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](#)

Scholia Graeca of the *Iliad* Scholia Graeca in Homeri *Iliadem* Townleyana recensuit Ernestus Maass. Oxford, Clarendon Press, vol. I. 1887, vol. II. 1888. £1 16s.

Walter Leaf

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 04 / April 1889, pp 155 - 156
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194545, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194545

How to cite this article:

Walter Leaf (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 155-156 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194545

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

100.—BRIT. MUS. **Add. MS.** 10,060 (ff. 101—134). Paper: ff. 34. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ inches. Minuscules. XVI cent.

Purchased in 1836 from Bp. Heber's Library. Book-plate of Hon. Frederic North.

Δημοσθένους Ολυνθιακοὶ λόγοι α', β' : with arguments and scholia.

101.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 6311 A. Vellum: ff. 79. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. Late XV cent.

Bought, for the Harley Library, of John Gibson, with other MSS. from Italy, 17 June, 1721.

"Δημοσθένους λόγος" περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου.

HYPERIDES.

102.—BRIT. MUS. **Papyri**, cviii, cxv. Large portion 11 ft. 3 in. $\times$ 1 ft.; and thirty-three small fragments. Uncials. I cent. B.C. (?) From the district of Thebes, in Egypt; cviii (the fragments) having

been obtained by Mr. A. C. Harris, and cxv by Mr. Joseph Arden, in 1847.

Bought for Brit. Mus. in 1872 and 1879.

1. *Λόγος κατὰ Δημοσθένους ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀρπαλείων* [cviii].

2. *"ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΔΥΚΟΦΡΟΝΟΣ."*

3. *"ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΞΕΝΙΠΠΟΥ ΕΙΣΑΓΓΕΛΙΑΣ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΠΡΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΕΥΚΤΟΝ."*

Ed. Churchill Babington, 1850, 1853; and others. See Cat. Anc. MSS. in B. M.

103.—BRIT. MUS. **Papyrus**, xcvi. Fragment. 3 ft. $6\frac{1}{4}$ in. $\times$ $9\frac{1}{4}$ in. Uncials. II cent. Obtained in 1856, in the district of Thebes in Egypt, by Rev. H. Stobart.

Bought for Brit. Mus. in 1857.

Λόγος ἐπιτάφιος.

Ed. Churchill Babington, 1858. See Cat. Anc. MSS. in B. M.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

SCHOLIA GRAECA OF THE *ILIAD*.

Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem Townleyana recensuit ERNESTUS MAASS. Oxford, Clarendon Press, vol. I. 1887, vol. II. 1888. £1 16s.

THOUGH the two volumes of this collection—the fifth and sixth of the Oxford edition of the Scholia on the *Iliad*—bear different dates, and the preface to the first is signed 'Oct. 1885,' they have only now been issued. It is thus nearly ten years since Römer showed that the 'Scholia B,' vols. III. and IV. of the series, were a slovenly and mutilated copy of an original which was far better preserved in the Victorian codex (V). It was generally, and as it now appears correctly, assumed that V was only a copy of the Townley Scholia; so that the publication of the latter has been for some time a recognized need of criticism. It is a matter of congratulation that the Clarendon Press should have so thoroughly repaired the error into which Dindorf was led by the general opinion of his day. It only remains to regret the waste which would have been saved if the Townley Scholia had come first, as it would then have been unnecessary to publish anything more of B than the excerpts from Porphyrius and occasional variants to the text of T. But the MS. seems destined throughout to waste energy; for the whole mass has actually been copied twice, by the Provost of Oriel as well as

by Professor Maass. Why the Clarendon Press did not allow Mr. Monro to have the credit, as editor, of his labour as transcriber it is not easy to understand.

The plan which Maass has most wisely adopted, in spite of the labour involved, of noting to each scholium whether or no it is contained in A or B, and if so whether in a fuller or briefer form, brings out the relation of the three MSS. in the clearest way. It only needs a glance down the margin to see how rare is a 'B + ' to indicate that B has the fuller form, how common is 'B - ' ; while at the same time it is remarkable to notice how small is the matter in T which is not to be found in either A or B. But it is not so much in new matter that the value of the edition is to be sought; it is in the certain knowledge of what the MS. had to offer—a knowledge which Bekker's partial and inaccurate edition most successfully confused.

The fault however was not entirely Bekker's; he published from V, and it is clear that V though a copy of T was not a complete or faithful copy. One or two instances will make this evident; the proof will be the more welcome as it extends our knowledge of the Didymus excerpts.

On Ψ 587 we have the obviously Didymean scholium *ἀνσχεοῦ οὕτως Ἀρίστηρχος ὁ δὲ Σιδώνιος διὰ β' σσ' ὡς τὸ καδδραθέην*. This is not given by Ludwich, and therefore can

hardly be in V; for so careful a collator could never have overlooked it. So O 706 *τινὲς γράφουσιν 'οὐδ' ἀφίκετο'* (for ἀτήγαγε) is Didymean, but not given by Ludwich. Ω 304 the meaningless *ἀρα ἐνικῶς* of V should, it appears, be ἀρσενικῶς, as T gives. N 229, Ludwich gives from V 'Ζηνόδοτος "ὅστις [so] μεθήσι πόνιοι," und darnach μεθήσι: 'Ἀρίσταρχος [so!]' "μεθήσι πόνιοι." The consistency of the Scholiast is fully vindicated now that we find that the second scholium belongs not to 229 at all but to 234, where it gives us a new piece of information not to be stigmatised by a 'so!' In my note on Ω 205 *ἐξενάριξε. τινὲς 'ἐξήνεξε' τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξέβαλεν*, V, I suggested that the right form might be *ἐξήναξε*, as though from *ἀναξ*. It now appears that *ἐξήναξε* is in fact the reading of T. On N 358 T has the only intelligible form of the scholium, as I long ago pointed out, 'Ἀρίσταρχος 'τῷ δ' ἔριδος.' 'Ἀριστοφάνης 'τοί.' But Maass's note 'οἱ pro τῷ A' is wrong; A has τοί in the text with οὕτως 'Ἀριστοφάνης, ἄλλοι δὲ 'οἱ δ' ἔριδος.' It is simply impossible that this last clause can be, as Maass seems to suppose, a corruption of 'Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ 'τῷ δ' ἔριδος.' The only admissible form of the Scholium, which was written for a text with τῷ, is οὕτως 'Ἀρίσταρχος' 'Ἀριστοφάνης [τοί], ἄλλοι δὲ 'οἱ δ' ἔριδος.' These cases, collected by a quite superficial preliminary examination of the second volume, will show that there are by no means despicable gleanings to be made even in the best worked field, that of the Didymean excerpts.

Maass omits to record one fact, which should not have been forgotten; viz. that two passages at least, Σ 39—49 and 444—456, have obeli appended to them. Whether there may be similar cases elsewhere I am not sure; but I recorded no more when working recently at the MS. Signs such as these should surely be included among the scholia, as they are equivalent to the statement 'Ἀρίσταρχος ἠθέτει: the more so as, though the athesis is not in either case directly asserted, it is alluded to on Σ 444.

With respect to the date of the MS., Maass distinctly adheres to the year 1059, deduced from the mutilated colophon; 'unde litterarum formas, quae tales sunt quales s. xi. et xii. inveniuntur, nequaquam abhorrere peritis puto constabit, modo ipsum librum inspexerint.' This however is too confident an assertion in face of Mr. Thompson's distinct opinion that the writing cannot be so early as the eleventh cent. (*Class. Rev.* ii, 103), and the question must be regarded as an open one. It is of no particular impor-

tance, as the Scholia in any case depend on their own merits. To the later history of the codex I can add one small fact. It was already in Florence in the year 1466, and was there employed by the well-known scribe John Rhosos of Crete in correcting a MS. of the *Iliad* now in the B.M. and known as Harley 5600. Not content with this, Rhosos also added to the Townleyanus a good many omitted lines—not always with wisdom. The following is his most brilliant achievement. After H 195 he found in his archetype, written no doubt either immediately below the last or above the first line of a page, the modest but correct comment, *κάντεῦθεν ὑπολάβωσιν ἡμᾶς φοβηθῆναι αὐτοῖς*. Not content with solemnly inserting this beautiful hexameter into his own text, he has carefully written it in the margin of the Townleyanus, with the proper α, β and γ to make sure that it should be read in the right place, and the usual στίχος to show that it is a line and must not be mistaken for a scholium. Rhosos has not added any other scholia; some of the metrical headings to books are in his hand, and so is the note after B 493 *λείπει ἐνταῦθα ὁ κατάλογος στίχοι τπδ'.*

Confidence may no doubt be felt in Maass' transcription, the more so as he had the use of Mr. Monro's copy. But in comparing some of the scholia, taken at random, with the MS., I find some corrections to make. E 586 the reading of T is *ἀπόπτυσμα*, not *ἀπόπτνγμα*, and this is required by the sense, as I showed in *Journ. Phil.* xii. 290. Z 164 *τεθναίης ὦ Προῖτε*] *καλόν σοι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν εἰ μὴ τοῦ καθυβρίσαντός σε κατισχύσεις* 'ἀλλ' εἰ βούλει ζῆν, ἐκείνον ἀνελε' εἰ γὰρ ἐμὲ ἡθέλησε βιάσασθαι, οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται. Here ἄλλως should be read for ἄλλ of T, the compendium for *ὡς* having been omitted in the MS.; the two explanations are obviously inconsistent. Φ 542 note, 'ἐπαιρόμενος B: ἐπερρωμένος'; this is misleading, as T also has *ἐπαιρόμενος*, *ερρω* being only interlined. Somewhat more serious is X 263, given by Maass *ἐντεῦθεν ἡ παροιμία ' <ὡς λύκοι> ἄρνα φιλοῦσιν ἐρσσαι*,' with note 'supplevi ex Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 211 et Diogeniano.' But the MS. has *ἐντεῦθεν ἡ παροιμία 'ἄρνα φιλοῦσι λύκοι, νέον ὡς φιλέονσιν ἐρσσαι*,' which needs no addition; Maass has evidently dropped some words owing to his eye wandering from *φιλοῦσι* to *φιλέονσιν*. But occasional errors of this sort must be excused out of gratitude to the scholar who has carried through so laborious and thankless a task.

WALTER LEAF.