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](#)

Hilgard's Grammatici Graeci, Part IV *Grammatici Graeci*, Pars IV., vol. 2. Choerobosci Scholia in Canones Verbales et Sophronii Excerpta e Characis recensuit et apparatus criticum indicesque adiecit Alfredus Hilgard. Annexa sunt partis quartae prolegomena. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1894. M. 22.

E. G. Sihler

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 06 / July 1895, pp 317 - 321

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202229, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202229

How to cite this article:

E. G. Sihler (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 317-321 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202229

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

exposition as the summaries of the argument on pp. 105, 110, 123, they furnish welcome guidance through the mazes of the discussion. When we come to weigh the net results and inquire how much should be accepted in modification of existing views, the gain is not at once perceived to be quite so certain or striking. Upon the main position, of an early origin for the dialogue, an opinion has been expressed above. That such a scathing criticism of the ideas preceded the constructive dialogues, or most of them;—this does not seem to be the key which exactly fits the *Parmenides*. In principle it is hardly more justifiable than the assumption of Schaarschmidt, who attributes the work to a sceptical pupil of the Academy, familiar with the objections of Aristotle. If the *Parmenides* stood alone, to shift it to one or other extremity of the series might perhaps serve. But how can its criticisms be isolated from those of the Eleatic stranger, or the half dubious proof advanced by Timaeus (51 B *sqq.*)? More plausible, if not altogether convincing, are the arguments with which the editor supports his view that in the second part the One is not an idea. Not only does he discriminate, as others have done, the various meanings of the ambiguous term One: but he points out that (1) the discussion commences just after the complete severance made between the ideas and the sphere of

'our' science: (2) that the historical Parmenides could not be said to have reached the region of the immaterial: (3) that in the course of the discussion itself One partakes of various ideas (such as Smallness), grows older and younger, and is the subject of opinion and perception (155 D). What then are we to make of this One, as the second part progresses? The editor answers that it is metaphysically an extended atom, its vital functions being three: it is (1) in time; (2) in space; (3) it has individuality, which however is more logical than physical. 'The beginning of existence to our minds for anything is the acquisition by it of distinctness in some form or other.' Other views are put forward, with similar independence and vigour, on controverted points. We have only space to allude to the clever use made of the myth in the *Phaedo* (p. xlviii.) to illustrate the hypothesis of two worlds, sensible and ideal, exact counterparts one of the other: and, lastly, the nature of the reasoning in the second part, the fallacies and violations of the law of contradiction which it is alleged to exhibit: a much disputed question which is fully discussed in the commentary (pp. 115, 117, 135, 137 *sq.*, cf. pp. lx.—lxiii.) and treated with great moderation and good sense.

R. D. HICKS.

HILGARD'S *GRAMMATICI GRAECI*, PART IV.

Grammatici Graeci, Pars IV., vol. 2. *Choerobosci Scholia in Canones Verbales et Sophronii Excerpta e Characis recensuit et apparatus criticum indicesque adiecit* ALFREDUS HILGARD. Annexa sunt partis quartae prolegomena. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1894. M. 22.

Habent sua fata libelli. The recent death of Heinrich Keil reminds us of the fact that the *Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum* was completed some time ago, long before this collection of the Greek grammarians was undertaken by Uhlig, Hilgard and their collaborators. The main portion indeed of the present volume, the scholia of George Choeroboscus on the verbal *canones* of Theodosius, has been printed before by Bekker in the *Anecdota Graeca*,—and by Gaisford, 1842.

The present edition may well be called the final one. The wretched paper and the small print of Bekker will no longer task eyes which need extra patience on account of the subject-matter. The splendid volumes of the present collection will I trust serve as a wholesome stimulus towards the *historical study*, if not of the Greek language, at least of Greek grammar, and the substantial services of a number of classical scholars will receive renewed attention. Foremost in the order of time is the name of Lobeck, whose endeavour was to maintain the categories and in a measure the treatment of the Alexandrine and Byzantine school. Next we may mention K. E. A. Schmidt, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grammatik des Griechischen und des Lateinischen*, Halle, 1859; Egger, *Apolonius Dyscoli*, Paris, 1854; G. F. Schoe-

mann, *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen nach den alten etc.*, Berlin, 1862, and the splendid work of *Steinthal*, which, if I am not mistaken, remains the chief thesaurus in this sphere, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen u. Römern*, Berlin, 1863. It may as well be stated with the utmost plainness at the outset that the Byzantines, of whom Choeroboscus is a fair type, must be considered, not as marking any stage of development of their own, but simply as the conservators and prolix reproducers of their Alexandrine masters. The ever recurrent plaint of *Krumbacher* in his excellent history of Byzantine literature (that the perverse classic scholars will not duly recognize the real value and services of the Byzantines) will not convert at least the weary student of the immortal *Swineherd* of Constantinople. Hilgard in his *Prolegomena* fixes the generation of Choeroboscus, pp. lxi. sqq. He was διάκονος¹ and οἰκουμενικός διδάσκαλος (Imperial professor) at Constantinople, cf. Justinian Cod. xi. 18. He was also librarian, χαρτοφύλαξ. He flourished (most probably) in the latter part of the reign of Justinian, say 550 A.D. and Schoell had placed him between 300—400, Prof. Sophocles in the chronological tables prefixed to his Byzantine lexicon put him 817. Before we undertake to describe and appreciate the work of the Byzantine professor, it may be well to recur briefly to the κανόνες ῥηματικοί of Theodosius the Alexandrine, briefly and inadequately reviewed by the present writer in a former volume of the Classical Review. Theodosius (and in this respect he differs little from the τεχνικοί, Apollonius and Herodian) presents Greek verb-inflection in a long succession of purely empirical 'rules.' τύπτω (the μεγὰ ῥῆμα) is inflected as the absolute and adequate type indeed of the 'verb on ω,' presenting not only all the forms which λύω has in our school-tables, but in its 'τυπῶ' future it represents μενῶ and the liquid verbs, in its 'ἔτυπον' it exhibits ἔλαβον, in its 'τέτυπα' it illustrates the type of ὅλωλα, as 'Perfect Middle.' It was a clotheshorse for the entire wardrobe of verb forms.

The great aim of that 'system' is to find a certain way to construct one form out of another, and this is called κανονίζεω.² To illustrate: (Theodosius ed. Hilgard, p. 44, (1889)) 'τύπτομεν: the last syllable of the

genitive participle τός of the Present and Future being dropped (ἀποβαλλομένης) and με being taken before the ν, the first person plural is made (γίνεται), λέγοντος λέγον λέγομεν, ποιούντος ποιούν ποιούμεν, λέξοντος λέξον λέξομεν; and the rule (κανόν) will be seen particularly useful for us in those on -μι, τιθέντος τίθεμεν, διδόντος δίδομεν.' One other example of how to κανονίζειν may be adduced: p. 47, 'τέτυφα: two tenses construct the Perfect (τὸν παρακείμενον); the Imperfect makes the first of the syllables, the Future the ultima, and the penultima (τὴν παραλήγουσαν) and the quantity (ποσότητα) of the syllables. Every Perfect then ends in α, and has preceding the ending either κ or φ or χ; and this is done in view of (πρὸς) the kinship with the Future; for when the Future is through the σ, the Perfect is through the κ, πείθω πείσω πέπεικα; but when through the ψ, the Perfect (is made) through the φ, λείβω λείψω λέλειφα; but when through the ξ, the Perfect (is made) through the χ, λέγω λέξω λέλεχα; but when the Future (is made) through a liquid (διὰ ἀμεταβάτου) the Perfect is made through it and the κ, κείρω κερῶ κέκαρκα, except the faulty (abnormal) ones, as νενέμηκα and the like. The Perfect has the same penult as the Future, λέξω λέλεχα, except the disyllabic ones of the fifth conjugation (i.e. group, συζυγία) when the penult is on ε; for then it is changed to α, κερῶ κέκαρκα. The initial syllable, as we said, is made (γίνεται) from the Imperfect (παρτατικός); and when the Imperfect begins with a syllable long by nature or by position (φύσει ἢ θέσει) the Perfect begins with the same, ἡγόραζον ἡγόρακα, ἔφθειρον ἔφθαρκα, but when the Imperfect begins with a short syllable (=syllabic augment) the Perfect is reduplicated, ἔλεγον λέλεχα.' But this will suffice to illustrate the κανόνες. They were contrived, not to teach³ Greek to those who knew absolutely no Greek, but from the motives of purism and to preserve literary language as over against the practice of the illiterate populace; to keep that type of speech distinct from that type of Greek which corresponded to the 'vulgar Latin' of the Western Empire.

These κανόνες then were the textbook of Choeroboscus: i.e. he dictated to his pupils (hence σχόλια ἀπὸ φωνῆς) his explanations, amplifications, illustrations of the Alexandrines, particularly amplifications. To be just to these dictations we must trust them, not as the literary composition of an author,

¹ Justinian's Novellae show the vast swarm of officials attached e.g. to St. Sophia.

² Steinthal's 'Flexionsschema' is not an adequate version, I believe.

³ Cf. Steinthal, p. 433.

but as the classroom-work of the practical teacher. Thus in the Prolegomena to the verb (p. 1, Hilgard) we learn that illiterate folk said ἐφάγαμεν ἐφάγατε and ἤλαθμεν ἤλαθατε, ἐδράμαμεν ἐδράματα, ἐλάβαμεν ἐλάβατε. We must not, and indeed we will not, wonder that the teacher reiterates the same illustrations, e.g. of what σολοικίζειν is, in the Prolegomena of the noun and the verb, cf. p. 104 of iv. 1 with p. 2 of iv. 2, 'ἐγὼ περιπατῶν ὁ τοῖχος ἔπescεν' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐμοῦ περιπατοῦντος ὁ τοῖχος ἔπescεν.' In his general Prolegomena he first assigns priority amongst the moods to Indicative, Imperative, Optative, because every complete statement (τέλειος λόγος) calls for one of these. Then he enumerates the eight parts of speech (τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου)—noun (ind. adjective), verb, participle, article, pronoun, preposition (πρόθεσις), conjunction (σύνδεσμος); why the noun takes precedence before the verb; definition of verb; the tenses; where the modern reader with his habits of Latin terminology will, I believe, often award the palm of significance to the terms of Alexandrine coinage, as παρατατικός for the Imperf. and παρακείμενος for the Perfect. The παρεπόμενα¹ (hence the *Accidence* of English Grammars) are enumerated. The moods (ἐγκλίσεις since Dionysius) in the freer personal analysis of Choeroboscus are often designated as θέλημα τῆς ψυχῆς or as ψυχικὴ προαίρεσις, τουτέστι καθ' ὃ ἐγκλίνεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἢ γοὺν εἰς ὃ ῥέπει ἡ ψυχὴ, p. 5, and going on he couples the dubitative function (διστάσαι) with the optative function (τὸ εὔχασθαι). Further on he enlarges on the sovereign position of the infinitive (ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος) among the moods—all the other moods being sometimes resolved into it (εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναλύονται). The rank of the moods was a well established topic of grammatical tradition; it is discussed pp. 6—9. Then (p. 9) follows a discussion of the voices (διαθέσεις from Dionysius on)—ἐνέργεια, πάθος, μεσότης, and so forth, all the παρεπόμενα being treated in their traditional Dionysian order, ending with the enumeration of the συζυγίαι,² of which there are in ω six of barytona, and three of perispomena; and in μι four. Substantially these categories remained unshaken from Apollonius Dyscolus to Wordsworth's Greek Grammar, whose

fifteenth edition of 1864 lies before me, a full generation after Buttmann had begun to apply linguistic analysis to Greek Grammar, and some time after Veitch's great task of stocktaking of actual forms had been published for the first time.

Choeroboscus is prolix: he takes absolutely nothing for granted, with merciless explicitness category after category is marshalled in his dictations. Theodosius on τύπτω has 5½ lines, Ch. has 142; on τύπτεις Th. has 8, Ch. has 111; on τύπτειν Th. has 13½, Ch. has 168; on ἔτυπον Th. has 14, Ch. has 603. It is not very difficult to make sport of much that we find in Choeroboscus, but we should endeavour to be just in realizing that Choeroboscus was not only an exponent of a grammatical tradition but a creature and a product of the same as well. In a very great number of topics he merely iterates the explanations of his Alexandrine predecessors, particularly the grammarians *par excellence*, Apollonius and Herodianus. Thus, when we read in Choeroboscus a discussion of the problem why there is no 1 p. dual before τύπτειν, we are disinclined to dwell on this profound matter, but when we see that the whole matter is really of Apollonian paternity we are decidedly sobered and inclined to be more respectful. -μεθον occurs³ Il. Ψ 485, Soph. Philoct. 1079, Electr. 950 and in an archaizing passage, Athenaeus iii. p. 98. And from this slender evidence of usage it has been 'canonized' beyond even Buttmann's time. Now then Apollonius with the characteristic craving of the Alexandrines for ἀναλογία raised the question: why no active 1 p. dual form (corresponding to the 1 p. dual τυπτόμεθον)? and Theodosius too had preserved this 'ζήτημα' without offering any solution (Theodosius, p. 44, Hilgard). Apollonius had suggested that τυπτόμεθον would not do because it lacked the characteristic of the dual, τ or θ, nor could it abandon the μ; and as it could not combine the two characteristic consonants, Greek had to dispense with the form, τύπτομον (as Ch. explains, p. 33) or τυπτοθμον would not do, because the characteristic consonant of the dual did not have the second place. Herodianus had said (in the generation after Apollonius) that the form would be τυπτομθον or τυπτομτον, but that this combination was impossible on phonetic grounds.⁴

¹ Cf. Dionysius Thrax, cap. 15.

² It may be well to remember that our 'conjugation' has developed a somewhat different, really a narrower sphere than συζυγία, cf. K. E. A. Schmidt, Beiträge, p. 364.

³ Cf. G. Curtius, das verbum der Griechischen Sprache, 2 ed. 1877, I. p. 101. The credit of pointing out the matter belongs to Elmsley on Aristoph. Acharn. 741.

⁴ For which the technical term was ἀσυνταξία.

It is exceedingly instructive to learn better from Choeroboscus the characteristic attitude of the Alexandrines towards analogy and inflexion, particularly as the majority of references are to works of Apollonius and Herodian which are lost. *E.g.* p. 42, Ch. cites Apollonius on favourite vowel combinations; on p. 46, on the augmenting of verbs beginning with the long vowels η and ω : 'just as bodies that have attained their own peculiar size, are not capable of further increase,'—($\alpha\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\xi\eta\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota$); or again p. 52: why are other compounds augmented before the entire compound, but prepositional compounds after the preposition? $\zeta\iota\nu\alpha\mu\eta\epsilon\xi\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\rho\omega\theta\eta\eta\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\epsilon\xi\omega\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\delta\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\ldots$

Again, p. 66: why is the 1. perf. of $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\omega$ etc. not $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha$ but $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$? Apollonius 'presents this defence' ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu\tau\eta\nu\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha\nu$) that the future is 'the cause' or 'responsible' ($\alpha\iota\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$) for the fact that the verbs of the 3rd $\sigma\upsilon\zeta\nu\gamma\iota\alpha$ ($\delta\theta\tau$) of barytones do not make their perfect on θ , 'because' ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, l. 35) their future is not made on a double consonant, '—whereas $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$ makes $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$ and $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$, both of which groups ($\sigma\upsilon\zeta\nu\gamma\iota\alpha\iota$) aspirate their thematic consonant in the perfect: Apollonius puts it this way: 'because thematic $\beta\phi\pi$ and thematic $\gamma\kappa\chi$ combine with σ future into ψ and ξ respectively, therefore they aspirate in perf.—because thematic $\delta\theta\tau$ do not combine with σ future into a double consonant, therefore they do not aspirate their thematic consonant in perfect. I will content myself with citing matter to characterize these efforts, omitting obvious analysis. In this last case Choeroboscus is so bold as to call the second of Apollonius' $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha\iota$ forced ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\eta$).

On p. 69: $\pi\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omega$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\upsilon\kappa\alpha$, but $\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha$: here, too, Apollonius appears as champion of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha$. On p. 94 (Attic perfect): $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\phi\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\lambda\iota\phi\alpha$, ' $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omega$ ' (sic) $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\kappa\omicron\alpha$. On $\omicron\iota$ Apoll. says nothing, but Choeroboscus with unflinching courage makes of $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ $\acute{\eta}\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha$. On p. 108: why $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$ but not $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$? The explanation of Ap. is adopted. On p. 237-38: some unnamed devotees of analogy suggested $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\phi\theta\iota$ as perf. imp. corresponding to $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, as $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\theta\iota$ accompanied $\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$. Ap. taught that the $-\theta\iota$ imperative accompanied only those participles whose genitive had $\nu\tau$: $\tau\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\theta\iota$, $\delta\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\alpha\rho\eta\theta\iota$, $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omicron\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\theta\iota$. On p. 256 Apollonius¹ is

¹ Cf. also Apollonius, Syntax 251, 16.

cited as meeting the objection that an optative of an historical tense (an independent pure optative) was illogical. The references to Herodian are interesting as emphasizing the continuity of grammatical $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as well as the efforts of H. to improve upon Apollonius. On p. 111: in the problem of explaining $\xi\omicron\rho\gamma\alpha$, $\xi\omicron\lambda\pi\alpha$: H. suggests a thematic $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\omega$. On p. 125 sq. the problem is this: $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\alpha$ and $\acute{\eta}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha$ form the entire aorist on this theme; $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$ $\acute{\eta}\kappa\alpha$ do not. Why not? The 'defence' of Ap. is this: 'because $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\alpha$ and $\acute{\eta}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha$ have no future in use, therefore they are not prevented from carrying their inflexion to the other moods and to the participle,² but the other verbs have futures in use $\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$ $\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$: therefore they are prevented ($\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$) from extending their inflexion to the other moods and to the participle. But Herodian presents another 'defence' (and it is not very clear to me): $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\alpha$ $\acute{\eta}\kappa\alpha$ *ought to* ($\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$) end on σ ; as it is not the actual case however (p. 126, l. 30), but they end on κ , and κ has no kinship with σ , of course they, as not 'guarding any part of analogy,' are prevented from extending their inflexion to the participle and to the other moods of the aorist. On p. 142, H. explains $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\rho\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$ from $\delta\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\omega}$. Herodian seems to have taken great pains to hunt up rare verb forms in actual literature: p. 143 he cites $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ from Alcaeus the comic writer (not the lyricist): $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ Herodian explains ($\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota=\kappa\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$) thus: we have $\phi\nu\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$, $\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$, and so $\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$; and $\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ as $\chi\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\nu$, $\kappa\tau\upsilon\pi\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\nu$. $\acute{\Pi}\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ is impossible for present because the single σ cannot be the characteristic of a barytone present; the verbs of this group ending on $\sigma\sigma$ or ζ . On p. 150 the problem is to explain $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$; Ap. suggested a present $\theta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, etc. Herodian suggested this explanation (p. 151): in the verbs it is the nature of σ and of λ to be doubled $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$, and those on $\sigma\sigma$ and $\lambda\lambda$ are fond of ($\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu\sigma\iota$) the barytone accent as $\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, except unless they are nominal derivatives; for these are perispomena as $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\omega}$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\lambda\lambda\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}$, $\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\alpha$ $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\omega\acute{\omega}$; and those having *one* σ or *one* λ are 'fond of' the perispomenon accent as $\phi\nu\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\chi\rho\nu\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\pi\omega\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$. Those then that have one λ and are not perispomena, I mean $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$

² The general reader will remember that the $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\eta$ was a separate part of speech.

θέλω ὀφείλω, *divided the inflexion* and as far as the imperfect...are inflected from barytones and after the imperf. in the succeeding tenses make the inflexion as from the perispomena. But this will suffice to show the methods and the problems of grammatical inquiry in the domain of verb-inflexion. I have emphasized the dependence of Choeroboscus on the Alexandrine masters because indeed he rarely seems to go forward alone or to desire to do so. *Steinthal's* summarizing judgment, p. 477, may be here cited: 'Die Theon's sass ihnen tiefer, war ihnen eigener, und so folgten sie ihren Geboten mehr als dem Gebrauche derer (he means the authors of Greek literature) die nichts von Grammatik verstanden, also nicht so gebildet waren wie sie.' The splendid *indices* of Hilgard have doubled the value of this volume and rendered it valuable even for the general Greek student; the citations of dialectical matters are frequent and copious, e.g. to the Attic, Aeolic, Doric, Ionic,¹ with occasional specification of ἀρχαῖοι, or παλαιοί, of νέοι and νεώτεροι or μεταγενέστεροι. The illustrations from the *Iliad* probably outnumber those from all other writers: those from the *Odyssey* are decidedly less frequent. We realize how Homer remained the school author of Greek teachers as Vergil of Roman grammarians, as a glance at Keil's general index will show. Aristophanes is considerably cited and *Plutus* and *Nubes* more frequently than the other plays: this too reflects school usage—Sophocles and Euripides somewhat less frequently than Aristophanes. Herodotus not once, Thucydides several times, Xenophon twice, from the *Cyropaedia*, Callimachus much more frequently than these, Theocritus a number of times, chiefly in illustration of Doric dialect.

In conclusion, I beg to call attention to an element of discussion in Choeroboscus which has no direct reference to verb-inflexion at all. I mean the introductory notes of syntactical purport prefixed to his treatment of several of the moods. In the case of the infinitive, 209 *sqq.*, the old question whether the infinitive is a verb or not, and that from certain points of view each may be said; the imperative function of the inf. in Homer is noted, and an

attempt made to explain that usage p. 210, l. 27, viz. it was using the *kind* for the *species* (τὸ γένος ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶδους); further, p. 211, the inf. is discussed in its aspect of a verbal noun:² τὸ περιπατεῖν = ὁ περίπατος; its abstract character, its complementary function with προαιρετικά. In the preliminary remarks on the imperative, p. 231 *sqq.*, the discussion touches upon these points; Apollonius had placed the optative before the imperative: Theodosius gave precedence to the imperative because 'the imperatives seem to have indicative forms,' as e.g. ἔτυπτε τύπτε, ἐποίει ποίει, ἐβόα βόα, etc.: the relation of the hortatory subjunctive to the imperative.

This subj. is defined as ὑποθετικός 'suggestive,' i.e. hortatory, and here by way of appendix Ch. touches upon the 'interrogative mood' of the 'philosophers' (Protagoras?) and disposes of the same.

The optative is placed before the subjunctive, because it makes τέλειος λόγος (p. 256), the functions of the optative in dependent constr. and oratio obliqua not being considered. And further on Ch. touches on the relation between the different optatives, viz. the future optative alone really maintains its temporal character (μέλλοντος μόνου σημασίαν ἔστιν εἶρην) whereas elsewhere the *durative* character (παράτασις) or the *completed* action (συνπλήρωσις) was brought out: τύπτουμι is defined as μένομι τύπτων, p. 257, l. 32; τετύφοιμι = μὴ ἐπιμένομι τύπτων, p. 257, l. 35; τύψειας, p. 258, l. 29-30, = εἰς πέρας τοῦ τύψαι ἔλθοις. The subjunctive (p. 277 *sqq.*) has more than one function or 'meaning' and was designated (ἔλαβε τὴν ὀνομασίαν) as ὑποτακτική from its being construed (ὑποτάττεσθαι) with one of these conjunctions, viz. ἵνα, ὅφρα [ὅπως, ἐάν], ἄν, the prohibitive μὴ, ὅταν, etc. (it was the established custom to cite and to inflect the subjunctive always with ἐάν: ἐάν τύπτω, ἐάν τύπτῃς, etc.); the conditional function being designated as 'dubitative' (διστακτικός): the twofold function of ἵνα with the subjunctive as ἀποτελεσματικός and αἰτιολογικός does not strike us³ as very clear.

E. G. SIHLER.

University of the City of New York.

¹ The recent publication of Prof. H. W. Smyth's great work on the Ionic dialect will add especial interest to this part of Hilgard's index.

² ὄνομα πράγματος. The use of πρᾶγμα for πράξις is a peculiarity of the technical language of the grammarians from Dionysius Thrax on.

³ Cf. Schoemann, Redetheile, p. 216 *sq.*