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](#)

***Latin Lyric Verse Composition.* By J. H. Lupton. Macmillan and Co. 3s.**

E. D. Stone

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 05 / May 1889, pp 217 - 218
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194971, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194971

How to cite this article:

E. D. Stone (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 217-218 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194971

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Sprache), and consist of statistical examinations of certain uses of the Infinitive. The results arrived at are not of startling novelty, but both works contain full digests of instances which will be found useful by grammarians and editors.—Dr. Birklein traces the development of the substantival use of the infinitive from Homer to Xenophon. In Homer and Hesiod we find the bare infinitive (present) as subject, e.g. κ 73 οὐ γὰρ μοι θεῖμιν ἐστὶ κομίζεμεν οὐδ' ἀποπέμψειν (into the origin of this construction Dr. Birklein does not enter: cf. Monro *Hom. Gram.* p. 157), but not the infin. with τὸ (in v 52 analogy points to τὸ being the demonstrative pronoun). Pindar and the lyric poets have the infin. with τὸ, but not with τοῦ, τῷ. In certain (later?) plays of Aeschylus (*Agam.*, *Suppl.*, *Prom.*) we find occasional instances of τοῦ, τῷ, with infin. (5 in all). In Thucydides, the orators, Plato and Xenophon this use is fully developed, the infinitive phrase or clause being treated exactly on the same footing as a noun. Incidentally the author finds occasion to defend the MS. reading τοῦ μὴ with infin. dependent on a verb of 'hindering' or 'removing' in the infin. with τὸ (e.g. Herod. I. 86, Thuc. I. 76, 2, Demosth. 23, 149, Plat. *Leus* 637 c, Xen. *Cyr.* II. 4, 23) which have been altered by Hertlein and Dindorf on the ground that the construction is illogical: Dr. Birklein might have supported his contention by comparing the Latin constructions *cave ne facias* and *cave facias*, which are precisely equivalent.

Dr. Grünwald discusses the 'infinitive of limitation' (e.g. in ἐκὼν εἶναι, ὀλίγου δεῖν, τὸ ἐπὶ σφᾶς εἶναι, τὸ νῦν εἶναι, εἰκόσαι, συμβάλλειν, ἀκούσαι, ἰδεῖν, εἰδέναι, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὡς εἴπειν, εἴπειν), maintaining that this use of the infin. is analogous to an accusative of limitation: so too in such phrases as ὀλίγοι ἐσμεν ἁμύνειν, 'we are few as to ἁμύνειν.' All such infinitives serve to limit a thought or the form in which a thought is expressed. The author does not deny that historically the infinitive is a dative (or locative: cf. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, p. 93) of a *nomen actionis*; but he holds that in the above-mentioned use it is felt as an adverbial accusative, and that when dependent on a verb like ζητῶ, δύναιμι, &c., it is felt as 'eine unmittelbare Ergänzung zum Verbum.' In drawing this general distinction between the historical origin of a form and its function in a certain usage the author appears to be quite on the right lines; but whether in function the 'limiting accus.' is more nearly related to an accusative of limitation or to the original dative meaning of the infinitive (ἁμύνειν 'with a view to ἁμύνειν') is a point on which it is more difficult to pronounce: in favour of the view that in ζητῶ μινεῖσθαι, δύναιμι ποιῆσαι the infinitive is most simply regarded as an object, a good deal might be said. Why does not Dr. Grünwald use the term 'object' instead of 'accusative' when maintaining this point? 'Accusative' is a term denoting a *form*, and cannot be properly applied to the Greek infinitive. In the course of the investigation reasons are given for holding with Madvig and a minority of German grammarians that in τὸ νῦν εἶναι, τὸ does not go with εἶναι, but that εἶναι is added to the phrase τὸ νῦν: in ὀλίγου δεῖν analogy points to δεῖν being an infinitive, not a participle as maintained by Usener and others.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

Latin Lyric Verse Composition. By J. H. LUPTON. Macmillan and Co. 3s.

THIS little book must be regarded chiefly as a school book, and secondarily as a collection of modern lyrics. From the first point of view there is one unqualified ground of commendation: the transla-

tions are almost always elegant and poetical; but this necessitates an excessive amount of help, which might have been avoided if the English were balder. This is however a fault, if a fault, on the right side. But then is this real training in the art of writing lyrics, which we will assume, though it is a large assumption, to be an art attainable in this overcrowded age by advanced scholars? I venture to think this would be far better taught by original exercises unfettered by the exigencies of translation, and there are very few of these in Mr. Lupton's book. The late Mr. Munro is credibly reported to have said that the only lyrics since Horace are to be found in *Lucretius*, a book composed for the use of Eton boys. These are in no instance translations, nor are they, as is too often the case with modern lyrics, mere centos of Horatian phrases. Whether they bear out Mr. Munro's high eulogium any one may judge by ordering the key. In Mr. Lupton's collection are pieces of various merit, but few absolutely faultless. Some of the best are the Asclepiads at the end of the book, though the rule he lays down for the Pherecratean verse, that it must end with a long syllable, is four times violated. Mr. Lupton is a purist in language, and protests against the intrusion of the silver age in the Horatian lyric. As however most of the exercises are the work of other pens, he is unable to exclude offenders. So we find 'profligere,' 'dulcisonus,' 'suavisonus,' 'blandiloquus,' 'alescere,' 'mellitor,' 'calyx,' 'expandere,' 'aeva,' 'caelos,' 'hymnus'; 'terrenus amor' is hardly justified by 'terrenum equitem'; and 'bees' must have had a sheepish sound to a Roman ear. 'Ast,' a word disallowed by Mr. Lupton, also occurs, and he has himself written 'audiui' in despite of his own canon, when 'audi' would have served his purpose as well. The use of 'gremium' for 'the heart' has been long exploded. 'Senilis' is strangely used for 'senex' three times in a translation from a chorus of Euripides.

But the line laid down by Mr. Lupton is too hard and fast; in many cases a well-trained ear with careful study may be trusted to decide whether a given word is or is not admissible, that is, whether Horace would have used it if he had wanted it.

There is a false print, 'negante' for 'neganti' in Ex. 10, and presumably an omission: 'sophia (en!) recenti' in Ex. 30. Twice the abl. of the comparative in -i- occurs, a form wholly unknown to the golden age.

Some grammatical points require attention. Unless the ordinary doctrine of the sequence of tenses has been completely upset by recent investigations, what is to be said for (16)—

Vindictæ divum sibi quisque munus,
mente quæ surgunt prohibente nullo ut
verba referret.

The subjunctive with 'dum' is scarcely defensible in Exx. 5, 32, 51. que—et, Exx. 21, 22, is at least very rare. Can 'suscitet cordi' mean 'awaken in my heart,' and 'mihi moreretur' 'die for me'? 'triste mane oritur' is not admissible, 'mane' being almost always used as an adverb; never with a distinctive epithet such as 'triste' and never with any verb but 'sum.' 'benignis suppliciiis' can hardly mean 'kindly punishments,' or 'lubens funus' 'a voluntary death.' But strangest of all is 'quando' in the sense of 'whenever,' Ex. 45.

Again, how all-important is the order of words. What is to be made of—

docuitque chartis
prudens honestum prava loquentibus
servare tortum.

or

amota terrae tantus amor fugae
desideranti.

or

quicquid amabile
fallebat, ut quondam vagantis,
sponte redit, simulacra somni.

Such criticisms as the above are not intended as specimens of the lyrics, many of which are admirable; but, as the book is intended mainly to teach boys, nothing should be admitted which is not unexceptionable, and a lyric, like a sonnet, ought to be a perfectly polished gem. There is no excuse for nodding.

E. D. STONE.

The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages compared with that of the Modern Languages. By HENRI WEIL. Translated, with Notes and Additions, by CHARLES W. SUPER, Ph.D., President of the Ohio University. Boston: Ginn and Company. 1887. Pp. 114. 5s.

PRESIDENT SUPER has rendered a genuine service to classical scholarship by translating this essay, written originally for the doctorate (1844), and given to the public in two subsequent editions (1869, 1879).

In the modern languages the order of words is so largely determined by the grammatical construction that the course of thought, especially in prose, is often disturbed by its dependence on the syntactical arrangement; divers shifts and inversions are needed to preserve a natural sequence of ideas: in short, these languages are not *free*, there is a tyranny of the analytic method, of the so-called 'logical order.' But the Latin and the Greek are free languages, the spiritual movement is independent of the syntactical movement, thought flows clear and unimpeded, ideas assert their rightful precedence, and all the powers of oral expression attain to full and perfect exercise. Such is the author's thesis: the statement of an obvious truth, to be sure, but forming the groundwork for a systematic development of principles that are often enough ignored and disregarded in spite of their cardinal importance. The reader attends with growing interest as the subject is unfolded step by step—the natural order of words, the pathetic order, the period, descending and ascending construction, rhetorical accent, the repose of emphasis: a treatment at once concise and far-reaching, and unincumbered by superfluous learning.

It is easy to anticipate the familiar corollaries that spring from such a theme, but they seem to gain renewed force as our author evolves and illustrates them. 'In translating from one language to another, if it is not possible to imitate at the same time the syntax of the original and the order of the words, retain the order of the words and disregard the grammatical relations.' And again: 'The great secret of a good translation is to find forms of expression which will allow the translator to adopt into a foreign idiom the order of words which is found in the original.' In *Darium vicit Alexander* ('Darius was conquered by Alexander'), something is said about Darius, not about Alexander. *Alexander* is, to be sure, the grammatical subject of *vicit*, but what of that! The consciousness must not be allowed to dwell on the grammatical relations; they are the postulates of speech, grammar is the *sine qua non* of intelligibility, and for that reason can be left to take care of itself where intelligent beings are concerned. *Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίγνονται παῖδες δύο* ('Darius and Parysatis had two sons'): the sentence begins with a genitive case, but what of it? The function of the genitive was not burdening the mind of Xenophon

when he began his story, and the function of the genitive is not to be flourished in the face of the learner as if it were something grand and awful. Far more significant is the arrangement with its harmonious effects and concomitants. The grammatical construction, the analytic principle is constantly pulling the learner in the wrong direction, diverting him from the path and blinding him to that which above all things he needs to see. In order to clear the way for him, to encourage and inspire him, you must bear as constantly toward the opposite pole. Early positive instruction in languages should always be synthetic: the analytical part is negative. You do not want your boy or girl to be grammatical (heaven forbid!), but only not to be ungrammatical. What he needs to be instructed in is the concrete: the combined effect and force of what he reads and writes. Recite to him whole masses of sonorous Latin and Greek; make him read the same aloud to you in the same way. Let him learn choice passages by heart; give him a chance to acquire a wide and discriminating vocabulary; set him to writing Greek and Latin in imitation of the models daily presented to his ear; guide him to express ideas, however simple, with clearness, euphony and energy. Such are the lessons we draw from Professor Weil's thoughtful and interesting work.

The translation, in the main well done, is at some points not satisfactory. A passage on p. 47 is rendered wholly unintelligible by an ambiguous thrice-occurring *it*. Another awkward ambiguity in the last four words of p. 61 might have been avoided without sacrificing the order of words illustrated, but the example is not suited for translation, and should have been given in the original French. The Greek and Latin illustrative passages when translated at all should have been translated in accordance with the doctrine inculcated by the essay itself, but this has not always been done. The words on p. 71, *τὸν εἰς τὴν χορηγίαν δαπανῶντα οὐκ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν δεῖ τιθέναι τῷ τοῦ χοροῦ διδασκάλῳ* (he who bears the expense of the representation ought not to be put in the same rank, &c.), are turned as follows: 'it is not necessary that we should put in the same rank him who bears the expense of the representation,' &c.—bungling and false for the French ('il ne faut pas mettre,' &c.) as for the Greek. The version given for the last example on p. 65 is both obscure and wrong. Of misprints there are a great many in the Greek text, not many in the Latin and the French, sciendam p. 18, soceram p. 27, ou p. 74, furtam p. 79, appidum twice p. 113. On p. 27, by an oversight in copying apparently, the French text of the disapproved version from Horace is appended to the English that represents the approved version.

As regards the Notes, whether the author's own or those added by the translator, any debatable points which they happen to touch involve nothing that in the least affects the validity of the main thesis; they are judiciously put at the ends of the several chapters so that it is left to the reader to use them or not, as he may find it expedient.

ISAAC FLAGG.
Cornell University.

A Grammar of the Latin Language by E. A. ANDREWS and S. STODDARD. Revised by HENRY PREBLE of Harvard University. Boston. U. S. A. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888. \$ 1.12.

THE ideal Latin grammar has not yet appeared, but such approaches have been made to a satisfactory standard that the credentials of any new comer are sure to be closely scanned. While a hearty welcome awaits any work that is the outcome of an inside and comprehensive grasp of Latin usages and that takes