

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](#)



***Stories from the Greek Comedians:* by the Rev. A. J. Church, with sixteen illustrations after the antique. London, Seely & Co. 1893.**

W. W. Merry

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 04 / April 1893, pp 181 - 182
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197458, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197458

How to cite this article:

W. W. Merry (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 181-182 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197458

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil, by WILFRED P. MUSTARD. Johns Hopkins Doctor-Dissertation. Reprinted from Colorado College Studies, vol. iii. Colorado Springs, 1892.

MR. MUSTARD'S results must be characterized as rather meagre. Moreover they are in general so obvious as to be of little value. The following are the chief:

1. Servius makes free use of the *lucus a non lucendo* principle. 2. He is fond of deriving Latin words from Greek, e.g. *ars* ἀρσ and τῆς ἀρῆς. 3. In several instances he fails to follow his own principle that a word should agree in its vowel quantities with the word from which it is derived, e.g. *sēcuris* from **semicuris*. 4. He sometimes advocates different etymologies for the same word in different parts of his commentary, e.g. *cadaver* *Aen.* vi. 481 *a cadendo*, but viii. 264 *cadaver dictum quod honore sepulture careat*.

The writer's claim that Servius is further inconsistent in deriving *castor* *a castrando*, and *tus* *a tundendo*, can hardly be allowed, for while Servius does forbid the derivation of Greek words from Latin, yet it is clear that to him *castor* and *tus* were not Greek, but Latin, and he proceeds to explain them accordingly.

Apart from the above general conclusions Mr. Mustard's dissertation is of a mechanical nature. Thus he gives us a list of the different languages from which Servius derives Latin words, a summary of his phonetic resources, aphaeresis, synaeresis, rhotacism, etc., an enumeration of the different writers whom Servius expressly mentions as his authorities, and lastly a complete list of all those etymologies of Servius 'which according to the highest and most recent authorities are no longer tenable.' This last list constitutes by far the larger part of the entire paper. Naturally most of the etymologies contained in it are of the most fantastic order,—etymologies whose falsity is so obvious to the most casual observer, that it is difficult to understand the object of the compilation. A few of these however challenge comment, and stimulate curiosity as to whom we are to understand by 'the highest and most recent authorities.' Brugmann and Stolz evidently do not belong among them, for Mr. Mustard rejects without discussion the etymology of *ara* for *asa* (Gramm.)—a conclusion from which Umbr. *asa* apparently leaves no escape. Cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, i. p. 427. Cf. also the author's rejection of *solium* for **sod-ium*, from root *sed-*, where Brugmann and Stolz illuminate the change of *d* to *l* by other undoubted examples. Other similar words are *Lupercal*, *inferiae*, *Liber*. Mr. Mustard's list to be useful ought to have included the reasons for his position in case of disputed words. Discussion of moot points cannot properly be waived in scholarly research by a general appeal to authority.

CHAS. E. BENNETT.

Cornell University.

Stories from the Greek Comedians: by the Rev. A. J. CHURCH, with sixteen illustrations after the antique. London, Seely & Co. 1893.

PROBABLY no one knows better than Mr. Church how difficult a task he undertook in preparing a volume of *Stories from the Greek Comedians*. But a writer who has achieved so much success in his

'Stories' from Homer, the Greek Tragedians, Virgil, Livy, etc., was not unwise in adding another volume to his popular series. The task was not made lighter by including specimens of the New Comedy, in the shape in which it has reached us. But the difficulty is not the same with the New Comedy as with the Old. The Old is somewhat too real, and the New not real enough. Still, for the sake of completeness, Mr. Church is right in giving us samples from Diphilus, Philémon and Menander, as they have filtered through Plautus and Terence: yet we have to remember that it took all the genius of Plautus, with his quips and cranks, his bold jests, and his rich vocabulary, to win the applause of a Roman audience for his renderings from the Greek. And the same audience failed to appreciate the more genuine article, presented in the delicate colouring of Terence. However, Mr. Church has been quite as successful in this part of his book as circumstances allowed: and the 'New Comedy' will, for not a few readers, have an intelligible meaning for the first time.

The case with Aristophanes is different: but the difficulties in the way of the adaptor are not less.

There is a full flavour about the plays which has to be toned down, a grossness of expression has to be pruned, without leaving the plays scentless and flat: there is a 'topical' element in the jests and the situations, which must neither be neglected nor overborne by commentary: there is the political and social purpose, which must be kept in view without being obtruded: and—hardest of all—there is a characteristic subtlety and lightness of touch, and a constant suggestion of true poetry, never obscured in the original by the coarser and commoner surroundings, which must, somehow, be retained even in an epitome, if it is to give a truthful sketch. These difficulties Mr. Church has very fairly faced. His method is to give a short introductory outline of each play, followed by sundry scenes, more or less complete, linked together so as to maintain the thread of the plot, and diversified with metrical renderings of lyrical passages. The volume is quite suitable for young readers; and few of them will fail to enjoy the description of the *fin de siècle* Athenian youth and his old-fashioned father, the 'Paradise of the Birds,' the formal trial of the thievish dog, the contest of Aeschylus and Euripides, and other scenes familiar to scholars. Older readers too may find a new interest in refreshing their memory with the treatment of social problems—ever old, and ever new—which perplexed the Athenian thinker no less than the modern Socialist. Praxagora and Blepyrus, in the 'Parliament of Women,' (p. 215) fight out the complications of communism most delightfully, and succeed in bringing the question to a solution—or a deadlock, whichever we like to call it. *Praz.* 'The first thing in my plan is that all should share and share alike....I shall make all land common property, and the money. Every man will have whatever he wants for the asking...No one will steal then. He would be stealing his own property. And if a man should say "Your coat or your life?" you'll only have to give it him, and go to the public store and get another.' This—if we subtract the humour—is not unworthy of Trafalgar Square (on Saturdays, Sundays, and Bank Holidays)! Mr. Church would have added to the interest of his illustrations, if he had given some better account of them than the mere title 'from the antique.' It may mean so much, or so little.

W. W. MERRY.

IN his instructive and—may I add?—most kindly notice of my *Notes on the Nic. Ethics* in the March No. of the *Classical Review*, Mr. Herbert Richards dissents from my view of the relation of ‘justice in exchange’ to ‘distributive justice’ in Book v. If I am wrong—and I readily admit that I may be wrong, for an objection coming from Mr. Richards comes with weight—my error is a very ancient one. It originates with the writer of M. M. who, in i. 33, 1193 b 36—1194 a 25—a passage to which I refer, vol. i. p. 433—treats ‘justice in exchange’ as a case of ‘distributive justice.’ It will be observed that, though the writer does not use the expression ‘distributive justice,’¹ he starts with the subject of *E. N.* v. 3 (the chapter on ‘distributive justice’) in his mind, and, after saying that returns are in proportion to labour, immediately goes on to instance *exchanges* in which labourers get the returns of their labour—ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἴσον, καὶ τὸ τῷ ἀνάλογον ἴσον δίκαιον ἂν εἴη. τὸ δ’ ἀνάλογον ἐν τέτταρσι γίνεται ἐλαχίστοις· ὥς γὰρ τὸ Α πρὸς τὸ Β, τὸ Γ πρὸς τὸ Δ. οἷον ἀνάλογόν ἐστι τὸν τὰ πολλὰ κεκτημένον πολλὰ εἰσφέρειν, τὸν δὲ τὰ ὀλίγα κεκτημένον ὀλίγα· πάλιν ὁμοίως τὸν μὲν πολλὰ πεπονηκότα πολλὰ λαμβάνειν, τὸν δὲ ὀλίγα πεπονηκότα ὀλίγα λαμβάνειν. ὥς δὲ ἔχει ὁ πεπονηκὼς πρὸς τὸν μὴ πεπονηκότα, οὕτω τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὰ ὀλίγα. ὥς δὲ ὁ πεπονηκὼς πρὸς τὰ πολλὰ, οὕτως ὁ μὴ πεπονηκὼς πρὸς τὰ ὀλίγα.

¹ Nor does he use the expression ‘corrective justice.’

ἔοικεν δὲ καὶ Πλάτων τῇ ἀναλογίᾳ ταύτῃ τοῦ δίκαιον χρῆσθαι ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ γεωργός, φησί, σίτον ποιεῖ, ὁ δ’ οἰκοδόμος οἰκίαν, ὁ δὲ ὑφάντης ἱμάτιον, ὁ δὲ σκυτοτόμος ὑπόδημα. ὁ μὲν οὖν γεωργὸς τῷ οἰκοδόμῳ σίτον δίδωσιν, ὁ δ’ οἰκοδόμος τῷ γεωργῷ οἰκίαν ὁμοίως δὲ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες οὕτως ἔχουσιν ὥστε τὰ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἀντικαταλλάττεσθαι τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις—then follow remarks, down to 1194 a 25, parallel to *E. N.* v. 5 (chapter on τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός) §§ 6—16, but differing from these sections in not using the term ἀντιπεπονθός, which does not occur till the subject of retribution in criminal cases is begun 1194 a 29.

J. A. STEWART.

MR. SKENE writes to complain that his views are not fairly represented in the notice of his book which appeared in our last number. The only point in which we think he has any ground for complaint is in the misquotation which occurs twice over in p. 129 a, where he is made to say ‘no word in Archaean Greek expressed “wet,” nor is any idea traced from it, unless it were composed of this monosyllable’ (ὕδ); the words actually used by him in p. 7 of his book being ‘no word in Archaean Greek expressed “wet,” or any idea traced from it’ &c. We regret the misquotation, but we cannot see that it in any way affects the argument.

ED.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

TWO BOOKS ON GREEK ANTIQUITIES IN RUSSIA.

1. *Bibliothèque des Monuments Figurés Grecs et Romains*, vol. iii.: *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien*, rééditées par SALOMON REINACH: large 8vo. Paris: Firmin Didot et Cie. 1892. (213 pages text, 2 maps, 5 plans, 86 plates.)
2. *Antiquités de la Russie Méridionale*, par Prof. N. KONDAKOF, COMTE J. TOLSTOI, et SALOMON REINACH. 4to. Paris. Leroux. 1891—1892. (555 pages, 477 illustrations in the text.)

THE series of reproductions of scarce and expensive folios, which M. Reinach had the boldness to project and the energy to carry

out, has now reached the third volume²; and this volume is even more useful than either of its predecessors, for the original edition of the *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien* was more than rare, it was practically unpurchasable. M. Reinach mentions that only 200 copies of the original work were produced, and that it was never sent into the market. Many of these have passed into the great libraries; and only in extraordinary and exceptional cases can a copy now be obtained. There are six copies known to him in Paris, four in the great libraries, and two in the possession of private individuals; I do not gather clearly from his words whether the copy which he

¹ For vol. i. see *Classical Review*, 1889, p. 83; for vol. ii. 1891, p. 131.