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](#)

***Divisiones quae vulgo dicuntur Aristoteleae.* Ed. H. Mutschmann. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xlii + 76.**

R. G. B.

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 04 / June 1909, pp 120 - 121
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003218, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003218

How to cite this article:

R. G. B. (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 120-121 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003218

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of accuracy, it possesses the further merit of simplicity and clearness, and reproduces well such virtues—they are not many—as can be claimed for the style of the original. The text adopted is, in the main, that of W. Christ (1895), and where Mr. Ross departs from this—as he does pretty often—the fact is signified in the notes. With regard to these notes, however, there is one general criticism I venture to make. Would it not be more clear and satisfactory to the reader if the authority for the lection adopted were stated in all cases? Often the change indicated is simply a reversion to the MS. tradition which Christ had discarded, but sometimes it is the adoption of a new conjecture; and at the expense of a very little extra space the student using the book might have been informed of the precise facts on each occasion. For this fault of method, as it seems to me, the blame rests, perhaps, rather with the general editors, who pursue a policy of rigid Laconism, than with the particular translator. Brevity is sometimes the soul less of wit than obscurity; and obscurity we find in several of Mr. Ross's notes. For example: '985^b 18 read τὸ δὲ Ξ τοῦ Η θέσει. Cf. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, i. 568': the change is excellent, but are we to understand that Gomperz is the originator? Again, how is a reader with Christ's text only before him to understand the note '988^b 28–29 read τῷ γῆν (?) . . . τῷ ῥαδίως. Cf. I. Bywater in *J. of Ph.* xxviii. 246.'

Apart from this one complaint, there is little fault to find with the book: it is (in spite of γῆν) well printed and furnished with a useful short analysis and a carefully compiled index. Mr. Ross deserves to be warmly thanked for the pains he has bestowed on his lengthy task, and complimented also on the skill and scholarship with which he has brought it to so successful a completion.

R. G. B.

Divisiones quae vulgo dicuntur Aristoteleae.

Ed. H. MUTSCHMANN. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xlii + 76.

THE 'Aristotelian Divisions' here printed are drawn from Diog. Laert. iii. 80–109 and from the Codex Marcianus 257. The

arrangement adopted by Mr. Mutschmann is to print first the 32 'divisions' of Diogenes, with the corresponding divisions of the Codex in parallel columns, and then to print afterwards in order the remaining divisions of the Codex, of which there are 69 in all. In the Preface, the editor gives us a sketch of the history of *δικίρεσις* as a logical method in Plato, Aristotle and the earlier Peripatetic school, with other matters pertaining to the question of origins, his conclusion being that 'divisionum nostrarum maiorem partem e vetere Academia et Peripato fluxisse.' At the foot of the text the editor prints not only critical notes but also—and this is a specially useful feature of the book—the pertinent *testimonia*, i.e. references to the parallels in Plato, Aristotle, etc. In addition to the earlier work at the text done by Cobet and V. Rose, the editor has had the advantage of consulting with Sudhaus and Wendland, whose names appear frequently in the foot-notes, and the result is decidedly good. Not that all doubtful points are finally settled; but most of these are likely to remain always in doubt, unless fresh evidence should be forthcoming. My remarks on matters of detail must be brief: D.L. 2, the notion of ἐρωτική φιλία might be illustrated from Xenophon. D.L. 5, Mutschmann's ἔργον, for θετόν of codd., is better than Cobet's θεατόν or Wendland's τέλος, and probably right. D.L. 8, it would seem more scientific to insert <καὶ ἀπολογίως> before rather than after καὶ κατηγορίας, and after καὶ εἰς (just above) perhaps κρίσεις might be inserted more plausibly than δικαστήρων. D.L. 11, τὰ δὲ πρὸς νόμους κτλ.; Wendland conj. περὶ for πρὸς, Mutsch. κατά, but read perhaps τὰ δὲ πρὸς <ὠφέλειαν οἶον> νόμος κτλ. (comparing the Marcian parallel). D.L. 13, the ed. after Sudhaus reads ἡ δὲ ἀνδρεία τοῦ . . . μὴ [ἐξίστασθαι] τρεῖν, the MSS. having μὴ ἐξ. ποιεῖν: Cobet deleted ποιεῖν, and Wendland conj. ποίει in place of it; more probable might be τόπον or τόπων. D.L. 19, for the 4th species a ref. should be added to the famous def. in the *Sophist*. Cod. M. 15, νόμοις φαύλοις καὶ μετρίοις: it is unlikely that μετρίοις stands for μοχθηροῖς, as the ed. suggests; read

perhaps ἀμέτροις or ἀλλοτρίοις. Cod. M. 6; if, as Sudhaus plausibly suggests, ἔχθρα is a blunder for καχεξία, we must transpose and write οἶον <καχεξία> νόσος κτλ. Cod. M. 30; read perhaps τὸ δὲ λέγειν <ὅτι> 'οὗτος ἐστὶν ἀληθὴς λόγος', ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστίν· ἐστὶ γὰρ πρᾶγμα κτλ. Cod. M. 41, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἀταξία κτλ.: rather than change ἀκολασία to ἀταξία twice, and add ἀταξία the third time,—as the editor proposes,—I should prefer to excise ἀκολασία twice. Cod. M. 42, the restoration proposed by the editor,—ὡς τὰ πολιτικά ἢ ἀνομοίως for ἡ τὰ π. ἢ ἀνόμοια,—has much probability, but why did he not go further and change the next ἡ to καί, to correspond with the other sentence-endings?

R. G. B.

Aristotelis de Animalibus Historia. Textum recognovit L. DITTMAYER. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxvi + 467.

Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles. Von GUNNAR RUDBERG. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1908. Pp. xxvi + 107.

It is safe to say that the new Teubner text marks a considerable advance in the study of the 'History of Animals.' The latest and best of previous editions was that of Aubert and Wimmer, of which Mr. Dittmeyer speaks in eulogistic terms, and to which, as his footnotes show, he is largely indebted; but, as regards their use of the manuscripts, Aubert and Wimmer were open to the criticism that 'criticis eorum ad-

notationibus non omnino fides haberi potest.' We may trust that in this respect the Teubner edition will prove reliable; and the editor claims that he records 'codicum A^aC^a (i.e. the representatives of the best family) omnes lectiones varias.'

Mr. Rudberg's 'Textstudien,' however, make it pretty certain that even the new Teubner text is not to be regarded as final. Mr. Rudberg deals mainly with William of Moerbeke's translation of the *Hist. An.*, giving a transcription of William's rendering of Book I. with the manuscript variants. He examines William's language and method of translation, and investigates the relation in which his Latin stands to the various Greek manuscripts. And finally he draws certain conclusions regarding the genealogy of the sources for the text—a problem which Dittmeyer, in his 'praefatio,' leaves untouched. Mr. Rudberg postulates an archetype, as representative of the first period of the text's history; as representative of the second period, he assumes the two archetypes which were the immediate sources of the two main families generally recognized (viz. A^a etc., and P etc.); close to this second period he places x, the source of William's Latin translation; and in the third period falls the division into the two families A^a, P. Whether these broader conclusions win acceptance or not (and they seem to require further proof), this careful study of William's style and value should prove indispensable to future investigators of the text of Aristotle. R. G. B.

CICERO'S ORATORY IN RELATION TO HIS RHETORICAL STUDIES.

1. *De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis* thesım Facultati Litterarum Universitatis Parisiensis proponebat L. LAURAND. Paris: A. Picard et Fils. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xx, 116. Fr. 3.
2. *Études sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron, avec une Esquisse de l'Histoire du 'Cursus.'* Par L. LAURAND. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxxix, 388. Fr. 7.50.

THESE two books, taken together, give an interesting and able estimate of Cicero as

a student of rhetoric and as a master of oratorical style.

The topics discussed in the Latin thesis are as follows:

I. What value did Cicero set upon the art of rhetoric? The conclusion reached is that he did not, as has sometimes been supposed, depreciate studies of this kind, but simply maintained that they must be conjoined with natural gifts, practice, and a well-stored mind.