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](#)

Zacher's Scholia of Aristophanes *Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien—Mitteilungen und Untersuchungen* zacher von Konrad. Besonderer Abdruck aus dem sechszehnten Supplementbande der Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie (pp. 503–746). Leipzig. Teubner, 1888. 6 Mk.

W. Gunion Rutherford

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 406 - 408

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191280, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191280

How to cite this article:

W. Gunion Rutherford (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 406-408 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191280

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

words and constructions. We set down at random a few words which call for a note in this connection : τὰ πολέμια (for τὰ πολεμικά) c. 18, ἐξαπίνης (for ἐξαίφνης) c. 21, λογάδες (for ἐπιλεκτοί) c. 62, κατεβίων with gen. c. 67, ἐκάς (for πόρρω) c. 69, δίκαιον c. 140 (here Classen is wrong). There are several others.

In the list of critics who reject the Ullrichian hypothesis M. Jules Girard is omitted. We conclude our notice of this good school book by stating our conviction that in ii. 2 μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτειδαίᾳ μάχην μὴν ἔκτω must be

bracketed with Steup. It is rightly remarked that we cannot discover the date of the battle at Potidaea from i. 24—62 : to get at the date we have to work back from ii. 2, and, as often, we find that the number, ἔκτω, is wrong. But these words in ii. 2 assume that the date of the battle is known. Also Thucydides would not have referred to the battle, which is outside the period within which he wishes to make his chronology exact, but to the resolution at Sparta to go to war.

E. C. MARCHANT.

ZACHER'S SCHOLIA OF ARISTOPHANES.

Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien—Mitteilungen und Untersuchungen von KONRAD ZACHER. Besonderer Abdruck aus dem sechszehnten Supplementbande der Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie (pp. 503—746). Leipzig. Teubner, 1888. 6 Mk.

THIS is a book of a very different type from the new edition of the Scholia of Sophocles which I lately reviewed in this *Review*. It is by a man whose work in different directions is known and appreciated as both painstaking and fruitful, and is itself a model of what such discussions ought to be.

The investigation is vitiated, as I believe I shall be able to show, by several serious omissions and misconceptions, but these do not prevent the book from serving the two chief purposes of all books—the conveying of knowledge accurately and lucidly and the stimulating of the minds of those who read them. In the first half of the book the various manuscripts of Aristophanes containing 'scholia' are described in the most thorough-going way. Great sagacity and common-sense are shown in grasping and explaining the indications which the several manuscript books supply of the relations between them and their originals. It is delightful and entertaining as well as instructive reading. We are carried back in imagination to the cloister in which the scribes performed their task; we learn in the clearest way their manner of working; we are made to see how in this case or in that they had only one manuscript to copy from, how such and such a scribe preferred to write 'scholia' and text simultaneously as he went along, and another liked better to write in the 'scholia' after the text was copied. Zacher can tell us also a great deal

about the manuscripts used to copy from, how the Venetus, for example, reproduces the codex from which it was copied not only in the number of the gatherings and the number of the lines of text contained in each gathering, but also in the number of lines to a page and in general appearance. He can prove that both the Venetus and the Ravennas were copied in the most mechanical way. Indeed every page is full of admirable inferences of this description. He has even been able to trace one more surprising history of a manuscript. If this is not so intensely interesting as the story of the Ravennas (it is given by Martin pp. 5 ff.), yet the identification of a Leiden codex of the *Lysistrata* with the missing portion of a Laurentian codex has still the same sort of fascination for every scholar.

Nor is this exact scrutiny of authorities confined to the best-known codices or to such as contain only pre-Tzetzesian notes. It is pursued also for manuscripts of a much later date and of less value and even for the editio princeps itself. The pages upon the editions of Tzetzes, Triclinius, and Thomas Magister are in a high degree instructive. Indeed of all this first part of the investigation a critic can have little to say but unqualified praise.

But Zacher at once enters upon more debatable ground when he comes to discuss the mutual relations of 'scholia'-carrying manuscripts and the bearing of such relations upon the question of manuscript 'scholia' tradition. I must own here to considerable disappointment. The sentence with which the book opens, perhaps I should say the first sentence of the preface, seems clearly to promise that the subsequent discussion will supply some clue to guide us through the labyrinth of 'scholia,' some

test to enable us to separate the ancient and valuable from the less ancient and gradually deteriorating notes, some manuscript help towards dissolving and crystallizing out into separate notes the crude mass of mechanically and purposely confused 'scholia' and comments of every sort. But it cannot be said that the result of the discussion fulfils the hopes thus raised. Up to a certain point Zacher sees the extent to which our knowledge of the 'scholia' of Aristophanes has suffered from the perverse way in which the corpus is now presented to us. 'Die ausbeutung der reichen und kostbaren schätze alter gelehrsamkeit, welche in den Aristophanesscholien aufgespeichert sind, wird bekanntlich sehr beeinträchtigt und erschwert durch den zustand in welchem uns diese scholien in den ausgaben vorliegen. Den grundstock haben von anfang an die scholien der Aldina gebildet, diese sind in den folgenden ausgaben mit ziemlich zufälligen oder willkürlichen zusätzen aus handschriften vermehrt worden, dann hat Dindorf die scholien der beiden ältesten handschriften, des Ravennas und Venetus, mit denen der Aldina zusammen verarbeitet und noch einiges aus anderen handschriften hinzugefügt, und Dübner endlich hat wider zahlreiches handschriftliches material hinzugefügt.' But he has not seen the most vital point of all, that this confusion was made worse confounded by Dindorf's arbitrary action is altering the sequence of the plays in the body of 'scholia' to suit his own pedantical preference for a so-called chronological order. In this as in so many other ways Dindorf's influence on Greek learning has been nothing short of calamitous. He has thus concealed a fact the significance of which for all work on the 'scholia' of Aristophanes is of the very first importance, namely, that the greater part of the 'scholia' as we now have them still form an ordered commentary on the extant plays. Under any circumstances there is bound to be some reason for the fact that the Ravennas, the Venetus, and the editio princeps all lead off with the plays in the order of *Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*. But what censure can be too strong for Dindorf's blindness when it can be seen at a glance that for its length the *Plutus* has an overwhelming burden of notes; when further even a cursory examination of the corpus of 'scholia' makes it plain that when a difficult word, construction, or allusion occurs in the *Plutus*, and also in another play of the series, it is generally in the *Plutus* only that we find it commented upon? So deeply indeed does this principle pene-

trate into the 'scholia,' that it constantly happens that a note which is meaningless where it stands at once becomes an excellent comment when transferred to a passage in another play later in the series or even to a later line of the same play. But more than this, there is not wanting evidence in the 'scholia' themselves that from a very early period in the history of Aristophanic criticism an ordered commentary (or its equivalent, a system of critical marks in a certain seriation, explained by *ὑπομνήματα* of various kinds) did exist upon the text of Aristophanes even when that text embraced plays now lost.

Yet primary though this fact is, it has escaped Zacher's notice, and he has been content to base his attempt to get back a century or so in manuscript tradition upon a discussion of the evidence supplied by the 'scholia' upon fifty lines of the *Nubes* and upon a few passages of the *Ranae* and the *Pax*. This, it seems to me, furnishes far too slight and frail a foundation for the superstructure imposed upon it. His arguments and inferences are still, as in the earlier half of the book, both sagacious and ingenious but they are no longer convincing. And even if they did not admit of dispute, they would not carry us much further in the knowledge of the 'scholia.' What does it matter whether we get back or no with any certainty to an hypothetical 'ur-handschrift' of the tenth century or even of the ninth? For we can as a matter of fact get much further back than that. Even with such a manuscript actually before us, we could not solve more easily than we can now the more important questions at issue. We might perhaps be able to set down as certainly recent a few pre-Tzetzesian comments which we now feel to be recent, but we would not get any appreciable help toward reconstituting the great body of true ancient scholia concealed in the untranslatable sentences of the 'scholia' as we have them. The corruption of these had been almost completed centuries before the existence of any 'ur-handschrift' that we shall ever be able to theorize about with any regard to facts. Means there are by which the ancient scholia may in some measure be rehabilitated, and one of these Zacher would have furnished us with if he had edited—and no man could do the work better—each in a separate shape the 'scholia' of the Venetus,¹ and of the other manuscripts which he so ably describes. This

¹ Perfect collations of the Ravennas already exist both by Martin and Holzinger, but of the Venetus as far as I know only partial collations.

must be the first desideratum for all students of the scholia, and in meeting it he would put 'the brethren of the guild'—to use his

own phrase—under a still greater obligation than he has already done by means of this most able and instructive work.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

STERNBACH'S ANTHOLOGY OF PLANUDES.

Anthologiae Planudeae Appendix Barberino-Vaticana Recensuit LEO STERNBACH. Leipzig, Teubner: 1890. Pp. xviii. + 149. 14 Mk.

This is a critical edition of fifty-two amatory epigrams from the Anthology of Cephalas, which, together with two others not in the Palatine MS., are found in two MSS. at Rome—one in the Barberini, the other in the Vatican Library. The former (called M by the editor) is a 14th century MS. of the Planudean Anthology which belonged to Fulvio Orsini (1529–1600). At the end of the MS. Orsini added in his own hand this appendix of fifty-four epigrams. The other MS. (called V) includes the same body of epigrams among other miscellaneous contents. It is of the sixteenth century, but in an unknown hand.

To the well-known sentence at the end of the table of contents prefixed by Planudes to the seventh or amatory section of his Anthology, τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα (ἀσεμνα καὶ αἰσχρὰ) πολλὰ ἐν τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ ὄντα παρελκόμεν, Orsini added a note in his copy, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦτα ἐν παλαιῷ εἰσι παρ' Ἀγγέλου τοῦ Κολωτίου. The epigrams now under our consideration were no doubt transcribed from Colloti's MS., and must have been originally transcribed before Colloti's death in 1549. From a careful comparison of the texts of M and V which has been made by the editor, it appears that neither is a copy of the other, but both are copied from a single archetype, either Colloti's MS. itself or an earlier copy of extracts made from it. The inference was long ago drawn by Jacobs that Colloti's lost MS. was a copy of the Anthology of Cephalas. All the indications which can be drawn from the body of epigrams before us go to support this view, and also, as I think, to show that it was an independent copy of the autograph of Cephalas, and therefore of co-ordinate authority with the Palatine MS. It may even have been the copy made directly from that autograph by Michael Magister, Keeper of the Records, which we know from notes made by the corrector of the Palatine MS. (on *Anth. Pal.* vi. 269, vii.

432, and the epigram (= vii. 450) written at the bottom of p. 257 of the MS.) had differences both in order and contents from the Palatine MS. If this were so, the value of the lost MS. might be immense. From Orsini's words, if we rely on their literal meaning, it appears certain that it was not one of those which were destroyed in the dispersion of Colloti's library at the sack of Rome in 1529: but there is no proof or indication that it was among those bought by Orsini after his master's death, and thenceforward it has wholly disappeared. It is not beyond hope that it may still exist.

The collection before us consists of thirty-three epigrams from the fifth and sixteen from the twelfth section of the Palatine Anthology, and five other epigrams, two of them being *δημρόκεντρα* from the ninth, and one an epigram from the eleventh section. The remaining two are not taken from the Palatine Anthology as we possess it. One (*Ep.* xlv.), attributed to Numenius, is the same, with a significant verbal change, such as was often made by Christian copyists or editors (cf. e.g. *Anth. Pal.* xi. 19 in *Pal.* and *Plan.*), as an epigram of Meleager's, *Anth. Pal.* xii. 60. The other (*Ep.* vii.) is a cento chiefly from Quintus Smyrnaeus, of which there is no trace in the Palatine MS. *Ep.* xii. (*Anth. Pal.* v. 82) is accidentally omitted in V, which gives the heading of it only. *Ep.* xv. (*Anth. Pal.* v. 41) is in the Planudean Anthology, and is therefore rightly omitted in M. V also prefixes to the matter common to both MSS. seven epigrams on statues of Priapus (*App. Plan.* 236–9. 241–3) which are not in the Palatine MS. If these, like the rest, were transcribed from a copy of the Anthology of Cephalas, that copy must have included the lost section on works of art. I am not able to trace any principle of arrangement in the order of the epigrams as they stand.

The editor has done his work very thoroughly, having made a fresh personal collation of the Palatine MS. and of the Codex Marcianus of Planudes, besides consulting six other MSS. of *Plan.* and also MSS. in various libraries which contain