



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The tract ascribed by some to Libanius has more claim to be called a "Complete Letter Writer," and defines 41 types, not omitting the love letter. His examples are less stilted than the other's, but we cannot believe that such a handbook had any vogue outside the school of rhetoric; in fact we have letters enough among the papyri collections to prove that the real thing was unlike in all respects to the school formula. But there was, no doubt, a special etiquette for writing to a sophist, and perhaps it was such a handbook as this that inspired Marcus Aurelius, whose epistolary style is so admired by Philostratus, with his exclamatory letter to Fronto—"O verba! O nitor! O argutiae! O kharites! O ἀσκησις! O omnia!"

In his Introduction Weichert collects the precepts of the rhetoricians on the varieties, style, and subject-matter of the model letter. One observes that such rules were made to be broken. The pupil is warned by Demetrius to avoid philosophic reflections, circumlocutions, sententiae, and other sophistic devices, but we know well that no sophist or pupil of a sophist had the heart to leave them out.

On the question of the authorship of these two tracts Weichert decides that the Demetrius who composed the τύποι was not he of Phalerum, and he follows Brinkmann in assigning the work to the second century B.C.; it was written by one Demetrius, in Egypt, and is the oldest extant handbook of its type. Weichert was able to test the tract assigned to Libanius in the tradition by an analysis of that sophist's own letters, and decides that they reflect the school of Libanius, so that we have here the familiar ghost of the pupil who publishes his master's notes in a form not intended by the lecturer. And since another tradition assigned the tract to Proclus the Platonist, which is impossible, it is evident that here we have the clue to the pupil's name, especially as we know that Libanius had no less than three correspondents named Proclus. This is a very neat explanation of the Proclus tradition and of the obvious likeness to the style of Libanius himself. This gives us for both the tracts that other soothing apparition—another man of the same name.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
February, 1911

WILMER CAVE WRIGHT

A Study of the Greek Epigram before 300 B.C. By FLORENCE ALDEN GRAGG. *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.* Vol. XLVI, No. 1 (September, 1910). Pp. 62.

The material of Miss Gragg's essay includes 324 epigrams from monuments and from the literary tradition. The writer's purpose is to define the characteristics of these epigrams, and in so doing to mark such development as is discernible before the Hellenistic period. Although there is no trace of polemic in the discussion, the conclusions militate against Reitzenstein's views: Miss Gragg believes that satirical epigrams were written in the sixth

century, that "satiric, convivial, gnomic, and love epigrams are developing rapidly" in the fifth century, and that "the epigram was early considered a distinct branch of literature." To a considerable extent her disagreement with Reitzenstein is due to her less skeptical attitude toward the epigrams attributed to classical poets in the literary tradition, and to her inclusion of material from Archilochus, Theognis, Euenus, and others that is usually treated as elegy rather than epigram. To a less degree the difference may be due to the elasticity of descriptive terms: who shall say whether the mere appearance of the name of the dead or of the dedicator *extra metrum* is sufficient to stamp an epigram as "a recognized form of *Kunstdichtung*"? All depends upon Reitzenstein's understanding of the terms employed; Miss Gragg is evidently attaching a different import to them.

In general the conservative attitude toward Reitzenstein's ingenious theories is commendable, especially in respect to the contention of the German scholar that the "literary" epigram necessarily presupposes the collection in book form of inscribed epigrams; nor are we disposed to object to the charity of the author in recognizing the authenticity of epigrams ascribed to early poets in MSS. But we must demur to the inclusion of the short elegiac poems of Euenus, Theognis, and others in an account of the epigram. Not that these poems do not belong in such a study, but simply that the writer, having once included them, immediately imposes upon herself a larger task—the history of τὰ ἐλεγεία and not merely of the epigram. For whatever connection they may have with epigram, their precise relation cannot be appreciated if they are considered apart from longer elegies. Miss Gragg does not need to be reminded that historical study of the epigram before 300 is impossible; the only historical introduction to the Hellenistic epigram is through τὰ ἐλεγεία in the broadest sense.

The essay bears every trace of careful workmanship: it shows an admirable command of the sources and of the interpretative material; it contributes interesting notes on the influence of other types, on meter, and on dialect; and it serves a very useful purpose in the mere collection of the scattered remains of early epigram, and in the convenient tabulation of recurrent details and formulas in the inscribed epigram. Although a defect in the plan has given rise to partial truth or total error, in execution the study is a model *Erstlingsarbeit*.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

P. Terenti Afri Hauton Timorumenos. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Critical Appendix, and Index, by F. G. BALLENTINE. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1910. Pp. xxi+129.

This is a difficult book to review. It shows careful study of Terentian literature (with one odd gap, noted below), and independent examination