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](#)

Riese's Edition of Ovid's Metamorphoses *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, ed. Alexander Riese. Vol. II. Metamorphoses. Tauchnitz. Lipsiae, 1889, 90 Pfg.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 10 / December 1889, pp 451 - 452

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196180, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196180

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 451-452 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196180

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

RIESE'S EDITION OF OVID'S METAMORPHOSES.

P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina, ed. ALEXANDER RIESE. Vol. II. *Metamorphoses*. Tauchnitz, Lipsiae, 1889. 90 Pfg.

THIS second edition of Riese's *Metamorphoses* follows the first at an interval of seventeen years. In the meanwhile, as might be anticipated in a period so active in the investigation of MSS. as the present, much has come to light which was then unknown or at least unpublished. In his former edition Riese had followed mainly two MSS. of the eleventh century, the Marcianus and Laurentianus 36, 12, both now under the same roof, the Laurentian library at Florence. Korn, in his edition of 1880, gave a more complete collation of these MSS., of which Riese has now availed himself to supplement or correct the apparatus criticus of his present volume. In addition, he has utilized three fragments published by Hellmuth: (1) a Tegernsee codex of saec. xii. (2) Munich 23612 of saec. xiii. (3) Leipzig I. 74 of saec. x. He lays little stress on any of them except the last, which unfortunately contains only iii. 131-252; yet in the unique character of some of its readings, e.g. *primi* 206, *fero* 213, *therodamas* 233, might seem to justify the belief that, if a complete duplicate of it could be found, some passages might be settled by it which at present rest on mere conjecture. Of Harl. 2610, published in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* for 1885, and containing i. ii. and iii. to 622, Riese forms an opinion partly favorable, partly not: his comparison of it with other MSS. will be found on p. xxx.

Riese's own contribution to the textual criticism of the *Metamorphoses* is to be found on pp. xxxi.-xlix. It is a collation of a MS. at Naples, iv. F. 3. This codex was wrongly assigned by Jannelli in his Catalogue of the MSS. in the Royal Library at Naples, published early in the present century, to saec. xiii.: it is really of saec. xi., as not only the Lombard character but the numerous pictures it contains sufficiently prove. Parts of it are in a different hand, vii. 4-488, viii. 340-402: and the Lombard writing ceases altogether at xiv. 851, the fifteenth book being added much later in a Gothic hand. In orthography it agrees closely with M (the Marcianus), e.g. *ammonet*, *ammiratur*; in the confusion of *b* and *v*, as *brevis*, *flevile*; in substituting *y* for *i*, as *nays*, *yrrus*, *yphis*, *sydera*, and even *dyrrus*:

NO. XXIX. VOL. III.

the accusative plural is generally -is not -es. It is markedly correct in the spelling of Greek names.

In the following passages Riese considers N to preserve the right reading alone (*unus solusque habet quae procul dubio vera sunt*): iv. 670 *Andromedan* N, *Andromedam* ML; iv. 778 *hominum simulacra ferarumque*, where ML have *ferarum*; vi. 506 *utque fide pignus* N and Priscian, *ut fidei* ML; vi. 629 *sed simul ex nimia mentem pietate labare* N, *eximia* ML, ac *nimia* Bentley; vii. 366 *uitantes omnia visu* N, *uitantes* ML; vii. 399 *iustissima* N, *iustissime* ML; vii. 569 *nec sitis est extincta prius* N, *extincta prius est* ML; xiv. 473 *neue morer referens tristes ex ordine casus* N, *referam* ML; xiv. 552 *quodque prius fuerat, latus est* N, *quodque sinus fuerat* M; xiv. 825 *ceu* N, ut Priscian twice, *sic* M (*in ras.*). In some of these passages N has preserved a reading which the divination of critics has recovered; and Riese believes that many others will find their way into the text of the *Metamorphoses* on the authority of this, now completely collated, codex.

I notice that in several places this new MS. agrees with Canonici vii. in the Bodleian, the importance of which I have pointed out in the *Journal of Philology* and in Mr. Charles Simmons's edition of books xiii. xiv. (Macmillan, 1887). Thus xiv. 155 *emersus* the first correction of N, and so Can.⁷; 288 *maneret* N, Can.⁷, *manerem* M; 641 *poterentur* Can.⁷ and N *m. pr.*, corrected into *potirentur* the reading of most MSS.; 705 *de multis alicui suadendo ministris* N, Can.⁷. In the following passage, where both N and Can.⁷ agree in reading *eritque* against *amoris* of M—

Certe aliquid laudare mei cogeris eritque
Quo tibi sim gratus meritumque fatebere
nostrum—

Riese retains *amoris* against all probability. One of two alternatives seems here inevitable: either, reading *amoris*, to expunge the following verse, or to adopt *eritque* which is found besides N and Can.⁷ in Can.¹ In such cases as this Ovid is surely his own best critic; and I confidently assert that such a combination as

aliquid laudare mei cogeris amoris
Quo tibi sim gratus

G G

is absolutely alien to the general style of the *Metamorphoses*.

It becomes exceedingly clear from an

examination of this codex how far from settled the text of Ovid's great work still remains.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

BISHOP WORDSWORTH'S EDITION OF THE VULGATE.

Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine. Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi ad codicum Manuscriptorum fidem recensuit JOHANNES WORDSWORTH, S.T.P., episcopus Sarisburiensis, in operis societatem adsumto HENRICO IULIANO WHITE, A.M. Societatis S. Andreae, Collegii Theologici Sarisburiensis Vice-Principali. Partis Prioris Fasciculus Primus Euangelium secundum Matthaeum. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCLXXXIX. 12s. 6d.

SCHOLARS will give a hearty welcome to this instalment of the important critical edition of the Hieronymian Version of the New Testament, undertaken by the Bishop of Salisbury eleven years ago. The series of Old Latin Biblical Texts noticed in these columns as they appeared have from time to time testified to the laborious and careful work that was being carried on, and raised our expectations of the promised edition. Needless to say that these expectations are not likely to be disappointed.

The present portion contains the Gospel of St. Matthew, with a short account of the plan of the work, the Prolegomena being naturally postponed.

Each page presents first the critically revised text, then the older version from the Codex Brixianus, selected as approximating most nearly to the text which Jerome may be supposed to have used, and, below, the conspectus of various readings.

The propriety of the selection of Codex Brixianus to represent Jerome's copy of the *Vetus Itala* may be illustrated by the fact that of the thirteen readings quoted by Professor Westcott in his article on the Vulgate (p. 1697a) to exemplify the difference between the older text and Jerome's, in no less than seven Brixianus agrees with the latter. On the other hand there are, as will be seen presently, a few cases in which the Vulgate agrees with the *Vetus* whilst the text as here revised departs from it.

Of course a complete collation of all codices would have been both impossible and

useless. Those have been selected which, as coming from different countries or different sources, embrace so wide an extent of space and time that we may expect to find the true reading in some or other of them. The editors have not sought to accumulate a multitude of witnesses for this or that reading, but rather to ascertain the readings supported by manuscripts which may be regarded as representative of schools or countries; for this I suppose they will have the assent of every one versed in criticism. The selected codices have been collated with the utmost care 'uel ad apices litterarum,' so that the philologist will find much to interest him in the diversities of spelling &c. recorded.

The codices constantly cited in this fasciculus number 28, but in addition to these there are several occasionally referred to, as well as many printed editions. The readings of MSS. of the older versions are also given. Of these MSS. there are in Matthew about 20, some fragmentary.

The causes of various readings in the Hieronymian Version are: first, in the Gospels the recollection of parallel passages, the scribes being above all unwilling to omit anything; secondly, the recollection of some one of the older versions, or of some rendering adopted by Jerome himself in his expositions; and thirdly, correction from Greek codices.

Some interesting examples of this last kind of correction are furnished by British-Irish codices. For example xiii. 35 'per prophetam,' the book called the Gospels of Mac-Regol adds 'esaia' with cod. Sin. and others. Jerome mentions the reading, but himself believed the true reading to be 'per asaph prophetam.' (This reading, I may remark, is ingeniously defended by Professor Rendel Harris in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. vi.). In xvi. 3. the same codex adds 'hyppochritae' but with many Old Latin codices. Again in xiv. 3, after 'fratres sui,' 'philippi' is added by several codd. with nearly all the Greek authorities. In xxvii. 55, after 'a longe,' the Book of Armagh and another MS. add 'vi-