

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

**The *Rhesus* of Euripides** *Euripides: Rhesus*. Edited by W. H. Porter. 6<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>" × 5". Pp. lii + 97. Cambridge University Press, 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

A. C. Pearson

The Classical Review / Volume 31 / Issue 01 / February 1917, pp 25 - 27  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00008507, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00008507](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00008507)

**How to cite this article:**

A. C. Pearson (1917). The Classical Review, 31, pp 25-27 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00008507

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

## REVIEWS

## THE RHESUS OF EURIPIDES.

*Euripides: Rhesus.* Edited by W. H. PORTER. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. liii + 97. Cambridge: University Press, 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

MR. PORTER has done good service in bringing our knowledge of the *Rhesus* up to date in this compact little volume. His work is careful and scholarly, and he has consulted all the available authorities. But, although the book is timely and will be useful, it would, I think, have been better, if its author had adopted a firmer and more independent line, especially in matters of textual criticism.

An editor of the *Rhesus* is faced at the outset with the disputed question of authorship. Mr. Porter's attitude is marked by extreme caution. Acknowledging that the play has many peculiarities, he holds nevertheless that the attack upon its genuineness has so far failed to establish itself. The strength of the argument against Euripides—that is to say, the absence of the pathos and sentimentousness elsewhere characteristic of him—is nowhere distinctly stated. The tendencies of style are more elusive; but most readers of the play seem to detect a difference of manner which has been aptly characterised by Professor Murray. The summary of stylistic data which Mr. Porter gives does not contain any of the most striking echoes of Sophocles and Euripides. Such, in regard to Sophocles, are the coincidences of 201 and *Trach.* 262, and of 866 and *Ai.* 792, *El.* 1110, *fr.* 168, the metaphorical use of *φιντεύειν* in 884, and the appearance of the *εἶδος Σοφόκλειον* in 756. Not that the *Σοφόκλειος χαρακτήρ* is to be identified within the sphere of language. It is more likely that those who discerned it remembered the Sophoclean *penchant* for the legends of the Trojan Cycle. *ταύς τε γὰρ μύθους*, as the author of the *Life* says, *φέρει κατ' ἴχνην τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ τὴν Ὀδυσσειάν δ' ἐν πολλοῖς δράμασιν ἀπογράφεται.* When Mr. Porter says

(p. xlix) that none of the Euripidean parallels is convincing, has he considered the parallelism of 80 and *Hipp.* 519, of 278 and *Andr.* 314, of 315 f. and *Phoen.* 1216, and of 656 and *Hclid.* 494 and *Phoen.* 161? But, of course, parallels to Euripides are double-edged, so far as they affect the question of authenticity. It would be more to the point, if someone would collect the characteristic items of Euripidean vocabulary which are foreign to the *Rhesus*; and here is perhaps a field which will yield good results. It is further to be noted that Rolfe's conclusion, quoted by Mr. Porter (p. xlvii), that 'the language is Aeschylean rather than Euripidean,' etc., is altogether baseless. His result is due to an oversight; for he has omitted from his comparative tables a table to contain the peculiarities common to Sophocles, Euripides, and the *Rhesus*. Yet it is quite certain that such a list would have more than offset the apparent leaning to Aeschylus. I regret also that Mr. Porter did not work out more fully the Homeric resemblances, an example of which he has pointed out in his excellent note on 864, as well as the purely domestic peculiarities (e.g. *πρωταυί*, *Ἐκτόρειά χεῖρ*, *ἐντάσσειν*, and the verbal ellipses<sup>1</sup> in 778 and 861). I should have liked to say something of another peculiarity of the play, the constant practice of repeating from an earlier passage one or more of the less common words or phrases, but must reserve this for another occasion.

Space could have been found for a closer examination of the language, if less attention had been given to Wilamowitz's Greifswald dissertation on the scholia (wrongly dated 1889 instead of 1877), which is rightly regarded as inconclusive. But I do not follow Mr. Porter's argument that Dicaearchus' quotation indicates that the lost prologue was a mere addition.

<sup>1</sup> These have also been noted by Mr. G. C. Richards in *C.Q.* X. 196.

to the original play. All that can be justly inferred is that Dicaearchus quotes as from Euripides a line which is not in our text; and, since his purpose was aesthetic rather than critical, there is the less reason to claim his authority in support of the tradition. The greater part of the Introduction discusses the Rhesus-myth and Dr. Leaf's recent article. Mr. Porter points out that Dr. Leaf is obliged to postulate a series of 'inventions,' in order to account for his version of the development of the myth; and he observes that the oracle-story of Polyaeus is actually inconsistent with the narrative of the play. It must be admitted that there is force in the argument that Hagnon's expedition offered a favourable occasion for the production of a play on the subject of Rhesus; but it is a violent assumption that such an event was improbable at a later date. Yet, unless we are prepared to go so far as this, seeing that Euripides certainly wrote a *Rhesus*, which he may have produced in 437, we do not advance any nearer to a conclusion that the extant play is genuine.

Mr. Porter very seldom departs from the text of Professor Murray, but he is certainly right in returning to *ἐπει δ' ἄν* (for *ἐπειδάν*) in 469, though his punctuation has not been revised accordingly. The only conjecture of his own which I have noticed is *δράσας* for *δράσαι* (*vulgo* *δράσαι*) in 105. The objection to this is not the co-ordination of adjective and participle, but the fact that *δράσας* is not an effective substitute for the required *δραστήριος*. In 54 *ἀρείσθαι* is unnecessary, to say nothing of its doubtful quantity (Jebb, *Ai.* p. 217). In 122 the vulgate is much to be preferred. In 251 Hoffmann's *πόθι* is unnecessary and, as I think, injurious. In 446 *ρίπτεϊς* is surely right. In 805 Musgrave's conjecture is much easier than Murray's, and its sense is satisfactory. Anyhow, it is misleading to say that Hesychius 'recognises both active and middle.' I am disappointed to find that Musgrave's *ἐπιδείξιας*<sup>1</sup> has not been

accepted in 364. In this context, and in view of the frequent confusion of the prepositions, the correction is certain. It carries with it the explanation of *οἶνοπλάνητος* — 'belonging to roving wine,' to be precise. Cf. Bacchyl. *fr.* 16 J. *σενομενᾶν κυλικῶν*, Callim. (*Ox. Pap.* XI. 85) *περιστείχοντος ἀλείσου*. It is an error, here and in 124, to speak of the verbal element being 'active.' Ultimately, the verbal adjective was neither active nor passive, but by association it tended to be grouped as either one or the other. *ἀρήϊφατος* in its first appearance was 'a slain warrior.' Subsequently, by a further process of epithetisation (or 'transference'), in combination with *κόπος*, it comes to mean in effect 'murderous.' But the subject is too large for treatment here.

In the following passages the editor's statements are open to criticism. 737: *ἀμβλώψ* (misprinted *ἀμβλωνψ* in the index) is not *ἀπαξ εἰρημένον*. See Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 89, 16 ff. 333: *βοηδρομεῖν* probably does not depend on *ὑστερον*. Cf. 412, 453. 270: it is simpler to treat *εὐτυχοῦντα* as agreeing with *ποιμνία*. 268: it is a very strange statement that *ἀγγέλλω*, with acc., = *to bring news of*, 'is perhaps not found elsewhere in Tragedy.' Similarly, I am surprised to read in the note on 110 that '*κλύω* with acc. (=hear of a thing)' is 'apparently unexampled.' 436: *περῶν* is an imperfect participle. 538: *φυλακῆν* is not accusative of place, but the phrase is the passive form of *τίνι ἐκήρυξεν φυλακῆν* (Kuehner-Gerth, I. 125). 546: *Σιμόντος* is not genitive of place, but qualifies *κοίτας* (cf. *ἔδραι τάφου*, etc.). 781: it is simpler to suppose that *ἵππους* is a case of inverse attraction. 191: the note is very confusing. However, the text is read, *λαβῶν* is logically prior to *δέχεσθαι*. In 374 Mr. Richards's suggestion (C.Q. X. 196) that *δίβολος ἄκων* is the Homeric *ἄκοντε δῶν* is well worthy of adoption. Cf., e.g., Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 79. In 875 I can see no objection to the rendering: 'To judge by your vaunts, my speech is not directed against you.' For Hector had precisely declared his own immunity from criticism (858). *γλώσσα* figured as a bow might have received illustration from Aesch. *Suppl.* 455 and other similar pas-

<sup>1</sup> L. Dindorf was probably right in preferring *ἐπιδείξιος*, but he should not be given the sole credit of the restoration.

sages. The comparison explains why *τείνεται* is preferred to *τέλει*.

There are several passages on which comment or elucidation would have been welcome (e.g., 703, 720, 789, and 849).

Although I have pointed out certain features which seem to me to be capable of amendment, the book is in general sound and sensible, and contains much that will be of value to the student.

A. C. PEARSON.

## UNIVERSITY DRAMA IN THE TUDOR AGES.

*University Drama in the Tudor Age.*  
By F. S. BOAS, M.A., LL.D. Oxford:  
Clarendon Press. 14s. net.

DR. BOAS has found a theme at once new and important; it is only surprising that no one has treated it before, except cursorily. Everyone knew that the Universities played a considerable part in the development of the drama; most students knew also that *Gammer Gurton's Needle* was performed in Christ's College Hall; a few choice spirits even knew that there were unprinted plays still to be found; but Dr. Boas went and found them, examined them, and in this book he puts them into their proper niche in stage history. He has done his work admirably; and the book, although it is full of detail, is attractive to read from beginning to end.

Dr. Boas points out that there was nothing in the University course to encourage the drama, or, indeed, humane letters generally; but other influences were at work. There must be high spirits and jollification where a thousand young men are gathered together, even if they have to grind at the Trivium and Quadrivium; and the English people have always loved play-acting. The revival of Greek learning helped; and we find the *Plutus* and the *Pax* performed in Cambridge. Terence, again, was always popular, and Plautus even more so. Who does not remember that the *Aulularia* was performed before Queen Elizabeth in King's College Chapel? From these to original plays is a short step.

A large class consists of plays on Biblical themes. Many Continental Latin plays of this kind were performed at Cambridge, and there are traces of similar performances at Oxford.

Nicholas Grimald, a Christ's man, well known in English literature, wrote a *Christus Redivivus* for Brasenose, where the main theme is relieved (after the usual fashion) by comic scenes amongst the soldiers; he is also the author of *Archiphrophaeta*. The Cambridge list is headed by a unique find of Dr. Boas's—the Greek play of *Ἰεφθάε*, by John Christopherson, presented in Trinity College. He gives a full analysis of this, with many extracts, which show that if Porson's canon was yet unknown, yet the author had no mean skill in verse-writing, together with both pathos and irony.

It is a great misfortune that there are very few English comedies left which belong to the age before Elizabeth. Several are mentioned—two by Grimald, performed in Oxford, and others in Cambridge, of which no trace remains. We must begin this class with *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, a play full of rollicking fun, and important in dramatic history. Dr. Boas discusses the authorship, and inclines to see him in John Bridges of Pembroke (B.A., 1556). Queen Elizabeth's visits to both Universities gave a new impulse to the drama; and after this we have a number of records of classical plays revived, Seneca included. Thomas Legge, Master of Caius, wrote the first play taken from English history proper, *Ricardus Tertius*, which was performed at St. John's in 1579, of which a long analysis is given. Italy has also had a part in University drama; and both *Victoria* and the excellent play *Hymenaeus* (now published by the Cambridge Press) are derived from that source. *Pedantius* is a burlesque of Gabriel Harvey, as we know from his bitter enemy Nashe. In Oxford there are