

PARVA GELLIANA*

1. NA 1.22.11 qui dicit ergo superesse se ei quem defendit, nihil istorum [sc. of the legitimate senses listed by Julius Paulus in §§9–10] uult dicere, sed nescioquid aliud indictum inscitumque dicit.

indictum] indoctum Falster

Indictum is the Latin for ‘unsaid’;¹ *inscitum* is a Plautine and Gellian word for ‘ignorant’ or ‘inept’. *Superesse*, said of an advocate, is for Gellius an ignorant usage, but all too frequent (§1 ‘inroborauit inueterauitque falsa atque aliena uerbi significatio’), and therefore inept but not in the least unsaid. Earlier commentators, seeing the difficulty, resorted to wild paraphrase: ‘Nam quae improprie et parum cum gratia efferuntur, ea perinde sunt ac si non dicerentur, indictaque manerent’ (Mosellanus);² ‘quippiam eorum quae superius verbo, superesse, contineri dictum non est’ (Carrio); ‘Non solitum proprie tali significatione dici’ (Thysius). The Delphin editor Proust, however, blithely rendered *indictum inscitumque* as ‘quod prius neque dictum neque scitum est’; when Horace wished to express that sense he did not disdain to clarify his meaning by writing ‘quam si proferres ignota indictaque *primus*’ (AP 130), ‘adhuc indictum ore alio’ (Carm. 3.25.7–8). But the qualification needed is ‘while Latin was used correctly’; furthermore, the supposed sense of *inscitus* is otherwise unsaid and unknown.³

Modern translators abandon the temporal contrast: thus Rolfe ‘in a sense that is unknown and not in use’, as if the sense in question were not all too well known and all too much in use. Beloe’s ‘but offends against all authority and correctness’ gives the required sense, but what does it translate? By the change of a single letter Christian Falster produced perfect sense, *indoctum inscitumque* = ‘unlearned and ignorant’, cf. 19.8.12 ‘indocte et inscite harenae dici uidentur’;⁴ that the corruption was current in the fourth century, when A was written, does not strain belief.

2. NA 2.23.22 itaque ut supra dixi, cum haec Caecilii seorsum lego, neutiquam uidentur ingrata ignauaque, cum autem Graeca comparo et contendo, non puto Caecilium sequi debuisse, quod assequi (nequi)ret.

assequi nequiret de Buxis: assequeret VPR: assequeretur C

* I wish to thank Bonnie Blackburn, K. M. Coleman, and Franco Cavazza for helpful comments and information; Albinia de la Mare for making available her microfilm of the Cesena MS. (n. 17); Nigel Wilson for bringing the Lincoln incunabula of Gellius to my attention; and the Librarian, Fiona Piddock, for assistance in identifying the donor.

¹ The Graecizing sense ‘ineffable’ (ἀφᾶτος) in the negative theology of ‘Apul.’ *Plat.* 1.5 (190) need not detain us.

² A perversity typical of Mosellanus, who finds the same sense at Hor. AP 130 and detects in our passage a paradox like Jerome, *Ep.* 14.1 (CSEL 54.45.16–17) ‘affatim diues est, qui cum Christo pauper est’.

³ Carrio: ‘at vt; *inscitum* sit quod non sciatur, quemadmodum hic capi existimo, plane nouum est, et erunt qui eam uocem in vulgato significato uolent exaudire. quibus non repugno.’

⁴ ‘Specimen emendationum in A. Gellii Lib. I, II, III & IIII’, in J. G. Krause’s *Nova litteraria anni M DCC XXI* (Leipzig, 1721), 138–43 at 140; at *Amoenitates philologicae* (Amsterdam, 1729), iii.224, he cites the parallel in answer to D. W. Triller, who in a letter of 12 June 1722 (Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, MS. E don. var. 6, 2^o, p. 5), gave *indictum* the unattested sense λόγον οὐκ ᾄξιον, and to A. H. Lackmann, who in a lecture at Eutin in 1722 asserted without argument: ‘*indictum* si per *non dictum* explicatur, sensui certe omnia optime conueniunt’ (*Primitiae Utinenses* (Lübeck, 1725), 55).

Since Gellius uses *nequeo* only four times, always in the perfect stem (2.23.3, 6.3.3, 15.31.4, 17.10.6), *non queo* twenty-one times in all stems, a better supplement would be *assequi* (<*non qui*>ret, yielding a morphological and rhythmical pattern identical with *perficere non quiret* 14.1.12, *ingredi non quiret* 20.1.30,⁵ and bringing Gellius closer to his model, Cic. *Off.* 1.110:

admodum autem tenenda sunt sua cuique, non uitiosa sed tamen propria, quo facilius decorum illud quod quaerimus retineatur. sic enim est faciendum ut contra uniuersam naturam nihil contendamus, ea tamen conseruata propriam nostram sequamur, ut etiamsi sint alia grauiora atque meliora, tamen nos studia nostra nostrae naturae regula metiamur; neque enim attinet naturae repugnare, *nec quicquam sequi, quod assequi non queas*. ex quo magis emergit quale sit decorum illud, ideo quia nihil decet inuita Minerua, ut aiunt, id est aduersante et repugnante natura.

Not only Cicero's language, but his doctrine, is recalled: Caecilius, mistaking the nature of his talents, failed to observe τὸ πρόπον.⁶

3. NA 7.14.4 non sane dignum esse imponendae poenae studio uisum est.

imponendae] imponendi Hertz *tamquam ex V* studio Madvig: studium codd.

In 1853 Hertz printed 'imponendi', with a construction Gellius elsewhere uses only in the plural; in 1883 he ascribed it to the sole medieval witness V,⁷ which Marache and Marshall deny by silence; as the latter explained, 'The reason is simply that Hertz was wrong'.⁸ Indeed V reads *ipponende poene*, as plain as print; but Vat. Barb. lat. 123 (s. xv) has *imponēdi pene*, by confusion of *e* and *i*. Did Hertz, who had still a young man's eyes when he went on his collating tour in 1845–7, misread V, or so confuse his notes as to ascribe to V a reading from Albert Dressel's collation of the Barberinianus? It is no objection that the Barberini collection was not acquired by the Vatican till 1902: for Hertz, MSS in the Vatican, Barberini, and Casanatense libraries are all *codices Romani* (ed. mai. ii, pp. lv n. **, lxxiv). Neither hypothesis speaks well for Hertz; but a third is hard to find.

It becomes ever more apparent that his *editio maior*, to which we are so much indebted, can never be taken on trust; but it would in any case need replacement in the light of recent improvements to our knowledge of the tradition and the text. Thus MS C anticipates Jo. Connellus' *inscriptionis* at pr. 10 (Paris, 1511),⁹ and presents the correct *ipsum* at 5.9.6;¹⁰ the *Florilegium Gallicum* anticipates Lambecius' conjecture

⁵ Cretic + molossus is a favourite Gellian clausula, cf. L. A. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988), 44; for the *adnominatio* 'sequi... adsequi' cf. *ibid.* 20 n. 5.

⁶ Note too 'inculcauit' §12 ~ 'inculcantes' *Off.* 1.111. If despite Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 68 n. 45 the five πάθη of 19.12.3 derive from *Off.* 1.69 (note 'carere et uacare' ~ Cic. 'uacandum'), then perhaps anger had already been interpolated into Cicero's text (where it produces bad balance and worse doctrine) from 1.89.

⁷ Still so, for C omits the end of §4 by *saut du même au même* from 'necessum est' to 'uisum est'.

⁸ LCM 15 (1990), 144, commenting on Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 37 n. 26.

⁹ Printed by Ascensius (whose own editions all refuse the correction) and sold by Jean Petit (who had also published Aegidius Maserius' edn., cit. Marshall on 2.2.7 *dum inspicimus* as ed. in *Bellouisu facta* 1508); reissued by Barth. Trot (Lyon, 1512), and thrice more in Paris. *Inscriptionis* also appears in Florence, Laur. 54.11, 25, 26, 31; London, BL Burney 175; Venice, Marc. lat. XIII.58 (3917); Lucca, Archivio arcivescovile, Bibl. Feliniana 478 (*ipsiusque inscriptionis*); Vat. Barb. lat. 123, 145, Ottob. lat. 2062 (*ipsis inscriptionis*). Florence, BNC II.i.72, Munich, Clm 5359, and Vatican, Chigi H VII.237 substitute it for the second *scriptionis* instead of the first.

¹⁰ Chicago, Newberry Lib. f90; London, BL Burney 176; Oxford, Bodl. Lib. E. D. Clarke 20; Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 1085 ('ipsum ac'); Vat. Barb. lat. 145, Ottob. lat. 2019 (corr. from *ipsos*), Vat. lat. 1537. Cf. LCM 14 (1989), 151. Hosius and Marshall write 'ipsum s'; the siglum is better reserved for the text inherited by the *recentiores*, not readings in this or that MS.

deprehendendi at 10.23.1, and a late MS of the Valerio-Gellian florilegium (Florence, Bib. Marucelliana C.220, Cavazza's M) Marshall's *caducei* at 10.27.5. Another instance:

NA 18.9.9 namque in altero ν geminum, in altero σ esse tralatum dicunt.¹¹

Hertz reports as follows:

(a) For ν QXOITN and early editions have the Latin letter, Z one that might be taken as Greek; for σ X has \bar{g} , OITN g , and QZ nothing.¹²

(b) Jan Wouwer, transcribing a collation of an unidentified *vetus codex* into his copy of Georgius de Caballis' edition (Venice, 1565),¹³ deleted n and noted that his MS. read σ .

(c) This collation was also transcribed by Heinrich Lindenbrog, who corrected n to ν , in a copy of Jo. Soter's second edition (Cologne, 1533), and by his brother Friedrich, who made no note on n (Hertz says nothing about s), in one of Jo. Tornaesius' edition (Lyon, 1592).¹⁴

(d) Wouwer's MS. was very similar to that collated by Gaspar Scioppius, who (so Jacobus Gronovius reports *ad loc.*), ignores n but registers '6', no doubt for σ .

This will no longer do, either for a Cobetian 'apparatus uere criticus' or for an overview of Gellius' tradition. As to the former, Marshall has already assigned Greek N to the consensus of the medieval manuscripts (rightly so, though scribal intentions cannot always be discerned) and lunate c to F,¹⁵ which Hertz did not see; to be precise, it reads in *altero*: *cess&ra'ns' latum* corrected in the margin to *in altero.c' esse transla[tum]*, a reflection of Gellius' own α , omitted in δ and replaced by the sign for *Graecum* in γ and hence in the basic *recentior* text (ς).

That is to say, the Greek letters can be recovered from the paradosis; which is enough for the textual editor. But the student of Gellian scholarship needs to know more:

(i) Both ν and σ are found in BL MSS Burney 174, Add. 16981; σ appears in Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana, Conv. Sopp. 188, and underlies the o of Laur. 54.25.

(ii) Several *recentiores*, and the *ed. pr.*, read s ,¹⁶ which Jenson, followed by many other early editors, misinterpreted as *scilicet*,¹⁷ and for which Carrio substituted p , thereafter the vulgate till 1853.

(iii) Soter, having read *scilicet* in his first edition (Cologne, 1526), in his second read σ ; thus whereas Wouwer's and Scioppius' MSS already exhibited σ , Heinrich Lindenbrog's ν was a conjecture inspired by the σ he found in print.

¹¹ 'For they say that in the one ($\epsilon\nu\nu\epsilon\mu\epsilon$) the ν has been doubled, in the other ($\epsilon\sigma\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$) the σ has undergone metathesis [i.e. $*\sigma\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon > \epsilon\sigma\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$].'

¹² Hertz also reports that for *tralatum* Z reads *translatum*.

¹³ Preserved in the Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (363 Gud. Lat. 8°).

¹⁴ Both books, held 'in bibliotheca publ. Hamburgensi' (Hertz, *ed. mai.* ii, p. lxxix) – now the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Carl von Ossietzky – were destroyed by Allied bombs (ex rel. Dr Eva Horváth of the Handschriftenabteilung, letter of 12 Aug. 1992).

¹⁵ Cf. Tornaesius' note: '*s. vet. editae. Tor. [= F] paulo aliter.*'

¹⁶ So Cesena, Bibl. Malatestiana S XVI 4; Chicago, Newberry Lib. f90; Florence, Laur. 54.30; London, BL Burney 175, 176; Oxford, Bodl. Lib. E. D. Clarke 20 m.^{1pc} (*LCM* 16 [1991], 48 errs); Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 1085; Vat. Barb. lat. 123 (s erased and followed by $g.s.$), Chigi H VIII.262 (s with superior $g.$), Vat. lat. 1537 (g with superior s), Vat. lat. 3453 (s subpuncted, in margin g). Others read *is*: London, BL Harley 2495, 2768; Lucca, Bibl. Feliniana 478; Vat. lat. 1535; Venice, Marc. lat. XIII.58 (3917).

¹⁷ Cf. *enim* for *.n.*, London, BL Harley 4859; Vat. lat. 1532; also in Connellus, along with *alteros* for *altero .s.* Georgius de Caballis reads *scilicet .s. translatum*.

(iv) The Archimandrite Afanasij Ivanov, in his Russian translation of 1787, reads ν and ς [*sic*] without comment.¹⁸

The strictly critical edition is not the place for such information, save insofar as right must be done by those whose conjectures have been confirmed by manuscripts. Nevertheless, Hertz having made the effort to provide it, one must both render him due gratitude and recognize that, errors apart, it is often out of date. But who, even with the resources to replace him, would be allowed the opportunity to do so?

4. NA 10.10.2 propterea non inscitum uisum esse eum potissimum digitum tali honore decorandum

The text requires the subject of *non inscitum uisum esse* to be *eum potissimum digitum decorandum* in the sense ‘the honouring of that finger in particular’, an impermissible construction. To be sure Livy offers two instances resulting from co-ordination with substantives, 1.20.7 ‘nec caelestes modo caerimonias, sed iusta quoque funebria placandosque manes ut idem pontifex edoceret’, 35.20.7 ‘Cn. Domitio extra Italiam quo senatus censuisset provincia euenit, L. Quinctio Gallia et comitia habenda’,¹⁹ but Gellius had no such excuse for writing *decorandum* instead of *decorare*; examples from late-imperial authors such as ‘signa requirenda oportet’ (Innocentius V.P. in *Grom.* i.312.29–30 Lachmann, cf. Hofmann–Szantyr 374, 378) will not justify this construction in an educated Antonine.²⁰ Read *inscite* and all is well: ‘therefore (says Apion) it was very reasonably held that that was the finger deserving to be distinguished with such honour’. It is an uncovenanted bonus that Gellius uses the adjective in five other places, the adverb in seventeen;²¹ for the litotes *non inscite* cf. 1.15.15, 3.1.12, 5.11.13, 17.2.26.²² The corruption (like *studium uisum* 7.14.4) was caused by forward assimilation of endings.

5. NA 18.15.2 M. etiam Varro in libris disciplinarum scripsit obseruasse sese in uersu hexametro, quod omnimodo quintus semipes uerbum finiret et quod priores quinque semipedes aequae magnam uim haberent in efficiendo uersu atque alii posteriores septem, idque ipsum ratione quadam geometrica fieri disserit.

Certain commentators adopt an explanation advanced, and then retracted, by Paul Maas:²³ that the five and seven *semipedes* correspond to the five and seven semitones in the perfect fourth and fifth, being geometrically equal ‘auf dem “Kanon” eines Monochords (oder dem Griffbrett einer Guitarre oder Geige) gemessen’. If a string 12 cm long is stopped 3 cm from the end, the resulting note will be a fourth above that on the full string; if instead it is stopped at the mid-point, it will yield the octave, a fifth above the fourth. Maas demonstrates this with a diagram

¹⁸ For Afanasij and his translation see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 246–7, where at n. 30 for ‘Dnepropetrovsk’ read ‘Dnipropetrovsk (Ukraine)’.

¹⁹ See Weissenborn–Müller *ad loc.*, cf. Kühner–Stegmann i.754.

²⁰ The paraphrase at Macr. *Sat.* 7.13.8, ‘et ideo uisum ueteribus ut ille digitus anulo tamquam corona circumdaretur’, is far too free to help.

²¹ Including respectively the comparative *inscitiores* (19.10.14) and the superlative *inscitissime* (10.16.5).

²² At 18.5.7 *non* does not negate *inscite*.

²³ *Hermes*, 48 (1913), 157–9, cit. Iancu Fischer in *Nopfile atice*, trans. David Popescu, (Bucharest, 1965), *ad loc.* (who, as if confusing piano-keys with intervals, makes C–E five semitones and F–B seven), and Maria Laura Astarita, *La cultura nelle “Noctes Atticae”* (Catania, 1993), 165 n. 27; Bernardi-Perini also adopts this explanation, without giving a source. These scholars have overlooked Maas’s ‘Berichtigung’ in the same volume, p. 636 (appended to the article in his *Kleine Schriften*, Wolfgang Buchwald (ed.), [Munich, 1973], 593–5).

in which the first 3 cm are divided into five semitones from *e* to *a*, and the 3 cm remaining to the mid-point are divided into seven semitones from *a* to *e'*.²⁴ Moreover, the fourth and fifth are generated by the very ratios, respectively 4:3 and 3:2, whose Greek names, *ἐπίτριτος* and *ἡμιόλιος*, Gellius had in his previous chapter, commonly held Varronian,²⁵ declared to be untranslatable; to each other they stand in the ratio 9:8 (*ἐπόγδοος*), found by over-ingenious Pythagoreans between the nine syllables in the 'right' half of the hexameter and the eight in the 'left' (Arist. *Metaph.* N6, 1093a28–b1), taken by Bonitz and others for the halves of the written verse with third-trochee caesura.

However, the 'right' and 'left' halves are simply the first and last three feet;²⁶ there is thus no parallel with *NA* 18.15.2. Nor in Gellius' discussion of *ἡμιόλιος* and *ἐπίτριτος* is there any mention either of music, for which several of his examples are unsuitable,²⁷ or of the *ἐπόγδοος*, which neither music nor cosmology could dispense with. More seriously, Varro would be conflating the mathematically incompatible doctrines of Aristoxenus, who conceived musical intervals as distances and divided the tone into two equal semitones, and Pythagoras, for whom they are ratios and the *λείμμα* (as later writers called it) of ditone to fourth is less than half a tone.²⁸ It is one thing to employ the two conceptions *successively*, when Gaudentius states in one section (§9, pp. 338–9 Jan) that the fourth contains five semitones, the fifth seven, the octave twelve, but in the next adduces their ratios, 4:3, 3:2, 2:1, another to do so *simultaneously*, when Maas says of his semitonally divided octave, 'Die Kenntnis dieser Elemente der physikalischen Akustik und der pythagoreischen Harmonielehre gehörte im Altertum zu der allgemeinen Bildung', citing discussions of the ratios.

But the fundamental flaw in the hypothesis is its reliance on an optical illusion, for it is not the quarter-string (the first 3 cm) that yields the fourth, but the three-quarters. Maas writes, 'Das [the equal space of fourth and fifth] kommt daher, daß die Octave genau in der Mitte der gespannten Seite [= Saite], die Quarte genau am Ende des ersten Viertels erklingt', but what is the first quarter as the player's finger advances through the frets is the last remaining quarter when the sounding part is related to the whole.

Revival of a theory withdrawn by its author, entailing the necessity of refuting a great scholar's errors, is all the more unfortunate when the true explanation had

²⁴ As Dr Bonnie J. Blackburn (pers. comm.) points out, instead of dividing the string by ratios and sounding the longer part, Maas took for model one of the three instruments he mentions, namely the guitar, on whose fingerboard the semitones are separated by frets. The note sounded at the fifth fret, which divides the whole string in 1/4 and 3/4, yields the perfect fourth; the next seven frets, which occupy the same space on the fingerboard and in Maas's diagram as the first five, cover the adjoining fifth, reaching to the mid-point of the string, which yields the octave.

²⁵ Hosius, edn. i, p. lv; but Astarita 165 takes 18.14 for Gellius' own work, intended to clarify the next chapter. If 'de numeris Latine scripserunt' (§2) denotes book 5 of *de disciplinis* (*NA* 10.1.6) rather than *Atticus* (Cens. 2.2) or the nine books *de principiis numerorum* (see Jerome's catalogue), Latin translations already existed when Varro wrote, let alone Gellius (Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 169 n. 26, where add Aug. *Mus.* 2.10.18 – ignored by J.-Y. Guillaumin, *RPh*³ 53 (1989), 105–9 – and the generic term *sesquatus*, Ter. Maur. 1577; Aug. *Mus.* 1.10.17 'ueteri iam nomine').

²⁶ So 'Alexander', confirmed by Samuel E. Bassett, *CPh* 11 (1916), 458–60; Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 117 n. 13 should be corrected.

²⁷ The former is exemplified by 3:2, 15:10, 30:20, the latter by 4:3, 12:9, 40:30; the simple terms apart, only 12:9 has musical relevance, forming part of the continued ratio 12:9:8:6.

²⁸ For the mathematical conflict see Ptol. *Harm.* 1.10, cf. Porph. *Comm.* 2.10, Boeth. *Mus.* 3.3. Ancient attempts at reconciling the two (on which see M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford, 1992), 239) do not avail us here.

already been given by Henri Weil,²⁹ whose exposition persuaded Maas but has in recent times been overlooked, at least by Gellian scholars.³⁰ Restatement, in greater detail, is required.

St Augustine, as avid a reader of Varro as Gellius himself, devotes the fifth book of his dialogue *De musica* to verse, distinguished from metre as having a caesura (5.1.1, cf. 3.2.3–4); bipartition commends the verse even as it commends the foot (5.2.2), which is divided into *ᾄσις* (*leuatio*) and *θέσις* (*positio*). The two parts, however, should not be interchangeable (5.3.4, cf. 3.9.20), but differ either in metrical pattern or in the number of *semipedes* (5.6.12–13); in the latter case the shortest acceptable verse comprises seven half-feet (5.7.14). Having considered various other possible verse-types, Master and Pupil return to the two most honourable verses, the hexameter and the iambic trimeter, both *senarii* and both divided by the caesura into five and seven syllables, or seven and five (5.10.21). After more discussion, the Master undertakes to show ‘cur ipsi senarii meliores sint uersus quam ceteri in quolibet alio pedum numero constituti’ (5.11.24). It is agreed that any line is divisible into two parts, themselves also lines and divisible into two; furthermore, ‘omnem longitudinem ad latitudinem porrigendam quae ab ipsa oritur tantum ualere quantum latitudinis quadratum occupat’ (5.12.25). *Valere* here recalls the technical language of geometry, in which a line *δύναται* the square drawn upon it; moreover, numbers being conceived geometrically, the notion $a^2 = b$ is expressed by saying that *a δύναται b*. After making sure that the Pupil understands square numbers, and is willing to base the calculation on *semipedes*, the Master proceeds to his proof (5.12.26):

M. Age nunc commemora membrum uersus heroici breuius quot semipedes habeat.

D. Quinque.

M. Dic exemplum.

D. ‘Arma uirumque cano.’

M. Num igitur aliud desideras, nisi ut alii septem semipedes cum istis quinque aliqua aequalitate conueniant?

D. Nihil prorsus aliud.

Those seven half-feet are themselves capable of forming a verse, if further subdivided into four and three. It is now time to apply these findings:

M. Duc ergo in legem quadrati has partes singulas, et uide quid faciant quattuor quater.

D. Sexdecim.

M. Quid tria ter?

D. Nouem.

M. Quid totum simul?

D. Viginti quinque.

Hence the squares of the two members into which the second part of the hexameter is subdivided add up to 25; but the first part, which cannot be so treated, must be squared as a whole (*tota in quadratum ducenda est*), yielding an amazing equivalence (*aequalitatem mirabilem*), for 5×5 also = 25.

Nec ergo immerito senarii uersus ceteris celebratiores nobilioresque facti sunt: dici enim uix potest quantum inter illorum aequalitatem in membris imparibus, et aliorum omnium intersit.

²⁹ *JbClPh* 8 (1862), 335–7; *ibid.* 13 (1867), 132–3; *Études de littérature et de rythmique grecques* (Paris, 1902), 142–4.

³⁰ But see Manfred Simon, *Das Verhältnis spätlateinischer Enzyklopädien der artes liberales zu Varros disciplinarum libri novem* (Diss. Jena, 1963), 83–4, on fr. 27 (GRF 220 = 116 GS).

The five *semipedes* thus have an equality with the other seven according to a geometrical principle.³¹ The match with Varro could hardly be better (cf. Gellius: 'aeque magnam uim habent', 'ratione quadam geometrica').³²

6. At *LCM* 9 (1984), 151, I cited from a letter by Gerald of Wales the words:

quoniam, ut ait Agellius, sine culpa mole sarcine uincitur, qui ad portandum onus etsi impar tamen deuotus occurrit.³³

This passage, I now find, had already been identified as coming from Ennodius,

sine culpa uincitur oneris immensitate, qui ad portandam sarcinam etsi impar tamen deuotus occurrit,³⁴

by way of the *Florilegium Angelicum*, one of the secondary collections to which Gerald owes his knowledge of Gellius;³⁵ for the ascription of a passage taken from a florilegium to another author also represented there compare Petrus Cantor, *Verbum abbreviatum* 53 (PL 205.194):

item Agellius: leges urbium sunt telae aranearum, que fortiora animalia transmittunt, minus fortia et debiliora retinent.

which is Val. Max. 7.2.ext.14, included in the Valerio-Gellian florilegium:³⁶

Quam porro subtiliter Anacharsis leges aranearum telis conparabat! Nam ut illas infirmiora animalia retinere, ualentiora transmittere, ita his humiles et pauperes constringi, diuites et praepotentes non adligari.

Those still tempted by the notion that Petrus preserved a translation from Plato Comicus (!) fr. 21 K.-A. in *NA* 8.8 should study medieval ascriptions as a genre. Just as Gellius gains matter he did not write, so on one page of the *Policraticus* (ii.30 Webb) passages from the ϕ florilegium (*NA* 10.8, 1.13) are assigned to Pliny and Frontinus; a sermon attributed to St Bonaventure (Quaracchi edn. ix.281-9) but in fact by Guibert of Tournai cites *NA* 3.6 (from *Policraticus* 5.6, i.303 Webb) without mention of Gellius, then ascribes to him an anecdote concerning Alexander from *Policraticus* 4.11 (i.270-1 Webb), cf. *LCM* 18 (1993), 126-7.

³¹ Cf. 6.10.27: '... in uersu occultiore consideratione numerorum ea quae inaequalia membra iunguntur uim aequalitatis habere inueniantur'. Augustine does not remark that the hexameter embodies the 'Pythagorean' 3,4,5 triangle.

³² The implicit exclusion of hephthemimeral caesura is due to summary exposition; at *Mus.* 5.5.9 Augustine admits it, yet at 3.2.3 the Master asserts that however far the Pupil proceeds in the *Aeneid* he will find word-end 'in quinto semipede, id est in duobus pedibus et semisse' (*Aen.* 1.9 refutes).

³³ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Speculum duorum*, ed. Yves Lefèvre and R. B. C. Huygens (Cardiff, 1974), 202.212-14.

³⁴ *Dictio in natale Laurenti Mediolanensis episcopi* 1.5 (MGH AA vii.1.25-7; CSEL vi.424.16-17).

³⁵ See A. A. Goddu and R. H. Rouse, 'Gerald of Wales and the *Florilegium Angelicum*', *Speculum*, 52 (1977), 488-521 at 513-14; cf. R. H. and M. A. Rouse, 'The *Florilegium Angelicum*: Its Origin, Content, and Influence', in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt* (Oxford, 1976), 66-114 = *eid.*, *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame, 1991), 101-52. With the sentiment contrast *NA* 2.23.22.

³⁶ Which also cites Gellius on the topic (11.18.18): 'Fures, inquit [Cato, *or.* fr. 172 SbC = *ORF*⁴ 224 Malc.], priuatorum furtorum in neruo atque in compedibus aetatem agunt, fures publici in auro atque in purpura'.

7. Eleven incunable texts of Gellius are recorded in bibliographies:³⁷

H7517 *Ed. pr.* Arnold Pannartz and Conrad Sweynheym, Rome, 11.4.1469.

H7518 *Eid.*, Rome, 6.8.1472.

H7519 Nicholas Jenson, Venice, 1472.

H7520 Andreas Jacobi (de Paltasichis; Andrija Paltašić), Venice, 1477.

H7521 Boninus de Boninis (Dobrić Dobrićević), Brescia, 3.3.1485.³⁸

H7522 Bernardinus de Choris and Simon de Luero (Lovere), Venice, 13.8.1489.

H7523 Venetian edition of 1491.

H7524 Cristophorus de Quaietis de Antegnago and Martinus de Lazaronibus de Rouado, Venice, 17.7.1493.

H7525 Boneto Locatello for Ottaviano Scotto, Venice, 13.11.1494.

H7526 Joannes de Tridino alias Tacuinus, Venice, 6.4.1496.

H7527 Philippus Pincius (Pinzi) of Mantua, Venice, 15.7.1500.

Ten are extant; but the Venetian edition of 1491 (H7523), against which Jacobus Gronovius claimed to have collated a manuscript in Lincoln College, Oxford,³⁹ is known only from a letter to his father accompanying his collation⁴⁰ and from the list in his edition of 1706, sig. *** **1^v. The collation does not record the readings of the edition, only divergences in the MS.; they include several readings found in the Venetian editions of 1472 (H7519), 1477 (H7520), 1489 (H7522), 1493 (H7524), and 1494 (H7525), but not in H7526, 'Impressum Venetiis per Ioannem De Tridino alias Tacuinum Anno domini M.cccc.lxxxvi. die .vi. Aprilis': e.g.:

14.1.16	<i>ceptum</i> Linc./ <i>ceptum</i> Jac.	<i>incoeptum</i> H7526
14.1.33	<i>ducente</i> Linc., Jac.	<i>dicente</i> H7526
14.3.7	<i>moribus</i> Linc., Jac.	<i>maioribus</i> H7526
14.6.5	<i>versu</i> Linc., Jac.	<i>uersus</i> H7526
14.7.4	<i>quotiensque</i> Linc., Jac.	<i>Quotiens</i> H7526
14.7.7	<i>reliquit</i> Linc., Jac.	<i>relinquit</i> H7526

These errors are all new to H7526 except *maioribus* at 14.3.7, found in H7517–18 but corrected in H7519.

The first known edition to include the chapter-headings of book 8, and to take account of them in its book-numbers, is H7524.⁴¹ If Jacobus' Veneta had them (he is silent on the question), then H7525, which, being derived not from H7524 but H7522,

³⁷ E.g. Miroslav Flodr, *Incunabula classicorum* (Amsterdam, 1973), 178–9; numbers as in L. Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum*, 4 vols. (Milan, 1948).

³⁸ Found by Lamberto Donati, *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia*, 2 (1927–8), 4/22, pp. 181–98 to exist in two very different editions: Brescia, Biblioteca Queriniana D.H.12 = A, *ibid.* Lechi 152 = B, 'quella definitiva' (p. 195). To B belong Bodleian Library Auct. O.5.2 and British Library 167.e.14; 'cicerrnis' (sig. [a5]^r24) has been corrected to 'ciceronis' in the former, 'futura' (sig. AA1^v28) – if not Donati's error – to 'futura' in both.

³⁹ MS. Lat. 59: s. xv; Florentine; scribe of Genoa, Durazzo B.III.18 (Caesar), Vat. Urb. lat. 51 (Jerome, *Epp.*); Greek by John Scutariota; presented, apparently in 1465, by Robert Fleming, dean of Lincoln Cathedral, who may have bought it from Vespasiano da Bisticci. See R. Weiss, *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, 8 (1935–7), 343–59, esp. 349, 356 n. 61; *id.* *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1967), 97–105, esp. 104; A. C. de la Mare, *Lincoln College Record*, 1962–3, 16; *ead.* in A. Garzelli (ed.), *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento* (Florence, 1985), i. 550; J. J. G. Alexander and E. Temple, *Illuminated Manuscripts in Oxford College Libraries* (Oxford, 1985), 99, no. 953.

⁴⁰ The letter, dated 18 Aug. 1670 (apparently Old Style; not 1 Sept., as Hertz, *ed. mai.* ii, pp. cxxv f. n. ***), was copied by Johannes Fredericus at the end of the collation in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Gron. 57, fasc. VI; it begins: 'Ecce tibi, Pater carissime, omnia, in quibus editionem, ut scripsi ante, Venetam anni 1491, a MS. Gellio collegii Lincolnienensis discrepare adverti.' The earlier letter is lost.

⁴¹ H7517–18 have no book-numbers, H7519–20 number the extant books 1–19 in text and table, H7521–2 in the running heads as well; none shows any awareness that a book is missing.

retains the old numeration and records the new-found lemmata only in a grudging note on the final page,⁴² was the more perverse in disdaining an improvement made two editions previously; but if not, it is all the harder to understand why H7526, though generally following H7524, should adopt the errors of H7523, for the readings implied by Jacobus' collation match H7524 as against H7522 and H7525, e.g.

14.5.2 *terminantur sed* Linc., Jac., H7517–22, H7525
terminant sed H7524, H7526

14.6.2 *ut sine arbitris* Linc., Jac. ('ut sine arbit. '), H7517–22, H7525
ut arbitris H7524, H7526

but H7526 as against H7524, e.g.

11.7.1 *nimis obsoletis* Linc., H7517–18, H7524
nimis absoletis H7519–22, H7525
nimie obsoletis, H7526
nimis Jac.

With these patterns in mind, we may consider 14.6.1, where Gellius' *doctrinae omnigenus* (preserved in δ and the Valerio-Gellian florilegium) had long since been corrupted in γ , and hence in ζ , to *doctrinis omnigenis*:⁴³

omnigenis Linc., Jac., H7517–18
oigenis H7519–22, H7525
oigenis H7524
origenis H7526.

The genealogy of error is manifest: the Roman editions spelt out the adjective; Jenson introduced the compendious *oigenis*, which by loss of its titulus became *oigenis*; this not being a Latin word, a Christian printer who found it in his copy emended to the name of the learned heretic. Since Jacobus ignores purely graphic variants between manuscript and edition, he cannot have found *oigenis* in the latter; the regular agreement of his edition with H7526 against H7524 precludes *oigenis*, but if it read *origenis*, it must be later, not earlier, than the one edition to read *oigenis*, namely H7524, and hence cannot have been published in 1491.

Is '1491' then simply *M.cccc.lxxxvi* misread as *M.cccc.lxxxxi*?⁴⁴ Jacobus himself, having made his collation in considerable discomfort and a foul temper, admitted the possibility of miscopying, 'quod interdum evenisse licet mihi conscius non sim, praestare tamen non possum, quum pene caecutiente per nimiam in socios bilem animo, horis insolitis, ne bibliothecae publicae dari solitas amitterem, ter quoque immensis ventris torminibus relinquere pensum cogentibus, ea collegerim'. The suspicion can be confirmed, for Lincoln College library holds a copy of H7526 presented by William Ruswell (or Rouswell, or Rosewell), a Fellow from 1556 to

⁴² fo. 72^r 'Sunt nonnulli qui existimant octauum librum noctium atticarum non reperiri: eumque qui nonus est uicem octauum tenuisse: quod si ita est uiderint doctiores. Asseruntque se subsequenter excerpisse ex uetusto exemplari: quae quidem magis placuit seorsum imprimere quam ordinem pristinum librorum infringere', followed by headings to bk. 8; cf. H7524, fo. 48^r 'A. Gelii Noctium Atticarum Liber Octauus hac aetate non reperitur. Sed ex uetustissimo exemplari haec capitula excerpta [sic] sunt', reproduced misprint and all in H7526, fo. 48^r. Whereas H7517–22 and H7525–7 are the work of well-known houses, the printers of H7524 produced only one other book, H12206/12210 = Ovid, *Heroides* (Venice, 14 Dec. 1493); the great Ottaviano Scotto, established 1479, disdained to learn from fly-by-nights (e.g. 14.6.4 *sit an* H7517–20, H7524, *sittun* H7521–2, *sit tum* H7525).

⁴³ F reads *doctrinis omnigenus*, with the left-hand minim of the *u* erased to leave an *i*.

⁴⁴ Although the readings noted above for H7526 all recur in H7527, it is harder to see how Pincius' 'M.ccccc.' could be so misinterpreted.

1564.⁴⁵ This, we need not doubt, was the incunable that Jacobus found to hand and against which he made his collation; H7523, the supposed Venetian edition of 1491, is a ghost.⁴⁶

67 *St Bernard's Road,*
Oxford OX2 6EJ

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS

⁴⁵ Shelfmark K.9.23; inscribed in 16th-C. hand 'Liber collegij Lincoln ex dono Gulielmi Ruswell'; bound with a defective copy of H14569 = *Opera agricolationum*, Ph. Beroaldus (ed.), (Reggio Emilia, 18 Sept 1496); inside front cover a Library bookplate of 1703. On the donor see Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses, 1500–1714*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1891–2), iii. 1281; V. H. H. Green, *The Commonwealth of Lincoln College, 1427–1977* (Oxford, 1977), 606. All cited readings of H7526 were confirmed by me for this copy; those of the other incunables were taken from the copies in the Bodleian and British Libraries.

⁴⁶ The compilers of the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, ix (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1991), col. 342, observe that H7523 is 'Nicht nachweisbar' and exclude it from their numeration: H7522 = GW 10598, H7524 = GW 10599.