

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](#)



Molhuysen on MSS. of the Odyssey *De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis scripsit P. C. Molhuysen*, Litt. Hum. Dr.: accedunt tabulae quinque. Lugduni-Batavorum. A. W. Sijthoff. MDCCCXCVI. Mark 4.20.

C. M. Mulvany

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 05 / June 1897, pp 273 - 275

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032108, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032108

How to cite this article:

C. M. Mulvany (1897). The Classical Review, 11, pp 273-275 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032108

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

that it has been executed. For without the offset of metre, as the present reviewer knows from dreary experience, Lucan is intolerable when translated; and we may freely grant that the modest wish which concludes the preface of Mr. Ridley's book

has been realized, 'I shall be more than satisfied if I have done anything to render the 'Pharsalia' in language, manner and thought more accessible than it has hitherto been to English readers.'

J. P. P.

MOLHUYSEN ON MSS. OF THE ODYSSEY.

De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis scripsit P. C. MOLHUYSEN, Litt. Hum. Dr.: accedunt tabulae quinque. Lugduni-Batavorum. A. W. Sijthoff. MDCXCXVI. Mark 4.20.

In a short preface Dr. Molhuysen explains his reasons for collating G (Mediceus Laurentianus xxxii. 24 saec. x.), F (Florentinus Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 52, saec. xi.), and P (Palatinus Heidelbergensis 45, anno 1201):—G had never been completely collated, and Ludwich's collations of F and P betrayed inaccuracy and want of skill. Pp. 3-32 are occupied with Prolegomena to the collation of GFP *cum* A. *Ludwichii editione*. The abbreviations used are explained pp. 153-4. Then follow *corrigenda* and five facsimiles, viz. G φ 399-423, F τ 63-83, and, to show the two chief of the four contemporary hands, P η 96-126, ω 543-548 *cum subscriptione*, and *Batrachomyomachiae finis cum subscriptione*.

The collation of G, the first of its kind, needs no apology; and of Ludwich's collation of F and P our author writes p. 30: 'talia menda inveni ut libere dicere audeam, Ludwichium non ea esse in legendis libris manuscriptis peritia ut scriptorem ad fidem codicum edere possit.' Certainly the mistakes alleged, pp. 30-32, are sufficient to destroy the authority of any *apparatus criticus*. Some of them one may judge for oneself by consulting the facsimiles: to these may be added τ 67 ὀρνέεις F according to the facsimile, but Ludwich has turned the present into the future. How serious the divergence between the two collations may be is evident δ 547. According to Ludwich the readings of our three MSS. are κτείναι G, κτείνη p.c. P² [and presumably κτείνεν F as in the text], but Molhuysen gives κτείνει G, κτείνεν F p.c. P², κτάνεν a.c. P, κτείνει p.c. P². In short it certainly seems that the authority has vanished of what was our best *apparatus criticus* of the *Odyssey*; though it will always remain to the credit of Prof. Ludwich, that

he so drew attention to these three codices, as to impel Dr. Molhuysen to give us the new collations. But one's faith in collations is sorely shaken, and, if collations of texts can be so faulty, what are we to think of our editions of scholia?

Even the new collation leaves room for criticism. Many orthographical details have been intentionally (p. 28) and, no doubt for the most part, rightly omitted. But one would have gladly been explicitly informed by Dr. Molhuysen, whether α 222 νόνημον is read by GFP though Ludwich failed to find it, or, though GFP read like all other MSS. νόνημον, the mis-spelling was thought too unimportant to be mentioned. So too Molhuysen may very reasonably have agreed with Cauer, *Grundfragen d. hom. Textkritik*, p. 58, that δ 672 ναυίλεται F is worthless as external evidence for the aorist demanded by Paech and Curtius; but it is to be regretted that the reading of F here is simply ignored. Similarly, according to Ludwich and, so far as I can read it, Molhuysen's facsimile, P reads η 107 καιροσσέν with -σσ-. If so, it is to be regretted that the collation is silent on the matter in view of Bergk's emendation καιροσσέν and the inferences drawn from it:—'if we suppose that in an Athenian¹ copy of the *Odyssey* ΚΑΙΡΟΣΕΟΝ was written,...it is easy to understand, how a copyist unacquainted with the rare adjective καιρόεις made a form καιροσέν out of the letters which he did not understand' (Cauer, *l.l.* p. 76). The double -σ- of P is hardly a mere freak of that MS. since it appears in Et. Mg. 499. 43, though see 498. 7, and has only been removed by emendation from Hesychius (see Schmidt, larger edition).

The Prolegomena, after the necessary description of the MSS., show how the

¹ Why Athenian? The Ionian alphabet, as it slowly developed, passed through its μεταχαρκτηρισμός in respect to single for double letters, and O = o or ou: cf. Cauer, *Del.*² 480 (Teos), 486 (Miletos), 491 (Halicarnassos), 496 (Chios), 503 (Samos), 516 (Naxos, αληον = ἀλλέων), etc.

copyists have corrupted the texts, for (p. 29) the chief aim of palaeography should be to show us 'quid in emendando scriptore licitum sit.' The verses omitted by G, F, or P are discussed severally, and 'haplographia' is illustrated in a very interesting manner. Also of great interest are the illustrations, p. 23, of the effect of the copyists knowing Homer too well: they often substituted the words of a similar verse for what was before them.

All three MSS. are shown to be copies of codices in minuscule script. It is noteworthy that G generally accents κήρυξ p. 28 n. (see Chandler, *Gk. Accent.* § 622), and in the dat. pl. and infin. writes more often than other MSS. κώπησ', ἔμμεν' and the like, p. 29, and 'fere semper' (see on α 170) εἶσ'. These elisions must be traceable to the influence of grammatical theories; why εἶσ'? εἶσι is a vox nihili, and we can hardly refer back to a time when the MSS. had ΕΣ = εἶσσ'. But the critical signs in G are probably due to the copyist. At least this is Molhuysen's view as to the antisigma (p. 4), and I think it may also apply to the asterisks, which are ascript to α 97-102. The scribe of G seems to have known Homer very well (see Molhuysen, p. 23, and cf. γ 106, 109) and, as all these lines recur, he may have written the asterisk against them on that account: cf. the explanation of this sign by some grammarian in Dindorf, *Schol. in Il.* I. xlv. In favour of this view is the circumstance that the asterisks are ascript, not merely to vv. 97-101, which were rejected by Aristarchus, but to v. 102 (= ω 488, B 167, Ω 121, etc.), which was not and could not be rejected.

It may be worth while to point out that the same MS. preserves a probably unique and ancient form in β 63 ἄσχετα = ἄνσχετα: cf. similar forms discussed by Schulze, *Quaest. Ep.* 44 n. Another trace of ancient 'Sandhi' may be found in the reading of GFP α 93 ἐσπάρτην, with which cf. ἐσπῆλιν = ἐς στ. Cauer *Del.*² 483, and see Smyth, *Ionic* p. 598.

One cannot but hope that what Dr. Molhuysen has done for GFP may be done by him or by other palaeographers for other important MSS. such as M, and that on the basis of such improved collations some competent person may attempt to show the relation of our MSS. to one another¹ and to the learned editions of antiquity, and to estimate the value of any single important

MS., in the several parts of the poem, as evidence for or against a given reading. I say, in the several parts, for inasmuch as a single huge roll of papyrus containing the whole *Odyssey* must have always been a rarity, it is therefore probable that the codices were put together from a number of *libelli* often of different origin. At present a reading peculiar to one MS. or to a minority, however old, has only so far the advantage over a modern conjecture, that it is less likely to be a mere conjecture, though it may be due to misreading, or mere carelessness. If such a reading is adopted, as e.g. δ 672 ναννίλευται is put into the text by Monro (cf. his preface 'pristinam Graecae linguae formam aucupari...nolumus...multis tamen lectionibus ex apparatu critico Arturi Ludwich...desumptis'), then the editor's justification is not the slight external evidence, which at present one cannot evaluate, but the fitness of the reading, its congruity with epic usage, and the probability of its having been the parent or at least the antecedent of the common reading. So, too, the reading of the Genevese papyrus (J. Nicole, *Rev. de Philologie*, 1894, p. 102) γ 372

θάμβησε δὲ λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν
θαύμασ<σ>εν δ' ὁ γεραιός

instead of

θάμβος δ' ἔλε πάντας ἰδόντας
θαύμαζεν δ' ὁ γεραιός

is an indeterminate quantity for us, if we consider it as external evidence against the vulgate. We stand in the same relation to the readings of the scholia. Conservatives and radicals alike act on the principle laid down by Van Leeuwen and Mendes, *Ilias*, p. xxii.: 'singulis locis quid sit legendum non codices grammaticorumve notulae docere nos possunt, sed dictionis epicae leges ex ipso Homero cognitae.' *Apparatus critici* and scholia are chiefly or merely valuable as collections of suggested emendations.

In this matter a review of the MSS. by one skilled in palaeography may render great service. For instance, all known MSS. of the *Odyssey* read καὶ for κατὰ in δ 72. The result is a construction too contorted for it to be probable that the error was deliberately spread by interpolation into texts which preserved κατὰ. Should we refer all our MSS. of δ to a single copy? and was the error due to reading κ' as κ', signs which denote the preposition and conjunction respectively in the papyrus of the Constitution of Athens? The true reading was

¹ See now *Odyssea I.*², edd. Van Leeuwen et Mendes.

preserved as late as the time of schol. T on Ω 323. Something too might be done by one well acquainted with the scholia. For example, on working through the scholia cited by Ludwich AHT i. pp. 46-7 as examples of the terms αἱ εἰκαυότεραι, χαριέστεραι and the like, it will be found that GFP tend to agree with one another and with the 'inferior' editions or copies: viz: γ 349, ϵ 232, ξ 428, τ 83 GFP have the

reading of the 'inferior' versions, but α 117 P and β 182 GF diverge. Again GFP differ from the 'more exquisite' versions β 170, ζ 291, η 74, \omicron 268, but γ 151 FP and λ 196 G agree with them. All this seems to show that our MS. tradition has preserved a text little influenced by Alexandrian criticism.

C. M. MULVANY.

FRANKLIN'S TRACES OF EPIC INFLUENCE IN THE TRAGEDIES OF AESCHYLUS.

Traces of Epic Influence in the Tragedies of Aeschylus. A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Bryn Mawr College for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by S. B. FRANKLIN. Baltimore, 1895.

DR. Franklin takes as the text of her thesis the well-known saying attributed to Aeschylus, τὰς αὐτοῦ τραγῳδίας τεμάχῃ εἶναι τῶν Ὅμηρου μεγάλων δειπνων, and examines the Aeschylean plays for traces of Homeric influence in epic forms, in epic vocabulary, and in syntax, subject-matter and style. She finds, as was to be expected, that Homer exercised a strong influence upon the tragedian, both in style and diction and in subject-matter. Her work is, on the whole, carefully done, although her lists of parallel passages and word-forms might have been considerably enlarged. The subject of the

thesis was evidently too broad, and might have been divided with profit. I have noted, also, a few misstatements: e.g. it is hardly true that μῶνος is 'quite frequent in the other tragedians' (p. 11), for in Euripides it is decidedly rare, and in *I. T.* 157 and *Alc.* 122 it rests upon conjecture. The author seems, also, to attribute a somewhat disproportionate importance to Paley's Aeschylus, excellent as that edition is in many respects. On p. 25, note 4 the rule for position before *muta cum liquida* is not clearly stated and needs qualification. Still, the work is in the main meritorious, and might with advantage be expanded into a larger and more comprehensive treatise. The English in which it is written is occasionally somewhat slipshod.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Middletown, Connecticut.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

HEAD'S CATALOGUE OF GREEK COINS.

Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum. Caria, Cos, Rhodes, &c. By BARCLAY V. HEAD, D.C.L. 28s.

A FRESH volume of the British Museum Catalogue of Coins is always welcome, and is sure to contain valuable information. But Caria is scarcely one of the more interesting parts of the Greek world. The islands and a few towns of the coast began to issue money early, but most Carian cities begin to mint only in the Hellenistic age or even later. Thus the light derived from the coins falls mostly on unhistoric days and local cults, rather than on the high-

ways of history. The local cults of Caria have considerable attraction; but the present is scarcely a fitting place for their discussion; therefore we do not propose to examine the volume at length, but only to note a few points.

The coins issued by the Carian Dynasts, Hecatomnus and Mausolus with Milesian types, were attributed by Mr. Head in the Catalogue of Ionia to Miletus: in the present volume he assigns them to Mylasa, but without giving detailed reasons for the change of attribution. The question however has some historic interest, and perhaps required discussion.

Mr. Head well points out that the so-called Rhodian standard of weight (drachm