

JAVIER VELAZA (ed.), *From the Protohistory to the History of the Text*, Series: Studien zur klassischen Philologie – Volume 173, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 2016, 394 pp., ISBN 978-3-631-66676-0

Ancient literature survives because it was transmitted. Works were copied and disseminated, translated to new physical formats, and preserved and studied in new institutional settings. Most of our classical texts emerge in their earliest copies centuries and centuries after their authors had died. Modern editions critically analyze the surviving copies in the hopes of taking us back as close as possible to the texts as originally written. Hence, the ‘transmission-history’ or to use what has been called by ‘a longer and nobler name’ of *Überlieferungsgeschichte* divides into two phases: the later being the history which begins with the manuscripts we have, and the earlier being the vast darkness between when the author stopped writing and our earliest copies. It is this phase the present volume, made up of papers presented at a colloquium in Barcelona in 2013, seeks to illuminate: the ‘protohistory of the text.’

The authors covered include most of the canon from Terence to the *Historia Augusta*. All of the papers except two deal with a familiar array of evidence: papyrus fragments (where we are fortunate enough to possess them), subscriptions, codicological and textual features of the earliest manuscripts which point to an earlier phase of transmission, ancient and early medieval testimonia, and so on.¹ The two exceptions are the very interesting discussion of Kruschwitz on how Terence’s plays went from script to performance, and Ramírez de Verger’s discussion of the early editions of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

The volume opens with Lucarini’s exploration of Plautus which takes us through three successive transformations of the Plautine corpus: the early edition containing forty, the so called Varronian edition, and the transcription into a codex. After Kruschwitz on Terence, we come to two essays on Cicero: Auvray-Assayas on the *De natura deorum*, who demonstrates how a medieval split in the tradition is seemingly reflected in the ancient testimonia, and Espluga on the speeches, who takes us all the

¹ On subscriptions, since the volume appeared, K. Wallenwein’s *corpus subscriptionum* has finally appeared in print, and will undoubtedly become the standard reference: *Corpus subscriptionum: Verzeichnis der Beglaubigungen von spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Textabschriften* (saec. IV-VIII). (Stuttgart 2017).

way from delivery to the medieval manuscripts, with useful appendices on the surviving fragments of ancient books. Next comes Moreno on Caesar; this essay deals almost exclusively with the contemporary testimonia for the formation of the *Corpus Caesarianum*, with the familiar evidence of Hirtius and Suetonius, with a coda on Caesar's lost works. On to Kiss on Catullus, which takes us through the whole tradition, up to the triumphant rediscovery in Verona and the exceedingly vexed question of the *Versus domini Benevenuti de Campexanis*. Then Funari on Sallust, which is a very useful catalogue of the fragments of ancient books with a brief discussion of the ancient grammarians. Next Oakley on Livy, which covers ancient testimonia, fragments, subscriptions, and the errors in the manuscript tradition which suggest something about the state of Livy's text in antiquity. From there, Fedeli on Propertius, which navigates the minefield of Propertian textual studies with grace, and not without occasional polemic, covering the testimonia, Martial in first place, the earliest manuscripts, and the quotations in ancient and earlier medieval sources. Next is Delvigo on Virgil, which understandably can only tackle two topics in the *silva antiqua* of Virgil's *Nachleben*, the (spurious) additional lines at the beginning of the *Aeneid* and the *laudes Galli* which Servius tells us originally concluded the *Georgics*. Then Tarrant on Horace, which covers three topics, the late *tituli* transmitted in the manuscripts, the presence of (ancient) interpolated lines, and the order of works in antiquity, particularly with regard to the transition to the codex. After Ramírez de Verger on Ovid, comes Velaza on Martial, which is focused primarily on Lindsay's old idea of ancient editions of Martial lurking behind the three medieval families of the text. Then comes Pecere on Juvenal and Persius, which explodes the idea of subscriptions pointing to ancient scholarly editions, and which concludes with a stimulating discussion of the Oxford lines of Juvenal. Finally comes Mayer on the *Historia Augusta*, which is ostensibly focused only on a minor life in the collection, that of Pescennius Niger, but covers the ancient evidence, the medieval families, and the very vexed question of the formation of the collection.

The papers in the volume are stuffed to the gills with information and facts relating to the transmission of these (mostly) central Latin authors, and they form a useful (and updated) supplement to the articles in *Texts and Transmission*, which is now almost thirty-five years old. Because papers hold so much of substance, specialists will find much to engage with and doubtless to criticize. For my own part, I will engage here with a few of papers touching topics near and dear.

It is a persistent vice among classicists that they rarely sift medieval evidence properly: they veer between totally unwarranted skepticism (see for example Kiss' masterful takedown of the ridiculous idea that Rather of Verona had not actually read Catullus) and equally unwarranted credulity. I present examples of the latter from the papers on Propertius and Catullus.

Nescit habere modum in *Pamphilus* 414 surely is indebted more to Isid. *Sent.* 2.39.15, *Libidinis inmoderata licentia nescit habere modum*, than to Propertius 2.15.30, *uerus amor nullum nouit habere modum*, if indeed one needs to posit a unitary source for so common a chestnut (13 unique attestations in *Brepols* CDS). But if one really wants to find a medieval reader of that line, Sibert, the prior of St. Pantaleon in Cologne, surely is a better candidate, in a line from a letter to the former abbot Rodolf, written between 1123 and 1138: *Sic enim uerus amor, nullum qui nouit habere modum . . .* (p. 99 Tombeur).² *Pamphilus* 420 *crimine lumen habet* is a collection of common words, and needs no connection with the likely corrupt manuscript reading of 2.32.2 *crimina lumen habet*. ‘Nourishing love’ at *Pamphilus* 237, *quamvis illicitum complexus nutrit amorem* is once again extremely common, disseminated from Ovid (as Butrica has already pointed out³) through the *Dicta Catonis* (1.36: *concordia nutrit amorem*). The reason for *complexus* has nothing to do with Prop. 1.12.5 *amplexu nutrit amores*; if one reads the passage in context, one realizes that Galatea is picking up on what *Pamphilus* has said just before (235-6), *Nos alternatim complexus basia tactus / Ut dare possimus, cum locus affuerit*.

So too with Catullus. Kiss argues for William of Malmesbury’s acquaintance with Catullus, following a line of argument begun with Robinson Ellis in 1867. William’s reading should never be underestimated, but the fact that he never mentions Catullus by name is troubling. His allusion is at first blush compelling: describing a girl in an erotic context as *sane nec inelegantem nec illepidam* (*Gest.* 2.159) does match very well with Cat. 10.4 *nec sane illepidum nec inuenustum* and 6.2 *ni sint illepidae atque inelegantes*. But caution is in order: other traces have not been found, and this may well represent a happy confluence of idea and expression. William says similar things at other points which do not have any link to a line in Catullus, *non illepidae formae virago* (*Gest.* 2.177), *nec illepidae formae, nec infaceti eloquii* (*Gest.* 4.389), and *nec timidum nec inelegantem* (*Gest.* 3.prol). Every element of the supposed borrowing from Catullus is paralleled elsewhere in the *De gestis*: this dramatically increases the odds of accidental confluence.

In both of these cases, the authors are repeating ideas that have been rattling around in the literature for decades, and they are surely not to be reproached for repeating them. Nonetheless, a volume like this should stand as an opportunity to re-examine, and not only repeat, old sureties.

Indeed, there are any number of cases in which new and old scholarship has not been taken into account. The *De septem septenis*, which contains

² On the date, see M. De Jong, *In Samuel’s Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West*, Leiden 1996, 290.

³ J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Toronto 1984, 22.

the earliest reference to Propertius, is still ascribed to John of Salisbury by Fedeli (193); it is approaching two hundred years since that ascription was shown false.⁴ The poor annotator of the Berne Papias (cod. 276) still passes without a name, despite the fact that is more than twenty years since Stagni identified him as Guido de Grana.⁵ The reading of the oldest manuscript of Nonius Marcellus (VLF 73) is still said to be IIII corrected to III at 3.21.14, despite the fact that it has been fifteen years since Liberman pointed out that there is no correction to the passage and that it simply reads III followed by a punctuation mark.⁶ Anyone at an institution that subscribes to the *Vossiani Latini* collection can check for themselves: the ghost of the missing hasta on f. 94r is actually bleed through from the verso.

Lindsay's idea of authorial variants in Martial is entertained a bit too generously by Velaza; the discussion of *Epig.* 10.28 overlooks a number of recent and not so recent discussions which propose far simpler and more plausible explanations of the variants across the families.⁷ Indeed, more caution in regard to the idea of ancient editions more generally would have been welcome. While admitting that there seem to be errors endemic to the whole tradition, Velaza judges them to be relatively trivial in both quantity and quality. He does not consider, however, Leary's discussion of the *Apophoreta* which persuasively argues for missing couplets, and at least one case of a nonsense lemma which does not correspond with the text (*Apoph.* 196).⁸

Mayer's article on the *Historia augusta* contains some puzzling omissions. The Murbach catalogue ought to be mentioned, whether or not one accepts the ingenious explanation of von Winterfeld,⁹ since it implies a different textual organization than that in Pal. lat. 899. The surviving fragment of the Murbacensis (Nuremberg frag. lat. 7) is equally passed over (though the surviving folio only covers a bit of Commodus), as is the only edition which could have used it, the Froben edition published in Basel 1518. Considering this evidence is rather important to accurately assess the place

⁴ See C. Németh, "Fabricating Philosophical Authority in the Twelfth Century: The *Liber Egerimion* and the *De septem septenis*," in S. Kangas et al., *Authorities in the Middle Ages. Influence, Legitimacy and Power*, Berlin 2013, 69-88, and D. Albertson, *Mathematical Theologies: Nicholas of Cusa and the Legacy of Thierry of Chartres*, Oxford 2014, 145 with references.

⁵ E. Stagni, 'Medioevo francese e classici latini: un nome ritrovato,' *MD* 34, 1995, 219-24.

⁶ G. Liberman, 'Remarques sur le premier livre des Élégies de Propertius' *Revue de philologie* 76, 2002, 49-100 at 55.

⁷ D. R. Shackleton Bailey "More Corrections and Explanations of Martial," *AJP* 110, 1989, 131-50; and A. Fusi, "Marziale e il fantasma di Scorpo. Nota a 10.48.23," in R. Perelli and P. Mastrandea, eds. *Latinum est et legitur... Prospettivi, metodi, e problemi dello studio dei testi latini*, Amsterdam 2011, 261-80. Obviously, Fusi's and Shackleton Bailey's solutions are incompatible, but they should at least be acknowledged.

⁸ T. J. Leary, *Martial Book XIV: The Apophoreta*, London 1996.

⁹ Paul von Winterfeld, "Nachrichten 180," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27, 1902, 527-8.

of P in the tradition, and it does not take that much effort to figure out that the Murbacensis could not have been copied from the Palatinus. This in turn puts a number of old certainties in doubt, not least the Italian origin of the Palatinus, asserted once again as dogma. At any rate, events have overtaken the analysis: the recent work of Modonutti (which appeared too late to be used in this volume) has put the whole question of P and Σ in an entirely different light.¹⁰

It is a pity more concern was not taken to identify manuscripts that are available online, with the exception of Mayer on the *Historia augusta*. We hardly need to be told that the famous *Florilegium Thuaneum* in Paris lat. 8071 is in Chatelain, tab. XIV, when the whole thing is available to everyone on *Gallica* (ark:/12148/btv1b9078246d), or about the numerous plates cited for Pal. lat. 24, when it is available at the Vatican and at the *Biblioteca laureshamensis* (urn:nbn:de:bsz:16-diglit-44273). So too Laur. 34.42 of Juvenal is available on *Teca digitale – BML* (idr=TECA0000406073) and cod. Guelf. 224 Gud. lat. of Propertius is available at the *HAB Digital Library* (diglib.hab.de/mss/224-gud-lat). This is just a small sampling. The availability of digital facsimiles is transforming the study of transmission: it is unfortunate that this volume does not help its readers in this regard.

The book would also have benefited from a stronger editorial hand. Some of the papers translated into English are unnatural to the point of being obscure. There are numerous misprints throughout, even afflicting the Latin. Not all the works cited in the notes are included in the bibliography at the end. Nonetheless, the worth of the volume as a whole should induce readers to overlook these defects. Its value as a whole outweighs the inconveniences attendant upon reading it.

Justin Stover
University of Edinburgh
justin.stover@ed.ac.uk

¹⁰ R. Modonutti, "I consiliarii di Severo Alessandro e la tradizione dell'*Historia Augusta* nel Trecento," *Segno e testo* 14, 2016, 381-410.

