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](#)

Characteristics of the Homeric Vulgate

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 01 / February 1902, pp 1 - 3
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205209, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205209

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1902). Characteristics of the Homeric Vulgate. The Classical Review, 16, pp 1-3
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205209

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1902.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOMERIC VULGATE.

THE ancient Homeric *κοινή*, though clearly distinguished from the other states in which the poems existed, was not a fixed text itself. It suffered from the variation natural to any text transmitted by writing, together with the more extensive discrepancies incidental to a tradition largely oral. Therefore though the *κοινή* is nowhere confused with the various attempts made to improve upon it, its copies were not at all identical; and anyone who reads the current apparatus critici is aware of material additions and omissions,¹ without apparent source. I have collected these variations, and give here a skeleton of the conclusions which result.

As non-vulgate I have put aside (i) readings attributed to the eccentric editions (*κατ' ἄνδρα* and *κατὰ πόλεις*), whether by their separate names or collectively (*ἐν πάσαις* etc.); (ii) readings ascribed to any grammarian by name; (iii) large variations in early quotations (Plato and Aeschines), Ptolemaic papyri, and in certain late authors such as Plutarch, who are known to have referred to copies which resembled these papyri. This last class is vague, but if any meaning is to be given to 'vulgate' the categories I have mentioned must be excluded, and the only question is how far the class should extend; (iv) readings introduced by *τινές* and *ἐνιοι*. It is now clear that these expressions, even in the latest scholia, go back to precise statements

about definite persons: and are to be distinguished from *ἐν τισι*, *ἐν ἄλλῃ*, *ἐν ἄλλοις*, *ἐν ἐνίοις* which refer to codices.

After making these exclusions we have, as sources for additions and omissions in the *κοινή*, (i) existing MSS., (ii) statements in scholia, (iii) quotations. The totals are (in lines)

Additions.	Omissions.
76	191.

The omissions are therefore $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as many as the additions. Arranged under sources we find—

	Additions.	Omissions.
MSS.	52.....	175
Quotations	14.....	15
Scholia.....	10.....	1.

In other words the additions come as to $\frac{10}{15}$ from extant MSS., as to $\frac{5}{15}$ from quotations and scholia together. The omissions come as to $\frac{11}{12}$ from extant MSS., as to $\frac{1}{12}$ from quotations and scholia. The part played by the MSS. is overwhelming in both categories, but with a marked increase of proportion in the omissions. The conclusion seems to follow that graphical conditions are mainly responsible for variations in the vulgate, and practically entirely responsible for omission.

While in the sphere of palaeography we appear to gain the observation, obvious perhaps but yet material, that omission is a much easier accompaniment of transcription than addition, we confirm—and this is of greater importance—our conception of the Homeric vulgate by noticing that the larger

¹ And of many various readings also, which I do not deal with in this article.

changes in it (viz. additions and omissions of lines) consist mainly of variants within the MSS. which we possess. It is possible that further collation may find some of the additions and omissions hitherto known from quotations and scholia in actual MSS.

We may next analyse these variants according to their intrinsic character (no distinction being made between addition and omission). Several classes are at once obvious. I give a few specimens of each.¹

I. Epic Formulae, added or omitted. These are subdivisible under several heads, of which the most abundant are 'speaking' and 'going.' A few examples taken as they come—

- B 516 τοῖς δὲ τριήκοντα γλαφυραὶ νέες ἐστι-
χώντο.
Γ 86a ὄφρ' εἶπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι
κελεύει.
Δ 138 ἣ οἱ πλείστον ἔρυτο, διὰ πρὸ δὲ εἵσατο
καὶ τῆς.
450 ἔνθα δ' αὖ' οἰωγῇ τε καὶ εὐχολὴ πέλεν
ἀνδρῶν.
461 αἰχμὴ χαλκείη, τὸν δὲ σκότος ὅσσε
κάλυψεν.
E 42 δούπησεν δὲ πεσὼν, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε'
ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

II. Influence of similar or identical Context.

- B 206 σκῆπτρόν τ' ἡδὲ θέμιστας ἵνα σφισι
βουλεύησι (199).
E 518a ἣ μὲν ἔχουσα κυδοιμὸν ἀναιδέα δημοτῆ-
τος (593, 594).
b "Αρης δ' ἐν παλάμῃσι πελώριον ἔγχος
ἐνώμα.
H 380 δόρπον ἔπειθ' εἶλοντο κατὰ στρατὸν ἐν
τελέεσσι (370, Σ 298).
Θ 183 "Αργείους παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀτυζομένους ὑπὸ
καπνοῦ (I 243).

III. Additions and Omissions less automatic.

(a) In genealogies and lists of names.

- A 265 Θῆσέα τ' Αἰγίδην ἐπιείκελον ἀθανά-
τοισι.
B 820 Αἰνείας τὸν ὑπ' Ἀγχίσῃ τέκε δι' Ἀφρο-
δίτην.
821 "Ιδης ἐν κνημοῖσι θεὰ βροτῷ ἐνθηῖσα.
Δ 87 Λαοδόκῳ Ἀντηνορίδῃ κρατερῷ αἰχμητῇ.
441 Ἄρεος ἀνδροφόνου κασιγνητῇ ἐτάρῃ τε.

¹ I am acquainted with Hoffmann's (*Φ und X der Ilias*, 1864, p. 89 sq.) and Molhuysen's (*De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis*, 1896, p. 11 sq.) attempts at classification. A satisfactory collection must of course extend over the whole poem and all available MSS.

(b) To complete or facilitate a construction:

- B 206 σκῆπτρόν τ' ἡδὲ θέμιστας ἵνα σφισι
βουλεύησι.
E 567 μήτε πάθοι μέγα δέ σφας ἀποσφάλλει
πόνοιο.
H 32 ἡμῖν ἀθανάτησι διαπραθέειν τόδε ἄστυ.
Θ 168a ἣ μήτε στρέψας μήτ' ἀντίβιον μαχέ-
σασθαι.
Ξ 70 νωνύμους ἀπολέσθαι ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἐνθάδ'
'Αχαιοῦς.
Π 658 Τρῶας φευγεμέναι· γινῶ γὰρ Διὸς ἱρὰ
τάλαντα.

(c) To complete a description, or elucidate a context;

- B 568a ἐν δ' ἄνδρες πολέμοιο δαήμονες, ἐστι-
χώντο,
b Ἄργεοιο λινοθώρηκες κέντρα πτολέ-
μοιο.
626 νήσου αἶ ναίουσι πέρην ἁλὸς Ἥλιδος
ἄντα.
738a χώρῳ ἐν δρυόνει, ὕδης ἐν πόνει δημῷ.
Γ 78 μέσσω δουρὸς ἔλων, τοὶ δ' ἰδρύνθησαν
ἅπαντες.
I 140a τὴν γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἐγὼ δώσω ξανθῷ
Μενελάῳ.

(d) Similes omitted.

- Γ 35, N 63-5, Φ 283.

Some of these examples fall under more than one class. The large divisions are Epic Formulae and Effect of Like Contexts. The rest are small.

This analysis accounts for about 120 cases out of 265. The remainder will not bear arrangement under definite headings. Their omission is not accounted for by known graphical laws, such as homoeoteleuton²; and on the other hand they are not indispensable to the context. Their omission (or addition) is possible. Why were they omitted or added? Either (1) graphically: when we must admit mechanical omission without definite resemblance; or (2) the several scribes omitted or added lines because they felt that this or that passage was improved by doing so. This posits more intention and purpose in scribes than is generally supposed.³

² Clear graphical omissions, which exist in great abundance, and are caused not only by homoeoteleuton but by homoearechon and homoeomeson, are excluded from this enquiry.

³ Such a scribe or reader appears to announce himself in three epigrams in the *Palatine Anthology* ix. 36, 37, 38. The third is the most explicit:

εὐρὼν Κομητᾶς τὰς Ὀμηρικὰς βίβλους
ἐφθαρμένας τε κοῦδαμῶς ἐστιγμένας,
οὔτις διεσμίλευσα ταύτας ἐντέχνως,

However the fact that both omissions and additions are much more frequent in MSS. than in literary sources, and that omissions are commoner than additions, suggests that omissions are due to a graphical cause. That so many lines are strictly dispensable (they impair the poetical value of a passage but do not absolutely ruin the construction), is due to the natural diffuseness of epos and to the circumstance that additions to and expansions of a statement tend to fall within a single line.

These considerations should provide an explanation of the greatest omission in the *Iliad*, namely the Catalogue. They do not do so, however, and we have to fall back on general probabilities (Leaf, *Iliad*, i.-xii. p. 46).

Another question may be asked. Are the additions, whether in MSS., quotations, or scholia, new or old matter? do they give us new lines or are they repetitions of material actually in Homer? The answer is given by the following table:—

	MSS.	Scholia.	Quotations.
Total of Additions...	65.....	10.....	14
New Lines	8.....	4.....	10

As was to be expected, the additions in MSS. are nearly all of lines extant in Homer or other epic literature (e.g. A 265 from

τὴν σαπρίαν βίβλας μὲν ὡς ἀχρηστίαν,
γράφας δ' ἐκαινούργησα τὴν εὐχρηστίαν.
ἐντεῦθεν οἱ γράφοντες οὐκ ἐσφαλμένως
μαθητιῶσιν ὡς ἔοικε μαθάνειν.

Cometas' metaphors do not leave it quite clear how far his critical activity proceeded, but he evidently 'used the knife' in one sense or another, and may have justified Timon's warning to Aratus.

Hesiod), sometimes with slight variations. On the other hand the additions made by scholiasts and found in quotations contribute new matter in rather more than half the cases.

Later MSS., that is minuscules and late Papyri, taken together yield a very small percentage of novelties. In the oldest papyri (not included in this calculation) the proportion is different. The four fragments of second or third century B.C. papyrus yield 26 extra lines, of which 5 are doubtful, 13 old, and 8 new. Omitting the doubtful restorations, about $\frac{2}{3}$ of the additions are old, $\frac{1}{3}$ new.

Since the mediaeval MSS. which exist in such great numbers make comparatively few additions to the text, and these almost exclusively lines already Homeric, it may seem probable that the addition of new lines in scholia and quotations are not vulgate but equivalent to the much more numerous additions introduced by the designations *τινές*, *ἐνιοί*. These, mainly preserved by the catholic interest of the Townley scholiast, would gain in value if age and source were ascribed to them; they have not survived in MSS., and the generous endeavour of this scholiast to save the stray and the eccentric has had as little effect upon the immovable Vulgate as in the other sense the Alexandrian obelus.¹

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ There is little distinction to be drawn between MS. and MS. in the matter of additions and omissions. The Townley MS. appears to come first with eight omissions, and Ge, Mc, and O5 to follow with five; among late papyri the Syriac palimpsest adds most lines.

THE OPENING OF SOPHOCLES *ANTIGONE*.

My conjecture as to the probable original form of v. 4 *sq.* has already appeared in this *Review* (xiii, 386), and I still believe it to be right. At the same place I have also expressed my belief in the correctness of Paley's treatment of v. 3. In what follows here I wish to deal with some other matters pertaining to the correction and interpretation of this speech of Antigone's.

In the first place I can no longer believe that the words *τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου κακῶν* in v. 2 are sound. Professor Semitelos was right in objecting, as others had done, to the position of the word *Ζεὺς* and to the un-

natural meaning that must be given to the phrase *ἀπ' Οἰδίπου*. We find the phrase used in the natural sense and in the same position in the verse *Ant.* 193 (*ἀσποῖσι παῖδων τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπου πέρι*). A simple remedy for the words, which has not, however, to my knowledge been applied by anyone, consists in changing *τῶν* to *τοῖς*. The collocation and contrast of *Ζεὺς* and *τοῖς ἀπ' Οἰδίπου* are excellent, and the *κακῶν* at the end of the verse would readily lead a careless copier to change *τοῖς* to *τῶν*. V. 2 *sq.* will thus be = *ἀρ' οἷσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς τοῖς ἀπ' Οἰδίπου (= τοῖς Οἰδίπου τέκνοις) κακὰ πάντα*