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](#)

Leeuwen and Costa's *Odyssey*, Vol. II *Homeri Odysseae Carmina cum apparatu critico*. Ediderunt J. Van Leeuwen, J. F., et M. B. Mendes Da Costa. Pars posterior. Carm. xiii.–xxiv. et index. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1892.

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 1-2 / February 1893, pp 31 - 32
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196726, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196726

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 31-32 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196726

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LEEUWEN AND COSTA'S *ODYSSEY*, VOL. II.

Homeri Odysseae Carmina cum apparatu critico. Ediderunt J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F., et M. B. MENDES DA COSTA. Pars posterior. Carm. xiii.-xxiv. et index. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1892.

As three-fourths of this edition of Homer are already before the world, and as the methods and peculiarities of the editors have been copiously reviewed in innumerable periodicals, it will be advisable for me rather to criticize some special points in this particular volume than to repeat what has been said before about the digamma or the augment or the use of *ἀν* and *κεν*. On this last point especially everybody knows what valuable work has been done by Mr. van Leeuwen, nor is it likely that any have been led astray by our authors' remarkable heresy concerning the augment which has filled their text with such forms as *ἦσκε* and *᾽βῆ*.

The first passage one turns to naturally is the last book, of which few will defend the authenticity. It is with surprise and dissent for my own part that I find the greater part of the termination of the *Odyssey* here retained as genuine, only *ψ* 310-343 and *ω* 1-204 being rejected in accordance with the obeli of Aristarchus. After referring to Kirchhoff's adverse judgment, the editors remark, 'vix credibile videtur eidem viro deberi manium garrulorum nugas molestas et suave filii nondum agniti cum moesto patre colloquium.' It is, of course, mainly a question of taste in poetry, but I confess that I can no more recognize the 'suavitas' of that 'colloquium' than Laertes could recognize Odysseus. It is in my eyes simply a bad copy of those transcendent recognition scenes which the veriest bungler could not steal from without a little of the honey sticking to his clumsy fingers. But let any one compare the garrulous feeble speech, *ω* 244-279, with any even the least good from the veritable Odysseus, and then with the 'manes garruli,' and see which it resembles most. Then how lamentably does the copyist betray himself by the hasty way in which he makes Laertes bolt out with his demand for a *σῆμα* in 329; how elegant is the touch, *ἀνὰ ῥίνας δέ 'Φοι ἦδη δρυμὸν μένος προέτυψε!* No; if one could credit Homer with this, one might tranquilly ascribe *Rhesus* to

Sophocles and Thomas Lord Cromwell to Shakespeare. And this is done by editors who declare of the word *πάντα* in *τ* 475, one of the most exquisite and delicate touches in literature, that it is 'vix sanum.' After having swallowed that camel!

A great deal is undoubtedly to be said for ejecting the story of the boar-hunt on Parnassus (*τ* 395-490); it comes as a serious interruption of a most interesting scene, and can be cut clean out without leaving any rough edge. 'Hinc alienos esse et postmodo igitur insertos quivis sentit' (*et igitur*, by the way, is rather dubious Latin). But there is nothing whatever in the lines themselves to betray late date, or which can be pronounced unworthy of the poet, and the awkwardly expressed observation of Aristotle (*Poetics* viii.), to which the editors do not refer however, cannot be understood to mean that he was ignorant of this passage. It will be wiser, I think, to leave it untouched, as Ludwig does. And why should this be secluded, when *ο* 225-256 are retained, though the editors agree with Nitzsch in condemning them? We ought not to condemn *anything* on purely subjective grounds, but if we do begin this practice, why should one passage be taken and another left?

In *ν* 158 they accept the reading or conjecture of Aristophanes: *μηδέ* for *μέγα* *δέ*. Aristarchus particularly combated this, so that there cannot well have been any ancient tradition in favour of it, nor is it at all in the Epic style. If one is conservative, one must stick to *μέγα*; if not, the line must go, for *μή* is nothing but a bad guess. *ν* 200-208 are ejected on the ground that 'aptam sententiam non praebeant verba,' but this is due to a false rendering of *ὄφελον μείναι*, which does not mean *mansissem* but *mansissent* (*χρήματα*). *π* 195: *θέλγεις* can hardly be right, because Telemachus goes on to say that a god makes Odysseus young and old at his pleasure; Odysseus then cannot be a *δαίμων*. *θέλγει* cannot be said to be against the metre until a good many similar pieces of scansion be got rid of. *ρ* 375: *ὦ ἀμέγαρτε* is an ingenious suggestion for *ὦ ἀρίγνωτε*, and may very possibly be right. *φ* 434: I would commend to the editors' attention the correction *κεκορυθμένον* for *κεκορυθμένος*, due to Protodikos, and one of the very best ever made, for it clears up a whole scene in the next book by the change of a single letter.

The vulgate represents Telemachus as standing by Odysseus when the fight begins (ἀγχι αὐτοῦ), as being armed (κεκορυθμένος), and πὰρ θρόνον. Now he was *not* near Odysseus, for he hits Amphinomus in the *back* (χ 92) and then *runs* to his father (χ 99). He was *not* armed, except with the spear, but κεκορυθμένος must imply more than that; he arms himself in χ 113. And πὰρ θρόνον is meaningless. But read κεκορυθμένον (ἔγχος), and how simple it all is! 'The spear stood near him resting against his chair headed with bronze.'

I have picked out some points on which I disagree with this edition, but need scarcely say that I agree with a great deal of it. However much remains only too doubtful in the reconstruction of the Homeric text, it is at least something that all of us unite in accepting Wackernagel's restoration of forms

due to assimilation, in resolving so many forms, in nine out of ten restorations of the digamma, and in turning out such stupid blunders as τοιούτω δὲ ζοικας in ω 254. Surely it is not too much to ask the most conservative of editors to cease from at any rate giving us stuff that cannot be construed. Compared with this, lines that will not scan and forms acknowledged to be false are a trifle, for they only offend a handful of students (who are very much given to introducing them themselves), but I am fain to believe that more people care to read Homer and to make some kind of sense of him than is apparently believed by the editors who gravely print what is often no more intelligible than a Hittite inscription, without even marking it as corrupt.

ARTHUR PLATT.

ARISTOPHANES AND THE 'ERASMIANS.'

Le poète Aristophane et les partisans d'Érasme, par TH. PAPADIMITRACOPOULOS. Leide, Brill. 1892.

M. PAPADIMITRACOPOULOS proposes in this pamphlet, reprinted from ΕΛΛΑΣ IV., to enlist the help of Aristophanes in support of the Modern Greek pronunciation of the ancient language, as opposed to the 'théories des partisans d'Érasme.' He proceeds to offer 'quelques témoignages que nous croyons propres à persuader tout lecteur non prévenu, et à confirmer dans son esprit l'opinion, que le seul juste enseignement sur la prononciation des lettres et des syllabes de la langue grecque est celui des grammairiens, qui viennent immédiatement après l'antiquité classique.' This programme sounds very plausible and moderate; but it is really the old trumpet-call to the battle again, so long waged between 'Reuchlinians' and 'Erasmians.' The question has become with the modern Greeks a question of patriotism even more than of scholarship; if the fortress they hold is strategically untenable, still they cling to it with the heroism of despair—at least we will let Dr. Blass say so, for he cannot draw down more missiles on his head than he has already encountered. 'The hottest and most persistent combatants,' he remarks (*Pronunciation of Ancient Greek* § 1), 'are the Greeks themselves, who, now that the

German pronunciation has been adopted even in Russia, are in fact the only people who still cherish itacism. Among them, however, there are not wanting enlightened investigators of language, who do not refuse to take a scientific view even of this subject.' The weakness of M. Papadimitracopoulos' position is suggested by the eagerness with which he seizes on a doubtful argument as 'une preuve évidente.' Considering how far-fetched and how slight are the majority of the Aristophanic puns, it is sanguine, to say the least, to accept as a 'preuve évidente' of the 'différence de prononciation fort petite entre le η et le ι à l'époque d'Aristophane', the line (*Pax* 926)

ΧΟ. βοί; μηδαμῶς, ἵνα μὴ βοηθῇν ποι δέη,

nor is the hiatus commonly found in εἶ οἶδα etc. a proof that εἶ was pronounced in the Modern Greek fashion with the sound of a *v*. It rather suggests the English *w*. One naturally turns to see what line the writer takes about the sheep and the dog, who are supposed to have done so much for the solution of the question by bleating βῆ βῆ and barking αῦ αῦ. M. Papadimitracopoulos 'does not think much of this': probably because, whatever the sound of sheep may be to various ears, there cannot here be 'une différence fort petite' between the pronunciation of η and ι. But, 'vu que le