IV. Bentley and Classical Scholarship in North America

ROBERT J. GETTY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Richard Bentley was born on January 27, 1662, and his tercentenary is a fitting occasion to consider what his importance has been and may yet be for classical scholarship on this side of the Atlantic. Manifestly the debt to him is less obvious than in the countries from which it is derived, and even in England and Germany the splendor of his learning has not been uniformly influential. The ghosts of Joannes Malalas as a reputable chronicler and of the tyrant Phalaris as a genuine letter-writer were so truly laid by Bentley himself that his manner of laying them has been overtaken, here as elsewhere, by an unmerited oblivion, from which the *Epistola ad Joannem Millium* is being rescued by the enterprise of G. P. Goold and the University of Toronto Press. The restoration of the digamma, like the first systematic arrangement of Callimachus' fragments, has long since passed into the stock of common knowledge. So too, for better or worse, have Bentley's critical observations on Homer and later Greek literature, although his annotations upon Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* were once pondered by W. A. Oldfather. "One rises," wrote Oldfather, "from the examination of these notes of Bentley with an increased feeling of respect for his philological acumen . . . I doubt if a higher average of success in emending the text of a classical author has often, if ever, been attained."[1] Such a judgment would support Jebb's conclusion that Bentley was more successful in the textual criticism of Greek than of Latin authors.[2] It would also confirm, if confirmation is needed, the admission, even of such a fervent admirer as Housman, that Bentley had a prosaic and not a poetic mind.[3]

As for the Latin poets whom he edited, the text of Manilius has

[1] William Abbott Oldfather, "Richard Bentley's Critical Notes on Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus*," *TAPA* 52 (1921) 41–52, esp. 52.

[2] R. C. Jebb, *Bentley* ("English Men of Letters"; New York 1882) 218–19.

[3] A. E. Housman, *Introductory Lecture . . . in University College London*, October 3, 1892 (Cambridge 1937) 25.

never had the interest for American scholars that it has enjoyed in more recent years among Bentley's fellow-countrymen.[4] Horace and Terence, of course, have been more popular, especially the former, and Bentley's editions have left, each in its own way, their mark on the scholarship of this continent.

The perpetuation of Bentleian readings in American texts of Horace moved a young graduate of Chicago, Harold Richard Jolliffe, to complain a quarter of a century ago: "Bentley's Horace was published only once in England, but many times in Germany, even as late as 1869. It is no wonder, then, that there is far too much of Bentley, not only in Meineke, Haupt, and Vahlen, but also in Müller, Kiessling, and Heinze, who have greatly influenced our American school texts."[5] Jolliffe, to be sure, was thinking of the successive German scholars who edited Horace since Americans turned their eyes and their steps towards Germany, as they began to do in the year of Waterloo when Edward Everett and George Ticknor betook themselves to Göttingen. But Friedrich Wilhelm Döring was editing Horace at Gotha when Meineke was a stripling, and it was in a spirit of high regard for Döring that the first important American edition of Horace appeared with a lengthy introduction and a full commentary in 1830.

If Thomas Farnaby, the English schoolmaster of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, could be called by Housman "the excellent and indefatigable Farnaby, the educator of his age,"[6] a similar description was merited two centuries later by Charles Anthon of Columbia College, who, unlike Farnaby, has his place in Sandys' history of classical scholarship. In the preface to the smaller edition of his *Horace* in 1839 Anthon complained of the "miserable prejudices" which he had encountered at home against the amplitude of a commentary designed to help the student, whereas his critics thought "the individual should have been allowed to kindle his own torch and to find his own way." From Europe, as he added, no such criticism had come: indeed the first London edition had sold particularly well "in the land of Bentley and Porson." Such a phrase to describe England was for Anthon not merely stylistic.

[4] See B. L. Ullman, *CP* 15 (1920) 305.
[5] "Bentley versus Horace," *PQ* 16 (1937) 278–86, esp. 285–86.
[6] *M. Annaei Lucani Belli ciuilis libri decem* (Oxford 1926) xxxi.

In meter, for instance, he followed Bentley and declared his opposition to Bentley's enemy, Alexander Cunningham, and others when he advocated the arrangement of the lesser Ionics of *Odes* 3.12 in four stanzas, each consisting of two tetrameters followed by a diameter. His text leaned as heavily on Bentley as on Döring: for example it contains the famous emendation, which had convinced Porson, of *siccis* to *rectis* in *Odes* 1.3.18: "qui siccis oculis monstra natantia (vidit)."[7]

Throughout the nineteenth century American editors of Horace, if not so Bentleian as Anthon, followed the tradition which Bentley's German admirers had established. There was no such revolt against him as took place in England forthrightly with A. J. Macleane in the middle of the century or, more circumspectly, with E. C. Wickham in its later years.[8] Whereas Wickham had avoided conjectures which Bentley had either approved or proposed, like *Marsi* for *Mauri* in *Odes* 1.2.39, *vepris inhorruit ad ventum* (or *ad ventos*) for *veris inhorruit adventus* in *Odes*

[7] Porson's approval of *rectis* in his note on Eur. *Hec.* 972 preceded Döring's salutation and acceptance of this "elegantissima Bentleii emendatio." As for Anthon's editions, Henry Drisler, *Charles Anthon, LL.D., A Commemorative Discourse* (New York 1868) 19, observed: "The edition of Doering furnished the basis of the commentary, while the brilliant but often arbitrary emendations of Bentley . . . supplied matter for much of the critical apparatus." In his larger edition of 1830 Anthon had criticized, not only Cunningham's edition of 1721, but also Richard Johnson's *Aristarchus Anti-Bentleianus* of 1717 and William Baxter's later and posthumous edition of 1725 for their attacks on Bentley. For Anthon generally see also Ernst Sihler, "Klassische Studien und klassischer Unterricht in den Vereinigten Staaten" 2, *NJbb* 10 (1902) 503–16, esp. 506–8.

The *British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books* 106 (1961) 861 mentions the following item(s): "Q. Horatii Flacci Opera . . . The Odes on the basis of Anthon: the Satires and Epistles by McCaul: with copious notes, partly original and partly selected . . . by G. B. Wheeler, 2 vol. *Cumming & Ferguson: Dublin*, 1846. 12°." Bentley and Döring were among the authorities from whom notes were selected by McCaul, whose commentary on the *Satires*, *Epistles*, and *Ars poetica* originally appeared in 1833. The Reverend John McCaul was a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, who is mentioned as an able administrator and epigrapher by W. B. Stanford, "Classical Studies in Trinity College, Dublin, since the Foundation," *Hermathena* 57 (May 1941) 3–24, esp. 17. He came to Toronto in 1839 as Principal of Upper Canada College and in 1843 went to the chair of Classics, from which he retired in 1880, and the Vice-Presidency (later the Presidency) of the University of King's College (from 1853 onwards University College as the instructional part of the University of Toronto in its beginnings). See also John King, *McCaul: Croft: Forneri. Personalities of Early University Days* (Toronto 1914) 13–101, esp. 30, where McCaul's regard to Bentley, reliance on Döring, and respect for Anthon are noted.

[8] Contrast the editions of Thomas Kidd "ad exemplar recensionis Bentleianae" (Cambridge 1817) and Macleane (London 1853), who remarked: "I have in no single instance adopted a conjecture of Bentley's . . . nor have I proposed any myself."

1.23.5–6, *Raetis* for *Raeti* in *Odes* 4.4.17, and *offensi* for *offensae* in *Epodes* 15.15, his American contemporaries, C. L. Smith and Charles E. Bennett for example, were retaining them in their college editions.

By encouraging the restoration in 1960 of the Shorey–Laing edition of the *Odes* and *Epodes*, the American Philological Association has unconsciously done what it could for the survival, in a moderate degree, of the Bentleian tradition. Paul Shorey in 1898 founded his first edition on Lucian Müller's Teubner text of 1875. Now there is much of Bentley in Müller's text—more than in that of Orelli in earlier years or, of course, in that of Keller and Holder which appeared a year or so too late to influence Shorey. Yet Shorey was much more cautious than Müller and, of the four emendations mentioned in the preceding paragraph as adopted by Smith and Bennett, he eschewed the first two—the pair which, as will be seen, subsequently aroused the *furor philologicus* of B. L. Ullman—although he accepted the third and fourth. Another which he took from Müller was Bentley's own *amice* for *amici* in *Epodes* 13.3–4: "rapiamus, amici, occasionem de die." Housman had not yet made his more brilliant but equally unnecessary alteration of this vocative.[9]

Shorey was tolerant of emendation, as he explained in his usual sprightly manner in a lecture which commemorated this Association's first half-century.[10] However, the cleavage in American scholarly opinion on this subject goes back to Gildersleeve and Humphreys, with whom, as Shorey remarked on the same occasion, our beginnings are linked.[11] Nowadays Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve is remembered when Milton W. Humphreys may be half-forgotten, but the precept of the latter has been generally followed in this country. His presidential address before this Association in 1883 bore the title "Conservatism in Textual Criticism" and recommended the adoption of Madvig's advice *abstinere et aliorum proterviam arcere*.[12] This is the reverse of Bentley's *noli itaque Librarios solos venerari*; *sed per te sapere aude*;[13] and it was

[9] *CR* 37 (1923) 104; see also Eduard Fraenkel, *JRS* 36 (1946) 193. Another edition which adopted *amice* was that of James Gow (Cambridge 1896).

[10] "Fifty Years of Classical Studies in America," *TAPA* 50 (1919) 33–61, esp. 48–49.

[11] Shorey (above, note 10) 37.

[12] *TAPA* 14 (1883) vii–viii; cf. *AJP* 11 (1890) 507.

[13] *Praefatio* to his edition of Horace (Cambridge 1711).

Gildersleeve, as Shorey recalled, who regretted that in this field Americans had been so unenterprising:

> It is not a little remarkable that, despite the activity developed by American scholars during the last quarter of a century, American contributions to conjectural criticism have been so few. This appeal from MSS that we have to a MS that has been lost does not seem to exercise the same fascination on the American as on the European mind.[14]

The most remarkable Latinist whom Canada has produced from her indigenous scholars was Andrew James Bell, who was not an editor but an acute philologist and observer of linguistic and stylistic usage. Bell had been the pupil of Studemund and Hertz at Breslau and of Brugmann and Heinze at Leipzig, and later became Macdonald Professor of Latin in Victoria College and Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Toronto. Douglas Bush has written how

> his eyes shining with mirth and triumph, the old scholar would toss and gore Sidgwick and Page and Munro and Postgate. Those editors, they would never trust the manuscripts, . . . and they had that incurable disease, the *cacoethes emendandi*! Then he would dive into a corner for his first edition of Bentley's *Horace* . . .[15]

In the book which he published when he had partly retired and which should be better known than it is for its illumination of Latin poetical usage, there is much shrewd and constructive criticism of Bentley's failure to appreciate Horace's tropes. True, he did justice to what he called "the prosaic common sense of Bentley in its hopeless task of reading a poet," but, instead of condemning out of hand Bentley's reason for proposing *nitedula* ("field mouse") for *volpecula* ("vixen") in *Epistles* 1.7.29, he argued that *volpecula* is actually a description of the mouse by a *callida iunctura*, as would appear from the mention of the *mustela* ("weasel" or "mouse-catcher") who subsequently advises her what to do when she has crawled through a narrow chink into a corn-bin.[16]

[14] "Brief Mention," *AJP* 23 (1902) 347–49.

[15] *In Memoriam Andrew James Bell 1856–1932*, published for Victoria University (Toronto 1934) 10. Bush's article, "A Classical Scholar," was reprinted by permission in this booklet (9–16) from the *Canadian Forum* for September 1929.

[16] *The Latin Dual & Poetic Diction* (London and Toronto 1923) esp. 175 and 413–15. *Nitedula* has had a long history in (and out) of American editions, for it is found in the

The victory of conservatism with regard to emendation was signaled by B. L. Ullman in his presidential address before this Association in the Horatian bimillennial year of 1935.[17] Entitled "Horace and the Philologians," it selected for attack both *nitedula* and the two conjectures which have been previously mentioned as arousing his *furor philologicus*, which he thus expressed:

> In the case of Horace it is that much overrated scholar, Richard Bentley (did I hear a gasp?), who is to blame for so-called emendations that still disfigure the text, though many have been eliminated. He is also responsible for giving currency to readings of inferior manuscripts and to poor emendations of earlier scholars.

This criticism followed an earlier remark that, though Bentley was ahead of his age, "he was not great enough to develop the scientific method of the nineteenth century," and preceded the article, already mentioned, of Ullman's pupil, Jolliffe.[18] The latter's doctoral dissertation is a valuable repertory of information about Bentley's influence upon European editors of Horace, but it laid itself open to criticism from M. L. W. Laistner at the end of a commemorative paper for the two-hundredth anniversary of Bentley's death.[19] Laistner complained that Jolliffe's work was "an extreme example of hostile criticism" and regarded it as falling "into the same generic class of writing as certain modern biographies, whose aim is to 'debunk' their subject." But contrary opinions may be held legitimately about the controversial parts of Bentley's matchless achievement. What Jebb wrote of his character is equally true of his *Horace*, as of so much of his work:

> The character may alternately attract and repel; it may provoke a feeling in which indignation is tempered only by a sense of the ludicrous, or it may irresistibly appeal to our admiration; but at all moments and in all moods it is signally masterful.[20]

expurgated edition of Horace by Thomas Dugdale, Jun. (Philadelphia 1815). Dugdale had "recourse . . . to the most accurate European editions" but was not a close follower of Bentley, e.g. he printed in *Sat.* 1.6.126 *rabiosi tempora signi.*

[17] *CJ* 31 (1935–36) 403–17, esp. 407–9.

[18] Ullman, *CP* 16 (1921) 91; Jolliffe (above, note 5).

[19] Jolliffe, *The Critical Methods and Influence of Bentley's Horace* (Chicago 1939); Laistner, "Richard Bentley: 1742–1942," *Studies in Philology* 39 (1942) 510–23, reprinted in *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages*, selected essays by M. L. W. Laistner, ed. Chester G. Starr (Ithaca 1957) 239–54.

[20] Jebb (above, note 2) 1. To Shorey (above, note 10) 59, Jebb's *Bentley* was among the works of "the safest, the sanest, most truly classical interpreter of the classics that the nineteenth century saw."

The substance of Ullman's and Jolliffe's censure has been hard, but no harder than that of Macleane and his reviser, George Long,[21] or, for that matter, than that of Bentley's own contemporaries, Richard Johnson, Alexander Cunningham, and the rest who, with all their limitations, were better qualified to animadvert than either Swift or Pope.

To Bentley's *Terence*, as to his *Horace*, Americans have often been kinder than his own countrymen. Edward St. John Parry's edition and commentary appeared at London in 1857, two years before that of Macleane for Horace, and is equally anti-Bentleian. On the other hand Minton Warren, who was hailed by his disciple at Johns Hopkins, Henry Rushton Fairclough, as "undoubtedly the best Terentian scholar in America"[22] and who had been the pupil of Studemund, wrote in the first volume of the *American Journal of Philology*:

> No doubt Hermann and Ritschl would have taken delight in knowing that the great master, in whose school they learnt, had proposed the same remedies for the text which had independently occurred to them, and Fleckeisen, Seyffert, Studemund and Luchs will experience no less satisfaction in ascertaining that very recent conjectures of their own were made by Bentley more than a century ago.[23]

More than a quarter of a century afterwards Sidney G. Ashmore wrote that Bentley's edition "is noted for the excellence of its critical commentary, which marked a distinct advance in Terentian scholarship, . . . is still valuable, and is perhaps the best extant witness to Bentley's critical acumen."[24] How different this appraisal is from Jules Marouzeau's more recent description of Bentley's critical acumen as "une critique plus intuitive que méthodique"![25]

Warren, like Gildersleeve, regretted his countrymen's earlier lack of interest in conjectural emendation and in critical editions.

[21] Second edition (London 1869).

[22] Preface to Fairclough's edition of the *Andria* (Boston and Chicago 1901), which was dedicated to Minton Warren *optime de Terentio merito*. For this excellent scholar see John H. Wright, "Minton Warren (1850–1907)," Bursian's *Biogr. Jahrb.* (1909) 40–42.

[23] Review of L. A. Paul Schroeder's and E. A. Sonnenschein's publications of Bentley's Plautine emendations, *AJP* 1 (1880) 351–57, esp. 353.

[24] Introduction to his edition, *The Comedies of Terence* (New York 1908) 65.

[25] Introduction, *Térence, Tome 1* (Paris 1942) 98.

After quoting Monk's observation that Bentley should have applied his learning to the maintenance and illustration of truth rather than to "fanciful alterations of the text of a Latin poet," he drily commented: "Time was when sentiments of this sort would have met with the cordial approval of most American scholars,"[26] His own labors on Terence had made him too optimistic about a widespread and lasting change of heart at home from an attitude which to him was typically English. Indeed he went on to mention "the prejudice, founded or unfounded, still existing in England against the exercise of conjectural emendation," for which "evidence enough may be seen in the paucity of critical editions which have appeared there of late." The belief that Bentley's native country no longer had a fertile soil for critical texts apparently died hard, for in 1908 Ashmore thought fit to explain his approval of Tyrrell's edition "to those scholars who imagine that no good text of an ancient classic can come out of England." Such contemporaries of Ashmore may have been taking at its face value Housman's assertion that the great age of English scholarship had ended in 1825,[27] but it was in England before the nineteenth century had ended that J. P. Postgate found for his *Corpus poetarum Latinorum* the superbly appropriate dedication *Bentleii manibus sacrum.*

The famous *Schediasma de metris Terentianis,* which Bentley made introductory to his edition, was the starting-point for the metrical researches of later scholars. From his younger days he was accustomed, as he said, to scan all iambic verse, except the tetrameter catalectic, in trochaic dipodies which began with the first ictus of the line and ended with its penultimate syllable. By doing so, he recognized what Gottfried Hermann later called anacrusis, or the initial short, long, or double short syllables of the line before its first ictus. This method of scansion, as C. W. E. Miller once indicated without reference to Bentley, was the application in reverse of Hephaestion's statement that some gave the name of acephalous iambic to the trochaic trimeter catalectic.[28] Anthon followed Porson rather than Bentley in teaching

[26] James Henry Monk, *The Life of Richard Bentley, D.D.*[2] (London 1833) 2. 418; Warren (above, note 23) 351.

[27] *M. Manilii Astronomicon liber primus* (London 1903) xlii.

[28] "Hephaestion and the Anapaest in the Aristophanic Trimeter," *TAPA* 34 (1903) 49–59, esp. 50.

iambic scansion,[29] but Humphreys, who continued to admit both possibilities, qualified Bentley's doctrine by maintaining that in either system the main or dipodic ictus must fall on the pure foot.[30] Humphreys also criticized Bentley for holding "that the third and fourth feet must not close with the ends of words, because that would cause ictus to fall on final syllables"; but he admitted at the beginning of his article that he had become a convert from the view "that accent had no influence at all either among the Greeks or among the Romans"; whereas Bentley, Hermann, Ritschl, Langen, and others held "that... the Latin accent was stress of voice as well as elevation, while the Greek accent, being only elevation as in music, was disregarded."[31]

Bentley had credited the fundamentally long syllables in the even feet of the iambic senarius with secondary ictus. By investing both dipodic and secondary ictus with an *accentus acutus*, and by maintaining regularity of quantity from dipody to dipody, he believed that he attained the pronunciation used by actors on the Roman stage.[32] How he read Terence is not only thus described in the *Schediasma* but also confirmed by a tale about one of his visits to Lord Carteret, Walpole's Secretary of State and then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland:

> Dr. Bentley, when he came to town, was accustomed, in his visits to Lord Carteret, sometimes to spend the evenings with his Lordship. One day old Lady Granville reproached her son

[29] *A System of Greek Prosody and Metre* (New York 1838) 52–72. Sihler (above, note 7) 509 mentioned that, when the young Anthon in 1824 published a little book on prosody, he did not yet know the name of Gottfried Hermann.

[30] "On Certain Influences of Accent in Latin Iambic Trimeters," *TAPA* 7 (1876) 107–45, esp. 118: "This is distinctly taught by ancient writers, and is accepted by Westphal, Geppert, and others." See also E. Castorina, *Appunti di metrica classica* 2: *Sulla scansione 'sdrucciola' nei metri giambici ed eolici* (Catania 1950).

[31] Humphreys (above, note 30) 122 and 107. Jebb (above, note 2) 137 also pointed out that Bentley's rule about word-ends is due, not to ictus, but to caesura. See also H. J. Edmiston, "The Question of the Coincidence of Word-Accent and Verse-Ictus in the Last Two Feet of the Latin Hexameter," *TAPA* 34 (1903) xxvi–xxviii; *CR* 17 (1903) 458–60.

[32] *Schediasma* ii: "Horum autem accentuum ductu (si vox in illis syllabis acuatur, & par temporis mensura, quae pedis Ditrochaei . . . spatio semper finitur, inter singulos accentus servetur) versus universos eodem modo Lector efferet, quo olim ab Actore in Scaena ad tibiam pronuntiabantur." At the seventieth annual meeting of this Association in 1938, Ernst Kapp of Hamburg, who held that *accentus acutus* meant stress to Bentley, discussed the *Schediasma* and the modern doctrine of ictus in classical verse. For Kapp's abstract see *TAPA* 69 (1938) xxxix–xl, which was noted by P. W. Harsh, *Lustrum* 3 (1958) 228, and for his complete paper *Mnemosyne* 9, 3rd. ser., (1941) 187–94.

> with keeping the country clergyman, who was with him the night before, till he was intoxicated. Lord Carteret denied the charge; upon which the lady replied, that the clergyman could not have sung in so ridiculous a manner, unless he had been in liquor. The truth of the case was, that the singing thus mistaken by her Ladyship, was Dr. Bentley's endeavour to instruct and entertain his noble friend, by reciting Terence according to the true *cantilena* of the ancients.[33]

The aged Lady Granville would have endorsed Julius Caesar's youthful stricture, "si cantas, male cantas, si legis, cantas," on what Gildersleeve, who was probably not thinking of Bentley, called "that 'poetry-reciting voice' of the ancients, that *mesê kinêsis* or *plasma* which lies midway between song and speech."[34]

A minor legacy of the *Schediasma* is the variation in the use of the terms *arsis* and *thesis* which has been so noticeable in this country. To Bentley the *arsis* of a foot was the *elevatio* whereby the actor raised the pitch and emphasis of his voice, whereas the *thesis* included the syllable or syllables which did not have ictus and were therefore less emphatic to the ear.[35] By *arsis* and *thesis* the Greeks meant the rise and fall of the foot in keeping time, but Bentley followed the Roman metricians who equated these terms with, respectively, the *elevatio* and the *depositio* (or *remissio*) of the voice.[36]

The earlier practice of American writers on metric was to follow Bentley. Anthon, for example, wrote: "That part of a foot which receives the *Ictus*, the stress of the voice, or beat of the time, is called *arsis* or *elevation*. The rest of the foot is termed *thesis*, or

[33] Andrew Kippis, *Biographia Britannica* 2 (London 1780) 280, quoted by Monk (above, note 26) 2. 324, note 12. Of the two, Carteret was the more likely to be in his cups; cf. his description in the *Dictionary of National Biography*: "He degraded himself by the vice of drinking, which, together with a great stock of Greek and Latin, he brought away with him from Oxford, and retained and practised ever afterwards."

[34] Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.2; "Brief Mention," *AJP* 25 (1904) 359.

[35] *Schediasma* i–ii: "*Arsis* autem sive *Elevatio* appellatur; quod in iisdem syllabis, quibus Tibicen *pedem* accommodabat, Actor *vocem* acuebat ac tollebat. In *Thesi* autem sunt ceterae syllabae, quae Ictu destitutae minus idcirco audiuntur." For criticism of Bentley's terminology, see Jacob Maehly, *Richard Bentley: Eine Biographie* (Leipzig 1868) 87–88.

[36] Marius Victorinus, *GLK* 6.40.10–17, mentioned both the Greek and the Roman usages of these terms. See J. Caesar, *Disputatio de verborum "arsis" et "thesis" apud scriptores artis metricae Latinos inprimis Marium Victorinum significatione* (Marburg 1885); C. E. Bennett, "What was Ictus in Latin Prosody?" *AJP* 19 (1898) 361–83, esp. 367–68; G. L. Hendrickson, *AJP* 20 (1899), esp. 206–8; W. Beare, *Latin Verse and European Song* (London 1957) 63–65.

depression."[37] It was still so in the 1870's when Humphreys stated: "I follow established usage with regard to the words *thesis* and *arsis*, although the ancients used them in exactly the opposite sense, *thesis* being the syllable that receives the ictus, and meaning the planting of the foot in marching, while *arsis* was the raising of the foot—not the voice."[38] In the 1880's Gildersleeve too was using *arsis* and *thesis* in the Bentleian sense,[39] as he had done in the revised edition of his *Latin Grammar* in 1872; but by the 1890's American terminology had gone back to the Greek metricians. John Williams White's translation of J. H. H. Schmidt's *Leitfaden* may have been influential in this respect:

> Now, however, it is customary to call θέσις, *arsis*, and ἄρσις, *thesis*, and thereby to pervert the signification of the Greek terms . . . We should, however, . . . employ the terms as they were used by the Greeks themselves, i.e. call the *downward* beat *thesis*, and the *upward* beat *arsis*.[40]

Samuel Ball Platner seems to have had some difficulty in adjusting himself to the reformed phraseology: "A *complete verse-foot* has at least one raising (*Thesis*) and one lowering (*Arsis*) of tone, produced by a greater or less stress of the voice."[41] But it was not long before such works as the Latin grammars of Gildersleeve and Lodge in 1895 and George Martin Lane in 1899 sanctioned definitions which were not so self-contradictory, and the Greek meanings were established as standard in American practice for about half a century.[42] But now the tendency seems to be, either to return to the Bentleian and English usage,[43] or else to avoid the terms *arsis* and *thesis* altogether.

[37] Anthon (above, note 29) 50.

[38] Humphreys (above, note 30) 119, note; cf. *TAPA* 9 (1878) 39–58. James M. Garnett, *AJP* 3 (1882) 355, spoke of "arsis (*Hebung*) and thesis (*Senkung*), to use these terms in their old signification and not *umgekehrt*, as nowadays."

[39] *Pindar the Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885 and 1890) lxvi–lxvii.

[40] *An Introduction to the Rhythmic and Metric of the Classical Languages . . . by Dr. J. H. Heinrich Schmidt* (Boston 1878) 22.

[41] *Greek and Roman Versification by Lucian Müller* (Boston 1892) 38.

[42] E. A. Sonnenschein, *CP* 16 (1921) 232: "By the 'rise' of the foot I mean the part which is commonly called the 'arsis' in this country (England) and the 'thesis' in America"; J. D. Denniston, "Metre, Greek," *OCD* (Oxford 1949) 564, note: "Arsis should . . . mean the weak beat, thesis the strong beat—if such a distinction existed. I follow the modern terminology, which has inverted the (Greek) meanings of the two terms. Wrong as it is, it has (at least in England) become canonical."

[43] Cf. Eugene G. O'Neill, Jr., *TAPA* 71 (1940) 337, note 7.

From 1890 onwards American metricians tended to pay less attention to Bentley, or else to forget him. His reading of the Latin hexameter was thought unsuccessful by William Gardner Hale in 1895. R. S. Radford, in an abstract on synapheia in 1901, did not allude to Bentley's discovery of its essential nature in anapaestic verse. Writing from Cornell in 1903, Alfred Gudeman also indicated a reaction against Bentley by defending Quintilian's judgment of Terence's works: "et plus adhuc habitura gratiae si intra versus trimetros stetissent." In the same year C. W. E. Miller, as has been seen, could restate Bentley's view of the trimeter without mentioning his name. To John Williams White in 1912 "Gottfried Hermann is the founder of the modern science of ancient verse." E. H. Sturtevant in 1919 likewise did not find occasion to mention Bentley, although his theme was "The Coincidence of Accent and Ictus in Plautus and Terence." [44]

Thus American interest in Bentley declined when American scholars ceased to go to school in Germany. "Our German teachers," wrote Gildersleeve, "had given us to understand that with the exception of the greatest Britons, such as Bentley and Porson and Dobree—a Channel Islander, by the way—English scholars were a lot of amateurs." [45] The journal which Gildersleeve founded did honor to Bentley from the start, for Warren's review in the first volume of the *American Journal of Philology* has already been mentioned, and his paper, "On Bentley's English MSS. of Terence," appeared in the third.[46] To the second Henry E. Shepherd, then Superintendent of Public Instruction in Baltimore and later President of the College of Charleston, contributed "A Study of Bentley's English," which claimed to be

[44] Hale, "Did Verse-Ictus destroy Word-Accent in Latin Poetry?" *TAPA* 26 (1895) xxvi–xxx; Radford, "Remains of Synapheia in Horace and Roman Tragedy," *TAPA* 32 (1901) ix–xiii; Gudeman, "Quintilian's Criticism of the Metres of Terence," *TAPA* 34 (1903) xlviii–li (on *Inst.* 10.1.99); Miller (above, note 28); White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London 1912) xiii; Sturtevant, *CP* 14 (1919) 234–44.

[45] "Brief Mention," *AJP* 36 (1915) 360; *Selections from the Brief Mention of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve*, edited by Charles William Emil Miller (Baltimore, London, and Oxford 1930) 335. Leonhard von Spengel is said to have exclaimed, presumably in 1866 or thereabouts and with reference to the absence of any classical periodical in England for a time before the *Journal of Philology* was founded: "Just think, in the fatherland of Bentley!" For the circumstances of this remark see the report of a speech by D. B. Monro, *Proc. Cl. Assn.* 1 (1904) 4–5.

[46] *AJP* 3 (1882) 59–71.

the first investigation of this topic and is much more detailed than Jebb's remarks.[47] Shepherd aptly observed:

> The student of English will find with surprise, as well as gratification, that many of the pithiest, homeliest phrases in our current American English are employed with perfect assurance by the greatest of classical scholars.

One of the "low and mean Ways of Speech" which Bentley's enemies at Christ Church had censured in his first *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* was the remark that, had the Agrigentines met with that tyrant's *Letters*, "they had certainly gone to pot."[48] The same expression was used by Gildersleeve when, in a discussion of recent metrical theory, he thus rendered a phrase which Friedrich Marx had used in a lecture: "with the annihilation of Athens at the end of the fifth century, the old tradition went to pot."[49] This may be a coincidence, but a comparison of "Brief Mention" with Bentley's prose style might be rewarding. Gildersleeve with his vitality (the quality which he attributed to Bentley) and many of the other virtues commemorated in his necrology by Miller, was a kindred spirit.[50]

Soon after his return from Germany, Gildersleeve published a striking and, at the time, a not undeserved indictment of English scholarship. In what he called the "epoch of his Teutonomania"[51] and with the memories of his revolutionary ancestors in his heart, he wrote:

> England has never had a philology . . . Bentley lived a century too soon, and England laughed at the new Aristarchus as she cheered glory-and-shame Porson, not knowing what she did. It is sad to look at the full-length caricature of Bentley, which Pope has drawn, with such malicious distortion, in his Dunciad,

[47] Shepherd, *AJP* 2 (1881) 20–29; Jebb (above, note 2) 169–75. A. T. Bartholomew's *Bibliography* of Bentley's works "and of all the literature called forth by his acts or his writings" left Shepherd's article unrecorded.

[48] Dyce's edition (London 1836) 2. 172; see also Jebb (above, note 2) 68.

[49] "Brief Mention," *AJP* 29 (1908) 370; *Selections* (above, note 45) 169. Marx, *NJbb* 22 (1908) 230–31, had said "dass . . . die antike metrische Tradition in Verfall gekommen ist."

[50] Gildersleeve, "Brief Mention," *AJP* 37 (1916) 500; *Selections* (above, note 45) 372; Miller, *AJP* 45 (1924) 100. For an appreciation of Gildersleeve's style see also Henry T. Rowell, *AJP* 75 (1954) 345.

[51] Miller, *Selections* (above, note 45) xxiii.

and to reflect upon the uniform fate of all those great men who have been sent to that ungrateful people.[52]

More than sixty years later he gracefully revised his youthful opinions of both England and Germany,[53] but not his admiration for Bentley which he had learned from his German professors.[54] Boeckh and K. F. Hermann, Schneidewin and Ritschl, Welcker and Bernays—these were the scholars who impressed Gildersleeve in the lecture-room; but Gottfried Hermann, the teacher of Ritschl and K. F. Hermann, had died at the end of 1848, nine days after Wilamowitz was born. Eduard Fraenkel, in a centennial commemoration of these two anniversaries, has called Hermann "the greatest classical scholar of his time," and, as Gildersleeve once remarked, there is worse reading than his *Opuscula*.[55]

One of the most illuminating articles in the *Opuscula* is the dissertation of 1819 on Bentley and the Bentleian edition of Terence.[56] Hermann's great admiration for Bentley, as he declared at the beginning, was inherited, when he entered the University of Leipzig at the age of fourteen, from his teacher Friedrich Wolfgang Reiz, who always mentioned Bentley reverentially and held him up to his pupils as the most perfect example of a critic.[57] Reiz, after whom the *colon Reizianum* was named, had been the first to communicate to his fellow-countrymen

[52] "Necessity of the Classics," *The Southern Quarterly Review* 10, n.s., (1854) 145–67, esp. 157. This article contains a strong attack on Anthon (163–64).

[53] "Brief Mention," *AJP* 37 (1916) 494–501, esp. 496–97; *Selections* (above, note 45) 364–76.

[54] Compare, with regard to contemporary reactions against J. H. H. Schmidt's system insofar as non-melic meters were concerned, "Brief Mention," *AJP* 34 (1913) 107; *Selections* (above, note 45) 275: "This is the line which Bentley and Porson and other English scholars opened up to an admiring world; this is the line on which I was taught to work by my German masters."

[55] Fraenkel, "The Latin Studies of Hermann and Wilamowitz," *JRS* 38 (1948) 28–34, esp. 28; Gildersleeve, "Brief Mention," *AJP* 25 (1904) 225; *Selections* (above, note 45) 107. For a vivid account of Hermann in his later years see that by Barnas Sears, President of Newton Theological Institution, in *Classical Studies: Essays on Ancient Literature and Art* by Barnas Sears, B. B. Edwards, and C. C. Felton (Boston 1843) 28–30.

[56] "De R. Bentleio eiusque editione Terentii Dissertatio," *Opuscula* 2 (Leipzig 1827) 263–87.

[57] Hermann's admiration for Reiz was also attested, *inter alios*, by Eduard Platner, Professor of Law at Marburg, in the *Zeitschrift für die Alterthums Wissenschaft* 1 (1849), quoted in *Classical Museum* 7 (1850) 478. See also J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* 3 (Cambridge 1908) 90; Fraenkel (above, note 55) 28.

Bentley's views on Terentian meters, and Hermann's enthusiasm was passed on to Ritschl, who was still editing Plautus when he taught Gildersleeve at Bonn, among other things, to "cultivate the feeling of truth" and held before him the example of Bentley.[58]

If James Luce Kingsley of Yale could be called the Addison of America, Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve was her Bentley.[59] To such a comparison Gildersleeve would have replied that Bentley was an Aristarchus among critics and he himself a Didymus Chalkenteros among grammarians.[60] But when he was compared by Paul Shorey with Jebb and Wilamowitz and found to hold his own in such company, Shorey justified his comparison by writing: "Great scholarship is as incalculable and as rare as genius." A stronger assertion in a series of lectures on scholarship was H. W. Garrod's: "Learning, consummate learning, is a thing a good deal more rare than genius"; and when he said this, he was thinking of Bentley.[61] The learning and the style of Gildersleeve warrant the comparison, as every page of "Brief Mention" attests; and it can be said of him, as was said by Lewis Campbell in discussing Benjamin Hall Kennedy, that "the Heroön of Dr. Bentley is not far off."[62]

In an excellent analysis of American classical scholarship in the twentieth century, Walter R. Agard did not go beyond German precept and example for its true beginnings in the nineteenth.[63] However his tribute to Gildersleeve as both scholar and humanist may now prompt the question whether Bentley was the latter.

[58] See Gildersleeve's account of Ritschl, *AJP* 5 (1884) 339–55, esp. 350. Hermann (above, note 56) 264–68 regarded Bentley, despite his faults, as the "unicus Terentii sospitator" and said of his metric that he "singulari cum fructu litterarum sensui omnia, iudicio prope nihil tribuit." In his turn Ritschl, himself the *sospitator Plauti* of his age, dedicated his edition of Plautus *Godofredo Hermanno, ad emendandum Plautum post magnum Bentleium duci unico* as a sequel to his *Zuschrift an Gottfried Hermann* of 1837. See Fraenkel (above, note 55) 28.

[59] For Kingsley cf. Daniel Coit Gilman, *The Launching of a University and Other Papers* (New York 1906) 175.

[60] Aristarchus: cf. Monk (above, note 26) 1. 310; Jebb (above, note 2) 205–6. Didymus Chalkenteros: see *Johns Hopkins University Celebration of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the University* (Baltimore 1902) 164.

[61] Shorey (above, note 10) 58; Garrod, *Scholarship its Meaning and Value* (Cambridge 1946) 10. For Gildersleeve's view of genius see his address (in which he defended Ritschl's dictum: "Enthusiasmus liegt nur in der Einseitigkeit") at Bryn Mawr College, *The Spiritual Rights of Minute Research* (Philadelphia 1895) 14.

[62] *JP* 5 (1874) 1.

[63] "Classical Scholarship," *American Scholarship in the twentieth century* ed. Merle Curti (Cambridge [Mass.] 1953) 146–67.

This may be doubted when his tempestuous career is recalled, including the "singular humanity" with which he was reproached by Boyle.[64] But the *Boyle Lectures* and the sermons provide evidence to the contrary, and there is the story which his grandson Richard Cumberland heard from his mother, who before her marriage had been Joanna Bentley and was her father's favorite child:

> She . . . told me that, when in conversation with him on the subject of his works, she found occasion to lament that he had bestowed so great a portion of his time and talents upon criticism instead of employing them upon original composition, he acknowledged the justice of her regret with extreme sensibility, and remained for a considerable time thoughtful and seemingly embarrassed by the nature of her remark: at last recollecting himself he said—"Child, I am sensible I have not always turned my talents to the proper use for which I presume they were given to me: yet I have done something for the honour of my God and the edification of my fellow creatures; but the wit and genius of those old heathens beguiled me, and as I despaired of raising myself up to their standard upon fair ground, I thought the only chance I had of looking over their heads was to get upon their shoulders."[65]

It is strange to realize that one of Gildersleeve's more caustic essays was directed against a descendant of Bentley in the line of Joanna and her daughter, Elizabeth Bentley Cumberland. Gildersleeve may not have known this, but such knowledge would not have mattered to him when he rebuked Walter Headlam, in language worthy of Bentley against Boyle for criticism of his *Pindar*.[66]

Thus the tradition of Bentley was quickened in the United States by a classical scholar and stylist of comparable excellence. The pendulum has now swung far from the interest in language and syntax which once gave American scholarship its distinctive character and is associated with such names as Gildersleeve, Goodwin, and Greenough. Some years ago Gilbert Bagnani observed that both the Bentleian and the Winckelmannian

[64] Monk (above, note 26) 1. 69; Jebb (above, note 2) 51.

[65] *Memoirs* (New York 1806) 9–10.

[66] "Brief Mention," *AJP* 28 (1907) 107–10; *Selections* (above, note 45) 136–40. Headlam was the great-great-great-great grandson of Bentley; see the *Memoir* by Cecil Headlam (London 1910) 2–5.

schools are currently under attack; but, in predicting that the pendulum would certainly reverse its swing, he declared that the third Renascence would come from "the inspiration of a new Bentley or a new Winckelmann."[67] Or, it may be added, from that of a new Gildersleeve,[68] who so well knew that, behind the great German teachers of Americans in the nineteenth century, stood Bentley, the ultimate master.

[67] "Winckelmann and the Second Renascence, 1755–1955," *AJA* 59 (1955) 107–18, esp. *ad fin.*

[68] Cf. Benjamin D. Meritt, *Greek Historical Studies* ("Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple": Cincinnati 1962) 16.