

# 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 *Plautus* [ *Plauti Comoediae*, recensuit et emendavit Fridericus Leo; volumen prius (Amph.—Merc). 1895. Pp. viii., 478. 18 M.; vol. alterum (Mil.—True. Vid. Fragm.). 1896. Pp. 575. 20 M. Berlin: Weidmann.]**

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 07 / October 1896, pp 330 - 334

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204575, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00204575](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204575)

## How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 330-334 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204575

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

NOTE ON VERGIL, *GEORGIC* II. 501—502.

'Non ferrea jura,  
Insanumque forum aut populi tabularia  
vidit.'

It is obvious that a literal translation such as 'public archives' produces a sad anti-climax, and spoils a noble passage. *Happy and innocent the peasant's life: he has never known the miseries of a great city; never seen the iron rigour of the law, the mad turmoil of the forum, or the public archives.* It sounds like saying, 'Happy the rural swain who has never known London; never seen the iron rigour of its law-courts, the mad uproar of its Stock Exchange, or—the Rolls Office.' This is surely a case where translation must give place to paraphrase; where for the word itself, so pointless in English, we must substitute the cruelties denoted by the word. Indeed, the fact that Vergil places *tabularia* last among the three evils of city-life is not more significant of the hateful sense it bore to him, than the

omission of any adjective such as he felt to be needful to lend ferocity to the two previous evils.

Yet Conington's Prose Translation has 'public archives': and Mr. Mackail is content with 'the archives of the people.' Moreover, neither the edition of Conington, nor that of Mr. Sidgwick, offers any answer whatever to the natural, the inevitable question, 'Why the Rolls Office?' And I find the same curious silence in three or four other editions. Yet Forbiger had long ago given the necessary explanation in his note *ad locum*: 'hoc est, nullum vectigal, nec portorium, nec pascua, a populo publicanus conduxit, quarum redemptionum tabulae, publica instrumenta, in tabulario servabantur.'

A translation might therefore run: 'who has never seen the iron rigour of the law, the mad turmoil of the Forum, or the grinding injustice of the tax-farmers.'

W. RAY.

LEO'S *PLAUTUS*.

[*Plauti Comoediae*, recensuit et emendavit FRIDERICUS LEO; volumen prius (*Amph.—Merc.*) 1895. Pp. viii., 478. 18 M.; vol. alterum (*Mil.—Truc. Vid. Fragm.*) 1896. Pp. 575. 20 M. Berlin: Weidmann.]

PROF. LEO'S *Plautinische Forschungen* appeared last year along with the first volume of the critical edition of the text and was noticed in vol. x. p. 206 of this Journal. The second volume of text, which has just come from the press, completes the handsome contribution of the Göttingen Professor to the study of Plautus. Plautus students may now congratulate themselves on the possession of three excellent editions, each with characteristics of its own; first, the large edition by Ritschl's pupils, Loewe (now dead), Goetz, and Schoell, the last volume of which appeared in 1894; then the small Teubner text by Goetz and Schoell (Leipzig, 1893-6); and now the edition of Prof. Leo. I hope that so generous provision may attract to this field of study many scholars who have hitherto been deterred by the difficulty of

the subject. It is the field which of all others is most in need of workers and where the richest harvests are to be reaped.

The chief characteristic of the new text will, I think, be acknowledged to be its close adherence to the MSS. Leo spares his readers the necessity of constant reference to the critical apparatus in order to guard themselves against accepting as Plautine what is merely 'editors' Plautus.' Since Ritschl's time the conviction has been growing stronger and stronger that it is in adherence to the MSS. that safety lies, and that in particular no reading which is supported both by the Ambrosian Palimpsest and by the other MSS. should be lightly set aside. Goetz and Schoell on the completion of their larger edition, the earlier volumes of which suffered from the want of that full knowledge of the readings of the Palimpsest which was supplied by Studemund's *Apograph* (1889), have met the demand for a less vigorously edited text. Their small Teubner edition is little more than a reproduction of the text of the MSS. with no emendations save such as are or seem indubitably correct

and with free use of the obelus throughout the plays to denote that a line is corrupt. A text of this kind is useful for the collector of statistics of grammar, prosody, or the like; for it saves him from the danger of including in his list words or forms whose position in the text is not thoroughly established. But it cannot quite satisfy the ordinary student, who wishes to have his author's writings in a readable, as well as a reliable form. Prof. Leo's text stands midway between the two texts of Goetz and Schoell in respect of its adherence to the MSS., just as his critical apparatus has neither the fulness of the large nor the extreme compression of the small Leipzig edition. As a specimen of the three I give *Truc.* 57 with its accompanying critical note in (1) the large, (2) the small Leipzig edition, (3) Leo's:—

(1) *Atque haec celamus clam ómnis summa indústria.*

*haec (hec L) celamus DL. haec caelamus CZ. heccelumus B. clam omnis summa Sch. l.s.s. p. 60. clāmina D. nos clammina BC (nos ex v. 58). nos Damna LZ. nos damna una Camerarius. nos clam mira (vel summa) Gronovius. damna nos Bothius. nostra damna Spengelius.*

(2) *Atque haec celamus nós clam †mina indústria.*

*celamus vel celumus.*

(3) *atque haec celamus nos clam magna industria.*

*celumus B. clam cf. Poen. 1239; damna recc. mina, correxi (summa Gronovius), cf. Cas. 45 Vidul. 42.*

The references in the last note have the object of proving that *celare clam* and *magna industria* are permissible phrases in *Plautus*. The student will find throughout Leo's critical apparatus a wealth of grammatical and explanatory comments of the kind.

It will be seen from this single specimen that the new text supplies a long-felt want. Unfortunately its practical usefulness is to some extent impaired by Leo's habit of leaving the MS. reading untouched in every case where it is the metrical blemish of Hiatus which shows the reading to be corrupt. That *Plautus* did not write the line with Hiatus Leo readily admits; but he holds that it probably appeared in this form in that recension of the second century A.D. of

which he believes both the *Ambrosian Palimpsest* and the *proto-archetype* of our other MSS. to be copies. This theory of the history of our manuscript tradition has (to my mind, unfortunately) induced him to leave every line of the kind in its corrupt form, with the addition of an ictus-sign to indicate the Hiatus. Had he confined this practice to lines which had the same unmetrical form in the *Palimpsest* as in the *minuscule MSS.*, there would not be the same ground for objection. But he has pushed the theory to its farthest limits by extending the same treatment to the host of lines for which we have only the evidence of the *minuscule MSS.* Now the passages preserved in the *Palimpsest* constitute the smaller portion of the writings of *Plautus*. For all the rest our manuscript authority is in reality nothing more than the text of a single lost *minuscule MS.* of *Charlemagne's* time or later, the immediate archetype of our existing MSS., and even its text has not been preserved to us unaltered. A single instance will show the weak point of Leo's system. It is well known that it was the practice of *Carolingian scribes*, in obedience to their text-books of orthography, to change O. Lat. *illi* 'there' to *illic* and O. Lat. *illic* 'to him' to *illi*. Leo himself readily removes the scribe's correction in a line like *Capt.* 278, where the MSS. with their *illic* 'there' give the line a syllable too many:

*quód genus illi est únum pollens átque honoratissumum.*

But in a precisely similar case, *Amph.* 263, where the *illi* 'to him' of the MSS. leaves a Hiatus in the line, he prints the line in its corrupt form, contenting himself with mentioning the emendation in the critical apparatus. Few of his readers, I fancy, will thank him for not doing as other editors do, who print:

*áttat illic húc iturust. ibo ego illic óbviam.*

Where the corruption has to be remedied by the withdrawal of a syllable, the emendation is made by Leo and, as a rule, excellently made. But where it is the addition of a syllable that is required, to remove Hiatus, the line is allowed to stand in its corrupt form with a troublesome obelus or its equivalent. Of course, *mediaeval scribes* erred as frequently by omitting a syllable or letter as by inserting one, so that the number of lines with this corruption is a large one;

and Leo's practice has seriously affected his presentation of the text. It is a thousand pities that he ever adopted this plan.

In the Introduction Leo confesses frankly that he has not collated the MSS. for himself, but has used the critical apparatus of the larger Leipzig edition: *aliud est apparatus criticum comparare, aliud scriptoris opus recensere et emendare*; in Plauto *utrumque facere mortalitas non concedit uni*. That is a statement to which those who have given attention to Plautus cannot but assent, as they will sympathize with the complaint, which he makes a little further on, of the difficulty of ascertaining whether one's conjectural emendations of Plautine lines have not been made before by some one else. Still an editor must always pay the penalty, be it great or be it small, for not having made himself familiar with the MSS. of his author. In *Curc.* 101, for example, Leo is wrong in making  $B^2$  an authority for *nautea*. The suprascript *t* over *nausea* in *B* is in Cameraerius' handwriting, so that *nautea* has no authority from the MSS. of Plautus; *Capt.* 433-44, 472-9, 516-23 are not 'omitted' by *O*, as Leo says, but have been cut off by the binder. In *Capt.* 516 *nemo* was probably the reading of  $B^1$  also, and in *Aul.* 560 it seemed to me that the original reading in *B* was *obsequium* or something of the kind, so that  $B^1$  practically agreed with the other MSS. which have *obsequium*. The critical note on *Capt.* 521 should be: Ne *BEV*, Nec *J*; on *Cist.* 668: *ais...*  $B^1$ , *ais há*  $B^2$  (with the apex-sign indicating a long vowel); on *Asin.* 19: *tu sup. scr. B* (not *BD*), and so on.

With Leo's account of the relation of the MSS. to one another I cannot altogether agree. The few readings which we have from the lost MS. of Turnebus are not sufficient to prove that it came from another archetype than *BCD*. And it is hardly right to say that the corrections in the first part of *B*, useful as they are, make our text of the first eight plays more certain than our text of the last twelve; for they may very well come from the first part of the same Archetype of the second part of which *B* (for the last twelve plays) is a direct copy. Nor should the readings of  $B^1$  in the first eight plays have too much weight assigned to them, when a strong combination of MSS. opposes. In *Aul.* 102, for example, *est*, omitted by *D* and by the group *EJ*, was probably omitted in the archetype too, and is a gratuitous insertion in *B*; in *Aul.* 146 *factum volo* (which Leo ventures to scan as a Choriambus) of *B* should not be preferred to *facta volo* of *DEJ*; nor in

*Cist.* 531 *amens* of *B* to *amans* of  $B^2VEJ$ ; nor in *Asin.* 860 *ista vera* of *B* to *vera ista* of *DEJ*.

Plautine Prosody cannot yet be said to be a settled matter. In particular the exact limitations of the Law of Breves Breviantes are open to discussion. The extreme application of the Law so as to allow the shortening of each and every syllable, whether long by nature or by position, whether accented or unaccented, I must confess I do not regard as worthy of discussion, and I am glad to see that Leo is of the same opinion; and also that he recognizes the part played by accent in Plautine metre (see, for example, his note on *Bacch.* 669). His text is not disfigured by a scansion<sup>1</sup> like *amīca* in *Stich.* 696:

‘*Amīca*,’ uter utrubi accumbamus? Abi tu  
sane sūperior.

But until the few examples offered by the MSS. of scansions like *amicitia*, *ágrōs*, *áquās* have been either satisfactorily removed or satisfactorily established, it must remain an open question whether we should say that Plautus ‘never allows,’ or rather that he ‘is averse to,’ the shortening of an unaccented vowel that is (1) long by position, (2) preceded by a Mute and Liquid, (3) preceded by *qu* (in the case of all vowels except *o* and *u*). Leo refuses *amicitia*, but accepts *ágrōs*, *áquās*. I doubt all three. It is in any case the safer policy to avoid these questionable scansions in conjectural emendations (e.g. *probrō das* of Leo in *Rud.* 733). But I cannot share his objection to *mīles Aul.* 528, which in Plautus' time seem to have retained the trace of the double consonant, *mīless*; nor again his acceptance of *ill(a)* beside *ill(e)* (e.g. *Trin.* 809 *lepidást ill(a) causa, ut cómmemoravi, dícere*), for *illā* was the pronunciation in vogue not so very long before Plautus' time. And I greatly doubt the possibility of Ecthipsis like *opt(u)līt Aul.* 722, *perd(i)tíssimus<sup>2</sup> Aul.* 723 (first word of the line). A third Singular Perf. Ind. in *-avīt* for *-avī* like *adnumeravīt* in *Asin.* 501 is not justified by forms like *exīt* for *exivīt*, etc., for while the reduction of *exivīt* to *exīt* is

<sup>1</sup> A scansion like this I can only characterize by a line constructed after the same model:

*Prósōdīam quam pérōdit Musa, inámoēnam, pérhōr-ridam, inútilem!*

<sup>2</sup> The next line begins with *perdīdī*, which may easily have perverted the form of the Superlative. *Pessumus* has been proposed. I have also thought of *peritissimus*, from a possible *perītus* (like *subītus*) from *perco* (cf. *puppis pereunda est probe Epid.* 74).

supported by instances like *dīnus* for *dīvinus* etc., we have no parallel instance of *-āvi-* becoming *-au-* or *-ā-*; and *-vit* 3 Sg. Perf. had a long vowel in Plautus' time. Leo's theory that final *s* after a short vowel might be elided before an initial vowel in Plautus has led him astray in *Rud.* 887-8:

illic in columbum, credo, leno vortitur,  
nam collus in columbari haud multo post  
erit.

Here the minuscule MSS. (the evidence of the Palimpsest is wanting) read *in columbari collum*, a transposition easily explained by the *in columbum* of the line above. *Collum* is of course inadmissible, for *collus* is the only form known in early Latin and is expressly attested for this line by Priscian. But Leo retains the order of the words in the MSS., making the last syllable of *collus* elided before *haud* and supposing Plautus for the sake of the pun to have changed the normal form *columbar* (a kind of stocks, 'pigeon-hole' stocks) to *columbar*, a very unlikely supposition. (Transposition of words which have the same order both in the Ambrosian and the minuscule MSS. is another matter. I would not change *me ita* of *Poen.* 1258 (AP) to *ita me*, as Leo has done.)

Other points that I have noted are: *Aul.* 299 the lost line probably ended in *existumat* and its loss was due to Homoeoteleuton; 406 *pt* is a Late Latin misspelling of *tt*: e.g. *attatae* of *Cas.* 468 is miswritten *aptate* in *E.* Has a similar corruption produced *optati* in this line? The line may have begun with *ptat(a)i* or *ptatae* in the Archetype, with the initial not supplied by the 'rubricator'; *Bacch.* 988\* the recurrence of *ut quod jubeo facias* in vv. 990, 993 is no reason for removing the words from this line. The joke lay in the iteration of the phrase; *Capt.* 201 in the *Captivi* we find examples of *aio* (written with the 'high-backed' form of *a*) confused with *dico* (written *dio* with contraction-line above), e.g. vv. 72, 694. The *ditis* or *clitis* of the MSS. here may be from *aitis*, and the true form of the lines something of this kind:

Elulatiōne haud opus est:  
Multa oculis muti mira ait is;

204 is not *vinclum* the Plautine form?; *Cas.* prol. 7, 13 in this post-Plautine prologue the archaism *anticua*, *anticuam* is possible, and even in v. 23 *aēs*; *Curc.* 124 how does Leo scan this line?; 316 *ventlum* from *vento-lo* is

as inadmissible as *circlos* from *circo-lo* in Accius 100 R. (read *circos*); *Epid.* 19 the Palatine Archetype seems to have had *utillire-spon* followed by a lacuna, the *respondi* of *B*<sup>2</sup> being as gratuitous a conjecture as the *respondit* of *E*<sup>2</sup>. There is therefore no MS. authority for bringing the Verb *respondeo* into the line; *Men.* 105 *domari* (cf. *ruvant Capt.* 84) seems the most likely form of the Verb, and *domātus* would be readily changed by a mediaeval scribe to *domitus* (from *domo*, I subdue); *Men.* 1042 the peculiarities of this passage in *A* and *P* may be explained if we suppose it to have originally run like this:

etiam hic seruom se meum aiebat, quem ego  
modo emisi manu,  
(?) ille qui se petere modo argentum, modo  
qui suom me erum,  
seruom se meum esse aiebat, quem ego  
modo emisi manu:  
is ait se mihi, etc.,

and the omissions in *A* and *P* to have been caused by the Homoeoteleuton; *Merc.* 138 (cf. *Poen.* 540) the Archetype too of our Nonius MSS. probably had *ramites*, for this is the spelling throughout the passage in the first hand of the Leyden MS., our best guide in matters of orthography; *Mil.* 100 *matre* is easily explained as an expansion of the supposed contraction *me*. Read:

is amabat meretricem ex (written *ē* in the Archetype) Athenis Atticis;

1006 *celocla* from *celōc-lā-* should be the Plautine form, so retain *illa* after *autem*; 1060 *porclena* from *porco-* is doubtful. Why not *procul-* (cf. *Phyrgio, tarpezita*) with the MSS.? *Most* 926 *eam dis gratiam* (sc. habeo) is closer to the MSS. (bis *A*, de his *P*; cf. *Most.* 563 *de his* for *dis P*); *Pers.* 190 *sed ita volo te: curre ut etc.* (*curre A*, *curare P*); *Pers.* 265 surely Sagaristio is boasting of his '*homines domiti*' in contrast to *boves domiti*. Read with *P*:

nunc amico hominibus domitis mea ex  
crumina largiar (*hominibibus A*);

*Most.* 1172 supply *men istum?* after *istum*, 'Forgive that slave of yours. I forgive that protégé of yours?'; *Poen.* 690 cf. *μυροχός ἀνδρείων καὶ γυναικείων μόριον* Hesych.; 778 there is MS. evidence for *arvio* (cf. *Phyrgio* for *Phyrgio Aul.* 508); 1290 *atritus* is a likely O. Lat. form and seems expressly attested by Paulus (*leg. atritus*: *atri*

coloris); so read *atritior* here with *A*, not *atrior* with *P*; *Pseud.* 593 I think *māchaera* was the Plautine pronunciation; 1205-7 the reason why those lines are written also after v. 1161 (at an interval of 42 lines) in *P* is that the scribe of the Archetype, in copying the proto-Archetype (which had 21 lines on a page and 42 on a leaf), turned over a leaf too many and did not discover his mistake till he had written the first two lines of the wrong leaf; *Trin.* 888 I doubt the explanation of *visillum* of the MSS. as a diminutive noun formed from *vis*. *Visillum* is a common form of *veixillum* on late inscriptions (e.g. *C.I.L.* vi. 1377, c. 180 A.D.). Can *veixillum* have had in Plautus' time the sense of 'a holder,' a vessel for holding liquid?; 1130 *proprius* (from *pro* and *privus*) may have had  $\frac{1}{2}$  like *illius* etc. The form *proprius* suits this line, also *Capt.* 862, *Merc.* 338; 1021 the explanation of *oculicrepidæ* by reference to *Anon. Vales.* 14, 87 *accepta chorda in fronte diutissime tortus ita est, ut oculi ejus creparent*, is far-fetched and should not have been accepted; *Truc.* 231 *nec umquam quisquam* (with the sentence-accent on *quisquam*) is supported by v. 240 *nec umquam ulla*, but does not involve the acceptance of *necumquam*, *necullus* as Plautine forms of *numquam*, *nullus*; 583 the *aca* of *B* for *accepta* here throws light on the puzzling *iteca* of v. 51 *res perit iteca in aedibus lenonis (lenoniis)*. It was a contraction for *intercepta*; 615 surely the line is trochaic like other lines of this passage; 675 *osculentiam* (so the

MSS.) for *obsequentiam* is exactly the kind of word we should expect from 'Truculentus,' the Mrs. Malaprop of Latin Comedy; 680 I cannot help thinking that *parasitus* is a comical name for a bag or scrip, here a money-bag (cf. *Stich.* 231); 691 why not keep the 'rustic' Latin form *conea* with the MSS. and *Probus*?; 877 is there much more reason for changing *refacere* here than for changing *recharmida* in *Trin.* 977?; 906 can the *purus* of the MSS. preserve a possible O. Lat. form of *puer* (cf. *socerus Men.* 957)? *Puerus est totum diem* will mean 'a boy is eating the live-long day'; 842 why has Prof. Palmer's emendation not been accepted, *Eam dem! pol. etc.*? Of misprints I have noted: *Asin.* 579 *vinginti*: p. 139 heading BACCHIDES: *Aul.* 468 *cirum*: *Bacch.* 1145 *nostras*: *Mil.* 152 crit. *om. P* for *om. A*.

The two volumes show a veritable *embarras de richesse* in felicitous emendations of the text and elucidations of Plautus' meaning. To mention all is impossible, but it is unfair to Prof. Leo to pass them over in silence. I will content myself with specifying from the last plays the emendations in *Trin.* 406, *Rud.* 1314, 829, and the explanations of *flector Truc.* 343, *continet Stich.* 452. Nor can I omit to mention how much has been done in this edition towards the restoration of the Plautine Cantica, all through keeping more closely than previous editions to the MSS.

W. M. LINDSAY.

### THE BERLIN PAPYRI.

*Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*, herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Erster Band, Hefte 4-12; zweiter Band, Hefte 1-6. (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1893-1896.) Each Mk. 2.40.

THE publication of the Berlin Papyri has proceeded, if hardly with the rapidity that was promised at the time of its commencement in 1892, at any rate with commendable regularity. Since the simultaneous issue of the initial three numbers in that year, the first volume has been completed in twelve parts, the last containing copious indices, some long lists of *errata*, and a couple of

photographic plates; and of the second volume six parts have already made their appearance. In all there have now been published 551<sup>1</sup> papyri—but a fraction, we are told, of what remains—varying widely in character, ranging in length from a few words to several hundreds of lines, and in date from the reign of the first Caesar to far into the seventh century. The general nature of their contents is too well known to need much specification here. Official decrees and injunctions, protocols and accounts of legal proceedings, tax and census returns, tax-receipts, leases, sales,

<sup>1</sup> Since these lines were written three more parts have been added, carrying the total to 627. These I hope to notice on another occasion. A.S.H.