

Michael D. Reeve

EDITING PORPHYRIO:
A CAUTIONARY TALE

Many years ago I wrote an article on the transmission of Florus when I had seen only a few of the 200 or so manuscripts. An experienced editor urged me to wait until I had seen more, but two things impelled me to go ahead and publish: I had enjoyed trying to read between the lines of recent editions, and mindful of Karl Popper and Alexander Kleinlogel I saw advantages in testing predictions of how the manuscripts would turn out to behave. The tests largely confirmed them, and I wrote another article.¹ For writing the present article I have no such excuse, because I shall not make predictions and do not intend to check the text in any of the pertinent manuscripts. The necessary research has been done by Luca Paretti and Stephen Oakley, but my purpose here is less ambitious. When the three of us were exchanging a flurry of correspondence in 2003, I drafted an account of what editors and others had been doing since the 1820s with the manuscripts of the work concerned, which number a mere 22. A story took shape of repeated failure to ask the right questions, to adduce valid evidence, and to learn from predecessors, but two 19th-century scholars whose names I had never met emerged with reasonable credit. At the same time, the relationship between textual and external evidence threw up a problem that has become more acute as more evidence of each kind has come to light.

To my draft of 2003 I added in 2014 only a title, opening and closing paragraphs, and references in some footnotes, and I reproduce them all here. As the one work published between 2003 and 2014 that might have made a difference made none, the story could still be told as I told it in 2003; but now that manuscripts have started to appear

¹ The two articles are Reeve 1988, 477–491, and Reeve 1991, 453–483. I had in mind Kleinlogel 1979 and the criterion of falsifiability set up in the fourth chapter of Popper 1934/1935.

regularly on line the distinction between published and unpublished evidence is fading. I sent the draft of 2014 to Stephen Oakley, and he kindly acknowledged use of it when he published his account of the transmission;² but apart from adding a reference that he immediately gave me in 2014, further details from the work concerned, and a note that I appended in 2020, I make no further changes. Here the story is, then, with just one piece of unpublished evidence included and electronic territory merely signposted.³

* * *

Though much of Porphyrio's commentary on Horace has been in print since 1474–1475 and the rest since 1481 (*ISTC* ih00472000, 00451000), no-one examined the foundations of the text until the 19th century. In 1824 a transcript of the commentary on the *Ars poetica* was published from a manuscript believed at the time to date from the tenth century, M (Munich Staatsbibl. C. L. M. 181),⁴ and in 1830 Joh. Caspar Orelli, announcing F. Hauthal's plans for an edition of Horace and the ancient commentators, added this:⁵

Cum hoc viro mihi peramico communicabo accuratum apographum integri cd. Monacensis Porphyrionis sec. X, quod mihi ante aliquot annos paravi et ex quo, aliquo iam examine instituto, permulta in illo scholiasta corrigi atque etiam quae passim exciderunt posse suppleri probe intellexi.

Hauthal himself, in a fuller account of his plans, mentioned Orelli's copy of M and went on to cite from Platina, librarian at the Vatican from 1475 to 1481, a statement that accounted for the late date of the other manuscripts: Pope Nicholas V, who held office from 1447 to

² Oakley 2023, 245–332, with the acknowledgement on pp. vii–viii. On p. vii he also acknowledges use of Paretto 2000–2001.

³ My thanks go to Stephen Oakley and Luca Paretto, whose thunder I have done my best not to steal. Peter Lebrecht Schmidt kindly lent me a copy of the unpublished dissertation by Elizabeth Hunter Jones, for which see n. 36 below, but I have denied myself any use of it here.

⁴ Hocheder 1824, v (where he says that he made the transcript in 1822), vii, 175–187. The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek has now put M on line.

⁵ Orelli 1830, lv.

1455, sent Enoch of Ascoli to Germany and beyond in search of new texts, and Enoch's finds included Porphyrio.⁶

Hauthal's plans raise another matter of historical interest. He states it as his aim *pretium et affinitatem* [of the main witnesses] *inquirere, et ita fontes minorum sive manu exaratorum sive typis exscriptorum invenire, eosque tandem in tabula synoptica (genealogica quasi) ante oculos ponere*.⁷ That must be among the earliest applications of the term 'genealogy' to the classification of textual witnesses. It recalls Orelli's *familiae et quasi propagationes quaedam et codicum et editionum*.⁸

Hauthal's preparations dragged on, and in 1858–1859 F. Pauly beat him into print with an edition of Acro and Porphyrio;⁹ but Pauly did not use M until p. 179 of his second volume, though he added a collation up to p. 144 (the gap went unexplained). Hauthal immediately retaliated with a *Prodromus* in which he listed his *subsidia* and edited both commentaries in *Carm.* 1. 1–2 and Acro's up to 1. 3. 25.¹⁰ For Porphyrio, M, "saeculo nono aut ineunte decimo exaratus", headed his *subsidia*, and he disclosed that Orelli's copy had been made by Karl Halm. His other *subsidia* were twelve manuscripts of the 15th century, two collations of the 16th, and four editions of the 15th and 16th, and he asked, but did not decide, whether M was the manuscript that Enoch found. His full edition, the first to use M from the outset even if at one remove, appeared in 1864–1866. A reviewer unhelpfully opined that M was either the source of the other manuscripts or an immediate offshoot of a common source,¹¹ but Wilhelm Meyer in 1870 committed himself: the three late manuscripts used in Hauthal's apparatus, and probably all the rest, descended in some way from M.¹² Accordingly, Meyer based

⁶ Hauthal 1830, 459 and 460–462 n. 15; and see Gaida 1913–1932, 338. 22–24.

⁷ Hauthal 1830, 451.

⁸ See Timpanaro 1985, 49–50.

⁹ Pauly 1858–1859. His title includes *post Georgium Fabricium*, who published his edition at Basel in 1555. Braunhard 1833–1835 includes a reprint of Acro and Porphyrio adjusted with the aid of the scholia in Leipzig Rep. I fol. 6 (s. xi) and apparently by conjecture; see I vii, x.

¹⁰ Hauthal 1859.

¹¹ Elsperger 1867, 26.

¹² Meyer 1870, 3–5.

his Teubner edition of 1874 on M and took from the late manuscripts only what he regarded as good conjectures. M. Petschenig overshot in his review when he said that Meyer had proved the descent of all the other manuscripts from M.¹³

Meanwhile, a further piece of external evidence about Enoch of Ascoli had come to light, and more followed. In the very year of Pauly's second volume and Hauthal's *Prodromus*, 1859, G. Voigt published a letter that Poggio wrote from the papal chancery on April 30th 1451 about Enoch's commission. It gave Ludwig of Erlichshausen this information:¹⁴

mittimus ... Enoch Esculanum ... qui diversa loca et monasteria inquirat si quis ex ipsis deperditis apud vos libris reperiretur. Idcirco ... velis omnes tui territorii libros sibi ostendere, antiquos presertim et prisce scripture, et simul permittere ut in tuo territorio scribi possit expensis nostris. Nolumus enim ut aliquis liber surripiatur sed tantummodo ut fiat copia transcribendi.

By October 28th Enoch had reached Verona, by December 6th Roskilde (near Copenhagen).¹⁵ In 1893 V. Rossi investigated the date of various letters about his return and concluded that though he was back in Rome by December 13th 1455, a few months after the death of Pope Nicholas V, he had not yet made any of his finds available for copying when he died in 1457 between August 28th and December 10th.¹⁶ Some of the letters that Rossi cited had been published before, but he established that only two, an undated one from Panormita and a reply from Aurispa dated *Idibus Decembris*, belonged to 1455. Then R. Sabbadini reported the date 1455 from Pier Candido Decembrio's account of the manuscript that included another of Enoch's discoveries, the minor works of Tacitus.¹⁷ More evidence about Enoch's knowledge of Porphyrio was published in 1895.

¹³ Petschenig 1874, 341–342.

¹⁴ Voigt 1859, 361 n. 2 = ²1881, 202 n. 1 = ³1893, 200 n. 3. He prints *apud vos*, but *apud nos* would give better order without changing the sense.

¹⁵ Sabbadini 1914 b, 276–277; Mancini 1882, 328–329.

¹⁶ Rossi 1893, 129–150.

¹⁷ Sabbadini 1901, 262–264. Stok 1985, 295–306, usefully brings the evidence together but nevertheless admits, p. 282, that since Sabbadini's day none

At Augsburg in the 1450s the young Sigismund Meisterlin was compiling a history of the city, founded by the Romans as Augusta Vindelicorum, and it puzzled him what connexion Horace had in mind at *Carm.* 4. 4. 17–22 between the Vindelici and the Amazons. Fortunately, someone helpful paid a timely visit: a papal envoy, Enoch of Ascoli, who told him that the cathedral library possessed an ancient commentary on Horace by Porphyrio. They went and consulted it together.¹⁸

Evidence also came to light about the earlier history of the text. In 1866 J. Klein published a scrapbook compiled in the mid ninth century by Sedulius Scottus, which includes several quotations from Porphyrio.¹⁹ In 1875, when H. Hagen published a catalogue of the manuscripts at Bern, he reported from a copy of Servius's commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*, Bern 363 (s. ix), a note interpolated at 9. 35, *Lege Pomponii expositionem in Oratium, quam vidi in Lorashaimm*, with *in Hlorashaimm* repeated in the margin (f. 25 v).²⁰ The name has become Lorsch, and the monastery there, founded in 764, is well known for its medieval holdings of classical texts.²¹

Through all these developments, M was guarding a secret. It had been in use for over a century when Bernhard Bischoff in 1940 reported from its last page the 15th-century entry “*maria v(irgo)*”, which he identified as an *ex libris* of Augsburg Cathedral. He also assigned M not to the tenth century but to the middle of the ninth and reported without comment P. Lehmann's view that it could

has been added except by Rubinstein 1958; and this letter reveals nothing of immediate relevance to Enoch or Porphyrio.

¹⁸ Joachimsohn 1895, 33–34, taken up by Traube 1906, 1239, and from there by Lehmann 1911, 85–86, and by Sabbadini himself, 1914 a, 244 and 1914 b, 277 n. 9. The Latin version of Meisterlin's *Cronographia Augustensium* has never been published; the German version now has, by Gröchenig 1998, but is not widely available. From Stephen Oakley in 2014: the relevant passage of the Latin version was published by Müller 2010, 251 n. 56. At p. 243 n. 23 Müller identifies his source as Augsburg 2^o cod. Aug. 56; for other manuscripts of either version he cites at p. 238 n. 3 Colberg 1987, 358–360, and the corrections at Colberg 2004, 988.

¹⁹ Klein 1866. Quotations from Porphyrio are listed in the index, p. 152.

²⁰ Hagen 1875, 348, and again in Hagen 1897, i.

²¹ Reynolds–Wilson 2013, 99–100, 109; Reynolds 1983, Index p. 488.

well come from Lorsch.²² Later, however, he dissociated the hand from Lorsch.²³

Still, everything else seems to fit. Whether M originated at Lorsch or not, Enoch found it at Augsburg Cathedral, and the late manuscripts will all descend from a copy that he took back to Italy, in accordance with what Poggio represented as a papal order: to make copies and not walk off with the originals.²⁴

Alas, Hauthal's edition already includes recalcitrant evidence ignored by Meyer. Meyer prints in italics words or phrases absent from M and supplied either in late manuscripts or by himself, and Hauthal's apparatus reveals that in many of these passages late manuscripts have words that M could have omitted by *saut du même au même*:

Carm. 1. 29. 2 *paras* <*non ante ... paras*>
Carm. 3. 24. 33 *querimoniae* <*si non ... querimoniae*>
Serm. 1. 4. 21 *recitentur* <*deinde ... delectentur*>
Serm. 1. 4. 107 *hortaretur* <*parce ... hortaretur*>
Serm. 1. 5. 77 *ostentare mihi* <*non est ... notos ostentare mihi*>
Ep. 1. 18. 75 *accepto* <*laeteris ... accepto*>

Meyer but not Hauthal reports the omission by M of another such passage:

Serm. 2. 2. 37 *adpetis* <*maiolem ... adpetis*>

Even if a 15th-century reader working on a copy of M had detected all these omissions, they would hardly have been repaired in a way that happened to account for them. Another passage omitted by M but present in late manuscripts, *Serm.* 1. 5. 51 *profect<os in coccei nervae villam ma>nsisse*, presumably formed a line, albeit a short one, in an

²² Bischoff 1940, 10 (I thank Michael I. Allen for checking the rare first edition at the University of Chicago). Lehmann 1928, 203 = 1959, 37, assigned M to the first half of the ninth century.

²³ Bischoff 1974, 78 n. 99; id. 1980, 194 (“wohl westdeutsch, nicht aus Lorsch”); id. 2004, 220 no. 2921 (“wohl Westdeutschland, IX. Jh., ca. Mitte”). Lehmann 1928, 203 = 1959, 37, had seen nothing in the hand that did not suit Lorsch.

²⁴ So for instance Bianca 1998, 209, who adds that Enoch's copy is probably lost.

ancestor, since there was no other reason for omitting it; and the same could be true of *Epod.* 17. 81 (*ab*) *inferis elicere*.

More evidence against the primacy of M emerged in 1894, when A. Holder published an edition based instead on a manuscript that he considered older and rightly assigned to the ninth century, V (Vat. Lat. 3314).²⁵ He does not say who found V, which he collated in October and November 1887. Instead, however, of citing textual evidence for its independence, he simply gave it pride of place. Nevertheless, he asserted the independence of M despite the impression “*primo quidem obtutu*” that it was a copy of V. By listing 54 passages where he follows M because V “*forte lapsus est*” he may not have meant that they all prove the independence of M, but do any? In only five where he prints the original reading of M is more than a single letter at stake:

- Carm.* 3. 2. 26 *vulga[ve]rit* M¹ (in a lemma)
Epod. 17. 81 *mentem amore incendere nihil in te potero [artis
 amore incendere nihil in te potero] artisque meae* M
Serm. 1. 7. 2–3 *esse* M ante ras. *est* V
Ep. 1. 11. 19 *sextili [sextili]* M
Ep. 1. 18. 101 *nihil* M *mihi* V

The two dittographies here could have been either emended away or skipped by *saut du même au même*, and none of the other three errors pose more of a challenge than such errors of a single letter as these:

- Carm.* 2. 17. 19–20 *astri<s> huius*
Carm. 3. 5. 43–44 *dei[e]cisse*
Carm. 3. 16. 23–24 *pastes* (correctly deciphered?) for *partes*
Epod. 5. 43 *scelur* (correctly deciphered?)
Ep. 1. 17. 1 *charactare*
Ep. 2. 2. 162 *id es[t]*

Holder’s apparatus yields eight more errors of V that he did not list: seven of a single letter, the eighth a longer but equally trivial haplography, *Ep.* 2. 2. 1 *sent[ent]ia*. Surely, in the 409 pages of

²⁵ Holder 1894. Seven ‘*Testimonia de Porfyryone*’ lurk at the back, pp. 612–613.

the edition, it must be more significant that V omits not a single word preserved by M. As for the late manuscripts, he put Paris B. N. Lat. 7988 close to the common source of V and M and derived the rest, *exempla Italorum interpolata*, from Enoch's manuscript; but he said nothing about the relationship of Enoch's manuscript to V and M, mentioned none of its supposed descendants except the three that "accurate a me examinati sunt", and cited no grounds for associating those three.

In an important review of Holder's edition, J. Häussner claimed to have collated V before him, and Marco Buonocore of the Vatican Library kindly gave me information that supports the claim: "Da una verifica nel nostro schedario, risulta che J. Häussner ha consultato il Vat. lat. 3314 sicuramente nell'anno 1887; forse proprio nel mese di aprile, in quanto il 27 aprile del 1887 era alla Vaticana, dove risulta aver consultato il Vat. lat. 3315. Purtroppo la sua scheda di richiesta del Vat. lat. 3314 ha solo l'anno, mancando sia il mese che il giorno. Mi sembra, comunque, certo, che la sua collazione del codice sia precedente a quella dell'Holder eseguita tra ottobre e novembre del 1887". Perhaps neither discovered it, because P. de Nolhac had mentioned its early date in a work that has a dedication written in August 1887.²⁶ Buonocore adds this, however: "Per il de Nolhac, non risulta nulla al riguardo". Be that as it may, Häussner gave sound reasons for deriving M from V and then bad reasons for not doing so.²⁷ His sound reasons for doing so were that at *Ars poet.* 139 M has an error attributable to the layout of V, namely the superscript phrase $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \mu\upsilon\varsigma$ inserted between the o and $\rho\omicron\varsigma$ of $\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$, and that at *Ep.* 1. 12. 22 and 1. 17. 14 it leaves gaps in words that V splits between lines, *ae|quam* and *reci|procum*.²⁸ His bad reasons for not doing so were 24 divergences, of which M turns out on inspection to have the better reading in only two, *Ep.* 2. 2. 155 *ullus* for *ullos* and

²⁶ Nolhac 1887, 226. Holder 1894, viii, showed that in 1570 Orsini put V at the disposal of Claude Dupuy, who made a collation; but it is absent from the section "De codicibus Porphyrianeis" in *Urba* 1885, 9–25, and from Antonibon 1888, 96–97, where he lists Vatican manuscripts.

²⁷ Häussner 1895, 915–918.

²⁸ Römer 1976, xxxvi, xlix, derives manuscripts that have *solī darentur* at *Tac. Ann.* 15. 43. 3 from Vat. Lat. 1863, which has *solī|darentur*, and manuscripts that have *prīmō res* at 15. 51. 1 from M, which has *prīmō|res*.

175 *perpetuus* for *perpetuis* (these were two of Holder's 54 passages). One of the other 22, however, may indeed be significant: *Serm.* 1. 10. 76 *enim* M for *autem* V. Though erroneous, *enim* surely arose from the Insular abbreviation for *autem*, and so M is unlikely to be a direct copy of V if V writes *autem* in full. If V abbreviates it, however, the argument is worthless.²⁹ As for the late manuscripts, he gave a good reason for not deriving from M what he considered the closest to V and M of those that he had seen, Vat. Chig. H VII 229: it has passages omitted by M but present in V. In fact he went further and said that it showed "fast durchweg" very close dependence on V. Published evidence allows his conclusion that it could not descend from M to be broadened: in the passages listed above where Meyer repairs omissions of M, Hauthal's late manuscripts agree with V against M. A discrepancy in a passage cited above, *Serm.* 1. 5. 51, affects the length of the putative line skipped in M: Meyer supplies the name as *Coccei*, Hauthal from late manuscripts and Holder from V as *Coccei Nervae*. An oversight of Meyer's, or was he following a manuscript that omitted *Nervae*?

Another reviewer of Holder's edition, P. Wessner, gave a weightier reason why M could not descend from V: M has the original reading of V in several places where corrections were made in V "bereits von erster hand" and sometimes by erasure.³⁰ Strangely, he concluded that only V "für eine ausgabe ... in frage kommt", even though Holder "natürlich" used M where it had better readings. Häussner too cited one reading like those listed by Wessner, but only as an example of the strange readings to be found in M: *Serm.* 1. 2. 133 *credimat* (*redimat* V² by erasure). Whether the argument is sound, however, depends on whether it really was the scribe of V who made the corrections and whether M is so much later than V that it could not have been copied from V before they were made. Erasures are unlikely to be paleographically datable unless the corrector wrote something new in the same space.

Little has happened since that affects the relationship of V, M, Enoch's manuscript, and the late manuscripts. The discovery of V has been attributed to its first attested owner, Agostino Patrizi,

²⁹ No edition confirms his statements about *Carm.* 1. 1. 22 (where he reports the same error), *Serm.* 1. 5. 98, *Serm.* 1. 7. 23, *Ep.* 1. 18. 41, *Ep.* 2. 2. 189.

³⁰ P. Wessner 1895, 417–418, where he listed twelve passages.

bishop of Pienza from 1484 to 1495, whose *ex libris* was added during that time (f. 1 r “A. Patritii ep. Pientini”),³¹ and Bischoff appears to have provided confirmation by assigning the hand of V to Tuscany or Umbria.³² M. M. Gorman has since assigned V specifically to the Badia Amiatina in south-western Tuscany, and he points out that Pius II opens Book IX of his *Commentarii* with a long description of Monte Amiata and its surroundings in connexion with his stay there in 1462.³³ A different suggestion has also been made, that Patrizi acquired V in 1471 on a diplomatic tour of Germany;³⁴ from their main destination, Regensburg, his party continued to places as far west as Sélestat on a route that passed through Würzburg, Mergentheim, and Heidelberg, and so took them, if not to Lorsch, at least close by.³⁵ Elizabeth Hunter Jones, who under the supervision of B. L. Ullman devoted a thesis to four of the late manuscripts, argued that Vat. Chig. H VII 229 best represented Enoch’s manuscript;³⁶ and Claudia Villa has added eight late manuscripts to the list that Hauthal gave in his *Prodromus*, so that the total of late manuscripts has reached 20.³⁷

³¹ Sabbadini 1905, 148, cited by Avesani 1964, 35, when he says it was because of V that Patrizi “fu nominato tra gli ultimi scopritori quattrocenteschi di testi classici”. So far as I am aware, it remains true that Patrizi is not known to have discovered anything else.

³² Bischoff 1968, 313; id. 1975, 82–83. In n. 23 above I mentioned that Lehmann had seen nothing in the hand of M that did not suit Lorsch, and indeed he expressed the same opinion about V; Wessner 1895, 418, had assigned both to Lorsch on the strength of the reference in Bern 363 and an entry for Horace in a ninth-century catalogue from Lorsch, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1877.

³³ Gorman 2002, 231, 242–243, 254, with plate 12 of f. 1 v.

³⁴ Bianca 1998, 403; without explicitly contradicting Bischoff, she gives Lorsch as the provenance of V. If Holder’s mention of Patrizi’s *iter Germanicum* was meant to imply that he discovered V in the course of it, then Holder anticipated both Bianca and Sabbadini 1905, 148.

³⁵ Kramer 1949, 554. The evidence comes from his own account *De legatione Germanica*, not yet published in its entirety from Vat. Lat. 3842.

³⁶ Jones 1960 (abstract; the thesis is unpublished). Like Holder and before him Antonibon 1888, 96, she gave the date 1460 for this manuscript, but no date is given by Pellegrin et al. 1975, 367–368, or by Buonocore 1992, 71–73 no. 22.

³⁷ Villa 1994, 127–129. Two of the eight had already been used in editions, Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 85 by Pauly and St Omer 656 by Holder. She includes Rome Vallicell. E 41, Hauthal’s no. 36, in which according to Hauthal “scholia potius ad Acronem quam ad Porphyriionem pertinent”. When Keller 1876, 145–146, reviewing Pauly 1875, said that besides M Pauly ought to have used Gud.

When R. Helm summarized the transmission in 1952, nothing entitled him to say that the manuscript at Wolfenbüttel, Gud. Lat. 85, best represented the later tradition, or that the whole of the later tradition descended from Enoch's manuscript.³⁸ Over the late manuscripts Hauthal and Holder ought also to have taken up an implicit challenge. Pauly set out with just one manuscript, Gud. Lat. 85, which he assigned to the 13th century.³⁹ Nowhere in his work of 1859–1866 did Hauthal defend against this dating his observation of 1830 that all the manuscripts except M were written after Enoch's discovery. In his *Prodromus*, doubtless to spite Pauly, he ignored Gud. Lat. 85 altogether, and though he assigned all his own manuscripts except M to the 15th century, he did not argue that they were all written after Enoch's discovery. In fact he needed a defence not just against Pauly, because others had put Gud. Lat. 85 in the 14th century.⁴⁰ Without referring to anyone else's dating, Holder put it in the 15th, and indeed his derivation of it from Enoch's manuscript required a date no earlier than 1455; but he would have received small comfort if he had lived to see the latest catalogue for Wolfenbüttel, which puts it in "14/15 Jhd".⁴¹ Hauthal and Holder suffered another setback, it might have seemed, when Keller assigned to the early 13th century a manuscript that they had assigned to the 15th, Paris

Lat. 85 and "die älteste Strassburger Handschrift", he meant not a manuscript of Porphyrio but C VII 7 of Horace, A in Oberlin 1788, vi–vii, 369–370, and D in Keller–Holder 1864–1869, I 301–304, II iv; Holder in his edition of Porphyrio cites it more often than any other glossed manuscript of Horace, and Keller went on to say in Keller–Holder 1899, vi, that Holder had collated it in 1864 but it perished in the bombardment of 1870.

³⁸ Helm 1952, 2415–2416. Tarrant 1983, 186, and Diederich 1999, 5–7, follow Holder. Kalinina 2007, 17–18, has nothing new to say and perversely assigns M to the 10th century. P. L. Schmidt in Schmidt–Herzog 1997, 259–261 § 446, shows more awareness of the uncertainties and provides copious bibliography, gratefully exploited here. Schmidt's alternative symbol for V, namely U, seems to have been invented by Schweikert 1915, 1, who ungrammatically calls it "Cod. Vaticanus (Ursinus)"; true, Holder used no symbol, but Häussner and Wessner opted for V.

³⁹ Pauly 1858, 4–5, 17–18.

⁴⁰ Ebert 1827, 90–91 no. 446; Kirchner 1847, 44 n., and id. 1854, xxvi. Presumably the dating accounts for expressions like "the manuscripts of the 14th or 15th century", used by Meyer 1870, 3, and Häussner 1895, 915.

⁴¹ Milchsack 1913, 132 no. 4389.

B. N. Lat. 7988;⁴² but Chatelain quickly put Keller right,⁴³ and Villa narrows the date to the second half of the 15th century. Villa has also brought Gud. Lat. 85 back into the 15th century. Of the other 18 late manuscripts that Villa lists, Vat. Lat. 8898 can be dated between 1464 and 1466, Bern 516 includes a work copied in 1472, Ottob. Lat. 1434 and Vat. Lat. 1518 include other works found by Enoch, five are datable after Enoch's death in 1457 from the identity of the scribe or the first owner, and she assigns five to the second half of the 15th century and the other four more broadly to the 15th century. Of these four, two have been illustrated, and neither looks at all likely to have been written in the first half of the century.⁴⁴ Unless, therefore, Gud. Lat. 85 or one of the other two, Laur. 52. 28 and Ricc. 840, can be shown to antedate Enoch's return in 1455, Hauthal's observation stands after all.⁴⁵

Not just the *terminus post quem* of the humanistic tradition matters but also, in view of the notion that V was not found until 1471, the *terminus ante quem* of whatever discovery brought the text into circulation among the humanists. If the late manuscripts descend from V as Häussner said of Chig. H VII 229, it must have been found before 1471, because Vat. Lat. 8898 is datable between 1464 and 1466. Worse, Ottob. Lat. 1434 has the arms of Biondo, who died in 1463, and Chig. H VII 229 those of Pius II, who died in 1464 and whose efforts to obtain Enoch's finds are mentioned in the letter

⁴² Keller 1902–1904, I vi–vii, xii.

⁴³ See the retraction in Keller 1902–1904, II v n. *, 508. Did his misdating perhaps go back far enough to underlie Holder's separation of this manuscript from the other late manuscripts? It can now be viewed on line in *Gallica*, and interested readers can decide for themselves whether Keller had any justification for the misdating.

⁴⁴ Buonocore 1992, plate CX of Ottob. Lat. 1379, plate CXXXIV of Vat. Lat. 3315; both are *chartacei*, and the watermarks reported in Pellegrin et al. 1975, 544 and Pellegrin et al. 2010, 248–249, suit a date after 1455. He also illustrates Urb. Lat. 359 in plate III, Chig. H VII 229 in plate X, Ottob. Lat. 1434 in plate XI, V (f. 64 v) in plate XIII, Vat. Lat. 8898 in plate LXXXI, and Vat. Lat. 1518 in plate CXXV. The frontispieces of three are illustrated again in Mariotti 1998: Urb. Lat. 359 in plate XXIX opposite p. 704, Ottob. Lat. 1434 in plate XXX opposite p. 705, Chig. H VII 229 in plate XXXII opposite p. 721.

⁴⁵ Laur. 52. 28 can now be viewed at teca.bmlonline.it. I withhold my own verdict.

of 1457 that provides the *terminus ante quem* for Enoch's death;⁴⁶ furthermore, a strong case has been made for deriving the former from Vat. Lat. 1518.⁴⁷ On the other hand, J. Ruyschaert's suggestion that Vat. Lat. 1518 was annotated by Pietro Odo da Montopoli, who died in 1463, was rejected by Augusto Campana.⁴⁸

Evidence has accrued for the medieval circulation of the commentary, but it contributes nothing to determining the relationship of V, M, Enoch's manuscript, and the humanistic tradition. The reference to Lorsch is one of many things in Bern 363 accompanied by an abbreviation of Sedulius Scottus's name, and more quotations have been found in his works.⁴⁹ An extract appears in Paris B. N. Lat. 7900 A of Horace (s. ix/x), which like Bern 363 has been assigned to Milan, and others in Munich C. L. M. 14420 (s. x²), which has been connected at one remove with Brescia.⁵⁰ Three extracts appear in the margins of a glossary annotated by Heiric of Auxerre, B. L. Harl. 2735 (s. ix).⁵¹ Between 1049 and 1160 a copy was recorded at Lobbes,⁵² and it may not be a coincidence that L. Carrion in 1583 spoke of forthcoming notes on Porphyrio, "quem multo plenior et integriorem habemus et aliquando cum dis volentibus in lucem dabimus",⁵³ because he used a manuscript of another rare text recorded at Lobbes, Valerius Flaccus's *Argonautica*.⁵⁴ An entry in a catalogue drawn up at Bury

⁴⁶ Rossi 1893, 134–135.

⁴⁷ On these three manuscripts see Pellegrin et al. 1975, 367–368, 563–564, Pellegrin et al. 1991, 98–99; on the relationship between Vat. Lat. 1518 and Ottob. Lat. 1434, Brugnoli 1960 a, 347–350, Brugnoli 1960 b, xxi–xxvi.

⁴⁸ See Donati 2000, 70–71.

⁴⁹ Hagen 1897, lii–lxvii; Dolbeau 1988–1989, 70–84, an important contribution that makes further references superfluous.

⁵⁰ Villa 1981, 12 (part I of an article written with G. C. Alessio). On the other hand, Bischoff 1998, 125 no. 585, puts Bern 363 in a group, "die wahrscheinlich aus dem Schülerkreis des Sedulius Scottus abhängig u. mit St Gallen verbunden ist".

⁵¹ Reeve 1985, 91. On this manuscript, later owned and annotated by Pierre Daniel, see Ganz 1991, 297–305. Diederich 1999, 5–7, conflates Porphyrio's remarks on *Carm.* 2. 1. 37–38 and 3. 28. 16 by confusing the extract on f. 85 v with Daniel's first note on it; Daniel at first misidentified the passage as 3. 28. 16 but then found the other.

⁵² Dolbeau 1978, 35 no. 336, and Dolbeau 1979, 230 no. 336.

⁵³ Carrion 1583, I 14 f. 27 r, pointed out by Hauthal 1830, 462 n. 15.

⁵⁴ See most recently Liberman 1997, lxxxii–lxxxiii.

St Edmunds in the mid 14th century reads as follows: *Pomponius Porphirionis floruit* [then a gap] *et scripsit Commentaria super omnes libros Oracii*.⁵⁵ This is the only attestation of Porphyrio's fuller name that I have met outside the manuscripts, the excerpts in Harl. 2735, and the catalogue of Lobbes; Sedulius Scottus uses either 'Porphyrio' or 'Pomponius' but never both at once, and no-one could have guessed that he was referring to the same person.

Apart from the information provided by Marco Buonocore, I have compiled this account entirely from published evidence, though not all of it is widely accessible. The upshot? Hauthal suggested in 1830 that the late manuscripts were all written after Enoch of Ascoli brought to Italy one from northern Europe, an event later shown to have happened by 1455, and earlier dates for two of them have evaporated. It has been plain since 1874, if not since 1864–1866, that some of them cannot descend from M, and no evidence has been offered that any of the rest do. After V entered the picture in 1887, it could easily be seen not to descend from M, and Häussner made a plausible case for deriving M from it, but the evidence offered by him and others to the contrary, though feeble, included a reading hard to explain, *enim* for *autem* at *Serm.* 1. 10. 76, if M was copied directly from V and V has *autem* written out in full.⁵⁶ Häussner described one of the late manuscripts as closely dependent on V, but no-one has shown that any of them descend from V or indeed that they have anything in common apart from being late.⁵⁷ Since 1895 it has been known that Enoch found a manuscript in the cathedral library at Augsburg, since 1940 that M belonged to that library in the 15th century. Why then has no descendant of M come to light? Over to Messrs Oakley and Paretti.

Michael D. Reeve
Pembroke College, Cambridge
 mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

⁵⁵ Rouse–Rouse 2004, 415 no. 488. Richard Sharpe, the general editor of the series, had kindly alerted me to the entry in November 2002.

⁵⁶ See n. 29 above. Addition of October 2020: at *Serm.* 1. 10. 76 V has *autem* in full (f. 115 v^a), M *enim* in full (f. 39 r^a); at *Carm.* 1. 1. 22 V and M both have *autem* in full.

⁵⁷ In 2026 this last remark is outdated. See n. 2.

Bibliography

- G. Antonibon, *Studi sull'Arte poetica di Q. Orazio Flacco* (Bassano 1888).
- R. Avesani, "Per la biblioteca di Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini vescovo di Pienza", *Studi e Testi* 236 (1964) 1–87.
- C. Bianca, "Enoch d'Ascoli", "Patrizzi Piccolomini, Agostino", in: Mariotti 1998, 209, 403.
- B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit* I (Leipzig 1940, Wiesbaden 1960, 1974).
- B. Bischoff, "Frühkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat", *Scriptorium* 22 (1968) 306–314.
- B. Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Munich 1974).
- B. Bischoff, "Paläographie und frühmittelalterliche Klassikerüberlieferung", *Settimane* 22 (1975) 59–86.
- B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen* II (Wiesbaden 1980).
- B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)* I (Wiesbaden 1998).
- B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)* II (Wiesbaden 2004).
- H. W. Braunhard (ed.), *Q. Horatii Flacci opera omnia* I–II (Leipzig 1833–1835).
- G. Brugnoli, "De IV codicibus libellum Suetonianum de grammaticis continentibus nuperrime adinventis", *Giornale italiano di filologia* 13 (1960 a) 346–350.
- G. Brugnoli (ed.), *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae. Pars prior: De grammaticis et rhetoribus* (Leipzig 1960 b).
- M. Buonocore, *Codices Horatiani in Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana* (Vatican 1992).
- L. Carrion, *Emendationes et observationes* (Paris 1583).
- K. Colberg, *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* 6 (1987).
- K. Colberg, *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* 11 (2004).
- S. Diederich, *Der Horazkommentar des Porphyrio im Rahmen der kaiserzeitlichen Schul- und Bildungstradition* (Berlin 1999).
- F. Dolbeau, "Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XI^e et XII^e siècles", *Recherches Augustiniennes* 13 (1978) 3–36.
- F. Dolbeau, "Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XI^e et XII^e siècles", *Recherches Augustiniennes* 14 (1979) 191–248.
- F. Dolbeau, "Recherches sur le *Collectaneum miscellaneum* de Sedulius Scottus", *ALMA* 48–49 (1988–1989) 47–84.
- G. Donati, *Pietro Odo da Montopoli e la biblioteca di Niccolò V* (Rome 2000).
- F. A. Ebert, *Zur Handschriftenkunde II: Bibliothecae Guelferbytanæ codices graeci et latini classici* (Leipzig 1827).
- <C. S. G.> Elspenger, rev.: Hauthal 1864–1866, *Blätter für das Bayer. Gymn.* 3 (1867) 20–26, 46–52.

- G. Gaida, *Platynae historici liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum* (Città di Castello 1913–1932).
- D. Ganz, “Heiric d’Auxerre glossateur du *Liber glossarum*”, in: D. Iogna-Prat, C. Jeudy, G. Lobrichon (edd.), *L’école carolingienne d’Auxerre de Murethach à Remi 830–908* (Paris 1991) 297–305.
- M. M. Gorman, “Manuscript Books at Monte Amiata in the Eleventh Century”, *Scriptorium* 56 (2002) 225–293.
- H. Gröchenig (ed.), *Cronographia Augustensium nach der Handschrift 158/4 in St Paul in Kärnten*. 1. *Abbildung des deutschen Textes*. 2. *Transkription des deutschen Textes* (Klagenfurt 1998).
- H. Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium* (Bern 1875).
- H. Hagen, *Codex Bernensis 363 phototypice editus* (Leiden 1897).
- J. Häussner, rev.: Holder 1894, *GGA* 1895, 915–918.
- F. Hauthal, “De nova Horatii editione”, *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 14 (1830) 450–462.
- F. Hauthal, *Acronis et Porphyrius qui circumferuntur commentarii in Quintum Horatium Flaccum I* (Leipzig 1859).
- F. Hauthal (ed.), *Acronis et Porphyrius commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum I–II* (Berlin 1864–1866).
- R. Helm, “Pomponius Porphyrio, Horazkommentator”, *RE* 21 (1952) 2412–2416.
- F. von P. Hocheder, *Des Quintus Horatius Flaccus Buch über die Dichtkunst oder Brief an die Pisonen* (Passau 1824).
- A. Holder, *Pomponi Porphyrius commentum in Horatium Flaccum* (Innsbruck 1894).
- P. Joachimsohn, *Die humanistische Geschichtschreibung in Deutschland I* (Bonn 1895).
- E. H. Jones, “A Fifteenth-Century Manuscript of Porphyrio’s Commentary on Horace”, *Dissertation Abstracts* 20 (1960) 2789–2790.
- A. Kalinina, *Der Horazkommentar des Pomponius Porphyrio: Untersuchungen zu seiner Terminologie und Textgeschichte* (Stuttgart 2007).
- O. Keller, rev.: Pauly 1875, *Zeitschr. für die Öst. Gymn.* 27 (1876) 145–146.
- O. Keller, *Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora I–II* (Leipzig 1902–1904).
- O. Keller, A. Holder (edd.), *Q. Horati Flacci opera I–II* (Leipzig 1864–1869).
- O. Keller, A. Holder (edd.), *Q. Horati Flacci opera I* (Leipzig 2¹⁸⁹⁹).
- C. Kirchner, *Novae quaestiones Horatianae* (Naumburg 1847).
- C. Kirchner, *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus zwei Bücher Satiren I* (Leipzig 1854).
- J. Klein, *Ueber eine Handschrift des Nicolaus von Cues nebst ungedruckten Fragmenten Ciceronischer Reden* (Berlin 1866).
- A. Kleinlogel, “Archetypus und Stemma: zur Problematik prognostisch-retro-diktiver Methoden der Textkritik”, *BWG* 2 (1979) 53–64.
- H. Kramer, “Agostino Patrizis Beschreibung der Reise des Kardinallegaten Francesco Piccolomini zum Christentag in Regensburg 1471”, in:

- L. Santifaller (ed.), *Festschrift zur Feier des zweihundertjährigen Bestandes des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs I*, Mitt. Öst. Staatsarchiv Supp. 2 (Vienna 1949) 549–565.
- P. Lehmann, *Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften* (Munich 1911).
- P. Lehmann, “Reste und Spuren antiker Gelehrsamkeit in mittelalterlichen Texten”, *Philologus* 83 (1928) 193–203 = id., *Erforschung des Mittelalters* 2 (Stuttgart 1959) 29–37.
- G. Liberman, *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautiques I* (Paris 1997).
- G. Mancini, *Vita di Leon Battista Alberti* (Florence 1882).
- S. Mariotti (ed.), *Orazio: enciclopedia oraziana III* (Rome 1998).
- W. Meyer, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Horazscholiasten Porphyrius* (Munich 1870).
- W. Meyer, *Pomponii Porphyrii commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum* (Leipzig 1874).
- G. Milchsack, in: *Die Gudischen Handschriften: Die griechischen Handschriften bearb. von F. Köhler; Die lateinischen Handschriften bearb. von G. Milchsack* (Wolfenbüttel 1913).
- G. M. Müller, “Humanistische Aspekte der *Cronographia Augustensium* des Sigismund Meisterlin”, in: G. M. Müller (ed.), *Humanismus und Renaissance in Augsburg: Kulturgeschichte einer Stadt zwischen Spätmittelalter und Dreissigjährigem Krieg* (Berlin 2010) 237–273.
- P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris 1887).
- S. P. Oakley, *Studies in the Transmission of Latin Texts II* (Oxford 2023).
- J. J. Oberlin, *Quinti Horatii Flacci Carmina* (Strasbourg 1788).
- J. C. Orelli, “Epistola critica ad Io. Nic. Madvigium”, in: *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orator Brutus Topica De optimo genere oratorum* (Zürich 1830) v–cvi.
- L. Paretti, *Porphyrio in Horatium. La tradizione del commento a Orazio di Porfirione dall’antichità alla riscoperta umanistica* (Potenza 2000–2001).
- F. Pauly, *Quaestiones criticae de Acronis et Porphyrii commentariis Horatianis* (Prague 1858).
- F. Pauly, *Scholia Horatiana quae feruntur Acronis et Porphyrii post Georgium Fabricium nunc primum emendatiora edidit Franciscus Pauly* (Prague 1858–1859).
- F. Pauly, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Horazscholiasten Porphyrius* (Prague 1875).
- É. Pellegrin et al., *Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane I. Fonds Archivio San Pietro à Ottoboni* (Paris 1975).
- É. Pellegrin et al., *Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane III 1. Fonds Vatican latin, 224–2900* (Paris 1991).
- É. Pellegrin et al., *Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane III 2. Fonds Vatican latin, 2901–14740* (Paris 2010).
- M. Petschenig, rev.: Meyer 1874, *Zeitschr. für die Öst. Gymn.* 25 (1874) 341–351.

- K. R. Popper, *Logik der Forschung* (Vienna 1934/1935); English translation: *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (London 1959).
- M. D. Reeve, rev.: J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin textual criticism in Antiquity* (New York 1981), *CPh* 80 (1985) 85–92.
- M. D. Reeve, “The Transmission of Florus’s *Epitoma de Tito Liuio* and the *Periochae*”, *CQ* 82 (1988) 477–491.
- M. D. Reeve, “The Transmission of Florus and the *Periochae* again”, *CQ* 85 (1991) 453–483.
- L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford 1983),
- L. D. Reynolds, N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford 2013).
- F. Römer (ed.), *P. Cornelii Taciti Annalium libri XV–XVI*, WS Beiheft 6 (Vienna–Cologne–Graz 1976).
- V. Rossi, “L’indole e gli studi di Giovanni di Cosimo de’ Medici”, *Rend. Acc. Linc.* V 2 (1893) 129–150.
- R. H. Rouse, M. A. Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede, ‘Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis’*, Corpus of British medieval library catalogues 11 (London 2004).
- N. Rubinstein, “An Unknown Letter by Jacopo di Poggio Bracciolini on Discoveries of Classical Texts”, *IMU* 1 (1958) 383–400.
- R. Sabbadini, “Il ms. Hersfeldense delle opere minori di Tacito”, *Riv. Fil.* 29 (1901) 262–264.
- R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici greci e latini ne’ secoli XIV e XV* (Florence 1905).
- R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici greci e latini ne’ secoli XIV e XV. Nuove ricerche col riassunto filologico dei due volumi* (Florence 1914 a).
- R. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini* (Catania 1914 b).
- P. L. Schmidt, R. Herzog, *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* IV, ed. K. Sallmann (Munich 1997).
- E. Schweikert, *Zur Überlieferung der Horaz-Scholien* (Paderborn 1915).
- F. Stok, “Le vicende dei codici Hersfeldensi”, *Mem. Acc. Linc.* VIII 28. 5 (1985) 277–319.
- R. J. Tarrant, “Horace”, in: Reynolds 1983, 182–186.
- S. Timpanaro, *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*, prima ristampa corretta con alcune aggiunte (Padua 1985).
- L. Traube, rev.: Sabbadini 1905, *BPhW* 26 (1906) 1237–1239.
- C. F. Urba, *Meletemata Porphyrianea* (Vienna 1885).
- C. Villa, “A Brescia e a Milano”, *IMU* 24 (1981) 1–17.
- C. Villa, “I manoscritti di Orazio III”, *Aevum* 68 (1994) 117–146.
- G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums* (Berlin 1859) = II² (Berlin 1881) = II³ (Berlin 1893).
- P. Wessner, rev.: Holder 1894, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 41 (1895) 417–432.

Porphyrio's commentary on Horace was last edited in 1894, after 70 years of chequered contributions from a succession of scholars: promising work announced in 1830 was followed by poor arguments, misdating of humanistic manuscripts, and failure to combine textual and historical evidence – shortcomings left partly unremedied in the edition of 1894. The present study of their persistence complements the analysis of the tradition published in 2023 by Stephen Oakley.

В последний раз комментарий Порфириона к Горацию был издан в 1894 г. Этому предшествовали семьдесят лет неравноценных вкладов ряда ученых: в 1830 г. ожидался многообещающий труд, но в дальнейшем приводились слабые аргументы, рукописи гуманистов неверно датировались, текстовые данные не соотносились с историческими свидетельствами. Частично эти ошибки так и остались не исправлены в издании 1894 г. Прослеживая, как они повторялись снова и снова, автор дополняет анализ традиции, опубликованный С. Окли в 2023 г.

CONSPECTUS

Carolo Lucarini quinquagenario	5
P. J. FINGLASS	
Poem-Division in Sappho's Papyrus Fragments	9
TATIANA KOSTYLEVA	
Eur. <i>IT</i> 288: Why Not the Lungs?	32
FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI	
Allusions in Euripides' <i>Electra</i>	36
GAUTHIER LIBERMAN	
De <i>Bucolicorum</i> Theocriteorum et Maronianorum aliquot locis disputatur	46
LUCIA PRAUSCELLO	
The Use of <i>πρόω</i> in the Septuagint, and its Value for <i>Esther</i> , Addition D 5	67
ROBERT A. KASTER	
A New Edition of Cicero's <i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>	83
MIKHAIL SHUMILIN	
In orationes Ciceronis emendatiunculae	98
GIOVANNI ZAGO	
Arte allusiva in Tibullo, 2. 2. Un esercizio di lettura	106
ANTONIO STRAMAGLIA	
... in <i>alium orbem terrarum delatos</i> (Petron. 1. 2)	113
WALTER LAPINI	
Come farsi amico il giudice (nota a Caritone VI, 7, 11)	119

DENIS KEYER	
Juvenal 6. 422–423: Female Genital Massage?	128
TIZIANO DORANDI	
Gli <i>Excerpta</i> della <i>Classis C</i> dell' <i>Ad se ipsum</i> di Marco Aurelio ...	136
MICHAEL D. REEVE	
Editing Porphyrio: A Cautionary Tale	150
THOMAS RIESENWEBER	
Zu einigen Stellen in der <i>Ars Rhetorica</i> des Consultus Fortunatianus	169
Keywords	200