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](#)

Dittrich's *Aetia* of Callimachus *Callimachi Aetiorum Librum I., prolegomenis, testimoniis, adnotatione critica, auctoribus imitatoribus* instruxit Eugenius Dittrich. Leipzig: Teubner, 1896. 2 Mk.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 09 / December 1896, pp 442 - 442

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205118, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205118

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 442-442 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205118

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DITTRICH'S *AETIA* OF CALLIMACHUS.

Callimachi Aetiorum Librum I., prolegomenis, testimoniis, adnotatione critica, auctoribus imitatoribus instruxit EUGENIUS DITTRICH. Leipzig: Teubner, 1896. 2 Mk.

THIS dissertation on the first book of the *Aëtia* of the poet Callimachus forms part of the twenty-third supplemental volume to Fleck-eisen's *Jahrbücher*, and extends to fifty-two pages. It includes a copious index nominum, which greatly adds to its value.

Dr. Dittrich has spared no trouble to obtain the *sources* of the fragments, out of which he reconstructs the first book of the *Aëtia*, in the most correct form. I mean that he has, wherever possible, procured new collations of the best MSS. of the various authors, Ammonius, Choeroboscus, the *Ety-mologicon Magnum* and four other lexica, Galen, Stephanus Byzantius, &c., in which the *Aëtia* are cited. See the list on pp. 204-5.

The plan of the treatise is as follows. First, the main discussion, in which the fragments expressly assigned to Bk. I. are arranged in something like probable order, and other fragments, quoted as by Callimachus, but not attributed to the *Aëtia*, are added as finding a place naturally in the series. In this section Schneider's *Callimachea* is naturally the ground-work; as naturally, the conclusions of Schneider are accepted with many reservations. Every one who has followed the literature of Callimachus knows how far below the level of Schneider's *Nicandrea* is this his latest work, indispensable as it notwithstanding is, partly from the vast grammatical erudition which distinguished Schneider among contemporary philologists, partly from the diligence with which he has recorded the opinions of other scholars, not only great names like Bentley, Blomfield, Näke, Gaisford, Meineke, Bergk, but men who like Hecker, Bachmann, Dilthey, &c., have made a special study of Alexandrian literature. Next to Schneider, Dr. Dittrich gives much weight to the opinions of Hecker, whose masterly work on

the Greek Anthology is not so well known in England as it deserves to be.

The Dissertation (p. 167-200) is followed by an *Argumentum Lib. I. Aetiorum* in which Dittrich draws out in sequence what he imagines to have been the plan of the poem. He considers it to have contained nine Elegies, the connecting thread in all of which was the story of Io's wanderings. Interwoven with this were other favourite stories of Greek mythology, e.g. Coroebus, Linus, the death of Ajax son of Oileus, the Oenotzopae, the legends connected with the building of Troy (pp. 201-204). Then the chief MSS. containing the fragments, and an epigram, first printed by Hagen, which gives a catalogue of the works of Callimachus, where I find a verse very interesting to students of Ovid's *Ibis*—

σκόπτω δ' ἐπ' ἀραῖς Ἴβιν Ἀπολλώνιον,

on which epigram Reitzenstein has written in *Hermes* xxvi. p. 308 sqq.

The actual fragments of *Aëtia* I, with the authors who cite them, the readings of the best MSS., and the conjectures of scholars, are contained on pp. 206-214.

I have found this work interesting all through, and though often disinclined to argue from particular fragments to conclusions as bold and decided as Dr. Dittrich's (some are so short that *no* argument can be drawn from them), am very grateful for this new excursion into a somewhat neglected field. In the treatment of his subject our author has worked in not a little Latin poetry, especially Ovid. I could wish that the *Ibis* scholia were better than they are; but even they have found a recognition, though a somewhat dubious one, in this treatise; and it is probable that if Egyptian researches recover any portion of the *Aëtia*, we shall come across many old friends, familiar to us from the *Ibis* and the *Metamorphoses*.

ROBINSON ELLIS.