Bob Kaster

A Neglected Witness to Macrobius’ Saturnalia*

The general shape of the Saturnalia’s early medieval tradition has been clear for over fifty years, thanks above all to Antonio La Penna, whose pioneering work was soon refined by James Willis. After test-collating eighteen of the pre-humanist witnesses, La Penna was able to show that the tradition comprises three clearly defined families. But where La Penna concluded that each family descended independently from the archetype, it was Willis’ contribution to show that two of the three families in fact had a common ancestor standing between themselves and that archetype. The tradition is thus of a common bifid type:

The descendants of $\alpha$ and $\beta_2$ as a rule contain all seven books, whereas $\beta_1$ had only Saturnalia 1-3. Though there is some contamination apparent, it is generally of a low to moderate level in the books writ-

* The study that follows is surely drier stuff than the lively interests typical of our celebranda, but her great learning and her broad scholarly sympathies encourage me to offer it to her, with great affection and great gratitude for many years of friendship.


2 Willis, art. cit., pp. 156-157. Willis’ account is characteristically terse; a more detailed account of the relations of $\beta$, and $\beta_1$, and of the individual mss to be mentioned below, can be found in The Medieval Tradition of Macrobius’ Saturnalia (to appear). For the three families I adopt the sigla $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\beta$, from the edition of N. Marinone (Turin 1977); for individual mss, I use the sigla chosen by Willis for his Teubner and by M. J. Carton for the three mss that she published (G, L, J: see [n. 4 on p. 258] and [n. 2 on p. 266] below). I have assigned sigla to the other mss referred to here.
ten from the ninth to twelfth centuries—a kind of background noise that, while audible, does not obscure the tradition’s main themes until the proliferation of manuscripts in the fifteenth century.

From an editor’s perspective, the families $\alpha$ and $\beta_1$ might be thought to share two advantages relative to $\beta_2$. First, while the earliest (nearly) complete witness descended from $\beta_2$ (R = Vatican Reg. lat. 2043) dates to the very end of the tenth or beginning of the eleventh century, $\alpha$ is represented by one witness from ninth-century France—N, written in the middle or third quarter of the century, and $\beta_1$ by no fewer than four: M = Montpellier Bibl. interuniv.-médecine H225, B = Bamberg Staatl. Biblioth. Class. 37 (M.V5), and V = Vatican Reg. lat. 1650, all three used by Willis, M and B dating to the last third of the ninth century, V to the second half; and O = British Library Cotton Vit. C.III, assigned to the tenth century by La Penna and ignored by Willis, but dated to the third quarter of the ninth-century by Bernhard Bischoff. Furthermore, important detail has been added to the ‘family portraits’ of $\alpha$ and $\beta_1$ since the work of La Penna and Willis, in the form of two manuscripts published by M. J. Carton: for $\alpha$ there is the added testimony of G, an eleventh century ms now in Strasbourg (Biblioth. Nat. et Univ. 14); for $\beta_1$, a previously unnoticed and very interesting Vatican ms of the early tenth century (L = Vatican lat. 5207). It is this paper’s aim

---


2 Thus Marshall, art. cit., p. 234.

3 For the dating of V (thought to be s. x by La Penna and Willis), see E. Pellegrin, *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque vaticane*, vol. 2, pt. 1, Paris 1978, pp. 337-338, after B. Bischoff. For M, B, and O, see Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden 1998-, vol. 2, p. 204, vol. 1, p. 47, and vol. 2, p. 109, respectively; though Bischoff notes that the last six folia of O (133-138, after Sat. 3.13.9 antea) were added in s. xth, the character of the text seems unchanged. A complete collation of O is available at the website «Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics» (http://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/).

4 M. J. Carton, *Three Unstudied Manuscripts of Macrobius’s Saturnalia*, Diss. St. Louis University, 1966, pp. 13-96, provides a complete collation; G, which Carton judged (incorrectly) a gemellus of N, was also noticed by La Penna, art. cit., pp. 239-240 (= his S). The other $\alpha$-mss used by Willis are P = Paris lat. 6571 (s. xi, complete) and D = Oxford Bodl.Auct. T.2.27 (s. x1, lost after Sat. 3.4.9).

5 M. J. Carton, *Three Unstudied Manuscripts*, pp. 99-138, provides a complete collation. Carton judged L a gemellus of B; it is in fact a gemellus of O ([n. 3 above). The other $\beta_1$-mss used by Willis is a close relation of B (cf. at [n. 1 on p. 265] below), Z = Madrid Escorial E. III 18: cited by Willis down to Sat. 1.17.6 (where the text in a hand
to add similar detail to our picture of $\beta_3$, by drawing attention to a manuscript that is very likely that family’s earliest surviving witness.

Or rather, I should say ‘by drawing renewed attention’, because the manuscript in question, Burgerbibliothek Bern Cod. 514 (= Q), has not gone entirely unnoticed before now: it was used in what deserves to be called the first modern edition of the *Saturnalia*, published by Ludwig von Jan in 1852 and based upon extensive use both of the pre-humanist manuscripts and the early printed editions.¹ But Jan for his part was in no position to identify the manuscript’s place in the tradition, while La Penna and Willis for their part ignored it, perhaps because it contains only book 7. It should be borne in mind, however, that ‘only’ book 7 (66 Teubner pages) amounts to about fifteen percent of the work as a whole and more than one-quarter of that portion where $\beta_1$ is absent and $\beta_2$ by itself represents one half of the tradition. As will become clear, there are several ways in which taking Q into account gives us a more complete and nuanced understanding of that half.

Q’s text of the *Saturnalia* (fol. 72r-112r) is written in a clear and fluid minuscule on pages generally ruled for twenty-seven lines, with ca. 35-40 characters to the line (not counting spaces). Though not as heavily corrected as some mss, it received the attentions of at least two different readers, and probably more;² there was also a modest amount of marginal annotation, mostly lost when the book’s margins were trimmed. Jan claimed that the text dated to the ninth century, presumably relying on the testimony of Albert Jahn, who collated the ms for him.³ But while that is certainly too early, a tenth-century date seems secure.⁴

of s. xii/xiii breaks off and is replaced by a heavily contaminated humanist text), Z provides virtually nothing useful not provided by BV and can be ignored, especially in light of the important new testimony of OL. One other $\beta_2$-ms, K = Vatican Pal. lat. 886 (s. ix in.), is a collection of excerpts (*Sat. 1. 11. 2-1. 11. 43, 2.1.7-2.7.11, 3.13.11-3.20.8*); its testimony falls into line with the other mss of the family. A partial collation was published by K. Tohill, *Excerpts from Macrobius in codex Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 886, «Manuscripta»* 22, 1978, pp. 104-108, who was apparently unaware that it had been used by Jan (= his V).

¹ L. Jan (ed.), *Macrobii Ambrosii Theodosii ... opera quae supersunt*, vol. 2, Quedlinburg and Leipzig 1852. The truly impressive scholarship of Jan’s edition has unfortunately been obscured by the horrendously inaccurate critical apparatus with which he provided it.

² See, e.g., 7.5.12 subducitis] subductistis Q¹, subducatis J’Q¹, subduccitis (ut vid.) Q¹; on J as an apograph of Q as corrected, see the appendix below.

³ L. Jan (ed.), *Macrobii Ambrosii Theodosii ... opera quae supersunt*, vol. 1, Quedlinburg and Leipzig 1848, p. lxxxiii, noting the contribution of Jahn, «bibliothecae praefectus».

⁴ It was dated to s. x in H. Hagen, *Catalogus codicum bernensium*, Bern 1875, p. 432,
As we turn to consider Q’s text, we must meet the other important descendants of $\beta_2$. Beyond R, the tenth- or eleventh-century ms already noted, which is complete down to 7.4.11, there are the two complete twelfth-century mss used by both Jan and Willis, F = Flor. Laurent. Plut. 90 sup. 25 and A= Cambridge Univ. Lib. FF.3.5 (written at Bury St. Edmunds). To these can be added another twelfth-century Cambridge ms, C = Corpus Christi College 71, which is a gemellus of A. The stemmatic relationship of RFAC is basically very straightforward: beyond sharing with F a large number of errors that distinguish the family derived from $\beta_2$, RAC share another set of errors that set them apart from F, and AC uniquely share still other errors that set them off from R. Thus:

What, then, does this stemma look like in book 7, once the additional testimony of Q is taken into account?

First, of course, there are the shared errors of RFAC that define $\beta_2$ in book 7, all of which are found in Q also, for example:

and omitted from Bischoff, Katalog der festländischen Handschriften; a 10th-century date for fol. 1-113 is confirmed by Dr. Patrick Andrist and Dr. Martin Germann of the Burgerbibliothek (personal communication), who add that fol. 114-126 belong to the 12th century. My thanks to these scholars for their help on this point, and to Dr. Andrist for his assistance in acquiring a digital scan of Macrobius’ text.

1 We also possess no fewer than three twelfth-century mss that are direct copies of R, entirely or in large part: H = British Library Harleianus 3859 (complete, though the text of Sat. 7.1.1-7.5.14 is derived from a different source; it is incorrectly described as comprising only Sat. 1.2.15-5.20.10 by La Penna, art. cit., p. 241); W = Florence Laurent. Plut. 51.8 (regarded, with R and C, as one of the three most important witnesses in the family by La Penna, art. cit., p. 233, but correctly judged an apograph of R by Willis, Teubner ed. p. viii); and J = Vatican lat. 3417 (books 1-4, 7: J is a copy of R in the first four books; on its derivation from Q itself in the last, see the appendix to this paper). The agreement of W and H can be taken to represent R when the latter is no longer available near the end of book 7.

2 A complete collation of C is available at the website cited at [n. 3 on p. 258].

3 I can of course give only a few examples here: a complete collation of Q is available at the website cited in [n. 3 on p. 258].
Next there are the numerous errors Q shares with RAC to distinguish them as a group from F, for example:

7.1.2 reverenda] verecunda 7.7.18 de (1st) om.
7.1.5 huiusmodi] eiusmodi 7.8.13 aquam novam semper sem-
7.1.14 iustum] –te per ac novam corpori] aquam no-
7.1.15 faciles tamen] facilesque vam corpori
7.2.6 gloriosum] gloriosissimum 7.12.7 tanto ... quanto] quanto ...
7.3.1 omnium except] except om-
tanto
7.3.15 temporibus] temporis 7.12.17 et per] per
7.6.4 nihil om. 7.12.31 Herodotus] herodatus
7.6.16 corpus et corpus] corpus 7.12.36 effluant] fluant
corpus
7.6.18 est om. 7.13.11 in hoc] hoc
7.7.16 vocavit] vocat 7.13.21 adsentiri] -tire
7.14.4 ultro] ultra

Then there are the errors that RAC share against QF, for example:

7.1.10 sonare] sociare 7.5.9 Gr. post ΠΑΝΤΟΔΑΛΙΗΣ om.
7.1.14 lopam] ioppam 7.5.14 stomachum] -o RAC

1 A case where AC’s common ancestor bequeathed them an attempt to make good a gap that had stood in 5, cf. the similar but independent attempt visible in the marginal addition of aram in J.
Primae facie, that sequence suggests a stemma that looks very much like the stemma drawn just above, with Q now occupying a place between the hyparchetype, $\beta_2$, and the common ancestor of RAC, thus:

![Stemma Diagram]

This picture, finally, appears to be corroborated by instances such as the following:

7.4.14 καθεκτική ΝΠΓΦQ, ΚΑΘΕΚΤΙΚΗ R, ΚΑΕΦΑΚΤΙΚΗ AC
7.9.16 corporei] corpore R‘Q, in corpore R‘AC
7.11.3 faciat] facit Q, fecit RAC

Here we see in each case a sequence of error that extends 'beneath' Q's putative place on the stemma: at 7.4.14 F and Q join the $\alpha$-mss in what is essentially the right reading (save for the perpetual confusion of $\Lambda$ and $\Lambda$), while the common ancestor of RAC introduced the roman F for Greek $E$, and AC’s ancestor swapped $a$ (lunate) $E$ for the $\Theta$; at 7.13.25, QF have a text that again is essentially correct save for eccentricities of word-division, while R’s nausicam builds upon nausica to produce the case that is needed in context and AC’s reading completes the mistaken ‘tidying up’ by removing an apparently superfluous syllable from the start of Alcinous’ name;
at 7.9.16 and 7.11.3 Q’s text plainly reflects the first stage of error (in the former case joined by R), which is subsequently extended.¹

I do believe that the picture above is more likely than not correct, but there are some data that at least complicate the picture: for not only are there a number of cases in which R agrees uniquely in error with AC against Q, there are also a non-trivial number of cases in which R agrees uniquely in error with Q against AC, for example:

7.2.12 audebat] debebat 7.3.1 omnium excepit] except omnium 7.3.3 alius] alias 7.3.8 possent] possint 7.4.4 cum om. 7.4.11 repugnantium] pugnantium 7.4.32 seriis et] seriis 7.5.11 quam de] quam 7.5.25 per os] post 7.7.5 solitos] -to 7.7.13 volent] volunt 7.7.15 satietatis] societatis 7.8.1 non om. 7.9.8 inesse] esse


Plainly, the stemma above cannot account for both sorts of agreement in any simple and straightforward way, since according to that stemma the errors uniquely shared by RQ are presumptively the legacy of γ and so also should appear in AC.

That being the case, there are only three plausible alternatives.² Either the stemma above is basically correct, and a certain number of the errors derived by RQ from γ were removed by correction from the line represented by AC – presumably from a source of the

¹ Cf. also 7.13.9 simulacra om. RFQ, aram J², aras AC, 7.13.17 me in omni] mei nominis FQ², mei nominis R (recte Q’AC, where the reading of β₂ reflected in FQ² was ‘corrected’ to construable form by the time the text reached R, and then corrected in fact by Q² and in the common ancestor of AC), 7.16.25 fellantes] fallentes GFQ, pallentes PA, lactantes C, alentes J²W²H² (deest R), 7.16.27 ad celerandos partus] ac(vel ad) celerando partu FQW, accelerando partus H, accelerando partui A, ad celerandos partus C (deest R: the text of β₂ is again reflected by FQ and R’s apograph, W).

² A further alternative – that R, AC, and Q each derives independently from γ – would be much less economical, since it would in effect require twice as much contamination to have occurred than any of the models about to be discussed.
sort represented by F – before AC themselves were written in the twelfth century, thus:¹

Or the stemma above is basically correct, and a certain number of the errors uniquely shared by RQ were introduced into R’s ancestry by contamination from Q, thus:

Or the line of descent represented by AC must stand ‘above’ Q in the stemma, and a certain number of the errors that we then see RAC inherit from γ were removed by correction from the ancestry of Q before that ms was written in the tenth century, thus:

¹ I say ‘presumably ... of a sort represented by F’ because the alternative would be a source derived from the other branch of the tradition, α: but a process of correction thorough enough to remove all the relevant errors from AC’s ancestry would also almost inevitably have imported some of the distinctive errors of α, of which AC give no evidence. There is some murkiness here, however: for example, if the correct reading that appears in AC at 7.13.17 (me in omni: [n. 1 on p. 263]) is not owed to scribal wit (or good luck), it cannot have been imported into AC from any β₂-ms that was not itself contaminated from α.
The second of these scenarios is least likely on its face: given the character of the errors that R shares uniquely with Q, even the dimmest ‘corrector’ would hardly have managed to transfer all of them from the latter to an ancestor of the former. As for the other two scenarios, either is possible; indeed, their structure finds an exact counterpart in the relations of three members of the family $\beta^1$. There three of the MSS used by Willis, BVZ, all clearly derive from a common hyparchetype, and B uniquely shares a number of distinctive errors now with V, now with Z (agreements in distinctive error of VZ against B are negligible). Willis inferred, I believe correctly, that B and Z are more closely related to each other than either is to V, and that some errors of BVZ’s common ancestor were removed from a predecessor of Z by contamination, thus:

As already indicated, I believe that in the present case the first stemma above is on balance more likely correct, given the chrono-

---

1 J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism*, Urbana 1972, p. 20; the sigla $\alpha$ and $\beta$ used in Willis’ diagram bear no relation to the use of those sigla elsewhere in this paper.
logical priority of Q and the examples above that show Q standing earlier in a sequence of error than AC.¹

It should in any case be clear that future editors of the *Saturnalia* will want to incorporate Q’s evidence for the light it throws on the behavior of family $\beta_2$ in *Saturnalia* 7: the agreement of Q with either R or AC will be sufficient to establish the reading of $\gamma$, and the agreement of either $\gamma$ or F with $\alpha$ will establish the text of the archetype.

**Appendix: Q and J**

Vatican lat. 3417 (= J), a twelfth-century book preserving *Saturnalia* 1-4 and 7, was unknown to La Penna and Willis, as it was to Jan before them. A partial collation of J’s text in book 7 was published by Carton, who judged it to be a *gemellus* of R and so potentially useful for the portion of book 7, after 7.14.11 in(ducere), where R is lacking.² That judgment, however, was doubly incorrect: in Books 1-4, J is not R’s *gemellus* but rather a direct copy of R as corrected, while in book 7 J is a copy of Q as corrected.³ The evidence of the latter relationship is unambiguous, for example:

1. beyond it own numerous peculiar errors, J has every one of the many peculiar errors of Q that escaped correction – including some that are gloriously absurd (e.g., 7.12.8 ait] fui) – save for three trivial cases;⁴

¹ Regarding the degree of correction that would be required to remove the relevant errors of RQ (i.e., $\gamma$) from the ancestry of AC, note that correction stripped R itself of one-third of those same errors (19/59): it would not take many ‘generations’ for such marks of kinship to be significantly effaced. For possible contamination from the branch represented by F, note the following places in book 7 where RAQ share an error while C shares the correct reading with F: 7.1.1 remotis] -tas RA’Q¹, 7.1.2 penetalibus] -bilibus RAQ, 7.5.1 qui ad] quia ad RAQ, 7.5.4 potuisse] -set RAQ¹, 7.7.18 in (iº) om. RAQ, 7.15.18 quod (iº) sed AQ (deest R). There are fewer places where RCQ share an error while A shares the correct reading with F: 7.5.13 mente] -tem RCQ, 7.10.11 crebro] in cerebro C’Q, in cerebro R.


³ I cannot demonstrate here the relationship with R in books 1-4 but do so in the study signaled at [n. 3 on p. 257]. Carton cannot be faulted for being unaware of Q, though she can perhaps be faulted for not noticing that Book 7 (which does not follow directly on the text of Books 1-4) was written by a hand different from the one that wrote books 1-4: it also appears to be s. xii but is slightly larger, and it consistently uses (e.g.) an abbreviation for est ($\div$) and a form of suspension stroke (for -u(m), n(on), m(en), etc.) quite distinct from those used by the scribe of the earlier books. A complete collation of J is available at the website mentioned in [n. 3 on p. 258].

2. J also lacks all the errors of Q that were removed by correction, save for a handful of cases in which the correction was probably made after J was copied;¹

3. although Q generally follows RAC in under-reporting the Greek (evidently a trait of γ, which sets its descendants apart from F), it joins PGF in preserving the quotation of Eupolis at 7.5.9, and so, consequently, does J;

4. and there are any number of eccentricities in J that are explained by its derivation from Q as corrected: so, for example, at 7.4.15 καθεκτικήν, where Q read καθεκτικήν with RFAC (= β₂), Q’s corrector placed a deletion-point under the second K, prompting J’s scribe to write καθεκτίκην.

J is not to be utterly discarded, for it gained by correction at least eight correct readings (presumptively conjectural, of course) for which it is the earliest witness, or among the earliest:

3.15.6 Lucullus ... Luculli J², Monac. Clm 15738: lucilius ... lucilii ω
3.15.6 vendidisse F'J²: -set ω
3.18.8 favumque J²Wσ, Guelph. 4619 alt. man., ed. Ven. 1472: fabumque ω
4.6.14 cum J²: om. ω
7.5.3 est J², ed. Ven. 1513: om. ω
7.5.11 multis J²C², ed. Ven. 1513: multis ω
7.7.6 celerius J², Monac. clm 15738, ed. Ven. 1472: celeriter Gβσ om. P
7.16.24 formandoque J²Wσ, Pontanus: firm- ω

But its value is otherwise negligible.

Princeton University

¹ These are: 7.1.1 remotis] -tas RA]Qσ, 7.1.5 sobrietate] -tem J]Qσ, 7.1.8 quia te] qui ante J]Qσ, 7.4.18 virtute] virtutem J]Qσ, 7.5.4 potuisse] -set RA]Qσ, 7.5.30 adpetentia] -tiam J]Qσ, 7.7.15 vinum] vicinum J]Qσ, 7.8.11 caruerunt] caluerunt J]Qσ, 7.16.10 mulierem] materem J]Qσ (matrem Qσ). All but one of these corrections were made by erasure and so are impossible to date relative to other corrections; in the exception, at 7.8.11, caluerunt became caruerunt when a stroke was added to the top of the l’s shaft in ink the same color as the main text.
Figure.