Modern conceptions of the term “philology,” no matter how divergent, all proceed from the basic notion that philology is a field which is concerned with the use of words.¹ For those who are concerned with the use of ancient words, the meaning of the term “philology” is, largely by necessity, attenuated to the study of written words. But the study of written words has never been and will never be (indeed simply cannot be) conducted uniformly. This essay will focus on the historical fluidity of the purpose, nature and returns of studying written words. It will be concerned not with a theory of what philology is, but rather with the consideration of the potentially multiplicitous effects on our philological pursuits of what philology has been in its own historical incarnations.

By nature, authors are lovers of words, and many (the best ones) are also students of the written words that went before; they are themselves philologists. As such, any writer worth the title “author” (the philologist-author)

¹. Etymologically, the term means “the love of words” (φιλο-, “loving,” and λόγος, “word”). λόγος also came to imply the rational use of words, “reasoning,” so by extension the term “philology” might also mean “love of reasoning.” Despite these etymological definitions, the term philology was only occasionally used even by the classical Greeks in the sense of “love of words” or even “love of reasoning.” Rather, they usually employed the term as signifying “love of learning” or “love of literature,” and often in direct contrast to “philosophy” (“the love of wisdom”). Nonetheless, the term “philology” itself has always been polysemous and all of the above were potential meanings in classical Greek (Liddel, Scott, and Jones 1996, s.v. φιλολογέω). Modern use of the term “philology” is no less diverse, varying widely between disciplines and continents, and signifying everything from the study of literature to linguistics.
actively participates in the textual exposition of his own philological prerogatives. That is, depending on his literary program the philologist-author must recover, uncover or indeed cover over his own literary precedents in his word-loving activity of writing. The activity with which scholars of classical literature occupy themselves, whether knowingly or not, is essentially the same, but instead of being driven by a self-defined literary program, they find themselves applying the (also largely self-defined) precepts of their definition of philology to the text of the classical philologist-author. The philologist philologizes the philologist. Philology then is itself largely concerned with its own recovery.

“The philologist philologizes the philologist” means that a philologist-scholar applies self-defined and sometimes arbitrary precepts of studying written words to the written words of a philologist-author. Even the relatively narrow definition of philology as “the study of written words” can imply more than one type of activity, so in the historical application of this process, there is nothing to prevent the philologist-scholar, the agent of philology, from conceiving of himself differently and of his activity (philology) as one of literary or metaliterary (or even extraliterary) creation rather than forensic examination of literary creation. That is, the philologist-author-scholar self-consciously expresses his own love of words by engaging with the literary precedents set by previous lovers of words. In short, there are multiple modes of philology even if the meaning of the word is purposefully constrained to that familiar to classical scholarship. Thus, in any scholarly effort to “recover” philology, consideration must be given to the fact that this endeavor is, in fact, attempting to delineate the margins of a historically protean field (if not discipline) and, furthermore, that it is being conducted from within, for scholars often define their own pursuits as philological.

By its nature, classical philology has a twofold historical dimension which affects its own definition and self-interrogation. First, it relies upon the diachronic transmission of written text from ancient archetype (itself often far removed from the author) to modern edition. Here the “concrete” philological subdisciplines of paleography, codicology, and textual criticism are seen as instruments toward the end recovery of an author’s original written words. But these “subdisciplines” are really disciplines in themselves, themselves conceived differently by different practitioners, themselves “concrete” only in so far as they proceed from the physical remains of the text, its documentary
components. Alongside the diachronic dimension of philology is the aforementioned synchronic variation in the mode of philology. Any manuscript must be viewed first as a cultural document, subject to contemporary and regional conceptions of philology, and only then as a witness to a text whose author rarely shared those conceptions. Thus, the philological history of a text, that is, the historical process of its production, transmission and reception, is an obstacle to our attempts to recover the purity of the archetype, since it has been tainted by diachronic and synchronic variation. But for this very same reason, the philological history of a text enables an examination into the variable nature of philology itself.

Such an examination will be approached here by way of a case study of a relatively obscure Latin poet: Rutilius Claudius Namatianus. That this particular author is not particularly canonical has served to attenuate the reception of his text—that is, any attention afforded his poem, either past or present, is narrowly defined. This extreme attenuation, itself a product of philological history—for who, if not philologists, defines the canon from which Rutilius is excluded?—provides insight into the very nature of the transmission and reception of a text, on which philological study relies.

Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, if that is his real name—an issue addressed below—was born into a noble family of Narbonese Gaul, perhaps of Tolosa (Toulouse), in the last half (if not the last quarter) of the fourth century.

2. The process of editing a classical text, even through a careful, methodologically structured study of surviving documentary witnesses, always involves a high degree of qualitative evaluation, and is thus far less science than it is art. Attempts to represent textual criticism as a mechanical (and therefore purely scientific) process have been made, but always fail to account for the inherent untidiness of textual transmission (especially of ancient texts), for which there is really no remedy but common sense and critical judgment. See below. For the history of classical textual criticism, see Kenney 1974 and Timpanaro 1981 (now available in English translation as Timparano 2005).

3. As I hope to demonstrate, this is a feature of textual criticism which is too often overlooked by editors of ancient texts, whose efforts to “recover” the author’s original text by comparing witnesses and arranging them into a stemma frequently fail to consider the importance of the culture surrounding the production of the witnesses themselves. G. Thomas Tanselle, in a paper on “older” textual criticism directed at editors of modern texts, briefly discusses the tendency of classical scholars to overlook the documents themselves in favor of their text: “there is a real sense in which one may still claim that a text does date from the time it is inscribed or set in type. The changes introduced by a scribe or compositor, whether out of habitual practice or out of inadvertence, produce a new text; and understanding as much as possible about the production of that text—the habits of the individual scribe, the characteristics of the period, and so on—helps one to know how certain readings occurred” (Tanselle 1990: 287).
Following in the footsteps of his father, who had achieved some political success in Italy, Rutilius pursued a political career at Rome, as was the fashion for the thoroughly Romanized Gallic aristocracy of the time. In this political endeavor, Rutilius met with success during the reign of the emperor Honorius. He served as magister officiorum in the year 412 and as praefectus urbi in the year 414. Rutilius lived through and witnessed the first death throes of the Roman empire in the West. The federate nation of the Visigoths, erstwhile subjects of the Eastern empire, rebelled late in the fourth century and, under the leadership of their general Alaric, eventually invaded Italy and sacked Rome in the year 410. Alaric died shortly thereafter, and his successor, Ataulf, led the Visigoths north into Narbonese Gaul, Rutilius’ homeland, which they plundered for five years before being driven into Spain. Throughout the Visigothic occupation of his homeland, Rutilius was at Rome, presumably helping it recover from the sack of 410. He held his offices in 412 and 414, only returning to his devastated lands in 416, after the Visigoths had vacated Gaul. His elegiac poem, most frequently entitled De Reditu Suo, “On his Return Journey,” describes, in two books, his return journey from the recently plundered city of Rome to his even more recently plundered Gallic homeland.

Rutilius presumably wrote his poem during or shortly after the journey described in the text, but of course knowledge of the text relies on its subsequent transmission through an unknown number of intermediaries. There is no record of the text’s existence until its rediscovery in the year 1493, which leaves modern editors at the mercy of an unknown number of unidentified modes of philology. However, subsequent to the poem’s discovery in 1493, the application of different modes of philology can be observed in the surviving witnesses and in humanist documentation. The poem’s survival is a product of humanist scholarship of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The humanists’ enthusiasm for record keeping permits the construction of a history of the process of the text’s reception and transmission.


5. The magister officiorum oversaw the bureaucracy of Rome, and the praefectus urbi was the emperor’s personal representative in the city (see the relevant entries in Hornblower and Spawforth 2003). By this time, the city of Rome was no longer the sole center of imperial administration, but as the traditional seat of Roman authority, it remained important both as a symbol and as the home to many influential families.

Primary Witnesses to the Text

Stemma

α (Inghirami, 1496) — ω (at Bobbio) [= (?) T (fragments from Bobbio, 7th–8th C.)] — B (Pio, 1520) — V (Sannazaro, 1501) — R (Crucianus, 1520–1530)

B  editio princeps (first printed edition), ed. Giambattista Pio, Bologne, c.e. 1520.
R  Rome, Biblioteca dell’ Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana, ms. Or. 202 (olim Caetani 158), ff. 2r–27v, c.e. 1520–1530.
T  Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, F iv 25, f. 21/22 (frammento), seventh–eighth century c.e.
V  Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Codex Vindobonensis Palatinus 277 (olim 387), ff. 84r–93v, c.e. 1501.

Until 1891, the text depended only upon one manuscript, V, produced in 1501, and the closely related but independent editio princeps, B, printed in Bologne in 1520. These two witnesses are direct descendants of the same now lost manuscript (α), which was produced in 1496 by Fedro Inghirami, who copied from a manuscript at the monastery of Bobbio. In the three and a half centuries before 1891, many editions of Rutilius’ poem were published in continental Europe, largely in a conscious effort to disseminate obscure ancient authors, either alone or in collections of “minor” poets. The variant readings of the editio princeps, B, were generally overlooked in favor of the Vienna manuscript, even though B was known to be an independent witness to the text. This exposes a common practice of Renaissance philology which persisted for centuries, the preferential selection of one manuscript as the “best,” the codex optimus. The codex optimus might be considered the “best” because it is the oldest one and thus temporally closer to the source, or because it is the one with the least apparent textual errors, or simply

7. Editions published between 1520 and 1891: Almeloveen (1687), Baehrens (1883), Barth (1623), Burman (1731), Castalio (1582), Damm (1760), Kapp (1786), Maittaire (1713), Mueller (1870), Panvinius (1558), Pithoeus (1590), Simler (1575), Sitzman (1616), Wernsdorf (1788), Zumpt (1840). For a full bibliography and brief description of each of these editions, with notes on their interrelationships, see Doblhofer 1972: 71–77.
because it was physically more accessible, or because of any other number of entirely subjective factors. This subjective, *prima facie* approach to a text is generally rejected by modern methodologies of the criticism of classical texts, especially when the text has only a few primary witnesses and when a stemma is easily and convincingly constructed.8 But for several centuries, printed editions of Rutilius which privileged *V*s readings circulated.

In 1891, a new manuscript, *R*, was discovered in Rome—it was produced between 1520 and 1530, close in time to *V* and *B*, but it represents a completely different branch of the text’s tradition, and is distanced from the *α* witnesses by the intervention of at least one unknown intermediary, *β*.9 During the centuries between the discovery of *V* and the discovery of *R*, editors of Rutilius were afforded wide latitude in the activity of emendation and transposition of lines. The textual tradition, even if one considered *B* alongside the “better” *V*, was rather meager, and Rutilius left behind no other work by which to evaluate his style. In addition, the culture of early editing was one which valued clever emendations, often regardless of their necessity or even likelihood. Early editions are, therefore, filled with speculative emendations and supplements. The discovery of *R*, and its subsequent collation with the texts of *V* and *B*, essentially doubled knowledge of the text by providing evidence from an entirely new branch of the tradition. Stemmatically, this propels the evidence much further back in time than the exemplar of the *BV* branch (*α*) by facilitating the textual reconstruction of the further removed archetype (*ω*). The evidence of the newly broadened stemma failed to support virtually all of the speculative emendations and supplements made before the discovery of *R*.

This invites consideration of the eminent fallibility of textual editing. The methods of textual editing, although somewhat formalized by modern methodology and now usually much better documented in a critical apparatus, are essentially the same now as they were in the sixteenth century—the editor emends as seems appropriate given his own understanding of the author’s style and the demands of the language in question. The process is, in other words, subjective and not always concrete. The stemmatic approach to textual criticism, the so-called Lachmann method, even in its earliest and most mechanical incarnation (that presented by Paul Maas), requires the editor to apply his critical judgement to the text in order to

---

8. This is not the place for a lengthy discussion on the methods of classical textual criticism, but those who are interested in an introduction might find West 1973 to be a good starting point.
9. The presence of *β* is felt mostly in *R*’s indication that its direct exemplar was lacking line 1.213 of the poem—a line which *ω* was able to transmit to the other witnesses.
emend the corrupt archetype that results from the process of recension. Subsequent modifications to the stemmatic method have focused on the failure of the mechanical aspects of recension to account for the complexities of transmission, and have resulted in a much less mechanical approach in which editorial judgment must be exercised throughout the process. While stemmatic recension is a valuable tool for most editors of classical texts, it shifts very little of the editor’s task from his own judgmental capacity. The necessity in textual editing of applying the non-systematizable, unteachable and largely indefinable quality of judgment, a quality which varies from person to person, makes textual criticism a field which has always resisted any overarching methodology. But in classical textual criticism this semi-artistic, anti-methodological quality of critical judgement is usually applied, according to some variation of the Lachmann method, to the emendation of an archetype which has been recovered somewhat mechanically through stemmatic recension. This produces a textual criticism which is by necessity a self-contradictory mongrel; Gurd describes it as a “cyborg discipline,” generated in part by mechanical method and in part by organic invention.

For an editor attempting to recover the “original” text of an ancient author, the mechanical component of textual criticism can only provide indistinct guidelines as to where to apply judgment. This of course problematizes the process since no two editors are likely to agree entirely on the proper application of judgment. Over time, then, the variable aspect of textual criticism actually produces an array of various editions, none of which may convincingly claim to approach the text of the lost original with

---

10. Maas first published his step-by-step guide to Lachmann’s method in 1927. His attribution of the invention of the entire process to nineteenth-century scholar Karl Lachmann was somewhat simplistic, as it seems to have been generated gradually in the work of Lachmann and others, all of it interpreted by Maas himself. The concept of studying the genealogy of manuscripts actually dates back to the sixteenth century. See Timpanaro 1981.

11. Most influential was Giorgio Pasquali’s response to Maas, which was particularly critical of the usefulness of Maas’ technique when the text’s transmission is contaminated by indirect relationships such as a scribe’s correction of one manuscript from another, thereby allowing it to resist accurate stemmatic recension, at least of a purely mechanical variety (Pasquali 1934). Also very influential was Joseph Bédier’s observation that a suspicious majority of stemmata produced by Maas’ technique are bipartite. This gave rise to another influential approach, often called “best-text editing,” which places even more emphasis on the editor’s judgment by denying any final authority to the mechanically produced genealogical aspect of the method (Bédier 1928). Subsequent methodological developments, particularly in the field of the editing of modern texts (visited briefly below), have tended to arise from one or the other of the criticisms of Maas. See Altschul’s contribution in this volume.

12. Thus in 1921, A. E. Housman expressed his now famous maxim, “criticus nascitur, non fit” (“The critic is born, not made”), in an attempt to combat any growing impressions that textual criticism might be entirely systematized or even wholly teachable (Housman 1961: 133).

complete accuracy. Gurd calls this “a field of radical textual plurality,” further observing that a new critical edition will not only continue to expand the field, but will also reflect (in its apparatus) the very plurality of the field.\textsuperscript{14} This observation is correct as long as that edition is properly critical by modern standards, i.e., it actually provides a useful apparatus with which to evaluate the plurality of the field, and also as long as the observation of the constitutive elements of the plurality is itself carried out critically. For if a text is to be viewed as the “singular plural” product of many individual acts of philology, the viewer must take care to observe also the philological plurality represented in the commission of those acts. If a critical text is viewed as a plurality constituted by its various iterations, then the text also becomes temporally displaced and corrupt, since its constituent iterations represent editions produced one after another, many of them feeding upon previous iterations, but each of them produced in its own temporally distinct philological climate. An editor (and a reader) must cope not only with textual variation and emendation, but also with the effects of previous editorial variation.

In the production of a new edition to add to the array of texts, an editor must observe textual corruptions and attempt to remedy them by applying his judgment. Added to this judgmental burden is the evaluation of the emendations proposed by all the previous editors, who were not only applying their own individual judgments to the text, but also doing so according to a variety of different philological methods. The decision as to whether or not a previous emendation warrants consideration, and thus inclusion in the text or apparatus, therefore, relies on the editor’s estimation not only of the previous emendation, but also of the process by which that emendation was generated. Here method and history collide, seemingly without recognition by many modern editors. Consider the text and apparatus of the first eight lines from Ernst Doblhofer’s 1972 edition of Rutilius:\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{quote}
velocem potius reditum mirabere, lector, 
tam cito Romuleis posse carere bonis. 
quid longum toto Romam venerantibus aevi!
nil umquam longum est, quod sine fine placet. 
o quantum et quotiens possum numerare beatos, 
nasci felici qui meruere solo,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{14} Gurd 2005: 44–55.

\textsuperscript{15} All translations are my own. Discussing textual issues in translation is difficult, and possible only with the most literal of translations. Thus, in order to facilitate discussion of the textual issues at hand, this translation is overly literal and does somewhat of a disservice to the poet.
qui Romanorum procerum generosa propago
ingenitum cumulant urbis honore decus!

1 potius VRB: prorsus Ke (in not.) reditu Baehr (in not.)
2 tam VRB: quam Pith tam cito VRB: quam me ita Barth (in not.) totum hunc versum
om. V1, suppl. V2
5 quantum VRB: quater Heins possum VR: possem B Panv non est Heins

Rather, you will be amazed, reader, that my swift return journey
can abandon the benefits of Rome so quickly.
How tedious for those who revere Rome their whole lives!
But nothing is ever tedious that pleases without end.
Oh, how greatly and how often can I count up the blessed men
who have warranted birth in that fruitful soil,
the noble offspring of Roman princes
who crown their innate glory with their city’s dignity!

1 rather VRB: absolutely Keene (in a note) by my return journey Baehrens (in a note)
2 so VRB: how Pithoeus so quickly VRB: how I [can abandon . . . ] thus Barthes (in a note) In V, the first copyist omitted this entire line, and the second copyist supplied it.
5 how greatly and how often VRB: repeatedly Heinsius I can VR: I might B Panvinius
I cannot Heinsius

While Doblhofer’s edition is excellent, and he rightly follows the readings
suggested by the textual evidence and what is known of Rutilius’ style, he feels compelled to report in his apparatus all of the emendations ever suggested. Note the appearance of speculative emendations of Baehrens (1883), Pithoeus (1590), Barth (1623) and Heinsius (1731), all of them made before the 1891 discovery of R (1891). Doblhofer has produced a critical apparatus
that preserves emendations which arise from a period of wild speculation. Each of these emendations was unnecessary and unlikely, and Doblhofer tacitly acknowledges this by relegating them to his apparatus rather than printing them as his text. Doblhofer’s editorial decisions here are supported in large part by R’s evidence bolstering that available to these philological speculators, and also by an understanding that the philological climate of the editors in question was one which put much more stock in speculation than his. In fact, a modern editor might be tempted to exclude these emendations from the apparatus altogether on the grounds that they are essentially useless to modern (as opposed to sixteenth-, seventeenth-, eighteenth-, or nineteenth-century) philological engagement with the text. However, this
temptation is not Doblhofer’s—there are no firm philological “rules” which dictate the essentially subjective evaluation of variants, or the reporting of previous speculation. By including these emendations in his apparatus, Doblhofer permits his reader to evaluate the treatment of the text by previous modes of philology. However, this presumes that the reader is able to distinguish such “antiquated” editorial emendations from the more modern ones (such as that of Keene in line 1, above). It takes a detailed understanding of the history of editing a particular text to evaluate the apparatus that includes previous editors’ emendations, since the apparatus itself usually cannot represent fully the historical dimensions of each emendation.

Lacking a single, universal mode of editorial practice, many of an editor’s choices will be guided instead by his conception of the purpose of his edition, his editorial intention. Doblhofer’s *Rutilius*, for example, is clearly intended in part to provide the reader with an apparatus that indicates even the most unlikely textual speculations produced by previous editors, therefore presupposing a reader who is both interested in access to the history of editing the text and well enough versed in philological history to evaluate such emendations. A modern editor will usually establish his intentions in the preface to his edition, thereby exposing his approach to the textual evidence and his expectations of his readers. For his part, Doblhofer establishes in his foreword that his intention is to summarize previous textual scholarship, with a view to examining the Romantic nationalism that colors the (largely French and Italian) mid-twentieth-century scholarship on Rutilius. He therefore has produced an edition that is particularly attuned to the historical treatment of the text.

This concept of editorial intention has always been present in the production of critical editions, which vary in editorial technique and in presentation according to the foreseen application of that particular edition. Thus, for example, while the weighty apparatus produced by Doblhofer’s historical approach to the text might appeal to experienced textual critics, it would be of less use to a reader whose interests lay elsewhere, and who is thus not the edition’s intended user. Such a reader might prefer Duff’s much simpler apparatus (1934), intended only to report particularly difficult textual cruces

---

16. “... die vorliegende versucht, die Ergebnisse der in den vergangenen Dezennien geleisteten Arbeit zusammenzufassen. An dieser haben sich vor allem französisiche und italienische Gelehrte beteiligt; das Bewusstsein der Landsmannschaft und der gemeinsamen Zugehörigkeit zur Romania ist als Triebfeder etlicher Studien über den ‘Gallier mit dem römischen Herzen’ unverkennbar” (Doblhofer 1972: 7). Although his preface suggests that his text-historical examination will focus only on the recent decades (since the last German edition), Doblhofer’s extremely thorough examination actually encompasses the text’s entire history, not just the most recent. His point about the Romance bias towards the Gallo-Roman poet is very interesting, and will be discussed further below.
and suggested emendations which are judged deserving of consideration, or perhaps Fo’s edition (1992), which provides no apparatus at all and thus presupposes a reader who is unconcerned with matters textual. Variation in editorial intention is an unavoidable function of simple practicality. Different readers have different needs, and thus require different editions. Since it is a matter of common practice, editorial intention itself has received no scholarly attention as a significant feature of the actual process of editing classical texts. However, it ought to be viewed as another problematizing factor in editorial philology, for a previous editor’s self-defined intentions in supplying (or not supplying) particular types of emendations and apparatus notations, while contextually significant, are obscured in the extratemporal plurality of a later iteration of the text. The plurality of the critical text is again corrupted, this time by the various intentions of its multiple editors.

Since the nature of a particular edition and the textual instance it embodies relies on factors dictated by its editor’s methodological approach and intention, the overall editorial plurality of the text is a function not only of judgmental variation, but also of editorial variation. The meticulous editor such as Dobhlhofer thus naturally engages with the previous products of his own profession, stretching his editorial judgment over the manifold field produced by all the text’s previous iterations. In this activity, editors usually make a deliberate, but sometimes almost self-contradictory, choice to segregate from that field those very textual instances upon which everything else ultimately relies: the text’s witnesses. As the foundation of textual knowledge, the surviving witnesses of an ancient text receive careful scrutiny from textual critics, but they are almost without exception treated as raw information, waiting for critical treatment to arrange and evaluate them as being more or less “correct” according to the demands of the editor’s methods and intentions. The witnesses themselves, even those which might contain evidence of ancient scholarly treatment (such as corrections or marginal notations), are perceived as the grist for philological criticism, the passive subjects of philologizing. But they can also be much more, as

---

17. In fact, in some ways, the more “scholarly” the witness, the more passive it becomes in the modern edition because even the “best” (i.e., that closest to a modern mode) Renaissance scholarship is seen as a philological hindrance to modern philologists’ attempts “to recover” the lost ancient purity of the text. For example, in Scribes and Scholars, a guide still much used to introduce students to the transmission of classical literature, Reynolds and Wilson (1991: 122–63) heap praise upon many Renaissance humanists’ modes of philology because they approximated modern modes, but also present humanist philological production as entirely problematic for the modern textual critic (216–18), who is forced to cleanse it from the text. This is somewhat counterproductive. As Reynolds and Wilson themselves establish for their readers, and as shall be seen below, Renaissance philology was no more uniform than modern philology. Thus the modern textual value of each instance of Renaissance tex-
they are themselves the products of philological treatment, even if the nature
of that treatment varies substantially from that to which they are subjected
by a modern editor.

Philological intentions quite naturally influence the returns of the self-
referential practice of philology. In philologizing a philologist, the philolo-

gical agent’s intentions have a direct impact upon the philological product.
As mentioned above, editorial intention ultimately affects the returns of
editorial philology by corrupting the plurality of the ancient text. Authorial
intention is central to the criticism of modern authors, for whom the evi-
dence is much more abundant and much less temporally distant than that
of ancient authors. Much of the recent debate in the editing of modern texts
has focused on the issue of authorial intention—to what extent an editor
can or should attempt to define the author’s ultimate textual intentions in
the face of an abundance of contemporary or near contemporary witnesses,
and even of the author’s own drafts or proofs. This is a debate which has
had little place in the editing of classical texts, where the textual evidence
is much more tenuous and often so far removed from the original author
that the best case scenario is the establishment of a text which more or less
approximates the substantial elements of the author’s original, leaving the
rest almost entirely to editorial discretion. However, given the useful con-
tributions to the field of textual criticism generated by the intentionalist
debate, and given the classical editor’s usual reliance on many centuries of
unknown intermediaries which the surviving witnesses represent, perhaps
more scrutiny should be given to the issue of “intermediate intentions”—the
philological intentions active in the transmission and reception of the text
by those witnesses. How might the historically distinct modes of philology
being practiced by the witnesses influence the text? And, more importantly,
how might they be of use to the text’s modern editor, whose own philological
goal is the production of an edition which, in accordance with modern clas-
sical philology, approximates the long-lost author’s philological intentions?

Perhaps the most telling indications in Rutilius of modern philology’s
dependence on historical modes of philology are the facts that the author
is usually still called by the name Rutilius Claudius Namatianus and that
his poem is still regularly entitled De Reditu Suo. In fact, none of the three
primary witnesses to the text agree on the name of its author or the title of

---

18. Most useful for exposing the issues and debate surrounding authorial intention are McGann
the poem. In the Vienna manuscript ($V$), the poem is introduced by the following *titulus* (f. 84r):

Ex fragmentis RuTili ciLaudii Namatiani
de reditu suo e Roma In Galliam Narbonen[sem]

From the fragments of RuTilius cLaudius Namatianus
on his return journey from Rome into Narbonese Gaul

The same information is given again in the *incipit* of the second book of the poem (f. 92v):

Rutilii claudi Namatiani de
reditu suo explicit liber i'. In[-
incipit liber ii'.

End of the first book of Rutilius Claudius Namatianus
on his return journey. Beginning of the second book.

Thus $V$ is clear in calling the poem *De Reditu Suo*, and the author Rutilius Claudius Namatianus. The first printed edition ($B$), gives slightly different information. The edition begins with the following frontispiece:

CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS POE-
TA PRISCUS DE LAUDI-
BUS URBIS, ETRURIAE,
ET ITALIAE

CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS, AN
ANCIENT POET, ON PRAISE FOR
ROME, ETRURIA,
AND ITALY

The first seven pages of the edition contain a dedicatory poem of the editor’s own composition (on which, see below). At the top of the eighth page, Rutilius’ poem is introduced with the following *titulus*:

AD VENERIUM RUFIUM RUTILI CLAU-
DII NUMATIANI GALLI VIRI CON-
SULARIS, PRAEFECTORII URBIS,
TRIBUNI MILITUM, PRAEFECTI PRAETORIO. LIBER PRIMUS
CUI TITULUS ITINERARIUM.

THE FIRST BOOK, DEDICATED TO VENERIUS RUFUS,
OF RUTILIUS CLAUDIUS NUMATIANUS,
A GALLIC MAN OF CONSULAR RANK,
PREFECT OF THE CITY, MILITARY TRIBUNE, PRAETORIAN PREFECT.
THE WORK IS ENTITLED “THE ITINERARY.”

The author and title are further introduced in the *incipit* of the second book of the poem:

RUTILII CLAUDII NUMATIANI DE REDITU SUO, ITINERARII LIBER SECUNDUS.

THE SECOND BOOK OF “THE ITINERARY” OF RUTILIUS CLAUDIUS NUMATIANUS
ON HIS RETURN JOURNEY.

Thus the first edition (*B*) calls the poet Rutilius Claudius Numatianus and seems to prefer the title *Itinerarium*—a rather prosaic and non-classical word which seldom occurs even in late antique Latin. But *B* also refers once to the title *De Reditu Suo*, which suggests that α, the ancestor of both *B* and *V*, at least contained the label *De Reditu Suo*, either as a title proper or an exordium. The Roman manuscript (*R*) is far from helpful in these matters. The *titulus*, which has been truncated by the margin, gives the work no title and reads simply: (f. 2r)

CLAUDII RUT[–]
LII POETAEGINISSIMI

OF CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS,
A MOST DISTINGUISHED POET

The *incipit* to the second book of the poem is no more helpful regarding
the poem’s title, and only serves to further complicate the issue regarding the poet’s name: (f. 24v)

EXPLICIT LIBER PRIMUS
CLAUDII RUTILII POETAE
INCIPIIT LIBER II
CLAUDII RUTILII
NUMANTI[-
ANI POETAE
DIGNIS][-
SIMI

END OF THE FIRST BOOK
OF CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS THE POET.
BEGINNING OF THE SECOND BOOK
OF CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS
NUMANTIANUS,
A MOST
DISTINGUISHED
POET.

Thus $R$ does not provide a title at all. It is highly likely that the archetype ($\omega$) was missing its first page.\(^{19}\) The first transmitted lines of the poem seem to represent the resolution of a thought (“rather, you will be amazed, reader, that my swift return journey ($reditum$) . . .”). While beginning a poem mid-thought might be considered a rhetorical gesture, it seems more likely that the poem has lost its first lines, in which Rutilius delivered a formal and traditional $recusatio$: excusing himself from undertaking grander poetic subjects in praise of Rome. The general confusion over the title, and the Rome manuscript’s utter lack of one, support this theory—the original $titulus$ was lost along with the first lines, leaving later copyists to invent a descriptive title of their own or infer one from the header over the second book of the poem. $De Reditu Suo$ is then a provisional title, an unlikely “best guess,” imposed upon the work by $\alpha$’s need to give the work some kind of descriptive title, likely taking $reditum$ in the first surviving line as its inspiration. Modern editors also feel the same need, and many entitle the poem $De Reditu Suo$ without comment—the modern tradition has been tainted by historical practice.\(^{20}\)

---

19. This sensible suggestion was first proposed by Keene 1907: 16–17.
20. Doblhofer’s excellent 1972 edition is the greatest exception. Not only does he engage with this problem very thoroughly, but he also refuses to commit to a single title given the conflicting
According to stemmatic theory, this author ought to be called Claudius Rutilius Numatianus or Numantianus, and not Rutilius Claudius Namatianus. The transposition of Claudius and Rutilius is actually relatively inconsequential, as both are properly family names, and late antique use of such double *gens* nomenclature was liable to accept either order.\(^{21}\) The *cognomen*, however, is a different matter—The *VB* branch is split between Namatianus and Numatianus. *R* presents a name which starts out Num- rather than Nam-, which should break the *VB* split in favor of Num-. Since history provides no significant help regarding the names, it is left to modern editors to determine whether they prefer the name ending–atianus (*VB*’s reading) or–antianus (*R*’s reading). At the very least, according to modern methodology, NAM- atianus should *not* be their reading.

Because the historical treatment of *V* as the best witness resulted in the widespread circulation of its variant of the name, the reading of *V* still prevails, despite modern philological practice. And this erroneous practice is continued in this essay, for the same reason that other modern editors continue it: because it would border on being counterproductive to publish a modern edition of a relatively obscure text under a now non-standard form of his obscure name. One common purpose of textual criticism—to provide texts which are easily accessible to other philologists—compels modern editors to contravene the precepts of modern stemmatic theory because of the precepts of historical philology. There may also be another reason to acquiesce to this apparent contravention—the issue of names and titles will be revisited below.

Our text of Rutilius’ poem is not complete. As mentioned above, it is extremely likely that the first few lines of the first book were lost along with the title. But this is not the only text missing from the poem, for the manuscript tradition has lost most of the second book, preserving only the first sixty-eight lines. All three of the primary witnesses thus must ultimately descend from a mutilated archetype (\(\omega\)). However, in 1973 codicologist Mirella Ferrari published the discovery of a scrap of parchment, labelled *T* in this essay, containing thirty-nine partial lines from the lost portion of the poem’s second book.\(^{22}\) At some time late in the fifteenth century at the monastic library of Bobbio, a piece of a 7th- or 8th-century manuscript of Rutilius was used to repair another codex, now at Turin.

The thirty-nine partial lines presented by the fragments at Turin provide evidence. His edition is cleverly titled “De reditu suo sive Iter Gallicum”—note however that this still propagates the unlikely title made familiar by historical practice.

\(^{21}\) Keene 1907: 15.
\(^{22}\) Ferrari 1973.
the earliest witness to the philological reception of Rutilius Namatianus’ text. The cursive minuscule script of the text and the interlinear corrections are typical of seventh- and eighth-century Northern Italy, and especially the early manuscript production of the monastery of Bobbio, itself founded early in the seventh century. As will become clear below, Bobbio was an important locale for the text of Rutilius Namatianus, as it is where \( \alpha \) was copied in 1496. Bobbio was renowned as a center of learning and knowledge, and a place where manuscripts were purposefully collected, copied and maintained. And yet, the seemingly careless treatment in the fifteenth century of Rutilius’ mangled text seems to imply differently. It is very likely that \( T \) and \( \omega \) are the same text—that the text copied at Bobbio in 1496, \( \alpha \), was copied from the source of these fragments. If, in the late fifteenth century, Bobbio possessed the exemplar for \( \alpha \), which was obviously mutilated, why then were pages of the missing and mutilated text being used, at the same time, as repair material? While the need to recycle dismembered papyrus pages is understandable, why did Rutilius’ text not warrant repairs itself? Rather than attempting to preserve the text on this page, someone at Bobbio instead used it to repair the inside margin of a 10th-century manuscript of the Life of Saint Severinus. At some level, whether conscious or not, the philological value of the Life of Saint Severinus was seen to be greater than that of Rutilius’ poem.

It is, of course, impossible to reconstruct the circumstances surrounding the damaging of the Bobbio manuscript or the recycling of a scrap of it into a patch for another manuscript. Given the cost of parchment, such reuse of materials from damaged manuscripts was common. However, it is clear that at least this one fragment lingered in the scriptorium, and was afforded philological value only as recyclable, not as a witness to an otherwise lost piece of text. Evidence suggests that the philology of textual recycling was very active at Bobbio, which was a major center of another type of textual recycling, the production of palimpsests, in which the parchment’s original text was effaced and then written over with another text. These practices were intended to further the philological survival of the repaired/upper text at the expense of the recycled damaged/lower text. E. A. Lowe, in a study of Latin palimpsests, showed that the medieval philologists responsible for this textual recycling did not practice it with any intentional malice. Texts were

---

23. Ibid.
25. “Come era usuale per gli artigiani che aggiustavano e rilegavano libri, i religiosi lavorarono impiegando al massimo, per pezze e fogli di guardia, materiale vecchio, sciupato o frammentario, che avevano a disposizione in loco . . . ” (Ferrari 1973: 3).
chosen for erasure largely because they were considered too obsolete or too damaged to be of use. Far from being destructive, this medieval approach has actually resulted in the survival of many fragments, such as those from Rutilius’ second book, and indeed of entire texts, such as Cicero’s *De re publica*, which otherwise would not exist today. Realization of this irony is made possible only by the modern philologists who seek out such lost texts amidst the recycled products of medieval philology.

The modern treatment of the Turin fragments has focused on the paleographical interpretation and text-critical analysis of the text they preserve. The original text printed by Ferrari in 1973 sparked a period of intense (for Rutilius) interest, best exemplified in the published discussion among Bartolucci, Castorina, Cecchini, Lana and Tandoi, each of whom provides an often fundamentally different interpretation of the text itself as well as speculation on supplements and emendations. Often, these paleographers and textual critics cannot even agree on what the letters are, let alone how to edit them. Take as an example the first preserved line of the fragments. Ferrari was very conservative in her original publication of the fragments, indicating the partial illegibility of many of the letters and declining to indulge in speculative supplement. Her first line reads:

]multus satiat . . . pan
]much ?satisfies? . . . {pan[

Fo (1992) interprets the partially illegible letters almost completely differently and supplies a minor supplement:

]multus solatia pan[is
]much bread . . . consolations

Tandoi, whose purpose was to present a sensible text of the fragments by means of liberal application of conjectural supplements, could not make much use of this first most fragmentary and illegible portion, and so not only left it without supplement, but did not even print the clearly legible letters “pa” near the end of the line:

]multus satiari . . .
]much . . . to be satisfied

This may serve as a reminder that the so-called “concrete” philological disciplines, upon which all philological activity is founded, are often far from concrete and are liable to the demands placed upon them by different modes of philological pursuit.

Aside from the Turin fragments, the text relies on humanist copies and humanist scholarship of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. The humanist activity around this text reveals much about the protean nature of philological activity, as each humanist who approached Rutilius’ poem did so in a different manner and for a different reason. As mentioned above, the monastic library at Bobbio was responsible for the text’s survival. In 1493, Giorgio Merula, a respected Milanese scholar, discovered the contents of the monastic collection at Bobbio. He dispatched his assistant, Giorgio Galbiato, to survey Bobbio’s library and inform him of its contents. The catalogue was recorded in Merula’s papers, and includes Rutilius. At this time, Merula was in the midst of a philological competition with his intellectual nemesis, Poliziano. The agonistic rivalry between Milanese Merula and Florentine Poliziano is well documented in their correspondence—it focused on the discovery and editing of Greek and Latin texts, including those discovered by Merula at Bobbio. Each of these men was afforded a degree of public esteem proportionate to his perceived literary and scholarly achievements. Philological activity, scholarly value aside, was thus a means of gaining social prestige. Though it may seem callous to acknowledge, one of the returns of humanist philology is personal gain. This had an effect on the treatment of the text of Rutilius, for Merula and Galbiato apparently dismissed it entirely as a text of value, as it was not among the texts they selected for publication. That Merula made no attempt to acquire or study this otherwise unknown text seems strange for a man whose reputation was as a seeker of new knowledge. Perhaps this short, late, and obscure text simply did not offer Merula what he was looking for: substantial philological ammunition in his rivalry with Poliziano. Modern philology may be suspected of the same sort of unscholarly motivation and returns, since many philologists are driven by academic culture to produce scholarly contributions of substance, often agonistic in nature, at least partly (it must be recognized) in order to increase their own scholarly profiles. But then, perhaps this is too cynical, and Merula simply ran out of time, as he died in 1494, leaving the philological treasure-trove at Bobbio for others to explore.

29. See Ferrari 1970.
Tommaso Inghirami, also known as Fedro, soon to be the chief Vatican librarian, visited Bobbio while he was in the region in 1496. He returned to Rome with some Bobbio manuscripts and with his own copies of others. Rutilius Namatianus is one of the latter. Fedro’s purpose was to acquire for the Vatican library as many texts as he could—an indication of a prime philological concern of the period: the purposeful discovery and movement of texts from monastic libraries into private, controlled collections. And this philological purpose was apparently successful, as Inghirami’s copy became the direct exemplar for the Vienna manuscript (V) and probably also for the first printed edition (B). The Bobbio copy, however, disappeared from the monastery in 1706, removed by a French officer and never seen again.

Much can, and has, been said about the production of the Vienna manuscript.31 In 1501, Neapolitan poet-scholar Jacopo Sannazaro, who was about to embark on an exilic journey into France along with his patron, King Federico of Aragon, visited Rome and produced the copy of Rutilius which is now V. He copied Inghirami’s text, or rather he, his companion Filippino Bononi, and a third scribe divided the text amongst themselves, each copying a portion.32 This is a scholar’s copy. Sannazaro carefully corrected the sections copied by his two colleagues (but not his own section)—his corrections usually bring the text into agreement with the readings of B, which suggests that he is merely correcting errors in his colleagues’ transcription. There is also evidence that Sannazaro undertook some careful emendation, but where his readings differ from B’s, his variants are usually quite astute and often come at locations where modern editors also feel the need to emend the text.

Sannazaro was himself a celebrated composer of Latin pastoral and elegiac verse, and he took much of his inspiration from classical verse of the same genres. During the four years of exile which followed his visit to Rome in 1501, Sannazaro sought out in France new manuscripts of classical verse, some of which, most notably the only surviving witnesses for Grattius’ Cynegética and the pseudo-Ovidian Halieutica, are bound up with his copy of Rutilius. He has suggested emendations in the margins of these other works. It seems that Sannazaro’s purpose was the collection of little-known classical poetry. His choice of texts and his scholarly treatment of them speak to his dual philological identity: poet and scholar. It is in the capacity of a poet-scholar-philologist that he produced the Vienna manuscript.

---

32. The identification Sannazaro and Bononi as two of the three scribes of V was made by analysis of their handwriting. See Ferrari 1970.
The circumstances surrounding the production of the first printed edition, *B*, are less clear, but the edition expresses enough about itself to situate it within the philological culture of its time. It was printed in Bologne in 1520 by Giambattista Pio, a teacher and scholar who produced and published several commentaries and editions of classical authors. In this slim volume, Rutilius’ poem is placed between a lengthy dedicatory poem of Pio’s own composition and a small collection of miscellaneous epigrams. The volume begins with this dedication:

LEONI DECIMO PONTIFICI MAXIMO
MEDICAE FLORENTINO IOAN-
NES BAPTISTA PIUS
CLIENS.

TO LEO THE TENTH, POPE,
FLORENTINE MEDICI, FROM
IOANNES BAPTISTA PIUS,
CLIENT.

The book was printed as an act of *clientela*, and is dedicated to the learned Medici Pope Leo X, famed for extravagance, in part because of his literary patronage. Perhaps in an effort to elevate the status of Rutilius to a level more befitting a gift to the indulgent papal patron, Pio invented a more distinguished career and pedigree for Rutilius. Reconsideration of the information found in Pio’s *titulus* to Rutilius’ poem (above) reveals that Pio attributes to Rutilius consular status (*VIRI CONSULARIS*) and the office of praetorian prefect (*PRAEFFECTI PRAETORIO*)—two honors he did not in fact achieve. Note also that Pio wishes the poem to have had the personal touch of an addressee, Venerius Rufius (AD VENERIUM RUFIUM). It is indeed conceivable that the original poem was dedicated or addressed to Rufius, a friend who succeeded Rutilius in the office of prefect of the city, and whom Rutilius addresses several times within the poem. However, the evidence of *V* and *R* seems to suggest that Pio has transformed the conceivable into fact without proof. In addition, the name Venerius arises from a textual corruption at line 1.421, where Rutilius laments his inability to fit Rufius’ proper name into elegiac meter.\(^33\) Since this poem lacked a

\[^{33}\text{At line 1.421, } B \text{ and } V \text{ preserve nonsense: } \textit{cognomen versus veneris, carissime Rufi} (\textit{your surname by Venus’ line, dearest Rufius}). \text{Pio must have interpreted this line to mean that Rufius’ family name was Venerius. } R \text{ preserves different, unmetrical nonsense: } \textit{cognomen venens, carissime Rufi} (\textit{selling your surname, dearest Rufius}). \text{Given the sense required here and the tendencies of scribal errors,}\]
proper *titulus* due to the mutilation of the Bobbio archetype, Pio invented (along with the title *Itinerarium*) a back-story which suited his needs. As a humanist's gift to a pope, it was now more meaningful, since, by way of Pio’s additions, this work was in antiquity a very distinguished poet’s gift to his fellow distinguished aristocrat. Although Pio was a scholar himself, his purpose in publishing this particular book was not strictly scholarly. There is little evidence that Pio attempted to correct the text of his exemplar as had Sannazaro (who had the same exemplar), and in fact it appears that Pio introduced a number of minor textual errors. The philological intention of this edition, is then, not scholarly, but rather sociopolitical: it is the product of a client-philologist, not a scholar-philologist.

The Rome manuscript, discovered in 1891, is a curious example of philological pursuit. Proudly copied by one Ioannes Andreas Crucianus, about whom we know little more than the fact that he was governor of Foligno in 1531, the text can be dated between 1520 and 1530. Examination of common errors and omissions reveals that *R*, like *V* and *B*, is ultimately descended from the mutilated Bobbio archetype, but that, unlike *V* and *B*, it is not descended from Inghirami’s copy. Loving care went into the physical production of the script, and the manuscript includes several amateurish, but enthusiastic illustrations. Crucianus also proudly presented his coat of arms and his name numerous times during his transcription. All of this enthusiasm for the production of a text might speak to a level of excitement about philological pursuits which is seldom seen today. But Crucianus’ scholarly ability clearly did not match his enthusiasm, for alongside this apparently proud achievement is an obvious and profound ignorance of the Latin language, let alone the demands of elegiac meter. In places, the text of *R* is so corrupt that Crucianus could not possibly have understood what he was writing down. In theory, this manuscript has equal stemmatic weight as *V* and *B* combined, but in practice, its only constructive contribution to the text is to broaden the stemma and thus add weight to the readings of *V* and *B* when in agreement. But what is a modern editor to do? According to stemmatic theory and modern text-critical practice, one must consider and should report all variant readings of *R* as representative of an entire branch of the tradition. As an example of the returns of this philology on the text and apparatus of a few lines of the poem, consider a relatively typical passage

---

34. For the purposes of criticizing Crucianus’ lack of ability, it hardly matters whether he was the author of the errors or was merely copying mindlessly from a poor exemplar, since he never even indicates potential errors—a practice that was common for sixteenth-century humanists.
which is selected simply because it will be discussed further below (Rutilius Namatianus 1.349–60).

Lux aderat: tonsis progressi stare videmur,
   sed cursum prorae terra relictā probat.
Occurrīt Chalybium memorabilis Ilva metallīs,
    qua nihil uberius Norica gleba tulīt,
non Biturīx lārgo potior strictūra camīno,
   nec quae Sardōnico cespīte massa fluit.
Plus confert populis ferri fecunda creātrix
    quam Tartessiaci glarea fulva Tagī.
Materies vitīs aurum letale parandīs:
    auri caecus amor ducit in omne nefas;
aurea legitimas expugnant munera taedas
    virgineosque sinus aureus imber emit.

349 tonsis progressi stare videmur BV: tensis progressu stare videmus R 350 prorae
   BV: pronae R 351 ilva BV: silva R 352 nihil . . . gleba BV: mihi . . . terra R 355
   fecunda BV: secunda R 356 tartesiaci BV: tartasiaci R 359 expugnant BV: expunat
   R 360 aureus BV: aure

Daylight arrived. Driving on with oars, we seem to stand still,
    but the land left behind demonstrates the ship’s motion. 350
We pass by Ilva, famed for the mines of the Chalybes,
    than which Norican soil has produced nothing more valuable,
nor is Biturigean ore stronger, despite being smelted in a copious forge,
nor the molten mass which flows from Sardinian sod.
The fertile mother of iron bestows more upon the people
    than the gold-hued gravel of the Tartessian Tagus.
Deadly gold is a substance that produces vices:
    blind love of gold leads to every crime;
golden gifts overcome the torches of lawful marriage
    and a golden shower buys maidenly embraces. 360

349 Driving on with oars, we seem to stand still BV: With taut things by progress we
   see standing R 350 ship’s BV: prostrate’s R 351 Ilva BV: forest R 352 soil . . . noth-

---

35. The text, apparatus, and translation are my own. For clarity, the variants are reported positively, and translated with an amount of carefully considered inanity. Crucianus likely did not understand what he was writing down, but must have had some passing familiarity with Latin, since most of his errors produce nonsense by means of actual (but erroneous) Latin words.
Here, in only twelve lines of the poem, \( R \) offers erroneous variants eight times, ranging from minor orthographic errors (e.g. \textit{pronae}, \textit{secunda}) which nonetheless confuse the sense, to truly bewildering nonsense (e.g. \textit{tensis progressu stare videmus}). This is representative of \( R \)'s textual contribution throughout the poem, and it means that the editor’s apparatus is largely consumed with recording \( R \)'s errors. Yet \( R \)'s contribution is considered important because it represents an independent branch of the stemma. By virtue of modern philological methods, \( R \) enjoys a privilege which is not afforded \( B \) or \( V \), despite the obvious deficiencies (in modern eyes) of its own philological method.

This then is the philological history of the reception and transmission of the physical text. Modern editions are dependent upon three witnesses produced by very different modes of study. For modern, scholarly purposes, it is hard to deny the obvious superiority of Sannazarò’s careful and scholarly copy, the product of his brand of philology, which happens to coincide most closely with the modern brand. Sannazarò’s scholarly transcription and astute emendation tends to highlight the shortcomings both of Pio’s relatively careless transcription of the same exemplar and of Crucianus’ obviously poor grasp of Latin. True, Pio’s edition permits the reconstruction of Inghirami’s copy and the identification of places where Sannazarò emended Inghirami’s text; and Crucianus’ manuscript broadens the stemma, and thus our quantitative (if not qualitative) knowledge of the text. But even a conservative modern edition, based in stemmatic recension, produces a text approximating a copyediting of the Vienna manuscript alone, but with an apparatus laden with inferior variants, especially from \( R \). In many ways, for the modern mode of philology, \( V \) really is the \textit{codex optimus} because of Sannazarò’s mode of philology.

With this in mind, the subject of Rutilius’ name might be revisited. The historical treatment of Sannazarò’s text as the \textit{codex optimus} produced the version of Rutilius’ name which is now in current usage. Consideration of the modes of philology in effect in the other witnesses, and their general textual ineffectiveness even in modern terms, tempts modern editors, whether consciously or not, to trust and approve Sannazarò’s variant despite the demands of stemmatic analysis and criticism, not because his text \textit{per se} is “best,” but because his scholarly and literary mode of philology coincides most closely with the modern and because he sought similar returns in the production of his text.
The philological returns sought by Pio’s eager but uncritical printed edition and Crucianus’ eager but almost illiterate manuscript were obviously different. Each took pride in his work, one as an offering to a powerful patron, the other as a private pleasure. A clue as to Pio’s reasoning for offering this particular poem as a gift, perhaps also the reason that Crucianus was so proud of his text, can be seen in the frontispiece to B:

CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS POETA PRISCUS DE LAUDIBUS URBIS, ETRURIAE, ET ITALIAE

CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS, AN ANCIENT POET, ON PRAISE FOR ROME, ETRURIA, AND ITALY

Rutilius’ poem, although technically a travel poem, does indeed present laudes Urbis, Etruriae et Italiae. This inspires one final consideration. Philology is not evident only in the processes of textual reception and transmission, it is evident also in the process of literary creation. Rutilius himself took part in a philological process, not just by writing the poem, but by writing a poem which made use of the precedents provided by literary tradition in the expression of his own agenda. He was, in other words, a philologist-author.

In the aftermath of the Visigothic sack of Rome and destruction of the Italian and Gallic countryside, Rutilius directed his literary efforts toward depicting Roman tradition surviving and thriving, even amidst the ruins. Even before the journey begins, before he leaves Rome itself, Rutilius delivers, in an elegant and learned rhetorical style, a 164-line encomium of Rome. He begins with regrets that he must travel along the Italian coast by sea because the roads north are no longer safe. Then he reflects on Rome’s greatness and its cosmopolitan nature, which leads him to exhort Rome to rise up again, to become stronger by her defeat, just as she had done several times in the days of the Republic: (Rutilius Namatianus 1.139–46)

36. Text and translation are my own.
submittant trepidi perfida colla Getae.
ditia pacatae dent vectigalia terrae;
impleant augustos barbara praeda sinus.
aeternum tibi Rhenus aret, tibi Nilus inundet,
altricemque suam fertilis orbis alat.

The very thing which dissolves other nations renews you;
your ability to grow by misfortune is your usual manner of rebirth.
Come then, let the impious race finally fall as a sacrifice;
let the panic-stricken Goths stretch forth their treacherous necks.
Let the pacified lands give tributary riches;
let barbarian loot fill your august lap.
Let the Rhine plow for you forever, let the Nile overflow for you,
and let the fruitful world nourish its nurse.

This travel poem is actually less about travel than it is about the continuance of “Romanness,” *Romanitas,* in the face of recent disaster. Rather than focus on the journey itself, Rutilius has structured his poem around a series of Roman vignettes which take place at the many purposeful pauses in his journey. Perhaps most notable is his stopover in Triturrita at the end of Book One, where he takes part in a boar hunt which might have been lifted from the pages of Virgil.\(^{37}\) In fact, Virgil was clearly at the front of Rutilius’ mind, for in his efforts to present an image of Roman rebirth, the poetry of the Augustan age of rebirth provided excellent literary precedents. Rutilius’ poem self-consciously displays thorough familiarity with his classical predecessors. At this relatively late date in Latin literature, Rutilius writes in a refined and elegant style which is modeled largely on that of the early empire, itself much influenced by Hellenistic conventions.\(^{38}\) While some echoes of other late authors such as Ausonius can be detected in Rutilius, the presence of golden age poets Virgil and Ovid is so pronounced as to require little detection at all. Garth Tissol has outlined Rutilius’ use of melancholy travel imagery inspired by and alluding to Ovid’s exilic poetry—making use of literary (that is philological) precedents to express his own message.\(^{39}\) Rutilius’ use of Virgil is also extremely evident. For example, consider now the content of a passage which was quoted above for purely textual reasons: (Rutilius Namatianus 1.349–60)

---

\(^{37}\) See Capponi 1986 for the literary allusiveness of this hunting vignette.
\(^{38}\) Cf. Bertotti 1969; Lana 1961; and especially Merone 1959.
\(^{39}\) Tissol 2002.
Daylight arrived. Driving on with oars, we seem to stand still, but the land left behind demonstrates the ship’s motion. We pass by Ilva, famed for the quality of its iron. This is in fact an elaboration of a passage of Virgil. In Book Ten of the Aeneid, Aeneas’ supporters gather to fight for his cause: (Virgil, Aeneid 10.172–74)

Rutilius describes his journey past the island of Elbe (Ilva), which is famed for the quality of its iron. This is just one of the...

sescentos illi dederat Populonia mater
expertos belli iuvenes, at Ilva trecentos
insula, inexhaustis Chalybum generosa metallis.

To him Populonia had given six hundred of
of her sons, skilled in war, but Ilva three hundred,
an island rich with the inexhaustible mines of the Chalybes.

Ilva, “rich with the inexhaustible mines of the Chalybes,” is just one of the
supporting city-states listed in this catalogue of Aeneas’ troops. Here Rutilius philologizes Virgil, and in doing so maintains the very same philological impetus which Virgil had begun four centuries earlier, for Virgil himself was of course alluding to (and so philologizing) Homer’s famous catalogue of ships. This is no mere passing allusion (in either Rutilius or Virgil), but a small part of a much more portentous series of allusions. For, in Virgil’s passage, 10.166–84, Aeneas’ supporters come not just from Elbe, but from Cosa, Populonia, Pisa, Caere, Minio, Pyrgi, and Graviscae as well. And Rutilius, in his poem, is careful to elaborate upon every one of these places as he passes or visits them.⁴⁰ The Roman places of Italy which were original supporters of the first Roman, the ancestor of the Roman race, are thus held up by Rutilius as continuing the Roman tradition. Rutilius not only knows his Virgil but uses him to his own philological end. Rutilius’ laudes Italiae are themselves founded upon the unified vision of Roman nationalism so central to the worldview of his Augustan exemplars. Because Rutilius’ poem foregrounds an agenda of Italian rebirth, it was naturally attractive to the Italian humanists, who also lived in a time of Italian national pride and renaissance. A quick glance at any bibliography on Rutilius will reveal the continuance of this philological trend: the study of Rutilius continues to be dominated by Italian scholars.

In the production of any modern edition, the editor finds himself contending with the accumulated effects of multiple variant forms of philology, let alone with variant forms of text. Starting with the original author, philology is constantly but not consistently applied to the production, reception and transmission of the text. Thus, in addition to being at the mercy of the chance survival of texts, modern philologists are essentially at the mercy of historical modes of their own discipline. In part then, any fully aware modern philologist must proceed from the understanding that he or she is taking part in this same process, engaging with and manipulating the returns of philology itself.

⁴⁰. For this, see Maaz 1988.