

us not a little as to the universality of such stories in the mind of primitive man. There is hardly a bit of Hebrew folk-lore that is not abundantly paralleled elsewhere. Primitive man reasons and speculates alike all over the world. In reading one may, of course, weary a little of the endless repetition of the customs of innumerable primitive tribes if one is not a comparative anthropologist: a little goes a long way to prove the point. But Sir James Fraser aims at giving us everything, and here is the mine into which all who are interested may dip if they are only so far inclined, or in which they may labour if they aim at knowing everything that is to be known on the subject. To all students of the Old Testament and all commentators thereon these volumes are indispensable, and many less scientific readers will gain from their study a new light as to the meaning of what they read in the Hebrew scriptures. Greek parallels, e.g., the story of Deukalion's flood, are by no means wanting. This tradition of some primitive flood in Thessaly, and Chinese traditions of floods, which are endemic in the valley of the Hwang-ho, are to be clearly distinguished from such a story as that of the Babylonian flood (equally natural in the land of the Two Rivers), which is demonstrably the actual original of the Hebrew tradition. What culture the primitive Hebrews had was naturally of Babylonian origin.

Dealing with the Tower of Babel, E-temen-an-ki, the temple of Enlil at Babylon (which is not the same building as the mound of Babil, with which Sir James appears to confuse it; vol. i, p. 360), is no doubt Herodotus's Temple of Belus, but that either this or the mighty ziggurat of Borsippa (Birs Nimrûd) is the actual original of the Biblical tower can hardly be proved. The tale is a record of the impression made on the minds of the primitive Hebrews by the soaring temple-towers of Babylonia, the usual mixture of wonder, envy, and thoroughly 'nasty' feeling which the childish barbarian feels when he sees or hears of the great works of a superior race. And it was naturally given a home at Babylon itself. Actually E-temen-an-ki was not very big, as ziggurats go; Birs Nimrûd is far greater, and as the most prominent landmark in the neighbourhood of Babylon has naturally been identified not only in modern Jewish, but also in modern British military tradition as the Tower of Babel itself. Sir James Fraser is no doubt right in accepting the late Prof. King's criticism of Koldewey's peculiar supposition that E-temen-an-ki had only one stage instead of the several which Herodotus apparently saw with his own eyes.

**Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum** a GUILIELMO DITTENBERGERO condita et aucta nunc tertium edita. Vol. II. Lipsiae: apud S. Hirzelium, 1917.

The first volume of this classic of epigraphical research was noticed in *J.H.S.* xxxvii. p. 127, where will be found a general account of the new edition and its distinctive features. The second follows it at an interval of two years and contains the historical documents from the Peace of Naupactus (217-6 B.C.) to the close of the Roman period, 405 in number. In the second edition the heading *Aetas Romana* (beginning in 146 B.C.) covered 115 texts; it is now subdivided, and we have 92 inscriptions belonging to the period 146-31 B.C. and 172 dating from Imperial times. This leaves 141 texts dated in the first seventy years covered by the volume: again, however, there are a number of inscriptions carried forward from later sections, and in order to give as full a conspectus as possible of the historical documents of the time in their chronological order, unnumbered references to the *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones* are inserted. It is not always easy to see why inscriptions which in the second edition were classed with those illustrating public, religious and private antiquities have been transferred to the historical section; for it is not necessarily precisely dated texts which are so treated, e.g. No. 504 in ed. 2, which appears as No. 899 in ed. 3, and several inscriptions which it would seem more natural to class with those illustrating *res sacrae* have been brought over, e.g. Nos. 650 and 667 in the second edition, now Nos. 540, 907. The Delphic inscriptions which record the sending of Athenian *theopiai* to various *Πυθαῖδες*, again, are of religious rather than historical interest. But Pomtow, who is responsible for Delphi's contribution to the volume, was evidently allowed a free hand, and has printed a great deal of material which might have been reduced in bulk by selection.

For the sake of completeness he includes (and rightly) some Latin inscriptions, such as that on the base of the monument of L. Aemilius Paulus.

The historical interest of this volume is of course not equal to that of the first, although it is an excellent thing that the study of the later Hellenistic period, hitherto somewhat neglected, should be made easier: and the third volume, which will in some respects be the most interesting of all, is yet to come. There is no indication that this is to be followed (as report ran) by a collection of metrical inscriptions to replace Kaibel's *Epigrammata Graeca*.

The editing, it need hardly be said, maintains the standard which we expect of the *Sylloge*: but we do not think that Dittenberger would have been guilty of *fulgur* (note on No. 623)! There is little, however, to criticise. Pomtow placed the inscription which records the *συμποσίεα* of Stiris and Medeon (No. 647) in 175 B.C. or thereabouts, but afterwards altered his opinion and thinks that it should be dated forty years later. His argument from a reconstructed pedigree seems inconclusive. In the commentary on No. 611 *διαφονέω* is explained by '*aushauchen, verhauchen*,' with a reference to No. 521 (in Vol. I.) It should be observed that the proper meaning of this word is not *to perish*, but *to be lacking, fail to correspond with the total or roll*. The LXX examples, especially Numb. 31. 49 and 1 Sam. 30. 19, as well as the metaphorical uses, make this quite clear. That the envoys mentioned in the inscription fell into the hands of pirates is likely enough, but what is expressed is the fact of their disappearance, not their death. Further parallels to the Acclamations recorded in the note on No. 896 *ἐβόησαν οἱ σύνεδροι κ.τ.λ.* may be found in P.Oxy. 41, as well as 1413 (which was not accessible to the editor). We note that Hiller von Gärtringen (Nos. 665, 679, 699) is careful to give the needful references to Mr. Tod's *Greek Arbitration*, which Pomtow seems to have overlooked (Nos. 546, 614). The Dryantianus named in No. 885 must surely be connected with the family which later furnished a pretender to the purple with a wife, Sulpicia Dryantilla: see *I.G.R.* 4. 500. (The later parts of *I.G.R.*, by the way, did not reach the editors.)

- (1) **A Handbook of Antique Prose-rhythm.** Vol. I., pp. 228. 1918. (2) **De Numero Oratorio Latino Commentatio.** Pp. 52. 1919. By A. W. DE GROOT, Litt.D., Conservator of the Library of the University of Groningen. Groningen, The Hague: J. B. Wolters.

In these two treatises we have an ambitious attempt to solve the problem of prose rhythm (or prose metre, as the author says it should properly be called) on new lines. Dr. De Groot cuts himself adrift both from ancient authority and from the methods of modern research. The results arrived at by Zielinski, for example, he regards as built on sand. That Zielinski records facts cannot be doubted; but facts often assume a new aspect when regarded from a new point of view, *i.e.* in relation to other facts. I have much sympathy with the writer's contention that the *clausula* should be scanned as part of the sentence. The results of divorcing its rhythm from the rhythm of what precedes it were pointed out in my review of Zielinski's latest work.<sup>1</sup> For example, take a familiar expression like *Quo me vertam nescio*. What the natural rhythm (or metre) of these words is may be seen from a line of Plautus—say *Curc.* 69 (an iambic senarius):

Quod si non affert, quo me vortam nescio.

The last four words have trochaic rhythm (after the caesura)—a rhythm indicated both by the quantities and by the accents:  $\underline{\text{Q}} - \underline{\text{d}} - \underline{\text{si}} - \underline{\text{n}} - \underline{\text{on}}$   $\underline{\text{a}} - \underline{\text{f}} - \underline{\text{f}} - \underline{\text{e}} - \underline{\text{r}} - \underline{\text{t}}$ . But when they appear at the end of a sentence in Cicero Zielinski treats them as containing the '*clausula*'  $\text{---} - \text{---} | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ , a double cretic (p. 32 and p. 100). This strange result is arrived at by treating the word *quo* as no part of the '*clausula*' and ignoring accents in the next two words.

<sup>1</sup> *Der Constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden* (Supplementband xiii., Heft 1, of *Philologus*, 1914), reviewed in *The Year's Work* for 1914, pp. 61-65. This work is not

mentioned in the bibliography of the *Handbook* (p. 217), but it is quoted in *De Num. Orat.* p. 30.