

NOTES ON THE FRAGMENT OF PHAEDRUS IN REG. LAT. 1616

The recently announced¹ acquisition by the Pierpont Morgan Library of the famous Codex Pithoeanus of Phaedrus (= P) is a matter of great importance to students of the text of this author. Since scholars were consistently denied access to the manuscript while it was in the hands of its former owner, the Marquis de Rosanbo, this new development will doubtless give fresh impetus to the study of the role played by this document in the formation of the text of the Fables of Phaedrus. Hence this is perhaps the ideal moment for a re-examination of the only other early manuscript of Phaedrus known to be in existence—the ninth- or tenth-century fragment in Vat. Reg. Lat. 1616 (= D).²

The portion of the manuscript containing the fragment of Phaedrus extends through the two sides of fol. 17 and the recto of fol. 18 and includes the major part of eight fables from Book 1: 11–13 and 17–21 (with 11. 1, the last two words of 13. 12 plus the whole of 13. 13–14, and 21. 11–12 omitted).³ Despite its brevity D has been labeled by E. K. Rand as the best source for the fables contained in it.⁴

This document has naturally been the object of considerable study on the part of editors of Phaedrus and others. The most recent edition which gives a reasonably full list of its readings is the second edition of A. Brenot published in 1961.⁵ B. E. Perry has indicated that his edition “is made up eclectically on the basis of the copious textual materials supplied by Havet and Postgate in their editions.”⁶ Hence, although he often cites readings from D, he makes no pretense of having provided a complete collation of its text. The most thorough study of D of which I know is that provided by F. M. Carey in 1926.⁷ In his

article Carey, in addition to providing a detailed description of the format of the manuscript, also includes a careful collation of its text and discusses its relationship with other sources. Despite the general excellence of this work, however, there are a few instances in which information about readings is presented in such a way as to leave the reader in some doubt about the actual text of D. There are also two instances in which errors have been made in recording D's readings. It is the purpose of this note to correct these few obscurities and errors in Carey's collation, to correct a few errors made by Brenot in recording the D readings, and to provide information not given by Carey or Brenot about the titles of the fables in D.

In his report on 13. 2,⁸ Carey leaves some doubt about the reading of D for *paenitentia* with his entry “(paenitentiae D(?), acc. to Hervieux).” Although Brenot lists D as reading *paenitentia* at this point, the actual reading is clearly *paenitentiae* (with *ae* in both cases indicated by *e-caudata*).

The entry in Carey's report on 19. 6, which reads “(preces: prece with *s* erased, acc. to Hervieux),” may leave some doubt in the reader's mind as to the text of D at this point. Actually Hervieux is wrong; the reading of D is clearly *preces* with no sign of an erasure.

In reporting the reading of 19. 7, Carey appears to have made a clerical error. The reading of D is not the erroneous *firmitas et posset catulos* recorded by him, but the correct *firiore posset catulos*.

For 21. 2, Carey reports that D has the correct reading *etiam iocus est*. Actually the reading is *etiam locus est*. It is conceivable that Carey was interpreting the *l* of *locus* as an instance of the use of *i-longa*. This, however,

1. B. E. Perry, *Babrius and Phaedrus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. cii.

2. For an account of the manuscripts of Phaedrus, see Perry, *op. cit.*, pp. xcvi–c.

3. The information about D contained in my own remarks about the manuscript is based on a study of a microfilm copy of Reg. Lat. 1616 placed at my disposal by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

4. E. K. Rand, “A Vade Mecum of Liberal Culture in a

Manuscript of Fleury,” *PhQ*, I (1922), 258–77.

5. A. Brenot, *Phèdre: Fables* (Paris, 1961).

6. Perry, *op. cit.*, p. ci.

7. F. M. Carey, “The Vatican Fragment of Phaedrus,” *TAPA*, LVII (1926), 96–106.

8. In all citations of the Fables of Phaedrus in this paper, the book number is omitted, since all fables dealt with are from Book 1.

seems highly unlikely. If such were the case, it would be the only instance of the use of this character in the entire manuscript. Two lines lower the word *iaceret*, which might be expected to begin with *i-longa* if it were the practice of the scribe to make use of this form, in fact begins with short *i*.

Another occasion for uncertainty on the part of the reader is provided by Carey's entry for 21. 6: "(ictu veterem: veterem ictu D, acc. to Hervieux)." Brenot adopts the order *ictu veterem* with no comment in the apparatus criticus. A glance at the manuscript reveals at once the cause of the confusion. The scribe originally wrote *veterem ictu*, but someone indicated that the order should be changed by entering three dots in a triangular pattern over *veterem* and a slanting line with one dot on each side over *ictu*. Whether the person responsible for the change in word order was the original scribe or someone else would be difficult to determine.

Errors made by Brenot in reporting D's readings, in addition to the wrong report on *paenitentiae* in 13. 2 mentioned earlier, include failure to record the omission of *sic ut* (11. 14) and failure to note the substitution in D of *tugulio* for *tugurio* (19. 4). Furthermore, no indication is given by Brenot of the omission of lines at the end of Fables 13 and 21, nor is any information provided by this editor with regard to the interpolation, reported in detail by Carey, at the end of Fable 13.

In his discussion of the format of D, Carey calls attention to the fact that the titles of individual fables are sometimes inserted at the beginning, sometimes after the moral has been stated, and sometimes in the margins.⁹ But except in the case of Fable 11, for which he quotes the title *DE LEONE ET ASINO* as

being provided in the margin, he gives no further information about these titles. Additional details are given here with the thought that the exact wording of the headings preserved in D might be of interest to students of Phaedrus. For Fable 12, the title, which, as in other cases, is in rustic capitals, is in the body of the text between lines 2 and 3 and takes the form *CERVVS AD FONTEM LAVDAT CORNVA*. In the case of Fable 13, the title is inserted at the beginning before line 1 and reads *VVLPIVS AD CORVVM*. The title of Fable 17 is inserted in the right margin opposite the opening lines with the wording *CANIS AD OVEM LVPVS TESTIS COMMODASSE CONTENDIT*. The last two words, though in the same hand as the preceding words, are in a fainter color of ink and appear to have been added a little later. The word *commodasse* doubtless reflects the fact that the text of line 3 in D has *commodasse* for *commendasse*. The title of Fable 18, *MVLIER PARTVRIENS AD VIRVM*, is in the body of the text between lines 1 and 2. The title for Fable 19 is in the body of the text between lines 2 and 3, in the form *CANIS PARTVRIENS AD ALTERAM*. The last line of Fable 19 is followed immediately by the first line of Fable 20, with no gap of any sort for the accommodation of the title. Although there is adequate room in the margin for the insertion of a number of words, no title for Fable 20 appears there. The title of Fable 21 is inserted before line 1 and reads *LEO DEFICIENS APER TAVRVVS ASELLVS*.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

9. Carey, *op. cit.*, p. 105.