

## TWO NOTES ON THE MEDIEVAL TRADITION OF MARTIAL

I. Martial's epigrams are transmitted in three families of manuscripts, called A B C by Schneidewin, who first distinguished them in his fundamental edition (Grimma 1842). A contains only excerpts, but its source began with a book absent from B and C, the *Spectacula*. About 30 pieces from this book can be collected from the oldest members of A, three French manuscripts of s. ix (H T R) (1). Three of the 30 are missing when the tradition reappears in Renaissance Italy, first in the survivor of two leaves prefixed by another hand to a manuscript of s. xiv, Bologna Univ. 2221 (2), then in many manuscripts of s. xv. It is commonly supposed that the Italian manuscripts all derive from one copy discovered in s. xiv, perhaps by Boccaccio, who owned a Martial that opened with the *Spectacula* (3).

74 years ago Lindsay brought to notice a manuscript of the same content as the Italian manuscripts but older than the Bononiensis and not Italian (4). If he ever inspected it, he nowhere announced his results, and even after four articles on the tradition of the *Spectacula* by U. Carratello (5) the silence remains unbroken.

Lindsay's discovery, Westminster Abbey 15 (henceforward W), consists of two English manuscripts that have been together since the same hand sparsely annotated them in s. xiv or even s. xiii. 'Wylton' at the

(1) The exact number of pieces depends on where divisions are made.

(2) G. Götz and G. Löwe, "Leipz. Stud." 1, 1878, 365-7, gave the first description and collation worth citing.

(3) Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, I, Florence 1905, 29; Billanovich, *Petrarca letterato*, I: *Lo scrittoio del Petrarca*, Rome 1947, 263-6; A. Mazza, "I. M. U." 9, 1966, 49; U. Carratello, "Giorn. Ital. di Filol." 26, 1974, 2-5, who rightly contests Billanovich's assumption that Boccaccio obtained the text "dalla solita fonte", Montecassino.

(4) "Deutsche Literaturzeitung" 26, 1905, 89, mentioned by Sabbadini, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 217.

(5) *L'editio princeps di Valerio Marziale e l'incunabolo ferrarese di Leida*, "Giorn. Ital. di Filol." 25, 1973, 295-9; *L'epigrammaton liber di Marziale nella tradizione tardo-medievale e umanistica*, *ibid.* 26, 1974, 1-17; *'Florilegia quaedam' di Valerio Marziale*, *ibid.* 142-58; *Due codici di Wolfenbüttel e l'Epigrammaton liber del Panormita*, *ibid.* 27, 1975, 222-4. I shall refer only to the second (Liber) and the third (Florilegia).

top of f. 1r, written in pencil but probably within a century of the dissolution, supplies a credible home for a volume that includes a work by Godfrey of Winchester. Be that as it may, the first manuscript contains in one hand of s. xiii Martial 1-14 (ff. 1-39r), the *Liber proverbiorum* of Godfrey (ff. 39r-47r), *Spect.* (ff. 47r-48v), and *Auson.*, *Caes.* 1-41 (f. 49r) (6). The combination cannot have come about before c. 1100, the date of the *Liber proverbiorum*. On the other hand the scribe can hardly be responsible for it: he gives a title only to the last text, and his conception of the first three seems to be fairly reflected in the annotator's numbering of the *Liber proverbiorum* as book 15 and *Spect.* as book 16.

In Martial 1-14 W belongs to Schneidewin's family C. Its text of the *Liber proverbiorum* escaped not only T. Wright (*Rolls series II*, London 1872) but also H. Gerhard (Würzburg 1974) and his learned reviewer in "*Mittellat. Jahrb.*" 11, 1976, 327-30. The excerpt from Ausonius circulated widely in the Middle Ages, and many manuscripts besides W attribute it to Sidonius (7).

In *Spect.* W differs as follows from Lindsay's text (Oxford 1903). I keep its spelling but do not report purely orthographical variants.

1. 2 *assiduus*, 3 *honores*, 4 *-que deum*, 6 *cures ad*, 7 *cadit*; 2 tit. *De opibus* (sic) *circa amphitheatrum*, 1 < > *ic*, 11 *sibi Roma ante corr.*, 12 *dilecte*; 3 tit. *De consensu nationum*, 4 *e poito*, 9 *tortis*, 11 *tunc*; 4 tit. *De latoribus*, 2 *miseras semper ante corr.*, 6 *inpensis vitam principis*; 5 tit. *De pasiphe*, 4 *donat*; 6 tit. *De mulieribus que confitebant* (sic) *venatorem*, 1 *sevit*; 6b a 6 non sep., 1 *nemeis et vasta in*, 4 *hec iam feminea vidimus acta manu*; 7 tit. *De laureolo*; 8. 1 *sit*, 2 *tunc*; 9 ab 8 non sep., 2 *premisit*, 4 *cornu*; 10. 5 *homini* (?); 11. 5 *deprendit*, 6 *sic*; 12 tit. *De sue pregnante*, 3 *exiliit*; 13. 1 *iacta*; 14. 1 *pignora*; 15 tit. *De meleagro*, 1 *summa tyre*, 2 *quantum est*, 8 *ferret*; 16 tit. *De hercule qui insidens tauro raptus est*; 16b a 16 non sep., 3 *scema*; 18. 1 *consuetam*, 3 *rapido*, 4 *nec ullis*; 19 tit. *De elephante et tauro*, 1 *totas... hareñas*, 3 *abore*; 20 tit. *De mirino et triumpho*; 21 tit. *De orpheo*, 8 *hec tamen hec res est facta ita picta alia*; 21b om.; 22 tit. *De rinoceronte*, 7-12 sep. cum

(6) For a description see J. A. Robinson and M. R. James, *The manuscripts of Westminster Abbey*, Cambridge 1909, 73. The quiring is a-d<sup>s</sup> e<sup>1</sup> o f<sup>s</sup>; d<sup>2</sup> and a quire after d are missing. Red and green initials alternate. The correct title for the *Liber proverbiorum* is added in a modern hand, William Camden's according to the annotated catalogue in the library; in Remaines, London 1605, part. 2, pp. 11-13 (see also part 1, p. 34), Camden quotes from a manuscript that had the correct title, probably Bodl. Digby 65 (3. 2 *contemni*).

(7) On the tradition of the *Caesares* see S. Prete, "*Studia Picena*" 39, 1972, 126-35, who lists on pp. 131 and 134 manuscripts that have this attribution (including W).

tit. *De carpophoro*, 7 *dorica quam*, 10 *biron*; 24 tit. *De naumachia*, 1 *horis*, 2 *ipsa*, 3 *nec*, 5 *spectes*; 25 tit. *De leandro*; 25b. 2 om., 4 *dum redeo*; 26 tit. *De natatoribus*, 3 *nexu*, 5 *racum*; 27 tit. *De carpophoro*, 2 om., 7 *posset... vincere*, 8-9 om., 10 *solveret esoniden*; 28. 3 *pars est et vidit*, 11 *fucines et pigri*, 12 *norunt*; 29-33 om.; Explicit.

Among readings absent from the earlier tradition so many recur in the Italian manuscripts that I will mention only the most manifest errors, 1. 4 *-que deum* and the omission of 21b and 27. 8-9. These establish a common ancestor.

If the Italian manuscripts all derived from one copy discovered in s. xiv, they might be expected to have common errors absent from the earlier tradition and W; but I can find none. In fact W proves that they do not all derive from one copy, because some but not all of them share with it the following errors: 1. 6 *ad*, 3. 4 *et e posito (et exposito)*, 8. 2 *tunc*, 9. 2 *praemisit*, 11. 5 *deprendit*, 19. 1 *totas... harenas*, 26. 5 *racum (raucum)*. Manuscripts that have these (8) include:

Vat. Lat. 11487 (m. xv<sup>2</sup>, written by Guido Bonatti) (9)

Paris. Lat. 8068 (m. xv<sup>3/4</sup>, Florence?)

Laur. 35. 39 (m. xv<sup>3/4</sup>, Florence, written by G. A. Vespucci) (10)

Berlin Ham. 429 (m. xv, in s. xviii at S. Michele di Murano, Venice)

Ven. Marc. Lat. XII 38 (ch. xv<sup>3/4</sup>)

Abbey J. A. 3221 (m. xv<sup>3/4</sup>, Siena or Rome?)

Bodl. Auct. F 4 33 (m. mid 1460 s, probably Padua, written by Bartolomeo Sanvito) (11)

Brit. Lib. Add. 12004 (m. xv<sup>4/4</sup>, Florence)

Hannover 506 (m. c. 1470-80, Florence).

Two further manuscripts, although their text came from elsewhere, have much the same titles:

Ven. Marc. Lat. XII 37 (ch. xv, from some Paduan library) (12)

(8) Not all have all of them, and I have not collated the Vaticanus and the Hannoveranus fully or the Hamiltonensis at all; but the rest agree at 3. 4, 8. 2, 11. 5, and 19. 1.

(9) J. Ruysschaert, *Codices Vaticani latini: codices 11414-11709*, Vatican 1959, 124. Bonatti went to Rome from Mantua.

(10) A. C. de la Mare, *The handwriting of Italian humanists*, I i, Oxford 1973, 125.

(11) A. J. Fairbank and R. W. Hunt, *Humanistic script of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries*, Bodleian picture book no. 12, Oxford 1960, no. 9 + plate 9; J. Ruysschaert, *Miniaturistes 'romains' sous Pie II*, in: *Enea Silvio Piccolomini Papa Pio II*, Siena 1968, p. 265 n. 131.

(12) This manuscript conflates two sets of titles. The one that matters agrees in 16 and 20 with W against its Italian relatives, which give *De hercule insidente tauro ad caelum rapto* and *De mirino [et] triumpho*.

Florence Naz. Banco Rari 48, olim II II 79 (m. xv<sup>2</sup>, Florence) (13). In the first six of these manuscripts books 1-14 of Martial are followed by the Liber proverbiorum of Godfrey as book 15 and Spect. as book 16. H. Gerhard has shown that the first three constitute a tight group in the Liber proverbiorum (14); of the next three, which he did not know, the Hamiltonensis and the Marcianus certainly belong to it (15), and Major Abbey's manuscript can hardly differ (16). W shares many errors with the group, including the omission of 114, 164, 197-8, 231, 238. 7-8, but is free from others, e. g. the transposition of 155 and 156. In Spect. it might appear from the Vaticanus or the Laurentianus that W cannot be the ancestor of its Italian relatives, because it omits 25b. 2; but so does the Marcianus, and so did the Parisinus before correction. Such a gap would not survive for long when it could be filled from elsewhere. A small sign that W may be the ancestor of its Italian relatives is 3. 11 *et*: W has an abbreviated *tunc* easily mistaken for *et* (indeed I first mistook it for *et* myself). Complete collation of the Liber proverbiorum, a much longer text, ought to yield the answer (17). At all events, a manuscript similar to W must have arrived in Italy by s. xv<sup>3/4</sup>. The Liber proverbiorum had actually been known there since the middle of s. xiii, and already in the guise of Martial (18), so that one may wonder whe-

(13) P. D'Ancona, *La miniatura fiorentina*, Florence 1914, II no. 613.

(14) Pp. 21-5. Another member that he takes account of is Vat. Lat. 1625, a manuscript of Spect. + 1-14 to which part of the Liber proverbiorum was added later.

(15) On the Hamiltonensis see H. Boese, *Die lateinischen Handschriften der Sammlung Hamilton zu Berlin*, Wiesbaden 1966, 204, and W. Maaz, "Mittelalt. Jahrb." 11, 1976, 328; in Spect. it breaks off after 7. Maaz, *ibid.* 328-9, also draws attention to Laur. Ashb. 1658 (s. xv), which contains two epigrams from the Liber proverbiorum, and a *De seriis lib.* of Martial appended to books 1-14 in a manuscript recorded by Henry of Kirkstede, librarian of Bury St Edmunds, on whom see R. H. Rouse, "Speculum" 41, 1966, 471-99.

(16) For a description see J. J. G. Alexander and A. C. de la Mare, *The Italian manuscripts in the library of Major J. R. Abbey*, London 1969, 95-6; it was lot 2960 at Sotheby's on 25. 3. 75. Dr de la Mare has kindly shown me a photograph of f. 208v, which contains Spect. 27-8. I am also obliged to Dr de la Mare for her opinion on the date and origin of this and other manuscripts.

(17) Unhappily the Italian manuscripts would need to be collated again. I went through 30-odd epigrams in W and noticed four readings that Gerhard does not report, 156. 1 *abundas*, 168. 3 *nudas*, 233. 3 *dicet*, 237. 9 *ratio <est>*; but three of the four are in the Parisinus and the Marcianus (the fourth, *dicet*, could easily have been corrupted back to *dicit*). Incidentally, one of these, *ratio <est>*, is also in Gerhard's A, and *ratione* in his C confirms it (from *ratioē*).

(18) P. Lehmann, *Pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters*, Leipzig 1927, 16, rightly denied that Godfrey palmed his work off as Martial's. When Manitius, "Zentralbl. für Bibl." Suppl. 67, 1935, 131, says: "übrigens wurde Godefrid von Win-

ther Spect. too had been known in Italy since the middle of s. xiii; but citations from the *Liber proverbiorum* earlier than s. xv all derive from a manuscript outside the group under discussion (19). In so narrow a tradition, and especially when the closest manuscript is English, the newcomer in s. xv seems likely to have been an English manuscript, and it may be worth recalling that in 1420, while he was in the service of Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, Poggio visited the library of Salisbury Cathedral, not five miles from Wilton (20). Admittedly the only acquisitions from England that he speaks of are Petronius and Calpurnius, and altogether he did not think much of English libraries (21); but at that date he would not have trumpeted Martial 1-14, and he might have found Spect. without realizing what it was. I do not wish to press this speculation, if only because neither Florence nor Padua lacked English visitors in s. xv<sup>14</sup>; but should it find favour, I have shown elsewhere how a text discovered by Poggio before 1420 failed to circulate before he finally settled at Florence in the 1450 s (22).

The other manuscripts of Spect. divide into two groups. The first, to which they almost all belong (23), has these innovations: 17. 4 *numen... tuum*, 21. 8 *haec tamen ut... ficta alia*, 22. 4 *tamen is*, 27. 7 *ignipedes*, 28. 1 *Augusti laudes fuera(n)t*. The other consists of two manuscripts, which both e. g. omit the whole of 14 and also 7. 10 *saevas*, 23. 3 *geminos*:

Bologna Univ. 2221 (m. xiv) (24)

chester († 1107) mit dem Namen Martialis Cocus beehrt, da er ein grosses Talent zur Epigrammdichtung besass" (similarly: Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, III 14), even that is not true: a pure accident of transmission brought about the ascription to Martial of the *Liber proverbiorum*, and 'Martialis Cocus' is not peculiar to manuscripts that contain it. On 'Cocus' see Schneidewin, I 21-2; Manitius, "Philol." 49, 1890, 562 n. 1; Lehmann, 97 n. 86; it masquerades as *totus* in the catalogue of s. xii<sup>14</sup> from Peterborough cited by Manitius (1935) 130 and in the roughly coeval list of books printed by C. H. Haskins, "H. S. C. P." 20, 1909, 91.

(19) Gerhard, pp. 17-20.

(20) Ep. I 43.

(21) Ep. I 37-8, 43, 51, 61, 70.

(22) "C. Q." 71, 1977, 202-25.

(23) I can vouch for Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 82, 85, Westminster Abbey 16, Brit. Lib. Add. 12006, 22006, 23893, Arund. 136, King's 32, Lansd. 837, Ven. Marc. Lat. XII 37, 186, Rimini Civ. SC 32, 101, Laur. 91 sup. 29. 2, Flor. Naz. Banco Rari 48, Ricc. 534, Rome Naz. Fondi Minori 41, Modena Est. Lat. 948, Brux. 1543-4, the first ed. Ven., and the ed. Rom. 1473. Schneidewin cites others.

(24) People agree on this date or at any rate repeat it, but enough time has elapsed since Götz and Löwe gave it currency (see n. 2) to justify a fresh inspection by someone competent. I should not be surprised if the famous leaf proved to be appreciably earlier than the body of the manuscript. For one thing, its missing fellow must have had more on it than Spect. 1-7. 9.

Vindob. 316 (m. xv<sup>3/4</sup>) (25).

Carratello maintains that the Vindobonensis does not derive from the Bononiensis (26), but his list of differences does not bear him out: all but one are corruptions of the Vindobonensis, and the other merely sets the metre right by an obvious transposition. When the Bononiensis is composite and the Vindobonensis not, their agreement in the other books too (Schneidewin, I xci) would be an amazing coincidence if they were independent of each other. The Vindobonensis must of course be consulted for what the Bononiensis has lost, 1-7. 9.

An annotator of Ambros. B 131 sup. (ch. xv<sup>2</sup>) refers variously to *antiqui codices* that had the Spectacula in book 8 and an *antiquus codex* that had them scattered about books 7 and 8; he also says that in *antiquo codice* 19 was missing and 20. 1 ended with *munus* instead of *myrimum*. Sabbadini, who reported these notes (27), assumed without more ado that the man could not judge *antiquitas* and was really talking about manuscripts of s. xv. The only evidence I have come across that might be relevant is Rimini Civ. SC 101 (m. xv<sup>3/4</sup>), probably from north-eastern Italy (28), where the Spectacula stand without title or subscription on ff. 81r-84r between 8. 7 and 12. 29 (29); but the text is that of the large group and shows neither of the peculiarities mentioned by Sabbadini's annotator. Non liquet, therefore.

It does not seem to me that any two of the three extant groups share significant innovations or that any one resulted from contamination of the other two.

The lost manuscript from which the three groups all derive has the same authority as T or R, which each omit what the other includes (30).

(25) H. J. Hermann, Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich, VI 1, Leipzig 1930, no. 105 (Oberitalienische Arbeit des dritten Viertels des XV. Jahrhunderts).

(26) Liber, p. 7.

(27) "S. I. F. C." 11, 1903, 329-33.

(28) Here too (cf. n. 16) I am obliged to Dr de la Mare for her opinion.

(29) Having no text with me, I was not aware that these epigrams belonged to different books.

(30) Cf. Götz and Löwe, op. cit. (n. 2) 366: "Hier [in Spect.] muss die jüngere Ueberlieferung zu Rathe gezogen werden; denn die Quelle, aus der sie den liber Spectaculorum hat, lässt sich nicht auf T zurückführen (H und R haben nur eine kleine Anzahl von Epigrammen), sondern basirt auf einer gleichberechtigten selbstständigen Handschrift". The important observation that T and R complement each other was first made by Carratello, Florilegia p. 145. Unless editors have overlooked excerptor's marks in H, I can think of no explanation that allows T to be a direct copy of it. As the history of T before s. xvi<sup>2</sup> remains obscure, let me reaffirm Schneidewin's view (I xxxviii, lxxxiii) that it furnished many of the readings in the

Its authority in relation to the third French manuscript, H, cannot be determined, though where they overlap, in 18. 5 - 28, it nowhere improves on H in a way striking enough to rule out conjecture (20. 2 *promisit* for *promisce*, 22. 5 *gravem* for *gradem*, 6 *imposita*<*s*>, 12 <*i*> *nunc*, 28. 6 *domini* for *domi*, 8 <*ire*>, 11 *pigri* for *tigri*). That T derives from H and R could do so proves nothing about the lost manuscript in the absence of significant agreements with T or R against H. If the agreement with T in omitting 29-30 is significant, then a copy of H lies behind both the lost manuscript and T (31).

Carratello has remarked that many readings customarily ascribed to Italian humanists already occur in the Bononiensis (32), and most of them are now attested in s. xiii. The time has come, therefore, for editors to give an honest report of what the manuscripts say. Lindsay's habit of equating T with the archetype of the group even when he admits that it was carelessly written (33) prejudices what ought to be a simple choice between variants (34).

II. Editions of Martial since Junius's second (Antwerp 1568) (35) have appended to Spect. two epigrams that in Lindsay's words "hab. florilegia quaedam". Ullman pointed out that these florilegia are just the various manuscripts of what has come to be known as the Florilegium Gallicum (36), compiled at Orléans or near by in the middle of s. xii (37).

margin of the ed. Gryph. (1539 and thereafter). Certainly no other extant manuscript known to me reads 1. 71. 1 *callidius* (*gall.* T), 3. 24. 2 *focis*, 4. 74. 3 *ardent*, 6. 23. 4 *te contra* (*e contra* T), 31. 2 *subigi*, 8. 21. 4 *axe*, 11. 39. 10 *abstinet*.

(31) One other agreement may be significant, 21. 8 *haec tamen* <*haec*> TW and the Bononiensis. The Italian relatives of W do not add the second *haec* (Bodl. Auct. F 4 33 anticipates Housman's *tantum*), and the large group reads *haec tamen* <*ut*>; but if the lost manuscript read *haec tamen* <*haec*>, these divergences are readily accounted for.

(32) Liber, pp. 9-10, 14.

(33) P. v.

(34) M. Citroni in his excellent edition of book I (Florence 1975), p. lxxv, makes much the same point.

(35) Editors believe other editors who cite a printing of 1566. None such appears in L. Degeorge, *La maison Plantin à Anvers*, Paris 1886<sup>3</sup>, 145-8, and I cannot find anyone who claims to have seen it.

(36) "C. Phil." 27, 1932, 22-6.

(37) R. H. Rouse, "Viator" 10, 1979, 131-60. For recent work on the text see J. Hamacher, *Das Florilegium Gallicum: Prolegomena und Edition der Exzerpte von Petron bis Cicero, De oratore*, Frankfurt 1975, though the excerpts from Martial still await an editor. Ullman, pp. 24-5, and Carratello, *Florilegia* 156-8, have proved that it was from an extant manuscript of the Florilegium, Paris. Lat. 7647, that

After excerpts from books 1-14 the *Florilegium Gallicum* has Spect. 13-14 and the two epigrams in question, which appear nowhere else. Its excerpts from the other books too include much that is not in A. By s. xii, however, these other books were available complete in numerous French members of C, and indeed the *Florilegium Gallicum* frequently agrees in error with C against A B or B. On the other hand it occasionally agrees with A against C, for instance in preserving 3. 31, and when it gives part of an epigram rather than the whole it often gives the same part as A (38). These facts led Ullman to cast doubt on the traditional division of the manuscripts into three families.

Though Ullman had looked through one manuscript of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, he passes over a notable feature of its text, and Carratello, to whom I owe my knowledge of it (39), misses its significance: some excerpts from book 3 occur amidst excerpts from book 5. Now many members of C, some older than the *Florilegium Gallicum* like Leid. Voss. Lat. O 56 (s. xi) and Ambros. H 39 sup. (s. xi-xii), put 3. 22 - 63. 4 after 5. 67. 5; and the displacement in the *Florilegium Gallicum* corresponds exactly. It follows that the *Florilegium Gallicum* took the staple of its text from a member of C and Ullman's suspicions were unfounded.

Exeter College, Oxford

MICHAEL D. REEVE

Douza supplied Junius with a text of the two epigrams; and I find in Bodl. Linc. 8<sup>o</sup> D 256, a copy of the ed. Basil. 1559 that has "Douzae" on the title page, what could be the collation that Douza put at his disposal. The margin below Spect. 28 has the following note entered in it: "Haec duo sequentia disticha ex vetusto quodam exemplari transcripta auctori suo restituere haud ab re visum fuit, quorum primo Caesari se excusat ob versus nondum satis exactos ad eum missos, et conclusio maioris fuisse epigrammatis videtur.

*Da veniam subitis, non displicuisse meretur  
festinat Caesar qui placuisse tibi.*

Asscribam et alterum, de victoria maioris et minoris inscriptum.

*Cedere maioris, virtutis fama secunda est,  
illa gravis palma est, quam minor hostis habet."*

Schneidewin (I lxxix) reports another copy of the same edition at Leyden annotated by Douza, and this would need to be examined as well before one could be sure, because in s. xvi collations were frequently copied. Incidentally, "de victoria maioris et minoris inscriptum" answers Schneidewin's objection to identifying Douza's manuscript with the one collated by Bongars (I cxxix); I have verified that Paris. Lat. 7647 has this title.

(38) Carratello's remarks on this point, *Florilegia* p. 153, I do not understand.

(39) *Florilegia*, p. 151. I have since verified it in Paris. Lat. 7647 and 17903.