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](#)

Skutsch's Studies on Plautine Prosody *Forschungen zur lateinischen Grammatik und Metrik* von Franz Skutsch. Erster band: Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur Plautinischen Prosodie. Leipzig (Teubner): 1892. (pp. 186.) Mk. 4.40.

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 09 / November 1892, pp 402 - 404
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186731, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186731

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 402-404 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186731

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Lubére tibi per mé licere intéllego ;
Verúm lubere hau liceat, si *liceát* mihi

there should be no comma after the second *liceat* ('but you would not be permitted to have your whim, if I were to be permitted to have mine'; so Ussing): but perhaps after all CD may be right (B has *iubeat*)—

Verúm lubere haud liceat, si *lubeát*, mihi.
If so, a comma is wanted after *lubeat* ('but I should not be permitted to have my whim, if the whim were to seize me'). This seems more antithetical: cf. 375 *Lubet*. The second *liceat* of A may be simply an echo of the first.—398 *quod* (Ussing) is preferable to *quid* (MSS.).—500 becomes a bacchiac line only by a 'tour de force.'

DO. Cedo sáne mihi. TO. At claré recitáto.

556 The insertion of *oh* is feeble.—634 *rogaret* (BCD) seems sound.—648 *olim* (Schoell) hardly suits the context.—662 Seyffert's *iam ut emas* or Bergk's *eam ut emas* is nearer to the MSS. than Schoell's *ut bene emas*; or hiatus in diaeresis after *video* may be tolerated.—667 ff. In A l. 669 follows immediately after l. 667; this points to something like the following arrangement

DO. Tóxile quid agó? TO. Di deaeque te
ágitant iratí, scelus,

Qui hánc non properes déstinare. DO.
Habéto.¹ TO. Abi, argentum écer
huc:

(668) Nón edepol mínis trecentis cárast:
fecistí lucrí.

(667) * * * * * eu praeda-
tú's probe.

(669) SA. Heús tu, etiam pro uéstimentis
húc decem accedént minae?

700 appears only in A in the form
QUIDESTTIBINOMEN * * * s * * * QUODADTE
ATTINET

¹ This would have to be addressed to Sagaristio:
'You shall have it' (i.e. the money).

Schoell reads

DO. Quid ést tibi nomen? SA. Ností id
quod ad ted áttinet.

But in the next line Dordalus asks *Quid attinet non scire?* which means not 'what does it not pertain to me to know?' but 'what does it pertain to me to be ignorant of?' Thus in 700 we want something with the meaning 'You must be ignorant of something,' 'You can't know everything.'—The assumption of a lacuna after 721 seems to me hasty.—754 *equis* has no probability; I would suggest *intégro* [et] *exercitu et praesidiis*, with hiatus in diaeresis.—805 *lude* for *elude* (MSS.) and 811 for *delude* (MSS.) are hardly justified in the uncertainty as to the metre.—808 Why is *palam* better than Ritschl's *probe*?

The spelling of words according to the principles of this series is continued—a method which seems to me to attach too much importance to accidental variations in MSS.: thus we have 50, 169 *aps*, 159 *abs*; 65 *puplicae*, 75 *publicam*; 62 *optineo*, 54, 61 *obtimeo*; 477 *prosum*, 677 *prorsum*; and so forth. Yet Schoell often spells *septumus*, *decumus*, *pessumus*, etc., in the face of the MSS.; and he does not hesitate to introduce the phonetic spelling *quierint* for *quieverint* (MSS.) in 78. Thus we have two wholly inconsistent methods of spelling co-existing in the same edition. I sincerely hope that the smaller edition of Ritschl's Plautus which is projected will be characterized by uniformity and consistency in this respect.

I have noticed a few misprints besides those mentioned in the Preface: an accent omitted in 8 and 236; inserted in 553; wrong punctuation in 277; p. 146, l. 16 should run 'Buechelerus de decl. p. 82² (202)'; p. 155 note on l. 613, *me* for *mea*; p. xxviii, l. 3 from the end, 550 for 549.

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

SKUTSCH'S STUDIES ON PLAUTINE PROSODY.

Forschungen zur lateinischen Grammatik und Metrik von FRANZ SKUTSCH. Erster band: *Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur Plautinischen Prosodie*. Leipzig (Teubner): 1892. (pp. 186.) Mk. 4.40.

THE leading object of this book is to prove that in Plautus and the older Dramatists

certain conjunctions, adverbs, and pronouns ending in -e might take before consonants another form in which this final vowel was dropt. Thus *nempe est* had a by-form *nemp'* *fruit*, *ille est* occasionally an *il(le) fruit*, *iste est* an *ist(e) fruit*, and so on, as we have *atque est*, but usually *ac* (i.e. *atq(ue)*) *fruit*. The ordinary theory which has been accepted by most

editors of Plautus since Ritschl's time, but which receives its *coup de grâce* from this volume, is that, before consonants, Plautus, for reasons of his own, chose to scan *nēpe*, while he retained the full nasalized form *nempe* before an initial vowel. The new view is strongly supported by the analogy of *atque est*, *ac fuit*, and needed only a presentation of all the instances of the parallel forms to have its correctness established. The full lists supplied by Dr. Skutsch show that in every case where the next word begins with a consonant the form *nemp(e)* suits the metre; that *proinde* is used by Plautus before vowels, *proin* before consonants, with perhaps not a single exception; and they will probably satisfy every one who takes the pains to go through them that these by-forms of *nempe*, *unde*, *inde* and the like are due to the syncope of the final short vowel, and not to any variation in the quantity of the first syllable. This syncope Dr. Skutsch believes to be due to the force of a neighbouring, usually a following, accent. *Nempe*, for example, in *Cas.* 599,

quā tū suspendis tē? Nempe tute dixerās,
loses its final *e* before the strongly accented first syllable of *tute*, in the same way that *malefacere*, *benefacere* become *malfacere*, *benfacere*, or in modern Italian tale cosa has assumed the form *tal cosa*. The exact truth about *ille*, *iste* is harder to establish with certainty. The old view that the first syllable was sometimes long, sometimes, even when the metrical ictus fell on it, short, would almost imply the existence of two separate words *ille* and *ile*, like Greek *viv* and *vūv*. Dr. Skutsch shows that *ille*, *iste* are necessary scansiones only after a short monosyllable etc., e.g. *ab illa*, and so may be included under the 'brevis brevians' law. This would to my mind indicate that these pronouns were often slurred in pronunciation, though it could not avail to prove the existence of an independent form *ille*, or rather *ile*, beside the form *ille* with first syllable long by position. The difference however between *ille* with the first syllable slurred and *ile* is a small one: and Romance forms, like French *le pere*, Italian *stasera*, 'this evening,' point to an entire suppression of the first syllable. In an Appendix he discusses the possibility of the same explanation for some lines that have hitherto defied editors, like

Stich. 768 *redd(e) cāntionem uēteri pro uinō nouom,*

Pseud. 239 *O Pseudole mi, sine sīm nihili.*
Mitt(e) me sis, sine modo ego ābeam,

as well as for the lines where *forte* is read by the MSS. and has been changed by the editors to *fors* (*Asin.* 794: *Curc.* 271: *Mil.* 720).¹

But it would be unfair to regard the book as being nothing else than a discussion whether Plautus scanned *nemp(e)* or *nēpe*, *ill(e)* or *ille*. The issues raised are much broader. We find scattered up and down the pages a more or less defined theory of the versification of Plautus, namely that it reflected in a singularly close degree the actual pronunciation of colloquial Latin in Plautus' own time, and that, although it was in its essence quantitative, being an imitation of the quantitative metre of the Greeks, it kept as far as was possible the metrical ictus in unison with the natural accentuation of everyday speech, so that, if we read aloud a line of Plautus with regard to the metrical beat of the spondees and trochees composing it, we shall have a fair idea of how the same sentence would sound in the ordinary talk of that period. This theory, first definitely formulated, so far as I know, in some articles of mine in the *Classical Review* of October-November 1891, and in the *Journal of Philology* of the same year, will, if it stand, not only modify to some extent the received text and scansion of very many lines of Plautus and Terence,² but will throw a good deal of light on the transition of literary Latin forms to the forms of vulgar Latin and the Romance languages. Dr. Skutsch, who gives his book the title 'Plautinisches und Romanisches,' lays

¹ We might add *mill(e)passum* in *Truc.* 334 *qui tibi mill(e) passum péperisti moré morae*, if this be the right reading; but the full form seems to be required in *Men.* 177. The shortened form might indeed, so far as the metre is concerned, have been used in phrases like that in *Mil.* 894, which I would read: *mala mille meres. St! ne pauca: peioribus conveniunt* (*malamilla* P, like *malafacta* read in *Trin.* 185 by C). *Biber(e) dari* is quoted by Charisius 124 K from Fannius; and *Pers.* 821 allows the scansion *biber(e) da*.

² To take an instance, not a very important one. In *Ter. Adelph.* 308 *non intellego | Satis quae loquitur (loquatur)*, 'I do not sufficiently understand what he says,' the accentuation *satis quae loquitur* would rather mean 'what he sufficiently says,' if it be the rule, as it seems to be, that the postposed relative attracts the accent. (See the article in *Journ. Phil.* 1891.) The MSS. however and the corrector of the Bembinus read *satis quae loquatur*, so that the jarring accentuation is, like so many cases of apparent conflict between accent and ictus, a mere 'editor's reading.' It is by the way this attraction of the accent by the postposed relative which makes me unwilling to depart from the order of the words given by the MSS. of Plautus, and confirmed by Festus, for *Cas.* 523 *séd facito dum mērula per vorsús quod cantat*,

stress on the latter point. He shows how closely Plautus in his *il(le) revertitur* approaches to the Spanish *el reverte*, in *il(le) revenit* to Provençal *el reve(n)*, how his scansion of *dé illa, cūm illa* explains the Romance forms *della, colla*, how *ēm illum* became *ellum*, a form almost identical with that used at present in the Abruzzi, *ellō*. When I add that there is a detailed discussion of the conditions under which Syncope, and the dropping of a Nasal before a consonant is allowed in Latin, it will be seen that the book covers a large amount of ground, and is of great importance for students of Latin. There is also in the first section a lucid and forcible exposition of the great law of Plautine prosody by which long syllables are shortened in words like *cavē, abī, patēr fert, simūl fert, volūptatem*, generally known as the law of the 'brevis brevians.' I see with regret that Dr. Skutsch favours its extension to medial syllables long by nature, e.g. *verēbamini* (al. *veremini*) Ter. Phorm. 902, and proposes the scansion *illam amābam olim* in *Epid.* 135 (p. 107). Not only facts but *a priori* considerations seem to me against such a shortening; but the subject is too large a one to discuss here. In the list of examples of the word *unde* in Plautus (p. 64), it is interesting to note how regularly the metrical accentuation coincides with the natural accentuation of the word, as stated by the Latin Grammarians, viz. paroxytone when Interrogative, barytone when Relative. There are scarcely half a dozen clear instances of conflict, the most marked being *Most.* 547. In *Mil.* 376, I

would read with the Palatine MSS. against the palimpsest: *opsecro, unde | Exiit haec huc? Und(e) nisi domo? Domo? Mē viden? Te video*—making *exit* the Perfect Tense, and giving to *me viden* the normal accentuation of the phrase in Plautus (*mē viden, mē vide*). In the sense of 'the where-withal' *unde* seems to have been accented, unlike the Relative, e.g. *Capt.* 850 *scis bene esse si sit unde*. In *Epid.* 144 *und(e) lubet* is a compound like *quōlubet*. *Quippe*, to judge from the list of examples on p. 95, seems to have retained its full trochaic form in the collocations *quippe qui, quippe quom, quippe quando*. With regard to the numerous lines where the MSS. offer the abnormal ictus *illīc* (Adverb), *illī* (Dative), Dr. Skutsch, while he agrees that the probable remedy for most is to alter the reading to *illī* (Adverb), *illīc* (Dative), thinks it too bold a stroke to apply this remedy to all, and prefers to suppose that the forms of *ille* without the enclitic *-ce* often came to take the accent on the last syllable, a supposition which undoubtedly finds some support from certain remarks which he quotes from the Latin Grammarians. The extension of the 'Elision of *-s* before a Vowel,' proposed by Dr. Leo, beyond a very limited area, e.g. *amatu's, amatu'st*, seems to me hardly warranted by the evidence as yet produced, and so in *Rud.* 888 (see p. 168), *nam in cōlumbari cōll(us) haud multo pōst erit*, it seems better to read *nam collus in cōlūmbari* (cf. *Plaut. frag.* 249 W.).

W. M. LINDSAY.

ENGELBRECHT'S *PATRISTISCHE ANALECTEN*.

Patristische Analecten, by AUGUST ENGELBRECHT (Wien 1892; 100 pp.).

WE have here four short Studies which the editor of Faustus and Ruricius in the *Vienna Corpus* (1891, vol. xxi.) gives us by way of Epilegomena. The first deals with the Ps.-Hieronymian Tract *De septem ordinibus Ecclesiae*. This is a letter from a theologian of the fifth century to a correspondent who has been recently elected Bishop by the popular vote on the ground of his influential position, although he has had no ministerial experience to qualify him for the duties of his office. He has appealed for some instruction, and he gets it from a severe mentor who does not shrink from warning him

against making just such appointments as his own. Internal evidence points to Gaul as the place of writing, and to 427 as the approximate date. This has been recently indicated by Dom Morin of the Benedictine Abbey of Maredsous in Belgium. But Engelbrecht challenges Dom Morin's further conclusion that the letter was written by Faustus of Riez to Rusticus of Narbonne. Rusticus had long been a monk at Lerins: whereas the new Bishop had been living in the world and was married. Faustus himself was in the year 427 a young monk twenty years of age at Lerins, though six years later he was made Abbot. It is therefore most unlikely that he would have been consulted in a case like this. Moreover the