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](#)

Notae Tironianae attributed to St. Cyprian

E. W. Watson

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 06 / July 1897, pp 306 - 306

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032431, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032431

How to cite this article:

E. W. Watson (1897). Notae Tironianae attributed to St. Cyprian. The Classical Review, 11, pp 306-306 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032431

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

meant is of course Sextus; but John proceeds: 'Latinas autem eum Fronto, nobilissimus orator, docuit, et pro quorundam opinione Plutarchi nepos.' And above, *Polier*. viii. 13, he says of Seneca: 'eum Fronto, secundum quosdam nepos Plutarchi, cujus meminit in primo Juvenalis.' John thus certainly distinguished Fronto from Sextus and made both (but the former doubtfully) the grandsons of Plutarch. What the origin of this report concerning Fronto may have been, I do not know. But it is worth observing that the passage which I have last quoted appears to contain a fragment of Fronto, for after quoting *Juv.* i. 12 John continues thus: 'semper eum (sc. Senecam), inquam, sic asserit (sc. Fronto) universos exterminare errores, ut aurea videatur saecula reformare, et deos ab humano genere exulantes, ejus opera revocatos, hominibus contractos societate miscere.' Mai (Fronto ed. 1846 p. xxxv.) says 'Fallitur Saresberiensis quod adinet ad Frontonis cognationem, nam Juvenalis de antiquiore Frontone loquitur. Reliqua

autem quo pacto dicere potuerit S. nisi Frontonem de Seneca scribentem legerit, eruditi dispicient.' Niebuhr supposes Juvenal's Fronto to be one Fronto Catus, mentioned by Pliny; we do not know that he was related to Plutarch; but we have some reason for thinking him to have been related to the tutor of Marcus Aurelius. See Mayor ad *Juv.* i. 12, and Buttmann's note given in Naber's ed. of Fronto p. 23. In what we have of the later Fronto, he speaks of Seneca only to attack him (ed. Naber pp. 155, 156, 224). See Mai's note, ed. 1846 p. 174.

Mai's references to John of Salisbury are deliberately passed over by Naber; but they deserve more attention than they received. The origin of John's statement, whatever it may be worth, remains unexplained. The curious passages in Appuleius (*Metam.* i. 12, ii. 3) where his hero's descent from Plutarch is mentioned, should not be forgotten in this connection.'

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

NOTAE TIRONIANAE ATTRIBUTED TO ST. CYPRIAN.

ALL the writers on this subject refer to an assertion of Trithemius, which is quoted in Hartel's preface to Cyprian p. lxxviii., to the effect that he had found a large collection of *notae* bearing the name of Cyprian. This collection has not been seen or heard of since. But in MS. 131 of New College, Oxford, at the end of a large collection of Cyprianic writings, genuine and spurious, there stands a short collection of *notae* headed *quaedam scripturarum notae apud celeberrimos auctores fuerunt quasque antiqui ad distinctionem scripturarum carminibus et historiis apposuerunt*. It occupies f. 119b—120b of the MS., which is of the 15th century and resembles, on the whole, Hartel's *B*. The contents are accurately enough described in the words of Trithemius, *primo characteres sive notae, postea dictiones per eosdem characteres designatae, ita quod dictio quaevis per notam sibi significatur praepositam*. The latest writer who mentions the matter, v. Dobschütz in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, column 136, casts

doubt on Cyprian's authorship, reasonably enough, and also on the honesty of Trithemius. But a sixteenth century scholar might well be misled by the position of this document at the end of the Cyprianic writings. It is true that the MS. does not assign it to Cyprian, but as much may be said of other writings attributed with more or less probability to him and printed to this day in the editions. So few of the MSS. of Cyprian's epistles have been examined, or at least so few have been described, that somewhere in Germany there may be found one containing the same *notae* in the same place. This would save Trithemius' reputation to some extent. He is not likely to have invented the connection between Cyprian and the *notae*; and yet his assertion would be, at the best, a monstrous exaggeration. I have no knowledge of the subject of *notae Tironianae*, and had no time to examine this collection. It might be worthy of the attention of some student.

E. W. WATSON.