

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](#)



Der Aufbau Der Plautinischen Cantica *Der Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica*. By S. Sudhaus. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1909.

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 24 / Issue 07 / November 1910, pp 222 - 224

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00045583, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00045583

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1910). The Classical Review, 24, pp 222-224 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00045583

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DER AUFBAU DER PLAUTINISCHEN CANTICA.

Der Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica. By S. Sudhaus. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1909.

THIS important work is a most ingenious application of the doctrine of 'Stollen,' enunciated by Otto Schröder in his well-known works on the choral odes of the Greek dramatists, to the cantica of Plautus. The general law is that each canticum consists of two metrical periods of equal compass (*i.e.*, containing an equal number of *metra*, or bars), with or without a third metrical period, which may either come between them or precede them or follow them—each of these divisions coinciding with a division according to the sense or subject matter.¹ The equal pair are called 'Stollen'—a mediaeval term for which there seems to be no exact equivalent in English, unless it is 'stanza.' 'Strophe' will not do, because the Stollen of the Greek choruses are subdivisions of the strophe and antistrophe. A very remarkable feature thus revealed is that in each canticum and each Stollen the number of *metra* is divisible by 4²—an arrangement which is natural enough, seeing that the Plautine cantica were written for singing and dancing. The figures given by Sudhaus arrest attention at once. *E.g.* *Mostellaria* 690-746 consists of two Stollen, each containing 108 *metra*.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{I. (lines 690-716): } 108 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \\ 60 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 24 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{II. (lines 717-746): } 108 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 60 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 18 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 18 \\ 8 \\ 16 \\ 8 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

¹ For instance, he divides *Casina* 621-758 into the following parts: I. 621-634 *lamentatio* (56 m.), 635-654 *πρόδῳ γῆρας* (64 m.); total 120 m.; II. 655-682 *narratio* (96 m.), 683-707 *mandata* (96 m.); III. 708-738 *conventio* (64 m.), 738-758 *precatio* (56 m.); total 120 m. Grand total 432 m.

² Except *Trin.* 1115-1124, which consists of 10+8+10 *metra*. Here the groups of 10 make an exception; for they are Stollen.

Rud. 906-937 consists of two Stollen, with 64 *metra* in each:

$$\text{I. (lines 906-923): } 64 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \\ 32 \end{array} \right.$$

$$\text{II. (lines 924-937): } 64 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \\ 32 \end{array} \right.$$

Rud. 938-962 is 'mesodic':

$$\text{I. (938-946): } 36 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 20 \\ 16 \end{array} \right.$$

Middle part (947-951): 20

$$\text{II. (952-962): } 36 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 20 \end{array} \right.$$

Most. 313-347 is 'pro-odic':

Introductory part (313-318): 24

$$\text{I. (319-335): } 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right.$$

$$\text{II. (336-347): } 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \end{array} \right.$$

Stich. 769-775 is 'epodic':

$$\text{I. (769-771): } 12$$

$$\text{II. (772-774): } 12$$

Concluding part (775) 4

The most startling instance of elaborate structure is given in the analysis of the monody of the drunken Pseudolus (*Pseud.* 1246-1284):

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{I. (1246-1267): } 80 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 32 \end{array} \right. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \\ 22 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 9 \\ 13 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ 32 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 22 \\ 10 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{II. (1268-1284): } 80 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \\ 22 \end{array} \right. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 9 \\ 22 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 9 \\ 13 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 32 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

How the structure of such cantica may have been developed from Greek models is illustrated by a comparison with a passage in the *Oed. Col.* of Sophocles, 207-253, which Schröder treated as consisting of three parts containing 36+23+36 *metra* respectively,³ but in which he is now inclined to accept Sudhaus' modification to 36+24+36 *metra*. Here, then, we find the numbers which Sudhaus has made familiar in Plautus—all divisible by 4. Between

³ See Schröder, *Sophoclis Cantica* (1907), p. 65; and Sudhaus, *Aufbau*, p. 118.

such a passage as this of Sophocles and the cantica of Plautus there no doubt lie several stages of development, which are for the most part concealed from us through the disappearance of the dramatic lyrics of Hellenistic times. But it is interesting and important to see the germ of a Plautine canticum in the earlier forms of Greek drama.

A strong feature of Sudhaus' case is that his metrical analyses involve no violent tampering with the text. On the contrary, he is, on the whole, ultra-conservative, so much so that one almost feels tempted to turn round and ask whether it is likely that the cantica should have been handed down in so perfect a condition—without a syllable too much or too little, in most cases; for we know that the dialogue parts of Plautus are by no means free from textual corruptions. Has not the author almost 'proved too much'? But it is only fair to add that the symmetrical correspondences of Stollen is itself a valuable instrument for detecting flaws in the text; and that Sudhaus has contributed some ingenious emendations in such passages; especially the transference of *et meam sententiam* (*Rud.* 918, where it is not wanted, and indeed is meaningless) to 939b (where it is wanted to complete the number of metra, and makes good sense if emended to *mea sententia*, abl.¹): cf. *Poen.* 1338, *Stich.* 641.

Whether Sudhaus has not gone too far in his subdivisions, and whether even his main divisions are always right, can only be determined by the closest examination and a consideration of all the other possibilities which offer themselves. I note three or four points of difficulty. Firstly, is not the *kind of metre* at least as important

a consideration as the *number of metra*? In many cases, at least, each metre has an *ethos* of its own. Yet the divisions of Sudhaus often involve breaking up a series of lines of uniform metrical structure; for instance, in one of the passages referred to above (*Rud.* 938-962) the series of 12 anapaestic dimeters (956-962) is broken in the middle. Why should not this canticum be treated as consisting of the following three parts: (1) 938-944, iambic dimeters, = 28 m.; (2) 945-955, varied metres, = 36 m.; (3) 956-962, anapaestic dimeters, = 28 m. That would also avoid the break in the middle of a sentence (l. 952) which Sudhaus has to face.² Or, to take another instance, the natural divisions of *Amph.* 202-261 (if the whole of this section of Act. I. Scene 1 is to be regarded as forming a unity) seem to be: (1) 202-218, iambic tetrameters, = 64 m.; (2) 219-247, mostly cretic tetrameters, = 112 m.; (3) 248-262, iambic tetrameters, = 60 m. But this arrangement fails to yield two Stollen of equal compass. Sudhaus therefore rejects it and analyses it as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{I. (202-230): 112} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 64 \text{ (iambic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \text{ (cretic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 16 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ \\ \text{II. (231-261): 112} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 64 \text{ (cretic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16 \\ 10 \\ 16 \end{array} \right. \\ 48 \text{ (iambic)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 24 \\ 24 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

which, I admit, is more symmetrical. But is not the symmetry purchased too dear at the cost of breaking up the sequence of the cretics (at line 231)? My arrangement also gets rid of the difficulty of taking 235-237 and 246, 247 together, as making up a total of 16 m., which seems to me rather forced.

¹ Lines 939a, b would then run—

GR. Mitte modo. TR. At pol ego te adiuvabo;
nam mea sententia
Bonis quod bene fit haud perit. GR. Turbida
tempestas heri fuit.

Or possibly we might retain the *et* of the MSS. (=also), reading *nam et mea sententia*, etc. *Adiuvabo* is the reading of the MSS. and is rightly retained; but I am not sure that Sudhaus is justified in calling the emendation *adiuvo* (Müller, accepted by most editors) a 'flagrant Germanism'; cf. *Rud.* 1040 *eo*, *Most.* 261 *non do*, 577 *clamo*, 853, 877, etc.

² In the running scene of the *Stichus* (274-325) Sudhaus considers that 280-288 (=32 m.), 290-300 (=32 m.) and 302-307 (=24 m.) represent three runs of Pinacium across the stage, the last at a quicker rate and therefore accomplished in fewer metra. But this involves breaking a sentence in the middle. And what becomes of the lines omitted?

Secondly, the question how the cantica are to be scanned (*i.e.*, what is the precise character of the metres employed), on which depends to some extent how many 'metra' are to be counted in each line, is a matter on which no final certainty has yet been reached—to put it mildly. Sudhaus is, of course, under great obligations to Leo's *Die Plautinischen Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik* (1897). Thirdly, opinions may differ as to the division of a canticum according to its subject matter, which is Sudhaus' main clue. Fourthly, it is not even certain where a canticum begins and ends, *e.g.* *Amph.* 202-218, *Pseud.* 1283 f. (not included in the canticum by Leo in his *Plaut. Cant.*, p. 41).

In conclusion, I desire to give a very warm welcome to this most stimulating book, of which every student of Plautus will have to take account. We shall look forward with the deepest interest to the complete edition of the cantica which Sudhaus promises. The present volume contains only select specimens, and strangely enough the author has deliberately omitted those which, he tells us, are the best *subsidia* of his theory, *e.g.* the cantica of the *Captivi*, which, however, will be found arranged according to Sudhaus' principles in the last edition of that play by Niemeyer (6th ed., 1910).

E. A. SONNENSCHN. EIN.

SELECT LETTERS OF SENECA.

Select Letters of Seneca. Edited with Introduction and Explanatory Notes by W. C. SUMMERS, Firth Professor of Latin in the University of Sheffield. Pp. cxiv + 383. School Class Books Series. London: Macmillan and Co.

SENECA may have been neither a deep thinker nor a great man. But he was undeniably a great preacher and a brilliant stylist, and his influence has been far-reaching. It is not creditable to modern scholarship that he should have suffered such neglect. He lacks a modern commentator, and his works have been almost entirely disregarded in the classical curriculum of our schools. And yet he is peculiarly suited for a school curriculum. He is rarely dull and seldom too difficult, though the average level of difficulty is fairly high, at any rate until the student has become familiar with the tricks of his style. Further, his philosophical writings form in many ways the best introduction to the views of the Stoic school, so influential at Rome under the early emperors. The language too is pure, and the style all-important in the history of post-Augustan prose. The thanks of English scholars are therefore all the more due to Professor Summers for his excellent edition of selected letters of Seneca. He has done his work

admirably. In three introductory chapters he traces the history of the pointed style of Latin prose, discusses the language and style of Seneca's prose, and gives a most interesting account of Seneca's critics and admirers from his own to the present day. These chapters are excellently written and deal fully and adequately with a subject almost entirely neglected by English scholarship. The selection of letters is most judicious, and the notes are precisely what is wanted. It is, however, to be regretted that there should be no discussion of the life and character of Seneca and no estimate of the importance of Stoicism in the ancient world. The omission of an introductory chapter on these themes is a real blemish to what is otherwise a book of unusual excellence. With regard to the text and notes there is singularly little to criticise.¹ The text is infinitely better than the unsatisfactory text of Hense in the Teubner series. Professor Summers emends fairly freely, perhaps to some critics it will seem that he does so too freely. But in nearly every case the existing text is highly unsatisfactory, and the suggestions

¹ In the note on the quotation from Hecato (*Ep.* 5. 7.), *desines timere si sperare desieris*, the parallel from Seneca's *Medea* 163 should be added, *qui nil potest sperare, desperet nihil*.