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](#)

Persius MSS

G. R. Scott

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 06 / June 1890, pp 241 - 247

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190705, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190705

How to cite this article:

G. R. Scott (1890). Persius MSS. The Classical Review, 4, pp 241-247 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190705

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

JUNE 1890.

PERSIUS MSS.

Cod. Bodl. Auct. F. i. 15 (formerly no. 2455)
Jahn's β ; *Cod. Trin. Coll. Cantab. O. 4.*
10 (referred to below as ω).

By the kindness of the authorities of Trinity College, Cambridge, I have now been able to put these two MSS. side by side and compare them.

Mr. Madan and Mr. Macray have been good enough to look at them carefully with a view to fixing their date and nationality more certainly. They think

(1) That in the Cambridge MS. the original text is late tenth century, the small hand used in glosses, which Prof. Conington thought to be by the same hand as the text, dates from about 1000 A.D. or soon after, and the larger marginal scholia perhaps from late eleventh century.

(2) That the text of the Oxford MS. dates from a little after A.D. 1000, and its scholia (and most of the *vv. ll.* which I had thought to be by the same hand as the text) from say 1050.

(3) That both MSS. were entirely written

in England, but that the Oxford one is in the text much more under foreign influence than the Cambridge one.

As to the connexion between the two MSS. it is closer than I thought. I was very wrong in accepting Prof. Conington's edition as an adequate authority for the readings of ω . It fails to notice a great number,¹ and is sometimes positively wrong.

Those, then, who have this edition, and wish to have a full account of ω 's readings, should note the following addenda and errata. (I have not noticed all the mere trivial misspellings of ω , such as *Prol. 2. sompniasse* for *somniasse*. These are plentiful. Where I have noticed trivialities my reason is that Conington has noticed similar trivialities in other passages, and therefore invited the inference that when he is silent these slight differences do not exist.)

¹ *E.g.* in the two passages, I. 57, III. 78, where I noted in my February article an important difference between ω and β , there is none, but Conington had failed to note ω 's reading.

ADDENDA.

Con.'s text.
I. 7. quaesiveris
32. hyacinthia laena
34. Hypsipylas
57. extet
106. unguis
II. 41. Poscis
III. 73. nec

78. sapio sapis est
84. nihilo nihilum

NO. XXXIV. VOL. IV.

ω .
quessieris
iacinthina lenna
his pipylas
extat
unges
Poscit
neque

satis est sapia^o
nihilum nihil

	Con.'s text.	ω .
IV.	29. veterem	ueteris
	33. ac	at (fortasse ac prius)
V.	7. Helicone	ilicone
	17. dicis	dicas
	71. cantum	canthum
	98. hac [error typograph., credo]	hoc
	128. nec quicquam extrinsecus	nequicquam extrinsecus
	136. ex	et
	140. oenophorum	inophorum
	142. Luxuria	luxoria
	145. quod	quam
	146. tu	tun
	149. nummos [error typograph., credo]	nummi
	155. huncine	hunc cine
	183. thynni	tiinni
VI.	14. vicini	Vicino
	15. ditescant	Ditescant (ex -unt)
	17. lagoena	laoegenia
	24. tenuis sollers	tenues solleris
	28. inops	inobs
	37. incolumis	incolomis
	urguet	urget
	48. dis	Diis
	79 deciens	decies

ERRATA.

	ω ap. Con.	ω .
I.	44. fas est in margin.	uel fas est in margin.
	91. compositas	compossitas
IV.	7. callidae	callide
	8. (tur in ras.)	(tur linea erasum)
V.	111. fexum e fixum ut vid.	fexum
	120. litaberis	litaberis (is alia manu additum)
	123. satira	satiri
	156. dominus	dominus in -os conversum
VI.	56. Cliviumque uirbii	Cluiumque ad uirbii

I now proceed to give an account, which I believe to be complete, of the differences between β and ω .

With regard to trivialities. they differ :—

- (1) Varying between *e* and *ae*, 38 times.
- (2) Varying between single and double consonant, e.g. *s* and *ss*, *t* and *tt*, 35 times.
- (3) Varying between *es* and *is*, 3 times.
- (4) Varying as to presence of *h*, 8 times.
- (5) Varying between *g* and *gu*, 5 times.
- (6) Varying between *i* and *y*, 5 times.

(7) Varying as to presence of assimilation, e.g. *ff*)(*df*, 5 times.

Considering how erratic both MSS. are on these points, so small a list of differences argues very strongly, it seems to me, for a close connexion. On no one of the points is the difference consistently or nearly consistently in the same direction. ω seems a little fonder of *e*)(*ae* than β .

I add a collation which will show to those acquainted with ω 's readings the exact readings of β in all points except the seven mentioned above.

	ω	β
<i>ProL.</i>	6. semipaganus	[in marg.] uel semipaganus
	14. Pegasieum	semipagus
		Pegaseum
		uel ue
I.	6. ^{ue}	que
	7. quessieris	quesiueris
	34. his pipylas	ypsiphylas

	ω.	β.
I.	36. At sensere poeta ^e	Adsensere poetae
	41. indulgeas	indulges
	44. vel fas est (in marg.)	aliquid (glossa, credo,) quod legere nequeo, supra 'feci' scriptum et erasum
	adūso (so in ras.)	aduerso
	50. nabe't	habet uel quid
	56. qui	qui
	58. pinsit	pinxit §
	59. imitata est	uel ri imitata est
	63. sermo	sermo est §
	69. docemus	[uerbum superscript. et erasum] uidemus §
	71. ros saturam	rus saturum
	72. fumusa	fumosa uel cum
	74. quem dictatorem	quem dictaturam §
	77. uerrucosa	uerrucosa ex uerrucusa
	85. qui	quid †
	90. uer [s. eras.] 'um	uerum
	95. Si	Si'
	105. lab ^r [s. eras.] is	labris
	106. rapit ^s	sapit
	107. uero uel su	uero [litura 3 litt. sequitur] ^m
	112. inquit ^s	inquis
	114. meje'te (sic)	meite
	120. ipse	ipsi Σ
	125. et	ad [in lit. ?]
	131. insecto	secto [post lituram 2 fortasse litt.]
II.	6. prumptum	promptum ex prumptum
	10. ebullit	ebullat ex ebullit
	patris	patrus ex patris
	13. expungas	expunga Σ
	14. conditor	conditur
	17. [qi. eras.] est	est
	18. est	est ^{no}
	19. taio.	staio §
	22. taio	staio ex taio
	26. ergannaque	ergennaque §
	35. manibus ['in' eras. et in ras. 'quatit']	manibus quatit
	37. Nunc	Hunc
	40. rogabit	rogabit ,rit
	41. Poscit	Poscis [s, credo, in ras.]
	45. arcessis	accersis [ex accessis, credo]
	59. aere ^a	aera
	70. uirgine	, uirgine
	73. animo	animi ex animo
III.	3. Stertimus (r. in lit.)	Sertimus
	17. pappere	pappare [a in ras.]
	21. maligne ^u	maligne
	37. ingeniom	ingenium
	43. quid	quod [o in ras.]

	<i>ω.</i>		<i>β.</i>	
III.	52. deprehendere ^u		deprehendere	
	63. timebit		tumebit	
	68. datur ^o qua fluxus		datus ex datur quam flexus	‡
	77. centurionum ^o		centurionum	
	78. sapia ^o		sapio	
	80. lumine		lumine ^a	
	81. rapiosa		rabiosa ex rapiosa ^d	
	84. nihilum		nichilum	
	104. crassis		crassisque	‡
	109. pecunia		pe [t eras.] cunia	
	114. haud		haut	
	116. iram		ira [rasura sequente]	
IV.	2. Di cere		Dicere	
	8. loquere ex loqueretur		loquere	
	16. Anticiras [ex -rus]		anteciras	
	merecas		meracas	§
	25. nectidi		[ras.] uectidi [ras.]	
	26. oberrat ^e		oberret ^{uel a a} [re in ras.]	
	28. comp ^e ta		competa	
	35. hi penemque		in ex hi penem	
	36. buluas		uuluas	
	46. cume [e in rasura, quae longius extenditur]		cum me	
	59. nequiquam		nequiquam	
V.	2. optare		obtare	
	4. educentis		ducentis	§
	5. rubusti		robusti	
	7. ilicone		elicone	‡
	8. progn ^e s [prior pars n in ras. Prius s uel f]		progn ^e es	
	11. primis		premis	‡
	13. stoloppo		stoloppo ⁱ	
	15. teris		teres ⁱ	§
	17. dicas		al. dicis doceas	§
	18. plebeaque		plebeiaque ^{uel e}	
	23. tibi		tibi ^c	
	26. his		his ^c	
	33. umbro		umbo	‡
	36. seposui		subposui	§
	44. anerecundia		uerecunda	‡
	45. dubites		dubitas ['a' in ras.]	
	51. quid ^o		quid ^o	
	57. hi indulgent dequoquit		hic indulget decoquit	§
	66. fiat		fiet ['e' in ras.]	
	quid ^o		quid ^o	
	70. se		te	‡
	73. quique		quique ^s	
	74. Puplius		Publius	
	100. ell [ras.] rum ^{eno}		elleborum	
	111. fexum		fixum	‡

ω.	β.
V. 114. liberque ac	al. atque liberque ac uel tus
116. polita	polita al. repeto
118. relego	relego
120. litaberis ['is' alia manu additum]	litabis
121. uncia	untia
127. negator	nugator †
128. nequicquam xst	nequicquam xt
136. et	et [t notatum ut eraderetur]
140. inophorum	enophorum uel quod
145. quod extinxerat	quam extinxerit ex—at
147. Vejentanumque	uegentanumque
150. sudore	sudare ex sudore
153. meror	memor
156. dominos ex dominus	dominos
159. abruptit	i. abruptit arripit [in ras.]
162. cherestratos	cherestratus
163. arrodens haec	abrodens hoc ['o' in ras.]
167. diis	dijs
168. censent Daue	censem da [ras. 2 litt.] ue
172. nec	ne [tum ras. unius lit.]
174. exieris nunc nc	exieras [ex exieris, credo] ne—c nunc
quod	in ras. quem
177. uigilia	uigila
179. actum	at cum ex actum
180. [ras. 1 lit.] uenire	uenere
183. tinni	thymi [prius, credo, 'thȳni']
188. alli	allii
189. 'haec' omiss.	§
VI. 4. strepidum	strepitum
10. Enni	ennii
11. quintes et	Quintus ex [in ras. 'x' fortasse al. man.] uel an
13. agulus	aggulus
14. Vicino	Vicini §
15. Ditescant [ex 'unt']	Ditescant
17. laeogenia	lagoena †
23. scombros	al. rombos scombros
24. solleris	sollers
26. Emule	Emole
32. inopi	inopis ex inopi al. sed
37. incolomis et	incolumis et
44. cladem pubis	cladem ex claudem pubis ex pupis
46. clamidens	clamides
49. in luco	al. duco in luco
50. Si	uel nisi t ni [in ras.]
51. inquis	uel s inquit ['t' in ras.]
56. Cliuiumque	Cliuiumque
58. haud promte	haut prompte

VI.	59.	unum	ω .
	63.	uins	est etiam
	66.	tatius	
	75.	Vnde	
	77.	plausisse	
	79.	depunge	

Vum	est	β .	iam
uin			
staius	[in ras.]		
Vende			
al. pavisse			
plausisse			
depinge			§

Everywhere else β 's reading = ω 's.

An analysis of these variations shows that in 32 places only β 's reading shows no trace of ω 's reading and no erasure which may have destroyed ω 's reading. In 2 of these, marked Σ , β seems simply to have made a slip. In 14 more, marked $\ddagger$, it is possible (in most of them probable) that the scribe of β , who I think knew what he was writing about, used his sense to correct ω 's mistakes. But there remain 16, marked $\S$, of such a

nature as to make it certain that β 's scribe had a sight of a MS. other than ω .

On the other hand, apart from the general feeling of connexion produced by finding the total amount of variation so very small, there are 28 passages, which I proceed to note, where β 's scribe appears to have seen a reading untraceable [as far as Jahn's information goes] except in ω . In some of these the point is one of spelling, in others it is more important. I have put the more important last.

		$\omega\beta$	
I.	129.	sopinus	
II.	6.	prumptum	
II.	45.	furtunare	
V.	142.	luxoria	
III.	69.	optare	
III.	80.	opstipo	
V.	98.	puplica	
VI.	28.	inobs	
IV.	28.	competa	
IV.	35.	dispuat	
V.	167.	diis	
VI.	48.	diis	
VI.	56.	virbii	
V.	188.	capud	
VI.	73.	patritiae	
III.	75.	munimenta	
II.	22.	taio	
II.	57.	mittent	
III.	17.	pappere	
III.	43.	quid	
IV.	11.	discernis	
IV.	23.	discendere	
V.	73.	quique	
I.	131.	et insecto	
V.	179.	actum	
VI.	11.	et	
VI.	59.	est etiam	
VI.	13.	ω agulus β aggulus	

		Cet.	
supinus			
promptum			x
fortunare			
luxuria			
optare			
obstipo			
publica			
inops			
compita			
despuat			
dis			x
dis			
virbi			
caput			
patriciae			
monumenta			
staio			x
mittunt			
pappare			?
quod			?
discernis			x
descendere			x
quisque			x
et secto in			?
at cum			x
ex			?
est iam			?
angulus			

8 other passages where $\omega + \beta$ are almost unique in their reading are I think worth adding.

		$\omega\beta + 1$ MS.	
VI.	21.	patenae	
II.	10.	patris	
III.	81.	rapiosa	
V.	145.	extinxerat	
VI.	26.	metuas	

		Cet.	
patinae			
patruus			x
rabiosa			x
extinxerit			x
metuis			

$\omega\beta + 1$ MS.

VI. 49. in luco

III. 116. iram

 $\omega\beta + 2$ MSS.

III. 68. datur

In the passages marked $\times$, β no longer has ω 's reading, but it can be distinctly seen that it had it once and has been corrected away from it. In the passages marked $\dagger$, an erasure in β just at the point where ω 's erratic reading occurs makes me believe β had that reading originally.

It is perhaps worth adding that in VI. 50 ω 's scribe (who does not know Latin and divides words erratically, e.g. VI. 22 ut arego for utar ego, V. 189 varicos oscenturiones for varicosos centuriones) writes arto creasque instead of artocreasque, and here β agrees with him, the writer of β 's scholia afterwards noting 'vnum verbum est' above.

I would submit, (though with some diffidence, owing to want of experience in dealing with MSS.) that the whole evidence is sufficient to prove that β 's scribe did copy his MS. in the main either from ω or from an extraordinarily exact copy of ω ¹; but that he had another MS. at hand, which he now and then consulted when dissatisfied with the reading of his main authority. Hence, as we have seen, here and there β 's readings have an independent value of their own.

With regard to the scholia (which I have looked at a good deal, but not gone through with any completeness), there are some curious signs of connexion, as it would seem, between the two MSS. ω has hardly any scholia after the end of *Sat. I.* and much fewer than β has even on *Sat. I.* Yet it looks as if the writer of β 's scholia had sometimes looked at ω 's scholia when he was writing. I am speaking at present of ω 's smaller and earlier hand.

The passage which really seems convincing is I. 114, 5. Jahn, in his edition of the scholia, reads on l. 114 *secuit Lucilius urbem*, the following scholium 'Quid ergo? Quod aliis licuit, mihi non licebit?' and a great deal more. On *genuinum* in the following line, he reads 'Genuinus proprie dens, qui sub genis est.'

In ω the text and scholia appear thus:

Secuit lucilius urbem

licuit cebit

quam nis aliis licuit $\mu\eta\iota$
dens ē q. sub genis ē. q. una cum homine nascitur

¹ Or perhaps ω and β may be (so to speak) brothers; I was inclined to think this impossible, for where ω has been corrected β has almost invariably used the correction. But Mr. W. M. Lindsay suggests to me that this may be so explained: a reviser corrected ω where the scribe had departed from the archetype; β was itself copied from that archetype, and so does not reproduce ω 's errors. If so ω is a very exact but unintelligent, β an intelligent copy of the same MS.

Cet.

induco

ira

datus

Te lupe, te mucī et genuinum fregit in illis.

 β has

dens ē q. sub genis ē. q. una cum hinc nascit quamvis aliis licuit m
n licuit cebit

Te lupe te mucī et genuinum fregit in illis

Both then have corrupted the first scholium in *exactly* the same way. And it seems an almost irresistible inference that β 's mistake in regarding the two scholia as one is due to the relative positions they hold on ω 's page.

Much less important, but confirmatory, is I. 120, where for 'O libelle, uidi homines stultos' ω reads uide, evidently a mistake, and β has uide corrected into uidi.

On I. 121, where Jahn reads 'si mihi Iliada Labeonis, aut Neronis Troicon tradas,' ω β both omit 'Troicon,' but here the omission does not destroy the sense.

There is one passage in which, but for the testimony of the experts on the comparative age of the hands, I should have said β 's scholium was a misinterpretation of one of ω 's larger-hand scholia. On I. 11 *tunc, tunc, ignoscite, nolo*, Jahn reads 'ἐκλειψις, sc. dicere.'

ω reads 'Tunc tunc defectio. Τοεξικ. dicere,' which appears to mean 'tunc tunc; then comes an ellipse: what should follow' ('viz.: τὸ ἐξῆς) is dicere.'

β reads Τοεξικ. i. defectio: which appears to turn sense into nonsense. In this case I suppose the two writers have copied from a common archetype.¹

People interested in the scholia on Persius may like to know that on I. 12 ω 's large hand reads 'cachinnus est cum voce risus immoderatus quod ΜΟΡΑ-ΓΕΛΩΝΤΔC dicunt,' thus confirming the reading which Jahn in 1843 quotes as attributed on authority that he does not trust (vid. pp. clxii. clxiii.) to the codex Bon. Vulcanii, but which Bücheler has merely adopted in the 1886 edition, and which certainly makes sense whereas Jahn's *μονογέρον-τας* is nonsense.

It seems noteworthy palaeographically that in two places I. 114 mejete, V. 147 Vejentanum, ω shapes an i very like a small modern printed j. In each place the i is between two vowels; in each it gets in some MSS. corrupted into g.

¹ It is possible that this Τοεξικ was originally a corruption of ἐκλειψις or ἐλλειψις.

G. R. SCOTT.