

PROPOSALS FOR THE TEXTUAL TRADITION  
OF THE POEM *DE MORTIBUS BOUM*  
BY SEVERUS SANCTUS ENDELECHIUS

No manuscript from the medieval period has been conserved of the Christian poem *De mortibus boum*, a dialogue between shepherds in the bucolic tradition written in the last decade of the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1</sup> Up until the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the most authoritative witness of the poem was the *editio princeps* published by Pierre Pithou in 1586, as well as reprints in 1589, 1590, and 1596.<sup>2</sup> From then on, the various editions of the poem were based on that printed edition, even after Emil Baehrens pointed out, in 1876, the poem's presence in the *Codex Aurelianensis* 288 (242) from the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>3</sup> Aside from this codex (*A*) and the lost copy (*X*) used by Pithou (*P*), there is a reference to a medieval manuscript (*Y*), also lost, in the 9<sup>th</sup>-century catalog published by Léopold Delisle in 1881 (*O*).<sup>4</sup> There is no mention of the hypothetical antigraph of the *Aurelianensis* (*M*).<sup>5</sup>

---

1) Regarding historical and literary aspects of the poem *De mortibus boum*, cf. Schmid 1953; Alimonti 1976; Barton 2000.

2) Pithoeus 1586; de la Bigne 1589; Pithoeus 1590; Pithoeus 1596.

3) Cf. Baehrens 1876, 264. Significant editions of the poem include Weitzius 1612; Gallandius 1772; Wernsdorf 1780; Piper 1835; Riese 1870. For a more complete list of subsequent reprints, cf. Cock 1968, 59. Given that the first collation of the manuscript, completed by Cock in 1968, was never published, D. Korzeniewski's 1976 collection of pastoral poetry includes the only publication of *De mortibus boum* with the variations offered by the *Aurelianensis* manuscript. Cf. Cock 1968; Korzeniewski 1976.

4) In textual studies of *De mortibus boum* and in the bibliographical references regarding the Saint-Oyen document in general, the manuscript is usually dated toward the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, as indicated by Delisle 1881, 385–387. In fact, the document was never seen by Delisle, who only reproduced the date given to him by the archivist Jules Gauthier when he sent Delisle a copy of the original. For well-founded reasons, the manuscript has been dated to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Cf. Turcan-Verkerk 1999, 170.

5) Whenever possible, we use the initials utilized by Cock in order to clarify the presentation: *Y* = manuscript mentioned in article LXXXVIII of the Saint-Oyen catalog; *O* = manuscript of the Saint-Oyen catalog; *X* = Pierre Pithou antigraph; *M* = *Aurelianensis* 288 antigraph; *P* = Pierre Pithou editions; *A* = *Aurelianensis* 288 codex (242).

The poet's full name, Severus Sanctus Endelechius, is the product of a peculiar formula used in 16<sup>th</sup>-century witnesses with the explicative connective *id est* between the first two names and the author's *cognomen*: *Severi Sancti, id est, Endeleichi Rhetoris*.<sup>6</sup> The explanation that the *cognomen* by which the celebrated rhetorician was known in secular culture was only added to the poem in a second instance – until then it was only in circulation signed in the author's incomplete and uninspiring name<sup>7</sup> – seems the most plausible.<sup>8</sup> In order to specify the author's identity, the editor may have added a clarification: "Severus Sanctus, who is, in effect, Endelechius the rhetorician."<sup>9</sup>

The author from Gaul can be identified in the two mentions made in Late Antiquity of a personage of the same name who was

---

6) There are numerous and varying justifications for the formula's duplicity: from the adoption of the name *Severus Sanctus* after Endelechius's conversion to Christianity to an erroneous reading of the *Pithoeanus* codex or even a *divinatio* made by Pithou himself. The idea that Endelechius adopted the Christian name Severus Sanctus was proposed by Teuffel 1913, 933. However, Paulinus names him *amicum meum Endelechium* in the Epistle in which he defines him as a *Christianum virum*, cf. Paul. Nol. epist. 28.6. According to Morelli 1915, 84–85, it is an error in the textual tradition: An unlearned scribe who vaguely recalled Epistles 28 and 31 written by Paulinus to Sulpicius Severus, *ad Sanctum Severum*, could have confused Endelechius with the recipient of the Epistles and changed the poem's *inscriptio*. Morelli's hypothesis is taken up and expanded by Moricca 1926 and, more recently, by Cock 1971, 157. According to Baehrens 1876, 264, the poet's true name is *Severus Endelechius*. Since *Sanctus* was commonly used in Late Antiquity, the copyist placed it before the poet's name and then, correcting himself, added *id est Endeleichi*. Wernsdorf 1780, 53–61, on the other hand, is inclined to consider that the poem's *inscriptio* is a conjecture made by Pithou, a fact that was refuted by Piper 1835, 77, and, later, convincingly rejected due to the appearance of the *inscriptio* in the *Aurelianensis* manuscript.

7) The form *Endelechius* is found in the *subscriptio* of Apuleius (cod. Laur. 68.2) and in the letter by Paulinus of Nola (Paul. Nol. epist. 28.6). The *Aurelianensis* codex and Pithou's edition coincide in the error of *Endeleichi* for *Endelechii*, while the Saint-Oyen catalog utilizes *Endelici*, possibly derived from *Endeleici*.

8) Bernays 1861, 3: "Der Abfasser des Titels, welcher der Zeit des Autors nahe genug leben mochte, wusste es durch zuverlässige Tradition, dass der als christlicher Dichter bekannte *Severus Sanctus* derselbe sei, welcher als Rhetor unter dem Namen *Endelechius* sich berühmt gemacht hatte; und diese Identität hat er auf dem einfachsten Wege, durch *id est*, ausgedrückt."

9) Corsaro 1975, 23, maintains a theory similar to that of Bernays, although he emphasizes the ideological aspect of this expression: the author could have voluntarily silenced his "profane" *cognomen*, but, a short time later, a Christian editor may have corrected the signature for ideological reasons in order to pay homage to a Christian personality who was also famous in secular culture.

a professional rhetorician: Epistle 28 from Paulinus of Nola to Sulpicius Severus and the *subscriptio* of codex *Laurentianus* 68.2 of Apuleius.<sup>10</sup> While Paulinus of Nola reveals the image of an influential member of Christian literary circles in the Theodosian Renaissance,<sup>11</sup> the *subscriptio* dated in the year 395 presents Endecheius as a prestigious rhetorician from the city of Rome who taught lessons in the great exedra of the Forum of Augustus, called the *Forum Martis*, after the initial forensic purpose of the space evolved and it became a center of intellectual, philological, and paleographic learning in the late Imperial period.<sup>12</sup>

Since the publication of Marcel Cock's "A propos de la tradition manuscrite du *Carmen de mortibus boum* d'Endéléchius" in 1971, textual criticism studies of the poem admit without discussion a classification of the witnesses that assumes the existence of three lost medieval manuscripts (*Y*, *X*, and *M*), of which at least two (*X* and *M*) are supposed to have been lost in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. In addition, this classification confuses important philological aspects – in particular, the superposition of the Saint-Oyen catalog (*O*) with the manuscript mentioned in the catalog (*Y*), and the ancient codex used by Pithou (*X*) with its printed edition (*P*) – and historical aspects regarding the circulation of the poem in the

---

10) The identification of the author of *De mortibus boum*, a poet and rhetorician, with the personage cited in the Apuleius *subscriptio* and in Paulinus's letter was made early on by Sirmond 1614, 73–74. Regarding the first dated *subscriptio* in Late Antiquity, cf. Pecere 1991, 68–69.

11) Paulinus of Nola presents Endecheius as a friend, brother in faith, teacher, and the prologue writer and editor of his panegyric in honor of Theodosius. As a *praeceptor rhetoricae*, Severus Sanctus Endecheius created rules, from the practice of traditional teaching, regarding composition exercises, which he himself published and put into circulation. Paul. Nol. epist. 28.6: *Alius libellus ex his est, quos ad benedictum, id est, Christianum virum, amicum meum Endecheium scripsisse videor, non tamen edidisse convincar. Is enim mihi auctor huius in Domino opusculi fuit, sicut ipsius epistola, quae libello meo pro themate praescribitur, docet. Fateor autem idcirco me libenter hunc ab amico laborem recepisse, ut in Theodosio non tam imperatorem quam Christi servum, non dominandi superbia sed humilitate famulandi potentem, nec regno sed fide principem praedicarem.*

12) The subscription of book IX of Apuleius's *Metamorphoses* presents Endecheius as a rhetorician from the city of Rome, under whose guidance Sallustius recited the establishment declamation of the course of study in the rhetoric school at the *Forum Martis*: *Ego Sallustius legi et emendavi Romae felix, Olibio et Probinno vv. cc. consulibus in foro Martis controversiam declamans oratori Endecheio.* Regarding the function of the *scholae* of the Forum of Augustus, cf. Carnabuci 2006.

16<sup>th</sup> century. However, based on the provenance, date, or ecdotic features of the manuscript and printed witnesses of the poem *De mortibus boum*, it seems possible to restore the relationships between *Y*, *O*, *X*, *M*, *P*, and *A*.

*The lost medieval manuscripts: X = Y?*

There are only two concrete references to the medieval phase of Severus Sanctus Endelechius's poem. The first attests to the existence of a manuscript that dates to before the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century (*Y*); the second, less precise, provides proof of the codex's age, *vetus codex* (*X*), which served as a basis for the *editio princeps* in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The supposed independence of these two lost manuscripts from one another merits new consideration.

The first mention of the poem *De mortibus boum* is found in the oldest catalog of the library in the abbey first called Condat, then Saint-Oyen, and finally Saint-Claude in the Jura department of Franche-Comté (*O*). The document, written in Carolingian minuscule by Mannon de Saint-Oyen, an ancient collaborator of Florus de Lyon, is not a complete inventory of the library, but rather a list of the codices donated to the abbey by Mannon at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>13</sup> Three fragments of the catalog containing the enumeration of 19 articles have been conserved. Each article corresponds to one of the 19 manuscripts included in the total 115 that provost Mannon donated to Saint-Oyen abbey. The *versus Endelici de mortibus boum* are mentioned in article LXXXVIII.<sup>14</sup> In the late 15<sup>th</sup> century, according to its omission in the 1492 in-

13) From a paleographic point of view, the Saint-Oyen list has all the characteristics of Mannon's writing. However, the decisive element of attribution to Mannon is the content and the formulation of the list, which allow the manuscripts described to be identified with the surviving ones with no room for ambiguity. Cf. Turcan-Verkerk 1999, 171–178.

14) [L]XXXVIII. *Item codex ubi sunt Claudiani poete in Rufinum libri II; Item Nemesiani cynegeticon; Item versus cuiusdam de Tarquinio et Lucretia; Item libelli Catonis; Item versus septem sapientium et versus de novem musis; Item versus duodecim sapientium de quattuor temporibus anni; Item conflictus veris et iemis; Item epigrammata Nasonis de libris Virgilii; Item exastica Sulpitii de eisdem libris; Item tetrastica in eisdem libris; Vita Virgilii cum epitafiis eius; Versus Octaviani Ce(sa)ris de Virgilio; Item epigrammata diversa, inter quae versus Endelici de mortibus boum; Item Avigenii liber fabularum; Item enigmata Symphosii.*

ventory, the manuscript mentioned in this article was no longer housed in the library at the Saint-Oyen abbey.<sup>15</sup>

Although Ludwig Traube suggested in 1893 the possibility of identifying the manuscript used by Pithou with the manuscript mentioned in the 9<sup>th</sup>-century catalog, an idea later revisited by Carlo Vecce, the separate nature of these two manuscripts is a commonly accepted fact following Cock's study.<sup>16</sup> To distinguish *X* from *Y*, Cock offers a single argument: the author's name in *Y*, *Endelici*, compared to the extended one found in Pithou's volume, *Severi Sancti, id est, Endeleichi Rhetoris*. It is clear, however, that Mannon committed many careless mistakes when copying the manuscript titles into the catalog.<sup>17</sup> Due to the document's very nature, compendiums and omissions are systematic, as is demonstrated in the same section of the poem in which the titles of the remaining works were excluded: *Item epigrammata diversa, inter quae versus Endelici de mortibus boum*.

In contrast to the *editio princeps*, which does not include any information about the origin of the text, the 1590 edition allows for a close relationship to be established with article LXXXVIII of the Saint-Oyen catalog. In the explanatory notes, absent from the 1586 edition, Pithou references the ancient codex of Endeleichius's poem, which he also claims to have received from Élie

---

15) The 1492 inventory of the library lists eighty-three manuscripts, among which the absence of a number of titles is noted either because they were not found in Saint-Oyen or because they had been destined for the sacristy. The manuscript containing *De mortibus boum* is among the twelve manuscripts on the Mannon list that were not cataloged in 1492. Cf. Castan 1889, 340.

16) Traube 1893, 284: "Vielleicht war dies die Handschrift, aus der Elias Vinet dem Pithou (vgl. dessen epigrammata et poemata vetera Paris 1590 pag. 478) das Gedicht des Endeleichius mittheilte." Vecce 1988, 77: "Il *Versus* rimanda all'area della valle del Rodano, e fu pubblicato da P. Pithou, senza indicarne la fonte, che forse era ε [= *Y* = manuscript mentioned in article LXXXVIII of the Saint-Oyen catalog]." Cock 1971, 159: "Pour prouver que le manuscrit *X* n'est pas identique au manuscrit *Y* et que le groupe *A-X* ne dépend pas directement d'*Y*, il y a un seul argument: *Y* nomme comme auteur *Endelechius* (ce qui est, comme nous l'avons exposé, le nom le plus exact), le groupe *A-X* le nomme *Severus Sanctus id est Endeleichius*. De là notre conclusion: le manuscrit *Y* appartient probablement à un groupe différent du groupe *A-X*."

17) For example, *Epheni* for *Ephesini* (LXXXII), *tesolonicensis* for *tesalonicensis* (XCI), *altercatione* for *altercationem* (LXXXIII), *agelorum* for *angelorum* (XCV), *terrogationis* for *interrogationis* (XCVII). Cf. Turcan-Verkerk 1999, 173.

Vinet.<sup>18</sup> This clarification in and of itself does not offer a connection to the 9<sup>th</sup>-century catalog, but it is completed by a letter signed by Vinet on May 7, 1567 – some fifteen years before he settled in Bordeaux and forged his friendship with Pithou in 1582.<sup>19</sup>

In the letter, the last fragment of which has been preserved, Vinet names certain works that caught his attention among the ancient manuscripts given by Simon Du Bois, among them a *Carmen bucolicon de mortibus boum* and a small book entitled *Avigenii liber fabularum*.<sup>20</sup> Given that the first edition of *Carmen bucolicon* does not indicate the origin of the text, which also does not appear among the works published or found by Vinet, little credit was given to the note in the 1590 volume.<sup>21</sup> The letter, therefore, corroborates the fact that Vinet gave the manuscript containing *De mortibus boum* to Pithou, perhaps following their meeting in 1582.

However, this document's greatest relevance in regard to the text's transmission lies in the work mentioned immediately after the poem: *Avigenii liber fabularum*. Not only does it coincide with the order described in the Saint-Oyen catalog, but Vinet, who may only have looked at the noteworthy titles in Du Bois's manuscripts, reproduces the catalog's formula exactly, including the spelling variation in the author's name. Among the multiple forms recorded in the manuscripts of the name of Avianus and this work in particular, the only example of *Avigenii liber fabularum* belongs to article LXXXVIII of the Saint-Oyen abbey catalog.<sup>22</sup>

---

18) Pithoues 1590, 478: "Severi. Atilii sive Caecilii Severi poetae Christiani sub Valentiniano Augusto meminit ex Sophronio Gregorius Gyraldus. Hic vero noster ut videtur, antiquior, et nisi valde fallimur Aquitanus: cuius carmen Eliae Vineti Santonis, optimi et doctissimi senis beneficio debemus." In the following footnote Pithou clarifies that *lapsae* (v. 17) is an emendation to the reading *lapsa* in the ancient codex: "Ib. nunc lapsae. v. c. [vetus codex] lapsa."

19) As a magistrate in the Chamber of Justice in Bordeaux, Pithou frequented the city's scholars and initiated a friendship with Élie Vinet, professor and principal at the school in Bordeaux. Three letters sent by Vinet to Pithou are conserved from this period. Cf. de Rosanbo 1928, 296; Desgraves 1977, 28.

20) "Il y a ung *Carmen bucolicon de mortibus boum* de la mezure, non de *Tityre tu patulae*, mais de *Scriberis Vario*, que je ne sais si aurez veu et leu comment l'on guerissoit l'hors les boufs de la peste, par le signe de la croix. Il y a aussi ung petit liuret intitulé: *Avigenii liber fabularum* ou la premiere fable commence: *Rustica deflenti*." Cf. Desgraves 1977, 126.

21) Cf. Nicéron 1734, 222–230.

22) Regarding the variations of the name Avianus (*Avianus*, *Avienus*, *Anianus*, *Anienus*, *Abdinus*, *Avionetus*, *Avinionetus*) and of this work in particular

Also of interest is the coincidence between the works included in Pithou's 1590 anthology,<sup>23</sup> many of them published for the first time and of unknown origins, and the collection of texts in *Y*, whose tradition is difficult to determine.<sup>24</sup> One suggestive clue that certain unique texts of the *Epigrammata et poemata vetera* were taken from the lost manuscript of the Saint-Oyen abbey is, in our opinion, the presence of two brief compositions published for the first time in the 1590 volume with the title *De Lucretia* and attributed to an unknown poet in Latin literature called Modestus.<sup>25</sup>

Faced with the absence of subsequent witnesses, not only of the work but also of the author, it does not seem unreasonable to recognize the poems published by Pithou in his *Versus cuiusdam de Tarquinio et Lucretia*, which Mannon attributed to "someone", possibly because the poet's name was unfamiliar to him. The identification of *X* with *Y* is, therefore, highly probable. No concrete

---

(*Avieni Fabulae, Fabulae Aviani Poetae, Aesopi Fabulae latinis elegis ab Avieno conscripta, Fabulae Avieni, Avianus, Collectio fabularum Rufi Festi Avieni, Aviani Aesopiarum fabularum liber, liber Aviani, Aviani Festi fabulae, Proverbia Aviani*), cf. Hervieux 1894; Manitius 1892, 110; Manitius 1895, 318.

23) Of the seventeen sections of the manuscript recorded in the catalog, Pithou published eight works with absolute certainty (*M. Aurelii Olympii Nemesiani, Poetae Carthaginensis, Cynegeticon* [Pithoeus 1590, 165–175], *Eorundem descriptio quattuor tempestatum anni* [Pithoeus 1590, 170–172], *P. Virgilii Maronis vita a Foca grammatico urbis Romae versibus edita* [Pithoeus 1590, 53–58], *Epitaphia P. Virgilii Maronis per tetrasticha eorumdem XII* [Pithoeus 1590, 92–94], *Item per disticha eorumdem* [Pithoeus 1590, 94–96], *De eadem re veteris scholastici poetae versus sub nomine Augusti Caesaris* [Pithoeus 1590, 70–72], *Incipit carmen Severi Sancti, id est, Endeleichi Rhetoris de mortibus boum* [Pithoeus 1590, 448–452], *Avieni Aesopiarum fabularum liber* [Pithoeus 1590, 311–334], *Caeli Symphosii Aenigmata* [Pithoeus 1590, 404–417] and probably another three (*Elogia musarum* [Pithoeus 1590, 47], *Valerii Catonis Dirae* [Pithoeus 1590, 61–67], *De Lucretia Modesti; Item* [Pithoeus 1590, 68]). Regarding the *conflictus veris et hiemis*, there is an explanatory note (Pithoeus 1590, 477), and only five sections with no mention (*Claudiani poete in Rufinum libri II, versus septem sapientium, epigrammata Nasonis de libris Virgilii, exastica Sulpitii de eisdem libris, thetrastica in eisdem libris*).

24) The chapter of the *Anthologia latina* dedicated to the *Carmina a Petro Pithoeo primum edita* is illustrative. Cf. Riese 1870, 323–330. Except for a group of texts (*epigrammata Nasonis de libris Virgilii, exastica Sulpitii de eisdem libris, thetrastica in eisdem libris, vita Virgilii*) associated with the tradition of *Vossianus latinus* and of *Parisinus latinus* 8093 when these were still a single codex, the remaining works are scattered among manuscripts that are heterogeneous in their origins, dates, and content. Cf. Vecce 1988, 76–78.

25) Cf. n. 23 above.

information survives regarding the medieval manuscript *M*, copied in *Aurelianensis*, although the evidence seems to indicate that it is the same *exemplar*  $X = Y$ .

*The 16<sup>th</sup>-century witnesses:  
A and P as descendents of  $X = Y = M$ ?*

The *Codex Aurelianensis* 288 (242) consists of 125 folios and dates, as does the first printed edition, to the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>26</sup> The document is currently located in the Médiathèque d'Orléans, but comes from Bourges, as indicated by certain texts contained in the codex, such as the list of archbishops in that city and the works of Jacques Cujas, *Consolatio Jacobi Cujacii* and *Definitiones Cujacii*. The codex's contents are varied, a mix of texts in Latin and French, among which the *Chronica Comitis Montisfortis* stands out.<sup>27</sup>

Although the intervention of more than one copyist can be noted, the only clearly defined writing is fully humanistic, careful and restrained, characteristic of the most uniform part of the codex (ff. 27r–67r), beginning with the poem *De mortibus boum* (ff. 27r–27v). On the first folio, the poem's text is distributed across three columns of forty lines each; the twelve remaining verses follow on

---

26) According to Cuissard 1889, 141–142, the section between folios 27r and 68v dates back to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and the rest of the manuscript to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Cf. Samaran / Marichal 1984, 570. Cock 1971, 158, proposes the date provided by a letter dated March 29, 1568 as the manuscript's *terminus post quem* (Antonius Contius ita respondi Biturigibus 29 die martij 1568, f. 21v). The *terminus ante quem* would be indicated by the archbishops list of Bourges (ff. 66r–67r), which stops at Renaud de Beaune, archbishop between 1581 and 1594. The year 1594, indicated by Cock to be the end of the archbishopric, corresponds with the date on which de Beaune was transferred to the archdiocese of Sens. However, there is documentation from the year 1602 in which de Beaune is mentioned as archbishop of Bourges. Cf. Baumgartner 1978, 111–113.

27) I. [s. t.] f. 1 *Singularia* ...; f. 3 *Ex Arnobio* ...; f. 8 *Ex Papiirii Masson Animalibus* ...; f. 10 *Quatre quatrains*; f. 11 *Differentiae juris canonici et civilis* ...; f. 14 *Jacobi Cujacii consultatio* ...; f. 20 *Quaestio canonica* ...; f. 27 *Carmen Severi Sancti, id est Endeleichii rhetoris, de mortibus boum*; f. 28 *Chronica Comitis Montisfortis*; f. 59 *Traité de paix entre Louis IX et le comte de Toulouse*; f. 65 *De triplici imperatorum corona* ...; f. 66 *Catalogue des archevêques de Bourges*; f. 69 *Seneca de quatuor virtutibus*; f. 78 *Cujacii definitiones* ...; f. 85 *Ex Paulo Orosio* ... II. *Extraits d'ouvrages de toutes sortes*.



f. 27v. The gaps in v. 50 and v. 79 are indicated with an asterisk. The color of the ink is light brown, and the corrections in dark brown belong to a different hand, not that of the copyist. Above *sanius* v. 11, the reviser wrote *saevius*. In the gap in v. 50, he added *sanus* but left the gap in v. 79 incomplete. He only used the abbreviation *-qz* for the enclitic particle *-que* in *quoque* v. 61, *dirarumque* v. 94, *iamque* v. 94, *affligitque* v. 99, *quoque* v. 130.

When the *Aurelianensis* codex is compared to manuscript *X*, which was the basis for the *editio princeps* *P*, Cock made a tacit identification between *X* and *P*, as if Pithou's edition were a faithful copy of the ancient manuscript *X*. Therefore, the 16<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript copy and the medieval antigraph used by Pithou appear in the same group *A-X*: "A and X represent two different phases of the text, although very close to each other; they belong to the same group, group *A-X*."<sup>28</sup> This group descends, according to Cock, from the hypothetical manuscript *M*. However, the distinction between *X* and *P* is extremely useful in establishing the relationship between the manuscript and printed witnesses. If the compared variants<sup>29</sup> are attributed, as they should be, to the manuscript *A* and to the printed edition *P*, it is clearly possible that *A*, along with *P*, could be a copy of *X*.

Indeed, the fact that *A* is not a copy of *P* can be seen in the discrepancies and errors present in *A*, inexplicable in a printed model; the fact that *P* is not a copy of *A* is evident, above all, in the variant *lapsa* in the footnote of the 1590 edition, absent in *A*. But nothing rules out the possibility that the *Aurelianensis* copyist and Pithou may have used the same antigraph, probably with the notes and even the transcription of a contemporary colleague: this would explain the choice of identical conjectures, especially *lapsae* in v. 17. Given the marginal notes, the footnotes, and the spelling, it is evident that the printed edition offers a more careful and detailed product than *A*. However, the very few discrepancies between *A* and *P*, the common errors (v. 22, v. 29), and the same gaps in the text (v. 50, v. 79) highlight the similarity between the two witnesses, ex-

28) Cock 1971, 159: "A et X représentent deux phases différentes du texte, quoique proches l'une de l'autre; ils font partie d'un même groupe, le groupe *A-X*."

29) *Carmen Severi* / *Incipit Carmen Severi, tacitus* / *tacitum* v. 8, *complerint* / *complerent* v. 15, *tui* / *tibi* v. 56, *mox ibi* / *mox sibi* v. 71, *cum* / *quam* v. 87, *relligionibus* / *religionibus* v. 122 and *numina noscimus* / *numen agnoscimus* v. 128.

pressed in the form of the author's and the poem's names. It would be better, then, to include the two 16<sup>th</sup>-century witnesses in a group *A-P*, eliminating the parity proposed by Cock of manuscript *A* with *vetus codex X*, which is probably also an antigraph of *A*.

In order to establish the connection between *Aurelianensis* and Pithou's edition, the context of the Bourges codex with the works of Cujas is of notable importance, which the textual criticism on the poem has inexplicably overlooked. From 1577 until his death in 1590, Cujas worked as a professor in the University of Bourges: he frequently exchanged editions and manuscripts with Vinet and Pithou, often including detailed observations and critical comments. Pithou acquired his historical method from his professor, Cujas. A devoted disciple, he followed him from Bourges to Valencia in order to continue to benefit from his valuable lessons.<sup>30</sup> A large part of the medieval manuscripts from the Pithou family library was given to Cujas, who, in his will, assigned Pithou the task of continuing his unfinished work.<sup>31</sup> The honorary epitaph dedicated by Pithou to his master is the expression of a shared dedication to the renewed philological ideals and methods of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>32</sup> Between 1551 and 1580, Vinet remained in contact with Cujas regarding the publication of Ausonius, and received useful collaboration from Pithou.<sup>33</sup>

In regard to the relationship between the missing manuscript *Y* from the Saint-Oyen abbey and the remaining witnesses, Cock uses the complete naming of the author in *A* and in *X* – and not in *A* and in *P*, as should be the case – and the unique name on the manuscript *Y*, to argue the independence of *Y* from the “group *A-X*”. As the need to substitute group *A-X* with group *A-P* has been clarified, we must now clarify the difference between the manuscript from the Saint-Oyen catalog *O* and manuscript *Y* with the poem *De mortibus boum* mentioned by *O*. It is clear that the *Incipit* of the lost medieval manuscript *Y* was not faithfully transcribed by Mannon in manuscript *O*, an inventory characterized by the abbreviation of titles and authors or their complete omission. The

---

30) Cf. de Rosanbo 1928, 281–282; de Rosanbo 1929, 322–323; Kelley 1970, 265–266.

31) Cf. Peignot 1829, 255–273.

32) Cf. Grosley 1756, 266.

33) Cf. Desgraves 1977, 16–20; de La Ville de Mirmont 1917, 63–78.

presence of the unique name in *O* is therefore not sufficient evidence to rule out a family relationship between *A-P* and *Y*, which may well have indicated the *tria nomina* of the author.

If the possibility that *A* and *P* descend from the Saint-Oyen manuscript (*Y*) is associated with the aforementioned identification of *X* with *Y* (and, therefore, also with *M*), a new rubric appears in the textual tradition of the poem *De mortibus boum*, which is consistent with the unseen documentation from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, particularly the letter mentioned by Vinet, the connection of the *Aurelianensis* with Cujas, and the frequent intellectual exchanges between Pithou, Vinet, and Cujas. Judging by the dates and production environment of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century copies, the theory of three lost medieval manuscripts (*Y*, *X*, and *M*) does not seem acceptable. A single medieval codex with the poem *De mortibus boum* (*X* = *Y* = *M*) must have circulated among the French humanists, and the *Aurelianensis* manuscript and Pithou's *editio princeps* must have descended from it.

The indispensable differentiation of the manuscript and printed witnesses, along with the subsidiary documentation from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, allow us to reconstruct the textual tradition of the poem *De mortibus boum* by Severus Sanctus Endelechius. A codex with the *Versus Endelici de mortibus boum* was donated by Mannon to the Saint-Oyen abbey in the late 9<sup>th</sup> century. Provost Mannon left a record of this donation in article LXXXVIII of the catalog, abbreviating the codex's contents. Before 1492, in accordance with the inventory completed in that year, the manuscript corresponding to article LXXXVIII of the catalog was no longer in the abbey library.

In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the manuscript must have passed into the hands of Du Bois. As is stated in the letter from 1567, Du Bois gave the codex containing *De mortibus boum* – and *Avigenii liber fabularum* – to Vinet. The note in the *Epigrammata et poematia vetera* of 1590 states that Pithou received the ancient codex from Vinet. He probably also copied from it the *versus cuiusdam de Tarquinio et Lucretia*, which are recorded by Mannon in the inventory of his donation. Given its date, provenance, and content, the Bourges codex is closely related to Cujas, who maintained a regular intellectual exchange with Vinet and Pithou. Both the textual aspects and the atmosphere in which the poem *De mortibus boum* circulated thus seem to confirm the transfer of a single medieval

codex in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, resulting in two copies: one manuscript, conserved in the *Aurelianensis* 288 codex, and another printed by Pithou, both derived from the lost manuscript that Mannon donated to the Saint-Oyen abbey in the late 9<sup>th</sup> century.

## Bibliography

- Alimonti 1976: T. Alimonti, Struttura, ideologia ed imitazione virgiliana nel *De mortibus boum* di Endelechio, Torino 1976.
- Baehrens 1876: E. Baehrens, Zur lateinischen Anthologie (Teil II), RhM 31, 1876, 254–272.
- Barton 2000: M. Barton, Spätantike Bukolik zwischen paganer Tradition und christlicher Verkündigung: das Carmen *De mortibus boum* des Endelechius, Trier 2000.
- Baumgartner 1978: F. J. Baumgartner, Renaud de Beaune, Politique Prelate, Sixteenth-Century Journal 9, 1978, 99–114.
- Bernays 1861: J. Bernays, Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der klassischen und biblischen Studien, Berlin 1861.
- Carnabuci 2006: E. Carnabuci, La nuova *Forma* del Foro di Augusto: considerazioni sulle destinazioni d'uso degli emicicli, in: R. Meneghini / R. Santangeli Valenzani (eds), *Formae Urbis Romae*. Nuovi frammenti di piante marmoree dallo scavo dei Fori Imperiali, Roma 2006, 173–195.
- Castan 1889: A. Castan, La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Claude du Jura. Esquisse de son histoire, BECh 50, 1889, 301–354.
- Cock 1968: M. Cock, *Ecloga Christiana*. Het Carmen van Endelechius Rhetor heruitgegeven, vertaald en bestudeerd, Louvain 1968.
- Cock 1971: M. Cock, A propos de la tradition manuscrite du *Carmen de mortibus boum* d'Endéléchius, Latomus 30, 1971, 156–160.
- Corsaro 1975: F. Corsaro, L'autore del *De mortibus boum*, Paolino di Nola e la politica religiosa di Teodosio, Orpheus 22, 1975, 3–26.
- Cuissard 1889: C. Cuissard, Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Orléans. Départements XII, Paris 1889.
- de la Bigne 1589: M. de la Bigne, *Sacrae bibliothecae sanctorum patrum seu scriptorum ecclesiasticorum VIII*, Parisiis 1589.
- de La Ville de Mirmont 1917: H. de La Ville de Mirmont, Le manuscrit de l'Île Barbe (Codex Leidensis Vossianus latinus III) et les travaux de la critique sur le texte d'Ausone; l'œuvre de Vinet et l'œuvre de Scaliger, Bordeaux 1917.
- Delisle 1881: L. V. Delisle, Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale III, Paris 1881.
- de Rosanbo 1928: L. de Rosanbo, Pierre Pithou, biographie, Revue du seizième siècle 15, 1928, 279–305.
- de Rosanbo 1929: L. de Rosanbo, Pierre Pithou érudit, Revue du seizième siècle 16, 1929, 301–330.
- Desgraves 1977: L. Desgraves, Élie Vinet, humaniste de Bordeaux, 1509–1587: vie, bibliographie, correspondance, bibliothèque, Genève 1977.

- Gallandius 1772: A. Gallandius, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum VIII*, Venetiis 1772.
- Grosley 1756: P.J. Grosley, *Vie de Pierre Pithou; avec quelques mémoires sur son père et ses frères I*, Paris 1756.
- Hervieux 1894: L. Hervieux, *Étude sur les fables latines d'Avianus et de ses anciens imitateurs et sur les manuscrits connus et inconnus qui les renferment*, Paris 1894.
- Kelley 1970: D. R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship*, New York / London 1970.
- Korzeniewski 1976: D. Korzeniewski, *Hirtengedichte aus spätrömischer und karolingischer Zeit: Marcus Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus, Severus Sanctus Endelechius, Modoinus, Hirtengedicht aus dem Codex Gaddianus*, Darmstadt 1976.
- Manitius 1892: M. Manitius, *Philologisches aus alten Bibliothekskatalogen (bis 1300)*, RhM 47, *Ergänzungsheft*, 1892.
- Manitius 1895: M. Manitius, *Zu lateinischen Dichtern (Fortsetzung). 4. Zum Florilegium des Micon*, RhM 50, 1895, 315–320.
- Morelli 1915: C. Morelli, *Frustula*, SIFC 21, 1915, 82–90.
- Moricca 1926: U. Moricca, *Endelechius o Sanctus Severus Endelechius?*, *Didaskaleion* 4, 1926, 91–94.
- Niceron 1734: J. P. Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres dans la république des lettres. Avec un catalogue raisonné de leurs Ouvrages XXX*, Paris 1734.
- Pecere 1991: O. Pecere, *Antichità tarda e trasmissione dei testi. Qualche riflessione*, in: O. Pecere (ed.), *Itinerari dei testi antichi*, Roma 1991, 55–83.
- Peignot 1829: G. Peignot, *Choix de testaments anciens et modernes I*, Paris 1829.
- Piper 1835: F. Piper, *Titi Flavii Clementis Alexandrini Hymnus in Christum Salvatorem. Graece et Latine. Severi Sancti Endelechii, rhetoris et poetae Christiani, Carmen bucolicum de mortibus boum. Latine et Germanice*, Gottingae 1835.
- Pithoeus 1586: P. Pithoeus, *Veterum aliquot theologorum scripta. Quorum nonnulla ex veteribus libris emendatius, aliqua nunc primum eduntur*, Parisiis 1586.
- Pithoeus 1590: P. Pithoeus, *Epigrammata et poemata vetera. Quorum pleraque nunc primum ex antiquis codicibus et lapidibus, alia sparsim antehac errantia, iam undecunque collecta emendatiore eduntur*, Parisiis 1590.
- Pithoeus 1596: P. Pithoeus, *Epigrammata et poemata vetera. Quorum pleraque nunc primum ex antiquis codicibus et lapidibus, alia sparsim antehac errantia, iam undecunque collecta emendatiore eduntur*, Genevae 1596.
- Riese 1870: A. Riese, *Anthologia latina sive Poesis latinae Supplementum. Pars prior: Carmina in codicibus scripta. Fasciculus II: Reliquorum librorum carmina*, Lipsiae 1870.
- Samaran / Marichal 1984: C. Samaran / R. Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste, VII: Ouest de la France et pays de Loire*, Paris 1984.
- Schmid 1953: W. Schmid, *Tityrus Christianus. Probleme religiöser Hirtendichtung an der Wende vom vierten zum fünften Jahrhundert*, RhM 96, 1953, 101–165.
- Sirmond 1614: J. Sirmond, *C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii Arvernorum Episcopi Opera*, Parisiis 1614.
- Teuffel 1913: W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur III*, Leipzig 1913.

- Traube 1893: L. Traube, Zur Überlieferung der Elegien des Maximianus, *RhM* 48, 1893, 284–289.
- Turcan-Verkerk 1999: A. M. Turcan-Verkerk, Mannon de Saint-Oyen dans l'histoire de la transmission des textes, *RHT* 29, 1999, 169–243.
- Vecce 1988: C. Vecce, Iacopo Sannazaro in Francia. Scoperte di codici all'inizio del XVI secolo, Padova 1988.
- Weitzius 1612: M. J. Weitzius, Severi, Endeleichi, Rhetoris et Poetae Christiani, *Carmen Bucolicum De Mortibus Boum*, Francoforti 1612.
- Wernsdorf 1780: J. C. Wernsdorf, *Poetae Latini minores II, in quo bucolica et idyllia T. Calpurnii Siculi, A. Septimii Sereni, D. M. Ausonii, Severi Sancti, Publ. Optatiani Porphyrii, aliorum, Altenburgi* 1780.

Buenos Aires

Inés Warburg