δυτικῶν τῆς Θεσσαλίας ἑκατον μέρος τετράς ἐκάλεσε, καθά φησιν Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τοῖς Θεσσαλικοῖς· δυομα δὲ φησιν εἶναι ταῖς τετράσι Θεσσαλιῶτιν, Φιλίων, Πελαγιών, Ἑστιαῖότειν. καὶ Ἀριστότελης δὲ ἐν τῇ κοινῇ Θεσσαλῶν πολιτείᾳ ἐπὶ Ἀλεύα τοῦ Πόρρου διἐρήσατο φήσιν εἰς δ’ μόρας τῇ θεσσαλίων. ἀλλοι δὲ καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ μο’ (Harpocration; cf. Photius and Suidas s. v. τετραρχία). Nauck would read τετραπτόλει, as the tragedians do not elsewhere use τετραρχία and the mention of a τετραρχία in Thessaly in the heroic age is an anachronism. But I suspect Euripides did not think of this point. Does not Shakespeare make Hector quote Aristotle? It looks as if the use of the word “tetrarchy” for a political division of a country originated in Thessaly; and if so, Euripides is probably using the technical Thessalian word.

1157. μεθηρμόσμεσθα: cf. Aesch. Prom. 313 καὶ μεθάρμωσε τρόπους | νέως. Wakefield and Earle conjecture μεθωρμόσμεσθα, which is very elegant; but there seems to be no convincing reason for the change.

1158. εὐτυχῶν ἀρνήτομαι: the typical instance of this construction; see M. and T. 910, and cf. Or. 1581.

1159 ff. These lines occur also at the close of the Andromache, Bacchae, Helena and (with a change in the first line) Medea.
As might be expected from its early date, the *Alcestis* shows a relatively strict metrical treatment. This is true both of the iambic trimeters, which have comparatively few (about fifty) cases of resolution, and of the logaoedic verses, which show very close responsion and very few irregular resolutions (see Rumpel *Die Auflösungen im Trimeter des Euripides* in *Philologus* XXIV. pp. 407 ff.; K. F. Mueller *De pedibus solutis in dialogorum senariis Aesch. Soph. Eur.*; the appendix to Earle’s *Alcestis*, and Groeppel *De Euripidis versibus logaoedicis* p. 91 f.).

In the schematization of the lyric metres I have not followed any one authority to the exclusion of others. In his metrical schemes of the play (in vol. III. of the *Kunstformen*) J. H. H. Schmidt pays, as usual, too much attention to mere outward symmetry, and cannot be implicitly trusted. More satisfactory, so far as it goes, is the treatment of Rossbach-Westphal in the third edition of their *Griechische Metrik*. I have also found Christ’s *Metrik* and Gleditsch’s *Metrik* (in the 2d vol. of I. Mueller’s *Handbuch d. klass. Alt.-Wiss.*) of great service. Of course, many different arrangements and schemes are possible, and no single one will meet the approval of all scholars. I have adopted in part the notation employed by Schmidt, as his system, thanks to the admirable way in which it has been presented, is now in vogue in this country.

**Metrical Appendix.**

**Metres of the Play.**

1–27 iambic trimeters.
28–37 anapaestic system.
38–76 iambic trimeters.
77–85 anapaestic system.
86–92 = 98–104 logaoedic: —
86 = 98 \(\underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) (troch. dim. cat. with anacrusis).
87 = 99 \(\underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) “ “ “ “ “ “
88 = 100 \(\underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) (First Glyconic).
89 = 101 \(\underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) (log. tetrap. cat.).
90 = 102 \(\underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) (log. trip. cat. with anacrusis).
91 = 103 \(\underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) (sync. log. tetrap. cat. with anacrusis).
92–104 \(\underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \mid \underline{\Delta} \) (sync. troch. dim. cat.).
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93–97 = 105–111 (anapaestic systems).

112–121 = 122–131 (logaoedic): —
112 = 122 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (sync. troch. dim. cat. with anaer.).
113 = 123 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (sync. troch. dim. cat.).
114 = 124 ≤ > | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (log. trip. cat.).
115 = 125 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (log. trip. cat.).
116 = 126 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (log. dip. cat. with anaerusis).
117 = 127 ≤ > | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (Second Phererectan).
118 = 128 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (troch. tetrap. cat. with anaer.).
120–21 = 130–31 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (sync. log. hexap. cat.).

132–5 anapaestic system.

(See also Rossbach-Westphal Griechische Metrik pp. 494–5, 165; J. H. H. Schmidt Kunstformen d. Gr. Poesie vol. III. pp. 11–111.)

136–212 iambic trimeters.

211–225 = 226–237 logaoedic-trochaic: —
213 = 226 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (two troch. tripodies cat.,
the first syncopated, both with anaerusis).
214 = 227 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤, — | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (two troch.
dims. cat., the first syncopated with anaer.).
215 = 228 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (First Glyconic with anaer.).
216 = 229 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (First Glyconic).†
217 = 230 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (First Phererectan).
218 = 231 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (two troch. trip. cat.).
219 = 232 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤, ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (troch. tetrap.
cat. with anaer. + First Phererectan).
220 = 233 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (troch., monom. cat. with anaer.).
221 = 235 b ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (troch. trim. cat. with
anaer.).
222 = 234 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (sync. troch. trim. with
anaer.).
223 = 235 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (sync. troch. trip. cat.).
224 = 236 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (log. tetrap. cat. with anaer.).
225 = 237 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (First Phererectan with anaer.).

(See also Rossbach-Westphal pp. 286–7; Schmidt pp. 1V–V; Christ Metrik²
p. 629.)

238–43 anapaestic system.

244–47 = 248–51: —
244 = 248 ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ | ≤ (log. tetrap. cat.).

* Often called Ithyphallius.

† The irrational long in the second foot (na στόλα | μον) of 216 is highly suspicious, as the
antistrophe has ≤. Schmidt and Rossbach-Westphal read στόλον, which, however, does
not seem to be used in this sense. Groepel reads δερὴν βροξύ in 229.
245 = 249 \_\_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (sync. log. trip. + First Pherecratean).

\{246 = 250
\{247 = 251 iambic trimeters.

252\--255 iambic trimeters.

252 = 250 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (Second Glyconic with anacr.).

253 = 250 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (troch. trip. cat., syncopated, with anacr.).

254 = 250 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (two iambic dims., the second syncopated).*

255 = 256 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (sync. log. trip. + Adonic).

(See also Rossbach-Westphal pp. 494-5 ; Schmidt pp. VI-VII.)

273-9 anapaestic system.

280-302 iambic trimeters.

303-305 dochmiac-trochaic:

\{303 = 406 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (dochmius + troch. trip. cat.).

304 = 407 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (troch. dim. cat. with anacr.).

305 = 408 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (sync. troch. trip. cat.).

306 = 409 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (sync. troch. dim. cat. with anacr.).

307 = 410 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (dochmius).

308 = 411 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (log. trip. cat. with anacr.).

309 = 411 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (troch. trip. cat. with anacr.).

400 = 412 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (sync. log. trip. with anacr. + sync. troch. tetrap.).

401 = 413 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (sync. troch. trip. with anacr.).

402 = 414 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (log. trip. cat.).

403 = 415 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (two log. trips., the first sync.).

416-34 iambic trimeters.

435-444 = 445-454 logaoedic:

435 = 445 \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ (log. trip. cat.).

* This line may also be regarded as an iambic tetrameter catalectic.

† May also be taken as an Adonic.
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436 = 446 - |  |  |  |  |  |  | (log. tetrap. with anacr.).
437 = 447 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. log. pentap. with anacr.).
438-9 = 448-9 - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (two sync. log. tetrapodies, the first with anacr., the second catalectic).
440 = 450 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (log. trip. cat.).
441 = 451 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. troch. dim. cat.).
442 = 452 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. log. pentap. with anacr.).
443-4 = 453-4 - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (First Glyconic with anacr. + First Pherecratean).
455-65 = 466-75 logaoedic: —
455 = 466 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (First Pherecratean).
456 = 467 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Second Pherecratean).
457 = 468 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (First Pherecratean with anacr.).
458 = *** |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Second Pherecratean).
459 = 469 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. troch. hexap. cat.).
460 = 470 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. log. pentap. with anacr.).
461 = 471 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (anapaestic monometer, syncopated).
461 b = 471 b |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. log. pentap. with anacr.).
462 = 472 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (dactylic tetram.).
463 = 473 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (dactylic tetram.).
464 = 474 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (dact. tetram. + sync. troch. trip. cat. with anacr.).
465 = 475 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. troch. pentap. cat. with anacr.).
476-567 iambic trimeters.
568-77 = 578-587 logaoedic: —
568-9 = 578-9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync.
Third Glyconic + log. trip. with anacr.).
570-71 = 580-81 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. log. hexap. cat. with anacr.).
572 = 582 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. troch. dim. cat.).
573 = 583 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Third Glyconic with anacr.).
574 = 584 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. troch. trip. cat.).
575 = 585 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Second Glyconic).
576 = 586 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (First Glyconic with anacr.).
577 = 587 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Second Pherecratean).
588-96 = 597-605 dactylo-epitritic, logaoedic.
588 = 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (dact. trip. cat. with anacr.).
589 = 598 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (2d Epitrite + dact. trip. cat.).
590 = 599 |  |  |  |  |  |  | “ “ “ “ “ “
591 = 600 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (dact. trip. cat.).
592 = 601 |  |  |  |  |  |  | (sync. log. pentap. cat., with anacr.).
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593-4 = 602-3 — | ⊥ ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. log. tetrap. with anacr. + log. trimet. cat.).
505 = 604 ⊥ | ⊥ > | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. hexamet. cat.).
506 = 605 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. pentamet. cat. with anacr.).
606-740 iambic trimetters.
741-6 anapaestic system.
747-860 iambic trimetters.
861-871 anapaestic system.
872-7 = 889-94 (μέλος ἀμοιβαῖον) logaoedic *:
872 = 889 ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. hexamet. cat. with anacr.).
873 = 890 ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. pentamet. cat. with anacr.).
874 = 891 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ — (dochmius).
875 = 892 ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. hexamet. cat. with anacr.).
876 = 893 ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (log. pentamet. cat. with anacr.).
877 = 894 ⊥ — | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. pentamet. cat. with anacr.).
895-902 anapaestic system.
903-10 = 926-34 logaoedo-trochaic :
903 = 926 ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ — (troch. monom. cat. with anacr.).
904 = 927 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (log. tetrapody).
905 = 928 ⊥ — | ⊥ | ⊥ — (sync. troch. dim. cat.).
906 = 929 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. dim. cat. with anacr.).
907 = 930-31 ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (troch. dim. cat. with anacr.).
908 = 932 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. log. trimet. cat. with anacr.).
909 = 933 — | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ " " " " " "
910 = 934 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (sync. troch. trimet. cat. with anacr.).
911-925 anapaestic system.
925-961 iambic trimetters.
962-971 = 973-81 logaoedic :
962 = 973 ⊥ — | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (Second Pherecratean).
963 = 974 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (Second Glyconic).
964 = 975 ⊥ > | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ " " " " " "
965 = 976 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (Second Pherecratean).
966 = 977 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (Second Glyconic).
967 = 978 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (Second Pherecratean).
968 = 979 ⊥ > | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ " " " " " "
969-70 = 980 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ | ⊥ (Second Glyconic + log. trimet.).
971 = 981 ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ ⊥ | ⊥ (log. trimet. cat.).
972 = 982 — ⊥ ⊥ | — ⊥ | ⊥ (First Pherecratean).

* The ejaculations made by Admetus stand extra metrum.
983–994 = 995–1005 logaoedic.
983–4 = 995–6 \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \) | \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \), | \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle > | \triangle \) (choriambic dimerter + log. trip. cat.).
985 = 977–8 \( \triangle > | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \), | \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle | \triangle \) (sync. log. trip. + sync. log. trip. cat.).
986 = 999 \( \triangle > | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ | \triangle \) (Second Glyconic).
987–9 = 1000 \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle > | \triangle \circ | \triangle \) (log. trip. with anacr.).
990 = 1001 \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \) (log. trip. cat.).
991 = 1002 \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ | \triangle \) (First Pherercratean with anacr.).
992 = 1003 \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ | \triangle \) " " " "
993 = 1004 \( \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ | \triangle \) " " " "
994 = 1005 \( \triangle > | \triangle \circ \circ | \triangle \circ | \triangle \circ \) (log. tetrap.).

1159–63 anapaestic system.
**GREEK INDEX.**

[The Roman numerals refer to the page of the Introduction; the Arabic numbers to the line of the play under which the word is discussed in the Critical Notes.]

### A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀγαλμα, meaning of</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁγών, meanings of</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἂδης, as common noun</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀεὶ and αἱκὲ,</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀ妁,</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀθρέω,</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ας, elision of, in 1st and 3d person,</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγαλμα, 595.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴδθρον, 658.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴματα, meaning of plur.,</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἵμφραντος,</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰνέω, meaning of,</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκλαυςτος, sigmatic and non-sigmatic forms of,</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκοιτις,</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκραεψής,</td>
<td>1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλς = μετρίως,</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλςκεσθαί, use of,</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλως, meaning of,</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμβαλείν, use of form,</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμέθυστα βιτ,</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀν, ellipsis of partic. with,</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄν, omitted after ἐστιν δῶρω,</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνα = ἄνάστηθι,</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιτέμνειν,</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντομαι and αἰτομαί,</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπαντλέω, metaphorical use of,</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπειρόδακος,</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπλακὼς and ἀμπλακὼς,</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπ' ἀχῆς,</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπὸ παντολας χθονὸς,</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπότομος, 118, 981.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρδη,</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρταμεω,</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀτίζων,</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐθις . . . πάλιν,</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐλός,</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐχέω, meaning of,</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφαγητειν,</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφορητειν,</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balne, first aorist of,</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βάρβιτος, nature of,</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βίτος, how different from ψυχή,</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπειν, with εἰς and πρός,</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουφόρβια,</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Γ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Γ for Π,</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γαμείν, not γαμήσειν, Attic form,</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γούναςι, form,</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Δ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page/Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δαιμόνων, meaning of,</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαφονός,</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέ, climactic force of,</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεινά πάσχειν,</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέσποινα, title of deities,</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάδοχος, as substantive,</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαπρέπειν, with gen.,</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόμω = εἰσιν,</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δυσπάλαιστος,</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύσφορο and δυσμενή,</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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E.

ëγχος = εἴφος, 76.
ëξων and εἶη, 295.
eῦλεων and ὀελεων, 644.
eἶμεν, form, 920.
eἰρ, form, 232.
ἐκ προσαστίον, force of prep., 835.
ἐκπρεπής and ἐνπρεπής, 333.
ἐκφέρεσθαι, 601.
ἐκφορά, 422.
ἐκβαίνειν and ἐκβαίνειν κέλευθον, 1001.
ἐμπας, 906.
ἐν γένει, 904.
ἐν δεσμών πίτνειν, 1050.
ἐν σοι ἐςμεν καὶ ἵν καὶ μή, 279.
ἐν τῷ ἡμέρᾳ, use of prep., 513.
ἐντυχόντι, meaning of, 1032.
ἐξ, denoting agency, 629.
ἐξέρχοσθαι, use of, 640.
ἐξώπιος, 546.
ἐπ' αὐτῷ and ἐπ' αὐτῶν, 148.
ἐπεστράφη, meaning of, 187.
ἐπήνεσα, idiomatic use of aor., 1095.
ἐπιγαμεῖν, meaning of, 305.
ἐπιπάροδος, xlix.
ἐπιστάθαι = δύνασθαι, 566.
ἐς δόν, 1101.
ἐς τρίτην μηρός, 320.
ἐστίν ὅποι, opt. without ἄν after, 117.
ἐστίν ὅως, opt. without ἄν after, 52.
ἐταῖρος, as adj., 776.
ἐτεμον and ἔταμον, 215.
eὐφωρος, 757.
eὐμαρῆς, 492.
ἐὔπροσθηγορος, 775.
ἐχθροζένους and κακοζένους, 558.
ἐχιδνά, emblem of cruelty, 310.
ἐχειν = "comprehend," 51.

Z.

Ζῆν χρῆν, 184.

Θ.

Θαρσεῖν, form in ρο, 38.
θολοῦν, 1067.
Οργκίας, orthography of, 1021.

Ι.

I of dative not elided in tragedy, 1118.
ἰ, mistaken for ῥο, 228.
iερα and iερη, 25.
iερός with gen., 75.
"Τννο, 590.
 iptόστασις, 590.

Κ.

Καὶ ... τε, 647.
καλλίνας, of a lake, 589.
καλὸς αὐτοῖς καταθανεῖν ἥκον βλου, 291.
καραστάμων, 1118.
κατά, with gen. and accus., 237.
κατάρχοσθαι, 74.
καταστήσασα = πούσασα, 283.
κατηρίζατο, form of augment, 162.
κάτω χθονός καὶ κατὰ χθονός, 45.
κεδνά πράξειν, 605.
κεῖνων ἔραμαι, 866.
κεύθος, 872.
κλαίω = "catch it," 64.
κλέω καὶ κλείω, 447.
κλίσια = λέχος, 904.
κοινοῦσθαι, with accus., 426.
κορηθεύειν, meaning, 313.
κόρος, form, 984.
κναναγής, use as epithet, 254.
κόδιον, 960.
κυρίω καὶ κυρίανδρε, 1140.
κυρήσαι καὶ κυρήσαι, 473.
κωμήται, of Thessalians, 476.

Λ.

Λακεῖν = "sing," 351.
Λάρισα, orthography of, 835.
λέγειν = "talk about," 697.
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λιπαραί, epithet applied to Athens, 452.
λοχαίος, 846.
λύειν = λυστελείν, 627.
Λυκίαν, constr. of, 114.

Μ.
Μαραλίνοσθα, “pregnant constr.” with, 236.
μεθαρμόξειν, 1157.
μεθαρμίζειν, 798, 1157.
μέθυ, 757.
μελαμπέπλοτσ λσω and μελαγχίμωσ πέ-πλος, 427.
μέν = “I suppose,” 146.
μέτον, τό, = “the difference,” 914.
μετακύμιοσ ἄτας, 91.
μετάστασις, of the chorus, xlii.
μή, with subj. to express apprehension and desire to avert, 318.
μή . . . ὀψελον, 879.
μηλοθύτης, 119.
μημήσκω, pres. not used by tragedians, 1045.
μοιμάμπεξ, 428.
μοισταια, 906.
μοιστστολος, 406.
μοίνος, μούνως, not Euripidean, 122.
μυρρινός, rare word, 173.

Ν.
Ναυκληρία, meaning, 112.
νεάνις, as adj., 679.
νεβρός, 585.
νεολαία, 103.
νέομαι, used in fut. sense, 737.
νεοσός = “child,” 403.
νόμως and δόμως, 574.
νοσφίζειν, 43.

Ξ.
Ξενώνες, 547.

Ο.
Οὐνείος, 532.
οίδα μή, with partic., 1094.

οίδα and οἴδας, 780.
οἰκετελεῖν, 437.
οἰκτηρεῖν, orthography of, 193.
ὀφανεῖν, 165.
ὀρῶ and οἴδα, with μή and subj., 1127.
ὁς εἶ, meaning, 640.
δαιος, meaning, 10.
δατίς γε, causal use of, 620.
δατρακον or ἀράκον, 98.
οἶκ οἶδ' εἰ and πεσκειν αὖ, 48.
οὖνκα, the form, 810.
οὐράνιος, in Euripides, 230.
οὖτω, post-positive, 333.
οὖχ' οὖτω = hanc impune, 680.
ὀθολομάτεγκτος, 184.
δχμα, 66.

Π.
Παίαν, use of the word, 424.
παρά = “during,” 926.
παραλύσαι, form, 117.
παρθένεια = “virginity,” 177.
πάροδος, 77 f.
πάρος, with gen. of time, 223.
πάτριος and πατρίδος, 249.
πέλτης = πελταστὰν, 498.
πέμψαντος . . . μέτα, 66.
πέραν = πέρα, 585.
πεφροντικὸς βλέπειν, 773.
πίτνειν = “to be cut off,” 103.
πίτνειν and πίπτειν, 948.
πίτνειν and πίπτειν, 183.
πίτυλος, Euripidean uses of, 798.
πλάθειν, 119.
πλέον, orthography of, 229.
πλήρης, meaning, 132.
πόδα πεζεύς, 869.
ποείν, form, 1107.
πομπίνης, use of word, 576.
πολείν, 29.
πολυάχειτος, 918.
πορεύειν, with two accus., 444.
πόρσω, 910.
πράσσω, not “old Attic,” 148.
πρέπει, meaning and constr., 1050.
πρεβέθεν, 282.
πρίν, with indic., 128.
προβήσεται or προβήσεται, 785.
προθυμίαν εξεῖν, 51.
προκόπτειν, metaphorical use of, 1070.
προπετήσ, 909.
πρός, adverbial use of, 1063.
πρός, "for the interest of," 57.
προσέγγιναι or συγεγγιναι, 482.
προσκήνων, doors in, xlix, 547.
προσπέτεσθαι, 421.
πρόσφατα, 845.
πυρά, meaning, 608.
πύργος, metaphorical use of, 311.

Ρ.
Πεέδρον, used in plur. by Soph. and Eurip., 458.
ρέψα, intransitive use of, 897.

Σ.
Σ, doubled in first aor., 230.
σανίς, meanings, 968.
σεσέγγυσαι, force of tense, 78.
συληρός, metaphorical use, 500.
σοῦ τὸ φράσα, constr., 832.
σο, for ττ, 148.
στατίζεσθαι, 90.
στείχεω ἐπὶ τινα, 74.
στερέω, form, 227.
σύγκασις, 410.
σύμμετρος, 26.
σόν, in Euripides, 915.
συνδύας, 474.
σφε, as sing., 553.
σχέδιος, 741.
σχήμα δύων, 911.
σφίξω, orthography of, 292.

Τ.
Τέραμανα and τέραμα, 457.
τιθεῖς and τίθης, 57.

tοξιχρήσης, 55.
-τόν and -τύν, in dual of hist. tenses and opt., 272.
tῶν ἀνδρα ἐμὲ, 331.
tετραρχία, 1154.
tι γένωμαι, meaning, 153.
tι κακῶν μείζον ἀμαρτείν ἀλάχου, constr. of, 879.
tύραννος, as adj., 1150.

Υ.
Ταμέναιοι, meaning, 576.
ὑπεραλγεῖν, with gen., 883.
ὑπερβάλλειν and ὑπερβαίνειν, 1077.
ὑπὸ σπάλαγχνοις εξεῖν, 1009.
ὑποβάλλειν, meaning, 630.
ὑπομαρτπτείν, metaphorical use of, 537.
ὑπουργῆσαι χάριν, 842.

Φ.
Φάμαι == "solemn addresses," 1005.
φεῖ, followed by a wish, 719.
φανῶ, with partic., 662.
φθινός, 100.
φιλατα, τά, 340.
φιλεῶ and φιλεύω, 294, 1137.
φλάξ, without adj., 4.
φρονεῖν δικόν vs. δόξω φρονεῖν, 565.
φρούρος, fem., 94.

Χ.
Χάλεβα, 980.
χειρ' ἐκτείνειν, 768.
χείρεσσα, form, 756.
χρήν, without ἄν, 384.

Ψ.
Ψυχορραγεῖν, 20.

Ω.
Ω and ο, confused in MSS., 88.
ώραιος, 516.
ώς ἄν, in final clauses, 740.
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