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](#)

Fay's *Mostellaria* of Plautus *T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria* : with Introduction and Notes by Edwin W. Fay, Professor of Latin in the University of Texas. Boston : Allyn and Bacon, 1902. Pp. xlvii, 157.

E. H.

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 08 / November 1903, pp 388 - 389

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208706, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208706

How to cite this article:

E. H. (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 388-389 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208706

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

parfaites par le travail dialectique,' etc. (p. 131). These extracts may suffice to indicate the standpoint from which M. Bovet approaches his theme. His main conclusions will be evident from the following: 'la divinité, qui a une place dans la pensée de Platon, n'en a point dans sa théorie des idées, c'est-à-dire dans sa philosophie' (p. 76). 'C'est ici, dans ces derniers écrits de Platon, que pour la première fois, chez un philosophe grec, l'idée de Dieu se trouve rattachée à une théorie du monde et invoquée pour l'explication de cette théorie' (p. 139). From this it may be seen that M. Bovet is an adherent of Lutoslawski's system of interpretation; and his object is, in short, to do for Plato's theology what the Polish scholar did for the 'logic.' The truth of the system he practically assumes, on the strength of its endorsement by Weil and Gomperz, without further attempt at verification. His main argument falls into two parts, the first dealing with the 'dialogues of Ideas,' the second with the later dialogues (as fixed in Lutoslawski's chronological scheme). In attempting to establish in the former part his negative conclusion that God has no place in the earlier phase of Platonism, M. Bovet naturally finds occasion to controvert a number of rival theories. First, he examines M. Couturat's view that 'omnia deorum dicta factaque mythica sunt,' which would make of the 'gods' merely another name for the 'ideas.' This is Teichmüllerism over again, and the arguments brought to support it are not wholly convincing. On the other hand, to say that it makes of Plato an atheist is scarcely a valid objection. Having disposed of M. Couturat, the writer proceeds

to criticize the theories of various other interpreters as to the relation in which God stands to the Ideas in middle Platonism. Zeller's identification of God with the supreme Idea; Fouillée's notion that the lower ideas should be regarded as immanent determinations of God; Stallbaum's account of the ideas as the thoughts of Divine intelligence; Brochard's theory that for Plato the Idea dominates God just as, for Greek religious thought, Destiny dominates Zeus,—all these interpretations M. Bovet reviews successively and rejects. None of them can be proved, he argues, for the Platonism of the 'Republic' period; and to ground them on texts drawn from any of the later dialogues is, he contends, a wholly illegitimate procedure.

M. Bovet writes clearly and states his points well; but it does not appear that he has made any valuable contribution to our knowledge of Plato's philosophical development in the present thesis. Perhaps his most original suggestion is that Plato's later theology was in some degree influenced by the writings of Xenophon,—a suggestion based on the fact that the 'Theaetetus' may be supposed to synchronize with the 'Memorabilia.' Unfortunately this piece of originality is not of a kind well calculated to impress his readers with a sense of his capacity for interpreting Plato. His sarcastic reference (p. 52) to those who attempt, like Bayrhammer and Fouillée, to explain Plato by a method 'qui consiste à éluder tous les problèmes par la synthèse des solutions contraires,' sounds somewhat more reassuring, and seems to promise independent thought. But is not that, too, a leaf from the book of M. Lutoslawski?

R. G. BURY.

FAY'S *MOSTELLARIA* OF PLAUTUS.

T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria: with Introduction and Notes by EDWIN W. FAY, Professor of Latin in the University of Texas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1902. Pp. xlvii, 157.

If the teacher chooses to play the sophist, the young student may be led to believe that the works of Plautus are faultless in metre and meaning throughout. But since Plautus comes comparatively late in Latin studies, the editor had better be frank, and let his readers know that the text of

Plautus defies systematic emendation, and that much of his meaning is lost to us. Professor Fay has taken the former course. For all that he says about manuscripts or variations of reading, his text might be copied straight from the playwright's autograph. If we accept his principles of prosody and metre, and keep an eye on his marks of quantity, every line of the play may be persuaded to scan. His commentary gives an explanation of everything, with few hints of doubt.

In the introductory paragraphs on

prosody and metre the most noteworthy thing is the frequent and undoubting application of the law of the *brevis breuians* to trisyllabic words of which the last syllable is elided. Line 73 is marked thus :

uenire id quod molēste est quā́m illud quod
cupidé petas.

Similarly *olēre* in 42, which is commonly regarded as a third declension form, is here treated as a second declension form with shortening of the second vowel. On the other hand the *brevis breuians* might have saved Professor Fay from scanning *dierecte* as three syllables in line 8.

Hiatus is very freely used. In 6 *malum* is left unelided, though *clamatiost* might safely have been corrected to *clamitatiost*. In 152-3, however, where hiatus may be excused by the slow enumeration, Professor Fay rejects this device, and gives us trochees followed by cretics in the same line.

His preface tells us that the text is based on the *editio minor* of Goetz and Schoell. In one place at least his imitation of this excellent model has gone too far, for he reproduces the note of interrogation which Goetz and Schoell, or rather their printers, have placed at the end of 364. But his allegiance is not usually so strict. Some of his sweeping changes will deserve the attention of subsequent editors : but there

is not much to be said for *eri filium*, which Plautus would have expressed by *erilem filium*, in 21 ; and in 1113 *numquam edepol hodie di med inuitum destinant tibi* is not near enough to the reading of the manuscripts, or good enough in point of sense, to justify the irregular ending. These two specimens may suffice.

The editor's explanatory comments are not less open to criticism. For example, he connects the name *Tranio* (1) with *terpaivo*, (2) with *Picus*, the Roman prophet-king, (3) with *pica*. Thus 667, which might seem a simple statement of purpose, is spoken by *Tranio* '*qua* prophet. Similar is Mark's Gospel, xiii. 11.' Similar ! Again, *caedere* does not mean 'peck at,' 'devour' : but *if* it means that in 65, 'we have here a further allusion to *Tranio-picus*.' Leaving these etymological puns, we may observe that *deputeo* (146) is a non-existent word, and rightly so ; and that *opprobriarier* in 301, in spite of 302, cannot mean 'to be accounted to me for good.'

These few remarks may indicate the faults of the book. Its merits are brightness and clearness, fertility in suggestion, a wealth of 'modern instances' (from Browning, Kipling, Lillian Bell, and some others), and a persevering endeavour, which does not always overreach itself, to get at the author's drift.

E. H.

OWEN'S *PERSIUS AND JUVENAL*.

A Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuuenalis saturae. cum additamentis Bodleianis recognouit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit S. G. OWEN, Aedis Christi alumnus. Oxford, Clarendon Press. No date, no pagination. Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d., 3s., and 4s.

THIS edition of *Persius* and *Juvenal* is certainly the handiest in existence. The paper and binding are good, the print is excellently clear, the notes, by the omission of unimportant variants, are rendered not only briefer than Mr Buecheler's but plainer and easier to use, and the whole is executed with sufficient accuracy of detail. I have only noticed faults or omissions in the text at *Pers.* v 87, *Iuu.* vi 132, xii 72, and in the notes at *Pers.* vi 7, *Iuu.* i 21, iii 187, iv 99, vi 73, vii 177, 204, xiii 65.

Persius is not difficult to edit. The two

authorities which preserve him, P on the one hand and AB on the other, are both exceedingly corrupt, yet each so well repairs the deficiencies of its rival that emendation is hardly required. Even recension is no troublesome or dangerous business ; for where the two witnesses dissent it mostly happens that either the one or the other is unmistakably wrong ; and in some places where the choice is doubtful it matters next to nothing how we choose, because both alternatives are good and even equally good. Accordingly one editor's text of *Persius* will not differ materially from another's, and Mr Owen's departures from Mr Buecheler's edition of 1893 are neither numerous nor important. Some of them are in the right direction, iii 48 and 107-9 and v 73-5 for instance, where Mr Owen reverts to an older and better punctuation, and i 92 *sqq.*,