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](#)

Onions' Nonius Marcellus [*Nonius Marcellus de Conpendiosa Doctrina* i.—iii., edited with Introduction and Critical Apparatus by the late J. H. Onions, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. Oxford (Clar. Press), 1895. (10/6). (Pp. xxvi. and 298.)]

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 07 / October 1895, pp 356 - 358

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202369, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202369

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 356-358 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202369

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ONIONS' NONIUS MARCELLUS.

[*Nonius Marcellus de Conpendiosa Doctrina* i.—iii., edited with Introduction and Critical Apparatus by the late J. H. Onions, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. Oxford (Clar. Press), 1895. (10/6). (Pp. xxvi. and 298.)]

THIS book, long looked for, has come at last. Since his collation of the Harleian Nonius in 1882, Mr. Onions was known to be engaged on a great edition, based on a personal collation of all the older MSS., of the *Compendiosa Doctrina*, that fourth century treatise on early Latin words and constructions in which is preserved for us almost all that we possess of the lost works of early Latin literature, dramatic, epic, satirical and historical. The large German edition of Prof. Lucian Mueller (2 vols., Leipzig, 1888), which appeared meanwhile, did not satisfy him. In two articles in the *Classical Review* (1888 and 1889) he criticized it severely on two grounds, excessive love of conjectural emendation, and insufficient MS. material. Prof. Mueller's collations, he showed, were made by other hands and were of varying value, that of L by Prof. Zangemeister being extremely good, those of V and A 'far from trustworthy,' while of the older MSS. FP and all but one of the extract-MSS. (ACXDMO) had not been collated. The importance of the omission in the case of F he demonstrated by showing that this codex contains corrections (F³) throughout books i.—iii. taken from a lost 'codex optimus' and therefore of the utmost value. Only one MS., the Escorial, remained to be collated by Mr. Onions at his untimely death in 1889. It was collated by me in the following spring; and now, after a regrettable delay of six years, that portion of the *Compendiosa Doctrina* which he left ready for the press is given to the world. It comprises books i.—iii., about one third of the whole work. For the rest, books iv.—xx., a full critical apparatus had been prepared, but the text had been written out for a part of book iv. only.

The mere fact that this edition is the first to avail itself of the readings of a lost 'codex optimus' is sufficient to make it indispensable to all students of Nonius (and all who study the earlier Latin literature or grammar must be students of Nonius), but, apart from that, it will be found on every page that Mr. Onions' characteristically English adherence to the MSS. and sobriety

of judgment has provided us with a text which can be accepted with confidence. The passages marked with an obelus as hopelessly corrupt are very few, and might possibly with safety be made still fewer;¹ and the careful examination in the introduction into the value of the several MSS. and their relationship to each other concludes with a statement of the rules to be followed in constructing the text, which shows the reader that he has firm ground under his feet.

On pp. xvii.—xix. of the introduction it is proved beyond, I think, possibility of doubt that the Harleian codex H (H¹, not H²) is a copy of the Laurentian F; further, that the Escorial codex from book ii. p. 130 M. to the end of book iii. is another copy of the Laurentian. We must, I think, add that the Laurentian itself (F¹ F², not F³) is nothing but a copy of the Leyden codex L. The following evidence seems of itself sufficient to establish this:—

In 230 M. 30 L has, with the other MSS., *cycno*, but the word is so written as to look very like *crono*. F has *orono*.

In 231. 22 L has *fupidius* (for *Fufidius*), but so written as to be indistinguishable from *stipidius*. F has *stipidius*.

In 66. 14 L has *leucotea* corrected by superscription of a somewhat large *h* to *leucothea*, and above this in Greek uncial letters ΑΕΥΚΟΘΕΑ, the superscribed *h* coming immediately under and between the O and Θ. F² has ΑΕΥΚΟΗΘΕΑ (in *rasura*), mistaking the *h* for Greek Eta, and referring it to the word above instead of to the word below.

In 67. 23 L has *prolaterios* with transposition-marks (like acute accents) above *a* and *e*, thus correcting the word to *proletarios*. F (i.e. F¹, for F³ corrects the mistake) has understood the marks to apply (as they usually do) to the syllables, not to the single letters, and gives *protelarios*.

A careful examination of L, which has been by the kindness of Dr. du Rieu, the Leyden librarian, sent for a time to the Bodleian Library, has convinced me that

¹ E.g. 39 M. 26 omit *me*; 79. 1 transpose *nequid* and *inprimis*; 88. 27 and 31 (stent); 92. 7 change *ultra* to *citra*; 95. 6 read *indapolis cena*; 96. 14 read *parabis tantum*; 106. 24 read with Gellius *sensibus*; 171. 15 change *puluere milico* to *pōlabro mystico* (*pō-lubrum* from *pō*, Gk. *ἄρο*, of *pō-situs*, *pō-lō*, etc. and *lavo*).

this view is correct. What seems to conflict with it is that F¹ in, I think, two¹ instances, and F² in four, add words which are not found in L, viz. :—

41. 7 *quam congegum* (sic) F¹ (in a passage of Cicero *de Off.*).

105. 17 *in suos* F¹ (from Cicero *Cato*).

125. 26 *odere* F² (in a line of Virgil).

169. 25 *ille* F² (in a line of Virgil).

185. 13 *ab natura* F² (from Sallust *Jug.*).

188. 2 *ac saluatim* F² (in a passage which is quoted shortly before by Nonius, p. 168 M. 10).

These instances, which probably deterred Mr. Onions from accepting the dependance of F on L, do not seem to me strong enough to stand against the great mass of proof on the other side. (See, for example, the passages quoted on p. xvi. of the introduction.) They may be used as arguments that another copy of Nonius besides L was used for occasional reference by the scribe of F, but I find no other evidence of this² and prefer to give the scribes the credit of supplying these omissions in L out of their own knowledge of Cicero and Virgil.

Our original authorities for the text are thus reduced to (1) L, (2) H²V, and for books i.—ii. med. PE, (3) the extract-MSS., (4) F³. Mr. Onions, like Prof. Mueller, regards L (especially the first hand, L¹) as our chief guide for orthography, and so prints the unassimilated form of the preposition in compounds, e.g. *inmitto*, *adpeto*, etc. He does not however go with Prof. Mueller the length of printing spellings of L like *aput*, *set*, etc. I found in his notes some indications of a partial admission of these spellings but not enough to justify me in altering the form of the text as he left it. For my own part it seems to me that *aput*, *set* and the like were the spellings in the Archetype (cf. *Class. Rev.* ii. p. 316). In the title Mr. Onions writes *De Compendiosa Doctrina* (cf. *Class. Rev.* iii. 300), not *Compendiosa Doctrina*, and *Tubursicensis* (the MSS. have *Tuburci*- and *Tuburgi*-³). For the text he gives

¹ I need not add the line from Virgil, 229. 29, *vis patet in praeceps tantum*, to which F¹ adds *t*, the initial of the next word in Virgil's line *tendit*, and F² *q.s.a.* (*que sub auris* (!)). All the MSS. end at *tantum*. F² has a similar addition to another line of Virgil, 182. 28, *rumpere et obductum uerbis uulgare*, where F² adds *d*, the initial of *dolorem*. A glance at Mr. Onions' critical apparatus for this line will show that the Archetype omitted *dolorem*.

² Of course one can be more certain about F¹ than F².

³ It seemed to me, when I saw the Paris MS. P, that there was little possibility of -RC- having been the spelling of PL. The fact that E, a MS. so

least weight to the extract-MSS., though he shows that for the first ten pages (to 11 M. 3 *conficeret*) three of these (ACX) come from a lost MS. of great correctness, and most weight to F³, of which he says 'This source is by far the best; and its corrections are almost invariably to be adopted.' With this estimate few will disagree.

The history of the MSS. I take to have been something like this. At the Revival of Letters under Charlemagne, Nonius Marcellus was recommended to monastery libraries as a useful dictionary of Early Latin, and a copy of a MS. of the whole of his works was sent from monastery to monastery that other copies might be taken of it. This MS. was possibly from England (witness the frequent confusion of *n* and *r*) and had lost a leaf containing book xvi. Another leaf (with book iv. pp. 406 M. 13—409 M. 14) was loose, and after the MS. had been for conveniences of copying divided into three parts, the first volume containing bks. i.—iii., the second bk. iv., the third bks. v.—xx., this leaf which had fallen out was placed for safety after the first leaf of vol. i. instead of vol. ii., so that all our MSS.⁴ have between p. 3 M. 13 and 14 this passage of book iv. From these data, that the first leaf of the Archetype contained p. 1 M. 1—p. 3 M. 13 and another leaf pp. 406 M. 13—409 M. 14, also that single lines, whose contents we know, are on two occasions omitted (17 M. 5 and 133 M. 28), we may estimate that the Archetype had some forty letters to the line, and in the page two columns of twenty-five lines each. The most faithful representative of the Archetype which we possess is the Leyden codex, L, a 9th cent. specimen of the calligraphy of Alcuin's school at Tours. The group PVE and the corrections H² come from a copy into which a large number of corrections had been entered, and these not taken from another MS. but the arbitrary emendations of some learned abbot, often right but more often wrong, and whose margins had been filled with glosses or rather indices to the lemmas.⁵ P and E come from a copy of this emended text, into which the scribe had entered the corrections only as far as the middle of book ii. The scribe of P stayed his hand when he reached the end of closely connected in the first two books with P, has -RG- is strong proof that this was the original spelling of P.

⁴ But not the original of F³, as Mr. Onions shows. This may have been the Archetype itself.

⁵ These are used by Glossary-compilers of the time (L. Mueller ii. pp. 270 *sqq.*).

this corrected portion ; and his fragmentary copy has since been curtailed by the loss of the last leaf. The scribe of E looked about for another corrected MS. (an uncorrected MS. of Nonius was thought little of) and in a happy moment secured F, which had been previously used as an exemplar by the scribe of the Harleian codex. Some other learned abbot compiled an abridged edition of Nonius, to make the book more suitable for a dictionary, omitting Books iii. and ix. which are concerned with the genders and cases, not the meanings, of words. He

began by mistake with the second volume of the Archetype and did not retrieve his error till he had finished his abridgment of book iv., which accordingly comes first in DMO. The scribe of the original of ACX began by writing out the text of Nonius in full, but after copying pp. 1—10 M. took up the abridged version, and copied from it the rest of book i. and the whole of book ii.; then returned to his first exemplar for books v.—xx.

W. M. LINDSAY.

SUDHAUS' EDITION OF PHILODEMUS.

Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica edidit DR. SIEGFRIED SUDHAUS, pp. lii + 385. Leipzig (Teubner) 1892. Vol. i, 4 marks.

PHILODEMUS of Gadara, the Epicurean philosopher and epigrammatist, whom Cicero attacks as a friend of Piso in his Speech *in Pisonem* (§§ 68, 70), and praises in the *de Finibus* (ii 119), is the author of more than twenty treatises discovered at Herculaneum in 1752. The house in which they were found is usually called *la villa di Pisone*, partly because 'its site agrees with Cicero's statement that the residence of the Pisos was visible from his own villa at Puteoli,'¹ partly because most of the MSS were written by members of the Epicurean school, of which Piso was an adherent. The difficulty of unrolling and deciphering all these charred *papyri* was enormous, and it was not until 1793 that the first volume of *Herculaneusia* was published. It contained the treatise of Philodemus *περὶ μουσικῆς*. This treatise has since been edited by Kemke (1884), while the philosophical works of Philodemus, *περὶ εὐσεβείας*, *περὶ ὀργῆς*, *περὶ θανάτου*, *περὶ σημείων* have been edited by Gomperz and others (1864—1886). The fragments of a treatise *περὶ ποιημάτων* have been since discussed and elucidated by Gomperz in an important paper published by the Vienna Academy in 1891.² The rhetorical works are now being edited in the Teubner series by Dr. Siegfried Sudhaus of Bonn, and the first volume is now before

us. The editor apologizes for the boldness of some of his conjectures by the sensible plea : *est aliquid audendum ; liber legi posse debet*. He acknowledges the help he has received from scholars like Buecheler, Usener and Gomperz, and puts forth his first volume in the hope that many other scholars may contribute towards the restoration of the text.

Since the date of its publication, something has been done in this direction by J. von Arnim in a Rostock program, and more by the editor himself, who has examined the *papyri* at Naples, and printed some of his results in the first part of the 53rd volume of *Philologus* (1894). All that I can offer here is a few remarks suggested by spending a single day in the cursory perusal of the Teubner text.

P. 20, col. i—ii, as restored in *Philologus*, runs as follows : τέλος ἐστὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς οὐ τὸ λόγῳ πείθειν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἀτεχνὸς πείθει μὲν, οὐ πείθει δὲ ῥητορικῶς ἀλλὰ διαλεκτικῶς ἢ κατασκευαστικῶς, ὡς καὶ Φρύνη κτλ. My object in citing this is simply to point out that, in the schools of rhetoric, Phryne must have been a stock example of persuasion effected by non-rhetorical means. She doubtless owed this distinction to the well-known story of the manner in which she was defended by Hyperides. She also appears in a similar context in Quintilian, ii 15 §§ 6, 9 :—*verum et pecunia persuadet et gratia...postremo aspectus etiam ipse sine voce, quo...formae pulchritudo sententiam dicat ; ...et Phrynem non Hyperidis actione quanquam admirabili sed conspectu corporis...putant periculo liberatam. quae si omnia persuadent, non est hic, de quo locuti sumus, idoneus finis. ideoque diligentiores sunt visi*

¹ Hayter's *Report on the Herculaneum MSS*, quoted on p. xlii of *Introd. to Cicero, de Natura Deorum*, ed. J. B. Mayor.

² *Philodem u. die ästhetischen Schriften der Herculaneischen Bibliothek*.