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](#)

Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit Fridericus Vollmer. Vol. II., Fasc. iii., Homerus Latinus. Teubner, 1913. M. 1.20.

J. Jackson

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 05 / August 2014, pp 182 - 182

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00007551, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00007551

How to cite this article:

J. Jackson (1914). The Classical Review, 28, pp 182-182 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00007551

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

emendation of a hopelessly corrupt passage. In support of this he cites *Athen.*, 7, 326, where Arcestratus, the author whom Ennius is paraphrasing, is quoted as saying ἐν δ' Αἰνῶ καὶ τῷ Πόντῳ τὴν ὕν ἀγόραζε. The objection to the emendation is that the localities differ. But *sus* and *finis* might easily be confused, and there is much to be said for the suggestion, though it is perhaps rash to insert any conjecture in the text at this particular point. This is not the place to criticise the text as a whole. It is now well known, and, whatever its deficiencies in points of detail, marks an epoch in the history of Apuleian criticism. The collation of F is a model of accuracy. The reviewer has checked it with the MS. throughout, and has found scarcely a single error, although at times the editor seems to express himself too confidently as to what the original reading may have been. There is a small slip in the Apparatus Criticus on p. 73, l. 25, where it is stated that the MSS. of Plato read εὐαγὲς. This is not borne out by the Apparatus Criticus of Burnet's *Plato* (*Leges*, p. 956), sc. 'εὐαγὲς Clemens Eus.: εὐχερὲς libri.' The one serious criticism, however, that we would pass upon the book is that the Apparatus Criticus is overcrowded with conjectures, many of which have no real interest and importance, and that it needs very careful reading owing to the many abbreviations and the closeness of the type. There can be few Apparatus Critici which are so tiresome to use. It is to be regretted that the publishers could not see their way to giving the editor considerably greater space. Had they done so, they would have removed a blemish from one of the best texts in their series.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Vol. II., Fasc. iii., *Homerus Latinus.* Teubner, 1913. M. 1.20.

WITH this little work, Mr. Vollmer brings his recension of Baehrens a stage

nearer the goal. It contains the thousand and odd verses in which Baebius Italicus¹ has enshrined the *Iliad* and his name; an index nominum; a preface, erring perhaps on the side of brevity (for not every reader can instantly refresh his memory with the Munich *Sitzungsberichte*); and a critical apparatus which, for the present, must be regarded as superseding all others. No detailed review of the text is possible here. It is based on an examination, or re-examination, of the whole ponderable manuscript material; and, though the editor indulges in one or two of his favourite exegetical bizarreries, he has introduced a substantial quantity of plausible, or more than plausible, corrections. A noticeable feature is the number of lacunae indicated, in most cases with something approaching certainty: the supplement, for instance, to v. 293, if not verbally exact, must, at any rate, be essentially so. There is an indubitable emendation—*anguineis* for *sanguineis*—at 891, a neat and equally indubitable change of punctuation at 489; and at 365 one heaves a sigh of relief at the passing of the purple soul. The selection of conjectures by former critics is generally adequate, though one or two omissions might be regretted. A minor, but welcome, innovation is the absence of the time-honoured and futile dissection of the poem into twenty-four books, and its replacement by marginal references to the *Iliad*.

J. JACKSON.

Caldbeck, Cumberland.

Vie de Porphyre. Par J. BIDEZ. Pp. vii + 166 + 73*. Teubner, 1913. M. 6.

OF the Neo-platonic masters Porphyry is, as M. Bidez observes, 'at once one of the most famous and one of the least understood.' For the history of his life practically the only reliable source is

¹ Mr. Vollmer adopts the full name, published by Schenkl, in 1890, from the *Vindobonensis*. His remark is incontrovertible: *Librarius ille qui acrostichide non perspecta proferre poterat iustum cognomen ITALICVS idem si gentile addidit BEBIVS, ego non dubito quin utrumque ex bono puroque hauserit fonte, scilicet ex codice carminis deperdito.*