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](#)

Von Planta's Osco-Umbrian Grammar *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*; zweiter Bd. (Formenlehre, Syntax, Sammlung der Inschr. etc.) von R. von Planta. Trübner, Strassburg. 1897. 20 Mk.

R. S. Conway

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 05 / June 1898, pp 254 - 257

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032200, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032200

How to cite this article:

R. S. Conway (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 254-257 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032200

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Lastly, the absence of an interrogative particle is common enough in Homer, in fact rather more common than actually appears from the vulgate; for the later Greeks could

not resist the temptation to turn Homer's οὐ οἶσθα; regularly into ἦ οὐκ οἶσθα; with a crasis.

T. L. AGAR.

NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

iii. 7. Δεινομένεος the papyrus, -εος Mr. Kenyon; cf. v. 35. This may be the better form, but the editor's argument that 'εο, even when contracted by synizesis, remains short (e.g. θεός Pind. *Pyth.* i. 56) is vicious. In θεότιμον xi. 12 θεο is anceps, but in xvii. 132 θεόπομπον is _ _ _ and θεοφιλές xi. 60 is _ _ _ Cf. θευπροσίαν x. 41. At best the cases of short εο (that is, εο where ε is treated like ι) are rare. In *Pyth.* x. 28 for βρότειον (_ _) many read βροτόν. In Praxilla 1 we have τεόν (_). In Bacch. viii. 12 I prefer to keep the epitrite unresolved.

ix. 45. Following the papyrus, Mr. Kenyon reads σών, ὃ πολυζήλωτ' ἄναξ, ποταμών. In the corresponding verse of epode α' (v. 19) he reads ἄ καὶ τότ' Ἀδραστον Ταλ[αιονίδαν]

and notes the difference between the scansion of Ταλαιονίδας here (_ _ _ _) and in Pind. *Ol.* vi. 15 (_ _ _ _ _). In 19 I propose Ταλαϊονίδαν as in Pindar, and in 45 πολυζήλωτε ἄναξ. In iii. 76, v. 84, Bacchylides, it is true, does not admit hiatus before ἄναξ. Still, his procedure is tolerably eclectic. We have τε ἰοβλεφάρων ix. 3, θέντα ἰόπλοκον ix. 72, Δάματρα ἰοστέφανον iii. 2, but μὲν ἰοστέφανων v. 3, λήξεν ἰοστέφανου xiii. 89; δὲ ἑκατι frag. 1, 7; and εἶ keeps its length before εἰπεῖν, ἔρδων, εἰδώς, though here the ictus falls on the adverb. If Pindar shows hiatus before ἄναξ, why not Bacchylides?

BEATRICE REYNOLDS.

Bryn Mawr College.

VON PLANTA'S OSCO-UMBRIAN GRAMMAR.¹

Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte; zweiter Bd. (Formenlehre, Syntax, Sammlung der Inschr. etc.) von R. VON PLANTA. Trübner, Strassburg. 1897. 20 Mk.

THE completion of Dr. Von Planta's great grammar deserves a cordial welcome. Every one who has used the first volume,—and that is the same thing as saying every one who has studied the Italic Dialects since its appearance in 1892—has waited anxiously for the second, which was to give us not merely a greatly needed revision of the text of the Oscan and Umbrian inscriptions, but also a commentary upon them, and an account of the morphology and syntax. And the volume now published will more than satisfy the expectation aroused by the

first. What was said in this Review (December, 1893, vii. 465) as to the general advantages and drawbacks of the fulness of treatment, which is the most striking characteristic of that volume, need not be here repeated. Much the same criticism might be applied to the 400 pages which in the second are given to *Formenlehre*; but on the other hand the reader will find that in mechanical details, such as the divisions of paragraphs, and the use of various type, this instalment of the grammar is far better arranged; and he will probably feel also that the discussion of forms actually occurring in the inscriptions is more practical, that is, it bears more on the interpretation of the inscriptions—which is after all the basis of every other kind of study of the dialects,—than the abstract elaboration of phonetic questions to which the first volume was devoted. But besides these the present volume, beyond all possible question, contains work of a very high order in quite a new

¹ [Professor Conway undertook this review in generous response to my urgent request, though his engagements made it quite impossible for him to deal with it until long after its publication.—G. E. M.]

field; the author has subjected the text of a large number of the inscriptions¹ to a minute and searching revision at first hand, sometimes with brilliant results, as in the deciphering and partial reconstruction of what may perhaps be called the *kulu-pu*-curse.

It would serve no useful purpose to dwell on matters which I have discussed in 'The Italic Dialects,' especially the variant readings which Von Planta kindly allowed me to include in the Addenda to that edition. But mention may be made of some new and important suggestions of Von Planta's, and then of one or two points in which our difference or agreement touches questions of special interest. The analysis of Latin *semper* on the pattern of *parumper* into a post-position with the neuter form corresponding to Gr. *ἐν* so as to mean 'for good and all, once for all, always,' is, so far as I know, new and, I think, incontestable. The suggestion (p. 179) that Osc. *serevkiđ*, *prupukid* (with the very uncertain form *medikiđ*), are ablatives which show a confusion of the *-io-* and *-i-* stems would enable us to render the first word as equivalent to a Lat. *servitium*, i.e. 'ministerium, administratio,' which would make very good sense. The restoration *osin[s]* ('obsint, adsint') in the third line of the Tabula Bantina for the corrupt *osii...* is quite convincing, and adds a new word to the Oscan vocabulary, with a phonetic treatment of the group *-ps-* which is very interesting. But perhaps the most important of the new suggestions I have noticed is the explanation which Von Planta offers (p. 352) of the difficult future perfect formation shown by Umb. *purđinsiusť*, *combifiansiusť*, etc. In these forms he sees an old infinitive or stem-noun in the accusative, like the regular Osco-Umbrian inf. *erom* ('esse') and the Latin 'uenum' in 'uenum-ire, uenum-do,' on which Postgate and Brugmann have respectively based their certain explanations of the Latin future inf. and gerund.² To

this infinitive we are to suppose was added as a post-position *-ce* (cf. Umbr. *-com*) meaning 'to,' and the following *-iusť* is at once intelligible as the fut. perf. equivalent to or identical with Lat. *ierit*. Until further support is found in the Italic group or elsewhere for this post-positional use of *-ce* with a case, the theory can hardly be said to be proved, but its simplicity is strongly in its favour. Curiously enough, Von Planta, so far as I can find, does not cite what might surely be regarded as the strong confirmatory evidence of the Sanskrit periphrastic perfects like *bōdhayām-āsa*, *vidām-cakāra* which show a precisely similar accusative infinitive form containing a long-stem vowel. Still the Latin forms like *aman-do* are much nearer evidence, though they do not show a conjugational use. Verbal phrases in Latin like *infittias ire* are also good evidence, if such were needed, of this periphrastic type.

I am very glad to find that I am at one with Von Planta in holding that *Būvaianūd* (p. 420) must be the name of a town, and that *do-ni-que*, *do-ni-cum*, contain the preposition *dō*. He recognises also that the stem of Lat. *is*, *ea*, *id*, is only used in Oscan and Umbrian in the nom. and acc.; the remaining cases being supplied by longer compound stems (*ieso-* etc.). But the similar distinction which he assumes in Oscan only in the use of the stems *eko-* and *ekso-* does not seem to me quite so certain. The most noteworthy of the author's negative conclusions is his rejection, *in toto*, of Zimmer's theory of the Italo-Celtic passive in *r*. He goes so far as to deny (p. 428) that *ūltiumam* is the object of *sakrafir* in the well-known *Jovila*-inscription (*I.D.* 113) except on the hypothesis that the verb is a personal deponent form. I cannot think that there is at present any evidence for the confusion of the personal (Umb. *emantur*) and impersonal (Umb. *ferar*) classes of these forms on which Von Planta bases his objections; in particular, *sakarater* of the Tabula Agnon. must surely be personal, if the following list of nominatives are to have any construction (*partec.* are derived) where, it is to be noticed, the gerundive is comparatively rarely substituted for it (*e.g.* Liv. 1, 8, *concitando ad se multitudinem*, and continually in the historians); (3) by the far greater frequency of the use of the gerund with *ad* than with any other prepn., in which one may see an echo of the earliest use of the form in *-dō* to express purpose, as it still does in the 'dative' use.

The gerundive, however, still seems to me to have been a present partic. in *-onjos*, *-enjos* (for the phonetics cf. *tendo: relvō*), whose use was severely and peculiarly restricted by its association with the 'gerund' forms, as Roby long since maintained.

¹ Chiefly those of Sulmona, Capua, and the Naples Museum (though here with some omissions); the more outlying inscc., in Rome, London, Berlin, and Vienna, and all the coins he has taken from other authorities, which are generally quite adequate.

² Brugmann's analysis of the 'ablative' of the gerund, *e.g.* *regundō*, into this inf. + the postposn. *-dō*, 'to,' appears to me to be established by one or two points in its usage which I have not seen quoted in this connexion: (1) by the fact that the abl. of the gerund is far more common than *e.g.* the genitive; (2) by the remarkable freedom of the use of the abl. as the equivalent of a modal active partic. (whence indeed the Italn. and Span. act.

whatever; and with Buck I prefer to regard *lamatir* as a present, not perfect, subjunctive, and therefore personal. But even should such a confusion of usage come to light in fresh inscriptions, the balance of probability would still seem to me to lie with Zimmer's view. Von Planta has undoubtedly put his finger on the weak point of the theory as at present stated when he demands some better explanation than Zimmer's of the origin of the deponent use in Italic. But if one may venture to say so, without more knowledge of the Celtic languages than I can claim, Thurneysen's *ipse dixit* (apud Brugmann's *Grundriss*, ii. p. 1392) which Von Planta accepts without question, seems to offer very slight and unconvincing objections to the striking parallelism of the Celtic forms, especially in Welsh. But in this as in other points where Von Planta's own conclusion may not commend itself to the reader, the usefulness of his grammar is not in the least diminished. It is characteristic of the book from first to last that justice is done quite as fully to the views which the author rejects as to those which he accepts; and there is something almost pathetic in the generous temper which leads him to credit old and almost forgotten writers (like Huschke and Newman) with even the smallest suggestions of value which can be counted as theirs. And as regards living writers Von Planta is equally chivalrous. I note in passing that Elmer's convincing discussion of the Latin prohibitive uses (in *A. J. P.* xv.) was unfortunately inaccessible (p. 434) to him, and his account of the Oscan and Umbrian prohibitions has suffered in consequence.

In the collection of inscriptions the author is guided by the principle of inclusion;¹ thus he prints spurious inscriptions, many of which have long fallen out of notice, side by side with the rest, generally warning the reader of their real character in a footnote.² Further, he includes one or two insc. from South Italy, of which it is still doubtful to what language they belong, e.g. the helmet insc. beginning with the word or words *Ferretur* and the still doubtful insc. of

Castelluccio beginning with *rovrs* (ξουρι?) and others which I need not mention. He includes also the large class of East-Italic or 'Sabellic' inscriptions, whose alphabet and language are still unsolved conundrums. The same method appears in his treatment of the difficult class of Etrusco-Campanian inscriptions collected in Nos. 172-177 *hhh*. It is now agreed that as a class they exhibit a mixture of language; but Von Planta abstains from any attempt to separate even individual inscriptions which might be regarded as having no Oscan characteristics whatever. In 165a, Von Planta gives as presumably Oscan the legend of a curious ring in the Pascale collection at Curti, which the present writer has reason to remember. The text as I read it⁴ runs: *pu βεκε vβε το rov θεov ovoma oou(ρ)is*, but it is written from right to left in Greek character of the second century A.D. squared, so that θ appears as θ, and σ as σ. This I published in facsimile in the *Athenaeum*, April 28, 1894, calling attention to the apparently archaic alphabet but offering no transcription. It was at length explained by the Earl of Southesk in the *Athenaeum* for June 23 of the same year as a Gnostic charm, similar to others on rings which he had in his own collection; the first words, *pu βεκε vβε*, he regarded as Koptic.

Among the new readings in insc. already known, which the author proposes, are two in the very difficult text of the Tanternaean Jovilae of Capua. In the first of these he reads *staiēf fud* instead of Bücheler's *staiēf fuf*, which he thinks impossible; and if the correction holds, the new verbal form is one of great importance (cf. Skt. *bhut*). In the second insc. of the pair he gives the protasis of the last sentence thus: *pūn medd pis inīm verehīas fust* (marking as doubtful only the first *d*, the *p* of *pīs*, and the *h* in *verehīas*) instead of Bücheler's *pūn medd pis ūniveresim fust*, which he thinks impossible. In the 'Italic Dialects,' No. 114, I marked the *ū*, the *s* and the *m* of *ūniveresim* as doubtful, and indeed, as I then lamented, certainty can hardly be hoped for, seeing the nature of the stuff in which this unfortunate inscription has been hewn—friable tufa full of 'faults,' that is, lumps of stone or other hard substances which cannot be cut with a chisel, but which have in places sprung out alto-

¹ The only exception to this is the limitation implied in the title; no dialects are recognised outside the Osco-Umbrian group; thus those nearest to Latin, like Faliscan, are left out, save for one or two specimens thrown in at the end.

² To No. 296a *toce stahu*, which is given as an insc. not hitherto published, I venture to think a similar note might have been added. It looks like the work of a forger who took at random two words from known Umbr. insc. in Latin alphabet, producing a fragment which declares that 'I am dedicated to (or on) bacon'!

³ This thoroughly misleading term (now promoted to a third meaning) seems to die hard.

⁴ I can vouch for the last three letters as *oou*, though they are very difficult to make out on the edge of the gem.

gether from the face of the block, leaving shapeless cavities behind. The letters *vere* may be regarded as fairly certain, but I hardly think that Von Planta's explanation of his *inim* will suffice to defend it. He renders the clause 'cum magistratus quis et (quidem) civitatis erit,' the apodosis being *sakrafir*, 'let a sacrifice be held.' This I find hard to understand¹ and still harder to parallel in any Latin or dialectic inscription. It would be useless to enumerate the large number of passages in which Von Planta's corrections agree with my own. But I have already alluded to his brilliant transcription of the *kulupu*-curse, which is written on nine tiny fragments of lead and can scarcely be read with the naked eye.

¹ Von Planta suggests that it was written in the 'sad, meddix-less period' of the siege, 214-211 B.C., but this does not seem to make the sentence much clearer.

The historical and archaeological aspects of the inscriptions lie outside the province of the grammar, which is an attempt to extract from these dialects the utmost value they possess, not so much for the study of Ancient Italy as for general comparative philology. But for this purpose Von Planta's work has easily surpassed all previous attempts, and the book is a monument of devoted learning, sound judgment, and keen penetration.

Sic vos non vobis; in the very excellence of his work lies the certainty of its being superseded, for it has enormously promoted inquiry into every point of Osco-Umbrian grammar. And in this province the book represents for our generation the high-water mark of research.

R. S. CONWAY.

TYRRELL AND PURSER'S EDITION OF CICERO'S LETTERS.

The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, Vol. V. Edited by Prof. R. TYRRELL, and Prof. L. C. PURSER. Dublin University Press, 1897. 14s.

EVERYBODY will be glad to congratulate the scholarly Editors of Cicero on the near approach to completion of their great work in this penultimate instalment. We read with pleasure that 'a considerable portion of the sixth and final volume of the (actual) correspondence is already printed,' and that the task 'will then have been completed, but for the Index, which must have a volume to itself'—an encouraging promise of thoroughness.

The present volume only includes the letters of a year and a half, but they reach the enormous number of 242, extending from March, 45, at the time of the death of Tullia, to August or September, 44, just about the time of the delivery of the First Philippic. Those of the latter year—all but five of which are after the Ides of March—are it need scarcely be said, fully equal in interest to any portion of the great collection. But the case is very different with the letters of the year 45, which are perhaps the least interesting—as the period is probably the least useful—of all Cicero's Life. It is worth notice that of the 163 letters remaining from this year only nine find a place in Mr. Watson's selection.

The volume is prefaced by two Introductory studies; one a biography of the younger Cicero, which does not succeed in eliciting any new facts of importance, the other a moderate and ably stated essay, from the author's point of view, entitled 'Cicero's Case against Caesar.' This latter is reprinted bodily from the *Quarterly Review*, which is, I venture to think, a mistake. It would have been better to write the essay specially in each case for its intended object. Where it first appeared, it was in part too technical and reference-loaded for its place. On the other hand where it stands now it has an uneasy appearance of writing down to a popular level. Perhaps this is the cause of the curious slip about M. Marcellus, so carefully condemned by our authors themselves in anticipation. On p. xiii. we read that 'even he who is no scholar will see how misleading it is to write as if 'patrician' and 'plebeian' were terms correlative with each other in the same way as the terms 'rich' and 'poor.' Two pages further on M. Marcellus is described as 'a great patrician.' Mr. Froude would of course have forgotten, but our editors ought not to have done so, that the Marcelli were a great plebeian—not patrician—family.

It is satisfactory to find that the Critical Introduction on the whole throws in its lot with the sound and almost convincing