



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Homerica. II

Author(s): T. L. Agar

Source: *The Classical Review*, Vol. 12, No. 5 (Jun., 1898), pp. 252-254

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/691326>

Accessed: 29/07/2010 06:26

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Classical Association and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to The Classical Review.

<http://www.jstor.org>

class are the 3rd plural of the present and perfect active of all verbs, the 3rd singular present of verbs in *-μι*, and one indeclinable, *πέρουσιν*.

The common characteristic of all the words in the first class is that they have been inherited by Greek as ready-made formations, and that the *ι* retains no trace of an independent existence or meaning. In these the *τ* remains unchanged.

In words of the second class the *ι* is really a postposition, and is in a sense isolated with a special demonstrative signification. In this respect they may be compared to the datives plural in *-σι*, which are by general consent a Greek formation in which an *ι* has been added to a form ending in *σ*.

In the verbal inflexions, which almost constitute the second class, the *ι* is Indo-germanic, it is true, but the presential character of the suffix has been emphasised and renewed by the contrast to the corresponding forms of the imperfect (cf. *ἔτιθεν*, *τιθέντι*; *ἔλεγον*, *λέγοντι*). For *πέρουσι* (*πέρουσι(ν)*) compare *γυνί*.

It is the *ι* in these words of the second class that has in Attic and Ionic the twofold attribute of converting the preceding *τ* into *σ*, and of taking the *νῦ* *ἑφελκυστικόν*. So closely connected is the addition of the *νῦ* *ἑφελκυστικόν* with the conversion into *σ*, that as Mr. R. J. Walker has pointed out, there is reason to believe that in those dialects which preserved the *τ* the *νῦ*

ἑφελκυστικόν did not appear. These facts taken together seem to indicate that the postpositional *ι* was in Attic and Ionic a nasalised and strongly palatal vowel. The retention of *τ* in *ἔστι* is regular. It is preserved from change by the preceding *σ*. Cf. *πίστis*, *πύστis*, *λήστis*, &c.

There is one striking exception to the law I have ventured to formulate, viz. *εἴκοσι*, which is the Attic and Ionic modification of *ἑκατὶ* (*vinçati*, *viginti*). The word deserves remark as presenting four anomalies within the compass of three syllables. The *ει* ought to be *ι*, the *ο* ought to be *α*, and if my contention is correct, the *σ* ought to be *τ*, and the final *ι* incapable of taking the *νῦ* *ἑφελκυστικόν*. It is evident that, as in almost all great irregularities, popular etymology has been at work. *ἑκατὶ* seems to have been taken as *εἰκότ + ι*, a combination in which *εἰκότ* was felt as the original neuter of *εἰκός*, and as meaning 'fair' or 'reasonable.' The *ι* was felt as being the same demonstrative postposition as in *πέρουσι*. This *εἰκότι* I believe to have been the parent of the historical *εἴκοσι*. For the change of accent see Wheeler's *Nominal Accent*, p. 106. That the vague notion of a fair or reasonable thing should be identified with the special meaning of twenty is no more strange than that the equally vague idea of score should come to mean the same number in our own language.

FRED. W. WALKER.

HOMERICA.

II.

Iliad iii. 64 ff.

μή μοι δῶρ' ἐρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης·
οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἔστι θεῶν ἔρικυδέα δῶρα,
ἄσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσω· ἑκὼν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις ἔλοιτο.

'Cast not in my teeth the lovely gifts of golden Aphrodite; not to be flung aside are the gods' glorious gifts that of their own good will they give; for by his desire can no man win them' (Leaf). This we may take to be the accepted interpretation. It is given by La Roche, Ameis-Hentze, Fäsi-Franke, Heyne, Voss, etc.

Now in the first place it seems more than doubtful whether *ἑκὼν* can legitimately bear

this meaning 'by wishing for them,' 'wenn er auch wollte' (Curtius, *Gk. Et.* p. 135). The only support for such a sense seems to be the rather curious statement of Aias in *H* 197:—

οὐ γάρ τις με βίη γε ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα δίηται,

where *ἑκὼν*, for which Aristarchus reads *ἑλών*, although it may not be strictly logical, need not have any unusual sense, because it merely emphasises the contradictory term *ἀέκοντα*. In such contrasts the Greeks, certainly in later times, pushed matters a long way, as witness *οἱ τ' ὄντες οἱ τ' ἀπόντες* (*Soph. Ant.* 1109). Clearly then, even if

ἐκὼν be right in H 197, it affords no justification whatever for the peculiar meaning attributed to ἐκὼν in our passage. For my own part I have no confidence that it is right in H 197; but ἐπέχων 'assailing' (cf. τ 71 τί μοι ὦδ' ἐπέχεις κεκοτηότι θυμῷ;) would be a more probable suggestion than the unmetrical ἐλὼν of Aristarchus, which indeed *pace tantū vivī* is nothing less than an absurdity, for no one could chase (δίηται) a man after he had killed him (ἐλὼν). Ajax, rough and blunt soldier as he was, may be supposed to have known his business better than to say that.

But even if for a moment we agree to take this questionable sense, 'by wishing for them,' as a possibility, what is the point of the remark? The argument embodied in the accepted interpretation already given is absolutely unconvincing. There are a great many things—the moon for instance—that a man cannot get by wishing for them, ἐρικυδέα in the highest degree, and yet might be very glad to be rid of, if he did get them. Accordingly we may safely say that this is certainly not what Homer meant by the clause, ἐκὼν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις ἔλοιτο, and apparently we must be content to take it as a mere exegesis of the preceding αὐτοί, though it is not easy to see why αὐτοί calls for any exegesis at all. This sense of the emphatic pronoun, 'of their free will,' 'spontaneously,' 'ultro,' is common enough, nor is it of the nature of the Homeric exegesis to explain the usage of such a word as αὐτός. So much then for the clause with ἐκὼν translated as above.

Now let us see how the matter stands with ἐκὼν in its correct and ordinary sense 'voluntarily,' 'not under compulsion,' 'being under no constraint.' Mr. Monro's version must not be left out of account. He says 'the meaning is not "no one can get them by wishing," but "no one can take them as a matter of choice," by willing or not willing: a man is wholly passive in regard to these gifts.' Here the right meaning is given to ἐκὼν, while the general interpretation of the clause remains not quite, but very nearly, the same. In the ordinary view the individual, the τις, is eager for the gifts and yet cannot get them. He would receive the offer of them with an enthusiastic 'Oh thank you very much.' In Mr. Monro's view he is indifferent about the gifts and would receive the offer with an unruffled 'Well, I don't mind if I do.' Now to say 'these things cannot be got by mere acquiescence' is not only a far less forcible and

less adequate statement than to say 'they cannot be got by earnest wishing,' but worse than that implies, if anything, that the converse of this indifferent assent would be successful in attaining them, which of course is far from being the meaning here.

There is, after all, only one interpretation that can rightly be given to the words as they stand, ἐκὼν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις ἔλοιτο. 'No one would take these gifts, if he could help it, if he had any choice in the matter, unless he were compelled.' Unfortunately this ruins the whole speech, for thereby Paris discourses in something like this strain: 'I did not make myself handsome. No one would be so, if he could possibly avoid it. But as it is impossible to get rid of beauty, how unjust of you to reproach me with it! I have it, because I can't help having it. The fault is Aphrodite's, not mine.' These ascetic sentiments, however laudable and appropriate in the mouth of a Simeon Stylites, are of course not in any degree suitable to the true character of the vain-glorious gallant, Paris. Nor, again, is there the slightest trace of an ironical or bantering tone to be found in the words.

I conclude then that none of the above methods of dealing with the lines gives a satisfactory result, and accordingly it may be worth while to suggest that without touching a single letter of the vulgate, by simply introducing a note of interrogation, a natural, easy, and unexceptionable meaning would be forthcoming, thus:—

μή μοι δῶρ' ἐρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης·
οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστι θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα,
ἴσσο κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσι· ἐκὼν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις ἔλοιτο;

'Do not cast in my teeth the lovely gifts of golden Aphrodite; not to be scorned are the glorious gifts of the gods, those that by their grace they give us; for would not any one right willingly receive them?' (sc. δῶρα Ἀφροδίτης). The words from οὐ τοι τοὶ δῶσι are virtually parenthetical Ὀμηρικῶς.

The tone of this is, I submit, in every way characteristic of the Trojan prince. He deprecates Hector's reproaches and contemptuous references to his personal attractions, and he asks whether any one and every one would not be handsome, if he could. The speech almost amounts to a retort upon his detractors. They would not object to be as well-favoured as he is. There is not one of them but would readily change places with him. The emphasis on ἐκὼν is well indicated by its position. The grapes are sour.

Lastly, the absence of an interrogative particle is common enough in Homer, in fact rather more common than actually appears from the vulgate; for the later Greeks could

not resist the temptation to turn Homer's οὐ δίσθα; regularly into ἤ οὐκ δίσθα; with a crasis.

T. L. AGAR.

NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

iii. 7. Δεινομένεος the papyrus, -εως Mr. Kenyon; cf. v. 35. This may be the better form, but the editor's argument that 'εο, even when contracted by synizesis, remains short (e.g. θεός Pind. *Pyth.* i. 56)' is vicious. In θεόπιμον xi. 12 θεο is anceps, but in xvii. 132 θεόπομπον is _ _ _ and θεοφίλης xi. 60 is _ _ _ . Cf. θευπροπίαν x. 41. At best the cases of short εο (that is, εο where ε is treated like ι) are rare. In *Pyth.* x. 28 for βρότεον (_ _) many read βροτόν. In Praxilla 1 we have τεόν (_). In Bacch. viii. 12 I prefer to keep the epitrite unresolved.

ix. 45. Following the papyrus, Mr. Kenyon reads σῶν, ὦ πολυζήλωτ' ἄναξ, ποταμῶν. In the corresponding verse of epode α' (v. 19) he reads ἄ και τότ' Ἄδραστον Ταλ[αιονίδαν]

and notes the difference between the scansion of Ταλαιονίδας here (_ _ _ _) and in Pind. *Ol.* vi. 15 (_ _ _ _). In 19 I propose Ταλαίονιδαν as in Pindar, and in 45 πολυζήλωτε ἄναξ. In iii. 76, v. 84, Bacchylides, it is true, does not admit hiatus before ἄναξ. Still, his procedure is tolerably eclectic. We have τε ἰοβλεφάρων ix. 3, θέντα ἰόπλοκον ix. 72, Δάματρα ἰοστέφανον iii. 2, but μὲν ἰοστέφανων v. 3, λῆξεν ἰοστέφανου xiii. 89; δὲ ἕκατι frag. 1, 7; and εἶδω keeps its length before εἰπείν, ἔρδων, εἰδώς, though here the ictus falls on the adverb. If Pindar shows hiatus before ἄναξ, why not Bacchylides?

BEATRICE REYNOLDS.

Bryn Mawr College.

VON PLANTA'S OSCO-UMBRIAN GRAMMAR.¹

Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte; zweiter Bd. (Formenlehre, Syntax, Sammlung der Inschr. etc.) von R. VON PLANTA. Trübner, Strassburg. 1897. 20 Mk.

THE completion of Dr. Von Planta's great grammar deserves a cordial welcome. Every one who has used the first volume,—and that is the same thing as saying every one who has studied the Italic Dialects since its appearance in 1892—has waited anxiously for the second, which was to give us not merely a greatly needed revision of the text of the Oscan and Umbrian inscriptions, but also a commentary upon them, and an account of the morphology and syntax. And the volume now published will more than satisfy the expectation aroused by the

first. What was said in this Review (December, 1893, vii. 465) as to the general advantages and drawbacks of the fulness of treatment, which is the most striking characteristic of that volume, need not be here repeated. Much the same criticism might be applied to the 400 pages which in the second are given to *Formenlehre*; but on the other hand the reader will find that in mechanical details, such as the divisions of paragraphs, and the use of various type, this instalment of the grammar is far better arranged; and he will probably feel also that the discussion of forms actually occurring in the inscriptions is more practical, that is, it bears more on the interpretation of the inscriptions—which is after all the basis of every other kind of study of the dialects,—than the abstract elaboration of phonetic questions to which the first volume was devoted. But besides these the present volume, beyond all possible quest on, contains work of a very high order in quite a new

¹ [Professor Conway undertook this review in generous response to my urgent request, though his engagements made it quite impossible for him to deal with it until long after its publication.—G. E. M.]