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](#)

Brown's Case Constructions A Study of the Case Constructions of Words of Time. By Lester Dorman Brown, Ph. D. Pp. iv + 141. Published by the Author, New Haven, Conn. 1904.

Haven Darling Brackett

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 08 / November 1906, pp 405 - 407

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995106, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995106

How to cite this article:

Haven Darling Brackett (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 405-407 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995106

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

some mysteriously sudden close after Theocritus. Now there is no book quite comparable to the Septuagint, for the purpose of hammering home these truisms. Apart, too, from its great literary importance, as being written in the *κωρυή* of Alexandria any time after the middle of the 3rd century B.C., the Septuagint has other (perhaps higher) claims on the interest of thoughtful persons. There is something more than a literary importance attaching to this (in some ways) greatest, as it is the first, of all translations of the Bible; and true criticism can never exhaust itself by any mere literary handling of its text. What the Vulgate has been, and is, to the West, that the Septuagint has been, and is, to the East. But more: the writers of the N.T., in almost all cases, appeal to the LXX version for confirmation of doctrine or historical declaration; and even before the Christian era it had acquired for itself the position of an inspired book. Messrs. Conybeare and Stock are well within the mark when (*Introd.* p. 20) they imply that the LXX version has exercised a world-influence. This fact alone would make it amply worth our while to study it, now and then, and reflect upon the signal position it occupies in the development of human history.

Hitherto no annotated edition of any portion of the LXX has been available for students; and, until quite recently, the aids to Septuagint study have been singularly meagre. But the publication of Dr. Swete's manual edition some few years back, followed—first by Hatch and Redpath's noble Concordance, secondly by Swete's Introduction, and lastly by the publication (early this year) of the first fascicle of the new Cambridge edition of the text, with an elaborate critical apparatus: all these aids, I say, have rendered it possible to approach the study of

the LXX with a sense of confidence and comfort unknown a generation ago.

Briefly, the aim of Messrs. Conybeare and Stock in their pioneer work is to render available for students selected portions of the LXX, so annotated as to give them a clear insight into the main peculiarities of vocabulary and style. With this excellent object in view they have chosen seven sections: (1) The Story of Joseph; (2) The Story of the Exodus; (3) The Story of Balaam and Balak; (4) The Story of Samson; (5) The Story of David and Goliath; (6) The Story of Elijah; (7) The Story of Hezekiah and Sennacherib. Each section is prefaced by short introductory remarks (these are, perhaps, the least convincing portions of the book); there is a fair abundance of linguistic notes at the foot of the printed text; there is a general introduction to the study of the LXX; and last, not least, a short grammar of LXX Greek. This portion of the work is excellent, and the writers deserve our thanks for their very careful conspectus. The General Introduction (pp. 1–24) is, perhaps, rather thin, but gives a fair and lucid account, on the whole, of the literary problem of the origin of the Septuagint. Few readers will be disposed to contest their general conclusions (*e.g.* as to the non-historical character of the Story of the '72'); but here and there a conjecture as to date or authorship seems to be based on too slender evidence (for an example, see *Introd.* p. 18 [top]).

The book is clearly printed, in fairly large type as far as the text is concerned, and is supplied with an 'index Graecitatis.' It is to be hoped that the editors will have the satisfaction of knowing their book is widely used.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

BROWN'S CASE CONSTRUCTIONS.

A Study of the Case Constructions of Words of Time. By LESTER DORMAN BROWN, Ph. D. Pp. iv+141. Published by the Author, New Haven, Conn. 1904.

THE problem which the author of this monograph sets before himself is this: to discover the factors which determine the meaning of nouns whose primary meaning is that of

time, when used in the regular temporal construction of the genitive, dative, and accusative cases. The material upon which the study is based is taken from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*, and is intended to include all instances of nouns (or equivalent expressions) used in these writings in any of the regular temporal

constructions of the oblique cases. The number of nouns so used whose predominant meaning is not that of time is very small—only 11 out of a total of some 3100 cases—and the investigation therefore centres about the few common nouns of time, *ἡμέρα*, *νύξ*, *μῆν*, *ἔτος*, etc.

The question of the method of classification to be used, whether it shall be by form or by function, arises early, and as would be expected of one working in the atmosphere of the classical department of Yale University, the author chooses to classify by form: in this case the choice is unquestionably wise. The first two classifications are preliminary and serve to foreshadow the lines upon which the detailed examination of the cases is to proceed. The third primary classification consists of a complete index according to number, case, and modifiers, of all the nouns of time used in temporal constructions in the above authors: upon the basis of this classification the author takes up the question of the overlapping of various cases. He considers first the instances where he believes the genitive case to be used like a dative expressing 'the time when,' and cites numerous examples. The cases, however, where the genitive is used with a meaning indistinguishable from that of the dative, are not, I believe, as numerous as the author supposes. In the first place, exclusive of certain passages in Herodotus, whose usage in this matter is clearly divergent from the Attic usage, all the examples of such cases which are given are, with a single exception (Thuc. 6, 3, 2), either the noun *νύξ* or a season (*χειμῶν* or *θέρος*). For example in Xen. *Hell.* 1, 1, 13: *αἱ νῆες ἅπασαι . . . τῆς ἐπιούσης νυκτὸς ἀνηγρόντο, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ περὶ Ἀρίστου ὤραν ἦγον εἰς Προκόννησον*, Mr. Brown holds that the meaning of the genitive is in no way different from that of the dative, the writer's purpose in both places being merely to date the action. But it will be admitted, I think, that an action can be dated in different ways. In some cases it is possible to use either the genitive or the dative, but is there not in most cases a slightly different shade of meaning according as one or the other case is used? Does not the frequent occurrence of the genitive *νυκτὸς* reflect the fact that from the nature of things the time of events of the night is less apt to be definitely known than the time of events of the day? I believe that the passages cited by the writer support this view. The dative *νυκτὶ* is cited in only four passages where it might seem not to differ in meaning from *νυκτὸς*; but in each of these cases a

special reason for the dative can, I think, be given. In *Hell.* 2, 1, 22; *Δύσανδρος δὲ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ, ἐπεὶ ὄρθρος ἦν, ἐσήμηνεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς εἰσβαίνειν*, Mr. Brown admits that the *ἐπεὶ* clause makes the dative natural; and in Thuc. 4, 103, 4: *ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ κατέστησαν τὸν στρατὸν πρὸ ἔω κ.τ.λ.*, the time is rather definitely defined by *πρὸ ἔω*. Furthermore in Thuc. 7, 6, 4: *καὶ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ ἔφθασαν παροικοδομήσαντες καὶ παρέλθόντες τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων οἰκοδομίαν*, the context shows that the exact time of the action was known to both the Athenians and the Syracusans; and in *Hell.* 4, 5, 4: *φανερὸς δὲ ἐγένετο καὶ ὁ νεὼς τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ καύμενος*, the time was from the nature of the event likely to be definitely known. In my judgment, the only passage cited where the genitive seems not to differ appreciably in meaning from a dative is Thuc. 6, 3, 2 (*τοῦ ἐχομένου ἔτους*).

Three passages from Homer and one from Herodotus show the dative used like the genitive. But in *Anab.* 1, 8, 22 (*ἡμίσει χρόνῳ*) and Plut. *Aristid.* 23 (*ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ*), where the author takes the dative as equivalent in meaning to a genitive, he overlooks the possibility that the idea of means may be present; cf. *χρόνῳ* as used in Her. 1, 76 *et al.* and often in tragedy. The only examples that seem to show the genitive encroaching on the accusative are certain cases of *λοιποῖ*, 'in the future.' But in all except two of these cases the verb is negatived, and, as the author says, here it is rather a case where the resultant meaning is the same whether the genitive or the accusative is used than an instance of the encroachment of one case on another. Clear examples of the use of the accusative for the dative are found only in Herodotus. On the whole then, the number of instances where any one case has the regular temporal meaning of another case is exceedingly small.

The results of the author's detailed examination of the genitive, dative, and accusative may be summed up briefly. In by far the greatest number of instances several factors make the temporal meaning clear without the aid of the inflectional ending. These factors are, in the order of their importance, first, the temporal meaning of the noun, and upon this the author rightly lays much stress; secondly, the modifying word, if any be present (*e. g.* a word of measure or a demonstrative word); thirdly, the verb, whether it expresses extensive or aoristic action; and lastly the context, in the broadest meaning of the term. As regards the expression of time by prepositional

phrases, examination shows that there is a marked preference for the equivalent case constructions of words of time.

On p. 68 the author gives an ingenious and plausible explanation of the origin of expressions which consist of a noun in the accusative singular with an ordinal numeral, translated usually by 'so many days (years, etc.) ago,' as *Hell.* 2, 4, 13: οἱ μὲν τὸ δεξιὸν ἔχοντες οὓς ὑμεῖς ἡμέραν πέμπτην τρεψάμενοι ἐδιώξατε. He thinks they may have arisen from cases like *Anab.* 4, 5, 24: καταλαμβάνει πάντας ἔνδον τοὺς κωμήτας καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τοῦ κωμάρχου ἐνάτην ἡμέραν γεγαμημένην, where the tense with which the temporal word is used may denote a state of continuance after the completion of the act. From such verbs the use of the noun with the ordinal was extended to verbs which express occurrence only.

The explanation which is given on pp. 96 f. of the origin of the genitive in statements of wages, as e.g. *Thuc.* 7, 27, 2: δραχμὴν γὰρ τῆς ἡμέρας ἕκαστος ἐλάμβανε, is ingenious, but to me not convincing. Comparing such expressions with expressions like *Anab.* 4, 6, 4: ἐπορεύθησαν ἐπὶ τὰ σταθμοὺς ἀνὰ πέντε παρασάγγας τῆς ἡμέρας, the author concludes that the genitive was originally closely connected with the verb. Now the genitive in such passages as the one from the *Anabasis*

clearly expresses the time within which the action of the verb takes place; he therefore suggests that the genitive in statements of wages may go back to a time when the pay was actually given and received some time during each day, comparing *Levit.* 19, 13 and *Deut.* 24, 15. It will be seen at once, I think, that this explanation rests upon a rather shadowy basis. I believe that an explanation of these genitives is rather to be sought along the line of such a sentence as *Anab.* 7, 6, 1: καὶ λέγει ὅτι δαρεικὸς ἐκάστω ἔσται μισθὸς τοῦ μηνός. If this case be taken by itself, it is entirely natural to take the genitive μηνός as depending immediately upon μισθός. Is it not then possible that these genitives, which in the historical period were doubtless almost purely formulaic, originally were dependent upon μισθός or an equivalent word, expressed or understood?

As is almost inevitable in a work of this kind, where the author is compelled to draw many minute distinctions, in some matters of detail the views expressed are open to question. But the work as a whole is done with painstaking care and accuracy. The main conclusions are amply sustained and the whole constitutes a suggestive and valuable beginning in a field of syntactical study which hitherto has been little explored.

HAVEN DARLING BRACKETT.

PROFUMO ON THE FIRE OF NERO.

ATTILIO PROFUMO, *Le fonti ed i tempi dell' incendio Neroniano*. Roma: Forzani, 1905. Pp. xii + 748. 20 lire.

THE first point that strikes one about the present work is its enormous size. It is a large and very heavy quarto (12½ × 8½ inches) with 49 lines to the page, and the amount of time and labour devoted to its production must have been immense. But one cannot help thinking that interesting and important as the fire of Nero is, especially to students of the early history of Christianity in Rome, Signor Profumo should have recollected that life is short and busy, and given us his results in a somewhat handier form.

The occasion of the work is a recently made assertion, formulated in a pamphlet by Prof. C. Pascal (*L'incendio di Roma e i primi Cristiani*, Milan 1900) that the Christians were as a fact the authors of the fire of Nero, taking 'qui fatebantur' in Tacitus,

Ann. xv. 44 § 5 to mean those who confessed their guilt as incendiaries: their denunciations of their fellow Christians led to the latter being proved guilty also, not however as incendiaries, but as Christians ('deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti sunt'). This charge naturally aroused much opposition: and the present work, the most careful study of the subject that has yet been made, brings us to the opposite conclusion. It has met with a favourable reception in the archaeological journals of Rome—such as the *Bullettino d'Archeologia Cristiana*, and the *Bullettino Comunale*.

The first part (pp. 1–194) deals exhaustively with the ancient authorities, whose testimony, with the single exception of that of Tacitus, who remarks 'sequitur clades, forte an dolo principis incertum (nam utrumque auctores prodidere),' asserts unanimously that