

used Cato, 'cui adeo est obsecutus ut nonnulla praeciperet a XIV saeculi moribus sane abhorrentia'.¹⁶ Salutati, with whom Jean de Montreuil corresponded,¹⁷ knew Cato, and his acquaintance Domenico di Bandino knew Varro. In 1407 one Giovenazzi of Siena owned Varro.¹⁸ About 1412 a correspondent informed Niccoli that Giovanni Corvini owned both; as Corvini entered the service of the Visconti, his manuscript may have been A. In 1418 Cosimo de' Medici owned Cato, and in 1426 the Visconti owned not only A but a separate Varro.¹⁹ Also in 1426 Poggio asked Niccoli for Cato and Varro, and in 1432 Niccoli himself wanted to borrow from Francesco Piendibeni 'uno libro antiquissimo' of Cato 'di lettera longobarda' because a manuscript he already possessed was 'molto corrotto'; Piendibeni, then at Montepulciano, had known Salutati and been chancellor of Perugia.²⁰ Thereafter references decrease in interest but not in frequency. A little work on the manuscripts and the external evidence should be enough to track the Marcianus through this maze.²¹ The more can be deduced about it, the better: unless its scribe copied the note on Cato 84 from his exemplar, he had two other manuscripts at his disposal in this very narrow tradition, and one would like to know when and where he worked.

A stage of the tradition earlier than the Marcianus emerges from two incorporated variants in Cato 160 (*in alio s(ic)ff(etur) . . .*). The view that alien matter had already accumulated round Cato's book goes back to J. M. Gesner's edition (Leipzig, 1735) and was forcefully put by Leo.²²

The most informative edition of either author is the Teubner Cato of A. Mazzarino (Leipzig, 1962; a second edition is announced), though trivialities clutter the apparatus and the text contains almost as many diacritical signs as words. The Teubner Varro of G. Goetz (Leipzig, 1929²) could hardly present a starker contrast, and for a proper apparatus recourse must be had to its archetype, Keil's *editio maior* (Leipzig, 1884); J. Heurgon has published the first volume of an edition for Budé (Paris, 1978).

M. D. R.

¹⁶ Mazzarino, xvi.

¹⁷ Gius. Billanovich and G. Ouy, *IMU* 7 (1964), 337–74.

¹⁸ H. Baron, *Leonardo Bruni Aretino: humanistisch-philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1928), 110 (Bruni to Niccoli, 17 Dec. 1407: 'A Iuvenacio percontatus de M. Varronis libris, tres dumtaxat reperio apud ipsum de re rustica, illos ipsos quos Florentiae habetis').

¹⁹ F. Pintor, *IMU* 3 (1960), 199 (reprint); E. Pellegrin, *La Bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza* (Paris, 1955), 169 no. 426.

²⁰ De la Mare, *Handwriting*, 59–61.

²¹ For his thesis on book 2 of Varro D. Petitjean contented himself with collating Laur. 51.4 of the fifteenth-century manuscripts; cf. loc. cit. (n. 5, above).

²² *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, i (Berlin, 1913), 272 with n. 1. Others, e.g. A. E. Astin, *Cato the Censor* (Oxford, 1978), 191–203, blame the disorder and doublets on Cato himself.

CATULLUS

Catullus was virtually unknown during most of the Middle Ages, although intriguing echoes of his work have been noticed in several writers of the ninth through the twelfth centuries, including Heiric of Auxerre and William of Malmesbury.¹

The main line of transmission begins appropriately in the poet's birthplace, Verona, where a manuscript (now lost) containing 113 of his poems came to light shortly after 1300.² The earlier history of this manuscript (called V by editors) is obscure. Bishop Rather could read Catullus in Verona in 966, but nothing securely connects the manuscript used by him with V. On the other hand, two of V's early descendants preserve an epigram by the Veronese Benvenuto Campesani in which Catullus is made to announce his return to Verona 'longis a finibus'; if the epigram is to be believed, its most probable meaning is that V was brought to Verona from the north.³

The text of V can be recovered in most places from three fourteenth-century descendants. The oldest and most faithful is Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 30 (O), copied in Italy shortly before 1375;⁴ O's exact place of origin is unknown, but it was in Lombardy by around 1430, to judge by the decoration off. 1^r. The next oldest extant manuscript, Paris lat. 14137 (*olim Sangermanensis*, hence G), was written in Verona in 1375 by Antonio da Legnago;⁵ it is closely related to Vatican, Ottob. lat. 1829 (called the *codex Romanus*, or R, by W. G. Hale, who discovered it in

¹ The most widely used edition is that of R. A. B. Mynors (OCT, 1958). The recent edition of D. F. S. Thomson (Chapel Hill, NC, 1978) gives more detailed reports of the major manuscripts and a fuller introduction, on which the present sketch is largely based.

² B. L. Ullman, 'The Transmission of the Text of Catullus', *Studi Castiglioni* (Florence, 1960), 1027–57, especially 1028–38; R. G. M. Nisbet, *PCPS* NS 24 (1978), 106–7 (imitations of poem 68 in the *Epicedium Hathumodae* of Agius of Corvey, composed in 874). G. Billanovich, *IMU* 17 (1974), 46 ff., discerns an allusion to Catullus 67.34 (*Brixia Veronae mater amata meae*) in a verse epistle appended to the *Commentum Monacense* on Terence in Munich Clm 14420, f. 144^r. The manuscript was written in Brescia near the year 1000; Billanovich identifies the author of the verse letter as Hildemar of Corbie, who emigrated to Brescia in 841. Unfortunately, the leaf containing the letter is torn and a direct reference to Catullus cannot be proved.

³ Three poems not transmitted with the corpus of Catullus' work were introduced by Murtus in 1554 as items 18–20: *Hunc lucum* (cited by several grammatical writers = *frag. 1* Mynors), *Hunc ego*, and *Ego haec* (= *Priapea* 85–6 Bücheler, II–III in *Appendix Vergiliana*, ed. Richmond (OCT, 1966), 131–3). They were removed from the text of Catullus by Lachmann; most modern editions go directly from poem 17 to 21. Poems not in V are cited under Catullus' name by several ancient sources (*fragmenta* 2–5 Mynors).

⁴ So, e.g., Ullman, 1036. Others, however, believe that V (or an ancestor) was the manuscript seen by Rather and that it never left Verona: Billanovich, 58–9.

⁵ Complete reproduction in R. A. B. Mynors (ed.), *Catullus: Carmina. Codex Oxoniensis Bibliothecae Bodleianae Canonicianus Class. Lat. 30 (Codices Graeci et Latini Photographice Depicti, XXI; Leiden, 1966)*; see also *Survival*, 80. Plates of OG in Chatelain, XIV–XVA, of R in AJA 1 (1897), pl. 1.

⁶ G. Billanovich, *IMU* 2 (1959), 160–9.

1896), produced in Florence shortly after 1375 for Coluccio Salutati.⁶ G and R derive from a lost copy of V, usually called X. All other surviving manuscripts so far investigated are either demonstrably or arguably dependent on OGR.⁷

The outlines of the transmission are thus tolerably clear, but the reconstruction of X (and so of V) is complicated by the presence of variant readings in both G and R;⁸ G contains near the beginning a few variant readings in the hand of the scribe (G¹), probably transferred from the exemplar (X), and a larger number of variants in a later hand (G²). R was corrected and emended over a span of years by Salutati himself. An important clue to the sorting of these GR variants is provided by Venice, Marc. Lat. xii. 80 (4167), or m, written by Poggio in an early form of humanistic script between 1400 and 1403.⁹ Poggio used R as his exemplar, and transcribed as well the marginal variants present in R at that time. The variants subsequently added to R by Salutati before his death in 1406 appear in m in a later version of Poggio's hand (designated m' by the most recent editor), presumably as a result of a second collation of R. The distinction between m and m' is therefore useful in separating two phases of Salutati's additions to R; since m (and more precisely m') was in turn the source of G²'s variants, Poggio's MS also assists in distinguishing the variants of G¹ from those of G².

With the distinction between early and late R² variants established, the different character of the readings in each phase can be clearly seen. The early variants may well have been Salutati's own conjectures, while at least some of the later ones must have come from another manuscript, not yet securely identified. There are several striking agreements with O in wrong or even impossible readings, and also agreements with G.¹⁰ The simplest explanation might be that Salutati had secured X and had found in it variants neglected by the scribes of G and R.¹¹ (R² agreements with O against GR might then point to pairs of variants in V.¹²)

Much remains to be discovered about the remaining late manuscripts,

⁶ Ullman, *Salutati*, 192–3, no. 96.

⁷ 'Quod ad ceteros codices attinet, . . . omnes a codicibus OGR originem aut duxerunt aut, quod nobis idem ualet, duxisse possunt,' Mynors (OCT), viii; cf. Ullman, 1052, Thomson, 3. The question, however, is far from settled and the current view may prove to be over-simplified; cf. M. D. R., *Phoenix*, 34 (1980), 179–80.

⁸ Study of the question was long hampered by the successive failures of Hale and Ullman to publish Hale's material relating to R; cf. Ullman, 1054 and Mynors (OCT), vii: '[R] correxerunt plures manus, quas hic omnes praeter recentissimas inuitus r appello, dum spero quandam de Colucci eiusque amicorum studiis peritissimum nos tandem aliquando plenius esse docturum.' For what follows see Thomson, 13–35, YCS 23 (1973), 113–29.

⁹ A. C. de la Mare and D. F. S. Thomson, *IMU* 16 (1973), 179–95.

¹⁰ Thomson, 19–20 (R²O), 26–7 (R²G).

¹¹ Some R² variants correspond with those of G¹, and are thus almost certainly derived from X (Thomson, 22–3).

¹² Thomson (25–9) proposes that X acquired some O readings between the copying of R and the later inspection of X by Salutati that produced the R² variants; following Ullman, 1043–4, he

approximately 150 in number,¹³ but on the present showing their value to an editor is as *fontes coniecturarum*. The latest editors have adopted Mynors's compendious form of citing their readings, using the sigla α through θ to designate the source or group of sources in which a conjecture first appears.¹⁴

One poem only (62) is preserved in a manuscript independent of V, Paris lat. 8071 (s. ix, France), a miscellany often called the *florilegium Thuanum* (T);¹⁵ most of T was copied from a French manuscript of the late eighth century, Vienna 277 (CLA x.1474), which has now lost Catullus along with most of its other contents. T and V derive independently from a common source containing lacunae (after lines 32, 58b) and corruptions; this source may not have been much older than Vienna 277 (TV agree in *cara* for *cara* in 58, an error perhaps due to misreading the *cc* form of a frequent in early Caroline minuscule.¹⁶ The date of V is disputed (the ninth and thirteenth centuries having both been recently proposed¹⁷), but comparison with T – itself carelessly written – shows clearly that V is more often and more deeply corrupt. Even when V has been adequately reconstructed, therefore, it offers a text that often requires (and often baffles) emendation.¹⁸ There is also reason to think that the tradition ultimately descends from a post-humous edition of Catullus' works in which the order and divisions of poems were at times those of the editor rather than the author.¹⁹

R. J. T.
suggests that some variants in X are the work of Petrarch and advances the hypothesis that X was Petrarch's own copy of Catullus, compared with O in Petrarch's last years.

¹³ Handlist in Thomson, 44–63, partial stemma, 69; cf. M. Zicari, 'Il codice pesarese di Catullo e i suoi affini', *Studia Oliveriana*, 1 (1953), 5–23, '11 "Cavrianeus" antaldino e i codici Catulliani affini al Bononiensis 2621', 4 (1956), 145–62, 'Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta di Catullo', *Bollettino*, 6 (1958), 79–99 (= *Studi Catulliani* (Urbino, 1978), 43–60, 61–77, 79–104 respectively).
¹⁴ Mynors (OCT), ix–xi; Thomson, 43 (with two deletions, one addition, and one substitution).

¹⁵ Plate in Robinson Ellis's edition of Catullus (Oxford, 1878), facing p. 100; Chatelain, NVA. See *ANTHROLOGIA LATINA*.

¹⁶ The ancient book from which Vienna 277 and V ultimately derive may have been preserved in a French library: Ullman, 1029, notes an echo of Catullus 68 in Venantius Fortunatus.

¹⁷ W. V. Clausen, *CP* 71 (1976), 42–3 (ninth); Thomson, 11 (second half of the thirteenth century). Clausen rejects the examples of OGR errors induced by Gothic script alleged by Ullman, and Thomson's appeal to 64.11 (following *Survival*, 80) as an additional instance is problematical. The correct reading *prima* is found in β ; GR (= X) have *primam* and O gives *posteam* (*pea*) in the text with *proam* (O') in the margin. If O's exemplar really read *proam*, that exemplar can hardly have been V, since X's *primam* would then be a remarkably acute conjecture. But if O is not a direct copy of V, then its peculiar errors reveal nothing about the date of V. (It seems more likely that O's *posteam* is a misreading of *primam* abbreviated *pma*, a form possible in Caroline as well as in Gothic.)

¹⁸ Debate over what Catullus actually wrote is still vigorous; see, for example, the provocative edition 'lectorum in usum' of G. P. Goold (Gronov, Mass., 1973) and the emendations published by R. G. M. Nisbet, *PCPS* NS 24 (1978), 91 ff.

¹⁹ Clausen, 37–41, suggesting 1–50 as the *libellus* dedicated to Cornelius Nepos. On the division of poems in V (often defective), cf. Mynors (OCT), xiv–xv.

(= R.G. Tarrant)