

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](#)



Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Alphabets. Kirchhoff Von A.. Gütersloh. 1887. Fourth Edition. 6 Mks.

E. S. Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 05 / May 1888, pp 145 - 146
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192583, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192583

How to cite this article:

E. S. Roberts (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 145-146 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192583

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to him, the Ἑβραῖοι were those of the Palestinian Jews—also called ‘those of the circumcision’—who rigidly adhered to Judaism, while the Hellenists were those Jews, whether belonging to Palestine or not, who willingly yielded to the influence of Gentile civilization and habits, and were thus distinguished by their free and liberal spirit. Now of course it must be admitted that the term Ἑλληνιστής might have been legitimately used of the latter class:—certainly οἱ μηδίζοντες in Boeotia were not in the habit of talking Persian:—but then, is there a particle of evidence that they were so called? If it could be proved that even one of the first seven deacons, all of whom bear Greek names, and who were doubtless Ἑλληνισταί, was a native Palestinian Jew, this would go far to prove the point: but all probabilities point in the opposite direction. Dr. Roberts makes much of the language in which the Epistle to the Hebrews is written. If we admit that the churches in Judaea could readily understand Greek, still more if we admit, what seems highly probable, that the LXX. was in common use among them, and that the writer of the Epistle, whoever he may have been (Dr. Roberts argues for the authorship of Luke) was more familiar with Greek than with Aramaean, especially for literary purposes, all the conditions of the problem are solved.

In one case Dr. Roberts strains our credulity gratuitously. He asserts that the

letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix was undoubtedly composed in Greek. If we heard of an official letter from an English civilian in India to his superior, would it be a ‘baseless statement without any warrant from the narrative’ to assume that it was written in English, even if we knew that both were capable of using Hindustani upon occasion?

To enter more fully into Dr. Roberts’s arguments would lead us still further out of the field of the *Classical Review*. In conclusion, I must repeat that Dr. Roberts seems to have gathered up into this outcome of his lengthened labours all the evidence that can be brought to bear upon his theme, and has treated it with candour and great ability. That his arguments do not always bear the weight which he would lay on them, is often, I am afraid, too evident on careful examination. That he has not proved his proposition in all its rigour, or even (as the Oxford undergraduate said of his Euclid) made it seem extremely probable, will be in my opinion the general verdict. But he may rest assured that he has done good service to the cause of Biblical criticism, to which he has devoted so much labour, by erecting an insuperable barrier against aberrations of opinion in the direction opposite to his own. He has brought into prominence a factor in the national life of the people to whom Christ spoke, which can never again fall back into undeserved neglect.

A. S. WILKINS.

Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Alphabets. Von A. KIRCHHOFF. Gütersloh. 1887. Fourth Edition. 6 Mks.

THE short preface to the fourth edition opens with an expression of regret that the work can still only claim the title of ‘Studies,’ and must not be considered to be a ‘History,’ in the proper sense of the term, of the Greek alphabet; though the discoveries of the last ten years have brought us appreciably nearer to the end in view. This end is in fact the answer to the question, when and in what way the Phœnician alphabet came to the Greeks. The attempts of Taylor, Clermont-Ganneau, von Wilamowitz and Gardthausen to throw light upon the further development of the Phœnician alphabet among the Greeks are summarily rejected by Kirchhoff, as based upon fallacious and unsatisfactory methods. The preface ends with the statement that in this edition two passages of former editions are withdrawn, in which M. Lenormant was charged with having falsified certain inscriptions. Kirchhoff’s opinion is unaltered, but—*de mortuis nil nisi bene*. In contrast to this attitude of Kirchhoff it is only fair to note that Professor Bechtel, who in his *Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts* has subjected some of the inscriptions in question to the most careful examination,

has come to the conclusion that ‘der Verdacht der Fälschung wird schwerlich bestehen bleiben können.’

The form of the work in this edition in no way differs from that of the former editions. A strictly conservative tone is adopted throughout, and it is only rarely that we find Kirchhoff’s views in any way modified.

P. 10. In discussing the date of the Lygdamis inscription Kirchhoff rejects the possibility which Ruehl (*Philologus* xli. 1882, p. 54 *sqq.*) seeks to prove, that the document may belong to the period when Lygdamis was still tyrant of both towns, Halicarnassus and Salmakis, and consequently must be some years older than the date assigned by Kirchhoff. On p. 12 the conjecture, apparently first made by Clermont-Ganneau, is accepted, that the peculiar form T in Ὠάρδιος, and Πανδάρτιος, Ἀλικαρναγ[έων] is none other than the Sampi, which elsewhere in the general Greek alphabet, the successor of the Ionic variety, has survived merely as an episemon, its position after ω denoting probably that it was received by the Ionians at a comparatively late period, perhaps only in the course of the sixth century.

P. 24 *sq.* The date of the inscriptions on the Sigeon monument, with their open form of η, is now held to be at latest the first half of the sixth century; consequently the older Milesian inscriptions, with

their closed form of η , are moved back to the beginning of the century, and may even be as early as the end of the seventh. This undoubtedly just correction of dates makes Kirchhoff all the more decided in favour of assigning the Abou-Symbel inscriptions to the time of Psammetichus I., and less inclined to give weight to the arguments of Wiedemann, who (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxv. p. 364 *sqq.*), relying on the Egyptologists and followed by Roehl, contends for the period covered by the reign of Psammetichus II. In connexion with this point three pages of new matter are devoted to a vigorous polemic against Mr. E. A. Gardner, who would make some of the Ionic inscriptions found at Naucratis to be at least as old as the Abou-Symbel inscriptions (see *Journ. Hell. Soc.*, vii. 220 *sqq.*). The controversy, if we may judge from the passage of arms between Professor Hirschfeld and Mr. Gardner (*Academy*, 1887), appears to be by no means concluded. The real issue may be said to depend upon the answer to the question: Is an inscription of the Abou-Symbel type, *i.e.*, in an alphabet which is Ionic in all essentials but the presence of ω , necessarily older, and older by a generation at least, than any inscription whatever which contains an ω ?

P. 49 *sq.* Kirchhoff argues in favour of an alphabet in Rhodes, common to it with the other members of the Dorian Hexapolis, in the period previous to that represented by the Abou-Symbel inscriptions. He regards favourably Roehl's attribution of an inscription found in Thera to Cos (Roehl, *I. G. A.* 471 *add.*).

P. 54 *sq.* The two inscriptions in a Hellenic alphabet but a non-Hellenic dialect discovered by MM. Cousin and Durriach in Lemnos (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* X. 1880), for which an Etruscan origin was claimed by C. Pauli (*Eine vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos*, Leipzig, 1886) and S. Bugge (*Der Ursprung der Etrusker durch zwei lemnische Inschriften erläutert*, Christiania), are by Kirchhoff, as it appears to me conclusively, determined to be written in the Phrygian alphabet.

P. 57. The materials are not yet sufficient to enable us to say whether the Eastern or the Western variety of the Greek alphabet prevailed on the Aeolic coast of Asia Minor.

P. 65. The alphabet of Cyrene in the sixth century, and by implication the alphabet of Thera during the same period, is held to be the Western variety.

P. 74 *sqq.* and Appendix. The latest of the Cretan discoveries (see *Classical Review* for February) could not be noticed in the text, but are spoken of in the Appendix. Kirchhoff apparently adheres to his cautious view of the not over-early date of the Gortyn Law Code, which he seems to place at about 500 B.C., and only says of the latest discovered inscriptions that they 'in eine frühere Zeit hinaufreichen.'

P. 84 *sqq.* The section on the alphabet of Naxos is considerably enlarged in consequence of the discovery of older inscriptions, notable for their peculiarities in representing the e -sounds, than were available for the third edition. The section on Keos also contains new matter.

P. 93. The retrograde inscription on the Dipylon vase (Roehl, *Imagg.* p. 68), with its crooked *iota*, which is accepted by Kirchhoff as the oldest specimen of the Attic alphabet, is however strangely enough mentioned only in a foot-note.

P. 101 *sqq.* The Corinthian alphabet receives further illustration from the large number of votive pottery fragments found at Penteskuphia, and now in the Berlin Museum.

P. 111 *sq.* The alphabet in use at Sicily is now, thanks to the discoveries at Olympia, assigned its definite position, as being nearly akin to that of Corinth, and the same alphabet is shown to have been in use at Megara.

P. 134. Kirchhoff maintains at some length, examining in detail the abecedaria found at Colle, Caere, and Formello, his former opinion that both groups of Italic alphabets—Etruscan, Umbrian, Oscan and Latin, Faliscan—had a Chalcidian origin.

P. 138 *sqq.* The Boeotian section has been remodelled and advantage taken of the discovery of eight stelae found at Thespie, which Kirchhoff thinks are commemorative of those who fell at the battle of Delium, B.C. 424.

P. 149 *sqq.* Kirchhoff notes that a Laconian inscription with a sign for ψ is still a desideratum.

P. 159. The inscriptions on the two bronzes found at Olympia (Roehl, *I. G. A.* 107 and 105 *add.*) are claimed for the Arcadian alphabet.

P. 161. The excavations at the Asklepion of Epidaurus have furnished one inscription in epichoric character; and Methona is similarly represented by the spear-head found at Olympia (Roehl, *I. G. A.* 46). Both of these by their forms of λ confirm the previously expressed view of Kirchhoff that the alphabet of Hermione, Epidaurus, Methona, must be separated from that of Argos.

P. 162 *sq.* The examination of the numerous Elean bronzes found at Olympia have induced Kirchhoff to assign the older of them to the sixth century, a date much earlier than that which in ed. 3 he had inferred for Sir W. Gell's well-known bronze. In the doubtful sign of the Elean inscription (Roehl, *I. G. A.* 113a, 1.4) he thinks may be concealed a special symbol for Elean ϕ .

P. 163 *sq.* The solitary archaic inscription discovered in Achaian soil is noticed, and so far as may be inferred from its crooked *iota*, it confirms what is known of the Achaian alphabet from the inscriptions of the colonies. Attention is drawn on p. 166 to a very interesting abecedarium found at Metapontum in which the \vdash as the symbol for ξ comes at the end.

P. 167. The alphabet in use at Cephallenia is determined from a retrograde inscription, the forms of which Kirchhoff, though he has no copy, is enabled to cite from memory.

In this fourth edition there are even fewer fac-similes or uncial copies of inscriptions than in the third edition, the author now deeming it sufficient to refer to Roehl's *Inscriptiones Graecae antiquissimae*. Those only who have laboured through former editions of Kirchhoff without the aid of such a collection can appreciate the value of Roehl's work.

E. S. ROBERTS.

The Gentleman's Magazine Library: Romano-British Remains. Edited by G. L. GOMME (Elliot Stock). Part II., pp. xii., 332. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE first part of this work, which I noticed in the *Classical Review* of last December (I., 298-300), contained extracts from the *Gentleman's Magazine* relating to local discoveries in twenty-seven English counties. Part II. comprises discoveries in the rest of England, in Wales, and in Scotland, with a supplement (pp. 301-418), Roman roads and stations and two or three points of historical interest (pp. 419-574), notes by the editor, a second supplement, and indices. There is a short Preface, which is scarcely so interesting as that in the first Part. Mr. Gomme had promised a notice of the chief antiquarians whose contributions are reprinted in these two volumes. The notice turns out to be a list far too full of names and far too sparing in information. Certainly some of the names recommended for insertion in the *English Biographical Dictionary* are quite unworthy of that honour, and at least one deserving antiquarian is omitted. One