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mastered, and that philosophy has never failed him and must again become his teacher and guide, is not far off a withdrawal from the Christian faith.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the volume is the sixth, on the translators of the *De Consolatione*. And the most interesting section in this chapter, at any rate for the ordinary English reader, is that on King Alfred’s famous translation. ‘It is in his translation of Boethius that Alfred’s personality is most strongly stamped. The theme was a congenial one. He too had had some taste of changing fortune in his own life; he too had felt the shock of a fall from high estate; and though he had now won his way to his throne again, and could look calmly back at the dangers and vicissitudes he had come through, he would not for that reason feel the less sympathy with the Roman patriot whose only crime—no crime indeed in Alfred’s eyes—was that he had lent an ear to the prayers of those who would fain be delivered from the yoke of a barbarian tyrant. This very sympathy....led him to identify himself so entirely with Boethius, that the latter is often quite lost sight of, the king taking his place and giving utterance to sentiments of which the Roman never dream’d’ (p. 173). Other translations or adaptations of the *De Consolatione* which the author notices are the Provençal poem *Boîce* in the eleventh century; that by Notker of St. Gall, which perhaps is a little earlier; the *Roman de Fortune* of Simun de Fraisne in the thirteenth century—the earliest vernacular version after that of Alfred; those by Jehan de Meun, Pierre de Paris, Renaut de Louhans, and other writers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; and lastly Chaucer, whose acquaintance with the Roman philosopher seems to have begun about 1369 and to have gone on until he ‘must have known his Boethius almost by heart’ (p. 215). Chaucer attempts what Alfred made no pretence at attempting, a literal translation and not a mere paraphrase: and it has a special value as an example of fourteenth century prose.

It would perhaps be worth the author’s while, in preparing a second edition, to look at articles bearing on his subject in the *Grande Encyclopédie* now being published by Lamirault, Paris, and of which about half has been issued. Great attention appears to have been paid to the bibliography.

A. PLUMMER.

---

**DORIC DIALECTS.**


It is a time of dialect study. Meister is proceeding with deliberateness; eight years elapsed between his first and second volumes Hoffmann has given us lately a volume on Arcado-Cyprian, which he calls South-Achaean (cf. *Class. Rev.* Jan. 1892, p. 54).

Shortly after the publication of Hoffmann’s volume Boisaq published his treatment of the Dorian group. This book we judge to be his doctor’s dissertation. Whatever may be the ultimate position assigned to the volume, it will prove a handy summary pending the publications of Meister and of Hoffmann. Considerations of convenience the author seems to have had in mind, for he has cited Cauer’s *Delectus*5 wherever possible. To the private student of dialects the book can be recommended on this account.

No such feature of practical utility attaches to the little monograph of Köppner.

Every writer on a group of dialects must of course adopt some principle of grouping. Boisaq gives us by way of introduction a sketch of the various groupings that have prevailed. Since the first edition of Gustav
Meyer's Greek Grammar it has been rather the fashion to subdivide as minutely as possible and not recombine in groups. Meister represents the same tendency, Hoffmann seems to be returning to the older group-system. Boisaq is diplomatic but perhaps betrays a leaning to Hoffmann, as elsewhere in the volume. I like however the point of view indicated by the following sentence: 'L'élöisme de judis est, pensons-nous, définitivement condamné et les dialectes vulgaires autrefois englobés sous cette rubrique apparaissent aujourd'hui comme des formes intermédiaires entre le dorisme et le lesbien.' The transition dialects will never admit of strict classification we believe. The members of our author's Doric group are as follows: A. Laconia, B. Tarentum and Heraclea, C. Messenia, D. Argolis, E. Corinth, Cleoneae, Sicyon, Phlius, Corecyra, Syracuse, etc., F. Megara, Chalcodon, Byzantium etc., G. Crete, H. Melos, Thera and Cyrene, I. Other islands in the Aegean, K. Rhodes, Gela, Agrigentum. The literary texts of Doric are Alcman, Pindar, Theognis (of no great importance), Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Archimedes. Doric passages in non-Doric writings are Thuc. v. 77, 79, Arist. Aetharnaes vs. 729 ff., Lyceistrata vs. 81-240, 980-1013, 1076—1318. Hesychius and the Grammarians furnish isolated words.

The phonology of the Doric group is next treated. I turn to the discussion of the peculiar uses of a, o, e, in Doric:—

1. a = Ion.-Att. e in (a) ἄρτομες; ἱαρός; στρατός, τριάς, τρίτος, τρίχως, τάμυρο; ἀπάρα. Πάναμος, σκυαρός, χάραδος, μαίστο. (b) κά (κεβ), γά, ὕθα."(θεβ), pres. ptc. dat. in ἀγας, φρατί (φρεν). (c) ἀπώλεις (πόλις Dor. for πολιών), ἀρπαν (Hom. τίφησι), ἀψία (= ἄρση, Ἑλ.) ἄρσης, ἰώς, πιάκω.

2. e = Ion.-Att. o in (a) ἀπάλλος, γεγυρφα, ἰδρημικόντα, ἀδελός (ἀβδολός), Ἰππεδάμιον.

3. e = Ion.-Att. a in (a) ἄρεσεν, ἅλκως.

4. o = Ion.-Att. a in (a) τέτορες, ἀνταργόφως. (b) καδαρός (καθαρός).

5. a = Ion.-Att. o in (a) ἀναρ (ἀναρ), ἀ ν ἁ ῶ ρο ν (ὅ ν ἐ ρ ο ν), σα λ ι (θ ο λ ι α). (b) γίκατι, ἀκοόσι, numerals in κάτοι (κάντοι), πλάσακτο (πλάτος). (c) ἀστακος, σκυαράσιος, πεδανίομε, ἰστοραγράφως.

For many of the above words our author does not attempt an explanation. We are not told for example that ἵαρος is the historically continuous form, although Sk. ἵσιρά- is brought forward, and ἵφος the new form, made (as Brugmann suggests I. § 287) on the analogy of the ἵφος adjectives of o's stems, e.g. διφός, φοβόρος. In-
posed to have a in place of the augment e. The same thing occurs a few other times on inscriptions but, so far as I know, only with forms of the verb πεινα. I call attention to the fact that in these cases the verb begins with δπο instead of επο. The occurrence is only sporadic. Perhaps it was 'stone-cutters' etymology' due to the preposition ἀπο. For ἄφαιστοι I have no explanation to suggest. σκυφάπομος (= εὔφαπομος?) is cited from an inscription inaccessible to me. If the a is metrically long there are two possibilities of explanation. We can regard σκυφα as a case form, an instrumental, either hyperdoric for η (cf. Br. Γρ. Π. p. 627), or the result of the contraction of the stem νι'-a, a mode of formation imitating that of instruments from consonant stems. For πεδανώμος, 'cultivating the fields,' and ἱστοφαγάφων we are certainly not far wrong in assuming a conscious pluralizing of πεδίων in the first case, and re-association with ἱστορία in the second. πετνυκοτιατηρίῳ for πετνυκοτιο is susceptible of a similar explanation. σκυρός cited under 1 (a) for σκυρός shows re-association with σκύρος, unless indeed σκυρός is analogous like λευρός, which seems to me the more probable explanation. In Doric ύπης for πι'δω the influence of βιάζω, similar in sound and meaning, is to be seen: πιδ'ω is, without doubt, a compound of ἤδη + /sed 'sit upon.' — Sk. πιδ < πι-σδ. The primary meaning is 'press' for both words, the derived 'oppress.' Cf. Lat. po-situs < ροσ-situs for a similarly clipped preposition—all of which has long ago been shown by Pott. Etym. Forsch. I.2 p. 514.

On p. 77 Boisacq discusses the locatives in υι, e.g. Cret. δπύ. The explanation of υι as the regular phonetic resultant of αι he very properly rejects, that is to say he adopts Hoffmann's objections to this theory as against Meyer. The explanation of Hoffmann is however adopted, itself cumbersome and not capable of proof. The bulk of the examples are on pronominal stems. Cret. δπυ is on the stem of the interrogation I.-E. γο. This was perhaps ἰον- (κρο?) with weak forms in γυ- (και?), Sk. κυ- in κυ-τρα and in κυ- (κυνα) are warrants for the latter stage. The suffix i is that of the locative, but it is probable that suffixless locatives were also in existence, Gr. πυ, *δρυ. The forms in υι stand in the same relation to these suffixless locatives as the Delphic dative-locative plurs. in -οις, e.g. ποις, οῖα κα (Ahr. Π. 367) to the locative sing. in -οι, e.g. ροιοι.

The above explanation, original with myself, has alas! been anticipated by Joh. Schmidt in the current number of K.Z. (xxxi., p. 294 fg.). To the explanation of υι as the ordinary locative suffix he prefers to equate *πα with Sk. κυ-vid, but I do not feel that his reasons are convincing. I further see no semasiological connection between κυ-vid 'whether' and δπυ as adverb of the place to which. It is to be noted that the transfer to nominal stems (e.g. δμαντί, πάλιν) would be facilitated for Greek by the stem νιヽ-s beside νιヽ-s.

Our author's discussion of the Greek nouns in -οις is not clear. On p. 149 he cites both Meyer's and Hoffmann's explanations of the doublots in -ης, -εις, with a possible leaning to the latter. We quite agree with Meyer (§ 323). On p. 152 Brugmann's correction of Wackernagel's equation of ἰτπαις = Sk. αγευ-ς is given. Wackernagel in K.Z. xxiv. p. 295 fg. explains gen. ἰτπαι in ἰτπαις > *ἴπταις. This should give us *ίπταις (cf. τείς < τερες). Brugmann therefore proceeds from a locative *ἴπταις, 're-locativized' into *ἴπταις > ἰτπαις. A still simpler explanation of the forms seems to me possible. A proto-hellenic form like *βασιλειείς was affected by the Greek accentual principle known as Dé Saussure's 'loi rhythmique,' whereby e.g. σοφός can come to stand for *σοφόν to avoid the accumulation of short syllables. We may start then from a *βασιλειείς, *τοκείς, etc., where i stands for a rhythmically lengthened e. A contraction of ε<ε will give us our ηιτείς— *τοκείς whence τοκείς.

A variation between -ες, -εις and -ες in proper names exists in the Doric dialects (Bois. p. 53) and this variation seems not to have been explained. The relation of -ες to -εις is easy cf. σώς θεός etc. For -εις and -ες I offer the following solutions. A name Κρατέας e.g. probably contains the stem κρατα-. The existence of forms Κρατειας and Κρατες may therefore be on the same footing as τελείω: τελεω and we must look for a suffix with initial η (ή) and a meaning like 'possessing power,' 'desiring power' or simply 'powerful,' Sk. iyant-titus and kiyant- 'quantus?' may be regarded as showing a 'possessive suffix' -yant (cf. -vant and -nant): tvayant- 'desiring thee' is generally explained as a denominative particle: it has a doublet tvayt-; it is possibly to be regarded as on the same level with iyant- kiyant- with secondary accent. All denominative stems do not accent the suffix, cf. Whitney2 § 1067. If we assume then a Gr. *κρατιέστι- we reach a nominative *κρατίσμα. For the doublet...
tvayánt-: tváyu-, we have the significant Greek doublet Ἀρσενός and Ἀρστεύ(ι)ας. We may however reach the explanation by comparing the proper names in -iou, e.g. Δευκάλιων (=Δευκαλίων) Ἀπόλλων (=Ἀπόλλων) with doublet Ἀπάλλας. A weak grade of the suffix -en- is in (cf. Brug. II. p. 335 fg.) and so we can reach a nominative (vocative!) *Κραστεύ·ς 'son of might' (cf. Κρονίων). In either case the > ά of the nominative was analogized by the prevalent first declension type. The name Ερμεία however suggests still another explanation. This has been compared with great probability by Sarameya; we must reconstruct I.-E. *Sermeía-; Sk. has anahtyxis of a before m and secondary νρδί. In Ερμεία the diphthong ɛ resolves itself into ɛy, and this secondary ɛ receives the same treatment as its predecessor whence Ερμεία. Whatever explanation is accepted, the conservative tendency in proper names must be taken into account. Names in -eos and -eis may be considered the antique parallel of our modern Johnston: Johnson.

Πετάλιος (p. 52) (nom. Πεταλαίος) δαμεργός δαμιργος (p. 64) and δάμορκος δαμιμάστων (p. 54) are compounds mentioned by our author. For the latter he cites explanations of Baunack and Meyer, all I think unsatisfactory. Πετάλιον is given under the general rubric εl-Ion.-Att. ο. For δαμιργός explanations of Meister and Hoffmann are given. These are only formally different, though Hoffmann clings to γοργος instead of γέρως as the second part of the compound, and elides o of his δαμω whereas Meister elides ɛ of his γερος. The true explanation of all these compounds lies in an insistence upon accentual effects. Greek Πεταλιός is a βάλλωντικ compound with accent on the first member but shifted in accordance with the Greek law of enuncia. Πεταλίος is a relic of the ταττχεύμα with accent on the final member, and the more frequent stem form ιπτυ- prevailed. Θέωρος, βάλλοντικ, proceeds from a, *θεω(ι)ος, ταττχεύμα, where the first member shows its suffix in the weakest grade, that is to say (>). Δαμω(ι)ογός comes from *δαμω(ι)ος in the same way. δαμεργός is proof perhaps of the grade *δαμιργός. The compound seems to be ταττχεύμα. Homer’s δαμεργος thanks a βάλλοντικ for its structure. The stem shows gradation perhaps in the form στίω = θείω, cf. Lat. Corneli-m to the stem Cornelio- (t).

I find some blemishes in Boisacq’s linguistic statements. After freely using the phrase ‘allongement compensate’ (p. 57) he seems to dodge the expression on p. 65 with his phrase: ‘ω résultat de la réduction en simples de consonnes nées d’une assimilation’ cf. Meyer § 74. Compare however p. 67 where ω ‘par allongement compensateur’ is discussed. The cases are equally ones of ‘compensative lengthening.’ I cannot help thinking he has been misled by Meyer who makes a sub-class under ‘compensative lengthening’ of what Boisacq has treated separately. Köppner on p. 543 cites προδιήλωμαν as an instance of ‘compensative lengthening.’ I should like to know why.

In discussing the explanations of δαμιργός cited above, Boisacq writes: ‘Hoffmann Gr. Dial. I. p. 151 critique cette étymologie et propose etc.’ Again on p. 68: ‘Si l’on compare p. 64 s. l’étymologie de δαμιργός indiquée par Hoffmann etc.’ The difference between Meister and Hoffmann is morphological and not etymological, I should say.

On p. 47, à μυρος of the Doric Προμαθείς we read: ‘la relation établie par Kuhn entre Προμαθείς et le sansc. pra-manthas. R. Math: mantbi, mantathi ‘faire tourner un morceau de bois dans un autre (pour allumer le feu sacré)’ est revoquée en doute.’ But why? If Sk. math represents I.-E. *math we have in Προμαθείς the deflected grade of the ά/ά series. If Sk. math = I.-E. math we can explain as *Προμαθεύς, and ά = Gr. ά Ion.-Att. η: cf. έρημος, Ion.-Att. ἔρημος = έρημος.

A thoroughgoing inconsistency of writing the vocalic nasals exists in Boisacq. p. 36 we have έτμον (έτμον), p. 68 βάλαις. On p. 161 I note *πρασσε士兵 but *φρονσε士兵. On the same page Cretic πλειασε is explained from πλασσα-σι, which could never be. The proto-hellenic form must have been *πλασσασί>*πλασσασί>*πλασσε士兵; in Ion.-Att. the influence of Hom. πλάςσασι or of the stem πλεον- gave πλάςσε, in Cretic *πλέασσε became πλάςσε as έρητα έρητα etc.

On p. 97 we have έξεί = έκ; on p. 98 ‘σ = ξ dans ζένωφαλον et Δασώλ = Δέξωλ.’ The first statement should read έξεί = έκ, cf. Baunack, Gort. p. 23.

The student ought to have a clue to άνταίνων (p. 103), a derivative of ανάφαινω, and πατάτσουνι is entitled to its usual sequence ‘(πατάτσουνι)’ as on p. 160.

On p. 91 όρις = όρισ is cited and the ή attributed to the influence of the oblique cases όριξων etc. (Pindar, Alemán and Theocritus). The existence of a stem όρις beside όριδ by hints at an original *-h- as final. It is possible to regard όρις as affected by the other bird-names in ά (cf. Bloomfield, Am. J. Phil. xii. p. 17). In the oblique cases we may regard χα as being affected.
with aspiration by way of legacy from the original θ.

I have noted a good many misprints: p. 38 varṣā- for varṣa; p. 49 πολιάκος for πολιάκος, but perhaps purposely according to § 5, 5 (p. 31), in the index p. 219 πολιάκος; p. 58 Del. 12, 7, 2 should be 12, 19 and ibid. 5. 2 ibid. 26; p. 83 Meyer § 116 should be § 166; p. 82 ἀναγραφότεν for ἀναγραφότεν; p. 88 τόκα for τόκα; p. 99 the gloss to στοκόρος: νευκόρος is an evident misprint for θεος (οἱ); p. 104 στατηράς but στατηράς(!); p. 175 the reference in the footnote, Brugmann Griech. Gramm.² p. 327, should read 135; p. 187 ἐπιτομήνιτι for ἐπιτομήντι; p. 193 σινή- is a peculiar transcription for Sk. ñynd.

A characteristic of the author's treatment is the following from p. 94. 'Depuis le IVᵉ siècle on trouve dans toutes les parties du dorisme, de même qu'en attique, en bétotien etc., les formes οὐδεὶς οὐδεὶς μηδεὶς μηδείς (le féminin restant οὐδείμα μηδείμα); nous n'insistons pas.' Cf. Meyer § 212. We need look to Boisaeq for no new explanations, and scarcely for any preference between contending ones, for we fancy the partiality shown to Hoffmann comes from his being the last writer on the subject. We must not demand too much however from a thèse d'agrégation.

Köppner gives us nothing by way of explanation. His little book amounts to a tabulation of Megaric words and to nothing more. I like his exhibition of common sense where he speaks on p. 561 of Aristophanes as a writer of pure Megaric.

On p. 543 he speaks of η <α 'in einzelnen verbis und anderen mit deren stamm gebildeten Wörtern, e.g. χρήματα, ἔγκτησιν.' Meyer's explanation § 38 ought to have been kept in mind.

On p. 544, 2, he deals with words that show a variation between α and ι. His final sentence is as follows. 'Mit Ausnahme des α in θελιβω erklärt es Meyer (Gr. Gr.² § 115) in allen aufgezählten Beispielen für älter und richtiger.' Some of the examples are ἰνικός and ἰνικός! But see Meyer, whom Köppner has not correctly reported.

I prefer the reasoned method of dealing with the Greek dialects, and for the present the comparative grammarians seem to furnish us with more reasons. A crying need of dialect students is an index verborum of all the material the inscriptions furnish us. Meantime let us hope for a new edition of Gustav Meyer's Griechische Grammatik. Cauer's Delectus and Meyer's Grammar make a very convenient and perhaps the very best means of working at the dialects for new venturers in the field.

EDWIN W. FAY.

University of Texas, Austin.

HARNACK ON EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.


The number of the Texte und Untersuchungen before us contains two treatises by Prof. Harnack, both eminently characteristic of their author.

The first is an investigation into the well known Gnostic treatise Pistis-Sophia preserved in Coptic in a MS. in the British Museum, and is an excellent piece of work. The doctrine or philosophy of the work has already been adequately discussed, but none but the vaguest ideas have existed previously on its date, and on the sect to which we are indebted for producing it. Prof. Harnack begins by discussing its quotations from the New, then its relations to the Old Testament, and especially the five Apocryphal Psalms of Solomon which it contains. He points out the light which it throws on the characteristics of the Christian Community at the time when it was written. It is significant as showing the importance of the questions which were then rife as to penitence and the forgiveness of sins. Finally he fixes its date to the second half of the third century. It was written in Egypt, but emanated from a school of Syrian Gnostics whom Epiphanius (Haer. 39, 40) mentions as settled there. The method of historical investigation seems to us on the whole admirable, and the results, as far as we can judge, correct. It and the