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](#)

Greek Noun-Formation *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation (based in part upon material collected by the late A. W. Stratton): Dental Terminations, I.* By Carl D. Buck. One vol. Royal 8vo. Pp. 46. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1918. \\$.50 net; \\$.53 post paid.

G. E. K. Brauhnoltz

The Classical Review / Volume 34 / Issue 1-2 / February 1920, pp 39 - 40

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00013342, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00013342

How to cite this article:

G. E. K. Brauhnoltz (1920). The Classical Review, 34, pp 39-40 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00013342

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

writings, of which most have not been reprinted since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,' as well as those more obviously presented in the *Scaligerana*. But, after all, a vast deal of the great scholar's criticism amounts to little more than the application of labels (laudatory or otherwise); thus Catullus is 'cultissimus poeta,' Claudian 'elegantissimus poeta,' Demosthenes 'pater eloquentiae,' Plutarch 'gravissimus scriptor,' and so forth. This sort of thing is not very edifying. But occasionally Scaliger is more descriptive and really critical, as when he deals with Lucan and Persius, Jerome and Eusebius.

The critical apparatus for the text of the *Aves*, as prepared by the late Professor White and Dr. Cary, is to be followed in the next volume of *Harvard Studies* by similar collations of the *Vespae*. They will be found invaluable for reference by minute students of the Aristophanic text.

Mr. Greene's main conclusions concerning Plato's view of poetry are thus expressed on the last page (75) of his essay: 'Plato did not formulate a definite creed about the poetic faculty, and his special utterances are moulded by special interests. Accordingly, those interpreters are mistaken who attempt to make a sweeping generalisation—as

that Plato expelled the poets, or that his real doctrine is contained in myths. . . . Since most contemporary poetry was content, Plato thought, to produce images, without passing on to the ideal world, it was so far to be condemned. He recognised, however, that the poet might express eternal forms, and so far as he did so, he became a philosopher. In some such way Plato imagined that the ancient conflict between philosophy and poetry might cease.' This view seems reasonable enough; one might indeed say that it is a work of supererogation to expend seventy pages in arguing for it. The crux of the matter lies in Plato's language in *Rep.* X.: is that intended for serious literary criticism or is it, as Mr. Greene says, to 'be read rather as a dramatic gesture, as a bit of satire on the accredited educators of Hellas' (p. 56)? Most trans-Atlantic writings on Plato bear trace of the pervasive influence of the views of Professor Shorey, and Mr. Greene's Essay is not an exception; among other points of agreement, he too refuses to bow the knee before the golden image of Socrates-Refictus which the St. Andrew's Professors have set up. There appears to be an error in the quotation from *Laws* 669A on p. 68; but this is the only slip that I have noticed.

R. G. BURY.

GREEK NOUN-FORMATION.

Studies in Greek Noun-Formation (based in part upon material collected by the late A. W. Stratton): *Dental Terminations, I.* By CARL D. BUCK. One vol. Royal 8vo. Pp. 46. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1918. \$50 net; \$53 post paid.

THE material collected in this instructive and closely-packed survey of Greek nouns and adjectives with *τ*-genitives is divided into four main groups: (1) genitive *-ατος*, (2) genitive *-ᾶτος*, *-ητος*, (3) genitive *-ωτος*, (4) genitive *-ιτος*, *-κτος*, *-ρτος*; these main groups are again subdivided into smaller classes.

In discussing the IE. *r/n* class Professor Buck makes the interesting observation that in proethnic Greek the

type *-ρ*, genitive *-ατος*, was moderately productive, whereas during the historical period it was in constant decline, and it has disappeared altogether from modern Greek; *ῥδωρ*, for example, has been replaced by *νερό*. From the semantic point of view the most noticeable feature is the number of words for parts of the body.

Of the types *-ās*, *-ᾶτος*, *-ης*, *-ητος*, and *-ως*, *-ωτος*, Professor Buck says: 'In Greek the formation with *-τ* has been largely displaced by that with *-τᾶ-*, yielding the numerous class of agent-nouns in *-τᾶς*, *-της*. With a few exceptions, it has survived only after root-forms ending in *ā*, *η*, or *ω*, and belonging to that type which represents a monosyllabic form of dissyllabic bases,'

e.g. compounds with -βλης, -κρās, -κμης, -βρως, etc. He adds that in these compounds the passive force greatly predominates, in notable contrast to the Sanskrit t-forms, e.g. *vicva-jī-t* 'all-conquering,' *madhu-kṛ-t* 'honey-making, bee,' etc. As in Sanskrit, the accent is regularly oxytone.

Rather more than twelve out of thirty-four pages of text are devoted to a most interesting discussion of Greek personal names; the different types are considered according to their group as explained above, and every dialect is carefully treated. The greatest space is devoted to the hypocoristic class of the type Μένης, Φέρης. It is noteworthy that apparently only in Boeotian, which also prefers a genitive in -ιος, is the consonant doubled, e.g. Φίλλεις, Ξέννεις, Μέννεις, etc. Names compounded with ἄναξ are also discussed at some length.

The name of the river Tigris has a special interest for many at the present day. It is taken from the Persian form

(O. Pers. acc. *Tigrām*); Herodotus has Τίγρης, acc. Τίγρην, while Xenophon and others use Τίγρης, Τίγρητος, with transfer to the τ-type. The form Τίγρις in Strabo, Plutarch, etc., is explained as having been favoured by popular etymology, which connected the name with the Persian word for arrow (Avest. *tigris*).

In the class -ως, -ωτος, γέλως, ἔρως, ἰδρῶς, and usually χρώς have no τ-forms in Homer; 'the secondary τ-inflection in these four nouns,' says Professor Buck, 'must have its source in the inherited τ-inflection of the verbal adjectives in -ώς, in spite of the fact that the analogy is a purely formal one, without semantic support.'

In the class with genitive in -ιτος, the name of the goddess Artemis is followed through the West Greek dialects, most of which show a τ-genitive.

The word lists at the end are very complete and occupy twelve full pages.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

T. MACCI PLAUTI, MENAECHMI.

Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by P. THORESBY JONES. Oxford University Press, 1918.

THIS edition follows the same plan as was adopted by Mr. E. J. Thomas in his *Aulularia*, i.e. the text is taken bodily from the edition of Professor Lindsay, together with the critical apparatus, and the work of Mr. Jones consists in providing the introduction and the commentary. In the latter a few suggestions are made as to readings, but the editor was debarred from making improvements in the text, even where Professor Lindsay gave him a lead, e.g. in l. 495, where *homini hic ignoto insciens*, the reading of B², is obviously right for several reasons.

The introduction is somewhat ambitiously conceived; Mr. Jones has thought it his duty to write a little treatise on Plautine metres and prosody (pp. 25-58), and he has clearly tried to think out the manifold problems therein involved for himself. But he is in-

sufficiently equipped for the task. Many statements are there made which will not bear examination, and I do not find that the task of the student has been lightened by any simplification of the method of grouping the facts. On p. 26 we are told that Plautus and Terence allowed substitutions for the iambus in order to bring ictus into harmony with accent; but it is not explained how these substitutions achieve the desired result: - = is just as bad from the accentual point of view as 0 =. And what is to be said of the statement on p. 31 that the dactyl is freely allowed as equivalent to the trochee in every complete foot of the trochaic septenarius except the fourth and the seventh? Mr. Jones apparently knows nothing about the great restrictions to the use of the dactyl; and he commits himself to scansion like *lu|bēntūs* in l. 979 without alarm. Nor is it true that diaeresis is observed in the trochaic septenarius to the same extent as in the iambic sep-