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](#)

On the Text of the Papyrus Fragment of the *Phaedo* *Notes on Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries*, by Thomas William Allen. London: Nutt. 1890. 3s. 6d.

E. M. T.

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 08 / October 1891, pp 387 - 387

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179478, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179478

How to cite this article:

E. M. T. (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 387-387 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179478

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the *Classical Review* vol. ii. p. 326 b, and xiv. 229 *patrimonia conduplicandi* for *patrimonia conduplicare*. We may note in conclusion that, though there is a complete Index of proper names, the want of a subject Index is in many respects an inconvenience.

E. G. HARDY.

A Short Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin for Schools and Colleges, by VICTOR HENRY, translated by R. T. ELLIOTT, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1890. 7s. 6d.

THIS is an accurate translation of a very good book. The merits of the original it is not necessary to dwell on now as M. Henry's *Précis de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin* has already been noticed in the *Classical Review* (vol. iii. p. 210). The highest ideal which the translator of a book of this sort could set before himself would be to rival the lucidity of the original, and the English of Mr. Elliott is almost as clear as the French of M. Henry. Mr. Elliott like other translators of foreign philological works had to face to some extent the difficulty of making for himself the technical terminology required. M. Henry, when dealing with the mysteries of 'Ablaut,' objects strongly to the German terminology which describes the *e*-forms of a root as the 'middle' and the *o*-forms as the 'strong' grade. The objection is well founded and a new term (*fléchi*) had to be invented which Mr. Elliott has translated by 'deflected.' As the word has not been used before so far as I know in Philology it is free from ambiguity, but can hardly be said to convey to the reader any very definite idea of the origin of the variation between *e* and *o* forms.

It is naturally not the province of a translator to set his author right; but as Mr. Elliott has improved the book for English readers by adding occasionally an English example where a French one was cited by M. Henry, one cannot help wishing that he had also removed some trifling obscurities and ambiguities in the original. In § 7 (p. 4) the beginner is likely to feel puzzled over the statement that 'inscriptions apart from the necessarily limited number of mistakes on the part of the writers give us absolutely accurate information.' Similarly in § 9 (e) the information about *-rr-* and *-σσ-* is put so briefly as to convey an erroneous idea, and the statement on p. 86 note 7 that **ḡos* = Skt. *yāvat* when put thus without any limitation is likely to lead the novice into an ancient heresy about final *s* and *t*. These are small points indeed, but I mention them because in using the book with my own pupils I found they were misunderstood. By an oversight on the part of the translator *aliturum* (p. 223 note 2) is described as an ablative.

On the title-page the book is described as one for schools and colleges, but notwithstanding its lucidity I am afraid it is much too hard for schoolboys, in England at least. The English schoolboy who devotes himself to the study of languages is generally so unversed in scientific ideas that the very precision of a book like this is to him a difficulty. The difficulty in this case is increased by the brevity of the introduction which postulates more knowledge than he possesses and plunges him too rapidly into a sea of ideas of which he previously knew nothing. Thus the very excellence of the book as a scientific manual militates against its success (*exoptato crede*) as a book for beginners. For those however who know the elements of the science already no better book could be found, and the translator has done good service by making M. Henry's treatise accessible to a wider public in this country than it would otherwise have obtained.

P. GILES.

Hermann Paul's Principles of the History of Language, translated by H. A. STRONG, M.A., LL.D. Sonnenschein: 10s. 6d. New Edition, 1890.

THE first edition of this translation was noticed in the *Classical Review*, Vol. iii. p. 180 a. f.; the work has now been carefully revised throughout, but most of what was there said both of its merits and defects is still applicable. In point of fact, as his readers know to their cost, Prof. Paul's style is not fitted to impart lucidity to an obscure subject, and Prof. Strong has not been able to emancipate himself sufficiently from the original to avoid the translator's bane—foreign forms of thought in English words. Where our praise is rightfully due to Prof. Strong is for the talents and research that he has brought to bear on his task so that his translation is a more valuable work than the original.

Many controversial topics of course suggest themselves on reading the book, but this is not the place to raise them. There still remain errata to be corrected, but we confine ourselves to one instance in which the mischief is serious. On p. 192 of the English version we read 'According to Verner's Law, in the original German a regular change has set in between the hard and the soft fricative (*h-ζ, p-δ, f-t, s-z*), and this change &c.' We are inclined to think that the examples in the brackets will seem to most readers to lack relevancy. On turning to the German (p. 153) we find 'Durch das Vernersche gesetz ist im urgermanischen¹ ein durchgreifender wechsel zwischen hartem und weichem reibelaut entstanden (*h—ζ, p—δ, f—b, s—z*), bedingt usw,' from which it is apparent that Prof. Paul has misprinted ζ for γ (soft guttural-fricative) and Prof. Strong has followed him with the additional misprint of *t* for *b* (soft labial-fricative). Another instance of a mistake copied from the original is on p. 374 (= 279) where *débonnaire* is given as from *de bonne air*; it should of course be *de bon air* although *de bonne aire* would have some justification.

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

Notes on Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries, by THOMAS WILLIAM ALLEN. London: Nutt. 1890. 3s. 6d.

MR. ALLEN has reprinted in this little volume the notes on Greek Manuscripts in Italian Libraries which he contributed to the *Classical Review* in 1889 and 1890, correcting and amplifying, and adding in his Preface memoranda of subsequent visits to other libraries at Brescia, Ferrara, Messina, Palermo, etc. We have thus descriptions of 470 MSS., out of which 64 bear actual dates. An Index of Classical authors is added.

E. M. T.

The Alcestis of Euripides, by M. A. BAYFIELD. Macmillan & Co. (Elementary Classics.) 1s. 6d.

THIS edition seems excellently adapted for the use of junior forms: the notes are short, and such as to supply a foundation for accurate scholarship: there are none of those 'fictions' which, introduced with the false idea of smoothing the beginner's path, have to be unlearned later on. To me however it seems a mistake to give notes such as 'προβθνη' = 'προέθηκα,' 'ῥῖε from ῥῖω,' &c. Young boys should go to their grammar and dictionary for accident, and notes should be given on syntax, where reference is perhaps beyond them: just as older boys may be left to

¹ It ought not to be necessary to draw Prof. Strong's attention to the fact that 'germanisch' does not mean 'German' but 'Teutonic.'