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THE 'CODEX ROMANUS' OF CATULLUS.

In the *Classical Review* for July, 1896, I published a brief statement to the effect that I had found, in the Vatican Library in Rome, a Catullus MS. 'of high importance,' which I thought to be 'at the least next to O and G in rank, and, in all probability, of the same rank,' and which promised 'to be of great service, not only in confirming O and G where they agree, and giving a 'casting vote' where they disagree; but also in throwing light upon the relationships of other MSS., and upon the history of the marginal and interlinear variants in various MSS.' I added that my collation, together with a discussion of a number of points of interest, would appear in the following winter in Vol. I. of the Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. The date of the announcement now seems remote, and I have for some time felt that I owed it to students of Catullus, and especially to the readers of the *Classical Review*, to state that I was not, as might be surmised, seeking a quiet oblivion for a regrettable rashness of judgment, but that the busy cares of a professorship in a new University, and the responsibility of the Chairmanship of the Managing Committee of the School in the service of which I discovered the MS., have left me little time for the very considerable labour of the preparation of my collation for print, and the incorporation with it of the collations of four other Vatican MSS. of Catullus, made at my suggestion by students of the School. This feeling received confirmation, when, on my return from a vacation in which I was beyond the reach of classical journals, I read the article of Professor Schulze in *Hermes* xxxiii., 3. In this article Professor Schulze says that, somewhat more than a year and a half ago, there ran through the daily papers, as well as through the classical journals, a statement that I had had the good fortune to find a MS. of Catullus, 'durch welche die Handschriftenfrage des Dichters endlich gelöst sei:' that the announcement aroused a pleasurable interest among all students of Catullus; that a fuller statement had been made by me in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, 1897, 1, p. 36 ff., 'leider ohne genanere Angaben darüber, wodurch sich denn eigentlich die neu entdeckte Handschrift vor allen übrigen auszeichnet;' and that, so far as he was aware, no further communication had been made upon the subject. He adds that, being in Rome in the Easter vacation of the present year, he collated the greater part of the MS. 'Leider,' he continues, 'wurden meine hochgespannten Erwartungen völlig enttäuscht. Die Handschrift des Mr. Hale (cod. Ottob. 1829) stimmt mit den anderen bereits bekannten Codices des Dichters, namentlich dem cod. M in Venedig' (which, it will be remembered, Professor Schulze collated for his edition of the year 1893, after Professor Ellis had called attention to it in his edition of 1878) 'so sehr überein, dass ich nicht sehe, wie die Kritik des Catull durch sie weiter gefördert werden kann.' He then cites a number of readings which M and R have in common, and goes on: 'Ich habe den grössten Theil der Gedichte verglichen und kaum eine neue, jedenfalls keine wertvolle neue Lesart gefunden, wohl aber überall dieselben Lücken, dieselben Schreibfehler, dieselben Versuche Unleserliches zu entziffern, dasselbe Äussere sogar der Handschrift wie in den anderen. Sie bietet Varianten zwischen den Zeilen und am Rande, aber auch sie sind meist bekannt.' Specimens follow, and a brief note upon the divisions of the poems by spaces or marginal indications. Professor Schulze adds that the codex is soon to be published in facsimile by Danesi in Rome, so that every one will be able to form his own judgment of the 'merkwürdige Handschrift,' and concludes as follows: 'Aufgabe des Mr. Hale aber wird es sein nachzuweisen, was diese Handschrift gerade vor den anderen voraus hat und inwiefern der Text der Gedichte Catullus durch sie eine neue kritische Grundlage gewinnt.'

The unfavourable opinion of Professor Schulze, especially within the lines of a province to which he has for so many years devoted himself, ought naturally to carry weight, and would seem to have disposed of the 'merkwürdige Handschrift,' and of its discoverer. An immediate rejoinder, or an immediate confession, seemed advisable. But it was too late to hope to get an answer into the following number of the *Hermes*,—the place where it should properly appear,—and I must therefore ask students of Catullus to suspend judgment, and wait for the appearance of a brief article which I trust the editors of the *Hermes* may accept for a later number, and for the collation K K 2
which I hope will appear before many months in the American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series,—the official journal of the American Archaeological Institute and of the American Schools of Classical Studies at Athens and Rome. Meanwhile, postponing for the present certain very important points of fact which will be at issue between Professor Schulze and myself, I beg to comment briefly upon the general scope and method of his article.

That it should have appeared at all excited my surprise. I should rather have expected a private letter, asking me if the collation would not soon be ready,—such a letter, in fact, as I have received from Professor Ellis, who, though so deeply interested in the new MS. as to have gone to Rome to study it personally, was not only unwilling to put the statement of his own opinion into print until I should have an opportunity to express mine in connection with my collation, but, with the greatest delicacy and consideration, would not even discuss the MS. in a public lecture, before the University of Oxford, until he had my consent,—of course most willingly given,—to do so.

If, however, Professor Schulze was to write upon the subject at all, I should not have expected that he would content himself with remarking the correspondence of the readings of R with those of other known MSS., and especially with those of M. I should have expected him to settle in his own mind precisely what these correspondences mean. In his edition of Catullus, he has treated M as the best representative of one tradition of the lost Verona MS., distinct from those represented by O, G, and D. R, which agrees with M as no other MS. does, would seem to offer him,—if he could no longer wait for the appearance of the collation of R, and the expression of the views of its discoverer,—a most interesting field of inquiry. Is R a copy of M, or M a copy of R, or how are they related? And is either of them a copy of the lost Verona MS., or are they copies or more remotely related descendants of a lost copy of that MS.? The settlement of this question might also lead the way to the settlement of another question which certainly is not without bearing upon the text of Catullus, namely that of the origin of this and that among the variants found in the various MSS. Professor Schulze dismisses this matter lightly with the statement 'sich bietet Varianten zwischen den Zeilen und am Rande, aber auch sie sind meist bekannt.' But it is not sufficient merely to possess a collection of variants. The question is, what is the value of each of them, i.e. what is its origin? Does it come down from the lost Verona MS., or is it an emendation by an Italian scholar of the fifteenth century? The settlement of this question is not to be reached by the mere remark that most of the variants found in R are already known, but through the determination of the relation of the existing MSS. to one another, and to the lost Verona MS.

Again, I find it remarkable that Professor Schulze speaks of the new MS. as having even the same external appearance as the others. As what others? He has especially mentioned O and M. O and M have not the same external appearance. M, though I shall at a later time be able to date it with a good deal of probability before 1412, is written in a humanistic hand much in advance of its time, while O is written in a North Italian Gothic hand. If, on the other hand, the external appearance of R is like that of O, the circumstance is certainly noteworthy. As a matter of fact, O, G, and R resemble one another in their style of writing, and all three are obviously older than any other Catullus MS. known to exist. This should be evident to the eye, even if one fails to see the very striking internal evidence of the same thing. Moreover, I am surprised that Professor Schulze should have seen no significance in the fact that, as mentioned in my Report in the American Journal of Archaeology to which he refers, the MS. once belonged to Coluccio Salutati. Coluccio died in 1406. This brings the MS. pretty near to the dates assigned hitherto to O and G. Further, Coluccio himself cites Catullus, in a letter written as many as ten years before this time (Novati, Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati, III. p. 36). Thus the probable latest date of the writing of R is pushed pretty well back. Further, how could Professor Schulze, with the fact of Coluccio's ownership in mind, help being forced to pause and consider the meaning, for this MS., of the letters written by Coluccio to Benvenuto da Imola on the 20th of July, 1374, and to Gaspare de' Broaspini on the 20th of July, 1375, and the 16th of November, or the 17th of October (for there is a doubt about the month), 1375? How could he then, recalling Chatelain's comment on the probable meaning of the etc. in the qü casignorius laborabat in extremis etc. on the last page of G, have failed to surmise that (as I myself have come to believe probable), a copy of V was
made under the direction of Gaspare, finished on the 19th of October, 1375, and sent to Coluccio; and that from this copy a scribe wrote the MS. which has now been found in Rome, leaving out entirely, as unessential, the address to the reader at the end, while another copyist, at this time or later, wrote the MS. G, copying most of the address to the reader, but dismissing all that came after the laborabat in extremis with the phrase etc. 1 If these surmises are probable, they certainly open up considerations which are not without consequence for the critical foundations of the study of the text of Catullus. In a word, Professor Schulze ought, in my opinion, to have seen, on many grounds, that the MS. deserved a good deal more than the passing glance which his work shows that he has given it.

As for myself, my belief is that the collation of R, while it, of course, will not transform the text of Catullus (Professor Schulze himself has pointed out, in urging the value of M in an earlier article in the Hermes, xxiii. p. 591, that not even the discovery of O was able to do this, since all our MSS. go back to a common source), will, taken in connection with other collations that need to be made, enable us to determine once and for all on what the critical foundations of the restitution of the text shall be based. I believe that I see, with great probability, what these foundations will be. But complete certainty can be attained only by one who has before him complete collations, not only of the three great MSS. (for I still, in spite of Professor Schulze's disappointment, regard R as a MS. of the same rank with O and G), but of a sufficient number of the seventy or more secondary MSS. to represent fairly well the whole mass of tradition for which they stand. Messrs. Burton, Denison, Tamblyn and Holmes, members of the School in Rome during my Directorship, collated four MSS. in the Vatican, to which I shall attach the sigla W, X, Y, and Z. Messrs. Shipley and Dixon, likewise members of the School, collated A and B respectively, soon afterward. Mr. Dixon has since that time returned to Europe to make collations of P (Parisinus 7989), C, A (Ellis's La1) La2, Ricc. 606, Vaticanus 1630, D, H, L, and M. He was recalled to this country before the last four collations were made, but I have since provided for them. With the help of Mr. Dixon and Mr. Washburn, Fellows of the University of Chicago, I plan to put out a complete collation of A B C D G H L A La2 M O P R T Vat. 1630 W X Y Z and Ricc. 606, together with the conclusions to which we come with regard to the main lines of descent, and the very complicated inter-relationships, of the secondary MSS. This done, I propose to publish a continuous restored text of the lost Verona MS. (uncertain restorations being indicated by underlining), with a critical apparatus comprising the readings of those MSS. which have survived the tests. I hope that by that time Professor Schulze will have been able to give a little more thought to the matter, so that he will not say of these things, as he has done of R, that he does not see 'wie die Kritik des Catull durch sie weiter gefördert werden kann.'

WM. GARDNER HALE.

The University of Chicago.

STARKIE'S WASPS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Wasps of Aristophanes: with Introduction, Metrical Analysis, Critical Notes, and Commentary, by W. J. M. Starkie, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, Late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Macmillan & Co.'s Classical Series. 1897.) 6s.

The preface states that this edition 'is intended to supply a general introduction to the study of Aristophanes.' It may be doubted whether the Wasps is the best play with which to introduce a beginner to Aristophanes: the details of the Athenian law-court system are not of much interest to modern readers, and there is nothing in the play, except the Marathon chorus, which is up to the poet's highest level. Apart from this there can be little fault to find with the way in which the editor has done his work. The book is not, like so many publications intended for school use, a mere epitome of matter to be found in previous editions. Mr. Starkie shows a thorough acquaintance with the literature bearing on Aristophanes and his times, and he has produced an edition of first-rate importance which should satisfy the requirements, not of beginners only, but of advanced students. A specially valuable feature of the book is...