

Cambridge University Press

0521604346 - Incerti Avctoris Aetna - F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

## INTRODUCTION

Cambridge University Press

0521604346 - Incerti Avctoris Aetna - F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

Abbreviated references to periodicals  
are in general those used in  
*L'Année Philologique*

## I. THE MANUSCRIPTS

The text of the *Aetna* mainly depends upon two families of manuscripts and upon certain readings preserved from a lost manuscript of a third family. The first family consists of only two members:

C, Cantabrigiensis Kk.v.34, in the University Library, Cambridge. C is assigned to the tenth century and is probably of English provenance. It is on the whole carefully written, though not free from errors in word-division and spelling.<sup>1</sup> I have used my own transcript.

S, fragmentum Stabulense, part of Parisinus Latinus 17177, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. It is assigned to the tenth or eleventh century and contains *Aetna* 1–345, in part badly mutilated or illegible.<sup>2</sup> I have relied on the reports of its readings given by Bachrens and Vollmer in their editions and by Ellis in *J.Ph.* 22 (1894), 5–9.

C and S are very closely related and were probably copied from the same exemplar, but they sometimes diverge, as at 16 non cessit C concessit S; 30 tumidisque C tumidis S; 49 peloniossa C pelonossa S; 107 charibdis C carinis *corr. in* charims S; 121 fluuio C fluuia S; 175 species C facies S; 188 incendi C incendia S; 190 ponentibus C ponent ibi S; 228 quod C quot S; 230 uin clo C mundo S; 287 admittere C admittat S; 315 eminus C et minus S; 322 primus C primos S. There are perhaps as many other divergences, neither more nor less serious. Most of them look like errors of copying by the scribes of C and S. The possibility that C and S were copied from the same manuscript is confirmed by their agreement in trivial errors of word-division and spelling unknown to the rest of the tradition. At

<sup>1</sup> C is described by Munro on pp. 29–30 of his edition and by Vollmer in *SBAW* (1908), Abhandl. 11, 34ff.

<sup>2</sup> S is described by Vollmer, *ibid.* pp. 28ff. and on pp. 10–12 of the introduction to his edition.

## INTRODUCTION

the most they are one stage removed from each other and together they represent a hyparchetype which I shall call  $\alpha$ .<sup>1</sup>

The second family consists of at least twelve members, but is itself divided into two branches, one on the whole free from interpolation, one badly infected by it. The whole family derives from another hyparchetype which I shall call  $\beta$ .

One manuscript of the  $\beta$  family occupies an intermediate position, Vaticanus 3272. In parts it is seriously infected by interpolation, but frequently it presents uninterpolated readings which affiliate it to the superior group, in which it may conveniently be included. This group, which I shall call by the collective description  $\gamma$ ,<sup>2</sup> consists of four manuscripts:

H, Helmstadiensis 332, in the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, dating, like the other members of the group, from the fifteenth century. H has been corrected in many places by a second hand ( $H^2$ ). I have used my own collation and microfilm.

A, Arundelianus 133, in the British Museum. I have used my own collation.

R, Rehdigeranus 125, in the City Library, Breslau. I have used microfilm.

V, Vaticanus 3272, in the Vatican Library. It contains only 1–433. I have used my own collation.

The separation of this group from the rest of the  $\beta$  family may be seen in certain places where it agrees with  $\alpha$  and probably represents the text of  $\beta$  against later alteration, for example 11 malis  $\alpha\gamma$  malas  $\gamma$  ( $\gamma$  = the interpolated group); 25 tanta  $\alpha\gamma$  causa  $\gamma$ ; 108 futurae  $\alpha\gamma$  figura  $\gamma$ ; 120 apta  $\alpha\gamma$  acta  $\gamma$ ; 161 retro  $\alpha\gamma$  recto  $\gamma$ ; 303 cremant  $\alpha\gamma$  cremant  $\gamma$ . It is yet more signi-

<sup>1</sup> Wagler in *De Aetna poemate quaestiones criticae* (Berlin, 1884), pp. 3–6, argues strongly that C and S are twins, concluding that ‘ex eodem exemplari descriptos esse luce est clarius’.

<sup>2</sup> For HAR without V I use the sign Z, though I should have preferred to use  $\gamma$ <sup>1</sup> (see my stemma on p. 29). Vollmer and Schwartz have made Z = HAR conventional and I have therefore retained it.

Cambridge University Press

0521604346 - Incerti Avctoris Aetna - F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE MANUSCRIPTS

ficant that in several places where CS or C preserve the true reading and an interpolation is found in  $\gamma$ , 3 or Z presents a gap, for example 60 *atque in bellandum quae cuique potentia diuum*  $\alpha$  *et que in . . . cett. om. Z et que in . . . quaecumque p. d. V atque in arma ruit quaecumque p. d.  $\gamma$ ; 327 ueluti siponibus actus C post sipon. . . non legitur S uerba post ueluti (uelut is V) om. 3 reuolutis aestibus amnis  $\gamma$ ; 445 siculi uicinia montis C spatium uacuum in Z secretis callibus humor  $\gamma$ .*

The second group within the  $\beta$  family consists of seven manuscripts:<sup>1</sup>

- P, Vaticanus 3255, in the Vatican Library;
- U, Urbinas 353, in the Vatican Library;
- N, Neapolitanus IV.E.7, in the National Library, Naples;
- Sl, Sloanianus 777, in the British Museum;
- Cors, Corsinianus 43.F.2I, in the Corsini Library, Rome;
- Rehd, Rehdigeranus 60, in the City Library, Breslau;
- Chig, Chigianus H.v.164, in the Vatican Library.

All these manuscripts date from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. I have myself collated PU and Sl in entirety, N and Cors in part. Cors was re-examined on my behalf by J. B. Hall and H. D. Jocelyn, for whose kindness my warmest thanks are due. For Rehd I have relied on such information as is provided by earlier editors. Of Chig I know virtually nothing.

The manuscripts of this group are beset by the wildest interpolations and corrupted so grotesquely that often they have lost all apparent connection with the original. Yet, though their authority is negligible, they are important as presenting numerous readings which are indubitably right, though in all probability the result of humanist conjecture. I do not think it is profitable to investigate questions of priority between

<sup>1</sup> I have not included Basileensis F.iii.3 and Vossianus Lat. 78, since they appear to have been copied wholly or very largely from early printed editions (see Ribbeck in his ed. of Vergil, vol. 4, 38 and 33–4). One MS., Corsinianus 43.F.5, offers only 1–6 and cannot be assigned with certainty to any group.

Cambridge University Press

0521604346 - Incerti Avctoris Aetna - F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

these manuscripts themselves and between them and the early printed editions. That there was some contamination is certain.

I use the sign  $\gamma$  to represent all or a majority of this group, the sign  $\delta$  for one of them or a minority. The attribution of a reading to  $\gamma$  or  $\delta$  in no way precludes its appearance in printed editions contemporary with or even earlier than the manuscripts concerned.

The Excerpts, preserved without much variation in three manuscripts<sup>1</sup> (see p. 62), represent a branch of the tradition which is derived from the archetype at about the same stage as  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . But they are not far removed from  $\alpha$ . They preserve the correct reading alone in a few places, frequently agree with  $\alpha$  against  $\beta$ , frequently with  $\alpha$  or  $\alpha\beta$  against G (see below), rarely with G. There are signs of carelessness and deliberate alteration in their text, such as the conflation and omission of lines. In all, the Excerpts contain just over forty lines of the *Aetna*.

The readings of the lost codex Gyraldinus represent a third branch of the tradition, older than and superior to  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .<sup>2</sup> The celebrated humanist and historian of the humanists

<sup>1</sup> Scaliger perhaps possessed a MS. of Excerpts now lost which differed slightly from our existing MSS. According to his notes, at 246 it had *quo Lucifer incubet*, where our MSS. of Excerpts have a space *quo . . . incubet*, and at 263 *haec hederis dignissima*, where our MSS. present *haec herbis d*.

<sup>2</sup> Such is my view, with certain qualifications. I shall discuss the readings of G in section III of this introduction, but I can conveniently give now a brief bibliography of the G question. The best account of the complicated history of G's readings, as far as it is known, is found in Wagler, *op. cit.* 10–14 (also Ellis, intr. 64 ff., though this is a little biased; Vollmer, intr. 20 ff.; Schwartz, intr. 6 ff.). On the 'codex Lucensis siue Gyraldinus': Jeep in his ed. of Claudian 1 pref. 30 ff.; Birt in his ed. of Claudian, pref. 89 ff. On Gyraldus: V. Rossi in *Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.* 37 (1901), 246 ff. On the quality of G's readings: extremely favourable to G: Wagler 15–40; Baehrens, intr. 6 ff.; firmly in favour of G, but with discrimination: Munro 30–2; Hildebrandt, 'Zur Ueberlieferung der Aetna', in *Philologus* 66 (1897), 97–117, particularly 111 ff.; Sudhaus in *GGA* (1903), 531 ff.; Vollmer, intr. 28 ff.; eclectic: Schwartz, intr. 8–9 and in *Philologus* 91 (1936), 354–5; unfavourable, even hostile: Ellis, intr. 75 ff.; Alzinger in *NJPhP* 153 (1896), 845 ff.; Vessereau, intr. (1923), 30–1; rejecting G altogether: Lenchantin in his ed. of 1926 and in *AAT* 60 (1924–5), 523 ff.

Cambridge University Press

0521604346 - Incerti Avctoris Aetna - F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE MANUSCRIPTS

Giglio Gregorio Giraldi (= Gyraldus, 1479–1552), in his account of the poet Claudian (*Historiae poetarum dialogi* 4, p. 372; Basel, 1545), writes as follows: ‘exstat item poema de Aetna monte, quod an ipsius legitimum sit, nec probare, nec refellere ausim. ex antiquissimo certe et castigato codice, qui Francisci Petrarcae fuisse creditur, illud ego ipse exscripsi.’ On a number of pages now joined to a copy of the *editio princeps* of Claudian (Vicenza, 1482) in the Laurentian Library at Florence (Laur. plut. 33.9 = L) an unknown hand of the late fifteenth century has copied sixteen lines of the *Aetna* (268 *plenaque* to 286 *uentis*, omitting 276–8) and various poems of Claudian supplementary to those in the edition. It is a plausible explanation to suppose that whoever added the poems of Claudian to supplement those in the edition also found 268–86 of the *Aetna* in the manuscript of Claudian from which he took them. The statement of Gyraldus and the evidence of L combine to suggest the existence in the fifteenth century of a manuscript of Claudian which also contained at least part of the *Aetna*. This may have been one and the same as the famous *codex Lucensis*. We learn from various sources<sup>1</sup> that Heinsius searched in vain

<sup>1</sup> In the copy of the 1619 ed. of Pithoeus’ *Epigrammata et poemata uetera* in the University Library, Leiden, in which Heinsius’ collation is copied by the younger Burman, after p. 191: ‘(Seueri Aetna) in ueterrimo codice post Claudiani poemata legi testis Lylius Gyraldus, cuius codicis apographum exstat in Medicea Bibliotheca, ex quo haec deprompsimus. N. Heins.’; a note added by Heinsius after the title-page of one of his copies of Pithoeus (see Vollmer, intr. 20): ‘in Aetna V significat cod. Florentinum, quem inde habuit Ernstius, nempe solum partem illam’ (i.e. the part for which Heinsius reports readings, 138–286); Heinsius in pref. to ed. 2 of his Claudian (Amsterdam, 1665), 5: ‘uolumen ipsum [sc. Gyraldinum], cum Lucae essemus, ut multa cum sedulitate, sic irrito successu est inuestigatum—quod in eo extitisse nonnulla compertum haberem, multo usui futura, quae ab aliis membranis mutuari haud possis, quale carmen istud in Aetnam—cuius partem potissimam, uulgatis exemplaribus longe castigatiorem, illic se obtulisse, tam Gyraldus ipse, quam schedae mediceae fidem indubitata faciant, atque omni exceptione maiorem’; Heinsius in his notes on *In Ruf.* 2.527 and *De R. Pr.* 1.171; the elder Burman on *Ov. Met.* 1.85; the younger Burman in pref. to his *Anth. Lat.* 1, p. 53.

## INTRODUCTION

for the manuscript Gyraldus had seen and copied, but did obtain from Florence through the agency of a certain Ernst a manuscript containing 138–286 of the *Aetna*. The date, provenance and character of this manuscript are not known. Heinsius made a collation of the verses it contained in a copy of Pithoeus' edition. Both the manuscript itself and Heinsius' own collation are lost, but three copies of the latter remain. The best of these was discovered in 1899 at Leiden by L. Alzinger.<sup>1</sup> It is another copy of Pithoeus' edition into which the younger Burman has transcribed Heinsius' collation. Vollmer (intr. 25 ff.) gives a transcription of Burman's copy and on this I have relied. The two other copies, which were published by J. C. Cramer in *Acta societatis Ienensis* 5 (1756) and by F. C. Matthiae in *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* 59 (1797),<sup>2</sup> appear to be less accurate and may usually be dispensed with. But Burman's copy is probably not free from errors.<sup>3</sup> The readings presented in Heinsius' collation agree exactly with those presented in L for 268–86. Heinsius believed that Ernst's manuscript was a copy of Gyraldus'. This is at least possible and it has become conventional to describe the readings offered by Heinsius' collation as 'lectiones Gyraldinae' or simply G.

The history of G's readings is like an incomplete jigsaw-puzzle. The various pieces of information we have look as if they would all fit into a pattern, if only we had the other pieces. To fill out the gaps by conjecture or by denying that they exist is not a procedure which inspires confidence. It may

<sup>1</sup> 'Neues handschriftliches Material zur Aetna', in *BBG* 35 (1899), 269–75.

<sup>2</sup> There is information about the way in which Matthiae found the readings in his *Nachträge zu den neuesten Bearbeitungen des Lehrgedichts Aetna* (Frankfurt am Mayn, 1822)—a work otherwise uninteresting, being incomplete because of the author's death.

<sup>3</sup> See Vollmer, intr. 23. The chances of the intrusion of casual errors in readings so often copied and re-copied, though with great care, must be high.



## THE MANUSCRIPTS

be that the pattern of transmission was quite simple (*codex Gyraldinus-codex Ernstii* (and *schedae mediceae*)–Heinsius–Burman), but it may have been far otherwise. No one, however, has yet shown good grounds for questioning such information as we have. Nothing in our sources suggests fraud of any kind or brings into doubt the veracity of Gyraldus,<sup>1</sup> Heinsius or Burman.<sup>2</sup> The evidence of L takes the readings as reported by Heinsius back at least to the fifteenth century.

It is possible that Ernst's manuscript is the same as the *schedae mediceae*<sup>3</sup> mentioned in Heinsius' preface to ed. 2 of his Claudian and as the *apographum* mentioned in the copy of Pithoeus' edition in Leiden, and that the *schedae mediceae* and the *apographum* are not in fact, as Schwartz supposes, the same as L. Wagler believes that Ernst's MS. was originally part of

<sup>1</sup> Though what Gyraldus says raises some questions. Gyraldus suggests that the poem was complete in the MS. he saw. Either, therefore, it suffered mutilation later or Gyraldus magnified the discovery of a fragment into that of a poem or he saw a MS. not connected with the *codex Ernstii*, etc. Again it is curious that, though the *Aetna* had been in print for over fifty years and ascribed to Vergil or rather Cornelius Severus not only generally, but by Gyraldus himself in another part of the same work, he says nothing of either here, but merely expresses uncertainty as to whether the poem should be ascribed to Claudian. It is possible (I say no more) that only 138–286 stood in the MS. Gyraldus saw. Title and conclusion were therefore missing and with them all mention of the author. There was enough in 138–286 to show that the poem was about Mt Etna, but either ignorance or forgetfulness concealed from Gyraldus the fact that the verses came from the poem ascribed to Vergil or Severus.

<sup>2</sup> Schwartz (intr. 8) remarks justly and sensibly: 'Unzweifelhaft entstammen die Lesarten von G zunächst einer, vielleicht mehreren Abschriften des 15. oder 16. Jahrhunderts; wie weit diese Abschriften die alte Hs. getreu wiedergeben, läßt sich nicht mehr nachprüfen, doch liegt kein greifbarer Anlaß zu übertriebener Skepsis vor.'

<sup>3</sup> The note in the Leiden copy of Pithoeus at 138 says: 'V denotat uarias codicis Medicei lectiones, quae hinc incipiebant in Heinsii libro'; at 268 the note says: 'VC. Fragmentum ex V.C. Mediceo, cuius uariantes in altero exemplari adscripterat Heinsius.' Ernst's MS. is here described as 'codex Mediceus', as is also L. Our evidence is not clear enough to show which is meant in Heinsius' preface.

## INTRODUCTION

L, that it contained only 138–267 and that Heinsius took his readings for 268–86 from L. This view is largely refuted by the separate reporting of L's readings in the Heinsian collation (see Vollmer, intr. 28). Why only 138–286 were preserved in the codex Ernstii and only 268–86 in L are questions we are in no position to answer. Why all or part of the *Aetna* appeared in a MS. of Claudian at all is a similar question. I suspect the answer to the latter is mere chance, though it may be that Claudian's frequent references to Mt Etna and his short poem about the pious brothers of Catania made him appear a suitable foster-father for the *Aetna*.

One other source, though one of doubtful authority, must be mentioned here. This is the so-called Excerpta Pithoeana. These are preserved in the Bodleian Library in MS. D'Orville 195 with the title 'Notae et emendationes Petri Pithoei in librum, cui titulus est Epigrammata et poematia uetera, Parisiis 1590'. These notes contain several excellent readings which are identical with conjectures made by scholars both before and long after Pithoeus, three readings agreeing with G and a number of other readings, some attractive, but some nonsensical and such as have more often been found in corrupt manuscripts than amongst the emendations of scholars.

## II. EDITIONS

The *Aetna* first appeared in print in the *editio Romana secunda* of Vergil (1471), edited like the *editio princeps* by Giovanni Andrea de' Bussi, bishop of Aleria in Corsica.<sup>1</sup> De' Bussi obtained from Pomponius Laetus a manuscript or manuscripts of the *Aetna*, *Ciris* and *Catalepton*, for in a letter to Pomponius prefixed to the edition we read: 'Tu mihi etiam Aetnam Maronis et Cirin,

<sup>1</sup> See Dibdin, *Introduction*, ed. 4, 2.531–2, Heyne–Wagner's *Vergil*, 4.640, Henry, *Aeneidea*, pref. 64 ff.