

THE MURBACH MANUSCRIPT OF THE *HISTORIA AUGUSTA*

JUSTIN STOVER
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
Justin.Stover@ed.ac.uk

RESUMEN

En este estudio reúno por primera vez todas las evidencias que tenemos del manuscrito perdido de la *Historia Augusta* del siglo IX de la Abadía de Murbach. Un examen de estas evidencias revela que el *Murbacensis* representa un texto muy diferente y superior al que se encuentra en el principal testigo textual del siglo IX, Pal. lat. 899.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Historia Augusta, crítica textual, paleografía

SUMMARY

This study brings together for the first time all the evidence we have for lost ninth-century manuscript from Murbach of the *Historia Augusta*. When this evidence is rigorously examined, it becomes clear that the *Murbacensis* represents a very different, and often superior, text to that found in the main ninth-century witness, Pal. lat. 899.

KEYWORDS

Historia Augusta, textual criticism, palaeography

Fecha de recepción: 20/08/2019

Fecha de aceptación y versión definitiva: 08/09/2020

The *Historia Augusta* has the distinction of being transmitted in three ninth-century manuscripts: the Palatinus (BAV Pal. lat. 899), the Bambergensis (Msc. class. 54, once E. III. 19), and the *Murbacensis*¹. Of these, the Palatinus (P) rightly holds pride of place. Twentieth and twenty-first century scholarship has proven that the *Bambergensis* (B) is a copy of P, and only a single folio of the *Murbacensis* (M) survives. Naturally P, as the only extant independent ninth-century manuscript, has received the most attention. In a pattern familiar from other texts, such as Nonius Marcellus or Ammianus Marcellinus, the transmission of the *HA* then goes silent for centuries. After several exiguous twelfth-century sightings, it reemerges in Italy in the fourteenth century. Here we suddenly find a florescence of manuscripts: the emergence of a new class, called Σ (a class distinguished from P in countless ways both large and small, all of which combine to create a vastly more readable text), and two fresh copies of the codex Palatinus. The first of these is Paris lat. 5816 (L), written in Milan around the middle of the fourteenth century, owned and annotated by Petrarch, and the ultimate source of the first printed edition². The second, formerly Phillipps 7448, was sold in 1980 by H. P. Kraus and its present whereabouts are unknown. Insofar as can be judged from the single published image, it was written around 1375 in Italy: it was in the possession of the Franciscan St. James of the Marches by the early fifteenth century³.

¹ The present study is one half of a diptych, the other panel being my “New Light on the *Historia Augusta*”, *JRS* 110, 2020, forthcoming. In a curious coincidence, after decades of neglect, I discovered after submission of this article of a forthcoming study on the Nürnberg fragment by Lukas Dorfbauer, now published as “Das Nürnberger Fragment und die karolingischer Überlieferung der *Historia Augusta*”, *Hermes* 148, 2020, 345-77. I am grateful to him for his penetrating comments on a draft of this article, and for sending a preprint of his study. On the tradition of the *HA*, see P. K. Marshall, “*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*”, in L. D. Reynolds, N. G. Wilson, eds., *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, 354-6; S. Ballou, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta*, Leipzig 1914; J.-P. Callu et al., “L’*Histoire Auguste* et l’historiographie médiévale”, *RHT* 14-15, 1984-85, 97-130; J.-P. Callu, O. Desbordes, “Le ‘Quattrocento’ de l’*Histoire Auguste*”, *RHT* 19, 1989, 253-75; and J. P. Callu, et al. ‘Introduction generale’, in *Histoire Auguste t. 1, p. 1*, Paris 2002². I assign new sigla in this article for the first four printed editions: Milan 1475, edited by Accursius = α ; Venice 1489, printed by Bernardinus Rizus (Bernardino di Novara) = β ; Venice 1516, edited by Egnatius = γ ; and Basel 1518, edited by Erasmus = δ . P is available online at *DigiVatLib*; B at *Bavarikon*; L at *Gallica*; E on the *Digitale Sammlungen* of UB Erlangen. All four of the first printed editions can be easily found on Google Books, or in the BSB *Digitale Sammlungen*.

² On this manuscript and Petrarch’s marginalia, see “Storici e storia nella riflessione petrarchesca. Il problema del canone”, *Studi medievali e umanistici* 12, 2014, 9-70. Ballou proved the derivation of the *editio princeps* (Milano 1475) from L (*The manuscript tradition*, 82-9).

³ H. P. Kraus, *Catalogue 153: Bibliotheca Phillipica. Manuscripts on vellum and paper from the 9th to the 18th centuries*, New York 1979, no. 42, 51, with detail of explicit and Iacobus’ ownership note; cf. *Iter* 5.463. Ballou, *The manuscript tradition*, 2n., was unable

We also have undeniable use of the *HA* by Boccaccio, as well as by a trio of fourteenth-century historians, Giovanni de Matociis, the *mansionarius* of Verona, the Dominican Giovanni Colonna, and the Bolognese commentator on Dante, Benvenuto da Imola. De Matociis himself uncovered the Palatinus at Verona – how it got there remains a mystery – and his interventions in the manuscript, which are discussed further below, left a decisive mark on the subsequent tradition⁴. The origin of Σ remains unknown, but it must have emerged before 1361, since Benvenuto certainly used a manuscript of that class⁵. Colonna's text of the *HA* presents an enduring mystery, which I discuss further elsewhere⁶. Given these data, it is hardly surprising that most scholarship on the transmission of the *HA* has pursued two interlinked questions: the nature of the relationship of Σ to P (in particular, whether Σ has any independent contribution to make), and the issue of when, where, and by whom the various layers of correction in P itself were applied⁷.

The scholarly consensus regarding the ninth-century manuscripts is that B and M have little to tell us that we cannot learn instead (and with greater ease) from P. Yet, the consensus is rather more fragile than it first appears. It is certainly true that B was copied from P – such is well known

to examine the manuscript, then in possession of Fitzroy Fenwick; unfortunately, she thought it was fifteenth-century. Hohl's 1927 edition adds another ten later manuscripts descending ultimately from P, the earliest being Vat. lat. 1899 (p); to them add London Harley 2658, discussed by L. Purser, "Notes on Manuscripts", *Hermathena* 6, 1886, 39-53, and Roma, Bibl. naz. MS Vitt. Emm. 1004. In total, there are some fifty manuscripts of the *HA* extant. I thank G. Woudhuysen for sharing his provisional handlist with me.

⁴ The best discussions are O. Pecere, "Il codice Palatino dell'*Historia Augusta* come 'edizione continua'", in O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve, eds., *Formative stages of classical traditions: Latin texts from antiquity to the Renaissance*, Spoleto 1997, 323-69, and M. Mayer, "La vida de Pertinax y el manuscrito *Pal. Lat. 899*", *Antiquité Tardive* 16, 2008, 169-75. In this study, to get around the virtually impossible task of dating corrections – some of them erasures or expunctions – I will use the sigla P1 to designate P before any correction, PB to indicate corrections to P made before B was copied from it, PL for those before L, and P Σ for corrections in P after L was copied from a Σ manuscript.

⁵ E. Hohl, "Wer ist Robertus a Porta Bononiensis?", *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 7, 1915, col. 221-4. On the date of the work and its manuscripts, see L. Sarasini "La tradizione manoscritta del *Romuleon* di Benvenuto da Imola", *Acme* 59, 2006, 301-15. I used Valencia 736 (available online at *Roderic*), f. 231v, which presents the Σ bridge passage for the mutilated life of Valerian, inc. *Inter hec Valerianus in Rethia, sicut scribit Iulius Capitolinus...*

⁶ See also R. Modonutti, "In quadam antiquissima historia: l'*Historia Augusta* nel *Mare historiarum* di fra Giovanni Colonna", in G. Albanese et al., eds., *Il ritorno dei classici nell'Umanesimo. Studi in memoria di Gianvito Resta*, Florence 2015, 449-74. He has also edited part of the text, from Hadrian up to Alexander Severus: *Fra Giovanni Colonna e la storia antica da Adriano ai Severi*, Padova 2013.

⁷ On Σ and P, see particularly, the perspicacious discussion of M. Mayer, "Génesis y evolución del texto de la *Historia Augusta*. Consideraciones a propósito de la *Vita Pescenni Nigri*", in J. Velaza, ed., *From the History to the Protohistory of the Text*, Frankfurt am Main 2016, 313-32; as well as (briefly) Marshall, "Scriptores", 355; and (at much greater length) Ballou, *The manuscript tradition*, 60-76.

and well established⁸. The *Murbacensis*, however, probably because it is almost entirely lost, has received very little attention. As such, while it is generally assumed that it has little to contribute to our knowledge of the text, there is a lack of certainty in the literature about the precise nature of its relationship to P. Peter considered it a sibling of P⁹; Hohl thought it predated P¹⁰; Boyer asserts that it belongs to the same family, “which is characterized by displacements in the text and by ‘Christian interpolations’”¹¹; Callu et al. assert that it belongs to the same class as P¹²; Marshall, in *Texts and Transmission*, thought it was “apparently copied from P”¹³. In general, the consensus has been that there is simply not enough evidence for the text of M for us to classify, much less employ it profitably in editing the text¹⁴. In this study, I bring together for the first time all of our evidence for the Murbach text, which is much more extensive than has been acknowledged, in order to assess, on a firmer textual basis, its relationship to P, and show the outlines of the effect that it has had and can have on the text of the *HA*.

1. *FRAGMENTVM NORIMBERGENSE*

The first bit of evidence we have for the *Murbacensis* is from (a fifteenth-century copy of) a ninth-century catalogue from the abbey of Murbach: *Vita Cesarum uel tirannorum ab Helio Adriano usque ad Carum Carinum libri VII*⁵. This entry has attracted considerable interest, not least because nowhere else is a manuscript division of the text into books attested¹⁶. (Indeed,

⁸ That B was copied from P was first demonstrated by Mommsen; see B. Boyer, “Insular Contribution to Medieval Literary Tradition on the Continent. Part II”, *CPh* 43, 1948, 31-9 at 33-5, reviewing earlier literature.

⁹ H. Peter, “Bericht über die Literatur zu den Scriptoribus historiae Augustae in den Jahren 1893-1905”, *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 130, 1907, 1-40 at 36.

¹⁰ Hohl, “Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der Historia Augusta”, *Klio* 13, 1913, 387-423 at 402.

¹¹ Boyer, “Insular contribution”, 36. I assume that by “Christian interpolations” Boyer is referring to the phrases omitted (almost certainly by accident) in the life of Aurelian by P; on which see “New Light”.

¹² Callu, *Histoire Auguste 1.1*, xcvi.

¹³ Marshall, “*Scriptores*”, 354.

¹⁴ The scholarly gap in the coverage of M is emphasized by M. Nobili, “Due note critiche alla *Vita Commodi* nella *Historia Augusta*”, in G. Piras, ed., *Labor in studiis. Scritti di filologia in onore di Piergiorgio Parroni*, Roma 2014, 193-9.

¹⁵ W. Milde, *Der Bibliothekskatalog des Klosters Murbach aus dem 9. Jahrhundert. Ausgabe und Untersuchung von Beziehungen zu Cassiodors ‘Institutiones’*, Heidelberg 1968, no. 293. J. P. Callu, “La première diffusion de l’Histoire Auguste (Ve-IXe s.)”, in J. Straub, ed., *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/1983*, Bonn 1985, 89-129, has a lengthy discussion of the entry.

¹⁶ It underpins the grand theories of Ratti (such as, to mention just one, “394: fin de la rédaction de l’Histoire Auguste?”, *Antiquite Tardive* 16, 2008, 335-48), and E. Savino (*Ricerche sull’Historia Augusta*, Napoli 2017).

Paschoud has argued that it is present in the catalog only through error¹⁷). For centuries, the manuscript was thought entirely lost, until an interesting fragment was turned up in Nürnberg in the middle of the twentieth century. Frag. Lat. 7 of the Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg is a single folio removed from a binding, written in a neat and round early Caroline minuscule¹⁸. It contains the text of *Commod.* 10.8: *habuit* to 14.2 *postea commo-*. In 1950, it was identified by Bernhard Bischoff as the sole remnant of the Murbach codex of the *Historia Augusta*¹⁹. In spite of its seemingly obvious importance and interest, it has never been properly published²⁰, so I present here a diplomatic transcription of the text²¹:

Habuit in deliciis homines appellatos nominibus verendorum
 utriusque sexus quoque libentius suis oculis applicabat. Habuit et ho-
 minem pene prominentem ultra modum animalium quem non
 appellabat sibi carissimum quem et ditavit et sacerdotio hercu-
 lis rustici praeposuit. Dicitur sepe[*pretio*]sissimis cibis humana 5
 stercola miscuisse nec abstinuisse gustum aliis ut putabat inrasis
 Duos gybbos retortus in lance an[*gen*]tea sibi sinapi perfusus exhi-
 buit eosdemque statim promovit acditavit. praef. praes. suum iu-
 lianum togatum praesente officio suo in piscinam d&rusit quem
 saltare &iam nudum ante concubinassuas iussit quatenus 10
 tem cymbala deformato vultu. genera leguminum coctorum
 ad convivium propter luxuriam continuationem raro vocavit.
 Lavabat per diem septies atque octies & in ipsis balneis edebat.
 Deorum templa polluta stupris & humano sanguine imita-
 tus est & medicum ut sanguinem hominibus emitteret & scal 15
 pris feralibus Menses quoque in honorem eius pro Augusto com-
 mo]dum . pro septembri . herculem . pro octobri . invictum . pro
 novembri exuperatorium . pro decembri[*amazonium*] ex sig-
 no ipsius adulescentes vocabant. amazonius autem vocatus est
 ex *amazonia* re concubinae suae marci quam pictam in amasone dili 20
 gebat. propter quam & ipse amazonico habitu in arena roma

¹⁷ F. Paschoud, "Chronique d'histoire tardo-antique", *Antiquité Tardive* 15, 2007, 349-65 at 360-1 and A. Cameron, "Antiquus Error / novus error: the HA, Nicomachus Flavianus, and the 'pagan resistance'", *JRA* 24, 2011, 835-46. This ingenious explanation goes back to P. von Winterfeld, "Nachrichten 180", *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27, 1902, 527-8.

¹⁸ B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des 9. Jhs.* vol. 2, Wiesbaden 2004, no. 3652 p. 327.

¹⁹ P. Zahn, "Hrabanus Maurus super Matheum. Zu einem neuen Fragmentfund in der Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg", *Bibliotheksforum Bayern* 1, 1973, 120-5, at 121.

²⁰ Callu et al., "L'Histoire Auguste", 100, present three readings from what they call an almost illegible text.

²¹ I use square brackets with italics to indicate illegible text. The manuscript punctuation, word division, line division and spacing have been kept as far as possible. I have also printed the original text; corrections are noted in the collations below. The transcription has been made from high resolution photographs kindly supplied by Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg.

nam procedere voluit. Gladiatorium & iam certamen subiit
 & nomina gladiatorum recepit eo gaudio quae acciperet
 triumphalia ludum semper ingressus. ē quotiens ingrederetur
 publicis monumentis indidit iussit pugnasse aut dicitur
 septingentis tricenis quinquies nominatus inter caesares quar-
 tum idum octobrium quas herculeas postea nominavit pudente
 & pollione cons. [a]ppellatus germanicus idibus herculeis. M[axim]
 mo & orfito consulibus adsumptus in omnia collegia sacer-
 dotalia sacerdos xiii kl invictas pisone iuliano consulibus.
 Profectus in germaniam xiiii kl aelias ut postea nominavit
 isdem cons. togam virilem accepit cum patre appellatus im //

<verso>

perator v kl exsuperatorias pollione iterum & apro consu-
 libus triumphavit x kl ian isdem consulibus. Iterum pro-
 fectus iii non commodias orfito & rufo consulibus datus in
 perpetuum ab exercitu & senatu in domo palatina commodi-
 ana conservandus xi kl romanas presente iterum con-
 sule tertio medians de profectioe a senatu & populo suo
 & electus est. vota pro eo facta sunt nonis piis fusciano iterū
 consule. Inter haec refertur in litteras pugnasse illum sub pa-
 tre trecentis sexaginta quinq. Item post ea tantum palma-
 rum gladiatorum confecisse vel victis retiariis vel occisis
 Vt mille con[ting]erent ferarum aū diversarum manu sua occi-
 dit ita ut elephantos occideret multa milia et haec fecit spec-
 tante saepe populo romano. fuit aū validus ad haec alias de-
 bilis [et infirm]us vitio & iam inter [ing]uina [pro]minentia ita ut
 eius tumorem per sericas vestes [populus Romanus agnosce-
 r[et] & [versus in eo multi scripti sunt] de quibus & iam in operibus
 marci [maximus gloriatur. virum ad conficiendas fera-
 tantarum fuit, ut elephantum conto transfigeret et] oris
 cornubasto] transmiserit et singulis ictibus multa milia fe-
 rarum ingentium [conficeret. impudentiae tantae fuit, ut cum
 muliebri veste in am[phit]eatro vel theatro sedens publice
 sepius biberit. victi sunt sub eo tamen cum ille sic vivere
 perlegatos mauri. victi daci pannoniae quoque compositae brit-
 tania in germania & in dacia imperium eius recusantibus
 provincialibus quae omnia ista per duces sedata sunt ipse com-
 modus insubscribendo tardus & negligens ita ut libellis una
 forma multis subscriberet. in epistulis autem plurimis vale-
 tantum scriberet agebanturque omnia per alios qui etiam con-
 demnationes in innum[er]is ver[tis]se dicuntur. per hanc aū negli-
 gentiam cum et annonam vastarent hi qui tunc rem publicam
 gerebant & iam inopia ingens romae exorta est cum fruges
 non desent & eos quidem qui omnia vastabant postea commo-

There are two gross errors that bind this text closely with P:
 verso l. 1 aet P & (an ampersand with a cauda) M
 10 gladiatorarum MP

Nonetheless a full collation reveals considerable discrepancies.
 recto l. 5 [preti]osissimis MPL] –imus P1
 cibus MPL] civis P1
 9 piscinam M] pircinam P
 15 hominibus emitteret M] homin<ras.>mitteret P1 hominibus se mitteret PB L hominibus emitteret B *corr.*
 20 amasone MPB] amasione P1
 21 certamen MPL] sertamen P1
 28 octobrium MPΣL *corr.*] octobrum P1
 30 xiii MPB] xiiii P1
 verso l. 28 agebanturque MB] agebantur quae P
 28 qui M] quin P

The *fragmentum Norimbergense* was corrected in what appears to be a ninth-century hand:

recto l. 2 quoo M1] quos M *corr.* P
 3 non M1] onon M *corr.* P
 7 argentea M1] argentea M *corr.* P
 23 quase PM1] quasi M *corr.* a se B quasi L quo ipse Σ
 28 idum (yd-) PM1L] iduum M *corr.* L *corr.*

One blatant error was missed:
 verso l. 31 inpia M] inopia PBΣ

At first blush, this may seem a rather meagre harvest. But the *fragmentum Norimbergense* consists only of a folio: were it to contain the whole text, on the basis of the sample above, we would expect it to contain some 2500 correct readings not transmitted in P and its ninth-century corrections. Obviously, given normal variation, such extrapolation is unsafe as anything more than a general guide, but at the least the degree of variation must point to its derivation from an independent source. Hence the text of the fragment precludes the possibility that M was copied from P.

2. FROBEN'S COLLATION OF THE *MVRBACENSIS*

Beyond the *fragmentum Norimbergense* the only explicit evidence we have for the text of the *Murbacensis* is a list of collations for almost half the text provided in the Basel 1518 edition (δ) by Erasmus for Johann Froben²².

²² This is n^o. 89 in V. Sebastiani's recent catalogue of the output of Froben's press, *Johann Froben: Printer of Basel: A Biographical Profile and Catalogue of His Editions*, Leiden 2018, 311-14.

As this was being prepared for printing, Froben and his correctors worked diligently to improve the text printed in the first two editions – Milan 1475 (α) and Venice 1489 (β) – soliciting the monks of Murbach for their copy of the text. At last Froben was sent the old manuscript by the Abbot of Murbach, Georg von Masmünster or George de Masevaux, including a text of the *HA*. At the same time, Froben managed finally to obtain a copy of Egnatius 1516 edition (γ) from Venice, at the Frankfurt book fair held the week before Easter in the first week of April in 1518. Unfortunately, both came a little too late: Erasmus' edition was already in press and half the text had been printed. Rather than revisit and reprint such a mass of material, Froben decided instead to include a collation of Egnatius' edition and the *Murbacensis* against the text which had already been printed, as he explained in the introductory letter he attached to the edition when it was finally finished in June of that year²³:

Johannes Frobenius sends greetings to the gentle reader.

Best of readers, I have the custom of using a manuscript exemplar from a monastic library, if any is to be found, when I am about to print any ancient author. Thus, when I intended to produce Spartianus, I twice sent messengers to the noble monks of Murbach Abbey, asking them to give me the old exemplar which I knew was kept there. But they denied that they could offer such a trifle, when their abbot was not present, and he by chance at that time had fled far away into Burgundy on account of plague. And so on account of his late return to his monks, I received the old manuscript of Spartianus too late, with eight gatherings of it [*sc.* the text] already printed. About the same time, I obtained from Frankfurt a Spartianus printed by the Aldine press, edited by Giovanni Battista Egnatius, which we used in the parts left to be printed, in such a way, nonetheless, that we did not cast aside the manuscript copy. For even if it was full of errors – the sort which afflict almost all the productions of the ancients, which are now in our books – nonetheless, it was useful. By its witness,

²³ Froben's Latinity and scholarly *bona fides* have been questioned, and it is entirely possible that the letter and collation were written by someone else (such as Beatus Rhenanus, whose conjectures are mentioned in the collation; see J. S. Hirstein, "Erasmé, l'*Histoire Auguste* et l'histoire", *Actes du colloque international Erasme (Tours, 1986)*, Genève 1990, 71-95 at 82); see in general S. D. Shaw, "A Study of the Collaboration Between Erasmus of Rotterdam and his Printer Johann Froben at Basel During the Years 1514 to 1527", *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 6, 1986, 31-124. I will continue to refer to the collator as Froben with this caveat. Hirstein ("Erasmé, l'*Histoire Auguste*", 80) thinks that this refers not to the Easter fair, but to the Michaelmas fair in 1517, the year before, which is certainly possible. The Latin text is printed in the 1518 edition; my translation is fairly free. I take my translation of *candidus lector* from Sir Thomas Elyot's *Dictionary* of 1538: "Candidus lector, a gentyll reder, whiche dothe not openly proude that which he redeth".

there was restored the proverbial *senarius* in Aelius Lampridius' life of Alexander Severus, Ὁ πολλὰ κλέψας ὀλίγα δοῦς ἐκφεύξεται, up to this point wanting in all copies. With regard to this passage, I wonder whether the Venetian editors had a greater desire to fill out the lacunae, so that an ignorant reader would not be able to claim that something was missing, than they did honesty and openness. There are also many other places where it is useful, and I decided to add here the portion which covers the first eight gatherings, also including those passages which Egnatius seems to have inserted or changed.

What follows is a long list of collations against the old codex (*Antiq.* or *An.*) and Egnatius' edition (*Egn.* or *Eg.*), for the lives of (in chronological order) Hadrian, Aelius, Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, Verus, Avidius Cassius, Commodus, Pertinax, Didius Iulianus, Septimius Severus, Pescennius Niger, Caracalla, Diadumenus, and Heliogabalus, with more than 300 *Murbacensis* readings recorded²⁴. Frobenius then concludes:

These struck me when I collated our work with the old manuscript and likewise with Egnatius' edition – they did not seem unworthy to bring to the reader's attention. But I want here first for the scales of sound judgment to be employed; one who doesn't have such judgment would be quicker to choose the more absurd reading over the correct one. So you, gentle reader, take good heed of my diligence, and farewell.

At Basel, the Vigil of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, 1518

This must mean that Froben only recorded readings of the *Murbacensis* that he found plausible, while ignoring what he saw as trivial errors and differences.

Froben would seem to offer crucial and somewhat neglected evidence for the text of M. To exploit that evidence, it is important to understand his method of recording variants. In the same list he intermingles readings of the *codex antiquus* and Egnatius' edition, adding occasional conjectures, a few unattributed, most by Beatus Rhenanus. In some cases, he does not provide an attribution for individual readings to either *Antiq.* or *Egn.* because he has already mentioned it in a previous entry. To give but one example, for p. 199 in the edition he lists the following:

ver. 3. Toparchas & Antiq.
ver. 7. Parasmanis. Egn.
ver. 13. fulmen decidens. Egn.
eodem. hostiam & victimarium. Egn.
ver. 28. ut Tatianum. Egn.

²⁴ One can also count the gatherings from Sebastiani, *Johann Froben*, 313.

ver. 31. Vuidium.
ver. 32. Catilium.

The last two readings in the list are not attributed to Egnatius, but that is only because Froben decided not to repeat the attribution. They are indeed Egnatian readings (Venice 1516, p. 29). Some caution, however, is in order, since Froben could and did make mistakes. At *Comm.* 12.5, he lists *Calendas Amazonias* in a sequence of *Murbacensis* readings. Fortunately, this passage is extant in the *fragmentum Norimbergense*, where we find that it reads *kal. Ian.* with *P. Amazonias* is actually a (brilliant) conjecture by Egnatius.

With that caveat, I present here Froben's list rendered for the first time into modern notation, with textual references according to the standard numbering²⁵:

Hadrianus

2.8: cum sollicitus MP] sollicitus δ sibyllinis M] simillimis δ sybillinis P
 3.3 quidem et MP] quidem δ a Traiano MP] traiano δ 4.6 quando MP] quare
 δ 5.2 afferebant MP] efferebant δ 5.5 reniteretur MP] reniterent δ 5.9 post
 haec MP] post hoc δ 5.9 Plotina MP] Plotia δ 5.10 Romam MP] Romana δ
 8.10 minus MP] munus δ 8.11 viro cui MP] viro δ 9.3 attiani MP] Attatiani
 δ 10.2 eum MP] eos δ (eos Σ vel eos *suprascr. a. m. P*) 10.4 cum MP] cur δ
 12.5 se hospitis MP] se δ 13.1 post haec MP] post hoc δ 13.3 cum M] ut P δ 13.8
 toparchas MP] tetrarchas δ (tetra *suprascr. a. m. P*) 16.1 nam et MP] nam δ
 16.2 Catacanas M catacannas P] Catacrianos δ catacaimos P *corr.* catacaymos
 Σ 19.4 urbe Roma MP] urbe δ 19.7 conto MP] centum δ P *corr.* cunctos
 Σ 19.12 molimine MP] volumine δ 20.11 rationes ita MP] rationes δ 22.5
 diligentia iudicum (-es P) sumptus MP] iudicum sumptus δ 22.11 et MP] ex
 δ 24.3 et Antoninus MP] Antoninus δ 25.1 quod MP] quo δ 25.5 post haec
 MP] post hoc δ

Aelius

1.1 eos MP] eorum δ illos MP] illorum δ 2.2 primus tantum MP] tantum
 δ 2.4 matre sed MP] matre δ quod cum MP] cum δ 2.5 duratuum cum M
 duraturum cum P] duraturum δ 4.7 hodie quoque legitur M hodieque P]
 hodie legitur δ 5.4 pernam tenapharmacum M nam terrafarmacum P] nam
 tetrapharmacum δ 5.7 anacliteriis MP] anaclinteriis δ 5.8 accubitationes MP]
 accubationes δ 6.3 incubuimus M P *corr.* (late) incubimus P incumbimus
 δ P *corr.* 6.6 sepultusque est MP] sepultusque δ 6.9 verum antoninus MP]

²⁵ Sometimes, where fitting, I have supplied readings beyond M, P, and δ; where the sequence of correction is not important in P, I have resorted to the P *corr.* convention.

verus antoninum δ 7.5 adoptionem venerunt M] adoptionem venirent δ
adoptionem venerunt P

Antoninus Pius

1.2 Fulvus MP] Fulvius Σδ 1.3 integer MPΣ] aeger δ 1.8 Lanuvia M]
Lavinia δ 2.2 est bonorum M] ex bonorum Σδ (et bonorum Pαβ) 2.3 soceri
fessi aetate M] socerum fessa iam aetate δ (soceri fessi iam aetatem P *Hohl*)
3.5 statuas eius MP] eius δ (*Erasm. conj.* statuas) 5.2 posuit et M P] posuit
δ 5.3 septenis et novenis MP] septennis et novennis δ 5.4 cespitio MP]
cespitio δ 6.1 umquam ullo MP] umquam δ 6.5 optavit MP] adoptavit δ 8.3
Tarracinensis (terr- P) portus MP] portus δ 8.3 Lanuviana MP] Laviniana δ
9.1 Rhodiorum MP] Rhodorum δ 9.4 solitis et M] solitis Pδ 9.8 Romethalcen
M] Rimethalcen Pδ 10.4 e Chalcide MP] Chalcide δ 10.4 Tiberianam MP]
Tiberinam δ 10.9 cococottas M] corocoetas δ corocottas P 13.3 adnitentibus
MP] admittentibus δ 13.4 antoninianas MP] antonianas δ

Marcus Antoninus Philosophus

1.2 a Vespasiano M] a principibus Vespasiano Σδ (a principibus a
Vespasiano P; *del.* a principibus *Salm.*) 1.8 sororem natu MP] uxorem natu
δ 2.3 Polino M] Pollione δ (Polono P) 2.4 Caninio Coloce M] Caninio Celere
Pδ 2.5 Attio Callotino M] Attio Collatino δ Attio Colatino P 3.5 larario MP]
aerario δ honoraret MP] ornaret δ 4.1 honorem MP] honore δ publicis exeniis
MP *corr.*] publicis xenii δ publicis exenii P1 5.3 in Hadriani MP] Hadriani
δ 6.1 iusta MP] busta δ (*Erasm. conj.* iusta) 6.2 impari MP] impar δ 6.3
Tiberianam MP] Tiberinam δ 6.4 iniret M] inierit Pδ 6.5 statum MP] status δ
7.1 existimationis MP] aestimationis δ 8.5 temperarunt MP] temperavit δ 9.4
patruum MP] partum δ 9.4 sorori MP] sororis δ 9.7 tricesimum M] tertium δ
tricensimum P 10.4 multis penatibus vel pauperibus sine crimine senatoribus
M] multis senatoribus vel pauperibus sine crimine δ multis senatibus vel
pauperibus sine crimine senatoribus P senatoribus pauperibus sine crimine
Σ 10.12 darentur MP] daretur δ 11.4 etiam MP] autem δ 11.5 itinerum MP]
iterum δ 12.4 egerat MΣ] gerit δ gerat P 12.12 funambulibus MP] funabulis δ
14.1 et Victualis MP] Parthis δ 14.5 censeat M] censebant δ censebat P 14.5
premerentur M] premeretur δ 15.3 displiceret MP1] displicerent δ 16.1 iam
in suo M] nam in suos Pδ 16.1 honoris M] honorum Pδ 17.2 cum MP] tum
δ 17.4 murrhina M] murrina P] myrina δ 17.6 clarioribus MP] claribus δ 18.1
cuiusque MP] cuius δ 18.2 a diis M] ab aliis P] ab aliis δ 18.8 constitutum MP]
constructum δ 18.8 Antoniniani MP] Antoniani δ 19.8 de qua MP] de quo δ
20.1 sub Marco M] sed Marco Pδ 20.2 dein MP] deinde δ 20.7 invitae MP]
invita δ 21.5 insereretur MP] inferretur δ 22.1 limite MP] limine δ 22.1 bellum
et MP] bellum δ 22.4 tot et talium . . . tot et tales M] tot talium . . . tot tales Pδ
22.12 consulem MP] consularem δ 23.1 est MP] esset δ 23.6 iusserat etiam ut
M] iurasse enim ut ne δ iusserat enim ne P 24.1 puniret MP] punirent δ 24.2

audirentur MP] audiretur δ 24.8 motus defectione Casii nec eius affectus saevi MP] mutus defectione Casii nec affectus seni δ 25.5 vindicare MP] iudicare δ (*Erasm. conj.* vindicare) 25.8 ignovit et MP] ignovit δ 26.4 vi subiti morte M] subito morte δ vi subiti morbi P 26.5 cum tamen impudicitiae M] cum pudicitiae δ cum impudicitiae P 27.7 imperantes MP] imperatores δ 27.11 exspiraret MP] exspirasset δ

Verus

1.1 secutos M (*conj.* Salmasius)] secuti sunt P *corr.* δ secutus P1 secuti sunt 1.4 inhorruisse M] obruisse δ inhonorruisse P 2.1 Aeliani M] aliam δ Aeliam P 2.5 Canimum et M] Caninum δ Caninium et P 3.5 non sedit M] sedit Pδ 4.1 proconsulatus MP *corr.*] post consulatus δ proconsulatos P1 4.3 pro consensus imperio MP] proconsuli imperio δ 4.6 triconibus et M] triconibus Pδ 7.3 Daphnen M] Damnem δ Dapnen P 7.4 Syris MP] Syriis δ 8.7 Maximinus MP] Maximus δ 8.10 habuit et MP] habuit δ 8.11 mimarios MP] mimaririos δ 9.1 aperte M] aperta Pδ inseverat MP] severat δ 9.2 simultatum MP] simulatum δ 9.4 non interfuit MP] interfuit δ 9.5 Codem et Eulectum M] Coedum et Tedetum δ Coeden et telectum P 10.5 ante adventum Lucium Faustina nece praeveniret M] ante adventum Lucii Faustina praeveniret δ ante adventum lucium Faustina ne praeveniret P 10.7 tantam MP] tantum δ 10.7 respergeret MP] respargeret δ

Avidius Cassius

1.9 odi MP] vidi δ 2.3 possumus MP] possum δ 2.8 mei MP] me δ 3.4 nonnumquam MP] numquam δ 4.8 conquiescentibus MP] consequentibus δ 5.3 aliud MP] aliquid δ 6.5 correcta MP] correpta δ 7.4 animo MP] nomine δ 8.6 ipsis vel MP] ipsis δ 9.1 hisque MP] his δ 10.8 Pisitheo MP] Dositheo δ 12.2 remuneranda MP] reverenda δ

Commodus

1.2 Lanuvium M] Lanubium Pδ 2.7 aedibus fecit MP] diebus fuit δ 2.8 in domo altam M] Hidonio aleam δ in domo aleam P (hidonio aleam L) 2.8 imitatus est MP] imitatus etiam δ 2.9 lenonum minister ut probris M] lebronum ministeriis probris δ lelomihi minister ut probris P1 lenonum minister ut probris P *corr.* 2.9 provexit MP] pervexit δ 3.6 eum serius MP] auterus δ 3.7 helluareturque viribus MP] eluereturque turibus δ 4.2 Tarrutini M] Tarrunteni δ tarruteni P 5.7 ea praemisisset MP] ea promississet δ cum eam oppressisset Σ (*Capreas misisset Hohl*) 5.12 iudicio MP] indicio δ 7.1 eam tum MP] eam δ 7.5 Mamertini Antoninum MP] Mamertium Antonianum δ 8.5 haec illi . . . interficeret MP] haec . . . interficerent δ 8.6 qui MΣ] cui Pδ ei MP] *om.* δ delinimenta M] delenimenta Pδ 9.3 parvulum M] pravolum δ parvolum P e cubiculo MP] cubiculario δ 10.5 dissicuit MP] disiecit δ 10.6 quibus . . . tulisset . . . fregisset MP] qui . . . tulissent . . . fregissent δ 11.3

piscinam M] pircinam Pδ 11.4 raro vocavit MP] revocavit δ 11.10 nomina MP] normia δ 14.5 immunitates M] immuntiones Pδ 14.8 facilitate MP] felicitate δ 17.1 Q. Aemilius M] Quintus Aelius δ Quintius Aemilius P 18.16 imperante MΣ] imperatore δ imperantem P

Pertinax

1.5 ducendi MP] dicendi δ 1.6 iter MP] itere δ 2.10 e Syria MP] Syria δ 5.7 militemus MP] militia munus δ 6.4 votis MP] notis δ 7.11 donativo MP] donativum δ 9.3 alimentaria MP] alimenta δ 9.9 senatui MP] senatu δ 10.2 cognitusque MP] cognitus δ 11.7 eos MP] nos δ 13.5 χρησόλογος M] chrestologum δ christologum P 14.2 eius pupulas MP] suis pupillas δ 15.3 patri MP] peciri δ

Didius Iulianus

1.2 Adrumetina MP] Adrumetia δ 2.1 curam MP] culpam δ 2.4 cum Sulpitiano MP] cum consul Pitianus δ 2.6 cum Sulpitiano MP^{corr.}] consule Pitiano δ consulpiciano PB 2.6 pollicentem MP] pollicente δ 4.5 quod et ipse MP] quod δ 7.7 esse maluit MP] maluit δ 7.10 incantato MP] incantando δ 8.1 Iulio Lato M] Iulio Lacio δ Iulio Laeto P 8.6 desertus MP] dersertus δ 8.10 sepulturam MP] sepulchrum δ 9.3 sibi praesules MP] praesules δ

Severus

1.6 quid sibi MP] quod sibi δ 4.7 legatione MP] legione δ 5.1 Germanicis MP] Germanis δ 5.8 vere M] vero δ P1Σ (vero L) 6.5 praef. praet. M] praefectus δ 6.10 pertimiscendo MP1] pertimiscens de δ (pertimescende P ^{corr.}) 7.6 poposcerunt MP] poposcerent δ 7.8 sodalibus Aelianis M] sodalibus Helviatis δ sodalibus Helvianos P 8.1 Provo et MP] Prolio et δ 8.12 praeciperet MP] praeriperet δ 8.17 item MP] eadem δ 9.4 victum viverent M] victu iuverant δ victum iuverant P 11.3 Adrumetinus MP] Adrumentinus δ 12.3 per Hispanias MP] et Hispanias δ 12.9 infra scriptos MP] conscriptos δ 13.3 Gracchum M] Graecum δ Graccum P 13.4 Claudium MP] Claudicum δ 14.1 praeter eos MP] praetor δ 4.7 occiderit MP] occidit δ 15.6 dicit MP] dixit δ 17.4 propter rerum antiquarum cognitionem et MP] *om.* δ (*même au même*) 17.4 Memphim M] mensam δ memfim P 18.1 in tributarios MP] vi tributarios δ 18.9 atque in MP] atque δ 21.8 quidem suum ne homini M] suum ne omni δ quidem ne homini P 22.2 ne praiceps MP] praiceps δ 22.3 tres Victoriolae MP] tres victoriae δ 22.5 corona dixisse MP] coxisse δ 24.4 aditum MP] additum δ

Pescennius Niger

2.4 Iulianum MP] Iulianus δ 2.5 dementia MP] clementia δ 3.2 nec sibi Pescennio M] neque Pescennio δ sibi neque Pescennio P 4.1 cum manu M] manu δ eum manu P 5.1 perinde M] proinde Pδ 5.4 legiones MP] legationes

δ 6.8 musivo M] musibo δ musio P 7.3 intimavit ut MP] intimavit δ 8.1 maximo MP] maximae δ 8.3 qua requisitum MP] requisitum δ 8.3 animantis MP] minantis δ

Clodius Albinus

Beyond Diadumenus in δ

Caracalla

4.1 Papianus MP] Papinianus δ 4.2 Papiiani MP] Papinianum δ 6.6 Reteanusque M] Reanusque δ Receanusque P 8.3 et huic MP] ad hoc δ 8.3 atque ad hoc M] atque ob hoc Pδ 9.3 moratus MP] morigeratus δ 9.7 ipse Caracalli MP] Caracalli δ 9.11 primus invexit MP] prius invexit δ 11.6 et divale nomen eripuit certe templum MP] *om.* δ (*même au même*)

Antoninus Geta

2.4 patuisset MP] paruisset δ 2.5 cucurisset MP] concurrisset δ 4.4 institissent MP] instituissent δ 5.3 nomen accepit MP] non accepit δ 5.8 farrata MP] farta δ

Opilius Macrinus

Beyond Diadumenus in δ

Diadumenus

2.2 et inperio MP] inperio δ 5.2 huic MP] hinc δ 7.2 intexam MP] interim δ

Heliogabalus

1.2 Pium Titum MP] Pium δ 2.4 Constantios MP] Constantinos δ 4.1 senatum MP] senatu δ 4.3 unquam MP] nunquam δ 4.4 pellicia an ossea M] pellicionossea δ pellicianosse P 5.1 subaret MP] subigere δ 6.2 et tribunatibus MP] tribunatibus δ 6.9 vinctum MP] fictum δ 7.1 matris deum M] matris etiam deinde δ matris etiam deum P 7.7 postea quam MP] postea quod δ 8.4 insecutus MP] insectatus δ 10.3 genere MP] nomine δ 11.5 celebraret MP] celebrarent δ 13.7 tegerent M] tegeret Pδ 16.2 Sulpitianus M] Ulpianus δ P *corr.* Ulpicianus P1 17.4 adfectato MP] adfectatio δ 18.4 quae quia digna MP] quae digna δ 26.6 dicens et hic M] dicens ex hic δ dicens et hinc P 27.7 frumentarius MP] fructuarius δ 28.3 quos illi agathodemones vocant habuit MP] *om.* δ (*même au même*) 30.1 popinarium MP] propinarium δ 30.2 multis mensis MP] multis δ 30.6 exhibuit MP] habuit B 34.1 ita ut nemo vir M] ita ut nemo δ ita nemo vir P 35.7 praedicaro MP] praedixero δ

Sadly, Froben's generosity in providing the readings of the *Murbacensis* has not always been graciously received. The early modern editions mostly ignored them; indeed, by the time we get to the Cologne 1527 reprinting

of the Basel edition, the list of readings is gone, albeit with corrections sporadically incorporated into the text. The modern age of classical scholarship has scarcely been more appreciative: Hohl and Peter cite them only haphazardly and seemingly at random. So, for example, Hohl ignores at *Ael.* 4.7 M's reading *hodie quoque* (*hodieque* P); at *Ant. Pius* 2.3, M's *soceri fessi aetate*; and at *Ael.* 2.5 M's odd *durativum* (*duraturum* P). Even worse, at *Verus* 3.5 he does not report M's *non sedit* (*sedit* P), despite conjecturally inserting a negation elsewhere in the line. The most thorough are the Budé editors, particularly Callu et al. Even so they only tend to cite Froben's collation of M, where it disagrees with either P or Σ²⁶.

Two egregious cases of neglect deserve particular consideration. At *Antoninus* 9.8, Froben reports that the *Murbacensis* read *Romethalcen*, where his own edition, the previous editions, and P read *Rimethalcen*, for the name of a client king of the Bosporan kingdom²⁷. We know his name was *Ροιμητάλκης* from coins and inscriptions, which would normally be Latinized as *Rhoemetalces*²⁸. M's *Rom-* gets us closer to the truth, and could not have been derived from P. Another comes in the life of Pertinax (13.5):

nec multum tamen amatus est, si quidem omnes, qui libere fabulas conferebant, male Pertinacem loquebantur, chrestologum eum appellantes, qui bene loqueretur et male faceret.

For the crucial word, P reads *christologum*. But this anecdote is attested elsewhere in the Latin tradition, in the so-called *Epitome de Caesaribus* 18.4:

Blandus magis quam beneficus, unde eum Graeco nomine χρηστολόγον appellavere.

So the most recent editions (Pichlmayr and Festy), but it is not entire clear whether this text originally contained Greek characters for the key word. The two earliest manuscripts write *chrestologon*, as does the early witness Freculf (2.2.19 Allen), but some of the other early manuscripts use garbled Greek characters (e.g. Leiden, VLF 96, f. 19ra: XPEGTOΛOTON), and there is ninth-century evidence for this in the *Collectaneum miscellaneum* of

²⁶ Callu et al. miss, for example, M's insertion of *et* after *solitis* at *Ant. Pius* 9.4, or M's agreement in (*quo*) *Rhodiorum* with P, against Σ's *corindiorum*. Earlier works by Callu and his collaborators had misunderstood Froben's letter, and the meaning of eight quires, and thought that the collation only went up to *Marc. Aur.* 9.7 ("L'Histoire Auguste", 100).

²⁷ Callu et al. (*Histoire Auguste* 1.1, 85) cite the reading but does not consider its implications.

²⁸ See S. Walentowski, *Kommentar zur Vita Antoninus Pius der Historia Augusta*, Bonn 1998, 113.

Sedulius Scottus (see Festy's apparatus, *ad loc.*). In this context a *Murbacensis* reading reported by Froben is particularly significant:

Pag. 247. ver. 2. χρῆσολογος

This reading has likewise been ignored, since Froben does not explicitly attribute it to *Antiq.* But once again this is because of its position in a sequence of *Antiq.* collations, which, as explained above, means it was indeed in M (it does not occur in Egnatius, so we can rule out a mistake). P's reading is thus a derivative transliteration, albeit one that reflects the iotacism of the *eta*, and the archetype, perhaps like the *Epitome*, contained the epithet in Greek.

This should not be surprising, since, as we saw above, Froben tells us he was able to restore another Greek passage with the assistance of M, at *Alex. Sev.* 18.5, where the earlier editions had left a gap following *talis est: idem addebat sententiam de furibus notam et Graece quidem, quae Latine hoc significat: "qui multa rapuerit, pauca suffragatoribus dederit, salvus erit", quae Graece talis est...* We do not know what M contained, but using it Froben was able to print: Ὁ πολλὰ κλέψας ὀλίγα δούς ἐκφεύξεται, as cited above. For the same passage P reads: *opolia clepsas oligas dus ecfeuxente*²⁹. (By contrast, the text of Egnatius ridiculed by Frobenius is a *de novo* translation of the Latin: ὅστις ἂν πολλὰ κεκλόπημεν [?] ὀλίγα δὲ τοῖς βοηθοῦσιν ἔδωκεν σῶος ἔσται). Since M seems to transmit the Greek word at *Pertinax* 13.5, there is no reason why *Alex. Sev.* 18.5 could not have been transmitted in Greek. Even if it were not, we would still have the correct reading ἐκφεύξεται, however transliterated, against P's *ecfeuxente*.

None of these instances could have been derived from P. Of the three hundred readings of M provided by Froben, nearly a quarter differ (to a greater or lesser extent) from P. Hence the conclusions to be reached by analyzing Froben's collations of M are entirely consistent with what can be deduced from the *Fragmentum Norimbergense*: there is virtually no possibility that M is derived directly or indirectly from P.

And yet Froben's collation is hardly even complete. If we compare the Basel edition with the *fragmentum Norimbergense*, we obtain the following:

quos M] quos δ
 non M] non δ
 gustum M] gustu δ
 piscinam M] pircinam δ
 raro vocavit M] revocavit δ
 amasone M] amazone δ
 nomina M] normia δ

²⁹ The Budé editor, C. Bertrand-Dagenbach, cites only *Frobenius 1518* for the Greek reading (*Histoire auguste. Tome III. 2e partie*, Paris 2014, 15), ignoring Froben's explicit statement about its origin.

quase M] quasi δ
 idum M1] Iduum δ
 gladiatorarum M] gladiatoriarum δ
 spectante saepe M] saepe spectante δ
 inopia M] inopia δ

Froben provides a much scantier collation:

piscinam M] pircinam δ
 raro vocavit M] revocavit δ
 nomina M] normia δ

We can grant that Froben had no interest in whether M was corrected, which rules out three on the first list. We can allow as well that he was not interested in relatively trivial issues of orthography, which rules out *amasones*. Finally, we can concede that he was not interested in outlandish errors, which removes *gladiatorarum*. Even with such generous concessions, however, he still missed well more than half of M's readings. Hence his list of collations can never be anything more than a partial guide to M. Given that and given the sheer number of variant readings that he still provides, the only logical conclusion is that M offered a text of the *HA* that differed radically from, and was at times superior to, that found in P.

3. IMPLICIT READINGS FROM THE *MURBACENSIS*

But there is yet another crucial aspect of Froben's list of readings that has been neglected: *he was not collating the Murbacensis against P*. Froben had never seen P or any text like P. Instead, his acquaintance with the text beyond Erasmus' edition could only have come from either the *editio princeps* (α) or the Venice 1489 (β). The former at least has something like a P text, although heavily contaminated. Even so, he is not collating M against α , but rather against the edition Erasmus has already prepared and which he has already printed. To determine, therefore, the readings of M, one must collate δ against P, and subtract from δ the readings found in Froben's list – most of which turn out to be either idiosyncracies and mistakes in Erasmus' text, or readings in print from α . One can verify this by examining accidental M readings, which are cases where Froben has printed a few words in order to situate a passage, and one of the incidental words he includes has an important reading diverging from P. One example:

Ael. 7.5: adoptionem venerunt M] adoptionem venirent δ adoptionem venerunt P *Hohl*

Froben cites this reading because Erasmus included a subjunctive where M (and, of course, P) had an indicative. But incidentally he tells us that M read *adoptionem* with δ and not *adoptionem* with P. *In adoptionem venire* is the normal idiom (cf. Lact. *Epit.* 38.7 p. 715 Brandt, Mar. Vict,

in *Eph.* 1:7, *Aug. Exp. Gal.* 63 p. 139 Divjak, idem. *Serm. Dom. In monte* 2.16, and Leo, *Tract.* 27). *In adoptionem venire*, by contrast, is attested only (supposedly) here. If editors had had in their hands another ninth-century manuscript which read *adoptionem* and not *adoptionem*, surely they would have printed the former and regarded the latter as an innovation of P?³⁰ We may not have the codex in our hands, but thanks to Froben's diligence we know it was written there, and *Ael.* 7.5 should be printed as *adoptionem venerunt*³¹.

As interesting as these few incidental M readings may be, they are not the primary reason why the list is useful. Instead its utility comes from its implicit readings, that is, where the Basel edition differs significantly from P, and the difference is passed over silently by Froben. Two cases present themselves from the *fragmentum Norimbergense*. We know from the Nürnberg fragment that M reads *praetiosissimis* where P originally had the reading *praetiosissimus*. The *-issimis* reading (P *corr.*) made it into the printed editions and so into δ . As a result, Froben does not mention it as a reading from *Ant.* because it was already in his text – yet it was in M, nonetheless. Or take M's *hominibus emitteret*. P shows considerable confusion at this point, with an original text that is unreconstructable due to erasure; by the time B was copied, at least, it had been corrected to *hominibus se mitteret*. This reading made it into L, and thence to the Milan and Venice editions. Erasmus, presumably by *ope ingenii*, made the easy correction to *hominibus emitteret* before he had access to the *Murbacensis*. Hence Froben does not mention this reading of the old manuscript, even though it confirms that a reading he was the first to print is correct.

Points at which δ differs from P (up through *Diad.*), where Froben records no *Murbacensis* reading, number in the thousands. This is best illustrated by examining several particularly corrupt passages.

Pertinax, 10.1-3 P (f. 48v)

Insidias paravit ei falco conquestus est . in senatu volens imperare quo quidem credidit . dum sibi quidam servus, quasi faviae seti qui filius ex ceioni commodi familia palatinam domum ridicula vindicasset . cognitusque iussus est flagellis caesus domino restitui . In cuius vindicta hii quod erant pertinacem, occisionem [-cas- *corr.*] seditionis invenisse dicuntur.

Pertinax 10.1-3 Hohl:

Insidias paravit ei Falco . . . conquestus est in senatu . . . volens imperare. quo quidem credidit dum sibi quidam servus, quasi Fabiae †setique filius ex Ceioni Commodi familia, Palatinam domum ridicule vindicasset . . . cognitusque iussus est flagellis caesus domino restitui. In cuius vindicta

³⁰ See, too, TLL s. v. *adoptatio* I 806.43-55 (Prinz) for the rather thin evidence for the word.

³¹ Callu et al. do record M's reading, but print P's (*Histoire Auguste* 1.1: 63)

hi[i] qu<i> oderant Pertinacem, occasionem seditionis invenisse dicuntur.

Basel 1518 (δ), p. 245:

Insidias paravit ei Falco volens imperare, de quo conquestus est in senatu, quod quidem senatus credidit. Dum sibi quidam seruus quasi Faviae esset filius qui ex Ceionii Commodi familia Palatinam domum ridicule vindicasset, cognitus, iussus est flagellis caesus domino restitui. In cuius vindicta hi qui oderant Pertinacem, occasionem seditionis inuenisse dicuntur.

Amid this morass, Froben provides us with precisely one textual note from M: 10.2 cognitusque M] cognitus δ. The actual differences, however, are as follows:

volens imperare *transp. post* Falco δ
add. de quo *ante* conquestus δ
 quo P] quod δ
add. senatus *ante* credidit δ
 seti qui P] esset δ
 ridicula P] ridicule δ
 cognitusque P] cognitus δ
 hii quod erant P] hi qui oderant δ
 occisionem P1] occasionem PLδ

Hence the question: what did M read? Did M really represent something like the text of P, and, amid nine differences in three lines, the only variant Froben saw fit to note was the relatively trivial *cognitusque*? Some of P's readings are certainly *absurdiora* and M may well have had something similar in such cases; but that can hardly account for all of them. Straightforward use of Froben's testimony would lead us to believe that M read (with an undetermined number of trivial errors) an actually sensible text:

Insidias paravit ei Falco volens imperare (de quo conquestus est in senatu) quod quidem senatus credidit. Dum sibi quidam servus quasi Faviae esset filius qui ex Ceionii Commodi familia Palatinam domum ridicule vindicasset, cognitusque iussus est flagellis caesus domino restitui. In cuius vindicta hi qui oderant Pertinacem occasionem seditionis inuenisse dicuntur.

Another passage, this one from the life of Heliogabalus (8.3-5), points in a similar direction. In the Basel edition, it reads (pp. 278-9):

Cum collatum inisset, in populum non nummos vel argenteos vel aureos vel bellaria vel minuta animalia, sed boves opimos, et camelos, et asinos, et cervos, populo diripiendos abiecit, imperatorium id esse dictitans. Insectatus est famam Macrini crudeliter, sed multo magis Diadumeni, quod Antoninus dictus est, Pseudoantoninum et Pseudophilippum eum appellans, simul quod cum luxuriosissimus extitisse, vir fortissimus, optimus, gravissimus, severissimus diceretur. Coegit denique scriptores nonnullos de nefanda, immo potius non ferenda eius dicta luxuria disputare, ut in vita eius.

For the same passage P reads (f. 78v):

cum conlatum inisset in populum . non nummos vel argenteos vel aureos bellaria vel minuta animalia sed boves optimos et camelos et asinos et cervos populo diripendos abiecit imperatorium id esse dictitans . Insecutus es [*corr.* est] famam macrini crudeliter sed multo magis diadumeni quod antoninus dictus est pseudo antoninum et [*corr.* ut] pseudophilippum eum appellans, simul quod ex luxoriosissimo extitisse . vir fortissimus . optimus gravissimus severissimus diceretur . coegit denique scriptores non nullos nefanda immo potius mipace de eiusdem dictum luxuria disputare ut in vita eius.

For comparison, Hohl prints:

Cum con<su>latum inisset, in populum non nummos vel argenteos vel aureos <vel> bellaria vel minuta animalia, sed boves op[t]imos et camelos et asinos et cervos populo dirip<i>endos abiecit, imperatorium id esse dictitans. Insecutus es<t> famam Macrini crudeliter, sed multo magis Diadumeni, quod Antoninus dictus est, Pseudoantoninum ut Pseudophilippum eum appellans, simul quod ex luxuriosissimo extitisse vir fortissimus, optimus, gravissimus, severissimus diceretur. Coegit denique scriptores nonnullos nefanda, immo potius imp<i>a[ce] de eiusdem victu et luxuria disputare, ut in vita eius...

Collating P against δ gives us the following:

aureos P] aureos vel δ
 optimos P] opimos δ
 deripendos P] deripiendos δ
 insecutus P] insectatus δ
 es P1] est PL δ
 ex luxoriosissimo P] cum luxoriosissimus δ
 nefanda P] de nefanda δ
 mipace de eiusdem dictum P] non ferenda eius dicta δ

By contrast, according to Froben, there is only one difference between the *vetus Murbacensis* and Erasmus' text: insecutus M] insectatus δ . Taking his testimony at face value would once again bring us to the conclusion that the text in M was far closer to the text of the Basel edition than it was to P.

For a third example, consider the letter of Verus to Marcus Antoninus in the life of Avidius Cassius. Hohl reads (*Avid. Cas.* 1.7-9):

Avidius Cassius avidus est, quantum et mihi videtur et iam inde sub avo meo, patre tuo, innotuit, imperii: quem velim observari iubeas. omnia ei nostra [e]di<s>plicent, opes non mediocres parat, litteras nostras ridet. te philosopham aniculam, me luxuriosum morionem vocat. vide quid agendum sit. ego hominem non odi, sed vide, ne tibi et liberis tuis non bene consulas, cum talem inter praecinctos habeas, qualem milites libenter audiunt, libenter vident.

As the typography indicates, the text in P is corrupt at a number of points (f. 51r): ediplicent P1; moriomen P; consulat P; tales P. The text in the Basel edition, however, is very different:

Avidius Cassius avidus est imperii, quantum et mihi videtur, et iam inde sub avo meo patre tuo innotuit, quem velim observari iubeas. Omnia enim nostra displicent, opes non mediocres parat, litteras nostras ridet. Te philosophiam anniculam, me luxuriosum morionem vocat. Vide quid agendum sit, ego hominem non vidi, sed vide, ne tibi et liberis tuis non bene consulat, Cum tales inter praecinctos habeas, qualem milites libenter audiunt, libenter vident.

Froben supplies us with only two differences between M and the Basel edition: ei M] enim δ and odi M] vidi δ. Taking Froben at face value would lead us to conclude not only that M may not have had all of the corruptions of P in this passage, but that it also had the transposition of *imperii* to after *avidus*, which is certainly more natural than the extreme hyperbaton in P.

At points, an intelligent consideration of these implicit readings of M can provide interesting textual information which Froben could not have grasped. Among Aelius' various excesses, he was particularly fond of indulging in an elaborate dish which contained the udders of sows, pheasants, peacock and wild boar, and which somehow involved pastry as well; this is the famous *tetrapharmacum*, beloved of antiquarians for five hundred years. The passage reads as follows in Hohl (*Ael.* 5.4):

nam te<t>rafarmacum, seu potius pentefarmacum, quo postea semper Hadrianus est usus, ipse dicitur repperisse, hoc est sumen, fasianum, pavonem, pernam crustulatam et aprunam.

P reads:

namterrafarmacum [tetr- corr.] seupotius pentefarmacum quo postea semper hadrianus est usus . ipse dicitur repperisse . hoc est sumen . fasianum . pavonem . pernam crustulatam . et aprunam.

δ displays one important difference, namely the omission of *pernam*:
nam tetrapharmacum seu potius pentapharmacum, quo postea semper Hadrianus est usus, ipse dicitur repperisse, hoc est sumen, Fasianum, Pavonem, crustulatam et aprugnam.

Froben gives us a truly mysterious variant in M: *Pag. 207, vers. 7. Pernam tenaphar. Antiq.* This must mean that M read *Pernam tenapharmacum* where P reads *Nam terrafarmacum* and the editions *Nam tetrapharmacum*. First, this gives us old manuscript support for the *ph* orthography. It may also provide us with a third reading for the first

syllable of the second word: *ten* aganst *terr* and *tetr*³². More importantly, however, it tells us that there was a transposition of *pernam* in M³³. *Pernam*, which is missing in δ (and in all the previous editions, $\alpha\beta\gamma$) could have been transposed to before *tetrapharmacum* and assimilated with *nam*. Then again, *pernam* may itself have been originally an interloper introduced as a gloss on the basis of the previous mention of the dish in *Hadr.* 31.4, where it is described simply as *de fasiano sumine perna et crustulo*³⁴. Were it originally a marginal gloss in the archetype of MP, its different placement in the two manuscripts would make perfect sense.

Regardless of whether this reconstruction is correct or not, the point remains that *pernam* occurs in this passage for the first time only in Froben's collation of M, and that M did not contain *pernam* where it is found in P. Indeed, here as elsewhere, the text of M already seems to have shared features with the text of the Basel and previous editions.

I have only offered a few particularly noteworthy examples of this phenomenon. But if we take the evidence of Froben's collations seriously, we will find literally hundreds of implicit M readings which deserve consideration. Paradoxically, Froben's collations prove exactly the opposite of what has usually been thought: the text of M was not much like P at all, and was much closer to the vulgate text of editions.

A comparison is instructive, since the 1518 *Historia Augusta* is not the only edition to come out of the house of Froben to present collations. Just a couple years later, the press would issue an astounding rarity, the *editio princeps* of Velleius Paterculus of 1520. The sole (massively corrupt) manuscript of this Roman history was discovered by Beatus Rhenanus at Murbach in 1515. Using a now-lost copy supplied by a friend, Beatus produced his edition between 1518 and 1519, ultimately supplying the Press with both manuscripts as well as his edition. As the work was nearing completion, J. A. Burer, Beatus' collaborator, noticed an error in the printed text, and proceeded to collate the printed edition (referred to by the siglum P) against the Murbach manuscript (\bar{M}). His collations (siglum B) were ultimately printed at the end of the edition. Besides P and B, the only surviving witness to Velleius' text is a later copy of the lost copy used by Beatus (Basel AN II 38, siglum A). Reynolds sums up the result:

Thus we have three witnesses to the text of Velleius: APB. The reconstruction of the archetype is no easy matter, and not least because of the partial

³² The reading *ten-* attributed to M could represent a misreading by Froben of an original *terr-* or *tetr-*.

³³ Callu et al. (*Histoire Auguste* 1.1, 60) records M's orthographic variation, but not its *pernam*.

³⁴ Perhaps *perna* was added here by a glossator to specify shoulder of boar, as indeed the phrase *perna apruna* is used in Apicius 8.338. It is worth noting that Apicius is named later in this same passage, *Ael.* 5.9.

character of B. But Burer's collation appears to be such a meticulous piece of work that one is reasonably safe in assuming from B's silence that P = (M)³⁵.

No one has made this same deduction regarding Froben's collation of the Murbach manuscript of the *Historia Augusta*. Even if we assume (without any particular evidence) that Froben's collation was less thorough than Burer's, there still ought to be a serious consideration of every passage in the collection up to *Diadumenus* where δ differs from P and the collation is silent. Perhaps the value of Froben's collation is more negative than positive. There needs to be a complete collation of the Basel text against P, and any differences which are not on Froben's list, and where P does not transmit nonsense, ought to be weighed carefully.

4. THE *ALIAE LECTIONES* IN THE BASEL EDITION

The text of the *HA* would have been better served if the monks of Murbach had delayed just a few months longer. As it is, we do not have a collation of the whole text, as we do for Velleius Paterculus, but for less than half of it, for Froben collated it only up to *Diadumenus*. This leads one naturally to ask how we can ascertain the readings of the *Murbacensis* for the rest of the text. In the introductory letter, Froben tells that it was useful in many places, but he singles out only the Greek at *Alex. Sev.* 18.5. At first blush, this makes the situation comparable to another Froben publication, Sigismund Gelenius' Ammianus of 1533 (which, incidentally, also reprints the 1518 edition of the *HA* with significant corrections). Gelenius had at his disposal the (now almost entirely lost) Hersfeld manuscript, which he used to restore a Greek passage missing in the previous editions and the other Carolingian manuscript (*Res gestae* 17.4.18-23). For the rest of the text, he certainly used the Hersfeld manuscript, but we have no way of knowing what represented his own contribution and what he took from his manuscript³⁶. While the general parallel holds for Froben's 1518 *HA*, we do have one helpful feature not employed in the 1533 Ammianus. As noted above, the first eight gatherings had already been printed, which means that the portion of the text for which the *Murbacensis* was available begins on p. 289 of the 1518 edition. On that page, in the outer margin at the bottom of the page we find a marginal note keyed to *Diad.* 4.3-4 *ut rumpi non poterit, fibris intercedentibus specie nervi sagittarii. Ferunt* (where the Basel edition

³⁵ Reynolds, "Velleius Paterculus", in Reynolds-Wilson, *Text and Transmission*, 431-3 at 432.

³⁶ See, briefly, G. Kelly, J. Stover, "The Hersfeldensis and the Fuldensis of Ammianus Marcellinus: A reconsideration", *Cambridge Classical Journal* 62, 2016, 108-29 at 126; and for more detail, G. Kelly, "Why We Need a New Edition of Ammianus Marcellinus", in M. Hanaghan, D. Woods, eds., *Ammianus Marcellinus: From Soldier to Author*, Leiden 2022 [forthcoming].

reads *ut rumpi non potuerit viris intersedentibus specie. Nervis agitari ferunt*):

Alia lectio. Ut rumpi non potu. interceden. specie nervi sagitarii. Ferunt &c.

Our manuscripts, P and Σ, read *utrum non potuerit viris intersedentibus specie nervi sagitarii ferunt* (a much later hand in P corrects *utrum* to *ut rumpi*, and some Σ manuscript read *intercedentibus*). In order to understand the meaning of the *alia lectio*, we must understand the textual basis of the Basel edition. Erasmus was using as a basis the previous published editions of the HA, the *editio princeps* produced in Milan in 1475 under Accursius (our α) and the Venice 1489 edition printed by Bernardino di Novara (β). A cursory examination of the evidence shows that he did not follow either of the two editions alone, but used both of them at different points. So from the lives of Avidius Cassius, Geta and Caracalla we find the following:

Avid. Cass. 1.7 imperii transp. post avidus est βδ

Avid. Cass. 1.9 odi] vidi βδ

Avid. Cass. 3.1 et om. βδ

Geta 1.7 patris] patris matrisve βδ

Geta 6.3 hoc α] haec βδ

faverant βδ] fuerant α (P)

Geta 4.5 parcis αδ] pacis β

Carac. 2.2 in ore semper αδ semper in ore β

Carac. 3.2 adlocutus β] locutus αδ (P)

Carac. 3.7 a percussoribus β] percussoribus αδ (P)

Carac. 4.10 editis β] edictis αδ

Carac. 7.3 doctissimis αδ] a doctissimis β

There is no consistency here: usually Erasmus seems to be following the Venice edition, but occasionally seems to switch to the Milan edition, even in a few cases where the Milan reading seems objectively inferior (*percussoribus* and *locutus* for example). At other times, he follows the Venice edition even when it clearly contains nonsense such as *vidi* at *Avid. Cass.* 1.9 (the passage is discussed above). Hence, one must conclude at best that Erasmus was not being systematic and instead was using the two editions *seriatim*, but with a strong preference for β. He was most certainly not doing any sort of rigorous collation of the two. There is no evidence that any manuscripts were employed before the *Murbacensis* was obtained.

To return then to the *alia lectio*, both α and β read what is in the main text of the Basel edition. If we turn to the 1516 edition of Egnatius (our γ), the edition Froben obtained at the same time as he obtained the Murbach manuscript, we find almost exactly the *alia lectio*: *Ut rumpi non potuerit intercedentibus specie nervi sagitarii. Ferunt...* It stands to reason, then,

that the editor of the 1518 edition used these *aliae lectiones* to mark the use of the new textual sources³⁷.

The consequence is that the 65 marginal readings marked *als.*, or *alius*, in the margin following this passage ought to derive from one of the two sources Froben had just obtained³⁸. Here I present for the first time these readings in modern notation, collated against the Venice 1489 (β) and 1516 (γ) editions:

Diadumenus

7.5 Gellae *in marg.* Alius Celsae.] Celsae γ Cellae β 9.4 Caracallae *in marg.* Alius Caracalli] Caracallae γ Caracalli β

Opilius

2.1 adolescendi *in marg.* Alius adolescent] adolescendi γ adolescenti β 4.7 fictione *in marg.* Alius factione] fictione γ factione β 10.6 nothus *in marg.* Alius notus] notus αβγ 15.2 redditus *in marg.* Alius creditus] redditus γ creditus β

Clodius Albinus

6.3 fusis *in marg.* Alius Phrysiis] Phrysiis γ fusis β 9.6 cumulant *in marg.* Alius tumulant] cumulant γ tumulant β 10.7 Plautini *in marg.* Alius Plautilli] Plautini γ placet ut illi β Plautilli α

Alexander Severus

6.4 videre *in marg.* Alius vivere] videre βγ vivere α 13.5 aream *in marg.* Alius arcam] aream γ arcam β 14.6 adiutam *in marg.* Alius ad vitam] adiutam γ ad vitam β 47.2 multos *in marg.* Alius ultimos] multos γ ultimos β 17.3 maria *in marg.* Alius numina] numina γ maria β 19.1 ubi *in marg.* Alius urbis] urbis γ ubi β 19.2 falsi rei *in marg.* Alius falsarii] falsarii γ falsi rei β 20.1 infectum *in marg.* Alius in factum] infectum γ in factum β 24.1 provinciales, gestorias, praesidales plurimas fecit *in marg.* Alius Praetorias, praesidales provincias plurimas fecit] Praetorias, praesidales provincias plurimas fecit γ provinciales, gestorias, praesidales fecit β 37.9 milij *in marg.* Alius ex nullis] milii γ ex nullis β 40.3 aurum *in marg.* Alius

³⁷ There are four *aliae lectiones* from before p. 289: *Pert.* 11.7 nos *in marg.* Alius eos. δ] eos αγ nos β; *Sev.* 16.1 herbarum *in marg.* Alius culparum δ] herbarum γ culparum αβ; *Heliog.* 19.5 moderatius *in marg.* Alius odoratius] moderatius α moderatus β odoratius γ; *Heliog.* 26.7 porcellarios *in marg.* Alius per cellarios] per cellarios γ porcellarios αβ. The last three, at least, reflect use of Egnatius' edition; the only way this is possible is if these sheets were reprinted with the marginal lectiones after Froben had obtained it. Given the small number of them, this hardly would have been onerous. There is evidence of such reprinting elsewhere; for example the marginal note on p. 309 is badly misprinted in the copy in Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele, 9.3.G.25, but correct in all the other copies I have seen, such as Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 73.C.12. Beyond this, there are also two different versions of the title page: see Hirstein, "Erasme", 74.

³⁸ Who altered the text after the two new sources were obtained cannot be guessed. It could not be Erasmus, since he was not present in Basel at the time; see Shaw, "A Study", 60.

annum] aurum γ annum β 40.6 Baphus *in marg.* Alius Baphijs] Baphus γ Bafius β 60.6 Dryas *in marg.* Alius Druyas] Druyas γ Dryas β

Maximini Duo

1.5 Thraciae *in marg.* Alius Threiciae] Threiciae P Thraciae $\Sigma\beta\gamma$ Threice α
 2.7 minusculis *in marg.* Alius minusculis] minusculis γ minusculis β 3.6
 suscipi *in marg.* Alius suspici] suscipi $P\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ 8.4 quin in exercitu faber *in*
marg. Alius qui sine exercitu miles faber] quin in exercitu faber γ qui sine
 exercitu miles faber β 8.5 Chironem *in marg.* Alius Scirronem] Scirronem
 γ chironem β 11.1 Osdroënis *in marg.* Alius Osrohenis] Osdroënis $P\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
 13.5 delicto *in marg.* Alius delectu] delicto $P\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ 13.5 Scythicis *in marg.*
 Alius siccis] Scythicis γ siccis β 17.6 audire *in marg.* Alius videre] audi-
 re γ videre β 20.5 tradiderunt *in marg.* Alius crediderunt] tradiderunt
 γ crediderunt β 23.2 deficiebant commeatus *in marg.* Alius deficiebatur
 commeatibus] deficiebant commeatus γ deficiebatur commeatibus β 27.6
 Toxotius *in marg.* Alius Troxotius] Toxotius $P\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$

Gordiani tres

2.2 Gracchorum *in marg.* Alius graecorum] Gracchorum γ graecorum β
 3.1 Alchionas *in marg.* Alius Balchionas] Alcionas γ Balchionas β 3.7
 Cybiratici *in marg.* Alius Cypriaci] Cybiratici γ cypriaci β 25.2 felicem
in marg. Alius feliciores] felicem γ feliciores β 28.2 in qua militaris portio
in marg. Alius militanea potior, & quae posset exercitum] In qua militaris
 portio γ militanea potior et quae posset exercitum β

Valeriani duo

1.5 remotioribus *in marg.* Alius. interioribus] remotioribus γ interioribus β

Gallieni duo

4.8 Corinthum *in marg.* Alius. Astacum] Astacum γ corinthum β 11.5
 aetate *in marg.* Alius pace] pace $P\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ 13.8 Macedoniam, Moesiam *in*
marg. Alius. Achenoniam, Boetiam] Macedoniam moesiam γ acheno-
 niam boetiam $P\alpha\beta$ (anthenoniam moesiam Σ)

Triginta tyranni

12.11 Electum *in marg.* Alius intellectum] intellectum γ electum β 12.17
 inopinata *in marg.* Alius. incognita] incognita γ inopinata β 13.2 minus
in marg. Alius. Unius] minus $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ unius P 32.5 imiviarum *in marg.*
 Alius. univiriam] imi viariam γ imiviarum $\alpha\beta$ univiarum (*vel* uni vi-) $P\Sigma$
 33.7 male nobis *in marg.* Alius. malevolis] malevolis γ male vobis β

Claudius

4.3 servator *in marg.* Alius. senator] senator γ servator β 6.2 Austrogoti *in*
marg. Alius. Ostrogotthae] Ostrogotthae γ austor goti β 6.2 Sigipedes *in*
marg. Alius. Gepidae] Gepidae γ sigipedes β 8.2 incendia *in marg.* Alius.
 Mancipia] mancipia γ incendia β 14.8 gubitana *in marg.* Alius. Succubita-
 na] Succubitana γ gubitana β 17.5 Volateralieuticum *in marg.* Alius. Boli-

tera halieuticum] bolitera halieticum γ voletarlieuticum β 17.5 Zanchas *in marg.* Alius. Laneas] laneas γ zanchas β

Aurelian

7.1 Monciacum *in marg.* Alius. Magori tiacum] Maguntiacum γ Monciacum $\alpha\beta$ (montiacum P1 magontiacum P Σ) 13.1 Auulnio *in marg.* Alius. Amulio] Amulio γ avulnio β 32.4 titulis *in marg.* Alius. Oculis] titulis $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ oculis P

Probus

2.3 Piratici *in marg.* Alius. Parthici] Piratici γ parthici β 15. 2 serunt *in marg.* Alius. Serviunt] serviunt P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ 16.5 voluntatem *in marg.* Alius. urbanitatem] voluntatem γ urbanitatem β 17.2 Ioppem *in marg.* Alius. Coptem] Ioppem γ coptem β 19.4 ibices oves *in marg.* Alius. Libycae oves] ibices oves γ libycae oves β

Carus

18.2 Murtium *in marg.* Alius. Marcum] Murtium γ Marcum β 18.5 Euthe-mus *in marg.* Alius. Eusthemus] Euthemus γ Eusthemus β

A brief glance at these yields a disappointing harvest. The vast majority relate to Egnatius' edition: sometimes Froben has printed Egnatius' readings in the main text, and inserted the Venice 1489 reading in the margin, and other times he has stuck to his main source for the main text, and supplied Egnatius' readings in the margin. A few of them show use of the *editio princeps*, such as *Clod. Alb.* 10.7 Plautini *in marg.* Alius Plautilli] Plautini γ (260v) placet ut illi β Plautilli α and *Alex. Sev.* 6.4 videre *in marg.* Alius vivere] videre γ (120r) β vivere α . There remain, however, a handful of interesting readings:

Opil. 10.6 nothus *in marg.* Alius notus] notus P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
Maxim. 3.6 suscipi *in marg.* Alius suspici] suscipi P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
 11.1 Osdroënis *in marg.* Alius Osrohenis] Osdroenis P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
 13.5 delicto *in marg.* Alius delecto] delicto P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
 27.6 Toxotius *in marg.* Alius Troxotius] Toxotius P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
Gall. 11.5 aetate *in marg.* Alius pace] pace P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$
Trig. Tyr. 13.2 minus *in marg.* Alius. Unius] minus $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ unius P
 32.5 imiviriam *in marg.* Alius. univiriam] imi viariam γ imiviriam $\alpha\beta$
 univiriam (*vel* uni vi-) P Σ
Aurel. 7.1 Monciacum *in marg.* Alius. Magori tiacum] Maguntiacum γ
 (200r) Monciacum $\alpha\beta$ (montiacum P1 magontiacum P Σ)
 32.4 titulis *in marg.* Alius. Oculis] titulis $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$ oculis P
Prob. 15. 2 serunt *in marg.* Alius. Serviunt] serviunt P $\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$

We can account for all of the sources of the 1518 from *Diadumenus* on – the Milan *editio princeps* (α), the Venice 1489 (β), Egnatius (γ) – except

the Murbach manuscript. It stands to reason that these, which cannot be accounted for by those three *fontes*, must represent the readings of M. Some of these are obviously nonsense, such *Maxim.* 13.5 *delectu* and *Gall.* 11.5 *aetate*; others are P readings which had never appeared in print before this, such as *Trig. Tyr.* 13.2 *unius*, 32.5 *univiriam* and *Aurel.* 32.4 *oculis*; some are orthographic peculiarities, such as *Maxim.* 11.1 *Osrohenis* and 27.6 *Troxotius*. (The spelling *Osdro-* is attested elsewhere in the *HA*, in Ammianus, and Eutropius; the M spelling *Osroh-* is attested in Jerome, *ep.* 129.4). Others are certainly correct: every editor of the *HA* prints *nothus* at *Opil.* 10.6 and *suspici* at *Maxim.* 3.6, with what has been reckoned to be no manuscript support, and Salmasius and Peter defended *serunt* at *Prob.* 15.2.

One more feature of the Basel edition must be attributed to the Murbach manuscript. It is well-known that the manuscript tradition of the *Historia Augusta* has been compromised by codicological problems in the archetype, quires and pages of the text put together in the wrong order. This confusion, if anything, was only exacerbated by a failed attempt by Matoci in the fourteenth century to remedy the defects, one which continues to manifest in the early editions of the text, the Milan 1475, Venice 1489, and Basel 1518 (the Venice 1516 of Egnatius is mostly free from the confusions, due to its use of a Σ manuscript)³⁹. The problems begin at *Alex. Sev.* 15.5, where the Basel edition prints (p. 309): *...capitali poena adfecit. In iocis...* The line beginning *in iocis* is for us *Alex. Sev.* 44.1: what we have is a massive jump across some thirty sections of text. What follows is *Alex. Sev.* 44.1-58.1 *lectis* (pp. 309-13; this is one of the rogue gatherings in the archetype), and then following that we pick with *Alex. Sev.* 15.6 *Negocia et* up to 43.6 *evenisset* [sic; *fecisset* P], which continues immediately with 58.1 *omnibus* (pp. 313-23), and so on. On p. 309, however, a marginal note is supplied:

Alius historiae ordo in quibusdam exemplaribus ponitur, sequitur enim Negocia & causas &c [15.6] pag. 313 ver. ulti. usque omnibus nominibus pa. 323 ver. 32 [58.1]. Hinc sequitur In iocis &c [44.1].

In other words, ‘in certain other exemplars’ we have that rogue gathering *Alex. Sev.* 44.1-58.1 placed after the block of 15.6-43.6, i.e. exactly where it belongs. Now the order in the main text is derived from the previous two editions, Milan 1475 and Venice 1489⁴⁰. So what are these “other exemplars”?

³⁹ On Matoci’s interventions, see Callu et al. “L’Histoire auguste”, 128; and especially Ballou, *The manuscript tradition*, 42-9.

⁴⁰ I present here the text in the two editions. Due to the lack of pagination in both the printed editions, I refer to the text using the Bildnummer from the digitized copies in the BSB: Venice 1489 (<http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0006/bsb00061092/images/>): (*Alex.* 15.5-6) *poena affecit.* (*Maximin.* 5.2) *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum* (*Alex. Sev.*

Egnatius' edition for one. Since he had a Σ manuscript, he was able to print for the first time what we now know is the correct order. But the note cannot be referring only to Egnatius. Examine the Basel edition's reading at *Maximin.* 5.3: *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum comperit Alexandrum.* This is undoubtedly the correct reading; unfortunately the second rogue gathering begins right in the middle of this line with *comperit*. Matoci's attempt to remedy the damage made things worse. He accidentally scooped up *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum* with the wrong text section, and as a result it ended up immediately following *Alex. Sev.* 15.5 and immediately before *Alex. Sev.* 43.6, producing the following:

...(Alex. 15.5) capitali pena adfecit. (*Maximin.* 5.3) *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum* (Alex. 43.7) fecisset et templare reliqua deserenda. (Alex. 44.1) In iocis...

To fix the grammar of *Maximin.* 5.2, Matoci supplied the words *Ubi vero Maximinus*. This unfortunate arrangement was maintained in both the Milan 1475 and Venice 1489 editions. Egnatius' edition, with its Σ source, is free from the intrusive *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum*, but when it comes to the passage whence it came in the *Maximini duo*, he simply prints Matoci's supplement (f. 145r), not the text transmitted in the manuscripts. The Basel edition, despite following a different order than Egnatius, also manages to dispose of the intrusive phrase, and at the same time lops off some authentic text as well:

...(Alex. 15.5) capitali pena adfecit. (Alex. 44.1) In iocis...

43.6–44.1) *et templare reliqua deserenda.* In iocis (Bildnr. 238)...(Alex. Sev. 58.1) *populum lectis.* (Alex. Sev. 15.6) *Negocia et* (Bildnr. 241)...(Alex. Sev. 43.6) *evenisset templa reliqua deserenda.* (Alex. 58.1) *Omnibus nominibus est adornatus* (Bildnr. 247)...(*Maximin.* 5.2) *occupatus est.* *Ubi vero Maximinus comperit Alexandrum* (Bildnr. 250) ...(*Maximin.* 18.2) *mecum sunt.*(Max. Balb. 8.2) *quos et senatui acceptissimos et sibi adversissimos esse credebant. Quare factum est: ut diximus: ut Gordianum adulescentulum principem peterent: qui statim factus est. Nec prius permissi sunt ad Palatium stipatis armatis ire: quam nepotem Gordiani Caesaris nomine nuncuparunt.* (Alex. Sev. 58.1) *Vario tempore cum etiam de Isauria* (*Maximin.* 18.2) *sentiant et Gordianos* (Bildnr. 253). Milan 1475 (<http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0006/bsb00069443/images/>): (Alex. 15.5–6) *poena adfecit.* (*Maximin.* 5.2) *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum* (Alex. Sev. 43.6–44.1) *et templare reliqua deserenda.* In iocis (Bildnr. 142)...(Alex. Sev. 58.1) *populum lectis.* (Alex. Sev. 15.6) *Negocia et* (Bildnr. 147)...(Alex. Sev. 43.6) *evenisset* [sic; fecisset P] (Alex. 58.1) *Omnibus nominibus est adornatus* (Bildnr. 159)...(*Maximin.* 2.5) *occupatus est.* *Ubi vero Maximinus comperit Alexandrum* (Bildnr. 164)... (*Maximin.* 18.2) *mecum sunt.*(Max. Balb. 8.2) *quos et senatui acceptissimos et sibi adversissimos esse credebant. Quare factum est: ut diximus: ut Gordianum adulescentulum principem peterent: qui statim factus est. Nec prius permissi sunt ad Palatium stipatis armatis ire: quam nepotem Gordiani Caesaris nomine nuncuparunt.* (Alex. Sev. 58.1) *Vario tempore cum etiam de Isauria* (*Maximin.* 18.2) *sentiant et Gordianos* (Bildnr. 170).

When, however, the text gets to *Maximin.* 5.2, we find the authentic text for the first time ever in print, *Occiso Heliogabalo ubi primum* restored to its place before *comperit Alexandrum* and Matoci's supplement finally banished. This correction is beyond conjecture: it could only have come from his manuscript. And the only way one could get it from a manuscript is if the manuscript did not share the disarrangement in P.

These twelve readings and the arrangement of the lives of Alexander Severus and the two Maximini are the only things after *Diadumenus* that we can securely attribute to the Murbach manuscript. Of course, any number of other readings could have been found there. After all, on many occasions the Basel edition prints readings from Egnatius which differ from the earlier editions with no comment. A selection, just from the *Gallieni duo*:

- Gal.* 4.3 querebantur Σγδ] quaerebatur Pαβ
 4.9 Sicilia Σ (scic-) γδ] Siciliam Pαβ
 6.7 mitteret P omitteret αβ amitteret Σγδ
 7.1 incitet Pαβ inceptit Σγδ
 7.4 togatos Σγδ rogatus P1 rogatos PB αβ
 12.1 consulta PΣαβ consulto γδ
 12.2 cuius ostendentia cum his scilicet pauca libet ponere Pαβ cuius ostendentia acumen (acuminis Σ) pauca libet ponere Σγδ
 13.3 quoque virgo P quae virgo Σ quoque virago αβ virago γδ
 13.7 cum Pαβ tum Σγδ
 13.7 militaris perit morte P militari perit morte Σγδ militari periret morte αβ
 14.3 vigilissimus Pαβ vigilantissimus γδ *om.* Σ
 19.4 ac Vestae *Mommsen*] adventam PΣαβ advecta γδ
 20.5 alium e Pαβ alium Σ alium et γδ
 21.3 dicant quam is γδ quamvis Pαβ

Given the editor's frequent recourse to Egnatius' edition, it does seem odd that just a few readings are signalled with *aliae lectiones* in the margin. By analogy, this means it is very likely that there are other M readings in the text too. It is also possible that some or most of the *aliae lectiones* were in fact found in the Murbach manuscript, as well as in one of the Venice editions.

To assess this possibility, we need to look at the textual sources of those two editions. The case of Egnatius' 1516 is relatively simple: it is based on the earlier Venice 1489 edition, with copious emendation *ex ope ingenii* and occasional recourse to a manuscript *in bibliotheca publica* to which Egnatius had access in Venice (see his note to *Marc. Aur.* 20.1)⁴¹. Since his text

⁴¹ On Egnatius' edition, see J. Hirstein, "L'Histoire du texte de l'*Histoire Auguste*: Egnazio et la *Vita Marci*", in G. Bonamente et al., eds., *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Argentoratense. Atti dei Convegno sulla Historia Augusta VI*, Bari 1998, 167-89.

displays definite Σ features (such as the doublet in *Marc. Aurel.* where a line from 21.9 is printed twice, the first time interposed in 17.4) and Bessarion's library, which became the public library in Venice, contained a Σ text of the *HA* (now Marc. Lat. Z 384), it is safe to conclude that Egnatius took the text of the 1489 edition and added material from the Σ family to produce his text. The 1489, however, presents a very different story.

5. THE *MURBACENSIS* AND THE LATER TRADITION

We will return to the 1489 presently. Before moving on from the *aliae lectiones* entirely, let us look more closely at one of the Murbach readings: *Gall. 11.5 aetate in marg. Alius pace $\delta(M)$] pace $P\Sigma\alpha\beta\gamma$* . A look at the context confirms the earlier characterization of this reading as a gross error (regarding Gallienus' enrolment as an Athenian citizen):

Quod neque Hadrianus in summa felicitate neque Antoninus in adulta fecerat *pace*, cum tanto studio Graecarum ducti sint litterarum, ut raro aliquibus doctissimis magnorum arbitrio cesserint virorum.

This is something that neither Hadrian at the height of his success nor Antoninus in his fully established peace had done, though they were both learned, with such a passion for Greek literature that in the judgement of great men they only rarely fell short of some of the most learned.

Adulta aetas is a well-attested phrase, unlike *adulta pax* which is only found here⁴²; nonetheless, it ought to mean 'in the first flush of manhood' (cf. *Bell. Alex. 24.2* and *Sall. Cat. 15.2*, among many others). But Antoninus was north of fifty when he took up the Empire – and there is nothing he could have done in his reign *adulta aetate*. Instead, this must be a reference to his famously pacific reign. Hence the *adulta aetate* is an error, but a very understandable one if a scribe were not paying close attention to the context.

This reading is found elsewhere. A manuscript of the *Historia Augusta* written around 1471, containing only the lives of the two Valerians and the two Gallieni, now housed in Erlangen (Universitätsbibliothek MS 647), transmits the reading *etate*⁴³. The manuscript was written for Giannantonio Campano (d. 1477), who had travelled to Germany on ecclesiastical business, and devoted his free hours to hunting for manuscripts⁴⁴. While we do not have direct evidence that he visited Murbach, we know his itinerary from

⁴² See the discussion and parallels in A. Bruzzone, *Flavio Merobaude. Panegirico in versi*, Roma 1998, 226.

⁴³ On E, see my "New Light".

⁴⁴ On Campano, see F. Di Bernardo, *Un vescovo umanista alla Corte Pontificia. Giannantonio Campano (1429-1477)*, Roma 1975.

Heidelberg to Rome took him within striking distance of the abbey⁴⁵. It is important to note that the reading *etate* is one of only twelve readings we can securely attribute to M from the second half of the *HA*, and the only one from the lives covered by the Erlangen manuscript. Hence, taken together, the provenance of the manuscript and the evidence of this distinctive reading strongly suggest that the Erlangen manuscript (E) was descended from the Murbach manuscript.

This is significant because E presents a very different text from that found in P, not least in the arrangement of the life of Valerian, which begins with a sentence not found in P, continues with *Val. 5.1 cuius – 7.1 superatus*, followed by another passage not in P, before proceeding to *Val. 1.1 Saponi* to 4.4 *Persici*, and finally joining P at 7.1 *nunc*. This arrangement is first found otherwise in the Venice 1489 edition⁴⁶. It is not in the *editio princeps*. I provide a detailed study of E's text elsewhere. Here it suffices to note that E has an extraordinarily close connection to the Venice edition. A small sample:

Val. 2.2 quid ad PΣα quid habet et Eβ
Gall. 2.1 occupavitque : atque Eβ
2.5 post venit add. deinde Eβ *om. PΣα*
16.1 tyrannos esse passus est Romanum dehonestantes imperium Eβ tyrannos vastari fecit PΣα (*suppl. per ante tyrannos Baehrens*) cf. *Alex. 2.2*.
17.1 dixit ille sciebam patrem meum esse mortalem Eβ nec defuit an ille se dixit sciebam patrem meum esse mortalem Pα nec defuit cum ille sic dixit sciebam patrem meum esse mortalem Σ *del. ut gloss. Hohl*

This chain of textual affiliations – M to E, E to β, β to δ – in turn solves the puzzle of Froben's collation of the Murbach manuscript. If E is indeed a descendent of M, Froben was looking at a manuscript which already had most of the distinctive features of his base edition, Venice 1489. Hence the scantiness of his collation. While we might not be able to assume the formula that where Froben's collation is silent δ=M, as editors assume for Velleius Paterculus, in every such case we have even stronger reasons to entertain the possibility that readings in the Basel edition taken from β – and particularly those where it diverges from α – may represent the text of the Murbach manuscript.

But the Eβ text, as I demonstrate elsewhere, is also strongly associated with the text available to Giovanni Colonna. Modonutti has shown that one of the additional passages only in β, a list of jurists in the life of Alexander

⁴⁵ Di Bernardo, *Un vescovo, 245-92*. One of Campano's companions, Agostino Patrizi, *De legatione Germanica*, wrote an account of the journey, extant in Vat. Lat. 3842, ff. 22r-85v.

⁴⁶ See E. Patzig, "Die römischen Quellen des salmasischen Johannes Antiochenus I. Eutrop und Ammian. Mit einem Anhang zur Textkritik der Scriptores Hist. Aug.," *ByzZ* 13, 1904, 13-50.

Severus, was in Colonna's text⁴⁷. In the life of Valerian, Colonna must have had a text which began with the same sentence as the Venice 1489 edition. Since Modonutti's edition only extends to Alexander Severus, I quote from Colonna's autograph (Florence, BML MS Edili 173):

Edili 173, f. 194r: Fuit autem hic Valerianus genere nobilis patre Valerio, et qui per omnes dignitatum gradus ad imperium venit.

β, beginning of *Val.* Valerianus imperator, genere, patre Valerio, censor antea et per dignitatum omnes gradus suis.

Edili 173, f. 194v: ubi nec vigor nec disciplina militaris nihil sibi valuit

β, after *Val.* 7.1: ubi nec vigor nec disciplina quin caperetur militaris quicquam valore potuit.

E, β, and Colonna are all closely affiliated for the section of the text that we can compare them. Hence, it is no surprise that we can find links between M and Colonna as well. For one, Colonna's exemplar seems to have had the correct order of text in the life of Alexander Severus, since he narrates Alexander Severus' campaigns as follows (Edili 173, ff. 142v-143r, ed. Modonutti 249):

(*Alex.* 58.1) Preterea in Mauritania Tigina per Furium Celsum res prospere geste sunt et in Ilyrico per Macrinum et in Armenia per Iulium Palmatum legatum. (*Alex.* 59.1) Igitur post belli gloriam, cum Rome apud populum et apud senatum civiliter vivendo nimium Alexander amaretur, ad bellum Germanicum proficisci voluit:

Caution is in order, because Colonna constantly rearranges his source texts, but this passage looks like a straightforward summary of a passage from *Historia Augusta*. And yet if Colonna's manuscript of the *HA* had P's arrangement of gatherings, the second half of the passage (on 115v in P), from *Igitur post* would have occurred some ten folios before the first half (concluding on f. 125r). Individual readings offer corroboration:

Marc. Ant. 22.4 tot et talium . . . tot et tales M] tot talium . . . tot tales Pδ
Colonna, p. 165 Modonutti: tot et talium . . . tot et tales

Comm. 2.9 lenonum minister ut probris M] lebronum ministeriis probris
δ lelomihī minister ut probris P1 lenonum minister ut probris PΣΣ lebronum minister inprobis L

Colonna, p. 190 Modonutti: In palatio autem inperiali mulierculas forme

⁴⁷ R. Modonutti, "I consiliarii di Severo Alessandro e la tradizione dell'*Historia Augusta* nel Trecento", *Segno e testo* 14, 2016, 381-410.

pulcroris instituit ad prostibulorum formam ac pudicitie ludibrium, on-
nibus undique convocatis lenonibus, tenebat
Comm. 17.1 Q. Aemilius M] Quintus Aelius δ Quintus Aemilius P
Colonna, p. 195 Modonutti: Quintus Aemilius

While the last of these is obviously insignificant, the first two strongly suggest that Colonna's manuscript was related to M.

One other interesting link can be sifted from our evidence. At *Ael.* 2.5 Frobenius reports the *Murbacensis* read *durativum* for P's *duraturum* – certainly an error, since *durativum* has very little claim to being a Latin word in use before the Middle Ages⁴⁸. Σ has the same reading. The same can be said for *Ael.* 6.3 *incubuimus* where P reads *incuibimus* (later banalized by the corrector to *incumbimus*), *Ael.* 7.5 *adoptionem* where P reads *adoptionem*, and other passages as well:

Marc. Aur. 12.4 egerat M Σ] gerit gerat P
Comm. 8.6 qui M Σ] cui P
delinimenta M] deliramenta Σ delenimenta P δ
Comm. 2.9 lenonum M Σ] lelomihi P1
Comm. 18.16 imperante M Σ] imperatore δ imperantem P
Sev. 9.4 viverent M] viverant Σ iuverant P
Pesc. Nig. 6.8 musivo M] musibo $\Sigma\delta$ musio P

We can also confirm this from the Nürnberg fragment, which reads *piscinam* correctly with Σ against P's *pircinam* at *Comm.* 11.3. Of course, most of these readings and the bulk of the other examples not adduced here are correct readings against errors in P, and so provide no sure evidence of influence. *Durativum*, however, as an idiosyncratic error, is sufficient to secure the connection between M and Σ . The same might be said for *musivo/musibo* at *Pesc. Nig.* 6.8. One might add as well that Σ 's *deliramenta* at *Comm.* 8.6 is more easily explained by M's orthography of *delinimenta* than P's more correct *delenimenta*.

Even so, M evidently did not share Σ 's frequent lacunae, or at any rate, not all of them, since Froben reports a reading for M at *Ant. Pius* 8.3, where Σ has dropped text due to a *saut du même au même*. I do not believe that these indications disprove the many links Σ evidently shares with P, but M readings could well have entered it through contamination. After all, having studied the textual dislocations, I do not believe it is possible that they could have been corrected without the aid of a correctly ordered exemplar. Since M indeed transmitted the correct order, perhaps it is from it (or a copy of it) that Σ derived its order.

⁴⁸ It is not in the *TLL*; for some medieval instances, see *DMLBS* s.u. 'durativus'.

6. CONCLUSION: THE *MVRBACENSIS* AND THE *PALATINVS*

The foregoing comprehends what can be gleaned of the text of Murbach manuscript. Disappointing as it might be at points, there are enough interesting and suggestive readings to complicate and perhaps clarify our picture of the transmission of the *Historia Augusta*. By way of conclusion, let us consider once more the question of M's relationship to P. As shown above, there is simply no way that M could have been copied from P. In some respects it bears a close relationship with P, both in its earliest stage (the nonsense reading *subaret* at *Heliog.* 5.1 is the most outstanding case) and after it was corrected. This suggests in turn that M is indeed a sibling of P. And yet, given M's evident links to the non-P sources for the text, is there anything in the extant tradition that cannot be accounted for via MP? Furthermore, a better understanding of M and whence it came tells us something about P itself. The consensus for decades has been that P was written in Italy, probably in the North⁴⁹. If M was written at Murbach before 840, from P's archetype, how could P have been written in Northern Italy? The only possibility would be that both P and its parent made a northern sojourn together, almost immediately after P was written. But, in fact, the evidence for an Italian origin for P has always been slim, based neither on positive palaeographic argumentation, nor codicological or paratextual information. In fact, the whole origin of the theory of P's Italian provenance goes back to a question mark left by Bischoff. Bischoff, in (rightly) rejecting the consensus that it was written at Lorsch, posited Italy as no more than a tentative suggestion, mostly to indicate that he could not associate the script with a known Carolingian centre⁵⁰. The only positive links he made with Italian Caroline minuscule was not in the writing of the main text, but rather the capitals employed in the incipits and explicits (and there are northern examples of very similar capitals). Along these lines, I would add further that there is unmistakable evidence of multiple hands in the text. Besides the shift conventionally acknowledged at f. 210r⁵¹, there are also

⁴⁹ E.g. Mayer, "Génesis y evolución", 320; Savino, *Ricerche*, 39; G. Zecchini, *Ricerche di storiografia latina tardoantica*, Roma, 1993, 47-8; Callu, "La première diffusion", 123, among many others. Pecere, "Il codice Palatino", 326, is much more hesitant.

⁵⁰ I owe these observations to the very stimulating paper presented by Prof. Michael Allen, of the University of Chicago, in Edinburgh in May 2019, based on his examination of Bischoff's notes currently held in Munich. For Bischoff's tentative views, see *Mittelalterliche Studien*, Stuttgart 1981, III, 62: "Wo wurde der Palatinus geschrieben, der zwar mit Verona verbunden ist [i.e. its later discovery at Verona by Matoci], aber in das wohlbekannte Bild das Veroneser Skriptorium unter Pacificus, nicht hineinpaßt und der auch sonst nicht sicher lokalisiert werden kann? Woher erhelt Fulda die Vorlage seines Textes? Wo begann die karolingische Überlieferung und auf welcher älteren Grundlage? Allzu selten sind Namen der an der Überlieferung Beteiligten und die näheren Umstände des Geschehens für die Nachwelt festgehalten worden".

⁵¹ Marshall, "Scriptores", 354n.

multiple hands active around the lacunose passages in the *Valeriani duo* and the *Gallieni duo*. This is similar to what can be seen in other traditions⁵². On f. 154r, ll. 4-5, right before the lacunose passage in *Gall.* 1.3-4, the writing suddenly becomes much more cramped (72 characters per line, instead of the normal 50-55), and the shape of individual letters shifts. Importantly, in the word *macrinus*, the scribe employs an *ri* ligature, where the bow of the *r* hooks and dips below the line. This form occurs nowhere else in the entire manuscript. Since this forms part of the main text, it must have been written at the same time and in the same place as the rest of the text, and may well provide a firmer palaeographic handle for further research. At any rate, it suggests, however weakly, that we ought to be looking for a place with Insular connections, and perhaps one with connections to the St. Gall-Reichenau region, as Murbach itself has⁵³.

Even with spotless transmission, the *Historia Augusta* would still be a work of many mysteries. The problems with the transmission have further mystified this curious text. The way forward is a renewed attention to what has actually been transmitted. Now that the text of the other Carolingian tradition independent of P has been identified and classified, we must await a text edited on this basis.

⁵² See J. Stover, "Space as Paratext: The Medieval Edition of Ammianus Marcellinus", in M. Teeuwen, I. Renwoude, eds., *The Annotated Book in the Early Middle Ages*, Turnhout 2017, 305-22 and Stover and Kelly, "The Hersfeldensis", 122. The same thing has been observed in a ninth-century Lorsch collection of earlier material, the *Epistolae Austrasiacae*, where the hand changes for a couple lines in the middle of one folio; see G. Barrett and G. Woudhuysen, "Assembling the Austrasian Letters at Trier and Lorsch", *Early Medieval Europe* 24, 2016, 3-57 at 21-2.

⁵³ As a very tentative stab, one might want to investigate Luxeuil (see, for example, Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS Lat. 12, s. ix inc.; discussed by L. W. Jones, "Dom Victor Perrin and three manuscripts of Luxeuil", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 23, 1939, 166-81, at 178-81, with plates). The clubbing of the ascenders and the distinctive shape of the *g* are suggestive.