THE MEDIEVAL TRADITION OF MACROBIUS’ SATURNALIA

Version 2.0

12/08

R. A. Kaster

Princeton University

Abstract: In laying the groundwork for a new edition of Macrobius’ Saturnalia, I have extensively checked the reports of the manuscripts in the Teubner edition of James Willis (1963), drawn on the collations of two important manuscripts published by M. J. Carton in 1966, and collated eighteen additional pre-humanist manuscripts wholly or in part (some of these collations are published in working papers #060803, 060804, and 060805). Drawing on the new data, this paper provides a refined understanding of the medieval tradition, including an improved stemma.

© Robert A. Kaster kaster@princeton.edu
The Medieval Tradition of Macrobius’ *Saturnalia*

Modern critical work on the text of Macrobius’ *Saturnalia* has advanced, not by a smooth, unidirectional progression, but by taking at least one step back for every two steps forward.

In 1852 Ludwig van Jan published his landmark edition, the first to draw on a broad sampling of the pre-humanist manuscripts and to use the early printed editions systematically. It was a great stride forward. Yet Jan’s text was yoked to a critical apparatus that was astoundingly inaccurate (a problem caused in part, but only in part, by his reliance on others to collate the manuscripts for him), and before the end of the century his text had been eclipsed by Franz Eyssenhardt’s Teubner edition, which set the clock back three or four centuries by effectively relying on only two manuscripts for the first three books and only one for the last four.

Antonio La Penna made the next large advance in 1953, by systematically surveying many of the manuscripts Jan had used, together with a number of others, and identifying for the first time the three manuscript-families that define the medieval tradition. But because he had based his analyses on test collations only, his conclusions contained not a few errors, large and small: most important was the mistaken judgment that the three families each descended from the archetype independently of the other two. That error was soon corrected by James Willis, who showed that two of the families are derived from a common ancestor that stood between them and the archetype, and Willis’ new Teubner, first published in 1963, clearly offered an improved text.

Yet this edition too was criticized, harshly but justly, for providing a critical apparatus that was neither accurate nor responsible. In its treatment of Macrobius’ relations to the ancient texts on which he drew, for example, or its approach to the work of other scholars since the Renaissance—constantly using the vague and dismissive *vulgo* to denote anything from the *editio princeps* of 1472 to a conjecture by Jan—it could most generously be called cavalier. But—as even the harshest of those critics barely suspected—there was still worse news: for most of the manuscripts, and above all for two main witnesses to one of the families, the apparatus failed—on
literally hundreds upon hundreds of occasions—to report errors that are 'significant' on any understanding of the term, including major faults such as omissions and transpositions. The upshot is this: more than a century and a half into the era of modern editorial method, the best available edition gives—in countless places—an inadequate or false idea of the text's documentary basis, or no idea at all.

In laying the groundwork for a new edition of the *Saturnalia* I have extensively checked Willis’s reports of the manuscripts, drawn on the collations of two important manuscripts published by M. J. Carton after Willis' edition appeared, and collated eighteen additional pre-humanist manuscripts wholly or in part. Basing itself on the new data, the discussion below provides a refined understanding of the medieval tradition.

All the extant manuscripts, it is clear, descend from a single ancestor that for five of the *Saturnalia*'s seven books presented a text which had suffered losses ranging from the serious to the catastrophic. This archetype was itself written in minuscule (there are no errors pointing to capital script), probably in the late eighth or very early ninth century. As already noted, La Penna first saw that the archetype’s surviving descendants fall into three families, which after Willis’ refinement can be represented thus:

```
   ω
  / \  
 /   \ 
α   β
    /  \
   β₁ β₂
```

Though contamination is present, it does not obscure the relations within the three families, as they are represented by the manuscripts on which an editor would be best advised to rely. We can survey each of the families in turn.

The relevant manuscripts are these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naples V. B. 10</td>
<td>s. IX med-¾ (Sat. 1.1.1 - 7.5.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I set aside one manuscript, Escorial Q.1.1 (= T, s. XV), which Willis used as a witness to α while warning that it was ‘mixtae originis, et lectiones aliquas vel veras vel falsas ex contaminatione habens’.13 ‘lectiones aliquae’, however, does not do justice to T’s character, for not only does it have many errors distinctive of α, it also has many errors distinctive of β, of β₁, and of β₂; indeed, it appears to have vacuumed up bad readings from every nook and cranny of the tradition. It is stemmatically worthless and has no good conjectures not also found elsewhere.

Together NDPG (or NPG after D departs in Book 3) share nearly 400 significant errors. These errors not only identify the manuscripts as a closely related family but also suggest (for example) that α itself bore traces of correction. This state of affairs, which would in any case be expected, probably explains the following patterns:

2.2.16 censorium risum] censorum risum N, censorum risum cum i. iudiciorum ss. D,

censorium iudicium P, recte G

3.15.8 Marcus post libro ponit N, om. P, recte G

7.3.18 magistrisve] magistris vel N, vel magistris P, vel magistris vel G.

Now, as Willis rightly remarked, N and P represent two extremes of scribal behavior.14 N’s scribe was deeply ignorant and as a result capable of writing awful nonsense; at the same time, precisely because he lacked any pretensions to learning, he did not attempt to ‘improve’ the text but aimed to reproduce what was in front of his nose. P’s scribe, by contrast, was clearly comfortable enough in Latin that, consciously or not, he repeatedly replaced words with their synonyms, and was learned enough to spot a metrical lapse and insert a stopgap of his own devising.15 We should be glad to have D and still more G to serve as a control upon these two extremes, and of course to have G as a witness after N departs at Sat. 7.5.2.16 All four manuscripts have many errors, including omissions, that do not appear in the others, and it is therefore clear
that none of them can be directly descended from any of the others. But what more can be said about the actual state of their relations?

Concerning G, La Penna and M. J. Carton drew firm but contradictory conclusions, the former stating that G (his S) was independent of NP, the latter arguing that G and N are gemelli. Both views cannot be true; in fact neither is correct. Carton reached her judgment by a hasty and superficial process that considered only the errors that N and G uniquely share, without regard for the patterns of shared errors in the family as a whole (that is, not just NG against P but also PG against N, plus the other combinations possible where D is extant). In fact, if there is a set a gemelli among the four, they are ND, not NG. Before D departs early in Book 3 it shares the following thirty-one errors with N against PG and (typically) all the other manuscripts:

1.17.54 hoc est] he; 1.19.11 superos] super; 1.20.3 quod] quid; 1.23.12 consociatam] conscia tam; 2.1.4 symposio] sym. posio; 2.1.8 repudianda] repudienda N (L), repuniendaD; 2.2.4 mos erat] monserat N, monstrat D; 2.2.8 solito] solio; 2.2.16 censorium] –orum;
2.3.16 M.] margus; 2.4.16 volebat] –abat (corr. D9); 2.4.27 venitque] venit venitque; 2.7.10 facit] fecit; 2.8.6 instauranda] –do; 3.2.10 profundus quam amoenus] –dis quam moenus;
3.4.8 qui diligentius] quit illentius N, quid illentius D.

To put these instances into perspective, ND share half again as many errors against PG as are shared in the same stretch of text by all the other possible pairs combined. Still, while I believe that a sibling relationship between these two books most probably explains this set of fact, the possibility cannot be ruled out that they are independent descendants of α that proved to be more
conservative in preserving the hyparchetype’s errors than the lines of descent represented by \( P \) and \( G \).

La Penna (who did not know \( D \)) reached his conclusion—that \( NP \) together form a branch from which \( G \) is independent—in a similarly hasty and superficial way, citing only two examples, both of which happen to be invalid.\(^{22}\) In fact, none of the three main sources—\( N(D) \)\(^{23} \) or \( P \) or \( G \)—is more closely related to one of the others than it is to the third; that is to say, the number and kind of errors that \( N(D)P \) share uniquely against \( G \) and the rest of the manuscripts (\( \beta \)) are not significantly different from the number and kind of errors that \( N(D)G \) share against \( \beta \), while the errors shared uniquely by \( PG \) against \( N(D)\beta \) are fewer still, thus:\(^{24}\)

\[
\text{N(D)P against G: 1.4.24 de futuro] futuro (corr. P\(^2\)); 1.6.6 γνῶθι σεαυτόν (gnot(h)i sceauton G\( β \))] gnothi cauton ND, gnothe auton P; 1.21.23 iam supra] supra iam; 1.23.16 vitiis] viitis; 1.23.16 futuri] ~rum; 1.24.21 omni alia] omnia alia (M); 2.3.1 facundissimum] fec- (R\(^1\)F\(^2\)A\(^1\), facc- G); 2.3.5 autem se] autem si; 2.3.9 dixerit] ~erat (corr. P\(^3\)); 2.5.5 heri] here; 2.6.3 Galbam] galbuam (corr. P\(^4\)); 2.6.4 testis] ~tes; 3.9.10 sive vos] sive (OLAC); 3.14.3 adscriptionem] adfert-; 3.16.6 superius] sermonis; 5.1.5 non una] nec una (G\(^2\)); 5.5.12 iuventa] inenta (F); 5.5.14 comprensio] compressa; 5.15.6 numerat] numerat; 5.15.7 oris quiem Osinium] oris mosinium N, orisque mosinium P (dein mosinium del.); 5.16.12 loci inde descripti] locun dede scripti N, iocunde descripti P (loci indescripti G); 5.20.11 fontibus] frontibus N, frondibus P; 6.1.36 acrior] agrior; 6.2.3 in pectus] inspectus; 6.2.20 ceu] seu (corr. N\(^3\)); 6.2.30 miretur] mireretur (corr. P\(^5\)); 6.9.5 quem de extis] quae ab aetatis magnitudine de extis; 7.4.12 omnium] ~ia.
\]

\[
\text{N(D)G against P: Praef. 5 mixtura] mixura (corr. G\(^2\)); 1.9.8 redintegratur] ~tus; 1.14.5 an terminum] ante terminum (A\(^1\)); 1.14.8 corrumperet] arrum- ; 1.16.39 mutatus] mutatus (B\(^2\)Z); 1.17.29 populus] ~os; 1.17.32 φωτι] ΦΩΝΤΙ; 1.21.15 solstitium] vel stitium (corr. G\(^2\)); 1.24.24 haec] et (B\(^1\)V); 2.2.4 reliqua erat] reliquerat (MBL, corr. G\(^2\)B\(^2\)L\(^2\)); 2.4.2 Ajax
\]
On the most economical explanation of these data, the agreements of N(D)P or N(D)G or PG mostly represent the common legacy of $\alpha$ that happens to have been removed by correction from the ancestry of G or P or N(D), respectively, as each descended independently from $\alpha$, just as we see still more errors being removed in the lists above. That the first two lists are longer than the third simply means that process of stripping away $\alpha$’s errors had progressed farther by the time the two eleventh-century manuscripts, PG, were written than it had by the time the common ancestor of ND was written in the ninth. And that is only what we should expect.

In graphic terms, then, the $\alpha$ family can most probably be understood to be constituted as follows:
The remaining manuscripts all descend from a book (= β) that must have been derived from the archetype not long after the archetype itself was written: we can be reasonably confident of this rough chronology because β’s oldest surviving descendant—a set of excerpts from Books 1-3 written at Lorsch in the scriptorium’s ‘younger style’ (Vatican Pal. lat. 886)—must itself date to the early years of the ninth century.29 As I have already noted, it was Willis’ main advance over La Penna to recognize the existence of β as the common ancestor of the two other manuscript families that La Penna had identified. By way of demonstration Willis pointed to a number of β’s errors—that is, the errors shared by all the manuscripts save NDPG—in Book 1.30 I can add a small selection drawn from Sat. 2-3, the other two books where we can trace β’s existence:

2.2.13 Caninius Rebilus] gaius servilius (maius servilius a); 2.5.4-5 Iuliam. venerat ad eum] iulia venerata deum MBVOLK (iulia venerata dominum RFAC, where the latter error obviously implies and extends the former); 2.7.16 βλέπεις] ΒΛΕΝΕΙϹ (Gr. om. L); 3.6.17 sive qui] sive (qui post relieti C); 3.14.9 M. Cato senatorem] mensenatorem (-sana- R); 3.15.8 Papirius om.; 3.16.6 ipse om.

Though β itself must have had the text of all seven books, we can reconstruct its character for only the first three because one of the two families descended from β preserves those three alone. It is to that family, β1, that we can now turn.

β1

The relevant manuscripts are these:
As we have seen, the first traces of this family (K) appear at Lorsch, just east of the Rhine, near the beginning of the ninth century. In the second quarter of the century a book probably descended from β₁ was written in the Loire valley, and the main body of witnesses, MBVO, were all written in France in the second half of the century. Of these books, MBVZ were used by Willis; K had been used earlier by Jan. The very interesting manuscript L was the discovery of Carton, who published a complete collation in 1966. O was judged by La Penna one of the three most important manuscripts of the family, along with B and V, though it was ignored by Willis. As we shall see, O is in fact an older sibling of L: together they provide important help in understanding the family’s structure.

It is clear that none of these manuscripts can have been the source of any of the others. The fact that M generally omits the Greek rules it out as a model; K and Z are similarly ruled out, the former because it is merely a set of excerpts, the latter by its date. As for the rest, consider this sampling of uncorrected omissions that appear in no other manuscript: in B, 1.17.22 terram . . . id est (see also 3.8.14, where B repeats ‘dedit. Plautus in Cistellaria qui e nuce nucleos’ after qui e nuce nucleos’); in V, 3.14.9 has . . . dare, 3.15.15 non dissimulanter . . . Cicero; in O, 1.18.6 –νε Βάκχε . . . ὁ κισ- (probably the equivalent of one line in the exemplar), 3.13.12 lumbos . . .
ficedulas, 3.18.3-4 nominatur . . . iuglans; in L, 1.17.25 Apollini, 2.3.16 ὡμοιόπτωτον, 3.10.1 diune.

Around 150 errors are shared by all or most of MBVZOLK in Saturnalia 1-3 against the correct text of α and β₂, a rate of conjunctive error that is roughly comparable to that of NDPG.⁴³

For a sampling of errors shared by MBVOL (and K where extant) that an early medieval scribe would be unlikely to detect or correct without reference to another manuscript, consider the following:⁴⁴


Beyond these errors—and setting O, L, and K to one side for the moment—the basic structure of the family is perfectly clear. First, in Saturnalia 1.12.21 - 3.19.5, where both M and B are extant, BVZ or (after Sat. 1.19.6) BV share another hundred errors that distinguish them from M.⁴⁵

Further, Willis noticed two important characteristics of BVZ—that BZ are more closely related to each other than either is to V, and that B nonetheless shares with V some errors that do not appear in Z—and he drew the correct conclusion: BZ are indeed gemelli, while an ancestor of Z lost through correction some of the errors transmitted from BVZ’s common ancestor.⁴⁶ So far, then, this is our picture:
With Willis I leave the source of contamination (χ) indeterminate: Z is present so briefly that it is difficult to see any patterns beyond its kinship to B; there are, however, no reliable signs of contamination from beyond the β₁-family or, for that matter, from M. ⁴⁷

Where, then, do O and L fit in this picture? ⁴⁸ It is clear, first, that they stand apart from BVZ: of the one hundred errors noted above that distinguish the latter three manuscripts from M, none appears in O or L. ⁴⁹ Further, it is clear that O and L together are derived from a common ancestor distinct from both BVZ and M, since they share over 60 errors that appear in no other manuscripts, for example:

1.6.22 duobus] duabus O¹L, 1.7.4 si ita] sita OL, 1.12.12 cum] cuius OL, 1.16.13 comitialibus] comitalibus OL, 1.16.10 urgentem] arguentem OL, arguentem M, ⁵⁰ 1.16.35 candidatis] -us OL, 1.17.31 βορείους] BΡΕΟΥϹ O, BΡΕΤΟΥϹ L (ΟΥϹ BVZ, Gr. om. M), 1.17.33 specie (om. a) OL, 1.18.20 χείματι] XΕΙΜΑΠ OL (D), 1.18.22 πέριξ] NΕΡΙΩ OL, NΕΡΥΞ L, ⁵¹ 1.23.3 θεωρεῖον] ΘΕΩΡΕΙϹΕΑΙ OL, 1.23.5 δαίμόνιον] ΔΑΙΜΟΝΩ OL, 1.23.7 ἦρως] ΝΠΩΩΝ OL (*ΠΠΟΝ B¹, ΠΠΟΡΝ B²), 1.23.22 δήνη] ΔΙΝΗΕϹ OL (ΔΙΝΗΕϹ DBV), 1.24.25 adprobanteque] adprobante quae OL, 2.4.9 forum] foret O¹L, 2.4.21 enim om. OL, 2.7.12 histrio] historio O¹L¹, 2.8.7 exercitationes] exertiones OL, 3.5.1
Now, if OL represent a lost manuscript (= σ) that is independent of π in the stemma above, there are only three options for its derivation:

(a) π \(\beta_1\) σ M
(b) π \(\beta_1\) σ M
(c) π \(\beta_1\) σ M

The expectations aroused by each option are clear. In the case of (a), we should expect OL to have both the 60-odd errors inherited from σ and a certain number of errors that πσ inherited from their common ancestor, against the truth in M; in the case of (c) we should expect, similarly, that the errors OL inherited from σ would be joined by a certain number of errors inherited from the common ancestor of σM, against the truth in π; in the case of (b), we should expect OL to have only errors transmitted from σ, plus of course their own peculiar errors and whatever background noise might have been generated by coincidence and casual contamination.

If we ask, then, with respect to (a) how many errors OL share with BV(Z) when M is correct, the answer is: five errors, of an exceedingly undistinguished sort.52 If we ask with respect to (c) how many errors OL share with M when BV(Z) are correct, the answer is: ten errors, of a scarcely more distinguished sort.53 I cannot persuade myself that this is anything other than background noise in either case. If that is so, then the provisional stemma drawn above can be filled out as follows:
I note that with such a stemma we should expect to find neither many instances in which *VOL* agree in error against the truth in *B(Z)M* nor many instances in which *B(Z)M* agree in error against the truth in *VOL*; and in fact we do not.54

As a final indication of *OL*’s independence from both *π* and *M*, consider the following fifteen errors that *OL* share uniquely with the manuscripts of family *β₂*:


At first glance these might appear to be instances where an ancestor of *OL* was contaminated by a *β₂* source. But since the passages include a high proportion of omissions (5) and transpositions (2)—the sorts of error more likely to be removed than imported by correction—these are probably errors that both *β₁* and *β₂* inherited from their parent: *β₁* passed them along to *σ*, but they had been stripped away by correctors before the streams of transmission reached *π* and *M*. 
There is in fact only one textual circumstance that I find truly puzzling, on any plausible understanding of the family:

1.17.54 si quidem Latonam physici volunt terram videri, cui diu intervenit Iuno, ne numina quae diximus ederuntur: hoc est aer, qui tunc umidus adhuc gravisque, obstabat aetheri ne fulgor luminum per umoris aerii densitatem tamquam e cuiusdam partus progressione fulgeret.

ne fulgeret VOL, ne fulgerent Z

ne fulgor nefulgeret B, ne fulgor refulgeret MB²

We seem prima facie to be faced with two very different, in fact contradictory, forms of corruption: on the one hand, the text of VOL appears to reflect a simple saut du même au même—from ne to the last syllable of progressione, or from fulg- to fulg-—that was inherited by πσ from β₁ and then further deformed in Z; on the other hand, the text of B appears to reflect the omission of a line of text (luminum . . . progressio = 63 characters, not counting spaces), which was then tidied up as the reading of M and a correcting hand in B. Absent one or another implausible-seeming assumption, involving odd sorts of correction combined with equally odd sorts of contamination, it is very difficult to see how B’s text (or M’s) could be derived from that of VOL, or vice versa; and given the stemmatic position that the overwhelming weight of evidence assigns to B, it is equally difficult to see how it could have received the authentic text of β₁ independent of VOL. In so far as a stemma is only a theory in graphic form—a structure of ideas meant to organize and explain a set of data—I record this case as the one datum that baffles the theory I have presented, or any other plausible theory I can imagine.

β₂

In the case of family β₁, then, as in case of family α, three independent lines of descent can be traced from the hyparchetype. That is not the case with our last family. The relevant manuscripts are these:
R Vatican Reg. lat. 2043 s. X ex./XI in. (lacking after Sat. 7.14.11)\textsuperscript{57}
F Florence Laur. Plut. 90 sup. 25 s. XII (complete)
A Cambridge University Library ff.3-5 s. XII (complete)\textsuperscript{58}
C Cambridge Corpus Christi College 71 s. XII (complete)\textsuperscript{59}
Q Bern, Burgerbibl. 514 s. X (Sat. 7)\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{RFA} were used by Willis, though he came to repent of using \textsuperscript{A}.\textsuperscript{61} His regret was misplaced, however: \textsuperscript{A} provides a valuable control on \textsuperscript{R}, especially when its testimony is combined with that of its gemellus, \textsuperscript{C}, which was used by Gronovius and judged one of the three most important manuscripts of the family by La Penna.\textsuperscript{62} \textsuperscript{Q}, the oldest witness to \textsuperscript{β}, contains only Book 7; it was used by Jan but ignored by La Penna and Willis.

Discussion here can be brief, since the relations among this family’s manuscripts are more transparent than in the case of the other two. It is clear, first, that none of these books descends directly from any of the others: \textsuperscript{R} is certainly the oldest book in the family (save for \textsuperscript{Q}) and so could not be derived from any of its kin;\textsuperscript{63} \textsuperscript{F}’s handling of the Greek (see below) shows that it is independent of \textsuperscript{RAC}, while it has a number of gross uncorrected errors that appear in no other book;\textsuperscript{64} \textsuperscript{A} is distinct from the rest in lacking the end of Book 3 (from 3.18.9 Plautus);\textsuperscript{65} and \textsuperscript{C} has a many unique, uncorrected omissions.\textsuperscript{66} Together they share roughly 200 errors that define their existence as a family, for example:\textsuperscript{67}

1.7.22 in posteros] et in posteros, internundino\] in trinundino \textsuperscript{FA}\textsuperscript{2}, intertrinundino \textsuperscript{RA}\textsuperscript{1},
inter trinundinum \textsuperscript{C},\textsuperscript{68} 1.24.23 patribus] patri, 2.5.7 respondisset] –deret (\textsuperscript{L}\textsuperscript{2}), 3.5.5 his \textit{om.},
3.15.8 fluentur] fluentur \textsuperscript{R}\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{FA}, fluent \textsuperscript{C} (\textit{om. \textsuperscript{R}}\textsuperscript{1}),\textsuperscript{69} 3.17.6 vocitati] vocati, 4.4.22 a
causa \textit{om.}, 5.2.2 νευρήν μὲν\] \textit{NEYPEHN FAC, NEYPENN R}, 5.3.12 hic posuit \textit{om.}, 5.5.3
dona . . . subiectis\] subs, 5.19.21 palici . . . placabiles \textit{om.}, 6.1.43 Lucilius] Lucretius,
6.5.13 sceptrum . . . dextra \textit{om.}, 7.3.14 genere \textit{om.}, 7.4.5 patiuntur . . . varietate \textit{om.}, 7.4.8
omnium disciplinarum\] disciplinarum omnium, 7.13.9 simulacra \textit{om. \textsuperscript{RFJQ, aras AC}}.\textsuperscript{70}
Beyond those errors, a clear bifurcation takes place, as RAC (joined in Book 7 by Q) share roughly another 100 errors that distinguish them from F, for example:

1.17.57 infera] inferiora, 1.23.13 sol est] solem AC\(^1\), ad solem R, 2.2.3 tam om., 2.4.11 audisset inter pueros] inter pueros audisset, 2.4.20 ad se hominem] hominem ad se, 3.1.6 contingat] contingit, 4.6.14 se in sanguine versat] se in s. versat (se in versat N), 5.9.14 miserit] miserat, 5.17.6 infudit] infundit, 7.1.2 reverenda] verecunda, 7.1.15 faciles tamen] facilesque, 7.1.19 digerendo] dicendo, 7.12.7 tanto . . . quanto] quanto . . . tanto.\(^71\)

F is further shown to be independent of and superior to the others by its far more faithful handling of the Greek: though F joins RAC in omitting all the Greek in Book 5 after Sat. 5.3.3 (evidently the legacy of β\(^3\)), it generally reports the Greek thoroughly, whereas the scribe of RAC’s common ancestor often copied only the first few words or letters of an extended passage.\(^72\)

The members of the sub-family formed by RAC arose on opposite sides of the English Channel: R was written at Mont St. Michel around the turn of the eleventh century; A and C were written at Bury St. Edmunds and St. Albans, respectively, sometime in the twelfth century. It is plain that the two English manuscripts have a common ancestor, for they uniquely share over 400 errors. I cite here only a selection of uncorrected omissions, transpositions, or the like from each book:\(^73\)

Praef. 4 post pollicetur add. id est ad utilitatem respicias,\(^74\) 1.2. 9 illa om., 1.4.26 Romam equitatum] equitatum Romam, 1.5.8 post nummum add. dixit, 1.6.8 Lucumonem vocatatum] lucii nomine vocatum, 1.7.29 perenne] per omnem lacum, 1.11.40 nonas caprotinas] caprotinas nonas, 1.11.41 librum illum divinum] divinum librum, 1.11.50 facit esse] esse facit, 1.12.27 a viro visa sit] visa sit a viro, 1.14.3 novae ordinationis] ordinationis novae, 1.16.3 fas est, quibusdam fas non est] fas non est, quibusdam fas est, 1.16.10 causa om., 2.1.3 eminentiores estis om., 2.4.31 Graecum epigramma ante breve, 2.7.2 Caesare] add. augusto, 2.8.2 ut aestimo, in hoc] in hoc ut aestimo, 3.5.1 hostiarum genus] genus

It is plain, too, that this common ancestor omitted even more of the Greek than the ancestor they share with R, the omissions commonly being marked by the abbreviation ‘GR’ at the appropriate point in the text.

I should note that C gives evidence of very attentive, even aggressive, correction by conjectural emendation in the recent history of its text (more recent, that is, than the common ancestor it shares with A): so for example, at Sat. 1.4.25 (‘si vis mihi equitatum dare et ipse cum cetero exercitu me sequi, die quinti Romae in Capitolio curabo tibi cenam coctam’), where the archetype’s corruption of ‘si vis’ to ‘si quis’ rendered the passage unintelligible, C’s text has velit sequi inserted (parallel to P’s independent sequi volet) and replaces tibi with ei for good measure; or at Sat. 1.7.3 (innumeræ inter om. C, innumeræ om. BVZOLRFA), where the deletion of inter at least makes the passage construable after B’s omission of innumeræ; or at 1.7.14 (principem) patrem C, om. A), where patrem is improvised to take the place of principem omitted in AC’s common ancestor. Compare also:

1.7.14 dissentit . . . receperant om. BVZOLRFAC, deinde receptus non est post in archana templorum add. C

1.10.2 inserto] incepto C, incerto A (where, again, the latter reading is the first stage of corruption)
2.3.6 Rebilus, ut quaereretur] ut a revilo quaereret C (a rewriting that follows from the preceding omission of *hoc*)

2.4.2 scripserat] fecerat C (*om. R*¹)


5.7.9 Palinuri] Miseni C (correcting Macrobius’ error)

5.13.4 a currente] currente RFA, currentis C (making C the only β₂ MS to offer a—more or less—readable version, cf. also 6.4.7 and 6.9.7 below)

5.19.2 vir alias] aurelius C, iurelius A (where again the latter reading is the first stage of error)

5.19.2 historia] historia sit C (quite a finicky ‘correction’)

6.4.7 aquai] aquae C, aqua RFA

6.7.4 Vergilius] virgilius qui C (in fact preferable to Rᵐ’s *cum* adopted by Willis)

6.8.15 liquido] ad liquidum C, liquidum A (another improvement on AC’s shared legacy)

6.9.7 in bidentes] et bidentes datae C, et bidentes RFA

6.9.13 rationi certae in rerum] rationem certam rerum C (after the nonsense produced by the omission of *nullus* in AC’s common ancestor)

7.1.25 coetus nullus] coetusve C, coetus A

7.4.5 habent et post saginam *add. C* (an attempt to make some sense out of the nonsense produced by β₂’s omission of *patiuntur* . . . *varietate* immediately following; a similar attempt is reflected in A’s *compositam*, for –*ta*)

7.16.2 iocum (Jan)] locum C (i.e., ‘topic’, a far from absurd alternative to ω’s meaningless *cum*)

7.16.25 fellantes (Meurs)] lactentes C (an intelligible alternative to GFQ’s *fallentes* or PA’s *pallentes*)
It is worth cataloguing these passages not just for the light they might throw on English philology in the eleventh- or twelfth-century, but because the care and intelligence they attest surely accounts for another very significant characteristic of C: it is the earliest witness I know for a strikingly high number of readings that Macrobius’ modern editors have actually adopted as corrections of the archetype’s corruptions. I list these readings here, indicating in parentheses the next earliest witness of which I know:

2.3.10 spectandum C (Guelph. 4619, Monac. Clm 15738): expec}-\omega
4.3.4 impositique C (Monac. Clm 15738): -tisque \omega
4.3.6 misericordiam C (Monac. Clm 15738): om. \omega
5.8.6 et C (ed. Ven. 1472 ex Verg.): atque \omega
5.3.14 inclusit C (ed. Ven. 1472 ex Verg.): -sis \omega (-si \textbf{R}^2)
5.6.13 radice C (ed. Ven. 1513): -cem \omega^28
5.13.19 adgressos C (Monac. Clm 15738): -sus \omega
5.15.7 Cosas C (ed. Ven. 1472): c(h)oras \textbf{a}, (c(h)oros \textbf{b}
5.15.8 quos C (Monac. Clm 15738, ed. Ven. 1472): quod \omega
5.15.9 Cupavo C (ed. Ven. 1472 ex Verg.): pavo \omega
5.15.9 Cygni C (ed. Ven. 1472, cigni \textbf{P}^4): cynni vel cinni \omega
5.15.11 duodecimo C (ed. Ven. 1472): undecimo \omega (though the error is perhaps Macrobius’)
5.17.15 Ulixes C (Ulyxes Monac. Clm 15738): -is \omega
5.22.2 ipsius deae (Eyssenhardt)] ipsius esse C (proposed independently by Willis), ipsiusce \omega^79
7.8.1 absumpserit C (Monac. Clm 15738): ass- \omega
7.14.21 sensus C (proposed independently by Jan): sensus unus \omega^80
To return, now, to the family of β₂ as a whole, it is clear that the manuscripts’ relations can be represented accurately thus:

\[ \text{s. ix} \]
\[ \beta_2 \]
\[ \text{s. x} \]
\[ R \]
\[ \text{s. xi} \]
\[ A \quad C \quad F \]
\[ \text{s. xii} \]

If we ask how that picture is affected when the evidence of Q, β₂’s oldest surviving descendant, is taken into account for Book 7, the answer is also clear; since I have analyzed the matter in detail elsewhere, I will simply summarize my findings here.⁸¹

Beyond sharing the errors of RFAC in Book 7 that define them as a family, Q also shares many of the errors of RAC that distinguish them from F and shares no significant errors with F against the truth in RAC:⁸² Q therefore clearly belongs on the left side of the stemma above. At the same time, Q lacks many of the errors that RAC later share. It would appear, then, that Q should occupy a position on the stemma between β₂ and RAC’s common ancestor, thus:

\[ \text{s. ix} \]
\[ \beta_2 \]
\[ \text{s. x} \]
\[ R \]
\[ \text{s. xi} \]
\[ A \quad C \quad F \]
\[ \text{s. xii} \]

This picture is in turn consistent with several instances where a sequence of error can be seen to extend ‘beneath’ the stemmatic placement posited for Q.⁸³

There is, however, one further detail to be filled in: for not only are there a large number of cases in which R agrees uniquely in error with AC (= ε) against the truth in QF (that is, RAC’s
inheritance from $\delta$ in the stemma above), there is also a non-trivial number of cases in which $R$ agrees uniquely in error with $Q$ against the truth in $\epsilon F$. These are circumstances that the stemma tells us should not arise, since the errors uniquely shared by $RQ$ are presumptively the legacy of $\gamma$ and so should also appear in $\epsilon$. We can recall, however, that we have seen just these circumstances arise in another case, in our discussion of the manuscripts $B V Z$ in family $\beta_1$: there $B$ and $Z$ were more closely related to each other than either was to $V$, as here $R$ and $\epsilon$ are more closely related to each than either is to $Q$; and yet $B$ and $V$ uniquely shared a certain number of errors that did not appear in $Z$. In that case the most probable explanation was that correction had stripped away errors passed on by the common ancestor of $B V Z$ before they could reach $Z$.$^{84}$ There is every reason to think that the same explanation is applicable to this parallel situation: some of the errors that were part of $\gamma$’s legacy to $R A C$ were removed by correction before they could reach $\epsilon$, thus:$^{85}$

$$\begin{align*}
&\beta_1 \\
&\gamma \\
&\delta \\
&R \\
&\phi \\
&\epsilon \\
&A
\end{align*}$$

Whatever the contamination’s source, there is of course no reason to suppose that its influence was confined to Book 7: it is only $Q$’s presence in the book that happens to make it visible.$^{86}$

In summary: the two Escorial manuscripts used by Willis (his $T$ and $Z$) should be discarded, but five other manuscripts ($G O L C$, and $Q$ in Book 7) can be recruited to fill out our understanding of the early medieval tradition. The understanding of that tradition on which my edition will be based can be represented thus (reconstructed intermediaries and likely paths of contamination are not shown):
Appendix

In this appendix I survey some of the pre-13th century manuscripts that have no role in the paper’s main argument. None of these books has been reported in comparable detail before.

1: Leiden Voss. Lat. Q2

Leiden Voss. Lat. Q2 (= Leid), a composite codex, contains three folia (31r-33v) from a book of s. IX2/4 produced in the Benedictine abbey of Ferrières-en-Gâtinais (Loire); these folia form one of three known links between Macrobius and the circle of Servatus Lupus. The folia preserve non-continuous segments of Sat. 1: fol. 31 = 1.1.4-1.2.23 (ca. 640 words); fol. 32 = 1.4.7-1.4.23 (ca. 690 words); fol. 33 = 1.9.14-1.10.9 (ca. 610 words). The gap in the text between fol. 31 and 32 is ca. 1360 words, or 2 folia; between fol. 32 and 33, ca. 5000 words, or 8 folia. The outer edge of fol. 33 was trimmed, causing the loss of 1-5 letters at the end (on recto) or beginning (on verso) of almost every line, along with any corrections entered in the margin.

Determining the text’s affiliation is in most respects unproblematic:

- it shares all the certainly or probably archetypal errors found in its extant segments of text;
- it shares none of the conjunctive errors of NDPG;
- it shares none of the conjunctive errors of BV;
- it does, however, share all but one of the errors common to BVOL, which are also the only shared errors of OL that appear in these segments;
- and it shares the one legacy of β that appears in these segments, 1.4.16 defendat] defendit LeidBVOLRFAC.

The conclusion suggested by those facts seems clear: Leid was a β₁ manuscript, in fact the earliest extant member of the family save for the excerpts in K (which do not overlap with these remnants); within β₁ it was not closely affiliated with BV, but the brevity of its text prevents a more precise identification of its place in the family.

However, its relation to the manuscripts of β₂ introduces a complication. Leid was quite
thoroughly corrected: the errors that appear uniquely in the text of Leid’s first hand—a score or so—were all removed, and some of the other correction found is quite finicky: for example, at 1.2.6 pernoscendae, the scribe wrote pernoscē at end of one line, ndae at start of next, which a corrector altered to pernoscen- / -dae. These facts are significant for this reason: whereas none of Leid’s corrected errors appears in RFAC, in nearly every case where Leid’s error was not corrected, it does appear in RFAC—and such cases are in fact the only places where we find RFAC agreeing in error in the segments of text represented by Leid’s surviving folia. According to the usual stemmatic principles, then, that set of facts should suggest that RFAC descend from Leid, and from that descent only one of two conclusions could follow: the implications of one would be interesting but no more, while the implications of the other would require a major revision in our understanding of the medieval tradition.

The first, less consequential option is this: the familial relation between Leid and BVOL is only apparent; instead, Leid, as RFAC’s ancestor, can be thought of as standing in the place of—even, perhaps, as being—β2. That is to say, Leid and BVOL share the errors they share not because they are all descended from β1 but because they are all descended from β, and those errors do not appear in RFAC simply because they were all removed by correction from Leid. We would then regret all the more that we have only three of the latter’s folia, but nothing would really be changed. The more consequential alternative is this: Leid and BVOL are indeed all descendants of β1—save that we now can no longer talk of β1 and β2; rather, β2 ceases to be an independent witness to one half of the tradition and instead becomes a sub-branch of the same family as LeidBVOL (and M); and that family is no longer β1 but, in effect, β itself.

Other considerations aside, however, the latter scenario faces an insurmountable obstacle, in the form of this question: if RFAC, which contain all seven books, belong to the same family as MBVOL, which contain only the first three, how ever did they come to have Books 4-7? To that question there are only three possible answers: from an α-source; or from Leid itself, which for
this purpose must be assumed to have been distinct from MBVOL in having all seven books; or from an otherwise unknown source, which for this purpose must be assumed to be independent of both α and β. The first answer is simply impossible, since (inter alia) α has, while RFAC lack, many errors in Books 4-7 that can be called 'uncorrectable': that is, they could not be detected or corrected without recourse to yet another manuscript. The other two answers are based on assumptions that are arbitrary and implausible on their face.

The question, then, comes down to this: is Leid the functional equivalent of β₂, the ancestor of RFAC, or is the set of facts above that first suggested such a relationship misleading? I think the latter alternative is more likely, though certainty is impossible. The uncorrected errors of Leid that recur in RFAC are mostly archetypal errors that we should expect to find in any case, whereas the shared non-archetypal errors are neither numerous nor impressive: 1.2.8 digestaque digesta PLeidRFAC, 1.9.15 Quirinum] —nium LeidBRFAC. The second of these errors is trivial, while the first could be the result of coincidence or contamination, as its presence in the certainly unrelated manuscript P shows. On the other hand, there are also two cases where an archetypal error seems to have been corrected uniquely in Leid among the early manuscripts, with the correction subsequently reappearing in β₂: 1.9.18 aede RFAC: sede Leid¹NDPGBVZOL, 1.10.6 profestum RF: profectum Leid¹NDPGBVZOLAC. In the first case, the correction was made with an expunction point under s (note, however, that there appear to be points under d and e also); in the second, profectum was crossed out with a series of diagonal strokes, and a reference sign (·/) was placed above it, pointing to a marginal correction (but that correction—presumably profestum—has been lost where the margin has been trimmed). These two readings might make still worthy of consideration the possibility that Leid, as corrected, spawned RFAC. But there are other ways by which the latter manuscripts could have acquired the good readings, and the evidence is, on balance, too slender to support the burden it would have to bear. It is best to regard Leid as an early and, regrettably, mostly lost member of β₁.
2: R and Its Descendants

No fewer than four extant manuscripts are derived from R, one of the chief witnesses to the family β₂. These are: J = Vatican lat. 3417 (Sat. 1-4, 7); W = Florence Laur. Plut. 51.8 (complete); H = British Library Harleianus 3859 (complete); I = Paris lat. 7412 (f. 80r-89v: Sat. 7.1.1-7.16.21). I will briefly demonstrate in turn each manuscript’s relation to R.¹⁰⁰

J contains the text of Saturnalia 1-4 on fol. 1r-90v, with Sat. 4.6.24 ending on the fifth line of fol. 90v. There follows immediately, in a different, somewhat later hand, a text that the new scribe identifies, in a marginal note, as ‘De s(an)c(t)o Nicholao lectio nona’, concerning some of the saint’s miracles; under that marginal label ‘a late fifteenth century hand . . . indicates that there is lacking here about one book of Macrobius’.¹⁰¹ The new text ends on fol. 92r, with fol. 92v left blank; the text of Saturnalia 7 then fills fol. 93r-129v, in a hand contemporary with but different from the hand of fol. 1-90.¹⁰² It is plain that the text of Book 7 has been copied directly from Q, the earliest extant witness to the β₂-family.¹⁰³ It is equally plain that the text of Books 1-4 has been copied directly from R: of the more than 500 uncorrected errors in R’s text of Book 1, J lacks only ten, all of them trivial, and it lacks none of R’s uncorrected errors in Books 2-4.¹⁰⁴ There are also many other eccentricities of J that are explained by the fact that R was its exemplar: for example, at 4.6.20, where R omits exclamando dicimus ita hic aliquia, a corrector wrote exclamando dicimus and ita hic aliquia on two separate lines in the margin, with insertion-points entered above only the first phrase; J’s scribe accordingly copied exclamando dicimus but omitted ita hic aliquia. Finally—and to anticipate my discussion of WH slightly—it is also fairly clear that J was the first of these manuscripts to be copied from R, since it sometimes follows the error of R’s first hand, where WH reflect R’s corrected text:¹⁰⁵

1.2.16 perblande] blande R J¹ (recte WH), 1.3.14 suprema (1º)] supra R J¹ (recte WH), 1.4.15 Liberalium (2º) om. R J¹ (recte WH), 1.4.25 me sequi] esequi J¹, ese qui R¹ (recte WH), 1.11.42 incelebres] incelebres BR J (recte WH), 1.12.16 Fulvius] fluvius B'R J¹
(recte WH), 2.7.10 lepida] lapide NI:R:J¹ (recte WH), 3.12.10 numquamne om. R:J¹
(recte WH), 4.4.19 rhetor] -ris R:J¹ (-res R:J⁻WH), 4.6.13 rhetor] -ris R:J (-res
R⁻WH).¹⁰⁶

To turn now to W: whereas La Penna counted this manuscript among the three most
important witnesses to the β₂-family, Willis tersely dismissed it in the preface to his edition as a copy
of R; and though Willis was criticized for simply asserting what he should have demonstrated, he
was almost certainly correct.¹⁰⁷ W refuses to follow R in uncorrected error on a few more occasions
than J—eighteen times in Book 1, against J’s ten—¹⁰⁸—but none of these errors would be beyond a
reasonably intelligent scribe’s ability to remedy on his own. Certainly none of them entails the sort
of textual deformation—omissions, transpositions, and the like—that would require comparison
with another manuscript to remedy and so might justify the suspicion that W was copied not from
R itself but from a corrected copy of R. For the record, however, I note that in Book 7 (where J no
longer follows R) W lacks another five of R’s uncorrected readings, at least three of which would
require a fair degree of attention or knowledge if a scribe was to notice or correct them suo ingenio
rather than through comparison with another manuscript: 7.6.4 a vini potu] a vino potu RFJQH,
avido potu A¹ (recte CW, non liquet I),¹⁰⁹ 7.10.1 πολιοκροτάφους] ΙΤΟΛΙΟ- RFJQ, ΙΤΟΛΙΟ-
Η, ΙΤΟΛΛΟ I, ΙΤΟΜΟ- AC (recte W), 7.11.8 reliquit] reliquit RFACQJ, reliquit J (recte
WH).

The case of H resembles that of W: like the latter book, H lacks more of R’s uncorrected
errors in Book 1 than does J—thirty-four this time (overlapping with W ten times, with J twice, and
with both J and W once)—with another eight divergences in Book 7 (here overlapping with W
three times);¹¹⁰ but in none of these, again, is there the sort of error that a moderately learned
scribe could not address on his own. There is, however, one eccentricity that both guarantees a
close kinship between the two manuscripts and suggests that H was not copied directly from R.¹¹¹
At 3.5.9 alioquin, where R reads alioqui, a hand noted in the margin alioqui et alioquin d(icitu)r
sub uno sensu, with three points placed over both *alioqui* in the text and the marginal gloss; the scribe of *H* wrote *alioqui et alioqui et alioquin dic(itu)r* sub uno sensu. The error confirms the latter book’s dependence on the former; but the first *et* in *H*, which does not appear in *R* (and which was subsequently erased in *H*), suggests that the gloss already stood in *H*’s exemplar, and that *H*’s scribe, after writing the initial *alioqui*, was already looking ahead to *et alioquin*. It seems likely, then, that *H* was copied not from *R* but from a lightly corrected copy of *R*, though little is at stake where *H*’s actual utility is concerned.

There is also a puzzle presented by the constitution of *H* that I should record, though I cannot fully explain it. The text of *Sat.* 6 ends on the seventh line of fol. 146v; the rest of the folium is left blank, as are the three folia following (two unnumbered, one numbered 146a), bringing to an end the gathering that began with fol. 138. The text of *Sat.* 7 then begins on fol. 147r, the first page of a new gathering, in what appears to be a contemporary but slightly smaller hand that uses abbreviations which appear nowhere else in the manuscript; and it is clear that the text at the start of Book 7 no longer follows that of *R* but is very closely affiliated with two other β2-manuscripts, *A* and (especially) *C*. This affiliation continues for just over six folia, to the top of fol. 153r, where *H*’s text resumes its close kinship to *R*’s, which it continues to follow until the end of the book; the change appears to coincide with a change of scribes at 7.5.16 illi soli non adsentior. It seems reasonably clear that the shift of affiliation at the start of the new gathering is due to a decision to copy the text there independently from, and perhaps simultaneously with, the text in the earlier gatherings. Why the affiliation should suddenly change in the middle of the gathering, producing a hybrid text for the book as a whole, is a more difficult question to answer.

Finally, and briefly, *I*. This singleton of Book 7 clearly descends from *R* after correction: e.g., 7.3.16 Socrates cum] Socrates RW1I, 7.4.4 cum om. R1JQ, si R2WH2I, 7.4.11 hinc] hoc RW1I, 7.4.14 καθελκτικη] KАΘFАKTIKH RWI, 7.4.24 morborum] membrorum RWI (om. ACH), 7.5.4 sensa] sensensa R2W1I (sesens R1), 7.5.28 nec] ne RWHI, 7.5.31 qua] quae RWHI,
7.9.6 raptantur] –tuntur RWHI, 7.10.5 δυσκρασίαν ΔCC- RWHI, 7.10.10 qui aut] quia ut R²A¹J¹C¹WI (qui ut R¹J¹Q, quia aut A²C², recte H), 7.10.11 crebro] in cerebro RWHI (in crebro JC¹Q). However, it is equally clear that I was copied, not directly from R, but from a corrected intermediary, since it lacks a number of R’s uncorrected errors; e.g., 7.4.32 sedandam] sedanda RW, 7.5.7 utrumque falsum] utrumque falsam RW (utramque falsam AHI, utramque falsa C), 7.5.12 faciorem] faciliorem] facilius est RW¹, 7.5.29 adpetentiam] ad penitentiam RA¹W¹H (appetentia W²), 7.6.2 ψυχρὸν] ΥΓΧΡΟΝ RW, 7.8.3 se digestionis] sedi digestionis RW¹, 7.9.9 excusare] excursare RFQ, 7.9.13 et dolore] ex dolore RJ²W, 7.11.9 virtute] –tis RWH, 7.26 opertu] -tum RWH, 7.27 disertissimus] diserti sumus RW²H. The manuscript is in any case negligible.

3: A, C, Vatican Ottob. lat. 1935 + Vatican lat. 6944 and Vatican Borg. lat. 326 Vatican Ottob. lat. 1935 (= Vol), dating to s. XII/XIII, contains the Saturnalia, down to 7.12.21 hiantium, on fol. 5r-63r: the rest of Book 7 is preserved as fol. 79r-83r in Vatican lat. 6944. The book is clearly and closely related to A: like A, it lacks the end of Book 3, from from 3.18.9 Plautus; like A, it contains the so-called Florilegium Macrobianum, a collection of nine brief texts or excerpts, between Books 6 and 7; and though Vol contains very little marginal annotation, what little it has tends to match the marginal notations in A—primarily words or phrases signaling the topics under discussion—sporadically throughout and consistently in Book 7. To define the relationship more closely, I have collated the two manuscripts against each other in Books 1 and 7, just under half the text.

First, of the roughly 250 errors that A and C share against all the other manuscripts in Books 1 and 7, Vol shares all but two. Furthermore, A and Vol uniquely share more than 200 other errors in the same books, including nearly forty omissions that a scribe would be unable to detect or correct suo ingenio. Plainly, either the two manuscripts are twins or one is derived from the other. The descent of A from Vol is ruled out, however, not just because it is fairly clearly the
older manuscript, but also because Vol has another score of omissions, and a dozen or so other ‘uncorrectable’ errors, that are not found in A.\textsuperscript{122} That Vol is A’s descendant, not its twin, is made likely by this fact: whereas A and Vol share forty omissions that distinguish them from all the other manuscripts, and Vol has nearly twenty further omissions that distinguish it from A, only a single omission found in A is not also found in Vol, and that a fairly trivial one (7.5.24 de). Vol’s descent from A is further corroborated by the following detail. At 7.1.14, the correct text is:

\begin{quote}
nonne si quis aut inter Phaeacas aut apud Poenos sermones de sapientia erutos convivalibus fabulis miscuisset, et gratiam illis coetibus aptam perderet et in se risum plane iustum moveret? ergo prima eius observatio erit aestimare convivas.
\end{quote}

Vol omits the underlined words: since the omission is not due to \textit{saut de même au même}, it is most likely due to a scribe’s failure to copy one line from an ancestor of Vol; and that ancestor should be A, where the lost words occupy exactly one line.\textsuperscript{123}

It is clear, however, that Vol does not reflect the uncorrected text of A. Unlike Vol, which shows very little correction, A was corrected at least twice: for example, at 1.5.13 tantus, where A’s first hand wrote \textit{quantas}, someone else changed the word to \textit{quantus}, which was then deleted by yet another reader (the state of A is misreported by Willis); or again, at 1.6.19 consultabatur, A’s scribe wrote \textit{consulabatur}, over which one hand wrote \textit{lt} (i.e., \textit{consulebatur}, the reading of G) while another hand wrote \textit{lt} (i.e., the correct \textit{consultabatur}). It seems plain that—as in the case of (e.g.) J’s relation to R discussed in section 2—Vol provides a snapshot of A’s text between two stages of correction: on the one hand, just over 100 errors that A’s scribe initially committed were corrected and do not appear in Vol; on the other hand, 75 of the errors that A and Vol uniquely share were ultimately corrected in A.\textsuperscript{124}

Finally, to the question, ‘Is Vol a direct copy of A?’, my answer would be, ‘I suspect not’. In Books 1 and 7 there are thirty-one uncorrected errors of A that do not appear in Vol (these include the two shared errors of AC and the omission of \textit{de} at 7.5.24 already noted). Many of these
would not be difficult for a scribe to detect and correct without reference to another manuscript (e.g., 1.13.6 censebantur censa- A, 1.13.21 refer[ ] rerefert A, 1.21.14 signo] singno A), but this is less clearly true of some others (1.15.11 diem] idem A, 7.11.8 relinquit] reliquit A, 7.16.13 subsistit] substitit A, 7.16.24 qui vitro] quitro A). There are, furthermore, these two details: at 1.4.9 si singulari numero dixeris, Vol uniquely has singulari numero si dixeris, which suggests an examplar in which si had been omitted (easily done before singulari) and then misplaced in an omits the underlined text, a loss of twenty-nine characters (not counting spaces, and assuming the likely abbreviation of accipiunt(ur)) due to the omission of a line in the exemplar. A, however, has si securely in place at 1.4.9, and a line of ca. 30 characters is more characteristic of Vol’s own format than it is of A’s, where 22-24 characters to the line is the norm. I suggest, then, that Vol was copied from a copy of A that was as lightly corrected as Vol itself. But however that might be, it is clear that Vol offers nothing substantially different from A except more error (and even less Greek): it can safely be ignored.

Vatican Borg. lat. 326 (= Borg) contains the text of Book 7 only, written in a hand of s.XII on fol. 83-99. Like Vol, it shares the errors that demonstrate AC’s descent from a common hyparchetype; it also has some of the errors that A and Vol otherwise uniquely share. But it has a much smaller proportion of these than Vol, and it has another characteristic that distinguishes it from the latter manuscript: it also shares some—but not all—of the ‘uncorrectable’ errors that are otherwise unique to C in Book 7. Since the relevant errors involved in both cases are not likely to have entered Borg’s ancestry by contamination, and since Borg is not obviously closer kin to A than it is to C, I infer that the seemingly distinctive errors of A and C found in Borg are actually the legacy of their common ancestor, ε, some of which were removed by correction as ε’s text descended to A, while others were removed by correction as ε’s text descended to C.

It hardly matters, however, because Borg is an exceedingly poor witness, whatever its relation to A and C. Not only does it have many further errors of its own, including omissions and
transpositions, but it repeatedly reveals the gross meddling of a scribe or reader who exuberantly rewrote the text. To give only three examples: in place of ‘... dum per frigus suum calorem vincit elementi. nec hoc praetereo, quod ex fructibus arborum illi sunt frigidiores, quorum sucus imitatur vini saporem’ at 7.6.12-3 we find ‘dum per frigus calorem vincit. arborum etiam fructus frigidiores sunt qui vini imitantur saporem’; for ‘sphaeralem [sc. motum] dico, quo movetur caelum, quo sidera, quo cetera moventur elementa. terrenis animalibus illi sex praecipue familiares sunt, sed non numquam adhibetur et septimus’ at 7.9.4 we find ‘id est orbicularis, quo omnia caelestia corpora rotantur, animalia vero terrena sex familiariter moventur, non numquam septimo’; and for ‘Ni molestus tibi sum, Dysari, patere plus nimio ex discendi cupidine garrientem, et dicas quaeso cur edulia satis calida facilius comprimimus ore quam manu sustinemus’ at 7.12.22 we find ‘quaero rursum, ni molestus tibi sim, cur cibos calidos facilius ore sustinetur et premitur quam manu teneatur’. Borg, like Vol, can safely be ignored.

4: M and Paris lat. 16676

Paris lat. 16676 (= X: s. XII) contains Books 1-2 and 7 on fol. 1r-47v. La Penna assigned the text of Books 1-2 to what we now call the β2-family, and in this he was largely correct. Presumably because he judged the book worthless, he did not attempt to establish a more precise affiliation; but the more precise affiliation that can be established shows that the book is not quite worthless. Beyond having the errors that distinguish β2 as a family, X has none of the conjunctive errors of BV or of OL. However, from 1.12.21, where M now begins, down through 2.4.12, X shares forty-seven of M’s singular uncorrected errors (that is, just under half); it also omits the Greek where M omits it and includes it where M includes it. The two manuscripts are plainly related, though it is not clear to me whether X should be regarded as an independent offspring of the same hyparchetype (compare the case B and Z) or a descendant of M from whose ancestry many of M’s distinctive errors were removed by correction. In either case, X should be worth using in M’s stead where the latter is lacking in the first half of Book 1.
La Penna also judged that in Book 7 \(X\) is related to \(F\), and here too he was correct.\(^{134}\) The basis of La Penna’s judgment was the fact that the subscription in \(X\)—‘Macrobiii Theodosii v.c. et illust(ri)s Convivior(um) Tercii [sic] diei explicit. In Egesippo’—is the same as that in \(F\), where the phrase ‘In Egesippo’ (on a new line, as in \(X\)) stands before \(F\)’s version of the *Florilegium Macrobianum*.\(^{135}\) To this can be added the following facts: \(X\) shares only one of the fifty errors that distinguish \(RACQ\) from \(F\) in Book 7, and that a fairly trivial slip easily attributable to coincidence (7.14.4 ultro] ultra); by contrast, though \(F\) has remarkably few unique errors in this book, \(X\) shares most of them, including all the omissions;\(^{136}\) furthermore, at the beginning of 7.1.17, where the archetype had the incorrect nam sicut, \(FX\) uniquely share the good correction nam si ut (in stemmatic terms, of course, an ‘error’). It is clear that \(F\) cannot be derived from \(X\), for a number of reasons: for example, in the long quotation from Eupolis at 7.5.9, \(X\) has slightly more of the Greek than \(RAC\), but less than \(F\), which (with \(Q\)) has it all; at 7.13.25 Nausicaam Alcinoi, \(X\)’s *nausica nalcinori* is plainly built on the (essentially correct) reading, *nausica analcinoi*, that \(F\) shares with \(Q\); and at 7.15.18 \(F\) has the complete text (‘sed et hoc in propatulo est, quia quibus aeger est pulmo accenduntur in maximam sitim, quod non eveniret nisi esset pulmo receptaculum potus’) where \(X\) omits aeger est . . . eveniret nisi—and it happens that in \(F\) the first word that \(X\) omits, aeger, is at the end of a line, directly above esset, the word with which \(X\)’s text resumes. It seems clear that \(X\) is derived from \(F\), probably directly. Whereas \(X\) is worth citing in Book 1, until \(M\)’s text begins, it is negligible in Book 7.

5: Montpellier Médecine 224

Montpellier Médecine 224 (= Mont) is a 12th-century book that was owned by the Collège de l’Oratoire de Troyes and by the French historian and antiquarian Claude Fauchet (1530-1601) before it arrived in Montpellier; it has not previously been reported. It contains a complete text of the *Saturnalia* save for the apparent loss of one folium at the end (from 7.16.33 subsistit emanat = ca. 925 words). But though it is complete, it is not all of one piece: it is clear virtually from a glance
that the text of Books 1-3 offers the same Greek text as manuscripts of the \( \beta_1 \)-family (save \( M \)), whereas the text of Books 4-7 shuns the Greek in the manner of the \( \beta_2 \)-family. Closer inspection of the text confirms these affiliations.

To take Books 1-3 first: correction in \( \text{Mont} \)’s ancestry has, not surprisingly, removed a number of the errors that its 9th-century antecedents inherited from \( \beta_1 \), but many still remain.\(^{137}\) More specifically, though it shows no affinity with either \( \text{OL} \) or \( M \), it shares most of the errors that unite \( \text{BV} \) (and \( Z \) where its 12th-century portion is extant);\(^ {138} \) on the other hand, it shares none of the errors that distinguish \( \text{BZ} \) from \( V \), and only one of the singular errors (so far as I have noticed) found in \( B \).\(^ {139} \) For direct evidence that \( \text{Mont} \) is most closely affiliated with \( V \), consider the following: at 1.5.8 ‘milli passum’ dixit pro ‘mille passibus’ et ‘milli nummum’ pro ‘mille nummis’, \( \text{Mont} \) joins \( V \), alone of the \( \beta_1 \)-family, in failing to omit \( \text{passibus . . . mille} \); and in reading \( \text{passus} \) for \( \text{passibus and nummos for nummis} \); at 2.4.31 \( \nu \ \tau \eta \nu \ \sigma \nu \ \tau \chi \eta \nu \), \( \text{Σεβαστέ} \ \epsilon \ \iota \ \chi \omicron \nu \), \( \text{πλέον} \ \epsilon \ \iota \ \chi \omicron \nu \), \( \text{πλέον \ ἐδίδουν} \), where \( B \) and \( V \) both include a Latin translation (‘non secundum fatum tum auguste si plus haberem plus darem’), \( B \) places the gloss before the Greek while \( \text{Mont} \) joins \( V \) in placing it after; and though \( V \) has notably few distinctive uncorrected errors, \( \text{Mont} \) tends to share those that it has.\(^ {140} \) As for whether \( \text{Mont} \) is a direct descendant of \( V \) or the descendant of a twin, the correction in \( \text{Mont} \)’s background prevents a clear-cut answer; but I suspect that \( \text{Mont} \) stands in the same relation to \( V \) that \( Z \) does to \( B \). It is in any case no more useful.\(^ {141} \)

It is plain that at least one of \( \text{Mont} \)’s ancestors was corrected against a \( \beta_2 \)-manuscript in Books 1-3,\(^ {142} \) and as already noted, that family was the source of \( \text{Mont} \)’s text in Books 4-7. The line of descent within the family is clear: \( \text{Mont} \) has most of the errors that distinguish \( \text{RAC} \) (and, in Book 7, \( Q \)) from \( F \); it has none of the conjunctive errors of the two English books, \( A \) and \( C \); in Book 7 it shares the errors that distinguish \( \text{RQ} \) from both \( \text{AC} \) and \( F \),\(^ {143} \) but it shares none of \( Q \)’s singular errors; and in all four books it shares (or, in a few cases, extends) many of the distinctive errors found in \( R \).\(^ {144} \) Yet \( \text{Mont} \) is far from displaying all of \( R \)’s uncorrected errors, and it might
well be $R$’s twin rather than its descendant. In any case, the state of $Mont$’s text—for example, the fact that at 4.6.5 it has a quotation from Homer ($Il$. 22.410-11) found in no other $b_2$-manuscript—suggests a background of contamination and correction a good deal more complex than that found in $R$’s other close kin discussed in section 2 of this Appendix.
Notes


4. Timpanaro, (n. 3), 790, was more direct, attributing the shortcomings ‘a una forma di orgoglioso isolamento. . . . Willis ama attegiarsi come un piccolo Housman’.

5. The worst offenses involve the manuscripts R and A, discussed below in the section on family β2; even La Penna, the only reviewer who knew the manuscripts at first hand, had scarcely an inkling (cf. (n. 2), 455). I can attest that after spending over a year of his life detecting and correcting Willis’ dismal lapses, a scholar will experience a suite of strong emotions—admiration not among them—on revisiting Willis 1972, 36-42, where the author impresses on future editors, earnestly and at length, the necessity of providing full reports of the manuscripts they cite. Nor is the edition of the Saturnalia an aberration: cf. Barker-Benfield’s characterization of Willis’ edition of the Commentary as ‘resting on a narrow, ill-chosen, and ill-collated manuscript base’ ((n. 2), 224).

6. For a gross but still relatively minor example, see n. 15 below.

7. More precisely: I have checked every report of a shared error in Willis’ apparatus and a generous sampling of reported singular errors; I have also recollated the manuscripts R and A.
I have attempted a census of all pre-13th-century witnesses (including, as a precaution, those on the border between s. XII and s. XIII), and have examined by microfilm or digital imagery all those not used by Willis except Troyes 514 (see n. 12 below), Oxford Bodl. Lat. class. b.3 (fragments of Books 1-2 from s. XII ex. / s. XIII), and Madrid Bibl. Nac. 7825 (Books 1-3, described in the National Library’s published catalog as s. XIII in. and as s. XV in L. Rubio Fernández, *Catálogo de los manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España* (Madrid 1984), 327 no. 373). For details see esp. nn. 32, 71, 86, and the Appendix.

The two complete books occupy 132 pages (Book 1) and 106 pages (Book 5) in the Teubner edition; the rest range from a mere 23 pages (Book 4) to 66 (Book 7). If the damaged books were each originally as long as Book 5, the equivalent of more than 300 pages has been lost.

A date no later than early s. IX is implied for \(\beta_1\) by the date of \(K\) (n. 29), and \(\beta_1\) is at least one copy removed from the archetype. A much-condensed version of *Sat*. 1.12-15 produced before 703 (probably in Ireland) opens a small window on the pre-archetypal transmission of the text, though the epitome is too severely redacted to throw any light on the present paper’s concerns: see A. Arweiler, ‘Zu Text und Überlieferung einer gekürzten Fassung von Macrobius *Saturnalia* 1,12,2-1, 15,20’, *ZPE* 131 (2000), 45-57. Similarly uninformative is another early fragment of the *Saturnalia*, Paris lat. 6370, written s. IX\(^{1/3}\), probably at Tours: a very important witness for the *Commentary*, the manuscript also has one surviving leaf of the *Saturnalia* (*Praef*. 1-6 commitemus [sic]), which shares the trivial error *promisce* (for –cue) with NDPG (*Praef*. 3) but lacks their more striking substitution of *indigeste* for *indistincte* (*Praef*. 3) and fails to follow NDG\(^1\) in writing *mixura* for *mixtura* (*Praef*. 6) or \(P\) in omitting *omnis* (*Praef*. 2; it happens that no striking errors of \(\beta\) occur in this opening segment).

I adopt the sigla \(\alpha\), \(\beta_1\), and \(\beta_2\) from N. Marinone (ed.), *I Saturnali di Macrobio Teodosio* (Turin 1977\(^a\)), 60.

I have not examined Troyes cod. 514, a late twelfth-century manuscript that La Penna judged a descendant of \(P\) (La Penna 1953, 230, noting that it often omits the Greek) and that Barker-Benfield calls its ‘twin’ ((n. 2), 222).

Willis 1957, 155; on \(T\) see also Willis 1972, 21-22.
Thus 5.13.12 stupet *om. NG*, tune *P*; it is probably owing to the same sort of learning that *P* alone has *Aen. 7.699* at 5.8.3, making good a loss that was plainly archetypal. Given the freewheeling approach of *P*’s scribe, Willis remarked (1963, viii), ‘ita fit ut soli *P* cautius fidendum’—although he repeatedly ignored this principle in practice, following *P* against the archetypal reading (even, in a couple of places, against both the archetype and Vergil) without warrant: e.g., 3.4.7 Labeo *P*: Labeo libro *ω*, 5.1.17 usus est Antonius *P*: est usus Antonius *ω*, 5.6.4 tenet *P*: latus *ω*, Verg., 5.10.2 capitis *P*: capiti *ω*, Verg., 5.13.31 id est *P*: hoc est *ω*, 6.7.2 gestit interroga Servium *P*: Servium gestit interrogare *ω*, 6.7.5 humani generis *P*: generis humani *ω*, 7.12.31 quam *P*: ac *ω*, 7.16.34 testis *P*: auctor *ω* (*CQ*’s reader points out that at 5.1.17 and 6.7.2 rhythmical considerations join stemmatic considerations in supporting *ω* against *P*). In the last of these places the note in the apparatus reverses the true state of affairs; in the rest there is no note at all.

*G*’s value as a control was seen by La Penna 1953, 229.

It is clear, in particular, that none of the later manuscripts is derived from *N*, which has many unique, gross, and uncorrected errors, including omissions: e.g., 1.4.2 crastini . . . die, 1.18.3 Bacchicas . . . colunt (after which *N* joins *DPG* in omitting the words *unde . . . celebratur*), 2.1.11 incertae . . . iocorum, 2.11.6 sunt . . . ornamentorum, 5.14.6 mecum . . . Arcadia, 6.1.22 idem . . . terram, 7.3.11 ut si . . . doloris.


The particularly close kinship of *ND* was noted by Willis 1963, viii.

In the few places where the error appears in one or two *β* manuscripts, by coincidence or contamination, the sigla are given in parentheses.

L.e., *NG* against *DP* (6), *PG* against *ND* (9), *NP* against *DG* (2), *DP* against *NG* (3), *DG* against *NP* (1).

La Penna 1953, 229, ‘S [= *G*] pare independente del ramo NP: per esempio, a 1, 3, 8 è immune da una lacuna di NP, che omettono *medium noctem - et post*; a 1, 17, 10 ha la lezione giusta *pestem* contro *testem*, errore di NP; ecc.’: in fact the lacuna noted occurs only in *P*, and *G* shares the error *testem*,
having been written over the original \( t \) by a corrector.

23 **ND** are here taken to represent the text of their probable common ancestor; \((D) = 'D while it is present'.

24 Again, in the few cases where one or two \( \beta \) manuscripts happen to share the error, their sigla are given in parentheses.

25 **P**'s reading evidently reflects a freelance attempt to provide some sense, in reaction to the nonsense bequeathed by \( \alpha \).

26 An erasure of 2-3 letters follows *Ennius in* in **P**.

27 I take it that the omissions at 4.6.14, 5.12.11, and 7.2.2 were made good by comparison with a \( \beta \) manuscript, though the first two would not be beyond the reach of a scribe or reader familiar with Vergil and with Macrobius' habits, respectively; cf. n. 15, on **P**'s supplement at 5.8.3.

28 Note that of the 133 errors that \( G \) shares with **NDP** in Book 1, no fewer than 51 were removed by correction; that \( G \) was corrected against a \( \beta \) manuscript is made plain by, e.g., 1.3.13 mane om. **NDPG** (*corr. \( G^2 \)), 1.3.13 post inferioribus add. locis \( G^2 \beta \), 1.6.7 habitus om. **NDPG** (*corr. \( G^2 \)), 1.11.48 significare om. **NDPG** (*corr. \( G^2 \)), 1.11.49 et . . . pararentur om. **NDPG** (*add. \( G^\alpha \)), 1.15.16 vocant om. **NDPG** (*corr. \( G^2 \)), 1.21.15 angustaque] naturaque **NDPG** (*corr. \( G^2 \), angustaeque **P**), where **P**'s corrector relied on his own wits to produce a reading that at least is construable in context). That an ancestor of \( G \) was similarly corrected against a \( \beta \)-manuscript is implied by, e.g., 1.21.23 iam supra] supra iam **NDP** and 3.9.10 sive vos] sive **NDP**.

29 On the provenance of Vatican Pal. lat. 886, B. Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Munich 1974), 35, 42, 114-15. The dating is based upon the fact that the scribe uses the suspension \( t' \) not only for \( -tus \), which continued to be the norm, but still occasionally for \( -tur \); alongside the suspension \( -t' \) that increasingly became the norm after 800: K. Tohill, *Excerpts from Macrobius in codex Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 886*, *Manuscripta* 22 (1978), 104-108, places the manuscript in or before 820, following E. K. Rand, *On the Symbols of Abbreviations for -tur*, *Speculum* 2 (1927), 52-65.

31 'Frankreich, IX Jh., ca. 3. Drittel': Bischoff 1998, 2:204. Paris lat. 16676 (s. XII) is a sibling or descendant of \( \textit{M} \) and will be cited in my edition in place of \( \textit{M} \) where the latter is lacking in Book 1: see Appendix section 4.

32 'Umkreis von Reims, IX Jh., 3. Drittel': Bischoff 1998, 1:47. Among the other pre-13th cent. witnesses, Naples V.B.12 (s. XII) was believed by La Penna to be very closely related to \( \textit{B} \) (1953, 228), and that is certainly correct (among the errors they uniquely share note, e.g., 1.7.17 tibi \textit{om.}, 1.7.34 Compitalibus] c. p. c., 1.7.35 consul pulso] compulso (corr. \( \textit{B}^2 \)), 1.11.22 dominisque] dominis, 1.17.29 reperta] repente, 1.24.4 cum ipse \ldots est philosophandi \textit{om.} (corr. in both); the Neapolitan book was owned by Janus Parrhasius and contains his corrections, along with extensive earlier correction. We can now add the excerpts of the \textit{Saturnalia} in the \textit{Florilegium Gallicum}, which M. J. Muñoz Jiménez has shown to be closely affiliated with \( \textit{B} \) ('La tradición manuscrita de Macrobio y los \textit{Saturnalium Excerpta del Florilegium Gallicum}', \textit{RHT} n.s. 3 (2008), 89-103, at 92-93: to the evidence adduced there add the omission of \textit{facit} at line 128 = \textit{Sat}. 2.7.11, shared uniquely by the \textit{Florilegium}, \( \textit{B} \), and Naples V.B.12); note also that according to the text given on p. 101 (line 123), the \textit{Florilegium} had the reading \textit{cades} at 2.7.9 (Laberius) that Willis prints as the conjecture of Schneidewin (actually, Sanadon).

33 From the area around Soissons: date and origin according to Bernhard Bischoff, cited in E. Pellegrin, \textit{Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque vaticane} vol. 2, part 1 (Paris 1978), 337-8. \( \textit{V} \) has a twin or descendant in Books 1-3 of Montpellier Médecine 224: see Appendix section 5.

34 The hand is s. XII/XIII to 1.17.6, thereafter s. XV. Used by Willis down to 1.17.6, \( \textit{Z} \) is still more closely related to \( \textit{B} \) than \( \textit{V} \), and stemmatically negligible, especially with the added testimony of \( \textit{OL} \). I will not use it in my edition.

35 'Nördliches Frankreich (?), IX Jh., ca. 3. Viertel', Bischoff 1998, 2:109. Bischoff notes that fol. 133-8 (= \textit{Sat}. 3.13.9-3.20.8) were added in s.XI ¼, though the character of the text does not change.

36 'Portions of the text through the first ten folia have been lost by mutilation, apparently through a triangular tear at the lower right corner. \ldots These mutilated portions of the text have been supplied for the most part on interpagination in a late fifteenth century hand' (Carton 1966, 7).
On the date and provenance, see n. 29.

Leiden Voss. Lat. Q2, fol. 31r-33v: on the affiliation of this book see Appendix section 1.

A partial collation of K was published by Tohill (n. 29), who apparently was unaware of Jan.

Carton 1966, 99-138. Carton concluded that L is a gemellus of B (ibid. 150-9), but her discussion of L’s affiliation is as unsatisfactory as her discussion of G’s (cf. at n. 18), for much the same reasons.

La Penna 1953, 227-8. La Penna’s low valuation of M—because it is missing before Sat. 1.11.2, because it has some ‘errori grossolani’ (hardly a distinguishing feature!), and because alone of this family it usually omits the Greek—was unjustified: its stemmatic value easily compensates for its faults.


That is, β₁-manuscripts share around 150 errors in the space of 216 Teubner pages; α-manuscripts share around 380 in the space of 462 pages. The β₁-manuscripts share another ten errors against α in reporting Greek that the β₂-manuscripts omit.

I include here only errors found after M begins at 1.12.21. For errors shared by BVOL before that point, see, e.g., 1.6.14 matrimisque om., 1.10.3 et Pomponium om. (corr. L²), 1.10.20 esse persuasum persuasum esse, 1.11.1 in om., 1.11.13 respondit[ non respondit], 1.12.16-17 vocasse. sunt qui hunc mensem om.; all such errors are also found in Paris lat. 16676, which in this part of its text is a descendant or twin of M (see Appendix section 4).

The close relationship of B and V was remarked by La Penna, 1953, 227. See, for example, the following: 1.19.12 huius modi] eius modi, 1.20.16 Cypriorum rege] rege Cypriorum, 2.1.10 visa est] digna est (corr. V²), 2.3.4 maior est] malorum B, maiorem V (corr. B²V²), 2.3.12 post πρέσβευσον add. si obtineris et pro nobis intercede, 2.3.16 ὁμοίόπτωσων] simile factum ὈΜΟΙΟΠΟΙΗΣΤΟΝ, 2.4.11 melius est] mallem, 2.4.11 porcum . . . filium] porcus . . . filius, 2.4.31 non secundum fatum tuum auguste si plus haberem plus darem add. ante Graeca B, post Graeca V (sim. F⁵), 3.4.6 meritos aris] merito sacris (corr. B²V²), 3.4.13 vocari eos om. (corr. B²), 3.6.6 secuti sunt] sunt securi, 3.13.11 flamen Martialis] martialis flamen.
46 Willis 1972, 19-20, whence I have adapted the stemma just below. Cf. also at n. 84 below, on RACQ in Sat. 7.

47 Contrast B, which imports via correction a striking number of errors otherwise peculiar to M, e.g.: 1.15.6 aut] ut MB², 1.15.12 die] diem MB², 1.17.47 cognominatur] -tus MB², 1.17.54 fulgeret] refulg-MB² (nefulgeret B), 2.4.28 nummis] nummüs MB², 2.8.3 πέψει] passi MB³, 2.8.6 remissionibus] - oribus MB², 3.2.16 vitulam] -la MB², 3.4.5 pingues] -is MB², 3.7.2 imperator] imperii MB², 3.7.6 sacrum esset] sacratum esset MB², 4.10.6 argute] arguit MB², 3.11.2 Cererin'] cereri in MB², 3.13.12 ex farina] et farina MB⁷, 3.14.8 vindicare] indicare MB², 3.14.8 fluentur] fluent MB², 3.16.10 maris sui] marinis suis MB², 3.17.17 sponsione] -nem MB².

48 Given the brevity of its extracts I do not attempt to place K, beyond saying that it seems to me to stand outside the sub-group BVZ (pace Tohill (n. 29), 105, who attempts to link K closely to B). I will not use K in my edition.

49 In another thirty places before M begins at Sat. 1.12.21, BVZ agree in error against OL, where the presumption must be strong that M lacked these errors also, as they are lacking in Paris lat. 16676 (cf. n. 44 and Appendix section 4).

50 OL’s error is evidently a ‘correction’ of the urguentem also found in M.

51 Both readings are closer to the archetype than the NEPiE of BVZF, the only other β-manuscripts to preserve the Greek.


54 For the former I believe there is only 1.7.37 suos] suo VOL*FA¹, 1.8.3 cuiusquam] cuiusque NDPGVOLRFA (haud scio an recte), 1.21.12 sublimem] -men DVOLRFC, 1.22.8 nexus] nexu VOL, 2.3.10 transit] transit VOLRFA, 2.6.5 Lucius] lucilius VOLRAJC, 2.6.5 ego] ergo VO¹L,
3.5.1 haruspices horu- \textit{VO} \textit{L}, 3.8.12 definitionem] diff- \textit{VOL}; for the latter only 1.18.10 ornatur] – tus \textit{M'B'Z'}, 1.22.1 \textit{post} conspectui \textit{add}. DE INVO \textit{B'VOLRFA} (DE INVVO \textit{MB'}). With the readings at 1.7.37, 1.21.12, 2.3.10, and 2.6.5, where \textit{VOL} agree with \textit{\( \beta \)_z}, compare the discussion immediately following.

55 As was suggested to me by C. E. Murgia. A book with a format like \textit{M}'s typically has ca. 60 characters (plus spaces) to the line. On the relation between \textit{M} and \textit{B'}, see n. 47.

56 I exclude here Vatican lat. 3417 (\textit{J}), Florence Laur. Plut. 51.8 (\textit{W}), and British Library Harleianus 3859 (\textit{H}), and Paris lat. 7412 (\textit{I}), four manuscripts derived from \textit{R}, which are discussed in Appendix section 2; and Montpellier Médecine 224, another 12\textsuperscript{th}-century descendant or (perhaps more likely) twin of \textit{R} in Books 4-7, discussed in Appendix section 5. On the very slender possibility that remnants of \textit{\( \beta \)_z} are preserved in Leiden Voss. Lat. \textit{Q2}, see Appendix section 1.

57 From Mont St. Michel, ca. 990-1015: J. J. G. Alexander, \textit{Norman Illumination at Mont St. Michel} (Oxford 1970), 232. Since \textit{R} is lacking after 7.14.11 animum in(ducere), I will use one of its copies, Florence Laur. Plut. 51.8 (= \textit{W}), as a stand-in; on this manuscript, see Appendix section 2.

58 From Bury St. Edmunds: N. R. Ker, \textit{Medieval Libraries of Great Britain} (London 1964\textsuperscript{3}), 17 (my thanks to J. S. Ringrose, deputy curator of manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library, for this reference and other information concerning this manuscript).

59 Attributed to St. Albans by R. W. Hunt: handwritten annotation inserted at p. 150 in the Parker Library’s copy of M. R. James, \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge} vol. 1 (Cambridge 1912), cf. Ker (n. 58), 165. R. M. Thomson (\textit{Manuscripts from St Albans Abbey 1066-1235} vol. 1 (Woodbridge 1982)) assigns the manuscript (p. 28) to a group of books made during (or shortly before or after) the abbacy of Ralph Guibuin (1146-51) and dates it to ‘Saec. XII med. or ’4’ (p. 83); he also notes (p. 49) that ‘the hands in which it is written are not found in other St Albans books, although they are reminiscent of Style II’.

60 Dated to s. X by H. Hagen, \textit{Catalogus codicum Bernensium} (Bern 1875), 432, and omitted from Bischoff 1998; my thanks to Dr. Patrick Andrist and Dr. Martin Germann of the Burgerbibliothek for confirming a 10th-century date for fol. 1-113.
Willis 1963, ix: ‘A vero neque doctus neque honestus homo scripsit—quam mala fide scripsit videbis lib. 6.7.9 [viz., the interpolation of laborare videmus]—unde si quis post me Macrobiurn eciderit, hortor hunc libro omnino contemnat’; cf. Willis 1972, 123. In fact A’s ‘misbehavior’ is no worse than the freewheeling approach of P (cf. n. 15), the manuscript that Willis prized above all the rest (1963, ix).

La Penna 1953, 235.

Nor can it be derived from Q, in Book 7, in view of (e.g.) the following uncorrected omissions in Q absent from R (but found in J, a manuscript that unquestionably does take its text of Book 7 from Q):

7.1.16 exerceat, 7.3.9 genere, 7.10.7 umoris, 7.11.8 membrorum, 7.12.36 dulces, 7.13.4 calorem, 7.14.22 qui potest . . . melius est.

E.g., from Book 1 alone: 1.2.12 faciam] facito, 1.7.6 vel (1º) om., 1.7.37 cunque] huncque, 1.10.5 gererentur] agerentur, 1.12.28 quod om., 1.15.20 putantes] arbitrantes, 1.16.36 etiam om., 1.17.35 augendoque] gignendoque, 1.17.38 idem Homerom om., 1.17.57 calore et umore] umore et calore, 1.22.4 unde . . . ait om. I also suspect, on the basis of the hand, that F is the youngest of the four manuscripts.

The text of Book 4 begins immediately after 3.18.9 non relinquemus on fol. 66r, a loss of ca. 900 words, or probably one folium (A typically has ca. 700 words to the folium, while C typically has 1000-1100). Note the complementary disturbance that appears in A’s twin, C: precisely the same segment that is missing in A—3.18.9 Plautus in —3.20.8 discessio est—follows 3.17.18 monstruosae in C, after which 3.17.18 magnitudinis —3.18.9 non relinquemus are found, written in the same hand. Evidently a folium came loose in A and C’s common ancestor, was incorrectly reinserted before C (or a predecessor) was copied, and had been lost entirely by the time A (or a predecessor) was copied.

These include: 1.7.3 innumeris inter (innumeris om. BVZOLRF), 1.8.6 enim, 1.9.11 Etymorum (spat. relict.), 1.11.6 tibi, 1.12.7 illae, 1.17.22 Ἀισθαλίωνα, 1.23.8 quam, 1.24.25 animi, 3.4.6 Maro, 3.20.3 fructus, 3.20.3 portenta, 5.1.20 infra, 5.8.8 arma, 5.13.5 quid, 5.13.27 relinquo, 5.13.36 alio loco, 6.1.8 cum, 6.1.9 Ennius in primo . . . prospevit in inferius fulgentibus aptum, 6.2.14 Lucretius ait . . . saecula ferrarum, 6.4.15 ingens, 6.6.6 corpora . . . letos] −ra tela modo atque oculis vigilantibus exit in ras., deinide tela − letos om. (spat. 28-30 litt. relict.), 6.6.11 laborem pro in eos impende, 7.1.6 solet, 7.2.1 semper,
7.3.8 –dere . . . scomma fuit. Note also the many good corrections (in stemmatic terms, ‘errors’) that appear uniquely in C, discussed below.

67 This number suggests either that \( \beta_2 \) was more carefully copied than \( \alpha \) or \( \beta_1 \) (cf. n. 43 above), or that more of its errors had been removed by correction by the time its main extant witnesses for Sat. I-6 were written in ss. XI-XII. It happens that when RFAC are joined in Book 7 by Q, the number of shared errors, viewed proportionally, rises quite noticeably (62 errors shared by RFACQ in the 66 pages of Book 7 vs. 49 errors shared by RFAC in the 132 pages of Book 1).

68 Where *intertrinundino* is the reading of \( \beta_2 \), and the readings of C and FA\(^2\) are attempts to render it construable.

69 C’s reading represents a normalization, since deponent forms occur only with the root *fluti*.

70 Where AC’s common ancestor bequeathed them an attempt to make good \( \beta_2 \)’s lack; a similar attempt is found in Vat. lat. 3417 (= J, in Book 7 a copy of Q; see Appendix section 2), where a reader wrote *aram* in the margin. Note also two places where \( \beta_2 \) extended an error already found in \( \beta \): 1.17.42 ad [progenerandum]\] ad progenerandarum MBVOL, progenerandarum RFAC; 2.5.4-5 Iuliam. venerat ad eum] iulia venerata deum MBVOLK, iulia venerata dominum RFAC.

71 Brussels Bibl. Roy. 10058 (fol. 33-43 in the composite codex 10057-62), a manuscript of s. XII/XIII containing only Book 7, also belongs to the group RAC, though extensive correction and contamination in its ancestry hinders more precise affiliation. Because of the loss of (probably) three folia in an ancestor it lacks 7.1.13 ita in omni – 7.4.1 et Praetextatus (ca. 2450 words).

72 There are over seventy such places in Book 1 alone. La Penna (1953, 232-3) took an unaccountably dim view of F: believing that it was copied from the same hyparchetype as A—which is certainly not the case—he dismissed it as a ‘codice misto’. But that label could be justified only by evidence that F was extensively contaminated from an \( \alpha \)- or \( \beta_1 \)-source in Books 1-3 or from an \( \alpha \)-source in Books 4-7: there is no such evidence. Nor can I see that either script or placement support La Penna’s statement that the Greek passages in F are ‘spesso aggiunti da altra mano di poco posteriore’ (ibid., 232).

73 For a complete record see ‘A Collation of Cambridge Corpus Christi College 71 (Macrobius Saturnalia)’, published on the website mentioned in n. 42. The close relation was noted by La Penna,
1953, 232. On Vatican Ottob. lat. 1935 + Vatican lat. 6944, a descendant of A dating to s. XII/XIII, see Appendix section 3.

On this interpolation cf. n. 143.

On the relation of H (= Brit. Lib. Harl. 3859) to AC in 7.1.1-5.14, see Appendix section 2.

This abbreviation, which appears in none of the other manuscripts, was also applied in a freelance fashion by C’s scribe (or by the scribe of another manuscript standing between C and AC’s common ancestor), who inserted it inappropriately in several places where he supposed that Greek had stood: e.g., 5.13.16 post imposuit, 5.13.19 post differentiam, 5.13.21 post perducit, 5.13.26 post comparare, 5.13.30 post remansit.

Guelph. 4619 (olim Gudianus 312, s. XIII) and Monac. clm 15738 (olim Salisburg. 38) are Jan’s G and S, respectively; the latter was written in Florence by Bartolomeo Fonzio in the 1460s (Barker-Benfield, (n. 2), 223 n. 3, A. C. de la Mare, ‘New Research on Humanistic Scribes in Florence’, in A. Garzelli (ed.), Miniatura Fiorentina del Rinascimento 1440-1525 vol. 1 (Florence 1985), p. 488; I thank CQ’s reader for the latter reference). I have not collated these manuscripts completely but have checked them against Jan’s reports.

But to read radice, with Jan and Willis, is probably to correct the author: the archetype’s radicem is the reading found also in Servius and most of Vergil’s ancient and medieval manuscripts.

The archetype’s reading is preferred here by Timpanaro, (n. 3), 791, and Marinone, (n. 11), 75.

Cf. also 5.18.5 Cacalo ed. Basil. 1535, Cacalo C: cot- ω, 7.14.2 offensa] offensu C ’olim volui’ Willis, and the following places where C is joined by one or two other manuscripts in a conjectural reading that is either correct or worthy of consideration: Praef. 8 proprii O2A4ωC: propria ω, 3.13.14 faciant PωC: faciam ω, 5.2.15 repulsam FG: -sa ω, 5.10.7 saepe peragrans R4C: om. ω, 5.11.28 et immobiles R4C: etiam mobiles ω, 5.12.5 infandum RC: infantum ω, 5.13.38 sero FC: servo ω, 7.14.10 manare AωC: -ere ω. Note also the readings that the correcting hand in C produced: 7.5.3 audere C2 (ed. Ven. 1472): audire ω, 7.5.11 mutis C2 (Bern. 404, ed. Ven. 1513): multis ω.

collation of $Q$ is published in ‘Four Manuscripts of Macrobius’ *Saturnalia* on the website cited in n. 42.

At 7.13.17 *mei nomini* $FQ$, *mei nominis* $R$, *recte* $Q^2AC$, I take *mei nomini* to be the reading of $\beta_2$, while $R$’s *mei nominis* is a misfired attempt at correction.

In the study just cited (n. 81), I note: 7.4.14 *καθελκτική* $NPGFQ$, *καθφακτική* $R$, *καθαφτική* $AC$, where $F$ and $Q$ join the $\alpha$-manuscripts in what is essentially the right reading (apart from the perpetual confusion of $\Lambda$ and $\Lambda$), while the common ancestor of $RAC$ introduced a Latin $F$ for Greek $E$ and $AC$’s ancestor swapped a (lunate) $E$ for $\Theta$: 7.9.16 *corpore* $R^1Q$, in *corpore* $R^2AC$ and 7.11.3 *faciat* $Q$, *pecit* $RAC$, in both of which $Q$ plainly reflects the first stage of an error (in the former case joined by $R^1$) that is subsequently extended; and 7.13.25 *Nausicaam* $Alcinoi$ *nausica an al cinoi* $Q$, *nausica analcinoi* $F$, *nausicam analcinoi* $R$, *nausicam alcinoi* $AC$, where again $QF$ have a text that 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 removes the apparently superfluous syllable from the start of Alcinous’ name.

See the stemma at n. 46 above.

The character of this source of correction is unclear: in general $AC$ do not show significant contamination from an $\alpha$ or $\beta_1$ source, yet the true reading *me in omni* at 7.13.17 (n. 82 above) cannot have reached $AC$ from a $\beta_2$ manuscript. If the source of correction was derived from $\beta_2$, we cannot know whether that source stood in the same line as $F$ or in a stream of transmission that has left no other trace.

Another manuscript that contains only Book 7, Bern Burgerbibliothek 404 (fol. 1r–8r + 49v–53v: s. XII/XIII), is also among $\gamma$’s progeny, sharing 35 of the 42 errors that distinguish $RACQ$ from $F$ and another 26 of the errors shared by $RQ$ (these include all the ‘uncorrectables’: e.g., 7.1.2 *huius sit* [huius, 7.2.3 *ut prius tibi*] prius tibi, 7.4.4 *cum om.*); it does not show any marked affinity with either $RAC$ or $Q$. Used sporadically by Jan, it can be regarded as an independent, and negligible, witness to $\gamma$.

So the Leiden University Library catalogue, reflecting the judgment of B. Bischoff: see *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts* vol. 2 (1998), p.56; cf. also K. A. de Meyier,
Codices Vossiani Latini vol. 2 (Leiden 1973-84), p. 9. On fol. 32r, line 5 and the beginning of line 6 (1.4.8–mitti . . . enuntiatione) are written in a different hand, which Bischoff associated with Fulda.

The other two are Paris. lat. 6370, in which the text of Comm. is annotated in Lupus’ hand, and M (unfortunately not extant before 1.12.21), written a bit later than Leid ‘in a hand reminiscent of Heiric of Auxerre’s (though not his)’ (B. C. Barker-Benfield, quoted by P. K. Marshall, (n. 2), 234). Leid’s association with Lupus is consistent with the curious intervention of a hand reminiscent of Fulda remarked in the preceding note.

Sigla in parentheses indicate MSS that have the correct reading, presumably as a result of conjecture:
1.1.6 absumpserat] assumpserat (P*G*VAC, assumserat Leid1), 1.2.2 Roma] Romana (D2), 1.2.8 tam] tum (NG*R), 1.4.14 Feralium] ferial- (J3), 1.4.14 Feraliorum] ferial-, 1.4.19 faxit] factum sit, 1.4.22 edi] egi, 1.9.16 Quirinum] –nium (VRFC1), 1.10.6 Liciniam] luciniam (lucianum Leid1). Note also 1.4.22 Atellana] –lania (though the latter reading is unobjectionable and probably wrongly rejected by Willis).

1.1.7 lectoris] –ri, 1.2.1 Iano] iaio, 1.2.10 adspirare] sperare, 1.9.16 ingressus] gressus, 1.10.8 obligato] allig-; cf. also 1.10.5 adicit] adiecit NDPGO*RA1, where Leid has the correct reading.

1.1.5 permenides, 1.2.1 commodo] quo modo, 1.4.16 inermes] –mos (P), 1.4.16 inermos] –mes, 1.9.15 patultium, 1.9.16 patultium (R), 1.9.18 protam] totam, 1.10.4 iudiciar] iudicariis in triduo

In place of the missing M I cite here its descendant or twin, Paris lat. 16676 (= X); note that all these errors were removed from Leid by correction (see further in the text below): 1.2.9 solstitiali die] solstitialis dies Leid’XBVOLR1 (stitialis dies R1), 1.9.15 Consivium] convicium Leid’XB*V, conivium O1, conscivium L (where the state of OL points to a corrected reading in their common ancestor), 1.9.18 exustas Leid’XBVOL, 1.10.3 et Pomponium om. Leid’XBVOL1 (what appears to be an insertion sign occurs at the appropriate point in Leid, but the correction has been lost with the trimmed margin), 1.10.3 fecere] facere NLeid’XBVOL (fort. recte), 1.10.4 defenderant] –rent Leid’XBVOL. The exception is 1.4.14 diei GXBVOLRC, where Leid has the correct dici.

These are: 1.1.5 coetus] –tos, 1.1.5 adprehenderit] adprae-, 1.2.1 iniucundum] inioc-, 1.2.2 requiro] requoro, 1.2.2 eique] eaque, 1.2.6 voluissem equidem] voluisse me quidem, 1.2.6 essent] esset, 1.2.6 meditandi] –anti, 1.4.8 eruere] erupere, 1.4.9 singulari] figurantur, 1.4.9 condicionis] –tionis, 1.4.9 si
singulari] singulari, 1.4.11 viridiorum] vidiorum, 1.4.14 significaret] -cabat, 1.4.17 adserenda] ads*renda, 1.4.17 respuendus] -dos, 1.4.17 furtim] -tum, 1.4.18 quo] co, 1.4.20 diequinte] -to, 1.9.14 fugientem] figi-, 1.9.16 deorum] -rem, 1.10.1 Saturnalibus] -aliios, 1.10.6 Liciniam] lucianum ('corrected' to the archetypal error luciniam shared by all the other manuscripts). Cf. also 1.4.19 occisit] occidit Leid\(^1\)F, where the error—replacing the rare with the common form—is surely coincidental; Leid does not, e.g., have F's furtim (for furtum) also at 1.4.19. The restoration of the rare form in Leid shows that the correction was made against another MS; the apparent restoration of the omitted words et Pomponium at 1.10.3 (preceding note) shows that it was not a MS closely related to Leid\(^{XBVOL}\) (1.1.7 colloquii] -qui Leid\(^{ND}\) is suggestive, but no more, since that change did not require comparison with another manuscript).

94 Cf. also 1.1.7 dicta, where Leid\(^1\) wrote dic at end of one line, ta at start of next, which a corrector later altered to di- -cta; and 1.9.16 eius, where Leid\(^1\) wrote e at end of one line (now partially lost where the edge was trimmed) and ius at start of next, which a corrector later altered to eius all on the second line.

95 The exceptions are 1.1.6 absumpserat, 1.2.8 tam, and 1.9.16 Quirinum, cf. n. 89 above. In none of these cases would it be difficult for an attentive and intelligent reader to arrive at the right reading.

96 E.g., 5.2.11 Didonis om., 5.11.15 est om., 5.11.21 adiecit om., 5.16.7 quid quaeque] quidque, 5.19.3 etiam om. \(\text{NP}\), post doctissimus G, 6.1.9 et in tertio . . . aptum om., 6.2.1 quasi . . . cognoscas om., 6.3.6 non . . . liquatae om., 6.8.13 versu . . . non om., 6.8.21 non ad eos om., 7.1.14 coetibus . . . risum om.

97 Note that if profestum was found in the common ancestor of RFAC, it was supplanted in turn by profectum in AC’s common ancestor.

98 La Penna 1953, 241, reported that H comprises only Sat. 1.2.15 - 5.20.10 on fol. 45-130, though the complete text is present on fol. 42-168; presumably he was provided a defective microfilm.

99 All four MSS are usually dated to s. XII, but see n. 106 below.

100 This discussion is based on a complete collation of J, collations of W and H for Books 1 and 7 (a bit under half the text, a sample sufficient for the present purpose), and collation of I: the collations of JWH can be found in ‘Four Manuscripts of Macrobius’ Saturnalia’ on the website mentioned at n. 42 (I have also collated H against R in Book 3). A partial collation of J for Book 7 was published by M. J.
Carton 'Vat. Lat. 3417 and Its Relationship to the Text of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* vii', *TAPA* 96 (1965), 25-30. For another close kin of R see the discussion of Montpellier Médecine 224 in section 5 below.

101 Carton, (n. 100), 26. In my digital image of the manuscript I can make out only 'hic deest . . . ', but I have no reason to doubt Carton's report.

102 Carton ibid. thought the same scribe wrote both Books 1-4 and Book 7, but the hand in the latter is slightly larger and consistently uses (e.g.) an abbreviation for est (+) and a form of suspension stroke (for -u(m), n(on), m(en), etc.) distinct from those used by the scribe of Books 1-4.

103 I show that J is derived from Q in an appendix to the study cited in n. 81.

104 J fails to follow R in these errors: 1.2.8 nota\] nata RWH1, 1.5.11 lecto relationibus\] lector elationibus RWH1, lectore lationibus H1 (ex dilecto rationalibus H2, cf. velut ex dilectu C, ex lecto rationalibus A), 1.7.22 navi lusu\] navi a lusu V1RF, navim a lusu J\] W, navim lusu H2 (recte H1; it is not at all clear in J that the suspension stroke over navi is in the first hand), 1.10.2 opinio\] opimo R (recte JWH), 1.11.28 magnanimitate\] magnimitate R, magninimitate W, 1.11.42 clari\] dari RWH (recte JH), 1.13.18 veritos\] voritos RH1 (recte JW), 1.17.26 eminus\] eminus RW1 (recte JH), 1.17.52 Πυθων\] ΠΥΘΩΤ J, ΡΥΘΩΝ RW1 (recte H), 1.21.3 in inferioribus\] infer- RWH1.

105 I take no account of I in this discussion, since it is clear (below) that its relation to R is more attenuated than that of the other three.

106 There are, further, several cases where both J and W reflect R’s uncorrected text while H follows R as corrected (1.13.10 ἐμβολίους EΜΒΟΛΙϹΜΟϹ PL: R J W, -EMBOΛΙϹΜΟϹ MV'O-R1FH (-ICMOIC CWm, om. A), 2.4.2 scripserat\] om. R J W, recte H, 3.5.6 eximios\] -ias R J W, recte H), and several where R was evidently not corrected until after all three manuscripts were written (1.1.1 feriatum\] celebratum R J W1, 1.3.14 suprema (²') supra R J W, 3.16.5 nunc\] modo R J W, at 3.9.11 faxitis\] faxistis R J W1, the correct reading is written in R’s margin without a reference sign calling attention to it. The only significant counter-example I have found is 7.2.11 longa narratio\] narratio longa R 'W, where W reflects R’s uncorrected text, J the corrected text (H for the moment follows a different source, see below): it may be that W’s scribe simply overlooked R’s correction, which is not signaled by the paired superscript dots normally used in the MS. If the chronological sequence
suggested here is correct, and if \( H \) was ‘written about 1100’ (M. D. Reeve, ‘The Transmission of Vegetius’s *Epitoma rei militaris*’, *Aevum* 74 (2000), 319, on the text of Vegetius that precedes Macrobius), then \( J \) and \( W \) should be dated to s. XI rather than s. XII (cf. n. 99).

La Penna 1953, 235, Willis 1963, viii; the criticism was registered by J. J. M. Curry in his review of the Teubner edition (AJP 88 (1967), 238). La Penna (1953, 247-9) identified as descendants of \( W \) another five manuscripts in Florence, dating to s. XIII and s. XV. The manuscript came to belong to Pietro de’ Medici (fol. 127'); in *Sat*. 1-3 the Greek passages were added in the margin in the hand of Ambrogio Traversari (d. 1439: G. Pomaro, ‘L’attività di Ambrogio Traversari in codici fiorentini’, *Interpres* 2 (1979), 105-15), thus supplementing the defective testimony inherited from \( R \).

\( J \) and \( W \) overlap in two cases here: 1.10.2 opinio] opimo \( R \) (recte \( JWH \)), 1.13.18 veritos] voritos \( RH^1 \) (recte \( JW \)).

Where note that \( W \) is joined by \( C \), a manuscript with extensive conjectural emendation in its background, cf. at n. 77 above.

I refer here to the behavior of \( H \) after *Sat*. 7.5.14: for the distinction, see further below.

My thanks to *CQ*’s reader for pointing out the full significance of this case.

My thanks to Dr. Justin Clegg, curator in the British Library’s Department of Manuscripts, for helpfully responding to my question concerning \( H \)’s make-up.

I note especially the ‘\( H \)’-symbol for *enim* and an abbreviation for *quia* comprising a *q* with a *v* on its side, its point touching the *q*’s shaft; there are also distinctive abbreviations for *quod* and *quidem*.

E.g., 7.1.16 ineptus] impetus, 7.1.17 *Atticas om.* , 7.2.3 ut prius tibi] prius, 7.3.7 dictum] dictum est, 7.3.18 et *ante uxore add.* , 7.3.23 esse omne] omne esse, 7.4.22 alimonia eius] eius alimoni a; see further the collation published in the paper cited at n. 74.

The last distinctive reading of \( AC \) shared by \( H \) is 7.5.14 ventrem] ventre \( ACHW^2 \) (\( W \)’s correcting hand otherwise shows a marked affinity with \( C \)); the distinctive abbreviation of *quia* occurs for the last time in the same section (use of the other abbreviations noted ceases earlier). I thank *CQ*’s reader for pointing out the change in hands, which is particularly noticeable (e.g.) in the way the two scribes write *quod* and *quid* at the start of a sentence.
Pellegrin, (n. 33), vol. 2, 702-3; the hand seems to fall within the upper part of the date-range. The folia are numbered 5-63, with the twenty-fourth folium unnumbered.

See n. 65 above.

The Florilegium also occurs after Book 7 in F, and in Paris nouv. acq. 1907-IV (fol. 16bis,19r), which contains fragments of Books 5 (f.14'-9') and 6 (f.14'-16', 17'-18', 20'-21') from a book plainly belonging to the β2-family: see B. Munk Olsen, ‘Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux’, RHT 10 (1980), 120-2 (where the description overlooks the fragments of Book 5).

More superficially, note that both books have the relatively uncommon two-column format, though Vol, which is ruled for 46 lines per column with ca. 30-32 characters to the line (spaces not included), has more text per page than A, which is ruled for 36 lines per column with ca. 22-24 characters to the line.

These are 1.22.4 demissio] demisso, 7.7.4 insidat] insidiat.

E.g., 1.5.9 unum mille . . . 1.5.10 hisne tam om., 1.5.10 comitiis . . . 1.5.11 plura de hoc om., 1.5.11 quem plerique . . . lucis in om., 1.7.35 urbe om., 1.9.8 reditur om., 1.9.16 autem om., 1.17.4 una Iunone . . . pro varis om., 1.17.54 edentur . . . aetheri om., 1.21.1 cuius partem . . . hemispherium om., 7.9.14 non suo . . . nescit dolorem om. Note also 1.1.2 sed erit] sed in hoc libro erit, 1.4.17 verba quae] adverbiose A2Vol (averbiose A1), 1.13.12 ex singulis quibus] ex quibus singulis quibus, 7.5.17 scimus autem similibus similia nutriri post dic queso . . . nutrientur (nutriantur ω), 7.14.10 permanent nullo] nullo permanent A,ullo permanent Vol. Some of these errors also appear in Vat. Borg. lat. 326: see below.

E.g., 1.2.5 post inter om., 1.4.11 -piuntur, genetivum in in um faciunt ut vi- om., 1.10.6 Liciniam . . . kalendarum om., 1.11.10 inter servos . . . invenies om., 1.12.18 dicit . . . 1.12.19 Maiam om., 7.1.14 ergo prima . . . erit om., 7.5.23 et ad sumenda . . . provocante om., 7.7.7 estst mediocri . . . frigus om., 7.10.13 vox acuta . . . 7.10.14 in eunuchis om., 7.12.29 congruenst erat nec oleum concrescere om. Note also Praef. 6 varia libamenta] lib- var-, 1.2.2 tunc post dicta sunt, 1.3.1 ita exorsus est, 1.4.10 sollemnis diei] diei soll- , 1.3.14 diei novissimum] nov- diei, 1.4.16 alterum etsi sola sedl] alterumque si sola si.

Cf. also, e.g., 1.24.12 absterrentur] exterentur A, exterentur Vol, where the latter error evidently
presumes the former; similarly 1.16.8 uti natalium] ut in atanalium A, ut in anatanalium Vol.


In this last instance note that A’s error was evidently derived from an exemplar that had a text written like C’s, in which qui is represented by a capital Q with an i in the center.

Pellegrin, (n. 33), vol. 1, 231-3; the text begins with the words Praetextatus solet, omitting ’primis mensis . . . minutioribus’.

These are: 7.4.24 morborum om., 7.5.16 fabricata om., 7.9.14 non suo . . . nescit dolorem om., 7.13.11 ut et] ut, 7.14.10 permanent nullo coagulo] nullo permanent coagulo, 7.15.13 poeta dixit] poeta (dixit ante poeta C). Note also cases were Borg reflects and extends an error of AVol: e.g., 7.15.3 Erasistratus bis] erasis tractus bis AVol, erasis tractor et eras tractatus Borg.

These are: 7.2.5 opima] a prima, 7.2.16 enim om., 7.4.3 sit facilior] facilior sit, 7.4.3 una censoria sit] censoria sit una, 7.5.10 captis] capitis, 7.6.1 de om., 7.6.21 et om., 7.7.9 quod egeritur et quasi infirmum effluuit] et quasi infirmum quod effluuit C, et quasi infirmum quod effluuit et egeritur Borg, 7.13.2 in aperto] imperato, 7.13.7 sibi om. (his A), 7.15.10 polenta] corpulenta (poculenta A), 7.15.14 se habeatur] habeatur, 7.16.7 et similia om., 7.16.12 terra et imbre] terra imbre.

For corroboration of this view, see, e.g., the state of C at 7.15.13 (n. 127), where dixit was evidently misplaced in the attempt to correct the omission in ε.


131 La Penna 1953, 244. Note, however, that after 2.4.12 X’s text consistently shares the features of RAC:

2.4.31 post C in CEBACTE Gr. om., 2.4.31 σὴν om., 2.4.31 TYXHN, 2.7.6 cena] –nūm RAC, scenam X, 2.7.13 οὐ μακρὸν οὐ μέγαν ποιεῖσ] Gr. om. post ΣΥ ΜΑΚΡΟ-, 2.7.16 Gr. post ΜΑΙ- om., 2.7.18 Gr. post ΣΥΠΙ- om., 2.7.19 Gr. post ΧΑΠΙ om., 2.8.2 Menippea] menipea, 2.8.3 τραγήματα] ΤΡΑΓΗΝΑΤΑ RAC, ΤΡΑΓΕΝΑΤΑ X, 2.8.4 ignitabulum] incitabulum, 2.8.7 adversum] –sus, 2.8.16 multos homines] homines multos, 2.8.16 post CY- Gr. om. Compare the shifting allegiance of H in Book 7, noted in section 2 above ad fin.

132 E.g., 1.12.35 appelletur] –aretur, 1.12.38 mensesque ita] menses itaque, 1.13.10 appelletabant]

appellabat, 1.16.8 Segetiam Tutilinam] segetiam seu etiam Tutilinam, 1.16.11 vindicavit] vindicare, 1.17.14 tamquam ΑΠΕΛΛΑΩΝΑ om., 1.17.45 Naxios] maxios M, maximos X, 1.17.54 ne fulgor . . .

progressione fulgeret] ne fulgor refugeret (B²), 1.17.65 ΑΔΕΛΦΟϹ] ΔΕΛΟϹ, 1.18.2 celebrant] –tur, 1.23.7 hoc est ΜΕΡΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΥ om., 2.3.5 cum umeris] cum umineris M, cum in humeris X.

133 On the basis of X’s Greek La Penna (ibid.) actually suspected that ‘esso derivi da fonte molta antica appartenente al gruppo’, but this is surely incorrect; both instances he cites as evidence of X’s distinctively correct text (1.17.5 ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΕΙΝ vs. ΕΡΜΙΝΕΥΕΙΝ and 1.17.9 ΤΑ ΖΩΑ vs. ΖΩΑ) are found in M.

134 La Penna 1953, 244 n.1.

135 On the Florilegium see n. 118.

136 These errors are: 7.5.1 indignum] dignum, 7.5.28 virtuti om., 7.8.7 qua] quia, 7.8.16 nulli] nullo, 7.10.4 si ergo] ergo, 7.11.8 timentes] timent (falsely ascribed to A¹ by Willis), 7.12.33 quaedam om., 7.12.35 inde] unde, 7.13.17 censu] censui, 7.15.9 finis (2º) om. F’s singular errors not shared by X are few and largely orthographical: 7.1.5 relegatus] religatus, 7.12.9 dicta] dixa, 7.12.17 vacuefacit] –fecit (also found in P), 7.14.20 rotunda] rutunda


1.7.34 pro capitis] capitis] capitis pro capitis. By contrast, when VZ share an error against B (whether B is correct or has a different error), the error appears in Mont: e.g., Praef. 11 nisi sicubi] ni sicubi NPBLβ2 (nisicūbinos O), ne sicubi VZMont, 1.12.38 supra iam diximus] iam supra diximus B, iam diximus supra VZMont, 1.15.6 sic] at sic VZMont, 1.16.38 noster gravis] inter graves BZ2, noster inter graves VZMont.


That several of V’s singular uncorrected omissions are absent from Mont—1.16.30 fari, 1.17.50 id est σῆπειν, 1.23.7 id est καιομένου, 3.14.15 non dissimulanter . . . idem Cicero—might suggest but certainly does not prove that the latter descended independently from a common source.

E.g. 2.5.4-5 Iuliam. venerat ad eum α: iulia venerata deum β1, iulia venerata dominum β2Mont, 3.15.8
On AC, cf. at n. 74 above. Note that at Praef. 4 et boni consulas oportet Mont has the marginal gloss *id est ad utilitatem respicias*, the same words that stand in the text of AC just before *et boni consulas oportet* (not reported for A in Willis’ apparatus): evidently the gloss already stood in the margin of δ, the common ancestor of RAC and Mont, before being interpolated in ε.


Note 5.13.34 addit ardorem et inter hostium] addit et inter hostium ardorem R, ardorem addit et inter hostium Mont, where both errors appear to be botched jobs of reinserting an interlinear *ardorem*, and neither seems likely to have given rise to the other. Cf. also 6.1.50 manat] mactat R, mantat Mont, where the latter reading looks more like the original error, R’s an attempt at correction.