

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](#)



Fierville's Quintilian *M. F. Quintiliani de Institutiones Oratoria Liber Primus*. Texte Latin, publié avec des notes biographiques sur Quintilien, l'histoire de l'institution oratoire et de ses abrégés, la classification et la description des manuscrits, le texte abrégé par Étienne de Rouen et par Jean Racine, des notes critiques, les variantes principales et deux facsimile de manuscrits par Ch. Fierville. Paris : Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1890. f. 10.

W. Peterson

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 32 - 36

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993132, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993132

How to cite this article:

W. Peterson (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 32-36 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993132

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of the desolation of Smyrna (after the earthquake of 178 A.D.) moved Marcus Aurelius to tears, and prompted that emperor to grant his aid in the rebuilding of the city (Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.*, ii 9, 2). In the times of the Byzantine renaissance the *Panathenaicus* of Aristides, together with the funeral oration of Psellus in memory of his mother and that of Gregory Nazianzen in

honour of Basil the Great, was mentioned by the side of the *De Corona* of Demosthenes, as one of the four masterpieces of eloquence; and at the close of the fourteenth century that memorable eulogy of Athens supplied the patriotic historian, Lionardo Bruno, with an appropriate model for his Greek encomium of Florence.

J. E. SANDYS.

FIERVILLE'S QUINTILIAN.

M. F. Quintiliani de Institutione Oratoria Liber Primus. Texte Latin, publié avec des notes biographiques sur Quintilien, l'histoire de l'institution oratoire et de ses abrégés, la classification et la description des manuscrits, le texte abrégé par Étienne de Rouen et par Jean Racine, des notes critiques, les variantes principales et deux facsimile de manuscrits par CH. FIERVILLE. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1890. f. 10.

In this volume M. Fierville has brought to bear on the first book of Quintilian's *Institutes* the wide knowledge of MSS. of which he gave proof in a former work (*De Quintilianeis Codicibus*, Paris, 1874). He believes that Halm's text (1868) rests on too narrow a basis, depending as it does mainly on the *Ambrosianus*, the *Bernensis*, and the *Bambergensis*; and he puts prominently forward certain MSS. of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as well as others of the fifteenth which are obviously copies of older codices now no longer extant. In fact the most valuable feature of the book is the account given of no fewer than sixty-seven MSS., twenty of which M. Fierville claims to have himself examined, either in whole or part. He proposes a classification of his own, differing from those of Zumpt and of Halm, according to which the various families of the *incomplete* MSS. (those with the great lacunae in Books v.-viii. and ix.-xii.) take first rank: examples are the *Bernensis*, the *Nostradamensis*, and the *Pratensis* (the last as representing the *Beccensis* now lost). In the second class he places the *Ambrosianus*, the *Bambergensis* G, the *Florentinus*, and the *Turicensis*—combating the view by which Halm inclined (rightly, as we shall see) to regard the last named two as copied, either directly or indirectly, from the second. Lastly come the various MSS. of the fifteenth century.

It is remarkable that M. Fierville nowhere notices Meister's edition (1886), which made a distinct advance on that of Halm, embodying as it does the main results of German criticism—which has lately been very busy over Quintilian—and setting forth in particular the readings of the *Nostradamensis*, as furnished by MM. Chatelain and le Coultre. It is not even mentioned in the list given on p. clxxv. The only references to one of the highest authorities, who has made Quintilian a life-study, occur on p. xci. where Meister appears as 'le récent éditeur de Darès le Phrygien' (the Teubner text, 1873), and in a foot-note on p. xv., where mention is made of Meister's early paper 'Quaestiones Quintilianeae,' Anhalt, 1860. And it is still more to be regretted that a work which its author evidently intended to be final, so far as it goes, should have been completed without a careful examination of the various MSS. in this country, some of which have never been collated at all. Perhaps it was his unfortunate experiences of certain English libraries (pp. lxx. and cxxviii.) that led this laborious scholar to confine his attention practically to the MSS. of France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy and Spain; and yet if he had ever visited the British Museum a prize would have been within his grasp. To say nothing of seven more or less interesting fifteenth century MSS. (one of which I think can be proved to be a copy of Poggio's), there is in the Museum a MS. of the greatest value, which must be reckoned with, at least in part, before any final text of Quintilian can be arrived at. After careful examination I can venture to affirm that it must take rank above both the *Turicensis* and the *Florentinus*, on which Spalding depended so greatly for the constitution of his text. This MS. (Harl. 2664), which was first noticed by Mr. Purser in *Hermathena* (No. xii.—1886), I

have now collated in considerable parts, and have also been at some pains to trace its history. It may be affirmed with certainty that it is the missing *Codex Dusseldorpianus*, referred to by M. Fierville at p. cxxiv. as having disappeared from the library at Düsseldorf before Gesner's time (see the preface to his edition of 1738, § 20, where he describes it, on the evidence of one who had seen it, as 'Poggianis temporibus certe priorem, necdum, quod sciatur, recentiori aetate a quodam collatum'). The following are the grounds on which I base this identification. We know from his diary that Harley's librarian, Humphrey Wanley, bought the codex (along with several others) on August 6, 1724, from Sig. John James Zamboni, Resident *Chargé d'affaires* in England for the Elector of Hesse Darmstadt. Hearing that the correspondence of this somewhat remarkable man (in twenty-one thick folio volumes) had found a resting-place in the Bodleian library, I examined it a short time ago, and ascertained that the Quintilian came to him from M. Büchels, who was librarian of the Court library at Düsseldorf in the beginning of last century, and with whom Zamboni drove a regular trade in MSS.

The correspondence is of a very interesting character, and throws light on the provenance of several of the Harleian MSS. The transactions of the pair began in 1721, when Büchels receives 1200 florins (not without much dunning) for a consignment of printed books. Zamboni, who was something of a humourist, is constantly endeavouring to beat down the librarian's prices: 'j'aime les beaux livres,' he says on one occasion, when pretending that he will not entertain a certain offer, 'j'aime les beaux livres mais je ne hais pas l'argent.' The trade in MSS. began in 1724, when Büchels sent a list from which Zamboni selected eleven codices, assuring his correspondent that if he would only be reasonable they would soon come to terms. Early in the year he offers 500 florins for the lot, protesting that he had no intention of selling again: 'sachez, Monsieur, que je ne vous achète pas les livres pour les revendre.' Three weeks after it came to hand he made over the whole consignment to Harley's librarian. It included our Quintilian and the great Vitruvius—the entries in Zamboni's letters corresponding exactly with those in Wanley's diary. In the end of the same month Zamboni is writing to Büchels for more, protesting that his great ambition is to make a 'très-jolie collection' of MSS. (Bodl. MSS. Add. D, 66.)

NO. XXXIX. VOL. V.

Where did this Quintilian originally come from? There is a clue on the first page, where we have the inscription *Iste liber est maioris ecclesiae*. This Mr. Purser has ascribed with great probability to Strasburg. The *Florentinus* has an inscription bearing that it was given by Bishop Werinharius (probably the first of that name, 1000–1029) to the Cathedral of St. Mary at Strasburg; and Wypheing, who catalogued the library there (*circ.* 1508) says of this bishop: 'Multa dedit ecclesiae suae praesertim multos praestantes libros antiquissimis characteribus scriptos; quorum adhuc aliqui in bibliotheca maioris ecclesiae repositi videntur.' The last phrase shows that there was a greater and a less church at Strasburg, and the inscription is too remarkable in point of form to allow of much doubt on this head. I cannot hear of any 'maior ecclesia' likely to dispute the title with Strasburg, though Mr. Madan tells me there was a minor one at Mendovi (Mons Regalis) in North Italy. Our MS., which is either late tenth or early eleventh century, evidently belongs to Fierville's second class. I have found in the margin marks which show clearly that at an early date it was used to supply the great lacunae in some MS. of the first or incomplete class; and for a time it seemed quite legitimate to infer that the Harleian codex was no other than the original of Bambergensis G (see Halm, Praef. p. viii.: Fierville, p. xc.). The courtesy of the Bamberg authorities has now, however, given me an opportunity of comparing the two codices side by side; and though on palaeographical grounds there was room for doubt, the Harleian MS. being written in a neater hand and seeming to be of older date, a full examination has convinced me that it was copied directly from the Bambergensis, as soon as the latter was completed by the addition of G and of the readings supplied by the hand now known as b (which indeed H slavishly follows). We may still claim for H, however,—in view of the defective state in which the *Bernensis*, *Bambergensis*, and *Ambrosianus* have come down to us,—the distinction of being the *oldest complete manuscript of Quintilian in existence*.

I must reserve for a volume which will shortly be issued from the Clarendon Press a more detailed statement of the relationship of the *Harleianus* to known MSS. of Quintilian. The settlement of the question involves a testimony to the critical acumen of that great scholar, C. Halm. In the *Sitzungsberichte der königl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1866, i. pp.

D

505-6, Halm sought to establish the dependence of the *Turicensis* and the *Florentinus* on the *Bambergensis*, by pointing out, among other proofs, the insertion at a wrong place in the text of both these codices of a marginal addition in Bg which was obviously meant to follow the words *legis quam* in ix. 2, 52 (see Fierville, p. xci.). Noticing that in FT this addition is inserted after *Clodius*, and not after *legis quam*, Halm drew the inference that FT had not been directly copied from Bg, but from some intervening manuscript. Now in the *Harleianus* the words referred to do come in between *quam* and *(Clo)dus*, which in Bg begins a new line on a fresh page. This among many other indications must be taken as proving that H was copied directly from Bg, and is the parent of both F and T. To it may therefore now be diverted the controversy which M. Fierville touches on at pp. xcii.-iii. The *Harleianus* and not the *Turicensis* may very possibly be the MS. which Poggio found in 1416.

In comparing the readings of Bg (and G), H, T, and F, I have found H, if not always in exact agreement with the Bamberg MS. (often owing to the fact that the copyist knew but little Latin), invariably nearer the parent source than either T or F. Here are a few scattered instances: i. 11, 4 pinguitudine Bg and H, pinguedine FT: i. 6, 14 diceres H (following b), dici FT: x. 1, 4 sit G H, om. FT: i. 1, 16 formandam Bg H, formandum FT: i. pr. § 1 pertinent H pertinent T: *ib.* § 6 amore H, studio F: i. 1, 3 hoc quippe uiderit Bg H, hoc quippe T: i. 2, 24 depellendam Bg H, repellendam T: ix. 4, 32 nesciat G H, dubitet F: *ib.* dignatur G H, digne dicatur F: viii. pr. § 3 dicendi G H, discendi T: ix. 4, 119 ignorabo G, ignoraba H, ignorabam T: *ib.* § 129 et hac fluit G H et hac et hac fluit T. To H must be attributed the remarkable gloss *vin demoni* in x. 3, 23, repeated in F but not in T. Noteworthy cases of the close adherence of T to H are the following:—Empedoclena. i. 45: *vesperuginem* i. 7, 12 (where Fierville gives a wrong account of T): *tereuntur* i. 4, 27: *flex his* x. 1, 2: *gravissimus* x. 1, 97: *ipsae illae quae extorque eum credas* x. 1, 110 where both give also *trans usum* for *transversum*, and *non repe* for *non rapi*: *morare refinxit finxit recipit* x. 3, 6: *nam quod cum isocratis* x. 4, 4. In other instances the writer of T has evidently tried to improve on the reading of H: e.g. in the title of book x. H gives an abbreviation which T mistakes for *quo enim dandum*: also *extemporal facilis* which appears in T as *ex-*

tempora vel facilis. So in i. pr. § 6 H gives *ir* and T makes it *iter* (while F omits the puzzle altogether): x. 1, 79 *ven̄ iudicis* (in mistake for *se non iud.*) which is made into *venit iudicis*. Many similar instances could be cited both in regard to T and F; the reading *tantum*, for instance, in x. 1, 92, which occurs in both, has evidently arisen from H which here shows something that looks more like *tantum* than *tacitum* (the reading of G). Again in every place where Halm uses the formula 'FT soli ex notis' H will be found to correspond.

M. Fierville devotes a long note (pp. xxxv.—vi.) to the discussion of a point which he could have cleared up in the British Museum. He inclines to believe that the Epitome often ascribed to P. P. Verger was really the work of Fr. Patrizi, who was Bishop of Gaeta from 1460 to 1494. There is in the Museum a beautiful copy of Quintilian, with the Epitome attached, which establishes this point. It is dated 1467, and on the last page the letter which is partly quoted by M. Fierville appears *as from Patrizi himself* to one Tranchedinus—the inscription being Franciscus Patricius F. Tranchedino s.p. dicit. There is another copy of the Epitome alone in the Bodleian at Oxford, with the same letter (beginning Franciscus Patricius francisco tranchedino), and at the end the following: M. Fab. Quintiliani abbreviatio per Franciscum Patricium Senensem nuper edita feliciter urbane et luculenter explicit.

Cum legeris nostri compendia parva laboris
Dicere non pudeat gratia magna tibi.

Nam quae vix poterat multis ediscere in annis
Mensibus haec paucis nunc meminisse potes.

Of the other MSS. of Quintilian in the British Museum one is a very scholarly work which I find anticipates several readings quoted by Halm from the Cologne edition of 1527. It bears an inscription showing that it was finished in January 1434. Another (from which I have derived some valuable readings for an edition of the tenth book) is dated 1470, and is probably a copy of the *Vallensis*: it contains copious notes, and reproduces the anonymous criticism on iv. 1, 1, given by M. Fierville on p. cxix. *non bene intellexit curam*. The copyist must however have had an older MS. by his side: at x. 6, 2 there is no lacuna, but in the margin the words *hic deficit antiquus codex*. This points to an explanation of the false lacuna shown here by Bn. and Bg.

In the Bodleian M. Fierville would have found the *Codex Dorvilianus*, which has never been collated at all (though it is mentioned by Ingram in his edition of 1809). It is Italian work, of the early part of the fifteenth century—earlier, Mr. Madan thinks, than the *Codex Bodleianus*. In some places it shows a remarkable resemblance to the *Ambrosianus* (e.g. *Getae* 1 pr. § 6: et quantum *ib.* § 8). In x. 1, 20 it gives the reading which Herzog conjectured, and which is probably right: neque vero tanta esse unquam debet fiducia facilitatis. This MS. is deserving of further study: a marginal note at ix. 3, 2 (*hic deficit codex vetustissimus*) shows that it must be copied from sources much older than itself.

For the *Codex Ioannensis* (in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge) M. Fierville is dependent on the account given by Spalding (Vol. ii. pr. p. 4). A recent examination has shown that this account must be amended in some particulars. Though in its present condition the MS. begins with *constaret* (i. 2, 3) a portion of the first page has been cut away for the sake of the ornamental letter: originally it must have begun at the beginning of the second chapter, like the *Nostradamensis* (N) Voss. 1 and 2, and Par. 7719, 7721 (see Fierville, p. 165). Again the reading at xi. 2, 33 is clearly *multiplici not ut duplici*, and in this it agrees with the Montpellier MS. which M. Bonnet has shown to be a copy of the *Bernensis* (*Revue de Philol.* Jan.—Mars, 1887). It is evidently a thirteenth century copy, probably indirect, of the *Bernensis*, and shows a distinct resemblance to N. For example I have found in it (unnoticed by previous collators) the reading lately accepted from N at x. 3, 2, *alte refossa*. It is wrongly quoted by Fierville at p. 50 as reading *notam* in i. 4, 9, just as the Balliol codex (from which I have derived some new readings) is wrongly quoted on pages 76 and 83. In the former place (i. 5, 33) the Balliol MS. gives *de quibus* quite distinctly, and in the latter (*ib.* § 50) *intro loci adverbium*.

The changes which M. Fierville has made in the text of the first book can hardly be considered commensurate with the great amount of labour he has expended; and it is somewhat depressing to think that the same methods might be applied to the other seven books without altogether transforming the existing text. No new reading of first-class importance is established. There are numerous instances of unimportant inversions in the order of words: of these the

best is perhaps i. 2, 4 *Nam et potest turpis esse domesticus ille praeceptor* (the reading of Bg and H): cp. *sapientiae studia* pr. § 14 for *stud. sap.*: *ib.* § 18: 1 § 20: 2 §§ 11, 13: 4 § 5: 5 § 3: 8 § 6: 12 § 13. The following (of which M. Fierville ought himself to have given a list) are the main divergences from Halm and Meister's texts: Pr. § 4 *summam inde* (which I have found in the *Codex Dorvilianus*, though M. Fierville says it occurs in no MS.): *ib.* § 6, where (ignoring Mommsen in *Hermes* xiii. pp. 428—430) he has *Marcelle Victori*: *ib.* *festinabimus* for *destinabamus*: *ib.* § 7 *bini iuvenes* for *boni*: *ib.* § 27 *ingenita quaedam quae adiuvant*, an unsatisfactory change for *ingenita cuique adiuventa* (H and probably also Bg): 1 § 12 *latinus... se perhibet*: *ib.* § 17 *qui id senserunt*: *ib.* § 20 *scisse se gaudeat*: 4 § 20 *attractionem*: *ib.* § 27 *feruntur*: 5 § 40 *dividunt*: 5 § 46 *diminutionem*: 6 § 14 *nomina*: 6 § 16 *quidquoque modo*: 6 § 30 *aliaque quae* (as H) 1 § 33 *agendi*. In Pr. § 6 *studio* seems an unnecessary change for *amore*: in 2 § 29 *paulatim* has been unaccountably left out, as also has *duas* in 2 § 7 and *est* in 7 § 13: and there is no note at 5 § 71 to show that some words are omitted in certain MSS. In only one place is a conjectural emendation attempted: i. 5, 45 *sane* for *ne*.

There are evidences (besides the omission of any reference to Meister's edition) that M. Fierville has been too much absorbed by his study of the MSS. to keep pace with the results of recent German criticism of Quintilian. The name of Kiderlin is nowhere mentioned, though his papers in the *Jahrbücher f. Class. Philologie* Vol. 131 and in the *Blätter f.d. bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen* ought to have been in the hands of an editor of the *Institutes*. The consequence is that readers of the First Book will still have to go elsewhere for Kiderlin's emendations, many of which (e.g. *inhonoratum* for *inhonoratam* 1, 5, 31) have already been received into the text by Meister. Even Madvig's certain conjecture *loquendi* for *loquendo* (1, 4, 3) has no place in M. Fierville's notes. Much more excusable than want of acquaintance with the recent work of Becher, Meister, and Kiderlin is M. Fierville's failure to find a place for Mr. Lane's excellent suggestion about the passage (1, 4, 16) hitherto considered altogether hopeless: in the recent volume of *Harvard Studies* he proposes to read 'nutrix Culcidis.'

The notes at the foot of the page illustrate the critical bent of M. Fierville's scholarship, consisting as they do in considerable part of

the grounds on which the editor discriminates between the mass of variants which his industry has brought together. While grateful for this guidance the student will probably find that something beyond mere critical notes is needed for a full understanding of Quintilian's text. In Pr. § 4 an explanation of *quibus id praestabatur* would have been by no means superfluous. In l § 11 it is hard to see how the editor explains *non rationi defuerit sed homini*; Halm's *defuerint* is certainly the easier reading. On l § 20 *nunquam non scisse se gaudeat*, M. Fierville cites Cic. *De Fin.* v. 55: but the passage (which has the present instead of the perfect infinitive) is hardly an apt parallel. Most codd. read *fecisse* = 'let him always feel pleased at having done his task,' which suggests the suspicion that *p.* (the contraction for pro) may have fallen out, and that the true reading may be *profecisse*. Parallels from the literature of Quintilian's own day might have been adduced in illustration of the reference

to the sham philosophers in Pr. § 16. In the very difficult passage 5 §§ 22—31 the editor's full notes would have been improved by a reference to Kiderlin's theory that Quintilian is here writing against the fashionable practice of accentuating the last syllable of Latin words. In 7 § 5 he might have defended his reading by pointing out that both with *per q* and *per c* the *duae sequentes* are to be supplied, the reference in the first instance being obviously to the form *qum*. In spite however of such drawbacks as these, M. Fierville has incorporated in his notes a vast amount of matter which is otherwise hardly accessible; and scholars will feel grateful to him for the labour he has spent on his task. The volume, which is enriched by two fac-similes of MSS. (the *Nostradamensis* 10th cent. and the *Pratensis* 12th cent.), will greatly facilitate the work of any future editor.

W. PETERSON.

BAUER'S SILIUS.

Sili Italici Punica, edidit LUDOVICUS BAUER.
Leipzig. 1890. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

At last we have the first volume of a new text of this little read and much depreciated author. It contains the first ten books. The remaining seven with the index are shortly to appear in another volume.

Of editions of Silius there is no lack. From the *editio princeps* [Rome 1471] to Lemaire's reprint of Ruperti [1823] they number not less than 53 of one kind or another. But in purifying and establishing the text of the *Punica* little has till now been done by editors since the time of Drakenborch [1717]. Recent efforts have for various reasons fallen short of the production of a complete edition. G. Thilo took up the work but eventually abandoned it. Hermann Blass, who followed him, came so near success that he left little but the details of execution to his followers. His treatise 'Die Textesquellen des Silius Italicus' [*Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* 1875, also issued separately] is a model of minute learning and clear argument. He determined the value of the evidence now extant of the readings of the lost *liber Coloniensis*. He traced the history of the discovery of the *Samgallensis* [1417 or 1416],

also lost, and proved it to have been very nearly equal in authority to the *Coloniensis*. Let them be called respectively S and C. From copies (or a copy) of S come all the existing MSS. Blass then examined with care the 25 MSS of which he could procure or make collations, a work for testing purposes exhaustive. He classified them in groups, the best of which consists of three Florentine MSS [L³ L⁴ F]. Upon these copies, particularly on L³ and F, occasionally supplemented by three others, particularly the Oxford [O] and the Vatican MS 1652 [V], the present text in general rests. The scattered evidences of C are numerous and striking enough to show even to a casual reader how splendid a manuscript we have lost. Bauer indeed holds it far superior to S. Thus in iv. 775 he adopts *genitoris* in preference to *redeuntis* of S, while Blass rather considers the former reading as indicating the reception of a gloss in C.

After the early death of Blass, his collections were handed over to L. Bauer, who now undertook the work. Following the principles of Blass with skill and industry, he has produced a standard work, which I trust will soon be completed. Students of Latin literature owe him much thanks for his labours. I have a few remarks to offer in detail.