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](#)

Brakman's *Frontoniana Frontoniana*. Seripsit C. Brakman. Traiecti ad Rhenum. 1902. Pp. 43 + 42.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 07 / October 1903, pp 360 - 361

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208548, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208548

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 360-361 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208548

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

marching orders are given for Altinum, she cannot repress a sigh: 'Comment Altinum? Et Venise?' But Venice, alas! is not Plinian. At Como M. Allain buried himself in the library for seven hours and a half: 'il a oublié moi qui l'attendais, sa

file à qui il devait écrire, et son déjeuner. Il m'avoue ingénument qu'il y serait encore,' if the librarians had not mentioned closing time.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

BRAKMAN'S *FRONTONIANA*.

Frontoniana. Scripsit C. BRAKMAN.
Traiecti ad Rhenum. 1902. Pp. 43 + 42.

THIS work, in two parts, contains the results of two distinct examinations of the palimpsest leaves (in the Vatican and Ambrosian libraries), containing the epistolary correspondence between the rhetorician Fronto and his friends, notably the Emperor M. Aurelius, his pupil as boy and youth, and other members of the imperial family. Its value consists in the carefulness with which the letters of the palimpsest have been scrutinized and re-examined; for in a MS so very hard to read as this Fronto palimpsest clear sight is two-thirds of the battle, and M. Brakman has obviously been able to make out much that had escaped the eyes of former editors, including even Naber (1867) and Studemund,—whose readings are published in an *Epistula Critica*, appended to Rudolf Klusmann's *Emendationes Frontonianæ* (1874). The extra words thus regained amount to a considerable total, in so much that a new edition will soon be necessary. It seems wonderful after the appearance in 1867 of so admirable an edition as Naber's that no one should have attempted a commentary on these letters; historically they have no slight value, and from the literary standpoint, the light they throw upon the attitude of the Antoninian epoch to the writers of the century which preceded it, especially the two chief representatives of Nero's principate, Lucan and Seneca, is of the highest importance. Nothing has ever been written upon the *Pharsalia* more scathing than the analysis in which its opening verses are dissected by Fronto p. 157 N., or more severe than the contempt which he has heaped on Seneca pp. 155, 156 N. From another and very dissimilar point of view, indeed, the point which most of all arrests the attention almost from the beginning to the end of

the collection—these letters are quite unique; I mean in the perpetual reference to an almost endless series of bodily complaints with which Fronto and his family on the one side, M. Aurelius (the Emperor) and his relations on the other, are from month to month assailed, each of which is successively recorded, and usually brings with the next post an expression of sympathy on the part of the writer. From another side, the archaizing tendencies in language which mark the epoch of the Antonines, find their clearest expression in this correspondence, which, with the *Noctes Atticæ* of A. Gellius, gives the best idea of these tendencies, in the loss of so much contemporary literature.

M. Brakman has spared no pains in the task he has set himself, the recovery of words or clauses which Mai and the other editors of Fronto had failed to decypher. There is a good number of such cases in all; and the gain of words so recovered and clauses so supplemented, is not inconsiderable. Many of the restitutions, where some of the letters of a word or words have been made out, but not all, are judicious, and commend themselves to such as are familiar with the peculiarities of Fronto's diction. On the other hand, where he merely deals with the text as printed by Naber, and has not been able to add anything from his own re-examination of the palimpsest, M. Brakman's criticism is often at fault. But, if I am not mistaken, the advantage which his eyes have given him in the much more important business of making out what the MS presents, quite outweighs the smaller and less conspicuous portion of his work, in which he stands on a level with several other critics. Yet even in this, the less successful part of the book, he deserves commendation for the industry with which he has collected illustrative parallels drawn from Fronto's own works: in no sense can

it be said that he has attempted to restore the ruinous portions of the building without first studying the prevailing mannerisms of the architect.

The book ends with a chronological investigation of the times when the letters were written.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

RIEMANN AND GOELZER'S COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF GREEK AND LATIN.

Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin.
Première Partie: Phonétique et Étude des Formes Grecques et Latines. Par O. RIEMANN et H. GOELZER. Paris, Librairie Armand Colin. 1901. Pp. 540. 20 fr.

THE well-known Comparative Syntax of MM. Riemann and Goelzer was followed in four years by a corresponding treatise on the phonology and morphology of the classical languages, which completes their great work. The literature of those four years naturally increased the proportion of new matter which M. Goelzer had to add to his lamented colleague's work, but otherwise the genesis of the later book does not differ from that of its predecessor. The main difference is that the authors, being essentially specialists in syntax, have been almost entirely compilers in the volume before us. But the compilation is eminently lucid and judicious. Brugmann is followed faithfully throughout, with abundant references to other authorities, and the arrangement is as admirably clear as the printing is a pleasure to behold. The book is a French counterpart to Mr. Giles's *Manual*—a reference to which I miss—, but its bulk allows of a much more liberal citation of authorities. I proceed to indicate points of detail which seem to call for comment.

P. 9. It is hardly 'more scientific' to divide our family into Asiatic and European, if Armenian is to be counted with the former: Armenian does not share in the Aryan confusion of *a*, *e*, and *o*.—P. 16. The account of the disappearance of the Greek dialects needs modifying in the light of Kretschmer's masterly essay (*Die Entstehung der koinḗ*, 1900). With Krumbacher (*Problem d. neugr. Schriftsprache*, 1903) we may think he goes too far in depreciating the part played by Attic in the growth of the colloquial *koinḗ*, but we can hardly make Attic the basis any longer, except so far as orthography goes. Is it right to cite ἐλευέρον or χάπιρα as 'common

Greek'? The dual is foreign to it altogether, and χάπιρ is still much more often found than χάπιρα.—P. 34. What authority is there for 'ῥάμαξα'? Il. vii. 426 and Od. ix. 241 may be quoted against it, to search no further.—P. 41. The confusion of long and short vowels is probably older than the Byzantine age.—P. 42. The authors' decision that *η* was a long *ē* (not *è*), differing from *ε* only in quantity, needs more evidence than they give to support it.—P. 49. Why 'αἶω est pour αἶω'?—P. 53. The relationship between βούλομαι and volo is not a fact to be assumed.—P. 54. The 'argument' of M. Beaudouin (n. 5), cited for making ζ = dz and not zd, was really not worth quoting.—P. 55. To say that the Sabine Clausus 'became' Claudius in Latin is a loose statement.—P. 79. The account of the Doric παῖδες etc., is more than dubious: the preservation of a primitive long syllable in 'παῖδας (p. παῖδavs)' is itself a blunder, and the correction of Choeroboscus therefore avails nothing.—P. 85. To postulate a Greek μῑμένο, πιπέτω, etc., is quite wrong: the weakest ablaut in this reduplicated conjugation is proethnic. The 'proethnique *dakara' in the note looks odd nowadays: Corssen should have been brought up to date. On the next page, it is very risky to assume that the Italo-Kelto-Germanic accent on the initial syllable goes back 'sans doute' to the primitive Indo-Germanic. There are too many peculiarities common to these three contiguous groups for us to argue from them to the parent language.—P. 88. *quinque* has *ī*, not *ī*.—P. 155. That *ῥ* became *av* in Greek was disproved by Streitberg. Cf. Brugmann *Grundriss* I². 394 anm. 2. The long sonant nasals should have had a few examples quoted, and some discussion: if there were such sounds—and I for one have always been somewhat sceptical—they appeared in Latin and Greek more than anywhere else.—P. 161. Idg. *fhūgā* and *fheūgō* are queer forms.—P. 180.