

# 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](#)



---

**Platt's *Odyssey of Homer* The *Odyssey of Homer*,  
edited by Arthur Platt, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity  
College, Cambridge. Cambridge, at the University  
Press. 1892. 4s. 6d.**

D. B. Monro

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 08 / October 1892, pp 343 - 348  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186469, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00186469](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186469)

**How to cite this article:**

D. B. Monro (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 343-348 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186469

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

962 is rightly changed by editors to *potissimum*; and the *miserrimum* of the Nonius MSS. in a line of Lucilius (xxvii. 40 M., ap. Non. 74 M.),

*ardum, miserrimum, atque infelix lignum  
sabucum vocant,*

should probably be *miserulum* (see Lucian Müller, *de re metrica* p. 353).<sup>1</sup>

The evidence then for a supposed accentuation of all superlatives, or even of all superlatives with the fourth last syllable short, on the fourth last syllable is too weak to win credence in face of the strong array of contrary instances. This disposes of one possible defence of *simillumus*. What of the other? Can we imagine any reason why this superlative should have been accented differently from the rest? I can only think of two. One, that as *purime* (with the suffix *-mo* added to the Positive stem) existed beside *purissime* in Old Latin, so a *\*simili-mus* may have existed beside *simillumus*. The other, that the analogy of *similior, similibus, sinnilium*, which in the verse of Plautus and in the pronunciation of his time seem, like all words of the metrical form  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ , to have had the accent on the first syllable,<sup>2</sup> might conceivably have caused a like accentuation of *simillumus*. Both suppositions are unlikely in themselves, and would require to be strongly supported by parallel instances. These are however not forthcoming. We have no instance of *facillumus*, though we have *facilior, facilibus, facilius*, like

*similior, similibus, similius*, and those that can be adduced of *miserrimus* are too weak to appeal to.

*Simillumus* then is not supported by the evidence at our disposal, and must be removed from the line of the *Asinaria* quoted at the beginning of this article. It may be that the first word of the line *portitorum* is a corruption of *portorum*, the (Plautine) Gen. Pl. of *portus*, or a gloss on it as *rusticus* is generally admitted to have displaced the genuine *rullus* in *Most.* 40 *germana inlucies, rusticus, hircus, hira suis*. I should like however to suggest an alternative explanation which, though not absolutely satisfactory, seems to me as likely to be right as any that has yet been suggested. The noun derived from *portitor* is *portorium*, 'the tax paid to the portitor.' In this word the accentuation of the antepenultimate syllable has caused syncope of the preceding vowel, *portorium* for *\*port(i)-torium*. The same thing happens in *frigidaria* (Lucil. viii. 12) for *\*frig(i)daria* beside *frigidus, audere* for *\*av(i)dere, ardere* for *\*ar(i)dere* beside *avidus, aridus* (for which Lucilius in the line quoted above uses the syncopated form *ardus*), and in other instances, the most recent discussion of which will be found in § 4 of the *Studies in Latin Grammar*. May we not suppose that the oblique cases of *portitor* were pronounced in colloquial Latin *port(i)toris, port(i)tori*, etc., and that the true scansion of this line is *port(i)torum simillumae sunt ianuæ lenoniae*? The oblique cases of *aevitas* (xii. Tab.) would similarly be *ae(vi)tatis* etc. with the same syncope of the syllable *vi* that is found in the derivative *aeternus*. Here the syncopated form became the classical form for nominative and oblique cases alike, *aetas, aetatis*, while with *portitor* the unsyncopated form finally asserted itself, *portitor, portitoris*.

W. M. LINDSAY.

<sup>1</sup> There is no need to scan *miserrimus* in Plaut. *Mil.* 713 *ille miserrimum se retur* etc., for, as we have seen, the true scansion is *il(le) miserrimum* (cf. *Capt.* 463). It must be confessed that the acceptance of this form would remove at a stroke the difficulties of that troublesome line *Pers.* 779 *solus ego omnibus antideo facile, hominum miserrimus ut vivam* (MSS. *mis. hom.*).

<sup>2</sup> See my article in the *Philologus* of this year.

#### PLATT'S ODYSSEY OF HOMER.

*The Odyssey of Homer*, edited by ARTHUR PLATT, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1892. 4s. 6d.

THE efforts that have been made of late years to determine the original form of the language of Homer have already led to the

publication of new texts of the poems. Among these the book before us will be welcomed as the first English attempt made since the subject entered upon the scientific stage of treatment. Mr. Platt begins by defending the plan of his book. It has been objected by Mr. Leaf that no complete text of the kind is possible, because our means of know-

ledge only enable us to recover the original form in certain cases: in all other cases we cannot tell whether we have the true Homeric word or not. Mr. Platt replies that half a loaf is better than no bread. The metaphor is not perfectly just: for a partially restored Homer would rather resemble a loaf which is unbaked on one side. But the question really depends upon the use to which we propose to put the restored text when made. Mr. Platt has brought together a great number of emendations, certain or probable, made by previous scholars, adding his own quota, and he has arranged them in an eminently convenient form. No student of Homer can wish this work undone. The doubt begins when we ask whether the new text is to supersede the old one for all purposes—whether, in short, it is to be used in schools. And this is not a purely scientific question. Mr. Platt appeals to our practice in the case of other authors, such as Aeschylus. But it is one thing to emend isolated errors of copyists, and quite another to restore a lost stage of the language. In the one case we correct the unsound places on the basis of a text which is generally sound. In the other case we do not know, even approximately, how much is sound. As Mr. Leaf says, 'here and there we have made a certain correction, but those of which we know nothing may be infinite' (*Iliad* xiii.). Now for practical purposes surely the first requisite is that a text should be formed upon principles which admit of being applied more or less completely. And this can only be when it represents a fairly attainable ideal—the Homer of Aristarchus, or the Homer of the fifth century B.C. A text which shows how far we have got on the way to the Homer of (let us say) the ninth century B.C. may be desirable as a possession, but does not satisfy this primary requirement.

After this preliminary discussion Mr. Platt goes on to state briefly the general rules on which his text is based. The digamma is restored where the metre admits it, but no violent changes are made, Mr. Platt holding that the sound was dying out in the time of the *Odyssey*. Contractions are generally resolved, and assimilated vowels such as we have in ὁρώ, ὁράαν, are restored to their primitive uncontracted state (ὁράω, ὁράειν). The long dative forms in -οισι, -ησι are given where it is possible. The aorist infinitives of the type of ἰδέειν become ἰδέεν, &c. We find ἦος and τῆος for ἔως and τέως, ἀκλέως for ἀκλείως, κρέων for κρείων, σπέος for σπείους, and so on. Most of the

changes made may now be regarded as warranted either by metrical facts or by the phonetic history of the language. But much remains to be said not only on points of detail but on the principles to be followed.

Let us take first the resolution of contracted vowels—a category which includes the greater part of the changes made in modern texts of Homer. We may assume that there was a constant tendency to substitute the contracted forms of later Greek for the open vowels of the Homeric dialect: and the metre admitted the change whenever, as in most cases, it was only the change from a dactyl to a spondee. But how far may we go in this direction? What sort of evidence justifies us in resolving a long vowel or diphthong into its original vowels? Mr. Platt seems to have been chiefly guided by rhythmical considerations. He observes, for instance, that before the so-called Bucolic division of the hexameter Homer decidedly prefers a dactyl. That is to say (*e.g.*) the metrical form πολύτροπον | δς μάλα πολλά is preferred to Καλυψώ | δια θεάων. He infers that when he can restore the former rhythm by resolving a contraction, he ought to do so. Accordingly we find him reading προσηύδαε (for προσηύδα) Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, παρ' Ἴλοο (for Ἴλου) Μερμερίδαο, and so on. The argument is that, since in each case the poet had two forms equally open to him—προσηύδαε and προσηύδα, Ἴλοο and Ἴλου, &c.—he must have chosen the form which gave the more usual and pleasing rhythm. But in many cases the assumption that the two forms were equally admissible is unproved. The form προσηύδαε cannot be shown to have existed in Homer. Indeed in Fick's opinion προσηύδα, which he writes προσαυδά, is from an Aeolic verb αἰδᾶμι, and the long ā therefore is not a product of contraction at all. However this may be, there is no doubt that in Homer the metre points to -ā and not αε. The case of the genitive in -οο is somewhat better, since there are several clear examples in Homer. But Mr. Platt seems to me to overlook a very important consideration, viz. the bearing on Homeric poetical language of the living dialect of Homer's time. When the phrase ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα was coined, it is pretty certain that the contraction of -αε to -ā was established in ordinary usage. There is therefore a strong presumption in its favour, unless the poet had a reason for employing another form. Similarly, of the three forms or stages of the genitive, in -οιο, -οο, -ου, the last is evidently the stage which had been reached by the contemporary dialect—the

genitives in *-οιο* and *-οο* being archaisms, and only retained through the force of poetical tradition. Under such circumstances there is surely a considerable presumption in favour of *-ου*. It is otherwise when we have a line ending with *Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο*. This rhythm, so common in the Latin hexameter, is very rare in Greek, and the reading *Θηβαίοο* is probable enough.

There are however contractions which occur so rarely that we may doubt whether they had any place in the original language of Homer. We may take as an example the combination *εο*, which is occasionally contracted to *ευ*, and occasionally scanned by synizesis as a monosyllable (*εϋ*), but much more commonly forms two distinct syllables. Here we cannot suppose that a monosyllabic pronunciation (whether to be expressed by *εϋ* or *ευ*) had been established in the spoken language. Both the metrical facts and the subsequent history of the Ionic dialect are decisive against such a supposition. We are therefore clearly bound to write *εο* for *ευ* wherever the verse admits this change. There is then a further question, which Mr. Platt does not seem to have gone into, whether in the places which still require a monosyllabic pronunciation we are to write *εο* or *ευ*. In such a matter no importance can be ascribed to the MSS., and if we write *ἐγγώνευν*, *θηέυντο*, *δατεύντο*, &c., we ought also to have *κάλευν* (8,550), *φόρευν* (24,417). If however we are satisfied that the contraction of *εο* into *ευ* was a change which had not been made in Homer's time, it follows that *ευ* for *εο* ought to be banished from the text. It is still possible to allow that *εο* was occasionally monosyllabic, that is to say, that without producing a true diphthong the two sounds could be slurred together sufficiently to form one syllable for the verse. On this view the monosyllabic *εϋ* is the result, not of a phonetic process, but only of a metrical licence, and is of the same nature therefore as the lengthening of *α* in *ἄθανατος*, or the monosyllabic scanning of *-υη* in *Αἰγυπτήν*. Accordingly it is chiefly found in words which could not otherwise come into the hexameter, as *βαλέομαι*, *πωλέομενος*, *θηέυντο*, *ἀνερίπτειν*. For *ἐγγώνευν* we may always write *ἐγγέωνον*: and perhaps *δατεύντο* should be written *ἐδατέοντο*. This treatment of *εο* will have the further advantage of being parallel to the existing practice with regard to *εω*, *εοι*, *εα*, *εη*, which continued to be written in the open form in later Ionic, though contracted in Attic. So for *θεοῦδος* we should surely write, not *θεοδφής*, but *θεοδφεής* (*-ης*). The acc. *θεοδφέα* is like

*νηλέα*. In 8,100 write *πειρηθέωμεν* (for *-ώμεν*.)

Coming to matters of more detail, we may observe that the arguments against *προσηύδαε* apply, though with rather less force, against *ἐφορμάεται* (1, 275), *ἐπιτολμαίτω* (1, 353), *νεμεσάεται* (4, 158), and similar forms. In these cases the contracted form is Homeric, the uncontracted form is not proved to be so. Here I would remark that *κοιμάται* (4, 403) with the *ā* in arsis, cannot be changed into *κοιμάετ'*, or *μνᾶται* (16, 77, 19, 529) into *μνᾶετ'*. The long *ā* in verbs of this class is only found in forms which could not otherwise come into the verse (*μνᾷόμενος*, *ἡβᾷοντα*, *πεινάων*, *μνάεσθαι*, &c.). In the case of *μνᾶται* there is the further objection that it is subjunctive (see 16, 77). Is it an accident that these emendations do not appear in the Index? What has been said of verbs in *-αω* is to a great extent true also of those in *-εω*, in which the preference for open forms *εε*, *εει* is generally confined to disyllabic verbs, such as *τρέω*, *ζέω*, *νέομαι*, &c. Mr. Platt makes a curious exception to his usual practice by not admitting resolution in the case of the pluperfect; *πεφύκει* (5, 63), *τεθήλει* (5, 69), *ὀρώρει* (5, 294), &c. The case for resolution is at least as strong as in the imperfect of verbs in *-εω*.

Among the genitives in *-ου* Mr. Platt counts the adverb *αὐτοῦ* 'there,' 'in the same place,' and accordingly sometimes writes *αὐτόο*. Whatever may be thought of other instances, this change can hardly be defended. The adverb *αὐτοῦ* must rank with *τηλοῦ*, *ὑποῦ*, and doubtless also with *οῦ*, *ποῦ*, *ὅπου*. None of these show any alternative form in *-οιο*, and the intermediate *-οο* is still less probable. If they are originally genitives, the exception is interesting as a confirmation of the archaic character of *-οιο*, *-οο*. They were no longer *felt as* genitives, and consequently the poetical usage which retained *-οιο* and *-οο* did not extend to them. It is perhaps also characteristic of the archaic *-οιο* that the *οι* is always in arsis, at least in our texts. Mr. Platt has introduced some exceptions (3, 123 *κείνοι' ἔγγονος*, 4, 718 *ἀλλ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδοί' ἔζε*, and similarly in 17, 115, 19, 272). It is not clear why he writes *ξείνοι' ἐρέεσθαι* (1, 405) and *ἀποιοχόμενοι' ἐρέουτο* (3, 77), since he leaves *-ου* before hiatus in many similar places.

Among Mr. Platt's resolutions the most untenable is that of the *ει* in the feminine of adjectives in *-υς*: viz.—*εὐρέτη* (1, 62), *ὠκείας*, *ὀξείας*, *θηλείας*, &c. For what are the facts? The *ει* of *εὐρεία* occurs in thesis, so

that resolution is metrically possible, in eight places of the *Odyssey*: it occurs in arsis, and therefore must be monosyllabic, in seven places. In ἡδέϊα, βαρεῖα, βαθεῖα, λιγεῖα it is always monosyllabic. Mr. Platt may perhaps have adopted the scanning -εῖ- on the ground that the original form of the feminine ending is -εῖα, and that vowels separated by *Ϝ* are not usually contracted. But this does not meet the fact that contraction here predominates. And the argument is a fallacious one. Whatever may be the history of the feminine ending, it is clear that in Greek we must begin with a suffix *μᾶ* (or *γᾶ*), not -ᾶ: just as we derive the -οιο of the genitive from -οσιο (-asya), not -οσιο or -οῖο. It is a confirmation of this view that we find the form ᾠκέα in Homer; for it is not likely that the language would possess three such successive stages as ᾠκέα, ᾠκεῖα and ᾠκέα at the same time. The case is not so clear with εἰ in Ἄργεῖος, Ἑρμείας, ἄρνεῖος and the like. The resolved form is excluded by a few instances only, such as ἀφνειότερος, τελειότατος. On the other hand it should be noticed in the discussion of these forms that a molossus rarely comes into the hexameter with the middle syllable in arsis, and consequently the metre generally allows it to be resolved.

The diaeresis of εἰ in κλειτός is much less probable than the resolution into κλειτός, especially if κλειώ is right instead of κλειώ. Similarly read ἀκαλαρρέτης (not -εῖτης). The diaeresis in the dative of neuters in -ος is well established, but ought not to be extended to nouns in -ις, gen. -ιος. The fact that the appearance of -εἰ of the dative in arsis (and therefore monosyllabic) is almost confined in our texts to such words as πόλει, πόσει, κόνει, ὕβρει is the best proof that we ought to write πόλι, &c. So πόλι (8. 569), not πόλι', κόνι (11. 191), μήτι (13. 299), not μήτι, and perhaps ὄψι (23. 94). It is not even certain that the -ι of these words is the result of contraction of -ῖ, as it may represent a primitive instrumental ending. (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. § 278.)

Coming to the combination οἰ, we must take exception to παντῶιος. The suffix is of the same nature as in οἶος, ἄλλοῖος, &c., in which Mr. Platt does not suppose diaeresis. The case of αἰδόιος, ἡόιος, &c., is parallel to that of ἀφνέιος, &c., already noticed. A new form, οἶων with long ῖ, is introduced by Mr. Platt as genitive plural of οἶς, and appears in seven places. The emendations by which this is effected are not always quite easy: see especially 12, 229 (πῶν οἶων for πῶν μέγ' οἶων), 20, 142 (κῶεσ' οἶων for

κῶεσιν οἶων). But the form itself is quite anomalous, and the ordinary οἶων fairly satisfactory. The older δῖων passed into οἶων in the way already explained in the case of -εῖα for -εῖα. In any case οἶων is not more difficult than the gen. sing. οἶός, which Mr. Platt does not get rid of. The further step answering to ᾠκέα for ᾠκεῖα is exemplified in the dative plural ὅεσσι for οἶεσσι (i.e. ὄεεσσι). It should be observed that the accent of the supposed οἶων is certainly wrong: just as on the other hand the accent of οἶων shows that it is a disyllable. But as Mr. Platt prints οἶων (ῖ) in 20, 3, the accent of οἶων is perhaps an oversight.

For δειδῶ Mr. Platt substitutes δέδῖα, a form that cannot be explained by phonetic laws, but may have been arrived at through the analogy of the plural δέδῖ-μεν, &c., much as γέγαα was invented by grammarians to account for γέγαμεν. On the other hand δειδῶ represents the true perfect δέδῖα, becoming δέδῖα, -ω as -οιο becomes -οο, -ον. Hence it is a question whether δέδῖα is not the Homeric form.

For ἡῶθεν, ἡῶθι Mr. Platt writes ἡόοθεν, ἡόοθι. It is difficult to judge of these forms in the absence of other adverbs of the kind from stem in -σ. Surely it is more probable that the ω comes from the nominative. In any case it cannot be directly obtained from οο. The Attic ἔωθεν, if not an independent creation, is in favour of ἡῶθεν.

Another doubtful resolution is that of αἰ in the oblique cases of παῖς. The nominative παῖς is certain enough, but the metrical evidence is against παιδός, &c., and the accent of παιδός, παιδί, παισί (though παιδων is on the other side) proves the high antiquity of the αἰ. Pending the solution of the etymological difficulty it will be best to be guided by the metrical facts.

The restoration of the digamma in ὄψ (vax) violates a rule which was laid down long ago by Leo Meyer (*K.Z.* xxiii.), viz. that *Ϝ* disappears in Homer before the sounds *ο* (except in *οι*) and *ω*. The discovery (for such it was) has not received the attention which it deserved. On the other hand Mr. Platt does not write the *Ϝ* in ἱφι, though he gives *ῖς* and *ῖφια*. For the possessive *ὄς* and *ῖός* he writes *ῖός* and *ῖῖός*. In the latter of these forms the smooth breathing is incorrect, since the word originally had initial *σ*: pre-Hellenic (or proto-Hellenic) *σεῖός* being related to Latin *suus* as *τεῖός* to *tuis*.

In the phrase ἄρπνιαι ἀνηρεῖσαντο Mr. Platt writes ἀρέπνιαι, apparently after Fick. But Fick also changed the second word into

ἀναρέψαντο, pointing out that the meaning required is 'carried away,' and this cannot be extracted from ἀνηρεύψαντο, but is obtained at once if we suppose a stem ἀρεπ-, akin to ἀρπ- and Latin *rapiō*. It was as a consequence of this emendation that he wrote ἀρέπναι, in order to bring out the original play of language,—'the snatchers snatched away.' It is a question whether this further step was justified, since the form ἀρπναι stands to the supposed ἀρεπ- as ὄρνυα to ὄρεγ- in ὀρέγω, &c. But with the retention of ἀνηρεύψαντο it loses all point.

More serious objection may be taken to some of the new forms introduced. Nauck's χήσεται for χείσεται (18, 17) cannot come from χασ- (in ἔχασον, χανδάνω). The root is χενδ-; cp. *pre-hendo*. Cauer's λελύντο (18, 238) is not admissible as the 3 plural of an optative. If the diphthong υι is allowed we may read λελύιτο (the subject is γνῖα): but -υντο is as little Homeric as -οιυτο and -αιυτο. So in 20, 383 Bekker's ἀλφουν is very improbable, no Homeric word ending in -οιυ. In 9, 283 Menrad's νῆν is an equally bold experiment in phonetics. In 16, 79 ἔσσωμι for ἔσσω μὲν (an emendation not noticed in the Index) is indefensible. The ending -ωμι is confined to the subjunctive of thematic tenses. In 9, 239, 338 a new adverb ἔντοθεν is taken from Rumpf. In 4, 692 Christ's φιλείη is admitted as the subj. of φιλέω, the MSS. having φιλοίη. The theory of subjunctives in -ιω, -υγς, &c. (*Rh. Mus.* xxxvi.) has not been accepted by scholars, and the optative makes sufficiently good sense. The change from the subjunctive ἐχθαίρησι is not without point.

Turning to emendations which do not depend upon questions of morphology, we may notice in 5, 391 ἡ δὲ for ἡδὲ. The force of the article is not obvious, and I cannot think that ἡ δὲ γαλήνῃ ἐπλετο νηνεμία is a good piece of Homeric Greek. In 8, 285 οἶδ' ἀλασκοπιῇν εἶχε seems a happy and expressive phrase, upon which ἀλαός σκοπιῇν is not an improvement. It is not obvious why Nauck prefers σίτου τε ἐπασσάμεθ' (9, 87, 10, 58) to σίτοιο τ' ἐπασσάμεθ'. If a hiatus is the object, it is more easily attained by omitting the τε. In 13, 173 the change of ἀγάσασθαι to ἀγάσσεσθαι is one of a series proposed by Cobet (and somewhat earlier by Madvig). Most of them are justified, but in this place the aorist gives the best sense. What was said was 'Poseidon is angered (ἡγάσσατο) because you are senders of men,' not 'will be angered if you are.' In 10, 39 στεῶν τε πόλιν καὶ γαίαν ἔκρηται the reference

is general, not to a future event and τε is therefore better than κε which Mr. Platt substitutes. In 10, 425 ὀτρύνεσθε ἐμοὶ ἅμα πάντες ἐπησθε 'bestir yourselves all that you follow me' is obtained by Mr. Platt by combining the two readings ὀτρύνεσθε ἐμοὶ... ἐπεσθαι and ὀτρύνεσθ' ἵνα μοι... ἐπησθε. Ingenious as this is, it is against Homeric usage, which only allows clauses to be connected in this paratactic way when the second has a good construction as an independent sentence. As ἐπησθε cannot be used as an imperative in an affirmative sentence, we must either insert ἵνα or read ἐπεσθαι. In 19, 316 ξείνους αἰδοίους ἀποπεμπέμεν ἡδὲ δέχεσθαι the substitution of αἰδοίους seems fanciful. Would it mean 'in the manner due to one who is αἰδοῖος'? In 22, 374 ὡς κακοεργεῖς εὐεργεσίῃ μέγ' ἀμείνων Mr. Platt reads κακοεργεσίης. The result is epigrammatic rather than poetical. Moreover εὐεργεσίῃ is connected with εὐεργέτης, whereas there is no κακοεργέτης. Compare also ἀεργεῖη. If Mr. Platt is right in adopting αὐτὸς ἐγὼν (for ἐκὼν) in 2, 133, why not also in 4, 649? And why change νῆα ἔρυσθαι (9, 194, 10, 444) when we have to leave νῆας ἔρυσθαι in the text (14, 260, etc.)?

Among misprints or clerical errors may be mentioned:—1, 152 τὰ γάρ for τὰ γάρ τ' (no foot-note): 1, 325, 339 οἱ δὲ (Mr. Platt does not follow the recent fashion of accenting these forms of the article): 8, 67 (and elsewhere) λίγειαν for λιγείαν: 8, 51 βένθοσθε: 8, 524 σφῆς for ἐφῆς: 10, 92 αἱ μὲν: 13, 407 αἱ δὲ: 11, 44 ἐτάροισιν: 13, 280 foot-note ἐνθ' ἔην: 15, 169 μηρμήριξε: 16, 431 μνάει for μνάσαι: 18, 176 ἡράον for ἡράε' (?): 23, 100 ἀλλῃ for ἄλλῃ. In 4, 372 μεθείς, if it is a present, should be μεθείς. In 24, 7 ποτέονται should probably be ποτάονται. Is the form ἦα at the end of a line (5, 266) to be read ἦα or ἦα? The resolution of -ου into -οο is neglected, contrary to Mr. Platt's practice, in 11, 83, 492, 19, 533, 22, 33, 41.

Mr. Platt occasionally writes οὐδέ instead of οὐδέ—a distinction which can hardly be carried out with any advantage. He also once or twice resolves γάρ into γ' ἄρ', as in 9, 319 Κύκλωπός γ' ἄρ' ἔκειτο μέγα ῥόπαλον παρὰ σηκῷ. But here at least there is no emphasis to give meaning to Κύκλωπός γε. And if we write δ' γ' ἄρ' γέρας ἐστὶ we ought to write in 17, 172 ὅς γ' ἄρ' ῥα, which is hardly possible.

A valuable part of Mr. Platt's book is the complete list of Bentley's emendations on the *Odyssey*. Those which he made on

the *Iliad* were given in Heyne's edition, but the others are now published for the first time. Since Bentley's time the chief progress has been due to G. Curtius, Ahrens, Benfey, Leo Meyer, and the many younger men who have carried on the study of language with ever advancing method. Even such a scholar as Cobet, in excluding the so-called comparative philology from his view, has shown that he was cutting himself off from a source of knowledge essential to

his subject, and that this cannot be done with impunity. Mr. Platt has made valuable investigations in the field of Homer, but his resources are hardly equal to so great a matter as a new recension. Such a work should come as a result and summing up of many discussions. The recent editions seem to show that it is a work for which the real masters of the science are hardly prepared.

D. B. MONRO.

#### A TRANSLATION OF THE *ILIAD* INTO MODERN GREEK.

Η Ἰλιάδα· μεταφρασμένη ἀπ' τὸν Ἀλεξ. Πάλλη.  
Μέρος πρῶτο. Α—Ζ. Ἀθήνα. Τυπογραφεῖο τοῦ  
Σ. Κ. Βλάστου. London, D. Nutt. 1892. 5s.

No one who is interested in the progress of modern Greek literature can have failed to note with satisfaction the decided reaction which is taking place in the attitude of the more serious men of letters towards their language. Though the patriotic Greeks make it a point of honour to laugh, such a work as Psychari's *Tò Ταξίδι Μου* cannot fail in time to have its effect on the more thoughtful, and to teach them that they will only kill their national literature if they insist upon writing it in an artificial and bastard tongue of bad Xenophontean grammar forced into the mould of French idioms. Those who have revolted against this false idea have had throughout to struggle against one chief difficulty. They have not been able to point to a sufficient mass of living contemporary literature to prove their assertion that the vernacular is capable of being as artistically used as the sham ancient language. There have of course been, besides the klephtic ballads which should form the boast of Greek letters, the poems of Salomos and Valaoritis, of Christopoulos and a few others: but so long as these were isolated, the patriot passed them by with a shrug as regrettable eccentricities. The vernacular can only take its right place when a considerable number of men work together, and produce good literature sufficient in quantity to exact attention. It is cheering to see signs that this need is being met. Some remarkable translations of Shakespeare by Polyhav have gained at least a more respectable hearing from the press of Athens than

would have been accorded ten years ago. Mr. Pallis' translation of the *Iliad* is another step in the right direction. It is not the first translation of Homer into the vernacular; students of Vincent and Dickson's *Modern Greek Grammar* will remember the specimen there given of Vikelas' rendering of the *Odyssey*, but I am not aware of a previous *Iliad*.

It would of course be absurd to pretend to give an appreciation of the literary merit of a translation into a foreign tongue; that must needs be left to natives. But it is permissible to express an opinion on the high value of a translation such as this for those who wish to learn the real spoken language. There is no doubt that the vocabulary and grammar here are quite pure and uncontaminated by pseudo-classicism. The introductory *Κριτικά* too show that the vernacular can be used not merely for the conversation of an uncultivated horde of peasants, but for the discussion of highly technical critical questions. It is true that not many of Mr. Pallis' conjectures are likely to find their way into our modern texts. Most of them have little internal reason, and some are unmetrical; the modern accentuation has of course spoilt the Greek ear for all the delicacies of ancient prosody. Still some of them are worth consideration; ἄμπεσε (fell backwards) for instance gives a far better sense than ἔμπεσε in iv. 108; it is not quite like Homer to say 'fell into a rock', which can only be understood to mean 'fell into a cleft of a rock'; and this should be expressed. But the translation has a different value, and will do good work if it contributes, as I hope it may, to the rehabilitation of the spoken tongue. I