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 *Iliad Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prior. Ilias. Volumen prius. 1902. 16 M.*

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 01 / February 1903, pp 58 - 58
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207336, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207336

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 58-58 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207336

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

QUERY: DANTE'S EUNOE AND AN ORPHIC TABLET. —In the well-known Orphic tablet in the British Museum (Kaibel, *I.G.S.I.* No. 641 and *J.H.S.* vol. iii. p. 112) the soul in Hades is bidden to abstain from a well-spring on the left hand—presumably Lethe—and to drink of another well flowing from the mere of Mnemosyne.

Εὐρήσεις δ' ἐτέραν τῆς Μνημοσύνης ἀπὸ λίμνης
ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ πορέον.

Mr. F. M. Cornford drew my attention to the fact that the two Orphic well-springs have a close analogy in Dante (*Purg.* xxviii. 130, xxxi. 98, and xxxiii. 127)

Quinci Letè, così dall' altro lato
Eunoè si chiama.

Commentators say nothing as to whence Dante borrowed his Eunoè. Can any reader of the *Classical Review* supply his source? My immediate reason for asking this question is that, in another Orphic tablet (Kaibel, *I.G.S.I.* 642), the words occur:

ἀλλ' ὁπάταμ' ψυχῇ φάος ἡλείοιο
δεξιδὼν εἰς οἶας.

Kaibel restores εἰσιθε ὡς δεῖ, Prof. Comparetti *εὐνοίας*; neither seems to me quite satisfactory, and I would suggest δεξιδὼν Ε[ὐν]οίας. Eunoia, consciousness of good, seems analogous to the Platonic *ἀνάμνησις* and the well may lurk in some obscure Neoplatonic writer. Or is it a local Pythagorean tradition surviving to Dante's time in Lower Italy, the home of the tablets?

JANE E. HARRISON.

REVIEWS.

LUDWICH'S *ILIAD*.

Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich.
Pars prior. Ilias. Volumen prius. 1902.
16 M.

THE great undertaking which Professor Ludwich, now many years ago, put before himself,—of collecting the documentary evidence for the Homeric poems,—has been materially advanced by the publication of this volume. In 1889 Prof. Ludwich gave us the *Odyssey*, in 1896 the *Batrachomachia*; we owe to him also a specimen of the Hymns, various specimens of Scholia, his Aristarchus, his *Homervulgata* and other books and programmes, leading up to his editions, the bibliography of which runs to pages. The world of 'Ομηρίδαι (if, as we have been told, this word is a synonym of 'Ομηρικοί) must offer its warm congratulations to the unwearied worker—collator and collector—upon the achievement of the greater portion of his task.

The book resembles in arrangement the *Odyssey*. A brief preface (which might have been longer, for the readers' convenience) gives a list of the MSS. used. Beside the papyri, which are complete up to date (and therefore slightly fuller than those used in Dr. Leaf's *Iliad*, vol. i, ed. 2) as many as 81 minuscules are cited. Some of these are taken over from older editions, others supplied by contemporary collators—most of the Paris MSS. from Leaf, the two Escorial MSS. from Bethe—the rest are due to the energy of the editor. Such a host of

codices, especially as their variants are given in full, assures to the edition an independent value in face of the rivals which have of late appeared upon the scene. While I acknowledge the merits of Dr. Leaf, it is not to him, nor to a third edition, but to Ludwich, that I turn for information on a given line.

As in the *Odyssey*, Ludwich has not arranged his MSS. in families: he contents himself with a reference to his *Beiträge zur Homerischen Handschriftenkunde* where his views are given. This system has the advantage that the value of the apparatus does not depend upon the correctness of the distribution into families, but it proportionately lengthens the critical notes. I must be allowed to say that the MS.-variants seem needlessly full; e.g. what is the value or significance of 'παμποικίλοι Ω (-πίκοιλοι Ο', -ποίκιλλοι P^a)' on Z 289, or of 'ἐλέην·X' and ἐκάβη Ο' on the same page? The editor has also mixed into his commentary the restitutions of philological critics, with whom as he says in his preface he has little sympathy. Exhaustive, the collection might have been useful, and deterrent; but Payne Knight and Brandreth *détonnent* among the quotations and the Alexandrians. The reader may be glad that the editor has not in obedience to the a priori critic printed portions of the text in smaller type. He did so in the *Odyssey*, but such a practice is not more trying to the eye than shocking to the judgment, when it meets one in editions which like those of Professor Ludwich, are permanent and standard.

T. W. ALLEN.