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 Lengthening of Final Syllables by Position Before the Fifth Foot in the Homeric Hexameter

T. L. Agar

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / February 1897, pp 29 - 31

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026044, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026044

How to cite this article:

T. L. Agar (1897). The Lengthening of Final Syllables by Position Before the Fifth Foot in the Homeric Hexameter. The Classical Review, 11, pp 29-31 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026044

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE LENGTHENING OF FINAL SYLLABLES BY POSITION BEFORE THE FIFTH FOOT IN THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER.

IN a note on *Hym. Dem.* 268-9 in the last issue of the *Classical Review*, Mr. Arthur Platt lays down as a metrical rule for Greek hexameters, 'that a syllable naturally short cannot be lengthened at the end of the fourth foot by position unless it form a monosyllabic word.' I trust Mr. Platt, whose courteous reference to myself makes dissent an unwelcome, if not an ungracious task, will forgive me, if I venture to doubt the validity of this canon for Homer and the earlier epic. The point is of capital importance for Homeric criticism apart entirely from the above mentioned passage from the *Hymns*, which may for the moment be left out of account. This rule, Mr. Platt says in effect, and I desire no better authority, is even more stringently observed by the later hexameter writers. From this I infer, and the conclusion seems by no means an unfair one, that the rule is the invention and creation of these later writers themselves. In that case the extent of its applicability to the Homeric poems would be an open question. For if we are dealing, as I suggest, with what is merely a late refinement in versification, we need not be at all surprised to find that the metre of Homer exhibits a general conformity therewith, a conformity in part of course originally inherent, in part, as I shall show, artificially superinduced. The Greeks, we may be sure, would not allow, if by a process of moderate correction and improvement they could prevent it, that 'The Poet' should lack an excellence that any of his successors possessed. There are, if I am not mistaken, certain features in the Homeric poems, which lend considerable support to my proposed restriction of Mr. Platt's rule. First of all the recurrent *βοῶπις πότνια* 'Ἥρη, to which he refers, is clearly an old formulaic line, and, as might be expected, if my supposition be true, exhibits no consciousness of any such rule. I confess I am loth to believe in the long *υ* of *βοῶπις*, and still less in that of the voc. *βοῶπι*, which I take to be the outcome of some strait-laced grammarians' refusal to recognise the primitive use of the nom. as voc. (cf. Cobet, *Mis. Crit.* p. 333 f.). *γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη* is a standing protest against the idea of *βοῶπις*. Such words as *πόλις*, *κληρίς*, and *ἄρνις*, evidently stand on a different footing. Φ 126 may in deference

to Mr. Platt's opinion, be given up; but we cannot disregard:—

- O 189 *τριχθα δὲ πάντα δέδαστο, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς*
 λ 338 *ξείνος δ' αὐτ' ἑμός ἐστι, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς*
 ζ 93 *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλὴνάν τε κᾶθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα,*
 B 842 *τῶν ἥρχ' Ἰππόθοός τε Πύλαιός τ' ὄζος Ἄργος,*
 B 813 *τὴν ᾗ τοὶ ἄνδρες Βατίειαν κικλήσκουσιν,*
 Λ 189 *τόφρ' ἀναχωρεῖτω, τὸν δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ἀνώχθω.*
 796 *ἀλλὰ σέ περ προέτω, ἅμα δ' ἄλλος λαὸς ἐπέσθω.*
 Π 38 *ἀλλ' ἑμέ περ πρόες ὦχ', ἅμα δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ὅπασσον.*
 Σ 400 *τῇσι παρ' εἰνάετες χάλκεον δαίδαλα πολλὰ.*

[Add also M 20.]

I find also:—

- B 522 *οἱ τ' ἄρα παρ ποταμὸν Κηφισὸν δῖον ἔανον,*

where Mr. Platt might well have adopted Bentley's *Κηφισοῦ* (i.e. -όο). There may be more; but the above instances will suffice. I refrain from quoting the lines ending *περίφρον Πηνελόπεια* for the reason given above.

Let me now propound certain passages, which seem to me to exhibit the handiwork of the enthusiast engaged in bringing Homer up to date.

- H 467 *νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνιοι παρέσταν οἶνον ἄγουσαι*

Here Bentley restored *παρέσταν*. Mr. Platt accepts it, and is surely right in so doing.

- η 114 *ἔνθα δὲ δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεθώοντα,*

The monstrous form *πεφύκασι* with a short seems to be a desperate evasion of *πέφυκεν*. The *πεφύκει* of the MSS. is another, for obviously the time required is present.

- Φ 602 *εἶος ὁ τὸν πεδίοιο διώκετο πυροφόροιο,*
 σ 8 *ὅς ρ' ἔλθων Ὀδυσῆα διώκετο οἷο δόμοιο,*

There is no other example of *διώκομαι*

transitive in Homer. In both cases it seems highly probable that δῖωκεν was the original.

Δ 331 οὐ γάρ πώ σφιν ἀκούετο λαὸς αὐτῆς,

There is here a probability of equal, or even stronger, cogency in favour of ἄκουεν, for ἀκούετο is a flagrant solecism, v. Leaf, *ad loc.*

χ 330 Τερπιάδης δ' ἔτ' αἰοῖδος ἄλυσκανε κῆρα μέλαιναν.

ἄλυσκανε is Wolf's reading for ἀλυσκαζε, which, as the scansion shows, must be an interloper: but since ἄλυσκάνω is not found elsewhere, perhaps ἄλυσκεν might put in a better claim to be the evicted tenant. The familiar aor. ἀλεύατο is of course excluded by the sense.

Φ 194 τῷ οὔτε κρείων Ἀχελώϊος ἰσοφαρίζει,
Ω 616 νυμφῶν αἶ τ' ἄμφ' Ἀχελῷον ἑρρώσαντο,

That Ἀχελῶος -ον should be read is hardly open to doubt. Confirmatory is:—

Hes. Theog. 340 Φᾶσιν τε Ῥῆσόν τ' Ἀχελῷόν τ' ἀργυροδίνην

where the omission of τε is plainly impossible, whatever MSS. may say.

B 750 οἷ τ' ἄμφ' ἱμερτὸν Τιταρήσιον ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο,

This case is similar to the preceding. The name of the river was Titaresus, and Bentley's correction Τιτάρησον is, even apart from the digamma, certain.

E 706. Τρῆχόν τ' αἰχμητὴν Αἰτωλίον Οἰνόμαόν τε,

Here again I cannot think Bentley was wrong in reading Αἰτωλόν in spite of the resulting molossus, cf. N 506 Ἴδομενεὺς δ' ἄρα Οἰνόμαον.

λ 484 πρὶν μὲν γάρ σε ζῶν ἐτίομεν ἴσα θεοῖσιν Ἀργεῖοι,

The original was in all probability ἔτιον. The alteration would be inevitable.

ι 530 δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι.

The form in common use is πτολιπόρθος. Whether πτολιπόρθον should be introduced I hesitate to say. As a correction it has at any rate the merit of simplicity.

P 387 χεῖρές τ' ὀφθαλμοί τε παλάσσετο μαρναμένουσιν

This striking schema Pindaricum, unparalleled in Homer, may be traced with some probability to the devoted care of a reviser, whose metrical conscience could not tolerate πάλαχθεν = παλάχθησαν. Being ἅπαξ λεγ. this 3 plur. aor. pass. would have to yield almost without a struggle in face of the attractions of so select a grammatical figure, all the more irresistible, because its adoption here increased the comprehensiveness of Homer's supposed universality.

Σ 583 ἔγκατα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα λαφύσσετον οἱ δὲ νομῆες

K 364 λαοὺ ἀποτμήξαντε διώκετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεὶ.
N 346 ἀνδρασιν ἠρώεσσιν ἐτεύχετον ἄλγεα λυγρά.

In these lines instead of the questionable duals Dr. Maguire has proposed λάφυσσον τοῖς, next διώκων νωλεμές, and for the third with less probability ἐτεύχον κήδεα.

Φ 343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καίε δὲ νεκρούς

No doubt δαίετο may be passive here: but if Hephaestus be the subject to both verbs, as is perhaps more likely, δαίεν would be in accordance with usage. δαίεν πῦρ would suit Mr. Platt's rule. In any case the passage is worth mentioning, as also are:—

Ψ 748 καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλεὺς θῆκεν ἀέθλια οὐ ἑτάριοι, ἀέθλον Bentley.

H 277 μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκήπτρα σχέθον, εἰπέ τε μῦθον σκήπτρ' ἔσχον van Leeuwen and da Costa. ἦρχε?

ξ 295 ἐς Λιβύην μ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἐφέσσατο πομποροῖο. ἐφέσσειν?

In δ 646 I would suggest that the peculiar ἀπηγάτο is the result of an unwarrantable lurking fear lest ἀπηγά had the final α short by nature.

In some instances appearances may have been saved by the intervention of that deus ex machina, hiatus licitus, e.g.

β 57 εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσι τε αἶθοπα οἶνον

Here Bentley's *πίνουσίν τ'* has the support of the notable and telling parenthesis. In β 325, *Hym.* vii. 31 et sim. *ἡμῶν*, if as is sometimes supposed, it represents an original *ἄμμιν*, would be an instance.

Mr. Platt's opinion on a metrical question carries great weight and deservedly so; but I think the evidence above detailed is sufficient to justify, or at least to render highly probable, the modification I have ventured to propose, suggested as it is by his own statement of the facts. It is easy to point to analogous instances of later refinements and limitations in metrical usage, which have been largely obtruded upon Homer to the great detriment of the text. Many elisions, afterwards prohibited or considerably restricted, were legitimate enough in the early Epic, that of *ι* in the dat. sing. and plur., that of the diphthong *-αι* in the dat. sing. of the personal pronouns and that of *-αι* in certain verb forms. Similarly the final *ε* of the optative *-ειε*, not elided in later Attic, was certainly elided by Homer. The natural consequence has been in this particular case, that the MSS. present us with several instances of a fut. indic. with hiatus following (cf. α 404), nor indeed has this deliberate, though well-intended, falsification everywhere been rejected even now.

Possibly the disappearance of *ηε* in favour of *εσκε* before a consonant is a phenomenon due to a similar cause, cf. II 464 *ἦεν ἄνακτος*, where thanks to ignorance of the digamma *εσκε* has not been put in.

With respect to *Hym. Dem.* 269 it is important to notice that *δνειαρ* is not due to anybody's conjecture. Had it been so, the case might be different: but so far we are dealing with the MS. reading, which is a little plethoric,

ἀθανάτοις θνητοῖσιν δνειαρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται.

Furthermore *δνειαρ* is a word well established in epic usage v. X 433, 486, δ 444, ο 78. So I still cherish a hope that we may at last be spared the needless spectacle of the unauthenticated, though analogical, *δνειαρ*, in favour of which I am sorry to see from your Nov. issue Mr. T. W. Allen betrays an unfortunate weakness. Whether he relies also on the metrical canon here disputed, there is so far nothing to show. Di melius.

Allow me to add in reference to Mr. Monro's communication (*Class. Rev.* Dec. 1896), that I regret having inadvertently omitted to notice Mr. Allen's responsibility for the *Hymns* in the Oxford Homer.

T. L. AGAR.

GREEK METRICAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM PHRYGIA.

(Continued from Vol. X. pp. 420-1.)

I. 14 and III. 2.

A number of examples of *λύγρος* from literature are given by Al. Rzach in a careful paper entitled 'Zur Metrik der Oracula Sibyllina' (in *Wiener Studien* xv. (1893) 103).

I. 13. It should have been mentioned that the stone, which is very faint here, seems to read *ΟΙΚΕΤΩΝ* or *ΟΙΚΕΤΩΝ*. *κ* is a common symbol for *κέ*, i.e. *καί*.

IV.

Found in the cemetery, Yaliniz Serai.

*Σύμμαχος Ἀντύλου
κέ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀντύλου
λος κέ Ἀλέξανδρος [κέ*

*Σύμμαχος κατὰ χ[ρησ]-
5 μὸν Κλαρίω Ἀπόλλωνι ἀν[έσ]-
τησαν. χρησμός.
Εἵσατέ μοι βωμὸν π[αν]θήα τῇδ' ἐνὶ χώρῃ,
εἰς αὐγὰς ἀθρόοντα πολυσκόπου ἡελίοιο,
εὐαγίας δ' ἐπὶ τοῦδε τε[λ]είετε μὲνός ἐκάσ-
το[ν],
10 ὄφρα κεν ἀλκήτωρ τε[λ]έθων τὰ συνώρια
τεύχω.
παγκάρπων γὰρ ἐγὼ πέλομαι μ[ε]ρόπεςσι
παρέκτω[ρ]
οὖς] ἐθέλω σώης τε κέ [οἷς] κλέος οἶδα
φορέσκειν.*

This is an inscription on an altar, erected by order of an oracle from the Clarian Apollo.

5. For the Apollo of Klaros (near Kolophon, see Preller, *griech. Mythol.* I⁴. pp. 283 (where in n. 4 other reff. are given), 286; and the excellent art. in Pauly-Wis-