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](#)

Van Leeuwen's *Enchiridium Enchiridium Dictionis Epicae*, scripsit J. van Leeuwen, J.F. Editio altera aucta et emendata. One vol. 9³/₈" × 6³/₈". Pp. xx + 431. Lugduni Batavorum: A. W. Sitjhoff, 1918. Fl. 6.50.

A. Shewan

The Classical Review / Volume 33 / Issue 1-2 / February 1919, pp 31 - 33

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00012324, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00012324

How to cite this article:

A. Shewan (1919). The Classical Review, 33, pp 31-33 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00012324

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS

VAN LEEUWEN'S *ENCHIRIDIUM*.

Enchiridium Dictionis Epicae, scripsit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J.F. Editio altera aucta et emendata. One vol. 9 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{8}$ ". Pp. xx + 431. Lugduni Batavorum: A. W. Sitjhoff, 1918. Fl. 6.50.

THE first part of the first issue of this handbook was noticed by Professor Platt in *C.R.* VII. 359. Those who have been aware for some time that a second edition was in preparation will perhaps be disappointed with it in one respect. Some of them had hoped that it would be a largely expanded treatise, embodying the principal discussions which have appeared of recent years, such as Witte's papers in *Glotta* on the versification, Wackernagel's on the Atticisms, Mr. Drewitt's on the Augment, and many, many others. Dr. van Leeuwen has, however, kept to his original object, to provide a *librum iuniorum praesertim philologorum manibus destinatum*, so that *strictim tangenda quae spissa sibi poscerent volumina*. Too much was expected. If ever a comprehensive treatise on the subject is planned, it will have to be encyclopaedic like Pauly-Wissowa's *Lexikon*, but men now living need not hope to see such a Thesaurus completed.

The changes in detail in this new edition are, if I may judge from the sections tested, mostly unimportant. Thus, in the list of digammated words, though there are numerous trifling alterations, testifying to the care with which the revision has been done, the only difference worth noting seems to be the omission of *Feλεῖν*. In fact there appears to be no modification of the author's attitude, except in the *Praefatio*, where, as one had anticipated, his conversion to the Unitarian faith rendered the recasting of parts of his statement *de origine et compositione carminum epicorum* inevitable. He maintains his conclusions with the confidence of a master. Of controversy there is comparatively little, though

some theorisings of Fick, Cauer, and others are sharply exposed.

Detailed criticism, however tempting, of the contents of the book is here impossible, and it is difficult to criticise them even in a general way without touching fundamental questions which are discussed incessantly by the experts, τέλος δ' οὐ πῶ τι πέφανται. As is well known, its author's efforts, through many laborious years, have aimed at the production of a Homeric Library *in parvo*. He has edited both poems twice; in his *Commentationes* he has provided a *Wegweiser* on the Homeric Question and interesting papers on other Homeric matters; and in the present work he constructs a basis for his text. His object here is to get as near as possible to that text in its original form, and that of course requires copious emendation of the *textus receptus*. The limits of such procedure are debatable, and have indeed been much debated by editors. He himself is among the thoroughgoing purgers. But these all go too far, and make trouble for themselves. A *Fe* or a *F'* is inserted which is not quite consonant with Homeric practice, and even, it may be added, unnecessary, considering the marked freedom with which Homer omits a pronominal form, or a fourth trochee is abolished and replaced by what proves to be only a 'Wernicke.' And then the digamma; there is surely too great readiness to improve what are called 'neglects' of *F*. They cannot all be easily and acceptably emended; you can only work away till you reach a point when you have to say the rest are in lines that are spurious, or corrupted in a way that cannot be discovered, and that is a thoroughly unsatisfactory conclusion. But are they neglects—the work, that is, of a generation who knew not the digamma? That has still to be decided. Take the class, numbering more than a third of the total, of cases in which the combination *ν* (very susceptible to modifi-

cation), ς (mobile, weak, and easily degenerating into the aspirate), or ρ (with *δύναμις φωνήεντος*), plus F (only a semivowel and not in its first youth), fails to make position. Need we wonder at this, when a short vowel at times is not in position, with little or no discernible excuse, and without rousing suspicion, before a combination of consonants such as $\chi\lambda$ or $\tau\rho$? And in the one case as in the other there is no ground for objection to the many occurrences in which there is a pause in the line or sense. But it is even possible that, in all these three combinations, assimilation produced FF , which became vocalised into a simple v , as in *εὔαδε, αἰέρονσαν, κανάξαις*. Such forms, Monro has suggested, were probably more frequent in the text at one time. There is something to be said for that view, and more still against the ultimate condemnation of passages, which the mere mixture of observances and neglects forbids. The cases of elision in spite of F , which are more numerous, present even less difficulty. In the third class the 'neglects' are few. Of course much depends on the degree of vitality to be ascribed to the F of Homer's day. As to that, one of the two extreme views is Jebb's, quoted by Dr. van Leeuwen, that it was a mere *soni umbra*. The other is his own, that it was *sonus vegetus et florentissimus*, but surely that is in conflict with the facts that many words had already lost the sound, and that it was weak in compound and derivative words, in proper names, in initial δF , and generally inside words. The *Verwitterungsepoche* or *Uebergangsstufe*—what Mr. Agar calls the 'in and out'—theory of other authorities seems to be the safest. It cannot be said that it is successfully refuted in the present treatise. For all the learning that has been bestowed on it, the Homeric digamma is still, in the words of the epitaph made for Joshua Barnes, *expectans iudicium*. Meanwhile, that it was, whether vigorous or senescent or quite moribund, the same to all the bards of the critics, their latest as well as their earliest, is one comforting result of recent research.

Another all-important matter for the constructor of a pristine text is that of

Contraction and Synizesis. How far is he to resolve contracted forms? Dr. van Leeuwen is all for resolution, and starts from the position that, as the original form of *γένεος* was *γένεσος*, therefore *γένους* or *γένευσ* was *alienum a priscis carminibus*. But that, even admitting the sequitur, does not help, for the *prisca carmina* were separated by a long interval from the two poems with which we are concerned. All we seem to be justified in saying is that, in this as in other respects, Homer's age was one of 'overlap.' Contracted forms were well established, but the old open forms had still a preference, with the to us very pleasing result that for every spondee there are three dactyls. There is too much abhorrence of contraction and synizesis. It seems to be a matter in which Ludwig's dictum that *Möglichkeit ist nicht Nothwendigkeit* should be borne in mind. It is interesting, by the way, to note the perplexity of those who amend freely, when they are 'up against' a harmless, necessary line such as *καί μιν φωνήσας' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, and find themselves between the devil of a digamma and the deep sea of synizesis.

There are, as is well known, a number of other points on which a straining after complete uniformity has proved a weakness of Homeric linguistic inquiry. The remark might be extended to include Homeric criticism also. A practice or rule is detected or assumed, and attempts are made to show that it is absolute and subject to no exception. These never succeed without a free use of the obelus for a residuum of passages that resist inclusion in the formula. Such a desire to effect perfect consistency has not been confined to Homeric research; it has been noted and condemned in the province of language generally.

Apart from such matters, the value of the book and the debt which all *φιλόμηροι* owe to its author are to be warmly acknowledged. The pains bestowed on making the contents complete and accurate are everywhere apparent. The references to the Homeric text are abundant, the cross-references within the work itself are extremely numerous, and the discus-

sions, always clear and sure, are greatly strengthened by constant quotations from the inscriptions and by indications of development in later Greek. An enormous amount of matter has been compressed into the volume, but its bulk has been, by various means, considerably reduced. The sections are numbered as before, so that the quotations of them, which are so useful a part of the author's editions of the poems, are not affected. The Index is not as full as the book deserves. In the old edition it sometimes failed me when hunting for a word or form.

But the book is an excellent one on a most fascinating subject. It is written, this examination of the dry bones of a language, in a style so bright and enjoyable, that I have known a Homeric student read it, not for the first time, for pure pleasure, as well as profit, in a summer vacation. That says something for its author's style and method, as well as for the charm of the marvellous language and verse of Homer. Happy the poet who had such instruments at his command, and happy we who have 28,000 lines of his matchless poetry on which philologists can work! Had only a single episode of the *Iliad* survived, or no more than

the *Menis*, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε, what a puzzle the language and verse would have remained, and what masses of volumes would have been devoted to the elucidation of the problems presented by the meagre materials! οὐδ' ἂν νηὺς ἑκατόζυγος ἄχθος ἄροιτο. And they would have left us little wiser. As it is, the student is well provided, though he would give his ears for a few fragments of pre-Homeric Greek, and surrender even more for a well-grounded assurance that that was the tongue the Minoans spake. Scholars have done their duty. The schoolboy has excellent summaries of the grammar and versification in the editions of the poems prepared for his use. At college he finds a most admirable introduction in the late Professor Seymour's *Homeric Language and Verse*, and he passes on to the *Homeric Grammar* and the *Enchiridium*. In his riper years he will, if he has the hardihood to 'wallow beneath such thorny shade,' find a lifetime's occupation in the philological journals, and will end his days, as he ought to strive to end them, by having, to use our author's words, *Homerum ut digitos suos cognitum*.

A. SHEWAN.

SELECTED ESSAYS OF PLUTARCH.

Selected Essays of Plutarch. Vol. II. Translated with Introduction by A. O. PRICKARD. Pp. xx + 336. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918. 3s. 6d. net.

THIS is a companion volume to that published by Professor Tucker in 1913, and it deserves a hearty welcome. It is to be feared that Plutarch has not many readers nowadays, and few from this small company penetrate beyond the *Lives*. Yet the *Moralia* are in many respects, as was recognised by Southey in the quotation which Mr. Prickard places on his title-page, the more valuable half of Plutarch's writings. Their value is to be attributed not so much to their literary merit, although many of these essays are pleasing

examples of skilful composition; nor to their scientific and philosophical significance, although they are among the most important authorities which we possess for our knowledge of the later Greek schools, and especially of the Stoa, as to the vividness of the picture which they present of the state of Graeco-Roman culture in the first century of our era. Plutarch himself is the best possible representative of his age. Born of a good family, he had received the most thorough education which was open to him; and he had a broad and liberal intelligence, as well as some practical experience in the administration of affairs. The variety of his interests is exhibited in the many-sidedness of the *Moralia*, whose title is justified only in so far as a considerable