

## II. Codices Pal. Lat. 1571-1573 as Sources for Vegetius

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

In the preface to his 1885 edition of Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*, Lang, after calling attention to the existence of more than 140 manuscripts of this work, expressed the opinion that only those dating from the twelfth century or earlier have any very great critical value.<sup>1</sup> The manuscripts are divided by Lang into two families designated  $\epsilon$  and  $\pi$ . The documents of the  $\epsilon$  group utilized by him in the preparation of his critical edition are the following:<sup>2</sup> Parisinus 7230, saec. x (=A); Monacensis 6368, saec. x (=M); Gudianus 84, saec. x-xi (=G); Laudunensis 428, saec. x (=L); and Parisinus 7383, saec. x (=Q). Members of the  $\pi$  family utilized by Lang are the following:<sup>3</sup> Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 909, saec. x-xi (=II);<sup>4</sup> Vaticanus Latinus 4493, saec. x-xi (=V);<sup>5</sup> Parisinus 7231, saec. xii (=D); and Perizonianus F 17, saec. xi (=P). There are, in addition, a few excerpts from Vegetius in Vaticanus Reginensis Latinus 2077, saec. vii (=E), which agree more closely with  $\pi$ , but occasionally follow the  $\epsilon$  family.<sup>6</sup>

Of the two families,  $\pi$  is the better inasmuch as its archetype was more carefully copied than that of  $\epsilon$  and did not sustain the

<sup>1</sup> Carolus Lang, *Flavi Vegeti Renati Epitoma rei militaris* (Leipzig 1885) xvi.

<sup>2</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxiii-xxix.

<sup>3</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxix-xxxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Lang lists this as a tenth-century manuscript. In E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford 1914) 367, it is recorded as having been written between the years 977 and 1026.

<sup>5</sup> Lang dates V in the twelfth century. The present writer, however, on the basis of an examination of a microfilm copy of the manuscript is inclined to date it in the late tenth or early eleventh century. At this time the writer would like to express his gratitude to The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University for permission to make use of its microfilm copies of the various Vatican manuscripts used in the preparation of this paper.

<sup>6</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxi-xxiii. E is a palimpsest containing seventh-century writing superimposed over a copy of fragments of various speeches by Cicero, executed in rustic capitals in the fifth century. For facsimiles of both upper and lower scripts see E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini antiquiores*, part 1 (Oxford 1934) plates 114-15.

mutilation which is characteristic of the  $\epsilon$  source.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand it is somewhat more difficult to determine the readings of  $\pi$  than of  $\epsilon$  by reason of the fact that, whereas  $\epsilon$  is represented by a number of ninth and tenth century manuscripts,<sup>8</sup> there are very few early  $\pi$  manuscripts. In identifying the  $\pi$  readings Lang relied chiefly on *II* and *V* since *P* and *D* have to some extent been contaminated with readings from  $\epsilon$  codices.<sup>9</sup> *V* is regarded by Lang as one of the best of the manuscripts of Vegetius in spite of the fact that it is somewhat later than most of his  $\epsilon$  documents.<sup>10</sup>

The Vatican Palatine collection of Latin codices contains three copies of Vegetius which were apparently unknown to Lang since no mention of them is made in the rather extensive list of Vegetius manuscripts included in his preface.<sup>11</sup> No doubt his unawareness of the existence of these three is to be attributed to the fact that they were accidentally omitted from the hand-written index of the Palatine manuscripts, which is the only alphabetically arranged guide to this particular section of the Vatican Library. The documents in question are: Pal. Lat. 1571 (folios 1<sup>r</sup>–36<sup>r</sup>), saec. XII (=C); Pal. Lat. 1572 (folios 1<sup>r</sup>–79<sup>v</sup>), saec. IX–X (=B); and Pal. Lat. 1573 (folios 1<sup>v</sup>–52<sup>v</sup>), saec. XII (=F).

Codex C begins with the words *Flavii Vegati* (sic) *Renati viri illustris institutorum rei militaris liber primus incipit feliciter In nomine dei summi*, followed by the introductory inscription found on page 1 of Lang's text, and ends (folio 36<sup>r</sup>) with the words *intractabiles sunt* (157.1),<sup>12</sup> at the same point at which the text of *V* breaks off. The writing in C has occasionally been altered by a contemporary corrector (C<sup>2</sup>).

The first folio of Codex B appears to have been lost before the present folio numbers were inserted since folio 1<sup>r</sup> begins near the end of the table of contents for Book 1 with the heading for chapter 23 (3.7). The portion of B's text executed by the original scribe extends to the end of chapter 15 of Book 4 (folio 79<sup>v</sup>) through the words *tela iactantur* (138.17). Several alterations in the writing have been made by the original scribe (B<sup>1</sup>), by a contemporary

<sup>7</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xvii.

<sup>8</sup> In Lang (above, note 1) xxxiv–xxxv three  $\epsilon$  manuscripts of the tenth century are listed in addition to those actually used in the preparation of the critical text.

<sup>9</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxi.

<sup>10</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxxi.

<sup>11</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxiii–xlviii.

<sup>12</sup> References are to page and line numbers in the 1885 edition by Lang (above, note 1).

corrector (B<sup>2</sup>), and by a fifteenth-century scribe (B<sup>3</sup>) who substituted many readings taken from Q or L or some other manuscript closely related to these two. From folio 37 through folio 79 the lower outer corner of each leaf has been lost by mutilation and has been restored by the substitution of later material on which the missing portions of the text have been copied by B<sup>3</sup>. In addition to the loss of the first folio of B noted above, a second folio has disappeared from between 74 and 75. This lost folio contained the chapter headings in the table of contents for Book 4 from number 31 (127.19) to the end of the list, and chapters 1 and 2 of Book 4 through *obprimatur* (130.13). The prologue of Book 4 was not lost, however, since in B, as in V (and C), this precedes the table of contents. In the numbering of the folios of B the numerals 35 and 52 have been skipped while the numerals 13, 36, and 37 have each been placed on two successive folios. In Pal. Lat. 1572, following the text of B are seven folios (80–86) containing the portion of the text of Vegetius extending from *Praeterea partem* (141.4) through *maculosus* (160.10) executed by the same fifteenth-century hand which filled in the lacunae in B caused by mutilation.

Codex F was copied by two contemporary hands of the late twelfth century, the first of which wrote folios 1–50 through *exuperent* (149.5), the second, folios 51–52, which contain the portion of the text extending from *Praeterea aliorum* (158.13) to the end of the work. The title of F reads *Incipit Liber Flavii Vegetii Renati Rei Militaris De Commentariis Auctorum*, and is followed immediately by the table of contents of Book 1, with the introductory inscription omitted.

Of the three new manuscripts<sup>13</sup> of Vegetius, F can be dismissed

<sup>13</sup> It is just possible that two of these three codices were utilized in some measure in the preparation of Petrus Scriverius, *Viri illustris Flavii Vegetii Renati et Sexti Julii Frontini viri consularis de re militari opera* (Leiden 1633). In his discussion of miscellaneous codices of Vegetius Lang pointed out (p. xlv) that Scriverius, in the preface to the work mentioned above, claimed to have made use of four Palatine manuscripts. The one designated by Scriverius as "Palatinorum quartus" was identified by Lang (p. xxix) as *II*. On becoming aware of this the present writer felt confident that the three remaining Palatine manuscripts used by Scriverius would prove to be BCF. An examination of a microfilm of the Scriverius edition kindly provided by the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris indicates, however, that certainly no more than two, and possibly none, of the documents designated BCF could have been among the four Palatine manuscripts of Scriverius. A comparison of the readings cited by Scriverius with the Palatine manuscripts themselves shows that Lang was in error in identifying the "Palatinorum quartus" of Scriverius with *II*. "Palatinorum quartus" is

as being of relatively little importance, since it, though primarily a  $\pi$  codex, has been contaminated with  $\epsilon$  readings. On the other hand B and C, both of which belong to the  $\pi$  family, offer promise of being of considerable value to future editors of Vegetius. This is especially true of B, which is approximately a century older than any other member of its family now known to be in existence. The following are only a selection of the examples which could be cited to show the agreement in error of  $BC\pi$  against  $\epsilon$ :<sup>14</sup>

4.9 <i>crebuit</i> ] <i>crevit</i>	88.11 <i>ad pugnam publicam</i> ] <i>ad</i>
26.19–20 <i>XIII alta</i> ] <i>XIII pedi-</i>	<i>publicam pugnam</i>
<i>bus alta</i>	94.21 <i>marcidus</i> ] <i>anhelus</i>
34.3 <i>quod</i> ] <i>cum</i>	95.1 <i>hoc</i> ] <i>haec</i>
38.16 <i>victuris</i> ] <i>picturis</i>	95.13 <i>facile</i> ] om. $BC\pi$
( <i>picture</i> C)	97.21 <i>cursuque</i> ] <i>incursuque</i>
45.3 <i>tignarios</i> ] <i>lignarios</i>	101.17 <i>evenerint</i> ] <i>fuertint</i>
46.4 <i>cohortarentur</i> ] <i>hortarentur</i>	102.14 <i>sive pedites sive equites</i> ]
51.20 <i>erat nomen</i> ] <i>nomen erat</i>	<i>sive equites sive pedites</i>
58.10 <i>emittitur</i> ] <i>mittitur</i>	108.3 <i>cornum</i> ] <i>cornu</i>
60.19 <i>harpagonas</i> ] <i>arpagones</i>	113.20 <i>vitare</i> ] <i>et vitare</i>
67.13 <i>auxiliarium</i> ] <i>auxiliari-</i>	118.18 <i>sperandum</i> ] <i>minime des-</i>
<i>umve</i>	<i>perandum</i> ( <i>minime ad-</i>
70.1 <i>prosecutores</i> ] <i>executores</i>	<i>desperandum</i> C)
84.18 <i>equitibus</i> ] <i>et equitibus</i>	120.15 <i>aut</i> ] <i>vel</i> .

Within the  $\pi$  family both B and C are in much closer agreement with V than with any other previously studied member of this group. In fact BC agree with V much more consistently than a comparison with the variants of V listed in Lang's *apparatus criticus* would indicate, since many variants in V, especially

certainly Codex Pal. Lat. 945, a. 1358 (not 1348 as alleged by Lang, p. xlii), while  $\Pi$  is the manuscript variously designated by Scriverius as "Palatinorum I," "Palatinus I," or "Palatinorum unus." The limited number of citations provided by Scriverius, coupled with the many errors obviously present in his reports, makes it difficult to determine whether his remaining two Palatine manuscripts are included in the BCF group. Such evidence as is available, however, indicates that, while B must definitely be eliminated from consideration, C and F may have been the two documents in question, although this is far from certain. But even if this is true, the information about these documents provided by Scriverius is so scanty that they, along with B, must be regarded as "new manuscripts."

<sup>14</sup> In the citations which follow the first reading is that accepted by Lang; the second represents the consensus of  $BC\pi$  unless otherwise noted. Throughout this paper, when B or C is cited, it is to be assumed that reference is made to the reading of the first hand. Although corrections have in many cases been made by second hands, these are ordinarily not noted in the lists of readings given since they rarely have any bearing on the purposes of this paper.

omissions, are not noted by Lang, and some which are included are reported erroneously. Many of these erroneous reports are doubtless to be attributed to the fact that Lang relied for the most part on Du Rieu's collation of V and checked the codex itself only in questionable passages.<sup>15</sup> The close affinity existing among B, C, and V is shown by the following partial list of instances in which the three agree in error against the other manuscripts:<sup>16</sup>

7.20 <i>civitatis]</i> <i>civilibus</i>	55.10 <i>cohortes et diversas]</i> om.
10.5 <i>valeant bellatores]</i> <i>valeant officium bellatoris</i>	BCV
10.10 <i>nam duo sunt genera]</i> om.	60.5 <i>quanto]</i> <i>quantum</i>
BCV	60.20 <i>lupos]</i> <i>locus</i>
15.13 <i>dabant]</i> om. BCV	65.17 <i>ordine]</i> om. BCV
16.12–14 <i>defendantur . . . vitalia]</i> om. BVC	69.2 <i>aliter]</i> om. BCV
18.20 <i>institutis atque perdoctis]</i> om. BCV	76.19–20 <i>argutissimosque . . . probatissimis]</i> om.
26.6 <i>et signa]</i> om. BCV	BCV
27.22 <i>ut subito duplicent]</i> <i>ne dubitent</i>	83.2 <i>propugnatores]</i> <i>pugnatores</i>
28.13–14 <i>gradu ire ac redire]</i> om. BCV	86.4 <i>artis]</i> <i>rei</i>
35.22 <i>omnes milites]</i> <i>omnibus militibus</i>	89.19 <i>deceat]</i> om. BCV
37.21 <i>dispositio . . . armorum]</i> <i>expositio . . . animorum</i>	90.6 <i>consequantur]</i> om. BCV
38.13 <i>animis corporibusque]</i> <i>animo corporeque</i>	92.6 <i>perniciem praeceps est]</i> <i>per iniquum est praeces</i>
40.21 <i>qua re tribuni dicuntur add.</i> BCV post <i>ex labore</i>	94.15 <i>coeperint]</i> <i>coeperint animo cum ordines solverint</i>
41.5 <i>praepeditis]</i> <i>perditis</i>	94.16 <i>animum . . . solverint]</i> om. BCV
41.12 <i>genus]</i> <i>genius</i>	99.2 <i>factis]</i> om. BCV
41.13–14 <i>ab eo . . . beneficio]</i> om. BCV	101.12 <i>dimicant melius et]</i> <i>dimicantes conflictu meliore</i>
44.16 <i>aperiuntur fossae]</i> <i>aperitur fossa</i>	106.4 <i>et in imparatos conturbatosque]</i> <i>quia inparatos cor (corde V)</i>
46.14 <i>in illo]</i> <i>illi</i>	113.7 <i>ab his qui in subsessa fuerint]</i> <i>a viris quae subsessa fuerit</i>
50.3 <i>acies]</i> om. BCV	117.15–16 <i>hi . . . occidebant]</i> om. BCV.

<sup>15</sup> Lang (above, note 1) xxxii.

<sup>16</sup> The V readings cited in this list and elsewhere in this paper are taken from the writer's own collation of this manuscript. It will be noted that many of the variants here reported are not included in the *apparatus criticus* of Lang's edition.

The large number of instances in which BVC agree in error strongly suggests the possibility that V was copied directly from B and that C was copied from B or V. A careful examination of all the variants in all three codices, however, indicates that no one of them could have been copied directly from any other. That V cannot be a direct copy of B is shown by the fact that there are occasional, though not numerous, instances in which V has retained the correct reading where B is in error. In the following typical examples it will be observed that C sometimes agrees with V, sometimes with B: 21.15 *agmine* V, *acie* BC; 48.12 *ipsos equos* CV, *equos ipsos* B; 52.14 *viguit* CV, *nocuit* B; 54.3 *faciunt* V, *faciant* BC; 70.11 *deficit* V, *defecit* BC.

Though relatively few in number, the cases in which V is correct where B is in error are too frequent to be accounted for as emendations on the part of V's scribe. Hence it seems probable that V derives from some copy of B in which some errors had been corrected from another manuscript, or, more likely, from some *gemellus* of B. In either case, B, as an earlier exemplar of the tradition to which V belongs, remains a very important manuscript of Vegetius. Its value as a source for the text is emphasized by the very large number of cases in which it has the correct reading where V, previously regarded as one of the best of the manuscripts, is in error. In the partial list of such cases given below it will be noted that C usually agrees with B against V:

10.16 <i>superflua carne</i> BC, <i>super carnem</i> V	44.9 <i>licet</i> BC, <i>libet</i> V
12.15 <i>enim</i> BC, <i>autem</i> V	45.14 <i>ad morem</i> BC, <i>ad amorem</i> V
22.18 <i>nuda constant</i> BC, <i>constant nuda</i> V	55.9 <i>esse</i> BC, om. V
27.1 <i>peditum</i> BC, om. V	56.5-6 <i>quotiens autem pugnatur et tubicines et cornicines</i> (cornices BC) <i>pariter canunt</i> BC, om. V
29.15 <i>semper fuisse</i> BC, <i>fuisse semper</i> V	64.13 <i>esse</i> BC, om. V
29.17 <i>provinciarum</i> BC, om. V	67.18 <i>regione</i> BC, om. V
35.16 <i>interesse</i> BC, om. V	69.11 <i>inchoetur</i> BC, <i>dicetur</i> V
39.18 <i>quingentaria</i> BC, <i>quingenta</i> V	71.17 <i>iaciendas</i> BC, <i>iacientes</i> V
39.22 <i>cohors</i> BC, om. V	74.19 <i>turribus</i> BC, <i>turbium</i> V
42.18 <i>princeps</i> B, <i>principes</i> CV	75.16 <i>duces</i> BC, om. V
43.22 <i>maximam</i> BC, <i>maxime</i> V	77.7 <i>infertur</i> BC, om. V

79.1	<i>superantur</i> BC, <i>superant</i> V	89.3	<i>praecepta</i> BC, <i>praeceptum</i> V
80.6	<i>transfugas</i> BC, <i>transfugans</i> V	95.18	<i>ad conflictum</i> BC, <i>adlictum</i> V
83.3	<i>quam convenit</i> BC, om. V	101.16	<i>nominabant</i> BC, <i>nominantur</i> V
84.3	<i>moris</i> B, <i>morisque</i> C, <i>mori</i> V	101.17	<i>pares</i> BC, om. V
85.7	<i>circumitores</i> B, <i>circuitoires</i> C, <i>circumitueros</i> V	106.10	<i>non</i> BC, <i>nam</i> V
85.15	<i>reddatur</i> BC, <i>redditur</i> V	109.2	<i>te</i> B, om. CV
85.20–21	<i>firmantur</i> . <i>Nam a castris diminutivo vocabulo sunt nuncupata castella</i> BC, om. V	109.7	<i>separare</i> BC, <i>superare</i> V
85.21	<i>quae</i> BC, om. V	109.24	<i>longissime</i> BC, <i>longe</i> V
		113.18	<i>subsessas</i> BC, <i>obsessas</i> V
		118.16	<i>beluis</i> BC, <i>pulvis</i> V
		120.4	<i>prodest</i> BC, <i>quod est</i> V.

In several instances B provides a reading which appears to represent a middle stage between the text of  $\epsilon$  and that of most of the other members of  $\pi$ . In 9.14, where most of the  $\epsilon$  manuscripts have the accepted reading, *ad incommam*, and most of the members of the  $\pi$  family have *a consule mario* (*a\*mario* C), B reads *a. din. c. mario*. The correct reading, *hostes a populo Romano* (67.9–10), appears in VC as *hostes populorum*—a corruption which can easily be traced to the *hostes populo r̄* appearing in B (with *a* inserted before *populo* by B<sup>2</sup>). In 89.9 the reading accepted by Lang is that of  $\epsilon$  II: *dux itaque vigilans sobrius prudens*. The following variations appear in other members of the  $\pi$  family: *dux prudens erit vigilans atque sobrius* V; *dux itaque vigilans atque sobrius et prudens* P; *dux erit vigilans* (*vigans* C, corrected by C<sup>2</sup>) *atque sobrius prudens*. Here, too, the reading of B, *dux erit vigilans atque sobrius et prudens*, appears to stand midway between that of  $\epsilon$  and most of the other members of  $\pi$ . It is perhaps worthy of note that in 50.12–13, where a great variety of readings is to be found in various manuscripts, B alone has the reading *posset sperari victoria* which was accepted by Lang as an emendation by Förster. C's reading at this point is *posset sperare victoria*, while V, as reported by Lang, has *posset sperare victoriam*.

C, like B, is not only an independent member of the  $\pi$  family, but also one of considerable worth in spite of its relatively late date. Ample proof that C cannot be a copy of V is provided by the table of instances cited above in which B retains the correct reading where V is in error, since in the overwhelming majority

of these cases C is in agreement with B against V. On the other hand it is equally clear that C cannot be a copy of B, since, in addition to examples already cited, the following cases may be noted in which C has the correct reading where B is in error:

14.24 <i>continuata</i> C, <i>continua</i> B	108.13 <i>pellere</i> C, <i>impellere</i> B
38.15 <i>mensuum</i> C, <i>mensum</i> B	109.3 <i>improvisos</i> C, <i>improvisus</i> B
91.10 <i>discalciatos</i> C, <i>disculcios</i> B	110.4 <i>de media</i> C, <i>dimidia</i> B
103.13 <i>ut cuneo</i> C, <i>et cuneo</i> B	125.2 <i>gaudent</i> C, <i>se gaudent</i> B
	129.13 <i>digeram</i> C, <i>dirigam</i> B.

The explanation of the existence of these readings in C undoubtedly is that C was copied from a *gemellus* of B which had in some cases retained correct readings from the common source where B failed to do so. Hence C, although obviously of less worth than B, does possess considerable value in its own right, both as an additional witness to the  $\pi$  tradition and as a source, along with V, for supplying the readings lost in the mutilated portions of B. Certainly both B and C deserve the attention of future editors of the *Epitoma rei militaris*.