

# 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 Truth about Homer. With some remarks on Professor Jebb's 'Introduction to Homer.'* By F. A. Palbt, M.A., LL.D. London, F. Norgate, and the 'Cambridge Chronicle' Office. 1887. 24 pp. 1s.**

T. C. Snow

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 09 / November 1887, pp 269 - 270

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00182046, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00182046](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00182046)

### **How to cite this article:**

T. C. Snow (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 269-270 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00182046

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

On Matt. viii. 15 Mr. Gwilliam (p. 160) quotes this MS. as agreeing with Widmanstadt and the Curetonian in reading *αἰρούς*, whereas on p. 171 he quotes it as reading *αἰρῶ*.

The text does not approximate to the Curetonian. On the whole Mr. Gwilliam derives from his study of Syriac MSS. a strong conviction in favour of the type of Greek text represented by the later MSS.

Prof. Sanday, on the other hand, from the phenomena of the *Codex Rossanensis* (Σ) draws an inference of an opposite kind. That *Codex* containing the first two Gospels is believed to date from the sixth century. It supports generally the common text, and is in some places the oldest uncial authority that does so. Nevertheless it is found to contain eighty-six manifestly wrong readings which have little or no support besides. 'And yet there is no difference in kind between these readings and those which form so large a part of the characteristic text of the great mass of MSS.' Its agreement with

these in other cases therefore tends rather to confirm the suspicion of wholesale correction and emendation to which they are exposed.

This MS. is so closely related to that known as N (also a *Codex Purpureus*) which contains fragments of the same Gospels, that Von Gebhardt thinks they may even have been copied directly from the same exemplar.

Space will not allow us to do more than mention the titles of the remaining essays: Prof. Driver 'On Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton'; Mr. Woods 'On the Septuagint Version of the Books of Samuel'; Mr. Edersheim 'On Wetzel's Theory of the Synoptic Gospels'; Prof. Sanday 'On the Commentary attributed to Theophilus of Antioch'; Mr. Randell 'On the date of S. Polycarp's Martyrdom' (which with Jahn, Lightfoot, etc. he fixes in 155 A.D.); and Mr. Neubauer 'On some Temanite and Nabataean Inscriptions dating from between 3 B.C. and 79 A.D.'

T. K. ABBOTT.

*The Truth about Homer. With some remarks on Professor Jebb's 'Introduction to Homer.'* By F. A. PALEY, M.A., LL.D. London, F. Norgate, and the 'Cambridge Chronicle' Office. 1887. 24 pp. 1s.

WE all know Mr. Paley's views on Homer. The real Homeric poems were the poems on the later events of the siege and the returns of the heroes, which we commonly call 'cyclic'; the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are manufactured epics only just older than Plato. In this pamphlet, Mr. Paley goes over the old ground, with no new arguments, but only a long moan over the sad perversity of Mr. Jebb in disregarding the old ones. Of course, there is no reviling or railing, no bitterness or insinuation, in Mr. Paley's language; in one sentence he gets as far as '*suppressio veri*,' but he retracts it in the next. He is not indignant, he is only sad. He knows the truth; the world and Mr. Jebb will neither believe nor listen.

We may say at once that Mr. Paley does disprove the theory which he attacks, the theory that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, just as they are, with every word and every line just as we have them, were finished before 800 B.C. But then that is a theory that nobody believes, not even Dr. Hayman. Everybody believes that the poems, as we have them, have undergone some amount of change since their origin; the question is, how much change, and what kind of change. Mr. Paley only refutes antagonists who hold that there has been no change at all. And, very strangely, Mr. Paley's theory is far more hostile to the irresistible internal evidences of growth in the poems as we have them, than the theories of his most old-fashioned opponents. He thinks, as they do, that the poems were written all at once; but while they leave plenty of time for interpolations and modernizations, he leaves no time at all; all the discrepancies of story, all the double redactions, all the differing usages of language, must have been put in by

the same author, with his eyes open, and then have spread over the world at once, stereotyped in the form which they have retained for 2200 years. Of course, Mr. Paley puts these down to the variations in the poet's sources; and that might stand when he used to regard the poet as a mere compiler, (though even then what a stupid compiler he must have been!); but in this pamphlet the theory of compilation is practically given up. Mr. Paley still talks about 'editing' and 'redaction,' and 'these poems in their new and highly elaborated form'; but when he says (p. 4) that 'Plato used a literary written epitome or "redaction" of the two poems, constructed each round a central figure, a dramatic *Protagonistes*, in an age of rhetoric, high culture, sophistic teachings of the rights and duties of humanity'; when he explains that Penelope's suitors are an imitation of Helen's suitors, and Odysseus's beggary at Ithaca is a reproduction of his beggary in the Trojan camp, that the characters of Helen and Menelaus are not degraded by Sophocles and Euripides, but elevated by the new poet from the savage level of the old epics,<sup>1</sup>—when Mr. Paley does all this, he is describing, not a redactor at all, but an independent poet, with an independent poet's responsibility for unity of treatment.

<sup>1</sup> This is the strangest of Mr. Paley's sayings, and deserves full quotation. Pp. 12, 13, 'It was thus, that in an age when women had begun to take their just part in social life, a Helen and a Penelope were invested with new attributes, and Helen ceased to be the "she-devil," the Erinyes of the tragedies, and became a kindly and hospitable matron. In the same way the Odysseus and the Menelaus of our Homer are by no means the treacherous villains that they are uniformly made to appear in tragedy. It is a perverse view that the bad character shews "decadence" from the good, as represented by Homer. Why should the poets of the most cultured age in Attica have systematically preferred the bad? Rather, we have to contemplate the evolution from savagery to Socratic teaching. No man of sense now holds that early man was good and moral, just and chaste, and that later man became depraved.' (The italics are my own.) But the tragedians lived in the 'cultured age' as well. Why did they leave the brutal Menelaus and the wanton Helen unreformed?

But in truth, so far as this theory of the date is concerned, refutation is more than Mr. Paley has a right to demand. The end of the 5th century B.C. is not one of the dark ages; if in the time of Aristophanes there appeared an epic poet of 27,000 lines, totally at variance with the traditions of his predecessors, and yet received at once into triumphant popularity all over the Greek world, he must have left some trace of his existence in our extant literature. If he could exist and be buried in silence, there is no reason why we should not believe that Greece was full of greater generals than Brasidas and greater poets than Sophocles and greater cities than Athens. History is at an end, and we had better burn our books.

Because Mr. Paley's theory is untenable, we may not therefore dismiss all his incidental observations. It is perfectly true that there are great difficulties connected with the sources of tragic story; (but what possesses Mr. Paley to include Mr. Jebb among people who do not 'possess any special acquaintance with the themes of the Tragic' ?) ; with the history of writing; with the structure of the Homeric language. To persevere in insisting on the difficulties is itself a good work; but there, I am afraid, Mr. Paley's services to Homer end. It is sad to say it of such an indomitable scholar, who has laboured so long in so many fields; but, so far as the Homeric language is concerned, he does not know the conditions of the problem. 'Such evident sacrifice of grammar to metrical convenience as *πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω*,' 'the rare words *τείρεα* 'stars' and *τέλσον* came from Sanscrit,' 'the frequent use of *ἐὸς* as *tuus*. . . these spurious modernisms also in the *Iliad* (*ἐὸιο* being thinly disguised under a reading *ἔϊος*).' The man who can say these things is scarcely one from whom we can hope to learn 'the truth about Homer.'—T. C. SNOW.

*Orphica, recens.* EUGENIUS ABEL, in Schenk's *Bibliotheca*, Pragae et Lipsiae, 8vo. 1885, pp. 320. 5 Mk.

THE editor of this work is already favourably known by his labours in the same field, having brought out in 1881 a careful edition of the *Lithica*. It is a field in which very little has been done by English scholars since the days of Tyrwhitt and Dr. Askew. The reason of this must be sought, we suppose, in the comparatively slight importance attached to the subject; since the condition of the Orphic texts has long been such as to offer the fullest scope for critical emendation. As Abel speaks in his preface of an 'editio major,' for which he is reserving his commentary, the present work must be taken as an instalment only. Its merits consist in a more thorough revision of the text; a better arrangement of the Fragments, by which they are grouped as far as possible under the headings of works known to have once existed; and in a considerable addition to the number of such *dissecta membra* hitherto collected. The last piece in this edition, the *Hymnus in Isim*, was only recovered about forty years ago from a marble slab in the island of Andros. It is unfortunately in a mutilated condition.

It is to the state of the text, as here represented, that the student will turn with most curiosity. The amount of Orphic lines, when some are recovered from writers as late as Marsiglio Ficino, will be a matter of less interest to him than their restoration to their primitive form. And certainly, when we consider that the manuscripts to be worked with are mostly of the 15th, or even 16th century, the task of such restoration will be seen to be a difficult one. Great latitude must, in such a case, be left to conjecture; the misfortune being that readings so obtained

fail to carry the sort of conviction we experience, when a slight verbal change in the text of a good manuscript makes the sense clear. A very few instances, to which our space limits us, will enable the reader to judge in some measure for himself, and will also serve to indicate how much has already been done for the text. In *Argon.* 178 (the numbering is from Hermann's edition), the reading, as it stood in Eschenbach's edition of 1689, was

*ἐν φθιτοῖσιν ἔτευξ', ἀσκληπιόιο εἵνεκα λάβης.*

Hermann adopted Pierson's emendation of *ἐν φθιμένοισιν*, but altered *ἔτευξε* to *ἔταξε*, on the ground that the former word would not be used in such a connection. 'Ἀσκληπιόιο', of course, was an obvious change. Abel, we think rightly, edits

*ἐν φθιμένοισιν ἔτευξ', Ἀσκληπιόιο, κ.τ.λ.*

Such phrases as *ἄγνωστον τεύχειν* (*Od.* xiii. 191) seem to justify this usage of *ἔτευξε*. In *Argon.* 1068 the old reading of Esch. was

*αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κ' ἐν τοῖσι δύνῃ ἀμέγαρτον ἔθηκαν ἀθάνατοι, κ.τ.λ.*

Voss altered the κ' ἐν to μὲν, which did not mend matters greatly. Hermann produced *αὐτὰρ οἱ Μινύησι δύνῃ, κ.τ.λ.*, which, with its lengthening of *αὐτὰρ*, could satisfy no one. Abel accepts the ingenious conjecture of Wiel, *ἐπείγομένοισι*. Dr. Wiel, in his *Observationes* (1853), had started a number of emendations of the *Argonautica*, many acute, others over bold. Now and then Abel improves upon these, as in *Argon.* 1114-5, where (speaking of the Macrobiū) the old text had

*μειλιχίῃ δέ τοι αἰὲν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε γαλήνη  
παῖδεν ἡδὲ τοκεῦσιν ἐπὶ φρεσὶν, ἡδὲ νόοιο,  
αἰσιμὰ τε βέζειν, κ.τ.λ.*

Hermann altered the latter part of the second line to *ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν οἶδαν εἴσιν*. Wiel, objecting to *οἶδαν*, suggested *εὐφροσύνη δὲ νόοιο*. Abel, with *ἐπιφροσύνη*, seems to us to be nearer the mark.

In *Frag.* xlvii. (Herm.), where the old reading was

*Πρώτιστος μὲν ἄναξ ἐκ ἐπιχθονίων Κρόνος ἀνδρῶν,*  
and where Hermann could propose nothing better than *ἄπ'* for *ἐκ*, Abel happily restores

*πρώτιστος μὲν ἄνασσειν, κ.τ.λ.*

In *Hymn.* lxiv. (on *Nómos*), v. 6

*καὶ φθόνον οὐ δίκαιον ῥαῖζον τρόπον αὐτὸς ἐλαύνει,*  
while *οὐ δίκαιον* seems certainly corrupt, neither Hermann's *οὐ νόμιμον* nor Wiel's *οὐτιδανόν*, accepted by Abel, will probably carry conviction. More satisfactory is *καὶ μῦθον ἀμείνων*, *Lith.* 362, for the old *καὶ σεμνὸν ἀδαντον*. One of the most difficult to decide upon is the proper name at the beginning of *Argon.* 751, where the course of the Argo near the Tauric Chersonese is being described. As they stood in Eschenbach's text, the lines were

*οὐ σύμης ὄρος ἐστὶ, πολὺς τ' εὐθαλῆς λειμῶν  
ἐνθάδ' ἀράξου ρεύμα μεγαβρεμέτου ποταμοῖο.*

'Symen nemo novit,' wrote Hermann, and gave the improved reading

*οὐ Σίνδης ὄρος αἰπὸν, καὶ εὐθαλῆς λειμῶνες  
ἐνθα δ' Ἀράξω ρεύμα, κ.τ.λ.*

This Abel retains. But the instance may serve to show on how conjectural a basis the text yet rests. The Sindi are no doubt mentioned by Strabo as in the Maeotic region referred to; but there is no striking resemblance between *Σύμης* and *Σίνδης*. Old Dr. Vincent, of Westminster, in his annotated copy of Gesner's *Orpheus*, conjectured *Σοδνῆς* (the Soanians being mentioned in the same chapter of Strabo, *Lib.* xi. c. ii.). It is just possible that