

# 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](#)



---

## *Essais de Métrique greeque*, par A. E. Chaignet. Paris. 1887. 6 fr.

C. B. Heberden

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 303 - 304

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184252, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00184252](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184252)

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

C. B. Heberden (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 303-304 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184252

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

Christ. The value of Funk's work is not so much in his having thrown fresh light on the hard sayings of the *Didache*, as in the fact that he has carefully collected the explanations hitherto offered, and has furnished the reader with all available material for the study of the book.—CHARLES MERK.

NEMESII EMESENI libri περί φύσεως ἀνθρώπου versio latina. E libr. ms. nunc primum edidit et apparatus critico instruxit CAROLUS HOLZINGER. Lipsiae, Freytag; Praga, Tempsky. 1887. 8vo. pp. xl, 176. 6 Mk.

To Hermann Usener belongs the credit of suggesting the publication of this book, which gives a text founded on two MSS. (B. i.e. Bamberg, 67; P. i.e. Prague, Metropolitan Library, L 94, a transcript of B.) both of the thirteenth century. Both contain in addition, Sen. n. q. and the Asclepius.

P. has no title, but Usener from a short description recognised in it a Latin Nemesius, and informed the editor of the discovery of the other copy B. Seven chapters (35–38, 42–44) are wanting in both MSS., and the Greek order, after c. 19, is several times deserted.

The translation appears to be different from that ascribed to Joannes Burgundius, a jurisconsult and judge of Pisa († 1194). It is slavishly literal, retaining many Greek words in Latin characters. Often a Greek word has been confused with another of similar form; thus ἐσθής appears as *sensibilitas*, προσκοῦσας as *obundientes*, κῶνον as *pulverem*. Many interpolations and *lacunae* in the Greek text may be corrected by aid of the Latin. The spelling has been corrected throughout, the Greek terms set side by side with the Latin in the *apparatus criticus*; a Latin index of seven pages closes the book.

In the current number (xlii 2 p. 276–285) of the *Rheinisches Museum*, H. von Arnim prints in parallel columns parts of Nemes. de nat. hom. c. 3 and the Latin of Prisciani solutiones ad Chosroën (ed. Bywater, Suppl. Aristot. i 2 p. 558). The title of the article, Sources of the tradition respecting Ammonius Sakkas would not necessarily attract a student of Nemesius.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus De Sacerdotio libri sex. Mit Anmerkungen neu herausgegeben von Carl Seltmann, Domcapitular in Breslau. Mit Genehmigung des Fürstbischöflichen Ordinariats zu Breslau. Münster und Paderborn, 1887. 2 Mk. 50.

The object of this edition is to supply a handy text of the *De Sacerdotio* with explanatory notes, to help theological students in the reopened seminaries to count the cost before entering upon the priesthood, and to help the clergy to fulfil the duties which they have undertaken. The book is well printed; and the notes, when they go beyond an alternative reading or the translation of a sentence, are mostly of a practical nature, giving examples out of the editor's own pastoral experience. They are moderate and sensible in tone.—A. P.

Essais de Métrique grecque, par A. E. CHAIGNET. Paris. 1887. 6 fr.

THE first part of this book (eighty pages) deals with the general principles of Greek metre, the second (pp. 81–265) is a study of the iambic metre in its various forms. There is also an appendix of a dozen pages on *asynartete* verses. M. Chaignet treats the subject from a purely metrical point of view. His

position is that the long syllable always = two short syllables; he does not admit that it ever = three short syllables or more, and is totally opposed to the rhythmical treatment of metre adopted e.g. by Westphal and Christ whom he constantly criticises. He does not, however, appear to contribute anything new of importance to the argument against the rhythmical doctrine. Moreover, there are serious defects in his book. (1) He does not distinguish the relative importance of the different writers on Greek metre and rhythm, e.g. sources of such different value as Aristoxenus, Hephaestion, and the various Scholia on Hephaestion. (2) The weakness of the metrical, and the strength of the rhythmical point of view cannot be seen without taking into account the entire range of Greek metres, lyrical as well as non-lyrical; the introduction on the general principles of Greek metre leaves the former too much out of sight, and the result is therefore misleading. (3) The book shows a want of accuracy, and contains a number of mistakes. The quotations are often given in a careless manner. Thus e.g. Marius Victorinus is quoted by the paging sometimes of Putschius, sometimes of Gaisford, and the change is made from one paging to another even within the limits of the same note, without any indication of the edition used. The quotations are not always correct, and the meaning is missed because the words are separated from their context. Thus the term *ἐπιλοκή* is apparently applied (p. 39) to a verse in which all the feet are pure, e.g. all dactyls, or all iambs, though the Schol. on Hephaestion quoted in the note, when taken in connection with the context, shows that it means a union of different species of verse in one genus, e.g. of iambs and trochees in the *ἐπιλοκή τρισημῶς*. The term *ἐπιάνθετον* is applied (p. 68) to a verse in which are united κῶλα of different species, e.g. trochees and iambs, though the passage quoted from the Schol. to Hephaestion shows that it means a verse in which are united κῶλα of different genera, e.g. trochees and dactyls. In a book on metre mistakes in quantity are particularly out of place. Some of these are merely misprints, but this cannot be said of the following. The line *λέοντες Ἕλληνας δύο δίδωμι* is quoted (p. 157), as an iambic trimeter brachycatalectic, and attention is called to the *anapaest* in the 4th foot. The line *Διόνυσος ὀντίκει παθ' ἡ Κάδμω κόρη* is said (p. 181), to begin with a *tribrach*. The lines—  
 λεύκιπποι ξυνομαίμονες ὄλβισαν ὄλβισαν  
 τὸ πρόβη' ἐκ δόμων δ' ἐνόμισαν θεοὶ σ' ἐμοῦ

are quoted (p. 158) as iambic trimeters catalectic! In his treatment of the iambic trimeter M. Chaignet advocates restoring to the Greek tragedians the *anapaests* in 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th feet which Porson expelled. He is more convincing in his argument against the symmetry which some scholars have fancied they discovered as a frequent element in the iambic trimeters of Greek tragedy. His criticism of Westphal's view that verses are *asynartete* if they have internal catalexis, shows that he does not altogether understand Westphal's meaning. His own conclusion is that *asynartete* verses are those in which the feet of the combined κῶλα differ from one another in genus or species ("il faut que les pieds qui composent la première série ne soient ni de même grandeur, ni surtout de même rythme que les pieds de la seconde, et qu'ils leur soient même contraires sous ce double rapport"). Both Westphal's view and M. Chaignet's involve difficulties. The latter has to exclude from the class of *asynartetes* some verses which are stated by Hephaestion or Scholia to be *asynartete*, and owing to a hasty reading of

Hephaestion attributes to him and adopts the incredible scansion of the asynartete line ἑστι μὲν καλὰ πᾶσι χρυσοῖσιν 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. OXIONS.