

Enara SAN JUAN MANSO, *El Commentum Monacense a Terencio*, Bilbao, Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco, 2015 (Anejos de *Veleia*. Series Minor, 31), 24 × 17 cm, 571 p., 26 €, ISBN 978-84-9082-162-6.

The textual tradition of Terence's comedies is an intimidating conundrum for the modern scholar, with more than 700 manuscripts and extensive horizontal transmission. Perhaps even more complex is the tradition of ancient (= late antique or medieval) scholarship on Terence, which consists above all in an immense corpus of scholia and glosses, still largely unedited and un-studied (for an overview see B. Victor, *History of the Text and Scholia*, in A. Augoustakis / A. Traill (ed.), *A Companion to Terence*, Oxford, 2013, p. 342-362). Most of this material is found as interlinear or marginal notes in Terence manuscripts, including in particular the famous Codex Bembinus (5th century) and a number of Carolingian exemplars. The origin and chronology of these scholia are often unclear: some could have written down in the manuscripts by their copyists, but more likely by one of their readers (as in the case of the Bembinus); some might have been composed *ex impromptu*, but more often they were copied from previous sources. These could be independent commentaries, such as that by Donatus (partly preserved), and/or notes found in earlier Terence manuscript(s), possibly, but not necessarily, the very manuscript from which Terence text was copied from time to time. Given its unfixed textual identity, this exegetical material was naturally prone to abridgement and interpolation, even when it was copied from a single manuscript together with the Terence text. In some cases, the marginal or interlinear notes were (re-)converted into a continuous, independent text (a 'commentary'), which nevertheless was always open to textual decomposition. Because of this textually fluid situation, every manuscript preserving exegetical notes on Terence, especially if anonymous, can be considered as the *codex unicus* of an independent tradition of Terence scholarship, or at least of a new version of it, as the author implies in the introduction of the volume under review (see also J. Zetzel's public lecture *In Rand's Margins: From Fraenkel's Review to a Post-Modern Servius*, APA, January 2004). This textual fluidity explains why most 'editions' of ancient Terence scholarship are collections of emended notes transcribed from individual manuscripts. That is to say, they are not critical editions in today's standard sense, deriving from a collation and 'Lachmannian' assessment of the testimonies, direct or indirect, of a given text, and aiming at the reconstruction of a 'genuine' text, as close as possible as to what the author wrote. The exception that proves the rule is F. Schlee's edition of *Scholia Terentiana* (Leipzig, 1893), which followed a 'traditional' editorial methodology, although fundamentally vitiated. In his edition, Schlee collected, emended and (arbitrarily) sorted into three 'traditions' a selection of notes transmitted in a (more or less) similar form in a number of manuscripts. His declared aim was to identify 'genuine' textual units out of the *mare magnum* of medieval scholia, 'to winnow out their ancient portions, leaving the medieval chaff behind', as E. K. Rand censoriously put it in an influential review (*Early Mediaeval Commentaries on Terence*, in *CPh* 4, 1909, p. 359-389). For this purpose, he selected and collated a number of 'authoritative' manuscripts, which accordingly preserved, although interspersed with 'spurious' material, notes originally belonging to one of these three traditions; these are four annotated MSS

of Terence (D, G, C, E) and a miscellaneous MS now in Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14420 [M]), which preserves a continuous, anonymous commentary of Carolingian origin (known as '*Commentum Monacense*', but see below). Schlee's edition met with scepticism or (harsh) criticism, and his idiosyncratic, and yet 'traditional' approach remains exceptional in the editorial history of Terence scholarship. Most other editors opted for a safer route, and printed texts from individual manuscripts: these include in particular P. J. Bruns' collection of notes from Halle Marienkirche 65 (H), attached to his Terence edition (Halle, 1811), and the collections of scholia and glosses found in Milan Ambros H.75 inf. (F) put together by A. Mai (*M. Acci Plauti fragmenta inedita. Item ad P. Terentium commentationes et picturae ineditae*, Milan, 1815), in Par. Lat. 12244 by E. Kalinka (*Analecta Latina: I. Scholia ad Terentium*, in WS 16, 1894, p. 78-85), in Vatican Lat. 3868 (C) by M. Warren (*Unpublished Scholia from the Vaticanus (C) of Terence*, in HSPH 12, 1901, p. 125-136), in Vat. Lat. 3226 (A Bembinus) by J. F. Mountford (*Scholia Bembinus*, London, 1934). All these 'editions' print the text as found in one particular manuscript, with only minor emendations; an extreme is Mountford's collection of the *Scholia Bembinus*, which is all but a diplomatic edition, apart from some editorial adjustments and additions. A *via media* between Schlee and Mountford's editorial methodologies is the one followed by F. Schorsch in his recent edition of parts of the commentary preserved in the aforementioned M manuscript (*Das Commentum Monacense zu den Komödien des Terenz*, Tübingen, 2011). Although the *Commentum Monacense* unusually appears as an independent continuous text, Schorsch's approach is similar to the one followed by previous editors of Terence scholia: he uses M as the main source, and does not systemically collate manuscripts that preserve portions of text comparable to the one transmitted in M, in different proportions (for a list see C. Villa, *La "Lectura Terentii"*, Padua, 1984, p. 29-30). In particular, he neglects Terence Par. Lat. 7900A (Pc), which preserves a very similar text to M, to the extent that Villa, followed by B. Munk Olsen (*La réception de la littérature classique au Moyen Âge (IX^e-XII^e siècle)*, Copenhagen, 1995, p. 45), considered it as a close relative of M, descending from the same Italian archetype. On the other hand, Schorch does extensively emend the text of M, not only spelling out abbreviations and standardising the orthography, but also correcting supposed 'mistakes' by collation with similar notes as transmitted in other traditions, including in particular Bruns' collection from H; to give just an example, at *Haut.* 382 M gives *tuae pulchritudini formam seruasti*, whereas Schorch prints *<quia> fidem seruasti*, reproducing the reading attested in the equivalent note in the *Commentum Brunsonianum*. Despite its partiality and flaws, Schorch's edition is thus to be commended for the awareness that M, just like all scholiastic manuscripts, preserves a unique text, which yet is made up of non-unique notes and thus belongs to 'a web of texts' (Zetzel). The reader might wonder by now when this review will actually begin. In fact, it is impossible to assess San Juan Manso's work without contextualising it within the textual and editorial history of ancient Terence scholarship, which I have sketched above. Building on her preliminary studies, San Juan Manso has produced the first complete edition of the *Commentum Monacense*, by which term she strictly refers to the exegetical work transmitted in manuscript M, ff. 79-144r, and no other text. As she emphasises in her 'criterios de edición' (p. 71-72), many of the glosses transmitted in M are also found, in a more or less similar form, in other manuscripts, but the collection of glosses found in M is unique; and it is this collection, this 'obra' that San Juan Manso edits, using M as a *codex singularis*, if not as a proper autograph. That is, she does not consider M as the descendent of an archetype of the *Commentum Monacense*: for her, the *Commentum Monacense* is the text transmitted in the *Codex Monacensis*, and not an earlier, archetypal text, to reconstruct with the aid of M and other

witnesses. An epitome of San Juan Manso's editorial approach is her treatment of the opening text (labelled 'accessus' by her) which precedes the actual *commentum* on *Andria*; only a few incomplete lines of this text remain in M, and only these are printed in her edition. In contrast, in previous works (including Schorch's edition) the missing parts of this *accessus* are reconstructed by using later manuscripts (especially Vat. Lat. 11455), and the completed text is referred to as *praefatio Monacensis*. San Juan Manso's editorial policy to reproduce a text as close as possible to M is not only apparent at the macro-level; in contrast with Schorch, she preserves medieval spellings (e.g. *An.* 1a *speties*, *An.* 233a *domine meae*), abbreviations (e.g. *An.* *Arg.* 1c *s.* for *scilicet*), and in general she prints the readings of M even when they do not make (very) good sense (e.g. *Haut.* 382 *tuae pulchritudini formam seruasti*, see above), or when they are patently 'wrong' (e.g. *An.* 200b *homine* and 235a *operiar*, both in Terence lemmata). Nevertheless, despite her dependence on M, San Juan Manso makes a more extensive use than Schorsch of other manuscript witnesses, in particular of Pc (Par. Lat. 7900A), which she often quotes in her primary apparatus; yet, as she emphatically underlines (p. 72), readings of Pc (and other manuscripts) are supposedly reported only to clarify doubtful readings of M. Whether this criterion is always applied is, however, not clear. In the lemma of *An.* 133a M gives *accurrit*, whereas San Juan Manso prints the 'correct' form *accurrit*, (also) found in Pc and indeed in all Terence tradition: is there need to report Pc in the apparatus to clarify M's reading? Moreover, *accurrit* is 'wrong', but if the aim of the editor is to print the original text of M, should not the editor preserve 'mistakes' of this kind, especially when they provide 'variant readings' for Terence lemmata? In fact, this is the rationale followed by San Juan Manso when she prints the aforementioned 'wrong' readings *homine* and *operiar*, against the 'correct' readings found in Pc, *omine* and *opperiar*. In contrast, she rejects the reading *illam* (257a) found in M, and prints the reading *ullam* of Pc, also because this is the one found in manuscripts of Terence (just like, however, *omine* and *opperiar*). Uncertainty and contradictions of this kind are probably inevitable in an edition based on what is *de facto* treated as an autograph manuscript: in such an edition all 'mistakes' can be potentially construed as original, and the purpose of a 'traditional' apparatus, such as San Juan Manso's primary apparatus, is less evident. The second apparatus is more helpful, presenting a learned and extensive collection of *loci paralleli*, including, but not restricted to, Donatus, Eugraphius and the *Commentum Brunsonianum*; this is one of the several reasons why San Juan Manso's volume improves, and probably supersedes, Schorch's incomplete 'edition'. The book is carefully researched, beautifully produced, and is accompanied by an extensive bibliography and a concise but helpful introduction, also discussing the *uexata quaestio* of the origin of the *Commentum* and its relationship with other similar texts. The policy of distinguishing between lemmata, glosses, proper notes and quotations is also valuable (cf. e.g. *An.* 160c **Doli**] sc. 'illius', nam non sunt uere nuptiae; item 'cum nihil obsint doli' i. 'calliditates serui', i. 'ante quam hoc possit scire Dauus'). I found less helpful the admixture of Latin and Spanish in the apparatus, which will make less appealing to the international audience what in any case will be the standard edition of this important piece of ancient scholarship. A final couple of notes. Although the overall argument on the uniqueness of M's text is correct, it is undeniable that most notes are not transmitted by M only, as San Juan Manso's extensive apparatuses helpfully reveal. As already pointed out, the *Commentum Monacense* is unique, but not its individual notes, which could (and at times should) be emended with less hesitation. In fact, despite her declaration of intents, San Juan Manso herself often uses other manuscripts to improve on the text preserved by M, as we have seen (cf. also *An.* 84a *a domum* M: *ad domum* Pc, 113a *pure* M: *puro* Bd, both in the note's text). For this reason, I wonder whether San Juan

Manso's dependence on M should have been less strict at the micro-level; in the end San Juan Manso's edition is not a diplomatic one, nor merely a normalised transcription, and there is no reason why it should be: an editor of a scholiastic text does not need to treat its assembler as an author. Moreover, despite its textual importance, the *Commentum Monacense* preserves only a fraction of ancient notes on Terence's text. If one follows San Juan Manso's reasoning, there will be no easy way to make this material available without a proliferation of editions of individual manuscripts; to avoid this, new forms of editing will perhaps have to be explored, digitally aided, in order to incorporate San Juan Manso's valuable edition into a larger editorial project of the corpus of medieval scholarship on Terence (similar to the one currently undertaken by R. Kaster for his Servius' edition). Meanwhile one must commend the author for her remarkable work, which will be especially valuable to any scholar interested in the reception of Terence in the Middle Ages.

Giuseppe PEZZINI.