

ENARA SAN JUAN MANSO (ed.), *El Commentum Monacense a Terencio*. Anejos de Veleia, Series Minor, 31, Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, 2015, 571 pp., ISBN 978-84-9082-162-6.

The early mediaeval commentaries on Terence are a greatly undervalued resource, both for students of the text of Terence and of its reception. They began to proliferate in the ninth century, as soon as the comedies became an established part of the Carolingian educational curriculum. Donatus' commentary had been rendered largely unusable due to the corruption of the text and its use of Greek, and to fill the vacuum a group of new commentaries appeared, modelling themselves on late-antique works on Vergil or Horace, but with little real information to go on—some of their glosses derive from standard grammars, but they also contain ludicrous explanations of the Roman past based on nothing more than misguided etymologies. Nevertheless, these texts became very popular, and quickly became contaminated—some early manuscripts, such as Paris, BnF, lat. 7903 (s.11), already contain two different redactions of the same notes written side by side in their margins.

Scientific, critical editions of these works are a major desideratum, and the problem for modern scholars has been further exacerbated by the partial edition published by Teubner in 1893 of the *Scholia Terentiana*, in which its editor, Friedrich Schlee, purported to offer readers a late-antique commentary which he reconstructed from various notes excerpted from a range of manuscripts, as well as a sufficient sample of a later commentary to demonstrate to them why they should not even bother reading it. Contemporary reviewers, such as E.K. Rand, were scathing, labelling Schlee's highly eclectic study "disastrous and futile", while the leading modern authority on Terence's transmission, Claudia Villa, has aptly described it as "una operazione arbitraria e del tutto inadeguata alla complessità del problema".¹

The *Commentum Monacense* (CM), a commentary originally copied in Brescia in Northern Italy around the year 1000, but now named after the single manuscript in which it is found, Munich, BSB, Clm 14420 (siglum *M*), was a particular victim of Schlee's hasty methodology. His main interest in it was in fact to extract the lemmata which he printed separately to provide evidence for the Δ branch of the Terence tradition, and he treated the remaining text of the CM in magpie fashion, including approximately a third of it in his reconstructed text. A good example is provided by the prologue to *Andria*, for which Schlee reproduces a single gloss in *M*, so that

¹ E. K. Rand, "Early Mediaeval Commentaries on Terence", *CP* 4, 1909, 359-89 at 366; C. Villa, *La "lectura Terentii"*. Vol. 1. *Da Ildemaro a Francesco Petrarca*, Padua 1984, 7.

the reader is left with no idea that the commentary on the prologue in fact occupies 31 lines in the manuscript.

Schlee's work, however misguided it may have been, also came at a time when classical scholars had little, if any, interest in the early reception and transmission of the texts which were their livelihood. In fact, until recently hardly anyone else has attempted to make any of these works available in print, and scholars are usually forced to rely on digital reproductions of manuscripts accessible on the internet. In the case of *M*, although the BSB has uploaded a reproduction, there is an added difficulty in that the opening four folios are severely damaged and practically illegible in the resolution provided on their website.

It is in this context that two major doctoral studies of the CM have been completed in recent years and have since been published. In 2011 Franz Schorsch produced a partial edition of the CM based on his dissertation at the University of Leipzig,² which contains a very useful introduction, discussing inter alia the relationship of the CM glosses to other texts, and summaries of the spelling and punctuation used by the scribe, but which has a major drawback in that he chose only to publish the commentary on three of the six plays, *Andria*, *Heautontimorumenos*, and *Phormio*.

Just four years later, Enara San Juan Manso (SJM) published the present edition, based on her dissertation at the University of the Basque Country. In it she provides a critical introduction which describes the mediaeval commentary traditions on Terence as well as the development of scholarly interpretations, the contents of the CM (comprising an *accessus* and glosses of various nature, grouped together as continuous text), the specific affinities of the CM to other manuscript traditions, the lemmata and their relationship to the text of Terence, and finally some reflections on the origins of the text and its sources. There is a complete description of *M*, then an extensive bibliography. Her text of the commentary for all six comedies (which I found very accurate whenever I had cause to examine it) then follows, accompanied by two apparatus; the first a slender one presenting variants from the other editions, such as Schlee and Schorsch, as well as a small number of cognate manuscripts (and glossing the lemmata using the Oxford edition of Kauer and Lindsay), and the second a much more extensive compilation of parallel passages from such sources as glossaries, grammarians, and other commentaries on Terence, including Donatus, Eugraphius, and the dominant exegetical text of the ninth century, the so-called *Commentum Brunsonianum* (CB), named after the early nineteenth-century editor of the only full edition of it to date, Paul Bruns.

I felt that some remarks of SJM about the importance of Schlee for scholarship on this topic (p. 12) were well-intentioned but misplaced—the gap

² F. Schorsch, *Das Commentum Monacense zu den Komödien des Terenz*, Tübingen 2011.

of more than a hundred years in any significant scholarship on this subject should be sufficient grounds for disregarding Schlee and his influence. It is also noteworthy (although by no means a criticism of SJM) that whenever she cites the CB it is through the medium of *H*, the manuscript from Halle used by Bruns in 1811 for his edition. *H* is later than many important witnesses for this text (such as BnF lat. 16235), and both contains interpolations and omits passages (in particular a large section of the commentary on *Adelphoe*); on the other hand, Bruns' edition is still the *only* easily accessible printed text of this commentary,³ and despite its relative early date, is a remarkably good transcript of the manuscript. What SJM's study really shows is the rapidly developing nature of this type of research. There has to be a starting point, and accurate editions such as this are required before other works are tackled—not only the CB, but also such works as the scholiastic commentaries on Terence. This in turn will allow us to study properly as yet unclassified exegetic traditions, such as those found in an inserted gathering in Escorial, S III 23, or in a later layer of glossing in Valenciennes, BM, 448.

Besides the immediate practical use of this edition for scholars struggling to decipher digital reproductions of *M*, particularly the opening folios, there is also some useful material provided on the nature of the text, particularly through SJM's analysis of scholia and their sources in the CM (pp. 17–22). Here in fact I found comparison of her analyses with those of Schorsch illuminating, since they come from different perspectives. In general, Schorsch's lists of examples are more complete and thorough,⁴ while SJM's give a much better overview since they relate to the full text of the CM. Thus SJM cites seven glosses where translations from Greek or Greek equivalents for Latin terms in Terence are given (p. 19 n.40), most of which occur in *Eunuchus*, while Schorsch, who did not publish this play, only lists two instances of the scholiast's apparent knowledge of Greek, both of which come from *Andria*.⁵ Nevertheless, neither of these was picked up on by SJM in this context—one is a direct word-gloss without reference to its Greek origin, while the other is a remark that the name Dauos is a Greek nominative. The two studies thus complement each other well, and can be used in close conjunction. Rather than going over the same territory, they exemplify the rich nature of this commentary material, where there is still much to explore.

³ A series of initial manuscript studies were undertaken in the 1970s by Y.-F. Riou into the CB, but unfortunately these did not progress beyond an edition of the *Accessus* to *Andria*; see 'Essai sur la tradition manuscrite du *commentum Brunsonianum* des comedies de Térence', *RHT* 3, 1973, 79–113.

⁴ Compare, for instance, his list of 26 usages of *ironice* or variants (p. 15 n.79); SJM (p. 20 n.50), cites only four "entre otros", while noting that it is by far the most commonly used reference to a rhetorical figure.

⁵ See Schorsch p. 17, and note too his useful observation that the varying quality of the scholia in the CM are a product of its disparate sources.

There remains the thorny issue of the relationship of the CM to the other commentary traditions. As noted by SJM, the close relationship of the lemmata in the CM to the text of BnF lat. 7900A (siglum *Pc*), written in Milan, as well as the presence in *Pc* of a chunk of commentary closely related to the CM, point strongly to a Northern Italian origin of the CM during the second half of the ninth century, in an area which had strong cultural links to Germany at this period. But there are still some much broader questions which need to be answered, particularly with regard to how some of the highly fanciful glosses of the CB, probably somewhat earlier in date and originating from the general area of Lotharingia,⁶ also turn up in the CM, while others do not. In the glosses to the didascalia to *Eunuchus*, for instance, SJM's edition now shows that the CM parallels the CB in stating that the *Ludi Megalenses* took their name from games dedicated to Jupiter which were held in the Greek city of Megale (*Eunuchus* 1 [didasc.]); in fact, they were held in Rome and were named after Cybele in her capacity as Mater Magna. Likewise, in the prologue to *Adelphoe* the CM parallels the CB in stating that the play *Synapothnescontes* by Diphilus was called *Sinaphotnes*, and that Contes Diphilus was a Greek playwright (*Adelphoe* 6a); this amusing error must have come about through ignorance of Greek and false word division of an exemplum in *scriptio continua*.

But the CM does not include other ludicrous inventions of the CB, such as its explanation of the didascalia to *Eunuchus* that the musician at the first performance, Flaccus, performed on *tibiae* which were of unequal length because a lame man has one leg shorter than the other (misunderstanding *Claudi* in the name *Flaccus Claudi* [i.e. Flaccus slave of Claudius] as a form of *claudus*, 'lame').⁷ Rand, who appears to have relied solely on Schlee for readings in *M*, in fact assumed that this last reading was present in *M*,⁸ and so placed little value on the CM, but SJM's edition now clearly shows it was not. Does this partial independence therefore show that the CM was a revision of the CB by careful scholars, or rather do both commentaries independently incorporate strands of faulty critical traditions? The relationship of the two texts needs to be established firmly, which can only start to happen when a critical edition of the CB of the same thorough standard as that of SJM appears.

ANDREW TURNER
The University of Melbourne
ajturner@unimelb.edu.au

⁶ For discussion of dating, see R. Jakobi, "Das Commentum Brunianum," in *Terentius Poeta*, ed. P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers, F. Felgentreu, Munich 2007, 37.

⁷ For discussion, see *A Facsimile Edition of Terence's Comedies: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F. 2. 13*, ed. B.J. Muir and A.J. Turner, Bodleian Digital Texts 2, Oxford 2011, "Introduction" § 6.3.

⁸ Rand (n.1), at 363.