

preten, der an einzelnen Stellen metrische Erscheinungen „malerisch“ oder „symbolisch“ deutet, haben bei aller Gegensätzlichkeit ein gemeinsames Kennzeichen: sie verlocken dazu, die Einzelstelle zu isolieren und streng genommen nicht Vergleichbares zu vergleichen.

Bloße Statistik überwindend, haben neuere Forscher<sup>24)</sup> die Metrik vor allem für die Interpretation des Einzelverses durch genaue Feststellung der Emphase bestimmter Worte und der Rolle der Satzgliederung fruchtbar gemacht. Man weiß, daß die Metrik heute der fortlaufenden Interpretation dienen kann. Es wurde hier versucht, auf diesem Wege zu einer interpretierenden Metrik zwei weitere Schritte zu tun: einmal, den metrischen Gesamtverlauf eines Gedichtes genau darzustellen, zum andern die beobachteten rhythmischen Linien mit dem Inhalt zu konfrontieren. – Der erste Schritt hat Konsequenzen für die Erkenntnis metrischer „Besonderheiten“ nach ihrem Stellenwert im rhythmischen Ganzen; auf diese funktionale Beurteilung der metrischen Einzelercheinung wird die Metrik wohl immer weniger verzichten können. – Der zweite Schritt, die Beobachtung der Konvergenzen zwischen Metrum und Inhalt, und zwar mit dauernder Rücksicht auf die Gesamtstruktur in beiden Bereichen, kann den philologischen Interpreten vielleicht anregen, das Verhältnis von Gehalt und Gestalt einmal von einer anderen Seite zu betrachten.

Heidelberg

Michael von Albrecht

---

## FRAGMENTS OF A NEW MANUSCRIPT OF LIVY

A *bifolium* of a manuscript of the first Decade of Livy has recently been rediscovered in the Hessisches Staatsarchiv at Marburg<sup>1)</sup>. It had come to Marburg when the archives and documents of the old Principality of Waldeck were moved there after

---

<sup>24)</sup> Vor allem Hans Drexler und Nils-Ola Nilsson.

<sup>1)</sup> I owe my knowledge of it to the kindness of my friend, Prof. Maunach, of the University of South Africa, who discussed the fragments with

the integration of Waldeck; for it had been used as a binding for a tax register and has an inscription on the bottom of the second verso:

Meininghëuser  
heb Register  
1641

Meininghëuser is Mengerlinghausen, one of the principal centres of the Waldeck Principality<sup>2</sup>).

The text is written in double columns of 39 lines with an average of 28 letters to the line; the height of the columns is 23.5 cm. and the width 7 cm. Dr. R.W. Hunt, who has kindly examined the photographs, tentatively identifies the hand as German minuscule of the eleventh century but precise identification with the hand of any known centre requires further research. The surviving text covers 5. 35. 5 *nullam iniuriam* – 5. 39. 2 *postquam nihil* and 6. 2. 11 *corum Romanis* – 6. 6. 1 *ab Licinio*. It must, therefore, have been the outside *bifolium* of a quaternion, because each side contains approximately 55–57 lines of the Oxford text and the lacuna amounts to 667 lines or the equivalent of 12 sides (55 × 12 = 660).

I have made a complete collation of the fragment, checking it, for convenience, against the text of the Oxford Classical Text (edited by Conway and Walters), and have noted all the places where it offers a divergent reading. The citations of other manuscripts, which will be seen to differ in some details from the reports in the Oxford text, are based upon fresh inspection of the actual manuscript and photostats<sup>3</sup>, made for a forthcoming new edition of the text of Livy 1–5<sup>4</sup>). For simplicity I refer to the fragment by the symbol W. Where only the reading of W is cited in the final column, it means that all the other manuscripts have the reading given in the Oxford text.

---

me and entrusted me with the responsibility of editing them. The credit for their original discovery belongs to the librarian of the Hessisches Staatsarchiv.

2) See, e. g. L. Bockshammer, *Ältere Territorialgeschichte der Grafschaft Waldeck* (1958), 187 ff.

3) I have used the collation of T by J. Dianu, *Tite-Live, étude et collation du manuscrit 5726 de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (1895).

4) For simplicity I use the sigla and the stemma conventionally employed for classifying the manuscripts of the first Decade; see, e. g. Bayet, *Tite-Live* (ed. Budé), tome 1, pp. lxxviii ff; R. M. Ogilvie, *C.Q.* 7 (1957), 68 ff.

	Oxford Text	Manuscripts	
I a)	1. 5.35.6	eos	eo W
	2.	Gallos	Gallus W
	3. 5.36.3	maluerint	maluerit WHOEDLMP: maluerint P <sup>c</sup> FUBA
	4.	adferant	afferent W
	5. 5.36.4	iisdem	hisdem W <i>cett.</i>
	6.	dimicatueros ut	dimica ut W
	7. 5.36.5	aut minari	aut mirari W: haud mirari H: aut minari <i>cett.</i>
	8.	cum illi se in	cum illis in W: cum illis ei in H: cum illi se in <i>cett.</i>
	9.	virorum	vivorum W
	10. 5.36.7	equo	quo W
b)	11. 5.36.8	eundem	eundem W
	12. 5.36.9	decerneretur	decerneret WHOEPFBLA: decerneretur F <sup>c</sup> D
	13. 5.36.10	tribuni militum	T.R. milia W
	14. 5.36.11	Q. Servilius quartum P. Cornelius Maluginensis	que Servilius quarto P. Servilius Maluginenses W: Q. Servilius Maluginensis H: Q. Servilius quarto P. Servilius Maluginensis <i>cett.</i>
	15. 5.37.1	civitas quae	civitasque W
	16. 5.37.2	extraordinarii	extraordinari WHE: extraordinarii <i>cett.</i>
	17	aut auxilii	auxilii WH: aut auxilii <i>cett.</i>
II a)	18. 5.37.4	convolsis	cum vulcis W
	19. 5.37.5	magno	magna W
	20. 5.37.6	celeritas	celebritas W: celoeritas H: celeritas <i>cett.</i>
	21. 5.37.7	haud	haut W
	22.	miscetur	miscentur WHOEPM: miscetur P <sup>c</sup> UFBA <sup>e</sup>
	23. 5.37.8	erant	erat W
	24.	tumultus	tumultos W
	25. 5.38.1	deductam	deductam W
	26. 5.38.2	erat ab dextera	ab dextera erat W

	27. 5. 38.3	artem	pano W
	28.	concurrissent	concurrissent WHOEPFUBL: cucurrisset DA: concurrissent M
b)	29. 5. 38.4	haud	haut W
	30. 5. 38.5	omnium	hominem W: hominum <i>cett.</i>
	31. 5. 38.8	multosque	multoque W
	32.	hausere	ausere W: haudere HO: hausere <i>cett.</i>
	33. 5. 38.9	incolumis	incolomis W
	34. 5. 39.1	obstepefactos	obstepefactos W: u We-s.1
	35.	velut	velud W
III a)	36. 6. 2. 13	Volscum	Vulscorum W
	37. 6. 2. 14	castra	crasta W
	38. 6. 3. 2	omnis	omnes W
	39.	adissent	adisset W
	40. 6. 3. 3.	inermis	inermes WT <sup>e</sup> OEPFUBM: inermis Ver. Ht
	41. 6. 3. 4	ultima	ultimam W
	42. 6. 3. 5	soluta	salute W: soluata T: soluta T <sup>e</sup> <i>cett.</i>
b)	43. 6. 3. 7	si qua	si quid W
	44.	se in agros eicere possent	se in agro eicere possint W: in agros eicere possent T: se in agros eicere possent <i>cett.</i>
	45. 6. 3. 8	alii arma	aliis arma WT: alii arma T <sup>e</sup> <i>cett.</i>
	46.	ab desperatione	ad desperationem W: ab desperationem T: ab desperatione T <sup>e</sup> <i>cett.</i>
	47. 6. 3. 9	ad decertandum	ad certandum W
	48. 6. 4. 1	triumphans rediit trium	triumphans praemium ad nos venientibus rediit trium p̄ W: triumphans praemium ad nos venientibus rediit trium HTDLA: triumphans rediit trium <i>cett.</i>

49. 6.4.2 currum *om.* W  
 50. ut quae WHTDLA: ut *cett.*  
 51. 6.4.3 quas quasi W  
 52. 6.4.4 accepti qui acceptique WT:  
 accepti qui T<sup>c</sup> *cett.*
- IV a) 53. 6.4.5 senatus consulto a Veiiis  
 soc. a vehis W:  $\overline{\text{soc}}$  auheis T:  
 $\overline{\text{sc}}$  auheis T<sup>c</sup>: senatus con-  
 sulto ( $\overline{\text{sc.}}$ ) a Veiiis *cett.*
54. occupatis ibi occupati sibi WT: occupatis  
 ibi T<sup>c</sup> *cett.*
55. contulerant contulerunt WHTDLA:  
 contulerant T<sup>c</sup> *cett.*
56. capitalisque poena qui non  
 capitalisque non W: capitalis  
 quae poena quae non T:  
 capitalisque poena quae non  
 T<sup>c</sup>: capitalisque poena qui  
 non *cett.*
57. 6.4.7 L. Iulius Iulus L. Aquilius  
 iullus tullius lutius aquili W:  
 iullus tullius lucius aquibus  
 TDL:  
 iullus tullius lucius aquilius  
 T<sup>c</sup>H:  
 l. iulius l. aquilius Ver. M:  
 iulius l. aquilius PFUB:  
 iulius tullius l. aquilius E:  
 iulius tullius aquilius OE<sup>e</sup>
58. 6.4.8 relinqueretur relinquerent  
 WHTDLAPFUBOEM:  
 relinqueretur Ver.
59. 6.4.9 oppida Etruscorum  
 oppida truscorum W:  
 oppid etruscorum: T:  
 oppida Etruscorum T<sup>c</sup> *cett.*
60. capta. ad Cortuosam  
 capta atque diruta Cortuosam  
 W: capta atque capta diruta-  
 que Cortuosam HTDL:  
 capta dirutaque Cortuosam A:

			capta ad Cortuosam Ver. T <sup>c</sup> OËPFUBM
	61. 6.4.10	integro	integros W
	62. 6.4.11	iam	vi W: iam W <sup>c</sup>
b)	63.	praeda erat	praede erat W: praederat T: praeda erat T <sup>c</sup> <i>cett.</i>
	64. 6.4.12	quadrato substructum	quadrato obstructum W: qua- dratos obstructum T: quadra- tos substructum T <sup>c</sup> : quadrato substructum <i>cett.</i>
	65. 6.5.2	in spem	spem WT: in <i>add.</i> T <sup>c</sup> <i>cett.</i>
	66. 6.5.3	quam a Volscis	quam Vulsciis W: quam Vol- scis ( <i>vel</i> Vulscis) MPOU: quam Vulcis FE: quam Vul- sciscis B: quam a Vulsciis ( <i>vel</i> Vulsciis) HTDLA
	67.	habuerint	habuerunt W <i>cett.</i>
	68. 6.5.5	moverunt	moverat WHITDLAUOE <sup>c</sup> : moverat T <sup>c</sup> PFBE: moveunt M: movent M
	69. 6.5.6	Potitus	Putitus WTHDLAPFBM: Potitus OEU
	70. 6.5.7	Publicolam	Publico iam WT: Publicolam T <sup>c</sup> <i>cett.</i>
	71.	creat; ii	creati hi WHOEU: creati hii TDLAPFBM
	72. 6.5.8	a T. Quintio	at lito quintio W: at tu ut oquitio T: at tito quintio T <sup>c</sup> : a tito quin(c)tio <i>cett.</i>
	73.	Stellatina	Stellatine W
	74.	Tromentina	Tremtina W: trementina H: romentina M: Tromentina <i>cett.</i>
	75.	Sabatina	Sabitina W
	76.	aeaque	aeaque W: haeaequae T: aeaequae T <sup>c</sup> : aaeaque H: aeaque MPFBOE: hae quoque U: aeae DLA
	77. 6.6.1	L. Sicinio	Licino WDLA: l. icinio HT: sicinio T <sup>c</sup> : L. Sicinio MPFUBOE

The results of this collation are of great importance and interest because they show that the fragment comes from a manuscript that would be of primary authority for the text of the first Decade. It can be seen at once that it belongs to the Nicomachean recension: it does not share any of Ver.'s characteristic readings (e.g. 6.3.9 *ultima in spe*; 6.4.5 *contemnentium*; 6.4.7 *anni exitu*; *et al.*) or omissions (e.g. 6.4.5 *ex ferocibus ... Roma*). Within the Nicomachean tradition it clearly belongs to the  $\lambda$  branch as the gloss at 6.4.1 (48) demonstrates. This is confirmed by other significant errors (50, 55, 57, 60, 77). W shares no significant errors with the  $\pi$  branch alone or with M alone. Furthermore it shows the closest affinity with H and, especially, T (which, of course, is only extant for Books 6–10). Notice particularly 7, 8, 16, 20, 42, 45, 46, 52, 53, 54, 59, 63, 64, 65, 72, 74, 76. It does not share the progressive errors displayed by the later witnesses to the  $\lambda$  tradition, notably DLA: cf., for instance, 28, and also 5.36.9 *Fabiorum ... placebat om.* DA; 6.4.1 *vero add.* DA; 6.4.5 (*b*) *aedificande* DLA. The only reading which would appear to be at variance with this conclusion is 5.38.7 where W rightly reads *nec* with T (and the corrector of M) against *ne* of the other manuscripts but this reading is not in itself significant and could be accidental, conjectural or influenced by *neclamore* immediately above. W, in addition to having numerous errors of its own, does not contribute any single new right reading to the text but its place in the history of the manuscripts of Livy is high. There is no formal reason why it should not be (indirectly) derived from T or a twin of T, and therefore for 5.35.5–5.39.2. (where T is missing) it should be cited in any future edition.

The relationship of W to H is corroborated by its provenance, because H has long been known to be in a German script. It is also relevant that O, which represents a basically  $\pi$  text, very close to E, but which has been contaminated with the  $\lambda$  tradition, was also written in or near Germany, possibly at Metz. H probably dates from the late tenth century, O from the early eleventh century. Some further light may be shed on the problem by the history of T which was written partly in the hand and under the direction of Servatus Lupus of Ferrières<sup>5</sup>) and which in its present state is the second half of a complete manuscript of the first Decade<sup>6</sup>). Lupus visited Hrabanus Maurus at Fulda about 828

5) C.H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières* (Med. Acad. of America, No. 4, 1930), p. 3 n. 1.

6) Dianu, *op. cit.* p. 7.

B.C. when Hrabanus was assembling his great collection of manuscripts<sup>7</sup>). No complete catalogue of Fulda manuscripts survives from that period but the mid-sixteenth century catalogue has an entry of a manuscript of the First Decade (*Ordo XXVII* no. 331)<sup>8</sup>) and it is probable that this manuscript, like the majority of the others listed, was old. Its fate is unknown. Fr. Modius referred to readings of a Fulda manuscript in his Frankfurt edition of 1588. Unfortunately none of the explicit citations which Modius makes coincides with the surviving fragment but something of the character of Modius' manuscript can be inferred from the following passages where he cites readings from it. I have selected them only from books 6–10 because of the closeness of T to the tradition in question.

7. 14. 1	rem bonam exemplo haud probabili actam cernebat	cernebat censebat MTOLA: cernebant censebat HD: censebat PFUBT <sup>e</sup>
9. 15. 7	amissa erant	<i>sic</i> MT <sup>e</sup> (missa erant T): amiserant (amiserant P) <i>cett.</i>
9. 30. 10	imperatorque	imperatoque T: impetratoque Ty <i>cett.</i>
10. 12. 6	professione	professione MTPFDLA: profectione UO
10. 13. 8	restringenda	restringuenda T: restingenda T <sup>e</sup> <i>cett.</i>
10. 14. 8	desperatos improviso tumultu	<i>sic</i> TODLA: desperato improviso tumultu M: <i>om.</i> PFU
10. 41. 14	qui ... erant muros occupavere: penetrare in interiora	qui T <sup>c</sup> P <sup>2</sup> F: quae MTPDLA muros T <sup>em</sup> : muri T <i>cett.</i> in interiora TDLA: interiora MPF.

The passages are not quite adequate to demonstrate that W was the manuscript used by Modius but some connection is manifest, so that the probability is high. When Fulda was sacked by

7) P. Lehmann, *Aus Fuldas Geistesleben* (1928), p. 15.

8) Palat. Lat. 1928. See K. Christ, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 64, 1933, pp. 130, 209.

Gustavus Adolphus in 1632<sup>9)</sup>, its manuscripts were scattered but since the land was given to William of Hesse, Waldeck would be a natural place for fragments of manuscripts to turn up.

Whether Lupus brought a T-text to Fulda from which W is ultimately derived or whether he found a manuscript at Fulda from which he copied T is not yet clear. The latter is perhaps more likely, but the connection between Lupus and Fulda must account at bottom for the relationship between T and W.

Oxford

R.M.Ogilvie

---

## AISCHYLOS ÜBER DIE FLOTTENSTÄRKE BEI SALAMIS (PERS. 333–347)

Die Zahl der Schiffe, wie sie Aischylos in den Persern v. 338 ff. durch den Boten der Königin Atossa vorrechnen läßt, hat seit dem Scholiasten zwei verschiedene Auslegungen gefunden. Der Scholiast behauptet z. St.<sup>1)</sup>, es seien nur 300 griechische und 1000 persische Schiffe gewesen. Erst neuerdings wurde seine These von Kierdorf in der Nachfolge von Broadhead und Blomfield wieder aufgegriffen<sup>2)</sup>. Nach der zweiten

---

9) Kl. Höffler, *Deutsche Klosterbibliotheken* (1922), 133 ff.

1) Scholia in Aeschyli Persae, ed. O. Dähnhardt, Lipsiae 1894: Scholia A, p. 112 und 114, zu v. 340 sqq. *Και γὰρ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις μὲν ὁ πᾶς ἀριθμὸς τῶν νεῶν εἰς τριακάδας δέκα ἦν, ἥτοι τ' νῆες ἦσαν. Ἐκ τούτων δὲ δέκα ἦσαν αἰ προηρούμεναι ὡς ἔκκριτοι καὶ βελτίονες καὶ ταχεῖαι. Τῶν δὲ ἑξέρη χιλιάς ἦν νεῶν, ἄντιων τὸ πλῆθος ἦγεν. Ἀπὸ τούτων δὲ αἰ ἔκκριτοι καὶ ἀριστοὶ καὶ ὑπέροκμοι καὶ ἐπαιρούμεναι διὰ τὸ εἶναι ταχεῖαι σ'...* Vgl. auch Scholia M, p. 115, zu v. 343 *Ἐκ τῶν τ' δέκα ἦσαν αἰ ἠρούμεναι ὡς βελτίονες.*

2) C. J. Blomfield, *Aeschyli Persae*, Lipsiae 1823, S. 132; E. R. Langeus et G. Pingerus, *Aeschyli Persae*, Berolini 1825, S. 173; J. W. Blakesley, *Herodotus*, London 1854 zu 7,89; W. W. Tarn, *The fleet of Xerxes*. *JHS* 28, 1908, S. 203; A. W. Gomme, *An historical commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford 1950, I. Bd. S. 234 f. und H. D. Broadhead, *The Persae of Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1960, S. 115 und 338; schließlich W. Kierdorf, *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege*, Studien zu Simonides, Pindar, Aischylos und den attischen Rednern, Göttingen 1966 (*HYPOMNEMATA*, Heft 16), S. 67.

Merkwürdigerweise geben die folgenden Autoren die Zahl der grie-