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](#)

***Der Dialect der homerischeti Gedichte:* von Dr. J. Van Leeuwen Jr. und M. B. Mendes Da Costa, aus dem Hollandischen übersetzt von Dr. E. Mehleb. Leipzig. Teubner. 1886. 8vo. pp. 158. Mk. 2.40.**

D. B. Monro

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 07 / July 1887, pp 199 - 199

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018237X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018237X

How to cite this article:

D. B. Monro (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 199-199 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018237X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

particularly called to his remarks on the vexed question of ϵ and η in forms like $\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\varsigma$, $\theta\eta\eta\varsigma$. He follows Aristarchos in writing long ϵ as η in all cases before ϵ and i sounds, and before o and a sounds when it comes from α ; but as ϵ when it arises from ϵ and stands before o and a sounds; thus $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\eta\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\theta\eta\eta\varsigma$, $\chi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$, $\chi\epsilon\rho\eta\epsilon\varsigma$. He thus agrees with Mr. Monro (*Hom. Grammar* p. 318) in holding that 'the long vowel of E-stems, such as $\theta\eta$ - $\delta\alpha\mu\eta$ -etc., was not originally the same sound as the Ionic η which represents older $\tilde{a}$, and that the two were differently affected by the phonetic influence of the following vowel.

Abel's edition of the Homeric hymns is a real advance, as it is a complete recension of the text based on a much needed new collation of the MSS., and entirely supplants Baumeister's praiseworthy but now antiquated work. It thus stands side by side with Gemoll's excellent edition, which appeared almost simultaneously, but late enough for the addition of a critical appendix in which Abel's readings are recorded. Gemoll is thus fuller in his apparatus, as he not only incorporates Abel's work, but gives throughout the readings of the 'Paris class' of MSS. which Abel deliberately omits as worthless. Abel however is more convenient for practical use, at least for those who decline the aid of Gemoll's excellent and original commentary.—W. LEAF.

Der Dialect der homerischen Gedichte: von Dr. J. VAN LEEUWEN, Jr. und M. B. MENDES DA COSTA, aus dem Holländischen übersetzt von Dr. E. MEHLER. Leipzig. Teubner. 1886. 8vo. pp. 158. Mk. 2.40.

THIS little book—the work of two Dutch scholars, now translated into German—gives a useful summary of Homeric accidence, with especial reference to the progress which has been made of late towards recovering the original forms of the dialect. This work, as is well known, may be, and has been, carried on in more than one way. We may approach it, with H. L. Ahrens and G. Curtius, from the vantage-ground of comparative Indo-European grammar; or we may confine ourselves, as Bekker did in the last generation, and as Cobet and Nauck still do, to the use of comparison within the field of the Greek language. The latter is the method chiefly followed in the book before us, the authors of which are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Cobet's criticism, and inclined to look with some distrust upon facts which lie beyond a strictly Hellenic horizon. The two methods, indeed, do not necessarily come into conflict: for all true conclusions (as Aristotle said) are harmonious. The restoration of the digamma, to take the most prominent example, may be accomplished (1) by comparing Greek with other languages which have preserved a labial spirant: or (2) by studying the metrical facts of Homer. But neither process gives such complete and certain results that we can afford to be satisfied with it alone. And in any case it is unscientific not to avail ourselves to the full of two sources of evidence which by their entire independence are peculiarly fitted to correct and supplement each other.

A few examples will show the nature of the preference shown by our authors for purely Greek analogies.

1. The loss of the augment in Homer, they say (p. 68), must be regarded as aphaeresis: and accordingly in the example of a restored primitive text given at the end of the book they write $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, and so on. They add that the omission of the augment in such a verb as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon$ can also 'perhaps' be regarded as an aphaeresis. This last kind of 'aphaeresis' is quite without parallel in Greek, or indeed in any language: yet it must be admitted unless the authors

consent to leave forms like $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon$ for $\eta\gamma\epsilon$ out of their theory. But the real objection surely is that the use of forms without augment is common to the oldest Greek and the oldest Sanscrit.

2. The Perfects in $-\acute{\alpha}$ ($-\phi\alpha$ and $\chi\alpha$) are said to be probably derived from those in $-\kappa\alpha$, by k passing into h (p. 80). No evidence is given of this phonetic change ever having taken place in Greek. The fact that Perfects in $-\kappa\alpha$ appear earlier than those which aspirate a radical π or κ (giving $-\phi\alpha$, $-\chi\alpha$), is far from proving that the latter are to be derived from the former—at least this would be the opinion of students of comparative grammar.

3. The treatment of the form $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ (p. 83) is an interesting example of conflict between the two methods. From a Greek point of view it seems to be present, and as such it stands alone, and deserves all the epithets, 'unheard of,' 'impossible,' 'inconceivable,' which are wont to be applied to an anomaly. On the other hand $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$, which also occurs in our texts, is supported as a perfect by other forms, $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\epsilon$, $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha\iota$, $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, &c. Hence Cobet and Nauck unhesitatingly change $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ into $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$. But comparative grammarians point out that $\delta\epsilon\delta\phi\iota\alpha$ is not correctly formed from a root $\delta\phi\iota$. The true form, as their more exact analysis shows, is $\delta\epsilon\delta\phi\iota\alpha$, which might become $\delta\epsilon\delta\phi\iota\alpha$, and so $\delta\epsilon\delta\phi\omega$, $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$. Accordingly, instead of turning $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ into $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$ or $\delta\epsilon\delta\phi\iota\alpha$, they turn $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$ into $\delta\epsilon\delta\phi\iota\alpha$ or $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$.

4. We may add to this list the assumption of such forms as $\epsilon\phi\phi\alpha\delta\epsilon$, $\epsilon\phi\phi\iota\delta\epsilon$ (for $\epsilon\phi\alpha\delta\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon$). It may be too much to maintain that a double digamma is impossible; but certainly there is no trace of the corresponding labial of other languages, such as Latin or Sanscrit, being either pronounced or written as a double letter.

5. In the list of digammatized words given by our authors (p. 28), we find $\phi\acute{o}\delta\phi\omega\nu$ and $\phi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. They have overlooked an interesting paper by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* xxiii. p. 49 ff.), in which he shows that F never remains in Homer before o or ω . And in the case of these two forms the independent evidence of the F is of the slightest.

It will be understood that the objections on which we have been insisting apply rather to the school of philology which this book represents than to the work itself. Its merits, on the other hand, are of a solid and useful kind. Readers will find in it the best results of an important vein of enquiry—that which seeks to purify the Homeric text from the corruption and modernisation that it must have undergone during the centuries when written copies were few and diplomatic criticism had not begun. This is an inquiry which was set in motion by Bentley, and is evidently by no means exhausted.—D. B. MONRO.

The Metamorphoses of Ovid. Books XIII. and XIV. Edited by CHARLES SIMMONS, M.A. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.

THIS is a scholarly edition of two of the books of the *Metamorphoses*, best suited for school reading. The introduction deals with the design of the poem, and justly dwells upon the consummate art with which Ovid has woven into one harmonious whole a web of stories entirely disconnected, save by the one recurring incident of a metamorphosis. Mr. Simmons has conscientiously studied most modern editions; though those of Loers (1843) and Magnus (1885) might have been consulted. The notes are marked by a good knowledge of the author, accuracy, and genuine poetic feeling; and are well calculated to stimulate interest. Particularly good are those on *invidiosus* (XIII. 414), the relation of *gener* and *socer* (*ib.* 509), Ovid's fondness for substantives in *-men* (*ib.* 778), and the Sibyl's