

# 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](#)



---

## ***Plautus Captivi. Recensuit F. Schoell. Leipzig, 1887.*** **8vo. (Teubner) xxii. and 136. 4 Mk.**

J. H. Onions

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 304 - 304

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184276, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00184276](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184276)

### **How to cite this article:**

J. H. Onions (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 304-304 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184276

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Hephaestion attributes to him and adopts the incredible scansion of the asynartete line ἑστι μὲν καλὰ πᾶσι χρυσόισιν ἀνθρώποιςιν as a combination of a dimeter trochaic acatalectic and an iambic hephthemimeris i.e. — — — — — and — — — — —. The book is disfigured by a large number of misprints.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

*Carmina figurata Graeca*, ed. CAROLUS HAEBERLIN.  
Editio altera. Hannoverae. 1887. 3 Mk.

THIS is a very complete and careful edition of the six poems in the Greek Anthology which are composed in lines of varying length arranged so as to represent the profile of the subject of the poem. The book contains a revised text with an *apparatus criticus*, the Scholia, and Latin prolegomena. The latter (sixty-six pages) consist of an account of the MSS., a list of editions, a critical and partly exegetical commentary and a discussion of the date and authorship of the poems as well as the relations between them. The conclusion is that with the exception of the second Βωμός they were written about 300—275 B.C., and that the traditional authorship is right, i.e. that the πτέρυγες ἔρωτος, the πέλεκυς, and the φόν were composed by Simias, the first Βωμός by Doriadas, and (contrary to the opinion of most editors) the σῦνγξ by Theocritus. In arguing for the authenticity of the latter poem the editor lays stress on the resemblance between the σῦνγξ and the 7th Idyll (θαλύσια) of Theocritus, and makes some ingenious conjectures as to the persons introduced under fictitious names in that Idyll. He also, following Wilamowitz, points out imitations of Lycophron's *Alexandra* in the Βωμός of Doriadas. The second Βωμός, which is distinguished from the other *carmina figurata* by being in an Ionic (not Doric) dialect, he assigns to the time of Hadrian. Many of the suggestions made in this part of the prolegomena must be (to say the least) very uncertain, as the writer himself admits, but he seems to have done everything possible to throw light on these obscure metrical curiosities.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

*Plautus Captivi*. Recensuit F. SCHOELL. Leipzig, 1887. 8vo. (Teubner) xxii. and 136. 4 Mk.

SCHOLARS will be glad to welcome another instalment of this work, invaluable to students of Plautus and Old Latin in general. In the preface Professor Schoell touches on a number of various points. He banishes, it may be hoped for ever, the forms *Valeis*, *Valide*, &c., shewing that several of the passages where they have been introduced on metrical grounds require other more far-reaching remedies. He brings the authority of Artemidorus, *Oneirocr.* I., 78, to prove that Ergasilus = ἐργάσιμος (*scortum*), and argues in support of the form *lorarius* which he has introduced from B, E, J into the headings of Acts I. and II., perhaps with doubtful wisdom. The *apparatus criticus*, which it is hardly necessary to say is given with the most minute accuracy, contains a complete account of the readings of the following MSS.—A, collated by Loewe, and afterwards a second time by Professor Schoell himself, B, D to v. 503, and E, all three times collated by Loewe, J, for which Prof. Sonnenschein's collation is used, and the Ottobonian fragment O, containing v. 400-555. The various emendations which have been suggested are not given with the *apparatus criticus*, but in the form of an *appendix critica* at the end of the volume. This was the method originally adopted in the edition of the Trinummus, and it seems unfortunate that it has not been followed throughout. The weak point of

the edition is perhaps the emendations. Prof. Schoell has introduced nearly 100 of his own of greater or less importance, and of these the most that can be said is that some of them may be right. One of those which seem most probable, is *Aetoli illi* which he reads for the *Aetoli* of the MSS. in vv. 24 and 93. We may mention among others v. 135, *Ossa atque pellis sum, miser, I macritudine*. The MSS. give here, *miseri amacritudine* B<sup>1</sup>, *miser amacritudine* B<sup>2</sup>, D, E, J; Nonius 136, 2, reads *miser macritudine* (*marcitudine* P<sup>1</sup>). Plautus uses the phrase *longa littera* (l) to suggest *suspensio per collum*, much as Hood speaks of "enlisting in the line." Another sense of *I longum* may be found in Ausonius, Epigrams, 128, 11, but is there any instance in classical Latin where it is used to denote excessive leanness? Ussing reads *miser macritudine* with Nonius, and this may be right though it hardly accounts for the *miseri* and *miseria* of the Plautus MSS. Was the original reading *miser A! macritudine*? *A!* might fairly be supposed to represent the deep sigh uttered by the unhappy Ergasilus, as he reflects on the terrible state of emaciation to which he has been reduced by the capture of his commissariat department. If *A* had dropped out in the original of B as in Nonius, the *i* of B<sup>1</sup> may represent the sign of insertion, a common source of corruption in MSS. In v. 199, Prof. Schoell reads *Eam queit erili imperio ingeniis nostris lenem reddere*, introducing *queit* for *que et* of the MSS. How is *queit* to be construed? Immediately below, v. 201, where the MSS. are hopelessly corrupt, he gives *multabo bolis, oculos si multum raditis*. What are the *bolis* (gains, catches) of which they are to be mulcted, and does the fact that the laws of the Twelve Tables forbid women *radere genas* (to tear their cheeks) in sign of mourning, justify the *lorarius* in telling the captives that he will mulct them of their gains if they tear their eyes to any great extent (*multum*)? v. 212 he reads *acquiter* which Priscian mentions as used by Plautus in the sense of *aeque*. Is there any authority for the use of *aeque* in the positive, meaning 'fairly' or 'equitably'?

In v. 690 he reads *qui per uirtutem perit abit non interit*. All the MSS. of Plautus give *perit abit non interit*. The reading *abit* seems to have been suggested by Nonius 422, 7, where the second hand of the Leyden MS. (L), with the Paris MSS. C and D, and the Montpelier MS. read, *perit aut*; as also, I believe, the Wolfenbüttel MS. It must however be remembered that the Harleian, Leyden first hand, and Paris P agree in giving *at*, and the united testimony of these three MSS. is not to be lightly set aside. In Nonius MSS. too *aut* is much

more likely to be a corruption of *at*, arising from *ut* (*at* corrupted to *ut* and corrected) than *vice versa*. Perhaps a better suggestion may be *Qui per uirtutem perit, perit at non interit*, proposed by Gertz. In support of this reading the following considerations may be urged, (1) That it is nearer the MSS. both of Plautus and Nonius. (2) That Nonius is distinguishing between *perire* and *interire*, not between *abire* and *interire*, as the reading *abit* would seem to require. (3) In v. 693, Hegio replies *Vel te interiisse uel periisse praediceant, not uel abisse, and periisse* in 693 seems to presuppose *perit* in 690. It should be mentioned that both these readings have already been suggested by English scholars, *abit* by Prof. Nettleship, *perit* by Prof. Palmer of Dublin.

The list might be considerably extended, but it is an ungrateful task to criticise individual details in a work of this importance, which the *apparatus criticus* alone must render indispensable.—J. H. ONIONS.