



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): John A. Scott

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Jul., 1913), pp. 376-378

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/261704>

Accessed: 06/09/2010 19:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

its previous history, with noteworthy literature bearing on the subject. See, e.g., the notes on Messene, Locri, and Rhegium in chap. 1. The same is true of the brief biographical notices on the first appearance of historical personages, as, e.g., that on Brasidas in chap. 11. Thucydidean usage is carefully noted everywhere. By this is meant (1) words apparently coined by Thucydides; (2) ἀπαξ εἰρημύενα or rare terms; (3) Ionic or poetic words and constructions; (4) peculiarities of Thucydidean syntax. The notes involving all such points show careful and constant use especially of the Classen-Steup commentary. But there is abundant evidence everywhere that Stahl, Shilleto, Krüger, Hude, Boehme-Widmann, Goeller, Bloomfield, Arnold, and Jowett were always consulted. The manifest object has been to give the reader the helps that are really necessary to understanding the text. Praiseworthy lucidity as well as brevity characterizes the notes, and the edition can be heartily recommended as an excellent one for school and college work. The indexes—Greek, 13 pages; English (including names and places) 8 pages, in double columns—are unusually full.

C. F. S.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik. By ADOLPH ROEMER.

Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. xii+528. M. 16.

This book is a continuation of the work of over thirty years in which the author has devoted himself with peculiar enthusiasm to the attempted discovery of the true Aristarchus. The results of all this labor are most distressing, since they apparently prove that the scholia in Ven. A, hitherto regarded of unique value in estimating the merits and defects of Aristarchus, are founded on ignorance and dishonesty, also that Aristonicus did not have the ability or the desire to interpret him truthfully, that Didymus was unable to comprehend the great Alexandrian, and lastly that the excerptor, who has preserved in part the comments of Aristarchus as mutilated by Aristonicus and Didymus, was himself ignorant, incompetent, and dishonest. Roemer groups these three, Aristonicus, Didymus, and the excerptor, under the heading "The perfidious and scandalous group of swindlers." How are we to reach the true original through this triple barrier of ignorance and imposture? The attempt is frankly impossible, but here and there certain indications may be found, chiefly in Eustathius, Porphyrius, and Townleanus B, with an occasional hint from Plutarch and Athenaeus, while the supposedly valuable scholia in Ven. A are to be ignored as entirely worthless. No work based on the reliability of Ven. A is of any value, hence this sad verdict on p. 501: "So wenig wie Lehms hatte Cobet eine Ahnung von der Aristarchischen Exegese."

This book is most difficult reading and demands the widest study in the same field in order to be able to determine the worth of the arguments, a study

few or none besides the author himself could have made. By the most intricate and erudite comparison of scattered scholia, Eustathius, and Porphyrius, it is shown that Ven. A credits Aristarchus with the very theories which he vigorously fought. Two examples will suffice to show how false these comments of A are.

X 329: οὐδ' ἄρ' ἀπ' ἀσφάραγον μελή τάμε χαλκοβάρεα,
ᾧφρα τί μιν προτιείποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσιν.

to which Ven. A has the following: (α) ἀθετείται ὅτι γελοῖος εἰ ἢ μελίᾳ ἐπετήδευσε μὴ ἀποταμῆν τὸν ἀσφάραγον, ἵνα προσφωνήσῃ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα. (β) ἀπολογούμενοι δέ φασιν, ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τύχης συμβεβηκὸς αἰτιατικῶς ἐξενήροχεν (Ariston.). By a series of convincing proofs and parallels the author shows that this reading is a distortion of the following: (α) ἀθετείται [ὑπὸ Ζηροδότου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους], ὅτι γελοῖος κτλ. (β) [κακῶς · καὶ ἀντιλέγει δι' ὑπομνημάτων Ἀρίσταρχος] ὅτι τὸ κτλ. Aristarchus is thus charged with the errors of the very men whom he sought to refute. A second and more striking illustration is found in

Ψ 405: ἦτοι μὲν κείνοισιν ἐριζέμεν οὐ τι κελεύω,
Τυδείδω ἵπποισι δαίφρονος, οἷσιν Ἀθήνη
νῦν ᾠρεξε τάχος καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ κῦδος ἔθηκεν.

ἀθετοῦνται οἱ δύο · πῶς γὰρ τὸ ἐκ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς γενόμενον ὀδεν ὁ Ἀντίλοχος; καὶ τὸ Τυδείδω ἵπποισιν . . . δηλον, ὅτι περὶ τοῦ Διομήδους ὁ λόγος A. Here, by the method followed in the previous example, Roemer shows the true reading should be: (α) ἀθετοῦνται οἱ δύο [ὑπὸ Ζηροδότου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους]. πῶς γὰρ κτλ. (β) [ἀντιλέγει δὲ δι' ὑπομνημάτων ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος, ὅτι ταῦτα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖ λέγοντα ὁ ποιητὴς τὸν Ἀντίλοχον.] Aristarchus was not the apostle of the law of analogy, but the opponent, and his position in practically all matters was the reverse of that implied in Ven. A. Thus the structure erected on these scholia by Cobet, Lehrs, and their followers crumbles.

Having removed the errors Roemer tries to give a revaluation of the work of the Alexandrians. His conclusions are as follows, though the foundations on which they rest are admittedly weak, since A is not to be regarded; Zenodotus had no conception of Homer or his times, and so accordingly tried to force him into the mold of a third-century philosopher, and ignoring tradition he emended or excluded verses at will; Aristophanes, though less radical, made no contribution to the appreciation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; Aristarchus was the first to grasp either the functions of an editor or the meaning of Homer. He saw that Homer belonged to a different world in culture, morals, and mythology; accordingly he did not try to fit Homer into the ideas of Alexandria, but let Homer interpret his own age, and advanced the true principle of explaining Homer from Homer. Aristarchus has never been surpassed in the ability and industry with which he investigated epic poetry. He was not understood, since a myth grew up about him that his

work was done under inspiration, whereas it was the fruit of careful and systematic observations. His work was a mystery to Aristonicus and Didymus, who failed utterly to comprehend the meaning or results of his labors, and their faulty transcripts or comments were in turn mutilated by an incompetent and indolent excerptor. The recovery of Aristarchus, without the discovery of new materials, is impossible.

The results of Roemer's studies are staggering and might well discourage anyone from studying the scholia to Homer, since it is impossible for any but the specialist to rectify a mistake or omission by the ready knowledge of Eustathius, Porphyrius, or outlying comments—comments not referring to the passage in question and whose meaning can be grasped only by the most shrewd combinations.

The importance of the author's work is such that there is a real need that all his writings in this field be collected into a single, compact volume. This is not an impossibility, since Professor Roemer's style is peculiarly adapted to condensation.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

The Golden Latin Gospels in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan. . . .

Now Edited for the First Time, with Critical Introduction and Notes, and Accompanied by Four Full-Page Facsimiles. By H. C. HOSKIER. New York: Privately Printed, MCMX.

This is a sumptuous and elaborate edition of the beautiful Gospels, written in golden letters on purple vellum, which formerly belonged to the collection of the Duke of Hamilton, and are frequently denominated "Hamilton 251." The present editor adopts the symbol p.

The volume contains an Introduction, of over 100 pages, devoted to a description of the manuscript, with detailed comparisons and discussions of other Vulgate MSS in connection with it. This Introduction is followed by Preliminary Remarks, giving different views as to the date and origin of the MS, and a careful, detailed description of the various hands to be distinguished in it, with peculiarities of each. And finally, we have the "Lectioes Variæ," a list of peculiar readings, with comparison of a large number of other MSS, quotations from the Fathers, etc.

An Appendix deals with another biblical fragment M̄ in the Morgan library.

It is a pity that so important a book should be disfigured by the style in which the subject-matter is treated. A serious work for the use of scholars is not the place for the facetiousness and diffuseness which characterize Mr. Hoskier's discussions. His paragraphing is excessive and unsystematic; he often makes independent sentences out of subordinate clauses (e.g. pp. xcv,