

#### IV. The Text of Cicero's *De senectute* in Codex Reg. Lat. 1414

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Codex Parisinus 6332, saec. ix (=P), is regarded by most editors as being the best available source for the text of Cicero's *Cato Maior De senectute*. Such is the view expressed by Simbeck in the preface to his edition,<sup>1</sup> and the same document heads the list of manuscripts included by Willeumier at the beginning of his text.<sup>2</sup> A notable exception to this point of view, however, is to be found in the Paravian edition by Barriera<sup>3</sup> in which P is relegated to the background in favor of codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 1587, saec. x-xi (=D)—the lost manuscript of Pierre Daniel which had shortly before this been rediscovered by Barriera in the Vatican Library. Although D is unquestionably an important manuscript, many scholars feel that Barriera's pride in discovery caused him to attach considerably greater worth to its readings than is justified by their actual merit. Hence, despite Barriera's enthusiasm for D, it is a safe assumption that P will for some time continue to occupy a position of great importance in the text tradition of *De senectute*. One notable defect in P, however, consists in the fact that its text breaks off after the words *quin ex* (78.4),<sup>4</sup> approximately 114 lines before the end of the work. Although there are several other manuscripts of approximately the same age as P which contain the final chapters of the text, yet, in view of the acknowledged superiority of P, an early copy of this manuscript, if carefully executed, and if made before the missing portions were lost, should prove to be a very useful document. In the paragraphs which follow the writer will attempt to show that Vat.

<sup>1</sup> K. Simbeck, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior et Laelius* (Leipzig 1917) iii.

<sup>2</sup> P. Willeumier, *Cicéron Cato Maior* (Paris 1940) 7.

<sup>3</sup> Atilius Barriera, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior De senectute liber* (Paravia 1921) v-xxxv.

<sup>4</sup> The second numeral in the citations of the text of the *De senectute* is the line number within the chapter calculated according to the line divisions in the Willeumier edition (above, note 2). This will doubtless vary slightly for other editions.

Reg. Lat. 1414 (folios 17<sup>r</sup>–43<sup>v</sup>), saec. XI (henceforth designated Ra), is such a manuscript.<sup>5</sup>

Ra was not employed in the preparation of any of the three critical editions mentioned above and was presumably unknown to their editors. Before publishing his work Barriera conducted a careful search for new manuscripts of *De senectute* in the Vatican Library, with the result that, in addition to his famous discovery, D, and Reg. Lat. 1762, saec. X (=K), which had been used by earlier editors, he was able to list in his edition twenty-two other Vatican manuscripts—all of the fourteenth or fifteenth century.<sup>6</sup> This carefully prepared list, however, does not include Ra, doubtless because of the fact that the Vatican hand-written index, which is the only alphabetically arranged guide to this particular section of the Reginensis collection, accidentally omits this particular codex.

The text of Ra is written on parchment in single columns of twenty-two lines each by two contemporary eleventh-century scribes, the first of whom copied folios 17<sup>r</sup>–33<sup>r</sup> through *dicendo uide-* (50.13), and the second, folios 33<sup>v</sup>–43<sup>v</sup>, from *-bamus etiam* (50.13) to the end of the work. Several alterations were made in the original text by the first hand (=Ra<sup>1</sup>), and a few additional changes were made by a contemporary second hand (=Ra<sup>2</sup>). The upper portions of several leaves have been damaged by water to such an extent that the top two or three lines in each case are partially illegible.

In cases in which P remains untouched by a second hand, its readings are reproduced by Ra with remarkable consistency. In fact, there are only six instances in which Ra agrees with other manuscripts against P<sup>7</sup>: 13.9 *Isocratis*] *socratis* RaVbDA<sup>2</sup>, *socrates*

<sup>5</sup> The author wishes to express his thanks to the Directors of *The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University* for permission to make use of a microfilm copy of codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 1414 in the preparation of this paper.

<sup>6</sup> Barriera (above, note 3) 41–43.

<sup>7</sup> The first reading quoted in the following citations is that accepted by Willeumier in his critical edition, and the readings of the various manuscripts cited other than Ra are taken from the *apparatus criticus* of this same edition (above, note 2). The anonymous referee who examined this paper has questioned whether Willeumier is correct in reporting that P has *coniuincta* for *coniuncta* at 59.24. It is his thought that, if Ra, copying a text which had *coniuincta*, changed the reading to *coniuncta*, “then Ra is a bolder emender here than he seems to be elsewhere.” No photographic reproduction of P is available to the writer at the present time, but, in view of the fact that Simbeck (above, note 1) lists no variant in P at this point, it is quite probable that the referee is correct in his supposition that P here agrees with Ra and the other MSS. If such is

PLA<sup>1</sup>; 38.12 *Pythagoreorumque* RaV, *phitagoreorumque* P<sup>1</sup>, *pithagoreorumque* P<sup>2</sup>; 44.4 *exstructisque* PDL<sup>2</sup>, *extructisque* RaVbA; 59.24 *coniuncta* Ra and most other MSS., *conuincta* P; 64.9 *quae* RaLbAD, K. *quae* PV; 65.9 *Adelphis* PL<sup>2</sup>D<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>2</sup>, *adelphi* RaAL<sup>1</sup>bD<sup>1</sup>. All of these discrepancies between P and Ra can readily be accounted for as slips or conjectures on the part of Ra's scribes.

In contrast with these few cases of agreement of Ra with other manuscripts against P, there are the following cases in which Ra and P agree, often in error, against all the other manuscripts employed in the Wuilleumier edition:

1.1	<i>ego</i> ] <i>te</i> PRa <sup>8</sup>	25.15	<i>eumpse</i> ] om. PRa
3.9	<i>suis libris</i> ] <i>libris suis</i> PRa <sup>9</sup>	28.8	<i>exsequi</i> ] <i>exequi</i> PRa
3.12	<i>sententiam</i> ] <i>sententiam finit</i>	29.5	<i>et</i> (after <i>Aemilius</i> )] om. PRa
	<i>prologus</i> ( <i>prolo</i> P) PRa	30.1	<i>Cyrus</i> ] K. <i>Cyrus</i> PRa
4.7	<i>difficilem Scipio et Laeli</i> ]	31.2	<i>tertiam iam enim</i> PRa <sup>13</sup> , <i>iam</i>
	<i>Scipio et Laeli difficilem</i> PRa		<i>enim tertiam</i> other MSS.
4.10–11	<i>malum potest</i> ] <i>potest malum</i>	32.3	<i>eis</i> ] <i>iis</i> PRa
	PRa	32.8	<i>afflixit</i> ] <i>adflixit</i> PRa
5.12	<i>dis</i> PRa, <i>diis</i> other MSS.	33.5	<i>ille</i> PRa, <i>ille quidem</i> other
7.4	<i>Sp.</i> PRa, <i>spurius</i> other MSS.		MSS.
8.6	<i>sunt</i> ] om. PRa <sup>10</sup>	39.7	<i>Q.</i> PRa, <i>quinto</i> other MSS.
10.10	<i>Cethego</i> PRa <sup>11</sup> , <i>chethego</i> or		except b which has <i>quanto</i>
	<i>chetego</i> in other MSS.	41.12	<i>Postumius</i> ] <i>posthumius</i> PRa
13.5	<i>naualesque</i> ] <i>naualesue</i> PRa <sup>12</sup>	41.13	<i>Archytam</i> PRa, <i>arcytam</i> other
13.10	<i>et</i> ] om. PRa		MSS.
17.5	<i>autem</i> ] om. PRa		
17.7	<i>multo</i> ] om. PRa	41.17	<i>App.</i> <sup>ss</sup> PRa, various readings
18.4	<i>Carthagini</i> ] <i>Kartagini</i> PRa		in other MSS.
21.4	<i>Lysimachum</i> PRa, <i>lysimacum</i>	42.15	<i>tam perditam</i> PRa <sup>14</sup> , <i>perditam</i>
	other MSS.		other MSS.

the case, then the number of instances in which Ra agrees with other MSS. against P is reduced from six to five. The writer would at this time like to express his gratitude to the referee for this and several other suggestions and corrections incorporated into the paper.

<sup>8</sup> It is impossible to determine whether the reading *uisum est mihi* (1.15), which is listed by Wuilleumier as peculiar to P alone, is shared by Ra also, since this passage falls within a faded portion of the manuscript where the original text is illegible.

<sup>9</sup> This reading is listed by Barriera (above, note 3) as being shared by E also.

<sup>10</sup> Barriera indicates that *sunt* was also omitted by Ca, a thirteenth-century codex.

<sup>11</sup> This reading, according to Barriera, is also shared by Ca.

<sup>12</sup> The form *naualesue* is reported by Barriera as being found in several of the late manuscripts.

<sup>13</sup> The word order of PRa at this point is also found in R, according to Barriera.

<sup>14</sup> According to Barriera, *tam* is also present in many late manuscripts.

43.3	<i>Pyrrhum</i> PRa, <i>pyrrum</i> other MSS.	48.3	<i>eis</i> ] <i>iis</i> PRa
43.7	<i>Coruncanium</i> ] <i>coryncanium</i> PRa	50.3	<i>Pseudolo</i> PRa, various readings in other MSS.
43.8	<i>Pyrrho</i> PRa, <i>pyrro</i> other MSS.	50.11	<i>Cethegum</i> ] <i>cetegum</i> PRa
43.13	<i>ex</i> (after <i>tum</i> )] om. PRa (but restored by Ra <sup>2</sup> )	52.4	<i>requiem</i> ] <i>requietem</i> PRa <sup>16</sup>
44.11	<i>caret</i> PRa <sup>15</sup> , <i>careat</i> other MSS.	57.8	<i>refrigerari</i> ] <i>refrigerare</i> PRa
47.9	<i>is</i> ] <i>iis</i> PRa	59.17	<i>etiam</i> ] <i>eam</i> PRa
		63.5	<i>optime</i> ] <i>optimae</i> PRa
		64.11	<i>ei</i> ] <i>ii</i> PRa
		73.5	<i>an melius</i> ] <i>hemilius</i> PRa
		75.10	<i>ne</i> PRa, <i>nec</i> other MSS.

In cases in which the text of P has been altered by a second hand, Ra for the most part accepts the P<sup>2</sup> readings, but in numerous instances gives the original P<sup>1</sup> readings, and in a few cases retains both. The following are instances in which both P<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>2</sup> readings are to be found in Ra:

- 1.1 *leuasso* P<sup>1</sup>Ra, *leuauero* P<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>1</sup>
- 3.4 *auctoritatis* P<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>1</sup>, *auctoritas* P<sup>1</sup>Ra
- 11.3 *fuerat* P<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>1</sup>, *fugerat* P<sup>1</sup>Ra
- 22.4 *modo* P<sup>1</sup>Ra, *dummodo* P<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>1</sup>
- 37.8 *patrius* P<sup>1</sup>Ra, *patria* P<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>1</sup>
- 74.5-6 *esse animo nemo potest*] *animo esse potest nemo* P<sup>1</sup>Ra, *animo esse nemo potest* P<sup>2</sup>Ra<sup>1</sup>

Apart from examples of agreement between P and Ra against all other manuscripts cited earlier, there are, of course, great numbers of instances in which Ra joins one or more other manuscripts in agreeing with P or P<sup>2</sup>. In fact, except for the six cases noted above in which Ra follows other manuscripts against P, the following readings unique to Ra represent the only instances in which Ra fails to agree with either P<sup>1</sup> or P<sup>2</sup> or both in the legible portions of the text:

3.11	<i>quid opus</i> ] <i>quid peste opus</i>	22.4	<i>senibus</i> ] <i>sensibus</i> (but with <i>uel senibus</i> written above the line possibly by Ra <sup>1</sup> )
4.5	<i>plerisque</i> ] <i>plerisque que</i>		
5.11	<i>est enim</i> ] <i>enim est</i>		
8.11	<i>de senectute</i> ] om. Ra	24.7	<i>etiam</i> ] <i>idem</i>
14.1	<i>suam</i> ] om. Ra	32.11	<i>illo</i> ] <i>illi</i>
18.6	<i>excisam</i> ] <i>excisa</i>	32.15	<i>fuerim</i> ] <i>fueri</i>

<sup>15</sup> Barriera reports that *caret* is also the reading of E and some of the late manuscripts.

<sup>16</sup> This reading is also to be found in many late manuscripts, according to Barriera.

34.5	<i>aperto</i> ] <i>aperto</i>	56.9	<i>qui</i> ] om. Ra
38.14	<i>commemoro</i> ] <i>cummemoro</i>	56.10	<i>num</i> ] <i>non</i>
40.6	<i>aliis</i> ] <i>alis</i>	56.20	<i>abundat</i> ] <i>abunda</i>
42.16	<i>decus</i> ] <i>dedecus</i>	56.21	<i>caseo</i> ] <i>ceseo</i>
48.5	<i>Ambiuius</i> ] <i>am*uil*u</i>	57.8	<i>igne</i> ] <i>igni</i>
54.2	<i>Hesiodus</i> ] <i>isiodus</i>	61.8	<i>M.</i> ] om. Ra
54.8	<i>apium</i> ] <i>et apium ex apium</i>	64.5	<i>quisque</i> ] <i>quisquisque</i>
55.2-3	<i>sed ea ipsa quae dixi sentio</i> <i>fuisse longiora ignoscetis</i> <i>autem</i> ] om. Ra, but added in margin in very faint ink by Ra <sup>1</sup> or Ra <sup>2</sup>	68.2	<i>amplissimam dignitatem</i> ] <i>am-</i> <i>plissima dignitate</i>    <i>Scipio</i> ] <i>sciopio</i>
55.14	<i>uideri</i> ] <i>uidieri</i>	70.9	<i>reliqua</i> ] <i>reli</i>
		72.10	<i>nauem</i> ] <i>naue</i>
		77.5	<i>uiuere</i> ] <i>uiuuiere</i>    <i>eam</i> ] <i>ea</i>

The fact that variants from P in Ra are so few in number and, in most cases, of such minor significance, coupled with the fact that Ra shares such a large number of errors with P, indicates quite conclusively that Ra was copied either directly from P or from a *gemellus* of this manuscript. The acceptance by Ra of a considerable number of P<sup>2</sup> readings and, in particular, its occasional listing of P<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>2</sup> readings side by side tend to support the view that P itself rather than a *gemellus* was the source of Ra. Another very cogent argument for this thesis is provided by the fact that in two instances in which words were omitted from the text by P and added in the margin by the first hand (60.9 *uoluerunt* and 63.2 *ipsa*), these same words were omitted from the text proper by Ra and, as in P, were added in the margin by the original scribe.<sup>17</sup>

In view of the high degree of accuracy with which Ra reproduces the text of P (or P<sup>2</sup>) up to 78.4, Ra obviously becomes important as a source for the remaining lines of *De senectute* if it can be established with a reasonable degree of probability that P was still intact at the time Ra was copied. In this connection it should be noted that the second hand of codex Leidensis Vossianus Fol. 12, saec.

<sup>17</sup> The following readings deserve special attention by reason of irregularities of one sort or another: 10.6 *consul*] *consulatum* Ra with PL<sup>2</sup>, but corrected by erasure; 14.3 *fecit*] *fecit* with PbAD<sup>1</sup>L<sup>2</sup>, but corrected by erasure; 15.10 *seniles*] *seniles* \*\*\*\*\* Ra (with faint traces of a word which was either *seniles* or *similes* visible in the erasure); 18.4 *cui*] *cui* Ra, but expunged by Ra<sup>2</sup>; 36.13 *sic ista*] *sicilas* Ra with b, but corrected by Ra<sup>1</sup>; 38.4 *dominatur*] *domitur* Ra, but corrected in margin either by Ra<sup>1</sup> or Ra<sup>2</sup>; 67.3 *quis est tam stultus*] *quis* \*\*\*\*\* *stultus* Ra (with no letters visible in the erasure, but with adequate space to accommodate the words *est tam*); 72.2 *quoad*] *quod* Ra, but with *quoad* written in the margin, apparently by Ra<sup>1</sup>.

ix-x (=L<sup>2</sup>) agrees with P (and consequently with Ra) more consistently than does any other one of the sources cited in standard critical editions. If the close agreement which exists between L<sup>2</sup> and PRa in the first 77 chapters should continue between L<sup>2</sup> and Ra beyond 78.4, this would do much to establish the probability that Ra retains the original text of P for the last 114 lines of the essay. An examination of the collation of the final chapters of Ra presented below will show that, as a matter of fact, Ra agrees with L<sup>2</sup> just as consistently in this portion of the text as in the earlier portions. Furthermore, the proportion of agreements between Ra and other manuscripts, V for instance, remains much the same in these final paragraphs as elsewhere. There appear to be quite adequate grounds, therefore, for assuming that Ra in its concluding pages presents a very accurate copy of the lost portions of the text of P as modified by P<sup>2</sup>, and thus deserves serious attention from future editors of the text of *De senectute*.

In the collation of the final portions of Ra with Wuilleumier's text appended below, every effort has been made to distinguish accurately between alterations in the text made by the original scribe and those to be attributed to a second hand. Note should be taken of the fact, however, that it is very difficult to distinguish different hands in microfilm copies of manuscripts, and thus a study of the original document may require modification of some of the designations included here:

78.11 <i>prudencia]</i> <i>prudenciae</i>	80.6 <i>eis]</i> <i>iis</i>
78.15 <i>sit]</i> <i>esset</i> with other MSS.	81.4 <i>liberi]</i> <i>libera</i> , corrected by Ra <sup>1</sup>
78.18 <i>posset]</i> <i>possit</i> with V against other MSS.	81.5 <i>intellegitur]</i> <i>extellegitur</i> , corrected by Ra <sup>2</sup>
79.1 <i>Xenophontem]</i> <i>senophontem</i> , corrected by Ra <sup>1</sup>	81.6 <i>plane]</i> <i>plene</i> with A <sup>2</sup> H
79.2 <i>carissimi]</i> <i>karissimi</i>	81.7 <i>inquit]</i> <i>inquit</i> , corrected by Ra <sup>1</sup>
79.3 <i>me]</i> <i>ne</i>	81.8 <i>sin]</i> <i>si</i> with L <sup>2</sup> D
79.7 <i>creditote]</i> <i>creditor</i> , corrected by Ra <sup>1</sup>	82.3 <i>patrum]</i> <i>patrium</i>
80.2 <i>clarissimorum]</i> <i>clarorum</i>	82.5 <i>posteritatis]</i> <i>posteritates</i> , corrected by Ra <sup>2</sup>
80.3-4 <i>quo diutius]</i> <i>quo iustius</i> with VA <sup>2</sup> K	82.7 <i>an censes]</i> <i>an necesse</i> Ra, <i>anne censes</i> Ra <sup>1</sup>    <i>ipse]</i> <i>ipso</i> with L <sup>2</sup> D <sup>2</sup>
80.4 <i>teneremus]</i> <i>tuerentur</i> RaL <sup>2</sup> A <sup>2</sup> K <sup>1</sup> H <sup>1</sup> , <i>teneremus</i> in margin by Ra <sup>1</sup>	82.9 <i>eisdem]</i> <i>isdem</i> with VL

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>82.12 <i>et quietam] et qui et*am</i><br/>(formerly <i>et qui etiam</i>)<br/><i>contentione]    contempione</i><br/>with A<sup>2</sup></p> <p>82.14 <i>excessisset] excersisset</i>, corrected by Ra<sup>1</sup></p> <p>83.2 <i>iniquissimo] iniquisimo</i></p> <p>83.5 <i>equidem] hec quidem</i></p> <p>83.6 <i>uero] enim</i> with most other MSS.</p> <p>83.7 <i>au eo] habeo</i> with most other MSS.</p> <p>83.9 <i>quis facile] facile quis</i></p> <p>83.10 <i>Peliam] pilam</i> with V<sup>2</sup>L<sup>2</sup>A<sup>2</sup></p> <p>83.11 <i>repuerascam] repuerescam</i> with most MSS.    <i>cunis] cumis</i>, corrected by Ra<sup>2</sup>    <i>recusem] recusemst</i>, corrected by Ra<sup>1</sup></p> <p>84.1 <i>quid habet] qui habet</i> RaL<sup>1</sup>, corrected by Ra<sup>2</sup></p> | <p>84.2 <i>habeat] habet</i> with most other MSS.</p> <p>84.3 <i>aut satietatem] ut satietatem</i> with L    <i>libet] i*bet</i> (perhaps originally <i>lubet</i> or <i>iubet</i>)</p> <p>84.9 <i>in illud] ad illum</i></p> <p>84.10 <i>colluione] conlauione</i> Ra, <i>conluione</i> Ra<sup>2</sup></p> <p>84.11 <i>solum] solos</i> with A<sup>2</sup>D<sup>2</sup></p> <p>84.12–13 <i>quo nemo uir melior] quo uiro uir melior</i></p> <p>85.3 <i>molesta] molestae</i></p> <p>85.4 <i>qui] quia</i> with bDL<sup>2</sup>A<sup>2</sup></p> <p>85.7 <i>ueror] ueror</i> Ra, <i>uereror</i> Ra<sup>2</sup></p> <p>85.9 <i>sumus immortales futuri] sum immortalis futurus</i> with L<sup>2</sup></p> <p>85.12 <i>defatigationem] defectionem</i> with A<sup>2</sup>D<sup>2</sup></p> <p>85.16 <i>possitis] posistis</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

## ADDENDUM

The writer did not become aware of the publication of P. Venini, *Marci Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior De senectute, Laelius De amicitia* (Torino 1959) until after the above article had already been sent to the printer, and he has only recently secured access to a copy of this book. None of the conclusions reached in the article, however, is outmoded or in any way altered by the new critical edition, since Venini makes no reference to codex Reg. Lat. 1414 and may be presumed to be unaware of its existence. Like Wuilleumier, she rejects Barriera's argument that D is the best manuscript of *De senectute* in favor of the more conventional view that P is the best source.