

**BENTLEY'S PLAUTINE
EMENDATIONS FROM
HIS COPY OF
GRONOVIVS, PP. 181-227**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649317783

Bentley's Plautine Emendations from His Copy of Gronovius, pp. 181-227 by E. A. Sonnenschein

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

E. A. SONNENSCHIN

**BENTLEY'S PLAUTINE
EMENDATIONS FROM
HIS COPY OF
GRONOVIVS, PP. 181-227**

Richard BENTLEY'S
PLAUTINE EMENDATIONS

FROM

HIS COPY OF GRONOVIVS

BY

E. A. SONNENSCHIN, M.A.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS IN THE MASON COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM



Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1883

[*All rights reserved*]

BENTLEY'S PLAUTINE EMENDATIONS

FROM HIS COPY OF GRONOVIVS.

BENTLEY'S notes and emendations on the text of Plautus contained in this volume are extracted from the margin of a copy of the Vulgate (Gronovius, Lugd. Batav. et Roterod., 1669), now in the Bodleian Library (Auct. S. infra I. 27). On the title page are the initials R. B., with letters indicating the place of the volume in a library; and the initials recur p. 1162. The fly leaf contains some additional notes, written, like the marginal correction, in Bentley's unmistakable hand. Besides these, the volume contains the hand of at least two other persons: (1) a certain Sheldon Mervyn (or Mervin), whose name appears on the fly leaf and *Dedicatio* p. 1, and who seems to have been the first possessor; (2) Gilbert Wakefield, the editor of Lucretius, whose name and arms appear on a printed plate attached to the cover, and whose hand is found in a few marginal notes, some in ink and some in pencil, scattered through the volume. One passage (Curc. II 1. 21), in which Wakefield's reading 'Lien crepat' (also published in his *Silva Critica*, Cambridge, 1789-95, V p. 100) is struck out in pencil, suggests the possibility that some of the pencil marks are by a fourth hand.

The history of the volume after the time of Bentley appears to have been as follows: (1) At Bentley's death (1742) it became the property of his nephew, Richard Bentley, who inherited all his uncle's classical books containing MS. notes (see Monk, *Life of Bentley*, p. 660). (2) It was probably purchased by Wakefield at the sale of the younger Bentley's books at Leicester in the year 1786: at any rate a copy of this very edition, described further as containing MS. notes, appears in the Sale Catalogue (no. 114), and there seems little reason to doubt that this is the volume in question. Wakefield himself, referring to Bentley's reading in *Amphitruo*, III 2. 54, remarks (*Silva Critica*, III p. 69), '*sic bene restitutum reliquit summus Bentleius in exemplari ejus, quod*

(1)

B

[I. 4.]

forte fortuna ad meas manus devenerit. AL. Ah! propitius sit potius. JUF. CONFIDO fore.' Here the phrase 'forte fortuna' would apply well enough to purchase at a sale.¹ (3) It was purchased by Richard Heber at the Wakefield Sale in 1802 for the sum of two shillings and six-pence (*vide* no. 987 in the priced catalogue of the sale). (4) It passed into the possession of the Bodleian Library, possibly by gift of Heber or by purchase at the Heber Sale (1834-36).

It is generally believed that Bentley's library was, unlike those of so many other scholars, successfully kept together; and no doubt a valuable portion of his books passed *en masse* through the hands of Richard Cumberland, who received them as a present from the younger Bentley, into the British Museum. But this was not the fate of all: several books with MS. notes by Bentley became the property of Anthony Askew, M.D., who doubtless bought them at the sale of part of Bentley's library which took place immediately after his death. These books were again thrown into the market at the Askew Sale (1785); and though some of them have found their way into public libraries², others may possibly still be buried in private collections.

The emendations of Bentley amount in all to 1094, and fall into three classes: (1) Those conjectures which coincide neither with the thoughts of other editors nor with recently-discovered MSS., and which are therefore new to the world. (2) Those conjectures which have since been independently made by modern editors or found in recently-discovered MSS. (3) Those readings which he borrowed, or may have borrowed, from previous editors or commentators, and simply 'entered' as approved by himself. These three classes are distinguished by different kinds of type³. In the last two classes the name of the scholar

¹ In another place Wakefield evidently misread Bentley's hand; see *Silva Critica*, IV p. 233, where he gives as Bentley's reading on *Amphitruo* Prologue 46:

Sed moris nunquam illinc fuit patri meo.

Bentley's correction in the margin stands 'moris illi n. f.' (not 'illinc'). A similar inaccuracy of Wakefield's is found in *Silva Critica*, V p. 107.

² E.g. an Aeschylus (1580), a Menander and Philemon (1709), a Terentianus Maurus (1684), and an interleaved copy of the 'Emendationes ad Tuscianas,' with many additional notes and corrections in Bentley's hand, all of which are in the Cambridge University Library; one at least of the volumes in the British Museum (Nicandri Theriaca, 1557) has likewise reached its present destination through the Askew Sale.

³ See *Explanations of Signs*, p. 194.

whom Bentley has anticipated, or to whom the reading may be due, is added in brackets. The following table exhibits the numerical relations of the three classes in the various plays¹:-

| | I | II | III | TOTAL. |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| Amphitruo | 9 | 9 | 40 | 58 |
| Asinaria | 11 | 8 | 23 | 42 |
| Aulularia | 12 | 8 | 22 | 42 |
| Captivi | 5 | 9 | 11 | 25 |
| Curculio | 10 | 11 | 20 | 41 |
| Casina | 3 | 43 | 22 | 68 |
| Cistellaria | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Epidicus | 16 | 21 | 22 | 59 |
| Bacchides | 12 | 13 | 38 | 63 |
| Mostellaria | 15 | 32 | 54 | 101 |
| Menaechmi | 9 | 19 | 34 | 62 |
| Miles Gloriosus | 26 | 30 | 57 | 113 |
| Mercator | 11 | 20 | 37 | 68 |
| Pseudolus | 13 | 16 | 32 | 61 |
| Poenulus | 14 | 48 | 31 | 93 |
| Persa | 1 | 6 | 15 | 21 |
| Rudens | 19 | 23 | 53 | 95 |
| Stichus | 3 | 2 | 11 | 16 |
| Trinummus | 5 | 17 | 15 | 37 |
| Truculentus | 1 | 15 | 10 | 26 |
| | 195 | 351 | 548 | 1094 |

It will be seen that half of the total number belong to class III; 546 corrections are by the hand of Bentley himself, and of these, 195 are new. Whether the 351 readings of class II can be claimed for Bentley, or whether the honour of them belongs to the various modern scholars who first published them, may be left to the decision of future editors of Plautus.

The readings contained in the present volume, taken together with

¹ The reader must be cautioned not to expect anything more than approximate accuracy in a table of this kind. The causes of possible error are numerous.

those of the copies of Pareus and Camerarius in the British Museum¹ and those contained in the notes on Bentley's editions of Horace (A. D. 1711) and Terence (A. D. 1725), represent Bentley's work upon the text of Plautus, so far as known at the present day. The emendations of the copies of Pareus and Camerarius amount to about 1140 in number; those of the editions of Horace and Terence to about 360. We have here, therefore, a considerable body of critical matter—not indeed so extensive as it appears at first sight, since the same reading frequently occurs in two, and occasionally in three, of the sources, but still important enough to claim examination and to justify the attempt to discover the relation of the various sources to one another, and their comparative value. It will be the object of this Introduction to determine: I. The relation of the Bodleian MS. notes to the British Museum MS. notes. II. The relation of the copies with MS. notes to the Plautine emendations in the notes to Horace and Terence. III. The approximate date of the emendations in MS. Under this head it will be necessary to examine, (1) the internal evidence, (2) the evidence of the handwriting.

I. The problem presented by the recensions in the three copies with MS. notes is a curious one. The Pareus has about the same number of emendations as the Gronovius²; but, while a considerable number are common to the two³, each has many valuable readings of its own, which are not found in the other. Neither recension is, therefore, independent of the other: on the contrary, Bentley appears to have used both copies during the period of his Plautus studies, and to have entered his emendations sometimes in the one, sometimes in the other, according to his convenience⁴. At the same time the considerable amount of common matter makes it probable that at some time or times Bentley transferred bodily from one copy to the other, rejecting only what on more mature thought he disapproved. Such transference, however, appears to have taken place in particular plays rather than from the one

¹ Press Marks 682. b. 10 and 682. c. 11. A collation of these readings has been published in an Appendix to the *Captivi* of Plautus, by E. A. Sonnenschein, 1886.

² In the following enquiry the copy of Camerarius is left out of account, as containing very few emendations, and being altogether of far less importance than the other two.

³ I. e. those marked with an asterisk in the present volume; see Explanations of Signs, p. 195.

⁴ I am informed by the Rev. Professor J. Wordsworth, of Oxford, that there is a similar relation between the several copies of the New Testament with MS. notes by Bentley.

volume, as a whole, to the other; and it must certainly have been previous to the stage of criticism which the volumes, as we have them, represent. In no single play can the one recension be entirely accounted for from the other. Thus in the *Bacchides*, while the Gronovius is on the whole decidedly superior¹, the Pareus and the Camerarius contain one emendation ('Inimiciorem' for 'Inmitioem,' III 4. 1) in which Bentley ingeniously anticipates the reading of the Ambrosian palimpsest, and which is probably superior to the reading of Gronovius, which he does not correct.

In the *Captivi*, on the other hand, the Pareus is far more complete; yet the Gronovius has 'larvae' on III 4. 66, while in the Pareus Bentley leaves 'larvae' uncorrected: the metre requires a trisyllabic word². In the *Epidicus* the Gronovius seems decidedly superior up to the end of Act II: but after that point the Gronovius almost ceases, whereas the Pareus has as many emendations in the last as in the first act, the whole number of readings of the Pareus being, however, in the *Epidicus*, only 22. In the *Mostellaria* the Gronovius has several emendations in Acts IV, V (lines 947-1155 in Ritschl's edition), while the Pareus cease altogether after Act III (i. e. of the edition of Gronovius, Ritschl line 966). In the first three acts there are many passages in which the Gronovius seems superior, e. g. I 1. 72, I 2. 11, I 2. 35, I 3. 75, II 1. 42, II 2. 95; but many in which it is inferior, e. g. I 3. 29, I 3. 53, I 3. 80, II 1. 66, II 1. 75, III 2. 127 (Par. IV 1. 41). In several plays it is very difficult to decide which copy has the advantage. Isolated instances are remarked upon in the foot-notes: the reader may be specially referred to those on *Casina* III 5. 1, *Curculio* II 3. 67, *Miles Gloriosus* II 4. 10, 11.

¹ Cf. especially IV 9. 145, where the conjecture 'uti' (for 'veluti') agrees with the note on Horace, Epistles II 1. 67, and is not found in the Pareus. Again in II 3. 86 the reading of Pylades ('Quantillum' for 'Quantulum') which is adopted, agrees with the note on Terence, Haut. IV 2. 1 but is not in the Pareus. Other passages in which the Gronovius is superior are III 4. 4, IV 6. 24, IV 7. 1.

² This word 'larvia,' which Bentley seems to have devised as a Plautine equivalent of 'larva' (which modern editors usually write 'lartia'), is characteristic of the Gronovius; it is found in Amph. II 2. 145, Aul. IV 4. 15, Capt. III 4. 66, Cas. III 4. 2, Men. V 4. 2, Merc. V 4. 20, 22. That it is a form deliberately approved by Bentley appears from the fact that it is adopted in the note on Horace, Epistles I 2. 34. It is found once in the Pareus (Aul. IV 4. 15). In the Gronovius the correction is always made in the same way (by writing the letters *via* in the margin), in exactly the same hand and with the same dark and glossy ink.

It is clear therefore that for a study of Bentley's work on Plautus, both the copies with MS. notes are essential. The same may be said of the emendations in the notes upon Terence and Horace, which form the subject of the next heading.

II. The relation of the copies with MS. notes to the emendations in the notes on Terence and Horace is also an interesting one. To what extent are the latter coincident with the former, to what extent inconsistent?¹

¹ The question has been already treated, in regard to the emendations in the copy of Pareus ('Parsana'), by Dr. H. Schenkl in an article in the *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* (*Zweihunddreissigster Jahrgang*, 1881). His position is that the inconsistencies between the notes on Terence and the 'Schediasma' on the one hand, and the 'Parsana' on the other, are so grave and numerous as to compel the inference that the latter represent an earlier stage of criticism.

His line of argument is presented under two heads: (a) That while Bentley is inexorable against all hiatus in his edition of Terence, the Parsana show a certain tolerance towards hiatus; (b) That the divergences between the quotations and emendations of Plautus in the notes on Terence and Horace and the Parsana make it impossible to explain the former from the latter. With regard to (a) Dr. Schenkl's argument proceeds on the assumption that what is true of the verse of Terence is true of that of Plautus. This was not Bentley's view; and any conclusions founded upon the assumption that it was, are wholly invalid. The following quotation from Bentley himself (ad *Eun.* III 1. 18) disposes of the argument of Dr. Schenkl. Speaking of the hiatus ('hiare') he says, "*Quod etsi Plautus sibi indulget in caesura, nunquam id facit Terentius!*" and in the notes on Terence we actually find him quoting Plautus with hiatus in caesura, e. g. *Trin. Prol.* 18 (on Phormio *Prol.* 26 and *Haut. Prol.* 1):

Hic nomen Graecus est Theauro fabular

and again in *Capt. V a. 24* (on *Andr.* I 3. 54).

Thus the readings of the Parsana in *Pseud.* I 1. 24

Interpretari | alium posse neminem

in *Stich.* II 1. 81 (Ritschl 235)

Ecceior auctionem | auid magni pretii

in *Merc.* II 2. 12

Tantum est. Dr. Lyimache salve, | Lt. Euge Demipho

and in *Pseud.* III 2. 67

Ut nostra properes amoliri | omnia

and similar cases, are entirely consistent with the principles and practice of Bentley in the year 1726.

To what extent Bentley would, in 1726, have allowed Plautus 'hiare' in other cases than in caesura, it is difficult to say. The Parsana give no clear sound on this point. Thus his correction in *Stich.* II 1. 63

Consensu: poene sum fama | emortuus

seems to allow the hiatus: whereas in *Mil.* I 1. 49

Edepol memoria est optima. Ar. Offae me monent

his correction is based upon a disinclination to allow hiatus in the same place.

Under the heading (b) Dr. Schenkl quotes several cases in which the notes on Terence present valuable emendations of which the Parsana give no hint, e. g. those on *Eun.* II 3. 65, both of which are accepted by Ritschl (*Bacch.* IV 4. 27, *Mil.* V 36). In two other passages the notes