

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](#)



Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine, par Louis Havet, rédigé par Louis Duvau. Paris : Delagrave. 1886. 4 fr.

C. B. Heberden

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 5-6 / June 1887, pp 162 - 162
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183726, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183726

How to cite this article:

C. B. Heberden (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 162-162 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183726

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ments. Language has its fossil remains of past formations now disused. In Language too we find a struggle for existence continually going on, and linguistic study is the history of the evolutions through which in different times and places the primitive type has passed.—J. E. KING.

Cours élémentaire d'épigraphie latine, par M. CAGNAT.
Paris: Thorin. 1886. Pp. x. 224. 8vo. 6 fr.

IN his article on 'Roman Inscriptions,' contributed to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in 1881, Hübner complained that there was no text-book of Roman epigraphy in existence. Since then two have appeared, one by Hübner himself in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* (i. pp. 475-548), the other the one which we have now to review. It consists of two parts, first, 'the elements common to different classes of inscriptions,' which includes the names of men, the *cursus honorum* and the imperial titles (pp. 1-118): second, the different classes of inscriptions (pp. 119-188). There is a 'complementary' chapter on restoring mutilated inscriptions, and a full index. That the book is good we need hardly say. The growth of classical studies in France has been more marked in epigraphy than in anything else, and M. Cagnat is not the least known among French epigraphists. And when his book has received Hübner's approval, what more is there to add? It is of course elementary. We almost think, indeed, it might here and there have been made even more so in detail: the abbreviations O. for Aulus, QV. for Quintus, S. for Servius, and others (pp. 6, 27) are very rare. But with epigraphy in the strict sense of the word—the forms, shapes, and combinations of letters—the book does not deal. There is a note on p. 75 on the accent denoting a long syllable; another on p. 193 just alludes to ligatures: but that is almost all. On the other hand, some parts of the book are not epigraphical in any special sense. The section on the transmission of names (pp. 30-44) corresponds to some of the first section of Marquardt's *Privatleben*, and the *cursus honorum* (pp. 53-97) is part of a *Römisches Staatsrecht*. However, the inclusion of these points does not render the book a bit the less useful, and its lucidity is admirable. There is some want of examples, particularly in the middle of the book, but we understand a supplement is speedily to follow, which will contain them. The print is excellent. At the bottom of p. 18 the reference should be to *Privatleben*, i.—F. HAVERFIELD.

Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine, par LOUIS HAVET, rédigé par LOUIS DUVAU. Paris: Delagrave. 1886. 4 fr.

THIS little treatise gives a trustworthy account of the principal Greek and Latin metres in a popular form. The introduction deals with accentuation and prosody, and distinguishes clearly between the different kinds of accent and quantity. Some rules are given for determining the natural quantity of Latin vowels in syllables which are long by position, a subject which is too often neglected. The bulk of the book consists of chapters on the following subjects: dactylic, anapaestic, trochaic, and iambic verse, the Lesbian lyrical poetry, paeonic and ionic verse, the general principles of choral metres, rhythmical verse in later Greek and Latin poetry. The Greek and Latin hexameter and elegiac are discussed at length, and the peculiarities of Homeric prosody are well stated, though exception might be taken to one or two matters of detail. The principal trochaic and iambic metres are also adequately described, as well as the difference in Latin poetry between the archaic prosody (especially that of the

dramatists) and the prosody of the classical period. The treatment of the lyrical metres is less complete, but so far as it goes, is sound and cautious. Thus, the disputed question of the exact relation between the so-called 'cyclic' dactyl and the trochee in logaoedic metres is stated as follows: 'The proper value of each syllable was probably altered a little, so that the strong beats came at equal intervals from one another.' This is a much safer statement than the account of the 'cyclic' dactyl which is now usually given. The theory of the exact correspondences between the rhythmical 'sentences' that form a period in choral metres, *i.e.* the so-called 'eurhythm' is wisely passed over without notice in a book which professes only to give ascertained facts. But the chapters on lyrical and choral metres are too short, and such important metres as dochmiacs and dactylo-epitritics should not be relegated to the glossary at the end of the book, where a mere definition is given, without any discussion. The same may be said of the Saturnian metre. In spite however of some omissions, and although some parts require to be more worked up in detail, the book is probably in its present form the best easy introduction to the study of Greek and Latin metres. The style is clear, and the terminology as simple as possible. There are a few misleading misprints, which should be corrected in a second edition.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

Altgriechischer Versbau, ein Versuch vergleichender Metrik, von H. USENER, Bonn, 1887. 2 Mk. 80 Pf.

ARISTOTLE records that theorists in his own day defined the typical hexameter as consisting of seventeen syllables in two divisions, the left division numbering eight, the right nine. It is the chief object of Usener's treatise to show that this theoretical division, viz.

~~~~~ | ~~~~~

was originally a real one, the hexameter having been formed by the fusion of two lines which, though together making a couplet, were metrically separate. Bergk vainly sought the origin of the Epic metre in a mechanical combination of the 'enoplios' with the so-called 'paroemiac.' The latter term really denotes nothing more than the anapaestic 'marching' verse (adapted for singing *παρ' οἶμον*). Usener, though he rejects Bergk's theory, unfortunately interprets the word as if derived from *παροιμία* (following Hephaestion, ch. 8), and makes use of it accordingly to denote the short verse (Kurzvers), which his own theory presupposes. Apart from the name, however, there is no doubt that a verse, corresponding more or less closely to the latter half of the hexameter, very frequently appears as the vehicle of gnomic sayings (e.g. *φιλεῖ δὲ νότος μετὰ πάχυν*), while similar sentences, embodied in hexameter verse, often take the same metrical form, e.g. Homer's *ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω*, and Hesiod's *παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω*. No less than 115 gnomic sentences of this type have been collected by Meineke, Nauck and others. The inference, that the hexameter was originally composite, is obviously a legitimate one. The fragment of a Linus song preserved by the Scholiast on *Iliad* xviii. 570 is a succession of these wrongly-named 'paroemiacs,' adapted, perhaps, to a circular dance.

Usener derives additional evidence from two sources. First, from the frequent neglect of the digamma in Homer after the caesura, e.g.

πᾶσιν ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα | τοὶ Φιλίφ' ἐγγεγάσιν  
εἰ δὲ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον | ὑποφείξομαι ὅττι κε Φείπης  
ἀλλ' ἄγε νῆα μέλαιναν | Φερύσσομεν εἰς ἄλα διᾶν  
ὥς ἔφατ'· Αἰνείας δὲ | Φεκατηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα.