The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Wessner's *Donatus Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti*: accedunt Eugraphi Commentum et Scholia Bembina recensuit Paulus Wessner. Vol. I, pp. 1, 542. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1902. 10 mk.

J. P. P.

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 04 / May 1904, pp 224 - 224
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209906, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209906

How to cite this article:

J. P. P. (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 224-224 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209906

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Sunrise seems to have given him immortal youth with other gifts peculiar to her time of day, which every reader of his books

knows and is the happier for knowing Long may he keep them!

T. R. GLOVER

WESSNER'S *DONATUS*.

Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti: accedunt Eugraphi Commentum et Scholia Bembina recensuit PAULUS WESSNER. Vol. I, pp. 1, 542. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1902. 10 mk.

THE celebrated commentary on Terenti certainly needed re-editing; and the present edition should give the reader all or most of what he wants. Besides A, the Paris MS assigned to the eleventh century and said to have formed part of the famous library of Fleury to which the uncial codex of Jerome's Chronicles also belonged, Herr Wessner gives collations of a Vatican MS of the thirteenth century (B) and 4 MSS of the fifteenth century (two in the Vatican one at Florence and one in the Bodleian). These are his 'meliores.' To supply their frequent deficiencies he calls in the help of 'deteriores,' a Dresden, a Leyden, and a Paris MS, to which is to be added a Malatestianus. The excerpts or Scholia in the margin of five MSS of Terence are also cited, that is to say the Scholia Bembina (from the famous uncial MS which once belonged to Cardinal Bembo), the Victoriana (tenth century), the Riccardiana (eleventh century), the Vaticana (Vat. 3868, ninth or tenth) and the Parisina (Par. 7899, ninth or tenth). The industry of the editor in collecting his material deserves our most grateful recognition; and it is to be hoped that his trustworthiness will prove to have earned it too. This is a matter which time alone can show.¹ It must, however, be observed that the book would have been more convenient to use had some of the material been retrenched. The *Vita* and the Commentary upon two plays only *Andria* and *Eunuchus* fill more than 500 pages, and more than a third of each page on the average is taken up with the critical apparatus. In the case of a great literary work, especially if ill preserved, there is something to be said for recording trifling variants. And of course

everything that may help to the recovery of the truth ought always to be given. But a commentary is not an original work; and most readers would have gladly spared such notes as the following 'cata antiphrasin AT, catantiphrasin B, cata antiphrasin V, catha antriphrasin C' (p. 225) for a *catalogue raisonné* of the kinds of mistakes that occur in the MSS upon which the text is based. The editor I hasten to say is no slave of his materials and does not pretend that his MSS are better than they are. Of recent emenders those most frequently mentioned are Rabbow, Sabbadini, and Schopen. As a detailed criticism of Wessner's work is here impossible, I content myself with referring briefly to two or three passages where I should prefer something different to what appears in his text. *Vita* c.5 (Volcatus) 'iter hinc in Asiam fecit: <in> nauem ut semel | conscendit, uisus nunquam est: sic uita uacat' <et> seems more likely.—On Andr. Prol. 24 7 'COGNOSCITE | per . . . 8 COGNOSCITE | sic dixit' etc. for the obvious omission I should prefer 'percognoscite,' an attested compound, to *pro* (Wessner) and a lacuna which Rabbow fills up with *indicate*. *Ib.* 25. 2. 'nam postmodum *dicit* in alio prologo' Wessner for *dein* A, *deinde* the rest. Perhaps '*idem in.*' *ib.* 1, 88. 2 (in the derivation of) *funus*' 'A funalibus dictum est, id est unciis et aculeis candelabrorum quibus delibuti funes et *ingenium* cereifomites infiguntur.' *ingenium* for which one MS has 'ingeni' is bracketed with Rabbow; but how can it have got in? Read *incerati* and bracket *cerei* as a gloss. This is seemingly better than to suppose that *cerei* has come from '*cera delibuti*' which some may prefer. *Ib.* III. 12. 1 'ITANE CONTEMNOR ualde temnor—temnor autem Graecum est id est caedor et reicior—nam veteres temnere dicebant sine praepositione.' It is clear that 'contemnor' would not be interpreted by 'temnor' and, except for A, the weight of authority is for for 'ualde contemnor.' We should read ITANE CONTEMNOR <contemnor> ualde temnor etc, as the commentator is explaining the meaning of the compound verb from the simple one.

J. P. P.

¹ Since this notice (which has had to wait a long time in type) was set up, has appeared Prof. M. Warren's review in the *American Journal of Philology*, 1903, p. 335, in which I am glad to read the words 'Having made myself many years since a collation of A, I can attest the extreme accuracy of Wessner's report of its readings.'