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](#)

Hoffmann on the Greek Dialects *Die Griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange, mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen dargestellt*, Dr Otto von Hoffmann. Erster Band. Der süd-achäische Dialekt. Mit einer Tafel. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1891. 8 Mk.

Charles E. Bennett

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 54 - 56

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184653, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184653

How to cite this article:

Charles E. Bennett (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 54-56 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184653

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

not to be found in other handbooks—a map of the battle-field of Pharsalia, which, like the one just mentioned, is derived from Heuzey's *Mission de Macédoine*. It may be worth mentioning in this connexion, for the benefit of the adventurous traveller, that Mount Ossa has not yet, like its neighbours Olympus and Pelion, been ascended, though it does not seem to present any difficulty, and ought from its position to command an exceptionally fine panorama. It is also consoling to think, in these days of advancing roads and railways, that there are still parts of Greece in which it is possible to rough it for several days together. From this point of view M. Fougères particularly recommends the route from Arta to Trikkala—in other words, from the Ambracian gulf to the north-west of Thessaly—through the upland valleys of the Pindus range. In order to accomplish this, the tourist should secure the services of a Wallach carrier—one of that race, in whose hands is most of the transport of these parts, and whose

villages are met with at frequent intervals along that chain of mountains—and he should be prepared to bivouac in the open air by night, in the neighbourhood of a wood fire, for which the forests supply ample materials. He will be sufficiently repaid by the beauty of the scenery, and, as he will traverse the pass of Gomphi, he will have the opportunity of tracing the route followed by the Roman consul Flamininus, by Quintus Marcius Philippus, and by other commanders on other occasions. To the majority of scholars, no doubt, especially on a first visit, the most famous sites, and the scenes of archaeological discovery, will prove more attractive; but Greece is a country which has a charm to offer to every class of visitors, and no better advice can be given to one who travels there than that which is suggested in the preface to this book—that he should follow his own tastes, and form his own plan. 'Plus un voyage est personnel, plus il laisse de souvenirs.'

H. F. TOZER.

HOFFMANN ON THE GREEK DIALECTS.

Die Griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange, mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen dargestellt, von DR. OTTO HOFFMANN. Erster Band. *Der süd-achäische Dialekt*. Mit einer Tafel. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1891. 8 Mk.

THE appearance of the initial volume of another exhaustive work on the Greek dialects, before Meister's revision of Ahrens is half completed, will doubtless occasion surprise to many scholars, especially to those who have not closely followed the recent symptoms of rivalry in this department of classical studies. The reasons which have impelled the author to inaugurate the present undertaking are clearly stated by him in his preface. He criticises Meister's work as defective in both plan and execution, repeating in this connexion the substance of his elaborate review of Meister's second volume, which appeared in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* for 1889, p. 873 ff.

The fundamental defect of Meister's method is held by Hoffmann to be his failure to observe the historical connexion of the different dialects. Each is treated separately, as an independent unit, no

attempt being made to reconstruct the larger units of dialect groups, and so to determine what was original to the group, and what has been the result of special development within the individual dialect. It is to meet this need that Hoffmann aims in the work now begun, the first volume of which lies before us. This volume is entitled *The South Achæan Dialect*, by which is meant South Aeolic in the wider and looser sense of Aeolic—the sense in which it was employed by Ahrens. Practically the Arcadian and Cyprian are the only representatives of this group. The name Achæan is chosen in preference to Aeolic, partly in order to reserve the latter designation for the dialect of Lesbos (whence the literary Aeolic), partly because of the evidence—amounting to strong probability—that the dialect group in question was, before the Dorian invasion, the speech of the southern or Peloponnesian division of the Ἀχαιοί. Corresponding to the South Achæan group Hoffmann sets up a North Achæan group, including the Boeotian, Thessalian and Aeolic (Lesbian), which are to form the subject of his second volume. Similarly he hints at his future treatment of the Doric dialects. He will make the

general name of Doric more inclusive than it is usually made at present, and will distinguish a north, middle, and south Doric, the second of these comprising Locrian, Aetolian and Elean, which latter, Hoffmann thinks, was rightly classed as Doric by Ahrens and should be to-day again brought into connexion with the other Doric dialects. The Ionic group will likewise be presented in a three-fold division. Throughout the work the attempt will be made to reconstruct, so far as possible, the original Doric, Ionic and Achæan types of speech, and to explain the deviations from these types which have arisen in the individual dialects.

It will at once be noticed that, as far as classification of dialects is concerned, Hoffmann's position marks a radical departure from the prevalent views of to-day and a return to Ahrens. All recent scholars have recognized the difficulties in the way of maintaining the old three-fold division of Ionic, Doric and Aeolic Greek. As a rule no precise classification has been made to take its place. The attitude has rather been negative. Certain very obvious relationships have been recognized. Thus the close connexion of the Cyprian and Arcadian is one of the clearest facts of Greek dialectology; so the relationship of Boeotian, Thessalian and Lesbian. Of the dialects classed by Ahrens as Doric certain have been set apart as forming a group by themselves, their relationship to each other being at present clearer than any other one fact about them. But while the above points and some others are excellently established, no one in recent years has pretended to make any ultimate classification of all the Greek dialects, in which there should be a well-recognized place for each—much less to revive the old division into Ionic, Doric and Aeolic; so that Hoffmann's attitude in this regard cannot fail to appear bold, to say the least. However, it is as yet premature to judge of his success in maintaining this thesis. The present volume treats only of the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects, whose relationship is so well established that his task here has been very simple. The test will come when the attempt is made to reduce the North and South Achæan groups to a single original, to show the substantial unity of the Doric and North Grecian groups, or to reconstitute the original of the Attic and Ionic.

As regards the other point urged by Hoffmann, the importance of treating each dialect not as an isolated phenomenon but as part of a larger whole, there can be no

doubt of the justice of his position. It is in fact the adherence to just this principle that has constituted the excellence of some of the most recent monographic work in Greek dialects, and it is the failure to adhere to it which Hoffmann so justly deplores in the work of Meister. Whether the principle can yet be applied to all dialects in our present state of knowledge is very questionable, but wherever it can be applied it ought.

In the execution of the task he has undertaken in the present volume, Hoffmann is in the main successful. A valuable feature of the book consists in the presentation of the chief inscriptions of the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects—an almost necessary convenience, as, since the appearance of Collitz' *Sammlung*, important additions have been made to the inscriptions of each dialect, notably to the Arcadian, by the discovery of the long inscription from Piali—while the reading of many of the Cyprian inscriptions has been greatly advanced during the same period. Not a little of this advance is due directly to Hoffmann himself. His earlier readings of certain Cyprian inscriptions, as given in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge*, xv. p. 279 ff., are repeated in the present work, accompanied by a number of new ones of greater or less plausibility. His reading, however, of the famous four line inscription from Golgoi, No. 144 (Coll. 68), comes no nearer solving the riddle of this puzzling monument than the efforts of Ahrens, Deecke, and Meister have done before him. Hoffmann's reading requires us in four lines to accept seven new words (Γράσθι, πῶθι, Φείσθης, ἀκοραιπῶς, κ.τ.λ.), several violent phonetic changes, one absolute (though tacit) violation of the orthographic principles of the Cyprian, viz. Γράσθι, κα' ρα· σι· τι·, besides a goodly number of syntactical and metrical peculiarities. After all this the resulting sense is far from convincing. The same must also be said of his reading of No. 145 (Coll. 69). But in the main he shows great ingenuity and offers much that commends itself as the correct text; e.g. No. 93 (Coll. 26) ἐμὶ ὁ λαὸς ὄδε, *I this stone here*, where Deecke ἤμὶ Ὀλάω ὄδε.

A full exegetical commentary accompanies most of the inscriptions, often containing new and suggestive modes of interpretation, e.g. No. 134 (Coll. 59) ἀπ' οὐ Φοι τὰς εὐχολὰς ἐπέτυχε, *after he obtained for himself his petition*; so also the interpretation of ὦ Φαῖς in No. 135, 10 (Coll. 60) as ὦ αἴς, with parasitic Φ, in the sense of ἐπὶ αἴς.

In the treatment of the sounds and in-

flections the results reached are, we think, in the main such as are likely to meet with general approval, as is also the genuine spirit of independence which has dictated them. Hoffmann's regard for the inviolability of phonetic laws is however by no means so profound as is demanded in certain quarters of Germany. In his eagerness to defend a theory or to furnish an explanation of a difficult phenomenon, he permits himself to ignore principles which are well recognized. Thus, p. 212, in commenting upon the relation of *κυβερνάω* to *κυμῆρῆναι*, he explains the former as resulting from the contamination of the strong and weak forms of the root, viz. *κυμῆρ-* and *κυμρ-*, which Hoffmann assumes might also appear as *κυβρ-*. No such form is conceivable. The *β*, if present, could only result as a parasitic sound in conjunction with *μ*, **κυμβρ-*, which of course would fail to explain *κυβερνάω*. So also *πλήστος*, No. 147, is explained as the regular resultant of *πλήιστος*, without any mention of the accepted law that primitive *η*s regularly develop as *εισ*.

On p. 205 the law for the assimilation of final *ς* is too general. Such assimilation is not to be credited for final *ς* before initial *π*, as *κἂ(π) πῶθι* for *κᾶς πῶθι*, even granting it in case of *ῥέπο(μ) μέγα* for *ῥέπος μέγα*.

Analogy seldom seems to figure with Hoffman as a factor in linguistic changes. Such forms as *δέκο*, *δέκοτος*, *είκοσι*, *έκοτόν*, are thought by him to have *ο* (instead of the normal *α*, representing *nasalis sonans*), in consequence of some subtle influence of the adjacent *κ*. No allusion to any other theory of explaining these forms is thought

necessary—much less apparently a refutation.

In connexion with the reference to *μ* for *μ*ε, *με*, p. 162, no allusion is made to the very probable theory that *μ* is for *μ(ν)*—a theory rendered the more plausible by the fact that *μ* occurs only before consonants, so that the ante-consonantal form *μ(ν)* would bear the same relation to the ante-vocalic form *μεν*, as the ante-consonantal form of the preposition *iv* to the ante-vocalic form *ἐν*.

The treatment of the sounds and inflections is followed by a handy summary of the syntax and an excellent index. The proof-reading has been commendably accurate for a work so trying and full of detail. On p. 149, § 22, three lines from the end, *ἰέναι* should stand for *εἶναι*, and on p. 37, under III. 2, the last example should read in the syllabic text *e·se·ta·se·* (not *e·sa·ta·se·*), thus conforming with usage as well as illustrating the principle under discussion.

These few criticisms are in no wise intended to detract from the value of a book which gives fresh proof of scholarly qualities and is indispensable to every student of Greek dialects. Special praise is moreover due to the author for the thoroughly dignified manner in which, under great provocation, he has passed criticism on the views of his opponents—particularly, of course, Meister.

The second volume, on the North Achaean, is promised for the latter part of the present year.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

BROWN UNIVERSITY,
Providence, R.I.

FENNELL'S INDO-EUROPEAN VOWEL-SYSTEM.

Indo-European Vowel-System, by C. A. M. FENNELL, D. Litt. 33 pp.

THIS is one of the most striking contributions to classical philology which has appeared for some time. The originality of Dr. Fennell's views and the freshness of his ideas are only equalled by the pertinence of his attacks on the weak points of his opponents, among whom he is disposed to reckon all Germans. This is scarcely surprising. Dr. Fennell's services to philology have not received proper recognition; the famous sonant-nasal theory was to a great extent anticipated by him, and as early as

1873 he published a refutation of Curtius' then reigning principle of 'phonetic case.' He is therefore naturally indignant at these being hailed as new discoveries by foreign scholars, and thus the 'Neugrammatiker' find small favour in his eyes. We fear that some readers trained in the methods and phraseology of his opponents will be disposed to look down on this work as belonging to an exploded state of the science, but they will be wrong. Where Dr. Fennell rejects the discoveries or the methods of the new school he does so with his eyes open. His antagonism is of knowledge and not of ignorance.