

Author(s): John J. Peradotto

Reviewed work(s): Codices Graeci Vaticani Saeculis XIII et XIV Scripti Annorumque Notis

Instructi by Alexander Turyn

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 88, No. 2, (Apr., 1967), pp. 209-213

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

REVIEWS.

ALEXANDER TURYN. *Codices Graeci Vaticani Saeculis XIII et XIV Scripti Annorumque Notis Instructi.* Bybliotheca Vaticana, 1964. Pp. xvi + 206; 205 pls.

Man, Jespersen has said, is a classifying animal. Our exact sciences seem to have as their aim the observation, comparison, and classification of data, the reduction of manifold variety to that ordered and fixed stability suggested in the etymology of the Greek word for exact science, *ἐπιστήμη*. The biologist, for example, not settling for the relatively uncritical classifications of language and conventional observation, minutely observes and compares the vast number of species at his disposal and, on the basis of comparative anatomy, genetics, behavior, ecology, etc., classifies them into expanding hierarchies of genus, family, order, class, phylum, and kingdom. Without this kind of observation, comparison, and classification, no body of knowledge can claim to be an exact and objective science.

One discipline which however long in the practice is still drastically short on exactness and objectivity is Greek paleography. For while the considerably larger number of Latin manuscripts can be dated and localized with some degree of accuracy, Greek manuscripts, with their infinitely greater and more bewildering variety of handwriting styles, especially for minuscules, make the business of estimating date and provenience hazardous in the extreme. Greek paleographers have long recognized the need for a complete catalogue of certainly dated manuscripts equipped with photographic specimens of each hand as well as the evidence for dating. Such a catalogue would serve as the paleographer's Archimedean point—the point of fixed scientific accuracy—against which manuscripts of unknown date and origin but identical handwriting style could be compared and classified. To be sure, this would not absolve the Greek paleographer of the need to acquire that sensitive capacity for discerning stylistic differences which comes from prolonged observation of a variety of hands. But in the absence of genuinely dated criteria, the most discriminating eye will slip into haphazard judgments analogous to those of the layman who ignores the fixed and refined taxonomic criteria of biology and, basing his judgments merely on superficial resemblance or identical environment and behavior, goes on to classify whales with fish or spiders with insects.

More than forty years ago Victor Gardthausen urged that such a catalogue was vital to the status of the discipline as a science, and even proposed a plan for its execution (*Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 1920, pp. 35-9). For one reason or another (mainly, perhaps, the fact that the manuscripts are widely scattered and often difficult of access, perhaps also the dearth of interested parties) the proposal has not been completely realized. But giant strides have

been taken in that direction in such works as Roberts' study of papyrus scripts, *Greek Literary Hands 350 B. C.—A. D. 400* (1956), Omont's *Fac-similés des manuscrits grecs datés de la Bibliothèque Nationale du IX^e au XIV^e siècle* (1891), the volumes of Cereteli and Sobolevski, and especially the monumental work of Kirsopp and Silva Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200* (1934-1945). Devreesse's *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (1954) contains an invaluable appendix which lists dated Greek manuscripts from A. D. 514 to 1593. Now we have Turyn's critical study of thirteenth and fourteenth century dated Greek manuscripts in the Vatican Library.

In planning the present work, Turyn tells us he first set himself the task of taking up where the Lakes left off, that is, of investigating dated Greek manuscripts from 1200 to 1400 in western European libraries of rather easy access and then of publishing specimens thereof. Soon finding this beyond the comfortable limits of a single volume, he considered it the next best thing to narrow the scope of his investigation to the Vatican Library. His preparatory exploration took him through recent inventories and catalogues of the Vatican collection, numerous critical editions and studies of ancient and Byzantine literature, both sacred and secular, and involved what must have been an exhausting search for pertinent subscriptions in the large number of codices not yet included in recent catalogues (over 1500 *Vatic. gr.* and over 400 *Barberin. gr.*). Then, for all those manuscripts which this investigation placed within the period under consideration, Turyn addressed himself more critically to subscriptions and notes containing dates, using ultraviolet light in the case of badly preserved material, rigorously excluding those with doubtful or unclear letters or numbers and those written by another hand than the scribe's or whose date represents the time of the completion not of the manuscript but of the prototype (e. g. *Ottobon. gr.* 440).

For each of the 107 manuscripts studied, Turyn has given a full scale photographic specimen of each hand (citing what portion of the text it contains and, in most cases, what critical edition of the work may be consulted), a description of the contents, critical data on origin and provenience, and a complete bibliography of other studies and reproductions. In addition, the colophons themselves are photographically reproduced and transcribed so that the reader himself may easily ascertain how sound the evidence for dating is and how accurately Turyn has assessed it. Wherever a colophon is found to yield considerable insight into the history and culture of the middle ages, Turyn accordingly brings it to the reader's attention. In cases where more than a single scribe worked on a manuscript but only one was responsible for a subscription, Turyn includes more than one facsimile only if he is able to demonstrate unequivocally that the codex was written continuously. It is in such cases that he shows himself the master of his art, when he certifies the date of the whole manuscript as that of the single subscription by an analysis of how that manuscript came to be assembled out of the various contributions of its scribes.

As one might expect, his descriptions of the contents of the thirty

manuscripts not as yet treated in the recent catalogues are more painstaking (*Barberin. gr.* 164, 297, 455, 503, 515, 541, *Vatic. gr.* 867, 899, 918, 920, 932, 980, 984, 1070, 1081, 1118, 1134, 1296, 1455, 1755, 1877, 1899, 1973, 2019, 2153, 2205, 2220, 2281, 2383, 2563). This is not to say, however, that his discussion of the other codices is cursory, for while he understandably avoids repeating all the particulars one may readily find in a catalogue entry, he nonetheless makes it his aim to indicate at least summarily the nature of each manuscript's contents. It is imperative that we have this information in analyzing the samples, for, as Turyn demonstrates, *genre* must be considered along with time and place of origin as a factor which determines variety of scripts. Some examples: one Romanos, the scribe of *Vatic. gr.* 1070, uses his everyday style in the colophon, then a solemn and careful style with rather few abbreviations for the psalms, and a third style, more cursive and relaxed with more abbreviations, for the *Quicumque Vult*; the scribe of *Vatic. gr.* 867 uses a solemn, expansive style with few abbreviations for the spurious *Lexicon* of Cyril of Alexandria, a more relaxed but still quite elegant hand with a moderate number of compendia for a Greek translation of Symeon Seth's *Stephanites and Ichnelates*, and, finally, for legal documents, a more cursive hand with small letters and a large number of compendia. Nor does a simple sacred/secular criterion, evident in these examples, suffice in every case for variety of style by a single scribe: one of the two scribes of *Vatic. gr.* 984 uses small letters and frequent compendia for Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae*, and a more formal and larger hand with fewer compendia for the same author's *Bellum Judaicum*.

A close study of so many thoroughly analyzed and documented specimens will not only enable trained paleographers to date other manuscripts with more precision, but may, so Turyn hopes, occasionally bring it about that they recognize some of the hands reproduced here in other manuscripts with which they happen to be especially familiar, thereby discovering much more about their dates, scribes, and places of origin, as well as possibly learning what role these scribes played in the manuscript tradition of certain works. Turyn often points the way as, for example, when his own acquaintance with the hand of Nicolaus Triclinius leads him to the strong suspicion that *Urb. gr.* 126 is the work of that scribe (pp. 112 f.). In the same way he recognizes the hand of *Vatic. gr.* 7 (clearly dated 1310) in *Ambros. L 39 sup.* and *L 44 sup.*, and thereby reveals the error of the cataloguers and other scholars who have attributed the latter to the close of the fourteenth century (p. 109 and *addenda*). Another and more important example of the same kind of thing occurs when, in analyzing *Vatic. gr.* 175 (pp. 124-30), Turyn recognizes the hands of the same anonymous scribe and the same learned corrector-rubricator, Ioannes Katrares, as in *Ven. Marc.* 616 (now 663, and appearing under the siglum G in most editions), which contains the seven extant plays of Sophocles and the Byzantine triad, *Agamemnon*, and *Eumenides* of Aeschylus, with annotations, various scholia, etc. in Katrares' hand, the more significant of which are the argument to the *Persae* and the "proto-Triclinian" metrical scholia to *Pers.* 1 and *Ag.* 1 and 40. Turyn reasons that, since the collabora-

tion of these two scribes is associated with a period of time somewhere around 1321/1322 (the firmly certified date of *Vatic. gr.* 175), and since the "proto-Triclinian" portions of *Ven. Marc.* 616 cannot have come before the time of Triclinius' scholarly acme, *Ven. Marc.* 616 must now be assigned to around 1320-1325, whereas previously it had been ascribed to the fifteenth century (e. g. by Merkel, Wecklein, Wilamowitz, Mazon, Murray, Fraenkel, and even Turyn himself), too late for serious consideration. This piece of evidence adds solid support to his own earlier conclusion and that of R. D. Dawe (*The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus*, pp. 189-94) that *Ven. Marc.* 616 represents a less contaminated stage of the tradition than *Neapol.* ii.F.31 (= Tr), the autograph of Triclinius' final edition. Also, by recognizing the hand of Katrares in the Euripidean P (= *Palatin. gr.* 287 and *Laurent. Conv. Suppr.* 172), which served as printer's copy for the *editio princeps* of Euripides in 1503/1504, Turyn is able to date it in the same period as *Ven. Marc.* 616.

Turyn takes nothing for granted in what a scribe may say in the subscription. He often catches one writing his date with discrepant year and indiction numbers, or with the wrong month or even day of the week. Neither does he take for granted what other scholars have had to say about the manuscripts under study. He corrects the Vatican cataloguers' transcription of the difficult monocondylion in the colophon of *Ottobon. gr.* 145 from Πέτρος ὁ εὐτελής μοναχός to Πέτρος ὁ Τελέμαχος and then invites the reader to verify his attribution by comparing *Ottobon. gr.* 145 with the known works of Petros Telemachos, *Coistin.* 168 and *Athos Laur.* I 70 (pp. 157 ff.). He exposes the serious misdating of *Palatin. gr.* 7, containing the *Batrachomyomachia* (V^s in Allen) and the *Odyssey* (R^s in Allen) by showing that it is the work not of George Chrysococcos the fifteenth century scribe, but of a learned physician-astronomer-scribe with the same name who flourished a century earlier. Students of the manuscript tradition of Aristophanes will find, thanks to Turyn, that White (*C. P.*, I [1906], p. 17) has not only misnumbered *Vatic. gr.* 38, but has failed to indicate that it contains the *Frogs* in addition to the *Plutus* and the *Clouds* (p. 130). Scrupulously re-examining the date in *Vatic. gr.* 2281, he turns up the forms εἶτον . . . εἰς τὸν κόσμῳ κτλ. (not the expected εἶτους . . . ἐκ τὸν κόσμῳ as transcribed in Franchi de' Cavalieri-Lietzmann, *Specimina codicum graecorum Vaticanorum*², p. xv, no. 35), and then cites for comparison the occurrence of εἶτον for εἶτους in certain inscriptions found in Syria. These are but random samples. A complete list of points like these where Turyn corrects or significantly qualifies scholarly work on the manuscripts in question would be too long for a review of the present kind. Suffice it to say that scholars involved directly or indirectly with the manuscripts that fall within the scope of Turyn's study would be rash indeed to overlook this book.

The text has been handsomely laid out, and (except for an unfortunate slip on the cover) meticulously proof-read. It is equipped with all the aids one expects of a good reference work of its type: an index of the manuscripts studied, page headings which include manuscript titles, plate references, and dates, a detailed *index nomi-*

num et rerum containing, among other things, names of scribes, key phrases from the colophons found to be helpful in identifying a manuscript by time or place of origin, and a list of manuscripts cited other than those which are the book's main concern (to which should be added, for the sake of completeness, a reference to *Vatic. gr.* 569 on p. 109).

"*Taedium perquirendorum codicum declinabam, non solum quia bibliothecarum pulvere vesci minime amo, sed etiam quia alios talia multo melius ac facilius expedire probe scio.*" So said Wilamowitz in the introduction to his critical edition of Aeschylus. His distaste for the centuries of dust that old books collect is not unique. He speaks for generations of philologists who have either given the tedious scrutiny of manuscripts short shrift or abandoned it entirely to scholars like Alexander Turyn who are at once more patient and more competent to lay the grounds of an exact science of Greek paleography and thereby to prepare in relative obscurity the indispensable pre-conditions for what, by the standards of the day, seem to be the more marketable wares of their colleagues.

JOHN J. PERADOTTO.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO.

T. A. DOREY (ed.). Cicero. Studies in Latin Literature and Its Influence. New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1965. Pp. xiii + 218. \$4.95.

This work is the first in a series of publications under the general supervision of D. R. Dudley and T. A. Dorey. If the present volume is any indication, one can look forward eagerly to its successors on Lucretius, Latin Historians, and Roman Drama. Seven eminent British scholars have contributed essays and the product is even more than one is led to expect. It is not just a study of Cicero as a literary figure, but also as a politician, a thinker, and a man. The book is designed primarily for the non-specialist, who is certainly well-served here. But there is sufficient scholarly apparatus, controversial judgment, and novel interpretation to stimulate as well the serious student of Latin literature and Roman history. Naturally, with seven contributors, the results will be uneven; but the general level is high. Many will find fault with details, but the conception is to be applauded. A satisfactory book on Cicero has yet to be written in English and, until one is, this collection of essays, all produced specifically for the volume, fills at least part of the void in admirable fashion.

H. H. Scullard's essay is a sketch of Cicero's political career in 25 pages. How does one perform a task of such magnitude in so brief a space? It is a venture easy to criticize, difficult, perhaps impossible, to carry off. Scullard, on the whole, has eschewed generalities and presents the events of his subject's career in chronological sequence. This calls for judicious selectivity, a matter of personal