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](#)

Scheuer on the MSS. of Tacitus' *Dialogus De Tacitei de Oratoribus Dialogi Codicum nexu et fide scripsit* Friedericus Scheuer, Diss. Bresl. 1891 (Bresl. Phil. Abh. vi. 1). Pp. 49. 2 Mk.

Alfred Gudeman

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 316 - 318

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186263, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186263

How to cite this article:

Alfred Gudeman (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 316-318 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186263

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SCHEUER ON THE MSS. OF TACITUS' *DIALOGUS*.

De Tacitei de Oratoribus Dialogi Codicum nexu et fide scripsit FRIEDERICUS SCHEUER, Diss. Bresl. 1891 (*Bresl. Phil. Abh.* vi. 1). Pp. 49. 2 Mk.

In Michaelis' edition of the *Dialogus* (1868), which marks an epoch in the critical history of the text, the attempt is made for the first time to establish the inter-relationship of our MSS. and to determine their respective authenticity. Michaelis' results, based as they were upon a very accurate collation of the MS. material, have found very general acceptance. They were briefly to the effect that the *X* class of MSS., represented by a Vaticanus (*A*) and by the codex Leidensis (*B*), was far superior¹ to the *Y* class, represented by *CDEΔ*. Of these, the *cod. Vaticanus* 1518 (*D*), though 'tamquam per somnum scriptus' (p. xiii.) and replete with compendia, transpositions, omissions and orthographical idiosyncrasies, we are assured, is entitled to the highest respect, and this chiefly for the reason that it agrees with *AB*, the superior validity of which is taken for granted, in a number of genuine readings,² a coincidence said to be due to the similarity of the archetypes of *AB* and *D*. From this Michaelis logically enough draws the conclusion that the variants in the other MSS. arose out of interpolations or corrections. *C* (Farnesianus) and *Δ* (Vaticanus 4498) are shown to be very closely related, while *E* (Ottobonianus) is put down as a direct offspring of *C*, a number of its readings having however been subsequently introduced out of *A*.

In 1881, E. Baehrens, in his edition of the *Dialogus*, undertook to demolish the results of Michaelis' investigation. According to his view, *Δ* and *E* were directly derived from a common archetype *Y* (designated by him as *M*), while *CD* represented the offspring of a brother of *ΔE* who probably died young. And this conception easily led him to assert the superior authenticity of *Y(M)* vs. *X(N)*.

¹ Michaelis (p. xii.) cites *nine* examples, out of a total of *twenty-three* available instances, of an agreement between *AB* vs. *CDEΔ* (the *cod. Vindobonensis* is ignored)—a very unfortunate selection as no fewer than *eight* of them give the false reading, the other being at best doubtful.

² Out of eleven instances cited on p. xiv. ch. 27, 16 *cum* for *et cum* of the *Y* class has nothing in its favour, while the *est* in 37, 23 is also unjustly retained by *ABD*.

Unfortunately, this scholar's efforts were but too frequently marked by a spirit of mere opposition and a fatal reluctance to accept any results not his own. He habitually mistook negation for refutation. This strongly developed 'odium philologicum,' however, coupled as it was with unquestionable learning and ingenuity, made him quick to see the weak points in an adversary's argument, and this was the case here. His opinions regarding the inter-relationship of our MSS. were, indeed, quite erroneous, but he clearly perceived that the *X* class did not entirely merit the high reputation which it enjoyed. What Baehrens utterly failed to do was conclusively to *prove* this assertion, and hence it is not surprising that critics such as Binde, Steuding, Helmreich and all subsequent editors of the *Dialogus* preferred to abide, with a few slight modifications, by the opinion of Michaelis rather than accept that of Baehrens in which truth and falsehood were so inextricably intermingled.

Under these circumstances, it was certainly a happy thought again to collect *sine ira et studio* all available material and to subject our witnesses anew to a searching and rigid cross-examination. This work Scheuer in the dissertation under notice has undertaken, and, as may be said at once, he has performed this very laborious and intricate task with method and circumspection, an unbiassed judgment, and, barring one instance, with praiseworthy accuracy. His investigation has, I feel convinced, practically settled the questions at issue, so far as problems of this nature admit of a strictly final solution.

It is of course impossible within the limits of a review to follow the author through the numerous and winding pathways traversed in his pages; all we can hope to do is to give a short *résumé* of his conclusions, relegating the reader to the perusal of the dissertation itself for the details.

The subject is treated under five heads:

I. De Dialogi codicum nexu et fide quid viri docti adhuc iudicaverint (pp. 1-7).

II. De codicibus Ottoboniano (*E*) et Vindobonensi *DCCXI* (p. 7-17).

Following in the footsteps of Steuding, Scheuer triumphantly demonstrates by a table of *forty* significant variants that Michaelis erred in supposing *E* to be an apographon of *C*. Nor can *ECΔ*, as Steud-

ing contended, have been derived from the same parent MS. In order to show this Scheuer introduces a new witness, the codex Vindobonensis (V_2). E and V are found to be so closely allied and at the same time so independent of AB on the one hand, and CDA on the other, as to leave no reasonable doubt that both go back to a common source. This result is further confirmed by the evidence furnished by the texts of the fragment of Suetonius' *de viris illustribus* and the *Germania*, these witnesses being here for the first time brought into requisition to decide the questions involved. That E was not copied from V_2 or vice versa, a possibility ignored by Scheuer, is easily shown by an examination of the sixty-five readings exhibited on pp. 12-14, for each codex has its own characteristic peculiarities.

III. De codicibus Farnesiano (C) et Vaticanis D et Δ (pp. 17-28).

In this chapter, it is clearly proved by means of tables, including the corroborative evidence of the Suetonian fragment and the *Germania*, that the position which Michaelis had assigned to D as the best representative of the Y class is unwarranted by the facts, DCA forming one group and EV_2 the other.

'Singula exemplorum EV_2 et CDA consensu ostendi archetypa, quorum utrumque cum ex altero pendere non possit ex archetypo Y originem duxit. His quidem locis y_1 cum AB consentiens libri testatur scripturas, y_2 ab $ABEV_2$ recedens librarii arbitrio vel negligentia corruptus est. Paucos eos locos, quibus CDA sanas tradunt lectiones, in y_2 restitutos esse censendum est' (p. 26). In these latter instances, however, the corrections, if such they be, concern only minutiae and do not therefore strictly speaking represent any real variant, with one possible exception in 33, 12, where $ABEV_2$ read *inscientia* for *scientia* of CDA . Again of the five cases classed as doubtful by Scheuer, y_1 is unquestionably correct in three instances, to wit: 15, 20 a Cicerone aut Asinio; 33, 10 ingressuri; 37, 21 expilatis sociis.¹ One—*vocetis* in y_1 *vocitetis* y_2 —is due to a neglect of a compendium, while in 22, 22 *supellectili* y_2 for *supellectile* seems to be sanctioned by general usage (cf. Sirker, *Tacit. Formenl. and Neue*, I. 244).

IV. De correctorum opera in codicibus D et E conspicua (p. 28-32).

We have seen that Michaelis supposed the coincidences between AB and D to have been due to the original agreement of their

archetypes and that E according to him had been in a number of instances corrected out of some MS. of the X class—an opinion which very seriously affected his criticism of the other MSS. Scheuer succeeds admirably in proving not only that Michaelis is entirely in error but that the very reverse is true, namely that these coincidences are due to the fact that D was corrected out of the X class, while it is B or one of its immediate predecessors which is indebted to one of the Y class of MSS., notably E , cf. p. 31 f.

The interrelationship of the MSS. of the *Dialogus* having thus been very plausibly determined, the author is now prepared to take up the all-important question of their respective validity. In the last chapter accordingly (De fide archetyporum X et Y), Scheuer collects a list of ninety-one variants in which AB or ABD are pitted against $CDEV_2$ and he finds that in fifty of these the Y class has preserved the genuine reading, the X class only in eleven instances, while the remaining thirty are put down as doubtful. He therefore concludes, on the basis of this convincing evidence, that the Y class represents a purer condition of the text than AB . I believe this inference to be fully justified; the list of variants, however, which Scheuer gives calls for a very thorough revision. In the first place, we must eliminate all variae lectiones due to mere orthographical differences or to pure negligence or to a wrong solution of compendia and the like; for all these readings are valuable only as furnishing a clue to MS. relationship, they do not represent different readings in the archetypes. This then will exclude the following readings: 5, 29 profugio—perfugio; 9, 24 percepta—praecepta; 6, 25 profert—perfert; 31, 30 promovēdos—permovēdos (*i.e.* $p\bar{r}$ = per, pro, prae); 6, 8 non—neque; 20, 16; 21, 44 nec—non; 31, 15 nec—neque (no confusion more common); 29, 3 auctoribus—auctoribus; 10, 26 artis—artes; 26, 3 diminuta—deminuta; 42, 5 iis—his—hiis; 32, 22 utquae—utquē; 2, 17 cū *i.e.* omni cf. ch. 13, 15; 7, 17 nō *i.e.* nomina. Of the remaining number of readings credited to Y 28, 1 qui—et and 39, 2 ridetur—ridear are, to say the least, doubtful; while in 21, 20 illae must unquestionably give way to regulae (*i.e.* reliquae) of AB . Among the readings given as doubtful, the Y class is correct in 22, 4 eiusdem aetatis oratoris; 22, 91 senior iam (cf. *Am. Jour. of Phil.* xii. 4, p. 446 f.); 24, 15 in tantum; 27, 16 et cum.

The genuine readings of AB or ABD vs.

¹ On this passage, cf. *Am. Jour. of Phil.* xii. p. 454 ff.

$CD\Delta EV_2$ are few in number and those cited by Scheuer turn only upon minutiae. The list is however somewhat increased by a number of readings unjustly relegated by the author to the doubtful column: 12, 12 et malis; 17, 20 fateretur; 19, 12 laudabat; 22, 24 et; 25, 5 constat; 41, 14 obscuriorque; and perhaps 12, 21 ac, and 32, 26 ego. The figures as revised will therefore be as follows. Out of *seventy-four* actual variants $X(AB)$ furnishes the correct reading in but *fifteen* cases, $Y(CD\Delta EV_2)$ in *forty-five*, while in the remainder neither the context nor a careful examination of Tacitean usage

enables us to fix confidently upon the genuine reading.¹ In an appendix Scheuer gives a minutely accurate collation of the codex Vindobonensis.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

¹ There remain about 100 such variants unnoticed by Scheuer in which the two classes seem to blend into one another. The majority of these arise out of orthographical differences and common scribal errors. They in no way, however, invalidate the conclusion reached by Scheuer, as might appear at first sight. But regarding this point, I must refer to the Prolegomena of my forthcoming edition.

BELOCH'S *STORIA GRECA*.

Storia Greca, Parte prima. La Grecia antiquissima, GIULIO BELOCH. Roma, 1891. Mk. 3.50.

THIS is the first part of a History of Greece by Professor Beloch, whose name is of course well known to students of the subject. It is concerned with Greece in the earliest times and contains five chapters: (1) The Greeks and their Origin; (2) Myth and Religion; (3) The Popular Epopee; (4) The Legends of the Races; (5) Homeric Greece. These are on the one hand well-worn topics, but on the other fresh information is constantly coming in and fresh opinions are being formed. When views differ and the last word cannot be said, it is all the more interesting to have before us the judgment of a thoughtful and learned writer. Thus Beloch is of opinion that the Greeks entered the peninsula from the north (p. 8); that the Thracians and Illyrians were not Greeks (*ibid.*); that the Epirots and Macedonians were Greeks (p. 9); that the names of Dorians and Ionians were formed in Asia and transferred to Europe (p. 17). He is especially interesting in his remarks on the dialects of the Greeks (p. 25), and on their physical, moral and intellectual character (p. 21). He rightly separates myth from religion (p. 39); and while attributing little importance to Semitic influence, and a good deal to Asiatic, he yet regards Greek religion as essentially a national product.

With regard to the Homeric Poems he adopts the nucleus theory. There was an original Iliad which by successive accretions has grown up into the present poem, but this original Iliad was of no great compass and

was the work of one poet (p. 65). He adopts this view because on the one hand there are differences between the various parts of our Iliad so great that they cannot be explained if the work is that of one man, and on the other there is too great a unity in the poem for it to be the result of a mere putting together of ballads. On p. 66 Beloch gives a sketch of this original Iliad and on p. 67 ff. follow the amplifications.

But this hypothesis of a gradual development of the Iliad involves us in as great contradictions as those which it attempts to remove.

(1) If the original Iliad was so excellent that poets chose to develop it rather than adopt another theme, why is so little of the original left?

(2) How can we explain the consistent, and on the whole homogeneous excellence of our Iliad if it is the work of a number of poets of different ages and perhaps places?

(3) How are we to account for the unity of the present poem, and why did not the later poets extend the range of it?

(4) How do we explain the fact that the poem went on growing for, say, two hundred years, and then never grew at all?

(5) It is true, as Beloch reminds us, that 'the newest song is the most pleasing,' but this truth holds good of ballads, rather than epics. So far as we know, the most important point in recitations from Homer was that 'Homer' should be recited, and this is inconsistent with the theory that the poem was being constantly enlarged during one or two centuries.

EVELYN ABBOTT.