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](#)

Diels's Presocratics *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Griechisch und Deutsch. Von Hermann Diels. 2te Auflage, Band II. 1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. Pp. viii + 469–864. 10 m.

A. C. Pearson

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 02 / March 1909, pp 48 - 50

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00002699, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00002699

How to cite this article:

A. C. Pearson (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 48-50 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00002699

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Seven Wonders 'owing to its sculptures' (p. 119). An angle capital, not only a volute, of this building is in the British Museum.

One of the many points which have specially interested me in this work is mentioned on page 114. What could Vitruvius have meant by attributing the invention of the Pseudodipteral formation of temples to Hermogenes, the architect of the Temple of Dionysos at Teos? I have often felt that the putting of the peristyle at a wider distance than ordinary from the cella can hardly have constituted a remarkable departure. The portico columns of most temples, including the Parthenon and Theseum, are at a distance from the inner row as great as the beams would allow. At Selinus the whole peristyle stands at a distance of two columniations from the cella walls, and this temple

happens to be given as *the* example of the Pseudodipteral arrangement in the recently issued American Dictionary of Architecture. The early Ionic temple at Locri had, I believe, a very wide peristyle, so also had some of the Doric temples of Paestum. Mr. Spiers himself gives the plan of the temple at Messa, on the island of Lesbos, and speaks of it as pseudodipteral, while in his chronology he places it early in the Fourth Century, and before any of the other Hellenistic temples, including Ephesus.

Of the Roman part of the book I have not space to speak. I can only say that it is fully equal in every respect to the Greek section, and even more indispensable, for there is no other book of any authority in English upon this subject.

W. R. LETHABY.

DIELS'S PRESOCRATICS.

Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und Deutsch. Von HERMANN DIELS. 2^{te} Auflage, Band II. 1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. Pp. viii + 469-864. 10 m.

THE appearance of this volume marks the further progress of the second edition, so that it is now complete with the exception of the Index Verborum. It is good news to hear that arrangements have been made for the preparation of a full verbal index 'with special reference to terminology,' and that its publication may shortly be expected. The present instalment contains the text of the Cosmologists and Sophists, with short notes at the foot of each page, the notes to the texts printed in the first volume, and a register of authors and names. The whole of the text, that is to say, the biographical and doxographical extracts as well as the actual fragments, is now printed uniformly in the larger type; and it is to be hoped that, when the book reaches its next edition, another improvement will be made by the transference of the notes to the Philosophers from the end of the second part to their

proper place below the pages to which they refer. There cannot be any practical difficulty in making this change, which has already been carried out to the great advantage of readers in respect of the less important writers printed in the present volume.

Prof. Diels has spared no pains in remedying the minor defects of the first edition: as illustrating the care with which the work of revision has been carried out, it may be mentioned that almost all the particulars to which exception was taken in this *Review* (xviii. 217 ff.) have now been modified. The principal additions to or alterations of the text in the second part are as follows. The chapter on Orpheus contains two new extracts (15^a and 22); but a passage in the former (p. 478, 28-30) is quite unintelligible as printed here. In the case of Epimenides, frs. 6, 7 and 17 of the old edition have been separated and rearranged, with certain additions, as belonging to a work bearing the title *Κρητικά*. A new chapter among the astronomers is now given to the fragments of the *Ἀστρονομίη* of Hesiod: this work,

formerly regarded as Alexandrian, is attributed by Diels, following Robert and others, to the sixth century B.C. The account of Pherecydes of Syros is enlarged by several fresh passages, and Acusilaus now receives complete treatment, whereas in the former edition Diels was content to refer to Müller, while pointing out certain additions to his collection to be found in Philodemus. A new chapter (73^a) has been added for the Seven Wise Men, which is however professedly incomplete: besides extracts from Laertius and Plato, it contains only the sayings preserved in Stobaeus (*fl.* 3. 79) under the name of Demetrius. I question if this addition is of much use, at any rate in its present form; and indeed, if Thales is left out of account, Dicaearchus was not far wrong in describing the Wise Men as οὔτε σοφοὺς οὔτε φιλοσόφους, συνετοὺς δὲ τινὰς καὶ νομοθετικούς.

As it may be predicted with confidence that this book will go through other editions, I subjoin some comments on points of detail, suggested by a fresh examination of the text and by the notes now first published: the references are to the page and line of the second edition. At p. 486, 22 surely *δρε* is required for *δρι*. At p. 531, 2 *δύη* takes the place of Meineke's *δύη* adopted in the *Poetae Philosophi*; but would not Timon follow the Homeric syntax? I cannot think *ὥς* is right at p. 577, 11; we seem to want *δι' ὃ*, or even *ῥ*. P. 580, 23: Richards' *ἀκροατήν* (*C.R.* xv. 298) should be added to the foot-note. Thinking that an adjective is wanted to balance *ικανώτατον*, I suspect that something has fallen out; perhaps we might read *δίκαι* <ὅν τε κρι> *τήν*. P. 618, 27 ff.: the arrangement of the text is very confusing, and the quotation from the scholiast on Aristophanes should be placed within brackets. On p. 619 (fr. 19) Eusebius is mentioned in the note, but the reference (*P.E.* xiii. p. 681 B) is nowhere given. In connexion with this fragment, I should have welcomed a note on the interesting word *αὐτοφυή*. L. and S., who certainly should not have compared Plat. *Prot.* 321 A, render *self-existent*, following (I suppose) Grotius and Valckenaer *diatr.* p. 41. But such a metaphysical application of the word seems

improbable; the only parallels I can find belong to a much later period. Cf. Suid. s.v. *Μαρκιανός*: *αὐτοφυή τὸν κόσμον καὶ διοικεῖσθαι οὐκ ἐκ θεοῦ*, the tenet of a man corrupted by Epicurean *δόγματα*. In [Plut.] *Plac.* i. 7, p. 881 E, *αὐτοφυή* is an epithet of *θεόν*, but Diels (*Doxogr.* p. 304) on other grounds refuses to ascribe it to Aetius. Similar to this is Aristid. i. p. 5, quoted by Valckenaer. I think that Clement's paraphrase—*ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸν μὲν αὐτοφυή τὸν δημιουργὸν γὰρ νοῦν εἰρηκεν*—points to an active meaning, *creative*, and that this is much more appropriate to the context. P. 627, 6: *ἐλεύθερον* is *unpledged*, see Wyse, *Isaeus*, p. 405. P. 661 (on Heracl. fr. 7): this fragment is most simply explained by being brought into connexion with frs. 98 and 107, so that in each case the worthlessness of sense-perception is contrasted with the intuition of *ψυχή*. Thus in *αἱ ψυχαὶ ὁσμῶνται καθ'* *Αἰδῶν* the emphasis is on *ψυχαί* (i.e., no longer *ῥίγες*): see also frs. 26, 27. P. 662 (on p. 66, 17): the reference to Anon. Iambl. is decisive in favour of Diels' interpretation. P. 662 (on p. 68, 11): the reference given for *δρέη=ἦτις* is wrong. P. 663 (on p. 71, 3): a note is required on the insertion of *τῆς*. P. 664 (on p. 75, 9): the supplement *τῆς αὐτῆς* is unnecessary, if *ἔξιν* is taken not as 'quality' or 'condition,' but in its special Stoic sense of *continuity*, i.e., unifying principle. Thus *κατὰ ἔξιν* = 'in so far as it is a unit': see the passages cited in my note on Zeno, fr. 56, 53. The subject to *σκιδνῆσι*, which is used absolutely, is not *θεός* (Bernardakis), but *θνητὴ οὐσία*. P. 665 (on p. 78, 13): Diels has changed his mind and now prefers *ἀγγὴ ξηρὴ ψυχὴ σοφωτάτη κ.ά.*, without giving any reason. The philosophical content of *αὐγὴ* deserves investigation: cf. Emped. fr. 135, and for the later schools, Chrysipp. ii. 611 Arn., Plut. *Mor.* 653 F. P. 684 (on Emped. fr. 15): the generalising *τε* is in place here and should not be changed to *κε*: the two passages quoted from the *Odyssey* do not support *κε* in a clause of general assumption. The very unusual aorists after *πρίν* and *ἐπεὶ* in the same fr. require explanation: cf. fr. 35, 3 ff. The thrice-repeated *αὐτὰ γὰρ ἔστιν ταῦτα* (frs. 17, 34; 21, 13; 26, 3) is rendered 'denn nur diese

(*vier Elemente*) gibt es,' i.e., 'only these exist,' not 'these are alone.' This is questionable (see Starkie on Ar. *Vesp.* 255); and I prefer the old view that the *reality* of the elements is asserted (i.e., 'they exist of themselves'). For another interpretation see Platt in *Journ. Phil.* xxiv. p. 246. Fr. 62, 1: the common view that πολυκλαύτων means *tearful* is to be preferred. A reference should be given to A 72. P. 688 (on p. 202, 5): the recently discovered commentator on the *Theaetetus* confirms Buttmann's κέρματα against the corruptions of Plutarch's MSS. Diels supplies ζώνθ' in the next line, but Alexander does not indicate that Empedocles drew this distinction: perhaps ὁσμᾶθ' (ὁσμάται) fell out before ὄσθ' ἀπέλειπε. P. 690 (on p. 209, 12): I think it improbable that μελάγκουρος means 'black-haired,' as Diels holds; and Hegemon's εὔκουρος proves nothing. Comparing εὔπαις, καλλιπαις, εὐπάρθενος Δίρκας, εὐτεκνος ξυνωρίς, I suggest that μ. = ἡ μέλαινα κόρη (cf. Theocr. 10. 26 f.). "Αἰδης μελαγχαίτης is another matter: if the reference is to *shorn*

hair, what is the point of μέλας? On fr. 133. Lucr. v. 100 should have been quoted. Fr. 30, 3 (cf. fr. 115, 2) πλατέος ὄρκου, and fr. 112, 1 κατὰ ('overlooking'?) require explanation. P. 274 (on Democr. fr. 179): Diels now gives ἐξω τί κως ἢ πονεῖν παῖδες ἀνιέντες, excellent palaeographically but not quite convincing. I laid no stress on ζωτικῶς, and cannot attempt to defend it here; but I must protest against the odd travesty of my suggestion which Diels inadvertently prints.

The following slips should be corrected. P. 58(A 5) and p. 67(B 31): the evidence of Aristotle and his commentators on the ἐκπύρωσις question is incomplete: e.g., *Phys.* iii. 205 a 3 is wanting. P. 77, 5: some words have been omitted from the text, as is obvious from the translation. P. 79, 4: ἄλλη is an error for ἄλλῃ. P. 187, 15: add a reference to 55 A 89^a. P. 189, 1: the reference should be Plut. *qu. conv.* viii. 3, 1, p. 720 E. P. 686 (on p. 188, 23): the MSS. reading should be given.

A. C. PEARSON.

T. W. ALLEN'S ODYSSEY.

Homeri Opera recognovit THOMAS W. ALLEN. Tomi iii, iv. Odyssea i-xxiv. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1908. 2s. 6d. paper, 3s. cloth.

IN 1889 A. Ludwich published his edition of the Odyssey, a revised text with an apparatus criticus based on the examination by himself and others of twenty-four MSS. In his preface he castigates and denounces with considerable freedom contemporary Homeric critics and their methods, appealing to the younger scholars to complete the examination of the extant MSS., to finish in fact the work so well begun by himself. This task, involving visits to libraries all over Europe, a task of immense extent and difficulty, 'opus non unius hominis' Ludwich calls it, has been undertaken and accomplished by Mr. Allen, who deserves every scholar's congratulation on his great achievement. With some help duly acknowledged,

he has examined and collated the extant MSS. of the Odyssey, more than seventy in all, with, as he says, only three exceptions, and the results of his labours are contained in these two modest volumes recommended by convenience of size, clearness of type, accuracy of printing and moderate cost.

This welcome text, one of the Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, must inevitably take the place of the time-honoured dumpy and ugly Oxford Pocket Edition, which with all its imperfections has so long held the field in the University. To compare the merits of the two would be an injustice to Mr. Allen's work, which challenges comparison with the very best. Though, perhaps, in general the necessity of extreme brevity has prevented him from giving in full detail much that can be found in Ludwich (e.g. ο 153, ω 532), yet by the grouping together of the MSS. into 'familiae,' indicated by small letters, he is often enabled to convey