

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](#)



Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship A History of Classical Scholarship from, the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages.* By John E. Sandys, Litt.D. Cambridge Univ. Press. Large crown 8vo. Pp. xxiii + 672. Cambridge, 1903. 10s. 6d. net.

Alfred Gudeman

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 05 / June 1904, pp 271 - 276

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990231, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990231

How to cite this article:

Alfred Gudeman (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 271-276 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990231

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

worth while to make one remark which has struck me more and more. The so-called *Ciceronianism* which many editors find in it has been unduly exaggerated: it is only true superficially and in a limited sense. Compared with the *de natura deorum* or the *de divinatione* it is intricate, obscure, and even difficult. Probably this traditionally Ciceronian style of the *Octavius* may have been caused by its superiority to the curious and involved Latin of Tertullian, in comparison with which it is no doubt limpid and easy. But even now that three centuries and a half have cleared it from many of its obscurities, it cannot be said to attain to

anything like the lucidity of Cicero. Any one who wishes to test this may do so by reading a single page; he will halt more than once, I had almost said, again and again. And this is not the fault of the MS., which is a very good one, though hardly rising to the excellence of the single MS. of Orientius which we now possess, and which within the last year has been so carefully re-edited by the poet's compatriot, M. Bellanger: it is inherent in the style which partly, indeed mainly, classical, bears notwithstanding no slight admixture of a quite different and much later epoch.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

SANDYS' HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP.

A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages. By JOHN E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Cambridge Univ. Press. Large crown 8vo. Pp. xxiii + 672. Cambridge, 1903. 10s. 6d. net.

THE complete history of any long-continued phase of intellectual activity is rarely written, until it has either run its course or has ceased to occupy a conspicuous or, at all events, a commanding position in the cultural movements of an age. This may possibly serve as a partial explanation for the otherwise strange circumstance, that we have had to wait until now for a comprehensive survey of classical scholarship; for we cannot close our eyes to the deplorable fact that the Humanities are at the present day virtually on the defensive and in many quarters in imminent danger of being relegated to the background as a superfluous literary luxury, merely calculated to retard the rapid acquisition of a materialistic education which our strenuously scientific age now demands. But while in this struggle for existence the survival of the fittest may be confidently predicted, the present might, indeed, seem an opportune time for a retrospect of the labours that during more than two milleniums have been spent upon the matchless literature of Greece and Rome. This task, as grateful as it is herculean, has fallen to the lot of Dr. Sandys, who needs no introduction to classical scholars.

The first of two volumes now before us comprises the period from the sixth century NO. CLX. VOL. XVIII.

B.C. to the beginning of the Renaissance within the extremely modest compass of 650 pages. To review a work of this nature in a way to do anything like adequate justice to it is manifestly impossible within the limits to which I am necessarily confined, so teeming is it with detailed and varied information on an astounding multiplicity of most interesting topics, so difficult is it to convey to one who may not himself have had occasion to traverse the extensive area here covered a vivid conception of the immense labour and the constant exercise of a discriminating judgment involved in the finished product. But as the learned author, by rising to the level of his stupendous undertaking, has produced a work which no student of the classics can neglect with impunity, the reviewer is, at least, happily relieved of the necessity of tabulating its varied contents with a view to whetting the reader's appetite for its perusal. It will suffice for our purpose to enumerate the principal headings of the six books into which the volume is divided and to discuss, as briefly as possible, such items as, in the judgment of the present critic, call for special comment.

After a preliminary chapter on the meaning and use of such terms as *scholar*, *philology*, *φιλόλογος*, *γραμματικός*, and *κριτικός* (pp. 1-13), bk. I. deals with *The Athenian Age* (c. 600-300 B.C.) in seven chapters (pp. 17-102); bk. II. takes up *The Alexandrian Age* (c. 300-1 B.C.) in two chapters (pp. 103-164); bk. III. is devoted to *The Roman Age of Latin Scholarship* (c. 168 B.C. - c. 530 A.D.) in four chapters (pp. 165-260);

bk. IV. to *The Roman Age of Greek Scholarship* (c. 1 B.C.—530 A.D.) in eight chapters (pp. 261–375); bk. V. discusses *The Byzantine Age* (c. 530 – c. 1350) in two chapters (pp. 376–428); bk. VI. finally, which comprises almost one-third of the entire volume (pp. 429–650), treats of *The Middle Ages in the West* (c. 530 – c. 1350) in nine chapters. Interesting paleographical facsimiles, portraits, and allegorical illustrations, which are all learnedly elucidated, a selected list of the principal sources consulted (other bibliographical references are given in profusion in foot-notes) are some of the external features of the book. But by far the most useful of these adjuncts is furnished by no fewer than twelve *chronological tables*, ‘doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis.’ They give a complete and accurate conspectus of the literary and philological activity of Europe for nearly 2,000 years. They contain in all about 900 names, with dates and a mass of sundry but valuable information regarding the foundation of famous monasteries, schools, and universities. Particularly welcome are the three last tables, covering the period from 600–1400, for the names and dates here conveniently classified are comparatively little known and, so far as I am aware, no similarly comprehensive conspectus has hitherto been accessible, the data having to be laboriously compiled from a variety of sources. Dr. Sandys aptly compares these ‘Chronica’ to the *liber Annalis* of Atticus, of which Cicero admirably said, ‘ut explicatis ordinibus temporum uno in conspectu omnia viderem,’ but the author’s modesty doubtless forbade him to add, that they will also be found far more trustworthy than Cicero’s chronological *vademecum* can be shown to have been, confined though it was within considerably narrower limits.

Bk. I. *The Athenian Age*: In the treatment of this period, Dr. Sandys has endeavoured to combine the eidographic and chronological methods, dealing with such subjects as the study of epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry, the development of prose style and rhetoric. Such a topical arrangement is not without its advantages, but they are neutralized by the fact that it is not carried far enough. Thus the survey of Homeric criticism is of little value, when, as here, it is restricted to the Athenian age. Again, this method of treatment necessitates some awkward repetitions, the ‘philological’ work of Plato and Aristotle in particular, having to be taken up at various points, which prevents the student from getting a

comprehensive view of the contributions of these men in the domain of classical scholarship. The account of the lyrical poets (pp. 43 ff.) seems to me somewhat irrelevant, for it is apparently inserted solely for the purpose of pointing out to what extent they exerted an influence upon or were cited by later writers, notably Plato and Aristotle. This information would have been more appropriately given under these names, but the author was prevented from doing so by the method which he follows in this first book.

Dr. Sandys seems to me to do scant justice to *Protagoras*, whose work is briefly referred to on pp. 27 and 78. We may readily grant that, if measured by absolute standards, it possesses few, if any intrinsic merits, but when we remember that, so far as we know, he was the first human being who became scientifically conscious of grammatical moods and gender and recall how long it was before any genuine progress was made in the field of Greek Grammar, the pioneer-work of this highly talented man, is, historically considered, an epoch-making achievement which well merits the plaudits of posterity. The profound sensation which his discoveries created is still reflected in the ridicule of Aristophanes who, as so often, is merely the mouthpiece of conservative public opinion.—Nearly two pages are devoted to the great comic poet, one, in briefer type, giving a synopsis of the *Frogs*. This is, as it should be; for this immortal play is the very cornerstone, in any case, the earliest extant specimen of literary criticism, and yet, in a history of classical scholarship, I cannot but think that the long list of plays, either directly cited or alluded to, according to the scholiasts, together with the number of lines parodied by him, ought to have been given, in order to convey a more vivid idea, not only of the extent of his reading, but of the keenness and the minuteness of his criticism, prejudiced and unfair though it undoubtedly often was.

Four pages in smaller type are given to a synopsis and discussion of Plato’s *Cratylus*. I do not object to the space accorded to this exceedingly interesting and important dialogue, but on the basis of comparative and intrinsic values the little more than two pages reserved for the *Poetics* seems a very meagre allowance. Regarding the Cratylean etymologies themselves, I regret to see Dr. Sandys still clinging to a view which, since the time of Schleiermacher has, indeed, been advocated by many illustrious

scholars. It is argued that, since the Platonic etymologies are, with but few exceptions, nothing short of ludicrous, they must be regarded in the light of caricatures or persiflage, as a sort of *reductio ad absurdum* of the etymological vagaries of his unscientific contemporaries. But this contention, I have always been convinced, is wholly unwarranted. It proceeds on the assumption that 'the king can do no wrong,' and it utterly ignores the well-known fact that etymology has only in very recent days been put upon anything like a scientific basis. It is psychologically improbable that Plato who, with the intuition of genius, discerned, as it were, in the distance, and in a few instances actually anticipated some truths regarding the origin and growth of language, universally accepted to-day, that Plato, I say, would have consciously invented such grotesque etymologies, had he been in possession of more accurate information. If they were all concocted in a spirit of Aristophanic badinage, then it is certainly passing strange that two milleniums were allowed to elapse before their satirical humour was discovered. No! Plato was as serious as ever Varro was in his *de lingua Latina*. Etymology exercised a strange fascination upon the ancient mind, poets, historians, and philosophers being as irresistibly attracted to it, as the moth to the light, and with equally disastrous results. The etymological monstrosities of a Plato and a Varro are, moreover, hardly worse than some of those perpetrated by G. Hermann or Hemsterhusius who had less excuse for them and whom no one would ever accuse of having indulged in playful fancy. Nay, some of the etymologies which find their way into print to-day still have a decidedly Cratylean flavour. We can, therefore, ill afford to smile at Plato for his etymological failure, but at the same time let us cease placing him on a pedestal to which he has no justifiable claim.

Aristotle, as already remarked, unfortunately does not receive a separate treatment, but his Homeric studies, his *Didascalie*, his contributions to Rhetoric and Dramatic Criticism are discussed under these various headings, while a chapter is devoted to Plato's and Aristotle's criticism of Poetry in general. A synopsis of the *Poetics* is, of course, not lacking, and it is duly extolled as a masterpiece which was not to be rivalled till the appearance of the *περὶ ὕψους*, to which exactly double the space accorded to the *Poetics* is assigned

(pp. 282-286). I yield to no one in my admiration for the immortal rhetorical essay of the Anonymus, but if we consider the brilliant inductions, the analytic acumen, the depth and breadth and catholicity of observation, and above all the marvellous influence upon dramatic literature and aesthetical canons of the brief and fragmentary Aristotelian treatise, the value of the *περὶ ὕψους* sinks into utter insignificance.

Aristotle's *περὶ ποιητῶν* Dr. Sandys thinks may have contained materials for his *Poetics* (p. 75), upon which he would thus have built his theoretical superstructure, as the *Πολιτεία* e.g. constituted the basis of the *Politics*. But the *περὶ ποιητῶν*, as can still be demonstrated, was one of the popular dialogues which discussed for a reading public the same or similar topics dealt with in the esoteric treatise which was never intended for publication and, indeed, there is *not a trace in extant sources* that the *Poetics* were ever consulted. The sporadic references in Themistius, in Diogenes Laertius, and certain parallelisms in Plutarch and even in Horace's *Ars Poetica*, whether directly or through the medium of Neoptolemos of Parion, were, if Aristotelian, ultimately derived from the *περὶ ποιητῶν*. If Dr. Sandys' surmise (p. 63) that Aristotle must have mentioned Thespis as introducing the prologue and the *ῥῆσις*, 'either in the fuller form of the *Poetics* or in some other work,' be correct, which I am disposed to doubt, we should not hesitate to ascribe these statements also to the 'other work,' i.e. the *περὶ ποιητῶν*, nor can I see any warrant for the assertion (p. 64), that Aristotle clearly preferred the poets of the Middle Comedy to those of the Old, because he labels Aristophanes a 'lampooner.' He certainly merits this epithet, but that Aristotle at the same time saw in him, as we do, a great deal more, is evidenced by the significant fact that, well acquainted though he was with the entire comic drama, he yet selected the 'lampooner' as its foremost and typical representative, just as he selects Homer for the Epos and Sophocles for Tragedy (Cp. *Poet.* ch. 3). Moreover, in view of such plays as the *Odyssees* of Cratinus and the *Aiolosicon* and *Plutus* of Aristophanes himself, to which even ancient critics assigned the *τῆς μέσης κομωδίας τύπος*, it is extremely doubtful, whether he would have been able to recognize the subtle and artificial differentiation between the Old and Middle Comedy, which latter is a purely

transitional phase at the best, the distinction in question having been made possible only by the rise of the New Comedy which Aristotle did not live to see.—It may be remarked in passing that Dr. Sandys at the close of this first book, inserts an almost full-page illustration of the Spada Palace statue, without a word of comment. But this statue, as long known, has nothing whatever to do with Aristotle, for not only did the present head not belong to it originally, but the basic inscription (ARISTI) itself proves that it was never intended to represent the Stagirite, but probably *Aristippus* (See Visconti, *Iconogr. Grecque*, Matz-Duhn, *Antike Bildwerke in Rom* I. No. 1174, Studniczka, *Röm. Mitth.* v. p. 12, Helbig, *Führer*, ad. loc.).

Bk. II. While the Athenian Age takes up about eighty pages, the treatment of the *Alexandrian* is comprised within but *sixty*. This, it would seem, is out of all proportion to the actual achievements of both periods, so far as classical scholarship is concerned. In the earlier, indeed, philological research as a profession or pursued as an end in itself can hardly be said to have existed, whereas in Alexandria it was developed to the highest point which it was destined to reach in antiquity. No new discovery marking progress, with the possible exception of Greek Syntax in the hands of Apollonius and Herodianus, is met with in later Graeco-Roman days. With the Alexandrian methods of textual and literary criticism all future scholars, including the Roman, rested satisfied. In the field of exegesis also, they left nothing for subsequent commentators to do but to compile, to condense and, in general, to feast upon the richly laden banquet provided for them. It is true, we possess not a single work of these Alexandrian savants, but from their 'disiecta membra' we can still acquire a perfectly adequate conception of their methods, the scope of their studies and, at least, the titles of most of their writings have been rescued from oblivion. With one exception, to be mentioned later, Dr. Sandys has, indeed, omitted nothing of salient importance. The story of the Library and the Museum, the names, data, and works, with an occasional brief estimate of the labours of the most noted scholars of this age, are all given with the requisite bibliographical references and the entire treatment is marked by that scholarly accuracy which distinguishes the work as a whole. And yet, I doubt, if any student, not already thoroughly conversant with the subject,

will rise from the perusal of these chapters with any other impression than that these 'dusty Alexandrians, pent up for ever between sea and sand-hills, drinking the tank water and never hearing the sound of a running stream,' as Charles Kingsley characterized them, were after all nothing but *γυνιοβόμβυκες*, mere 'doctores umbratici.' This unjust conception is primarily due to the fact that the author, in his otherwise laudable striving for utmost conciseness and rigid objectivity, has neglected to give, either in an introduction or in retrospect, the requisite cultural background or perspective, which might have enabled the student to see more clearly the peculiar causes and conditions which made Alexandrian literature and scholarship what it is. The critical estimate of the Byzantine period, based on Krumbacher, Wilamowitz, and Frederic Harrison (see p. 417, 424 ff.) may show how adequately, though briefly, this might have been done. The evolution of the cultured man of leisure into the professional scholar, the shifting of the intellectual focus from democratic Athens to monarchical Alexandria, the fact that, with Menander, Greek genius had virtually ceased to be spontaneously creative and original, nearly all the forms of literary expression having been developed to their artistic culmination—these are some of the salient considerations which will help us better to understand and appreciate Alexandrian achievement. These scholars simply fulfilled the mission to which they were historically assigned. They took an inventory of their priceless literary inheritance and bequeathed it to posterity. The poets, having no longer a nation for an audience in the strict meaning of that word, and with no great objects to kindle their imagination, were compelled to appeal to a highly cultured, but small reading public. Artificiality of expression, erudition, and formal elaboration thus naturally took the place of the simplicity, spontaneity, and inspiration which distinguished the Golden Age of Greek Literature, and which was recognized as irrevocably past. But true as this is, our knowledge of Alexandrian literature is after all too fragmentary to warrant the somewhat sweeping, though traditional condemnation found on p. 115. In any case, Theocritus must be exempted, who, typical Alexandrian though he was in many respects, is admittedly one of the world's immortal poets. Yet he is referred to but briefly and 'kühl bis ans Herz hinan,' the author having nothing further to say of his matchless Idyls than

that they must have charmed these urban Alexandrians by their pictures of rural life. Strictly speaking, the whole paragraph on Alexandrian Literature is somewhat irrelevant, for we learn nothing of the studies which poets, like Apollonius, Callimachus, Lycophron, and Theocritus, devoted to their predecessors, for it is only on this score that they can have any just claim upon our attention in a history of classical learning. Still, perhaps not too much stress should be laid upon the above desiderata in a first attempt at a complete survey of the entire subject, the author being only too naturally drawn to inspection rather than to introspection, to synthesis rather than to analysis, and I doubt not that in a second edition Dr. Sandys, relieved of the initial task of collecting, sifting, and arranging the vast concrete material, will not fail to add at proper intervals in his book illuminating comments, such as I have indicated, so that the student may more readily recognize definite and characteristic landmarks in the development of classical learning.

In matters of details, I note the following: The sceptical attitude assumed toward the *librarianship* of *Callimachus* seems to me unwarranted. It is, to say the least, as authentically attested, as that of Zenodotus, Eratosthenes, or Aristarchus. The pinacographic labours of Callimachus, as Dr. Sandys himself admits, would alone render such an assumption intrinsically plausible, and it would be still further strengthened, if Th. Birt's ingenious hypothesis (*Das antike Buchwesen*, pp. 486 ff.) be correct, as it may well be, that the famous saying of Callimachus, μέγα βιβλίον, μέγα κακόν (to cite it in its current, shortened form) was not a satirical allusion to the long-winded epic of Apollonius, but referred rather to an innovation of Callimachus, by which the hitherto prevalent but cumbrous 'Grossrollensystem' was discarded for the more practicable 'Kleinrollen,' a change which would in a measure correspond to that from the ponderous folio to the lighter octavo in more modern times. But the author, in company with some scholars of repute, lays stress upon chronological difficulties which are alleged to militate against the librarianship of Callimachus. These objections do not, however, in my judgment, possess any genuine validity. The traditional data of the lives of Zenodotus and Callimachus, as well as the birth of Eratosthenes, are admittedly mere approximations, and even if Zenodotus did die not far from 234, nearly 90 years old, there is not the slightest reason

for supposing that he held the onerous position of librarian for more than 50 years, even granting that he received the appointment as late as the accession to the throne of his pupil, Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, in 285 B.C. He may, for aught we know to the contrary, have retired at the age of sixty or even earlier, being succeeded by his pupil Callimachus, who would then have been not more than fifty, probably somewhat younger. After an incumbency of this office of about 25 years, he was in turn succeeded by Eratosthenes who, according to the generally accepted chronology, was called to Alexandria just about the time of Callimachus's death (c. 235 B.C.). The elasticity of our available data, therefore, our complete ignorance, in particular, of the length of time Zenodotus held the librarianship, the positive and unimpeachable statement that Callimachus was appointed to the same position, the strong collateral evidence, finally, pointing in the same direction—all these considerations ought to be sufficient to warrant the acceptance of the *librarian* Callimachus without any philological compunctions of conscience.

On p. 118 we are told that Aristarchus had criticized Philetas in a special *ὑπόμνημα*, entitled *πρὸς Φιλητᾶν*. But this is clearly an error, shared by many others. It was, I am convinced, nothing more than a kind of supplement to the *Ἀτακτα* of Philetas, the first Greek Dictionary known to us and which seems to have enjoyed a wide celebrity, being probably still extant in the time of Athenaeus, who quotes from them a dozen times. See esp. ix. 383 c. In like manner Aristophanes composed a book *πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου πίνακες*, i.e. additions to the great Catalogue, and Callimachus himself wrote *πρὸς Πραξιφάνην*, his teacher, which was, therefore, presumably not of a censorious nature, but, like the *πρὸς Κομανόν* of Aristarchus, merely designated the recipient by way of dedication. If the treatise *πρὸς Φιλητᾶν* had been of a polemical character, we should have expected *κατά* (contra) rather than *πρός* (ad), this preposition being used *hostili sensu* only if it does not refer to a proper name. Cp. e.g. Aesch. *κατὰ Κτησιφώντος*, Josephus *κατὰ Ἀπίωνος*, Hippolytos *κατὰ πασῶν αἰρέσεων*, Proclus *κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*, by the side of Aristarchus *πρὸς τὸ Ξένωνος παράδοξον*, Sext. Emp. *πρὸς μαθηματικούς*, Origen *πρὸς . . . Κέλσου ἀληθῆ λόγον* etc.

There is a wide-spread belief, though the 'canons of best authors,' compiled at

Pergamum and Alexandria, in a measure disprove it (see p. 156), that, with the possible exception of Plato and Aristotle, the philological labours of Alexandrians were virtually confined to poetry, while their Pergamene rivals devoted themselves with almost equal one-sidedness to prose, and it is this belief that has had not a little to do with the general acceptance of the view that the Canon of the Ten Orators originated in the school of Crates. Under these circumstances an otherwise insignificant bit of evidence, preserved among papyrus scraps, brought to light by Grenfell and Hunt, but unfortunately overlooked by Dr. Sandys, at once assumes a singular importance. It is this: *Ἀριστάρχου*. [εἰς τὸ Ἡρόδοτου α' ὑπόμνημα (Amherst Papyri II <1901> No. 12). Not only have we here the first proof that Aristarchus occupied himself with the 'father of history,' but we are also justified in inferring that the alleged neglect of the prose master-pieces of Greek literature is probably an unwarranted assumption, not unnaturally caused by the almost complete silence of our sources regarding this phase of Alexandrian research, although we shall not be far wrong in supposing that, if their activity in this field had not been incomparably inferior in bulk and quality to their consummate achievements in the criticism and exegesis of poetry, we should have known a little more about it than we admittedly do. In the brief note (p. 136) on the calculation of the ἀκμή, that peculiar chronological panacea of Eratosthenes and his disciple Apollodorus, I miss a reference to the brilliant and fundamental article on

the subject by Diels (*Rhein. Mus.* 31 pp. 1 ff.) to whom we owe the rediscovery of this ancient method and the knowledge of its influence. P. 155: The statement in Strabo that, according to Crates, Menelaus had sailed from Gadeira to India, probably suggested, as may be remarked in passing, the same idea to Columbus, as I have endeavoured to show in the *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars*, Dec. 1902.

Excepting a few minor details, such as the non-Homeric contributions of Aristarchus, the only serious omission in the account of Alexandrian scholarship seems to me the failure even to mention *Demetrius Magnes*, a contemporary of Cicero. One need but glance at the long but certainly far from exhaustive list of homonyms, such as the Apollonii, Apollodori, Demetrii, Dionysii, etc., in Wissowa's Lexicon, to feel that the very idea of Demetrius' works, entitled *Περὶ συνωνύμων πόλεων* and *Περὶ τῶν συνωνύμων ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων*, was in the nature of an inspiration. Such treatises must have filled a long-felt want, as is, indeed, evidenced by the extensive use made of them in many later writers, and the chapter on Deinarchus, fortunately preserved to us by Dionysius, also shows what circumspection, learning, and scholarly accuracy Demetrius applied to his grateful but difficult task. The loss of the second work, in particular, is most deplorable, so that its author eminently deserved, at least, a passing mention in a complete survey of classical scholarship.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

(To be continued.)

BRIEFER NOTICES.

A Greek Grammar: Accidence. By GUSTAVE SIMONSON, M.A., M.D., author of *A Plain Examination of Socialism*. Swan Sonnenschein. xiii+351 pp. 6s. 6d.

THIS Grammar has many good points. It is written with a considerable knowledge of modern discovery, and avoids most of the old mistakes in matters of form. Thus the facts about σ:ττ are correctly stated (p. 6); evidence is given for the pronunciation of internal aspirate in certain compounds (12); the sounds of the symbols are carefully stated, and (a useful addition) the Latin transliterations of some are given (p. 11);

the verb-forms have been carefully sifted, and such tables as the Synopsis on p. 125 or 126, with its classified stems, are excellent; the sections on the formation of words and the classification of compounds, at the end, are clear and compendious; the print is good. On the other hand, in a book of so much detail, we should have expected more. The author has not studied the history of the alphabet, or he would not write that *Sampi* is 'evidently a combination of C (= σάν, i.e. σίγμα) and π': it is of course the old sibilant M. Both F and Q are found in inscriptions, as should have been stated. On the