

CODICES VAT. LAT. 1701, 2110, AND 8591 AS SOURCES FOR CICERO'S *TOPICA*

Since W. Friedrich's discovery toward the end of the last century of Codex Ottob. Lat. 1406, it has generally been agreed by scholars that the manuscripts of Cicero's *Topica* fall into two families (which in this paper will be designated fam. 1 and fam. 2). Fam. 1 is described by all recent editors of the *Topica* as being composed of only two manuscripts: Codex Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1406 (fols. 44<sup>v</sup>–57<sup>v</sup>), designated O, and Codex Vitebergensis, an. 1432, designated f. Fam. 2, according to most authorities, is made up of all the other known manuscripts of the work, the most important of which are Codex Vossianus 84, saec. x, designated (A), Codex Vossianus 86, saec. x, designated (B), Codex Marcianus 257, saec. x, designated m, Codex Vossianus 70, saec. x, designated V, Codex Einsiedlensis 324, saec. x, designated a, Codex Sangallensis 830, saec. x, designated b, Codex Sangallensis 854, saec. xi, designated c, Codex Sangallensis 818, saec. xi, designated d, Codex Leidensis 90, saec. xi, designated L, and Codex Erfurtensis, saec. xii, designated e. Such is the view taken by W. Friedrich,<sup>1</sup> A. S. Wilkins,<sup>2</sup> and H. Bornecque.<sup>3</sup> H. M. Hubbell assumes a three family classification: like other editors, he places O and f in fam. 1, but he divides the rest of the manuscripts into two groups with (A), (B), and m making up fam. 2 and the others, fam. 3.<sup>4</sup> All the above-mentioned editors agree that fam. 1 is more reliable than fam. 2 (or fam. 3). In actual practice, however, Bornecque adopts its readings somewhat less frequently than do the others.

It is the purpose of this paper to point out that Codex Vat. Lat. 8591 (fols. 44<sup>v</sup>–63<sup>r</sup> or

pages 88–125),<sup>5</sup> saec. xi, henceforth designated C, is a manuscript of the *Topica* belonging to fam. 1 and is somewhat earlier than O, and that Codex Vat. Lat. 2110 (fols. 57<sup>r</sup>–65<sup>r</sup>), saec. xv, henceforth designated g, and Codex Vat. Lat. 1701 (fols. 152<sup>r</sup>–172<sup>r</sup>), saec. xv, henceforth designated h, also belong primarily to fam. 1, although both have been slightly contaminated by the other tradition in a few places.<sup>6</sup>

In the literature dealing with the manuscript tradition of Cicero's *Topica*, O is consistently described as dating from the tenth century.<sup>7</sup> Since this document is in Beneventan script, however, it has been included by E. A. Lowe in his catalogue of Beneventan manuscripts and listed as dating from the end of the eleventh century.<sup>8</sup> A paleographical study of the text of O will show that Lowe was unquestionably correct in his dating of the document. Codex C was copied in a Carolingian hand quite similar to that employed in Parisinus (Bibl. nat. lat.) 6190, which was written in the interval 1028–34.<sup>9</sup> Although C is shelved in a section of the Vatican Library for which no printed catalogue is yet available, a brief description of it is contained in a Vatican handwritten inventory. There it is dated simply in the eleventh century. It is also included by E. M. Sanford in her list of libri manuales dating from the eleventh century.<sup>10</sup> Hence this document can safely be assigned to the middle of the eleventh century. Some alterations in the text of C were made by the original scribe (=C<sup>1</sup>), and a few additional changes were made by a contemporary corrector (=C<sup>2</sup>).

1. W. Friedrich, *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera rhetorica*, II (Leipzig, 1893), lxxvi.

2. A. S. Wilkins, *M. Tullii Ciceronis rhetorica*, II (Oxford, 1903), iii.

3. H. Bornecque, *Cicéron: Divisions de l'art oratoire, Topiques* (Paris, 1924), pp. 61–62.

4. H. M. Hubbell, *Cicero: De inventione, De optimo genere oratorum, Topica* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), pp. 380–81.

5. A dual system of numbering is used in this codex. Apparently the customary practice of numbering folios was first employed, but later many of the folio numbers were removed and page numbers were added throughout.

6. The information about Codices COgh and Vatican

handwritten inventories contained in this paper is based on microfilm copies of these documents kindly placed at my disposal by the directors of The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

7. It is thus dated in the editions of Friedrich, Wilkins, Bornecque, and Hubbell (nn. 1, 2, 3, and 4).

8. E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914), p. 366.

9. C. Samaran and R. Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*, II (Paris, 1962), plate x.

10. E. M. Sanford, "The Use of Classical Latin Authors in the Libri Manuales," *TAPA*, LV (1924), 220.

A survey of the vast number of cases listed below in which Cgh agree with O (and occasionally with f) against other manuscripts, both in error and in correct readings, will prove beyond question that the three new manuscripts, like O (and f), are members of fam. 1.<sup>11</sup>

1. 8: eorum librorum] \*librorum eorum COgh; 2. 3: inventam] inventa COgh; 2. 7: quod] \*quia COgh; 4. 4-5: scripsisses] cavisses COghf; 6. 2: partis f, partes COgh, artes fam. 2; 8. 8-9: ducuntur] dicuntur COgh; 10. 3: nulla] \*ulla COgh || earum] \*earum rerum COgh; 10. 6: lex] lex elia santia CO, lex elia sanctia g, lex elia sentia h; 12. 4: graece \*om. COgh; 14. 2: Fabia] \*Fabiae COgh; 14. 4: viri \*om. COgh; 19. 3: factum est] factum sit COgh; 21. 6: repugnat COgh, pugnat fam. 2 f; 23. 11: rerum] omnium COgh; 25. 1: sint] \*sunt COgh; 26. 2: membra habet] \*habet membra COgh; 27. 5: sunt] sunt earum autem (aute g) rerum quae non sunt COgh; 27. 10: insita] insignita COgh || intelligentia] intelligentiae COghf; 27. 11-12: explicanda sunt] explicanda est Cghf, est explicanda O; 28. 5: iuris COgh, om. fam. 2 f; 28. 9: nexu COghf, nexo fam. 2; 29. 10: communitate] communione COgh; 29. 15: qui inter se] \*inter se qui COgh; 29. 18: servitute] servitute COgh; 31. 13: per COghf, om. fam. 2; 31. 14: quadam] \*aliqua COgh; 32. 7: utens] \*enim utens COgh; 39. 5: propiore] loco proprio C, propiore loco O, propiore loco g, proprie loco h; 42. 3: mandaris] mandaveris COgh; 42. 5: appellatur COghf, appelletur fam. 2; 44. 3: heredes] heredem COgh || instituissent] instituisset COgh; 44. 5: obtinuissent] obtinisset COgh; 46. 5: aut (first) \*om. COgh; 47. 3: et \*om. COgh; 48. 2: appellant] appellantur COgh; 49. 1: velut COghf, vel fam. 2; 49. 4: negantia ea COghf, negantia fam. 2; 52. 5: post] \*at (ac C) post COgh; 53. 17: est om. COgh; 54. 6-7: et ex eis unum aut plura] et ex (ex om. Ogh) his (iis h) alia negatio rursus adiungitur et ex his (iis h) primum COgh; 57. 8: ad hanc COgh, ad haec fam. 2 f; 58. 8: sed COghf, et fam. 2; 59. 3: et cetera COghf, ceteraque h, cetera fam. 2; 61. 3-4: accidissent] cecidissent COghf; 61. 6: navim COghf, navem fam. 2; 62. 2: quae] \*ut COgh; 62. 3: velut] \*vel COgh;

62. 8: irascitur COgh, irascatur fam. 2 f; 63. 8: et om. COgh; 63. 10: fortuna] \*necessitate COgh; 64. 2: vel ignorata vel voluntaria] ignorata Cgh, ignorata sunt O; 64. 4: subicitur ille] ille subicitur COgh; 64. 6: in \*om. COgh; 65. 7: consilio] \*consilia COgh; 66. 2: inter] \*ut inter COgh; 66. 3-4: aequius melius] quid equius melius C, quid melius aequius Ogh; 66. 4: eis om. COgh || enim \*om. COgh; 68. 4: spectantur] expectantur COgh; 69. 14: inanimis] inanimatis COgh; 70. 2: ipsis COghf, ipsa fam. 2; 71. 3: comparantur COghf, comparentur fam. 2; 72. 2: ambigitur COghf, ambigetur fam. 2; 72. 5: perficiamus] \*efficiamus COgh; 73. 7: maxima fam. 2 f, maxime COgh; 74. 7: tum] cum COgh; 74. 8-9: tormentis] torti COgh; 74. 10: animi] animi sunt COgh; 75. 4: quo id] ad quod COgh; 75. 6: imprudentes] \*imprudenter COgh; 77. 3: in om. COghf; 77. 4: opera divina quaedam] \*quaedam opera divina COgh; 78. 7: rentur eos] videntur eis COgh; 79. 4: disputationem] \*quaestionem COgh; 79. 5: alios] \*alios quibusdam alios COh, alios quibus alios g; 79. 6: duo genera] duo sunt genera C, duo genera sunt Ogh; 80. 3: in (second) om. COgh; 82. 6: aut sitne] cum an sit COgh; 82. 7-8: primum . . . secundum . . . tertium] prima . . . secunda . . . tertia COgh; 82. 13: sit necne sic] sit nec sit C, sit necne sit C<sup>1</sup>Oghf; 82. 14: equid] et quid COgh || haec om. COgh; 82. 15: sint om. COgh; 82. 17: sic] sic ut cum COgh; 83. 7: partitio sic COghf, partitio fam. 2; 83. 9: sit om. COghf; 86. 1: duo sunt genera] \*duo genera COgh; 86. 5: cohortationes] cum fiunt cohortationes COgh; 86. 8: cum] \*tum COgh; 87. 2: sint] sunt COgh; 88. 5: rei (second) om. COgh; 88. 6: huius] huic COgh; 90. 3: et (first) om. COgh; 90. 4: tributionem fam. 2 f, tuitionem COgh || cuique om. COgh; 92. 2: instruuntur] instituuntur COgh || quae om. COgh; 92. 5: sit factum COghf, factum sit fam. 2; 92. 7: appelletur] appellatur COgh; 95. 2: vocant COghf, appellant fam. 2; 96. 2: defenditur] defendetur COgh; 96. 4: possint] possunt COghf; 97. 6: id est om. COgh; 98. 1: sequitur COgh, consequitur fam. 2 f; 99. 3: quod] \*quos COgh.

The four members of fam. 1 here under consideration—COgh—can be shown to fall

11. In the citations from the *Topica* used throughout this paper, the text of Bornecque (n. 3) is followed. The last number in each citation is the line number within the designated chapter calculated according to the line divisions in Bornecque's text. This will occasionally vary slightly for other editions. The readings marked with an asterisk in the

following list are those accepted by Friedrich (n. 1), Wilkins (n. 2), and Hubbell (n. 4). The readings of O cited in this list and elsewhere in the paper are based on my own collation of this manuscript. It will be noted that many of these readings are not reported in the critical editions.

into two subdivisions, C and Ogh.<sup>12</sup> Abundant evidence for such a distinction is provided by the following list of cases in which Ogh are in agreement against C.

10. 3: neque C, nec Ogh; 18. 5: puerulorum C, puerorum Ogh; 20. 3: conubium C, conubii ius Ogh; 29. 9: mortuorum pecuniae] mortuorum peccuniae C, pecuniae mortuorum Ogh; 32. 4: quos ad C, ad quos Ogh; 34. 4: sententiarumque C, sententiarumve Ogh; 34. 5: vocant C, vocantur Ogh; 35. 3: vocant C, appellant Ogh; 37. 4: hinc ea] ea C, hinc Ogh; 43. 7: non possis arbitrum C, arbitrum non possis Ogh; 44. 2: Curiana causa Cg, causa Curiana Og<sup>2</sup>h; 44. 3: qui C, agens (aiens gh) de eo qui Ogh; 46. 5: pupillae aut pupillo C, pupillo aut (et g) pupillae Ogh; 47. 1: a C, ex Ogh; 49. 5: si C, ut si Ogh; 50. 8: forma C, formula Ogh; 52. 5: rubor pallor C, pallor rubor Ogh; 54. 6: ex C, om. Ogh; 58. 6: vi sua C, sua vi Ogh; 58. 7: quod C, non quod Ogh; 58. 8-9: causam statuae C, statuae causam Ogh; 60. 9: causa fuit in parentibus C, in parentibus causa (casa O) fuit Ogh; 63. 7: est C, om. Ogh; 66. 3-4: aequius melius] quid equius melius C, quid melius aequius Ogh; 66. 5: illi (third) C, om. Ogh; 66. 8: esset C, fuisset Ogh; 66. 10: cognititis argumentorum C, argumentorum cognititis Ogh; 67. 1: locus ille C, ille locus Ogh; 69. 1: plura bona ut C, ut plura bona Ogh; 72. 7: ad te haec ita C, haec ita ad (a g) te Ogh; 75. 2: nonnumquam verum C, verum nonnumquam Ogh; 76. 1: fortuitorum, C fortuitarum rerum Ogh; 86. 6: ad (second) C, et Ogh; 87. 3: dixi C, diximus Ogh; 87. 7-8: appellari de eodem et de altero C, de eodem et de (et de om. O, de om. g) altero appellari Ogh; 90. 2: conligentur C, colliguntur Ogh; 90. 7: etiam C, etiam (etiam om. O) rursus Ogh || dicitur esse C, esse dicitur Ogh; 90. 9: aut C, atque Ogh; 92. 5: de tribus C, om. Ogh; 96. 2: legem dicere C, lege dici Ogh.

On the basis of the readings just listed it may be concluded tentatively that the archetype of fam. 1 was the source of two hypothetical manuscripts,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , with  $\alpha$  in turn serving as the source of C, and  $\beta$  as the source of Ogh. Within the  $\beta$ -subdivision, O is somewhat more closely related to g than to h, as is shown by the following list of cases in which Og are in agreement against h (and, in most instances, against C).

12. No attempt is made here to determine the exact position of f in relation to the other manuscripts of fam. 1, since the variants of f cited in the critical texts are far from complete.

14. 5: duae formae Ch, formae duae Og; 26. 6: duo sunt genera h, sunt duo genera C, duo genera sunt Og; 27. 8: si agnationem (agnitionem C) Ch, om. Og; 28. 6: consistat Ch, consistit Og; 30. 6: haec Ch, hoc Og; 31. 7: sunt igitur eae] sunt igitur he h, igitur hae sunt C, igitur sunt hae Og; 32. 8-9: attinet Ch, pertinet Og; 33. 5: divisione Ch, divisionem Og; 35. 6: idem Ch, quidem Og; 42. 6: est usus Ch, usus est Og; 58. 7: naturam Ch, natura Og; 71. 7: igitur Ch, igitur igitur Og; 72. 10: possumus Ch, possumus Og; 75. 5: insaniam Ch, insania Og; 93. 2-3: Latine appelletur C, appellatur latine h, appellatur latine Og.

In spite of the close affinity existing among Ogh, neither g nor h was copied from O, as can be seen from the following cases in which both retain readings omitted by O.

15. 3: non (second); 29. 13: adde; 30. 4: manus; 40. 1: etiam; 47. 4: autem; 54. 4: quoque; 58. 2: rerum; 63. 4: aliae (first); 82. 17: autem; 96. 12: rebus; 99. 1: et (second).

At the same time g and h cannot be copies of each other since each has omissions not shared by the other. To cite only one example in each case, 26. 4: et primum de ipsa definitione dicatur, is omitted by h but preserved by g, while 63. 1-2: constantia in aliis non inest, is omitted by g but present in h.

Each of the members of fam. 1 has a certain number of readings peculiar to itself. Because of the special role of O in the past history of the text of the *Topica*, the following partial list of readings peculiar to it will perhaps be of interest to the student of Cicero, especially since most of them have not been listed in the critical editions.

14. 8: fuerit] fuit O; 15. 3: non (second) om. O; 22. 1: causis] rebus O; 22. 3: at si quis] sed qui O; 22. 5: praestare] restaurare O; 23. 2: convenit] convenerit O; 24. 6: tecto] tectu O; 27. 5: rursus] rursum O; 27. 11-12: explicanda sunt] est explicanda O; 28. 9: cessio] concessio O; 29. 6: pecuniae] pecuniae sunt O; 29. 13: adde om. O; 30. 2: differant] differunt O; 30. 4: manus om. O; 30. 5: formae sunt] vero sunt formae O; 33. 8: est infinitior] infinitior est O, infinitior g, est diffinitior h; 33. 9: rivorum a fonte] a fonte rivorum O; 34. 7: interesse] interesset O; 36. 3-4: partitio-

Any conclusions based on the limited evidence available would be of little or no value.

nem] *divisionem* Cgh, *divisione* O; 36. 5: *frena*] *frenos* O; 36. 9: *esse verbi*] *verbi esse* O; 37. 1: *iunctum*] *coniunctum* O; 37. 3: *limine*] *lumine* O; 40. 1: *etiam om.* O; 40. 2: *genere*] *forma* Cg, *pro forma* O; 43. 1: *genus*] *genus est quod* O; 44. 4: *mortuus*] *moreretur* O; 44. 5: *hereditatem*] *hereditatem secundus heredes* O; 45. 10: *multa*] *multaque gh*, *multa quod* O; 47. 4: *autem om.* O; 51. 4: *inquiebat*] *inquibat* O || *tale quid*] *quid tale* Cgh, *quid talem* O; 52. 3: *crepitus strepitus*] *strepitus crepitus* O; 52. 4: *quid eiusmodi*] *quid est huiusmodi gh*, *quidem huiusmodi* O; 52. 5: *signa*] *signa sunt* O; 53. 2–3: *qui etiam ab adiunctis longe diversus est om.* Cgh (with the preceding *et repugnantibus* also omitted by g), *longe ab adiunctis diversus* O; 54. 4: *quoque om.* O; 55. 1: *illa rethorum sunt*] *modo sunt illa rethorum* O; 55. 5: *sec cum*] *sic um* O; 57. 9: *sunt necessariae*] *necessariae Cgh*, *necessariae sunt* O; 58. 2: *rerum om.* O; 61. 1: *a quo*] *in quo* O; 61. 3: *Pelio nisi enim*] *pelio cese securibus abiegnae ad terram trabes cecidissent nisi enim* O; 63. 4: *aliae* (first) *om.* O; 63. 8: *etiam*] *aque etiam* O; 69. 6: *autem*] *autem sic* O; 69. 13: *utentia*] *vigentia* O; 70. 2: *contenta*] *contempta* O; 70. 7: *commoda*] *autem commoda* O; 73. 14: *his rebus*] *rebus his* O; 77. 1: *haec fere sunt*] *fere sunt haec* O; 77. 7: *multarumque*] *mutarumque* O; 78. 1: *homine*] *nomine* O; 78. 2: *autem est*] *est autem* O; 82. 17: *autem om.* O; 83. 9: *ceteraque*] *et ceteraque* O; 83. 10: *natura*] *et natura* O; 84. 8: *si fugienda*] *vel si fugienda* O; 90. 2: *hi*] *hic* O; 92. 9: *vocetur*] *vocantur* O; 95. 7: *firmius*] *firmum* O; 96. 12: *rebus om.* O; 98. 4: *habet*] *habent* O; 99. 1: *et* (second) *om.* O; 99. 2: *invidia*] *invidiam* O; 99. 3: *praecepta*] *percepta* O.

From the classification of fam. 1 outlined above, the following guidelines emerge for the interpretation of the new evidence provided by Cgh. When readings of Cgh agree with those of O or Of against all other manuscripts, it is obvious that such items may be labeled as fam. 1 readings with much greater certainty than was formerly attainable in cases in which only O and f were available as witnesses. Hence, in view of the acknowledged superiority of fam. 1 over fam. 2, those readings common to COgh deserve serious consideration for adoption into the text. Since Bornecque accepted readings of O less consistently than Friedrich and Wilkins had done before him and Hubbell was to do later, the practical result of the application of the principle stated above

would be rejection of many of Bornecque's readings, in favor of alternate readings accepted by Friedrich, Wilkins, and Hubbell on O's testimony, in those instances in which the O readings are definitely established as the readings of fam. 1 by the evidence of Cgh. Such items are indicated by an asterisk in the list of COgh readings given above. Future editors may, by reason of the new evidence available, prefer to restore some of these readings.

There are some additional cases in which readings accepted by Friedrich, Wilkins, and Hubbell, though not found in all manuscripts of the COgh (and f) group, still deserve serious consideration for inclusion in the text, since they are supported by somewhat more restricted combinations of fam. 1 manuscripts, such as COg, COh, CO, or Cgh. The following are examples.

2. 5: *illam*] *illa* COh (but with *illa* preceding *tibi* in O); 9. 6: *est ergo*] *ergo est* COh; 10. 8: *asse*] *aere* COhf; 23. 7: *re om.* Cghf (but not *om.* O, as reported by Bornecque); 27. 2: *tangive*] *tangique* COgf; 33. 1: *autem*] *tum* COgf; 33. 7: *subiciuntur*] *subiciantur* CO; 53. 2–3: *qui etiam ab adiunctis longe diversus est om.* Cgh (with the preceding *et repugnantibus* also omitted by g); 57. 9: *sunt necessariae*] *necessariae Cgh*; 58. 4: *et quidem*] *equidem* COf; 71. 10: *forma*] *formis* COh; 76. 6: *generis est*] *est generis* CO; 79. 5: *alios*] *alios quibusdam alios* COh (with *alios quibus alios* in g).

On the other hand, there are several instances in which Bornecque's readings are to be preferred to those of the other editors. Often when Bornecque has rejected a reading of O in favor of other manuscripts, but Friedrich, Wilkins, and Hubbell have accepted the O reading, presumably on the assumption that this is the reading of fam. 1, it will be found that C agrees with Bornecque's text against O. In such cases, it is obvious that the O readings are not genuine fam. 1 readings, but represent errors which have crept into O itself or, if they are shared by gh, into the archetype of the  $\beta$ -subdivision of this family. At the same time, the agreement of C in these cases with the fam. 2 manuscripts indicates that C has inherited the common reading of

fam. 1 and fam. 2 through the archetype of fam. 1 and thus has preserved the correct reading. The following is a list of those cases in which C, by supporting the Bornecque readings (based on fam. 2) against the O readings accepted jointly by Friedrich, Wilkins, and Hubbell, indicates that a preference should be given to the Bornecque version over the alternate version.

2. 3-4: *libris illis* (not *illis libris*); 15. 4: *est* (not *esset*); 22. 1: *causis* (not *rebus*); 22. 3: *at si quis* (not *sed qui*); 29. 9: *mortuorum pecuniae* (not *pecuniae mortuorum*); 34. 4: *sententiarumque* (not *sententiarumve*); 35. 3: *vocant* (not *appellant*); 35. 6: *idem* (not *quidem*); 36. 5: *frena* (not *frenos*); 43. 7: *non possis arbitrum* (not *arbitrum non possis*); 44. 2: *Curiana causa* (not *causa Curiana*); 46. 5: *pupillae aut pupillo* (not *pupillo aut pupillae*); 52. 5: *rubor pallor* (not *pallor rubor*); 53. 14: *omne argentum* (not *argentum omne*); 55. 1: *rhethorum sunt* (not *rhethorum*); 58. 8-9: *causam statuæ* (not *statuæ causam*); 60. 9: *causa fuit in parentibus* (not *in parentibus causa fuit*); 66. 10: *cognitis argumentorum* (not *argumentorum cognitis*); 67. 1: *locus ille* (not *ille locus*); 72. 7: *ad te haec ita* (not *haec ita ad te*); 73. 14: *his rebus* (not *rebus his*); 75. 2: *nonnumquam verum* (not *verum nonnumquam*); 78. 2: *autem est* (not *est autem* as in Wilkins and Hubbell or *autem* as in Friedrich); 83. 10: *natura* (not *et natura*); 93. 2-3: *Latine appelletur* (not *appelletur Latine*).

The fact that the identity of the readings of fam. 1 can now be established with a much greater degree of certainty by the use of the three new manuscripts of this family favors the acceptance of several items now witnessed by COgh (or COg or COh or CO) which all editors formerly rejected when they were supported only by O or Of. In the following list of such instances, the first reading cited is that of Bornecque, the second, the new reading recommended.

8. 8-9: *ducuntur*] *dicuntur* COgh; 15. 1: *exesae* CO (also supported by the reading of h, which is *hae corrosae vel exesae*); 27. 5: *sunt*] *sunt earum autem* (aute g) *rerum quae non sunt* COgh; 31. 4: *et quasi*] *quasi* COg; 39. 5: *propiore*] *loco propiore* (with *loco* appearing in COgh);

40. 2: *genere*] *forma* COg (with *pro* prefixed in O); 43. 4: *finis magis*] *magis* COg; 64. 4: *subcitur ille*] *ille subcitur* COgh; 66. 4: *parati eis*] *parati* COgh; 68. 3: *ea quae*] *omnia quae* COgh (but with *omnia* preceded by *ea* in Ogh); 73. 7: *maxima*] *maxime* COgh; 75. 4: *quo id*] *ad quod* COgh; 78. 7: *rentur eos*] *videntur eis* COgh; 79. 6: *duo genera*] *duo sunt genera* C (but with the same words appearing in the order *duo genera sunt* in Ogh); 82. 7-8: *primum . . . secundum . . . tertium*] *prima . . . secunda . . . tertia* COgh; 82. 17: *sic*] *sic ut cum* COgh; 96. 2: *defenditur*] *defendetur* COgh.

In a few instances in which all recent editors have followed O against the manuscripts of fam. 2, Cgh agree with fam. 2 against O. It is obvious that in such cases Cgh rather than O reflect the fam. 1 readings, and their evidence combined with that of fam. 2, outweighs the evidence of O. The following four readings thus supported by Cgh and fam. 2 should be accepted into the text.

11. 6: *adiunctis*] *coniunctis*; 69. 8: *atque*] *et*; 80. 3: *autem aut*] *autem*; 96. 7: *ista*] *ita*.<sup>13</sup>

Among items which deserve special comment is the reading of O for *tecto* in *eius* (24. 6). Bornecque, Wilkins, and Hubbell (with Friedrich maintaining silence) report that O, along with the other manuscripts, reads in *tectum eius* at this point. Actually the reading of O is *tectu* in *eius*, which is very close to the *tecto* in *eius* accepted by editors from the commentary of Boethius.

The expression *earum autem rerum quae non sunt*, which appears between *sunt* and *non* (27. 5) in COgh, obviously was in the archetype of fam. 1 and probably was in the archetype of the *Topica*, but it was omitted by the archetype of fam. 2 because it ends with the same word (*sunt*) as the preceding passage. It should be added to the text.

The clause *qui etiam ab adiunctis longe diversus est* (53. 2-3), included by Bornecque but omitted by other recent editors, is absent from Cgh. A portion of the clause appears in O in the form *longe ab adiunctis diversus*. Bornecque provides no information in his apparatus as to the source of the passage. If,

13. Although Bornecque lists *ista* as the reading of the second hand in the fam. 2 cluster, *ita* is recorded by him as

being the reading of the first hand of this family. This, therefore, is the reading pertinent to the present situation.

as seems probable, he has based it on the text of O, support for it from this quarter is very weak, since O at this point clearly does not preserve the reading of fam. 1. Hence, unless there is unreported support for it in fam. 2, the passage should be removed from the text.

In 66. 2, where Bornecque has agier in place of the agier oportet of the other editors, neither reading is duplicated in full by any manuscript of the COgh group. But the presence of oportet in C and oporteat in the other three indicates that agier oportet should be preferred to a version which omits oportet.

The reading ex aliis libris found in C for 99. 3, though found only in this manuscript,

is an improvement over the aliis in libris or aliis libris of the the printed editions and so deserves a place in the text.

From the data which have been presented above, it becomes clear that the three new manuscripts of the *Topica* discussed in this paper will be of considerable value to future editors of this work. This is especially true of C, since it is perhaps as much as a half century older than O, hitherto regarded as the best representative of fam. 1, and often preserves a more accurate version of the text of fam. 1 than that to be found in O.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

### P. OXY. 2359 AND STESICHORUS' ΣΥΟΘΗΡΑΙ

The hunt of the Calydonian boar was a popular theme in classical art and literature and makes its first appearance in *Iliad* 9. 529 ff. Artemis, Homer tells us, set loose upon the Calydonians a fierce boar because their king, Oeneus, did not offer to her the first fruits of his land. Meleager, son of Oeneus, gathered together a hunting party and slew the boar. In a subsequent dispute over the beast's hide Meleager slew the Curetes, the sons of Thestius and brothers of Meleager's mother, Althaea.

Among the numerous authors who have treated this topic Stesichorus is to be included. The title of his work and the only lines that could be attributed to it before the emergence of papyrological evidence are provided by Athenaeus at *Deipnosophistae* 3. 95: Στησίχορος τέ φησιν ἐν Συοθήραις. "κρύψαι δὲ ῥύγχος / ἄκρον γὰρ ὑπένερθεν." The situation appeared to change in 1956 when E. Lobel, in a volume of Oxyrhynchus papyri devoted to Greek poetry, placed under the heading Stesichorus, Συοθήραι (?), the following fragment, consisting of two adjacent columns:<sup>1</sup>

Column i.  
Θεο]τιάδαι.  
]αρ ὀψιγόνου τε καὶ ἀσπασί-  
οι ]ν ἐν μεγάρ[ο]ισιν· ἀτὰρ πόδας

]τ...αθο. Προκάων Κλυτί-  
ος ]σθαν.  
]ας δὲ μόλ' [E]ὑρυτίων  
]ς τανυπ[έ]πλου  
]ας  
]. Εἰλατίδαο δαίφρονος

Column ii.

ἔνθεν μὲν Λοκρ[οὶ  
ἰζάνον αἰχματαί[  
τέκνα φιλα[  
ηρὲς Ἀχαιοί[  
καὶ ὑπερθύμοι[  
θ' ἱερὰν Βοιωτῖδ[α ν]αίον[  
χθόνα πυροφόρ[ον. ]  
ἔνθεν δ' αὖ Δρύοπ[έ]ς τε καί[ι  
λοι μενεχάρμα[ι

Lobel attributes this fragment to Stesichorus on the grounds that the language and meter are characteristic of him;<sup>2</sup> he also thinks that, if it does belong to Stesichorus, it is almost certain that column i is from the *Συοθήραι*.<sup>3</sup> It consists of a catalogue of individuals; the catalogue includes the sons of Thestius and Eurytion, who have important parts to play in the traditional accounts of the hunt. Eurytion was accidentally killed by Pelias in

1. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XXXIII* (London 1956), no. 2359 (Stesichorus 45 [Page]).

2. On the meter of this fragment, see B. Snell, "Stesichorus' *Συοθήραι*," *Hermes*, LXXXV (1957), 249-51.

3. Lobel's identification has been generally accepted. However, in a review of this volume of the papyri (*CR*, VIII [1958], 17), H. Lloyd-Jones suggests that the fragment might belong to Stesichorus' *Ἀθλα ἐν Πελίᾳ*.