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 Prose Composition* for college use, by Walter Miller: Part I. based upon Livy xxi. and xxii.; Part II. based upon Cicero, Cato Maior and Laelius. Boston: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn.**

Edward Capps

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 71 - 72
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184896, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184896

How to cite this article:

Edward Capps (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 71-72 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184896

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

W. Wunderer, *Ovids Werke in ihrem Verhältniss zur antiken Kunst*. No Augustan poet wrote more directly under the influence of works of art than Ovid. In many passages he has works of art distinctly in mind, and he often describes them, always with great fidelity. The passages are adduced and the various works of art, or artistic types, [had in mind are briefly adverted to, especially representations of gods and demigods.

I. Müller, *Ad Galen*. vii 478, 11 sqq. ed. Kuehn. Here the writer would read, for the Σεβήρος, Σεβήρων of the text, Βήρος and Βήρων respectively (i.e. Marcus Antoninus Verus, the philosopher and Lucius Verus).

O. Staehlin, *Observationes criticae in Clementem Alexandrinum*. An admirable account of the MSS. (of which pedigrees are attempted, in part) and editions, followed by emendations of more than sixty passages.

Indices (of articles, subjects, words, passages cited and emended).

Curtius' Griechische Schulgrammatik. 20ste Auflage, bearbeitet von DR. W. VON HARTEL. Preis: geb. 2 M. 40 pf. Leipzig, Freytag, 1890.

In completeness, accuracy and practical sense, this standard grammar fully justifies its popularity. Careful and competent revision has given it one great advantage over other school grammars, in that its sparing (but for the purpose quite sufficient) elucidations from linguistic history are trustworthy and up to date. Criticisms need be few. A good many teachers are likely to regret the installation of *λύω* in the place of honour which *τίπτω* held in our fathers' time. Despite the agreement of several first-class grammars in this choice it does not seem obvious that *λύω* is any improvement. *Λέπω*, or better still *πέιθω*, with its two perfects and aorists and its easily understood distinction between present and aorist stem, would be decidedly more useful. Passing to details, we note on p. 10 the doctrine that dentals before *μ* pass into *σ*: this should have been marked as a mere empiric rule. **Ἀφν* is twice given as the Attic nominative of *Ἐφνός*; but it should have been marked as a theoretical form only, and if *ἄρρηνοβοσκός* will warrant **Ἐφνός*, the doublet **Ἐφνός* (i.e. *ἡρῆν* against *ἡρῆν*) has older attestation in *πολύρρην*. In the paradigm of *τίθημι* is it not time to introduce *τέθηκα* for the post-classical *τέθεικα*? The printer must be charged with some slips:—*-σαν* for *-σθων*, p. 62; a passage repeated, p. 113 (top); *Κρούδης*, p. 129; *πεποιθέναι* apparently omitted, p. 173, 5th line from bottom; *τυγχάνω*, p. 245. In the Syntax there might be much more of the reason why. Grammatical labels are often irritating enough to the advanced student; to the schoolboy they generally mean blank confusion, unless supplemented by full explanations. A few more illustrations from his own language—such as are given on p. 153 of this book to explain some difficult genitives—will often help him to understand why a construction is the natural one to use, and he will then give his memory a fair chance. In conclusion, we must quarrel with one very misleading piece of comparative syntax appearing under the genitive case. *Δωρεάς ἀξιοῦσθαι* is equated with *praemio dignari*, and *μακαρίζω τινα* *τινος* with *gaudere aliquam re*. The intelligent schoolboy, who has been told that the Greek genitive includes the original ablative, must assume that these are ablative usages, a conclusion likely to dissipate the last shred of respect for grammar as a province of common sense.

Grammaire Grecque, par le p. JAS. JANSSENS, S.J. Ouvrage mis en harmonie avec la Grammaire latine du même auteur. Troisième édition. Bruxelles, Société Belge de Librairie, 1889.

THERE is a good deal of philology in this grammar, all of it unfortunately of pre-Reformation date. It is a wilderness of weakenings and metatheses. *Α* is weakened to *ε* and that to *ι*, *τ* to *σ*; *-έμεναι* sheds its ending and expels *μ* between vowels to become *-ειν*; *λέληχα* passes to *έλληχα* by metathesis in order to produce *έλληχα*, and so forth. After this we hear without surprise that *δούλων* comes from **δουλοσων*, *ὑστερος* from *ὑπὸ* and *ἔσχατος* from *έξ*, that *οὗτος* is *δ αὐτός*, and that the future tense is formed by the addition of *εσω* from *-ειμί*. Unluckily our author convicts himself of sinning against a measure of light by admitting that he has heard of liquid and nasal sonants. The student who carefully neglects all the grammarian's elucidations will get on fairly well, though he might be criticised if he used *νός* as an Attic genitive of *νός*. But he is to be pitied when he tries to understand the dialects.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Latin Prose Composition for college use, by Walter Miller: Part I. based upon Livy xxi. and xxii.; Part II. based upon Cicero, Cato Maior and Laelius. Boston: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn.

THESE books deserve favourable consideration for two excellent features, viz. the plan of using a Latin author as the basis of the exercises, and the table of synonyms of thirty-two pages, to which frequent reference is made in the exercises. The books are to be used by classes which are at the same time reading the Latin texts from which the exercises for retroversion are drawn. The student is thus furnished with 'a definite model of style and expression' which he is obliged to study more thoroughly and thoughtfully than ordinarily, and in turning the English into Latin he has before him a living exemplification of those rules of accident and syntax which, given independently, prove arbitrary and puzzling. The exercises consist of an abridgement of the Latin author in the form of a continuous narrative, for written translation, and for oral translation disconnected sentences. The choice of material for the former is, in general, judicious. About six pages of Latin are represented by one of English in Part I. and in the Cato; in the Laelius there is a larger proportion of English. For convenience in teaching more attention might well have been given to a careful gradation of the exercises according to the progress of the student in his Latin reading; in Livy xxi. the proportion of English to Latin is very uneven. The words and idioms required for the translation of the exercises are generally such as are found in the originals; the constructions however are often very different, requiring close attention on the part of the student and giving a wider range for practice in the important principles of syntax.

Below the exercises for written translation are copious notes and references to the standard grammars. These notes are generally helpful and to the point, yet there are too many repetitions (e.g. in Pt. II. the same note is found four times between pp. 5 and 11). Other notes seem useless: e.g. *factura*, a word not frequent in this sense, is suggested (Pt. I. p. 21) as a translation for 'loss,' while Livy himself in this place employs the more usual word *clades*. It is doubtful moreover if much light will be thrown on the meaning of *rabula* by the verb *rabiere* (Pt. I. p. 28), a word which the ordinary student will never meet again. It would have saved time and annoyance if notes had always been

given in full where first needed, instead of requiring the student continually to turn forward to another part of the book (as in Part II.).

The table of synonyms is the same in both books. Distinctions are stated briefly, clearly, and for the most part logically. The table would be much improved for practical use if the more usual constructions were regularly indicated. This is done in three cases, but in one of these the information is incorrect (cf. *conor ut*, p. 5). The giving of roots and doubtful etymologies might well have been dispensed with. There is utter lack of system in giving roots. Sometimes we find the form of a root that appears in Sanskrit, again it is the Greek or Latin form, always without designation. Not infrequently the radical form is incorrectly given, as (Pt. I. p. 5) Skt. Vdhar 'support,' for Vdhr̥, and others. The inaccuracies of this kind that appear suggest that probably Vanček has been too blindly followed. But no matter how presented, etymologies of any but the simplest kind and confined to the language in hand are entirely out of place in elementary textbooks.

EDWARD CAPPS,
Yale University.

The Writers of the New Testament: their Style and Characteristics, by the late WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX. Hodder and Stoughton. 1890. 2s. 6d.

THIS little book has suffered much from the absence of the author's revision. In a single reading we have noticed the following misprints: p. 21, ἀναθεματίσαμεν; 74, ἐρχόμενος; 90 (διαδιδόναι) the examples from St John are omitted; 91, ὑπολαβασθάνειν; 128, π' τῶν; App. II. (paging), for 611 read 161; p. 162, Polyb. εἰθεσμένους, παρασκευάζαι; Judith I. τηχῶν (πηχῶν), Περσίδε (Περσίδα), Ἰορδάνον (Ἰορδάνου); p. 166, Dion. Hal. V. (it should be VI.) μεθῶν (μαθῶν), Οκτάουος (Ὀκταούσιος), ἀλλήλως (ἀλλήλων); 178, Sap. Sal. δρυμένων (δρωμένων), οὔτε repeated, οὐδ αὖ τοι (οὐδ' αὐτοί); 180, Acts δποιήσας, ἐν(έν), ἡμῶν (ἡμῶν), Rom. γύνοντες (γύνοντες), ἐλάτρεσαν, Epict. ἄ, τε (ἄτε), ὀλίγον (ὀλίγον), ἀφώτιστον, ὀδόν τ., ὄντ αὐτοῦ, last line (.) for (;); 128, ἐθεράπευσε; 183, ποιο (never); 184, Part-Alexandrine for Post-Alexandrine (as in pp. 155, 156), εὐχαριστιεῶς for εὐχαριστικῶς; 185, εἶδεοι for εἶδεοι, ἄψυφον for ἄψυχον; 188, καθορίζται.

The book is intended to point out the differences of style noticeable in the different writers of the New Testament. It is much less full and systematic than Davidson, but sometimes brings out points which were neglected by him. Tables are given in Appendix I. showing (1) the affinities in vocabulary

between St Luke and St John. [It would have been well to have compared with these the affinities between St. John and St. Mark, e.g. the word ὁπάριον, and St. John and St. Matt., e.g. the word βρώσις.] (2) Affinities between St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Luke, and Hebrews (3) between St. Luke and the Catholic and later Pauline epistles. Appendix II. contains specimens of Hellenic and Hellenistic composition (1) comparing Philo and Josephus with the LXX., (2) comparing narrative and descriptive passages in Polybius, Dion. Hal. with the Apocrypha and New Testament, (3) comparing philosophical passages in Polybius, Philo, Epictetus with the Apocrypha and New Testament.

In the preface we are told that the author's MS. was left ready for the press, but it has certainly more the appearance of a collection of loose notes made for private use, or as a preparation for a future treatise. No clear principles are laid down. All is hazy and uncertain. The book may be sometimes suggestive to a scholar, but can be only bewildering if used as a handbook by a beginner.

The following instances may illustrate what has been said. P. 177, Dion. n. 3, on τίθεται τὸν χάρακα. 'It may be questioned whether there is sufficient reason for the use of the med.' If this note implies a doubt as to the correctness of the reading, it may be set at rest by the fact that it is used again by Dion. Hal. vi. 29, ix. 26; if it is a question as to the force of the middle, it may be compared with στρατοπέδον θέσθαι Plut. I. p. 497, ἀδλιν ἔθεντο Hom. II. ix. 232. There is no objection to the note if pencilled as a marginal query by a hasty reader; but to print it, without taking the small amount of pains required to ascertain the facts, is a proceeding unworthy of a scholar. P. 63, speaking of the epistle of St. James, it is said 'the gen. always follows the nom. except ὕμῶν twice.' A more careful examination would have shown τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων i. 18, τοῦτον μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία i. 26, τῶν ἱππῶν τοὺς χαλίνους εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλομεν iii. 3. The feeble grasp of grammatical principles joined to the superstitious use of grammatical terms may be seen in such sentences as the following: p. 34, 'In Col. ii. 2 συμβιβασθέντες may be called either a nom. abs. or a constr. κατὰ σύνεσιν'; p. 54, 'The case of ἀρκοῦμενοι (Heb. xiii. 5) may be described as a *nominativus pendens*; σκιὰν ἔχων ὁ νόμος in x. 1. rather as a nom. absol. for we should almost certainly read δύνανται just below'; p. 88 'It is hardly worth while to make believe that λέγων (Apoc. xi. 1) has a Hellenic constr. by calling it a *nominativus pendens*, though it is more like that than anything else.'

NOTES.

ANTIOPE, C, 49-52.

ἔφονται δέ σοι
πέτραι τε... ὕμναι μουσικῇ κηλούμεναι
δεν... τε μητρος ἐ... οὔσα ἐδώλια
ωστευμ... ν τεκτόνων θήσει χερσί.

So Professor Mahaffy now reads the passage. When the first transcript was published in *Hermathena*, I put down as conceivable supplements for I. 52, σχολήν τε πολλήν, πόνον τ' ἐλαφρόν and ὥστ' εὐμάρειαν. He had then deciphered only τε: his present reading supports the third of these suggestions.

If ὥστ' εὐμάρειαν may be taken as likely, the

restoration of the previous line becomes less hopeless, for the number of possibilities is reduced. Further, if ὕμναι is now made out in I. 50, it is unreasonable to read τέρεμναι there and not τ' ἐρμυναί. ἐρμυνός is a well-accredited adjective, τέρεμνος is not. But if τε follows πέτραι, we have to look in the next line for another substantive, also as subject to the verb ἔφονται. And thus δένδρη τε becomes very probable. (δένδρη τε has already been suggested, see Prof. Mahaffy's note *ad loc.*) I propose

δένδρη τε, μητρος γῆς λιπόνθ' ἐδώλια

i.e. leaving their seats or places in the frame of their