

THE SOURCE OF THE k^{red} -COLLADONIUS MARGINALIA TO PETRONIUS' *BELLUM CIVILE*

A. FRED SOCHATOFF

Carnegie Institute of Technology

In an earlier investigation devoted to the activities of Henry Stephanus in relation to the text of the long poem in the *Satiricon* commonly titled the *Bellum civile*, I presented evidence leading to the belief that the version of the poem printed in Stephanus' *Poetae veteres* of 1564 was the source of the Codex Leidensis Voss. Misc. 1, fasc. 6 (k).¹ The belief was also ventured that the *Emendationes* printed by Stephanus in the margin of the poem, attributed by the anthologist to a friend preferring to remain anonymous, were the source of a set of marginalia in the manuscript designated as k^1 .

A second set of marginalia in k, written by a hand markedly different from that responsible for the text of the poem and the k^1 marginalia, is designated k^{red} . The complete correspondence of the k^{red} readings with the *Notae in Epos de bello civili* attributed to Germanus Colladonius raises the question of a possible copying of one by the other or the derivation of both from a common archetype. The question, unfortunately, cannot be answered in view of the meager evidence available, although one is tempted to assume that k is the paper manuscript of the poem known to have been in the possession of Paulus Stephanus, with whom Colladonius had a business association, and that the *Notae* are derived from the k^{red} scholia.² Even though this question has no definitive answer, it may be of some worth to look into the source of

¹ "Stephanus and the Text of Petronius' *Bellum civile*," *TAPA* 94 (1963) 287-89. In the symbolic representation of manuscripts and editions 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*.

² Sochatoff (above, note 1) 291-92; cf. 287.

the readings. For purposes of convenience they will be termed *k*^{red} readings, but it should be borne in mind that they constitute also the *Notae* of Colladonius.

I

One preliminary measure calls for an acquaintance with two of the major families to which the textual remains of the *Satiricon* belong. The largest quantity of text is found in sources known as Family I. The surviving representatives of Family I are all editions except for Joseph Scaliger's *Leid. Scal. 61* (L), which is an edition in manuscript form. In Family II are the so-called *excerpta vulgaria*, containing smaller quantities of text and represented by fifteen manuscripts. The earliest editions of the *Satiricon*—the *editio princeps* of 1482, the *Bernardiniana* of 1499, and the *Chalderiana* of 1520—were all based on Family II sources.

The Petronius selections in the *Poetae veteres* of Stephanus, largely indebted to the 1520 edition, were also of Family II derivation. The same was true of the *editio Plantiniana* published by Sambucus in Paris in 1565. That Stephanus may have had access to the materials of Sambucus was demonstrated in my earlier article.³ Like Stephanus, Sambucus drew heavily on the 1520 edition, but he added that he corrected no fewer than fifty errors in it on the basis of a "vetustus codex." The nature of that unidentified codex is not known, but it is believed also to be of Family II.⁴

Seven readings of *k*^{red} show a correspondence with those cited by Sambucus as drawn from his "vetustus codex," as is evident in the following collation, in which the readings of Buecheler's *editio maior* (1862) are arbitrarily taken as lemmata.

Collation I

- 4 peragebantur] peragrabantur *k s*, peragebantur *k*^{red} *ms*
 22 nobilis] mobilis *k s*, nobilis *k*^{red} *ms*
 27 virum] iure *k*, virum *k*^{red} *s*
 68 magnaeque] magnae *k s*, magnaeque *k*^{red} *ms*
 105 cedent] cedunt *k s*, cedent *k*^{red} *ms*
 113 aures] auras *k*, aures *k*^{red} *s* (*et i.m. ita v.c. vul. auras*)
 178 meatibus] mentibus *k*, meatibus *k*^{red} *s* (*et i.m. ita v.c. vulg. e mentibus*)

³ Sochatoff (above, note 1) 289–90.

⁴ Lois May Beatty, on p. 9 of "The *Bellum civile* of Petronius in the Editions *s*, *sc*, and *st*," an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh in 1936.

Striking though the correspondence is, it is present in only seven of the sixteen readings explicitly attributed by Sambucus to the "v. c." Six additional readings show a correspondence between k^{red} and marginalia of Sambucus' edition, the latter, however, without avowal of debt to the "vetustus codex."

Collation 2

- 13 et laesae] elisae k s, et laesae k^{red} ms
 51 geminam] geminam k s, gemino k^{red} ms
 107 omnia quae] omniaque k, omnia quae k^{red} s(et i.m. ita coniectura ducti scripsimus vulg. Omniaque)
 117 porthmeus] proteus k ($\Gamma\rho$ certe $\iota\sigma$ parva $\iota\sigma$ Portmeus l' putri k^{red}), porthmeus s(et i.m. ita coniectura ducti scripsimus: utitur & Iuven. ea voce Graeca, Cheronte⁻ por titorem designanto sic)
 135 voratur] vocatur k s(f. voratur ms), voratur k^{red}
 144 pulsae] pulso k s(f. pulsae ms), pulsae k^{red}

Four of the six readings are conjectures set forth by Sambucus, apparently without the authority of any manuscript. That he had access to two Family I fragments is stated by Beatty, who attributes them to Turnebus.⁵ Whether the fragments included *Bellum civile* passages is not known. In any case, the thirteen readings presented in the two collations may indicate a debt of k^{red} to the marginalia in Sambucus' edition of 1565. They are, however, only a small portion of the k^{red} material, and search for further sources of that material is in order.

II

The previously mentioned Turnebus (whose name is sometimes spelled Tornaebus) is responsible for reference to a manuscript about which there is considerable wonder. He mentions deriving some readings "... e Petronio Memmii v. c. ... quem domi sub sera et claustro habet, ne quem foris obscoenus et lascivus scriptor impura sua petulantia contaminet."⁶ The role of the lost Codex Memmianus becomes more prominent in light of a comment made by Pithoeus, who was the editor of two editions of the *Satiricon*, published in 1577 and 1587. In

⁵ See above, note 4.

⁶ *Adversariorum Libri XXX* (Orleans 1634) 20.

the Preface to his *Adversariorum Subsecivorum Libri II* written in 1564, Pithoeus refers to a passage of Petronius not extant in "vulgatis Petronii exemplaribus," but extant "cum magna eius Satyrici parte, in meo libro, cuius ego procacitatem, petulantiam, et lasciviam privato carcere ita damnavi, ut tamen eius copiam viris optimis et amicissimis non negem, quam non ita dudum feci Errico Memmio."

That the manuscript Turnebus referred to as kept under lock and key by Memmius is the same as the one which Pithoeus declared was his own and which he had shown to Memmius seems likely. A plausible explanation of the contradictory information, that of B. L. Ullman, is "that the manuscript was originally owned by Memmius and 'borrowed' by Pithou."⁷ Confirmation is added by a letter of Dousa written in 1569, in which he refers "Ad Petronium . . . Gallicanum Memmianae bibliothecae exemplar, quod utinam Pithoeus nobis invidere abstineat diutius."⁸ Ullman, citing other references to the possessiveness of Pithoeus, believes that he "probably kept it until his death in 1596."⁹

Adding to the complications concerning the Codex Memmianus, which contained Family 1 readings, is the disagreement over its identification with other manuscripts. Ullman unhesitatingly identifies it with a "Benedictinum vetus Floriacense" also used by Pithoeus and no longer extant. "Memmius must have got the manuscript from Fleury," he declares. "It suited Pithou's fancy to name the manuscript which he had in his own possession after its original home."¹⁰ That identification must be evaluated in light of a comment by Scaliger that the Memmianus was a copy of the Codex Cuiacianus, also now lost: "il (M. Cujas) avait presté à P. P. [Petrus Pithoeus] son Petrone, et à moy aussi. . . . C'est le premier Petrone que nous ayons eu. Je l'ay copié sur cet exemplaire, je l'ayme mieux qu'un imprimé. . . ."¹¹ Dorothy J. Fulmer regards as "very remote" the "possibility

⁷ "The Text of Petronius in the Sixteenth Century," *CP* 25 (1930) 131.

⁸ Quoted by Ullman (above, note 7) 131.

⁹ Ullman (above, note 7) 132. He believes that the "Alia quaedam Petronii fragmenta hinc inde collecta ex Henrici Memmii cod. vet." printed at the end of the text in the Sambucus edition are to be attributed to Turnebus (137). The passage (149.9-12) is found elsewhere only in the editions of Tornaesius and Pithoeus and Scaliger's L.

¹⁰ Ullman (above, note 7) 141.

¹¹ Jacobus et Petrus Puteani, *Scaligeriana sive Excerpta ex ore Josephi Scaligeri* 2 (Leyden 1668) 285.

that the Cuiacianus was The Benedictinus from Fleury;" and she also refuses to accept "the belief that the Memmianus was a copy of the Cuiacianus as Scaliger says."¹² The fact nevertheless remains that the passage attributed by Turnebus to "Memmi v. c." and similarly credited to Memmius in the Sambucus edition (*Satiricon* 149.9-12) is reproduced only in Scaliger's L and the editions published by Tornaesius and Pithoeus. Since the edition of Tornaesius (*t*) is avowedly indebted to the Cuiacianus, the relations of Cuiacius and Scaliger become a matter of concern.

III

Although Scaliger as early as 1567 evinced some interest in publishing poems of Petronius in an *Appendix Vergiliana* which would have made use of Stephanus' materials, the project fell through. Going to Milan to study law with Cuiacius in 1570, he saw his first manuscript of Petronius (as noted above). Writing to Pithoeus one year later, he mentioned possessing a number of poems from the *Satiricon* for his *Catalecta*. Whether the source was Cuiacius' manuscript or another writing is not known, but the radical order in which some passages are presented in the *Catalecta* implies the use of a manuscript of the florilegium type.¹³ For his autograph edition preserved as L, which belongs to a time later than the 1572-73 period of the *Catalecta*, Buecheler believed that Scaliger had drawn on the Cuiacianus: "transcripsit illa Scaliger, nisi fallor, ex Cuiaciano codice eodem quem Tornaesius adhibuit."¹⁴ That he drew on the Cuiacianus seems likely; that he copied it is less likely, for L contains readings which were presented as conjectures in the *Catalecta*. The date of L has not been established,

¹² Page 68 of "The Tornaesius Edition of Petronius," an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh in 1936.

¹³ Ullman (above, note 7) 147, on the basis of study of some of the readings of Scaliger's L, believes that Scaliger had such a manuscript.

¹⁴ Preface to *editio maior* (1862) xiii. That 1571 was the precise date of L (which he designates l) and that the Cuiacianus was one of the sources drawn upon by Scaliger in the composition of it are beliefs unequivocally set forth by Konrad Müller in his recent edition *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon* (Munich 1961) xiv-xvii. My great admiration for this scholar's critical remarks is tempered by the fact that he shows no recognition at all of the manuscript tradition represented by codices containing only the *Bellum civile*. Hence, he does not allude to k or to the k^{red} marginalia.

but if it did not appear soon after the *Catalecta*, it must be dated within the last twelve years of the century, for in 1588 Scaliger declared that he had not looked at Petronius for fifteen years.

In two editions of the *Satiricon* that were published in the interval between 1573 and 1588, that of Tornaesius in 1575 and the second edition of Pithoeus in 1587 (*p*), the Cuiacianus plays a part to be looked at. Tornaesius was quite explicit in listing his sources. In addition to the *Chalderiana* of 1520, the *Poetae veteres* of Stephanus, the Sambucus edition, and the *Catalecta* of Scaliger (about the use of this last, more will be said later), two *exemplaria* were mentioned in his preface. Despite this explicit listing, Tornaesius was somewhat obscure in identifying the two. One, generally regarded to be the lost Codex Dalecampianus, he had at the start and used. When his work was more than half finished, however, he secured another manuscript—like the first, of the Family 1 type—which he considered useful. For the portions of the *Satiricon* already on the press (67 pages), he introduced the new material in an appendix; for those portions not yet set (42 pages), he incorporated it into the text of his edition. That second *exemplar* is generally believed to be the Cuiacianus. Goldast first made the identification in his edition of 1610, and scholars have affirmed confirmation of it in more recent years.¹⁵

Pithoeus also mentioned the materials he used for each of his two editions, albeit, like Tornaesius, with some obscurity. Included among those for the second edition was a codex which had not been included among those for the first edition of 1577 (*p*), a *Vetus Tholosanus* which the editor stated had come into his possession only after the earlier publication. This manuscript Ullman identifies with the Cuiacianus.¹⁶

The possibility that the Codex Cuiacianus was employed in the editions of Tornaesius and Pithoeus is of more than slight importance. The introduction of Family 1 readings into the text of Petronius, a phenomenon generally assigned to the last third of the sixteenth century, rests on the contribution of four sources, *L p p t*. That the first

¹⁵ See e.g. Fulmer (above, note 13) 79, and Müller (above, note 14) xx.

¹⁶ Ullman (above, note 7) 141-43. A later investigator does not dispute Ullman's contention but adds the reservation that "the evidence is not conclusive" (Margery J. McClure, "A Comparative Study of the Pithoeus Editions of Petronius," an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh in 1934, page 4). Müller (above, note 14) xxiv, shares the conviction of Ullman.

edition of Pithoeus may have been greatly indebted to the Codex Memmianus has already been noted. That the other three sources (L p t) may have been indebted to the Cuiacianus makes the role of that manuscript—which, it should be remembered, Scaliger stated was the prototype of the Memmianus—a considerable one.

"The number of agreements in p with the readings of Scaliger and Tornaesius," declares Miss McClure, "is striking to say the least."¹⁷ Certainly no less striking is the agreement of Tornaesius and the *Catalecta* of Scaliger (sc), especially in the readings of the *Bellum civile*. That Tornaesius drew upon Scaliger's publication is evident in the presence of four pages in t headed *Ex Catal. Ios. Scal.* Tornaesius placed in this separate section Petronius poems which he said were not in his *exemplaria* and which he could not fit into his continuous narrative. Moreover, although he clearly made use of the editions of 1520 (c), of Stephanus (st), and of Sambucus (s), in addition to the *Catalecta*, Miss Fulmer has pointed out, "In some 120 cases sc and t agree in the text of t against st. Fourteen of these readings are in the text of the *Troiae Halosis* and 63 in the *Bellum Civile*. There are 28 readings in the text of t duplicated only in the text of sc, all of them in the *Bellum Civile*."¹⁸ Small wonder that she draws the conclusion, "He [Tornaesius] used sc a great deal, especially for the text of the *Bellum Civile*."¹⁹

IV

This seems to be a fitting point to return to k^{red}. It should be borne in mind that its readings are found as the second set of marginalia in k, the text and first set of marginalia of which have been seen to coincide with the text and the marginalia of the *Bellum civile* printed by Stephanus. That Tornaesius made use of the *Poetae veteres* of Stephanus is clear.²⁰ That Scaliger also expected to use Stephanus materials for the *Appendix Vergiliana* which did not materialize has been referred to previously. Hence, the possibility that there may be some relationship between k^{red} and Tornaesius and/or Scaliger should now be looked into.

¹⁷ McClure (above, note 16) 21.

¹⁸ Fulmer (above, note 12) 53.

¹⁹ Fulmer (above, note 12) 77.

²⁰ Fulmer (above, note 12) 50-52, and Müller (above, note 14) xxi.

In five places a relationship is seen between the readings of k^{red} and marginalia included by Tornaesius, as is evident in the following collation.

Collation 3

- 14 auro] an reo k(circo k^1 $\text{'}\sigma$ auro, $\text{'}\sigma$ caveae k^{red}), Mauri $t(et\ i.m.\ auro\ al'\ circo)$
 49 tam] tam k($\text{'}\sigma$ iam k^{red}), iam $t(et\ i.m.\ tam)$
 92 usus] usum k t , usus k^{red} mt
 111 stratos] strictos k t , stratos k^{red} mt
 232 hic] hinc k t , hic k^{red} mt

A sixth instance of relationship may be discerned in the situation relating to the word *male* in line 30. It is omitted from the text of t but included in the margin; in k it is justified by a k^{red} scholion: "male, id est, improbo more, ut supra male pubescentibus annis." Three possibilities suggest themselves: that Tornaesius drew upon k^{red} for some of his marginalia, that the k^{red} readings were derived from t , that the t marginalia and k^{red} were copied from a common source. Before making a choice from the three, let us note that in quantity the number of ties is not so considerable as to justify our subscribing to either of the first two possibilities suggested.

More impressive is the number of ties between readings of k^{red} and those in the *Catalecta* of Scaliger. In some cases, such as the following, the relationship involves other manuscripts or editions, notably the s of Sambucus.

Collation 4

- 22 fugere] fugere k(fregere k^{red}), fregere s sc
 25 fractique] factique k(fractique k^1 k^{red}), fractique $sc\ s(et\ i.m.\ vulg.\ facti)$
 133 flumina] fulmina k(flumina k^{red}), flumina s sc
 178 omina] omnia k(omina k^{red}), omina $sc\ s(et\ i.m.\ ita\ coniectura\ ducti\ scripsimus\ vulg.\ Omnia\ mox\ fortior\ ominibus)$
 180 insolitae] insolita k(insolitae k^{red}), insolitae s sc
 189 flumina] fulmina k(flumina k^{red}), flumina s sc
 258 liber] Liber k(liber k^{red} $et\ sscr\ liber\ non\ enim\ Bacchum\ intelligit$), liber s sc
 266 diducta] deducta k(diducta k^{red}), deducta s sc

More often, however, the relationship between k^{red} and sc is restricted to those two writings themselves, as is true of the following readings.

Collation 5

- 21 exactaque] exactaque k, exsectaque s, exactaque k^{red} sc
 27 virum quaerunt] iure quaerit k, virum quaerit s(et i.m. ita v.c. iure), virum
 quaerunt k^{red} sc
 58 mersam] mersant k s, mersam k^{red} sc
 61 omnis] omnis k s, omnes k^{red} sc
 98 Sullanus] Syllanus k s, Sullanus k^{red} sc
 111 gemina . . . morte] gemina . . . morte k s, ἴσ gemino . . . Marte k^{red}, gemino
 . . . Marte sc
 128 Titan] titubans s k(ἴσ namque ora cruento Deformi Titan vultum caligine t.
 sic k^{red}), Titan sc
 168 furentes] ferentes s k(ἴσ frequentes l' nocentes l' sequentes k^{red}) sc(et i.m.
 frequentes)
 271 intremuere] intremuere k s, infremuere k^{red} sc

The collation make plain not only the community of k^{red} readings and those in the *Catalecta* of Scaliger, but also the union of the two against some readings of Sambucus. In five instances (21, 27, 61, 98, 111), moreover, the union admits a third member, the autograph edition of Scaliger, L.

V

At this point it is worth recalling that L has been seen to possess a close relationship with the Codex Cuiacianus. Before exploring a possible link between those two writings and k^{red}, we should inquire into the situation involving the latter and L alone. Such an inquiry is furthered by the following collation.

Collation 6

- 5 quae fulvum] quae fulvum k s sc, fulvum quae k^{red} L
 8 usu] usu k, usus s sc, risu k^{red} L(et i.m. usu)
 8 trita] trita k s sc t(tracta mt), tracta k^{red} L(et i.m. trita)
 11 accusatius] accusatius k s, crustas sc t(Silices *St.* accurant *Scal.* mt), *Ip.* accusant
 al' accusatius ἴσ accurant ἴσ advectant, nam et verbo hinc opus est, et illi
 pecuaria habebant amplissima, non solum marmora k^{red}, accusant L(et i.m.
 crustas)
 24 quaerit se natura nec] quare se natam non k s sc, quaerit se natura nec k^{red} L
 28 citrea] citrea k s sc, *Ip.* aurea ἴσ cedrea k^{red}, aurea L(et i.m. al. c.v. citrea)
 30 sensum trahat] sensum turbant k sc, turbant sensum s, sensum trahat L
 30 hoc sterile] hostile k s sc t, sterile k^{red} L

- 32 essurit] extruit k, exstruit s, esurit k^{red} L(et i.m. al. v.c. essur)
 34 atque] atque k t(inde mt) L(et i.m. inde), Γp. inde ῑσ inque vel eque k^{red}
 36 phasidos] phasidis k s sc, phasidos k^{red} L
 47 dedecoris populo] dedecoris populo k s, dedecus est populi sc t(dedecori populo mt), dedecori populo k^{red} L
 51 gemino] geminam k s st(et i.m. gemino), tergemino sc t(et i.m. Praetera ge.), gemino k¹ k^{red}(et i.m. Γp. gemino, luxuria scilicet et ambitione) L
 55 latrantibus] latrantibus k sc L(et i.m. lacerantibus), ῑσ lacerantibus l' latitantibus k^{red}
 60 excita] excissa k, excissa s, excita t(excissa mt), Γp. excisa id est, coercita, constrata sic super usque exciderat k^{red}, excisa sc L
 69 cocyti] cocyta k sc s(et i.m. f. Cocyti vel Cocytea), cocyti k^{red}, Cocyti L
 71 tellus] vellus k(tellus k^{red}), tellus L
 80 Fors . . . potestas] om. k s sc, hab. k^{red} L
 92 vanos] vanus k s, varius sc t(varios mt), varios k^{red} L
 92 usus] usum k s sc t(usus mt), usus k^{red} L
 93 fatentur] fatentur k t(iubentur mt) L(et i.m. iubentur), iubentur k^{red}
 102 tunc] tunc k s sc, tum k^{red} L
 105 tibi cedent] mihi cedunt k sc s(et i.m. cedent v.c.) t(tibi cedent mt), tibi cedent k^{red} L
 114 claustra] castra k s sc, Γp. claustra k^{red}, claustra L(et i.m. al. castra)
 120 mande] manda k(et ssc mande k^{red}), pande L(et i.m. al. manda l. mande)
 134 Martem] mortem k s sc, Martem k^{red} L
 140 imbre] igne k s, imbre k^{red} sc L t(igne mt)
 149 mansuescit radiis] mansuescunt radii k s sc, mansuescit radijs k^{red}, mansuescit radiis L
 185 vincta] iuncta k s sc, vincta k^{red} L
 186 horrore quievit] quievit honore k s sc L(et i.m. v.c. horrore quievit), horrore quievit k^{red}
 191 stabant et vincta] stabat et victa k, stantibus at victa sc, vinctaque mox stabant s(et i.m. ita v.c.), Γp. stabant k^{red}, Γp. et vincta k^{red}, stabant et vincta L
 194 pariter] passim k s sc, pariter k^{red} L
 210 volucer] volucer k s sc t(volucris mt), volucris k^{red}, volucrum L(et i.m. al. volucris volucer)
 212 hoc] haec k s sc L(et i.m. al. v.c. hoc), hoc k^{red}
 212 tonitru ferit] tonitru fert k, attonito fert t(tonitru ferit mt), tonitru k^{red}(et i.m. ῑσ Atque hoc Romano tonitru ferit omnia,) tonitru ferit L
 220 temptare] tentata k t(tentare mt), tentare k^{red} L
 220 uti] acti k s(et i.m. v.c. icti f. actus), actus sc t(uti mt), uti k^{red} L
 232 hic] hinc k s sc t(hic mt), hic k^{red} L
 237 dat vela] vela dat k, dat vela k^{red} L
 282 erumpit] erupit k, erumpit k^{red} L

Analysis of the collation produces the following observations. First, the relations between the readings of k^{red} and those of L are more

numerous and more striking than the relations between k^{red} and sc. Second, the marginalia of Tornaesius often suggest a reading paralleled in the k^{red} -L alliance against other readings. One explanation of both conditions involves the part that may have been played by the Codex Cuiacianus. It should be recalled that this codex (1) was seen by Scaliger while he was engaged in the preparation of his *Catalecta*, (2) is regarded as one of the sources of L, and (3) is believed to be one of two *exemplaria* specifically mentioned by Tornaesius—the one he acquired after his edition of the *Satiricon* was already in the process of being printed. If the Cuiacianus is accepted as a source of the k^{red} readings, the situations implicit in Collations 3, 4, and 6—all three—become entirely plausible. For his *Catalecta* Scaliger probably made more extensive use of the editions of Stephanus and of Sambucus than of the Codex Cuiacianus, which he had seen only a short time before. That he also used a florilegium-type manuscript seems likely. For his autograph edition, which was prepared somewhat later than the *Catalecta*, he drew more heavily from the Cuiacianus. From that codex were drawn also some of the readings of k^{red} . This explanation does not account for all of the k^{red} readings or for some of the conjectures which their author sees fit to suggest, to be sure, but it emerges as a plausible accounting for most of them.