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](#)

Lindsay's *Plautus* (Vol. II) *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*. Vol. II. (Miles Gloriosus—Fragmenta). Edited by W. M. Lindsay in Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. 6s.

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 09 / December 1906, pp 446 - 449

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995301, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995301

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1906). Review of Daniel A. Clark 'Creating the College Man: American Mass Magazines and Middle-Class Manhood, 1890–1915' The Classical Review, 20, pp 446–449 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995301

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tolerare possum. Sed malo de una voce loqui, quam Headlam cum multis ita mutandam duxit, ut bubuleus oves pascere dicatur, quod nec in Graecia nec opinor in Britannia moris est. *ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντος Ἴνιν δόμοις ἀγάλακτον οὕτως ἀνὴρ. οὕτως* in Aristophanes *Vesp.* 1182, Lysistr. 785, et Plato *Phaedr.* 237 b. Faciunt *βούρας*, nec vident sequi *μηλοφόνουσιν ἐν αἵταις*.

GUILELMUS RIDGEWAY de Supplicibus Aeschyli scripsit. Qui postquam rectissime exposuit Supplices omnium quas habemus tragoediarum longe esse antiquissimam (accuratiora autem scire velle male ludentis est), choreutes fuisse quinquaginta, nonnullae aliae, quae legenti mihi gratissima fuerunt, cum inter nos archaeologi quidam manifestae veritati obstrepere nondum desinant, sane gravem necdum solutam quaestionem aggreditur. Qui tandem fieri potest, ut Aegypti filii Danaïdas quasi *ἐπικλήρους* sibi in matrimonium tradi iubeant; Danao patre superstiti? Certum est, ipsos Argivos, qui puellas a vi defendunt, Aegyptiis eas concessisse, cum iura sua per leges repeterent. Ego quoque olim difficultati solvendae me imparem esse confessus sum (*Hermae*, vol. xxii. 286). Itaque magna cum expectatione hanc praelectionem legebam. Qua tamen excidi; nam Ridgeway omnia a matris potestate repetit, concertare autem *ἐνδογαμίαν* et *ἐξωγαμίαν* quas anthropologi dicunt. Ego ex eis sum qui inter Aricas gentes umquam aliam atque patriam potestatem fuisse negant, cum ipsa lingua luculenter hoc

videatur docere. Sed quantum ad Graecos, testimonia examinare sufficit, quibus fretus Ridgeway Atheniensibus Aeschyli aetate maternum ius notissimum fuisse adfirmat. Duos testes adfert, Iustinum et Varronem, sed unde Romani homines ea sumpserint quae Dracontis legibus et Homero Hesiodoque praeferre iubemur, ne quaesivit quidem. Utraque fabula aetiologica est. Iustinus, pro quo saltem Clearchus Solensis, Aristotelis discipulus, laudandus erat (apud *Athenaeum*, p. 555 d), Cecropem *διφυνή* appellatum esse tradit tamquam matrimonii inventorem; Varroniana fabula quin his nugis a ludente grammatico superstructa sit, non dubitabit qui aetiorum Graecorum vicissitudines et origines persequi didicerit. De talibus pragmaticorum ineptiis serio agere piget, qui vel grammaticorum regulam, qua *Ἀθηναία* de femina Attica dici vetatur, a Cecrope repetunt. Sed fac, matrimonium institutum sit a Cecrope, quid hoc probat? Quis fuit ante Cecropem, quem primum Atheniensium regem terra edidit? Matris potestatem inter Praeadamitas valuisse equidem minime nego. Haud impune negligitur quam vocare consuevimus fontium investigatio, siquidem ex auctore fides eorum pendet quae a seris compilatoribus tradita accipimus. Sed ne ab Aeschyli quidem fontibus quaerendis manus cohibebimus, neque iam despero hac ratione ipsam eam quam Danaïdum causa offert quaestionem solvi posse. Sed hoc longiorem requirit disputationem.

U. DE WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF.

Berolini.

LINDSAY'S PLAUTUS (VOL. II).

T. Macci Plauti Comoediae. Vol. II. (Miles Gloriosus—Fragmenta). Edited by W. M. LINDSAY in *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*. 6s.

THE second volume of Professor Lindsay's Plautus contains many interesting features and raises many difficult problems. For it is to the plays herein contained that the collation which he discovered in the margins of a copy of Plautus in the Bodleian Library mainly relates. From this collation he has been able to improve the text in a number of places. It is unnecessary to dilate upon the real advance which is thus achieved, because the readings commend themselves, and, resting as they do on undoubted MS.

authority, they will be sure to command the approval of all future editors. My own sense of their value is shown by the fact that I consider myself fortunate in being able to introduce those of them that relate to the Rudens in my 'editio minor' of that play.

Immediately connected with this discovery is another feature of Prof. Lindsay's edition, on which I must speak with some reserve. It seems to me that he is inclined to rest too heavily on this Bodleian collation, and to attempt to make it do more work than it is qualified to do. In other words, he regards it as a collation which may be trusted to represent faithfully, at least in its main features, the lost Codex Turnebi. I

am still sceptical as to whether the Bodleiana can be regarded as a collation, in the proper sense of the term, of any one MS. or of any two MSS. If it were, it ought to have led to an advance in our knowledge of the text analogous to that which was effected by the unearthing of the Ambrosian palimpsest. For we should be able to infer *ex silentio* that in passages in which there is no variant indicated in the collation the depraved text of the Gryphius edition (A.D. 1540), in the margins of which the collation is made, represents the lost Cod. Turn. The absurdities to which this would lead are obvious: I open the book at random and find in Rud. 390 ff. the lines ending at wrong places and an essential word (*eam*) omitted; *ibid.* 411 an impossible *nobis* inserted; 839, 841 two blunders; 853 *rapite hunc* for *rapi te*. Are we to suppose for a moment that such disfigurements of the text stood in the Cod. Turn.? On the contrary they date from the fifteenth century and were all got rid of in the first scientific text of the play—that of Camerarius, 1549. And are we to infer that the Cod. Turn. had *orationes* Poen. 55, *indoctior* 581, *utitur* 770,¹ *refert aio* 778, *Threcae sunt celumnae* 1168¹? In these instances we have the express testimony of Turnèbe that his codex had *rationes*, *con-doctor*, *uritur*, *refert rario*, *Graecae sunt hae columnae* respectively; and there are many other cases of discrepancies between the Cod. Turn. as known from Turnèbe and the same MS. as represented in the Bodleian collation. That there are nuggets of gold in this collation I have recognized from the first; but if there is also an admixture of sand, it is necessary to adopt an eclectic method of procedure in dealing with its several readings and to try each one of them on its merits before employing it for the purpose of reconstructing the common archetype form which, in Prof. Lindsay's opinion, both the Codex Turnebi and the existing MSS. of the Palatine family were derived. I hope some day to contribute further observations as to the relation of these Bodleiana both to the Codex Turnebi, as known to us from Turnèbe's *Adversaria*, and to the readings reported by Lambin as found in his 'libri veteres'; but the question is too large and difficult to be dealt with in this review.

A few examples will illustrate the editor's modus operandi. In Rud. 650 the Bodleiana have *T. uis*, as a supplement of the defective

line *Quis istic est qui deos tam parui pendit?* Professor Lindsay draws the inference that *uis* was the reading of the archetype (preceded by the name of the speaker, *Tr.*). And so confident is he of this that his critical apparatus gives no hint that the extant MSS. have a lacuna (i.e. nothing at all) in this place. On the basis of this supposed archetypal reading he proceeds to emend: *TR. uis <diam tibi?>* But this is to ignore the fact (also mentioned in his critical apparatus) that Lambin quotes from his admirable 'libri veteres'—the source of so many indisputably good readings—the words *paucis expedi* as ending this line and forming part of the speech of Daemones. Whatever these 'libri veteres' may have been,² their reading is in the present instance of superior intrinsic merit to that of the Bodleiana and alone deserves consideration in any hypothetical reconstruction of the archetype in this passage. Moreover Prof. Lindsay is on the horns of a dilemma: either the Cod. Turn. had *uis*, in which case the 'libri veteres' of Lambin are not the same as the Cod. Turn. and there were other MSS. (now lost) in the field; or the Cod. Turn. had *paucis expedi*, in which case the Bodleian collation is convicted of including elements foreign to the Cod. Turn.

At the end of Rud. 457 *subita ueniam* is set up as the archetypal reading on the basis of the Bodleiana (the Palatini have a lacuna after *subit*) and Prof. Lindsay feels himself bound to follow whithersoever it may lead—even to what seems to me the impossible reading *subita uia*. It is to be noted that the Bodleiana contradict the Palatine at another point of this line (*me* for *res*): here then we are left in doubt as to what the archetypal reading was, if any weight is to be attached to the *me*. The difficulty of a double reading presents itself at numerous other places, e.g. Pers. 85 *oculus* (or *oculos*) and *ac ius*; Rud. 636 *uimeam* and *umerum* (*umerun?*). Often the editor recognizes the difficulty of deciding what the archetype had by the addition of the words 'ut videtur,' e.g. Poen. 898, Rud. 222, 580, 629 ('cod. ut vid.');

² Professor Lindsay has pointed out to me that in my review of his first volume (*Class. Rev.* xix. p. 312) I did him an injustice in implying that he had changed his opinion as to the source of the readings attributed by Lambin to his 'libri veteres.' This is quite true and I regret that I had forgotten the passage of his Codex Turnebi (p. 16) in which he says that Lambin probably had access to a transcript of Turnèbe's marginalia: i.e. that the 'libri veteres' are merely another name for the single Cod. Turn.

¹ These readings (Poen. 770, 1168) come from the collation, not from the text of the Gryphius edition.

as in Poen. 30, where *pertant* is put down as the archetypal reading without qualification, because it seems to explain the readings *pereant* CD and *peritent* T; though it would also be possible to argue from *peritent* cod. to *pertant* and *pereant*. In some cases the editor frankly confesses that no inference can be drawn, e.g. Poen. 266 '*reginas vel reliquias* cod.', Pseud. 802 '*avaritia vel hominum avaritia* cod.' These passages ought surely to teach us caution in dealing with all readings of the Bodleian collation.

It would have greatly enriched the critical apparatus, if the editor had given us a complete transcript of the Bodleiana, or of such of them as he judges to be derived from the Cod. Turn. These are not accessible to the general reader, and indeed they are often hard to decipher in Prof. Lindsay's facsimile. In the present edition they are merged, together with the readings of the Palatini, in the hypothetical readings which are put down as those of the archetype. For instance, in Rud. 457, the critical apparatus gives '*subita ueniam* ut vid. cod.' Who would guess from this that the existing MSS. have a lacuna after the letters *subit*? This method of procedure implies the use of another critical edition by a reader who desires to know the evidence not only as to the Bodleiana but also as to the Palatini, though Prof. Lindsay's inferences are exceedingly valuable as a supplement to any other critical apparatus.

In one respect the editor might easily improve his apparatus in future editions; instead of using 'codd.' (with double *d*) for the readings of AP, and 'cod.' (with one *d*) for those of A in the absence of P or P in the absence of A, and P for P^A in those parts of the plays in which we have the evidence of T, it would conduce to clearness to give in each case the sign of the MS. or MSS. concerned: i.e. AP, A, P, P^A as the case may be. As it is, a complicated process of thought is involved in interpreting each of the notes. I have noticed also a few passages in which the apparatus requires correcting or supplementing: in Rud. 481 no account is taken of the Palatini, in Rud. 1087 *exaequabitur* (the right reading, I think) is found in D as well as B; in Pers. 120 the Palatini have *cui*, not *qui*; in Most. 579 (*meri*)*diem* A ought not to have been omitted, nor the readings of A in 765 (*sub* . . o), 981 (*heu*) of the same play; in 886a '*sis* P' would have indicated that *sies* of the text is a conjecture.

Apart from the question of the reconstruction of the archetype there are many passages

in this volume which challenge criticism. In some of them the editor seems to me to show ultra-conservative tendencies; but this may be explained by the conditions under which this edition was produced (see Preface to vol. I. p. 1). For example, in the following passages of the *Mostellaria*: 5 *nidoricupi*; 328 *manus*, 594 *manum* (the accusative is surely impossible in both passages); before l. 467 a line of asterisks is absolutely necessary if *quoque terram* is retained in 469; 593 is marred by hiatus and violation of the accentual character of the third rise; 675 *euoca* with hiatus; 925 *umquam* is unintelligible after *quia* (read *numquam* with B², and delete the mark of interrogation at the end of the line); 1091 is metrically wrong; 1177 *unam noxiam unam* with aposiopesis won't do. In 63 *inhonestis* is to me incomprehensible: I propose to emend the passage (62 f.) as follows:

Eruóm daturi <si> éstis, bubus quód feram,
Date; sí non estis, ágite porro périgte, etc.

(For the form of speech cf. Poen. 571, Cas. 831, Cist. 378, etc.) The following may also be cited from other plays: Poen. 331 *insecundo*, Rud. 304 *capsimus incenati* (how this can be scanned I fail to see), 455 *quam huc* (hiatus), Pseud. 132 *penitus*, 578 *prius*, Trin. 541 *haecst*; nor can Rud. 888 stand in the form here given (according to Priscian).

Less explicable are a number of passages in which the editor has rejected or suspected a reading which has MS. support and seems at least capable of defence: e.g. Most. 712 *ullum* (AB²; *nullum* B¹CD is impossible after *nil erit*); Most. 504 *scelestae hae*; Rud. 485 requires only a slight emendation to make it a perfect line; so too several other lines which are obelized in this volume. In Most. 784 the reading of A *Theoropides* (ignored in the crit. app.) is the form of the name which suits the metre best, and not only in this line but throughout the play: the MSS. have either *Theoropides* (so A four or five times) or *Theuoropides* (so P sixteen times), and the only trace of a *p* before the *r* is in two passages (784, 962). Here, however, Professor Lindsay agrees with all other editors, including myself in my first edition of the play; in the second edition I am restoring *Theoropides* throughout. Stich. 723 is offensive to the editor in point of metre, but his solution of putting *age* 'extra versum' is hardly acceptable. Stich. 502 is objected to on the ground of the hiatus at the caesura, and similarly Poen. 1051: in the former case emendation is employed (*auspicavin*, with *-ne* attached

to the third word in the sentence—a very doubtful expedient), in the latter the word *ergo* is obelized, and an ‘antiqua forma’ *erego* is suggested (‘*vix erego*’) in the note. If the editor has so strong an objection to this kind of hiatus, why should he even suggest the introduction of it in Rud. 1202 (‘*vix opino*’) and also in a passage where hiatus would be far more objectionable, Stich. 290? Does he hold that *opinor* is not a genuine Plautine form? Nor do I see justification for the suggestion of *minat* and *ludificemus* in Stich. 21, 578. In Truc. 91 *nudius* gives a better rhythm than *nudiu*. Why does the editor object to *siquis* in Stich. 182? Such forms are now generally recognized (cf. *siquidem* side by side with *siquidem*, etc.): in Stich. 715 Prof. Lindsay himself introduces it (with a protest) where it is not necessary in the opinion of other

recent editors. Nor do they agree with him in Most. 217, where he accepts Klotz’s conjecture; the scansion in *senecta* is unobjectionable in the first foot of the second colon of the iamb. septen.

I have noticed a few questionable spellings: *i* is a common error for *e* in the Ambrosian, and therefore may well have figured in P too; if so, the *mulieri* of B in Most. 256, the *uirtuti* of Truc. 495 have no weight, and the *miis* of Pseud. 764 may not be an ‘antiqua forma’ but simply an error. Consistency in this matter is difficult, especially in a work of this compass; but I do not understand why Prof. Lindsay prints *periet*, Stich. 497 (A) but not *propetno*, *ibid.* 425 (A), *uein* Pseud. (324 (A) but not *ei*, *ibid.* 326 (A).

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

NÉMETHY’S *TIBVLLVS* AND *LYGDAMVS*.

Albii Tibulli Carmina: accedunt Sulpiciae Elegidia. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit GEYZA NÉMETHY, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae Sodalis. Budapestini. MCMV. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 348, Sewed. Kron. 6.

Lygdami Carmina: accedit Panegyricus in Messallam. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit GEYZA NÉMETHY, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae Sodalis. Budapestini. MCMVI. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 180, Sewed. Kron. 3.

THESE are two of a series of ‘Editiones Criticae Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum a Collegio Philologico Classico Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae publicis iuris factae.’ They are welcome contributions to our knowledge of associated authors of whose entire remains no complete annotated edition had appeared since that of Ludolph Dissen, published in 1835, and no longer up to date.

The two volumes are, we are told by the editor, a *πάρεργον* of a larger work written by him in Hungarian on Roman Elegy, during the preparation of which he had often wished that someone else had previously done what he thereupon undertook.

The first volume comprises what the editor considers the genuine remains of Tibullus, viz. Books I. II. and IV. ii.–vi.

NO. CLXXXII. VOL. XX.

inclusive, xiii. and xiv. (according to the traditional division), to which he has added the Elegies of Sulpicia, Book IV. vii.–xii. inclusive, as being required for a right understanding of some of the others. The second volume includes the Elegies of Lygdamus, Book III., and the anonymous Panegyric on Messalla.

The editor has rearranged the poems of Tibullus and of Sulpicia in what seems to him to be their chronological sequence, a proceeding which he has endeavoured to justify in an Appendix of eleven Excursus. First, under the Heading ‘Marathus’ come I. iv, viii, and ix; under the Heading ‘Detestatio belli’ I. x; under the Heading ‘Delia’ I. iii, i, v, ii, and vi; under the Heading ‘In natalem Messallae’ I. vii; under the Heading ‘Ambarualia’ II. i; under the Heading ‘Sulpiciae Elegidia’ poems IV. viii, ix, x, xi, xii, and vii; under the Heading ‘Tibulli Elegidia de amore Sulpiciae’ IV. ii, iii, iv, v, and vi; under the Heading ‘In natalem Cornuti’ II. ii; under the Heading ‘Nemesis’ II. iv, vi, and iii; under the Heading ‘In natalem Messalini quindecimviri’ II. v; and, finally, under the Heading ‘De amica innominata’ IV. xiii, and xiv. In the Excursus three moot questions have been entirely ignored: viz. (1) ‘Was Tibullus the Albius of Horace?’—the ‘immitis Glycera’ of whose Ode I. xxxiii Mr. Némethy thinks

G G