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](#)

***Terenti Phormio*. Edited by the Rev A. Sloman. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 3 Mk.**

J. H. Onions

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 1-2 / February 1888, pp 23 - 25

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191863, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191863

How to cite this article:

J. H. Onions (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 23-25 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191863

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The 'heap of dew' is a characteristic comic expression like *nebulae cyatho*, *Poen.* i. 2, 64—an expression which, though now generally expelled from the text, seems to me to have been rightly preserved by the early editors. Or perhaps we should read:—

Post autem *rorem* nisi tu aut *ervom* ederis.

157

Nequitiae stabulum.

Ussing strangely describes this verse as a *dimeter creticus*, as if he took the *a* in *stabulum* to be long like the *a* in *pabulum* in the verse before.

207

Magis nimio munditiis Munditiam antideo.

This form of expression by which a quality or state is personified is common in *Plautus*, but it has not been recognised yet in *Capit.* ii. 3, 32, which should be printed

Qui me Honore honestiorem semper fecit et facit.

221

Eho tu, nihili cana culex, vix teneor quin quae decent te dicam.

One feels disposed to accept here A. Palmer's emendation (*Hermath.* v. p. 55)

Nihili cucule! vix teneor, &c.

The word *cucule* is just the one wanted, and it is such a word as would have been corrupted into *culex*.

663

Habet, sed duos.

This is a very good instance of the idiomatic use of *sed*, which is excellently illustrated by Mayor on *Juv.* v. 147. It seems to be very rare in early Latin; however Mayor quotes an example from *Rud.* 789. Ussing does not comment on the usage in either place.

687

Attat cesso magnifice patriceque ita ero meo ire advorsum.

All the MS. give *patriceque amiceque*. The latter word was expelled as a gloss by Hermann, though it is actually written twice in A. But on what word could *amice* be a gloss? We should, I think, either read *philice* for *patrice*, or, changing *Attat* to *At*, which is more suitable, read

At cesso magnifice et patrice philiceque ita ero meo ire advorsum.

The verse is an anapaestic tetrameter. *Patrice* and *philice* are both ἀπαξ εἰρημένα. Similarly formed adverbs are coupled together in *Mil.* 215 *euscheme*... et *dulice* et *comoe dice*.

763

OL. Edepol ne tu si equos esses, esses indomabilis.

Lys. Quo argumento? OL. Nimis tenax es.

It is surprising that no one has here accepted the admirable conjecture of Bentley; *sternax* suits the sense, and accounts for the allusion to a horse; *tenax* seems to have no meaning.

The words *considium*, 888, and *dismaritus*, 896, are to be added to the *Dictt.* They both are found in A according to Studemund.

The *Cistellaria*, one of the most ingenious and the best-written of the plays of *Plautus*, has come down to us in a very defective condition. The large number of fragments cited by grammarians as from this play had already led scholars to this conclusion, which the discovery of A has amply confirmed. Cardinal Mai, when he stated that A contained five leaves with about 180 lines of the *Cistellaria* hitherto unpublished, understated the case. Studemund declares that ten pages of A are devoted to the *Cistellaria*, and that of

these seven, containing at least 260 lines, are wanting in the other *codices*. The *lacuna* begins after verse 215 of Ussing's edition and extends to 317, which verse in former editions immediately follows 215, though 215 is the end of a soliloquy in *anapaests*, and 317 is part of a dialogue in *septenarian trochaics*. Between these verses (215–317) Ussing inserts the fragmentary portions of the *Cistellaria* which seem to belong to this part of it, both those quoted by grammarians as from the *Cistellaria* and the *Syrae* (which seems to have been an alternative name for the play, the *Syrae* probably being the *Lena* and *Melaenis*), and the readings of A so far as they have been deciphered and recorded by Mai and Studemund. One of the most remarkable points in the new passage is *rāvim* in verse 260

Expurigabo hercle omnia ad raucam *rāvim*.

compared with *Poen.* 3. 5. 33 (777)

Nego et negando, si quid refert, *rāvio*.

Ravis is marked long in the *Dictt.*

362

Miserrumam habui: ut illaec hodie quot modis

Moderatrix linguae fuit atque inmemorabilis!

It is a mistake to change *ut* of the MSS. to *at*. Such *pleonasm* in interjections is characteristic not only of Latin comedy but of Cicero's more familiar letters.

After verse 380 there is another long *lacuna*, which Ussing supplies as before, adding occasionally in italics words of his own to indicate the train of thought.

397

Non enim hic ubi ex Tusco modo

Tute tibi indigne dotem quaeras corpore.

Surely the simplest correction of this verse is to read *huc* for *hic*, and understand *reduco* et *revoco* from verse 394.

The new words which A contributes to the *Dictt.* from this play are *confuscius* 311, *exconcinnare* 267, *excissatus* 385.

Ussing undoubtedly deserves the hearty thanks of all readers of *Plautus*, and their best congratulations on having completed his great work. It may be granted that no part of his commentary seems so richly with instruction in *Plautine* language and usage as the *Miles* of Brix or the *Pseudolus* of Lorenz; and it must be allowed that he has not made such striking and brilliant emendations as Robinson Ellis's *ne frū quidem* for *ne erit quidem* Most. 585, Seyffert's *ovis* for *quis* Pers. 174, A. Palmer's *nitri* for *matrī* *Truc.* 892, or his *exules dica* (ἐξούλης δίκη) *Rud.* 848. Yet he has done solid, though perhaps hardly brilliant, service to the text; his explanations are clear, sensible, and conveyed in the choicest Latin; his acknowledgments of indebtedness to others are hearty and copious, and when he dissents he dissents courteously. With all these solid good qualities it cannot be doubted that his will be the standard *Plautus* for at least a generation; and indeed it is probable that a far longer time than that will elapse before an annotated edition of all the plays of *Plautus* appears to supersede the work of the able pupil of Madvig.—R. Y. TYRRELL.

Terenti Phormio. Edited by the Rev. A. SLOMAN.
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 3 Mk.

THIS edition contains an introduction and a text, more or less independent, followed by exegetical notes. It is adapted for schools, and passmen in the Universities, and will no doubt be found more serviceable than any edition which has previously appeared in English. At the same time it cannot be denied that the book contains many inaccurate

and misleading statements, and occasionally serious blunders. The introduction is divided into five parts. The first contains a short history of Roman Comedy, the second a sketch of the plot and characters of the *Phormio*, the third deals with metres and prosody, the fourth with accidence and syntax, while the fifth says a few words on the subject of the MSS. authority. The account of Roman Comedy is sufficient, and on the whole accurate. 'Naevius 235-204' should be 'Naevius wrote between 235 and 204,' '*fabula praetexta*' has earlier and better authority than '*fabula praetextata*,' and 'national tragedies' is more exact than 'historic or tragic plays.' The outline of the plot is full and clear; but is there any authority for the statement that Chremes is Nausistrata's second husband, or that Pamphila proves to be a citizen of Athens? The subject of metres and prosody is much less adequately treated, and can scarcely be handled satisfactorily in a work of this kind. Mr. Sloman says 'the eighth foot of the trochaic octonarius is always either a trochee or a spondee.' How does he propose to scan *vv.* 728 and 735? The sentence beginning 'Some scholars' at the bottom of p. 28 is unintelligible as it stands. What Mr. Sloman means is no doubt, 'Some scholars maintain that the reason why the last syllable of an iambic word may be shortened is, because in an iambic word the word-accent must always fall on the first syllable, except in those cases where a final syllable has disappeared.' What he says is something quite different. On the question as to the pronunciation of final *m*, it would have been better to refer to the constant omission of final *m* in Old Inscriptions, than to its disappearance from the first persons of the pres. ind. of verbs. In dealing with the subject of final long vowels it is always necessary to distinguish carefully between the natural retention of the original length in old writers, and the artificial lengthening employed as an archaism by Vergil and the later poets. So again the it of the perfect and the *ât* of the subjunctive, which are universally admitted, should be distinguished from the same terminations in other moods and tenses where the length is much more doubtful. The fourth rule as to the admission of hiatus should run: a long final vowel, or a vowel before *m*, may be shortened, and not elided, in the case of a monosyllable on which the metrical accent falls. In the rest of the introduction there is little that calls for remark. It may however be mentioned that the words 'repeated questions' are not free from ambiguity, that the *Bembine* is written in rustic capitals, not in 'uncial characters,' and that it scarcely seems a sufficient recognition of Donatus to classify him among commentators 'who to some small extent supplement MSS. authority.' The text is on the whole conservative and sensible: *v.* 21, 'sibi id esse rêllatum putet' is a hopelessly impossible scansion. The MSS. vary considerably, but on the whole *id sibi rêllatum putet* (Dziatzko) seems the most probable reading. *v.* 190, *protinam* should be read with Donatus and Nonius. *v.* 390, *Stilponem inquam: noueras*, the colon should be omitted, and so again in *v.* 934: *v.* 550 *facturus* should be *facturi's*, and *v.* 798 *locutus* should be *locuti's*: *v.* 772 *illi* is very doubtful; the MSS. have *uis A*, his later MSS. Has *uis* been wrongly introduced from the previous line? *v.* 1038 Mr. Sloman has bowdlerized *amica lenone* into *uxore emunda*. The change, though excellent from the moral, is unfortunate from the metrical point of view, and is likely to lead to a misconception of Athenian customs with regard to marriage. The exegetical notes generally attempt to explain the difficulties of the play, and on the whole with success, though

some of the explanations are unintelligible, some doubtful, some demonstrably wrong. The following, among others, may be cited as instances in point: the note on *tibiae pares* and *impares* in the didascalia is confused and difficult to follow. The whole question is very obscure, but Mr. Sloman's explanation of *tibiae dextrae* and *sinistrae* is entirely opposed to that of Varro, quoted by Servius, on *Aen.* ix. 615: '*dextra unum foramen habet, sinistra duo, quorum unum acutum sonum habet, alterum gravem.*' *v.* 9. The 'correct form in Cicero is *cum*' is misleading. *Quum* first appears in Renaissance MSS. *v.* 39. For 'Terence's time' read 'classical Latin.' *v.* 43. It seems rather bold to state categorically that 'adverbs in *tim* were old Accusatives.' *v.* 64. 'when affixed to the sec. pers. sing. perf. ind. act.' suggests that the shortening is confined to this case only. *v.* 72. The theory that *provincia* and *providentia* are connected is surely as dead as Queen Anne, and the same remark applies to the explanation of the form *amarier* given on *v.* 92. *v.* 102. It is unnecessary to explain *vin cam* by the omission of *ut*. *v.* 137. The *dativus commodi* or *incommodi* after *facere* or *fieri* should be distinguished from the instrumental ablative: there is the same difference as between 'to do something to' or 'for' and 'to do something with' a person in English. In the introduction to Act I. Sc. 3, read 'cousin' for 'brother,' and so throughout. *v.* 154. *ueniat* is the reading of A¹, not A², according to Umpfenbach's *apparatus criticus*. In the same line *adventi* is explained as a contraction of *adventui* = *adventui's* with the *s* dropped. What authority has Mr. Sloman for this, surely impossible, theory? *v.* 155. *quod* is explained as an 'accusative of respect,' and this old familiar *deus ex machina* is brought in again and again. When shall we see the last of it? *v.* 159. *non potitus essem* should be part of the apodosis: *v.* 212. *ëm istuc* is the right scansion. In the same line *ut respondeas* does not depend on *serva*, but *ut* is used like *ἵνα* with the future or subjunctive in Greek. *v.* 226. Does not *vincibilem*, if really transitive in sense, mean rather 'convincing,' like *vincibilia argumenta* in Apuleius? *v.* 231. *itane* is rightly explained below on *v.* 315. *Temperans* with the dative = 'careful for' should be distinguished from *temperans* with the genitive = 'temperate in,' or 'careful of.' *v.* 297. The note on *sumeret* in the next line should be given on *daretur* here. *v.* 320. How can *responsum* be understood? *v.* 330. Mr. Sloman says 'editors strangely prefer' the form *tennitus* quoted by Donatus; but on textual questions Donatus' authority, where we can be sure what he read, outweighs that of all the MSS. together. Similarly Nonius quotes *dispennite* from Plautus. *v.* 426. If *idem* is nom. masc., what does *te melius feceris* mean? *v.* 484. Does not '*palaestra*' mean to suggest that Phaedria found Dorio a tough customer to 'rastle' with? *v.* 502. Is not the emphatic *cum tum* opposed to the explanation suggested by Mr. Sloman? With this text Stalbaum's seems the only possible explanation. *v.* 506. The point of the proverb is lost. 'Of elinging to a wolf's ears cometh satiety, and you dare not let go for fear he should turn again and rend you.' *v.* 508. *ne sies* is more probably an ironical prohibition. *v.* 519. rather *possumus pati*, i.e., I don't like it any more than you, 'but what can't be cured, must be endured.' *v.* 586. *me executionem* surely means simply 'I'll shake myself,' the object being to show that he has no portable property about his person. *v.* 624. can *modo* be taken with *uno ore*? surely not. *v.* 663. why? *v.* 713. why again? *v.* 723. is it 'probable,' or even conceivable, that *interest* = *inter rem est*? *v.* 724. the line is much better given to

Chremes with A. *Te* is of course used in a general sense like 'you' in English. v. 741. *Istorsum* certainly does not mean 'from' where you are. v. 746. *porro* means simply 'further,' 'again,' 'in turn,' and so in v. 923. v. 768. could *casa* be used of 'the master's house'? The sense will in any case be the same, 'don't go further and fare worse.' v. 771. does not *recta prava facere* mean to do right or wrong indiscriminately? cf. *bona mala tolerare*. v. 556. *fanda nefanda*, etc. In the introduction to Act iv. Sc. 2 read 'father' for 'former husband.' v. 804. is not *hoc* ablative='it was this which misled you'? v. 820. the note is unintelligible; the words mean simply 'in the present state of my affairs.' v. 822. does Mr. Sloman hold that *medicari* regularly takes the dative? The note suggests this view. v. 840. is this explanation certain? v. 848. is it not rather a touch of the universal, old as the hills, pessimism, 'some one is sure to come in just when I want to go out'? v. 917. is this note intelligible? The subjunctive is causal. v. 943. read rather 'I'm dead and buried.' v. 973. surely 'wash away your offences' is quite good English, and represents *laulum* much better than 'whitewash.' v. 978. this note is superfluous. v. 1015. *non nego* could not possibly be understood, it must be *nego*. v. 1028. the translation 'victimized' puts the cart before the horse. The above instances among others gathered in a hasty perusal will serve to show that the book is not free from faults. If Mr. Sloman will thoroughly revise his work, correcting mistakes, and omitting what is uncertain or unnecessary, he will add much to the value of a second edition. The printing and references are generally correct, and the stage directions, though occasionally too modern in spirit, cannot fail to be of use.

J. H. ONIONS.

RECENT WORK ON SALLUST.

1. *Edm. Hauler : die Orléaner Palimpsestfragmente zu Sallusts Historien* (Wiener Studien. ix. 1. 1887, pp. 25-50).

These fragments of the second and third book of the Histories were discovered by Dr. Hauler early in 1886. While reading an Orléans MS. of miscellaneous Christian fathers, he observed that the manuscript was a palimpsest and found to begin with under a part of Jerome's commentary on Isaiah what soon proved to be the opening words of the speech of Cotta which we already possess. Comparison soon showed that the torn column before him completed the Berlin fragment, which was bought now forty years ago of a bookseller in Toledo. The Vatican fragments also are clearly, from the evidence of writing, spelling, &c. parts of the same MS.—an uncial MS. of the fourth or perhaps fifth century. The new find consists of sixteen columns. Adding these to the two Berlin and eight Vatican, we have in all in a more or less mutilated condition twenty-six columns of this MS. The events touched upon belong to the years 75 and 74 and include incidents in the war of P. Servilius against the Isaurians, the war of Pompeius and Sertorius, and the operations of M. Antonius Creticus against the pirates (perhaps at Massilia).

As a photograph published in an earlier number of the Wiener Studien of one page of the MS. sufficiently shows, the deciphering of the characters has been a very difficult task. Dr. Hauler has therefore given the results of his studies from time to time by instalments in different learned magazines, concluding his labours in the present article in which the complete text of the fragments is printed. Taking all

these six articles together we have a very full and very erudite commentary, both textual and historical. Towards the settlement of the text Mommsen, Wölfflin, v. Hartel and others have contributed some very clever conjectures.

In a paper in the Archiv f. Lat. Lexikographie (1886 p. 535) Hauler published some notes on the language of the new fragments. Besides new geographical names the dictionaries are enriched by two new words *periaci* (telum poterat) and *semipletus* (or ? *seminpletus*). Noticeable also are *permoestus*; *ingressus* (in a local sense); *tela reddere* (for *remittere*); *fide societatem acturos* (for *facturos*); *provincias inter se parauere* (for *compar.*); *neque socios prodituros firmabant* (for *adfirm.*); *tela in incertum iacere*; *ne extrema uictis paterentur*; *illi in sapientiam cesserat* (cp. Tac. G. 23 *Chattis uictoribus fortuna in sapientiam cessit*, Curt. 3. 6. 18 *temeritas in gloriam cesserat*); *cuius* (*Matris magnae*) *erat de nomine exaudiri sonores*, meaning according to Hauler 'immediately after the invocation of the goddess' &c. (cp. Tac. G. 7 *unde feminarum ululatus audiri sc. erat*); and indeed we shall have a new and signal instance of Sallust's *brevitas* if the italicized words in '*montem, ex quo in fugam oppidi teli coniectus erat, occupavit*' mean, as v. Hartel explains and Hauler thinks probable, *si ex oppido fugere conarentur*; but conjecture is surely necessary here: *iuga fanum forum terga infuma rugam* are suggested.

2. The third and posthumous edition of Jordan's *Sallust* (1887) differs but little, too little perhaps, for Jordan was not inclined to alter his mind, from its predecessor. The print is somewhat larger, but the only novelty in the text seems to be in C. 22, 2 where a dagger is put to *atque eo dictitare fecisse*. There are a few alterations of no great importance in the critical notes and a number of misprints have been corrected, but it is unfortunate that the following have been left in the text: p. 12 l. 12 *ante* for *antea*, 35. 9 *quod* for *quos*, 79. 11 *postero* for *postera*, 96. 15 *iam prope* for *prope iam*, 97. 32 *in eo aspero* for *in eo tam aspero*, 102. 12 *fama* for *famam*, 104. 5 *incertae forsitan* for *incertae ac forsitan*, 120. 17 *denique* for *denique nunc*. (A new misprint occurs on p. 112. 37 *se* for *si*). The critical notes also are not without their errors, nor have the marginal numbers to the sections even yet got always into their proper places.

The book will be welcome at any rate as making the new fragments more accessible. They are printed after Hauler except that the notes of interrogation over doubtful letters—an awkward device—are not always over the right letters. The three columns containing part of Pompeius' letter to the Senate, which we have from the MS. V, are not set out in full by Jordan, but he notices some variants in the critical apparatus. It is disappointing to find that our gain from this quarter is very small. *Exercitus* and *nobis* in § 6 are claimed by Hauler as improvements, but Jordan not without good reason retains V.'s *exercitu* and *nobis*.

In the preface, which is dated but four days before his sudden death (10 November 1886), Jordan speaks of being at work on a fuller critical edition of the author and of the remarks he hoped to publish on the new fragments. His friend Mr. P. Krüger took charge of the book after Jordan's death.

3. *A new text* by A. EUSSNER (1887) takes the place of Dietsch's in the Teubner series. A discussion of the reasons for new readings is promised at a future time. It will be enough therefore to mention a few of the more striking deviations from Jordan's text. In C. 18, 5 *nequiuuit* is read for *nequiuert*, in 50, 4 *dixit* for *dixerat*, in 59, 3 *colonis suis* for *calonibus*;