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](#)

T. S. Brandreth

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 03 / March 1893, pp 107 - 108

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197069, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197069

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1893). T. S. Brandreth. The Classical Review, 7, pp 107-108 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197069

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

*Uranias huc imperatis invecta (?) est, Cerforum
sacratrix Semonum; suā aetate finitā fertili
in regnum (?) Proserpinae abiit. Ite vos*

*praeter (porro) pacati (benevolentes) qui hoc
legistis. Copiam (?) det vobis divitem honesta
Herentas.* W. M. LINDSAY.

T. S. BRANDRETH.

T. S. BRANDRETH, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, is, so far as I know, the only editor who attempted to follow up the work of Knight by another edition of the *Iliad*. The date of his book is 1841. Concerning Brandreth himself I know no more than this, and that he also published a Dissertation on Homeric metre which has some valuable observations in it; let the curious look up the *Dictionary of National Biography*. I have never seen his *Iliad* alluded to in even the most distant manner, but I hope to show that he must not be entirely neglected in the future.

We reconstructors of Homer remind me (or should I be more grammatical in saying 'myself'?) of the famous criticism of Byron by Goethe. 'Kühnheit' and 'Keckheit' we have, most of us at any rate, but alas! there is that opposite depressed scale: 'sobald er reflectirt ist er ein Kind.'¹ True enough is this of Brandreth anyhow. Take for example his *δφα* for *δφρα*, for *δφρα* if you please is nought but a corruption of *δφα* (i.e. *δφα*), his *ῥν* (Δ 473) for *νίόν*, his *δφιν* = *δον*, where Knight had already seen the truth, his *δουριν* as dative of *δόρυ*. O Kühnheit und Keckheit! Accents he eschews, a matter wherein I confess to sympathizing deeply with him, though the argument that Homer certainly did not use them might perhaps enable us to dispense with the necessity of using any alphabet at all, and should at least restrict us to a pre-Euclidean one. But it is not much avail to rake up such details; let us rather look at the bright side of the shield, and do what honour we may at this late date to a man who deserved more than he ever got.

I will give some illustrations of Brandreth's work without further preface.

A 90. 'εἰ κ'. Vulgo ἦν, sed Homerus tales contractiones raro admittit, et ἂν meo iudicio vox ei ignota erat. Ita ἐπὶ ἦν et ἐπειδὴν recentiorum inventa sunt.'

B 672. *Χαροπος* for *Χαρόπου*, coll. A 426. Very doubtful.

¹ See Arnold's Preface to *Poetry of Byron*; Goethe's *Conversations with Eckermann*, Dec. 16, 1828, Jan. 18, 1825.

Γ 140. *καὶ Ἀργεος*, 'patria semper *Αργος* et non *Γαστυ*.' Ingenious but improbable.

373. ἦρετο for ἦρατο. See also Ε 510, X 393. Cobet at present enjoys the credit of this.

Δ 384. ἐπὶ Τυδεΐ τεύλαν. So Menrad, followed by van Leeuwen and Da Costa, an admirable and I think certain correction.

E 293. ἐξελυθεν with astonishment that no one had seen it before him. So Ahrens.

349. οὐχ ἄλῃς for ἡ οὐχ ἄλῃς. 'Homerus huiusmodi elisiones non admittit.' So elsewhere.

396. αὐτος for ωῖτος.

782. *φλεισσι* for *λείουσι*, and elsewhere.

Z 508. *λοεσθαι* for *λούεσθαι*. 'ἐνρρεος vox nihili' but one can hardly commend *ἐνρροσφιν*.

I 533. ἡ λαθεῖ ἡ ἐνοήσεν for ἡ οὐκ ἐνόησεν, with remark that crasis of ἡ οὐκ is un-Homeric and that the negative ruins the sense.

Δ 696. *Κριναμενος τε τριηκοσί*, coll. A 307, 329.

N 707. *ταμεσθαι* for *τέμει δέ τε*, coll. I 576. See Leaf.

O 290. *καὶ ϛ'* ἔσσωσεν, arguing that *καὶ* 'ante vocalem producitur' only in Ω 60, 570, 641. But qu.?

339. *Μηκιστη* δε *Πουλυδαμας*. So Nauck.

Π 779. 'βουλυτονδε, ad horam secundam post meridiem; tunc enim boves ab aratro solvuntur.' This in the main correct explanation was proposed by Mr. Frazer in the *Classical Review* for Oct. 1888; add to his illustrations the following from *La Petite Fadette*, chap. xxi.: 'C'était l'heure de délier les bœufs, parce qu'ils avaient fait leur demi-journée.' But why should Brandreth be so positive about the exact hour?

Ω 154. *ὅς ϛ'* ἄξει. 'This brilliant discovery,' says Leaf, was made by Bekker and afterwards by Cobet, and has suggested the same restoration in other passages. The correctness of this conjecture when once made is quite obvious.' Whether Brandreth was led by this passage to introduce the pronoun elsewhere I do not know; anyhow he does introduce it very freely indeed. In B 102—7, six lines, he has inserted it six

times. But like the rest of us he has often introduced it when the order of the words makes it impossible—e.g. Υ 340 : ὡς *ἑταῖρον* *λίπε* *τὸ* *αὐτό*. (See Monro *H.G.* § 365 2nd ed.)

These instances will be enough to show

that it will be as impossible to neglect Brandreth as Knight. It is no small satisfaction to me to be the means of rescuing from undeserved oblivion a Fellow of my own College, *ad maiorem Trinitatis gloriam.*

ARTHUR PLATT.

BUSTS OF JULIUS CAESAR.

I NEED hardly say that I entirely agree with Mr. Tilley in his remarks on the portraits in my *Life of Caesar*. In justice however to my good friend Mr. Putman,—the most obliging of publishers, save in this one matter of illustrations,—I must take blame to myself for not having alluded in the preface or elsewhere to the very doubtful evidence in favour of other portraits besides that on page 78. I would myself have preferred to limit the illustrations to two or three portraits of Caesar himself, and as a consequence failed to take sufficient trouble about the others that were pressed upon me.

Mr. Tilley's note however gives me an opportunity of drawing attention to an omission which neither he nor any of my reviewers seems to have noticed. The Berlin basalt bust of Caesar, to which I made allusion in the preface, does not appear in the volume; it was unaccountably omitted after the sheets had gone out to New York, and the bad representation of the Vatican bust seems to have been substituted for it. Of all the so-called busts of Caesar this is the most singular and in some ways the most interesting. Bernoulli is very sceptical about it, and no doubt justly so, but it appears to me to have at least one or two points in common with the coins, and the exceeding hardness of the basalt may, I suppose, possibly account for some of the points of difference. I have not seen the

original, but I was greatly attracted by a fine cast of it shown me by Professor Michaelis in his gallery at Strassburg, and a letter which he afterwards very kindly wrote to me on the subject, quoting Conze's somewhat doubtful opinion and at the same time giving me his own, made me wish to include it in my book, with the word of warning which does actually appear in my preface.

If this strange and realistic bust is not a portrait of Caesar, it must at least be a portrait of some remarkable man. It is in fact so striking that it would be a great boon to all who are interested in Caesar's personality if the question as to its genuineness could be even approximately settled by experts. What Bernoulli says of it is certainly not the last word that can be said. And I take advantage of Mr. Tilley's remarks to invite specialists to concentrate their attention on a question of such real and lasting interest; for if it be Caesar at all, it must, I think, be the one real and unidealized portrait of him; while if it must be reckoned altogether doubtful, we should at any rate be able to rid our minds of an impression which it is not easy to shake off, so long as the strange features of this bust are even dimly associated in our minds with the Dictator.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

THE BERLIN PAPYRI.

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin, herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden, Hefte 1—3 (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892). Each Mk. 2.40.

OF the four great collections of papyri, in London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna (Leyden

does not seem to have maintained its position of late years), that at Berlin has hitherto been the least generally available. It is true that no official publication of this class of manuscript (with the exception of those containing texts of classical authors) has been made by the British Museum since 1839, or by Paris since 1865, and that the