

XVI.—A Critical Edition of the *Vatican Mythographers*

KATHLEEN O. ELLIOTT

RADCLIFFE COLLEGE

AND

J. P. ELDER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The *Vatican Mythographers*, useful for *testimonia*, for information on the transmission of learning in the late Empire and early Middle Ages, and for illumination of the development of physical, moral and theological interpretations of ancient myths, have never been critically edited. This study, looking forward to such an edition, summarizes our present knowledge or views on the general characteristics, sources, dates, authorship, and manuscripts of each of the three collections of myths.

The three collections of myths which have been blessed with the striking, if unreasonable, title of *Mythographi Vaticani*¹ are generally known to classicists, if they are known to them at all, as rich sources for *testimonia* to classical authors. But they remind one, in the problems they pose as in their yield, of the scholia to Statius to which they often have a baffling resemblance, or of the mysterious comment on Virgil² scattered about in the crowded margins of *cod. Bern.* 172 — “summi plena iam margine libri Scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus” — like Juvenal’s annoying *Orestes*. And so one may fairly call them highly deceptive sources which should be used with much caution. Too often their text has been forced by their Procrustean editors, Angelo Mai and later Georg Bode, to conform obediently to the “accepted text” of their presumed sources.³ Avoiding for the moment the question whether

¹ All three were first edited together by Angelo Mai, *Class. Auct. e Vat. codd. ed. tom.* 3 (Rome, 1831; hereafter cited as Mai) 1–277 and 365–379. For a review of this edition, see G. Bode, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1832) 2^{er} Band, 977–1000. The traditional title is derived from the fact that Mai used only Vatican mss. The next, and last, edition, from which these works are usually cited, was that of Georg Bode, *Scriptores Rerum Mythicarum Latini Tres Romae Nuper Reperti* (Celle, 1834; two volumes, usually bound together; hereafter cited as Bode 1 or Bode 2). On his preparation for this edition, see G. Bode, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1833) 3^{er} Band, 1881–1887.

² On which see J. J. Savage, “The Commentary of Servius Danielis on Virgil,” *HSPH* 43 (1932) 96–105.

³ As shown in detail by K. O. Elliott, *Text, Authorship and Use of the First Vatican Mythographer* (unpubl. Radcliffe diss., 1942).

these presumed sources really were direct sources, we can at least say that today we know enough about differences in the families of manuscripts of some of these sources, e.g. Servius or Isidore, to make us wonder what text Servius or Isidore actually put out. That, in turn, leads us to the next question: if these mythographers did draw upon such sources as Servius or Isidore, what version of their texts did the mythographers use? Hence an honest text of these mythographers, i.e. a text established from *their* manuscripts and from a study of contemporary vocabulary and syntax, should be of considerable use to classical students.

For another group of scholars, those who interest themselves in the transmission of ancient lore into and through the Middle Ages and the rich and varied uses these ages made of this lore, these mythographers have many an interesting light to shed in the general illumination of mediaeval culture.⁴ Someday, for example, someone will give us the full and fascinating story of classical mythology in mediaeval poetry, much as Professor Bush has done — and one hopes with nearly as much skill — for two periods of English poetry.⁵ Doubtless this story will come out slowly, bit by bit,⁶ but whoever undertakes this task will probably turn first of all to Servius, the scholia to Statius and the like, then to the vast mediaeval literature on Ovid⁷ (particularly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which Traube so happily named the *aetas Ovidiana*),⁸ then to our *Mythographi Vaticani*, and only then to the more

⁴ On mythology in the Middle Ages, see O. Gruppe, *Gesch. d. klass. Myth. u. Religionsgesch. während d. Mittelalters im Abendland u. während d. Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1921), who discusses *Myth. Vat. 1* and *2* on pp. 9–10, and *Myth. Vat. 3* on pp. 11–14; F. v. Bezold, *Das Fortleben der antiken Götter im mittelalterlichen Humanismus* (Bonn, 1922); H. Liebeschütz, *Fulgentius Metaforalis: ein Beitrag z. Gesch. d. antiken Myth. im Mittelalter* (Bibl. Warburg, 1926), who *passim* has a good deal to say on the Vatican mythographers.

⁵ D. Bush, *Mythology and the renaissance tradition in English poetry* (Minneapolis, 1932) and *Mythology and the romantic tradition in English poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).

⁶ For one interesting bit, see J. C. McGalliard, *Classical mythology in certain mediaeval treatments of the legends of Troy, Thebes, and Aeneas: a study in the literary paganism of the middle ages* (unpubl. Harv. diss., 1930).

⁷ The more important studies on this large subject have been collected by E. H. Alton, "The Mediaeval Commentators on Ovid's *Fasti*," *Hermathena* 20 (1930) 119–151; F. Ghisalberti, "'L'Ovidius Moralizatus' di Pierre Bersuire," *Studi Romanzi*, 23 (1933) 5–136; L. K. Born, "Ovid and Allegory," *Speculum* 9 (1934) 362–379; J. Engels, *Études sur L'Ovide Moralisé* (Groningen, 1945).

⁸ L. Traube, *Vorlesungen u. Abhandlungen*, 2, *Einleitung in lat. Philol. d. Mittelalters* (ed. P. Lehmann, Munich, 1911) 113.

obscure by-ways such as the commentaries on Martianus or the works of Guillaume de Conches, Alain de Lille, and John of Salisbury. Or, to take another example, a reliable text of these mythographers will be indispensable for the scholar who may study the changing attitudes of the mediaeval mind toward the old myths, and describe for us the evolution of the physical, then the moral, and finally the theological interpretations of these stories, until in time the pagan divinities blossomed into full-fledged vices and virtues.⁹ Liebeschütz in his excellent *Fulgentius Metaforalis*¹⁰ has told the last part of this tale; the first part, however, still awaits its teller. For both classicist and mediaevalist, then, it is important that there be a trustworthy critical text of these three tracts.¹¹ No such edition yet exists.

The present study has a twofold purpose: to acquaint scholars with the progress being made in preparing such a critical text, and to enlist from them whatever help they can furnish the project.¹² Toward such ends we present here in brief form an evaluation of the two standard editions of these collections; then follows a highly condensed chapter on each of the three treatises, devoted to general characteristics, sources, date, authorship, and manuscripts. It will be noted, and indeed this study aims to emphasize the point, that our ignorance in many of these matters considerably surpasses our knowledge. Finally, it should be added that, although we shall avoid unwarranted dogmatism in distinguishing between direct sources, common sources, and quotations, we consider that one of the most important features of the new edition would be its collection of *testimonia*, sources, and parallel passages. Such a collection, if the evidence of the manuscripts is read aright, should contribute materially to our knowledge of the interrelationship of such works as the Servian scholia, the scholia to Statius, the fables of Hyginus, the pseud-Acro scholia, Fulgentius' *Mitologiae*, the *Mythographi Vaticani*, and the *Narrationes Fabularum Ovidianarum*.

⁹ See C. E. Lutz, *Dunchad: Glossae in Martianum* (Lancaster, Pa., 1944) xii, note 12.

¹⁰ See note 4.

¹¹ "Neue Ausgabe dringend notwendig," Manitius, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit. d. Mittelalters* (Munich, 1911-1931; hereafter cited as Manitius) 2, 660.

¹² Such as information on American holdings of photostats or microfilms of MSS of these works, or on copies of Bode advertised for sale.

I. Mai's Edition

In 1831 Mai published the *editio princeps* of these three collections (see note 1). Unhappily he neglected to identify his manuscripts beyond mentioning laconically in his preface that the text of this or that one was preserved "in uno tantum Svecorum olim Reginae, nunc vaticano, codice" or "in palatino chartaceo" or in a book that once belonged to Fulvio Orsini. The result has been no little confusion, and no less labor. Moreover, his transcriptions are frequently incorrect, a fact which will surprise no one acquainted with this industrious prefect's habits. His text is further vitiated — we speak from at least scholastic purity — by his frequent euphemistic changes: ". . . illud non celabo, me videlicet complura mythographorum horum vocabula, quae, ut fit in ethnica mythologia, pudicis auribus ingratiore accidissent, euphemismis commutavisse . . ." (Mai, praef. xvi). Whether a "rem habuit" is actually less salacious than a "concubuit" or whether a "complexus" is more delicate than a "compressus" is doubtless a matter of secular taste.

Mai's manuscripts can now be identified as follows; see pp. 199, 203, and 207 below for more information on these:

For *Myth. Vat. 1*

1. *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401.

For *Myth. Vat. 2*

1. *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401.
2. *Vat. lat.* 8743; discovered by Mai a year after his text had already been printed but not published, and used by him only for filling the lacunae in *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401 which he had already noted in his printed text (see Mai 365–379). Apparently as late as 1923, to judge from Manitius (see note 11) this manuscript was still unidentified.

For *Myth. Vat. 3*

1. *Vat. lat.* 3413.
2. *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1290.
3. *Vat. Pal. lat.* 1726.
4. *Vat. lat.* 1960; a compendium.

II. Bode's Edition

In 1834 Bode put out his edition, copies of which are extremely hard to come by today (see note 1). This is chiefly distinguished from Mai's by its critical notes, consisting of parallel passages, possible sources, some *lectiones variae*, and by its very useful index.

At the end he has appended some *Observationes in Mythographum Primum* which are not without value. His textual sources were (Bode 2, 3-4):

For *Myth. Vat. 1* and *2*

Mai's text, emended by reference to such sources as Servius and Fulgentius, and by his own ingenuity (Bode 1, proem. xix). Bode did not make or have others make for him a new collation of *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401, the only source for Mai's text, and since Mai had not discovered *Vat. lat.* 8743 in time for use in establishing his text, Bode, too, made no use of it. The upshot is that often in Bode's text we are twice removed from the readings of the manuscripts: once through Mai's euphemisms or inaccuracies, and once again through Bode's emendations of Mai's text. In his *sigla* Bode (2, 3-4) designates Mai's text for *Myth. Vat. 1* as *A* and for *2* as *B*.

For *Myth. Vat. 3*¹³

1. Mai's text (based on the four manuscripts listed on p. 192 above).
2. *Goting. Univ. theol.* 100; designated as *H*.
3. *Goth. M.* II, 136; designated as *L*.
4. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 8508; designated as *N*.
5. In emending his text Bode had recourse to two Wolfenbüttel manuscripts of Servius (*Aug.* 2091, designated by him as *C*;¹⁴ and *Aug.* 2546, designated as *D*) and to two of Fulgentius (*Gud.* 4638, designated as *E*; and *Gud.* 4640, designated as *G*).

III. *Myth. Vat. 1*¹⁵

General Characteristics. The collection is divided in our sole manuscript into three books, the first of which contains 101 myths, the second 102, and the third 31. This division appears to mean little, whether one look at it from the point of view of the subjects of the myths or from that of sources. No definite rationale in the order of the myths in Bk. 1 is observable. We start fairly hopefully with Prometheus (though one does wonder what has happened to Saturn and his brood), pass on to Neptune and Minerva, meet up with Scylla, and from there go to dine with Procne. The order

¹³ On Bode's *H*, see his notice in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1833) 1^{er} Band, 89-91. Bode himself collated his *H* and *L*; F. Dübner "excerpted" *N* for him (Bode 1, proem. xix).

¹⁴ On this MS, designated as *W* in the Harv. *Servius*, see A. F. Stocker, "A New Source for the Text of Servius," *HSPH* 52 (1941) 65-97.

¹⁵ On which see Schanz-Hosius-Krüger, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* (Munich, 1920; hereafter cited as Schanz) 4², 242-245; Manitius (see note 11) 2, 659; Elliott (see note 3) 179-193.

of myths at the opening of Bk. 2, however, is suggestive of what we may perhaps rightly call the traditional order in mythographical literature, as seen in Fulgentius, *Myth. Vat.* 2, and the like (see below, p. 200), i.e. Saturn, Jupiter, Neptune, Pluto, the Furies, the Fates, the Harpies, Proserpina, Apollo, the nine Muses, Apollo and the "corvus" and "laurus," Mercury, and Liber. One might conclude, then, that *Mythographus* 1 merely combined three separate treatises — Bk. 1 with its confused order, Bk. 2 with its orthodox arrangement, and Bk. 3 which contains most of the purely Roman stories (Regulus, Torquatus, Camillus, the seven civil wars of Rome, Atilius, the Fabii, and Marcellus¹⁶). But the stupid errors perpetrated by *Mythographus* 1, such as taking over from Servius words which are the lemma of the next comment on Virgil and which make little or no sense in *Myth. Vat.* 1's text,¹⁷ would strongly argue against such a view and would rather support the theory that he consulted at least certain of his chief sources himself. On the whole, then, the division into books would appear to be merely a bow to custom and to have been established on nothing more noble than numerical grounds.

One final point in the arrangement of the myths merits attention. One can detect a few series in the stories. There is a Heracles group (47–69, in which 67, on the Myrmidons, seems to have no proper place), a brief Apollo set (113–118), a short Liber series (120–123), and the above mentioned Roman tales (219–226). The explanation for these groups is probably to be found in the sources which the compiler used, i.e. perhaps he took one portion from one source until he had finished that series, and then moved on to another source and another subject. Unfortunately, as will be brought out below, the loss of many of the sources used in common by our author and other writers whose works are still extant makes such disentangling a very difficult task. Yet it is surely significant that in the case of the only two sources directly used by *Mythog-*

¹⁶ Fab. 30 in Bk. 1, however, deals with Amulius and Numitor, Fab. 74 in Bk. 1 with Tarquin and Lucretia, and Fab. 202 in Bk. 2 with the flight of Aeneas (citing Cato as a source). Such stories, of course, would not be found in a Greek mythological handbook, if indeed such were still read or even extant. Did these Roman tales perhaps come from commentaries on the *Aeneid*?

¹⁷ E.g. Fab. 205 ends with "Discite iustitiam vel nunc in poenis locati." The entire story is taken verbatim from Servius *ad A.* 6.618; the "discite" line is the lemma and comment of Servius' next scholium (*ad A.* 6.620). While such a moral note of warning is not incongruous with the import of Fab. 205, it is the only example of direct address in all of *Myth. Vat.* 1, and would seem to have been a rather bad slip.

raphus 1, Servius and the scholiast to Statius (if the same man wrote the comment on both the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*), it is possible to detect our author's using each source for a whole succession of stories.

No ancient author has been quoted directly. All quotations appear to have been taken over by *Mythographus 1* from his sources. Of Greek authors he mentions Asclepiades, Eratosthenes, Ister, Pherecydes, Euphorion, and Demosthenes; of Roman prose writers, Cato, Varro, Livy, Pliny, Asper, Longus, Solinus, and Orosius; of Roman poets, Ennius, Terence, Gallus, Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Juvenal, and Statius. Plainly in the late Empire there was such a continuous exchange of material between mythological and scholiastic literature that in the blended tradition one cannot easily discern single lines and threads.¹⁸ This intermarriage — one hesitates to call it cross-fertilization — had been going on long before the time of *Mythographus 1*, and so one need feel no surprise at finding almost any curious bit of information in this mythographical collection.

The stories are presented in a starkly business-like style, with so little attention given to their poetic or imaginative qualities that one can safely conclude that the author of this treatise had no time for matters of the spirit. His task, one feels, was to provide "mythological facts," and in as straightforward and concise a fashion as possible. There was to be no nonsense here! This suggests the purpose for which the book was made. As the great handbooks were passing out of existence in the late antique period, as learning in general declined and men ceased to be able to read Greek, there arose a need for such short, comprehensive collections. Hyginus, who gave no Roman stories, would not fill the bill. Perhaps, then, this was designed as an ancillary text for boys reading the great writers of old, particularly the poets. If the work was written in the low-tide of the sixth or seventh centuries, it was typical of the period when epitomes were a standard part of the intellectual milieu. It would, then, be a sort of *ars mitologica*.

*Sources.*¹⁹ The chief ones are unnamed. Two authors, Servius and the scholiast to Statius, were used directly.

¹⁸ See Gruppe (see note 4) 1.

¹⁹ See R. Schulz, *De Mythographi Vaticani Primi Fontibus* (Halle, 1905; hereafter cited as Schulz), and Elliott (see note 3) 182-191.

One can collect a number of cases to show that *Mythographus 1* used Servius artlessly.²⁰ But then, to turn to the sunny side, there are numerous examples of his intelligent adaptation of Servius.²¹ In general, the version of a story given in Servius is shortened by *Mythographus 1*. This does not necessarily mean that our author failed to understand Servius's version,²² but merely that he quite rightly omitted from Servius what was not pertinent to his purpose, e.g. grammatical notes (he slips once in Fab. 37, borrowing from Servius *ad A.* 3.73), Greek (if he or his readers knew any at all), and rambling quotations from other authors. Rarely does he actually contract the story itself.

The other source used directly by *Mythographus 1*, the scholia to Statius, was used in about the same fashion. One point here merits notice: there is some evidence for believing that *Mythographus 1* used a manuscript of the Statius scholia at times akin to Jahnke's *Pb*, at times akin to his *M*.²³

Of those works which appear to have used with *Mythographus 1* a common source, the following are the chief ones: Hyginus in his *Fabulae*, Servius Danielis, Lactantius, Solinus, Fulgentius, and Isidore. Only once does our author agree with Hyginus (Fab. 31 with Hyg. 259), once with Solinus (Fab. 79 with Sol. 32.17), and only once with Servius Danielis (Fab. 101 with Serv. Dan. on *A.* 1.505). This is a passage of considerable length, and not an easy

²⁰ E.g. Fab. 95 includes the "autem" (which, like the other offensive words here cited, has been omitted from Bode's text) at the start of the story in Servius (*ad E.* 8.55). In Servius it makes sense; in *Myth. Vat. 1* it is out of place. Similarly, "vero" at the opening of Fab. 228, taken over thoughtlessly from Servius *ad A.* 6.893, betrays carelessness. "Supra" in Fab. 182 means nothing; in its source, Servius *ad A.* 7.190, it refers to *A.* 7.187. In the last sentence of Fab. 161 our author writes: ". . . et satis a nullo fecit oraculo." The answer to the puzzling "a nullo" (if our text here is correct) is to be found in Servius *ad E.* 5.11: ". . . et a nullo cognitus fecit locum oraculo." Again, in Fab. 64 our mythographer, borrowing from Servius *ad G.* 3.4, wrote: ". . . unde eum durum appellavit." The subject, Virgil, would be clear enough to a reader of Servius, but hardly to a reader of our collection. Hence Mai and Bode inserted a "poeta" after "durum" in their text. After Fab. 195, taken from Servius *ad A.* 3.121, our writer added what followed in Servius, a list of Greek dialects. It may raise our estimation of his intellectual curiosity, but it cannot be said to be within the scope of his project.

²¹ E.g. Fab. 127 has the clause "dicit Virgilius"; Servius says (*ad E.* 2.31) "diximus in Aeneide."

²² Cf. Schulz (see note 19) 10.

²³ Ed. of R. Jahnke (Leipzig, 1898). On the agreements in errors between *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401 and Jahnke's *Pb* and *M*, see Elliott (see note 3) 185, note 1, and 187, note 3. These conclusions may be swept away entirely when we know more about the readings of more MSS of these scholia.

instance to explain. Since it is unique, one is tempted to conclude that *Mythographus 1* did not possess Servius Danielis, if that oddly concocted affair had yet come into existence, but perhaps had a manuscript of Servius in which this note had been added. More likely, however, he drew this story from a now lost source which is also, in some way, back of Servius Danielis or back of such a source of Servius Danielis as Aelius Donatus. Or quite possibly he drew this note from an unknown source which had drawn it from one of the sources of Servius Danielis. Of the making of such theories there is no end — and little profit.²⁴

There is a strong resemblance between items in the *Narrationes Fabularum* of Lactantius (at least a convenient name for the author of these "argumenta") and *Mythographus 1*. Yet Lactantius is usually a deal longer, and it would seem fairly safe to say that each independently used the same sources. The question of the relationship of Fulgentius to *Mythographus 1* is a much knottier matter. It is indeed impressive that each often shows the same order of myths (see p. 200 below); impressive, too, that each often has the same exact phrase. Yet a careful examination will reveal two important facts: first, Fulgentius contains a number of mystical explanations which our author lacks; presumably they did not appeal to him as within the proper scope of his work. Second, now *Mythographus 1*, now Fulgentius, has the longer version, while each displays the same verbatim base. Against the opinion, therefore, of several excellent scholars,²⁵ we conclude that each independently used the same sources or sources emanating fairly immediately from the same sources.

With Isidore's *Origines* our author agrees upon relatively few occasions. No single fable is found *in toto* in Isidore; the nearest approach is Fab. 124 where all but the first sentence appears in Isidore 8.11.71-75. And there are three cases of partial agreement.²⁶

Finally, to say the obvious, *Mythographus 1* surely used some sources now lost to us. A study of his relationship to the above

²⁴ Equally puzzling is a phrase in Fab. 160. *Mythographus 1* has taken his story from the shorter Servius *ad E.* 5.11, but adds "unde laudes meruit." Servius Danielis here reads: "merito ergo 'laudes' qui talia fecerat," of which this appears to be some sort of contraction.

²⁵ See references and arguments of Schulz (see note 19) 13-18, and of Elliott (see note 3) 190-191.

²⁶ Fab. 107 with *Orig.* 8.11.38; Fab. 113 with *Orig.* 8.11.53; Fab. 119 with *Orig.* 8.11.45-49.

sources still extant cannot but persuade one that there is little, if any, original stuff in the whole treatise. What element of originality there is would appear to be confined entirely to the realm of selection, rejection, and arrangement of stories. Probably, then, most of the material for which we can spot no definite sources was plundered from works now lost. Two possibilities certainly stand out: Virgilian commentaries (indeed bits of the Berne scholia confirm this view²⁷) and mythological handbooks.

We have a good deal of definite evidence for his method of using sources. In the best manner of compilers, he not only took several fables in succession from the same author (see p. 194 above), but at times quite deftly combined within the same myth scraps from a number of sources.²⁸ These are often indicated by "alii dicunt," an expression he may have picked up from Servius, or by his favorite "aliter." The *apparatus criticus* of our projected edition will illustrate this.

Authorship and Date. No good clues are to be found. At least he was no Hyginus.²⁹ As for his date, the mention of Orosius (ca. 415 A.D.) in Fab. 219 gives us a "terminus post quem," and the date of *cod. Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401 (saec. XII) gives us the other boundary. The many errors in this manuscript, however, show us that the work was copied several times at least, and thus narrow down the span. Moreover, the straight-forward, unallegorical manner in which the myths are presented might persuade one that the author lived before the Carolingian age. Indeed, if one may trust one's general impression — and this is no bad way of dating a work or a manuscript in the early Middle Ages — this work would seem to have been composed by a man who was striving laboriously and woodenly to *preserve* knowledge, and not by one filled with the joy of *discovering* knowledge. To follow this somewhat vague line, the work would appear in many respects to be a product of the Merovingian age, though hardly one of its "brighter aspects." Certain palaeographical considerations would tend to confirm this theory.³⁰ The suggestion has been advanced, owing to resemblances between

²⁷ See Schulz (see note 19) 58–69.

²⁸ E.g. Fab. 23 comes from the scholia to *Theb.* 2.281 and to *Achil.* 1.28.

²⁹ See O. Rossbach, "Ein falscher Hyginus," *Jahrb. f. class. Philol.* 131.1 (1885) 408–410.

³⁰ Suggested to us by the late Professor E. K. Rand, for whose encouragement in this project we should like here to record our gratitude. The whole matter of possible Merovingian signs in *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401 needs further study.

Mythographus 1 and the Berne scholia, that the author of the former, too, was an Irishman of the eighth or ninth centuries.³¹ But scholarship has already given the learned Irish quite enough of a load without thus increasing their academic burdens. Still, one cannot deny that an Irishman on the continent may have been the parent of this work too.

*Manuscripts:*³²

- *1. *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401; saec. XII; ff. 1^a–28^b; *inc.* Prometheus post factos a se homines, *expl.* ad occasum sequi videtur.³³

IV. *Myth. Vat.* 2³⁴

General Characteristics. This collection consists of a prooemium and 230 myths, with no division into books. One might fancy that we could get a good insight into *Mythographus 2*'s intellectual interests from the prooemium, with its wide scope and vision, were not most of it derived word for word from Isidore (*Orig.* 8.11.1–4), or from some source also used by Isidore. Like *Mythographus 1* this one shuns allegorization and any imaginative comments upon the interpretation, much less the function, of myths; like *1* he is probably composing a handbook for schoolboys. Indeed, *Mythographus 2* seems even more didactic in purpose than *1*. And again, as in the case of the first mythographer, the originality seems to consist almost wholly of the selection of material. But he differs from the first in three notable respects: his stories are usually a

³¹ Tentatively proposed by Schulz (see note 19) 74.

³² For the MSS of the three works, we have merely indicated location, date, pertinent folia, and the *incipit* and *explicit*. An asterisk before the number indicates that one of us has studied the MS; otherwise, our information comes from second-hand sources. Whenever we have not given this basic information, it is to be attributed to deficiencies in our notes or in printed catalogues. Detailed descriptions and bibliographical lists have been omitted, since they seemed inappropriate to the present brief study. No speculations on the interrelationships of the MSS have been advanced. We hope, in the forthcoming summer, "si Bellonae videtur," to take "soundings" of critical passages in the MSS and thus begin to formulate some sort of stemma.

³³ A special warning should be issued in regard to Renaissance collections of myths which furnish some stories not found in *Myth. Vat.* 2 or 3 but only in *1*. While a first examination might convince one that here was *Myth. Vat. 1* with its stories arranged in a different order, probably some able Renaissance scholar was merely independently repeating the process of *Mythographus 1*, i.e. going back to Servius and the Statius scholia, as an examination of the order of the myths with regard to such sources will quickly reveal. One such case is to be found in *cod. Magliabecchianus* 8, 1445, saec. XV, in the Bibl. Naz. Centr. in Florence.

³⁴ For bibliography, see Schanz (see note 15) 4², 245, and Manitius (see note 11) 1, 509; 2, 656–660 and 808.

good deal longer, owing partly to his habit of using more sources for one tale than *Mythographus 1* did; his style is better than that of the first, though it would hardly win any prize for composition today; and, most important, there is a definite system and purpose in the order of his myths. At least the first part of the work consists of definite sequences, i.e. fables dealing with one divinity, and these are arranged in a hierarchical succession. We begin with Saturn, pass on to his children, then to the other chief gods and goddesses, then to minor divinities, then to the giants and Titans, the prophets and seers, outstanding mortals, and so on. This is not an original order, but customary in mythological treatises, as the following tables illustrate:

<i>Myth. Vat. 1, Bk. 2</i>	Fulgentius	<i>Myth. Vat. 2</i>
102-3 Saturn	2 Saturn	1 Saturn
104-5 Jupiter		2-3 Jupiter
106 Juno		4-8 Juno
107 Neptune	3 Neptune	9 Neptune
108 Pluto	4 Pluto	10 Pluto
	5 Tricerberus	11 Tricerberus
109 Furies	6 Furies	12 Furies
110 Fates	7 Fates	13 Harpies
111 Harpies	8 Harpies	14 Fates
112 Proserpina	9-10 Proserpina	15 Proserpina
		16 Jupiter
		17 Latona
113 Apollo	11 Apollo	18-21 Apollo
	12 corvus	22 corvus
	13 laurus	23 laurus
114 nine Muses	14 nine Muses	24 nine Muses

Sources. Again, the chief ones are not named. The first question, however, to ask here is whether *Mythographus 2* used *Mythographus 1*. F. Keseling, disagreeing with earlier scholars, concluded that the second knew the first, and may have been guided by him in selecting and weaving together his myths, but did not actually use him as a direct source.³⁵ Rather, the first and second, he held, used common sources. There probably can be little doubt that the second did not actually draw material from the first, but as for the conclusion that *Mythographus 2* was partially guided by the first, one can only answer with a "non liquet." It is true that they

³⁵ In his excellent *De Mythographi Vaticani Secundi Fontibus* (Halle, 1908; hereafter cited as Keseling) 116-130.

reflect the same sources frequently, whether direct or indirect. If the second did not know the first and if they wrote, as seems likely, several centuries apart, this coincidence is striking. On the other hand, we still must consider the general mythographical literature. When did it become systematized within formal, narrow limits? How does Fulgentius, reflecting the traditional order, come into this picture? May each mythographer, then, have simply followed independently a fairly orthodox order, and have independently used about the same sources? Then, too, one wishes that we knew more about the distribution and number of copies of *Mythographus 1* which were extant in the Carolingian period. It must be remembered that our sole manuscript is a twelfth century product.

The matter of the other sources possibly used by the second mythographer need not detain us long. Keseling has done as excellent a job on this score as the available material permitted. The second, like the first, drew heavily upon Servius; he appears not to have known Servius Danielis. As for the relationship of our author to the scholia to Statius, we are beset by very thorny problems. First of all, it should be said at the outset that we very much need a new edition of these scholia, with a much more copious *apparatus criticus* than the slim affair given us by Jahnke.³⁶ As things now stand, it is impossible to get a fair picture of the many divergences between the chief families of manuscripts. All one can now say is that apparently *Mythographus 2* used the scholia to the *Thebaid* but not to the *Achilleid*. Isidore, too, is a delicate case and, without entering here into the question of his sources, we have concluded that our author used him only once directly (cf. prooem. with *Orig.* 8.11.1-4); on the whole, each used common sources. Fulgentius is an easier matter; here there can be little doubt that *Mythographus 2* used him, and heavily, as a direct source.³⁷ He does not, however, seem to have used the scholia to Lucan or the early scholia to Juvenal, or Hyginus, or the *Narrationes Fabularum*; coincidences here are probably to be attributed to direct, or more likely to indirect, common sources. Finally Keseling suggests that the second mythographer used some sort of mythographical commentary on Virgil, which would also be reflected in

³⁶ Again and again it becomes apparent that an ample justification for a bulky *apparatus criticus* in editions of scholia is to be found in the odd rays of light that seemingly trivial and unimportant *lectiones variae* throw on such matters as sources, relationships between works, dating, and the provenance of a tradition.

³⁷ Convincingly demonstrated by Keseling (see note 35) 67-83.

the longer Servius, Philargyrius, and Probus. Since we know nothing about any such work or works, it would be as hard to deny this suggestion as to confirm it.³⁸

Authorship and Date. The author, a Christian, is not named in any manuscript. If he actually took the prooemium from Isidore, we then have a "terminus post quem" for our author. We must be careful not to be influenced by the customary statement that *Mythographus 2* lived after *Mythographus 1*, although on the whole this may appear likely. Actually, they resemble one another in many features, e.g. in their absence of allegorization, their selection of stories, and their use of the same sources. That probably will tell us that neither lived after the tenth century, but nothing else. Perhaps some help is to be had from stylistic considerations. To anyone familiar with grammatical literature of the Carolingian age, *Mythographus 2* could easily seem to have belonged to that period; syntax, vocabulary, and method of definition all point to this.

Manitius suggested that the author of the second treatise was Remigius of Auxerre.³⁹ While *Remigiomania* can become rather dangerous, it must be said that style, attitude, and verbal similarities all support this thesis. After going through Remigius's profane and secular works — a neither particularly pleasing nor light task — we have noted no parallels striking enough to confirm Manitius's suggestion. This, of course, by no means rules out this busy Carolingian as a candidate for authorship.

Manuscripts:

1. *Brit. Mus. Burn.* 311; saec. XV; ff. 163–369; *inc.* Dii, quos pagani deos, *expl.* veneno periit (Bode 1, 149, 30).
- *2. *Magl. Fior. lat.* 8, 1445; saec. XV; ff. 211^a–256^a; *inc.* ii quos pagani, *expl.* morbi causa (Bode 1, 149, 38).
- *3. *Marc. Venet. lat.* 10, 119; saec. XV; ff. 1^a–78^b; *inc.* Dii vel dei quos pagani deos asserunt, olim homines fuisse produntur.
- *4. *Marc. Venet. lat.* 14, 109; saec. XV; ff. 104^b–160^a; *inc.* Mithologarium liber incipit. Mitologiarum liber. Dii quos pagani deos, *expl.* beneno periit. ΤΕΛΩΣ ΜΙΘΟΛΟΓΙΑΡΒΜ ΛΙΒΕΡ FELICITER FINIT A.D. MCCCCLXII.

³⁸ Cf. G. Thilo, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*, 1 (Leipzig, 1881) Praef. lxxvi: "Praeter hos libros fabularum volumen aliquod, quod non iam extat, ad augendum Servianum commentarium ab illo adhibitum esse probabile est." The "ab illo" is the compiler of the longer Servius. Thus this view, which apparently began with Thilo, was based on his now rejected theory on the origin of Servius Danielis.

³⁹ Manitius (see note 11) 1, 509.

- *5. *Med. Laur.* 16, 39; saec. X; ff. 85^b–89^b; mixture of bits of *Myth. Vat.* 1 and 2; *inc.* quos pagani deos asserunt homines olim fuisse produntur et pro unius cuiusque vitae meritis coli apud suos post mortem coeperunt. qui apud Aegyptummi sis. apud cretam iovis, apud mauros iuba, aput latinos . . . delos apollo. In quorum etiam laudibus accesserunt et poetae et compositis carminibus in celum eos sustulerunt. Nam . . . (Bode 1, 1–4 and 74–77). But is this merely Isid. *Orig.* 8.11.1–4?
- 6. *Monac. lat.* 9682; saec. XII; ff. 1–71.
- *7. *Monac. lat.* 11703; saec. XV; ff. 268^a–271^b; *inc.* Dii.
- *8. *Monac. lat.* 14120; saec. XV; ff. 105^a–130^a; *inc.* Fabulas poete a fando nominaverunt quia non sunt res facte . . . Dii quos pagani asserendo venerantur, *expl.* balearicae minori et maori (Bode 1, 127, 27). Then follow 25 myths belonging to the argumenta to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.
- *9. *Monac. lat.* 23717; saec. XV; ff. 212^a–216^a; *inc.* Dii quos pagani deos venereant, *expl.* esse terrae civitates quas insignitas constat esse turribus (Bode 1, 91, 4). Ff. 216^a–229^b contain myths not wholly derived from *Myth. Vat.* 1, 2, or 3.
- *10. *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1401; saec. XII; ff. 29^a–72^b; *inc.* Ii quos pagani deos asserendo venerantur, *expl.* paucis comitantibus.
- *11. *Vat. lat.* 8743; saec. XV; ff. 1^a–76^b; *inc.* Ii qui, *expl.* causa.
- *12. *Vindob. lat.* 3120; saec. XV; ff. 217^a–249^b; *inc.* Prohemium in Fabulas POETARVM. FABVLAS poetae a fando nominaverunt quia non sunt res factae sed tantum modo fictae . . . possit opprimere spoliata custodibus urbem. Prologus in fabularium. HI QVOS pagani deos asserendo venerantur, *expl.* in speciem ranarum transfiguravit.

V. *Myth. Vat.* 3⁴⁰

General Characteristics. After a one-page prooemium, this mythographer treats Saturn, Cybele, Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, Pluto, Proserpina, Apollo, Mercury, Pallas, Venus, Bacchus, Hercules, Perseus and the “duodecim signa caeli.” The mere recital of these subjects at once brings out several noteworthy points: the order, like that of Bk. 2 of *Mythographus 1* and that of *Mythographus 2*, is the traditional one, as a glance at the lists on p. 200 above will show. And, unlike these other works, this mythographer has stuck to major personages on the whole. A careful reading of the work reveals several equally striking points. The author has shown far

⁴⁰ For bibliography, see Schanz (see note 15) 4², 245–246; Manitius (see note 11) 2, 804; F. Ghisalberti, “Mitographi latini e retori medievali,” *Archivum Romanicum*, 7 (1923) 110, notes 3–6, and 111, notes 1–2; E. Rathbone, “Master Alberic of London, ‘Mythographus Tertius Vaticanus,’” *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, 1 (1943) 35, notes 1–6, and 36, notes 1–3 (particularly the Bibl. Warburg publications there cited).

more talent in organizing his material than did either of the other two. Under a general topic such as Juno or Hercules, stories are marshalled in a masterly order, with one leading to the next, and so on. Then, too, as a study of his sources reveals, the author weaves together in one section material from far more sources than either of the other two attempted. One would not hesitate to pronounce him a much more learned man, and one who used his learning with sense and imagination. It is not surprising that Petrarch had a special copy of this work made for his own use, a sumptuous book indeed, and that Boccaccio turned to this collection when composing his own treatise on the pagan gods. Perhaps, however, the characteristic that most impresses the reader is the allegorical interpretation of the myths, a feature already seen in the works of Dunchad, John the Scot, and Remigius of Auxerre, but carried much further in this later writer. In the elaborate interpretations of *Mythographus* 3, both morality and physics play important rôles, and the pagan divinities are well on their way to becoming symbols of virtues and vices. Long discussions on the origin of evil, types of wickedness and manifestations of it, methods of knowledge, the nature of the soul, the capabilities of the human mind, and the like are frequently found. Euhemeristic and Stoic interpretations abound. In short, one could hardly miss the fact that one is now in the twelfth or thirteenth century, and the contrast with the chastely stark and factual approach of the first two mythographers is most impressive.

Sources. This subject was investigated in 1912 by R. Raschke in a doctoral thesis.⁴¹ In one sense, this was not a difficult task, since this mythographer frequently names his sources and thus one can pile up quite a list of names, as Raschke did. Bode's index was invaluable here. Such a list includes Fulgentius, Servius, Macrobius, Martianus Capella and Remigius' commentaries on Martianus, Prudentius, and Psalms as the chief sources, though one can find occasional references to Cicero, Hyginus, Rufinus, and Isidore scattered through the work. But in another sense, this subject has scarcely begun to be investigated. There are two reasons for such a statement: first, a good many obvious borrowings, not attributed to any source, have not been tracked down. Second, Raschke was not acquainted with a good many of Remigius' commentaries since they had not then been published. Of many we

⁴¹ *De Alberico mythologico* (Breslau, 1912); see also Gruppe (see note 4) 11-12.

still today have only excerpts in print. It is our conjecture that many of the hitherto unlocated borrowings will ultimately be traced back to Remigius when we have more of his works published. Of particular importance will be his commentary on Martianus Capella.⁴² *Mythographus 3* time and again uses Martianus as a point of departure in a discussion. What he presents as his little commentaries on these remarks of Martianus will almost surely be found to come in great measure from Remigius' bulky and highly influential study of Martianus. Indeed, to make a somewhat risky guess, it seems doubtful that *Mythographus 3* will be found in the end to have had any major sources not still extant.

Authorship and Date. This work, as it has recently been shown, was undoubtedly written by a Master Alberic of London, perhaps a canon of St. Paul's, in the middle or later years of the twelfth century.⁴³

Manuscripts:

- *1. *Ambros. lat.* E. 128 sup.; saec. XV; ff. 21^a–57^a; *inc.* fuit, *expl.* habebat.
- *2. *Ambros. lat.* O. 109 sup.; saec. XV; ff. 1^a–101^b; *inc.* Alberici opus non Augustini, ut in aliis codicibus legitur . . . Divi Aurelii augustini de integumentis . . . liber incipit feliciter. Fuit, *expl.* habebat.
- *3. *Bamberg. hist.* 4/2. E. III. 11; saec. XIII/XIV; ff. 15^b–18^b; *inc.* Incipit tractatus de diis gentium et fabulis poetarum. De Ortu Ydolatrie. uit in egypto vir potens et divitiis affluens vocatus syrophanes, *expl.* quia virencia iuveni deo congruunt. Explicit de diis gentium et fabulis poetarum.
- *4. *Bamberg. class.* 48. M. II. 1; saec. XV; ff. 57^a–91^a; *inc.* ulta viri veteres cum scribendo sibi gloriam, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat.
- *5. *Bern.* 223; saec. XV; ff. 59^a–87^a; *inc.* Fuit in egipto vir, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebant. Explicit albericus londonensis de veritate fabularum anno domini 1456^o, 19^a martii deo gracias.
- *6. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 8500 (Petrarch — Sforzesca family at Pavia — Blois — Fontainebleau — Paris); saec. XIV; ff. 83^a–

⁴² On *Myth. Vat.* 3's debt to Remigius on Martianus, see Raschke (see note 41) 5–7; M. Esposito, "On Some Unpublished Poems attributed to Alexander Neckam," *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 30 (1915) 466–468; Gruppe (see note 4) 11–12. Professor C. Lutz, who is at work on an edition of Remigius on Martianus, has generously offered us all possible assistance. When *Myth. Vat.* 3 cites John the Scot (Bode 1, 159, 4) or uses him without naming him, he probably derives this from Remigius (cf. Manitius [see note 11] 2, 804). On John's use of mythology, see C. Lutz, *Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum* (Med. Acad. Amer. Publ. 34) xxiv, notes 7–9, and xxv, notes 1–4.

⁴³ As shown, through some interesting detective work, by Rathbone (see note 40).

- 105^a; *inc.* Poetarius compositus ab Alberico viro illustri ac doctissimi . . . Fuit vir in egypto ditissimus nomine Sirophanes, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat. Explicit.
- *7. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 8508; saec. XII/XIII; ff. 1^a–95^b; *inc.* Fuit vir, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat. Felici fine felici claudere fine.
- *8. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 8699; saec. XIV; ff. 1^a–47^b; *inc.* Fuit vir in egypto ditissimus, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat. Explicit liber poetarium Albrici phylosophis.
- *9. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 13191; saec. XII/XIII; ff. 60^a–78^a; *inc.* Fuit in egypto vir ditissimus nomine sirophanes, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat.
- *10. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 14627; saec. XV; ff. 265^a–323^a; *inc.* Multi viri veteres . . . figmenta manaverunt. Fuit in egypto, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat. Explicit Albericus londonenses.
- *11. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 16246; saec. XV; ff. 8^a–43^b; *inc.* Multi viri veteres cum scribendo . . . manaverunt . . . Capitulum primum de ortu ydolatrie. Fuit in egypto vir, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat. Explicit Poetria magistri albrici.
12. *Bodl. Digb.* 221; saec. XIV; ff. 1–34; *inc.* Fuit vir in Egipto ditissimus nomine Syrophanes.
13. *Bodl.* 571 (2019); saec. XV; f. 191.
14. *Bodl. Auct.* F 5. 16 (2581); saec. XIV; ff. 139–157.
15. *Bodl. Canon.* 572; saec. XV; ff. 1–65; *inc.* Albrici, sive Alberici, Londoniensis Allegoriae poeticae sive de veritate ac expositione poeticarum fabularum tractatus.
16. *Brit. Mus. Harl.* 2557; saec. XV.
17. *Cantabrig. Regin.* 10; saec. XIII/XIV; ff. 29^a–55^a; *inc.* Fuit in egypto vir, *expl.* et in figura transit.
18. *Cantabrig. Trin.* 884; saec. XIV; ff. 21^a–37^a; *inc.* Fuit vir in egypto, *expl.* pro inde pingitur semi-homo semi-equ(u)s.
19. *Cheltenham.* 1151 (present location unknown to us); saec. XV.
20. *Cremon.* 129; saec. XV; ff. 14^a–40^b; *inc.* Incipit poetarium seu scintillarium Albrici. Fuit in Egipto vir doctissimus nomine Syrophanes, *expl.* pectus et ora lee caudam serpentis habebat. Explicit poetarium sive scintillarium Albrici de integumentis fabularum. Deo gratias. Amen.
21. *Dunelm. Hunter.* 45.
- *22. *Goth. M. I.* 55; saec. XIII/XIV; ff. 223^b–279; *inc.* Multa viri veteres cum scribendo sibi gloriam querere viderentur . . . pene figmenta manaverunt. Explicit prologus. Incipit liber de ortu ydolatrie. Caputale primum. Fuit in egypto vir ditissimus nomine Sirophanes, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat. Explicit liber de poetario albrici.
- *23. *Goth. M. II.* 136; saec. XIII; ff. 162^a–190^a; *inc.* Fuit vir in egypto, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat.
- *24. *Goting. Univ. theol.* 100; saec. XIII; ff. 1^a–36^b; *inc.* uit in egypto.

- *25. *Hafnien.* S 2094; saec. XV; ff. 1^a–63^b; *inc.* FVit in egipto vir clarissimus, *expl.* serpentibus (*corr. in* serpentis) habebat. Explicit Poetarum liber de entegumentis fabularum.
- *26. *Marc. Venet. lat.* 10.70 (3328); saec. XV; ff. 21^a–69^a; *inc.* Fuit, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat.
- *27. *Marc. Venet. lat.* 14.11 (4320); saec. XV; ff. 56^a–73^b; *inc.* Fuit in egipto, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat.
- *28. *Med. Laur.* 90.22; saec. XV; ff. 47^a–80^a; *inc.* Fuit vir in egipto ditissimus nomine Sirophane hic habuit filium, *expl.* ut etiam numquam in vestrum accedant aspectum (Bode 1, 191, 45). Vale.
- *29. *Med. Laur.* 90.38; saec. XV; ff. 3^a– ?; *inc.* Vit in aegypto vir ditissimus nomine Syrophanes, *expl.* caudam serpentibus habebat.
- 30. *Monac. lat.* 369; saec. XV.
- 31. *Monac. lat.* 10728; saec. XV (saec. XIII Schmeller-Meyer).
- 32. *Monac. lat.* 21566; saec. XIII; ff. 20–67; *inc.* Vita patrum secundum fabulas. Multi viri veteres conscribendo.
- 33. *Prag.* 632; saec. XIV; ff. 138^a–167^a; *inc.* Fuit in Egipto vir ditissimus nomine Sirophanes, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat. Explicit Istoriola.
- *34. *Vat. lat.* 1960; saec. XIV; compendium; ff. 25^a–27^a; *inc.* Fuit in egipto vir potens, *expl.* quod virencia iuveni dicto congruunt (cf. no. 3).
- *35. *Vat. lat.* 3413; saec. XII/XIII; ff. 1^a–46; *inc.* Fuit in egipto, *expl.* ora lee caudam serpentis habebat EXPLICIT.
- *36. *Vat. Pal. lat.* 1726; saec. XV; ff. 136^a–175^a.
- *37. *Vat. Pal. lat.* 1741; saec. XV; ff. 159^a–192^b; *inc.* Fuit vir in Aegypto, *expl.* de sapientia.
- *38. *Vat. Reg. lat.* 1290; saec. XIV; ff. 8^b–29^b; *inc.* FVit in egipto vir quidem ditissimus nomine Sirophanes, *expl.* et pisces semper stant in aquis. Ergo deo gracias. Explicit liber ymaginum deorum cuius auctorem non repperi scriptum sed fertur fuisse quendam Albricum philosophum.
- *39. *Vindob. lat.* 260; saec. XIII; ff. 1–39; *inc.* Multi viri veteres cum scribendo . . . figmenta manaverunt. Vir fuit in egipto, *expl.* caudam serpentis habebat. Explicit hic liber.
- *40. *Vindob. lat.* 2298; saec. XV; ff. 161^a–186^a; *inc.* Multa viri veteres . . . figmenta manaverunt. Fuit in egipto vir, *expl.* habebat. Explicit albericus londonensis.
- *41. *Vindob. lat.* 3400; saec. XV; ff. 154^a–181^a; *inc.* Fuit in egipto vir, *expl.* caudam serpentes habebat. Finiunt libri poetarii de fabularum integumentis ovidii laus deo.
- 42. *Vratisl.* 1474.
- 43. *Wigorniens.* F. 154; saec. XV; ff. 1–16.