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](#)

***Tabellarisk oversigt over den Latinske litteraturs historie*, by Bastien Dahl. Published by Cammermeyer, Christiania and Copenhagen, 1891.**

G. C. W. Warr

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 69 - 70

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184847, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184847

How to cite this article:

G. C. W. Warr (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 69-70 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184847

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Feb. 474. But such small points are no real blemish and Mr. Hodgkin's book deserves a hearty welcome as an attempt to popularize an important and neglected period of history, nor is it without instruction even for advanced students.

E. W. BROOKS.

A History of Greek Literature from the earliest period to the death of Demosthenes, by F. B. JEVONS, M.A. Second edition, 1889. pp. xvi. 525. 8s. 6d.

THE second edition of Mr. Jevons' excellent volume is a reprint of the first (1886) with the addition of an appendix on Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect and recent 'expansionist' theories, and a series of examination questions. The greater part of the appendix on Fick and the expansionists consists in a quotation from an article by the writer in *J.H.S.* (1886) on the rhapsodizing of the Iliad. Mr. Jevons maintains that the 'aggregationists' (the school of Lachmann, now practically extinct) and the 'expansionists' reverse the actual order of proceedings. Only in the earliest times was the composition of a long poem possible because only then could the requisite number of auditors be assembled night after night to listen to it. Fick's theory Mr. Jevons only partially adopts, maintaining that there was a trans-literation from Achaean or Aeolic to Ionic only to a certain extent, and that even to that extent the Iliad was not Ionized at one time but only piecemeal by the rhapsodists. To these latter he assigns a far-reaching influence on the construction of the present text. The Homeric hymns are a collection of invocations with which the rhapsodists prefaced their recitations. If the god or hero in whose honour the rhapsodist was about to recite did not happen to be referred to in Homer, the rhapsodist, after giving the invocation, boldly inserted an appropriate reference to him in the text. Thus he accounts for Z 130-141 (description of the worship of Dionysos). Again, the habit which the rhapsodists had of rounding off their recitations by a few lines to complete the extract accounts for some of the discrepancies, comp. e.g. E 575-579 with N 656-659. The latter may have been added by a rhapsodist to finish off a recitation of N 330-655. Other inconsistencies may be due to the rhapsodist inserting a line or two of explanation necessary for understanding the extract. Mr. Jevons finds examples of this in Ξ 30-40 and Π 69-86.

Finally, Mr. Jevons contends that, whereas we know on good evidence that the Iliad was rhapsodized and we have thus a *vera causa*, while we have no evidence that it was expanded, we are bound logically to exhaust the consequences of the rhapsodizing before considering the action of purely hypothetical causes. Whatever may be the value of Mr. Jevons' ingenious contributions towards the solution of the Homeric question (which is after all insoluble), and they seem to me to be of no slight importance, the broad and liberal spirit in which he deals with it deserves recognition. It may be contrasted with that of some critics (mostly German I suspect), who, as he caustically remarks, 'examine the Homeric poems as they would a candidate's dissertation for a degree, and have no hesitation in rejecting the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey for not knowing his Homer.'

As the first edition came out before the birth of the *Classical Review*, perhaps I may be allowed to make a few remarks on the book generally. It is divided into two parts, Greek Poetry and Greek Prose, and the aim is rather to give a conspectus of the development of Greek Literature than to deal with the subject biographically. Of course the two methods

run together to a great extent, but the former is, I think, more interesting and more philosophical. 'Classical Greek Literature is the proper introduction to literature generally because in it the laws which determined its development are simple and can be easily traced.' The reason why Greek Literature clings so closely to and so clearly represents the civilization of the time at which it appeared is because it was originally composed for the ear and not for the eye, for a public that listened and did not read. To this cause is traceable much of its excellence, e.g. its 'lucidity,' its avoidance of needless repetition, its consciousness of itself as an art.

R. C. S.

Tabellarisk oversigt over den Latinske litteraturs historie, by BASTIEN DAHL. Published by Cammermeyer, Christiania and Copenhagen, 1891.

THE special feature of this synopsis of the history of Roman literature is that, in place of a chronological classification of the authors, the writings are separately classified according to their subject-matter in parallel columns and at the same time in historical sequence, so that each meets the eye in its proper relative position both from the literary and historical point of view. Alongside of these columns we have, in chronological order, an apt selection of historical landmarks, not merely dates but likewise names and events, and especially events of importance in relation to literature. There are few faults, even of omission, except that the Christian literature is entirely left out, notwithstanding that the chronology is carried down to the fall of the Western Empire. Not only is the Christian theology excluded, but the Christian poets (even Prudentius) disappear. The author should rather have taken pains, even at the expense of an additional column, to mark the gradual emergence of the new schools from the age of M. Aurelius onwards. It is likewise to be regretted that some more or less questionable dates are given without a note of interrogation. For instance, B.C. 184 is assigned as the birth-year of Terence. This implies what is surely impossible, that he had made his name as a dramatist and formed his style at the age of 17 or 18 (for the *Andria* was produced B.C. 166). The statement of Nepos (on which the author presumably relies), that Terence was contemporary (*aequalis*) with Scipio minor, need not be taken to mean that he was no older; and the contrary is affirmed e.g. by Fenestella and Santra (in Suetonius *de poetis*). The date B.C. 55, which is given for the birth of Juvenal, depends on an isolated statement (in one manuscript, the cod. Barberini), the authority for which is not established. The *Dialogus* of Tacitus is dated A.D. 96, the year of Domitian's death. As regards this we have only the historian's statement that he published nothing during Domitian's reign; but his words rather suggest that he had written something (therefore, the *Dialogus*) before that emperor came to the throne (A.D. 81). Hyginus (*libri grammatici*) is dated circ. 120 A.D.: an earlier date is more likely, since veterans of Vespasian (who died A.D. 77) were still living when the work was composed. The date assigned to Terentianus' work on prosody, 'circ. 292 A.D.' is too late, perhaps by a century; that writer quotes among his 'exempla novella' Septimius Serenus, Annianus and Altius Avitus, who are of Hadrian's time or not much later. Terentianus was placed at the close of the third century solely on the ground that he cites Petronius; it is strange that the author leaves him there, while he has rightly removed

Petronius from the third century to the first. In one or two instances of doubtful authorship the reader is likely to be puzzled. The anonymous 'Ilias Latina' (Homerus Latinus) is ascribed to some 'Italicus,' apparently distinct from Silius Italicus. The evidence for this is the supposed acrostic formed by the initial letters of the last eight lines of the poem (Italices). If we accept the view that the author thus modestly disguised his name, it seems less likely that there was another poet of that name than that the poem (a mere translation) was a juvenile essay of Silius. Similarly an historian 'Florus' appears by the side of the poet 'P. Annius Florus.' There is little reason to doubt that the two writers are identical, in spite of the 'L. Annaeus' prefixed to the name of the former in some MSS.

Apart from these incidental defects, the execution as well as the plan of the work is excellent. It is somewhat surprising that a synopsis of this kind has not yet found its place where it would be most useful, in our Latin dictionaries.

G. C. W. WARR.

Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses. Vol. xi.
Halle: Niemeyer, 1891. 4 Mk. 80.

A. Hildebrand, *De verbis et intransitive et causative apud Homerum usurpatis*. The writer discusses, first verbs of which the intransitive force may be explained by an ellipsis of words denoting the object (only *ἵππους* with *ἄρμα* and *δίδρον, νῆα, ὄδω, χρόνον*): here belong but six simple verbs (*ἐλαύνω, διώκω, ἔχω, στρέφω, κέλλω, ἵμι*, with *διατρέβω*) and their compounds. Secondly, he gives an account of other intransitive verbs of which the intransitive force has often been explained by an ellipsis of the reflexive pronoun (*βάλλω*, etc.). This is a false explanation, since comparative grammar shows that in the vast majority of cases the intransitive is the original force. Many verbs are discussed and the sense of many verses is examined: original views are presented on *ἐρείδω, ἄρμωζω, πυκάζω* (primarily transitive), *κατακρύπτω, παύω, περιτροπέω, διέμαι, πῆσσω* (primarily intransitive). The results of this minute study of the language of Homer point distinctly to a diversity of authorship, not only for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but also for various parts of the two poems.

H. Pusch, *Quaestiones Zenodoteae*. Great attention has been paid to the Homeric studies of Zenodotus, but not to the other works current under this name. The writer first shows that there were at least four scholars of the Alexandrine age named Zenodotus, viz. Zenodotus Ephesius (*fl.* under Ptolemy Philadelphus), Z. Mallotas, Z. Alexandrinus, Z. Philetaerus, the three latter of uncertain date. He then frames lists of the works of these men, critically discussing the testimonies relating thereto and briefly characterises their features. Zenodotus Alexandrinus was author of *λύσεις Ὀμηρικῶν ἀπορημάτων, πρὸς Πλάτωνα περὶ θεῶν, εἰς τὴν Ἡσίοδου θεογονίαν*. Zenodotus Mallotas, also called *δ Κρατήσιος*, and often confounded with the former, wrote works known as *πρὸς τὰ ὕμ' Ἀριστάρχου ἀθετούμενα, Παιονία*, and a commentary on Aratus. His only foolish dictum appears to have been his assertion that Homer was a Chaldean (Schol. A on *Il.* Ψ 79). The works known as *ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα (ἐπιτομαί)* and *ἐθνικά λήξεις* could not have been the work of Z. Ephesius, but may have been composed by one of the others. The work *διαφορὰ φωνῶν καὶ ἡχῶν* was composed by Zenodotus Philetaerus. Zenodotus Ephesius, the greatest name, was the author of *γλῶσσαι*, editions of Homer, Hesiod, Anacreon and Pindar, besides essays on Homeric subjects. He was acute and untiring, but too subjective.

W. Meiners, *Quaestiones ad Scholia Aristophanea Historica pertinentes*. This suggestive and well-written dissertation begins with a sketch of the Aristophanic studies of the early grammarians, and of the history of the Scholia. Didymus Chalcenterus compiled the work of his predecessors, and his commentary caused theirs to pass into oblivion: his material, slightly augmented by other grammarians, was re-edited with additions by Symmachus (Hadrian's reign), and later by Phaenus. Then the Scholiasts began their excerpting, using not only the Symmachean commentaries but also earlier ones in which the purer Didymus was embodied, if not Didymus's own. Thus was wrought, before the time of Suidas, the body of Scholia which duly found their way to the several MSS. of the plays. The historical Scholia of Aristophanes are almost wholly Didymean in origin, there being at least 53 passages that are demonstrably Didymean. The arguments used to show this relation are: (1) mentions of Didymus's name, and traces of his style (*μήποτε*, etc.); (2) coincidences with Hesychius, who we know drew from Didymus's *lexicon comicum*; (3) proverbs, etc. The sources of Didymus are explored, with the result that we find Herodotus as authority in 14 places; Thucydides, 37; Xenophon, perhaps 6; Ephorus, 10 or 12; Theopompus, 8 (*Pac.* 363 is not included in Muller's *F. H. G.*); Hellanicus, 3; Androtion, 6; no trace of Demio, Phanodemus, or Demetrius Phalereus, but Philochorus, apparently 28 (of which the following are not found in *F. H. G.*:—Schol. ad *Lys.* 1138, *Ran.* 720, *Nub.* 549, *Vesp.* 1223, *Lys.* 1144, *Nub.* 584, *Il.* 34, 35, *Thesm.* 841, *Vesp.* 283, *Ran.* 191, *Plut.* 173); Craterus, 5+5 (private *ψηφίσματα*); Aristotle's *πολιτεία*, 4 [the discovery of the *Ἀθ. Πολ.* shows that the number is much larger, not to speak of numerous Didymean-Aristotelian citations in the antiquarian scholia]; list of Olympioniceae (Eratosthenes?), 3; Aesch. *Soc.*, 1 (*Ath.* 527). The only doubtful historical scholia are those on Coesyras; *Eq.* 445, *Il.* 12-14 [is not this Philochorean?]; *Plut.* 180, but they all have marks of Didymus. An index of passages and of persons adds to the value of this important contribution to our knowledge more especially of the historical studies of Didymus.

Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis. Edd.
I. MUELLER et A. LUCHS. Vol. v. 1891. Erlangen, Deichert. M. 6.

H. Steiger, *Der Eigennamen in der attischen Komödie*. In this literary study, under the heads *Wortwitz* and *Sachwitz* all the proper names and adjectives, historical and fictitious, occurring in Attic comedy are discussed, and remarks made on their various connotations. The proverbial character of many proper names is touched upon: e.g. Orestes is shown to be proverbial for a man of power and violence, dangerous to society.

A. Koeberlin, *De participiorum usu Liviano capita selecta: cap. I: de usu Liviano in iungendis participiis liberiore disputatumcula*. The writer treats of the instances in Livy of the future active participle connected with a foregoing expression by an apparently otiose conjunction (e.g. *deficiente consilio rogantesque*, *I.* 29, 3), the origin and stylistic value of this habit of speech. He concludes by saying that there is no essential difference between Livy and the Augustan poets in this matter, and that 'in Livii Curtique operibus participia illa tamquam ornamenta orationis comparere.'

H. Bezzel, *Coniecturae Diodorae*. The value of the underrated Codex Coislinianus is vindicated, and forty-five passages of the text, mainly from books xii. xiv. xv. and xvii. are emended. An important essay.