

THE METATEXT OF PROPERTIAN MANUSCRIPTS: *VATICANVS PALATINVS LATINVS 1652* AND *SCORIALENSIS g.III.12**

GREGORIO RODRIGUEZ HERRERA

1. Introduction: the metatext

Arranged around the main text of a codex we may find *marginalia*, glosses, *tituli*, *argumenta* or *comentarii* whose aim is to facilitate the reading and interpretation of a literary work. All these textual elements constitute the so-called metatext, which is not the work of the classical author but that of the copyist, the corrector, the glossator or rubricator, who express so their critical interpretations of the source text, as conscientious critics, as well as their literary taste, as subjective readers⁽¹⁾.

The metatext, moreover, allows us to establish relationships among different manuscripts or even different branches of a manuscript tradition contributing, in a fundamental or subsidiary way, to the knowledge of the manuscript transmission of an author⁽²⁾.

2. The codices

Both *Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 1652* and *Scorialensis g.III.12*, two fifteenth-century codices of Italian origin, have been characterised in detailed codicological descriptions by different scholars⁽³⁾, therefore I will refer here just to those data relevant to the present paper.

* This work was supported by the NEH Research Fellowship granted by the *Center of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Saint Louis University* and the *Mellon Fellowship of the Vatican Film Library, Saint Louis University*.

(1) L. HOLTZ, «Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaires», *Il libro e il testo*, Urbino, 1984, p. 141-167.

(2) M^a. T. MARTIN RODRIGUEZ, «Los *tituli* de las *Sátiras* de Juvenal en los manuscritos españoles», *CFC-Elat* 9, 1995, p. 9-32; C. CODOÑER, «Los *tituli* en las *Etymologiae*. Aportaciones al estudio de la transmisión del texto», *Actas del I Congreso de Latin Medieval*, León, 1995, p. 29-46.

(3) A codicological description of *Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 1652* is offered in M. BUONOCORE, *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Assisi, 1995, p. 64-66. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Toronto, 1984, p. 307-308; É. PELLEGRIN, *Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, Paris, 1975, vol. I, p. 304-306. Besides for a thorough description of *Scorialensis g.III.12* and its position within the Propertian manuscript tradition with a discussion of Butrica's conclusions regarding this manuscript, cf. T. ARCOS PEREIRA – M^a. E. CUYÁS DE TORRES, «El *Scorialensis g.III.12* de Propertio», *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid, 1994, vol. II, p. 561-567.

According to De la Mare's account quoted by Butrica⁽⁴⁾, *Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 1652*, copied in Naples in 1459 or earlier, presents two hands identified as those of Gianozzo Manetti and his son Agnolo. The codex contains Tibullus, Catullus, Calpurnius Siculus, Nemesianus, and Propertius. Besides, the last folio (132^r) reads an epigram by Petrus Montopolitanus to Gianozzo Manetti, dated 21 February 1460. Within the Propertian tradition, it belongs to "the humanistic vulgate", although in the fourth book it is closer to *Tomacellianus*⁽⁵⁾. Following Hanslik, I will refer to it henceforward as manuscript *l*⁽⁶⁾.

De la Mare also states that *Scorialensis g.III.12*, which only contains Propertius' *Eligies*, was copied in Rome between 1450 and 1475⁽⁷⁾. The codex shows three hands apart from that of the copyist, who also adds textual variants and reading tips, whereas the third one draws a calligram (f. 2^v) and inserts several supralineal and marginal annotations. Codex *Scorialensis g.III.12* belonged to Antonio Agustín, Archbishop of Tarragona, and after his death in 1586, was transferred to the Real Biblioteca de El Escorial. As different manuscript reference numbers have been assigned to this codex⁽⁸⁾, I will refer to it henceforward as *Scor*⁽⁹⁾.

3. Trespotii puto: the authorship of the marginalia

The presence in both codices of the same marginal note *Trespotii puto (ut) Lucanus in 3^o Trespotii dryopesque ruunt*⁽¹⁰⁾ to correct the wrong reading of Prop. 1.11.3: *ilies propertius* has justified the relationship of these two manuscripts⁽¹¹⁾. Indeed the note is right in ascribing the text to Lucanus 3.179 *Threspoti Dryopesque ruunt, quercusque silentis*⁽¹²⁾.

Following De la Mare's attribution of codex *l* to both Gianozzo Manetti⁽¹³⁾ and his son

(4) Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (supra n. 3), p. 307.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 109 and 143.

(6) Cf. R. HANSLIK, *Propertius*, Madrid, 1988 (= Leipzig, 1979), p. IX. For Swodoba this is manuscript 33. Cf. L. SWODOBA, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Propertius* (Diss.), Viena, 1963, p. 41.

(7) Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (supra n. 3), p. 219.

(8) *Ibid.*, p. 220.

(9) Find the *sigla codicum* at the end of this paper.

(10) *l* fol. 79^v and *Scor.* fol. 6^r.

(11) *VI* is omitted in the marginal note in *Scor.* For the Propertian text we follow P. Fedelli's edition. Cf. P. FEDELLI, *Propertius*, Stuttgart, 1984.

(12) Anyway, the variant *Trespotii* is recorded in numerous manuscripts. Cf. R. HANSLIK, *Propertius* (supra n. 6) Furthermore, this Propertian text has been corrected by different humanists. Cf. G. R. SMYTH, *Thesaurus Criticus ad Sexti Propertii Textum*, Leiden, 1970, p. 14.

(13) Gianozzo Manetti (1396-1459), born in Florence and disciple of Ambrogio Traversari, was a merchant and a diplomat. In 1453 he went into exile, first to Pope Nicholas V's court and later to that of Alphonsus V, king of Naples. Here he became one of the king's protégé's since Alphonsus V had already met Gianozzo when he visited Naples as the ambassador of Florence and admired his talent. Besides, the epistle dedicatory to the king in his *De dignitate et excellentia hominis* had triggered his exile. He translated into Latin the following works: *De hebraica uirtute* by Salterio, *Nuevo Testamento*, the *Ethica ad Nichomacum* and the *Ad Eudemum*, as well

Agnolo⁽¹⁴⁾, Butrica claims that the previous marginal note was made by Manetti, although he does not specify which one⁽¹⁵⁾. Buonocore also holds the opinion that the text is the work of both father and son and adds that Agnolo's hand is present after folio 28^v, that is, where *Catulli Carmina* begin, although he notes that “con rare annotazione marginali de più mani”⁽¹⁶⁾.

Certainly, this manuscript belonged to Gianozzo Manetti's library which, after his death in 1459, was enlarged by his sons, first Agnolo and later Giovanni. Then it became the property of a son of the latter – Gianozzo – and from him it passed on to his son Giovanni who sold it to Ulrico Fugger around 1555. Fugger arrives in Heidelberg in 1567 and will remain there until his death in 1584. As a token of gratitude for his hospitality, Fugger left his library in his will to Elector Palatine Federico, and at this moment Manetti's books became part of the Palatine Library⁽¹⁷⁾.

This information becomes relevant to our discussion because at the end of this Propertian manuscript, on folio 132^r, there is an epigram by Petrus Montopolitanus⁽¹⁸⁾ on Gianozzo Manetti's death which was transcribed by his son Agnolo. This fragment allows a comparison of the hand in this epigram with codex *l* and with other texts by Agnolo – such as his own signature and handwriting in *Palatinus Latinus* 1418, folio b^v, or in *Palatinus Latinus* 1021, an autograph by Agnolo and his father Gianozzo, which contains a translation of Aristotle's *Ethic to Nicomachus* – which reveals that codex *l* is an autograph manuscript by Agnolo from folio 28^v onwards, and that several marginalia to the Propertian text, among them the emendation to Prop. 1.11.3, are also the work of Agnolo Manetti.

Regarding the same note by the third hand in *Scor*, this is just a copy of codex *l* and not an emendation by the glossator, who also copies other annotations *verbatim* elsewhere in the manuscript, as will be show in this paper.

as the *Magna Moralia* by Aristotle. Cf. M. E. COSENZA, *Dictionary of Italian Humanists*, Boston, 1962, vol. V, p. 1075-1076; G. MANETTI, *Vida de Sócrates*, Introducción, texto y traducción por J. Bossini, Madrid, 1994, p. 11-15; Cf. J.E. SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, New York – London, 1967, vol. III, p. 45; A. SORIA, *Los humanistas en la corte de Alfonso el Magnánimo*, Granada, 1966, p. 59-66.

(14) Agnolo Manetti (1432-1479), born in Florence, was Gianozzo Manetti's son and disciple. A merchant and a diplomat, like his father, he also held public office in his city. His father secured him a strict and sound education. Well versed in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, he collaborated closely with his father and accompanied him to his exile in Naples. At Gianozzo's death, he did not obey his father's wish to give his library to the Santo Spirito in Florence for public use, rather he took care of it, studied it and enlarged it. Cf. G. M. CAGNI, «Agnolo Manetti e Vespasiano da Bisticci», *Italia Medioevale e Humanistica* 14, 1971, p. 293-312; M. E. COSENZA, *Dictionary of Italian Humanists*, p. 1073.

(15) Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 146 and 307.

(16) Cf. M. BUONOCORE, *Properzio* (*supra* n. 3), p. 65.

(17) C. M. CAGNI, «I codici Vaticani Palatino-Latini appartenuti alla biblioteca di Gianozzo Manetti», *La Bibliofilia*, 62, 1960, p. 1-43.

(18) For Petro Montopolitanus' *Carmina*, including the one quoted, see M^a. T. GRAZIOSI ACQUARO, «Petri Odi Montopolitani *Carmina* nunc primum e libris manu scripta edita», *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 19, 1970, p. 7-113.

4. *Palatinus Latinus 1652 and Scorialensis g.III.12 in the vulgata propertiana*

In spite of this coincidence in the emendation to Prop. 1.11.3, it is clear that *Scor* is not a copy of *l*. The latter presents a high number of the errors of the manuscript from which GSC⁽¹⁹⁾ was copied, whereas in *Scor* we only have the reading Prop. 2.8.77. *ista] haec*. We must note though that the copyist himself makes two corrections that reproduce the following errors in GSC:

Prop. 3.11.46 Mari] mori *ex mari cum –o- supra lineam Scor*.

Prop. 4.1.118 quam] quem *Scor*.

These differences notwithstanding, both manuscripts are related as part of the so-called *vulgata propertiana*⁽²⁰⁾ and therefore share some of their readings⁽²¹⁾:

Prop. 1.1.3 constantis] constantes *l Scor*².

Prop. 1.11.3 Thesproti] ilies propertii *l Scor*.

Prop. 1.20.28 suspiria] supina *l Scor*.

Prop. 2.1.25 tui] tiri *l; uiri Scor*.

Prop. 2.3.33-34 hac *ambobus locis] ah l Scor*.

Likewise, both codices have in common many of the errors and interpolations in codex *F*, or of its correctors, and of codex *g*⁽²²⁾, and even the absence of them⁽²³⁾, as shown below⁽²⁴⁾:

Prop. 1.1.17 leuius (*in marg.* leuius *Scor*².)] melius *l Scor*.

Prop 1.20.29 secluditur] subcluditur *Scor.*; subcruditur *l*

Prop. 2.1.3 haec (Calliope)] mihi *l Scor*.

Prop. 2.1.23 nec] non *l Scor*.

Prop. 2.2.13 tunicas] tunicam *l Scor*.

Prop. 2.3.3 requiescere] requiescere *l Scor.*; cognoscere *Vulgata*

Prop. 2.9.38 precor] quidem *l Scor*.

Prop. 2.10.9 procedere] succedere *l Scor*⁽²⁵⁾.

Prop. 2.10.10 nunc] namque *l Scor*.

(19) For the readings of GSC cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 101-103.

(20) *Ibid.*, p. 143-147.

(21) *Ibid.*, p. 143.

(22) For the readings of *F* and *g* Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 146-147.

(23) A higher number of differences occur in Book 4 –4.7.55; 5.7.56; 4.7.59; 4.8.57; 4.9.5– just where *Tomacellianus* becomes the source of *l*. Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 109.

(24) T. Arcos Pereira and M^a E. Cuyás de Torres have already noted Butrica's errors in the readings of *Scor*. Cf. T. ARGOS PEREIRA – M^a E. CUYÁS DE TORRES, «El *Scorialensis* g.III.12 de Propertio» (*supra* n. 3) p. 561 y 566-567.

(25) J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 147 observed that this reading is not in *Scor*, however it does appear on folio 19v.

- Prop. 2.11.1 scribebant de te alii uel] scribebant alii ne sis *l Scor*.
 Prop. 2.13.47 minuisset] munuisset *l Scor*.; iurasset *Vulgata*
 Prop. 2.26.15 ob inuidiam] prae inuidiam *l Scor*.
 Prop. 2.34.88 quis] quis *l Scor*.; quin *Vulgata*
 Prop. 3.11.14 Maeotis (meotis in *marg. Scor^l*)] iniestis *l Scor*.
 Prop. 3.13.27 munus erat (munus erat in *marg. Scor^l*)] pompa fuit *l Scor*.
 Prop. 4.1.42 abiegni] abiegni *l Scor*.; ambigui *Vulgata*.
 Prop. 4.2.2. paterna]; paterna *l Scor^l* (*corr. in marg.*); petenda *Vulgata Scor*.
 Prop. 4.7.59 parta] uecta *l Scor*.
 Prop. 4.11.14 et sum] ipsum *l Scor*.
 Prop. 4.11.53 cuius rasos] cui commissos *l (corr.) Scor*.

5. The annotations to *Palatinus Latinus 1652*

As shown so far, from the textual point of view, both codices present readings that establish a link between them, although, on the other hand, as mentioned above, other readings make it impossible to state that one is a copy of the other⁽²⁶⁾. However, a group of metatextual elements indicate that both codices are related due to the collation of *l* or another intermediate codex by the copyist, the *rubricator* and the glossator of *Scor*. In order to establish these common features, I will show and classify the annotations present in *l*.

Codex *l* offers a limited number of glosses due to, at least, three hands apart from that of the copyist⁽²⁷⁾. The copyist himself, Agnolo Manetti, inserts some omitted words or letters:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Prop. 2.3.1 (f. 85v) | iam <i>supra lineam cum</i> ^. |
| Prop. 2.9.1 (f. 88v) | est ... et <i>supra lineam cum</i> ^ ... ^. |
| Prop. 2.13.58 (f. 91r) | quid <i>supra lineam cum</i> ^. |
| Prop. 2.20.10 (f. 94r) | membra <i>ex memba cum</i> -r- <i>supra lineam</i> . |
| Prop. 4.11.52 (f. 129r) | claudia <i>ex caudia cum</i> -l- <i>supra lineam cum</i> ^. |
| Prop. 4.11.54 (f. 129r) | exhibuit <i>ex exhibuit cum</i> -h- <i>supra lineam</i> |

(26) Apart from the readings that may help to determine whether *l* and *Scor* belong to a group of manuscripts, we find many readings that differ in both:

- Prop. 1.13.1: quod *l* quoque *Scor*.
 Prop. 1.13.21: solamonide *l* salamonide *Scor*.
 Prop. 1.16.15: ille *l* illa *Scor*.
 Prop. 1.17.3: cassiope *l* (*in marg. alii cassiope Scor^l*); calliope *Scor*.
 Prop. 2.5.23: connexos *l* conuexos *Scor*.
 Prop. 2.18.26: belgicus *l* bellicus *Scor*.
 Prop. 2.23.8: urerer *l* uteret *Scor*.
 Prop. 2.26.2: lapsas *l* lassas *Scor*.
 Prop. 2.32.13: platanis pariter ungentibus *l* pariter platanis urgentibus *Scor*.
 Prop. 3.3.39: l(a)etabere *l* vectauere *Scor*.

(27) There is even a fifth hand that incorporated just the reference number of some elegies but it is seemingly a very late hand and not really relevant to this work. The glosses due to it include: Prop. 2.20 (f. 94r): *in marg. dext. EL XX lib II*; Prop. 2.24 (f. 96r): *in marg. sin. 24 lib II*; Prop. 2.32 (f. 100v): *in marg. sin. XXXII*; Prop. 2.34 (f. 101v) *in marg. sin. 34*.

Another group of glosses written in the margins aims to include forgotten lines, as in the following examples:

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Prop. 2.2.10 (f. 85v) | <i>cum ·/· add. in marg. sin.</i> : Centauris medio grata rapina mero |
| Prop. 2.28.52 (f. 99r) | <i>add. in marg. dext.</i> : Vobiscum Europe nec proba Phasiphae |
| Prop. 4.9.17-18 (f.127r) | <i>add. in marg. dext.</i> Herculis ite boues, nostrae labor ultime clauae,/ bis mihi quaesitae, bis mea praeda, boues |

A second hand – *l*² – interferes in the metatext to restore some readings that had been erased and written over or just written over⁽²⁸⁾:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Prop. 1.5.13 (f. 76 v) | Ah: <i>in marg. sin.</i> forte fuit Ha. |
| Prop. 3.5.31 (f. 105v) | Sit: <i>in marg. sin.</i> fuit Sic. |
| Prop. 4.4.32 (f. 121r) | formosa: <i>in marg. dext.</i> fuit primo famosa. |
| Prop. 4.4.48 (f. 62r) | roscida: <i>in marg. dext.</i> fuit rorida |
| Prop. 4.11.14 (f. 128v) | leuatur: <i>in marg. dext.</i> fuit legatur |

In these examples it seems that the glossator had erased syllables and letters to write the definite readings over them not only moved by a philological interest but also by a palaeographical zeal⁽²⁹⁾.

On the whole, the most interesting annotations for this study are those which do not correct the text but add all sort of information. In this way, scholiasts, aware of the difficult transmission of the Propertian text, usually provide readers with variant readings from other codices⁽³⁰⁾. Thus, the copyist himself – Agnolo – adds the following ones:

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Prop. 2.3.22 (f.86r) | quiuus <i>supra lineam</i> lyricis |
| Prop. 2.6.1 (f. 87r) | ephyraeae <i>supra lineam</i> corinthiae |
| Prop. 2.13.36 (f. 90v) | etiam <i>supra lineam</i> quondam |

A third hand – *l*³ – has also written, although perhaps somewhat later, some other variant readings:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Prop. 2.13.11 (f. 90r) | in gremio: <i>in marg. dext.</i> alii ingenio |
| Prop. 3.13.4 (f. 111v) | libera: <i>in marg. sin.</i> alli lubrica ⁽³¹⁾ |
| Prop. 4.5.9 (122r) | inducere: <i>in marg. dext.</i> non ducere |

The marginal note that has been assigned to Pontanus⁽³²⁾ is also the work of *l*³:
Prop. 2.13.1 (f. 90r) Etrusca: *in marg dext.* itura

(28) Butrica has already noted that the codex presents many corrections of this sort in Books 3 and 4. Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 109.

(29) This type of glosses is not frequent in Propertius' *Elegies*; in fact they constitute the only case we have found in the manuscripts consulted so far.

(30) For the readings of the different Propertian manuscripts I have followed the ones in R. HANSLIK, *Propertius* (*supra* n. 6) and G. R. SMYTH, *Thesaurus* (*supra* n. 12).

(31) This reading is just in manuscript 83. Cf. R. HANSLIK, *Propertius* (*supra* n. 6).

(32) Cf. P. FEDELI, *Propertius*, p. 75.

Finally, a fourth hand – l^4 – probably later, adds a new variant reading:

Prop. 3.17.2 (113r) *pacato: in marg. sin. bacchato alius mss paccato*

Besides, the examination of a strikingly high number of partially or totally underlined words in the codex has revealed that the underlined parts correspond to variant readings in other codices. Therefore, it must be assumed that a scholiast – a copyist, a corrector or a later scholar studying the text – worked with several codices and chose one of them to underline, as a sort of reminder, those different readings either to highlight the variants or to collect them in a new copy of the codex. By way of illustration, the items underlined in the *Monobiblos* are given below⁽³³⁾:

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1.1.3 <u>constantes</u> | 1.6.21 <u>nunquam</u> |
| 1.1.13 <u>Psilli</u> | 1.6.23 <u>nunquam</u> |
| 1.1.17 <u>non nullas</u> | 1.6.24 <u>nota</u> |
| 1.1.24 <u>cytalinis</u> | 1.6.32 <u>tinguit</u> |
| 1.2.13 <u>collucent</u> | 1.7.6 <u>diuam</u> |
| 1.2.16 <u>Telayra</u> | 1.7.16 <u>euolasse</u> |
| 1.2.25 <u>sim tibi</u> | 1.7.19 <u>cupiens</u> |
| 1.3.13 <u>correctum</u> | 1.8.14 <u>proiectas</u> |
| 1.3.18 <u>metuens</u> | 1.8.17 <u>quodcunque</u> |
| 1.4.5 <u>metidos</u> | 1.8.20 <u>orithos</u> |
| 1.4.9 <u>Ne dum</u> | 1.8.21 <u>de te</u> |
| 1.4.14 <u>libet</u> | 1.8.22 <u>lumine</u> |
| 1.4.19 <u>posthaec</u> | 1.8.26 <u>Heleis</u> |
| 1.4.21 <u>omnis</u> | 1.9.11 <u>numerini</u> |
| 1.4.25 <u>temptatur</u> | 1.9.29 <u>manus</u> |
| 1.5.8 <u>solet</u> | 1.9.34 <u>leuat</u> |
| 1.5.9 <u>At</u> | 1.10.7 <u>labentis</u> |
| 1.5.13 <u>Ah</u> | 1.10.15 <u>diuersos</u> |
| 1.5.21 <u>totiens</u> | 1.10.20 <u>aeger</u> |
| 1.6.4 <u>in emonias</u> | 1.11.5 <u>adducere</u> |
| 1.6.11 <u>possum</u> | 1.11.15 <u>amota</u> |
| 1.6.15 <u>deductas</u> | 1.12.19 <u>discedere</u> |
| 1.6.17 <u>debita</u> | 1.16.14 <u>suplicis a</u> |

(33) All these readings coincide with those in *Scor* or its glossators except for the following ones:

- 1.2.16: Hilaira *Scor*.
- 1.4.5: Nictidos *Scor*.
- 1.6.23: unquam *Scor*.
- 1.7.16: euiolasse *Scor*.
- 1.18.31: resonet tibi *Scor*.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1.16.22 <u>tristis</u> | 1.20.4 <u>Minius dixerat</u> |
| 1.16.23 <u>plena</u> | 1.20.11 <u>cupidas ... rapinas</u> |
| 1.16.33 <u>nixa</u> | 1.20.12 <u>Hadriacis</u> |
| 1.16.38 <u>irato dicere tota loco</u> | 1.20.13 <u>durum</u> |
| 1.16.46 <u>et</u> | 1.20.23 <u>inuictus</u> |
| 1.18.17 <u>calore</u> | 1.20.25 <u>sectari</u> |
| 1.18.23 <u>nostris</u> | 1.20.26 <u>Zetus</u> |
| 1.18.24 <u>sunt</u> | 1.20.29 <u>subcruditor</u> |
| 1.18.31 <u>resonent tibi</u> | 1.20.32 <u>Ha hamadyas hinc</u> |
| 1.19.5 <u>nostrer</u> | 1.20.34 <u>Thyniasin</u> |
| 1.19.11 <u>dicit</u> | 1.21.5 <u>ut possit</u> |

All the glosses to *l* examined so far have helped to establish the Propertian text and consequently have stirred the interest of scholars from the Renaissance to our times. In this codex, however, we find another type of annotations, also very frequent in other Propertian codices, which have more to do with textual commentaries⁽³⁴⁾. The few ones we find in *l* are in the hand of Agnolo Manetti.

The first gloss is the abovementioned note to Prop. 1.11.3, which can be classified as a variant reading as well as a gloss indicating the scholiast's erudition and knowledge of Latin literature and its commentators.

A second gloss of mythological nature to the word *Melampus* is in Prop. 2.3.51:

(f. 86v) *in marg. dext.* ami(a)thionis filius medicus qui filias preti pungasse fertur

Finally, we find an example of marginal gloss of a more subjective nature conveying the scholiast's opinions of the text. In this type of glosses, scholiasts are not acting as experts but just as individuals expressing their own personal view on the text⁽³⁵⁾. The annotation to Prop. 4.5.31-32, a distich from the elegy dedicated to the procurer Acanthis, belongs to this category:

Si tibi forte comas uexauerit, utilis ira:

Post modo mercata pace premendus erit

(34) On this type of annotations to the Propertian text cf. T. ARCOS-PEREIRA – M^a. E. CUYÁS DE TORRES, «Las glosas y *marginalia* a las *Elegías* de Propertio en el *Scorialensis* g.III.12», in M. RODRIGUEZ-PANTOJA (ed), *Las raíces clásicas de Andalucía*, Córdoba, 2005, p. 358-366; E. F. LÓPEZ-CAYETANO, «Observaciones sobre las anotaciones marginales del *Escorialensis* S-III-22», *Actas del IX Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos. Humanismo y Tradición Clásica*, Madrid, 1999, p. 195-199; M^a D. GARCIA DE PASO-CARRASCO – G. RODRIGUEZ-HERRERA, «Las glosas a las *Elegías* de Propertio en el *Salmanticensis* BU 245: Una aproximación al *Monobiblos*», in M. RODRIGUEZ-PANTOJA (ed), *Las raíces clásicas de Andalucía*, Córdoba, 2005, p. 367-379; G. RODRIGUEZ-HERRERA – M^a E. CURBELO-TAVIO, «Las glosas al *Monobiblos* propertiano en el *Scorialensis* c.IV.22», in M. RODRIGUEZ-PANTOJA (ed), *Las raíces clásicas de Andalucía*, Córdoba, 2005, p. 381-388.

(35) Cf. E.F. LÓPEZ-CAYETANO – G. RODRIGUEZ-HERRERA, «Los motivos amorosos en los *marginalia* del *Scorialensis* s.III.22», *CFC. Estudios Latinos* 19, 2000, p. 141-156; G. RODRIGUEZ-HERRERA, «Comentarios subjetivos en los *marginalia* a Propertio del *Vaticanus Ottobonianus* 1514», *Scriptorium* 61/2, 2007, p. 425-429.

The gloss to these lines, *monitus versutissime lenae*⁽³⁶⁾ (f. 122^v *in marg. dext.*) «a piece of advice from the procurer said with malice», shows a personal evaluation on the part of the scholiast, who, in a passage that lists a catalogue of excuses – *causae* – suggested by Acanthis to elude the lover and arouse thus a greater passion in him, the scholiast focuses on a distich related to the *munera amoris*, that is, to the greedy beloved⁽³⁷⁾.

6. The glosses in *Palatinus Latinus 1652* also present in *Scorialensis g.III.12*

In this section I will give a detailed account of all the metatextual features that, in my opinion, clearly relate *Scor*⁽³⁸⁾ with *l*. The following discussion will allow me to hypothesize that *Scor* is undoubtedly later to *l* and that the latter, or some other codex associated to it, was involved in the process of copying and correction of *Scor*⁽³⁹⁾.

First, the second readings in *Scor*, written by the copyist himself, correspond mostly with other ones in *l*⁽⁴⁰⁾, such as the following ones in *Scor*:

- Prop. 1.17.3 (f. 10r) calliope: alii cassiope
- Prop. 1.2.13 (f. 1v) persii dent: alii collucent
- Prop. 1.20.4 (f. 11v) minus: // Minius
- Prop. 1.17.19 (10r) peperissent // sepelissent
- Prop. 2.25.43 (29v) prodente prodire
- Prop. 2.32.12 (34r) aulcis auleis
- Prop. 3.12.32 (47v) natasse ... uacasse
- Prop. 3.18.17 (52r) tentum tecum
- Prop. 4.1.43 (56v) tepidus// tremidus (trepidus, *l*)
- Prop. 4.2.30 (59r) uita// uina
- Prop. 4.4.48 (62r) roscida// rorida (roscida *l*, *sed in marg.* fuit rorida *l*²)

Moreover, the examples of second readings in *l* are also present in *Scor* as second readings by the third hand –*Scor*³.

- Prop. 2.6.1 ephyraeae: *supra lineam* corinthiae *l* (f. 87r); *Scor*³ (f. 16v)
- Prop. 2.13.36 etiam: *supra lineam* quondam *l* (f. 90v); *Scor*³ (f. 21r)

(36) Cf. **Pl. 39 a**.

(37) Cf. E.F. LÓPEZ-CAYETANO - G. RODRIGUEZ-HERRERA, «Los motivos amorosos» (*supra* n. 35) p. 148-150; M^a. D. GARCIA DE PASO-CARRASCO - G. RODRIGUEZ-HERRERA, «La consideración de la mujer en *Marginalia* a las *Elegías* de Propertio» *Faventia* 27/1, 2005, p. 63-72.

(38) For a detailed taxonomy of the glosses and *marginalia* in *Scor* cf. T. ARCOS-PEREIRA – M^a. E. CUYÁS DE TORRES, «Las glosas y marginalia» (*supra* n. 34).

(39) Regarding *Brussels Bibl. Royale 14638* and codex *v*, Butrica notes the coincidence of some *tituli* and of three marginal notes to Prop. 2.11.1; Prop. 2.20.1 and to Prop. 4.9.70, which leads him to conclude that both manuscripts are somehow related. Cf. J. L. BUTRICA, *The Manuscript Tradition* (*supra* n. 3), p. 111.

(40) The variants incorporated by the copyist of *Scor* and not present in *l* include Prop. 3.11.37 (45r) uulnera: funera and Prop. 3.25.9 (55v) limina// lumina.

Besides, the glossator of *Scor*³ reproduces exactly the same marginal note to *Melampus* in Prop. 2.3.51 on f. 15v *in marg. dext.*

Amiathyonis medicus qui fil[ias] praeti pugnass[e] fertur (**Pl. 39b**)

Since the same passages are frequently commented in different manuscripts and in different terms, the use of the same words for the same purposes to comment the same passage, as in the example above, is quite unusual⁽⁴¹⁾.

Lastly, the gloss to Prop. 4.5.31-32 *monitus versutissime lenae* can also be read in *Scor* (f. 63v) in the copyist's hand, not in a later one (**Pl. 39 a et c**). The presence of this gloss proves to be a powerful evidence of the relationship between both texts as this particular Propertian excerpt is not usually annotated or highlighted by scholiasts. Actually, only in manuscript 115 there is a mark pointing to the previous line:

Prop. 4.5.30: maior dilata nocte recurret amor

This call of attention may be justified by its character of universal maxim, very much in fashion at the time, and its comprehensive nature in the sense that it captures the spirit of the whole passage on excuses, as explained above. Therefore, the commentary *monitus versutissime lenae* becomes a distinctive feature of both codices that puts emphasis on the motive of the *puella auara* or of the *munera in amore*. This feature acquires even more prominence because these motives are usually illustrated by glossators with a different passage, Prop. 3.13.49-50:

Auro pulsa fides, auro uenalia iura,
Auro lex sequitur⁽⁴²⁾

So far, we can conclude that the copyist himself added in his own hand readings present in *l* and the *marginalia* to 4.5.31-32, and the glossator –*Scor*³– wrote the remaining glosses, that is, those that have contributed to the establishment of the text as well as the emendation to Prop. 1.11.3 and the commentary to Prop. 2.3.51. All this, together with the already discussed emendation based on Lucan –*Trespotii puto* ...– constitute solid arguments to support the relationship between *Scor* and *l*. A different question is whether we should consider the possibility of *Scor* being earlier than *l* since all the metatext in *l* is included in *Scor* and not the other way round. However, the fact that the gloss to Prop. 4.5.31-32 is in *Scor*'s hand and the remaining are in the glossator's hand makes me think (i) that the copyist read an intermediate manuscript from which he took the annotation and the readings, and (ii) that the glossator worked with Agnolo Manetti's copy –codex *l*– from which

(41) For example, in Prop. 1.1.11 *Partheniis* is glossed in manuscript 115 with *Parthenius flumen Arcadiae*; in 127 with *Mons Archadiae* and in β with *Parthenius mons arcadiae ubi uirgines uenari consueuerint et ab iis quibus cognominatus est*.

(42) In this way, for example, this passage is marked with a brace in *Scor*, V and 115; with the word *nota*, an usual reference mark, in β and 118; with a hand in 117; and with a marginal note, a repetition of the same line, *auro pulsa fides*, in *Scorialensis s.III.22*. Likewise, this excerpt is already included in the 13th-century anthology contained in *Vaticanus Reginensis 2120* and in the 14th-century one contained in ms. lat. 16708 of the National Library in Paris.

he copied the other glosses. This claim could be further corroborated by, first, the fact that the copyist, the corrector and the glossator of *Scor* considerably enlarged the metatext in *l* and, second, the fact that the expression *puto ut ...* in the gloss to Prop. 1.11.3 is typical of a humanist quite confident of his knowledge of Latin literature, a profile that matches that of Agnolo Manetti⁽⁴³⁾.

7. Further evidence: the *tituli*

Although all these arguments clearly show the connection between *Scor* and *l*, there is still one element that supports this bond: the *tituli*.

The *tituli* to the elegies have been partially recorded in the critical edition of Propertius. Both Hanslik and Fedelli include the *tituli* in their editions, but the former uses the generic abbreviations *O*, Σ , and σ ⁽⁴⁴⁾, which do not take into account many variants, whereas the latter's edition gives account of the readings of just ten manuscripts and also again leaves out some variants⁽⁴⁵⁾. If we disregard *N*, which is not entitled, the examination of these critical edition reveals that there are two branches. Broadly speaking, the first one, which comprises the Italian manuscripts —*AFLV*—, includes *tituli* that refer to the person to whom the elegy is addressed, the most predominant being *Ad Cynthiam*, as expected. The second one just comprises *P*, whose *tituli*, in general, not only mention the person to whom the elegy is addressed but also add information about the contents, as a sort of *accessus*.

The *tituli* in the codices under scrutiny fall into the first group, *ALFV*, with a few exceptions⁽⁴⁶⁾. First, they share with *F* those *tituli* that makes the latter different from *ALFV*, so that the position of *l* and *Scor* in this branch of the manuscript tradition becomes reinforced. The differing *tituli* are the following ones:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Prop. 2.25 | ad amicam iratam <i>LV</i> ad amicam <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.2 | ad librum suum <i>LV</i> ad librum secundum <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.3 | somnium propertii <i>LV</i> tertium somnium propertii <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.4 | De triumpho caesaris <i>LV</i> de triumpho IIII capitulum <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.11.17 | <i>priori coniungunt LV</i> de omphale <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.11.21 | <i>priori coniungunt LV</i> de semiramis <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.11.39 | <i>priori coniungunt LV</i> de cleopatra <i>F l Scor</i> . |
| Prop. 3.13 | de auaritia et luxuria matronarum <i>LV</i> de auaritia et luxu matronarum <i>F l Scor</i> . |

(43) Cf. *supra* note 11.

(44) *O omnes codices uel fere omnes; Σ plus XXV codices praeter nominatos; σ minus XXV codices praeter nominatos.*

(45) It is noteworthy to mention some interesting *tituli* as the ones in υ : Prop. 1.21 *Ad militem* or Prop. 2.26.29 *De amica sua persequenda*.

(46) Information provided by the critical apparatuses in Hanslik and Fedeli. Two *tituli* in *Scor* differ from those in *AFLV* and *l*: Prop. 2.8 ad amicam *LVFl* | ad amicam *Scor*; Prop. 3.19 de incontinentia mulierum *LVFl* | de inconuenientia mulierum *Scor*.

Secondly, when *l* and *Scor* present *tituli* unlike those in *ALFV*, the text in both codices coincides. Again new evidence of the relationship between these two manuscripts is provided by the metatext⁽⁴⁷⁾:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Prop. 1.2 | ad cynthiam <i>AF</i> ad cynthiam amicam <i>V</i> non esse elaborandum ad culturam formam <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 1.5 | ad gallum <i>LVF</i> ad gallam <i>A</i> ad emulum (suum <i>l</i>) gallum <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 1.9 | ad emulum irrisorem <i>ALVF</i> ad suum emulum ponticum <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 2.27 | de incerta mortis hora <i>LVF</i> de incerta hora mortis <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 2.29 | ad cynthiam <i>L²</i> ad cynthiam de sua uisione <i>l Scor</i> ⁽⁴⁸⁾ |
| Prop. 3.15.11 | <i>nou. eleg.</i> de fabula antiope <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 4.6 | <i>priori coniungunt LVF</i> de sacrificio <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 4.6.11 | d iouem <i>LV</i> de caesare <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 4.7 | de cynthia <i>LVF</i> de cynthia somnium <i>l Scor</i> |
| Prop. 4.8 | sine titulo <i>LVF</i> de cynthia et dracone <i>l Scor</i> ⁽⁴⁹⁾ |
| Prop. 4.9 | de hercule et cacho <i>V</i> de hercule <i>l Scor</i> ⁽⁵⁰⁾ |
| Prop. 4.10 | de ioue feretrio <i>LVF</i> quare appellatur iuppiter feretrius <i>l</i> ⁽⁵¹⁾ <i>Scor</i> |

Similarly, the *incipit* to the *Monobiblos* is the same in both manuscripts: *Propertii umbrii meuanii poetae elegiographi clarissimi incipit liber primus. Ad tullum.*

Therefore the coincidence in the choice of *tituli* constitutes a new link that relates both manuscripts and reveals the copying work of the *rubricator* of *Scor*. In the case of *l*, the hand of the *rubricator* is the same as that of the copyist and the glossator, that is, Agnolo Manetti himself was the author of the whole Propertian manuscript.

8. Conclusions

The present study allows us to conclude that the Propertian text in *Palatinus Latinus 1652* –*l*– was glossed by Agnolo Manetti. Likewise, the conjecture *Trespotii...* to Prop. 1.11.3 is the work of Agnolo and not of his father, Giannozzo Manetti. The copyist of *Scorialensis g.III.12* wrote in the margins numerous textual variants that coincide with the readings in *Palatinus Latinus 1652*; he could have copied them directly from this codex or from an intermediate one since he added the marginal note of Agnolo Manetti to Prop. 4.5.31-32 *monitus uerutissime lenae* in his own hand. Furthermore, the glossator to *Scor* rendered the remaining annotations of Agnolo Manetti *verbatim*, hence the presence of the speculation to Prop. 1.11.3 with the same introduction *Trespotii puto...* Finally, the almost absolute

(47) Manuscript 96 and *F* have the same *tituli* but not the same elegy division, as in the case of Prop. 3.11. Similarly, MS 96 shares with *l* and *Scor* some of its specific *tituli*, in particular Prop. 1.2; 1.5; 1.9; 4.6; 4.6.11; 4.8 and 4.9.

(48) Hanslik mistakenly assigns to *Scor* the *titulus* Ad cynthiam.

(49) This *titulus* is also in t, 78, 95, σ. Cf. R. HANSLIK, *Propertius* (supra n. 6).

(50) This *titulus* is also in t, 78, 80, 95, σ. Cf. R. HANSLIK, *Propertius* (supra n. 6).

(51) Hanslik mistakenly assigns to *l* the following *titulus*: *qua causa Iuppiter dictus sit feretrius.*

coincidence of the *tituli* in both codices attests to the influence of *Palatinus Latinus 1652* on *Scorialensis g.III.12* as three different hands—that of the copyist, the *rubricator* and the glossator—introduced elements from the metatext of Agnolo Manetti.

Besides, the datation of *l* around 1459 proves that *Scor* was copied in the third third of the 15th century, but not earlier than 1460 since its composition, following the information provided by the metatext, must be later than *l*. Furthermore, as *l* was copied in Naples and the presence of Agnolo Manetti in this city is attested at least until 1458⁽⁵²⁾, *Scor* might have been produced in Naples as well, which would explain the inclusion in *Scor* of glosses and marginalia present in *l* in the hands of *Scor*¹ and *Scor*². This would imply the dismissal of Rome as the city where *Scor* had originated, as it has been claimed. In conclusion, I claim for *Scorialensis g.III.12* a date of copy that ranges between 1460 and 1475 and a new possible place of production: Naples.

Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

Gregorio RODRIGUEZ HERRERA

SIGLA CODICVM⁽⁵³⁾

| | |
|-------------|--|
| <i>l</i> | Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 1652 (*) |
| <i>Scor</i> | Scorialensis g.III.12 (*) [Hanslik 79] |
| V | Vaticanus Ottobianus 1541(*) |
| β | Vaticanus Latinus 5174 (*) |
| σ | Vaticanus Urbinas Latinus 641 (*) |
| 96 | Vaticanus Barberinianus 34 (*) |
| 115 | Vaticanus Latinus 3272 (*) [Butrica v; Hanslik 115] |
| 117 | Vaticanus Latinus 1611 (*) |
| 118 | Vaticanus Latinus 1612 (*) |
| 127 | Salmanticensis BU 245 (*) |
| | Scorialensis s.III.22 (*) [not included in Hanslik] |
| | Vaticanus Reginensis 2120 (*) [no reference number in Hanslik] |
| A | Leidensis Vossianus Latinus 38 |
| F | Laurentianus plut. 36.49 |
| L | Holkham.Misc. 36 |
| P | Parisinus Latinus 7989 |
| t | Guelferbytanus Helmstadensis 373 |
| 78 | Dublinensis bibl.collegii S.Trinitatis K 2.37 |
| 83 | Groninganus bibl. Universitatis 159 |
| 95 | Laurentianus 33.11 |

(52) After staying in Rome between 1454 and 1455 helping his father in the preparation of Nicholas V's biography, Agnolo Manetti probably moved to Naples, as its name in a 1458 census in Naples attests.

(53) Original manuscripts and microfilmed copies consulted have been marked with (*). References to manuscripts have been taken from Butrica, Fedeli or Hanslik, as indicated in the paper. When a different reference is given, references used by these authors are provided between square brackets.

NOTES ET MATÉRIAUX

| | |
|----------|---|
| <i>G</i> | Genoa BU E.III.29 |
| <i>S</i> | Florence BN Mag. VIII.1053 [Butrica S; Hanslik a] |
| <i>C</i> | Cambridge Add. 3394 [Butrica C; Hanslik 115] |
| <i>g</i> | Göttingen philol 111 ^b [Butrica g; Hanslik i] |
| <i>v</i> | véase mss. 115 Brussels Bibl. Royale 14638 [no reference number in Butrica; Hanslik <i>v</i>] |