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](#)

Some Homeric Genitives

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 05 / June 1897, pp 255 - 257

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031978, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031978

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1897). Some Homeric Genitives. The Classical Review, 11, pp 255-257
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031978

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

boy declamations quoted in this part of the treatise is that of 'Nero Caesar primo imperii anno.'

That a sure inference can be drawn from these three points I do not of course for one moment propose to maintain. But in view of these it *does* seem to me the most likely hypothesis to ascribe this incident of the exaction of portoria at Brundisium to a time before the reign of Trajan and probably after Nero's accession. Thus viewed, the passage is a confirmation of Tacitus *Ann.* xiii. 50 as to the revival of portoria again after their abolition in B.C. 60. And also it tends to strengthen the theory I venture in this paper to propose, viz.: that Trajan revived the gift once bestowed on Brundisium by Sulla.

Therefore from this chance allusion in Appian I would suggest the inference that Brundisium's trade and commercial prosperity were objects of interest to Sulla the Dictator, and also to some one of the Emperors before Marcus Aurelius; and further that Trajan is the Princeps to whom this may be best ascribed. But as one great justification for these conclusions must be the necessary rejection of all other explanations of this ἀτέλεια as less probable, I have therefore attempted to prove this in the first part of this paper.

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.
March, 1897.

SOME HOMERIC GENITIVES.

THE ordinary assumption is, I suppose, that Homer uses the genitives in -ov, i.e. -oo, or -oio, indifferently as suits his verse; for myself at any rate, I always had made that assumption. It is obvious of course that with certain words the genitive in -oio is impossible for an epic poet. All words with short penultimate and long antepenultimate must make the genitive in -oo, Ἀξιοῖο for instance being impossible. Again a long penultimate and short antepenultimate can only allow of the longer genitive at the expense of its being elided; thus for example Μενελάοιο is practically removed and the poets had to fall back on Μενελάoo.¹ The case is similar with words like ζόφος; ζόφοιο being impossible the poet could only use ζόφοο.

But it is equally certain, though less obvious, that in the days when the genitive was only in -oio or -oo, when the latter was not yet contracted into -ov, no word could make its genitive in -oo if its penultimate and antepenultimate were both short; thus ἀπαλόο would be out of the question and the poet can only have used ἀπαλοῖο. At this

period, which is pre-Homeric, there were three classes of the words with which I am now concerned; first, those which made the genitive only in -oio, secondly those which made it only in -oo, thirdly those which made it in both, as μύθοιο and μύθοιο, δόμοο and δόμοιο, (δόμοο being possible by elision of final o which must surely have once been permissible, whether or not in Homer, or else by interlengthening of final o or lengthening before two consonants).

Now it appeared to me a somewhat interesting question whether any traces of this state of things exist still in Homer. I argued that if my speculations about the pre-Homeric condition, when -oo was not yet contracted, were correct, we might find that words like μέγαρον, Ἀλκίνοος, ἐϋξεστος etc. make the genitive in -oio much more frequently than in -ov.

Accordingly I read through the *Odyssey* (down to ψ. 296 *bien entendu*) noting all the genitives of either of these two forms. With the aid of Dunbar's *Concordance*² I then made a list of all of them, which I tabulated and now present the results.

Let us first take the words which are metrically equivalent to θάνατος or ἀπαλός.

¹ Whether Μενελάοι' and the like were ever much used is a difficult question. That we hardly or never find such words with hiatus of -ov in *thesi* in our text might be explained on the hypothesis that such hiatus has been removed by alteration of the text, insertion of a particle or something of the kind. But my own view is that such a form as Μενελάοιο by the Homeric period had been almost or altogether driven out by the great natural advantages of such forms as Μενελάoo.

² In such a prodigious task as making a *Concordance* we must expect a few errors, and it is from no spirit of hostile criticism that I observe that some such are to be found here. Thus ἀμφιπόλου and χρυσοπέδιλου are both omitted by Dr. Dunbar. But if I have lost two or three cases, it will make no difference to the general results in so great a number.

From these there are in the *Odyssey* 217 genitives in -οιο and 55 in -ου (16 before a vowel, 39 before a consonant). Next words metrically equivalent to Ἀλκίνοος: 212 in -οιο 61 in -ου (25 before a vowel, 36 before a consonant, and of these 36 proper names furnish 23, and 6 of the 36 are in late passages). I take ἡμέτερον as the reading of β. 55, γ. 301, ρ. 534 for ἡμετέρον is almost certainly wrong there, though given by the *Concordance* from the text of Ameis. Thirdly, other words where -οο is impossible, as ἀποχόμενος, δολιχίρετος, κασίγνητος etc.: 36 in -οιο, 16 in -ου (8 before a vowel, 8 before a consonant). Thus taking all three sets together, we have 465 genitives in -οιο against only 132 in -ου.

So far then the conjecture is verified. It really is true that the traces of an ancient time, when the genitive in -οο was not yet contracted, are to be found in Homer—and not in the most ancient part of him. But still there is a chance that it may be only because the long genitive is more convenient for the hexameter than the short, though as I have taken three classes of words separately and got the same results in all, this can hardly account for it. We must test the results then somehow, but this requires very great care. I have formerly had occasion to observe how much commoner the short genitive is than the long in the Bucolic poets; if we were to take a test from them, this peculiarity would make it worthless. But again if we should take our test from Apollonius, still more if from Nonnus, it would be vitiated by the opposite defect; for these conscious imitators of Homer, probably to give an archaic air to their compositions, use the long genitive by preference more than Homer does himself. We seem therefore to be reduced to Hesiod and the Hymns; I will take the *Works and Days*. Here (taking all three classes together) we have 26 genitives in -οιο¹ against 27 in -ου. The conclusion is that we might naturally expect the two forms to be about equally used, and that the great inequality in Homer is due to some disturbing cause, which cannot well, so far as I can see, be any other than that which I have suggested.

If such marked traces are to be found of a state of things when the genitive in -οο was not yet contracted into -ου, we have two ways of explaining the phenomenon open to us. Either in the Homeric period such contraction was still comparatively rare and

was to a considerable degree avoided, or else the long forms had become so far fixed with μέγαρον and Ἀλκίνοος and the rest that they still were naturally used with these words, even though there was no objection any longer felt to scanning -οο as a monosyllable. Partly, no doubt, the preponderance of the long forms is due to old phrases being kept from the pre-Homeric period, but this can have had very little influence, and certainly is not the main cause. We might try to decide the question by seeing whether the long forms are commoner in the common words, of which μέγαρον might be quoted as a very strong example, for there are 44 instances of μέγαροιο against only one of μέγαρου; whether any conclusion can be drawn from the more numerous contractions of proper names I much doubt; but in any case I prefer to attack the problem from a different point of view. If the former hypothesis is the correct one, that is to say if there was still a certain difficulty in the Homeric period in contracting the genitive in -οο, then we ought to find that words like νόστων, Θηβαίων, and others where both the longer and the shorter forms were equally possible, are generally in such a position in the line that they can be resolved. Taking then the words which are trochaic in the *Odyssey*, as ἀγρός,² I find 77 unresolvable genitives in -ου against 121 or 126 resolvable; but of these 77 there are 44 at the end of a line, that is to say there are over 160 such genitives with the -ου in *thesi* to only 33 with it in *arisi*. And this is easily intelligible; with νήσοο for instance gradually becoming νήσου, it is obvious that it would be a much less shock to the ear to keep νήσου with the metrical beat on the first syllable; it is when the beat is thrown on to the *second* syllable that the ear will feel the objection to it. If I may venture to quote my own feelings, I think this distinction is valid. I have long felt something odd about such lines as τὸν δ' οἶον νόστων κεχημένον, and a sort of instinct to be saying to myself νόστοιο κεχημένον though I knew it to be wrong. But I never felt anything of the kind about a genitive at the end of a line.

In the *Works and Days* we have 6 resolvable genitives of this kind, 8 with -ου in *arisi*, 8 at the end of lines. The numbers are small but show plainly which way the wind blows.

Ought we then always to write -οο in Homer when we can? Nobody writes

¹ I am assuming the true reading of 705 to be εἶεῖ ἄτερ δ' αελοῖο καὶ ὠμῆ γῆρα' ἔδωκεν.

² I have to omit τούτων, αὐτοῦ, τολού, as they are not in the *Concordance*.

στηθη for στήθεα in Ionic poetry, even when στήθεα is a spondee: why then should we not write νήσοο for νήσου even when it is a spondee and leave the reader to see the scansion for himself? The only objection would be that in many of the instances we have -ου before a vowel. Are we then to write Φοίκο' ἀπερχομένη? And why not after all, when ἔγχε' ἐρειδόμενος and the rest have been accepted? However it is obviously better to remain content with the ordinary reading in such cases; moreover it is very doubtful whether it does not come to the same thing; see Mr. Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 381. All that I feel at all sure about is that there was a certain reluctance to have the -ου in *arsi*, and this of course bears upon the first class of words such as ἀπαλός, Τηλέμαχος, κασίγνητος; for these, if they have the short genitive at all, must have it in *arsi*.

I proceed to the last class I shall consider, the genitives of pyrrhics, as δόμος. Omit-

ting those of ἐμός, ἐφός, ζύγον, θρόνος, κύπος, σπόδος, στράτος, σκοπός, as either not in the *Concordance* or vitiated by beginning with two consonants so that ζύγοιο, etc. are impossible, I find in the *Odyssey*, 74 genitives in -οιο, 40 in -ου short before a vowel, 7 in -ου long before a vowel, 22 in -ου before a consonant. Thus we have 29 in *arsi* to 40 in *thesi*. Compare now the *Works and Days*: 4 in -οιο, 4 in -ου short before a vowel, 3 in -ου long before a vowel, 8 in -ου before a consonant; i.e. 11 in *arsi* to 4 in *thesi*. Again we see the same objection in Homeric verse to -ου in *arsi*. In the whole *Odyssey* from the first line to the bitter end I make the total number of instances of -ου in *arsi* (except τοῦ) to be 239. This includes one or two words like Αἰόλου which should be read Αἰόλοο. The proportion is thus about one in fifty lines. In the spurious termination it is perceptibly higher, about one in thirty.

ARTHUR PLATT.

PROFESSOR FRANCKEN'S EDITION OF LUCAN.

PROFESSOR FRANCKEN has paid me the high compliment of replying to my criticisms of his edition of Lucan I—V [*C.R.* Feb. 1897]. It was perhaps hardly necessary to admit that my remarks were so often justified, even for the sake of explaining how the mistake arose. It is on the other hand a good thing to have an exact statement that codices U and V are in the new edition represented by a fresh and minute collation made by Prof. Francken himself. I never dreamt of implying that this was not so: but I am very glad to be told plainly that it is so.

The Professor's tone is not conciliatory. Let me say, if it be needed, that I was not hunting for chances of finding fault. Where he now shews that evidence of MS readings is wrongly given in Hosius and rightly in his own book, I am the first to welcome the vindication. In one or two places I had, it seems, not caught the exact meaning of his critical note: for which I am truly sorry.

I will not pass in wearisome review all the passages in which Prof. Francken's replies seem to me unsatisfactory. But here is a pretty instance of our differences. On I 453 I objected to the critical note 'datur UMP', on the ground that the

editor had no codex P available here. I suggested that this was a slip. His reply is that P stands for 'Proverbia', and he refers me to the 'indculus praemissus'. I hope I do not err in taking this to mean the list on page xlii headed '*notae codicum*'. Anyhow I find there a mention of '*de libro Lucani proverbia* (Rhein. Mus. 1891)'. And the abbreviate symbol given for it is not 'P' but 'Prov'. Who is to blame?

When he comes to the interpretation of certain passages the Professor not seldom represents me as having said what I certainly did not say. I have only to apologize for having in these cases failed in conveying my meaning. He seems also, in discussing his alterations of the received text, to argue as though both sides stood on an equal footing. Now I rather hold that a corrector has a double task—first to displace the received text, then to make good his own. I still think that Dr. Francken seldom does the former, much less the latter, with success.

I will add a few words in reference to his argument against my reverence for the MSS tradition in the case of Lucan. The MSS do not, he says, carry us back further than the Carolingian age. He seems to fancy that I believe the text to have come