

**Stephanus and the Text of Petronius' *Bellum civile***

A. FRED SOCHATOFF

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

## I.

Of the sixty-odd manuscripts in which the *Satiricon* of Petronius has been reproduced, three have set forth only the long poem of 295 lines (119–124.1) which, dealing with the civil dissension between Julius Caesar and Pompey, has been designated the *Bellum civile* (or the *De bello civili*). Two of the three, Codex Dresdensis Dc 141 (d) and Codex Monacensis 23713 (m),<sup>1</sup> are close both in time and in the textual tradition they represent. The date 1489 placed on the last folio of the Codex Dresdensis is generally accepted as that of manuscript d. On the other hand, a date later than 1408 is generally assigned to m despite the appearance of that number in the Codex Monacensis. Beck and Buecheler were prone not to question the 1408 date, but literary authorities view it with suspicion, attributing it to a scribal error, and place the manuscript in the last third of the fifteenth century, a date which Sage and other scholars have seen fit to accept. The third manuscript containing only the *Bellum civile*, Codex Leidensis Voss. Misc. 1, fasc. 6 (k), is believed to be somewhat later. It differs from the other two also in the fact that, whereas they are full of interpretative scholia and commentary, the scholia in it are with but two or three exceptions textual, introducing variants and conjectures for words in the text.

Preserved in the University Library at Leyden, k has an inscription consisting of the single word *Petronij* but no subscription. It is of paper, 213 by 345 millimeters, and contains one column to the page, a column averaging thirty-two lines. Thus the fascicle presenting the *Bellum civile* contains five folios and is unpagged. The initial *O* of the poem is about twice the size of

<sup>1</sup> In the symbolic representation of the manuscripts I follow the designations used by the late Evan Taylor Sage, who was good enough to place at my disposal the results of his numerous studies of the text of the *Satiricon*.



No less significant is a collation of the disagreements in the readings of d and m. Most arise from the tendency of d to employ *f* for *v* and of m to employ *sc* and *st* for *s*; from the use of *t*, *p*, *c* in one manuscript where the other uses *th*, *ph*, *ch*; from a difference in interpretation of abbreviations. Of the twenty-five divergences not thus to be accounted for, the following are examples.

## COLLATION j.

- j. v. 18 cruorem) cruore d cruorem m  
 k. v. 90 dehiscit) adhijscit d dehiscit m  
 l. v. 91 uanos) uanus d uarius m  
 m. v. 168 ite furentes) id deferentes d ita ferentes m  
 n. v. 241 gurgite) iurgite d gurgite m  
 o. v. 268 quatiens) faciens d quatiens m  
 p. v. 279 nobilis) om d  
 q. v. 282 erumpit) arripuit d eripuit m

The closeness of d and m is further attested in the commentary presented in the two manuscripts. Both the interlinear glosses and the more extensive marginalia in the one are for the most part matched in the other. The words over which glosses are written and the passages chosen for elucidation are practically the same in both; and all the interpretative writing in m, with possibly five exceptions at the most, is found in d also.

## II.

Manuscript k is on the whole a "better" manuscript than either d or m or both of them; it contains fewer corruptions and is closer to the accepted text than they. That it nevertheless belongs to the same textual tradition is indicated in the following collation.

## COLLATION r.

- r. v. 30 trahat) turbant k m torbant d  
 s. v. 30 hoc sterile) hostile d k m  
 t. v. 64 iulius) tertius d k m  
 u. v. 109 est) et d k m  
 v. v. 137 carentia) arencia d arentia k m  
 w. v. 181 laetior) latior d k m  
 x. v. 198 aut) ac d k m  
 y. v. 220 temptare) tentata d k m  
 z. v. 226 pauida) trepida d k m

Thus, in a number of passages at which the manuscript tradition is divided, the three—d, m, and k—stand in agreement.

And yet k seems to be a number of stages removed from d and m. Some of its readings depart from the unanimity held by the other two and are closer to another tradition, the *N*3 tradition (to be explained below). Illuminating is the following collation, in which *M* is used to represent the coincidence of manuscripts B P R, *N*1 that of manuscripts A E F U, *N*2 that of manuscripts C D G J K Q, *N*3 that of V *a b c*, and *N* the coincidence of the three last subgroups.

#### COLLATION      a'.

- a'. v. 27 uirum) uirum *M C D G K Q U* uisum *s* uiri k<sup>1</sup>  
    iure A E F *N*3 k    mire d m
- b'. v. 36 unda) unda *M N* k    ora d    hora m
- c'. v. 108 destruet) destruet A B F R *N*2    destruat *N*3 k  
    destruo U    destruit P d m
- d'. v. 139 stellis) stellis *M N* k    telis d m
- e'. v. 191 et uincta) et uincta *M A C D F J K U* k<sup>1</sup>    uincta Q  
    iuncta G    uicta E *N*3 k    deuicta d m
- f'. v. 245 uicit) uidit *M N* k    cernit d m
- g'. v. 282 erumpit) erumpit *M* erupit *N*3 C D E F J K Q *s* U k  
    efudit A    arripuit d    eripuit m    om G

It is readily observed that the agreement of d and m against the field is not always shared by k; that the latter frequently associates itself with the readings of better traditions than those represented in the readings of d and m. Moreover, at those places where there is a division of the manuscripts opposed to the two *Bellum civile* manuscripts, as in a', c', and e', k is seen to take its place invariably with the *N*3 subgroup.

Furthermore, a number of the relationships possessed by k in common with d and m are destroyed subsequently by two correcting hands of k. Of those correcting hands, it is now time to take cognizance.

#### III.

The original hand of the text of manuscript k and the same black ink with which it is inscribed are reproduced in a set of scholia, the readings of which I shall designate as k<sup>1</sup>. Having to do in their entirety with textual questions, these are written in both

the left and right margins. They are generally preceded by the sign 2, which appears also in the text, above and to the left of the first letter of the word which the scholium concerns; the reference mark, however, is sometimes absent from the annotation. The readings of  $k^1$  deal with only the establishment of the text of the *Bellum civile*, presenting corrections, conjectures, and emendations of words or phrases.

A very clear second hand is found in  $k$ , identifiably a second hand from the color of the ink employed and the nature of the writing; for these scholia are in red ink and by a hand which is more angular, more narrow, and less full than that of the text. Distinctive variations are to be observed in the letters  $g$ ,  $s$ , and  $t$ . The author of the  $k^{\text{red}}$  notes, moreover, did not confine himself to the left and right margins; he wrote a number of annotations above the words to which they refer. Words commented upon in the side margins are underlined in the text, but no reference mark accompanies those discussed in the upper margin. The scholia of  $k^{\text{red}}$  concern both textual and exegetical matters. Those of the first type are sometimes written in the margin without a reference mark of any kind, but often they are introduced with the sign 2 or  $\text{ῑσ}$ , or  $\text{αῑ}$ , or  $\text{ἰ}$ . There is reason to believe that the 2 is a stenographic reproduction of the Greek characters  $\Gamma\rho$ , which in turn represent  $\Gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon$ , that is, *write*. The  $\text{ῑσ}$  may similarly be an abbreviation for the Greek term  $\text{ῑσως}$ , *perhaps*. A Latin term, *alii*, *others*, is designated by both  $\text{αῑ}$  and  $\text{ἰ}$ . The employment of such symbols is quite common among scholars of the time. The readings of Colladonius, for example, as preserved in the second edition of Burmann (Utrecht 1743), are introduced mainly with  $\Gamma\rho$  and  $\text{ῑσως}$ , sometimes with *alii*. In two cases a conjecture hazarded by the scribe of  $k^1$  has the emending 2 of  $k^{\text{red}}$  appended to it.

The exegetical scholia make use of four signs:  $\text{ῑ}$ ,  $\text{ῥ}$ ,  $\text{i.}$ , and  $\text{sc.}$ , obviously representing *infra*, *supra*, *id est*, and *scilicet*, respectively. These notes are by no means numerous and are often presented only to explain a textual correction or conjecture. The interest of both  $k^1$  and  $k^{\text{red}}$  in the poem is unmistakably directed to the text, but the scribe of the latter was more discursive and felt impelled at times to set forth the interpretation imparted to a passage by his correction or suggestion. On several occasions reference is made to other parts of the *Satiricon* itself, and once a

citation is presented from Ovid, a poet held in great favor through the ages.

The two correcting hands,  $k^1$  and  $k^{red}$ , are responsible for destroying the original relationship of manuscript  $k$  with  $d$  and  $m$  in a number of places. Both the existence of the original relationship (already referred to above) and the subsequent destruction of it are disclosed in a collation presenting some of the readings introduced by the two sets of  $k$  scholia.

#### COLLATION      $h'$

- $h'$ . v. 4 peragebantur) peragrabantur  $d$   $k$   $m$  peragebantur  
 $\quad \quad \quad k^{red}$
- $i'$ . v. 24 quaerit se natura nec) quare se natam non  $d$   $k$   $m$   
 $\quad \quad \quad quaerit se natura nec$   $k^{red}$
- $j'$ . v. 24 fractique) factique  $d$   $k$   $m$  fractique  $k^1$   $k^{red}$
- $k'$ . v. 47 hoc dedecoris) hoc dedecoris  $d$   $k$   $m$  dedecus est  $k^1$   
 $\quad \quad \quad dedecoris populo$   $k^{red}$
- $l'$ . v. 60 excita) excissa  $d$   $k$   $m$  excita  $k^1$  excisa  $k^{red}$
- $m'$ . v. 80 Fors . . . potestas) om  $d$   $k$   $m$  hab  $k^{red}$  *i.m.s.*
- $n'$ . v. 105 tibi cedent) mihi cedunt  $d$   $k$   $m$  tibi cedent  $k^{red}$
- $o'$ . v. 144 pulsae) pulso  $d$   $k$   $m$  pulsae  $k^{red}$
- $p'$ . v. 169 dicite) discite  $d$   $k$   $m$  dicite  $k^1$
- $q'$ . v. 190 iussa) missa  $d$   $k$   $m$  spissa  $k^1$  iussa, iusta  $k^{red}$
- $r'$ . v. 212 hoc) hac  $d$   $m$  haec  $k$  hoc  $k^{red}$
- $s'$ . v. 220 uti) acti  $d$   $k$   $m$  actus  $k^1$  uti  $k^{red}$
- $t'$ . v. 293 epidamni) epidaurea  $d$  epidauria  $k$   $m$  epidamni  
 $\quad \quad \quad k^{red}$

From both the  $r$  and  $h'$  collations it is evident that the three manuscripts containing the *Bellum civile* exclusively— $d$ ,  $k$ ,  $m$ —all bear relations within themselves. However, from the  $a'$  collation we note that  $k$  detaches itself from the other two and associates itself with better traditions. Also evident from that collation is the fact that  $k$  maintains a relation with the  $N3$  subgroup when its sister manuscripts are in disagreement. Finally, from the  $h'$  collation we observe a further widening of the cleavage as a result of the emendations suggested by  $k^1$  and  $k^{red}$ .

#### IV.

Three editions of the *Satiricon* were published between 1482 and 1520: the *editio princeps* of 1482 (designated by the symbol  $a$ ),

the *editio Bernardiniana* of 1499 (*b*), and the *editio Chalderiana* of 1520 (*c*). A clear relationship has been demonstrated to exist between the three and the late-fifteenth-century Codex Vaticanus Barb. Lat. 4 (V), so that the use of a symbol (*N*3) to represent their coincidence is justified.<sup>2</sup>

Forty-four years passed until another printed edition appeared. In the year 1564 an anthology of classical verse was published in Paris under the aegis of Henry Stephanus. The *Poetae veteres* included among other pieces the *Bellum civile* of Petronius. Although it is known that his son Paul (born *ca.* 1566) later possessed a paper manuscript of the poem,<sup>3</sup> Henry Stephanus maintained that he did not have recourse to manuscript evidence for his excerpts from Petronius. Indeed, there is evidence that practically his sole source was *c*, the edition of 1520, printed similarly in Paris; misprints found in the earlier work are perpetuated in the *Poetae veteres*. And yet an examination of the version of the *Bellum civile* printed in the edition of Stephanus reveals a relation to exist not only between it and *c* but also between it and manuscript *k*. Except for four readings, at vss. 12, 71, 81, 108, the latter two are identical. I present the following examples (*st* representing the 1564 edition of Stephanus and *mst* the marginalia of that edition).

## COLLATION      u'.

u'. v. 9 aes Ephyreiacum) ac spireum cum k st c Hesperia  
coccum k<sup>1</sup> mst

v'. v. 135 tremefacta) armis acta k st c demissa k<sup>1</sup> mst

w'. v. 220 uti) acti k st c actus k<sup>1</sup> mst

x'. v. 276 inter torto) inter toto k st c intertorto k<sup>1</sup> mst

The agreement between the marginalia of Stephanus and those of the manuscript, in every case identical, would seem to indicate a closer kinship between the *Poetae veteres* version and k than between either of them and c. That condition is further confirmed by the following readings.

<sup>2</sup> A thorough study was made by Lillian A. White in *The Early Editions of the Satiricon of Petronius*, an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh in 1933.

<sup>3</sup> Anton, in his edition of the *Satiricon* (Leipzig 1781), mentioned among other materials available to his predecessor Goldast a "chartaceo de bello civili, deprompto ex Bibliotheca Paulli Stephani" (p. xxiii).

## COLLATION      y'.

- y'. v. 55 errat) errat k st erat c  
 z'. v. 91 haustis) haustis k st austris c  
 a". v. 104 uera mihi fas est) uera mihi fas est k st fas est mihi  
    uera c  
 b". v. 213 mari) mari k st mare c

Other indications, in addition to the readings, point to a relation between the Stephanus version and k. First, although there is a general similarity in the punctuation of k, st, and c, that employed in the first two is almost identical. Again, in about a dozen cases apices are found placed upon the same words in both k and the Stephanus edition, although the latter contains others besides. Further, the text is indented at precisely the same five places in both writings, at vss. 67, 79, 102, 121, and 283. Finally, at v. 128 the same marginal notation appears in both, *Deesse videtur versus ante hunc*.

A number of conditions, it is apparent, contribute to the belief that a direct interrelation took place between manuscript k and Stephanus' version of 1564. The direction, moreover, in which the influence proceeded is illuminated by several considerations. First, the statement of Stephanus denying employment of manuscript resources points to the copying of k from the edition. Secondly, despite the fact that strictly accurate dating of sixteenth-century manuscripts is difficult, librarians of the University of Leyden, the present depository of k, have expressed the opinion that it was written toward the end of the century.

Some evidence, none of it direct to be sure, is contributed also by the marginalia of k<sup>1</sup>. They are in every case, even down to the conjectured absence of a line at v. 128, similar to the *Emendationes* printed by Henry Stephanus in the margin of the poem as presented in the *Poetae veteres*. The authorship of the latter (and of the marginalia presented with the other Petronius excerpts) is attributed by the editor to a friend who preferred by his own choice to remain unknown. In his *Catalogus interpretum*, Lotichius attributes the readings to Ioannes Auratus, a Parisian professor contemporary with Stephanus; he adds, however, that they were attributed at one time or another also to Hadrianus Junius, Aemarus Ranconetus, and Theodore Beza. If Auratus is not the author of the *Emendationes*, the next likely candidate is Beza,



<sup>4</sup> Mildred Daschbach, on p. 13 of *Sambucus and the Text of Petronius*, an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh in 1931.

- f". v. 47 hoc dedecoris) hoc dedecoris k s Q dedecus est k<sup>1</sup>  
dedecoris populo k<sup>red</sup>
- g". v. 80 Fors . . . potestas) om k s Q hab k<sup>red</sup>
- h". v. 119 ingenti) ingenti k s viginti Q ingenti Q<sup>b</sup>
- i". v. 120 mande) manda s manda<sup>e</sup> k<sup>red</sup> mande<sup>a</sup> Q
- j". v. 135 tremefacta) armis acta k s demissa k<sup>1</sup> trinis acta Q  
armis Q<sup>b</sup> tumefacta k<sup>red</sup>
- k". v. 144 pulsae) pulso k s pulsae k<sup>red</sup> Q
- l". v. 169 dicite) discite k dicite k<sup>1</sup> s Q
- m". v. 184 ausus) ausus k s Q<sup>b</sup> ausu k<sup>red</sup> haustus Q
- n". v. 190 iussa) missa k s Q<sup>b</sup> spissa k<sup>1</sup> iussa, iusta k<sup>red</sup>  
iussa Q
- o". v. 194 pariter) passim k s Q<sup>b</sup> pariter k<sup>red</sup> partem Q
- p". v. 212 hoc) haec k s hec Q hoc k<sup>red</sup>
- q". v. 220 uti) acti k s Q actus k<sup>1</sup> uti k<sup>red</sup>
- r". v. 293 epidamni) epidauria k s epidanni Q epidamni  
k<sup>red</sup>

The collation, first, discloses the close relationship between k and s that is to be expected in view of the use of *c* by both. Also, it indicates that the corrected Q as much as Q itself had an influence on k. There is a distinct probability that Henry Stephanus had access to the edition of Sambucus which, though not published until 1565, was in the process of preparation in Paris at the time when the *Poetae veteres* was being put together.

Was he influenced also by the activities of Tornaebus and of Pithoeus? Although not associated, the two used the same manuscript, one no longer extant (W). For his *Adversaria*, the first part of which appeared in 1564, Tornaebus drew upon a manuscript which he called "Memmianus," so named because he secured it through Henry Memmius. Pithoeus, working on his own *Adversaria* at the same time, quoted a passage from Petronius which he declared to be present not in "vulgatis exemplaribus" but only "in meo libro," a book that he had showed to the selfsame Memmius "non ita dudum." He edited two editions of the *Satiricon*, one appearing in 1577 and the other in 1587. I have not seen the *Adversaria* of Tornaebus or the 1577 Pithoeus, but I have seen the second Pithoeus edition.

In investigating the possibility of influence on Stephanus by Pithoeus, I have found significant evidence in the variants presented in the 1587 edition (designated in the following collation by *vp*).

## COLLATION s".

- s". v. 9 aes Ephyreiacum) ac se Piretum k<sup>red</sup> v<sup>p</sup>  
t". v. 92 uanis lapis inuenit usum) uanis lapis inuenit usum  
k v<sup>p</sup>  
u". v. 111 .gemina.stratos.morte) gemino.stratos.Marte k<sup>red</sup> v<sup>p</sup>  
v". v. 128 deformis titan) deformis titubans k v<sup>p</sup>  
w". v. 135 tremefacta) tumefacta k<sup>red</sup> v<sup>p</sup>  
x". v. 210 uolucer) uolucer k v<sup>p</sup>  
y". v. 271 tubae) tubae k v<sup>p</sup>

The evidence is significant in that the collation indicates a relationship but offers no clue concerning the direction in which the influence traveled. Bringing external facts into consideration, I am impressed by the possibility that *k* influenced Pithoeus rather than that he influenced it. For one thing, his first edition did not appear until thirteen years after the *Poetae veteres*. In the meantime, we learn, from a statement by Dousa in 1569, that Pithoeus was far from generous to fellow scholars in the use of his materials. There is the additional consideration that the variants show the influence of readings from *k*<sup>red</sup>, which were inserted in the manuscript at a time subsequent to the penning of *k* and *k*<sup>1</sup>.

I earlier referred to the fact that the *Bellum civile* readings of Germain Colladonius are introduced with the same symbols as those employed in the marginalia of k<sup>red</sup>. As a matter of fact, the symbols introduce identical readings and conjectures in both. Even more significant is the fact that a complete collation of the k<sup>red</sup> readings and those of Colladonius indicates not merely a kinship of some kind between the two but complete identity. As for the quantity of material presented, the k<sup>red</sup> marginalia include all the remarks presented under the name of Colladonius in the Burmann edition, but the latter omit two of the former. Three possibilities come to mind: that k<sup>red</sup> was the source for Colladonius, that the reverse condition occurred, or that the two were derived from a common archetype.

Lack of information concerning both the history of the k<sup>red</sup> readings and the activities of Colladonius as a Petronian editor prevents a positive choice from the three possibilities. The library authorities of the University of Leyden know nothing of the history of k prior to its installation in the Vossiana Library, whence it passed on the death of Voss to the university. As for Colladonius, he was born in the first decade of the sixteenth

century and lived for eighty-five years, being active at a time paralleling that of the circulation of the manuscript. Extensive diplomatic and pro-Calvinistic service did not impede but possibly complemented an interest in text recension. His part in the publication of *Édits politiques et civils* in 1568 is said to have been considerable. Colladonius himself possessed a library of manuscripts, for he presented a Codex Justinianus, of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, to the Geneva Library, and, what may be more significant in this investigation, at his home Henry Stephanus found a manuscript which furnished the basis for an edition of an early Christian work against the Arians published by Stephanus.<sup>5</sup>

The younger Burmann, in the list of scholars quoted in his edition of the *Satiricon*, refers to the work of Colladonius as *Notae in Epos de bello civili*. He, regrettably, makes no other statement in reference to the activities of Colladonius as a Petronian editor. It is tempting to hypothesize that the paper manuscript mentioned by Anton as a part of the library of Paul Stephanus was k and that Colladonius, who we have noted had a business association with the Stephani, secured the readings for his *Notae* from the k<sup>red</sup> readings of that manuscript. To test the validity of this hypothesis is impossible in view of the meager evidence now available. That hypothesis aside, however, it seems not at all unreasonable that either the k<sup>red</sup> marginalia provided the source for the *Notae* or that the two were drawn from a common archetype. In either case the source of k<sup>red</sup> is a highly relevant question. Several possible sources suggest themselves, notably a manuscript known to have been possessed by Cuiacius, or the *Catalecta* of Scaliger (1572), or the edition of Tornaesius (1575). The investigation of that question is one deserving individual attention in itself.

<sup>5</sup> The biography of Colladonius is printed in the Biographie Universelle (Paris, Delagrave). It is based on articles in the Biographie Suisse and Genève Littéraire.