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](#)

Ashmore's *Adelphoe of Terence The Adelphoe of Terence*. With Introduction, Notes and Critical Appendix by Sidney G. Ashmore L.H.D. Macmillan & Co. 1893. 3s. &d.

F. F. Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 61 - 62
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187396, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187396

How to cite this article:

F. F. Abbott (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 61-62 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187396

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is an account of a love-adventure, related by the writer; the third, 'de tribus sociis,' is a mere anecdote, in 20 elegiac verses. These trifles have been edited with the elaborate care characteristic of the 'Mediaeval Library,' of which the volume forms a part, the variants of several different MSS. being minutely recorded. The student of Mediaeval Latinity will appreciate the chapter on grammatical anomalies (p. 38 ff.).

The *Acolastus* and *Pammachius* bring us into the comparatively broad daylight of the age of Humanism and of the Reformation. It would not indeed be easy to find two Latin plays of the time which better typify those two movements, where they accorded and where they conflicted, than do these. The *Acolastus*—early known in England by Palsgrave's 'Ecphrasis' of it (1540)—is one of the first and best dramatizations of the

favourite story of the Prodigal Son,—the work of a talented schoolmaster, who, like our own Udall, knew how to apply the art of Terence and Plautus to modern issues, and to convey wholesome examples in elegant verse. The 'Pammachius,' on the other hand, is the work of a militant and fanatical Protestant, a furious assault upon the Roman church, which has left its traces in the work of a kindred spirit among the English reformers, Bishop John Bale. Bale translated it, and his *Kyng Johan* is a palpable adaptation of its motives to the career of that heroic precursor (as Bale regarded him) of the Protestant Henry. Both plays are edited with his usually minute care by Dr. Bolte, one of the first living authorities on the Latin drama of the sixteenth century.

C. H. HERFORD.

ASHMORE'S *ADELPHOE OF TERENCE*.

The Adelphoe of Terence. With Introduction, Notes and Critical Appendix by SIDNEY G. ASHMORE L.H.D. Macmillan & Co. 1893. 3s. 6d.

It is a pleasure to take up an edition of one of the plays of Terence with the feeling that the average school or college student may use it without running the risk of loading his mind with a mass of misinformation in regard to the Terentian metres and language. This edition would seem to be especially suitable for those who are beginning their study of Latin comedy, as the author has presented in his introduction a brief survey of the development of Greek and of Latin comedy, with biographical sketches of Terence and of his predecessors in the drama, together with chapters upon the division of a play into acts and scenes, the actors, the theatre, the MSS., the text of Terence, and the Terentian metres. The facts are well chosen and stated clearly and accurately in the main.

This is especially noticeable in the chapter on metres, for some of our English editions of Terence and Plautus either present incorrect views on the subject of the metres in comedy, or else present correct views in such a blind fashion that the results are very misleading to the student. It may be noted in passing that to the rather full list

of reference books upon metre and prosody on p. lvi. Klotz's *Altrömische Metrik* should be added, and that on p. lxiii. the editor rather unfortunately confuses 'the length of a vowel' with 'the length of the syllable' in which it stands, and uses 'arsis' (cp. note to v. 142) of the accented part of the foot. Both better usage and the practice adopted by many of the school grammars apply this term to the unaccented part of the foot. In view of the fact that the introduction is made so full, the reviewer would have liked to see Suetonius's 'Life of Terence' included. Suetonius's sketch is admirably adapted to serve as a preface, or perhaps better as a conclusion, to the study of Terence. Personal experience has shown that it is always read with eagerness by students, and that it gives them an inclination to get at original sources, and unless it is printed in a college edition of Terence it is quite inaccessible for class-room use. The text of the *Adelphoe* followed by Professor Ashmore is that of Dziatzko. The edition has a critical appendix, which, as the editor says, is in the main a defence of the adopted text. The main excellence of the book, in the reviewer's opinion, consists in the good judgment which the editor has shown in his choice of material for his commentary, and in the concise and clear form in which

it is put, while many notes like those to *enim* v. 168 and *vide utrum vis* v. 195 give ambitious students an opportunity to carry their investigations further than the limits of a school or college textbook allow. The principal general defect in the notes lies in a confusion of colloquialism and archaism. The occurrence of a form, a word or a form of expression in Plautus and Terence and its failure to appear in later Latin do not furnish a sufficient proof, as the editor seems to assume, that it belongs to the *sermo cotidianus*. Such a word or expression may have belonged to the literary speech of the third or second century B.C. and may have disappeared from use altogether, and in fact its failure to appear in colloquial Latin of a later date makes that hypothesis probable—a theory which is made still more probable if the word or expression occurs in other literature of the period of Plautus or Terence. On the other hand certain expressions which are so highly colloquial as perhaps to be barred out of formal Latin altogether are passed over by our editor without mention of the fact: e.g. compounds of *dis*—like *disperii* and *discupio* (v. 355), the omission of *se* in such a phrase as *quo*

pacto haberet, enarramus (v. 365), or *prae manu* (v. 980)—one of the forms which the many proverbial expressions with *manus* took. One or two minor points in the commentary may be noticed: *ipsus* (v. 78) is not the ‘older form of the pronoun,’ while the statement (v. 209) that there is no well-authenticated instance of the fut. ind. with *faxo* in Plautus is surprising, cf. *Pseud.* 49 *faxo scies*, 393 *faxo aderit*, 1039 *faxo scibis* and many others. The use of the ablative after *usus sit* (v. 429) is not very clearly stated. *Usus est* is followed by the ablative because of the verbal force in the substantive *usus* and cannot be explained by a comparison with *opus est*, for the use of the abl. with *opus est* (v. 335) is merely by analogy from its use with *usus est* (cp. *Schöll Archiv.* ii. p. 209). On p. lvi. one should read *quantitative* for *quantitive* and in the note to v. 37 *the arm or the leg* for *the arm of the leg*. These are minor defects which detract but little from the excellent edition of the *Adelphoe* which Mr. Ashmore has given us.

F. F. ABBOTT.

University of Chicago.

LEVISON'S *FASTI PRAETORII*.

Fasti Praetorii inde ab Octaviani imperii initio usque ad Hadriani exitum by HANS LEVISON, Dr. Phil. 5 mks.

THIS is a complete list of all those who are known to have held the praetorship, either from the express statement of authors or inscriptions, or from their having held praetorian appointments or the consulship. The collection is the result of considerable labour, and is, so far as I have tested it, extremely accurate. The praetors are arranged according to the emperors under whom they held the office, but in several lists. Under A are those, the date of whose praetorship is either known for certain or can be assigned with great probability; under B those who are known to have held some praetorian appointment at a particular date; under C those who are known from the *Fasti* to have been consuls, but whose *cursum honorum* is not otherwise known; under D and E those who are either known or supposed to have held office under a certain emperor. The names are all

arranged in chronological order in A, B, and C, as far as this is possible; in D and E they seem to be placed indiscriminately. Thus it will be seen that the usefulness of the collection for purposes of reference depends almost entirely upon the Index, which occupies thirteen pages and professes to be complete. The only criticism that I shall make on the book is that it seems to be compiled on no particular principle. In certain cases we have a fairly full *cursum honorum* given, e.g. of T. Flavius Sabinus (by the by why should this personage stand almost alone in being distinguished by his tribe?), but in a number of other cases, where just as much is known of the *cursum honorum*, we have only the date or office bearing on the praetorship. Thus no hint is given that Verginius Rufus was ever legatus of Germany; it is not stated that L. Junius Blaesus was ever proconsul of Africa (where he is described as proconsul Ciliciae, it should of course be altered to proconsul Siciliae), and so with many more names which might be mentioned. In a few