

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 Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by John Gilmore, M.A. London, Macmillan and Co. 1888. 8s. 6d.**

A. H. Cooke

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 08 / October 1889, pp 368 - 369

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195745, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195745

How to cite this article:

A. H. Cooke (1889). *The Classical Review*, 3, pp 368-369 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195745

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the old interpretation of ἀλφιστής, 'barley-meal eating,' and object to the statement (p. 448²) that the Stoics did not discountenance the marriage of close relations, as leaving an impression more unqualified than Zeller intended, as is shown by the continuation of the discussion in Zeller (iii.² 1, 261ff.),

and some other points equally insignificant. But even such are few and far between, and bear no proportion at all to the vast mass of systematised information which is so admirably and lucidly set forth.

L. C. PURSER.

A Theory of the Origin and Development of the Heroic Hexameter. By FITZ GERALD TISDALL, Ph.D. 40 pp. New York, 1889.

THIS is an ingenious and wholly independent attempt to solve the problem of the origin and development of the heroic hexameter. The author had never seen Usener's treatise on Altgriechischer Versbau, and seems to have been ignorant of Allen's paper Ueber den Ursprung des homerischen Versmasses in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, 1879, and of the discussion in Westphal's Metrik, Vol. II. He observed that the 'feminine caesura,' after the trochee in the third foot, predominated in the Homeric poems, and connected this with the frequent appearance of a trochee in the sixth foot of the verse. He desired 'a theory which shall explain the invariable absence of the dactyl from the sixth foot.' His statement of the prevailing view of the growth of the Homeric verse is hardly fair. Probably Mr. Monro, to whose Grammar he refers, does not hold that the hexameter had its origin 'in joining together words which form six consecutive dactyls.' Dr. Tisdall's view as to the gradual evolution of metrical forms is, I think, generally accepted.

The author works out for himself with considerable labour what had been pretty well established before—that quantity was disregarded in the most primitive verse. The primitive foot he believes, was the spondee. The dactyl was a later invention. 'It may have resulted from accident, but I fully believe that it came about naturally and necessarily in the development of the heroic metre, and not before.' The primitive long metre was the spondaic trimeter; the dimeter would have been too short, the tetrameter would have been too easily separated into dimeters. The original hexameter was formed by the union of two spondaic trimeters. The verse-sentence and word-sentence corresponded, and each trimeter was followed by a slight pause. The pause after the first trimeter was shorter than that at the close of the hexameter, for the two trimeters were more closely connected with each other than with the preceding and following hexameters. 'An equal division of the verse is precisely what a composer would aim at.' Since the first half of the verse, with the shorter pause, would require more time for recitation than the second half, in order to restore equality to the trimeters a short syllable was added to the second half of the verse, immediately after the pause. (This is illustrated by the capital letters B.D.E.S. in which the type-founder makes the upper half smaller than the lower in order to give an apparent equality to the two halves of the letter; while to the untrained eye, both halves are of the same size.) The pause when placed in the middle of the third foot carried the centre of gravity of the verse a trifle too far back, and the feminine caesura was preferred. But the masculine caesura was for a long time (in the spondaic hexameter period) the legitimate pause, and acquired as it were vested rights, and was never cast

out utterly but always had a strong feeling in its favour.

As for the rhythm of the verse—in the coincidence of the word-sentence and verse-sentence, the important words would come first and the slow spondaic movement was preferred for the first two feet, as more emphatic. The antithesis is formed by the accelerated movement of the dactyls in the fourth and fifth feet. 'Spondaic' verses are a survival of the original metres.

These are, in brief, the views set forth in this tract. It is a pity that the author did not know the investigations of Allen and Usener which seem to show conclusively that the original Indo-European metre consisted of four feet—not of three. Perhaps he would not allow any connection between the Greek hexameter and the metres of other nations.

Some statistics with regard to the difference of rhythm in different Greek and Latin poems close the paper. The most interesting is the following: 'The

feminine caesura in the third foot (♩ ♪ ♪ ♪) as ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, Ἄ πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλά α 1, occurs in Iliad, 545 [in 1000 verses]; Odyssey, 580; Vergil, 106. The masculine caesura

(♩ ♪ ♪ ♪), as τίς τ' ἄρ σφῶε θεῶν Ἄ ἐριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι A 8, occurs in Iliad, 287; Odyssey, 261; Vergil, 256—almost exactly the same in the three poems. The masculine caesura (♩ ♪ . ♪) [sic],

as μῆνιν ἔειδε, θεά, Ἄ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος A 1, occurs in Iliad, 150; Odyssey, 158; Vergil, 591!! This difference between masculine caesuras has, I think, never before been noted.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias.

Edited with Introduction and Notes by JOHN GILMORE, M.A. London, Macmillan and Co. 1888. 8s. 6d.

EDITIONS of Ktesias were more frequent in the former than they have been in the latter half of the present century. Besides the works of Borheck (Ed. 2, 1808-10) and Lion (1823), we have the laborious compilations of Bähr (1824) and K. Müller in the Didot series (1844). Since the time of Müller, however, no one appears to have thought it worth while to spend much time over an author who, as Rawlinson puts it, 'forges names and numbers at pleasure, distorts with wonderful audacity the historical facts best known to the Greeks, and is convicted by the recent cuneiform discoveries of having striven to rise into notice by a system of enormous lying wheret the history of literature scarcely presents a parallel.

The object of the present edition of the *Persika* of Ktesias is two-fold: (1) to improve the arrangement of the text, by bringing the fragments and epitome into their proper connexion; (2) to incorporate in the notes the results of modern discoveries, so far

as they bear directly or indirectly on the narrative of Ktesias. The extant remains of the twenty-three books of the *Persika* consist of two epitomes (that of books 1-6 by Diodorus, that of the remaining books by Photius), and fragments, seldom verbatim, preserved in various authors from Xenophon to Eustathius. Of the two objects the present editor has had before him, the former is of minor importance, few of the fragments being of a value which calls for a determination of their place in the original work. With regard to the latter, it becomes a question whether the knowledge of ancient Eastern history which the editor possesses would not have been better employed in producing some independent work, rather than by grafting his knowledge in the form of notes on an obscure and untrustworthy writer. Mr. Gilmore annotates with care and impartiality; he holds no brief either for Ktesias on the one hand, or Herodotus on the other. He has to make the best of a bad author, and he perhaps makes it when he says that Ktesias' statements on Persian history from the defeat of Astyages down to B.C. 398 are 'at least deserving of consideration.' He does not embark upon the task of whitewashing one more evil reputation, and his verdict upon his author would probably on the whole be that of Aristotle, Plutarch, Arrian, and Lucian, with whom to characterise anything as 'a statement made by Ktesias' is often only a polite way of saying that it is a *λαμπρόν ψεύσμα*.

A. H. COOKE.

Demosthenes, Ausgewählte Reden; für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von DR. KARL WOTKE. Mit einer Karte u. einem Titelbild. Zweite vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig, Freytag. 1889. pp. 92; 80 Pf.

THE first edition of this text of eight of the public speeches of Demosthenes was noticed at some length in the *Classical Review*, i p. 271. After a lapse of nearly two years we now have a slightly enlarged edition reproducing the same text, together with all the misprints which I then pointed out; the only difference being that they are now enumerated in the preface with the quiet remark that the proper correction of the text is reserved for a third edition. The short biographical notice and the summaries of the speeches, which were formerly in Latin, now appear in an expanded form and a German dress. Notes on historical points have been added at the end of the book. In the index of names, the same blunders which I mentioned in Nov. 1887 are repeated in the German version. Thus Erythrae in *Chers.* 24 is still described as situated in Boeotia, when the context clearly proves that Erythrae in Asia Minor is meant; and the Carian Prince of the *de Pace* 25 is still identified with Mausolus instead of his brother Idrieus. The editor is good enough to thank reviewers of his first edition *für ihr freundliches Wohlwollen*. If he cares to retain their goodwill, he will take pains not to allow his book to be reprinted again without removing these flagrant mistakes.

J. E. S.

La Morale d'Aristote, par MME. JULES FAVRE (née Velten). Paris, F. Alcan. 1889. 3 f. 50.

AN unpretending book might be written on the *Ethics* of Aristotle, which would both give considerable assistance to those who were studying the original for the first time, and also perhaps prove of interest to the general reader unacquainted with Greek or unwilling to grapple with the difficulties

of Aristotle's own text. Such a book would give the contents of the *Ethics* accurately and completely, but would present them in an easier form with a certain amount of explanation and expansion, so as to be half a translation and half a commentary. Its author would need to be a good Greek scholar, well read in more of Aristotle than the *Ethics*, and yet aware of the differences between the different Aristotelian writings, with a lucid style, a clear understanding, and something of Aristotle's own love for the *minutiae* of analysis, division and classification.

La Morale d'Aristote stops considerably short of this ideal. There is no evidence in it that its author has any knowledge of Greek, and it contains some things that would suggest the opposite inference. Mme. Jules Favre quotes Aristotle very often, at great length, and by no means injudiciously, but the quotations always come from the translations by Thurot or Saint-Hilaire, and there is not a single reference anywhere to the original. Again, without a single word of explanation or comment, the author treats the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the *Eudemian Ethics*, the *Magna Moralia*, the *Politics*, &c. as all equally Aristotelian and authoritative, quoting from each in turn anything that she likes, as though the author were known to be the same and to have written them all on exactly the same principles. *A fortiori*, therefore, no doubts are hinted at as to the internal unity of the *Nicomachean Ethics* themselves.

These are serious drawbacks, but not the worst. Not only have we all sorts of things obtruded upon us which are not to be found in what must be reckoned at any rate as the most complete and authoritative exposition of Aristotle's views on moral subjects, but the account of what is to be found there is by no means satisfactory. It cannot be said with truth that the author has properly grasped either the first principles of the system or the details in which it is worked out. There is not room here to show this with regard to the first principles, but the unsatisfactory way in which details are dealt with may be illustrated.

The general theory of the mean is stated in the very briefest way, and it is quite plain that Mme. Favre has never realised to herself accurately in detail what it means. She has no idea of what the thing is, of which there may be too much, too little, or the right amount. In the general statement she does not tell us, and we presently find her representing Aristotle (p. 99) as making vice to be an excess of virtue, and again (p. 108) as making rashness an excess of courage and insensibility an excess of temperance. It is no wonder therefore if she thinks that Aristotle contradicts himself (p. 108). Aristotle says that the 'absolute mean' belongs to arithmetical proportion, and that the 'relative mean' is different: Mme. Favre makes him compare the relative mean and its extremes to arithmetical proportion (p. 99).

One of the best tests of capacity to understand and expound a complicated subject is furnished by the book on justice, for, though there are no metaphysical difficulties about it, it certainly requires a clear head. But the exposition here given is not clear nor complete nor accurate. For instance in the brief account of 'la justice dans la réciprocité' there is not a word about the subject to which Aristotle gives nine-tenths of the chapter, the subject of trade, money, &c. In many other matters also the details are either omitted or erroneously stated. Yet Aristotle has a special turn for details, and it is only by going carefully into them that we can really understand his meaning and appreciate his intellectual power.

On page 366 Mme. Favre calls Aristotle 'l'ami de Socrate et de Platon.' Now Socrates was put to death more than a dozen years before Aristotle was