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](#)

Altchristliche Texte. Heft VI. of Berliner Klassikertexte
herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung der kgl.
Museen zu Berlin. by C. Schmidt and W. Schubart.
Berlin, 1910.

James Hope Moulton

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 05 / August 2013, pp 176 - 177

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00005357, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00005357

How to cite this article:

James Hope Moulton (1913). The Classical Review, 27, pp 176-177 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00005357

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SYNTAX IN GREEK INSCRIPTIONS.

Griechische Forschungen I. Die Nebensätze in den griechischen Dialektinschriften, in Vergleich mit den Nebensätzen in der griechischen Litteratur, und die Gebildetensprache im Griechischen und Deutschen. Von EDUARD HERMANN. Mit zwei Tafeln. Teubner, 1912. M. 10, cloth M. 12.

THIS volume really contains two distinct books: one, an analysis of Subordinate Clauses in non-Attic inscriptions; the other, a discussion of the question how these inscriptions are related to popular speech, whether in fact there was always a literary dialect in Greek. It is a pity that both these have been included in one volume: they are quite independent, and they must be estimated apart.

The first part of the work is excellent. Hermann arranges his matter in such a way that it is easy to understand. The pronouns and conjunctions are put in alphabetical order, the dialects in the order of Thumb's handbook, which is taken for convenience and without prejudice. Special tables are given for the Delphian manumissions; others for comparison with the dialects in literature; afterwards each pronoun and conjunction is discussed by itself, and tables show the form of each in the dialects. In all these, Attic inscriptions are left out of account, references being given for them to Meisterhans. In the very middle of these, like the meat in a sandwich, comes the other treatise. Hermann will have it that the inscription represent the speech of educated persons; and he draws a parallel with modern Germany, where those who were educated, yet spoke a dialect, always made concessions to the Schriftsprache. He gives a number of details about this matter in Germany, but they help us little in discussing Greek. He admits himself that the conditions are different; yet he sticks to his principle. But the conditions are vitally different. Printing is one, wealth and poverty is another, the size of nations another, artistic sense another. In Greece we should imagine all had a high level of education through the agora, the theatre, and the games; there was no such

thing as what Hermann has in mind. The only uneducated class were the women. The very differences of dialects, and the changes of the same dialect, go against his views. The case is different where the inscriptions are poetical; for there was a literary tradition, of course.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache (Die Kultur der Gegenwart, Teil i., Abteilung viii). Third edition. Royal 8vo. Pp. viii + 582. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. M. 12.

Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. Edited by A. GERCKE and E. NORDEN. Royal 8vo. Vols. i. and ii. Second edition. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. (Vol. i., pp. xii + 632), M. 13; (Vol. ii., pp. viii + 442), M. 9.

THE issue of new editions of the above works testifies at once to their rapid sale and to the care taken in their revision. The volume of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* has been substantially increased by more than a hundred pages. The greater part of the new matter is to be found in Professor Wilamowitz's section on Greek Literature, in which the Attic and Hellenistic literatures in particular receive fuller treatment. The rapidity with which new editions of Gercke and Norden's *Introduction* have been called for has not required or rendered possible any considerable changes. In the first volume the chapter on *Metrik* has been enlarged, and the order of the chapters altered. The second volume has been shortened a little by the omission of part of the chapter on Greek Art. We may welcome the success of these excellent manuals and be grateful for the labour of the authors in improving them.

X.

Altchristliche Texte. Heft VI. of *Berliner Klassikertexte* herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung der kgl. Museen zu Berlin. By C. SCHMIDT and W. SCHUBART. Berlin, 1910.

THIS collection includes all the Greek Christian fragments on papyrus pre-

served in the Berlin Museum, except Biblical texts. Dr. Schubart's well-known skill as a decipherer of papyri guarantees sufficiently the minute accuracy of their reproduction; and his colleague, with expert knowledge in another field, secures the thoroughness of the editorial work. It can hardly be said that the contents modify greatly the sense of disappointment with which we scan the remains of Christian Egypt as preserved on the papyri. The non-literary and non-Christian documents are of endless value for lexical and grammatical study of the Greek Bible, and even for its *Realien*; but neither literary nor non-literary papyri of a definitely Christian origin give us any large amount of help. The volume has four patristic texts. Ignatius *ad Smyrnaeos* iv.-xi. (plus a few lines before and after) is presented from a codex of the fifth century, which is six centuries older than our only existing MS., and has important variants. Hermas follows (*Sim.* ii. 7-10, iv. 2-5, viii. 1) in some third-century fragments, an additional witness to his popularity in Egypt. Then come two anthologies, from Basil and from Gregory of Nyssa (both fifth century). An Easter pastoral, by Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria (seventh century), will interest students of Byzantine *Kunstprosa*, of whom, I fear, I am not one. The rest of the book (pp. 110-132) is occupied with sundry fragments, mostly liturgical, and nearly all very late. Indices to the new texts and two facsimiles complete the volume. For the philologist its interest will be mainly in the presence of accented texts, such as the *Osterfestbrief*, which was as ambitious in its form as in its style. In the

Ignatius text (l. 33) I note ΑΟΠΑΤΟΙ, with which the editors compare ΑΝΘΕΤΗΚΕ in the Basilexcerpt (l. 69). The aspirate had vanished centuries before from pronunciation: it is interesting to see its tradition surviving in a place which our modern orthography will not recognise. Latin forms like *Euhemerus*, *Euhodius*, etc., may be compared.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek.
By H. P. V. NUNN. Cambridge University Press, 1912. 2s. 6d. net.

MR. NUNN has written an unpretentious little book for the help of students, assuming no knowledge of grammar beyond the accident. Indeed the first twenty pages presume that even English grammar is in need of summary restatement as a basis of a reasonable understanding of Greek. The precaution is not at all needless, as many teachers will witness, when Greek enough for the reading of the New Testament has to be acquired after the atmosphere of grammar has become a memory of rather distant schooldays. I am glad to see Mr. Nunn's plea for this late and simple Greek as a desirable first step even for those who intend to pursue their studies into the classical literature. Hellenistic may be found a powerful ally for the endangered study of the Greek language and literature. Mr. Nunn's summary of syntax is simple and accurate, and based on sound teacher's instinct, which makes large use of comparison with English, and Latin in a more limited way. There are not many criticisms of detail to be suggested, and most of them are in the opening pages, before the syntax proper is reached. The example illustrating 'Diphthong' (p. x) will not help an English reader, who can recognise no diphthong in 'Caesar.' The definition of 'Deponent' verbs (p. 7) might be brought up to date; and *πεφιλήσομαι* (p. 10) guarded with a remark that it is a very limited example of the Future Perfect. In the same table it is hardly accurate to deny Hellenistic the Perfect Continuous. English only has it in periphrastic form, and Greek is not devoid of this. On p. 64 I should greatly question Mark 15²³ as an instance of repeated action in the Imperfect ('kept giving'): *ἐδίδουν* is conative, 'offered.' The Epistolary Aorist (p. 66) is not wholly replaced by our Present: Phil. 2²⁵, Mr. Nunn's example, might as well be rendered 'I thought it necessary to send E.' On p. 76 I notice *οἱ πολλοί* mistranslated 'many.' The misprints *tonitruum* (Acc. Sing.) (p. 88) and *εἰ τί* (p. 115) may be noted. Mr. Nunn is to