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](#)

L. Müller's Nonius, Part II *Nonii Marcelli Compendiosa Doctrina*, Pars II. Emendavit Lucianus Muller. 12 Mk.

J. H. Onions

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 07 / July 1889, pp 300 - 303
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195423, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195423

How to cite this article:

J. H. Onions (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 300-303 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195423

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

its neat renderings. The book is well got up in the style of Weidmann's *Haupt-Sauppe* Series. I have not come across any misprints. There is an error p. xxxii, where the

reference on I 120 should be *de amicitia* instead of *de senect.*

H. A. HOLDEN.

L. MÜLLER'S NONIUS, PART II.

Nonii Marcelli Compendiosa Doctrina, Pars II. Emendavit LUCIANUS MÜLLER. 12 Mk.

THE second part of this work contains text and *apparatus criticus* of books v-xx, followed by *Adversaria Noniana*. Of the four MSS., earlier than the 15th century, which contain the whole of these books, Professor Müller gives the readings of three, the Harleian (H), Leyden, Voss F 73 (L), and Wolfenbüttel (V); the Paris MS. Latin 7667 (P) he passes over. Of the three which contain the whole, except portions of book v., the Bamberg (A), Paris MS. Lat. 7666 (C), and Leyden 116 (X), he supplies us with a collation of the Bamberg only. The three extract MSS., Paris, MS. Lat. 7665 (D), Montpellier (M) and Oxford (O), he omits altogether. The readings of H and L are on the whole accurately given; the collation of A and V is however far from trustworthy. The *Adversaria Noniana* consist of six chapters; I. *De vita Nonii*; II. *De Compendiosa Doctrina Nonii*; III. *De insequentium saeculorum ad saeculum xv. studiis Nonianis*; IV. *Quid profecerint grammatici a saeculo xv.*; V. *De codicibus adhibitis*; VI. *De rationibus editionis*. In the *Vita Nonii* there is little that is new. Prof. Müller says, in speaking of the title of the work, that H and A call him Tuburgicensis, V Tuburcensis, on the authority of Prof. Heinemann (p. 303 *sub fin.* he says Tuburticensis on the same authority), D and M Tiburcensis. It would be simpler to say that Florence xlviii. 1 (F) H A and X give Tuburgicensis, V Tuburcensis (the first c looks as if the scribe had hesitated between g and c), P Tuburgicensis or Tuburcensis, which it is impossible to decide, C D M and O Tiburcensis. L, Berne (B), Geneva (G) and Cambridge (Z) have no title. The most original suggestions in this chapter are perhaps that Nonius called his son Herculus as a compliment to the ἄλλος Ἡρακλῆς, who should one day cleanse the Nonian stable, and that the scholars of the present day who have worked at Nonius are descended from some member of his family who came from Africa to the

country of the Vandals to avenge on them the injuries which they had wrought in the land of Nonius.

In the second chapter Prof. Müller suggests that the title of the work should be *Nonii Marcelli Compendiosa doctrina*, not *De compendiosa doctrina*. It seems however more probable that the original title has been retained by the extract MSS. D M and O, which give Nonius Marcellus, *De compendiosa doctrina*. The titles of the different books without exception begin with *de*, and they are quoted by Priscian in this form, e.g. Nonius Marcellus, *de doctorum indagine*. It seems then natural to suppose that the title of the whole work would follow the same lines. In the remainder of this chapter he gives a list of the authors quoted by Nonius, and says a few words about the authorities from whom Nonius drew. His general conclusion is that none is earlier than the age of Hadrian, and in the main he agrees with the views expressed by Schmidt as long ago as 1868. Of Prof. Nettleship's pamphlets on this subject he appears to have no knowledge whatever.

In the third chapter he mentions the obligations of Priscian and Fulgentius to Nonius, and quotes the subscription of the Montpellier MS. to show that the text was revised as early as A.D. 402. But is it at all clearly established that this subscription refers to Nonius, and not simply to the Persius, which in the Montpellier MS. immediately follows the Nonius? The remainder of this chapter, dealing chiefly with the MSS., will be more conveniently discussed in connexion with the fifth chapter.

In the fourth chapter he gives a very brief account of previous editions, and discusses the services rendered to Nonius by successive generations of commentators. Of past scholars he speaks with some show of respect; his contemporaries, to quote his own words, '*objurgat leniter ut solet comiterque.*' In the sixth he states the principles which he has followed in the present edition, speaking of himself with the modesty which he says '*insitam penitus sentit sibi et infixam.*'

In the fifth chapter and the second half of the third he gives some account of the MSS. which he uses, and a very brief statement of his views as to their mutual relations and relative importance. His account of L is full and accurate, that of H and V brief but generally correct. With regard to P he is however entirely mistaken. He still maintains the erroneous view, which I myself in common with Prof. Sievers suggested, that it is a copy of the Harleian. This is however a complete misconception. No one who has examined the MS. could doubt for a moment that it is, as Prof. Havet pointed out, a combination of three entirely different MSS. To prove that the first three books of P are not copied from H it is only necessary to say that P has the Index, which is wanting in H, and that it indicates a lacuna after *leat* (3, 14), *carris modium* (5, 13), *Plantus* (8, 23), and *lib. II.* (17, 5), of which there is no sign in the Harleian. The first part of P is, as Prof. Havet suggests, very closely connected with H² V. Indeed it seems almost certain that all three are copies of one and the same MS. The parent MS. appears to have combined the peculiarities of the two classes F L and H² P V, and to have been corrected from a MS. belonging mainly to the second class. H² V generally give the corrected, rarely the original, reading; P generally the corrected reading, occasionally however the original, and sometimes a combination of the two. Thus P has the Index with L, the marginal notes with H² V, and the lacunae at 3, 14 5, 13, 8, 23 and 17, 5 with V. In the title too the scribe of P hesitates between Tuburgicensis and Tuburcensis and finally leaves it doubtful: the scribe of V also hesitates but decides in favour of c. The following specimen readings will serve to show the relations between the three MSS.: 2, 12, *pubuerem*, P¹, *puuerem* H² L¹ V¹, *puberem* F H¹ L² V² = *pu^uberem*. 9, 14, *utantur* P¹, *utauntur* P², *utuntur* H², *utuntuntur* V, *utantur* F H¹ L = *utantur*. *ib.* 16, *poetia* P, *poⁱetia* H² V, *poeta* F L = *poeta*. 27, 23, *uocat* P¹, *locat* F³ HP² V, *uocat* F¹ L = *uocat*. 61, 1 *deuoratendo* P¹, *deuortendo* H² P² V, *deuorando* F H¹ L = *deuorando*. 64, 15, *viii* P, *iiii* F³ H V, *v* F¹ L = *v*. 81, 8, *avis* P¹, *avis* H² P² V, *abis* F H¹ L = *avis*. 83, 17, *tabuliono* P, *tabulino* F³ H V, *tabulono* F¹ L = *tabulino*. 84, 2, *plocito* P

V², *plocio* F² H V¹, *plocio* F¹ L = *plocio*. 89, 22, *egisit* P V¹, *egisito* V², *egisto* H², *egisio* F H¹ L = *egisio*. 131, 20, *sciamaca ia* H² P V, *sciamaca* F H¹ L = *sciamac^{ia}* &c. &c. The fourth book of P is a copy, not of the Harleian, but of the Cambridge MS. (Z). This MS. is closely related to G and the first hand of H. Indeed all three MSS. appear to have been copied from the same original at the same time, and perhaps by the same scribe. Z was then corrected either from the same original as the second hand of the Harleian, or at any rate from a very similar MS., but the corrections in Z are only partial, while in H they are complete. These corrections are sometimes introduced into the text, sometimes added in the margin. Thus, where Z is uncorrected, P regularly gives the uncorrected reading, e.g. 247, 30 *pladum* P Z, 249, 20 *fu^eerit* P Z, 314, 28, *fructus* P Z, 315, 11 *gravi* P Z, 342, 13 *uirgilius uerbenis* P Z &c. &c. Some mistakes in P are clearly due to misreadings of Z, e.g. 266, 22 *uidet* P¹, *uideb.* (*uidebis*) Z, 267, 31 *intumenissem* P¹, *intuenissem* (*interuenissem*) Z, *ib.* 35 *sinen quis* P, *sinenouis* Z, written so as to look like *sinen quis*, with many others which can scarcely be reproduced. Where Z is corrected in the text P gives the corrected reading, e.g. 233, 10 *reunitatis* P Z², 315, 34 *grauum um fore* P Z², 316, 5 *deploidi arrecta* P, *deploida recta* Z, 334, 4 *nisi abesse* P Z², or combines the two, e.g. 243, 47 *e memiseris* P, *memiseris* Z, 313, 17 *ductiae* P, *ductae* Z, 334, 16 *cornius* P *corni^{us}* Z &c. &c. Where the correction is written in the mg. the first two scribes of this part of P, who continue down to 310, 22, either omit it altogether, or add it in the margin, e.g. 235, 7 *filio* P Z tx, *filo* P Z mg, *ib.* 34 *fidi aequales* P Z tx, *fide equales* P Z mg, 275, 3 *habere* P Z tx, *adhibere* P Z mg, 302, 28 *fero* P Z tx, *ferre* P Z mg. The third scribe from 310, 22 to the end of the book sometimes introduces the marginal reading into the text, e.g. 323, 6 *nunc hinc* P, *hinc* Z tx, *nunc* Z mg, 330, 11 *et ut ille et utile* P, *et utile* Z tx, *et ut ille* Z mg, 331, 10 *claudam claudus* P, *claudus* Z tx, *claudam* Z mg, 342, 38 *sta statu^eae esse tu esse* P, *statu esse* Z tx, *statu^eae esse* Z mg., the mark of reference in Z being in such a position as to suggest that the correction was to be inserted between *sta* and *tu*. It may be mentioned that the sign in P which Prof. Quicherat calls '*signum mendi*,' Mons. Meylan the

'signe de renvoi,' regularly occurs in Z, where a reference is made to a marginal correction.

The last fifteen books of P are perhaps on the whole most closely connected with the group ACX. Thus P agrees with these MSS. in giving *De numeris et casibus* as the title of the ninth book, while H L V have *de generibus et casibus* in the text, though in the index L has *de numeris et casibus*. In this part of the work however all the MSS. agree so closely that it is scarcely possible to divide them into distinct groups. With regard to F Prof. Müller is still more signally mistaken. No description or collation of this MS. has ever yet been published, and, as it is much the most valuable authority for the text of the first three books, it may be worth while to give some account of it. Professor Anziani holds that it belongs 'more probably to the end of the ninth than the beginning of the tenth century.' It is a large quarto MS., consisting of 93 folia (eleven quaternions and five extra leaves), written in double columns, twenty-six lines to a page, in the same hand throughout. It has been corrected several times probably by the same scribe. The following hands may be distinguished (1) F¹ the original copy (2) F² corrections by the same hand from the original MS. (3) F³ corrections by the same, or perhaps another hand, from a MS. of an entirely different class (4) F⁴ recorections of F² or F³, probably again from the original MS. (5) F⁵ a few conjectures in a 15th century hand. Sometimes the original writing is completely erased, sometimes a line is drawn through, or a dot placed under a letter or letters. Where the correction is effected by erasure it is impossible to determine to which of the different hands it is due. Where a word has been changed or added it may generally be decided, as F² is in darker ink than the other hands. This MS. originally contained both title and index, but the index has been completely erased. Those hands of F which seem to be derived from the original MS. (F¹ F² F⁴) are so closely related to L (L¹ L²), as to lead to the conclusion that F and L are descended from the same parent MS. This seems to have been a MS. of an inferior quality, disfigured by many mistakes and omissions, but preserving as a rule the old spelling, especially the non-assimilation of prepositions. It had also been corrected throughout, the corrector making many alterations, additions and omissions, and regularly assimilating the prepositions. While L¹

generally retains the non-assimilated form of the preposition, F and L² regularly prefer the assimilated form. In other respects the different hands vary very much, though as a rule F¹ corresponds to L², F² F⁴ to L¹. The following instances will show the close relation between the MSS.: 227, 4 *bene* F¹ L, *ib.* 6 *ingremeta gonmemorem* F¹ L, 228, 25 *intectori* F¹ L, *ib.* 29 *apud om.* F¹ L, 230, 11 *plaucidi* F¹ L, *ib.* 32 *masi* F¹ L, 231, 4 *solic* F¹ L, *ib.* 18 *uade* F¹ L, *ib.* 19 *stipidius* F¹ L, *ib.* 21 *suadum* F¹ L, *oportuno pavidet* F¹ L, *ib.* 27 *aetra* F¹ L, &c. &c. And not only is F a twin brother of L, but, when corrected by the three hands, became also the parent of H. It is indeed the precise MS. which Prof. Havet presupposed as the original of that MS., and it will probably be a surprise and pleasure to him to find his theory established beyond all possibility of dispute. The following facts among many others which might be adduced may be accepted as sufficient proof. I. The first three books of F and H both occupy 93 leaves. II. The words *qui ouum inspecerant* 117, 8, with which the first scribe of H ends in the middle of a column (f. 53 v), are also the last words of the sixth quaternion (f. 48 v) in F, the precise point at which this part of the MS., consisting of 93 ff. (11 quaternions and five leaves), would naturally be divided for purposes of copying. III. The correct readings of H¹ are regularly given by one of the four hands of F. IV. The peculiarities of H¹ are explained by comparison with F., e.g. 44, 10

naugias H¹ = ^a*nagis* F, 77, 15 *baretere* H¹ = ^a*bretere* F, 97, 20 *atiere* H¹ = ^a*ptiere* F, 137, 15 *sere id* H¹ = ^{i.d.}*sere* F, 182, 28 *uulgare*

^a*decoepit* H¹ = ^a*uulgare coepit* F. Similarly all the following readings of H¹ are due to marginal corrections in F.: 49, 1 *Trossuli equites Romani dicti trossuli*, 67, 20 *ex atque proletarium pedito*, 81, 11 *farris in farris trite*, 86, 10 *cecutiunt lippium oculi mei cecutiunt*, 87, 21 *clipeat operit clipeat et accium*, *ib.* 23 *audet galeare operire*. So 107, 23 where H¹ gives *incideret q*, 114, 25 where it reads *Tusculanarum q*, the *q* is due to a *q* or *signum mendi* which occurs some dozen times in the margin of F. Numberless similar instances might be brought forward but '*actum, aiunt, ne agas.*' In his account of the extract MSS. again Prof. Müller is no less mistaken. Of the one group A C X he says that C X are copies of A. Now of this group C is the most correct and perhaps

the oldest, A the least correct, and there seems no ground whatever for supposing that either C or X is descended from A, though all these may be copied from the same original. In speaking of the other group D M O he says that O belongs to the beginning of the 9th century. Is not 9th a misprint for 11th? It is assigned in the catalogue to the 11th cent., but may be as early as the tenth, ninth it cannot be. These three MSS. again are independent of one another, though all may be descended directly from the same parent MS. The MSS. of Nonius Prof. Müller divides into two great classes, the first comprising F H¹ L¹ G Z B, the second H² L² V the Escorial and the extract MSS. The first class he considers the most valuable and in this class he assigns the chief place to H¹ and L¹. In this view he fails to appreciate the importance of the fact pointed out by Prof. Havet, that in discussing the relative value of the MSS. of Nonius it is absolutely necessary to divide the work into three portions; (1) Bks. I-III, (2) Bk. IV, (3) Bks. V-XX. In the first part the MSS. fall into three groups which may be arranged as follows in order of merit: (1) F³ (H¹) (2) H² P V (3) F F¹ F² F⁴ (H¹), L¹ L². The Escorial I have not as yet been able to collate. The extract MSS., though they offer many independent readings, agree on the whole most closely with L¹ especially in the non-assimilation of prepositions. It should however be mentioned that for the first ten pages, where A C X give the whole, they seem to represent an independent tradition, superior perhaps to any other. In Bk. IV the MSS. may be divided into

two classes: (1) H¹ G Z or (where Z is corrected) Z¹ (P) B. (2) H² L V Z² (P). The extract MSS. vary between the two. The reading of the second group is generally though by no means invariably to be preferred. In the remaining books the MSS. resemble each other so closely that it is very difficult to group them. The nearest approach to a classification is perhaps: (1) H L P? V (2) P? A C X (3) D M O, the first group being on the whole the most trustworthy. In point of orthography however L¹ is *facile princeps* throughout. In the first part, of the entire MSS. F H L P V and the Escorial, Prof. Müller gives the readings of H L V alone; of the extract MSS. A C X D M O and the Zurich MS., A only is represented. Of the entire MSS, containing book IV, H L V G Z (P), he omits Z: of the extract MSS. B D M O, he omits M. and O. The entire MSS. containing the remaining books are four in number, H L P V; of these he passes over P. Of the first class of extract MSS. A C X, we have a collation of A only; the second class D M O is quite unrepresented. We cannot help regretting that Prof. Müller should have devoted his undoubted abilities for so long a time to a task for which he possesses such inadequate materials.

J. H. ONIONS.

[The above has been corrected for the press by Mr. S. G. Owen, the writer of the obituary notice which will be found on a later page of this *Review*. The Editors can only join with him in expressing their deep sense of the loss they have sustained in the death of a most valued contributor, who was always ready with advice and help at whatever cost of trouble to himself.]

GRAMMATIK DES HOMERISCHEN DIALEKTES.

Grammatik des Homerischen Dialektes, von
GOTTFRIED VOGRINZ. Paderborn. 1889.
416 pp. 7 mks.

A NEW Homeric Grammar suffers immediate comparison with that of the Provost of Oriel. The German work is about one third larger than Mr. Monro's. One third of the book is devoted to Phonology and Inflection, another third to Word Formation and Semasiology, and the last third to Syntax. No chapter is given on Versification, but many questions of metrical quantity are treated in the first part of the work. The Greek index is nearly twice as full as Mr. Monro's, but this hardly

atones for the entire lack of definite cross-references, and the table of contents, covering four pages, does not compensate for the want of an index of subjects.

The type and paper are clear and good, but the pages are rather crowded. Only one font of type is used. The division into articles is often indistinct and without numbered or lettered subdivisions, which are necessary for easy reference. Nineteen sections cover more than one hundred pages, with no running titles or page headings, or any indication of the current §. The 99th section, on the meaning of prepositions, covers more than 23 pages without a single