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](#)

The Nature of the Ancient Homeric Vulgate

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 2009, pp 4 - 9

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029334, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029334

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (2009). The Nature of the Ancient Homeric Vulgate. The Classical Review, 15, pp 4-9 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029334

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Seminar and, provided the winnowing is intelligently done, of very useful ones. There is however a certain danger of excess. Principal B. J. Wheeler in a very suggestive address to the first meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific coast Dec. 30, 1899 says, 'The exaggerated attention paid to syntax at present in American class-rooms of Greek and Latin constitutes the severest menace to the usefulness and therefore to the continuance of classical study which now exists,' and again 'In the philological class-rooms of Germany and America pure literary study has been reduced dangerously near to a minimum...On every hand one marks the effort to establish aesthetic criteria by measuring and counting and classifying.'

Possibly Mr. Wheeler somewhat over-

states the evil. At any rate there are indications of counteracting tendencies, first in the recognition, which has been very plain in certain recent syntactical work, of the paramount importance of the context for determining the essential character of an idiom; and secondly in the growth of a school of refined and sympathetic interpretation, to which the *Nation* of Dec. 27, 1900 in a review of Prof. Smyth's Greek Melic Poets refers in words which may fitly close this article. 'Here is a book displaying an erudition and thoroughness which we usually call German, a lucidity, neatness, balance and judgment which we may fairly call French, associated with a breadth and delicacy of literary culture which we expect from Cambridge and Oxford.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

THE NATURE OF THE ANCIENT HOMERIC VULGATE.

I RETURN from the mediaeval text of Homer, its content and the manner of its formation, to the third century B.C. and the times of the Alexandrians. Here I wish to consider the ordinary or common text.

In a previous article (October, 1899) I endeavoured to find methods by which the readings of this text, so neglected in our sources,¹ might be recovered. I suggested that beside the thirty-one² cases in which the *κοινή* is distinctly mentioned, its reading was (I) the opposite of that offered by *ἅπαναι, αἱ πλείους*, and other expressions for the majority, (IIa) the opposite of Aristarchus' reading where Aristarchus only is mentioned, or where the non-Aristarchean reading is attributed to *ἄλλοι, τινές*, etc., (IIb), the non-Aristarchean reading held by a single critic provided it is found in the

majority of our MSS. Experience since writing that article inclines me to put *ἄλλοι, τινές*, etc., on the level of the single individual, i.e. into class IIb, and to require MS. backing before I reckon their reading as the *κοινή*. With this alteration I maintain the rule.

The readings ascertainable as the result of these methods give us the *κοινή* as far as it can be recovered. Though a good deal has been written about the ancient vulgate, and Ludwig in his well-known book has vindicated its age, and though we have adequate accounts of the changes undergone by the early Homeric written text in general (e.g. in Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, p. 35 sqq.), no attempt has been made to represent the intrinsic character of the Vulgate. This I wish to consider here.

The total of readings which results from putting these rules into operation is over 600, far too great a number to be exhibited or discussed in a magazine-article. I will content myself with giving specimens from two books, and collecting classes of characteristics, premising explicitly that I nowhere aim at exhaustiveness, nor enter into greater detail than is necessary to permit of a general conclusion.

I mark the readings according to the classes given above; an asterisk implies an explicit statement in the scholia.

¹ We have, strictly speaking, no direct information about the Homeric text. The two grammarians on whom we mostly depend are entirely concerned with Aristarchus; one ascertains his readings, the other assigns meanings to his signs. The real text, from which Aristarchus differed, and to which his signs referred, did not interest them; moreover it was common property, in the hands of everyone. Aristarchus himself assumed it, dealt with it, scarred it with obeli, and imported endless readings into it, but rarely mentions it by name, and is never content with its authority. Therefore it is that our scholia are taken up with everything else but the *κοινή*, and our direct references to it are survivals of obiter dicta of commentators on Aristarchus.

² Really 32; I omitted T 189 in B.

A

*Vulgate.**Aristarchus.*

91	ἐνὶ στρατῷ	ἀχαιῶν (Zen. Aristoph. Sosig.)	I.
108	οὐδέ—οὐδ' ¹	οὔτε—οὔτ' (Aristoph.)	I.
117	σόν	σῶν	II.a
124	πω	που (Aristoph. Sosig.)	I.
142	ἐς	ἐν	II.a
157	σκιόεντα	σκιόωντα	II.a
168	ἐπήν	ἐπεῖ	II.a
169	φθίην	φθίηνδ' (Zen.)	I.
203	ἴδης	ἴδῃ	II.a
204	τετελέσθαι	τελέεσθαι	II.a
241	τοῖς	τότε	II.a
258	βουλῇ	βουλὴν (ἢ πολύστιχος)	I.
298	μαχέσσομαι (Heracleo)	μαχήσομαι (Mass. Argol. Sinop. Antim. Aristoph.)	I.
304	the same		
332	τε	τι (Cypria)	I.
350	οἶνοπα	ἀπείρονα	II.a
404	βίῃ	βίην	II.a
424	μετὰ (ἔνιοι)	κατὰ (Mass. Sinop. Cyp. Antim. Aristoph.)	I.
423	ἔποντο	ἔπονται (πάντες)	I.
432	ἐντὸς	ἐγγὺς	II.a
434	ὑφέντες (Zen.)	ἀφέντες	II.b
435	προέρυσσαν	προέρεσσαν (Argol. Sinop. Sosig.)	I.
447	κλειτὴν	ιερίην	II.a
484	μετὰ	κατὰ	II.a
522	μή σε	μή τι (πᾶσαι)	I.
524	ἐπινεύσομαι ¹	κατανεύσομαι	II.a
531	διέτμαγον	διέτμαγεν (πᾶσαι)	I.
553	οὐδέ—οὐδ' ¹	οὔτε—οὔτε (Rhian. Aristoph.)	I.
585	χερσὶ	χειρὶ (Mass. Sosig. Aristoph.)	I.
598	οἰνοχόει	οἰνοχόει (Argol. Mass. Antim. Zen. Aristoph.)	I.

Δ

17	αὐτως (Aristoph.)	αὐ πως	II.b
148	τ'	δ'	II.a
170	μοῦραν	πότμον	*
205	ἴδης	ἴδῃ	II.a
213	εἰλκεν	ἔλκεν (αἱ πλείους)	I.
238	δ'	om. δ'	II.a
260	κρητῆρσι	κρητῆρι	II.a
277	ἰόντι ¹ (Zen.)	έόντι	II.b
319	κατέκτα	κατέκταν	II.a
321	ικάνει	ὀπάζει	II.a
333	θ'	θ' om.	II.a
400	ἀμείνω	ἀμείνων	II.a
426	έόν	ἰόν	II.a
456	φόβος	πόνος	II.a
527	ἐπεσσυμένον	ἀπεσσυμένον	II.a

This list of pairs of opposed readings—the vulgate on the one hand and the grammarians' preference on the other—deserves consideration. It will be seen that the difference is

of very various sorts, now of forms, now of entire words or phrases. I proceed to draw up classes of the former type of divergence between the *κοινή* and the eccentric editions.

¹ There is some doubt about the tradition.

1. The vulgate adds the augment to verbs :

φύνοχοι = οἶνοχοί, A 598.
 εἶλκεν = ἔλκεν, Δ 213 al.
 ὀπλίζοντο = ὀπλίζοντο, Θ 55.
 εἰστῆκε(ν) = ἐστῆκε(ν), Ψ 691 al.
 ἤλπετο = ἔλπετο, P 603.
 ὑπεισείετο = ὑποσείετο, Ξ 285.
 ἐτέτυκτο = τέτυκτο, Ψ 455 ; Θ 163.
 ἀμφεφόβηθεν = ἀμφιφόβηθεν, Π 290.

2. The vulgate writes *ει* for *η* in these cases :

δαμείης = δαμήης, Γ 436.
 θείης = θήης, Z 432.
 θειοῖο = θηοῖο, Ω 418.
 περιστείωσ' = περιστήωσ', P 95.
 σαπείη = σαπήη, T 27.
 φανείη = φανήη, X 73.
 καθείατο = καθήατο, Ω 473.
 ᾗδει = ᾗδη, E 64.
 πορφύρει = πορφύρη, Ξ 16.

3. The vulgate forms the future of μάχομαι in -εσσ- :

μαχέσσομαι = μαχήσομαι, A 298, 304 ; Γ 290 ; I 32.
 μαχεσόμεθ' = μαχηόμεθ', B 377.

4. The κοινή assimilates consonants :

πασυνδίη = παυνδίη, B 12.
 ἀστήσων = ἀνστήσων, K 32, 176.
 ἀσχεο = ἀνσχεο, Ψ 587 ; Ω 518.
 ἀδδύεται = ἀνδύεται, N 22.
 ἀλλέξαι = ἀνλέξαι, Φ 321.

5. The κοινή contracts vowels :

πολεῖς = πολέας, Φ 131.
 ἀκλεις = ἀκλείες, M 318.
 νεμεσσηθῶμεν = νεμεσσηθέωμεν, Ω 53.

6. The κοινή affects crasis :

κάκειθι = καὶ κείθι, Γ 402.
 κάκείνω = καὶ κείνω, O 45, 179 ; Π 648.

7. The κοινή prefers *α*-forms to *ε*-forms (aorist to imperfect, etc.) :

πέτατ' = πέτετ', X 198.
 ἐπεβήσατο = ἐπεβήσατο, K 513.
 ἐσαγείρατο = ἐσαγείρετο, O 240.
 ἀφυσσάμενοι = ἀφυσσόμενοι, Γ 295 ; K 579.
 ἀγασσάμενοι = ἀγασσόμενοι, H 41.
 παύσασθαι = παύεσθαι, Γ 434.

8. The κοινή prefers the singular verb with neuter plurals :

φύγεν = φύγον, Θ 137 ; Δ 128.
 πέσεν = πέσον, O 714.
 φέρεν = φέρον, Ω 341.

9. The κοινή prefers optatives to subjunctives :

ἐθέλοιμι = ἐθέλωμι, Θ 23 ; I 397.
 πεπιθόμην = πεπιθώμην, I 112.

10. The κοινή avoids apponent hiatus :

τ' αἰδρεῖη = τε ἰδρεῖη, H 198.
 ἔργ' εἰδυίας = ἔργα ἰδυίας, *passim*.

Other similar classes might be established, but the usage of the κοινή fluctuates in them, and in several even of the ten just given, occasional contradictory examples may be found. On the whole, however, these heads indicate the real nature and tendency of the κοινή. To characterise these ten classes means an incursion into the field of linguistic, which I make with becoming modesty. I imagine it may be safely said that the κοινή-forms are later in time than those of the editions and Aristarchus. εἶλκεν is later than ἔλκεν, τεθνηώς than τεθνηώς, μαχέσσομαι than μαχήσομαι, ἐθέλοιμι than ἐθέλωμι, the singular verb with neuters plural than the plural verb, elision than the digamma, crasis than division, contracted than open vowels. We find, therefore, in the κοινή a tendency in the cases mentioned to assimilate the older forms and usages, which remained intact in all or most of the eccentric editions, to the later language. The κοινὰ underwent the influence of contemporary and Attic Greek in a way which the eccentric editions did not.¹

Several observations are to be made on this conclusion.

1. The statement covers but a part of the variants of the κοινὰ. The variants which come under the ten heads given above do not amount to more than 70-80, and allowing 20 for similar but less constant variations, the total will not be more than 100, that is less than one-sixth of the whole. The specimens from books A and Δ yield a smaller proportion, for out of 47 cases one can hardly find more than 6 or 7 which are due to the influence of current Greek. The remainder of the variants are substantial, and consist of words or phrases.

2. The tendency to assimilate the dialect of an author to later or current Greek is not peculiar to the Homeric vulgate. There are good grounds for supposing all prae-Attic writers to have been affected by it.

¹ And hence probably come the depreciatory epithets 'careless,' 'inferior,' αἱ εἰκαιότεραι, τὰ φανλότερα, which the grammarians apply to it. They do not imply an inferior source of text, but that the vulgate, or part of the vulgate, had not 'worn well.'

(I may refer to Fick's articles on the Lyric Poets in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge*, vols. ix., xi. and elsewhere.) In the later world of scribes it is to be seen actively at work in the MSS., not only of Homer but of most other Greek authors. In the published Homeric material it may be studied most evidently in 'G' (Vindob. 39): this MS. substitutes the Attic for the Ionic, the prose for the poetical form in cases like *ταῖς* for *τῆς*, *ναυσὶ* for *νηυσὶ*, *Ἀθηνῶν* or *Ἀθηναίων* for *Ἀθήνῃων*, *πόλεως* for *πόλιος*, *ἐλληλυθῶς* for *ἐλληλουθῶς*, *φύλακας* for *φυλακούς*, *μάρτυρες* for *μάρτυροι*, *γούνασι* for *γούνεσσι*.

On this account I think one is justified, in the case of the *κοινή*, in considering the tendency as unintentional; it is true that for one or another of the variants deliberate ancient authority may be found (Zenodotus approved of *μάρτυρες*, and Heracleon read *μαχέσσομαι*), but apart from the fact that even Zenodotus is long junior to the *κοινή*, it is not to be supposed that these variants are due to their bidding. The vulgarisations of the *κοινή* arise rather from its being the edition in constant use. Ex hypothesi it was continually copied, and continual copying brought with it the usual average of graphical variant. *Ναυσὶ* for *νηυσὶ* was substituted not in obedience to the canon of a grammarian, but from the unconscious association of a copyist, and the larger variants in this province, *ῥνοχόει*, *σαπέη*, *πασσυνδή*, *κάκεϊνος*, which were not considered errors but substantive *variae lectiones*, are also the work of the scriptorium. They represent the standard of the publishing-office at a given moment, and the history of the changes in spelling of the Authorised Version, the Book of Common Prayer, Shakespeare, Milton and our other classics in English, is a sufficiently exact parallel. The changes in the spelling of the Bible from generation to generation have been the work not of the antiquary or the scholar, but of the Queen's Printers. They have not dislodged whole words, but they have assimilated and modernised spelling.¹ The variants in which the *κοινή* shews a specifically later text than that of the eccentric editions are due to causes similar in kind.²

These formal variants, as I have said, cover about one-sixth of the total differences in the *κοινή*. The remainder do not share the character of lateness which these possess. They are *prima facie* as old and as original

as their opposites. In the specimens given from A and Δ, *ἐνὶ στρατῷ*, *σόον*, *σκιόεντα*, *οἶνοπα*, *προέυνσαν*, *κλειτήν*, *χερσί*, *μοῖραν*, *κρητήρσι*, *ικάνει* do not carry the traces of degeneration from *ἀχαῶν*, *σῶν*, *σκιόωντα*, *ἀπείρονα*, *προέρεσαν*, *ιερήν*, *χερί*, *πότμον*, *κρητήρι*, *ὀπάζει*. The intrinsic superiority, where such exists, of one member of each pair over the other, must be decided by special investigation. It is impossible to say, as we may of the formal variants, that the readings of the *κοινή* are later than, or are derived from, their opposites in the eccentric editions. In five-sixths of the ancient vulgate readings are presented as old, and *prima facie* as intrinsically good as those of the eccentric editions; in the remaining sixth the vulgate has suffered an external modernisation.

Ludwich has shewn the vulgate to be attested by the quotations as far back as the former half of the fifth century: are we to take it some generations farther, and say that Pisistratus established it, in other words that *ἡ κοινή = ἡ Πεισιστράτειος*?

The question of the truth of the tradition which made Pisistratus order an edition of Homer has been fully and recently discussed.³ The investigation has been somewhat at cross purposes. Lehrs treated the subject with elegant derision, Wilamowitz emphasised and interpreted the testimony of Dieuchidas (suggested indeed long before by Ritschl) but with some perversity declined to believe in the substantiality of the tradition; Ludwich, while combating Wilamowitz's arguments step by step, arrives at the same conclusion, a result repeated in his book on the Homeric Vulgate and singular in one who has done so much to assert the claims of the Lower Criticism and written historical evidence. Cauer treats the matter with his usual judgment, but Ritschl's treatise, some few details apart, contains as acceptable an account as any.

It is unnecessary for me to state the arguments or to take a decided position. The essential is already won, the age, the character, and the authority of the *κοινή*: Pisistratus, Solon, Hipparchus are but figure-heads, and mostly indifferent to the Lower Criticism. However, if Solon or

¹ The same comparison—with printed German classics—has been made by Cauer, *l.c.* p. 35.

² One particular case of which was recognised by the ancients, who called it *μεταχαρακτηρισμός*.

³ Wolf, *Prol.* p. cxlii. sq.; Ritschl, *Opuscula*, i. 1, sq. (1838); Lehrs *Aristarchus*, p. 434, sq. (1862); Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Hom. Untersuchungen*, 235, sq. (1884); Flach, *Pisistratos und seine literarische Thätigkeit* (1885); Ludwich, *Aristarchs Hom. Textkritik*, ii. 390 sq. (1885); Cauer, *Grundfragen d. Homerkritik*, 80 sq. (1896).

Pisistratus did establish any text of Homer, that text can have been no other than the *κοινή*, and however inferior the direct evidence for their achievement may be, we have the only real proof that can be given *in tali materia*, agreement with later conditions. If Pisistratus were the reputed father of the *κοινή* it is natural that we find no mention of him in the scholia. The grammarians ignore the *κοινή*, because it was in everyone's hands and because it had suffered by transmission; they *a fortiori* ignored also its author; they may, or they may not, have disbelieved the tradition which gave Pisistratus that title. It is more important to realise that the same account explains the absence of reference to an Athenian edition, *Ἀττικὴ ἔκδοσις*. We are informed explicitly that Aristarchus thought Homer an Athenian; the Attic edition to him therefore was not one among the *κατὰ πόλεις*, but the *κοινή* itself. In his silence with regard to the *κοινή* is included silence upon its origin and its putative author.¹ While therefore I do not find it necessary to assert the authenticity of the Pisistratean legend, I find that it agrees with all the conditions, and that the omission to notice it in the scholia is no impediment to its probability.

Here I might stop, but a line which has been used by both sides to support their views may be better for impartial discussion.

B 557

Αἶας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας
στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἦν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες.

¹ This is only Ritschl's account (*l.c.* p. 50) in other words: 'Fragt man nun, wie es zugehe, dass auch dieses Textes in der Alexandrinischen Kritik angeblich so selten Erwähnung geschehe, so ist die Behauptung, seiner kritischen Unsicherheit halber sei er keiner sonderlichen Beachtung gewürdigt worden, ein so unbestimmter als willkürlicher Nothbehelf. Vielmehr bildet sich, wenn man sich nach den erhaltenen Andeutungen die kritische Thätigkeit der Alexandriener zu vergegenwärtigen sucht, sofort die Ueberzeugung, dass diese, mitten unter einem reichen Vorrathe abweichender Ueberlieferungen, von irgend einer Grundlage ausgingen, die ihnen als das Gegebene galt, was durch vergleichende Zuziehung anderer Autoritäten zwar im einzelnen vielfach modificirt werden konnte, für die Anordnung im Ganzen aber als feste Norm betrachtet wurde. Diese Unterlage ihres kritischen Geschäftes war aber, den klarlichsten Anzeigen zufolge, keine andere als der Pisistrateische Text, der gleichsam die Vulgata geworden war. Die Nothwendigkeit stets wiederholter namentlicher Anführung würde nun schon dadurch wegfallen, dass eben jenes Verhältniss die allgemeine Voraussetzung war, worauf alle Ausübung Homerischer Kritik beruhte, und worüber eine ausdrückliche Verständigung niemand begehrte oder nöthig hatte.'

The second line it is well known is stated by various late authorities to have been inserted by Solon or Pisistratus. The data are as follows. It stands in all known MSS. with the exception of seventeen—the families *b g h*, the Venetus A and several other single minuscule MSS. and apparently the papyrus Bodl. Gr. class. a. 1 (P) s. iv.-v. (Petrie Hawara &c. 1889 p. 24-8). There is no scholion on the line in A, T omits the whole of the catalogue, in B and L (on B 494 and 557) the legend (with Solon's name) is repeated. The line however is alluded to in the A scholia on Γ 230: *ὅτι πλησίον ὁ Ἰδομενεὺς Αἶαντος τοῦ Τελαμωνίου ἐτάσσετο κατὰ τὴν ἐπιπώλησιν συμφώνως, παραιτήτων ἄρα ἐκείνων τὸν στίχον τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον, στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἦν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες, οὗ γὰρ ἦσαν πλησίον Αἶαντος Ἀθηναῖοι*. The questions which have been asked, and differently answered, on this evidence, are (1) what did Aristarchus exactly do with regard to the line, (2) was it in the *κοινή* or no?

Wilamowitz for instance considers the line a proof that Aristarchus knew and believed the legend about Pisistratus: and that on this ground he ejected the line and it is consequently wanting in many MSS. Ludwig, naturally, knows that Aristarchus' operations did not affect the text of Homer, but both he and Caer think the line was not in the vulgate: the former thinks the whole story about Pisistratus a fable, the latter believes that Pisistratus did introduce the line but that his interpolation did not take effect.

(1) The word *παραιτεῖν* in the scholion on Γ 230 is of itself vague: its usage in scholastic Greek rests on two passages (which I find in Ludwig's index). K 1 (on ἄλλοι) *παραιτήτων τοὺς γράφοντας ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Ζηνόδοτος ὅλλοι μὲν*. He 'deprecates' Zen.'s reading. A 365 is a better parallel: *ὅτι παλιλλογέιν παρήτῃται· ἄλλοτριον ἄρα οἱ ἐπιγραφόμενοι στίχοι εἰκοσι ἐπτά*. The obeli are appicted to vv. 366-393. In the version of this scholion in B we find *οἱ δὲ ἀθετοῦντες τοὺς στίχους οὐκ ἔωσι μαθεῖν ἡμᾶς ὅθεν ἤλω χρυσήτης*. It is a case of ordinary *a priori* athetesis, and *παραιτεῖν* = *ἀθετεῖν*. The case of B 558 appears similar; it is a line, not a reading, and the ground for the censure is also intrinsic, viz., the contradiction of other passages (Δ 273, 327, N 681 given by Strabo 394). We miss the evidence of the obelus, since the line is omitted in Ven. A, and apparently in the papyrus, but the probability seems considerable that athetesis is meant. The expression would be excessively mild for an

οὐκ ἔγραφε (besides that there are not more than three instances where Ar. is said to have had recourse to this extreme step).

(2) The second question, did the verse stand in the κοινή? is closely connected with this. The phrase τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον, suggests perhaps at first sight that Aristarchus is combating the reading of an individual which was not generally received. In reality, however, it is the language of athetesis, by which Ar. conveys his view as to the sources of the κοινή. Cf. A 474 ἀθ. ὅτι νομίσας τις τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα Παιήονα εἰρῆσθαι προσέθηκεν αὐτόν. B 319 ἀθ. προεῖρηται δὲ ἡ αἰτία (sc. 318 ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει ἀρίδην καὶ τὸν ἐχόμενον προσέθηκεν), ib. 668 σεσημειώται πρὸς τὸν ἐξῆς ἀθετούμενον· οὐ γὰρ νοήσας τις ὅτι τὸ σημαυνόμενον τοιοῦτόν ἐστι... ἐξήγησεν ὑπὸ τίνος ἐφιλήθησαν διὸ προσέθηκε τὸν ἐκ διός. E 183 ἀθ. ὅτι δεξιόμενος τις εἰ μὴ τις θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐναντιούμενος ἐνέγραψεν αὐτόν. I 416 ἀθ. ὅτι νομίσας τις κρέμασθαι τὸν λόγον προσέθηκεν αὐτόν. N 658, 9 ἀθ. ὅτι πλανηθεὶς τις... ἔταξεν αὐτούς. H 353 ὅτι τις... προσανεπλήρωσεν. (Cf. also Π 97, Σ 444, Υ 256, Φ 570, Ω 45, 130).¹ The wording of these passages is at least as personal as that of the note on Γ 230; we are therefore not to see any reference to the Pisistratus legend in the ὑπὸ τινων; Aristarchus athetised as he everywhere does, on intrinsic grounds.

There are of course references in the scholia to lines certainly not in the ordinary text; but the formulas are different (ὅτι ὑποτάσσεται, ὑποτάσσουσιν ἐνταῦθα in A, ὅτι τινες ἐπάγουσι in T), and also the MSS. shew no trace of them. B 558 stands in the bulk of the MSS. and is alluded to in the

¹ The tone of these passages—dissatisfaction with the κοινή as an authority, and search for some personal source beyond it—may temper our surprise at one extraordinary scholion. Γ 406 (ἀπόειπε κελεύθους) Ἀρίσταρχος ἀπόειπε διὰ τοῦ κ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ σ κελεύθου. θαυμάσειε δ' ἐν τις ἡ ἑτέρα διὰ τοῦ π πόθεν παρέδου. οὔτε γὰρ ἐν τοῖς Ἀρισταρχείοις οὔτε ἐν ἑτέροις τῶν γούν μετρίων ἐμφερόμενον πέφυκεν. (Ἀπόειπε κελεύθους codd.) A true grammarian's utterance, whether it is Aristarchus or Didymus that speaks. No 'decent' edition had the reading, and the grammarian cannot think how it 'got in' to the κοινή. It was always there. The other reading started in some eccentric edition, and all the μέτριοι, Antimachus, Euripides, Philetas, Rhianus, *vrais moutons de Panurge*, copied it.

Similarly A 97 the grammarian will not rest with the vulgate as the authority for the anti-Aristarchean reading: he will 'give it a name,' *ἔοικεν οὖν ἡ ἑτέρα Ζηνόδοτου εἶναι*. A 455 Didymus makes a shot at schoolmasters, *γραμματισταί*, as the originators of the vulgate: T 269-273 he divines sophists behind the text. Γ 18 he expresses simple surprise that the reading, not Aristarchus', has merits: *ἔχει δὲ τὸν Ὀμηρικὸν χαρακτῆρα καὶ ἡ σὺν τῷ ἔρρωφ γραφή, καί περ οὐκ οὕσα Ἀριστάρχειος*.

formula of athetesis. I therefore conclude that in Aristarchus' day it was part of the vulgate.²

The line, however, is actually wanting in the MSS. I have mentioned, and Quintilian (v. 11, 40) notices its absence from some texts: *neque est ignobile exemplum Megarios ab Atheniensibus cum de Salamine contendere victos Homeri versu, qui tamen ipse non in omni editione reperitur, significans Aiace[m] naves suas Atheniensibus iunxisse*. (Strabo 394, when he says οὐ παραδέχονται δὲ τοῦθ' οἱ κριτικοὶ διὰ τὸ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ἀντιμαρτυρεῖν αὐτοῖς seems to use a fuller version of the note on Γ 230 or on the line itself.) This is not due to Aristarchus' athetesis: Aristarchus' athetesis consisted in the affixing of a sign to the particular line and its effect stopped there. This, as I have mentioned, Ludwig, *l. c.* p. 398, makes good against Wilamowitz: I add the figures. 366 lines are athetised by Aristarchus, 8 are omitted by our MSS. (6 in single MSS., one in two, one in a quotation). The probability that B 558 is omitted in some MSS. on account of Aristarchus' athetesis is nil.

I presume its omission is really owing to the effect of the legend, reduced to such a form as that in which we find it in the B scholia: (*γράφει δὲ καὶ τὸν Σόλωνος λόγον, ὥς τινες, παραλόγως, τὸ ἔν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο. ἐν γὰρ τῇ πράτῃ οὐκ εἶχε ποιήσει τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀκολουθία οὕτως, οἱ δ' Ἄργος εἶχον*). There were a certain number of omissions, as of variants, within the κοινή in antiquity: this was one of them. I think therefore that Aristarchus athetised the line on intrinsic grounds: and that no conclusion can be drawn from his action as to whether he believed the legend, either that Pisistratus inserted this particular line, or that he made an edition of Homer generally.

I conclude that the ancient vulgate, though it suffered from the natural conditions of transmission in spelling, dialect and syntax, appears as to the bulk of its text at least the equal in age and goodness of the only other existent authority, the eccentric editions. The quotations carry it back into the fifth century, and it is a question of merely historical interest whether the name of the legendary Athenian Ptolemy should be attached to it.

The enquiry proceeds to the non-vulgate or eccentric editions. T. W. ALLEN.

² The story also as believed in antiquity implies that the line was usually if not always read, no less than the other lines which schol. B quotes (836, 868: schol. on B 494) as having decided similar political cases.