



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

article covering the whole subject from the beginning. His work forms a connected whole which leaves but few points exposed to attacks that do not assail his entire theory. The quotations from Greek and Latin writers, with which he buttresses his logic, are so numerous and varied that they can be accepted or rejected only after a diligent and most exhaustive research. Accordingly I have found myself compelled to submit but one side of the question, and to present what is in fact but an abstract of the volume before me. If in this I have done it justice—a difficult task, owing to the interdependence of the various questions discussed and to the close relation of the citations with the argument—the review will acquaint American students with the most important single work on versification which has appeared in recent times, revolutionary in theory and far-reaching in conclusions.

F. M. WARREN.

De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo. Scripsit SERGIUS SOBOLEWSKI. Mosquae, MDCCCXC.

De vi et usu praepositionum ἐπί, μετά, παρά, περί, πρός, ὑπό apud Aristophanem. Scripsit IOANNES ILTZ. Halis Saxonum, MDCCCLXXX.

Professor Sobolewski's treatise is a welcome addition to the apparatus of the student of Aristophanes. The best MSS are made the basis and a copious literature has been at the service of the author. The great lesson taught is the faithfulness of the comic poet to the prose standard of his time, though the lesson is no new lesson; for the Aristophanic scholar does not need to be told now-a-days¹ that not a solitary preposition is used by him otherwise than it would be used in prose, except for purposes of parody or paratragedy. Only in saying this we might seem to exclude from the list of Aristophanic scholars some editors of Aristophanes who do not think it worth while to notice exceptional syntax. Let us hope that after a time some of these things will get into the grammars, that some future Kaegi will note not only the scarcity of σύν in model prose as compared with μετά, but also the rarity of ἀνά and ἀμφί, will tell the schoolboy to what sphere of literature anastrophe belongs, and that Greek prose does not allow the preposition to be put between the adjective and the substantive—a liberty to which the novice in Greek is tempted by Latin examples.

Under the head of εἰς, ἐς Sobolewski follows the lead of Bachmann in making εἰς the only Aristophanic form before vowels—the nine examples of ἐς being accounted for by the tragic tone of the passages. In fr. 543, however, where Bachmann has ἐς because it is Ionic, S. denies with Meisterhans that ἐς is Ionic and writes with Bergk and Kock εἰς. The Dindorfian law of ἐς before consonants and εἰς before vowels is absolutely rejected by S., as E was written for EI down to 380 and ἐς is to be transliterated εἰς. Besides, he adds, if ἐς is the more elevated form before vowels, why should it lose that character when it is put before consonants? True, there are traces of ἐς in the old language, as is shown by the familiar formula ἐς κόρακας, as is shown by κάς, which cannot

¹ 'Modes of expression inadmissible in prose were equally inadmissible in comedy except when they were employed for malice prepense and to give color to the work' (Rutherford, N. P. p. 38).

come from *καὶ εἰς*, but in the height of Attic there was only one form and that was *εἰς*. As for Thukydides, Sobolewski does not believe that an author who, in spite of his *σεμνὸν γένος*, was careful not to use poetic constructions, or at any rate used them rarely, should have been more tragic in the use of *ἐς* than the tragic poets themselves. In the matter of *εἵνεκα* vs. *ὄννεκα* S. sides with Wackernagel against *εἵνεκα*. Under *διὰ* c. acc. he recognizes an instrumental signification—without a quiver of emotion. Some slight feeling at least would have been becoming even if I am wrong in my protest against the loose parallel often made, *διὰ* c. acc. = *διὰ* c. gen. See A. J. P. X 124, Pindar I. E. xcvi, and Justin Mart. Apol. I 53, 11, where I say that 'owing to' will cover all the cases of supposed confusion. Indeed, 'owing to,' 'thanks to,' will easily cover three of the four Aristophanic examples cited by Sobolewski. Pax 323: *διὰ τὰ σχήματα*, L. 936: *διὰ τὰ στρώματα*, Ec. 603: *διὰ τοῦτο*, and 'thanks to' in all these passages is 'a murrain on.' It is the same use of *διὰ* that we have in the phrase *εἰ μὴ διὰ* 'if it had not been for,' which gives the obstacle, not the means of prevention. When *διὰ* c. gen. is used the agency is purposeful, when *διὰ* c. acc. is used it is accidental. So explain Ec. 741: *διὰ τὸν ὄρθριον νόμον*. It did not lie in the design of the *κιθαροφῶδός* to wake up the man who thanks her for waking him up, any more than it lay in the design of the cock to wake Philokleon too late (Vesp. 100).

Under the head of *κατὰ* c. gen. S. discusses the famous passage Pax 241: *ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαίριμος, ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν*, but without a happy result. Theoretically *ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν* ought to mean 'the fellow that bears down on his legs.' This bearing down on the legs is a mark of the soldier's trade. It is not the *εὖ διαβὰς* . . . *ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροισιν* of Tyrtaios, which has been cited. That is the attitude of the warrior in actual conflict, *χεῖλος ὁδοῦσι δακῶν*. This is the habitual gait of a man that has to stand guard for hours, that has to march as the ancient soldier had to march under heavy burdens, under loads which gave the man-at-arms of antiquity swollen legs (see Pers. 5, 189; Juv. 6, 397) and straddling walk, so that the swagger of the Pyropolinices of the old time was not simply the moral but also the physical result of his business. With this expression I am tempted to connect the *κατασκελής* of Dionysios Hal. (Iud. Isocr. 3), which is rendered 'dried up,' though Sylburg divined its meaning, as he shows by his version 'claudicans.' 'Dried up' does not apply to Isokrates, and if *κατασκελής* can mean 'straddling,' and so 'rocking,' we have an admirable adjective for the deliberate, swaying, processional style of Isokrates, to say nothing of the comfort that always comes from making two difficult passages explain one another. But if *κατασκελής* cannot mean *κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν*, in the sense attached to it here, it may denote 'leggy,' 'big-legged,' as *κατάκνημος* means 'calfy,' *κατάκομος* 'hairy,' *κατάσαρκος* 'fleshy'; *καταπύγων* it is not necessary to translate, and *καταπῶγων* is 'beardy.' The big, swollen legs are the consequence of much standing and the cause of much straddling.

Under *ἐπί* c. gen. S. rejects Krüger's distinction between *ἐπί* c. gen. and *ἐπί* c. dat. in a local sense (I 68, 41, 1), a distinction which, it is true, might well be reversed theoretically as well as practically, for we should expect the natural position to be expressed by *ἐπί* c. gen., the unnatural by the dat. Fixity of position is in fact often denoted by *ἐπί* c. gen. (see my Justin Martyr Apol. I 26, 15), and it is not impossible that there may be some such feeling

as we have in regard to *ὑπό* c. gen. and *ὑπό* c. dat. In refutation of Krüger S. points triumphantly to Eq. 783: *ἐπὶ ταῖσι πέτραις καθήμενον* compared with v. 754: *ὕταν ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ καθήται τῆς πέτρας*, but he might have claimed here, not mere indifference, but, if one must refine, reversal. It would be easy to make Demos wriggle in the one passage and sit quiet in his 'fixed normal position' in the other. At any rate, the genitive is much more common in Attic daily speech than the dative, as S. shows, though, as he also notes, Rutherford is wrong in denying *ἐπὶ* with dat. in this sense to Attic (Babrius, p. 7).

Under *παρά* S. recognizes no distinction between *παρά* c. dat. and *παρά* c. acc., and it must be confessed that it may seem an over-refinement to give *καθεύδων παρά τινι* the personal sense and *καθεύδων παρά τινι* the physical sense—the one 'in one's bed,' the other 'alongside of'—but for prose the distinction seems to hold. *παρά* is characteristic locality (Fr. *chez*), with gen. 'from which,' with dat. 'at which,' with acc. 'to which.' *παρά* 'along,' 'by the side of,' has no personal significance. One says *παρ' ἐμὲ καθήμενος* (Plat. Euthyd. 271 A) as one says *παρὰ πόδας μου* (Protag. 310 C), but *παρ' ἐμοί* is not 'by my side,' it is 'in my room' (l. c. 310 B). Needless to say, genitives and datives when found with *παρά* are always persons in Aristophanes, three exceptional datives being one a quotation, one parodic, one anapaestic, and the gen. in Ach. 68 being more than doubtful. *περὶ* c. gen. and *περὶ* c. acc. are kept as well apart in the borderland as could be expected. One cannot always separate 'speaking and thinking' from 'behavior.' There are some pretty examples of *ὑπό* with gen. of inanimate objects, which Mr. Hickie, who made that a test of purity of style, would have done well to heed when he was working at Aristophanes and before he had emptied his grammatical learning on the unoffending head of Andokides (see A. J. P. VI 487). But what was to be a 'Brief Mention' has expanded into something more than a 'Book Notice,' and I will stop before it becomes something more than a 'Review.'

Sobolewski undertakes to cover the whole ground of the prepositions. Iltz in his dissertation limits himself to the prepositions that take three cases. He is much more reserved in his statement than Sobolewski, and goes no further than the safe declaration: *Aristophanis dicendi rationem propius ad prosaicorum quam ad poetarum usum accedere*. If the author had contented himself with mere references to the passages, the dissertation would have shrunk into very modest dimensions, but the reader will be very glad to have the material for criticism so ready at hand, as, for example, p. 17, in which the local use of *ἐπὶ* c. dat. 'on' is treated in the most mechanical way, without any remark about context, without any discrimination of meaning. We could learn quite as much from a concordance. Some of the passages are highly lyrical, some of them show the sense of 'addition to,' 'heaped on,' but they are all despatched with the sentence: 'Cum dativo *ἐπὶ* praep. multis locis ita usurpatur ut ab *ἐπὶ* c. gen. nullo fere modo differat at aequae rem aliquam in summa aliqua re versari indicet,' which might be true for Thucydides (see Kümmell, de praep. *ἐπὶ* usu Thucydideo), but is not necessarily true of Aristophanes. Occasionally there is an attempt at criticism, as where he favors *ἐν* against *ἐπὶ* in Plut. 337-8: *λόγος γ' ἦν . . . πολλὸς | ἐν τοῖσι κουρείοισι*. For this he claims the authority of V, not recorded in the apparatus, and of Cobet. He might have claimed Porson and von Velsen as well, but there is no valid

objection to *ἐπί*. The talking customers would naturally sit outside. See Isocr. 18, 9: *καθίζων ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐργαστηρίοις λόγους ἐποιεῖτο*, though, of course, Cobet would change here also (VL 282). See other passages cited by Blaydes. In brief it must be said that, apart from some convenient statistics, no considerable furtherance of our knowledge has been noted in Itzl's ninety pages.

B. L. G.

Q. Horatius Flaccus, erklärt von ADOLF KIESSLING. Erster Teil. Oden und Epoden. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1890. Preis 3 Mark.

Six years have passed since Kiessling published his first edition of the odes and epodes of Horace; during that time he has given us the satires and also the epistles. He has now turned his attention to a rather thorough revision of the first part of the whole work, and the results of his labor lie before us.

As he tells us in his preface to this second edition, the commentary appears "in vielfach berichtigter und erweiterter Form," not an unfamiliar story, and one which it is safe to believe is not always too welcome to the book-owner, especially if (as happens not infrequently, though not in this case) the second, much enlarged edition appears so soon after the first as to leave but little time for the enjoyment of possession. To the scholar, however, even if an owner of the first edition, all real improvement will be welcome, and improvement Kiessling has given us in this edition, for the words of the preface are not idle ones, and a careful study will easily reveal many additions and a number of corrections.

These changes in the commentary are of three kinds: (1) changes in the wording; (2) additions; (3) abridgments. Of the third class there are not many cases and these are generally of minor importance. Of the first kind we find examples throughout the book from the introduction on, so he has changed e. g. on page 3 of the introduction the words "führte dazu zu versuchen" to "führte zu dem Versuche"; on I 4, 5 he has changed "beachte den beabsichtigten malerischen Gegensatz" to "Der malerische Gegensatz ist beabsichtigt." In the same way the didactic tone of "Beachte den wirkungsvollen Kontrast," etc., in his note on III 3, 13, is changed to "Wirkungsvoll tritt die Auffahrt des Bakchus und Romulus dem *eniti* gegenüber." I 2, 13 . . . des Tiber, der '*vorticibus rapidis et multa flavus arena*' durch Rom *strömt*, has suited K. better than . . . *fließt*. As foreign a word as 'Kakophonie' must be made to go and 'Missklang' is substituted instead. But this tendency to correct is not without its nemesis: in his note on I 8, 1 "*cur*" fragt nicht nach dem Motiv sondern nach der Ursache . . . the new edition reads "*cur*" fragt nicht nach der Ursache, sondern nach der Ursache, etc. A decidedly more idiomatic rendering is given in the summary of I 8, 1, where "Bei allen Göttern, Lydia," etc., is changed to "Um Gotteswillen, Lydia," etc.

But changes of this sort, which are found throughout the book, although they often improve it, yet are of minor importance to the student as compared with the many additions which Kiessling has made to his notes. These are either continuations of already existing notes, throwing more light on the subject commented on, or they are entirely new, dealing with things not touched