The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

A Neglected MS. of Martial

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 06 / July 1902, pp 315 - 316

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206380, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206380

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1902). A Neglected MS. of Martial. The Classical Review, 16, pp 315-316
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206380

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

how many times was Dirce likely to have burnt her rival's hair. Rothstein quotes half a line of Tibullus, I. 9, 21 'ure meum potius flamma caput,' for a parallel, as though *capilli* were a synonym of *caput* and as though branding on the forehead was not a common punishment in ancient times. R. Titius' emendation enables Dirce to wreak her spite against Antiope as often as she pleased: 'She scratched her face and pulled her hair.' One of the *u*'s in 'uulsit' was omitted and *l* changed to *f*, for which see my remarks on III. vii. 60 in *C.R.* xv. p. 40a.

Such in a single poem are the results of the refusal to recognise that the Propertius of the MSS. is buried under an unusual

accumulation of text corruption. A sober criticism assumes as one of its first principles that it has no right to argue from the tradition of one text to the tradition of another; but the criticism of the recent reaction treats the codices of Propertius as if they were manuscripts of Plato or of Virgil and imputes to the poet all but the whole of the solecisms and absurdities which should be laid at their door. 'You are mistaken,' says in effect this new school of healers by faith. 'We have observed A, B, C. But we have never seen anything like this scarred and pitted D. You must be mistaken. This is not smallpox: it is original sin.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

A NEGLECTED MS. OF MARTIAL.

THE paper Renaissance MS. of Martial in the Laurentian Library (XXXV 39), known as *f*, was mistakenly pronounced by Schneidewin to be a mere 'Italian' text, unworthy of notice, and has in consequence been neglected by subsequent editors. Schneidewin's mistake affords fresh illustration of the danger of relying upon a stranger's collation of a MS. instead of examining the MS. for oneself. He got his knowledge of *f*, he tells us, from two sources: (1) a collation made specially for him of parts of Book I, in particular of I xlix, (2) an old collation¹ preserved in the Royal Library, Copenhagen (no. 219).

Now *f*, like the British Museum Martial (*Q*), has suffered greatly at the hands of a corrector (or correctors) (*f*²), who has used some trivial 'Italian' text, so that the *f*² readings, like the *Q*² readings, are quite unworthy of notice. Parts of Book I, including epigram xlix, having been omitted at their proper place, are supplied from this 'Italian' source; and the Copenhagen collation throughout makes a most disastrous jumble of *f*¹ and *f*² readings. Schneidewin's information was therefore woefully misleading.

Through the kind exertions of the Foreign Office the Italian authorities consented to transmit the MS. to the Bodleian Library, where I have managed to make the deliberate examination that a corrected text of

this kind requires. The result has been to vindicate for *f* nearly the same position as *Q* among the authorities for the Gennadian text of Martial, that is to say, a position inferior only to *L* and *P*.

Neither *f* nor *Q* are direct transcriptions of an unadulterated Gennadian text. The originals of both contained some (not very many) variants and insertions, introduced (no doubt by a corrector) from an 'Italian' text. Thus both *f* and *Q* exhibit some things omitted in the archetype, epigrams like I i-ii² and lines like VII xcii. 5-8. A glance at *f* shews us that XIV xcvi. 2-xcix. were inserted in the side margin, xcv-xcvi in the bottom margin of its original. And unfortunately for Schneidewin's investigation, the corrector of *f*'s original had been perhaps more active in Book I than at any other part. Hence such *f*¹ readings as I iv. 7 *solet* for *potest*, ix. 2 *at* for *sed*, x. 4 *igitur* for *ergo*. A reading, apparently from this source, but of better quality is *Apona* I lxi. 3, for which the archetype of the Gennadian family had *Aponi*.

In the main however *f*, like *Q*, exhibits the genuine Gennadian text. The importance of its testimony may be gauged from a single instance. In VII xx. 13:

Sed mappa cum iam mille rumpitur furtis,

² In *L* these epigrams are entered on the fly-leaf, but by a much later hand, not the hand of the (twelfth century) scribe. I should add that the insertions in *Q* and *f* are not always the same. *Q* has inserted things not found in *f*; *f* has insertions not found in *Q*.

¹ Through the courtesy of the Danish Librarian I have had the opportunity of inspecting this in the Bodleian Library.

the archetype of *LPQf* had as last word of the line something which could not be deciphered. *L* offers *uirus*, *P* *hirus*, *Q* (kindred to *P*) *hircus*. It so happens that this part of Book VII has been by an error written twice in *f*. In the one occurrence of the line the word is omitted, but in the other we find an undecipherable word that looks like *lurus* or *turris*. The 'ductus litterarum' has been as faithfully reproduced by the scribe as by the scribe of *f*'s original.

Similarly *f* seems to reproduce the archetype's reading in I xxvi. 7 with its *sed nec* (*sed nec L*, *sed PQ*); cxi. 3 *quit tibi* (*quid tibi LPQ*; *qui tibi edd.*); II lxvi. 6 *tangat et sanum* (so *P*); VII xxvii. 5 *teti* (for *laeti*; *tetri LPQ*); lxxii. 3 *leuesse* (*leuesue LPQ*) *libre* (for *leues selibrae*); XII lxi. 3 *me tu* (for *metu*; *me L*); XIV xxiv. 2 *acus sportas* (for *acus tortas*), etc., etc.

Often too, its testimony is welcome, where the other MSS. of this family disagree. One example will suffice. In the introductory epistle (omitted by the other families of MSS.) of Book II editors read: 'Video quare tragoedia atque comoedia epistolam accipiant, quibus pro se loqui non licet.' This reading depends on *P*, which has *qua tragoedia aut qua comoedia*. But *f* agrees with *LQ* in *quare tragoedia aut comoedia*, which must have been the reading of the archetype and was probably what Martial wrote. The plural verb is justified by the plural relative clause *quibus...licet*; cf. Cic. Deor. Nat. I, 117 'nisi forte Diagoram aut Theodorum, qui omnino deos esse negabant, censes superstitiosos esse potuisse.'

Even in the matter of orthography, the evidence of *f* is not wholly without value; e.g. VI xxviii. 9 *adplicabat* (*appl- L*); lxvi. 6 *adtraxit* (*attr- L*); lxxvi. 4 *hostilis* Acc. Pl. (-les *L*); VIII iii. 11 *dulcis* (-ces *L*). In VI xxxv. it reproduces faithfully the archetype's spelling (attested by *L*) v. 1 *clepsydras*, v. 6 *clebsydra*. Like all Renaissance MSS. it abounds in modern and in pseudo-archaic spellings; but spellings characteristic of Italy like *legittimus*, *seppellire*, *rodis* (for *rudis*), *plombea* (cf. Ital. *piombo*) probably came from the Archetype, which was in Lombard script.

A curious feature of *f* is the omission of I xlviii.—lix. In the archetype I xlviii (with heading *DE LEONE ET LEPORE*)—ciii. 2 followed I xiv. The identity of the heading of I lx. and I xlviii., is clearly the cause of *f*'s defect.¹ Another peculiarity, already mentioned, is the double occurrence of a part of Book VII, epigrams x–lxi. Fortunately the corrector has left untouched the passage at its second occurrence, so that we have the *f*¹ text unobscured, and can appreciate how faithfully it reflects the Gennadian text. In the later books especially (but occasionally elsewhere), the corrector has a habit of using red ink, so that his corrections (e.g. *miose* for *mios*, i.e. *Myos* in VIII xxxiv. 1), can be more easily distinguished from the *f*¹ readings.

It is the corrector who has supplied (from an 'Italian' text), the red-ink headings from Book VII onwards (and elsewhere, when omitted by the scribe), e.g. VIII xxxiv *DE MIOSO DEFORMI* (11). That is the reason why the Gennadian subscriptions do not appear after the end of Book VI. But that they appeared in the original of *f* is shewn by the fact that the scribe has left large enough space for them. For example, he has left a space of three lines at XIII iv, which is quite inadequately filled by the *TRVS* of *f*². Finally I may mention that *f* is the 'Florentinus,' from which Beverland derived the variants mentioned by Schneidewin on p. lviii of his Prolegomena. Another copy of these will be found in the marginalia of a printed text in the Leyden Library (755 H 38; cf. 755 H 32). It is also the 'Florentinus' whose variants are entered in the margin of a Plantin text in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The readings of *f* must find a place in the *apparatus criticus* of editions of Martial in the future.

W. M. LINDSAY.

¹ The disorder is heightened in *f* by the fact that the corrector of *f*'s original had inserted in the margin I xxii., which has the same heading; so that in *f* this epigram occurs twice, once after I. xiv. and again at its proper place. At its first occurrence the epigram comes from the 'Italian' text and should be ignored. Schneidewin's *f*-reading in v. 3, *seruamur*, belongs to this first occurrence.