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

De Apulei Quae fertur Physiognomia recensenda et emendenda. Scripsit Richardus Foerster. Leipzig, 1887. 1 Mk. 20.

H. N.

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 09 / November 1891, pp 429 - 429
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167800, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167800

How to cite this article:
H. N. (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 429-429 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167800

Request Permissions : Click here

CAMBRIDGE JOURNALS

Downloaded from http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR, IP address: 128.122.253.212 on 04 May 2015

plex and inconsistent corrections by the three later scribes, and the other interpolations of uncertain date and authorship. The reviser of the text, however cautious he may be, can scarcely expect to escape the animadversion of his successors. It is thus that Kempf retaliates upon Halm with an attack that is of the true *tu quoque* sort. Halm had spent much time in Bern in careful study of the codex; his friend Wilmanns had personally made for him a list of readings from the Vatican MS.; yet notwithstanding all this care, Kempf, who has been allowed to borrow the Swiss codex, finds it an easy matter to show instances of oversight on the part of Halm no less obvious, though much less numerous, than those which exposed his own recension to criticism. Some of the corrections in the present edition are worth mentioning, *e.g.* in the passage i. 6. 2, where Kempf's old reading from the Bern codex (*concionante seiunxit*) was overlooked by Halm, who noted **elu*it*, conjecturing *eluxit*, which Kempf himself has now accepted; in iv. 7. ext. 1, where Halm had, apparently in despair, adopted the conjecture of Foertsch, *et hora a Dionysio constituta veniam qui acceperat supervenit*, but where Kempf now establishes Madvig's reading *et eam qui acceperat supervenit, i.e. et hora supervenit et eam qui acceperat*, though for convenience of reading this is hardly as good as that of C.B. Hase, *qui eam acceperat*; and in vi. 7. 3, in which Halm incorrectly read *prosequeretur*, noting *sequeretur* from B, but ignoring the *persequeretur* of Kempf, which is from the *psequeretur* of the Bern codex (the first hand).

On the whole, however, it cannot be truly said that the corrections and additions to the work of Halm are sufficient to impair the authority of the text that scholars have now been using for two decades; and it is perhaps not too much to say that some of Kempf's alterations in his own former readings are distinctly no improvement, substituting as they occasionally do an unintelligible for a quite intelligible lection. A good instance of this is afforded by the much disputed passage (v. 3. ext. 3) which Kempf in his recension of 1854 gave in the body of the text as doubtful, but cleverly suggested the reading *vix vitalis vita hominum* from Cic. *Lael.* 6. 22 *cui potest esse vita vitalis* etc., without, however, clearing up the difficulty involved in the following *experet*, for which, it may be remarked, the Torrenian edition reads *exstat*. Halm's admirable remarks on this passage (Praef. xvi.) amounted, it may be remembered, to a demonstration, proving beyond question that the *hominum extar extollit* cited by Kempf from the Vienna codex was a pure misreading of *hominum extar et tollit i.e.* hominum exstaret (= esset). In the present edition, Kempf alters his own text, if anything, for the worse, and clearly sins against logic in permitting such an impossible reading to stand as *beneficii commercium sine quo vix vita hominum experet tollit*, which he himself marks with an asterisk. At times he has allowed the most unsatisfactory of his former readings to stand such as *itaque qui amara suggillatione* of vi. 9. 12; while the best of the corrections noticeable in the new text are really those of Halm, *e.g. catenatae cervices totius tunc fori ora clauserunt* vi. 2. 3), or of Madvig, who furnishes what is perhaps the best of all the emendations, in the well-known passage over which so many editors have given way to despair (vii. 2. ext. 10), but which is now made beautifully simple by the reading *a caritate istud pater, ab usu Philippus*, etc., in place of Halm's *avus o Philippus*, as given by the Vienna codex.

H. T. PECK.

Columbia College.

D. Junii Juvenalis Satira Septima. Texte Latin, publié avec un Commentaire critique, explicatif, et historique, par J. A. HILD, Professeur à la faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. Paris, Klincksieck, 1890. 3 frcs.

A gracefully written exposition, which, although offering and professing to offer little that is new, will be found useful to students and attractive to literary readers. The editor has grappled conscientiously with the difficulties of the text, and intersperses very sensible remarks on the weakness of the composition, which he justly regards as inferior to that of several other of Juvenal's pieces. One error should be mentioned. On pages 30 and 32 the *Lectiones Ausonianae* are attributed to Julius Caesar (J. C. and C.) Scaliger insted of to Joseph Justus.

H. N.

De Apulei Quae fertur Physiognomia recensenda et emendenda. Scripsit RICHARDUS FOERSTER. Leipzig, 1887. 1 Mk. 20.

THIS essay (thirty pages in length) is reprinted separately from the supplement to Jahn's *Jahrbücher*. Foerster begins by denying, quite rightly, that the *Physiognomia* edited by Valentine Rose can be the work of Apuleius of Madaura. The Latin style alone is sufficient to put this hypothesis out of court. He proceeds to discuss afresh the relations of the existing manuscripts to their lost archetype, and then gives a series of emendations, based partly on the Greek of Adamantius, partly on independent conjecture. A considerable number of these will probably be accepted. The following are suggested as possible improvements. Apuleius p. 117 1 *pupillae oculorum iactantes et porrectae vanitatem detegunt. Iactantes* cannot be right, as some word is wanted corresponding to εὐρύτης in the Greek, and Foerster therefore proposes *late patentes*. Perhaps *lātescentes*. P. 122 8 *niger* (so Foerster rightly for *sinister*) *circulus si fuerit rubeus in umidis oculis.....magnanimum hominem et sapientem.....declarat, iuxta pueros*. Foerster proposes *in pueros dementem*. But *iuxta* in this Latin may mean 'with regard to.' Ti. Donatus on *Aen.* 4 371 *tanta mala iuxta me commissa sunt: ib. Aen.* 5 6 *aliquid mali.....iuxta salutem Didonis esse commissum:* Faustus Reiensis *Epist.* p. 6 *iuxta substantiam Dei.....scriptum*. The true correction may perhaps be *iuxta pueros* [*furiosum*]: or, if *iuxta* be an adverb, *iuxta puerosum, puerosum* being formed on the analogy of *virosus* and *mulierosus*.

H. N.

The Evagoras of Isocrates, with an introduction and notes by HENRY CLARKE, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 2*s*. 6*d*.

THE notes in this edition are sufficiently full, and instructive and profitable both with regard to the language and subject-matter. It may be regretted that no notes are given to the Ὑπόθεσις, an interesting piece of ancient literary criticism, possessing some interest and demanding some explanation. I note but few and unimportant omissions in the notes on the text. To the note on κινδύνων in § 2 might be added a reference to § 65. On § 7 (ὑπερβάλλῃ) add reference for the active to § 13, for the middle to § 41. On the same section it might be noted that the agent with δουλευτέον is expressed in the accus. rather than the dative because the dative might be mistaken for the indirect object after δουλευτέον. (Similarly in the passage xvii. 56 cited in the note on § 75 we have the accusative μεμνημένους rather than the genitive, to avoid collision with the genitive τούτων that follows it.) On § 8 a reference should be given to Dr.