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. Macci Plauti Aulularia.

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 03 / March 1889, pp 123 - 123

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194351, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194351

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1889). T. Macci Plauti Aulularia.. The Classical Review, 3, pp 123-123
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194351

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the insignificance which Parmenides attaches to his own account of the phenomenal world, as compared with the part of his poem on true Being.

In excuse for such an edition, it may perhaps be pleaded that it is, as the editor says, the first English one. But there is the pity of it. As to the greater part of the commentary, we regret that English work should have begun with an inaccurate compilation from foreign sources. As to the philosophy, which in matter and manner is a sort of modern Neoplatonism, it would be

depressing if foreign critics thought the book at all representative, and supposed that the study of Plato in England had not yet advanced beyond this uncritical stage.

Fortunately, however, valuable help on the *Timaeus* is to be had from English sources. There is also a considerable discussion of the dialogue in the translated part of Zeller's monumental work, the importance of which from an educational point of view and for purposes of independent study is well known. We have learnt it still better by contrast.

J. COOK WILSON.

T. MACCI PLAUTI AULULARIA.

T. Macci Plauti AULULARIA, texte Latin, publié d'après les travaux les plus récents, avec un Commentaire critique et explicatif et une Introduction, par ALEXANDRE BLANCHARD. Paris, Klincksieck, 1888. 3 frcs.

THE title-page of this edition would lead one to expect a text based upon the masterly edition of Goetz (1881), with such improvements as have been suggested during the seven years which have since elapsed (e.g. by Leo in his edition of 1885), and such contributions as the editor has to offer of his own. M. Blanchard however has preferred the more arduous and ambitious course of constructing his text entirely *de novo*. In the preface he states his method as follows: 'Un éditeur de Plaute doit avoir lu les commentateurs, connaître leurs conjectures, les goûter selon leur valeur, mais les négliger le plus souvent pour s'en tenir à la lettre des manuscrits, du moins toutes les fois que cela est possible.' The principle here laid down is unexceptionable; but what is possible and what is impossible in Plautine criticism is a question of evidence, which must be answered according to the lights of the critic. The present volume does not give one the impression that M. Blanchard has himself entered into a minute and laborious examination of the usage of Plautus or that he has a wide experience of MSS. One is rather led to infer that by the time he reaches a second edition he will be inclined to modify his views on a number of passages and will probably find himself more in harmony with doctrines which at present hold the field. At any rate his introduction and notes ought to have stated

more explicitly than they do the grounds of his dissent. One would like to know on what principle he can justify his reading in line 81, *Redi nunc jam intro* in view of line 327, where under precisely similar circumstances he reads *Tace nunc iam tu*: in both passages the MSS. have *nunc iam*, and the line begins with an iambic word. Again, is it not inconsistent to read (with the MSS., but in defiance of the metre) *Meae fidei tuaeque rei* in line 121, while accepting the obvious correction *filiai* for *filiae* in 372 and 797? It is hard to reconcile with M. Blanchard's general principles the change of the MS. reading *sunt* into *sint* (368), a change which seemed unnecessary to Goetz and to Wagner in his second edition (cf. Rud. 304): one wants to know the editor's grounds for suspecting 648 to be corrupt. In regard to the scansion of line 47 can the editor explain his two statements (i.) that *modo* forms two short syllables: (ii.) that the first syllable of *incedit* is short? He scans 655 *Mănē măn- | ē quīs ille | est*, etc., though in the very next line he recognizes that *ille*, even with the ictus on it, may be a pyrrhic; the scansion *mănē măn- | ē quīs ille | est*, etc., is in accordance with a well-known law as to variation of accent in two successive iambic words. In the explanatory notes the editor has hardly used his space to the best advantage. We are informed three times over that *sis* = *si vis*. In 129 *utrique* is most simply regarded as a dative, not a genitive. In 606 *omni* = *ulla* (not *nulla*).

E. A. SONNENSCHN.