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](#)

Linguistic Studies by John and Theodore Baunack.

Benj J. Wheeler

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 03 / March 1889, pp 130 - 131

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194405, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194405

How to cite this article:

Benj J. Wheeler (1889). Linguistic Studies by John and Theodore Baunack.. The Classical Review, 3, pp 130-131 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194405

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LINGUISTIC STUDIES BY JOHN AND THEODORE BAUNACK.

Studien auf dem Gebiete des griechischen und der arischen Sprachen. BAUNACK, JOHANNES und THEODOR. Erster Band. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. I. Theil, 1886, 6 Mk.; II. Theil, 7 Mk. 1888.

THE recent appearance of the second part completes now the first volume of this bibliographical venture of the Baunack brethren. They evidently expect to have a good deal to say, and want a serial of their own to say it in. As early as 1885 appeared a most creditable sample of their joint labours, an edition of the inscription of Gortyn—the best and most serviceable of the numerous editions which have sprung into existence since Halbherr's famous discovery. In the volume before us, the younger brother is represented in one article only, occupying about 175 of the 475 pages of the volume. This is an extremely important Avestan study, the results of which will have a direct bearing upon the determination of Zoroaster's relation to the native folk-cults of the Iranian people.

It is however in the work of the elder brother, Johannes, that the readers of this journal will have the most interest. It is work of such merit that it should not be lost sight of, though certainly this form of publication renders it more liable to be, than if it were embodied in one of the standard journals like Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* or Bezzenberger's *Beiträge*.

Of most uniform excellence and perhaps of most permanent value is the collection and explanation of the inscriptions recently excavated from the temple of Asklepios at Epidauros. Many of these are of first-rate importance both from a linguistic and an antiquarian point of view; cf. e.g. the account of the miraculous cures effected in the temple as recorded in inscr. Nos. 59 and 80. Baunack's annotation is rich in citations of parallel passages from literature and inscriptions, and abounds in fine observations of linguistic peculiarities.

A miscellany of various discussions and observations under forty or more separate titles, grouped in two collections of 'Analekten,' occupies somewhat less than one-third the space of the volume. These are by no means of uniform value. Many of them disport themselves upon the enchanted ground of the etymology of proper names. Rarely do his results attain to a conviction, but surely he abounds in devices and clever

ideas. The most satisfactory of his discussions in this field are those which deal with the clipped names (*Koseformen*) in extension of Fick's treatment, *Griechische Personennamen* (Göttingen, 1874). He presents on pp. 58 ff. and 231 ff. a valuable collection of these clipped forms, which include, beside the first element of the original compound, a trace of the initial sounds of the second element; thus, Πολυ-ξ-ώ: Πολυ-ξ-ένη, Τήλε-φ-ος: Τήλε-φ-άνης, Μενε-σθ-εύς: Μενε-σθ-ένης, Πολυ-ξ-ίδα: Πολύ-ξ-ενος, Θεό-γν-ις: *Θεό-γν-ητος, &c. Most interesting also is the discussion of names with doubled consonant like Ξενοκ-κώ, βιοττίς, &c., a discussion which is here continued from the author's investigation in the *Studia Nicolaitana* (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 47 f.

Of the various attempts at the determination of phonetic laws, none appears to me more successful than that on pp. 239 ff., in which it is shown that in Elean, and probably also generally in common speech, the simple initial τ' might, before nouns beginning with a vowel, officiate in place of the fuller form of the article, τὸν, τοῦ, &c.; in the same way h' for δ, ἡ, &c. This leads to a not improbable explanation, certainly the only explanation thus far offered, of the aspiration in ἵππος (*árra-s, equus*), ἡμέρα (*ἡμαρ, τετρα-ἡμερος*), &c., i.e. it resembles the l in Fr. *hierre* (= *l'hierre, hedera*).

The identification of the negation *ne* in νέ-κταρ (*κτείνω*) must be accepted; perhaps, too, in νέποδες. The etymology of ἀγαθός as 'sehr laufend' (cf. βοη-θός) is no more convincing than Johansson's rehabilitation of the old one with Goth. *gōds* (Bezz. *Beitr.* xiii. 115 f.). The attempt to find the meaning 'water' in Σάμος is by no means set upon its feet by Σαμο-θράκη, nor is the aphaeresis from *ἀσαμός accounted for.

When our author in discussing the etymology of Ἀΐδης falls back upon the time-honoured composition of *a-* priv. with √vid-, i.e. 'unseen' (!), he entirely overlooks the phonetic law established by Wackernagel (Kuhn's *Zeitschr.* xxvii. 276 f.). The Attic form is ᾄδης (*ā*), but ᾗδ- could yield only Attic ᾗδ; ᾗδ- only ἡδ; ᾗδης must represent an original *aifid-*, as in ᾄττω = **aifittō*, cf. *ā* in κᾶω, κᾶω, ᾗεί. Ἀΐδης (Attic ᾄδης) may be etymologically associated as masculine patronymic (**Aidos*, **Ais*, femin.) with *aifēi* (*ἀεί*), *aíōn*, or perhaps with *aia*, 'earth,' but certainly with some word having the diphthong *ai* in its first syllable.

The connection of κόσμος with √σκυ-, view,' is forced. I see no objection to deriving it from *κόνσμος (cf. τρακοστός from *-κονστός) and connecting with Lat. *censeo*.

The volume is provided with excellent indices.

BENJ. J. WHEELER.

Iliaca.

Xenophon, Hellenica, Books I-IV. Edited on the basis of Büchsenhütz's edition, by IRVING J. MANATT. Ginn and Co. Boston, 1888. \$1.65.

THIS book is one of a series called 'The College Series of Greek Authors' edited under the supervision of Professor White of Harvard University, and Professor Seymour of Yale University. The works of the series are all prepared on a uniform plan. A German edition is made the basis, that is, it is revised and adapted to the use intended in America. Each work contains an Introduction, the Text with Commentary on the same page, Appendices (containing brief accounts of manuscripts, editions, &c., and Critical Notes), and Indexes. Beautiful, large type is used, and the books are in every way pleasing to the eye.

The Introduction (19 pp.) to this work gives a brief account of the rise of the Athenian Empire, a sketch of the Peloponnesian War, a brief discussion of the relation of the *Hellenica* to Thucydides, the unity of the *Hellenica*, the time of composition, the chronology, the sources, and finally of Xenophon as an historian. The Introduction is satisfactory for the purpose intended, which is to familiarize the young pupil with such facts as are necessary for an intelligent study of the text. Perhaps some of the details may be questioned. It is stated, for instance, that 'the mention of the battle of Coroneia as the most important of his time suggests the inference that Xenophon wrote these words before the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea had been fought.' Rather the contrary. By implicitly ranking Coroneia above Leuctra, Xenophon may be covertly disparaging the exploits of Epaminondas in comparison with those of his great hero, Agesilaus. The characterization of Xenophon as a historian is too favourable. It may be indeed, as stated, that he never invented a positive falsehood; but to omit the most important achievements of a commander and then dwell upon insignificant matters that are not consistent with the historian's theory of strategy, is not much better. It is suggested that Epaminondas did not appear in the same brilliant light to his contemporaries as to dispassionate posterity. It is certain that he did not: but Xenophon knew that the shock of Leuctra was felt from the centre to the circumference of the Hellenic world, and he knew that it was the work of Epaminondas. The best defence attempted is that 'Xenophon, interested in the public events of his time, in some of which he took part, noted them down more perhaps for his own than for the public eye.' He would, in that case, presumably omit some of the events which it was not possible to forget; but the closing sentence of the work must then be bracketed.

The Commentary is placed, in two columns, underneath the text. (For use in the class-room a copy of the text alone is furnished with each copy of the book.) At the beginning of each chapter is a *précis* of the matter narrated in the chapter. The Commentary also, in addition to discussing grammatical questions, explains historical allusions; so that the student obtains much historical information from a study of the book. The grammatical

comments are judicious, and parallels are cited in sufficient number. The work would, perhaps, be improved by noting the constructions and use of words peculiar to Xenophon among Attic prose authors. This might be considered premature in a work for young pupils: but it is just these that need constant warning that Xenophon's Attic is not of the purest. The practice, one might say the necessity, of beginning the study of Greek with Xenophon, generally makes it necessary for the student afterwards to unlearn a good deal. So far as was observed in perusing the book, no remark is made even on the use of σύν. Positive errors are few. In the note on i. 6, 7 is the remark: 'the infin. with εἶπον not signifying command is extremely rare.' This is certainly too strong. Not to mention poets or Herodotus, it is a construction used by Thucydides, Andocides, Aeschines, Demosthenes, Lycurgus, Plato (repeatedly), Aristotle. Xenophon himself has several other examples of it. This, however, is a mistake on the right side: it is well to give a warning against the promiscuous use in some of our exercise books of the infin. and of ἔτι with the finite verb after both εἶπον and φημί (which, with rare exceptions, takes the infin.). On i. 6, 29, Σάμιος ὀνόματι Ἰππέως, the use of ὀνόματι instead of ὄνομα or τοῦ ὀνόματος is noted, but it is not stated why Xenophon did not say simply Ἰππέως Σάμιος. The conjecture of Dindorf (mentioned in the Critical Notes) that this (ὀνοματι) is a marginal gloss, seems improbable because of the arrangement of the words. Such cases of ambiguity were sometimes avoided by analogous means. Cf. Thuc. iii. 101, 2, εἶλον κάμην πάλιν ὄνομα ἔχουσιν. In Hell. i. 4, 2, ὄνομα is, indeed, probably a gloss.—On the same paragraph is the note, 'ἐν ταύταις: taken strictly this contradicts μίας.' Are we to understand that because ships are drawn up in a single row, other ships cannot be placed (on the same line) ἐν αὐταῖς? —On iii. 1, 1 it is remarked that Σάμιος is not named in the *Anabasis*, but that mention is made of the admiral Pythagoras. It might have been added that 'Pythagoras' probably grew out of δ Σάμιος by a ridiculous blunder of some old copyist.—In the note on iii. 4, 11, τὸν αὐτοῦ ὄλκον, the fact is ignored that here αὐτοῦ is not simply eius, and that in vii. 1, 20 (cited), οἱ ἄλλοι αὐτῶν σύμμαχοι, the presence of the attrib. ἄλλοι affects the case materially. —On iv. 4, 1, ὡς Ἀργεὺς τῆς Κορίνθου ὄντος, the rendering as if Argos were Corinth is probably inadvertent, as it is not consistent with the rest of the note. Cf. also ix. 8, 34.

The Critical Notes are designed to give an introduction to the textual criticism of the *Hellenica*. They call attention to the chief passages which have been considered doubtful, and state some of the most plausible conjectures. Original emendations by the American editor of course are not to be looked for, nor must one expect to find recognized the most recent work which is scattered about through the various journals that contain articles on Xenophon. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that on i. 1, 35 Büchsenhütz's objection is repeated, that 'from Decleia one could not possibly see ships entering the