

# CICERO'S *SOMNIUM SCIPIONIS* IN CODEX VAT. PAL. LAT. 1341

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

*Saint Louis University*

In the course of the last century and a quarter two manuscripts have had an especially important role to play in the establishment of the text of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*. These are Parisinus Regius 6371, saec. XI (=P) and Bambergensis M. IV. 15, saec. XI (=B). In his 1848 edition of Macrobius, Jahn<sup>1</sup> utilizes a large number of manuscripts including PB for *Somnium Scipionis*. In his editions of Macrobius published in 1868<sup>2</sup> and 1893,<sup>3</sup> Eyssenhardt bases his text of *Somnium Scipionis* on P and B alone. In his edition of Cicero's *De re publica* published in 1936, Castiglioni<sup>4</sup> uses a large number of new manuscripts for the text of *Somnium Scipionis* but still retains P and B in his list. In his 1955 Teubner edition of Cicero's *De re publica*, Ziegler<sup>5</sup> bases his text of *Somnium Scipionis* on a selection of the manuscripts cited by Castiglioni, including P and B. In his 1963 edition of Macrobius, Willis<sup>6</sup> reverts to the practice followed by Eyssenhardt of using a fairly small number of manuscripts for *Somnium Scipionis*. In fact, for most portions of the work he uses only four documents. These include P and B, but the others are new manuscripts not utilized by earlier editors. Thus it is seen that P and B are the only documents which have been used consistently by all recent editors of the work by Cicero under consideration. These two manuscripts have obviously exerted much influence in shaping our texts of *Somnium Scipionis*.

<sup>1</sup> Ludovicus Ianus, *Macrobii Ambrosii Theodosii Opera quae supersunt* 1 (Leipzig 1848).

<sup>2</sup> Franciscus Eyssenhardt, *Macrobius* (Leipzig 1868).

<sup>3</sup> Franciscus Eyssenhardt, *Macrobius* (Leipzig 1893).

<sup>4</sup> Ludovicus Castiglioni, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Re Publica* (Torino 1936).

<sup>5</sup> K. Ziegler, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Re Publica* (Leipzig 1955).

<sup>6</sup> Iacobus Willis, *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* (Leipzig 1963).

through the past century and doubtless will continue to exercise such influence in generations to come. In view of this situation it would appear, therefore, that if an older and more accurate *gemellus* of either of these manuscripts could be brought to light, this would be quite valuable as a source for restoring earlier readings of the tradition represented by it.

It is the purpose of this paper to point out that just such an older and more accurate *gemellus* of B exists in Codex Vat. Pal. lat. 1341, folios 93<sup>r</sup>–94<sup>v</sup> (henceforth designated Q).<sup>7</sup> The text of Q has been copied in a neat Carolingian hand which is listed in a Vatican handwritten inventory as dating from the eleventh century. Many features of the writing, however, indicate that the manuscript can be no later than the tenth century. The perpendicular strokes of tall letters are consistently either clubbed at the top, as in the ninth century, or spindle-shaped, as in the tenth. The hooks to the left at the top of tall letters so frequent in the eleventh century are completely absent. The lower loop of *g* is almost always open and occasionally the top loop also is open. All of this evidence taken together points to a comparatively early Carolingian period—certainly to one not later than the tenth century.

In his long list of manuscripts of *Somnium Scipionis*, Jahn includes among those for which dates are given only three which possibly come from the tenth century or earlier:<sup>8</sup> Codex Frisingensis 162, saec. X–XI (nunc Monacensis lat. 6362);<sup>9</sup> Codex Parisinus Regius 6370, saec IX; and Codex Bongarsii, saec X–XI (nunc Bernensis 347). The first of these three documents is listed by Castiglioni as dating from the eleventh century.<sup>10</sup> The third is regarded by Jahn himself as being of the eleventh century, but note is taken by him that the manuscript is

<sup>7</sup> The text of *Somnium Scipionis* is preceded in this manuscript by the *Commentarii* of Macrobius (folios 62<sup>v</sup>–93<sup>r</sup>) executed by the same scribe who copied the work of Cicero and two other contemporary scribes. At this point the author wishes to express his gratitude to the Directors of The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University for making available to him a microfilm copy of Q for his use in the preparation of this paper.

<sup>8</sup> Jahn (above, note 1) lxii–lxxxvii.

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that Codex Frisingensis 164, listed by Jahn (p. lxiv) as dating from the ninth century, though containing a part of the *Commentarii* of Macrobius, does not contain *Somnium Scipionis*.

<sup>10</sup> Castiglioni (above, note 4) xlvii.

dated in the tenth century in the catalogue published by Sinner.<sup>11</sup> Thus only one of the manuscripts in Jahn's list actually has an undisputed claim to being considered as dating from the tenth century or earlier. Castiglioni includes a previously unstudied tenth century manuscript, Parisinus Ashburnam. 454, in his edition.<sup>12</sup> Willis uses two ninth century manuscripts: Codex Bodleianus Auct. T II 27, saec. IX ex. (=D) and Codex Parisinus n. a. 16677, saec. IX in. (=E).<sup>13</sup> E, however, extends only through *Africanum* (3.3.5).<sup>14</sup> Hence, if Q is to be regarded as dating from the tenth century, it is probably one of the four earliest manuscripts containing the text of *Somnium Scipionis* in full. This in itself, apart from Q's relationship with B, gives it a strong claim to attention. This relationship of Q with B, however, is another factor of considerable importance, since Q, in addition to being a *gemellus* of B, as will be demonstrated below, is much older than B. Castiglioni,<sup>15</sup> Ziegler,<sup>16</sup> and Willis<sup>17</sup> date B simply as saec. XI. Jahn<sup>18</sup> and Eyssenhardt,<sup>19</sup> however, indicate that it was written in the late eleventh century. Hence the difference in age between Q and B is at least a century, if not more. A few corrections have been made in the text of Q by the original scribe (Q<sup>1</sup>) and some alterations have been inserted by a later hand (Q<sup>2</sup>), probably in the late tenth century.

<sup>11</sup> Jahn (above, note 1) lxxv.

<sup>12</sup> Castiglioni (above, note 4) xxxix.

<sup>13</sup> Iacobus Willis, *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Saturnalia* (Leipzig 1963) vii-viii.

<sup>14</sup> In the citations from *Somnium Scipionis* in this paper the first and second entries indicate the chapter and section numbers found in the texts of Jahn, Eyssenhardt, and Willis. The third entry indicates the line number within the section as calculated by the line divisions of Willis. This will vary only slightly, if at all, for the texts of Jahn and Eyssenhardt. Hence the reader should experience little difficulty in locating passages in any of the three editions mentioned above. The problem will be greater in the case of the editions of Castiglioni and Ziegler since these editors, treating the *Somnium Scipionis* as a part of Book 6 of *De re publica*, use a different system of chapter numbering. Hence, the section numbers of the other texts are not to be found in their editions, but the chapter numbers of these other texts are included, in parentheses in Ziegler and in square brackets in Castiglioni. By comparison of the texts of Jahn, Eyssenhardt, or Willis with those of Castiglioni or Ziegler it should be possible for the reader to locate citations in the last two works without excessive difficulty.

<sup>15</sup> Castiglioni (above, note 4) xlvii.

<sup>16</sup> Ziegler (above, note 5) xxxvi.

<sup>17</sup> Willis (above, note 13) vii.

<sup>18</sup> Jahn (above, note 1) lxiv.

<sup>19</sup> Eyssenhardt (above, note 2) v.

The work of Macrobius in Q is preceded (folios 2<sup>r</sup>-60<sup>v</sup>) by a ninth century copy of the *De arithmetica* of Boethius. It is argued by W. M. Lindsay that the Boethius portion of this manuscript was copied in the scriptorium of St. Nazarius in Lorsch,<sup>20</sup> but he has nothing to say about the remaining portions of the codex beyond indicating that they are of later date. There is, in the case of these later portions also, ground for believing that Lorsch was the point of origin. On folio 94<sup>r</sup> one line was omitted from its proper position in the text but was inserted in the lower margin by the original scribe. The place of omission was designated by a crossed *d* in the text and the line inserted in the margin was preceded by a crossed *h*. This method of indicating omissions is English in origin<sup>21</sup> and was frequently used in Lorsch<sup>22</sup>—a continental center known to be under strong insular influence. Other features of Q which indicate that it was probably copied by an insular scribe or one who had been trained in England include many instances of the use of a 7-shaped character for *et*, several instances of use of a character resembling our division sign for *est*, and one instance of the use of a sign resembling an H with extended cross-bar for *enim*.<sup>23</sup>

That Q is closely related to B is certified beyond question by the following list of instances in which these two documents agree with each other against all the other manuscripts cited by the editors mentioned earlier. Since most of these variants are simply changes in word order, it is impossible to say that all of them are cases of agreement of Q and B in error. Some of them may retain the order followed by Cicero himself. In a few instances, when Willis has failed to cite variants in B, information has been taken from the editions of Jahn or Eyssenhardt (1868). In such cases this fact is signified by the insertion of the names of these editors after the entry in question. The first reading cited in each case is that accepted into his text by Willis; the second, the reading shared by Q and B against all other manuscripts:

<sup>20</sup> W. M. Lindsay, "The (Early) Lorsch Scriptorium," *Palaeographia Latina* 3 (1924) 20.

<sup>21</sup> E. A. Lowe, "The Oldest Omission Signs in Latin Manuscripts," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Vol. 6 (*Studi e Testi* 126 [Rome 1946]) 76.

<sup>22</sup> Lindsay (above, note 20) 44.

<sup>23</sup> In addition there are many instances of use of this symbol for *enim* in the *Commentarii* in this codex.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 2.2.6 <i>solis amfractus</i> ] <i>anfractus solis</i>                               | 5.2.7 <i>efficiunt distinctos</i> ] <i>distinctos efficiunt</i> <sup>24</sup> |
| 2.2.13-14 <i>propinquorum manus</i> ] <i>manus propinquorum</i>                     | 5.2.8 <i>omnium fere</i> ] <i>fere omnium</i>                                 |
| 3.2.6. <i>evolaverunt</i> ] <i>evolarunt</i>  | 6.2.5 <i>solis ardore</i> ] <i>ardore solis</i>                               |
| 3.4.3 <i>potest</i> ] <i>poterit</i> ( <i>poterit</i> B corr. from <i>paterit</i> ) | 8.4.5 <i>occidit quidem umquam</i> ] <i>umquam quidem occidit</i>             |
| 3.6.2-3 <i>illum incolunt</i> ] <i>incolunt illum</i>                               | 9.1.1 <i>pateat igitur</i> ] <i>igitur pateat</i> (Jahn, Eyss.)               |

There are, of course, many additional examples in which Q agrees, often in error, with B and a limited number of other manuscripts. The following list of such instances does not profess to be complete. Other examples may be found by comparing the collation included within this paper with the *apparatus criticus* of Willis' edition and the various earlier editions:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1.1.1 <i>M'. Manilio</i> ] <i>A. Manlio</i>                          | 7.5.2 <i>omnia sunt</i> ] <i>sunt omnia</i>                          |
| 1.2.10-11 <i>est consumptus</i> ] <i>consumptus est</i>              | 8.4.2 <i>est origo</i> ] <i>origo est</i>                            |
| 1.3.3 <i>non facta solum</i> ] <i>non solum facta</i>                | 8.5.3 <i>concidat</i> ] <i>occidat</i> , corr. Q <sup>2</sup> (Jahn) |
| 1.4.3-4 <i>aliquid in somno tale</i> ] <i>in somnio aliquid tale</i> | 8.5.5 <i>qua</i> ] <i>quam</i> (Eyss.)                               |
| 3.7.8 <i>mihi parva</i> ] <i>parva mihi</i>                          | 9.3.5 <i>violarunt</i> ] <i>violaverunt</i>                          |
| 4.1.2 <i>tua om.</i>   | 9.3.8 <i>sum om.</i> (Jahn, Eyss.)                                   |

These many instances of agreement of Q and B, often in error and often against most or all of the other published manuscripts, can hardly be attributed to chance. It must be assumed either that one was copied from the other or that both stem from a common source. The following partial list of instances in which B has the correct, or almost correct, text where Q has omissions or errors is adequate to show that Q could not have been the source of B:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1.3.3 <i>sed</i> B, om. Q                              | 6.3.4 <i>cerne</i> BQ <sup>2</sup> , om. Q          |
| 2.1.6 <i>partum</i> BQ <sup>2</sup> , <i>paratum</i> Q | 7.3.2 <i>reditu</i> B, <i>reditum</i> Q             |
| 2.2.8 <i>alter altera</i> B, <i>alter ab altera</i> Q  | 7.5.4 <i>unius</i> BQ <sup>2</sup> , <i>huius</i> Q |
| 3.2.4 <i>arbitraremur</i> B, <i>arbitramur</i> Q       | 7.5.5 <i>contueri</i> ] <i>contuere</i> B, om. Q    |
| 3.6.1 <i>via est</i> B, <i>est via</i> Q               | 8.2.8 <i>mundum</i> B, <i>mundus</i> Q              |
| 5.2.4 <i>manens</i> B, om. Q                           | 8.2.9 <i>mortalem</i> B, <i>mortalis</i> Q          |
| 5.2.6 <i>cursus</i> B, <i>concursus</i> Q              | 8.4.2 <i>ex</i> ] <i>e</i> B, <i>et</i> Q           |
| 6.1.1 <i>etiam</i> BQ <sup>2</sup> , om. Q             | 9.3.6 <i>exagitati</i> B, <i>agitati</i> Q          |

On the other hand, even if B were older than Q, it could not be regarded as the source of Q by reason of the extensive list of

<sup>24</sup> Jahn (above, note 1) reports that *efficiunt* is omitted by B.

instances quoted below in which Q has the correct reading where B is in error:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1.1.2-3 <i>mihi fuit</i> Q, <i>fuit mihi</i> B                                     | 6.1.8 <i>esse</i> Q, <i>est</i> B   |
| 1.3.1 <i>autem</i> Q, om. B  | 7.1.4 <i>tempore certo</i> Q, <i>certo tempore</i> B  |
| 1.4.7 <i>equidem</i> Q, <i>et quidem</i> B   | 7.2.3 <i>et</i> Q, <i>vel</i> B   |
| 2.1.8 <i>triumphum</i> Q, <i>triumphos</i> B<br>(corrected from <i>triumphus</i> ) | 7.4.5 <i>annum</i> Q, <i>animum</i> B   |
| 3.3.6 <i>ita inquit</i> Q, <i>inquit ita</i> B                                     | 7.4.6 <i>scito</i> Q, <i>scit</i> B   |
| 3.5.3 <i>iniussu</i> Q, <i>invisu</i> B  | 8.2.5 <i>est deus</i> Q, <i>deus est</i> B  |
| 3.5.4 <i>migrandum</i> Q, <i>migrandus</i> B (Jahn)                                | 8.3.1 <i>nam quod</i> Q, <i>nam quoniam quod</i> B,<br><i>namque quoniam quod</i> B <sup>2</sup>                    |
| 3.5.5 <i>defugisse</i> Q, <i>defuisse</i> B  | 8.3.4 <i>habeat</i> Q, <i>habent</i> B  |
| 3.7.2 <i>mihi contemplanti</i> Q, <i>nihil con-</i><br><i>templandi</i> B          | 8.4.6 <i>ab alio renascetur</i> Q, <i>ab alia re</i><br><i>nascetur</i> B    <i>aliud</i> Q, <i>aliud aliquid</i> B |
| 3.7.6 <i>a</i> Q, om. B  | 8.5.4 <i>ullam</i> Q, <i>ulla</i> B (Jahn, Eyss.)   |
| 4.3.4 <i>eam</i> Q, <i>ea</i> B  | 9.1.1 <i>id</i> Q, om. B (Jahn, Eyss.)  |
| 5.2.3 <i>excitato</i> Q, <i>excitatio</i> B  | 9.3.2 <i>dederunt</i> Q, <i>dederunt</i> B (Jahn,<br>Eyss.)   |
| 6.1.7 <i>maculis</i> Q, <i>masculis</i> B  |   |

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the evidence cited above is that Q and B stem independently from a common archetype, which may be designated  $\beta$ . A comparison of Q and B will, therefore, in many cases enable editors to restore the readings of  $\beta$  with a high degree of certainty and thus carry the tradition back to an earlier stage. In the cases listed above in which Q follows other manuscripts where B is in error it may safely be considered that Q has preserved the  $\beta$  reading and that B has corrupted that reading. By the same token, in those instances in which B agrees with other manuscripts where Q is in error, it may be assumed that B has preserved  $\beta$  readings which have been corrupted by Q. The combined evidence of Q and B, therefore, obviously provides a much more accurate picture of the source of B than is presented by B alone. For this reason Q deserves to be used in the preparation of future critical editions of *Somnium Scipionis*.

There are several instances in which Q and B seem to be following separate traditions. In some cases this can be accounted for by assuming that  $\beta$  had alternate readings representing two different families and that Q chose one while B accepted the other. Strong proof that such double readings existed is provided by the variants of Q and B for *duorum* (5.2.6). Some manuscripts read *duorum* at this point, most others, *modorum*; but B has *duorum modorum*, while Q has *modorum* only. This suggests that  $\beta$  had both readings and

passed both on to B, but that the scribe of Q chose *modorum* from the two possibilities. Another example of the same sort is seen in the case of *aliud* (8.4.6). Most manuscripts read *aliud*, but several have *aliquid*.<sup>25</sup> Here B has *aliud aliquid*, while Q has *aliud*. In all probability  $\beta$  had the combination of both readings. The presence of alternate readings in  $\beta$  might also account for the fact that at 3.4.4-5 B has *medium* in agreement with one large group of manuscripts while Q has *medio* in agreement with another large group.

Another method of explaining the existence in Q and B of different readings representing alternate traditions would be to assume that an intermediary intervened between  $\beta$  and B which had some of its readings altered on the basis of some manuscript of a different family, with the result that these particular readings were passed on to B, whereas Q retained the original readings of  $\beta$ . A development of this sort may well be responsible for the appearance in B at 8.2.8-9 of the correct reading, *mundum . . . mortalem*, where Q, in agreement with many other manuscripts, has *mundus . . . mortalis*.<sup>26</sup> It seems probable that  $\beta$  had *mundus . . . mortalis*, which was altered to the correct reading in some intermediary between  $\beta$  and B and thus appears in the correct form in B.

In the collation of Q with the text of Willis which follows, minor variations in orthography such as substitution of *e-caudata* for *ae* and the like have been ignored.

#### COLLATION

Title: *Somnium Scipionis M. T. Ciceronis excerptum ex libro vi de re publica*

1.1.1 <i>M'. Manilio]</i> A. Manlio	2.2.2 <i>in om.</i> Q, add. Q <sup>1</sup>
1.2.4 <i>reliquis</i> Q, <i>reliqui</i> Q <sup>2</sup>	2.2.4 <i>animi ingenii tui consilii</i> Q,
1.2.6 <i>itaque</i> (with all other MSS.)	corr. Q <sup>2</sup>
1.2.10-11 <i>consumptus est</i>	2.2.6 <i>anfractus solis</i>
1.3.3 <i>solum facta</i>    <i>sed om.</i>	2.2.8 <i>alter ab altera</i>
1.4.3-4 <i>aliquid in somno tale]</i> <i>in somnio</i>	2.2.13-14 <i>manus propinquorum</i>
<i>aliquid tale</i>	2.3.1 <i>exclamasset</i> Q, <i>exclamanisset</i> Q <sup>2</sup>
2.1.3 <i>cartaginem</i>	2.3.1-2 <i>ingemuissetque</i> Q, <i>ingemuissentque</i>
2.1.6 <i>partum]</i> <i>paratum</i> Q, corr. Q <sup>2</sup>	Q <sup>2</sup>
2.1.8 <i>cartaginem</i>	2.3.2 <i>leniter]</i> <i>leviter</i> (with all other MSS.)
2.1.9 <i>aegyptum siriam</i>	<i>st]</i> <i>et</i>

<sup>25</sup> See the *apparatus criticus* of Castiglioni (above, note 4).

<sup>26</sup> See the *apparatus criticus* of Castiglioni (above, note 4).

- 2.3.3 *parumper*] *parum rebus* (with most other MSS.)
- 3.1.5 *principii* (with final *i* partially erased)
- 3.2.4 *arbitramur*
- 3.2.6 *evolarunt*
- 3.3.4 *optime*
- 3.4.3 *potest*] *poterit*
- 3.4.4-5 *medio*
- 3.5.8 *tum*] *dum* Q, corr. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 3.6.1 *est via*
- 3.6.2-3 *incolunt illum*
- 3.7.3 *dae*] *hae*
- 3.7.6 *proxima citima* (with *proxima* expunged)
- 3.7.8 *parva mihi*
- 4.1.2 *tua* om.
- 4.1.3 *templo* Q, *templa* Q<sup>1</sup>
- 4.2.1 *sunt septem*] \*\*\**ptem* Q, *septem* Q<sup>2</sup> (with *ſ* for *sunt* apparently erased)
- 4.2.6 *de septem*] *subter* (with all other MSS.)
- 5.1.4 *ratione* Q (with *vel -nis* written above by Q<sup>2</sup>)
- 5.1.7-8 *possunt*] *sunt* Q, corr. Q<sup>1</sup>
- 5.1.8 *ex altera* Q, *quaeque ex altera* Q<sup>2</sup>
- 5.2.4 *manens* om.
- 5.2.6 *concursum* || *duorum*] *modorum*
- 5.2.7 *distinctos efficiunt*
- 5.2.8 *fere omnium* || *nodus*] *modus*
- 6.1.1 *etiam nunc*] *nunc* Q (with original *nunc* expunged and *etiam nunc* written above by Q<sup>2</sup>)
- 6.1.8 *eosque*] *hosque*
- 6.1.10 *partim transversos* om.
- 6.2.5 *ardore solis*
- 6.3.2 *qui insistent*] *quinsistent* Q, corr. Q<sup>1</sup>
- 6.3.3 *urgent*
- 6.3.4 *cerne* om. Q, add. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 6.3.6 *angustata*
- 6.3.7 *atlanticum*
- 6.4.4 *transnatare* || *quis*] *vix*
- 7.1.2 *unius cuiusque*] *unus cuiusque* Q, corr. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 7.1.3 *posteris*] *poteris* Q, corr. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 7.2.1 *eis*] *his*
- 7.2.2 *eis*] *his*
- 7.2.4 *fuere* om. Q, add. Q<sup>1</sup> || *cum* om.
- 7.2.5 *anni\*\**
- 7.3.1 *populariter*] *loqueleriter* (with most other MSS.)
- 7.3.2 *reditum*
- 7.3.4 *eandemque*] *eadem* Q, corr. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 7.3.5 *retulerint*
- 7.4.3 *quandoque* (-*que* partially erased)
- 7.4.6 *cuius*] *huius*
- 7.5.2 *sunt omnia*
- 7.5.4 *unius*] *huius* Q, corr. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 7.5.5 *contueri* om.
- 7.5.10 *iis*] *his*
- 8.1.2 *patra* Q, *patria* Q<sup>1</sup>
- 8.1.4-2.2 *tamen . . . sic* om. Q, add. in marg. Q<sup>1</sup>
- 8.2.8 *ille mundum*] *ipse mundus*
- 8.2.9 *mortalis*
- 8.3.5 *sese movet*] *de se movet* Q, *se ipsum movet* Q<sup>2</sup>
- 8.4.2 *origo est* || *ex*] *et*
- 8.4.5 *ne*] *nec* || *umquam quidem occidit*
- 8.5.2 *quod ipsum* om. Q, add. Q<sup>2</sup> || *movetur*] *aequetur* Q, *movetur* Q<sup>2</sup>
- 8.5.3 *mori*] *moveri* || *concidat*] *occidat* Q, corr. Q<sup>2</sup>
- 8.5.4 *natura et consistat* (with all other MSS.)
- 8.5.5 *qua*] *quam* || *impulsa* Q, *impulsu* Q<sup>2</sup>
- 9.1.1 *igitur pateat*
- 9.1.3 *inanimus* Q, *inanimus* Q<sup>2</sup>
- 9.1.4 *interiore* Q, *interiori* Q<sup>2</sup>
- 9.2.4 *ocius* (corrected to *ocius* by expunction)
- 9.3.5 *violaverunt*
- 9.3.6 *agitati*
- 9.3.8 *sum* om.

EXPLICIT SOMNIUM SCIPIONIS MARCI TULLII CICERONIS EXCERPTUM EX LIBRO SEXTO DE RE PUBLICA.

While the earlier portions of this paper have dealt with the relationships of Q to other manuscripts exclusively in terms of the texts of *Somnium Scipionis* in these codices, it is obvious that conclusions



reached on this basis will be even sounder if they can be supported by evidence from the texts of the *Commentarii* of Macrobius in the same manuscripts. With this in mind the author has prepared a complete collation of the *Commentarii* in Q. This collation points definitely to the same relationship between Q and the other manuscripts for the *Commentarii* as for *Somnium Scipionis*—namely, that Q is a *gemellus* of B which has retained correct readings in many places where B has fallen into error. That Q is a *gemellus* of B for this section of the codex as well as for the *Somnium Scipionis* section is indicated by the following partial list of instances in which QB agree in error:<sup>27</sup>

1.1.4.6 <i>nec</i> ] <i>ne</i>	1.12.8.6 <i>obrepere</i> ] <i>obripere</i>
1.1.6.2 <i>Phaedone</i> ] <i>phaedrone</i>	1.12.14.9 <i>dicitur</i> ] <i>vocatur</i>
1.2.1.7 <i>animates constaret</i> ] <i>constaret animatos</i>	1.20.3.7 <i>dux et</i> ] <i>dux sed et</i> <sup>28</sup>
1.2.3.2 <i>semper</i> (second) om.	1.20.7.2 <i>iure cor caeli</i> ] <i>caeli cor iure</i>
1.2.3.3 <i>ridenda</i> ] <i>deridenda</i>	1.20.12.5 <i>constabat</i> ] <i>constabit</i>
1.2.8.1 <i>velut</i> ] <i>vel</i>	1.20.18.1 <i>est</i> om.
1.3.5.4 <i>est</i> om.	1.21.6.1 <i>igitur</i> om.
1.3.7.7 <i>est</i> ] <i>est et</i>	1.21.6.2 <i>gradum</i> ] <i>igitur gradum</i>
1.3.17.2 <i>eius</i> om.	1.21.14.4 <i>sibi caeli</i> ] <i>caeli sibi</i>
1.4.3.1 <i>inquit</i> om.	1.21.20.3 <i>cosummata</i> ] <i>consumata</i>
1.5.6.8 <i>eam tamen</i> ] <i>tamen eam</i> (ea B)	1.21.22.4 <i>Graeco nomine</i> ] <i>nomine greco</i>
1.5.11.10 <i>sibi</i> om.	1.21.24.4 <i>caeli</i> ] <i>caelum</i>
1.5.17.6 <i>id est</i> om.	1.21.26.2 <i>Saturnum post omnes</i> ] <i>post omnes saturnum</i>
1.6.3.5 <i>reddunt</i> om.	1.21.28.2 <i>quaerenda proposuimus</i> ] <i>proposuimus quaerenda</i> ( <i>preposuimus</i> B)
1.6.23.6 <i>contigit</i> ] <i>contingit</i>	1.21.29.3 <i>ferri</i> ] <i>fieri</i>
1.6.25.5 <i>adhaereret</i> ] <i>hereret</i>	1.22.3.4 <i>et</i> om.
1.6.76.9 <i>munerum</i> ] <i>numerus</i> (corrected by a later hand in Q)	1.22.4.4 <i>terra</i> om.
1.6.77.10 <i>dicunt</i> ] <i>vocant</i>	1.22.5.3 <i>illa</i> om.
1.7.2.3 <i>alia</i> om.	2.1.5.7 <i>aures</i> ] <i>auribus</i>
1.7.3.5 <i>affectata</i> ] <i>esse affectata</i>	2.1.7.5 <i>sphaerarum caelestium</i> ] <i>caelestium sphaerarum</i>
1.8.8.6 <i>contagione</i> ] <i>cogitatione</i>	2.1.9.3–4 <i>respondentes ordine</i> ] <i>ordine respondentes</i>
1.10.8.5 <i>admoneri</i> ] <i>admonere</i> ( <i>ammonere</i> B)	2.1.11.6 <i>sibi consonantes</i> ] <i>consonantes sibi</i>
1.10.9.2 <i>ad</i> ] <i>ac</i>	
1.11.11.1 <i>amicior</i> ] <i>amicitior</i>	

<sup>27</sup> Since the chief purpose of the collation here cited is to establish the relationship existing between this part of Q's text and the corresponding part of B, the author has used as the basis for his collation the 1893 edition of Eyssenhardt rather than the edition of Willis, by reason of the fact that Eyssenhardt provides a somewhat fuller list of the variants in B. Line numbers have been calculated on the basis of line divisions in the Eyssenhardt text. These will possibly vary slightly for other editions.

<sup>28</sup> Note should be taken of the fact that a gap exists in the text of B extending from 1.12.14.10 to 1.19.24.2.

- 2.1.12.2 *omnibus om.*  
 2.1.13.3 *sibi consoni] consoni sibi*  
 2.1.13.4 *compositis] compositis ut*  
 2.1.15.2 *totum minorem] minorem totum ||*  
     *insuper eius] eius insuper*  
 2.1.16.3-4 *tria ad duo] duo ad tria*  
     *(II ad III B)*  
 2.1.25.2 *quae] quae in*  
 2.2.15.4 *hinc] hanc (with hinc as alternate*  
     *reading Q)*  
 2.2.16.5 *quartam] quartum*  
 2.2.23.1 *enim om.*  
 2.2.23.4 *numerorum om.*  
 2.2.23.5 *mundi anima] anima mundi*  
 2.3.12.7 *mundi corpore] corpore mundi*  
 2.4.3.4 *artiore] altiore (final e altered to i*  
     *Q<sup>2</sup>)*  
 2.5.16.2 *concessae divum] divum concessae*  
     *(ocessae B)*  
 2.5.20.6 *calidus] calens*  
 2.5.25.3 *iusum] visum*  
 2.7.7.4 *duos] duo*  
 2.7.13.4 *sit] fit*  
 2.8.1.12 *oblicus] obliquus*  
 2.9.1.3 *eius ambitu] ambitu eius*  
 2.9.8.4 *circulus] circus*  
 2.10.15.7 *fitque] sitque*  
 2.11.1.1 *a om*  
 2.11.7.5 *circumitione] circuitione*  
 2.12.5.3 *sit] fit*  
 2.12.9.1 *sed nec] set ne*  
 2.14.15.2 *iungenda divisio est] divisio est*  
     *iungenda*  
 2.14.25.6 *evenient] eveniunt*  
 2.15.8.4 *ut mel] et mel*  
 2.15.18.1 *Aristoteles] aristotelis*  
 2.15.25.3-4 *aut et se] aut se*  
 2.15.27.7 *animam hoc esse] hoc esse*  
     *animam*  
 2.15.27.9 *argumenta sumamus] sumamus*  
     *argumenta*  
 2.15.30.3 *ministret] ministrent*  
 2.16.3.1 *si] sic*  
 2.16.4.7-8 *hic moderatam differentiam]*  
     *moderatam differentiam hic*  
 2.16.5.10 *ergo om.*  
 2.16.7.3 *videmus] videamus*  
 2.16.8.4 *videtur] videatur*  
 2.16.9.8 *anima] animal*  
 2.16.12.1 *ignis inquit] inquit ignis*  
 2.16.12.4 *moventemque] et moventem*  
     *(moveutem B)*  
 2.16.13.5 *est sibi] est ac sibi*  
 2.16.14.6 *motus est] est motus*  
 2.16.16.5 *dicis] dices*  
 2.16.18.3 *et om.*  
 2.16.19.5-6 *quo devincta est] quod vincta est*  
 2.16.20.7 *seu] an (seu indicated in Q as*  
     *alternate reading)*  
 2.16.20.9 *ait in medium] in medium ait*  
 2.16.21.7 *cadere in animam] in animam*  
     *cadere*  
 2.16.22.6 *est] esse*  
 2.16.24.5 *se] te*  
 2.16.25.4 *enim om.*  
 2.17.7.2 *perfectione sublime] sublime*  
     *perfectione*  
 2.17.11.4 *inclusus] clausus (corr. Q by a*  
     *later hand)*  
 2.17.16.3 *exhortatio] adhortatio (adortatio B)*

These examples of agreement of QB in error distributed fairly evenly, as they are, throughout the *Commentarii*, along with the examples cited earlier from *Somnium Scipionis*, make clear that the copies of both of these works contained in QB are *gemelli* stemming from a common source,  $\beta$ . Furthermore, the fact that Q is the more accurate *gemellus* for the *Commentarii*, as well as for *Somnium Scipionis*, is emphasized by the large number of instances in which it has retained the correct readings, derived presumably from  $\beta$ , where B has fallen into error. The list of such instances given below contains only a fraction of the examples which could be cited:

- 1.1.3.11 *ergo* Q, *igitur* B  
 1.2.5.1 *iactantur* Q, *notantur* B  
 1.2.14.9 *adsignare* Q, *facere* B  
 1.2.17.3 *inimicam* Q, *inimica* B  
 1.3.9.4 *sibi est* Q, *est sibi* B  
 1.3.13.4 *sint* Q, *sunt* B  
 1.4.5.10 *contemplanti* Q, *contemplandi* B  
 1.5.5.1 *ipsam* Q, *ipsa* B  
 1.5.8.2 *aliqua* Q, *alia* B  
 1.5.16.6 *eo* Q, om. B  
 1.6.3.7 *efficiunt* Q, *efficiuntur* B  
 1.6.28.5 *colligatio est cum* Q, *colligationem cum* B  
 1.6.38.3 *quod* Q, om. B  
 1.6.50.9 *fuera*t Q, *fuera*t B  
 1.6.70.5 *latinitas* Q, *nativitas* B  
 1.7.3.6 *velut* Q, om. B.  
 1.7.9.5 *nam* Q, *illam* B  
 1.8.2.2 *praedixit* Q, *praediximus* B  
 1.8.8.8 *se* Q, om. B  
 1.8.12.6 *alios otiosis* Q, om. B  
 1.9.4.5 *fugit* Q, *fuit* B  
 1.9.8.2 *suo* Q, om. B  
 1.10.12.3 *vulturem* Q, *vulture* B  
 1.10.12.4 *tondentem* Q, *rodentem* B  
 1.11.3.5 *esse* Q, om. B  
 1.11.6.9 *inde* Q, om. B  
 1.12.4.2 *positae* Q, om. B  
 1.12.9.2-3 *ad corpora usque deferrent* Q, om. B  
 1.19.25.2 *utrique* Q, *utriusque* B<sup>29</sup>  
 1.19.25.8 *ratione* Q, *rationem* B  
 1.20.32.6 *magnitudine* Q, om. B  
 1.21.2.7 *in eam partem* Q, *in ea parte* B  
 1.21.6.6 *nullam inter eas* Q, *inter eas nullam* B  
 1.21.18.2-3 *cum idem primum vas impleretur* Q, om. B  
 1.22.4.3 *esse* Q, om. B  
 1.22.13.1 *dedignatur* Q, *designatur* B  
 2.1.9.5 *acumina consonabant* Q, *consonabant acumina* B  
 2.1.17.3 *et* Q, om. B  
 2.2.10.3 *superpositas* Q, om. B  
 2.2.15.10 *hiabant* Q, *habebant* B  
 2.3.7.6 *quia in corpus* Q, *quia anima corpus* B  
 2.3.8.1 *fabulam* Q, *fabula* B  
 2.4.2.3 *efficit* Q, *efficitur* B  
 2.4.12.6 *explananda* Q, *explicanda* B  
 2.5.4.1 *caelum* Q, om. B  
 2.5.15.5 *loquimur* Q, *loquitur* B  
 2.5.18.4 *suis* Q, om. B  
 2.5.35.2 *ad nostra* Q, om. B  
 2.6.6.7 *id est* Q, om. B  
 2.6.7.5 *videtur* Q, *habetur* B  
 2.7.15.7 *corpore* Q, *corporis* B  
 2.7.20.1 *finis* Q, *finem* B  
 2.8.8.4 *excedat* Q, *excedit* B || *est* Q, om. B  
 2.9.6.3-4 *sed omnis . . . est insula* Q, om. B  
 2.10.1.3 *deinceps* Q, *deinde* B  
 2.10.13.2 *ita* Q, *itaque* B  
 2.10.15.5 *asperitatem* Q, *asperitate* B  
 2.11.10.4 *sit* Q, *sint* B  
 2.11.12.4 *quae* Q, om. B  
 2.12.6.2 *receptus* Q, *receptum* B  
 2.12.12.3 *videntur* Q, *videtur* B  
 2.13.9.4 *aperiri* Q, *aperire* B  
 2.14.1.5 *fiunt* Q, *sunt* B  
 2.14.6.2 *immobile* Q, om. B  
 2.14.8.2 *et ex accidenti* Q, om. B  
 2.14.33.6 *sequetur* Q, *sequitur* B  
 2.15.14.7 *movetur* Q, *moventur* B  
 2.15.32.3 *animam* Q, *anima* B  
 2.16.21.8 *est* Q, om. B  
 2.17.1.1 *igitur* Q, om. B  
 2.17.10.2 *primum virtutes* Q, om. B

The higher degree of accuracy maintained by Q's scribe, as indicated by the examples cited above and hundreds of others which might be cited, clearly establishes the right of this manuscript to be considered as a source superior to B for establishing the text of the *Commentarii*. This right is made all the more impressive by the fact that Q contains the full text of a passage some thirty pages in length which has been

<sup>29</sup> See above, note 28.

lost from B: *vero id est* (1.12.14.10) . . . *stellas refertur* (1.19.24.2-3). In addition there are several instances in which Q retains the full text for passages which have been omitted from B with the substitution of the word *usque*. These include: *hic est* (2.1.2.3) . . . *nodus est* (2.1.3.9-10); *et in ipsis* (2.5.1.1-2) . . . *in terris* (2.5.3.9); *homines* (2.11.2.1) . . . *habeto* (2.11.3.7); *nec enim* (2.12.1.2) . . . *parte mortalem* (2.12.1.10); *quod autem* (2.13.1.3) . . . *atque vis* (2.13.5.7).

In this same connection it is worthy of note that Q contains the full text for a gap in P extending from *diligens in hunc* (1.17.5.1) to *quam iure* (1.20.7.2). Since this lacuna overlaps the large lacuna in B noted above, the availability of Q for those portions of the text omitted by both B and P is especially important. Incidentally, in other instances in which P omits words or phrases Q almost always has the complete text.

Q, of course, has errors of its own, but these are far less numerous than the errors of B. Most of the errors of Q consist in inversions of word order or omissions of words. Often omitted words are restored between lines or in margins by one or another of the contemporary scribes who participated in copying the codex. This suggests that the correctors were probably relying on  $\beta$  as the source for their insertions. Rarely does Q make any attempts to emend the text. The variants which exist can in almost every instance be attributed to slips or to failure on the part of the scribe to comprehend the meaning of his exemplar. There is no evidence that comparisons were made with other manuscripts or that readings were adopted directly from such sources. Hence, it can quite safely be assumed that Q gives us a much more reliable picture of the text of  $\beta$  than can be found in B and so should be of great usefulness to future editors of both the *Commentarii* of Macrobius and the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero.