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](#)

Les Scolies Genevoises de l'Illiade, publiées avec une étude historique, descriptive et critique sur le Genevensis 44 ou Codex Ignotus d'Henri Estienne et une collation complète de ce manuscrit, par Jules Nicole, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Genève. Paris: Hachette. 1891. 35 frcs.

W. Leaf

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 09 / November 1891, pp 413 - 414

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0016771X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0016771X

How to cite this article:

W. Leaf (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 413-414 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0016771X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Les Scolies Genevoises de l'Iliade, publiées avec une étude historique, descriptive et critique sur le Genevensis 44 ou Codex Ignotus d'Henri Estienne et une collation complète de ce manuscrit, par JULES NICOLE, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Genève. Paris: Hachette. 1891. 35 frs.

THIS is a work of immense toil, real acumen, and scholarly research of which Switzerland, where little has been done for Homeric study since the days of Koechly, may well be proud. For practical purposes it may be divided into two parts. One consists of pages 196–212 of Vol. I. The rest of the work forms the other.

The MS., now in the library at Geneva, was once the property of Henri Estienne, who used it in the preparation of his *Poetae Epici Graeci*, as Prof. Nicole makes plain. It dates from the thirteenth century originally, but parts have been recopied in the fourteenth. The text is closely allied to that of D, without being copied from it; a fact which has led Prof. Nicole, following the example of previous scholars, to enormously overrate the importance of the place which it can take in Homeric criticism. As a matter of fact an inspection of the variants which he gives in his collation only confirms the views which I have elsewhere expressed as to the critical worthlessness of D and all its kin. The scholia, with an important exception, are closely allied to those of B and T; but there seems some ground, as Prof. Nicole argues, for supposing them to have come from an earlier and better progenitor of these two collections, which they sometimes expand and elucidate. But it is hardly worth while to waste time in the arid regions of these exegetic scholia; the seventeen pages which are mentioned above contain far different matter, and so far outweigh in importance all the rest of the work as to deserve all the space which can be spared for them.

The scholia to book xxi., which occupy these few pages, are drawn from a rich source of Alexandrian learning. It must be said at once however that they do not add much to our knowledge of the work of Aristarchos. There are a good many scholia of Aristonikos, but these are generally identical with those in A. Here and there they give small additions or expansions; for instance the reading *ιβυκτίωνα* in 169 is

ascribed to Kallistratos as well as to Zenodotos. These scholia, unlike those of A, generally have the name of Aristonikos in full at the beginning. Nikanor is entirely absent. There is very little that can be ascribed to Didymos, whose name does not occur at all. But to him is no doubt due the schol. on 452 *διχῶς ἀπέβλεψε*. This variant however cannot be right: *ἀπέβλεψε* is not admitted either by rhythm or sense as an alternative for *ἀπέπεμπε*. It is probably a corruption of *ἀπολεψέμεν*, which we know to have been read by Aristarchos in 455 in place of the vulgate *ἀποκοψέμεν*. Such a transposition and corruption would be by no means beyond the copyist's power, as will presently appear. The quotation of a new variant on 492 as being *ἐν τῇ Χίᾳ καὶ Κυπρίᾳ* also looks Didymean; and there are various other notes which may be by Didymos, so far as the evidence goes; but they lack the phrases and turns by which his work is recognised in the Venetian scholia.

Herodian on the other hand is well represented. He is quoted more at first hand than in the Venetus and his citations are often reproduced verbally. And with him are quoted also a large number of other books and authors bearing on Homer which yield the most valuable part of these excerpts. We find ourselves among a number of authors of whom nothing whatever was known before. Even in the case of those who were already known from the Venetian scholia we find our knowledge extended; sometimes they are quoted by an additional name which served to identify them in antiquity, sometimes the titles of their books are given where the Venetian epitomator was content with the bare name of the author. Thus Alexion becomes *ὁ χωλός*; Komanos is *ὁ Ναυκρατίτης*. Of critics never mentioned in A we have Duris quoted twice, Phanodikos, Peisistratos of Ephesos, and another who is twice called Aridikes—a name hitherto absolutely unknown, and no doubt corrupt. A long scholion on 363 quoted from Peisistratos of Ephesos and Hermogenes *ἐν τῷ περὶ προβλημάτων* is interesting. These authors argue that the right reading is *μελδομένον* and not *μελδόμενος*, as given in the vulgate; and they explain the corruption by assuming that the original reading in the old alphabet was *μελδομενο*. But *ὁ μεταγράφων εἰς τὴν νῦν γραμματικὴν οὐκ ἐνόησεν ὅτι 'μελδομένου' ἦν*,

ἀλλ' ἄνευ τοῦ ὑ ἀναγκάσκων ἀδιανόητον ἡγήτο
καὶ ἡμαρτημένον εἶναι, διόπερ προσέθηκε ἀντὶ
τοῦ ὑ τὸ σ, 'μελδόμενος' ποιήσας.

But to the general student these few pages contain a still more interesting peculiarity in the number of quotations given from classical authors. We have here three new lines of Alkaios, two of Sophokles, one of Euphorion, four of Xenophanes; a new Homeric ἀπόρημα by Aristotle, and a law of Solon, of which only a few words were previously known from the Lexicon of Harpokration. It must be admitted that this is a rich gleanings in so small a field; it is provoking to think how much more of the same sort we might have if a freak of fortune had not limited these extracts to a single book of the Iliad. As it is, Greek lexicography is enriched by at least two new words, πρόσγονος quoted from the Λαρισσαῖοι of Sophokles in the sense of πρόγονος: and κνύπαιδες attributed to Sophron.

Unfortunately the scholia are in many cases in a state of terrible confusion. One may suffice as a specimen; I commend it to the attention of emenders as a puzzle worth some little pains to solve, for it contains the law of Solon and a quotation from the Δαίδαλος of Sophokles. Prof. Nicole has given a solution which is ingenious, and at least in the main probably right; but I

withhold it in the hope that some readers of the *Classical Review* may arrive independently at even more satisfactory results. The MS. runs as follows: (282) ἐρχθέντα]... Κράτης "εἰλθέντ' ἐν μεγάλῳ" ἱαλεῖν γὰρ φησὶ εἶναι τὸ εἶργειν ὥστε τὴν τῆς κωλύσ δίκην ἐξ οὐλῆς εἰάν τις ἐξηλμάτων ἀντὶ δικανικῆς ἢ ὁ ποί καλεῖσθαι καὶ παρατίθεται σόλωνος ἐννεάζονι ἐξ οὐλῆς ἀνάξιον ἢ εἰς δημόσιον ὀφλάνῃ καὶ τῷ ιδιώτῃ ἐκάτερος· ὁ σοφοκλῆς ἐν δαυδάλῳ ἔλλη-
μενήσω τὸν δ' ἔα χαλκευτῷ πῆδη.

It is perhaps only fair to would-be solvers to give them one hint; the letters ὁ ποι may be neglected if desirable. It is easy to see, as Prof. Nicole has pointed out, how they got into the scholion. The original of the Genevensis, like the Bankes papyrus, was in the habit of giving the name of every speaker at the beginning of his speech. When the narrative was resumed after a speech, the poet was regarded as the speaker, and a contraction of his name, ὁ ποί, was placed at the beginning of the line. The scholia were in this original evidently crowded into the margins, so that the copyist carelessly included these letters in what he was copying.

There are also two quite corrupt lines of Alkaios which may be set as a puzzle at some future date, if readers of the *Classical Review* care for more problems in emendation.

W. LEAF.

PLUMMER'S EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. JUDE.

The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, by the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.
(Expositor's Bible, Hodder and Stoughton.
1891.) 7s. 6d.

THIS is a book which may be commended as the product of a thoroughly cultivated mind, equally imbued with common sense, sound scholarship, and deep religious feeling. The union of these qualities is one of the most hopeful signs of the time to those who remember how often in earlier decades of the century scholarship has shown itself hard, dry, and pedantic, removed from all sympathy with life or literature; while religion appeared a mere creature of emotion, cowering under the shelter of Church authority, and suspicious of the free use of the intellect as likely to breed either heresy or atheism. In such commentaries as the present, and in those by Bishop Westcott or the much lamented Dean Plumptre, we have books addressed to the

general public which are full of instruction to scholars; and on the other hand we have learned editions of the Greek Testament, such as those by Bishop Lightfoot, which are interesting not to scholars only but to all educated readers.

In his introductory chapters Dr. Plummer discusses with much fairness the question of the authenticity of the Epistle of St. James. He comes to that which appears to me the only tenable conclusion, viz. that it was written by the president of the Church at Jerusalem, 'the brother of the Lord'; which latter phrase he interprets as meaning the son of Joseph and Mary. As to the date he considers that it could not have been written while 'the crisis as to the treatment of the Gentile converts was at its height,' but leaves it an open question whether it appeared previously to the Council at Jerusalem—say between 45 and 49 A.D.—or shortly before the author's death—say between 53