

**PEDANTIUS: A LATIN
COMEDY FORMERLY
ACTED IN TRINITY
COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649764013

Pedantius: A Latin Comedy Formerly Acted in Trinity College, Cambridge by G. C. Moore
Smith

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

G. C. MOORE SMITH

**PEDANTIUS: A LATIN
COMEDY FORMERLY
ACTED IN TRINITY
COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE**

PEDANTIUS.

A LATIN COMEDY FORMERLY ACTED
IN TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

EDITED BY

G. C. Moore Smith M.A.

Professor of English Language and Literature
in University College, Sheffield

« How full of harmless mirth is
our Cambridge *Pedantius* ! »

Sir J. Harington.

LOUVAIN
A. UYSTPRUYST

LEIPZIG
O. HARRASSOWITZ

LONDON
DAVID NUTT

1905

PREFACE.

I cannot send this edition of *Pedantius* into the world without returning my thanks to all who have assisted me in the course of my work. Among these I must specially mention my friend Mr G. J. Turner of St John's College, Cambridge, and Lincoln's Inn, thanks to whose legal knowledge and acquaintance with the documents contained in the Record Office it was alone possible to re-construct the history of Edward Forsett and his family; Dr J. S. Reid, Fellow and Librarian of Caius College, who most readily gave me valuable help of various kinds; Mr Aldis Wright, Vice-Master of Trinity College, Dr Henry Jackson, Mr E. Harrison, and Mr W. W. Rouse Ball, Fellows of Trinity College, Dr Peile, Master of Christ's College, and Mr R. F. Scott, Fellow and Bursar of St John's College. I would also include some kind correspondents to *Notes and Queries*; and, last but not least, Professor Bang, who has given himself endless trouble in fulfilling his high conception of the duties of General Editor, and at whose suggestion I undertook this particular piece of work.

University College, Sheffield

1st June, 1904.



INTRODUCTION.

I. THE TEXTS OF *PEDANTIUS*.

Pedantius first appeared in printed form in 1631, forty years, according to its editors, more probably fifty years, after it was first acted. It had been licensed by the Stationers' Company on the 9th February 1630 (1631). It appeared as a duodecimo, with the titlepage, the copper plates of Dromodotus and *Pedantius*, the introductory verses by the editors, the *Personæ*, *Argumentum* and the concluding list of *Erratula corrigenda* headed *Fabulam lecturæ* given in this volume. As will be seen, the book gave no indication of its authorship. This text will be called henceforth P.

Two MSS. of *Pedantius* exist, one in the Library of Caius College Cambridge, one in that of Trinity College. The Caius MS. 62 (formerly 125) is of the 16th or 17th century and contains three plays, Legge's *Richardus III*, *Hymenæus* (without a title) and after them *Pedantius comœdia acta | in collegio Sanctæ et | individua Trinitatis | auctore M^{ro} | Forcet*. This text, which is written in a beautiful hand, will be henceforth called C.

The Trinity College MS R 17 (9) also includes *Pedantius*. This text seems not to differ from C and is apparently a copy of it, made — to judge from the writing — in a hasty and perfunctory manner. No further attention will be paid to it.

We have now to consider the relation in which P and C stand to each other.

The two texts differ from each other both by omission and addition on either side: and it can be shown that neither is in all points nearer to the original form of the play than the other.

Many differences between them are mere re-arrangements of the words forming a phrase, the substitution of one word for a synonym, or the expansion of a brachylogy.

Thus in Act I Sc I

P
 maiores tui
 heris conueniat
 nunc dierum præcepta
 aptius
 causa
 revulsæ
 siccine, verbero?
 sapis
 id reformido
 in mensa
 illam
 venerer meum

C
 tui maiores
 conueniat dominis
 præcepta nunc dierum
 melius
 gratia
 diuulsæ
 siccine agis, verbero?
 sapis
 reformido
 in mensam
 tuam
 meum venerer

P contains many passages, especially passages of pedantry, which appear to be afterthoughts, intended to introduce fresh humour.

By comparison with the C text, several of such passages are shown to be intrusive and to interrupt the connexion of ideas: and we are led to believe that other passages, though more neatly introduced, which occur in P only, are of the same character.

Clear cases of such intrusion are:

I. 3. 459 etc.

C
Dro. Cauendum est ab eo
 tanquam a Scorpione.

Ped. Imo quemadmodum
 qui sunt a Scorpiis icti, vel
 Scorpionibus etc.

III. 5. 1505.

C
Ped. Video te Cimmerijs ten-
 ebris occæcatum esse & egere
 multum candela ingenij mei.

Dro. Tuum caput ergo can-
 delabrum est.

Ped. Quid ego tibi multa?
 Diogenes es.

Dro. Habes tu pluralitatem
 et tot quot verborum, sed nul-
 litatem philosophiæ. Ut probem
 te idiotam esse, responde:
 Nonne Sol tibi videtur bipe-
 dalis?

P
 Inserts after Scorpione:
 aut *Cane celesti*, qui in diebus
 Canicularibus calore suo no-
 civo plus mordet quam ullus
Canis latrabilis.

P
Ped. Video te Cimmerijs ten-
 ebris occæcatum esse & egere
 multum candela ingenij mei.

Dro. Tuum ergo caput can-
 delabrum est.

Ped. Quid ego tibi multa?
 Diogenes Cynicus es. Compara
 dolium tibi.

Dro. Carcer amoris est do-
 lium tuum dolorificum. Sed ut
 probem te idiotam esse, res-
 ponde: non tibi videtur Sol
 bipedalis?

Here the editor of P, taking occasion of the mention of Diogenes, has substituted a joke on *dolium* and *dolorificum* for a sentence of C, with the result that the next sentence, « ut probem etc » is no longer led up to, but appears as an abrupt transition.

V. 3. 2567.

C

Merc. Nosti manum & stylum hunc?

Ped. Certe difficulter admodum, scripta enim sunt vti videtur raptim et negligenter.

Merc. Perlegas quæso has paucas lineas.

Ped. Tu non putas me non posse legere?

Merc. Imo scio te etiam intelligere posse.

P

P after « stylum hunc » introduces a long passage, playing on the words *suppositas*, *Donatus*, etc. before resuming the original connexion.

Gril. Lege distincte, si vis, singula.

Ped. Quid? num tu me putas non posse legere.

Gril. Imo etiam intelligere posse scio.

If there were any doubt that C has here the original form of the passage, it would vanish on the consideration that the words *Nosti manum & stylum* followed by *raptim* are parodies of Gabriel Harvey and indicated as such by Nash in his reference to the play⁴. In the P form the word *raptim* disappears.

P therefore has additions not in the original text: and probably the majority of the pedantic passages which occur in P and not in C are of this character.

P also has *omissions* of original passages:

II. 3. 1122.

C

Dro. Cum natura velit omne grave ferri deorsum, *tum doctrina et amor contrariantur non minus quam ens et non ens.*

Ped. Mihi vero sic omnem abstulit animum ut nesciam ens sim an non ens.

P

Dro. Cum natura velit omne grave ferri deorsum.

Ped. Mihi vero etc.

⁴ Nash's spelling *Dromidote* also supports the C text, which has *Dromidotus*, not *Dromodotus*. On the other hand Harington's *Pedantius* agrees with the P text, C having *Pedantius*.

IV. 2. 1903.

C

finiamus ambulando, ex quo magis erimus Peripatetici, *docebat enim Aristoteles discipulos suos ambulans*, idque cum ratione : nam etc.

P

finiamus ambulando, ex quo magis erimus Peripatetici, idque proprijssima ratione : nam motus excitat calorem

On the other hand C also contains, if not additions to, at any rate omissions from, an earlier text.

If we assume that any passages satirical of Gabriel Harvey necessarily belong to the first text, we must condemn C for omitting the passage in Act 1. Sc. 3. l. 371 etc.

P

Ped. Cogitabam iam dudum ipse vos invisere, & quasdam in Scholis Rhetoricis recitare Declamationes meas, quæ nempe, vt Demostheni, *lucernam olent*.

C

Ped. Cogitabam iam dudum ipse vos revisere.

Dro. Mallem olerent lucernam quam barbulae tuae vnguenta.

Ped. Composui, congeSSI, consarcinaui tres plusquam *Philippicas*, aut *Catilinarias* contra... armentum Oppidanorum...

Dro. Hæc sunt extra causam, Pedanti.

Dro. Hæc sunt extra causam, Pedanti.

If P is here more original, we must suppose that the passage was omitted from C in view of some performance of the play at a time when the topical allusion to Harvey had lost point.

It is however possible that if the play was performed several times within a few years, fresh Harvey allusions would be added. The above passage is therefore not very convincing as to C's inferiority. With it goes probably another, at the end of the play, l. 2934.

P

Ped. Vale vicina Academia. O fœlicem illam Academiam quæ Pedantium receperit, miseram illam, quæ amiserit.

C

Ped. Vale tu quæ dudum introijsti vidua, nam ego iam etiam sum viduus.