

# 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](#)



---

**Ludwich's Edition of the *Odyssey*, and Seymour's Edition of the *Iliad* *Homeri carmina* recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars Altera. *Odyssea*. Volumen Prius, 1889. Volumen Alterum, 1891. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk. *Homer's Iliad*; Books iv-vi. Edited on the base of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by Thomas D. Seymour. Ginn. Boston, 1891.**

W. Leaf

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 12 - 13  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184495, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00184495](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184495)

**How to cite this article:**

W. Leaf (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 12-13 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184495

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

disyllable like *fōrma* and *grōma*), \**nōnma*. And this, by Havet's law, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vi. 31, 2, would necessarily become *nōrma*, as \**can-men* (*canō*) became *carmen* and \**gen-men* (*genō*) became *germen*.<sup>1</sup> The other

<sup>1</sup> These derivations are simpler than Corssen's connexion of *carmen* with Sk. *śasman-* 'praise,' and of *germen* with Sk. *gārbhas* 'embryo': the root-vowel of *śasman-* is *e* (Lat. *censeō*, Brugmann, *Grundriss* i. p. 292) not *a*, and the root of *gārbhas* does not appear elsewhere in Latin (certainly not in *gremium*). Further, according to Brugmann (*ut supra* p. 429), whose view has certainly not yet been disproved, \**casmen* would in Latin become \**cāmen*, not *carmen*: for which reason also we cannot derive *germen* from *gerō*, as this would only give \**gesmen*, \**gēmen*.

derivations suggested for *nōrma* are impossible: that it goes with Sk. *nar-* 'to guide,' a root invented by Pāṇini to derive *nāras* 'man' from, or that it is a loan-word representing either *γνώμων* or *γλωφίμη*. It is true that *γνώμων* according to Liddell and Scott (they give no instance) meant a carpenter's square; but the Latin form of *γνώμων* could only be \**gnōmō* or \**nōmō*, leaving both the *r* and the termination of *nōrma* unaccounted for. And why the carpenter's square should be called 'well known,' which is all the meaning that can be extracted from *γλωφίμη*, is not apparent.

E. R. WHARTON.

## LUDWICH'S EDITION OF THE *ODYSSEY*, AND SEYMOUR'S EDITION OF THE *ILIAD*.

*Homeri carmina* recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit ARTHURUS LUDWICH. Pars Altera. *Odyssea*. Volumen Prius, 1889. Volumen Alterum, 1891. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.

THIS new critical edition of the *Odyssey* marks a step in the progress of Homeric textual study, but no one sees more clearly than the editor himself that it is far from finality. But it is the first advance which has been made since the publication of La Roche's edition in 1867-8. That the advance is substantial, if not at once understood from the name of the editor, can easily be shown.

The list of MSS. quoted by each is in itself sufficient proof. La Roche uses fifteen, Ludwig twenty-three. But these twenty-three include a large amount of new material of a better class than La Roche's. Only eight of La Roche's are found worthy of a place in Ludwig's list. Of those which are common to both, Ludwig in no case depends on La Roche's collation, as may indeed be supposed. In fact he has made his own collation of all but five of his list—a work of vast labour, especially in the hands of so accurate a collator as we know Professor Ludwig to be. The seven of La Roche's which Ludwig rejects are all of late date, four or five of them being of the 15th century, and only a part of one, the Marcianus 647 containing the last fifteen books, as old as the 13th. This fragment by the way seems to deserve attention, and I am a little surprised to find that Ludwig makes no mention of it in his Prolegomena.

Of the fifteen new MSS. of which collations are given, one is the Berlin papyrus ascribed to the 8th century. This is unfortunately a very small fragment, containing only parts of some eighty lines of the 14th book. Then come two MSS. in the Laurentian Library at Florence, both ascribed to the 10th century—as old as the Ven. A of the *Iliad*, and older than any other known complete MS. of either poem. One of these is not mentioned at all by La Roche in his *Hom. Textkritik*; and Ludwig gives but little account of it. Indeed he is throughout his Prolegomena very sparing of descriptions of his MSS. and of several says nothing at all. This is an omission which I cannot but think is to be regretted. But it appears that only two of his MSS. belong to the 14th century, four to the 15th, and two, which are quoted only at second hand, to the 16th. Fifteen are earlier than the 14th. It is clear therefore that his materials are even more in advance of La Roche's in quality than in quantity.

In the region of scholia Ludwig is of course an acknowledged master; no one is so well qualified to bring the results of ancient and particularly of Alexandrian criticism to bear on the Homeric text. So far as the Aristarchean scholia are concerned—and these are of course critically the most important elements in the correction of the text—Ludwig's work may be regarded as final until some hitherto unknown material is discovered. When his gigantic task of the formation of a complete critical corpus of the whole of the *Odyssean* scholia is ended—if indeed one man can end it in a

lifetime—we shall be able to say the same of those scholia which, though not Aristarchean, yet contain a considerable amount of critical matter. There still remain the scattered notices of grammarians and later writers; and it is doubtless here that most still remains to be done.

As to the text itself, readers of the second volume of *Aristarch's Homerische Textkritik* know what they have to expect from Professor Ludwig—most uncompromising hostility to all the methods of fashionable modern conjecture, with its innovations made for the sake of grammatical uniformity and philological purism. The forms given in Ludwig's text are those of the MS. tradition, however they may horrify the historical grammarian. Ludwig will have nothing to say to *ἐν, προσηύδαε, ὁράοντες* and the like. And in a critical apparatus such a rule is surely the only right one. Such an edition should confine itself strictly to the collection of materials on which emenders may base their work if they like. The task of producing a really archaic text, if possible—and I at least think it far more possible and even practical than Ludwig does—is entirely distinct from the collection of the diplomatic evidence, and the two cannot be too carefully kept apart. I even question if the text of such an edition should not rigorously confine itself to the traditional vulgate, relegating to notes even the most undoubted improvements of Aristarchos and his school, to say nothing of the corrections of more recent editors. Such a plan has the immense advantage of simplicity and intelligibility, it leaves at all events no doubt as to what the real reading of the MSS. is. On this point we are too often left in doubt by La Roche, who lays it down as a rule, which he is far from rigidly following, that he will give an Aristarchean text. Such an attempt is in fact doomed to failure, for our materials are not complete. But we have at all events firm ground if we confine ourselves to the actual readings of MSS.; and we have a further great gain in the compendiousness of the apparatus, if what stands in the text is always known to be the reading of MSS. in general, with variants alone

given in the *Adnotatio Critica*. It has been a too common mistake to fall between two stools in the attempt to make a text which shall at once serve for the student, as being the best which conjecture can produce, and for the scholar, who may be aiming at a quite different ideal text, and asks only for rough ore which he can work up in his own moulds. Ludwig himself has perhaps not entirely avoided this difficulty; but even as a mass of ore his edition is indispensable, and will at once take its place as the necessary starting-point for all further criticism on the *Odyssey*. It will, alas! be a long time before we can hope for his *pars prior* as a basis for the text of the *Iliad*.

*Homer's Iliad*; Books iv-vi. Edited on the base of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by THOMAS D. SEYMOUR. Ginn. Boston, 1891.

THE school edition of *Iliad* i.-iii. by the same editor has already been noticed in the *Classical Review*; the present volume is one of the 'college series' for more advanced students. The notes are a free adaptation of those of the well-known edition of Ameis and Hentze with numerous additions, of which the illustrative passages from English authors call for special recognition. At the end of the volume, in place of the vocabulary given in the school edition, we have here an appendix giving a short account of the chief MSS., editions, and auxiliaries, and critical notes in which the conjectures of the modern emenders and the variants of the Alexandrian critics receive brief notice. It would not be hard to criticise so condensed an apparatus, both for its omissions and its inclusions: it would surely have been more instructive to the learner if fewer readings and fewer books had been named, and a short discussion had been appended to those that were given. But it would be a pity to seem to quarrel with so good an edition, excellent alike for scholarship, taste and typography.

W. LEAF.