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](#)

Leo's *Plautinische Forschungen* Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie, von Fr. Leo. (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, pp. viii. 346.) Berlin. 1895. 13 M.

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 04 / May 1896, pp 206 - 209
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203892, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203892

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 206-209 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203892

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LEO'S *PLAUTINISCHE FORSCHUNGEN*.

Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie, von FR. LEO. (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, pp. viii. 346.) Berlin. 1895. 13 M.

PROFESSOR LEO'S *Forschungen* is the most important work on Plautus that has appeared since Ritschl's *Prolegomena*. The number of new suggestions which it offers is so great that it is impossible for a reviewer to treat the whole work in detail. Of the last five of the six chapters into which it is divided, I will only say that chaps. ii. iii. and iv., which deal with the Biography of Plautus, his Greek originals and the genuineness of the Prologues of his plays, are perhaps the most valuable part of this valuable volume and will meet with the most ready acceptance. In chap. v. the case for Prof. Leo's theory of the elision of final *-s* after a short vowel before an initial vowel in Plautus is stated with so strong an array of facts as to make me ashamed of my scant recognition of this theory in the *Latin Language* (ch. ii. § 137, p. 123); and the whole question of the dropping of final *-s* in Latin is thoroughly investigated. Chap. vi. contains the brilliant discovery that *-ae* of the Gen. Sg. (originally a disyllable *-āi*) is treated differently by early poets from *-ae* of the Dat. (Loc.) Sg. (originally a long diphthong *-āi*) in that Synaloephe of Gen. *-ae* is avoided.¹ But since every one who takes an interest in Plautus must get and read this book for himself, I prefer to use the space at my disposal in a fuller discussion of the chapter which has the most importance for the restoration of the text of Plautus, I mean chap. i. which deals with the history of the Plautine Text in antiquity.

It has for a long time been known that our text must have come ultimately from actors' copies; and various readings have been with more or less probability referred to the changes which would have to be made at the Plautine revival in the first century B.C., in order to make the meaning and metre intelligible to the audience. Thus

¹ Philologists owe gratitude to Prof. Leo for this interesting proof of the different course of development taken by these two case-endings, and will forgive him for his strange explanations of *Pomplio* as a Dual (p. 333) and of Gen. *-āi* from *-ās* like Ital. *crāi* from *crās* (p. 321n.).

The elision of the *-ae* of *meae* in *Epid.* 563 *dōmī meae eocām sālūam* need cause no difficulty. *Meae* is a Locative.

the substitution in our MSS. of *purgitant* for the Plautine *purigant* in *Aul.* 753:

nōn mi homines placēt qui quando māle fecerunt purigant,

is claimed for this period; for, it is argued, a later scribe would merely replace the obsolete *purigant* by the familiar *purgant* without troubling himself to preserve the metre (cf. *Truc.* 245 *demum oggerunt* (*A*) for *demus danunt* (*P*); *Pseud.* 432 *forsitan ea tibi* (*P*) for *fors fuit an ista* (*A*). Further, that corruptions existed in the Plautine text as early as Varro's time is known not only from his mention in the *Lingua Latina* ix. 61, 106 of the corruption *lauari* for *lauare* in *Truc.* 323, but also from Festus' account of his explanation of *Curc.* 568, which shows that the text used by Varro had *uapula ergo* instead of *uapulare ergo*. It is then a perfectly natural supposition that in the first complete edition of the twenty-one plays, an edition from which both the fourth century Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) and the Archetype of our other MSS. (*P*) are derived, there were errors which were transmitted to both families of MSS. Indeed Schoell has gone so far as to argue from certain lacunae, which he professes to find in both *A* and *P*, that the common original had holes in certain pages and that each page contained a certain number of lines. It is therefore no new theory which Prof. Leo brings before us in the first chapter, where he emphasizes the significance of these corruptions common to *A* and *P*. What is new is his conjecture (I say conjecture, for the facts are too uncertain to admit of proof) that this original edition of the twenty-one plays was comparatively late, only a century or two earlier than the Ambrosian Palimpsest itself, belonging to the second century A.D., and being a product of the Archaic Revival of that period. The theory of that time, he says,—a theory which we find carried into practice in contemporary inscriptions,—that hiatus was allowable in verse, induced the editor or editors of Plautus to leave unemended such lines as exhibited hiatus; so that passages like *Poen.* 453–6 (*AP*):

sex immolauī | āgnos nec potui tamen
propitiam Venerem facere uti | esset mihi.
Quoniam litare nequeo abii illic
iratus : uotui | exta prosicarius,

reproduce the Plautine text of the first edition, in other words, the high-water mark beyond which Plautine students of to-day can hardly expect to pass. Prof. Leo draws up a long list of lines in which hiatus is exhibited in the *A* and the *P* versions, and supposes them one and all to have stood in this form in the original edition, an edition referred by him to some period after Probus, by others to some period after Varro. The list is an alarming one; and Prof. Leo's whole theory is likely to have something of a paralysing effect on Plautine emendation, to suggest tacit acquiescence in MS. corruptions rather than a vigorous effort to get past and beyond them to the actual words of Plautus.

And yet it seems to me that the time has not yet come for such a policy of despair. The whole history of Plautine emendation has shown us that the canon of textual criticism which has led to success is that the readings common to *A* and *P* are to be accepted as the right readings, unless it can be shown that the mistake is one into which the scribe of *A* and the *P* scribe may have fallen independently. There are several considerations which should prevent us from abandoning this canon, found so useful in the past.

Prof. Leo's list of lines, similarly worded in both *A* and *P*, in which the laws of scansion, as they are known to us, are violated, is, as I have said, a long one. But it would have been a good deal longer, if the list had been compiled a few years ago, prior to Skutsch's clever discovery that the final vowel of *-que*, *-ne* was dropped in conversational Latin, and therefore in the versification of Plautus, in other words besides *atque* (*ac*), *neque* (*nec*), *viden*, &c. Skutsch made that discovery by observing that *A* and *P* agreed in presenting a large number of lines of this form:—

Poen. 419 *perque meos amores pérque Adel-
phasium meum* (Iamb. Senar.)

which violated our ordinary rules of scansion. But rightly judging that, where *A* and *P* agreed about a reading, that reading would probably be correct, he looked about for an explanation of the apparent irregularity, and discovered this law of Latin pronunciation. Has not Prof. Leo himself in the last chapter of this book removed from the list of 'corruptions common to *A* and *P*' all those lines in which *-ae* of the Gen. Sg. stands in hiatus, by showing that

the pronunciation of this diphthong in Plautus' age was of a kind that enabled it to stand before an initial vowel without causing hiatus? And we do not find in his list *Poen.* 388:

*húius cor, huiús studium, huius saúium,
mastígia,*

now that Buecheler, accepting the common reading of *A* and *P*, has shown that there is no corruption, but that *cor* in the time of Plautus was a syllable long by position. We are then entitled to believe that before many years are passed Prof. Leo's list will be considerably reduced by new discoveries about Plautine pronunciation and prosody.

Even now we can diminish it by the consideration, surely a very natural one, that since the same tendencies to error were present to the ancient scribe of *A* as to the mediaeval scribes of 'Palatine' MSS., they must occasionally have fallen into the same mistake. Thus the scribe of *A* is, like all scribes, inclined to Haplography, and writes, e.g. *quemquam* for *quemquam quam* in *Most.* 608. The scribes of the 'Palatine' MSS. are inclined to the same error, and write, e.g. *visita sit* for *visitata sit* in *Trin.* 766. We need not then suppose *gerere* <re>*m* of *AP* in *Trin.* 773 to be a corruption that existed in the first MS. of Plautus. It may well have crept into *A* and into some *P*-archetype independently. In *Stich.* 289 *CD* have the same error as *A*, *hamum* for *hamulum*; but the fact that *B* has *hamulum* shows us that the mistake is one for which the scribe of *A* on the one hand, and the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* on the other are responsible, and which must not be foisted into the original of *AP*. And yet how many lines must be in the same case, while the needed indication is lacking! *Poen.* 388–90 with their numerous homoeoteleutons, or rather homoeoarchons, offer a regular pitfall to scribes; and as a matter of fact the scribes of *ABCD* have all gone wrong in this passage; but luckily they have gone wrong at different parts and in different ways so that the common archetype of *A* and *P* for once escapes being saddled with the responsibility for the error. Or, again, Transposition is a common fault of the scribe of *A*, as in the *Stichus* at v. 350 &c. It is also a common fault of the 'Palatine' scribes, as in the same play at vv. 117, 293, 295, &c. What wonder then that *A* and the 'Palatine' MSS. coincide in one of the instances of transposition in this play (v. 275), or in so

natural a transposition as in *Pseud.* 997, where the true reading: *propera pellegere ergo epistulam* has become in both families of MSS. *propera pellegere epistulam ergo*? The same considerations may make us pause before we assign to the original edition of Plautus every mistake that is found at once in a line of the 'Palatine' text and in the same line as quoted by Nonius. Our MSS. of Nonius, as I have tried to show in the *Philologus* of this year, are all derived from a single MS. of the eighth or ninth century, and only in Books i.—iii. have we readings of a seventh or eighth century archetype. The writer of this MS. or the writer of its parent archetype may quite conceivably have fallen on his own account into the same error as a 'Palatine' scribe, if the error is a natural one to fall into, e.g. *Asin.* 807 *puras* for *pure*. On the other hand the quotation of a line by Nonius or some other grammarian often affords the very proof we need and shows us that a corruption common to *A* with the 'Palatine' MSS. was not necessarily a corruption of the first edition of Plautus. For example, in *Mil.* 1413 *A* has *mittemus*, *BCD mittimus*; but the Priscian MSS. have *amittimus*, a fact which argues for the true reading *amittimus* having been the reading of the early Plautine text.

And is there not a further possibility with regard to the consensus in error of *A* and the 'Palatine' MSS., viz. that some early 'Palatine' archetype was provided with the record of readings of the 'Ambrosian' family? These readings, entered in the margin of this archetype or between the lines, might be allowed by subsequent copyists to oust the original 'Palatine' readings. There are many indications that the early 'Palatine' MSS. contained variants, interlinear and marginal; and while it is possible and in many cases probable that these variants existed in the common archetype of *A* and *P*, it is also possible that they were often introduced at a later period into the *P* text from *A*. Even the appearance of the same gloss in *A* and in *P* MSS. is not proof positive that this gloss had been written in the common archetype of *A* and *P*. There were stock glosses for certain words; and these stock glosses may have found their way as explanations of these words into *A* and into *P* at different times. Thus *rogo* is the stock or standard gloss of *O. Lat.* *oro* and has ousted the *O. Lat.* word in *Pers.* 321 in *P* (*quod me dudum rogasti*), but not in *A* (*quod mecum dudum orasti*); in *Mos.* 682 it has ousted

oro in *A* (*bonum aequumque rogas*), but not in *P* (*bonum aequomque oras*). Similarly with *simul* for *simitu*, *tui* for *tis*, &c. A scribe at any time might explain the old word by its modern equivalent; so that the appearance of the modern equivalent instead of the Plautine word in both the Ambrosian and the Palatine text does not warrant the conclusion that the gloss had already supplanted the archaism in the common original of *A* and *P*.

All these considerations should, I think, keep us from being overmuch alarmed by the list of apparent corruptions in the first edition of the twenty-one plays. Before we accept it, we must first assure ourselves that the corruption has not insinuated itself into the 'Palatine' text at a later date; and I think that if we make a closer investigation into the immediate archetype of our existing Palatine MSS., an archetype referred by general consensus to the eighth or ninth century, we shall find that it was surprisingly free from a large number of errors which appear in our minuscule MSS. and which get the credit of having belonged to the proto-archetype (*P*). And we must also assure ourselves that what is called a corruption is really a corruption. How many of the cases of hiatus quoted by Prof. Leo are really metrical blemishes of Plautine verse, is by no means easy to decide. The last word on hiatus has not yet been spoken; and I for my part do not see how Cicero's statement about the 'antiqui poetae,' that they 'saepe hiabant,' is to be set aside. The most recent investigations into the Saturnian Metre have increased the likelihood that prosodical hiatus was found to a very large extent in primitive Latin verse. Prof. Leo, who still clings to the old-fashioned 'quantitative' theory of the Saturnians, has ignored this fact, and prefers to set aside Cicero's statement as a mere mistake, due to his having a text of the early writers in which old forms like *med*, *ted*, *sed* appeared as *me*, *te*, *se*, &c., with consequent hiatus. But the actual instances quoted by Cicero cannot be explained away in this fashion, nor yet the statements of other grammarians about such scansions of Ennius as *militum octo*. The truth is that we have yet to learn under what circumstances prosodical hiatus was legitimate in early Latin poetry; and it is not allowable to seize upon each and every example of a hiatus in our two texts of Plautus as an instance of a corruption in the text. Both in cases of hiatus and of other apparent corruptions

common to the *A* and the *P* texts it will be a safer policy for us to accept them as genuine and try to find an explanation of them than to label them without further effort as

corruptions which existed in the first edition of the twenty-one plays.

W. M. LINDSAY.

SCHWAB'S SYNTAX OF THE GREEK COMPARATIVE.

Historische Syntax der griechischen Comparison in der klassischen Litteratur, von OTTO SCHWAB. Heft 2. Würzburg, 1894. Pp. 180. 5 Mk.

In the *Classical Review* for December, 1894, pp. 454—459, I reviewed a first instalment of this treatise. The second instalment, which forms Heft 12 of Schanz's *Beiträge*, deals with 'rising Comparison' (*steigernde Comparison*). I need not here repeat my strictures on 'adversative Comparison' save to note in general that Schwab appeals to his tenet of $\tilde{\eta} = \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'$ $\acute{o}\nu$ to explain several of the categories in this part of his essay.

Theory aside, the conclusions Schwab draws from a statistical study of the Greek comparative amply confirm what seems to be proved for the Aryan genesis of the comparative, viz. its construction with a separative case. It is gratifying therefore to quote from Schwab (p. 2): '*Nie ist $\tilde{\eta}$ ausschliesslich oder auch nur in unbedingt bevorzugtem numerischen Verhältnisse gebraucht, wo der Genitiv stehen könnte.*'

Exceptions might be taken to one of the categories, where the so-called 'anomalous' comparatives *κρείττων* etc. are said to have maintained their *original* (i.e. 'adversative') character even in 'rising comparison.' Is it thereby implied that these comparatives are more archaic than those in *-τερος*? The suffix *-tero*, however, has comparative force in all the Aryan languages. It would seem that it must have had it in the Aryan period. Still doubt arises because in Rig Veda *-tara-* is practically limited to pronoun stems.

This limitation need not, however, bring into uncertainty the identification of the comparative and agential suffixes *tara* and *tar* as suggested in the first review. Ultimately both the comparative suffixes *-yan-s-* and *tara* go back to demonstrative agglutinative groups,¹ and we can hardly

¹ This does not favour 'adversative comparison.' We can illustrate the up-growth of a denominative suffix for the comparative from a phrase like 'Compared with John (from <the standpoint of> John) James is the strong <one>.'

doubt the kinship of the suffix of Sk. *an-ya-*, and Lat. *al-io-* with the more fully developed *-ya-n-s-*. For the agential suffix *-tar-* I refer to my 'Agglutination and Adaptation' (*Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 409 sq., and especially 434). But though *-tara-* cannot be called a living comparative suffix in Rig Veda, yet, inasmuch as the suffix in *-yan-s* retains participial value there as in no sister language, it is by no means certain that the Greek suffix *ῶν* should be assigned a really more archaic force than *-τερο-*.

Our author is liable to the charge of some rather sanguine differentiation, e.g. after saying (p. 60) that the universal use of *πατρός* instead of $\tilde{\eta}$ *πατήρ* 'wohl an das national-ethische Moment des anerkannten familiären Vererbungsprinzips und die daraus sich ableitende rhetorische Wirkung des *πατρόθεν ἐπονομάζειν* erinnert,' he goes on to say that $\tilde{\eta}$ is used 'sobald nicht die individuelle Persönlichkeit bzw. eine nationale oder Familien-Generation, sondern der natürliche Gattungs begriff *πατήρ* gemeint ist—gleichsam als ein bestätigendes argumentum ex contrario.' Now among the examples that he cites are the following out of the same sentence from Plato (*Krito*, 51 A) $\tilde{\eta}$ οὕτως εἰ σοφός, ὥστε λελθὲν σε ὅτι μητρός τε καὶ πατρός . . . τιμωτέρον ἐστὶν ἢ πατρός . . .) (καὶ σέβειν δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπέκειν . . . πατρίδα χαλεπαίνουσιν ἢ πατέρα. But which of us is not liable, in our eagerness to make points, to admit rather trivial pleas in seeking to explain away what is not in accord with our theories?

The mode of presentation of the statistics does not make them available for the reviewer, but it has seemed to me in many cases that the genitive was used where no *real* demonstrative article² could stand, e.g. with reflexives, with the *comparatio proportionalis* (= 'too great for'), with proverbial comparison (*μέλιτος γλυκίων*), etc. As to the phrase *μείζω λόγον* etc., we are told (p. 13) that it never has the article, and no substantive in similar cases has in poetry,

² The nominalizing article with participles and infinitives and the article with abstract nouns are not really demonstrative.