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](#)

Dimitrijević's *Stubia Hesiodica* *Studia Hesiodica* scripsit Milan R. Dimitrijević. Lipsiae. B. G. Teubner, 1899. Pp. 1–234.

T. L. Agar

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 03 / April 1900, pp 165 - 166

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082305, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082305

How to cite this article:

T. L. Agar (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 165-166 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082305

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS.

DIMITRIJEVIĆ'S *STUDIA HESIODEA*.

Studia Hesiodica scripsit Milan R. DIMITRIJEVIĆ. Lipsiae. B. G. Teubner, 1899. Pp. 1-234.

The author of this admirable treatise, Milan R. Dimitrijević, was born at Belgrade in 1875 and died prematurely at Leipzig in 1897. Though the work of so young a man, the book is the work of a master: not only does it exhibit extensive reading and research, but the skill and power shown in dealing with a peculiarly difficult subject give clear proof of the high quality of the author's mental endowments. By his untimely death classical learning has lost a most promising disciple, and sympathy must also be felt for the bereaved mother, by whose wish this book was published 'pro monumento filii, ne deesset in litteris nostris optima spei memoria.'

The title, *Studia Hesiodica*, is perhaps hardly sufficiently definite: for of the received Hesiodic poems only that which we know by the inadequate title of 'The Works and Days' is here discussed. After enumerating the chief MSS., the most important being Parisinus 2771 (saec. X/XI) C and Laurentianus XXXI. 39 (saec. XII) D, supplemented by two Egyptian papyri, the first (A) belonging to the Austrian Archduke Rainer, and already used by Sittl and Kirchhoff for their edition, the second (C) not hitherto used but made known to the writer by favour of Prof. J. Nicole, the author first considers the question whether the poem was known to the ancients in its present form, and claims to have proved from the testimony of ancient poets and commentators that it was so known as far back as the 6th century B.C. It is inferred, perhaps rather too confidently, from a statement in Plutarch (vit. Thes. 20), that Pisistratus established the text with the assistance of either Onomacritus or Cercops, in fact that Pisistratus did for Hesiod just what tradition says he did for Homer. Probably the one statement is as likely as the other. At any rate Pisistratus will serve as a terminus *a quo* in attempting a history of the Hesiodic text. In passing, it may be remarked that many, indeed almost all, editors have supposed that we possess only a portion of a much longer poem, the *Ἔργα Μεγάλᾳ*, mentioned by Pliny. To this belief the author, following Sittl, gives no credit.

Now we come to the main purpose of the book, which is to establish on solid ground the assumption of two ancient recensions. Their relationship can only be ascertained from (1) the remarks of ancient writers, scholia, lexica, &c., and (2) from quotations of the verses of the poem in other ancient authors.

Consequently the scholia are subjected to examination. First comes the commentary of Proclus (A.D. 450) already edited in England by Gaisford from C. It is incomplete, as is proved from quotations in Tzetzes, the Etym. Mag. and other similar evidence. Next come the notes of the Vetus Grammaticus, hitherto anonymous but now identified by the author with Joannes Choeroboscus (A.D. 590). These notes too are proved to be merely excerpts from the original. The two commentators are sharply distinguished and an attempt is made to reconstitute their work by additions from Tzetzes and other sources. The discriminating test is the character of the annotation. If it be philosophical, moral or historical, it goes to Proclus; if grammatical or critical, it is referred to Choeroboscus. The dividing line is certainly clearly drawn, but we may doubt whether it is not after all too rigid. Soon it appears that Proclus drew all his historical and mythical lore from the older commentary of Plutarch, which was his primary source of information: in fact Proclus's work is to a large extent a rechauffé of Plutarch's with a colouring of Platonism. We have now to follow our author in his collection of the remains of Plutarch's commentary with its multifarious learning, its delight in moral interpretation and its disinclination to grammatical criticism. The proof is not always convincing; for it is hardly possible to feel complete confidence in the highly subjective argument, quod universa tractandi ratio redolet ingenium Plutarcheum.

In contrast to Proclus, the notes of Choeroboscus are essentially critical and grammatical. He draws upon the Scholia Vetustissima of the second century A.D., which again in our author's view are probably derived in the main from the writings of Aristonicus (B.C. 30) and Didymus (B.C. 10). Aristonicus wrote a dissertation *περὶ τῶν σημείων τοῦ Ἡσίοδου*, that is, an explanation of the critical marks attached to the edition

of Aristarchus (B.C. 210). Our author is decidedly of opinion against Waeschke and Flach that Aristarchus did not write a commentary on Hesiod. His argument against the evidence which is supposed to establish the opposite view (*v. pp.* 118 ff.) is strong and convincing. The commentary of Didymus recorded the opinions of Alexandrine critics, particularly those of Aristarchus, but the length of his remarks caused the scholiasts to prefer to make their extracts from the more concise Aristonicus.

Chapter III deals with the quotations by ancient writers, so far as they afford evidence of genuine variants. These are discussed with discrimination and good sense, but it may be well here to mention a few points of difference. In l. 64 Origen's *διδασκόμεναι* seems entitled to more consideration than our author is inclined to bestow upon it. The vulgate *διδασκῆσαι* is an atrocity, not in the least degree redeemed by Voss's apparent success in introducing *διδασκήσαιμι* into Hym. Dem. 144. Again I find it necessary to protest against the idea, broached and defended in a long note pp. 172 f., that *ἔδωρήσαντ'* could stand before *πῆμα* in l. 82 by apocope. This is a much more serious matter than *ἔπος* 'φυγεν, the harmless oddity we meet in a well-known edition of Homer. It opens a ready way for the introduction of the most admirable and inextricable confusion into our conception of epic metre. By taking a few more liberties of this kind, *e.g.* turning *ὄνεαρ* into *ὄνεαρ* with another eminent authority, we should soon be enabled to scan the greater part of Herodotus and Thucydides. In l. 199 the defence of *ἵτην* against *ἵτον* is not convincing, nor is *ὄς κ' ἔμμορε* from Stobaeus in l. 347 a variant of any value. In l. 352 the *ἴσα ἄτρησι* of A is really worth very little as evidence for *ἴσ'* *δάτρησι* pace Meineke and Nauck; for the writing *ἐκ πλήρους* must once have been universal. Still *ἴσ'* *δάτρησι* even without MS. support is a true restoration, though a surprisingly bold step for our

author, who rarely goes one jot beyond the tradition. He is essentially conservative and would doubtless have refused to believe that in l. 235 :—

τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσι,

setting aside the dispute between *γονεῦσι* and *τοκεῦσι* (D) the real remedy is transposition :—

τίκτουσιν δὲ γονεῦσι ἐοικότα τέκνα γυναῖκες.

To return to the author's conclusions, the *testimonia veterum*, he observes, are either all for, or all against, the vulgate, never against one another; consequently they, the *veteres*, must all have used copies of the same edition, which was different from our vulgate. Of this other recension, as our author calls it, we have 52 readings more or less important, in fact nearly all better than those of the vulgate. Again 17 lines of the vulgate were not in this edition, which however had nine lines which the vulgate does not give. Next comes the question, what was the origin of these two recensions. The vulgate was in the hands of many in the first centuries of our era. In the fourth it alone existed. Proclus and Choeroboscus had it: the Alexandrines, *i.e.* Aristarchus with his contemporaries and predecessors, had it not. Neither had Seleucus or Didymus. Finally, whoever was the author, it must be pronounced a bad piece of work. The other, the earlier and better, recension was probably executed by Aristarchus, who would have for a foundation to work upon the supposed edition of Pisistratus.

The above will serve to indicate the scope of this treatise. It is, as the preface says, *opus imperfectum magis quam inchoatum*. Its merits are very striking, but can hardly be exhibited here without copious quotation: enough however has been said to prove that the work is one that no conscientious editor of Hesiod's *Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι* can well afford to neglect.

T. L. AGAR.

PATRICK'S *SEXTUS EMPIRICUS*.

Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism. A Degree Thesis accompanied by a Translation of the First Book of the 'Pyrrhonic Sketches,' by MARY MILLS PATRICK. 8vo. pp. viii, 163 Cambridge, Deighton. 1899. 5s.

THIS little book deserves a hearty welcome as an introduction to the study of Sextus Empiricus. For the historian of philosophy the stores of information which Sextus accumulated respecting the tenets of his dogmatic foes have far more value than his