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](#)

Zum Eleischen, Arkadischen und Kyprischen Dialekte, Meister von Richard. Leipzig, Giesecke und Devrient: pp. 45. 1 M. 20 Pf.

H. W. Smyth

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 62 - 63

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993338, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993338

How to cite this article:

H. W. Smyth (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 62-63 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993338

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of the Apostles. On the gloss *econes, sacerdotes rustici*, Dr. Fisch founds a long argumentation to shew that *ec-o*, which he connects with *Eg-eria*, is an old word = *sacerdos*. It is much more probable that the word is *aecones* or *aegonis*, and the reference to Vergil *Ecl.* 3, 2, *non, verum Aegonis*, and the parody of it quoted by Suetonius, *Vita Vergilii* 43: *non, verum Aegones nostri sic rure loquuntur*.

H. N.

Commentationes Fleckeisenianae. Teubner: Leipzig, 1890. 6 Mk.

This is a collection of seventeen papers on Classical subjects published by friends of Dr. Fleckeisen in honour of his seventieth birthday. The *carmen gratulatorium*, in Latin hendecasyllables, is written by O. Stange.

Fr. Giesing contributes a most interesting paper on 'Der Ausgang des Königs Oedipus von Sophokles und die aristotelische Katharsis,' arguing successfully against the view of Graffunder (started by Schneidewin) that the last scene of the *Oedipus Rex* was not in the play in its first form, but that Sophocles changed the original conclusion in order to adapt it to the motive of the *Oedipus at Kolonos*. Giesing overthrows both the external argument (of Schneidewin) drawn from a comparison with Seneca's corresponding play, and the internal argument (of Graffunder) drawn from a comparison of the final scene with the rest of the drama. But the most important part of the paper is that which deals with Aristotle's definition of tragedy. Giesing defends Goethe's explanation, which, after the discussion of Bernays, most scholars had abandoned, until the essay of Theodor Stisser ('Die Katharsis in der Poetik des Aristoteles') appeared in 1884. Goethe had rendered the words *δι' ἑλέου καὶ φόβου παραινουσα τὴν τῶν τοιοῦτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν* thus: '(Die Tragödie ist die Nachahmung einer bedeutenden und abgeschlossenen Handlung), die..... nach einem Verlauf aber von Mitleid und Furcht mit Ausgleichung solcher Leidenschaften ihr Geschäft abschliesst'; and his view was that Aristotle did not refer to the moral effect of tragedy on the spectator but only to the construction of a drama, which like all poetical works requires an 'aussöhnende Abrundung' (*kátharsis*). Giesing, in defence of this view, points out that *διὰ* need not be instrumental but (and especially with a verb of motion like *παραινῶ*) may determine the space or time to be traversed before the end (*kátharsis*) is reached. The argument by which Giesing supports the explanation of the passage is novel and interesting. He turns against Bernays the passage in which that scholar found his best weapon for his own view, namely Aristotle, *Poetics*, Bk. viii. c. 7 (the discussion on the function of music in a state): *τῶνδ' ἱερῶν μελῶν δρῶμεν τούτους, ὅταν χρήσωνται τοῖς ἐξοργίζουσι τὴν ψυχὴν μέλεσι, καθισταμένους ὥσπερ ἰατρίας τυχόντας καὶ καθάρσεως*. Here we have (1) orgiastic or enthusiastic music as the cause of (2) the state of enthusiasmos, and (3) *ἱερὰ μέλη* as its remedy and *kátharsis*. Giesing finds three similar elements in the theory of tragedy: (1) the development of the plot and the catastrophe arouse (2) states of fear and pity, which are (3) stilled by purificatory means, not mentioned, but corresponding to the *ἱερὰ μέλη*, and therefore distinct from (1) and (2). He shews then that the *καθάρσις* consists as a rule in 'die Söhnung und Versöhnung' of the hero, and the *kátharsis* is the effect of this on the audience; and works it out in the *Ajax* and *Antigone*.

W. Gilbert tries to shew that *Agamemnon* ll. 1316-1329 are spurious, having been inserted by an actor. The same writer interprets *ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην*

(l. 1444) 'nihil turpe honoreque carens perpassi sunt sed egregie cum eis actum est' and shews that there is no good authority for attributing to *ἄτιμος* the meaning of *with impunity*. On l. 1448 (*ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν εὐνῆς παροφώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς*) he accepts Pauw's *εὐνῆ* but interprets 'sed mihi, non sibi eam adduxit ad lectum ut meae libidini (ulciscendi) non ut suae libidini (vel Veneri vel superbiae) aliquid accederet.'

F. Polle introduces a number of suggestions in Euripides by a very German effusion of gratitude to Fleckeisen accompanied with personal details. The most interesting point perhaps is his view that the *Phoenician Maidens* came not from Tyre but from Sicily. Hartung had already suggested that their home was Carthage, but Euripides would never have applied to a peninsula the phrase *Φοινίσσας ἀπὸ νῆσου* (l. 204), which would naturally mean either Tyre or Sicily. Tyre cannot, without extravagant hypotheses, be reconciled with l. 208 *σγγ.* ('*Ἴόνιον κατὰ πόντον..... ὑπὲρ ἀκαρπίστον πεδίων Σικελίας Ζεφύρου πνοαῖς κ.τ.λ.*'), whereas *Τύριον ὄδμα* l. 202 may well be the sea over whose waves the Phoenicians of Carthage sailed to their colonies in Sicily. It was natural that Euripides should introduce a chorus from Sicily into one of his late plays, when the attention of the Athenian people was riveted on the island of the west. For those who are interested in the western Phoenicians there is also a paper by the author of 'die Geschichte der Karthager,' bringing forward new arguments for his view that the Fair Cape (*καλὸν ἀκρωτήριον*) of the treaties between Carthage and Rome preserved by Polybius was the modern Cape Porto Farina and not Cape Bon. F. Hultsch contributes 'Conjectanea in Polybium.' H. Uhle has a paper of conjectures on the *Symposium* of Plato, and M. Wohlrab writes on the MSS. of the *Theaetetus*. Students of ancient astronomy will find an account (with diagrams) of Geminus' *Isagoge* by Karl Manitius. J. Büttner Wobst, who has recently dealt with Zonaras in a first instalment of *Studia Byzantina*, contributes a long discussion of the sources of that historian. F. Rudolph works out the theme that Larensius, the host in Athenaeus, was no other than the famous Herodes Atticus. F. Poland writes on the *locus classicus* for the theatre at Olympia (Xen. vii. 4, 31). R. Albrecht prints, with an introduction, an unpublished Latin poem of Tito Vespasiano Strozza (1475) entitled *In Ponerolycon*, a satire on Bonvicino dalle Carte. The other papers are *Ad Plauti Miltlem Gloriosum Marginalia* by T. Hasper; *Zur Beweisführung Ciceros in der Rede für Sextus Roscius aus Ameria* by E. Lincke; *Ad Frontinum* by T. Opitz; *De locis aliquot Dietyis-Septimii* by H. Dunger and Faberius; *Studie über einen Parteigänger Caesars nach Ciceros Briefen an Atticus* by O. E. Schmidt.

J. B. BURY.

Zum Eleischen, Arkadischen und Kyprischen Dialekte, von RICHARD MEISTER. Leipzig, Giesecke und Devrient: pp. 45. 1 M. 20 Pf.

SINCE the advent of Dr. Otto Hoffmann polemics have laid hold of Greek dialectology, a department of investigation which has hitherto enjoyed an almost total exemption from the strife waged by the comparative grammarians.

After the fashion of the youthful privat-docent, who seeks to win recognition or even notoriety by drawing his *schläger* against his older kinsmen in philology, Hoffmann has thought it good to make an assault upon Meister, the editor and extender of Ahrens' Greek Dialects; and has been ignominiously routed. In No. 22 of the Göttingen *Gelehrte Anzeigen* for 1889 will be found a lengthy review by the

Königsberg privat-docent of the second volume of Meister's invaluable re-creation of Ahrens. To this critique the above-mentioned brochure is a caustic and crushing rejoinder. Candour requires it to be said that, whatever the defects in Meister's treatise, his antagonist must be adjudged guilty of slovenliness in preparation for his task of reviewer, of unfairness as a reviewer, and of an insolence which, itself devoid of method, presumes to teach method to a scholar, whose works have been before the world for over twenty years.

Meister takes up seriatim the charges made against him, defends himself with skill, and generally gives Hoffmann his quietus. We must, however, confess ourselves not satisfied with the explanation of ἰ(ν) τύχαι ἀζαταί as *bei eingetretener Dürre*. One instance, though perhaps the most flagrant, will characterize Hoffmann's procedure. H. accepts—with the exception of a single word—Meister's reading of *C.D.I.* No. 1156, ascribes it to Blass and Kirchhoff, and then pronounces against Meister for not adopting it. As might be expected from the nature of the brochure, it contains no new matter. Here and there however light is cast upon the transliteration of some of the most obscure Kyprian inscriptions.

To those who possess the second volume of Meister's work, a statement of the change in the author's positions may not be unwelcome:

p. 24 (*C.D.I.* 1156): ἀλανείως has nothing to do with ἄλη and λαμβάνω.

p. 150 (*C.D.I.* 59): τὰς εὐχολᾶς is ablative genitive.

p. 151 (*C.D.I.* 60₅): ἔχρηος not ἔ(γ)χηρος; and so ὕφαις and ἔ in ἔ τύχα, p. 221, without the nasal. These forms I had already adopted in treating of Kyprian.

p. 233: Genitives in -αῖος and datives in -αῖι in Phoinikian names in -α, and gen. in -ῖος and dat. in -ῖι of Greek *iota* stems, owe their *F* to the influence of -ῖος, -ῖι of -ῖν stems.

p. 260: πρόλεμος and σφάλλω are to be dissociated.

p. 267: πός and πρόσ are to be derived from autovocalic ποτι and προτι. That this, Brugmann's explanation, is preferable to that of Bechtel, whereby πός is from ποτ + s, I fail to see. Cf. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. xviii. p...

p. 280: *Fōs* in Homer is no support for the reading *Fō dh* in *C.D.I.* 77 (Γάμαλκος, γὸ δῆ, ἀνέθηκε Ἀπόλλωνι). Meister now reads *Fōde de suo*.

In the *Classical Review* for March 1890, Mr. Moulton, in his sharp critique of Hoffmann's *Præsens der indogermanischen Grundsprache*, implies that Göttingen is now the old 'school' in linguistics. I would put the question: because the Junggrammatiker claim that they alone are the Levites who have in charge the tabernacle of comparative grammar; because, as Fick will say in the preface to the forthcoming edition of his *Indo-European Dictionary*, the science of etymology is the only department of comparative philology not now annexed by the Junggrammatiker—does all this lead to the Göttingen school the flavour of antiquity? In what respect does the work of Fick upon accent, of Collitz upon the vowel and consonantal system of Indo-European, of Bechtel upon Greek and German grammar, bear the marks of a creed outworn? First the reign of Curtius, then the bipartite monarchy of Brugmann—Osthoff!

H. W. SMYTH.

Byzantinische Historiker des zehnten und elften Jahrhunderts. I. Nikephoros Bryennios. Eine philologisch-historische Untersuchung von JOHANNES SEGER, Dr. phil. München: Lindauer. 1888.

MANY who are familiar with the name of the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnena may be ignorant that her husband Nikephoros Bryennios was also an author and played an important part in the learned society of the day. His historical work, which is rather a sort of a family chronicle of the Komnenoi than a regular history, has been chosen by Herr Seger as the subject of the first of a series of studies on the Greek historians of the tenth and eleventh centuries. If Dr. Seger carries out his plan, he will have done somewhat the same service for the period from Leo Diakonos to Anna Komnena that Hirsch performed, fourteen years ago, for the ninth and the earlier part of the tenth century. Dr. Seger's valuable work falls into six chapters. Having given an account of (1) the life and family and (2) the work of Nikephoros, he (3) discusses the sources which that writer used and passes judgment on his value as an historian. He then goes on (4) to examine the language and style of his author, and (5) devotes a special chapter to the Preface or Προθεωρία. The concluding chapter (6) is bibliographical.

The value of Nikephoros' ἑλὴ ἱστορίας is thus summed up (p. 58): 'Sein Wert als Geschichtsschreiber ist somit ein sehr bedingter, und jedenfalls weit geringer als man bisher annahm. Grösser ist die kulturhistorische Bedeutung des Werkes gerade als einer Parteischrift und durch eine Fülle von Nachrichten über spezielle Verhältnisse des byzantinischen Reiches.'

We hope that Dr. Seger will soon give us another instalment.

J. B. BURY.

De adiectivorum verbalium -τος terminatione insignium usu Aeschyleo. CHARLES EDWARD BISHOP. Lipsiae, 1889. pp. 87. [Doctor.-Diss.]

THE dissertation before us gives a careful collection of the -τος verbals in Aeschylus, with some critical matter in reference to obscure passages. It attempts to classify results from the standpoint of the verbals themselves, as active, passive, past and future; and this suggests some interesting results, though difficulty in grasping them often arises from a separation of uses of the same word under several different headings. In Aeschylus there are comparatively few cases of the modal future (Lat. *-bilis*), or of the instrumental active. About 200 cases (*sporós* 105 times included) of verbals from neuter or neuter passive verbs have the neuter present-participle meaning. Twenty are classified as intermediate between neuter and proper active in meaning, and thirty as instrumental active. Of these latter none are used in reference to persons, and all are compounds, many of them the artificial compounds of which Aeschylus is fond. Among them are several which other writers have treated as passive.

The simple past-passive-participle use (Latin -tus) is by far the most common. Forms classified here are from a large variety of verbs, and the percentage of simple forms (*i.e.* without prefix) is much larger than elsewhere. In connection with these verbals no emphasis is laid on the time, so that the same word may be present past or future as determined (or not determined!) by the connection. Nearly two-thirds of the forms with future meaning have the prefixed *a* privative. It remains to speak of the modal future use (Latin -bilis, or sometimes the gerundive *c.g.* κλαυστός). About thirty verbals are cited here, and one of these, πιστός, occurs some thirty times. Many of these cases have the meaning 'worthy to be —'; and in ten or twelve of them preceding writers have found a notion of necessity which Bishop denies. Such words as ἄδικτος, ἄκλητος, etc., may be explained otherwise; yet as they occur in the