

## XXII.—The Textual Tradition of the Ovidian Incunabula

GRUNDY STEINER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

The stemma of a group of MSS may normally be reconstructed because the human eye, mind, and hand seemingly cannot transcribe a substantial amount of text without some error and because an error once introduced into a tradition must be perpetuated unless it is eradicated, possibly by successful emendation or, more surely, by correction from some uncorrupted source. The chief obstacles, therefore, to the reconstruction of stemmata lie normally in emendation and interpolation by the copyists and in the fusion of readings from more than one source. By contrast, when a modern publisher preserves the plates of an edition, subsequent printings will reproduce the original exactly, or, better yet, misprints which have been noted may actually be expunged. Under these circumstances later printings tend normally to equal if not surpass the accuracy of their first editions. Since, however, the printers of the incunabula set up their text anew each time, this cleavage between the traditions of written and printed texts is only faintly marked in early editions. The present study, therefore, is an attempt to set forth in some detail the filiation of the incunabula editions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, exclusive of those which contain the notes of Raphael Regius. The results indicate that by far most of them belong in one long linear descent with only minor branches and that while common errors normally make possible the precise identification of the parent, almost every printing bears traces of an editorial hand which has endeavored to improve upon the readings accepted by its predecessor.

The six source-editions for the period have already been identified<sup>1</sup> as the texts prepared respectively by Franciscus Puteolanus

<sup>1</sup> See the present writer's "Source-Editions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1471–1500)," *TAPA* 82 (1951) 219–231 for the evidence. Bibliographic references for the editions will be found there. The sigla for this paper are identical. The collation for this study includes the sections of *Met.* 3, 7, and 12 collated for the source-editions and many new test passages, a virtually complete collation of *Met.* 3 in the Accursius source-edition (5a) and all its reprints and of extensive new test passages from *Met.* 7 and 12 for the Accursius reprints. In every instance where a significant variant appears in the Accursius texts, the source-editions 1a, 2a, 3a, and 4a have likewise been collated.

(Bologna 1471), Joannes Andreas (Rome 1471), Federicus de Comitibus ([Venice 1472]), Joannes Calphurnius ([Venice] 1474), Joannes Bonus Accursius (Milan 1475), and Raphael Regius (Venice 1493) as editor or publisher. The conclusions reached here do not deny the primacy of these editions which are the sources of the large unified groups of printings. The paper is concerned, however, with the step-by-step differences within those groups and how the groups are interrelated.

The differences and relationships can be analyzed in two chronological stages: first, the period of the early source editions from the years 1471–1475; and second, the period of the reprints from about 1475 to about 1498. An obvious difference between the stages is that the printings of the second period contain no new signed editorial epistles and in only one instance (5h) are the alterations in the text capable of assignment to any known scholar.

When the texts of the early source-editions are examined one fact becomes immediately apparent: the edition of Andreas (2a), despite occasional agreements with the others, differs so much from the other source-editions that there can be no question of the independence of its editing and MS sources. The agreements among the other early source-editions can be illustrated by means of these selected variants:<sup>2</sup>

	1a	3a	4a	5a
3.157	memorale	nemorale	memorale	memorale
3.384	quod	quot	quod	quod
7.246	lactis	mellis	lactis	lactis
3.171	thanis	ranis	thanis	rachnis
7.186a	sopito	sopito	sopito	sopitis
7.440	senex	senex	senex	senis
3.207	Innobates	Innobates	Ichnobates	Ichnobates
3.212	pheleras	pheleras	plerelas	plerelas
12.431	Pheo comes	Pheo comes	Pheocomes	Pheocomes
12.450	cecli	cecli	oecli	Oecli
12.108	lernesia	lernesia	lyrnesia	lynersia
3.210	cribasus	orbasus	oribasus	oribasus
3.217	tycte	stricte	sticte	Tictae

In all references to the text of the *Metamorphoses* the line numbering follows the edition of Ehwald (Leipzig 1915).

<sup>2</sup> The corresponding readings in Andreas' text are: *nemorale*, *quot*, *uini*; *Hyamis*, *sopite*, *ferox*; *Oenobates*, *Pherelas*, *Phebocomes*, *Oceli*; *Lernesia*; *Oribadus*; *syrite*.

These typical passages seem to require the following interpretation: There is no connection between the editions of Andreas (2a) and Puteolanus (1a). Federicus de Comitibus (3a), while he repeats some peculiar readings published by Andreas, by and large follows closely the text of Puteolanus. The retention of certain readings which look like misprints in the Puteolanus text makes it highly likely that Federicus or his editor made use of a copy of Puteolanus' book. On the other hand an extremely large number of peculiar readings suggest a separate MS source. It is very likely, therefore, that Federicus had before him a MS and a copy of the Puteolanus edition; that he attempted to correct the printed text by means of the MS, but that he grew weary of changing the printed work of his predecessor at every turn; hence his text came to be more and more like that by Puteolanus in the later books. Calphurnius, who was associated personally with Puteolanus when he published his edition (4a), surely used the work of his colleague. They share notable readings and errors including the omission of 3.216. In all probability the one took a copy of the other's book, collated the readings of one or more new MSS in its margins, marked those which should be adopted, and sent the thing off to the printer. There is a lingering doubt about the source employed by Bonus Accursius, but he claims in his preface (5a) only to have "corrected and emended" the *Metamorphoses*. What he corrected and emended must have been the text of Puteolanus or Calphurnius. This is attested by common errors. The weight of agreements seems to indicate<sup>3</sup> that he used the Calphurnius text as his base, correcting its errors, where they caught his attention, through readings culled from one or more new MSS.

To summarize: the edition of Andreas stands by itself; that of Puteolanus seems to underlie the other three source-editions. They may all three have been based upon it, each with new material from MSS, but it seems a little more likely that the Accursius text is based upon that of Calphurnius.

The second period contains only editions which are at first

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted, for example, that the compendium sign for the passive ending of *narratur* at 7.827 seems very small in the microfilm of the Henry E. Huntington Library copy which was available for this study. This, coupled with the fact that the *-tur* endings are printed out in most adjacent passages, would have made it easy for Accursius' printer to miss the sign and produce the erroneous *narrat* which appears first in 5a.

glance reprints of the source-editions already considered. Andreas' text was copied only by John of Paderborn in Louvain [ca. 1475] (2b); so this tradition again stands by itself. The text of Puteolanus was reprinted twice (1b: Ferrara 1476; 1c: Bologna 1480) and so also the text of Calphurnius (4b: [Rostock ca. 1476]; 4c: Pinerolo 1480), in each instance, apparently, directly from the source-edition in question and with reasonable faithfulness. The real complexities arise in the stemma of the Accursius printings.

These fall into two groups on the basis of geography and chronology. The first group comprises editions printed from 1475 to 1480 in Milan, Parma, and Vicenza; the second, editions printed after 1480 in Venice. The Vicenza printing links the groups.

The source-edition was twice reprinted directly in 1477: first (5b) in July at Parma by Corallus who attached a brief biographical note by Calderinus, and second (5c) in September at Milan by Zarotus who reproduced the source-edition line by line, page by page, and, at times, almost error by error (e.g., 3.511 *achaiades*; 7.711 *Mora*: 12.9 *teellus* and 12.240 *bibembres*, to say nothing of the correction of *temen* at 12.105 to *taman*).

Readings like *studio* for *stygio* (3.76), *calentes* for *cadentes* (7.283) and *lumina* for *limina* (12.45) (all variants not found in the source-edition) illustrate the textual unity of the printings from Parma and Vicenza. Other selected variants suggest the interrelationships of members of this subgroup (the corrected readings are marked by an asterisk):

	5b	5d	5e	5f
3.84	fugit	*figit	fugit	fugit
7.109	uiolentia	*uoluentia	uiolentia	uiolentia
12.277	forpice	forpice	*forcipe	*forcipe
3.157	memorale	*nemorale	memorale	*nemorale
3.680	uudas	*undas	uudas	*undas
12.14	coeptus	*coeptis	coeptus	*coeptis
3.384	quod	*quot	*quot	quod
3.542	docebat	docebat	docebat	*decebat
7.537	feries	*feris	*feris	feries
3.721	nexit	*nescit	nexit	dixit
7.827	narrat	*narratur	narrat	narrauit

The most plausible explanation of the variants quoted is that the anonymous printer (5d: 1479) and Portilia (5e: Parma 1480) as well as Lichtenstein (5f: Vicenza 1480) all had before them *corrected* copies of Corallus' text (5b). The correctors worked with varying success. Sometimes they all caught an obvious error (e.g., at 7.778 they all corrected *erit* to *exit*). Sometimes they all missed an error (particularly one which, at first glance, seemed to make sense). In 7.283, for example, *guttae cadentes* beguiled them all despite the presence of *calentes* in all the source-editions including that by Accursius. Usually, however, one or two caught the error and, conversely, one or two let it go. Only a small residuum of passages (e.g., the last two quoted) show common errors or peculiarities in the two Parmese printings (printings which both include the Calderinus note). Since both texts introduce a substantial number of new readings, probably the common peculiarities are the result of similar MS sources. In general, the anonymous printer had the most successful corrector of the three and one who brought the text somewhat into line with the editions by Puteolanus and Calphurnius. Portilia's corrector had perhaps the least success but found some readings (like 3.224 *agliodos*; 7.541 *corpore*, 690 *posset*, 769 *frequentes*; and 12.325 *gurgite*) which were entirely new to the printed tradition but destined to reappear in the Regius editions in the last decade of the century.<sup>4</sup>

The Venetian printings descend in a straight line from the text published by Lichtenstein (5f) at Vicenza. Bernardinus de Novaria printed from a corrected copy of this. The result is the sharing of many unique variants (e.g., 3.435 *uenique* for *uenitque*; 3.675 *Nacris* for *Naris*; 3.690 *diam* for *chiam*). The greatest cleavage in the textual tradition comes, however, with the text printed by Capcasa (5h: [Venice] 1489) after revision by Valerius Superchius. Into the text of *Met.* 3 alone, for example, Superchius seems to have introduced more than thirty significant variants. Some of these had appeared in one or the other of the Parmese printings (5d and 5e), but several are entirely new to the Accursius tradition. This text was reprinted with minor changes by Lazarus de Saviliano

<sup>4</sup> There is a growing mass of evidence to link at least the 1492 illegal Regius edition (6a) and possibly the legal text (6c) as well with Portilia's text. On p. 229 of the study of the source-editions (above n. 1) the sigla 5e and 5d should be reversed in note 16.

(5i: Venice 1492) and his text was reproduced with great carelessness in 1497 or 1498 (5l) in Venice by Christophorus de Pensis.<sup>5</sup>

The progressive development of the text through the four printings made in Venice subsequent to Lichtenstein's work can be illustrated by the following variants:<sup>6</sup>

	5g	5h	5i	5l
3.721 7.827	dixit narrauit	dixit narrauit	dixit narrauit	dixit narrauit
3.533 12.310	aera Eurymanus	aera Eurymanus	aera eurymanus	aera eurymanus
3.52 7.687 3.171	tegimen illa refer rachnis	tegmen ille refert thanis	tegmen ille refert thanis	tegmen ille refert tbanis [ <i>sic</i> ]
3.579	dature	dature	daturi	daturi
3.697 3.385	intectis perstat	intectis prestat	intectus praestat	intectus praestat

In the first two passages (cited also in connection with the earlier Accursius printings [see above 315]) the Venetian printers perpetuated readings offered first by Lichtenstein. Other examples show how variants entered the tradition at subsequent levels. The last two contain apparent misprints by de Novaria (Lichtenstein

<sup>5</sup> The colophon actually reads "*Impressum Venetiis per Cristopherum de Pensis de Mandello. M. ccclxxxii. die. vii. mensis ianuarii . . .*" but for bibliographic considerations the book is usually assigned to 1497 or 1498 on the thought that at least a *v* has fallen from the Roman numeral. On textual grounds it certainly seems to be a descendent of 5i rather than a predecessor which it would surely be if it were correctly dated 7 Jan. 1492.

Probably editions \*5j and \*5k (Hain 12147 and 12148, respectively) will never be found. They do not appear in the manuscript of the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* according to information forwarded graciously by Dr. Heinrich Roloff of the Auskunftsabteilung of the Öffentliche Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek in Berlin, and must in all likelihood be relegated to the category of "ghosts." \*5j may be an echo of the misdated 5l.

Another ghost, probably, is Hain 12152. Microfilm from the copy at the Universitätsbibliothek in Erlangen reveals that the copy there is merely twenty-three gatherings from the Puteolanus source edition (1a). It is likely that the same will be true of any other reported copies.

<sup>6</sup> They follow, of course, these readings in Lichtenstein's printing: *dixit*, *narrauit*; *aere*, *Eurymonus*; *tegimen*, *illa refer*, *rachnis*; *dature*; *in lectis*, *perstat*.

read *in tectis* at 3.697) and Capcasa which seem to be the sources for subsequent new readings.

Only verbal evidence has been presented in the construction of this stemma. Actually details of punctuation and orthography provide strong supporting evidence for the conclusions reached although, in the interest of brevity, they have not been reported here.

The evidence summarized indicates that except for the edition of Andreas (2a) and its reprint (2b), the text of Puteolanus (1a) underlies all the printings of the period. Some of its marks are preserved only in its reprints (1b and 1c) and at times the edition of Federicus (3a); others survive in the edition of Calphurnius (4a) and its reprints (4b and 4c); while some persist late into the Accursius tradition as, for example, the rather curious *quod* for *quot* in 3.384 which escaped the critical scrutiny of Calphurnius and Accursius in their editions (4a and 5a) and of the correctors for Corallus (5b), Lichtenstein (5f), and de Novaria (5g) in their printings, until it was finally suppressed by Valerius Superchius (5h) in 1489. But counter to the force of persistent error runs another tendency. Scarcely any editor, whether he signed an epistle or let his work go forth under the name of a predecessor, was willing to leave the text unchanged. All tried to catch the obvious typographical blunders; nearly all seem to have touched ground, as it were, by bringing in something new from the MSS. How much they interpolated can never be known, but gradually, to their credit, they did introduce and retain more and more correct readings. In any event, although type fonts and the press had replaced the copyist's pen and many identical copies could be produced (which certainly was a great levelling force), it is clear that the text of the *Metamorphoses* was subject to the same stresses and strains in the printing shops after 1470 as in the scriptoria during the decades immediately before.