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](#)

***Homeric Grammar for Upper Forms of Schools.* By F. E. Thompson. Rivingtons: 1890. 2s. 6d.**

Y.

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 08 / October 1890, pp 378 - 378

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191103, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191103

How to cite this article:

Y. (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 378-378 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191103

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It is further claimed that the original form of the verse was either that of two tripodies, or that of three dipodies. Each of these two forms gave rise to a hexameter in different places, and from the fusion of these hexameters is descended the present form. Anacrusis and catalexis were common; hence a dactyl containing the caesura would arise in the third foot of the first type of hexameter, and in the second and fourth feet of the second type. Survivals of such an anacrusis may still be noted, as in O 18, and ♣ 396. Finally, the author attempts to show that rhyme is a common feature of the older verses, and that we must therefore assume it for the original form: this rhyme is either of hexameters, of dipodies, or of tripodies, and this fact in respect to dipodies and tripodies is adduced as evidence of the two-fold origin of the hexameter. The chapters on the development of the present metre from these elements are less important.

These assumptions give rise to a few questions which Kluge has not satisfactorily answered: If rhyme were general, why should it have become as uncommon as even the author admits? Is not the periodical repetition of similar sounds more simply explained as merely rhetorical, and are we justified in finding in it, occurring so sporadically, evidence as to the original length of the verse? If the second, third and fourth feet are the ones in which on this theory the dactyl most naturally arose, how does it happen that as a fact the fifth foot is the favourite place for them? Passing by the artificial explanation of the origin of quantitative scansion, why should the spondee be assumed as the original foot rather than the dactyl? It is the characteristic of early and ruder poetry to be rhythmic without too much regard to the number of syllables; is the Greek epic alone to be an exception, and is it reasonable to ascribe to it such an artificial principle of rhythm as that here described? It would be more simple to assume that both feet, dactyl and spondee, are crystallizations from an early freer movement, in which the longer syllable naturally attracted the recurring accent. The freer, less artificial is not descended from the more artificial; precision and the regulation of liberty come with the growth of poetry. It is true that the hexameter naturally falls asunder into two or three parts, but this is no proof that these are distinct elements in origin.

The second part of the book gives the percentage of verses of the older and of the later form in each section of the *Iliad*, and endeavours to establish the relative dates of these sections on this basis: thus the oldest passages are A 521—574, M 41—85, 252—289 and, with some short passages in N O, constitute an Older Wrath. Other short sections here and there are scattered bits of older work. The wrath of Achilles is treated also in a Later Wrath, and the two lays on this subject are worked together with additions at different points, made at various periods. The author's statistics have a value independent of that of the theory based upon them; they show clearly certain metrical peculiarities in different sections of the *Iliad*, and the metrical relation of these sections to each other.

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS,
N. Y.

Homeric Grammar for Upper Forms of Schools.

By F. E. THOMPSON. Rivingtons: 1890. 2s. 6d.

If this book did not contain an advertisement of two other works 'by the same author,' the reader would set it down as by a novice in book-making. On almost every page appear marks of inexperience or of haste. The heading 'Homeric Prosody' (probably

for 'Homeric Grammar') stands on every left-hand page of the book, while the headings on the right-hand page are not systematic. The main faults of the book are negative rather than positive. It fails to distinguish sufficiently between what is important and what is exceptional, and thus our old friend, the passive-ending -μενον appears simply as 'rare.' But the author has an entirely wrong view of the Homeric dialect and even tries to explain 'the development of Epic into Attic'! See pp. viii., 1, 126. When he says that in ἑξείσεν 'a vowel has probably been lost,' he doubtless means that a consonant has been lost: but he may not have been clear in his mind, for he says on p. 11 that 'the group δέος [where δ appears to stand for δF] is more difficult of discussion.' The material is ill digested. On p. 20 the same note is given in two recensions; cf. on p. 26, 'But, N.B., in some cases the true ending appears to be -oo, and we should write 'Ιῶο', etc., and below 'The metre often requires -oo as with 'Ιῶο above'—as if the metre were not the only indication for the forms 'Ιῶο and ῶο. Lack of mental digestion is seen in § 11, where 'Caesura,' 'Diaeresis,' 'Hiatus,' and 'Elision' are brought into one article. The definitions are not always happy; as, p. 15, 'Hiatus is the gap produced by non-elision,' and, p. 14, 'Apocope is the cutting off of a short final syllable.' The paragraph on 'prodelision' might have been omitted, since the only example given seems to be not Homeric. The English expression is often careless, as, p. 20, 'Diphthongs can be shortened in Homer as in Iambics before a vowel following it [sic] in the same word.' The proof-reading has been carelessly done. The author has trusted too much to the printer, who has well done his part in making a comely book, but one that will not bear inspection.

—Y.

Die Sprüchwörter bei den Römischen Komikern. Von WILHELM VON WYSS, Dr. Phil. Zurich, 1889. Pp. 111. 2 Mk.

A COLLECTION of proverbs and proverbial sayings from Pl. (including the fragments), from Ter. and Ribbeck's *Fragmenta*. It appears to be very complete, and the proverbs are well grouped according to their sources rather than according to their application. The headings in the Table of Contents—Mythological, historical and geographical proverbs, Proverbs from public life, Nature in proverbs, etc.—with a sufficient number of sub-classes, enable one to use the book for reference, and take the place of an index. The author has used the work of his predecessors, Schneider, Pflüg, Wortmann and especially Otto in Wölflin's *Archiv*, iii. iv. v. and has contributed something to the subject by careful use of the collections of Greek proverbs.

But when this is said, all is said. No genera principles are laid down to distinguish a proverb from a metaphor which has become idiomatic; *tragulam inicere* is included (p. 32), but not *ballistam intendere*, or *oblinere* (p. 67), but not *dare uerba*. No line is drawn between proverbs clearly taken from the Greek and those which bear merely an accidental resemblance to Greek sayings. No real help to the understanding of difficult passages is given. P. 79, there is no distinction between *uigilans dormiat* and *uigilans somniat*; p. 90, the uses of *cuculus* are given but the wide differences in application are unnoticed; p. 88, *Simia* so called because he was as ugly as a monkey; p. 73, *Pseud.* 1196, *quem hominem nullius coloris noui*, p. 78, *Pseud.* 318 f., etc., etc., are illustrations of difficulties passed over too lightly. Other explanations are either from editions which are in