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 Homervulgata *Die Homervulgata als voralexandrinische erwiesen*, von Arthur Ludwich. Leipzig, Teubner. 1898. Mk. 6.

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 39 - 41

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042323, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042323

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 39-41 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042323

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LUDWICH'S HOMERVULGATA.

Die Homervulgata als voralexandrinische erwiesen, von ARTHUR LUDWICH. Leipzig, Teubner. 1898. Mk. 6.

UNTIL the year 1891 the critical material for the text of Homer consisted of statements in scholia, quotations in authors of all ages, and manuscripts. The latter, mainly Byzantine and eked out by some dozen uncials and papyri reaching back about as far as the Christian era, were homogeneous among themselves, and presented a text various indeed but on the whole sufficiently uniform to be called a vulgate. To this vulgate the readings of the Alexandrian critics, on the one hand, and certain of the quotations on the other, stood in contrast.

In the year 1891 this state of things was altered, or thought to be altered, by the discovery (by Mr. Flinders Petrie) and publication (by Professor Mahaffy) of a fragment of Λ older than any yet found papyrus, and offering remarkable variants: for some time this fragment stood alone. In 1894 M. Jules Nicole put forth a second similar document, and this was followed in 1897 by several such fragments found and published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. All these documents agreed in being apparently of the Ptolemaic period, that is to say of the second or third century B.C., and in making very remarkable additions to the ordinary text, additions which if not different in kind are different in a very high degree from any hitherto found in an actual manuscript.

These discoveries excited natural interest among scholars generally, both those who were conversant with the existing evidence for the Homeric text, and others who appear to have been less abreast of it. Thus we have had articles in various journals by MM. Diels, Gomperz, Menrad, Meyer and possibly others: while it was not to be supposed that the historian of Aristarchus, Prof. Arthur Ludwig, would be idle on an event which touched his province so nearly. In 1891, directly after the first publication, there appeared from his pen a programme 'Die sogenannte voralexandrinische Ilias,' in 1897, a treatise 'Ueber Homercitate aus der Zeit von Aristarch bis Didymos,' and finally the substantial book of 204 pages which I am now discussing.

Two claims have been made for these new fragments by their editors or critics. First, that they represent the prae-Alexan-

drian state of the poems, the state out of which by the critical labours of Zenodotus and his successors the existing text or vulgate was produced. This legend, false as most legends, dies hard, and Prof. Ludwig may well be indignant that even his exhaustive work upon Aristarchus, published as long ago as 1884, has not driven it from the minds—I do not say of editors, of whom omniscience is not expected, and who have produced their documents with conspicuous ability—but of self-appointed critics. It is known to anyone who has examined the evidence that the reverse of this statement is the truth: the Alexandrian school, singular as it may appear, had little or no influence upon tradition. The vulgate indeed coincides in certain proportions with Aristarchus' readings: but it is an open question whether those coincidences are effects of Aristarchus' editions or not. In any case the common text was generally speaking unaffected by Alexandria or by any other school, and to see in these fragments the raw material out of which the vulgate was critically formed is a misapprehension.

A different and more subtle suggestion has been put forward by the distinguished editors of the last discovered fragments, and it is against this claim that the more novel and weighty part of Prof. Ludwig's book is directed. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt wish us to believe (and they return to their opinion in their last book, *Oxyrynchus Papyri* I. p. 46¹) that, Alexandrians apart, the fact of the occurrence of such remarkable additions to the text in nearly all the very few Ptolemaic papyri of Homer that have been found proves that the vulgate, as we have it, cannot have been in existence at the time to which these documents belong—that it must have come into existence later. The fact is certainly striking, and must be admitted to prove the abundance and diffusion of 'eccentric' texts of Homer on a larger scale than was otherwise known. If there had been no other evidence, these phenomena might justifiably have led to a suspension of judgment upon the age of the vulgate: though even then it would have been open to point out the enormous working of the element of chance, and that

¹ 'This [the insertion of a new line] shows the influence of the Ptolemaic manuscripts of Homer.' The influence of the Ptolemaic MSS. will not have waned till manuscripts ceased to be written.

another happy find of Ptolemaic Homers might throw these four scraps into a minority.

However other evidence is in existence, and we are relieved from the uncomfortable situation of balancing improbabilities. This evidence is of two sorts: (1) the clear statements of Didymus and Aristonicus, who distinguish between on the one hand, the editions of Aristarchus and the other Alexandrians, the *πολιτικά*, the *κατ' ἄνδρα* and the other particular categories, and on the other *αἱ κοινά*, *ἡ κοινή*, *αἱ δημόδεις* and so forth. Even supposing this vulgate were not the same as our vulgate, still these expressions evidently posit a vulgate as existing in the time of the Alexandrians.

(2) The second class of evidence consists of the quotations in prae-Alexandrian writers, from Herodotus downward. Prof. Ludwig has collected and arranged these from page 71 to 133 of his book, with a diligence and acuteness that can be appreciated only by anyone who has himself attempted such a collection. The results are tabulated p. 138 *sqq.* and deserve the most serious attention. Twenty-nine separate writers quote 152 portions of the Homeric text, amounting to 480 lines more or less. In these 480 lines there are not more than nine to eleven lines of addition to the ordinary text.

These figures may possibly be slightly modified, but in substance they may be taken as correct. The element of chance enters largely into quotation as such, but not more largely than into the discovery of scraps of papyrus. On the whole the nature of the evidence is undeniable, and shows beyond dispute that the text of the fourth and fifth centuries was essentially the same as ours; that is to say, that the vulgate existed as far back as the fifth century.

I regard this calculation as the striking merit of Prof. Ludwig's book. The reader is so apt to be impressed by the four lines added to © in the second Alcibiades, and by the different version of Ψ 77 *sq.* in Aeschines' speech against Timarchus, that it is a real service to be recalled by the impartial proof of figures to the reality of the case. I should however mention that there is much beside these statistics in this book: the author has reprinted all the papyri in question, and in a most handy form; having established the age of the vulgate, he follows out a series of bold and original conclusions which concern both the linguistic and the historical critic. Every page is rich

in acute and well-supported statements brought from the abundant store of the acknowledged master of his subject.

I return to the papyrus-fragments. If they are not the material out of which whether by Alexandrian or by natural processes the vulgate was constructed, what are they, and what is their importance? In the first place they are nothing new, or *sui generis*: additions to, and subtractions from, the text of Homer, are of all common phenomena the commonest; they are found in full life from the earliest quotations to the latest Renaissance manuscript, they form the greatest field for the operation of Aristarchus' *athetesis*. It is true they are never found on the scale of the additions in these fragments, except indeed so far as Zenodotus' edition affords a parallel. Secondly, history has known ever since the Venetian scholia were published, that there existed beside the vulgate and the Alexandrian editions, a number of sporadic or 'eccentric' texts, some called by the names of individuals, some after places. We unfortunately know very little about them, and their recorded variants (though this may be accidental) are mostly verbal. Further, quotations show the existence of copies differing very widely from the vulgate. The phenomena exhibited by Aeschines' speech against Timarchus and by the Platonic Second Alcibiades, are exactly of the same character as we find in the four papyri. Unfortunately names cannot be put to any of these manuscripts or editions. The only distinctive mark about the papyri is an interlinear variant in one of them which is ascribed by the scholiasts to Antimachus; the Aeschines-passage agrees in one verbal variant with some of the City editions, and there are similar coincidences in some Platonic quotations. However there can be little doubt that the papyri belong to one or more of these eccentric editions, and I see no absolute improbability in Menrad's suggestion of the *πολιτικός*. The importance of the fragments is that they at last furnish us with a specimen, actually in writing and on papyrus, of such editions,—in other words, that they confirm the quotations. Their effect in this direction is most important and salutary. Quotation has always been a discredited source of evidence. All sorts of obvious conditions (lapse of memory, association, carelessness, deliberate alteration to suit a context, on the part of the writer; and all these plus his own private sins on the part of the scribe) have allowed critics to disregard almost any given

quotation. We know now that Plato and Aeschines were not the victims of recollection, and did not adapt passages to their ends: they consulted, on these two occasions, copies more or less resembling the four fragments. I will take a more striking example to show how the credit of quotation is raised by these discoveries.

The lines Ψ 222 sq. which in our MSS. and editions run:

- 222 ὥς δὲ πατὴρ οὐ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὅστέα
καίων
223 νυμφίου ὅς τε θανὼν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε
τοκῆας
224 ὥς Ἀχιλεὺς ἐτάριοι ὀδύρετο ὅστέα καίων
225 ἐρπύζων παρὰ πυρκαϊῇ, ἀδινὰ στεναχίζων

are thus quoted by Plutarch, *Cons. ad Apoll.* 117 C;

- 222 ὥς δὲ πατὴρ οὐ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὅστέα
καίων
223 νυμφίου ὅς τε θανὼν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε τοκῆας
223a ἄρρητον δὲ τοκεῦσι γόνον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκε·
καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω δῆλον εἰ δικαίως
ὀδύρεται, ἀλλ' ὅρα τὸ ἐξῆς·
223b μόνος τηλύγετος πολλοῖσιν ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι.

The two new lines are as typical a specimen of epic 'padding' as could be wished; neither are essential, both exist elsewhere (P 37, I 482). Short work would be made

of this quotation by anyone who sought to prove the extinction of all texts but the vulgate in Plutarch's time. However, if we consult *Greek Papyri Series II.*, Oxford, 1897, p. 11, we find at the top of a column

χωρῶσεν δ
αρη ν δε τ
224 ως α υσ ετ
225 ερπυζων παρ

where the line beginning *αρη* is evidently Plutarch's 223a, and yet another line of 'padding' shows itself between 223a and (as far as we can tell) 223. Plutarch's accuracy is therefore vindicated; he verified his references. His copy was not the same as Bodl. MS. Gr. class. b. 3 (P), but was similar to it. Time has submerged them both: a bit of one has been dug up. It must follow that quotations are to be treated with more respect than heretofore,¹ and this I take to be the real lesson taught us by these finds. It is much to be hoped that the energy of the explorers may again be rewarded, and that they may supply us with fresh evidence to establish the proportion and relation between the vulgate and the editions independent of it.

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ Even Aristotle's, on which Prof. Ludwig and critics generally are over-severe.

LEAF AND BAYFIELD'S *ILIAD*, Vol. II.

ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΙΛΙΑΣ. The *Iliad* of Homer with Introductions, Notes and Appendices, by W. LEAF, Litt. D., and M. A. BAYFIELD, M.A. Vol. ii. (xiii.-xxiv.). London, Macmillan & Co. 1898. Pp. lxiii + 634. 6s.

THE second volume of Mr. Bayfield's school edition of Dr. Leaf's *Iliad*, containing the last twelve books, brings to an end a work of considerable practical importance from its bearing on the study and teaching of Homer in England. Dr. Leaf represents the advanced disintegrating school of German criticism, which has never been very favourably regarded here in spite of Grote's ably advocated Achilleis theory. Still even those who cannot accept these extreme views may be glad to welcome a handy edition, which sets forth the ideas of a prominent—they

themselves would perhaps say, a predominant—school of Homeric criticism. How boys will like the constant calls to observe that the poetry is a vile piece of patchwork is problematical. They will probably wonder why the editors ever stooped to deal with so faulty a production. Apart from this the merits of the volume are conspicuous and undeniable. It is admirable for accurate scholarship, for thorough mastery of Homeric lore and for judicious consideration of all difficult points. In short it possesses all the advantages belonging to Dr. Leaf's well-known larger edition, set forth with effective conciseness. Nor does it lack new features of its own, for which Mr. Bayfield deserves the thanks of his readers.

In the present volume of nearly 700 pages, of which the text occupies about 300, we have first a General Introduction giving an