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](#)

Schlee's *Scholia Terentiana*. *Scholia Terentiana*. Collegit et disposuit Frid. Schlee. Leipzig: 1893. Teubner. 184 pp.

Sidney G. Ashmore

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 08 / October 1894, pp 353 - 357

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018864X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018864X

How to cite this article:

Sidney G. Ashmore (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 353-357 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018864X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The same reasoning may be applied to another of G.'s arguments. The *Ciris* omits those parts of the Scylla-legend which Ovid dwells upon, because they were familiar already as Ovid had presented them in *Metamm.* viii. It is equally possible that Ovid, having the *Ciris* before him, enlarged on those parts which he did not find there.

The general view of G. may be thus stated. The first sketch of the *Ciris* was made shortly after the publication of the *Georgics* (four lines of which (i. 406-409) form the argument of the poem and are repeated in it word for word *Cir.* 538-541), i.e. in 30-29 B.C. Its author, at the time quite young and under the influence of Catullus and the imitators of the Alexandrian school, was diverted from his project and only resumed it in later life, perhaps when sixty years of age. What it may have lost in youthful fire, it has gained in finish and apt imitation of other and later poets, particularly Ovid. In form however it still retains the Alexandrian outline on which Catullus and Calvus constructed their epyllia, the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis, and the Io: with an additional tendency to Lucretian reminiscences, natural to an author who had purposed, as he tells us (5 *sqq.*), a more ambitious poem of a philosophical or scientific, probably astronomical, character. His training shows itself pre-eminently Greek: he seems indeed to have fixed his residence in Athens, and to this are probably owing not only his frequent allusions to recognized Athenian customs and observances, e.g. the *navis Panathenaica* and *peplum* embroidered with the battle of the Giants, the *τρίρυγες* used to fasten the hair (Thuc. i. 6), but the minute description of the coast-scenery in the neighbourhood, and the details about the founding or building of Megara. Hence also the number of Greek words, which G. estimates as 146 in a total of 1360, an average exceeding Catullus,

many of them not proper names, *psalterium*, *storax*, *thallus*, *sophia*, *haliaetos*, *oestrus*. In estimating the merits of the poem, G. is inclined to side rather with the depreciatory side. It is, as has often been observed, in an extraordinary manner a cento: the vast array of parallels now collected does not seem to me to add much to this at once obtrusive and palpable note of inferiority. It abounds, too, in parentheses and repetitions, sometimes, no doubt, purposely introduced to give a rhetorical effect, more often from imperfect command of poetical technic. G.'s lists here are curious and very interesting in comparison with Catullus' sixty-fourth poem, which is open to the same criticism. My own inclination is to rank the *Ciris* higher than G. would admit: especially the speeches of the Nurse are well conceived and the suggestion of Scylla's real object in her mysterious visit to Nisus' bed-chamber is conveyed in language which recalls Ovid without his indecency. It is a pity that we cannot compare here Cinna's *Smyrna* with the *Ciris*: but from Martial's epigram it seems to have been doomed early to extinction; yet we may feel certain from Catullus' high-flown eulogy, as well as from the fine fragments which have survived, that Cinna had poured all the resources of a lavish art into his portrayal of Myrrha's incestuous passion.

Much is to be learnt from the metrical details which form another section of Ganzemüller's dissertation. I cannot but agree with him in his disparagement of Drobisch's and Lederer's statistics; in contrast with these mechanical appraisers of poetry, all that G. has put together as to the characteristics of the *Ciris*, looked at as a new experiment in hexameter, is sound, judicious, and convincing. There are however points on which he is silent, and to which I hope again to return.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

SCHLEE'S SCHOLIA TERENTIANA.

Scholia Terentiana. Collegit et disposuit
FRID. SCHLEE. Leipzig: 1893. Teubner.
184 pp.

THIS is an attempt to place within convenient reach of Terentian scholars all that are valuable of the scholia existing in manuscripts other than the Bembinæ; and to

establish the antiquity and importance of these scholia, in opposition to the adverse judgment of Umpfenbach in *Hermes* ii. 338—a judgment that now for the first time is shown to have had little foundation in fact. Indeed, since the year 1867, when Umpfenbach edited the Bembinæ scholia in the journal already named, the scholia of the

other MSS. have in general been regarded as unworthy of particular study, no one thinking it worth his while to test the accuracy of Umpfenbach's unfavourable verdict.

The test has at last been made by Frid. Schlee, with the result that the value of a large portion of the other Terentian scholia is established as equal, or nearly so, to that of the scholia of the codex Bembinus; and the importance of the lemmata of the codex Monacensis is for the first time brought to light.

The editor has made special use of the following codices: Victorianus (D), Decurtatus (G), Vaticanus (C), Riccardianus (E), and Monacensis (M), the last the oldest of the MSS. containing lemmata, and assigned by Halm to the eleventh century. The lemmata referred to are of considerable length, and fairly numerous, and since they are evidently derived from an ancient codex of the D family, are considered to be deserving of publication, especially as the MSS. of this family are more or less in a mutilated condition.

As a basis for what is to follow the editor begins his book with a discussion of the Calliopian recension, pp. 1-11. Students are familiar with the threefold classification of the Terentian codices, attributed to Umpfenbach. The codex Bembinus (A) constitutes in itself class I. To class II. belong the codices Victorianus (D), Decurtatus (G), and Fragmentum Vindobonense (V). This is the D family. Class III. contains the Parisinus (P), Vaticanus (C), Basilicanus (B), Ambrosianus (F), and Riccardianus (E). These are known as the P family. The most ancient of all these MSS. is the Bembinus. It is also the most trustworthy, because it is the only one certainly free from the arbitrary alterations of the unknown grammarian Calliopus. Which of the other two families is more strictly representative of the original Calliopian recension is a question concerning which there still exists considerable doubt, notwithstanding many efforts have been made to solve the problem. All that has been positively ascertained is that each family has suffered, to a greater or less degree, from the correcting hand of a commentator of the fourth or fifth century, whose name was probably Calliopus.

In Umpfenbach's opinion the Parisinus (P) and Vaticanus (C) exhibit the Calliopian corrections and alterations more faithfully than do the Victorianus (D) and the Decurtatus (G). Frid. Leo ('die Ueberlieferungs-

geschichte des Terenz,' *Rh. Mus.* 1883) finds the original recension preserved in DG, while in PC he discovers the same recension revised and changed by some writer who failed to subscribe his name. Dziatzko (*Comment. Woelfflin.* Lips. 1891) concludes that Calliopus, about the fifth century, produced an edition of Terence in which he had made many violent and arbitrary alterations, both verbal and metrical, and that this edition is now represented by the codices PC; that this edition gradually acquired such importance and authority that many of its readings crept into the vulgar text, and that the vulgar text, thus corrupted, is to be seen in a more or less genuine form in the codices D and G; and, further, that the similarity now traceable between these two classes of MSS. is due not so much to the readings which have passed from the family of PC into that of DG, as to those which belonged originally to the accepted text, and have remained common to the two families in spite of subsequent alterations.

It will be noticed that Leo's view attaches the name of Calliopus to the DG recension, while Umpfenbach and Dziatzko give it to the recension of which PC are the exponents. But the question, says Schlee, to which of the two the name more properly belongs is of slight consequence, so far as the constitution of the text is concerned. A more important point is the relative antiquity of the two recensions,—a matter regarding which both Leo and Dziatzko are in substantial accord and one that has been ably treated by Schlee. The latter is at pains to show that DG are descended from an archetype older than that of PC, while each family springs ultimately from the same recension—a recension believed to have been in common use in the third or fourth century of our era.

In short, our editor reaches a conclusion in all essentials the same as that arrived at by Dziatzko, and differing from that of Leo in regard merely to the name of the author of the later recension (= PC). From the third century to the fifth there existed, besides the Bembine, a second recension in common use. The MSS. of this recension, being circulated in the schools, gradually became burdened with scholia, and often, to save space, were written without due attention to the metres. In the fifth century Calliopus made his recension from a MS. of this class, and in doing so introduced many metrical corrections, omitted not a few of the scholia, added marginal

illustrations from an earlier MS., and altered the text (= PC). This recension acquired considerable authority. But the other MSS. also, which had been supplied with scholia for use in the schools, were passed from hand to hand, and frequently copied, and in this way became more and more similar (= DG) to the Calliopian recension. DG therefore are derived from a recension older than the Calliopian, and according to Schlee are entitled to greater consideration, especially as Calliopius declined to adhere to his exemplar, but made changes in the text in harmony with his own peculiar fancies and prejudices.

But while DG may be of greater importance than other MSS., wherever the question of the scholia is to be considered, it is improbable that they are so important to the constitution of the text as Schlee appears to maintain. Indeed there is evidence that our editor, like others before him, has underrated the value of PC in this regard. A discussion of this point in detail would be out of place here; but the reader is referred to an article of the relative value of the MSS. of Terence by Prof. E. M. Pease in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* for 1887, vol. xviii. (see also my edition of the *Adelphoe*, pp. li. and lii., Macmillan & Co.), in which the writer proves at length that, next to the Bembinus, the Parisinus is the most trustworthy of the MSS., and that, while the original form of the Calliopian recension is to be sought in DG, yet PC represent by their archetype an edition of the Calliopian recension, worked over, illustrated and arranged according to a MS. sprung from the best period; that PC are more closely bound together and have suffered less from errors creeping into the individual MSS. than DG, and that in general more changes have been made in the archetype of the D family than in the archetype of the P family. The similarity of these conclusions to those of Leo will be readily observed.

The theory that Calliopius is only another name for Alcuin, the celebrated Anglo-Saxon scholar of the time of Charlemagne, has lately been revived by Gutjahr (*Act. Reg. Soc. Litt. Sax.* 1892), but is rejected by Schlee.

The second paragraph, pp. 11-17, estimates the value to be attached to the scholia handed down by the codex Monacensis (M). In *Hermes*, vol. ii. p. 388, Umpfenbach says: 'Kaum auf ein ursprüngliches corpus gehen die Trivial-

scholien zurück, die sich in gleicher oder sehr ähnlicher Fassung in den Handschriften seit dem ix.—x. Jahrhundert, nur bald vermehrt, bald vermindert, finden und ihren Ursprung aus halbbarbarischer Zeit nicht verleugnen. Die undankbare Mühe, sie zusammen zu schreiben, hat sich ein Namenloser zu Verona im xi. Jahrhundert gegeben. Die Frucht seines Fleisses ist die Münchener Handschrift 14420 = M.' To this our editor replies: *haec fere omnia prava sunt*; for, as he explains, the writer of M was not the first to collect the materials (lemmata and scholia) of which the commentary is composed. He merely made a copy of a commentary already in existence, as may be proved from an examination of the lemmata themselves. Nor was M made from any one or more of the MSS. as they now appear. A comparison of the *subscriptions* and *indices* of this and other codices indicates that M, while not derived immediately from G, must have proceeded from some MS. of the DG family very closely related to G; and its lemmata are the more valuable for the reason that they supply much of what is lacking in the codex Decurtatus, a MS. now in great part destroyed. Hence just so many of the lemmata are printed on pp. 17-34 as, in the judgment of our editor, are useful in determining the text, or otherwise important to a correct valuation of the codex itself.

The fourth paragraph, pp. 34-37, reviews those particular points on which the authority and importance of the Monacensis are believed to rest: (1) This codex confirms certain good readings which, on account of the discrepancies between the MSS., were previously doubtful; (2) it establishes the correctness of certain ancient forms; (3) it agrees in some particulars with the codex Bembinus, against the testimony of the other MSS.; (4) it adds weight occasionally to recent conjectures; (5) it frees the text from a number of superfluous readings which are found in all the MSS.—both the later ones, and even the Bembinus; (6) it helps to restore the ancient reading of the DG family in many places where the true reading has been altered through the influence of PC; (7) finally the lemmata of this codex lend confirmation to the theory that the Riccardianus (E) and the Ambrosianus (F) belong, not to the PC, but to the DG family—a matter regarding which there has been some difference of opinion.

According to the fifth paragraph, pp.

37—39, the scholia in DGEFPC and M fall into three groups. The first group consists chiefly of extracts from Servius and Priscian, which occur only in DGE, and are written in the margin. They are by the same hand as the words of the text, or at least by one that is not later. The second group embraces many more scholia than the first, which consists for the most part of brief glosses; each scene begins however with a so-called *explanatio praeambula*, indicating the characters about to be introduced, and explaining how the scenes are connected one with another. These scholia are more perfectly preserved in M than elsewhere; they appear however also in DGEFPC. In PC they are added by a later hand; in the rest they are by the same hand as the text itself. The scholia of the third group are only fragments of what was once a much fuller commentary, and are found in the last pages of D and G.

The sixth paragraph, pp. 39—42, deals exclusively with the first group of scholia. Here the editor explains that certain scholia taken from Donatus, Eugraphius, Festus, Porphyron, and Isidorus, are to be reckoned in the same category with those of Priscian and Servius; and that all these are to be distinguished from the remainder of the great body of the scholia, and are to be esteemed as of primary importance on account of their antiquity and fulness. The scholia of the first group are printed on pp. 53—78; those of Servius and Priscian being given on pp. 53—67, those of Donatus on pp. 67—75, those of Eugraphius on pp. 75 and 76, and the rest, together with those of an unknown scholiast, on pp. 76—78.

A. Funck, in his review of this work in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Oct. 28, 1893, suggests a comparison of the scholia of Donatus with the commentary that passes under his name, and remarks that the commentary is fuller and more to the point. Only occasionally, he says, do the scholia add anything new, as *e.g.* on *Phorm.* ii. 2, 24, where a citation from Juvenal, i. 135, is given in illustration of the use of *rex = patronus*.

The seventh paragraph, pp. 42—48, discusses the second group of scholia. These are taken from M, and are here printed for the first time—on pp. 79—162. Owing however to the frequent repetitions and unnecessary fulness which characterize the group, the editor has omitted a good deal of what, after due deliberation, has appeared to him to be superfluous. The scholia are by an unknown hand, distin-

guished for convenience as *Commentarius Antiquior*. At the top of the first page of G are to be found the letters: COMMENTARII OOPEIVS. The letters OO are uncertain. That Calliopius is not intended there can be little doubt. Woefflin (*Arch.* viii. 419 sq.) hints that the reference may be to the grammarian Pompeius who wrote a *Commentum Artis Donati* about the close of the fifth century. To this group of scholia was originally prefixed a *Vita Terenti*. The life however has not been fully preserved in any of the MSS., owing, in some instances, to the loss of the original first page, as in the case of D and G; in another instance, that of C, to the obliteration of the life by a scribe who wished to make way for other scholia.

As the unknown scholiast has nowhere mentioned any of his authorities, it is difficult to determine the sources from which the scholia of the second group have been drawn. Our editor however thinks he has detected points of contact with Festus, Isidorus, Eugraphius, Donatus, and the scholia of the codex Bembinus. He traces certain agreement also between the glosses of this group and those of the *Corpus Glossariorum*. A list of glosses is given on pp. 45—47, with references to the plays in a parallel column. It is probable, says Schlee, that the scholia of this group accumulated by degrees from various sources—the writings of grammarians, commentators, *glossatores*, etc.—and that accordingly they were penned by different hands; but that the *praeambulae explanatioes* prefixed to the scenes were the work of a single scribe,—a fact indicated by the character of their diction. These scholia in question are chiefly valuable for the elucidation of the text of the codices Victorianus and Decurtatus, since in this family they appear as given by the first hand, and are better preserved than in the Parisinus and Vaticanus.

The eighth paragraph, p. 49, gives a brief account of the third group of scholia, of which a specimen taken from codices Barbarinus, Riccardianus, and Victorianus is printed at the close of the volumes, on pp. 163—174. These scholia are in the form of a continuous commentary, and are later than the eleventh century. Their purpose is similar to that of the preceding group, except that they bear upon the meaning of sentences as a whole, rather than upon the peculiar significance of single words. The first part of the commentary

contains a brief life of the poet which, being taken from Orosius iv. 19, falls into the error of confusing the name of the dramatist with that of Q. Terentius Culleo, the Senator (Liv. xxx. 45). Following the life is a treatise in comedy, taken principally from Euanthius, and enriched with quotations from Horace and Juvenal. Then follow a commentary on the prologue to the *Andria* and a summary of the plot; after which come certain *explanationes praeambulae* which outline individual scenes in the play, and enlighten the reader as to the characters that appear in them.

Our editor finally felicitates himself on having worked in an unknown field, for, as he has already remarked, the scholia which he edits have been looked upon as of slight importance—the work of the unlearned of the Middle Age. The ground for this unfavourable judgment he claims to have removed. Terence, he says, was studied by school children in the very earliest times (cf. Sid. Ap. *Ep.* iv. 12), and his diction could not have been properly understood without assistance. The commentary of Donatus was of too learned a character to be suited to boys, for whose use editions with brief notes or glosses were better adapted. In one of these school editions,

he repeats, the codices known as the Victorianus and Decurtatus had their origin, and the scholia are derived from a similar source.

That this collection, so well edited, of Terentian scholia will be generally helpful to students of Latin comedy, and of special service in settling difficulties in criticism and interpretation, no one need doubt. We have only to regret, in company with the writer of the review in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, that the editor has not added to this most praiseworthy edition both the commentary of Donatus and the scholia of the codex Bembinus. The former is at present accessible only in such early editions of the poet as those of Lindenbrog, Klotz, Westerhovius, and Stallbaum. The latter must be sought in the special articles of Umpfenbach in *Hermes* ii. and Studemund in *Neue Jahrb.* 97. To combine these four available sources of early Terentian criticism in one convenient volume would greatly facilitate the labours of modern scholars, and would be an undertaking worthy of the special experience and critical skill of the editor of the *Scholia Terentiana*.

SIDNEY G. ASHMORE.

Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

HÜBNER'S *MONUMENTA LINGVAE IBERICAE*.

Monumenta Linguae Ibericae edidit AEMI-
LIUS HÜBNER. 4to. pp. cxlii. 264. Berlin,
Reimer, 1893.

AT the request of the editor of the *Classical Review* I submit to its readers a very brief description of the last and not the least noteworthy outgrowth of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Its unique importance and interest would demand in justice a far fuller notice than, unhappily, I can at present attempt to give.

The lingua Iberica is that of the primitive inhabitants of the Spanish peninsula, the people, that is, who were there before Phoenicians, Greeks, Celts or Romans. Its remains are now collected, practically for the first time, by the great epigraphist who edited the Spanish volumes of the *C.I.L.*, Emil Hübnér. The courage needed to undertake such a task is matched by the scrupulous care with which it has been executed, though neither is new in the army of scholars whom Mommsen has inspired; and it is not to be counted the least of their

triumphs to have rescued from the dust what must be by far the largest articulate record of pre-Aryan Europe.

In Hübnér's numbering the volume contains some seventy-six inscriptions, five or six of which are of some length (containing from fifty to a hundred and fifty letters), besides coins from nearly 200 towns, each of which shows several different species and legends. The types of these are described, not reproduced, but of the inscriptions in the narrower sense facsimiles are frequently given. In all points of method the editor follows the lines which the *C.I.L.* has once for all established, fulness and definiteness of all certain information bearing on the text of the inscriptions, combined with a jealous repression of merely conjectural matter. All the inscriptions are transcribed into italics, and those given in facsimile are represented also in black and white in Iberian *aß*. But in two respects the plan of the book goes beyond that of the *Corpus*. Its admirable indices include all the ancient local and personal names of Iberian territory, taken