

# 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](#)



---

**Jan's Musici Scriptores *Musici Scriptores Graeci*,  
recognovit, prooemiis et indice instruxit Carolus Jan.  
Supplementum, melodiarum reliquiae. Teubner, 1899.  
M. 1.20.**

D. B. Monro

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 04 / May 1900, pp 226 - 226  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082536, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00082536](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082536)

**How to cite this article:**

D. B. Monro (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 226-226 doi:10.1017/  
S0009840X00082536

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

JAN'S *MUSICI SCRIPTORES*.

*Musici Scriptores Graeci*, recognovit, prooemiis et indice instruxit CAROLUS JAN. Supplementum, melodiarum reliquiae. Teubner, 1899. M. 1.20.

IN this small volume of the Teubner series of texts—the number of pages is sixty in all—we have from the highly competent hand of Carl von Jan a complete collection of all the fragments of Greek music as yet discovered. In the case of such a book our chief duty is to recommend it to the attention of scholars. A few points may be noticed.

The fragment of the *Orestes* of Euripides the editor (following M. Gevaert) now pronounces to be in the Dorian 'mode'; that is to say, it is based on a scale of the Dorian species. On the question whether the genus is Chromatic or Enharmonic he decides in favour of the former. The mysterious Z is regarded by him (no doubt

rightly) as simply a mark of the end of the line.

The two Hymns to Apollo now appear in a much more complete form than has been possible hitherto. In the first Hymn a great improvement has been effected by the transposition of the two fragments. The process of filling up *lacunae* by conjecture has been carried on with great ingenuity and success.

The Seikilos inscription has now received the missing final note, which has so important a bearing on the tonality.

The three Hymns which for so long were the only specimens of Greek music have received some fresh light, especially from an article by M. Th. Reinach in the *Revue des études grecques* ix. (1896.) The observation of the law of accent has now drawn a distinction between this hymn and the others.

D. B. MONRO.

PETERSON'S *CLUENTIUS OF CICERO*.

*M. Tulli Ciceronis pro A. Cluentio Oratio*: edited with introduction and notes explanatory and critical, by W. PETERSON M.A., Hon. LL.D. St. Andrews and Princeton. Pp. lv, 271. London, Macmillan and Co. (*Classical Series*) 1899. 3s. 6d.

DR. PETERSON had laid all teachers of the classics under a debt of gratitude by his well-known translation of the *pro Cluentio*, which was revised and issued with certain notes in 1895. Some further comments of his, upon the text, appeared in this Review in June 1898. He has now followed up these preliminary labours by a new edition of the speech, in which he claims, not without reason, to have constituted the text on independent lines. What these lines are, will best be seen if we proceed to examine certain passages in the light of Dr. Peterson's criticism.

But it may be remarked, at the outset, that finality is not to be expected in the constitution of such a text as that of the *pro Cluentio*. There were, as Classen first pointed out in his edition of 1831, two

recensions of the text: the 'vulgate' as it is called, which is represented by the promiscuous crowd of codd. deteriores, and the superior recension represented by the MSS. known as ST. The latter is supported, on the whole, by P the fragmentary Turin Palimpsest of the 5th or 6th century, which itself however displeases us at times by its ineptitudes; e.g. §35 postulari (for post uiri): §92 om. natura: §101 praeferebatur (for proferebatur): §129 iuretur (for inuretur), §146 in mente (for sine mente). But in three or four cases P has yielded invaluable evidence e.g. §130 multitudini: nemini licitum: and it goes far to establish the value of the ST recension.

We find further evidence of the existence, in the 14th century or earlier, of a better recension or at least of some MS. from which marginal corrections were taken down in MSS. of the vulgate order of text. Dr. Peterson mentions (after Classen) the cod. S. Marci (b<sup>2</sup>). He further says (p. xliii)—'There was a codex S. Victoris, believed by Classen to have been used by Lambinus and collated also by Gulielmuis': adding that Sylvius cites it in his edition of