

## Vers 934

*quamquam hic † qualest †, quam⟨quam⟩ hic horridus, scitus,  
bellus mihi.*

Schon Lipsius stellte ⟨s⟩*qualust* her, akzeptiert von Seyfert, Ernout, Enk. Allerdings ist *squalus* selten: in einem Enniuszitat bei Nonius 172,20 (= Enn. scen. fr. 311 V.<sup>3</sup>). Leo zieht daher Spengels Konjektur vor:

*quamquam hic squalet, quam⟨quam⟩ hic horret, scitus ⟨et⟩  
bellust mihi.*

Näher bei der Überlieferung wäre folgendes:

*quamquam hic squalidust, quam⟨quam⟩ hic horridus, ⟨hic⟩  
scitus, bellus mihi.*

## Vers 950

Der Vers wird nach Schoell meist *Astaphium* gegeben. Diese ist jedoch V. 914 schon fortgeschickt worden. Es spricht also, wie überliefert, weiterhin *Phronesium*, und zwar beiseit.

Köln

Peter Rau

## ROMAN CURSIVE INFLUENCE IN THE TEXT OF THE *GEORGICS*

During an investigation of the textual history of Vergil's *Georgics*, I became interested in the relatively large number of errors, many of them bizarre or at least meaningless, in the surviving majuscule manuscripts of this author<sup>1</sup>). Few are recognized as variant readings, and with good reason, since they usually do not turn up in the later tradition. In fact, in M, many were rec-

---

1) The most complete majuscule manuscripts of Vergil's works are: M – Mediceus Laurentianus lat. XXXIX, 1. P – Vaticanus Palatinus lat. 1631. R – Vaticanus lat. 3867, called the "Romanus." Also found in the examples of readings cited below is the fragmentary manuscript A – Vaticanus lat. 3256 and Berolinensis lat. fol. 416, and V – Veronensis XL (38).

tified late in the fifth century by the writer of the subscription in this MS, Apronianus (Consul A. D. 494). Because these readings are often meaningless and obviously incorrect, and since they seem to lower the value of these old MSS as witnesses of the Vergilian text, I wondered about their origin.

The possibility that some of these errors might be traceable to a confusion of letters in the Roman Cursive script was suggested to me by work already done along these lines by Constans (on Tacitus)<sup>2</sup>) and by Brunhölzl (on Lucretius and several other Latin writers)<sup>3</sup>). But, apart from the work by these two scholars, the possible influence of cursive scripts seems to have been largely ignored. When this possibility was first raised, little attention was paid to it. At the beginning of this century, for example, M. Thompson mentioned the occasional use of a cursive script in literary texts and wrote: "The general application of the Roman cursive hand to the purposes of literature would hardly be expected." After citing some examples of this literary use of cursive, he added the more interesting remark: "From the survival of comparatively so many literary remains in this style, it may be inferred that it was used as a quick and convenient means of writing texts intended probably for ordinary use rather than for the market"<sup>4</sup>). Even this limited assessment encourages examination of the text of Vergil's works because of this author's popularity and the widespread and lasting role he enjoyed as part of the school curriculum. Thompson himself goes no further as it is not his task to delve into the origin of textual corruption in specific authors. Since the appearance of Thompson's work, other Latin literary texts in cursive script have been published, including at least one of Vergil<sup>5</sup>). Aside from the findings of Constans and Brunhölzl to be discussed shortly, the only serious treatment of this question

---

2) L. A. Constans, "La 'Préhistoire' du texte de Tacite," *Memoires*, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, XIII (1927), 507-520.

3) Franz Brunhölzl, "Zur Überlieferung des Lukrez," *Hermes*, 90 (1962), 97-104. "Zum Problem der Casinenser Klassikerüberlieferung," *Abhandlungen der Marburger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 3 (1971), 111-143. "Zu den sogenannten codices archetypi der römischen Literatur", *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff* (1971), 16-31.

4) M. Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford (1912), p. 339. This is a verbatim restatement from his earlier book, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*, London (1901), p. 215.

5) Vergil: P. Fuad 1.5 (IV-V) irregular cursive; Sallust: PSI 1.110 (IV) cursive with uncial; Aesop (?): P. Mich. 7.457 (III) cursive.

has been given by J. Mallon<sup>6</sup>). Other published accounts on the subject of textual criticism make no mention of cursive scripts as a source of corruption<sup>7</sup>).

Mallon, in his thesis, suggests that distinguishing between the scripts of "books" or "literary texts" and those of "documents" is unwarranted. He points out that many books were indeed copied in the scripts used for acts and documents, i. e., often in scripts commonly called "cursive", although Mallon prefers the term "common scripts", because he considers "cursive" a quality apparent in different scripts, not a type itself<sup>8</sup>). He also feels that the Capital and Uncial scripts arose from "la fixation et l'arrangement calligraphique d'une écriture vulgaire" and that they, in turn, did not give birth to other scripts<sup>9</sup>).

In the same vein, A. Dain expresses the opinion that Uncial was not normally used for library works, but rather for luxury books<sup>10</sup>). Actually, Uncial lies outside the range of this problem because of its relatively late appearance. Yet the significance of these remarks is of real interest because of the possibility that the survival of the Rustic Capital manuscripts of Vergil and Uncial MSS of other authors depended more on their value as possessions than on the quality of their texts. From our modern point of view they are indeed valued as texts because of their age, whereas the ancients may have appreciated them primarily for other reasons. The fact is that they contain many errors and it remains to be demonstrated, I think, that they are in all cases better witnesses than some of the later MSS.

Constans and Brunhölzl, for their part, deal with the problem directly and informatively. Each attempts to describe, through a study of the transmitted errors, the archetype of the surviving MSS of the authors in question. Each recognizes a large number of errors caused by confusion of letters and each comes to the conclusion (apparently independently) that many of these

---

6) Jean Mallon, *Paléographie Romaine*, Madrid (1952).

7) E. g., Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism*, Oxford (1958). Giorgio Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence (1971). James Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism*, Urbana (1972). See also L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford (1974), p. 201. As a cause of corruption in Latin scripts, the authors here list letters commonly confused in capital, uncial, and minuscule scripts. They make no mention of cursive.

8) Mallon, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 159-162.

9) *Ibid.* p. 160.

10) A. Dain, *Les Manuscrits*, Paris (1964), pp. 68f.

cases of letter confusion could have occurred only with a copyist working from a II<sup>nd</sup> or III<sup>rd</sup> century Roman Cursive script<sup>11)</sup>. Brunhölzl, in particular, challenges the traditional belief that confusion of P and T arises in Capital script, locating it rather, as already noted, in Roman cursive of the II<sup>nd</sup> or III<sup>rd</sup> centuries. Nonetheless, the traditional view is still offered in the second edition of Reynold's and Wilson's book *Scribes and Scholars*<sup>12)</sup>. In spite of this, it is more likely that Brunhölzl is correct, as seems clear from personal study of the cursive scripts themselves, using the facsimiles published in the Rylands and Oxyrhynchus collections of papyri<sup>13)</sup> and in Mallon's *Paléographie Romaine*.

Although neither Constans nor Brunhölzl claims to have found all possible examples of confusion in cursive, there is sufficient overlap in their respective discussions for each to confirm the work of the other. The letters which each identifies as sources of confusion in cursive are: Constans – r, a, and p (e. g., par for rap); n and ri; r taken for ni; t and r; te and re; p and t; f with e, t, i, and s; ci and u. Brunhölzl – b and d; r and a; t and a; p and t; al for ar; e and l. A glance at the following table which I have compiled shows the potential confusion inherent in the cursive scripts. The abbreviated reference at the top of each column identifies the papyrus from which the examples are taken.

a) Letters	P. Ryl. 4.611 (A. D. 87/88)	P. Oxy. 17.2103 (III <sup>rd</sup> )	P. Oxy. 1.32 (II <sup>nd</sup> )	P. Oxy. 4.720 (A. D. 247)
a				
r				
p				
t				
c				
s				

11) Constans, *op. cit.*, p. 512; Brunhölzl, "Zur Überlieferung des Lukrez," p. 100.

12) Reynolds and Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

13) *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, ed. A. S. Hunt, J. de M. Johnson, V. Martin, C. H. Roberts, E. G. Turner, Manchester (1911–1952), 4 vols. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ed. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and others, London (1898 ff.).

b)	P. Ry. 4.613 (IInd)	P. Oxy 4.735 (A. D. 205)
b		
d		
c)	P. Oxy. 1.32 (IInd)	P. Oxy. 31.2565 (A. D. 224)
e		
u		

The e and u, not mentioned in earlier treatments, are added under c) in the table above because confusion of these letters appears with some frequency in the *Georgics* and seems an obvious source of confusion in the examples of cursive which I examined.

This study is confined principally to the first book of the *Georgics* since it offers a sufficient number of examples for an evaluation of this approach to the study of textual corruption. In the lists below, the capital letters identify the majuscule MS of Vergil in which the variant is found. The reading on the left has been judged correct by Geymonat<sup>14</sup>).

#### Confusion of s () and c ():<sup>15</sup>

G I	25	invisere MP	inviscere R
	36	nec (sperant) M <sup>1</sup> PR	ne (sperant) M
	180	faticat AMRP <sup>2</sup>	faticat P
	183	(oculis) capti APRM <sup>2</sup>	apti M
	252	praediscere MP	praedicere AR
	318	concurrere MP	consurgere R
	495	(inveniet) scabra M <sup>1</sup> R	sabra M

14) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. Marius Geymonat, Paravia (1973).

15) Here in the case of s and c, and sometimes elsewhere, omission occurs after two distinct letters (sc) have been misread (as ss) and what then appeared as a superfluous s was eliminated.

## Confusion of s (𐌱) and t (𐌿):

G I	211	usque AMR	utque P
	218	cedens ARM <sup>2</sup> P <sup>2</sup>	cedent P cadens M
	256	tempestivam (silvam)	tempessilvam P
	258	diversis APRM <sup>2</sup>	diversit M
	314	messis PRM <sup>1</sup>	messit M
	506	facies M	faciet R
G II	166	venis PM <sup>2</sup>	venit M

## Confusion of t (𐌿) and c (𐌺):

G I	52	sit AMRP <sup>2</sup>	sic P
	111	(procumbat) culmus MPR	ulmus A
	174	currus AMRP <sup>2</sup>	turgus P
	315	lactentia M <sup>1</sup> P	latentia M iacentia R
	422	concentus RM <sup>1</sup>	contentus M
	456	nocte M	note R
G II	3	crescentis M <sup>1</sup>	trescentis M
G III	236	oblitum P	oblicum M

## Confusion of y (𐌶) and u (𐌺):

G I	166	Mystica AP	mustica MR
	306	myrta MR	murta P
	337	Cyllenius M	Cullenius R
	345	fruges RM <sup>1</sup>	fryges M

## Confusion of e (𐌶) and u (𐌺):

G I	10	et MRP <sup>2</sup>	ut P
	78	urunt MPRA <sup>1</sup>	erunt A
	82	requiescunt AMP	requiescent R
	117	umore AMRP <sup>2</sup>	emore P
	135	ut MPR	et A
	439	sequentur M	sequuntur R <sup>1</sup>
	446	rumpent M <sup>2</sup>	rumpunt R rumpentu M
G II	168	ligurem P	ligyrum M (y and u also)

## Confusion of t (𐌿) and r (𐌿):

G I	257	signorum AMRP <sup>1</sup>	signotum P
	370	at Boreae RM <sup>1</sup>	arboreae M

Confusion of r () and s ():

G I	102	laetus AMR	laetur P
	266	facilis (rubea) AMR	facili P
G II	415	caeditur MR	caeditus P

Confusion of a () and r ():

G I	66	pulverulenta AMR	pulveaulentr P
	224	credere APR	caedere M

Confusion of b () and d ():

G I	91	adstringit MPR	abstringit A
	127	quaerebant PR	quaeredant M
	240	ad APR	ab M

Confusion of g () and s ():

G I	387	gestire RM <sup>1</sup>	sestire M
-----	-----	-------------------------	-----------

Confusion of u () and n ():

G I	17	Pan ovium PRM <sup>2</sup>	pan onium M
	457	moneat RM <sup>2</sup>	moveat M

Confusion of s () and i ():

G I	49	messes AMR	meises P
-----	----	------------	----------

Confusion of ar () and al ():

G I	145	artes AMPR <sup>2</sup>	altes P
-----	-----	-------------------------	---------

Confusion of m () and nc ():

G I	137	tum MPR	tunc A
	139	tum APRM <sup>1</sup>	tunc M

Confusion of m () and nt ():

G I	201	lembum MPR	lembunt A
-----	-----	------------	-----------

Confusion of eru () and ruu ():

G I	300	fruuntur PR	feruntur M
-----	-----	-------------	------------

Confusion of am () and ma ():

G I	115	amnis AMR	manis P
G II	313	ima MR	iam P

Confusion of ra (λλ) and m (Μ):

G II 321 cum PRM<sup>2</sup> cura M

Confusion of p (Ϯ) and r (ϳ):

G II 389 pinu MR rinu P

These examples from the *Georgics* strongly confirm the earlier suggestion of cursive influence. It is also clear that a number of variant readings as well as the obviously erratic mistakes arose in manuscripts written in cursive scripts. Even a cursory examination of variant readings from elsewhere in the Vergilian text further strengthens this conclusions. Confusion of cursive s and r, for example, seems likely in:

Aen. VI	528	additus PR	additur FM
Aen. VIII	115	fatur MRV	fatus P
Aen. X	446	miratus M	miratur PR
Aen. X	621	fatur MP	fatus M <sup>2</sup> R
Aen. XII	496	testatus MV	testatur PR

and of t and s in:

G III	127	nequeat RM <sup>2</sup>	nequeant P nequeans M
G IV	282	habebit M	habebis P habenis R
Aen. VIII	239	intonat MP	insonat R
Aen. VIII	519	suo tibi R	tuo sibi M suosibi P <sup>1</sup> suo tibi <i>in</i> suo sibi <i>corr.</i> P
Aen. V <sup>II</sup>	529	tonare M <sup>2</sup>	torare M sonare PR
Aen. IX	645	(se) mittit MR	(se) misit P
Aen. X	245	spectabit R	spectabis MPV
Aen. X	696	manens PR	manent M manet M <sup>2</sup>
Aen. XII	455	volant PR	volans MP <sup>2</sup>

Since it is likely, as I suggested in an earlier study<sup>16</sup>), that the majority of important variant readings in the Vergilian text arose

16) *A Study of the Greek Word-lists to Vergil's Aeneid Appearing in Latin Literary Papyri*, University of Cincinnati Dissertation 1968 (unpublished), 37. See also my "The Greek Word-lists to Vergil and Cicero," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 52, No. 2, Spring 1970, pp. 307-308. The papyri texts of the *Aeneid* from Egypt and elsewhere in the Near East give evidence of being the end products of a lengthy Eastern tradition. Since they do not exhibit an independent textual tradition, but rather merely echo the variant readings of the surviving majuscule MSS in the West, it seems clear that these variant readings are quite old and were already in existence when MSS of Vergil were first brought to the East.

early (well before the time of the earliest surviving MSS and papyri), it seems reasonable to conclude that a better understanding of the early textual history of the Vergilian corpus (as well as that of other Latin authors) can be obtained only by accepting the fact that cursive scripts were used in the early stages of the transmission of the text.

Akron/Ohio

Robert E. Gaebel

## THE LOW BIRTH-RATE IN ANCIENT ROME: A POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTING FACTOR

There is considerable evidence to show that Roman society in the late Republic and early Empire was afflicted by a low birth-rate. Augustus in 18 B.C. found it necessary to pass the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* in the hope of raising the birth-rate by penalizing the unmarried and the childless. In 9 A.D. he attempted to supplement this law with the *lex Papia Poppaea*. The very existence of this legislation indicates that the problem of childlessness was widespread and long-lasting, a view which is further supported by references to this subject in Latin literature<sup>1</sup>).

A number of theories have been put forward by scholars to explain this fact. Among these are the notion that Romans prac-

---

1) Augustus's attempt to raise the birth-rate did not lack precedent in Roman history. Valerius Maximus tells the story that the censors Camillus and Postumius, as early as 403 B.C., had fined elderly bachelors for failing to marry and sire children (Val. Max. 2.9.1) and Metellus Macedonicus, censor in 131 B.C., made a speech urging men to marry and procreate, which was read out to the Senate by Augustus in support of his own legislation (Suet. Aug. 89.2). However it seems unlikely that Augustus's attempts to solve the problem were very successful. Tacitus states explicitly that they were not (Tac. Ann. 3.25) and in view of the fact that the Augustan legislation was reinforced by Domitian and re-enacted in the second and third centuries A.D. it seems that the low birth-rate continued. Jones disagrees with this view and argues that there was a slow but appreciable increase in the birth-rate following Augustus's legislation (A.H.M. Jones, *Augustus* [London 1970], p. 136). Nevertheless there is considerable evidence for the existence of marriages which produced no children at all or only one child, as Balsdon shows (J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Roman Women* [London 1962] pp. 194 ff.).