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](#)

Note on Three Passages of Plaut. *Trucul*

J. H. Gray

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 10 / December 1894, pp 447 - 448

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189140, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189140

How to cite this article:

J. H. Gray (1894). Note on Three Passages of Plaut. *Trucul*. The Classical Review, 8, pp 447-448 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189140

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The sequence is not violated by this interpretation. Cf. Gildersleeve's *Lat. Gr.* § 517, R. 2, and the example there cited from Pliny.

I urge the consideration of *ut* in a consecutive sentence as a relative and submit the following explanation of its etymology. The point is to account for the loss of the initial consonant *qu*. I see in *ut* a representation of Sanskrit *utá*, which means 'and also' but is also interrogative. Now in Sanskrit *utá* takes the optative, and the sense

is precisely 'and so,' cf. Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax* p. 260.

In Latin beside *cum* was probably **cut* (cf. Sk. *ku-tra*), **cubi*, etc., but the similarly used *ut* = Sk. *utá* mastered the other forms and gave *ubi* etc.

In the form *utī* we possibly have a Latin representative of Sk. *utá vāi*.

EDWIN WHITFIELD FAY.

Washington and Lee University,
Lexington, Virginia.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *HELENA*.

1135 MR. HORT's suggestion *εἰσέει* for *εἰς ἐν ἧν* has already been proposed in my edition of the *Helena* (Clarendon Press, 1882; revised, 1892). I wrote: 'It has occurred to me...to suggest *εἰσέει* (*véw*), "piled up" the sails into the ship... Of this verb however the pres. and imperf. do not seem to occur in Attic Greek...only the aor. *ἐνήσα* and the perf. pass. *νένημαι* or *νένησμαι* are found.' But the MS. reading may be right = 'were fitted into one (figure),' i.e. compactly. *Εἰς ἐν* = *una* is rather a favourite expression with Euripides. Cf. l. 742, *Orest.* 1640, among other instances.

I had also cited, on l. 388, the passage from Pindar, *Ol.* i. 38 (61) upon *ἐπαυον*. I think *πεισθείς* is certainly corrupt, but probably some participle in *-θείς* stood in the original.

I append a few notes of my own.

122 Adopt W. G. Clark's reading (from the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, 1854-1859) *εἶδον*, *εἰ καὶ νῦν σ' ὄρω*, a reiteration in varied terms of l. 118 = 'I saw her, just as I see you now.' [*Εἶδον*, *ἧν* &c. has been suggested to me as still nearer the MSS. *εἰδόμην*, but *ἧν* with subj. is not definite enough for the sense.]

263 Read *'λαβον* (*ἐλαβον*), with Porson and Dindorf, for *λαβεῖν*. Hermann's *λάβον* is not only a doubtful form, but does not give the meaning required. The indicative

means 'would that I, after being obliterated, had (then) taken a plainer form.'

679 Read (with Dindorf, &c.) *τί δ' for τὰδε* and *ἐφῆχ'* for *ἔθηχ'*, but retain *τῶνδε κακῶν*, 'which of these misfortunes did Hera inflict upon you in consequence of the trial?' i.e. in revenge for her slighted beauty. In 675 Menelaus had asked *τί νῶν χηρήζονσα προσθεῖναι κακόν*; Helen replies with lamentations and a vague allusion to the *κρίσις*, whereupon Menelaus inquires more precisely.

1158 It has been suggested to me to read *τί* for *αἶ*, and some verb such as *ἐπαυον* for the unmeaning *ἐλιπον* of the MSS. 'Why did they (the Greeks) make desolate the chambers &c.?'

1247 Perhaps read *ἐξορίζομεν*, 'take out (and let down) into the sea.' Cf. *διορίσαι* 394, also l. 828.

1353 *'πύρωσας* may be genuine. Reading *ὄν* for *ὦν*, the sense may be 'thou didst inflame (with love) one whom thou oughtest not,' i.e. Paris, the votary of Cybele. It is true that *πυρώω* in this sense lacks positive authority, but the meaning is possible and natural, just as *succendere* is used absolutely without *amore* by Propertius, i. 2, 15. Paley's *ἐκυρσας εὐνῶν* is not convincing.

1453 Read *εἰρεσίας* with *μάρηρ*. *Ῥοθίους*, 'amid the surge.'

C. S. JERRAM.

Trinity College, Oxford.

NOTE ON THREE PASSAGES OF PLAUT. *TRUCUL.*

PLAUT. *Trucul.* 667-8, 896, 952 (Schoell's text).

I offer brief notes on the distribution of the dialogue in these three passages.

(1) vv. 667-8. Strabax the rustic lover has been talking outside the house to Astaphium, the maid of Phronesium. The old arrangement of the end of the scene was

STRABAX. *Ibitur, ne me morari censeas.* ASTAPHIVM. *Lepide facis.* But Schoell divides STRABAX. *Ibitur.* ASTAPHIVM. *Ne me morari censeas.* STRABAX. *Lepide facis.* His reason is that by Langen's canon *morari* in Plautus never = *cunctari*. This is true, but nevertheless the old division is right and *morari* is transitive with the object *te* omitted *more Plautino*. Keep then the old distribution and translate, 'I will go, lest you should think that I am keeping you here,' for which Astaphium thanks Strabax by the reply 'That's very nice of you.' It was Strabax who was detaining Astaphium, not *vice versa*: the thanks belong naturally to Astaphium, not to Strabax.

(2) v. 896. The soldier Stratophanes returns. He sees Phronesium and Astaphium and addresses them *quid hic vos agitis?* Phronesium angrily retorts *ne me adpella*. What are we to do with the next three words? BCD give *nimius evi*, LZ *nimum sevis*, *ilicet* is Schoell's conjecture. I would read *saevit*, take the three words together, assign them to Stratophanes and treat them as an aside. *Nimum saevit: ilicet*, 'she's very angry: it's all up.' Then Phronesium, who has commenced *ne me*

adpella, goes on naturally *potin ut mihi molestus ne sies?*

(3) v. 952. Phronesium is getting all she can out of Strabax and Stratophanes, who bid against one another for her favours. Strabax offers silver, Stratophanes gold, this will determine the distribution of the line. The gold Philippics belong to Stratophanes, *talentum argenti* to Strabax. Thus, to take the conjectures of Camerarius and Brix, Strabax will be made to say *Em tibi talentum argenti*, which Stratophanes outbids with *Philippicum aes est: tene tibi*.

To mix the gold and the silver and assign the whole line to the same speaker is impossible for any one who has read carefully what has gone before. The only real question is what we are to read at the end of the line, *i.e.* in what terms Stratophanes makes his offer.

Spengel and Langen object to *Philippicum* as non-Plautine, and Langen has shown that *Philippus*, not *Philippeus* is the more regular Plautine form. It will perhaps be best to read *Philippum hoc aes est: tene tibi*, but my point is the division of the line rather than the form of the adjective employed.

J. H. GRAY.

MONRO ON GREEK MUSIC.

The Modes of Ancient Greek Music, by D. B. MONRO, M.A., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. Oxford: 1894. (144 pp.) 8s. 6d. net.

MR. MONRO'S book merits the serious attention of all students of Greek music. From the time of Böckh it has been the general assumption of scholars that the 'modes' of Greek music—the *ἀρμονίαι* familiar to readers of Plato's *Republic*—were, like the modern major and minor, scales distinguished by the order of their intervals, and that each of the seven degrees of the diatonic octave could and did form the final of such a scale. This thesis has been elaborately expounded by Westphal, Gevaert, and numerous other writers on the subject. Mr. Monro's object is to prove that the modes were nothing more than keys differing only in pitch, and that of modes in the modern sense one only was known to Classical Greek music, *viz.* a scale corresponding to the modern minor as played in descending from A to A, and represented by the standard 'Dorian' octave, extending from E to E,

but having for its tonic the 'μέση' (A). It will be seen at once how revolutionary Mr. Monro's work is; and there is no question that the author has marshalled the facts which he adduces as evidence with great skill, so that his argument is, *prima facie* a very telling one.

Putting aside for the moment the statements of Greek writers on music, to whom the appeal must ultimately lie, we may premise that there are two circumstances which create at the outset a prejudice against Mr. Monro's view, a prejudice which it is his business to dissipate by the most convincing proof that the ancient authorities can be interpreted only in the sense which he attributes to them. The first is the fact that although the trained modern ear can detect a certain difference of 'colour' in keys of different pitch (Helmholtz, *Tonempfindungen*, p. 476 f.), it is impossible to us to conceive of such keys as exerting so strong an influence on human sensibility and character as that attributed by Plato and Aristotle to the modes. How, we ask.