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](#)

The Dialect of Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns August Fick, ‘*Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung und sprachform wiederhergestellt, mit einem anhang über die versabzählung in den homerischen epen.*’ Göttingen, 1887. 4 m. ‘*Die ursprüngliche sprachform und fassung der hesiodischen Theogonie.*’ *Bezenberger's Beiträge zur kunde der indogermanischen sprachen*, xii. 1. ‘*Die ursprüngliche sprachform der homerischen hymnen.*’ 1b. ix. pp. 195–246.

G. C. Warr

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 07 / July 1888, pp 196 - 200
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192868, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192868

How to cite this article:

G. C. Warr (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 196-200 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192868

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

must not be demanded, but an independent weighing and statement of the difficulties in the restoration proposed by others; this is of the first importance in a writer who would place epigraphic results fairly and dispassionately before students. This free and masterly point of view never appears to me to be occupied by Mr. Roberts.

On p. 192, no. 164, Mr. Roberts says of a small inscribed vase found in Rhodes, 'as both the alphabet and the dialect of this inscription are Ionic, it is probable that the vessel came to Rhodes in the way of commerce.' But there is every probability that the Ionic alphabet and dialect were used in the fifth century in Rhodes as in the Doric colonies on the mainland (see *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1887, p. 292), and the inference is therefore unjustifiable.

On p. 234 and p. 346 no reference is made to E. Curtius's interesting discussion of the historical aspect of the famous Naupactian inscription, *Hermes* X., p. 237.

On p. 126-7, under 'Sicyon,' no reference is made to the small class of inscribed Sicyonian vases, which (once assigned to a Corinthian fabric) are now referred to Sicyonian potteries on account of the symbol for epsilon, χ .

On p. 5 Mr. Roberts lays down that the most ancient Greek inscriptions were written right to left; 'then followed a period of transition during which the *βουστροφηδόν* arrangement prevailed,' and this new method, in the sixth century, 'prevailed so far

as to be characteristic.' In the beginning of the fifth century 'as a natural consequence of' the former change, there ensued 'the complete adoption of the left to right direction.' This account is very superficial; it is almost ludicrous to say that the Greeks, after learning from other races to write towards the left, began for some unstated reason to write towards the right, and resolved to write every second line in the new way, keeping the alternate lines in the old fashion; then, after doing this for a century, until they were well accustomed to it and it had become 'characteristic,' they resolved to write every line towards the right. The truth seems to be that the Greeks learned from the Phoenicians to write towards the left, and that in Asia Minor they became acquainted with the boustrophedon method of writing, which was there used regularly from a remote period in the Syro-Cappadocian or 'Hittite' hieroglyphics. Boustrophedon arrangement is found among the earliest Greek inscriptions, and is no more characteristic of the sixth than of the seventh century, taking the proportion between the entire number of inscriptions known and those which are written Boustrophedon.

In the index, p. 411, I observe a misprint, Men Aziothenos in place of Aziottenos. Under 'Mesembria,' a reference should be added to p. 272.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DIALECT OF HESIOD AND THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

August Fick, '*Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung und sprachform wiederhergestellt, mit einem anhang über die versabzählung in den homerischen epen.*' Göttingen, 1887. 4 m.

'*Die ursprüngliche sprachform und fassung der hesiodischen Theogonie.*' Bezzenberger's *Beiträge zur kunde der indogermanischen sprachen*, xii. 1. '*Die ursprüngliche sprachform der homerischen hymnen.*' *Ib.* ix. pp. 195-246.

PROFESSOR FICK, in these writings, has completed his reconstruction of the Greek Epic poetry by a dissection of the Hesiodic text and that of the Homeric hymns. He dates the emigration of Hesiod from Cyme, and the consequent foundation of the Locri-

Boeotian school, by the Cimmerian invasion of Asia Minor, B.C. 690 (which Sayce, however, puts some twenty years later on the evidence of the Assyrian records). An earlier date is precluded, he thinks, by the tradition (for which Philochorus is responsible) that Stesichorus was the son of Hesiod and born in his old age; and likewise by the mention, whether direct or indirect, of Aetna, *Theogon.* 860 (where with Schömann he reads 'Αἶτνης (as) for αἰδνῆς), since the mountain can hardly have been known till after the foundation of Naxos. The poet had quitted Ascrea after the unjust award and the loss of his patrimony, and settled near Naupactus: so Fick infers from *Op.* 635-9, *τῇδε* meaning the place where his father had landed, not the place where he afterwards

'settled' (νόσσοιο). Here, therefore, not in Boeotia, he composed the lays which were afterwards enlarged in the Hesiodic school, viz. the 'Reproof' addressed to Perses, the 'Works,' and the 'Song of the Five Ages.' These poems were composed in his native Aeolian dialect, which can be restored throughout all the genuine portions. The Theogony was composed, under Delphian auspices, in a dialect closely related to the Thessalian and other known dialects of Northern Greece, its special character being due to the contact of the amphictyonic tribes at Delphi. The poem originally consisted of three books. The first treated of the primeval powers, probably on the basis of an earlier Cyprian Theogony; hence it is that Aphrodite is established as Urania by the side of Uranus, but Chaos (vacant air) is substituted for Oceanus (the air-stream) as the original parent. The second treated of Cronos and his brother Titans; the long description of the birth of Zeus was introduced in honour of Crete, whence the Delphian priesthood was founded. The subject of the third book was Zeus, his victory over the Giants, his marriages and offspring. This Theogony was composed before the 'Works,' as the introductory description of Eris in the latter refers by way of correction (v. 11, οὐκ ἄρα κ.τ.λ.) to the former (*Theogon.* 225). Two poems were subsequently added (in the same dialect), the first intended for the Ἐρωτίδεια at Thespiae, and accordingly glorifying Helicon and the local river Permessus (with the subsequent addition of Hippocrene and Holmeios), the other apparently for the Ἀμφιάρεια at Oropus; Ἐλευθήρ, v. 54, denoting the city of Eleutheris in that neighbourhood.

These poems of Hesiod, like the original Homeric poems, were transposed into the quasi-Ionic or so-called 'Epic' dialect, with large additions (including the 'Days') and a mass of 'rubbish' subsequently thrown in. The Ionic editor was, according to Fick's conjecture, Cercops of Miletus.

Diogenes Laert. ii. 46 says of this poet, ἐφίλονεῖκε Ἡσίοδῳ ζῶντι, which Fick, arguing from the context, explains as meaning that he professed to embody Hesiod, that is, engrafted his own productions on him. The two names are also coupled together in Athenaeus (xi. p. 503 D) in reference to a Hesiodic poem entitled Αἰγίμος. Again, the statement that the Ναυπάκτια ἔπη (which must have originated in Locris, and therefore in the Hesiodic school) were ascribed by the majority to a Milesian (Pausan. x. 38, 11), notwithstanding that the original

composer was (according to the logographer Charon) Carcinus of Naupactus, may be explained on the supposition that Cercops had revised these as well as the other poems of the Locrian (Hesiodic) school. The fact that he was the author of an Orphic Theogony (known as the ἱεροὶ λόγοι) tallies with several remarkable indications of mysticism in the Ionic additions, e.g. the praise of the 'sole-begotten' (μονογενής) Hecate, the curious ceremonial rules, which the Pythagoreans borrowed from the Egyptian priesthood (e.g. *Op.* 731-2, and 742-3), and the word-puzzles (πέντοζος, ἀνόστειος, &c.). That the list of lucky and unlucky days was inspired by the same Egyptian influence is implied in the statement of Herodotus (ii. 82), even if he does not directly refer to 'Hesiod.' There are direct indications of Ionian origin in the strange reference to the month Lenaeon (*Op.* 504), and to the Βίβλιος οἶνος, not the wine of Biblis in Thrace, nor 'straw'-wine (as Hehn suggests, *Kulturpflanzen*, p. 492), but the wine of Biblos, a district of Naxos which still preserves its old name (comp. Mr. Bent's 'Cyclades,' p. 369). The mention of Amphidamas of Chalcis (*Op.* 655) belongs to another Ionic section and therefore, of course, gives no clue to the date of the real Hesiod.

It is recognised by all modern commentators that the Hesiodic text has been extensively worked over and corrupted. Fick's division, however, is mainly based on the number and metrical value of the Ionic forms, the genuine portions being those which he has found it possible to retranslate, with occasional alterations and excisions, for which he accounts in all cases. The Ionic residuum includes, besides the 'Days' and many shorter passages, the list of rivers (*Theogon.* 338-45), which can hardly be older than Hecataeus, the hymn to Hecate (*ib.* 411-52), and the description of Hades (*ib.* 720-815), which implies the later idea of a division of τιμαί after the dethronement of Cronos. *Op.* 564-618 is a short farmer's calendar, separately composed; 504-63 is manifestly Ionic in its elaborate description, and replete with Ionic forms.

The Ionisms consist of the numerous words in which the digamma is neglected, the Ionic use of ἐς, ἔσω, ἄν for κε, ἔως for αἶως, ἔσαν, ἔην (which, in the Theogony, cannot *ex hypothesi* be altered to Aeolic ἔεν), Ionic contractions (gen. ἑών for ἁών, accus. ἦ for εἶα; contracted dative of the εσ stem, e.g. ὄρει, σελά: Ἀχελῷον, Σιμοῦντα, γῆς for γαίας, ἀθλος, &c.). With these are found non-Epic or false forms, e.g. ἀρηρῦαν for

ἀράρῳιαν, ἀγόμενος, πμπλεύσαι, χρύσεια δῶ for δώματα, εἰς for εἰς, γέντο (for ἐγένετο), &c., and misuse of words, e.g. ἀφθίτος of a person, γλαυκή for 'the sea,' χθόνιος meaning merely 'terrible.' Another evidence is the dative plural οἰς and αἰς for οἰσι(ν) and αἰσι(ν), e.g. θνητοῖς μέγ' ὄνειρα. These forms, though very old in the Dorian (and Cyprian), were strange to the Aeolian, and did not belong to the older Ionian dialect. Where they occur in the genuine portions, they are alterable; e.g. *Op.* 167 for τοῖς δὲ may be substituted the Aeolic accusative τοῖς (governed by κατένασσε), which the Ionic reviser would misunderstand. On the other hand, we can explain from the Delphian dialect τοῖς μὲν—τοῖς δὲ, *Theogon.* 538, 40, in the sense which the context requires, viz. 'on the one side'—'on the other side'; for in Delphic inscriptions οἷς frequently occurs with the meaning 'whither' (e.g. οἷς κα θέλη), an interpretation which the other reading τῷ μὲν—τῷ δὲ will not bear. Instead of rejecting v. 638, as he formerly did (*Bezenb.* xii. p. 34), Fick now explains οὐδετέρους similarly as an adverb ('to neither side'). His hypothesis, of course, excludes forms exclusively Aeolic from the *Theogony*, e.g. the infinitive -μεναι. But these are removable, e.g. by reading v. 306 μὴ γῆμεν ἐνὶ, and v. 480 ἡμὲν τράφεν ἥδ' ἀτιτάλλην (compare φέρειν for φέρειν in Delphian inscriptions). The dative plural -εσσι in other than εσ stems belongs also to the Delphic (e.g. ἐμ πάντεσσι τοῖς ἀγώνεσσι); also θεν = θησαν (e.g. κατεστάθεν, διελέγεν); the shortened ας representing original αὐς (πᾶσ' αὐς, Ἀρπυῖας, βουλᾶς) is inconsistent with Aeolic αἰς, but probably belonged with similar forms (ες for εἰς, &c.) to the Thessalian dialect, and was borrowed by the poet himself in the 'Works,' compare vv. 663, 675 with *Theogon.* 60; accusatives plural τός and αὐτός occur in Delphian inscriptions. The Delphic word ἄρματα (noticed by Plutarch) meaning 'ties' or 'tokens of friendship,' gives the sense required in *Theogon.* 639, and is restored by Fick in place of ἄρμενα, so getting rid of the next line with its misplaced allusion to 'nectar and ambrosia.'

Fick's reconstruction no longer rests on the linguistic evidence obtained by the experiment of retranslation. He has now formulated a second theory which, if verified, must certainly go far, as he claims, to establish the first—viz. that those portions both of the Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, which his analysis indicated as the genuine products of the earlier schools, were constructed symmetrically in regularly proportioned sections

and (in the case of the oldest poems) subdivided in strophes; while on the other hand this systematic arrangement was nearly always disturbed or neglected by the Ionian translators. The application of this theory requires a considerable reduction of the 'Menis,' and a slight reduction of the other Homeric poems as at first reconstructed. The arrangement is much more obvious in the Hesiodic poetry (where indeed it was conjectured by Gruppe), and the analysis of the latter could alone have given the clue, which Fick now employs so boldly and ingeniously. He has not investigated the Homeric Hymns from this point of view. Gemoll, the last editor, notices the recurrence of short strophes in the Hymn to Apollo, and the three successive speeches of the god (247 seqq.) measure 7 lines each. The recurrence of 5-line strophes in the Hymn to Aphrodite must be regarded as hardly more than accidental, unless the text has been largely altered. The 'Menis' with its extension, and the first 'Nostos' were constructed, according to Fick, on a somewhat complex scheme involving two units (9, 11), the 'Oitos' on a simpler system, in which each section merely numbers some multiple of 5 or 10, the 'Tisis' on a similar principle (10 being here multiplied by 11 to form the larger unit), the unmutated portion of the original 'Telemachia' corresponds with the 'Tisis' in its dimensions, and the second 'Nostos' has a definite, though less formal structure. The arrangement of the genuine *Theogony* is strictly stichometric; the three books are of equal length and similarly subdivided, the unit being (as he now holds) 18. The component parts of the 'Works,' if the Ionic additions are eliminated, disclose the same symmetry. The 'Song of the Five Ages' is exactly half the length of one book of the *Theogony*, viz. 72 lines, which are divided in accordance with the five-fold partition of the subject and are arranged in strophe and antistrophe. The 'Reproof' likewise measured 72 lines in 9 equal strophes. The genuine *Ἔργα* consisted of the introductory description of the two-fold Eris (24 lines in short strophes), instructions to farmers in 3 divisions making 72 lines, and instructions to sailors in 48 lines; the mode of subdivision as well as the total (144) corresponding to the division of the *Theogony*, and going to prove so far that both poems were the work of Hesiod. The nucleus of the Hesiodic poetry—that is, the actual production of Hesiod—thus consists of 720 lines (*Theo-*

gony 3 × 144, Reproof 72, Five Ages 72, Works 144). The earlier of the subsequent additions, in the 'mixed' dialect, but still retaining a superficial symmetry, amount to 138 lines. The remainder (the production of Cercops) is quite devoid of symmetry and likewise of poetical genius.

In determining the original dialect of the principal Homeric Hymns, Fick applies the same criteria combined with internal evidence as to the locality and audience, in accordance with his leading doctrine, that all the older Epic poetry was composed in a native, living dialect. He argues that the Hymns (iv. vi. x.) to Aphrodite were designed for a Cyprian festival, and probably to serve as an introduction to the recitations of the Cypria at Salamis, from the frequent reference to that city and to Paphos, especially in the opening and concluding lines of the principal hymn; from the mention of war-chariots (*σarıναι*) as still in use (iv. 13, cf. Herod. v. 113); and from the praise of the Aeneadae, which he interprets as intended indirectly for Teucer's Salamis. He draws the same inference from the text, which, he maintains, originally preserved the digamma, apparent exceptions being due to alteration, e.g. *καὶ εἴματα*, where *καὶ* is a substitute for the peculiar Cyprian *ιδέ* (cf. v. 164). The text lends itself to retranslation in the Cyprian dialect by a uniform preference for open *ea*, *eos*, *aos* (which forms are connected in that dialect with the retention of *yod*, e.g. *ῥεπιја, τέρχνја, ἀτέλιја*). Dissimilar vowels (where the text is not corrupt) remain uncontracted, while *εε*, *οο*, *αα*, coalesce (e.g. *δρέονσα*, but *δρῆν*). The genitives in *-ου* are probably altered from *-ω*, and *Ἑρμω*, *Ἀγχίσεω* from *Ἑρμαν*, *Ἀγχίσαν* (a Cyprian and Arcadian form), as in the Cypria (Kinkel, 9, 4) *Τανταλίδαν* has been changed to *Τανταλίδου*: the infinitives in *-ειν* represent Cyprian *-ην*. As regards the well-known description of the adorning of Aphrodite (iv. 55 *seqq.*), he supposes that the Ionian composer of the Homeric lay of Ares and Aphrodite borrowed it (*Od.* viii. 362–6), as it is out of place there. Gemoll argues the other way, pointing out rightly that *ἐς Πάφον* (v. 59 of the Hymn) must have been copied from the Homeric line (363), otherwise it would have been *ἐν Πάφῳ*; and that the closing of the doors (v. 60) is an obvious addition; the phrase itself (*θύρας ἐπέθηκε φαεινάς*) is one of the Homeric tags, which are very frequent in this hymn. Hence he concludes that the author of the Hymn must have known the Odyssey in its present form. I cannot, however, agree with his opinion that the com-

poser of the Cypria copied his description from the same source. The only evidence he adduces is that, in the extant fragment, the Horae are added to the Charites, and the details are much more elaborated. The contrary is, I believe, the true inference. The minute and rich description in the Cypria (the missing portion of which was, no doubt, equally elaborate) must have been the original, which was poorly abridged by the composers both of the Hymn and the Lay.

As regards the Hymns to Hermes and Demeter, Fick holds that they were composed as they stand in a dialect which neglected the digamma. In both Ionic contractions are found. The name of the god, in the former, is declined *Ἑρμῆς, Ἑρμέω, Ἑρμῆν*. But the regular use of the fuller forms *οισι, ησι* for *οις, αἰς*, shows that this hymn belongs to the older Ionian school. He maintains that the latter forms, in Ionian poetry, are not older than the end of the sixth century, though they had previously been used by 'Ionising' poets, who adopted the Ionic dialect for their elegies, such as Tyrtaeus and Theognis, to whom they were familiar in the Doric dialect. He accordingly rejects the fragment ascribed to the Samian Asios (Kinkel, p. 206) which contains *καλοῖς* and *δεσμῶις*, and alters *θεοῖς* to *θεῶι* in a fragment of Evenus (of Paros) wrongly attributed to Theognis (Bergk, fr. 490), which in the old Parian writing would be liable to be miscopied (*ΘΕΟΙ-ΣΗΕΝΔΕΙΣ*). On the other hand, the frequent occurrence of *οις* and *αἰς* in the Hymn to Demeter implies a later date for that hymn. Fick conjectures that it was composed (for the Eleusinian festival) by a Parian poet, from the special reference to Iambe and to Paros (in the last lines); he might have noticed, as another indication, the Ionic *γλήχων* for *βλήχων* (v. 209). He argues more decidedly for the Ionian authorship of the Hymn to Hermes from its general comic tone, resembling that of the Homeric lay just mentioned. From the scene of the main incident being laid at Pylos, he infers that it may have been composed for the festival of the Clarian Apollo at Colophon (a colony of Pylos), being (as he thinks) intended in honour of Apollo rather than Hermes himself. The occurrence of 'Hesiodic' phrases is not, of course, inconsistent with an Ionian origin from his point of view.

Fick follows the majority of editors in dividing the Hymn to Apollo into two distinct hymns, the first addressed to the

Delian, the second to the Pythian, Apollo. He explains the correspondences between them on the supposition that the author of the latter (composed for the Delphian festival) borrowed from the composer of the Delian hymn (Cynaethus). Now that he accepts the traditional date (Ol. 69) for this author, abandoning a conjecture which placed him a century earlier, he would presumably invert that hypothesis. But Gemoll is right, I think, in spite of so many authorities, in refusing to bisect the Hymn. All the ancient references are to one hymn. The other theory rests only on a very late writer (Aristides), who in re quoting (as he evidently does) from Thucydides (iii. 104) refers the lines 169 *seqq.* by mistake to the end of the hymn (*προοίμιον*) instead of the end of the *ἔπαινος*. To me it appears most probable that Cynaethus himself added to his Delian hymn some older material borrowed from Delphi, which he transposed, with additions and repetitions, into the same dialect for the benefit of his Ionian public. Thus it is clear why the digamma can be restored in most of the Pythian, but not in the Delian section; and this theory alone, I believe, explains the awkwardness which marks the conclusion of the first and the commencement of the second portion. Such a clumsy compilation is just what we might expect from the composer who 'rhapsodised the Homeric verse.'

Fick's general theory of an Ionian translation of the Epic poetry is certainly strengthened by the cumulative evidence now collected; and so is his argument in favour of the Aeolian dialect as the original vehicle of the Homeric poetry, if he has succeeded in establishing the Aeolic element in the sister (Hesiodic) epic. Few, however, will agree with him in ascribing so large a performance to one translator, even if he is justified in interpreting the statement of Hippostratus, which I have just quoted, as meaning that Cynaethus 'rhapsodised' the whole *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The alternative view which I have suggested¹—that the Ionicising of the Epic poetry resulted from its reduction to writing for Ionian readers by Ionian experts in that art—seems to be confirmed by the discovery that the earlier poems (which I hold to have been composed memorially) were constructed in regular sections and strophes. For such a framework, far from being a hindrance, would be a great, if not indispensable, aid to memorial

composition, as well as an assistance to the singer or reciter, and a partial safeguard against alteration. It is, I suppose, an article of faith in the conservative cultus of Homer, that the entire complex of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was held together in the mind of one poet by mere power of memory. But, in fact, even such relatively small poems as Fick's analysis supposes could hardly have been framed so consistently without some such system. On the other hand the revisers might well dispense with it, if they availed themselves of writing. And without writing the amplification and dove-tailing of the earlier materials would be totally impossible. Our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are strictly *books* of highly artificial construction.

That the Ionians took the lead in extending the use of writing need not be demonstrated here. This might be inferred from their early and constant intercourse with the Phoenicians, which perhaps explains the origin of their name (if Brugsch is right in deriving it from the Semitic), and likewise the fact that their name alone reached the Hebrew geographer (Gen. x.), while there is no Oriental record of the Achaeans (excluding the Akaiusha of the Egyptian inscriptions), or their immediate descendants and namesakes the Aeolians (*Ἀχαιολεῖς*). If this be so, it is difficult to believe that the Ionicising of Homer was not begun till so much other written poetry had appeared, and literary prose had been introduced by the Ionian philosophers and historians. To pass over other arguments, the 'Epic' dialect must have become the established vehicle of written hexameter verse when it was adopted for the Delphic oracles. Unfortunately, indeed, the extant oracles, which purport to be the oldest, are not genuine, *e.g.* that given to Glaucus (Herod. vi. 86), which was compiled after the event, partly from Hesiod (*Op.* 282) and partly from current proverbs. But it may be reasonably assumed that they were uniform in dialect with the oldest of the genuine texts which we possess. The Greek of the oracles was so familiar that they appear never to have been translated into local dialects. Hentess (*Oracula Graeca*) rightly considers that the two quasi-Doric oracles cited in Herod. iv. 157, 159, were invented in Cyrene, but partly altered in transcription, and that the so-called oracle so often quoted, *ἀ φιλοχρηματία Σπάρταν ὀλεῖ, ἄλλο δὲ οὐδέν*, is merely a Doric proverb.

¹ See Nos. 2 and 3 of this review: 'The Aeolic element in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.'