

SOME MANUSCRIPTS OF AUSONIUS

When Ferrarius prepared the second edition of Ausonius (Mediol. 1490), his one supplement to the works printed by Girardinus in the first (Ven. 1472) was a text of the *Ordo Urbium Nobilium* quite unlike what stands in modern editions: not only does it omit some sections and alter the order of others, but it presents the long sections on Narbonne and Bordeaux incomplete and largely in prose. According to Ferrarius, Georgius Merula found these *excerpta*, as he calls them, in the library of St Eustorgius, Milan. A later hand also added them to T, Leid. Voss. Lat. Q 107 (chart. xv), which editors regard as the best manuscript of the family that produced the ed. Ven. 1472 (1). Hence a rash identification of T with Merula's Eustorgianus (2).

In 1908 Sabbadini showed that at some date before 1310 Benzo of Alessandria found in the chapter library at Verona a manuscript that contained the *Ordo* and the *Ludus Septem Sapientum* (3). Lo and behold, Benzo's quotations from the *Ordo* agreed with Ferrarius's text, prose and all (4). Hence much discussion of the relationship between the Veronensis and the Eustorgianus (5).

The Eustorgianus still exists. Arrange Benzo's quotations not in the traditional order of sections, as Sabbadini did, but in the order of Sab-

(1) Whether it deserves this reputation will be the subject of a later article; but A. Pastorino, *Opere di Decimo Magno Ausonio*, Torino 1971, 203-4, is obviously skating on thin ice when he treats T as the lone representative in the *Ordo* of a family that it represents with about twenty other manuscripts elsewhere.

(2) R. Peiper, *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Ausonius*, "Jahrb. für class. Phil." suppl. 11, 1880, 213-5; cf. his edition, Leipzig 1886, xxxv - xxxvi.

(3) Bencius Alexandrinus und der cod. Veronensis des Ausonius, "Rh. Mus." 63, 1908, 224-34, and *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, II, Firenze 1914, 128-50.

(4) No mention of them, or indeed of Ferrarius's edition, in A. Pastorino, loc. cit. (n.1).

(5) Sabbadini, "Rh. Mus." 233-4, *Scoperte* 148; S. Prete, *Ricerche sulla storia del testo di Ausonio*, Roma 1960, 84-91; R. Weiss, *Ausonius in the fourteenth century*, in: *Classical influences on European culture A.D. 500-1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar, Cambridge 1971, 69.

badini's references, and a striking fact emerges:

Benzo	Ferrarius
f. 129 § 3 (Alexandria and Antioch)	—
f. 134v § 10 (Athens) (6)	id.
f. 136 § 2 (Carthage and Byzantium)	id.
f. 138v § 6 (Capua)	id.
f. 140 § 7 (Aquileia)	—
f. 142v § 1 (Rome)	—
f. 143 § 11 (Catania and Syracuse) (7)	id.
f. 145v § 5 (Milan)	id.
f. 151 § 4 (Trier)	id.
f. 151v § 8 (Arles)	id.
§ 13 (Narbonne)	id.
f. 152 § 12 (Toulouse)	—
§ 14 (Bordeaux)	id.
f. 152v § 9 (Tarracona)	—

Clearly Ferrarius's *excerpta* came from a manuscript not of Ausonius but of Benzo's chronicle, and five sections are missing because Benzo's brief versions in prose could hardly go under the name of Ausonius. By an amusing chance Sabbadini used Ferrarius's source without recognizing it: it was the very manuscript from which he took Benzo's quotations, Ambros. B 24 inf. (membr. xiv), identified 20 years ago with no. 301 in an inventory of the library at St Eustorgius drawn up in 1494 (8). Did reading this manuscript launch Ferrarius's *praeceptor* Merula on his own career of exploration? "Benzo" says Sabbadini "andava in cerca di notizie per la sua enciclopedia...: nel che ebbe, due secoli dopo, imitatore il concittadino Giorgio Merula, il quale parimenti dal 1488 al 1493 esplorò e fece esplorare parecchie biblioteche e archivi d'Italia per compilare la *Historia Vicecomitum*" (9). Merula came to Milan in 1486, and already by February 1489 someone there knew Benzo's quotation about it from the *Ordo* (10).

The hand that added the *Ordo* to T, which I will call T⁴, also added

(6) Sabbadini gives this quotation in "Rh. Mus." 231 but omits it in Scoperte 147.

(7) In Scoperte the reference reads f.142v, which makes no difference even if this quotation precedes the one about Rome.

(8) T.Kaeppli, La bibliothèque de Saint-Eustorge à Milan à la fin du XV^e siècle, "Arch. Frat. Praedicatorum" 25, 1955, 41. I found this by way of the annotations in the Inventario Ceruti, I, Milano 1973.

(9) Scoperte 133.

(10) Scoperte, I (Firenze 1905) 157; II 148 n.145.

Epp. 12-13 (11), which the main scribe omitted because they contained so much Greek. As no other manuscript of the *Ordo* includes these letters, the agreement of T⁴ with Ferrarius's edition there as well as in the *Ordo* led me to suspect even before I looked at Benzo's quotations that T⁴ simply used Ferrarius's edition (12). The two errors of the edition that it avoids, *Ordo* 75 *Arpinis* for *Alpinis* and 167 *cuius* for *civis*, do not suffice to establish its independence. As for Peiper's view, which was still being repeated in 1960, that T⁴ imitated the script of an exemplar written *longobardis litteris* (13), it has not the slightest foundation (14).

As long as Ferrarius's *excerpta* were thought to have come from a manuscript of Ausonius, Benzo could not be held responsible for their form; but now that Benzo has turned out to be his authority, it is manifest that Benzo himself summarized not only the sections omitted by Ferrarius but also those on Narbonne and Bordeaux. His introduction to the latter says as much: *de hac urbe multa preclara ... scribit vir illustris Ausonius, qui in ea originem habuit; unde sic in t e r c e t e r a loquitur*. To quote Sabbadini again, "le citazioni di Ausonio si allontanano dal solito metodo di Benzo, il quale preferisce trascrivere liberamente le sue fonti e *quando son poesie parafrasarle in prosa*" (15).

The attribution of Benzo's wording to Benzo instead of the Veronensis clears up a further problem. Another manuscript of the *Ordo*, P, Paris. Lat. 8500 (membr. xiv), which spent the fifteenth century at Pavia after being owned by Petrarch (16), also contains the other work quoted by Benzo, the *Ludus*. As its text agrees with Benzo's, Sabbadini jumped to the conclusion that Ausonius was one more of Petrarch's acquisitions from Verona, and even when his assumption about the text of the Veronensis forced him to believe that P took the *Ordo* from elsewhere, he retreated from his conclusion only so far as to declare P composite (17). There the matter has rested, with one cu-

(11) My numeration follows Schenkl's edition ('M.G.H.' V 2, Berlin 1883), which is far easier to use than Peiper's because it has running titles.

(12) This or one of the subsequent edd. Ven. was certainly used by whoever added the *Ordo* to another member of the same family, Laur. Ashb. 1732, as his corrections elsewhere show.

(13) Peiper, Ueberlieferung 198-9, ed. lxxi; Prete, op. cit. (n. 5) 85.

(14) Weiss, op. cit., 69 n. 3. I have a microfilm, and he is unquestionably right.

(15) Scoperte 147.

(16) L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, I, Paris 1868, 138-9; P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, Paris 1907, I 204-9; A. Petrucci, *La scrittura di Francesco Petrarca*, 'Studi e Testi' 248, Vaticano 1967, 128 no. 52.

(17) "Rh. Mus." 234, Scoperte 149. He invokes Nolhac's statement that "il est

rious interlude. In 1971 R. Weiss brought to notice a list of Ausonius's works compiled at Verona soon after 1320 by Giovanni Mansionario; the list includes both the works quoted by Benzo, and he inferred that Giovanni was recording the contents of Benzo's Veronensis (18). By publishing this list and drawing the obvious inference Weiss did more for the textual history of Ausonius in six pages than other writers of the last 20 years have done in two thousand (19). He did not go on,

formé de plusieurs manuscrits distincts" (Petrucci speaks of different hands), but whether the various works of Ausonius belong to distinct manuscripts no-one has yet disclosed. I doubt it.

(18) Op. cit. (n. 5).

(19) At the risk of offending several industrious people I will enlarge on this pronouncement. In 1941 Jachmann published an assault on the entrenched theory that the wide divergences between two groups of manuscripts go back to different editions issued by Ausonius himself. Jachmann's arguments have been repeated over and over again with less clarity, vigour, and perspective, by S. Prete in a book and several articles. More commendably, Prete has encouraged his American pupils, and they in turn pupils of theirs, to investigate the tradition of selected works towards a new edition, and at least five dissertations from this school can already be consulted: T. J. Gradilone, "D.A." 23, 1963, 3360; M. E. Creighton, "D.A." 28, 1968, 4149-A; N. W. Tobin, *ibid.* 4151-A; J. F. Coleman, "D.A." 31, 1971, 5380-A; J. M. Stachniw, "D.A." 32, 1971, 401-A. Two others, apparently submitted without success, are mentioned by Prete, 'Studi e Testi' 220, Vaticano 1962, 327 n. 1, and Coleman 265; the substance of the first, by G. Vignuolo, is presumably reproduced in his article in "C.W." 54, 1961, 248-50. I have seen the two most recent of these dissertations, however, and must reluctantly say that they lead nowhere at all and sow a great deal of confusion in the process. Coleman begins with a wearisome survey of the literature and passes by way of perfunctory comments on the manuscripts to constructing an unusable apparatus that amongst other things imputes illusory omissions of whole works to K. Stachniw offers needlessly minute descriptions of manuscripts that have already been described with needless minuteness by her predecessors; treats every manuscript, regardless of hands, as a uniform whole in its contents; says incredible things about the date of manuscripts and next to nothing about their origin; builds her stemmatic arguments, such as they are, not on errors but on agreements, orthographical trivialities included; ends with inaccurate collations and texts that incorporate unmetrical conjectures; and talks all manner of nonsense throughout in the name of Prete's "anthological theory". To judge from her frequent citations, some of these strictures apply equally to Gradilone, Creighton, and Tobin, and others must too if she has come away with the idea, for instance, that Schenkl's ω contained *Mosella*, or that his p defies classification (192-4, 197). The blame for most of this clearly lies not with the authors themselves. Lest three writers who take issue with Prete should regard my indictment as a vindication of their own articles, I hasten to add that I have found in them only one thing of importance for the textual history of Ausonius, D. Nardo's observation about C, Cantab. K^k V 34, in "Atti dell'Ist. Ven." 125, 1966-7, 352-4. I have not seen F. Della Corte, Ausonio, Genova 1956-7.

however, to compare the contents of P in detail with Giovanni's list, but merely echoed Sabbadini's view that though P might owe the *Ludus* to the Veronensis "textual differences" demanded another source for the *Ordo* (20). Since these differences have now been laid to the charge of Benzo, nothing speaks against Sabbadini's initial conclusion that P derives from the Veronensis. On the contrary, something else speaks strongly for it.

Giovanni's list includes the *Periochae*, which Schenkl and Peiper edited from P alone. Schenkl dismissed as a descendant of P a manuscript that Peiper was able to reinstate when H. Mueller-Struebing supplied him with a collation, Harl. 2613 (chart. xv) (21). Despite Peiper's verdict the Harleianus has almost disappeared from the literature; one writer, for instance, relegates it to a footnote even more curt than Schenkl's (22), and Weiss does not mention it. Perhaps the following comparison between the Harleianus and Giovanni's list will achieve more than Peiper's four pages of readings, which have the undeniable disadvantage of needing to be studied. The dots in the right-hand column stand purely for the works indicated by the titles.

Giovanni	Harl. 2613
<i>Decius Magnus Ausonius vir illustrissimus prosopopoea in chartam plura et preclara opera metrico stilo composuit. Scripsit enim</i>	<i>Decii Ausonii.</i>
1. <i>paschales versus stilo heroico</i>	<i>Decimi Magni Ausonii opus et primo versus paschales incipiunt foeliciter...</i>
2. <i>item ad Poncium Paulinum primo beati Ambrosii notarium, postea Nolanum episcopum, epistolas metro heroico tres</i>	<i>epistola eiusdem metrica ad Paulinum presbyterum nondum episcopum ... alia epistola ad eundem Paulinum ... epistolae Sancti Paulini (...) ...</i>
3. <i>item librum de ludo septem sapientum versu trimetro iambico ad Repanium proconsulem</i>	<i>ludus septem sapientum ab Ausonio ad Drepanium ...</i>
4. <i>item epistolas prosaicas ad Theodosium imperatorem et ad Symachum patricium</i>	<i>Symmacus Ausonio salutem dicit ... Ausonius Sym-</i>

(20) Op. cit. (n. 5) 70 n. 7.

(21) Schenkl xl n. 37; Peiper ed. xxxviii - xxxxi, xxxvi.

(22) Prete, op. cit. (n. 5) 87 n. 4.

- macho suo salutem ... Symmachus Ausonio suo salutem dicit ... Theodosius Augustus Ausonio parenti sal. ... Theodosio Augusto Ausonius salutem ...*
5. *item periochas Homerice Yliados et Homerice Odyssie* *periocha Homerica Iliadis ab Ausonio ... incipit periocha Odyssiae ab Ausonio...*
6. *item de gripo numeri ternarii versu heroico librum unum* *Ausonius Symmacho suo salutem ... incipit grypus trinarii numeri ... eiusdem prosopopoea in chartam...*
7. *item ad Hesperium filium suum et ad Deoforium Ausonium nepotem eodem genere metri* *Ausonius Hesperio filio salutem ... προτρεπτικός ad Ausonium nepotem ... genethliacos eiusdem ad eundem ...*
8. *item eglogam de ambiguitate vite eligende eodem metro* *aeogloga eiusdem de ambiguitate eligendae vitae ...*
9. *item ad Hesperium filium suum de ordine imperatorum*
10. *item ad eundem de imperatoribus res novas molitis a Decio usque ad Dioclecianum versu iambico trimetro iuxta libros Eusebii Nannetici ystorici*
11. *item monasticon de erumpnis Herculis*
12. *item de institutione viri boni*
13. *item de etatibus animantum secundum Hesiodum*
14. *item de Pitagoricis diffinitionibus*
15. *item de cathalogo urbium illustrium singulos libros omnes versu heroico* *catalogus urbium nobilium eiusdem ...*
16. *item eodem genere metri de regibus qui regnaverunt in Ytalia inter bellum Troianum et principium Romani imperii librum unum*
17. *item ad Hesperium filium concordie libri fastorum cum libris consularibus librum unum*
18. *item cronicam ab initio mundi usque ad*

tempus suum

19. *item libellum de nominibus mensium
Hebreorum et Atheniensium*

20. *item de eruditionibus (23) Hebreorum
et interpretationibus Hebraicorum nomi-
num librum unum*

*Scriptis et alia plurima et fuit natione Bur-
degalsis et ob ingenii gloriam a Theodo-
sio Augusto magnis dotatus honoribus et
consul est ordinatus.*

P contains with one small exception just the same works of Ausonius as the Harleianus, but in a different order (24). Shall we still be told that the Harleianus derives from it ?

The common order of the Veronensis and the Harleianus shows that both the Harleianus itself and P, which has a very similar text, derive from the Veronensis. Moreover, the watermarks in the Harleianus are all Briquet 12135 (Verona 1491), though the script does not look so late. Other descendants of the Veronensis are the ed. Ven. 1507, prepared by the Veronese scholar Avantius (25), and three manuscripts of which none offers more than two works: Harl. 2599 (chart.), written at Verona about 1471 (26); Ven. Marc. Lat. XII 69; and Guelf. Gud. Lat. 145 (27). Beyond the works listed by Giovanni, who was concerned only with Ausonius and omitted even the letters written to him by Paulinus, Symmachus, and Theodosius (28), its contents are unknown;

(23) In his discussion Weiss more plausibly gives *traditionibus*.

(24) For a full description of P see Peiper, *Ueberlieferung* (cf. n. 2) 222-3; the pertinent section is described in his edition, xxxvi - xxxviii. The Harleianus omits *Ep.* 25 (Schenkl) 123 - end and *Ep.* 24; Schenkl, xl n. 37, seems to be saying that these 84 lines fell out through loss of leaves, but they were never there.

(25) Peiper, *Ueberlieferung* 209, ed. xxxxi. To Peiper the Veronensis meant Bosso's manuscript, of which more in a moment.

(26) Peiper's description of this manuscript, xxxxi - xxxxii, comes from Schenkl, xl n. 37, but his conjecture about its source, xxxxi, is his own. Schenkl's informant misread the owner's name, which was Hieronymus de Calderariis. The scribe of the dated part also wrote the two works of Ausonius, evidently at much the same time.

(27) Peiper, *Ueberlieferung* 277-8, ed. xxxxii. In the Gudianus the poem concerned was added by a later hand.

(28) I attach no weight to the absence from Giovanni's list of the *prosopopoea* (*Epigr.* 35 Schenkl) in both places where it occurs in the Harleianus. Only the second occurrence counts, because the composition of the Harleianus and the title on f. 2r show that it was repeated on f. lv by an afterthought; and if *προσωποποιία* baf-

but P and Harl. 2599 mix with Ausonius the same two extracts from Prudentius, *De fide* and *De natura animae*, and the occurrence in P of works by Fulgentius and Prudentius rightly suggested to Peiper a connexion on the one hand with a manuscript of Ausonius and Fulgentius (and more) catalogued at Bobbio in the tenth century and on the other with an old manuscript of Ausonius and Prudentius sent to Politian from Verona by Matteo Bosso in 1493 (29).

What, though, became of 9 - 20 in the Veronensis? 15 survives, as we have seen, and 9, 11 - 14, and 17, appear in extant manuscripts, but 10, 16, and 18 - 20, seem to have vanished without trace; and whatever one thinks about 18 - 20, at least 10 can hardly have been anything but a genuine work of Ausonius. Here an awkward possibility other than mere oversight arises: that Giovanni did not record the contents of the Veronensis as it lay before him but used an outdated list of contents at the front. This possibility happens to be supported by a familiar piece of evidence that has nevertheless attracted no attention, namely a remark of Bosso's in his covering letter to Politian (30):

veterinosus vix legitur (sc. 'our' manuscript) et atramento subcroceo Longobardoque caractere excriptus est, carie tineaque obesus ...
eundem vero ex notatione indice ad libri caput apposita mancum et truncum plerisque locis offendet plusquam caeteros.

Though I do not altogether understand the phrase *ex notatione ... apposita*, the gist of the sentence is not in doubt: the contents of the manuscript no longer corresponded to the list at the front. Ah, but was not Benzo's Veronensis dismembered in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries? This notion rests on two assumptions of Sabbadini's, and both have proved groundless: the Eustorgianus, which he identified with part of the Veronensis, has turned out to be something quite different, and P, which he believed to have taken the *Ordo* from elsewhere because the Veronensis had lost it, has turned out to have taken it from the Veronensis after all. That no great indignity befell the Veronensis for at least 100 years hereabouts is suggested by the almost identical contents, so far as Ausonius goes, of P, written in the middle of the fourteenth century, and the Harleianus, written in the second half of the fifteenth. Let us surmise, then, that at the beginning of the fourteenth century the Veronensis contained no more works of Ausonius than appear in P.

fled Giovanni, *in chartam* on its own is unlikely to have conveyed anything.

(29) Ed. xxxxii - xxxxv. Giovanni knew Fulgentius: Sabbadini, *Scoperte* II 89.

(30) *Familiares et secundae Matthaei Bossi epistolae* (Mantua 1498) LX.

Still, 9 - 14 deserve a word. In Giovanni's list the poem on usurpers, 10, follows *De ordine imperatorum*, which even in the fullest manuscripts, VBWΣ, breaks off halfway through Elagabalus. That can hardly be a coincidence, and it allows in the first place an answer to a rhetorical question of Schenkl's: "utrum in Caesaribus, qui nunc desinunt in tetrastichorum carmine XXIII medio, quaedam interciderint an Ausonius taedio adfectus aut morte impeditus opus abruperit, quis quaeso nunc diiudicet?" (31). The answer is surely "interciderunt quaedam", namely the second couplet on Elagabalus and quatrains on the other emperors before Decius; the lost work then took up the story. After that, speculation becomes decidedly less appealing. Together with *De ordine imperatorum* W, Paris. Lat. 4887 (s. xii), contains the four short poems that followed the lost work in the Veronensis, 11 - 14 (32). If this is significant, two explanations offer themselves: either W derives from the Veronensis in its defective state, or the list prefixed to the Veronensis never corresponded entirely to its contents but was transcribed in its own right. The second explanation would sever the connexion of Giovanni's list with anything tangible at the point in question and perhaps at other points too. The first has the unfortunate consequence that V, Leid. Voss. Lat. F 111 (s. ix), would have to derive equally from the Veronensis and therefore be composite, because it contains works absent from Giovanni's list.

Politian, who during his life brought many an old manuscript to light, by his death consigned others to darkness, and one of these may have been the Veronensis; certainly his failure to return it was lamented by Bosso some years later, as C. Dionisotti has shown (33). Yet Avanti-
 tius augmented his edition of 1507 with works "diu in situ iacentia" that had not been at his disposal in 1496, and the proximity of his text to Harl. 2613 shows that he took them directly or indirectly from the Veronensis (34). A bold conjecture of Peiper's would even preserve the Veronensis into the seventeenth century, though without effect on the text (35). Whatever its fate, it had survived long enough to lessen the misfortune of its loss.

Exeter College, Oxford

MICHAEL D. REEVE

(31) xlv n. 46.

(32) Schenkl xlv, where three descendants of roughly the same date are mentioned.

(33) "I.M.U." 11, 1968, 183 - 5.

(34) Cf. Peiper xxxxi. He cannot have taken them from the Harleianus, which omits *Ep.* 25. 123 - end (cf. n. 24).

(35) xxxxi n. **.