

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 Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum
Latinorum Claudiani Mamerti Opera, ed. A.
Engelbrecht, Vienna, 1885. 6 Mk. Sedulii Opera Omnia,
ed. J. Huemer, Vienna, 1885. 9 Mk. Orientii Carmina, ed.
Robinson Ellis, Vienna, 1888. [Printed separately from
vol. xvi. of Corp. Script. Eccles. Lat.]**

W. Sanday

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 1-2 / February 1888, pp 19 - 21

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019184X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019184X

How to cite this article:

W. Sanday (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 19-21 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019184X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

III.

- Claudiani Mamerti Opera*, ed. A. ENGELBRECHT, Vienna, 1885. 6 Mk.
Sedulii Opera Omnia, ed. J. HUEMER, Vienna, 1885. 9 Mk.
Orientii Carmina, ed. ROBINSON ELLIS, Vienna, 1888. [Printed separately from vol. xvi. of *Corp. Script. Eccles. Lat.*]

In trying to make up some of the arrears of this important series it will be impossible to give more than a very brief notice of the less recent volumes, just calling attention to their more distinctive features. From this point of view the edition of Claudianus Mamertus attracts our attention in two ways: (1) by the peculiar state of the MS. evidence for the text, and (2) by the interesting discussion which Dr. Engelbrecht has based upon it of the diction of Claudianus Mamertus in its historical and literary relations.

There is this peculiarity about the MSS. of the treatise *De Statu Animae* that their value is in almost inverse ratio to their date. The best is *Cod. Lipsiensis (M) saec.* xi.-xii.; next to it come *Codd. C. G. saec.* xi.; then *Cod. L. saec.* x. ex., and *Cod. S. saec.* xi.; and at the bottom of the list of the more important MSS., *Cod. A., saec.* ix., and *Cod. B. saec.* x. in. This will be no great paradox to any one who has much experience of ancient texts. It is now generally recognised that in the case of authors of whom there are a number of MSS. extant, what the textual critic has to deal with is not so much MSS. taken singly as the archetypes of groups of MSS. But the archetype of a late MS. may itself be early, or if not early at least not separated by many transcriptions from the original. All depends upon the history of its line of antecedents. Dr. Engelbrecht has worked out the problem for Claudianus in a thoroughly scientific and trustworthy fashion, and has presented the result in the form of genealogy (p. xi.)

Another principle of textual criticism is illustrated in this edition. In constructing his text Dr. Engelbrecht had not only followed *M* (as he was bound to do), wherever it agreed with another leading MS., but he had also frequently adopted its readings where it stood alone. In a case like this the genealogy of the MSS. gives very little presumption either way: the right reading

might be in the line of *M*, or it might be in the line of *C. G.* &c. The only means of deciding between them was by an inductive examination of the general character of such singular readings in *M* and in the other groups. By a process of this kind, and especially from the renewed study involved in preparing the index, Dr. Engelbrecht was led to change his mind, and not to attribute so much weight to the singular readings of *M* as he had done originally. The result is a rather long list of alterations in the Preface (pp. xvi.—xxvii.). We will not blame him for this, but will rather praise the care and conscientiousness which he has shown in revising his work. In the large majority of cases—in all those where the revision is due to a clearer apprehension of the usage of the writer—the ‘second thoughts’ are pretty certainly right. In regard to a few readings (e. g. 27. 4, 57. 20, 63. 11, 70. 7, 8 &c.) which turn on more general considerations I should be inclined to say that the old was better. But taking the edition as a whole it is an excellent one. It will certainly never be necessary for an editor to take up this not very profitable treatise again.

Special mention should be made of the monograph in which Dr. Engelbrecht has treated of the Latinity of his author in *Sitzungsberichte d. phil.-hist. Classe d. Kais. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1885, vol. cx. p. 423 ff. (also published separately). It is most instructive for the literary history of Gaul in the latter half of the fifth century when the secular schools of rhetoric were on the point of giving place to the schools which grew up round the monasteries. The influences which formed the style of Claudianus are traced with great care, especially that of the African writers Fronto and Apuleius; and numerous illustrations are given of the relation of Claudianus to his contemporary and friend Sidonius Apollinaris, as well as of the peculiarities of Claudianus. In two Appendices Dr. Engelbrecht shows (1) that the more correct order of the names is Mamertus Claudianus, the latter being the name by which the writer would usually be called; and (2) that the anonymous romance *De Constantino Magno eiusque matre Helena*, published in Teubner's series by Heydenreich in 1879, was probably written in Gaul.

If the edition of Claudianus Mamertus is a typical example of the value of late MSS., that of Sedulius may be taken as a typical

example of the value of early ones. Here there is an extraordinary wealth of MSS. in close proximity to the age of the writer. At the head of the list would come the famous Turin MS. in capitals (*T*), ascribed to the seventh century, which is the last of the specimens of capital-writing in Zange-meister and Wattenbach (*tab. xvi*). Of nearly equal date and like Cod. *T* from the library of Bobbio, is the Ambrosian Fragment *M*. This too is a famous MS., as it was from it that Peyron unearthed the palimpsest remains of Cicero *Pro Scauro* which gave rise to his classical treatise (Stuttgart, 1824). Then come two MSS. of the eighth century in Anglo-Saxon characters *A* and *Γ*, the first from St Martin's at Tours; and a long list of ninth and tenth century MSS. follow. According to a well-known subscription the poem of Sedulius was reduced to order from the MS. left by Sedulius and first published by Turcius Rufius Asterius who was consul in 494; and Huemer thinks (no doubt with reason) that the MSS. are all traceable to a common archetype written in vernacular Latin in the next century. The traces of this vernacular Latin which the editor has faithfully chronicled, though he has only admitted them sparingly—perhaps a shade too sparingly—into the text, constitute their chief value. When a really inductive study comes to be made of the Latin of the fifth and sixth centuries this edition of Sedulius will be one of the first authorities for it. Besides the *Carmen Paschale* itself, Huemer has also edited from MSS. of the ninth to the eleventh centuries the prose version of the poem which Sedulius wrote at the instance of his patron, the presbyter Macedonius. Another feature in his edition is the full and careful index of places in which Sedulius has been quoted or imitated by later writers.

I shall be forgiven if for once I anticipate in order to notice without further delay an English contribution to the Vienna series. It is gratifying to think that English scholarship should have a part, however small, in this great undertaking; and it could not be better represented than it is by Mr. Ellis. I may be misled by national partiality, but it seems to me that there is a touch of elegance and finish about his work which is not quite attained by the majority of these commentaries. It is not more thorough or more scientific (though it is both thorough and scientific), and I am not sure that the positive results are greater, but its characteristic feature is (if I am not mistaken) a subtle refinement of style which is felt throughout

the whole. The problem that the editor of Orientius has to deal with is an altogether different one from those of which we have just been speaking: no longer an abundance of MSS. where the only question is to select the right reading, but a defective text, at best resting upon two MSS. and often only upon one. Here conjectural emendation was a necessity, and there was free scope for scholarship. In other volumes the text had been based upon a single MS.; but they were in prose, and the verse of Orientius required more delicate handling. Mr. Ellis, I think, will be found to have been fully equal to the task imposed upon him. My principal wish about his commentary would be that there had been a little more of it. Orientius has been fortunate in his previous editors and critics, especially the first editor Delrio (whose conjectures have in many places been verified by the Ashburnham MS. which he did not possess), and Commirius. Mr. Ellis has given them well-merited praise (p. 13). But one would like to know a little more about Schondonehus and Rivinus. We may note by the way that *ed. Mignianus* on p. 26 (*ad Commonit.* l. 306) seems to be Martène. The index again might with advantage have been somewhat fuller. It is about on the same scale with the other volumes of the series; but these *indices locutionum* are so valuable, and that which Mr. Ellis has just published in his edition of Avianus is so excellent, that one was tempted to hope for rather more. Sometimes the index has a bearing upon the text. For instance, *blandus* is clearly a favourite word with Orientius (cf. *Comm.* I. 117, 161, 182, 209, 325, 450, II. 111, 319, 337). Now in *Comm.* I. 548 *in bene securo pectore tuta quies*, *A* reads *blanda quies*. It would not however follow that this was what Orientius wrote, as a writer's favourite words are also apt to run in the head of the scribe and to come out when his attention relaxes. Mr. Ellis is doubtless right in printing *tuta*.

We must not take up room with one or two other little *desiderata*, but there are two points of orthography on which a question may be raised. In *Comm.* I. 120 *admotis: ammotis A, amotis B*, the temptation must have been strong to read *ammotis* (cf. *ammugit AB*, which Mr. Ellis has adopted in I. 178). The geographical distribution of this particular form of assimilation is a matter of some interest; it probably began in Italy but it is found also in that strange *farrago*, the MSS. of Gregory of Tours. The other point is *offer* in I. 217 where both the MSS. have *offers*. The latter is a well attested

form (cp. Roensch, *It. u. Vulg.* p. 294, to whose list other authorities might be added.)

The emendations are a tempting field, but we must not linger over more than two or three of the most prominent. I. 377 *sanctus (is) et uictor per tot modo praelia miles* (with which may be compared line 44 of the third poem more doubtfully attributed to Orientius *De Trinitate*, where for the corrupt *flecteris* Mr. Ellis would read *plectitur is*). In the *Commonitorium*, Schenkl and Baehrens follow Commirius in reading *sanctus et invictus*. Mr. Ellis' conjecture might naturally be preferred on palaeographical grounds: the principal objection to it would be the tendency to the disuse of *is* in writers of this date; I do not remember an example in these poems beyond the attractive conjecture just mentioned. Another neat emendation, involving the least possible disturbance of the text, is in *Comm.* I. 535

*dic, rogo, quid (miserum) tantus furor † laxat
habenas
ut tibi non sat erit quod tibi iam satis
est,*

where Mr. Ellis' note runs "fort. *exit* h. e. liber habenis fertur." Yet I am not sure that Rivinus is wrong in thinking that *habendi* underlies *habenas*, though his *urget habendi* is not very near, and *angit* (*āgit*) perhaps hardly better. In *Comm.* II. 216 I should much doubt the reading *uixit qui modo mille simul*,

explained as meaning "just a thousand in all." Schurzfleisch's *millesimum* is obvious, and as Orientius writes *suspicio*, *herēmo*, *fiant* (vid. Index) the shortening of the vowel would be no great objection. A corrupt line in the first *Oratio*—a sort of *Benedicite*—on p. 61 may perhaps be remedied. It runs in the MS. thus

*Solum statium cum fertura [fetura] mobili
quae paret homini, quaeque † capta de una,
tibi cantat uni, conticescit ceteris.*

Mr. Ellis suggests *tractu deuia*; but is anything more needed than *quaeque capitur deuia*?

'The solid earth with all its stirring brood
Of creatures tame, of hunted creatures wild.'

It would be easy to go on in this way; but I must content myself with commending to the reader this scholarly edition of a poet by no means without merit. The elegiac moralisings of Orientius are often pointed and marked by considerable sincerity of feeling. They contain besides one striking historical picture, that of the great Vandal invasion of 406 A.D., in which

uno fumauit Gallia tota rogo. (*Comm.* II. 184).

W. SANDAY.

USSING'S CASINA AND CISTELLARIA.

T. Maccii Plauti Comoediae. Recensuit et enarravit
JOHANNES LUDOVICUS USSING. Voluminis tertii
pars prior Casinam et Cistellariam continens.
Havniae, mdccclxxxvii. 6 Mk.

THE able and industrious Danish scholar, who has now accomplished the very arduous task of giving the world a complete edition of Plautus with a revised text and a commentary, has, it must be confessed, been rather hardly used. Eight years ago he published the second part of the third volume, holding back the first part, which was to contain the *Casina* and *Cistellaria*, on the suggestion of Studemund, who promised an edition of the *Cistellaria* founded on a searching examination of the Ambrosian palimpsest (A). That edition has not yet appeared, and Ussing, warned by advancing years and urged by his bookseller, is now at last forced to issue his edition of these plays, using much the same diplomatic materials as he had ten years ago. He does not however complain, but courteously expresses his conviction that the edition of Studemund's *Cistellaria*, when it does appear, will at once supersede all other editions of the play.

Ussing exhibits, as before, in the footnotes the

readings of the Palatino-Vatican *codex* (B) whenever his text differs from it; but in this part of his work he frequently adds the readings of the *codex Ambrosianus* I. 257 (E) and a *codex Britannicus* (I). These MSS. seem to have been copied—very carelessly—in the tenth or eleventh century from a *codex* closely resembling B, but not from B itself, as is proved by the fact that in some places, e.g. *Cas.* 932, E and I contain words wanting in B but found in A. The reading of the Ambrosian palimpsest A is carefully noted in so far as it has been hitherto deciphered and recorded.

By far the most interesting point in this instalment of Ussing's work is the certain restoration of verse 788 of the *Casina* from the Ambrosian palimpsest, which however will not be new to readers of Geppert's edition. The supposed bride *Casina* surprises the old *roué* Lysidamus* and his steward Olympio by the roughness of her gestures when approached. This is not surprising inasmuch as it is not *Casina*, but the stout slave Chalinus who is hidden under the bridal

* *Lysidamus* is the name of the old reprobate in A. Studemund has shown that the monstrous name *Stalino* by which previous editors have designated him arose from a corruption of the word *titivillitio* in verse 326 and of the words *sta ilico* in 883.