

MANUSCRIPTA



March 1977

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Two Texts of Cicero, *Philippicae* 11.20.21 . . . 11.21.5, in Arch. S. Pietro H 25*

The manuscripts which have been used in the critical editions of the *Philippicae* of Cicero fall into two closely related families derived from a single archetype as can be seen from the fact that all of them share certain errors. One of these families is made up of a single Vatican manuscript, Arch. S. Pietro H 25, folios 18-80, saec. IX (=V) or Vaticanus Basilicanus H 25, as it is designated in most critical editions; the other family, designated D, is made up of the remainder of the manuscripts of the *Philippicae* which have been consulted by editors, ranging in age from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries.¹

V, which is written in a clear Carolingian hand, is regarded by scholars as being by far the best of the extant manuscripts of the *Philippicae* in spite of the fact that it has *lacunae* in Orations 11, 12 and 13 and ends with 13.10.12, thus omitting 14 in its entirety. Clark emphasizes that the arrangement of V's text in three columns per page points to its ultimate derivation from some codex of the fourth, fifth, or sixth century (with several intervening manuscripts doubtless written in the same format).² An excellent photograph of folio 48^r of V which clearly shows the triple-column arrangement of the manuscript can be seen in the guidebook prepared by the Vatican Library for its display of Latin manuscripts of classical authors held from April to December in 1973.³

Evidence for an even earlier origin for a small segment of V is to be found on folio 80^r of the codex.⁴ Near the top of the third column

* The present article is a revised version of a paper read at the Second Saint Louis Conference on Manuscript Studies held at Saint Louis University on October 16-18, 1975.

¹ F. Schoell, *M. Tullius Cicero, Fasc. 28: Orationes in M. Antonium Philippicae XIV* (Leipzig, 1916), 121-22; Albertus Curtis Clark, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes Pro Milone, Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro Rege Deiotaro, Philippicae I-XIV* (Oxford, 1952), 8-12; André Boulanger et Pierre Willeumier, *Cicéron, Discours, Tome XIX: Philippiques I à IV* (Paris, 1959), 32-35; Pierre Willeumier, *Cicéron, Discours, Tome XX: Philippiques V à XX* (Paris, 1960), 7.

² Clark (above, note 1), 8.

³ *Survie des Classiques Latins, Exposition de Manuscrits Vaticans du IV^e au XV^e Siècle, 14 Avril -31 Décembre 1973* (Vatican City, 1973), opposite 44.

⁴ Information about Arch. S. Pietro H 25 presented in this paper is based on a microfilm copy of the manuscript made available to me by the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

of this page after the word *dedit* (11.18.13)⁵ appears a passage of thirteen lines in the codex which correspond roughly to *sed de hoc* (11.20.21-22) . . . *designatus* (11.21.5-6). The same passage appears a second time in the same hand on folio 80^v at the bottom of column 2 and at the top of column 3 in its correct position with reference to the surrounding text. The first copy of the passage has been deleted by an x-shaped mark drawn through its entire length, probably by a later hand, but is still entirely legible. Since two copies of this part of the text, both in the same hand, are available in V, it will be convenient to refer to the earlier as Va and to the later one, which is in the correct position, as Vb. Clark, Schoell, and Wuilleumier have all noted the presence of both Va and Vb, but Clark and Wuilleumier collated only Vb, taking no account of the variants of Va. Schoell, on the other hand, listed the variants of Va in his *apparatus criticus* along with the variants of Vb, but took no cognizance of the significance of the Va variants.

The first impulse of the student attempting to account for the existence of both Va and Vb in the same manuscript is to assume that the scribe of V was copying from some exemplar which had *gerendum dedit* (11.18.13) and *senatus dedit* (11.20.21) on the same three-column page at about the same position in the inner and outer columns. It would be natural to assume that in this situation the scribe, after copying the *dedit* of 11.18.13, as he turned his gaze back to his exemplar, accidentally let his eye shift to the *dedit* of 11.20.21, two columns removed from the one he had just copied, and resumed copying the work from that point. After he had copied thirteen lines, it may be assumed, realizing the error he had made, he returned to the material following the first *dedit* and continued from that point in the correct order inserting Vb in its proper position. Va was probably left intact for a time, but was deleted at a later time by some unknown person.

This type of hypothesis seems reasonable at first sight, but if one compares the readings of Va with those of Vb (as listed below), it becomes impossible to believe that a single scribe copying from a single text at shortly separated intervals could have produced two copies so different from each other. The following is a list of the variants of Va and Vb for the passage in question: 11.20.21-22 *sed de hoc quidem*] *sed de hoc di quidem* Va, *sed de hoc quidem* Vb; 11.20.22 *hactenus*] *actenus* VaVb; 11.20.22-23 *amicissimo ac de*

⁵ Citations in this paper are by the number of the *Philippica* referred to, the number of the chapter within the oration, and the line number calculated according to the line divisions in the Wuilleumier text (above, note 1).

me optime merito] *ac e me optime frito amicissimo* Va, *amicissimo ac de me optime merito* Vb; 11.20.23 *etsi quis]* *etsi quis* Va, *si quis si quis* Vb; 11.20.24 *verum]* *verba* Va, *verum* Vb | *recusanti]* *recusati* Va, *recusanti* Vb; 11.21.1 *patres conscripti]* *hic* Va, *patres conscripti* Vb; 11.21.2 *dignitate]* *dignitatem* Va, *dignitate* Vb | *temporum]* *temporum* Va, *temporum* Vb | *gravitate]* *gravitates* Va, *gravitate* Vb | *est ut]* *etot* Va, *est ut* Vb; 11.21.3 *Asiam]* *si* Va, *asiam* Vb | *Syriam]* *suria* Va, *suriam* Vb; 11.21.4 *inutile]* *inutili* Va, *inutile* Vb; 11.21.5 *sit om.* Va, *sit* Vb | *videte]* *vepete* Va, *vide*** (with two letters obliterated) Vb.

Although, as noted above, A. C. Clark provided no collation of Va in his critical edition of the *Philippicae*, he discussed both Va and Vb in detail in his work, *The Descent of Manuscripts*, quoting the texts of both in full.⁶ After taking cognizance of the rather radical difference between the two he reached the conclusion, with complete justification I think, that Va represents an alternate version of the passage which crept into V or an ancestor of V from some earlier source—probably a rustic capital manuscript. He noted that *E* and *F* were confused in Va where *frito* appears in place of *merito* (11.20.23) and emphasized the fact that these two letters are quite similar in appearance in rustic capital manuscripts. In spite of his assumption that Va represents an earlier version of the text than that found in Vb, however, Clark gave no consideration to the possibility that any of the variants peculiar to Va might restore the original readings of Cicero.

It is the purpose of this paper to argue that Clark was correct in his claim that Va represents an older version of the passage in question and to present additional evidence for such a claim overlooked by Clark. In addition it will be suggested that two of the readings peculiar to Va restore the original text of Cicero.

A notable feature of the readings of Va is a tendency to confuse *p* and *d*. This is seen in the Va version of 11.21.2 where *temdorum* appears for *temporum* and in the Va text of 11.21.5 where *vepete* appears for *videte*. Such frequent confusion of these two letters in a relatively short text plus the confusion of *e* and *i* in the latter example is almost certain proof that the Va text was based directly or indirectly on some copy of the *Philippicae* written in either square capitals or rustic capitals of the fourth or fifth century. If it may be assumed that such a document was written in a square capital hand similar to that employed for the text of Vergil in codex Vat. Lat. 3256, saec. IV, it is easy to see how *P* and *D* on the one hand and *E* and *I* on the other could have been confused. A study of a fac-

⁶ Albertus Curtis Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts*, (Oxford, 1918), 166-67.

simile⁷ of any folio of this manuscript will reveal that the loop of *P* regularly takes the form of an arc which begins slightly to the right of the top of the vertical stroke, extends outward and downward for about a third of the length of the letter, and breaks off without curving inward towards the vertical stroke. In *D* the loop begins a little to the right of the top of the vertical stroke, as in the case of *P*, curves downward to the bottom of the letter, and then curves inward to the left, but breaks off well before reaching the vertical stroke. If in any instance a scribe writing in this hand should accidentally extend the loop of *P* a little further than usual and turn the loop of *D* in a little earlier than usual, the result would be that the two letters would be quite similar in appearance and thus easily confused. The same confusion can exist in rustic capital manuscripts for the same reasons. Consultation of the facsimile of a portion of codex Vat. Lat. 3226 included by E. A. Lowe in volume 1 of *CLA*⁸ will reveal a close similarity between *P* and *D*. This is a manuscript of the *Comedies* of Terence written in a rustic capital hand of the fourth or fifth century. In the line at the top of the right column in the facsimile (*Phormio* 29) in the phrase *ad poetam* the *D* of *ad* and the *P* of *poetam* will be seen to be quite similar. Many instances in both Vat. Lat. 3256 and Vat. Lat. 3226 may be found in which *E* and *I* are almost identical. Otto Ribbeck calls attention to the confusion of *P* and *D* in codex Mediceus, a fifth-century rustic capital manuscript of Vergil, citing the example of *Georg.* 4.162, where *purissima* is written *durissima*.⁹ Ribbeck also notes the following instances in which *E* and *I* are confused in codex Vat. lat. 3225, a fourth-century rustic capital manuscript of Vergil: *Aen.* 4.555, where *rite* is written *rete*; 4.562, where *spirare* is written *sperare*; and 5.156, where *ingens* is written *entens*.¹⁰

From what has been said above it seems clear that the text of *Va* has in some way been derived from some source of the fourth or fifth century distinct from and almost certainly even earlier than that from which the remaining portions of *V* and the *D* manuscripts were derived—in other words, some source other than the *VD* archetype. One can only conjecture about how this development took place. The following represents one possible explanation out of many which might be suggested. Perhaps some now lost manu-

⁷ Many facsimiles of parts of this codex have been printed. See, for example, E. A. Lowe, *CLA*, Part I (Oxford, 1934), 7, plate 13. Also see cover of *Surviv* (above, note 3) which is a facsimile from the same manuscript.

⁸ Lowe (above, note 7), 5, plate 12.

⁹ Otto Ribbeck, *Prolegomena Critica ad P. Vergili Maronis Opera Maiora* (Leipzig, 1866), 242.

¹⁰ Ribbeck (above, note 9), 243.

script of the *Philippicae* (which, for the sake of convenience, may be designated x), while being copied in square capitals or rustic capitals in the fourth or fifth century, had the material corresponding to 11.20.21-22 . . . 11.21.5-6 which follows the word *dedit* inserted prematurely into its text after the word *dedit* in 11.18.13. This would have come about presumably because the scribe allowed his glance to wander from the first *dedit* in his exemplar (11.18.13) to the second (11.20.21) and copied the passage in question before he realized he was writing in the wrong place. It might be assumed, as suggested above hypothetically for V itself, that the scribe of x, after copying the material of the misplaced insertion, realized his error and returned to the regular text, leaving the insertion undisturbed. Thus, after this same material had been recopied in its proper position, x would contain two copies of the passage, as V apparently did at one time, since the x-mark deleting Va in V appears to be later than the writing of the manuscript itself. To continue reconstructing a possible explanation of the appearance of Va in V (with a text quite different from that of Vb), one might assume that in the ninth century or somewhat earlier the owner of some ancestor of V compared his manuscript with x or some descendant of x which contained both copies of 11.20.21-22 . . . 11.21.5-6 and, on reaching *dedit* in 11.18.13, observed that x (or its descendant) contained a number of lines at this point missing from his own manuscript (the ancestor of V). Under these circumstances it would be quite natural for him to copy the supposedly missing lines into the margin of his manuscript. The next copyist would incorporate these lines into his copy—perhaps V itself—thus producing a manuscript with the x version of the passage (which is the equivalent of the Va version) following *dedit* in 11.18.13 and the V version (which is the equivalent of Vb) in its proper position. If this manuscript was not V itself, it was an ancestor of V which established a pattern closely followed by V. All of this is, of course, highly conjectural, but if this or some similar explanation might be accepted, it would account for the fact that Va is so different from Vb although both were obviously copied by the same hand. Furthermore, in accordance with this hypothesis, Va would assume much greater importance for textual criticism, since it would have to be regarded as being derived from an earlier version of the *Philippicae* independent of the archetype which produced the other portions of V and the manuscripts of the D family. Hence, whether or not one accepts the hypothesis outlined above, the possibility that some such development may have occurred requires that serious consideration be given to the readings of Va as possible sources

for restoring the original text of Cicero.

In spite of the fact that many of the readings of Va are obviously corrupt, there are some notable exceptions. It is, for instance, significant that in 11.20.23 Va, in agreement with the D manuscripts, has the correct reading *etsi quis* where Vb has a wrong reading—*si quis si quis*.

A variant of Va which may be of special interest to future editors of the *Philippicae* is the combination *hoc di quidem* in 11.20.22 where other manuscripts have only *hoc quidem*. Obviously it must be assumed either that a spurious *di* crept into the source of Va under unknown circumstances or that *di* is a genuine reading which was accidentally omitted by the common archetype of V and the manuscripts of the D family. *Di* would easily fit into the text, *Sed de hoc, di, quidem hactenus ne . . .* as an expletive in the sense, "But enough, ye gods, concerning this lest. . . ." It must be admitted that Cicero usually added *immortales* when he used *di* in this sense, but *di* alone is used on occasion by other classical writers, as Terence in *Andria* 232 and *Phormio* 740. Palaeographically it would seem easier to account for the omission of *di* by the archetype of VD than for its addition to the source of Va. Hence, since the omission of *di* can be traced to a single manuscript—the VD archetype—and since the version retaining *di* appears to be an independent earlier version, there would seem to be good reason for adding *di* at this point in future editions.

A second reading of Va which will possibly be of considerable interest to future editors of this text is *hic* in 11.21.1, where the other manuscripts have *patres conscripti*. At this point Vb uses the abbreviation *pc* for *patres conscripti* and doubtless many of the D manuscripts do the same. It seems quite probable, therefore, that the discrepancy between Va on the one hand and Vb and the D manuscripts on the other hand has arisen from a confusion of the *h* of *hic* and the *p* of *pc* (or possibly the *hi* of *hic* and the *p.* of *p.c.*) Such confusion would be more likely to occur in a manuscript written in minuscule characters—a half-unical manuscript of the sixth century, for instance—than in a majuscule one. If it may be assumed that Cicero used *hic*—which would fit into the passage well as an adverb meaning "on this occasion"—and if it may further be assumed that the VD archetype was copied in the sixth century from a half-uncial exemplar, then it is quite possible that the loop of the initial *h* of *hic* by accidentally being elevated above its normal position, gave the appearance of *p* to the letter with the result that *p* was copied into the VD archetype. The *i* of *hic* may well under those circumstances have been interpreted as a period by

the scribe of the VD archetype, and thus what had originally been *hic* became *p.c.*, later interpreted as *patres conscripti*. Since *hic* makes good sense and is derived from the earlier tradition, it seems that it deserves to be incorporated into the text in place of *patres conscripti*.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH
Saint Louis University

Three Manuscript Sermon Fragments by Richard Hooker

Included in a volume of assorted manuscripts at Trinity College, Dublin, mainly in the hand of James Ussher (1581-1656; Archbishop of Armagh, from 1625 to his death), are three incomplete sermons that were understandably, but we think incorrectly, assumed to be by Ussher when his nineteenth-century editor first published them.¹ They were in fact written by Richard Hooker (1554-1600) and merely copied by Ussher, possibly from the autograph.

Ussher assembled one of the outstanding collections of books and manuscripts of the seventeenth century, which eventually found its way to Trinity College at the Restoration. One of Ussher's friendships, which proved fruitful as a manuscript source, links him to Hooker; for Ussher knew Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, some of whose manuscripts passed to him when Andrewes died in 1626. As a friend of Hooker, Andrewes in his turn had helped to take charge of Hooker's papers soon after his death,² and some of them ultimately reached Ussher. Various obstacles arose to prevent publication of any of these remaining papers, but between 1612 and 1614 several of Hooker's shorter works, commonly known as the "Divine Tractates," were published for the first time, and in 1618 they helped to make up the first collected edition of Hooker which included as well the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Preface and Books I-V.³ But the *Polity* still lacked its last three books which

¹ See *Works*, ed. C. R. Elrington (Dublin, 1847-64), 17 (1864), xxiv-xli. James H. Todd edited vol. 17 according to Elrington's plan, but he entrusted the transcription of the fragments to a Dr. Reeves. See the "Advertisement" to vol. 17.

² See C. J. Sisson. *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker* (Cambridge, 1940), esp. pp. 92-95, 104, 151-52.

³ For bibliographic details of all these early editions, see W. Speed Hill, *Richard Hooker: A Descriptive Bibliography of the Early Editions 1593-1724* (Cleveland, 1970).