



University  
of Glasgow

Whitaker, G. ... brevique adnotatione critica ...: a Preliminary History of the Oxford Classical Texts. Published in: *Classical Books: Scholarship and Publishing in Britain since 1800*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2007. *Bulletin (University of London. Institute of Classical Studies)*. Supplement; 101, 113-134

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/3828/>

Deposited on: 13 November 2007

**... BREVIQUE ADNOTATIONE CRITICA ...: A PRELIMINARY HISTORY  
OF THE OXFORD CLASSICAL TEXTS**

**Graham Whitaker (University of Glasgow)**

On 3 July 1896, at one of the less regular meetings of the Delegates of Oxford University Press (OUP) held during the Long Vacation,<sup>1</sup> approval was given to publication of the Oxford Classical Texts (OCT) series. This approval was the outcome of discussions and proposals over more than ten years; indeed, it would be possible to take any one of several dates as marking the start of the series. While these earlier discussions need to be reviewed in order to explain why the series developed as it did when it did, this is also a preliminary attempt to look generally at the early history of the Texts, and its focus is the period to 1939, although some later developments in the series will also be mentioned.

1) Prehistory: a tale of false starts

To set the series in its historical context it is necessary to go back to 1850 and the establishment of the Teubner library of Greek and Latin classics. This had provided in a small octavo format a revised text with an introduction, apparatus criticus and (where appropriate) an index of names.<sup>2</sup> The uniformity of the series in format and appearance was one of its selling points, as was its relative cheapness compared to fuller editions issued by British publishers, such as the Sophocles edited by Lewis Campbell (1830-1908).<sup>3</sup> There was criticism of the standards of editing both in Germany and elsewhere and it was the opinion of Charles Cannan (1858-1919), Secretary to the Delegates during the crucial period from 1898 to 1919, that the German editors had done ‘so much less than is generally supposed’ in re-examining manuscripts.<sup>4</sup> Nonetheless, the Bibliotheca Teubneriana provided the measure by which any new series of texts would be judged, particularly a series based on similar principles of a clearly-defined manuscript tradition supplemented by an apparatus criticus, and it had been able to establish itself widely in Europe with editions of both standard and non-standard authors.<sup>5</sup>

The first proposal that has relevance to the eventual form of the OCT series arose from a memorandum, originally presented to the Delegates in 1883 for a series of revised

classical texts and prompted in part by the concerns of schools from at least 1881 onwards.<sup>6</sup> A committee was appointed on the motion of Benjamin Jowett (1817-1893) to consider how this might be implemented, as far as Greek texts were concerned.<sup>7</sup> This committee reported to the Delegates in June 1884 that any such series should be based on five specific principles.<sup>8</sup> On that occasion, the Delegates appointed Evelyn Abbott (1843-1901) to superintend the series and asked him to make arrangements for three volumes in the series ‘the names of authors and editors to be submitted to the Delegates for their approval’. When Abbott reported in May 1886, and the Delegates considered his memorandum a month later,<sup>9</sup> he had secured three editors: Jowett for the *Republic* of Plato; Richard Jebb (1841-1905) for Thucydides; William Watson Goodwin (1831-1912) for Aeschylus.<sup>10</sup> Abbott issued a warning, however, that ‘Such a series can only be issued within a reasonable time by combining the republication of good texts already in existence with the preparation of new’. As ‘good texts’, he cited Lewis Campbell’s Sophocles, the Demosthenes of Wilhelm Dindorf (1802-1883) and Xenophon of Ludwig Dindorf (1805-1871).<sup>11</sup> It is not difficult to see why nothing came directly of this proposal. Jowett’s posthumous edition of the *Republic*, published jointly with his pupil Lewis Campbell in 1894, owes more to Campbell’s contributions in the establishment of the text than to Jowett’s own; it had been somewhere in Jowett’s mind since the 1860s and it is not likely that the Delegates envisaged a three-volume work. It does however include short English analyses - the third of the five principles - at the side of the page, so that we have one example of how the series might have looked. Neither was it realistic to suppose that Jebb, who was principally concerned until 1900 with his Sophocles in its various editions, would have been easily diverted to Thucydides, even though he had written on the subject of the speeches.<sup>12</sup> The interesting idea of securing the Harvard-based Goodwin, who had written on Aeschylus in 1877,<sup>13</sup> also came to nothing. More importantly, to realise the intention of adding analyses to existing texts would have incurred any expenses associated with resetting the page, while the mixture of older and new texts would have given a lack of focus to the series. A few of the five principles recommended in 1884 were eventually to find their way into the OCTs: something of the guidelines for the establishment of the text, the introduction (though not that it should be in Latin), and the proposal for indexes of names and subjects. A notable difference is that the OCTs did not have - at least in name - a supervising editor, although unofficially Ingram Bywater (1840-1914) acted as such during his lifetime.

The Press regularly received proposals from scholars or members of the public. One such was submitted by Frederick William Bussell (1862-1944) in 1890;<sup>14</sup> Bussell was later to be Vice-Principal of Brasenose College (1896-1913) and was ordained in 1891. He published on philosophy (including a book on Marcus Aurelius in 1910), on theological topics, and on Roman constitutional history; he was also involved in the English folk-song movement and provided the incidental music for a performance of *The Knights* in 1897. In some ways his proposal, though diffuse in a way that resembles his biography, is more significant than the 1884 proposal and its associated memorandum from Abbott in 1886. It was considered at a meeting of the Delegates on 16 May 1890<sup>15</sup> and outlines over five pages a scheme for a *Bibliotheca imperialium scriptorum*, to include Greek and Latin authors, with the general object of providing ‘in a convenient form the texts of those authors, at present on the whole neglected, who lived & wrote during the Christian & Imperial era.’ Bussell’s scheme also laid out the form of the edition, and this is the aspect closest to the future form of the OCTs. He proposed a series of texts ‘with short analyses, introductions, & of a general unity of design’. Bussell was opposed to commentaries: ‘It seems that we require to guard ourselves against this idea - that the knowledge of facts &c. accumulated by others’ patience is in itself an education, or indeed leads to a real friendliness w[ith] an ancient author.’<sup>16</sup> He also recommended a preface in Latin: ‘It befits the dignity of a University & will be a reversion from the diffuseness of modern writing ... & appeals at once to the learned world.’ Even though this elaborate proposal was rejected by the Delegates, it is impossible not to think that something lingered on, if only as a memory, when plans were being drawn up for the OCTs a few years later.

The next development came in May and June 1893, when local support was canvassed, probably on Bywater’s initiative, and came in the form of a set of printed circulars from the Colleges, signed by more than fifty names. The text of this read as follows:

The undersigned desire to suggest to the Delegates of the Press the issue of a series of texts of Greek and Latin writers without commentary. They believe that such an edition would command a wide sale: but they recommend the undertaking on the grounds that it is needed, that it would be worthy of the University Press, and that it would do much to organise classical research within the University.

Two dissenters scored through the last clause, with one (Walter Hobhouse [1862-1928] of Christ Church) adding the caveat that the series should not duplicate existing texts where these were adequate. The question of organising classical research is significant: it suggests that supporters of the series were convinced that any new text required original manuscript research. A push in this direction had already been given by the series of *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, based on manuscripts in Oxford and other libraries, which began publication in 1881 (Aryan Series) and 1882 (Classical Series).<sup>17</sup> Opinion does not seem to have been canvassed outside the University on this occasion; had it been, it would doubtless have found a positive response from Gilbert Murray (1866-1957) in Glasgow. Towards the end of 1893 he produced his own proposal – which came to nothing – for a series of critical texts. He asked the views of Bywater, Samuel Henry Butcher (1850-1910) and Robinson Ellis (1834-1913) among others, all of whom were to contribute early volumes to the OCTs.<sup>18</sup> The principal difference in Murray's scheme seems to have been the proposed addition of the scholia and any ancient biographies to what were otherwise to be plain texts, devoid of any full apparatus criticus.<sup>19</sup>

The third significant event in 1893 was the death of Jowett and the publication of his will,<sup>20</sup> which provided for a fund to promote 'the making of new translations or editions of Greek Authors, or in any way promoting and advancing the study of Greek Literature, or otherwise to the advancement of learning'. In fact, Philip Lyttelton Gell (1852-1926), Secretary to the Delegates from 1884 to 1898, saw such a fund as a threat rather than an opportunity; in May 1897 he wrote to Edward Caird (1835-1908), Master of Balliol in succession to Jowett, urging 'unity between the texts which we shall produce and any commentaries or translations which the College may provide'.<sup>21</sup> Nonetheless Jowett's death seems to have stirred the Delegates into thinking that something ought to be done to realise the spirit behind the 1884 and 1886 proposals, if not the exact letter, which they modified in line with the various recommendations made since. Additional prompting came in the form of a further recommendation made by the Delegates in November 1895 when concern was voiced about the 'the small number of remunerative books recently offered for publication'.<sup>22</sup> The Finance Committee was therefore asked to look *inter alia* at the question of remuneration for authors and the issue of books in cheaper styles. Both these questions were relevant to the fledgling series; the payment of royalties was accepted, but the issue of books in a cheaper style was to be decided on the merit of each case. By 1896 a plan for the series had finally emerged, even though many

details – including its title – remained unresolved.<sup>23</sup> The Delegates' decision on 3 July had in fact been anticipated by one taken on 19 June, when they had agreed 'to accept as ... likely to prove remunerative to the Press ... an edition of Thucydides, in the Cheap Classical Texts Series, by Mr H. Stuart Jones, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, the Editor receiving £50 upon the publication of the work, with a promise of further remuneration dependent on the sales after the first cost had been recouped.'<sup>24</sup>

David Binning Monro (1836-1905), Provost of Oriel, had in fact approached Henry Stuart Jones (1867-1939) in May 1896, and Gell wrote to him that month.<sup>25</sup> In June Gell wrote to William Ross Hardie (1862-1916) asking him to consider an edition of Pindar, and to Murray on the subject of Euripides.<sup>26</sup> The principles to be adopted emerge in these letters: a 'plain text, with the more important various readings' and following 'very much in form and proportions' Bywater's *Nicomachean ethics* of 1890; the initial remuneration would be proportional to the labour involved, with the prospect of royalties after the costs of production had been recovered. The words 'cheap' and 'remunerative' recur in a way that strongly suggests that the organization of research within the University stood low in the Press's priorities.<sup>27</sup> Hardie provided the first failure for the series: he was to edit neither Pindar, nor his own counter-proposal, the speeches of Cicero. In the immediate aftermath of the July meeting, Gell wrote additionally to Cyril Bailey (1871-1957) on the subject of Lucretius and Arthur Blackburne Poynton (1867-1944) on Horace, asking them to prepare reports on what needed to be done to establish a new or revised text.<sup>28</sup> He also tried to enlist Albert Curtis Clark (1859-1937) to do Theocritus (nothing came of this until Wilamowitz' edition in 1906). Other early plans included texts of Lucan and Sallust, neither of which was to appear – a Sallust was only published in 1991 – and Velleius Paterculus by Robinson Ellis. This was issued in 1898 and in its typography and style sets the pattern for the Latin texts in the series; although it was formally announced as being part of the series, it did not appear as such, shorn of its concluding critical commentary, until stocks of the initial edition were exhausted, which did not happen until 1928. One other text was ready by 1898 – Bywater's *Poetics* – although this had been in preparation for several years. Together with the first volume of Stuart Jones's Thucydides (completed by May 1899 but not issued until 1900), it seems to have been treated as a further exploratory volume until the official launch of the series in 1900.<sup>29</sup> Although several letters in the Archive files urge the appointed editors on to the speedy production of their

texts, matters were not helped initially by delays on the part of the Delegates in settling details such as payments to authors. This caused intense frustration to Gell, who was anxious to conclude contracts with the editors; he was only able to do this in January 1897.

## 2) Conflict with Methuen

One of the effects of the delay was a collision with a similar proposed series by Methuen, already in an advanced state of planning. The firm of Methuen had been founded in 1889 by A.M.M. Stedman (1856-1924), who changed his surname in October 1899 to Methuen, thereby becoming Algernon Methuen Marshall Methuen. Its prosperity during the first few years was founded on the publication of works by Kipling, H.G. Wells and others; in addition, it had made a particular feature of developing series, notably in religion, and in 1899 would begin to publish the Arden Shakespeare.

The problem of the overlapping classical series first came to the fore in October 1897 and was to recur for the next seven years. It is one of the episodes in the history of the OCTs where the conduct of the Press might be called disreputable, though Cannan would not have seen it in this light. The main OCT file contains a summary of the negotiations between 3 December 1897 and 28 April 1898, from which the details of the Methuen series emerge. The general editor was Edgar Cardew Marchant (1864-1960), and arrangements were already in place for Louis Claude Purser (1854-1932) to undertake Cicero's letters, James Smith Reid (1846-1926) to edit the speeches and philosophical works, Sidney George Owen (1858-1940) to edit unspecified works of Ovid, Wallace Martin Lindsay (1858-1937) to edit Martial, William Starkie (1860-1920) Sophocles, and Robinson Ellis Phaedrus. The minute of a meeting on 19 March 1898 continues: 'Dr Sandys [John Edwin Sandys (1844-1922)] having abandoned Demosthenes, and Mr Marchant being himself willing to abandon Thucydides, Mr. Marchant would suggest to Methuen to divert in some way the energies of the other editors.'<sup>30</sup> The editions taken over from Methuen were therefore only three: Purser's Cicero letters, Owen's Ovid and Lindsay's Martial; Starkie's Sophocles was initially included, but he continued instead to edit individual plays of Aristophanes, while the OCT Phaedrus was eventually allocated to John Percival Postgate (1853-1926). The 'diversion of energies' resulted in the edition of Terence by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell

(1844-1914) and Cicero's *Rhetorica* from Augustus Samuel Wilkins (1843-1905) – and that is all. Reading the minute of the initial meeting between Cannan and Stedman on 2 December 1897,<sup>31</sup> one's impression is that Stedman fatally compromised his position from the outset and that the Press took advantage of this thereafter. The commercial terms that were initially negotiated were unacceptable to him; there were disputes over the length of the agreement, and the question of whether Methuen might be permitted to publish other texts outside the terms of the agreement. The eventual agreement provided for Methuen to issue copies of each text in the Classical Series under its own imprint, although Cannan specified that this was to be in Latin; trade terms for the Press and Methuen copies were to be identical. In addition, although Stedman requested a clause requiring the Press to take back unsold Methuen stock, Cannan was advised by Henry Frowde (1841-1927), head of the London business of the Press at Amen Corner, to delete this.<sup>32</sup> The agreement was to run for twenty years from 30 September 1899, the date that both parties took as the official launch of the series, although – as noted earlier – nothing officially appeared until the beginning of 1900. The inevitable happened. There was no particular reason, or commercial advantage, why schools, scholars or libraries should buy a Methuen imprint rather than direct from Henry Frowde; in addition, the agreement excluded Methuen from the American market. By 1904, Methuen decided to give up publishing the Texts and in April requested that their remaining stock should be taken back. Since this did not form part of the agreement, Cannan could dictate terms. Methuen had taken 100 copies, as required by the agreement, of each of the first ten titles; of these thousand copies only 106 had been sold, and the Press would only offer fifteen guineas for stock which had cost Methuen £71 initially. It had been a cheap, effective and ruthless way of removing the challenge.

### 3) Developing a philosophy – and a style

Each editor in the series was equipped with a brief guide on the presentation of the text and critical notes. Its practical austerity mirrors that of the texts as printed. It has already been noted that Bywater's *Ethics* was the model adopted, and that the principle of reporting a limited number of the main manuscript variants was to be followed. Readings from the scholiasts could be included and emendations reported where necessary. Emendations in the text were discouraged overall, though some editors (Bailey in his first Lucretius edition, and Owen whose conjectures were strongly criticised by A.E.



Housman [1859-1936])<sup>33</sup> introduced them. Some editors went their own way: *brevique adnotatione critica* was not to be inflicted upon Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848-1931) – his title page reads ‘recensuit et emendavit’ – nor on Hermann Diels (1848-1922). Later, Robert Chapman (1881-1960), successor to Cannan as Secretary to the Delegates from 1920 to 1942, was to regret the ‘monstrously overgrown’ Livy volumes. It was made clear to editors that if they wished to discuss textual problems in detail it was open to them to do so, either in a separate *editio maior* or critical study. Bywater had again shown the way in 1892 with his *Contributions to the textual criticism of Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics* and Wilamowitz followed his example: the text of his *Bucolici Graeci* was published on 2 January 1906, and his account of the textual history appeared almost simultaneously. The two were reviewed together in several sources.<sup>34</sup>

Some of the characteristics of production should be mentioned. A uniform Crown octavo format (measuring 7½ x 5 inches) was adopted, which reduced the wide margins of Bywater’s *Ethics*. No word of English appeared: prefaces, following Teubner (or Bywater’s example) were in Latin.<sup>35</sup> The austerity afforded to editors extended to the lack of dates and pagination. Volumes in the series were unnumbered. These were decisions taken at an early stage (in 1898/9, probably by Cannan). The reason was practical: it was envisaged that sales of the Texts might be increased if they could be issued on India Paper, which had been used for Oxford Bibles since 1875, and was only manufactured by Thomas Brittain in Hanley. The thinness of this paper enabled double the number of pages to be included in a volume, making them an attractive prospect in terms of warehouse storage as well as practical for the user. Aristophanes, Euripides and Herodotus could each be combined into one volume; Catullus could be issued with Tibullus and Propertius, and so forth. Lack of pagination gave flexibility. It also meant that the texts could be adapted to other needs of the Press, as for example when Murray’s text and apparatus was reprinted unchanged as the basis for the Oxford editions of single plays of Euripides that began to appear in the 1930s.<sup>36</sup> Lack of dates meant that reprints, facilitated by electroplating many of the texts, could continue to appear with an identical title page, irrespective of format. Neither decision was universally popular. In August 1911 the Press received a letter from J. Ricker, the University Booksellers and Publishers in Giessen, with the observation that this policy made it impossible for the German scholarly method of quoting with utmost exactness to be preserved.<sup>37</sup> The Press was however slow to respond to this criticism; dating and pagination only became standard

practice in new editions and reprints after the Second World War.<sup>38</sup> It was also unwilling to agree to school requests that selected passages from the Texts should be made available on a regular basis.<sup>39</sup> The number of variant formats already made the accounting of editors' royalties a time-consuming business, and Cannan was reluctant to add to this burden.<sup>40</sup>

Other matters had to be taken into account: Latin orthography (u/U versus v/V), syllabic division, and the layout of particular literary forms. For the first, the rules of Wilhelm Brambach's *Hilfsbüchlein für lateinische Rechtschreibung* (Leipzig, 1884<sup>3</sup>) were adopted as a model, though not without dissent.<sup>41</sup> John Burnet (1863-1928) was particularly concerned about the layout of the text for the Platonic dialogues, to produce clarity; he was in favour of introducing inverted commas, for example, to which Bywater objected.<sup>42</sup> The Greek language also caused problems. Cannan wrote to D.B. Monro in April 1898:

A dreadful thing has happened! Jones applied for information about ν ἐφελευστικόν so I gave him Burnet's first sheets to look at, and his eagle eye in a fine frenzy at once detected ἔστιν τῆς and all kinds of varieties. So he went to Burnet, and Burnet has replied, saying the Inscr. pap. & MSS have not the slightest trace of any rule or principle and he has followed Schanz in reproducing the first hand of the Clarkeanus ... I wish something was known about the Greek language; this kind of thing is worse than the difficulty of getting two Delegates signatures to a cheque for £3 7 6 in Holy Week.<sup>43</sup>

#### 4) Three case studies (Aurelius Antoninus; Terence; Hellenica Oxyrhynchia)

Although it is impossible to discuss all the individual volumes in detail within the compass of a single article,<sup>44</sup> some comment should be made concerning the five continental scholars who contributed to the series in the period under review – famously Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Hermann Diels, but also the Dane Karl Hude (1860-1936), the Dutch scholar Jan Hendrik Leopold (1865-1925) and the Austrian Robert Kauer (1868-1930). Gilbert Murray approached Wilamowitz – there is a reference to this in a letter from Cannan to Murray of October 1903<sup>45</sup> – and Diels was well known

to Bywater, who had contributed to the *Supplementum Aristotelicum* series issued under the auspices of the K. Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften.<sup>46</sup> Wilamowitz recommended Hude, who was to edit both Herodotus and Lysias, probably on the strength of his edition of Thucydides (1898-1901). Hude taught at and was later (1921-1927) to be Rector of the Metropolitan School in Copenhagen.<sup>47</sup> The only information in the files relating directly to him is contractual, and the only document in the Wilamowitz *Bucolici Graeci* file is the account of sales during the lifetime of the edition. Not surprisingly, these show a marked decline during the First World War; how far this might be specifically attributable to the German name of the editor is uncertain, in view of the general decline in sales at that period. There are two letters from Hermann Diels. His edition of Theophrastus was the first OCT since Bywater's *Ethics* to have a full integral *index verborum*. Diels requested it; because of his eminence, and with Bywater's agreement, the request was granted.<sup>48</sup> In the case of John Swinnerton Phillimore (1873-1926) and Propertius, the index was published separately.<sup>49</sup> Other editors had to make do with a briefer index of names or places.

Leopold is, I think, unique among these five names in making the initial approach himself, though the position in respect of Kauer is not clear. He was born in 1865 in the Dutch city of 's-Hertogenbosch (Den Bosch) in North Brabant. His life was marked by a series of disappointments, both personal and professional. He studied at Leiden from 1883 to 1892 and then taught at the Gymnasium Erasmianum in Rotterdam. He applied for a professorship at Leiden in 1913 and Groningen in 1917 and was passed over on both occasions. After the First World War he became increasingly deaf and reclusive and died in 1925. Like Housman, he was a poet as well as a classical scholar (the first collected edition of his poetry was published in 1912; it is still familiar to the older generation of Dutch readers).

In addition to some articles on the text of Marcus Aurelius, he had published a translation of selections from Epictetus (1904) and a study of the posthumous writings of Spinoza (1902), so that his philosophical credentials were sound.<sup>50</sup> He contacted the Press in January 1907; his letter – in fluent English – pointed to the failings of the Teubner text by Stich and set out his proposal to revise the text, with due attention being paid to Vaticanus A ‘the value of which has ... not yet been fully realised by the critics’, and a ‘careful revision of the apparatus criticus of Stich, a great part of which may be safely

cancelled ...'<sup>51</sup> All this would have recommended itself to Cannan: here was an editor who seemed to understand the principles behind the series without having to be told them. He consulted Bywater, who approved, and the news was conveyed to Leopold at the beginning of February. Leopold was unwilling to give a definite date for completion, since he was waiting for photographs of the Vaticanus to be made. Nonetheless the text reached Oxford, probably in September, and in time for orders to be given for printing at the beginning of November. The book was published on 14 July 1908 in an edition of 2000 copies, and Leopold received 15 guineas for his work. His text is one of the OCT titles for which there is a subsequent history preserved in the file. By 1953 the stock was nearly exhausted; for a revision of the text the Press decided on the advice of Paul Maas (1880-1964) and Eric Robertson Dodds (1893-1979) to approach Willy Theiler (1899-1977) in Bern, who had produced a parallel text and German translation for the Artemis Verlag series *Die Bibliothek der alten Welt* in 1951. Negotiations continued during 1954, but were ultimately fruitless. Theiler, who took a long time to reply to letters, decided that more work was needed on the manuscript tradition in the light of his researches at the Vatican Library, and that the confines of an OCT was not the place to present it. Leopold's text therefore went out of print in September 1965 and has to date not been replaced in the series.

Robert Kauer collaborated with W.M. Lindsay on a replacement edition for Tyrrell's Terence, and their correspondence for the years 1911-1926 is preserved at St Andrews.<sup>52</sup> Kauer's work on the manuscripts of Terence and his edition of the *Adelphoe* (1903) would have been known to Lindsay, and it is likely that the invitation to collaborate came from him. The two editors were at work on the new edition by 1921, and in a letter written on Christmas Day of that year, Lindsay details how the work was being undertaken. It was not a happy collaboration, in that the two editors were working at cross-purposes, with Lindsay (who had undertaken three previous texts for the series) mindful of the restrictions. Kauer sent in his collations between September and December and had apparently originally planned to send an accompanying text. He decided thereafter to concentrate instead on a more systematic study of the manuscripts, with an *editio maior* in mind, where the textual problems and questions of orthography could be treated at length. The actual work of preparing the text fell to Lindsay, who wrote that he would delay sending this in to the Press until Kauer had completed his larger-scale study or – if that took too long – would consult Kauer on difficult passages. Lindsay was

particularly tactless in his dealings with his co-editor – in one passage of the letter he opined that ‘You Austrians do not seem to be so fond of work as the Germans are’. Kauer, hurt and irritated in equal measure, felt it necessary to remind Lindsay that he was an Austrian government official in the Ministry for Social Welfare and his scholarship was a spare-time activity.<sup>53</sup> They disagreed over other aspects: the use of ictus-marks (Kauer *pro*, Lindsay *contra*); the order of the plays; and the views on orthographic practice which Lindsay had put forward in his *Early Latin verse* (Oxford, 1922). Relations seem almost to have broken down in 1924, and when the edition was published Kauer effectively disowned some of the readings which Lindsay had retained against his advice.<sup>54</sup>

In the case of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* volume of 1909, the OCT was published on condition against an honorarium paid to the Egypt Exploration Fund. The Delegates stipulated that the Fund should agree, after the *editio princeps* had appeared (1908) in the fifth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (P. Oxy. 842), that neither the original papyrus nor photographs of it should be made public further for a period of two years after the OCT.<sup>55</sup> The Fund initially demurred, preferring one year, but agreed. A further problem arose when the Press learned that Eduard Meyer (1855-1930) was also working on the text and proposed to publish it in Germany.<sup>56</sup> Since Meyer had worked from the text of the *editio princeps*, there was little in effect that the Fund or the Press could do to prevent this. Arthur Surridge Hunt (1871-1934), writing to Cannan, confirmed that ‘Newly recovered classics when once printed are always regarded as common property’.<sup>57</sup> Nonetheless the Press took legal advice on the position, but decided against action. The edition was published on 17 June 1909, and a further letter from Chapman to Hunt just before publication gives an insight into the pricing of OCTs:

The printing has cost just £70, then we have to pay your fund (an extraordinary charge, other texts not being copyright) as well as yourselves. We can’t very well put on a price which looks forward to a steady sale in schools and the disappearance of the initial cost after 5000 (at which point the editors always want to begin again). I made calculations on the 3/6 and 4/- basis; but at that price we should make hardly any profit if we sold every copy tomorrow. As far as we can judge the price does not seem to make such difference to the sale of the series in

Germany. Of course if a cheap pirate appeared we might have to take steps to meet him.<sup>58</sup>

## 5) Critical reaction

From the outset, this was mixed. As early as the April 1900 issue of *Classical Review* J.P. Postgate devoted part of an (unsigned) editorial to the series.<sup>59</sup> He noted that it provided evidence of the revival of scholarship in England:

Twenty years ago, we may safely say, such an undertaking would have been destined to collapse, whereas now there is a fair prospect of its being brought to a creditable, if not to a distinguished conclusion.

In his grudging manner, Postgate expressed satisfaction with the production and appearance of the volumes, but regretted what he termed the ‘tied connexion’ of the series to its place of origin.

But we cannot but feel that the existence of this ‘tied’ connexion justifies the question why the delegates of the Clarendon Press did not make their roll of editors more representative of the best English scholarship than it is ... In some cases the connexion between the editor and the text is not immediately obvious while others have to be taken entirely upon trust.

In contrast, Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve (1831-1924) writing in the ‘Brief Mention’ section of the *American Journal of Philology* gave a warmer welcome to the enterprise:

The list of editors includes many of the leading names in the classical world of Great Britain and Ireland, and in most cases special fitness will be recognized. Aeschylus has fallen to SIDGWICK ... Catullus and ROBINSON ELLIS infallibly suggest each the other ... As there is no English text, the price can be kept down in the American market, and, under the editorial supervision of such scholars as have been named, the series can not fail to find wide acceptance in this country as well as in England.<sup>60</sup>

The philosophy behind the series was never likely to win whole-hearted approval from those, like Housman, who thought it was a textual critic's role to show judgment without favour to particular manuscripts, and to eschew conjectures unless they were solidly based; nor from those who thought it an editor's duty to present the full manuscript evidence. This is reflected in the variety of critical responses. In many of the earlier reviews, the word 'conservative' or its implication appears.<sup>61</sup> Nonetheless the Press was able to point to a high level of critical appreciation: a document in the OCT file preserves a selection of favourable quotations copied from the Gercke/Norden *Introduction to Classical Scholarship* (published in several editions from 1910).<sup>62</sup> Even when the texts were criticised, the standard of printing and production was always praised.

#### 6) Relations with Teubner and others

From the outset the Press was careful to keep a watch on the Teubner series. Not all English schools had rushed to adopt the OCTs in preference, as a letter in 1904 from Frederick Brooke Westcott (1857-1918), Headmaster of Sherborne, makes clear.<sup>63</sup> Elsewhere, Ricker's letter of 1911 already referred to mentions the success that the texts were achieving in Germany against the competition from Teubner.<sup>64</sup> In part, this was due to the new texts that the series offered, against some of the older Teubner offerings; in part, to the higher standards of production. In France, matters were different and Teubner proved difficult to dislodge; Humphrey Milford (1877-1952) wrote from Amen Corner to Cannan that 'I am not very hopeful – seeing the completeness of the Teubner list, its entrenched position and its much lower prices.'<sup>65</sup> Pricing was a key factor and for some markets the Press was forced to reduce prices to match Teubner; as a result Teubner wrote to the Press in 1913 suggesting that the OCT prices were artificially low and offering in effect a form of cartel pricing.<sup>66</sup> The approach was rejected. During the First World War, Teubner lost markets outside Germany, but the OCTs were only able to make partial inroads into these markets, particularly Italy, where the cloth editions in particular were generally thought to be too expensive.<sup>67</sup> The situation there was not helped either by the publication of the Paravia series from 1916 onwards.

In the case of the Loeb Classical Library, the Press almost certainly lost an opportunity to disseminate the OCTs more widely. In July 1906 Charles Upson Clark (1875-1960) of Yale University had written to the American office of OUP in New York

and suggested, as a prototype Loeb project, ‘editions of your Greek and Latin texts faced by an English translation ... and provided with explanatory notes at the foot of the page’.<sup>68</sup> The translations were to be recognised literary works, so that the whole would have joint appeal to students of classical literature as well as ‘all lovers of good literature and attractive books’. Clark went on to cite Jebb’s Sophocles as one of his models and to name some of the editors and texts to be included, although only one (Plutarch by Bernadotte Perrin [1847-1920]) is identical with those eventually issued in the Loeb series. OUP New York forwarded a copy of the letter to Henry Frowde in London, with an enthusiastic recommendation and a request that the OCT plates might be used; Frowde passed this to Cannan, who promptly poured cold water over the idea. He felt that this was a purely American scheme:

... we could not do more than undertake to sell copies here with Mr Frowde’s imprint, and I don’t think there would be much demand in the ordinary course of trade though by the time the books were ready the Times might be mad enough to try to sell an edition. Personally I cannot understand how Prof. Cook [Department of English at Yale] is going to get an English class to have anything to do with the difficult Greek of Theocritus and it happens that the Greek masterpieces are particularly difficult ... Perhaps the mere sight of the Greek type will be educational.<sup>69</sup>

In 1919 Alfred Denis Godley (1856-1925) wrote to Cannan to verify whether the Press allowed its texts to be used for Loeb’s (he was preparing his Herodotus of 1920-1924 for that series); Cannan replied that:

I had years ago a correspondence with [T.E.] Page [1850-1936] and it was settled that Loeb would keep clear of our Texts: I really don’t see how we could have come to any other conclusion, Loeb having at the first plumped on Teubner.<sup>70</sup>

This is not entirely true. When the Loeb series began publication in 1912, the first numbered volume in the series was the Apollonius Rhodius of Robert Cooper Seaton (1852-1915), and the same author that Seaton had edited as one of the earliest OCTs (1900). He was therefore able to use his Oxford text as the basis of the Loeb edition. One other exception was made for Postgate’s Tibullus (1905 as an OCT, 1912 as a Loeb).



As far as the Budé series is concerned, there is little evidence of the Press's attitude, although it seems safe to assume that there would have been concern over the effect on sales in Francophone countries. The earliest Budé volumes were Plato, the *Characters* of Theophrastus and Aeschylus in the Greek series and Lucretius and Persius in the Latin; all of these had OCT equivalents. The one significant document is a memorandum from Chapman to Humphrey Milford, dated 12 January 1921, which followed a complaint by Cyril Bailey that his Lucretius edition had been plagiarised by the French editor Alfred Ernout (1879-1973). Since a new edition was shortly to be published (1922) Chapman, who suspected that the Diels edition of Theophrastus had been similarly used, was able to write to Milford that 'The impending n/e of our Lucretius text [published in 1922] will make the French editor look foolish, but the public wont discover that. Do you feel like WAR?'<sup>71</sup> Others took a more benign view of the newcomer – notably Phillimore. In October 1920, on the initiative of the Poet Laureate Robert Bridges (1844-1930), a circular letter signed by members of the University was sent from Oxford to Germany calling for a renewal of scholarly contact and reconciliation following the First World War.<sup>72</sup> The hostility that this caused both locally and at a national level was reflected in the correspondence columns of *The Times* during the remainder of October, and beyond. Phillimore took his stand on the question in an essay entitled *The comity of learning* published in *The Glasgow Herald* on Saturday 20 November (1920) in which he contrasted what he viewed as the tyranny of the Teubner with the infant Budé and Paravia series. The essay reflects both prevailing post-war nationalism and Phillimore's own sympathy for the tradition of French humanism.

## 7) After the First World War

One of the most important documents for the later history of the series is a memorandum, dated 16 November 1922, from Chapman to Humphrey Milford in London.<sup>73</sup> This gives a list of the titles then in preparation and sets out Chapman's own thoughts about the development of the series. The list includes Gilbert Murray's proposed edition of the fragments of Euripides (not published); Sophocles, where Murray (who had been asked to undertake this as well as Euripides by Cannan in June 1906)<sup>74</sup> resigned in favour of Alfred Chilton Pearson (1861-1935), whose edition was published in 1924; Murray's Aeschylus, which eventually appeared in 1937; and Hesiod and Pindar by Alexander William Mair (1875-1928).<sup>75</sup>

The remainder of Chapman's memorandum is worth quoting at some length, since it makes clear why the series developed subsequently as it did. He noted that:

A grave difficulty in the way of increasing the series is that the present-day editor seems unable to keep within the limits of space laid down by Bywater & Monro and on the whole fairly observed especially by the earlier editors ... I think future expansion of O.C.T. must be limited by two rules: 1) Accept no edition for which there is no real need' – here he echoes Walter Hobhouse's observation of nearly thirty years previously – '[t]his excludes authors of whom a satisfactory text exists in Teubner or elsewhere, though we might like to have them to fill obvious gaps ... 2) Do not encourage promising scholars to take up an author, but wait till an editor offers who is notoriously the right man and irresistible – as Pearson for Sophocles. This will no doubt prevent some useful work from ever getting done; on the other hand nine times out of ten the best editor is urged from within or from on high and is not deterred by caution.

The first of these rules would explain why some authors have never appeared in the series – an obvious example is Plutarch, where the Teubner editions of both the *Moralia* and the *Lives* have held sway together with the Loeb translations. The second would explain why more texts in the post-1945 period have appeared as adjuncts to larger editions, though often providing second thoughts on the text in the process. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the OCT of Plotinus (1964-1982) by Paul Henry (1906-1984) and Hans-Rudolf Schwyzer (1908-1993) that overlapped with the publication of their large-scale edition (1951-1973).

#### 8) Some conclusions

It is possible here only to present a few concluding comments. I have tried to demonstrate why the series came into being when it did, and that its conception lacked clarity of purpose which was reflected in the way it was received. There is no doubt that commercial strategies were uppermost; this explains the way in which the Methuen challenge was disposed of and the almost obsessive concern with matching Teubner on price until the First World War. The series also provided an opportunity to display high

standards of design, printing and production, to the credit of the Press. Beyond 1939, the development of the series has reflected social and economic changes, as well as historical factors. In the aftermath of the Second World War, for example, the Press looked abroad for potential editors – admittedly with limited success – partly in the same spirit that sought to establish scholarly contact through international bodies and publications, in contrast to the nationalism which lingered on after the First. In other ways the Texts have adapted, to include some authors, at least, outside the normal canon and to reflect new discoveries, such as Menander, or in editions of fragments. This in turn has diminished the emphasis on ‘brevi’ in the apparatus. Presentation is also less austere, notably since 1990 with the arrival of a preface in English. The variety of formats has gone. Economic conditions have changed, to the extent that sales of the series depend less on individual undergraduates, far less on schools, and more on institutional subscriptions, for which the market is worldwide. Such sales confer authority on the Texts, especially in an age of bewildering variety. Economies are possible now to a greater extent in book-production. The intermittent publication schedule remains a feature, and possibly a strength, for it chimes with the thinking behind Cannan’s often-repeated remark about the Press: ‘I do not think the University can produce enough books to ruin us’.<sup>76</sup> Perhaps that also holds true for the editors of classical texts.<sup>77</sup>

## **Appendix: List of Oxford Classical Texts, in order of publication by year, to 1939**

**(Exact dates are given where these are recorded in the Archive files)**

### **Greek texts:**

Aristotle: Nicomachean ethics edited by Ingram Bywater (1890)

Aristotle: De arte poetica liber edited by Ingram Bywater (1898, second edition 1911)  
Replaced by: Rudolf Kassel (1965)

Aeschylus edited by Arthur Sidgwick (1900)  
Replaced by: Gilbert Murray (1937, second edition 1955) and thereafter Denys Lionel Page (1972)

Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica edited by Robert Cooper Seaton (1900)  
Replaced by: Hermann Fränkel (1961)

Aristophanes edited by Frederick William Hall, William Martin Geldart 2 vols. (1900-1901, second edition 1906-1907)

Plato edited by John Burnet (1900-1908)  
I (1900, second edition 1905): Euthyphron etc.  
II (1901, second edition 1915): Parmenides etc.  
III (1903): Theages etc.  
IV (1905): Clitophon etc.  
V (1908): Minos etc.  
The *Res publica* was published separately in 1902, and incorporated into IV.  
Replaced in part by: Elizabeth A. Duke et al. (1995), Simon Roelof Slings (2003)

Thucydides edited by Henry Stuart Jones 2 vols. (1900-1901)  
Revised by John Enoch Powell (1942)

Xenophon edited by Edgar Cardew Marchant (1900-1920)  
I (1900): Historia Graeca  
II (1901, second edition 1921): Commentarii, Oeconomicus, etc.  
III (1904): Expeditio Cyri  
IV (1910): Institutio Cyri  
V (1920): Opuscula

Euripides edited by Gilbert Murray (1902-1913)  
I (1902): Cyclops, Alcestis, etc.  
II (1904, second edition 1908, third edition 1913): Supplices, Hercules, etc.  
III (1909, second edition 1913): Helena, Phoenissae, etc.  
Replaced by: James Diggle (1981-1994)

Homer edited by David Binning Monro\* and Thomas William Allen‡ (1902-1912)  
Volume 1\*‡ (1902, second edition 1908, third edition 1920)  
Volume 2\*‡ (1902, second edition 1908, third edition 1920)  
Volume 3‡ (1908, second edition 1917)

Volume 4‡ (1908, second edition 1919)  
Volume 5‡ (1912)

Demosthenes edited by Samuel Henry Butcher, William Rennie\* (1903-1931)  
I (1903): Speeches I-XIX  
II.1 (1907): Speeches XX-XXVI  
II.2\* (1921): Speeches XXVII-XL  
III\* (1931): Speeches XLI-LXI  
Replaced: by Mervin R. Dilts (2002-)

Bucolici Graeci edited by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (2 January 1906, second edition 1910)  
Replaced by: Andrew Sydenham Farrar Gow (1952)

Longinus edited by Arthur Octavius Prickard (1906, second edition 1947)  
Replaced by Donald Andrew Russell (1968)

Hyperides edited by Frederic George Kenyon (20 March 1907)

Aurelius Antoninus edited by Jan Hendrik Leopold (14 July 1908)

Herodotus edited by Karl Hude. 2 vols. (1908)  
Volume 1 (1908, second edition 1920, third edition 1927)  
Volume 2 (1908, second edition 1913, third edition 1927)

Hellenica Oxyrhynchia edited by Bernard Pyne Grenfell and Arthur Surridge Hunt (17 June 1909)

Theophrastus, Characters edited by Hermann Diels (24 May 1909)

Lysias edited by Karl Hude (1912)  
Replaced by: Christopher Carey (2007)

Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta papyracea nuper reperta edited by Arthur Surridge Hunt (1912)

Aristotle, Atheniensium respublica edited by Frederic George Kenyon (1920)

Sophocles edited by Alfred Chilton Pearson (1924)  
Replaced by: Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Nigel Guy Wilson (1990)

Pindar edited by Cecil Maurice Bowra (1935, second edition 1947)

Aristotle, De caelo edited by Donald James Allan (23 July 1936)

Aeschylus edited by Gilbert Murray (1937)  
Replaced by: Denys Lionel Page (1972)

## **Latin texts:**

Velleius Paterculus edited by Robinson Ellis (1898, 1928 as an OCT)  
Caesar: Commentarii edited by René Du Pontet 2 vols. (1900-1901)

Lucretius edited by Cyril Bailey (1900, second edition 1922)

Tacitus: Opera minora edited by Henry Furneaux (1900); second edition of Germania and Agricola edited by John George Clark Anderson (1939)  
Replaced by Michael Winterbottom et Robert Maxwell Ogilvie (1975)

Vergil edited by Frederick Arthur Hirtzel (1900)  
Replaced by: Roger Aubrey Baskerville Mynors (1969)

Cicero: Epistulae edited by Louis Claude Purser (1901-1903)  
I (1901): Epistulae ad familiares  
II.1 (21 July 1903): Epistulae ad Atticum, pars prior: libri I-VIII  
II.2 (21 July 1903): Epistulae ad Atticum, pars posterior: libri IX-XVI  
III (8 July 1902): Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem etc.  
Replaced by William Smith Watt, David Roy Shackleton Bailey (1958-1982)

Cicero: Orationes edited by Albert Curtis Clark, William Peterson\* (1901-1911)  
I (1905): Pro Sex. Roscio etc.  
II (1901, second edition 1918): Pro Milone etc.  
III\* (1907, second edition 1917): Divinatio in Q. Caecilium etc.  
IV (1909): Pro P. Quinctio etc.  
V\* (1911): Cum Senatui gratias egit etc.  
VI (1911): Pro Tullio etc.

Horace edited by Edward Charles Wickham (1901); second edition by Heathcote William Garrod (1912)

Propertius edited by John Swinnerton Phillimore (1901, repr. 1907)  
Replaced by: Eric Arthur Barber (1953, second edition 1960)

Cicero: Rhetorica edited by Augustus Samuel Wilkins. 2 vols. (1902-1903)  
I (1902): De oratore libri tres  
II (1903): Brutus, Orator, etc.

Terence edited by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell (1902)  
Replaced by Robert Kauer and Wallace Martin Lindsay (1926)

Martial edited by Wallace Martin Lindsay (1903, second edition 1929)

Persius and Juvenal edited by Sidney George Owen (1903, second edition 1908)  
Replaced by Wendell Vernon Clausen (1959)

Catullus edited by Robinson Ellis (1904)  
Replaced by Roger Aubrey Baskerville Mynors (1958)

Nepos edited by Eric Otto Winstedt (1904)

Plautus edited by Wallace Martin Lindsay. 2 vols. (1904-1905)

I (1904): *Amphitruo* etc.

II (1905): *Miles gloriosus* etc.

Stautius: *Silvae* edited by John Swinnerton Phillimore (1905, second edition 1917)

Replaced by: Edward Courtney (1990)

Tibullus edited by John Percival Postgate (1905, second edition 1914, third edition 1924)

Stautius: *Thebaid*, *Achilleis* edited by Heathcote William Garrod (1906)

Tacitus: *Annals* edited by Charles Dennis Fisher (1906)

Appendix Vergiliana edited by Robinson Ellis (1907); reprinted with *Vitae Vergilianae*, edited by Colin Hardie (1954)

Replaced by: Wendell Vernon Clausen, Francis Richard David Goodyear, Edward John Kenney, John A. Richmond (1966)

Asconius Pedianus edited by Albert Curtis Clark (1907)

Tacitus: *Histories* edited by Charles Dennis Fisher (1910)

Isidore: *Etymologiae* edited by Wallace Martin Lindsay. 2 vols. (1911)

Livy

Volume 1 (I-V) edited by Robert Seymour Conway and Charles Flamstead Walters (1914)

Replaced by: Robert Maxwell Ogilvie (1974)

Volume 2 (VI-X) edited by Charles Flamstead Walters and Robert Seymour Conway (1919)

Volume 3 (XXI-XXV) edited by Charles Flamstead Walters and Robert Seymour Conway (1929)

Volume 4 (XXVI-XXX) edited by Robert Seymour Conway and Stephen Keymer Johnson (1935)

Ovid: *Tristia*, *Ex Ponto* edited by Sidney George Owen (1915)

Phaedrus edited by John Percival Postgate (1919)

Terence edited by Robert Kauer et Wallace Martin Lindsay (1926)

---

Note on sources and citations

The main source is the Archive at OUP, which includes the Minutes (Orders) of the Delegates; the Minutes of the Finance Committee; the series of ninety letter books of Bartholomew Price (1818-1898), Secretary to the Delegates from 1868 to 1884, which record outgoing correspondence from 1868 to 1904; letters into the Press; a general file for the OCT series; files for individual titles, instituted by Charles Cannan, who became Secretary in 1898; the minutes of the Classical Texts Committee of the Press; and the house journal of the Press, *The Periodical*, produced from 1896 onwards at its London office – this is useful for dating

---

purposes. In one instance, the Classical Texts Committee minutes, the source is, or was, missing from the Archive; in others, records are incomplete – files no longer exist or have been weeded – so that the answers to some questions which they raise can only be inferred or remain unanswered. If all the relevant Archive records at OUP are taken into account, together with correspondence elsewhere, the texts themselves, and associated reviews, there are probably more than 1500 documents. I shall concentrate on the OUP Archive evidence in what follows. It is also necessary to remember that some of the development of the series may have taken place during informal conversations, held locally in Oxford, and otherwise undocumented.

All references are to documents in the Archive at Oxford University Press, unless otherwise stated. Quotations from these are included by permission of the Secretary to the Delegates of Oxford University Press. Quotations from the Jebb Papers are included by kind permission of Lionel Jebb; and from the letter by Housman from the Murray Papers in the ownership of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, by kind permission of Dr Alexander Murray and of the Society of Authors as the Literary Representative of the Estate of A.E. Housman. Reasonable attempts have been made to identify the author's estate or copyright holder for letters written to the Press.

The project file for the OCT series has the Archive reference CG59/309. DOB refers to the relevant Delegates' Order Book, with page number; FCM to the Minutes of the Finance Committee; PLB to the Bartholomew Price letter books, with following volume and folio number.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> There were only six Delegates present at this meeting: The Vice-Chancellor (John Richard Magrath), Ingram Bywater, David Binning Monro, Sir William Markby, Frederick York Powell and Charles Cannan.

<sup>2</sup> In the early Teubner texts, the apparatus criticus is printed as part of the prefatory material.

<sup>3</sup> Oxford, 1871-1881; second edition of vol. 1, 1879

<sup>4</sup> CG59/309: Copy of letter, C. Cannan to W.H.D. Rouse, 30 March 1917

<sup>5</sup> On the Teubner series see E. Menge and H. Marx, *The firm of B.G. Teubner and its connection with classical learning*, *Arethusa* 2:2 (1969) 203-211. At the time the OCT series was inaugurated in 1900, Teubner had more than 150 titles available.

<sup>6</sup> First on 16 February 1883, DOB 1881-1892, 93, clause 4 (1): 'The following proposals were taken into consideration: 1) The Vice-Chancellor [Jowett]: A Series of Texts of some of the principal Greek Classics ... The consideration of (1) was deferred, the Secretary being instructed to prepare an estimate of the cost of the undertaking.' It was subsequently considered on 14 December 1883, DOB 1881-1892, 131, clause 4. The mention of 'schools' in this context might seem ambiguous, in making possible reference to the Oxford usage for B.A. degree examinations, and therefore suggesting that the needs of undergraduates rather than school pupils were being addressed. This is as unlikely to have been true at that time, in view of school reforms and the establishment of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board (1873), as it was later when there are repeated references to the OCTs being directed towards both school and undergraduate use. On this see, for example, CP38/692: Copy of letter, Peter Spicer to Gunnar Carlsson, 11 November 1953: 'The O.C.T. series is designed for schoolboys and undergraduates, and the idea was always to give an apparatus as select and brief as possible.' See also notes 27 and 39.

<sup>7</sup> There is some evidence that Jowett was actively attempting to marry off texts and editors even before December 1883. S.H. Butcher – later to edit a part of the OCT Demosthenes – wrote to Richard Jebb on 7 August 1883 that he had received an approach from Jowett: 'Indeed I wrote to [Jowett] to find out his vision on some important points, eg whether in editing Demosthenes there should be any critical discussion about the genuineness of the speeches. if there is to be such, the edition at once becomes much more than text and analysis and essay on language ... But this is only one instance of the difficulties that arise in a compromise between a popular and a scholarly edition.' (Jebb Papers in possession of the Family).



---

<sup>8</sup> 6 June 1884, DOB 1881-1892, 154, clause 10. The five principles were: i) The texts were to adhere as closely as possible to the best MS. authority. Wherever uncertain, the MS. authority was to be quoted, and any conjecture admitted into a text to be marked [with \*]: any passage retained, though hopeless, to be marked [†]: important *various readings*, including emendations, to be added at the foot of the page. ii) *An Introduction* was to be prefixed to each author, giving: a) A list of MSS., a description of two or three of the most important, and remarks on the chief uncertainties of reading; also an account of the Scholia and a list of the best editions. b) The chief peculiarities of style, grammar, and any remarkable usages of words. iii) Short *analyses* in English were to be given: in prose authors, at the side of the page; in the dramatic poets, in the page itself, the play being divided into scenes, and the exits and entrances of the actors marked; the story in epic poets was to be analysed at the beginning of each book. iv) Full *indices* of names and subjects and a list of remarkable words were to be supplied. v) *References* to parallel passages or illustrations might also be added. A sixth principle referred to the remuneration of the editors ‘to be at the rate of 30s. per sheet of sixteen pages: the supervising editor was to receive a payment of 6s. per sheet of sixteen pages.’ A copy of the printed proposal (‘Series of Greek Texts’) recording these details and dated 10 June 1886 is inserted at DOB 1881-1892, between 243 and 244.

<sup>9</sup> 18 June 1886, DOB 1881-1892, 243 f.

<sup>10</sup> On Abbott’s approach to Jebb to undertake a text of Thucydides, see Jebb Papers (in possession of the Family) 58, E. Abbott to R.C. Jebb (received 26 June 1886).

<sup>11</sup> For the Sophocles, see note 3. The other texts published by the Press are: *Demosthenes*, ex recensione Gulielmi Dindorfii (Oxonii, 1846-1851); *Xenophontis Historia Græca*, ex recensione et cum annotationibus Ludovici Dindorfii. Editio secunda (Oxonii, 1853).

<sup>12</sup> R.C. Jebb, The speeches of Thucydides, in *Hellenica: a collection of essays on Greek poetry, philosophy, history and religion*, ed. E. Abbott (London, 1880) 266-323; also in Jebb’s *Essays and addresses* (Cambridge, 1907) 359-445

<sup>13</sup> W.W. Goodwin, On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 8 (1877) 69-86 = *Journal of Philology* 10 (1882) 214-232

<sup>14</sup> OUP/PUB/11/10

<sup>15</sup> 16 May 1890, DOB 1881-1892, 417, clause 4 (3). For the letter declining the proposal see PLB 50, 153: Copy of letter, C.E. Doble to F.W. Bussell, 20 May 1890.

<sup>16</sup> The question of the role of commentaries in education provoked widely differing views. In America, for example, John Williams White had written in the preface (p. viii) to the revised edition of his *Oedipus Tyrannus* (Boston, 1879) that ‘The day for putting a bare text and a Greek-Latin lexicon into the hands of a student, and telling him to elicit the beauties of his author, is happily past. The method of instruction that inducts the learner thoroughly into the spirit of what he reads, and makes him for the time a living, feeling actor in its scenes, must be the better.’

<sup>17</sup> Of direct relevance to the OCT series in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* are A.C. Clark’s *Collations from the Harleian MS. of Cicero* 2682 (1891), *The Vetus Cluniacensis of Poggio* (1905) and *Inventa Italarum* (1909); and Sir William Peterson’s *Collations from the Codex Cluniacensis* (1901).

<sup>18</sup> D. Wilson, *Gilbert Murray OM, 1866-1957* (Oxford, 1987) 56.

<sup>19</sup> Although texts with scholia for use in schools are comparatively rare there is a German example in the edition of Vergil’s *Aeneid* 2 by Ernst Diehl, which includes the commentary of Servius (Bonn, 1911).

<sup>20</sup> 8 November 1895, DOB 1892-1898, 150, clause 10.

<sup>21</sup> PLB 69, 89: Copy of letter, Philip Lyttelton Gell to the Master of Balliol (E. Caird), 11 May 1897

---

<sup>22</sup> 8 November 1895, DOB 1892-1898, 149, clause 5: ‘Dr [Thomas] Fowler called attention to the small number of remunerative books recently offered for publication by the Delegates, and it was resolved that the Finance Committee be requested to consider the following questions: 1) The payment of a royalty on books recommended as likely to be remunerative. 2) The issue of books in a cheaper style, either in lieu of, or in addition to the more costly publications. 3) The possibility of a prompter consideration and decision upon books proposed to the Delegates, and of holding Meetings during July and September with this special object. 4) The appointment of a publishing assistant in London specially qualified to push the sales of Educational and Learned Books: and, 5) The possibility of increasing the Educational Publications of the Press by discovering the wants of Schools and of College Tutors.’ Relevant to this is the fact that the Press was losing income in the US in its most profitable sphere, the sale of Bibles; and the termination of the agreements dating from 1883/1885 with Nelson & Sons (New York) for the sale of both the Bible and the Prayer Book from 4 September 1895. This led to the establishment of an American Office in New York in September 1896, the legal costs of which were substantial. After reference to the Finance Committee, several of the recommendations were adopted – though not that for a publishing assistant in London: 19 June 1896, DOB 1892-1898, 198, clause 10 (3).

<sup>23</sup> The Delegates (or Charles Cannan) first thought of ‘Bibliotheca Clarendoniana’. C.E. Doble (Assistant Secretary) wrote to Cannan on 15 July 1896 (PLB 65, 582): ‘... I can’t help thinking that the title ‘Bibliotheca Clarendoniana’ for the Classical Texts is a little ambiguous. The name suggests history rather than classics, and has a reminiscence of the Clarendon Historical Society which has published some seventeenth-century reprints at Edinburgh. But you have no doubt considered this.’ Cannan applied to Bywater for a Latin translation of ‘Oxford Classical Texts’ (PLB 72, 337: Copy of letter, Cannan to Bywater, 7 May 1898).

<sup>24</sup> 19 June 1896, DOB 1892-1898, 196, clause 3 (1)

<sup>25</sup> PLB 65, 102: Copy of letter, Gell to Henry Stuart Jones, 16 May 1896. Also PLB 65, 334: Copy of letter, Gell to Stuart Jones, 15 June 1896

<sup>26</sup> PLB 65, 369: Copy of letter, Gell to W.R. Hardie, 20 June 1896. PLB 65, 411: Copy of letter, Gell to Gilbert Murray, 26 June 1896.

<sup>27</sup> It is uncertain how early the exact purpose and readership of the series became codified. Later (certainly from the 1940s) dust jackets of the texts in the series would include the following description of the series: ‘The *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* now contains more than eighty volumes, and includes most of the authors commonly read in Schools and Universities. In undertaking the series, the Delegates were greatly influenced by the consideration of the educational advantages of a long series of Classical Texts upon a uniform plan. As the Oxford Texts are used by the Examiners for the Certificate of the Universities Joint Board and at the Universities themselves, volumes bought at school should serve as the beginning of a small library which will be used by its possessor throughout school and undergraduate life; and be a better stimulus to literary interest than annotated editions of the parts of an author’s works which are set for the next examination.’ Peter Sutcliffe (*The Oxford University Press: an informal history* [Oxford, 1978] 91) refers to ‘early prospectuses’ for the series containing a similar description. On school use see also notes 39 and 63.

<sup>28</sup> PLB 65, 487: Copy of letter, Gell to Cyril Bailey, 4 July 1896. PLB 65, 489: Copy of letter, Gell to A.B. Poynton, 4 July 1896

<sup>29</sup> Stuart Jones was paid £25 as a first instalment of the £50 due to him on completion of the first volume: 11 May 1899, FCM 1894-1900, 411, clause 5.

<sup>30</sup> The other editors were ‘diverted’ as follows: R.Y. Tyrrell from Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Pindar; W.S. Hadley from Euripides; [James] Gow from Horace; [J.D.] Duff from Lucretius; [A.S.] Wilkins from Vergil; and [G.] Ramsay from Tacitus.

<sup>31</sup> CG59/309: Memorandum of meeting, dated 3 December 1897. Also DOB 1892-1898, 402.

<sup>32</sup> CG59/309: Memorandum, H. Frowde to C. Cannan, 16 February 1899

---

<sup>33</sup> For Housman's review of Owen's Persius and Juvenal see *Classical Review* 17 (1903) 389-394; Owen's reply is at *CR* 18 (1904) 125-131 and Housman's rejoinder at *CR* 18 (1904) 227-228.

<sup>34</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin, 1906). Reviews of this and the text together include those by Edward Fitch, *American Journal of Philology* 27 (1906) 336-341; and Max Rannow, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 24 (1907) 1276-1291, 1308-1316.

<sup>35</sup> This changed only in 1990 with the publication of a replacement for Pearson's Sophocles of 1924, edited by Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Nigel Wilson.

<sup>36</sup> On the question of (non-)pagination see PLB 72, 238: Copy of letter, Cannan to H. Furneaux, 27 April 1898. 'We are trying to do without pagination, with the express purpose of issuing separate parts - or at least of using the plates to produce separate editions e.g. of Greek plays, and the op. min. [of Tacitus] have of course a still greater claim to be treated separately: though I am not quite sure whether we should not first issue them together. This can be considered later, though I foresee that the Indexes may bring the question on when they come to be printed. As to their preparation they should clearly be separate for each work; an Index Nominum is all that is necessary I think, but I will consult Bywater.' One of the earliest examples of such reprinting occurred in 1906, when Marchant's text of Xenophon's *Hellenica* was reissued with G.E. Underhill's commentary; both were originally published in 1900.

<sup>37</sup> CG59/309: Letter, J. Ricker to Oxford University Press, 16 August 1911. Ricker notes that 'the sale of [the texts] is increasing in Germany, and you will promote the importation if the desiderata of our book buyers are complied with'. In February 1920, a similar letter from Sir Arthur Hirtzel, editor of the OCT Vergil, drew attention to the fact that the lack of dates made it impossible to distinguish new editions (in the case he mentions, Euripides) – CG 59/309: Letter, Hirtzel to Chapman, 19 January 1920. Many of the published reviews also complained, as for example H[enri] G[raux], in reviewing the first volume of Burnet's Plato (*Revue des Études Grecques* 14 [1901] 330): '... mais la suppression de toute pagination, sans gêner précisément les recherches puisque les pages d'Estienne sont marquées en marge, constitue une innovation très peu louable, contre laquelle je ne cesserai de protester'.

<sup>38</sup> By this time, it is likely that a combination of factors (weeding of files, imperfect memory, etc.) led to some incorrect first publication dates being printed; the first volume of Thucydides is suspect.

<sup>39</sup> CG59/309: Memorandum, Humphrey Milford to Cannan, 16 July 1908: 'Gordon (not Goodson) of Tonbridge clamours for single books of the Republic. Chapman is I think going to consider possible divisions of O.C.T. in the spacious calm of August.' Memorandum, Milford to Cannan, 6 September 1909: 'I don't think it is worth issuing the unannotated single books (plays etc), except in response to definite orders (such as J.S.P[hillimore]'s); schoolmasters warmly approve and then lament that their boys are not up to plain texts.'

<sup>40</sup> By 1911, the following formats were offered: limp cloth (the distinctive tooled brown cloth) on ordinary papers; uncut copies in paper covers (at a saving of up to 1/- [£0.05] per volume); stout cloth, interleaved with writing paper; and – for certain volumes – India paper. Lindsay's Martial, for example, sold at 5/- (£0.25) in paper covers, 6/- (£0.30) in limp cloth, 12/- (£0.60) in cloth, and 7/6 (£0.38) for the India paper edition.

<sup>41</sup> Documented particularly in PLB 72; see for example 72, 384: Copy of letter, Cannan to A.C. Clark, 11 May 1898; 634/5: Copy of letter, Cannan to H. Furneaux, 13 June 1898: 'As to the spelling I have been through all the points left doubtful by Brambach, with Robinson Ellis and with the help of your replies to the questions ... We propose the compromise suggested by Brambach viz. V, u, v. As to the mistakes you find in Brambach it is not intended to impose his authority upon the editors on special points on which they [635] find him impossible or clearly wrong: but only to use him to set the standard to be followed when the editors have no special preference or conceive a point to be doubtful or tolerably arguable. Anything of sufficient importance may be mentioned in the preface, and a special spelling of a rare word might I should think be defended by the citation of the M.S. (or other) authority in the apparatus, might it not?'

<sup>42</sup> A compromise was eventually reached: Cannan wrote to Burnet on 17 May 1898 (PLB 72, 444): 'I saw Bywater today. He will agree to paragraphing the Phaedo & Republic etc.; but he is dead against inverted

---

commas; and himself is in favour of solid printing. I think therefore it will be safest to accept the paragraphing & no commas as a compromise. That is Jowetts plan.'

<sup>43</sup> PLB 72, 113: Copy of letter, Cannan to [D.B. Monro], 5 April 1898

<sup>44</sup> For a detailed discussion of Murray's Euripides and Aeschylus (1937), see C. Collard, Gilbert Murray's Greek editions, in *Gilbert Murray reassessed*, ed. C. Stray (Oxford, 2007) 103-32. Housman, to whom Murray had sent a copy of his second volume, described it as 'much the pleasantest edition and clearest apparatus to use', although he also noted [A.W.] Verrall's 'baleful influence' (Bodleian Library. MS Murray, 10 fol. 153: Housman to Murray, 4 November 1904; printed in full in *The letters of A.E. Housman*, vol. 1, ed. A. Burnett (Oxford, [2007]) 167-168).

<sup>45</sup> PLB 89, 149

<sup>46</sup> Volume 1.2 of the series = *Prisciani Lydi quae extant* ed. I. Bywater (Berlin, 1886)

<sup>47</sup> On Hude and Herodotus, see CG59/309: Copy of letter, Cannan to H. Stuart Jones, 29 April 1905. For a memoir of Hude, see Carsten Høeg, Karl Hude, 1860-1936, *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft* 271 (1940) 55-61.

<sup>48</sup> File OP750/5333: H. Diels to Cannan, 28 September 1908; I. Bywater to Cannan, 5 October 1908.

<sup>49</sup> *Index verborum Propertianus* (Oxonii, [1905])

<sup>50</sup> *Stoïsche wijsheid* (Rotterdam, 1904); *Ad Spinozae opera posthuma* (Hagae Comitum, 1902)

<sup>51</sup> File OP749/5319: J.H. Leopold to [Oxford University] Press, 17 January 1907

<sup>52</sup> St Andrews University Library, Department of Manuscripts & Special Collections (SAUL), MS 36326/215-229. Kauer's collations are also preserved.

<sup>53</sup> SAUL MS 36326/286: Copy of letter, Lindsay to Kauer, 25 December 1921; MS 36326/220: Letter, Robert Kauer to W.M. Lindsay, 30 December 1921. Kauer was also having to cope with hyperinflation in Austria.

<sup>54</sup> SAUL MS 36326/221: Postcard, Kauer to Lindsay, 9 October 1924; SAUL MS 36326/225: Letter, Kauer to Lindsay, 31 May 1926. According to the obituary notice of Lindsay by H.J. Rose in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 23 (1937) 487-512 (which also contains Lindsay's own memoir and bibliography), Lindsay 'came as near to anger as was possible to his mild and sunny nature when he found that his Terence rested on collations partly inaccurate; Kauer had not completed as he should the task of finding out exactly what the tradition tells us' (p. 504). This criticism needs to be read in the light of the Kauer/Lindsay correspondence as a whole.

<sup>55</sup> File OP750/5325: Copy of letter, Cannan to J.S. Cotton, 29 October 1907

<sup>56</sup> His work was issued as *Theopomps Hellenika* (Halle, 1909).

<sup>57</sup> File OP750/5325: Letter, A.S. Hunt to Cannan, 9 March 1909

<sup>58</sup> File OP750/5325: Copy of letter, Chapman to Hunt, 3 June 1909. Pirating of texts, and its effect on pricing remained a problem for the Press: pirated copies of the Homer OCT volumes in Greece meant that prices had to be kept artificially low.

<sup>59</sup> *CR* 14 (1900) 145

<sup>60</sup> *AJPh* 21:1 (1900) 110. *The Times* also published a notice of the first volumes (Friday 13 April 1900, 10), concentrating on Stuart Jones's Thucydides and Bailey's Lucretius with a discussion of the general editorial principles. The unnamed writer also hoped that the series would include Seneca, Lucian and Plutarch.

---

<sup>61</sup> Apart from notices in the *Classical Review*, other periodicals which reviewed the series regularly include the *Cambridge Review*, *Hermathena*, the Dutch journal *Museum*, and in Germany, the *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* and *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*. Some examples of ‘conservatism’: Thucydides, reviewed by S. Widmann, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 18 (1901) 33-36, 425; Sidgwick’s Aeschylus, reviewed by R.Y. Tyrrell, *CR* 14 (1900) 362-3; Apollonius Rhodius, reviewed by Edward Fitch, *AJPh* 22:3 (1901) 326-31.

<sup>62</sup> *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. A. Gercke and E. Norden (Leipzig, 1910-12<sup>1</sup>)

<sup>63</sup> CG59/309: Letter, F.B. Westcott to Cannan, 12 January 1904. Westcott wrote that ‘we rather affect Teubners etc, because of their “vileness”’ but suggested sending a circular to Headmasters ‘calling their attention to the expenditure etc attending the production, & asking them if they would be prepared (in the interests of English “scholarship”) to pledge themselves to use English printed texts’. This caused the Press to look more closely at the interests of schools; a document listing towns or schools where the texts had been sold is preserved (CG59/309: Memorandum, Frowde to [Cannan], 20 June 1904).

<sup>64</sup> On 31 January 1905, Cannan had written to Henry Frowde (copy in CG59/309): ‘Wilamowitz Möllendorf [sic] who is far the most brilliant classical scholar in Germany has just expressed a wish that Murray’s Euripides should come into use in Germany ... This, & some other German phrases suggest the question whether we are selling as many in Germany as we should. If not it might be worth while to try to get a German ally. Who is the chief German enemy of Teubner?’ See also Frowde’s reply of 3 February, and note 44.

<sup>65</sup> CG59/309: Memorandum, Milford to Cannan, 23 July 1907

<sup>66</sup> CG59/309: Letter, B.G. Teubner to H. Frowde, 30 October 1913

<sup>67</sup> CG59/309: Memorandum, H. Frowde to [Cannan], 5 December 1916. Frowde proposed to draw copies for sale at a lower price on the continent, to match Teubner.

<sup>68</sup> CG59/309: Copy of letter, C.U. Clark to Oxford University Press, New York City, 6 July 1906

<sup>69</sup> CG59/309: Copy of letter, Cannan to Henry Frowde, 1 August 1906. Cannan raised four objections: i) The difficulty of making the translation and explanatory footnotes face the text: ‘What will be done with say the second, sixth and ninth satires of Juvenal, and such parts of Horace as are untranslatable?’ ii) Some of the texts proposed were not even planned: ‘Plutarch in Greek would be a desperate undertaking which we have not thought of.’ iii) The proposed completeness of the series would mean the inclusion of ‘some very dull books’. iv) Most of the existing translations were copyrighted in England, so that the American Branch would have had to pay fees for their use. Nonetheless the Printer (Horace Hart) was asked to give an estimate of making a set of electroplates from the existing plates of OCT titles (CG59/309: Memorandum, Hart to Cannan, 26 July 1906). The cost amounted to £1097. Cannan’s views were echoed in an unsigned article on translations of the classics, in *The New Age* for 27 March 1913, 501-502.

<sup>70</sup> CG59/309: Letter, A.D. Godley to Cannan, 22 April [1919]; Copy of letter, Cannan to Godley, 23 April 1919. Godley’s Loeb used the edition of Herodotus by Heinrich Stein (revised ed., Berlin, 1869-71). On the early history of the Loeb Classical Library and the decision by James Loeb to adopt the Teubner texts, see Z. Stewart, *Gründung und Geschichte der Loeb Classical Library*, in *James Loeb 1867-1933: Kunstsammler und Mäzen*, ed. B. Salmen (Murnau, [2000]) 99-106.

<sup>71</sup> File LB1357-9: Copy of memorandum, Chapman to Milford, 12 January 1921

<sup>72</sup> *The Times*, 18 October 1920, 8, under the heading “Reconciliation.” Oxford letter to German intellectuals.’ Chapman was among the signatories. It was condemned in an editorial in the same issue, p. 13. Letters were published on the subject almost daily thereafter. On 22 October a second list of members of the University subscribed to the letter (p. 11). The Poet Laureate himself replied on 27 October (p. 13). The Vice-Chancellor’s letter was published on 30 October, p. 11 and effectively closed the correspondence.

<sup>73</sup> CG59/309. Memorandum: R.W. Chapman to H. Milford, 16 November 1922

---

<sup>74</sup> D. Wilson, *op. cit.*, 425, with reference to Bodleian Library, MS Murray 397, fol. 61

<sup>75</sup> On these and the other titles mentioned by Chapman, see G. Whitaker, What you didn't read: the unpublished Oxford Classical Texts, in *Oxford classics: teaching and learning 1800-2000* ed. C. Stray (London, [2007]), 154-167.

<sup>76</sup> Cited in Sutcliffe, *The Oxford University Press* (Oxford, [1978]), 115

<sup>77</sup> I gratefully acknowledge the generous assistance of Dr Martin Maw (OUP Archivist) and his staff, and of Dr Norman Reid (St Andrews University Library) and the staff of the Special Collections Department. I am also most grateful to Chris Stray for his advice at various points and for supplying references from the Jebb Papers; and to Dr Wim van den Groenendaal, who kindly translated various documents from Dutch for me. The paper has also benefited from comments when it was originally presented at the University of Glasgow and subsequently at the British classics conference, Hay-on-Wye, in 2005, and at the University of St Andrews in 2006.