5
The way from Bentley

In his biography of Bentley, Jebb[1] makes the following observation. 'Bentley's influence has flowed in two main streams, the historical and literary criticism of classical antiquity, as best seen in the dissertation on Phalaris; the verbal criticism, as seen in his works on classical texts.' He goes on to suggest that first Holland and then Germany 'received both currents', whereas England 'felt his influence chiefly in the way of textual criticism. The historical and literary criticism by which he stimulated such men as Wolf was comparatively unappreciated in England until its effects returned upon this country from Germany.' Thus singling out England, Holland and Germany, perhaps he implied that the same cannot be said of France and Italy. I made it explicit above (p. 72) that some French and Italian reserve towards Bentley's work may have affected the course of classical scholarship in those countries. Even allowing for this point, however, Jebb's remarks somewhat simplify the facts as I have sought to describe them earlier, nor is it clear what Jebb means by literary criticism; but in substance his remarks are true.

How it came about that not only Bentley's inspiration but also that of brilliant earlier scholars like Gataker and Pearson could have fallen away is a matter for historical conjecture. As far as Bentley himself is concerned, his influence first was very strong. Yet none of his contemporaries before J. Markland (born 1693, hence his junior by above thirty years) was more than competent as a scholar and critic. To receive a Bentleian stimulus the recipient had to have a mind and vitality commensurate, at any rate in some aspects, to his own. More important, to talk of a 'school of Bentley', at that time, is misconceived. For such was the depth and width of the new scholarship glimpsed by him that a generation or two had to elapse before the fresh potentialities inherent in it could be seen. That did not happen before Porson, and even then not as fully as it might have done.

It is right, therefore, to be brief in comment on most of Bentley's

younger contemporaries before Markland. Joseph Wasse was his junior by ten years (born 1672), Samuel Clarke by thirteen (1675), John Davies by seventeen (1679), and Peter Needham by eighteen (1680).

Although these were energetic scholars, they did not bring about a true advance in classical studies. Bentley's remark about the oldest of them has often been quoted.[2] 'When I am dead, Wasse will be the most learned man in England.' The object of Bentley's admiration frustrated his prophecy by dying four years before the master, and it would be hard to talk of Wasse's editions in these terms. Monk was entirely right – at any rate as far as Markland and Dawes are concerned – to note, with nice understatement, 'had he (Wasse), however, survived him (Bentley), Markland, Taylor, Dawes, and perhaps other scholars, might have disputed the truth of his prediction'.[3] His Thucydides, and even more the treatment of the manuscripts and the text of his Sallust, showed that he was indeed massively learned, but lacking in discrimination. John Davies had more sense and his editions of Cicero's *De ora tore*, *Tusculans*, *De natura deorum* and *De officiis*, apart from Caesar, Minucius Felix, are not without explanatory value; his interests have something of that seventeenth-century range which was fast disappearing in his time. Samuel Clarke, the precocious 'lad of Caius', had even wider interests. He was, intellectually, the most distinguished of these men. But his fame derived primarily from his works on metaphysics, moral theory, and theology (tinged with unitarianism), secondarily from his propagation of Newtonian principles, and only thirdly from his editions of Caesar and Homer. He was however one of the few of his generation not to pour scorn on Bentley's discovery of the digamma.[4] Peter Needham has been mentioned already in connexion with Bentley's contribution to his edition of Hierocles.

Better scholars than these were heralded by Charles Burney as the *Pleiad* in English scholarship. Together with (first) Bentley and (last) Porson, the five, to complete an heptad[5], were said to be Dawes, Markland, Taylor, Toup, and Tyrwhitt. Sandys calls the conceit happy.[6] If 'Pleiad' implies, as it is said to do, seven stars of approximately the same order of magnitude, the conceit is scarcely happy, whatever its justification for the *Pléiade* of the French Renaissance. The first and last are out of all proportion to the rest; yet even Bentley's and Porson's 'sizes' are not comparable. Markland and Dawes stand head and shoulders above the others, though they are not Bentleys and probably not Porsons.

But nearly all of them were stars. The same cannot be said of a

triad briskly proposed by the egregious Samuel Parr: 'Porson first, —Burney third'.[7]

Yet whether Pleiad or no, and Bentley or Porson apart, Jeremiah Markland must here take pride of place. Since the two-hundredth anniversary of his death fell in 1976, the Philological Society of Cambridge, his university, had, in the following year, a paper read by C. Collard which commemorated his work and documented its reception over two centuries.[8] As one might expect, the paper started with Housman's famous judgement on Markland, which comes in the same review I have quoted several times in these pages: 'It is probable that Englishmen are right in counting Porson the second of English scholars, but many judges on the Continent would give that rank to Markland. He is the only one except Bentley who has been highly and equally eminent in Greek and Latin and I believe that Bentley did him the honour, extravagant I admit, to be jealous of him'.[9] Housman's belief that Bentley was jealous of Markland has puzzled many; no one, to my knowledge, has been able to discover any evidence for it. Evidence of continental admiration of Markland, at any rate later than Wyttenbach and Wolf,[10] seems also hard to come by. But there are many cases of the contrary view, culminating in the patent misjudgement in Wilamowitz's *History*. There[11] he talks of 'violent conjectural criticism', *gewaltsame Konjekturalkritik*, in Statius' *Silvae*, in which Wilamowitz took little interest, and said to be not very different in Euripides' plays, which after all were among the fields where Wilamowitz had shone. He compounds this prejudice by likening Markland to Wakefield – a very uneven performer – and then oddly uses the comparison as a stick to beat Markland, not Wakefield, with. But these are minor discontents. What compels attention is Housman's considered opinion of Markland's excellence.

Markland's interests were as wide as befitted a seventeenth-century scholar, although he lived all but seven years of his life in the eighteenth. He became a Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, at the age of twenty-four, in 1717, but after some spells of private teaching and a few years abroad he moved, in 1752, to a small village where, in increasingly bad health, he spent another two dozen years. He died at the age of eighty-four. While in Cambridge he regularly called on Bentley, and the older man's influence on his work cannot be doubted. As Monk said, upon Bentley's model his critical taste and skill were formed.[12] He was, however, no party-man and no university-politician. He shrank from the academic feuds in which many delighted. He was a friend of Conyers Middleton, Bentley's

opponent, and indeed dedicated his *Remarks* on Cicero to him. In his candour and his objection to 'preferment' (he twice rejected the Regius Chair of Greek at Cambridge) Markland recalls the attractive figure of Thomas Gataker, whom I mentioned earlier. But there the likeness ends; Markland's almost neurotic self-distrust would have seemed strange to a religious believer like Gataker, although, on the other hand, Gataker would have admired the fortitude with which the invalid kept despair at bay and, except for the last few years, continued his scholarly work.

His output in fact was considerable. He applied the Bentleian principle of 'reason in editing' over a wide area, and applied it in distinguished and penetrating fashion. He began with an *Epistola Critica* on Latin passages, especially in Horace, which he dedicated to Dean Hare, at that time a friend of Bentley. The first sentence shows the affiliation: 'You may perhaps be surprised that I, a newcomer to scholarship, should have entered this field, or should have hoped to gain some reputation after the conspicuous success of your distinguished friend in restoring the text of Horace.' The Latin of the original is assured and elegant. The *Epistola* already shows his wide reading of verse as well as prose, and what is even more important, the ability of the born textual critic which divines sense not only behind the nonsense of a transmitted text but behind apparent sense in which successive generations have acquiesced. He also shares with Bentley and other true textual critics that he is instructive even where his answer will not convince. There is excellence, but there are also unconvincing answers, overstatements, false starts. Such may have been the faults that caused Bentley to censure some trial sheets of a new edition of Apuleius which Markland had shown him and did not proceed with.[13]

But I find few of these imperfections in his large edition of Statius' *Silvae*, which appeared in 1728, only five years after the *Epistola*, a fully mature and highly accomplished work. This book has been discussed of late more than it used to be for a long time; and my own reading of his *Statius* leads me to a conclusion similar to that which I have expressed in connexion with Bentley's *Horace*, although the younger critic had the advantage (and disadvantage) of such a model. Genuine critical endeavour will find Markland ahead of modern editors and not to be shrugged off, as many have been ready to do.

The only other sizeable piece of Latin work from his pen is interestingly different from all his textural criticism. Yet the tradition

is doubtless that of Bentley, for Markland's *Cicero* comes midway between Bentley's *Phalaris* and Porson's *Letters to Travis*. Markland's *Remarks on the Epistles of Cicero to Brutus and of Brutus to Cicero: In a Letter to a Friend. With a Dissertation upon FOUR ORATIONS ascribed to M. Tullius Cicero* appeared in 1745. It attempted 'to prove them all spurious and the work of some Sophist' – which echoes, with dubious appropriateness, Bentley's term, sophist. Like the *Phalaris*, this 'Dissertation' (again a Bentleian term) is partly history, literary and political, and partly criticism, textual, stylistic, and, to some extent, literary. The three heads in the *Remarks* are language, facts and history, and what he calls reasoning. In the *Dissertation* these distinctions are less marked. Since he had convinced himself that, differently from the letters to and from Brutus, Cicero's four speeches *post reditum* did not, on the whole, go wrong on matters of historical fact, most of the weight of the *Dissertation* is directed against matters of style and text. On these the book is worth pondering for its implications. With regard to history as well as style he convinced Wolf and many others. But unlike the *Phalaris*, and later the *Letters to Travis*, his main contention has been proved to be mistaken. The reasons for that are not to be found so much in personal shortcomings as in tile contemporary state of knowledge of ancient history. These shortcomings were not amended until another generation had gone by.[14] But though handicapped in this way, he did usefully attempt to take a wide view of Roman literary works outside the ambit of the classical Roman poets.

In the six years before the *Remarks* and the *Dissertation* he had already shown his mettle over a wide range of Greek studies by distinguished contributions to editions of Lysias (J. Taylor), Maximus Tyrius (J. Davies), and Plutarch (*De Iside*, ed. S. Squire). After the *Remarks* and the *Dissertation* all his work was dedicated to Euripides (notes on *Hippolytus* for Musgrave's edition, which were given prominence by the appearance, to him undesirable, of his name on the title-page; a full edition with translation and critical notes of *Supplices*; a smaller edition of the two *Iphigenia* plays), to Sophocles (notes for W. Bowyer's edition, an essay on Greek athematic nouns, and contributions to Bowyer's *Conjectures on the New Testament*). These works are outside my field of competence, but I would say nevertheless that they strike me as possessing the same, or almost the same, virtues that distinguish the Statius and the *Remarks* and *Dissertation*, except perhaps for a muffling of the earlier vigorous tone. Elmsley reviewed *Supplices* and the *Iphigenias* and bestowed

praises that were decidedly faint.[15] He allowed that 'for modesty, candour, literary honesty and courteousness to other scholars, he is justly considered as the model which ought to be proposed for the imitation of every critic'. Yet we are also told that Markland was not 'a man of genius', but that 'he was endowed with a respectable portion of judgment and sagacity'. This judgement is certain to underestimate his Latin work. As for his work on Euripides, a comparison of the considered view of the young Wilamowitz with his rather carping remarks in the *History* cited earlier may be helpful. He said in *Analecta Euripidea* (in 1875, nearly half a century earlier):[16] 'The foundations of a sound text (i.e. of *Supplices*) were laid a century ago by two men who were equals in boldness, J. Markland and J. Reiske, as is shown by their interfering with perfectly sound passages. On the other hand they excellently emended much that was unsound; Markland's meticulous work healed more, whereas Reiske's acuteness, in spite of his occasional rashness, succeeded in removing more deep-seated faults.' This strikes me as fairer than Elmsley's or Wilamowitz's later estimate. In his commemorative paper on Markland, Collard has provided a good list of felicitous conjectures that have stood the test of time.[17] This is but a selection from a large number. What matters even more is the persuasiveness of some of Markland's work. He was able to produce what a recent editor of Euripides who knew what he was about could describe in these terms: 'the second (i.e. Markland's conjecture at *Hippolytus* 993) is so obviously superior that no mss. will induce me to believe that Euripides preferred the first' (i.e. the reading of the mss).[18]

Richard Dawes (1709-66) was a fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, from 1731. His fellowship lapsed, in accordance with the statutes of the time, when he declared himself unwilling to take holy orders, and in 1738 he was appointed to the mastership of Newcastle Grammar School and St Mary's Hospital. After more than ten years' teaching, he resigned his post over disagreements with the Town Council, into which he had entered with notable gusto, and, retiring on a pension in 1749, moved to Heworth, then a small and secluded place on the Tyne nearby, where he spent his remaining years, unstudiously and, it appears, without academic interests or pursuits. He died at Heworth in 1766. What little was known of his eccentric life was brought together in two brief sketches, first (in 1828) by J. Hodgson, the local clergyman,[19] and later (in 1894), in more critical fashion, by the philologist P. Giles, subsequently Master of Emmanuel College.[20]

Dawes was a man of one book. The book, *Miscellanea Critica*, was published by the Cambridge University Press in 1745 about three years after Bentley's death. It acquired repute, even fame, and over the next eighty years or so achieved five editions. The texts 'of the Attic poets, and also of Homer and Pindar', which he promised in his preface did not materialize. But the one book which he did publish gave a new turn to Bentleian studies. Both aspects are there: the *Miscellanea* are unthinkable without Bentley, but they put a new complexion on parts of Bentley's work.

He was what they now call an unstable personality, cantankerous, petulant, and neurotically fearful of being slighted. Monk advances the guess that one of his early productions – a proposal to print by subscription his Greek version of *Paradise Lost* Book I – had been severely mauled by Bentley.[21] This mayor may not be true. It is likely, however, that some slight at the hand of Bentley, whether imaginary or real, produced a lasting irritation with a scholar immeasurably his superior. For virtually all his references to Bentley are critical and often carping. Some seem to be designed to make the reader forget that without the foundation laid by the older man Dawes' corrections would not have been even possible. Doubt is thrown on this proposition in Giles's memoir,[22] but the basic point is surely incontrovertible.

A perverse example is the manner in which he seeks to deprive Bentley of his just renown as the discoverer of the traces in Homer of the digamma, however dubious the actual application of the discovery to the Homeric text, and however different the standing of the letter in the various Greek dialects. Instead of acknowledging that he is walking on Bentleian ground, and doing his best to clear it, he grumbles, carps, and prevaricates. In the introduction to his section (IV) on that residual sound, he grudgingly expresses agreement with 'the illustrious Bentley' that there was such a sound in the Homeric poems, and even that a symbol is needed to indicate its effect in print (which is not it foregone conclusion). All the rest however is censure: Bentley's edition should have appeared and did not; the residual sound is not really *Vau*, since this is Aeolic and does not fit the Homeric dialect which he describes as Ionic; and so it goes on.[23] Malicious quotation occurs. Thus he sets down expressions from a eulogy of the great scholar – 'greatest by far of all critics', etc. – only to subvert it in order to give prominence to a minor correction.[24] He apes Bentley's opponents in the Phalaris controversy by repeating their charge that the only oracles he consulted were 'indices and

lexica'.[25] Unlike them he must surely have understood the folly of this charge, and I suspect that he did.

Nevertheless there can be no doubt about the new complexion which Dawes's work put on Bentley's discoveries. Housman ascribed to Dawes 'a preternatural alertness and insight in the two fields of metre and grammar'.[26] But to praise his insight in these fields presupposes that these fields were already established, as they were one and a half or two centuries later. Yet there was, in his time, no such thing as scientific grammar in the later sense of the term, and Bentley apart, even less metre. Perhaps it would be more realistic to say that Dawes attempted to generalize some of Bentley's insights and impressions and, in turn, to use these generalizations to steady textual emendation and further observation.

His remarks on synaphia provide an instructive example. They occur in a chapter (I) on the ancient metrical writer Terentianus Maurus. We have seen that this metrical device had been rediscovered by Bentley in the specific case of anapaests.[27] Bentley had cited Terentianus when he came to widen his own rule to embrace ionics.[28] Dawes rightly remarks that Bentley had overlooked Terentianus' application to anapaests – which does not, as he implies, make Bentley any the less the rediscoverer of that practice. But Dawes generalizes it[29] and then proceeds to apply it to Catullus' glyconics in poems 61 and 62. For there the presence of synaphia had been overlooked in a number of cases, though already corrected in one of them by Bentley,[30] and his transposition of the final words at 61.215-16 *insciis* and *omnibus* is striking and, I think, superior to other attempts.

The same procedure of metrical generalization leading to further observation, and often emendation, is found also in other chapters: in chapter II, where the metre and text of Pindar are at issue and, perhaps for the first time, some slight progress is achieved in the understanding of choral metre; in III, where metrical errors in the editing of Callimachus are exposed; and in the last chapter (V), where he deals with Attic drama, reconsiders Bentley's basic thoughts on ictus and accent, and makes a determined foray into the prosody of drama (especially pp. 195ff., where Aristophanes' *Plutus* is discussed). Perhaps most important of all is chapter IV. For here a reasoned attempt is made for the first time to ask how Bentley's discovery of a vanished Greek letter – I mean of course the *digamma Aeolicum* – may be applied to the metre and text of Homer. Having earlier remarked on Dawes' determination to deprive Bentley of his due as originator and discoverer, we should

now add that this must not make us deprive Dawes of the honour due to him. He did not solve the question fully, but his discussion made further progress possible.

A very similar proviso applies to the other field in which he excelled – Greek grammar. For the same method (if it can be called that) may be seen at work. The most celebrated case is, of course, the observation, later named *Canon Dawesianus* (more appositely one of the *Canones Dawesiani*),[31] that ὅπως μὴ διδάξῃς is a solecism to be replaced by ὅπως μὴ διδάξεις.[32] Dawes' canon is likely to be an overstatement,[33] but without his generalization and the further observations attendant on it, the grammatical category would not have been sufficiently refined. It seems to me to follow that it is not so much a question of Dawes' 'preternatural alertness and insight' in these two fields of metre and grammar, though no doubt he possessed a great deal of alertness and insight. What is at issue is Dawes' intelligence in asking some of the right questions that arose from Bentley's pioneering discoveries. Had Dawes stuck to his last, and if he had not thrown away what was attainable to him and no one else, he might have anticipated the course of 'scientific' nineteenth-century grammar and metric with their delicate adjustments between theory and observation. As it was, he, at any rate, corrected earlier assertions and stimulated later enquiry.

After this ever more intensive study of largely Greek verse, it adds a new touch to the picture when we find important contributions to Greek prose by other members of the presumed Pleiad. I do no more than mention Markland's friend, John Taylor (1704-66), known as Demosthenes Taylor, for many years resident as a fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. For in spite of his edition, very serviceable at the time, of Lysias (to which Markland contributed a good deal) and part of Demosthenes, there was little in this good college and university man – diligent scholar though he was – that would justify inclusion in a list that begins with Bentley and closes with Porson.[34] Elmsley, in the review of Markland mentioned earlier, remarked, 'we are not quite certain that one of the preceding names ought not to be exchanged for that of Samuel Musgrave', and I should not be surprised if he had Taylor in mind. If the concept of the Pleiad could claim greater merit than it can, this may be a case where the devoted and able amateur, Musgrave, prevails over the professional working in a university, Taylor. Samuel Musgrave practised, not very gainfully, as a doctor in Exeter, Plymouth, and London,[35] and spent much of his time studying Greek tragedy. He was able to produce editions

of Euripides' *Hippolytus*, of the whole of Euripides (three volumes, 1778, preceded by the textual discussions of his *Exercitationes in Euripidem*), and briefer notes on Sophocles. The critical standing of his work impressed good judges abroad.[36] Later Wilamowitz warned against underestimating Musgrave, as, he adds, is done 'by some whom he excels by far in judgement and in knowledge of Euripidean idiom'.[37] A scrutiny not only of the text but of the critical *apparatus* of a competent modern edition occasionally proves a good test for the quality and survival (not always the same) of earlier critical work. This will be applied to some more dubious cases below. Musgrave comes out well on this showing. In textual work on tragedy, however, he finds a rival in an older contemporary and fellow townsman, like himself an amateur scholar – Benjamin Heath, whose *Notes on the Greek Tragedians* appeared in the same year, 1762, as his *Exercitationes*.[38] Both Heath and Musgrave knew their Attic drama well, and had a shrewd critical sense. They worked before the steadying of observation by Porson and the Porsonians and were not without some inherent naivete.[39] But for all that they were fine early specimens of the type represented in this century by the admirable John Jackson with his *Marginalia Scaenica* of 1955. One can only regret that this species is unlikely to survive, if indeed it still exists.

Nor are the two remaining men, Jonathan, or John, Toup and Thomas Tyrwhitt, what would now be known as 'professional academics'. But they were critical scholars of considerable interest, in that they independently developed Bentleian lines of study. Toup (1713-85), after his education at Exeter College, Oxford, (although many years later M.A. of Pembroke College, Cambridge) spent[40] much of his life as clergyman in remote parishes in Cornwall, until he was appointed prebendary of Exeter Cathedral at the age of sixty. Like Markland and Dawes he was a *vir solitarius*, though Marklandian self-distrust and Dawesian petulance were not among his failings. Nevertheless, he gloried in independence and outspoken censure, which prompted J.J. Reiske's description of him as an *homo truculentus et maledicus*. Toup's contributions to the study of the Greek lexicographers, chiefly the *Suda*, but also Hesychius, were second only to John Pearson's and in a different sense to the *Epistola ad Millium*. But they lay the subject open more instructively because Toup argues and does not only emend or identify quotations, though he emends and identifies a great deal. (The three parts of his *Emendationes in Suidam* appeared from 1760 to 66, his *Epistola critica*, dedicated to his patron Bishop Warburton, in 1767, and the

Curae novissimae . . . in Suidam in 1775; a four-volume edition of the *Emendationes* and *Epistola* as well as the still unpublished work on Hesychius appeared posthumously in 1780 and 90. The 1790 edition also contained contributions by Tyrwhitt and Porson, the latter signing with a string of initials what he had written in 1787.) It will be seen that a tradition of critical and highly original work on these basic sources was now established.

Quite rightly, therefore, Toup regarded himself as a Bentleian, however independent. Since he often criticizes Bentley, along with many others, it is worth noting what he says about him, near the end of the *Epistola*. 'This brings me to the end of a letter that is already overlong. If, in native outspokenness and the heat of argument, I have said anything unduly rash or ill-advised against our own Bentley, I herewith unsay it. He is the lasting glory of our country. If then I have any understanding of Greek studies at all, I gratefully acknowledge that I have learned more from him than from any other critic past or present. Let only blockheads carp at him and only Ill-will personified fail to praise him.' And he concludes by citing from Virgil's affecting commemoration of Marcellus in *Aeneid* VI – 'let me offer these gifts such as they are and pay an ineffectual tribute'.[41] This is not bad for a *homo truculentus et maledicus* and it makes a pleasing contrast with Richard Dawes.

Apart from many contributions to Theocritus, some in Warton's commentary, some separately issued, and adversaria to various writers, Toup, after many years of maturing, brought out a critical edition of Pseudo-Longinus, *De sublimitate* in 1778, the book by which, Porson said, 'his mind was first inclined to critical researches'.[42] Critical the book certainly was, but the edge on earlier work – especially Zachary Pearce's of 1724 (whose Latin translation he reprints) – is not as marked as in the field of ancient lexicography, and little attempt is made to notice the links with ancient literary theory and rhetoric. Instead Toup prints a *Dissertatio philologica de vita et scriptis* of Longinus as the author accepted by the Dutch scholar P.J. Schardam.

Perhaps the most interesting figure in classical scholarship in the mid-eighteenth century before Porson's maturity was Thomas Tyrwhitt (1730-86), who graduated at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1750 and was for some years a Fellow of Merton. Though residing in Oxford he held the deputy secretaryship of war. Later he resigned his fellowship on becoming Clerk of the House of Commons. The last eighteen years of his life he lived the life of a scholar without university post or other preferment.

Tyrwhitt was unique at the time in applying the critical methods developed in classical work to the criticism and editing of English literature. He thus continued Bentley's attempt at Miltonic criticism, but without the grotesqueness marring it. He anticipated early nineteenth-century work elsewhere, for example in Germany, where Lachmann was equally eminent in classical and medieval German studies. This is not to say that he had at his disposal Bentley's peculiar divinatory genius or Lachmann's new procedures. Nevertheless what he achieved was not achieved by others, and it helped to develop a new discipline.

His most sustained effort in English studies was his five-volume edition of Chaucer with notes and essays, a first attempt to make historical sense of the poet's language and metre; four volumes appeared anonymously in 1775, the fifth volume, a glossary, followed three years later. The edition was often reprinted and held the field for more than a century and is thought not to have been superseded until Middle English studies had come into their own. A recent study of Tyrwhitt as a Chaucerian scholar proclaims his unique standing: he was 'the founder of modem traditions of Chaucer editing,[43] and author of 'the first effective modern commentary on Chaucer'.[44] The Chaucer had been preceded by textual criticism of Shakespeare and was followed by the celebrated discovery of Chatterton's authorship of the poems written allegedly by various authors of the fifteenth century, especially one said to be named Thomas Rowley. The discovery was published in an appendix to his third edition of the Rowley poems, which he confirmed later in his *Vindication of the Appendix to the poems called Rowley's* – the Phalaris argument in a new field, and applied, not to a 'sophist' but to a forger of great poetic talent.

His strictly classical work also excelled by the width of his range and his critical resilience. He published on the Attic dramatists, the orator Isaeus, on Strabo, on the fables of Babrius, the poems 'de lapidibus' ascribed to 'Orpheus', and, his largest classical production, an edition with commentary of Aristotle's *Poetics*, but also contributions to the *Suda* and to Greek metre, suggested by Dawes' and Toup's books.

This then is some, evidence (very little of it but perhaps enough to show the trend) that underlies the assertions of Jebb that introduce this chapter. Jebb saw Bentley's influence in two main streams: historical and literary criticism of antiquity on one side, and verbal criticism on the other. The latter he found appreciated both in this country and abroad, especially in Holland and Germany; the former almost

entirely abroad. If these are real trends, as they are likely to be, they must have formed in Bentley's life-time and in the first generation after him, say up to the last third of the eighteenth century. And this appears to be the case. All the scholars mentioned in this chapter (Porson of course excepted) were his younger contemporaries, some very much younger. One might ask therefore which of the master's conceptions and preconceptions were taken up and developed by the men of the Pleiad so called.

We have already noticed that Greek studies in seventeenth-century England flourished, and flourished more impressively than Latin. In the eighteenth century this balance was redressed, largely owing to Bentley's work, and I regard as false the charge that his critical operations were more relevant to the state of transmission of Greek than to that of Latin texts. Among Bentley's younger contemporaries only one man was able to encompass something of the kind. That man, as we have seen, was Markland. But we have also seen that, on an admittedly lower level of critical achievement, Wasse and Davies could teach something new on Sallust as well as on Thucydides, on Cicero, Caesar, Minucius Felix as well as on the Greek of Maximus Tyrius, admittedly assisted in that case by Markland's *Annotationes*.

On the Greek side the ancient lexicographers should have been mentioned first, because of the early literature they preserve. Here Pearson's and Bentley's basic work on the *Suda* was continued with great distinction by Toup and Tyrwhitt. Zachary Pearce and Toup advanced also the criticism of 'Longinus', Tyrwhitt of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Editorial and explanatory work on Homer still lagged behind. But insights, more or less important, into the text and dialogue metre of the Greek dramatists, especially Euripides and Aristophanes, were obtained by virtually all the scholars whom we have named, especially Markland and Dawes, Toup and Tyrwhitt. Some competent contributions to the Greek prose writers were also made. Hellenistic literature however lost much of the attention which Bentley had paid to it, and interest in later Greek, pagan and Christian, declined. Markland's additions to Bowyer's textual criticism of the New Testament stand, as far as I know, alone in that generation as contributions to biblical scholarship by classical scholars. But in the grammar and metre of classical Greek considerable progress was made by Dawes. Above all Markland and Dawes, Toup and Tyrwhitt, also Musgrave and some others, were textual critics on Bentley's principles – competent all of them, and some outstanding.

This evidence adds up to a fine tally of achievement, which is not easily matched anywhere at the time, not even by the celebrated trio of Hellenists in Holland, Hemsterhuys, Valckenaer, and Ruhnken, who also were intent on developing Bentley's hints.

Against these high technical achievements we should now set the other aspect of Bentley's innovations – in Jebb's formula, the historical and literary criticism of antiquity. Before doing so we might briefly recall the state of affairs in early seventeenth-century classics. The early humanistic tradition gave to classical scholars not only their necessary concerns with text, style, and Latin rhetoric, but theology, biblical scholarship, the Fathers of the Church, besides what was then understood as philosophy, the metaphysics underpinning theology, ethics, and traditional logic. These subjects, besides the verbal pursuits of textual study, style, and rhetoric, can scarcely be underestimated in their importance. What I have said about Gataker and Pearson will bear this out. Gataker's great commentary in particular is a unique work of English classical scholarship, bringing together elucidation of the Stoic philosophy of Marcus Aurelius and of the Greek text, its verbal form and its style. In a comparable way Pearson's *Ignatius* is 'classical philology' applied to Christian subject-matter. Bentley works still in this tradition, as anyone can readily see who reads the Boyle lectures, on the one hand, and his suggestions for editing the New Testament, on the other. This subject-matter was on the way out (in discussing Porson we shall remark on it again), although the doctrinal frame and, in social terms, the union between classical scholarship and Church preferment were to persist still awhile.

If theology and philosophy were no longer the primary concerns, another subject-matter has to be noted: precisely the literary and historical criticism which Bentley had initiated in his early works, the *Epistola* and the *Dissertation*. In Bentley's own time, and in the subsequent generation we have discussed, these matters too recede. But it needs to be remembered that Markland's *Remarks* and *Dissertation* have these larger aims, though they are not executed with the master's flair for the only right and appropriate answer. We have seen also that Bentley's application of classically derived criticism to the text of Milton reappears, refined and reasonably justified, in Tyrwhitt's Chaucer and his Shakespearian emendations. Likewise what might be called the Phalaris procedure is not only transferred, with dubious outcome, to a Latin field, as it is by Markland, but, with full success, and a lively measure of literary insight, in Tyrwhitt's proof of the spuriousness of Chatterton's Rowley poems.

It is not convincing, therefore, if it is said that a dichotomy between the two major types of Bentleian criticisll1 appears in Bentley's time and immediately after, with the literary-historical implications rejected in his own country. What is true is a strong emphasis on the textual, stylistic, and metrical types of criticism in Bentley's own time and the subsequent generation up to, say, the last third of the eighteenth century. But there are also notable cases to the contrary. The dichotomy is not fully established at that period.