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](#)

Homerica. (VIII.)

T. L. Agar

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 03 / April 2001, pp 145 - 148
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029826, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029826

How to cite this article:

T. L. Agar (1901). Homerica. (VIII.). The Classical Review, 15, pp 145-148 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029826

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

APRIL 1901.

HOMERICA. (VIII.)

OD. VIII. 352 f. AND THE LENGTHENING OF SHORT VOWELS BEFORE *χρ*.

θ 352 πῶς ἂν ἐγὼ σε δέοιμι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι
θεοῖσιν,
εἴ κεν Ἄρης οἴχοιτο χρέος καὶ δεσμὸν
ἀλύξας;

ACCORDING to Ameis-Hentze the form *χρέος* instead of the only well authenticated Homeric *χρεῖος* has caused La Roche to suggest (*Hom. Unters.*, p. 41) *χρέως* with monosyllabic scansion as the original reading. The result sounds anything but rhythmical. The equal division of the verse into two separate parts is a device not so richly beautiful as it is fortunately rare. To read the line as a verse at all is rather a trial to the vocal organs, a dangerous delight, not to be indulged in too frequently by the wise and prudent. Hence, if *χρέος* is as inadmissible as I fully believe it to be, I should prefer to attempt the restoration of the line in this manner:—

εἴ κεν ὁ γ' οἴχοιτο χρεῖος καὶ δεσμὸν ἀλύξας.

The pronominal *ὁ γε* without further addition is sufficiently lucid here, and yet it might easily have been displaced to make room for the very correct gloss, *Ἄρης*. Certainly the metrical outcome of this hypothesis need not fear comparison with La Roche's curious effort.

There are one or two interesting points attaching to the examples of *χρεῖος* in NO. CXXXI. VOL. XV.

Homer, which for the purpose I have in view may be exhibited at length:—

- γ 367 εἴμ' ἔνθα χρεῖός μοι ὀφέλλεται, οὗ τι
νέον γε—
Λ 686 τοὺς ἔμην οἴσι χρεῖος ὀφείλετ' ἐν Ἥλιδι
δίῃ
φ 17 ἦλθε μετὰ χρεῖος, τό ρά οἱ πᾶς δῆμος
ὀφέλλε·
θ 355 Ἥφαιστ', εἴ περ γάρ κεν Ἄρης χρεῖος
ὑπαλύξας—
Λ 688 δαίτρενον· πόλεσιν γὰρ Ἑπεί
ὀφείλον,
698 καὶ γὰρ τῷ χρεῖος μέγ' ὀφείλετ' ἐν
Ἥλιδι δίῃ.
N 746 χρεῖος, ἐπεὶ παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀνὴρ ἄτος
πολέμοιο—
α 409 ἦ ἐὼν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδ' ἰκάνει;
β 45 ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος, ὃ μοι κακὸν
ἔμπεσε οἴκῳ.

The odds against *χρέος*, which is not very likely to find many advocates—it is also impugned by Leo Meyer (*Kuhn's Zeitschr.* VII., p. 208.)—are not, however, quite nine to one, as would seem from the above list. It has the support, whatever it may be worth, of the accepted, but for all that not very trustworthy, reading of λ 479:—

ἦλθον Τειρεσίαιο κατὰ χρέος, εἴ τινα βουλὴν
εἶποι,—

so that in this case as in several others the questionable form exists in duplicate. It would seem as if there had been a deliberate intention not to leave the modernised form entirely without a comrade to keep it in countenance.

But it may be observed that *χρεός* in this latter line departs not only from the quantity of *χρεῖος*, but is used in an uncertain sense. The commentators obligingly give us the choice of three renderings, (1) 'on business with,' (2) 'in need of,' (3) 'for consultation with.' To add to the difficulty the identical expression *κατὰ χρεός* actually occurs in the 'Hymn to Hermes,' l. 138 :—

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τοι πάντα κατὰ χρεός ἤνυσε δαίμων,

where it evidently means 'duly,' 'in due course,' and contributes nothing to the elucidation of the usage in the Homeric passage.

I would suggest, as the only possible solution short of absolute surrender to *χρεός*, that in λ 479 the original must have been subjected to some slight alteration, and might previously have run thus :—

ἦλθον Τειρεσίαο κατὰ κλέος—

This is a little different from the usual *μετὰ κλέος*, but this difference would correspond to a difference in the sense of the expression. He came not 'in quest of,' 'to find,' the fame of Teiresias, cf. Δ 227 *μετὰ κλέος ἵκετ' Ἀχαιῶν*, but 'because of his fame,' 'along of,' as we say in provincial English of the North.

So much then for the validity of *χρεός* in Homer. I must now return to θ 353. The lengthening of the ο of *οἴχοιτο* before *χρεῖος* in my proposed emendation will not be objected to in face of γ 367 *εἴμ', ἔνθα χρεῖος*, φ 17 *ἦλθε μετὰ χρεῖος*, where the 'production' is that of a syllable in arsis.

With regard to Δ 686 *τοὺς ἵμεν οἴσι χρεῖος* the case is different, and I have a suggestion to make, which, if well founded, is of some importance in the sphere of metrical usage. The ι of *οἴσι* being here in thesis, the better reading would be, as I judge, *οἴσιν χρεῖος*. In fact I venture to maintain that, other means failing, the ν ἐφελευστικόν is a necessity here; for although *χρ* would always suffice to lengthen a preceding short vowel in arsis—of this there are examples in plenty—it would be quite a different matter if the vowel were in thesis. Then I submit this vowel would remain short, as in the well-known instances Ψ 186 :

ῥοδόεντι δὲ χρεῖον ἐλαίῳ—.

Ω 795 καὶ τὰ γε χρυσεῖν ἐς λάρνακα θῆκαν ἐλόντες.

Accordingly I should not regard the traditional reading of θ 353 as metrically open to any valid objection any more than Hym. Apoll. 293 :—

πᾶσι θεμιστεύοιμι χρεῶν ἐνὶ πτόνι νηῶ.

On the other hand La Roche's reconstitution of θ 353 in this light becomes worse than ever: but let it rest in peace. Why stretch the corpse, and such a lovely corpse, again upon the rack?

I proceed to add to the passages already adduced Hym. Herm. 332 :—

σπουδαῖον τόδε χρῆμα θεῶν μεθ' ὁμήγουριν ἦλθε

and one of a unique, but very suggestive, character from the Hymn to Apollo l. 439 :—

ἐς λιμέν', ἥ δ' ἀμάθοισιν ἐχρίμψατο ποντοπόρος νηὺς.

Now I do not claim to have absolutely proved by these instances the canon I have ventured to lay down, but the probability of its truth is at least considerably strengthened thereby, and may derive still further confirmation and support both (1) from examples of its applicability to improve existing rhythms and (2) from the facility, with which such adverse examples as occur in the vulgate may be corrected.

(1) I will begin by referring to α 409 and the very similar β 45, quoted above in the list of instances of the use of *χρεῖος*. The primitive and more acceptable rhythm in these lines may fairly be supposed to have been :—

ἦ ἐὼν αὐτός χρεῖος—
ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτός χρεῖος—.

In ρ 121 *ὅττεν χρῆζων* at the beginning of the line is clearly improved by the restoration of the dactyl *ὅττεο*. No advocacy is here required. None shall be used.

And so probably enough in Δ 686, although, as I have said, *οἴσιν* would be at least correct, yet something might be advanced both on grounds of sense and rhythm in favour of :—

τοὺς ἵμεν, οἴσι τι χρεῖος ὀφείλετ' ἐν Ἥλιδι δῆ.

In A 37, 451, perhaps I may not be alone in preferring to the vulgate this emendation :—

κλύθι μεν, ἀργυρότοξος, ὃ Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας.

For the nom. for voc. v. *Cobet. Misc. Crit.* p. 333, Monro H. G. § 164 and for the article used as relative pronoun v. Monro H. G. § 262.

I expect less ready support and approval for my next suggestion, on the analogy of Hym. Apoll. 439, quoted above, that a 13:—

τὸν δ' οἶον νόστου κεκρημένον ἡδὲ γυναικός,

may have had originally, as the second hand in U (Monacensis Augustanus) gives it,

νόστοιο κεκρημένον,

while the very similar, but even more cumbersome *andante* movement of ν 378 σίτου καὶ οἴνου κεκρημένον, would certainly be infinitely improved in lightness, harmony and rhythm, if read:—

σίτοιο καὶ οἴνοιο κεκρημένον—.

(2) The adverse instances of lengthening of a short vowel in thesis before χρ are neither numerous nor formidable. In ν 215 we now read:—

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω καὶ ἴδωμαι.

For this I have elsewhere (*Journ. Phil.* xxvii., p. 172), without any idea that the second foot was really illegitimate, proposed to restore:—

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τάδε χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω τε ἴδω τε.

I need not dwell on the un-epic character of the article here. The hitherto unsuspected fact that it is also unmetrical, merely confirms the general opinion which already condemns, and has long condemned, τὰ χρήματα as a late depravation, though the terrors of χρ seem to have prevented any suggestion of the above easy remedy.

ν 263 ἀλλὰ χρήματα μὲν μυχῶ ἄντρον
θεσπεσίριο
θείομεν ἀντίκα νῦν—

The tradition here has not been altogether fallacious, for in four reasonably good MSS. PHTU (Ludwich) may be found the true reading ἀλλ' ἄγε instead of ἀλλά FGDSLW.

ξ 385 πολλὰ χρήματ' ἄγοντα σὺν ἀντιθέοις
εἰτάροισι

Here again the MSS. in three instances at any rate, GLW, indicate an unexceptional reading:—

πολλὰ κτήματ'

This is to some extent confirmed by the analogous case of ν 120, where the accepted text has ἐκ δὲ κτήματ', though a minority of MSS., already started on a wrong tack, has χρήματα there also (κτήματ' FGPBDSU; χρήματ' MLW, Eust.) Ludwich.

There remains, I believe, but one other instance of this lengthening in thesis:—

π 185 ἡδὲ χρύσεια δῶρα τετυγμένα

Here the MSS. render no assistance towards a restoration; but the subjoined is not a very far-fetched remedy, nor one from which the vulgate could not be developed with tolerable facility:—

ἡδ' ἔτι χρύσεια δῶρα

ἡδ' ἔτι would be read ἡδέ τι, and then the meaningless τι would of course drop out altogether. Compare ξ 173, where although ὄφρα τι is in no wise meaningless, yet I am distinctly of opinion that Homer said ὄφρ' ἔτι, in spite of the recurrence of ἔτι in the next line. Such recurrences are not uncommon in Homer.

I now pass for a moment to the consideration of θ 355:—

"Ἡφαιστ', εἴ περ γάρ κεν Ἄρης χρεῖος ὑπαλύξας.

On the principle I have endeavoured to establish, the intolerable ending -ος ὑπαλύξας, now defended on grounds, which carry no conviction, but cannot well be discussed at present, may be easily redeemed by a simple tmesis:—

"Ἡφαιστ', εἴ περ γάρ κεν Ἄρης ὑπὸ χρεῖος ἀλύξας.

In conclusion I cannot but remark on the curious inconvenience of the duplicate set of verb forms exhibited in the lines, on which I have been commenting, ὀφείλεται, ὀφείλον, ὀφείλετο contrasted with ὀφέλλεται, ὀφέλλε. The inconvenience is enhanced, when we have to find room for another ὀφέλλω, *augeo*, which has obviously no connection with the above double-barreled eccentricity. It must not be supposed that the variation of spelling in the verb that signifies 'I owe' is a point of absolute differentiation between the Iliad and Odyssey, as might appear to be the case from these lines. So far as can be ascertained, the authority of Aristarchus (v. on Λ 688) seems to have largely prevailed in the Iliad in favour of the spelling -ειλ-; but -ελλ- is not by any means absent from the older poem, as may be easily seen. In fact we have in the Iliad pretty much the same

elegant confusion as in the *Odyssey*. If the latter gives us γ 367 *χρείός μοι ὀφέλλεται* (*debetur*) and ξ 233 *αἶψα δὲ οἶκος ὀφέλλετο* (*augebatur*), the former is a good second with:—

A 353 *τιμὴν περ μοι ὀφελλεν Ὀλύμπιος ἐγναλίξαι* (*debebat*)

Υ 242 *Ζεὺς δ' ἀρετὴν ἀνδρεσσιν ὀφέλλει τε μινύθει τε* (*auget*).

In this difficulty are we to throw Aristarchus overboard or to accept his pilotage and allow him to guide us into smoother waters? I leave the question unanswered for more experienced seamen to tackle. Non omnia possumus omnes. T. L. AGAR.

ON ARISTOTLE'S *POETICS*, CH. VIII. 1451^a 22 *sqq.*

ὁ δ' Ὅμηρος ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διαφέρει καὶ τοῦτ' ἔοικεν καλῶς ἰδεῖν, ἥτοι διὰ τέχνην ἢ διὰ φύσιν. Ὀδύσσειαν γὰρ ποιῶν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἅπαντα ὅσα αὐτῷ συνέβη, οἷον πληγῆναι μὲν ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ μανῆναι δὲ προσποιήσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἄγερμῳ, ὃν οὐδὲν θατέρον γενομένου ἀναγκαῖον ἦν <ἢ> εἰκὸς θάτερον γενέσθαι, ἀλλὰ περὶ μίαν πράξιν οἷαν λέγομεν τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν συνέστησεν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα.

My attention was directed to the difficulties of this passage by an interesting paper upon several places in the *Poetics* and other Aristotelian writings, recently read before the Oxford Philological Society by Mr. J. A. Smith of Balliol College.

There appear to be two main views on the interpretation. The first is that the words οἷον πληγῆναι μὲν ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ μανῆναι δὲ προσποιήσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἄγερμῳ give examples of what Homer left out, and this may well seem at first sight the natural explanation. But then the *Odyssey* does contain the first incident. Robortello meets this difficulty by supposing, apparently, that οὐκ ἐποίησεν means 'did not describe at length,' on the ground that the wounding by the wild boar is only briefly alluded to (*uno tantum atque altero verbo exposuit*).¹ Some modern scholars, since the incident is really described at length, interpret οὐκ ἐποίησεν rather as amounting to 'did not embody in his poem as a part of the main subject,' or something similar. The other view is that by a brachylogy, which does not seem altogether impossible, πληγῆναι μὲν κ.τ.λ. is given as an example corresponding to ποιῶν and μανῆναι δὲ κ.τ.λ. as one corresponding to οὐκ ἐποίησεν. The scholars who maintain this view are well aware that it has its difficulties, but feel compelled to it by the fact that the first incident is really mentioned in the poem; and think they find some confirmation in

the following clause ὃν οὐδὲν θατέρον κ.τ.λ., which seems to indicate a discrimination between the two incidents. It is rather against their ingenious interpretation that Aristotle is fond of pointing such an antithesis as they suppose by an emphatic οὐ following the second member of it: but the main thing is that the supporters of neither view have considered sufficiently the great difficulty in which both sides are involved by the next clause ὃν οὐδὲν θατέρον γενομένου ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἢ εἰκὸς θάτερον γενέσθαι. On the second view, as we have said, the clause would allege a ground for discriminating between the two incidents. The sense then would be 'Homer put in the first incident but omitted the second, because neither of these incidents involved the other.' This would be very awkward logic. The reason for preferring one to the other could not lie in the mere fact that neither involved the other; it would have to be that the first suited the plan of the poem: and then also the reason for rejecting the second must be, not that it was disconnected with the first, but that it had not the characteristic which justified the admission of the first, that is to say that it was not connected with the story.

On the first view the sense would be:— 'Homer embodied neither incident in his main subject because neither involved the other.' But that two incidents should be unconnected can be no reason for excluding both from the main subject; one of them may be connected with it and if the rule were carried out every incident would be eliminated from a poem. Thus, whether we suppose Aristotle intended to say that the first event was put in and the second left out, or that both were left out, the clause ὃν οὐδὲν κ.τ.λ. seems to cause insuperable difficulties. Only if neither of these alternatives, which have been taken to be the only possible ones, was true would these difficulties disappear.

¹ I owe this reference to Mr. A. O. Prickard.