

PROPERTIUS

Propertius seems to have been virtually unknown from the end of Antiquity to the middle of the twelfth century.¹ Although the text achieved its greatest popularity in Italy during the fifteenth century, its circulation began in the north of France, perhaps in the valley of the Loire. The earliest references and imitations are in John of Salisbury² and the *Pamphilus*,³ which suggests that a manuscript was available in the Loire region in the second half of the twelfth century. The earliest surviving manuscript, Wolfenbüttel, Gud. lat. 224 (previously Neapolitanus, hence N), was copied in northern France shortly before 1200;⁴ the second oldest extant manuscript, Leiden, Voss. Lat. O.38 (A), was copied about fifty years later, probably near Orléans, for Richard of Fournival.⁵ Two other thirteenth-century scholars, each working at or near Orléans, show knowledge of Propertius: the compiler of the florilegium in Vat. Reg. lat. 2120 (formerly part of the manuscript that is now Paris lat. 15155),⁶ and the author of numerous marginal additions in a manuscript of Papias's *Vocabularium* (Berne 276).⁷ Both sets of citations seem to be independent of N and A, and probably derive from their common source, which may be identified with the archetype.

The Italian manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries all derive from A and N (or, conceivably, a close relative of N).⁸ After Fournival's death A went to the library of the Sorbonne,⁹ where it was

This account is based on J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (diss. Toronto, 1978; a revised version is to appear in the *Phoenix* Supplementary Volumes series).

¹ The imitations in Alcuin, c.9.12 (*PLAC* 1:229) and c.49.9 (1.262), and in Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Hon. Lud.* 1.78 (11.7) have no extant intermediate source, but could have come from a collection of *sententiae* or a glossary, rather than from direct access to a manuscript of Propertius.

² *De septem septenis* prologue (*Joannis Saresburiensis postea Episcopi Carnotensis Opera Omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles (Oxford, 1848), 5.209).

³ Ed. F. G. Becker (Ratingen, 1972); cf. lines 237 (1.12.5), 414 (2.15.30), 420 (2.32.2), 641 (1.5.30).

⁴ M. R. James, *CR* 17 (1903), 462; complete facsimile, with introduction by T. Birt: *Codex Guelferbyanus Gudianus 224 olim Neapolitanus phototypice editus* (Leiden, 1911).

⁵ R. H. R., *RHT* 1 (1971), 96 f. (with plate off. 10°); *RHT* 3 (1973), 267; plate off. 9°, Chatelain, *cii.2*.

⁶ D. M. Robathan, *CPh* 33 (1938), 188 ff.; É. Pellegrin, *BEC* 103 (1942), 74 ff.

⁷ R. H. R., 'Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Orléans', *Viator*, 10 (1979), 131–60; M. D. R. and R. H. R., 'New Light on the Transmission of Donatus's "Commentum Terentii"', *Viator*, 9 (1978), 235–49.

⁸ The claim that Propertius was known and imitated by the Paduan scholars Lovato Lovati and Albertino Mussato (cf. Guido Billanovich, *IMU* 1 (1958), 155 ff.) does not survive an examination of the alleged parallels; Butrica, 207–9.

⁹ B. L. Ullman, *CPh* 6 (1911), 284.

seen and copied by Petrarch.¹⁰ Petrarch's manuscript (now lost) was in its turn copied several times, and its direct and indirect offspring constitute the largest family of manuscripts. The earliest known copy, Florence, Laur. 38.49 (F), made about 1380 for Coluccio Salutati, was also the most influential single representative of the Petrarchan form of the text.¹¹ The other direct or close descendants of Petrarch's manuscript still extant are: Oxford, Bodl. Holkham misc. 36, formerly Holkham Hall 333 (L), copied, perhaps at Genoa, in 1421 by Giovanni Campofregoso;¹² Paris lat. 7989 (P), copied in 1423, the earliest surviving manuscript to combine Tibullus, Propertius, and Catullus, and the unique manuscript of the *Gena Trimalchionis*,¹³ and Venice, Marc. Lat. Z. 443 (1912) (Z), copied at Padua in 1453.¹⁴ Since A itself is extant only as far as 2.1.63 and Petrarch's copy of A is lost, the readings of A for most of the text must be reconstructed from FLPZ, with occasional help from the excerpts in Paris lat. 16708.¹⁵ A was negligently copied (as were some other Fournival books), and its corruptions prompted valiant efforts at conjectural emendation in its descendants.

The other branch of the tradition, represented by N, had found its way to Italy by 1427, the probable date at which Vat. lat. 3273 was copied in Florence by Antonio Beccadelli (Panormita).¹⁶ It is tempting to connect the copying of Panormita's manuscript with the fact that in May of 1427 Poggio agreed to send his copy of Propertius to Niccolò Niccoli in Florence; Poggio might have found N or a copy in France and brought it back to Italy.¹⁷ Vat. lat. 3273 and five later manuscripts descended from the same N source¹⁸ are of practical importance to the editor only in 4.11.17–76, where a leaf of N has been lost. They are of great interest for the history of the transmission, however, since some evidence suggests that their common source was not N itself but a manuscript of the same family. The common source has been identified with a manuscript that was in 1484 in the possession of Bernardino Valla;

¹⁰ The excerpts in Paris lat. 16708 (s. xv) seem to have been copied from A while it was at the Sorbonne; the existence of this florilegium was first noticed by P. Damon, *CPh* 48 (1953), 96 f.; complete list of Propertian contents in Butrica, 268 n. 7.

¹¹ For F see Ullman, *CPh* 6 (1911), 284 ff.; A. C. Ferguson, *The Manuscripts of Propertius* (diss. Chicago, 1934), 34–61.

¹² J. P. Postgate, *TCPhilS* 4 (1894), 1 ff.; the first gathering has been lost and the text begins at 2.21.3.

¹³ O. L. Richmond, *JPh* 31 (1910), 162 ff.; A. C. de la Mare in *Medieval Learning*, 239 ff.

¹⁴ C. Hosius, *RhM* 46 (1891), 577 ff.; it is a direct descendant of Petrarch's manuscript from 2.29 onwards.

¹⁵ F and Z (from 2.29) are direct descendants of Petrarch's manuscript, but L and P derive from a lost intermediary copy; Butrica, 234–72.

¹⁶ R. Sabbadini, *SFC* 7 (1899), 106 ff. Butrica, 218 f., 231 n. 1. N itself may have been in Naples from the 1480s onward; Butrica, 166.

¹⁸ Four are Florentine: Munich, Univ. Cim 22 (1460–70), Paris lat. 8233 (1465, signed by Gerardo del Ciriagio), Cologny-Geneva lat. 141 (formerly Abbey 5989, 1466), Vat. Urb. lat. 641 (1465–70); the last is Roman, Bibl. Casanatense 15 (1470–71, copied by Pomponio Leto and rubricated by Sanvito). On the relation of these manuscripts to N, see Butrica, 219–27.

readings cited by Poliziano in 1489 and Franciscus Puccius in 1502 establish the N-type character of Valla's manuscript, and Poliziano's description of it as a 'codex vetustus' would seem to rule out the possibility that it was a humanist copy.¹⁹ The most striking indication that Valla's manuscript was not N comes from Puccius's note that Valla's manuscript did not begin a new poem at 2.27.1; this is true of Vat. lat. 3273 and its five related manuscripts, but not true of N (or A).²⁰ Further study of these six manuscripts may reveal whether a manuscript related to but independent of N circulated in fifteenth-century Italy.

The other surviving manuscripts present various conflations of the N and A texts, in most cases with some attempt at emendation.²¹ One group of three Paduan manuscripts of the 1460s collectively called Δ – Deventer 1.82 (1792) (D); Vat. Ottob. lat. 1514 (V); Leiden, Voss. Lat. Q. 117 (Vo) – has been singled out by several editors and critics as witnesses to a strain of text independent of N and A;²² on close inspection Δ proves to be a carefully corrected descendant of Z and related manuscripts, and its apparent superiority derives from the fact that it exhibits in one recension readings that had originated in several sources during the previous forty years.²³

The *editio princeps* was probably that printed anonymously at Venice in February 1472 (Hain Suppl. 4888); in the same year Vendelino de Spira printed at Venice a text of Propertius together with Tibullus and Catullus (Hain *4758), from which all other incunabular editions derive. The edition most generally used has been for some time that of E. A. Barber (OCT, 1960²⁴); the Teubner text of R. Hanslik (Leipzig, 1979) offers much fuller information on manuscript variants, but the reports lack discrimination and the text is marred by erratic judgement in the choice of readings.²⁴

R. J. T.

¹⁹ S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Rome, 1973), 149, accepting the identification of Valla's manuscript with N.

²⁰ Butrica (224 f.) notes as well the presence in Vat. lat. 3273 and its fellows of nonsensical glosses unlikely to be humanist in origin.

²¹ For a classification cf. Butrica, 273–354.

²² D and V were introduced by Bachrens in 1880, V misdated to c. 1400 and D to 1410–20; these false datings misled Housman and helped to vitiate his work on the Propertian transmission. The value of Δ was most recently upheld by P. J. Enk in *Hommages à L. Herrmann* (Brussels, 1960), 339 ff.

²³ Butrica, 302–9.

²⁴ See A. La Penna, *Giannoni*, 54 (1982), 515–23.

PUBLILIUS

Why the mimes of the Syrian Publilius swept audiences of the late Republic off their feet might be easier to say if more had come down to us than two fragments quoted by grammarians and a collection of one-line maxims in *senarii* and *septenarii*. No doubt citizens too snooty to be caught enjoying light entertainment declared their admiration for the maxims, as in later generations the two Senecas and Gellius did. Already by the time of the Elder Seneca an alphabetical collection may have been made, and the *sententiae* that according to his son 'pueris ediscendas damus' (*Ep.* 33.7) may have included some of Publilius'; certainly Jerome learnt one of Publilius' at school (*Ep.* 107.8).

The medieval collections that survive show no sign of having been compiled from anything but one original collection larger than any of them.¹ Over 700 verses can be assembled from five sources:

1. Σ 265 vv. (159 peculiar to Σ) A-N; prose substitutes for O-V supplied from ps.-Seneca, *De moribus*,² whence the title 'proverbia Senecae'.

This collection had much the widest circulation. Lupus of Ferrières and Sedulius Scottus used it,³ and several manuscripts survive from s. ix: Paris lat. 2676 (P^a, s. ix²/4, Loire valley) and 7641 (P^b, s. ix¹, France), Vienna 969 (A, s. ix²/3, Mainz), Berlin lat. 4^o 404,⁴ Valenciennes 411 (X, given to Saint-Amand by Hucbald⁵), and Zürich Rh. 95 (R, s. ix/X, south-west Germany⁶). Equally important is a manuscript of s. xi,

¹ Accretions from other authors might have been expected, but the versification and style are uniform and rival attributions do not occur. In that respect Publilius' *sententiae* differ from the Greek set ascribed to Menander, which includes lines from other authors; but the ascription may be a later curtailment of a fuller title. When these 'Menandri sententiae' were compiled is not known, but in their transmission they closely resemble Publilius'. See the edition of S. Jaekel (Teubner, Leipzig, 1964).

² On this see Manitius, *Geschichte*, i, 112–13.

³ Lupus: *Correspondance*, ed. L. Levillain, i (Paris, 1927), 144–5 (*Ep.* 31, c.843), 196–7 (*Ep.* 46, a. 845); Sedulius: L. Traube, *ABAW* 19 (1891), 370.

⁴ Described by Mommsen, *RhM* 18 (1863), 594–5; missing since the war ('Kriegsverlust' according to Dr Ursula Winter of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in a letter of 21.6.81). It is an important witness to Cicero's *De amicitia*.

⁵ F. Giancotti, *Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta delle Sentenze di Publilio Siro* (Messina, 1963), 57–80 with plate 1. It is one of the three independent witnesses to Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*; its brother there, B. L. Add. 1.1983 (s. xii¹), also contains Publilius and appears to be its brother again (Giancotti missed it).

⁶ Professor Bernhard Bischoff has kindly communicated the date and origin of pp⁸AR.

5pp. 1999

TEXTS AND TRANSMISSION 74899

A Survey of
the Latin Classics

EDITED BY
L. D. REYNOLDS

Contributors

P. K. MARSHALL

M. D. REEVE

L. D. REYNOLDS

R. H. ROUSE

R. J. TARRANT

M. WINTERBOTTOM
and others

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD
1983