

MARIELLA BONVICINI, *Il 'novus libellus' di Catullo. Trasmissione del testo, problematicità della grafia e dell'interpunzione*, Quaderni di «Paideia» 15, Cesena: Stilgraf Editrice, 2012, 183 pp. ISBN 978-88-9624-015-1.

Gilberto Biondi has turned the University of Parma into a lively centre of Catullan studies. This book, signed off there in 2011 and sent to this journal in 2014 for review, consists of four chapters, twelve numbered illustrations at the end (of book-production from ancient Rome to 1501) and five unnumbered ones in the text (of Catullus 62.30-48 in TOGR and the Aldine of 1502), a bibliography, and indexes of topics, passages, and scholars. The outer chapters provide a general sketch of transmission and presentation but say little about Catullus; the inner discuss spelling and how editors of Catullus since 1900 have handled it. Bonvicini disclaims originality at the outset, and readers who want to know what Catullus put in his *novus* or *nouos libellus* must go elsewhere.

The fourth chapter, 'Problemi di interpunzione nel *libellus*', best shows the limitations of the book. No problem in Catullus is discussed, even though a decision on punctuation is required by the very first sentence of the collection: does the question end with *expolitum* or with *Corneli*? Editors have sometimes rejected an interpretation or a conjecture because the absence of punctuation in ancient copies would have made it hard for a reader to grasp, but B. does not mention such arguments, let alone give examples. Incidentally, someone as interested in punctuation as B. should take more care over her own. Her treatment of relative clauses is poor, and many sentences are separated only by a comma, as in a passage further marred by poor coordination (p. 102): 'Nel papiro del nuovo Gallo ... ogni verso si inizia con una *littera notabilior*, occupa una sola riga e i pentametri appaiono rientranti rispetto agli esametri, le parole sono separate da un punto medio'.

In the first chapter B. naturally talks about different scripts and the graphic mistakes that could arise in copying, and she twice mentions that editors have disagreed about the script of V, the lost Veronensis (pp. 24, 35); but she cites only one piece of evidence that has been invoked and expresses no opinion.

It was perhaps in the second chapter, 'Problemi di grafia nel *libellus*', that B. had the best chance of reaching conclusions helpful to editors, but she comes out favouring the view of Mynors amongst others that several things make it impossible to restore Catullus's spelling even if he himself was consistent and never varied it for contextual reasons: a shortage of contemporary evidence, conflicts in such evidence as we have, the unreliability of

late-antique grammarians as guides to Republican practice, the inconsistency of the authoritative manuscripts both among themselves and internally.

The discursive part of the third chapter had already appeared in *Paideia* 65, 2010, 649–63, but here B. adds 15 pages of tables. In view of divergent practice, she says, the survey ‘sarà utile’. To whom or for what?

In short, this is not really a book about Catullus. That said, however, the outer chapters and elements of the second offer an up-to-date account of how Latin literature was transmitted and presented from the late Republic to the present day. Since it appeared, *Scribes & scholars* has gone into a fourth edition (Oxford 2013), but the Italian translation, *Copisti e filologi* (1969), made from the first, was last revised in 1987 before the third (1991), and B.’s 19 pages of bibliography consist largely of works published since.

I comment on some details.

Pp. 13–14: B. implausibly follows Verdière in regarding *parcus* at 39.11 as a graphic corruption of *pinguis*.

P. 18 n. 38: B.’s most recent example of damage to libraries concerns the fire of 1904 at Turin. Add the flood in 1966 at the Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence; the flood in 2002 at two libraries in Prague, on which see Emily Ray, ‘The Prague library floods of 2002: crisis and experimentation’, *Libraries & the cultural record* 41, 2006, 381–91; the fire in 2004 at Weimar; the collapse in 2009 of the Stadtarchiv, Cologne; and perhaps wanton destruction in 2013 at Timbuktu (reports varied).

P. 26: B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)* III, Wiesbaden 2014, 138 no. 4524, was inclined to put T in the third quarter of the ninth century. On its emergence, well before ‘gli ultimi anni del 1500’, I have a note forthcoming in *Hermes*.

P. 33 n. 89: Enea Silvio Piccolomini was echoing the passage of Quintilian that B. quotes at p. 19 n. 41.

P. 36: A manuscript M appears in B.’s stemma but nowhere in her discussion.

P. 43 n. 125: On incunables of classical texts see also O. Mazal’s four volumes, *Die Überlieferung der antiken Literatur im Buchdruck des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 2003; he discusses Catullus in vol. 2, pp. 416–30.

P. 49 n. 15: This repeats the end of p. 48 n. 8.

P. 74 n. 4: Against Flores–Tomasco on Nicolaus Heinsius and the *apparatus criticus* see my remarks in *Aevum* 80, 2006, 179–80.

Pp. 74–75: Lachmann is mentioned here but not in the index of scholars. His choice of manuscripts for his edition of 1829 has come under heavy fire, but not even Fiesoli in a long chapter on the edition (pp. 61–105) can spare a word for his use of *testimonia*, for instance at 1.2 (Fiesoli reproduces the page in plate IV). Together with his *libri*, they rightly led him to accept *arido*, but B. in her epigraph prefers *arida*.

P. 108 n. 26: Moreau–Maréchal misstates two shelfmarks. She also men-

tions the oldest manuscripts of the Leiden corpus, ABV, but without giving details of their layout.

P. 113: B. puts Alcuin 'alla fine del IX secolo'.

P. 116 n. 48: Barzizza died in 1430; see R. G. G. Mercer, *The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, London 1979, 135-36.

P. 117: The printer has omitted the upper part of the *punctus elevatus*.

Pp. 117-18: 'Tutti i codici di Catullo appartengono all'età umanistica, più precisamente alla seconda metà del 1300.' OGR yes, but surely B. knows perfectly well, even if she never quite says it either on pp. 37-40 or elsewhere, that apart from T no other among the hundred-odd was written before 1400.

P. 118: B. says that Salutati commissioned G and may have punctuated it. For G read R, on which see now T. De Robertis and G. Fiesoli in T. De Robertis, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (ed.), *Coluccio Salutati e l'invenzione dell'umanesimo*, Florence 2008, 238-43 no. 63.

P. 123: Neither Aldus's *Institutiones* of 1493 nor his *Rudimenta* of 1501 includes anything on punctuation, a topic introduced in the *Institutiones* of 1508; B. does well to mention it, especially since it is not mentioned by K. Jensen, 'The Latin Grammar of Aldus Manutius and its Fortuna', in D. S. Zeidberg & Fiorilla Gioffredi Superbi (ed.), *Aldus Manutius and Renaissance culture: Essays in memory of Franklin D. Murphy*, Florence 1998, 247-85.

Slips or misprints (few): p. 22 n. 48 *magisteri*, p. 43 *tum* omitted after *additos*, p. 107 n. 22 'un «rivers of letters», p. 113 n. 41 *quoque* for *quosque*, p. 123 *Istitutiones* and *quam potuimus* for *quae potuimus*.

I was left feeling that B. is a hard-working scholar capable of digesting a wide range of material and summarizing it clearly and concisely. These virtues appear to best advantage, however, in the parts of the book that have least to do with Catullus.

MICHAEL D. REEVE
Pembroke College, Cambridge
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

