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](#)

The Ambrosian MS. of Prudentius

E. O. Winstedt

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 01 / February 1905, pp 54 - 57

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991273, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991273

How to cite this article:

E. O. Winstedt (1905). The Ambrosian MS. of Prudentius. The Classical Review, 19, pp 54-57 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991273

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

M. 401 *sqq.*, Pha. 568 *sqq.*, Th. 476, *sqq.*¹ The use of *non* with the optative (1589) is also Senecan; see H.F. 936; Pha. 946; O. 258, Th. 48, 185. The only difficulty presented by the passage is the transitive use of *quiescere* (in the sense of *tacere*) in l. 1586. I know nothing like it in the other plays, and must admit the possibility of editorial interference here.

(5) 1619–1641 and (6) 1693–1707^a. I put these together because all the rest of the description of the scene at the funeral is full of our editor's characteristic faults: e.g. we read at l. 1644 *quis illum credat ad flammam rapi?* The meaning is of course that his face was so joyful that none could imagine him at death's door, but the simile of a moaning lion which immediately precedes is a very bad introduction to the thought. And again in ll. 1679–1681 occur four clauses, three of which come almost verbally from the other plays.

(7) 1863–1898 (at least).² A passage similar to (1) and (4) above, and like them choral. Here, however, Seneca precedes the editor: see 1867 *ipsa quiddam plus luce perit*, 1880 the allusive *funus plangite uerum* (addressed to Cretans), 1884 *nondum Phoebe nascente genus* (of Arcadia), 1897 *non stabulis nascitur infans* (as it did in the time of Thracian Diomedes). The only objection taken to the passage is the fact that in l. 1883, an anapaest follows a dactyl: the same however occurs, as Leo observes, in H.F. 1064. In case some may object to *caerula Crete* of l. 1874 I quote from a recent article in the *Archiv*³ dealing with

¹ The only passage where no novelty is introduced is Pho. 84 *sqq.*, which however is very brief.

² I think ll. 1849 *sqq.* quite Senecan. Leo himself (p. 66) notes, in answer to Richter's criticisms (p. 25), that *aliqua* is 'ualde ex Senecae more' (Melzer well compares Pho. 249): so is *grex* in 1850 (cp. H.F. 507, 1149, Tr. 32, 959, A. 701), and 1852 *sqq. matribus miseris adhuc | exemplar ingens dera*l seems to me to have a thoroughly Senecan ring.

³ 1905. 1. p. 81.

this adjective: 'So dürfen wie uns also gar nicht wundern wenn selbst die Insel Creta als *dominatrix uasti freti* (Pha. 85) Sen. H.O. 1874 das Attribut *caerula* bekommt.' *Caeruleis equis* of H.F. 132 is much harder. The other half of the chorus is not Seneca's: observe the ineptness of *mundi turba citati* in l. 1903 (in A. 827 the epithet *concitatus* is applied with full force), *mundum . . . caelumque tulit* of 1906, the phrase *uector Olympi* (= Atlas) of 1907, the absurd anaphora of *nempe*⁴ in 1911–2. The exact line of demarcation between the two sections is doubtful: it must be either at 1898 or 1900.

Here then we say farewell to Seneca. It seems, at least, to me impossible to ascribe any of what follows to his pen. There is not, it is true, much 'reminiscence' here,⁵ but matter and style are intolerably weak. The question as to when the editor did his work I do not feel qualified to attack. Some indeed may think that too much time and space have already been devoted to the question of the genuineness of a Senecan play. The present age, with a literature that shares several weaknesses with silver Latin, has little sympathy with the writers of that style. Ovid, to whom Spenser owes much, is nowadays labelled a mere trifler; Valerius, a real poet, is classed with, even below, the pointed but wearisome Lucan. When we come to Senecan plays, the tendency to say that nothing is too bad to stand there seems almost irresistible to a certain class of critics. It is therefore desirable that those who are interested in the literary work of the first century after Christ should satisfy themselves that the inferior metal which they affect is at any rate pure.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

⁴ Which he never uses elsewhere in chorus.

⁵ This feature is, in fact, much less noticeable in the latter half of the play.

THE AMBROSIAN MS. OF PRUDENTIUS.

To have a decided prejudice in favour of a manuscript solely on the score of antiquity has long been proved a false principle; but to entertain a prejudice against a manuscript on that score and no other, is a peculiarity that I think one may fairly say is reserved to editors of Prudentius. I

have several times treated in this journal of their neglect of the old Paris MS.; and now I would speak for its brother, at Milan. In the Ambrosian library is a MS. of Prudentius (D. 36. Sup.) in an uncial hand of the seventh or eighth century coming from Bobbio.

With the solitary exception of Heinsius none of the editors has condescended to look at the MS.: even the careful Dressel, who raked over Italy for almost every fifteenth or sixteenth century fragment, is content to reproduce Heinsius' few and often incorrect statements about it. His description of it for instance is quite misleading: 'codex Ambrosianus antiquissimus *Cath. et Perist.* aliquot tantum hymnos praebebat' he says. One imagines a miserable ill used and illegible fragment;

OLD HAND.

- ff. 1-8 *Cath.* vii. 149-ix. 93.
 ff. 22-29 *Cath.* xii. 113 to the end. *Per.* x. 1-205.
 ff. 35-74 *Per.* x. 454-1140, i., ii., iii. 1-112.
 ff. 80-135 *Per.* v. 343-575, iv., xiv., vi., vii., ix., *Ap.* i. up to 847.
 ff. 147-178 *Ham.* 806-967: *Psych.* to 667.
 ff. 183-206 *Psych.* 843-915; *Symm.* i. to 336, 561-657, ii. to 84.

In the present number of the *Journal of Philology* I have endeavoured to prove that the later MSS. of Prudentius fall into two main groups, a French and English group and a German group, of which the German group is distinguished by the transposition of the *Peristephanon* from its correct position and placed at the end of the volume of poems immediately after the *Cathemerinon*; and by severing the last two hymns of the *Cathemerinon* from the rest of the book and placing them after the *Peristephanon*. The first of these changes undoubtedly occurs in *Ambr.*, but by a kind of mistake, for at the end of *Cath.* xii is written 'Finit Cathemerinon. Incipit Apotheosis,' though what immediately follows is *Per.* x and the rest of the *Peristephanon*. Now this placing of the hymn to Romanus before the rest of the *Peristephanon* is one of the special characteristics of the other, the French and English class; and it is with the French class that the order—or rather disorder—of the rest of the *Peristephanon* agrees. There is one unfortunate exception to that statement and with it is bound up the question whether the last two hymns of the *Cath.* were separated from their fellows or not. *Per.* xi, xii, xiii cannot have stood where they do in the French MSS., after *Per.* ix, because in *Ambr.* that hymn is followed by the *Apotheosis*; but it seems such an unjustifiable proceeding to insert them, and them alone, between *Cath.* x and xi that I surmise that origin-

ally that gap was filled merely by the missing parts of the *Cath.*, and those three hymns of the *Per.* were either omitted or occurred in the other gap between *Per.* iii and v.

LATER HAND.

- ff. 9-21 *Cath.* ix. 94- end of x. *Per.* xi., xiii., xii. The verses of Constantina and Damasus on Agnes. *Cath.* xi., xii. 112.
 ff. 30-34 *Perist.* x. 206-453.
 ff. 75-79 *Per.* iii. 113-215, v. 1-342.
 ff. 135-142 *Ap.* 848-1084, *Ham.* to 135, 581-805.
 ff. 179-182 *Psych.* 668-892.
 ff. 207-314 *Symm.* ii. 85-520.

ally that gap was filled merely by the missing parts of the *Cath.*, and those three hymns of the *Per.* were either omitted or occurred in the other gap between *Per.* iii and v.

However that may have been, *Ambr.* is in order an interesting connecting link between the two different classes; but in its readings it belongs distinctly to the better class (e.g. *Ps.* 177 uirtus et; 414 foedatur; the omission of the verses inserted in the German MSS. after *Ham.* 858; the reading 'caede stupenda' *Cath.* ix. 85). Indeed, though in view of such instances as *Cath.* ix. 58-60 and *Ps.* *Praef.* 63 it may be impossible to rely exclusively on *Put.* and *Ambr.*, still for such part of the poems as they contain they should form the base of any future edition.

I may perhaps notice here one form of corruption which is especially frequent in the MS.: the omission or addition of *m* or *n*, possibly due to the use of the stroke to represent those letters (e.g. *Ap.* 308 face-rent, 314 patrem, 400 audiant, 433 plagam, 462 reuicta, 529 matrems, 623 separant, 774 pleue): the confusion of *b* and *u* as in the last example is also common.

In the collation which follows I omit variations of spelling, and other unimportant variants, and also the readings given in Dressel's apparatus except when they are mistakes. In that case I have given the correct reading adding a star. For convenience sake I have separated the

readings of the old hand from those of the later hand which has filled up the missing parts; and where the variants are also found in the Paris MS. I have placed 'Put' in brackets after them.

Cath. vii. 151 pullati (*Put.* and practically all *MSS.*). 169 hauriat (*Put.*). 165 derogat (*al. m. suprascr. l'ne*). *205 pectoris is a correction by a later hand from 'corporis.' The 'u' of *rubiginem* is altered to 'o' and the 'in' appears to be over an erasure, but, I think, by the first hand. viii. 31 cernat (*corr. al. m.*). 57 esequentum (*corr. in 'obs'.*). (*64 in-ruans.) (*71 cibumue.) 72 temptas. ix. 5 corda

(*corr. in -e al. m.*). 10 *corefusu. 18 *quam. profundo (*corr. in -a al. m.*). 27 praemissus (*ae corr. in o*). 58-60 *The order is* 60, 59, 58 (*Put.*). 'et' is altered to 'fit' by a later hand. 59 referta (*Put.*). 60 ferte qualis ter quaternis (*Put.*). 72 dissolubilis (*Put.*). 74 reulso (?) (*corr. in recluso*). 90 sibila (*Put.*). xii. 133 quo (*Put.*). 184 pinxerint (*Put.*). 195 durum (*corr. in di*).

Ap. 1st Praef. 12 in om. *2nd Praef.* 30 concitarum. 47 fertiles (*Put.*). 53 dent. 55 messe. *Ap.* 26 uera. 27 ni (*Put.*). 90 ratio uia (*Put.*). 97 quem. 117 munere. 137 subtrahite accensi frigescit. 160 om. (*Put.*). 181 existet. 186 et quis. 201 quod somniat. 202 exit.

209 numen (*mut. in no- al. m.*). 226 summumediae. 230 fit. 232 sursum (*Put.*). 248 and 249 are transposed, and 248 reads 'siue supernatus fuerit sibi ipse repente' (*Put.*). 254 om. ut (*Put.*). quo. 260 sensus (*Put.*). 265 qui (*Put.*). 269 generauerit unus. 284 fit nobis. 295 percurrere scrinia. 308 facerent. 310 condimus. 322 possint (*Put.*). 329 caecapdefert. 337 lege. 360 procellis (*Put.*). 395 fragrans. 398 multae. 400 audiant. 408 auctor. 419 quid sis. 425 roseos et qui (*Put.*). 436 deus deus (*Put.*). 439 regit (*Put.*). 454 orbi (*Put.*). 464 reserarat (*Put.*). 472 perferre. 484 frustra.

487 om. (*add. al. m.*). 523 arte (*Put.*). 530 materne ex. 573 et om. 577 fore nuntiat (*Put.*). 673 que (quae *Put.*). 676 reddit. 700 stupefacta—auctorem om. 702 purgamen (*Put.*). 722 qui om. 729 paruo de. 774 pleue. resoluef. 791 ipsa (*Put.*). 793 uerus uerus deus ille (*Put.*). 794 esse. 797 diest. 834 distans (?).

Ham. 818 nequiquam (*Put.*). 868 quod. 908 densa (*densetur Put.*). 916 tristes et (*Put.*). 936 ueniam. 947 minaci (*al. m. ex -ci?*). *Ps. Praef.* 1 om. *add. al. m.* 60 parente natus alto et ineffabili (*Put.*). 68 impleuit. *Ps.* 36 exultant. 56 famulas-

que. 67 figurant. 104 contempta. 111 erigidis.

137 ex. 165 sequurus. 177 et (*nam supra al. m.*). 216 o (*Put.*). 220 nobis. 263 morsa. 269 at. 272 ac sub is written over an erasure and 273 added in the margin by another hand. 275 perspicit. 290 et om.

293 funali. 298 possent. 324 neruon (neruum *Put.*).

338 quem (*corr. al. m.*). 407 effata. 413 nequiquam (*Put.*). 429 dulcibus (*corr. in lux- al. m.*). 449 flam-
m lv
deobom. 492 peculator (*Put.*). s. *add. al. m.* 498 sacerdotelumni (*corr. al. m.*). 500 olamca flatu (*classica supr. al. m.*). 510 ingemuit. 515 formauit (*corr. in durauit al. m.*). 553 neste (*Put.*). 570 incertus. 578 se om. 591 ligant (*ba supra al. m.*). 615 nec. 623 addubitas (*corr. in. at- al. m.*). 630

scaelus embaestae (*corr. al. m.*). 635 gradum (*corr. al. m.*). 642 arce (*mut. in arcem al. m.*). 649 est (*corr. al. m.*). 894 ac. 906 om. *add. al. m.* 910 omnes (*Put.*).

Symm. i. Praef. 9 pertulerat. 17 focos trudent. 37 discutit. 74 spes. 79 subsistit. 23 quia. 43 qui.

47 ut exul. 61 criminiamota. 62 at. blandosque

mirros (*corr. al. m.*). 66 firmarant. 74 aptus. 117 tactataeferuit. 151 parumque. 165 ianctant (*abie- al. m. supra*). 168 isidicum (*subcumbit al. m. supra*). 169 ne terrester est ne deam. 179 obiceret (*audire supra al. m.*). 190 quod in urbe. 196 seruauit terror. 205 habitu. 209 inpressit. 223 fiant is written over senatu by another hand. probantur. 230 uiro. 233 dus. 256 et geniale parantur. 266 creata. 282 regione iacentes. 289 triumphis. 318 breuiorem. 561 graecos. 584 genitoris olso. 585 magnis lateram adcurrit. 610 quam uocant. 614 om. *add. al. m.* 638 si...temptet (*cum...temptat supra al. m.*). 649 partam (*altered by a later hand to patriam*).

Symm. ii. Praef. 48 fidentem merito. 51 planus. 9 eductos...calentes. 13 sacratum. 14 ecquis. 35 cuique dextra est. 40 nomen. 47 uoluit (*malum al. m. supra*). 48 conualuit...trina (*docta al. m. supra*). 69 ueterem. 73 suus (*corr. al. m.*). 84 ecquis.

Per. i. 3 scriptura. 22 dura (*Put.*). 25 decorum est hoc (*Put. 2*). 27 morte. 69 nobis (*corr. al. m.*). 76 nec. 97 domantur. 98 ritu. 119 perstrepat.

After 120 an uncial hand supplies in the margin a verse 'quo beatae trinitatis concinatur gloria.' ii. 4 triumphas (*Put.*). 44 dispensas. 86 praestrigiis. 106 qua (*Put.*). 134 spem (*Put.*). 160 primus (*al. m. ex promus*). 193 turbidis (*Put.*). 213 effectus. 222 luces. 250 sitique. 285 nihil. 287 ut. 328 retudit (*Put.*). 333 sed iam. 437 confoederantur (*Put.*). 439 mansuescit (*Put.*). (*463 *Ambr. does not read creditus as Dressel says.*) 483 et stabunt. 487 euolens. 514 orare in puluinar numae. 521 doma. 545 quia. 579 martyras (*Put.*). iii. 12 tres. 21 flere (*Put.*) changed to flore. iv. 17 promit. 25 inligataest (*changed to -tae est*). 88 numero. 103 uinctus. 134 negarit (*Put.*). 146 *heperco (*changed from lup- by a later hand*). 151 iuliam (*Put.*). 153 pangat (*Put.*) changed to -dat. 157 *euoti. 167 uitiosa (*Put.*). v. 390 nec. 392 figat. 394 ad. 464 aspectum. 484 interterit. 520 *subter. 574 sit. vi. 8 superbum. 24 ne. 46 patrem osatum (*corr. al. m.*). 55 resignarat. 78 nec. 79 resoluat. 126 *quos foro. vii. 20 uuida. 42 mitiferis. 78 hebet. 82 quid.

x. 22 luculente (*r. al. m.*). 54 pauentum. 59 est (*om. add. al. m.*). 116 *tundatur (*changed to tend- by a later hand*). 144 ingentia (*uel insignia supra al. m.*). 178 deas deosque. 180 et. 196 cybaebis. 204 uictus. 480 ruit (*corr. in -at*). 483 saenitia. 495 artis. 508 fetit. 578 resistet. 597 minore. 688 spectem. 692 quantulus. 713 impiorum. 725 cedere. 768 parata nobis gloriae. 784 grata (*changed to data*). 789 munere est. 840 ego. *879 uelut. 881 laterna. (*896 quidam not quondam as *Dressel says*.) 912 praefectus ergo ratus. 972 seu retunus tactibus. 1012 consecrandus. 1025 blattealis. 1076 accepit fragitidas. 1080 sic om. 1117 uligo. xiv. 6 fidei ac. 20 offerebat. 59 tunc. 63 ascensus. 79 Christo. 89 subiectu. 110 malorum taetrius omnium est. 112 ac.

A glance at the variants just given is sufficient to show that there is a much greater agreement between the two oldest MSS. of Prudentius than one could gather from

Heinsius' few readings, and if space did not prevent me from giving spelling-variants the same impression would be still more strongly enforced. Suffice it to say that most of the statements made in my article on the spelling of *Put.* apply too to *Ambr.*

From whatever source the later hand, which has filled up the gaps, derived its text, it is by no means a contemptible authority. In proof of that it is sufficient to note that the lines inserted in the worse class of MSS. after *Ap.* 937, *Ham. Praef.* 43, *Ham.* 69, *Symm.* i. 367, ii. 143 do not occur. I did not completely collate this latter part of the MS., but examined a number of readings, of which I will give a few to illustrate its worth.

Cath. ix. 102 ac. x. 8 *fol.* spiritus simul et caro seruit: and then as *Dressel's* i. 60 arcet. (154 ut est eleazar.) 157 atra e. xi. 111 perpetem. xii. 67 puero cui. *Ap.* 895 aggenitus. 923 dicitur inloto. *Ham. Praef.* 46 duorum. 62 cadet. 95 non sint. 107 deos. 786 agresti aburitur. *Ps.* 727 in commune bonis tranquillae plebis ad unum Sensibus in tuta ualli statione locatis Extruitur (as *Put.*). 752 hoc habet. 781 cuncta. 873 uiribus/artae. *Symm.* 1. (497 prodigia et laruas.) *Symm.* 11. 143 ignauiam trahere istam, *underlined*, and robur eneruatum etc. *written above.* 326-8 ceu quadrupes egit. Mox tenerum etc. 474 per amplum sub hoste Ingenium. *Per.* v. 169 hunc lacesso. x. 222 conantem. 228 spadonem. 253 promiscue. 333 pecuda. 399 hic. xi. 9 minuta. 65 excide. 87 hypolitus fiat ergo agitet 111 errore. 161 decurrunt celsis. 162 iaceant. xiii. 32 iustitia. 54 utrumque. 68 titubetque. 86 uenit. 90 doctatis atque loci iussus genus edere christianus inquit Serno. 96 abire.

E. O. WINSTEDT.

NOTES ON ROMAN BRITAIN.

(See *C.R.* XVIII., Pp. 398 sq., 458 sqq.)

MR. McELDERRY'S 'Notes on Roman Britain' in the time of Domitian are interesting and suggestive, and form a pleasant change from the general style of many English writers on the subject. But I do not think they can all be taken as they stand:—

(1) *The establishment of a colonia at Lindum (Lincoln).*—It is probable enough on general grounds that this occurred in the latter part of the first century or very soon afterwards. But the *senum coloniae* of Tacitus (*Agr.* 32) is just as rhetorical a plural as the *aegra municipia* of the same sentence, which can only refer to the one known *municipium* of Britain, Verulam. The Mainz inscription of *M. Minicius M. fil. Quir. Lindo Martialis* (or *Marcellinus*), tribune or primipilus of the 22nd legion *Primi-genia*, gives no better proof. I have always hoped that Minicius might turn out British-born. But, on our present evidence, the chances are dead against it. It is not merely (as Mr. McElderry states in his postscript) that parallels can be quoted for eastern-born officers. It is that in the time of Septimius Severus (to which Minicius pretty certainly belongs) the Mainz inscriptions suggest that the bulk of the officers in this legion (as not improbably in others) were Orientals: 'wie es scheint, lauter Asiaten,' says one epigraphist. Earlier, the primipili and tribuni on the Rhine were generally Italian born, according to Prof. v. Domaszewski, and

Lincoln on either score is excluded. Nor is Lindus in Rhodes so unlikely. Men of the Quirine tribe occur there, though the tribe has of course no necessary connexion with the place, and I see no sort of reason why an officer should not have hailed from it about 200 A.D. as easily as from other attested Eastern sites.

(2) *Legio II adiutrix in Scotland.*—Personally, I believe the Camelon altar cited by Mr. McElderry to be a forgery. But it should be observed that, even if genuine, it cannot normally refer to this legion. The text is certain: the letters and stops plain, and the emendation of A | DIE into A | D. P. F. (easy enough in a MS.) will not do on a stone. If genuine, the altar refers to the Legio II A(ugusta). If forged, it may of course refer to anything.

(3) *Withdrawal of troops about A.D. 76.*—I do not think that the Baalbek inscription proves all that Mr. McElderry wants. It does not say that Velius Rufus led his vexillationes of eight (or nine) legions to Mauretania. Nor is such a view at all likely, though it has Mommsen's authority. The British legions were never employed for special service in Africa, and the Rhenish legions only in later times. Moreover, we have no record of trouble in Africa under Vespasian—though we have under Domitian. It seems preferable to connect the vexillationes of Velius with the legionary tiles of Mirebeau, seventeen miles N.E. of Dijon,