

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 *Homer Homeri Opera et Reliquiae*. Recensuit D. B. Monro, M.A. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXCVI. 10s. 6d. net.

T. L. Agar

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 08 / November 1896, pp 387 - 390

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020485X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020485X

How to cite this article:

T. L. Agar (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 387-390 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020485X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Reiske and has been adopted by several editors. In v. 33. 19 what has the quotation to do with the text? There are a good many other things of the same kind. In v. 25 note 1 *tyiya* is an error for *tyaiy*. In the Index *μηχανοῦσθαι* appears as the infinitive of *ἐμμηχανῶντο*.

In the text of Herodotus it is fortunately not often the case that the variants affect the general sense, and no one could have found fault with the editor if he had simply appended his commentary to one of the common texts. The present text professes to be taken 'not without corrections' from Stein's smaller text. How far the corrections go we have not examined, but since they were undertaken at all they might with advantage have been carried further. Why, for instance, does the editor write *Φειδιππίδης* when he always speaks of the man as *Philippides*? The guiding principle in the selection of various readings and conjectural emendations is not apparent. Many of the

best are passed by, while others of little or no value appear. As to the editor's own conjectures they are rather of the rough and ready order; does he seriously imagine that Herodotus would have written as he suggests v. 69. 7?

The question of the dialect is with perfect justice left undiscussed. Where it is incidentally touched upon, the problem is hardly fairly stated. It is not merely the MSS. of Herodotus *versus* the Ionic inscriptions, but the MSS. of Herodotus *versus* the poetical remains of Ionia. But there is no need to pursue the subject here.

After all these are more or less superficial blemishes which do not interfere with the solid value of the book, however much they may annoy the classical scholar who reads it. We trust that Mr. Macan will soon give us also an equally thorough discussion of the Great Persian War.

J. STRACHAN.

MONRO'S HOMER.

Homeri Opera et Reliquiae. Recensuit D. B. MONRO, M.A. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXCVI. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS convenient and handsome volume with its red and gilded edges contains, printed on little more than a thousand pages of India-paper of fine, perhaps even excessively fine, quality, the whole of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the Homeric *Hymns*, the so-called *Epigrams*, then the metrical fragments of the lost epics of the Epic Cycle, culled from Athenaeus and others, with the outlines of their arguments in the prose of Proclus, and lastly the parody of the Battle of the Frogs and Mice, that curious specimen of the mock-heroic, attributed to Pigres, the brother of Queen Artemisia of Halicarnassus. The inclusion of this last is perhaps the one point in the scheme of the book, to which exception might be taken. The piece is as little connected with Homer or the earlier age of epic poetry as the *Argonautics* of Apollonius Rhodius or a play of Aeschylus; consequently its appearance here may fairly be said to mark the extremity of gracious concession to a discredited, and perhaps never generally accepted, popular tradition.

The editor in his article on Homer in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* long ago expressed

an opinion to the effect that the exclusion of the *Epigrams* and *Hymns* from modern editions of the Homeric poems was an inconvenient purism, inasmuch as these appear to be 'the original documents, to which the narrative of Homer's life was afterwards adjusted.' The present work may therefore be regarded as the long-delayed realization of this opinion. The convenience referred to is certainly enhanced by the addition of the collectanea of the Epic Cycle.

With regard to the text, here adopted, of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* little need be said. The *Iliad*, as Mr. Monro informs us in his brief preface, is a reproduction of his own school-edition, while that of the *Odyssey* differs little from that of Dr. Merry in his well-known work. Such differences as there are arise from the occasional adoption of readings derived from the *apparatus criticus* of A. Ludwich (Lipsiae, 1889-91). The treatment of the text is therefore in the main eminently conservative, though by no means reactionary. The editor expressly disclaims any attempt to restore the earlier forms of the language, that is, to give us the latest results of modern criticism. 'Pristinam Graecae linguae formam aucupari noluimus.' Still he has not been absolutely unrelenting in this resolve. It has not operated so far as to prevent *ἦος* and *τῆος* appearing con-

sistently in place of the traditional εἶος (εἶος) and τείως (τείος).

In the treatment of the monosyllabic τέως and ἔως there is not quite the same consistent uniformity. In κ 348 ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἄρα τῆος ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πένοντο the old established τέως μὲν has been extinguished, as also in π 370, and probably no one would have grieved, if a similar change had been made in ο 231 and ω 162, where τέως μὲν is still allowed to flourish. Again in ρ 358 instead of ἔως ὃ τ' we find ἦος but in τ 530 and P 727 ἔως μὲν remains in undisturbed possession of the field.

It is somewhat surprising and a little disappointing that while in the two great epics κενὰ ἰδυῖα *et sim.* everywhere appear instead of the κένδ' εἰδυῖα of MSS. the same change has not been made in the *Hymns*, e.g. *Hym. Dem.* 195, *Aph.* 44 and *passim*. If it be intended that such forms should serve as an indication of the late date of the whole work, this object might equally well be secured by placing the later form in the foot-note without allowing it to disfigure the text itself. Moreover the weight of such evidence is enormously exaggerated, when these forms are silently removed from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and only left to prejudice our judgment of the *Hymns*.

However these are slight blemishes, and some may even think that they are not rightly so named.

The main interest of the volume for Homeric students lies in that portion, which contains the *Hymns*. We have here without much doubt the best text of these interesting relics hitherto produced in this country, not excepting even the magnificent posthumous edition by Prof. A. Goodwin, which in the main Mr. Monro has admittedly followed. He has, however, availed himself of the most recent work that has been done in the way of restoring the text from its numerous corruptions. We meet with conjectural emendations sometimes admitted into the text, sometimes, though less frequently, only mentioned in a foot-note. Along with the names of the earlier scholars Martin, Barnes, Ruhnken, and Voss, those of Hermann, Gemoll, Allen, Tyrrell, and Postgate may be found. A few of the emended and uncertain passages will now be referred to, and solutions occasionally suggested.

HYM. DEM.

55. τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων may safely be corrected τίς θεός, as οὐρανίων is certainly nom. sing.

99. Porson's φρεῖατι Παρθενίῳ is quite worthy of mention and indeed of acceptance.

226-7. Mr. Monro places a colon after κελεύεις, and reads θρέψω, κοῦ μιν. The comma should probably be kept with θρεψέμεν, οὔ μιν following. The fut. infin. occurs after ὑπέδεκτο in l. 444. The corruption may be due in the first instance to the copyist's eye passing from ΕΜΕΝ to ΟΜΙΝ. The vulgate is merely a clumsy attempt to reconstitute the resulting ΘΡΕΠCOMIN.

268.

ἦ τε μέγιστον
ἀθανάτοις θνητοῖς τ' ὄνειρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται.

This is worse than the retention of the unmetrical θνητοῖσιν ὄνειρ, which is at least Greek. The corruption is probably due to the intrusion of τέτυκται. The original would require no verb, but the later Greeks would not acquiesce in this, as many interpolations witness. I suggest:—

ἀθανάτοις θνητοῖσι τ' ὄνειρ καὶ πολὺ χάρμα.

Possibly with Stoll ἀθανάτων θνητοῖσιν.

478. σεμνά, τά τ' οὐ πως ἔστι παρεξίμεν οὔτε
πυθέσθαι
οὔτ' ἀχέιν.

Read παρεξίμεν, not with the sense of *negligere* (Ruhnken), but of 'to divulge,' 'publish,' and οὔτε κοῦν, an old word not found in Homer, but suitably combined with πυθέσθαι *in parte accipientis*.

HYM. APOLL.

53. In spite of the multiplicity of conjectures, none satisfactory, the true reading is not far to seek. It is given in S the Vatican MS.

ἄλλως δ' οὐ τις σέω ποθ' ἄμεται, οὐδέ σε λήσει.

'But otherwise no one will ever have dealings with thee, and thou shalt know it to be so—thou shalt not forget thy isolation.' Cf. Ψ 326, λ 126, Ω 563.

It is not a little remarkable that the itacism of λίσσει should have been so misleading.

125. χερσὶν ἐπήρξατο. Read χέρος' ἐπορέξατο. This elision is a fruitful source of corruption.

181. I could have wished Mr. Monro had

given us περικλύστοι ἀνάσσεις. He follows the Moscow MS. in editing περικλύστου for the περικλύστης of the rest. The

Brussels MS. Γ has περικλυστης, a very fair indication of the truth. The step here required is really no greater than that taken in l. 255 where the MSS. tradition is unhesitatingly disregarded, ἡ δ' ἐσιδοῦσα, in favour of ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα.

299. Mr. Monro happily suggests τυκτοῖσιν for the traditional κτιστοῖσιν.

402. ἐπεφράσατο νοῆσαι. Is not the true reading ἐπεφράσατ' οὔτε νόησε? Cf. note on *Hym. Dem.* 227.

487-8. We might read without much violence and with considerable advantage:—

ἰστία μὲν πρῶτον καθέμεν λῦσαι τε βοείας,
νῆα δ' ἔπειτα θοὴν ἀν' ἐπ' ἠπείρου ἐρύσασθε,

i.e. ἀναερύσασθε, cf. l. 506 θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆ' ἐρύσαντο. The similarity of ἀν' to the termination of θοὴν may have facilitated its loss. The hiatus *pace* Spitzner is not tolerable.

HYM. HERM.

48. Mr. Monro contributes κατὰ νῶτα as a suggestion towards the amelioration of this passage and would leave διὰ ῥινῆρι unchanged.

103. ἀκμηνοί (Monro) seems far better suited to the sense than ἀκμήτες (Ilgen).

116. τόφρα δ' ὑποβρυχίας. Ludwich's ὑποβρύχους is without the slightest authority, though generally admitted into the text. The corrupt tradition may with greater probability be derived from τόφρα βεβρυχίας.

168. ἀλιστοι. Nearly all the MSS. have ἵπαστοι. B has ἀπ στοι which may be completed ἀπυστοι 'unheard of.' Hermes has no mind *agitare inglorius aevom*. He intends to be κύδιμος.

224. Assuming ἔλπομαι εἶναι to be the original we are compelled by the sense, apart entirely from any question of the digamma, to accept Schneidewin's Κένταυρον λασιαύκενα.

315. ὁ μὲν νημερτέα φωνῇν
οὐκ ἀδίκως ἐπὶ βουσὶν ἐλάζυτο κύδιμον Ἑρμῆν.

Perhaps φωνῇν may be left undisturbed (v. Mr. Monro's note) and οὐκ ἀδίκως read οὐ γάδεν (ἐχαδ'), ὡς, cf. Δ 24 Ἥρη δ' οὐκ ἔχαδε τῆθος χόλον.

461. ἡγεμονεύσω ἡγεμόν' ἔσω, cf. κ 361 ἱς ῥ' ἀσάμινθον ἔασα. See also Cobet *Misc. Critica*. p. 385, on Ξ 209 ἀνέσαιμι. The sense would be 'I will stablish thee etc.'

HYM. APHR.

134. οἷ τοι ὁμόθεν γεγάασιν. Both usage and metre demand οἷ τ' ἐξ ὁμόθεν γεγάασιν. τ' = τοι.

151. ἐς λέχος εὖστρωτον, ὅθι περ πάρος
ἔσκειν ἄνακτι
χλαίνῃσι μαλακῆς ἐστρωμένον

M εὖστρωτον in spite of the impracticability of ὅθι. The true reading can hardly have been other than:—

ἐς λέχος ἡύστρωτον, ὅ περ πάρος ἔσκε ἄνακτι
χλαίνῃσι μαλακῆς ἐστρωμένον

194. οὐ γάρ τοί τι δέος παθέειν κακὸν ἐξ ἐμέθεν γε,

A simple transposition of δέος and κακὸν gives a satisfactory line:—

οὐ γάρ τοί τι κακὸν παθέειν δέος ἐξ ἐμέθεν γε.

for which confirmation, if required, may be found in ε 347

οὐδέ τί τοι παθέειν δέος οὐδ' ἀπολέσθαι.

Hermann and Franke rashly substitute an imaginary δέος for τι δέος.

252. I cannot think that Martin's στόμα χείσεται for the corrupt στοναχήσεται of the MSS., though adopted by most editors, Wolf, Hermann, Baumeister, Abel, Monro, gives an adequate meaning. Matthiae's στόμα πλῆσεται, satisfactory in sense, is intolerable in metre. In neither respect is Buttman's ἀχῆσεται commendable. I offer στόμα ἥσεται. The later Greeks were not familiar with this form of the future of ἥδομαι, for which they used ἥσθησθαι; but in the epic period we have a witness for it in ἥσατο, which is read without question in ι 353.

With the meaning 'my lips will no more delight to mention' no fault can be found, and we may compare the description of the anticipated behaviour of the goddess, ll. 48-9.

257. νύμφαι μιν θρέψουσιν. Perhaps νύμφαι εὖ θρέψουσιν.

266. καλαὶ τηλεθάουσιν, ἐν οὔρεσιν ὑψηλοῖσιν. Mr. Monro places a period at the end of this line, after which ἐστᾶσ' ἡλίβατοι comes in very abruptly. The effect is not altogether pleasing. But what are we to say of Gemoll's emendation, thoughtlessly followed in Goodwin's text? We find in Gemoll's edition, with a fine disregard of metre,

καλαὶ τηλεθάουσαι· ἐν δ' οὔρεσιν ὑψηλοῖσιν

with ἐν δ' Gemoll, ἐν MSS. at the foot of the page. Except indeed for the foot-note and his commentary we might charitably assume he intended to edit, ἐν οὔρεσι δ' ὑψηλοῖσι, which would serve his purpose well enough, and seems worthy of adoption, with perhaps Schneider's ἡλιβάτοις in 267.

284. For φασίν τοι we might read φάς μιν τεν with a comma only after κελεύω (283), cf. I 35 φάς ἔμεν ἀπτόλεμον Γ 44 φάντες ἀριστῆα. This is nearer to the ductus litterarum than Matthiae's φάσθαι.

HYM. DION.

55. διε κάτω. That an elision here existed suggests itself from the δι' ἐκάτωρ of M. Perhaps δι' ἀκάτωρ, cf. ἀκατος, ἀκάτιον, ἀκάτη. Lat. actuario.

xxviii. 10. ὑπ' ὀβρίμης Γλαυκώπιδος is not to be turned into ὑπὸ βρίμης with Ilgen. It is merely the strict grammarian's correction of ὑπ' ὀβριμοῦ Γλαυκώπιδος.

Even if the later Greeks could accept ὀβριμος as an adj. of two terminations only, they could by no means retain the gen. in -oo.

xxix. 4. τιμὴν should probably be τίμιον, cf. *Hym. Herm.* 528.

xxxiii. 16. ναύταις σήματα καλά, πόνου σφισιν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες—

For σφισιν Mr. Monro suggests σβέσιν, mentioning other conjectures κρίσιν, λύσιν, σχέσιν. It seems not improbable that

κάλ' ἀπονόσφι περ

is the original expression, 'fair prognostications for sailors far away.' If the α of ἀπονόσφι were once misappropriated to καλά, the development of πόνου σφισιν is just what might be expected.

There is no call to prolong this paper with emendations of the *Batrachomyomachia*. Its literary value is small, and it is so marred with corruptions as to be hardly entertaining. Moreover all attempts at correction labour under the disadvantage of being in general too good for their surroundings, for example Ludwich's ἔδακον δ' ἔο (48).

Let me conclude by saying, that Mr. Monro's volume will be appreciated not only by scholars but by all book-lovers, et quantum est hominum venustiorum. At their hands it well deserves a hearty welcome.

T. L. AGAR.

ELMER'S PHORMIO.

P. Terenti Phormio. With Notes and Introductions (based in part upon the second edition of Karl Dziatzko). By H. C. ELMER, Ph.D. Boston: Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, 1895. Pp. xlix + 182. \$1.00.

THIS is an adaptation, with additions, of the well-known edition of the *Phormio* by Prof. Dziatzko of Göttingen. The merits of the German original are well known, and need not be emphasized here. The introduction, in particular, is invaluable to students of Terence, and they have reason to be thankful that it has at last been made accessible in English. The character of Elmer's introduction is, in general, much the same as that of its model, and shows the same excellences. The text of the edition is printed in clear, large type, and furnished with stage-directions. It may be questioned, however, whether these are wholly an advantage, as

they cut up the text and make the scansion more difficult for the beginner. In many places Elmer has preferred a different reading to that adopted by Dziatzko. These changes are chiefly in the direction of a closer adherence to the MSS. (and to A in particular). In a number of cases they seem to be distinct improvements: in others they appear much less satisfactory. In the *didascalía* Elmer reads ATILIVS (HATILIVS Dziatzko, and so A in the *didascalíae* of the Eunuchus and Adelphoe). He points out that in A an initial H is often wrongly employed. But his statement (p. 155) that there is no real evidence that Hatilius was ever a recognized form seems too strong; cf. C. I. L., X. 8067, 11, *L. Hatilius Felix*. In the *periocha* l. 7 he retains *eam visam Antipho*, defending the hiatus by similar instances from Plautus. This may be right: a grammarian like G. Sulpicius Apollinaris may have tolerated such a line, though