

The manuscript transmission of the *Anthologia Salmasiana*, related to the ‘Uranthologie’ compiled in Vandal Africa around 534 A.D. (ω), and including poets’ anthologies and various collections of poems, goes back to a common archetype (α), whose later tradition is divided up into two branches: the former is formed by an almost unique codex (A), containing all the surviving poems of the original sylloge, except for the poem *In laudem Solis* (*Anth. Lat.* 389 Riese = 385 Shackleton Bailey) transmitted by the latter branch of the tradition (β),<sup>1</sup> represented by “Excerptorum codices”.

### Cod. *Parisinus Lat. 10318* (*Salmasianus*)

The codex, kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale, once called *suppl. Lat. 685*, then *Parisinus Lat. 10318* (*Salmasianus*)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I will discuss the original presence in α of the *In laudem Solis* – c. 389 R –, which is not transmitted by A, but by the codices of β, at the appropriate moment (after the synthetic description of the *Parisinus Lat. 8071* or *Thuaneus*, the most representative codex of the Salmasian sylloge among those of the β branch, which transmits the poem).

<sup>2</sup> On the so-called Salmasian codex, named after the owner, the humanist Claude de Saumaise (1588-1653), who made it known to the community of scholars, cf. Omont *Anthologie de poètes latins dite de Saumaise*, reproduction réduite du manuscrit en onciale, Latin 10318, de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris [1903]; Lowe *CLA* V 593; Bischoff *Karl der Grosse* (1965), II, 249; 252-253; Id. *Paläographie und frühmittelalt. Textüberlieferung* in *La cultura antica nell’Occidente latino dal VII all’XI secolo* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo 22), I, Spoleto 1975, 83; M. Spallone *Il Par. Lat. 10318* (*Salmasiano*): *dal manoscritto alto-medievale ad una raccolta enciclopedica tardo-antica*, “IMU”

(**A**), written around 800 A.D.,<sup>3</sup> is a manuscript witness of the first branch and ‘codex plenior’ of the original poetical sylloge (named ‘anthologia Salmasiana’ after it). It is a miscellaneous codex,<sup>4</sup> now acephalous (also the final part is missing), starting with the sylloge under discussion, which is contained at pp. 1, l. 6-188, l. 16:<sup>5</sup> cc. 7-215 and 217-379 R; but single *pièces*, as well as the poem (216 Riese) previously omitted and what remains of a whole group of poems (belonging to the original anthology) are included in other sections of the codex, respectively at pp. 192, l. 21-193, l. 28: cc. 380-382 R; pp. 211, l. 28-212, l. 10: c. 216 R; pp. 273, l. 23-274, l. 29: cc. 383-388 R. As is known, its anthology is the core of the collection of poems of various origin – and not corresponding to a single ancient sylloge – called, from Burman on, *Anthologia Latina*.<sup>6</sup>

Field specialists have occasionally expressed their opinion on the copyist – I mean on the quality of the

25, 1982, 1-71 (ceterosque quorum subsidia in Conspectu librorum *VPS* laudantur, usque ad Radiciotti *Problemi di datazione di codici in onciale* (Par. lat. 10593, CLM 6224, Par. lat. 10318), “Archivio Soc. Romana di Storia Patria” 116, 1993, 53-63, tav. I-II).

<sup>3</sup> Different hands of copyists can be identified (many of them are recent), among which: **A**<sup>1</sup> = librarius se ipse corrigens; **A**<sup>2</sup> = manus altera antiqua, ascribed to the IX century by Bonnet ap. Riese *Zur lat. Anthologie*, “JkP” 26, 1880, 260 (see Riese *Praef.* [1894] XVII-XVIII and Maddalena Spallone *Il Par. Lat. 10318*, 53 ff.; tab. VIII); **s**<sup>1</sup> = e correctorum (recentium) manibus frequentior (‘Salmasii plerumque ex editorum sententia’, but see Spallone *l. laud.* 55-57).

<sup>4</sup> A detailed description of the codex and an exam of its content in Spallone *Il Par. Lat. 10318 (Salmasiano)* cit. 1-36.

<sup>5</sup> P. 84 vacua.

<sup>6</sup> An always useful overview is offered by R.J. Tarrant *Anthologia Latina in Text and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classis*, ed. L.D. Reynolds, Oxford (reprinted with corr.) 1986, 9-13, even though by now it needs updating and integrations.

copy he made, on his erudition (and maybe I should say his *latinorum*), his pronunciation, his handwriting, his tics etc. – but they rarely agreed on the most important matters. Julius Sillig, in his day, recommending the direct collation on the basis of documentary evidence (which Burman had not done),<sup>7</sup> added: «Freilich ist zu erwähnen, dass die Handschrift von Fehlern wimmelt und einen sehr unwissenden Abschreiber verrät». Traube's (famous) opinion<sup>8</sup> about him is essentially different: «Seine Kenntnisse im Lateinischen waren gering, aber gerade ausreichend, ihm, der von dem Inhalt des Abzuschreibenden wenig genug verstand, allerlei geläufigere Wortbilder vorzuzaubern. Es war ein rechter Halbgebildeter und, philologisch betrachtet, ein arger Interpolator». This opinion was resumed (and in case applied to the copyist of the Salmasian antigraph)<sup>9</sup> by Shackleton Bailey,<sup>10</sup> who used it to justify the typology of his emendations to the poems of the Salmasian anthology.<sup>11</sup> However, Traube's view is opposed to the opinion Tim-

<sup>7</sup> *Beiträge zu einer neuen Bearbeitung der Anthologia Latina*, "Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik" 1828, Bd. 3, 201: «Dass sie eine neue genaue Collation wohl verdient, werden folgende Lesarten zeigen, die von Burmann, obgleich in ihr befindlich, gar nicht oder ungenau angeführt worden sind».

<sup>8</sup> "Philologus" 50, 1895, 124 = *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, III 51; *Nomina Sacra* 1907, 223.

<sup>9</sup> *Anthologia Latina* I 1 (Stuttgartiae 1982), *Praef.* V adn. 3: «Ceterum quae ille [scil. Traube] de scribae indole scripsit, utrum ad ipsius codicis scribam pertineant an ad antiquiorem quendam a quo is descripsit, profecto nihil interest».

<sup>10</sup> Already in the Introduction to *Towards a Text of Anthologia Latina* Cambridge 1979, 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Anth. Lat.* I 1, *Praef.* V: «Hoc viri clarissimi iudicium [...] nos admoneat oportet ut in vitiis huius codicis purgandis rationem potius quam litterarum ductum sequamur».

panaro expressed twenty years before Shackleton Bailey's edition: «l'antologia Salmasiana è uno di quei testi in cui le corrottele meccaniche (grafiche, o anche dovute alla pronunzia volgare, ma non ad arbitrii del copista) sono di gran lunga prevalenti».<sup>12</sup> Following him, De Nonno<sup>13</sup> has also recently talked about a «testimone letteralmente formicolante, in ogni sua parte, di corrottele e volgarismi».<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, it does not matter here to show 'qualis librarius fuerit' (the problem has been investigated by the mentioned scholars), but to concentrate on the operating criteria he followed to create the codex and to compile the index of the anthology of poems contained in the surviving initial part of the manuscript he wrote.

In order to understand how the copyist of the Salmasian codex worked and then deduce those elements useful to reconstruct the antigraph, it is firstly helpful to combine all the data provided by the surviving codex. I am referring in other words to the paratextual data: the *incipit* and the *explicit* and the respective *inscriptiones*, as well as the numeric indications. With regard to the last ones, we will distinguish – as has been done<sup>15</sup> – between Roman numerals in the margins, marking the sections (instead of the books) of 'anthologia Salmasiana' and descending from the antigraph (probably already used in the original sylloge), and the numerals (Roman

<sup>12</sup> *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann* 1963, 84 (= 1981<sup>2</sup>, 92).

<sup>13</sup> Review on Shackleton Bailey *Towards a Text...* cit., "RFIC" 110, 1982, 104-105.

<sup>14</sup> *Per il testo e l'esegesi del centone Hippodamia* (Anth. Lat. 11 R.<sup>2</sup>), "Studi Latini e Italiani" 5, 1991, 34 and n. 7.

<sup>15</sup> By Riese (*Anthologia Latina* I<sup>2</sup> 1, *Praef.* XXI-XXIV, XXXV) and the scholars after him (especially Spallone *Il Par. Lat. 10318 (Salmasiano)* cit., 12 *passim*).

as well, but) introduced *ex novo* by the copyist of the Salmasian codex in a different paratextual area (after the *inscriptio* of the first poem of the series).

In order to offer the survey of the Roman numerals of the antigraph and the Roman numerals ascribable to the copyist, in the meantime I will provide – as I did in my *Anthologiae codicis Salmasiani index a librario confectus*<sup>16</sup> – a table containing in order: the pages of the Salmasian codex,<sup>17</sup> the Roman numerals there preserved in the margin of the poems and those that fell but were rewritten and put [between squared brackets] by Riese in the margin of the sections of ‘anthologia Salmasiana’ which do not have them; (the corresponding page of Riese’s edition and) the Roman numerals – written on the copyist’s own initiative – that we find in the *inscriptiones* of the poems which open the following section, and their interpretation given (after each *inscriptio*) by Riese in the apparatus of the reference edition *Anthologia Latina* I<sup>2</sup> 1, Lipsiae 1894.

- p. 1* cod. Salm. [VI] ~ (p. 33 Riese, ante c. 7:)  
 EPIGRAMMATON LIBRI: *sic inscribenda est tota sylloge, id quod apparet ex c. 200 inscriptione et c. 379 subscriptione; cf. et c. 287. VI addidi: cf. praefatio. 7-18: Centones Vergiliani*
- p. 46* cod. Salm. [VII] ~ (p. 82 Riese:) 19 (Praefatio).  
 VII *addidi*

<sup>16</sup> In the *Appendice* to *Apographa Salmasiana 2. Il secolo d'oro di 'anthologia Salmasiana' (continuazione e fine)*, Hildesheim 2010, 115 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Scil. the pages following the lost eleven initial fascicles (eleven quaternions, with a total of 176 pages) – all containing, as usually believed, sections of ‘anthologia Salmasiana’ (with a total, considering the average number of 29 lines per page, of more than five thousand verses) – numbered, on recto and verso, by progressive Arabic numerals (starting from 1).

- p.* 47 cod. Salm. ~ (p. 84 Riese:) c. 20. Uersus Octaviã<sup>ni</sup> uiri inlustri annorum XVI filius Crescentini uiri magnifici. sunt uero uersi CLXXII **A**. *Hoc est: sylloga cuius est praefatio c. 19, constat 172 carminibus quae quidem in A titulis insignita sint, c. 20-199;*<sup>18</sup> *incipit a carmine Octauiani. cf. quae dicam ad c. 200 inscr.*
- p.* 48 cod. Salm. VIII ~ (p. 85 Riese:) c. 21 ('Sacrilagus capite puniatur' ...). VIII *sic* **A**; *quod nescio an ad c. 20 iam ponendum sit*
- p.* 61 cod. Salm. [IX] ~ (p. 102 Riese:) c. 38-80. *Versus serpentini. – IX in mg. dubitanter (nam et ad c. 22 potest ascribi)*<sup>19</sup> *addidi*
- p.* 66 cod. Salm. X ~ (p. 111 Riese:) c. 81 (PORFIRII Versus anacyclici). *ante u. 1 X rubro colore* **A**
- p.* 67 cod. Salm. XI ~ (p. 112 Riese:) c. 82 (De tabula). *ante u. 1 XI rubro colore* **A**
- p.* 67 cod. Salm. XII ~ (p. 113 Riese:) c. 83 (Epistula. Dido Aeneae). *ante u. 1: XII **A** rubro colore in mg.*
- p.* 73 cod. Salm. XIII ~ (p. 119 Riese:) c. 84 (De rosis). *ante u. 1 XIII a m. pr. atramento scriptum*
- p.* 74 cod. Salm. [XIV] ~ (p. 122 Riese:) c. 90. *Praefatio pertinet ad c. 90-197, ni fallor. XIV addidi*
- p.* 101 cod. Salm. [XV] ~ (p. 162 Riese:) c. 198 (Verba Achillis ...). *XV addidi*

<sup>18</sup> Actually the total number of the poems forming this section of the 'anthologia', because of the titles and of the consequent division of the poems in the Salmasian codex, which are partially different from Riese's reference edition, is – it may perhaps not be immediately perspicuous in Riese's apparatus (despite the clarification 'carminibus quae quidem in A titulis insignita sint') – exactly 172, as its copyist writes.

<sup>19</sup> Idem Riese (*Praef.* XX adn. 2): «Ad c. 22, 1 p. 58 rubro scriptum erat IX sed erasum est – unde corrige quae in eius adn. dixi –; non igitur debuit huic loco adscribi».

- p.* 104 cod. Salm. [XVI] ~ (p. 166 Riese:) c. 199 (VESPAE Iudicium coci ...). XVI *addidi*
- p.* 108 cod. Salm. [XVII] ~ (p. 170 Riese:) c. 200. LIBER GRĀMATON | EX PLI CIT | XVI<sup>20</sup> ∴ INCIPIT · PER · UIRGILIŪ · UENERIS | TROCAICO · METRO sunt uero | uersus. XXII **A**. (*Hoc est: sylloga hic incipiens constat 22 carminibus c. 200-222 (exc. 216).*<sup>21</sup> *cf. quae dicam ad c. 223 inscr.*)  
*Inscr. om. B, sine interuallo post c. 118 Peruigilium ponens. XVII in mg. addidi*
- p.* 112 cod. Salm. [XVIII] ~ (p. 175 Riese:) c. 201 (De Thetide). XVIII *addidi*
- p.* 116 cod. Salm. [XIX] ~ (p. 183 Riese:) c. 217 (Epistula. Amans amanti). XIX *addidi*
- p.* 118 cod. Salm. XX ~ (p. 187 Riese:) c. 223. TEMA INCIP (*conf.*) LOCUS UIRGILIANUS · UIUO . . . DUCO · UIRI CLARISSIMI CORONATI **A** *eqs* URSUS XXIII *add.*  
**A** *omnia rubro colore scripta. (Hoc est: sylloga hic*

<sup>20</sup> Riese attributed this number XVI (in the subscriptio ‘*Liber grāmaton explicit XVI*’), standing before the separation sign (three points forming a triangle with the vertex at the bottom) followed by ‘*incipit · per · uirgiliū · ueneris*’ (all written in majuscule letters and related to c. 200), to the ‘Streitgedicht’, c. 199, entitled *Iudicium coci et pistoris iudice Vulcano*, whose author is a poet called Vespa. He was convinced – *Praef.* XXI, adn. 1 – that section XVI, as well as the previous one (XV), consisted originally («olim») of a bigger number of poems.

<sup>21</sup> This is the evidence – already adduced by Riese (*Praef.* XXIII and XXXV) – that the copyist of the Salmasian codex on his own initiative adds the number of the poems of each section (whose numeration instead was already in the antigraph): the poems of this section turn out to be 22, except for c. 216, accidentally omitted and copied in another section (pp. 211-12 of the Salmasian codex), but ascribable to this section on the basis of codices *Thuaneus* and *Vossianus*.

- incipiens constat 23 carminibus c. 223-253.*<sup>22</sup> *cf. quae dicam ad c. 254 inscr.) XX A rubro colore in mg.*
- p. 121* cod. Salm. XXI ~ (p. 191 Riese:) c. 232 (SENECAE De qualitate temporis).
- p. 134* cod. Salm. [XXII] ~ (p. 209 Riese:) c. 254 (FLAVII [FL (*cum titulo*) · A] FELICIS viri clarissimi Postulatio honoris [-ri A] apud Victorinianum eqs). Sunt uersus (ūr) XXXII, *h. e. sylloga hic incipiens constat 32 carminibus c. 254-285 XXII in mg. addidi*
- p. 141* cod. Salm. [XXIII] ~ (p. 221 Riese:) c. 286 (SYMPHOSII scholastici Aenigmata). XXIII *in mg. addidi*
- p. 156* cod. Salm. [XXIV] ~ (p. 247 Riese:) EXPL (*cum titulo*) · ENIGMATA · SINFOSI · | INCIP (*cum titulo*) · LIBER · EPI · GRAMATON · UIRI · CL<sup>ARI</sup> (*cum titulo*) | LUXORI · ET · SPECTABILIS . sunt ūr' | LXXXXVII A 287. XXIV *addidi*
- p. 188* cod. Salm. ~ (p. 291 Riese:) c. 379. [*in fine:*] Epigrāmaton · expli (*cum titulo*) · feliciter · | incip (*cum titulo*) · calculus · dionisi · | episcopi · alexandrini · decem | nouemnalis | c. I A

The following sections of the Salmasian codex, despite belonging likely to the original Salmasian poetical sylloge, are materially separated from it:

<sup>22</sup> Otherwise Riese *Praef.* XXIII: «Iam p. 118 *uersus* XXIII indicantur: scilicet hinc ad p. 134 viginti quattuor carmina (c. 223-253; sed 245-252 [FLORI De qualitate vitae], nullis titulis discreti, pro uno habentur) sunt». He, however, is mistaken about the overall number of the section («viginti quattuor»), because he forgets that cc. 236-237 are not divided not only in **A**, but in all the rest of the manuscript tradition (**BV**), so they were counted as only one by the copyist of the Salmasian codex.



- p. 192-193 cod. Salm., c (surmounted by tit.) II ~ (p. 292 f. Riese:) c. 380 (Versus domni petri referendarii in basilica palatii s(an)c(t)e marie) u. 1-3 *rubris litteris scripti sunt* A. [Sequuntur c. 381-382]
- p. 211-212 cod. Salm., XI ~ (p. 183 Riese:) c. 216 (Postolatio muneris),<sup>23</sup> *post quod* EXPLICIT A
- p. 273-274 cod. Salm., (Apulei platonice · explicit. de remediis salutarib; feliciter.) XVIII ~ (p. 294-296 Riese:) Incipit uersos de singulis causis<sup>24</sup> sunt uer (*cum titulo*) LXX · c. 383 (de altionibus) [seq. c. 384-388. *Reliqua desunt*].<sup>25</sup>

In all the three above-mentioned cases, the numbers II, XI, XVIII<sup>26</sup> (which are affixed to sections or chapters probably belonging originally to the *epigrammaton libri*

<sup>23</sup> Riese (*Praef.* XIX): «carmen ut ex codd. B [= *Parisinus* 8071 vel *Thuaneus*] V [= *Vossianus* Q. 86] manifestum fit, ad anthologiam pertinens, in qua A p. 116 praetermisit».

<sup>24</sup> Regarding the late African origin of the Salmasian anthology (preceding the final *explicit* of p. 188), and also of these poems, Riese (*Praef.* XXV): «*de singulis causis* carmina ad Vandalorum aetatem referenda videntur, et quidem c. 387 ad Hunerici regnum (ann. 477-484) certe pertinet».

<sup>25</sup> C. 388 R ends abruptly at p. 274 in correspondence of the verso of the final sheet of the last surviving fascicle (XXXI, despite the current wrong positioning of the fascicle XXVIII after this one: so the codex is mutilated both in the beginning and in the final part).

<sup>26</sup> Among these three numbers belonging to the 'new' numeration started at p. 189 and marking the opuscola *post anthologiam*, the number XVIII – already suspected by Teubner editors, and particularly by Riese who at first (*Praef.* XIX) brands it with a 'sic' (as Baehrens does) and then changes it doubtfully (*ibid.* XX: «fortasse ...») in XVI – could be explained with the numbers of the sections of the *de remediis salutaribus* lost together with the six sheets fallen before p. 273 (see Spallone *art. cit.* 26, n. 101, and 36).

forming the ‘anthologia Salmasiana’ – closed by the *explicit* of p. 188 – but now are in the second part of the codex and numbered according to their position) prove to be added by the copyist of the Salmasian codex. He must have borrowed the Roman numeration system he found in the anthology of poems of the first part, and numbered the textual units of this second part referring to the macroscopic paratextual elements (*incipit* and *inscriptio*) which mark it.

It is now necessary to remind the reader that some of the ‘original’ numeric indications (which probably can be traced back, through the direct antigraph of the Salmasian codex, to the original epigrammatic anthology closed by the *explicit* of p. 188, but are) missing in the Salmasian codex, were restored by Riese: [VI], [VII], [IX], [XIV-XIX],<sup>27</sup> [XXII-XXIV]<sup>28</sup>; others (few) are in the margins of the Salmasian codex: VIII; X-XIII, XX, XXI. The poems in correspondence of some numeric indications, both missing in the Salmasian codex, then reconstructed by Riese (12 out of 19),<sup>29</sup> and transmitted by the codex, are – in most of the cases – in a limited

<sup>27</sup> The number XVI, missing in the margin of the Salmasian codex, is however in the *explicit* in correspondence of the *inscriptio* of c. 200 (LIBER GRAMMATON | EX PLI CIT | XVI · · · INCIPIT · PER · VIRGILIUM · UENERIS | TROCAICO · METRO), and was added by Riese at the side of the (previous) c. 199 VESPAE Iudicium coci.

<sup>28</sup> «Numeros enim nonnullos – Riese annotated (*Praef.* XXI) – omissos esse non est mirum, cum codex quamquam antiquissimus tamen procul ab anthologiae archetypo non quidem tempore absit sed librariorum socordia deflexerit. Qui et carmina tota omiserunt ...».

<sup>29</sup> Of the XXIV original sections (or chapters), I-V, corresponding (it is believed) to the lost eleven initial quaternions of the codex, are missing.

number:<sup>30</sup> among the 12 sections (or chapters), whose numbers have been restored by Riese, [VII] counts two (short) texts, [XV-XVII] count one poem each, [XXIII] contains Symphosius/Simposius' sylloge; among the 7 sections (/chapters), whose numbers are in the margin of the poems of the Salmasian codex, VIII and X-XII have only one poem each.

So, we may calculate around five thousand verses distributed in the only sections I-V contained – according to the *communis opinio* – in the missing initial eleven fascicles of the codex;<sup>31</sup> to these we must add, then, all the lost verses (which cannot be calculated) in the second part of the codex which were the continuation of c. 388, and the following sixty-four poems (in their entirety) out of the seventy poems stated in the *inscriptio*.<sup>32</sup> As we were saying, all these lost verses distributed in few sections – compared to the 4.269 surviving verses allocated in at least 19 out of the 24 sections (this was the number of sections of the first part of the Salmasian codex), which

<sup>30</sup> This is why Riese (*Praef.* XXI adn. 1) admitted: «Capita VII, X-XII, XV-XVII pluribus olim carminibus constitisse verisimile est».

<sup>31</sup> If we suppose – as everybody thinks – that the Salmasian codex opened with 'anthologia' as the principal text there copied («tamquam primarium codicis argumentum»), and that it totally occupied its first part («eam primam codicis partem tenuisse totam», according to Riese *Praef.* XX).

<sup>32</sup> The *inscriptio* on the recto of the final sheet of the last surviving fascicle (XXXI) says: 'Incipit uersos de singulis causis sunt uer (*cum titulo*) LXX · de alcionibus'; however, of these seventy poems announced on the recto of the sheet corresponding to p. 273, according to Saumaise's numeration, starting with c. 383 *De alcyonibus*, less than six survived, because the (mutilated) codex stops abruptly at p. 274 after v. 3 of c. 388.

are partially preserved or can be restored<sup>33</sup> – lead us to believe that the person who compiled the original African ‘anthologia’ – or rather ‘*syllogarum sylloga*’ –, in late Vandal age,<sup>34</sup> wanted to collect a huge amount of poetical materials (mostly epigrams), and aimed at handing down to the following ages an anthology of poems of a considerable size, if not also uncommon. So we understand that – as (apparently) shown by the numbers marking the beginning of the sections completely vanished together with the poems they were affixed to, and with also who knows how many other poems in the same section, and by the section numbers luckily saved because they were copied with the single poems they were affixed to<sup>35</sup> – the later *excerptio* suffered by the

<sup>33</sup> Among Riese’s (innumerable) credits, maybe the biggest one is (more than the reconstruction of most of the history of the Salmasian codex and its description, even if remarkable) the reconstruction – excellent, considering the period – of the surviving sections of ‘anthologia Salmasiana’, of which I have given an account (and which was approved by later critics).

<sup>34</sup> It is *opinio communis* (Bischoff, Spallone, Tandoi, Langlois and many others) that this ‘Uranthologie’, compiled in Africa around 533/4, already included all the poems contained in the Salmasian codex (Shackleton B., who re-edited *Anth. Lat.* I 1, leaves the question open, *Praef.* IV: «*utrum haec ‘anthologia’ ut primum redacta est an postero tempore ampliata in codicem Salmasianum pervenerit incertum est*»; opposite, on the other hand, the opinion of Vössing *Die Anthologia Salmasiana, das vandalische Karthago und die Grenzen der Stilanalyse*, in *Der Stilbegriff in den Altertumswissenschaften* Rostock (Inst. f. Altertumswiss.) 1993, 149-155 [whose *petitio principi* – 154 n. 40 – «... könnte natürlich im Einzelfall dennoch in Africa entstanden sein! Es geht hier nur um die Zugehörigkeit zur Uranthologie!» – was not followed by others]).

<sup>35</sup> As has been said, the numbers of four sections (VIII and X-XII) out of seven (transmitted by the Salmasianus codex) are each affixed to one poem only (furthermore, cc. 81 and 82, marked by X and XI, count 32 and 15 verses respectively).

anthology<sup>36</sup> reduced drastically the original collection and modified its *facies*, making its previous structure (almost) unrecognizable.

For this reason, now we must ask ourselves how the (only) surviving<sup>37</sup> seven numeric indications guided the copyist of the Salmasian codex and reader of the codex written by him. These seven indications are scattered in the 188 pages of the anthology of poems: the first (VIII) is related to seventeen *pièces*, the second (X) to only one poem, the third (XI) to only one poem, the fourth (XII) to only one poem, the fifth (XIII) to six poems, the sixth (XX) to nine, the seventh and last section (XXI)<sup>38</sup> to thirty-one/(thirty-three) Riese<sup>39</sup> (actually twenty-three in the Salmasian codex, if you consider that cc. 236-237 are not divided in **A** and that, in this codex, cc. 245-252 form one poem), out of a total of 379 poems – according to Riese’s numeration. This is the number of poems forming the ‘anthologia salmasiana’ before the closing *explicit*. I think this may explain the need of the copyist

<sup>36</sup> Regarding this, see now Paolucci *Interferenze fra il Carmen saeculare di Orazio e il carme In laudem Solis dell’Anthologia Latina*, 2. *Il vettore codicologico*, “Incontri triestini di Filologia Classica” VII 2007/08, 306-312. In the specific case of poems omitted in **A** and **β**, with the *iscriptio ‘aliter’*, probably «the compiler felt that one poem on these themes was enough» (Courtney *Observations on the Latin Anthology*, “Hermathena” 129, 1980, 49).

<sup>37</sup> Although this copyist understood their original use so that he applied to the poems of the second part of the Salmasian codex this criterion of division into sections that he found in the model of the poetic sylloge.

<sup>38</sup> This section – Courtney writes (*Observations* cit., 48) – «begins with the first Seneca poem, 232, and seems to end with 253; this is not a group of unified character, and must have been put together by drawing poems from various sources».

<sup>39</sup> Calculating also cc. 223<sup>a</sup> and 238<sup>a</sup>.

of the Salmasian codex, who probably found in the anti-graph only the Roman numerals which he later copied in the margin of the surviving poems – since they were missing in his anti-graph and previously omitted together with the poems in whose margin they were written<sup>40</sup> –, to rely on other evident paratextual elements (*incipit, explicit, inscriptiones*), so that he could number on his own initiative the poems included between one paratextual element (which marked visually the beginning of a textual section) and the following one.

The following table gives an account of the paratextual elements the copyist of the Salmasian codex used to number the series of the poems (placed between a paratextual element and the following one), to which he then added – in Roman numerals – the overall number of the poems copied after (each one), so that he could provide an index of the sections of the ‘anthologia’ (with the respective poems) both of the first and also of the second part of the codex (containing anthology’s sections previously omitted). First part of the codex until the closing *explicit* of p. 188:

*p. 47-108* cod. Salm. ([VII], VIII, [IX], X–XIII, [XIV–XVI]) ~ c. 20. Uersus Octavia<sup>ni</sup> uiri inlustris annorum XVI filius Crescentini uiri magnifici.

<sup>40</sup> If we believed that also the copyist of the present codex ‘plenior’ made an *excerptio*, as who preceded him did, so that he, in his turn, might have continued omitting poems and relative Roman numerals affixed at their side, this copyist might likewise, and, maybe, even more so, have needed to make up for the lack, in the codex he was writing, of the original framework of the epigrammatic *corpus* – and for the consequent loss of its functionality – with a different (and understandable for the user) indexing criterion.

- sunt uero uersi CLXXII<sup>41</sup> **A** (*sylloga constat 172 carminibus quae quidem in A titulis insignita sint, c. 20-199*)
- p. 108-118 cod. Salm. ([XVII], [XVIII], [XIX]) ~ c. 200. LIBER GRAMMATON | EX PLI CIT | XVI ·· INCIPI · PER · UIRGILIUM · UENERIS | TROCAICO · METRO sunt uero | uersus. XXII **A** (*sylloga hic incipiens constat 22 carminibus c. 200-222, exc. 216*)
- p. 118-134 cod. Salm. (XX, XXI) ~ c. 223. TEMA INCIP (*comp.*) LOCUS UIRGILIANUS · UIUO . . . DUCO · UIRI CLARISSIMI CORONATI *A eqs* URSUS XXIII **A** (*sylloga hic incipiens constat 23 carminibus c. 223-253*)
- p. 134-141 cod. Salm. ([XXII]) ~ c. 254 (FLAVII FELICIS viri clarissimi Postulatio honoris [-ri **A**] aput Victorinianum *eqs*). Sunt uersus (ūr) XXXII (*sylloga hic incipiens constat 32 carminibus c. 254-285*)
- [p. 141-156 cod. Salm. ([XXIII]) ~ c. 286 (SYMPHOSII scholastici Aenigmata)]
- p. 156-188 cod. Salm. ([XXIV]) ~ c. 287. EXPL (*cum titulo*) · ENIGMATA · SINFOSI · | INCIPI (*cum titulo*) · LIBER · EPI · GRAMATON · UIRI · CL<sup>ARI</sup> (*cum titulo*) | LUXORI · ET · SPECTABILIS. sunt ūr' | LXXXXVII **A** (*sylloga hic incipiens constat 97 carminibus c. 287-379, scil. Luxorii 89, deinde alia octo: namque c. 378 in quinque dividitur*) – c. 379 [*in fine:*] Epigrāmaton · expli (*cum titulo*). feliciter.

Second part of the codex related to a poem previously omitted and to anthology sections belonging to the original poetical sylloge:

<sup>41</sup> Regardless – as you can see – of the numeric indications in the margin of some poems (VIII, X-XIII), as well as in the ‘explicit’ of the ‘liber epigrammaton’ before poem 200 (XVI), forming this series of 172.

- p.* 192-193 cod. Salm., c (surmounted by tit.) II ~ (p. 292 f. Riese:) c. 380 (Versus domni petri referendarii in basilica palatii s(an)c(t)e marie) u. 1-3 *rubris litteris scripti sunt* A. [Sequuntur c. 381-382]<sup>42</sup>
- p.* 211-212 cod. Salm., XI [librarius ipse] ~ c. 216 (Postolatio muneris), [*in fine:*] EXPLICIT A
- p.* 273-274 cod. Salm. (Apulei platonice · explicit. de remediis salutarib; feliciter.) XVIII [librarius ipse] Incipit uersos de singulis causis sunt uer (*cum titulo*) LXX ~ c. 383 de altionibus A [post quod c. 384-388. *Reliqua desunt*].

The initial letters of the sections [XVII], XX, XXII, [XXIII v. 18, in correspondence of the first of the *Symphosii Aenigmata*, after the *Praefatio*] and XXIV – I mean those sections containing the overall numbers of the poems written below, due to the copyist’s own initiative – are recognizable by sight<sup>43</sup> thanks to their different colouring. They highlight the paratextual elements the copyist followed to number (since many ‘original’ Roman numerals were missing, already dropped together with the poems opening the sections, to which they were

<sup>42</sup> Cc. 380-382 Riese, written in a smaller script, were added – to remedy an evident oversight – at the bottom of pp. 192-193, under the tables for the computation of Easter of the *calculus Dionisi*, that is the first text following the *explicit* of the Salmasian poetic anthology (incip [*cum titulo*] · calculus · dionisi · | episcopi · alexandrini · decem | nouemnalis | c. I), whence at p. 192 the progressive numeric indication, at the side of c. 380: c (surmounted by tit.) II Versus domni petri referendarii in basilica palatii s(an)c(t)e marie.

<sup>43</sup> According to what Riese already remarked (*Praef.* XXII adn. 2): «Litterae initiales librorum XVII, XX, XXII, XXIII v. 18, XXIV variis coloribus pictae sunt».



affixed) the poems forming each section of the first part (using, then, the same numerical criterion for the poems previously omitted and then copied in the second part) of the codex transmitting the ‘anthologia Salmasiana’. It is possible that the copyist, while working, had the idea of numbering this way the poems of the following sections of the ‘anthologia’ – which are recognizable thanks to their paratexts written in a bigger script and with painted initial letters – in order to provide the reader with some kind of a progressive index of the epigrammatic anthology there contained. That is what we may think considering the small size of the numeric indication written in red at p. 47 (‘sunt uero uersi CLXXII’), at p. 108 (‘sunt uero | uersus. XXII’) and at p. 134 (‘Sunt uersus [ũr] XXXII’), but especially the position of the numeric indication at p. 118 (‘ursus | XXIII’), written on two lines beside vv. 1-2 of poem 223, and that at p. 156 (‘sunt ũr’ | LXXXXVII’), also written on two lines (the first completing the third line of the *inscriptio*, the second beside the title of Luxor. 287).<sup>44</sup>

In spite of the fall of the first eleven fascicles of the codex ‘plenior’, which may have caused the loss of a considerable part of the original anthology,<sup>45</sup> and even if the final loss damaged the pentameter of c. 388, the distichs following v. 3 and all the remaining sixty-four poems

<sup>44</sup> Peculiarities which in any case (considering as well their regular occurrence in the codex) rule out the possibility that these numbers «a librario familiae libri Salmasiani additos esse» (as Riese thought *Praef.* XXIII), rather than by the copyist of the Salmasian himself (see Spallone *cit.* 60).

<sup>45</sup> As has been said, H. Omont *Anthologie de poètes latins dite de Saumaise* *cit.*, p. 3 calculated that the 176 pages, corresponding to the eleven missing fascicles, could contain around five thousand verses.

out of seventy indicated in the *inscriptio*<sup>46</sup> on the recto of the surviving final sheet of the last fascicle (XXXI), wrongly bound before fascicle XXIX – to which we must add the almost sure omission of poem 389 (which was in the archetype of the sylloge, but lately transmitted only by the codices which can be connected to  $\beta$  branch)<sup>47</sup> – the *Anthologia* there contained is the most conspicuous sylloge of the Antiquity after Martial's epigrams (furthermore it is joined to the 'Martialis excerpta' in the codices *Parisinus Lat. 8071* and, with another anthology of poems attributed to Seneca and Petronius, in *Vossianus Q. 86*).

As regards the origin and the provenance of the codex,<sup>48</sup> Traube ascribed it – as is known – to a Spanish copyist of the VII century for reasons regarding writing and grammar (now considered totally outdated thanks to the acquired knowledge on Late Antiquity). Lowe dated it to the VII century and indicated a different place of production (*CLA V 593*: «Origin uncertain: probably North Italy or South France») (Rand instead thought

<sup>46</sup> 'Incipit uersos de singulis causis sunt uer (*cum titulo*) LXX · de altionibus' is written on the recto of the sheet corresponding to p. 273 according to Saumaise's numeration, but this section starting with c. 383 *De alcyonibus* abruptly stops – because of the mutilation suffered by the codex – on the verso of the same sheet (p. 274 Saumaise), after v. 3 of c. 388.

<sup>47</sup> And, obviously, the accidents of transmission which can be inferred from the 'original' Roman numerals affixed to sections now probably reduced (as regards the numbers of poems there contained) or completely missing, which have been mentioned so far.

<sup>48</sup> An always helpful survey in M. Spallone *Il Par. Lat. 10318 (Salmasiano)* cit., 36 ff., but see also Spallone "AAHG" 37, 1984, coll. 249-254, and Schetter "Gnomon" 58, 1986, 300-304 (= W. Schetter *Kaiserzeit und Spätantike. Kleine Schriften 1957-1992*, hrsg. v. O. Zwierlein, Stuttgart 1994, 460-465) reviewing Baumgartner *Untersuchungen zur Anthologie des Codex Salmasianus* Baden 1981.

it was a transcription, made in France, of an exemplar arrived there from Spain). Bischoff's opinion is more convincing: he thinks the codex was written between the end of the VIII century and the beginning of the IX in central Italy, in an area between Southern Tuscany and Umbria. Maddalena Spallone as well thinks the codex belongs to the same period and associates the writing with the so-called (by Petrucci) 'Roman' Uncial, connecting it, as far as it concerns its production, to the Roman environment.

There is no (trustworthy) information on the codex until 1615. Riese did not know the exact year when Jean Lacurne 'bailli d'Arnai le Duc' donated it to the Burgundian scholar Claude de Saumaise (Salmasius), who put his *ex libris* on the superior margin of the first page and made it famous among the scientific community (to the point that some scholars – Scriverius, N. Heinsius, who got it from his hands, and others – could make partial copies of it); Riese thought<sup>49</sup> of a date not earlier than 1609 (when Saumaise returned to Dijon). One year after Riese's second edition (I<sup>2</sup> 1 1894), Omont deduced the year 1615 from a letter by Saumaise: *Deux lettres de Cl. Saumaise à J.A. de Thou sur les Anthologies grecque et latine (1615)*, "Revue de philologie" s. n. 19, 1895, 187. The following history of the codex until 1775, when Ruhnken went to Paris, where he lived for a year, to examine the Bibliotheca Regia and collate the codex for Burman junior,<sup>50</sup> who, after three years, published the I volume of his *Anthologia Latina* (Amstelaedami 1759) – started by Riese *Praef.* XII ff. – is usefully contained

<sup>49</sup> *Praef.* XIV

<sup>50</sup> To remedy to the partial dispersion of Hensius' 'schedae Salmasianae', inherited from by the paternal uncle Burman senior.

in my *Apographa Salmasiana. Sulla trasmissione di 'anthologia Salmasiana' tra Sei e Settecento* (2004) and *Apographa Salmasiana, 2. Il secolo d'oro di 'anthologia Salmasiana' (continuazione e fine)* (2010), to which I refer.

It is not known where or on the shelves of which library it was kept during the Middle Ages and beyond, until the years of its discovery. What is certain is that the Middle Ages did not know the Salmasian anthology through the manuscripts' branch represented by **A** (and, if that was the case, by *Reginensis Lat. 123*),<sup>51</sup> but through numerous manuscript witnesses, all French, which transmit excerpts of the sylloge starting from c. 96 – two of them (**BW**) add, totally out of place, poem 30 – so that it is clear that all these manuscript witnesses derive from an exemplar ( $\beta$ ) which did not transmit any poem contained in the surviving sections [VI]-XIII of the Salmasian codex, but started some poems after the opening of the section, beginning with c. 90 entitled *Praefatio*, to which Riese affixed the number [XIV].

<sup>51</sup> About this codex, containing (as regards only the *Anthologia Salmasiana*) cc. 116-117, Riese (*Zur latein. Anthol. nachtr. u. Beitr.*, “RhM” 65, 1910, 481) supposed even its direct dependence on the Salmasian codex («Es ist nicht unmöglich, dass die Handschrift direkt aus **A** abgeschrieben ist»).

The other branch of the tradition ( $\beta$ ) is formed by a family of a certain number of manuscript witnesses descending from an only ancestor (probably written in France, as all the manuscripts deriving from it). The codices belonging to this family contain variously rich excerpts of the *Anthologia Salmasiana* together with authors and texts of variegated origin (especially Martial). The  $\beta$  family is divided up into three branches: the first two – very near to each other – are formed respectively by **B** and by the humanistic apograph derived from the ancient *Vindobonensis* 277 when it was still intact (**W**);<sup>1</sup> the third branch, quite distant from the others, by **V**. In the lost antigraph of **V** (named  $\gamma$ ) converged the so-called (the name comes from the surviving codex) *Anthologia Vossiana* (which will be discussed later).

### Cod. *Parisinus Lat. 8071* or *Thuaneus*

Among the manuscript witnesses of the  $\beta$  branch,<sup>2</sup> all belonging to the so-called (by Riese) genre of the «Excerpta», two – *Parisinus Lat. 8071* and *Vossianus Lat. Q. 86* – contain many poems of the Salmasian anthology together with ‘excerpta Martialis’; furthermore, each

<sup>1</sup> The relationship between what now remains of *Vindobonensis* 277 and **B** is discussed below and, further on, in the pages concerning the examination of its direct copy, **W**, written by Sannazaro in his own hand (currently named *Vindobonensis Palatinus 9401\**).

<sup>2</sup> Only the basic information here (summed in *VPS. Sigla*): problems and relative bibliography can be found in my works gradually quoted in this essay.

codex contains its own poems in addition to those in common with **A**.

I am starting, as usual,<sup>3</sup> from cod. *Parisinus Lat. 8071* or *Thuaneus (B)*,<sup>4</sup> IX<sup>3/4</sup> century (Bischoff),<sup>5</sup> ff. 51v-56v and 57r, which transmits<sup>6</sup> eighty poems in all<sup>7</sup> of the *Anthologia Salmasiana*; the contiguous series of these poems, starting from 96 R (= 85 SB = 7 Zurli *VPS*), arranged in an order not so different from **A** (96 R [= 85 SB = 7 Zurli *VPS*], 98 R [= 87 SB = 9 Z], 101 R [= 90 SB = 12 Z], 103 R [= 92 SB = 14 Z], 111-113 R [= 100-102 SB = 22-24 Z], 116-118 R [= 105-107 SB = 27-29 Z], 127 R [= 116 SB = 38 Z], 129-136 R [= 118-125 SB = 40-47 Z], 142 R [= 131 SB = 53 Z], 145 R [= 134 SB = 56 Z], 152 R [= 141 SB = 63 Z], 153 R [= 142 SB = 64 Z], 156 R [= 145 SB = 67 Z], 160 R [= 149 SB = 71 Z], 180-184 R [= 170-174 SB =

<sup>3</sup> Riese started the description of the two (most important) «Excerptorum codices» not from *Vossianus* (even if it is a bit more ancient), but from *Thuaneus*, because – as he explains (*Praef.* XXXVII-XXXVIII) – it has the precedence over the other codex as to accuracy and number of poems in common with **A**.

<sup>4</sup> (A classic description in) Riese *Praef.* XXXIV ff. (and the scholars who preceded him there quoted); Munk Olsen *Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux*, “RHT” 10, 1980, 132-133.

<sup>5</sup> I discussed about the relationship and the relative chronology between this important witness of the family **A** [=  $\alpha$ ] of Martial (siglum **T**) and the surviving florilegium of the same family, *Vossianus Lat. Q. 86 (R)* – written (it is believed) around 850 A.D. – in *I codici T e R di Marziale*, “RFIC” 129, 2001, 51 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Before f. 51v, the codex exhibits Juvenal, but, after satire IX, cc. 392 and 393 R (= 388 and 389 SB); then Eugene of Toledo’s poems, then ‘Martialis excerpta’, among which – in correspondence of the beginning of book V – c. 26 R (= 13 SB), and Catull. 62.

<sup>7</sup> Including c. 26 R (=13 SB) and considering *Flori De qualitate vitae* (written in **AB** as a *carmen continuum*), which is made up of eight *pièces* (see *infra*).

92-96 Z], 192 R [= 182 SB = 104 Z], 196 R [= 187 SB = 109 Z], 197 R [= 188 SB = 110 Z], 199 R [= 190 SB], 203 R [= 194 SB], 205 R [= 196 SB], 206 R [= 197 SB], 209 R [= 200 SB], 214 R [= 205 SB], 216<sup>8</sup>-224 R [= 207-216 SB; 223-223<sup>a</sup> R = 214-215 SB = Zurli *Coronatus* 1], 232 R [= 224 SB], 234-237 R [= 226-229 SB], 245-252 R [= 238-246 SB],<sup>9</sup> 256 R [= 250 SB], 257 R [= 251 SB], 259-261 R [= 253-255 SB], 263 R [= 257 SB], 265 R [= 259 SB], 266 R [= 260 SB], 268 R [= 262 SB], 269 R [= 263 SB];<sup>10</sup> Luxorii 296 R [= 291 SB], 303 R [= 298 SB], 310 R [= 305 SB], 318 R [= 313 SB]; 389 R [= 385 SB = Zurli *In laudem Solis*]), with the *Pervigilium Veneris* (200 R = 191 SB) placed between cc. 118 and 127 R (= 107 and 116 SB = 29 and 38 Z), and cc. 103, 142 and 153 R (= 92, 131 and 142 SB = 14, 53 and 64 Z) – in this order – between cc. 245-252 R (written uninterruptedly in **AB**) *Flori De qualitate vitae* and c. 273 R (= 267 SB), and c. 273 R before 256 R (= 250 SB).

<sup>8</sup> C. 216 R, initially omitted in **A**, but later added after the Salmasian poetry section at pp. 211-212, was put back to its place by Riese «Thuanei [et *Vossiani Q. 86 (V)*] auctoritate».

<sup>9</sup> This series of poems – *Flori De qualitate vitae* – is copied as a ‘carmen continuum’ both in **A** and **B**. The editor from Stuttgart (firstly writes, by mistake, 238-245 in the heading, but then) numbers separately the v. *nemo non haec vera dicit, nemo non contra facit* – which, in the manuscripts, as is known, closes c. 251 R – transposed by Riese and Di Giovine (*Flori Carmina* 1988) at the end of 250 (so that the right numeration in Shackleton Bailey is 238-246).

<sup>10</sup> When Riese *Praef. XXXIV-XXXV* talks about «foliis 51<sup>v</sup>-56<sup>v</sup> Salmasiani florilegii carmina tria et septuaginta ...» obviously refers not to the overall number of the Salmasian poems in **B**, but to the series of poems copied in succession almost in the same order of the poems of **A**, starting from c. 96 R and ending with c. 269 R, before, I mean, the four poems by Luxorius.

C. 26 R (= 13 SB) is before the Salmasian series, at the beginning of the book V of the ‘excerpta’ by Martial. After c. 389 R (= 385 SB = Zurli *In laudem Solis*) – which is the last poem concluding in **B** the Salmasian series and the only one, belonging to this series, missing in **A** – there are the valedictory verses of the copyist,<sup>11</sup> which precede the ‘Explicit’<sup>12</sup> of the whole sylloge,<sup>13</sup> and c. 30 R (= 17 SB), omitted in its own place and added here at f. 57.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Already printed by Riese and in my recent ed. (*Anonymi In laudem Solis* rec. L. Zurli, trad. N. Scivoletto, Hildesheim 2008) after the critical apparatus of this poem.

<sup>12</sup> Riese (*Praef.* XXXV): «post 389, versiculis quibusdam librarii interiectis, legitur ‘Explicit’, i.e. ni fallor: ‘Explicit florilegium’».

<sup>13</sup> Whence Riese (*ibid.* XXXVI): «C. 390 sq., quamquam ad syllogam eandem non pertinuisse videntur, hic tamen, quia in *B* extant, addidi».

<sup>14</sup> The following texts are Ennod. *car.* 2, 26-28; two riddles (3, 6) of *Aenigmata codicis Bernensis 611* (481 R), contained also in *Lipsiensis Rep.* I 74, ff. 15v-24; the famous ‘excerpta’ from Seneca’s tragedies and Lucan 9, 696. Right after (f. 58), cc. 390 (*Eucheriae versus*) and 391 R (= 386 and 387 SB), followed respectively by ps. Ov. *Halieutica* and Gratii *Cyнетicon l. I* (the four poems are arranged in the same sequence of the ancient cod. *Vind.* 277).