

XXXII. The Sources and the Character of *Del governo de' regni*

JOHN-THEOPHANES PAPADEMETRIOU

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

In 1583, a collection of fables was printed at Ferrara under the title, *Del governo de' regni*.¹ This was an Italian rendition of the celebrated book, *The Fables of Bidpai*. It is not to the immediate purpose of this study to recount the vicissitudes of the book as it moved westward from India, the country of its origin, to eastern and western Europe.² Suffice it to note here that this book was formed by substantial Indian, Persian, and Arabic contributions to and modifications of the nucleus of the *Pañcatantra*. The various versions of this book, which enjoyed extreme popularity for many centuries, have been known under literally scores of different titles, such as *The Fables of Bidpai* (or, *Pilpai*), *Kalilah*

¹ L. Allatius, *De Symeonum scriptis diatriba* (Paris 1664) 184 and, after him, Fabricius quote erroneously 1584 as the year of the first edition of the book instead of 1583. *Del governo* was edited by E. Teza: *Del governo de' regni sotto morali essempli di animali ragionanti tra loro*, in the series: *Scelta di curiosità letterarie inedite o rare dal secolo XIII al XVII in appendice alla collezione di opere inedite o rare*, No. 125, Bologna 1872. Teza's text is a reprint of the original edition and was printed in only 206 copies. All references to *Del governo* hereafter refer to the pages of Teza's edition. For literature pertaining to *Del governo*, see C. Filosa, *La favola e la letteratura esopiana in Italia dal medio evo ai nostri giorni*, in the series: *Storia dei generi letterari italiani* (Milano 1952) 135-36. On pages 128-32, Filosa discusses also other Italian versions of the *Fables of Bidpai*.

² See I. G. N. Keith-Falconer, *Kalilah and Dimnah or the Fables of Bidpai* (Cambridge 1885) xiii-lxxxvi; also, Joh. Hertel, *Das Pañcatantra, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914) 401 ff. On page lxxxvi of Keith-Falconer and page 403 of Hertel, there are tables indicating the genealogical relations of the various versions of the *Fables of Bidpai*. Such tables can also be found in F. Max Müller, *Selected Essays on Language, Mythology and Religion* 1 (London 1881) 528; M. Landau, *Die Quellen des Decameron* (Stuttgart 1884), inserted between pages 18 and 19; J. Jacobs, *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai* (London 1888) lxxx; V. Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux arabes* 2 (Liège 1897) ix. Chauvin, *op. cit.*, pages vi-vii, mentions three other old genealogical tables which are not listed here. The most complete table was published by F. Edgerton in C. H. Tawney's and N. M. Penzer's *The Ocean of Story* 5 (London 1926) 243. It should be noted, however, that none of the above listed tables is truly complete. For example, the sixteenth century Greek version of Th. Zygomalas is not listed in any of them. For bibliography, see primarily Chauvin, *op. cit.*

wa-Dimnah, Stephanitēs kai Ichnēlatēs, Directorium humanae vitae, Novus Aesopus, etc. The Italian version, the subject of this article, was published by the printer Dominico Mammarelli and was dedicated by him to a notable lady of his time.³

Giulio Nuti, a versifier who lived at Ferrara during the second part of the sixteenth century, has been considered the author of this Italian version.⁴ His name appears at the top of a sonnet included in the original edition of *Del governo* and dedicated to the same lady to whom Mammarelli addressed the entire book. The absence of any explicit statement to the effect that Nuti also translated the text of *Del governo* has given rise to some dispute regarding the translator's identity.⁵ The source of the translation, however, is indicated in a rather obscure prefatory paragraph which mentions the Greek version of Symeon Seth.⁶ Symeon's version was, in turn, a translation made in the 11th century A.D. from the Arabic of Ibn al-Muqaffa.⁷

³ See *Del governo* xxix.

⁴ See Filosa (above, note 1) 132.

⁵ See E. Teza, "Appunti per la bibliografia del Panchatantra," *Orient und Occident* 2 (Göttingen 1864) 707-17 (esp. 707-9). Teza denied that Nuti translated *Del governo*, mainly on the grounds that: (a) Nuti is not mentioned in the edition as the translator of the book, but only as the composer of the accompanying sonnet; and (b) Nuti is an obscure author and is not likely to have known Greek. Teza, however, did not attempt to identify the translator. A new theory concerning the question of authorship is advanced (see below, 434-37).

⁶ Concerning Symeon Seth, see L. Allatius (above, note 1) 181-84; P. Possinus' *Glossarium* to his edition of Pachymeres' *De Andronico Palaeologo*, Migne PG, vol. 144, columns 742 and 745; Ch. Graux, *Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs de Suède, mises en ordre et complétées* par Albert Martin (Paris 1889) 36, where older works on Seth are listed; Geo. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* 1 (Baltimore 1927) 771, where more references are given. A new theory concerning the identity of Symeon Seth was proposed by S. Eustratiades in his articles, "Συμεὼν Λογοθέτης ὁ Μεταφραστής," *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 8 (1931) 47-65, and "'Ο Χρόνος τῆς ἀκμῆς Συμεὼν τοῦ Μεταφραστοῦ," *ibid.* 10 (1933) 26-38.

⁷ The version of Ibn al-Muqaffa has been preserved in a very large number of Arabic manuscripts. The Arabic text of Muqaffa has been the subject of a great many studies and has been edited repeatedly. A general survey of the Arabic manuscripts was published by M. Sprengling, "Kalila Studies," *AJSemL* 40 (1924) 81-97. See also L. Cheikho, "The Text of Kalilah and Dimnah" (in Arabic), *Al-Mashriq* 4 (1901) 978-86. For the influence of Ibn al-Muqaffa on Arabic literature, see G. Richter, *Studien zur Geschichte der älteren arabischen Fürstenspiegel*, in the series *Leipziger semitistische Studien*, N. F., 2 (Leipzig 1932). The best editions of Muqaffa's Arabic text are the following two: L. Cheikho, *La version arabe de Kalilah et Dimnah, d'après le plus ancien manuscrit arabe daté* (Beyrouth 1905; 2nd revised edition 1923). Cheikho's text was translated into Italian by M. M. Moreno: *La versione araba del libro di Kalilah e Dimnah* (Sanremo 1910); also, into Russian by I. Iu. Krachkovskii and I. P. Kuzmin, *Kalila i Dimna*² (Moscow 1957). The most recent (and best) edition, based on the

From the time of Leo Allatius on, various scholars have called attention to this Italian literary work without, however, offering satisfactory answers to many problems concerning it. Since *Del governo* is a translation from the Greek, determining the character of the Italian rendition and the possible additions by the translator hinges on the clarification of the relation between the Italian and its source. This task has been complicated because the printed Greek texts of *Stephanitês* have been and still are far from definitive, since none of them has taken into consideration the entire and very complex manuscript tradition of the book. The best Greek edition was made by Vittorio Puntoni in 1889 on the basis of nine Greek manuscripts belonging to four different recensions.⁸ (References made hereafter to the Greek text are to the chapters, pages, and paragraphs of Puntoni's edition.) Before his edition of the Greek text appeared, Puntoni had published a detailed and painstaking comparative study of the same nine Greek manuscripts, the Latin translation of Possinus,⁹ *Del*

oldest Arabic manuscript, was made by Taha Husein and Dr. 'Azzâm, *Kitâb Kalilah wa-Dimnah* (Cairo 1941). This text was translated into French by A. Miquel: *Ibn al-Muqaffa' Le livre de Kalila et Dimna*, in the series *Études arabes et islamiques, textes et traductions* 1 (Paris 1957). For older editions of the Arabic text, see V. Chauvin, *op. cit.*, vol. 2; and W. N. Brown, "A Comparative Translation of the Arabic *Kalila wa-Dimna*, Chapter vi," *JAOS* 42 (1922) 217-18.

The life of Ibn al-Muqaffa has been the subject of numerous studies; a recent and informative one is by D. Sourdel, "La Biographie d'Ibn al Muqaffa' d'après les sources anciennes" in *Arabica* 1 (1954) 307-23; see also the excellent study of F. Gabrieli, "L'Opera d' Ibn al-Muqaffa'," *Rivista degli studi orientali* 13 (1932) 197-247.

⁸ V. Puntoni: *ΣΤΕΦΑΝΙΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΙΧΝΗΛΑΤΗΣ*, quattro recensioni della versione Greca del *Kitâb Kalilah wa-Dimnah* (the Arabic title in Arabic characters), in the *Pubblicazioni della Società asiatica italiana* 2 (Firenze 1889). The first edition of the Greek text was made by S. G. Stark, *Specimen sapientiae Indorum veterum; id est, liber ethico-politicus, pervetustus, dictus arabice* (Arabic title), *Graece ΣΤΕΦΑΝΙΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΙΧΝΗΛΑΤΗΣ* (Berlin 1697). This text was reprinted in Athens by Typaldos in 1851. Stark's text was based on only one manuscript in which the Greek prefatory chapters were left out. The prefaces omitted in Stark were published by P. F. Aurivillius: *Prolegomena ad librum Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης e codice manuscripto Bibliot. Acad. Upsal. edita et latine versa dissertatione academica quam praes. Joh. Flodero publico examini submittit Pet. Fabian. Aurivillius* (Upsaliae 1780). The text of the prefaces was published again (on the basis of two other Greek manuscripts) by V. Puntoni, appended to his edition of the *Directorium: Directorium humanae vitae, alias parabola antiquorum sapientium; accedunt prolegomena tria ad librum ΣΤΕΦΑΝΙΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΙΧΝΗΛΑΤΗΣ* (Pisa 1884).

⁹ The Latin translation of Possinus appeared in 1666 as an appendix to Georgios Pachymeres' *Historia rerum a Michaelae Palaeologo gestarum*. The appendix is entitled, *Appendix ad observationes Pachymerianas. Specimen sapientiae Indorum veterum. Liber olim ex lingua Indica in Persicam a Perzoe medico: ex Persica in Arabicam ab anonymo; ex Arabica in Graecam a Symeone Seth; a Petro Possino Societ. Jesu novissime e Graeca in Latinam translatus*. Possinus' publication was reprinted in Venice in 1729, and again in vol.

governo, and several Arabic manuscripts containing the version of Ibn al-Muqaffa.¹⁰ In this paper (referred to below as "Memoria"), Puntoni contributed most of what has been known about the sources of *Del governo*. Other scholars who had dealt with *Del governo* before Puntoni had a much more limited knowledge of the manuscript tradition of the Greek text; consequently, the results of their labors were not very enlightening.

Puntoni put the study of *Del governo* on a firmer foundation, and through a comparison with his Greek manuscripts he demonstrated that the Italian translator had indeed drawn on Symeon's text. A comparison of the two texts reveals that *Del governo* repeats two of the three prefaces in the Greek, i.e. Prefaces B and C, and fourteen of the fifteen regular chapters (Chapter 8 is not included). According to Puntoni, the first seven chapters of *Del governo* were based on Greek recension III, and the text of the prefaces was based on recension I. Puntoni believed that the remaining chapters (9 to 15) came from a source kindred to recension I.¹¹

It is hardly necessary to present more evidence to prove that Symeon's translation of *Stephanitês* was the source of *Del governo*, although there would be no difficulty in adducing further proof. There is only one story in *Del governo* that had been thought up to the present time to have no equivalent in the Greek manuscripts of *Stephanitês*; but, now, as will be shown below, this story is known to exist in one Greek manuscript, E², that has not been

143 (1891) of Migne, PG. It is now known that Possinus used for his translation the Greek Codex Barberinianus 1.172. See L.-O. Sjöberg, "Eine verschwundene Handschrift des Stephanites-Textes," *BZ* 50 (1957) 4-6; also, cf. J.-Th. Papademetriou, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of Stephanitês kai Ichnêlatês* (Urbana 1960) [hereafter referred to as *Studies*] 73-82; *Studies* is the author's doctoral dissertation, written under the sponsorship of Prof. B. E. Perry and accepted by the Univ. of Illinois in 1960, when it became available to the public through the facilities of the University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich., in microfilm and photo-offset copies. An abstract summarizing the findings of *Studies* appeared in *Dissertation Abstracts* 21 (Ann Arbor [Mich.] 1961) 2707. The subject of the present article was suggested to the writer by his research for *Studies*, but it does not constitute part of it or summarize its results.

¹⁰ V. Puntoni, "Sopra alcune recensioni dello Stephanites kai Ichnelates," *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, serie quarta, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 2 (Rome 1886) 113-82.

¹¹ See Puntoni's edition, page v, and "Memoria," pages 138-42 and pages 164 ff. E. Jamison, however, in her recent book, *Admiral Eugenius of Sicily, His Life and Work and the Authorship of the Epistola ad Petrum and the Historia Hugonis Falcandi Siculi* (London 1957) 11, note 1, places *Del governo* in recension III.

explored until now.¹² Consequently, the main concern in this discussion will be to identify the exact source of *Del governo* and to define more precisely the relation of the Italian text to its Greek prototype. On these points, Puntoni's views, which have been generally accepted hitherto, must be substantially altered and expanded.

The background of the following discussion is the study of forty-three Greek codices containing the text of *Stephanitês*.¹³ These codices fall into six distinct recensions which differ extensively from one another. Recensions I–IV correspond, in terms of general contents, to the ones recognized by Puntoni. Recensions V and VI are introduced for the first time.

The view sustained below is that the Greek sources of *Del governo* are exclusively recensions I and V and, more specifically, manuscripts E (=recension I) and E² (=recension V).¹⁴ Manuscript E contributed the two prefaces and Chapters 12 to 15, while E² contributed Chapters 1 to 11. It is important to state here that E and E² are found respectively in fols. 1r–141v and 193r–248r of the same codex, now at the Escorial. This codex, in the past, had escaped the attention of the students of *Stephanitês*.

Before the direct dependence of part of *Del governo* on manuscript E is demonstrated, it will be necessary to discuss the relation of the Italian text to recension I in general.

That the two prefaces, B and C, of *Del governo* came from recension I is easy to establish. The two prefaces are fused into one continuous text in the Italian exactly as they are in recension I.¹⁵ The text of recension I in Prefaces B and C is characterized

¹² The symbol E² represents the text of Codex Escorialensis Y.-III.-6 fols. 193r–248r. Another recension of the Greek text is preserved in the same codex in fols. 1r–141v; the text in these folios is represented hereafter by the symbol E. Two other Greek manuscripts are mentioned frequently in this article: H¹=Codex Atheniensis, 1201, pages 1–174; and L¹=Codex Laurentianus 57.30, pages 1–78. Manuscripts E, H¹, and L¹ belong to the Greek recension I.

¹³ Most of these manuscripts were explored for the first time in *Studies* and are listed on pages vi–viii; to the manuscripts listed therein, the following ones should be added: Codex XΣ 16 of the public library of Kozane (which does not contain the text of Zygomalas, as implied in *Studies* 164, but that of Symeon Seth); an extensive fragment in Codex 373 of the library of Trinity College in Dublin; Codex N 156 of the Zamoyiski Library in Warsaw; Codex C 46 sup. of the Ambrosian Library of Milan; and a fragment in Codex 468 of the Synodal Library in Moscow. The existence of the last three manuscripts became known to the writer through a kind communication (Aug. 14, 1961) of Mr. L.-O. Sjöberg to Prof. B. E. Perry.

¹⁴ See above, note 11.

¹⁵ Concerning the text of the prefaces in all Greek recensions, see *Studies* 126–45.

by a set of extensive and intentional omissions. These omissions cover a good part of the text between fables in which moralistic elaborations on the fables are usually expounded. In *Del governo* the very same portions are left out. Since this set of lacunae is not duplicated by any other Greek recension, there can be no doubt that the prefaces of *Del governo* are a translation of the prefaces of recension 1. The most striking lacunae of *Del governo* and recension 1 in the prefaces are:

1. Preface B ends after the text corresponding to Puntoni, page 26, line 15. In addition, the beginning of Preface C is also missing. Thus, Prefaces B and C are fused into one unit, and we go directly from the Fable of the Thief with the Mantle and the Poor Man to the Fable of the Secret Word *Selem*. This lacuna covers a lengthy portion of the text (= Puntoni, page 26, after line 15 to page 33, line 22).

2. The text between the Fable of the Secret Word *Selem* and the following fable is also omitted (= Puntoni, page 38, line 1 to page 39, line 2).

3. The text between the Fables of the Adulterer and the Well and The Pearls to be Pierced is also left out (= Puntoni, page 39, line 16 to page 40, line 17).

4. The text between the following two fables (= Puntoni, page 44, line 8 to page 45, line 15) is also lost.

What may be puzzling about the text of the prefaces in *Del governo* is the absence both of Preface A, which is usually found in the manuscripts of recension 1, and of the characteristic introductory paragraph of recension 1, which reads as follows:

Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῆς παρούσης πραγματείας: αὕτη πρῶτον μὲν,
ἢ περὶ τὸν Περζωὲ ἀποστολὴ πρὸς Ἰνδῖαν καὶ διάγνωσις τῶν ἐκέϊσε·
ἔπειτα ἰνδικὴ βίβλος ἣν ἐκόμισεν ἐξ Ἰνδίας, etc.

(see complete text in *Studies* [note 9], pages 44 and 129). These seeming differences between *Del governo* and recension 1 simply indicate that *Del governo* drew on the branch H¹L¹E (see note 12) of recension 1, in which both Preface A and the introductory paragraph preceding it are omitted. Of course, there is another introductory paragraph in *Del governo*, but its sources are different. This point will be further clarified below, after the

dependence of Chapters 12 to 15 of *Del governo* on the branch H¹L¹E is revealed.

In the text of Chapters 12 to 15, *Del governo* and the branch H¹L¹E of recension 1 present several similarities by virtue of which they can be contrasted as a group to any and all the other Greek manuscripts. The most important instances in point are:

1. In Chapter 12, paragraphs 138a and 138b, manuscripts H¹, L¹, and E have two extensive interpolations¹⁶ not found in any other Greek manuscripts of any recension. In *Del governo*, however, both interpolations appear.

2. In Chapter 14, H¹, L¹, and E have a unique feature not found in any other Greek manuscript, for paragraph 144a is omitted and the other paragraphs intervening between 142a and 144b have the following order: 142a, 144b, 142b, 143. This unique order of H¹L¹E is reproduced faithfully in *Del governo*.

3. In Chapter 15, H¹, L¹, and E are the only three Greek manuscripts to include paragraphs 148 and 149, which are lost in all the other Greek manuscripts of all recensions. *Del governo*, nevertheless, follows again the pattern of H¹L¹E and includes both paragraphs.

The examples cited thus far constitute sufficient reasons for considering the two prefaces and Chapters 12–15 of *Del governo* as derivatives of the branch H¹L¹E of recension 1.

The dependence of *Del governo* on manuscript E rather than on H¹ or L¹ is more difficult to demonstrate. The difficulty arises because these three manuscripts either are copies of one another or, at least, have a very close common ancestor.¹⁷ Furthermore, the copyists happen to have been extremely faithful to their exemplars, almost never interpolating or emending, but often reproducing even the orthographical mistakes of the exemplar. The differences between the three manuscripts are very infrequent and very minute. Fortunately, the careful copyists did slip on rare occasions, and thus there are a number of passages in which the

¹⁶ For the text see Puntoni, 297–98.

¹⁷ The relation between L¹ and E is discussed below, note 29. The statement that H¹ is this closely related to L¹ and E is based on a thorough comparison of the three manuscripts, the results of which will be presented in a revised edition of *Studies*, to appear in the future. The relation between H¹ and L¹ is also discussed by B. E. Perry in "Two Fables Recovered," *BZ* 54 (1961) 9–10 (esp. page 9, note 7).

reading of E differs from that of H¹ and L¹. In several such instances the differences are so minute that it is not possible to ascertain from the translation the reading of the Greek prototype. Nevertheless, in every instance where the meaning of the readings of the three Greek manuscripts differs, *Del governo* follows the reading of E against H¹ and L¹. For example, in Preface B, §6 (= Puntoni, page 26, lines 1-2), *Del governo* and E can be contrasted sharply to H¹ and L¹ (underlining added)

H ¹ , L ¹	E	<i>Del governo</i> (page 7)
and all the other Greek MSS. that contain this part of the text		
ὁ πλοῦτος	ὁ πλοῦτος	la ricchezza,
καὶ	καὶ	e
<u>ἡ παιδεία.</u>	<u>ἡ πένια.</u>	la povertà.

Another argument, of external nature, can also be adduced in support of the view that E rather than H¹ or L¹ was the source of *Del governo*. It may be repeated here that manuscript E is the beginning part of a codex that also contains E². If E², as indeed it will be shown below, is the source of *Del governo* for the other part of the text (i.e., Chapters 1 to 11), it is natural to assume that the translator resorted to the other source included in the same codex, i.e. E, rather than some other second codex such as H¹ or L¹.

It has been stated above that Chapters 1 to 11 of *Del governo* are translations of the corresponding chapters in E². The evidence in support of this statement is found primarily in the numerous and extensive lacunae that E² and *Del governo* suffer in common in this part of the text.¹⁸ All the lacunae of E² appear again in *Del governo* without exception. These numerous lacunae are extensive and intentional, and there is no room for a hypothesis attributing the similarity to accident. The resulting gaps are bridged over by intelligible connecting sentences so that only a comparison with other manuscripts reveals the loss of text. Chapter 8, which is left out in E², is also omitted in *Del governo*.

¹⁸ There are sixteen such lacunae common to *Del governo* and E². Since it would be too lengthy to describe them here, see *Studies* 90, where they are listed in connection with E².

Certain possible objections to the theory stated above concerning the source of *Del governo* for Chapters 1 to 11 should now be raised and discussed.

First, it might be argued that *Del governo* is a descendant of recension III in the part of the text that is here traced to E². Indeed, recension III has had many more representatives than recension V (= E²) and suffers most of the lacunae of recension V. Secondly, if it is admitted that E was partially the source of *Del governo*, why could not Chapters 9 to 11 come from E rather than from E²? Thirdly, *Del governo* has a peculiar introductory paragraph, right after the title of the book, which has been a puzzle to scholars for a long time. How could this paragraph be derived from the suggested sources of *Del governo*?

None of the above possible objections really contradicts the theory advanced here. Recension III could not have been the source of *Del governo* in place of E². The following facts will support this view. All the manuscripts of recension III have a lacuna in Chapter 1 where paragraphs 3b and 4 are lost. In these paragraphs, the Fable of the Doomed Man is included. The same lacuna appears also in all the other Greek manuscripts and in all the offshoots of the Greek recensions into other languages (Slavonic, vernacular Greek, and the two Latin translations¹⁹). *Del governo* and E² are the only two texts in which this Fable of the Doomed Man is preserved. An additional argument may be adduced from Chapter 9. In this chapter, recension III leaves out paragraph 133b, which both E² and *Del governo* preserve.

It is more difficult to distinguish whether E or E² was the source of *Del governo* in Chapters 9 to 11. The two manuscripts are not very different in this part of the text; and, furthermore, the translation is not always a literal one.²⁰

The first element that favors a connection with E² rather than

¹⁹ Concerning the Slavonic, see also the article of A. V. Rystenko, "Istorii Poviesti 'Stefanit i Ixnilat' v Vizantiiskoi i Slaviano-Russkoi literaturax," in *Lietopis Istoriko-Filologicheskago Obshchestvo pri Imperatorskom Novorossiiskom Universitete* 10. *Vizantiisko-Slavianskoi Otdel'nie* 7 (Odessa 1902) 238-79; also, *Studies* 160-62 and 171-72 for bibliography. Concerning the vernacular Greek version, see *ibid.* 163-65. Concerning the Latin translation of Possinus, see "Memoria," 115 ff.; and *Studies* 73-82. Concerning the Medieval Latin translation, see A. Hilka, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters*. 1. *Der Novus Aesopus des Baldo*. 2. *Eine lateinische Übersetzung der griechischen Version des Kalilabuchs*, in *Abh. d. Gesell. d. Wiss. z. Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl.*, N. F., 22 (Berlin 1928).

²⁰ See below, pages 437-39.

with E is the omission of Chapter 8 in *Del governo*. If the translator had followed manuscript E for this part, he would not have omitted Chapter 8, which E does include. It must be assumed then that he followed E² to the end of the manuscript's text (= Chapter 11), and thus omitted Chapter 8 just as E² did. This conclusion is borne out by a comparison of the readings of E, E², and *Del governo*, as indicated by the following examples. In Chapter 10, E², and *Del governo* omit the beginning sentence of paragraph 135k, which E and L¹ preserve (see Puntoni, page 288). In the same chapter at the beginning of paragraph 135o, E reads: πάντας . . . ; E² reads: ὑπὲρ πάντας . . . ; *Del governo* agrees with E², reading: sopra tutti gli altri . . . (page 129).

The introductory paragraph of *Del governo*, far from militating against the view sustained here, gives further support. This introductory paragraph comes immediately after the title of the book and reads (*Italics added*): “Sotto morali essempli / di animali ragionanti tra loro / tratti prima di lingua Indiana in Agarena da / Lelo Demno Saraceno: et poi dall’ Agarena nella / Greca da Simeone Setto Philosopho Antiocheno: / et hora tradotti di Greco in Italiano.”

This introductory paragraph resembles the introductions found in the manuscripts of recension III.²¹ Yet it differs from them as well as from the introductions of all other Greek manuscripts in the following important points:

1. It speaks as if *Stephanitês* were translated from the Indian directly into the Arabic. The introductions of all the manuscripts of recension III do not make such a point. As a matter of fact, only one manuscript (i.e. Laurentianus XI.14) alludes to an Indian version at all.
2. It attributes the translation from Indian into Arabic to “Lelo Demno” whom it calls a Saracene rather than an Arab.
3. It connects Symeon Seth with Antiochia and states that he translated the book into Greek from the “Agarene” dialect. All the other Greek manuscripts of all recensions that make reference to the Arabic version of the book use a derivative of the word Arab or Saracene, but *never* “Agarene.”

²¹ See *Studies* 91–96, where the introductory paragraphs found in the manuscripts of recension III are cited.

All the riddles of the introduction of *Del governo* can be explained with the help of the unique introductory paragraph of E² which reads as follows (the important words for this discussion are underlined):

Ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἀγαρίνων (*sic*) διαλέκτου συγγραφῆς μετένεξις Συμεὼν μαγίστρου καὶ φιλοσόφου Ἀντιοχέως τοῦ σήθ· διήγησις τῶν κατὰ Στεφανίτου (*sic*) καὶ τὸν Ἰχνηλάτην λεγόμενος (*sic*) τῇ Σαρακινικῇ (*sic*) διαλέκτῳ καὶ λήλε καὶ Δέμνε.

Certain similarities between the introductions of *Del governo* and E² are obvious. The connection of Seth with Antiochia²² and the use of the word “Agarenic” instead of “Arabic” relate these two introductions and contrast them as a group with all the other manuscripts of *Stephanitês*.

It remains to explain the mention of India in *Del governo*, which is not found in E², and the creation of this hypothetic translator, “Lelo Demno.” On the first point, only one explanation is possible within the framework of our understanding of the relation of *Del governo* to the Greek recensions of *Stephanitês*. If the suggestion that *Del governo* is based partly on E and partly on E² is correct, it should be possible to explain this difficulty with the help of these two manuscripts. E² does not mention India, but at the beginning of E the title of the book is given as: Ἰχνηλάτου καὶ Στεφανίτου μῦθοι ἰνδικοί.

Of course, the Italian translator did a little more than just mention India; he stated that “Lelo Demno” translated *Stephanitês* from Indian into the “Agarenic” language.

The words “Lelo Demno” appear also in the introduction of E², but anybody whose knowledge of *Stephanitês* was limited to E and E² would not be able to make any sense out of them.

²² Leo Allatius, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 181, states that Symeon Seth was from Antiochia and supports his statement with the testimony of a Paris manuscript; Allatius' opinion has been adopted occasionally (e.g. in Filosa, *op. cit.* [above, note 1] 135). It was refuted by Fabricius (*BG* 5.5.460, in the edition of 1714), who pointed out that the palace of Antioch in Constantinople was meant in the Paris manuscript rather than the city of Antiochia. Fabricius' argument has been repeated frequently, and most recently by M. E. Colonna, *Gli Storici bizantini dal iv al xv secolo*; 1, *Storici profani* (Naples 1956) pages 118–19. It has remained unnoticed, however, in the discussion of this question, that Symeon Seth is clearly connected with the city of Antiochia in the introductory paragraph of E², in some of the Slavic manuscripts of *Stephanitês*, and in the prefatory notes of his medical works as edited by I. L. Ideler, *Physici et medici Graeci minores* 2 (Berlin 1842) 283.

Indeed, the whole introductory paragraph as written in E² makes very little sense. The translator found himself in the difficult position of having to decipher it without the benefit of knowledge of the introductory paragraphs of other manuscripts. He must have resorted to his other manuscript, i.e. E, and found India mentioned as the place of origin of the book. Thus, he knew: (a) that there had been an "Indian" version of the book; (b) that there had been an "Agarenic" version of the book; (c) that from the "Agarenic" the book had been rendered into Greek by Symeon Seth and that this translator was named explicitly; (d) that the Greek title of the book was *Stephanitês kai Ichnêlatês*.

Then what was the translator to make out of the incomprehensible passage that appears in the introductory paragraph of E², which translated literally would read: "the one called (=masculine participle) in the Saracene dialect both Lele and Demne"? Obviously, thought the translator, this refers to a Saracene named "Lelus Demnus" who translated the book from Indian into the Agarenic. In this way everything that he knew would connect and fall into place, after a fashion.

This opinion, that "Lelo Demno" (a proper analogic transliteration of "Lelus Demnus" into Italian) was found by the translator in E², can be further supported by the fact that no other Greek manuscript of *any* recension gives a reading that approximates "Lelo Demno" more than the reading *ληλε* and *Δέμνε* of E². Also, in some other loci where the meaning of the Greek was obscure, the Italian translator displays some propensity for using his imagination in order to make sense out of obscure Greek passages.²³

Before the discussion of the sources is concluded, a brief summary of the results is in order. The translator who wrote *Del governo* drew exclusively on two Greek manuscripts still extant, namely E of recension I and E² of recension v. Generally, he did not conflate the two manuscripts but as a rule followed one at a time; even when extensive omissions appeared in his exemplar, he did not fill the gaps from the other one. He drew on manuscript E for Prefaces B and C and Chapters 12 to 15, and on manuscript E² for Chapters 1 to 11 (which is as far as E² goes). Whatever noteworthy omissions appear in the Italian translation,

²³ See the passage listed below, pages 437-38; see also, "Memoria," 160-62.

such as Preface A and Chapter 8, resulted from the existence of the very same gaps in the manuscripts used for the respective sections of the Italian text.

The date of the Escorial codex creates no problem. According to the cataloguer,²⁴ it was written by different hands in the 16th century. This is borne out by a note on fol. 141^v of E, which informs us that it was finished by a certain Gregorius on the 15th of July of 1564. Since *Del governo* was printed in 1583, it is entirely possible that it was translated from a codex written 19 years before that date.

The next question is, therefore, whether the Escorialensis Y.-III.-6, in which E and E² are found, would have been available to an Italian translator between 1564 and 1583. The internal evidence adduced thus far should suffice to prove that this was so; but further than that, the external history of the Escorial codex sustains the same view and helps to confine within even narrower time limits the composition date of *Del governo*. An investigation of the external history can lead also to a likely identification of the author of *Del governo*.

The copyist himself informs us (fol. 141^v) that the codex discussed here was written in 1564 for Francesco Patrizi (1529–1597), the famous sixteenth-century Italian hellenist and philosopher. Patrizi lived mostly in Italy, but he traveled in various parts of Europe; in the process of his travels he acquired a rich collection of manuscripts. In 1575 a large number of these manuscripts were sold by Patrizi to Philip II for the Escorial library.²⁵ The manuscripts included in this sale are recorded in an old inventory, and among them is listed the Escorial codex containing E and E².²⁶ From the description in this old inventory of the manuscript contents, there is no doubt that all the texts known to be in the

²⁴ See E. Miller, *Catalogue des mss. grecs de la Bibliothèque de l'Escurial* (Paris 1848) 228.

²⁵ Ch. Graux in his *Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de L'Escurial*, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences philologiques et historiques* 46 (Paris 1880) 127–29, mentions the fact that Patrizi sold a collection of manuscripts to Philip II, but he was not able to identify them. The old inventory mentioned in this article is published in the very informative article of E. Jacobs, "Francesco Patrizi und seine Sammlung griechischer Handschriften in der Bibliothek des Escorial," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 25 (1908) 19–47. The date of the sale is discussed on page 26. I am indebted to Prof. P. O. Kristeller for his calling my attention to this article and to its significance for the identification of the author of *Del governo*.

²⁶ See Jacobs (above, note 25) 16, 42 (entry 63), and 43.

codex now were already included in it in 1575. Consequently, there is no question as to the identification of the codex. The record of this transaction also makes it possible to determine the latest possible date that the codex would have been readily available to a translator working in Italy or anywhere outside Spain. Since it is also known from the copyist's note that the codex was written in 1564, it can be reasonably deduced that the dates 1564 and 1575 constitute the time limits within which the Italian translator must have written *Del governo*. Throughout this period Patrizi must have been the owner of the codex, and naturally the possibility arises that he was the author of the Italian version.

It is useful to recall here that the authorship of *Del governo* has been a point of dispute for a long time.²⁷ The person most frequently credited with the translation is Giulio Nuti²⁸ because he is mentioned in *Del governo* as the composer of a sonnet included therein (see above, page 423). Nevertheless, as Teza pointed out (see note 5), the appearance of Nuti's name at the top of the sonnet is hardly conclusive proof that he wrote the entire book. On the other hand, since this particular manuscript of Patrizi is clearly the source of the Italian translation, whoever wrote *Del governo* must have used it. Therefore, unless it can be proved that Nuti or someone else borrowed temporarily Patrizi's codex, and translated it, Patrizi himself must have written the translation before he sold the manuscript and then published it several years later.²⁹

²⁷ Teza (above, note 5) was not the first to deny that Nuti wrote *Del governo*. F. S. Quadrio, in his *Della storia e della ragione d'ogni poesia* 4 (Milan 1749) 105, not being aware of the Greek source of *Del governo*, considered it simply a capricious paraphrase of *La morale filosofia* of A. F. Doni, which is an Italian version of the *Fables of Bidpai* deriving indirectly from the Hebrew rather than the Greek version; see C. Filosa (above, note 1) 135, notes 31 and 35; and I. G. N. Keith-Falconer (above, note 2) lxxvii-lxxix.

²⁸ For example, Nuti is mentioned as the author of *Del governo* by W. Pertsch, "Über Nuti's italienische Bearbeitung von Symeon Seth griechischer Übersetzung des Qalilah wa Dimnah," *Orient und Occident* 2 (Göttingen 1864) 261-68, esp. 262; G. Toffanin, *Il Cinquecento*, page 551, in *Storia letteraria d'Italia* 6³ (Milan 1929); C. Filosa (above, note 1) 136. Filosa presents the most serious argument in favor of Nuti's authorship by pointing out that all of Nuti's works were printed in Ferrara by Mammarelli, the printer of *Del governo*. It is noteworthy, however, that all of Nuti's works are in poetry, and none is either a translation or simply in prose.

²⁹ According to Jacobs (above, note 25), especially page 26, Escorialensis Y.-III.-6 was written in Cyprus where Patrizi spent several years around 1564. Jacobs' arguments are forceful and take into account a number of notes by the copyists of

Besides Patrizi's ownership of the manuscript at the time that the translation was written, several other factors lend support to the view that he wrote *Del governo*. Patrizi is known to have made many translations from Greek manuscripts. Although several of these were based on manuscripts included in the collection sold to Philip II in 1575 and, therefore, must have been written before that date, the publication dates of these translations are several years later than the date of the sale.³⁰ Two of these translations are of special importance, because they present an exact parallel to the procedure which Patrizi may have followed in publishing *Del governo*. The two works are (1) *Joannis Philoponi breves, sed apprime doctae et utiles expositiones in omnes XIII Aristotelis libros eos qui vocantur metaphysici*, quas Franciscus Patricius de Graecis Latinas fecit . . . Ferrariae, apud D. Mamarellum, 1583;³¹ and (2) *Procli Elementa theologica* . . . Ferrariae, apud D.

several manuscripts in Patrizi's collection. If Jacobs' conclusion is correct, it would have been even less likely that Nuti or someone else living in Italy could have gained access to the manuscript to make a translation. There is one serious reason, however, for doubting Jacobs' conclusion concerning the provenance of this particular codex. The text of E has an extremely close affinity to another older (late 15th century) manuscript of *Stephanitês*, i.e., Laurentianus 57.30 (=L¹). The differences between the texts of the two manuscripts are extremely few and unimportant, while their similarities are striking and, except for the concurrence of Atheniensis 1201, find no parallel in the other forty manuscripts of *Stephanitês*. Moreover, it is known that L¹ was in Italy at the time that E was written, and consequently there is a strong likelihood that E should be a copy of L¹ rather than of some lost Cypriot manuscript, which would have to be assumed if Jacobs' view is correct. If it is true that E is a copy of L¹, a re-examination of the provenance of several other Escorial manuscripts which Jacobs (above, note 25) traces to Cyprus is necessary. That L¹ was in Italy in 1564 can be established beyond doubt. There are still only two manuscripts of *Stephanitês* in the Laurentian library, L¹ and L² (=Laurentianus 11.14), and they have both been there since the end of the fifteenth century, since two such manuscripts are mentioned in an inventory of the Medicean Library which was completed on Oct. 20, 1495. The inventory was written by a commission, the most prominent member of which was the famous librarian and collector of manuscripts, Ianos Lascaris. The handwritten catalogue of Lascaris' commission (which included also Lascaris' personal collection) was published in part by K. K. Müller, "Neue Mittheilungen über Janos Lascaris und die Mediceische Bibliothek," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 1 (Leipzig 1884) 332-412; see especially 336, 380, and 409; cf. also the corrections and additions of P. de Nolhac, "Inventaire des manuscrits grecs de Jean Lascaris," *Mél. Rome* 6 (Paris-Rome 1886) 251-54. Müller, in his article, cites abundant bibliography on Lascaris' efforts and journeys to the Orient for the collection of Greek manuscripts. For a more recent study, see B. Knös, *Un ambassadeur de l'hellenisme, Janus Lascaris, et la tradition byzantine dans l'humanisme français* (Paris 1945) 34 ff.

³⁰ Jacobs (above, note 25), especially 46-47.

³¹ See Jacobs (above, note 25) 40, entry 48, where Patrizi's Escorial source is described.

Mammarelum, 1583.³² The year of publication of both works, 1583, indicates clearly that, although they must have been written while Patrizi was still in possession of their manuscript sources (i.e. before 1575), several years elapsed before they were finally published; and it should be noted that their publication was in precisely the same year as that of *Del governo* (i.e. 1583) and was by the same printer (i.e. D. Mammarelli).³³ Furthermore, around this time (1578–1592) Patrizi had settled in Ferrara, where he taught at the university.³⁴

The above arguments do not explain why Patrizi's name does not appear as that of the author in the original edition of *Del governo*, but they do give greater plausibility to the claim of his authorship than those that have been advanced in favor of other candidates (see notes 5, 26, and 28).³⁵

Once the exact sources of *Del governo* are known, it is possible to observe the method and approach of the Italian translator to his task.

By and large, the translator seems to have tried to be faithful to his sources. He avoided conflation and for the most part translated literally. Yet he did have occasional flights of imagination which led him to deviate from his prototype. These occasional deviations fall generally into the following four categories:

1. Free interpretation and subsequent expansion or interpolation of the Greek, as in the introductory paragraph (see above, pages 431–32). Such interpretative attempts sometimes resulted in a complete change of the text. A good example is the following passage in which there is an amusing mixture of faithful literalism with fanciful interpretation:

³² See Jacobs (above, note 25) 35, entry 12.

³³ Actually, these are not the only works of Patrizi published by Mammarelli (the spelling of the printer's name differs in the various editions). In the same year, 1583, Mammarelli printed Patrizi's *La militia romana di Polibio, di Tito-Livio e di Dionigi Alicarnaseo da Francesco Patricii dichiarata*. Another work of Patrizi was printed by Mammarelli during the next year: *Apologia contra calumnias Theodori Angelutii* (Ferrara 1584); and several more were printed by the same D. Mammarelli or his son B. Mammarelli during subsequent years.

³⁴ See Jacobs (above, note 25) page 26.

³⁵ The final settlement of the issue of the authorship may rest with a thorough examination of Patrizi's correspondence and works, edited and inedited, and the study of the style and translation techniques used in *Del governo* in comparison with the other translations by Patrizi.

E ² (fol. 194 ^r)	<i>Del governo</i> (page 16)
Λέγεται μοί ποτε ὥς	A me è stato altre volte raccontato, che
ἔμπορός τις, πολύολβος ὦν,	e' fu un ricchissimo mercatante, il quale avendo bisogno,
καὶ βίον (sic) ἐπιετανοῦ (sic) κατὰ τὴν ποιήσιν εὐπορῶν . . .	secondo che e' disse il Poeta, della vita di Epitteto; . . .

No Greek manuscript mentions Epictetus and the passage obviously alludes to Hesiod (*Opera*, line 31):

ᾧτινι μὴ βίος ἔνδον ἐπηετανὸς κατάκειται.

In some other cases, the Greek text is expanded and dramatized. Such is the case at the end of the Fable of the Lion and the Hare in Chapter 1, where the Italian text shows “dramatic” expansion and elaboration over the Greek:

E ² (fol. 203 ^v)	<i>Del governo</i> (pages 35–36)
. . . ὅφ' ὦν	.. dalla quale
ὁ λέων	
πλανηθεὶς	ingannato, molto iracondo
ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν	vi si lanciò per vendicarsene:
ἐν τῷ φρέατι	e trovatosi in fondo, nè cosa trovando, e gridando “aiuto, aiuto, che io mi affogo” e la lepre ridendosi, ischernendolo con varii motteggi,
καὶ ἀπεπνίγη.	ve lo volle vedere affogare. Con la quale nouva ritornatasi a' compagni, fu da tutti cen grandissima letizia accolta: e fattigli di molti doni, per la libertà per lei loro ricovrata.

2. Omissions which do not come from the Greek. For instance, the text of E² corresponding roughly to Puntoni, page 99, line 18 to page 100, line 27 is omitted in *Del governo* for no obvious reason. This is part of a lengthy moralistic elaboration, the rest of which is included in *Del governo*.

3. Condensations of the Greek narrative. These appear occasionally together with omissions. For example, the text of Chapter 14 in *Del governo* is partly condensed and partly left out. Almost the entire last page of Chapter 14 in the Greek prototype (i.e. E, fol. 138^v) is not translated into the Italian, while the first part of this chapter is condensed into a more compact narrative.

4. Interpolations not occasioned by difficulties in the Greek text. Such a case appears in *Del governo* on page 15. There, after what is the end of Preface C in the Greek (= Puntoni, page 47), the Italian continues with the following paragraph in which the value of the book is stressed: "Ed è del tenore che segue, per ammaestramento e della vita privata, e specialmente per ammaestramento de' re, e de' principi; i quali per gli esempi che vi si raccontano, deono molto bene avvertire alla bontà ed alla tristizia de' loro consiglieri, per potere salvare sè, ed i popoli loro giustamente governare."

In spite of the above described deviations, *Del governo* cannot be considered anything but a translation, though not always a faithful and accurate one. The alterations effected in the Italian do not follow a single or consistent pattern fashioned after a conscious effort to change or improve the character of the book. The changes rather seem to have been haphazard, occasional, and inconsistent and to have come about by momentary inspiration or *ἀπρόψα*. They were aimed at solving a particular difficulty or improving a particular paragraph without an intentional plan behind them that would take into consideration the total end result. No stories were added or subtracted, no manuscripts collated or conflated. This brings the Italian translation into sharp contrast with other renditions of *Stephanitês* such as the Latin of Possinus, where changes were made after a consistent plan and with permanent aims in mind.³⁶ Yet, some of the changes in *Del governo* do add a more vivid and compact character to the narrative. Such changes in conjunction with the not infrequent elimination of lengthy rhetorical passages (which already had taken place in the particular Greek manuscripts that served as sources for *Del governo*) make the Italian narrative an easier and more rapid composition than those found in the printed editions of the Greek text.

³⁶ Concerning the nature of Possinus' translation, see *Studies* 80.