

XII.—Codex Vat. Reginensis 1560 of Persius

WENDELL CLAUSEN

AMHERST COLLEGE

This article contains a description and collation of the text of Persius in Vat. Reg. 1560.

The text of Persius depends, in the main, on three ninth-century manuscripts, which represent two distinct traditions: Montepessulanus 125 (P) belonging to one tradition, Montepessulanus 212 (A) and Vat. Tabularii Basilicae H. 36 (B) to the other.¹ These three manuscripts have been much studied,² but about a large number of later manuscripts or *deteriores*, scattered throughout the libraries of Europe, little or no reliable information exists. Of some few, indeed, accurate and detailed accounts have been published, e.g., Laurentianus 37.19,³ Vat. Reginenses 1562 and 1424.⁴ But most are known only in negligent or antiquated collations, e.g., the manu-

¹ For a good summary discussion of the manuscript problem see D. M. Robathan, "Two Unreported Persius Manuscripts," *CPh* 26 (1931) 284 ff. Facsimiles of single pages have been published by Chatelain, *Paléographie des classiques latins, dixième livraison*, pl. CXXI, CXXII, CXXIII.

² But not always well; see Robathan, "Leo's Edition of Persius," *TAPhA* 68 (1937) 123–128. Probably something is still to be learned, and any future editor of Persius should make a minute collation of all three manuscripts. From a rather brief examination of B I have collected the following readings and notes: *m.* (*m.1*) indicates the first hand, *m.2* a contemporary corrector:

1.50 non est hic est (*pr. est exp. m.1*) 1.56 nugalris (1 *exp. m.2*) 1.60 linque (*caudam add. m.2*) 1.76 brisei 1.86 libratim ant. 1.105 labris ·|· in udo 2.34 oculos (*os in ras. m.1?*) 2.35 quant voluit *m. ut vid.* 2.72 magna (*alt. a partim eras.*) 3.1 fenesias 3.2 limine *m. corr. m.1* 3.22 fedelia *sed fort. voluit fid- m.1* 3.29 trabeat (*e add. m.2*) 3.39 iuuenti 3.62 quo perferat *m. corr. m.2* 3.65 fuerat crateros 3.70 mummus 3.83 meditantis 3.93 locupo (*p ex r m.2*) 4.2 ducere *corr. radendo m.?* 4.12 pede *om. m. add. m. rec.* 4.43 illa *m. corr. m.2* 4.49 abice (*i sup. a scr. m.2*) 5.3 ponitur *m. corr. m.2* 5.7 helicone *om. m. add. eadem m. rec. quae* 4.2 pede *et* 6.2 chordae *supplevit* 5.18 *om. Sed versu 17 mycenis in ras. dimidio longiore scripsit m. 2, quod sic interpretandum: librarius parum diligens, dum vocabulis relinque (17) et plebeiaque (18) in eisdem litteras exeuntibus decipitur, duos versus sic turbavit: hinc trahe quae dicis mensasque relinque prandia noris; quod monstrum deinde sustulit m.2 prandia noris erasis et versu 18 in calce paginae suppleto* 5.23 cornutae 5.95 sambucem *m. corr. m.2* 5.119 exerce 5.135 stupas 5.154 diumsum *m. corr. m.2* 5.187 inflantes

³ F. Ramorino, *St. Ital.* 12 (1904) 229 ff. Cf. F. Leo's edition (Berlin, 1910), xvii–xviii.

⁴ Robathan, *op. cit.* (above, note 1).

scripts at Bern,⁵ while still others remain unexamined — how many is conjectural. These *deteriores*,⁶ though varying widely in age and value, are important because they must be employed where both P and AB fail, and because also where P and AB offer metrical variants, a sufficient study of these *deteriores* may eventually lead, through a delineation of the text tradition, to determining the ancient readings.⁷

Vat. Reginensis 1560 ranks among the more interesting of these manuscripts by reason of its age and readings.⁸ The account of it which M. Cerrati published⁹ is quite inadequate. Cerrati did not give a regular collation of Vat. Reg. 1560, but compared its readings with those of Laur. 37.19, which had been studied by F. Ramorino in 1904;¹⁰ and of some 133 items which Cerrati listed more than 20 are erroneous.¹¹ Cerrati's failure to distinguish correcting hands also vitiates his report; for in unravelling the tangled skein of manuscript relationships it frequently makes all the difference whether a variant can be assigned to the original scribe correcting himself, another contemporary corrector, a later corrector, or a Renaissance scholar. Out of some 23 instances Cerrati only designates the corrector in three (3.116, 6.2, 6.41), and of these three only one (3.116) is even interesting. Thus a complete new collation is necessary; supplementing and correcting Cerrati's reports would only provoke more confusion.

Vat. Reg. 1560 is a composite manuscript containing some fourteen separate texts, several of which have been studied and published by J. P. Elder.¹² The text of Persius on fol. 72r-79v is

⁵ The collations of C. G. Mueller, which Jahn used for his edition (Leipzig, 1843), and which were taken over from Jahn by Santi Consoli² (Rome, 1911), are remarkably inexact. I have made a complete study of the manuscripts at Bern, which I hope to publish soon. Cod. Bern. 257 *saec. X in.* (Jahn, *op. cit.*, ccvii-cc) is important, and Cod. Bern. 398 *saec. XII (ibid., cc-cci)* has a special interest in that it shows strong traces of Insular influence and may represent a divergent tradition.

⁶ Many of them are listed by Jahn, *op. cit.*, clxiii-ccxiv, and by Santi Consoli, *op. cit.*, x-xiv and 175-188.

⁷ See Leo's edition, xvii.

⁸ I collated Vat. Reg. 1560 in the Vatican Library, July, 1949. I wish to express my thanks to Prof. J. P. Elder of Harvard for answering some queries about the manuscript and for the generous loan of his notes.

⁹ *RFIC* 40 (1912) 113-119. On p. 119 Cerrati also reports Vat. Reg. 2029 *saec. X*, fol. 63v, which contains the prologue of Persius.

¹⁰ See above, note 3.

¹¹ E.g., at 3.101, 4.5, 4.19, 4.25, 4.51, 5.7, 5.47, 5.95, 5.105, 5.148, 6.39, 6.80.

¹² "A Medieval Cornutus on Persius," *Speculum* 22 (1947) 240-248 (243-248). "The Missing Portion of the *Commentum Einsidlense* on Donatus' *Ars Grammatica*," *HSPH* 56-57 (1947) 129-160.

written in Carolingian minuscules and should probably be dated *saec. X in.* So early a date is indicated, aside from the general appearance of the *ductus*, by the paucity of abbreviations, NT ligatures, and the occurrence of open *a*. Vat. Reg. 1560 is thus older than most *deteriores*. The unfortunately mutilated text begins at the top of fol. 72r with *Sat.* 3.99 and concludes on fol. 79v;¹³ there follow on fol. 80r–81r a *vita Persii* and an *Annotatio* of the usual sort on the missing prologue, which begins: *Satyrae proprium est ut verba humiliter dicat . . .* and ends: *in aliis nectar (Prol. 14)*. Fol. 72–77 are gathered in a ternion, fol. 78–85 in a quaternion; there are no signatures. Ruling is Old Style with 23 lines on fol. 72–77, 24 on fol. 78–85; although the text itself is written in single columns of 23 lines throughout, except for 18 lines on fol. 78r–78v because of a hole in the parchment, 24 lines on fol. 79r, and a final 19 lines with a three-line subscription on fol. 79v. Folios measure approximately 215×177 mm. It is evident, however, that this part of the manuscript has been trimmed, probably for rebinding in its present form, since scholia in the outer margins of 72r and 73v have been slightly truncated (usually one or two letters). For some reason the outer margin of fol. 79 was cut away (55–70 mm.), so that most of the initial letters on the verso were removed. The text, including initials and titles, was written throughout by one scribe in light brown ink; there are no rubrics. The same scribe added abundant, though trivial, scholia and glosses to fol. 72r–73v, and other hands wrote notes on fol. 73v, 76r, 76v, 77r. Some corrections were made by the original scribe, but most are to be assigned to other hands which seem to be of about the same age.

These corrections, especially the large number by erasure on fol. 72r–74r (*Sat.* 3.99–5.41), are one of the curious features of Vat. Reg. 1560. The erasures would seem to involve deliberate correction where they occur, since the ink has not flaked off elsewhere; yet it is something of a puzzle what the uncorrected reading could have been in such places as 4.8, 4.12 (*pede* om.), 4.28, 4.32, 4.38, 5.2, 5.3, 5.8 (*offa*?), 5.17 (*huc*?). On occasion, a scrutiny of the parchment or a comparison with other manuscripts has detected the uncorrected reading; and in the following instances there even seems to emerge a kind of pattern of alteration to conformity with

¹³ Thus 321 lines of text (plus a few lines for titles) are missing, unless 2.26–34 which wrongly stand after 5.124 should be excepted.

Laur. 37.19 (L) or an exemplar like it.¹⁴ In the two columns below *m.* signifies what was, or may have been, the original reading of Vat. Reg. 1560—the question mark indicates conjecture; *m.2* the present corrected reading of the manuscript. Readings marked with an asterisk seem to be peculiar to L.

<i>m.</i>	<i>m.2</i>
4.3 periclis AB	pericli LP
4.9 puta (?) PAB	puto L
4.13 est PAB	es L
4.16 desinas AB	desinis LP
4.26 erat (?) AB errat (?) P	oberrat L
4.33 frigas AB	fricas L
4.40 forficae AB	forpicae L
4.51 umera (?) AB	munera L
4.51 respuat (?) AB	respue LP
4.51 est PAB	es L
5.7 helicone PA	* helycona L
5.18 plebi que (?) P plebeia (?) Leid. 78	plebeiaque LAB
5.148 picem (?) P	pice LAB

But the impression which this list gives is delusive; for within approximately the same span of lines even more readings occur which have not been corrected to agree with L, or have been corrected against L.

Vat. Reg. 1560	L
3.112 decussa AB	discussa
4.25 vectidis <i>m.2</i>	vectidi
4.35 hi PAB	in
4.45 pretegit <i>m.2</i> PAB	protegit
5.2 carmina PAB	carmine
5.13 stloppo <i>m.2</i>	* stoplo
5.45 hoc PAB	* hec
5.47 equalis AB	aequali P
5.59 fecerit AB	fregerit P
5.77 fargragine	farragine AB
5.92 veteres savias	veteres avias

¹⁴ Cerrati's article is based on the notion of a "grande affinità" between L and Vat. Reg. 1560.

5.95 colonis <i>m.2</i>	* caloni si
5.105 spe vendi noscere	specimen dinoscere AB
5.108 notasti P	notasse AB
5.111 transcendere AB	transcendere P
5.116 politus P	polita
5.123 satyrum	satyri P
5.130 quin P	quid AB
5.137 heu P	heheu
5.141 quin trabe P	* quin in trabe
5.142 rapias PAB	* rapitis
5.146 tu PAB	* tune

Vat. Reg. 1560 apparently inclines to the AB tradition, as does L, but that any more exact judgment about the character of the manuscript would be premature has been sufficiently indicated. Comparison of manuscripts in a mixed tradition is difficult and perplexing enough with the facts at hand; here, where no adequate control of the other *deteriores* exists as yet, such a study would prove futile.¹⁵ Therefore no comment is made on individual readings, except for some notes in the body of the collation.

In this collation, based on Leo's text, *m.* designates the original scribe, *m.1* the original scribe correcting himself, *m.2* other correctors. Nothing need be added about the collation of the *vita Persii*, except that it is based on the text in Leo's edition, pp. 64-66. I include it for completeness, although its worth seems slight.

VAT. REG. 1560

[*Sat. 3*] 99 *incipit* sulphureas 101 excutit (tit *in ras. m.2*) 105 at*illum (t *eras.*) 112 holus 114 haud 115 alget 116 ira *m. iram m.2* 118 sani est

[*Sat. 4*] DE HIS QUI AMBIUNT HONOREM *m. ANTE ETATEM add. m.2* 1 barbatas *m. barbatum m.1* 3 popille *m. pupille m.2* pericli* (s *eras.*) 8 quirites (ui *in ras. m.2*, q *ex t facta*) 9 puto (u *et o in ras. m.2*) illud male (llu *in ras. m.2*, fuerat istud?) 12 vel cum fallit pede *in ras. m.2* varo (v *in ras. m.2*) 13 es* (t *eras.*) 16 desinis (*all. i in ras. m.2*) antyciras 18 assiduo (*pr. s in ras. m.2*, fuerat ads-) 19 haud 21 pannucea 22 cum (c *et m in ras. m.2*) discinto *m. discincto m.2* 25 nostin vectidis *in ras. m.2*

¹⁵ Thus it would be impossible to draw any valid conclusions about the Bern manuscripts from the inaccurate reports in Jahn's *apparatus*; see above, note 5.

26 curim; *m.* curib; *m.2* oberrat *in ras. m.2* 28 iugam *m.* iugum
m.1 compita (*ita in ras. m.2*) 29 veteris 31 cepe farratam . . .
 ollam 32 aceti (*ace in ras. m.2*) 33 fricas (*c ex g m.2*) 36 mar-
 centis *m.* marcentes *m.2* 38 inguinibus *in ras. m.2* detons *m.*
 detonsus *m.2* extet (*alt. e in ras. m.2; ligatura ET quae semper alibi*
nulla hic est, ergo fuerat extat) 40 forpicae (*p ex f m.2*) 41 filex
 43 subter (*b ex p m.2*) 45 pretegit (*pr. e in ras. m.2, fuerat pro-*)
 49 vibice (*v in ras. m.2*) 51 respue (*alt. e in ras. m.2 ut vid.*) *es in*
ras. m.2 munera cerdo *in ras m.2* 52 ut noris subpellex

[Sat. 5] SATYRA IIII; 2 ora *in ras. m.2* 3 mesto hianda (*ia*
in ras. m.2) 4 vulnera (*u in ras. m.2*) par*thi (*t eras.*) 5 Corsum
 (*C in ras. m.2*) 7 helycona *in ras. m.2* 8 olla *in ras. m.2* 9 insulto
 (*so in ras. m.2*) 10 anelanti 11 p̄mis 13 stloppo (*t ex c m.1*)
 14 acri (*c in ras. m.2*) 15 teres *m.* teris *m.1* pallentis *m.* pallentes
m.2 17 hinc (*in in ras. m.2*) dicas 18 -us plebeiaque *in ras. m.2*
 21 secreti 23 amicae 24 ostendisse (*pr. s in ras. m.2*) 25 picte
 26 his voces 27 sinuoso* (*so eras.*) 28 voce* (*m eras.*) 29 e*nar-
 rabile (*n eras.*) fr*bra (*i eras. et pr. r corr. in i*) 31 succinctis
 33 umbo (*m in ras. m.2*) 36 seposui 37 tum 40 voltum 41 me-
 minit 44 adque 45 federe 46 dici 47 equalis 49 fata *m.* ic ss.
m.1 51 quid bis 53 nevoto 54 talis 55 palentis 56 irriguo
 ma*vult (*1 litt. eras.*) 57 decquid 58 putris et 61 vitam . . .
 relittam 64 frugem 66 cras *om. m. add. m.1* 67 set 69 paulu
 70 se 71 frustra 76 nec tressis agosa 77 lippas *m.* lippus *m.1*
 fargragine 78 temporis 79 recussas 81 assigna marcae 87 haec
 reliqua tollet 90 mansuri 91 cadit *m.* cadat *m.1* tugosaque
 92 savias tebello 94 adque 95 cicius colonis (*col in ras. m.?*)
 97 id *om.* 104 vibere 105 veri spe vendi noscere 111 inquae
 transcedere 112 glucto 116 pellicula 117 sub pectore 119 dig-
 num 120 quidam (*a ex e m.1*) parvulum 121 semyntia 123 ba-
 thilli 124 hoc sentis *post 5.124 veluti suo loco exstant vss. 2. 26-34*
eadem qua ceteri manu scripti, sed in marg. dex. manu paulo recentiore
adnotantur haec: Hii versus dampnati. sunt de II satyra. *Nullo*
mendo laborant hi versus 129 nervo sagittet 130 inpunior 131
 adque meus egit 133 omissus 136 et sitiente 137 verge sed
 heu 138 varo 139 ten*dis (*2 litt. eras. ut vid.*) 141 obstet 142
 aegeum 143 moveat 148 -um pice *in ras. m.2* 150 nutrie ster-
 gant deuncis *m.* deunces *m.1* 153 laeti 155 hunc in ean* (*t eras.*)
 sub* eas (*1 eras. ut vid.*) 156 domino 159 ettam en 162 durum
 165 limem chrusidis 168 cense 170 adque 171 ad si dices

172 nunc *om.* accersor 174 nunc nunc 176 palpo ad quem 177 largo 182 rubrum quae 183 thinnitu metalba 184 voves *m.* moves *m.1* recutita quae pelles 185 lemure 186 calli 187 infantis 188 alii 190 fulfennius

[*Sat.* 6] ODE QUINTA CAESIUM BASSUM LYRICUM
 POETAM ALLOQUITUR 2 cordae *m.* chordae *m.1* 4 adque latine 5 agitare *bis* 6 aegregius inssisse 7 hibernat quae mare q< 8 scopili 9 luna i 11 pytagoreo 14 vitini 15 horti 16 obit cenarae 18 varro 20 holus 22 ego utor 23 scombros 24 turdorum 26 aemule metuis erba 27 ast brutia 30 ovia mergit 31 lacera cespite 33 cerulea 35 cinnema 36 ceras opicent 37 urget 39 piper et 40 fenisicae crassa 41 cineri deulterior 43 misa 44 aeris 45 aciem *m.* aciam *m.1* 46 clamides 47 ingentes cesoriar hennus 50 ve 51 audeo 55 superest *om.* accede 56 mannus 58 aut tamen *om.* 59 est mihi tecum 60 mannus 61 inae cursu 62 hunc 63 vin tu 64 deest 65 querere condam 66 stadius 67 fenoris 68 reliquum *utrobique* impensius angue (*fuera*t ungue) 69 coquetur 71 tuus hic 74 illi p̄ma omtō 75 mergare 77 pingues pavisse 80 ineptus *male Cerrati, qui ligaturam NT non agnovit* PERSII FLACCI SATYRA EXPLICIT
 FELICITER INCIPIT VITA AULIS PERSII FLACCI DE COMMENTARIO PROBI VALERII SUBLATA

VITA

1 decessit autem rubrio asinio gallio 2 natus est in 3 reliquid fere *om.* sisenna fuscia 4 studuit vero vulterris rethorem cepit discedere phylosophya 5 cessium ut *om.* pomianum aequetum phylosophyae reliquid sed—ludos *om.* usus—habente *om.* 6–8 pietatis—tarde *om.* 8 imperfecte ultimo ibi et quasi finitum contractavit cesio scripserat—coeperunt *om.* 9 aetatis suae 10 divertit illius temporis principem haberent