



476242

930.1 J17

Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby

a cura di
Carmine Ampolo



EDIZIONI
DELLA
NORMALE

Seminari Arnaldo Momigliano, I
Scuola Normale Superiore
Pisa 18-19 dicembre 2002

redazione di
Donatella Erdas, Anna Magnetto

© 2009 Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa
Prima edizione: marzo 2006
Seconda edizione riveduta e ampliata: novembre 2009
ISBN 978- 88-7642-365-9

Indice

Premessa e apertura dei lavori CARMINE AMPOLO	1
La vita e la carriera di Felix Jacoby MORTIMER CHAMBERS	5
Lo Jacoby di Arnaldo Momigliano RICCARDO DI DONATO	31
Jacoby's Hesiod: Dissonances of an Anti-Harmonist GLENN W. MOST	45
Risposta a Glenn W. Most GRAZIANO ARRIGHETTI	63
Gli studi omerici di Felix Jacoby FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI	69
L'indagine di Jacoby sugli usi funerari ateniesi FRANCESCA MALTOMINI	93
Il <i>Patrios Nomos</i> di Jacoby, la critica del testo, il cimitero del Kerameikos nell'immaginario civico ateniese BENEDETTO BRAVO	109
Jacoby e l'elegia latina LUIGI GALASSO	133
Risposta a L. Galasso GIAN BIAGIO CONTE	145

Storiografia e letteratura antiquaria. Le scelte di Felix Jacoby GUIDO SCHEPENS	149
Il problema della storia locale LEONE PORCIANI	173
Risposta a L. Porciani MARIO TELÒ	185
Aspetti dell'etnografia in Jacoby ANDREA ZAMBRINI	189
«Zwischen Philologie und Geschichte». Il contributo dei <i>FGrHist</i> all'edizione dei grammatici greci antichi FAUSTO MONTANA	201
Felix Jacoby, Arnaldo Momigliano e l'erudizione antica BENEDETTO BRAVO	227
Felix Jacoby and Ancient Greek Chronography ASTRID MÖLLER	259
Jacoby e la storiografia su Roma arcaica CARMINE AMPOLO	277
La nuova collana «I Frammenti degli Storici Greci» EUGENIO LANZILLOTTA	287
<i>Unus testis?</i> La discussione su Jacoby e il nazismo CARMINE AMPOLO	293
Felix Jacoby <i>Ueber die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente</i> , in «Klio», IX, 1909, pp. 80-123 Note di aggiornamento bibliografico a cura di LEONE PORCIANI	299 345
Il carteggio Jacoby-Meyer. Un piano inedito per la struttura dei <i>FGrHist</i>	357
Indice degli autori antichi e moderni	397
Indice delle fonti antiche	405



Ex libris di F. Jacoby.

Premessa e apertura dei lavori

«È forse simbolico che il più grande lavoro filologico di questo secolo nel campo greco-romano sia il commento ai frammenti degli storici greci di F. Jacoby (1923 sgg.)». Così scriveva A. Momigliano nel 1958, a supporto ed esemplificazione della sua tesi della «fine della millenaria distinzione tra filologia, antiquaria e storia»¹. Da parte di Momigliano si tratta di uno dei tanti segni del suo altissimo apprezzamento per Jacoby, da un duplice punto di vista: per il valore filologico dell'opera e per il valore storiografico che per lui aveva il superamento della differenza tra antiquaria e storia. È un tema controverso per la storiografia antica ed anche per quella moderna; ed è uno dei temi su cui verterà il nostro seminario. Del resto, quello di Momigliano non è certo un giudizio isolato. In uno dei più informati e bei profili biografici contenuti nel volume *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia*, curato da Ward W. Briggs e W. M. Calder III, Mortimer Chambers riporta la semplice opinione di un collega del Christ Church di Oxford, Robert Dundas: «Jacoby era l'uomo più dotto d'Europa»².

¹ *L'eredità della filologia antica e il metodo storico*, in «RSI», LXX, 1958, pp. 442-458 [= *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Roma 1960, pp. 463-480], che in origine doveva essere una voce di enciclopedia. Si noti che Momigliano aggiunse nella ristampa dell'articolo nei *Contributi* l'indicazione «conclusioni che desidero discusse e corrette». Da scolaro di G. De Sanctis – che fu egli stesso critico poco benevolo dei primi scritti di F. Jacoby anche per motivi 'di scuola' (Beloch vs Wilamowitz) – in un primo momento aveva espresso un giudizio molto meno positivo; ad es. il criterio usato nei *FGrHist*, basato sui generi, era criticato per influenza dell'estetica crociana.

² New York-London 1990, pp. 205-210; la citazione è a p. 205.

Le citazioni potrebbero facilmente moltiplicarsi, ma chiunque usi assiduamente i *FGrHist* ed abbia letto i commenti o l'*Atthis*, anche quando non ne condivida le idee, è preso da un senso di ammirazione, se non di vertigine, davanti all'opera immensa di un unico studioso. Ciò giustifica già ampiamente la scelta di un seminario su di lui. Vi è poi un collegamento, non solo ideale, con i famosi seminari di storia della storiografia e degli studi classici che Arnaldo Momigliano tenne a lungo qui alla Scuola Normale, e di cui molti di noi, a partire dal nostro Direttore, Salvatore Settis, hanno un ricordo indelebile. Come alcuni ricorderanno, proprio l'opera di F. Jacoby avrebbe dovuto essere oggetto del seminario di Momigliano l'anno della sua scomparsa. In questo spirito, come allora anche oggi, si è cercato di mettere insieme studiosi affermati e giovani studiosi di valore della Scuola Normale Superiore o comunque a contatto con essa.

Può sembrare presunzione occuparsi di un colosso come Jacoby, scolaro di Diels e legato a Wilamowitz; ma si tratta solo di indagare criticamente la storia dei nostri studi e di fare scuola attraverso questo confronto vitale, facendo sempre rivivere l'opera di grandi maestri, con libertà di giudizio e rispetto insieme, nell'ambiente stimolante della Scuola Normale, che unisce ricerca avanzata, tradizione e circolazione di idee nuove. Tra l'altro proprio qui si porta avanti il progetto di un Lessico storiografico greco (ora ampliato anche al latino) concepito da G. Nenci, continuato da U. Fantasia e da me stesso, grazie alla collaborazione di giovani studiosi, tra cui ricordo in particolare, in veste di coordinatore, Leone Porciani³. E alla Scuola Normale si incoraggia, in vari settori, la ricerca sulla memoria dell'antico e sulla storia degli studi classici (che verrà potenziata grazie all'azione decisiva di Salvatore Settis, che qui ringrazio).

Mi preme chiarire che si tratta di un Seminario di lavoro con tempi purtroppo serrati e non di un congresso puramente 'accademico'. Mi scuso quindi in anticipo di uno stile molto informale e privo

³ Il primo fascicolo del *Lexicon Historiographicum Graecum et Latinum* (abbr. *LHG&L*) è stato pubblicato nel 2004 presso la Scuola Normale Superiore dalle Edizioni della Normale.

dei rituali tipici di molti convegni. A parte le relazioni preliminari generali e quelle relative a nuovi progetti di edizione di frammenti storici, per gli altri contributi è prevista una discussione affidata a singoli studiosi.

Il Seminario si apre con una relazione di Mortimer Chambers, che da tempo prepara una biografia di F. Jacoby, attesa anche per chiarire alcuni punti oscuri o dibattuti della vita dello studioso dalla formazione fino all'atteggiamento verso il nazismo, atteggiamento che comunque non pare incidere sulla sua immensa opera scientifica. Alcune anticipazioni hanno già destato molto interesse.

Seguono relazioni su singoli settori o scritti, senza una pretesa di totalità, ma cercando comunque di dare una idea d'assieme attraverso interventi dedicati ai diversi campi di cui si occupò Jacoby (e non solo ai frammenti degli storici, all'*Atthis* o alla voce *Herodotos* nella *Realencyklopädie*). Ci sono lacune dolorose, alcune dovute a motivi contingenti altre a scelte consapevoli, ma per avere un quadro completo avremmo dovuto prolungare troppo il seminario, trasformandolo in un ampio convegno, cambiando, per così dire, *ghenos* o genere letterario.

Desidero ringraziare tutti i partecipanti, e soprattutto coloro che hanno accettato di presentare una relazione in tempi ravvicinati.

Un grazie particolare alle mie collaboratrici, anch'esse peraltro giovani studiose di valore, Anna Magnetto e Donatella Erdas, il cui aiuto è stato per me fondamentale.

Un augurio a tutti noi di buon lavoro, consapevole che, come dicevano i Greci, χαλεπὰ τὰ καλά.

CARMINE AMPOLO
Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

Jacoby's Hesiod: Dissonances of an Anti-Harmonist

Perhaps the rest of us, still wrestling with the demons of our innate mediocrity or by now almost resigned to them, can derive some degree of consolation from the reflection that even the greatest philologists have had their failings. Richard Bentley was not only the universally admired unmasker of the Epistles attributed to Phalaris and the epoch-making editor of the Latin poetry of Horace and Terence; he was also the indefatigable but thoroughly misguided emender of the already entirely correct text of Milton's English poems, which he imagined had been corrupted by the secretary to whom Milton had dictated them in his blind old age but who instead had passed on to the world texts vitiated by false readings so numerous and so desperate that only the prince of conjectural criticism could possibly correct them. Friedrich August Wolf was not only the widely revered founding father of German *Altertumswissenschaft* and the author of the *Prolegomena ad Homerum* which defined the field of Classics for generations thereafter; he also edited Cicero's four orations *post reditum* in a futile attempt to prove their inauthenticity, and was convinced as well of the spuriousness of the *pro Marcello*. And Felix Jacoby was not only the editor of the *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* which remains one of the enduring monuments of 20th century Classical scholarship and a labyrinth of erudition whose complex structure and winding byways every graduate student in the field must learn to master if he is to qualify himself as a serious scholar; he was also the author of *Hesiodstudien zur Theogonie*¹ and the editor of *Hesiodi Carmina. Pars I. Theogonia*².

¹ F. JACOBY, *Hesiodstudien zur Theogonie*, in «Hermes», LXI, 1926, pp. 157-191 (= F. JACOBY, *Kleine Philologische Schriften*, hrsg. v. H.J. Mette, I, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag 1961, pp. 219-48).

² F. JACOBY (ed.), *Hesiodi Carmina, Pars I. Theogonia*, Berlin, Weidmann 1930.

It is easy to understand why even those who know something about Jacoby's work on ancient history, and those who know something about Hesiod, might be less than entirely familiar with these two works of his on Hesiod. For – in comparison with the vast archipelago of Jacoby's scholarship on ancient history and historiography, on Latin elegiac and didactic poetry, his numerous contributions to Pauly-Wissowa, and his impassioned pronouncements on the teaching of the classical languages in the German schools – his article and his edition of the *Theogony* might well give the appearance of standing alone, like two tiny islands, far away from the main shipping lines, unvisited by tourists, bleak and windswept. Not only have they been left behind almost entirely by the development of scholarship on Hesiod over the past seventy years – characteristically, what has continued to be reprinted since then, and to provide fruitful stimulus for further research, has not been Jacoby's edition itself, but rather Paul Friedländer's celebrated and devastating review of it in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*³. What is more, the links between this article and edition on the one hand and Jacoby's earlier and later works on the other are far from obvious. Of the 259 publications listed by Herbert Bloch in his bibliography of Jacoby's scholarly works, these are the only two whose titles indicate that they have anything at all to do with Hesiod (they are items 194 and 218 respectively)⁴. It is only with the articles on Homer which Jacoby wrote in the years immediately following the appearance of his Hesiod commentary that they are obviously connected⁵; but these few Homeric studies of Jacoby's (three articles and two book reviews) are hardly more than a brief episode of what might be described as a form of methodological perseveration, in which he

³ P. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Review of JACOBY, Hesiodi Carmina* cit., in «GGA», CXCIII, 1931, pp. 241-266 (=Hesiod, hrsg. v. E. Heitsch, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1966, pp. 100-130).

⁴ F. JACOBY, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, hrsg. v. H. Bloch, Leiden, Brill 1956, pp. 1-15.

⁵ On Jacoby's Homeric studies see F. PONTANI, *Gli studi omerici di Felix Jacoby*, in the present volume; they are items 226, 227, 228, 230, and 237 in Bloch's bibliography of Jacoby's publications.

did little more than apply to the field of Homer the techniques he had already applied to Hesiod – as it were, just another couple of barren, rocky islets.

Another contributing factor to the relative lack of influence exercised by Jacoby's work on Hesiod is no doubt the fact that the *Pars II* which in his 1930 edition (Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., p. 1) he promised as an indispensable supplement to that edition never saw the light. To be sure, Jacoby's teaching career was terminated traumatically by the Nazi seizure of power only a few years after the publication of his studies on Homer and Hesiod, and it must not be forgotten that it was only with enormous difficulties and in a different country, after he left Germany for England in 1939, that he was able to continue his life-work, his research into and edition of the ancient Greek historians. Nonetheless it would be superficial, and hence implausible, to invoke only such external and contingent factors in order to explain his continuing failure in the last three decades of his life to provide the commentary to the *Theogony* which he had promised in 1930, to say nothing of the edition of the *Works and Days* and of the other poems ascribed to Hesiod which might reasonably have been expected to follow upon his edition of the *Theogony*. To point the problem succinctly: Jacoby made quite sure that, however formidable the obstacles, by the end of his long life he had succeeded in completing a large part of *FGrHist*; but neither anyone else, nor even he, seems to have really attached very much importance to his finishing his work on Hesiod.

These are the data. They raise at least three questions. Why Hesiod, then, for *Jacoby*? Why Hesiod *then*? And why Hesiod *thus*? Though these questions can easily be distinguished from one another – they regard the place of Hesiod in Jacoby's oeuvre, Jacoby's choice to concentrate upon Hesiod exactly when he did, and Jacoby's method of treating Hesiod – the answers to them are closely interrelated; considering them, we may be able not only to assess more fairly the significance of Jacoby's work on Hesiod within the terms of his own scholarship, but also to identify what, if anything, is significant about that work even today.

To begin with, it is obvious that Hesiod has a much broader presence within Jacoby's works than one would guess if one simply read through the titles of his publications. For the first volume of *FGrHist*, comprising the genealogists and mythographers and first published in 1923, Jacoby had had to study closely not only the text

of Hesiod's poems but also the ancient commentaries to them, and had had to develop a clear sense of the modes and paths of transmission and the degree of familiarity of those poems among Greek readers and writers during the 5th century. Jacoby's commentaries above all to the fragments of Pherecydes and Acusilaus, to a lesser extent also to Hecataeus, are filled with deeply meditated and often quite original discussions of various passages of Hesiod. Beyond such individual references, Jacoby also indicated in various publications his conviction that there was a linear continuity within the development of Greek historical thinking which led all the way from Hesiod, through Hecataeus and Herodotus, to Thucydides⁶. But this is certainly not enough to explain why Jacoby would ever have chosen to devote himself at all to a full-scale edition and commentary on the *Theogony* (after all, there were very many other Greek authors with whom he was no less deeply familiar), let alone why he chose to do so just when he did. Did he decide to work on Hesiod and Homer merely in order to have a relaxing break from his (presumably more strenuous and serious) work on the Greek historians, as Willy Theiler suggests in his *Gnomon* obituary on Jacoby⁷? This is hardly likely: even for someone of Jacoby's Prussian work habits, it seems a very odd way indeed to unwind, and the whole tenor of his Hesiod studies is anything but relaxed.

It seems much more plausible to locate Jacoby's work on Hesiod within the general context of the fascination with the archaic period of Greek culture which became widespread in German Classics in the years following the First World War and to interpret that work as an idiosyncratic, polemical rejection of certain aspects of that trend. I have argued elsewhere⁸ that in the decade of the 1920's scholarship

⁶ F. JACOBY, *Die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie*, in «Klio», IX, 1909, pp. 80-123, here p. 101 note 67 (= JACOBY, *Abhandlungen* cit., p. 39 note 67); *Review of* J.B. BURY, *The Ancient Greek Historians*, in «Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift», XXIX, 1909, pp. 419-429, here 426 (= JACOBY, *Abhandlungen* cit., p. 71).

⁷ W. THEILER, *Felix Jacoby †*, in «Gnomon», XXXII, 1960, pp. 387-391, here 390: «Auch mit griechischer Dichtung erholte er sich um 1930 von seiner Historikerarbeit».

⁸ For further details and the general context, see G.W. MOST, *Zur Archäologie der Archaisk*, in «Antike und Abendland», XXXV, 1989, pp. 1-23; *Πόλεμος πάντων πατήρ*.

on the earliest centuries of Greek poetry, philosophy, and history gave to many young German Classicists who had been shaken by the Great War and the subsequent political and economic turmoil an opportunity to express in a safely veiled way their commitment to a larger cultural movement of pessimism and archaism which was associated above all with the name of Friedrich Nietzsche: the power of Nietzsche's old antagonist, Wilamowitz, remained unquestioned, but the members of a younger generation, by choosing to concentrate in their professional work upon that very same earlier period to which Nietzsche himself had assigned the greatest importance (and by confining their reading and discussion of Nietzsche himself to their private lives), could satisfy deeper cultural needs without at the same time endangering their academic careers. The decade or so after the end of the First World War was, in Germany at least, the decade of the Archaic age. During these years, it was on archaic themes that Hermann Fränkel and Wolfgang Schadewaldt wrote their habilitations and Bruno Snell his promotion⁹. In the same decade, a renaissance in Pindar studies was initiated by monographs by Dornseiff and Wilamowitz and was crowned by translations by Dornseiff and Borchardt¹⁰; while in archaeology Ernst Buschor was devoting himself to presenting to a wider public the monuments of archaic Greece, first from Athens at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, then starting in 1929 at the University of Munich¹¹. In

Die Vorsokratiker in der Forschung der Zwanziger Jahre, in *Altertumswissenschaft in den 20er Jahren*, hrsg. v. H. Flashar, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag 1995, pp. 87-114.

⁹ H. FRÄNKEL, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1921; W. SCHADEWALDT, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*, Halle an der Saale, Max Niemeyer Verlag 1928; B. SNELL, *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff des Wissens in der vorplatonischen Philosophie (σοφία, γνώμη, σύνεσις, ιστορία, μάθημα, ἐπιστήμη)*, Berlin, Weidmann 1924 (Philologische Untersuchungen, 29).

¹⁰ F. DORNSEIFF, *Pindars Stil*, Berlin, Weidmann 1921; U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Pindaros*, Berlin, Weidmann 1922; F. DORNSEIFF, *Pindars Dichtungen übertragen und erläutert*, Leipzig, Insel-Verlag 1921; R. BORCHARDT, *Pindarische Gedichte*, in *Gesammelte Werke in Einzelbänden. Übertragungen*, ed. by M.L. Borchardt, E. Zinn, Stuttgart, E. Klett 1958, pp. 97-141, and *Einleitung in das Verständnis der Pindarischen Poesie*, pp. 142-147.

¹¹ See for example E. BUSCHOR's various article in «MDAI(A)», XLVII, 1922, pp. 53-60, 81-91, 92-105, 106-109; LI, 1926, pp. 142-149; LII, 1927, pp. 205-212;

philosophy in particular, the fragments of the Presocratics, which already in 1903 Diels had first made generally available in his celebrated bilingual edition¹², finally began to attract the attention of a large number of Classical philologists and also of professional philosophers; while from a Neokantian perspective, but in very different ways, Ernst Cassirer (in connection with the anthropological speculations of Aby Warburg) and Ernst Hoffmann on the one hand, and Martin Heidegger on the other, attempted to identify in the earliest traces of Greek speculative thought an archaic way of thinking which would not be simply primitive and defective with regard to Aristotelian and modern logic, but would have its own philosophical value and cultural dignity¹³.

Inevitably, Hesiod too benefited from the attention that Classicists were newly paying to early Greek philosophy and

LV, 1930, pp. 163-166; and with R. HAMANN, *Die Skulpturen des Zeustempels zu Olympia*, Marburg, Im Verlage des Kunstgeschichtlichen Seminars der Universität 1924.

¹² *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, hrsg. v. H. Diels, Berlin-Zürich, Weidmann 1903, 1906², 1912³, Nachtrag zusammengestellt für die Benutzer der 3. Auflage 1922 und 1922⁴, 1934⁵ hrsg. v. W. Kranz, 1989¹⁸.

¹³ E. CASSIRER, *Die Begriffsform im mythischen Denken*, Leipzig-Berlin, B.G. Teubner 1922 (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, I); *Der Begriff der symbolischen Form im Aufbau der Geisteswissenschaften*, in «Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg», I, 1921-1922, pp. 11-39; *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*, I-III, Berlin, B. Cassirer 1923-1929; *Sprache und Mythos. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Götternamen*, Leipzig-Berlin, B.G. Teubner 1925 (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VI). E. CASSIRER, E. HOFFMANN, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, in *Lehrbuch der Philosophie*, hrsg. v. M. Dessoir, Berlin, Ullstein 1925, pp. 7-256. E. HOFFMANN, *Die griechische Philosophie von Thales bis Platon*, Leipzig-Berlin, B.G. Teubner 1921; *Die Sprache und die archaische Logik*, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr 1925; *Kulturphilosophisches bei den Vorsokratikern*, in «NJW», V, 1929, pp. 2-24. M. HEIDEGGER, *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles. Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung*, Freiburger Vorlesung Wintersemester 1921/22, hrsg. v. W. Bröcker, K. Bröcker-Oltmanns (= *Gesamtausgabe* II, 61, Frankfurt a.M., Klostermann 1985); *Platon: Sophistes*. Marburger Vorlesung WS 1924/1925, hrsg. v. I. Schübler (= *Gesamtausgabe* II, 19, Frankfurt a.M., Klostermann 1992); *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, Marburger Vorlesung SS 1925, hrsg. v. P. Jaeger (= *Gesamtausgabe* II, 20, Frankfurt a.M., Klostermann 1979).

literature in general. Rzach had laid the textual foundation for the scholarly study of the Hesiodic poems with his *editio maior* of 1902¹⁴ (the *editio minor* was published the same year, then revised and republished in 1908 and 1913)¹⁵; editions and commentaries followed in ever increasing numbers, in England and France especially before and during the war¹⁶, in Germany especially afterwards¹⁷. To generalize somewhat crudely about the fundamental tendency of most of the work on Hesiod by German scholars during this period: precisely those features of Hesiod's poetry which had long been recognized as characteristic of his texts as they are transmitted, but which had previously often been rejected as unworthy of the great poet and hence were athetized as inauthentic, were now emphatically accepted as entirely typical features of the archaic mode of style and thought for which Hesiod himself became the most important extant example. That is to say, the progress which, according to many German scholars, was taking place during these years in Hesiodic studies consisted not so much in new discoveries about the texts, as rather in a new valorization of its already recognized features, which now were prized as authentically archaic rather than being rejected as incoherent and hence spurious. We may take Schmid-Stählin's formulation from 1929 as a particularly authoritative and influential statement of this change in orientation:

¹⁴ *Hesiodi Carmina*, cur. A. Rzach, Leipzig, Teubner 1902.

¹⁵ *Hesiodi Carmina*, cur. A. Rzach, Leipzig, Teubner 1902, 1908², 1913¹.

¹⁶ *Hesiod. The Poems and Fragments*, ed. by A.W. Mair, Oxford, Clarendon Press 1908; *Hésiode. Les travaux et les jours*, éd. P. Waltz, Paris, Picard 1909; *Hésiode. Les travaux et les jours*, éd. P. Mazon, Paris, Hachette 1914; *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homeric*, ed. by H.G. Evelyn-White, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard University Press 1914; then *Hésiode. Théogonie, Les travaux et les jours, Le bouclier*, éd. P. Mazon, Paris, Les Belles Lettres 1928.

¹⁷ *Hesiods Theogonie*, hrsg. v. W. Aly, Heidelberg, Carl Winter 1913; then *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies*, cur. P. Friedländer, Berlin Steglitz, Officina serpentis 1921; *Hesiodos Erga*, hrsg. v. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Berlin, Weidmann 1928; JACOBY, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit.; F. SCHWENN, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter 1934.

Daß hier ein in allem Wesentlichen durchaus planmäßig angelegtes Werk vorliegt, daß die auf den ersten Anblick befremdlichen Versetzungen und Einkeilungen großenteils wohl begründet sind, ist ebenso klar, als daß es an kleineren Zusätzen und Umarbeitungen aus späterer Zeit nicht fehlt. Die sinnlosen Metzeleien, die ein ebenso beschränkter wie selbstbewußter Rationalismus im vorigen Jahrhundert im Text der Theogonie anzurichten liebte, werden jetzt glücklicherweise nicht mehr unbedingt als Beweise methodischen Scharfsinns bewundert. Wo es sich um einen ersten Versuch auf dem Gebiet der didaktisch-systemhaften Epik handelt, darf man natürlich nicht die logischen und ästhetischen Maßstäbe unserer Tage anwenden, um Echtes von Unechtem zu sondern; nur bei vorsichtig konservativem Verfahren *lernt* man aus der Theogonie etwas für die Geschichte der ältesten poetischen Technik der Griechen¹⁸.

The typical features of the Hesiodic texts whose previous evaluation was being reversed during the 1920's may be characterized on the most general level as both macroscopic and microscopic collocations of material in terms which seem to violate category distinctions familiar to us. Macroscopically, Hesiod combines, under the umbrella of an account of the births of the gods, more or less systematic classifications of at least three kinds of entities which we at least have little difficulty keeping apart: the familiar deities of Greek cult, above all the Olympian gods and other divinities associated with them in Greek religion; the various parts of the physical cosmos conceived as a spatially articulated whole (which were certainly regarded as being divine in some sense but were rarely if ever personified as objects of cult veneration), including the heavens, the surface of the earth, an underlying region, and all the things contained in them; and a large number of more or less personified embodiments of various kinds of good and bad moral qualities and human actions and experiences. What is more, this synchronic, systematic classification is combined with a diachronic narrative of the eventual establishment of Zeus'

¹⁸ W. SCHMID, O. STÄHLIN, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Erster Teil: Die klassische Periode der griechischen Literatur*, von W. SCHMID, *Erster Band: Die griechische Literatur vor der attischen Hegemonie* (= *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Siebente Abteilung. Erster Teil. Erster Band*, hrsg. v. W. Otto, München, C.H. Beck 1929, pp. 259-260).

reign of justice, including not only a series of dynastic upheavals but also an extended epic account of celestial warfare. How these systematic and evolutionary perspectives and the various kinds of divine entities are to be understood in their relation to one another is not always clear. Moreover, microscopically, the text has often been thought to contain all imaginable kinds of local disruptions: repetitions, contradictions, logical and semantic lacunae in the classifications, jumps and confusions in the narratives, superfluous material and material whose immediate relevance is hard to discern. And as if all that were not enough, there are lines that do not scan, and others in which the transmission seems to be divided between two equally plausible variants.

How was a rational order to be brought into this apparent farrago? Hesiod himself may well have boasted that the Muses had transformed a mere shepherd into an accomplished poet; but generations of philologists seemed to operate on the basis of the diagnosis that the transformation had not been a resounding success. Starting with Guyet in the latter 17th century¹⁹, the usual method of treating these difficulties was that of Analysis: identifying contradictions and on their basis distinguishing interpolations of later material into the authentic text which could then be restored by athetizing these spurious incrustations. The method was canonized by Wolf's hasty but influential 1783 edition of the *Theogony*, published together with notes by Heyne²⁰, and it remained dominant through the 19th century. But by the 1920's at the latest, an anti-Analytic reaction seems to have set in, based in part upon the new fascination with archaic thought in its own terms, in part too upon a general, fatigued skepticism with regard to the method of athetization of alleged interpolations, which had turned out after several generations to produce numerous mutually incompatible hypotheses which competed with one another but were not susceptible to standard forms of intersubjective control and hence were not capable of leading cumulatively to a generally recognizable form of scholarly progress. Even in the case of Wilamowitz, the doyen of an older generation

¹⁹ F. GUYET, in *Hesiodi Ascræi Quae Extant*, cur. J.G. Graevius, Amsterdam, Daniel Elzevir 1667.

²⁰ *Theogonia Hesiodæa*, cur. F.A. Wolf, Halle, Ioh. Iac. Gebauer 1783.

and a celebrated Analyst with regard to Homer, the changing times left their unmistakable mark upon his own understanding of Hesiod: for the very same *Ilias und Homer* of 1920, which analyzed Homer's *Iliad* into a series of different strata composed not only by Homer himself but also by other poets who lived before and after him, contained as well an appendix on the proem to Hesiod's *Theogony* in which Wilamowitz declared programmatically at the beginning, «Meine Absicht ist, das Proömium als echtes Werk Hesiods zu erweisen, indem ich es erkläre, ohne mich viel um die herrschenden Meinungen zu kümmern, die es zerpflücken» and concluded triumphantly, «So ist denn wohl der Zusammenhang aller Teile klar geworden, und statt hieran herumzuzerren und zu nörgeln, wird man empfinden, wie Arat und Kallimachos und das ganze Altertum empfunden hat, daß hier ein Dichter ersten Ranges zu uns spricht, mag er die homerische Form, gerade weil er Neues und Persönliches zu sagen hat, auch nicht mit homerischer Leichtigkeit handhaben»²¹. And the same Wilamowitz's 1928 edition of Hesiod's *Works and Days* did indeed, to be sure, exclude the *Days* as un-Hesiodic, and hence printed and commented on only the first 759 lines of the text; **but within that first section, Wilamowitz took pains to reject as little as inauthentic as possible, and grandly dismissed several generations of German Analytic scholarship on Hesiod, with a seigneurial wave of his hand, as misguided, futile, obsolete, and now thoroughly discredited:**

Auch weiter ist bis in das 19. Jahrhundert nichts nennenswertes außer etlichen Konjekturen und Athetesen geleistet, und dann haben sich die trefflichsten Männer in wilde Vermutungen verrannt, von denen zu reden mich schon die Pietät zurückhält. ... Die Person des Hesiodos ward verflüchtigt, ... die Erga in einen Haufen von Sprüchen aufgelöst und zusammengestrichen. All das braucht nicht widerlegt zu werden; ein Riesighaufen brannte lichterloh und ist nun in Asche zusammengesunken, die der Wind verweht.

²¹ U. von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin, Weidmann 1920, pp. 464, 476-477. In point of fact, the Analysts were no longer quite so uncontestedly dominant as Wilamowitz suggests in his somewhat heroic self-stylization. But Wilamowitz was writing early, already in 1920; and in any case he was not fully in touch with the early traces of the new tendency.

... Wie alle früheren kritischen Behandlungen und Ausgaben durch Rzach entbehrlich geworden sind..., so gilt dasselbe mehr oder minder für die Interpretationen, die sich immer mehr auf einzelne Partien beschränkten, also nur die Kritik im Auge hatten. Ich glaube, daß von den letzten zwei Generationen, mit denen ich gelebt habe, sehr viele den Dichter und seine Werke im ganzen richtig aufgefaßt haben, aber das kam ihm direkt nicht zugute. Man wich ihm aus. Unberufene schreckten durch ihre Behandlung ab. Eingestehen müssen wir, daß es deutsche Philologen waren, die den Dichter wetteifernd mißhandelten; da hat das Ausland freilich nur einen negativen Vorzug, denn es tat gar nichts für ihn²².

These were the prevailing winds in Germany in these years; and it is precisely against them that Jacoby defiantly sets his face. Both his article and his commentary are filled with laments about the terrible times in which he must live, when the kind of Hesiod scholars he calls «Harmonists» (Jacoby, *Hesiodstudien* cit., p. 163 = 224, p. 170 = 231, p. 177 = 236, p. 185 = 243) have become ever more numerous and influential; and his Hesiod project as a whole can be seen as a misguided but courageous attempt to turn back single-handedly the clock of what the philologists had taken to be scientific progress in their discipline, and to urge them to return instead to the very same Analysis which had dominated the field half a century earlier, albeit now in a supposedly healthier, saner form. This is a strange and quixotic project, and it requires some explanation if it is not to seem simply absurd.

It would be quite mistaken to reduce the import of Jacoby's work on Hesiod to his notorious analysis of the text into what he took to be its various strata of cumulative interpolation. To do so would be to neglect the valuable parts of his edition of the *Theogony*, in particular two. First, Jacoby submitted Rzach's depiction of the manuscript transmission of the poem to careful analysis and correction in the second chapter of his introduction (Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., pp. 44-87). Comparison of Jacoby's results with Martin West's²³ shows that in fact Jacoby himself not only mistook the quality of a number of individual witnesses to the text but also, more generally, seriously

²² WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Hesiodos Erga* cit., pp. 8-9.

²³ *Hesiod Theogony*, ed. by M.L. West, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1966, pp. 48-61.

underestimated the complexity of the relations among the manuscripts and groups of manuscripts; yet there can still be no doubt that Jacoby's analysis of Rzach's material meant, at that time, a significant improvement in the *recensio* of the poet. And second, Jacoby's ample collection of ancient *testimonia* regarding Hesiod, his poetry, its dissemination, and ancient scholarship on it, in the fourth chapter (Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., pp. 106-135), has not been superseded even today, and remains perhaps the single section of Jacoby's edition which has proven itself to be of most durable value.

But of course it was Jacoby's analysis of the layers of interpolation, prepared in his 1926 article (Jacoby, *Hesiodstudien* cit.), continued in the first chapter of his preface (Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., pp. 1-43), and signalled by a complex set of typographical mechanisms throughout his edition (explained at Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., pp. 88-89, 138), which was the real scandal. The initial reviewers were divided between admiration for the skill of the German typesetters²⁴ and mockery at the complexity and pseudo-objectivity of the system²⁵, while Friedländer's celebrated *bon mot* that the result is «diese Mischung, sagen wir von Aristarch und Reichskursbuch» (Friedländer, *Review* cit., p. 245 = 105) is repeated approvingly by later scholars (so West, *Theogony* cit., p. 102) – it may acquire further pungency from the fact that, in German slang, to say «ich verstehe Bahnhof» means that one does not understand anything at all of what is being said. This is the part of Jacoby's work on Hesiod (and perhaps not only on Hesiod) which has left the least trace upon subsequent scholarship and which at the same time is most evidently characteristic of his approach – only the obstinate piety of a devoted disciple could ever have conceived of claiming, «Der versprochene Kommentar fehlt: Auch so bleibt die Analyse des Textes, sowenig sie bis jetzt Zustimmung gefunden hat, im wesentlichen schlagend» (Theiler, *Jacoby* cit., p. 390).

To be sure, Jacoby himself seems to have taken great pleasure in pouring generous doses of vitriolic polemics upon the efforts of

²⁴ So anon. *Review of* JACOBY, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., in «BAGB (SC)», III, 1931, pp. 59-66.

²⁵ T.A. S. (i.e. Sinclair), *Review of* JACOBY, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit., in «JHS», L, 1930, pp. 368-69.

previous Analysts, who he claimed had torn the poem to pieces on the basis of shallow logic and stupid misunderstandings of the true nature of Hesiodic poetry; and one might easily be misled by such violently critical utterances into thinking that Jacoby did not himself belong squarely within the Analytic tradition (so Theiler, *Jacoby* cit., p. 390). But no critic who, once he has finished with the 1022 verses of the transmitted *Theogony*, has left only 404 of them standing as authentic, declaring that fully 61% of the text is spurious, can safely be termed a Unitarian in any simple sense of the term – by contrast, Mazon's Budé edition, published two years earlier, had athetized 'only' 25% of the text (Mazon, *Hésiode* cit.). How are we to explain this odd discrepancy between Jacoby's polemics and his method? Must we conclude that he himself was torn in some way between Unitarian and Analytic tendencies, or that he sought in vain some uneasy compromise between them, or that he was not fully aware of the methodological implications of his very own scholarly practice?

Dissonances there are within Jacoby's approach, and they are certainly fundamental ones; but I do not think that they can be grasped fully on the level of a simple conceptual opposition between Analysts and Unitarians. As an interpreter of Hesiod, Jacoby was certainly an Analyst. He saw the staggering complexities and apparent incoherences of the poem as a *problem* for interpretation, not as an *opportunity* for interpretation, and as one which could only be resolved by postulating a plurality of individual composers, each one of whom was responsible for some part(s) of the text and only one of whom was named Hesiod; and this, if anything, is the very essence of the Analytical method. But other scholars, at least on Jacoby's view, had not asked themselves just when the interpolations they thought they had discovered had entered into the text, or had contented themselves with declaring vaguely that they were later additions, or else had hypothesized that different recensions of the text circulated in the ancient world (without explaining how these had come about or what their relation was to one another or how they had been combined into a single text), or had even supposed, most absurdly of all, that certain apparently competing textual versions went back to Hesiod's revisions of his own poem. It was for this failure to explain just how and why the alleged interpolations had come about, and not for the assumption of interpolations *per se*, that Jacoby rebuked the Analysts; and in contrast to them, Jacoby himself put consider-

able effort into developing a coherent and highly detailed theory of the development of the text of Hesiod from the very beginning. On the basis of a narrow textual selection (as indicated above, less than two fifths of the transmitted text), Jacoby identified a unique and coherent poetic personality, that of Hesiod himself; the spare, austere, somewhat banal poem he had produced was then expanded in the following two centuries by waves of rhapsodes who, every time they performed the poem, brought their audiences' expectations and their own ideas into it by cumulative interpolations (which, fortunately for the modern scholar, almost never actually altered the words of Hesiod's text but instead only added new verses to it); all this material was finally put together by an anonymous editor around the end of the 6th century B.C. who published the poem in a form which already Pindar and Aeschylus read and which was not significantly different from the version transmitted to us.

Thus the heart of Jacoby's edition is the identification and discrimination of the various rhapsodic interpolations into Hesiod's text. In general, this might seem a plausible strategy; but, as the Germans say, «der Teufel steckt im Detail». No one will doubt that Hesiod's poems were exposed by the very nature of their transmission to the possibility of such elaboration by rhapsodes; but at the same time it has in the whole of the last century only been Jacoby himself, and no other scholar, who was convinced that he was in a position to identify specific cases of such elaboration, and to distinguish the various hands involved both from Hesiod and one another, with what he repeatedly termed «mathematical certainty». The difficulty with Jacoby's method is well put by West, who liquidates the central thrust of Jacoby's approach without even bothering to mention him by name: «It would be unrealistic to deny the possibility that the *Theogony* suffered other alterations and interpolations in the archaic period; sanguine, on the other hand, to claim infallible ability to detect them. ... in general, unsubstantiated suspicion is all that one has to go on» (West, *Theogony* cit, p. 50). The initial premise of Jacoby's work is the unity of the poetic individuality of Hesiod, and the ultimate goal towards which it tends is the identification of that unity on the basis of the textual elements which belong to it and to it alone; but in the meantime, between a utopian beginning and an unattainable end, in the actual practice of the indefatigable scholar, we are confronted with nothing other than the laborious and self-assured procedures of Analysis.

In fact, what Jacoby sought to provide for Hesiod in 1930 was the exact counterpart for what Friedrich August Wolf had established for Homer in 1795: the outlines of a history of the poet's text during antiquity. Wolf too had pointed to the kinds of modifications the text was likely to have undergone during the various phases of its transmission from its oral beginnings to its codification in Alexandria; in this light we can understand that even Jacoby's collection of the ancient *testimonia* concerning Hesiod is no mere antiquarian exercise but an integral part of his attempt to provide a conspectus of that ancient phase of transmission, since what interests Jacoby about the materials he has gathered here is far less the question of the historical truth of some of the data they might provide and far more the information they yield concerning the image that later Greeks had concerning Hesiod (so too, of course, in his work on the ancient lives of Homer a few years later). But Wolf had been shrewd, or craven, or lucky enough to simply point out the problem in general terms without having to go on to provide a detailed analysis of the Homeric poems, line by line – his *Prolegomena* were never completed, the scholarly edition of Homer they were designed to introduce was never prepared, and the edition of Homer Wolf ended up publishing a decade later was intended merely *ad usum scholarum*. Jacoby, more ingenuous, or courageous, or unfortunate, attempted to perform the next step by actually furnishing the proof for rhapsodic interpolation, line by line – and failed dismally to convince his colleagues and successors. What both Wolf and Jacoby share is a fundamental dissonance inherent in their conception of their scholarly practice, an allegiance at one and the same time on the one hand to very 18th century notions of the logical clarity of science and the indispensable coherence and clarity of the founding texts of Western literature and philosophy, and on the other to very 19th century ideas of the original genius of the individual poet and the historical development of culture as an anonymous, cumulative evolution. This tension between Enlightenment and Romantic paradigms is the most basic dissonance within Jacoby's work on Hesiod; it is much odder to find it in a work published in 1930 than in one which appeared in 1795.

But there seems to be another dissonance in Jacoby's article and edition as well: an underlying anger which not only provides a strong dynamic tension pushing the argument forward but also keeps on bursting out into the open in violent attacks upon other

scholars, whom Jacoby does not hesitate to describe as blind, stupid, lazy, careless, ignorant, and dishonest. Jacoby, of course, was well known for the joy he took in polemics (Theiler, *Jacoby* cit., p. 390), but my own, admittedly subjective impression is that the hostility he expresses so frequently in his work on Hesiod is rather more drastic than what we find in most of the rest of his oeuvre – to be sure, the very genre of *FGrHist*, monumental, impersonal, perdurable is not such as to encourage vicious personal attacks on other scholars: did Jacoby need some other outlet for his spleen? Again, there may well be a psychological connection between the asperity of his criticisms of others and the self-assurance with which he presents his own views in these Hesiodic studies: operating now in a somewhat less familiar terrain than that of the Greek historians, Jacoby may have felt it convenient to adopt a rhetorical strategy designed to lend him an authority he suspected he did not already possess (though in fact that strategy, if that is indeed what it was, worked in just the opposite direction, making his decisions seem even more subjective and arbitrary than they already were).

Perhaps, though, the anger, if I am correct in identifying it as such, has a different explanation. Jacoby's whole life project, after all, was founded upon the careful analysis and combination of the fragments and testimonies regarding the ancient Greek historians; his monumental opus is the result and the expression of many years of his stern application of a method of determining inconsistencies and contradictions, of ascertaining kinds of dependence and variation, of creating stemmata of sources and derivatives. This method is in certain regards (by no means in all) not very different from the Analysis of Greek epic: in both cases, the scholar carefully sifts the enormous mass of transmitted material in an attempt to stratify it chronologically and distinguish early and authentic levels from later accretions. By the 1920's, Jacoby, who was born in 1876, had reached middle age, and he knew that, if posterity was going to remember him after his death, it was with *FGrHist* that he would be identified. But in the same decade, Jacoby seems to have recognized that the new tendency which was coming into fashion in German Classics in those very years could someday end up putting his methodology into question. If scholars did not care to distinguish different hands in Hesiod – if, in his terms, they became «Harmonists» who sought at all costs to reconcile apparent inconsistencies rather than exploiting them – what interest might they have someday

in the distinctions Jacoby was drawing among the different hands which transmitted the fragments of the Greek historians? Perhaps Jacoby felt betrayed by his colleagues: they seemed to be abandoning the method on which he, together with them, had been raised and to which he had devoted his life, and what they seemed to prefer in its place was a nebulous, confused gallimaufry. Even Wilamowitz, the prince of the Analysts, seemed to be turning his back on them, at least in his work on Hesiod. So Jacoby's choice of Hesiod in the second half of the 1920's may have been intended as a call to arms for his colleagues throughout Classics, a demonstration within this more canonical field of the infallibility of the method he was applying to the fragmentary historians; and his dedication of his edition to Wilamowitz, «Philologorum Principi nonum decennium fortiter ingresso» (Jacoby, *Hesiodi Carmina* cit.), may even have been meant somewhat less as an obligatory homage to the great man all revered, and somewhat more as a flagrant dissonance, an urgent admonition to the prince of philologists to return at last to his senses, to use his strength and authority to turn German Classics around before it was too late. If so, his call went unheeded; Germany crashed around his ears; and in another country, and another language, he returned to the field he knew best, and for the rest of his life continued to work in it, and only in it.

I close with a series of disquieting questions. Are the failings of the great philologists simply the inevitable result of their all too human failure to forget their human limitations and their consequent delusion that, if they are great in one field, they must be great in every other one as well? Do Bentley's errors about Milton tell us nothing about the limits of his scholarship on Greek and Latin poetry, and are Wolf's mistakes about Cicero quite irrelevant to assessing his theories about Homer? Or might we not see more unmistakably, in the clearer light of a field in which they were not so expert, the more conspicuous outlines of the defects and limits of the methods they seem able to apply with such resounding success in the fields with which they are so familiar? Does not Bentley's treatment of Milton in fact suggest fundamental flaws and dangers in his method of conjectural criticism of the ancient poets (however brilliant and convincing many of his individual emendations are), and does not Wolf's conviction that five of Cicero's speeches were spurious hint at the flaws in the historical method he applied to Homer too (however indispensable Wolf's vision of a unified cultural history of

ancient Greece has become for us)? If so, then the case of Jacoby's Hesiod ought to worry the users of *FGH* – and that means virtually all of us who work on any aspect of the ancient world – more than it seems to have done hitherto. For it is only one alternative to conclude that Jacoby made the contingent mistake of erroneously applying to the poems of Hesiod a method that worked fine for the fragments of the Greek historians; the other is to worry that the failure of his work on Hesiod might show more clearly the hidden but ineluctable dangers and defects of the method he applied to the historians.

If the latter alternative should turn out to be the right one, that would be worrisome indeed.

GLENN W. MOST

Risposta a Glenn W. Most

In apertura della parte introduttiva alla sua edizione del 1930 della *Teogonia* esiodea¹, dal titolo *De Theogoniae Hesiodae textus condicione*, Jacoby confessava di nutrire qualche trepidazione: «criticam hanc Theogoniae editionem, ... non sine magna trepidatione in publicum emitto, cum sine commentario perpetuo stare vix possit». Ma la causa della «trepidatio», come in queste parole appariva indicata da Jacoby, cioè la mancanza del commentario relativo a tutto il poema, lasciava subito il posto – o forse meglio veniva precisata – da quanto faceva seguire immediatamente dichiarando la consapevolezza del dissenso che avrebbe suscitato il fatto che molte delle parti del poema esiodeo che la sua edizione avrebbe proposto come da condannare perché non autentiche – ad esempio l'Inno a Ecate, la Titanomachia, la descrizione del Tartaro – proprio in quel periodo, nei primi decenni del secolo, «his imprimis temporibus», erano state, volta a volta, assai positivamente valutate e, pertanto, considerate autentiche.

Dunque, Jacoby lasciava intendere qual era lo scopo primario che questa fatica editoriale perseguiva: purgare, appunto, la vera *Teogonia* esiodea da quanto interpolatori e rapsodi a quella avevano aggiunto, e il rammarico per la mancanza del commentario si rivelava avere il suo motivo principale nel non poter fornire, in quello, prove adeguate per le esclusioni proposte, una rinuncia che comportava il rischio che i risultati raggiunti avrebbero potuto non incontrare approvazione. Ovviamente, ci sarebbero state molte altre cose da dire in un commentario alla *Teogonia* così da renderne

¹ *Hesiodi carmina*, recensuit F. JACOBY, Pars I, *Theogonia*, Berolini, apud Weidmannos 1930 (Bibliothecae Graecae et Latinae Auctarium Weidmannianum, II 1); la citazione è da p. 1.