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](#)

T. Macci Plauti, *Menaechmi* Edited, with *Introduction and Notes*, by P. Thoresby Jones. Oxford University Press, 1918.

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 34 / Issue 1-2 / February 1920, pp 40 - 41

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00013354, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00013354

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1920). The Classical Review, 34, pp 40-41 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00013354

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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-

tenarius (cf. p. 31 with p. 29). Imperfect acquaintance with phonetic principles is shown by the statement (p. 34) that determination of quantity by position is 'artificial.' On p. 36 Brix is said to have 'further elaborated' the conclusions of Langen and Klotz, whereas he actually preceded them by some twenty to thirty years. Mr. Jones is quite right in emphasising the rôle of accent in the structure of Old Latin verse; but he has overemphasised it by failing to call attention to the fact that coincidence of accent and ictus is a rule only in certain feet of the line. Adopting the position that there is coincidence throughout, he has to fall back on the sentence-accent as a universal panacea; in regard to iambic words at the end of the trimeter he hazards the statement that 'the ictus falling on the final syllable of a line is of the second or weaker variety' (p. 38). Where did he get this idea of two degrees of ictus? On p. 42 he says: 'A long syllable may be (and commonly is) scanned as short if the preceding syllable is short and bears ictus,' adding in a note, 'and therefore word — or sentence — accent also (according to the view adopted above).' But he has himself just said that this applies only to 'the great majority' of cases. The question remains how to deal with the minority (e.g., *Sed ecclum*, l. 275). The words 'and commonly is' also give no pause. Can Mr. Jones quote a single case in which a long syllable is *not* to be scanned as short under these conditions?—'Shortening of vowels long by nature occurring in a polysyllabic word are to be regarded as doubtful' (p. 43; cf. the note on l. 37, p. 121). Then Skutsch wrote in vain.—The statement about the apparent quantity of *sincipūt* (p. 49) shows ignorance of Jacobsohn's work: and the suggestion that the length may be due to loss of final *s* (*caput*—*caput-s*!) is indeed a novelty.

The notes also contain some bad errors in prosody. Take, for instance, the light-hearted suggestions on lines

126, 580, 754, and 979. Is *prōfēctō* (126) a misprint? Moreover, the note contradicts the text. On what principle can the *nec* of 580 (preceded by a long syllable) be other than long (here by position)? Cretic feet of the form --- are not rare. A lurid light is thrown on the scansion - 0 - by a remark in the introduction, p. 46, where the mute and liquid ('*nec leges*') are appealed to. In 979 the variation of stress seems to me quite unobjectionable, and the supposed noun *mōlitum* quite uncalled for. So, too, the scansion *prōperabo* in 754. The note on 461 also contains a bad mistake of scansion.

In the above remarks I have spoken of 'shortening' in order to fall in with current terminology; but I must add that it does not represent my present views, which I have indicated in two articles *C.R.* XX, 1906, pp. 158f., and *Class. Philology* VI, 1911, pp. 1-11. In the latter I pointed out that no such law as is involved in the doctrine of 'Breves Breviantes' as applied to iambic words like *domī* is known to phoneticians, even when that doctrine is amended as Mr. Jones amends it on pp. 37 and 40 of his introduction. That is to say, the stress on the first syllable of these words does not account for the apparent shortening of the second syllable.

I am sorry to write thus severely of an edition on which the editor has clearly spent much trouble. But soundness on metrical and prosodical matters is essential in an editor of Plautus. In other respects I find the commentary generally adequate, though it contains many statements which I personally cannot accept; e.g. 'anacoluthon,' l. 64 f.; 'subjunctive by attraction,' 111; 'generalising subjunctive,' 144; 'humorous exaggeration,' 229 (Messenio is complaining of the delay in reaching home); colloquialism of the phrase *certo scio*, 'in classical prose *pro certo*,' 292; 'pained surprise,' said to be expressed by the spondaic word in the fourth foot, 294; is not the subjunctive in 1045 and 1106 simply prospective?

E. A. SONNENSCHN. .