

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Doric Dialects

Les Dialectes Doriens, Phonétique et Morphologie by Émile Boisacq; Der Dialekt Megaras, und der Megarischen Colonien by Friedrich Köppner

Review by: Edwin W. Fay

The Classical Review, Vol. 7, No. 1/2 (Feb., 1893), pp. 58-62

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [The Classical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/691375>

Accessed: 31/01/2014 10:33

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

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 dreamt' (p. 173). Other translations or adaptations of the *De Consolatione* which the author notices are the Provençal poem

Boëce in the eleventh century; that by Notker of St. Gall, which perhaps is a little earlier; the *Roman de Fortune* of Simun de Fraïnsne 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. Mr. Stewart has tabulated a number of mistranslations, and points out that (as we might expect) Chaucer is much better in the bits of Boethius which he has done into verse in his poems than in the same pieces as they appear in the set prose translation.

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.

Les Dialectes Doriens, Phonétique et Morphologie. Thèse d'Agrégation présentée à la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles, par ÉMILE BOISACQ, Docteur en Philosophie et Lettres. Paris, Érnest Thorin, 1891. 220 pages.

Der Dialekt Megaras, und der Megarischen Colonien von FRIEDRICH KÖPPNER.—Besondere Abdruck aus dem achtzehnten Supplementbande der 'Jahrbücher für classische Philologie.' Leipzig, Teubner, 1891. Pp. 530—563. 1 Mk.

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 Boisacq 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* 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. Boisacq 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. Boisacq 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'éolisme de jadis 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, Cleonae, Sicyon, Phlius, Corcyra, Syracuse, etc., *F.* Megara, Chalcedon, 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. *Acharnae* vs. 729 ff., *Lysistrata* 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*, *ε*, in Doric:—

1. *a* = Ion.-Att. *ε* in (*a*) **Ἀρταμης*; *ιαρός*; *στράφω*, *τράπω*, *τράφω*, *τράχω*, *τάμνω*; **Ἀπτάρα*, *Πάναμος*, *σκιαρός*, *χάραδος*, *μάντου* (*β*) *κά* (*κέν*), *γά*, **θα* (*θεν*), pres. pt. dats. in **ασσι*, *φρασί* (*φρεν*). (*c*) *ἀπόναφε* (*πονάω* Dor. for *πονέω*), *ἄερσαν* (Hom. *ἔρση*), *ἀψία* (= *ἔορται*, Hes.) *ἄτερος*, *υἰάσι*, *πιάζω*.

2. *ε* = Ion.-Att. *ο* in (*a*) **Ἀπέλλων*, *γεργύρα*, *ἔβδεμήκοντα*, *ὀδελός* (*ὀβολός*), *Ἰππεδάμων*.

3. *ε* = Ion.-Att. *α* in (*a*) *ἔρσενες*, *ἴλεος*.

4. *ο* = Ion.-Att. *α* in (*a*) *τέτορες*, *ἀνεπιγρόφως*. (*b*) *κοθαρός* (*καθαρός*).

5. *a* = Ion.-Att. *ο* in (*a*) *ἄναρ* (*ἄναρ*), *ἄνα ιρον* (*ἄνειρον*), *σαλία* (*θολία*). (*b*) *Ἰκάτι* (*εἴκοσι*), numerals in **κάτιοι* (*κόντιοι*), *πλέασι* (*πλέοσι*). (*c*) *ἄστακος*, *σκιφατόμος*, *πεδιανόμος*, *ιστομαγράφων*.

For many of the above words our author does not attempt an explanation. We are not told for example that *ιαρός* is the historically continuous form, although Sk. *isirá-* is brought forward, and *ιερός* the new form, made (as Brugmann suggests I. § 287) on the analogy of the *ρος* adjectives of *o/ε* stems, e.g. *διερός*, *φοβερός*. In-

deed what our author says, p. 33, seems to make the *ιερός* form the continuous one: 'Aux formes pleines et primitivement accentuées -*έμο*, -*έρο* de l'ionisme et de l'arcado-cypriote répondent en dorien les suffixes non accentués -*αμο*, -*αρο*.'

The classification I have above made groups under (*a*) all the cases of variation between *a*, *ε*, and *ο*, in connection with the nasals and liquids, and these form a large majority of all. Can we not explain the phenomenon in group (*a*) as one of gradation? The inference would be fair if not cogent. Accent is however the disturbing cause in gradation, and there seems to be no right to assume a change of accent in *ιαρός* as compared with Sk. *isirá-*. A soberer explanation for many of the above words has been reached by Joh. Schmidt in the current number of *K.Z.* (xxxii. p. 323 ff.). Neighbouring vowels have an assimilating effect upon one another, e.g. **Ἀπέλλων* gave way to **Ἀπόλλων* because of the following *ω*; in the same way *ὀδελός* is more original than *ὀβολός*; *Κέρκυρα* has had its *ε* labialized by the *υ* of the following syllable; *ἔτερος* out of *ἄτερος* is due to the penultimate *ε*, not, as heretofore explained, to re-association with *εἰς*. For words etymologically insecure however we may still hold that such variants are a phenomenon of gradation, and due to accent. Accent is the comparative grammarian's principle of gravitation and doubtless lies behind many a yet unexplained change, as surely as the attraction of the planet Uranus on the planet Neptune led to the discovery of the latter. There may be those who will think I am comparing great things with small, and such will attach no importance to the priority of *ιαρός* as against *ιερός*. The Greek mathematicians were content to work out their conics a thousand years before there was practical application for the results. We can be humble and imitate them, feeling sure that our instrument of precision will at last bring something out of the darkness of the pre-historic time.

Under (*b*) I have classed cases of *a = η*. This group Boisacq has explained save *κά* (*κεν*); he denies the relation of **θα* to **θεν*, but cf. Henry's *Comp. Gr.* § 187, 6: *γά* has perhaps been affected by *κά* (?).

Under (*c*) I have tabulated miscellaneous cases. *υἰάσι* has been hesitatingly explained by Boisacq (p. 38) as analogical to *πατράσι* etc. I see no reason for the hesitation. *ἄερσαι*, Hom. *ἔρση*, has a prothetic vowel, and is for the present out of the reach of investigation perhaps. In *ἀπόναφε* we are sup-

posed to have *a* in place of the augment *ε*. The same thing occurs a few other times on inscriptions but, so far as I know, only with forms of the verb *πονέω*. I call attention to the fact that in these cases the verb begins with *ἀπο*° instead of *έπο*°. The occurrence is only sporadic. Perhaps it was 'stonecutters' etymology' due to the preposition *ἀπο*°. For *ἀψίαυ έορταί* I have no explanation to suggest. *σκιφατόμος* (= *ξίφοτόμος*?) is cited from an inscription inaccessible to me. If the *a* is metrically long there are two possibilities of explanation. We can regard *σκιφα*° as a case form, an instrumental, either hyperdoric for *η* (cf. Br. *Gr.* II. p. 627), or the result of the contraction of the stem *-ο* + *a*, a mode of formation imitating that of instrumentals from consonant stems. For *πεδιανόμος*, 'cultivating the fields,' and *ιστοριαγράφων* we are certainly not far wrong in assuming a conscious pluralizing of *πεδιόν* in the first case, and re-association with *ιστορία* in the second. *πεντηκονταστατήρω* for *πεντηκοντο*° is susceptible of a similar explanation. *σκιαρός* cited under 1 (*a*) for *σκιερός* shows re-association with *σκιά*, unless indeed *σκιερός* is analogical like *ιερός*, which seems to me the more probable explanation. In Doric *πιάζω* for *πέζω* the influence of *βιάζω*, similar in sound and meaning, is to be seen: *πέζω* is, without doubt, a compound of *έπι* + *√sed* 'sit upon.' = Sk. *√piḍ* < *pi-sd*. The primary meaning is 'press' for both words, the derived 'oppress.' Cf. Lat. *po-situs* (< a) *po-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 *vi*, e.g. Cret. *δπιυί*. The explanation of *vi* as the regular phonetic resultant of *oi* 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. *δπιυί* is on the stem of the interrogation *I.-E. qo-*. This was perhaps *qvo-* (*kvo*?) with weak forms in *qvu-* (*kw*?), Sk. *ku-* in *kū-tra* and in *ku-à* (*kuva*) 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*, **δπιυ*. The forms in °*υς* stand in the same relation to these suffixless locatives as the Delphic dative-locative plur. in *-οις*, e.g. *ποις*, *οισ* *κα* (Ahr. II. 367) to the locative sing. in °*οι*, e.g. *οίκοι*.

The above explanation, original with myself, has alas! been anticipated by Joh.

Schmidt in the *current* number of *K.Z.* (xxxii. p. 294 fg.). To the explanation of *i* as the ordinary locative suffix he prefers to equate **πιυί* with Sk. *ku-vid*, but I do not feel that his reasons are convincing. I further see no semasiological connection between *ku-vid* 'whether' and *δπιυί* as adverb of the place to which. It is to be noted that the transfer to nominal stems (e.g. *ἀμπάντιυί*, *πλίυι*) would be facilitated for Greek by the stem *v-iv*-s beside *v-iv*-s.

Our author's discussion of the Greek nouns in *-εύς* is not clear. On p. 149 he cites both Meyer's and Hoffmann's explanations of the doublets in *-ήςς*, *-εύς*, with a possible leaning to the latter. We quite agree with Meyer (§ 323). On p. 152 Brugmann's correction of Wackernagel's equation of *ιππεύς* = Sk. *aṅvayu-s* is given. Wackernagel in *K.Z.* xxiv. p. 295 fg. explains gen. *ιππηφος* from *ιππειφος* > **ιππειφος*. This should give us **ιππειφος* (cf. *τριεύς* < **τριειες*). Brugmann therefore proceeds from a locative **ιππειηγ*, 're-locativized' into **ιππειηγ-ι* > *ιππηφι*. A still simpler explanation of the forms seems to me possible. A proto-hellic form like **βασιλειεφος* was affected by the Greek accentual principle known as De Saussure's 'loi rythmique,' whereby e.g. *σοφώτερος* came to stand for **σοφότερος* to avoid the accumulation of short syllables. We may start then from a **βασιλιεεφος*, **τοκεεφος*, etc., where *ε* stands for a rhythmically lengthened *ε*. A contraction of *ε* + *ε* would give us our *η*,— **τοκεής* whence *τοκεύς*.

A variation between *-έας*, *-είας* and *-ίας* in proper names exists in the Doric dialects (Bois. p. 53) and this variation seems not to have been explained. The relation of *-εας* to *-ιας* is easy cf. *σιός*. *θεός* etc. For *-έας* and *-είας* I offer the following solutions. A name *Κρατέας* e.g. probably contains the stem *κρατεσ-*. The existence of forms *Κρατείας* and *Κρατέας* may therefore be on the same footing as *τελείω*: *τελέω* and we must look for a suffix with initial *y* (*i*) and a meaning like 'possessing power,' 'desiring power' or simply 'powerful.' Sk. *iyant* 'tantus' and *kyant* 'quantus?' may be regarded as showing a 'possessive suffix' -*yant* (cf. *-vant* and *-mant*): *tvāyánt* 'desiring thee' is generally explained as a denominative participle; it has a doublet *tvāyú-*; it is possibly to be regarded as on the same level with *iyant*-*kyant*- with secondary accent. All denominative stems do not accent the suffix, cf. Whitney² § 1067. If we assume then a Gr. **κρατέσιγητ*- we reach a nominative **κρατέσιγας*. For the doublet

tvāyánt- : tvāyu-, we have the significant Greek doublet Ἀριστεύς and Ἀριστέ(ι)ας. We may however reach the explanation by comparing the proper names in -ίων, e.g. Δευκαλίων (<*Δευκαλιων?) Ἀπόλλων (<*Ἀπολιων?) with doublet Ἀελλίας. A weak grade of the suffix -jen- is in (cf. Brug. II. p. 335 fg.) and so we can reach a nominative (vocative?) *Κρατεσιᾶ-s 'son of might' (cf. Κροτίων). In either case the > ä of the nominative was analogized by the prevalent first declension type. The name Ἐρμείας however suggests still another explanation. This has been compared with great probability to Sārameyā-; we must reconstruct I.-E. *Sermeija-; Sk. has anaptyxis of a before m and secondary vrddhi. In Ἐρμείας the diphthong εῖ resolves itself into ey, and this secondary y receives the same treatment as its predecessor whence Ἐρμείας. Whatever explanation is accepted, the conservative tendency in proper names must be taken into account. Names in -είας and -εας may be considered the antique parallel of our modern Johnston : Johnson.

Ἰππεδάμων (p. 52) (nom. Ἰππεδάμος?) δαμιοργού δαμιοργοί (p. 64) and θέδωρος θεμνάστου (p. 54) are compounds mentioned by our author. For the latter he cites explanations of Baunack and Meyer, all I think unsatisfactory. Ἰππεδάμων is given under the general rubric ε=Ion.-Att. o. For δαμιοργός explanations of Meister and Hoffmann are given. These are only formally different, though Hoffmann clings to ὄφοργος instead of ὄφεργος as the second part of the compound, and elides o of his δαμιο whereas Meister elides ε of his ὄφεργος. The true explanation of all these compounds lies in an insistence upon accentual effects. Greek Ἰππεδάμος is a *bāhuvrīhi* compound with accent on the first member but shifted in accordance with the Greek law of enclisis. Ἰππόδαμος is a relic of the *tatpuruṣa* with accent on the final member, and the more frequent stem form ἵππο- prevailed. θέδωρος, *bāhuvrīhi*, proceeds from a, *θε(-)δώρος, *tatpuruṣa*, where the first member shows its suffix in the weakest grade, that is to say (-). Δαμι(-)οργός comes from *δαμι(-)φοργός in the same way. δαμιοργός is proof perhaps of the grade *δαμιέργος. The compound seems to be *tatpuruṣa*. Homer's δημοεργός thanks a *bāhuvrīhi* for its structure. The stem θεο- shows gradation perhaps in the form σίν = θεόν, cf. Lat. Corneli-m to the stem Corneli-o (?).

I find some blemishes in Boisacq's linguistic statements. After freely using the phrase 'allongement compensateur' (p. 57)

he seems to dodge the expression on p. 65 with his phrase : 'ω résultant 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 προδηλωμένα as an instance of 'compensative lengthening.' I should like to know why.

In discussing the explanations of δαμιοργός 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 δαμιοργός indiquée par Hoffmann etc.' The difference between Meister and Hoffmann is morphological and not etymological, I should say.

On p. 47, à propos of the Doric Προμαθείς we read : 'la relation établie par Kuhn entre Προμηθεύς et le sanscr. pra-manthas. R. Math : manth, manthati "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 Προμηθεύς the deflected grade of the ā/ā series. If Sk. math = I.-E. mṛth we can explain as *Προμηθεύς, and ῆ = Gr. ā Ion.-Att. η : cf. ἔβαρε, Ion.-Att. ἔβητε < *ἔβητε.

A thoroughgoing inconsistency of writing the vocalic nasals exists in Boisacq. p. 36 we have ἔταμον (= ἔτμον), p. 68 βωφῆς. On p. 161 I note *πρασσησι but *φρησι. On the same page Cretic πλιασι is explained from πλιησι, which could never be. The proto-hellenic form must have been *πλιησι > *πλιασι > *πλεασι; in Ion.-Att. the influence of Hom. πλένεσι or of the stem πλεον- gave πλέοσι, in Cretic *πλέασι became πλιασι as Φετία Φετία etc.

On p. 97 we have ἐς = ἐκ; on p. 98 'σ = ξ dans Ζενοφίλου et Δεσίω = Δεξιω.' The first statement should read ἐς = ἐξ, cf. Baunack, *Gort.* p. 23.

The student ought to have a clue to ἀνπανσιν (p. 103), a derivative of ἀναφαίνω, and παπιδουσι is entitled to its usual sequence '(= ψηφίζουσι)' as on p. 160.

On p. 91 ὄρνιξ = ὄρνις is cited and the ξ attributed to the influence of the oblique cases ὄρνιχων etc. (Pindar, Alcman and Theocritus). The existence of a stem ὄρνιχ beside ὄρνιθ- hints at an original -gh- as final. It is possible to regard ὄρνιξ as affected by the other bird-names in -ξ (cf. Bloomfield, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xii. p. 17). In the oblique cases we may regard -χ- as being affected

with aspiration by way of legacy from the original *-θ-*.

I have noted a good many misprints: p. 38 *varṣā-* for *varṣā*; p. 49 *πολιάχος* for *πολιᾶχος*, but perhaps purposely according to § 5, 5 (p. 31), in the index p. 219 *πολιάχος*; 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 *ἀναγραφόντεν* for *ἀνγραφόντεν*; p. 88 *τόπα* for *τόκα*; p. 99 the gloss to *σιοκόρος*: *νεωκόρος* is an evident misprint for *θεω* (ο ?); p. 104 *στατήρης* but *στατήρας* (!); p. 175 the reference in the footnote, Brugmann *Griech. Gram.*² p. 327, should read 135; p. 187 *ἐπιορκιόντι* for *ἐπιορκόντι*; p. 193 *sūnjá-* is a peculiar transcription for Sk. *çūnyá*.

A characteristic of the author's treatment is the following from p. 94. 'Depuis le IV^e siècle on trouve dans toutes les parties du dorisme, de même qu'en attique, en béotien etc., les formes *οὐθείς οὐθέν μηθείς μηθέν* (le féminin restant *οὐδεμία μηδεμία*); nous n'insistons pas.' Cf. Meyer § 212. We need look to Boisacq 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 <a* '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 *ει* and *ι*. His final sentence is as follows. 'Mit Ausnahme des *ει* in *θλείβω* erklärt es Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*² § 115) in allen aufgezählten Beispielen für älter und richtiger.' Some of the examples are *ῥεικον* and *ῥικος*! 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.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristliche Literatur, von OSCAR VON GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK. VII. Band. Heft. 2. 'Ueber das Gnostische Buch Pistis-Sophia.' 'Brod und Wasser: Die Eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin.' Zwei Untersuchungen, von ADOLF HARNACK. (Pp. 144. Leipzig, 1891.) Mk. 4.50.

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