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](#)

Monro's *Odyssey* XIII.–XXIV *Homer's Odyssey*, xiii.–xxiv. Edited with English notes and appendices, by D. B. Monro, M.A., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. Pp. 512. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

T. L. Agar

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 02 / March 1902, pp 121 - 125
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205544, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205544

How to cite this article:

T. L. Agar (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 121-125 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205544

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

χρόνον ταῖς διαβολαῖς τινων ὑπαχθεῖς, ὑφείναι τι τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐνοίας ἀναγκασθῆς, τὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ποίησον· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνόν φασι, διαβαλλομένου τινος τῶν συνήθων, τὴν μὲν ἑτέραν τῶν ἀκοῶν ἀνείναι τῷ διαβάλλοντι, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐπιμελῶς ἐπιφράσσειν τῇ χειρὶ. ἐνδεικνύμενον, ὅτι δεοὶ τὸν ὀρθῶς κρίνειν μέλλοντα, μὴ ὅλον εὐθὺς τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἀπάγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἥμισυ τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἀκρίβειαν διασώζειν πρὸς ἀπολογίαν τῷ μὴ παρόντι.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

* * *

CICERO *Ep. ad Att.* xiii. 23. 2.—Libri ad Varro-
nem non morabantur. Sunt enim defecti, ut
vidisti: tantum librorum menda tolluntur.

Various suggestions have been made for the corrupt *defecti*, amongst others *defecti*, *descripti*, *effecti*, *refecti*, *delecti*, *adfecti*. Of these *delecti*, the conjecture of Lambinus, is the least unsatisfactory and is adopted by Tyrrell and Purser in their edition of the Letters. I propose to read *defaecati*. We thus get a good Plautine word, which would certainly have been corrupted, and which seems regularly to have been used of literary revision, cf. Sidon. Apoll. I. 1. 3: sed scilicet tibi parui tuaeque examinationi has <litterulas> non recensendas (hoc enim parum est) sed defaecandas, ut aiunt, limandasque commisi, sciens te immodicum esse fautorem non studiorum modo verum etiam studiosorum.

GEORGE W. MOONEY.

* * *

ON HORACE, ODES III. AND IV

iii. 4, 49. magnum illa terrorem intulerat Jovi...

It has often been noted that this stanza 'mars the

effect of the picture of imperial calm.' In fact the current interpretation ruins the passage. Is it not possible to take away the point at the end of the stanza and explain *intulerat* as a rhetorical substitute for *intulisset*? The protasis would naturally follow in the form *nisi nil potuissent* or *possent*, but its place is taken by the rhetorical question, *quid possent*. In the Odes the pluperfect subjunctive is not found in the apodosis, its place being taken by the pluperfect indicative, e.g. iii. 16, 3. In cases where a corresponding affirmation would be in the imperfect indicative Horace uses the imperfect subjunctive in the apodosis. Thus in iv. 6, 19, *ureret* suggests *urebat*, 'he was for burning,' 'was the man to burn.' Cf. iii. 14, 27.

iv. 11, 3. apium.

There can, I think, be little doubt that the *apium* of the Augustan poets is not parsley but wild celery, *apium graveolens*. Parsley will not suit Virgil's habitat for the plant, and Virgil is exactly supported by Dioscorides, who places the *apium rusticum* of the Romans in watery ground. The only argument adduced against wild celery is that the stiff leaves of this plant could not be used for wreaths. But they were. A wreath found on a mummy near Thebes (Egypt) in 1885 is composed of the leaves of this plant tied on to strips of papyrus and interspersed with petals and buds of *Nymphaea caerulea*. The leaves are not twisted but stand out from the papyrus strips, as vine leaves stand out from the *philyra* or like material in the wreaths of Dionysus. By the kindness of Mr. Anthony Gepp and Professor Meurer I have just seen a photograph of this beautiful wreath. The original is, I believe, at Rome.

J. SARGEANT.

* * *

REVIEWS.

MONRO'S *ODYSSEY* XIII.-XXIV.

Homer's Odyssey. xiii.-xxiv. Edited with English notes and appendices, by D. B. MONRO, M.A., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. Pp. 512. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

EVERY student of the Homeric poems will welcome the appearance of this volume. It is a work worthy of the University from which it proceeds and of the scholar, who has already contributed much to the exact knowledge of the language of the Greek epic by his Homeric Grammar and other publications. The University of Glasgow, it may be noted, receives the compliment of the dedication.

The text and commentary occupy nearly 300 pages, and although Mr. Monro's annotations are in general terse and full of matter, the product of careful and keen

consideration, it is for that reason the more to be regretted that he did not allow himself at least another hundred pages for this section of his labours. Even then he would have fallen short of the number of pages, considerably over 500, taken up by the first twelve books and commentary in the earlier volume, of which this is the continuation and completion. It cannot be said that this economy of space is due to the existence of the work referred to, and has been rendered possible because of any free reference to its pages; for beyond a complimentary reference to the note on γ 315, little direct use seems to be made of the previous volume. Still this regrettable brevity has its compensation in the interesting and valuable appendices, six in number, for which the author has so been able to find accommodation pp. 289-501. We have also no

less than eighteen illustrations, of which the striking and pretty view of the Old Harbour of Corfu (p. 19), the comical naval battle (p. 95), the Icelandic Hall (p. 218), and the Homeric axe-heads (p. 176) may be mentioned as interesting and valuable. The last named indeed could hardly be dispensed with, if any definite idea of the nature of the contest proposed by Penelope is to be formed by the reader. The subjects of the appendices, which form so substantial a part of the book, are: 1. The Composition of the *Odyssey*. 2. The Relation of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*. 3. Homer and the Cyclic poets. 4. The History of the Homeric Poems. 5. The Time and Place of Homer, and 6. The Homeric House.

In discussing the Composition of the *Odyssey* Mr. Monro marks the predominance of the folk-lore element over that of heroic legend. The folk-lore tales (*Märchen*) belong he says to the realm of pure fancy, to an imaginary time and place. But the severance from semi-historical tradition seems scarcely so absolute as he would make it. To take one of the instances he adduces, it has been said and it seems indisputable, that *Laestrygonia* is only an obscured tradition of a Norwegian Fiord and the Land of the Midnight Sun, belonging to a time and place not so much imaginary as forgotten.

Nothing could, I think, be more admirable than the mode in which Mr. M. demonstrates the necessity for the appearance of *Telemachus* in the *Odyssey* in opposition to the view that 'the *Telemachia*,' as it is called, is either an independent poem or an enlargement inserted by a different author. Excellent too is the explanation and justification of the second council of the gods (ε 1-42). Still Mr. M. is not entirely conservative. He does not accept as genuine the whole of the *Odyssey*, as we have received it from tradition. He rejects absolutely the song of *Demodocus*, part of the description of the Gardens of *Alcinous* (ll. 103-131), the concluding portion of the *Nékyia* (λ 565-627) and from ψ 297 to the end of the poem.

In App. iv. the examination and refutation of the ordinary conception of the *Homeridae* as a clan claiming descent from Homer or as a society of professional rhapsodists, whereas the term merely implies students and admirers of the Homeric poems, is interesting and important. Even more so is the argument by which *Pisistratus* and his alleged collection of the scattered poetry of Homer are, unless I am

much mistaken, finally disposed of. *Pisistratus* gets a great fall, and whoever undertakes to set him on the wall again will have enough to do. *Sudet multum frustra que laboret.*

Then we have a review of the literary criticism of the poems, which commenced with *Antimachus* at the end of the fifth century. A very high encomium is bestowed on *Aristotle* in this connection, though the story of his *Iliad* of the Casket is properly dismissed as 'a picturesque myth.' In the section dealing with the question of the antiquity of the vulgate text and with the various forms of interpolation, which have interfered with its integrity, we have a mass of well-ordered learning and criticism. Perhaps I may be allowed to take exception to one argument. It is inferred with respect to a Homeric quotation (Ψ 77-92) in *Aeschines*, that because it was read by the Clerk of the Court (*γραμμαρεύς*) and not spoken by the orator himself, we have therefore no security that the words really come from *Aeschines* at all. But this objection would only hold good, if the *γραμμαρεύς* edited the speech afterwards, or if we had a verbatim report taken down by some one present at the trial. If *Aeschines* published his own speech, he must be held responsible for any quotation it may contain. Two general conclusions are reached. 1. That previous to the time of the *Alexandrine* critics the text had suffered much from interpolation. 2. At the same time copies existed not greatly different from our vulgate. Then follows a favourable estimate of the services rendered by *Aristarchus*, who besides his merits as a textual critic is credited with having interpreted obsolete words, maintained correct inflexions, noted the historical environment, the geography, the antiquities, the customs &c. and with having shown throughout 'a supremely rational spirit.'

In the next essay, 'The Time and Place of Homer,' we have a concise summary of the chief features of the Homeric Dialect and a few of the restorations of the original forms are given. Mr. Monro is undoubtedly right in saying that no restoration of the text can be complete; but yet it by no means follows, as we might almost suppose he means to recommend, that we should refrain from removing modernisations, even flagrant ones, because we cannot hope to resuscitate the primitive forms in their totality. For instance we have probably in all texts, certainly in all MSS., *κατήκισται* (π 290), though it is quite certain that the

only admissible form is *κατηείκισται* (Herwerden), the simple verb being *αεικίζω* not as afterwards *αικίζω*. A correction of this kind is quite a different matter from writing *πάνς* for *πᾶς*, *τόνς* for *τούς* or even *τᾶος* or *τῆος* for *τεῶς*, &c., which forms might with great advantage be confined to the obscurity of a note.

In dealing with the Homeric house Mr. M. argues very effectively for the existence of one threshold only to the *μέγαρον*, showing the practical identity of the *λαῖνος* and the *μέλινος οὐδός*, that in fact the two thresholds belong to the same doorway.

If we turn to the consideration of the text, a considerable advance will be found here on the editor's Oxford Homer of 1896. A few examples may be mentioned to make this clear. We have now:—

ν 194 *ἀλλοειδέ* *ἐφαίνετο* (an emendation first made by Payne Knight) for *ἀλλοειδέα φαίνεσκειτο*. ν 400 *ἄνθρωπον* for *ἄνθρωπος*, a distinct improvement. ο 453 *περάσαιτε* for the impossible *περάσσητε*. π 206 *ἦλθον* *ἐικοστῷ* for *ἦλθον* *εἰκοστῷ*. 317 *νηλείτιδες* for *νηλίτιδες*. 369 *φθίσαιμεν* for *φθίσωμεν*. ρ 60 *τελέσσαι* for *τελέσση*. 81 *ἔχοντα* *σε* for *ἔχοντά σε*. 222 *ἄορά γ'* for *ἄορας*. τ 539 *αὐχέν'* *ἔαξε* for the absurd *αὐχένας ἦξε*. 586 *ἀμφαφάοντας* for *ἀμφαφώνοντας*. ν 138 *μιμνήσκοντο* for *μιμνήσκοιτο*. 315 *εἰ δὴ μή μ'* for *εἰ δ' ἦδη μ'*, perhaps a questionable change. 383 *πέμπωμεν* for *πέμψωμεν*. ψ 206 *ἀναγνούσης* for *ἀναγνούση*.

For these and other similar improvements Mr. Monro merits all praise; nor are we under less obligation to him for many valuable contributions in the notes to the better understanding of the text. I may refer to the note on *λυκάδας* (ξ 158-62), the new and ingenious explanation of ο 156-8, the examination and redistribution of ο 294-8, the new version suggested for ρ 413 *προῖκος γεύσεσθαι Ἀχαιῶν* (But would not *γεύσασθαι* be required?), the note on ο 555 *προβιβάντα*. In τ 37 we have a new explanation of *μεσόδμαι* 'the stone bases of the wooden pillars' supporting the *μέγαρον*. This seems highly probable in itself; but the order of the enumeration *τοῖχοι—μεσόδμαι—δοκοί—κίονες* seems peculiar. In ψ 243 *περάτη* is explained as 'passage,' a new view possessing strong claims to acceptance. I have some doubt about the proposed version of χ 14. It seems hardly natural enough for Homer. 'Who would expect a man to commit suicide by murdering another, who had all his friends about him?' is the question according to Mr. Monro, the implication

being that the murderer would be lynched on the spot. This might be taken from a modern writer, but is it quite like Homer?

If I now proceed to mention sundry points, in which I am unable to agree with Mr. Monro, I do so with a full and cordial recognition of the many great merits and high quality of this edition. In ν 34 I find the statement that for *βλάβεται* 'it is always possible to read *βλάβετο*.' This can only be so, if we take no account of metrical equivalence. In ν 91 *μνάεσθ'* is required for *μνάσθαι*. Mr. M. rightly points out that in l. 41 the metre is defective. Here it is so in a higher degree. In ξ 296 the local sense attributed to *ἵνα* seems doubtful. ξ 406 *πρόφρων κεν δὴ ἔπειτα Δία Κρονίωνα λιτοῖμην*. Mr. M. renders this 'I would be fain thereupon to entreat Zeus' (*sc. Ζεὺς ξείνιος*) *i.e.* to make my peace with him. I submit that the true sense of the words is with strong irony: 'I should be very eager forsooth after such a deed to say a prayer to Zeus.' Eumaeus means he would have qualms about praying to Zeus. Neither of Mr. Monro's arguments avails here. *πρόφρων*, he says, implies *eagerness* to do something, not *confidence* in doing it. Granted: but then that is precisely what E. wishes to convey by his ironical remark 'I shall not be in any hurry to pray.' He would in fact be rather shy about saying a prayer to Zeus, and would be inclined to pray to any god rather than to Zeus *ξείνιος*. Nor again in this rendering is the force of the aor. neglected. The present would mean 'to say my prayers habitually': the aor. 'to breathe a single prayer.' Now if we compare the two versions, the one I have given and Mr. M.'s, it is plain that the present would suit his new version better than it does mine:— 'I should be fain thereupon to make many prayers to Zeus, to entreat Zeus many a time and oft.' He would importune Zeus with incessant prayers for forgiveness. The other version, which has the advantage of maintaining the irony of l. 402, is on the contrary made more effective by the aor. He would not say a single word that might draw the attention of Zeus to his case.

In ο 21 Mr. M. desiderates as a preliminary the restoration of the *F* of *οἶκον*. Surely P. Knight's *κείνοο οἶκον βούλετ'* is good enough and probable enough.

ο 373 is clearly nothing but an interpolation.

ο 524. It is eminently desirable, and indeed only reasonable, that *τελευτήσῃ* and similar forms should be recognised not only as future indicatives, but also as the correct

archaic forms of the non-thematic aor. subj. This would apply to ἀρκέσει (π 261) ἀλύξει (τ 558).

π 10. I suggest that ὑπό is here adverbial with the sense of 'faintly,' 'indistinctly.' The sound is subdued or muffled. The barking of the dogs makes it impossible to hear it very clearly; but like the *motif* in a piece of music it may be detected in the midst of the louder harmonies.

π 19. I am strongly inclined to believe that τηλύγετον is merely an erroneous tradition of τηῦγετον cf. our shamefast and shame-faced.

π 195. ἡ κυκλική deserves much credit for preserving what is certainly the true reading here θέλγεις.

ρ 218. A manifest interpolation. That such a line ever came from the lips of the author of the *Odyssey* is a downright impossibility. The use of the article τὸν ὁμοῖον —τὸν ὁμοῖον is as informing as the Attic preposition.

ρ 387. τρύγοντα ἐ αὐτόν was probably ἔφε γ' αὐτόν. The emphasis given by γε is quite justified by the sense here. Contrast Ξ 162 where no such emphasis exists. That the particle should have disappeared is only natural. In face of the later ἐαυτόν it could hardly be preserved. In θ 396 δέ ἐ αὐτόν should rather be δ' ἐ γ' αὐτίς.

ρ 447. οὕτως is in my view far better explained as indicating a place at some distance from the speaker.

ρ 484. The apodosis is virtually in the voc. οὐλόμενε, O lost one, if etc. This form of expression is quite natural in English.

ρ 586. I should much prefer to read the line thus:—

οὐκ ἄφρων τὸ ξείνος δέεται, ὥς περ ἂν εἴη.
'The stranger—no fool he—thinks of this just as it would be.' To join ἄφρων with δέεται more closely than this merely begs the question.

σ 3. I am afraid that ἀζηχῆς still remains a riddle unsolved. The insuperable difficulty for etymologists in many cases is that the ancients in transmitting an obsolete word practised no machine-like accuracy, and never scrupled to make a modification that seemed to them to simplify matters, to bring the word a degree nearer to the comprehension of their own day, e.g. τηλύγετος.

σ 408. κατακείμετε as fut. indic.—not imperative—needs some consideration. Surely we have to deal with 'a direct request,' and that is why the apology of the next line is needed.

τ 159. κατεδόντων. This is perhaps best explained as a 'causal genitive' with ἀσχαλάα.

υ 23. ἐν πείσῃ. The other explanation of this unique word, 'obedience' should at least be mentioned. That the phrase means 'in bondage' is hard to believe.

υ 83. ἔχει. If the first interpretation, that of Faesi, be right, as Mr. M. declares, why does he end by suggesting ἔπει? The traditional reading both here and in μ 209, which he refers to, is decidedly the best. All that is necessary in the latter place is to restore the true order of the words τὸδ' ἐπι μεῖζον κακόν.

υ 106. ἦατο rather suggests that the mills were placed on trestles or stands like our sewing-machines.

υ 224. δίομαι takes an acc. without any such objective clause as here follows, e.g. N 283 etc.

υ 273. There seems to be a double meaning here. Ostensibly Antinous says:— 'Zeus does not allow us to do otherwise than be silent under his rebuke; otherwise we should have answered and confuted him.' The veiled meaning is of course:— 'we should have killed him before now.'

φ 26. Perhaps the curious ἐπίστωρ means 'one who goes in quest of,' the whole forming an apt description of a knight-errant.

φ 50. I cannot regard the explanation of σανίδος as at all probable.

χ 126. Possibly ὀρσοθήρη may mean a swing-door, or if not, a staircase-door.

χ 219. βίας is a very strange word here and certainly requires some comment.

χ 408. εἶσατο is a very excellent suggestion.

ψ 3. I would suggest ἐριγμαίνοντο as possibly concealed under ἐρικταίνοντο. It would meet the requirements of the passage well enough.

ψ 16. Instead of ἐρέουσα read ἐνέπουσα and the difficulty disappears.

ψ 316. In the original possibly:—

οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ ἐ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι
αἶσ' ἦν (K αἶην rather points to this).

ω 8. ἐκ πέτρης I should say depends certainly on ὀρμαθοῦ and not in any degree on the verb.

ω 128. May not ἄλλον be explained here by reference to the previous line, so that the meaning would be 'other than the design to have us removed altogether,' ἡμῖν φραζομένη θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν?

ω 240. I can hardly agree that this line is the only real exception to the rule men-

tioned. What is the unreality about E 734, to take only one example?

ω 343. This line may be looked upon as an interpolation introduced by some one, who was not pleased to see *διατρύγιος δὲ ἕκαστος* without a verb.

I will conclude with the following list of desiderata for the editor's kindly consideration: χ 12 *δίοιτο* for *οἴοιτο*, ω 67 *νῶι* for

νῶιν, τ 215 *ξέινος* not *ξέινε* for *ξέινέ γ'*, φ 434 note on *κεκορυθμένος*, ω 67 *ἐν ἐσθῆτι* without the superfluous τ', φ 125 *τανύσσεσθαι* (Jordan) for *ἐρύσσεσθαι*, ρ 322 *ἀπαμείρεται* for *ἀποαίνυται*, ω 485 *θείομεν* (*θήομεν*) *ἐκκλησιν* for *ἐκκλησιν θέομεν*, unless he is prepared to stand by *θείομεν*. In τ 579 I am glad to see *ἄμα σποίμην* for the usual *ἄμ' ἐσποίμην*.

T. L. AGAR.

CESAREO'S *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES.

Sofocle: '*Antigone*,' con note di PLACIDO CESAREO; Torino (Loescher). 1901.

If any considerable number of Italian editions of the Classics can be compared with this, scholarship in that country leaves little to be desired. The purposed scope of the editor's work may be given in his own words:—'Ho procurato di rendere ai giovani il senso intimo d' ogni passo (o, quando ce ne poteva esser più d' uno, tutti quanti con le rispettive difese dei vari sostenitori), discutendo, vagliando, scegliendo quello che mi pareva il migliore; insomma mi sono attenuto a un' analisi il più che da noi si poteva scrupolosa, non diremo già fine... Ma ciò a cui abbiamo dato il miglior posto è appunto l' arte; chè non s' abbia a dire una tragedia di Sofocle si possa intenderla senza apprezzarla nel suo senso estetico e gustarla. Abbiamo quindi, volta a volta, notato le figure, le immagini, i concetti, la posizione delle parole nel periodo e nel metro, tutte le leggi generali e le anomalie peculiari, le quali formano la bellezza dei vari luoghi, o vi contribuiscono.'

This comprehensive design Sig. Cesareo has carried out with admirable success. His scholarship is accurate, and he shows a literary and dramatic taste superior to that of several of his predecessors in the same

field. An acquaintance at first hand with the works of English and German editors has enabled him to take a comprehensive view of all points of difficulty, and his judgment is, in the present writer's opinion, rarely at fault. His style is clear and concise; and if the few translations which are given are somewhat lacking in distinction (senza caratteristico distintivo), this is perhaps due to a desire to make them as literal as possible. In the result, we have a commentary which is at once thorough, appreciative, and scholarly, and which Italian teachers and students should hail with satisfaction. If boys are meant to be included under the term 'giovani,' the notes should be relieved of a good deal of matter which can have no interest for them,—in particular, the frequently recurring lists of editors' names, and the enumeration of untenable and improbable views. There are many points and passages on which Sig. Cesareo would be quite safe in simply giving his own opinion. Also there should be a good deal of translation (not literal) into Italian of the best literary style. The editor has already before him an unsurpassable model in the translations of Prof. Jebb, the first appearance of which marked an epoch in English classical scholarship.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

MARCHANT'S *XENOPHON*.

Xenophontis Opera Omnia recognovit E. C. MARCHANT. Tomus II. Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Convivium, Apologia Socratis. Oxonii.

MR. MARCHANT has brought out the second volume of his useful *Xenophon*. Like

Schenkl's second volume (1876), which it much resembles, (I hope it will not resemble it in being the last), it contains the *libri Socratici*. It is very convenient to have these together in one fairly handy volume. Using as I understand mainly the collations of other scholars, but making himself well