

ARTICLE IV.

REVIEW OF RILEY'S TRANSLATION OF THE COMEDIES OF
PLAUTUS.¹

By George M. Lane, Professor in Harvard College.

THESE volumes belong to a collection of translations known by the name of Bohn's Classical Library. It would seem that, like many other of Mr. Bohn's publications, this collection was intended for a very wide circulation; otherwise, the mystery of such faultless paper, such precise and truly English type, so substantial a binding, all for a very moderate price, would be inexplicable. In point of mechanical execution, nothing better could be desired for Homer, for Horace, or for Shakspeare. The literary labor has been performed chiefly by graduates of the two great English universities; and these translations are interesting as showing some phases of English study, — as straws show which way the wind blows. Under the auspices of such a publisher, and favored by the extensive circulation to which the collection is destined, and which, indeed, it has already, the translators might have done much for the furtherance of that classical taste which has always been one of their countrymen's highest boasts. The service would be at best but an humble one, for the translator stands, in the dignity of his calling, below the editor and commentator; yet he is regarded as an associate, and his labors are no despicable contribution to philological science. It would, furthermore, be a great injustice if we expected from these volumes the learning and penetration of a great past generation: Bentley, snuffing out the errors of transcribers with the sagacity of a Spartan hound; Porson, stubborn and wayward, but lord of the field he trod; Elmeley, with his fine acumen and ἀκριβεία; of such names a nation may well be proud. Yet, if they have passed away, and with them the hegemony of England has vanished, it need not deprive their epigoni of the honor of doing great deeds, as vassals of some great kingdom take a pride in doing feats of valor, albeit under a foreign banner. A careful use of the labors of scholars we

¹ The Comedies of Plautus literally translated into English Prose, with Notes, by Henry Thomas Riley, B. A., late Scholar of Clare Hall, Cambridge (England). London: Henry G. Bohn. 1852. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 564 and 544.

expect in an undertaking of this sort, though these scholars be foreigners.

This use Mr. Riley, in common with the other translators, professes to have made. His book is founded mainly on the text of Ritschl, or, as he calls him throughout, Ritschel. We can hardly conceive how our translator never wondered, in the course of the long preparatory studies necessary for his undertaking, why the *e* was found in the Latin name Ritschelius, while the Rhenish Museum, in which many of his choicest labors are gathered up, stared at him with Ritschl on the title-page. Did it never occur to him that, if the Latin termination were dropt, it would be wise to drop the *e* also? Or has he silently followed some new theory of proper names, imitating the example of some Germans, who show us in their books such English names as *Bentlei* and *Elmslei*. But our translator commits a less pardonable offence than that of misspelling the name of Plautus's principal editor. He does not even know the name of the dramatist himself. His preface begins with these words: "The following pages contain a literal translation of all the existing works of *Marcus Accius Plautus* (or, as he is called by *Ritschel* and *Fleckeisen*, T. Maccius Plautus), the Roman comic writer." From this mode of expression we must infer that Mr. Riley still believes the real name to be M. Accius Plautus, and T. Maccius Plautus to be a wild speculation of the two editors. Now this leads to one of two conclusions; either that the writer is not acquainted with the dissertation *de Plauti poetæ nominibus*, which would be an unpardonable piece of ignorance in him; or, if he has read it, and still persists in calling the name M. Accius Plautus, in direct opposition to the usage of the learned since the appearance of that publication, it shows a degree of perverseness which is proof against all reasoning.

Now a translation based on the text of Ritschl claims to be far in advance of all other translations of Plautus, and to give the results of the latest investigations in this department of Latin literature. And really, if there be any one period in the history of Plautinian criticism that deserves special commemoration, it is the interval which has elapsed between the publication of Thornton's version and the present moment. Nay, we may go still further, and say that, in the last thirty years, more has been done to restore the poet to his original form than in all the rest of the time since the revival of literature. However great, then, the merits of former translations may have been, a new one is imperatively demanded; for of the two things demanded of a translator, the one, the felicitous diction, the inventive

power, and something of the *afflatus* of the original writer, remains always the same, and is in the main independent of time and change. But the critical requisites of the translator vary from year to year and from day to day; he must be a rigid scholar, familiar with all the implements of his art, and able to follow the path of criticism and exegesis up to the moment when he writes. No translation, then, can be deemed a *κρῆμα ἐς ἀσέ*, but only *relatively* good.

Few of the great writers of antiquity have met with so hard a fate as Plautus. Of the hundred and thirty dramas ascribed to him by the ancients, only twenty have weathered the storms of time; and these have come driving into port with battered hulks, shivered masts and drooping pennons. In ancient times prologues were added for practical representation on the stage; glosses and interpretations of grammarians were modified and crept into the text as interpolations. By his own countrymen he was not at all times understood nor appreciated. And when at last the living, spoken word had died out, the difficulties of the metre — rough in comparison with the burnished and glittering rhythms of the Augustan age — added only one more to the many corruptions which were distorting the text. Of the few remaining plays, the best manuscripts contain only portions. When Latin literature was again zealously cultivated at the revival of letters, it was a matter of great consequence to possess a complete and readable text of Plautus; but a real text, in the present sense of the word, was impossible, nor, indeed, was it under the circumstances necessary. Gradually, clearer views were attained with regard to the state of the manuscripts, and codices, mutilated to a great extent, were seen to rest on firmer foundations than the smoother but more suspicious copies of a later age. But the art of criticism was slow in its unfoldings; *gut ding will weile haben*; and before the great laws of this art were developed by Reiske and Bekker, all that was done was sporadic and disconnected. Even Gronov's edition, published at Amsterdam, which for many years passed as the Vulgata, betrays little recognition of philological method.

In the latter half of the last century, Friedrich Wolfgang Reiz, professor at Leipsic, edited the *Rudens*. The merits of Reiz, both in this and in other works, is not small; one honor, especially, is his, that of being the first German to comprehend and advocate the laws of metre, which had been laid down by Bentley.¹ A peculiar mental

¹ In opposition to the younger Burmann, who attacked the Bentleyian system in the preface to his Phædrus, Reiz wrote a dissertation entitled *Burmannum de metris Terent. judicare non potuisse*.

organization, however, unfitted him for writing, and his main influence was exerted in his university lectures. These, according to the testimony of his pupils, must have been preëminently suggestive and inspiring; and among his auditors there was one fully fitted to imbibe the new ideas advocated by the master, to carry them out with force and vigor, and to publish them to the world. This was Gottfried Hermann. It is an interesting psychological fact that, with all his felicitous audacity and originality of thought, the authors he treated with special predilection in all his after life, were those he had studied at the university.¹ Among other writers, Plautus engaged his attention, and eleven years after the publication of the *Rudens* by Reiz, Hermann came out with his edition of the *Trinummus* (1800); and from that time to the present, steady progress has been made in the criticism of all the plays.

Nothing can be further from our purpose, in the review of a mere translation, than to attempt a sketch of the criticism of Plautus. But we have grave charges to bring against Mr. Riley, and to substantiate these we are compelled to glance at a few of the most prominent changes and aeras of the text. Hermann ended a long and honorable career in 1848. Some time before his death, he had seen that the Augean labor of editing Plautus must be undertaken by some younger man. Who this was to be, could be a matter of no doubt; it was Friedrich Ritschl, formerly professor in Breslau, now in Bonn; and at a congress of philologists, held, we believe, at Dresden, he solemnly entrusted Plautus to him as a precious legacy. Thus it has been reserved for the third generation to finish what the first had begun. But the master did not live to see the ripened fruit of the pupil's labors. The first volume of Ritschl's complete edition appeared in 1848, dedicated with pious veneration to the Manes of Hermann. Since then five more plays have been issued, and the remainder will appear at no long intervals.

We must pause for a moment to notice the edition of Weise, Quedlinburg and Leipsic, 1838, in two octavo volumes. This is utterly without worth, and undeserving of mention among the editions of Plautus. But Mr. Riley has made it the basis of his second volume, with the exception of the *Amphitruo* and *Rudens*. We may congratulate ourselves that he has done so; for what has passed through the hands of both Weise and Riley is so corrupt that it saves us from all consideration of it.

¹ See the interesting remarks of Otto Jahn, in his *Gottfried Hermann, eine Gedächtnissrede*, Leipsic, 1849, p. 8.

Besides Ritschl's two editions, the larger with critical apparatus, and the smaller *scholarum in usum*, containing only the text, one other deserves special notice. It is that of Alfred Fleckeisen, published in Teubner's excellent collection of classics. Dr. Fleckeisen, who is quite a young man, a teacher at the gymnasium of Weilburg in Nassau, began his Plautinian studies at the university; rigorous methodical investigation pursued ever since that time has enabled him to contribute valuable elucidations on Plautus. Of his edition, the first volume appeared in 1850, and contains the *Amphitrua*, *Captivi*, *Miles Gloriosus*, *Rudens* and *Trinummus*; in two of these plays he was consequently able to avail himself of Ritschl's publication. The second volume came out in 1851, containing the *Astineria*, *Bacchides*, *Curculio*, *Pseudolus* and *Stichus*. Of these five plays, the *Bacchides*, *Pseudolus* and *Stichus* had been edited by Ritschl. But in these Fleckeisen shows anything but a slavish adherence to authority; and where he had not his valuable assistance, though he modestly confesses he had no other critical aids than such as had already appeared in print, his own emendations are such as to give the book an independent and permanent value.

The present position, then, of the plays of Plautus, is a peculiar one. For the first time we have a firm critical basis as far as the labors of Ritschl have extended; the manuscripts have been arranged in classes, and the better ones collated with extreme diplomatic fidelity. But, owing to the great corruption of the text, this process fails to satisfy the demands to be made of an editor of Plautus. Hence Ritschl goes back a step further, and starting, with the principle, that the lawlessness of the metres is due rather to the ignorance of the copyists than to the poet himself, he restores order and harmony by transpositions and emendations, not arbitrarily made out, but founded on a lifelong observation of the laws which the dramatist follows.¹ Mr. Riley has done well then in taking Ritschl's edition for his basis, and, as this is the only thing in his translation we can honestly praise, we must allow him all due credit for what he could not avoid. But for a good translation, two things are requisite: first, good means; and, secondly, ability to use them. Means, Mr. Riley has, ability to use them he has not. As far as we can judge from internal evidence, he seems to be a well-disposed young man, who after finishing his studies at the university — what he has studied he

¹ The laws of criticism are well grouped under four heads: *integritas linguae Latinae*, *concinntas numerorum*, *sententiae sanitas*, *consuetudo Plautina*. — *Præf. Mil.* p. xxi.

has not informed us, but we will charitably suppose it was not philology — took it into his head to make a translation of Plautus. A dictionary and grammar he had before; and so buying a copy of Ritschl's *editio minor scholarum in usum*, he seated himself, translated his *passum* every day, and, when he had done enough for a volume, printed it. But translating a classical author is nowadays a very different thing from what Mr. Riley conceives it to be. Go back of course we must to the best text; yet this is the least thing to be done in the case of any author, the first step only in the case of an author like Plautus. Ritschl has ransacked every nook and cranny of classical antiquity and turned all the splendor of his lore upon his favorite author. But his task has been a gigantic one, and he may well be pardoned, if here and there a corrupt place has escaped his eagle eye. The text of every play gives the final result of his investigations at the moment of publishing it; but the *ῥημίσις αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος* of Solon no man may say with more truth than he. After a series of brilliant dissertations, enough to satisfy most men's yearnings for fame, not a year passes by without copious testimony to his zeal in the form of programmes, articles for philological journals, etc., none of which may be neglected by the classical student, still less by the teacher or translator. Hardly has he printed one play, before in the preface to the next he corrects not a few places which he had passed unnoticed.

The text of Plautus being thus, as it were, in the process of reconstruction, we may fairly expect from a translator independent research. If he have not made this, we may yet call his work negatively good, if he collates and treasures up what has been done before him. When Mr. Riley says his translation is founded on the text of Ritschl, he says what is not true, and to screen him from the charge of wilful misrepresentation, we must be lenient enough to tax him with unpardonable carelessness. It is not true that he has followed rigorously, as he should have done, the bare text of Ritschl. Still less is it true that he has followed this scholar in all his labors, and comprehended his spirit. To do this, a long preparatory course of study is necessary, and much more erudition than Mr. Riley gives token of. The preliminary works are scattered here and there in pamphlets or buried in philological journals. The mere labor of collating and digesting what has been printed on Plautus, is no trifling one. Probably not a public library in America contains one-tenth of the fundamental works. The library of Harvard College has nothing at all. But this is no excuse for the translator's neglect of

duty; on the contrary, the difficulty of obtaining such works is the very reason why he should have incorporated the results in his version, the only thing which would have made it acceptable to scholars.

In point of exegesis, we have some very good works on single subjects or detached places, but naturally, this branch must lag behind till a proper text is established. As a whole, very little has been done since the edition of Taubmann, 1605—1624. Here, again, Mr. Riley's book is lamentably defective; he says, in the preface to the second volume: "Particular care has been taken to explain the difficult passages, and it is hoped the notes may prove of value to the classical student." The classical student who finds these notes valuable is to be pitied. Here and there he will find, to be sure, some very diverting blunders of the translator, the only original things in the whole book. But, with these exceptions, the notes are so antiquated and betray so little cognizance of what has been done during the past century, that one might easily think Mr. Riley had slept as many years as Epimenides of Crete.

Translations differ naturally, often by imperceptible grades, according to the ability and taste of the translators. Of course, they are at best but an imperfect substitute for the original, and are to this somewhat as the *φαστασία* of the Stoics was to their *κατάληψις*, or perfect comprehension. With the original artist, form and matter are supplementary ideas, mutually conditioning and conditioned; the same inspiration that suggests the idea strikes out the appropriate form. The translator must put asunder what God hath joined together. One factor of the original — the idea — he retains as it is; but with the more important and characteristic part, the beauty of form, he must either dispense altogether, or he must create something new in place of the original. We can now make an approximation to the original in two ways, which we may call analogy and resemblance. The former, we may compare to sculpture; the latter, to painting. It is to the employment of wholes and masses that the plastic art owes its dignity; a Gerard Dow-like minuteness of detail would be only repulsive. The effect of painting, on the other hand, — and here we do not speak of the highest branches of painting, — is produced by the accurate resemblance of parts, not of wholes. A Greek tragedy, for example, translated analogically, would as a whole affect the mind of the reader not unlike the original; the coloring of tropes and metaphors would change; the lyrical parts would be given by kindred lyrical measures in English; the dialogue

by kindred dramatic measures. In the second class of translations, which we have compared to painting, the dignity of mass and form vanishes, and, if the original be a poem, the stubborn difference of the two languages inevitably reduces it to prose. The loss, as a work of art, is somewhat compensated by a succession of faithful little pictures. But on the rigorous fidelity of these pictures all the merit of a literal translation depends.

Let us now look into the details of Mr. Riley's version, and see how he answers our conditions. We would premise that, in the following pages, we shall treat mainly the first three plays of his translation, the *Trinummus*, the *Miles Gloriosus*, and the *Bacchides*. But if the book have any character at all, it can be learned from these; nor can we do Mr. Riley injustice by taking a portion of his book as the representative of the rest, for we may fairly suppose these three important dramas to be done with as much care as any in the book. At any rate, the majority of his readers will probably not care to advance further; and it was only the illusive hope of finding something to praise in the work, that has enabled us to keep right onward, as far as we have done.

Under the head of criticism, belong the spurious verses or interpolations which Ritschl particularly has hunted out with wonderful sagacity, and exposed with convincing logic. In the English, these are not indicated at all as supposititious; we read over them as smoothly as we do over the indubitably genuine parts of the poet. Yet in the English, if anywhere, we need brackets to make the matter at once plain to the eye; since in the original, apart from the sense, some defect in the form or the metre betrays the hand of the bungler; whereas in the translation, the genuine parts being reduced to quite as bad English as the spurious insertions, the distinction is not so readily made. More extensive, and for this reason the reader recognized, are the interpolations which were made chiefly by Italian scholars at the revival of letters, to fill out gaps in the manuscripts. Of this we have a notable instance in the beginning of the *Bacchides*, where a long prologue is inserted to make amends for the loss of the first few scenes of the play. This interpolation is so ill-managed, both in its matter, which is based on a totally false conception of the nature of the whole play — it is put into the mouth of Silenus, who is introduced because the sisters in the play are called *Bacchides* — and in point of form, which differs as much from the style of Plautus as black does from white, that modern critics pass it by unnoticed. Mr. Riley translates it like an integral part of the play, appending

the following note; the reasons assigned in it are truly diverting to read in the second half of the nineteenth century: "There is little doubt that this Prologue is spurious" (we hope he is using a *littes* here), "but as it is prefixed to many of the editions" (to what sort of editions?) "and to Thornton's and the French translations, it is here inserted. Lascaris, the Greek grammarian, says, in a letter to Bembo, that it was discovered by him in Sicily. Some writers have supposed it to have been written by the Poet Petrarch." We should like to be informed who thinks it nowadays to be the work of the Poet Petrarch? It is now well made out that this scene was composed by Antonio Beccadello of Naples, who is generally called, from his birthplace, Antonius Panormita.¹ This we notice in passing. A translator should not for a moment think of alluding to such ineptiae.

Another general fault is the improper division of the acts and scenes. The traditional arrangement which has generally been followed, is arbitrary in the extreme, and has hardly presumption in its favor. We do not remember that Mr. Riley justifies himself anywhere for his return to this; but this is so important a step backward from the plain indications of the book before him, that his readers ought to have been specially warned.

The genuine parts of the dramas are not always preserved with the same conscientiousness with which the spurious lines are translated. Sometimes single words are omitted without much real injury to the sense; but such omissions destroy our confidence in the translation, and make its accuracy appear very questionable. In the *Trinummus*, for example, all authorities without exception read (v. 1070): "Mare, terra, caelum, di, nostram fidem;" in the translation: "O sea, earth, heavens, by my trust in you," the word *di* being omitted. In the *Bacchides*, 248, Chrysalus returning from abroad salutes his master, whom he meets all of a sudden, with the words: "Seruus salutet Nicobulum Chrysalus." Nicobulus answers: "Pro di immortales, Chrysale, ubi mist filius?" There is a certain *ἦθος* here in the vocative *Chrysale*,

¹ Cf. Ritschl, de Plauti Bacchidibus, 1839, and in his *Parerga Plantina*, Lipsic, 1845, p. 401. We would recommend to Mr. Riley's notice the remarks on p. 399: "sive inventionem spectas poeticam; nihil excogitari ab ipsius fabulae argumento et nexu alienius potuit, nihil magis abhorrens ab antiquitatis sensu, moribus veteris comoediae nihil repugnantius, nihil sententiarum vel insubitate frigidius vel obscuritate impeditius vel earundem molestius repetitione; sive verba et numeros contemplaris, nihil sermonis aut inficitius ieiunitate aut insolentia importantius, prosodiae autem et metrorum puerili imperitia nihil turpius, tanto flagitiosius."

which expresses the master's surprise at meeting him thus unexpectedly; we may paraphrase it by "Why Chrycealus! Is that actually you!" The vocative is omitted in the translation (p. 165). To give an instance from the third play, the *Miles*, 874, the translation omits (p. 114) the word *ordinae*, "in order, from beginning to end," of the original "rem omnem demonstraui ordine." In other cases the omission does more injury to the sense, e. g. *Miles Glor.*, 559, 560: Si ego me sciente paterer uicino meo Eam fieri apud me tam insignite iniuriam; the translation (p. 98) omits "apud me;" these words cannot well be omitted, for Periplectomenus speaks with great deliberation, and it was naturally a cumulus to the offence, if Periplectomenus suffered it to be committed in his own house. The omissions occasionally extend to parts of lines or even whole lines; *Miles Glor.*, 860, the phrase "quia ego sibi non dixerim," is omitted for no conceivable reason; in the same play the translator has wholly misapprehended vs. 1190, 1191; of the other blunders we shall speak in their place. We mention the passage now only to notice that he has entirely left out the words: ille inebriat me ire cum illa ad portum; if these words had been inserted in their place it would have spared Mr. Riley the mortification of many blunders in one short sentence (translation, p. 181). Immediately below, the scene ends in the English with "Come then begone. But see the door opens opportunely" (p. 181); whereas the Latin has one whole line more (v. 1199): "Hilarus exit, impetruit: fahist, quod nusquamst, miser."

Neither do we find, apart from the omissions, a close adherence to the established text. At intervals we meet with traces of an eclectic criticism not felicitously applied, and indicating that the writer had other copies before him, and intentionally or unintentionally culled from them. V. 1160 of the *Miles*, for instance, reads as follows: 'Inpe-trabis, inperator, quodam ego potero, quod uoles: this is rendered (p. 129): "General, you shall assign me whatever you please, so far as I am capable." Here Mr. Riley seems to emend from inpe-trabis inperator to *inperabis*. That the emendation is altogether untenable, the words quoad ego potero show at a glance. In the same play, v. 708, Ritsehl emends to [Ideo ut liberi] me curant: with the observation "glossema expulsum principium versus aliqua coniectura probabiliter redipsi studuimus." But the glossema does not trouble Mr. Riley, who follows that, not the emendation. In general, it may be remarked, that the *Miles* is full of errors of this sort; we mention one or two more instar omnium; v. 1239 seq.: Si pol

me nolet dūcere uxōrem, genna amplēctar Atque obsecrabo. *aliō* modo si nōn quibꝰ impetrāre Consciscam letum. The meaning of the *aliō modo* is apparent, but the English book has (p. 188): "If I shall be unable to prevail upon him in *some way or other*," without an indication that this is not the reading of the text he professes to follow, but the emendation of Acidalius. On p. 91 the translation reads—it is the graceful little speech of Philocomasium on her feigned arrival from sea: "Where with raging billows I have been *so recently* dismayed?" what means *so recently*? What codex or what editor has any indication of a *super* or the like? What necessity is there of any deviation from the plain words of Plautus: "sacris fructibus ubi sum *adfluctata multum*" (*Miles*, 414).

In the *Bacchides* we notice one curious thing which is to us altogether inexplicable; v. 711 (translation, p. 186): *Rēcta porta inuādādam extemplo in oppidum anticum et uetus*. An attempt to point out here any essential difference between the *anticum* and the *uetus* would end in a mere quibble; Plautus likes occasionally to add the one word to the other as a sort of supplement, e. g. *Trin.* 381; *Historiam ueterem atque antiquam*; *Mil.* 751: *orationem ueterem atque antiquam*; *Most.* 2, 2; 45: *scelus anticum et uetus*; so [*Amphitr.* 118], *Pers.* 1, 2, 1. In this he is imitated by later writers, as by Tacitus and Juvenal.¹ The pleonasm is the converse of *novus et recens*, and resembles exactly the Greek *παλαιός και ἀρχαίος*. Mr. Riley renders the place in question: "Straight at the gate that instant I'll attack *the old town and the new*."

We have observed that, in almost all instances where grammars and dictionaries give no solution of a new word or phrase, our translator is quite at fault. Latin lexicography and Latin grammar will be very materially modified by the investigations made within the past few years, and still to be made. New words, new forms of words, and new principles of syntax, must first be established on the authority of manuscripts, discussed in commentaries and monographs, and approved by scholars, before they find their tardy place in the organism of grammar, or are garnered up in the treasure-house of dictionaries. Hence these works are always lagging behind the age. The professional philologist cannot do without them, but he would be a wretched philologist who did not stand above them, and was not in a condition to modify, control and augment them. The purest sources for Plautus have furnished many new words for which corruptions stood in

¹ This usage is illustrated by Heinrich, on Juvenal 6, 21, and Doederlein, *Synonymik*, IV. p. 84.

the old editions. For instance, the adjective *vesculus* — *tiny*, a diminutive of *vescus*, *small*, is restored by Ritschl in the *Trin.* 886: 'Est minusculeum alterum, quasi uesculum uinariura. This form is attested by Festus, and confirmed by the analogy of such diminutives as *venustulus*, *liquidiusculus*.¹ Mr. Riley confounds this with *uaculum uinariom*, the old reading, and renders it "about the size of a wine-cask," taking *uinarium* for the adjective and *uesculum* for the substantive. In the *Bacchides*, 929, Ritschl, following others, restores *termento* for *tormento* in the sentence: *non pētus tormentó ruit*. This is done on the express testimony of Festus, who assures us that *termentum* for *detrimentum* occurs in the *Bacchides*; and as this is the only place in what we have of this play where Plautus could have used it, we can have no hesitation in adopting it, in preference to the reading of the manuscripts. Mr. Riley (p. 195) goes back to *tormentum* in his translation: "Not more decidedly did it fall by the engine of war."

The nominative singular *canes* for *canis* is critically certain in Plautus, *Trin.* 172: *Fecisset edepol, ni hæc præsensisset canes*; translation, p. 11: "I' faith, he would have done it if the dogs had not perceived this in time." The *præsensisset*, which some manuscripts have in this line, is a mere guess of ignorant copyists, who, like Mr. Riley, did not understand the *canes*.

On p. 23, we find the following note on the value of the drachma: "*Olympic drachmæ*) — V. 425. As already mentioned, the 'drachma' was about ninepence three-farthings in value. As one hundred made a 'mina,' one-fourth of the price received would go to satisfy the banker's claim." The passage in the translation which this note is intended to illustrate is: "There were a thousand Olympic drachmæ paid to the banker, which you were owing upon account;" the original reads in Ritschl's text: "*Trapezitæ mille drachumarum Olympicum, Quas dé ratione déhibuisti, rédditæ.*" The note alluded to omits the essential point to be explained, namely, what an *Olympic drachma* is. We fear that our translator will not be able to explain this by any citation from the ancients, nor by any authority of works on numismatics. Furthermore, the contraction of the genitive plural *Olympicum* for *Olympicarum* is rare.² The fact is, the Olympic drachma is a *ἀπασὶ λεγόμενον*, and, though Ritschl has it in his text, if the translator had used a due degree of care, he would have seen that the bad penny soon returns,³ but in a more intelligible form: *Trapezitæ*

¹ Proleg. *Trin.* p. lxxxii.² *Ibid.* p. lxxxix.³ *Præfat. Sticht.* p. xix.

mille drachumarum olim *Olympicho*. Olympichus or Olympicus is the name of the trapezita. This reading Fleckeisen has properly adopted in his text.

We subjoin one or two further instances where the meaning of words has been misapprehended; *Bacchides*, 803–805, of the pirates disappointed of their booty :

Tristes sileo,
Quoniam éxtemplo a portu íre nos cum auró uident,
Subducunt lombam *capitibus cassantibus*.

Mr. Riley says: "Shaking their heads." Not so. The manuscripts have here to be sure *quassantibus*, which is an ancient corruption, as it is quoted by Servius, ad Georg. 1, 74. But *capitibus quassantibus* for "caput quassis," as Servius explains it, would be hardly Latin. Mr. Riley does not understand the *cassare* of the text, like *caso* as frequentative from *cadu*.¹ It occurs, also, *Miles*, 852 and 857, and *Asinaria*, 403 (Fleckeisen); two of these three places are also mistranslated. *Capite cassanti* or *capitibus cassantibus* differs very materially from *quassare caput*; it = *with drooping head*, the gaze fixed on the ground from sadness or fear; like Sophocles, *Antig.* 269, λέγει τις εἰς, ὡς πάντας εἰς πέδον κάρ α Νεῦσαι φόβῳ προύτραπεν.² This meaning may be illustrated by *Bacchides*, 668: Núm qui tibi nummi éxciderunt, ére, quod sic *terrám* [tacens] *Optuere*? Quid nos *maestos tristisque* esse cónspicor? and by the place referred to in the *Asinaria*, where Leonida enters angry *cassanti capite*, and with his looks bent on the ground does not see the other persons present. *Quassare caput* expresses not dejection and thoughtfulness, but intense wrath; Juvenal, 2, 130: nec galeam quassas nec terram cuspide pulsas nec quereris patri?³ It corresponds to the Greek *σειεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν*; Soph. *Antig.* 289: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ πάλας πόλεως Ἄνδρες μόλις φέροντες; ἐγγύθουν ἐμοὶ Κρητῆ κάρα σεῖοντες.

In the same play, v. 273, we read: Chrys. Porro étiam auscultá púgnam quam uoluit dare; Nicolul. Etiám quid porro? hem *accipitrina* haec nunc erit. The manuscripts have here *accipe trina*, which is unintelligible. For this Hermann (not "Ritschel" as Mr. Riley says) ingeniously emends *accipitrina*. How Mr. Riley came to

¹ The existence of this verb is furthermore confirmed by the *cassabundus*, explained by Festus, p. 48, "*cadro cadens*," and by Varro, L. L., p. 141, Müller, derived "*a cadendo*."

² The inaccurate statements of Freund, Dr. Andrews should have corrected, but has not.

³ See Heinrich ad loc., whose citations by no means exhaust the subject.

translate it as he does we cannot see (p. 166): "Besides, listen to another struggle of his as well which he was desirous to enter on. Nicob. What, besides as well? Oh! this will turn out now a regular hawk's nest." Accipitrina has not found its way into the Lexicon, not even the latest, as Klotz's, or Andrews's Freund. But in regard to the intended meaning of the emendation there can be, we imagine, no doubt, though we have not Hermann's explanation to refer to; *accipitrinus* is the regular adjective from *accipiter*, like *hirundininus*, *asininus*, *caninus*, from *hirundo*, etc., and in general like adjectives in *inus*, from names of animals. The noun to be supplied is the preceding *pugna*, and the interpretation to be looked for in *Pers.* 3, 3, 5: *Populi labe, pecuniarum accipiter.*

Many other mistakes in this edition are less pardonable, as they show an ignorance of metre and grammar. For instance, *Mil. Glor.* v. 370: *Nunquam hércle deterrébor Quin úderim id quod úderim.* Philocom. *Ego stúlta moror múltum, Quae cum hóc insano fábuler;* translation, p. 88: "By my faith, I shall never be intimidated from having seen what I really did see. Phil. In my foolishness I am delaying too long in parleying with this madman." We have always heard that a large portion of the time spent on the classics at Cambridge and Oxford was devoted to the making of Greek and Latin verse. Perhaps Mr. Riley with this practice may explain to us the use of the pyrrhic *tā mō* in the iambicus septenarius, if *moror* means to delay. If *moror* multum be by Plautus, we must read *mōror* multum = *μωραίρειν*, "producta prima syllaba," as Nero did, in his pun on the word *moror*, according to Suetonius, vit. Ner. 85. If *moror* be not Plautinian, the emendations proposed, *Set sumne ego mora multum* or *Pol ego sum mora multum*, or (praef. Stich. p. xvii, note) *ego mora moror multum*, go back equally to the adjective *μωρός*.

A similar critical and prosodical blunder is made in the translation (p. 122) of the anapaestic septenarius of the *Miles*, 1026: *Cáldūm refero ad te cónsilium:* "I bring you back your clever plot." Though here a third and orthographical blunder is superadded. Mr. Riley has in his mind *Cállidūm* refero, which a moment's consideration of the metre would have shown to be impossible. In general, one must read between the lines, and from the translation conjecture what word the translator had in his mind; we read, for example, *Mil. Glor.* p. 98, translation: "Yes, but 'twas improperly done; for it befits a person that is a servant to keep his eyes and hands and talk asleep." The Latin word corresponding to asleep is *domitos*. At the first glance one might think the *asleep* of the translation were

a free version, for *domitos*, in *subjection*; one familiar, however, with Mr. Riley's ways, would not hesitate to assert that he took it for a form of the verb *dormire*.

But it is tedious to dwell upon errors in detail, and to pick out flaws from which no general truths can be drawn, no principles deduced. Inconsiderable, however, as they may seem in themselves, they all prove one fact, that for all critical purposes the book is worse than worthless. We are left, then, to another assumption, that this version is intended for popular circulation, for general reading.

If this be the intention, we must again say the writer has disastrously failed. We will not now speak of the higher qualifications of a translator. To an intelligent reader who takes up the book without a knowledge of Latin, it must be difficult to understand; and one who is familiar with the original, and opens the book with the hope of meeting an old friend in a new garb, will be surprised at the awkward English *Plautus* uses; we find repeatedly such phrases as "That is *being* carefully done" (p. 11), "When at any time the ground is *being* ploughed" (p. 29). See pp. 118, 128, 139, 167, etc. In direct questions introduced by *utrum* — *an*, the *utrum* is faithfully translated by *whether*. This may have been good English some centuries ago, although even then we suspect it was a Latinism or a Grecism. Nowadays it is chiefly heard in the lower classes of Latin schools, where teachers are constantly vexed at being obliged to correct such translations as "*Whether* was it right for me to discover the treasure to him, *or* should I have permitted" (p. 11); or "*Whether* should I be pretending that in jest *or* seriously" (p. 156). Quite uncalled for is the barbarous use of *Directly* as a conjunctive adverb; p. 96, note: "*Directly* Sceledrus turns his back the old man calls out for Philocomasium." This occurs even in the text, p. 99: "that *directly* the captain returns from the forum I may be caught at home." An English reader must furthermore smile at some of the graceful innovations, like (p. 157): "Where then should I take my place? Bacch. Near myself, my life, that with a *she-wit* a *he-wit* may be reclining at the repast;" p. 35: "Give attention to your *he-friend* in the courts of justice, and not to the couch of your *she-friends* as you are wont to do." We have heard in common parlance of *he-goats* and *she-goats*, but *he-wits* and *she-wits* are something quite new. We cannot see the necessity of translating the simple *hic homo* this *individual* (p. 62), nor why a *long* conversation would not do (p. 122) as well as "a *lengthy*" one. In the *Miles* (p. 86) the sentence "If I shall make her so as you may see her come out hence from our house," we are

totally at a loss to explain the words "so as" by any common principle of exegesis.¹

It has always been accounted one of the most characteristic beauties of the two ancient languages that they present the concrete for the abstract, the sensuous and tangible for the immaterial. The stock of words is very scanty which express states, conditions, relations of things, passions and affections. The names of objects and things, on the other hand, is large. Hence, in everything which passes beyond mere external description, the classical writers are limited to a narrow round. Yet here, as in physical forces, what is lost in breadth, is more than gained in intensity. The Greeks and Romans are yet of the earth, earthy. The cold and hueless outline of the intellectual idea has for them no independent life. They cannot lay it before you drawn with rigid measurements, with mathematical proportions, and with correct perspective. But in place of the abstract idea, they lay before you a form suggestive of it, a form which you can see and touch and feel, trembling with life, glowing and glittering with shifting tints from Nature's own sun. They do not seek to wrest from you the cool assent of the understanding, but they would make you laugh and weep. They could not well discourse of the sun's radiation and actinism and polarization; but you hold your breath and crouch down when they tell you of Phoebus Apollon speeding down like night, of the arrows clattering on his shoulders, of the terrible clang of his silver bow. The energy of this primitive materialism permeating all parts of the language, is what the translator into any modern language, and particularly the translator into French and English, must most strive to give. Sometimes in despair he must confess that the dull colors on his pallet will not depict what lies before him dashed out with a bold hand and in Tyrian hues. Sometimes he can reach it, though he must strive and strain in order to accomplish it; and sometimes, though rarely, the prosaic soberness of the English will allow him to give a faithful transcript of figurative speech, though it may be with the loss of the harmonious rhythm of the original. Strip Plautus of his rhythm, and

¹ *Bacchides*, 1156: *Nicob. Quid est quod pudeat? Philox. Set amico homini tibi, quod uolo, credere certumst; translation, p. 266: "Nicob. What is it that you're ashamed about?" (It should be, "What have you to be ashamed about?"). The following words of Philoxenus are not to be understood: "Still as you are a person, a friend of mine, I'm determined to entrust you with what I could wish." It would be easy to emend "a personal friend," but if this had been the intention of the translator he would have added it in an erratum.*

let Horatian cavillers say what they may, it is prose, but prose bordering hard on poetry. Strip him of his characteristic diction, and it is a higher potency of prose, the prose of prose. The idea may remain the same, but in place of the prattle of childhood it is given with the effete and inane mumblings of senility. In this transformation our translator has been very successful; he gives us the purest abstraction of the idea, and is a perfect philological iconoclast. If our duty as reviewer required us to enumerate all the places where he has sinned in point of language and inadequacy of expression, we should say, see his works throughout. But as such a comparison would not offer much that was instructive, unless it showed us the inferiority of the moderns to the ancients, we propose to cite a few cases where the language is needlessly weakened.

In the *Trinummus*, 615 (translation, p. 38), Stasimus says: "Prépemodum, quid illíc festinet, scéntio ac subolét mihi." The *subolet* of this verse expressing a function of the senses is more vigorous than any verb meaning mere intellectual action; Stasimus is dogging after the matter, and might be addressed as Odysæus is in the *Aias*:

οὐ δὲ δ' ἐπιφραεῖ
Κυρὸς Λυξυρίας ὡς τις σὺρπος βδοαί·

And in connection with *subolet* even the weaker verb *scéntio* is strengthened and becomes sensuous. In the translation: "I pretty nearly guess and I have a strong suspicion," the *noiveté* of the Latin is entirely lost. Similar to this is the translation on p. 38: "For my part I know you how you are disposed in mind; *I see it, I discover, I apprehend*. In this English there is no peculiar significancy in the three verbs, and any of them might be omitted without injury to the sense. Not so in the Latin, where the verbs express operations of the different senses (v. 698), *video, subolet, scéntio*. In the prologue to the same play, Luxuria says (v. 4): "Nunc, né quis *erret* adóstrum, paucis *in uiam Dedicam*;" why might not the *erret* be rendered here *go astray*, instead of Mr. Riley's: "Now that no one *may be mistaken*, . . . I will conduct you into the right path?" Our translator wishes frequently to improve on the original, and to substitute finer words; so in the speech of Charmides on his return (*Trin.* act 4) a place full of metaphors, Mr. Riley gives us "the azure *surface* of ocean." Plautus is more vivid, giving *campos*, fields. Among the most common tropes are those pertaining to the art of war. To this class belong the words of the Sycophanta (*Trin.* 867): 'Aput illas *aedís sistendae* mihi sunt *sycophántiae*; this is not a strong meta-

phor, yet the abstract *sycophantiae* is colored by the word *sistendae*; it is not "at this house are my devices to be put in practice," but "to be planted" like a balista or tormentum.

A singular case of delicacy we find in the Braggart Soldier, p. 59: "We are listening to you (it should be: *we will listen*) with most attentive ear." The Latin is, indeed, coarser (v. 774): "tibi *pér-purgatis* óperam dabimus aúribus." But the English does not convey the humor of the Latin, and as the phrase is found also in Horace and Persius, it should be translated literally, and the application of the word *purgare* explained in a note.¹ On the same page of the translation, Mr. Riley's college feelings have led him to use a term which is altogether too modern for the Latin *lautam*: "Do you want one that has taken her degree, or a novice in the art?" The woman required to carry out Palaestrio's devices is unquestionably one of the strong-minded; but we have yet to learn that the Romans had Female Colleges, or conferred the degree of Mistress of Arts.

A warm and genial tone is further given by a dexterous application of those little irregularities that occur in every language and among all people, by anacoluthic sentences, by the resumption of the main subject through a demonstrative pronoun, when the verb is separated from the subject by intervening clauses, and the like. Or there is a charm of great simplicity where words of similar etymological origin are connected, like *ἀνὴρ ἢ πάντας αὐταὶ ἢ τρόφος ἐπέχει*, on which connection the Homeric scholiasts so often artlessly say: *ἢ ἀνὴρ ὅτι παρερμολογεῖ, κ. τ. λ.*² In all these cases the English might with propriety imitate the Latin, without any danger of becoming stiff and unnatural, which we admit might sometimes be the result of too close an adherence to metaphorical language. These little irregularities, however, are not to Mr. Riley's taste; all characters must for him speak in rounded turns, avoiding all appearance of ease, and using the formal phrases of a *bas bleu* or a professed talker at a dinner party. Thus, in the prologue of the *Trinummus*, *Luxuria* says (v. 17): *Senés, qui huc uenient, í rem uobis áperient*; the chatty *í* vanishes in the version (p. 4): "the old men

¹ See on this the commentators on Horace, *Epist.* 1, 1, 7, particularly Schmid and Obbarius; Otto Jahn on Pers. 5, 63 and 5, 86.

² *Bacch.* 399: *Nunc Mnestiche specimen spectar nunc certamen cernitur*; Riley, p. 172: "Now M. the sample is on view, now the contest is being decided." *Mil. Gl.* 799: *Mis prohibent uxore, quae mi huius similis sermones serat*; Riley, p. 193: "to be uttering speeches to me like this." *Bacch.* 640: *Hinc statuum status decet ex auro*. Examples of this, arranged in classes, are given by Lobeck, *Paral. Gr. Gr. de figura etymologica*, II. p. 501 seq.

who come hither will disclose the matter to you." In the same play, Mr. Riley overlooks the point of the *quod ciui immuni cantari solet*. The words of the malediction are (v. 351):

Quôd habes ne habeás, et illuc, quod nón habes, habeás, malum.

According to the translation (p. 19): "That which thou hast mayst thou not have, and mayst thou have *that misfortune* which thou hast not." What schoolboy does not see here that the epigrammatic sting of the saying lies in the unexpected termination? *quod non habes habeas* is said with a suspension of the voice and then with emphasis is added: *malum*, namely, misfortune. This is so common in the comedy, that it were needless to give examples of it; we would only mention as similar (*Rudens*, 107): Plesidippus. At di dabunt (meaning *virile secus*). Sceparnio interprets *παρά προσδοκίαν*, Hem tibi quidem hercle quisquis es magnum *malum*. A sort of parallelism is to be noticed in the whole speech of Sceledrus in the *Mil. Gl.* (345 seq.): *utrum egon' id quod uidi uiderim* — an *illic faciat quod facturum* — *primus ad cibum uocatur primo pulmentum datur* — in *nostra melius est famulo familia*; then follows v. 352: *Sét ego quod ago id me ágere oportet*, a lively sentence with special emphasis on the *agere*, as in the phrase *age si quid agis*, or the English "If it were *done* when 'tis *done* then it were well 'twere *done* quickly." The straightforward emphasis of the Latin is not recognized in the translation (p. 87): "But it is necessary for me to mind what I am about."

A studied plainness we find, furthermore, in the case of threats, where one wishes to make his words perfectly clear and intelligible, that there be no danger of misunderstanding, and then repeats what he has said in the very same words. In these instances, Mr. Riley takes care to vary the discourse with true Parisian anxiety; whereby the essence and charm of the whole is lost. Take, as an instance, *Mil. Glor.* 504 and 511 (translation, p. 75): "But so may all the Gods and Goddesses prosper me if a punishment *with* the rod is not given to you *at my request*," and "If *the* punishment of the whip is not given to you" (the word *mih*i, translated *at my request* in the first passage, being omitted in the second place). We could hardly infer from the translation with what a deliberate calmness the threat is uttered, then justified with mock solemnity by the offences of Sceledrus, ranged with somewhat of the formality of a public accuser under four heads, and then clinched by the very same words repeated

in the same order, the synonyme *uirgeum* merely being substituted for *stimuleum* :

V. 502: Nisi mihi supplicium *uirgeum* de té datur.

V. 510: Nisi mihi supplicium *stimuleum* de té datur.

In the following passage, Riley's version gives the sense well enough, *Mil. Glor.* 538: nunquam édepol hominem quémquam ludificárier Magis facete uídi et magis miris modis; translation, p. 97: "I faith, I never saw any man more cleverly fooled, and *by more singular devices.*" But the tinkling of the Latin words is not adequately given in the English; the effect of the similarity of ending is quite as strong as in *Tac. Ann.* 1, 24: nullis satis certis mandatis, in spite of the short *magis*; and, furthermore, the words begin with the same letter, so that we have a double alliteration, at the beginning and the end, as in *Bacch.* 96: *obsonatum opulentum obsonium.* Something akin to the effect of this might be given by *wise and wondrous ways.*¹ Altogether, the alliteration comes off poorly in this translation. If we remember rightly, there is a discussion of the matter by Nāke in one of the early numbers of the Rhenish Museum. If Mr. Riley had only studied this he might have drawn many hints from it. In some instances, besides the alliteration, a peculiar effect is attained by connecting words of the same root, *Mil. Glor.* 959: Quae te amat tuatque éxpetessit púlcram pulcritúdinem. Riley, p. 118: your *extreme beauty.* V. 998: Quae amat hunc hominem *nimium lepidum et nimia pulcritúde*; translation, p. 120: "this *very* charming man with his *exceeding* beauty." *Ibid.*, 1177: Fácito uti ueniás ornatu ornátus huc nauclérico; Riley, p. 130: "Take care to come here *dressed* in the *garb* of a master of a ship." *Bacch.*, 1169: Non hómo tu quidem es, qui istóc pacto tam *lépidam inlépide* appéllas; Riley, p. 207: "You surely are not a man to address a *pretty woman so rudely* in that fashion." *Mil. Glor.*, 763: Bónus bene ut *malós* descripsit móres; Riley, p. 108: "How *clearly* the *good* soul has described their bad manners." *Ib.*, 1035: Quia sic te *uolgo uólgem*; Riley, p. 123: "because I make you so common to the mob."

In the scene of the *Bacchides*, beginning with v. 170, Chrysalus the slave, returning to Athens from Ephesus, salutes his master's country after the ancient fashion, and then prays to Apollo that he

¹ Examples of this are given by Nipperdey ad *Tac. Ann.* 1, 24; Lobeck, *Palilipom*, *Gramm. Graec.* I. p. 53.

may find Pistoclerus, the trusty friend of his young master, before meeting with Nicobulus, his master's father. Neither the object of the prayer is very creditable to the morality of Chrysalus, nor does the tone in which it is spoken say much for his reverence of the god. Mr. Riley's words are quite dignified (p. 162): "I salute thee, neighbor Apollo, *who dost have thy shrine* close by our house." Not so the real words of Chrysalus: *Salúto te, uicine Apollo, qui aédibus Propinquos nostris áccolis*. In the description of the fight, by the same Chrysalus, mention is made of a pirate-galley sent out against his master's ship. Nicobulus interposes (v. 281): *Perii hércle; lembus ille mihi laedit latus*. Mr. Riley renders: "Troth I'm undone; that bark breaks my heart;" adding, in the note: "literally 'hurts my side,' or, in other words, 'gives me a twitch.'" This is not the exact import of *laedit latus*; Nicobulus conceives of himself as the ship which is attacked by the rostrum of the pirate-galley; *Liv.* 28, 30: [*navis*] *obliqua ipsa ictum alterius rostri accipiebat*; *id.* 37, 30: *naves neque ipsae ferire rostro hostem poterant et obliquas se ipsae ad ictus praebant*. In modern parlance, then, an equivalent would be: "I feel her broadside." In v. 296 of the same scene, a military expression may also be recognized: "*Reuórsionem ad térram faciunt uésperi*." Riley, p. 168: "At nightfall they returned ashore." The application of the term in military language is seen in the example from Nonius, pp. 222, 18 and 245, 14, given in the lexica, from Varro: *ad milites facit reversionem*; and Caesar: *reversionem fecit ne post occipitium in Hispania exercitus qui erant relinqueret*. The idea is: "at nightfall they *right about face* for shore."

The strictures we have thus far been compelled to make, would be the same if the author translated were an ordinary prose-writer. In the drama, a greater difficulty is found than in other works, owing to the diversity of character. As a general thing, translators are too apt in their microscopic study of detail to overlook many essential points, which cannot be felt till the whole play is so imbibed that it has become a part of one's succus and sanguis; they are too much inclined to consider the single speeches as so many organic wholes, and to overlook the fine-spun threads which bind the parts together. And yet this harmonious union of the parts deserves more attention in the ancient drama — where speech and counterspeech follow in rapid succession, *καὶ τύπος ἀντίτυπος καὶ πῆμ' ἐπὶ πῆματι κεῖται* — than anywhere else. The eager and dialectic Athenian audience loved a quibble, if neatly given, or a smart retort. It was a sort of poetical justice on a small scale, when the biter was bit or the captor caught;

even the march of tragedy is for a while suspended for quibbles and cavils that appear to a modern to border on the childish. In the comedy something analogous occurs, though not precisely the same. Any attentive reader of Plautus will know how important is the mutual relation of the speeches one to another. The slave who is hemmed in on every side, and subject to the caprices of a master in intellect often below himself, raises himself by a skilful play of words to a moral equality with his owner, or finds a humorous consolation in pert repetitions. For example, in the *Bacchides*, 671, Chrysalus says: Fortassis tu auri dempaisti parum? Mnesilochus replies: *Quid, malum, parum? immo uero nimis multo minus quam parum.* Then Chrysalus retorts: *Quid malum igitur stulte, quoniam, etc.* Mr. Riley renders this (p. 184): "Chr. Perhaps you took too little of the gold? Mnes. *How a plague* too little? Why yes, indeed, a very great deal less than too little. Chr. *Why the mischief*, then, simpleton," etc. The peculiar pertness of the slave is lost by the variation: *Why the mischief* and *How a plague*. In the same way, Stasimus answers with a sting at Callicles in the *Trinummus*, 602: Call. *Quomodo tu istuc, Stasime, dixisti?* Stas. *Nostrum erilem filium Lesbonicum suam sororem desopondisse; hoc modo.* The tone in which the *hoc modo* is said, can be better learned from a good reader than from a commentary; it is not recognized in the colorless translation (p. 32): "*To what effect* were you speaking about this, Stasimus. Stas. That Lesbianicus, the son of my master, has betrothed his sister; *in those terms.*" This impudence it is occasionally difficult to give in the English. So with the confirmatory particle *ne*, placed by way of exception after the pronoun it modifies, to make an antithesis in an answer to the interrogative particle *ne*. Of the many instances of this we quote one (*Mil. Glor.* 438): Philocomasium. *Egone?* the slave Sceledrus. Tu *ne*. Riley, p. 92: "Phil. I? Sceledr. Yes, you." This should have been noticed in an explanatory note.

In the Index appended to the second volume of the translation (p. 541), we have a long list of "Puns, equivoques, Onomatopoea and play upon words instances of in the author." Plays upon words, Onomatopoea, equivoques and puns are not the highest species of wit; nevertheless, we can only commend the translator for referring to them, and we presume this is one of the things of which "it is hoped they may be found of value to the classical student." Though strength be wanting, the good will is worthy of all praise. Yet we could not in conscience recommend the classical student to pin his

faith in Plautinian punstery on Mr. Riley's sleeve; for some of the most obvious puns he not only passes by without comment, and without including them in his formidable list, but he translates them in such a way as clearly to show that he has not noticed them. An instance is *Bacch.*, 276: Chrys. Quin tu audi. Nicobulus. Hem, audi ingénium haut pernoram hóspitis. One sees at the first glance that a pun is here "perpetrated," as Mr. Riley would call it in his college slang,¹ on the words *audi* and *audi*, which stand in the same relation to each other as *navita* and *navita*, *favtor* and *favtor*. The commentators do not mention it, and so the translator does not see it; he renders blindly (p. 167): "Chrys. Nay, but do you listen. Nicob. Well, I was not aware of the disposition of my avaricious entertainer." He should have read his Cicero, and related in a note the anecdote of Marcus Crassus and the Caunian figs. When this general was embarking his troops for the Parthian war, he was met by a huckster, crying Caunian figs: "Cauneas! Cauneas!" Though burning, doubtless, to engage with the enemy, the general was too prudent to disregard the evident admonitions of the gods; for was not *Cauneas* manifestly meant for *caue ne eas*?²

It is often effective for the dramatic poet that his hearers know more of the course of events than the speakers themselves. When Oedipus, in the play of Oedipus King, finds out by long and painful search that it was he who killed his father Læus, it was not without a secret feeling of exultation that the spectator, who had heard the story a hundred times on his grandam's knee, congratulated himself on his superior knowingness. "There now," he would cry towards the end of the play, "you've found it out at last; why, I knew it all, half an hour ago. You are a king, Oedipus, and I am only a *συντοτόμος* or *γναφεύς*. If I had only had your opportunities, I should have managed it a hundred times better." Of all such vanity, Mr. Riley must be acquitted. He has too great respect for all the speakers to imagine he knows more than they; he is too ingenuous to conceive that a word used by one man in a particular sense, may be understood by the second in a different way, and that thus a quibble or series of quibbles may arise, which are sometimes diverting. When Mnesilochus arrives from abroad, his young friend Pistoclerus, unaware of the change in his friendly disposition, proposes to give him the *cena viatica* usually given to returning friends. Mnesilochus, however, has decided objections to a supper which "riles his bile."

¹ See his note on page 168.

² Cic. de Div. 2, 40, 84; Plin. 15, 19, 21.

"What?" says the simple-minded Pistoclerus, "you don't mean to say you've been taken ill on your arrival? Mnesilochus answers: "Aye, and grievously ill too," meaning by his illness a mind diseased at the discovery of his friend's supposed treachery. But we do best to let Plautus himself speak, *Bacch.*, 536: Pistocler. Sáluos sis Mnesiloche. Mnesil. Salue. Pistocler. Sáluos peregre quom áduemís, céna detur. Mnes. Nón placet mihi céna quae bilém movet. Pistocler. Núm quae aduenienti aégritudo obiécstas? Mnes. Atque acérruma. Pistocler. 'Vnde? Mnesil. Ab homine, quém mi amicam esse árbitratus sum ántidhac.

Now the translation (p. 178): "Pistocler. Health to you Mnesilochus! Mnesil. Hail! Pistocler. As you are arrived safe from abroad a dinner must be given. Mnesil. A dinner pleases me not which excites my choler. Pistocler. Has any vexation befallen you on your arrival? Mnesil. Aye, and a very grievous one. Pistocler. From what quarter? Mnesil. From a person whom heretofore I had supposed to be my friend."

Let us suppose for a moment that Mr. Riley were translating Shakspeare from the Latin, and had before him the Latin equivalent for: "You stir my choler. — Then take your neck out of your collar." This he would undoubtedly render as follows: "You excite my indignation. — Then take your neck out of your ruff."

We append one instance more where Mr. Riley overlooks an obvious point. It is v. 692 seq. of the *Trin.*: hæc famigerátio Té honestet, me autém conultitet, sí sine dote dúxeris. Tybi sit emolumentum honoris: míhi quod obiécént, siet. Lysit. Quid? te dictatórem censes fóre, si aps te agrum accéperim? Riley, p. 87: "The spreading of this report might do credit to you, but it would defile me, if you were to marry her without a portion. For you it would be a gain of reputation; for me it would be something for people to throw in my teeth. Lys. Why so? Do you suppose that you will become Dictator if I accept the land of you?" This translation is quite blind, and makes Lysiteles's answer appear out of place. Not less blind is the note on the passage: "Lysiteles says satirically, and rather unkindly it would seem, 'What? do you suppose, that if I accept this piece of land from you, you will attain the Dictatorship as the reward of your high spirit?' The Dictatorship was the highest honor in the Roman Republic." The fact of the case is simply this: Lesbonicus uses the word *honor* of course in the sense of *sic honori, sic laudi tibi*, Lysiteles quibbles on it, and speaks as if he understood it in its political sense, "office in the state service."

We have thus treated mainly of two classes of faults in this translation: disregard of the laws of criticism, and want of appreciation of the Plautinian dramas as works of art. Perhaps we ought (we certainly should if we had proceeded systematically) to have spoken, first of all, of the translator's ignorance of Latin. One generally presupposes, however, on the appearance of a new translation, that the translator is acquainted with the language of the author; and not till one is satisfied that a book does not answer higher requisitions, does he inquire whether it satisfies the lowest demands that can be made of it. Superficial as the classical instruction is thought to be in most American colleges, we believe that a dozen students might be selected from the two upper classes in any college, who, with the aid of a grammar and dictionary, and with a few general directions, would succeed in producing a much better translation of Plautus. The greater part of Mr. Riley's errors are grammatical and syntactical, and even in the plays we have cursorily run over, their number is so large that we must point out classes rather than examples. We cannot enumerate all the cases where mistakes have been made in the forms of verbs, e. g. *Bacch.* 123: "I, stultior es bárbaro Potúcio, Qui tantus natu dêorum nescis nómína; translation, p. 159: "Go to, you are more foolish than Potúcius, the foreigner, *who at an age so advanced* [N. B. that these words are applied to Potúcius instead of Lydus] *knew* not the names of the divinities."¹ Nor can we treat of blunders in the forms of nouns, as *Trin.* 826: Nam te omnes sæuom — commemorant, ego contra opera expertus; Mr. Riley's translation, p. 44: "on the other hand, I have experienced your kindly aid," indicates that he takes the ablative *opera* in the common phrase *opera experiri* (*Capt.* 435. *Mercat.* 1, 2, 42. *Bacch.* 387) for the neuter plural of *opus*. Some mistakes occur so often that it is inconceivable that the translator himself should not at some lucky moment have had some glimmering of the truth. The corrective power of *immo* or *immo uero* is generally unnoticed; *Trin.* p. 51: "Charmidea.

¹ *Trin.* 463: Lesbianic. *oculum* ego *ecfodiám* tibi Si uerbum addideris. *Stas.* Hercle quin dicám tamen; Nam si sic non licébit luscus dixero; i. e. I will have my say notwithstanding, and if you dig out my eye, so that I cannot speak as a two-eyed man, I will speak at any rate with one eye." Now hear Riley, p. 26: "Stas. Troth, but I will talk; for if I may not be allowed to do so as I am, then I will submit to be called (dixero) the one-eyed man." *Bacch.* 1135: *Exolueré* quanti fuere; Riley, p. 205: "Of whatever value they may have been they are now out of date." As nearly as one can divine what the translator means here, he understands *quanti* as equivalent to *quancumque*, and takes *exolueré* for the perfect of *arolesco*.

How now; and did you ascend even to the heavens? Sharper. Yes; we were carried in a little skiff right on up the river against the tide." From this English, one could hardly conjecture that the Latin is as follows (942): Eho, 'An etiam in caelum *éscendisti*? *Immo* hóriola aduecti sumus, where the corrective *immo* substitutes the easy *sailing up* for the more difficult *clambering up*.¹ The various cases of *ecquis* and *equi* are commonly misunderstood in the translation. *Mil.* 794: *écquæ ancillast illi?* Peripl. Est primé cata; Riley, p. 110: "*But what sort of a maid has she?* Peripl. She is a rare clever one," for "has she a maid? she *has*," etc.² Among other prevalent mistakes we would mention mistranslations of *si* used in the sense of the Greek *ei*, to see if.³ With the negatives, also, mistakes occur (*Trin.* 62): Ne tu hércle faxo haut néscias quam rem égeris; Riley, p. 6: "Aye, faith, I should cause you *not to be knowing* the thing you were about;" with the explanation in the note: "that is the risk you run in taking her for your wife." The real meaning is the opposite. In the same play (819): Mfhi quidem *áetas áctast ferme, tía istuc refert máxume*; the common idiom *tua refert* is misapprehended in the translation (p. 17): "my life, indeed, is nearly spent; this matter principally concerns *your own*." *Bacchides*, 1170: So-

¹ Some other striking instances of mistranslation of *immo*, are *Trin.* 991. *Miles*, 1400. 1248. 978. *Bacch.* 572.

² So with the neuter (*Mil.* 42): Pyrgop. *Ecquid meministi?* Artotrog. *Memini*; centum in Cilicia; Riley, p. 72: "What do you remember? Artotr. I do remember *this*. Other pronouns also come in for their share of mistakes; so *quidam* (*Trin.* 348): *set ego hoc verbum quom illi quidam dico praemonstro tibi*; Riley, p. 19: "but when I apply these expressions to *that same person*." Further, *ipse* (*Trin.* 800): *uxorem quoque campus uti celes face*; translation, p. 42: "take care that you conceal this matter from *that same wife* of yours." Also *istic* (*Trin.* 818): *eo ego ergo igitur intro ad officium meum. Tu istuc age*; translation, p. 43: "I am going indoors then, to do my duty in consequence. Do you see about this matter;" for 'do you do *your part*.' The neuter relative pronoun he renders in the following sentence, *quam quæe mulieres sc. faciunt* (*Mil.* 465): "in carrying out anything with as much boldness as *some women*." *Alienus* homo he understands a *certain person* (p. 89). The adverb *hic* is falsely translated by the pronoun (*Trin.* 28: *Nam hic nimium morbus mores inuasit bonos*; Riley, p. 4: "For *this faultiness* (no! *morbus = disease*) has encroached too much on good morals." What faultiness pray? *Hic* means *here*, *apud nos*, as in v. 34. On the contrary, in the *Miles*, 61: *Rogitabant; "hicin' Achilles" inquit mihi. "Immo eius frater" inquam*; translation, p. 72: "They questioned me about you. 'Is Achilles *here*?' says one to me. No says (*sic*) I, *his brother is*."

³ Cf. on this usage, Herzog on *Cæs.* B. C. 2, 34, 1. For instances of the mistranslation, see pp. 9. 10. 29. 52. 131.

nex óptume quantumst in terra sine me hoc exorare ábs te ut, etc.; Riley, p. 207: "Most worthy old gentleman, *by whatsoever is on the earth* let me entreat this of you that," etc. The *quantumst in terra* does not mean what it is made to, but belongs immediately with the superlative; it is the same construction which is found, *Rudens*, 708: Exi e fano natum quantumst hominum sacrilegissime; examples of this usage are given by Heindorf on Hor. Sat. 1, 6, 1.

The following are some of the mistranslations of single words: *Mil.* 720: *Continuo* excruciarer animi; Riley: "I should have been *everlastingly* tormented in mind," for *straightway*. Ib. 971: Ut tui copiam sibi potestatemque facias; "that you may give her your support and assistance," p. 119. In this play we have one most remarkable error; it is in the sentence in v. 1191: 'Ego illi dicam ut me ádiutorem qui ónus feram ad portúm roget; translation, p. 181: "I shall tell *him* that she asks for me to be a helper to carry her baggage down to the harbor." 'Ille iubebit me íre cum illa ad pórtum (this is entirely omitted in the English); ego *adeo* ut tú scias Prórsu Athenas prótinam abibo técum; "I shall go, and understand you I shall immediately be off with you for Athens." The particle *adeo*, used here as frequently, to set off the *ego* against the *ille*, Mr. Riley takes for the verb *adeo* or *abeo*.

The word *aedem*, *Trin.* 687, Riley renders *building*. Why not *temple*? Ib. 687: 'Atque eum me agrum habére quam te, túa qui toleres moénia; Mr. R. (p. 87) takes *qui* for the nominative instead of the ablative. V. 886: *Concubium* sit nóctis priusquam ad póstre-mum peruéneris; Riley (p. 47): "T would be the dead of night before you could come to the end of it;" *Concubium* is not the *dead of the night*, but *bed-time*.¹ In the words which immediately follow, we have the noun and adjective inverted in the translation: 'Opus far-tost uíático. "There is need of provision crammed tightly in for your name;" what *provision* is, is intelligible, but what p. "crammed tightly in" can be, is not. *Viaticum* is the adjective and *factum* the noun.² V. 908: *Sesquipede* quidamst quam tu longior; translation, p. 48: "He is a person somewhere about *half a foot* taller than you." *Sesquipede* means a foot and a half.

In the *Bacch.* 86, we read: *Bacchis*. 'Vbi me fugiet mémoria ibi tu fácto ut subueniás soror. Soror. Pól magis metuo mi in monendo né defuerit óptio; Riley, p. 154: "B. When my memory

¹ Dissen, de partibus diei et noctis.

² Prolegg. *Trin.* p. lxxxii. Yet here the other reading *opus factost viatico* is not improbable, and is defended by Haapt in the *Rhein. Mus.*, 1850, p. 478.

shall fail me then do you take care to aid me, sister. 2d Bacch. I' faith I'm more afraid that I shan't have the *choice* of prompting you." As it stands this is incomprehensible; in order to attach any idea at all to this answer of the sister we must at least say: "the choice of prompting you or not." Even so it is putid. Mr. Riley has here confounded the two words *optio*; the *optio* of this place means as in *Asin.* 101: "assistant." *tibi optionem sime Leonidam.* In vs. 814, 815, we find a more pardonable error: O stulte, stulte, nescis nunc venire te: Atque in eopse adstas lapide ut praeo praedicat. The English is (p. 191): "O fool, fool, you know not that you are at this moment on sale; and that [another error, there is here no dependence] you are standing on the very same [sic] stone as the auctioneer puts you up." Our translator does not agree with the student in Faust, that the word must always be accompanied by an idea; he follows rather the injunction of Mephistopheles, and holds fast to words, when ideas fail; the words "as the auctioneer puts you up," are inserted as an equivalent for the Latin, but they have no meaning at all; *ut* is here neither a particle of comparison nor a temporal particle. As *ubi* refers primarily to place, secondly to time, so conversely *ut* (like the Greek *iva*) may have a secondary local meaning. Examples of this are not given in the ordinary dictionaries, at least not in Forcellini, Scheller, nor Freund;¹ the usage is mentioned by Gesner, Thesaurus, IV. p. 1119, and instances adduced.²

Mr. Riley's Notes are as bad as his text. We have referred above to the present condition of Plautinian exegesis. It will be a great addition to philological literature when the *Iusti Commentarii* promised by Ritschl appear. But years will probably pass before this takes place. In the mean time, the necessary illustration of the author must be drawn from other sources. Our translator sometimes

¹ Nor has the American translator added it, as he should have done.

² Of the countless errors and misstatements we are compelled to pass over, there is one to which we must allude, though we must refrain from commenting on it, as we cannot do so in terms consistent with the character of this Review. It is *Bacch.* 107: Simul hic nescio qui turbare coepit: deoedamus hinc. The translator gives this so (p. 158): "2d Bacch. A little so sister (PISTOCLEUS is seen at a distance). Besides, he's beginning to cause I don't know what bustle. Let's begone hence." Every man has a right to ablepsy, but Mr. Riley abuses his right. If he chooses in his own private studies to go back a couple of centuries, and to disregard everything that has been done in that time, it is folly to be sure, but folly in which he has a perfect right to indulge. When, however, in a printed book he covertly attributes to Ritschl a false interpretation which this distinguished scholar was the first to expose and repudiate (see Ritschl's own words, Rhein. Mus. 1846, p. 600, note), it is more than folly,—it is immorality.

draws his erudition from the Delphin editor; sometimes from Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities. The latter is a very good book, but it is meant for young pupils, and not for public teachers. In other cases his quotations have a most recondite air; the unstable levity of his own attainments is ballasted by weighty names, as the puny poet Philetas of Cos put lead on his sandals to prevent being blown away. He says, for instance: "We learn from Caelius Rhodiginus" (p. 55); "we learn from Festus" (pp. 4 and 102); "Varro tells us" (p. 5); "we learn from Cato (on Rural Matters)" (p. 70); "we learn from St. Augustine," and the like. We should have recommended to Mr. Riley to remember the sound advice of Niebuhr: never to quote at second-hand a passage from a classical author without crediting the source from which you have taken it. It is not consistent with our plan to consider the cases in which such erudition is borrowed and improperly applied, as we wish to reserve the remainder of our space for original errors. We glance at a few. In v. 308 of the *Bacchides*, we find a note about the Megabuzi or Megalobuzi, priests of the Ephesian Artemis. Chrysalus is inventing a fiction to account for the non-delivery of the money for which Mnesilochus and he had gone to Ephesus; the money, he says, was deposited with one Theotimus, a priest. "Who is this Theotimus," says Nicobulus. "O," says Chrysalus, "he is the son of Megalobyzus." Mr. Riley mentions in the note the view of Taubmann, "that Megabyzus was a general name for the priests of Diana; and that the words 'Megabyzi filius,' a son of Megabyzus, have the same import as the word Megabyzus itself." It is true, now, the filius M. may stand for one of the Megabyzi, after the analogy of *παῖδες ἱατρῶν, ῥητόρων*, etc. But what the English commentator adds *de suo*, had better have been left out: "It may, however, mean that Theotimus was a priest, and *not of necessity that his father was so.*" We do not see how this could well be the case. For in the first place, Strabo says distinctly that the Megalobuzi were the priests of Artemis, and consequently the father of Theotimus must have been a priest; secondly, Strabo says in the same place that these Megalobuzi were *ἐντροῦχοι*.¹ At what time of life these priests became *ἐντροῦχοι*, we confess we do not know; it is barely possible that a Megabyzus might have a son before becoming a priest. But it seems probable that the ready-witted Chrysalus goes a step beyond the mark, and, in his anxiety to make a plausible story with due particulars about names and dates, connects two

¹ See the copious citations in Hermann, *Alterth.* II. p. 345, note 4; and *Pærgæ Plantina*, p. 406 seq.

ideas, which the audience would at once see to be inconsistent, viz. the son of Megabyzus — filius eunuchi.

Page 175, Riley, we have a very misty note on a clear matter; it is on the place in the *Bacch.* 465: *Nám illum meum malúm promptare málim quam pecúlium.* The note is: "He seems to mean that he had rather put up with insult or violence from his pupil than be responsible for his misdeeds; in which latter case probably some part of his peculium or savings would be taken from him in the shape of fines." Mr. Riley has translated it rightly, but does not understand his own translation; the idea is this: 'whatever he has the disposal of melts away; I wish then he would have the charge of my mishaps rather than of my peculium; for in that case my floggings, etc. would be diminished day by day.'

Bacch. 879: *Chrys. Ducentis Philippis pepigi. Nicob. Váh, salus, me séruauisti.* Riley, p. 193: "I've struck the bargain for two hundred Philippeans. Nicob. Well done! Goddess Salvation thou hast saved me." Note: "It was a proverbial expression with the Romans to say that the goddess Salus, 'health' or 'salvation' 'had saved' or 'could not save' a person, as the case might be." This note would be applicable, *Capt.* 528: *Néque Salus seruáre si uolt mé potest.* But the salus is here the abstract for the concrete, *Chrysalus* is the salvation of his master.¹

Apart from the positive errors in the notes, which have a direct bearing on the understanding of the original, many statements might be adduced in which an exploded idea is indirectly inculcated, and which make the book a dangerous one to put into the hands of youth. Such is the assertion, for instance, on p. 23, about the *Porta Trigemina* receiving "its name from the three twin-born [sic] brothers the *Horatii* who passed beneath it when going to fight the *Curiatii*"² (note on p. 133); such too is the note on *Sappho* (p. 183, Riley): "Who was enamored of *Phaon* the Lesbian; when he deserted her, she threw herself from the *Leucadian* promontory or *Lover's Leap*." If *Sappho* had been a contemporary of Mr. Riley, he would have considered the matter twice before making so serious a charge; but as she lived many centuries ago, he does not hesitate. But truth is independent of time; and our translator deserves as severe a castigation for repeating without a moment's inquiry or without a modifying

¹ Cf. in general on this mode of expression, *Nägelsbach, Lat. Stilistik*, p. 36.

² See the remarks of *Becker, de Rom. veteris muris atque portis*, Lipsiæ, 1842, p. 94; id. *Röm. Alterthamer*, I. p. 158.

clause the slanders which Welcker has proved to be morally impossible, as if Sappho had died yesterday.

We cannot refrain from mentioning one place more in the notes, which borders on obscurity; it is on p. 137: "He asks what has been done with or become of his eye? on which Pleusicles tells him, by way of a quibble, that he has got his eye, alluding to his right one, while the Captain alludes to the left over which the *lectica* has been placed." We need not remind the reader that Pleusicles comes in disguised with a ship-master's dress. But why Mr. Riley wishes to put a *sedan-chair* over his eye we are unable to say, nor do we see the advantages to be derived from so strange an ophthalmic treatment. Would it not be as well to hold fast to the word used by Plautus in a preceding part of the play, and call it a *culcita* rather than a *lectica*?¹

In the beginning of the *Bacchides*, besides the spurious verses to which allusion has been made, a translation has been added of the fragments which Ritschl has collected and arranged. The translation has then the merit of novelty; probably no edition nor translation exists which, like this, exhibits the play with two heads. On the probable bearing of these fragments several notes are appended; on the first verse, which reads: "those who are of a thrifty turn of mind, modest and without servility," the annotation is (p. 151): "It is not unlikely that this and the next three lines are fragments of a Prologue, spoken by Pistoclerus, in which he is complimenting the ingenuity shown by the slave Chrysalus throughout the piece, as he is making reference to the punishment of slaves when speaking of 'chains, rods, and the mill;' to which latter place refractory slaves were sent for hard labor." It is more probable that Pistoclerus, who is engaged by his friend Mnesilochus, to find for him his mistress Bacchis, takes occasion to moralize, and to contrast the condition of the upright young man with that of reckless fellows like his friend; to the chains, rods and mill the sufferings of the lover are compared. The dramatic interest of the first part of the piece depends much on the character of Pistoclerus and his sudden transformation; and unless this idea is seized and made prominent, the general bearing of the fragments can hardly be understood. The whole subject is fully discussed in two articles by Ritschl; in the first, published at Breslau in 1836, and afterwards reprinted in the *Parerga Plautina*; the

¹ We may observe, in this connection, that Riley has not followed the proper punctuation on v. 1182; see *Rhein. Mus.* 1850, p. 317.

second on "The original form of the Plautinian Bacchides," in the Rhenish Museum, IV. pp. 354 and 567. The latter article may be considered a running commentary on the beginning of the play, and as the editor here justifies his arrangement of the fragments, and points out the connection of the several parts, a translator must in justice to him study it carefully. Mr. Riley does not appear to have seen it. At any rate, he has made no use of it. Nor has he, furthermore, availed himself of the ingenious and delightful commentary of Schneidewin on the first scene of the second act.¹ It is here that Pistoclerus, who has suddenly fallen a victim to the arts of Bacchis, comes upon the stage at the head of a whole army of cooks and attendants, with all the appurtenances for the opulentum obsonium to be held at Bacchis's house. At this inauspicious moment, he is met by Lydus, the stern old teacher of his younger days. It is easy for Lydus to infer from the appearance of his pupil, what his objects are; and the dialogue which takes place in consequence, is one of the liveliest in the whole play. One peculiar feature, however, in the whole conversation was never recognized till pointed out by Schneidewin; the retorts of Pistoclerus all have reference to the instructions of Lydus, and contain parodies on his former dictations. Thus, when Lydus inquires who lives in yon house, the dwelling of the Bacchides, Pistoclerus answers with a string of names: *Amor Voluptas Venus Venustas Gaudium Locus Ludus Sermo Snausuauidatio*; this is a parody on the names of deities, which were thrown into the form of *versus memoriales* for the convenience of youth, as in the following verses of Ennius, which embrace the names of the twelve gods:

Juno Vesta Minerva Ceres Diana Venus Mars
Mercurius Jovis Neptunus Vulcanus Apollo.

And the following question of Lydus shows that he perceives the allusion: *Quid tibi commercist cum diis damnosissimis?* This question gives Pistoclerus a chance for another parody; his answer is given in syllogistic form: *Malis sunt homines qui bonis dicunt male; Tu diis nec recte dicis: non aequum facis*, a hit at Lydus's old lessons in logic. The moral observations and common-places, the historical and mythological allusions, in which this scene abounds, all find in this way their ready explanation.

And this leads us to speak of another remarkable thing which has continually forced itself on our attention in the perusal of the notes

¹ *Scena Plautina*, in the Rhein. Mus. II. p. 415 seq.

of this version. It will hardly be credited that one should have attempted to translate an author who himself translates from the Greek, who describes Greek scenes and Greek men and Greek ways, and who abounds in reminiscences of Greek poets and proverbs, without being penetrated with the spirit of the Greek literature. Yet such is the case. Mr. Riley has done nothing for the illustration of his author by citations from the Greeks; nay, far from showing this, the occasional mention of Greek names in the notes would go to prove that he never studied that language at all. Where he quotes a word he makes a blunder; his accents are at one time dealt out meagrely, at another time scattered broadcast with the lavish profusion of Lord Timothy Dexter's punctuation-marks; it would have been well if, like that sagacious gentleman, he had added a page or two at the end of his book, of perispomena and properispomena, oxytona, paroxytona and proparoxytona, that the gentle reader might season the Greek as he chose. When he so far commits himself as to translate a Greek name, he translates it wrongly. In a note on the *Bacchides* (p. 149), we are told that "this play is generally supposed to have been borrowed from a Comedy of Menander, which was called *Δις Ἐξαπατῶν*, "the Twice Deceived." The name of Paris, *Alexander*, is derived, according to the same erudite source (note on p. 109), "from two Greek words, signifying 'the brave man.'" A few pages afterward (note on p. 162), we have some information about one "Apollo *Prostiteros*." That the reader who is so fortunate as not to own Mr. Riley's translation, may not imagine this the name of some foreign scholar, or some mediaeval commentator, we would inform him that this is the form assumed under Mr. Riley's Circean wand by the old-fashioned Apolle *Prostatarios*. The Captain's name, *Pyrgopolinices*, from whom the play of the *Miles Gloriosus* has its appellation, means (note on p. 69), "the much-conquering tower, or something similar." The vagueness of these words, or something similar, is discreditible in a philologist. According to this interpretation of the ending *-nices*, the name of the Athenian *Hipponicus* would mean "the Conquering Horse," and *Nausinicus* "the Conquering Ship," or something similar. The middle component of the name, in direct opposition to the simplest laws of Greek composites, he derives from *πολύς* instead of *πόλις*; and what makes the matter still worse is, that in v. 1055 of the same play, Plautus himself gives what is nearly a Latin equivalent for the Greek name, viz. *urbicape*, occisor regum.

From the cursory view we have thus taken of this version of Plau-

tus, it will be evident, we trust, that the objections we have to make to it, are not unfounded. It is always pleasanter to praise than to blame, and nothing is more disagreeable than to censure without qualification. But, as Plautus says, if it be a thankless task, it is sometimes useful: *castigare ob meritam noxiam Immoene est facinus, uerum in aetate utile et conducibile.* Mr. Bohn's Collection is destined to do much harm before its real nature is apprehended. It may be seen on the shelves of all our booksellers, and is praised in the shallow newspaper articles of the day. It is its phalanx-front alone which makes it appear imposing. If Mr. Riley's book had appeared by itself, we should never have noticed it. But many respectable men in both hemispheres will buy whatever appears in a collective form, thinking to get in a complete mass the whole wisdom and learning of the ancients. Yet it is obviously not intended mainly for this class of readers. The evident plan of the publisher, whose good name, as far as we know, has never before been tarnished, is to furnish to classical students, openly and on a broad scale, those works which have long been considered dishonorable aids, rather than mistaken pedagogical appliances. The way in which the collection is made, will, however, it may be reasonably hoped, defeat the publisher's plans, and make it an unprofitable investment. Yet it is not the errors, however abundant they may be, for which the undertaking is chiefly to be condemned. It is for the low standard of scholarship here set up, for the absence of all those qualities which a liberal education is supposed to foster and draw out, for the substitution of accident in the place of law, and unquestioning mechanical plodding in the place of methodical philosophical investigation. And all this is done at a time when English scholarship is giving unequivocal signs of a speedy regeneration. For unless the symptoms be deceptive, a new time is approaching, when the application of foreign method and the engraftment of foreign erudition on native sterling English good sense, will produce new fruits; not like the exotic productions in which the English classical press has for some years past abounded, mere compilations and assimilations of other men's labors, but fruits from a sturdy English stock of which the germ indeed has been brought from abroad, but which has taken fast hold of English ground, and thrives in English air. We sincerely hope that this time is not far distant; and then English Philology will be stripped of its technical scholastic character, will show its adaptation to the times, and advance with a rapidity not less than that of the material sciences.