

## ARCHIVIO DI SAN PIETRO H 36 AS A SOURCE FOR JULIUS SEVERIANUS

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

*Saint Louis University*

*Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae* by Julius Severianus, though a minor rhetorical work, has considerable interest for the classicist for the reason that it deals extensively with works by Cicero. The standard critical edition of this by Halm<sup>1</sup> is based on only three manuscripts: Würzburg, Univ. Bibl. M. P. Misc. F 5a, saec. VIII-IX (= A); Monacensis lat. 14436, saec. XII (= E); and Monacensis lat. 756, saec. XV (= V).<sup>2</sup> In addition, three early printed editions are cited extensively.

In the interval since the publication of Halm's text in 1863 only a limited amount of information about additional manuscripts of Julius Severianus has come to light. In the Introduction to his edition of the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus R. A. B. Mynors pointed out in 1937 that certain Cassiodorus manuscripts along with certain manuscripts of Julius Severianus can be regarded as constituting a single family ( $\phi$ ) since all of them have the same contents: (1) Cassiodorus, *Inst. Saec. Litt.*, form II; (2) a short tract *De Topicis*; (3) a tract *De Syllogismis et Parallogismis*; (4) an anonymous *Computus Paschalis*; (5) a tract *De Propositonum Modis*; (6) Julius Severianus, *Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae*; and (7) *Excerpta de Dialecticis Locis* (which is a collection of excerpts from the second book of Boethius, *De Differentiis Topicis*). In addition to the Würzburg manuscript utilized by Halm this family, according to Mynors, includes three others: a Reichenau manuscript, Karlsruhe Augiensis 171, saec. IX; Parisinus lat. 2200, saec. IX; and Milan Ambros. D. 17 *infra*, an. 1462.<sup>3</sup>

In 1692 Giuseppe Billanovich, in classifying a copy of Severianus

<sup>1</sup> Carolus Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig 1863) 353-70.

<sup>2</sup> Halm (above, note 1) 354. For a facsimile of A and additional details about the manuscript see E. A. Lowe, *CLA*, Part IX (Oxford 1959) 46, plate 1402.

<sup>3</sup> R. A. B. Mynors, *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones* (Oxford 1937) xxiv-xxvi.

contained in a tenth-century manuscript which once belonged to Petrarch but is now an uncatalogued manuscript in the Bodmer collection, calls attention to a second family of Severianus manuscripts distinct from the  $\phi$  family mentioned above.<sup>4</sup> This second family (which is made up of a copy in the *Heptateuchon* of Thierry of Chartres—Chartres 497, saec. XII;<sup>5</sup> Parisinus lat. 7231, saec. XI; Parisinus lat. 7696, saec. XI; and Parisinus lat. 7713, saec. XV)<sup>6</sup> is characterized by the inclusion of Cicero, *Partitiones Oratoriae*, along with the work of Severianus. The Bodmer manuscript is added to the second family by Billanovich since it, too, has this work by Cicero included in conjunction with the text of Severianus.

It may be concluded from the information presented above that early manuscripts of Severianus are comparatively rare, inasmuch as only four of those discussed in printed literature date from the tenth century or earlier. It is the purpose of this paper to indicate that another early manuscript, thus far unnoticed by scholars, exists in Arch. S. Pietro H 36. This codex is made up of portions of two separate manuscripts which have been bound together.<sup>7</sup> The first part contains (ff. 1<sup>r</sup>–57<sup>v</sup>) a ninth-century copy of the *De Arithmetica* of Boethius preceded by Isidore, *De Arithmetica* (*Etym.* 3.1–9), and followed by miscellaneous other statements about arithmetic; and (ff. 58<sup>r</sup>–63<sup>r</sup>) a portion of the *Satires* of Persius, usually dated at the end of the ninth century; and (ff. 63<sup>v</sup>–64<sup>v</sup>) a short poem ascribed to Ausonius (*Anthologia Latina* 645) and some ecclesiastical material. The text of the *De Arithmetica* of Boethius in Arch. S. Pietro H 36 is obviously closely related to the copy found in Pal. lat. 1341, an early ninth-century

<sup>4</sup> Giuseppe Billanovich, "Il Petrarca e i Retori Latini Minori," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 5 (1962) 103–64.

<sup>5</sup> According to Billanovich (above, note 4) 116 this manuscript was destroyed during World War II. It should be noted, however, that a microfilm copy of the codex is available at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>6</sup> Billanovich (above, note 4) 116.

<sup>7</sup> Information about the Vatican manuscripts discussed in this paper is based on microfilm copies of these manuscripts placed at my disposal by the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University. Since 1940 the Archivio di S. Pietro has been a part of the Vatican Library. Thus far no printed catalogue of the Latin MSS in this collection has been published, but several handwritten inventories are in the Vatican Library. For a list of these see Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Latin Manuscript Books Before 1600* (New York 1960) 214. Microfilm copies of these are available in the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

Lorsch manuscript,<sup>8</sup> since the same material from Isidore serves as a preface to Boethius in both manuscripts. Neither, however, can be a copy of the other, since each preserves correct readings where the other has errors or omissions. The text of Persius contained in this manuscript is well known to classicists, since it has frequently been utilized in the preparations of critical editions of Persius. The text of the poem ascribed to Ausonius was collated by Riese in his edition of *Anthologia Latina*.<sup>9</sup>

The second part of Arch. S. Pietro H 36, ff. 65–72 (which will henceforth be designated B), is obviously the final portion of a longer manuscript which belonged to the  $\phi$  family of Cassiodorus-Severianus manuscripts since it contains (ff. 65<sup>r</sup>–69<sup>v</sup>) *Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae* of Julius Severianus and (ff. 69<sup>v</sup>–72<sup>v</sup>) the same excerpts from Book 2 of the *De Differentiis Topicis* of Boethius which are found as the last item in all the other  $\phi$  manuscripts. The text is in a clear Carolingian hand which may be dated around A.D. 820 since *t* with an apostrophe over it and *t* with a 2-shaped symbol over it are both used for *-tur* on numerous occasions and *t* with an apostrophe is used once for *-tus*.<sup>10</sup>

Of the two ninth-century manuscripts of Severianus previously discussed in print, Parisinus lat. 2200 is reported as dating from about the middle of the century<sup>11</sup> and Karlsruhe Augiensis 171 is ascribed to the early part of the century.<sup>12</sup> Hence the latter is of approximately the same age as B, which shares with it the distinction of being, next after the Würzburg manuscript, one of the two earliest sources of Severianus. In spite of the fact that these two documents are just

<sup>8</sup> See Chauncey E. Finch, "Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* in Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 1341," *TAPA* 97 (1966) 184; Bernhard Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Munich 1974) 47.

<sup>9</sup> Alexander Riese, *Anth. Lat.*, part 1, fasc. 2 (Leipzig 1906) 111–12.

<sup>10</sup> Edward Kennard Rand, "On the Symbols of Abbreviations for *-tur*," *Speculum* 2 (1927) 52–65.

<sup>11</sup> Mynors (above, note 3) xxiv in describing the portion of Parisinus lat. 2200 which contains Cassiodorus and Severianus designates it as being written "in a large IXth-century hand" without providing additional details as to dating. Claudio Leonardi, in his catalogue of the manuscripts of Martianus Capella, includes a description of this manuscript because it includes some material from Capella. On the authority of Bischoff he ascribes to it the date "sec. IX in-med." ("I Codici di Marziano Capella," *Aevum* 34 [1960] 427–28).

<sup>12</sup> Mynors (above, note 3) xxiv, who uses as his source Alfred Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, Erster Band (Leipzig 1906) 401–03.

about equal in the matter of age, however, B is in one respect definitely superior to the Reichenau manuscript, since its text is practically complete,<sup>13</sup> whereas the Reichenau document, by reason of a rearrangement of its folios, has lost from the body of its text the 53 lines intervening between *cogebantur* (367.1) and *solitudine* (368.26).<sup>14</sup>

Several features in the script of B suggest that it was copied in a Continental scriptorium under Insular influence. The symbol ÷ is used for *est* (357.27). The letters *t* and *s* are in many cases almost identical in form as in Pointed Insular hands. Frequent use is made of *i longa*. The abbreviation *eī*; for *eius* is found three times (363.8; 368.18; 369.21). Lindsay calls attention to the use of *eī* for *eius* in various Continental monasteries of Insular origin such as Fulda, Würzburg, Freising, and Murbach<sup>15</sup> and to the fact that *ei*; is used for *eius* in Insular script.<sup>16</sup> The form used in B seems to be a combination of the two, and thus may be assumed to point to Insular influence.

There are 47 instances in B in which *t* with an apostrophe is used for *-tur* as opposed to only five cases in which *t* with the 2-shaped symbol is used for *-tur*. It is quite possible, in view of the large preponderance of instances of *t* with the apostrophe, that the 2-shaped symbol apparently used in the remaining five cases was originally an apostrophe and that this was in each case converted into the 2-shaped symbol by the addition of an extra stroke by a later hand. If this is true, it might be argued that the manuscript was copied even earlier than A.D. 820. This conclusion is rendered somewhat doubtful, however, by the one instance in which *t* with an apostrophe is used for *-tus* (*inventus* 369.29).<sup>17</sup>

The classification of B as a member of the  $\phi$  family proposed above on the basis of external evidence is fully borne out by the internal evidence, since the readings of this manuscript agree very closely with those of A, the oldest manuscript of the  $\phi$  family. The following are instances in which A and B agree in error against all other sources cited by Halm: 355.11 *certos* ] *certus* AB; 356.30 *gesta sunt* ] *facta sunt* AB || *in militia* ] *in militiam* AB; 358.7 *sibi* ] *sivi* AB; 359.20 *replebis* ] *reples* AB; 360.9 *adversario* ] *adversa* AB; 360.18 *passuum* ] *passum* AB; 361.22

<sup>13</sup> A few words near the margins of some folios in B have been rendered obscure by mildewing.

<sup>14</sup> Holder (above, note 12) 402.

<sup>15</sup> W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915) 39.

<sup>16</sup> Lindsay (above, note 15) 40.

<sup>17</sup> Lindsay (above, note 15) 372-74.

*inquit* ] *inquit* AB; 364.1 *omnia* ] *omnis* AB; 364.21 *acerbum* ] *acervum* AB; 364.27 *penetravit* ] *penetrabit* AB; 365.31 *sed* (second) ] *et* AB; 366.10 *actum iri* ] *hac. tui. ri.* A, *actui* B; 367.10 *sumuntur* ] *sumatur* AB; 368.11 *si me isto pacto* ] *sisto pacto* AB; 369.22 *Vareno* ] *bareno* AB; 369.25 *periurio* ] *peiurio* AB.

In addition to the examples cited above there are, of course, several instances in which B agrees in error with A and one or more other sources.

In this same connection note should be taken of the following cases in which B agrees with A against all the other recorded sources in preserving the correct reading: 364.14 *patiat* AB; 367.16 *illud est* AB; 368.4 *magis* AB.

While the evidence just cited makes it abundantly clear that the relationship existing between A and B is a very close one, it is at the same time quite certain that B could not have been copied from A, as is shown by the following list of instances in which B has retained the correct reading where A is in error: 355.1 *atque* B, *adque* A; 355.21 *sed et historiarum* ] *sed et hystoriarum* B, *sed et storiarum* A; 356.4 *atque* B, *adque* A; 357.22–23 *quaecumque enim* B, *quae enim* A; 360.10–11 *inbecilla* B, *invecilla* A; 362.3 *livor* B, *libor* A; 365.10 *res ista* B, *res sta* A; 365.22 *livor* B, *libor* A; 365.29 *eum quem cum* B, *eum cum* A; 366.1 *pudicitiae* B, *pudicitia* A; 366.5 *livorem* B, *liborem* A; 366.24 *livor* B, *libor* A; 368.14 *mari* B, *ma* A; 368.19 *istius* B, *stius* A.

While some of the errors of A noted above are of such a minor nature that they presumably could have been corrected by the scribe of B had he been copying from A, this certainly is not true of all of them. On the contrary, it seems clear that A and B were copied separately from some common source, and therefore B has considerable value as an independent witness to the text of the *Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae* of Julius Severianus.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> In addition to the copy of Julius Severianus in Arch. S. Pietro H 36, I know of three late manuscripts of this work in the Vatican Library: (1) Vat. lat. 3402, ff. 106<sup>v</sup>–118<sup>v</sup>, saec. XV–XVI, copied by Nicolaus Lyburnius; (2) Vat. lat. 5216, ff. 18<sup>r</sup>–23<sup>r</sup>, saec. XV–XVI; and (3) Urb. lat. 452, ff. 215<sup>r</sup>–224<sup>r</sup>, saec. XV (see Cosimus Stornajolo, *Codices Urbinales Latini*, Tomus I [Rome 1902] 462–64). I have seen all three of these documents in microfilm reproductions. Another copy, which I have not seen, is, according to the Bodleian catalogue (Falconer Madan, *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* [Oxford 1897] 437), contained in Bodleian 20625 (= MS Auct. T. 2.21.). This document is dated by the catalogue in the first half of the eleventh century.