

## CODEX VAT. LAT. 1608: A SOURCE FOR CATULLUS

GERALD J. O'GORMAN

*St. Louis College of Pharmacy*

The text of the poems of Catullus, in precarious dependence after the late Middle Ages upon the continuing existence of one manuscript (the Veronensis, later lost),<sup>1</sup> subsequently proliferated—the earthy poet became quite popular with Renaissance humanists—into an incalculable number of manuscripts, of which at least eighty dating from the end of the fourteenth century through the fifteenth are extant.<sup>2</sup> Generally recognized today by students of Catullus as direct—or indirect through the intermediary of a lost *alpha* manuscript—copies of the Veronensis manuscript (= V) are the three earliest codices: Oxoniensis Canonicianus class. lat. 30, *saec.* xiv (= O), revealed by Robinson Ellis in 1867; Parisinus lat. 14137, *a.* 1375 (= G), brought to light by C. I. Sillig in 1830; and Ottobonianus lat. 1829, *saec* xiv *ex.* (= R), discovered by William Hale in 1896. Senior to OGR but containing only Catullus 62 is the ninth century florilegium, Parisinus lat. 8071, called the Thuanus (= T). The remaining manuscripts, with several exceptions to be noted below, have been commonly regarded, and therefore ignored, by editors of Catullus as *recentiores ergo deteriores*.

During the past one hundred years O and G have enjoyed full, respectable careers as bases for critical texts and editions by Schwabe,

<sup>1</sup> Existing copies and descendants reflect the strong likelihood that the lost Verona manuscript was written in Gothic script; V in turn was probably copied from a French manuscript. See B. L. Ullman, "The Transmission of the Text of Catullus," *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* (Firenze 1960?) 1037.

<sup>2</sup> Hale found evidence—did he actually view the mss?—of 120 manuscripts; R. A. B. Mynors reports over 80 at hand, and ten more in the apparatuses of predecessors. Cf. William G. Hale, "The Manuscripts of Catullus," *CP* 3 (1908) 233–56, and R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *Catulli Carmina* (Oxford 1958; reprinted with corrections 1960) viii.

Ellis, Baehrens, Pascal, LaFaye, Kroll, and Schuster. On the contrary, although R had been originally the property of Coluccio Salutati, whose death in 1406 authenticates the early date of the codex, this significant manuscript until a decade ago had received relatively scant attention from editors. For instance, Robinson Ellis in his 1904 OCT edition of the *Carmina* betrays a reluctance to commit himself textually about the role of R in the Catullan recension;<sup>3</sup> even though Ellis admitted that R, because of its early date, had value, he avoided any dependence upon it for vexatious passages, preferring O or G readings or, in maddening inconsistency, the readings of one or another of the ten minor manuscripts he was juggling in his *apparatus*. Carol Pascal in his 1916 edition agreed with Ellis upon the equality of R with OG; yet he, like Ellis, cited R only infrequently in his critical appendix.<sup>4</sup>

The Budé edition of Catullus by George LaFaye, published in 1922, openly acknowledged the usefulness of R readings in the reconstruction of the archetype;<sup>5</sup> LaFaye, however, diffused the manuscript's import by elevating almost to the level of OGR two other manuscripts—Berolinensis Diezianus B. Sant. 37, a. 1463 (=D), Lachmann's primary source for his 1829 edition of Catullus, and Venetus Marcianus lat. xii 80, *saec.* xv *in.* (=M), apparently an offspring of R corrected.<sup>6</sup> LaFaye furnished only a handful of citations from R.

The Teubner edition of Catullus, published in 1923, was distinctive for the archaic flavor of its *apparatus criticus* as drawn by its editor, William Kroll.<sup>7</sup> He cited no manuscripts other than OG (and T for poem 62) except by a general siglum denoting an indistinguishable mass of *deteriores*—a practice prevalent in nineteenth century critical texts. Published in 1949 was the new Teubner edition by Maurice Schuster, who did not personally survey any manuscripts but simply em-

<sup>3</sup> *Catulli Carmina* (Oxford 1904). Ellis' unwillingness to employ R widely in his edition was at least partly if not wholly stemming from scholarly deference to Hale, the discoverer of R, whose promised full collation of R was due at any moment. In his preface Ellis remarks: "non sum ausus omnia [ex R] uulgare, ne inuenti sui gloriam auctori uiderer praeripere" (p. ix).

<sup>4</sup> *Q. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Torino 1916).

<sup>5</sup> *Catulle: Poésies* (Paris 1922).

<sup>6</sup> For M, see Mynors (above, note 2) vii and Ullman (above, note 1) 1051. Ullman, 1052-53, exposes D as merely a copy of a valueless ms in the Riccardiana Library.

<sup>7</sup> *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig 1923).

ployed the apparatuses of previous editors.<sup>8</sup> His judgment, in agreement with many of his predecessors, was that O is the best copy of V.

Yet despite the seeming multitude of editions of Catullus since 1900, what was clearly needed in the mid-twentieth century was a fresh, first-hand, impartial investigation of the primary manuscripts, especially R;<sup>9</sup> such a study emerged in print in 1958.

R. A. B. Mynors, in addition to making thorough use of O and G in the preparation of his 1958 *OCT* edition,<sup>10</sup> also investigated and employed extensively the oft-ignored R, particularly the numerous corrections by later hands found in the manuscript. The paramount crux in the R text is the status of these corrections, which Mynors unwillingly but helplessly designates under the common siglum r.<sup>11</sup> The sources, the sequence, the authority of these corrections, i.e. of r, are shrouded in our ignorance of the correctors, but one consequence of the publication of Mynors' edition has been a quickening of scholarly interest in R and its corrected readings. In a review of Mynors' edition in the *American Journal of Philology*, Philip Levine laments Mynors' lack of differentiating information about the correctors of R.<sup>12</sup> Noting that Mynors properly separates early corrections from the original text by the symbol r, Levine deplores the confusing inclusion under R of variants and other additions by one or more hands different from that of the first scribe.<sup>13</sup> Levine, in general praise of the independent and extensive study embodied in Mynors' critical apparatus,

<sup>8</sup> *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig 1949). Schuster ix confesses his dependence: "Ludovicum Schwabe et Rob. Ellis et C. P. Schulze editionibus suis apparatus criticos intentissima cura confectos adiecisse nemo ignorat; quibus cum in recensendo carminum Catullianorum textu tum in adnotatione critica adornanda me usum esse fundamentis ingenue profiteor."

<sup>9</sup> R. G. C. Levens—in *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*, ed. Maurice Platnauer (Oxford 1954) 298—makes this precise point: "What has chiefly been lacking in recent editions of Catullus, and what must chiefly be looked for from future editors, is independence of judgment based on first-hand study of the MSS; in particular, the status of R needs clarifying." Ullman (above, note 1) 1054 echoes the thought.

<sup>10</sup> Mynors (above, note 2). Unless otherwise indicated, citations of Catullus in this paper are from the text and *apparatus criticus* of the 1960 reprint.

<sup>11</sup> Mynors declares: "correxerunt plures manus, quas hic omnes praeter recentissimas invitus r appello." Hale—in "Catullus Once More," *CR* 20 (1906) 160—reported at least eight hands in R.

<sup>12</sup> *AJP* 80 (1959) 415–24.

<sup>13</sup> Levine (above, note 12) 418.

concludes that the variant readings in R are far more complicated than Mynors' edition indicates and that until a searching paleographical examination unravels R's secrets, the manuscript must remain controversial.<sup>14</sup>

Unconcerned at least momentarily about the separation and identification of the correctors, G. P. Goold notes in a lengthy, detailed review in *Phoenix*:

Sometimes we are confronted with indications that some of the readings which Mynors denotes by r represent a genuine tradition going back to the archetype; and Hale was evidently of like opinion: "the text of Catullus must be based on OGR and R<sup>2</sup> [Mynors' r]."<sup>15</sup>

Later in his review Goold reiterates, in reference to r readings, his conviction that "some certainly—possibly many—are not conjectures but part of a genuine tradition."<sup>16</sup>

Goold's thesis—that some corrections gathered under Mynors' r represent an independent, trustworthy tradition—finds reinforcement in Mynors' frequent acceptance of r readings over those of OGR. Of the 191 r readings cited by Mynors, he accepted over 130 into his text, in most instances without support of either O or G.<sup>17</sup> If it may be assumed that Goold is correct in his evaluation of r readings and that Mynors' editorial choice of r over OGR is indicative of r's merit, then it is obvious that another manuscript containing numerous r readings in its text takes on special value as a possible source of additional information about that tradition. It is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that codex Vat. Lat. 1608 (folios 1<sup>r</sup>-41<sup>v</sup>), a. 1479 (henceforth designated K), includes a remarkable number of such readings.<sup>18</sup> The sole modern editor who has taken note of this

<sup>14</sup> Levine (above, note 12) 420.

<sup>15</sup> "A New Text of Catullus," *Phoenix* 12 (July 1958) 97.

<sup>16</sup> Goold (above, note 15) 98.

<sup>17</sup> Of the 191 r readings, Mynors accepted 109 without concurrence of O or G; in 22 other cases r joins with O or G—never with both—to preserve the best reading.

<sup>18</sup> The study of Vat. Lat. 1608 presented here is based upon a microfilm copy on deposit at the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University. Regarding the manuscript's date, Hale and Mynors both give 1479 without explanation. Vat. Lat. 1608 has evidently been identified with the codex referred to in the following entry from Vatican Library records: "1479. Computa bibliothecae apostolice. Satisfeci scriptori qui scripsit Catullum poetam et Priapeiam Virgilii simul in bonis litteris ducatis

manuscript is Mynors, who in his preface lists K without comment among other late manuscripts.<sup>19</sup> In response to an inquiry from this writer, Professor Mynors stated in a private letter that he did not collate any Vatican manuscripts completely except the Romanus and that he looked at the others only where the text was not securely established by O, G, and R.<sup>20</sup>

A study of Mynors' *apparatus criticus* reveals that he cited four readings from K, three of which he adopted into his text: 55.16 *luci*; 63.77 *pecoris*; and 97.5 *hoc*. These emend the readings *lucet*, *pectoris*, and *hic* of OGR. At 58.5 the *magnanimos Remi* of K, supplanting the impossible *magna admiremini* of OGR, is partially accepted through Vossius' *magnanimi Remi*. That K contains an impressively large percentage of the corrected readings in R was not noted by Mynors; in truth, he was doubtless unaware of the textual correspondence between r and K.

That K was not copied directly from O or any of O's descendants is confirmed by the retention in K of lines omitted by O: 26.2, 61.143, 62.43-44, 64.330, 64.379-81. Likewise K cannot be regarded *prima facie* as a direct descendant of either G or R since it contains the lines 92.3-4, omitted by both documents. Further evidence of disparity between K and the primary codices will be indicated in the course of the paper.

In his *apparatus criticus* Mynors cites 191 readings of r; in 133 instances the readings correspond with those of K. Within the cluster of Kr readings, the following are the instances wherein such readings have been rejected by Mynors. Coupled with each common error is Mynors' reading together with his source:<sup>21</sup>

3.16 *bellus ille* Kr, *o miselle* edit. 1473

4.6 *negant* Kr, *negat* OGR

tribus, die ultima maii 1479." Eugène Müntz and Paul Fabre, *La Bibliothèque Du Vatican Au XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris 1887) 155. Only "*saec. xv ex.*" is given in *Codices Vaticani Latini*, III (Codd. 1461-2059), ed. Bartholomeus Nogara (Rome 1912) 95.

<sup>19</sup> Mynors (above, note 2) x.

<sup>20</sup> Letter to the author from Professor R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford University, November 13, 1961.

<sup>21</sup> The Greek letters found here and elsewhere in this paper are Mynors' sigla denoting groups of fifteenth century manuscripts, arranged according to the evolution of emendations. For further information on these groupings, see Mynors ix-xi.

- 4.11 *citherio* r, *cythereo* K, *cytorio* η  
 4.13 *cithori* r, *cythori* K, *cytore* η  
 5.8 *deinde* mi Kr, *dein mille* Aldina || *da* Kr, *dein* Aldina  
 9.2 *antistes* Kr, *antistans* Avantius  
 10.13 *facerent* Kr, *faceret* OGR  
 11.3 *ubi* Kr, *ut* OGR  
 11.11 *horribiles* Kr, *horribile* Haupt  
 37.2 *pileatis* Kr, *pilleatis* OGR  
 38.2 *male est* si Kr, *malest* Lachmann  
 44.11 *petitorum* Kr, *petitorem* OGR  
 46.3 *auris* Kr, *aureis* OGR  
 48.4 *umquam* Kr, *numquam* OGR  
 55.13 *herculis* Kr, *herculei* OGR  
 61.197 *cupis capis* Kr, *cupis cupis* OR (G has -a-)  
 62.8 *certe* Kr, *certest* Haupt  
 62.28 *quod* Kr, *quae* T  
 62.32 *aequalem* Kr, *aequales* OGR  
 62.40 *contusus* Kr, *conuolsus* T  
 62.45 *suis sed* Kr, *suis est* T  
 64.180 *quem uae* r, *quemue* K, *quemne* OGR  
 64.227 *obscura* Kr, *obscurata* OGR  
 67.12 *isti* Kr, *istius* OGR  
 76.18 *extrema* Kr, *extremam* cod. Berol.  
 84.2 *insidias* Kr, *hinsidias* Politianus and Calphurnius

It is worth noting that Mynors declined in over half the cases above to employ the reading found in OGR—an editorial procedure which suggests at the minimum a slight distrust of OGR readings that contradict r.

The following list includes the over 100 instances in which r readings promoted over OGR into Mynors' text are shared by K:

2.3	<i>cui</i>    <i>appetenti</i>	4.27	<i>castor</i>	14.16	<i>abibit</i>
2 <sup>b</sup> .3	<i>ligatam</i>	5.13	<i>tantum</i>	16.3	<i>me</i>
3.9	<i>circumsiliens</i>	6.17	<i>uersu</i>	22.17	<i>tamque</i>
	<i>illuc</i>	7.5	<i>oraclum</i>	28.10	<i>trabe</i>
3.14	<i>orci quae</i>	8.4	<i>quo</i>	28.11	<i>fuistis</i>
3.16	<i>o</i> (1 <sup>o</sup> )	10.3	<i>tum</i>	29.14	<i>comesset</i>
4.4-5	<i>siue</i> . . . <i>siue</i>	10.7	<i>se</i>	30.6	<i>cui ue</i> K,
4.8	<i>Thraciam</i> K,	10.22	<i>fractum qui</i>		<i>cuiue</i> r
	<i>traciam</i> r	10.31	<i>ad</i>	35.12	<i>amore</i>
4.20	<i>uocaret aura</i>	10.33	<i>tu insulsa</i>	37.16	<i>semitarii</i>
4.25	<i>haec</i>	11.11-12	<i>ulti/mosque</i>	41.4	<i>formiani</i>

42.7	<i>illa</i>	52.3	<i>peierat</i>	64.239	<i>ceu</i>
44.10	<i>conuiuia</i>	55.12	<i>en</i>	64.249	<i>tum</i>
45.3	<i>perdite</i>	55.18	<i>tenes</i>	64.253	<i>te</i>
45.5	<i>pote</i>	61.4	<i>hymenaeae hymen</i>	64.255	<i>heu hoe . . . heu</i>
45.10	<i>at acme</i>	61.13	<i>tinnulla K,</i>		<i>hoe K,</i>
45.12	<i>suauiaata K,</i>		<i>tinnula r</i>		<i>euohe . . . euohe</i>
	<i>sauiaata r</i>	61.61	<i>nil</i>		<i>r</i>
45.13	<i>septimille</i>	61.110-11	<i>quae . . . quae</i>	64.262	<i>tinnitus</i>
45.14	<i>uni</i>	61.114	<i>o pueri</i>	64.267	<i>thessala</i>
45.17	<i>sinistra ut</i>	61.119	<i>taceat</i>	64.275	<i>refulgent</i>
45.21	<i>acmen</i>	61.134	<i>male</i>	64.276	<i>linquentes</i>
45.24	<i>libidinesque</i>	61.161	<i>rasilemque</i>	64.280	<i>campi</i>
46.5	<i>aestuose K,</i>	61.226	<i>bene uiuite</i>	64.282	<i>aura</i>
	<i>estuose r</i>	62.58	<i>cara</i>	64.290	<i>nutanti    sorore</i>
46.10	<i>quos</i>	64.7	<i>uerrentes</i>	64.293	<i>uelatum</i>
47.4	<i>praeposuit</i>	64.22	<i>seclorum</i>	64.311	<i>colum</i>
48.1	<i>iuuenti</i>	64.61	<i>saxea</i>	64.328	<i>optata</i>
48.6	<i>sit</i>	64.62	<i>et</i>	65.16	<i>bacchiade K,</i>
49.7	<i>patronus</i>	64.106	<i>sudanti</i>		<i>bactiade r</i>
50.7	<i>abii</i>	64.145	<i>praegestit</i>	66.71	<i>pace</i>
50.8	<i>facetiisque</i>	64.164	<i>auris</i>	67.37	<i>hic</i>
50.10	<i>somnus K,</i>	64.195	<i>meas</i>	68.73	<i>amore</i>
	<i>sompnus r</i>	64.212	<i>moenia</i>	76.11	<i>tu</i>
50.12	<i>uersarer</i>	64.213	<i>concrederet</i>	76.26	<i>mi</i>
51.1	<i>mi</i>		<i>aegeus</i>	89.4	<i>macer</i>
51.3-4	<i>te/spectat</i>	64.219	<i>cui</i>	97.8	<i>meientis</i>
51.10	<i>flamma</i>	64.224	<i>infuso</i>	102.1	<i>amico</i>
51.11	<i>tintinant</i>	64.235	<i>sustollant</i>		

The existence of such a multitude of instances of agreement between K and r can hardly be accidental; it points inescapably to the conclusion that one of these sets of readings has been derived from the other, or that the two descend independently from some common source, identity unknown. That K could not be a copy of R corrected is proven not only by the presence in K of lines omitted from R, but also by the plethora of readings wherein K agrees with the established text against R. The following list, representing but a small fraction of such readings, includes Mynors' sources as well as the R (and in most cases OG) readings:

- 5.11 *conturbabimus*  $\theta$  & K, *conturbauimus* OGR
- 6.8 *fragrans* Itali & K, *flagrans* OGR
- 7.6 *batti* ed. Rom. & K, *beati* OGR (*al. beari* GR)
- 9.9 *suauiaabor*  $\zeta\eta$  & K, *suabior* OGR
- 10.1 *uarius*  $\gamma$  & K, *uarius* OGR
- 10.24 *decu*t  $\theta$  & K, *docu*t OGR

- 11.13 *feret*  $\eta$  & K, *fere* OGR  
 12.16 *amem*  $\delta$  & K, *almeni* R, *ameni* OG  
 16.8 *sunt* Pliny & K, *sint* OGR  
 17.1 *o colonia quae*  $\delta$  & K, *oculo in aque* OGR  
 17.18 *se edit.* 1472 & K, *me* OGR  
 21.4 *pedicare*  $\delta$  & K, *dedicare* OGR  
 33.8 *potes asse uenditare*  $\eta$  & K, *potest ase uendicare* OGR  
 34.12 *amnumque* cod. Pisarenensis & K, *omnumque* O, *omnum* GR  
 42.15 *hoc satis* OG & K, *satis hoc* R  
 55.1 *molestum est*  $\beta$  & K, *molestus es* OGR  
 62.17 *nunc* T & K, *non* OGR  
 64.20 *tum* M & K, *cum* OGR  
 64.139 *blanda* O & K, *nobis* GR  
 64.183 *lentos* O & K, *uentos* GR  
 66.83 *colitis* OG & K, *queritis* R

Although consideration must be given to the possibility that some of the r readings were obtained directly from K (which would in itself establish K as a very important manuscript), in view of the late date of K it seems quite unlikely that such could have been the case. It is more probable that K derives ultimately from some lost manuscript which was the direct or indirect source of the r readings.

If such a probability is accepted as the explanation for possession by K of so many r readings, then it follows that the other readings in K should be of special interest as possibly preserving further notable features of the lost manuscript—which obviously must have been of considerable excellence. That K's worth in the Catullan manuscript tradition is not limited simply to supporting r readings is evident in the following list wherein K anticipates or duplicates emendations of modern editors accepted by Mynors:

- 6.13 *ecfututa* Lachmann & K, *et futura* OGR  
 22.8 *derecta* Statius, *directa* K, *detecta* OGR  
 31.5 *Thuniam* Schwabe, *thyniam* B. Guarinus & K, *thimiam* OGR  
 61.12 *concinsens* Mynors & K, *continens* OGR, *concines* r  
 61.40/50 *o hymen hymenaeae* Lachmann & K, *o hymeneae hymeneae hymen* OGR, *hymen o hymeneae hymen* r  
 63.62 *figuraest* Lachmann & K, *figura est* OGR  
 64.21 *tum* Aldina & K, *cum* OGR  
 66.63 *uuidulam* A. Guarinus & K, *uindulum* OGR, *uividulum* r  
 68.109 *pheneum* Avantius & K, *peneum* OGR



In the light of the evidence presented, it is clear that K must be considered an important element of Catullan manuscript tradition. Its affinity with r, both in “common errors” and in accepted readings, its persistent agreement with the established text against the readings of OGR, its anticipation of emendations by modern editors—all point to the excellence of K as a source of new textual information. Its meritorious readings should be given serious consideration by future editors of Catullus as possible improvements of the text.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> My gratitude is extended to the anonymous referee of the Association whose frank yet gracious comments indicated paths of improvement.