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](#)

Engelbrecht's *Patristische Analecten* *Patristische Analecten*, by August Engelbrecht (Wien 1892; 100 pp.).

J. Armitage Robinson

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 09 / November 1892, pp 404 - 406

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186743, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186743

How to cite this article:

J. Armitage Robinson (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 404-406 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186743

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

stress on the latter point. He shows how closely Plautus in his *il(le) revertitur* approaches to the Spanish *el reverte*, in *il(le) revenit* to Provençal *el reve(n)*, how his scansion of *dé illa, cūm illa* explains the Romance forms *della, colla*, how *ēm illum* became *ellum*, a form almost identical with that used at present in the Abruzzi, *ello*. When I add that there is a detailed discussion of the conditions under which Syncope, and the dropping of a Nasal before a consonant is allowed in Latin, it will be seen that the book covers a large amount of ground, and is of great importance for students of Latin. There is also in the first section a lucid and forcible exposition of the great law of Plautine prosody by which long syllables are shortened in words like *cavē, abī, patēr fert, simūl fert, volūptatem*, generally known as the law of the 'brevis brevians.' I see with regret that Dr. Skutsch favours its extension to medial syllables long by nature, e.g. *verēbamini* (al. *veremini*) Ter. Phorm. 902, and proposes the scansion *illam amābam olim* in *Epid.* 135 (p. 107). Not only facts but *a priori* considerations seem to me against such a shortening; but the subject is too large a one to discuss here. In the list of examples of the word *unde* in Plautus (p. 64), it is interesting to note how regularly the metrical accentuation coincides with the natural accentuation of the word, as stated by the Latin Grammarians, viz. paroxytone when Interrogative, barytone when Relative. There are scarcely half a dozen clear instances of conflict, the most marked being *Most.* 547. In *Mil.* 376, I

would read with the Palatine MSS. against the palimpsest: *opsecro, unde | Exiit haec huc? Und(e) nisi domo? Domo? Mē viden? Te video*—making *exit* the Perfect Tense, and giving to *me viden* the normal accentuation of the phrase in Plautus (*mē viden, mē vide*). In the sense of 'the where-withal' *unde* seems to have been accented, unlike the Relative, e.g. *Capt.* 850 *scis bene esse si sit unde*. In *Epid.* 144 *und(e) lubet* is a compound like *quōlubet*. *Quippe*, to judge from the list of examples on p. 95, seems to have retained its full trochaic form in the collocations *quippe qui, quippe quom, quippe quando*. With regard to the numerous lines where the MSS. offer the abnormal ictus *illīc* (Adverb), *illī* (Dative), Dr. Skutsch, while he agrees that the probable remedy for most is to alter the reading to *illī* (Adverb), *illīc* (Dative), thinks it too bold a stroke to apply this remedy to all, and prefers to suppose that the forms of *ille* without the enclitic *-ce* often came to take the accent on the last syllable, a supposition which undoubtedly finds some support from certain remarks which he quotes from the Latin Grammarians. The extension of the 'Elision of *-s* before a Vowel,' proposed by Dr. Leo, beyond a very limited area, e.g. *amatu's, amatu'st*, seems to me hardly warranted by the evidence as yet produced, and so in *Rud.* 888 (see p. 168), *nam in cōlumbari cōll(us) haud multo pōst erit*, it seems better to read *nam collus in cōlūmbari* (cf. *Plaut. frag.* 249 W.).

W. M. LINDSAY.

ENGELBRECHT'S *PATRISTISCHE ANALECTEN*.

Patristische Analecten, by AUGUST ENGELBRECHT (Wien 1892; 100 pp.).

WE have here four short Studies which the editor of Faustus and Ruricius in the *Vienna Corpus* (1891, vol. xxi.) gives us by way of Epilegomena. The first deals with the Ps.-Hieronymian Tract *De septem ordinibus Ecclesiae*. This is a letter from a theologian of the fifth century to a correspondent who has been recently elected Bishop by the popular vote on the ground of his influential position, although he has had no ministerial experience to qualify him for the duties of his office. He has appealed for some instruction, and he gets it from a severe mentor who does not shrink from warning him

against making just such appointments as his own. Internal evidence points to Gaul as the place of writing, and to 427 as the approximate date. This has been recently indicated by Dom Morin of the Benedictine Abbey of Maredsous in Belgium. But Engelbrecht challenges Dom Morin's further conclusion that the letter was written by Faustus of Riez to Rusticus of Narbonne. Rusticus had long been a monk at Lerins: whereas the new Bishop had been living in the world and was married. Faustus himself was in the year 427 a young monk twenty years of age at Lerins, though six years later he was made Abbot. It is therefore most unlikely that he would have been consulted in a case like this. Moreover the

style of the writer of the letter is a marked one, and is not that of Faustus. A further argument against the identification of the writer with Faustus may be found in the Latin Version from which his Scripture quotations are made. A few examples will show that he is familiar with a pre-Hieronymian Version, whereas the citations of Faustus appear to correspond far more closely with the Vulgate. Thus in Isa. xl. 6 he reads (Vallarsi, t. xi., p. 2, ff. 159, 162): 'omnis caro foenum, et omnia gloria hominis ut flos foeni. aruit flos,' &c. (Vulg. 'eius,' 'agri,' 'exsiccatum est'); Ezek. iii. 17 (f. 170) 'speculatorem te posui' (Vulg. 'dedi te'); Luc. xxii. 27 (f. 158) 'in gentibus quidem qui discumbit, major est: inter uos autem non sic, sed qui ministrat' (Vulg. 'nonne qui recumbit?'); Jno. xv. 5 (f. 174) 'uos autem sarmenta' (Vulg. 'uos palmites'); 1 Tim. iv. 12 (f. 168) 'forma...in sermone' (Vulg. 'exemplum...in uerbo'). These instances might easily be increased. In one passage, 1 Cor. xii. 27, he gives us rightly (f. 167) 'membra ex parte = ἐκ μέρους' (Vulg. 'ex membro' = ἐκ μέλους), for which Sabatier gives no Latin authority. It is possible that a closer investigation might throw some light on the personality or at least the locality of the writer: but Engelbrecht does not seem to have noticed the problem of the Biblical quotations either here or in his edition of Faustus.

The opening lines of the piece are difficult, but it may be questioned whether Engelbrecht is right in implying from them that the new Bishop had had even a slight experience of the priestly office. The words 'ad sacerdotalis ordinis dignitatem' may be taken as referring generally to his episcopal office, and the instructions as to his relations with his wife (f. 171, 'propter...periculum sacerdoti') seem to bear this out. According to Engelbrecht, the writer adds two words to our dictionaries: 'potentari,' in the sense of 'potentem fieri,' and 'professa,' twice used apparently for 'an orphan' (Waise). But Ducange gives: 'professa, femina continens, quae uirginitatem profitetur, non tamen in Monasterio,' adding an example from a Spanish Canon where 'professa' and 'uidua' occur together as here. Although the results reached are mainly negative, the Study is an interesting one, and the style and temper in which it is written are a model of sober criticism.

2. The second Study is entitled 'A MS. Edition of the Letters of Ruricius.' The search for MSS. brings to light now and then a mournful proof of the disappointment of

a scholar's hopes, in the shape of an edition fully prepared for the press, but from some unknown cause never finding its way into print. An example of this is Hoeschel's edition of the *Philocalia* of Origen, with its dedication to Sir Henry Wotton, completed in 1606 and still sleeping in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. Engelbrecht introduces us to a similar instance a century later in the edition of Ruricius with an introduction and critical notes by Père Danton (Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 11378). Although no fresh evidence for the textual tradition is preserved in this book, Engelbrecht confesses that he was wrong in neglecting it; and he makes full amends by devoting twenty pages to extracts from its notes, to which he has frequently added further elucidations of his own.

3. Next comes a fascinating little essay on the Modes of Address used by the Bishop Ruricius to his various correspondents. The consistency with which these are employed leads to important conclusions as to the rank of those whom he addresses. Engelbrecht promises us a complete investigation into the modes of address employed in late Latin letter-writing, and gives us here a specimen of his method and results. The use of 'filius' is especially noteworthy. It is used by a Bishop to a younger Bishop, to Priests, to persons of high station in the world, and to personal friends. 'Patronus' and 'papa' are confined to Bishops: they sometimes occur together ('patrono et papae Aeonio episcopo'). One exceptional form of address is: 'Domino uenerabili admirabili et sanctis omnibus aequiperando fratri Sidonio Videnti Ruricius.' Here Engelbrecht finds the true explanation by a comparison of 1 Sam. ix. 6, where in the Vulgate 'uidens' is used interchangeably with 'uir dei.' It is simply a translation of the seer (LXX. ὁ βλέπων). More apt illustrations of its use as a title would be 1 Chron. ix. 22 'Samuel uidens,' and 2 Chron. ix. 29 'in uisione Addo uidentis.' The whole of this Study is full of interest, and it is full of importance for the historical criticism of letters of the period.

4. The last section is devoted to gathering together the results of criticisms which have appeared since the publication of the Vienna edition of Faustus and Ruricius. A special discussion of Dom Morin's review is to appear shortly in the *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*. We may note with regret that, while there are eight German and three French reviews, no English scholar seems to have criticized the book. It is a serious loss to us that our greater English scholars almost

never write such reviews, although such an exception as Lightfoot's famous review of Stanley's 'Corinthians' is a signal instance of the usefulness of work of this kind. It is the minute criticism of details that alone can afford any satisfaction or give

any real assistance to an author. We may hope that the *Classical Review* will prevail on those who can criticize in this way to do so from time to time, as indeed it has done occasionally already.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

FOWLER'S *JULIUS CAESAR*.

Julius Caesar and the Foundation of the Roman Imperial System, by W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1892. 5s.

MR. WARDE FOWLER'S *Life of Caesar* in the 'Heroes of the Nations' series is an excellent piece of work. The author seems to have kept in view the requirements of the unlearned reader who desires to understand the career and work of the greatest statesman of antiquity. The arrangement of facts is well-proportioned, the style lucid and vigorous. The interest of the narrative never flags. The portrait of the hero is gradually drawn and finished with repeated touches, as each circumstance of his career brings out his characteristic qualities. The limits of the book did not allow as full a survey of the previous history of Rome as could be desired. But such space as could be devoted to this purpose has been judiciously employed. Nothing that was strictly necessary by way of introduction has been left unsaid, and while the biographical point of view is always maintained, no opportunity is lost of explaining the political and social condition which the Graeco-Roman world had reached in the century before Christ.

All these merits the unlearned reader will discover for himself. But there are other qualities in Mr. Fowler's work to which no one can do full justice who is not acquainted with the original authorities, the difficulties they present, and the controversies to which they have given rise. Direct reference to these is for the most part excluded by the the scheme of the book. But those who are familiar with them will not fail to see that they have everywhere been carefully weighed by a writer fully equipped with the necessary learning and remarkably impartial in his judgments. In both these respects Mr. Froude's attractive *Life of Caesar*, though conveying upon the whole a true picture, leaves something to be desired.

The only part of Mr. Fowler's book

which seems to me open to criticism is that which deals with the period before Caesar's first consulship. Like all the rest of us who have written on it, he is rather too much disposed to make conjectures do service in the absence of ascertained facts and to build up an apparently solid causeway of narrative on the quicksands of fragmentary and untrustworthy texts. No one—I say it with the deepest respect for his unrivalled learning—has carried this practice to such unwarrantable lengths as Mommsen. His purest conjectures are stated by himself as if they were undisputed facts and are accepted by the present generation of English scholars with the same unquestioning reverence as those of Niebuhr were by the last. What makes this the more unsafe with regard to the period we are considering is that Mommsen writes of it with the prejudice of a violent partisan.

The statements which have come down to us as to the early career of Caesar are very scanty and fragmentary, and are too often marked by credulity or bad faith. We must therefore be content to be ignorant. The interest of this part of Caesar's life is, after all, mainly personal. The historian is not concerned with him till he begins to exercise an important influence on the course of Roman affairs: and no one can show that this was the case before the consulship of Cicero, when Caesar was probably thirty-nine—only two years younger than Cromwell at the meeting of the Long Parliament. The remaining nineteen years of his life are fortunately the most fully known period of ancient history.

Mommsen's attempted distinction between 'the democracy' and 'the great multitude' and his discovery of 'the attempts of the democracy to escape from the impending military dictatorship' rest on nothing but his unproved assertions. His detestation and scorn of democracy will not allow him to admit that the supersession of oligarchy by the