



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.

Sia ch' ei favelli o di palesi. Laudi
 Ebbi dai prenci un dl, ma più d' assai
 Furon quelle da me già tributate
 Lodi a lui sol fra tutti. In sempiterno
 Viva adunque tal uom saggio e prudente,
 Sempre beato in suo deslo, col core
 Atto al bene operar. Questo mio libro
 Io gli lasciai qual nobile retaggio
 Quando a sci volte diecimila distici
 Ei venne a pareggiar. Ma il tempo intanto
 Il mio lungo parlar, ciò che udir fêi
 Ad altri già, condusse al termin suo,
 Che discendean di giovinezza i giorni
 A vecchia età. Poi che l' inclito libro
 Così venne al suo fin, del verso mio
 Tutta è piena la terra. Ognun che alberga
 Senno e fede e saggezza entro al suo core,
 Mi loderà dopo la morte mia,
 Ned io morirò più mai, ch' io son pur vivo
 Da che il seme gittai di mia parola.

We part from this translation of the whole Shâhnâmeh with the expression of our gratitude and delight. While many translations of Oriental poetry are not intelligible when the original is not at hand, or efface the character of the original by arbitrarily suggested traits, Pizzi's translation joins adequateness to poetical beauty, and gives a vivid impression of Firdausi's poem to those also who do not know the original. But the principal reason for the excellence of the translation is simply this: only a man who is himself of a poetical temperament is able to render works of poetry. This seems a matter of course, but has nevertheless often not been heeded in our days.

It is to be hoped that the work of Professor Pizzi will not be confined to the cultivated circles of his own country, but will afford intellectual enjoyment likewise to all those who love the melodious tongue of Italy and who desire to become acquainted with the work of the greatest poet of Persia.

JENA, *May* 18, 1892.

EUGEN WILHELM.

Was ergibt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauch Xenophons in der Anabasis für die Behandlung der griechischen Syntax in der Schule? Ein Beitrag zur Methodik des griechischen Unterrichts, von ARTUR JOOST. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892.

A great practical problem in Germany is the reduction of the amount of grammar to be learned in the elementary study of Latin and Greek, and each new school-grammar that is put forth bases its claims to acceptance on its success in narrowing the range of inflexion and syntax. Rare forms have been discarded and minute syntactical rules have been suppressed. In Latin, Caesar's Gallic War has been analyzed with a view to what is important for the beginner; Caesar, despite the evident drawbacks, being still the beginner's

book. True, the result is not altogether satisfactory to those who take a wider view of the study. True, one asks in wonderment, 'Are *quasi* and *tamquam* of as little importance to a beginner as they are to the student of the *Bellum Gallicum*?' But the new fad must work itself out; and it is not surprising to find the method applied to Greek, not surprising to take in hand a bulky volume on the *Anabasis* in which the occurrences of the various constructions have been counted, from the use of a participle to 'represent a subordinate sentence,' which is found 1630 times, down to the long list of constructions that occur but once, such as *μόνος* in the predicative position, *φοβείσθαι* with the inf., and the unreal wish. Of course, Dr. Joost, the author of this laborious work, is well aware that Xenophon is not a model of Atticism, but the *Anabasis* is the book out of which Greek is first learned, the Germany of William the Second is nothing if not practical, and if counting is not practical, what is practical? All constructions that occur only three times are made to occupy lower rooms in the synagogue, and others are bidden to come up higher. Representation is strictly on a property basis.

At the end of the book the practical inferences are given. Let us take the section that pertains to the verb. Whatever may be thought of the principle some of the statements may be suggestive.

The causative signification of the active voice—which, needless to say, has nothing to do with the active voice—is to be emphasized, and so are the direct and indirect reflexive significations of the middle, to the repression of the 'technical and dynamic' meanings of which so much is made in some grammars; and the beginner is to learn betimes to combine the passive with *ἑπί*. We are next told that *ἐπει* and *ἐπειδή* (temporal)¹ are to be practised with imperf. and aor. ind., and all (plpf.?) the indicative tenses with *εἰ* of the real or logical condition. This last rule, by the way, stands in curious contrast to the proceeding of a certain editor of the *Anabasis*, who actually omitted the real or logical condition from the list of hypothetical sentences (A. J. P. III 435). The unreal condition makes a poor show. Not so *ὥστε* with ind.; not so the causal *ἐπει* and *ὅτι*. The subjunctive, says Joost, with a touch of German sentimentality, is no longer 'to lead a joyless and lonely life.' In the language of the Psalmist, the subjunctive is 'to keep house and be a joyful mother of children.' Only her children are to be chiefly members of the conditional, temporal, relative and final sentences, and verbs of fear are to be kept in their proper place and not to be too obtrusive. The opt. of wish is comparatively rare, but the opt. of *oratio obliqua* is to be brought to the front,² and the opt. with *ἄν* is to be introduced to the knowledge of the boy at an early period; nor is inf. with *ἄν* = opt. with *ἄν* to be kept back. The ideal condition (*εἰ* w. opt.) is common, common is the iterative use of opt., common the final use after historical tenses. The present imper. is more common than the aor., but both may be admitted side by side. The prohibitive is of secondary occurrence and secondary importance. Of the infinitive constructions the verbs of saying take precedence of verbs of thinking, and it may be remarked, in passing, that this seems to be true of grammarians as well. The use of the inf. as a subject is important, especially in combination with certain

¹ *ἐπει* temporal is not normal. See Zycha, Wiener Studien, VII 84.

² On the untrustworthiness of Joost under this head see A. J. P. XIII 257 f.

impersonal verbs, such as *δεῖ, δοκεῖ, ἐξεστι*; so also the use of *ὥστε* w. inf. The inf. with *ικανός* and the like, the inf. with (personal) *λέγεται*, the inf. with *βούλομαι* and *ἔθελω*, these are important also, but *κελεύω* receives a special note. The fut. inf. with verbs of hoping, promising and swearing is to be learned early. The present participle as the representative of a temporal sentence is to be learned first, later the aor.; the perf. is of less consequence. The causal sense comes next. The participle as the representative of a relative sentence with and without the article is important; less so the gen. abs., which is found chiefly in pres. and aor. Then the boy is to learn the participle after verbs of perception, actual and intellectual, and their equivalence to a verb with *ὄτι*, which latter statement being half a truth, is the worst of lies, as we shall see. *τιγχάνω* with the part. is important, and so is *ἔχων*. *λαμβάνω* is of less moment. The fut. part. with or without *ὥς* to represent a final sentence deserves especial prominence, and the equivalence of the verbal adj. in *-τος* to perf. part. pass. is to be pointed out.

Doubtless many inferences would have to be changed as soon as one passes from the Anabasis to another sphere of literature, but, apart from that, the whole method seems to be a mistake. This is not the way to reach the desired minimum of syntax. The minimum of syntax is to be reached by concentrating attention on the variations from the standard, which is the mother-tongue. Why should a sledge-hammer stress be brought to bear on *κελεύω* with inf., on *βούλομαι* and *ἔθελω* with inf., which we could hardly use otherwise if we tried? To be sure, the acc. and inf. is a different matter for the Germans, but the chief trouble is not there, but with the acc. and inf. after verbs of saying and thinking, though even these have English analogies, as 'declare him to be,' 'believe him to be.' The analysis of the participle, to which Joost gives so much space, may be necessary for Germans, but English participle and Greek participle coincide to a considerable extent, so much so that English and Greek alike feel the difference, which Joost ignores, between the participle and *ὄτι* with the finite verb. 'I see her walking' (*βαδίζουσαν*) and 'I see that she walks' (*ὄτι βαδίζει*) may be the same thing to a German reader of English. They are not the same thing to one born to English speech.¹ In Greek a verb of actual perception requires the participle, and if used with *ὄτι* becomes a verb of intellectual perception, which often excludes actual perception. It is passing strange that one should recognize the categories of 'sinnliche und geistige Wahrnehmung' and yet fail to draw the most evident inferences from the two spheres of use. Take Joost's treatment of *ὄραν* with the participle. It would require no wizard to predict that present participle (67 times) and perfect participle (12 times) would be the prevalent tenses (see my Pindar, Int. Ess., cxi; A. J. P. X 124). The fut. part. is necessarily used of intellectual perception, and the one aorist is an illustration of the intrusion of an element which is often neglected in the treatment of the participle. In *εἰ τοῦτον ἰδοῦμι καταλευσθήντα* (7, 6, 10) the aor. tense is due to the wish in *ἰδοῦμι*, as it is so often due to the wish in *ἐφορᾶν* (A. J. P. X 124), as it is so often due to the will

¹ And yet it is a German grammarian who attempts to give the difference between the infinitive and the participle in English, thus: 'I heard her singing' entspricht also mehr dem deutschen "ich hörte, wie sie sang," "I heard her sing" mehr dem Ausdruck "ich hörte, dass sie sang." Koch, Wissenschaftliche Grammatik der Englischen Sprache, §512.

in *περιορᾶν*; but this last, it appears from Joost, Xenophon uses in the *Anabasis* with the present participle only, so that the oratorical usage would be a surprise to him who knows the *Anabasis* only. As to the construction of *ὄρᾶν* with *ὄτι*, all the examples cited (2, 2, 5; 3, 2, 29; 5, 8, 20; 6, 1, 27) have to do with intellectual perception. *ὡς* (6, 4, 23) is 'how.' In 3, 2, 23 the construction is determined by *ἐπιστάμεθα*. As to *ὥστε*, Joost echoes one of the latest words on the subject, and repeats (p. 335) after Wehmann (*de ὥστε* particulae usu), "the undeniable fact that *ὥστε* with the infinitive can represent an actual consequence," and so illustrates once more the other undeniable fact that people who call themselves grammarians will force language to say what language suffers circumstance to say. With *ὥστε* and the inf. 'die wirkliche eingetretene Folge' may be an inevitable inference, but it is an inference from extra-linguistic sources (A. J. P. VII 164).

As I have already intimated, I have no faith in Joost's method, but that does not mean that I can find no use for his laborious collection of facts. To the student of Greek syntax, of Greek style, the array of figures will give many welcome illustrations, and will occasionally suggest new points of view, and for all such contributions to his resources every scholar will be thankful, even if the statements are not so exhaustive as they undertake to be, and the framework on which the facts are strung is rickety and defective.

So much for Joost. But before dismissing this matter it may be as well to notice briefly an article by Koch on the same general subject. Koch is a professed grammarian and a successful grammarian, so far as editions go, and the plaint which he makes in the *Jahrbücher* for 1892 (Paed. Abt. 408-48) is touching. In this article, 'Die notwendigkeit einer systemänderung im griechischen anfangsunterrichte,' he records Schliemann's experience in the acquisition of Greek, and laments the long and ineffectual dawdling of schoolboys over the elements. Of course, Koch recognizes that Schliemann's method requires Schliemann to begin with and a long unbroken stretch of time, but Koch thinks that Schliemann's experience is instructive, and that the process may be shortened by treating Xenophon's *Anabasis* as Schliemann treated the Modern Greek rendering of Paul and Virginia. So he attacks vocabulary, forms and syntax after a fashion with which we in America have been familiar for a number of years. To an old teacher, whether in sympathy with the method or not, it is rather amusing to find that Koch emphasizes the frequency of the irregular verbs, and calls attention to the fact that the second aorist occurs almost as often as the first. This will hardly be news to any conscientious drillmaster, though I cannot recall at this moment any published statement of the fact. But leaving all pedagogical inferences aside, one point is a matter of general interest to the student of Greek, and that is the relative frequency of imperf. and aor. ind., about which something will be said in this *Journal* when Hultsch's elaborate study of the narrative tenses in Polybius is finished. Meantime even K.'s playing with the subject may receive a word or two of notice. A statistical study, published some years ago in this *Journal* (IV 163), showed that in the Pindaric narrative the aor. preponderates over the imperf. "The aor.," it was said, "preponderates in both classes [of odes, the logaedic and the dactylo-epitrite]." "This is the rule everywhere, must be the rule in lyric poetry." But according to Koch's count it is not the rule in Xenophon's

Anabasis, and on the basis of Xenophon's Anabasis he bids us revise our definitions of the imperfect, which, indeed, sorely need revision, if duration means length of action. For "the imperfect has nothing to do with the absolute length of the action, it has only to do with the vision of the narrator" (A. J. P. IV 160), or, in the words of a great scholar, 'imperfectorum usus *oculatis testibus* proprius est' (Cobet, NL 409). "So rooted is the tendency in beginners to consider imperfect 'prolonged' and aorist 'momentary' that a course of *εἰθῶς* with the imperfect and of high numbers with the aorist is necessary to get them into right habits of thought" (A. J. P. l. c.).

Especially rebellious is Koch against the statement that Greek and Latin use the imperfect alike, and to show that the Greek imperfect and the Latin imperfect are different, he gives the result of his count of the historical tenses in twenty-nine chapters of Caesar's Gallic War and in the first book of the Anabasis:

	Caesar.	Xenophon.
Hist. praes.	31.60	11.70
Imperf. ind.	22.10	51.70
Perf. ind.	31.30	1.15
Pluperf. ind.	15.	1.15
Aor. ind.		34.30
	100.	100.

The figures are interesting—though he counts perf. ind. as an hist. tense in Xenophon—but what do they prove? Are we to judge Latin and Greek by two such representatives as Caesar and Xenophon just because they are school-books? The simplicity of the one is not the simplicity of the other. They are both soldiers, but Caesar is the statesman turned soldier, Xenophon is the Socratic turned soldier. We can speak of Xenophon's *bonhomie*. I fail to recognize the *bonhomie* of Caesar in the Commentarii. Still, as the imperf. is the tense of sympathy, Caesar may be the true representative of the genius of the Latin language. *ἀστοργότεροί πως εἰσι*, as Marcus Aurelius said of the patricians (I, 11), and that was the reason why his heart turned to the good old African, Fronto. 'Nihil,' says our African friend, Ep. II 7 (p. 135, Naber), 'minus in tota mea vita Romae repperi quam hominem sincere *φιλόστοργον*: ut putem, quia reapse nemo est Romae *φιλόστοργος*, ne nomen quidem huic virtuti esse romanum.' And Soranus, Gynaec., p. 287 (Rose), is almost as hard on the Roman mothers: *ὃν γὰρ ἐγκεῖται τοσαύτη στοργή ταῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει* (sc. Ῥώμῃ) *γυναιξίν ὡς τὸ καθ' ἑκάστον ἐπιβλέπειν, ὃν τρόπον πράττουσιν αἱ καθαρῶς Ἑλληνίδες. μηδενὸς οὖν ἐπιθεωροῦντος τὰ κινήματα, διαστρέφεται τὰ κῶλα τῶν πλείστων.*

But we must wait for the facts, however irksome the delay may be, before we formulate a difference between Greeks and Romans on the basis of their relative use of imperfect and aorist. There are differences within the Greek range which must be settled first—differences of department, of dialect, of individual. Cobet, for instance, says of Herodotus that he uses the imperfect for the aor. *ἰασί* (Mnemos. 1883, p. 90), and the more leisurely imperfect would suit the Ἰάονες *ἐλκεχίτωνες* as admirably as does the leisurely hiatus. Or shall we account for the difference by the epic tone of early history, or by the loitering grace of the delightful author himself? Koch does not like Demosthenes. More's the

pity. "Ich gestehe offen," he says, "dass ich bei der lectüre des Demosthenes, trotz der angewandten mühe, den erwarteten genusz weder erzielt noch selbst gehabt habe." But perhaps he will not deny that Demosthenes knows how to tell a story, and the narrative in LIV 3-12 has always been considered a model. In that narrative the aor. and imperf. nearly balance, as they nearly balance in two other model narratives, Lys. III 5-20 and XIII 5-30; but the aor. preponderates a little. Still, what does all the counting amount to? All these statistics of the finite verb are crossed by the use of the participle, by the use of the *oratio obliqua* infinitive, by the use in Latin of *cum* with the subj. Too many elements enter into the calculation to allow us to formulate. Even the proportion of participles to finite verbs refuses, as I have shown, to give a mechanical result (A. J. P. IX 151). And yet I think it would be much safer to ascribe the different proportions of imperf. and aorist in Latin and Greek to national differences, to artistic differences, than to different conceptions of the tense. I know that grammarians insist on a difference between Greek pluperfect and Latin pluperfect. That is distinctly an article of faith with some theorists. But how is it with the historical present? The historical present is, we are told, Aryan beyond a doubt. It is a common possession of Greek and Roman. Yet Homer and Pindar do not use it, and Vergil does. Vergil uses it as a Roman: "Gladio cominus rem gerit," as Caesar says in the string of historical presents which he uses in telling the story of Pulio and Voreus (B. G. 5, 44). To Homer and Pindar the historical present "must have been either too vulgar or too hurried" (Pindar, Intr. Ess., cii); but Brugmann, who said in his first ed. (Gr. Gr. §156): "Dass Homer das praes. hist. fremd ist, erklärt sich aus dem Charakter der epischen Diction," says in his second ed.: "Wie es zu deuten sei, dass Homer das praes. hist. fremd war, ist unklar." In both editions, however, he admits that "kunstmässige Handhabung der Sprache bediente sich dieses Praesens als eines rhetorischen Mittels zur Belebung der Rede." Now look at Koch's table again and see how much more freely the Roman uses the hist. present than the Greek. In Dem. LIV 3-12 the histor. presents amount to 5 per cent., in Lys. XIII 5-20 to 14 per cent., in Lys. III 5-20 to as much as 17 per cent. In the 29 chapters of Caesar we have no less than 31.60 per cent. The inference is irresistible that there was no difference in the conception of the relation, only a difference in the artistic presentation. The Roman is apt to overdo, and Caesar's story of Pulio and Voreus would to a Greek taste overdo the histor. present as badly as our African friend Fronto in his story of Arion (p. 237, Naber). But the whole matter of the tenses is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. English and German have perfects and preterites that are very much alike, and yet how few Germans use the English perfect with absolute correctness, and *vice versa*!

However, Professor Whitney has discussed this whole matter of perf. and aor. in a recent number of the Journal (XIII 289), and I am satisfied to leave Koch in his hands. Only I must add in conclusion that it is a little surprising that Koch should have cited a doctored passage from Aelian V. H. XIII 33 as a specimen of the massing of irregular verbs, without noticing the array of aorists, which, on his own principles, he might fairly have ascribed to Aelian's Latinizing tendencies.