

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](#)



Mélanges Renier. Recueil de travaux publiés par l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (Section des sciences historiques et philologiques) en mémoire de son président Léon Renier. Paris, Vieweg. 1887. pp. lx, 468. 15 fr.

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 308 - 309

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184331, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184331

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 308-309 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184331

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Verrius, whether from materials supplied by Festus himself or by other works of Verrius. The argument of chapter II. is that the single glosses often give indications of having been extracted in groups from the same works, and afterwards distributed among the various letters; thus (as Hertz pointed out) many of the glosses on proverbs may have come from Sennius Capito: the continuous glosses on names (e.g., *Caeso, Caesar*, p. 57; *Lucius, Lycius, Luceres, Lucani*, p. 119; *Opiter, Opitulus, Opitulata*, p. 170; *Mamercus, Mamurius, Mamers, Martialis, Mamilia turris*, p. 130) may in like manner go back to some one authority, perhaps Varro. The same reasoning holds good with regard to the groups of glosses which illustrate points of antiquities. Again, the same notes often occur under different glosses, probably from the conscious effort of Verrius to spare his readers trouble.

The same correspondence between groups of glosses under different letters may, it is argued in the third chapter, be observed in the second parts of some letters. And some of the series of glosses on Cato and Plautus may be analysed into smaller groups.

The fourth chapter contains an attempt to prove that the alphabetical order originally contemplated by Verrius in each letter had been disturbed, not probably by Festus, but through an early confusion in the redaction of the book by Verrius himself.

In chapter V., Dr. Reitzenstein mentions a number of the most important authorities which it is probable that Verrius used at first hand.

The aim of the whole essay is to show the homogeneity of the work abridged by Festus, and the improbability of the hypothesis that this very poor scholar made any additions to the work of Verrius. Without entering into details we may say at once that in our opinion Dr. Reitzenstein has succeeded, especially by the close reasoning in Chapter I., in raising a strong presumption in favour of his view, though proof is perhaps not attainable.

Dr. Reitzenstein is also, we think, quite successful in demonstrating the existence of homogeneous groups of glosses under different letters, and right in referring them respectively to the same authorities.

The analysis of Catonian and Plautine glosses into smaller groups was undertaken at the suggestion of Studemund. It appears to us to rest on a more shadowy foundation than, no doubt, Dr. Reitzenstein would admit. His case is far the strongest in the case of the Plautine glosses, but even here the evidence is not conclusive. The point which he tries to make is this: that under the letter *C* (Paulus, p. 60-62), we find three groups of Plautine glosses, in which the plays are respectively quoted in alphabetical order, (1) *Curionem—Crumena*: from *Aulularia, Amphitruo, Bacchides*—(twice), uncertain plays; (2) *Corinthienses—Celassis*: from *Aulularia, Amphitruo, Bacchides, Casina* (thrice), *Cistellaria, Miles* (four times), *Stichus*; (3) *Custoditio—Cudere*: uncertain except in one instance. And corresponding to the second series under *C* is a series under *A* (*Adarinti—auca*): from *Aulularia, Casina, Miles, Menaechni, Poenulus, Rudens, Trinummus*.

After the letter *C* Dr. Reitzenstein admits that the smaller groups of Plautine glosses quite vanish. But even under *A* and *C* he is obliged to make some assumptions which (is it owing to English "beef-mindedness"?) we are unable to accept. To make the gloss *Corinthienses* refer to the *Aulularia*, (559 *Corinthiensem fontem*), our author says it is impossible that Plautus can ever have used *Corinthienses* for the inhabitants of Corinth. Now *Atheniensis* is common instead of *Athenacus*; may not *Corinthiensis* have been used in

the same way by Plautus for *Corinthius*? If so, there is no necessity to think of the *Aulularia* here. *Conivolis* is referred to the lost part of the *Cistellaria* on hardly any evidence. *Cogitatio*, we are asked to believe, must have come out of the *Miles*, though it is not given in the MSS. either there or anywhere else in the remains of Plautus. *Clientam*, again, must come from the *Miles*, though, it might, on our author's own showing, come equally well from the *Poenulus* or the *Rudens*. *Capulum* must again refer to the *Miles*, because Nonius refers to *capularis* in this play in his gloss on *Capulum*. But *Capulum* might be a gloss on Lucretius's *ire ad capulum*. In his remarks on the Plautine series under *A*, Dr. Reitzenstein assigns *audilavi* on a conjecture of Bergk's to *Miles* 211, though it actually occurs *Stichus* 167. He then asserts that Paulus's words (p. 28), '*advelitatio*' *iactatio quaedam verborum figurata ab hastis velitaribus*, refer "zweifello" to *Rudens* 525, *equidem me ad velitationem exerceo*. True, Turnebus thought this was possible. But Dr. Reitzenstein can hardly mean that Verrius took *advelitationem* as one word. If Verrius read *velitationem*, then the gloss has been transferred by an error from *V* to *A*, (for *me advelitationem exerceo* is untranslatable), and nothing is proved for the letter *A*. If the passage in the *Rudens* is referred to, *advelitatione* must be read (against the authority of *A* and *B*) in the text of Plautus. This was recognised by Turnebus. The gloss *auctor* feminine, it is assumed, refers to *Trin.* 107, or *Stichus* 129. It may equally well be meant for Vergil's *auctor ego audendi*, which is a stock quotation in the grammarians for the feminine use of *auctor*. The first point in dealing with Paulus is to remember, not only that he is a worse epitomist of a bad epitomist, but also that whole masses of Latin prose and poetry have perished.

In all this, as indeed in other parts of the book, we think Dr. Reitzenstein far too much inclined to mistake mere presumptions for certainties. This fault is conspicuous in the fourth chapter, which is a mere attempt to prove what cannot either be proved or disproved. We miss, by the bye, any mention either in this chapter or elsewhere of Verrius's original division of each letter into *libri*. The destruction of this arrangement by Festus is, no doubt, responsible for much of the obscurity which besets the whole subject.—H. NETTLESHIP.

Mélanges Renier. Recueil de travaux publiés par l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (Section des sciences historiques et philologiques) en mémoire de son président Léon Renier. Paris, Vieweg. 1887. pp. lx, 468. 15 fr.

THIS memorial volume opens with a short sketch of Renier by Desjardins, which is followed by a full bibliography under the three headings of *Livres Classiques, Travaux de Vulgarisation, and Travaux d'Érudition*. Under the last head Renier's works and occasional writings on epigraphical subjects are carefully detailed. The essays themselves are the work of some thirty different scholars. Those on classical subjects comprise the following topics: 1. The author of *c. Aristogit. I* and his acquaintance with Athenian institutions, by H. Weil. (Weil questions the ignorance imputed to the writer of this speech by J. H. Lipsius, *Leipziger Studien*, 1883). 2. Observations on the Text of the *Œconomicus*, by Ed. Tournier. (A number of emendations, some of them of a very drastic character and making seemingly too little allowance for free and even loose writing, the former intentional the latter unin-

tentional, in Xenophon's dialogue. Tournier acts up to a maxim for which he thinks a good deal could be said: 'n'essayez pas de corriger un passage avant de vous être assuré qu'il ne doit pas être supprimé.'). 3. Whether the teaching of Pythagoras contained Egyptian elements? By F. Robiou. (A mild affirmative is supported by reference to ancient Egyptian records). 4. Remarks on the Attraction of the Demonstrative and Relative in Latin, by O. Riemann. (Supplementary and corrective of Madvig and Draeger). 5. VE in Greek, by L. Havet. (F', = *va* in the sense of 'as,' is assumed to have dropped out in Homer where the metre suggests the loss of a consonant before *ws*). 6. Commodianus, by G. Boissier. (An interesting account of the early Christian poet based on recent research. 7. Athenaeus and Lucian, by J. Nicole. (An ingenious attempt to fix the relative date of these authors by the examination of a passage in which Lucian apparently ridicules Athenaeus' blunder in giving Σκύφος as the nickname of Dercyllidas instead of Σίσυφος which Ephorus doubtless had). In the other classical articles, Chatelain directs attention to important manuscript authority for Virgil to be found in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* and Alfred Jacob gives a description of some Greek palimpsests (originally containing ecclesiastical matter, such as homilies, lectionaries, parts of Basil, Chrysostom, the *Scala Paradisi*) in the same library, while Haussoullier writes on the three Doric tribes in Crete. The remaining papers range from Semitic Notes to the Spaneas and from Pirro Ligorio to the Persian Apocalypse of Daniel.—W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Latin Examination Papers in Miscellaneous Grammar and Idioms. A. M. M. STEDMAN. Bell. 2s. 6d.

THIS collection of 'Grammar and Critical' papers does not of course profess or desire to be original,

but it is one of the useful labour-saving devices which have recently cropped up, as the production of schoolbooks has become more organised. The papers themselves, like most others, contain good, bad, and indifferent questions: but the large number, 133, which Mr. Stedman has collected gives quite sufficient choice to make the book most welcome. The hour spent in making a grammar paper is perhaps as well spent as any other devoted to needful drudgery: but there is no reason why so many people should spend it so often. With Mr. Stedman's help a good grammar paper can be set in ten minutes: and for this he will get abundant gratitude in the right quarter.—A. S.

Extracts for Translation. Selected by R. C. JEBB, H. JACKSON, and W. E. CURREY. Bell. 4s. 6d.

THE versions of these pieces were published some years ago by the three excellent scholars whose names they bear, and are well-known among teachers. They are so good, and so useful, that we have often been surprised that they have so few competitors.

Schoolmasters and other teachers will be glad to know that the originals are now thus conveniently collected in one volume, which can be used in class, and will save time in the study.

We only regret that the 'composition' pieces are so comparatively few. They are all good: and Professor Jebb is far and away the most brilliant composer in Greek and Latin now living.

The book has an interest for old Cambridge men, it may not be impertinent to add, as a record of the time when the colleges awoke to the scandal of having nearly all the best teaching done by private coaches. No one did more at Trinity College to remove this abuse than Mr. Jebb, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Currey.—A.S.

DEDICATION.

(From the forthcoming "*Echoes of Hellas*.")

Ὡς τόδε σοί, δέσποινα καλῶν ἐπήραν' Ἀθηνῶν,
 μνήμ' ἀνέθηκα τῆς Ἀθίδος οἰχομένης,
 ἀσπάσιοι Φιδηλίδ', ἐμὸν φάος· ἥσπερ ἐν ἀγνοίς
 αἰδῶς τ' ἀτρεκίη τ' ὄμμασιν ἐνδίαει.
 ἱμερτὸν δὲ μάλ' ἡμετέραις ἐν Ὀμηρίσιν ἦδεν
 ὀψὲ χορευούσας· καὶ σὺ παρήσθῃ, θεά·
 οἶά γ' Ὀμηρίειν σπουδάζομεν, οὐδένες ὄντες,
 φάσμασι ποιντοῖς φάσματα τῶν φθιμένων
 βαίον ἔτ' ἀγκαλέσαι χρήζοντες, ἵγχι ποθεινῆς
 Ἑλλάδος, οἷς ἔμπης ἡχόα θέσπιν ἔχει.

G. C. WARR.