

The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Mr. Agar's *Homerica*. Reply

T. W. Allen

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 4 / Issue 03 / July 1910, pp 206 - 208

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800019005, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800019005

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1910). Mr. Agar's *Homerica*. Reply. The Classical Quarterly, 4, pp 206-208

doi:10.1017/S0009838800019005

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MR. AGAR'S *HOMERICA*. REPLY.¹

I AM afraid I have not made myself understood.

- (i) ι 209 ἐν δέπας ἐμπλήσας ὕδατος ἀνὰ εἴκοσι μέτρα
χεῦ'.

To gain support for his alteration of ὕδατος into ὕδωρ, Mr. Agar discusses the syntax of the whole line. He says that the view that δέπας is the object of χεῦ' 'leaves ὕδατος ἀνὰ εἴκοσι μέτρα without any suitable sense at all.' He therefore reads ὕδωρ as object. I remark that 'the sense of ἀνὰ is the same with ὕδωρ as with ὕδατος.' I mean that it is distributive in either case, and therefore does not recommend the alteration. I take the genitive ὕδατος to be partitive and directly dependent on χεῦ', like πάσσε δ' ἀλὸς θείοιο.

- (ii) η 129 ἐν δὲ δύο κρήναι ἥ μὲν τ' ἀνὰ κῆπον ἅπαντα
σκίδνεται, ἥ δ' ἐτέρωθεν ὑπ' αὐλῆς οὐδὸν ἵησι
πρὸς δόμον ὑψηλὸν, ὅθεν ὑδραίνοντο πολῖται.

Mr. Agar amends ι31 into πρὸς δόμον ὑψηλοῦ, and then remarks that 'the accepted interpretation,' namely 'that the second spring flows beneath the courtyard wall, issues again in the centre of the courtyard and forms a piece of ornamental water there' is inconsistent both with the vulgate and with his emendation. He continues 'the fashion of forming artificial ponds, so much followed in later days, is scarcely likely to have been in vogue in primitive times.' I deny all this. Mr. Agar has set up a bogey, his 'ornamental water,' and then knocked it down, to the damage of the verse, which he proceeds on this ground to emend further. I conceive no reason why the κρήνη which the goodness of Alcinous provided for his people should not have flowed in his yard. Does Mr. Agar imagine the Mycenaean age too primitive for a fountain?

- (iii) ι 29 ἥ μὲν μ' αὐτόθ' ἔρυκε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων,
ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖοι, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.
ὥς δ' αὖτως Κίρκη κατερήτυεν ἐν μεγάροις
Αἰαίῃ δολόεσσα, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.

I say 'this verse [30] is absent in most MSS. Mr. Agar condemns it, but unable to do without it, composes another in its place. Its absence is

¹ See *Cl. Quarterly*, iv. pp. 58 sq.

All I say here is that when Mr. Agar says 'certainly such a punctuation' [as that here printed] 'fails to convey the least idea that μάλα—δημον is intended to be regarded as parenthetic,' he betrays an unfamiliarity with Greek punctuation. So he does. There is no way of indicating a parenthesis in Greek except by colons. Dashes are an invention of the modern printer, and worse than inverted commas, which have some kind of tradition.

(viii) σ 192 κάλλεϊ μέν οἱ πρῶτα προσώπατα καλὰ κάθηρεν
ἀμβροσίῳ.

In order to recommend his own invention κάλλεϊ μέν οἱ πρῶτα πρόσωφ' ἀπάλ' ἦκα κάθηρεν, which I may say without offence no one wants, Mr. Agar attacks first the meaning of κάλλει. The view that κάλλος here cannot mean 'beauty' I suppose rests on a disinclination to join an abstract noun with a concrete verb, and a disbelief that such a union was possible in Homer. There can be no other reason, for the scholiast's assertion νῦν τὰ μύρα is unsupported. To get round the objection I quote from the lexica Γ 392 κάλλεϊ τε στίλβων καὶ εἵμασιν, ζ 237 κάλλεϊ καὶ χάρισι στίλβων, which seem decisive, for it is no harder to say 'wash in immortal beauty' than 'glisten' or 'trickle with beauty and graces.' The objection appears to me another case of the tendency to make Homer, his age and his language, much too primitive.

T. W. ALLEN.